HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME ONE

B. HERDER

+

To Sister Mary Catherine of the Holy Eucharist

in loving memory of

Mother and Dad!

From your loving sister

Catherine

Sept. 26, 1957

Anniversary

Mother Nov. 20, 1929

Dad Dec 5, 1956

Please pray for them.

MONASTERY OF ST. DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH 10th STREET
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY — 07103

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME ONE

PERIOD OF EARLY EXPANSION

B. HERDER BOOK CO.,
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.
1946

MONASTERY OF SAINT DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH 10th STREET
NEWARK 3, NEW JERSEY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT
Sti. Ludovici, die 15. Nov., 1931,
Joannes Rothensteiner,
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR
Sti. Ludovici, die 17. Nov., 1931,
✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1931
BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Third Impression

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

A comprehensive history of the Church for English readers has long been needed. Such a work should contain a wealth of detailed information that cannot be embraced within the compass of a two or three volume abridgment; it should indicate, by more than passing mention, the causes, development, and consequences of the notable movements that have affected the Church; it should be written by an eminent scholar whose talent combines tireless patience in research, sound historical judgment, facility in clear exposition, unswerving loyalty to ascertained truth, and a zeal for God's honor; and it should be provided with an adequate index. As we read in Chapter II of the Second Book of Machabees, "to collect all that is to be known, to put the discourse in order, and curiously to discuss every particular point, is the duty of the author of a history. . . . We have taken care for those indeed that are willing to read, that it might be a pleasure of mind, and that all that read might receive profit." Persuaded that Mourret's *History of the Catholic Church* meets these requirements, we have undertaken the translation of it, that students of history in English-speaking countries may have ready access to the treasures of information which it contains.

THE TRANSLATOR

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

"The history of the Church may rightly be called the history of truth." [1] Bossuet develops this thought, saying: "Truth is a queen dwelling in herself and in her own light. . . . Yet, for man's good, she is willing to reign, and Christ came into the world to found that empire. . . . Amid the passions of a world sworn to her defeat, she has not begged for human aid. She herself has formed for her defense fearless champions who are worthy of her greatness. . . . This is what I mean when I call the history of the Church a history of the reign of truth. The world has threatened, but the truth has stood firm; the world has used clever deceits and flattery, but the truth has remained uncorrupted. Heretics have stirred up mischief and confusion, but the truth has remained pure. Schisms have torn the body of the Church, but the truth has remained whole." [2]

The truth here spoken of by Pascal and Bossuet is simply religious truth. But that is precisely the kind of truth which enlightens us about our origin, our destiny, and our duties; this is "the whole man."

In one sense, the history of this truth goes back to the very earliest times of the world, for God, the sole revealer of our origin and destiny, spoke by His prophets before speaking to us by His Son Jesus Christ,[3] and it is permissible to say that the Church is composed of all those who have lived by these

[1] Pascal, *Thoughts.*

[2] Bossuet, *Sermon sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ.*

[3] Heb. 1:1. "What greater authority can there be than that of the Catholic Church, which centers in itself all the authority of past ages, and the ancient traditions of mankind up to their first origin?" Bossuet, *The Continuity of Religion* (*i.e., Discourse on Universal History,* Part II), tr. by Victor Day, p. 227.

revelations, even all those who, "invincibly ignorant of revealed dogmas but following the precepts of the natural law and disposed to obey God in all things, have, by virtue of divine light and grace, been able to acquire life eternal." [4] If by the Church we mean all those who are called, who believe in the true God, the Church has always existed." [5] From this point of view we may regard the Church "as appearing in three successive phases. The first, universal in principle, but made to last only until Christ, is the Patriarchal Church, composed of those who preserved the tradition of religious truth without any organization except that of the family, without any aid except remnants of more or less altered revelations and graces more or less consciously received. The second, essentially local, is the Mosaic Church, at once a spiritual and a temporal society, including merely the Jewish people and given a special organization for effectively conserving the truth until Christ. The third, universal and perpetual, is the Christian Church properly so called, the Catholic Church, a spiritual society organized to embrace all races and all ages, and continually aided in the infallible accomplishment of her mission." [6]

Notwithstanding the notable progress recently made in the history of religions, it will always remain difficult to carry out the vast plan of religious history contemplated by Frederick Ozanam. His plan was to sift from the traditions of each people "an element immutable, universal, primitive," [7] which is truth. Christians know that "among races and nations outside Christianity, there still exist remains of primitive truths, mixed with numerous errors. They know that these peoples have a soul as have Christian peoples, religious desires and

[4] Pius IX, Encyclical *"Quanto conficiamur"* (August 10, 1863), in Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* no. 1677.

[5] Hurter, *Theologiae dogmaticae Compendium,* 7th ed., I, 209.

[6] Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Église,* I, 3.

[7] Ozanam, *Letters,* p. 19.

longings formed according to the same plan, made for the same end. Christians are, therefore, not surprised at seeing those desires and aspirations express themselves by similar institutions and rites. What the Christian seeks and really finds in Christian doctrine, ceremonies, and Sacraments, these others also seek but do not find, and they try, by certain essays and efforts, to make up for the great mercy which they have not received in fulness." [8] By the very fact that religious truth is broken up, scattered, and mixed with numberless corruptions, its history presents difficulties that are practically insurmountable.

The same is not true of the history of the Church, understood in the stricter and more usual sense of the words, that is, the history of the spread and development of the visible society founded by Jesus Christ. This history may be divided into three periods, marked out by the three epochs which the Church has sought to penetrate with her spirit: the Greco-Roman period, the Middle Ages, and modern times.

"The Greco-Roman period extends from the time of Christ to the fall of the Roman Empire. During that epoch the Church grew in the midst of conflicts she was obliged to wage against violence and heresy. The Empire gave way, like a mold that has proved too small, and the barbarians poured in and seized upon the fragments.

"The Middle Ages extend from the fall of the Roman Empire to the Protestant Revolt. During that period the Church labored to train and then to unite these new races. But her work met with opposition from human passions, and the Church herself was weakened by contact with them. European unification was not accomplished and had to be supplemented by the system of European equilibrium.

"Modern times extend from the Protestant Revolt to our

[8] Grandmaison, Preface to *Christus, manuel d'histoire des religions,* p. 43. This book and a larger work, *Où en est l'histoire des religions,* supply the elements for a universal history of religion.

own day. During this period the opposition bursts forth and repels the influence of the Church in things temporal and, in some countries, even attacks it in things spiritual, going back from the Church to the Gospel, from the Gospel to God. Useful outward progress is made, but men's souls have become superficial and restless. The Church acquires new vigor, draws her lines closer, and waits." [9]

The Fathers of the Vatican Council, considering these varied phases of the life of the Church, regarded it as "an invincible testimony of our faith." [10]

This testimony of the Church is to be found in her triumphs, in her benefactions to mankind, in her wonderful adaptation to different periods of history, in her immortal continuance. So obvious are the facts that no honest man denies that the Church in past ages has triumphed over obstacles of force, deceit, and intellectual pride by the use of means that would have destroyed any other society, and that she has disciplined and ennobled the individual, the family, and mankind. What arouses our admiration, what is unparalleled and altogether divine, is that this Church, which has continued to endure, has ever been attacked. A thousand times she appeared as though on the verge of being completely destroyed; and each time God raised her up by some extraordinary act of His power." [11]

H. A. Taine, in a celebrated passage, says that an impartial study of history reveals that Christianity has "the great pair of wings indispensable for lifting man above himself, above his grovelling life and his limited horizon," and that "every time these wings droop or suffer injury, public and private morals become debased, cruelty and sensuality stalk abroad, and society becomes a den of thieves and a brothel." [12]

Less obvious at first glance is another trait of the Church's

[9] Brugère, *loc. cit.*
[10] Vatican Council, Session 3, chap. 3 (Denzinger, no. 1794).
[11] Pascal, *Thoughts.*
[12] Taine, *Les Origines de la France contemporaine,* 22d ed., XI, 146.

life. It has recently been pointed out by the renowned Protestant Professor Adolph von Harnack, who says: "In its organization this Church possesses a faculty of adapting itself to the course of history, while it always remains the same old Church." [13]

A rapid glance will show the justice of this remark. In the three epochs through which the Church has thus far passed, her outward organization, following the laws of living organisms, has experienced the three successive phases of formation, full maturity, and decline; but her doctrine, her moral teaching, and her hierarchy always emerged with their characteristics unchanged and with a renewed vitality.

From the first century to the sixth, with the Greco-Roman world before her, the Catholic Church first unfolded her activities in the great capitals (Athens, Alexandria, Rome) and in the Roman provinces of Gaul, Africa, and Britain. This was the work of her missioners. At the same time her apologists and doctors translated her dogmas into the philosophical language of the Greeks, set forth her moral teaching and organized her discipline with the aid of the legal terminology of Rome. The fourth century marks the height of this work. The liberty of the Church was proclaimed by the Edict of Milan in 313; the Catholic creed was settled at the Council of Nicaea in 325; Christian thought was expressed in the writings of the Church Fathers: St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome. The next two centuries saw the break-up of the Roman Empire under the blows of the barbarians and the influence of its own corruption. This was a period of decline. St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory the Great bear anxious testimony to this decadence; but they also labored to prepare the future.

That future was in the hands of the barbarians. From the

[13] Harnack, *What is Christianity?*, p. 257.

fifth to the sixteenth century a new society was formed, grew, and fell. The outward organization of the Church followed these different phases. After growing strong at Rome, its center, with Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, Christianity radiated to the various nations through its bishops and monks. St. Remigius converted the Franks, St. Augustine of Canterbury evangelized Britain, and St. Boniface carried the Gospel to Germany. The Church crowned her work by grouping the converted nations into a vast unit; this was the Holy Roman Empire, inaugurated by Charlemagne and Leo III, and continued under the auspices of Gregory VII and Innocent III by the rulers of Germany. The religious, social, and political organization of the thirteenth century marked the apogee of that age. It was the epoch of the Crusades, of chivalry, of Roman and Gothic art, of the great universities, of the great religious Orders, St. Dominic, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Louis. These names tell the whole story. But through the influence of many causes—the Greek Schism, the Great Schism of the West, the Renaissance, and, it must be acknowledged, numerous internal abuses—medieval society—Christianity as it was called—was dismembered. As at the time of the fall of the Roman Empire, the Church, through her popes and doctors, labored to safeguard the welfare of the world that was crumbling and also to instil her spirit into the new age that was to follow.

This is the modern period. The formation of the various European nations from the wreckage of the Holy Empire, the expansion of commerce by the discovery of America, the more rapid diffusion of thought by the invention of printing, the penetration of the ancient spirit into European arts and letters by the coming of Greek scholars who were expelled from Constantinople—these were the elements that formed the modern world. It began with a formidable heresy, Protestantism,

which wrenched from the Catholic Church a large part of Germany, separated England, and agitated France.

The Church's first care is to combat error. By the founding of new religious Orders, the most illustrious of which is the Society of Jesus, by the Council of Trent, by a new expansion of foreign missions, by the reform of her clergy under the influence of St. Charles Borromeo, by the new congregations of the Oratory, the Mission (Vincentians), and St. Sulpice, by the spread of the doctrines of the spiritual life through the influence of St. Francis de Sales, the Church strove both to combat heresy and to Christianize the modern world. There was a moment in France, under the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV, with St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul, Bossuet and Fénelon, Petau and Thomassin, when it seemed that the acme of modern times had come. But certain errors springing more or less consciously from Protestantism—Jansenism, Gallicanism, Quietism, Rationalism—soon paralyzed the Christian advance and paved the way for the disaster of the Revolution. Amid these unparalleled catastrophes, the Church of France was successively stripped of her ancient privileges, her rights, and her temporal possessions, persecuted in her ministers and her worship, officially replaced by a so-called national religion, and the whole world was disturbed by this terrible shock.

Did the nineteenth and twentieth centuries inaugurate a new age, or did they merely continue the decadence of the previous epoch? We are too near the events to pass judgment. As Joseph de Maistre was wont to say, "The eye does not see what touches it." But we may confidently expect new triumphs for the Church. Not to speak of the promises of the Christian faith, it seems that the study of the past must inspire the historian with confident hopes.

All the forms of society which the Church, ever since her

birth, has met along her path, all the powers that have fought against her, have, like every earthly organism, had their origin, their rise, and their decline. The Catholic Church alone, to quote Harnack again, "possesses a faculty of adapting itself to the course of history, while it always remains the same old Church."

This same "course of history" shows us the Catholic Church maintaining that in herself alone is to be found the whole of Christianity, nay, the whole of religion. There are two Christian groups that strive against her for predominance —Protestantism and the Greek Schism. The former is on the way to doctrinal dissolution; the latter appears to be held motionless in an inertia that forebodes death. As for those religions (Buddhism and Islam) whose influence and numbers can be compared with those of Christianity, the first touch of historical and philosophical criticism seems to destroy their apologetic basis and essential dogmas. The "natural religion" preached by the eighteenth century philosophers, has had its day; the positive study of the history of religions has demolished its foundation. Catholicism seems, therefore, even to those who consider it only from the viewpoint of history, to stand alone in the face of an absolute agnosticism which leads to anarchy. Which of the two will win out? "Those who will come after us will know whether the strife now preparing is really more serious than the conflicts which have gone before, whether it will end in a more glorious victory for Christianity or be the beginning of the fulfilment of the prophecies regarding the end of the world. But this uncertainty cannot disturb the confidence of the Christian believer. Whatever are to be the vicissitudes of the future, the Church's past gives sufficient proof of her divine origin. Even if we prescind from the initial force, *i. e.*, the person of her Founder, and regard Church history as beginning with the Apostles, we are forced to conclude

that they established a more than human institution, that God was really with them, and that He is still with their work," [14] sustaining it with His mighty hand and guiding it to a glorious destiny.

[14] Duchesne, *Les Origines chrétiennes,* 2d ed., p. 467.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE APOSTOLIC PERIOD

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 3

CHAPTER

I. CHRIST AND THE CHURCH 5
The Founding of the Church 5
The First Pentecost 9

II. THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE JEWS 14
Jerusalem 14
The Miracle at the Beautiful Gate 16
The First Christians 20
The Organization of the Church 24
Doctrine 25
The Liturgy 27
The Church and the Civil Government 33
St. Stephen the Deacon 36
Simon Magus 39
The Eunuch of Queen Candace 44
Saul of Tarsus 46
Herod Agrippa, King of Judea 49
Ananias and Saphira 53
Baptism of Cornelius the Centurion 55

III. FIRST CONTACTS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH WITH THE GRECO-ROMAN WORLD 61
The Church at Antioch 61
Barnabas 62
St. Paul 63
Paul and Barnabas 65
Peter and Paul at Antioch 69
The Epistle to the Galatians 71

CHAPTER PAGE

The Council of Jerusalem 74
Internal Development of the Church 79
Liturgy and Ritual 86
Christian Morality 91
Dogma 94
St. James the Less 96

IV. The Early Church and the Greco-Roman World . . 99
Paganism 99
St. Peter at Rome 101
St. Paul in Europe 107
Epistle to the Romans 111
St. Paul at Rome 114
St. Peter Again at Rome 117
The Burning of Rome 119
The Neronian Persecution 120
The Destruction of Jerusalem 123
Christianity at Rome 125
The Synoptic Gospels 128

V. The Early Church and the Eastern World 132
St. John 133
Christianity in Palestine 135
Christianity at Rome 136
Popes Linus, Cletus, and Clement I 138
Alexandria 141
Disciples of St. John 145
The Persecution under Domitian 148
The Apocalypse 151
St. Clement of Rome 156
Cerinthus 161
The Gospel of St. John 163

VI. The Church and the Barbarians 169
Evangelization by the Apostles 169
Beginnings of the Church in Spain 173
Apostolic Origin of Christianity in France 178
The First Christian Communities in Gaul 182
The First Apostles of Provence 185

PART II

THE CONFLICT

CHAPTER PAGE

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 193

I. FROM TRAJAN TO HADRIAN 196
The Emperor Trajan 196
St. Ignatius of Antioch 202
Pope St. Evaristus 207
Pope St. Alexander 209
Pope Sixtus I 210
The Emperor Hadrian 211
Aquila 216
The Ebionites 218
Gnosticism 219
Pope St. Telesphorus 224

II. ANTONINUS PIUS TO SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS 226
Persecutions 226
St. Polycarp 229
Antoninus Pius 231
Marcus Aurelius 231
St. Felicitas 233
St. Justin Martyr 234
St. Cecilia 237
The Martyrs of Lyons 238
The Emperor Commodus 244
The Martyrs of Scillium 244
The Early Apologists 246
The Question of Penance 250
The *Shepherd* of Hermas 252
Apologetic Writings of St. Justin 255
St. Irenaeus 263
Tertullian 271
Minutius Felix 276
The Letter to Diognetus 277

III. CHRISTIAN LIFE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRD CENTURY 279
The Hierarchy 279
Baptism 281

CHAPTER PAGE

The Sacrament of Penance 285
The Liturgy 287
The Easter Controversy 291
Church Property 294
The Poor 298
Influence of the Church upon the Old Régime 301
The Church and the Intellectual Movement 302
The Spread of Christianity 304
Montanism 306

IV. From the Persecution of Septimius Severus to That of Decius 310
First Years of the Reign of Septimius Severus 311
The Empress Julia Domna 313
St. Perpetua 316
St. Potamiana 320
Martyrs of Asia and Gaul 320
Successors of Septimius Severus 321
Pope St. Zephyrinus 322
Pope St. Callistus 322
Popes St. Urban I and St. Pontianus 324
Montanism in Africa 324
Tertullian and Montanism 326
Papal Condemnation of Montanism 330
Clement of Alexandria 331
Origen 337
Theology of "The Principles" 341
Origen's "Contra Celsum" 345
Origen's Zeal 348
St. Hippolytus 349
The Question of Penance 356
The Persecution under Maximinus 358
Philip the Arabian 362
Pope St. Fabian 365
Church Property 365
The Spread of Christianity 369
St. Gregory Thaumaturgus 371
Origenists 373
St. Cyprian 375

CHAPTER PAGE

V. From the Persecution of Decius to the Beginning of Diocletian's Reign 377
Decius 378
Decius' Edict of Persecution 379
Pope St. Fabian 382
St. Agatha 383
St. Pionius 383
St. Babylas 385
St. Acacius 386
The Persecution in Africa 388
St. Cyprian 390
The Schism of Felicissimus 393
The Schism of Novatian 395
St. Dionysius of Alexandria 397
St. Cyprian's Treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiae* 398
The Question of Rebaptism 399
Pope St. Stephen 402
St. Firmilian 406
The Plague 408
The Emperor Valerian 409
Valerian's Edicts of Persecution 413
Pope St. Sixtus II 416
Martyrdom of St. Cyprian 419
Martyrdom of St. Fructuosus 421
The Emperor Gallienus 422
Pope Dionysius 424
Popes Felix, Eutychian, and Caius 425
Organization of the Church 425
The Ascetic Life 434
Paul of Samosata 436
Judaism 439
Paganism 440
Manichaeism 441
Mithraism 443

VI. From Diocletian to Constantine 446
Beginning of Diocletian's Reign 446
Origin of the Persecution 451
St. Marcellus 454
First Edict of Persecution 456

CHAPTER PAGE

Persecution in the Provinces 459
Persecution in Rome 460
Later Edicts of Persecution 462
Abdication of Diocletian 465
St. Agnes 466
Pope St. Marcellus 467
The Edict of Peace 470
The Persecution under Maximinus 471
Attempts to Revive Paganism 473
Christian Apologists 475
Meletius of Lycopolis 478
The Plague 479

PART III

THE PEACE INAUGURATED BY CONSTANTINE

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 483

I. THE EDICT OF MILAN 484
The Apparition of the "Labarum" 487
Constantine's Victory 489
The Edict of Milan 491

II. DONATISM 499
The Beginning of the Schism 499
Bishop Hosius of Cordova 504
St. Miltiades 506
The Council of Rome 506
The Donatists' Appeal to the Emperor 508
The Council of Arles 510
Decisions of the Council of Arles 515
Pope St. Sylvester I 518
The Council of Ancyra 519
The Martyrdom of St. Salsa 522
The Forty Martyrs of Sebaste 523

III. RELIGIOUS UNITY 526
Constantine's Policy 526
Basilicas 528
The Lateran Basilica 529

CHAPTER PAGE

The Catacombs 530
Christian Architecture 532
The Liturgy 535
The Ceremonies of the Mass 536
The Roman Religion in the Time of Constantine . . . 540
Legal Reforms 542
St. Helena 545
The Fathers of the Desert 547
St. Hilarion 549
St. Pachomius 551

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. THE PRIMITIVE CANON OF THE MASS . . 557

APPENDIX II. LETTER FROM THE CHURCHES OF LYONS AND VIENNE TO THE CHURCHES OF ASIA AND PHRYGIA 560

APPENDIX III. LIST OF THE MARTYRS OF LYONS . . . 572

APPENDIX IV. THE DIDACHE, OR TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES 573

APPENDIX V. THE EDICT OF MILAN 583

BIBLIOGRAPHY 585

INDEX 603

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

VOLUME I

I. THE APOSTOLIC PERIOD

II. THE CONFLICT

III. THE PEACE INAUGURATED BY CONSTANTINE

Introductory Remarks

At the time of the Savior's death eleven men of lowly station, timidly seeking refuge in an upper room in Jerusalem, formed almost the entire Church. Less than a century later, Christianity was firmly established not only in Jerusalem, but in Antioch, Rome, Athens, and Alexandria, in the chief cities of the East and West, and even among a large number of barbarous nations. To relate the advance of this marvelous expansion of the Church in the ancient world, is the main purpose of this part of the present volume.

What we speak of as the ancient world, in the time of Christ and His Apostles really comprised three different worlds. The Jewish world, with Jerusalem as its center, was intermingled with the other nations by its commercial relations, and obstinately separated from them by its beliefs. The western pagan world, with Rome and Athens as its capitals, was unified by the Greco-Roman civilization: in Rome politics and government were enthroned; in Athens art was brilliantly cultivated. The eastern pagan world, with its metaphysical speculations and religious fancies, gathered about Alexandria. Outside these centers of thought and life, Antioch, an immense city on the Syrian coast, was a meeting-place of all the ancient civilizations. Into these cities the gospel of the Carpenter of Galilee, preached by twelve unlettered men, entered, supplanted the ancient religions, and created a new world. After the conquest of these centers, when the bright light from Palestine had illumined their intellectual heights,[1] Christianity passed the frontiers of the civilized world and entered

[1] We owe this metaphor to Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History,* II, iii, 1), who says: "The saving word began to flood the whole world with light like the rays of the sun."

those barbarous countries which Rome scarcely knew and which scarcely knew the Roman world, and soon the conquest of the ancient world by the religion of Jesus Christ was definitely accomplished.

Before we narrate this astonishing spread of the gospel, it will be useful briefly to recall the story of the foundation of the Church.

CHAPTER I

Jesus Christ and the Church

The Founding of the Church

"In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and Philip his brother tetrarch of Iturea and the country of Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilina; under the high priests Annas and Caiphas; the word of the Lord was made unto John, the son of Zachary, in the desert. And he came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of penance for the remission of sins. . . . Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that Jesus also being baptized and praying, heaven was opened; and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape as a dove upon Him; and a voice came from heaven: 'Thou art My beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased.' "

IN these words the Evangelist St. Luke relates the first public manifestation of Him whom His disciples soon afterward acclaimed as "their Lord and their God," and the Church acknowledged as its Head.

Jesus had been born of the Virgin Mary about thirty years before,[1] in a stable at Bethlehem, a town in the kingdom of

[1] Probably in 749 A. U. C. We know that Herod died in 750; and the Gospel insinuates that Jesus was born a short time before. Dionysius Exiguus fixed upon the year 754 A. U. C. as the beginning of our era, but it was found that he was mistaken in his calculations. (Cf. Fouard, *The Christ, the Son of God,* I, 42 ff.) The same chronology is established by astronomical computations undertaken to determine the year of Christ's death. The work of De la Porte and Pio Emmanuelli, astronomer at the Vatican Observatory, seems to prove that the Savior's death occurred on Friday, the 7th of April, 783 A. U. C., the year 30 of our era. In that year the 14th Nisan began at about 6 o'clock on the evening of April 6. The 7th of April, 783 A. U. C., was a Friday. This coincidence did not occur in any other year between 28 and 34 of our era. (Cf. *Cosmos,* 1913, pp. 520, 565. A bibliography of this question will be found in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* April 15, 1913.)

Juda, as the ancient prophets had foretold. Thus far His life had been hidden from the eyes of the world; but the hour was now at hand for Him to manifest Himself.

His public ministry began on the day of His baptism. Then for three years He went about Galilee and Judea doing good. "He declares high mysteries, but confirms them by great miracles; He enjoins great virtues, but gives, at the same time, great lights, great examples, and great graces." [2]

The doctrine that He preached was very old and yet very new. "Every scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven is like to a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old." [3] He gathered, as in a sheaf, the religious truths and divine precepts that had been spread in the world, from the beginning, by the patriarchal and the Mosaic religion, and He supplemented them by a revelation of deeper mysteries and the preaching of more perfect virtues.

Belief in one God, the expectation of a liberator (Messias) and the hope of a restoration of Israel, were the chief foundations of the Jewish faith. Christ taught them that the God they adored was Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,[4] that the Messias they expected was truly the Son of God,[5] and that the restoration for which they hoped was nothing but the redemption of the world.[6]

Until then the Jews had been aroused to obedience to God by the hope of earthly rewards. "Jesus Christ sets forth to them a future life, and keeping them suspended in that expectation, He teaches them to disengage themselves from all things of sense. . . . Not satisfied with telling us that a life eternally happy was reserved for the children of God, the

[2] Bossuet, *The Continuity of Religion*, p. 97.
[3] Matt. 13:52.
[4] Matt. 28:19.
[5] John 8:58.
[6] Matt. 26:28.

Messias has also told us wherein it consists. And this is life eternal, to be with Him where He is in the glory of God the Father; life eternal is to behold the glory He has in the bosom of the Father; life eternal, in a word, is to know the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent." [7]

"With such new rewards, Jesus Christ must propose also ideas of virtue, practices more perfect and more refined. He proposes to us the love of God even to the hating of ourselves. He proposes to us the love of our neighbor so as to extend that kind disposition towards all men. He proposes to us humility, even to the extent of loving shame for the glory of God." [8]

Thus in the realm of morals as in that of doctrine, the old ideal is immeasurably surpassed. Is this the whole message of Christ? By no means. Those who listened to the Master soon understood that He had the future especially in mind. The second year of His ministry, His calling of the twelve Apostles and the choosing of a certain number of disciples laid the foundations of a society with Himself as the center and inspirer. At the head of the Twelve He placed Simon, the son of Jona, whom He named Peter. Peter's primacy is "so manifest a prerogative that the Evangelists, who in the catalogue they make of the Apostles observe no certain order, unanimously agree in naming St. Peter before all the rest as the first." [9]

Then, confronted by the misunderstanding of the populace and the ill-will of the Pharisees, the Master, in conformity with the custom of popular teaching in the East, altered the ordinary form of His discourses. Instead of direct exhortation and instruction, He now habitually made use of little figurative stories and popular parables or fables, to make His

[7] John 17:3. Bossuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 99, 110.
[8] Bossuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 110 f.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

thought understood or surmised. Yet the subject of a large number of these parables is a mysterious kingdom, sometimes called the kingdom of God, at other times the kingdom of the heavens. This kingdom is compared to a field where cockle, sowed by the devil, chokes the grain,[10] or to a mustard seed that becomes a great tree,[11] or to leaven which a woman kneads in a mass of dough until all the latter is leavened,[12] or to a net which is cast into the sea and filled with all kinds of fishes.[13]

To the eyes of the disciples, the picture of this kingdom was still somewhat dim. It appeared to them in turn as something afar off and very near, as beyond this visible world and as transformed in this world. The fact is that, in the Master's thought, it is near, inasmuch as it is given in this life, but far off, inasmuch as it is consummated and perfected in the next life. In any event, it clearly appears that this future kingdom was to take the form of a society organized about Christ the King. The mother of the sons of Zebedee, understanding it in an earthly manner, asked that her sons be given places of honor in the future kingdom.

Most of the uncertainties disappeared during the forty days of intercourse which the risen Christ granted His disciples. Henceforth it is evident that the word "kingdom," so often used by the Master in the course of His earthly life, while sometimes meaning the reign of God by grace, and more often the supreme revelation of the last days, ordinarily refers to an earthly and militant society or church, with the mission of realizing in every man the individual reign of God and thereby preparing for the coming of a triumphant Church in Heaven.

Further, this Church, organized and living, is there before

[10] Matt. 13: 24–30.
[11] Matt. 13: 31 f.
[12] Matt. 13: 33.
[13] Matt. 13: 47–49.

the eyes of all. It is a perfect society, having received from the Master its special purpose, the salvation of the world; its essential doctrine, the gospel teaching; its sacred liturgy, centering in the Eucharist; its divine hierarchy, with degrees marked by the Sacraments of Baptism and Orders; its supreme head, designated by the Savior's special choice. Jesus said: "Simon, Bar-Jona . . . Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church. . . . And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven.[14]. . . Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." [15]

Jesus ascended into Heaven. No essential element seemed lacking in the divinely organized society which He left upon earth. Yet the attitude of His disciples was still timid. Abandoned to their own weakness, trembling before the Jewish police, they did nothing but pray together and piously keep in their hearts, along with the memory of the Master's conversations, the recollection of the great miracle of the Resurrection, performed to sustain their faith. They awaited the coming of the promised Comforter, because, when Jesus was leaving, He said to them: "If I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you." [16]

[14] Matt. 16: 17–19.

[15] Luke 22: 31 f. "The mighty words which so clearly establish Peter's primacy, also established the episcopacy. He who said to St. Peter: 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth . . .' said the same thing to all the Apostles. . . . But the latter promise does not annul the former. Christ's promises, as also His gifts, are not taken back. . . . The power given to several contains a restriction in its partition, whereas the power given to a single one and over all and without exception, conveys plenitude. It was the teaching of a holy bishop of Gaul that the authority in the Church was first established in the person of a single man and was extended to others only on condition of being always referred to the principle of its unity." Bossuet, *Sermon sur l'unité de l'Eglise,* in *Œuvres* (Lachat ed.), XI, 599 ff.

[16] John 16: 7.

The First Pentecost

Such was the Apostles' attitude until the day of Pentecost. On that day "they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them parted tongues as it were of fire, and it sat upon every one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with divers tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak. Now there were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. And when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together and were confounded in mind, because that every man heard them speak in his own tongue. And they were all amazed and wondered, saying: 'Behold, are not all these that speak, Galileans? And how have we heard, every man our own tongue wherein we were born? Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea, and Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews also, and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians; we have heard them speak in our own tongues the wonderful works of God.' " [17]

This long enumeration should not surprise us. The historian Josephus says that there was no nation in the world where the Jews had not established a foothold.[18] Philo declares that in his time they were to be found in every important city of the Empire and even in the islands of Europe and Asia. Scattered by their conquerors, or drawn to com-

[17] Acts 2: 1–11.

[18] Josephus, *Jewish War,* II, xvi, 4. About 140 B. C., a Jewish poet wrote this line about his own race:

Πᾶσα δε γαῖα σέθεν πλήρης καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.

"The earth and the sea are all full of thee." (*Sibylline Oracles,* III, 271. Cf. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 1–6; Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs,* pp. 273–284.)

mercial cities by their mercantile spirit, the children of Israel had penetrated almost everywhere. This dispersion seems to have been providential; in the midst of idolatrous peoples, the Jews had sturdily maintained the two essential doctrines of their religion: belief in one God and hope for a Messias. Thereby Judaism was preparing the world to receive the teaching of Christ.

Although the Jews were scattered in the world, they loved to come home to strengthen their faith at the traditional feasts of their nation. It is not surprising, therefore, that the feast of Pentecost, at the end of the harvest time, drew a large number of them to Jerusalem.

These men of foreign speech were astounded at the miracle of Pentecost. The believers among them humbly glorified the God of their fathers. Others, in a spirit of skepticism or raillery, exclaimed: "These men are full of new wine."

But the chief of the Twelve arose—Simon Peter, to whom Jesus had shortly before entrusted the care of feeding the lambs and the sheep. "Ye men of Judea," he said, "and all you that dwell in Jerusalem, be this known to you, and with your ears receive my words. For these are not drunk, as you suppose. . . . But this is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel. . . . 'I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.' " [19] "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him, in the midst of you, as you also know: this same being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, you by the hands of wicked men have crucified and slain. Whom God hath raised up having loosed the sorrows of hell, as it was impossible that He should be holden by it." [20]

[19] Acts 2: 14–17.
[20] Acts 2: 22–24.

Thus, at the very moment when the most genuine inspiration of the Divine Spirit enlightens his soul, the Apostle Peter, representative and head of the teaching Church, rests his whole preaching upon a fact and upon a truth. The fact is that of the Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth who, having been put to death before the whole people, came forth triumphantly from the tomb. The truth, suggested by this deed, is the right of that Jesus to an immortal survival, for "it was impossible that He should be holden by the bonds of death," and He already begins to show how He survives in the souls of His faithful followers and in the authority of His Church. With mounting enthusiasm, Peter cries out: "This Jesus hath God raised again, whereof all we are witnesses. Being exalted therefore by the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath poured forth this which you see and hear." [21]

Even while Peter was speaking, the Holy Ghost performed in the hearts of the listeners another prodigy, of a kind different from the gift of tongues bestowed on the eleven Apostles. An all-powerful inner grace, such as that spoken of by Christ when He said, "No man can come to Me, except the Father, who hath sent Me, draw him," [22] transformed their souls. Addressing Peter and the other Apostles, some cried out: "What shall we do, men and brethren?" "Do penance," Peter answered, "and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." He thus pointed out the twofold condition required for initiation into the Christian life and for salvation. That condition is both interior and exterior; it includes a disposition of the soul and a ceremony performed by the priest in the name of Christ. The essential characteristics of the Catholic Church could not be announced more clearly and

[21] Acts 2:32 f.
[22] John 6:44.

precisely, and this at the very moment when the Church was born.[23]

This Pentecost has always been regarded by the Catholic Church as the date of her birth. On that day the rites of the Old Law lapsed [24] and the New Law became of universal obligation.

At Peter's words, three thousand persons were converted and baptized. Of these three thousand converts, some bore the gospel seed to the various countries where they lived, others formed the nucleus of the Church at Jerusalem.

[23] In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of January 16, 1909, Dr. Adolph von Harnack, the most illustrious German church historian of our day, acknowledges that "some of the principal elements of Catholicism go back to the Apostolic age" and that "it is possible to establish, by impressive proofs, that the Catholic concept of the infant Church is historically the true one, *i. e.*, that Christianity, Catholicism, and Romanism are, in the light of history, perfectly identical." This was the first time that a Protestant theologian uttered a proposition so diametrically opposed to the traditional contention of his Church. It merits special attention because of Harnack's particular competency. True, he restricts his declaration by adding that "the chasm that separates Jesus from the Apostles has not yet been bridged over," and that "the hierarchy of the factors at work within the complex organism of Christian thought and the forms of ecclesiastical life were constantly changing." But the importance of his general declaration is great. Harnack's article is reproduced almost in its entirety and critically examined by Batiffol in his *Primitive Catholicism,* particularly pages ix ff., 94–113.

[24] Hurter, *Theologia dogmatica; De Ecclesia,* thesis 37, no. 281.

CHAPTER II

The Early Church and the Jews (30–42)

OUR Lord in His sermons and parables repeatedly announced that the kingdom of God, rejected by the Jews, would be accepted by the Gentiles. But the Israelites, none the less, remained the chosen people, the nation "of the promise." It was at Jerusalem, in a group belonging to the Jewish race, that the Church had its cradle. The earliest disciples of Christ religiously followed most of the Jewish observances, and withdrew from them only gradually and with utmost respect. The Synagogue, after the defections of its children, was buried with honor.

How great had been the destinies of the children of Abraham and Jacob before God and man! Yahweh, by His covenant with them, by the prophets He raised up in the midst of their nation, by the numerous wonders He performed for them during the ages, had done for them what He had done for no other people. On their part, scattered as they were throughout the nations, they had remained faithful to the two great doctrines which the Lord had entrusted to their safekeeping: belief in one God and the hope of a Messias. Athens might lay claim to the glory of unparalleled art; Rome, to that of incomparable political science; but Jerusalem was the center of the purest worship that had been offered to the Divinity.

Jerusalem

The Roman domination, established in Judea in 63 B. C., did not result in depriving the Jewish people entirely of their

independence. Under the rule of the Herods, the children of Israel had kept a partial autonomy, which enabled them to remain faithful to the religion revealed to their fathers, and to celebrate, in the Temple at Jerusalem, the great ceremonies handed down by their ancestors. Baleful domestic divisions, however, had imbroiled the nation. The party that was preponderant in numbers as well as in the prestige of its members, was always that of the Pharisees.[1] Of these meticulous observers of the Law, some were hypocrites, like those on whom Christ heaped maledictions; others were pure and upright, like those who braved all human respect to follow Him. There were, besides, the pleasure-loving Sadducees and the ambitious Herodians, fond of an easy life, who gladly accepted the customs and practices of Greece and Rome.[2] At the opposite extreme were the Essenes. These visionary fanatics haughtily looked down on the other sects and considered themselves as the sole heirs of the heavenly promises. They endeavored to realize a superhuman purity.[3] The strictest of the Essenes made a point of not going to the Temple, for they held it to be stained by their degenerate fellow-Jews; but in this they were not followed by the body of the nation. For the people of Israel the Temple remained the sacred place where the Jewish nation offered its traditional sacrifices, aware of its great supernatural mission. They were proud of this noble edifice; its rebuilding, begun by Herod the Great, was not completed until the year 64, by Agrippa II. When a son of Israel, standing at the top of Mount Olivet, surveyed the gigantic wall which made the Temple look like an enormous fortress, the whole series of intercommunicating terraces, and at the summit the sanctuary itself, and its roof, covered

[1] Beurlier, *Le Monde juif au temps de Jésus-Christ,* I, 44–47. Cf. Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ,* pp. 265–284; Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew,* II, 304 ff.

[2] Beurlier, *op. cit.,* p. 43.

[3] *Idem,* p. 48.

with gold plates, reflecting the sun,[4] his national pride was exalted; a grim irritation stirred in his soul against the foreign usurper; the memory of the heroic Machabees who, a century earlier, had won back the Temple and religious liberty in Palestine, enkindled in his breast both patriotism and religion.

The faithful disciples who had been won from the ranks of the Jewish people by Christ's preaching and the prodigies of Pentecost, shared in these noble feelings. Following the example of their Divine Master,[5] they regularly went up to the Temple and mingled in the crowd of the worshippers. "For them the new religion was not the foe of the old, but its fruit. They rightly judged that the holy souls of both Testaments—the Old and the New—really formed one and the same Church about one and the same Messias, misunderstood by some, acclaimed by others, but the sole object of Israel's hopes. . . . To God, the Author of the Old Covenant, it pertained to signify to all, by permitting the destruction of the Temple and the nationality of Israel, that the legal end of Mosaism had come." [6]

The Miracle at the Beautiful Gate

Meanwhile the Apostles preached with extraordinary success. A few days after the baptism of the three thousand Pentecostal converts, two thousand persons joined the Church following a miracle which is related in the Acts of the Apostles.

It was about three o'clock in the afternoon. Peter and John had gone up to the Temple to pray.

[4] On the Temple at Jerusalem, see art. *"Temple"* in the *Dict. de la Bible.* Cf. Vogué, *Le Temple de Jérusalem;* Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité,* IV, 205–211; Stapfer, *op. cit.,* pp. 403–453.

[5] St. Thomas, *Summa theol.,* III, q. 37; q. 40, 4, 0; q. 47, 2 ad 1.

[6] Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* I, 46.

"A certain man who was lame from his mother's womb, was carried: whom they laid every day at the gate of the Temple, which is called Beautiful, that he might ask alms of them that went into the Temple. He, when he had seen Peter and John about to go into the Temple, asked to receive an alms. But Peter with John fastening his eyes upon him said: 'Look upon us.' But he looked earnestly upon them, hoping that he should receive something of them. But Peter said: 'Silver and gold I have none; but what I have, I give thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk.' And taking him by the right hand, he lifted him up, and forthwith his feet and soles received strength. And he leaping up stood and walked and went in with them into the Temple, walking and praising God. And they knew him, that it was he who sat begging alms at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple; and they were filled with wonder and amazement at that which had happened to him. And as he held Peter and John, all the people ran to them to the porch which is called Solomon's greatly wondering.

"But Peter seeing, made answer to the people: 'Ye men of Israel, why wonder you at this? or why look you upon us, as if by our strength or power we had made this man to walk? The God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son Jesus, whom you indeed delivered up and denied before the face of Pilate, when he judged He should be released. But you denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you. But the author of life you killed, whom God hath raised from the dead, of which we are witnesses. And in the faith of His name, this man whom you have seen and known, hath His name strengthened; and the faith which is by Him, hath given this perfect soundness in the sight of you all. And now, brethren, I know that you did it through ignorance, as did also your rulers. But those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all the prophets, that His Christ should suffer, He hath so fulfilled. Be penitent, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out. That when the times of refreshment shall come from the presence of the Lord, and He shall send Him who hath been preached unto you, Jesus Christ, whom heaven indeed must receive, until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the

mouth of His holy prophets, from the beginning of the world. . . . To you first God, raising up His Son, hath sent Him to bless you; that every one may convert himself from his wickedness.' " [7]

The Apostle was still speaking when the priests who were on duty in the Temple arrived. They were accompanied by a group of Sadducees. The disciples of Christ had no more bitter enemies than these sectaries, one of whose principal tenets was the denial of the resurrection of the dead. Upon hearing the doctrine of survival being preached, not merely as a hope, but as a truth established by the Resurrection of Christ, they became furiously angry. They remarked to the priests that addressing the people in the porch of the house of God, without commission from the hierarchical authority, was an act of culpable boldness. To seize the two Apostles and hurry them off to prison was the work of a moment. It was evening, too late for a trial, and hence further proceedings were postponed to the next day. But many who heard Peter's discourse believed in Christ. The infant Church of Jerusalem was now made up of five thousand men.

On the following day the leaders of the people, the ancients and the scribes, met together. In this gathering were to be seen the High Priest Annas,[8] Caiphas, John, and Alexander.[9] In full numbers the court assembled, which had but recently condemned the Master; it would now try the disciples.

The judges, placing Peter and John in their midst, asked: "By what power or by what name have you done this?" [10] The scene, despite its simplicity, was one of unparalleled im-

[7] Acts 3: 1–26.

[8] A long time before, the Romans had removed Annas from the office of High Priest and had bestowed it upon Caiphas. But the Jews considered this office inalienable; and no real Jew would concede that any foreign power had a right to remove the High Priest. Annas, therefore, retained the title of High Priest, although he no longer performed the duties of the office.

[9] Acts 4: 5 f.

[10] Acts 4: 7.

portance. For the first time the lowly disciples of Christ, "illiterate and ignorant men," [11] stood in the presence of those hostile powers of which their Master had given them a glimpse. But the heavenly aid which had been promised did not fail them. The presiding officer of the Sanhedrin did not dare say "miracle" or "cure." He called the prodigy "this."

The Acts tell us that Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, turned a simple and direct look upon his judges, and said to them:

"Ye princes of the people and ancients, hear. If we this day are examined concerning the good deed done to the infirm man, by what means he hath been made whole, be it known to you all and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God hath raised from the dead, even by Him this man standeth here before you whole. This is the stone which was rejected by you the builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved." [12]

"Seeing the constancy of Peter and of John, understanding that they were illiterate and ignorant men, they wondered. And they knew then that they had been with Jesus. Seeing the man also who had been healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it. But they commanded them to go aside out of the council; and they conferred among themselves. . . . And calling them, they charged them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." [13]

To impose silence on the two Apostles, to hinder the divulging of a fact which glorified the name of Jesus—such was the only penalty which the persecuting despots found.

But Peter, aided by the Holy Ghost, did not yield. He replied: "If it be just in the sight of God, to hear you rather

[11] Acts 4: 13.
[12] Acts 4: 8–12.
[13] Acts 4: 13–18.

than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." The *Non possumus,* so often repeated by Peter's successors before the powers of this world, was heard for the first time in the precincts of a court. The religious chiefs of Jerusalem might well, on that day, have convinced themselves that a new power had arisen on earth. The Master had said: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's."

The members of the Sanhedrin did not know what to do with the Apostles. "They threatening, sent them away, not finding how they might punish them, because of the people; for all men glorified what had been done, in that which had come to pass." [14]

The First Christians

As soon as the Apostles were released, they returned to their brethren and related to them what the chief priests and the ancients had said.

"Who having heard it, with one accord lifted up their voice to God and said: 'Lord, Thou art He that didst make heaven and earth, the sea and all things that are in them. Who, by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David, Thy servant, hast said: "Why did the Gentiles rage, and the people meditate vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes assembled together against the Lord and His Christ." . . . And now, Lord, behold their threatenings, and grant unto Thy servants that with all confidence they may speak Thy word, by stretching forth Thy hand to cures and signs and wonders to be done by the name of Thy holy Son Jesus.' And when they had prayed, the place was moved wherein they were assembled; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spoke the word of God with confidence.

"And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul; neither did any one say that aught of the things which he possessed

[14] Acts 4: 21.

was his own; but all things were common unto them. And with great power did the Apostles give testimony of the resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord. And great grace was in them all. For neither was there any one needy among them. For as many as were owners of lands or houses, sold them and brought the price of the things sold, and laid it down before the feet of the Apostles. And distribution was made to every one, according as he had need." [15]

In these few lines the Acts of the Apostles sketches the first Christian community. Let us attempt to complete the picture with the help of various documents furnished by archeology, tradition, sacred and profane history.

It is plainly to be seen that the little society has a head. This head is the one who, after the Ascension, presided at the choosing of Matthias to replace Judas, so as to fill up the number of the Twelve. He is also the one who, on Pentecost, spoke to the crowd in the name of the Apostolic College. And it is he who defended the rights of Christian preaching before the Sanhedrin. It is Simon, son of Jona, to whom Jesus gave the power of binding and loosing, that is, of governing His Church; it is Peter, to whom were given the keys of the kingdom and who was commissioned to "confirm his brethren" in the faith.

The Galilean fisherman's burning faith, the promptness of his zeal, the clear-sighted intuition of his soul, which led him first of all to proclaim his belief in Christ the Son of the living God, and the thrice repeated avowal of his love for Jesus, may have prepared him for this office; in fact, he received it by the free choice of his Master. And this headship was religiously recognized and accepted by all. The Pauline tradition, represented by St. Luke,[16] and the Johannine tradition, represented by the Fourth Gospel,[17] as also the Pales-

[15] Acts 4: 23–35.
[16] Luke 22: 31.
[17] John 21: 15–17.

tinian tradition, echoed in St. Matthew,[18] and the Roman tradition, expressed in St. Mark, agree in representing Simon Peter as the head of the infant Church.

At the same time another authority seems to hover over the community of Christ's disciples: it is the authority of the Holy Ghost. Nothing in the Acts of the Apostles is more remarkable than the frequency with which that book mentions the Holy Ghost. Every important event in the infant Church [19] is attributed to His inspiration.

The name of the Holy Ghost is one of the first words on Peter's lips when for the first time he addresses the disciples, gathered together to choose a successor for Judas the traitor.[20] From the Holy Ghost the Apostles receive the gift of tongues.[21] To the Holy Ghost Peter attributes all the supernatural manifestations on Pentecost.[22] The Apostle charges Ananias with having lied to the Holy Ghost,[23] and Saphira with having tempted the Spirit of the Lord.[24] Stephen, the first martyr, is spoken of as a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost,[25] as one by whose mouth the Spirit of God speaks.[26] Later on we note that the Holy Ghost sets apart Paul and Barnabas,[27] and prevents Paul and Silas from passing into Asia.[28]

And this Spirit is represented as a Spirit of peace, of charity, and of joy.[29] Under His influence, and under the paternal

[18] Matt. 16:18.
[19] Lebreton, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité*, I, 284–288.
[20] Acts 1:16.
[21] Acts 2:2 ff.
[22] Acts 2:17.
[23] Acts 5:3.
[24] Acts 5:9.
[25] Acts 6:5.
[26] Acts 6:10.
[27] Acts 13:2, 4.
[28] Acts 16:6. The Acts of the Apostles has been called the "Gospel of the Holy Ghost." Cf. Lebreton, *op. cit.*, I, 285.
[29] Acts 13:52.

authority of the head of the Apostles, the young community is organized and develops as a united family. A superficial outsider might have observed in them only a group of pious Jews, or a community of cenobites like the Essenes and Therapeutae.[30] They still kept the Mosaic observances, prayed at the appointed hours,[31] and showed themselves scrupulously faithful to the Law. They were liked by the people because of their simple, pious, and gentle life.[32] This the chief priests had seen at the time of the arrest of Peter and John. From the little group there radiated a fragrance of kindliness, uprightness, and wholesome joy. Among them labor was held in honor, in their midst the destitute found the charm of an enlarged family which generously opened for them all its treasures of affection and its material resources. The members of the community called one another brothers, to show the tender charity that united them. The Temple porches, the galleries that formed part of that edifice, were their usual meeting-place during the day.[33] There were to be found the memories of their Master's most endearing words and discourses. In the evening they returned to their lodgings and, in small groups,[34] took part in a mysterious meal that still more intimately recalled to their mind the last hours of Jesus. The people called their meeting by the Hebrew word *Kahal,* which was applied to gatherings of this sort; but they themselves used the Greek word *Ekklesia* (Church), by which the old Hellenic cities designated the meeting of the people for deliberation on matters of state.

[30] On the religious societies of Essenes and Therapeutae, see Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, bk. 1, chap. 2. Cf. Philo, *On the Contemplative Life;* also Massebiau, *"Le Traité de la vie contemplative et la question des thérapeutes,"* in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions,* 1887, pp. 170, 284.

[31] Acts 3:1.

[32] Acts 2:47; 4:33; 5:13, 26.

[33] Acts 2:46; 5:12.

[34] Acts 2:46.

The Organization of the Church

Let us examine the inner life of this Church more closely. There we shall discover an autonomous organization, capable of sustaining its life independently, should the Jewish people some day break away from Christ.

The Apostles exercised an undisputed authority over the faithful. They had been the Savior's confidants, specially chosen by Him to accompany Him and aid Him. Hence, in the mind of the new converts, they are the authentic witnesses of the departed Master. To them one turns for an authorized account of His discourses, promises, blessings, and examples. The mystery of Pentecost, by designating them as in a very special manner filled with the Holy Ghost, and the gift of miracles, which is more particularly reserved to them,[35] vests them with an altogether exceptional authority. When Peter passes by, the sick are carried out and put on beds or cots, so that his shadow may fall upon them.[36] Such privileges made their authority absolute and their teaching infallible.[37] Moreover, Christ had in a positive manner confided to them the power of teaching,[38] and, subject to Peter's authority, the power of governing the faithful.[39]

It is possible that, under the Apostles, the community had for a short time only the ministry of prophets directly inspired by the Holy Ghost. But if this embryonic state ever existed, it lasted only a very short time." [40] The Apostles soon instituted a governing authority, which was frequently entrusted to those who were favored with these mystical communications. A council of elders (*presbyteri,* priests) and a college of seven deacons later completed the organization.

[35] Acts 5: 12.
[36] Acts 5: 15.
[37] Bainvel, art. *"Apôtres,"* in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*
[38] Matt. 28: 18 ff.; Mark 16: 15.
[39] Matt. 18: 17 f.; Ephes. 4: 1–13. Cf. 1 Cor. 12: 28; 1 Pet. 5: 2; Acts 20: 28.
[40] Prat, art. *"Evêque"* in the *Dict. de théol.,* IV, 1657.

After the other Apostles dispersed, James "the brother of the Lord" took their place at Jerusalem and filled the office of head of the local Church. At his death (A. D. 61), a successor was appointed; he was likewise a relative of the Lord, Simeon, who lived until about the year 110. "This Jerusalem hierarchy presents exactly the grades of rank which, later on, became universal." [41]

A close examination of the early Church at Jerusalem shows that, besides the exercises of devotion in the Temple, which the disciples of Jesus attended along with their Jewish brethren, they had their own special services in private houses, where their meetings were held. There the Master's life and discourses were repeated. "These various accounts, a thousand times retold, finally led to a uniform oral version, which was a sort of traditional catechism. The Gospel thus assumed its first authentic and authorized form. We have no need to look for any other cause for the identity of expressions and turns of phrase that characterize the three synoptic Gospels." [42] More precisely, this early preaching took two forms, which it borrowed from the traditions of the synagogue: the *agada,* a kind of historical narrative or discourse, and the *alaka,* a form of dogmatic or moral teaching.[43] The synoptic Gospels are related to the *agada;* the Apostolic epistles belong rather to the form of the *alaka,* and the Gospel of St. John to both.

Doctrine

The doctrine of the new religion was at first contained entirely in these accounts and teachings. A speculative theology

[41] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, p. 63. The author supposes James, "the brother of the Lord," to be distinct from James the Apostle, the son of Alpheus. This distinction, though held by a number of modern scholars, does not seem to be well founded. (See Ermoni, art. *"Jacques"* in the *Dict. de la Bible.*)

[42] Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* I, 41.

[43] Vigouroux, *Manuel biblique,* I, 338.

would have taken no hold upon minds so little prepared to receive it. Yet we can distinguish with clearness and precision the three chief dogmas that emerged from the faith of this early period: the Incarnation, the Trinity, and the Redemption.

From the very first the faithful believed firmly in the Incarnation of the Son of God. "The declarations of St. Paul, St. John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews only expanded the common belief, which, though at that time still wanting in power of expression, was deep and unyielding. . . . The essence of this belief was in the souls of Christians from the first. . . . The early Christian books all take this fundamental belief for granted, as universally accepted and firmly rooted in tradition." [44]

Belief in the dogma of the Trinity is equally clear. "To admit that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are God, is to admit that they participate in the very essence of the One God, that they are, each of them, identical with Him, yet without being deprived of certain special characteristics. This is the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; not certainly, as it was formulated later, in opposition to transient heresies, but as it appealed to the general conscience of the early Christians, and claimed the homage of their faith. The generality of Christians in the first century, even in Apostolic days, stood here almost exactly at the same point as present-day Christians." [45] "But Jesus is not only the Messias and the Son of God, He is also the Savior. . . . He is their Redeemer, and it is by His death on the Cross that He has won His rights over them. We must not think that this conception, upon which St. Paul insists so often and so strongly, is merely the result of his own personal reflections. . . . St. Paul tells us [46] that, find-

[44] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
[45] *Ibidem*, p. 32.
[46] Gal. 2 : 1 f.

ing himself at Jerusalem after his first mission, he communicated to the leaders of the Church, to Peter, James, and John, as well as to the others, the gospel which he had taught the Gentiles, in order, he says, not to 'run in vain.' . . . As his statement was not disputed, we must conclude that the redeeming efficacy of the Lord's death was from that time acknowledged by the Apostles." [47]

It is, then, true to say that, although Christianity has its roots in the Jewish tradition, from the very first days it passes beyond that tradition and is distinguished from it, like a powerful shoot animated by a new sap. It keeps the sacred books of the Old Testament in order to clarify and supplement them in the light of a faith proper to itself. And this faith rests neither upon a collective mystical inspiration nor upon a purely internal illumination of each individual, but upon a solid teaching that constitutes the Apostles' message, which they communicate and impose with authority on every member of the Christian community. It is Tradition, the *Paradosis,* or Teaching of the Apostles, the *Didache tôn apostólôn.*[48] This rule of faith is based, in the last analysis, on the divine authority of Jesus. He is the Christ; He is the Lord. As Christ, He is the realization of Israel's Messianic hope; as Lord, He is the Voice, the very Word of the heavenly Father, who declared Him to be such on the day of His first manifestation: "This is My beloved Son; hear Him." [49]

The Liturgy

The autonomy of the Christian Church showed itself also in its ceremonies. "The Acts of the Apostles distinctly acquaints us with three of these rites: Baptism, imposition of

[47] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 32.

[48] Acts 2:42.

[49] Matt. 3:17, Luke 9:35. On Tradition as the rule of faith in the early Church, see Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism, passim.*

hands, breaking of bread. Even if we suppose, as has been somewhat gratuitously asserted at times, that these three ceremonies were in use in Israel already before the time of Christ, they were practiced in the Christian community according to the very special manner taught by the Apostles and with a specifically Christian meaning. It was a Baptism 'in the name of the Lord Jesus'; it was an imposition of hands 'to confer the Holy Ghost'; it was the breaking of bread 'renewing the mystery of the Last Supper.' " [50]

In the first place, we see that no one can be admitted to the community without going through a ceremony of initiation; it is a liturgical ablution, the Baptism of water. Even though the candidate were already favored with a direct effusion of the Holy Ghost, he is not dispensed from the sacramental rite. After the example of the Divine Master, who willed to receive a similar initiation from the Precursor, the catechumen goes down into a stream of water, as did the eunuch of Queen Candace,[51] or the water is poured upon his head, as must have been the case when the Apostle St. Paul received Baptism at the hands of Ananias [52] and when St. Paul himself baptized his jailer in prison.[53] This rite signifies death to profane life and birth in a new life that will incorporate the candidate with Christ by making him a member of the Church. St. Paul speaks of the burial accomplished by baptism; [54] and tradition has always referred to the baptismal rite the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, when He spoke to him about the necessity of being born again. So the Church requires of the neophyte the fulfilment of two preliminary con-

[50] Yves de la Brière, art. *"Eglise"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi catholique,* I, 1252.

[51] Act 8:26–38; 10:44–48; 11:15–17. It would seem that at the beginning Baptism was habitually administered by immersion, only occasionally by pouring. (See Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* II, 171.)

[52] Acts 9:18.

[53] Acts 16:33.

[54] Rom. 6:4.

ditions: repentance and faith. On Pentecost, Peter said: "Do penance, and be baptized." [55] To the eunuch of Queen Candace, Philip the deacon said: "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest" be baptized.[56] When all these conditions are fulfilled, the neophyte, putting off the old man, sees the new man born in him, with the inner grace and the indelible character of the Christian. Henceforth he belongs to a race of "saints"; [57] he can say that he is of a "kingly priesthood," [58] and even of "the offspring of God." [59]

Thus the Apostles sought to make the unique and transcendent character of Christian Baptism stand out. They contrasted it with the baptism of John and were wont to call it "the Baptism of Jesus." [60] So great was their insistence on this point that some writers have questioned whether the primitive formula of Baptism was not: "I baptize you in the name of Jesus." [61] This opinion must be rejected; the Apostles' insistence on the use of such expressions is sufficiently explained by their desire to indicate clearly the distinctive character of Christian Baptism.

The imposition of hands perfects the special quality of the Christian by conferring upon him the Holy Ghost. In Samaria, Peter and John met some of the inhabitants who had been converted and baptized by Philip the deacon, and imposed hands on them to confer the Holy Ghost.[62] St. Paul, when he found some disciples of John the Baptist, first baptized

[55] Acts 2:38.
[56] Acts 8:37.
[57] Rom. 15:26.
[58] See 1 Pet. 2:9.
[59] Acts 17:28.
[60] Acts 2:38; 8:12; 10:48; 19:5.
[61] *V. g.,* Peter Lombard and Cajetan. St. Thomas (*Summa theol.,* III, q. 66, art. 6, ad 1) restricts the validity of this formula to the first century, and thinks that the Apostles made use of a special dispensation in substituting it for the ordinary formula.
[62] Acts 8:12–18.

them, and then imposed hands on them.[63] Theologians consider this ceremony to be the Sacrament of Confirmation. In the Apostolic age, marvelous signs, often called "charismata," accompanied the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

The Spirit speaks by the mouth of the newly confirmed; the Spirit prophesies the future; the Spirit gives them commands, raises their arms, enlightens their view; the Spirit manifests Himself in visions, ecstasies, prayers, and devout hymns. The Spirit pours Himself out in strange and at times inexplicable gifts, like the gift of tongues.[64] The Epistle to the Hebrews appeals to God's testimony to His Church "by signs and wonders and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." [65] We are here in the presence of those mystical gifts which, by their essential quality, are above all the endeavors and efforts of man [66] and depend solely upon God's good pleasure. We know that the rule to be followed by those whom God favors with such states, is to subordinate all these extraordinary ways to the authority of the Church.[67] We might also remark that the gifts bestowed by the Holy Ghost upon the early Christians do not differ essentially from those which God later gave to His great mystics, such as Francis of Assisi, Catherine of Siena, and Teresa of Jesus, and that the Church since then has never met with such frequent and extraordinary graces. Those mystical gifts lasted but a short time in the Apostolic age and were subordinated to two principles: the faith authentically received, and common edification.[68] St. Paul

[63] Acts 19:1–6.

[64] For the theologians' explanations and those of the Rationalists, see Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* I, 175–184; Lesêtre, art. *"Langues"* in the *Dict. de la Bible,* IV, 74–81.

[65] Heb. 2:3 f.

[66] St. Teresa, *Way of Perfection,* chap. 32.

[67] St. John of the Cross, *Ascent of Carmel,* bk. 2, chap. 30.

[68] Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 28 f.

writes: "Though an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we preached to you, let him be anathema. . . . If any seem to be a prophet or spiritual, let him know the things that I write to you, that they are the commandments of the Lord." [69] So far as we are able to conjecture, the sole purpose of God in lavishing such abundant and striking gifts upon His Church was to signify plainly that a new society had come into being, marked with the seal of truth and manifestly aided by the Divine Spirit.

But we have not yet penetrated into the most sacred sanctuary of the infant Church. When towards evening groups of disciples were "breaking bread from house to house," and "persevering in prayer," [70] they knew they were performing the most solemn and touching ceremony of their religion. When celebrating the Last Supper with His disciples, Jesus had commanded them to renew the memory of it. They were faithful to this command. Their rite had nothing in common with those fraternal "agapes" in use among the members of the various societies and corporations in the Greco-Roman world. The meals of charity, or Christian agapes, were not introduced into the Church until later on. The religious meal of which we are here speaking, was simply the commemoration of the one which the Savior took with His disciples the day before His death. The change made by Jesus in the celebration of the Jewish Pasch divided it into two distinct parts, the first being merely a preparation for the second. From that first part, the disciples of Christ kept, not the symbolic food courses, which they replaced by others, but only the prayer formulas. It was concerning this first common meal, to which each one brought his share, that St. Paul refers when he directs that the rich wait for the arrival of the poor, so that

[69] Gal. 1:8; 1 Cor. 14:37.
[70] Acts 2:42–46. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:16–21; 11:23 ff.

there may not be the scandal of some eating abundantly and others have nothing to eat.[71]

At the close of this meal the celebration of the Eucharist, properly so called, began.[72] By Baptism the Christian felt that he was incorporated in the mystical person of Christ surviving in the Church; by Confirmation his soul was penetrated by the action of the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier. In the Eucharist, it is Jesus Himself, present under the species of bread and wine, who is united with the Christian in the closest manner. The new convert felt himself, in a way, the equal of the disciple who rested on the breast of the beloved Savior. Unspeakable mystery! It appeared so great, it so reached the inmost fibers of the heart, that it was not spoken of in the presence of the profane. Instinctively, by a common accord, the early Christians observed this law of the "secret," which safeguarded their worship from sacrilegious profanations and indiscreet curiosity.[73] Further, "in this mystery the Church would find an indelible line of demarcation, separating her from Mosaism. Whether or not the disciples felt this from the very first, the Cross arose more and more inexorably between them and the Jews, casting the latter behind and ordering the Christians to advance. Jesus' death was the crime of the Jews and the salvation of the Christians. . . . It was the Cross that destroyed the Synagogue and built up the Church, and its living and efficacious memorial is nothing other than the Eucharist." [74]

[71] On the Eucharist and the agape among the early Christians, see Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive,* 1st ser., pp. 283–325; Funk, *"Agape"* in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.,* 1903; Leclercq, art. *"Agape"* in the *Dict. de théol.*

[72] We may see in our present beginning of the Mass the continuation of this portion of the primitive rite.

[73] The *disciplina arcani* was not a legislative measure of ecclesiastical authority, as was long supposed, but a simple custom. There was no hesitation in departing from it whenever there seemed to be a good reason for so doing. See Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive,* 1st ser., pp. 1–41.

[74] Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* I, 44.

The Church and the Civil Government

Though separated from the Jewish and the pagan world by their hierarchy, beliefs, and rites, the disciples of Christ had no wish to adopt an attitude of rebellion or sullenness in the society in which they lived. St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, writes: "They are Hebrews; so am I. They are Israelites; so am I." [75] And when the tribune of Rome asked him, "Art thou a Roman?" he proudly answered: "Yea." [76] "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's," [77] Christ had said; the Apostle adds: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers; for there is no power but from God." [78]

The temporal powers with which the infant Church came in contact were the leaders of the Jewish nation and the Roman emperors. Forty years before the Christian era the title king of Judea became the prerogative of the family of the Herods, who, thanks to the backing of the Romans, supplanted the Machabees. The scepter was gone forth from Juda; a stranger reigned in the promised land. No doubt the policy of the Herods tended to constitute an independent realm, its unity assured by Judaism; but, to accomplish this purpose, they needed the protection of Rome; hence their equivocal attitude. The summary appointment and removal of high priests, which they subordinated to the varying needs of their political calculations, lowered the standing of the priesthood, and their deference to the Roman authorities favored the introduction of pagan customs into Palestine.[79]

The early Christians took a clear and frank attitude toward

[75] See 2 Cor. 11:22.
[76] Acts 22:25–28.
[77] Matt. 22:21.
[78] Rom. 13:1.
[79] On the political organization of Palestine at this period, see Beurlier, *Le Monde juif à l'époque de Jésus-Christ,* and Mommsen, *History of Rome,* IV, 158.

the government and the laws; they celebrated the national feasts and holidays,[80] taking part in the Temple worship and the synagogue devotions,[81] and carefully avoiding every legal defilement.[82] They obeyed all the laws, whether fiscal or other, and, save for disputes arising among themselves—which they reserved to the judgment of their community—they carried their cases to the regular civil tribunals. This strict loyalty won the people's esteem and admiration.[83]

Rome's protectorate in Palestine was not clearly defined. It was represented at Jerusalem by a procurator, who reserved to himself the *ius gladii,* or the judgment of important matters. But he rarely exercised this supreme right and often, like Pilate, followed the policy of non-intervention, being disinclined to place his power at the service of the local parties and priestly grudges.

The Christians' attitude toward the imperial laws and authorities was as loyal as it was toward the Jewish authorities. They paid the taxes levied for the Roman metropolis; they obeyed their masters, if they were slaves;[84] if they were Roman citizens, they did not hesitate to exercise their right to appeal their case to the tribunal of Rome.[85]

But the authorities, Jewish as well as Roman, soon manifested their hostility against the Christians. The Romans, according to their custom, showed themselves more cautious on Palestinian territory; but the ill-restrained hatred of the priestly caste, who had put Jesus to death, quickly burst forth against His disciples.

The Sadducean family of the high priest, which brought about the condemnation of Christ, was still in power. Up to

[80] Acts 2:1; 18:18; 20:6; Rom. 14:5.
[81] Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:42; 10:9.
[82] Acts 10:14.
[83] Acts 5:13.
[84] See 1 Cor. 7:21.
[85] Acts 22:25–28; 25:11 f.

the year 36 the office of high priest really belonged to Caiphas, who left its exercise to his brother-in-law Annas and his relatives Alexander and John.[86] These ambitious and heartless schemers were ill-pleased to see the continued growth of a community invoking the name of one whom they had crucified. The very fact that the disciples of Jesus had won the favor of the populace, made the Christians even more suspect in the eyes of the authorities. While it is true that many, at sight of the Christian practice of charity, said: "See how they love one another," others (as the Acts of the Apostles insinuates) were seized with a sort of terror at seeing the miracles which they performed.[87] The disciples of Christ did indeed frequent the synagogues and go up to the Temple; but they also held meetings of their own in private houses, and there created centers of religious activity independent of the sacerdotal authority. Thus especially reasoned the Sadducees, who cherished the most persistent hatred for Christ and who were exasperated by the preaching of the resurrection of the flesh. A number of Herodians and Pharisees were won over by the same bitterness and apprehension. The arrest of the Apostles, the stoning of St. Stephen, the beheading of St. James, and the imprisonment of St. Peter were the sequels of this sinister coalition.

The Acts thus relates the arrest of the Apostles:

"The high priest rising up, and all they that were with him (which is the heresy of the Sadducees) were filled with envy. And they laid hands on the Apostles and put them in the common prison. But an angel of the Lord by night opening the doors of the prison, and leading them out, said: 'Go, and standing speak in the Temple to the people all the words of this life.' Who having heard this, early in the morning entered into the Temple, and taught. And the high priest coming, and they that were with him, called together the

[86] Acts 4:6.
[87] Acts 2:43.

council and all the ancients of the children of Israel; and they sent to the prison to have them brought. . . . But one came and told them: 'Behold, the men whom you put in prison are in the Temple, standing and teaching the people.' Then went the officer with the ministers, and brought them without violence; for they feared the people, lest they should be stoned. . . . And the high priest asked them, saying: 'Commanding, we commanded you, that you should not teach in this name; and behold, you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine. And you have a mind to bring the blood of this man upon us.' But Peter and the Apostles answering, said: 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' . . . When they had heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they thought to put them to death. But one in the council rising up, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, respected by all the people, commanded the men to be put forth a little while. And he said to them: 'Ye men of Israel, take heed to yourselves what you intend to do as touching these men. . . . For if this council or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it, lest perhaps you be found even to fight against God.' And they consented to him. And calling in the Apostles, after they had scourged them, they charged them that they should not speak at all in the name of Jesus; and they dismissed them. And they indeed went from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus. And every day they ceased not in the Temple and from house to house, to teach and preach Christ Jesus." [88]

St. Stephen the Deacon

These events took place toward the end of the year 32. "The Sanhedrin evidently assumed the right to condemn the accused to be flogged; it seems that they wished to bring a capital charge against the Apostles. Subsequently St. Stephen was put to death without any protest from the Roman authorities, and Saul was sent on a mission with letters patent from the Sanhe-

[88] Acts 5: 17–42.

drin. All these facts show that Tiberius, already ill and completely addicted to the shameful passions of a lustful old man and hateful tyrant, had permitted the prevalence at a distance of a more liberal policy with regard to the provinces subject to the Empire. Pilate was still at Jerusalem; but he was preoccupied with the agitation that was beginning to brew in Samaria, a disturbance that he soon after stifled in blood by horrible massacres." [89]

Profiting by this political tranquillity, the religious activity of the Christian community took on a new enthusiasm. The twelve Apostles, overburdened by the works of charity which the growing number of the faithful rendered more and more absorbing, "calling together the multitude of the disciples," asked them to designate assistants "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," who would be able to act in their place. The entire assembly accepted this proposal. Seven helpers were chosen, at their head Stephen, "a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." [90] This was the institution of a new order of ministers, the diaconate.

If the passage where the Acts of the Apostles speaks of the institution of the diaconate is compared with other passages of the holy books where it is mentioned, notably the Epistles of St. Paul, it would seem that there is question, not of a transitory ministry established by a purely human will, but of a higher institution possessing a definitive character and prompted by the Holy Ghost. The great importance which the Apostles attached to the choice of the first seven deacons, their evident concern to indicate the conditions to be fulfilled by those chosen, the solemnity with which they surrounded the new institution, the enumeration of the rare qualities which St. Paul required of deacons, and the close association between them and the bishops, is to be explained only by this lofty idea of the

[89] Le Camus, *op. cit.*, I, 97.
[90] Acts 6: 1–6.

diaconate. Even from a purely historical point of view everything leads us to believe that the Apostles, by imposing hands on the newly chosen, were conferring on them a sacramental grace that would aid them to fulfil their important duties worthily.[91]

Scripture mentions three of these duties: the "serving of tables," [92] that is, the daily distribution to the poor, especially the widows, of food supplied by the resources of the rich, the administration of Baptism,[93] and preaching.[94]

In this last duty no one acquitted himself more brilliantly and zealously than the deacon Stephen. His ministry was exercised particularly among the Hellenist Jews, to whom the Apostles probably had less ready access. The power of his word [95] and the gift of miracles which accompanied it,[96] brought him great success with the populace, who gathered about him. His enemies began to dispute with him, but "they were not able to resist the wisdom and the Spirit that spoke" through him.[97]

"Then they suborned men to say they had heard him speak words of blasphemy against Moses and against God. And they stirred up the people and the ancients and the scribes; and running together, they took him and brought him to the council. And they set up false witnesses, who said: 'This man ceaseth not to speak words against the holy place and the law. For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the traditions which Moses delivered unto us.' And all that sat in the

[91] The Council of Trent (Sess. 23, canon 6) declares that the diaconate is of divine institution: *"Si quis dixerit in Ecclesia catholica non esse hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quae constat in episcopis, presbyteris, et ministris, anathema sit."*

[92] Acts 6:2.

[93] Acts 8:38.

[94] Acts 7: 2–53.

[95] Acts 6:10.

[96] Acts 6:8.

[97] Acts 6:10.

council, looking on him, saw his face as if it had been the face of an angel. Then the high priest said: 'Are these things so?' . . . Stephen said: 'You stiffnecked and uncircumcized in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do you also. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them who foretold of the coming of the Just One; of whom you have been now the betrayers and murderers: who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it.'

"Now hearing these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed with their teeth at him. But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looking up steadfastly to heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And he said: 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.' And they crying out with a loud voice, stopped their ears, and with one accord ran violently upon him. And casting him forth without the city, they stoned him. And the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man, whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, invoking, and saying: 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.' And falling on his knees, he cried with a loud voice, saying: 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' And when he had said this, he fell asleep in the Lord." [98]

Thus died the first Christian martyr. Like his Master, with his last breath he delivered his soul into the hands of the heavenly Father and prayed for his executioners.

Simon Magus

The persecutors triumphed. Being now rid of him whom they considered their most formidable opponent, they hoped easily to get the upper hand over the others by terrifying them. The procurator had let the murder of Stephen take place; and when it was over, he raised no protest. They felt, therefore, that they might go ahead. After Stephen's death, "there was

[98] Acts 6: 11—7: 59. Cf. Lagrange, *Saint Etienne et son sanctuaire à Jérusalem.*

raised a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all dispersed through the countries of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles." [99]

But these wretched designs were thwarted. An event took place which, with the regularity of a law, would be repeated in the course of the centuries: the violent dispersion of the Christians occasioned a more rapid diffusion of Christianity. Philip the deacon's evangelization of Samaria, and the conversion of Saul, the future Apostle of the Gentiles, were the first fruits of Stephen's martyrdom.

The province of Samaria, located in the middle of Palestine between Galilee and Judea, was inhabited by a mixed population, made up of the remnants of the ancient kingdom of Israel (destroyed by Salmanasar in 721) and Assyrian colonists who were brought in by the conqueror.[100] These alien colonists in their new abode preserved the form of worship of their former country. Some time afterwards, the Samaritans, alarmed by a plague which they considered to be a vengeance of the god of the country whom the new inhabitants had disregarded, had recourse to one of the former Israelite priests transported to Assyria, to teach them the worship of Yahweh. This priest made his residence at Bethel. But each of the ethnic groups, while adopting the worship of Yahweh, continued to worship the gods of its home land; thus Samaria had a multitude of cults, and each town had its own religion.[101] The religion of the country was, therefore, a corrupted Judaism mingled with paganism. When the Jews returned from captivity, their refusal to accept the help of the Samaritans in the rebuilding of the Temple accentuated the unfriendly feeling between Samaria and the other two provinces. It is probably to this period that

[99] Acts 8:1.

[100] See 4 Kings 17:5; 18:9; 1 Esdras 4:10.

[101] See 4 Kings 17:21–41. Cf. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, III, 575–586.

we must refer the worship on Garizim, the rival of Jerusalem. From the Gospel we knew that, in the time of Christ, a sharp hostility existed between the Jews and the Samaritans.[102] Yet Jesus spoke of them in terms of gentle mercy,[103] and before His Ascension into Heaven, He expressed His desire that the evangelization of Samaria should be undertaken after that of Jerusalem and Judea, but before that of the countries of the Gentiles.[104]

About the year 33, at the period of St. Stephen's martyrdom, the people of Samaria were greatly stirred by the proselytism of a man who, exploiting the religious unrest of a people ever prompt to welcome new envoys of the divinity, proclaimed himself to be a superhuman being.[105] His name was Simon. He was born in the village of Gitta, near Sichem,[106] and was reputed to be an extraordinary magician. If we accept the testimony of the *Clementine Homilies,*[107] Simon was brought up in Egypt, where he became familiar with those vague and pretentious theories toward which Alexandrian Judaism was tending and which were later formulated in the different Gnostic sects.

By the strangeness of his imaginings, the prestige of his sorcery, and the boldness of his declarations, this man exercised a kind of fascination over the masses. And the people said: "This man is the power of God, which is called great." [108] St. Jerome relates that Simon used to say to his listeners: "I am the word of God, I am Beauty, I am Consolation, I am the All-powerful, I am the All of God." [109]

[102] John 4:9; 8:48.
[103] John, chap. 4; Luke, chap. 10.
[104] Acts 1:8.
[105] Acts 8:9.
[106] St. Justin, *Apol.*, I, 26.
[107] Homilies, II, 22.
[108] Acts 8:10.
[109] St. Jerome, *In Matth.*, 24:5.

When Philip, the second of the seven deacons, left Jerusalem, he went to Sebaste [110] to preach the gospel. In that district, refractory to the Jerusalem authorities, he was assured of escaping the persecution of the Jewish priests. The deacons, in consequence of their dispersion, were freed from the material cares of the community, which until then had constituted their chief duties, and now devoted themselves to the ministry of preaching. Our missioner soon found himself confronted by Simon the Magician.

We know very little about Philip. It would seem that he was born at Caesarea.[111] His four daughters assisted him in his ministry by instructing the neophytes. They also seem to have had an important part in the charitable works of that early period. Philip had received the gift of miracles in an unusual way. His name seems to indicate a Hellenist origin, which would have facilitated his relations with peoples who were alien to Judea. Philip cured so great a number of possessed persons, paralytics, cripples, and infirm of all sorts, that many Samaritans asked for Christian Baptism. Simon himself asked for and received this initiation into the faith of Christ.

The deacons were authorized to baptize, but not to give the Holy Ghost. This latter power was reserved to the Apostles. They soon learned of the success which God bestowed on Philip's preaching and thought the time had come for conferring on the new Christians the complement of the sacramental graces received by those who were initiated into the faith of Christ. Peter and John went into the midst of the young Christian group of Sebaste and imposed hands upon each member of the new community, conferring the Holy Ghost on them.

[110] This was the ancient Samaria, capital of the province of that name. The name Sebaste, or Augusta, was given to it in memory of Augustus, who had bestowed it on Herod.

[111] From the Acts of the Apostles (21:8 f.) we know that later he dwelt at Caesarea with his four daughters.

There is reason to suppose that the outpouring of spiritual graces which was ordinarily produced at Jerusalem upon the newly confirmed was repeated in Samaria with particular splendor. A holy enthusiasm seized upon those who had just received the grace of the Spirit. Words were powerless to express the holy joy that filled their hearts, the ecstasy that raised their souls toward mystical contemplation. The expression on their faces, the incomplete phrases that died on their lips, and their unfinished gestures, left no doubt as to the efficacy of the sacramental rite.[112] Those who were present could not resist the impression of a presence and a particular action of God in their midst.

Simon was a witness to these moving scenes. The wretch, whose conversion may not have been free from ulterior motives, then experienced in his heart the worst temptation of his life. He yielded to it, boldly came to St. Peter, offered him money, and said: "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I shall lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." The first of the popes now found himself face to face with the first heresiarch. The Acts of the Apostles records his admirable reply: "Keep thy money to perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." [113] The magician bowed and pretended to be sorry. Soon, however, we see him, going about the world unrepentant and rebellious, followed by a wretched woman, Helena, whom he called "the Eternal Thought," whom he pretended to "deliver," and whom he made a partner in his works of sorcery. Later on an entire theologico-philosophical system was attributed to him. Probably this is merely a synthesis, made by his

[112] Referring to these facts, a Protestant author writes: "Therein we see the sacramental and magical idea that has ever since predominated in the Catholic Church." (Monnier, *Notion de l'apostolat,* p. 170.) In those events we see rather the notion of sacramental efficacy, *ex opere operato,* which thus is traceable to the earliest beginnings of Christianity.

[113] Acts 8:20.

disciples, of the ideas he spread, and perhaps intended simply to cover the immorality of his conduct.

According to this system, Simon held that the principle of all things is a spiritual, eternal, and invisible fire. From this first principle emanated lower spirits, in a gradation more and more material—the eons. It was their function to create and preserve the world. These spirits keep in captivity the eternal Thought of God, whose work they are. Who will deliver this divine *Ennoia?* Simon will, the Standing One, the Word, the great Power of God; and his whole mission will be to labor for this deliverance.[114] If these be really Simon's ideas, all the fancies of Gnosticism had their germs in the head of this innovator.

This wicked man who, almost immediately after the Savior's death, thus withstood the Church, was crafty and violent, intelligent and depraved, attacking both discipline and faith. He left a deep and sad memory in the first generations of Christians, who attributed to him a mass of crimes and adventures, wonderful and sinister.[115] His name survives in the language of the Church; she gives the name "simony" to the crime of trafficking in spiritual things.

The Eunuch of Queen Candace

The evangelization of Samaria was a great step in the spread of Christianity. The Church had passed the confines of the Jewish world and was soon to receive a pagan into its

[114] This system is developed in *The Great Announcement,* curious fragments of which are preserved in the *Philosophumena,* IV, vii; VI, vi ff.; X, viii.

[115] Fanciful details about Simon Magus are to be found in the pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* and in the *Clementine Homilies.* More trustworthy information is contained in Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius, IV, xxii; in St. Justin, *First Apology,* 31 and 56; *Dialogue with Trypho,* 70; St. Irenaeus, *Adv. haereses,* I, 22 f.; Tertullian, *De anima,* 34; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata,* II; VII, 17; and the *Philosophumena,* VI, 7–20.

ranks. The honor of this conversion belongs also to the deacon Philip.

The man who was the subject of this new conquest belonged to that category of foreigners who, though not being circumcised nor binding themselves to the prescriptions of the Mosaic Law, felt the profound influence of Jewish monotheism. They were usually called proselytes or "men fearing God." They were free from the superstitions of idolatry and from belief in the abstract divinity of the philosophers, and were accustomed to adore the true, personal, living God in the Temple at Jerusalem. This man was an officer of the queen of Ethiopia. He was returning home from a pilgrimage to the Holy City, driving in his chariot along the road which skirts the Mediterranean coast. Philip, impelled by the Spirit of God, approached him and heard him reading the prophet Isaias. He said to the eunuch: "Thinkest thou that thou understandest what thou readest?" To this the eunuch answered: "How can I unless some man show me?" Philip then sat beside him in the chariot and, interpreting the text of Isaias, announced Jesus Christ to him. As they went on their way, they came to a body of water. "The eunuch said: 'See, here is water; what doth hinder me from being baptized?' And Philip said: 'If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest.' And he answering, said: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' " Philip then went down into the water with him and baptized him.[116]

In this scene, so vividly reported in the Acts of the Apostles, we perceive the method followed for the initiation of men of good will into the Church. An inner grace and good example impelled them to pray and to read the Scripture; but there must be a minister of God to interpret the divine words for them, to instruct them, and, after being assured of their sufficient instruction and of their faith, to baptize them.

[116] Acts 8: 26-40.

Did the newly baptized eunuch bring about any conversions in Ethiopia? We have no evidence on this subject. We only know that Philip preached Jesus, while going from Azotus to Caesarea, in the almost pagan cities of the ancient country of the Philistines. But he seems to have turned only to men of the Jewish race or to strangers who, like the officer of Candace, adored the God of Israel: these latter were known as "proselytes of the gate."

Such was the first result of the persecution in which the first Christian martyr was slain. The second result was the conversion of one of Stephen's persecutors.

Saul of Tarsus

Those who stoned Stephen laid down their garments at the feet of a young man whose name was Saul, and who "was consenting to his death." [117] While Philip was evangelizing Samaria, "Saul as yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest and asked of him letters to Damascus, to the synagogues; that if he found any men and women of this way, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." [118]

He whom the Scripture here calls a young man may have been thirty years old.[119] The world has, perhaps, never known a more ardent soul. His incredible zeal had led him to defend, with unwearied animosity and perseverance, the purest Pharisaic traditions. He was born in a Hellenist center, Tarsus of Cilicia, of a father who was a Roman citizen. Yet he had been but slightly influenced by Greece and Rome. He was a Hebrew,

[117] Acts 7: 59.

[118] Acts 9: 1 f.

[119] According to the ancients, one was spoken of as a "young man" until he reached thirty years of age. Old age began at 60. Between 30 and 60 was the ripe age. Cicero speaks of Antonius as a young man (*adulescens*) when the latter was thirty years old. (*Second Philippic*, 21.)

the son of Hebrews; "a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees." [120] He himself said: "According to the most sure sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." [121] Whole-hearted as he was, he could not do things by halves. He accepted the whole system of minute prescriptions and complicated traditions which made the Pharisee's life a veritable slavery. Anyone who he thought was trying to harm that network or attenuate those traditions, he looked upon as a foe to be fought. It was probably in the synagogue of the Cilicians that he first heard the teachings of Christ and defended the cause of the Temple and the Law with that subtle argumentation which he owed to his teacher Gamaliel, in that vivacious, abrupt, impelling, incorrect, but remarkably forceful style which he seems to have acquired from life rather than from books or study, from his own soul rather than from the influence of a school or from the atmosphere of any country.[122]

Stephen's trial and execution, which Saul witnessed, unleashed his fury. In consequence of circumstances which we cannot precisely detail, but which the most elementary logic compels us to admit, Saul had not seen any of the wonderful things that occurred on Calvary, at the Resurrection, and on Pentecost. To his biased mind, the accounts which he heard of those events no doubt struck him as absurd fables and hateful inventions. In his eyes, Stephen was an impostor or a fool. At any rate, the Christians were foes of the Pharisaic tradition and therefore must be exterminated at all cost. In his own later description of his religious fury, he compares himself to a wild beast on a rampage.[123] He is no longer satisfied merely to look on at the execution of a victim, but enters private houses and

[120] Acts 23:6.

[121] Acts 26:5.

[122] "The smiling and majestic panorama of Tarsus seems to have left no trace in Paul's imagination. . . . Inanimate nature he views only in its relations to man. His realm is psychology." (Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* I, 19 f.)

[123] Acts 8:3.

drags out the people living there, men and women, to cast them into prison. But soon, for want of victims, the persecution at Jerusalem died out. Therefore, Saul requested the high priest Caiphas [124] to commission him officially to seek out the Christians of Damascus and put them in chains. There God's grace was waiting for the ferocious persecutor.

"As he went on his journey, it came to pass that he drew nigh to Damascus. And suddenly a light from heaven shined round about him. And falling on the ground, he heard a voice saying to him: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?' Who said: 'Who art Thou, Lord?' And He: 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the goad.' And he trembling and astonished, said: 'Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?' And the Lord said to Him: 'Arise, and go into the city, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do.'" Saul rose up, blind. He was led to Damascus, where the head

[124] Caiphas was not deposed until the year 36 by Vitellius, the governor of Syria. St. Paul's conversion must have taken place in 33. This date can be inferred from his Epistle to the Galatians, wherein we are told that he made his second journey to Jerusalem fourteen years after his conversion; but this journey must coincide with the famine that occurred about 47. In general, the chronology of the Apostolic age—from Christ's Passion to the fall of Jerusalem—has been a subject of countless studies. A summary of those investigations may be found in an article by Prat, *"La Chronologie de l'age apostolique,"* published in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* 1912, p. 372. Brassac, on the basis of a recent discovery, published an article entitled, "Une inscription de Delphes et la chronologie de saint Paul," in the *Revue biblique* for January and April, 1923. According to Levesque, the following are the principal landmarks of this chronology:

Martyrdom of St. Stephen. Conversion of St. Paul	33
St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem	36
Second visit to Jerusalem	46–47
Dispute at Antioch	50
Second Mission	51–54
Arrival at Corinth	51 or 52
Meeting with the proconsul Gallio	52 or 53
Third missionary journey	54–58
Epistle to the Romans	57–58
Beginning of imprisonment at Caesarea	58
Arrival of Festus	60
End of first imprisonment at Rome	63

of the Christian community, Ananias, cured him, baptized him, and presented him to the assembled brethren.

Such was the historically undeniable event [125] which not only gave St. Paul to the Church, but exercised a considerable influence on the great Apostle's theology, and thereby on all Catholic theology.[126] Jesus, the crucified of Jerusalem, manifests Himself to Saul as a Being ever living, and blames Saul for persecuting His Church—"Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" These two ideas—Christ ever living, and Christ identifying Himself with His Church—remained as two master thoughts in the Apostle's teaching and, through him, were transmitted into the teaching of the entire Church.[127]

Herod Agrippa, King of Judea

While these events were taking place at Damascus, the authorities at Jerusalem continued to plan new measures against the disciples of Christ. Up till then the chief priests had always stopped short of capital punishment.[128] We may well suppose that fear of the people had much to do with this restraint. It also seems that the procurator, Pontius Pilate, after his lamentable surrender in the matter of Christ's death sen-

[125] "To draw from these discrepancies [Acts 9:1–22; 22:1–21; 26:9–20] an argument against the historical character of the narrative seems to us a forced and arbitrary proceeding. If they were perfectly reconcilable, or even if they had never existed, those who will not admit the miracle would just as decisively reject the testimony of the Acts of the Apostles. . . . Their denial of the miraculous rests on a philosophical theory, the discussion of which lies outside the scope of historical research." These are the words of the Protestant scholar, Auguste Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul,* p. 59.

[126] "It is a well-known fact that Augustine's theology, and through Augustine that of St. Thomas, and through St. Thomas all Scholasticism, are derived by direct descent from the doctrine of St. Paul." (Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* I, 17.)

[127] Prat, *op. cit.,* pp. 50–62.

[128] The slaying of Stephen has been regarded as the result of a spontaneous outbreak. It was not officially approved, nor was it carried out by the Jewish and Roman authorities.

tence, showed himself less inclined to make new concessions to the religious authorities of Jerusalem. But the events of the years 36 and 37 allowed the enemies of the Christian name to push their boldness farther.

Upon the evidence of an impostor, who claimed that he knew and could point out the place where Moses had buried certain precious vessels, a large number of Samaritans met together on Mount Garizim. Pilate looked upon this noisy gathering as the beginning of a revolt and had the unfortunate crowd pitilessly massacred. In this instance it would seem that the Roman governor, yielding to the promptings of his restless and somber temperament, had exceeded the bounds of a just repression. Because of his disinclination to help the chief priests in their strifes, the latter took advantage of the occasion to denounce him to the legate of Syria, Lucius Vitellius. This man, whose son, of the same name, later occupied the imperial throne, appears in history as the type of a common upstart. Just then he was trying by every means to win the favor of the people whom he governed. Josephus relates that one of his first measures was to return to the Jews the priestly vestments which had been kept in the Antonia tower ever since Herod the Great.[129] Vitellius cordially received the protests of the Jewish authorities and sent Pilate to Rome. He was banished to Vienne in Gaul. If we are to accept Eusebius' statement, Pilate, whose life had been a strangely tormented existence ever since the condemnation of Christ, committed suicide there.[130] Meanwhile the death of Tiberius (March 16, A. D. 37) and the succession of Caligula did but encourage the criminal projects of the Jews. The policy of the new emperor, before madness deranged his mind, was to give the peoples of the East their autonomy and native rulers.[131] A friend and com-

[129] Josephus, *Antiquities,* XV, xi, 4; XVIII, iv, 2.
[130] Eusebius, II, vii.
[131] Josephus, *Antiquities,* XVIII, v, 3; Suetonius, *Caligula,* 16.

panion of his debauches was Agrippa, the brother of Herodias. In Pilate's place, Vitellius put his friend Marcellus, who was agreed to his policy.

The situation became especially threatening for the Christians when imperial favor restored the royalty at Jerusalem in the person of Herod Agrippa I. This grandson of Herod the Great, thanks to Caligula's protection, at first bent his efforts to the territorial reconstruction of his ancestor's realm. His fawning attitude toward Emperor Claudius made his fortune. With regard to his Jewish subjects, his policy was equally shameful. To gain the regard of the priests, this debauched wretch hypocritically pretended to observe every smallest prescription of the Mosaic Law. To win popular favor, he exempted the inhabitants of Jerusalem from the tax due the king from each family.[132] From such a monarch as King Herod Agrippa the Christians could expect nothing but new persecution.

This time the persecution fell upon the head of an Apostle. Did Agrippa imagine that James, the son of Zebedee, was at the head of the Christian community? It is not unlikely that this "son of thunder" was one of the most forceful preachers of the new faith. The king of Judea had him put to death; but we have no evidence touching the circumstances. We know only that he was not stoned, as the Jewish law provided, but was beheaded according to Roman custom.[133] One day his mother had asked a high place of honor for him in the Messianic kingdom. His martyrdom was the Master's reply: James the son of Zebedee was the first of the Apostles to shed his blood for Christ.[134]

[132] Josephus, XXX, vi, 3.

[133] Abdias (*Historia certaminis apostolici*) says: *"Cervicem spiculatori porrexit."*

[134] On St. James, son of Zebedee, usually called James the Greater, see Ermoni, *"Les Eglises de Palestine aux deux premiers siècles,"* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclés.*, January 18, 1901.

Amidst the Paschal festivities of the year 42,[135] the Jerusalemites and pilgrims who had come to Jerusalem from other places to celebrate the great Jewish solemnity, suddenly learned that Peter, the chief of the Twelve, had been placed under arrest. Agrippa had carefully calculated the circumstances of this clever stroke, through which he displayed his zeal for the religion of his subjects, while at the same time he gratified his personal hatred.

The formal trial and execution were postponed to a few days later. The astute monarch was doubtless preparing some new theatrical effect, calculated to impress the populace. Meanwhile, as we learn from St. Luke, "prayer was made without ceasing by the Church unto God for Peter." [136] Closely guarded by four squads of soldiers, who were successively relieved at each of the four watches of the night, Peter was chained to his keepers. As he waited for the hour of his deliverance or martyrdom, a bright light suddenly filled the prison, Peter heard a voice saying, "Arise quickly"; the chains fell from his hands, and an angel stood before him in human form. Peter wondered whether he was the victim of a hallucination. But the angel, directing Peter to follow, led him to the iron gate of the prison, which opened of itself. The Apostle was free. He at once turned his steps to a friend's house, where the faithful ordinarily met for common prayer: it was the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark. There Peter told the astonished family the miracle of his deliverance. Then he said: "Tell these things to James and to the brethren." [137]

The James here mentioned was the bishop of Jerusalem. According to accounts that appear to be very early, the son of Cleophas and Mary was placed at the head of the Church in

[135] The reasons for adopting this date are set forth in Fouard, *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity*, pp. 406 ff.

[136] Acts 12: 5.

[137] Acts 12: 1–19.

Jerusalem in 42, when the Apostles dispersed to preach the Gospel.[138] He was the first bishop of the holy city.[139] His piety, his faithfulness to the ancient prescriptions of the Law, his long prayers in the Temple, and his spirit of justice, made him venerable to the Jews as well as to the Christians. He was popularly known as "the Just" and "the rampart of the people." [140] One day Paul joyfully related to him what God had done for the Gentiles. With undisguised national pride, James replied: "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews that have believed; and they are all zealots for the Law." [141] But James was a witness of the risen Christ and this was enough to make him insupportable to the sect of the Sadducees. A fierce Sadducee, Annas the younger, a son of the high priest Annas, who had been more instrumental than anyone else in Christ's death, later on, in the reign of Agrippa II (A. D. 62), gratified the ancestral hatred by putting to death the holy Bishop of Jerusalem.

Ananias and Saphira

"They shall deliver you up to councils," the Savior had said, "and in the synagogues you shall be beaten. . . . Be not thoughtful beforehand what you shall speak." [142] But He had also foretold that the enemy would sow cockle in the field of the householder, and that false prophets would rise up among the people.[143] The Church would not escape persecution, nor would she be spared schisms and heresies. The early Christian

[138] Eusebius (V, xviii, 14) states that the Apostles stayed in Jerusalem for twelve years after the Ascension. Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata,* VI) testifies to the same tradition. In the corrected chronology, the Ascension is generally placed in the year 30.

[139] Eusebius, II, i and xxiii; III, v; IV, v; VII, xix. Cf. St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus,* chap. 2 (*P. L.,* XXIII, 639).

[140] Eusebius, II, xxiii.

[141] Acts 21:20.

[142] Mark 13:9–11.

[143] Matt. 13:25; Mark 13:22.

community of Jerusalem was well acquainted with both.

From the beginning two currents were discernible among the disciples of Christ: that of the Jews of Palestine and that of the Hellenist Jews. The latter name was applied to those Jews who, during the period of the dispersion, had adopted the Greek language and to some extent also the customs of the Greeks. The diaconate was instituted in consequence of the demands of the Hellenists, who complained that their widows were neglected "in the daily ministrations." [144] The opposition between the two parties remained a permanent source of strife in the community.

More serious difficulties arose from the fact of its economic organization. We have already observed that, through a natural prompting of charity, most of the first Christians sold as much of their possessions as they could and gave the price into the community treasury. During the Savior's own life the Apostles had had a community purse: an attempt was made to continue this early tradition in a larger circle. Christianity spread especially among the poor. For the rich to place their possessions into a common fund was the most delicate means they had to come to the relief of their poor brethren.[145]

[144] Acts 6: 1.

[145] "There is a surprising likeness," says Renan, "between such attempted organizations of the proletariat and certain Utopias that have been undertaken in times not very remote." (Renan, *Les Apôtres,* p. 112.) But it is evident that profound differences separate this common life of the first Christians and the organization contemplated by Communism. True it is that in both cases the distribution is made according to each one's needs, not in proportion to his contribution; but among the Christians, the offering is spontaneous, without any sort of constraint: any doubt as to this is removed by St. Peter's words to Ananias. Moreover, no mention is made of the proceeds of labor. Did they remain the property of the worker or did they too become part of the community fund? The text gives no indication. Furthermore, between the Communist soul, altogether concerned with the division of earthly things, and the Christian soul, with its thought in Heaven, any supposed likeness is artificial. To call this primitive organization a Utopia and to say that the Church was eager to abandon it as soon as it was seen to be chimerical, is no less erroneous. In fact the Church never has abandoned that ideal. Renan himself acknowledges this to be so. He says: "When whole countries became Christian, the rule of the primitive Church took refuge in the mon-

"A certain man named Ananias, with Saphira his wife, sold a piece of land, and by fraud kept back part of the price of the land, his wife being privy thereunto; and bringing a certain part of it, laid it at the feet of the Apostles. But Peter said: 'Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost, and by fraud keep part of the price of the land? Whilst it remained, did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power? . . . Thou hast not lied to men, but to God.' And Ananias, hearing these words, fell down and gave up the ghost. . . . And it was about the space of three hours after, when his wife, not knowing what had happened, came in. . . . And Peter said to her: 'Why have you agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Behold the feet of them who have buried thy husband are at the door, and they shall carry thee out.' Immediately she fell down before his feet and gave up the ghost. . . . And there came great fear upon the whole church and upon all that heard these things." [146]

By this terrible example God showed the members of the young Church that one does not deceive His ministers with impunity, and that nothing is more unworthy of a Christian believer than to evade a duty or even a counsel by an act of disloyalty.

A like event was never witnessed again. The economic régime of the early Church soon disappeared, made impossible by the very fact of its growth. But a source of more lasting conflict presently arose in connection with the question of admitting pagans into the Church.

Baptism of Cornelius the Centurion

The Savior, speaking to His disciples of the signs that would portend the fall of Jerusalem, had said: "Unto all na-

asteries. In a certain sense, the monastic life is but the continuation of that primitive Church. The convent is the result of the Christian spirit. There is no perfect Christianity without the convent, because nowhere else can the Gospel ideal be realized." (*Op. cit.*, p. 128.)

[146] Acts 5: 1–11.

tions the gospel must first be preached." [147] The Apostles took advantage of every opportunity to carry out the Master's injunction.

Peter lived habitually in Jerusalem. But his duties as head of the Church obliged him to visit the Christian groups founded in various places.[148] The districts evangelized by the deacon Philip were the first to which he went, to consolidate and extend the work so happily begun. God blessed his apostolate by numerous miracles. At Lydda, in the southern part of the rich plain of Sharon, "he found a certain man named Eneas, who had kept his bed for eight years, who was ill of the palsy. And Peter said to him: 'Eneas, the Lord Jesus Christ healeth thee: arise, and make thy bed.' And immediately he arose. And all that dwelt at Lydda and Sharon saw him; who were converted to the Lord." [149] At Joppa,[150] an important seaport which appears to have been a center of Christianity, he raised to life a widow, Tabitha, a woman "full of good works," who seems to have devoted her fortune to the needs of the early Church.[151]

In these cities, with their mixed population, the problem of admitting pagans into the Church presented difficulties which the Apostle did not hide from himself. The question was not to decide whether the infidels should enter the kingdom of God; the Master had solved this question in their favor. It concerned the conditions on which they were to be admitted. Must they first become Jews in order to become Christians? Would they have to pass through Judaism to come to the Gospel? This was the point at issue. The Jerusalem Jews (Hebrews, they were called) were clearly inclined to answer the question in the affirmative. But the Hellenist Jews (the Greeks) inclined to

[147] Mark 13: 10.
[148] Acts 9: 32.
[149] Acts 9: 32–35.
[150] Now Jaffa.
[151] Acts 9: 36–42.

the negative. Little by little the views were formulated with sharper cleavage between them. It is not surprising that the conflict was long and even bitter. Christianity and Judaism seemed to be striving for their existence. If, said the Hebrews, "the Gentiles enter the Church directly, and there obtain through faith alone the same rank and privileges as the Jews, what becomes of the rights of Israel? What advantage has the elect people over other nations? Is not this to deny the absolute validity of Judaism? On the other hand, if circumcision be imposed on the Gentile converts, is not that in itself a declaration that faith in Christ is insufficient for salvation? Does it not reduce the gospel to the position of a mere accessory to Mosaism? Is not this to deny the absolute validity of the work of Jesus Christ?" [152]

Peter was deeply concerned over this problem, when a heavenly vision brought him the light. One day, as he was at prayer on the roof of a tanner's house, which he had chosen for his residence, in view of that sea by which the gospel was to spread in the pagan world, he had a prophetic ecstasy. He saw the heavens open and a sort of linen sheet let down. It was knotted at the four corners and was suspended from the firmament. When he looked into it, he saw therein all kinds of four-footed beasts, reptiles, and birds. And he heard a voice saying to him: "Arise, Peter; kill and eat." But he answered: "Far be it from me. For I never did eat anything that is common and unclean." We know that, according to the Mosaic Law, certain animals were called unclean, and no one could eat them without himself becoming defiled. This mixing of clean and unclean animals in the great sheet made the whole collection unclean. The voice replied: "That which God hath cleansed, do not thou call common." This was done three times. Then the sheet was taken up into heaven.

Peter wondered what might be the meaning of this vision,

[152] Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, p. 125.

when three men came and told him that a certain Roman centurion named Cornelius, a just and God-fearing man, to whom the whole Jewish nation gave good testimony, had been directed by an angel to find Peter and hear his words. Peter's eyes were opened. He saw God's purpose: the legal observances abolished or at least given their death blow by the sacrifice of Christ; the Old Law gradually giving way to the New; and, as a direct consequence, the Gentiles entering the Church through Baptism alone, without the need of first being circumcised.

Peter went to the centurion's house and instructed him in the chief truths of the faith. He was preparing to confer Baptism on Cornelius and all the members of his household, when the Holy Ghost, this time before Baptism had been given, descended upon the catechumens. The mystical graces of prophecy and of the gift of tongues were bestowed upon these still pagan souls. God Himself came to purify them in a manifest way. No longer was any hesitation possible. Then Peter said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?" And he poured the water of Baptism upon the head of the pagan Cornelius, and likewise baptized his entire household.[153]

Word of this event soon reached Judea and there caused a great stir. When Peter returned to Jerusalem, "they that were of the circumcision," as the Scripture calls them, found fault with him. They said to him: "Why didst thou go in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them?" The Apostle boldly faced the storm. He related the details of what had occurred: the vision on the roof, the appearance of the angel to the Roman centurion, the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the household of the unbaptized man. Their murmuring was silenced by this simple and firm narration. Peter concluded by saying: "If

[153] Acts 10: 1–48.

then God gave them the same grace as to us also who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that could withstand God?" [154] The malcontents held their peace. But "they that were of the circumcision" soon started their complaints again, loudly recriminated, and made the first schism in the infant Church.

On the other hand, those who were urged on towards new countries by zeal for the Gospel, those who were fired by the memory of the Savior's words to announce the Gospel "to every creature," were moved with a new enthusiasm, seeing the great prospects opening before them. On the Phenician coast, at Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, and Byblus, the gospel missioners, after preaching in the synagogues, met pagans who were troubled by religious unrest, who longed for purification, and were seeking for the truth. The same was true of the island of Cyprus, where the Jews had settled in large numbers in the time of the Machabees.[155] But there was another city where the Jewish world was found even more mingled with the pagan: Antioch, the capital of Syria.

At the time of the dispersion following the martyrdom of Stephen, Apostles and disciples took refuge in Antioch and there preached the glad tidings in the synagogues.[156] Shortly afterwards some Christians from Cyprus and Cyrene, more familiar with Gentile society, came to Antioch and there announced the Gospel to the pagans themselves.[157] Upon learning that Peter had baptized a Roman centurion, they redoubled

[154] Acts 11:17.

[155] See 1 Mach. 15:23.

[156] Acts 11:19.

[157] Acts 11:20 f. The names of these first apostles are unknown. It has been conjectured that the principal ones were Lucius the Cyrenean, Manahen (foster brother of Herod Antipas), and Simon who was called Niger (mentioned in Acts 13:1). From St. Luke (Acts 6:5) we learn that Nicolas, one of the first seven deacons, was from Antioch.

their zeal. It was in this city, the third largest of the world,[158] the "metropolis of the East," that the Church, for the first time, was about to have extensive contact with the Greco-Roman civilization.

[158] Rome and Alexandria were the first two. See Josephus, *Jewish War,* III, ii. 4. Cf. Strabo, *Geography,* XVI, ii, 5.

CHAPTER III

First Contacts of the Primitive Church with the Greco-Roman World (40–62)

The Church at Antioch

THE city of Antioch was the residence of the imperial legate of Syria. About the middle of the first century it may have counted half a million inhabitants. It had been built by Seleucus in a superb location on the banks of the river Orontes. At first it was the capital of the Seleucid kings, who embellished it with that taste for theatrical decoration which they showed in the construction of their large cities. Its magnificence increased under Roman rule. The extensive ruins, which the traveler may still see,[1] lead us to imagine what may have been, for example, the great *Corso,* paved with marble and white stone, lined with sumptuous residences, public monuments, and royal palaces, which traversed the full length of the city. The wealth of its inhabitants, grown rich through commerce, the luxury of its buildings, the soft beauty of the encircling countryside, all favored the growth of a sensual paganism. The worship of Apollo and of the nymphs was displayed in long processions, which used to pass through woods of laurel and myrtle along roads bordered with roses and jasmine, to venerate the colossal statue of Apollo of Daphne which was celebrated throughout the world.[2] At this spot it was that Julian the Apostate later tried in vain to revive a paganism already fatally stricken.

In a retired section of the city, a group of Jews, drawn

[1] Cf. Müller, *Antiquitates antiochenae.*

[2] Cf. 2 Mach. 4:33.

thither long before by the Seleucidae, who hoped thus to foil the Ptolemies, were worshipping the true God. Many historians think Antioch was the scene of the martyrdom of the saintly old man Eleazar, of the seven Machabee brothers, and of their heroic mother.[3]

In course of time, between these true adorers of Yahweh and the multitude of idolaters, there gradually emerged a mixed and undefined mass: Hellenist Jews, more or less imbued with pagan customs, and "God-fearing" pagans attracted by the grandeur of Jewish monotheism and the hope of a Messias-Redeemer. It was through these intermediate groups that religious propaganda finally reached the out-and-out pagans, those whom St. Luke calls "the Greeks." [4]

The preaching of the Christian missioners was very successful; "the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believing, were converted to the Lord." [5]

News of this soon reached the Church at Jerusalem, which, by St. Peter's vision at Joppa and the circumstances accompanying the baptism of Cornelius, was prepared to understand and accept this extension of the apostolate. The "brethren" of Jerusalem sent one of their number, Barnabas, to Antioch to learn the facts.

Barnabas

The Levite Joseph, surnamed Barnabas (Bar Nebuah, "the preacher," or "the consoler") because of his zeal in preaching the word of God or because of his kindly and unselfish character which made him liked by all, was already a person of note in the assembly of the faithful. The Acts of the Apostles tells us that, at the very first, he sold a field and gave the

[3] St. Jerome, *Liber de situ et nominibus locorum;* St. Augustine, *Sermones, 1 de Macch.*

[4] Acts 11:20.

[5] Acts 11:21.

money to the Apostles for the aid of the young community.[6] When the converted Saul, as yet not fully trusted by the Christians, came to Jerusalem, it was Barnabas who introduced him to the assembly.[7] Barnabas was a native of Cyprus, not far from Tarsus. It may be that he had already known Saul and, better than anyone else, could guarantee the sincerity of that whole-hearted and loyal man, incapable of deception. Barnabas "was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." [8] He was tall and had a noble bearing, which at Lystra made the people take him for Jupiter. His repute and personal appearance carried weight with the people.[9] The choice of Barnabas for the mission to Antioch was a happy one, for no one was in a better position to understand the new Apostolic campaign, in which some of his fellow-Cyprians had labored so effectively.

Barnabas came to Antioch, and not only approved the catholic movement that was developing there, but likewise decided to further it by increasing the number of the missioners. His mind turned to his friend Saul, for he knew that ardent soul, open to great undertakings and full of zeal for the conversion of the Gentiles. He therefore went to Tarsus and soon afterwards brought Saul back with him.

St. Paul

The new missioner of Antioch was destined henceforth to occupy the first rank, if not in the hierarchy, of which Peter

[6] Acts 4:37. This piece of land must have been at Jerusalem. In that city there lived a sister of Barnabas, or at least a near relative, named Mary, the mother of John Mark. (Coloss. 4:10; cf. Acts 12:12.)

[7] Acts 9:27 f.

[8] Acts 11:24.

[9] St. Luke seems to say that Barnabas was one of the first converts of the Apostles, Acts 4:36; Eusebius (I, xii) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata,* II, xx) say that he was one of the seventy-two disciples. The Church gives him the title of Apostle, as it does St. Paul.

remained the unquestioned head, at least in the work of preaching the gospel. We might almost say that his history becomes the story of the spread of Christianity.

Saul of Tarsus was then in the full vigor of maturity, being a little more than forty years old. His person was not at first glance imposing. Being puny in appearance and fully aware of his outward defects,[10] he trembled, as indeed he did throughout his life, at the very thought of facing a new audience. But throughout his life the commanding voice of his conscience and of his irresistible vocation impelled him to preach to all, in spite of everything, "in season and out of season," the faith in Christ who was his life. "Woe is unto me," he said, "if I preach not the gospel."

After his baptism and the curing of his blindness, he felt the need of visiting all the synagogues of Damascus to declare openly that he had seen with his own eyes, living and risen, that Jesus who had been ignominiously put to death and buried, who called Himself the Son of God. Then, leaving his coreligionists dazed at his declarations, but not doubting his word, he hastily fled from the tumult to spend some time in intimate converse with God. He set out for Arabia, that is, in all likelihood, for the Sinai peninsula. There, for a year or perhaps two years, he explored the meaning of the revelation he had received from God on the Damascus road and of the traditional teachings he received from the lips of Ananias. In the

[10] With touching frankness, he refers to them in his Epistles (1 Cor. 2:3; 2 Cor. 10:1–10; cf. Acts 14:11). The somber features of this portrait were freely exaggerated in the Acts of Paul and Thecla in the fourth century, and in the Chronicle of John Malalas of Antioch, written in the sixth. They represent St. Paul as "short, bald, stout, with short legs, eyebrows meeting, prominent nose." These details, reported by enemies, are maliciously exaggerated. That St. Paul suffered greatly from periodic inflammation of the eyes, the best exegetes infer from several passages in his Epistles (Gal. 4:15; 6:11; 1 Thess. 3:1; 2 Tim. 4:16, etc.). This painful ailment, which the Apostle considered to be an "infirmity of the flesh" (Gal. 4:13), and other trials, possibly of a moral nature, he regarded as a providential offset to the visions and ecstasies with which he was favored (2 Cor. 12:1–9).

light of his new faith, he reread the Scriptures, which he had so long scrutinized under the direction of Gamaliel. Now he was equipped for controversy and exhortation; but not yet able to set forth his doctrine freely. At Damascus, when he came back there to preach, assassins were hired to murder him. He escaped only through the clever stratagem of friends, who let him down from the city wall in a basket. At Jerusalem, where he went to see Peter, he encountered new snares. He remained there only a fortnight. Then he returned to his native Tarsus, where for five or six years he again nourished his soul in silent prayer and study, no doubt holding in restraint, in heroic resignation to God's designs, his burning desire to preach Christ everywhere.[11] Thither Barnabas went to make Paul his companion in the apostolate, or rather his teacher and leader.

Paul and Barnabas

For a whole year Paul and Barnabas evangelized Antioch. There is no evidence that any act of authority or any popular disturbance impeded their zeal. We can easily imagine the two Apostles, one with his burning word, the other with his contagious piety, taking part in the conversations of this commercial population which was stirred, but not satisfied by feverish occupation in business and love for pleasure. We see them, now disputing with the orators in the market-place, now gathering the people about them at street corners, to show them the charming ideal of the beatitudes.[12] Conversions were rapid and many. Soon the Church at Antioch acquired a fame that raised it above all the Christian congregations of the time. On the other hand, the pagans understood that here was a society distinct from Judaism. From the name of Him who was ac-

[11] Cf. Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul*, I, 65–67.

[12] In a street at Antioch, near the temple of all the gods, is pointed out the place where St. Paul is said to have preached to the multitude.

claimed by all His followers as their only Master, the pagans called them Christians (χριστιανοί).[13]

These Christians were not niggardly in testifying their charity toward the mother Church at Jerusalem. In the year 44, when the prophet Agabus foretold the famine that would afflict the holy city, the Christians of Antioch began at once to gather alms. Paul and Barnabas, accompanied by Titus, brought these alms to Jerusalem when the famine came, eighteen months later, shortly after the martyrdom of James the Greater. The terror of the persecution still weighed upon the city. Peter had returned from Rome and was there, as were also John and James the Less. James was appointed head of the local Church. The envoys from Antioch placed their offerings in the hands of the council of the ancients and profited by the occasion to explain the situation which Providence had brought about at Antioch. Peter, James, and John saw that a special grace had been given Paul for the conversion of the pagans,[14] that he was the Apostle of the uncircumcised, as Peter was of the circumcised,[15] and they simply asked the two missioners to be mindful of the poor of Jerusalem.[16] Probably even at that time it was possible to foresee that the state of wretchedness would continue in the Holy City, in the midst of almost ceaseless revolts and repressions, until the day of its final destruction. Paul promised the Apostles of Jerusalem never to forget their poor and kept his promise with unfailing fidelity.

Fortified with the approbation of those who were rightly regarded as "pillars" of the Church,[17] Paul and Barnabas resumed their apostolate with new zeal. They went first to the island of Cyprus, the birthplace of Barnabas, where the pro-

[13] Acts 11:26.
[14] Gal. 2:9.
[15] Gal. 2:8.
[16] Gal. 2:10.
[17] Gal. 2:9.

consul Sergius Paulus embraced the faith, and Saul—his name suddenly changed to Paul—took charge of the preaching. Returning to the continent, they evangelized Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, in short, the whole region that was known as Roman Galatia.[18] Everywhere their method was the same. They would first appear in the synagogues, where they would preach as long as the Jews listened to them. But as soon as the door was closed to them, or a disturbance led to their expulsion, they boldly addressed the pagans. To their fellow-Jews they said: "Because you reject it [the word of God] . . . behold we turn to the Gentiles." [19] Between the years 47 and 52 they founded no less than seven Christian centers.

But their very success was sure to involve their newly founded churches in a momentous dispute. It was impossible not to see that Antioch was the center of all the new Christian communities, and Paul seemed to be their leader. What, then, of the influence of the mother Church? In these new communities the Jewish observances were not all kept. What was happening to the ancient traditions? The Church at Jerusalem was being recruited by a considerable number of priests and Levites,[20] some of whom did not altogether forsake the narrowness of their rabbinical training and showed themselves extremely sensitive.

No doubt God had spoken to Peter at Joppa with regard to the centurion Cornelius. But the situation was now much

[18] The scholarly works of Perrot (*De Galatia provincia romana,* Paris, 1867) and Ramsay (*Saint Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen,* London, 1900) have removed every doubt as to the location of Roman Galatia. It was Roman Galatia that St. Paul evangelized on his first missionary journey, and it was to the inhabitants of that district that he addressed his first Epistle. On this point and on certain important consequences with regard to the chronology of St. Paul's life, see Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* I, 84–89, 104 f. Cf. Belser, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament;* Dufourcq, *L'Avenir du christianisme,* III, 27–29.

[19] Acts 13:46.

[20] Acts 6:7. Cf. Acts 15:5.

changed. The present issue was not whether to admit a pagan and his family into the Church, regardless of the Jewish legal observances, but whether a sort of federation of churches might be formed, with a center and a head, seeming to draw the disciples of Christ into a movement quite different from that over which Jerusalem had theretofore had the direction. Some half-converted Jewish priests were grieved to see the Holy City deprived of its primacy, the Temple abandoned, the work of Moses rejected. Their complaint was apparently sanctioned by the example of their chief, James the Less, who was seen to be so assiduous at prayer in the Temple, and so exact in fulfilling the prescriptions of the Law.[21]

Some years later the Council of Jerusalem made allowance for whatever was reasonable in these claims. Unfortunately certain ill-disposed persons embittered the dispute. Paul and Barnabas, at the time of their previous journey to Jerusalem, saw through the designs of "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privately to spy our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into servitude." [22] Some of these were simply narrow, obstinate men who would not for any reason give up a view once taken or a prejudice once formed. Others were jealous and malicious; in their bitter attacks on the Apostle and his labors, it seemed they aimed at the very work of Christ Himself in His most ardent missioner.[23]

[21] Hegesippus, in Eusebius, II, xxiii; Josephus, *Antiquities,* XX, ix.

[22] Gal. *2*: 4.

[23] The Tübingen school makes no mistake in affirming the existence of a party ruthlessly hostile to St. Paul. But they are wrong when, without proof and even in face of most convincing evidence to the contrary, they attribute the inspiration and guidance of that party to St. Peter and St. James. We know what St. Peter's attitude was regarding the conversion of the Gentiles, and we see St. James joining in the conciliary declaration which disavowed the sect in question. Those whom St. Paul calls "false brethren unawares brought in" could not be Apostles. St. Epiphanius supposes that the future heretic Cerinthus belonged to this Judaizing sect. (*Haereses,* 26.)

Peter and Paul at Antioch

The storm broke loose shortly after the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch. The two missioners declared to their listeners that the hour was now at hand to open wide the door of faith to the Gentiles.[24] At this, some men, who had arrived from Jerusalem and claimed to speak in the name of the Apostles, rose up before them. St. Luke does not give us their names. St. Paul applies to them a word difficult to translate, which may refer to the haughtiness of their claims and the insufficiency of their authority (ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι), "super-apostles" or "apostles above measure." [25] They declared: "Except you be circumcised after the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved." [26] They succeeded in winning over part of the Antiochene Jews and made loud proclamation of their commission from the Church at Jerusalem. Their daring went farther. When Peter came to Antioch for the purpose of observing at close quarters the progress of the gospel in one of its most important phases, they appealed to him against Paul's methods. At the same time, they tried to stir up the principal Churches founded by Paul against him and his teaching.

Peter followed the line of conduct revealed to him at Joppa, freely mingling with the converted pagans. He was seen to sit at their tables, without concerning himself about the food that was served. The men from Jerusalem endeavored to persuade him that such conduct scandalized the Jews and troubled their consciences. Already, they said, a large part of the Antiochene Jews had risen up against Paul and the converted pagans. They advised Peter to live as a Jew, observing the Mosaic prescriptions, to restore confidence and peace. The Apostle of the circumcised,[27] moved by this reasoning, yielded. Little by little,

[24] Acts 14:26.
[25] See 2 Cor. 11:5; 12:11.
[26] Acts 15:1.
[27] Gal. 2:8.

to quiet the Jews, he discontinued his close relations with the converted pagans, ate with his fellow-Jews, and followed the same rules as they. Barnabas, too, weakened and was won over. Following them, a number of Christians began a strict observance of the Jewish regulations at their meals.

Paul saw the danger and judged that he was qualified to denounce it to Peter. At Jerusalem he had been officially recognized by the Apostles as the providential Apostle of the uncircumcised. It was evident that by Peter's present conduct the work which God had entrusted to him was threatened with failure. "To maintain circumcision, with the implied full observance of the Law, was to forego the hope of conquering the world. Never would the world become Jewish. The question of principle was graver still. To make a Mosaic practice an essential condition of salvation, was virtually to deny the transient nature of the old economy, the sufficiency of the Redemption, the value of the blood and merits of Jesus Christ, the efficacity of grace; this would be to overturn the fundamental dogma of Christianity." [28] The Apostle of the Gentiles, therefore, was in duty bound to point out to the head of the Church the effects of his excessive condescension. In one of his Epistles he writes: "When I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: 'If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?' " [29] Peter yielded to Paul's reasoning,[30] and the danger dreaded by Paul seemed to be warded off.[31]

[28] Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul*, I, 71.

[29] Gal. 2: 14.

[30] "Peter certainly yielded to Paul's reasons. If he had been obstinate, this whole affair, instead of being an argument in favor of St. Paul's gospel, would be a serious objection, which St. Paul could not have remembered without utterly ruining the thesis which was so dear to him." (Prat, *op. cit.*, I, 74.)

[31] Such is this famous Antioch incident, reduced to its just historical proportions. Enemies of the Holy See have made a great fuss about it; and some

The Epistle to the Galatians

But the sect was not satisfied with acting merely at Antioch. Its emissaries had already visited the Christian communities of Galatia, disturbing the neophytes by the confidence with which they everywhere repeated their famous motto: "Without circumcision there is no salvation." Nothing could be more painful to Paul's heart. These earnest people of Galatia had received the faith of Christ with most enthusiastic eagerness and had welcomed the Apostles with marks of filial affection. With his own hand, in spite of the painful infirmity of his eyes, Paul wrote as best he could, in big letters,[32] an epistle vibrating with feeling that he made no attempt to restrain.

The Epistle opens with a prayer for the increase of their charity:

"Grace be to you and peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for our sins." Then, without

apologists of the papacy have been so disturbed by it that they have gone to great lengths in an effort to prove that the Peter of this incident is not the Peter who was the head of the Church. We need scarcely say that neither the pope's infallibility nor his supreme authority in the Church is in any way involved in this passing disagreement. Peter's whole fault was in letting himself be momentarily circumvented by Judaizers, who misled him as to the effects of his conduct. As Tertullian says, "The fault was one of conduct, not of preaching, *conversationis fuit vitium, non praedicationis.*" (*De praescriptione,* chap. 23.) Was St. Peter then living at Antioch? Tradition gives him the title of bishop of that city; and Antioch itself has always honored him as its first founder. (See Eusebius, *H. E.,* III, xxxvi, and *Chron.,* bk. 2.) In matter of fact, the Apostles were the bishops of all the churches that they founded; their authority over those churches may rightly be called an episcopate, but we should not imagine it organized like that of their successors. The latter, attached to a single church and residing there, were alone true bishops in the sense we give the word. But when Peter, the supreme head of the Apostolic College and of the whole Church, arrived at the "metropolis of the East," that city acclaimed him as its pastor. "There the name 'Christian' was born. Church history bears witness to the fact that this Church, though founded by St. Barnabas and St. Paul, recognized Peter, because of his lofty office, as its first pastor. Peter had to come there when it was so prominent for its brilliant profession of Christianity, and his chair at Antioch became a solemnity in the Churches." (Bossuet, *Sermon sur l'unité de l'Eglise,* 1st point.)

[32] Gal. 6: 11.

any oratorical caution, the Apostle goes straight to the point: "There are some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. . . . The gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. For you have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion: how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God."

With a few masterful strokes Paul then describes his past life, his conversion, the divine lights granted him, and his relations with the other Apostles. In these lines, which we can feel were written hurriedly, Paul clearly sets forth the two unanswerable arguments on which he builds his whole contention: his doctrine comes to him directly from Christ and has been expressly and repeatedly confirmed by the chief Apostles, notably by Simon Peter. His solid guaranty is Christ's word, declared authentic by the hierarchy. Why, then, should he retreat? For, he says, "if I build up again the things which I have destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator." Why return to the letter of the Law, when we have the grace of Christ? This thought of the grace of Christ transports him. He says:

"With Christ I am nailed to the cross. And I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and delivered Himself for me. . . . O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth, crucified among you?"

The Law has, indeed, been appealed to, and Moses. Is there any question of setting up the faith in opposition to the Law, Christ in opposition to Moses? Not at all. The Apostle asks only that the Law of Moses should not make anyone forget the

promises made to Abraham and realized by the grace of Christ. Between Abraham and Christ, Moses gave the Law to restrain passions, to maintain faithfulness to the promises, and to prepare for the advent of grace.

"The Law was our pedagogue in Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after the faith is come, we are no longer under a pedagogue."

But all this is argument. The Apostle is eager to speak more directly to the heart of his dear Galatians. He writes:

"You know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel to you heretofore; and your temptation in my flesh, you despised not nor rejected. . . . I bear you witness that, if it could be done, you would have plucked out your own eyes and would have given them to me. . . . They would exclude you, that you might be zealous for them. . . . My little children, of whom I am in labor again, until Christ be formed in you. And I would willingly be present with you now, and change my voice."

Then the Apostle returns to his argument. Taking his stand on his enemies' ground, he makes use of a thoroughly rabbinical logic, an allegorical interpretation of the story of Agar and Sara. The Christian is not the child of a slave; he is a free man. The Epistle continues:

"We are not the children of the bondwoman, but of the free: by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free. . . . Walk in the spirit, and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. . . . The fruit of the Spirit is charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity. . . . Against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences."

Such are the main lines of the famous Epistle to the Galatians, in which Paul opens his soul to his disciples. Its style is

simple, picturesque, and sincere, at times hesitant, as though beneath the weight of a crushing thought, like the feeble body of the Apostle; again it is proud, brilliant, reaching the sublime, under the impulse of a superhuman inspiration.

The Council of Jerusalem

History does not tell us what effect was produced by this letter to the Galatians. But we do know that very soon the trouble sprang up again at Antioch. So intense did it become that the brethren at Antioch decided upon an appeal to the Apostles and ancients at Jerusalem.[33] From them it was that these dissenters said they had received their commission; to them the Antiochene Christians turned to have the pending conflict settled by a competent authority that was recognized by all.

The delegates from Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas at their head, set out, by way of Phenicia and Samaria, for the Holy City. Their solemn reception by the Apostles and ancients [34] shows that the latter wished to repudiate any solidarity with the coterie that had stirred up so many disputes. But this party, which had its center in Jerusalem and claimed to have connection with the supreme religious authority of the city,[35] was ready to renew its attacks. It was violently aggressive. No doubt it repeated all the curses of the old rabbis against violation of the Law.

[33] Acts 15:2.

[34] Acts 15:4.

[35] The expression *τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, which St. Paul uses (Gal. 2:12), may signify persons who claimed to have been sent by James or who were in his entourage. This is the most likely interpretation of the text. "Anyhow, we should not wonder if this old man who, from the testimony of St. Epiphanius [*Haereses*, LXXVIII, 14], was then from 85 to 88 years old, and had never left his Palestinian surroundings, had not fully realized the situation at Antioch, and judged things not exactly in the same way as did Peter and Paul." (Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, I, 151.)

The Apostles and ancients were assembled in council. All were waiting to hear what Peter and James would say. "Men, brethren," said Peter, "you know that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God, who knoweth the hearts, gave testimony, giving unto them the Holy Ghost, as well as to us. . . . Now therefore, why tempt you God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?"

After Peter finished speaking, "all the multitude held their peace." It was not easy to say anything against words so full of authority and good sense. Paul and Barnabas were brought into the council to tell "what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." Then James arose. Although Peter's hierarchical authority was beyond dispute among the faithful, yet James' moral authority was universal at Jerusalem, even in the Jewish world. His regular attendance at the Temple had gained him the particular esteem of the zealots; his being a "brother of the Lord" won him exceptional deference. After citing certain words of the prophets, he concluded by saying: "I judge that they who from among the Gentiles are converted to God, are not to be disquieted. But that we write unto them that they refrain themselves from the pollution of idols and from fornication (πορνεία) and from things strangled and from blood."

This was clearly an acceptance in principle of the law of liberty proclaimed by Peter and Paul. But it also took into account the need of managing the transition cautiously. The whole assembly agreed to the view expressed by James. The prohibition against eating blood and things strangled went back to the early days of the world. God had given this prohibition to Noe for the purpose of inculcating in his descendants respect for human life. The ban on food offered to idols

was intended to inspire a horror of idolatry. The word "fornication" in this passage probably means marriage between relatives within the degrees of consanguinity and affinity forbidden by the Book of Leviticus.[36]

The Council of Jerusalem then drew up the following decree: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things: that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication. From which things keeping yourselves, you shall do well." [37] In the letter written to the Church at Antioch we find these additional words: "Some going out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, to whom we gave no commandment." [38]

This assembly, which took place about the year 51, is commonly spoken of as the Council of Jerusalem.[39] Besides giving the faithful a rule of conduct, the Apostles and ancients proclaimed a rule of faith by refusing, contrary to the claims of Christians overly imbued with the Pharisaic spirit, to recognize circumcision and the Jewish observances as necessary for salvation. The rule of conduct which was laid down could have only a passing significance. As St. Thomas Aquinas says, "its only purpose was to facilitate the union of Gentiles and Jews living together, and it therefore ceased in course of time;

[36] This is the view of Father Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* I, 76. Le Camus (*L'Œuvre des apôtres,* I, 161) holds a like opinion. In any case, the decree cannot refer to the sin of fornication as such. It is concerned with determining certain outward and public facts, which are capable of serving as the ground for admission into or exclusion from the Christian society. According to the Book of Leviticus, cohabitation within forbidden degrees is a heinous deed (*revelare turpitudinem*). (Lev. 18:7–18.)

[37] Acts 15:28 f.

[38] Acts 15:24.

[39] Melchoir Cano (*De locis theologicis,* V, 4) considers it a provincial council; Torrecremata (*De ecclesia*), a diocesan council; Benedict XIV (*De synodo dioecesana,* I, i, 5), a sort of council. Some authors look upon it as a tribunal rather than a council. (Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* II, 153.)

when the cause ceased, the effect would likewise disappear." [40]

St. Luke relates that the Christians of Antioch received the decree of Jerusalem enthusiastically.[41] Henceforth the road to the Gentiles was wide open to the Apostles, and Antioch could be proud of having been the starting point of this movement of free expansion.

The Judaizing party did not, however, lay down their arms; they merely changed their tactics. Finding they could no longer hope to shelter themselves under hierarchical authority, they set up for a schismatic sect with chiefs of their own. The Epistles of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. Jude, and St. James supply a few valuable data about this revolt and schism. St. Paul, writing to the Colossians some time between 58 and 63, warns

[40] *Summa theologica,* Ia 2ae, q. 103, a. 4. St. Paul (1 Cor. 8:4–10) interprets the decree somewhat broadly. It is possible that the Jerusalem decree, in its practical regulation, was not observed everywhere, but only where there was a question of scandal for certain Jews. Thus are explained the numerous texts gathered by German scholars to cast doubt upon the authenticity of the Council of Jerusalem, because it is supposed that it was not applied in some places. For references of all these texts, see Dufourcq, *L'Avenir du christianisme,* III, 22. The authenticity of the account of the Council, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, is attacked on the ground that St. Paul recounts it differently in his Epistle to the Galatians. This difficulty does not exist for those who, like us, agree with Le Camus (*op. cit.*), Belser (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*), Weber (*Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefes vor dem Apostelkonzil*), and Round (*The Date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*), that the Epistle to the Galatians is anterior to the Council of Jerusalem and that it relates a journey made by St. Paul to Jerusalem in the year 47. The provisional character of the practical regulations promulgated by the Council, and their early abandonment, account for the numerous variants of the decree, as found in the manuscripts. The copyists, thinking to correct an error, altered the text to make it conform to the practice of their time. Amidst these divergencies, the critics distinguish two versions: the Eastern and the Western, but they are not agreed on the question which version is the earlier. At all events, the fact of these variants does not affect the authenticity and the substantial integrity of the decree. On this question, see a scholarly article by Coppieters in the *Revue biblique,* 1907, pp. 35 ff. The so-called "Canons of the Council of Antioch," discovered in 1572 by Father Torres, S.J., have proved to be apocryphal; they were composed at Antioch about the year 360. The critical questions concerning the Council of Jerusalem are summed up by Leclercq in Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles* (French transl.), vol. I, part 2, pp. 1070 ff.

[41] Acts 15:31.

the faithful against false doctrines that are "according to the tradition of men," "according to the elements of the world,[42] and not according to Christ." [43] In his pastoral Epistles he names some of the leaders of the sect: Hymeneus, Alexander, and Philetus.[44] He also mentions their disputes over words, their idle questions, and the endless patriarchal genealogies to which they appealed.[45] St. Peter and St. Jude denounce their contempt for authority and their denial of the coming of the Lord.[46] St. John declares that at the time he was writing certain Antichrists, who had come from the ranks of Christians, denied that Jesus was the Son of God or the Christ, and said that He was only a man and had only the appearance of a body.[47] In these details, as also in those to be found in the Apocalypse,[48] we can recognize the germ of Ebionitism and Docetism. In the spread of Christianity, its chief auxiliary had been Judaism; but soon the Judaizing spirit became its principal internal enemy.

It is impossible to deny the existence of the Judaizing sects in Palestine during the Apostolic age, and there is reason to believe that the party condemned by the Council of Jerusalem formed the nucleus of that sect. But it would be a serious mistake to exaggerate, as Baur does, the extent of their influence, by misunderstanding the perfect orthodoxy of those "churches of God which are in Judea," which, as St. Paul testifies in his

[42] By these "elements of the world," St. Paul means the elementary religious institutions, Jewish or other, which could serve as a preparation for the Christian faith for one who knew how to pass beyond them, but which could be an obstacle to the faith for those who let themselves be seduced and halted by them.

[43] Coloss. 2:8.

[44] See 1 Tim. 1:20; 2 Tim. 2:17.

[45] See 1 Tim. 1:4; 4:7; 6:3–5. Today exegetes generally hold that the "endless genealogies" spoken of in the Epistle are fabulous genealogies to be found in certain Jewish apocrypha, not the genealogies of the eons. (Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, I, 375.)

[46] See 2 Pet. 2:10 f.; Jude 8.

[47] See 1 John 2:18 f., 22 f.; 4:2, 3, 15.

[48] Apoc. 2:9, 14–16, 20–25.

Epistle to the Thessalonians, suffered from those Jews "prohibiting us to speak to the Gentiles, that they may be saved." [49] The Acts of the Apostles also mentions Christian communities in Galilee, in Samaria, and on the coast of the Mediterranean. "The term Judaeo-Christianity, strictly speaking, applies only to those Christians, born in Judaism, who looked upon the Law as still binding, and who therefore found themselves engaged in an irreconcilable conflict, not only with St. Paul, but with all Christianity." [50]

But in the daughter churches, two currents still appear: that of the *Ecclesia ex Judaeis,* made up of Christians of Jewish birth, who continued to observe the Law, and that of the *Ecclesia ex Gentibus,* made up of non-Jewish Christians, for whom the Law, though certainly of divine institution, had been provisional, and was now abolished. Beginning with the Council of Jerusalem, this latter current takes on a preponderant rôle. The triumphant formula is decidedly that of the Epistle to the Galatians: "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but a new creature. And whosoever shall follow this rule, peace on them and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." [51] In fact, and justly so, all the bonds are broken.[52]

Internal Development of the Church

In the Church thus freed, the organization, the form of worship, and the symbol of faith developed in a more autonomous way. There is a very precious document which contains a wealth of information about the Christian life of this period: it is the *Didache,* or *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles,*

[49] See 1 Thess. 2: 14–16.

[50] Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 238; Harnack, *History of Dogma,* I, 289.

[51] Gal. 6: 15 f.

[52] For a detailed study of the relations of the Christian Church with Judaism, and for its progressive separation therefrom, see Batiffol, *op. cit.,* pp. 1–36.

written some time between 70 and 100, but echoing traditions that are earlier than the date of its composition. It is the work of a Judaeo-Christian, who, in the opinion of some authors, wrote at Antioch,[53] but who, at any rate, clearly has in view the situation brought about in the Church by the apostolate of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch.[54]

The organization of the hierarchy presents a stage of development intermediate between that shown in the Acts of the Apostles and that revealed by the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Apostles, prophets, doctors, *episkopoi-presbyteroi,*[55] and deacons: these are the ministers who seem to be entrusted with distinct functions.

First we must distinguish from all the rest the Apostles in the strict sense of the word, "the Twelve." They exercise a double function in the churches: that of founders and that of pastors. As founders of the Church, in dependence upon Christ and the Holy Ghost, they are invested with special prerogatives, the chief ones being doctrinal infallibility, universal jurisdiction, and the possibility of receiving a divine revelation for the direction of the universal Church. We shall see the Church appeal to the authority of the Apostles as a decisive test in controversies. No territorial circumscription limits their powers. When they feel the need of acting in concert, as at the Council of Jerusalem, or when St. Paul declares that he does not wish to "build upon another man's

[53] Bestmann, *Geschichte der Christlichen Sitte,* Part II, pp. 136–153.

[54] The *Didache* was widely known among the Christians until the fall of the Roman Empire, and was then lost. It was refound at Constantinople by Ph. Bryennios, who published the text in 1883. Cf. Hemmer, *"La Doctrine des douze apôtres,"* in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* 1907, pp. 193 ff.

[55] We do not translate these Greek terms, because the *episkopos* is not necessarily what we call "bishop," and the *presbyteros* may be a bishop. We saw above that all the *presbyteroi* took part in the Council of Jerusalem; and the Acts of the Apostles, when recounting St. Paul's farewell to the pastors of the Church of Ephesus, calls them now *presbyteroi,* and again *episkopoi.* (Acts 20: 17–28.) St. Jerome says: *"Eosdem episcopos illo tempore quos et prebyteros appellabant."* (*Comment in Epist. ad Titum,* 1: 5.)

foundation," [56] this is because of a spirit of discretion and prudence, or because of an intimate dependence upon the Holy Ghost. These extraordinary privileges disappear with the last of the twelve Apostles. No one thereafter is able to appeal to them except the Roman Pontiff, and the era of public revelation closes at the death of the last of them. As to the teaching and disciplinary authority which they exercise as pastors, that will last until the end of the world and will be handed down by perpetual succession.

But the name "Apostles" was also given, even in the New Testament writings, to other persons besides the Twelve. Barnabas is called an apostle,[57] as also are Andronicus and Junias; [58] and St. Paul says that Christ, after appearing to Peter and to the Eleven, appeared to more than five hundred brethren, then to James, and lastly to all the Apostles.[59]

When the *Didache* speaks of Apostles, without specifying that it refers to the Twelve, it means ministers sent out on mission. An apostle is an "envoy of the Lord." He should not stop in one place more than a day, or at most two days. If he remains three days, he is a false prophet.[60] The apostle has a claim only to his nourishment; he should be given nothing except some bread for his sustenance until he reaches his next stopping-place. If he asks for money, he is a false prophet.[61]

Among the sacred ministers, after the apostles the *Didache* mentions the prophets. The apostolic writings speak of the ministry of prophecy.[62] St. Paul refers to the part taken by

[56] Rom. 15:20.

[57] Acts 14:4, 13.

[58] Rom. 16:7.

[59] See 1 Cor. 15:5–8. It might be supposed that the text refers to the Twelve, if the context did not seem to indicate that there is question of others besides them.

[60] *Didache,* XI, 5.

[61] *Ibidem,* xi, 6.

[62] Eusebius, III, xxxvii.

prophets in the Christian assemblies,[63] and the Acts of the Apostles mentions by name the principal prophets in the Church at Antioch.[64] They are men who, like the prophets of the Old Law, speak under the direct action of the Holy Spirit and who at times foretell future events.[65] But the prophets of the *Didache* appear to have, if not an altogether different character, at least a different importance in the Church. What were their special functions? Were they from the ranks of the laity, endowed with charismatic gifts, which circumstances made conspicuous? Or did they hold some rank in the hierarchy? On this interesting and difficult question no definite answer can be given.[66]

[63] See 1 Cor., chap. 14.

[64] Acts 13:1.

[65] *E. g.,* Agabus; Acts 11:28; 21:10.

[66] One cannot help being impressed by the place which the prophets hold in the *Didache.* They are mentioned fifteen times, whereas the doctors and apostles are spoken of only three times, the *episkopoi* and deacons only once. To the prophets only are given the firstfruits (XIII, 3); they have the right to form assemblies (XI, 11), and they are called the high priests of the Christians (XIII, 3). Yet most writers do not consider that these indications are sufficient to regard the prophets as hierarchical chiefs. These authors note that all the ecclesiastical writers of the first centuries, from St. Paul to St. Irenaeus, passing through St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius, St. Justin, and all the witnesses of that period cited by Eusebius, declare that the leaders of the Church are the *episkopoi,* and this notwithstanding the persistence of the prophetic ministry in the Church until the close of the second century. (On this persistence, see Justin, *Dial.,* 87, 88; *First Apology,* 67; Irenaeus, *Haereses,* XI, 34; Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, xvi, xvii.) Moreover, there is no evidence to corroborate the meaning which at first glance would seem to result from the *Didache.* It is said that the emphasis with which the *Didache* speaks of the prophets is explicable if we admit that this collection of maxims and precepts, composed at Antioch or in one of those cities with a large admixture of pagans, where disturbed souls eagerly gathered around preachers and seers, became an echo of the exceptional testimonies of respect and honor with which Christian prophets were then surrounded, an echo also of the liberty granted them at times to convoke assemblies (supposing that the words ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίος mean: convoking assemblies, and not: acting in view of the earthly mystery of the Church, as several scholars translate them. Cf. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 107 f.) The gifts that were offered to the prophets are likewise explicable, if it is supposed that, being travellers or foreign to the countries where they were preaching, they generally had no possessions and practised no trade. It may also be held that, because of the relative liberty ac-

After the apostles and prophets, the *Didache* mentions the doctors or *didascales*. From the Acts of the Apostles we know that there were doctors in the Church at Antioch.[67] Like the prophet, the doctor was a minister of the word; the former spoke under the action of the Spirit, whereas the latter spoke according to knowledge acquired in the ordinary way. Several times doctors are spoken of by Hermas, the pesudo-Clementine Homilies, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen.

corded them, as attested by St. Paul, a liberty by virtue of which any one of the faithful then took part in the divine service (1 Cor., chap. 14), and because of the particular rôle which the prophets filled, they were given the name of high priest, which, in the time of Christ, was no longer reserved exclusively to the high priest actually in office. (Jacquier, *La Doctrine des douze apôtres,* p. 232.) In reality, we are told, the rôle of the prophets seems always to have been restricted to preaching and the edification of the faithful. We should bear in mind that, "before becoming a tradition that is maintained, Christianity is a 'word' that is propagated." (Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 108.) The prophets of whom we are speaking, were bearers of the Christian word at the time when that word had a determining part in the Church's destiny. Hence, great homage was given them. Despite these arguments, many authors of note consider that the word "prophets" in the *Didache* means actual rulers of particular churches, real bishops, whether at that period it was judged fitting to raise to the episcopal office a certain number of prophets, who retained their former title, or whether the title of "prophet," then so highly esteemed, was used to designate the chief of the *episkopoi.* We may indeed note that at this period, the Churches are invariably governed by a council of *presbyteroi-episkopoi,* with one of their number at their head and, moreover, we nowhere find a special title to designate this chief, unless it be the name of prophet. In the Acts of the Apostles, the prophets Judas and Silas are called chiefs, ἡγούμενοι, the very name which is given to the chiefs of the communities to which the Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed. St. Clement of Rome calls the bishop *archiereus,* the very title here given to the prophets. And we can well understand that the word "prophet," applied to the bishops, was transitory. So long as the twelve Apostles lived, they were the chiefs of the *presbyteroi* in the churches which they founded, and soon after the period of which the *Didache* speaks, the council of *presbyteroi-episkopoi* disappeared nearly everywhere, giving way to a single *episkopos:* this word naturally prevailed as the designation of the chief of the particular church. Michiels, in a scholarly article in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* (I, 1768), thus concludes the critical study of the various texts of the *Didache* regarding the prophets: "We distinguish these prophets, clothed with a sacred character, from those who are prophets simply because they have the charisma of prophecy; and we think the former were missionary bishops. This is the key to the interpretation of the various passages cited." We share this view.

[67] Acts 13: 1.

The *Didache,* after directing the faithful to meet together on Sundays for the "breaking of bread" and for the giving of thanks, adds: "Appoint therefore for yourselves *episkopoi.*" [68] It then briefly indicates the qualities these should have, and their functions. They must be "worthy of the Lord, meek men, and not lovers of money, truthful and approved, for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers." [69] If we compare these words with what we know from contemporary sources—St. Paul, St. Clement, St. Ignatius, and St. Justin—and from archeological monuments of the time, they suggest the greatness of the ministry confided to the *episkopoi.* They are ministers of the Eucharistic sacrifice described in the preceding lines of the *Didache.*[70] For this reason they should be "worthy of the Lord." They must be "meek," as becomes those who have the duty of governing their brethren; "not lovers of money," for they have to administer the possessions of the community; "truthful and approved," because, as resident ministers, they must teach the community and preach—a duty that the prophets and doctors performed only in passing.

The word *episkopos* (bishop) was taken from the administrative institutions of the Greeks, who thus designated a civil official having an office of superintendence and inspection. The term was soon applied exclusively to the head of a particular Church. As the *Didache* uses this word only in the plural, some historians have thought that the title at that time given to the head of the local Church was "prophet."

Subject to the orders of this head, whatever name we give him, were the ancients or *presbyteroi,* who at that period and for some time afterwards, met together in a council, called

[68] *Didache,* XV, 1.

[69] *Ibid.*

[70] Funk and Harnack have noted the importance of the conjunction οὖν connecting the two clauses. "Appoint *therefore* . . ." (Harnack, *The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries,* p. 79.)

presbyteral (*presbyterion*). Many indications, which we need not dwell upon, lead us to suppose (though we cannot be quite positive) that, at the period spoken of by the *Didache,* these ancients had the "powers of orders," of a bishop—for instance, that of ordaining priests—though not possessing the "powers of jurisdiction." The title "ancient" is of Jewish origin. Among the Jews it was customary to entrust the direction of each synagogue to a council of ancients.[71]

Upon this institution the Apostles modeled the organization of their first communities. St. Paul admonishes Timothy to remember the grace he received by the imposition of the hands of the ancients,[72] and St. Peter implores the ancients to feed the flock entrusted to them.[73] Before long the meaning of the word became precise. After the death of the Twelve, when each separate church was placed under the direction of a single chief, when the institution of the council of elders disappeared, and the word "bishop" took on its own meaning, the title "elder" or "ancient" was used only of simple priests. This is the meaning of the word in St. Ignatius' letter, in which he congratulates the Ephesians on the happy circumstance that their ancients (*i. e.,* priests) are united to their *episkopos* (*i. e.,* bishop) like the strings of a lyre.[74]

[71] Jacquier, *La Doctrine des douze apôtres,* p. 242.

[72] See 1 Tim. 4:14.

[73] See 1 Pet. 5:1–5.

[74] St. Ignatius, *Ephesians,* 4. On the important question of the distinction between the presbyterate and the episcopate, see Prat, art. *"Evêques,"* in the *Dict. de théol.* The learned author proves: (1) that from the very beginning no trace is found of an "amorphous church"; for all the churches had chiefs, who are called sometimes presiding officers (1 Thess. 5:12; Rom. 12:8), sometimes directors (Heb. 13:7, 24; Acts 15:22), or angels (Apoc. 1:20), or pastors (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2; Ephes. 4:11), but most often overseers or elders (*presbyteroi*); (2) that there was lack of uniformity in the organization of the primitive churches, at least until the death of the Apostles and the disappearance of the charisma; (3) that the episcopate is of Apostolic origin; as to this, no doubt can be entertained in the face of the testimony of St. Clement at Rome, St. Irenaeus at Lyons, Tertullian in Africa, and Clement of Alexandria. (Cf. Michiels, art. *"Evêques,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi catholique.*)

As to the deacons, concerning whom we have already learned from earlier documents, the *Didache* supplies no additional light on their duties. Their domain continues to be that of works of zeal and charity, preaching, and the service of the poor.

If we consider the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the latter half of the first century as a whole, as it is described in the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles,* it appears to be nearly always on the move. The apostle, the prophet, the doctor, in a word the "itinerant minister," occupy the stage more frequently than the resident clergy, who, however, have the duty of supervising and controlling them.[75] The missioner is more conspicuous than the ordinary priest or the bishop: he is the center about whom the multitude gathers. To him go the people's offerings; and more than once we find the prophet even taking part in the functions of divine worship. But as the individual churches become organized in a more stable manner, the bishop's authority emerges more emphatically. Soon we find the bishop's pastoral function absorbing all the functions of the apostle, prophet, and doctor. These latter have only a transient place in the hierarchy, and disappear from it in the second century.

Liturgy and Ritual

The *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* supplies information on the liturgy no less interesting than on the hierarchy. The Christian's life is described as a life of prayer. He must pray at least three times a day.[76] From other sources we know that the hours for prayer were the third, the sixth, and the ninth,[77] *i. e.,* nine o'clock in the morning, noon, and three o'clock in the afternoon. The Christian's attitude at prayer was usually

[75] *Didache,* XI, 1–12. Cf. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 109 f.
[76] *Didache,* VIII, 3.
[77] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata,* VII, 7.

that of the orant, standing, bareheaded, with hands raised to the level of the shoulders. The Jews ordinarily prayed with their head covered; slaves were not permitted to uncover their head; but St. Paul directed Christians to pray bareheaded, like free men.

Outside the fixed times of prayer, the Christians were urged "to seek daily the presence of the saints (*i. e.,* other Christians, their brethren), that they might find rest in their words," [78] and to "be frequently gathered together seeking the things which are profitable for their souls." [79] On Sunday, the Lord's Day, they are to confess their sins, be reconciled with their brethren if there have been any quarrels between them, and to offer the sacrifice.[80]

The prayer formulas mentioned in the *Didache* are the Lord's Prayer and the prayers accompanying the reception of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. The Lord's Prayer is quoted verbatim, along with the following doxology: "For Thine is the power and the glory for ever," [81] a doxology that recalls the formula in Paralipomenon: "Thine, Jehovah, is greatness, power and majesty, victory and magnificence." [82]

Brief but exact information is given about Baptism. Whoever is to be baptized, prepares himself by a day or two of fasting.[83] First he must be taught all that he is to believe.[84] He will be brought to some body of running water—spring, brook, or river [85]—because running water, being fresher and purer than stagnant water, is a better symbol of the regenerating and refreshing action of the Sacrament. If living

[78] *Didache,* IV, 2.
[79] *Ibidem,* XVI, 2.
[80] *Ibidem,* XIV, 1 f.
[81] *Ibidem,* VIII, 2.
[82] 1 Par. 29: 11.
[83] *Didache,* VII, 4.
[84] *Ibidem,* VII, 1.
[85] *Ibidem.*

water is not to be had, other water may be used, that has been gathered in some receptacle; in this case the water is poured three times on the head of the person to be baptized, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." [86] This is the earliest mention we have of baptism by pouring. This method which, as we have already stated, must have been employed in the beginning by the Apostles on various occasions and by way of exception, later disappeared from the current practice of the Church in consequence of the regular building of baptismal pools, which happened wherever Christian communities gathered together and where baptism by immersion was practiced.[87] Baptism by pouring, used only for sick people, was no longer administered except in case of absolute necessity.

It has been remarked how carefully the *Doctrine of the Apostles* enumerates sins; [88] it even arranges them in two lists, which, after a fashion, might be considered early examinations of conscience.[89] It clearly affirms that sins can be forgiven.[90] We know also that in Antioch, at the beginning of the second century, sinners could obtain remission of their faults by applying to the bishop.[91] The self-accusation of sins, spoken of in the *Didache,*[92] may not have been a sacramental, but a simple ritualistic confession, similar to that which the Jews used to make to one another in their synagogues.[93]

Likewise it is not sure that chapters 9 and 10, containing

[86] *Ibidem,* VII, 3.
[87] De Rossi, *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana,* 1886, p. 19.
[88] *Didache,* chaps. 1 to 5.
[89] *Ibidem,* chap. 5.
[90] *Ibidem,* XI, 7.
[91] St. Ignatius, *Ad Phil.,* chap. 8.
[92] *Didache,* IV, 14; XIV, 1.
[93] Buxtorf, *Synagoga judaica,* chap. 20. Cf. Morin, *De poenitentia,* bk. 4, chap. 2, nos. 21 f. Such, at least, is the view of several eminent Catholic scholars, *e.g.,* Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, 14, 32.

thanksgiving prayers with regard to a mysterious meal, refer to the Eucharist. The meal alluded to may have been the purified and Christianized continuation of the *Kiddush,* or Jewish religious meal, and the invocations preceding and following it may be regarded as something like our blessing or grace before and after meals.[94] In chapter 14, however, the mention of the Eucharist is beyond doubt.

"On the Lord's Day come together, break bread and hold Eucharist [give thanks], after confessing your transgressions, that your

[94] Batiffol (*Études d'histoire et de théologie positive,* pp. 71–78), Cagin (*L'Eucharistie,* p. 254), Duchesne (*Bull. crit.,* 1884, p. 385) and Ladeuze (*Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* 1902, pp. 339–399) think that there is question here of both the Agape and the Eucharist. The question of the Agape is of considerable apologetic importance. Most Rationalists hold that originally the Eucharistic supper was merely an ordinary meal which, after long evolution, became divided into two distinct ceremonies: the Eucharist and the Agape. Among the noteworthy books on this subject, is that of Baumgartner, *Eucharistie und Agape im Urchristentum.* The learned author cites and minutely analyzes a vast number of texts, grouped according to the countries whose practice they show. Then he states the following conclusions: in the first century we find, in all Christian centers that we know of, institutions that are perceptibly identical with regard to the Agape and the Eucharist. On Sundays, early in the morning or sometimes about midnight—the hour of the Lord's Resurrection—the Christians met together to celebrate the Eucharist. This latter is connected with religious instruction and includes essentially the prayer of thanksgiving pronounced by the bishop over the bread and wine; the people take part in this liturgical function by saying the *Amen* and by receiving Communion. Sunday evening the Christians, following an old Jewish custom, take their meal in common, and this image of their brotherly love is also an occasion for them to refresh and succour their needy brethren: it is the Agape, a meal sanctified by prayer and by the exercise of the charismata of tongues and of prophecy; the celebration of the Eucharist was never connected with this evening meal, but, according to St. Paul (1 Cor., chap. 11), the Agape was an image of the great love which Christ showed to His disciples at the Last Supper. "Baumgartner's work," says Vanhalst (*Revue d'histoire ecclés.,* 1911, p. 721), "forms a solid defense of the Roman conception of the Eucharist. It is of genuine scientific value, harmonizing with the dogmatic conceptions of Catholic tradition." Yet, on several points, particularly on the subject of the Jewish prayers recited before the meal, Baumgartner's study should be supplemented by that of Mangenot, *"Les soi-disant antécédents juifs de l'Eucharistie,"* in the *Revue du clergé français,* 1909, pp. 385 ff., and by that of Batiffol, *"Nouvelles études documentaires sur la sainte Eucharistie,"* in the *Revue du clergé français,* LX, 513.

offering may be pure; but let none who has a quarrel with his fellow join in your meeting until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord, 'In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great king,' saith the Lord, 'and my name is wonderful among the heathen.' Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord." [95]

There has been much insistence upon the identity of the Lord's sacrifice (θυσία) with that of Malachias, and thereby the comparison of the Lord's sacrifice with the Old Testament sacrifices; this leaves no doubt as to the agreement of chapter 14 with the Apostolic and universal Eucharist of the Lord.[96] That is indeed the "breaking of bread," the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, spoken of by St. Paul and St. Justin.[97]

True, the words of institution, the words of consecration, are not mentioned. It is not explicitly said that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, as was later specified in the paraphrase given of this passage in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. But we should not forget that the *Didache* was a manual of piety for the use of the ordinary Christian, and not a ritual.[98] Moreover, if we consider the time and place of this book's composition, after Christianity's first contact with the Greco-Roman world, which was so avid of mysteries and so accustomed to look upon Oriental ceremonies as curious symbols, we are not surprised that the Christians were fear-

[95] *Didache*, XIV, 1–3; XV, 1.

[96] Cagin, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

[97] We do not understand how Rauschen (*Eucharistie und Bussakrament in den ersten 6 Jahrhunderten der Kirche*, p. 2) can say that one may hardly appeal to the *Didache* in favor of the Real Presence. If that text were isolated, doubtless it would be obscure; but when compared with so many other Apostolic, patristic, and archeological texts, its interpretation leaves no doubt.

[98] The prayer formulas given by the *Didache* are, moreover, only indications. We know that, in those early years, the celebrant himself improvised prayers. That practice continued until the fourth and even the fifth century. See Cagin, *Te Deum ou Illatio*, p. 342, and Souben, *Le Canon primitif de la messe*, p. 12.

ful of handing over the holiest of their mysteries to the extremely fanciful and perchance insulting interpretations of the pagans. Herein we find one of the circumstances that best explain the spontaneous origin of the "law of the secret," which did not rest on any written text, but upon a custom that was equivalent to a law and that assuredly had a solid justification. "The way of the Eucharistic prayers as given in the *Didache*—by suppressing the formulas most closely connected with the mysteries—was in accord with the rule known as the discipline of the secret." [99]

Christian Morality

Similar reasons explain the form in which the *Didache* sets forth the Christian moral teaching. Some scholars have thought this teaching contained traces of Montanism and Encratism.[100] But an unbiased examination of it reveals nothing more than a stern asceticism, justified by the need of warning Christians against infiltrations from the surrounding paganism. "Thou shalt not commit fornication; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not use magic; thou shalt not use philtres; thou shalt not procure abortion, nor commit infanticide.[101] . . . Regard not omens, for this leads to idolatry; neither be an enchanter nor an astrologer nor a magician, neither wish to see these things, for from them all is idolatry engendered."[102] Such commands evoke that whole pagan world where voluptuousness, cruelty, and superstition had almost unbridled sway and met the gaze at every turn.[103] "Be not one who stretches out his hands to receive, but shuts them

[99] De Rossi, *Bullettino di archeol. crist.*, 1886, p. 23.

[100] These heresies of the second century will be discussed *infra*.

[101] *Didache*, II, 2.

[102] *Ibidem*, III, 4.

[103] We know how indulgently the most famous philosophers spoke of the loosest morality, and how the most serious Greek philosopher sanctioned the exposing and destruction of infants. (Cf. Aristotle, *Politica*, bk. 4, chap. 16.)

when it comes to giving [104] . . . for the Father's will is that we give to all from the gifts we have received." [105] As for the poor, "provide for him according to your understanding, so that no man shall live among you in idleness because he is a Christian.[106] . . . If he has a craft, let him work for his bread.[107] . . . If he will not do so, he is making traffic of Christ; beware of such." [108] By such firm and prudent words a remedy is pointed out for the ills that afflict this Gentile world, which Christianity is entering for the first time. The helpfulness of labor has never found more earnest advocates than the first Christians.

As we might expect, a statement of Christian morality at that period does not neglect the important question of family duties. "Thou shalt not withhold thine hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but thou shalt teach them the fear of God from their youth up." [109] Beyond the family circle there is a sort of enlarged family, including the servants. A Christian will be mild toward his servants. "Thou shalt not command in thy bitterness thy slave or thine handmaid . . . lest they cease to fear the God who is over you both; for he comes not to call men with respect of persons, but those whom the Spirit has prepared." [110] A Christian's mildness, inseparable from the spirit of firm justice, will extend to all men. "Thou shalt not desire a schism, but shalt reconcile those that strive. Thou shalt give righteous judgment; thou shalt favor no man's person in reproving transgression." [111] A Christian should go still farther toward those who are his brethren in Jesus Christ. He should hold himself ever ready to place his per-

[104] *Didache*, IV, 5.
[105] *Ibidem*, I, 5.
[106] *Ibidem*, XII, 4.
[107] *Ibidem*, XII, 3.
[108] *Ibidem*, XII, 5.
[109] *Ibidem*, IV, 9.
[110] *Ibidem*, IV, 10.
[111] *Ibidem*, IV, 3.

sonal belongings at their service, for "if you are sharers in the imperishable, how much more in the things which perish?" [112]

Such are the chief precepts of individual and social morality that we find in *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles.* A general commandment inspires them and dominates them all: love of God and love of neighbor. It is impressive to see how insistently the author of this little book repeats this commandment and inserts it in the midst of his particular precepts. "First, thou shalt love the God who made thee, secondly, thy neighbor as thyself.[113] . . . Bless those that curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for those that persecute you.[114] . . . Thou shalt hate no man.[115] Be thou long-suffering and merciful and guileless and quiet and good." [116] The most expressive and complete symbol of love is found in the Eucharist. "Concerning the Eucharist, hold Eucharist thus. . . . As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom." [117] Lastly, this love, which is recommended as the principle of all, is not a vague private sentiment. It does not dispense with obedience to the hierarchical authority and faithfulness to the teaching received by tradition. "My child, thou shalt remember, day and night, him who speaks the word of God to thee, and thou shalt honor him as the Lord.[118]

[112] *Ibidem,* IV, 8. It is sometimes asked whether this passage did not prescribe a real community of possessions. That it did not, seems beyond doubt. A real community of goods was never obligatory, even at Jerusalem, where St. James supposes the existence of rich and poor (3: 1–9; 5: 1–5). It lasted but a short time, and did not exist elsewhere.

[113] *Ibidem,* I, 2.

[114] *Ibidem,* I, 3.

[115] *Ibidem,* II, 7.

[116] *Ibidem,* III, 8.

[117] *Ibidem,* IX, 4.

[118] *Ibidem,* IV, 1.

See that no one make thee to err from this way of the teaching, for he teaches thee without God." [119]

Dogma

The teaching here spoken of seems to be especially the moral doctrine we have just set forth; but this is closely connected with a dogmatic teaching that is expressly recalled by the *Didache*. This dogmatic teaching is of the simplest and, at first glance, appears to lack originality. But a close examination shows that its originality and interest consist precisely in this, that it takes its phrases almost word for word from the Old and New Testament and gives us a symbol of faith essentially identical with that of the Church today. Men sometimes try to point out a contrast between the "grand gesture" of the Gospel and the "scholastic formulary" of Catholicism; the natural connection between the two is found in the *Didache*. The following is a summary of its dogmatic teaching.

God is in three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.[120] He is the heavenly Father, [121] the Creator,[122] and almighty. Nothing happens in the world without Him,[123] and to Him belongs eternal glory through our Lord Jesus Christ.[124]

Jesus Christ is our Lord and Savior,[125] the Son of God.[126] He speaks in the Gospel, He is spiritually present in His Church, and He will come again visibly on judgment day.

The Holy Ghost is God with the Father and the Son.[127] He

[119] *Ibidem* VI, 1.
[120] *Ibidem*, VII, 1.
[121] *Ibidem*, VIII, 2.
[122] *Ibidem*, I, 2.
[123] *Ibidem*, III, 10.
[124] *Ibidem*, VIII, 2; IX, 4; X, 4.
[125] *Ibidem*, X, 2.
[126] *Ibidem*, XVI.
[127] *Ibidem*, VII, 3.

has spoken by the mouth of the prophets and He prepares man for the divine call.[128]

The Church of God is universal, and every man is called to belong to it.[129] It has been sanctified by God, freed from all evil, and prepared by the eternal kingdom.[130]

The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* naturally echoed the great and mysterious expectancy of the kingdom of God, which solaced men after the Savior's death and in which the thought of each one's preparation for death, "which comes like a thief," the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the last judgment, and the ancient Messianic hopes of the Jewish people, more or less transposed and spiritualized, are mixed together in a way that is sometimes curious.[131] The *Didache* stresses the necessity of watching, of not letting the lamps go out, of having the loins girt, in a word, of being always ready. In this it does but repeat the teaching of Christ. It speaks of the signs that will accompany the *parousia,* or second coming of the Son of God: the increase of false prophets, the darkening of the heavens, the sound of the trumpet, and the resurrection of the dead.[132] These, too, are merely the recalling of Christ's words.[133] Like Christ, it declares, "ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh." [134] Like Him, it is concerned with the founding of the Church upon a solid hierarchy. Nowhere in this devout writing do we observe that feverish expectancy of a proximate end of the world, destruc-

[128] *Ibidem,* IV, 10.

[129] *Ibidem,* X, 5.

[130] *Ibidem,* IX, 4; X, 5.

[131] On the formation and characteristics of the eschatological hope in Israel and in Christian times, see Labauche, *Leçons de théologie dogmatique,* II, 347–393, and Lemonnyer, art. *"Fin du monde,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi catholique.*

[132] *Didache,* XVI, 1–8.

[133] Similar expressions are to be found in the prophets, in their malediction of certain kingdoms whose downfall they predicted. (Cf. Ezech. 32:7 f.; 38:20.)

[134] *Didache,* XVI, 1.

tive of all authority [135] and serving as the principal basis for Christian renunciation, which, we are sometimes told, existed at the beginning of Christianity.[136] These Christians, whose religion is nourished by the thought of the mysterious *parousia,* are of the number of those whose faith nothing will shake, neither the tragic death of the bishop of Jerusalem nor the destruction of Jerusalem itself.

St. James the Less

This latter event does not concern us now, as it belongs to a later period of history; but the martyrdom of the first bishop of Jerusalem in the year 62 closes the period of the Christian expansion that had its center at Antioch.

About the year 60, the holy Bishop of Jerusalem was occupied with the dangers with which the Christian faith was threatened by the teachings of false doctors claiming connection with Simon Magus and teaching that faith without works sufficed for salvation. He wrote "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," that is, to all the converted Jews who were at Antioch or elsewhere, in contact with the pagan world, a letter intended to warn them against the danger of these false doctrines. He says: "What shall it profit, my brethren, if any man say he hath faith, but hath not works? Shall faith be able to save him? And if a brother or sister be naked or want daily food, and one of you say to them: 'Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled,' yet give them not those things that are necessary for the body, what shall it profit? So faith also, if it have not works, is dead in itself." [137]

The Christians, dispersed among the pagans, found abominable examples in the pride and corruption and brutality of

[135] Sabatier, *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit,* p. 23.

[136] This is the error maintained by Loisy in *The Gospel and the Church,* and in *Autour d'un petit livre.*

[137] James 2: 14–26.

the rich toward the poor; some, it seems, yielded to this fatal influence. Their venerable pastor says: "Hearken, my dearest brethren: hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith? . . . But you have dishonored the poor man. Do not the rich oppress you by might? And do they not draw you before the judgment seats?" [138] Then, in a tone recalling the courageous language of the prophets of old, he says: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl in your miseries, which shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be for a testimony against you, and shall eat your flesh like fire." [139]

The high priest was still Annas II, son of him who had condemned Christ. Profiting by a vacancy in the governorship—Festus was dead and his successor Albinus had not yet come to Palestine—Annas summoned James and certain other Christians before the Sanhedrin. According to Josephus, they were accused of violating the Law.[140] James was sentenced to be stoned. A passage from Hegesippus' *Ecclesiastical History,* quoted by Eusebius,[141] gives us a simple but dramatic account of his martyrdom, wherein, beneath a few apocryphal details, the most exacting critics recognize a basis of historical truth. Notwithstanding every threat, the saintly old man, who, we are told, was ninety-six years old, merely repeated that Christ is truly the Son of the living God. The scribes and Pharisees, furious at this attitude, had him thrown down from the top of the Temple, whither they had urged him to climb that his voice might reach all the people. As the fall did not kill him, they accomplished his death by stoning him. James the Just, repeating his Master's words, said as

[138] James, 2: 1–9.
[139] *Ibidem,* 5: 1–6.
[140] *Antiquities,* XX, ix, 1.
[141] *H. E.,* II, xxiii.

he was dying: "I beseech Thee, O Lord, God and Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." A fuller ended the bishop's life by crushing his head with the staff he used in preparing his cloth.

The teaching of the martyr bishop now became even more venerable for the Christians, who used to read his Epistle in the churches. At Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, in that Greco-Roman world where the faith was spread by the earnest preaching of the Apostles, the admonitions of James the Less about contempt for riches and the necessity of good works came like a lesson providentially adapted to the condition of the young Christian communities.

CHAPTER IV

The Early Church and the Greco-Roman World (42–70)

WHILE the hierarchical organization, the Christian life, and the symbol of faith were developing at Jerusalem and Antioch and in the Christian communities dependent upon those two centers, the Apostles and the missioners, under the direction of Peter and Paul, were widening the field of evangelical conquests. Peter, though continuing to watch over the Christian communities of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, Bithynia, and Mesopotamia, founded the Church of Rome. Paul, after a journey across Asia Minor, also entered Europe and preached the glad tidings at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth.

Of this new spread of Christianity and of all the expansion which followed, Rome was the center and remained such ever after: the capital of Greco-Roman civilization became the capital of the Christian world.

Paganism

Christianity appeared to the earthly-minded and carnal Jewish world as a scandal; to the haughty and pleasure-loving pagan world it seemed foolish.[1] True, just when Peter was entering Rome, when Paul was addressing the Athenians on the Areopagus, the old pagan religion of Greece and Rome appeared to have received its death-blow. The Empire, under its protective administration, leveled the races it conquered; and at the same time deprived the old offi-

[1] "Unto the Jews indeed a stumbling block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness." (1 Cor. 1:23.)

cial cults, which incarnated the soul of the city and the State, of their chief strength. Pagan philosophy was popularized, and thus lost its prestige. Confidence in Plato was weakened no less than faith in Pallas Athene. In the great and woful void produced about men's souls, from the Mediterranean shores to the Black Sea, a kind of religious ferment set in. The phrase "weariness of living" (*taedium vitae*) passed with Ulpian into the stern language of Roman law.[2]

Unfortunately the place left vacant by the old traditional paganism was already taken. The ancient mystical cults of Hellas rose up again. From Egypt and eastern Asia there came something like an invasion of strange, mysterious, seductive rites. Under Caligula, about A. D. 39, the worship of Isis became naturalized, so to speak, at Rome. After Isis, came Adonis and Aphrodite of Byblus, Elagabal of Emesa, the Baal of Doliche, and the celestial Virgin of Carthage, who drew crowds to their altars. They one and all prepared the way for that great Mithraic worship, that adoration of the sun god (*Sol invictus*), the last to hold out against the religion of Christ. These new cults had a more powerful sway over men's souls than did the ancient national cults. To a people enamored of festivities, they brought the emotions of their rollicking processions and their secret terrors. To souls homesick for the Infinite, they opened their mysteries, they offered a glimpse, in a blessed beyond, of some sort of intimate fusion with an ineffable divinity; all visible forces are merely its infinitely fertile and varied aspects.

We cannot say that the idea of perfection was entirely absent from this effort toward the purification which the new mysteries presupposed or which their followers were expected to acquire.[3] But this purification was chiefly external, ritualis-

[2] Justinian, *Digest,* XXVIII, iii, 6, 7.

[3] See Foucart, *Les grands mystères d'Eleusis,* p. 110.

tic; it left the heart untouched.[4] Some choice souls found in the legendary myths propagated by these religions an occasion for aspiring to a divine world. In reality, however, these myths were "the strangest and most indecent of all paganism." [5] While the public and secret ceremonies of the new religions, infested with magic and immorality, succeeded in inspiring the popular masses with nothing but the very lowest religious ideas, this great All-Infinite, which lofty minds conceive, yet wherein evil and ugliness have a place as essential as goodness and beauty, suggested to them the notion of a truly moral and supernatural life. In spite of outward similarities, which have been carefully collected and classified in vain,[6] the soul of that pagan world seemed essentially opposed to the spirit of the Gospel. The latter, therefore, did not hesitate to take its stand, knowingly and openly, as the enemy of all these religions; it ascribed their inspiration to the devil, and did not hide its intention of combating them everywhere, as one combats a mortal foe.

St. Peter at Rome

A certain clever writer has imagined a conversation between the Apostle Peter, reaching Rome poor and ill-clad, and one of those idle Romans looking for news who were often to be met with at that time. The Galilean fisherman declares that he has neither gold nor silver, that he has spent a considerable part of his life fishing on a lake of his native country and mending his nets in order to gain a livelihood;

[4] See Juvenal, *Satires,* VI, 519–595. Cf. St. Jerome, *Ep. ad Laetam, 7.*

[5] Boissier, *La Religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins,* II, 384.

[6] On these tactics and claims, see Allo, *L'Évangile en face du syncrétisme païen.* For our exposition, we have borrowed liberally from this work. On the moral and religious condition of the Greco-Roman world, valuable information will be found in J. P. Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, Freiburg, 1930, pp. 49 ff.; cf. Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew.*

that he now comes to preach a God who was put to death on a cross between two thieves; that he intends to introduce the worship of this God in place of the worship of devils and to spread it over the whole earth. The Roman shrugs his shoulders and goes his way, murmuring: "Poor fool." [7] Tacitus' and Suetonius' contemptuous way of speaking about the Christians makes such a dialogue seem not improbable.[8]

Early traditions relate that Peter came to Rome about the year 42, immediately after his miraculous deliverance from prison. These traditions appear likely. A number of very ancient Roman sarcophagi depict the imprisoned Apostle. It may be conjectured that the early Church of Rome wished thereby to represent the relation between St. Peter's imprisonment and his coming to the Eternal City. The Acts of the Apostles says that, after Peter was freed, "he went into another place." [9] Might not this other place be Rome? [10] Another argument has been drawn from a passage of Suetonius. The historian is speaking of Emperor Claudius' expulsion of the Jews from Rome; he says this measure was decided upon following a disturbance stirred up among these Jews by a certain Chrestus.[11] It would seem that he is confusing the

[7] Gerbert, *Esquisse de Rome chrétienne,* I, 14–17.

[8] Tacitus, *Annals,* XV, 44; Suetonius, *Claudius,* 25.

[9] Acts 12: 17.

[10] Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 11.

[11] "Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from Rome." (Suetonius, *Claudius,* 25). The name "Chrestus" was rather common at Rome among slaves and freedmen. To these two reasons we should add the testimony of ecclesiastical writers who, ever since St. Jerome, unanimously assign to St. Peter's pontificate a duration of twenty-five years, which they call "the years of Peter." It is true that some, as for instance the author of the catalogue of the popes (the Philocalian Calendar), place the beginning of these twenty-five years at Christ's Ascension, whereas others, such as pseudo-Ambrose (in his commentary on St. Paul, *P. L.,* XVII, 45), begin the reckoning, not with St. Peter's coming to Rome, but with the foundation of the Roman community, and still others (*e. g.,* Lactantius) declare that "during twenty-five years, and until the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Nero, they [the Apostles] occupied themselves in laying the foundations of the Church in every prov-

founder of Christianity, Christ, whose name is slightly altered, and some important leader whose coming or residence in Rome gave a new impetus to the Christian propaganda. If this is not the Apostle Peter, to which of Christ's Apostles or disciples are we to attribute the honor of being mistaken for the Master? [12]

Upon reaching Rome, Peter must have been welcomed by more than one brother in the faith. Among the strangers in Jerusalem on Pentecost, baptized by St. Peter, St. Luke mentions inhabitants of Rome.[13] These converts, after returning home, no doubt related the wonders they had witnessed, and such of their compatriots as made the same Jerusalem pilgrimage in the following years could but confirm what the first converts had said about the new religion. There is every likelihood that some of these latter were also converted and in turn may have converted some Jews of Rome. In any case, in the Jewish quarters of Porta Capena, Campus Martius, Trastevere, and Subura, where the closely united children of Israel plied a variety of trades—cobblers, retailers of everyday articles, or high-class merchants whose fine shops [14] were frequented by the aristocracy—there must have been talk of the Galilean prophet, His death, His Resurrection, and the strange events that occurred on Pentecost.

ince and city. And while Nero reigned, the Apostle Peter came to Rome." (Lactantius, *Death of the Persecutors, 2.*) "None of these evidences goes back farther than the fourth century. But, since the Philocalian Calendar, insofar as it concerns the list of the popes, depends upon the Chronicle of St. Hippolytus, drawn up at Rome in 235, and as the latter depends upon earlier pontifical lists, we are led to believe that the twenty-five years of St. Peter were already set down in the episcopal lists of Rome toward the end of the second century. It is impossible to go farther back. Thus early and independent testimonies give us the period of twenty-five years and connect it with St. Peter's apostolate; but this accord in the matter of the number of years ceases when we wish to know exactly to what that number applies." Duchesne, *Les Origines chrétiennes,* p. 28.

[12] Allard, *Histoire des persécutions,* I, 15.

[13] Acts 2: 10.

[14] Martial, II, 17; V, 23; VI, 66; IX, 60; X, 87, etc.

It was in one of the poor quarters inhabited by the Jews that the Apostle lodged.[15] Having neither learning nor rank nor high social standing, he was probably not invited to speak in the synagogues, as later on happened to St. Paul, whose title of scribe would bring him this honor. The chief representative of Christ had to win souls one by one through informal conversations, testifying to all that compassion, love of the brotherhood, and indulgent charity accompanied with modesty and humility,[16] which he later recommended to his disciples. His first conquests were made among these poor, lowly people. Therefore, the philosophers of that time looked upon the Christians as "a collection of slaves, common laborers, and old women." [17]

Grouped about these Jews at Rome were a multitude of Orientals—Syrians, Egyptians, people of far-off Asia Minor —who were brought together by community of race and traditions. Among all of them the Messianic hope, more or less deformed, was very much alive. Says Suetonius: "There had spread over all the Orient an old and established belief, that it was fated at that time for men coming from Judea to rule the world." [18] Some of these men must have given ear to Peter's words.

In the Roman world itself the poor at least listened with delight to the words of peace, purity, and deliverance addressed to them by the Apostle. In this number were the slaves, those men without rights, without defense or standing, whom the Roman civil law treated as things. We hear, as it were, the echo of the Apostle's voice in this passage of

[15] Probably in one of the lanes where the Jews of Trastevere and Porta Capena lived huddled together. Fouard, *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity,* p. 344.

[16] See 1 Pet. 3:8.

[17] Tatian, *Address to the Greeks,* 33; Minucius Felix, *Octavius,* 16; Origen, *Against Celsus,* 1, 62.

[18] Suetonius, *Vespasian,* IV; Tacitus, *History,* V, 13.

his letter intended for them: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if for conscience towards God, a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it if, committing sin and being buffeted for it, you endure? But if doing well you suffer patiently, this is thankworthy before God. For unto this are you called: Because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow His steps. . . . By whose stripes you were healed." [19] These poor slaves were, in very truth, among those to whom Peter addressed these astonishing words: "You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you may declare His virtues, who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light." [20]

Little by little there gathered around the Apostle, besides the poor and the slaves, a number of pagan women of less lowly station. Perhaps they were of the number of those matrons whom the Latin poet shows us coming, athirst for moral purification, to ask in the worship of Isis for numerous ablutions and endless penances, entering the cold waters of the Tiber three times every morning and crawling around the Campus Martius with bleeding knees.[21]

Christianity gradually ascended from the lower ranks of society to the higher. Tacitus relates that, about the year 43, a matron of the highest social rank, Pomponia Graecina, quit the world after the murder of her friend Julia (daughter of Drusus), who was a victim of Messalina's intrigues. "She lived to a great age and in unintermitted sorrow." [22] Finally her unusual manner of life aroused suspicion. She was ac-

[19] See 1 Pet. 2: 18–24.
[20] *Ibidem*, 2: 9.
[21] Juvenal, VI, 522. Cf. Tibullus, I, 3, 23–32.
[22] Tacitus, *Annals*, XIII, 32.

cused of "embracing a foreign superstition" and was consigned to the adjudication of her husband Plautius, a man of consular rank, one of the conquerors of Britain. He adjudged her innocent, and, says the Roman historian, her conduct "during the reign of Claudius escaped with impunity and redounded thereafter to her honor." [23] This passage of Tacitus for a long time led to the supposition that this high-born matron had become a follower of Christ. De Rossi's archeological discoveries in the crypts of Lucina—*e. g.,* the inscription of one Pomponios Grekeinos, probably a nephew of this Pomponia Graecina—led him to surmise that the cemetery known as that of Lucina, one of the most ancient of Christian Rome, was the property of Pomponia Graecina herself.[24] The great Roman lady, as wretched in her luxurious surroundings as the slaves in their chains, sought peace in the doctrine preached by the Galilean fisherman.

Conversions of this sort were, however, very rare in the first half of the first century. About the year 51, when the Emperor Claudius, because of a Roman tumult for which a certain Chrestus was held to blame, "commanded all Jews to depart from Rome," as we learn from St. Luke,[25] the Christian community must have been very largely composed of poor Jews. This was not the first time that the civil power dispersed the Roman Jewry. As on previous occasions, the banishment of the Jews did not last long. When the tumult quieted down, they were allowed to return little by little.[26] In a few years, perhaps in a few months, the Roman Jewry was reëstablished, and Christianity resumed its continuous spread at Rome.

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* I, 306–315; Northecote, *Roma Sotteranea,* I, 124, and Allard, *Histoire des persécutions,* I, 24–27. Cf. Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* p. 13.

[25] Acts 18: 2.

[26] Allard, *Hist. des pers.,* I, 18–22.

St. Paul in Europe

Peter must have left the city with his flock of Christians. He did not return until about the end of 63. But, while the head of the Apostles was again preaching the gospel in the East, Paul entered Europe.

About the year 51, while the Apostle of the Gentiles was hesitating at Troas as to what direction he should take, in a dream he saw a Macedonian standing near him and saying to him: "Pass over into Macedonia and help us." The Apostle understood that God was commanding him to turn toward Europe. He decided to cross the sea, accompanied by one who appears for the first time in the narrative and who becomes the annalist of the new Apostolic campaign. It is Luke, a Gentile, a native of Antioch, a physician, a man of intellectual culture, as his writing shows. "With the advent of Luke, somewhat of the Grecian genius found its way into Paul's mind and works. It had gifts to offer him which were unknown in the East, though they were to be found in abundance along these lovely coasts whither the apostles were steering their course—gifts of harmony, the beauty of sweetness and light." [27]

The Apostolic group landed successively at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth. In all these cities, proud of their great historic memories, but inhabited by people thirsting for religious truth, the missioners' words were listened to eagerly. Wonderful conversions took place in all classes. At Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and Corinth, Christian communities were organized. Supernatural gifts—prophecy and the gift of tongues—were manifested in extraordinary abundance. The "Lord's Supper," or the Eucharist, as at Jerusalem and Antioch, there became the central act of worship. In the evening, after sunset, by the light of many lamps,[28]

[27] Fouard, *St. Paul and his Missions*, p. 106.
[28] Acts 20:8.

the Christians met together in a room which usually occupied the uppermost floor of the house. As in the Jewish environment, the liturgy began with a supper which was called the meal of charity, or agape.

The Greeks, especially the Corinthians, unfortunately introduced a practice of Greek societies, that each member should eat at the society's meal what he himself had brought. Hence there arose regrettable abuses, against which St. Paul had to protest forcefully.[29] These abuses hastened the separation of the Eucharist from the agape, which then gradually disappeared from Christian public worship. At the close of the fraternal supper, those who had partaken of it greeted one another with a holy kiss of peace and charity.[30] The meeting-place was no longer, as it had been before, the synagogue, but the home of one of the brethren. "Here they found the true Ark of God, with the indwelling Eucharistic presence; here, too, there was a High Tribunal where every difference was speedily adjusted;[31] in fine, God's house was a center of social life so beneficent and delightful that to be excommunicated from its pale seemed the most dreadful of all punishments."[32] Words of thanksgiving were on the lips of all. There was a charm of virtue, a serenity of unexcelled joy. Such brotherhood merited the praise of the pagans, who exclaimed: "See how they love one another."[33]

Athens alone almost completely resisted the Apostle's preaching and the grace of God. After it had lost its independence, and Greece, which became a Roman province in 146 under the name of Achaia, had Corinth for its capital, Athens was nothing more than a city of schools, as Cambridge and Oxford are today. The only people to be seen there were pro-

[29] See 1 Cor. 11:17 f.
[30] See 1 Cor. 16:20; 1 Pet. 5:14.
[31] See 1 Cor. 6:1–7.
[32] See 1 Thess. 5:12–21. Fouard, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
[33] Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, XXXIX.

fessors, philosophers, and orators, who spent their time instructing youth.

As in Demosthenes' time, the most frequented place in the city was the Agora. The two philosophies then most in vogue were Epicureanism and Stoicism; their spokesmen were accustomed to meet in the Agora for the discussion of moral questions. Paul makes his appearance there and, from the first words of his address, raises his hearers' thoughts to the idea of the Divinity and His greatness, of the worship that man owes to Him. The serious, touching, confident words of this stranger aroused curiosity, but stirred diverse impressions in his hearers' minds. The followers of Epicurus, observing that the speech was about religious questions, murmured: "What is it that this word sower would say?" The disciples of the Porch, less contemptuous, thought that a new god was being set forth. Finally, curiosity got the better of scoffing skepticism.

That the stranger's doctrine might be heard the better, he was invited to go up to the Areopagus, far from the noise of the Agora. There, in the presence of Hellenism's greatest art and her finest memories of the past, Paul delivered that justly admired address which is recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

"Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are too superstitious. For, passing by and seeing your idols, I found an altar also, on which was written: 'To the unknown God.' What therefore you worship, without knowing it, that I preach to you: God, who made the world and all things therein; He being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is He served with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing it is He who giveth to all life and breath and all things; and hath made of one, all mankind, to dwell upon the whole face of the earth, determining appointed times and the limits of their habitation. That they should seek God, if happily they may feel after Him

or find Him, although He be not far from every one of us; for in Him we live and move and are; as some also of your own poets said: 'for we are also his offspring.' Being therefore the offspring of God, we must not suppose the divinity to be like unto gold or silver or stone, the graving of art and device of man. And God indeed having winked at the times of this ignorance, now declaring unto men that all should everywhere do penance. Because He hath appointed a day wherein He will judge the world in equity, by the Man whom He hath appointed; giving faith to all, by raising Him up from the dead." [34]

This mention of Christ's Resurrection, of a miracle so foreign to Greek minds, put an end to the interest and surprise with which at first they listened to the Apostle's words. He was unceremoniously interrupted. The Epicureans and Stoics returned to their speculations about pure morality. Yet a few hearers were moved; such was Dionysius, a member of the celebrated Areopagus—the Church of Paris honors him as its founder—and also a lady of rank, named Damaris.

Nevertheless a step had been taken in the Greek world. The great Apostle, who could be a Jew with the Jews, now makes himself more and more a Greek with the Greeks, to win all to Christ.[35] This "Hebrew of the Hebrews . . . a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees," [36] readily takes his comparisons from the military and civil life of the citizens of the Empire,[37] adorns his preaching with verses of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides, and declares his sincere admiration for the Roman peace and the imperial order. Not that he now put his ideal in a new setting. His thought, passing beyond the confines of the Empire, as beyond those of the Jewish world, was limited only by the bounds of that humanity for which his Master had

[34] Acts 17:22–31.
[35] See 1 Cor. 9:21.
[36] Phil. 3:5; Acts 23:6.
[37] Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* I, 20.

died on the cross. And as he said, in words that seem to have burst forth in flames from his glowing soul, his heart opened to "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever modest, whatsoever just, whatsoever holy, whatsoever lovely, whatsoever of good fame." [38]

Epistle to the Romans

It is not certain that Paul went as far as Rome on his first missionary journey in Europe. But it is beyond doubt that, from the time Claudius began his persecution, Paul was ceaselessly in relation with Rome, whether by voice or by writing. In 58, while staying at Corinth, he thought the time had come to send to the Christians of Rome, in the form of a letter, the great doctrinal exposition now known as the Epistle to the Romans.

The mere enumeration of the twenty-four persons whom the Apostle greets at the close of this letter is like a roll call of the Christian community of Rome, as it was in the middle of the first century. We see that, at this period, several members of the Roman Church are known to the Apostle, at least by name, and that he counts many friends among them. We also observe that, from the time of Claudius' decree, the Christian community, which at first was recruited on the spot in the Jewries and among a few strangers, chance arrivals from the Orient, has now made a daring opening in the most aristocratic families of the Empire. Besides Jewish-born Christians, such as Prisca and Aquila or people in the household of Aristobulus (grandson of Herod), we meet such of the Roman race, as Urbanus, Ampliatus, Rufus, and Julia, not to speak of those of Narcissus' household, and genuine Greeks, such as Phlegon, Hermes, Epenetus, Philologus, and Nereus.[39]

We have no indication that, in a gathering made up of such

[38] Phil. 4:8.

[39] Rom. chap. 16.

diverse elements, painful clashes occurred. Pagans and Jews, rich and poor, fraternized in the love of Christ. It is none the less true that, from the contact of the Jewish with the Hellenic or Roman element, misunderstandings may have arisen. Greeks and Romans were proud of their material civilization with its untold wonders and an intellectual culture which they highly esteemed. Naturally they were inclined to look down upon this insignificant Jewish race, whose ceremonies seemed so odd and whose mission, in any case, appeared to be ended. On the other hand, the Jews were no less proud of their ancient law, which they had from God Himself, and of the promises given to their father Abraham. They were reluctant to see themselves placed on the same footing as the Gentiles with regard to salvation.

Paul had an idea, very dear to him, which he called his gospel, because he was convinced that God had given him the mission of spreading it and furthering its success. This idea was that paganism without the law and Judaism with the law had given proof of their impotence, and that both must give way to a higher form of religion; "so that the religion of Christ, taking the place of the law of Israel and the error of the Gentiles, would gather in the net of the Church both Jew and Gentile together." [40] This is the whole teaching of the Epistle to the Romans, "the most important and the most vigorous of Paul's epistles, the one we may regard as the summary of his theology." [41]

The Apostle says: "There is no respect of persons with God. For whosoever have sinned without the law, shall perish without the law; and whosoever have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law. . . . But now without the law the justice of God is made manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the justice of God, by faith of Jesus Christ.

[40] Le Camus, *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* III, 314.
[41] *Ibidem,* p. 315.

. . . There is no distinction [between Jew and Gentile]: for all have sinned, and do need the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" [42] In this thought of redemption by the blood of Christ, Paul wishes to reconcile Jews and Gentiles by love; at this thought his heart is thrilled, and from his soul come forth those accents, perhaps the most vehement that have ever come from a human soul: "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who is against us? He that spared not even His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how hath He not also, with Him, given us all things? . . . Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or distress or famine or nakedness or danger or persecution or the sword? . . . I am sure that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things to come nor might nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." [43]

In the last chapters of his epistle, St. Paul deduces certain practical conclusions which are worth noting in order to see the attitude of the Church at Rome toward the Empire. Since henceforth Jews and Gentiles are fused into a single society open to all, the time has come for the Jew to abjure every thought of revolt. St. Paul speaks particularly to those Israelites whose seething nationalism would not consent to fusion in the great Roman unity: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers. . . . He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. . . . The prince is God's minister. Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." [44]

When the Apostle wrote these lines, Seneca and Burrus

[42] Rom. 2: 11 f.; 3: 21–24.
[43] Rom. 8: 31–39.
[44] Rom. 13: 1–5.

were governing the Empire in Nero's name, and the latter had not yet given his people any reason for cursing him. But the accidental circumstances of the government at the time when the Epistle to the Romans was written are of little moment. St. Paul was proclaiming a principle that the Church was to repeat after him with the same energy, namely, that a Christian should be second to none in obedience to the just laws of his country and in respect for its magistrates. This commandment would but make more striking her uncompromising attitude when the higher rights of God and of justice were at stake. The young Roman Church and St. Paul himself were soon to give a brilliant example of this heroic resistance.

St. Paul at Rome

Four years after writing his Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul entered Rome as a prisoner. He had been set upon in a tumult in Jerusalem, whither he had brought the offerings collected in Achaia for the brethren of Jerusalem, and had been arrested by the Roman police and haled before the governor of Judea. Before the tribune Claudius, he demanded his rights as a Roman citizen and uttered the solemn formula of appeal to Caesar. After an imprisonment at Caesarea, he was brought to Rome, reaching there in March, 62, just when Nero's personal reign was beginning. Burrus had just died and was replaced by the infamous Tigellinus, the companion of the Emperor's debauchery; Seneca had retired from public life, and, as has been said, "Nero now had only the Furies for his advisers."

But the ruler no doubt paid little attention to this Jewish prisoner and to the religious quarrel in which he was said to be involved. Paul had to wait two years for that appearance before the Emperor which he had demanded as the right of a Roman citizen. During those two years he lived in a condition

of mitigated imprisonment in the custody of a pretorian, freely receiving those who came to visit him. The Christian community at Rome had grown. One of the letters written by the Apostle during his imprisonment speaks of Christians belonging to Caesar's household.[45] It would seem that his words brought about many conversions, even among the soldiers. In the same letter he says that his chains have become a preaching of Christ in the whole pretorian camp near which he was lodged.[46] There it was that he wrote several of his Epistles: probably the short note to Philemon, the letter to the Churches of Asia Minor known as the Epistle to the Ephesians, the exhortation to the brethren at Colossa, and certainly the letter to the Philippians.[47]

These so-called Epistles of the Captivity are distinguished from the others by a tone of greater tenderness and a deeper mystical doctrine. The Apostle's first letters were merely an echo of his missionary preaching; the Epistle to the Romans condensed his fundamental dogmatic teaching. In his correspondence with the Churches of Asia in general, with the Christians of Colossa and of Philippi, his soul is poured forth in more touching accents. At the close of his letter to the Philippians he writes these exquisitely delicate lines: "I have thought it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother and fellow laborer and fellow soldier. . . . He was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him; and not only on him, but on me also." [48] To Philemon he writes: "As Paul an old man, and now a prisoner also of Jesus Christ, I beseech thee for my son, whom I have begotten in my bands." [49] In these Epistles

[45] Phil. 4:22.

[46] Phil. 1:13.

[47] Each of these letters alludes to an imprisonment of the Apostle. The Epistle to the Philippians certainly dates from the Roman imprisonment. It is possible that the other Epistles were written by St. Paul while he was in prison at Caesarea. Cf. Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament,* IV, 282.

[48] Phil. 2:25–27.

[49] Philemon 9 f.

of the Captivity are to be found lofty and enlightening views upon the interior life, upon Christ considered as the foundation of all things, upon the abasement of the Son of God, upon the struggle we have to engage in against the infernal powers, upon the old man and the new man, upon the union of Christ and His Church.

There is nothing equal to the touching words with which the Apostle, on his knees, begs the Christians to strengthen the inner man within themselves: "I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for you Gentiles, bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that he would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened by His Spirit with might unto the inward man, that Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts; that, being rooted and founded in charity, you may be able . . . to know also the charity of Christ." [50] For Christ is the foundation of all: "God, according to His good pleasure, hath purposed in Him . . . to reëstablish all things in Christ, that are in heaven and on earth." [51] And it is this Christ who, out of love for us, so greatly humbled Himself. "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. . . . He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross." [52] But alas, although on one hand Christ draws us, on the other the powers of evil seek to seduce us. "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in high places." [53] Of what, at bottom, does the whole Christian life consist? "To put off, according to former conversation, the old man, who is corrupted according to the desire of error, and

[50] Ephes. 3: 1, 14–19.

[51] Ephes. 1: 9 f.

[52] Phil. 2: 6–8. Cf. Durand, *"La Divinité de Jésus-Christ dans saint Paul,"* in the *Revue biblique,* 1903, pp. 550 ff.

[53] Ephes. 6: 12.

be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth." [54]

Paul's words are no less tender when he speaks of the Church than when he speaks of Christ and of God; for him, Christ is the living God, and the Church and Christ are one. The Church is the body of Christ; it is Christ continuing to live, through time and space, by His ministers and His Sacraments. If God, in His Church, has bestowed diverse ministries and graces, all this was done "for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ, that . . . doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in Him who is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in charity." [55]

St. Peter Again at Rome

St. Paul's trial was finally ended. In 63 he appeared, if not before the Emperor, at least before the council having jurisdiction in the case of his appeal.[56] The imperial tribunal, unconcerned with religious disputes, provided these did not disturb public tranquillity, may have regarded Paul's case as a mere conflict of Jewish sects, and acquitted the Apostle, who, as he himself expresses it, "was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." [57]

[54] Ephes. 4: 22–24.

[55] Ephes. 4: 11–16. We have purposely given as literal a translation as possible of this sentence, in which the most personal, the most grammatically involved, the densest and the most powerful traits of St. Paul's style are revealed.

[56] Willems, *Le Droit public romain,* p. 475.

[57] 2 Tim. 4: 17.

When Paul was set at liberty, he probably went to Spain; the Christian beginnings of that country seem to be connected with his apostolate. He also revisited the Christian communities of the Aegean sea-coast. The so-called pastoral letters, written to Titus and to Timothy, give us a few details of this journey.

St. Paul's stay at Rome, though he was a prisoner, had been of advantage to the progress of the Church. The Christians, comforted by his presence and example, showed themselves more confident and courageous.

At the very time when Paul left the Eternal City, Peter reached there. There can be no doubt of this second journey of the chief of the Apostles to Rome. But the fact of Peter's residence at Rome has borne such consequences and aroused so great controversies, that it is worth while considering the evidence for it. "After the middle of the second century a precise and universal tradition clearly existed as to St. Peter's visit to Rome. . . . It is very remarkable that a position entailing consequences of such crucial importance never was questioned in any of the controversies between the East and Rome. . . . But the evidence goes back farther than the end or even the middle of the second century. In his letter to the Romans,[58] St. Ignatius of Antioch alludes to their Apostolic traditions. . . . Without speaking of the allusions to it which it has been thought possible to trace in the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel contains an extremely clear allusion to the way in which St. Peter met his death.[59] . . . St. Clement, in the celebrated passage on Nero's persecution,[60] connects the Apostles Peter and Paul with the Danaides, the Dirces, and other victims who suffered as a result of the burning of Rome. . . . There is no one,

[58] St. Ignatius, *Romans*, 4.
[59] John 21: 18 f.
[60] *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 5 f.

even including St. Peter himself, but records his sojourn in Rome. His letter to the Christians in Asia Minor finishes with a greeting which he sends them in the name of the Church of Babylon, that is, the Church of Rome." [61]

Though the reality of St. Peter's residence in Rome is historically established, we have only vague data about his labors there. "In Trastevere, in the ghetto, on the Aventine, at St. Prisca; on the Viminal, at the spot marked by St. Pudentiana; on the Via Nomentana, at the Ostrian cemetery, at the place called *Ad nymphas sancti Petri,* or *Ubi Petrus baptizabat;* in the Vatican region, where he shed his blood: at these spots a few traditional souvenirs enable us vaguely to follow the Apostle by the half-effaced traces of his footsteps." [62]

The Burning of Rome

More exact historical documents are preserved regarding the terrible persecution which troubled the end of St. Peter's Roman pontificate.

On July 19, A. D. 64, a fire started in the shops surrounding the Circus Maximus and, fanned by a strong wind, destroyed, one after the other, the sections of the Palatine, the Forum, the Caelian hill, the Aventine, and the Esquiline. This conflagration lasted six days. More than half of old Rome was burned. The people for the most part were able to save their lives by fleeing to the Campus Martius, where they had temporary shelter; but they saw themselves reduced to utter destitution by this disaster. As usually happens in such cases, they at once

[61] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 45; cf. Fouard, *St. Peter,* pp. 407 f.; Guiraud, *Questions d'histoire et d'archéologie chrétienne, la venue de saint Pierre à Rome;* De Smedt, *Dissertationes selectae in primam aetatem Ecclesiae,* pp. 12–22; Grisar, *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages,* I, 284 ff. Guignebert, in a voluminous work, *La Primauté de Pierre et la venue de Pierre à Rome,* attempts to reopen the question and to revise the claims of the Christian tradition to historical certitude.

[62] Gondal, *Au temps des apôtres,* p. 239.

asked who was the person responsible for the calamity. On every tongue was one name—that of the Emperor.[63]

Not long before, Nero had revealed his cruel, vain, and whimsical nature. Three years earlier, to avenge the murder of Pedanius Secundus, prefect of Rome, he had ordered the victim's four hundred slaves put to death. Popular indignation expressed itself by an uprising, which the police had difficulty in curbing.[64] Since then the tyrant's crimes had increased. Burrus was dead, and public opinion accused Nero of putting him out of the way. Octavia, overwhelmed with shame, had likewise disappeared. Seneca, in retirement, was hourly expecting a decree of death or torture. The terrible Tigellinus ruled. The Emperor, elated by the base flattery of his courtiers, curiously mingled his bloody cruelties with visions of literary glory and, it was said, lulled his remorse (if the monster was capable of that feeling) by reciting poetry. Word spread that some one had seen Nero, in actor's costume, contemplating the conflagration from the top of a tower, while he sang the destruction of Troy.

The Neronian Persecution

An idea, possibly suggested by one of the many Jews at court,[65] entered the despot's mind. To accuse the Christians of

[63] Tacitus, *Annals,* XV, 44; cf. *Annals,* XV, 67; Suetonius, *Nero,* 38; Pliny, *Natural History,* XVII, 1.

[64] Tacitus, *Annals,* XIV, 42 ff.

[65] St. Clement of Rome, alluding to the slaughter of Christians by Nero's orders, attributes it to jealousy (*First Epistle,* 5). Moreover, we know that Nero was surrounded by Jews (Josephus, *Antiquities,* XVIII, XIX, XX). It is noteworthy that the Jews, ordinarily confused with the Christians in the legal measures of this period (Tacitus, *Annals,* XV, 44; *History,* V, 5), were clearly distinguished from them in Nero's persecutions. Carlo Pascal (*L'Incendio di Roma e i primi cristiani*) and Bouché-Leclercq (*L'Intolérance religieuse et la politique*) blame the burning of Rome upon the fanaticism of a few Christians, whose criminal exaltation was made use of by Nero and his court for the accomplishment of a hateful scheme. Di Crescenzo in his reply (*Un difensore di Nerone*) and Semeria (*Il primo sangue cristiano*) have little difficulty in refuting this thesis, so contradic-

the outrage would deflect the unpleasant gossip from his own person and at the same time give occasion for those mass executions which his notion of beauty transformed into horrible festivity. But the investigation which was begun soon brought to light the existence of a "vast multitude" [66] of Christians. To hold them all responsible for the fire would be too open a defiance of likelihood. A pretext was at hand for condemning them *en masse:* were they not, as a whole, "enemies of mankind," that is, of Roman civilization? Tacitus says they "were convicted, not so much on the charge of burning the city, as of hating the human race." [67] This same historian continues: "In their deaths they were also made the subjects of sport, for they were covered with the hides of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs or nailed to crosses or set fire to and, when day declined, burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his own gardens for that spectacle and exhibited a Circensian game, indiscriminately mingling with the common people in the habit of a charioteer." [68]

A passage in St. Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* adds a few details to Tacitus' account. It seems that Nero, whose

tory to the texts of Suetonius, Pliny, Tacitus, and Dio. Renan and Havet hardly ventured to insinuate a similar accusation. Renan, *The Anti-Christ,* chap. 13; Havet, *Le Christianisme et ses origines,* IV, 228.

[66] *"Multitudo ingens"* (Tacitus, *Annals,* XV, 44).

[67] *"Haud perinde in crimine incendii quam odio generis humani convicti sunt"* (Tacitus, *loc. cit.*). Tertullian attributes to Nero a decree which may be summed up in these words: *"Christiani non sint,* Let there be no Christians." Tertullian (*Apol.,* 5; *To the Nations,* I, 7) calls this decree *"institutum neronianum."* The word *institutum* in Roman law does not necessarily mean "edict" or "decree." In itself, Tertullian's expression might signify only that Nero inaugurated the period of cruelty against the Christians (Cezard, *Histoire juridique des persécutions,* p. 18); but a comparison of this text with that of Sulpicius Severus (II, 41) and the early Christian writers' general way of speaking, leads us to suppose that Tertullian had in mind a special undertaking by Nero against the Christians as such.

[68] Tacitus, *loc. cit.* According to the old Roman law, the punishment for the crime of arson was death by fire or in the games of the circus. See the law of the Twelve Tables; Gaius, in the *Digest,* XLVII, ix, 9; Callistratus, in the *Digest,* XLVIII, xix, 28; Paul, *Sent.,* V, 20. Cf. Cezard, *op. cit.,* p. 13.

depraved taste set all decency at nought, had introduced the custom of making those condemned to death impersonate certain characters of mythology. The people would be treated to the sight of Hercules painfully tearing from his body a burning garment made of pitch, or of Orpheus torn to pieces by a bear, or of Daedalus tumbling from the sky. Christian women were forced to impersonate the Danaides or Dirce. In the former case, before dying, they had to go through a series of tortures which we can only surmise; in the latter case they were fastened to the horns of wild bulls and dragged about the amphitheater.[69] These horrible executions were the signal for a persecution that extended into the provinces and lasted at Rome until Nero's death in 68.[70]

The most illustrious victims of this persecution were the Apostles Peter and Paul. Tradition fixes the year of their martyrdom as 67. In the first and second centuries, St. John, St. Clement of Rome, and St. Dionysius of Corinth speak of St. Peter's martyrdom without mentioning the manner of it; but in the next century, Origen says that the head of the Roman Church was crucified head downwards.[71] Thus was fulfilled a prophecy spoken by the Savior, when He said to Peter: "Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldst not." [72] St. Paul was beheaded. This was the form of execution reserved for Roman citizens.[73]

[69] Clement, *First Epistle,* 6. A Pompeian text and fresco seem to prove that this last named punishment was often inflicted on women who had been condemned to death.

[70] See the reasons advanced by Tillemont, Ruinart, and De Rossi. They may be found in Allard, *Hist. des pers.,* I, 58–76.

[71] In Eusebius, III, i. This form of capital punishment was not unprecedented. See Seneca, *Consolation to Marcia,* 20.

[72] "This He said, signifying by what death he [Peter] should glorify God." (John 21 : 18 f.)

[73] A tradition, recorded by St. Jerome, places St. Paul's martyrdom on the same day as that of St. Peter. Another tradition, represented by St. Augustine, places a year's interval between the two deaths. Dionysius of Cornith, Tertullian, and

The Destruction of Jerusalem

It may be that the Jews were the first to give Nero the idea of persecuting the Christians. It was not long before they, in turn, experienced a most humiliating defeat by a Roman emperor, which ended with the burning of their Temple and the destruction of their Holy City.

About the year 62, shortly after the martyrdom of St. James the Less, a rude peasant, Jesus, the son of Ananias, began running through the streets of Jerusalem, uttering terrible curses upon the city and the Temple. "A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds," he cried out; "a voice against Jerusalem and the sanctuary . . . a voice against all the people." He kept repeating these threats until, during the siege of the city seven years later (A. D. 70), he was struck in the forehead by a stone and died.[74] Jerusalem was in an unexampled state of excitement. A horrible massacre of three thousand Jews (A. D. 66), ordered by the Roman procurator Gessius Florus, stirred up a general revolt of the city's population against the Roman authority. One of Nero's last acts, in 68, was to send Vespasian to Palestine with instructions to subdue the rebels at all costs. The general was already before the walls of Jerusalem when the acclaim of the Syrian legions brought him to the imperial office, left vacant by the successive deaths of four emperors (Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius), all of whom died within eighteen months. The task of carrying on the war he left to his son Titus. The siege, one of the most sanguinary recorded by history, lasted seven months and ended by Titus gaining possession of Jerusalem. The Temple was destroyed. The survivors of the siege were

the priest Caius merely associate the two Apostles in their martyrdom. (See Eusebius, II, xxv.) The most reliable tradition places St. Peter's martyrdom on the Vatican hill; the tradition placing it on the Janiculum did not arise until the Middle Ages. (See Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 11.)

[74] Josephus, *Jewish War,* VI, v, 3.

made prisoners or sold as slaves. The veil of the Holy of Holies, the seven-branched candlestick, the Book of the Law and the Table of the Loaves of Proposition were carried off as trophies to Rome. This was "the abomination of desolation" foretold by the prophets. This was the fulfilment of the Savior's prophecy: "If thou also hadst known, and that in this thy day, the things that are to thy peace; but now they are hidden from thy eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, and thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee . . . and beat thee flat to the ground, and thy children who are in thee. And they shall not leave in thee a stone upon a stone; because thou hast not known the time of thy visitation." [75]

The destruction of the Temple had a considerable influence upon the destinies of the Christian Church. Thenceforth the observance of the Mosaic ceremonies became impossible in its most essential elements. The priesthood of Aaron, the perpetual sacrifice, and the secondary ceremonies dependent on them were now antiquated and ceased. The Christians had not witnessed the final fall of the Holy City. Seeing the Roman standards raised around Jerusalem, they remembered the Master's warning: "When therefore you shall see the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet . . . then they that are in Judea, let them flee to the mountains." [76] They withdrew to the city of Pella in Perea, near the left bank of the Jordan. There they lived, poor indeed, on their savings, full of confidence in the immortal vitality of their Church. But when Jerusalem fell, "that terrible fall inspired them with a grief like that which a devoted child feels at the death of an unnatural mother. Even toward the Synagogue, deicide and persecutor though it was, a sort of filial reverence existed among

[75] Luke 19: 42–44.

[76] Matt. 24: 15 f. The best interpreters explain the "abomination of desolation" as meaning the Roman military ensigns, which Tacitus (*Annals,* II, 17) calls "the tutelar deities of the legions."

these Christians."[77] Thirty years later, the author of the Epistle attributed to St. Barnabas[78] tried to console the Jews who bemoaned the loss of Sion and the end of their ancient observances, by showing them that the holocausts of the Old Law merely prefigured a sacrifice that is performed and will ever be performed, and that all the ceremonies of Judaism had a hidden meaning which, on being revealed, abrogated them. "The horror for unclean food survived in the aversion to be practiced with regard to wicked men;[79] the brazen serpent and Moses' extended arms were honored in the image of Christ, of whom they were figures.[80] The Jews, as also the Gentiles, had placed their hopes in a material temple."[81] The Temple had now been destroyed by their enemies; but those enemies were to take upon themselves to build to God His true temple, a spiritual edifice.[82]

Christianity at Rome

The providential connection between the Christian Church and its Jewish beginnings was not broken; but the Christian communities became more and more detached from the traditions of the Synagogue, in their hierarchy and also in their ceremonies, and even in the form of their doctrinal teaching.

St. Paul's three pastoral Epistles, written during his last days,[83] are, as it were, the Apostle's last will and testament. In a few clearly indicated details, they give us the picture of the hierarchical organization of the Church at that period.

At the head is the bishop. He is the "steward of God,"[84]

[77] Champagny, *Rome et la Judée,* II, 312.

[78] Funk and Bardenhewer judge that the Epistle of Barnabas was written sometime between 96 and 98.

[79] *Epistle of Barnabas,* 10.

[80] *Ibidem,* 12.

[81] *Ibidem,* 16.

[82] *Ibidem.*

[83] Cf. Prat, *La Théologie de saint Paul,* I, 465–469.

[84] Θεοῦ *οἰκόνομος.* (Tit. 1:7.)

says St. Paul. He should, therefore, be a model of perfection among the faithful: sober, chaste, kindly, amiable, just, without conceit, hospitable, so that even those outside may bear him a good testimony.[85]

Deacons should be men of tried virtue: upright, incapable of double-dealing, not self-seeking, keeping the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.[86] For duties so difficult, a trial is necessary. They are to be ordained only after a preliminary probation, a sort of novitiate.[87]

At that time devout widows had a special part in the activities of the Church. To them was entrusted the direction of certain works. To these duties were to be admitted only women at least sixty years old, who had been only once married, and who were commendable for their good works, for the way they brought up their children, for their zeal in the exercise of hospitality, in the washing of the feet of the saints.[88]

As for simple Christians, all their duties are summed up in the Apostle's single advice, that they be faithful to the obligations of their condition and state. Each Christian is a member of the great social body of the Church. Let each one conscientiously perform the duties imposed on him by the place he occupies. Let the old men take care to remain "sound in faith, in love, in patience." [89] Let the aged women avoid evil-speaking and see that their outward conduct is such as becomes holiness.[90] Let the young women love their husbands and their children, and remain chaste, circumspect, busied with their

[85] See 1 Tim. 3: 1–7. The Epistle speaks of the deacons in the plural, but of the *episkopos* in the singular. The words *episkopos* and *presbyteros* are always used without distinction; but this verbal confusion should not mislead us as to the real distinction between the office of bishop and that of priest.

[86] See 1 Tim. 3: 8 f.

[87] *Ibidem,* 3: 10.

[88] *Ibidem,* 5: 9 f.

[89] Titus 2: 2.

[90] *Ibidem,* 2: 3.

home duties, submissive to their husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.[91] Let servants obey their masters; in all things let them show a perfect docility, that in all things they may honor the doctrine of God, our Savior.[92]

But this enumeration of duties does not give what is, according to the Apostle, the very soul of the Christian life. This is piety—earnest, faithful piety, devoted above all to the faith received from Christ by the tradition of the Apostles and ancients. The bishop must exercise himself in piety, since piety is profitable to all things.[93] The widows should continue in supplications and prayers night and day.[94] This piety must not stray off in private fancies. As there is a hierarchical center of the Church, so there is a "deposit of faith." "O Timothy," the Apostle writes, "keep that which is committed to thy trust," [95] "keep the good thing committed to thy trust." [96] "Continue thou in those things which thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee: knowing of whom thou hast learned them.[97] . . . The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." [98] Paul denounces evil teachers, "disobedient, vain talkers," "teaching things which they ought not." [99] The Church casts forth teachers who betray the salutary doctrine; [100] for the Church, "the house of God," is "the pillar and ground of the truth." [101]

[91] *Ibidem*, 2:4 f.
[92] *Ibidem*, 2:9 f.
[93] See 1 Tim. 4:8.
[94] *Ibidem*, 5:5.
[95] *Ibidem*, 6:20.
[96] 2 Tim. 1:14.
[97] *Ibidem*, 3:14.
[98] *Ibidem*, 2:2.
[99] Titus 1:10 f.
[100] See 2 Tim. 4:3.
[101] See 1 Tim. 3:15.

The Synoptic Gospels

When St. Paul gave these solid and precise admonitions, the Christians had long known where to find that "deposit of faith" of which he spoke. They had first sought it and found it in the preaching of the "witnesses of Christ," of those who had received instruction from His immediate hearers. The venerable Papias, "the hearer of John, who was a companion of Polycarp and one of the ancients," mentioned by St. Irenaeus,[102] declared that his whole care had ever been to inquire "into the words of the presbyters, what Andrew or Peter or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples, had said." And we are struck by Papias' expression of the rule of faith in that early day; he says: "For I did not suppose that information from books would help me so much as the word of a living and surviving voice." [103] Now, Papias tells us that he learned from his master, "John the Ancient," that Peter's preaching was put in writing by one of his disciples, Mark. The precious fragment containing this information is so important that it deserves to be quoted in full.

"And the Presbyter [John] used to say this, 'Mark became Peter's interpreter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not, indeed, in order, of the things said or done by the Lord. For he had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed Him, but later on, as I said, followed Peter, who used to give teaching as necessity demanded but not making, as it were, an arrangement of the Lord's oracles, so that Mark did nothing wrong in thus writing down single points as he remembered them. For to one thing he gave attention, to leave out nothing of what he had heard and to make no false statements in them." [104]

As we read these lines, we seem to be witnessing the process

[102] Eusebius, III, xxxix, 1.
[103] *Ibidem*, no. 4.
[104] *Ibidem*, no. 15.

by which St. Mark's Gospel was written. Papias says further that "Matthew collected the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted them as best he could." [105] From the prologue of the Third Gospel we know that the author, Luke, a disciple of St. Paul, undertook to write the history of Jesus in chronological order, which the aged witness of those times states was absent from St. Mark's. Here, then, we have the whole story of the composition of the three Synoptic Gospels. As to the date of their composition, that seems fixed thereby. The appearance of the three Gospels preceded the appearance of the Acts of the Apostles, and the latter, written by St. Luke, was published about 62 or 64; therefore this date seems the latest that can be assigned for the composition of the three Synoptics.[106]

Shortly afterwards we see another collection being formed, that of the Catholic Epistles, *i. e.,* letters addressed to the whole Church. Into this collection was admitted a greater or lesser number of Epistles, according to local differences. Finally seven came to be agreed upon by all. These seven letters are the three Epistles of St. John, the two of St. Peter, that of St. Jude, and that of St. James. By the addition of St. John's Gospel and his Apocalypse, of which we shall speak presently, the canon, that is, the official list of the books of the New Testament, became fixed; the Christian Bible was thus complete.[107]

Later on the Church was to proclaim the authenticity of

[105] *Ibidem,* no. 16.

[106] See Batiffol, *Orpheus et l'Evangile,* p. 132. Harnack (*Die Apostelgeschichte,* p. 22) holds the same view as we have just set forth. Some Catholic authors, basing their conclusions on a text of St. Irenaeus (*Haereses,* bk. 3, chap. 1), prefer placing the writing of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels after the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul. But that passage is a mutilated text and has not the meaning supposed, as Cornely proves in his *Introductio ad Novum Testamentum,* III, 76–78.

[107] On the formation of the canon of the New Testament, see Batiffol, *Orpheus et l'Evangile,* pp. 55–80.

these collections. On all sides Christians were eager to fix upon the accounts of the ancients, to gather their teachings. St. Luke, at the beginning of his Gospel, refers to an abundant literary growth. This subsequently increased still more. The apocryphal gospels—the name given to those histories of Jesus which the Church rejected from her canon—at times had the childish character of popular legends, or the perverse tendency of heresy. A mere comparison of their fanciful and fabricated narratives with the serious and religious soberness of the canonical Gospels is enough to show the genuineness of the latter. It is true that each of the authors adopted by the Church has his own style and a definite aim. St. Matthew's style is simple, uniform, and unstudied; and it is evident that his aim is to show his compatriots, the Christians of Palestine, the fulfilment of the prophecies in Christ. St. Mark is animated, picturesque, and always has in mind the Roman world; by the narration of our Lord's many miracles he wishes to impress upon that world the almighty power of God. St. Luke's narrative reveals a literary culture superior to that of his predecessors, and his purpose to spread the catholic ideas of his teacher, St. Paul.

But the three writings resemble one another in their lifelike and precise character. The image that rises in the mind of one who reads these gospels is that of all Galilee and Judea before the destruction of Jerusalem. Skeptical Sadducees, hypocritical Pharisees, the timid disciples of Jesus, all these pass along one after the other on the shore of that Lake Tiberias so colorful with its population of fishermen, on those roads that are burned by the hot sun, through the ripening harvests, and in that great city of Jerusalem where scribes carry on their discussions in the Temple porticoes. The portrait of Jesus traced by these unlettered writers is so utterly inimitable that the cry wrung from the unbelieving philosopher will ever issue from the lips of whoever reads these

gospels with a sincere and upright heart. Their words "speak to the heart," and if they were the work of invention, "their contrivers would be more astounding than is the hero." [108]

[108] Rousseau, *Emile,* in *Œuvres* (Didot ed.), II, 597.—As to the order in which the three Gospels were written, Lebreton thus sums up the latest critical conclusions, which simply return to the traditional positions: "The primitive catechesis is embodied in the Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew and, in Greek, in St. Peter's preaching. This latter was followed by St. Mark, while St. Matthew's collection is preserved in St. Luke's Gospel, and more exactly in the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew. These two other gospels thus utilize St. Mark's narrative and a few secondary sources." (Lebreton, *"Les Evangiles synoptiques,"* in the *Recherches des sciences religieuses,* 1910, p. 505; cf. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents,* Part II.)

CHAPTER V

The Early Church and the Eastern World (68–100)

THE mysterious personage whose testimony is so stressed by Papias and whom he calls John the Ancient, has always stirred the ingenuity of historians and exegetes. Our own opinion is that this person is the Apostle himself. Papias' text appears clear. True, Eusebius makes John out to be a different person; but his interpretation of the text, which he quotes, is apparently inspired by a desire to take from the Apostle John the authorship of the Apocalypse. The Bishop of Caesarea rejected the doctrine of this book and ascribed it to a writer of less authority.[1]

[1] The following is the famous text of Papias, as recorded by Eusebius: "I shall not hesitate to append to the interpretations all that I ever learnt well from the presbyters and remember well, for of their truth I am confident. For unlike most I did not rejoice in them who say much, but in them who teach the truth, nor in them who recount the commandments of others, but in them who repeated those given to the faith by the Lord and derived from truth itself; but if ever anyone came who had followed the presbyters, I inquired into the words of the presbyters, what Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, had said, and what Aristion and the presbyter John, the Lord's disciples, were saying." (Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, xxxix, 4.) The Presbyter John, the Lord's disciple, is mentioned twice: once among those who had spoken (in the past), and once among those who were still speaking (in the present); this is because he is the sole survivor of the Apostles, because he alone of them still speaks. Moreover, the intention of showing that there is question of one and the same person is evident from the identity of the titles attached to the two names. It is always "the Presbyter John," John "the disciple of the Lord." Eusebius, whose antipathy for John's Apocalypse is well known, and who had it from Dionysius of Corinth that the Apocalypse was the work of a certain John, distinct from the Apostle John, eagerly seizes upon Papias' double mention of John and uses that fact as an argument for his view. He says: "This calls for attention: for it is probable that the second John is the one who saw the revelation which passes under the name of John." (Eusebius, III, xxxix, 5.) In his desire to strengthen the opinion which he wanted to have accepted, Eusebius

St. John

Thus far we have scarcely met the name of the Apostle John.[2] Up to the last years of the century of the Apostles, tradition as well as Scripture is almost silent about the labors of the second son of Zebedee. This "son of thunder" had not yet taken those sublime flights presaged by the impetuosity of his character and the ardor of his love. The "disciple that Jesus loved," whose head rested on the Savior's breast at the Last Supper, out of obedience to a divine mission from his Master [3] must have led a life of silence and prayer and recollection in the modest home where he received the Blessed Virgin. More than once our Lord restrained the imprudent vehemence of that ardor; and it was used in laying the foundations of an interior life that would some day reveal its great depth. In close association with the Blessed Mother, the soul of this virgin Apostle was enriched with unction and charity, while losing nothing of its force. The thunder of his voice would be heard, but at the hour and in the manner marked out by God.

After the Blessed Virgin's death, at which he was present,[4]

appeals to two reasons, which are not very cogent, namely: that the second John is called Presbyter—but so is the first; and that Ephesus has two monuments to John, which Eusebius lets us suppose are burial monuments—but the very term which Eusebius had to use, μνήματα, indicates "memorial" monuments. It is not surprising that two monuments of this kind should have been erected in honor of the same person.

[2] There is no further mention of him after the day when St. Paul came to Jerusalem to set forth his gospel before "James and Cephas and John," who were then regarded as "pillars" of the Church. (Gal. 2: 1, 2, 9.)

[3] John 19: 27.

[4] Probably at Jerusalem. "An arbitrary interpretation of an obscure text of the Council of Ephesus is the sole foundation on which is based the opinion which locates the last residence and the tomb of the Blessed Virgin at Ephesus. . . . The tradition which records that Jerusalem was the last home of the Holy Virgin rests, on the contrary, upon explicit testimony, which, it is true, only dates back to the fifth century." (Fouard, *St. John and the Close of the Apostolic Age,* p. 72.)

after the death of the other Apostles, who were martyred for their faith, John was the only one left of the intimate group which had received the Savior's confidences. The eyes of the entire Church then turned to the beloved Apostle. Everyone felt a presentiment of some mysterious destiny in his regard. Once our Lord, speaking of John, had said: "So I will have him remain till I come, what is it to thee?" [5] And a rumor spread that this disciple would not die.[6] But Jesus had said also: "You shall indeed drink of the chalice that I drink of; and with the baptism wherewith I am baptized, you shall be baptized." [7]

At a date which cannot be determined with absolute exactness, between the death of SS. Peter and Paul and the destruction of Jerusalem, the Apostle John fixed his residence at Ephesus.[8] With some likelihood we can date his arrival about the year 68. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, speaks of a whole crowd of ancients gathered about John.[9] The departure of this colony is naturally explained by the dispersion that took place two years before the destruction of the Holy City. Ephesus was in constant relation with Jerusalem. Many Jews lived in Ephesus and openly practiced their religion, thanks to the privileges which Hircanus had obtained for them from Dolabella.[10] These Jews came to Jerusalem in large numbers to perform their devotions in the Temple. Probably many of them were witnesses to the Pentecostal miracles, and it is not unlikely that a Christian community was formed in Ephesus at an early date. Its membership seems to have been composed

[5] John 21 : 22.

[6] *Idem*, 21 : 23.

[7] Mark 10 : 39.

[8] The testimony of tradition is unanimous on this point. Harnack (*Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I, 320–381) and Jean Réville (*Le quatrième évangile*, pp. 9–18) have vainly tried to shake the authentic and reliable testimony of St. Irenaeus on this point. (*Haereses*, II, xxii, 5.)

[9] Eusebius, III, xxix.

[10] Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIV, x, 11–13.

mostly of disciples of John the Baptist. St. Paul, upon returning from Galatia, found at Ephesus certain insufficiently trained Christians, who contented themselves with the precursor's baptism.[11] In spite of violent opposition, the preaching of the Apostle of the Gentiles succeeded there wonderfully, so that he said: "A great door and evident is opened unto me; and many adversaries." [12] The First Epistle to Timothy informs us that Paul, prevented from continuing his apostolate at Ephesus, entrusted to this disciple, who was a native of the country, the direction of the Church which he had established there.[13]

It was a providential choice that John and his companions made in fixing upon the city of Ephesus for their residence. Being on the coast of Ionia, almost opposite the island of Samos, Ephesus occupied one of the choicest sites as a place of transit between the East and the West. Commercial activity, great though it was, did not absorb the people's minds. From time immemorial that city had been a great center of religious activity. Its temple, venerated throughout the world, kept alive, more than did any other place, the religious craving which was then disturbing so many pagan souls.

And so we presently see John and the group of his disciples becoming the center of an important movement. The Churches of Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea soon placed themselves under his direction. Before recounting the history of this new development of Christianity, it will be profitable to cast a rapid glance over the general situation of the Church in Palestine, Rome, and Asia Minor.

Christianity in Palestine

We have already said that the Christian community of

[11] Acts 19: 1–5.
[12] See 1 Cor. 16: 9.
[13] See 1 Tim. 1: 3; cf. 2 Tim. 1: 18; 4: 12.

Jerusalem had mostly taken refuge in the city of Pella. They soon founded a new center of equal importance somewhat farther north, in the city of Kochaba.[14] But in both places the refugees lived under precarious conditions. Most of them had no resources other than their labor. Eusebius relates how, a few years later, our Lord's relatives, summoned before their persecutors, who were somewhat disquieted by the report of their noble birth, "showed their hands, adducing as testimony of their labor the hardness of their bodies, and the tough skin which had been embossed on their hands from their incessant work." [15] The same historian, basing his statement on an ancient text of Hegesippus, tells us that the successor of James the Less in the episcopate was also a relative of the Savior. It was Simeon, the son of Cleophas, cousin-german of our Lord.[16] He was martyred under Trajan about the year 110.[17] At the time of which we are now speaking, he bore his adversity with a heroism worthy of his glorious predecessor. In him seemed to live again that Apostle James who had so forcefully anathematized wealth and had said: "Hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom?" [18] But these praiseworthy Christians, it seems, did not recruit adepts. They were devout and austere, and whole-heartedly attached to Christ; but as they had not yet broken sufficiently with Israel's past, they remained almost altogether outside the great movement that would regenerate the world by freeing it from the Law.

Christianity at Rome

In spite of appearances, the situation at Rome was hardly any better. In many respects the first two Flavian emperors

[14] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* xxx, 2.
[15] Eusebius, III, xx.
[16] *Ibidem,* III, xi and xxxii.
[17] *Ibidem,* IV, v.
[18] James 2:5.

(Vespasian and Titus) deserved the praise later voiced by St. Augustine, when he called them "the most benignant emperors." [19] The good will that they accorded the Jews extended to the Christians.[20] But neither of these emperors abolished that principle of public law which, looking upon Christianity as opposed to the Roman civilization, served as a ground for the Neronian persecution. "Every one of Nero's institutes was abolished," says Tertullian, "except his edict of persecution." [21]

The third emperor of the Flavian family was Domitian. The beginning of his rule gave the Christians equally great hopes, but also aroused terrible suspicions. While men of letters, highly honored by the new emperor,[22] showered their praises upon him,[23] common rumor accused him of the death of his brother Titus,[24] and some discerning persons questioned whether his virtues were not more apparent than real. The last two years of Domitian's reign fulfilled the most sinister anticipations.

Meanwhile the Christian Church profited by the broad tolerance which the Emperor granted it. The faith entered the ranks of the highest Roman society and was openly practiced.

[19] *City of God,* v, 21.

[20] Some writers, on the basis of a text of St. Hilary (*Contra Arianos,* 3) and an inscription preserved in the crypt of the Church of St. Martin at Rome, have placed Vespasian among the persecutors. But in St. Hilary's text Vespasian is named probably by mistake in place of his son Domitian (Allard, *Hist. des pers.,* I, 85); and the inscription in St. Martin's Church is certainly false, as Marucchi shows (*Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 20).

[21] "*Permansit, erosis omnibus, institutum neronianum.*" (Tertullian, *Ad nationes,* I, 7.) Tertullian refers to Nero's charge against the Christians independently of the accusation of setting fire to Rome—namely, that they were enemies of mankind, *i. e.,* of the Roman civilization.

[22] Tacitus and Pliny were decorated by him with the pretorship. (Tacitus, *Annals,* XI, 11; Pliny, *Epistles,* III, 11; VII, 16.)

[23] Quintilian calls him "the most righteous of censors" (*Institutes of Oratory,* bk. 4, pref.). Martial praises him because under him "chastity was commanded to enter our homes." (*Epigrams,* VI, 2–4, 7.)

[24] Dio Cassius, *Roman History,* LXVI, 26.

Evidence of this may be seen in the appearances of the cemeteries of the Flavians' time. All of them are even with the ground; their entrances are never disguised; they open upon the fields, along the highways, and sometimes display monumental façades. "Some of these burial-places, excavated with magnificent and almost royal care, are adorned with every refinement of art." [25] Among the cemeteries of this period we may note, on the Via Salaria, the catacomb of Priscilla, belonging to the noble line of the Pudens; on the Ostian road, the cemetery of Lucina, who is probably none other than the famous patrician Pomponia Graecina; and near the Porta Ardeatina, the great burial domain of the Flavians, belonging to the grand-daughter of Vespasian, Flavia Domitilla.[26]

Popes Linus, Cletus, and Clement I

The three popes who, during this period, presided over the destinies of the Church of Rome belonged to the lowest ranks of the people. The first, LINUS, was, it is supposed, a former slave. At least this is what certain historians think

[25] De Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae Urbis Romae,* p. 2. The history of the catacombs is divided into four periods. During the first period (the first two centuries), the catacombs were family burial places, protected by the law, and recognized to be *loca sacra, loca religiosa.* The owners of these tombs, or rather private cemeteries, sometimes of vast extent, including gardens and houses, with dining-rooms for funeral feasts, could receive in them the bodies of their clients. Wealthy Christians admitted the bodies of poor Christians into their burying-grounds, and there, instead of funeral banquets, liturgical meetings took place. During the third century, the Church, profiting by the Roman law regarding associations, founded common cemeteries. This was the second period. During the third period (from Constantine to Alaric, 313 to 340), no more cemeteries were established except at the surface of the ground; yet the catacombs continued to be a place of pilgrimage, and many Christians insisted upon being laid to rest near the venerated remains of their predecessors. This was the period of the great inscriptions, many of them due to Pope Damasus. Lastly, beginning in 410, the catacombs ceased to be places of burial, and no inscriptions were placed on the tombs; yet they continued to be visited for several centuries. This was the fourth period of their history. (Cf. Marucchi, *op. cit.,* I, 113–117.)

[26] Marucchi, *op. cit.,* I. 23.

may be inferred from his very name.[27] This first successor of St. Peter seems, in any event, to have belonged to a very humble class. We know almost nothing of his pontificate. St. Epiphanius supplies us with a list of the first eleven popes according to a very ancient document; he says that Linus governed the Church for twelve years.[28] The tradition recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis* adds that he maintained the regulations established by St. Peter,[29] that he died a martyr, and was buried on the Vatican hill.[30]

Of the life of his successor, ANACLETUS (or CLETUS) even less is known.[31] It would seem that his name, too, must be that of a slave or freedman. Probably he belonged to that group of poor people that formed the first nucleus of the Church of Rome. Perhaps this humble disciple of the Apostles changed his name from Anacletus ("the blameless") to Cletus ("the called" of the Lord). Like his two predecessors, he was martyred.[32] Eusebius says his pontificate lasted twelve years.[33] Perhaps this figure should be reduced two or three years.

Cletus' successor in the see of Peter was CLEMENT I. After the names of the Apostles there is none more venerable and illustrious in Christian antiquity. Less than a hundred years

[27] Fouard, *St. John,* p. 49. Duchesne (*Liber pontificalis,* I, 121) observes that "this name is extremely rare in Christian epigraphy."

[28] Epiphanius, *Haereses,* XXVII, 6.

[29] The *Liber Pontificalis* seems to say that he began to govern the Church during the lifetime of St. Peter, and many writers are of opinion that St. Peter, being occupied in the labors of the apostolate, left the administration of the Roman Church to Linus and Cletus. (Rufinus, Preface to the *Recognitions* of St. Clement.) But this opinion is now generally rejected.

[30] Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* I, 121. De Rossi does not venture to declare that the sarcophagus discovered underground in the seventeenth century, near the confession of St. Peter, is the authentic tomb of St. Linus. (Duchesne, *loc. cit.*) St. Peter's successor is probably the person mentioned by St. Paul, 2 Tim. 4: 21.

[31] Duchesne (*op. cit.,* I, lxix) gives reasons which incline one to regard Cletus and Anacletus as the same person. (Cf. De Smedt, *Dissertationes selectae,* VII, art. 2.)

[32] Duchesne, *loc. cit.*

[33] Eusebius, III, xv.

after the death of Clement of Rome, as he is called, his figure is adorned with a wonderful halo. The Christians appeal to his authority, and heretics seek shelter under his respected name. A whole pseudo-Clementine literature arose. In spite of this fame, perhaps because of it, his life and writings are surrounded with shadow. Legend became mingled with his history to such an extent as almost completely to obscure it. He is said to have been of senatorial rank, related to the Flavian dynasty. Some historians even identify him with the Consul Titius Flavius Clemens, Domitian's cousin, whom the Emperor had executed on a charge of "atheism," *i. e.,* Christianity. But then how are we to explain the silence of the Fathers regarding the raising of a member of the imperial family to be the head of the Roman Church? It is more reasonable to suppose that Pope Clement was a simple freedman, or the son of a freedman, of the household of the Consul Clement.[34] Tillemont, and other scholars after him, thought that the contents and form of Clement's letter to the Corinthians indicate that he was of Jewish origin.[35] What is certain, however, is that no more genuine witness to the Apostolic tradition can be found. St. Irenaeus says: "This man [Clement], as he had seen the blessed Apostles [Peter and Paul], and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the Apostles still echoing in his ears and their traditions before his eyes." [36] Following Origen and Eusebius, many have attributed to him the writing of the

[34] Lightfoot establishes a great likelihood for this hypothesis. (*The Apostolic Fathers,* I, 60–63.)

[35] Tillemont, *Mémoires sur les six premiers siècles,* II, 149–166, 545–568; De Rossi, *Bullettino di archeol. crist.,* 1863, pp. 27 ff.; 1865, p. 20; Lightfoot, *op. cit.,* I, 16–61; Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 162.

[36] Irenaeus, *Hæreses,* III, iii, 3. Duchesne (*op. cit.,* I, 161) says that Clement was old enough to have seen the Apostles and to have conversed with them, as St. Irenaeus asserts. Origen identifies him with the person of the same name who labored with St. Paul in the evangelization of Philippi. (Origen, *In Joannem,* I, 29.)

Epistle to the Hebrews under the inspiration of St. Paul, or at least the translation of this epistle from the original Aramaic text.[37] The only authentic writing of St. Clement of Rome is the lengthy and beautiful Epistle to the Corinthians.

From the text itself it appears that this letter was written at the end of a great persecution, probably the one that broke out against the Christians of Rome in 95.

The fears shown by some far-sighted men at the outset of Domitian's reign regarding his natural inclinations, were in fact accentuated and generalized. On the pretext of adorning the city of Rome and of increasing the happiness of his subjects, the Emperor spent great sums of money foolishly. By immense constructions, by endless festivities which Martial and Statius glorified in their poems, the imperial treasury was exhausted; the intoxication of power, a sort of madness, occupied a more and more predominant place in the ruler's soul. Domitian was one of those unscrupulous men whom necessity makes rapacious and fear cruel.[38] Rome trembled at seeing the return of the worst days of Nero. Public opinion was not mistaken. As under Nero, the Christian Church was the first to suffer from the outburst of tyranny. The development of Christianity, retarded in Judea, was likewise halted in Rome.

Alexandria

By good fortune, at that very time Asia Minor became wide open for the spread of the gospel. Next to the city of Ephesus, Alexandria seemed to promise the brightest future for the Christian religion.

Like Ephesus, which became the metropolis of the Roman province of Asia in 129 B. C., the city built by Alexander the

[37] Eusebius, VI, xxiii.

[38] "*Inopia rapax, metu saevus.*" (Suetonius, *Domitian*, 3.)

Great and containing his tomb, a century later also fell under the might of Rome. Old Egypt became a Roman province and its great capital was thereafter the center and a sort of rallying place for the world of philosophers, thinkers, poets, artists, and mathematicians. Under Roman sway, however, Alexandria jealously kept its religious autonomy. The vast temple of Serapis, which from the top of its artificial hill surveyed the commercial activity of the whole city, appeared to symbolize that haughty independence. *There* was located the great library containing 200,000 volumes, which Antony brought from Pergamus to replace that of the Museum which had been burned when Julius Caesar set fire to the Egyptian fleet. This library was the meeting-place of Alexandrian Hellenism and of Jewish culture. The Jews had long been settled in Egypt. At Alexandria they formed an important community which, in this city of a million souls,[39] reached a figure of more than 300,000, about one-third of the total population.[40] One of our canonical books, Wisdom, was probably written at Alexandria toward the middle of the second century B. C.[41] The Bible had there been translated into Greek under the first Ptolemies, between 280 and 230 B. C. The Jewish books had an influence upon the notions of Greek philosophy. And Alexandrian Judaism, though still venerating at Jerusalem the center of the theocratic religion, was renewed by contact with Hellenic civilization. From this reciprocal influence was born the work of Philo.

We have very little information about the life of this Jewish writer, who was a contemporary of Christ. We know only that his brother, or rather the son of his brother, was alabarch, or chief collector of the customs at Alexandria, and that Philo himself was deputed by his fellow-Jews (A. D. 40) to go to

[39] *Dict. de la Bible,* I, col. 354.

[40] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 239.

[41] *Dict. de la Bible,* I, col. 356; Touzard, in *Où en est l'histoire des religions,* sec. 7, nos. 148–152.

Rome to appease the wrath of Caligula, who had been angered against the Jews because they refused to adore him as a god.[42] Philo of Alexandria was principally an exegete, but applied Plato's idealism in the interpretation of the holy books. Many Fathers of the Church speak of him with a respect that borders on admiration. Philo had none of the narrowness of the Pharisees attached to the letter of the Law. He was a man of mysticism and inner worship. With him the idea of philosophy and that of revelation, far from being mutually exclusive, harmonize with each other.[43] But it is also noteworthy that the ideas which Philo sets forth in his books are not so much personal, as they are ideas slowly and deeply elaborated in the Alexandrian atmosphere, ideas that, outside the limited circle of scholars, penetrated into the minds of the ordinary people.[44]

Such being the case, Alexandrian philosophy, if ill directed, might contribute to the perversion of the Christian movement and might lead it in the direction of vague and dissolvent fancies; but if wisely regulated, it might become, by its broad spirit, a powerful instrument in the spread of Chris-

[42] Beurlier, *Le culte impérial,* pp. 264–271.

[43] Bréhier, *Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie,* pp. 311–318. Cf. Louis, *Philon le Juif;* Lebreton (*Les Théories du Logos au debut de l'ère chrétienne,* in *Etudes,* vol. 106, and *Les Origines de la Trinité*) shows that Philo's doctrine is fundamentally a Jewish doctrine, altered and distorted, not a doctrine taken from the pagans, as was once claimed. For Philo, the Logos is "the world of the ideas of the personal God according to Moses." The origin of this conception is connected with the Sapiential literature of the Old Testament. "In Palestine, as also in Egypt, the Jews were accustomed to meditate upon these inspired pages, notably Baruch 3:10–38; Job, chap. 28; and especially Prov., chaps. 1 to 9; Ecclu. 24:5–47; Wisdom 7:10; 10:17. Considering the outward operation of this Wisdom, we find it very similar to the Logos of the Stoics or the popular Hermes of Egypt or the *amesha spenta* of Persia or the Logos of Philo. But the Scriptural notion of the hypostatic Wisdom, in which Israel adored the only true God, is quite opposed to the pantheistic materialism of the Porch, as also to the mythological phantasies of Egypt and Persia, which were an undefinable product of Alexandrian speculation. The contemporary apocrypha, as also the books of the Bible, show how deeply this notion had penetrated the minds of the chosen people." (D'Alès, in *Etudes,* 1912, p. 90.)

[44] Bréhier, *loc. cit.*

tianity. It is a fact that, at a very early date, Alexandria was entered by missioners of the gospel. According to Eusebius, the first Christian community there was founded by St. Mark.[45] It is probable that the Alexandrians and the Cyrenians who were present at Pentecost may have preceded him there. The Acts of the Apostles tells us that one of the most eloquent preachers of the good tidings, Apollo, "one mighty in the Scriptures, fervent in spirit," was a native of Alexandria. Alexandrian Jews are mentioned among the adversaries of Stephen.[46] Soon, beside brilliant apologists of the school of Clement of Alexandria, the Gnostic sects began to increase. Both truth and error appeared in a powerful and spirited manner, overflowing with life and splendor.

The influence of Alexandrian culture was not confined to the Roman province of Egypt; it entered the province of Asia, the capital of which was Ephesus. This province was not limited to Ionia, strictly so called, *i. e.,* the valleys of the Meander, the Cayster, and the Hermus; it embraced Mysia as far as Mount Olympus, Lydia, Caria, and a part of Phrygia.[47] The Apostle of the Gentiles had exercised his zeal there, and St. Peter went there to strengthen the faith of the neophytes won by St. Paul. Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Loadicea, like Ephesus, faithfully kept the memory of their great founder; but curious mystical conceits, germs of the Gnostic and Judaizing heresies that soon powerfully declared themselves, were threatening to corrupt the purity of the faith there. The arrival of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" was, therefore, most opportune. St. Paul, disputing with the doctors of an enslaving Law, had given them the theory of a liberating grace. John, as a genuine witness, now spoke to them of that Word of life "which he had

[45] Eusebius, *H. E.,* II, xvi.
[46] Acts 6:9.
[47] Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung,* I, 333 ff.

seen with his own eyes and touched with his hands." [48] Those intensely earnest people of Asia had been won by Paul's fiery arguments; they now fed their souls upon John's more tender and mystical words. Not that the "Apostle of Love" ever suppressed the necessity of precise doctrine and a supreme authority in the Church. Quite otherwise. No one ever showed greater severity and horror against the heretic who betrays his Master as Judas did. John will not have hospitality extended to such a traitor, not even a simple greeting; he who greets a heretic "communicateth with his wicked works." [49] Since the Word of God was made flesh, since He came into this world, that He might bring it light and life,[50] this light and life must serve to distinguish the children of God from the children of the devil, the children of light from the children of darkness.[51] But the Apostle's firm and uncompromising stand in the presence of evil came solely from the strength and fervor of his love. His hearers felt it deeply; their speech —he showed a remarkable facility in making use of its turns and phrases—becomes the means by which the genius of Asia and that of Europe fraternize in the spirit of the gospel.

Disciples of St. John

John did not come alone to Ephesus. With him he brought companions and disciples, or at least he was visited and aided by several of them.

Among these brethren in the apostolate, we know especially the Apostle Philip.[52] Like John, he was born on the shores

[48] 1 John 1:1.

[49] 2 John 11.

[50] John 1:1–14.

[51] John 3:19 f.

[52] Eusebius seems to confuse the Apostle Philip with Philip the deacon. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus in the latter part of the second century, who had every means of being well informed, says positively that St. John's companion in Asia was the Apostle Philip. The fragment from Polycrates is in Eusebius, III, xxxi.

of Lake Tiberias, and a particular bond of friendship seems to have united the two Apostles. It was to Philip that Christ had addressed those profound words: "Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me?" [53] The earliest traditions tell us that he preached the gospel in Phrygia; all the records agree that he spent the last years of his life at Hierapolis. He had three daughters: one of them, who was married, was buried at Ephesus; the other two remained virgins and aided the Apostle by devoting themselves to works of charity.[54]

John's three principal disciples, whose names are handed down to us, were Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias. Ignatius was probably a native of Syria. This, at least, is the conjecture of several scholars.[55] We have very little information about his life or his labors in the Church of Antioch, of which he was bishop.[56] But the letter he wrote to the Christians of Rome, on his way to martyrdom in that city, enables us to penetrate the depths of his great soul. History can boast of none more courageous in the face of death.

Polycarp is likewise known to us by his glorious martyrdom, but we are ignorant both of his family and birthplace. Tertullian relates that Polycarp was made bishop of Smyrna by St. John.[57] It is by his authority, often appealed to by his disciple St. Irenaeus, that the Church of Gaul glories in having received the pure Apostolic tradition. St. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, in his old age, wrote as follows to the heretic Florinus:

"These opinions [that you teach], O Florinus, that I may speak sparingly, do not belong to sound doctrine. These opinions are in-

[53] John 14: 10.

[54] Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, xxxi.

[55] But their arguments are contested by the Maronite Assemani, *Bibl. orient.*, vol. III, part 1, p. 16.

[56] Cf. Eusebius, *Chron.*, 11th year of Trajan.

[57] Tertullian, *De praescr.*, 32.

consistent with the Church. . . . I can speak even of the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and disputed, how he came in and went out, the character of his life, the appearance of his body, the discourses which he made to the people, how he reported his intercourse with John, and with the others who had seen the Lord, how he remembered their words, and what were the things concerning the Lord which he had heard from them, and about their miracles, and about their teaching, and how Polycarp had received them from the eyewitnesses of the word of life. . . . I listened eagerly even then to these things through the mercy of God which was given me, and made notes of them, not on paper, but in my heart. . . . I can bear witness before God that if that blessed and Apostolic presbyter had heard anything of this kind he would have cried out and shut his ears. . . . He would have fled even from the place in which he was seated or standing when he heard such words." [58]

We saw Papias' testimony in connection with the question of the composition of the Gospels. Of his life we are as uninformed as in the cases of Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp of Smyrna. We know that he was bishop of Hierapolis. Eusebius calls him "a man of varied education and notably well versed in the Holy Scripture." He took great pains to gather the oral traditions regarding the Savior's life and words; for this purpose he visited several churches and summed up what he learned in five books entitled: *Exegesis of the Words of the Lord.* The extant fragments of this work are of the highest value for the history of Christian origins.[59] Although conscientious in what he relates, Papias seems to have lacked tact and discernment in the interpretation of doctrine. Eusebius says: "I suppose that he got these notions by

[58] Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, xx, 4–7.

[59] They were published by Harnack, *Patrum apostolicorum opera,* and by Funk, *Patres apostolici.* In the thirteenth century, the *Exegesis* of Papias was still extant. Mention is made of it in a catalogue of the cathedral of Nimes dating from that century.

a perverse reading of the Apostolic accounts, not realizing that they [the Apostles] spoke mystically and symbolically." [60] Thus it happened that his work, undertaken to preserve the most genuine traditions, was later used by the millenarians, who appealed to his authority in behalf of their fanciful views.

Among the "disciples of the Lord" whom Papias had seen and consulted, he mentions Andrew, Peter, Thomas, James, and Matthew.[61] These Apostles must have visited their brethren in Asia only in passing. The two chiefs in whom the East gloried were John and Philip. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, writes: "Two great stars have set in Asia, but they will rise at the last day: Philip, one of the Twelve, whose remains lie at rest at Hierapolis, and John the Apostle, who slept upon the Savior's breast, and who, martyr and doctor, has his tomb at Ephesus." [62] The real head of the churches of Asia was John the Apostle. We shall presently see the proof of this in the *Letter to the Seven Churches.* When St. John reached Asia, the churches founded by St. Paul were about to assume the definite form generally adopted later; one after the other, they were abandoning that assembly of ancients which had governed them, under the direction of a resident bishop or under that of an Apostle, and were placing themselves directly under the authority of a bishop. John, while not attaching himself particularly to any one see, exercised over them all that universal jurisdiction vested by Christ in His Apostles, a jurisdiction that was to end only with the last of them.

The Persecution under Domitian

About the year 95, John's paternal governance was suddenly disturbed by the violent persecution of Domitian. The

[60] Eusebius, *H. E.,* III, xxxix, 12. Eusebius calls him "a man of very little intelligence." (*Ibid.,* no. 13.)

[61] Eusebius, *H. E.,* III, xxxix.

[62] *Idem,* III, xxxi, 3.

amazing extravagance of the last of the twelve Caesars had ruined the public treasury. There was no hope of filling the void by an increase of land-taxes or indirect taxes which already weighed so heavily on the commerce of Rome. The Emperor thought of the tax which, since the year 70, all those of Jewish birth paid their conqueror; he now extended it to those who "lived as Jews." [63] The expression was vague; it opened the way to most odious searching and inquiring. At any rate, it applied to the Christians, and perhaps had them chiefly in mind. By means of countless official informers,[64] Domitian was able to learn of the progress made by the new religion among the great Roman families. It is well known that the property of all persons condemned to death or proscribed escheated to the Emperor.

Many Christians refused to let themselves be taken for Jews. The separation of the two religions was by this time a fact. To pay the Jewish tax seemed to them a lie, nay, a kind of abjuration of the faith. The Emperor was angered. Who were these people, strangers to the religions officially sanctioned at Rome, who "lived as Jews," but repudiated the religion of the Jewish people? The epithets "innovators" and "atheists" were cast at them.

Inquisitorial proceedings increased. Domitian's fury was at its height, when one of his informers pointed out to him, among the Judaizers and "atheists," his own cousin-german, Flavius Clemens, father of two children whom he intended for the imperial service. Flavius Clemens, the consul of that year (95), was the son of Vespasian's elder brother, Flavius Sabinus, who was prefect of Rome in the time of Nero and who in 64 witnessed the massacre of Christians. This Sabinus, it seems, had been deeply and painfully impressed. Tacitus

[63] Suetonius, *Domitian*, 12.

[64] Tacitus, *History*, IV, 50; *Life of Agricola*, 45; Pliny, *Letters*, I, 5; II, 11; Juvenal, IV, 110–118.

relates that in Sabinus' last years his gentleness, moderation, and aversion for sanguinary contests were spoken of and even led some people of fiery temper to accuse him of cowardice.[65] Sabinus' son and daughter-in-law courageously embraced the Christian religion. It was a case of death or proscription. Flavius Clemens was executed in the very year of his consulate. Flavia Domitilla, his wife, was exiled to the island of Pandataria. Another Flavia Domitilla, their niece, was interned on the island of Pontia. The historian Dion Cassius, relating their execution, says they were condemned for the crime of "atheism." [66] Suetonius seems to allude to other executions of Christians of the highest station when he writes: "He put to death many senators, among them several exconsuls, including Civica Cerealis, at the very time when he was proconsul in Asia, Salvidienus, Ortus, Acilius Glabrio while he was in exile—these on the ground of plotting revolution [*quasi molitores rerum novarum*]." [67] Glabrio was consul in 61.

Besides need for money and hatred of the Christian name, another feeling entered the tyrant's soul—fear. Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, tells that, "like Herod, he [Domitian] was afraid of the coming of Christ," [68] because throughout the East it was being noised abroad that the government of

[65] Tacitus, *History*, III, 65–75.

[66] Dio Cassius, LXVII, xiv. Cf. Suetonius, *Domitian*, 15. Fifty years after Clement's death, St. Justin wrote that the pagans still called the Christians atheists. (*First Apology*, 6.) In the legal terminology of Rome, beginning in the second century, the word "atheist" does not, strictly speaking, signify the absolute denial of the Divinity, but rather a refusal to honor the gods of the Empire and to take part in public worship. Those were the only gods recognized by the State. Not only did it recognize them, but it incorporated their worship in the political institutions. While the *sacra privata* and *gentilitia* concerned only the family or the gens, the *sacra publica* were closely associated with the prosperity of the city. The State could compel participation in public worship. Such was the law of Rome. (Cf. Cicero, *De legibus*, II, 8–10; Livy, XXV, 1.)

[67] Suetonius, *Domitian*, 2.

[68] Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, xx, 1.

the world would belong to a scion of David. So he ordered a search to be made for all living descendants of that king. The grandsons of Jude, having come to Rome from the depths of Batanea, were sent back after a look at their calloused hands, which evidenced their life of manual labor. It is possible that John, so renowned for his close relations with Jesus, was summoned for the same reason. However this may be, we do know that, having come or been brought to Rome, he there was subjected to the terrible ordeal of boiling oil. We learn of this from Tertullian, who says: "The Apostle John was first plunged, unhurt, into boiling oil, and thence sent back to his island exile." [69] The traditional site where this event is supposed to have taken place is the Latin Gate or, more exactly, the open space later occupied by the Roman gate.[70]

The tyrant's persecution reached beyond Rome, even into Asia. The Apocalypse, written shortly after, speaks of "the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus." The angel of the Lord says to the angel of Smyrna: "I know thy tribulation," and to the angel of Pergamus: "I know thou hast not denied my faith." [71] The Acts of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius of Antioch relate that "during the storms and persecutions, he diverted the danger by the firmness of his soul." [72] Pliny, writing from Bithynia in 111 or 112, says that certain Christians avowed to him "that they had quit their faith twenty years ago," [73] very likely in this persecution of Domitian.

The Apocalypse

The island to which Domitian's tribunal banished the

[69] Tertullian, *De praescr.*, 36.
[70] Tillemont, *Mémoires:* St. John the Evangelist, art. 5.
[71] Apoc. 2:9 f., 13; 6:9–11; 20:4.
[72] *Acta S. Ignatii* (ed. by Funk), II, 260.
[73] Pliny, *Letters*, x, 96.

Apostle John was one of the Sporades in the Aegean Sea, the most arid and uncultivated of those islands mentioned by ancient Greek poets. A long volcanic mountain chain, its two parts connected by a narrow ridge, barely supported a few sorry orchards. The Apostle was probably obliged to labor in the mines. There it was he learned, perhaps from some Christians who came from Miletus or Ephesus, which were only a few hours' sailing distance away, that in Asia, as at Rome, the Christians were hunted out, despoiled, and put to death for their faith. There, too, he heard of the advance of another dread evil: heresy, which had so greatly disturbed St. Paul, was developing there in an alarming manner. The Apostle of the Gentiles had been much concerned about certain men of Asia who combined an excessive worship of the angelic powers with exaggerated painstaking in the matter of observances, feasts, abstinences, and practices of humiliation, thus lessening the part of the Savior in the work of salvation.[74] Not long before, in Galatia, the question was one of opposition between the Law and the faith. But here we have to do with a new doctrine, cleverly arranged, with a tendency to corrupt the Christian religion in its very essence. Under the influence of certain men claiming connection with the deacon Nicolas, and calling themselves Nicolaites, the sect spread rapidly. Besides the strange mysteries of its doctrine, it possessed a particular character of immorality in its practices. St. Irenaeus speaks of the "unrestrained indulgence" which he noted among the Nicolaites,[75] and St. John remarks "the depths of Satan" that he observed therein.[76] The Apostle's presence in Ephesus had doubtless restrained them; his exile at Patmos seemed to leave them free rein.

[74] Coloss., chaps. 1 and 2.
[75] St. Irenaeus, *Haereses*, I, xxvi, 3.
[76] Apoc. 2:24.

"On the Lord's Day," *i. e.,* a Sunday, while the soul of the exiled Apostle was afflicted at the thought of so many evils, he was taken up in spirit. He says: "I heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet saying: 'What thou seest, write in a book. . . .' And being turned, I saw . . . one like to the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the feet, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. . . . His voice as the sound of many waters. . . . His face was as the sun shineth in his power. And when I had seen him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying: 'Fear not. I am the first and the last, and alive, and was dead, and behold I am living for ever and ever and have the keys of death and of hell.' " [77]

Revelations of this sort, "apocalypses" as they were called, were not rare at that period. Supernatural gifts or charisms were frequent in the early Church. Unfortunately, illusion and fraud were mingled in them. Thirty years earlier (A. D. 58), St. Paul had found so many prophets and prophetesses at Corinth that he felt the urgent need of regulating the manifestations of their noisy inspirations.[78]

The account of John's visions, written at Patmos,[79] or perhaps at Ephesus after his return from exile, was addressed directly to the seven Churches of proconsular Asia: Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea. Indirectly it was destined for the whole Church. A preface, often given the title of "Letter to the Seven Churches," in a tone of authority that we can feel rests on a divine mission, assigns blame and praise to each of the Christian communities. The Church of Ephesus is relaxing from its first

[77] Apoc. 1: 10–18.

[78] 1 Cor. 14: 26.

[79] Harnack says: "I make profession of this heresy, which attributes the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to one and the same author." Harnack, *Chronologie,* I, 675, note.

fervor;[80] the Christians of Laodicea are lukewarm;[81] those of Sardis are spiritually dead;[82] the communities of Pergamus and Thyatira allowed themselves to be partly seduced by the Nicolaites.[83] Only the Christians of Smyrna and Philadelphia receive nothing but praise, for having courageously suffered persecution from the enemies of the faith.[84]

After this preamble, there begins a series of visions; their strange character and seeming lack of order are at first disconcerting, but their power captivates. As Bossuet says, "All the beauties of Holy Scripture are gathered together in this book. . . . Notwithstanding its depth, the reader feels so gentle an impression and so superb a harmony of God's majesty, that it is something to ravish heaven and earth. . . . In the Gospel we see Jesus Christ as man, talking with men, humble, poor, weak, and suffering. But the Apocalypse is the Gospel of the risen Christ: He there speaks and acts as a conqueror."[85] The purpose of the book is to encourage the Christians to whom it is addressed, to show them that the triumph of the saints is assured, that the persecuting empire will be laid low, that upon its ruins will rise up a new and glorious Jerusalem. The whole book is an invitation to the Churches to look for strength in the hope of Christ, who will return triumphantly.

This moral aim is the chief intent of the Apocalypse. But we can easily see in it a great dogmatic and liturgical inspiration also.

The doctrine of this book is especially Christological and eschatological.[86] Christ is called "Alpha and Omega," the

[80] Apoc. 2:4 f.
[81] Apoc. 3:15–20.
[82] Apoc. 3:1.
[83] Apoc. 2:14–20.
[84] Apoc. 2:9 f.; 3:7–10.
[85] Bossuet, *L'Apocalypse,* preface.
[86] Here and there in the Apocalypse will be found also important indications of doctrine regarding God, the Trinity, the angels, the Church, etc.

"Prince of the kings of the earth," "He that searcheth the reins and hearts," He who has "the keys of death and of hell," the Lord God, the object of adoration for Heaven and earth.

As for this visible world, it will come to an end after frightful calamities. The devil will come forth from the abyss, will seduce nations, and will encompass the city of the saints with enemies. But God and His own will triumph. The wicked will be the everlasting prey of hell, where they will fall with the beast, the false prophet, and the dragon; whereas the just will enter into possession of Heaven. For them God will create a new Heaven, a new earth, a new Jerusalem, where they will reign forever. The Apocalypse furnishes no additional data enabling us to fix upon the date of these catastrophes. Evidently all the figures which it gives are symbolic numbers.[87] The world must remain ignorant of a date which Christ Himself said He did not know, or was unwilling to reveal even to His most intimate confidants.

The magnificent images by which the Apocalypse represents Christ's eternal glory were destined to exercise a deep influence on the development of Christian liturgy. The slain lamb standing on the throne amid the unnumbered throng of the elect; the ancients gathered about Him, carrying cups that contain the prayers of the saints; the cry of the martyrs rising from beneath the altar; the song of thanksgiving ascending from the multitude to God, like a "new canticle," to glorify the Lamb for having "redeemed us to God in Thy blood, out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation"; the angels

[87] For example, the number seven, recurring all through the Apocalypse, is plainly symbolic. Besides the seven Churches, there are the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the seven signs, the seven vials, the seven angelic prophecies about great Babylon, the seven characters of the final triumph. (Crampon, *La Sainte Bible,* VII, 434.) The thousand years of peace mean simply a long period of time. The number seven everywhere indicates something accomplished and complete, and the number 666, which is the sign of the beast, indicates the unachieved, the imperfect, the evil, threefold, *i. e.,* characterized absolutely.

standing round about the ancients, who "fell down before the throne upon their faces and adored, saying: Amen"; the incense rising to the throne—all these magnificent scenes would little by little inspire the liturgical ceremonies of that "breaking of bread," which, by the addition of new rites, would become the solemn Mass, celebrated by a bishop with his priests about him, amidst the smoke of incense, before an altar bearing relics of the saints and often adorned with the very image of the Lamb of God slain for the salvation of men.[88]

These sublime visions and fervent exhortations would make a powerful impression upon the Churches of Asia. Such and such details or allusions, which have become obscure for us, no doubt were living words to the men of that time.

St. Clement of Rome

But the Church is more than a society guided by a common inspiration: it is a hierarchical organization with a supreme authority to regulate its operation and to decide disputes. At the very hour when persecution and heresy were increasing their ravages, a painful quarrel broke out in the Christian community at Corinth. Following certain troubles, the precise cause of which we do not know, some members of the council or presbyters were deposed. In a city like Corinth disorder may assume very serious proportions. The Greek spirit, naturally particularistic and fickle, found it hard to submit to the fundamental law of Christianity, which established its hierarchy on the unity of doctrine and government. Thirty years earlier, St. Paul was obliged to administer a sharp reprimand to the Corinthians, who were saying: "I am of Paul; and I am of Apollo; and I am of Cephas," [89] as they

[88] See *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.*, under the word *"Agneau."* Cf. Olier, *Cérémonies de la grand'-messe,* bk. 6, chap. 2. The Office of All Saints takes its whole inspiration from the Apocalypse.

[89] See 1 Cor. 1:12.

might have said: "I belong to the Porch, or to the Lyceum, or to the Academy." The schism threatened to rend the Church. To prevent this, there was need for something besides the exhortations of a doctor or prophet; the situation called for the decision of a supreme chief and sovereign judge. This is why recourse was had to the successor of the Apostle Peter, to Clement of Rome.

The Roman Pontiff wrote them a letter wherein, along with an admirable spirit of prudence, there appears the consciousness of undeniable authority.

He begins by excusing himself for not having intervened sooner. He says: "Owing to the sudden and repeated misfortunes and calamities which have befallen us, we consider that our attention has been somewhat delayed in turning to the questions disputed among you." [90] This is evidently a reference to the persecution of Domitian. Then the head of the Roman Church enters clearly upon the capital question: the necessity of humble submission to the order established by God in all things, and principally in His Church. "Let us be humble-minded, brethren, putting aside all arrogance and conceit. . . . Let not the wise man boast himself in his wisdom. Let him boast in the Lord, to seek Him out and to do judgment and righteousness." [91] But to be just and righteous is to bow before the order and harmony that God has established in all things. "The ocean and the worlds beyond it are ruled by the same injunctions of the Master. The seasons of spring, summer, autumn, and winter give place to one another in peace. . . . All these things did the great Creator and Master of the universe ordain to be in peace and concord." [92]

[90] Clement, *First Epistle*, I, 1. The opening salutation does not bear the name of the Church of Rome; but no critic questions that the author was Pope Clement.

[91] *Ibidem*, XIII, 1.

[92] *Ibidem*. XX, 8–11.

This comparison, taken from the harmony of the physical world, which the Greeks called the *Kosmos,* or order *par excellence,* was particularly well chosen. Clement pushes his argument farther. He takes his analogies from the human body and the social organization. "Let us take our body; the head is nothing without the feet; likewise the feet are nothing without the head." [93] He recalls that, in the Old Testament, God, the direct author of the Law, instituted a hierarchy composed of four degrees: the laity, the Levites, the priests, and the high priest.[94] "The Apostles received the gospel from the Lord Jesus Christ, who was sent from God. They appointed their first converts to be bishops and deacons." [95] The bishop of Rome in fine compares the ecclesiastical discipline to military discipline. "Let us consider those who serve our generals. . . . Not all are prefects nor tribunes nor centurions nor in charge of fifty men, or the like, but each carries out in his own rank the commands of the emperor and of the generals." [96] We know how inclined St. Paul was to use these military comparisons.[97] But Christians are something more than an army. Clement says they are also "the flock of Christ," [98] or, better still, "the members of Christ." [99] The flock should be at peace under the safekeeping of the presbyters; [100] the members of Christ's body should not be torn asunder.[101]

The consequences that follow from these principles are solid and clear. "Let no one rebel against correction.[102]. . .

[93] *Ibidem,* XXXVII, 5.
[94] *Ibidem,* XL, 5.
[95] *Ibidem,* XLII, 1, 4.
[96] *Ibidem,* XXXVII, 2 f.
[97] See 2 Cor. 10:3–6; Ephes. 6:10–18; 1 Tim. 1:18; 2 Tim. 2:3.
[98] Clement, *First Epistle,* LIV, 2.
[99] *Ibidem,* XLVI, 7.
[100] *Ibidem,* LIV, 2.
[101] *Ibidem,* XLVI, 7.
[102] *Ibidem,* LVI, 2.

Let all submit to the presbyters.[103]. . . Let the offerings be made and the ceremonies be performed, not according to each one's pleasure and without order, but as the Master commands and at fixed hours." [104] The pontiff sums up the whole instruction, saying: "Let us put aside empty and vain cares, and let us come to the glorious and venerable rule of our tradition." [105] The letter closes with these lines, in a spirit of calm but firm authority: "You will give us joy and gladness if you are obedient to the things which we have written through the Holy Spirit, and root out the wicked passion of your jealousy. . . . We have sent faithful and prudent men, who have lived among us without blame from youth to old age, and they shall be witnesses between you and us. We have done this that you may know that our whole care has been and is directed to your speedy attainment of peace." [106]

"Whether we consider this spontaneous act of Rome in itself or whether we weigh the terms of the letter, we cannot escape the impression that, as early as the end of the first century of the Christian era, *i. e.*, about fifty years after her foundation, the Roman Church was conscious of possessing supreme and exceptional authority, which she will never cease hereafter to claim. . . . But how did the Corinthians receive the exhortations and the messengers of the Church of Rome? So well, that St. Clement's Epistle was placed by them almost on a level with the Holy Scriptures. Seventy years later [107] it was still read on Sundays in the assemblies of the faithful." [108]

By the fulness and reliability of its teaching, St. Clement's letter deserved the honors given it in the first centuries. Al-

[103] *Ibidem*, LVII, 1.
[104] *Ibidem*, XL, 2.
[105] *Ibidem*, VII, 2.
[106] *Ibidem*, LXIII, 2–4.
[107] See Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, xxiii.
[108] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome*, p. 85.

though it recalls the truths of the faith only in passing and insofar as they are related to the practical purpose of the letter, those truths are a sort of portrayal of the Christian beliefs in their main lines. The author appeals in turn to God's supreme authority and His creative power, to His providence, and to His love.[109] The last judgment, Heaven, and the resurrection of the dead are presented as the final end of man;[110] Christ, as man's divine model. The Son of God, equal to the Father and the Spirit by His divine nature, became man like us to save us by His death.[111] Through Him, our high priest and our advocate with God the Father, man, aided by grace and making his faith fruitful by his works, has hope of being saved.[112]

In testimony of the bonds, which in the Church have ever united the law of belief and the law of prayer,[113] dogma and liturgy, the Pontiff inserts in his letter a solemn formula of prayer which we may regard, if not as the official formula of liturgical prayer of that time, at least as a specimen of the way the celebrants developed the subject of Eucharistic prayer:

"Thou dost humble the pride of the haughty, thou dost destroy the imaginings of nations . . . thou dost slay and make alive . . . and art God of all flesh . . . thou dost multiply nations upon earth and hast chosen out from them all those that love thee through Jesus Christ thy beloved child. . . . We beseech thee, Master, to be our help and succor. . . . Feed the hungry, ransom our prisoners, raise up the weak. . . . O merciful and compassionate, forgive us our iniquities and unrighteousness, and transgressions and shortcomings. Reckon not every sin of thy servants and handmaids. . . . Give concord and peace to us and to all that dwell on the earth. . . . Thou, Master, hast given the power of sovereignty to them [our rulers and

[109] Cf. Clement, *First Epistle,* chaps. 19, 23, 29, 35.
[110] Cf. chaps. 5, 24, 25, 26, 50.
[111] Cf. chaps. 2, 7, 12, 31, 32, 35, 49.
[112] Cf. chaps. 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 32, 33, 35.
[113] According to the well-known formula, ***lex orandi, lex credendi.***

governors]. . . . And to them, Lord, grant health, peace, concord, firmness. . . . Direct their counsels according to that which is good and pleasing before thee. . . . O thou who alone art able to do these things and far better things for us, we praise thee through Jesus Christ, the high priest and guardian of our souls, through whom be glory and majesty to thee, both now and for all generations and for ever and ever. Amen." [114]

Such is the beautiful prayer that ascended to God from the Christian assemblies of Rome, like a hymn of serene peace and unspeakable purity, after Domitian's persecution, in the midst of that "corrupted and corruptive" society, whose baseness and cruelty are recounted by the pens of Tacitus and Suetonius.[115]

Cerinthus

The fall of the Flavians was followed by a conservative reaction, from which the Christians profited. At Domitian's death, in 96, St. John returned from exile to Ephesus. There he had the consolation of being again in the society of Christians in which he had lived for about thirty years. This whole crowd of converts, some from the ranks of Judaism, some from paganism, were all more or less imbued with the same philosophical ideas that issued from Alexandria. The educated discussed abstract systems that were venturesome and obscure. Even the common people spoke the language of those ideas; and by that unfelt influence which descends from the heights of speculative science little by little into the practice of life, curious theories insinuated themselves into the popu-

[114] Clement, *First Epistle,* chaps. 59 to 61. This letter was widely known and greatly venerated in Christian antiquity. But it seems to have been neglected in the West from the fourth century onward. In the Middle Ages it was altogether unknown. In the seventeenth century it was partly recovered in the famous *Codex Alexandrinus.* Bryennios, in 1875, reconstructed the entire text. The beautiful prayer, quoted above, forms a part of recently discovered fragments.

[115] *"Corrumpere et corrumpi sæculum vocatur."* (Tacitus, *Germany,* 19.)

lar beliefs. Some people were making a distinction between Christ and Jesus, regarding the latter as a mere man, like other men. This theory had been taught especially by a certain mysterious personage, Cerinthus, whose life is almost entirely unknown to us. His views are recorded by St. Irenaeus.[116] Cerinthus seems to have been a native of Egypt. He was a Jew before his conversion. After becoming a Christian, he kept his narrow views, refusing to admit the catholic character of Christianity. If we are to accept St. Epiphanius' report,[117] Cerinthus organized even around St. Paul a sort of opposition preaching for the purpose of maintaining the Christian religion in strict dependence on Judaism. But the Judaism to which Cerinthus held was that interpreted by Philo—a synthesis of pagan wisdom and Mosaic teaching. After travelling through Palestine, Syria, and Galatia, Cerinthus returned to Asia. He may have settled at Ephesus during St. John's exile. Here is a brief outline of his teaching: So far is the supreme God raised above all things, that even the angels do not know Him. He is neither the Creator nor Lawmaker of the world. This function belongs to the angels. As for Jesus, He is the son of Joseph and Mary. At His baptism, a power of the supreme God descended upon Him and remained in Him until the Passion exclusive. This divine entity was the Christ. The power of the supreme God left Him during His Passion, but nevertheless He rose from the dead.[118]

Did Cerinthus confine himself to teaching by word of mouth, or did he put his ideas in writing? Contemporary evidence is too vague on this point to allow us to decide. We know that he made devoted disciples among the Christians.

[116] St. Irenaeus, *Haereses*, I, xxvi, 1.

[117] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses*, XXVIII, 2–4.

[118] St. Irenaeus, III, xi, 7. On Cerinthus, cf. *idem*, I, xxvi, 1; Tertullian, *De praescr.*, 48.

Upon St. John's return to Ephesus, the heresy of the Cerinthians was a great peril for the Church. Polycarp relates that John, the disciple of the Lord, one day entered a bath at Ephesus and there saw the heresiarch; thereupon John ran out, crying: "Let us fly lest the baths fall in, since Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within." [119]

Besides Cerinthus were there any forerunners of Docetism —later propounded by Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion—the error which holds that Jesus Christ had only an apparent body? Or did Cerinthus himself teach this heresy? It is impossible to say. But several passages of St. John's writings seem to have such a doctrine in mind.[120]

However this may be, to refute the false notions that were circulating about the adorable person of the Savior, nothing could equal the testimony of him who had known the Master intimately, who had rested his head upon His breast the night before He died, and who had heard His last words on Calvary. St. John addressed to the Christians of Asia Minor, who had been converted from paganism, a letter which may be considered as a preface to the Gospel which he wrote later. This letter begins thus:

"That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life. . . . That which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." [121]

The Gospel of St. John

These words indicate the aim of the Fourth Gospel: to show, as against the new heretics, the identity of Jesus of

[119] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, xiv, 6.
[120] John 1:14; 19:34; 1 John 1:1; 4:3; 2 John 7.
[121] 1 John 1:1.

Nazareth with the eternal Son of God, the life and light of the world. The first three Gospels had given a glimpse of the eternal preëxistence of Jesus Christ.[122] St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, and later in the Epistle to the Hebrews, represented Christ as the sole revealer and sole mediator of the invisible Father.[123] St. John's originality consisted in this, that, in the light of more intimate recollections and deeper supernatural illuminations, he made Christian revelation more precise on these points; and that, in his exposition, he ventured to use the abstract expressions of Oriental language, expressions that were common in the country where he was writing.

Soon afterward St. John's Gospel appeared. It begins thus: "In the beginning was the Word, and Word was with God, and the Word was God." This term "Word" or "Logos" was in common use by the Alexandrian philosophers. But we would be quite mistaken if we therefore concluded that the Evangelist's thought is at all dependent upon a particular philosophy. In the philosophy of Philo the word "Logos" means vaguely an organ of the divine power, although we cannot exactly say whether it is confounded with God or constitutes a distinct person; for other philosophers, this word signified either a being intermediate between the world and God, or divine reason spread forth in the world, or something entirely different. The Logos, for the Hellenists of the time, was the favorite word to express whatever is beautiful and harmonious and great. We may form an idea of this by considering what the eighteenth century philosophers put under the name of Reason, those of the nineteenth under the name of Science, those of the twentieth under the name of Life. The Apostle seized upon this word—he uses it only four times in all his writings—and declares to that Alexandrian world,

[122] Mark 12:35–37; Matt. 22:41–46; Luke 20:41–44.
[123] Coloss. 1:13–20; Heb. 1:2 f.; 7:6; 9:15; 12:24. Cf. 1 Cor. 8:6.

seduced by all the grand things which that term suggested to them, that its ideal is fully realized only in this Jesus, whose witness he (John) is.[124] And the Evangelist makes the idea of the Word, or Logos, more precise by means of the two clearer words, light and life. "The Word was with God. . . . In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." [125]

The wonderful prologue containing these words so far surpasses the ordinary conceptions of the human mind as to dazzle and astound it. "This son of thunder does not speak a human language; he flashes lightning, he thunders, he stuns, he humbles every created mind under the obedience of the faith, when, by a rapid flight, cleaving the air and piercing the clouds and rising above the angels, he intones these words: 'In the beginning was the Word.' " [126]

Once the theologian has set forth the grand concept we should have of Jesus Christ, the part of the witness begins. St. John's aim in writing his Gospel is evidently to prove the faith; but he wishes to prove it by history, chiefly by that which he knows in a more personal way. He is not at pains to harmonize his account with that of the preceding Evangelists. "As a rule John records the events in the order of their happening; and nevertheless it is possible to note a progressive movement in the march of ideas, which warrants the division of the Holy Book into three parts. The first recounts the various greetings accorded by the world to the Light bestowed on it by the Incarnate Word; [127] the second describes the implacable resistance it met with from the creatures of Darkness; [128] the third describes the eclipse of the

[124] On the comparison of Philo's Logos with the Logos of St. John, see Lebreton, *Les Origines du dogme de la Trinité,* I, 515–523.

[125] Anyone who will consult a Concordance, under the words "light" and "life," will be impressed with the important place which these two ideas hold in St. John's Gospel.

[126] Bossuet, *Elévations sur les mystères,* Seventh elevation.

[127] John, chaps. 1–4.

[128] John, chaps. 5–12.

Light, but only an apparent eclipse, since from it Jesus emerges in a more striking manifestation of His Divinity: His love attaining its climax in the Eucharist and the sacrifice on the Cross.[129] None but God could have loved so greatly as this." [130]

The Fourth Gospel seems to flow in a single stream. The events and discourses connect, explain, and supplement each other in a magnificent unity. Everything in it is lifelike and glowing; the events are intermingled with dialogue and animated retort, with realistic interruptions; the actors of the story seem to live again in its pages. Even the abstract ideas take on a body, and the most material events evoke supernatural realities. The Savior's features appear more lifelike than in the Synoptic Gospels; the inner depths of His soul are more clearly revealed. The Apostle, writing his narrative after a long interval, "recording conversations and discourses that he did not write down on the spot, subjects these conversations and discourses to certain literary transformations," by giving them "a personal stamp of his own in the construction of phrases and the grouping of ideas." [131] Yet it is quite natural to think that the beloved disciple was able to attain to deeper realities than the other Evangelists, either by the more intimate confidences which his divine Friend may have bestowed on him, or because a more ardent love made it easier for him to understand and remember, or because a half-century of intense mystical life revealed to him more clearly a saying at first imperfectly understood.[132]

[129] John, chaps. 12–20. The last chapter, undoubtedly added as an afterthought, presents a somewhat different point of view.

[130] Fouard, *St. John*, p. 176.

[131] Lepin, art. *"Evangiles,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi catholique.*

[132] Fouard (*St. John*, p. 175) admits as probable that other hands coöperated with St. John in the editing of his recollections. Calmes (*Comment se sont formés les Evangiles*, pp. 5–7, and *L'Evangile selon saint Jean*, Introduction) is willing to consider rather broadly the part of St. John's disciples in the editing of his Gospel. But, on any supposition, these authors maintain that the whole Gospel re-

The appearance of St. John's Gospel was one of the greatest events in the early Church. It occurred about the year 98.[133] The Evangelist accomplished his purpose. "Without any direct controversy or specific mention of the heresy, by a simple mention of the opposite facts," [134] which he himself had witnessed, he reduced to nothing all the affirmations of Cerinthus. Thereafter, in the teaching of the faithful, the influence of this book was immense. Eusebius says: "It is read in all the churches under heaven." [135] Some heretics tried to make it serve their own purpose; others fought it with all their might. Especially in Alexandria it occasioned many metaphysical speculations. Eusebius speaks of "a school of sacred learning" or *didascalia,* founded in Alexandria at an early date.[136] This was the germ of the famous school on which Clement of Alexandria and Origen shed such incomparable luster. It was the beginning of a new phase in the history of the Church. In Jerusalem, Christianity appears as a brotherhood, with St. James the Less as its father; at Antioch it appears as a propaganda, with St. Paul as its chief champion; at Rome it declares itself as a government, with St. Peter as the head; at Alexandria it presents itself as a

produces the Apostle's thought. Even with this restriction, the hypothesis admitted by Fouard and Calmes seems to us improbable. The perfect unity of plan and style to be observed in the Fourth Gospel does not easily comport with the supposition of a plurality of collaborators; unless these latter be regarded as simple scribes, passive secretaries, solely engaged in rendering with scrupulous care the thoughts and expressions of the Apostle—which would fundamentally be a return to the traditional thesis. (On the history of the Fourth Gospel, see Levesque, *Nos quatre evangiles.*)

[133] Probably the Apostle had begun to write his Gospel during his exile at Patmos, or even earlier, and it was merely the reproduction and orderly arrangement of his habitual preaching.

[134] Döllinger, *The First Age of Christianity and the Church,* I, 192.

[135] Eusebius, *H. E.,* III, xxiv, 2. On the Gospel of St. John, see Corluy, *Commentarium in Evangelium S. Joannis;* Knabenbauer, *ibidem;* Lepin, *La Valeur historique du quatrième Evangile;* Nouvelle, *L'Authenticité du quatrième Evangile.*

[136] Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, x, 1.

philosophy, with St. John as its doctor. These were, however, merely diverse aspects, successive adaptations, of a doctrine always one, always identical: for it to enlarge and develop was simply to succeed in fathoming the Master's teaching more and more deeply.

The story of St. John's last years has not been recorded; it is lost in fanciful legend, with which the Gnostics embellished it. What we can accept as a truthful detail is the continuance of his amiable kindness. All the traditions represent him as a kindly man advanced in years, summing up all his teaching in one saying: "My little children, let us love not in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth." [137] These same traditions are agreed in saying that his death was as gentle as falling asleep.[138] His tomb soon became an object of universal veneration. Today, upon the ruins of the city of Ephesus, it is thought that traces of it are to be found on the side of a hill where eight or ten poor families are living together; and the memory of the great Apostle survives in the name of the little village which these families have founded, Aya Suluk, the place of the "Holy Theologian" (*aghiou apostolou*).[139]

[137] See 1 John 3:18.
[138] Zahn, *Acta Johannis*, p. 256.
[139] Le Camus, *Voyage aux pays bibliques*, III, 132 ff.

CHAPTER VI

The Church and the Barbarians

WE have clear and precise documents in abundance regarding the evangelization of the great centers—Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, and Alexandria. But, for the history of Christian origins among most of the peoples far removed from these famous centers, the documents are scanty and obscure. In default of written texts, we must rely mostly on inferences, conjectures, more or less ancient traditions, and legends containing an odd mixture of truth. Tradition, as well as writing, is good evidence, and "what is engraved on the altar by public worship and in the heart by prayer is more enduring than marble or bronze." [1] Besides, if we have a mere probability that a witness of the first centuries, a man of the Apostolic age, evangelized a district or shed his blood there, would not this be enough for Christian people to venerate the least traces of that evangelization or martyrdom?

Evangelization by the Apostles

A highly respectable tradition tells us that the twelve Apostles "planted the Church in their blood." [2] Where did they suffer martyrdom? Thus far, besides the names of Paul and Barnabas, who were apostles in the broad sense of the word, we have met only the names of Peter, John, the two Jameses, and Philip. What and where were the labors of their brethren in the apostolate? Did they go beyond the regions of which we have been speaking?

[1] Lacordaire, *Sainte Madeleine,* chap. 6.

[2] ***"Isti sunt qui, viventes in carne, Ecclesiam plantaverunt sanguine suo";*** responsorium of the third nocturn of the Common of Apostles.

Eusebius says that "Thomas, as tradition relates, obtained by lot Parthia." [3] St. Jerome supposes that he evangelized Persia also,[4] and Rufinus says he was buried at Edessa,[5] where St. John Chrysostom mentions his tomb. "It is one of the four Apostolic tombs that are known: the others are the tombs of Peter, Paul, and John." [6] Another tradition has it that he preached the faith and was martyred in India.[7] This statement seems to be corroborated by an archeological monument, the Oodeypore inscription, in eastern India,[8] and by the fact that the Hindu Christians, known as "Christians of St. Thomas," have honored this Apostle from time immemorial as the founder of their Church. It seems, however, that their founder was a Nestorian missioner named Thomas, and that they have pushed back the date of his preaching to Apostolic times, so as to glory in a more ancient beginning.[9] The only fact emerging with certainty from all these different reports is that St. Thomas the Apostle exercised the apostolate in regions beyond the eastern and southern frontiers of the Roman Empire; regions which at that time went under the vague designation of India. According to the tradition accepted by the Roman Martyrology, the Apostle was pierced with a lance by order of a persecuting king, and his body was transported to Edessa. The legendary details in the *Acta sancti Thomae* are not trustworthy because this writing bears evident traces of Gnosticism.[10]

[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, i; cf. Socrates, *H. E.*, I, xix; *Clementine Recognitions*, IX, xxix.

[4] St. Jerome, *De vitis apostolorum*, 5.

[5] Rufinus, *H. E.*, II, v.

[6] St. John Chrysostom, *Hom. 26 in Heb.*, 2.

[7] St. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orationes adversus Arianos*, 33, 11.

[8] *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, Munich, January 8, 1900, p. 7.

[9] Art. *"Thomas,"* in Vigouroux' *Dict. de la Bible.*

[10] The best edition of the *Acta sancti Thomae* is that of Max Bonnet, 1884. According to Lipsius, this work dates from the close of the third century. (Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, I, 346.)

There is greater uncertainty regarding the nations evangelized by St. Matthew after his departure from Palestine. Clement of Alexandria simply says that Matthew preached the Gospel to the Hebrews for fifteen years, and then went to convert the pagans.[11] St. Gregory the Great and the historian Socrates say he went to Ethiopia,[12] and this is the tradition adopted by the Roman Breviary.[13] But St. Isidore of Seville and Simeon Metaphrastes state that he devoted himself to the evangelization of the Parthians.[14] As to his martyrdom, the details given in the *Acta sancti Matthaei* are not reliable.[15]

Even vaguer is the information about the apostolate of St. Matthias, whom some of the Fathers confuse with St. Matthew.[16] One tradition has him stoned to death by the Jews in Judea; there is another and more probable tradition which says that he preached the gospel in Ethiopia and was martyred there.[17]

All the authors who speak of St. Bartholomew agree in saying that he evangelized India. But, in the vast region designated by that term, where are we to locate the exact district to which he went? The view adopted by the Roman Breviary is that it was Armenia. It is said that he was there flayed alive and crucified by order of Astyages, whose brother Polymius, king of Armenia, he had converted.[18] St. Simon and St. Jude, according to the Roman Breviary, together evangelized Mesopotamia, where they were martyred.[19] They

[11] Clement of Alexandria, *Pedagogus*, II, i.

[12] St. Gregory the Great, *In I Regum* 4: 13; Socrates, *H. E.*, I, xix.

[13] Roman Breviary, September 21.

[14] St. Isidore of Seville, *De ortu et obitu Patrum*, 76; Metaphrastes, *Vita S. Matthaei*, IV, 5.

[15] In Tischendorf's *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, pp. 167–189. Cf. the Bollandists' *Acta sanctorum*, September, VI, 194–227.

[16] *E. g.*, Clement of Alexandria.

[17] *Acta sanctorum*, February, III, p. 444.

[18] See Tillemont, *Mémoires*, I, 387.

[19] Roman Breviary, October 28.

are also said to have preached the gospel in Persia, and St. Simon in Egypt. That this Apostle preached in other parts of Africa and in Britain, is considered purely legendary by the Bollandists.[20]

The Acts of the Apostles mentions the name of Andrew only in the list of the Apostles, and the Epistles do not speak of him at all. The tradition recorded by Eusebius [21] and Nicephorus [22] says that, after the dispersion, he crossed Cappadocia, Galatia, Bithynia, and Colchis, to mysterious Scythia, north of the Black Sea, between the Don and the Danube, where he disappeared in the darkness of the barbarian world, quietly introducing the Christian faith in the southern provinces of the future empire of the czars, until, after fulfilling his mission as apostle to the Scythians, he returned through Thrace to the Greco-Roman world, coming down through Macedonia and Epirus as far as Achaia, where he died.[23] Andrew was arrested and condemned to death in the heart of the Hellenist world, at Patras in Achaia, near the Strait of Lepanto. Before him he saw the X-shaped cross on which he was to be put to death: he greeted it in words which the Church has inserted in her liturgy, to remind her ministers what should be the sentiments of a true apostle of Christ: "O lovable cross, O cross so eagerly wished for and at last so happily found, may I never quit thee, that He who redeemed me by thee, by dying on thy arms, may by thee also receive me and keep me forever in His love." [24] Bossuet calls

[20] *Acta sanctorum,* October 29, XII,

[21] Eusebius, *H. E.,* III, i.

[22] Nicephorus, *H. E.,* II, xxxix–xliv.

[23] Gondal, *Au temps des apôtres,* p. 320.

[24] The arrest, interrogation, condemnation, and martyrdom of St. Andrew are related in the celebrated Letter of the Priests and Deacons of Achaia on the Martyrdom of St. Andrew (Tischendorf, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha,* p. 155). The authenticity of the letter is defended by the best critics: Noël Alexander, Galland, etc. Tillemont questions its integrity. In places it seems to be an oratorical amplification of details taken from authentic documents. No reliance is to be placed on

Andrew "the first-born of the Apostles," [25] because he was the first to bring disciples to Jesus, notably his brother Simon Peter; he was thus chosen by God to give the world an example of triumphant heroism in the face of martyrdom. Not only did the twelve poor fishermen of Galilee, through their preaching, give the world their Gospels and their Epistles, the loftiest lessons mankind has ever heard, but they also gave the finest examples of conduct ever seen. "When God wishes to show that a work is entirely that of His own hand, He reduces all to powerlessness and despair, and then He acts." [26]

Beginnings of the Church in Spain

If to these labors of the twelve Apostles we add what we know or can reasonably surmise of St. Paul's labors, we understand how St. Ignatius of Antioch, at the beginning of the second century, was able to write in significant terms—though they should not be taken literally—that the Church had spread "to the limits of the earth." [27] St. Clement of Rome declares that the Apostle of the Gentiles was not put to death until after "he had reached the limits of the West." [28] It is natural to suppose these words refer to Spain. We may wonder why St. Paul, at the time of his Epistle to the Romans (A. D. 60), speaks only of Spain, and not of Gaul and Africa. Perhaps the reason was that Gaul and Africa had already received the true faith. "When we know how reluctant St. Paul was to go and preach where other Apostles had preceded him,[29] we

The Adventures of Matthias and Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals (Tischendorf, *op. cit.*, p. 132). See Flamion, *Les Actes apocryphes de l'apôtre André*, Louvain and Paris, 1911.

[25] Bossuet, *Panégyrique de saint André*, 2d point.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] St. Ignatius, *Romans*, 3.

[28] Clement, *First Epistle*, v, 7.

[29] Rom. 15:20.

are led to suppose that cities like Carthage or Marseilles may have received the gospel even before the year 60. In the Second Epistle to Timothy we read: 'Crescens [is gone] into Gaul, Titus into Dalmatia.' [30] For in this passage, we should read 'Gaul' rather than 'Galatia,' however slender may be this preference." [31] In a word, at the close of the first century, seventy years after the Savior's death, it appears that not only has Europe been traversed from end to end, from east to west, but Asia and Africa have been penetrated far beyond the frontiers of the Empire. Harnack enumerates forty-one localities where the existence of Christian communities is historically attested in the course of the first century.[32] We know these communities formed only a very small minority in the Church. Even the Epistles of St. Paul and of St. Peter witness to the presence of many such communities which they do not name; those founded by the other Apostles are even less known. The miracle of Pentecost was verified in a new sense: "Men out of every nation under heaven . . . heard them speak in their own tongue," and St. Clement of Rome was able to ask in his prayer, "that the Creator of the Universe may guard unhurt the number of His elect that has been numbered in all the world." [33]

[30] 2 Tim. 4: 10.

[31] Batiffol, in the *Revue biblique,* April 1895, p. 140. The interpretation of 2 Tim. 4: 10, in the sense of Gaul is much disputed. The words Celtia, Galatia, and Gallia appear to have been synonymous in the language of the period. Only the circumstances can determine whether Gaul or Galatia is meant.

[32] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity,* II, 91.

[33] St. Clement, *First Epistle,* LIX, 2; Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, 175. Cf. Batiffol, *"L'Extension géographique de l'Eglise,"* in the *Revue biblique,* April 1895; Grandmaison, *"L'Expansion du christianisme,"* in *Etudes,* July 1903; Rivière, *"La Propagation du christianisme dans les trois premiers siècles,"* in the *Revue pratique d'apologétique,* March 15 and April 1, 1906; Allard, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs,* Lecture 2, "The Spread of Christianity Outside the Roman Empire." Was the condition of the ancient world favorable or unfavorable to the spread of Christianity? A great part of the discussion that has arisen over this question rests upon an equivocal statement of the problem. The question can be answered exactly only by a distinction. Whereas, in the ancient world, everything seems to have been

It is no less noteworthy that the geographical spread of Christianity was duplicated by a deep penetration of its spirit into society. This is what Harnack calls its "intensive penetration." Since the day when St. Paul wrote: "There are not many wise according to the flesh among you," [34] the Church had made many a conquest in the social and intellectual aristocracy. At Athens it won a member of the Areopagus, at Rome under Nero it counted members in Caesar's household,[35] and under Domitian among the members of the imperial family. We know also that the Christians of Alexandria did not hesitate to enter upon the philosophical discussion of their faith. By Alexandria the whole eastern civilization would be penetrated with Christianity. By Athens and Rome the two great nations of Western antiquity would transmit to Europe the spirit of the gospel. And can we say further that two of

providentially disposed to facilitate the rapid spread of Christian doctrine, yet everything appears to have been prepared by the spirit of evil to hinder its acceptance. The unity of the civilized world under a single ruler, the universality of the Greek language, the spread of the Jews, depositaries of a monotheistic faith and of the Messianic prophecies, over the whole world, evidently favored the preaching of the Gospel, while the decadence of the traditional religion, the avowed powerlessness of the philosophical sects, the lassitude engendered by the very excesses of civilization, inclined men's minds to listen to a new preaching. But the powerful unity of the Empire, as soon as it would turn, as in fact it did, against the religion of Christ, was capable of creating a most formidable obstacle to it. Wherever the narrow and carnal spirit of the Jews prevailed—as it did almost everywhere—it made them bitter enemies of Christianity. The cultivation of the Greek language and of the ancient authors of Hellas was sure to make contemptible the speech of a few obscure and unlettered Jews. Although the old mythology had few believers, it was already replaced by the worship of Rome and Augustus, by the whole prestige of a national religion, and by those Oriental mysteries with their purification rites that attracted the lofty-minded, and with their sensual practices that so well suited the instincts of the masses. The philosophical sects prepared men's minds for heresies. Pagan Rationalism rebelled against a religion of authority with as great violence as did pagan sensualism against a doctrine of purity and humility. In short, between the worship of Pan—*i. e.*, nature raised and divinized by its own forces—and the worship of Christ, of a God made man and crucified to redeem a fallen world, the opposition was explicit and absolute.

[34] 1 Cor. 1:26.

[35] Phil. 4:22.

the nations destined to play a preponderant rôle in the history of the West, Spain and France, contained Christian communities even in the first century, and that the Churches of these two countries—that of the "Catholic kingdom" and that of the "most Christian kingdom"—can boast of an Apostolic origin? This question merits the pains of closer study.

Says Duchesne: "St. Paul no doubt took the opportunity to go to Spain, where the first beginnings of Christianity seem to be connected with him." [36] The thought of evangelizing Spain was early in the mind of the great Apostle. "When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, I hope that as I pass I shall see you," he wrote from Corinth to the Romans.[37] And again: "I will come by you into Spain." [38] This keen desire is explained by the fact that although Spain was slowly and with difficulty conquered by the Roman armies, yet, owing to the natural genius of its inhabitants, it rapidly became one of the most cultivated provinces of the Empire. The renown of the two Senecas, Lucan, Martial, Silius Italicus, and Quintilian, all of them Spaniards, was not dimmed by the glory of a Horace or a Virgil. An inner impulse seemed to urge the humble disciples of Christ to carry the gospel to all points of civilization in the ancient world. St. Paul seems "to have considered the Spanish mission as the height of his career, after which he might end his course, having brought the faith even to those pillars of Hercules which marked the outermost bounds both of the Empire and of the world." [39] Probably he carried out his intention about the year 63, right after his trial before Caesar and his acquittal, following two years spent in Rome. St. Clement of Rome, well situated for acquiring exact information, declares that Paul "reached the

[36] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 43.
[37] Rom. 15:24.
[38] Rom. 15:28.
[39] Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne*, p. 26.

limits of the West." [40] We naturally regard this expression as equivalent to the *"Hesperia ultima"* of Horace [41] and the *"extremique orbis Iberi"* of Lucan.[42] St. Jerome says that the Apostle's journey was by sea.[43] In that case he would have landed at Tarragona or Cadiz.

"None of the spots where St. Paul may have founded churches is known to us. If these churches existed, we are ignorant of the treatment they received in Nero's persecution." [44] The Marquesia (Maravesar) inscription in Lusitania, lauding Nero for having "purged the province of brigands and of those who teach a new superstition to mankind," is apocryphal.[45] More to be credited is the remark in the Martyrology of Ado, regarding a mission of seven bishops sent to Spain by St. Peter, subsequent to St. Paul's mission.[46] The chief of these missioners, Torquatus, is said to have founded the Church of Acci or Cadiz. A bishop of Cadiz in A. D. 300 presided over the famous Council of Illiberis (Elvira), and probably this bishop owed his preëminence to the honor of being Torquatus' successor. The soundest proof of the antiquity of the Spanish Church is the very complete organization and development of that Church at the end of the third century, as appears from the Acts of the Council of Elvira.

What is to be said about the coming of the Apostle St. James the Greater to Spain? It seems to be affirmed by a vague text of St. Jerome [47] and an *Apostolic Catalogue* of

[40] *First Epistle,* v, 7.

[41] Horace, *Carmina,* I, 36.

[42] Lucanus, *Pharsalia,* VII, 541. Pliny and Silius Italicus use similar expressions to designate Spain.

[43] *"Ad Hispaniam alienigenarum portatus est navibus."* (St. Jerome, *In Isaiam,* cap. IX.) This voyage would necessitate a call at Marseilles. The journey by land would have brought St. Paul to Arles, Nimes, and Narbonne.

[44] Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 29.

[45] *Corpus inscrip. lat.,* II, 25. Cf. Walsh, *Marmor Hispaniae antiquum;* Leclercq, *loc. cit.*

[46] Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien,* I, 103–117.

[47] *In Isaiam,* 12:42.

dubious authority. But no mention is made of this Apostle by Orosius, Idacius, Martin of Braga, Braulio, John of Biclaro, or Isidore of Seville. The Mozarabic Liturgy contains no mention of a special devotion to St. James as founder of the Spanish Church. Moreover, as the Apostles did not leave Jerusalem before the year 42, and as St. James the Greater was put to death that very year, it would seem impossible to allow for his journey to Spain. James could have gone there only in the sense that his relics were taken there. Probably they were transported to Spain at some undetermined date and occasioned the celebrated pilgrimage to St. James of Compostela,[48] for centuries the most popular pilgrimage in all Christendom.[49]

Apostolic Origin of Christianity in France

More than forty cities of France have claimed the honor of being founded by disciples of Christ or of the Apostles.[50]

[48] From *Jacomo apostolo,* according to some; others say, from *Campus stellae,* because of a star which in 772 miraculously revealed to Bishop Theodomir the place where the relics of the Apostle would be found.

[49] Upon the question of St. James' coming to Spain, see Leclercq, *op. cit.,* pp. 31–42. About the middle of the sixteenth century, some people of Biscay, not satisfied with claiming connection with three Apostles—St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. James the Greater—made claim to another title in favor of the antiquity of their Church. In their district they had found a tombstone bearing the name of a certain *Bilella, serva Christi;* thereupon they said that the evangelization of their district was due to St. Bilella, a domestic servant of Christ. (Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 40.)

[50] The chief Apostolic personages who are claimed as founders of the Churches of Gaul are the following: St. Fronto, honored at Perigueux, St. Martial at Limoges, St. George at Le Puy, Sts. Savinianus and Potentianus at Sens, St. Altinus at Orleans, St. Aventinus at Chartres, St. Mansuetus at Toul, St. Sixtus at Rheims, St. Sinicius at Soissons, St. Memmius at Chalons-sur-Marne, St. Florus at Lodeva, St. Genulfus at Cahors, St. Aphrodisius at Beziers, St. Clarus at Albi, another St. Clarus at Nantes, St. Ursinus at Bourges, St. Eutropius at Saintes, St. Julian at Le Mans, St. Crescens at Vienne, St. Santinus at Meaux, St. Taurinus at Evreux, St. Nicasius at Rouen, St. Exuperius at Bayeux, St. Saturninus at Toulouse, St. Gatianus at Tours, St. Austremonius in Auvergne, St. Paul at Narbonne, St. Eutropius at Orange, St. Peregrinus at Auxerre, St. Lucian at Beauvais, St. Gery at Cambrai, St. Spirus at Bayeux, St. Latiunus at Séez, St. Amator at Autun, St. Rieul at Senlis, St. Restitutus at Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, St. Amadour at

These claims are of unequal worth. A general Church History cannot be expected to discuss them in detail. The same cannot be said of the Provençal tradition, which assigns to Apostolic times the evangelization of Marseilles and the environs of that great city. Because of the celebrity of the disputes which it has raised and because of its own importance, the question of the Apostolic origin of Christianity in Provence requires that we treat it in some detail.

The Martyrology of the Church (December 29) says that the evangelization of Provence by disciples of our Lord was the fountain-head from which "the streams of Christian faith have spread through all Gaul." [51] Is this true? The most unbiased historical researches permit us to answer this question

Cahors, St. Valerius at Treves, etc. Many of these founders are identified with persons who did something in the company of Christ or of the Apostles. Thus St. Amator of Autun is supposed to have been a servant of the Child Jesus and His blessed Mother; St. Martial of Limoges, the child whom the Savior presented as a model of humility; St. Restitutus, the man born blind; St. Gatian, the man with the pitcher, who led the Apostles to the Cenacle; St. Ursinus, the reader at the Last Supper; St. Aphrodisius, the protector of the Holy Family in Egypt; St. Julian is no other than Simon the leper, and St. Amadour the publican Zaccheus. St. Joseph of Arimathea is supposed to have traversed the entire length of France, carrying to England the Holy Grail, or vessel of the Precious Blood which was gathered beneath the cross. Thus we see that, in traditions of very unequal worth, not only southern France lays claim to an Apostolic origin for its Churches, but also northern France. It is, therefore, by forgetting the facts, that some critics have been able to speak humorously of this product of "southern imagination" and of the "claims made by Marseilles and Tarascon." Surely a historian's first duty, after noting the common ground of these local traditions, should be to ask himself whether such an agreement is sufficiently explained by the concourse of "belfry vanities," or whether, on the contrary, it does not presuppose a genuine primitive tradition, of which these beliefs are merely more or less distorted popular translations. Are not the strangest legends—and their birth is favored quite as much by the mists of the North as by the sunshine of the South—often an index of a great historic fact which explains their origin? "At the basis of legends, there is more history than we think," wrote Ozanam (*Les Poètes franciscains,* p. 466.) Ordinarily even the poets embellish with their fictions only the deep beliefs of the people.

[51] "*Arelate in Gallia, sancti Trophimi, cujus meminit sanctus Paulus ad Timotheum scribens . . . ex cujus praedicationis fonte* (*ut sanctus Zosimus papa scribit*) *tota Gallia rivulos fidei recepit.*" (*Martyr. rom.,* 4 Kal. Jan.)

in the affirmative. But, for the sake of clearness and exactness in the conclusions to be drawn from this fact, the historical problem must be divided into three subsidiary questions: that of the Apostolic origin of Christianity in Provence; that of the organization of local churches in Provençal territory; and that of the first apostles of Provence.

Of the Apostolic origin of Christianity in Provence there can scarcely be a doubt. "Aside from any positive evidence," writes Duchesne, "there is a likelihood that the region close to the Rhone was evangelized at an early date. Marseilles enjoyed commercial relations that reached the full extent of the Mediterranean. . . . It is natural to suppose that, among so many vessels which, in the earliest times of Christianity, dropped anchor in the harbor of Marseilles, some there were from which preachers of the gospel landed.[52]. . . We may consider it as highly probable that, in those same early times, I would even say in the time of the Apostles, at this great port so frequented by Greeks of Asia Minor and by Syrians, there was a little nucleus of Christians. Thence the gospel spread to the interior of the country." [53]

The inference of the learned critic is fully confirmed by positive archeological evidence. Two monuments that seem to go back to the middle of the second century [54]—an inscription now preserved in the Marseilles museum and a sarcophagus found at La Gayole, within the territory of Aix—show that Christianity was solidly implanted in Provence at that period and may even have had its martyrs there.

The Marseilles inscription (called the inscription of Volusianus) [55] is, according to Edmond Le Blant, the epitaph of two Christians (Volusianus and Fortunatus), who perished

[52] Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule,* I, 75

[53] *Ibidem,* p. 103.

[54] *Ibidem,* p. 76.

[55] A carefully executed copy of this may be seen in Albanès, *Armorial et sigillographie des évêques de Marseille,* p. 4.

by fire—martyrs perhaps.[56] This inscription, coming from excavations that were made in 1837 in the valley of the Carénage, was classified among the pagan monuments of the Marseilles museum. "There it was," says Ulysse Chevalier, "that Edmond Le Blant found it in 1849. He drew de Rossi's attention to it, and the latter saw it himself three or four years later, and perceived that it was a most precious Christian monument." [57] The famous Roman archeologist in one of his subsequent writings has, in fact, declared that he regards Volusianus and Fortunatus as two Marseilles martyrs, who suffered death about the same time as the celebrated martyrs of Lyons, and that their eulogy was carved in stone immediately after their martyrdom—a fact that is almost unique in Christian antiquity.[58] The sarcophagus of La Gayole belongs to the same period.[59] A comparison of these monuments with similar ones of Gaul leads Le Blant to the following conclusion: "While studying our first Christian inscriptions, I have shown that their distribution throughout all Gaul marks the advance of the new faith. . . . This revolution of souls took place on the shores of Provence, in the southern Rhone valley. . . . This fact is attested by our epigraphic monuments." [60]

These conclusions are corroborated by other historic facts. "The famous documents quoted or analyzed by Eusebius at the beginning of the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical History*

[56] Le Blant, *Catalogue des monuments du musée de Marseille,* pp. 1 ff.

[57] *Gallia christiana novissima,* p. vii.

[58] De Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae Urbis Romae,* II, x. The German scholar, Otto Hirschfeld, shares the view of Le Blant and de Rossi on the antiquity and the Christian character of this inscription. (*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum,* XII, 55.) "The inscription of Volusianus and the sarcophagus of La Gayole possess an antiquity comparable to that of the earliest vestiges of subterranean Rome." (Jullian, *Revue catholique de Bordeaux,* XIX, 196.) "This opinion," says Chevalier, "is in conformity with that of the severest critics." (*Op. cit.,* p. vii.)

[59] Le Blant, *Les Sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule,* p. 158.

[60] *Ibidem,* p. xviii; cf. Bérenger, *Les Traditions provençales,* pp. 176–187.

bear glorious testimony to the existence and vitality of Christianity in Gaul a century after the death of the Apostles." [61] A text of St. Irenaeus shows that in his time there were churches in Germany, probably in the Roman provinces of that name on the left bank of the Rhine, and among the Celts: in other words, in the Gallic provinces north and west of Lyons.[62] To reach there, if Le Blant's theory is correct, Christianity probably had to be established in the Provençal region; that foundation would therefore go back to a very early date. Our hypothesis finds support in the ancient tradition, frequently cited in history, which always regards the Church of Marseilles as the mother Church of the region.[63]

The First Christian Communities in Gaul

When we ask when and how the first churches of Gaul were established, the answer is not so clear. We know that in the Apostolic period Marseilles had an important colony of Jews.[64] It must have been among them that the first Christian community was organized. If St. Paul, on his way to Spain, landed at Marseilles, as we may reasonably suppose, his first preaching would have been, according to his practice, among these Jews. These considerations lead us to conclude that this community was the first to be made into a particular Church, with a bishop at its head. But we have no direct documentary evidence to this effect. Duchesne expresses the opinion that all the scattered Christian groups from the Rhine to the

[61] Duchesne, *Les Origines chrétiennes,* p. 449.

[62] *Haereses,* I, x, 2.

[63] "The bishops of Marseilles had kept a certain authority over what was called the Second Narbonnaise, the district between the lower Rhone valley and the lofty Alpine chain. At the end of the fourth century all the bishops of this region received ordination from the hands of the bishop of Marseilles, who, moreover, considered himself to be the founder of all their sees. This was the old tradition." (Duchesne, *Les Fastes épiscopaux,* I, 103.)

[64] Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* I, 142.

Pyrenees must have formed, until about 250, only one community, subject to a single head, the bishop of Lyons.[65] But Harnack attacks this conclusion in a notable dissertation, in which he maintains that the Lyons province, in the third century, counted several organized bishoprics.[66] The French scholar's opinion seems, therefore, in the view of historical criticism, not entirely beyond dispute.

His chief argument is the silence of the episcopal lists of Gaul, none of which, except that of Lyons, goes back to the middle of the second century; but Duchesne himself gives us the elements for focusing this argument. He says: "It is commonly imagined that the churches carefully preserved the lists of their bishops from their very foundation. This is true of certain large churches, like those of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. But many others did not attempt to fix these lists, or they let them be altered. . . . At Carthage we find only three or four bishops previous to the fourth century. . . . In the diptychs, or liturgical lists, arbitrary suppressions or additions were often made." [67]

Besides the silence of the episcopal lists, we should consider the silence of the Fathers of the first centuries, notably of St. Irenaeus. When he appeals to tradition against the heretics, he makes no reference to the tradition of the churches of Marseilles and Arles. It is true that, in the extant writings of the Fathers of the first four centuries, we meet no clear allusion to the early churches of Gaul. But we should note that this silence extends to the Christian communities themselves; and the most exacting critics, despite this silence, have no hesitation in admitting, at least as very probable, the

[65] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, I, 36.

[66] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, II, 264 ff. Duchesne replies to Harnack in the second edition of his *Fastes épiscopaux*, pp. 43–46.

[67] Duchesne, *Les Origines chrétiennes*, 2d ed., p. 459. It is true that Duchesne declares that he eliminated all suspect names from the episcopal lists which he uses as a basis for his argument.

existence of Christian communities at Marseilles and its environs from earliest antiquity. As far as concerns the writings of St. Irenaeus—of which only fragments remain—we can understand that, in his argument from tradition, he would content himself with the authority of St. John, whom he knew so well through the intermediary of his master Polycarp.[68]

We are also told that, in the Apostolic age, it was customary to establish episcopal sees only in the very large centers. But were not the cities of Marseilles and Arles of the first importance?[69]

St. Gregory of Tours attributes the origin of the churches of Gaul to a mission of seven bishops sent thither in the third century.[70] Duchesne, however, says: "Gregory's evidence about the sending of the seven bishops is too weak and its origin too obscure for it to enter into the woof of history."[71]

Lastly, appeal is had to the famous text of Eusebius: "The *parishes* (*paroikion*) of Gaul over which Irenaeus *has supervision* (*epescopei*).[72] If the word *epescopei* suggests the idea of episcopacy, the word *paroikion* seems to refer to organized Christian groups. In Eusebius the word *paroikia* often

[68] See *supra*, p. 147.

[69] Ausonius, in the fourth century, in his enumeration of the great cities of the Empire, places Arles among those in the first rank. Ahead of it, in Gaul, he places only the city of Treves, which was then the imperial residence. Ausonius, *Carmina*, XIX, 8. Pavia was a much less important city. Yet de Rossi judged that he had found, in an epigraphic monument, proofs of the Apostolic origin of its episcopal see. (See *Bullett. di archeol. crist.*, 1876, p. 77.) De Rossi's conclusions have been contested by Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia*, Turin, 1899.

[70] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, II, 20 ff. (bk. 1, chap. 28). On the other hand, St. Gregory in his *De gloria martyrum*, chap. 47, says that St. Saturninus was *"ab apostolorum discipulis ordinatus,"* and in chapter 79 of that same work he says that St. Ursinus of Bourges was ordained and sent *"a discipulis apostolorum."* Should we, in agreement with Duchesne, say that these words "can mean no one but the pope" or are we to see a contradiction between these two passages and the passage in the History of the Franks? (Duchesne, *Les Fastes épiscopaux*, pp. 20–26.)

[71] Duchesne, *Les Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 451.

[72] τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν δὲ παροικιῶν ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει; Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, xxiii, 4.

(notably in this chapter 22, which contains the ambiguous phrase) has the meaning of diocese.[73]

In short, the documents of archeology and the information of history contain nothing that contradicts, in a strict and precise way, the tradition of the Apostolic origin of the episcopal sees in Provence.[74] But who were the first to occupy those sees?

The First Apostles of Provence

On this last question, we have no hesitation in taking our stand on the conclusions of a historian whose erudition and critical acumen no one will question. Says Ulysse Chevalier: "Who were the first apostles of Marseilles, who was its first bishop? . . . We must first remark that it is a begging of the question to declare that a tradition first appears in the eleventh century—it goes back at least to the tenth century—because earlier documents do not mention it. What documents? we might ask. Provence was ravaged again and again by Saracens and Normans and therefore has a paucity of official documents dating earlier than the ninth century. Not a single one exists among all the *instrumenta* of the province of Aix. These repeated destructions, whether accidental or intentional, have deprived us of a knowledge of facts which fragmentary chronicles or documents with numerous gaps do not enable us to supply. All we can do is to bemoan the lack." [75]

[73] Du Cange, under the word *"Parochia."* Duchesne says: "Here, as often, the phraseology of Eusebius impairs the clearness of his testimony." (*Op. cit.*, p. 450.) In his *Fastes épiscopaux* (2d ed., p. 43), Duchesne, although acknowledging that the word *"paroikia"* has, in the same chapter of Eusebius, the meaning of "diocese," refuses that sense to it in the passage which we are here considering.

[74] Dr. Marx thinks that "it can be affirmed with very great probability that episcopal sees existed as early as the second century in the chief cities of the southern part of Gaul." (*Manuel d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 1st epoch, chap. 1, sect. 18.)

[75] Chevalier, *Gallia christiana novissima*, Marseilles, p. viii.

Though documents say nothing, regional traditions and local religious practices more than ten centuries old offer their support. The following are the chief data: Fourteen years after our Lord's death, when a religious persecution broke out in Palestine, the following persons boarded a ship without sails: Lazarus, his sisters Mary Magdalen and Martha, their servant Sara, Sidonius, the man who was blind from his birth and who was cured by Christ, the two Marys (the mother of James and Salome), and Maximin, one of the seventy-two disciples. This boat was driven by Providence to the shores of the Camargue. They landed at the mouth of the Rhone, at the spot now occupied by the village of les Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer. The two Marys and Sara settled there, and Lazarus went to evangelize Marseilles; Maximin went to Aix; Martha to Avignon and Tarascon. "The blessed Marie Magdalene," says the *Golden Legend,* "desirous of sovereign contemplation, sought a right sharp desert, and took a place which was ordained by the angel of God, and abode there by the space of thirty years without knowledge of anybody. In which place she had no comfort of running water nor solace of trees nor of herbs. And that was because our Redeemer did to show it openly, that He had ordained for her refection celestial, and no bodily meats. And every day at every hour canonical she was lift up in the air of the angels, and heard the glorious song of the heavenly companies with her bodily ears. Of which she was fed and filled with right sweet meats, and then was brought again by the angels unto her proper place, in such wise as she had no need of corporal nourishing." [76]

How ancient is this tradition? It is not surprising that we find no trace of it in the writers of the first centuries, since they say almost nothing about the Apostolic origins of Christianity in Provence—origins which archeological monuments

[76] Voragine, *The Golden Legend,* II, 626.

and historical inference lead us to hold as demonstrated facts. A church dedicated to St. Martha in the seventh century in the city of Tarascon,[77] the spread of devotion to this saint, which seems to be evidenced by the extensive use of the name "Martha" in the ninth century in the Arles district and the dependencies of the Marseilles bishopric[78]—these are the earliest traces of devotion paid to the holy family of Bethany.

At the same time there appeared in the East traditions that St. Lazarus' tomb was on the island of Cyprus and that of St. Magdalen in the city of Ephesus. But these traditions are not trustworthy;[79] they appear not to go back to the early centuries, for the famous *Peregrinatio Silviae* (fourth century) makes no mention of them;[80] and they are probably the result of a confusion in names: it may be that the Lazarus and Magdalen of the Gospel were confused with a holy monk named Lazarus, who died in the island of Cyprus in 822, and a Magdalen who was buried at Ephesus in the fifth century.[81]

A third group of traditions appears at Vézelay in Burgundy, where the relics of St. Magdalen became the object of public veneration and of numerous pilgrimages in the eleventh century. Are these traditions and this veneration dependent upon those of Provence, as Bérenger maintains?[82] Or do the Provençal traditions depend upon those of Burgundy, as

[77] Manteyer, *La Provence du I^er^ au XII^e^ siècle,* pp. 60–62. There is every reason to suppose this St. Martha to be the St. Martha of the Gospel; but there is no positive indication of identity. The word "Martha" comes from the Aramaic word *"mara"* (master), and might mean "mistress." Plutarch (*Marius,* 17) cites this name as that of a Syrian prophetess who accompanied General Marius. (Cf. Schegg, *Evangelium nach Lukas,* II, 530.)

[78] Manteyer, *op. cit.,* p. 62. In Avignon also a church is found dedicated to St. Mary Magdalen in the eleventh century. (*Ibidem,* p. 66.)

[79] Duchesne says: "I do not vouch for the authenticity of this tomb of Lazarus (in the island of Cyprus), nor for the tomb of Magdalen at Ephesus." (*Les Fastes épiscopaux,* I, 2.)

[80] Bérenger, *Les Traditions provençales,* p. 54.

[81] This is Bérenger's hypothesis (*op. cit.,* p. 52).

[82] *Ibidem,* pp. 81–88.

Duchesne holds?[83] Or do both depend upon Auvergne legends, as Georges de Manteyer[84] and Dom Germain Morin[85] try to prove? With scholars so divided on the question, evidently it is not very clear. We shall merely observe that the Provençal traditions supplanted the others before long. Since the eleventh century it is in Provence that the veneration of St. Lazarus, St. Magdalen, St. Martha, and St. Maximin has continued with undiminished splendor. The "holy places of Provence," as they were called, became places of numerous pilgrimages. They have been visited by many saints and persons of high rank, among whom we mention St. John of Matha, King St. Louis, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Brigid of Sweden, Charles VIII, Louis XII, Anne of Brittany, Louis XIII, and Louis XIV. On one single day there were five kings there;[86] a single century brought eight popes thither.[87] The founder of seminaries in France in the seventeenth century and the restorer of the Dominican Order in the nineteenth century went there to place their new labors under the protection of the great penitent; the renowned preacher of Notre Dame boasted of venerating "in those holy places which might be thought to belong to Heaven rather than to earth, the last footprint, as it were, of Christ's life in our midst."[88]

Such are the facts. After an impartial examination of them we can understand that the editors of the *Acta sanctorum,* taking the point of view of strict historical criticism, decline to give their sanction to claims which our present knowledge does not allow us to establish with sufficient certainty. But we

[83] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 328–340.

[84] Manteyer, *op. cit.*

[85] Morin, *Etudes sur saint Lazare et saint Maximin,* p. 28.

[86] In 1332: Philip of Valois, king of France; Alphonso IV, king of Aragon; Hugh IV, king of Cyprus; John of Luxemburg, king of Bohemia; Robert, king of Sicily.

[87] John XXII, Benedict XII, Clement VI, Innocent VI, Urban V, Gregory XI, Clement VII, Benedict XIII. The two last named are considered antipopes.

[88] Lacordaire, *Sainte Marie-Madeleine* (*Œuvres,* IX, 351).

can also understand how the devout people of Provence, rightly proud of having received the first fruits of the Christian faith on the soil of France, and without ever having had any other patron saints to invoke except these holy friends of the Savior, are unwilling to abandon their veneration, now more than ten centuries old, in the presence of objections of indecisive critical scholarship, and declare they will maintain the old traditions of their district so long as the manifest falsity thereof is not proven.[89]

[89] It is impossible for us to summarize here the lengthy controversies that have arisen concerning the apostolicity of St. Martial of Limoges, St. Saturninus of oulouse, St. Austremonius of Auvergne, St. Julian of Le Mans, etc. We shall merely give, with Vigouroux, the results of historic researches with regard to St. Denis of Paris: "The Martyrology and the Roman Breviary (October 9) now identify St. Dionysius the Areopagite with the first bishop of Paris. But the *Vetus Romanum Martyrologium* distinguishes them from each other. (Migne, *P.L.*, CXXIII, cols. 169, 171.) The chronicle that bears the name of Lucius Dexter (d. 444) identifies St. Denis of Paris with Dionysius the Areopagite; but it is commonly acknowledged that this writing is not authentic. The earliest known writer to make one person of St. Dionysius the Areopagite and the first bishop of Paris, is Hilduin (d. 840), abbot of Saint-Denis. (*Vita sancti Dionysii,* in Migne, *P. L.*, CVI, col. 15.) In favor of regarding St. Denis of Paris as the Areopagite, see Freppel, *Saint Irenée.* Against this identification, see *Acta sanctorum,* October, IV, 767." Vigouroux, art. *"Denys l'Aréopagite,"* in *Dict. de la Bible.* Once there was a separate feast in honor of each of these two saints, one as bishop of Athens, the other as bishop of Paris. From this liturgical fact it was deduced that St. Denis of Paris and St. Dionysius the Areopagite were two different persons. This argument is answered by Freppel as follows: "It is true that, in some martyrologies, the feast of St. Denis comes twice. But the reason for this fact is quite simple. As the same person had been successively bishop of Athens and bishop of Paris, the Greeks celebrated his memory on October 3, and the Latins on the 9th. Hence the two feasts came together in the same lists, and finally the two persons became only one. This is not the sole instance to be found in the old martyrologies." Freppel. *Saint Irenée,* p. 90. Cf. Darboy, *Œuvres de saint Denys,* Introduction.

PART II

The Conflict

Introductory Remarks

"I CAME not to send peace, but the sword," [1] the Savior said. No epoch better fulfilled that prophecy than the two centuries following the death of the last Apostle. Persecutions, heresies, schisms, disputes—this is all that a first glance perceives. Under Trajan, Hadrian, Decius, and Diocletian, the formidable might of the Roman Empire was hurled against the early Church. In Lucian, Celsus, and Marcus Aurelius, the old pagan spirit in its subtlest and most deceptive aspects attempted to dissolve or captivate the Christian spirit. In the vast syncretism of all the exalted religious aspirations and all the unbridled instincts, the Gnostic heresy threatened to allure the world in its train. At nearly the same time, Montanism seemed on the point of misleading Christianity into a grim and rebellious asceticism. Further, the schisms of Hippolytus, of Meletius, and of Novatian, the heated controversies about Baptism, penance, and Easter, disturbed the faithful, divided the episcopate, and involved the supreme authority itself.

This is the first view presented by the history of the Church from the death of St. John the Evangelist to the Edict of Milan. Yet a closer look shows that, in this same tragic period, the faith was strengthened. Amidst persecutions, countless martyrs shed their blood with a heroism that most impressively demonstrates the divinity of our religion. The attacks of heresy caused the Church to define her beliefs in formulas by which Christian faith will live thereafter. In the distress.

[1] Matt. 10: 34.

the faithful gathered more closely about their priests and bishops. The latter, in their disputes or doubts, so frequently turned to the sovereign authority of the Roman pontiff that they strengthened the preëminence of that high office. In the face of opponents attacking them in the name of philosophy and science, the Christians showed themselves to be polemics, scholars, and philosophers. Apologetics and theology found expression in works of the highest worth. In fine, when the old religions of antiquity broke down by their own doctrinal and moral insufficiency, the Church, in her powerful vitality, was able to take from their ceremonies, expressive of true religious aspirations, the elements of a liturgy both solemn and impressive.

In short, in the early years of the fourth century, the Edict of Milan and the Council of Nicaea do not, as often is said, so much found an authority or create a dogma, as recognize and confirm a situation that was won in the midst of the conflict.

In the matter of the external persecutions undergone by the Church during this period, we may distinguish three distinct phases. The first embraces the last years of the first century and all of the second century. The simple fact of professing Christianity was a crime; but the simple fact of abjuring it freed an accused person from all prosecution. During the second phase, including the entire third century, the juridical situation of the Christians underwent no basic change, but it grew more insecure. Their lot was subject to the good pleasure of the emperors, who at irregular intervals issued decrees of persecution against them. It was no longer the latent hostility of the earlier time, but open war, preceded by a formal declaration. During the third phase, covering the first twelve years of the fourth century, now that the Roman Empire had several heads, the persecution, general at first, soon became local and was often marked by extreme violence; it

died out or revived according to the provinces and caprice or particular circumstances.[2]

As to the internal crises which, at the same time as the persecutions, upset the Church by heresy, schism, or controversy, they had three chief sources. The first was that Judaic or Judaizing spirit—narrow, jealous, hemmed in by national perspectives and by temporal hopes—which our Lord encountered during His life on earth. This was the origin of the Ebionites, Nazarenes, Essenes, Elkasaites, and similar Gnostic sects. Paganism, under the many forms it had assumed both in the East and in the West, became another source of heresies by its penetration into Christian society; from a certain point of view, Gnosticism is only a monstrous compromise between Christian truth and pagan errors. The third source of the internal troubles that desolated the Church of the second and third century must be looked for in that spirit of exaggerated individualism and exclusive autonomy which, from Simon Magus to Novatian and Meletius, stirred up so many rebellions, either silent or openly declared, and created so many parties refractory to the law of doctrine and the guidance of the hierarchy.

These are the events we are now to recount, following, so far as possible, a chronological order, from which we will depart only when clearness seems to require it.

[2] Cf. Allard, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs,* pp. 80–108.

CHAPTER I

From Trajan to Hadrian (98–138)

The Emperor Trajan

THE peace policy that allowed St. John the Apostle to return to Ephesus, publish his Gospel, and die in peace in a steadily growing Christian community, continued throughout the reign of the Emperor Nerva. The coming of Trajan in 98 seemed at first to consolidate the religious policy of his predecessor. The new ruler's first act was a long letter to the senate, promising not to put to death any righteous man.[1] It was with marked friendliness that Rome received this soldier, son of a soldier, who had won military glory at the age of forty-two, a man of austerity in spite of certain hidden weaknesses,[2] whose speech was clear, precise, and forceful, notwithstanding his lack of literary culture.[3] The old senatorial aristocracy saw itself in this prince, who possessed a robust but short-spoken good sense, a devoted but narrow patriotism, a conservative but not discerning mind, ready to sacrifice everything to the Roman order and the unity of the Empire, but having no care for things of the soul or respect for inner liberties or sense of the delicacies of conscience; in a word, capable of interpreting in a spirit of judicious tolerance the duty of giving to Caesar what is Caesar's, but unable to respect or perhaps even to comprehend the duty of giving to

[1] Xiphilinus, in Champagny, *Les Antonins*, I, 227.
[2] Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs*, II, 118.
[3] Dio Cassius, LXVII, 7; Aurelius Victor, *Epitome*, 13.

God what is God's. Such was Trajan. Pliny praises him because, after the fifteen years of Domitian's assertion of divinity, he refused to call himself God.[4] If he had a god, it was that of Roman unity, and as he considered this unity to rest upon the unity of religious worship, it could be foreseen at the outset of his reign that the Christians had every reason to dread the narrowness of his patriotism.

A broader and deeper mind would have understood that Christianity, instead of weakening the necessary foundations of the Empire, was able to strengthen them. Although the Christians were not disposed to give their sovereigns a homage of adoration, they prayed for them with sincere heart and obeyed them loyally. We have already seen the beautiful prayer for the emperor which Pope St. Clement sent to the Christians of Corinth right after Domitian's persecution,[5] and we are acquainted with the lessons of obedience which St. Paul gave to the Christians of Rome during the tyranny of Nero.[6] Trajan was not keen enough to see in the Church the "great school of respect,"[7] which might perhaps have saved the Empire's unity against more real dangers. Like Nero, he saw an enemy where there was an ally; for him Christianity was the *odium generis humani.*

It is probable that there were martyrs in the first years of Trajan's reign;[8] but the rescript in which the Emperor's policy toward the Christians is expressed was written in 111 or 112. We must pause to consider this imperial act, the principles of which dominated the whole religious policy of the Antonines.

[4] Pliny, *Letters,* X, 25, 97.

[5] See *supra,* p. 160.

[6] See *supra,* p. 113.

[7] This phrase is Guizot's. "The principles of Christianity, if graven on the heart, would be incomparably more powerful than this false honor of monarchies, these human virtues of republics, and this servile fear of despotisms." (Montesquieu, *Esprit des lois,* bk. 24, chap. 6.)

[8] Allard, *Histoire des persécutions,* I, 142.

In the fall of 111,[9] Trajan received from the legate of Bithynia, who was then Pliny the Younger, a long letter, setting forth the embarrassing situation in which the emperor's representative found himself on account of the considerable development of Christianity, and asking of the emperor a regulation for his guidance. The germs of faith sowed in the various provinces of Asia Minor by the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul had grown extraordinarily. The Christian communities, profiting by the Roman legislation regarding *hetairiae,* or professional and religious corporations, increased everywhere, driving back paganism before them. The temples were deserted; the sale of animals intended for the sacrifices suffered a crisis. Hence arose repeated complaints, which were taken to the legate. Nearly everywhere, in his tours through his province, Pliny found himself in the presence of some of these Christians, of whose doctrine he knew nothing and, furthermore, cared little to know. But he did know that "they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up."

As an upright magistrate, careful to prosecute only crimes enumerated in the law of his country, Pliny judged it not proper to proceed with rigor against such people. But informers intervened, some of them anonymously, in such numbers and so insistently, that the legate had to do something about the matter. Pliny's letter continues: "I judged it so much the more necessary to extract the real truth, with the assistance of torture, from two female slaves, who were styled deaconesses: but I could discover nothing more than de-

[9] Some authors say 112. From the standpoint of general history, the date is of little importance.

praved and excessive superstition. I therefore adjourned the proceedings, and betook myself at once to your counsel." [10]

In reply to the lengthy communication of the accomplished scholar, Trajan writes with that "imperial brevity" [11] which came to him from his military character and was suited to the giving of commands: "The method you have pursued, my dear Pliny, in sifting the cases of those denounced to you as Christians, is extremely proper. It is not possible to lay down any general rule which can be applied as the fixed standard in all cases of this nature. No search should be made for these people; when they are denounced and found guilty, they must be punished; with the restriction, however, that when the party denies himself to be a Christian, and shall give proof that he is not (that is, by adoring our gods), he shall be pardoned. . . . Informations without the accuser's name subscribed must not be admitted in evidence." [12]

Tertullian points out the illogical part of this decision. He says: "It forbids the Christians to be sought after as innocent, and yet it commands them to be punished as guilty." [13] Its unreasonableness is patent if it is looked at from the point of view of morality. But Trajan, as a jurist of ancient Rome, was scarcely aware of this point of view when reasons of state seemed to be involved. It is true that the Christians did not commit any crime in common law; but simply by not per-

[10] Formerly there was a lengthy controversy between scholars with regard to the authenticity of this letter. It has been denied by Aubé (*Histoire des persécutions,* p. 219), Desjardins (*"Les Antonins d'après l'épigraphie,"* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* December 1, 1874), and Havet (*Le Christianisme et ses origines,* IV, 425 ff.). But the authenticity of the letter is now universally acknowledged. See Boissier, in the *Revue archéologique,* 1876, p. 114; Renan, *Les Evangiles,* p. 476, note; Allard, *Histoire des persécutions,* I, 116 ff.; Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur,* II, 866; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers,* part 2, I, 51.

[11] *"Imperatoria brevitate,"* says Tacitus, referring to Galba. Tacitus, *History,* bk. 1, chap. 18.

[12] Pliny, *Letters,* x, 97.

[13] Tertullian, *Apology,* 2.

forming certain religious ceremonies touching the State gods, they were disturbing the "Roman order." This is precisely why a simple "adoration of the gods" will bring them complete pardon. The "Roman order" does not require search to be made for Christians: this would involve a commotion not demanded by the situation. The crime of being a Christian will become punishable only if it is made manifest by a precise denunciation.

This, at any rate, is Trajan's view. From this principle many of his successors drew more severe consequences; they did not alter it essentially. The reasons of State, so unjustly appealed to against the Christians, were advanced, now by the jealousy of Jewish sects, now by the monstrous calumnies which the pagans invented about the Christian mysteries. But, even when the decrees of persecution seem forced upon the emperors by the rage of the people, the final reason for the attack on Christianity will remain this principle which, through Trajan, goes back to the first persecution by Nero: the Christian is the enemy of the Roman civilization, understood after the pagan manner; he is an object of "hatred for mankind." [14] Thus are we to explain this curious anomaly, puzzling at first glance, namely, that the fiercest persecutors of the Church are not always the most detestable from the moral point of view. Often they have but little care for the Roman unity, whereas those most devoted to the State are at times led to make a sort of divinity of it, to which they sacrifice all.[15]

This was so in the case of Emperor Trajan. His reign was

[14] Allard, in his *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs* (pp. 120 ff.), and more fully in the *Revue des questions historiques* (July, 1912), clearly shows that the liberty accorded to Christianity, far from being a cause of weakness for the Roman Empire, was, from the time of Nero, an element of peace and security.

[15] On the causes of the persecutions, see Allard, *op. cit.*, pp. 109–125, and *"La Situation légale des chrétiens pendant les deux premiers siècles,"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* 1896, pp. 5–43; Callewaert, *"De la base juridique des premières persécutions,"* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 1911, pp. 5–16, 633–651.

glorious in many respects, but it was stained by the blood of three holy pontiffs: the head of the Church of Rome, the head of the Church of Jerusalem, and the head of the Church of Antioch: St. Clement, St. Simeon, and St. Ignatius.

The account of the condemnation, exile, and death of the great Pope St. Clement is preserved in the *Passio Clementis,* [16] which is quoted by Gregory of Tours,[17] and seems to be known to the writer of the note on Clement I in the *Liber Pontificalis.*[18] The plainly legendary details of this document were pointed out long ago. But "even in the most incorrect histories, there is usually some basis of truth." [19]

According to the best critics, the following are the historical elements contained in this document. On the occasion of a popular uprising in Trajan's reign, Pope Clement was exiled to the Chersonesus. There he found two thousand Christians, who had been condemned to the hard labor of the marble quarries long before. Clement consoled and encouraged them. Many conversions took place in the district. With the building material of the abandoned temples and with the wood of the forsaken sacred groves, churches were constructed. These facts reached the ears of the Emperor, who spared the multitude of the Christians, but ordered the aged Pope to sacrifice to the gods, under pain of death. When Clement refused to obey this command, the judge gave orders that an anchor be fastened to his neck and he be thrown into the sea. "There is nothing incredible in this account," says Allard,[20] and

[16] See this document in Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* I, 189 ff.

[17] St. Gregory of Tours, *De gloria martyrum,* 35 f.; cf. *Missale gothicum,* in Mabillon, *De liturgia gallicana,* p. 218.

[18] Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis,* I, 124, note.

[19] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* II, 139. Tillemont makes this remark in connection with the Acts of SS. Nereus and Achilleus. And he does not pass a definite judgment on the authenticity of the *Passio Clementis.* He says: "We would wish that these things were as certain as they are famous." (*Ibidem,* p. 174.) But the difficulties which made the learned critic hesitate, have, it seems, for the most part been removed by Allard, *Histoire des pers.,* I, 170 ff., and by de Rossi, *Bullett. di archeol. crist.,* 1864, p. 5.

[20] Allard, *op. cit.,* p. 170.

Duchesne proves that the tradition of St. Clement's martyrdom was current in Rome as early as the end of the fourth century.[21]

There is no historic document that enables us to determine the date of St. Clement's martyrdom. But we know the date of the death of St. Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, and of St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch. It was the year 107.[22]

The story of the last days of the holy Bishop of Jerusalem is told by Eusebius, who takes the details from Hegesippus' account. This latter, a converted Jew of the second century, was well situated to be exactly informed. Simeon, son (or grandson) of Cleophas and cousin of our Lord, was 120 years old. He was denounced by Jews and by Judaizing Christians, both as a Christian and as a descendant of King David. The accusation was received by the consular legate of Palestine, Tiberius Claudius Atticus, who had the venerable old man tortured. The holy Bishop's courage aroused the admiration of all present. At last he was put to death on a cross. Hegesippus adds that, as the search for David's descendants was further prosecuted, those very ones who had denounced their pastor were arrested and put to death after being found to belong to the number of the Savior's relatives. God's justice was thus exercised even in this world upon the vile informers.[23]

St. Ignatius of Antioch

We are totally ignorant of the circumstances that led to the arrest and execution of St. Ignatius. We have no details of

[21] Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis,* I, 124; cf. *ibidem,* p. xci. Duchesne observes that neither St. Irenaeus nor Eusebius nor St. Jerome speaks of the martyrdom of this great Pope. So true is it that silence by the very best informed writers on an event of the highest importance cannot be regarded as a conclusive proof against the historical reality of that event.

[22] Eusebius places St. Simeon's martyrdom in the tenth year of Trajan, *i. e.,* 107. On the date of St. Ignatius' martyrdom, see Allard, *op. cit.,* pp. 189–192.

[23] Eusebius, *H. E.,* III, xxxii, 1–4; cf. *Acta sanctorum,* February, III, 53–55.

his martyrdom. But we possess something better than that: the genuine letters in which the intrepid confessor of the faith, shortly before being ground by the teeth of lions, reveals his great soul. "Neither Christian antiquity nor indeed any other antiquity offers anything more beautiful." [24] Ignatius was condemned at Antioch. His journey to Rome, along the coasts of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, was a triumphal progress. The fame of the holy bishop had spread through all the Church, especially in Asia Minor. Why did Roman justice require that he be put to death in Rome, in the amphitheater? We know that it was customary for the Romans to choose the most handsome men for those spectacles, and not the least of the trials which the Christian martyrs had to undergo was to be thus displayed to satisfy the curiosity of the populace. But beyond the growling wild beasts, beyond the crowd thirsting for excitement, they beheld, like the deacon Stephen, the opened heavens. This is the example that St. Ignatius gave. In the letter which reached Rome ahead of him, he wrote to his beloved brethren:

"Pray for me, that God would give me both inward and outward strength, that I may not only be called a Christian, but be found one, when I shall no longer appear to the world. . . . I write to the churches and signify to them all that I am willing to die for God, unless you hinder me.[25] Suffer me to be food to the wild beasts, by whom I shall attain unto God. For I am the wheat of God; and I shall be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. . . . Let fire and the cross, let the companies of wild beasts, let breakings of bones and tearing of members, let the shattering in pieces of the whole body, and all the wicked torments of the devil come upon me; only let me enjoy Jesus Christ.

[24] Allard, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

[25] St. Ignatius may have feared that the intervention of the Christians at Rome would obtain the Emperor's favor, or rather that the earnestness of their prayers would rob him of the martyr's crown.

. . . Pardon me, my brethren; ye shall not hinder me from living; nor, seeing I desire to go to God, may you separate me from Him for the sake of this world. Suffer me to enter into pure light; where being come, I shall be indeed the servant of God. If any one has Him within himself, let him consider what I desire." [26]

Not without good reason has this letter been considered to set forth the perfect idea of Christian martyrdom. A Christian martyr is not merely a witness to a dogmatic fact; he is also *eo ipso,* to use St. Thomas' phrase, a "witness of the faith," [27] a witness of Christ living in him, of that eternal life to which martyrdom opens the way for him and toward which he rushes with all the strength of his hope and love.[28]

St. Ignatius' letters to the various churches have a still more important bearing. Two great heterodox currents were then flowing through the churches of the East. Some attacked the Savior's divine person, holding that He was simply a man; such were the Ebionites and the Cerinthians. The others attacked His human nature, teaching that the Word of God became incarnate and died only in appearance; these were the Docetae. The former heresy spread especially in the churches of Magnesia and Philadelphia; the latter advanced mostly in the churches of Tralles, Smyrna, and Ephesus. From all these churches there came to the bishop of the great Church of Antioch, to this glorious confessor of the faith, requests for advice. The replies to these requests are the letters to the Magnesians, the Philadelphians, the Trallians, the Smyrnaeans, and the Ephesians.

"There is one God, who manifested Himself through Jesus

[26] Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, 255–261. Translation by Edward Burton, in the *Apostolic Fathers,* vol. II.

[27] St. Thomas, *Summa theologica,* 2a 2ae, q. 124, a. 4. *"Martyr dicitur, quasi fidei christianae, per quam visibilia pro invisibilibus contemnenda proponuntur."*

[28] Freppel, *Les Pères apostoliques et leur époque,* pp. 397–419.

Christ, His Son," he writes to the Magnesians;[29] and he urges them "to be diligent therefore to be confirmed in the ordinances of the Lord and the Apostles . . . in the Son and the Father and the Spirit."[30] "God manifested Himself through Jesus Christ, His Son, who is His Word proceeding from silence."[31] After so clearly affirming the divinity of Christ, Ignatius also affirms His real humanity. "He is in truth of the family of David according to the flesh . . . truly born of a virgin . . . truly nailed to a tree in the flesh for our sakes.[32] . . . I know and believe that he was in the flesh even after the Resurrection."[33]

The two heresies which the confessor of the faith attacks spring from the same root—the Judaizing spirit. The holy Bishop gives warning of the danger. To the Philadelphians he says: "If anyone interpret Judaism to you, do not listen to him."[34] "Be not seduced. To face about would be to give up the grace you have received. The prophets of old are appealed to; but the prophets were disciples of Christ in the Spirit, and to Him they looked forward as their teacher. . . . It is monstrous to talk of Jesus Christ and to practise Judaism."[35]

But it was not enough to defend the divinity of Christ against the naturalism of Cerinthus; the reality of His redemptive Incarnation against the fanciful idealism of the Docetae;[36] in a word, the broad and full teaching of the Gospel against the narrow conceptions of a decadent Syna-

[29] *Magnesians*, 8.
[30] *Ibidem*, 13.
[31] *Ibidem*, 8. See other citations in Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, I, 122 ff.
[32] *Smyrnaeans*, 1.
[33] *Ibidem*, 3.
[34] *Philadelphians*, 6.
[35] *Magnesians*, 9, 10.
[36] The dogma of Redemption is explicitly taught in several places in St. Ignatius' letters. (Tixeront, *op. cit.*, I, 126.) The Real Presence of the Savior's body in the Eucharist is clearly affirmed in the *Letter to the Smyrnaeans*, 7.

gogue. It was necessary also to proclaim the great principle that preserves the Church from schism and heresy. On this point the letters of St. Ignatius are of the first importance.

Like Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch knows only one guarantee of orthodoxy—obedience to the hierarchy. The Roman pontiff endeavored to prove the legitimacy of that hierarchy by its Apostolic institution. Ignatius is a mystic, and so views this principle from a different angle. He speaks of being "subject to the bishop as to the grace of God, and to the presbytery as to the law of Jesus Christ." [37] "It is fitting that you [priests] should live in harmony with the will of the bishop, as indeed you do. For your justly famous presbytery, worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop as the strings to a harp. Therefore by your concord and harmonious love Jesus Christ is being sung." [38] The faithful are members of Christ. Ignatius says to them: "It is profitable for you to be in blameless unity, in order that you may always commune with God." [39] "Be united to the bishop and to the presbytery and to the deacons." [40] "The bishops are the thought of Jesus Christ, as Jesus Christ is the thought of the Father." [41] "For the first time in Christian literature, we find here the name 'Catholic Church' pronounced." [42]

But does the holy Bishop of Antioch acknowledge a supreme head of this Catholic Church? It is beyond doubt that he does. The two fundamental principles of his ecclesiology—the hierarchy and unity—presuppose the existence of a sole authority; and the text of his letter to the Romans shows that he considers that the seat of that supreme authority is at Rome.

[37] *Magnesians*, 2.
[38] *Ephesians*, 4.
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] *Philadelphians*, 4.
[41] *Ephesians*, 3.
[42] Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, p. 139.

The beginning of his letter to the Romans, or rather to the Roman Church, is significant. He addresses it "to the Church beloved and illumined," to the Church that "presides in the country of the Romans, that presides at the love-feasts" (the charities).[43] If we weigh these expressions, if we compare them with those used by Ignatius in his letters to the other Churches, there is no room for doubt; here is question of the primacy of the Church of Rome over the entire Catholic Church. The Church of Rome "presides in the country of the Romans," she "presides at the charities." "If the martyr had been writing to the Bishop of Rome, these presidencies might be considered merely local in character, because, in his own diocese, the bishop always presides. But here, there is no question of the bishop, but of the Church. Over what did the Roman Church preside? Was it merely over some other Churches or dioceses, within a limited area? Ignatius had no idea of a limitation of that kind. Besides, were there in Italy any Christian communities distinct in their organization from the community of Rome? The most natural meaning of such language is that the Roman Church presides over all the Churches." [44]

Pope St. Evaristus

The see of Rome was at that time occupied by St. Alexander, the second successor of St. Clement. His first successor

[43] Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, 152.

[44] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* p. 85. Cf. Chapman, *"Saint Ignace d'Antioche et l'Eglise romaine,"* in the *Revue bénédictine,* 1896, pp. 385 ff. Funk (*op. cit.,* I, 253) says: "There is no doubt but that Ignatius, in this passage, is speaking of the primacy of the Church." This interpretation is admitted by many Protestants, *e.g.,* Lightfoot, Jülicher, and Harnack. Harnack, however, tries to prove that the preëminence of the Church of Rome came solely from the preëminence of its charity. This explanation is refuted by Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 141–143. The clearness of St. Ignatius' affirmations in the matter of the essential dogmas of the Catholic Church led Protestants and Rationalists long since to cast suspicions on the authenticity of his letters. Bardenhewer, after relating the history

was St. Evaristus. We have no contemporary document concerning these two popes. The *Liber Pontificalis,* composed in the sixth century,[45] says that St. Evaristus was born of a Jewish father at Bethlehem. It is said this Pope ordained fifteen bishops, seventeen priests, and two deacons, and, for purposes of administration, divided the city of Rome into titles or parishes. These expressions must not make us suppose that St. Clement's successor constructed or consecrated in Rome parish churches properly so called. The reference is probably to private houses, such as the house of the Senator Pudens, which St. Peter is said to have made the meeting-place of the first Christians, or the houses of some other Christians whose names are recorded in Scripture or tradition: Prisca, Aquila, Lucina, Eudoxia, Pammachius, Fasciola.[46] By the fact that a house or a room was consecrated to liturgical worship, it was marked with a sign or title (*titulus*), similar to the signs or titles by which treasury officials marked property that was reserved to the service of the emperor. Such is the most likely explanation of this term, which passed into the language of the Church and is today reserved for churches having cardinals as titulars.[47]

According to the *Liber Pontificalis,* we also owe to Pope Evaristus the law that a bishop must be assisted, in his

of the disputes on this subject, concludes as follows: "The evidence of their authenticity is simply overwhelming." (*Patrology,* p. 34.)

[45] The first three centuries are the poorest in documents on the popes. The few lines which the *Liber Pontificalis* devotes to each of them are not free from criticism. The last persecution of Diocletian systematically destroyed the Christian books, the registers, and the acts of the martyrs; this loss was irreparable. Only fragments of these documents remain. Under such conditions, the field of conjectures and probabilities is necessarily more extensive than that of fully demonstrated truth. Yet these conjectures we gather with care, out of regard for whatever portion of truth they may contain, and if we set them down as such, we shall know that we are not false to historic truth.

[46] Martigny, art. *"Titre,"* in the *Dict. des antiq. chrét.*

[47] This is the likely sense of the obscure phrase, *"propter stylum veritatis"* (*Liber Pont.,* I, 126).

preaching, by seven deacons, whose duty it is to attest the authentic statement of his words against possible charges of heretics.[48] It is supposed that the preaching here referred to was the recitation of the Preface and Canon. The Prefaces at that time varied with each Mass; into them were sometimes introduced, besides the recalling of the feast, exhortations suited to the circumstances.[49] Evaristus is supposed to have occupied the see of St. Peter for eight years and to have died a martyr; but neither tradition nor history gives us any details of his death.[50]

Pope St. Alexander

His successor, Alexander, is said to have governed the Church for ten years, from 105 to 115. The *Liber Pontificalis* credits him with the insertion into the liturgy [51] of the words *"qui pridie quam pateretur,"* which precede the words commemorating the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and originating the practice of blessing water, in which salt has been mixed, for use in sprinkling houses.[52] The official note giving him the title of martyr seems to depend upon a *Passio Alexandri* which is not contemporary with the events and does not merit more than relative confidence. According to this document, Alexander was beheaded and buried in a catacomb on the Via Salaria.[53] This Pope may have witnessed the

[48] Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, I, 126.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum*, I, 4 f.

[51] *"In praedicatione sacerdotum."* (*Lib. Pont.*, I, 127.)

[52] *Ibid.* On this ceremony, see the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, bk. 3, chaps. 75 ff., in Muratori, *Liturgia romana vetus.*

[53] See *Acta sanctorum*, May, I, 371 ff. On the value of this document, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, II, 590, and Duchesne, *op. cit.*, I, xci. "It is probable," says Chamard, "that the editor of the *Liber Pontificalis* confused Pope Alexander with a famous martyr of that name, who was buried on the Via Nomentana. . . . However, it is no less probable that he had another document from which he obtained the more certain notion of the pope's martyrdom." (Chamard, *Les Origines de l'Eglise romaine*, chap. 7.) It has been noted that most of the popes of the first three cen-

triumphal festivities given at Rome for twenty-three days in 106 or 107, to celebrate Trajan's victory over the Dacians. Pliny relates that 10,000 wild animals were killed in those festivities, and that 10,000 men fought in honor of him who was called "the most merciful emperor." [54] Probably more than one Christian met his death on that occasion.

In the course of the following years, the head of the Church of Rome might have seen some great works carried out for the adornment of the Eternal City: the enlargement of the baths of Titus; a gigantic aqueduct to bring a new water supply (*Aquae trajanae*) to Rome; the 260,000 seats of the Circus increased by 5,000; and upon a new forum, ornamented with a triumphal arch and a splendid colonnade, the famous column of Trajan (140 feet high), surmounted by a statue of the Emperor in military uniform with a javelin in his hand. It did not enter Trajan's mind that he was working for Christian Rome, and that one day his statue would be replaced by that of St. Peter, the lowly Galilean fisherman, a greater conqueror than any emperor, since he conquered not bodies, but souls.

Pope Sixtus I

The head of the Church, chosen to succeed St. Alexander, was a Roman called Sixtus. Doubtless the people and the clergy of the city concurred in his election. If we take Eusebius' words literally, the first four popes after St. Peter were nominated by their predecessor, namely, Linus by St. Peter, Cletus by Linus, Clement by Cletus, and Evaristus by Clement.[55] If this method of appointment really was in use, it

turies are called martyrs. Although this qualification cannot be explained by precise details, it is true in a rather broad sense. (See St. Cyprian, *Epistola ad Cornelium; apud Epistolas S. Cornelii*, 7; cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IV, 364; De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, II, pref.; Chamard, *loc. cit.*)

[54] Pliny, *Letters*, VIII, 4; Dio Cassius, LXVIII, 15.

[55] Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, xiii, xxxiv.

seems not to have been long continued. A number of reliable documents establishes the fact that in the third century the election of the bishop of Rome, though his primacy was universally recognized, was subject to the same regulations as that of other bishops; the canons of the Council of Arles (in 314) and of the Council of Antioch (in 341) inform us that they are ratifying an ancient custom when they decree that "a bishop may not be appointed otherwise than by a synod, according to the decision of those bishops who, after the death of his predecessor, have the right of choosing a worthy successor." [56] It is also certain that the priests and the people took part in these "synods." [57]

The election of Sixtus I must have occurred at the end of Trajan's reign, because the *Liber Pontificalis* merely says that he governed the Church in the time of Emperor Hadrian.[58]

The Emperor Hadrian

Hadrian, grandnephew and adopted son of Trajan, succeeded the latter in 117. He ruled the destinies of the Empire for twenty-one years. Hadrian was a cautious politician, more discreet than his predecessor, foregoing any ambition for conquests in Asia, confining himself to the task of being an attentive and diligent administrator, being his own minister of finance, of justice, of war, of the interior, and filling each of these offices with undeniable superiority. But he was also an artist, a traveler fond of every novelty, not fearful of offending the gods of his country by having himself initiated into all the mysteries of the Oriental religions. Viewing his character from these two angles, we would expect that Ha-

[56] Council of Antioch, canon 23. Hefele, *History of the Councils of the Church*, II, 73.

[57] Cf. *Canones Hippolyti*, canons 7–28, *apud* Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 525.

[58] *Lib. Pont.*, I, 128.

drian would be less a persecutor of Christianity than was Trajan. Would not the statesman resolutely sacrificing every ambitious undertaking for the sake of the Empire's tranquillity, the philosopher skeptical of every religious creed, let the Christian religion develop freely at Rome and in the provinces? An important rescript, issued by Hadrian about 124,[59] seemed to justify these anticipations. Licinius Granianus, a proconsul of Asia, complained that popular rage often induced magistrates to pass death sentence upon men whose only crime was the name they bore and the religious sect to which they belonged. If this did not imply a request for the revision of Trajan's rescript, it was at least a complaint about abuses in its application. The reply of the imperial philosopher was hesitant. He forbade "clamorous entreaties and outcries," with which the mobs hostile to the Christians used to besiege the magistrates. But he made no decision as to whether the name of Christian was punishable, or whether, to incur the rigor of the courts, a person must be guilty of some specific crime. He said: "If anyone accuses and proves that the aforesaid men do anything contrary to the laws, you will also determine their punishments in accordance with their offences." [60]

In short, in words less firm than those of Trajan, the Emperor Hadrian took into account only the matter of external order. His decisions seemed more liberal than those of his predecessor; but they were no less fatal for the Christians. In fact, of the jurisprudence which, since Nero, considered the mere name of Christian as an offence against the national institutions, he abolished nothing; he found no fault with the popular frenzy which branded the disciples of Christ with the

[59] Modern criticism is unanimous in recognizing the authenticity of this rescript, quoted in full by St. Justin at the end of his *First Apology*. (See Waddington, *Fastes des provinces asiatiques*, pp. 197 ff.; Allard, *Hist. des pers.*, I, 242; Renan, *L'Eglise chrétienne*, p. 32, note.)

[60] St. Justin, *First Apology*, 68.

charge of atheism and immorality; he withdrew nothing of Trajan's regulation which directed magistrates to condemn every Christian who would refuse to sacrifice to the gods of the Empire. The popular charges became less clamorous, but they grew more numerous; though the magistrates appeared somewhat more exacting regarding the genuineness of the accusations, they continued pitilessly to condemn the accused who were denounced as Christians and proven to be so.

Thus Hadrian's reign was no less disastrous for the Christians than that of Trajan. The Acts of St. Faustinus and companions, of SS. Alexander, Hermes, and Quirinus, of St. Getulius, of SS. Sophia, Pistis, Elpis, and Agapius, of SS. Sabina and Seraphia, of SS. Herperus and Zoe (slaves), of St. Mary (a slave), and of St. Symphorosa and her sons, all bear witness to the blood that was shed under the rule of this Emperor. To recover the historic truth at the basis of the acts of these martyrs, it is often necessary to sift the many legends with which popular imagination embellished them. Archeological monuments of unquestionable authenticity, however, leave no room to question their substantial truthfulness and the genuineness of certain characteristic details.[61]

Mary, a slave, in the service of a decurion, was accused of being a Christian. The excited mob called for her death, crying out: "Let a terrible fire consume her alive." The judge said to her: "Since you are a slave, why do you not profess the religion of your master?" As remarked by the historian of the persecutions, this was a truly Roman question. Such is the idea which the Romans had of a slave's conscience. It was Seneca who wrote: "A slave never has the right to say, No." [62]

[61] For a critical consideration of these *Acta*, see Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 202–234, 266–280.

[62] *"Servus non habet negandi potestatem."* Seneca, *De beneficiis*, III, 19. On the substantial authenticity of the Acts of St. Mary, see Le Blant, *Les Actes des martyrs*, p. 184.

Symphorosa was the widow of the martyr Getulius, who had been put to death at the beginning of Hadrian's reign for having evangelized the Sabine country. To her the Emperor said: "Sacrifice to the all-powerful gods, or I will sacrifice you along with your children." "Whence comes this happiness to me," she replied, "that I am worthy of being offered with my sons as a victim to God?" "Choose, either to sacrifice to our gods, or to die." In answer to this, she said: "I desire only to rest with my husband Getulius, whom you slew for the name of Christ." Hadrian, after having her variously tortured, ordered that she be thrown into the Anio, with a stone fastened to her neck. On the next day, the Emperor had her seven children put to death in various ways.[63]

In one respect, Hadrian seems to have rendered the condition of the Christians better. He tracked them down and had them sentenced to death; but he let them talk. In his reign the pleas in behalf of the Christian religion increased in number. These pleas (apologies) were addressed sometimes to the emperor, again to the senate, or to public opinion. Eusebius preserves this fragment from an apology presented to Emperor Hadrian by Quadratus, a disciple of the Apostles in Asia Minor: "The works of our Savior were always present, for they were true, those who were cured, those who rose from the dead, who not merely appeared as cured and risen, but were constantly present, not only while the Savior was living, but even for some time after He had gone, so that some of them survived even till our own time." [64] A few years later, shortly after 135, there appeared another apology, more celebrated among the Fathers, which seems to have

[63] Ruinart, *Acta sincera*, pp. 18–20; Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, I, 207–209.

[64] Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, iii, 2; Funk, *Patres apostolici*, p. 371. Funk (*loc. cit.*) fixes upon 125 or 129 as the date of the writing of this Apology. Evidently the words "until our day" do not refer to the date of the Apology, but to the period of the author's childhood, *i. e.*, the years 80–100. (Cf. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 149.)

served as a basis for the apologetic work of St. Justin. It is the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus,* by Aristo of Pella. The author personifies in a Jew (Jason) the whole list of objections which the pagans made against the Christian religion; he appears to have planned a complete apologetic. Eusebius, Origen, Celsus, and St. Jerome speak of this important work, of which, unfortunately, neither the original Greek text nor any translation has come down to us.[65]

The device of placing in the mouth of a Jew all the calumnies passed about by the people against Christianity, is comprehensible at that period. The Christians remembered that the fiercest of the persecutions against their faith had been let loose through the denunciations of the Jews. Moreover, the Jews had just made themselves hateful to the Empire; to point to them as the sworn enemies of the Christian name might be good tactics. In 132, a deed of desperate fanaticism stirred up Judea. A certain Bar-Coziba ("son of deceit"), who changed his inglorious name to Bar-Cocheba ("son of the star"), claimed to be the star foretold by Balaam, *i. e.,* the Messias. The eighty-five jubilees of Elias, according to the calculations of the rabbis, were near their close. The most famous of these rabbis, the scholarly Akiba, since then venerated by the Jews as a second Moses, gave royal anointing to Bar-Cocheba and set him upon a horse, the while he himself held the stirrup. The whole Jewish race, save those who acknowledged Jesus as the Messias, bounded with hope. So grave did the danger to the Empire appear, that Hadrian summoned Julius Severus, the ablest of his generals, from the interior of Britain. The revolt was put down without pity. Palestine was subdued and devastated with unfeeling and inexorable rigor. Those who escaped death on the field of battle were sold in the slave markets of Terebinth and Gaza. A man,

[65] On Aristo, see Batiffol, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes, la littérature grecque,* pp. 89 f.; Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* pp. 48 f.

so it was said, was sold at the price of a horse. Those who were not bought were taken to Egypt as slaves.[66] What was left of Jerusalem was destroyed; the Temple site was plowed up and sowed with salt, as a sign of malediction and sterility. In the place of the holy city there arose Hadrian's completely pagan city, Aelia Capitolina; on the ground but recently occupied by the Temple, was placed a statue of the Emperor beside one of Jupiter.[67]

During this terrible campaign, many Christian converts from Judaism were martyred by their countrymen for having refused to take part in the revolt. These heartless cruelties deeply affected their brethren sprung from the Gentile world, who, we may well suppose, joined with the Roman pagans in a malediction of the deicidal and fratricidal race that so long followed them with its hatred.

Aquila

But the Synagogue was not dead. Very soon after the great catastrophe it showed evidences of vitality. A scholar, Aquila by name, gave an impetus to the study of the Jewish Law by presenting his fellow-Jews with a new translation of the Bible, intended to replace the Septuagint Version. The union of the Jewish and the Greek spirit was to bring about the gigantic movement of Gnosticism.

The Jewish nation had just undergone a cruel chastisement, but the Jewish Synagogue was free. Its faith was not proscribed in the Roman Empire, its places of prayer were left standing, its meetings were legal.[68]

Among the pagans who, under Hadrian, were engaged in

[66] St. Jerome, *In Zachariam*, II; Origen, *Against Celsus*, VII.

[67] Champagny, *Les Antonins*, II, 71–74.

[68] *Idem*, p. 85. There are preserved some Judeo-Roman tombs of this period, with the palm, the candlestick, the titles of "father" and "mother of the synagogue."

the construction of Aelia Capitolina, was, so it was said, a Greek from the province of Pontus, a relative of the Emperor. His name was Aquila. The extent of his knowledge and the energy of his character persuaded the Emperor to appoint him to superintend the immense building project. Impressed at sight of the virtues and miracles that were in evidence among the Christians, he asked for and received Baptism.[69] But, as his heart was not purified by humility, knowledge remained his supreme god. He was reproved on account of his passion for astrology. This angered him. He was excommunicated. No longer wishing to be a Christian, ashamed to become a pagan again, he became a Jew. He imagined a Judaism that would break all the bonds connecting the religion of Moses with the religion of Christ, and that would set up the Old Law in opposition to the New. For this reason, says St. Epiphanius, he wrote a new Greek version of the Bible, "suppressing such parts as bore testimony in favor of Christ." [70] A learned rabbi, Akiba, helped him in the undertaking.[71]

Such was the origin of the famous Greek Bible of Aquila, an important work, ingenious, carefully done, showing a deep understanding of the Hebrew language, but slavishly literal and obviously colored in the Messianic passages, as was remarked by St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, Origen, and St. Jerome.[72] The Jews favored it as against the Septuagint, and made use of it in spreading their doctrines in the Greek world. They employed it also to corrupt Christianity and to nourish, in the Church, that Judaizing spirit which, in the teachings of the Ebionites and the Elkesaites, tended to base the religion of Christ on a very gross interpretation of the Old Testament.

[69] St. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus,* chap. 14.

[70] *Ibid.*

[71] St. Jerome, *In Isaiam,* 49.

[72] See Batiffol, art. *"Aquila,"* in the *Dict. de la Bible.* Aquila's translation is incorporated in Origen's Hexapla.

The Ebionites

The Ebionites, whose origin we observed at the very beginning of Christianity, had, by fusion with the sect of the Essenes, taken on a new development about the year 100. We find their doctrine set forth in a series of sermons and adventure stories published under the name of St. Clement of Rome.[73] According to Essenean Ebionitism, God has a form and members, because every being is finite and limited. Created beings are divided into good and bad. So, too, there are good and bad prophets. The latter are descended from Eve, the female, evil element of the world. From Adam are descended the good prophets, the greatest of whom is Jesus. He is the son of God, but he is not God, for God is the Unbegotten, the Innascible, and Jesus is the begotten and the son.[74]

The Elkesaites, whose ideas and practices we learn from Origen, St. Epiphanius, and the *Philosophumena,* took their doctrine from the Book of Elchasai, which was held to be a revelation made in the third year of Trajan (A. D. 100) by a gigantic angel, called the Son of God, having at his side a wife of like size, the Holy Spirit. A curious baptism, with magical formulas and odd incantations, was the form of initiation into this sect. All the ritualistic laws of the Jews were kept. Christ, born of Mary, as other human beings are born, was merely a reincarnation, for he had already passed through several bodies and had borne several names. The *Philosophumena* adds that the Elkesaites had also certain secret beliefs and practices.

These strange sects would count for little in the religious movement of mankind. Before long they disappeared. It is mostly their oddness that draws attention to them. Yet they

[73] The *Recognitiones* is a popular romance. The pseudo-Clementine writings will be found in the first two volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca.*

[74] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* I, 165 ff.

have a symbolic significance. The Ebionite, like the Elkesaite, is the proud Jew, inconsolable for the loss of his nationality and for the failure of his gross Messianism, trying to obtain a compensation in a majestic but vain fancy in which he seeks to draw the nations after him.[75]

Gnosticism

A less ephemeral success crowned the attempts of those who sought to revive the Jewish spirit by its union with the Hellenic. This was the origin of Gnosticism, which is "the evolution of Jewish thought, stimulated by Greek philosophic speculation." [76] This applies especially to the first phase of the Gnostic heresy. If we consider the whole history of Gnosticism, we shall see that it is an effort of Greek thought to absorb Judaism and Christianity, as well as an effort of Jewish thought to assimilate Christian and Greek thought without itself being transformed. May we not also discover therein an effort of the Christian spirit—an effort legitimate in principle, but less so in its actual development—to give philosophic expression to the doctrines and practices of Christianity, or, if you wish, to transpose into the language of ancient philosophy the doctrinal and moral teaching of the sacred Books? Tertullian remarks that, in the strangeness of its formulas and symbols, Gnosticism did in reality broach the greatest problems that stir the human mind, namely: What are the possible relations between God and the world? How can the Pure Spirit, the infinite Being, know, produce, and govern the material and the finite? What is the origin of evil, and how, once it has been committed, can it be repaired? [77]

The history of the Gnostic movement includes two distinct phases. During the second phase especially, toward the close

[75] *Ibidem*, p. 168 ff.

[76] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 113.

[77] Tertullian, *De praescr.*, VII; cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta a Theodoto*, 78.

of the second century and beyond, we meet that multiplication of systems, with strange names, mysterious and sometimes shameful ceremonies, and obscure theories, in which theurgy, so-called illuminatism, and magic are more in evidence than philosophy. The first phase, appearing in Hadrian's time and continuing to the reign of Antoninus Pius, is, on the contrary, marked by the intellectual worth and relatively high moral attitude of the leaders of the movement.

The idea inspiring Gnosticism possesses a certain majesty. Jewish monotheism is plainly its starting point. There is primarily a desire to conceive a very pure and lofty idea of the Divinity. To make this idea as pure as possible, it is stripped of every notion applicable to human nature, until it is impossible to speak of it except by calling it the Great Silence (*Sige*). To make this idea as lofty as possible, they conceive God as an infinitely remote Being, infinitely separated from man and nature, and they call Him "Chaos" (*Bythos*). An eternal silence in the depths of an infinite chaos: this, they say, is the only concept worthy of the Divinity.

But matter is here, palpable and unrefined; evil is here, visible and distressing; the heart of man is here, aspiring to purification, to liberation from matter, to union with God. How is this appalling dualism to be solved? It is on this question that the schools divide.

In the time of Trajan, a certain Saturnilus of Antioch, spoken of by Hegesippus,[78] taught that between the supreme God, whom no one can know or name, and the visible world, there were intermediate spirits, created by God. After a dazzling image, fleet as lightning, which came to them from God, they created, or rather they tried to create, man. They succeeded in producing only an incomplete, crawling creature. This was primitive man. But God, recognizing therein some image of Himself, took pity on it; He sent it a spark of life

[78] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, xxii, 5.

which made this creature a man, and which is destined some day to return to the divine principle.

This is merely a rough outline of the great systems that Basilides, Carpocrates, and Valentinus elaborated in Hadrian's reign.

Basilides was born in Syria. He taught at Alexandria [79] and he gave out his doctrine to be a traditional teaching going back to the Apostles, professing to derive his ideas from St. Peter through the intermediary of a certain Glaucias, and also appealing to the authority of St. Matthew.[80] His theory was not much more than an amplification and more systematic statement of Saturnilus' doctrine: the idea of an inaccessible divinity, of an evil world, of intermediate spirits whom God employed to act upon the world, forms the basis of his religious philosophy. He adds the notion of a division of the spirits into good and bad angels, and he gives an important place to magical operations.[81]

Carpocrates of Alexandria, a contemporary of Basilides, is openly a Platonist. According to him the first principle of all things is the Monad, in which eventually every spirit will be absorbed in perfect bliss. All souls, before their earthly existence, have contemplated the eternal truths; but some keep a more vivid memory of them than do others. Great men are those in whom these memories are the more perfect. They possess the Knowledge (*Gnosis*), which is the supreme good. The line of great men includes Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and, most eminent of all, Jesus, in whom the eternal ideas, which he had perceived in the bosom of the Father, were so

[79] Basilides taught about the years 133–155. (Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 290.)

[80] Or St. Matthias, according to the variant readings of the manuscripts.

[81] Such is the description given by St. Irenaeus (*Haereses*, I, xxiv, 3 ff.). The author of the *Philosophumena* (VII, xiv) gives a different interpretation; but all the evidence leads us to suppose that we have to do with an evolution of the doctrine of Basilides, such as it was in the third century. (See Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée*, pp. 62–64.)

present and living. Virtue, says Carpocrates, is an ascent toward the Monad, or toward the Father, by a progressive liberation from human conventions and laws. It is evident to what excess such a doctrine might lead. Carpocrates' disciples made immorality a means of salvation.[82]

Valentinus of Rome was a mighty spirit. He was metaphysician, psychologist, and poet. Of God, man, nature, the various forces that move beings and their deepest antinomies, he purposed giving a complete explanation capable of satisfying the philosopher by its closely reasoned logic and of being grasped by the populace by its lifelike figures.[83] For him *Bythos* and *Sige* (Chaos and Silence) are not two names of the Primal Being, but the divine Couple, the supreme *Syzygie* from whom everything emanates. Like his predecessors, Valentinus did not hide the fundamental antinomy between spirit and matter, God and the visible world. His whole effort consisted in showing how this infinite gap is filled with an infinite number of intermediary beings unequally perfect, how this radical opposition is corrected by a gradual yielding of the ascending and descending powers, and by the intervention of beings of pacification and harmony, placed in the world by the supreme couple who are at the summit of all things.

From Chaos and Silence are born Spirit and Truth. This is the primal Tetrad or Quaternion: *Bythos, Sige, Nous,* and *Aletheia.* Spirit, united to Truth, gave birth to the Word (*Logos*) and to Life (*Zoe*); and these communicated existence to man and to the Church. The blessed Ogdoad is thus constituted.

According to the distance to which beings go from the Primal Principle, they lose, by imperceptible diminution, some-

[82] St. Irenaeus, *Haereses,* I, xxv; Dufourcq, *op. cit.,* pp. 64–66.

[83] The spread of Valentinus' ideas at Rome began about 135. (Harnack, *Chronologie,* 291.)

thing of the divine; yet they remain fecund and by generating form a series of superior beings or Aeons, which together constitute Fulness, or Pleroma. In this Pleroma, every Aeon aspires to complete comprehension of the Chaos; and this aspiration constitutes its life and joy.

It also produced the evil of the world. For the lower Aeons, those who descended as far as the limits of the Pleroma, have been jealous of the perfect Spirit, or *Nous*. In vain have the spirits of the Confines tried to restore harmony in the Pleroma; a lower Wisdom, a degraded Reason, was born in the midst of these conflicts. It is Achamoth. Being exiled from the Pleroma, Achamoth joined with Chaos; from these two was born the Demiurge, or Creator of the material world, and the whole of the material world has constituted the *Kenoma* (Void, Nothing). The decadence did not halt, but continued even to the supreme Evil, to Satan, Belzebuth, the Master of the lower world.

Man finds himself between these two worlds. The Demiurge made him material, but Wisdom infused a spirit into him. On the confines of the Kenoma, but aspiring to the Pleroma, man is divided between two worlds. Who will save him? A higher being, Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Spirit gradually purifies and who eventually will lead the elite of mankind with him into the Pleroma.

In consequence of these troubles, there was produced a division in mankind. It thenceforth includes the Materials (Hylists), the Animals (Psychists), and the Spirituals (Pneumatists). These last no longer have need of good works or virtues; they have Knowledge (Gnosis). Whoever knows the mysteries, possesses salvation; whoever knows the enigma of the world, is freed from all rule; whoever has Knowledge, no longer needs faith or law.[84]

[84] St. Irenaeus, *Haereses*, I, xi; Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée*, pp. 48–53.

Pope St. Telesphorus

The immoral consequences that would result from such a doctrine may easily be surmised. At first they were not perceived. The pope who then occupied the see of Rome, St. Telesphorus, seems, however, to have been greatly concerned with maintaining austerity among the Christians.

Telesphorus was a Greek, says the *Liber Pontificalis,* and, before he became pope, lived a hermit's life. Must we understand by this that he followed the eremitical manner of living, and that the people and clergy of Rome went to the desert to look for him? Or are we to suppose that he simply belonged to a group of priests living an ascetical life more perfect than that of the rest of the clergy? This much at least is certain, that the pope who took up the government of the Church about 125 was prepared, by his previous life, to become the defender of morality among the Christians. The *Liber Pontificalis* credits him with the institution of the Lenten fast.[85] By these words we must understand the regulation of the Lenten penance: for we know, from St. Irenaeus' explicit testimony, that the Lenten observances go back earlier than this period.[86] Moreover, even after St. Telesphorus, there was great diversity in the length of the fast as in the amount of mortifications practiced in imitation of the Savior's fast, and uniformity in these observances did not obtain universally until the beginning of the fourth century by the fifth canon of the Council of Nicaea.

The *Liber Pontificalis* also attributes to St. Telesphorus the institution of the Christmas midnight Mass and the introduction of the *Gloria in excelsis* into that Mass. Pliny's celebrated letter to Trajan[87] informs us that the Christians

[85] Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.,* I, 129.

[86] Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, xxiv, 11. On the beginnings of the Lenten fast, see Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 129.

[87] Pliny, *Letters,* x, 96.

used to meet together before daybreak to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice. The clergy of the East have kept this practice of saying Mass at early dawn. In the West, once peace came to the Church, the hour of terce [88] was the regular time for the Holy Sacrifice. The *Liber Pontificalis* alludes to this practice and supposes that it existed at Rome in the time of St. Telesphorus. St. Irenaeus says that this Pope ended his life by a "glorious martyrdom"; [89] but we have no details regarding his last moments. The Western Church honors him on January 5, the Eastern on February 22.

[88] By the ancients, the time between 6 o'clock in the morning and 9 o'clock was called the hour of prime; from 9 o'clock to noon, the hour of terce; from noon to 3 o'clock, the hour of sext; from 3 o'clock to 6 o'clock, the hour of none.

[89] Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, vi, 4.

CHAPTER II

Antoninus Pius to Septimius Severus (138–202)

UNDER Trajan and Hadrian the Christians had mainly to die. Their fearlessness in the presence of torture and death was their great apologetic. Some of them did publish written apologies, but their purpose was to offer a defense against calumny and injustice. From Antoninus Pius to Septimius Severus their courage does not fail at the sight of torments; but their apologetics assume a greater scope. Not merely do they refute their enemies' charges, but they labor to win over those enemies; they also endeavor to defend the purity of their faith against heretical alterations and, in the heat of the strife, they start the first theological synthesis of their beliefs.

Persecutions

From the coming of Antoninus Pius to the middle of the reign of Commodus, the legal status of Christians remained what the rescripts of Trajan and Hadrian had made it. The Church was nearly all the time suffering persecution in some place or other, now because of formal accusations in accordance with the imperial rescripts, now in consequence of popular commotion half-heartedly repressed or even encouraged or aroused by the magistrates themselves. From the middle of Commodus' reign to the middle of that of Severus, the Christians enjoyed about fifteen years of peace, a sort of transition between the régime of persecution by rescript, in force throughout the whole second century, and that of persecution by edict, which prevailed at intervals during the third

century.[1] St. Polycarp, St. Felicitas and her sons, St. Justin, St. Cecilia, the martyrs of Lyons, and the martyrs of Scillium were the most illustrious victims of the persecution of this period.

We know but little of the pontiffs who governed the Church at this time. Under Diocletian all the registers of the Roman Church were destroyed—an irreparable loss for the history of the Roman pontiffs. The *Liber Pontificalis,* written in the sixth century and based on oral traditions and doubtless on certain written documents that had escaped the search of the persecutors, says of St. Hyginus, the successor of St. Telesphorus, that no trace is found of his genealogy.[2] It is supposed that he was a philosopher and native of Athens. Tradition credits him with "the organization of the clergy." [3] It has been supposed that this remark concerns the institution of minor orders.[4] His successor, St. Pius I, is set down as the brother of Hermas, of whom we shall have to speak later. The statement that to him is due the practice of celebrating Easter on Sunday [5] is certainly a mistake, because Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Sixtus are mentioned by St. Irenaeus as having observed this custom.[6] About St. Anicetus, successor of St. Pius I, we know almost nothing, except that he was born at Emesa, a city of Syria, and that he made rules about the life of the clergy, whom he forbade to take excessive care of their hair.[7]

St. Soter, who succeeded him, is supposed to have been a native of Campania. It is said that he showed great zeal in observing liturgical regulations, and forbade women to touch

[1] Allard, *Hist. des pers.,* I, iii.
[2] Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.,* I, 131.
[3] *"Clerum composuit."* (Duchesne, *loc. cit.*)
[4] *Ibid.,* note.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, xxiv, 14.
[7] "There can be no question here of the tonsure, which even in the sixth century was still one of the episcopal insignia." (Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 134.)

the sacred linens.[8] Eusebius quotes a valuable letter of Dionysius of Corinth, which shows that this Pope, continuing the generous traditions of his predecessors, was in the habit of giving liberal succor to poor churches. The testimony of the bishop of Corinth is noteworthy as an homage of that time to the mother Church, which, as in the days of St. Ignatius, always merited the glorious title of "the one that presides at the charities." Dionysius wrote as follows to the Romans: "This has been your custom from the beginning, to do good in manifold ways to all Christians, and to send contributions to the many churches in every city, in some places relieving the poverty of the needy, and ministering to the Christians in the mines, by the contribution which you have sent from the beginning, preserving the ancestral custom of the Romans, true Romans as you are. Your blessed bishop Soter has not only carried on this habit, but has even increased it." [9] The end of the letter shows with what veneration the documents coming from the Apostolic See were always received at Corinth: "Today we observe the holy day of the Lord, and read out your letter, which we shall continue to read from time to time for our admonition, as we do with that which was formerly sent to us through Clement." [10]

St. Eleutherius, who was chosen to succeed St. Soter, is said in the *Liber Pontificalis* to have negotiated with an Anglo-Saxon king, or rather the head of a clan,[11] about the conversion of Britain. The historical genuineness of this event, however, is questionable.[12] More authentic is his correspondence with the Churches of Lyons and Vienne on the occasion of the martyrdom of St. Pothinus and his companions.

It was during the pontificate of Eleutherius that Irenaeus

[8] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, I, 135.
[9] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, xxiii, 10.
[10] *Ibidem*, no. 11.
[11] Great Britain was then a Roman province, and could not have had a king.
[12] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, I, cii ff.

began his great work, in which he recognizes the Roman Church as the "chief guardian of the Apostolic tradition." With Pope St. Victor, who succeeded St. Eleutherius and who governed the Church until the close of the second century, papal history is illumined with more numerous documents. In his pontificate the great baptismal controversy took place and the first discussions began in the Trinitarian controversy.

Tradition calls both of these popes martyrs. In the early centuries this title was bestowed, not only on those who gave up their life for the faith, but also on those who faced the risks of a perilous situation.[13] But it is highly probable that Roman pontiffs were put to death in a time when the sword of persecution threatened everyone who did not practice the religion of the emperors. The silence of written documents is no reason for refusing these venerated pontiffs of the Roman Church the glorious title which the Catholic Church gives them in her liturgy.

St. Polycarp

Providence has, at least, permitted to come down to us the authentic Acts [14] of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, disciple of St. John the Apostle. This venerable witness of the Apostolic times was the victim of one of those popular disturbances stirred up by the enemies of the Christian Church. It occurred in 155, under the proconsulate of Statius Quadratus, while Antoninus Pius was emperor. Polycarp had reached the age of eighty-six years. To the stadium, where the proconsul was then seated, the mob led him with indescribable tumult, in which could be heard especially this

[13] St. Cyprian gives Pope Cornelius the name of martyr for the single reason that he had "willingly occupied the Apostolic See at Rome at the very time when the tyrant was issuing the most terrible threats." (Letter of St. Cyprian to Antonianus; *apud Ep. S. Cornelii,* x, 9).

[14] "These *Acta* defy the hostile efforts of criticism. They were written less than a year after the event." (Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* I, 66.)

shout: "Death to the atheists!" But we will let the precious document speak for itself, somewhat abridging the account.

"The proconsul sought to persuade Polycarp to deny Christ, saying: 'Have respect to thy old age,' and other similar things, according to their custom, such as, 'Swear by the fortune of Caesar; repent and say: Away with the atheists.' But Polycarp, gazing with a stern countenance on all the multitude of the wicked heathen then in the stadium, and waving his hand towards them, while with groans he looked up to heaven, said: 'Away with the atheists.' Then the proconsul urging him, and saying: 'Swear, and I will set thee at liberty; reproach Christ,' Polycarp declared: 'Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He never did me any injury. How then can I blaspheme my King and my Savior?' When the proconsul yet again pressed him, and said: 'Swear by the fortune of Caesar,' he answered: 'Since thou pretendest not to know who and what I am, hear me declare with boldness, I am a Christian.' The proconsul then said to him: 'I have wild beasts at hand.' But he answered: 'Call them then. It is well for me to leave this world for a better.' Then the proconsul said to him: 'I will cause thee to be consumed by fire, seeing thou despisest the wild beasts.' But Polycarp said: 'Thou threatenest me with fire which burneth for an hour, but art ignorant of the fire of eternal punishment reserved for the ungodly.'

"While Polycarp spoke these and many other like things, he was filled with confidence and joy, and his countenance was full of grace, so that not merely did it not fall as if troubled by the things said to him, but, on the contrary, the proconsul was astonished.

"The crowds cried out that Polycarp should be burnt alive; and they immediately gathered together wood and fagots out of the shops and baths. The funeral pile was made ready. When they had bound him, placing his hands behind him, he looked up to heaven and said: 'Lord, I praise Thee for all things, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, along with the everlasting and heavenly Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Son, with whom, to Thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and in all coming ages. Amen.'

"When he had pronounced this *amen,* those who were appointed for the purpose kindled the fire. And we then beheld a great miracle.

The fire, shaping itself into the form of an arch, like the sail of a ship when filled with the wind, encompassed as by a circle the body of the martyr. Then those wicked men commanded an executioner to go near and pierce him through with a dagger. The centurion then placed the body in the midst of the fire and the fire consumed it." [15]

Antoninus Pius (138–161)

Nothing had been changed in the religious policy of the Empire under Antoninus Pius. He succeeded Hadrian in 138 and held power until 161. The surname given him by the Roman people and preserved by history is based on the veneration he showed for his adoptive father Hadrian, on the veneration he professed for the old memories of Rome, and on the moderation he exercised in the government of the Empire. Antoninus Pius guided the civilization and power of Rome to its apogee. But unfortunately he shared the baleful prejudice of his predecessors, looking upon the Christian religion as an enemy of Roman civilization. He merely prescribed, and not always with success, that order and regularity be adhered to in prosecuting the disciples of Christ.[16]

Marcus Aurelius (161–180)

Marcus Aurelius, was worthier in his private and public life than his three predecessors. He had a lofty mind, a heart

[15] Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, 314–345. On the authenticity of this account, see *ibidem,* pp. ci–cv.

[16] Eusebius (*H. E.,* IV, xiii) cites a decree of Antoninus forbidding the arrest and punishment of Christians for the simple charge of being Christians. Tillemont admitted the genuineness of this edict; but it has now generally been abandoned. Allard, writing in 1885 (*Histoire des pers.,* I, 293), says: "The apocryphal character of this document has no need of being demonstrated. It is obvious." Ten years later, Harnack reëxamined the document and came to the conclusion that it is made up of several fragments, some authentic, others interpolated. He endeavored to reconstruct the genuine text which underlay the revisions of it that we now possess. It thus appears that what the Emperor forbade was the prosecution of a Christian on the charge of being a Christian, but allowed it on the charge of atheism, which would have been a charge under the common law.

that was kind even to weakness and tender even to illusion. Yet he did but aggravate the condition of the Christians in the Empire. "The nineteen years of his reign were the most vexatious and cruel that the Church had passed through." [17] This seeming anomaly can be explained, if we consider three facts, stated by all historians. The first is the disintegration of the ancient world, a break-up that took place under the government of the new Emperor. Upstarts, adventurers, coming one knew not whence, became suddenly popular and at every moment threatened that hereditary succession to the throne, which by natural or adoptive sonship [18] seemed to be the most solid foundation of the imperial government. Moreover, the most powerful bond of the unity of the Empire, the old national religion, appeared to weaken and dissolve in contact with the Oriental religions which kept penetrating more and more. An imperilled power easily becomes a tyrannical power. Nothing is commoner in history than the violent and sudden activity of institutions that are about to perish. The Roman Empire was no exception to this general rule. The old society rose up by a sort of instinct of self-preservation against all the powers which it regarded as hostile.

And that was not all. Marcus Aurelius was not only an emperor, he was also a philosopher. Out of all the religious forces around him—the old Roman religion, so stern and strong, the need of purification which penetrated the religions of the East, even Christianity, which he detested while secretly feeling the influence of its pure morality—he formed a new and lofty philosophy. This philosophy was made up entirely of elements taken from other sources, though he thought it quite original. He jealously defended it, as being his very own, against all other doctrines. The most formidable of these

[17] Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 329.

[18] The imperial power, which was handed on by heredity under the Caesars and the Flavians, was transmitted by adoption under the Antonines.

rivals he considered to be Christianity, to which its apologists were beginning to give the form of a philosophy.

The third fact is this: floods, famine, epidemics, disasters of all kinds had befallen Rome and Italy from the first months of the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Four years later the plague ravaged the Empire from end to end. In such circumstances the first impulse of the Roman people was to look for some persons to blame for these calamities, that they might immolate them to the gods. Such victims were found. "They think the Christians the cause of every public disaster, of every affliction with which the people are visited. If the Tiber rises as high as the city walls, if the Nile does not send its waters up over the fields, if the heavens give no rain, if there is an earthquake, if there is famine or pestilence, straightway the cry is, 'Away with the Christians to the lions!' "[19] Marcus Aurelius himself was superstitious. And he was also weak. Not on him could reliance be placed to suppress these uprisings of the populace. He allowed those outbursts to take place and permitted them to reach their utmost consequences.

St. Felicitas

One of the most touching incidents of this outburst of Roman superstition was the martyrdom of St. Felicitas and her seven children at Rome, in 162. "She had remained a widow," we are told by the Acts of her martyrdom,[20] "and had consecrated her chastity to God. Night and day she spent in prayer, and was an edification for pure souls. The pagan

[19] Tertullian, *To the Nations*, I, 9; *Apology*, 40.

[20] These Acts are not the original ones, *i. e.*, not a simple copy of the judicial proceedings drawn up by the pagans and sold to the Christians by agents of the court; but they are closely dependent on such an official report and were written only one year after the event. On the original Acts, see Le Blant, *"Les Actes des martyrs,"* in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, vol. 30, part 2. Cf. Allard, *Hist. des pers.*, I, 342 ff.; De Rossi, *Bullett. di archeol. crist.*, 1863, p. 19; Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, I, 210 ff.

pontiffs, seeing that, owing to her, the fair repute of the Christian name had increased, spoke of her to Antoninus Augustus,[21] saying: 'This widow and her sons insult our gods, angering them so much that there will be no way to appease them.' The Emperor sent Publius, the prefect of the city, instructing him to force Felicitas to sacrifice to the gods. To the prefect's first urging the brave matron replied: 'Your threats cannot make me change my resolve, nor can your promises seduce me. I have within me the Holy Ghost, who will not permit that I be overcome by the demon.' Then said Publius: 'Wretched woman, though you find it sweet to die, at least let your sons live.' 'I know,' answered Felicitas, 'that my sons will live if they consent to sacrifice to the idols; but, should they commit this crime, they will go to eternal death.' On the next day the prefect summoned her with her seven sons before him. 'Take pity on your children,' he said. Thereupon the Christian woman turned to her sons and said: 'Lift up your eyes to Heaven, my children. Jesus Christ awaits you there with his saints.' " The mother and children were brave to the very end. Sentence of death was decreed against them. The eldest of the sons was beaten to death with leaded whips; the second and the third fell beneath the blows of the cudgel; the fourth was thrown into the Tiber. The last three and the mother were beheaded.[22]

Felicitas and her sons died as victims of popular superstition. The next year Justin was sacrificed to the jealousy of the pagan philosophers.

St. Justin Martyr

Justin was born in the early years of the second century at Sichem, the modern Nablus, in Palestine. His father, Priscus,

[21] That is, Marcus Aurelius. See De Rossi, Allard, and Leclercq, *loc. cit.* The name Antoninus was given to all the rulers of the Antonine dynasty.

[22] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, 210–214.

and his grandfather, Bacchius, were pagans and native Greeks. Justin was brought up in paganism. He was precocious and at a very early age attended various schools of philosophy. Being consumed with a desire for truth, he sought it of the Porch, then at the Academy, and in the school of Pythagoras. Plato's doctrine, which he next encountered, held him longer, but without fully satisfying his mind and heart. An old man, whom he chanced to meet while he was walking alone by the sea, showed him, beyond the light which comes from the study of philosophy, a light which could be found in the reading of the prophets. Justin began to read the Bible. By feeding his mind with the Sacred Scriptures, he came to understand better how human wisdom had appeared to him so insipid when he asked it for the reason of life. These things he himself tells us in books filled with his personal experience. He also relates how the sight of Christians persecuted for their faith and braving all dangers so as to remain faithful to their religion, demolished all the prejudices which his pagan education had given him about the followers of Christ.[23] About 135, he became a Christian. But this did not make him abandon philosophy; he merely tried to instil the Christian spirit into it. Or rather, he strove to set forth Christian teaching about God, man, and the world, as a new philosophy, which is, he said, "the only safe and profitable one." [24] Still travelling about the world, he continued to wear the philosopher's cloak,[25] defending his faith by spoken word and by pen against all comers—heretics, Jews, and pagans. He was convinced that "everyone who can speak the truth, yet speaks it not, will be judged by God." [26]

One of his most vigorous campaigns was against the Cynical philosopher Crescens, "who said that the Christians are

[23] See *Second Apology*, chap. 12.
[24] *Dialogue*, chap. 8.
[25] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, xi, 8; Justin, *Dialogue*, chap. 1.
[26] *Dialogue*, chap. 82.

atheists and impious, doing so to win favor with the deluded mob and to please them." [27] Justin not only attacked him wherever he was sowing his calumnies and provoked him to public disputations, but also offered, though unsuccessfully, to debate with him in the presence of the Emperor.[28] In the course of his campaign, he convicted Crescens of not understanding the matter under discussion.[29] The Cynic never forgave the Christian philosopher for the public humiliation he had suffered at his hands.

Justin did not delude himself. He writes: "I too, therefore, expect to be plotted against and fixed to the stake, by some of those I have named, or perhaps by Crescens, that lover of bravado and boasting." [30] He was in fact denounced to the Roman authorities by Crescens or at Crescens' instigation,[31] along with six other Christians. After a short examination, he was beaten with rods and beheaded. We have the official report of his trial, from which we give the following extracts:

The Prefect (Rusticus): "What science are you studying?"

Justin: "I have studied all the sciences, one after the other. I have chosen the doctrine of the Christians."

Prefect: "What is that doctrine?"

Justin: "To believe in one only God, Creator of all things, and to confess Jesus Christ, the Son of God, future judge of mankind. But I, being a mere feeble man, cannot speak of His infinite divinity as it should be spoken of. This is the work of the prophets, who foretold Him for centuries through an inspiration from on high."

Prefect: "Where do the Christians meet?"

Justin: "Wherever they can; for the God whom the Christians adore is everywhere."

Prefect: "Are you a Christian, then?"

[27] *Second Apology,* chap. 3, no. 2.
[28] *Ibidem,* no. 5.
[29] *Ibidem,* no. 4.
[30] Τοῦ φιλοψόφου καὶ φιλοκόμπου. *Ibidem,* no. 1.
[31] Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos,* 19; Eusebius, *H. E.,* IV, xvi, 8.

Justin: "I am."

Prefect: "People say you are an eloquent philosopher. If I have you flogged and have your head cut off, do you think you will then ascend to Heaven?"

Justin: "I do not think so; I know it. Of this I am so confident that I have no doubt about it."

Prefect: "Sacrifice to the gods."

Justin: "A man of sense does not abandon piety for error."

Justin's companions—Evelpistus, Hierax, Paeon, Liberianus, Chariton, and a Christian woman named Charita—replied in like manner.

Evelpistus was a slave. To him the judge spoke with contempt, saying: "What are you?" Evelpistus answered: "I am a slave of Caesar; but, being a Christian, I have received my freedom from Christ, and I have the same hope as these others." This was the first time that a slave dared publicly claim his dignity as a man before a Roman magistrate. The prefect issued the following sentence: "Let those who have been unwilling to sacrifice to the gods be scourged and beheaded." [32] The sentence was executed at once.

This was in 163.[33] The Acts tell us that the bodies of these martyrs were removed by the Christians and placed "in a fitting place," that they might be worthily honored by their brethren.

St. Cecilia

A few years later a young lady of senatorial rank, Cecilia, wife of the Roman patrician Valerian, was sentenced to death for the same "crime." Out of consideration for her rank and out of pity for her youth, or perhaps for fear of stirring up

[32] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, 86–89.

[33] Renan made futile efforts to free Marcus Aurelius, the emperor-philosopher, from blame in the execution of Justin, the first Christian philosopher. Scholars have not been convinced by Renan's attempt to push St. Justin's martyrdom back to the reign of Antoninus Pius. (See Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 265.)

too intense feelings in Rome, the judge ordered the sentence to be carried out in Cecilia's house. Tacitus, Suetonius, and later historians mention several instances of such executions in private houses, the condemned persons being variously ordered to open their veins, or to starve themselves to death, or to drink poison. The prefect who sentenced Cecilia directed that she be suffocated in the bathroom of her house.[34] But the Saint survived this penalty. A lictor, who was sent to cut off her head, gashed her neck three times, and left her still breathing. She continued in agony three days. After her death, the Christians buried her in a cemetery on the Via Appia.

The Acts of St. Cecilia, drawn up after the peace of the Church, for purposes of edification, have not the same historic value as the Acts of St. Justin. But the learned De Rossi, by deleting some long speeches, evident amplifications, and a few details that he judged to be legendary, has succeeded in reconstructing historically the account of St. Cecilia's arrest, trial, and death. Archeological discoveries confirm every point of the story of that young martyr, so dear to Christian piety.[35]

The Martyrs of Lyons

While the purest Roman blood was shed in the very city of Rome for the glory of the Christian name, Gallic, Greek, and Asiatic blood was poured out for the same cause in the capital of Lyonese Gaul.

Divine Providence has permitted the preservation of one of the most exquisite accounts of martyrdom of which the Church can boast. It is recorded in a document of unquestioned authenticity, the letter written in 177 by the Churches

[34] An illustration in Martigny's *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.* (art. *"Balneum"*), enables us to understand how asphyxiation could be produced by the freeing of steam in the bathroom of an ancient Roman house. (Cf. Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 423.)

[35] On the martyrdom of St. Cecilia, see Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 419–430; De Rossi, II, xxxiii, 150, 155, 161; Guéranger, *Life of Saint Cecilia.* Her martyrdom took place some time between 177 and 180.

of Lyons and Vienne to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia.[36] Even Renan in presence of this memorable document was unable to restrain his deep feeling. He says: "It is one of the most extraordinary pieces that any literature possesses. Never has a more impressive picture been drawn of the lofty enthusiasm and devotion to which human nature can attain. It is the ideal of martrydom, with the least possible boasting on the part of the martyrs." [37]

The city of Lyons was at that time the administrative metropolis of the three provinces of the Gauls. The representatives of sixty-four peoples resided there, as in a federal city. The worship of Rome and Augustus, in charge of a high priest representing the three Gallic provinces,[38] was there conducted with the greatest solemnity. It has been said that, at the very time when in the Eternal City the Roman religion seemed to be retreating before the advance of philosophy, it was establishing a mighty center for itself in the great Gallic city.[39] Furthermore, the stream of commerce which had long since developed between the ports of Asia Minor and the Gallic cities of the Rhône had, by the very force of things, become a field of fruitful apostolate. The Christian communities

[36] With the exception of Ernest Havet, whose extraordinary bias is well known, all historians who have written of the early centuries of the Church, both ancient historians and modern—*e. g.,* Tillemont, Renan, Harnack, Aubé, Gaston Boissier, Duchesne—regard this letter as undoubtedly genuine. An attempt to disprove this authenticity has been made recently by James Thompson in the *American Journal of Theology* (July, 1912, pp. 359 ff.). The principal reason adduced is that before Eusebius, *i. e.,* before the fourth century, no historian, pagan or Christian, speaks of the Christians martyred at Lyons in 177. Allard (*Revue des quest. hist.,* January, 1913, pp. 53–67) refutes this paradoxical theory by showing, in agreement with De Smedt (*Principes de la critique historique,* chaps. 13 and 14), Harnack (*Expansion of Christianity,* II, 261), and Boissier (*Fin du paganisme,* I, 242 ff.), that the negative argument by itself cannot be a historic proof.

[37] Renan, *Marc-Aurèle,* p. 340.

[38] He was called "the priest of the three provinces of Gaul." (Orelli, inscription 184, vol. I, p. 98).

[39] Boissier, *Inscriptions antiques de Lyon,* p. 467; Bernard, *Le Temple d'Auguste et la nationalité gauloise,* p. 30.

of Lyons and Vienne were increased by the addition of Syrian and Phrygian elements that brought, along with the Christian traditions of the East, a constant renewal of vitality.

An aged and venerable bishop governed the Church of Lyons in the middle of the second century: Pothinus. His principal helper, his right hand as it were, was Irenaeus: both were natives of Asia. Both of them, too, had been disciples of Papias and Polycarp, who in turn were disciples of St. John. The Church of Lyons was nourished with the purest doctrine by an active correspondence with the churches of Asia; and it radiated its light. Archeological monuments indicate, if not a strict filiation, at least some religious dependence between the churches of Autun, Langres, Chalons, Tournus, Dijon, and the Church of Lyons.[40]

The Roman colony had its center at Fourvières; the famous altar where the worship of Rome and Augustus was celebrated was at the confluence of the Rhône and the Saône. The center of the Christian population was probably on the islands of the confluence, near Athanacum, now Ainai.

Between the two religions, Christian and pagan, a clash was inevitable. This appeared the more imminent since a floating population of laborers, clerks, people who were rich and poor, idle and busy by turns, according to the fluctuations of commerce, was ever ready to foment disturbances. In 177 this popular agitation, for some unknown reason, was suddenly turned against the Christians. The Christians were publicly insulted. In the streets, on the country roads, in the public places, they were attacked, stones were thrown at them. It may be that the native Lyonese confused the Christians and their mysterious ceremonies with those gross Gnostics who had been brought to the great city of the Gauls by the commercial activity of Asia. Unhappily the Roman authorities

[40] Tillemont, *Mémoires*, III, 35 ff.; cf. Bulliot, *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Saint-Martin d'Autun*, pp. 47–50.

were unconcerned with repressing these enmities or dispelling these misunderstandings. In the absence of the imperial legate, the tribune and the duumvirs attempted merely to put an end to the agitation by arresting a number of those whom popular report designated as Christians.

Among those whom they imprisoned were the venerable Bishop Pothinus, the priest Zachary, the deacon Sanctus, the neophyte Maturus, Attalus of Pergamus, a young female slave, Blandina, and several other Christians. One of them was placed under arrest at the first sitting of the court. This was Vettius Epagathus, a young man of noble birth and great virtue. Affected by the tortures that were being inflicted upon the accused, he gave vent to his indignation and requested that he should be heard in defense of his brethren, while he ventured to assert that there was nothing at variance with religion or piety among them. But the judge only asked whether he also were a Christian. He confessed and was thereupon transferred to the ranks of the accused.

Meanwhile the imperial legate returned to Lyons. The trial continued. At first the slaves of the accused were brought forward and put to the torture. When urged by the soldiers, says our document, "they falsely accused us of Thyestean feasts and Oedipodean incests, and things which it is not right for us either to speak of or to think of." [41] These abominable lies added to the popular rage. But every effort was made to obtain a confession of these crimes from the accused themselves. In the amphitheater, before an infuriated multitude thirsting for the sight of blood, the Christians were scourged, placed in hot iron chairs, thrown to wild beasts that dragged them around the arena, in short, subjected to every torture that the maddened crowd demanded. The deacon Sanctus, from whom they tried to force a revelation of the secrets of the Church, would say nothing more than, "I am a Christian." Not another word

[41] Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, i, 14.

could be extracted from him. The executioners then exercised their fury upon the slave Blandina. She was short and feeble. Her fellow-Christians, especially her mistress (also among the accused), were apprehensive lest she should weaken. But she was heroic. For a whole day she endured the most atrocious tortures, repeatedly saying: "I am a Christian woman, and nothing wicked happens among us."

The greatest anguish of the accused was not the thought of torture; it was the fear that some of their brethren might prove weak and deny Christ. Ten of them actually did so. But every day the arrests continued. Loyal Christians filled the places left vacant by the apostates. Our document tells us that those who resisted showed no arrogance or contempt toward these weak brethren. They condemned no one, but merely wept and prayed. They humbled themselves beneath the hand of God, to whom they owed their constancy; if anyone called them martyrs, they would not accept this title, saying that those only are martyrs who have confessed Christ to the very end.

The attitude of Pothinus, the venerable head of the Church of Lyons, was sublime. The legate asked him who was the God of the Christians. The Bishop replied: "If you are worthy, you will know." He was beaten unmercifully; the populace threw at him whatever they could lay hands on. Half-dead, he was thrown into a dungeon, where he expired two days later.

In fine, those who were found to be Roman citizens were sentenced to be beheaded; the others were destined for the beasts.

A fifteen-year-old boy, named Ponticus, and the slave Blandina, were kept for the last. It was hoped that, after they had witnessed all the sufferings of their brethren, they would weaken. But both of them showed admirable strength. The most refined torture was inflicted upon the boy. The tender words of Blandina aided him, with the grace of God, to remain constant to the end.

Blandina now alone remained. "After scourging, after the beasts, after the gridiron, she was at last put in a net and thrown to a bull. She was tossed about a long time by the beast, having no more feeling for what happened to her through her hope and hold on what had been entrusted to her and her converse with Christ. And so she too was sacrificed, and the heathen themselves confessed that never before among them had a woman suffered so much and so long." [42] Forty-eight martyrs died thus in the metropolis of the Gauls.[43]

The letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne,[44] from which we have taken the details of this martyrdom, closes with these words: "Divine grace did not fail the martyrs; the Holy Ghost dwelt in their midst." The Acts of St. Felicitas, of St. Justin, in fact, nearly all the Acts of this period, close with a triumphant doxology: "Glory to God unto all ages!" Of the two powers that clashed in the great Gallic city as in the capital of the Empire, it was the Christian power that triumphed. More and more the Empire was visibly nearing its fall. Marcus Aurelius observed this. The philosopher in him vainly resisted through sheer duty, saying: "Let the god that is in thee be lord of a living creature, that is manly and of full age . . . as one who awaits the signal of recall from life in all readiness." [45] If this meditative prince, transformed into a man of action during part of his reign, could have penetrated the future, he would have spoken with still greater bitterness the words he addressed to the tribune who came to his tent for the last time to ask for instructions: "Go to the rising sun; I am setting."

[42] *Ibidem,* no. 56.

[43] Their names will be found in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (ed. De Rossi-Duchesne), p. 73, and in Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* I, 106 f. About half of the martyrs have Greek names, and about half, Latin. From this fact we may infer a similar numerical proportion among the Christians of Lyons.

[44] Harnack (*Expansion of Christianity,* II, 261) admits the distinction between the Church of Lyons and that of Vienne; Duchesne (*Fastes épiscopaux,* p. 41) denies it.

[45] Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations,* III, 5.

From all sides barbarous races were pressing on the Roman frontiers. In their rear, the great nation of the Goths was beginning to move forward. Upon all these races, who were soon to give the death-blow to the Roman colossus, the rising sun of the Gospel was casting its rays. Perchance the philosopher-prince had some forboding of the future of the world, when, in his last hour, with a gesture that was more despairing than stoical, he turned his head from his son Commodus and covered his face so as to see no one, and to die alone.[46]

The Emperor Commodus (180–192)

Commodus was a complete antithesis to his father. He was without any care for the country, without any policy unless that of all tyrants, which consists in confiscating and proscribing through hatred and fear and avarice. Yet from this inane and blood-thirsty despot the Christians suffered less than from his upright and intelligent predecessors. At one time it would seem that his father's spirit was urging him, that the impulse given by Marcus Aurelius was being continued: the blood of martyrs was poured out copiously. At another time, a gentler influence, that of the Christian servants of his palace or the all-powerful prayer of a beloved woman, inclined his fickle soul toward clemency.[47]

The Martyrs of Scillium

The best known episode of the persecutions that raged in Commodus' reign is that of the Scillitan martyrs. The Acts of these martyrs "is rightly reckoned among the earliest and most reliable monuments of Christianity antiquity." [48] From it we quote the following:

[46] Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 433.

[47] *Ibidem*, p. 435.

[48] Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 436; cf. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, 108; *Analecta Bollandiana*, XI, 102.

"On the seventeenth day of July [180], when Speratus, Nartallus, Cittinus, Donata, Secunda, and Vestia were brought into the judgment-hall at Carthage,[49] the proconsul Saturninus said: 'Ye can win the indulgence of our lord the Emperor if ye return to a sound mind.'

Speratus: 'We have never done ill; but when we have received ill we have given thanks, because we pay heed to our Emperor.'

The Proconsul: 'We, too, are religious, and our religion is simple.'

Speratus: 'If thou wilt peaceably lend me thine ears, I will tell thee the mystery of simplicity.'

The Proconsul: 'I will not lend my ears to thee, when thou beginnest to speak evil things of our sacred rites.'

Saturninus, the Proconsul, said to the rest: 'Be not partakers of this folly.'

Cittinus said: 'We have none other to fear except only our Lord God, who is in heaven.'

Speratus said: 'I am a Christian.' And they all agreed with him.

The Proconsul: 'What are the things in your chest?'

Speratus: 'Books and epistles of Paul, a just man.'

The Proconsul: 'Have a delay of thirty days and bethink yourselves.'

Speratus: 'I am a Christian.' And with him all agreed.

The Proconsul read out the decree from the tablet: 'Speratus, Nartallus, Cittinus, Donata, Vestia, Secunda, and the rest who have confessed that they live according to the Christian rite, . . . it is determined shall be put to the sword.'

Speratus: 'We give thanks to God.'

Nartallus: 'Today we are martyrs in Heaven; thanks be to God.' " [50]

Among the Christians martyred under Commodus, mention should be made of the philosopher Apollonius,[51] the senator Julius,[52] and a large number of other confessors of the

[49] The Roman colony of Scillium, in Africa, depended on Carthage.

[50] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, I, 109–111.

[51] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 183.

[52] Allard, *op. cit.*, I, 442; *Acta sanctorum*, August, III, 700.

faith.[53] But the Christians, spreading in increasing numbers through all ranks of society, became numerous at the imperial court. We know, for example, of the aged eunuch Hyacinth, a priest of the Church of Rome. He was the foster-father of that Marcia who was a former slave of a nephew of Marcus Aurelius and entered Commodus' palace as a slave in 183, following the confiscation of her master's property. She at once became the favorite of the Emperor, who raised her to the rank and honors of a real wife, except for the title of empress. "The tradition is that she greatly favored the Christians and rendered them many kindnesses, inasmuch as she could do anything with Commodus." [54]

The author of the *Philosophumena* relates that one day Marcia, "wishing to perform a good work," sent for Pope Victor and asked him for the names of the martyrs who were laboring in the mines of Sardinia. She then obtained letters of pardon, entrusted them to her old friend, the priest Hyacinth, and gave him full powers for carrying out the pardons.

A modification had taken place in the relations of the Empire and the Church. It was not yet, indeed, an official recognition of Christianity, but the summoning of this Pope to the palace to receive a communication touching his Church, and this commission carried by a Christian priest to the procurator of Sardinia, were events that show the social importance acquired by the Church and the notice which the government authorities were taking of her and of her hierarchical organization.

The Early Apologists

During the second half of the second century, the Christians did more than simply die with courage. The mere reading of their judicial examinations shows them exercising a confident

[53] St. Irenaeus, *Haereses,* IV, 33.
[54] Dion Cassius, *Roman History,* LXXIII, 4.

and spirited effort to convert others. Among them, and besides them, were the apologists—theologians, catechists, not only striving to free Christianity from the charges made against it, but also spreading a knowledge of its harmony, beauty, and moral excellence, showing that it was dissociated from the heretical sects that were compromising it by their evil repute, and promoting its beneficent and sanctifying action. This was the work of a group of educated Christians. The most illustrious were Justin Martyr, the philosophers Aristides, Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, and Athenagoras, Irenaeus, the renowned bishop of Lyons, the author of the *Shepherd,* the unknown author of the *Epistle to Diognetus,* and that great polemic whose valiant defense of the faith was known to the second century, but who, in the next century, fell into the snares of error—Tertullian.

These defenders of the Christian faith differed in style, temperament, education, and point of view. But they were all moved by the same inspiration. They felt that the struggle taking place between the pagan and the Christian world was not merely a struggle between two contending powers, but a struggle between two contrary systems of thought, two opposing moral attitudes. It was to justify the Christians' thought and moral attitude, to bring them a victory among their contemporaries, that these men wrote and spoke.

Aristides was an Athenian philosopher. His plan is simple, but bold. The populace insulted the followers of Christ by calling them atheists; the charge made against them by the courts was that of atheism and impiety. Aristides wishes to prove, as against these charges, that the Christians alone have a correct idea of the Divinity and pay it worthy homage. In the matter of religion, he says, men are divided into four clases: the barbarians, the Greeks, the Jews, and the Christians. The barbarians adore the powers of nature, the sun and the winds. The Greeks have deified the powers and passions of man. The

Jews have the worship of higher spirits, angels, but they make the mistake of honoring these more than they do God Himself and of confining themselves too much to wholly external ceremonies. The Christians alone adore God in spirit and in truth by the purity of their faith, but even more by the purity of their lives. The apology of Aristides, like the *Didache,* ends with a charming picture of the life of the early Christians.

Aristides' apology, which appeared in the reign of Antoninus Pius,[55] must have made a deep impression on upright souls.[56] Notwithstanding the gravity of the charges against the false religions, the tone of the work is calm and dignified, respectful toward the philosophers and poets of Greece.

Quite otherwise was the apology which the Assyrian philosopher Tatian published soon after. It has been said that "Tatian inaugurated the school of virulent apologists." [57] Bardenhewer says that Tatian everywhere displays a passionate harshness and partiality. He is unwilling to see any good in Hellenic culture. He repeats, without investigation, all the calumnies that were current against the Greek philosophers. What attraction there was in the warmth of his discourse and the strength of his conviction was offset by the repulsion which the bitterness of his attack aroused.[58] The fiery apologist, precursor of Tertullian, ended, like the latter, by suddenly separating from the Church. About 172 he returned to the East and founded the Gnostic sect of the Encratites, who forbade marriage, as also the use of wine and meat, and who,

[55] Eusebius places this Apology in the time of Hadrian. Until 1889, only an Aramaic fragment of it was known. In that year, Rendel Harris discovered, at the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, a Syriac translation of it, which has led scholars to assign its composition to the period of Antoninus.

[56] The Apology of Aristides has left traces in the ancient Aramaic literature. In a somewhat abridged form, it was contained in the famous *Life of Barlaam and Joasaph.* (See Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 46.)

[57] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 156.

[58] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.,* p. 58.

in celebrating the Eucharist, used water in place of wine—whence the name *Aquarians* which was given to them.

Athenagoras was a Christian philosopher of Athens. He frankly rejected the apologetics of invective and returned to that of simple exposition. He says that "what those need who have a care for truth and their own salvation, is the direct exposition of truth." [59] And he admits that this exposition is able to convert only well-disposed souls.[60] The apologist enters upon a large number of proofs: the innocence of the Christians, the perfection of their doctrines and moral teaching, the dogmatic and moral inferiority of paganism. He holds that every mind can find in itself traces of knowledge that will make it docile to Christian teaching. Athenagoras is familiar with the Greek poets and frequently quotes them. He is far above Aristides and Tatian in the purity and beauty of his language; but he lacks that powerful originality which assembles arguments into a well-ordered whole and gives them vitality.

Theophilus had been a pagan; he was converted in manhood through the reading of the prophets,[61] and became bishop of Antioch. He also contrasts the doctrinal perfection and holiness of Christianity with the ignorance, contradictions, and moral inferiority of paganism. But he particularly insists on the dispositions of soul of his opponents. His method is psychological. He writes: "You say to me: 'Show me your God.' I reply: 'Show me what sort of men you are, and I will show you my God. Show me the eyes of your soul, that they are clear-sighted; show me the ears of your heart, that they are able to hear.' " [62] "No doubt," he says in another place, "the reason you have such a false notion of God, is because you do

[59] Athenagoras, *De resurrectione,* **11.**
[60] *Ibidem,* no. 1.
[61] Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum,* **I, iv.**
[62] *Ibidem,* II, i.

not practice His service." [63] And again: "Formerly I too refused to believe. But now, upon better reflection, I believe. . . . In God is my guarantee. If you too wish this, submit to God also." [64] Theophilus is the first to express by the word Trinity, *Trias,* the personal distinction of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in God.[65]

Toward the end of the second century appeared a sharp but very superficial little work of the Christian philosopher Hermias, the *Irrisio gentilium philosophorum.* We know also the names of three other apologists: Melito, Apollinaris, and Miltiades. Of Melito of Sardis only a few fragments are extant. Of Apollinaris and Miltiades we have nothing. We may well suppose that, like those we have just mentioned, their apologetics consisted of occasional writings, composed hurriedly, as it were in the midst of the strife. With Hermas, St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, and Tertullian, we come to works that are more mature.

The Question of Penance

During the latter part of the second century, four great problems claimed the attention of those who belonged to the Church and of those who regarded her with religious curiosity from without: a moral problem, a philosophical problem, a dogmatic problem, and an apologetic problem. Hermas, St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, and Tertullian successively broached these four problems.

The Church, expanding among the Gentiles, opened her arms wide to the converts from paganism, to converts whose former life was often voluptuous or frivolous. She thus assimilated elements that were less pure than those of her first days. The virtue of the neophytes was not sustained by the

[63] *Ibidem,* I, i.
[64] *Ibidem,* I, xiv.
[65] *Ibidem,* II, xv. Theophilus calls the three persons: God, the Word, and Wisdom.

enthusiasm which marked that early period. Less frequent and less powerful were the mystical graces which at first Providence bestowed upon the Christians so lavishly. Christian communities now counted in their ranks some criminals, murderers, adulterers, and apostates. Could such offenses be blotted out by penance?

Two extreme opinions came to light. By an excusable exaggeration, many of the early Christians had imagined that Baptism and the Eucharist conferred a sort of impeccability. Did not God's gift have the power of communicating an incorruptible life? And was it possible that a rational man, permitted to nourish his soul upon his God, would reach such an excess of ingratitude as gravely to offend Him thereafter? [66] Therefore, when these Christians witnessed the first apostasies, they saw only one possible penalty for the abominable defection: exclusion from the Church, malediction, or at least abandonment of the guilty one to God's justice. These Christians took in strict literalness the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews:

"It is impossible for those who were once illuminated [by baptism], have tasted also the heavenly gift [of the Eucharist], and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost . . . and are fallen away, to be renewed again to penance. . . . For the earth that drinketh in the rain which cometh often upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is tilled, receiveth blessing from God. But that which bringeth forth thorns and briers, is reprobate and very near unto a curse, whose end is to be burnt." [67]

But the harshness of such a solution provoked a radical reaction. Self-styled doctors held that every fault of a Christian should be regarded as indifferent. Did not the disciples of Carpocrates teach that man is saved by faith and charity, and

[66] See *Acta Thomae*, p. 73.
[67] Heb. 6: 4–8.

that the rest does not count?[68] Did not certain Valentinians declare that once anyone has recognized the rights of the Holy Spirit over the spirit, the flesh should be given its rights?[69] These doctrines, slowly trickling into the mass of the faithful, appeared to many to be the true solution.

As usually happens, the clear declarations and the decisive tone of such teaching made converts among the people, ever ready to prefer a shocking doctrine that is asserted with clearness and force to a prudent doctrine which employs shades of difference in its formulation.

Weak but sincere souls that had yielded to sin, or feared they might yield, suffered unspeakable agony. From what he had seen with his own eyes, St. Irenaeus gives us a picture of those "who have their consciences seared as with a hot iron. . . . Some, in a tacit kind of way, despairing of attaining to the life of God, others have apostatized altogether; while others hesitate between the two courses, being neither without nor within."[70]

The Shepherd of Hermas

Between the years 140 and 154, according to the conjectures of the best critics,[71] there appeared at Rome a book that aimed to bring peace to troubled consciences, to refute the two radical doctrines, and to offer a prudent solution to the problem, in conformity with the Gospel spirit of justice and mercy. This book was entitled *Poimen* (*Shepherd*), and was written by a brother of Pope Pius I.[72] Its style was simple, figura-

[68] St. Irenaeus, *Haereses,* I, xxv, 5.

[69] *Ibidem,* I, vi, 3.

[70] *Ibidem,* I, xiii, 7.

[71] Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, cxxx.

[72] It is no longer doubtful that the author of the *Shepherd* is Hermas, a brother of Pius I; but it is questioned whether the same author took up the writing of his book at different times. This hypothesis of successive editions was defended in 1910 by Grosse-Braukmann in his brochure, *De compositione Pastoris Hermae.*

tive, and popular. The author first relates his own history. He was born in slavery, sold by his master to a Roman matron named Rhode, later freed by her, and then married. He acquired a large fortune in business, but at the same time lost both faith and virtue. Chastised by God, and stripped of his riches, he had, he says, the grace to bow beneath the hand of the Lord who struck him. But, while he was plowing on a small farm, at the gates of the city, an angel of God appeared to him in the form of a shepherd. This angel gave him certain counsels of morality which he was to communicate to his brethren.

These counsels are divided into three books: the book of the Visions, the book of the Similitudes, and the book of the Precepts or Commandments.

Hermas is not a controversialist, but an apologist, in the sense that he wishes to defend the Church and make her loved. What he desires is to confound the hypocrites and the wicked and reject them that, being thus purified, "the Church of God shall be one body, one mind, one spirit, one faith, one love." [73] A single inspiration runs through the whole work—to give hope of salvation to the fallen Christian. Its general subject is "the pardon of sins after a sincere repentance." He says: "The Lord bears no malice against those who confess their sins, but is merciful." [74] Every fault is remissible, according to Hermas. Neither murder nor adultery nor apostasy—the three sins that some later on wished to exclude from pardon—is reserved. Yet the author attaches two conditions to the pardon: the penitent, once converted, must afflict his soul, humble and purify himself; [75] the penitent can be converted only once.[76] Hermas seems to say also that this pardon is only an excep-

[73] Hermas, *Similitudes,* IX, xviii, 4.
[74] *Ibidem,* IX, xxiii, 4.
[75] *Ibidem,* IX, xxiii, 5.
[76] *Precepts,* IV, i, 8; iii, 6.

tional grace accorded merely in view of the proximate end of the world.[77] This moral doctrine of the *Shepherd* was received in the middle of the second century as a voice of mercy. Today it seems severe. But, to appreciate it, we must put ourselves in spirit in the times when this work appeared.[78] In a period when martyrdom was threatening every Christian, a popular sermon, as Hermas' book really was, without aiming at too great theological exactness, gave Christians to understand that all were required to possess their soul in readiness for heroism.

Hermas is not theologically precise, either when he speaks of the end of the world, which he supposes to be imminent, or when he discourses on the Trinity, which he seems to grasp but poorly.[79] But he loves and venerates the Church with his whole heart. It is, he says, the first of all creatures; for it the

[77] *Visions,* I and II; cf. III; *Similitudes,* VIII, ix, 4.

[78] A. d'Alès (*"La discipline pénitentielle d'après le Pasteur d'Hermas,"* in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* 1911, pp. 105–139, 240–263) says: "Hermas' work is not an official document, but a private document of very great worth, because it naïvely reflects the preoccupations of the pastors of the Roman Church in the second century, and the expedients of their zeal. . . . We can understand that it was judged inopportune to enumerate, for catechumens, the opportunities they might have for being reconciled to God, should they fall into sin after Baptism. For Christians who have fallen into sin after Baptism, specifically to adulterers and apostates, or idolaters, the *Shepherd* offers, for one time, on condition of penance being performed, divine pardon, and also—as is evidenced throughout the book—reconciliation with the Church. At the same time it took pains to warn them that this favor would not be repeated. For those who fell again after a first reconciliation, we cannot see what the *Shepherd* offered; but doubtless it did not leave them without hope. Whatever the severities of the *Shepherd* for the δίψυχοι, one thing stands out clearly in the book, namely, that whoever is willing to do penance, can again enter into favor with God."

[79] "Hermas never uses the terms Word and Jesus Christ to designate the Savior: He always designates Him by the title of Son of God or Lord. This Lord is made up, during His mortal life, of two elements, a humanity or a flesh and a holy Spirit that dwells therein. Hence the question that comes up is this: Does not Hermas confound with the Holy Ghost the divine element joined to the flesh of Jesus?" (Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* I, 115.) There seems to be only a want of verbal exactness. Lelong, in the preface of his translation of the *Shepherd,* says that, previous to Hermas, the Church showed no mercy towards sinners, and that the change in its attitude was due to Hermas. These wholly gratuitous assertions are successfully

world was made;[80] it is established upon the Son of God as upon a rock, and belongs to Him as to a master.[81] And it is a hierarchical church, with its various chiefs, bishops, priests, deacons, apostles or missioners.[82] Its function is to teach the faithful, to train the elect.[83] This sole Catholic Church, superposed upon the local Churches and including them all, has a supreme head. When the aged woman who stands for the Church appears to Hermas, she hands him a book; and Hermas is directed to bring this book to Clement, the head of the Church of Rome, who will see that it reaches "the cities abroad."[84]

The *Shepherd* of Hermas spread rapidly among the faithful. Its diffusion is attested by St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, by several Latin versions, and by an Ethiopic version. Some churches even included it, with the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians, in the canon of their sacred books.

Apologetic Writings of St. Justin

The moral anguish that distressed the souls of Christians quieted down little by little. But many cultivated minds were anxious about another problem. Nearly all scholarly men of the time of Marcus Aurelius were enamored of philosophy. A few apologists there were who thought they could venture to

refuted by d'Alès in *Études,* 1912, pp. 87 ff.; cf. d'Alès, *"La Discipline pénitentielle au IIe siècle en dehors d'Hermas,"* in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* May-June, 1913, pp. 201 ff.

[80] *Visions,* II, iv, 1. Cf. I, i, 6; III, iii, 3–5.

[81] *Similitudes,* IX, xii, 1, 7 f.

[82] *Visions,* II, ii, 6; II, iv, 3; III, v, 1.

[83] *Ibidem,* III, ix, 7–10.

[84] *Ibidem,* II, iv, 3. Why this mention of Clement of Rome, since Hermas wrote under the pontificate of Pius, his own brother? Some have supposed that Hermas merely reëdited and amplified an earlier work, going back to the pontificate of St. Clement, and several times revised and reëdited. Others think that he wished to give his work an appearance of age. Did not the great Pope Clement of Rome personify the papacy? It has been noted, moreover, that the description of the hierarchy, as given in the *Shepherd,* also refers to an earlier epoch.

present Christianity as a "new philosophy." But what connection was there between this and the old philosophies? In what was it separated from them? What were its constituent elements and its tenets? Could a synthesis of it be presented that would be understood by a follower of the Greek philosophers? Justin the Philosopher made it his duty to undertake the formidable task of replying to these questions.

Hermas probably was a priest. Justin was a layman,[85] but he had delved into the teachings of the Church. He even opened a sort of theological school at Rome. His noble attempt at a synthesis is not without inexactitudes and even errors, but this first essay of religious philosophy exercised an immense influence over the minds of his and of the next century.

The publication of Justin's first apology is generally placed at about the year 150. The second made its appearance a few years later, about 155,[86] and the *Dialogue with Trypho* some few years after that, about 160.[87]

If we separate the philosophic doctrine from what is purely discussion, arguments *ad hominem,* and claims for actual rights, it can be reduced to this: Christianity is the true religion because it is the universal and absolute religion. Although the Word is fully manifested in Christ, yet the ancient world, everywhere and in all ages, possessed the seed of it.[88] The great day of the Incarnation was preceded by a vast and brightening dawn.

As a basis for his contention, Justin takes two sacred sayings. One is from St. Paul: "When the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law, these having not the law are a law to themselves . . . their con-

[85] Bardenhewer, *Les Pères de l'Eglise* (French trans.), I, 147.

[86] Pantigny, *Justin, Apologies, texte et tradition,* Paris, 1904, pp. XII f.

[87] Archambault, *Justin, Dialogue,* Paris, 1909, I, lxxxiv.

[88] This is what St. Justin calls λόγος σπερματικός, σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου. (*Second Apology,* 8.)

science bearing witness to them." [89] The other is from St. John: "[The Word is] the true light, which enlighteneth every man." [90]

He says: "All men are partakers of the Divine Word; its seed is implanted in their soul." [91] "This germinal understanding comes from the Word; by virtue of it the wise men of old were, from time to time, able to teach beautiful truths. . . . For, whatever good the philosophers and lawmakers said, they owed to a partial view or knowledge of the Word. . . . Socrates, for instance, knew Christ in a certain way, because the Word penetrates everything with His influence. . . . Therefore, too, Plato's doctrines are not altogether contrary to those of Christ, although not absolutely like them, as may also be said of the teachings of the Stoics, the poets, and the historians. . . . So we may say that whatever good the ancients had belongs to us, to us Christians. . . . Besides, all who have lived according to the Word are Christians, even though they have been regarded as atheists: such were Socrates and Heraclitus among the Greeks, and, among others, Abraham, Ananias, Azarias, Misael, and Elias, besides many more. . . . As they knew the Word only in part, they did not have that lofty knowledge, free from all blame, which is our portion. Therefore was the Word made man. . . . It is one thing to possess only a seed of the Word; quite another thing is it to possess the Word Himself, who is communicated to us by His grace." [92]

Freppel, after summing up St. Justin's theory of the Word, says: "Such is that enlightening and fruitful doctrine which at the school of Alexandria will presently open those great vis-

[89] Rom. 2: 14 f.

[90] John 1: 9.

[91] *Second Apology*, 8. The summary we here give of St. Justin's doctrine about the Word is taken from Freppel, *Les Apologistes chrétiens du IIe siècle*, p. 327. It is composed of textual quotations from St. Justin.

[92] *First Apology*, 46; *Second Apology*, 8, 16, 13, 14. (Freppel, *loc. cit.*)

tas into which Clement and Origen will rush with daring and not without some danger. It is a whole programme of Christian philosophy, embracing the theory of human knowledge, the intellectual constitution of the ancient world, and its relations with Christianity." [93]

Justin considers humanity as a great unit, with its different parts brought together by Christ, who is the center and the soul of it all.[94] Yet he does not hold that natural reason is sufficient for the possession of saving grace, or that it is absolutely sufficient even when aided by interior grace, to the exclusion of any external revelation. No one more forcibly shows the eminent part of external revelation in the genesis of faith than Justin. He even admits a direct influence of the books of Moses upon the teaching of the Greek philosophers and seems to attribute to revealed faith alone whatever truth Hellenic wisdom possessed. In short, his expressions have not all the exactness we might wish. If some of them may be interpreted in the sense of an unorthodox "subjectivism," others seem, on the contrary, to be inspired by a suspect "extrinsicism." In an admirably majestic attempt Justin wished to include all the objective and subjective elements of a belief to which he clung with loyal submission, without surrendering any of the rights of his philosophic reason. But at times this proved an impossible task for him, or at least, in the exposition of the Catholic faith he did not find those precise expressions which the Church, aided by the Holy Ghost, was to employ later.[95]

Some defects of expression and of thought, still more striking and no less explicable, are to be noted in Justin's writings when he speaks of the Trinity, the angels, and the end of the

[93] Freppel, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

[94] Conformable to the words of Scripture: "Jesus Christ, yesterday and today; and the same forever" (Heb. 13:8); "by Him all things consist" (Coloss. 1:17).

[95] See Freppel, *op. cit.*, pp. 224–227.

world. He clearly teaches the existence of one only God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Neophytes, he says, are baptized in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." [96] "In all the offerings that we make, we bless the Creator of the universe through his Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Ghost." In these words, Justin merely purposes expressing and professing the faith of the Church, and he is quite orthodox. But when he attempts a philosophical explanation, he, like Hermas, expresses himself in terms which the later decisions of the Church would no longer allow to be used. Between the Father and the Son, he seems to admit a certain subordination, hard to understand, in the perfect unity of will and divine essence.[97] He supposes the angels have an airy body; and he says: "Although many true Christians think otherwise . . . I am assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead that will last a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be rebuilt." [98] In other words, he professes Millenarianism as a private opinion.

When Justin speaks as a philosopher, his assertions can be accepted only with reservation.[99] But they should be accepted

[96] *First Apology,* 61; cf. *Dialogue,* 56, 60, 126, 127; *First Apology,* 13.

[97] On Justin's subordinationism, see Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* I, 220 f.

[98] *Dialogue,* 80.

[99] Puech (*Les Apologistes grecs du IIe siècle*) proves that, although St. Justin and the other apologists of that period sought to express Christian doctrine in the philosophical language of their time, they are not thereby philosophers after the manner of the pagans. They are, first of all, Christians, disciples of Jesus, going first to the Gospels in their quest of truth. Puech thus concludes his study: "What they ask us to accept is a revelation interpreted by reason; but it is first a revelation." (*Op. cit.,* p. 307.) The most important work on St. Justin's theology is A. Feder, S.J., *Justins des Martyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus, dem Messias und dem menschgewordenen Sohne Gottes,* Freiburg i. B., 1906. In agreement with Petau, Newman, and Duchesne, Feder says that "he cannot help seeing in Justin's expressions certain traces of moderate subordinationism which, though rejecting Arianism, places restrictions on the perfect equality of nature or implies a dependence of the person." Justin's comparative silence about the nature of the Third Person of the Trinity is to be explained, says Feder, by the purpose of his writings.

with the greatest veneration when he speaks as a witness of the faith of the Church. In this capacity, his testimony on the sacrifice of the Eucharist is one of the most precious bequeathed to us by Christian antiquity.

Until his time, the "Discipline of the Secret," as it was later called, did not permit this holiest of mysteries to be divulged. But Justin, considering it necessary to have the pagans see Christianity with its whole economy of doctrines, ceremonies, and moral practices, could not conceal the fact that the Eucharist was the center of all these. Moreover, the people and even the philosophers had too long believed, or pretended to believe, that the Christians' secret was a cloak for some shameful practices. Justin considered that the time had come to disclose everything.

The following are the two famous passages in which the Christian philosopher for the first time reveals to the whole public the sacred ceremonies of the Eucharistic sacrifice:

"Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss of peace. There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water. And he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being accounted worthy to receive these things at His hands. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen. This word Amen answers in the Hebrew language to γένοιτο [so be it]. And when the president has made the eucharist, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion. And this food is called among us Eucharistia [the Eucharist], of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the

remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread and, when He had given thanks, said, 'This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is My body'; and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, 'This is My blood.' And He gave it to them alone."

This is the apologist's first description of the Mass. But, as though he feared not to have sufficiently described this supreme act of religion, he returns to the subject a few lines further on:

"On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings with all the earnestness of his soul, and the people assent, saying Amen. And there is a distribution of the consecrated Eucharist to each, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well-to-do and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on

which God made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior on the same day rose from the dead." [100]

"In this account," says Freppel, "it is easy to recognize the sacrifice of the Mass in all its essential or integral parts: the offertory, the consecration, and the communion. A single officiant with deacons, the reading of a portion of the Old or New Testament, an exhortation to the people based on the passage read, the offering of bread and wine (with water added) as the matter for use in the sacrifice, thanksgiving offered to God by the presiding officer, and hymns of praise in which the whole assembly joins, a lengthy prayer by the celebrant alone, during which he consecrates the offerings by the Savior's own words, the changing of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, again prayers of thanksgiving interrupted by the people's acclaim, expressing by a word their participation in the act performed by the celebrant, the kiss of peace (a public sign of Christian brotherhood), communion distributed to those present and brought by the deacons to the sick and others who are absent, a collection for the benefit of the poor: this whole picture of the Christian liturgy in the middle of the second century is evidently that of the sacrifice of the Mass as it is celebrated today all over the world. St. Justin's description corresponds point by point with the great central act of Catholic worship. It would be difficult to imagine a more impressive condemnation of Protestantism than this testimony by one of the earliest apologists of the Christian religion." [101] We know that Justin's

[100] *First Apology,* 65, 66, 67.

[101] Freppel, *op. cit.,* p. 304. Various scholarly works supplement the description given by St. Justin. Comparing this description with the few indications to be found in the *Didache* and in the *Epistle of St. Clement,* and with the various archeological and liturgical monuments that have been brought to light, we can reconstruct, in its main lines, the history of the ceremonies of the Mass. The short account taken from the Gospel, which in the Roman rite extends from the words *"Qui pridie"* to the words *"Hoc facite in meam commemorationem," i. e.,* the account of the first con-

courageous plea did not stop the course of the persecution and did not prevent his own martyrdom. But his work was none the less fruitful. Certain calumnies could no longer be repeated against the Christians except by people who were in bad faith. It was thenceforth established that Christian thought could fearlessly enter the domain of philosophy and count for something there.[102]

St. Irenaeus

Pagan philosophy, with its frontal attack upon Christianity, was one of the great dangers of the Church at the close of the second century. The Gnostic sects, employing the outward expressions and the formulas of the Christian spirit, tended to dissolve it; they were a peril no less serious. A new

secration by Christ at the Last Supper, formed what might be called the nucleus of the Mass, nay, of the whole liturgy. The first Christians, as a preparation for the renewal of the Savior's great act, following His example, adopted the ritual which governed the Jewish religious assemblies, consisting of the reading of selected passages of the Bible, the singing of psalms, a sermon, and a closing prayer. They added merely the reading of the Apostolic Epistles and of the Gospels, after these had been written. This was the origin of that part which liturgists call the Mass of the Catechumens. After the dismissal of the catechumens, the real Mass began. The priest first praised God the Father, Creator of all things. This was the origin of the Preface and Sanctus. Next, the recital of the Last Supper recalled the Incarnation of God the Son, and His Passion, followed by His glorious Resurrection. An invocation to the Spirit, the Sanctifier, or *Epiklesis,* concluded the rite of homage to the Holy Trinity. There remained the communion of the faithful; this was preceded by the Lord's Prayer and followed by a prayer of thanksgiving. Thus the whole fabric of the Mass was fixed. It is to be noted, however, that in the primitive Mass, only two parts were unchangeable: the recital of the Last Supper and the Lord's Prayer. Outside these two portions, the priest improvised as his piety suggested. This original freedom very soon was replaced by determined rites. In the East, these rites assumed a fixed type; the West, on the contrary, offered a great variety, manifested by the Milanese, African, Hispano-Gothic (or Mozarabic), Celtic, and Gallican liturgies. But in all this liturgical variety the account of the Last Supper always remained the nucleus. Of all the developments which the liturgy has taken in the course of the ages, if we are to believe the liturgists, there was not one which was not connected with that first account. (Cf. Vigourel, *Cours synthétique de liturgie,* Paris, 1904, and *La Liturgie et la vie chrétienne,* Paris, 1909.)

[102] Rivière, *Saint Justin et les apologistes du II^e siècle,* Paris, 1911.

apologist, St. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, saw the peril and averted it.

The priest who in 177 was chosen to succeed the glorious martyr St. Pothinus in the see of Lyons, was born at Smyrna or in the neighborhood of that city about 130. The relations which he had in his youth with Polycarp, the illustrious bishop of Smyrna, and with the venerable Papias, his extensive literary culture, and his lofty virtue soon made him conspicuous among the clergy of Lyons. While Pothinus was bishop, the clergy of Lyons sent Irenaeus to Rome to Pope Eleutherius as their representative to treat of important matters, commending him as "zealous for the covenant of Christ." [103] We know almost nothing of his episcopal ministry or his death. In one passage St. Jerome gives him the title of "martyr." His death must have taken place during the persecution of Septimius Severus in 202. But his strife against false Gnosticism, the chief object of his zeal, would suffice to make him illustrious and venerable among all the bishops of old Gaul; his treatise *Against Heresies* is an imperishable monument.[104] In this book the entire heretical movement of the second century lives again before our eyes, as does the whole Protestant revolt in Bossuet's *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.*

Gnosticism, in passing from the schools of Basilides, Carpocrates, and Valentinus to those of their first disciples, greatly degenerated. Or rather, these latter logically deduced the fatal consequences inherent in the primitive teaching. The fancies of a whimsical metaphysics brought forth the eccentricities of a capricious morality. Secundus, looking for the

[103] Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, iv, 2.

[104] The real title of the work is, *The Refutation and Overthrow of Knowledge (Gnosis) so-called.* But it is usually cited by the briefer title, *Adversus haereses.* St. Irenaeus' work was written in Greek, but we possess it only in an old Latin translation.

origin of evil, did not stop with Achamoth; he went back to the very womb of the Pleroma. Marcus introduced into his system the speculations of the Cabala. The Ophites, in a complicated doctrine that absorbed all the others in the third century, explained the whole system of the world by the conflict between a mysterious serpent (Ophis) and the Creator (Jaldabaoth), so as to bring man nearer to the good and inaccessible God. The Cainites, exalting strength, even in evil, peopled their Olympus with all the scoundrels who had dishonored mankind, from Cain to Judas. Some Gnostics, it is true, tried to stem the movement that was carrying the new sect toward every revolt and depravity. But no great results came of the efforts made in this direction, whether by Ptolemy, a philosopher of clean and exact mind, or by Theodotus and Alexander, whose souls were really enamored of moral purification and asceticism. One important branch of the Gnostic sect had a tendency "towards the most abominable moral aberrations." [105]

The early Fathers, and St. Irenaeus first of all, compare with the masters of Gnosticism a certain man who had started out from an altogether opposite point of view, but then espoused their theories and even claimed to work out a clearer and more exact system from them. This man was Marcion.

Marcion was born at Sinope on the Black Sea. After making a fortune at sea, he came to Rome about 140 and presented the Roman Church with a large sum of money, two hundred sesterces (about $8,000).[106] Marcion's first idea was to react against that mixture of Christianity and gross Judaism which the founders of Gnosticism professed. "But since the soundness of his judgment did not equal the warmth of his convictions, his zeal carried him beyond the bounds of moderation and truth. Like Luther, whom he strikingly resembles, he

[105] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 141.
[106] *Ibidem*, p. 134.

ended by attacking dogma, on the pretext of wishing to correct an abuse." [107] The antithesis which St. Paul points out between the faith and the Law, between the Old Testament and the New, Marcion considers a radical antagonism. In a book which he published under the title of *Antitheses,* he says that from this opposition it follows that the God of the Gospel, the Father of mercies, must be the enemy of the God of the Jews, author of the creation and of the Law. Thus, by an altogether different route, Marcion arrives at the dualism of the Gnostics. He says that certainly the purpose of Redemption is to rescue man from the evil work of creation; but the good God who became incarnate, unwilling to owe anything to the Creator, possessed only an appearance of humanity. By this second notion Marcion, after cursing the Creator and the Law, finally "evaporates the Gospel history into an absolute Docetism." [108]

These are the doctrines which the Bishop of Lyons unmasks and refutes. We will not attempt to follow this "very exact inquirer into all doctrines," as Tertullian calls him,[109] in his inquiries and arguments. In the words of one of his most discerning interpreters, we will give a brief summary of his great treatise. With pliant but close reasoning Irenaeus shows that the Gnostics are driven to one or other of two final explanations: dualism or pantheism. "He pursued them into these two last intrenchments. You cut God off from the world, he said, or you confuse God with the world; in either case you destroy the true notion of God. If you put creation outside of God, whatever name you give to eternal matter—Void, Chaos, Darkness—is unimportant; you limit the divine Being. This is tantamount to denying Him. There is no use in your saying that the world may have been formed by angels. Either they

[107] Freppel, *Saint Irénée,* p. 287.
[108] *Ibidem,* p. 185.
[109] Tertullian, *Adversus Valentinianos,* 5.

acted against the will of the supreme God, or according to His command. On the first hypothesis, you accuse God of powerlessness; on the second, in spite of yourselves you are brought to the Christian doctrine, which considers the angels as instruments of the divine will. If, on the contrary, you place creation in God, in such a way that it is reduced to a mere development of His substance, you enter upon a path even more inextricable. In this case whatever imperfections and defilements there are in creatures become transferred to God Himself, whose substance becomes theirs. You say that the world is the fruit of ignorance and sin, the result of a failing or a fall of the Pleroma, a progressive degeneration of the Being, or, to use your favorite metaphor, a stain on the tunic of God. But do you not see, in this confusion of the Infinite with the finite, it is the divine nature itself that declines, that degenerates, that is stained with vice or imperfection? Could the notion of God be more seriously altered?" [110]

But the holy Bishop is not satisfied with refuting the error. Desirous of giving his readers the rule of faith by which every particular opinion must be judged, he then sets forth the whole Catholic doctrine in a great synthesis. In so doing, St. Irenaeus is not merely an apologist, he is also a theologian: in fact, he may rightly be called the father of Catholic theology.

The rule of faith laid down by St. Irenaeus is clear and sound. Religious truth is found in the tradition of the Church: this is the sum and substance of his doctrine. The genuineness of the faith of the present is proved by the fact that those who now teach it received it from the Apostles. Its absolute infallibility is guaranteed by the indefectible assistance of the Holy Ghost. We quote some of the holy Bishop's own words. "The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world,

[110] Freppel, *op. cit.*, p. 357. The exactness of Freppel's summary may be verified by reading the *Adversus haereses*, bk. 2, chap. 30.

even to the ends of the earth, has received from the Apostles and their disciples this faith.[111] . . . This is the unchangeable rule we receive at baptism.[112] . . . The only true and life-giving faith, the Church has received from the Apostles and imparted to her sons. For the Lord of all gave to His Apostles the power of the gospel, through whom also we have known the truth, that is, the doctrine of the Son of God; to whom also did the Lord declare: 'He that heareth you, heareth Me.'[113] . . . The Church is the Church of God.[114] . . . Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God."[115] And the center of that Church is at Rome: "the very great, the very ancient and universally known Church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul[116] . . . , Rome, whose pastors are connected with the chief of the Apostles by an uninterrupted series of legitimate pontiffs;[117] for it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church on account of its preëminent authority."[118]

[111] *Haereses,* I, x, 1.

[112] *Ibidem,* I, ix, 4.

[113] *Ibidem,* III, pref.

[114] *Ibidem,* I, vi, 3; xiii, 5.

[115] *Ibidem,* III, i, 1.

[116] *Ibidem,* III, iii, 2.

[117] *Ibidem,* III, iii, 2 f. It is especially from St. Irenaeus that we know the list of the first Roman pontiffs. Probably he took it from Hegesippus. (Cf. Michiels, *Origine de l'épiscopat,* pp. 303–336.)

[118] *"Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam."* (*Haereses,* III. iii, 2.) See an excellent commentary on this text, in Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 207–210. "It would be difficult," says Duchesne (*The Churches Separated from Rome,* p. 80), "to meet with a clearer assertion: (1) of unity of doctrine in the universal Church; (2) of the sole sovereign importance of the Church of Rome, as witness, guardian, and organ of the Apostolic tradition; (3) of her superior preëminence over the whole of Christianity." On the interpretation of this text, and especially of the words that follow, viz.: *"hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio,"* see Morin, *Revue bénédictine,* 1908, pp. 515 ff. Harnack, Duchesne, and Funk refer the words *"in qua,"* not to the Roman Church, but to the other churches. Morin sets forth

After thus establishing the rule of faith of the Catholic Church, St. Irenaeus, in an ample synthesis, gives the essential content of that faith. The great Bishop's whole theology is inspired by these words of St. John: "This is eternal life: that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." [119] Assuredly it is well to insist upon the infinite distance separating us from God; but in exalting His supreme Essence we must be careful that we do not make of Him the supreme Impotence and the supreme Indifference. By what right may we deny to the infinite Being the power of producing, outside of Himself, a world which, while not being He, depends upon Him in its operations and in its substance? We must rather hold to this dogma of creation, which, mysterious though it is, contains the only reasonable solution, because, distinguishing what must be neither separated nor confused, it escapes the two shoals of dualism and pantheism.

But not only did the infinite Being have the power of producing real creatures, He had the power of making Himself known to them, the power of redeeming them from their faults and their wretchedness, the power of raising them even to Himself by a sort of deification. The mediator of all these divine mysteries is Christ. Jesus Christ, the Wisdom of God incarnate, truly God [120] and truly man, is the Revealer of

with great clearness that *"sunt undique,"* in the incidental clause, is a copyist's mistake: these two words take the place of others which designated the heads of the Church (*praesunt, sunt undecim?*). Hence there is no reason why we should not connect *"in qua"* with the Roman Church. Thus understood, the text, renders still more striking homage to the primacy of the Apostolic See.

[119] John 17:3.

[120] In St. Irenaeus there have been noted a few subordinationist expressions, *i.e.,* favoring the theory of the Son's subordination to the Father; *e.g.,* III, vi. 1; V, xviii, 2 f. But, in these passages, St. Irenaeus scarcely does more than repeat expressions of the Gospels and of St. Paul. Yet we must acknowledge that his expressions, like those of Hermas and St. Justin, lack the exactness that is found in the Fathers after the definitions of the Council of Nicaea. Even though St. Irenaeus can be freed from subordinationism, he cannot be freed from the millenarist error, which was doubtless owing to his excessive deference toward the

God,[121] the Redeemer of man[122] fallen in Adam,[123] and the Deificator of him who abandons himself to His grace.[124] These three ideas sum up the Christology of St. Irenaeus. That revelation, redemption, and deification produce their full effects only after this life, in the kingdom of glory, but in this life the Eucharist, where God and man meet and unite in an outpouring of unspeakable love, is the divine seal of the work of revelation, redemption, and deification.

Our exposition of St. Irenaeus' teaching would be incomplete if we failed to mention the large place he gives to the Blessed Virgin Mary in the economy of grace. St. Justin had already mentioned her effective and voluntary participation in the work of the Redemption. St. Irenaeus stresses the part taken by her. As St. Paul contrasted the work of the first Adam with that of the second Adam, Jesus Christ, so the Bishop of Lyons contrasts the first Eve, who brought about the fall, with the second Eve, Mary, who saved mankind. He says: "The knot of Eve's disobedience was loosed by the obedience of Mary. One resisted God's command, the other sub-

authority of Papias. (See Irenaeus, *Haereses,* V, xxviii; cf. Freppel, *op. cit.,* p. 486; Tixeront, *op. cit.,* I, 239.)

[121] *Haereses,* III, v, 3.

[122] *Ibidem,* III, xvi, 9; xviii, 1 f. On St. Irenaeus' explanation of the Redemption, see Rivière, *Histoire du dogme de la Rédemption.* Rivière shows that often St. Irenaeus' expressions have been interpreted in too narrow and literal a sense. "The prominence which he gives to Satan is for him a means of conceiving and expressing the laws of Divine Providence revealed to human reason by the economy of salvation." (Rivière, *"La Doctrine de saint Irénée sur le rôle du démon dans la Rédemption,"* in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne,* 1911, pp. 169 ff.) Moreover, even should we have to consider more literally the question of man's redemption from the hands of the devil, and to admit that, according to St. Irenaeus, the devil has a positive part in the drama of the Redemption, this rôle, from beginning to end, would be that of usurper and impostor. We might say that justice is exercised from God to him, but "as it is exercised by a judge upon a robber whom he unmasks and forces to disgorge." This latter interpretation is offered by Galtier in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* 1911, pp. 1 ff.; 1912, pp. 345 ff.

[123] *Haereses,* V, xxxvi, 2.

[124] *Ibidem,* V, ii.

mitted thereto. Eve heeded the devil's words, Mary gave ear to the voice of the angel. As the human race fell into bondage to death by means of a virgin, so is it rescued by a virgin." [125]

We cannot overemphasize the importance of the part taken by St. Irenaeus in the history of the Church. This first of Catholic theologians is the last pupil of the immediate disciples of the Apostles. He who made the first systematic synthesis of our faith had still in his ears the last echoes of the Apostolic teaching. His work is a golden ring joining the spirit of the Gospel to the teaching of the Fathers.[126]

Tertullian

St. Irenaeus' treatise was a death-blow to the Gnostic heresy. Valentinianism, Marcionism, and Ophism survived the attack only by becoming transformed. Heracleon, Apelles, and, so far as concerns Ophism, an unknown theologian,[127] were the authors of these transformations, which somewhat delayed the final ruin of those sects. But the Church was still facing Judaism and paganism, ever menacing, ever ready to contend with her for souls, ever ready to combine with the remains of Gnosticism so as to give them a new life.

The defenders of Christianity were aware that repelling the enemies' attacks was not enough. A more important task was demanded of apologetics: utterly to destroy the wall of prejudice which the Jew and the pagan had set up against the Catholic Church; to enter upon the enemies' ground; to impress the masses by strong, alert, and animated works; to use the language of Cicero as well as that of Homer; to keep in mind the jurist and the scholar of Latin culture, as

[125] *Ibidem,* III, xxii, 4; V, xix. On this idea of devotion to Mary and the beginnings of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, see Newman, *Catholic Doctrine and Devotion with Respect to the Blessed Virgin,* a letter to Dr. Pusey, 1865.

[126] See Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée* (*"Les Saints"*), p. 184.

[127] De Faye, *"Introduction à l'étude du gnosticisme"* in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions,* 1902, p. 166.

well as the philosopher fed on Plato. In short, the new apologetics must be a conqueror, under pain of remaining ineffective. Tertullian, Minutius Felix, and the Greek author of the *Epistle to Diognetus* were the principal representatives of this school.

Tertullian, the son of a pagan centurion, was born at Carthage about 160. He was carefully educated, made a thorough study of the Greek language and of jurisprudence, and for some years practiced law.[128] Shortly before 197, he was converted to Christianity, and was soon afterwards ordained to the priesthood. He began at once to display an incredible activity against the enemies of the Church.

Tertullian was first of all a polemic. He was possessed of a vigorous mind, a rare scholarship, and perfect mastery of Latin, to which he added new words and phrases. He was quick in repartee and sharp in speech; but his reasoning is more dazzling than reliable, and his arguments are often inspired by passion. In one place he writes: "Unhappily I am always dominated by the fever of impatience." [129] "Like St. Justin, Tertullian experienced the strength and the weakness of many philosophies before settling down in the Christian faith.[130] But, whereas Justin retained some friendly feeling for the systems he had left, Tertullian never finds enough epithets with which to belabor the pagan philosophers, those mountebanks, those despisers of God and man,[131] those patriarchs of heretics,[132] those animals of glory." [133]

A recent historian of Tertullian's philosophy [134] has been able, by utilizing the researches of Nöldechen and Monceaux,

[128] It is doubtful whether we should attribute to him the passages introduced in the Pandects under the name of Tertullian.

[129] Tertullian, *De patientia,* chap. 1.

[130] *Apol.,* 46.

[131] *Ad nationes,* bk. 1, *passim.*

[132] *De anima,* 3.

[133] *Ibidem,* 1. D'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien,* p. 2.

[134] D'Alès, *loc. cit.*

to determine with almost certain assurance the date of the first works of the celebrated African priest. It must have been in 197 that he wrote his *Ad nationes* and his *Apologeticus;* in 197 and 200, his *Testimony of the Soul;* about 200, his treatise *De praescriptione.*[135] The *Ad nationes* is an apology of the Christian religion addressed to the pagan nations; the *Apologeticus* is a plea addressed to the provincial magistrates of the Empire; the *De praescriptione,* his masterpiece, is directed against all heresies. Even in his first works Tertullian makes known his threefold purpose: to confound paganism, to refute Judaism, and to pursue the last remains of the Gnostic heresy.

Amid incomparable beauties, his apologetic contains regrettable gaps and dubious rashness. When he looks for a sincere testimony about man, we see that he too disdainfully rejects that of philosophy;[136] but with vigor and penetration he analyzes the deep aspirations of what he calls the soul of the artless man. "These testimonies of the soul are simple as true, commonplace as simple, universal as commonplace, natural as universal, divine as natural.[137]. . . That which is derived from God is rather obscured than extinguished. It bears testimony to God [its author] in exclamations such as: 'Good God! God knows!' etc. . . . Therefore, when the soul embraces the faith . . . it beholds the light in all its brightness." [138]

But it would be wrong to suppose that in proposing a way to lead souls to the faith, Tertullian despises reason.[139] The very center of his whole argument is the divinity of Christ.

[135] *Ibidem,* p. xiii.

[136] *De testimonio animae,* 1.

[137] *Ibidem,* 5.

[138] *De anima,* 41.

[139] On the assertions to this effect by Guignebert (*Tertullien,* p. 256) and Courdaveaux (*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* 1891, XXIII, 1 ff.); see d'Alès, *op. cit.,* p. 34, and Cabrol in *Science catholique,* 1891.

For this he appeals to three proofs: the testimony of the Old Testament prophecies, of the Gospel miracles, and of the annals of the early Church.[140] In the paradoxical exaltation of his high-minded fervor, he does indeed boast of the abasements in the Gospel and of the scandal of reason, going so far as to write, if not, *"Credo quia absurdum"* (I believe, because it is absurd), which is neither his nor St. Augustine's, at least an equivalent phrase, *"Credibile est quia ineptum; certum est quia impossibile."* [141] He means that the object of faith is that which reason without revelation would not perceive as something fitting or possible. The fiery apologist is so ardently convinced, and feels his conviction so keenly, that he cannot imagine that the truth, so clear to him, does not appear equally clear to others. Yet he writes this sentence, worthy of a real psychologist: "Faith, destined to a great reward, is acquired only at the price of great labor." [142]

The superb peroration of Tertullian's *Apologeticus* will illustrate his animated and captivating eloquence. "Your courts are battlefields where we contest for the truth. Sometimes death ensues. It is our victory over you. Sacrifice, excellent magistrates, sacrifice Christians; the mob will thank you. Torment, torture, condemn, grind; your injustice will reveal our innocence. Therefore does God let you go ahead. When your hand harvests us, we increase; the blood of Christians is a seed.[143] Your philosophers have made less disciples by their writings than Christians have by their example. People come to us out of curiosity; they join us through conviction; then they long to suffer that they may wash away their sins in their blood; for martyrdom wipes out everything. It is a

[140] These three proofs are analyzed in d'Alès, *op. cit.*, pp. 5–33.

[141] *De carne Christi*, 5.

[142] *Apol.*, 21.

[143] The exact wording of this oft-quoted text is: *"Semen est sanguis christianorum."* (*Apol.*, 4.)

strange contrast between things divine and things human: when you condemn us, God absolves us."

In his *Ad nationes,* in the *Testimony of the Soul,* and in the *Apologeticus,* Tertullian has pagans and Jews in mind; his *De praescriptione* is addressed to the heretics.

With marvelous penetration, Tertullian conceives two ways of refuting heresies: an analytical method, resting on a detailed discussion of texts and points of doctrine; a synthetic method, settling the question as a whole by the simple establishing of a fact. He later uses the first method, in defending the idea of God against the dualism of Marcion and the pantheism of Valentinus and the idea of creation against the doctrine of Hermogenes. But first he wishes to show how all heresy, that is, every doctrine resting on individual choice (*hairesis*), on unrestrained inquiry, may be averted by a preliminary question. Tertullian makes appeal to his knowledge of the law. He knows that before the courts there are nice points of non-acceptance, of *exceptions,* as the Roman law calls them, among which the principal one is *prescription,* peremptory exception by which a possessor, under certain conditions, without any other procedure, sets aside any claim of a third party to his property. Tertullian pleads prescription against every heresy, whatever it may be.

He takes his start from a series of undeniable facts, namely, that Christ has entrusted His teaching to His Apostles, that the latter have handed it on to the churches they founded, and that from these Apostolic churches have sprung all the others, like shoots inseparable from their common stock. In other words, the method instituted by Christ for the spread of His teaching is tradition, and the authentic organ of that tradition is the Church, in so far as it is connected with the Apostles by an uninterrupted chain. Hence no one is allowed to appeal to his own personal interpretation against her. Tertullian

says: "Who are you? When and whence did you come? As you are none of mine, what have you to do with that which is mine? Indeed, Marcion, by what right do you hew my wood? By whose permission, Valentinus, are you diverting the streams of my fountain? This is my property. I have long possessed it. I am the heir of the Apostles." [144]

We can scarcely imagine a more overwhelming fervor. This very fervor does at times speak in rough, bitter tones, in which passion has too great a part. In his *De spectaculis*, which appeared about 200, the "severe African" cannot suppress his satisfaction at the thought of the future punishment of the persecutors. "What a spectacle is that fast-approaching advent of our Lord," he says, "now owned by all, now highly exalted, now a triumphant One. . . . What there excites my admiration? Which sight gives me joy? Which arouses me to exultation?—as I see so many illustrious monarchs, whose reception into the heavens was publicly announced, groaning now in the lowest darkness. . . . Governors of provinces, too, who persecuted the Christian name, in fires more fierce than those with which in the days of their pride they raged against the followers of Christ! What world's wise men besides, the very philosophers now covered with shame! Poets also trembling before the judgment-seat of Christ. The tragedians, louder voiced in their own calamity, the play-actors, much more 'dissolute' in the dissolving flame." [145]

Minutius Felix

Christian apologetics strikes a gentler note with the *Octavius* of Minutius Felix and the *Epistle to Diognetus.*

Was Tertullian's *Apologeticus* published before or after the *Octavius?* Critical study has not yet found a definite answer to this question, but it has concluded that the latter work

[144] *De praescriptione*, 37.
[145] *De spectaculis*, 30.

was written in the last years of the second century. It is in the form of a dialogue. Its author, like Tertullian, was a lawyer and perhaps an African. But there is a contrast between the two. Minutius Felix avoids whatever may be offensive to the prejudices of the pagan scholars he is addressing. He lays stress on the depravity of polytheism and clears Christianity of the calumnies heaped upon it. But to establish his arguments he appeals to the wise men of Greece and Rome rather than to the sacred writers. The mysteries of the Christian faith are left in the background. The author's aim is not to bring his reader into the interior of the temple, but to facilitate the approach to it. Even when most sharply criticizing the pagan horrors, his words breathe a contagious mildness. Its artistic composition and elegant style have given this little dialogue the title of "the pearl of Christian apologetics." The best profane writers of the second century—Frontinus, Aulus Gellius, Apuleius—cannot refuse the author of *Octavius* a place in the foremost ranks.[146]

The Letter to Diognetus

The same charm of style and the same gentleness are to be found in another small work, written in Greek, by an unknown author and at a date that can be determined only approximately. Probably it should be put at the close of the second century or, as Zeller and Funk think, in the first years of the third. The work is the *Epistle to Diognetus.*[147]

The author's principal argument consists in describing the supernatural life led by true Christians, then in showing how the Church, the depositary of the treasure of Revelation and

[146] A scholarly and critical edition of *Octavius* is that by Waltzing, Leipsic, 1912.

[147] The manuscript in which the *Letter to Diognetus* was preserved, and which was destroyed in the siege of Strasbourg in 1870, dated only from the thirteenth century. On the date of composition, see Funk, *Patres apostolici,* I, cxiii; cf. Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 68.

dispenser of grace through the Sacraments, is not merely the divinely organized "economy" for the sanctification of a chosen few, but also, either by the radiant influence of its virtues or by the blessings it draws down upon the world, an instrument of salvation for all mankind. With fine depth of thought, the writer says: "To speak simply, what the soul is in the body, Christians are in the world. . . . The flesh detests the soul and makes war upon it, because it is prevented by the soul from indulging freely in pleasure; the world for the same reason detests Christians. . . . The soul is confined in the body, and does itself hold the body in check; the Christians are in the world as in a prison, and they restrain the world." [148]

[148] *Letter to Diognetus,* VI, 1, 5–7.

CHAPTER III

Christian Life at the Beginning of the Third Century

WHILE Christian apologetics was speaking in tones of confidence, the Church was enjoying comparative freedom. The last six years of Emperor Commodus and the first nine years of Septimius Severus were a time of peace. She profited thereby to develop her hierarchical, sacramental, and liturgical institutions, to complete the organization of Church property, to promote the study of theology, and to give a new impulse to her Apostolic expansion. We have now reached the point where we should take a general view of this internal activity of the Church. And then we shall have to resume the story of her struggles against persecution and heresy.

The Hierarchy

Tertullian's works show us the Church as an essentially graded society. The laity are subject to the deacons and priests, and all owe obedience to the bishop.[1] No longer is there any mention of the presbyterial council. The monarchical episcopate is established everywhere. The lists of bishops which the historian Hegesippus gives in the middle of the second century leave no doubt on this point.[2] The bishop's authority comes from the fact that he is the depositary of Apostolic authority, handed down to him through an uninterrupted series of bishops connected with the Apostles.[3] Unlike the Apostles,

[1] *De praescriptione,* 32.

[2] Our knowledge of Hegesippus we owe to Eusebius' quotations in the first books of the *Ecclesiastical History.*

[3] Irenaeus, *Haereses,* III, ii, 2; Tertullian, *De praescr.,* 32.

the bishop has a limited territory, first called a "parish," later a "diocese." The first bishops were chosen and instituted by the Apostles; but at an early date it became the custom to nominate bishops by election. When a see became vacant, the lower clergy of the diocese met and elected one of their number, after obtaining from the people a good testimony in favor of the candidate. Then they presented this candidate to the bishops of the neighborhood, who assembled in the principal city of the vacant diocese to preside at the election and to give canonical institution to the bishop-elect.[4] The documents of the second century and of the early third show us the bishop administering his diocese in complete independence of the lower clergy. Yet in many instances he takes counsel of them and sometimes even asks the advice of the people.[5]

Simple priests and deacons, unlike bishops, are promoted to Orders only upon the good testimony of the people. They can exercise no function without the approval of the bishop who ordained them;[6] in case of serious fault, they can be deposed by the bishop.[7] They are his helpers in the work of instructing the faithful and in the administration of the Sacraments. At the meetings of the Christian community they take their places around the bishop, as it were his crown. While the episcopal see is vacant, they assume charge of the administration of the diocese and render an account of their administration to the new bishop.[8]

The duties of deacons are: to preach, baptize, and under the bishop's control to administer the property of the Church, to serve the bishop at the altar, to announce the meetings of

[4] Tertullian, *Apol.*, 39; St. Cyprian, *Letters*, 38 f., 67 (*alias* 78); Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xliii.

[5] St. Cyprian, *Letters*, 14, 34, 39.

[6] Tertullian, *De baptismo*, 17; St. Ignatius, *Smyrnaeans*, 8.

[7] Tertullian, *De baptismo*, 18.

[8] St. Cyprian, *Letters*, 30–36.

the faithful, to maintain order, to receive the offerings of the faithful and to divide them among the poor.[9]

Virginity, so earnestly recommended by St. Paul and exemplified by the Savior, His blessed Mother, and the Apostle St. John, is the ideal which the faithful, and especially the clergy, endeavor to approach. But as yet it is not made obligatory upon the clergy by any positive rule. The imperial laws forbidding celibacy placed too great an obstacle in the way of recruiting the clergy if celibacy were made a strict obligation. The only requirement is that, following the precept of the Apostle,[10] the candidate for the clerical state be not twice married.[11]

Baptism

Initiation into the Christian life was by Baptism, preceded by the catechumenate, and immediately followed by Confirmation and participation in the Holy Eucharist. When a pagan, disillusioned from the mysteries of his religion or touched by the courage of the martyrs or by the example of Christian virtues, comes to the bishop to ask for a share in the Christian mysteries, the bishop first makes him undergo a probation, vaguely mentioned by Hermas [12] and St. Justin,[13] clearly organized in the time of Tertullian,[14] and called the catechumenate. For several days the postulant remains at the entrance

[9] St. Justin, *Apology,* I, 65; St. Ignatius, *Trallians, 2.*

[10] 1 Cor. 4:12; 9:7 ff.; Acts 20:34.

[11] Sabatier takes up a theory already maintained by Renan and Ritschl, and holds that the Catholic Church was hierarchically constituted and became a Church of authority only by reaction against the Gnostic movement. (*Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit,* pp. 32 ff., and *passim.*) The whole history of the first two centuries, as we have just recounted it, protests against such an assertion. A direct refutation may be found in Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* pp. 143–163, 210–217.

[12] Hermas, *Visions,* III, vii, 3.

[13] *First Apology,* 61.

[14] *De praescr.,* 41. Tertullian's *De poenitentia* was addressed to catechumens.

to the Christian meeting during the celebration of the mysteries, for, right after the first prayers, the deacons exclude the catechumens. But the Church gives him instruction apart.[15] She then requires that he "renounce the devil and his pomp and his angels," [16] that he prepare for the solemn initiation by prayer, fasting, vigils, and confession of his sins.[17] Such at least was the rule at Carthage, as described by Tertullian. He says that the Church is thus exacting with the candidate for Baptism in order to be assured that he will not fall back into sin once he is baptized.[18] The Church should be composed only of saints.

Then comes the day of Baptism, "illumination," "reconciliation," "palingenesis" (new birth) as it is called.[19] Regularly the candidate is dipped three times in the water, in memory of Christ's burial; his threefold coming out of the water symbolizes the mystery of the Resurrection. At each immersion the name of one of the three divine persons is pronounced.[20] In case of necessity, however, especially in case of sickness, Baptism was conferred by sprinkling or pouring. Some paintings of the third century depict ceremonies which may go back to the end of the second century, showing the candidate standing in the baptistry, with the water reaching to his knees, and being sprinkled on the head.[21]

The days especially reserved for the initiation of the catechumens are the Saturday before Easter and the Saturday before Pentecost, but Tertullian declares that, strictly speaking, Baptism may be conferred on any Sunday or even on any ordinary day.[22]

[15] *Idem, De baptismo,* 1.
[16] *Idem, De corona militis,* 3.
[17] *Idem, De baptismo,* 20.
[18] *Idem, De poenitentia,* 6; *De baptismo,* 20.
[19] Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus,* I, 6.
[20] On the triple immersion, see Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean,* 26.
[21] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* II, 334.
[22] Tertullian, *De baptismo,* 19.

When the baptismal ceremony is over, the new Christian is clothed in a white garment and introduced into the assembly of the faithful. The bishop, seated, presides at the meeting. The priests, at the bishop's side, and the deacons, whose duty it is to maintain order, are the only ones occupying places of honor. The rich are shoulder to shoulder with the poor, the freemen with the slaves. The newly initiated comes up to the bishop. The head of the Church, by the imposition of hands and anointing with holy chrism, confers on him the Sacrament of Confirmation, which makes him a perfect Christian and is looked upon as the complement of Baptism.[23]

At length the newly baptized is admitted to participation in the Eucharistic sacrifice. We have already given St. Justin's description of the principal ceremonies of this rite. Passages from Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and the canons of Hippolytus [24] enable us to complete the picture. From the middle of the second century the "breaking of bread" is finally separated from the fraternal meal which accompanied it. The sacred function henceforth appears in all the purity of its rite, free from the abuses that so greatly afflicted St. Paul. We can easily imagine the neophyte's feeling when for the first time he was present at the mystery so long awaited.

A movement among the deacons and inferior ministers is a sign that the sacrifice is about to begin. Some go among the assembled faithful to see that each one stays in his proper place and to direct the liturgical acts; the others place on the

[23] On Confirmation, see St. Irenaeus, *Haereses,* IV, xxxviii, 2; Tertullian, *De baptismo,* 7 f.; St. Cyprian, *Letters,* 73. The Sacrament of Confirmation is sometimes called *consignatio.* This word is used in the *Gelasian Sacramentary.*

[24] The authority of Tertullian and St. Cyprian is well known. As to the Canons of Hippolytus, Batiffol says, "we possess no more complete and explicit description of the institutions of the early Church: it is a document of the highest rank." (*Anciennes littératures chrétiennes,* p. 158.) Save for a few easily recognized retouchings, the Canons of Hippolytus agree admirably with whatever we know about the liturgy in use at the beginning of the third century. (*Ibid.*)

altar the bread and the chalices prepared for the sacred repast.

"The Lord be with you all," says the bishop. "And with thy spirit," they respond. "Raise up your hearts," the bishop then says. To which they answer: "They are with the Lord." He continues: "It is fitting and just."

After several prayers, the chief of which is an invocation to the thrice holy God, the bishop, amid profound silence, slowly pronounces over the bread and wine the mysterious words first uttered by the Savior the night before He died. The mystery is consummated. Christ is on the altar, in the midst of His faithful, under the mystical veils of the consecrated elements. Again the prayer begins, more earnestly, addressed to the God here present, though invisible. Of a sudden a deacon's voice cries out: *"Sancta sanctis"* (holy things are for the holy). "Amen," the people respond. The bishop receives communion, then the priests and deacons, and lastly all those present. The bishop lays the consecrated bread in the communicant's right hand, which is open and held up by the left hand. The deacon holds the chalice, from which each one drinks directly. At each communion, the bishop says: "The body of Christ," and the deacon: "The blood of Christ." Each communicant responds "Amen."

When the communion is over, the deacon gives the signal for prayer. All pray, sometimes kneeling or even prostrate, in sign of humiliation and penance, sometimes standing up, with arms extended and the hands open like Jesus on the cross, to testify that they are ready to endure every suffering. Says Tertullian: "Thither [toward Heaven] we lift our eyes, with hands outstretched, because free from sin; with head uncovered, for we have nothing whereof to be ashamed. . . . With our hands thus stretched out and up to God, rend us with your iron claws, hang us up on crosses, wrap us in flames, take our heads from us with the sword, let loose the wild

beasts on us—the very attitude of a Christian praying is one of preparation for all punishment." [25]

The Sacrament of Penance

Such words well express the feelings that must have animated the neophyte when, on the day of his initiation, he received the threefold Sacrament. Is it possible now that this man, first prepared by so much fasting and prayer and then favored with so many graces, should ever offend the Lord?

We know that, in the time of Hermas, many Christians answered in the negative. Their faults are hardly subdued when they revive. But experience continues unfortunately to show the possibility of sinning even after Baptism. Precisely with these falls in view the Savior established another Sacrament, a "second penitence," a "laborious Baptism," as it is sometimes called—Penance. He instituted it the day He gave His Apostles and their successors the power "to remit and to retain sins." At the beginning of the third century the Sacrament of Penance appears as an institution everywhere, but differently organized in different churches.

The *Canons of Hippolytus* place on the lips of a bishop consecrating another bishop these significant words: "Grant him, O Lord, the office of bishop, the spirit of clemency and the power of remitting sins." [26] On the other hand, Tertullian explicitly teaches that the remission of sins is made by means of confession. He says: "This act, which is more usually expressed and commonly spoken of under a Greek name, is ἐξομολόγησις (exomologesis). . . . Of confession repentance is born; by repentance God is appeased." [27] This pardon of sins,

[25] Tertullian, *Apol.*, 30. For more details, see Cabrol, *Le Livre de la prière antique*, chap. 8: "A Mass at Rome at the beginning of the third century," pp. 90–118.

[26] Canon 17.

[27] *De poenitentia*, 9.

moreover, is applicable to all faults without exception. "To all sins committed, whether by flesh or spirit, whether by deed or will, the same God who has destined penalty by means of judgment, has withal engaged to grant pardon by means of repentance, saying to the people, 'Repent thee, and I will save thee.' " [28]

If now we seek to know what were the rules followed in the practice of confession and of the works of satisfaction that accompany it, we find ourselves in the presence of divergent practices. Certain churches show themselves extremely severe with regard to the great sins, particularly murder, adultery, and idolatry. Whoever has committed, even once, any of these three crimes, is forever excluded from the Christian community. Are we to infer from this that the churches considered these three sins irremissible? Not at all. Their decision is purely canonical and external. The sinner, though he may no longer hope for a return into the Christian communion, can hope for the remission of his sin. The Church merely refuses to make an outward declaration of this pardon.[29]

Was confession public or sceret? From a text of Sozomen [30] it would seem that primitively the confession was public, at least in certain churches. If so, this practice was soon suppressed. What is certain is that the confession enjoined at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian, was a secret confession.[31]

Ordinarily the work of satisfaction or the penance must

[28] *Ibidem,* 4. Such is the declaration of Tertullian as a Catholic. After he went over to Montanism, he declared certain sins unforgivable.

[29] This is what Batiffol seems to prove in his *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive,* first series, pp. 73 ff.

[30] Sozomen, *H. E.,* VII, 16.

[31] St. Cyprian, *De lapsis,* 28; Tertullian, *De baptismo,* 20. On this text, see d'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien,* p. 332, note; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata,* and *The Rich Man's Salvation, passim.*

precede the absolution. Often this satisfaction is nothing more than the public confession; at other times it consists of fasts, alms, and prayers. Let us not find fault with the harshness of this discipline: it was what rescued our forefathers from the temptations of a sensual and bloodthirsty paganism, firmly established them in their faith in Christ, and made heroes and martyrs of them.[32]

The Liturgy

It is also true that feasts and liturgical prayers of indescribable loveliness gently attached souls to the Church, sus-

[32] Renan and, since him, a certain number of Rationalist scholars claim to have found the origin of our Sacraments in the Oriental mysteries, particularly those of the Gnostics, We have had occasion to call attention to the Gospel origins of the Eucharist, of Penance, and of Baptism. The resemblances to be noted between the Christian mysteries and the mysteries of Oriental religions "are due to the fact that they appertain to the essence of all religion, or that they are purely formal and belong to the profane culture of the common environment in which the members of the particular religions are recruited." (Allo, *L'Évangile en face du syncrétisme païen,* p. 68.) "A very little historic sense will suffice to make clear to us that the first churches, being composed of converts from the Synagogue, would tend to model themselves on that pattern; and that the missionary apostles, who had lived for a longer or shorter time in the Christian communities at Jerusalem or Antioch, brought with them customs and traditions already well defined. They had no reason to turn to pagan institutions for a type of organization which they already possessed. And, moreover, the profound horror they felt for paganism told against any imitation of that kind." (Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 37.) We can admit as true that, "when the Church did at length triumph over external obstacles and could come forth into the light of day, she revealed what she was able, by her power of assimilation, to develop without harm to her doctrinal purity. . . . As early as the third century St. Gregory Thaumaturgus understood that many religious habits of the new converts were suited to the promotion of real piety. . . . The anniversary of Christ's birth was celebrated on the day of the *Natalis Invicti*—a fact that is admirably symbolic." (Allo, *op. cit.,* pp. 148 ff.) In the famous inscription of Abercius, a Phrygian bishop of the second century, the symbolism is so like that of Oriental religions that some scholars have denied its Christian origin. See Leclercq, art. *"Abercius,"* in the *Dict. d'archéol, chrét.* The origin of Christian worship, the nature of its development, its indebtedness to the Jewish and pagan religions, and the significance of this latter, are treated by Cabrol, art. *"Culte chrétien,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.* The article contains a very complete bibliography of the subject. See also Brunsmann-Preuss, *Handbook of Fundamental Theology,* Vol. II, St. Louis, 1929, pp. 601–696.

tained in them, along with fear, which is the basis of wisdom, that love which is the height of perfection. The center of all these feasts is the Holy Eucharist.

We have already seen how the liturgy of the Mass was born of the simple account of the Last Supper. The ceremonies of the Mass became in turn the inspiration of all the prayers forming the religious setting of each day, week, and year.

The Divine Master had said: "We ought always to pray, and not to faint." The ideal of the Christian life is a perpetual communion with God by prayer. But the nature and tone of these prayers vary with different hours, circumstances, and commemorations.

Thus it is that each day certain hours are assigned to prayer. In the Acts of the Apostles we see that the Apostles and their disciples met for prayer, preferably at the third hour, or the sixth, or the ninth, that is, at nine o'clock in the morning, at midday, or at three o'clock in the afternoon (terce, sext, and none). Later we shall note that terce is the hour when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles; sext, the hour of our Lord's crucifixion; none, the hour of His death. Morning and evening are also times naturally indicated for prayer in the practice of all peoples. The Christian day is thus constituted. The canonical office is simply its development and more exact ordering.[33]

In the Christian week a place is set apart for the Sunday. How was the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath brought about? Very naturally and simply, it seems. "The Christian meeting takes place at first on the Sabbath evening, as in the synagogue. There is prayer and preaching. Then comes the 'breaking of bread.' The ceremony ends at dawn on Sunday." [34] But this "breaking of bread," the essential act, is performed on Sunday, the day of the Savior's Resurrection,

[33] Cabrol, *Le Livre de la prière antique*, pp. 204–234.
[34] *Ibidem*, p. 231.

the Lord's Day. Thenceforth this day becomes a day of special prayer, and, consequently, the day of rest, substituted for the Sabbath. The old Sabbath practice survived a little while longer. Traces of its persistence are found in certain monastic ceremonies mentioned by Cassian and in the celebrated *Peregrinatio Silviae*. Finally Sunday is universally accepted as the great feast-day of the week.

Wednesday and Friday, on the contrary, are days of penance. We find mention of this fact in the earliest books, such as the *Didache* [35] and the *Shepherd* of Hermas.[36] Friday is the day of the Lord's death and Wednesday that of His betrayal. Ultimately Saturday is considered also as a day of grief and mourning. Such is the origin of the liturgical week. The institution of the Ember days preserves some remains of it.[37]

At the same time as the liturgical day and week, the liturgical year develops. The first feast to appear is Easter. "By this name, in the beginning, we understand not only the feast of the Savior's Resurrection, but the commemoration of His Passion and death. These three feasts are at first as it were a single feast. They spoke of the Easter of the Passion, the Easter of the crucifixion, and the Easter of the Resurrection." [38] The remembrance of the divine sacrifice, which inspired the Christian day, created the Sunday, and sanctified the week, also created the Easter solemnity, the nucleus of the whole liturgical year.

Easter brought in its train the feast of Pentecost, which is the fiftieth day after the Resurrection. These two feasts are mentioned by the earliest ecclesiastical writers. But such a solemnity calls for a preparation by prayer and fasting.

[35] *Didache*, VIII, 1.
[36] *Similitudes*, V, 1.
[37] Cabrol, *op. cit.*, pp. 230–234.
[38] *Ibidem*, p. 235.

Hence the season of Lent, which, after some fluctuations, becomes established as a period of forty days before Easter. The thought of the Savior's sufferings and death is inseparable from the thought of His Incarnation, which gave Him a nature capable of suffering and dying. The remembrance of His birth into the glorious life also recalls the remembrance of His birth into the earthly life. Thus the feast of Christmas is established.

"Christmas and Easter then become the two poles of the liturgical year. Christmas, like Easter, has its preparation; Advent. The rest of the year is drawn into the orbit of these two feasts." [39] All other feasts and Sundays of the year are related either to the Christmas or the Easter cycle. Henceforth every Christian, by simply joining in the liturgical prayers of the Christian community, can "follow the ways" of Jesus, "be united to His virtues and commune in His mysteries," that is, realize the whole of religion, and "that admirable cycle of the Church, which heretofore was, and always ought to be, the joy of the people, the source of light to the learned, and the book of the humblest of the faithful." [40]

The Church of the second century did not celebrate any other feasts universally. But each individual Church piously and festively celebrated the anniversary of the death of its more illustrious martyrs. In 155 the Christians of Smyrna, in their letter relating the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, announce their plan to celebrate the feast of the martyr by a meeting at the very place where his body rests. Toward the end of the century, Tertullian mentions the custom of commemorating the dead by the Eucharistic oblation. These feasts do not become universal in the Church until later.[41]

[39] *Ibidem,* p. 238. In this exposition of the liturgy, we have made extensive use of Dom Cabrol's ideas, and at times even of his words.

[40] Guéranger, *Liturgical Year,* Advent, p. 13.

[41] For a further development of this topic, see Cabrol, *op. cit.,* pp. 290–301, and Delehaye, *Les Origines du culte des martyrs.*

The Easter Controversy

The liturgical work, slowly elaborated in the second century, was to become, by its development, one of the most solid foundations and most conspicuous signs of the unity of the Church. It may be in the design of Providence that the greatest blessings are to be won at the price of the greatest trials. About the end of the second century, the fixing of the date of Easter, the center of the whole liturgy, occasioned one of the most painful conflicts that have afflicted the Church.

By common accord, all the churches of the East and West had acclaimed the feast of Easter as the great solemnity of the Christian year. But they differed as to the date of its celebration, and the settling of that date did not proceed without difficulty. It was generally agreed that the Savior ate the Pasch on the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan, corresponding to the fourteenth day of the March moon. The Christians of Asia stuck to that date, and on that day merely substituted the Eucharistic supper for the Jewish ritualistic repast. Moreover, they celebrated their feast of Easter on whatever day of the week fell on that date. Thus, they said, it was that the Apostles John and Philip and, since them, all the Churches of Asia, had celebrated the great feast. The Christians of the West made a different calculation. In their opinion the purpose of the great Christian feast was the commemoration of Christ's Resurrection. But Christ rose from the dead on Sunday. Was it not precisely to celebrate this mystery that the Sunday of every week became a holyday? To them it seemed that the annual commemorative feast should be celebrated only on a Sunday. They fixed upon the Sunday following the 14th Nisan. Their feast did not always correspond with the date on which Christ came forth from the tomb, but at least it corresponded with the day of the week when that mystery was accomplished. The Sunday kept its solemnity,

and thereby the separation of Christianity from Judaism was accentuated. The Westerners appealed to the tradition of SS. Peter and Paul as against the tradition of SS. John and Philip. They blamed the Easterners—the "Quartodecimans," as they were called—for seeming to follow the Old Law, for giving their feast a Jewish color. At the bottom of this simple question of a date lay the old opposition between the Judaizing spirit and the Catholic spirit.

While Anicetus was pope, Polycarp, the venerable bishop of Smyrna, had vainly tried to have the Quartodeciman practice accepted in the whole Church. The Roman pontiff, in turn, was unable to induce the aged bishop to adopt the Roman practice. These two representatives of the Church conferred together on the question, but without result. Yet concord was not at all broken. The diversity of practice caused merely an uneasiness in the Church. One community would be in Lenten mourning while another would be chanting the alleluia of the Resurrection. The contrast was the more offensive when there might be seen in the same city, namely, at Rome, Asiatics remaining faithful to their customs and celebrating Easter in the midst of the Christians, on the same day as the Jews. Under Pope Soter the relations between Westerners and Easterners were particularly strained. Some disturbances, about which we are not clearly informed, took place over this matter at Laodicea in Phrygia. Men gave way to passion. About 191 Pope Victor decided to intervene. He requested the Bishop of Ephesus, Polycrates, to assemble the bishops of Asia at Ephesus and urge them to conform to the Roman practice. Polycrates did assemble the bishops, but, in their name as in his own, he replied to the Pope that neither he nor his brother bishops could abandon an Apostolic tradition.[42] Was not the Apostolic tradition the supreme rule, the final

[42] On the councils concerning the feast of Easter, see Hefele, *Councils*, 1, 80 ff.

"canon of the faith"? Those on the other side appealed to an identical motive.

The conflict between the two Apostolic traditions would have remained unsettled, or would have issued in schism, had not one supreme authority, interpretative of the tradition, been universally recognized. Pope Victor, the titulary of that supreme authority, judged the moment had come to exercise it toward the whole Church. By virtue of the power that he held from Jesus Christ through the Apostle Peter, Pope Victor gave orders to all the bishops of Christendom to celebrate the feast of Easter on Sunday. From all points of the Christian world, from Jerusalem as from Alexandria, from the churches of Pontus as from those of Gaul, assurance of adherence came to the Roman pontiff.[43] Only the province of Asia continued to resist. Victor considered he might now go to the very limit of his powers. He wrote to all the churches that the insubordinate brethren without exception would be separated from the Catholic communion.

Not a voice was raised in the Church to claim that the Bishop of Rome was exceeding his rights, was arrogating a new power; but a venerable voice was heard, respectful and peacemaking. It was that of the aged Bishop of Lyons. Irenaeus, providentially brought to the West, had unhesitatingly accepted the Western custom for his church, but he was pained to see the old churches of Asia, where he had passed his youth, and the grand Church of Ephesus, whose traditions he used to invoke against the heretics, on the point of being separated from the body of the universal Church. He wrote to the Bishop of Rome a letter which is partly preserved by Eusebius. In substance, Irenaeus reminds Pope Victor that failure to observe Easter on Sunday did not seem to him to be one of those matters for which anyone should be

[43] Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, xxv.

expelled from the Church, and recalled the conference between the holy bishop Polycarp, disciple of St. John, with Victor's predecessor, Anicetus. "They communicated with each other," he says, "and they parted from each other in peace, for the peace of the whole Church was kept both by those who observed and by those who did not." [44]

As St. Peter gave in to the just remonstrance of St. Paul, so the Roman Pontiff gave in to the advice of "Irenaeus, writing in the name of the Christians whose leader he was in Gaul." [45] The excommunication of the churches of Asia had no further consequences. And Eusebius says that thus Irenaeus justified his name, which means "peace," for he brought peace to the dispute.[46] Little by little the Churches of Asia adopted the Roman usage, which the Council of Nicaea had only to consecrate.

Church Property

As the authority of the Church grew strong in all grades of the hierarchy, she increased her works of charity, teaching, and apostolate.

From the beginning, the Church had her treasury of charity. Firstfruits, tithes, and free-will offerings of the faithful had been its first sources.

The *Didache,*[47] the *Didascalia,*[48] the *Apostolic Constitutions,*[49] and the *Canons of Hippolytus* [50] mention the custom

[44] *Ibidem,* V, xxiv, 17.

[45] *Ibid.,* no. 11.

[46] *Ibid.,* no. 18. St. Irenaeus, in his letter, does not deny to St. Victor the universal Church's right of excommunication. Duchesne, after relating these facts, says: "What terms are we to make use of if we are forbidden to apply the title of 'Head of the Church' to one who is the depositary of such plenary authority?" (*The Churches Separated from Rome,* p. 96.)

[47] *Didache,* XIII, 3–7; Funk, *Patres apostolici.* I, 32.

[48] *Didascalia,* 8, 9.

[49] *Apostolic Constitutions,* II, 25, 34, 35.

[50] Canons 186–194; in Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 524.

of bringing the firstfruits of the harvest to the church and placing them in the hands of the bishop. The *Leonine Sacramentary* gives us the form of blessing then pronounced by the bishop over the offerings.[51] The *Didascalia*[52] and the *Apostolic Constitutions* speak also of the tithe. This contribution, which later was made obligatory, was regarded as a voluntary offering and was not general in the third century. The free-will gifts of the rich into the hands of the bishop, for him to use in the service of the poor, seem, on the contrary, to have been very abundant at the beginning of the third century. Tertullian speaks of this when he says: "The family possessions, which generally destroy brotherhood among you, create fraternal bonds among us. One in mind and soul, we do not hesitate to share our earthly goods with one another. All things are common among us but our wives. We give up our community where it is practiced alone by others."[53] St. Cyprian tells us that the churches had boxes for the people's offerings.[54] Yet the Church seems to have possessed no landed property during the first two centuries. It is only at the beginning of the third century, or at the earliest towards the end of the second, that we can say the Church began to own landed property.

Throughout the Empire at that period there was a great development of burial associations. In the late years of the second century,[55] Septimius Severus by rescript permitted, under certain conditions, the formation of societies that could possess cemeteries. There is reason to think that this rescript, probably issued in reply to some governor alarmed by the number of unauthorized associations, sanctioned rather than

[51] Cited in Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
[52] *Didascalia*, 9.
[53] Tertullian, *Apology*, 39.
[54] *De opere et eleemosyna.*
[55] De Rossi, *Bullett. di archeol. crist.*, 1866; p. 11.

created this general movement.[56] The Christians cherished a great veneration for the dead. In the burial of their deceased brethren they used aromatics such as the pagans offered to their gods. "The Christians' only luxury," says Tertullian, "is in death." [57] The Church at once took advantage of the facilities offered by the Emperor's rescript.[58] Some cemeteries became the property of burial associations made up entirely of Christians.[59] It is even likely that the Christians took their already founded institutions for the support of the clergy or assistance of the poor and incorporated them as mutual benefit societies.[60]

The *Philosophumena,* published about 230, says that the administration of the cemeteries belonged to the bishop.[61] Thomassin proves in a general way that the bishop at that time had supreme authority in the administration of Church property and revenue, which were possessed by communities. In the performance of this onerous duty he was assisted by the priests and deacons of his church. These latter gave an accounting to the bishop, but the bishop had to give an accounting only to God.[62]

The property and income of the church formed a common aggregate administered by the bishop, who was alone at the

[56] Allard, *Histoire des pers.,* II, 10.

[57] *Apol.,* 42.

[58] Until then the Christians had been buried in private properties, as also they had held their meetings in private houses.

[59] We do not say "the property of the Church." Before Constantine the Church never had a legal existence at Rome, even as a group of small burial associations. And the law did not allow anyone to belong to more than one association. (Justinian, *Digest,* XLVII, xxii, 1.) But the State, even while ignoring the Church, could recognize private associations having a specifically determined purpose.

[60] The words of Tertullian (*Apol.,* 39), *"Coimus ad Deum . . . arcae genus est . . . modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die . . . apponit,"* may be compared with the following texts of Gaius (*Digest,* III, iv, 1): *"Permissum est habere arcam communem,"* and of Marcian (*Digest,* XLVII, xxii, 1): *"Permittitur stipem menstruam conferre . . . Semel in mense coeant."*

[61] *Philosophumena,* bk. IX, chap. 12.

[62] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* Part 3, II, 5.

head of that administration. And the bishop must use these possessions, in the name of the community, for holy purposes that correspond to three needs. He must maintain our Lord in His own person, present in the midst of His people, by public worship; in the person of His ministers, according to these words, "He that receiveth you, receiveth Me"; and in the person of the poor, according to these other words, "As long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me."

During the first two centuries, public worship was extremely simple. The ministers lived from the common funds, as did the poor.[63] Many had given up their patrimony to live solely by the altar. Those who did not make this renunciation were by that very fact considered to have renounced their share in the ecclesiastical distributions; and well-to-do clerics were charged with the support of the poor. Others, following St. Paul's example, supported themselves by the labor of their hands. In a word, the ecclesiastical patrimony was merged with that of the poor.

This religious regard for poverty is very impressive in the first centuries of the Church. The *Shepherd* of Hermas says that, as the young elm, which appears barren, shares in the fruitfulness of the vine, so the poor man bears the fruit of prayer that belongs to him and to the rich who support him; their good works are their common patrimony before God.[64]

It could not occur to the mind of any Christian to deny the right of private property. In many passages of Scripture, especially in the Decalogue, stealing is regarded as a sin. But what a contrast between the concept which Christians then had about the riches of this world, and the pagan idea! "In every city the rich and the poor were two enemies living by the side of each other, the one coveting wealth, and the other seeing their

[63] *Didache*, 13; Funk, *Patres apostolici*, I, 30–32.
[64] *Similitudes*, 2.

wealth coveted. No relation, no service, no labor united them. The poor could acquire wealth only by despoiling the rich. The rich could defend their property only by extreme skill or by force. They regarded each other with the eyes of hate." [65]

The Poor

Widows, orphans, the aged, the infirm—all these were the privileged objects of Christian charity. Tertullian tells us how the rich woman, with the hours of her day marked out, goes from door to door in lodgings of the poor, bringing comfort to her suffering brethren.[66]

For the Christian of that time, as for the inspired authors of the Psalms, by the poor is meant anyone who is weak and liable to be oppressed: the stranger, the slave, women, children. In the eyes of the pagans, a foreigner is an enemy, a barbarian; but the Christian recognizes a bond other than citizenship. As we read in the *Epistle to Diognetus,* "every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is a foreign country. . . . They have their citizenship in heaven." [67] This feeling was shown especially in the way the followers of Christ exercised hospitality. "A stranger arrives in the evening at the house of a Christian family. He is poor and unknown. From beneath his cloak he takes out an old papyrus marked with the seal of another poor man, whom the Christains call the bishop of such or such a city. Sometimes the stranger brings nothing, for letters and seals have been counterfeited by the heretics. A sign agreed upon identifies him. The family is awakened. The stranger's dusty feet are bathed. This is what St. Paul calls 'washing the feet of the saints.' He is asked to pray with the family and in the name of the fam-

[65] Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City,* p. 454.
[66] *To his wife, 2; De cultu feminarum, 2.*
[67] *Letter to Diognetus,* 5.

ily. If he is a bishop, he is asked to preach in the little domestic church. And the pagans who, on their way home from their revelries, pass this house and see a poor man entering among these other poor people, scarcely suspect this is a pastoral visit by a bishop from some distant place to this church, where even his name is unknown." [68]

In pagan antiquity a slave was without rights, without family, without fatherland; he was even without God.[69] Claudius, Nero, Domitian, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius made laws tending to improve the lot of the slaves. But nearly all these laws were at once abrogated by nullification; nearly all are to the same purpose and repeat the same provisions.[70]

The pagan world did not find the secret of giving the slave the soul of a free man or of inspiring the master with a feeling of genuine and effective brotherhood toward his servant. The Christian Church, on the contrary, preaching the universal redemption by Christ and teaching all her children the lessons of obedience and lowliness of heart, as also respect for the dignity of man, was able safely to repeat at its meetings the words of St. Paul, "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free.[71] . . . You are bought with a price; be not made the bondslaves of men." [72] When Christian slaves, as Mary,[73] Evelpistus,[74] and Blandina,[75] courageously shed their blood for Christ, the

[68] Champagny, *La Charité chrétienne dans les premiers siècles de l'Eglise,* p. 82.

[69] *"Quibus extera sacra aut nulla,"* says Cassius, in the *Digest.* Ulpian speaks of "the slave or any other animal"; Gaius: "Slaves, beasts, and other things"; Paulus: "A slave's head has no rights." At the customs, the same tax was paid for slaves as for horses and mules.

[70] See Allard, *Esclaves, serfs et mainmortables,* pp. 61–65.

[71] 1 Cor. 12: 13.

[72] *Ibidem,* 7: 23.

[73] See *supra,* p. 213.

[74] See *supra,* p. 237.

[75] See *supra,* p. 242.

Church rejoiced in honoring them in a special way.[76] A contemporary of Hadrian, called Hermas, who was converted by St. Alexander, in no way imperiled public order when, on a certain Easter, he freed 1,250 slaves at one time. They were all Christians, therefore all prepared for freedom.

Gradually Christian customs influenced pagan society. "The progress started out from the Church, passed by way of philosophy, reached the domain of law, which received it without perhaps suspecting its Christian origin." [77] Those judges who had heard the sublime answers of Christians such as Evelpistus or Blandina, those crowds that had seen them die, could not remain wholly unmoved by such sights. Ideas of justice, human brotherhood, and the equality of souls in God's sight, rose from the dungeons and amphitheaters even to the palaces of the Palatine. It came to pass that a slave was recognized to have some sort of civil right; a milder jurisprudence than the strict law came into being. Between the slave and his fields there was admitted a sort of undefined union and affinity. In the sale of slaves, the son was no longer separated from his father, quite as if the slave was a member of a family.[78]

Women and children were also given greater freedom. Their threefold servitude was born of the same principle; their threefold freedom advanced abreast.[79] Claudius had freed

[76] The tomb of the slave Ampliatus, discovered in the nineteenth century, is more magnificent than are most of those of underground Rome. (See Allard, *"Le Tombeau d'un esclave chrétien,"* in *Lettres chrétiennes,* March-April, 1882.)

[77] Champagny, *op. cit.,* p. 151.

[78] Allard, *Les Esclaves chrétiens.*

[79] Troplong, *Influence du christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains,* p. 316. On Christianity's influence in the first centuries, see Calippe, *Saint Paul et la cité chrétienne*; Baudrillart, *La Charité aux premiers siècles du christianisme;* Badet, *La Femme chrétienne au temps des persécutions;* d'Azambuja, *Ce que le christianisme a fait pour la femme;* Maxime Sabatier, *L'Eglise et le travail manuel;* Lallemand, *Histoire de la charité,* vol. II; Kurth, *Les Origines de la civilisation moderne,* vol. I; Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe.*

woman from the necessity of permanent tutelage. The sons, who, like the slaves, had been excluded from any property rights, were granted them in the time of Nerva and Trajan. The murder or starvation of new-born children, and their abandonment or their sale to strangers were punished by Antoninus Pius, at least in the case of the rich. Among the poor, these practices were tolerated. What could a poor man, they said, do with his children?

Influence of the Church upon the Old Régime

During the first two centuries the Church could hardly affect the world except by her moral influence. That influence was considerable. But the old régime had in itself the germs of its own dissolution. Its three foundations—religion, the family, and property—were undermined at their base. The Roman religion was sapped by philosophical skepticism. It was in vain that Stoicism tried to restore it. The Stoic's whole contribution was a moral attitude, not a doctrine. The old régime of the family had disappeared, not by reform, but by corruption. The economic régime, based on the exploitation of vanquished peoples and on slavery, exhausted the world and was headed for a catastrophe.[80] Christianity appeared with a complete programme of social restoration,[81] capable of raising up the ancient world, if it would accept its inspiration, and capable of replacing it if it should decide to reject it. Under the shelter of a pure and holy religion, the Church, by the restoration of the family, could furnish the old régime with respect for woman and for the child, the indispensable foundations of every organized society. By raising up the

[80] Chevalier and Legendre, *Le Catholicisme et la société,* Paris, 1907, p. 16.

[81] See Garriguet, *Valeur sociale de l'Evangile;* Lugan, *L'Enseignement social de Jésus;* Calippe, *Saint Paul et la cité chrétienne.* See also the first pastoral letter of Cardinal Pecci (later Leo XIII) on the Church and Civilization, his Encyclical *"Immortale Dei,"* and his letter to Cardinal Lavigerie (October 27, 1888) on the Abolition of Slavery.

soul of the slave and by sanctifying labor, this would have transformed the economic order. Even the political régime might have been restored. By its doctrine of the separation of the powers, by teaching the duty of rendering to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's, the Christian religion would have destroyed imperial despotism in its more atrocious aspects. By the diffusion of its spirit of charity, it would have calmed the inevitable conflicts and, so far as this world allows, would have established a reign of concord and peace.

But the old régime would not accept this Christian restoration. Therefore, it fell under the blows of the barbarians, while the Church resumed her work amid the victorious races.

The Church and the Intellectual Movement

The Church had also a plan of intellectual renovation. Her very doctrine, which St. Irenaeus summed up and Tertullian defended, was a programme, the most extensive and pregnant that was ever presented to the human mind. A writer of our day, one who did not accept our faith, has stated this with fine loftiness of thought:

"On the one hand, it [the preaching of Christianity] was so simple that it could be summed up in a few brief sentences and understood in a single crisis of the inner life; on the other hand, it was so versatile and rich that it vivified all thought and stimulated every emotion. It was capable, almost from the outset, of vieing with every noble and worthy enterprise, with any speculation, or with any cult of the mysteries. Clear and transparent, it was also profound and full of mystery. It was a doctrine, and yet no doctrine, a philosophy and yet something different from philosophy." [82]

The city of Alexandria, that center of scientific speculations, was the very place to become the home of the Christian intellectual movement. Teachers, recruited from everywhere, be-

[82] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, I, 102.

fore audiences that were cosmopolitan, but always eager to learn, there discussed the most varied theories, taken from Jewish and pagan sources. There it was that Gnosis shone the brightest. And there a fearless Christian resolved to found a great school of religious philosophy, or rather to reorganize on a vaster scale the "Didascalia" which Eusebius speaks of as belonging to the earliest times of Christianity.[83]

This man, whom his disciple Clement of Alexandria calls "the first in power of all the holy and truly remarkable men that were his teachers," [84] was called Pantaenus. The Church honors him with the title of saint. He was a native of Sicily.[85] Before becoming a Christian he had been a follower of Stoic teaching.[86] He was led to the Christian faith by converse with some disciples of the Apostles, perhaps with St. Polycarp, whom he knew in the East, according to Tillemont's conjecture.[87] With great earnestness he set about the study of the Scriptures.[88] His reputation as an exegete, philosopher, and theologian spread far and wide, reaching even "India," that is, probably southern Arabia, where the people had frequent dealings with Alexandria. The inhabitants of that country, delighted by what they heard of the famous Christian philosopher, expressed a desire to hear the gospel from his lips. Pantaenus, with the sanction of his bishop, Demetrius,[89] went to them and, it is said, found there St. Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew.[90] On returning to Alexandria, he continued his teaching until 212, according to St. Jerome [91]—202, according to others. Before his death he had the joy of seeing the first writ-

[83] Eusebius, *H E.*, VI, iii.
[84] *Stromata,* I, 1.
[85] *Ibid.*
[86] St. Jerome, *Catal.,* 36; Eusebius, V, x.
[87] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* III, 288.
[88] Photius, *Codex,* 118; Tillemont, *loc. cit.*
[89] Tillemont, *op. cit.,* p. 290.
[90] St. Jerome, Letter 70, *Ad Magnum.*
[91] St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus,* 36.

ings of his disciple Clement of Alexandria and those of Origen, a young disciple of the latter. St. Pantaenus was a priest. His influence was exercised especially by his oral teaching; but he also composed several Scripture commentaries, of which a few fragments remain.[92]

Later the Christian school of Alexandria took on a sort of official character under the direction of the bishop. But in Pantaenus' time its organization was rudimentary. It had no definite premises. The pupils met at any hour of the day at the professor's house. But, to use the words of Clement of Alexandria, when the venerable Pantaenus, "the true, the Sicilian bee, gathering the spoil of the flowers of the prophetic and Apostolic meadow, engendered in the souls of his hearers a deathless element of knowledge," [93] their enthusiasm heralded the glorious light which this school would one day cast upon the Christian world.

The Spread of Christianity

This Christian world was marvelously enlarged during the persecutions of the second century. From statistics based on authentic documents we know that Christianity then had organized communities in all the provinces and that, thanks to the churches of Mesopotamia, it had even passed beyond the bounds of the Empire.[94] Tertullian could boast: "We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp, tribes, companies, palace, senate, forum—we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods." [95]

The penetration of Christianity into all classes of society was accentuated during the whole course of the second cen-

[92] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, p. 292.
[93] Clement, *Stromata*, I, i.
[94] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, II, 324 ff.
[95] *Apol.*, chap. 37.

tury.[96] The military career was abhorrent to some, either because it seemed opposed to evangelical meekness, or especially because the soldiers were perpetually in danger of apostasy. Rigorists, like Tertullian, even taught that the profession of arms was utterly incompatible with Christianity.[97] But the Church was more tolerant and never hindered Christians from entering the army.[98] The number of soldier-martyrs is considerable, precisely because acts of idolatry were often required of them. But many times the Christian soldiers, by their deep sense of duty and discipline, were recognized to be the best defenders of the Empire.

Under Marcus Aurelius, during the German campaign, they saved the army, the Emperor, and perhaps the Empire. Marcus Aurelius was in a fortified camp in the country of the Quadi, that is, northwest of what we now call Hungary, surrounded by barbarians. "It was the middle of the summer. Water was lacking. The Roman soldiers, parched with thirst, were incapable of fighting. The gods were implored. Marcus Aurelius prayed, howsoever his philosophy permitted him to pray, and he had incantations made by the magicians, the inevitable camp-followers of the armies. The twelfth legion, called the *legio fulminata,* recruited in the Christian district of Melitene in Cappadocia, was entirely Christian. Its soldiers met together outside the camp, where they knelt down and prayed to the true God, as the Christians prayed. These six thousand men praying, with their arms outstretched, presented so strange a sight that the barbarians stopped in surprise." [99] Presently they resumed the fight and rain began to fall abundantly upon the army. The Roman soldiers held out their helmets and shields to catch the water and repelled the

[96] See Rivière, *La Propagation du christianisme dans les trois premiers siècles,* chap. 2.

[97] *De corona militis,* 1.

[98] See Allard, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs,* pp. 169 f.

[99] Champagny, *Les Antonins,* III, 115.

enemy while quenching their thirst. Of a sudden there was lightning, and the hail fell so hard upon the barbarian army that its soldiers scattered in panic. The Roman army was saved.

When a monument commemorating Marcus Aurelius' victories in Germany was erected later on the Campus Martius, the prodigy was attributed to Jupiter Pluvius. But besides the official testimony, the memory of the event as it occurred spread among the people, inspiring the pagans with a religious veneration for the God of the Christians and also strengthening the faith of the Christians themselves.

Montanism

At the beginning of the third century Christianity was enjoying a broad tolerance, its influence was growing, it was continuing to expand, its works of zeal and charity were increasing among the poor, and it was displaying a scientific élan among its intellectual élite. Therefore it seemed that now the Church could give free rein to her most magnificent hopes. But in the designs of Providence doubtless the periods of peace and prosperity, which God grants His faithful, are only truces, during which they must fortify themselves for new strifes. While the events we have been relating were taking place, a sect, which came into being obscurely in a village of Phrygian Mysia, was growing; it was to ravage the Church and turn her most eloquent apologist against her. Many doctors of the school of Alexandria were to trouble the faithful by doctrinal recklessness. The very expansion of Christianity would soon invite a terrible persecution. In the next chapter we shall have occasion to recount these new trials. At present we will only relate the birth and progress of the Montanist heresy.

Phrygia was the country of Corybants and orgiastic rites.

Of all the regions of antiquity, it was the most given to religious chimeras. St. Justin refers to the foolish simplicity with which the Phrygians accepted every odd novelty.[100] A certain Montanus, a neophyte, a former priest of Cybele, exploited this tendency by cleverly giving a Christian coloring to all the extravagances of his haughty and perverse mind.[101] For the regular authority of the hierarchical pastors he substituted personal inspiration and ecstasy. This was, he said, returning to the charisms of Apostolic times; it was putting oneself into direct contact with God without the intermediary of men. On the basis of these two reasons he presented his conception as a Christianity more perfect than that of the traditional Church. Many believed him and joined him. Ordinary Christians glorified martyrdom; Montanus commanded that it be sought. "Shame," he said, "upon the Christian who dies in his bed." Some of his followers might be seen rashly inviting torture, reserving a cowardly yielding when the torture actually began, as did the Phrygian Quintus, who is mentioned in the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp. He had led several companions to martyrdom, but at the sight of the beasts, they became frightened and apostatized.[102] The Christians praised chastity; Montanus condemned marriage. The Christians, on the authority of St. John, relied on the Paraclete; Montanus claimed to be, if not the Paraclete, at least His authentic mouthpiece.[103] He read the Prophets and the Apoca-

[100] *Dialogue,* 119.

[101] According to St. Epiphanius, the rise of this sect dates from the year 157. (*Haereses,* XLI, 1; cf. Harnack, *Chronologie,* p. 372.)

[102] *Martyrdom of Polycarp,* 4. Eusebius speaks of a Montanist, Alcibiades, who, being in prison along with other confessors of the faith, at first took no food but bread and water, according to the rigor of the sect, but soon afterwards thankfully used the gifts of the Creator. (Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, iii.)

[103] On the identification of Montanus with the Holy Ghost, see a curious inscription published by Clermont-Ganneau, in the *Bulletin archéologique du comité du travail historique et scientifique,* 1901, p. 310. The inscription reads as follows: *"Flavius Abus, domesticus, i[n] nomine Patris et Filii [et ?] Do[mi]ni*

lypse, but he also read the Book of Henoch, which contained many precise details about the last days of the world. This book gives us an idyllic description of the earth which God will adorn on the last day for His elect, where God will give the just all the joys of the spirit and of the senses, an unmixed happiness and a boundless fecundity. The followers of the new doctrine declared that Montanus had more things revealed to him than Christ.[104] He certainly preached more of them. Montanus' plan was very simple: to outbid the Church by exaggerating her dogmas and precepts. In course of time this became the tactics of many heresiarchs.

Unfortunately such an attitude was easier to hold than to put into action. Renan says: "It seems that private inspiration, in the case of Montanus as in most cases, was accompanied by license and audacity." [105] Two women, Priscilla and Maximilla, joined the new Paraclete, like him prophesying and like him falling into ecstasies, assuming the exercise of ecclesiastical functions and stirring up the whole region. Some were blinded by their enthusiasm, but "doubts were also expressed as to the virginity of Priscilla, who, like her companion Maximilla, had, it was said, left her husband to follow Montanus." [106] It was discovered that Themison, a supposed confessor of the faith, who was greatly honored in the sect, had bought his freedom. Another, Alexander, was even less worthy; he had been summoned before the tribunal, not however as a Christian, but as a robber.[107]

How did such extravagances succeed in seducing anybody besides the simple Phrygian country folk? Montanus was clever, it was said; several of his disciples outdid him in clever-

Muntani, quod promisit complevit." On some recently discovered inscriptions, see the *Echos d'Orient,* V, 148; VI, 61; VII, 53.

[104] Tertullian, *De praescr.,* 52.

[105] *Marc-Aurèle,* p. 216.

[106] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 200.

[107] *Ibid.*

ness. They showed astounding ability in adapting their theories to their audiences, completely changing them when need required. The doctrine of private interpretation has rarely been a model of consistency. Montanism, when it spread in Africa, had to be transformed and softened. It no longer took a stand hostile to the Great Church, but assumed an air of piety, edification, and uncompromising austerity.[108] In this way the sect caught in its snare the genial, though harsh and fiery, author of *Apologeticus* and *De praescriptione.*

[108] D'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien,* pp. 441 ff. See Labriolle, *La Crise montaniste,* and *Les Sources de l'histoire montaniste.*

CHAPTER IV

From the Persecution of Septimius Severus to that of Decius (202–259)

In general the first half of the third century was comparatively tranquil for the Christians. Aside from the persecution of Septimius Severus, which continued for nine years, and of Maximinus, which lasted three years, the emperors for various reasons did not attack the Church. But in the case of those two persecutions, the nature of the decrees which started them and the severity with which those decrees were carried out, made them particularly terrible.

And this period was especially productive of great men. It was the time when Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Hippolytus, and St. Cyprian, in the full maturity of their talent, published their masterpieces. No other age can boast of producing a more powerful writer than Tertullian, a more catholic genius than Origen, a more prolific scholar than Hippolytus, and a more congenial man of action than St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. But in the early years of the century Tertullian went over to heresy, and it is unknown whether he ever returned to the true faith. Origen was alarming in his daring. St. Hippolytus was in conflict with Pope St. Callistus. St. Cyprian, a too docile disciple of Tertullian, held a doctrine about Baptism that placed him in opposition to the Church of Rome.

The loftiest problems were appealing to the consideration of men's minds. Never was the mystery of the divine life examined with more earnestness. But in the confused mixture of opinions, such rash hypotheses have a foreboding of heresy,

and certain independent attitudes have an appearance of schism.

The admiration aroused by the history of this half-century is tinged with anxiety. The development of ideas did, it is true, prepare the way for the great definitions of the next century; but it was also a prelude to the great heresies that were to disturb that period.

First Years of the Reign of Septimius Severus

The era of religious peace, begun in the reign of Commodus continued under the very short government of Pertinax and for some years longer under Septimius Severus. There was no hint that this ruler would start another persecution. He seemed not to have any philosophical persuasions, such as led Marcus Aurelius to regard the Christians as rivals. Nor did he have that exclusive devotion to the national religion which Trajan considered the very safety of the Empire, nor the whimsical ferocity of Nero, who might at any moment be expected to take the most sanguinary measures. Septimius Severus had been in turn orator, lawyer, something of a physician, magistrate, and general. He was an upstart with no passion except commonplace ambition. No fanaticism stirred him. In fact, so far as religion is concerned, he was curious rather than anxious. When traveling in the East, he adored Serapis and made a collection of whatever books he found in the sanctuaries. When he was governor of the province of Lyons, he had no hesitation in providing a Christian nurse for his eldest son Bassianus, nicknamed Caracalla in history.[1] In a certain illness he was cured through the care and perhaps the prayers of a Christian slave, Proculus Toparcion, whom he had attached to his person and lodged in his palace.[2] That a number of Christians were in his suite is evidenced by

[1] Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, 3.
[2] *Ibid.*

certain inscriptions and various archeological indications.[3]

But the good will of Septimius Severus, based neither upon any deep conviction nor upon a permanent political interest, was not to be counted on. It was no guarantee against the Emperor's personal whims. It permitted popular calumnies to run on, and was at the mercy of any court influence.

Through the influence of Christian apologists, the upper classes of society lost their prejudices against Christian practices. But horrible reports continued to circulate among the common people. "None are more noisy clamorers for the punishment of the Christians than the mob. The other classes no doubt are, in proportion to their authority, sincere in their pious reverence; no hostile spirit is breathed from the senate itself, from the knighthood, from the camp, from the very palace." [4] "The outcry is that the State is filled with Christians —that they are in the fields, in the citadels, in the islands." [5] "The income of the temples is falling off," the priests of the idols lamented; "no one any longer drops an obolus into the sacred offering box." The people of Carthage were crying out like the people of Rome: "To the lions with the Christians!" And they demanded the spoliation of the Christians' property and the dissolution of the burial corporations, saying: "No burial-grounds for the Christians!" [6]

The Christians at court were living so worthily as to win everyone's respect, yet the modest and firm reservation which they kept in their homage to the emperor,[7] could not entirely hide their convictions regarding the almost idolatrous character of the honors paid the Caesars.[8] Hence they were regarded

[3] De Rossi, *Bullett. di archeol. crist.*, 1863, p. 83; Boissier, *Rome and Pompeii; Archæological Rambles*, p. 129.

[4] Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, 35.

[5] *Ibidem*, 1.

[6] *"Areae non sint!"* (Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, 3.)

[7] *"Casti et sobrii et probi."* (Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, 35.)

[8] Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, 15; *To his Wife*, II, 6.

with a menacing ill-will, which at times became malice. The famous caricature of Alexamenes adoring a crucifix with an ass's head, discovered in 1856 in an apartment on the Palatine, and nearby the inscription *Libanius episcopus,* seem to be a malicious jest by some pagan serving boys against the Christian serving boys of the household of Septimius Severus.[9] The men of letters, who were numerous at the court and who had come from all parts of the Empire, appear to have often indulged in like pleasantries. A certain woman supplied a common bond to this vague spite, by creating a rallying point for all the religions represented at court. It was the Empress herself.

The Empress Julia Domna

Before becoming emperor, Septimius Severus had married the daughter of a high priest of the temple of El-Gabal at Emesa. Her name was Julia Domna. "She was a woman of strong will, and of remarkable intelligence and cultivation. As empress, she was soon surrounded by all that was most intellectual in the Empire. At that time, cultivated men had ceased to ridicule the gods. They were becoming religious. . . . A woman of such practical ability that, if allowed, she would have ruled the State, could not ignore the religious position, and she interested her circle in it also. In spite of edicts old and new, the progress of Christianity was becoming daily more alarming. The old religions could only bring against it a divided force. Might they not be drawn together round some tenet or symbol, and thus acquire a kind of unity? . . . The

[9] This is the view of De Rossi. The drawing may be seen in Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 39. The original caricature is preserved in the Kircher Museum at Rome. It represents a man with an ass's head stretched upon a cross, and beside him another man at prayer, and the following inscription: "Alexamenus adores his god." Haupt's hypothesis is that the drawing was not an anti-Christian caricature, but an allusion to the worship of Trypho. This view, however, is not accepted by scholars generally.

Empress had, however, too much good sense to pose as inspired. She left that rôle to a rather mysterious personage, Apollonius of Tyana, who was known to have lived in the time of the Caesars and the Flavians. His reputation as Pythagorean ascetic, miracle-worker, wandering preacher, and sorcerer, still lingered in Asia Minor and elsewhere. One of the Empress' literary circle, Philostratus, was set to write his life. Julia Domna had in her possession some rather doubtful memoirs by a certain Damius, said to have been a companion of Apollonius. These she gave to Philostratus, and on this foundation he embroidered extensively, borrowing right and left, even from the Christian Gospels, the traits best calculated to bring out the importance and virtues of his hero: such as his love for his fellow-creatures, his great compassion for human misery, and his deep religious devotion to the gods in general, and the divine Sun in particular. The book had a great success. In surroundings hostile to Christianity, it was soon seen what capital could be made of it, if not in favor of pagan syncretism, at least against the spread of Christianity." [10]

It should be noted that the persecution of the Christians had never been officially discontinued. It was neglected, not abrogated. If popular denunciations should be made against the Christians, the magistrates might consider they had a right to act. Seeing how the Emperor felt about it, they hesitated, at least in Rome and Italy, where they were so near him. But in Africa people were extremely excitable. The pagans scratched on walls and carried through the streets the sacrilegious symbol of the "ass's head." [11] On the other hand, some Christians, who had been worked up by Tertullian's reckless preaching, even refused to serve in the imperial army. Of this number was that soldier, praised by Tertullian in his *De corona*

[10] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 263 ff.
[11] Allard, *Histoire des pers.*, II, 29–53.

militis.[12] Most of the Christians rightly protested against these compromising acts of rashness. Not so Tertullian. He became more and more stirred up, and in his paradoxical and blustering writings glorified them. The enemies of the Christians were not slow in using Tertullian's violence of speech to influence the Emperor.

Popular clamor, clever insinuations by the literary men at court, imprudence on the part of some Christians who adopted the tone of the fiery polemic, and other causes combined at the beginning of the third century to urge the Emperor to take some measures of repression against the Christians. Septimius Severus yielded. He did not purpose introducing any new legislation touching those who were born of Christian parents. But he was determined to prevent new conversions. While on a visit to Syria, he issued a decree which is thus summed up by his historian Spartianus: "Under penalty of severe punishment, he forbade anyone becoming a Jew or a Christian." [13]

"The decree was more than an attack upon freedom of conscience: it was an explicit decree of persecution. Up to the beginning of the third century, the existing laws seemed to be sufficient against the Christians. In fact they had made many martyrs. Yet they did not prevent the development of the Church. Severus determined to cut off at its root a growth that troubled his distrustful policy. He forbade anyone to make another a Christian, or anyone to become a Christian, for the decree has this double meaning." [14] A new crime was listed in the penal code of the Empire. And for this new crime there was put in force a new procedure more terrible than the former. "Theretofore, to initiate a legal proceeding against

[12] Allard, *ibidem,* pp. 31–38.

[13] "*Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit; idem etiam de christianis sanxit.*" (Spartianus, *Severus,* 17, in *Historiae Augustae Scriptores sex.*)

[14] Allard, *op. cit.,* II, 62. The words of the decree forbade "*christianos fieri.*"

the Christians, it was necessary to run the risk of making a formal accusation, in accordance with Trajan's rescript.[15] Now, however, converts and those who helped in a conversion, were brought under a special law and procedure. Against them the magistrates could act of their own accord, without waiting for an accusation to be brought. And this category of Christians was large in the third century. Converts were far more numerous than lifelong Christians. Tertullian, though extreme in the way he expresses his thought, is fundamentally correct when he says: 'Nobody is born a Christian; he becomes one.' " [16]

St. Perpetua

At Rome, in Africa, and in Asia Minor the most terrible persecution broke loose. Among the illustrious martyrs of these persecutions, we shall make special mention of St. Perpetua and her companions, of St. Potamiana, and of St. Andeol.

The Acts of St. Perpetua and her companions are "one of the purest and most charming monuments of Christian antiquity." [17] Part of them was written by Perpetua and Saturus or, on the basis of their disclosures, by one of the Christians who visited them in prison. Another part, as Tillemont supposes, and as Aubé and Doulcet accept, is an extract from the court records of the African proconsulate or at least of notes written down at the martyrs' trial.[18] In the proconsulate of Minutius Timinianus, probably at Tuburbium near Carthage, or perhaps at Carthage itself, there were arrested Revocatus

[15] Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, 4.

[16] *Apol.*, 18; cf. *De testimonio animae*, 1; Allard, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[17] Allard, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

[18] Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'empire romain*, p. 224; Doulcet, *Les Rapports de l'Eglise chrétienne avec l'Etat romain*, p. 149.

and Felicitas (slaves), Saturninus and Secundus, and Vibia Perpetua, a young married woman of good family. All of them were catechumens who were receiving religious instruction from a Christian named Saturus. Saturus was not present when they were arrested, but he surrendered to the authorities, so that his lot might not be separated from the fate of those whose instructor he was, or rather that, being imprisoned along with them, he might complete their training for membership in the Church.[19] At first they were confined in private houses under the guard of the *custodia privata,*[20] and were soon baptized. Perpetua, whilst being baptized, asked one thing of the Holy Ghost: that her body might be able to endure the tortures.

Her prayer was answered. The Acts clearly set forth this noble young woman's character as candid, alert, joyful. In the very hour of her death she says: "During my life I have always been cheerful; I shall be even more cheerful in the next life." [21] Her aged father, the only pagan in her family, at first urged her to worship the gods. "Father," she said, "do you see this vase on the ground?" "Yes," he answered. "Can you call it anything but a vase?" To which he replied: "No, indeed." She then said to him: "So too I cannot call myself anything but a Christian." [22]

The newly baptized were soon obliged to change their comparative freedom for a gloomy dungeon. The oppressive heat of the prison and the indelicate promiscuity of numerous prisoners were a painful suffering for Perpetua; but even more

[19] Ruinart, Preface to the *Passion de sainte Perpétue,* p. 83; Pillet, *Histoire de sainte Perpétue,* pp. 63–67.

[20] Rambaud, *Le Droit criminel romain dans les Actes des martyrs,* p. 30.

[21] Ruinart, *Acta sincera,* p. 92.

[22] This comparison may have been suggested to Perpetua by the symbolism of Christian art of that time, in which a vase was often carved on the tombs as an emblem of the Christian. (Northecote, *Roma Sotteranea,* II, 83.)

painful was the separation from the infant she was nursing. Shortly afterwards her baby was brought to her. "Then," says Perpetua, "I felt no more suffering. My dungeon became a fond abode, which I preferred to any other."

As the time for her trial drew near, her father hastened to her. Overwhelmed with grief, he tried again and again to persuade her, saying: "Be mindful of your old father. You have been my darling child above all your brothers. Do not make me an object of shame. Think of your baby, who will not be able to live without you." "In this manner," she says, "did my father speak to me. He knelt at my feet, calling me now, not his daughter, but his lady. And I felt pity for his white hair. I tried to reassure him, saying: 'At the trial, God's will be done.' And my father went away less desolate."

The martyrs were summoned before the procurator Hilarianus. The magistrate first put the women aside. Addressing Saturus, he said: "Young man, offer sacrifice; do not think yourself better than the princes." Saturus replied: "I think myself above the princes of this world if I am worthy to suffer for the Prince of the world to come." The two women were then brought forward. Felicitas was questioned first. She said: "I am a Christian. I despise all earthly things for God." Perpetua was then asked: "What do you say? Will you sacrifice?" Smilingly she answered: "I am what my name signifies: I do not change." [23] The scene becomes suddenly pitiful. Perpetua tells us: "On a sudden my old father appeared, carrying my child. 'Have pity on the child,' he said. Then Hilarianus commanded: 'Sacrifice for the health of the emperors.' To this I replied: 'I will not sacrifice.' As my father kept standing there, Hilarianus had him driven away with a rod. I felt the blows of the rod as though I myself had been struck, so much did I pity my father's age. Then the judge delivered the sentence, by which all of us were condemned to

[23] *"Sum et nominis mei sequor auctoritatem ut sim Perpetua."*

the beasts; and we joyfully went down into the prison."[24]

When the martyrs entered the amphitheater, Perpetua was singing. Revocatus, Saturninus, and Saturus faced Hilarianus and said to him: "You have judged us, but God will judge you." The beasts were let loose upon them. Revocatus and Saturninus were first attacked by a leopard, then torn by a bear. When another leopard leaped upon Saturus and the martyr's blood began to flow, the mob sneeringly cried out: "See him washed, see him baptized!" Perpetua and Felicitas were each wrapped in a net and exposed to the attack of an infuriated cow, which tossed Perpetua in the air and let her fall on her back. In this fall her garment was torn. That modesty might be preserved even in her death, she gathered the folds of her torn garment; then with a clasp she fastened her hair, which had been undone by the tossing and the fall, not wishing, in the glory of her martyrdom, to die with her hair dishevelled, like a woman in mourning. When the time came, according to the usual practice, for the martyrs to receive the *coup de grâce,* they gave one another the kiss of peace, as was done during the sacrifice of the Mass. Then each offered his throat to the knife. The gladiator appointed to give Perpetua the death blow, trembled; his knife was ill aimed and struck her in the side. Perpetua, firmer and calmer than her executioner, took his hand which had dealt the awkward blow, and placed the point of the dagger to her breast.[25]

[24] Duruy (*History of Rome,* VII, 64) writes: "This young woman who went to her death crushing the hearts of all her family is a heroine of a peculiar nature." Allard makes a fitting reply, when he says: "These words of Duruy are senseless, or else they mean that a real hero, having to choose between the duty of confessing his faith and the fear of saddening those whom he loves, ought to turn his back on his duty." (*Histoire des pers.,* II, 116.)

[25] Ruinart, *op. cit.,* p. 95. The history of Christianity in Africa owes many fine discoveries to Father Delattre. One of the most notable has reference to these seven martyrs. After long and patient labors at Carthage, he succeeded, in 1906 and 1907, in unearthing, from some almost wholly destroyed ruins, nearly

St. Potamiana

St. Potamiana was martyred at Alexandria about the same time. She was a young slave, as pure as she was beautiful. Her master had conceived a violent passion for her. Furious at being unable to triumph over his slave's virtue, he denounced her as a Christian. She was summoned before the prefect Aquila, who threatened to give her over to the brutality of the gladiators. But she remained unshaken. She and her mother were sentenced to be burned alive. A cauldron was prepared, full of boiling pitch, into which the young slave was let down. She died bravely amid horrible torture.[26]

Martyrs of Asia and Gaul

In the early Church of Alexandria, St. Leonides, the father of Origen, was beheaded for the faith.[27] Many other Christians met the same fate. In the younger churches of Gaul, there also perished by the sword Felix, Fortunatus, and Achilles, apostles of Valence, Ferreol a priest, and Ferrutius a deacon, apostles of Besançon. Along the Rhone, in the country of the Helvetii, a Christian missioner met a more atrocious death at Bergoiate. His name was Andeol. Tradition relates that the Emperor Septimius Severus, in 208, while passing along the Rhone on his way to make war in Britain, saw Andeol preaching the gospel to a large gathering of people at Bergoiate. This was an open disregard of the imperial edict. The Emperor was furious, leaped down from his chariot, ordered Andeol to be stretched out on a rack, then had his head

seven thousand epigraphic fragments. Of these, thirty-five, when carefully pieced together, finally gave the following inscription: *"Hic sunt martyres Saturus, Saturninus, Revocatus, Secundus, Felicitas, Perpetua."*

[26] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, v; Palladius, *Lausiac History*, chap. 3; cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. III, note on St. Potamiana.

[27] Eusebius, VI. ii.

sawed off with a wooden saw. "Today this lowly victim has what no Caesar has, a tomb still standing and still visited, a city bearing his name, pilgrims who love him and pray to him." [28] The city of Bergoiate is now the city of Bourg-saint-Andéol in the Vivarais district.

Successors of Septimius Severus

The persecution gradually died out after the death of Septimius Severus (A. D. 211). His four immediate successors showed no hostility toward the Christians. Caracalla (211–217) appears to have received from his Christian nurse [29] an instinctive regard for the followers of Christ. Elagabalus (218–222) hoped to unite all religions under the supreme worship of the Syrian god whose name he bore. Alexander Severus (222–235), in his domestic chapel, honored together Abraham and Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana and Christ.[30] His mother Mammaea had dealings with St. Hippolytus and Origen. Eusebius says that Origen "even lived near her for a while and explained to her a great number of matters about the glory of God and the divine teaching."

The four pontiffs who governed the Roman Church during this period of calm were not for this reason free from serious care. In fact there were few epochs more violently disturbed by heresy and schism, and few trials were more painful to the Church of Rome than the defection stirred up by the most zealous of her former defenders, Tertullian, and the sad events that for twenty-five years made an obstinate antipope of one of the most conspicuous priests of the Roman clergy, a future martyr, St. Hippolytus. But these four popes were equal to their task.

[28] Champagny, *Les Césars du IIIe siècle*, I, 236.
[29] Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, 4.
[30] Eusebius, VI, xxi, 3.

Pope St. Zephyrinus

Zephyrinus governed the Church from 198 to 217.[31] He was a Roman by birth, a priest of simple, kind, and charitable character. The antipope Hippolytus and the Montanist Tertullian, with whom he was in conflict, accused him of ignorance, avarice, and weakness, saying that he allowed himself to be dominated by his secretary Callistus. These charges do not stand up under an impartial examination of the facts. The truth is that, in his doctrinal decisions, he was concerned much more with following tradition than with examining the philosophical arguments of his opponents; hence the contempt with which he was regarded by those who prided themselves on their knowledge. We know also that, although he received many offerings, he spent them generously for the poor; hence the charge of avarice made against him. He judged it proper to moderate the excessive severity introduced into the Church in the matter of adulterers; this action on his part led to his being charged with blameworthy condescension to sinners. The charge of his being unduly dominated by Callistus cannot be maintained when we consider that at the death of Zephyrinus the clergy unanimously chose Callistus to succeed him, and that Callistus in his pontificate gave many proofs of moderation and prudence.[32]

Pope St. Callistus

Callistus I, like Zephyrinus, was a native of Rome. He occupied the see of Peter from 218 to 222.[33] Hippolytus and Tertullian both picture him in an unfavorable light. But if we examine the facts adduced by these writers and strip them of

[31] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 139.

[32] Döllinger (*Hippolytus and Callistus*) clears Pope Zephyrinus of the charges brought against him by Hippolytus and Tertullian.

[33] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 141.

malevolent interpretations we must absolve Callistus from the grave charges brought against him. His life was a variegated one. While a slave of a high officer in Emperor Commodus' palace, he was entrusted by his master with the handling of certain funds; in the course of his financial operations, he lost not only his master's money, but also money which had been entrusted to him by certain Christian brethren. He took to flight out of fear of his master, who succeeded in catching him, and had him imprisoned in a dungeon. But, considering that the best way of recovering his money would be to free his slave, whose ability and honesty he knew, he had Callistus released. The latter was soon on the road to recuperate the whole amount by making certain Jews, who had tricked him, disgorge. These Jews took revenge on him by denouncing him as a Christian. The unfortunate Callistus was sentenced to the mines of Sardinia. When Pope Victor besought the powerful intervention of Marcia for the freedom of the confessors of Sardinia, the name of the poor slave was not on the list; but the procurator liberated him at the request of Hyacinth, the papal legate. Callistus returned to Rome, where Pope Victor provided him with an annual pension.

The constancy in misfortune shown by this slave, his intelligence, the regard of his fellow-prisoners, marked him out for the choice of the clergy for the important office of deacon. His conscientious performance of the duties of this office made Zephyrinus decide to call him to his side as his chief helper. At the death of Zephyrinus, he was unanimously chosen to succeed him. In the see of Peter this former slave showed not only practical qualities of a high order, but, in the difficult questions he was called upon to solve, he revealed a prudent and enlightened mind, as also a sure and delicate tactfulness. In the arduous difficulties of the Trinitarian dispute, we see him reject the extreme opinions of Sabellius and also those of Hippolytus. In the hotly disputed question of

penance, he stoutly claimed for the hierarchical authority the power of remitting the sins of the flesh; but in estimating the penalty he showed himself ready to take account of the intercession of the confessors of the faith.[34] As stated by the learned critic who has published the first thorough study of the work of this pope, nearly everything for which he was blamed turns to his credit.[35]

Popes St. Urban I and St. Pontianus

We know very little of the pontificates of Urban I (222–230) and Pontianus (230–235). Eusebius barely mentions these two pontiffs,[36] and the brief notice of them in the *Liber Pontificalis* is not very reliable. They sustained the contest against the antipope Hippolytus. Pontianus, who was exiled with him to the mines of Sardinia, received his repentance and abjuration. In a word, the painful conflict carried on by the four popes we have just been considering, was a conflict of moderation against violence, of mercy against ultra-rigorism, of prudence against inconsiderate enthusiasm.

Montanism in Africa

The courage of the martyrs has sometimes been explained as an artificial enthusiasm, "an intoxication of the amphi-

[34] What Hippolytus and Tertullian never forgave Callistus, was the moderation wherewith he prudently avoided extreme measures in ruling the Church. "Rope-walker" is the insult they cast at him in their pamphlets. Tertullian (*De pudicitia*, x, 9–11) says: "Come, you rope-walker upon modesty and chastity and every kind of sexual sanctity, who, by the instrumentality of a discipline of this nature remote from the path of truth, mount with uncertain footstep upon a most slender thread, balancing flesh with spirit, moderating your animal principle by faith, tempering your eye by fear; why are you thus wholly engaged in a single step? . . . If any wavering of the flesh, any distraction of the mind, any wandering of the eye, shall chance to shake you down from your equipoise, 'God is good,' . . . A second repentance will await you."

[35] Döllinger, *op. cit.*

[36] *H. E.*, VI, xxi and xxiii.

theater." The authentic Acts of the Christian martyrs give the lie to this false explanation. It was not merely before the crowds that the Christians had to defend their faith; it was also in the intimacy of their own family circle; it was in the presence of their pagan neighbors; it was under circumstances that could not give them any renown among men, that Christians of all ages, countries, and conditions, confessed their faith with a calmness and precision that excludes any hypothesis of morbid exaltation. But the censure directed against the martyrs of the Church does fully apply to the sect that started with Montanus. Certain apocryphal Acts are manifestly a legendary amplification of the truth; the persons mentioned in the accounts have no connection with the Roman world. And they describe the judges and the accused as indulging in repartee with equal fury. Most of these fanciful documents are of Montanist origin.[37]

The Montanist heresy passed from the East to Africa, probably visiting Rome on the way. When it reached Africa it had given up its early extravagances and the spirit of rebellion which marked it at its birth. At least, in the first years of the third century, its presence in Africa seems to be a slow infiltration into a few Catholic communities. However, when the Montanists gave up their schismatic projects, they did not abandon their purpose of purifying the Church of its so-called

[37] On the basis of certain expressions in the prologue and epilogue of the Acts of St. Perpetua and her companions, as the text has reached us, some writers (*e. g.,* Basnage) deny the orthodoxy of these illustrious martyrs. It is very likely that the author of the two passages was a Montanist. But there can be no doubt of the orthodoxy of St. Perpetua and her fellow-martyrs. Both external and internal evidence is at one on this point. (See Freppel, *Tertullien,* I, 347 ff.) A. d'Alès (*La Théologie de Tertullien,* pp. 442 ff.) uses Freppel's arguments to refute the conclusions of Nöldechen and certain other critics. The article by d'Alès, *"L'Auteur de la Passio Perpetuae"* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclés.,* concludes as follows: "The *Passio Perpetuae* contains several details which seem to us to show the hand of Tertullian. . . . The Montanism imputed to Perpetua and her companions, we regard as a legend which owes its origin to this almost certain fact, that the hagiographer of the martyrs of 203 was Tertullian the Montanist."

weaknesses. They affected a stricter morality, a more inflexible doctrine, and a heroism more disdainful of human considerations. By this attitude they set themselves up as reformers of a fallen society.

Tertullian and Montanism

It was this claim that seduced Tertullian. His lofty mind and positive character inclined him to such a doctrine. At the outset of his career, the zealous African's orthodoxy was unspotted. As a Christian, as a priest, as a defender of doctrine, he was devoted to the Gospel as explained by the practice of the Church. Only one tendency disturbed the harmony of this great character and unsullied genius: this was his inclination to exaggerate everything in morals as in dogma, in practice as in theory, to enlarge everything beyond bounds, both in good and in evil. In his *Exhortation to the Martyrs,*[38] written in 197, he compares them to gladiators "who fancy themselves more winsome from the bites and scars of the contest." Such words show us that he was already on the descent leading him to Montanism.

Tertullian was also tempted by another error of Montanus' followers—millenarianism. Our Lord, comparing the smallness and insecurity of earthly things with the greatness of eternal things, endeavored to keep His hearers' eyes fixed upon the coming of the future kingdom, a coming that was imminent from many points of view, if only by each one's death or by the extraordinary manifestations of God's power, such as the destruction of the Jewish nation and the inauguration of an era of grace. Many Christians, at the beginning of the third century, believed the end of the world to be near. This was not enough for Tertullian's imagination. In his work *Against Marcion,* which appeared about 207, Christ's tri-

[38] *Exhortation to the Martyrs,* 5.

umphal coming assumes the form of an Oriental mirage:[39] besides the glory of a heavenly kingdom, there are the splendors of an earthly kingdom, to last a thousand years. This millenarianism was not yet condemned, but it was vigorously opposed by a certain priest, Caius, and by the school of Alexandria; it was Tertullian's second step outside the confines of sound orthodoxy.[40] He now takes a third step. The Savior had promised the Apostles to send them the Holy Ghost or Paraclete. The Montanists were not satisfied with the fulfilment of this promise in the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles. They contrasted the kingdom of the Paraclete with the kingdom of the Gospel, and declared that this third kingdom had been fully manifested only by Montanus.[41] Tertullian was led astray by this curious theory: in a way, he leaped into it. About 207, in his treatise *On the Veiling of Virgins,* he wrote: "A time for everything. . . . The germ bursts the flower, and from the flower the fruit opens. . . . Righteousness was first in a rudimentary state, having a natural fear of God: from that stage it advanced, through the Law and the Prophets, to infancy; from that stage it passed, through the

[39] *Against Marcion,* IV, xxiv.

[40] See Gry, *Le Millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement.* This question of millenarianism has proved of very great interest to a considerable number of historians and theologians. Harnack propounds certain theories that are more brilliant than solid. According to him, millenarianism, a manifestation of enthusiasm in the early Church, was originally an essential and official part of Christianity, especially in the minds of the people. Its decline was caused by the infiltration of the doctrine of the Logos; its final extirpation "is perhaps the most momentous fact in the history of Christianity in the East." (Harnack, *History of Dogma,* II, 300.) The truth is, on the contrary, that its decline was owing to these facts: (1) that the basis of millenarianism is found neither in the Gospels nor in the Epistles (Gry, *op. cit.,* pp. 43, 46, 61); (2) that the view of millennialist writers does not necessarily reflect that of the Christian people among whom they lived. This fact is evidenced by the way Trypho speaks in his Dialogue with Justin. The former practically says to Justin: "Are you a millenarian, then?" We could scarcely understand such a remark put on the lips of Trypho by St. Justin, if the millenarian opinion was common in his time.

[41] Some even made a distinction between the Holy Ghost and the Paraclete, placing the latter much higher in the divine hierarchy.

Gospel, to the fervor of youth: now, through the Paraclete, it is settling into maturity: He has succeeded to Christ." [42] In the course of this treatise Tertullian shows a firm purpose of not separating from the Church; [43] yet it is impossible not to see in this passage a decisive though unconscious step towards the Montanist heresy. The notion of a new phase of humanity, superior to that inaugurated by Christ, inspires nearly all the subsequent errors of the fiery apologist, particularly that which concerns flight from persecution and second marriage.

Is it right to flee from persecutors? This is the question that many Christians asked themselves in the reign of Septimius Severus. Montanus, in his desire to outdo Christian morality on every point, recklessly replied that it is not right. Tertullian agreed with this view. Christ said: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another"; but, said the Montanists, He was speaking for His contemporaries. The times have changed. The Holy Ghost, breathing upon the world, no longer allows such cowardice. These maxims are proclaimed by Tertullian in 212 and 213 in the *Scorpiace* and the treatise on *Fleeing in Time of Persecution.* Moreover, if Christ could replace the polygamy of ancient times by monogamy and praise continence, why could not the Paraclete, a hundred and sixty years after the Apostles, give the law of chastity its final crown and, if not condemn marriage as an evil, at least condemn second marriages as adulterous? This is the theory which Tertullian maintains after 213, in his treatise on *Monogamy.*

From that time forward, Tertullian's Montanism grows more emphatic day by day. At bottom, each of his new doctrines was a blow at traditional dogma. In a general way, his conception of a Church receiving its inspiration from the

[42] *The Veiling of Virgins,* chap. 1.
[43] *Ibidem,* chap. 2.

Paraclete, weakens the authority of the Law and of Christ, opens the way to private inspirations, "substitutes for the visible and hierarchical Church, the heir of the Apostles' teaching and power, a Church that has no priesthood or any other investiture but that of the Spirit." [44] This final step he takes in his last works, notably in his *De Pudicitia.* The Church to which he will still grant the right of remitting sins now is merely an indiscernible Church: "The Church, it is true, will forgive sins; but it will be the Church of the Spirit, by means of a spiritual man; not the Church which consists of a number of bishops." [45]

Thus Montanism, at first considering itself nothing more than an awakening of the Christian spirit, ended in the negation of a visible Church. The adherence of the great African polemic gave it a new lease of life. The sect spread in the East and in the West. In Africa, its followers boastfully called themselves Tertullianists. They still bore that name in the time of St. Augustine, who brought their last survivors back to the Church.[46]

The heads of the Church, seconded by vigorous apologists, had long combated the Montanist errors. Among the defenders of the good cause Eusebius cites Apollinarius of Hierapolis, Miltiades, Serapion of Antioch, Apollonius, and an unnamed person who wrote about 211. Apollinarius, bishop of Hierapolis, for several days publicly debated with the followers of Montanus. So successfully did he refute them that they withdrew in confusion, and "the priests of the region asked him to write out a memoir of what had been said against them." [47] From the fragments which Eusebius records of these apologists, we learn that the Montanists gloried espe-

[44] D'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien,* p. 492.
[45] Tertullian, *On Modesty,* chap. 21.
[46] St. Augustine, *Contra haereses,* chap. 86.
[47] Eusebius, *H. E.,* V, xvi, 4.

cially in the visions of Montanus, the ecstasies of Priscilla and Maximilla, and of several martyrs to whom they laid claim. But the defenders of the hierarchical Church confidently assailed them on the ground of the scandalous conduct of their leaders,[48] pointed to the incoherence and wretchedness of their so-called revelations,[49] questioned the number and quality of their supposed martyrs,[50] and cited the authority of the episcopate against their claims.[51] Several councils of the bishops of Phrygia and the vicinity met to condemn them. Mention is made of one at Iconium and of another at Sunnada.[52]

Papal Condemnation of Montanism

The bishops of the West were not so well informed on the beginnings of Montanism, which moreover somewhat moderated its tenets there, and at first appeared to be merely a doctrine of moral renovation. The bishops, therefore, were less prompt in disapproving it. Pope Eleutherius, impressed with the difficulty by the letter sent him in 177 by the Lyons martyrs from their prison, seems not to have settled the question definitely; nor did his successor Victor. Pope Zephyrinus appears to have hesitated for a while as to what attitude to take. Tertullian relates that Zephyrinus sent letters of communion to the Montanist churches, but upon receipt of new information from Praxeas, a confessor of Asia, he changed his decision and revoked his letters even before they had reached their destination.[53] Whatever may be the facts of this particular incident, the heresy was proscribed, and "what is really important is the origin and character of the primitive movement, and the attitude of the Church. However eagerly

[48] *Ibidem,* V, xviii, 2, 3, 5, 6.
[49] *Ibidem,* xviii, 1.
[50] *Ibidem,* xvi, 20.
[51] *Ibidem,* xix, 2, 3.
[52] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 89 f.
[53] Tertullian, *Against Praxeas,* 1.

the speedy return of Christ was looked for towards the end of the second century, however deep was the respect then felt for the prophetic spirit and its various manifestations, the Church was not drawn away by Montanus from the true path; neither prophecy in general nor the expectation of the Last Day was forbidden; but orthodox tradition was upheld against religious vagaries, and the authority of the hierarchy against the claims of private inspiration." [54]

As for that great man who placed his genius at the service of the heresy, the Church, while condemning his errors, continued to appeal to the immortal works he had written in defense of the truth. "The Fathers of the third century are careful not to mention him by name; but St. Cyprian and Novatian sought inspiration in his writings. The Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries have no hesitation in speaking of him by name, and variously mingle praise of him with blame. This man, who exercised a profound and at times disturbing influence on his period, remains one of the most notable witnesses of the ancient faith. That department of knowledge which is interested in origins continues to seek light about the beginnings of Western theology by questioning him whom Bossuet calls the weighty Tertullian." [55]

Clement of Alexandria

Tertullian is beyond question the most powerful writer of the third century. But he is neither its greatest scholar nor its deepest thinker: these titles belong to Origen. But Origen

[54] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 205. In Asia Minor there was an excessive reaction against Montanism. St. Irenaeus tells of people who, rather than admit the manifestations of the Holy Ghost, rejected the Gospel of St. John, in which the effusion of the Holy Spirit is foretold. (*Adversus haereses,* III, xi, 9.) Are these heretics the same as the Alogi mentioned by St. Epiphanius? Döllinger (*Hippolytus and Callistus,* pp. 273 ff.) considers these Alogi as different from the Antimontanists.

[55] D'Alès, *op. cit.,* p. 498.

cannot be separated from him who was his master, Clement of Alexandria, nor from the great school which he so brilliantly personified, nor from the whole intellectual movement which he represented.

About the year 180, Pantaenus, who was then directing the Didascalia of Alexandria, saw the arrival of a Greek philosopher. This philosopher said that he had gone through Greece, southern Italy, Syria, and Palestine in search of truth, and had nowhere found it complete. According to his own words, "he found rest in Egypt, like a hunter who at last discovers his prey." [56] The name of the newcomer was Titus Flavius Clemens. Probably he was born at Athens.[57] As a result of his journeys and studies he possessed a wealth of information and experience which led St. Jerome to call him "the most erudite of all ecclesiastical writers." [58] Pantaenus kept him at his side and, about 190, made him his assistant in the work of teaching. At Pantaenus' death (*circa* 200), Clement succeeded him at the head of the school. He was then a priest, as he tells us in his Pedagogue.[59]

Under his direction the organization of the Didascalia was soon changed. It became a great official school, a sort of university, dependent upon the bishop, who thereafter had the right to appoint the director of the school and his assistants.[60] Its scope broadened. Three currents of ideas at that time threatened to carry men's minds outside Christian truth. These were Stoicism, Platonism, and Gnosticism, which, though its organization was undermined, still survived by its spirit. Clement recognized these three currents, as he had been momentarily drawn into them before his conversion. But the new teacher assumed an even greater task. If ever a school

[56] Clement, *Stromata,* I, i.
[57] St. Epiphanius, *Hœreses,* XXXII, 6.
[58] St. Jerome, Letter to Magnus (*Letters,* 70).
[59] Clement, *Pedagogus,* I, vi.
[60] St. Jerome, *Catal.,* 34; Letter to Paula (*Letters,* 36).

deserved the honor of having been a complete moral training for its disciples, it was the school of Alexandria, as organized by Clement. We have proof of this in the famous trilogy in which he sums up his whole teaching: the *Exhortation to the Gentiles,* the *Pedagogue,* and the *Stromata.*

The *Exhortation to the Gentiles* is an apology, but an apology addressed to the faithful and seeking to combat in them the practical paganism not yet overcome in morals and surviving in countless unconscious prejudices.

Rescued from the pagan spirit by the *Exhortation to the Gentiles,* the man whom Clement addresses is trained in the Christian life by the *Pedagogue.* This is a treatise on moral education. Its delicate psychology and practical advice remain of permanent value for all ages.[61]

The *Stromata* initiates the disciple into the Gnosis, as Clement calls it, that is, the concept of complete Christianity with faith as its foundation, the knowledge for disciplining his efforts in the search of truth, virtue of directing his apostolate among men and of raising his soul to God by the purest contemplation. This is a strange and surprising book, encumbered with a large number of varied details, well named *Stromata, i. e., Tapestries, Medlies, Miscellanies.* Its lack of method is intentional, for, as the author says, he wishes to eliminate the artificial, not to go beyond nature, but to conduct his disciple on a mountain with a variety of perspectives, not in a symmetrically laid-out garden.[62] Its only unity consists in an ever identical Christian spirit, a constant elevation and a determined concern for perfection. Thus this book, beginning with didactic instruction that is in a way commonplace, ends with the loftiest mystical elevations.

This word *Gnosis,* or Knowledge, so repeatedly coming from

[61] See P. Lhande, *Jeunesse,* a little rule for home training, according to Clement of Alexandria, Paris, 1912.

[62] *Stromata,* VI, i; VII, xviii.

the pen of the Alexandrian philosopher, should not mislead us by its etymology. For Clement, Gnosis is the state of perfection; the Gnostic is the perfect Christian.[63] What constitutes the essence of Gnosis is, therefore, not knowledge, but virtue, love. "By love," he says, "the Gnostic is already in the midst of that in which he is destined to be, and does not desire anything, having, as far as possible, the very thing desired. Nor will he, therefore, eagerly desire to be assimilated to what is beautiful, possessing, as he does, beauty by love. Carried to God on the wings of love, he lives a free man on the ruins of all his desires. He is no longer present here below, but wholly with the object of love.[64] . . . Just as weight in a stone, so the knowledge of such a one is incapable of being lost. He will employ caution so as to avoid sinning, and consideration to prevent the loss of virtue." [65] Clement takes pleasure in multiplying and varying the details of this picture; it forms an essential part of his apologetics. Whatever may still trouble his brethren's souls, by way of appeal or regret—the Stoic's blessed impassibility, the love that raises a Platonist's soul towards ideal beauty, the fulness of knowledge which Gnosticism promises its followers—all this the author of the *Stromata* finds, and shows in the soul of the complete Christian, of the true mystic who has reached the summit of the mount of perfection.

Later false mystics attempted to make it appear that their errors had the sanction of Clement.[66] Like many mystics, he sometimes fails to weigh his words. "Yet his great exaggera-

[63] Here we have something like what we have already noted with regard to the Logos. "Gnosis" and "Gnosticism" belong to that class of words in which a whole epoch places its ideal of perfection and happiness, as at other periods the words "Civilization" or "Culture" or "Progress" became symbols of a people's aspirations.

[64] *Stromata,* VI, ix.

[65] *Ibidem,* VII, vii.

[66] *E. g.,* Molinos and Madame Guyon.

tions convey their restrictions in their very excess, and it is easy to see that they need correction. But when this is applied by the author himself, the meaning is unmistakable." [67] In one place Clement says that "a Gnostic's virtue is incapable of being lost"; [68] but he adds that this fact is owing to the Gnostic's efforts and foresight, to his good inclination, aided by divine grace.[69] He declares that perfect love banishes every selfish motive of fear or hope; but a consideration of his doctrine as a whole clearly shows that he excludes from perfect love only motives that come from the hope of temporal advantage, of a reward other than God himself.[70] He describes the perfect Christian as having mind and heart firmly fixed upon an unchangeable center, that is God; not that the perfect Christian is to rest satisfied with inactive contemplation, but that in this contemplation he may find a means of more rapidly and directly advancing to his end. He says: "As, then, those who at sea are held by an anchor, pull at the anchor, but do not drag it to them, but drag themselves to the anchor; so those who, according to the Gnostic life, draw God towards them, imperceptibly bring themselves to God." [71]

When Clement speaks of God, the Trinity, the human nature of Christ, the Christian life, he sometimes employs expressions wanting in exactness and precision. But these defects are nearly always in the words rather than in the thought. Most of the time they are due to the imperfection of a theological terminology still in process of formation. Thus, when speaking of the Divine Persons, at times he goes so far in expressing their unity, that he seems to make them modes of one

[67] Bossuet, *Tradition des nouveaux mystiques* (*Œuvres,* Lebel ed., XXVIII, 28).
[68] *Stromata,* VII, vii.
[69] *Ibid.*
[70] Freppel, *Clément d'Alexandrie,* p. 466; cf. Bossuet, *Cinquième écrit sur les maximes des saints.*
[71] *Stromata,* IV, xxiii.

and the same substance and thus invites the charge of modalism.[72] Other passages where he seems to carry too far the primal dependence of the Son upon the Father, have laid him open to the charge of subordinationism.[73] He divides all Christians into two categories, those who rely on faith alone, and those who rise to Gnosis; but, on the other hand, he declares that Gnosis presupposes faith, and that faith contains Gnosis in germ; so his distinction has nothing in common with that which, in the false Gnosticism, separates the hylics, the psychics, and the pneumatics, granting to these last scandalous license.[74]

The many inexactitudes in Clement's writings and their evident exaggerations have led some theologians to pass severe judgment on his doctrine.[75] But apparently this was not the reason that decided Pope Benedict XIV to strike his name from the martyrology, but rather the fact that, before the appearance of his name in the martyrology of Usuard (eleventh century), no trace has been found of any public veneration paid to this ecclesiastical writer in any Church whatever, with either the explicit or the tacit sanction of a bishop.[76]

[72] *Pedagogue,* I, 7 f.; III, 12; *Stromata,* V, vi; VII, 12.

[73] *Stromata,* IV, 25 f.; V, 14; VII, 2.

[74] *Pedagogue,* I, 6.

[75] *E. g.,* Petau considers that Clement's writings contain the germs of Arianism. On Clement's doctrine and errors, see Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* I, 243–256.

[76] Benedict XIV, *Œuvres,* VI, 119–125. There is a flavor of "that Hellenic Christianity, with its uncertain outlines and its vague and luminous horizon" in the *Odes of Solomon,* a pseudepigraphal work, traces of which are found as early as the third century. It was considered a lost writing, until the Orientalist, Rendel Harris, found it (in 1906) among some Syriac manuscripts brought from the banks of the Tigris. There are several indications that this work, which is a remarkable expression of Jewish mysticism with Gnostic tendencies, is an Egyptian work, and "we can easily imagine this pseudo-Solomon writing his poems in the atmosphere where Clement grew up, perhaps not far from his master Pantaenus." (D'Alès, in *Etudes,* 1911, p. 769.)

Origen

The greatest merit of Clement of Alexandria is that he trained Origen. In the main, if we disregard a few still vague but suggestive ideas regarding the ways of mysticism, Clement's personal contribution to the ecclesiastical sciences is of little importance. The author of the *Pedagogue* was an educator, a marvelous wakener of souls, one of those teachers whose whole worth is in their professorial chair or in their informal converse with their pupils. Clement recognized this himself, for at the beginning of his *Stromata* he questions whether it is permissible for him to write, to confide to a dead book what is made for oral, living teaching.[77] Quite different is Origen. His works, as well as his teaching, mark the beginning of an epoch in the history of human thought. Until St. Augustine, whose authority supplanted his, all the Greek and Latin Fathers obtained inspiration from his exegesis, his apologetics, and his theology. This "labor-loving Origen," as St. Athanasius calls him,[78] not only is, like Irenaeus, a harvester of all the knowledge of his time, but, like St. Augustine, a sower of new ideas. History must pause in veneration before the person and work of this great scholar.

Origen was born of Christian parents, at Alexandria, in 185. His first instruction he received from his father Leonides; at an early age, he attended the School of Alexandria, where he heard Clement's instructions. From his earliest years the boy revealed earnest piety and an avid desire for knowledge. Eusebius says: "The life of Origen, indeed, appears to me worthy of being recorded, even from his tender infancy. It was in the tenth year of the reign of Severus, when Alexandria

[77] *Stromata*, I, i.

[78] Τοῦ φιλοπόνου Ὠριγένους, St. Athanasius, *De decretis nicaeni*, sec. 27 (Translation by J. H. Newman, in Library of the Fathers, VIII, 48).

and the rest of Egypt was under the government of his viceroy Laetus, and the churches there were under the episcopal administration of Demetrius, that the flame of persecution blazed forth mightily, and many thousands were crowned with martyrdom. It was then, too, that the love of martyrdom so powerfully seized the soul of Origen, though yet an almost infant boy, that he advanced so close to encounter danger, and was eager to leap forward and rush upon the conflict. . . . His mother concealed his clothes in order to compel him to remain at home." [79] From childhood, under his father's direction, he devoted himself with utmost eagerness to the study of the Scriptures. "It was not sufficient for him merely to read what was simple and obvious in the sacred books, but he sought also what was beyond this, into the deeper senses of the text, and was busily employed in such speculations even at that age." [80] Leonides moderated the boy's ardor, but "they say that frequently, when standing over his sleeping son, he uncovered his breast and, as a shrine consecrated by the divine Spirit, reverently kissed it and congratulated himself upon his favored offspring." [81]

In 203, the illustrious head of the School of Alexandria, proclaiming courageous and prudent principles regarding martyrdom, condemned both the cowardly and the presumptuous.[82] He judged it proper to retire to Cappadocia, to his disciple, Bishop Alexander, whose church he administered after Alexander was imprisoned for the faith. The great Christian School might have remained silent a long time, if the bishop, Demetrius, had not placed at its head the ardent disciple who was already its glory. Origen was not more than eighteen years old at the time. In the very midst of persecution, the fearless young man, by dint of his extraordinary power for work,

[79] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, ii, 6.
[80] *Ibidem*, VI, ii.
[81] *Ibid.*
[82] *Stromata*, IV, iv.

succeeded in gathering about his professorial chair an ever increasing number of hearers. His very success was a safeguard for him. Heretics and even pagans, among the most distinguished in the city, were eager to hear him. That he might the better fit himself to instruct such an audience, Origen resolved to undertake a methodical and searching study of philosophy. And as his guide in this study, he chose the founder of Neoplatonism, Ammonius Saccas.[83] He also wished to learn Hebrew and to perfect himself in philology. One of his pupils, Ambrose, placed his great wealth at Origen's service, obtaining books for him and having carried out for him all the research that he required.

About 212 Origen went to Rome, prompted by a desire to become acquainted with "the very ancient Church of the Romans," [84] as he himself says. Beginning with the year 215, his life became extremely disturbed. A violent persecution of the Christians forced him, that year, to flee to Palestine. Although a layman, he was invited to give lectures there to the faithful in the churches. So great was his fame that, in 218, Mammaea, the mother of the future Emperor Alexander Severus, summoned him to Antioch to confer with him about the Christian religion. But at the same time Bishop Demetrius blamed him for usurping functions reserved to ecclesiastics. About 228 his friends, Bishop Theoctistus and Bishop Alexander, ordained him to the priesthood. Soon after that, about 230, he published his great theological work, *Peri Archon,* or, *The Principles.* But his bishop, Demetrius, accused him, not only of infractions against the laws of the Church, but of heresy. Two synods at Alexandria in 231 deprived him of the office of teaching and forbade him to exercise the sacerdotal ministry. A Roman council in the pontificate of Pontianus (*circa* 232) agreed in this condemnation.

[83] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xix.
[84] *Ibidem,* xiv.

Were the condemnations of Origen motivated solely by a desire to protect orthodoxy and discipline, or did less honorable motives influence these decisions? St. Jerome thought so, and declared so in no uncertain terms.[85] Yet we must acknowledge that *The Principles,* though perfectly orthodox in its main lines, and though abounding in noble views which posterity used to advantage, contained many reckless and dangerous assertions.

Like Irenaeus at the beginning of his book on *Heresies,* and like Tertullian at the beginning of his treatise on *Prescription,* Origen began by setting down the rule of faith, from which, he says, he will never depart. This rule is the preaching of the Church, connected with the teaching of the Apostles and of Christ.[86] At the very outset of his work, the author enumerates the certain truths that we have from this teaching; they are almost the very ones we profess today when we recite the Apostles' Creed. But, in addition to these truths, ascertained with finality and which all are bound to believe, others, which God leaves to the free inquiry of scholars, form the domain for the exercise of the theologian's sagacity.

In this study, says Origen, the theologian draws from two sources: Scripture and philosophy. Sacred Scripture should be the object of our whole veneration, because it contains the word of God. But it is susceptible of three meanings: a somatic or literal sense, a psychic or moral sense, and a pneumatic or spiritual sense. There are a few passages that have only a spiritual sense. These can be recognized by the practical impossibility of taking them literally; in such case, the Chris-

[85] *"Damnatur a Demetrio . . . Roma ipsa contra eum cogit senatum; non propter dogmatum novitatem, nec propter haeresim, ut nunc adversus eum rabidi canes simulant, sed quia gloriam eloquentiae ejus et scientiae ferre non poterant et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur."* (St. Jerome, *Rufinus, Apol.,* II, 20.)

[86] *Principles,* Pref., 3. Save for a few fragments in Greek, there is nothing extant of this treatise except Rufinus' Latin translation, in which Rufinus strives to palliate Origen's errors, especially with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. St. Jerome made a literal translation of it; but that has been almost totally lost.

tian will confidently pass over the figure or allegory and come directly to the mystery which it cloaks.[87] Origen, and especially his followers, would apply this last rule abusively and, on pretext of seeking a deeper sense, would too readily substitute the allegory for the letter, fancy for the rule of faith.

As he had learned from his teacher Clement, Origen held that philosophy is a very noble and lofty thing, that "perchance philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily, till the Lord should call the Greeks." [88] Like his master, he also believed that philosophy is not such or such a system, but rather a method and a spirit.[89] But he who in enthusiastic youth had received the teachings of Ammonius Saccas, he who had sat at school beside Plotinus, would in spite of himself often let the Neoplatonic doctrine enter into his theology and at times vitiate it in a dangerous way.

Theology of "The Principles"

All the problems of religious philosophy which God has left to the discussion of men, Origen groups around two great questions: that of God's relations with the material world, and that of the origin of evil and its remedy.

He holds that matter is created, really created, that is, drawn forth from nothing, but that it is eternal; for, he says, if God for a single moment could have been not the Creator, he would have acquired a new perfection at a given time; He would not be the Almighty Eternal. For the same reason, God created all the beings that He could draw from nothing; our world is but a moment in the midst of an infinity of worlds that have preceded it and that will come after it. Between the world and God is an ascending order of creatures, more and more perfect, more and more free from matter, yet without

[87] *Principles,* IV, xiii.
[88] *Stromata,* I, v and xx; VI, xvii.
[89] St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Panegyric on Origen,* 13 f.

any being absolutely lacking a body, howsoever subtle. God exists as a descending order which, while maintaining the unity of nature between the Divine Persons, and even their consubstantiality,[90] graduates their plenitude and subordinates the activities of the Son and of the Holy Ghost to that of the Father. It must be confessed that Origen's language is clearly that of subordinationism. The only excuse that can be found for it is his desire to combat the Modalists, whom he always had in mind.

It is somewhat after the manner of Gnosticism that Origen tries to explain the relations of God with the world. Perhaps through consideration of this first question, Duchesne says that Origen's system, on matters in which the faith did not seem to him to be at stake, is "a sort of compromise between the Gospel and Gnosticism." [91] On the second chief question of his treatise, the problem of evil, Origen so far departs from the Gnostic system that he takes the contrary attitude.

Whereas heretical Gnosticism explains the origin of evil by a fatal decadence of beings, Origen holds that all the degrees of good and evil, all the degrees of the being of creatures, are to be explained only by freedom. The object of the eternal creation was beings equal in faculties and gifts, but free. They have not all been equally faithful to God; hence the differences between them.[92] Some became angels, others human beings, others devils. But the evil which free will made, free will can repair, not however by the mere powers of nature, but by the coöperation of man with God. About this coöperation the great scholar uses expressions of unsurpassed clearness and force.[93] The possibility of this coöperation is owing to the

[90] The word ὁμοούσιος is to be found in Origen, if he is rendered exactly in the Latin translation of one of his homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[91] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 259.

[92] *Principles,* I, viii; II, ix; III, v.

[93] *Ibidem,* III, i, 22. Cf. III, i, 18.

Incarnation, by which Jesus Christ, true Son of God, became truly man, and thereby made Himself capable of expiating and redeeming the sins of men. This redemption is accomplished by His death and is perpetuated by the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. Through these mysteries or Sacraments, Christ unites Himself to whosoever is willing to be united, grants His strength to whoever accepts it, communicates His divinity to whoever consents to receive it.

But the triumph of good over evil would not be worthy of God unless it were complete. Origen glimpses a regeneration of all creatures at the end of time, a sort of return to unity by a fusion of every created being in the Uncreated, a fusion that is not the absorption of God in man, nor of man in God, but one in which every creature, even a sinful one, gradually purified by the avenging fire, that is, by the fever of its remorse,[94] will at last enter into the friendship of God. Then death will be destroyed, the body will be spiritualized, the material world will be transformed, and everywhere there will be only peace and harmony in love.[95] Origen's book is a curious mixture of boldness and timidity; when he approaches the question of the consummation of all things, he hesitates and humbles himself. He says: "These subjects, indeed, are treated by us with great solicitude and caution, in the manner rather of an investigation and discussion, than in that of fixed and certain decision." [96] Yet we feel that, even if he dare not place his full assurance in this vision of the final regeneration, he puts his whole desire and his whole heart into it.

There was never anything artificial about Origen's enthusiasm. When repulsed at Alexandria, he was welcomed with favor by the bishops of Palestine, and at Caesarea he opened

[94] *Ibidem,* II, x, 4.
[95] *Ibidem,* I, vi, 4; III, vi, 6.
[96] *Ibidem,* I, vi, 1.

a theological school that had a more marked scientific character than the Alexandrian School. Origen begins there by teaching dialectics; he then teaches physics, geometry, and astronomy, and after that takes up the subject of morals, which, as one of his hearers said, "seems to be incarnate in the teacher himself." [97] From morals he passes to metaphysics, reviews all the philosophical systems, and recommends the study of all the writers, save those who deny the existence of God and of Providence.[98] The master then saw flocking to Caesarea the most illustrious disciples, such as Gregory, the future Thaumaturgus, and his young brother. There he publishes his greatest works of exegesis and the gigantic monument of Biblical criticism known as the *Hexapla.* Its purpose is to make visible the exactness of the translation known as the Septuagint Version, and to supply a safe basis for the textual criticism of the Sacred Books. In six columns he places opposite the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters, the same text transliterated into Greek letters, the version of Aquila, that of Symmachus, that of the Septuagint, and that of Theodotion. His fame became universal. He was consulted from all sides; his writings spread in the West as in the East. Yet he withstood all the enemies of the Church: heretics, Jews, and pagans. For he loved the Church with a boundless love. "The Church alone," he said, "is in possession of the right faith [99] . . . The true canon of the Scriptures is that alone which the Church guarantees.[100] . . . The formula of the true faith is that which is in the baptismal symbol.[101] . . . The heretics have the name of Christians; but in reality they are robbers and adulterers: robbers who make off with the vessels of the

[97] St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *op. cit.,* chaps. 7–15.
[98] *Ibid.*
[99] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* bk. 1, sec. 19.
[100] *Homily 1 on Luke.*
[101] *Commentary on St. John's Gospel,* bk. 32, sec. 9.

temple, adulterers who stain the chaste dogmas of the Church." [102]

Origen's "Contra Celsum"

But the heretics were not the only enemies of the Church. The middle of the second century marks the starting point of a series of open attacks upon Christianity by the pagan philosophers, attacks that continued until Julian the Apostate. Scholars, such as Crescens and Fronto, assailed the Christian religion with the weapons of historical criticism and dialectics. Their writings were soon eclipsed by the work of the Platonist Celsus, whose *True Discourse* (about 178) is the most violent diatribe that pagan antiquity produced against the religion of Christ. Therein insult is heaped upon the Christians, their sacred books, their dogmas, their worship, their whole life. The Bible is made out to be a mass of silly fables; Christ and His disciples, as commonplace impostors: the rapid spread of Christianity, as the result of the panic caused by the terrors of the last judgment and the fire of hell; the organization of the Church, as the most dread peril that ever menaced the prosperity and security of the Empire. The work is skeptical and abusive, false to the point of flagrant lying, humorous to the point of low comedy; yet it betrays extensive knowledge, remarkable keenness, and consummate cleverness.[103] There was only one man capable of at once presenting a complete and victorious refutation of it—Origen. For a while he withstood the persistent entreaties of his friends, not through lack of courage, but because he was convinced that

[102] *"Casta Ecclesiae dogmata"; Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* bk. 5, sec. 1.

[103] Celsus' work is lost, but it can be almost entirely reconstructed, thanks to the method of his opponent, Origen, who refutes his teaching by quoting his exact words and following him step by step.

any human effort was powerless to reëstablish destroyed or shaken faith in men's souls. He says: "If it were possible, indeed, for me to enter along with my words into the conscience of everyone without exception who peruses this work, and to extract each dart which wounds him who is not completely protected with the whole armor of God, and apply a rational medicine to cure the wound inflicted by Celsus . . . I would do so. . . . It is the work of God alone to take up His abode invisibly." [104] Yet he decides to do so, "to refute the statements of Celsus and thus to prepare the way for the triumph of the truth." [105]

In the preface Origen declares what he conceives to be the true proof of Christianity, which is not a mental exercise, but which can make a man pass from unbelief to the faith, or strengthen a Christian in his belief. He declares: "I venture, then, to say that this 'apology,' which you require me to compose, will somewhat weaken that defense [of Christianity] which rests on facts, and that power of Jesus which is manifest to those who are not altogether devoid of perception." [106] But what, in Origen's mind, is that "apology which rests on facts (*τὴν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀπολογίαν*)"? What, especially to his mind, shows the truth of Christianity is the moral power and the moral perfection of the Church. "There is not a single juggler," he says, "who by means of his proceedings invites his spectators to reform their morals." [107] "Nor would the Christians, had they owed their origin to a rebellion, have adopted laws of so exceedingly mild a character as not to allow them, when it was their fate to be slain as sheep, on any occasion to resist their persecutors." [108] And again he says: "Agreeably to the promise of Jesus, His disciples performed even greater

[104] *Against Celsus,* V, i.
[105] *Ibidem,* Pref., 4.
[106] *Ibidem,* Pref., 3.
[107] *Ibidem,* I, 68. Cf. II, 44; VIII, 43.
[108] *Ibidem,* III, 7.

works than these miracles of Jesus. . . . Many, too, who were lame in the feet of the inner man, as Scripture calls it, do not simply leap, but leap as the hart." [109] And he adds that the spread of Christianity and the persecution daily increases the power of the Christian faith.[110] We might almost suppose we were listening to the words of the Vatican Council declaring that "the very Church herself, in view of her wonderful propagation, her eminent holiness, and her exhaustless fruitfulness in all that is good . . . offers a great and evident claim to belief, and an undeniable proof of her divine commission." [111]

This, however, does not mean that the apologist makes little use of the other proofs: prophecies, miracles, and our Lord's explicit declarations. For Origen devotes to these proofs the major part of his book. But, since his aim is that of practical apologetics, he wishes first to bring before his reader the proof that he can best grasp, the moral miracle of the life of the Church.

Further, whatever proof is offered, it will be effective, says Origen, only for a soul that is well-disposed. "Respecting the whole history related in the Gospels concerning Jesus, there is need of candor in those who are to read, and of much investigation and, so to speak, of insight into the meaning of the writers." [112] But this is far from the prompting which inspired the work of Celsus. Celsus is not at any pains to understand the Scriptures; [113] he consults nothing but his hatred; [114] he parodies, he scoffs, he descends even to buffoonery,[115] and thus, instead of throwing light on any-

[109] *Ibidem,* II, 48.
[110] *Ibid.*
[111] Vatican Council, session III, chap. 3 (Denzinger, no. 1794).
[112] *Against Celsus,* I, 42.
[113] *Ibidem,* III, 74.
[114] *Ibidem,* II, 11.
[115] *Ibidem,* V, 18. Cf. II, 56; III, 21; IV, 13.

thing, he darkens everything; in place of rising, he sinks.[116]

None of Origen's works better reveals the depth of his apostolic soul; an apostle writes or speaks, not to gratify himself with vain notions, but to influence souls, to convert them to Christ, to save them.

Origen's Zeal

It is beyond question that the *Contra Celsum* contributed in large measure to the salvation of many souls. Yet the zealous apologist was not satisfied. To Christ he had given his labor and his tranquillity and, under especially painful circumstances, he had made sacrifices that were even more intimately personal; but he had not shed his blood for Christ. The longing of his childhood had not been realized. When a mere boy, he envied the lot of his father Leonides, who was put to death for the faith. Later on, in 235, at the beginning of the persecution of Maximinus, two of his friends, Ambrose and Protoctetus, were cast into prison, and Origen wrote them his *Exhortation to Martyrdom.*

"Fifteen years later, the Decian persecution found him at his post of Christian teacher, and he was arrested, dragged to the rack, thrown into prison, and loaded with chains, and his limbs were wrenched asunder. He was threatened with the stake, and subjected to other tortures. Nothing daunted his courage. Nevertheless, less fortunate than his friend Alexander, who died in prison, Origen lived on. He survived the end of the persecution for two or three years, and found time to associate himself with Cornelius, Cyprian, and Dionysius, the great bishops of the day, in the merciful work of reconciling the apostates, whose faith had failed in the days of trial. His friend Ambrose died before him. A letter on martyrdom from his old disciple Dionysius, then bishop of Alexandria, was one of the last that he received. At last he died, crowned with all the honors a Christian may aspire

[116] *Ibidem,* VII, 46.

to in this world, and poor to the very last. It was at Tyre that he gave up his beautiful soul to God." [117]

He left behind an immense work [118] that aroused more discussion after his death than during his life. St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Pamphilus, and Eusebius of Caesarea vigorously defended him. Others bitterly accused him of having favored the heretical tendencies of his contemporaries by teaching the eternity of creation, the materiality of the angels, the subordination of the Son and the Holy Ghost to the Father, by giving too large a place to allegory in the Scriptures, by favoring belief in the preëxistence of souls, by insinuating the expectation of a final restoration of all things in God, a restoration that will be shared by the damned and even the devils. These are the errors for which, more or less justly, Origen has been blamed. It is hard to say exactly how far they should be attributed to him. His writings were falsified even while he was living; Origen complains of this sadly.[119] If there are gaps and errors in the very numerous subjects which this great man broached, often for the first time, beyond the path marked out by tradition, his work as a whole has never been attacked by anyone and merits our admiration. With Origen, Catholic theology, roughly hewn by St. Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, is penetrated with a generous breath of true science and true criticism. His upright intentions, devotion to the Church, and ceaseless labor, and that longing for sacrifice which animated him to his last day, make him a model for anyone with the ambition of devoting his life to the defense of his faith.

St. Hippolytus

While Catholic science was making so great progress in the

[117] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 253.

[118] Six thousand volumes, according to St. Epiphanius. "This enormous number is not improbable, if we consider the peculiarities of an ancient library, and the small size of the rolls (*volumina*) written on." (Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 255.)

[119] Freppel, *Origène,* II, 445; Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 260.

East, it appeared in the West in works that were less brilliant, but firmer and clearer. St. Hippolytus must be regarded as the principal representative of this movement. His commentaries on the Scripture are rightly preferred to those of Origen, if not for depth and originality of thought, at least for the soundness of the principles inspiring them, for the soberness of the views, for the tactfulness and good taste that guide his interpretations and practical applications. St. Jerome enumerates the great exegetical works of St. Hippolytus; but only fragments of them are extant.[120]

St. Hippolytus' chief work is the *Refutation of All Heresies,* better known as the *Philosophumena.*[121] It was discovered on Mount Athos in 1842 and published for the first time at Oxford in 1851.[122] It probably appeared about the year 230. From the preface we learn that the author's purpose is "to show whence the heretics derive their doctrines. They come from pagan wisdom, philosophic doctrines, deceitful mysteries, and the stories of wandering astrologers." Here we no longer have the fine confidence of Justin, Clement, and Origen in philosophy, "the gift of God to the Greek genius." Hippolytus, more of a lawyer than a metaphysician, is Roman in character as well as by birth, although he writes in Greek; he is distrustful of obscure speculation and its dangers; on the other hand, he carries his taste for precision to extremes. If he

[120] St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus,* 61; *Commentary on Matthew,* Prologue. The most complete work on St. Hippolytus is d'Alès, *La Théologie de saint Hippolyte.*

[121] Attempts have been made to prove that the *Philosophumena* was not written by St. Hippolytus. It has been variously attributed to Origen, Caius, Tertullian, Novatian, or some member of his school. A. d'Alès, having examined all the arguments advanced for these different opinions, concludes, in agreement with Funk, that "the attribution of the work to St. Hippolytus is as certain as any fact can be that still lacks direct attestation." (D'Alès, *op. cit.,* pp. xxxv–xliii.)

[122] Duncker-Schneidewin, *Refutatio omnium haeresium.* (See Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* pp. 208 ff.) The first book of this work was already known and attributed to Origen. The Codex discovered in 1842 contains books 4–10. We still lack books 2 and 3.

thinks that a man is evasive or through prudence or cleverness weighs the pros and cons, Hippolytus makes such a one, even though he be pope, the object of his strongest invectives and his sturdiest opposition.

The *Philosophumena* relates two disputes in which Hippolytus even caused a schism by his resistance to popes whom he judged had yielded to error. His heroic martyrdom and humble retractation no doubt blotted out this fault before God; and, as we shall see, attenuating circumstances must have considerably lessened its gravity. The historical facts are beyond cavil.[123]

The first controversy in which Hippolytus engaged was the Trinitarian dispute. Its origin involves the teaching of very early Fathers. When a Jew or a pagan was admitted to the Church, his baptismal initiation was made in the name of the Trinity. He was told: You have heretofore worshipped the one only God adored by your patriarchs, your prophets, or your philosophers. But your faith was incomplete. Henceforth you will adore the Son of God, whom you are going to receive in the "breaking of bread," and the Spirit of God, who will make you a perfect Christian. The three sacred names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were thus at the very beginning the distinctive sign of the Christian faith. The first Christians not only adored the Father as Creator, the Son as Redeemer, and the Spirit as Sanctifier, but also loved them "with their whole

[123] "In the entire history of the Church few events are so strange as the schism of St. Hippolytus. An eminent member of the Roman clergy, continuing to be an antipope until shortly before his death; opposed to him, the legitimate pope, St. Callistus, who was an object of attack during his life and was vilified after his death: this was a situation more rare than it was edifying. . . . We cannot expect to clear up all the points in the question, by means of a unique and evidently partial document, the *Philosophumena*. . . . How far Hippolytus was mistaken as to the import of his claims and whether he was convinced that his adversary had fallen from orthodoxy and was not fit to exercise apostolic authority, must remain a mystery. . . . But when he became a victim of persecution and was face to face with death, Hippolytus recovered and again became a good churchman." (D'Alès, *La Théologie de saint Hippolyte,* pp. 1, 211, 213.)

heart, and their whole soul, and with all their strength." Since, even before Tertullian used the word "person" to distinguish the three divine terms of the Trinity, the intimate love was a relationship of a personal sort; the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost were, to Christians of the first centuries, subsisting individualities.

The Fathers of the Church were watchful that the doctrine of the divine oneness did not suffer from this threefold adoration. It is noteworthy how insistently St. Justin, Theophilus of Antioch, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen keep repeating that it is the Word that was revealed to men in the divine apparitions of the Old Testament. They employed this argument to show the Jews that Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word, is none other than the "angel of Israel," so often manifested to their fathers. This same argument they use to convince the pagans that Christianity is not a new religion, but that it is connected with the birth of mankind. And, in fine, they employ it also against the Gnostics, when proving that the same God is the author of the two Testaments.[124]

For a long time these general dogmatic affirmations were sufficient. But as philosophical speculation entered into the Christian world, men's minds became engaged in the explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity. Two extremes were possible: to exaggerate the unity or to over-emphasize the trinity. And in fact these two excesses appeared toward the end of the second century. One was the error of a wealthy tanner of Byzantium, named Theodotus; the other, of a Christian of Asia, named Praxeas, about whose personal history we know nothing.

Theodotus was a well-educated and scholarly Christian. Having had the misfortune to apostatize during a persecu-

[124] Genoulhac, in his *Histoire du dogme catholique*, bk. 12, chap. 1, has gathered together a large number of texts on this point.

tion, he came to Rome in the time of Pope Victor, there to hide his shame. When recognized by some of the brethren, he alleged in self-justification that, in denying Christ, he had not, after all, denied God, but only a man. Calling to his aid his abundant erudition and persuasive eloquence, he strove to prove his doctrine by Scripture texts and by reason. According to him the teaching of the Gospel amounts to this: A very religious man, Jesus, born of a virgin, received on the day of his Baptism an outpouring of divine graces which made him capable of fulfilling the mission of Messias. But this outpouring of grace did not make him God. He merely became the adopted son of God. Some of Theodotus' followers, however, maintained that Jesus became divinized after his resurrection. About 190, Pope Victor excommunicated Theodotus. The latter resisted and, in the midst of scholarly men, organized a sort of Church, or rather a school of philosophy, with himself at the head, which concerned itself more with Aristotle and Plato than with the teaching of the Church. A second Theodotus, called the Banker, to distinguish him from the Tanner, gave a religious color to the sect by adding to its founder's theories about Jesus certain odd speculations about Melchisedech. By a private interpretation of a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[125] he called Melchisedech the Son of God and identified him with the Spirit that descended upon Jesus on the day of His Baptism. About 234, one Artemon revived the schism by claiming that the doctrine of Theodotus had been the doctrine of the Church until the time of Pope Zephyrinus, who altered the tradition.

This heresy seems to have had no importance beyond what it owed to the talents, intrigues, and social influence of its chiefs. An attack upon so well-established a dogma could not disturb the faithful very greatly. It met a ruthless opponent in Hippolytus, who placed his vigorous talent and consummate

[125] Heb. 7:3.

erudition at the service of tradition and of the Holy See.

But an opposite error had already started. In connection with the Montanist dispute we mentioned a mysterious person known by the name of Praxeas.[126] He came to Rome to enlighten Pope Zephyrinus as to the real character of the sect, and particularly as to the excesses which the cult of the Paraclete gave rise to. Praxeas made so little account of the Holy Ghost that he absorbed His personality as well as that of the Son in the divine Personality. In other words, he revived the Modalist error, which considered the three Persons of the Trinity as modes or aspects of one Substance. Those holding this opinion were wont to call themselves Monarchians, because, they said, they desired to maintain the monarchy in the government of the world. Their opponents ironically gave them the name of *Patripassians,* because it logically followed from their theory that the Father had been crucified with the Son on Calvary. Tertullian, who never forgave Praxeas for having contributed to the condemnation of the Montanists, said of him: "Praxeas did a twofold service for the devil at Rome: he put the Paraclete to flight, and he crucified the Father." [127]

Pope Zephyrinus, after receiving such useful information from Praxeas, seems to have testified his kindness towards him, but in his friendliness perhaps closed his eyes for a

[126] So vague is all information regarding Praxeas, that De Rossi and Hagemann doubt whether he should not be identified with Epigonus or Callistus. De Rossi's conjecture, identifying Praxeas with Epigonus, is maintained in the *Bullett. di archeol. crist.,* 1886, pp. 1 ff., 17 ff. Gerhard Esser, in his learned monograph, *Wer war Praxeas?,* discusses the question. The historical problem is a curious one. Tertullian not only attributed to Praxeas the introduction of "Patripassian Monarchianism," but also wrote an entire treatise against him. Hippolytus, who was well situated to become acquainted with the Patripassian heresy, since he fought against it personally at Rome, says not a single word about Praxeas; he speaks of Noetus and the latter's disciple, Epigonus (*Refutation of all Heresies,* IX, 2). It seems impossible to decide whether or not "Praxeas" is merely a fictitious name.

[127] *Against Praxeas,* 1.

time to Praxeas' doctrine, which appears, moreover, to have been spread by him only by way of gradually advancing insinuations.[128] Hippolytus expressly charges Zephyrinus with having favored heresy by permitting the new doctors to be heard. In fact, many of Praxeas' followers quickly spread his teaching. Noetus preached it at Smyrna, Epigonus brought it to Rome. Finally Sabellius became its chief protagonist. As Tertullian says: "Soon you hear nothing but people talking about monarchy." [129] The Monarchians' tactics were to present themselves as the opponents of the Theodotian heresy. Perhaps a consideration of the real services which they rendered the Church in fighting the heresy was the chief reason why the Pope did not proceed at once with rigor. The simple and upright man who was at the head of the Church merely affirmed the traditional truths. He said: "I know that there is one God, Jesus Christ; nor except Him do I know any other that is begotten and amenable to suffering. . . . The Father did not die, but the Son." We have this remark from Hippolytus himself.[130] From these statements, the author of the *Philosophumena* concludes that Zephyrinus really professed the doctrine of the new teachers, even while wishing to have it appear that he was disowning it. With open derision the Pope was called ignorant. It is likely that Zephyrinus was a stranger to philosophical studies. Perhaps it was well that he was so and that, while speculative theories were clashing with each other, a pontiff who knew only tradition, which was in his keeping, merely repeated the statement of that tradition, "keeping a firm hold on the two ends of the chain, though not always seeing the middle where the chain continues," [131] and leaving the trial of the systems to the future.

[128] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 225.
[129] *Against Praxeas,* 3.
[130] *Philosophumena,* IX, 6.
[131] Bossuet, *Libre arbitre,* chap. 4.

The Question of Penance

The man on whom Hippolytus heaped his mightiest maledictions was not Pope Zephyrinus, but his friend and adviser, Callistus. When, at Zephyrinus' death, the clergy chose Callistus in his place, Hippolytus refused to recognize him and allowed a schismatical party to confer the government of the Church of Rome on himself.

His opposition to Callistus was bitter and relentless. The new Pope, at the outset of his pontificate, condemned Sabellius. But Hippolytus accused him of not being sincere, of issuing his condemnation as a political move, and of personally sustaining a scarcely attenuated Monarchianism.[132] What are we to think of these charges? The sole authority for them is the *Philosophumena.* "It is quite strange that Tertullian, who disliked Callistus and who addresses him with many reproaches, does not charge him with such a misdeed. The witness of the author of the *Philosophumena* is isolated and, moreover, is that of a personal enemy. Until further historical researches are made, Callistus must at present, to judge exclusively by the facts, be regarded as orthodox.[133]

In another grievance against this Pope, Tertullian's violent opposition joined that of Hippolytus. We have already noted that several churches, while not denying God's power to forgive all sins without exception, refused canonical absolution to three categories of sinners: apostates, adulterers, and murderers. In other words, the excommunication of those who had committed any of these three sins was perpetual.[134] In Callistus' time this rigorism had become general.[135] For Chris-

[132] A description of this moderate Monarchianism will be found in Duchesne, *Origines chrétiennes,* p. 316, and Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* I, 291 f.

[133] Tixeront, *op. cit.,* I, 297; d'Alès, *op. cit.,* pp. 32–35.

[134] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 230.

[135] This fact is evidenced in the *Philosophumena,* VI, 41, and Clement's *Stromata,* II, 13.

tians who fell into one of these sins, the situation was very painful and usually did not promote the correction of the sinner. Condemned to the status of "penitents" for their whole life, without the prospect of ever returning to the communion of the Church, many lost courage, and forsook a penance that seemed to them to fail of its purpose.

Callistus thought to remedy this state of affairs. By a decree which we know only from Hippolytus and Tertullian, he ordained that henceforth fornicators and adulterers should be subjected to a merely temporary penance and that, after it had been performed, they could be absolved like ordinary sinners and received back into the communion of the faithful.[136] This rule was supplemented by certain minor prescriptions conceived in the same spirit.[137] Tertullian and Hippolytus cried "scandal!" Tertullian says: "I hear that there has even been an edict set forth, and a peremptory one, too. The Sovereign Pontiff—that is, the bishop of bishops—issues an edict: 'I remit, to such as have discharged the requirements of repentance, the sins both of adultery and of fornication.' . . . And where shall this liberality be posted up? On the very spot, I suppose, on the very gates of the sensual appetites. . . . The Church, the true, the modest, has none to whom to make such a promise; and if she have had, she does not make it." [138] Hippolytus' diatribe is not so violent; but it is no less bitter. Even after the death of Callistus, under Popes Urban and Pontianus, Hippolytus continued to hold the title of bishop of Rome, and consequently of head of the Church. The conflict ended only when Maximinus issued his decree of persecution. Pontianus, the legitimate pope, and Hippolytus, the antipope, were arrested at the same time and sentenced to the mines of Sardinia. In prison they became recon-

[136] Tertullian, *Modesty,* 18.
[137] See Tixeront, *op. cit.,* I, 343 ff.
[138] Tertullian, *op. cit.,* 1.

ciled to each other, or rather Hippolytus, before his death, renounced the schism and counseled all his followers to rally to the Church.[139]

A fine monumental statue of white marble, erected at Rome in honor of St. Hippolytus, was discovered in some excavations in 1551. On it are engraved the titles of several of his writings. The object of many of these was the defense of sound doctrine. He fought the Theodotians, and also the Alogi and the Marcionites. That the Christians might not be dependent upon Jewish calculations in the matter of the date of Easter, he drew up Easter tables based on a cycle of eight years. His last work was probably the *Chronicles,* only fragments of which remain. The schism that he provoked did not survive him. His name is not found in the episcopal lists of Rome, and the *Liber Pontificalis* calls him simply "a Roman priest." [140]

The Persecution under Maximinus

Besides St. Pontianus and St. Hippolytus there were other illustrious victims of the persecution of Maximinus. To their names we can add that of Ambrose, Origen's closest friend, that of Pontianus' successor, Anterus, and perhaps also that of St. Barbara. This persecution lasted only three years; it began and ended with the reign of Maximinus. And it was only local.[141] In some places it was furious, in others mild, and in many places there was no persecution at all; compared with other persecutions, it claimed but few victims. Maximinus of Thrace, a brutal, coarse soldier, after having his predecessor, Alexander Severus, assassinated, was made emperor by the acclaim of the army. He had scarcely any idea what

[139] This is attested by a metrical inscription of Pope St. Damasus, which was found and partially restored by De Rossi.

[140] See A. d'Alès, *La Théologie de saint Hippolyte.*

[141] Letter of Firmilian to St. Cyprian, in *Letters of St. Cyprian,* LXXV.

Christianity might be. This former wrestler, of Herculean stature, who drank an amphora of wine in a single day and crushed a horse's jawbone with a blow of his fist,[142] had no intellectual or religious concern of any kind. He persecuted the Christians because Alexander had favored them. As Eusebius says,[143] this was the whole secret of his policy toward the Church.

Although Maximinus was simple and boorish, he had all the cunning of his rustic ancestors. Shrewdly he "commanded at first only the heads of the churches to be slain, as the abettors and agents of evangelical truth." [144] This is how Pontianus and Hippolytus, pope and antipope, were arrested early in his reign and banished to Sardinia. Origen also was a leader. Did the crowned barbarian misunderstand the influence of that great man? Or did Origen's immense popularity make him hesitate? Or, through a refinement of cunning, did he plan to accomplish his purpose by striking the one who, being Origen's disciple, friend, and Maecenas, had been the instigator of all his works? In any event, after Pontianus and Hippolytus, one of the principal persons arrested by the Emperor's orders was Ambrose, who had placed his influence and fortune at the service of the head of the Alexandrian School.

We have no information as to Ambrose's occupation before he was connected with Origen. "We know merely that he appeared with luster at the court of Severus or Caracalla, since Origen relates that he had made solemn entries into many cities. After withdrawing to Alexandria, he lived there surrounded by a large and flourishing family. His wife, Marcella, was a Christian. He had brothers and sisters and several children. Ambrose, perhaps yielding to the gentle in-

[142] Capitolinus, 1–3; Herodianus, *Historiae*, 7.
[143] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xxviii.
[144] *Ibid.*

fluences surrounding him, gave up paganism, but did not accept Christian truth without difficulty. Gnosticism, so brilliant at Alexandria, first beguiled his inquiring and subtle mind. But, as in the case of many others, Valentinus' error served him as a transition from paganism to Christianity. About 212, Ambrose embraced the orthodox faith. The instrument of his conversion was Origen. From that time he was passionately devoted to Origen and supplied him with books and copyists. And he spurred him on, questioning him insistently, unceasingly making that great mind gleam with its sparkling genius. Most of Origen's Scripture commentaries are due to Ambrose's generosity, and perhaps even more to his importunity." [145]

Ambrose was arrested with a priest of Caesarea, named Protoctetus, and a number of other Christians. His property was seized either by virtue of a legal confiscation or in consequence of illegal violence or disturbance. The Emperor had ordered that the Christians named by his informers be brought to him where he was encamped on the bank of the Rhine. Ambrose and his companions were placed in a wagon and sent off toward Germany. There, stripped of every title or office, they were to be exiled or sentenced to death. But they were spared a martyr's death.[146] There is reason to suppose they were set at liberty by the governor of some of the provinces through which they passed. Maximinus' reign was constantly disturbed by the conspiracies of his rivals, who tried to alienate from him the officials of the Empire. One of these officials, by freeing the Emperor's prisoners, would, so to speak, be pledging himself to the Emperor's rivals. We find Ambrose still living at the close of Philip's reign, about 248.

The Roman government was more watchful in the case of

[145] Allard, *Histoire des pers.*, II, 204 f.

[146] In the early centuries the title of marytr was not limited to those who died for the faith. It was given also to those who had suffered great tortures for the same cause.

Pontianus' successor, Anterus. The *Chronicle* of Hippolytus, quoted by the Philocalian Calendar, relates that Pontianus, having reached Sardinia, resigned his office, and Anterus was ordained in his place.[147] As to the reason for this strange resignation and for his being so quickly replaced, Allard supposes that "the recent adoption by the Roman Church of the corporate form as a basis of its relations with the government, and the growing importance of material interests entrusted to the head of the community, moved Pontianus to take the step he did; he wished that, in the crisis which was about to disturb the peace, the State would find a responsible administrator to deal with, a chief able to speak and treat in the name of his brethren." [148] Pontianus lived but a short time after his resignation. Anterus died at Rome even before his predecessor's martyrdom. The *Liber Pontificalis* says that the pontiff was put to death "for having carefully sought the Acts of the martyrs in the court records and for having hidden them in his church." [149] He was buried in the papal crypt in the cemetery of St. Callistus. The marble slab closing his tomb and marked with his name (*Anteros episcopos*) was found by De Rossi.[150]

St. Barbara was probably martyred under Maximinus at Nicomedia. The Acts of her martyrdom are of an early date.[151]

Maximinus' reign ended in a scene of murder similar to

[147] Document cited by De Smedt, *Introductio generalis ad historiam ecclesiae,* p. 511.

[148] Allard, *op. cit.,* II, 196.

[149] Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* p. ci; cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires,* III, note 11 on St. Anterus.

[150] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* II, 56, and plate 3. St. Anterus was a Greek. During his brief pontificate he began a collection of the Acts of the martyrs. He was supposed to have issued a decretal permitting the transfer of bishops from one see to another. But this document is apocryphal. (Cf. Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* I, xcv, c, 147; Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum,* I, 15.)

[151] See Tillemont, *Mémoires,* vol. III, note 1 on the persecution of Maximinus.

that which began it. One day in March, 238, while the Emperor was asleep in his tent before Aquileia, the pretorians rushed upon him to slay him. He was awakened by the noise and, so it is said, anticipated their outrage by committing suicide.

His two immediate successors, Pupienus and Balbinus, reigned only a few months. Under them and under Gordian III, who followed them, the Christians were not molested by the imperial magistrates. The Acts of the martyrs mention, in his reign, only the torture of the slave Sabina by her pagan mistress, because she refused to abjure the Christian religion. When the "brethren" learned that she had been consigned by her cruel mistress to a dungeon in the mountains, her feet in chains, condemned to hard labor, almost dying of fatigue and hunger, a distressing case of conscience was offered them for solution. The Christian law, howsoever favorable to the freeing of slaves, had always regarded a slave's escape as a violation of property rights. Tertullian said: "Such an act would be contrary to justice, to equity, and to honesty."[152] But might an abuse of power, such as this case presented, a violation of the first principles of natural law, justify an exception to the general rule? Their conscience decided that it did. Some fearless Christians succeeded in liberating the heroic slave; they changed her name to Theodota, which she used thereafter to evade her inhuman mistress' attempts to find her.[153]

Philip the Arabian (244–249)

The successor of Gordian III was Philip, the son of an Arab bandit. He had made his way into the Roman army. and, like Maximinus and Gordian, obtained the imperial office through a military uprising and the murder of his predecessor.

[152] Tertullian, *Against Marcion,* I, 23.
[153] *Acta sanctorum,* February, I, 44.

But this criminal upstart, who was born near Palestine in a district peopled by Christians, had early been initiated into the Christian faith.[154] While a mere boy, he shared in the trials of the Church and was persecuted under Maximinus; then he shared in the rejoicing of his brethren when the tyrant's fall restored peace and freedom to them.

The Christians were glad to see on the imperial throne a man who had received Baptism and never disavowed it. But the Church could not withhold her condemnation of the crime by which he came to power. During his journey to Rome to be invested with the imperial insignia, his stop in the city of Antioch was marked by an incident which is related by Eusebius, St. John Chrysostom, and the *Chronicle of Alexander*.[155] It was about the middle of April, 244.[156] The Christians of Antioch, gathered together at night, were celebrating the vigil of Easter. The holy Bishop Babylas, who later bravely gave his life for the faith, presided over the meeting. Philip, accompanied by his wife Otacilia Severa, who was also a Christian, advanced to take a place in the midst of the faithful. But the bishop recognized him. Coming up to the Emperor and placing his hand on Philip's breast, he said: "You have committed a murder; the Church can receive you only to the ranks of penitents."

"He then," says St. Chrysostom, "drove the sovereign from the church, with no more trouble than a shepherd has in driving out a sick sheep from his sheepfold." [157] The guilty Emperor obeyed and humbly took his place at the rear of the

[154] That Philip was a Christian is plainly stated by Eusebius (*H.E.*, VI, xxxiv), Vincent of Lerins (*Against the Heretics*, 23), Orosius (*Historiae adversum paganos*, bk. 7, chap. 20), and Dionysius of Alexandria, in Eusebius (VII, xix).

[155] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xxxiv; St. John Chrysostom, *De sancto Babyla*, VI; *Chron. Alex.* (ed. 1615), p. 630.

[156] Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs*, III, 302.

[157] St. John Chrysostom, *loc. cit.*

church among those who, in lowly attitude, awaited the pardon of their sins.[158]

Philip the Arabian was not a model Christian, but he was sincere. He marked his reign by several humane measures. He abolished that publicity of vice which had long been the scandal of the pagan world.[159] In 248, at the millennial of the founding of Rome, he granted a general amnesty, which permitted the return of exiled or deported Christians.[160] The disfavor which he showed toward idolatrous associations may be responsible for the fall of the Arval Brethren. All preceding emperors had held it an honor to belong to this association;[161] but Philip, who had been raised to the throne by the accident of chance, was not rooted in the Roman world; even if he thought of depriving paganism of its position of State religion, he did not have the power to do so. "Even the Christians did not ask him to do this. All they demanded of the State was the right to exist, a right accorded them by Alexander Severus. *'Christianos esse passus est,'* says Lampridius.[162] Philip granted it to them even more generously."[163] Moreover, the representatives of Christianity seem to have had free access to him.[164] Eusebius speaks of letters written by Origen to Philip and to the Empress Severa. St. Jerome and St. Vincent of Lerins had these letters in their hands. St.

[158] Champagny, *Les Césars du III^e siècle,* II, 211; Allard, *op. cit.,* pp. 224 ff. Duruy (*History of Rome,* VII, 173, note) questions the authenticity of this account, for no reason except that it is too much like the story of St. Ambrose stopping Theodosius at the threshold of the church. That the event is substantially true, is held by Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'empire romain,* p. 471, and by Renan, *Marc-Aurèle,* p. 586, note.

[159] Champagny, *op. cit.,* p. 217.

[160] *Justinian Code,* IX, xi, 7.

[161] *Bullett. di archeol. crist.,* 1869, p. 14.

[162] Lampridius, *Vita Alexandri,* 22.

[163] Allard, *op. cit.,* II, 236.

[164] This is the sum total of the truth contained in the *Acta sancti Pontii.* The legendary accounts in these Acts are criticized by Petau, *De doct. temp.,* bk. 2, chap. 25, and Tillemont, *Mémoires,* vol. V, note 7 on Valerian. Cf. *Acta sanctorum,* May, II, 274–279.

Vincent says that Origen in his letters speaks to the Emperor with "the doctrinal authority of the Church." [165]

In its outward organization, its geographical expansion, its penetration into society, and the development of ecclesiastical science, the Church made notable progress in the reign of Emperor Philip.

Pope St. Fabian (236–250)

On January 10, 236, St. Anterus was succeeded by Pope Fabian. According to Eusebius, his election was miraculous: the descent of a dove upon Fabian's head in sight of the electors marked him out for their unanimous choice, though he was a simple layman, had but recently come to Rome, and was almost unknown there.[166] He ruled until 250, when he became one of the first victims of the persecution of Decius. What we know of him indicates that he was an eminent administrator. He regulated the parish administration and to some extent established the plan of a Christian Rome, dividing the city districts among the seven deacons and instituting seven subdeacons to collaborate with the seven ecclesiastical notaries in editing the authentic Acts of the martyrs.[167]

Church Property

In Fabian's pontificate, thanks to the temporary peace which the Church enjoyed, ecclesiastical property became

[165] *"Christiani magisterii auctoritate."* (*Commonitory,* chap. 17.)

[166] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xxix.

[167] *Lib. pont.,* I, 149. Pseudo-Isidore, Gratian, and later canonists credit Fabian with various apocryphal regulations regarding ecclesiastical procedure, matrimony, the Eucharist, ordinations, etc. (Jaffé, *Regesta,* I, nos. 236–250.) According to the statement of St. Gregory of Tours, the first evangelization of France was due to St. Fabian, who, we are told, sent Gratian to Tours, Trophimus to Arles, Paul to Narbonne, Saturninus to Toulouse, Dionysius to Paris, Austremonius to Clermont, and Martial to Limoges. But it has been known for a long time that this account contains historical inaccuracies. The Church of Arles, for instance, certainly existed before the year 250. (See Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux,* I, 47, and Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity,* II, 264.)

organized, Christian propaganda spread afar and entered more and more into the upper classes of Roman society, and religious studies developed under the impulse of illustrious teachers.

The study of the way Church property was constituted at this period deserves special attention. One of Pope Fabian's first acts was to seek in Sardinia the body of his predecessor, St. Pontianus, that he might give it honorable burial, as he did the body of St. Anterus, in the papal cemetery of St. Callistus.[168] Such an event is significant. This journey, made openly by the Pope and his clergy, must have received the Emperor's authorization; Roman law was explicit in such cases.[169] But this authorization was an official confirmation of the rights of the Christians, especially of the bishop of Rome, to the cemetery of St. Callistus.[170] A passage in the *Philosophumena* seems to indicate that, in the time of Pope Zephyrinus, this cemetery was, so to speak, the headquarters of the Church of Rome (*domus Ecclesiae*).[171] A special crypt was provided there for the burial of the Roman pontiffs. In the time of Philip, the underground vaulting was decorated with paintings, and over the catacomb rose a church or sanctuary that was plainly visible. In the middle of the third century other catacombs were still private property; but it cannot be denied that the cemetery of St. Callistus was corporate property and belonged to the Church represented by the bishop of Rome.

The same must have been true of several other cemeteries. Must we extend this legal status and suppose that other property besides cemeteries possessed this quality of collective ownership? The importance which imperial rescripts attribute

[168] *Lib. pont.*, vol. I.
[169] *Digest*, XLVIII, xxiv, 2.
[170] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, II, 77.
[171] *Philosophumena*, IX, 7.

to Church properties, the general terms used in speaking of them, and the general attitude of the Christians in the administration of these possessions, lead us to suppose so with a likelihood that is almost certainty. When Decius resumed the persecution of the Christians, one of his first acts was to seize these places of worship and to set guards at their entrances. Gallienus, when giving peace to the Church, declared that he restored the ecclesiastical property to the representatives of the Church. The practice of Christians in the middle of the third century of building oratories in plain sight over the catacombs, and the calmness with which Gregory Thaumaturgus erected the big church at Neocaesarea, indicate a security of people who consider they are acting in accord with legal prescriptions.

A point quite beyond doubt is that all these properties were administered by the hierarchical authorities of each church, at the head of which was the bishop. When the attention of the government was drawn to them, this was not so much because of their material value as because of the fact of their being administered by the churches. In each city the Christian community, with the bishop at its head, the various ranks of the clergy, its tribunals, its treasury, and its charitable works, formed a sort of little city of its own. In the middle of the third century, according to St. Cyprian, Decius would have preferred to see a competitor at Rome rather than a bishop.[172] This importance was so much the greater since all the local Churches fraternized together and, through councils, correspondence, and interchange of alms, formed a single large body, the "great Church," as Celsus calls it, with the bishop of Rome as its undisputed head, for he and he alone is the one appealed to from all sides as arbiter in the disputes of individual churches and as the guarantor of unity against the claims of heresy.

[172] St. Cyprian, *Letters,* 55.

There is no doubt about the fact of a civic organization of the Church, based on solidly established Church properties, in the middle of the third century. But difficulties confront us when we try to ascertain more exactly the legal character of these properties and the manner of their administration by the heads of the local churches.

The first two legal forms of Church property seem to have been individual ownership and corporate ownership through the forming of legally authorized societies. The first Christian meetings were held in the houses of some of the brethren, and the first Christian cemeteries were merely the burial places of some patricians converted to Christianity. When the Church had possessions of her own, these were sometimes placed under the names of individuals. But this arrangement could only be temporary: there was too much risk in the possible apostasy of the nominal owner, or in his simple whim or that of his heirs. Presently that method was abandoned. The enactments of Septimius Severus about burial associations must have supplied the Christians with a legal means of forming patrimonies. The churches which, in Trajan's reign, made use of all sorts of stratagems to hide their organized life from the authorities,[173] must have been eager to take advantage of the legal form which the new rescript offered them. As we said above,[174] this legal procedure would be an effective safeguard only if the government was unaware, or was thought to be unaware, of the existence of a bond between the various burial associations and a higher society embracing them all. This ignorance and this pretence of ignorance were possible in the second century, but became less and less so in the course of the third. It may be that, during the long intervals of peace which the Christians enjoyed

[173] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 277.

[174] See *supra,* p. 296, note 59.

during the first half of the third century, the friendly emperors openly tolerated or recognized, though tacitly and without any decree or rescript to that effect, the right of the churches to possess landed property under the title of being religious societies. "To tolerate the Christians meant to tolerate the Christian body; to persecute the Christians meant to persecute the collective entity they necessarily formed. . . . When Gallienus wrote to the bishops to come and claim their churches, when Aurelian evicted Paul of Samosata from the church of Antioch, the Christians must certainly have been tempted to consider themselves authorized, both as individuals and as a body." [175] This conviction must have become firmly established under Philip.

The Spread of Christianity

Philip's rule was also very favorable to the geographic extension of Christianity. Origen, in his *Contra Celsum,* states that nearly the whole known Roman world was evangelized. Among the nations to whom the gospel was preached, he cites the following: some Breton and German tribes, Dacians, Sarmatians, and Scythians in Europe; a part of Ethiopia in Africa; the Seres, Hindus or Chinese in Asia.[176] Under Philip, Christianity developed so extensively in the provinces near the Black Sea that medals were struck there having the Emperor's image on one side, and on the other a religious subject.[177] In this same period a portion of Pontus, which had previously opposed Christianity, was converted with marvelous rapidity. St. Gregory of Nyssa relates that when St. Gregory Thaumaturgus as bishop entered Neocaesarea, one of the large cities of the district, he found about

[175] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 280.
[176] Origen, *Against Celsus,* II.
[177] Lenormand, *Mélanges d'archéologie,* III, 199.

seventeen Christians there; a few years later, the same city counted scarcely that number of pagans.[178]

Several concurring indications incline us to believe that in the time of Emperor Philip Christianity had at length entered the highest ranks of officialdom, which previously had been closed to it because of the acts of idolatry that were required of imperial officers. The Acts of St. Calocerus and St. Parthenius, martyred under Decius, say that these saints belonged to the household of Aemilianus, who died a Christian in the very year of his consulate.[179] The archeological discoveries of De Rossi [180] and Léon Renier [181] confirm the exactness of this information, formerly considered doubtful by Tillemont.[182]

The impulse given to religious studies by Origen, was spread by his disciples, especially in the East. At Alexandria itself, Heraclas and Dionysius, both of them converted philosophers and bishops, shed such brilliance by their teaching that scholarly Christians came to their school from all parts of the world. Julius Africanus, who was trained under Heraclas' direction,[183] published the first essay of universal chronology (the *Chronicles*), and a sort of encyclopedia (*Cestoi,* "Embroideries").[184] In Palestine, Theoctistus, bishop of Caesarea, and Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, remained attached to Origen as to their master.[185] Alexander founded a Christian library at Jerusalem. At Antioch a certain priest named Geminius, whose writings were preserved in the

[178] St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Gregorii thaumaturgi, P. G.,* XLVI.

[179] *Acta sanctorum,* May, IV, 302.

[180] De Rossi, *op. cit.,* II, 301; cf. p. 213.

[181] Renier, *Mélanges d'épigraphie,* pp. 1–46. Cf. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions,* II, 241 ff.

[182] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* vol. V, note 32 on Diocletian, and *Histoire des empereurs,* III, 310.

[183] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xxxi.

[184] *Ibid.*

[185] *Ibidem,* VI, xxvii.

Church for a long time,[186] followed the same traditions, though less eagerly. In Asia Minor, Firmilian in Cappadocia and Athenodorus and Theodore in Pontus were second to none in their enthusiasm for the great doctor of Alexandria and Caesarea. Nearly all these teachers paid for their faith, if not with their life, at least with their blood. The most devoted to Origen's memory and his most illustrious continuator was Theodore. Through humility he gave up the name Theodore (gift of God) and took the modest name Gregory (watcher); but the gift of miracles which God bestowed upon him brought him the glorious name of Thaumaturgus (miracle-worker).

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocaesarea in Pontus, is best known for his prodigious miracles, a few of which we shall mention by way of example. Two brothers, quarreling over the possession of a pond, made him their arbitrator. He spent the night in prayer. The next day the pond was all dried up and the dispute became purposeless. The overflowing of the Lycus River caused great damage in all the neighboring country. Gregory went to the spot where the dyke usually gave way before the force of the waters. There he stuck his staff in the ground; the staff put out roots and became a large tree, thereafter protecting the dyke and the country. Two Jews wanted to make profit out of his charity. One of them asked him for an alms to help him bury his companion, who was shamming death. Gregory gave the requested alms and passed on. When the impostor ran to his accomplice, the latter was really dead. The city of Comana in Pontus was discussing the merits of certain of its clergy who were proposed for the bishopric. The bishop of Neocaesarea

[186] St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus.*

pointed out a man dressed in tatters, his face and hands black with coal-dirt. By a special grace from God, Gregory divined that this poor man was of noble birth and high culture, who wished to conceal, under ragged garments and the humble occupation of a charcoal burner, the higher station which he considered full of danger for his soul. Gregory had him acclaimed by the people. The Church now honors him by the name of St. Alexander the Charcoal Burner.

But Christian antiquity honored the Bishop of Neocaesarea as a theologian no less than as a miracle-worker. St. Gregory of Nyssa devoted a glorious panegyric to him. St. Gregory of Nazianzus calls him a "theophane." St. Basil appeals to his authority and, to justify one of his own doctrines, finds nothing better than to trace it back, through his grandmother St. Macrina, to "Gregory the very great." [187]

This illustrious witness of the ancient faith did not leave many writings; moreover, St. Basil complains that his works had been altered in his time.[188] Yet we have from his hand an undeniably genuine document, his *Exposition of the Faith,* noteworthy for its theological importance and its place in the history of dogma, no less than for the miraculous origin attributed to it.

St. Gregory of Nyssa relates that one night the Bishop of Neocaesarea, while wondering how he should oppose the heresies spreading in the Church, was favored with a heavenly apparition. An aged man, clothed in priestly vestments, and a majestic woman of more than human beauty, appeared to him. He understood that the two persons were

[187] St. Basil, *Letters,* 204.

[188] *Idem,* 210. The *Panegyric of Origen,* of great historic value, and a Canonical Epistle which deserves to be consulted for its information regarding the penitential discipline of the early Church, were almost the only known works of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus until 1558, when De Lagarde discovered and published the Greek text of *To Philargius, on Consubstantiality* and the treatise *To Theopomus, on Divine Impassibility.* In 1883, Martin published eight homilies by St. Gregory.

St. John the Apostle and the Blessed Virgin Mary; from them he learned a doctrine which he "at once put into writing, to preach it in his church." "This document," continues the Bishop of Nyssa, "he left to his successors as an inheritance coming from God."

This symbol is a profession of faith in the "one God, Father of the living Word and of the subsisting Wisdom, Perfect begetting the Perfect; in the one Lord, Sole of the Sole, God of God; and in the one only Holy Spirit in whom is revealed the Father who is above all things; and in the perfect Trinity, which is divisible or separable neither in glory nor in eternity nor in royalty." [189] The Bishop of Nyssa also says that the Church of Neocaesarea in his time still preserved the manuscript of this symbol from the very hand of Gregory Thaumaturgus.

The Origenists

Unfortunately all the disciples or self-styled disciples of Origen did not have this purity of belief. In Egypt and Palestine certain ascetics made use of the name of the Alexandrian teacher not only to lead a life of almost inhuman austerity, but to maintain his most debatable theories about the end of time, without the restrictions that he attached to them. These theories they pushed to the strangest excess. Others, calling themselves Origenists, sought under the protecting patronage of such an illustrious name to renew the abominations of the Gnostics and Eastern Montanists. Some Christians were seduced by these aberrations. Forty years of peace, scarcely interrupted by Maximinus, had brought about a lessening of fervor in the rank and file of the people; the favorable attitude of the government facilitated the entrance of ordinary subjects into the Christian communities. This is a

[189] St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita S. Gregorii Thaumaturgi,* in Migne, *P. G.,* XLVI, col. 910.

law from which the Church has never escaped: persecution decimates and purifies it; prosperity expands and corrupts it. In some regions, undisguised Montanists made havoc among the faithful by repeating the follies of Priscilla and Maximilla. In Cappadocia, after an earthquake, a prophetess took advantage of the consequent panic, stirred up the multitudes, and led them after her. She said they must flee from Cappadocia, a cursed country, and emigrate *en masse* to Jerusalem. Onward she advanced, barefoot, over mountains and through snow, followed by bands of fanatics.[190] A priest and a deacon of Caesarea joined the caravan, but it was the prophetess who baptized, consecrated, and presided at all the liturgical functions. The Montanists were triumphant, and pointed to these events, enlarged by imagination, as the precursory signs of the end of the world and of God's summons to the heavenly Jerusalem.

The pagan atmosphere, which the martyrs' enthusiasm held in check in times of persecution, slowly recovered its sway over souls, which it encompassed in various ways. In customs, in practices of public as well as private life, in official festivities, in works of art, everywhere could be seen the imprint of a religion that was one with the family and civic institutions. The Christian Emperor Philip kept the title of supreme pontiff; medals struck in his honor bore marks of paganism;[191] and all this was but a manifestation and symbol of the pagan spirit which was subtly resuming its empire over those whom the faith of Christ had rescued from it. Christians were marrying unbelievers, were painting their faces, were tinting their eyelids, like pagan dandies; they were again going to the theaters, even to the gladiatorial combats. It seemed possible to believe as a Christian and to live as a

[190] St. Cyprian, Letter 74, sec. 10 (*Ante-Nicene Library*), being letter 75 of the Oxford edition.

[191] See Allard, *L'Art païen sous les empereurs chrétiens,* pp. 71 ff.

pagan. Origen bemoaned the way Christians were neglecting the Church devotions,[192] the way luxury was replacing the poverty of old,[193] the deacons' lack of delicacy in administering the goods of the Church;[194] bishops yielded to the general decline of sturdiness, seeking to grow rich through commerce and looking down on the poor.[195]

St. Cyprian

No one reacted against this laxity more forcibly than a young African priest, who soon became bishop of Carthage. Tascius Caecilius Cyprianus was born at Carthage about A. D. 210. He grew up in the luxury of a wealthy pagan family, studied public speaking and law, was fond of the world, sought success and glory in the profession of rhetor, nay, even defended idolatry in his speeches. But paganism was unable to satisfy his upright mind, nor could it gratify his heart enamored of purity. Having made a thorough study of Christian doctrine by conferring with the priest Caecilianus (about 235), he was converted to the new faith and from that time forth radically transformed his life.[196] He sold his possessions, distributed the price of them to the poor, made a vow of continence, and renounced profane literature forever. In his Christian writings, which are considerable, not a single quotation from a pagan author is to be found.[197] He knew Tertullian in the latter's old age and always called him his teacher;[198] but he never had Tertullian's fiery rash-

[192] Origen, *Homily 12 on Exodus.*

[193] *Ibid.* Cf. *Homily 20 on St. Matthew,* no. 25.

[194] *Homily 20 on St. Matthew,* no. 25.

[195] *Ibid.*

[196] St. Cyprian, *Letter to Donatus,* sec. 4.

[197] Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne,* II, 207.

[198] St. Jerome says that St. Cyprian never let a day pass without reading Tertullian. He would say: *"Da magistrum"* ("Give me the master"). St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus,* chap. 53.

ness. What especially characterized this great man, the greatest the Latin Church knew from Tertullian to St. Augustine, was the harmony he accomplished between absolute mastery of himself and great gentleness towards others. Being a wonderfully well balanced genius, "usually very moderate, a friend of the just middle course, but most vigorously defending his moderate ideas," [199] he found the secret of that constant harmony in a deep Christian faith, which penetrated his speech, his thought, and his life. The learned historian of Christian Africa writes that "until St. Augustine we find no writer more deeply filled with Christian thought." [200]

But just when Cyprian, chosen bishop of Carthage in 249, was about to devote himself heartily, with the new authority of his pastoral office, to the work of reforming Christian morals, an imperial edict declared the most terrible and perfidious war on Christianity that it had thus far had to sustain. Roman paganism, finding in the new Emperor a man capable of gathering together its strength, weakened by forty years of religious tolerance, rose up to avenge the old national religion against the invasion of new cults recently introduced into the Empire. The Christians were the first to suffer from this vengeance.

[199] Monceaux, *op. cit.*, II, 237 ff.
[200] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER V

From the Persecution of Decius to the Beginning of Diocletian's Reign (250–284)

DURING the first half of the third century there was real and almost constant peace, though it was incomplete and always precarious and threatening. But even this measure of tranquillity gave the Church an opportunity to consolidate her institutions and offered a free rein to religious studies. The second part of the century, however, was dominated by the scope and widespread effects of the persecution, if not by its length. Decius' purpose in methodically attacking the entire hierarchy was to destroy the Church as a social institution. Valerian, with an eye mostly to its possessions, tried to ruin its cult and its works. Aurelian, by using all his might to revive and protect the worship of Mithra, stirred up against the Church the most formidable religious rivalry that Christianity had ever encountered.

But the very character of these persecutions implied the recognition of a fact of utmost importance. This was the existence of the Church as a corporate, hierarchically organized, proprietary association, that is, a society perfect both in right and fact. The social character of the Church, howsoever much disturbed, survived all these shocks. Whether persecuting or tolerant, the heads of the civil society reckoned with her. "For half a century there succeeded each other the régime of Terror and the régime of Concordats." [1] Christian scholarship could not develop as at the height of the Alexandrian School; but the results of the social, as well as those of the theological organization, were not lost. New

[1] Allard, *Histoire des pers.*, II, 436.

teachers took their stand thereon in refuting new errors. Lastly, as a final result of the social benefactions of the Church and of the knowledge of her teachers, as of the courage of her martyrs, the old popular prejudices against Christians crumbled of themselves.

The cry of the second century multitudes, "To the lions with the Christians!" is no longer heard except in times of unusual calamity; and the outcry was not far-reaching. Persecution less and less evinced the feelings of the populace, and more and more became a deliberately calculated policy. Notwithstanding most cruel trials, the Church saw a strengthening of those foundations on which the work of final pacification was established under the Emperor Constantine.

Decius

Unlike the Neronian persecution, that under Decius was not the work of a despot's caprice: it was the result of a strictly conservative and pagan reaction against the favors granted the Christians under Emperor Philip, a jealous rivalry against the social status acquired by Christianity during the first part of the third century. Decius was merely the instrument of that reaction and rivalry—an instrument wonderfully adapted to the task laid upon him by the faction which put him on the throne. The pagan writers praise him as a man of Stoic regularity of life,[2] but the Christians denounce him as "an accursed wild beast" for his work of calculating and methodical destruction.[3] He was the narrow mind and implacable arm at the service of a passion. The divinity of Jupiter and Minerva gave him little concern, or rather he confused it with the divinity of the Roman State,

[2] Aurelius Victor, *Epitome,* 29; Zosimus, *Historiae,* bk. 1, chap. 21; Trebellus Pollio, *Claudius,* 13.

[3] Lactantius, *Death of the Persecutors,* 4; St. Optatus, *Against the Donatists,* bk. 3, sec. 8; Dionysius of Alexandria, quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xli.

the only divinity he understood and adored, if we may say that it is adoring anything or anyone to sacrifice everything to it or him, even justice and pity.[4]

The pagan reaction did not wait for the end of Philip's reign to show itself. A letter of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, preserved in Eusebius' *Church History,* gives us a lifelike account of an uprising against the Christians of Alexandria in 249. Dionysius had just been installed there, when a man, whom the holy Bishop calls "a certain wicked prophet and poet," succeeded in persuading the people that their gods were imperilled by the Christians. "He excited the mass of the heathen against us," says Dionysius; "they considered this the only piety and the worship of their demons, namely, to slay us." [5] They began by seizing an old man and, upon his refusal to pronounce certain impious words, they beat him, thrust pointed reeds into his face, dragged him through the streets, and stoned him. A virgin, Apollina by name, received so many violent blows on her jaw that all her teeth were broken. A maddened throng rushed upon the houses of Christians, who were robbed and driven from their homes. Night and day the streets resounded with the cry: "Anybody that refuses to blaspheme Christ will be dragged away and burned!" These scenes of violence continued until an outbreak of civil war in the city gave the mob's savage fury another direction. The Christians then enjoyed a respite, which, however, did not last long. Soon Decius' edict inflamed the persecution and, in a way, made it more dreadful, by putting it under the direction of the authorities.

Decius' Edict of Persecution

We do not possess the text of this decree. But contemporary testimony, especially the letters of St. Cyprian and

[4] See Fustel de Coulanges, *Ancient City,* pp. 484 ff.

[5] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xli.

the authentic Acts of the martyrs, enable us to reconstruct its sense, without risk of substantial error. All the Christians of the Empire, both clergy and laity, born in Christianity or converts, were commanded to present themselves on a certain day [6] for the purpose of offering sacrifice to the gods of the Empire [7] and of abjuring their faith in Christ.[8] Disobedience entailed a criminal trial. Thus officially prosecuted, the Christians were first to be tortured and, if the torture did not make them abjure, they were to be punished with banishment or death. The possessions of exiles and fugitives escheated to the imperial treasury. There had never been any edict of persecution conceived in such general yet precise terms. The aim of Septimius Severus had been to halt the spread of Christianity, and he took account especially of converts and those who were making converts; Maximinus selected mostly bishops and scholars for his attack; the edict of Decius reached everybody, without qualification and required all the followers of Christ to abjure the faith.

Terrible was the effect produced by this edict. Then was verified the thought so concisely expressed in the *Imitation of Christ* eleven centuries later: "Temptations do not make us wicked; they show us what sort of men we are." Softness of life had penetrated nearly everywhere: at first defection was well-nigh universal. A reliable witness, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, in an undeniably genuine document, has left us the following impressive picture:

"The Emperor's decree had arrived, very much like that which was foretold by our Lord, exhibiting the most dreadful aspect; so that, if it were possible, the very elect would stumble. All, indeed, were greatly alarmed, and many of the more eminent immediately gave way to

[6] St. Cyprian, *De lapsis,* 2–3.
[7] *Ibidem,* 8; Letter 52.
[8] St. Cyprian, *De lapsis,* 8.

them; others, who were in public offices, were led forth by their very acts; others were brought by their acquaintance, and when called by name, they approached the impure and unholy sacrifices. But pale and trembling as if they were not to sacrifice, but themselves to be the victims and the sacrifices to the idols, they were jeered by many of the surrounding multitude, and were obviously equally afraid to die and to offer the sacrifice. But some advanced with greater readiness to the altars, and boldly asserted that they had never before been Christians. Concerning whom the declaration of our Lord is most true, that they will scarcely be saved." [9]

Yet pagan practices had not affected all the Christians and even among the most softened there remained a basis of deep faith. Seeing the example of some heroes, the Christians as a whole finally recovered themselves. As St. Dionysius says: "solid and blessed pillars of the Lord, confirmed by the Lord Himself, and receiving in themselves strength and power, suited and proportioned to their faith, became admirable witnesses of His kingdom." [10] At sight of their heroism, we shall see the "lapsed," as they were called, humbly asking to be readmitted into the Church.

The persecution raged at all points of the Empire at one and the same time. Rome, Italy, Greece, Asia, and Africa gave martyrs. The crisis was short: beginning in 250, it was almost ended in May 251, even before Decius' death. But never did persecution so deeply upset the Church. The scandal of the apostasies, the profound uneasiness that resulted from it in the Church, the efforts of the *lapsi* to obtain reconciliation, the disputes that arose on this point between those favoring rigor and those favoring mercy, the schisms that resulted, all these extended and prolonged the disturbance produced by this short and violent crisis.

[9] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xli.
[10] *Ibid.*

Pope St. Fabian

Decius was cold and methodical. He shed blood with a calculating mind. In making him regard Christians as enemies of the Empire, the Emperor's political sense deceived him;[11] but it was not at fault when it persuaded him that the bishop of Rome was the supreme and indispensable head of the Church. Decius ascended the imperial throne in October 249; on January 20, Pope St. Fabian was martyred. We have no details of his death; all we possess is a letter of St. Cyprian "to the priests and deacons abiding at Rome," who had sent him the sad news. "When the report of the departure of the excellent man, my colleague, was still uncertain among us, I received a letter sent to me from you, in which I was most abundantly informed of his glorious end. What is thus glorious to you in connection with the memory of your bishop, ought also to afford me an example of faith and virtue."[12]

What Decius wanted to attack was not so much Fabian's person as his sovereign authority. His purpose was not so much to suppress a man as to overthrow a rival institution.

[11] Aubé (in *L'Église dans la seconde moitié du IIIe siècle,* pp. 4, 7, 13 f.) and Bouché-Lèclercq (in *L'Intolérance religieuse et la politique*) seek to justify Decius, and the persecuting emperors in general, on the ground of a necessity of social defense. True, the Empire in the middle of the third century was endangered by the barbarous races that were pressing on its frontiers. But the Christians hardly figured in these vast migrations. The Empire was likewise endangered from within, by a lessening of the military spirit and by the aristocracy's abandoning political careers. But surely it was not the fault of the Church that Commodus, Caracalla, and Gallienus had to exempt from military service all the senators, the urban decurions, nearly all the middle class, that finally all compulsory military service had to be abolished, to such an extent that the army was wholly made up of "soldiers furnished by contract" (Duruy, *History of Rome,* VII, 196), that, beginning with Trajan's reign, the rich had to be forced to accept the offices of decurion, edile, and duumvir. Littré is quite correct in saying that, "since the imperial authority lacked the power to maintain or vivify anything, there would have been a profound stagnation, had it not been for the coming of Christianity." (Littré, *Etudes sur les Barbares,* p. 27.)

[12] St. Cyprian, Letter 3, sec. 1.

For eighteen months—that is so long as Decius was able to reside in Rome—he succeeded, by trickery, terrorism, and various intrigues, in preventing the election of a successor to the martyred Pope. Not until the spring of 251, when the Emperor had to go to Mysia to combat an invasion of the Goths, did the Christians feel free to elect a successor to St. Fabian.

St. Agatha

Among the victims of the Decian persecution in Italy tradition places the illustrious martyr of Catania, St. Agatha. "The account which we have of her martyrdom is the work of a late writer. . . . Yet certain exact traces seem to have been preserved. It would be hard to place among the narrator's inventions Agatha's sublime replies to the questions of the governor of Sicily. The judge asks her: 'What is your status?' To this she replies: 'I am free and noble born, as is evidenced by all my relations.' 'If you come of so noble and illustrious a family,' said the judge, 'why do you lead the base life of a slave?' Agatha answered: 'I am the servant of Christ, and therefore of servile status.' 'If you were really of noble family,' said he, 'you would not humble yourself even to the taking of the title of slave.' 'The highest nobility,' she replied, 'is to be the slave of Christ.' " [13] This is in perfect conformity with the feelings and manner of speech of the Christians of that period, who were at times pleased to assume, out of humility, the title and way of living of slaves.[14]

St. Pionius

In Greece the Christians, more enervated than elsewhere, were abandoned by their Bishop Endaemon, who was said

[13] *Acta sanctorum,* February, I, 621.

[14] Allard, *Histoire des pers.,* II, 301. Cf. Allard, *Les Esclaves chrétiens,* pp. 239 ff.

to have gone over to the pagan priesthood. They apostatized *en masse*. Three, however, gave an example of admirable courage. On February 23, 250, the anniversary of the death of St. Polycarp, says the Acts, the priest Pionius celebrated the sacrifice in honor of the martyrs in the presence of a Christian, Asclepiades by name, and of a Christian woman, Sabina. The latter was a slave whom the Christians had rescued from her cruel pagan mistress. She had retired to Smyrna, to the house of the holy priest Pionius, a former orator famous for his eloquence, but especially praiseworthy for his virtue. "The Eucharistic prayers were scarcely concluded, those present had scarcely consumed the consecrated bread and wine, when the city officer Polemon entered the apartment, followed by several policemen. When he saw Pionius, he said to him: 'You are not ignorant of the imperial decree commanding you to sacrifice.' To this Pionius replied: 'As for decrees, we recognize only those which command us to adore God.' The officer then said: 'Come with me to the public square.'

"When they reached the square, a large crowd poured into it. They all wanted to see. Those who were short stood on ladders or boxes. Pionius, having reached the middle of the square, held out his hand and, with smiling and radiant face, addressed the people thus: 'Men of Smyrna, you who love the beauty of your walls, the splendor of your city and the glory of your poet Homer, hear me. I am told that you ridicule the Christians, who, yielding to force, have sacrificed to the gods. Allow me to remind you of Homer's words, "Rejoice not over those who are dead, insult not a blind man, assault not a corpse." I prefer to undergo death and torture rather than contradict what I have learned and taught.' He spoke a long time. The whole multitude listened so attentively that no one dared to interrupt him. When he had finished, he was led to one of the shrines at the side of the square. There one after the other tried to make him yield, saying:

'Pionius, you are pure and gentle. You are worthy to live. You have many reasons for loving life. How good it is to live and to breathe in this sweet light.' Pionius replied: 'Yes, yes, it is good to be filled with light. I do not despise the gifts of God. But I look for a more beautiful light.' Polemon then said to him: 'Sacrifice!' He answered: 'No!' When asked, 'What God do you adore?' he said: 'The almighty God, whom we know by His Word, Jesus Christ.' Asclepiades was then questioned: 'Which is your God?' 'Christ,' he answered. They asked him: 'Is He then another?' 'No,' replied Asclepiades, 'He is the same God that we have just confessed.'

"A few days afterward, when Pionius gave like replies before the proconsul, he was condemned to be burnt alive. Stakes were set up, to which Pionius and a Marcionite priest named Metrodorus were fastened. The latter was at the left of Pionius, who kept his eyes and his soul fixed upon Heaven. Firewood was piled about them and kindled. Pionius, closing his eyes, prayed silently. Then his face shone with a keen joy. He said 'Amen' and gave up his soul like a light breath. Such was the death of the blessed Pionius, a gentle and pure man, without blame or sin." [15] This is the account in the Acts. What happened to Sabina and Asclepiades? The Acts do not say. Probably they were martyred along with Pionius, or shortly after.[16]

St. Babylas

Among the martyrs in proconsular Asia we should not forget St. Babylas, the courageous bishop of Antioch, who fearlessly halted the Emperor Philip at the door of the church and made him expiate the crime which brought him to the throne. Although St. Babylas' martyrdom is certain, we do

[15] *Acta sanctorum,* February, I, 37–46; Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* II, 67–88; Eusebius, IV, xv.

[16] Allard, *op. cit.,* II, 388.

not know the circumstances of it. According to Eusebius, he died in prison at Antioch.[17] St. Chrysostom says he was beheaded.[18] It is said that he wished to be buried with his chains and that a hundred years later, when his body was brought near the temple of Apollo at Daphne, it silenced the oracle that spoke there.[19]

St. Acacius

Acacius, bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, was also arrested. His trial is one of the most curious recorded. We have the authentic Latin translation of the original court record, which must have been written in Greek.[20] We will quote its principal passages. It is a precious document, for it is a sort of abridgment of the arguments used between Christians and pagans.

A certain Martianus, said to be of consular rank, addressed Acacius:

Martianus: "You profit from the Roman laws; you should love our rulers."

Acacius: "Who loves the Emperor as much as the Christians do? We pray assiduously for him."

Martianus: "I congratulate you on these sentiments. Therefore offer a sacrifice to the Emperor."

Acacius: "I pray to the true God for my ruler, who has no right to require that I sacrifice to him. Who can worship a man?"

Martianus: "Tell us who this God is, that we may honor Him."

Acacius then pretends not to see the irony of this question. He begins by setting forth at length the faith of the Christians, then with animated irony and indignation he attacks

[17] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xxxix.
[18] *De sancto Babyla*, 11.
[19] Allard, *op. cit.*, p. 427.
[20] See Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, II, 89 ff.

the divinities of paganism. Evidently he is aware of the skepticism of the examining magistrate: he repeats and tartly revives the chief criticisms of Euhemerus against the pagan gods. The judge lets him say what he wishes, replies tamely, not very anxious to subject himself to the ridicule of an apology which would be suspected of not being very sincere. The Bishop triumphantly insists and grows more censorious and acrid. Finally the judge loses patience and interrupts him: "Sacrifice or die!" Acacius replies: "You are like the Dalmatian highwaymen, who use only one expression, 'Your money or your life!' to cut off any discussion with those whom they have seized. Condemn me; but hear what our Holy Books say: 'With what judgment you judge, you shall be judged.'" To this Martianus answers: "I am not here to judge, but to compel."

These words very clearly enunciate the aim of Decius' decree. It did not enter the Emperor's mind to pass judgment on the doctrine of the Christians or to measure the degree of their guilt; he wanted to wipe them out by apostasy or by death. Martianus, perhaps because of the Bishop's popularity, declined to assume responsibility for his condemnation, and therefore sent a report of the trial to the Emperor. Decius was even more of a skeptic than Martianus. And it may be that he was interested in the humorous style in which the head of the Church of Antioch ridiculed the gods that were none of his concern. Further, Decius' systematic policy was implacable, but he was personally not wicked. It has been noted that, every time he had an accused person before him, he showed him indulgence. A contemporary document relates that one day at Rome, when the Emperor was presiding at the trial of some martyrs, he granted pardon to one of them, Celerinus, whose youth and courage had touched him.[21] Acacius' unruffled daring had the same result. The messenger

[21] Letter of St. Lucian to Celerinus, in St. Cyprian, *Letters*, 21.

who was sent to Rome with the report of his trial brought back the Emperor's pardon for the accused.

The Persecution in Africa

Christian Africa, proud of its ninety bishops [22] and of the glory of its Tertullian, had the appearance of great vitality. Yet its fervor, which was more superficial than deep, more clamorous than solid, paved the way for many disappointments. There were, indeed, some who faced the executioners undaunted and who entered the amphitheater with the stride of a gladiator.[23] Besides these, and even among them, were so-called Christians who are spoken of by St. Cyprian as proud, attached to worldly interests, affected, and fond of luxury,[24] and members of the clergy who were careless of their duties, pompous, and jealous of one another.[25] These Phenicians and Berbers spoke Latin, but they had not acquired the Roman discipline; their minds were eager for Greek culture, but did not possess the polish of Athens or Alexandria.

Between the years 236 and 248 the Church of Africa was disturbed by lamentable divisions, the cause and nature of which are unknown to us. The letters of St. Cyprian inform us that Privatus, bishop of Lambaesa, the first church after that of Carthage, had to be condemned as a heretic by a council; that Donatus, bishop of Carthage, and Fabian, bishop of Rome, wrote severe letters against him.[26] In 249, by almost

[22] This is the number given by the African council that condemned Privatus of Lambaesa. On Christianity in Africa, its beginnings, organization, internal conflicts, martyrs, councils, and great men, see Aug. Audollent's scholarly article *"Afrique,"* in the *Dict. d'hist. et de géog. ecclés.,* I, cols. 705–861. Columns 853–861 contain a very complete bibliography.

[23] See *supra,* p. 326, Tertullian's text, which was able to provoke such demeanor.

[24] St. Cyprian, *De lapsis,* 5, 6.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] St. Cyprian, Letter 69.

unanimous choice, Cyprian became bishop of Carthage. Even at that date the ferment of revolt had not subsided. Five priests formed an opposition which lasted throughout his episcopate. One of these priests was Novatus, who gratified his dissenting spirit by taking advantage of the disturbed condition of Africa, made the more distressing by the persecution. Through intrigues he succeeded in forming a schism which, once established in Africa, found enough accomplices in Rome and the East to spread and invade almost the whole Church.

When Decius' decree reached the African provinces, it gave rise to two extreme attitudes. Those who consulted only their own ease hurried to the offices of the magistrates even before the prescribed time limit, for the purpose of performing the required sacrifices. For several days processions of prominent people might be seen at Carthage going up the steps of the Capitol, followed by their slaves and freedmen and farmer-tenants. Parents led their little children, and husbands their wives.[27] The rich offered goats, sheep, and oxen; the poor cast a little incense on the altar. Then at tables prepared for the purpose, they all ate some of the sacrificed meats, and passed from one to another the cup of libations. The sacrilege was then completed. At Saturnum, Repostus, the bishop, headed the procession going to the temple to sacrifice.[28]

But soon there was talk of terrifying signs of divine vengeance. A woman who had sacrificed was suddenly taken with severe pains and died while furiously biting her tongue, which had touched the profane food. St. Cyprian testifies as follows: "With my own eyes I saw a little child, whose nurse had defiled his lips with the wine of idols, vomit forth the Savior's blood which was offered him." [29] The stream of apostasies ceased. The imperial courts then began to act. Those who re-

[27] All these details are given by St. Cyprian, *De lapsis,* 8 f.; *Letters,* 10, 19, 59.
[28] St. Cyprian, Letter 64.
[29] *De lapsis,* 25.

sisted were imprisoned and horribly tortured. Their bodies were lacerated with iron prongs, which were used to scrape their bleeding wounds. In the words of St. Cyprian, "it was no longer the limbs, but the wounds of the servants of God that were tortured." [30] Remarkable constancy and humility were displayed by a number of Christians, as Paul, Fortunion, Bassus, Mappalicus and his companions. Others delivered speeches, put on a bold front, and aroused the wonderment of the multitude.[31] The executioners' instructions were, not to kill, but to compel the Christians to sacrifice; the torture would be interrupted for a while, and then resumed. In this way a goodly number of these confessors of the faith survived the persecution. Among them was a certain Lucian, who later was one of the first promoters of the schism.

St. Cyprian

At the very outset Cyprian had to make up his mind. At Carthage, as at Rome, the bishop was one of the first aimed at. As soon as the decree was published, the pagan throngs shouted: "Cyprian to the lions!" [32] "Those around him thought, and he felt also, that being so well known in Carthage, he would inevitably be arrested, and that in such an acute crisis the bishop's life would count for more than would his martyrdom. He left the town and found a safe retreat outside, where he evaded the search of the authorities, but kept up communications with his flock, and especially with those clerics who had contrived to remain with them." [33] Flight in time of persecution had always been considered permissible. On more than one occasion the Church proclaimed this truth against the exaggerations of Marcionism and Montanism. But the

[30] Letter 8.
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] Letter 55 (*Ante-Nicene Library,* Letter 54).
[33] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 289.

Bishop's relentless enemies were not slow to profit by his flight, hoping thus to undermine his authority.

They proceeded with the utmost cleverness. First they sought to have him condemned by the Church of Rome. Not the least proof of the universal authority of the Roman Church at that time is this attempt to influence it in favor of the schism. The details of the intrigues that were contrived are unknown to us. We have only the letter written to Cyprian, during the interregnum between Fabian's death and the election of Cornelius, by the presbyteral council that was directing affairs at Rome. It was intended for the clergy of Carthage and, between the lines of deferential and moderate expressions, it intimated a disapproval of Cyprian's flight.[34] For him to show that he had fulfilled his duty as pastor so far as the situation allowed, he had only to make a frank statement of the reasons for his withdrawal and to send to Rome thirteen letters written by him to his Church from the time of his leaving the episcopal city.[35]

Thus the first scheme failed. Novatus and his accomplices were more successful in their second move. It consisted in contrasting the bishop who fled with the Christians who confessed their faith by undergoing torture. The persecutors, either from weariness or for some other reason, had released a large number of the latter. The rebellious faction intoxicated them with praise. Those who had not yielded to the threats of the executioner, were caught in the snare of flattery. It was an old custom for bishops to take into account the requests of martyrs in shortening the period of penitential probation. The apostasy of the lapsed was liable to perpetual penance. Perfidiously Novatus and his friends told the apostates that the confessors had the power to pardon them. At the head of the confessors was Lucian, who, because he bore on his body the scars of numerous wounds received for the faith, came to be regarded as a

[34] Letter 55 (*inter Cyprianicas*).
[35] St. Cyprian, *Letters*, 5, 6, 7, 10–19.

being superior to the rest of mankind. And he gave it out that he was deputed by a martyr named Paul, and distributed countless *libelli* of indulgence. These *libelli* were not, like those of the early martyrs, notes of recommendation, submitting the case of the lapsed to the judgment of the bishop; they were letters of pardon, in terms of command, *e. g., "Communicet cum suis,"* "Let him return to the communion of his brethren." And priests admitted the lapsed to the Sacraments without referring the matter to the bishop. To act thus was to set up a religious authority above the bishop and in opposition to him, contrary to all tradition.

Cyprian wrote three pastoral letters from his place of retreat: one to the confessors, exhorting them to give *libelli* only to the lapsed whose penance was nearing its completion;[36] the second was to his priests, absolutely forbidding them to receive any of the lapsed into communion on their own authority;[37] the third letter was to the people, advising patience, peace, and obedience to the bishop's authority.[38] The wiser minds heeded these words of their bishop and left the solution of the pending difficulties to him. Cyprian's decisions were prudent and moderate. He showed himself exacting in the case of those who spontaneously, at the first behest, rushed to offer an impious sacrifice; he was less severe toward those who resisted a long time before falling; he was still more indulgent toward those who, though not really offering sacrifice, had by money payments obtained a certificate of sacrifice. These last were called *libellatici.*[39] They were guilty, since "it was criminal for them to pass for apostates, even if they had not apostatized."[40] Nevertheless the guilt of the *libellatici* was not so great as that of the *sacrificati.*

[36] Letter 10.
[37] Letter 9.
[38] Letter 11.
[39] Letter 52.
[40] Letter 21 (*inter Cyprianicas.*)

These decisions, in conformity with those which the clergy and confessors gave at Rome,[41] would have ended the conflict if the purpose of the ringleaders had not been to make trouble for the Bishop at any price. The confessor Lucian, in the name of a group of confessors, wrote an insolent letter to Cyprian.[42] The *libelli pacis* increased in number. There was a regular traffic in them. As Cyprian expresses it, there was "a *libelli* fair." [43] The maneuver was to combine against the Bishop both the confessors and the lapsed by conferring sovereign authority on the former, and by offering the latter, at a discount, the power to escape the penance which they had incurred.

The Schism of Felicissimus

Only one step remained to be taken: to organize a schism. This was done toward the end of 250. The five priests who had unceasingly conspired against Cyprian formed its nucleus. Novatus was the soul of the conspiracy. Its nominal leader was Felicissimus, a rich layman of doubtful morals, but of considerable influence because of his wealth and social standing. At once Cyprian summoned a meeting of the bishops of the region. The purpose was to prepare the way for Cyprian's return by ending the schism. Felicissimus and his friends would not listen to anything. The council excommunicated them. Novatus then left for Rome. His intention was nothing less than to obtain backing for himself in the Roman Church.

The gradual abatement of the persecution gave hope that the papal interregnum was nearing its end and that soon the

[41] Two letters from Rome, with which all the churches were acquainted, referred the case of the *lapsi* to the decision of the bishops, who would act after peace became established. Previously, only those who were in danger of death could be reconciled.

[42] Letter 16 (*inter Cyprianicas*).

[43] "*Negociationis mundinas.*" Letter 10.

election of a bishop of Rome could be held. The future successor of St. Peter must be "the pope of the confessors," "the pope of the martyrs." This is what Novatus kept repeating when he arrived in the Eternal City. He found the Christians there divided. Among the candidates for the tiara was a learned priest, but one inured to scheming. His name was Novatian.[44] During the persecution he had succeeded, by means that were far from heroic, in evading the search by the authorities;[45] and he had also obtained a preponderant influence in the presbyteral council. He is the one who, in the name of the Roman clergy and confessors, wrote the letters condemning the attitude of the Carthaginian confessors and approving that of the bishop. But the fomenters of schism are always grouped according to their passions and interests rather than according to their ideas. Novatus and Novatian, as soon as they met, made common cause. Their plan seems to have been, first, to stir up among the confessors of the faith at Rome a movement like the one at Carthage. In this they did not fully succeed. A venerable priest named Moses, who had been imprisoned for several months past, edified the whole Church by his patience in the midst of tortures and privations. The plotters tried to win him over. But when he saw that he was really being asked to abet the cause of five priests in rebellion against their bishop, he refused to join the movement.[46] After his death (January or February, 251) some of his comrades in prison were unfortunately seduced. Yet this success did not seem enough. Novatus and Novatian concentrated their efforts upon the papal election, which disconcerted their plot. In the spring

[44] His "treatise *De Trinitate* is written with a care for order and method, which made it for a long time the model of works of the same kind. . . . His writings are the first which were composed in Latin at Rome on theological topics." (Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* I, 327).

[45] Letter 16; Eusebius, VI, xliii.

[46] Eusebius, *loc. cit.*

of 251,[47] the priest chosen to succeed St. Fabian was Cornelius, well known as a man of gentle and moderate character, and everywhere venerated for his lofty virtue. It is supposed that he belonged to the upper aristocracy of Rome. One of his first acts was to assemble a council of sixty bishops, which approved the decisions of the Bishop of Carthage regarding the lapsed. The whole Church in the West promptly accepted this approval.[48] Thus the schism of Felicissimus received its death blow.

The Schism of Novatian

A rumor quickly spread that the bishop of Rome was not Cornelius, but Novatian. Two friends of the latter, one probably being Novatus, went to southern Italy and there persuaded three bishops, simple countrified men, to come immediately to Rome and join with other bishops in putting down a great conflict. Once at Rome, they were circumvented, threatened, deceived, and, in the evening, after a plentiful dinner, they were induced to give Novatian the liturgical consecration that made him a bishop.[49] It was reported that Cornelius' election was absolutely null and void because he had made himself radically unworthy of the episcopal dignity by obtaining from the Roman authorities a certificate of apostasy and by communicating with apostates. Novatus and Novatian championed the strictest requirements. According to them apostates must give up all hope of being again received into the Church, even

[47] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* vol. III, note 1 on St. Cornelius, says it was in June, 251. But Doulcet (*Essai sur les rapports de l'Eglise avec l'Etat romain*) fixes March as the date of the election.

[48] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xliii.

[49] Details of this ordination may be seen in a letter from Pope Cornelius, quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.,* VI, xliii). The language of this letter is sharp. But the vivacity with which the facts are told and judged is not such as to weaken their substantial truth.

at their last breath; and anyone who pardoned them, thereby condemned himself.[50] Thus Novatian, and especially Novatus, broke with their former doctrines. But revolutionary spirits are ever more anxious to be in logical accord with their goal than with their principles. The goal of Novatus and Novatian was to wreck the authority of Pope Cornelius. They thought their purpose would be furthered by having Cornelius' moderation looked upon as an apostasy, and his so-called apostasy as a radical irregularity vitiating his election.

Novatianism, therefore, posed as the party of strict and incorruptible morality. Its success was due to this assumed position, to the regard in which Novatian was held, and to the active propaganda of Novatus. Outside of Rome, a little Novatian Church was founded at Carthage under the direction of one of the consecrators of Novatian, Evaristus by name, and of a Roman confessor, Nicostratus. In Gaul, Bishop Marcian of Arles made use of Novatian's principle in the government of his diocese, and joined the schism. In the East, the rigorist ideas triumphed, especially at Antioch, where Bishop Fabius openly endorsed them, and they spread in various parts of Asia Minor. The followers of the sect called themselves *Cathari* (Puritans).[51] Their leader dedicated an encyclical "to those who have remained firm in the Gospel." [52]

The danger was a serious one. A council presided over by Cornelius had condemned the doctrine of extreme indulgence; another council condemned the doctrine of extreme rigor. Sixty bishops, assembled at Rome—not counting the priests and deacons who accompanied or represented their bishops—condemned Novatian, his followers, and his doctrine.

But the dissenters did not recognize Cornelius' authority or that of the assembly which they called "his council." If

[50] For a résumé of Novatian's teaching, see St. Pacianus, Letter 3.

[51] St. Cyprian, Letters 41 and 59.

[52] "*Plebi in Evangelio perstanti salutem.*" (Dedication of the *De Cibis.*)

their eyes were to be opened and they were to be made to love the truth, they would have to be convinced, their errors would have to be refuted, and the unsoundness of their leaders' reasoning would have to be made plain. The task of doing this was undertaken by Cyprian of Carthage and Dionysius of Alexandria.

St. Dionysius of Alexandria

Next to Gregory Thaumaturgus, the most brilliant disciple of Origen was Dionysius, whom Eusebius and St. Basil call Dionysius the Great. He was born of a distinguished though pagan family at Alexandria. The Didascalia enlightened him as to the truth of Christianity. He was converted and soon elevated to the episcopal see of his native city. Like Cyprian, he judged it prudent to elude the persecutors by flight, and like him, he later showed that base fear had no part in his decision. Except for some fragments preserved by Eusebius, most of his works have perished. Eusebius says that Dionysius wrote extensively on the subject of penance and the *lapsi*. Therein he set forth a doctrine conformable to that of Pope Cornelius and St. Cyprian. He zealously opposed the Novatian Church established at Antioch,[53] reported to Cornelius regarding his labors against the heresy, and wrote to Novatian the following letter, which Eusebius inserts in his *History*. It reveals a tender charity as well as a deep faith:

"Dionysius sends greeting to his brother Novatian. If, as you say, you were forced against your will, you will show it by returning voluntarily. For it was a duty to suffer anything at all, so as not to afflict the Church of God; and, indeed, it would not be more inglorious to suffer even martyrdom for its sake, than to sacrifice; and in my opinion it would have been a greater glory. For there, in the one case, the individual gives a testimony for his own soul, but in the other he

[53] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xlvi.

bears witness for the whole Church. And now, if thou persuade or constrain the brethren to return to unanimity, thy uprightness will be greater than thy delusion, and the latter will not be laid to thy charge, but the other will be applauded; but if thou art unable to prevail with thy friends, save thine own soul. With the hope that thou art desirous of peace in the Lord, I bid thee farewell." [54]

St. Cyprian's Treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiae*

The schism of Novatian was the occasion for the writing of St. Cyprian's immortal treatise, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*. The Church, he says, is the spouse of Christ. "He cannot have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother (*Habere non potest Deum patrem qui Ecclesiam not habet matrem*)." [55] But the Church is one. St. Cyprian bases the unity of the Church upon two foundations. The first is Christ's words to St. Peter: *"Tu es Petrus."* By these words the Savior founded the Church upon one man. The second foundation is this fact, that gifts made by Christ, particularly Baptism, the priesthood, and the altar, belong to the legitimate Church and to no other. The interpretation of this second principle later gave rise to the baptismal controversy. Cyprian concluded that the fomenters of schism have no excuse. The least excusable are those who, in time of persecution, showed themselves courageous confessors of the faith. This remark was a direct blow to the confessors whom Novatian had led after him and whose

[54] *Ibidem,* VI, xlv. (As to whether this letter was addressed to Novatus or Novatian, see Migne, *P. G.,* XX, 633, note. Tr.)

[55] *De unitate,* 6. Harnack (*History of Dogma,* II, 76) considers the expression *"Mater Ecclesia"* as peculiar to Africa. And he also thinks that in this matter Clement of Alexandria does not agree with the Africans. Certainly the doctors of the Church in Africa were fond of calling the Church the Mother of Christians. (See Tertullian, *To the Martyrs,* I, 2; *Against Marcion,* bk. 5, chap. 4; *On Monogamy,* 7; *On Prayer,* 2, quoted by A. d'Alès, *La Théologie de Tertullien,* p. 215.) It is true that Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* VI, 16) interprets the commandment to honor one's father and mother in relation to the divine Wisdom rather than with reference to the Church; but in two well-known passages he clearly speaks of "our mother the Church" (*Pedagogue,* I,

authority he sought to make supreme.[56] Cyprian also addressed the followers of Felicissimus,[57] who were raising their heads at Carthage. The leader of the schism at length assembled a so-called council at Carthage. Twenty-five bishops were notified. Five came, of whom three were apostates and two, heretics. One of the latter was Privatus of Lambaesa, cut off from the Church by a previous council. Cyprian at once (May 15, 252) assembled a council of forty bishops, who again proclaimed the true principles of penance. The pseudo-council replied by declaring Cyprian deposed and electing in his place a certain Fortunatus, whom Felicissimus vainly tried to have acknowledged by Rome. Thus the schism did in its own way bear witness to the supreme authority of the Roman Church, of which St. Cyprian said that it was "the chief Church whence priestly unity takes its source (*Ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*)." [58]

The Question of Rebaptism

The controversy raised by the question of the *lapsi* was not yet ended, when the baptismal controversy sprang up. All the

5 and 6). Moreover, this idea of the Church as our Mother is a classical and universal conception from the second century onwards. This notion is one of which St. Irenaeus is especially fond; it is met with also in the letter of the martyrs of Lyons and in the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

[56] It has been justly remarked that the sole aim of St. Cyprian's treatise is to plead the need and importance of the unity of each individual church, and thereby of the authority of the bishop. That was, in fact, the chief point at issue in the recent conflicts with Felicissimus, Novatus, and Novatian. St. Cyprian does not concern himself with the question of the unity of the universal Church; but this is not excluded by his reasoning. On the contrary, the principle of unity which he urges and defends for each church, is also valid for the universal Church. And the unity of the latter is the best guaranty for the unity of the former. As Bossuet says: "Unity is the guardian of unity." (Cf. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, pp. 364 ff.)

[57] Was the *De unitate Ecclesiae* written against the party of Novatian, as Tillemont (*Mémoires*, IV, 105) held, or against that of Felicissimus, as Chapman thinks (*Revue bénédictine*, 1902 and 1903)? We are inclined to believe that St. Cyprian had both factions in mind.

[58] Letter 59, sec. 14.

sects which, one after the other, claimed to absorb in themselves the Christian movement, had perished wretchedly. Judeo-Christian heresies, Gnosticism, Marcionism, Montanism, and Novatianism, all gradually died out. Many of their followers humbly begged for admission into the traditional Christian communities. But what conditions must these repentant heretics be obliged to fulfil? The question was a simple one, and everybody agreed in the same solution whenever it was a case of a heretic who had been baptized in the true Church. He was reconciled by the "penitential" imposition of hands, or in some instances by anointing with oil,[59] but without a repetition of his baptism, the validity of which could not be questioned. But it was different when the repentant heretic had been baptized in a sect that was already separated from the Church.

The solution of the question seems never to have raised the least shadow of a doubt in Cyprian's mind. He regarded it as a corollary of his concept of the Church, as he had expounded it in the *De Unitate Ecclesiae*. He held that Baptism conferred outside the Church was no Baptism at all.[60] At the beginning of 255 he set forth this conclusion in a long letter,[61] basing his doctrine on two arguments. First, Baptism conferred outside the Church cannot be a true Baptism, because Baptism forgives sins; but, the Church alone has this power; in it alone are found grace and the means of communicating or receiving it; it alone is the spouse of Christ, it alone can bring forth children to Christ. The saying: "Outside the Church, no Baptism,"

[59] According to some authors, this would have constituted the Sacrament of Confirmation. (Tixeront, *op. cit.*, I, 366.) If this be so, persons so acting must have misunderstood the character of this Sacrament, which no one can receive more than once. On the early rites of Confirmation and on the problems arising from the diversity of these rites, see J. de Guibert, art. *"Confirmation,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.*, II, cols. 651–654.

[60] *"Non abluuntur hic homines, sed potius sordidantur."* (*De unitate ecclesiae*, 11.)

[61] Letter 69.

is the logical consequence of the expression: "Outside the Church, no Holy Ghost." [62] Secondly, how can a minister of the Sacrament, who has neither the true faith, nor grace, nor the Holy Ghost, communicate these to others? [63] How can a baptized person who has not the faith be incorporated into the Church? [64] Certainly we cannot suspect the sincerity of the holy Bishop of Carthage; his zealous love for the Church was his sole inspiration when he developed these arguments with unexcelled earnestness. But he employed his logic overmuch in the manner of his teacher Tertullian. His first argument confuses the validity of the Sacrament with its actual efficacy. The second argument, if pushed to its ultimate conclusion, would result in the destruction of the visible Church, in the notion of an invisible Church dependent upon the internal dispositions of minister and subject. Why not extend this baptismal theory to all the other Sacraments and to all the liturgical ceremonies which have the power of giving grace? The theories of Wyclif and Zwingli were the consequence of reasoning of this sort.

With great confidence in these arguments, which he thought conclusive,[65] Cyprian assembled a council at Carthage in the autumn of 255 and succeeded in having his view approved by it. He confidently sent the decision of the council to the Church of Rome. This decision he no doubt considered a further argu-

[62] *Letters,* LXIX, 2 f.; LXXIV, 6; LXXV, 14; LXIX, 10 f.; LXX, 3; LXXIII, 6; LXXIV, 4 f.; LXXV, 8, 12.

[63] *Letters,* LXIX, 8; LXX, 1 f.; LXV, 7, 9–11.

[64] Letter 73, sects. 4, 17 f.

[65] St. Cyprian, in his controversies, later sets up the African tradition in opposition to the Roman. In the present instance he takes little account of the argument from tradition. In an expression after the manner of Tertullian, he says: *"Non est de consuetudine praescribendum, sed ratione vincendum."* (Letter 71, sects. 2 f.) Hugo Koch, a Protestant historian, in his *Cyprian und der römische Primat,* maintains that this text contains a radical denial of the Roman primacy. The context points rather to the following meaning: to be the representative of tradition and to be in the position of authority does not dispense one from the use of sound reasoning.

ment in behalf of that unity and holiness of the Church which he so heartily defended and tried to make prevail. The see of St. Peter was then occupied by Pope Stephen.

Cornelius had been exiled to Centumcellae (Cività Vecchia) in 252, and was martyred there two years later. Shortly after his death, he was succeeded by Lucius. It is not certain how long the latter's pontificate lasted. Nicephorus says he reigned six months; Eusebius says eight months. According to Cyprian, he wrote several letters on the way Christians should be treated who lapsed during the persecution;[66] but these letters are now lost. We know also that immediately after his election he was banished. St. Cyprian, learning of both events at the same time, wrote him a letter of congratulation and condolence.[67] His exile did not last long, but it led St. Cyprian to give him the title of martyr, which in this case should not be taken in the strict sense.

Pope St. Stephen

Lucius was succeeded by a Roman priest named Stephen, a charitable and peaceful man. According to the testimony of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, he maintained the ancient fame of the Roman Church by his fatherly solicitude for the spiritual needs of all, even the most distant churches. Out of a deep respect for holy things he forbade priests and deacons, says the *Liber Pontificalis,* to wear liturgical vestments outside the church. His conciliatory spirit was a contrast to that of the Bishop of Carthage, who was so quick in decision and action. As a result of this difference in character, there arose regrettable conflicts between Stephen and Cyprian.

With sometimes divergent views, but with like concern for the welfare of souls, the Roman Pontiff and the Bishop of Carthage endeavored to regulate the situation created in the

[66] St. Cyprian, Letter 67.
[67] Letter 61.

dioceses of Merida and Leon in Spain by the defection of their bishops, Basilides and Martial. These men had requested or accepted certificates of sacrifice. Cyprian was indignant at such a scandal and called upon the Pope to depose them. Stephen yielded to the sound reasoning of the Bishop of Carthage. The two Spanish bishops were declared unworthy of the episcopate. Soon after, Cyprian urgently [68] called the Pope's attention to a quite opposite danger. The Bishop of Arles, Marcian, who had been won over to Novatianism, applied its principles strictly and refused any pardon to the lapsed. We have not Stephen's reply, but he must again have granted the justice of Cyprian's request and deposed Marcian, for the latter's name is not found in the list of the bishops of Arles.[69]

The recollection of the rather sharp communications in these two matters may have influenced the Pope's attitude when Cyprian's delegates came to Rome to notify him of the decision of the Council of Carthage. This much is certain, that the messengers from Carthage were received coldly at Rome.[70] On the question of the Baptism of heretics, the Roman Church had an immemorial tradition; it is even probable that not long before an explicit papal decision had solemnly confirmed this tradition.[71] We cannot suppose that the defects and dangers of Cyprian's theory were perceived by the Pope and his counsellors, as we see them today after Protestantism and Jansenism, after the Council of Trent and the Council of the Vatican. After considering the arguments of the Bishop of Carthage and the decision of the African Council, the Roman Pontiff

[68] Letter 68. The letter is insistent to the point of seeming to lack respect.

[69] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* IV, art. 34 on St. Cyprian.

[70] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* I, 308. Firmilian of Caesarea, who was an ardent partisan of Cyprian and therefore under the suspicion of exaggerating, says he learned from a certain deacon, Gratianus by name, that the legates of the Bishop of Carthage were not admitted to Stephen's presence and that Cyprian was spoken of as a false prophet. (Letter 75, sec. 25.)

[71] Batiffol, *op. cit.,* pp. 396 f.

merely appealed to tradition and commanded that it be followed. From the Pope's letter we have only this decisive passage: "If then any shall come to you from any heresy whatsoever, be there no innovation, beyond what has been handed down, namely, that hands be laid on such to repentance." [72]

The tradition here appealed to by Stephen was not merely that of Rome, but also that of Alexandria and all Egypt, of Jerusalem and Palestine—in short, of the chief Catholic centers. Cyprian on his part was unable to appeal even to a unanimous practice in Africa, for, in the council of 255, the bishops of Numidia forcibly appealed to an early tradition contrary to that of Carthage.[73] Antioch, northern Syria, and some districts of Asia Minor followed the Carthaginian practice. At any event, the Pope, appealing to the authority which was his by virtue of his primacy,[74] ordered the Church of Carthage to follow what he judged to be the tradition.

The Pope's decision was not a dogmatic definition, but a disciplinary command to an individual church. The Bishop of Carthage protested with characteristic vehemence. While not denying the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome, he thought that, in a matter of this sort, "each prelate hath, in the government of the Church, his own choice and free will, hereafter to give account of his conduct to the Lord." [75] Stephen's

[72] Letter 74, sec. 1. The famous text reads as follows: *"Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est."* Tillemont, Bossuet, and many others have understood the text to mean that "nothing should be repeated except what tradition intends to be repeated," *i. e.*, that only the imposition of hands should be repeated, but not the Baptism. But this is not the interpretation that the words received from contemporaries. The Pope states a general principle: the traditional practice should be followed and, consequently, no innovation should be introduced. This is the meaning given to the passage by Eusebius (*H. E.*, VII, iii). St. Vincent of Lerins (*Commonitory,* chap. 6) understands the words in this same sense. (Cf. St. Cyprian, *Letters,* 74, sec. 2; 70, sec. 5; *De rebaptismate,* 1; see Saltet, *Les réordinations,* pp. 22–28.)

[73] *"Dicunt se in hoc veterem consuetudinem sequi, sed non est de conseutudine præscribendum."* (St. Cyprian, Letter 71, sec. 2.)

[74] We learn this detail from Firmilian. Letter 75, sec. 5 (*inter Cyprianicas*).

[75] Letter 72, sec. 3.

intervention seemed to Cyprian an encroachment upon his rights. On September 1, 256, Cyprian convoked another council, attended by eighty-seven bishops. In his opening address he said: "Upon this same matter each of us should bring forward what we think, judging no man, nor rejecting anyone from the right of communion, if he should think differently from us. For neither does any of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience." [76] Should these ambiguous words be regarded as implying a recognition of the rights of the Roman Church or a thinly veiled criticism of its claims? Both interpretations have been held.[77] There was no protest against the papal authority. "Nothing was read from the correspondence of Stephen, his name was not even mentioned; and yet there was no bishop more present than he to that Council of Africa whose members were greatly disturbed by the lesson the Bishop of Rome had just given to the Bishop of Carthage. . . . One after the other, the eighty-seven bishops gave their vote and stated its grounds: they held no other doctrine than that of Cyprian.

"But at that very moment, Pope Stephen was forwarding to all the churches of Christendom the decision by which he acknowledged the validity of Baptism conferred by heretics. . . . Was the whole episcopal body to be divided into two hostile camps: on the one side, Rome and Alexandria, on the other, Africa and Asia Minor? Notwithstanding some affirmations to the contrary, Rome did not as yet excommunicate any church; but she spoke of severing relations with the churches that would not acknowledge the validity of heretical Baptism." [78]

[76] See the text in Cyprian, *De baptismo haereticorum.*

[77] P. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 392; A. d'Alès, *Question baptismale,* p. 26.

[78] Batiffol, *loc. cit.*

St. Firmilian

Then appeared, against the Pope and his doctrine, the most forcible writing that was occasioned by this painful dispute. Its author was Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a man whose learning and virtue were praiseworthy, but who had been stirred up by the recent discussions. To his mind, the real schismatic is he who, wishing to excommunicate the Church, merely excommunicates himself from the Church. Such is the real heretic, the worst of all heretics. It was to Pope Stephen that these words were addressed.[79] The Church is hierarchical, and the Church is one, says Firmilian. The Church is hierarchical because its authority rests on that of the Apostles. They have handed down their authority to the bishops. Without the bishops there is no Baptism, no Holy Orders, no altar. But who is it that gives heretics—Core, Dathan, and Abiron—the right to confer the Holy Ghost? Who is this destroyer of the hierarchy, if not Stephen? The Church is one. The guarantee of this oneness is fidelity to the Apostolic authority. Whoever is with the Apostles, shares in this oneness, without there being need of conformity of practice in everything. Is the Easter ceremony celebrated in the same manner and at the same date in the whole Church? Is Rome, in its liturgy, in full accord with Jerusalem?

We can see the flaw in this very clever reasoning. They want the hierarchy, but are silent about the pivotal point of that hierarchy; they proclaim oneness, but forget that there must be a judge of that oneness, an arbiter in the conflicts that might break it. They speak of the baptismal question as though it were simply a matter of ceremonies, while failing to note that

[79] *"Tu haereticis omnibus pejor es."* (Letter 75, sec. 25.) On the authenticity of this letter, which Molkenbuhr questions, see Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, p. 175. Possibly some places in our present Latin text were altered by a Donatist. On St. Firmilian, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. IV, *passim*.

it touches on higher questions, which the Pope has the right to decide.

Furthermore, while the Pope was only propounding his right and duty to interpret the Catholic traditions, certain polemics arose to defend his cause. Among them was the author of the *Liber de rebaptismate,* a suggestive work, although its ideas are somewhat confused and not well arrayed.[80] He examines the theological aspect of the baptismal question and insists particularly upon the power of the divine names invoked in the baptismal formula, a power that is exercised independently of the faith or official rank of the minister. He has a glimpse of the difference between the validity and the efficacity of Baptism, and thus destroys the basic argument of the rebaptizers, namely, that a heretic as such cannot give or receive the Holy Ghost. He says we must distinguish between the immersion and the virtue of the immersion. These two things can be separated; one can be without the other. The immersion made in the name of the Trinity, even by a heretic, has the power of giving an indelible character and hence does not need to be renewed. As to the virtue of the immersion, that will be produced when the heretic is converted to the true Church.

The Pope, notwithstanding the sharpness of the attacks made upon his decision, had the forbearance not to excommunicate anyone. A great misunderstanding was at the root of these heated disputes and divided men whose devotion to the Church no one could question. Stephen and Cyprian soon showed this by generously giving, both of them, their lives for the faith. And the voice of moderation was heard. As Irenaeus had done in the midst of the disputes over the Easter question, Dionysius of Alexandria became the advocate of pacification with Stephen. After that Pope's martyrdom, Dio-

[80] An analysis of this work will be found in Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne,* II, 94 ff.

nysius continued his efforts for peace with Sixtus II. Sixtus and Cyprian renewed their interrupted relations. The Bishop of Caesarea, Firmilian, likewise resumed relations with Rome. At the end of the third century, all Africa had joined in the Roman practice. There was a more prolonged hesitation in the East; but there, too, the traditional practice finally triumphed, as did also the authority of the Roman pontiff.[81]

The Plague

The persecution of the Christians under Gallus and Valerian contributed not a little to restore union to the Church. That we may grasp this the better, we must resume our interrupted narrative of the events.

A plague which decimated Rome and the provinces under Emperor Gallus, gave rise to new severity toward the Christians. In the midst of universal terror, of selfishness and pagan cowardice,[82] they alone gave an example of true charity. St. Dionysius of Alexandria tells of their caring for the sick, closing the eyes of the dead, bathing the bodies of the deceased, and themselves becoming victims of their devotion, "so that this form of death appeared nowise inferior to martyrdom itself." [83] St. Cyprian bears the same testimony in his *De*

[81] Anglicans, Gallicans, Josephists, and, more recently, the Old Catholics, have frequently quoted the violent words of St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian in the baptismal dispute as a confirmation of their errors. But they lose sight of the fact that, outside the crises in which certain difficult circumstances created a painful misunderstanding between Rome and Cyprian, the latter recognized that "the Church of this see had become the mother and root of the Catholic Church spread over the earth. In a severe crisis which Cyprian had to pass through in his own diocese, he appealed to the Roman Church (the Roman bishop) in a manner which made it appear as if communion with that Church was in itself the guaranty of truth." (Harnack, *History of Dogma,* II, 88.) For Cyprian, the See of Rome was always *locus Petri,* and the Church of Rome was *"Ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est."*

[82] St. Cyprian, *De mortalitate,* 16; Pontius, *Vita Cypriani,* 97; Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, xxii.

[83] Quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, xxii.

mortalitate; but he considers the plague as a means of detaching Christians from the present life and preparing them for the conflicts to come.[84]

The valiant Bishop's anticipation was soon realized. Gallus, desiring to assuage the wrath of the gods, ordered propitiatory sacrifices to be offered in every city. The Christians were prevented by their faith from taking part in these idolatrous acts. Then it was that Gallus arrested the Bishop of Rome, Pope Cornelius, no doubt hoping thus to terrify the Christians and to witness a repetition of the apostasies in the time of Decius. But he was greatly mistaken. Scarcely did the news of the outrage spread abroad, than the Christians hastened in throngs to confess their faith and declare themselves ready to die.[85] A large number of those who had lapsed in the preceding persecution sought to rehabilitate themselves by heroic professions of faith before the magistrates, and several suffered death. The Emperor felt that too great rigor toward the Pope would but enkindle the enthusiasm. Therefore, he merely banished Cornelius to Centumcellae, where the Pontiff died; and he also exiled Cornelius' successor, Lucius, immediately after his election.

The Emperor Valerian

During the two years of Gallus' persecution, defections were few. The efforts of Cornelius, Cyprian, and Dionysius of Alexandria had borne fruit. Those who were real Christians during the peace showed themselves real martyrs in time of trial.

Upon Valerian's coming to the throne, the Church joined in the unanimous acclaim of the Roman people in hailing this honest man, honored both in civil life and in the army, a valiant general who had defended the Empire on every fron-

[84] St. Cyprian, *De mortalitate,* 15.
[85] *Ibid.*

tier, and—a rare exception in those times—had come to the throne without staining his hands with the blood of his predecessor.

One of the new Emperor's first acts was to recall the Pope from exile. Lucius returned to Rome in triumph. St. Cyprian describes the ovation given him in the streets of the Eternal City.[86] Lucius died in Rome shortly afterwards, March 5, 254. It may be that the sufferings of his banishment hastened his death. St. Cyprian gives him the title of martyr, as he does Cornelius.[87]

At first Valerian showed great friendliness to the Christians. Dionysius of Alexandria says: "How kind and friendly he was towards the servants of God. For never was there any of the emperors before him so favorably and benevolently disposed toward them, not even those who were openly said to be Christians, so plainly received them, with such excessive civility and friendship in the commencement of his reign. All his house was likewise filled with pious persons, and was like a church of God." [88]

The Church profited by this peace to heal the wounds inflicted by persecution and schism and the calamities of the times. Here and there traces of the old heresies still troubled the purity of the faith. Some who were more or less consciously the heirs of Gnosticism celebrated Mass without wine; they were called *Aquarii*. Their excuse was that during the persecution the odor of the wine taken in the morning would betray them before the pagans. Cyprian refuted their error and shamed them for their timidity.[89] Others, imbued with Judaic traditions, waited until the eighth day to confer Baptism on their children, as the Jews did for circumcision, and

[86] Letter 58.

[87] Letter 67.

[88] St. Dionysius of Alexandria, Letter to Hermammon, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, VII, x.

[89] Letter 63.

they would not give any signs of affection for their children until these had been cleansed of original sin. Cyprian condemned their superstition.

The poor were in great numbers. Persecution, the plague, and, above all other causes, the progressive decadence of the Roman world under the influence of pagan corruption and military despotism, were making labor more unproductive, wealth less abundant, and poverty more frequent and beyond cure.[90] To combat this evil, Cyprian wrote his beautiful book *On Works and Almsgiving*. The Bishop of Carthage preached both by word and example. Certain bishops of Numidia wrote asking him for contributions for the redemption of captives. A collection taken up among the clergy and people of Carthage amounted to 100,000 sesterces (about $5,000). Cyprian immediately forwarded this magnificent gift to his colleagues.[91] From Rome, where Pope Cornelius had fed 1,500 poor persons,[92] Pope Stephen sent relief to the Churches of Syria and Arabia.[93] The enemies of the Church turned these very deeds of generosity into an excuse for a new persecution.

A defect of major importance in any ruler is a ready yielding to the influence of those about him. And this was one of Emperor Valerian's faults.[94] It became more conspicuous as he grew older. A certain Macrianus, an ambitious soldier who reached the loftiest offices of the Empire, won the Emperor's confidence, diverted his friendliness from Christianity by introducing him to magic,[95] and gained a powerful ascendancy over him. Then he denounced the Church as the great peril of the Empire. In the case of an emperor who, like Valerian, had

[90] Champagny, *Les Césars du III^e siècle,* II, 381.

[91] Letter 60.

[92] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xliii.

[93] *Ibidem,* VII, v.

[94] Aurelius Victor says he was *"multum iners."* (*Epitome;* cf. Zosimus, *Historiae,* bk. 1, chap 36.)

[95] Magic was the last relic of paganism. The writings of the Fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries abound in allusions to magical practices.

a close acquaintance with Christians, their mysteries, their practices, and their spirit, it was no longer possible to make false charges of infamous doings at their meetings, as had been done under Nero and Domitian, or to suggest the menacing influence of their spread, as under Septimius Severus, or their systematic hostility toward the Empire, as under Decius. Macrianus spoke only of the wealth of the Church, of the extent of its properties, of the vastness of its treasures that must be concealed in the shadow of its sanctuaries, since it supplied such abundant alms. He failed to understand, or rather he pretended not to understand, that the Church did not hoard up treasure, that, as St. Cyprian said, "whatever is given is bestowed on widows and orphans," [96] that the church buildings and cemeteries, however extensive they seemed, were unproductive capital, that the font of all the Church's resources was in the generous hearts of its members, ever ready to come to the relief of their brethren in distress, and not in chests from which they could be stolen. From that time onward the old Emperor's imagination was obsessed by the vision of a Church storing up treasures in its temples, while the coffers of the State were empty. Instead of attributing the deplorable financial condition of the Empire to economic and moral causes, which a little close attention would have revealed—slavery, the poor organization of labor, the unjust distribution of wealth, the unproductive consumption of income, the moral disorders that encouraged both the indolent distrust of the workers and the insolent luxury of the masters—Macrianus drew the Emperor's attention to a powerful society that was absorbing wealth, depriving the State of it, and bringing on public ruination. By talking thus, the clever schemer not only gratified a personal grudge, but also echoed the popular rumors exploited by the pagans.

[96] *De opere et eleemosynis,* 12; Library of the Fathers, III, 241.

Valerian's Edicts of Persecution

These charges resulted in two edicts of persecution in 257 and 258. Neither of them was directed against Christians as individuals so much as against the Christian Church. No one was required to apostatize. The first decree merely enjoined upon the hierarchical heads of the Church to join officially in the worship of the gods, although, if they so wished, they might continue their worship of Christ, and to abandon the collegiate form of church organization. At first glance these two prescriptions may seem comparatively mild. But, in fact, "no previous persecutor had adopted so grievous a measure against the Church." [97] It attacked both the hierarchy and the social form of the Church. Without running the risk of a popular uprising and without even requiring the heads of the Church to abjure their belief, it merely called upon the latter to join in the national worship, while it dissolved all the corporate bonds which had held the Christians together. After that it would matter but little if the faithful did not offer incense to the Roman gods and if they continued to exist merely as groups of individuals. This they could do, but cut off from their chiefs and deprived of their possessions. The Christian Church, thus stricken in its head and foundation, would inevitably dissolve and cease to be.

The situation was especially serious because of the terrible penalties which the old Roman law attached to prescriptions of this sort and because of a new legal procedure which increased their severity.

According to the letter of the law, every crime of impiety, that is, every refusal to honor the gods of the State, was punishable with exile. Thus, whether they obeyed the law or

[97] Allard, *Les dernières persécutions du troisième siècle,* p. 54. (See Healy, *The Valerian Persecution.* Tr.)

defied it, the priests and bishops would perforce be separated from their flocks: in the one case, by their act of idolatry; in the other case, by their banishment beyond the frontiers.

Even more radical were the penalties attached to the laws about associations. The Roman law, with its centralized absolutism, punished any attempt to found or reëstablish a forbidden society as equivalent to the crime of a robber who by armed force seizes upon temples or public buildings.[98] Since, in this pagan theocracy, every public institution possessed both a religious and a political character, the punishment of this crime became that of lese majesty, almost identical with sacrilege [99] and punishable by death.[100] Therefore, in a hidden and indirect, but terribly effective manner, the edict of 257, with its appearance of ignoring the laity, really was an attack upon them: a layman frequenting a cemetery or holding a religious meeting became liable to capital punishment, which, in Roman law, was of two degrees: death or forced labor.[101]

Nevertheless, this first decree did not have the effect anticipated. It aimed at the chiefs of the Church—Stephen, Cyprian, and Dionysius. They were the first to suffer, but their courage strengthened the faithful. We are not in possession of the details of Pope Stephen's death; probably he was banished straightway after the promulgation of the decree; he died soon afterwards in exile and received from the Church the title of martyr.[102] The Bishop of Carthage was banished to Curubis in Africa, and the Bishop of Alexandria to Kephro in Libya. But both of them maintained communication with

[98] *"Quisquis illicitum collegium usurpaverit, ea poena tenetur, qua tenentur qui hominibus armatis loca publica vel templa occupasse judicati sunt."* (Ulpian, *Digest,* XLVII, xxii, 1.)

[99] *"Proximum sacrilegio crimen est, quod majestatis dicitur."* (*Ibidem,* XLVIII, iv, 1.)

[100] Marcian, *ibid.,* no. 3.

[101] Callistratus, *Digest,* XLVIII, xix, 28.

[102] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* II, 80–87; Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* I, xcvii and 154, note.

their colleagues, who continued to hold religious meetings. The authorities did not venture to attack all the bishops. It was thought sufficient, by way of example, to arrest a number of bishops, priests, and laymen for holding illegal meetings and to sentence them to forced labor in the mines.

The government seized the cemeteries and places of worship and placed guards at their entrances. But the Christians were still able to enter without being detected. In the time of Septimius Severus they had provided the catacombs of Callistus with secret passages. These were now increased in number. These passages in the underground burying-places, intended to baffle pursuit, can still be seen. They probably date from the time of Valerian. Of course the Christians were running considerable risk.[103] In a crypt on the Via Salaria some Christians holding a liturgical meeting were discovered by soldiers, who quickly blocked the entrance to the cavern with stones and earth. After the peace of the Church, the skeletons of these Christians were found, as also the silver vessels that had been used in the Eucharistic sacrifice.[104] Pope Damasus, when restoring the catacomb, did not disturb these venerable relics, but simply made a little window in the wall so that pilgrims might venerate the remains of these martyrs of the Holy Eucharist. St. Gregory of Tours says that they could still be seen in his time.[105]

Probably to this same period belongs the episode of another martyr of the Eucharist, the acolyte St. Tarsicius, who was attached to the service of one of the Roman catacombs. While bearing the sacred species, which had been consecrated in the crypt, to some Christian home, he was seized by soldiers, who ordered him to hand over what he carried. As Pope Damasus' charming inscription says, "he refused to give up to the dogs

[103] De Rossi, *op. cit*, II, 258.
[104] *Acta sanctorum*, October, X, 483.
[105] *De gloria martyrum*, I, 38.

the body of Christ," and the soldiers clubbed him to death, while he pressed to his heart the sacred pyx holding the body of the Lord.[106]

The imperial government had been unable to sequestrate all the cemeteries and places of worship; many of them belonged to Christians of high rank, who placed them at the use of their brethren. Two reasons hindered the effectiveness of the edict of 257: the courage of the heads of the churches, and the many connections they had with persons in high places, even in Caesar's very palace. To terrify the priests by more frightful penalties and to paralyze the influence of their powerful protectors, was the purpose of the edict of 258. Bishops, priests, and deacons, instead of being subject to banishment, could now be executed without examination or regular trial or substantiated charges. Senators, knights, and other members of the nobility, if they continued to profess Christianity, were to be at once deprived of their rank and fortune, and beheaded. The Christians of Caesar's household would thus see their wealth confiscated and themselves reduced to the condition of the lowest slaves.[107]

The imperial chancery sent copies of the edict to the governors of the various provinces. The persecution broke out anew in all parts of the Empire. Pope St. Sixtus and his deacon St. Lawrence in Rome, St. Cyprian in Carthage, and St. Fructuosus in Spain were the principal victims.

Pope St. Sixtus II

Pope Stephen was succeeded by Sixtus II. Pontianus, the author of the Life of St. Cyprian, calls him "a good and peace-

[106] The following is the epitaph composed by St. Damasus:

"Tarsicium sanctum Christi membra gerentem
Cum malesana manus premeret vulgare profanis,
Ipse animam potius voluit dimittere caesus
Prodere quam canibus rabidis coelestia membra."

[107] St. Cyprian, Letter 80.

making pontiff." [108] We have no reliable information about his pontificate except what he did to end the baptismal dispute and to resume correspondence between the Holy See and the Bishop of Carthage.

The police lost no time in hunting for the Bishop of Rome. "Sixtus II had not discontinued the holding of Christian meetings and the celebration of Christian worship. But he was unable to assemble the faithful in the cemetery of Callistus, which was officially known to the government authorities as the corporate property of the Church, and was watched by the police. On the sixth of August he offered the Holy Sacrifice on the other side of the Via Appia, in one of the underground chapels of the cemetery of Praetextatus. This cemetery was probably not yet part of the ecclesiastical domain. Being private property, it escaped sequestration. However, the inviolability of "religious places" did not hold against the new prescriptions, which ordered the immediate seizure of the bishop and his clergy. The cemetery was entered. When the soldiers came in, Sixtus was seated in his chair, addressing the faithful. He and the ministers of worship were led away. The Christians present asked to die with him; but the soldiers, satisfied with their important capture or fearing to encumber themselves with so large a number of prisoners, did not lay hands on the laity. St. Cyprian says that the prefects (of the pretorium or of the city) were in permanent session to judge the Christians. Before one of these Sixtus was brought, and was sentenced to be beheaded in the very place where he had been seized while celebrating the holy mysteries.

"While Sixtus was being led back, the first deacon, Lawrence, who was not present at the time of the arrest, ran up to his spiritual father to bid him a last farewell. Tradition reports this tender dialogue between them: 'Father, where goest thou without thy son? Where goest thou, O priest, without

[108] Pontius, *Life of St. Cyprian,* 14; cf. Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, ix.

thy deacon?' asked Lawrence in a tone of mild reproach. The Pontiff replied: 'Son, I am not abandoning thee. Greater strife awaits thee. Do not weep; thou wilt follow me in three days.' Lawrence might have been arrested at once; but the persecutors, for some hidden reason, seemed not to see him. Having reached the cemetery, they went down to the very crypt where Sixtus had preached the word of life. He sat down for the last time in his chair and offered his head to the executioner's sword. Greater than that emperor who wished to die standing, he received the mortal blow as a bishop, in the seat of the pontiffs, presiding over the persecuted Church." [109]

The reason why they had not immediately executed Lawrence, the first deacon, soon became evident. They hoped through him to lay hands upon the supposed treasures of the Church, which they thought were in his care. The prefect of Rome sent for him and ordered him to surrender the possessions that he was keeping. The deacon, anticipating a confiscation, had already given all the Church's reserve funds to the poor. He asked to be given one day before answering. "The next day he returned, accompanied by the poor who were fed by the Christians. 'Here are the treasures of the Church,' he said. The prefect took offense at this spiritual and heroic reply. He sentenced Lawrence to be burnt alive. The martyr was stretched out on a gridiron. As he was undergoing the torture of a slow fire, the persecutors tried to wring from him, before he should die, information as to the location of the wealth of the Church. It is related that Lawrence said to the judge: 'This side is roasted enough, turn me over'; then adding:

[109] Allard, *op. cit.*, p. 85. Cf. Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, I, 155 f., notes. It has been possible to reconstruct the story of St. Sixtus' martyrdom and burial by bringing together St. Cyprian's testimony (Letter 80), St. Damasus' inscription on the tomb of St. Sixtus, his inscription on the tomb of SS. Felicissimus and Agapitus, and a passage in the *De officiis ministrorum* (bk. 1, chap. 41) of St. Ambrose.

'Taste now.' The brave deacon raised his eyes to Heaven, and died while praying for Rome." [110]

Martyrdom of St. Cyprian

Soon after these events, Cyprian was arrested on a charge of being sacrilegious, a conspirator, and an abettor of an illegal association. The previous year, at Curubis, a mysterious vision foretold his martyrdom [111] and brought him great joy. His flight, for which his foes charged him with cowardice and which he had accepted as a duty, was the most painful sacrifice for him. The genuine sentiments of his soul were revealed in that fervent *Letter to the Confessors and Martyrs,* which he wrote in the midst of the persecution. In it he says:

"With what praises shall I extol you, most valiant brethren? You yielded not to suffering, but suffering rather yielded to you. The crowd of bystanders witnessed wondering the heavenly conflict, the conflict of God, the spiritual conflict, the battle of Christ; that His servants stood, of secular weapons indeed naked, but armed and trustful in the armor of faith. . . . What a spectacle was that to the eyes of God! As it is written in the Psalms, the Holy Ghost speaking to us: 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.' Precious is this death, which purchases immortality at the price of its own blood. How did Christ rejoice there, how gladly in such His servants did He both fight and conquer. The champions and maintainers of His own name He uplifted, strengthened, animated. And He who once overcame death for us, ever overcomes it in us." [112]

On September 14, 258, Cyprian at length had an opportunity to confess his faith before the persecutors in his own city of

[110] Allard, *op. cit.,* pp. 91 f. Historical criticism has attacked the details of this martyrdom; but no well-founded doubt has been cast upon the substantial truthfulness of the account.

[111] Pontius, *op. cit.,* 12.

[112] St. Cyprian, *Letter to the Martyrs and Confessors.*

Carthage. The official record of his trial and execution have come down to us without alteration. We quote this priceless document as follows: [113]

"The proconsul Galerius Maximus said: 'Art thou Thascius Cyprian?' Cyprian answered: 'I am.' 'Art thou he,' said Maximus, 'who hath borne the highest offices of their religion among the Christians?' 'Yes,' answered the Bishop. 'The most sacred Emperors have commanded that you offer sacrifice,' said the proconsul. 'I will not offer sacrifice,' replied Cyprian. 'Be persuaded,' said the proconsul, 'for your own sake.' Cyprian replied: 'Do thou as thou hast received orders: for me, in so just a cause, no persuasion can move me.'

"Maximus, having consulted with his assessors, pronounced the following sentence with much emotion: 'Thou hast long lived in impiety, and hast made thyself the center of a band of pestilent conspirators; thou hast acted as an enemy to the gods and to the sacred laws of Rome: neither the pious and most august princes Valerianus and Gallienus, nor the most noble Caesar Valerian, have been able to recall you to a dutiful adherence to their religion. Since, then, thou art convicted as the author and instigator of so many iniquities, thou shalt become an example to those whom thou hast seduced: the authority of the laws shall be vindicated by thy blood.' After these words he pronounced the sentence from his tablet, 'Let Thascius Cyprian be beheaded.' 'Thanks be to God,' said Cyprian: and the crowd of Christians who surrounded him, exclaimed, 'Let us die with him!'

"The holy martyr was then led away, followed by a great concourse of people, to an open field near the place where he had received his sentence; and having put off the rest of his garments, and committed them to the deacons, he first prostrated himself in prayer to God, and then stood in his inner vestments prepared for the fatal stroke. He tied the bandage over his eyes with his own hands; and that he might

[113] There is every reason for us to believe that this document is not merely a composite of ancient materials, as Basnage and Goerres have maintained, but —as Allard and Leclercq think—the official report of the trial, copied by the Christians. (Cf. Cabrol, art. *"Actes des martyrs,"* in the *Dict. de litt. et d'archéol. chrét.*)

owe that office to friends which he could not himself perform, Julian a presbyter, and a subdeacon of the same name, bound his hands. To the executioner he appropriated a gift of twenty-five pieces of gold: the Christians, whose avarice was not mercenary, sought no other memorials than handkerchiefs dyed with the blood of their bishop." [114]

Many other bishops and priests also died for the faith in Africa, Asia, at Rome, in Gaul, and in Spain. We have not the authentic Acts of all these martyrs. Those of St. Fructuosus, bishop of Tarragona, and of his two deacons, Augurius and Eulogius, seem to be almost contemporary with the events they relate.[115]

Martyrdom of St. Fructuosus

Aemilianus, the governor, said to Fructuosus: "Do you know the commands of the Emperor?"

Fructuosus: "No, but I am a Christian."

Aemilianus: "Do you know that there are gods?"

Fructuosus: "I know nothing of the sort."

Aemilianus: "You will learn."

Fructuosus raised his eyes to Heaven and prayed.

Aemilianus: "Who, then, will be obeyed, feared, and honored, if people refuse to worship the gods and adore the emperors?"

Aemilianus (to Augurius): "Do not listen to what Fructuosus says."

Augurius: "I adore the almighty God."

Aemilianus (to Eulogius): "Do you adore Fructuosus?"

Eulogius: "I do not adore Fructuosus, but I adore the same God that Fructuosus adores."

Aemilianus (to Fructuosus): "Are you a bishop?"

Fructuosus: "I am."

Aemilianus: "You have been."

And he ordered all three to be burnt alive.

"When the three martyrs walked to the place of their execution

[114] Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, II, 105; cf. Monceaux, *St. Cyprian.*

[115] Allard, *Histoire des pers.*, III, 98 ff.

in the amphitheater, they seemed like the three Hebrews, and like these made one think of the Trinity. When the flames had burnt the cords that tied their hands, they knelt down and ceased not to pray until the moment they gave up their spirit." [116]

These events took place on January 21, 259. The next year Emperor Valerian, having been made prisoner by King Sapor, walked behind his conqueror's chariot in chains. He was now himself a slave. For many years he continued to drag out a wretched and degraded existence among the Persians.

The Emperor Gallienus

The lesson was profitable to his son Gallienus, who knew that the Christian society was so deeply rooted and so widely extended that there was no hope of destroying it or of absorbing it in the imperial government. It may be that the influence of Salonina, his wife, who probably was a Christian,[117] inclined him favorably toward Christianity.

Gallienus put an end to the persecution and restored to the Christians all their possessions that had been confiscated. It is particularly noteworthy that he regulated all these matters with the heads of the Churches. We still have his letter to Dionysius of Alexandria on this subject.[118] This procedure was an official recognition of the hierarchical authority of the

[116] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, II, 118 ff.

[117] The Empress Salonina was a remarkably interesting character. Though of Roman stock, she seemed to belong to the intellectual lineage of those Syrian princesses—such as Julia Domna and Mammaea—who exercised so dominant an influence at the court of Severus. She was enthusiastically devoted to Greek studies, especially philosophy, and at first was in touch with Plotinus and Porphyry. Whereas the latter turned bitterly against the Christians, and Plotinus introduced into his *Enneades* merely a vague coloring of the Gospel, it may be that Salonina even became a Christian. Allard and De Witte favor the view that she did. De Barthélemy, Kraus, and Drury believe that she did not go beyond a compromise between Christianity and Neoplatonism; but they also think that she inclined Gallienus to treat the Christians favorably.

[118] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VII. xiii.

bishops. His successor Aurelian went even farther and in the matter of a property dispute on which, in 272, the Christians of Antioch were divided, he "ordered the building to be given up to those to whom the rulers of the Christian religion in Italy and the bishop of Rome should write." [119] One step more, and Church and State would treat with each other for the first time as one power with another. A religious policy was being prepared which led to the edict of Constantine.

But Gallienus' weakness prevented his decree from bearing its full fruit. "While he was saying at Rome: 'Let us amuse ourselves,' he was losing the government of the world." [120] Ambitious soldiers carved out ephemeral kingdoms for themselves in the provinces. Gaul, Britain, and Spain were grouped under the independent rule of Posthumus; in the East a powerful confederation was formed under Odenatus and Zenobia; Egypt and the Danube provinces submitted to new masters. It was the era of the "Thirty Tyrants." [121] Of these only one, Macrianus, showed himself plainly hostile to the Christians, but he was unable to destroy the great influence which they had acquired by their knowledge and virtue and which, in moments of danger, made them powerful mediators. We have an example of this in an episode reported by Eusebius. While the Roman legions were besieging Alexandria, two highly regarded and eminent Christians—Eusebius, later bishop of Laodicea, and Anatolius, who followed him in the same see—mediated between the Romans and the Alexandrians, and thus saved a large number of the besieged from death.[122]

During the more than thirty years, from 260 to 295, there

[119] *Ibidem,* VII, xxx.

[120] Trebellius Pollio, *Gallieni duo,* 16, 17, 21.

[121] These ephemeral kings, most of them former imperial officers, who governed according to Roman traditions, were not thirty in number, nor were they more tyrannical than the Roman emperors. But they are known as the "Thirty Tyrants."

[122] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, xxxii.

were three short and localized persecutions: the one in Egypt under Macrianus; another in 269 under Claudius Gothicus; and the one that was decreed by Aurelian in 274, which, however, ended with his death. With these exceptions, the Christians enjoyed comparative peace during this period.

Pope Dionysius

This peace gave the Church a chance for reorganization. The see of St. Peter was vacant for a whole year after the death of Sixtus II. In July, 259, the Roman clergy elected Dionysius.

The new pontiff was united by ties of friendship to that other Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. But when the latter was denounced to the Pope for his unorthodox way of speaking of the Trinity, the Pope asked him for an explanation. Dionysius of Alexandria at once withdrew the expressions that had given scandal to the faithful.[123] Pope Dionysius, in his own name and in the name of a synod which he had assembled in Rome to elucidate the Trinitarian question, wrote a circular letter to all the churches of Egypt, in which, while preserving a middle course between the two extremes, he condemned Sabellian Unitarianism and subordinatian Tritheism.[124] He wrote also to the Church of Caesarea in Cappadocia, which was afflicted by the invasion of the Persians; and he sent it aid for the redemption of the captives. His letter, as St. Basil testifies, was respectfully preserved in the archives of Caesarea. This act of charity, following upon the recent strained relations between Bishop Firmilian of Caesarea and the predecessors of Dionysius, was of a sort to strengthen the union of the Eastern churches with Rome. It was under the pontificate of Dionysius that Aurelian, having to decide the ownership of certain ecclesiastical property be-

[123] St. Athanasius, *De sententia Dionysii,* 13; *De synodis,* 43.
[124] *Idem, De decretis Nicaenae synodi,* 26.

tween two claimants, ordered that it belonged to the one who was in communion with the bishop of Rome. For these various reasons, Dionysius' pontificate marks an important date in the history of the Holy See.

Popes Felix, Eutychian, and Caius

The next pope, Felix, governed the Church for five years, worthily continuing the work of Dionysius. His important letter on Christ's perfect divinity and humanity was later deemed worthy of being incorporated, in large part, in the Acts of the Third Ecumenical Council.

We know almost nothing about Eutychian and Caius, who were the two successors of Felix. The records of their pontificates must have been destroyed in the persecution of Diocletian. According to the *Liber Pontificalis,* Eutychian reigned eight years, eleven months, and three days, but these figures do not agree with those of Eusebius, who speaks of only ten months, or with the Corbie catalogue, which gives him one year and one month.

A similar divergence is to be found between the *Liber Pontificalis* and Eusebius regarding the pontificate of Pope Caius. The former authority gives him a reign of thirteen years; Eusebius, fifteen. The *Passio Sanctae Suzannae*—which, however, is not altogether reliable—gives some reason for supposing that Caius was a relative of Diocletian.

Organization of the Church

During the thirty-odd years of peace which Providence granted the Church, its rulers had two important works to undertake: to restore and consolidate discipline, and to defend the purity of the faith against paganism and heresy.

The second part of the third century saw the strengthening and completion of the hierarchy: the authority of the priest-

hood and episcopate, and most of all the authority of the Roman pontificate, was a matter demanding the attention of the civil government. Beneath these higher grades of the traditional organization, a certain number of lower orders appeared.

The Emperor Gallienus treated of these religious questions with the bishops; Aurelian would recognize as legitimate bishops only those who were in union with Rome. A passage in the *Liber Pontificalis* speaks of Pope Dionysius handing over to the priests the churches which the government had given back.[125] And we find it said that Pope Cornelius enumerated, among the ministers of his Church, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, and porters.[126] From this time forth these are the various grades of the hierarchy. This is what Tertullian and Cyprian call the *ordo,* the *clerus,*[127] as distinguished from the *plebs* of the faithful. Other texts enable us to enter into more detail regarding the nature and functioning of this hierarchy.

The bishop of Rome's supreme authority is evident from a consideration of the controversies which we have already recounted. Never did Cyprian or Firmilian or Dionysius of Alexandria venture to speak authoritatively to the whole Church. Only the bishops of Rome did so. Scholars stir up questions; the bishop of Rome decides them. In the excitement of the discussion he is sometimes charged with abusing his authority, but that authority itself is never called in question.

Yet each bishop, as head of a local church, has a great power. He alone represents the Apostolic tradition before the people; he alone represents his faithful people in their relations with the other churches or with Rome. No letter is ad-

[125] *Lib. pont.,* I, 157; cf. Introduction, page c.
[126] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xliii.
[127] Tertullian, *De monogamia,* 11 f.; St. Cyprian, *Letters,* 40, 58.

dressed to the clergy unless the see is vacant. At times we meet the phrase, "the bishop and his people": these are the two elements of a church.[128]

Three factors enter into the election of a bishop: the votes of the faithful of the church that is to be provided with a bishop; the vote of the clergy, and, lastly, the confirmation of this choice by the neighboring bishops, who impose hands on the bishop-elect. It is clear that this last act is the essential condition; it is this which "gives the episcopacy." [129] Novatian had three poor, ignorant and beguiled bishops impose hands on him; the only reason why Pope Cornelius would not recognize his election was because the three bishops were intoxicated and had acted under the influence of fraud and terror. Novatian's conduct as well as the Pope's words presuppose, as an accepted truth, that the imposition of hands by three bishops confers the episcopacy.[130]

The special office of priests is to offer the sacrifice. Tertullian is as positive on this point as Cyprian. Whereas in the earliest period the priests stood around the bishop, who was the chief officiant, now they often celebrate the sacrifice by themselves. And churches are placed in their charge.[131] Their second function is to catechize. First they teach the catechumens, the *audientes,* then the faithful, who come to them for a knowledge of the faith.[132] In fine, they administer the Sacrament of Penance insofar as it is a private matter. In all these duties they are closely dependent upon the bishop, whose helpers they are. In the East only, they sometimes have charge of a few rural communities, and are then called "rectors of the people," or *"chorepiscopi,"* country bishops.[133]

[128] St. Cyprian, Letter 58, sect. 4.

[129] *Idem,* Letter 67, sec. 5.

[130] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VI, xliii.

[131] *Lib. pont.,* I, 157.

[132] St. Cyprian, *Letters,* 18, sec. 2; 29; 63, sec. 3; Pontius, *Life of St. Cyprian,* 3 f.

[133] Gillmann, *Das Institut der Chorbischöfe im Orient,* Munich, 1903.

The Eastern *chorepiscopi* of the third century seem in principle to have had episcopal powers. The Council of Sardica, in 343, forbade the granting of these powers. Thereafter the *chorepiscopi* were merely priest "visitors" or inspectors, at times a sort of resident pastors, but always under the authority of the bishop. In the West the institution of *chorepiscopi* came later. It is in the fifth century that for the first time in the West this title is given to two priests, Armentarius at Riez and Eugraphus in Dalmatia. But its meaning is not very clear; it does not become so until the eighth century.[134]

The deacons were always of great importance in the Church. The development of the Church, the increasing number of meetings, and the growth of the ecclesiastical patrimony considerably added to the variety of their duties. The creation of minor orders relieved them of many of their occupations. But the management of Church property and the direction of the works of charity were sometimes a heavy burden. Among the deacons, one, who is called first or archdeacon, had principal charge of the Church possessions and the works of zeal. We have seen how these duties affected the first deacon, Lawrence.

[134] The history of the *chorepiscopi* can be studied only by carefully distinguishing the Eastern chorepiscopate from the Western. They differ both in the period when they existed and in their special traits. In the East the chorepiscopate existed from the second to the eighth century. The earliest *chorepiscopus* of whom we know in the East was Zoticus, who was *chorepiscopus* of Cumana (Phrygia) in the latter half of the second century. The latest mention of *chorepiscopi* is in the report of the Council of Nicaea in 787. Except for the enigmatic case of Armentarius and Eugraphus in Dalmatia, *chorepiscopi* are not mentioned in the West before the second half of the eighth century. In the East the *chorepiscopi* were at first rural bishops, entirely independent of the city bishops. They became more and more subject to the latter, until finally they no longer had any episcopal character at all. The regulating of their progressive subordination was the work of the councils of Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Nicaea, Antioch, Sardis, and Laodicea. The Western *chorepiscopi* "appear to be rather coadjutors of the bishop, entrusted with governing portions of the diocese more or less distant from the episcopal city, to which they remain attached; they have the episcopal dignity, but depend upon the city bishop, and are merely his auxiliaries." (Zeiller, in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.*, 1906, p. 87; cf. Bergère, *Etude historique sur les chorévêques*, Paris, 1905.)

The same seems to have been true at Carthage [135] and Alexandria.[136]

Subdeacons (*hypodiaconi*) appeared at the same time in Rome under Pope Cornelius,[137] and at Carthage under the episcopate of St. Cyprian.[138] In 251 the Church of Rome counted 46 priests, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, 52 exorcists, lectors, and porters.[139] St. Cyprian's letters mention the existence in Africa at this period of all these lower orders, except that of porter.

In the East, historical sources indicate a different development of the lower clergy. From the middle of the third century we find there ministers performing similar functions. But they are not reckoned as of the clergy. Subdeacons and lectors are ranked among the clergy later on, when their functions are regulated in a more stable manner. The other minor clergy do not receive a real ordination, but at most are simply blessed by the bishop when the latter chooses them as assistants for the deacons.[140]

As to the remuneration of priests, we learn from a passage in one of St. Cyprian's letters that in his time they received a monthly salary (*divisiones mensurinae*) and offerings (*sportulae*).[141]

The laity is subordinated to the clergy, but not absolutely excluded from the management of the church. In several instances St. Cyprian says that he will not make a decision without first seeking the advice of his clergy and the approval of the *plebs*.[142] As to the people's part in the election of the clergy,

[135] Tertullian, *De baptismo*, 17; *De praescriptione*, 42.
[136] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, VI, 3.
[137] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, xliii.
[138] *Letters*, 29; 34, sect. 4; 45, sect. 4, etc.
[139] Eusebius, *loc. cit.*
[140] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. I, part 4, chap. 8, sect. 1.
[141] St. Cyprian, Letter 39, sect. 5; cf. Letter 41, sect. 2; Eusebius, V, xxviii, 10.
[142] Letter 14, sect. 1; cf. Letter 34, sect. 4. He asks the clergy for their *consilium*, and the people for their *consensus*.

it became more and more a negative one and before long was reduced to the right to indicate cases of unworthiness among the candidates.

The bishop, according to the extent of his resources, takes account, if not of the strict right, at least of a sort of claim which every Christian has of being assisted by his Church in case of need; for the Church is a brotherhood, a mutual aid society, in which it is the duty of the rich to come to the relief of their destitute brethren.[143]

This brotherhood continues even after death. The bodies of Christians are laid to rest in common cemeteries. The best known of these cemeteries at Rome are the catacombs of Callistus, Lucina, and Praetextatus. The body of the deceased brother, with or without a sarcophagus, is placed in a niche, which is then closed by a stone slab, or sometimes simply with bricks, along the sides of the underground passages. On these tombs, besides the name and age of the departed brother, are engraved inscriptions such as the following: *"In pace, Vivas in Christo, Vivas in gloria, Pete pro nobis."* These inscriptions betoken, not only a tender kindliness of brotherhood, but also a confident and tranquil hope. The people often came to these venerable spots for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice on the tomb of the martyrs, not only during the times of persecution, but likewise in times of peace, thus showing the union ever existing between the Church on earth and the Church in Heaven. This pious custom is evidenced by the altars, episcopal seats, the whole arrangement of the catacombs with their *atria,* apses, and chapels.[144]

This brotherhood and mutual relief was a bond between different churches. The tradition of the Apostles gathering

[143] St. Cyprian, *Letters,* II, 2; VII, 4; XLII, 4.

[144] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea, passim;* Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéol. chrét.,* vol. II; De l'Epinois, *Les Catacombes de Rome,* Paris, 1896.

contributions for the poor churches was perpetuated and strengthened. The union of the churches forms more than a simple federation; it constitutes one Church, the Catholic Church. The city official Polemon asks Sabina, a slave: "Since you are a Christian, to what church do you belong?" She answers: "To the Catholic Church." The rhetor Pionus makes the same reply. He is asked: "What is your name?" "Christian," he says. "Belonging to what church?" "Catholic," he replies.[145] No one may rightly say, as did Renan [146] and Harnack,[147] that this Catholicism is nothing more than an "imperialization of Christianity," merely an adaptation to the life of the Roman Empire. "Even as early as the time of the Easter controversy, there are churches beyond the boundaries of the Empire, in the Kingdom of Edessa. . . . And yet what is said of the churches that are in Gaul is said also of the churches that are in Osroene. Though they are Syriac in language, they hold epistolary relations with the Bishop of Rome. . . . The Syriac Catholicism of the Kingdom of Edessa proves that Catholicism is not mere 'Roman-ism' (*romanitas*)." [148]

Such is the concept, such the organization of the Church during the latter half of the third century. But along with clearly formed institutions we find others that are as yet only roughly outlined or incomplete. Such are, intermediary between the individual churches and the universal Church, ecclesiastical provinces, patriarchates, and primacies.

In 325 the Council of Nicaea notes the existence of ecclesiastical circumscriptions, called provinces or *eparchies,* embracing several individual churches grouped about one city, which is called the metropolis, the ecclesiastical head of which has a

[145] Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* II, 76.
[146] *Marc-Aurèle,* p. 69.
[147] *History of Dogma,* II, 149 f.; *Constitution and Law of the Church,* chap. 5.
[148] Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 229.

higher rank than the other bishops.[149] These provinces and metropolises are mentioned by fourth-century writers, who do not intimate that they are something new or recent. Hence we are led to suppose their gradual and progressive formation at the time we are now considering.

The preponderant standing of certain churches, regarded as mother churches, goes back to the beginning. At the outset, Jerusalem was considered the mother church of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee.[150] At an early date Antioch had under its dependence all the churches of Syria, and Alexandria all the churches of Egypt. In the third century, Bishop Serapion of Antioch writes to the Christians of Rhossus in Cilicia, warning them against the apocryphal Gospel of Peter; Bishop Heraclas of Alexandria deposes Bishop Ammonius of Thmuis.[151] Whence came these primacies? From the fact that certain churches, having been founded by the Apostles, or by their disciples and, therefore, as it were under their eyes, were regarded as particular centers of orthodox faith. When Tertullian reproaches the heretics with not having the approval of any church founded by the Apostles or "in any way Apostolic," [152] he is referring to this special authority of certain churches. Of course, many of these metropolitan cities are likewise metropolises in the governmental organization of the Roman Empire. But it would not be right to hold that the Church modeled its organization upon that of the Empire. "Nowhere, before Diocletian, certainly not in the West, is there in the grouping of churches the least indication of a desire to reproduce the lines of the imperial province. . . . Italy depends entirely on the See of Rome; the See of Alex-

[149] Council of Nicaea, canon 4.

[150] Hegesippus, in Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, xxxiii. After the destruction of Jerusalem, Caesarea gradually took its place. By the time of Constantine, Jerusalem again was the metropolis of Palestine.

[151] Photius, *Interrogatio* 9.

[152] "*Ab ecclesiis quoquo modo apostolicis.*" (*De praescr.*, chaps. 31 ff.)

andria is the ecclesiastical center for both Egypt and Cyrenaica, although in civil affairs these countries were separately administered." [153]

The following are included in the rights of the metropolitan: to convoke the annual provincial council and preside at it; [154] to preside at the election of the bishops of his province, as also at their consecration; [155] to furnish *litterae communicatoriae* to nominated bishops.[156]

Outside the institution of metropolises already developing, we see signs of the formation of patriarchates. The bishop of Alexandria exercised a supremacy over the Thebaid, Pentapolis, and Libya, that is, over several provinces. In the number of bishops dependent, in a sense, upon the bishop of Antioch, some preside over entire provinces. Alexandria and Antioch are soon looked upon as sees of patriarchal authority.[157] Moreover, the bishop of Carthage, exercising a primacy over all Africa, seems to be as it were its primate.

The institution of councils was also developing. Before the time of Constantine, there is no question of an ecumenical or general council.[158] In the second century the Montanist dispute and the Easter question were settled by particular councils. In the third century these become regular and are presided over by the bishop of the principal city. The bishops are amenable to these councils and may even be removed by them, as we have seen in the case of Privatus of Lambaesa.

[153] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 383. In the East the boundaries of the ecclesiastical provinces were not made to coincide with those of the imperial provinces until the close of the third century, under Diocletian; in the West, this took place at a later date. (Duchesne, *loc. cit.*)

[154] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, xxiv. In Africa the councils were held twice a year: in spring and autumn.

[155] Council of Nicaea, canon 4.

[156] Council of Elvira, canons 25, 28.

[157] See Vailhé, *"Formation du patriarcat d'Antioche,"* in the *Echos d'Orient,* March–April 1912.

[158] The assembly of the Apostles at Jerusalem was, of course, a real council. (See *supra,* p. 76.)

The Ascetic Life

Besides the clerical life and the simple Christian life, we find in the third century the first organization of the ascetic life. It is to be seen among the "consecrated virgins," [159] the ascetics, and the hermits.

The virgins consecrated to God made a vow of chastity into the hands of their bishops. Some of them lived at home; others, though not forming real convents, formed groups which the bishops sometimes had to rebuke for certain abuses.[160] But everywhere they showed a zeal which makes St. Cyprian call them "the choice flock of faithful souls, leading on earth the life of the angels of heaven." [161] It was a general custom for them to wear a veil and long garments made of inexpensive materials.[162]

The ascetics were Christians seeking to realize evangelical perfection. Usually they wear special dress. Origen mentions them after the priests, deacons, and virgins, in a list he gives of the different classes of Christians.[163] By the austere practice of chastity and poverty they diffused a fragrance of edification among the Christian people. Often the clergy were taken from their number. Bishops and scholars, like Origen, came from their ranks. And sometimes, on the contrary, a bishop, as Narcissus of Jerusalem, resigned his episcopal see and joined in their life of mortification and humility. At the close of the third century, Hieracas, an Alexandrian doctor, or-

[159] Tertullian, *De jejunio,* 13; St. Cyprian, Letter 75.

[160] *E. g.,* in the case of the *mulieres subintroductae;* Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, xxx; Council of Elvira, canon 87; Achelis, *Virgines subintroductae.* We should not confuse the *mulieres subintroductae* with the *Agapetae,* about whom St. John Chrysostom wrote a special work.

[161] St. Cyprian, *De habitu virginum.*

[162] *Ibidem.*

[163] *Second Homily on the Book of Numbers,* 10, 19 ff.; *Homily on the Epistle to the Romans,* VI, 15 f.

ganized a group of ascetics leading the common life. By choice they dwelt outside cities, in quiet, solitary places, where they combined the contemplative life with practices of asceticism.

Those who were more strongly attracted to the contemplative life went farther. They entered the deserts of Libya or Egypt and there, remote from men, felt nearer to God. These were the hermits. The Fathers of the eremetical life are St. Paul of Thebes and St. Antony of Heraclea. Paul of Thebes, born of a wealthy family about 228, was a man well educated in profane letters. He advanced through the desert until he came to a cave shaded by a large palm tree, near which flowed a spring of living water. There he spent eighty-six years in meditation and penance and died at the age of one hundred and thirteen years.[164]

Antony, who became the principal disciple of Paul of Thebes, was born in 251 at Coma near Heraclea, of a Coptic family. About 270, after his parents' death, he sold his property, placed his sisters in a house for virgins, and lived the life of an ascetic near his village. In 283 he moved into the desert, there to meditate in complete recollection.[165]

In Diocletian's reign the number of hermits increased. These solitaries, while apparently withdrawing from mankind to lead an intense interior life in the desert, rendered to their contemporaries and to posterity the most eminent services which men have ever been able to render their fellows. To have a profound knowledge of human nature, its defects, its obstacles, and the manner of overcoming them, to become deeply informed on the mysteries of the contemplation of God and union with Him, the monk Cassian has merely to recall the maxims of the Fathers of the desert.[166] After him, all spiritual

[164] St. Jerome, *Vita sancti Pauli;* cf. *Analecta bollandiana,* II, 561; XI, 292; XX, 121, 127, 211.

[165] St. Athanasius, *Life of St. Antony,* no. 2; cf. *Analecta bollandiana,* II, 341; XVIII, 70; XX, 90.

[166] Cassian, *Collationes.*

writers draw from that incomparable mine. From it comes all our asceticism and all our mysticism.[167]

When the connecting bonds of the hierarchy became stronger, a new burst of asceticism and mysticism appeared in the Church. After Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, after Origen and Cyprian, we have Paul and Antony. How was Renan able to write, and how could a historian of Harnack's worth repeat that, in the history of the Church, the hierarchy stifled enthusiasm and that mediocrity alone created authority? [168] It is the enthusiasm of Cyprian and Antony, as later of Teresa and Ignatius, that most earnestly demanded the restraint of a rule; and it is the rule which, while disciplining these enthusiasms, made them stronger. The union of a powerful interior life and a firm hierarchy enabled the Church to repel the attacks of heresy, renewed in the person of Paul of Samosata, and the attacks of paganism, renewed and rekindled under the patronage of Emperor Aurelian.

Paul of Samosata

The Church in the course of the ages has known heresiarchs who were more original thinkers than Paul of Samosata; but she has perhaps never encountered a more elusive and wily character and, at bottom, one that was baser and more shameless. He was born in wretchedness and penury,[169] but through unscrupulous and insinuating ways gradually rose to wealth and honors. Queen Zenobia held him in high esteem. Reaching out for worldly greatness and also for a high position in the Church, he acquired almost at the same time, on the recommendation of high personages whom he flattered, the dignity of bishop of Antioch and the lucrative

[167] Rodriguez, in *The Practice of Christian Perfection,* takes most of his fundamental maxims and examples from the Fathers of the desert.

[168] Quoted by Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 406.

[169] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VII, xxx.

post of receiver of taxes at a salary of 200,000 sesterces. "He wished rather to be called a magistrate than a bishop, strutting through the forum, . . . escorted by multitudes going before and following after him." [170] His life was worldly, his morals were not free from suspicion.[171] Since he showed himself easy-going with regard to the weaknesses of his clergy, even while letting it be known that he was cognizant of them, his priests said nothing against him, lest they be disciplined by him. Some, whom he loaded with favors, spread his praise abroad and testified to his virtue.[172]

The great school of sciences at Antioch, which later rivaled that of Alexandria, was not yet founded.[173] But in the writings of men who, like Theophilus and Serapion, cultivated sacred letters in the metropolis of the East, we note the traits that were to characterize the doctors of that school. In contrast to the lofty and often obscure speculations of the Alexandrian scholars, they set up a commonplace but clearly defined doctrine. They cultivated dialectic more than metaphysics, literal exegesis more than allegorical. The scheming Bishop seized upon this method and soon, in writings of which only fragments remain, published a whole body of doctrine regarding God and Christ.

The Alexandrians became enamored of the theory of the Logos. Paul says that the Logos, or Word, deserves our full homage; but it is a mere attribute of God, without a subsistence of its own, as impersonal as the word spoken by a human mouth.[174] In God there is only one Person, and we must acknowledge only one, unless we wish to destroy the oneness of the Divine Essence and give the lie to hundreds of explicit

[170] *Ibid.*, no. 8.

[171] *Ibid.*, nos. 12–14.

[172] *Ibid.*, no. 12.

[173] Eusebius (VII, xxix), however, speaks of a "Greek school of sciences at Antioch."

[174] Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae,* III, 300; St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* XLV, 3.

texts of the Old Testament. But the Thought of God, after being manifested by Moses and the prophets, was communicated in a more perfect manner to Jesus of Nazareth. The theodicy of Paul of Samosata is nothing more than the Modalism of Theodotus and Artemon, rejuvenated by a more positive and dialectical method of exposition. His Christology is also taken from the Adoptianism of these writers; but he claims to justify it by a more scientific exegesis. For him Christ is a being apart; though so penetrated by the Word of God that we do not lie in calling him "the God born of a virgin," or "the God of Nazareth." [175] But, in reality, Christ is a mere man, who Himself declared in clear, express terms: "My Father is the only true God," [176] and "The Father is greater than I." [177] On the cross He cried out that He was forsaken by His Father.[178] The Gospel of St. Luke says that, in His childhood, He "advanced in . . . . grace with God and men." [179]

Many followed Paul of Samosata because of his high office, his relations with others still higher, and the resources of his subtle and crafty mind. Cyprian was no more. Firmilian of Caesarea, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus rose up in defense of the orthodox teaching. Firmilian twice journeyed to Antioch; [180] Dionysius wrote to the clergy and faithful of that city. The heresiarch protested his orthodoxy, altered his statements, declared that he had no other purpose but to set forth the traditional doctrine in a more methodical and exact manner: to affirm the divinity of the Word without compromising the essential dogma of the oneness of God, and holding the Logos consubstantial (*homoou-*

[175] *Contra Apollinarium*, II, 3.
[176] John 17:3.
[177] John 14:28.
[178] Matt. 27:46.
[179] Luke 2:52; see Eusebius, *H. E.*, VII, xxvii–xxx.
[180] Eusebius, VII, xxx.

sios) with the Father; to affirm the divinity of Christ; but explain it by Gospel texts. His opponents departed, deceived by his protestations; but soon after, when they learned that the denial of Christ's divinity was spreading more and more among those who heard the Bishop of Antioch, they were angered at his bad faith. Malchion, a priest of Antioch, who was versed in exegesis and Aristotelian logic, offered to debate with his bishop. To prevent evasion, it was decided that the debate should be held in the presence of the bishops of the neighboring region and taken down by stenographers. More than seventy bishops of Asia Minor and Syria came to Antioch for this gathering. When driven to state his ideas precisely, Paul of Samosata set forth a doctrine which the council declared heterodox. The Bishop of Antioch was deposed and the word *homoousios,* under which he hid his denial of the personality, and thereby of the divinity of Christ, was proscribed.[181]

Judaism

Paul's condemnation affected Judaism, for he relied very much on the Jews.[182] His teaching, exalting Jewish monotheism in its full rigor and reducing the part of Jesus to that of a prophet, was perhaps an undertaking of Judaic restoration inspired by Queen Zenobia, whose friendliness for the Jews and Judaism was well known.[183] The religion of Israel, deprived of its Temple and therefore of its great religious cere-

[181] The Greek word *ousia* at that time was ambiguous, and could equally well mean "person" or "substance." From the explanations given by Paul of Samosata it is evident that he understood *homoousia* (*i. e.,* the possession of the *ousia* in common) in the sense that the Father and the Son were the same person. Later on, when *ousia* came to have the precise meaning of "substance," as opposed to "person" and *"prosopon,"* the term *"homoousios"* ("consubstantial") was consecrated by the Church as expressing the orthodox doctrine. (See St. Hilary, *De synodis,* 81 f., and St. Basil, Letter 52.)

[182] Reinach, *Histoire des Israélites,* p. 39.

[183] See Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* I, 341.

monies, its priests and Levites, disappeared by extinction. After vainly attempting to rise again through the philosophy of Philo, then through Gnosticism, it withdrew into an exclusive worship of the Law. To comment on the Law and to paraphrase its commentaries seemed to be the whole occupation of its scholars. The Mishna and the two Talmuds (of Galilee and of Jerusalem) represent their entire labors from the second to the fourth century. But since the Jews spread everywhere in the Roman world, the Church was at pains to watch over possible contacts between them and the Christians. About the year 300, the Council of Elvira forbade Christians to eat with Jews or to have their crops blessed by them.[184]

Paganism

The greatest enemy of Christianity at the close of the third century was still paganism. Euhemerus' criticism had given the death blow to the worship of Jupiter, Saturn, Venus, and the other ancient gods. But the pagan spirit was deep-rooted. They made fun of Olympus and its mythology; but they kept on having gods; and since those gods did not rise above the natural order, and corresponded only to earthly longings, it was still paganism. The Roman statesman was ever ready to immolate anything to the god of the city; the Greek artist considered the beauty of art and nature as the reason for human life; the common people turned to pleasure as to their supreme end and god; for all, learned or ignorant, rich or poor, stones and trees and statues continued to be objects of superstitious worship. Arnobius, a scholar of that period, in the account of his life before his conversion to Christianity, says: "I worshipped images produced from the furnace. . . . Whenever I espied an anointed stone and one bedaubed with olive oil, as if some power resided in it, I worshipped it, I ad-

[184] Council of Elvira, canons 49 f.

dressed myself to it and begged blessings from a senseless stock." [185] During the third century, the disasters that befell the Empire and the presentiment that its break-up was coming, awakened in men's souls, along with a deep anxiety, a real need of religious meditation and prayer. In the case of some this feeling was the starting-point of their conversion to Christianity, but unfortunately in the case of many this feeling was perverted and corrupted by paganism and became its ally. It found expression in three different forms: Neoplatonism, Manichaeism, and the worship of Mithra or the Sun.

Neoplatonism was paganism's attempt at a religious philosophy—as it were its theology. Plotinus drew up a graded list of being: Being *in se,* Intelligence, the World Soul, Souls, Stars, the Forces of nature. He thus provided pagan minds with a sort of new pantheon. By his theory of common virtue, of ascetic observances and ecstasy, he furnished a sort of programme of religious life that is not without a certain grandeur. But his work did not accomplish for paganism what Philo's did for Judaism. It was a brilliant essay, but failed to draw men's souls.[186] His more famous disciple, Porphyry, was conspicuous mostly by his destructive and spiteful criticism of Christian dogma.[187]

Manichaeism

Manichaeism later on assumed all the appearances of a Christian heresy and attracted numerous followers in the Roman world. But at first, in the spirit of its founder, in its doctrines and in its practices, it was a pagan sect. Its founder, Mani, is supposed to have been born at Mardinu, south of

[185] *Adversus nationes,* bk. 1, chap. 39.

[186] Christianity made use of its good elements, as it had done in the case of Philo's philosophy.

[187] Methodius of Olympus and Eusebius of Caesarea wrote in refutation of Porphyry. But their works are lost, while of Porphyry's book we have only a few fragments.

Ctesiphon, between 214 and 218. He was brought up in the sect to which his father belonged. Later he had private revelations and, when twenty-four years old, began to preach his own system in Babylonia, Persia, Turkestan, and even India. A conspiracy of the magicians brought about his death. Bahram I, king of Persia, had him arrested and beheaded about 275. His system is derived from the old naturalist religion of Babylonia and Chaldea, supplemented by elements from Persian sects. "The foundation of the system is dualism. From all eternity, there are two principles, or rather two kingdoms that are opposed: the one, of Light; the other, of Darkness. Light is the good both physical and moral; Darkness, the evil. These kingdoms are forever placed side by side in their lower and upper parts: yet they never blend together." [188] Satan, a being who came forth from Darkness, one day entered the region of Light. God, the King of Light, drove him out with the help of primitive man; but the latter was made prisoner and, in Satan's embrace, the pure elements became mingled with elements of darkness. Since then, man, being drawn in opposite directions by angels and by devils, is the battle-ground and the victim of a tragic struggle.

How can his liberation be effected? By the practice of austere asceticism. He must set three seals: one on the mouth, one on the hand, and one on the heart; [189] in other words, he must abstain from all pleasures of the senses. The perfect man will go even farther: he will have such a profound regard for universal life that he will not pluck a fruit or crush a blade of grass. As a reward, immediately after his death he will enter into the paradise of Light.

The form of worship was simple: it consisted simply of hymns and songs. In the month of March there was a festivity in memory of Mani's death; this feast brought all his fol-

[188] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, I, 406.
[189] "*Signaculum oris, manus et sinus.*"

lowers together, and they prostrated themselves before a richly adorned throne.

Such was primitive Manichaeism. In a summary and arbitrary way, but very expressively, it corresponded to the two problems presenting themselves to man's conscience in the gloomy hours of life: the origin of evil and the possibility of freeing oneself therefrom. Manichaeism quickly spread in the East, but did not reach the Roman Empire directly until about 280. The Church does not appear to have attacked it until the beginning of the fourth century.

Mithraism

The cult of Mithra, god of light, seemed a real menace to Christianity in the third century. Long acclimated to Rome,[190] Mithraism in the middle of the third century was the most widespread form of that vague monotheism which, in pagan beliefs, was gradually taking the place of the discredited fables of classical mythology. God of the Sun, god of fire, giver of life, purifier—under such titles Mithra appealed to the naturalism of the primitive cults and also to the growing demands of consciences. For distressed souls, for hearts troubled by remorse, it had the sacrifice of the bull, [191] expiating every sin and giving the votaries a rebirth unto a new life. To such as were fond of marvels it offered curious ceremonies, a series of initiations, and the attraction of mysteries. Although ceaselessly speaking of rebirth and expiation, it did not require its members to practice any austerities or self-denial or virtue. The tombs of the priests and other members bear immoral

[190] Under Septimius Severus the worship of the Sun was spread by Julia Domna and her literary circle.

[191] In the ceremony of the sacrifice of a bull, the Mithraist, lying in a ditch, was sprinkled with the blood of a bull that was slain above him on a platform, through which the blood dripped down. The Mithraist then came out of the ditch, cleansed of his faults by this blood-sprinkling, which gave him an eternal rebirth (*"in aeternum renatus"*).

paintings and materialist expressions, mingled with figures which might be thought the product of a spiritualist or even Christian brush.

More completely than any other cult, Mithraism summed up the condition of a society divided between pagan corruption and a higher ideal. This exact conformity with the moral condition of the ancient world explains its power over all classes of the Roman population.[192] The religion of Mithra seemed destined to conquer the Mediterranean world, when Aurelian, the son of a priestess of the temple of the Sun at Sirmium, determined to inaugurate the religion of the *Sol Invictus* at Rome. "Worshipped in a splendid temple, by pontiffs equal in rank to those of ancient Rome, having magnificent plays held in his honor every fourth year, *Sol Invictus* was also elevated to the supreme rank in the divine hierarchy and became the special protector of the emperors and the Empire." [193] "Did the Emperor hope thus to stop the progress of Christianity? Everything points to it." [194] But the outcome disappointed his expectations. The success of Mithraism was more superficial than deep. Its spread was halted wherever it found itself in the presence of a clearly formulated religious doctrine. It was rejected in Greece, Egypt, and Syria, where no doubt it was thought that, "taking one set of gods with another, it was better not to traffic with the strange deities of barbarians and other enemies of the Empire, but to adhere to those of their ancestors." [195] Judaism resisted stubbornly. Only a few Gnostic sects were seduced. Christianity was safeguarded by the solidity of its organization and the soundness of its doctrinal and moral teaching. It was futile for the priests of the new god to tell the Christians: "Mithra is truly Christian." [196]

[192] Allard, *Histoire des pers.*, III, 221.
[193] Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, p. 114.
[194] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, I, 398.
[195] *Ibidem*, p. 397.
[196] St. Augustine, *Tractatus V in Joannem.*

Equally profitless was it for a magistrate to urge a martyr, saying: "Do you see the sky? Sacrifice to it." [197] They heeded the voice of their own learned teachers, telling them that God cannot be adored except by the names given Him by Moses, the prophets, and Christ; [198] they got their inspiration from Rome. The religion of Mithra, despite its obliging advances, its official worship, and the pressure of imperial magistrates, robbed the Church only of an insignificant number of her children. It merely created one more obstacle for her. The pagan world, disabused of its old mythology, was seeking to fill a need of adoration and purification. In the new attraction of this cult and in its mysterious ceremonies, it found a factitious satisfaction, which must have arrested many souls on the way to truth.[199]

[197] The *Acts of St. Pionius.* Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* II, 85.

[198] Origen, *Exhortatio ad martyrium,* 47.

[199] On Mithraism, see Cumont, *Textes et documents figurés relatifs au culte de Mithra;* A. d'Alès, *"Mithraicisme et christianisme,"* in the *Revue pratique d'apol.,* February 1, 1907; C. C. Martindale, in *Christus,* pp. 383–405; Lagrange, *"Les religions orientales et les origines du christianisme,"* in the *Correspondant,* 1910, pp. 209–241; Valensin, *"L'Image du Christ devant le syncrétisme gréco-romain,"* in the *Etudes,* 1911, pp. 441–480; Pinard, *Infiltrations païennes dans le culte juif et dans le culte chrétien* in *Revue apologétique,* 1909.

CHAPTER VI

From Diocletian to Constantine (284–306)

SOME emperors, hostile to the Christian idea, but fearful of exposing the tranquillity of the State and their own power to the disturbances of a religious persecution, feigned to ignore the Church. At the end of the third century this attitude was no longer possible. Vainly Diocletian tried to adopt it when he came to power in 284. In his case, such a policy seemed dictated by friendliness rather than contempt. Soon, however, being forced to recognize the great social situation of Christianity, he saw that he must choose one of three policies: to absorb the Church in the State, to exterminate it by violence, or to grant it full liberty. The first alternative suited his taste for centralization; he attempted to apply it so long as he was the only one at the head of the Empire. In the time of the tetrarchy, Galerius' fatal influence led Diocletian to violent persecution. After his abdication, this latter policy was continued by Maximinus and Galerius; but Galerius saw it was not effective. When Galerius was dead and it was perceived that all the methods of oppression had exhausted their might against the Church, a new emperor, Constantine, personally convinced of the truth of Christianity, judged that the moment had come to assure it full liberty in the Roman Empire.

Beginning of Diocletian's Reign

Diocletian's court and even his personal character seemed to give assurance of good will toward the Christians. His wife

Prisca and his daughter Valeria, if not Christians, were at least catechumens.[1] Eusebius, who was contemporary, says that Diocletian entertained a "singular good will for the true faith." [2] "Why," he adds, "should we speak of those in the imperial palaces, and the sovereigns themselves, who granted their domestics the liberty of declaring themselves freely, in word and deed, on religion, and I would say almost the liberty of boasting of their freedom in the practice of the faith? These, indeed, they eminently valued, and considered them as more acceptable than their associates in the imperial service." [3] Eusebius also remarks: "The same privileges one could observe conferred on the rulers in every church, who were courted and honored with the greatest subserviency by all the rulers and governors." [4] In a tone of joy, which he shares with all his brethren, he says: "Who could describe those vast collections of men that flocked to the religion of Christ, and those multitudes crowding in from every city, and the illustrious concourse in the houses of worship? On whose account, not content with the ancient buildings, they erected spacious churches from the foundation in all the cities. These, daily increasing in magnitude and improvement, were not restrained by any odium or hostility. Nor was any malignant demon able to infatuate, nor did human machinations prevent them, as long as the providential hand of God superintended and guarded His people." [5]

Profiting by this security, the Christians carried out extensive works in the catacombs. In the last years of the third century, the interior architecture of the underground cemeteries underwent a transformation. The burial chambers were enlarged, sometimes assuming the aspect of little basilicas.

[1] Lactantius, *Death of the Persecutors,* 15.
[2] Eusebius, *H. E.,* VIII, i, 2.
[3] *Ibid.,* no. 3.
[4] *Ibid.,* no. 5.
[5] *Ibid.,* nos. 5 f.

The popes, foreseeing another era of persecution, began to excavate additional passages and rooms, which received light and air from above and which intercommunicated in groups of three or four.[6]

The heads of the Church had reason to anticipate evil days, seeing that an exaggerated feeling of security had taken hold of souls. Says Eusebius: "When we sank into negligence and sloth, the divine judgment began to afflict us." [7] In what did this negligence consist? The Bishop of Caesarea, relating what took place before his own eyes in the East, mentions especially jealousies, useless disputes, scheming ambitions, rivalries, and intrigues. "One envying and reviling another, hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest heights of malignity." [8]

The decadence of Christian life in the West is more precisely indicated by the famous Council of Elvira,[9] held about the year 300.[10] This Council deserves our attention because it supplies us with valuable documents, because it begins a series of celebrated Spanish councils, and because it is the first council whose Acts have come down to us. "The Council of Elvira is important for the study of Christian society on the eve of the last persecution. From it we can learn the worldly life of the Christians, and the principles that guided the heads of the community. While the Council gives us a complete and precise enumeration of the evils afflicting Christian society at the close of the third century, it also exhibits a sternness of repression well calculated to make us esteem the moral ideal represented by the prelates of that time and gen-

[6] De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* III, 422, 425, 488, and *passim.* Cf. Leclercq, art. *"Catacombes,"* in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.,* and Allard, art. *"Catacombes,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.*

[7] *H. E.,* VIII, i, 7.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Illiberris, now Granada, in Spain.

[10] On the date of the Council of Elvira, see Hefele, *Councils,* I, 132.

erally realized in their churches. There would not have been such severity toward sinners had they been very numerous or if they could have relied on the approval of public opinion and common practice." [11]

Among the Christians whom the Council severely penalizes are those who accepted the office of *flamen, i. e.,* priest of the municipal or provincial cult of Rome and the emperor. The honorary significance of that office was probably more considered than its religious significance, but the duties of the office might lead Christians to take part in idolatrous sacrifices. The Council decides that any positive act of idolatry would be punished by perpetual exclusion from the Christian community; [12] that if the *flamen,* though not taking part in the pagan sacrifices, gave public games at his expense, such as gladiatorial combats or immoral shows, as was the practice, he could, after doing penance, receive communion at the close of his life; [13] that a *flamen* in this latter category, if he were a catechumen, could not be baptized until after three years' probation.[14] The following canons impose certain spiritual penalties: for a woman who in anger beats her servant excessively,[15] for those who engage in practices of magic or sorcery,[16] for women who leave their husbands, or husbands who desert their wives,[17] for parents who give up their children to prostitution,[18] for consecrated virgins who are unfaithful to their vows.[19] The Council condemns the marriage of Christians with heretics, Jews, or pagans; but disciplinary penalties are imposed only for marriage with heretics and

[11] Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne,* I, 60.
[12] Canons 1 and 2, in Hefele, *op. cit.,* I, 138.
[13] Canon 3.
[14] Canon 4.
[15] Canon 5.
[16] Canon 6.
[17] Canons 7–11.
[18] Canon 12.
[19] Canon 13; cf. canon 14.

Jews, because these are less indifferent than the pagans for the religion of their partner, and less willing to have the children brought up in the practice of the faith.[20] In the same spirit the Council announces penalties against Christians who have their crops blessed by Jews or who eat at table with Jews.[21] Evidently the purpose of all these prescriptions is to eliminate the Jewish or pagan spirit from the Christian communities and to prevent its infiltration.

Several canons show that the clergy itself needed to be protected from such influences. The Fathers of Elvira considered the matter of clerical continence. Canon 27 forbids the clergy keeping in their houses any women except their sisters or daughters.[22] The famous canon 33 forbids "all who are employed in the service of the altar," if they were already married when they received Holy Orders, to continue marital relations with their wives, under pain of deposition.[23] Canon 20 forbids the clergy practicing usury, *i. e.*, according to the language of the time, lending money at interest. Canon 48 forbids the baptized throwing money into the shell which has been used at Baptism. Canon 32 recalls the ancient discipline, reserving to the bishop the right to restore a penitent to the communion of the Church; but a spirit of evangelical mercy is at once shown in canon 38, which declares that a layman has the right to administer Baptism in case of necessity, and in canon 39, which permits a pagan in danger of death to be given both Baptism and Confirmation by the bishop, and in article 42, which allows the time of the catechumenate to be shortened for the sick.

[20] Canons 15 and 16.

[21] Canons 49 and 50.

[22] The purpose of this canon seems to be the exclusion especially of *agapetae* and *mulieres subintroductae*. (Cf. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* French trans., I, 201, note, and 236; Duguet, *Conf. eccles.*, I, 431–443.)

[23] Ecclesiastical celibacy was an evangelical inspiration widely followed by the clergy before it was made a matter of positive legislation. On this subject, see Vacandard, *Etudes de critique et d'histoire religieuse,* pp. 71–120.

Canon 58 gives us information about the organization of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Spain. It appears to be very similar to that which we have noted in Africa in the time of St. Cyprian. Metropolitan rights are not attached to certain cities, but belong to the bishop of the province who has been longest in the episcopacy; his bishopric is called *prima sedes.*[24]

This general view of the Christian and ecclesiastical life in the East and the West at the end of the third century will enable us better to understand the blow which Diocletian's measures of persecution dealt to the clergy and the people.

Origin of the Persecution

When Eusebius speaks of the negligence of the clergy and laity as being punished by God's judgment, he seems to be referring especially to the decrees of persecution issued by Diocletian beginning in 302. But other trials also afflicted the Church in the last years of the third century. The character of both is explained by the new turn taken by the imperial policy.

For more than eighty years the Roman Empire had been governed by barbarians. Maximinus was a Goth; Philip, an Arabian; Decius, Aurelian, and Probus were Pannonians; Aemilianus, an African. Diocletian was a Dalmatian, and the helpers whom he soon associated with himself came from the banks of the Danube. These emperors had no taste for Rome, its institutions and its memories. They hardly came to the Eternal City once or twice in their life. They had but scant respect for its divinities, and took little account of its Senate. But they regarded the vast Roman Empire as a means of exercising those proud energies which made them masters of the civilized world. Hence arose a new interpretation of patriotism. If by this term we mean the cult of the national tradi-

[24] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 162.

tions, they are altogether devoid of any patriotic feeling; but if by patriotism we mean the jealous defense of the frontiers and a passion for national unity, they were patriotic in the highest degree. Diocletian's clear mind and firm purpose made him the most eminent representative of this new policy.

He seems to have come to the throne with a systematic plan of government. Two phrases sum up his programme: administrative centralization, and the defense of imperial unity; one word expresses its spirit: absolutism. Thus he is the real founder of the later Roman Empire. The more surely to abolish all local political life and every traditional liberty, he first altered the administrative division of the Empire from top to bottom. The Roman world contained about sixty provinces. He increased the number to ninety-six. He then grouped these provinces in more extensive circumscriptions, called dioceses; each diocese was governed by a vicar, *i. e.,* a representative of the prefect of the imperial praetorium. The Senate was reduced to the function of a municipal council. A sort of State Council, called consistory, and a Council of five ministers under the Emperor's immediate direction, expedited governmental business.

The Church promptly adapted itself to this organization. Perhaps it was hard to do otherwise. The groupings of bishops became organized according to the circumscriptions of the provinces. The bishop of the city where the governor resided was at the head of the bishops of his province. Beyond doubt this system offered practical conveniences, but the ecclesiastical institution lost much of its autonomy thereby. The imperial authority insensibly took the place of the Apostolic. Owing to this political and religious centralization around the civil power, Constantine's successors were able to make their authority weigh heavily on the Church. These were the first effects of Diocletian's centralizing absolutism. From his idea

of the national defense there later followed, though less directly, other consequences harmful for religion.

Diocletian learned from the events that gave rise to the period known as that of the Thirty Tyrants. He considered that a regular hierarchical division of the Empire would be the most effective means of preventing those arbitrary and violent dislocations so constantly threatened by personal ambitions or by the urge of popular instincts. He divided the Empire between two who would share the title of emperor, called Augusti, and two heirs presumptive associated in the government and called Caesars. This form of government has been called tetrarchy. It was definitely established in 292. The government of the West was entrusted to Maximian Hercules, who had under his orders, as Caesar, Constantius Chlorus; Diocletian, as first Augustus, kept the East for himself, and was assisted by the other Caesar, Galerius. Diocletian, himself a barbarian, chose for auxiliaries three soldiers who also were barbarians. Galerius was an able and brave general, but an unscrupulous politician. His choice proved to be particularly unfortunate for the Church. Like many mountaineers of his race, he was brutal and crafty, instinctively knowing how to handle men by a clever combination of deception and terrorism, and by a family tradition inimical to Christianity. He was the evil genius of the new imperial régime. It was in vain that Diocletian arranged the powers of the four sovereigns one subordinate to another. He did not reflect that in combinations of this sort a single element of violence, in hours of disturbance, almost inevitably carries along with it the elements of moderation. This is what happened before long.

The work of national defense undertaken by Diocletian considered not only internal enemies, but also and especially enemies from without. The frontiers were everywhere threatened by new barbarians. There he placed a strong series of

military posts supplied with shock troops (*limitanaei, riparienses*), and behind these a solid force of reserves. The discipline had to be strict as danger was threatening. Perhaps at no point was the thrust of the barbarians stronger than along the frontiers of the Danube provinces, where Galerius was in command. He profited by this circumstance to gratify his hatred of the Christians. The historian Lactantius shows us Galerius' aged mother filling her son with detestation of the followers of Christ;[25] she was a fanatical pagan, who may have been jealous of Prisca and Valeria, the Christian princesses of Diocletian's court.

Galerius' ruse consisted in asking from Diocletian, on the pretext of strengthening military discipline, the reëstablishment of the sacrifices to the national divinities. Having obtained his request, Galerius ordered the Christian officers to sacrifice to the gods of the Empire. Many refused and were degraded. A few whose refusal was more forceful were put to death. Diocletian recoiled before the shedding of blood, and Constantius Chlorus followed his example. But Maximian Hercules exhibited almost as great a severity as Galerius, and even inflicted capital punishment on those who refused to sacrifice. Among the martyrs of this first persecution were SS. Marcellus and Cassian. Their authentic Acts have come down to us.

St. Marcellus

While the anniversary of the birth of Maximian Hercules was being celebrated at Tingis (now Tangier), in 298, a centurion by the name of Marcellus walked up to the military standards that had been assembled to receive incense and adoration. But instead of adoring them, he threw down his military belt and cried out: "I am a soldier of Jesus Christ, the

[25] Lactantius, *Death of the persecutors*, 11.

eternal King." He also cast off his military cap and threw down his arms, saying: "From this day forth I cease to serve your emperors, for I cannot adore your gods of wood and stone, deaf and dumb idols." At these words, those who were present were at first stricken with amazement, then they brought the centurion before the legionary prefect. On October 30th, Marcellus was tried. The following is the official record of his trial, as set down by the Christians of Tangier:

"Is it true that you spoke the words set down in the report of the prefect?"

"Yes."

"You were serving as a regular centurion?"

"Yes."

"What madness made you renounce the military oath and speak as you did?"

"There is no madness in those who fear God."

"Did you speak all the words as stated in the report?"

"Yes."

"Did you throw down your arms?"

"Yes. It was not fitting for a Christian serving the Lord Christ to serve in military forces of this world."

Then Agricola, a lieutenant of the prefect of the praetorium, said: "The conduct of Marcellus should be punished in accordance with the regulations." He thereupon announced the sentence: "Marcellus, who served as regular centurion, has publicly renounced his oath and has spoken other mad words. I command that his head be struck off." [26]

Upon hearing this sentence pronounced, Cassian, a clerk of Agricola's court, was filled with indignation. He flung away his stylus and tablets. Agricola leaped from his seat, shaking with anger, and asked the clerk what he meant. Cassian replied: "You have given an unjust sentence." The lieu-

[26] Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, II, 157 f.

tenant had Cassian taken to prison. That same day Marcellus was beheaded. On December 3d, Cassian was tried in the very place where he had formerly been a clerk; since he gave the same sort of answers as Marcellus, he was executed in the same manner.[27]

It seems, however, that the victims of this persecution were not very numerous.[28] But the first step had been taken. Now that the Emperor's will had weakened, Galerius might hope to go farther.

First Edict of Persecution

In 302 Galerius went to Nicomedia, Diocletian's usual residence, and remained there until the early part of 303. Under constant pressure from his mother, he undertook by every means to wring from the Emperor a decree of persecution. Diocletian's good sense resisted. "The old man long opposed the fury of Galerius, and showed how pernicious it would be to raise disturbances throughout the world and to shed so much blood; that the Christians were wont to meet death with eagerness." [29] Galerius insisted. At last Diocletian agreed to call a council of friends and government officials. They were divided in opinion, but, as often happens in deliberative assemblies when there is no strong hand directing the discussion, soon those who had been undecided joined the ranks of the violent. The persecution was decided upon. Diocletian merely succeeded in having them agree that no blood should be shed.

A decree was prepared. But Galerius, as though he feared the Emperor or his council might revoke their decision, could not wait for the promulgation of the edict. On the 7th of the kalends of March (February 23, 303), the pagans were about

[27] *Ibidem*, pp. 159 f.
[28] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VIII, iv.
[29] Lactantius, *loc. cit.*

to celebrate the feast of the *Terminalia* (*i. e.,* the field boundaries) by sacrifices to Jupiter Terminus. With a mixture of superstition and skepticism which marked that period, the Caesar declared this date was indicated to give Christianity to understand that it had finally reached its end.[30] Strange to say, Diocletian, who was of a cold and calculating disposition, showed himself accessible to such a consideration. And he never gave up his superstitious tendencies. At dawn, on February 23d, an armed force entered the great church of Nicomedia, pillaged the furnishings, seized the sacred books and gave them to the flames. Then the Pretorian Guards came in battle array, with axes and other iron instruments and, with the incomparable skill of Roman soldiers in promptly constructing or demolishing buildings, roads, and tunnels in their campaign,[31] they attacked the walls of the cathedral, which in a few hours was levelled to the ground.

The Emperor could not now retreat. On the following day (February 24th) a decree ordered the destruction of the churches and sacred books, the discontinuance of Christian meetings, and abjuration by all Christians. For those of noble rank the penalty was to be stripped of their dignities; for those of lower rank, to be made slaves; for slaves, to be deprived of the right ever to be freed.[32]

Diocletian, as a clever politician, thought that, without shedding of blood, by simple administrative measures or penalties of social degradation, he could abolish Christianity, which he had formerly favored. Galerius, still urged on by his aged mother, pointed out to the Emperor, by daily repetition of calumnies and insinuations, that Christianity was breaking up the discipline of the army, corrupting the magistracy, invading

[30] *Ibidem,* 12.

[31] Roman soldiers were remarkably competent at this sort of work. See Lacour-Gayet, *Antonin le Pieux,* pp. 165–171.

[32] Lactantius, *op. cit.,* 10, 11, 12; Eusebius, *H. E.,* VIII, ii; *Life of Constantine,* bk. 2, chaps. 50 and 51.

the imperial palace, everywhere conspiring, and ready to attack even his own sacred person. The imperial colossus gives the impression of a machine that is having more and more difficulty in functioning. Each day the Emperor is saddened more and more. On the other hand, his health begins to show the effects of old age and becomes less robust. If a positive attack upon him should excite his anxiety, it will make him feel that he is in danger from the Christians, and he will yield to Galerius' arguments.

Through the imprudence of a Christian and, soon afterwards, through Galerius' perfidy, several such attempts on the Emperor occurred. In a fit of anger, a Christian tore up a copy of the decree which was posted in the forum. He was immediately put to death at the stake. It was impossible to find any accomplices. But presently a fire broke out in the imperial palace. Might not the Christians be responsible? While a fruitless investigation was being made among them, the fire broke out again. Galerius, feigning panic, while rumor pointed to him as the author or instigator of the disaster, left Nicomedia hurriedly, declaring that there were designs upon his life and that of the Emperor.

This time Diocletian's wrath broke out. Soon Galerius was able to measure the significance of the change that took place in the Emperor's mind. The methodical Diocletian, once he undertakes the extermination of the Christians, pursued his purpose to the very limit, combining against them all the forces of the State, as he did for the centralization of his Empire for the defense of its frontiers.

The first measures of severity were directed against the members of his own family and the servants of his palace. The mother of Caesar Galerius must have rejoiced at seeing her two rivals, Empress Prisca and her daughter Valeria, forced to sacrifice to the gods.[33] By good fortune, their defec-

[33] Lactantius, *op. cit.*, 15.

tion was not contagious. "Eunuchs, once the most powerful, and who had chief authority at court and with the Emperor, were slain"; but they did not apostatize.[34] Eusebius describes the torture of a certain Peter, who was chamberlain:

"We shall give an account of the end of one, leaving it for our readers to conjecture what must have been the character of the sufferings inflicted on the others. He was led into the middle of the aforesaid city, before the emperors already mentioned. He was then commanded to sacrifice; but as he refused, he was ordered to be stripped and lifted on high, and to be scourged with rods over his whole body. . . . But as he was immovable amid all these sufferings, his bones already appearing bared of the flesh, they mixed vinegar with salt, and poured it upon the mangled parts of the body. But as he bore these tortures, a gridiron and fire was produced, and the remnants of his body, like pieces of meat for roasting and eating, were placed in the fire, not at once, so that he might not expire soon, but by little and little. . . . He, however, persevered in his purpose, and gave up his life victorious in the midst of his tortures. Such was the martyrdom of one of the imperial domestics, worthy in reality of his name, for he was called Peter." [35]

Officers, magistrates, Bishop Anthimus of Nicomedia, priests, deacons, laymen, on the unproved suspicion of having had a part in the burning of the imperial palace, were burned or drowned *en masse*. The Christians thought they were living in the time of Nero.

Persecution in the Provinces

From Nicomedia the persecution extended into the provinces. But at first it was not marked by the same ferocity there. In some places its severity was attenuated by the kindliness of the magistrates, who were Christians or favorable to

[34] *Ibid.*
[35] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VIII, vi.

Christianity. Moreover, the terms of the decree were not exceeded—its violation was not a capital offense. Yet a few Christians were put to death for refusing to give up the books or furnishings of the churches. Of this number was St. Felix, bishop of Thibiuca (Tubzag) in proconsular Africa, whose Acts are undeniably genuine. He was convicted of refusing to give up the holy books, and on June 24, 303, was brought before the proconsul Anulinus.

"The proconsul said to him: 'Why do you not give up your vain Scriptures?' Felix answered: 'I have them and I keep them.' Anulinus had him placed in the underground dungeon. Six days later he was brought out, still in chains. It was ten o'clock at night. Anulinus said to him: 'Why do you not give up the Scriptures?' Felix replied: 'I will not give them up.' On July 25th, Anulinus ordered him to be transferred to the court of Maximinus. Meanwhile Felix was brought back to prison and put in irons. Nine days later he left for Venosa in Apulia, at the foot of the Apennines.

"The prefect of the praetorium of Italy ordered the chains removed, and said to Felix: 'Why will you not give up the Scriptures of the Lord? Have you them?' Felix replied: 'I have them, but I am not going to give them up.' The prefect said: 'Let his head be cut off.' Felix exclaimed: 'I thank Thee, O my God, who deignest to deliver me!' He was led to the place of execution. It was the 30th of August. Raising his eyes to Heaven, he said aloud: 'My God, I give Thee thanks. I am fifty-six years old. I have kept my virginity. I have kept Thy Gospels. I have preached the faith and the truth. Before Thee I bow my head, O my God, to be immolated.' " [36]

Persecution in Rome

A certain number of Christians, by ruse or by the connivance of the local authorities, surrendered some worthless

[36] Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, II, 195.

papers instead of the sacred books.[37] Others submitted to the orders of the decree. These were branded with the name of traitors.

The persecution reached Italy. At Rome the sacred books were seized, the archives scattered, the possessions of the Church confiscated. Unfortunately these facts are known only through allusions in the *Liber Pontificalis*,[38] or by untrustworthy remarks of the Donatists. Eusebius, who lived in the East, was not well informed of what was happening at Rome. Pope Eutychian (d. December 7, 283), martyr or confessor, was succeeded by Caius, who seems not to have left Rome during the persecution. Most of the time he probably remained hidden in the catacombs. Tradition credits him with the conversion of many pagans. His tomb, in the cemetery of Callistus, became an object of great veneration.[39]

As to Pope Marcellinus, who governed the Church after Caius (296–304), we would prefer to know him from some source other than the writings of his foes, the Donatists. In the catacombs of St. Callistus, he saved from profanation the area where the popes of the third century and many martyrs had been buried, filling it with earth.[40] But he had the grief of seeing the archives of the Holy See almost completely destroyed. The existence of these archives and of the papal library, located in one of the most frequented places of the city, near the theater of Pompey, was known to every one. The city authorities had no need of an informer to get possession of so considerable a collection of records which could not easily be removed.[41] This was an irreparable loss for the

[37] St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium,* III, 30.

[38] Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, I, ci and 182.

[39] *Ibidem,* I, xcviii, 161; Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* p. 11; De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* III, 114.

[40] De Rossi, *op. cit.*, I, 2 f.; II, 106, 251, 270, and part 2, pp. 52–58.

[41] Allard, *Hist. des pers.*, III, 185; De Rossi, *De origine et historia scrinii et bibl. Sedis apostolici,* p. xxxvii; *"Biblioteca della Sede apostolica,"* in *Studi e documenti di Storia et Diritto,* 1884, p. 334.

history of the papacy and explains our lack of documents. The Donatists blamed Pope Marcellinus for this disaster. They called him "traitor," but brought forward no evidence in support of the charge. St. Augustine notes this fact.[42] Probably Marcellinus died at the hands of the executioner or in prison. This seems to be indicated by the veneration of his tomb in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, a private burying-place, where he carried out extensive works to supplement the common cemeteries which the edict suppressed.

Later Edicts of Persecution

Those who induced Diocletian to launch the persecution, made use of every pretext to have him increase the penalties. Attempted revolts in Syria and Armenia gave them a chance to persuade him that the Christian conspiracy was winning the provinces. Two new edicts were issued that same year (303). The first of these directed the imprisonment of all the clergy: bishops, priests, deacons, lectors, exorcists; the second ordered that they be punished with death if they refused to sacrifice to the gods. In some provinces these edicts were not rigorously applied, but in certain others they were exceeded. There are genuine Acts showing us Christian laymen being put to death for going to Mass on Sunday.

[42] St. Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani,* II, 202; *De unico baptismo,* 7. A legend inserted in the *Liber pontificalis* (I, 162) says that Marcellinus offered incense to the gods. The *Liber pontificalis* adds that he repented and died a martyr (pp. lxxiv, xcix). "The legend which accuses St. Marcellinus of sacrificing to idols is taken from an apocryphal *Passio.* The account in this *Passio* is certainly false: it speaks of a council of bishops held at Sinuessa; but such an assembly was impossible in a time of persecution. Yet it appears that Marcellinus, if not guilty of apostasy, was responsible to some extent in the matter of giving up the sacred books. St. Augustine does not specify him by name and offers but a weak defense of him against the attacks of Petilian: *"Episcopos nominas, quos de traditione codicum soletis arguere. De quibus et nos solemus respondere: Aut non probatis, et ad neminem pertinet; aut probatis, et ad nos non pertinet."* (H. Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéol. chrét.,* I, 63 f.)

Such was the case of Felix, Dativus, Ampellius, and their companions, among them eighteen women, who were put to death at Carthage, February 11, 304, together with the priest Saturninus. They were placed on wooden horses and underwent the torture of having their sides torn with iron nails, which ripped pieces of flesh from their bodies. None of them weakened. For the last, the persecutors reserved a little boy, Hilarion, who had been seized during Mass along with his father and brothers. "The judge said to him: 'Did you follow your father and your brothers?' Hilarion, raising his voice, said: 'I am a Christian; I went to the meeting of my own accord.' The proconsul tried to intimidate the child, saying: 'I will have your hair pulled out, your nose and ears torn off.' 'Do as you please,' replied Hilarion: 'I am a Christian.' 'Let him be cast into prison,' ordered the judge. The boy replied: 'Deo gratias!' "[43] The accused Christians, after being tortured, were returned to prison, where the proconsul forgot them. They died of starvation.

Such punishments were as hateful as they were illegal. The edicts of 303, like the edict of Valerian, were aimed only at the clergy. But a fourth decree (304) affected the laity. Its tenor was almost the same as that of Decius' decree. Every Christian, of whatsoever country, was obliged to offer public sacrifice to the gods of the Empire.[44] This was a formal command to every Christian to apostatize. The persecution was not only universal, but likewise ruthless and brutal.

Eusebius writes:

"We ourselves have observed, when on the spot, many crowded together in one day, some suffering decapitation, some the torments of flames.[45] . . . As every one had the liberty to abuse them, some beat them with clubs, some with rods, some with scourges, others

[43] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, II, 218.
[44] Eusebius, *De martyribus Palaestinae*, 3.
[45] *H. E.*, VIII, ix, 4.

again with thongs, others with ropes. Some had their hands tied behind them, and were suspended on the rack, and every limb was stretched with machines. Then the torturers applied the pincers to the whole body. Some indeed were suspended on high by one hand from the portico, whose sufferings by reason of the distention of their joints and limbs, were more dreadful than any. . . . There were some also, after the tortures, placed in the stocks, stretched by both feet to the fourth hole. Others again, being cast on the ground, lay prostrated by the accumulated tortures which they had endured.[46] . . . Others, at Pontus, endured torments that are too horrible to relate. Some had their fingers pierced with sharp reeds thrust under their nails. Others, having masses of melted lead, bubbling and boiling with heat, poured down their backs, and roasted, especially in the most sensitive parts of the body.[47] . . . We are already acquainted with those of them that shone conspicuous in Palestine. . . . Who can behold, without amazement, all this: their conflicts after scourging, with bloody beasts of prey, when they were cast as food to leopards and bears, wild boars and bulls, goaded with fire, and branded with glowing iron against them? At these scenes we have been present ourselves." [48]

There were veritable massacres. The inhabitants of a certain small city in Phrygia had all embraced Christianity. The church was set on fire when the whole population was gathered together in it. They all perished, along with their curator, duumvirs, and other magistrates.[49] The prescriptions of legal procedure were violated with impunity. A Christian no longer had any rights. If he brought a civil suit against a pagan, the latter had only to establish his opponent's religion in order to nullify the suit. If he dared murmur, he was declared incapable of instituting civil proceedings, and his case was referred to a criminal tribunal that he might be punished for

[46] *Ibidem,* VIII, x.
[47] *Ibidem,* VIII, xii.
[48] *Ibidem,* VIII, vi.
[49] Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones,* v, 11; Eusebius, *H. E.,* VIII, xi.

being a Christian. It was unrestrained terrorism; it was the bloody legislation of Nero, Valerian, and Decius, left to the arbitrary administration of the magistracy, of the police, and of the populace.

Abdication of Diocletian

In 305 an important political event led to a change in the situation. Diocletian's health was declining. On March 1, 305, when the Emperor appeared in public after a severe illness, he was hardly recognized. His mind was enfeebled as well as his body. Galerius then persuaded him that the time had come for him to resign. The ambitious Caesar, by the threat of a civil war, had already brought Maximian Hercules to the same resolve. This double resignation raised Galerius and Constantius to the dignity of Augusti. They appointed two Caesars: Flavius Severus, a brutal sot, and Galerius' nephew, Maximinus Daia, a dissolute barbarian. The two new Caesars were the creatures of the first Augustus; and it seemed to Galerius that he could easily dominate Constantius, who was a man of peaceful disposition and of weak health. Further, Galerius had taken the precaution of keeping Constantine, the son of Constantius, at Nicomedia as a hostage. But soon afterwards Constantine went to his father in Gaul. Neither father nor son was inclined to follow Galerius' policy of persecution. Gaul and Britain, until then under the jurisdiction of Constantius, enjoyed comparative peace. Spain, added to their domain after the remaking of the tetrarchy, shared in the advantages of this situation. Severus, subordinate to the tolerant Constantius, followed his policy. The Western provinces escaped almost entirely from the persecution,[50] which, in the East, under the coarse Galerius and the licentious Maximinus, was marked by unlimited brutality and immorality. A large

[50] Eusebius, *De martyribus Palaestinae*, 13.

number of Christians accepted martyrdom rather than yield to the shameful proposals of their judges; some even killed themselves to escape the ignoble attempts made upon them by their executioners.[51]

St. Agnes

The martyrdom of St. Agnes probably belongs to this period. Agnes is one of the most gracious and poetic figures of the Christian martyrology, but one about whom we have very little reliable documentary information. Yet, even if we entirely reject her Acts, which are posterior to the fourth century, we can obtain a fairly clear notion of her history by simply combining the information taken from oral tradition by St. Ambrose, St. Damasus, and Prudentius.

"At the time of her arrest she was very young, scarcely more than a child. She was twelve or thirteen years old, an age which at that time made her marriageable in Rome.[52] Did the spite of a rejected suitor contribute to her arrest? This may be inferred from St. Ambrose's account: 'If you expect me to consent,' she said, 'that would be an insult to my divine Spouse. May this body perish, which can be loved by carnal eyes without my so wishing!' " Torture was tried. "She stood up, fearless, in her proud courage, and gladly offered her body to cruel torture." A more dreadful suffering was proposed: "I will expose your modesty in a brothel," said the judge. Agnes was not disturbed. She replied: "Christ is not so forgetful of his own as to let our precious purity be lost. You may plunge a wicked blade into my breast, but you will not stain my body by sin." St. Damascus relates that Agnes was brought underneath the arcades of the stadium of Alex-

[51] *Idem, H. E.,* VIII, xii. On these virgin martyrs, see St. John Chrysostom, *Homily 51;* St. Augustine, *City of God,* I, 26.

[52] See Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* art. *"Matrimonium."*

ander Severus—where her church now stands in the Piazza Navona—but "her long hair draped the virgin's body like a cloak." She was sentenced to be beheaded. "She stood up," says St. Ambrose, "and bent her head in prayer." [53] Prudentius tells us that a single stroke cut off her head, and death came before pain.[54] "Thus," concludes Allard, "ended the life of this girl, of whom we know two facts with certainty: that she lived pure and died a martyr." [55]

But the tetrarchy broke up. Constantius Chlorus died in 306, and the legions acclaimed his son Constantine as his successor. Maximian's son Maxentius, encouraged by this example, took advantage of Severus' unpopularity and had himself proclaimed emperor by the people of Rome and the Pretorian Guard. The aged Hercules, who had abdicated reluctantly, in the ensuing anarchy resumed his title of Augustus. The political situation was not improved by the death of Severus in 307, that of Hercules in 310, and the choice of a new Augustus, Licinius. The religious situation remained almost the same, continuing peaceful in the West, disturbed in the East.

Pope St. Marcellus

Diocletian's abdication in 305 brought about a great diminution of the persecution in the West. Maxentius was proclaimed emperor in 306. From that time there was a reign of peace, in the sense that pursuit of Christians and assaults on

[53] *De virginibus*, I, 2.

[54] *Peristephanon*, XIV, 89 f.

[55] Allard, *Hist. des pers.*, III, 385–394. See Tillemont, *Mémoires* (ed. 1702), V, 344–723; art. *"Agnès,"* in the *Dict. d'hist. et de géog. ecclés.*, and in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.;* Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Santa Agnese nella tradizione et nella leggenda;* Jubaru, *Sainte Agnès, vierge et martyre, d'après de nouvelles recherches; Revue des quest. hist.*, January, 1908. Jubaru maintains that there were two martyrs called Agnes: one celebrated by St. Damasus and St. Ambrose, and one praised by Prudentius, and that the pseudo-Ambrose confused them.

Church property were discontinued. But at first this peace did not spell security. The new Emperor's situation was not very firm, and his terrible rival Galerius might be expected to try to take his place. Pope Marcellinus died in 304; his successor was not chosen until 308. The new pope was Marcellus, about whom we have scarcely any information except the epitaph by Damasus at the end of the fourth century and a note in the *Liber Pontificalis,* written in the sixth century, which says that "Marcellus organized the twenty-five titles (*tituli*) in the city of Rome into so many parishes (*dioeceses*) for the reception, by baptism and penance, of the multitudes of converts to the faith and for the burial of the martyrs." [56] These expressions, referring to the ecclesiastical organization which the sixth century editor of the note had before his eyes, should not be taken literally. There were no real parishes at that time: in the fourth century the words *dioecesis* and *paroecia* were elastic and meant any portion of territory subject to an administrator.[57] It is not improbable that Marcellus, whilst awaiting the restitution of the churches, organized worship in the temporary buildings which the Christians were then using for their meetings, and he may have established some connection between the places of worship and the burial places. From Eusebius we know that the church buildings and cemeteries were not returned to the Church until the pontificate of Miltiades, in 311. St. Damasus' inscription tells us that Pope Marcellus was a victim of disturbances in Rome caused by an apostate, who had renounced Christ in a time of peace,[58] and blamed the Pope for refusing to receive back into the Church those who had denied the faith during the persecution until after they had done penance proportionate to their fault. A

[56] *Lib. pont.,* I, 164.

[57] Hefele, *Histoire des conciles* (French trans.), II, 22, note.

[58] "*Christum qui in pace negavit.*" See Pope Damasus' inscription in Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéol. chrét.,* I, 229, and *Lib. pont.,* I, 166.

group of apostates, demanding unconditional reinstatement, stirred up serious disturbances in the Christian meetings and in the streets. The foes of Marcellus held him responsible for the disorder and denounced him to Maxentius, who banished him. He died in exile and, about the end of 309 or the beginning of 310, was succeeded by Eusebius,[59] a Greek priest, who occupied the Roman See only four months. St. Damasus' inscription tells us that the troubles stirred up under the pontificate of his predecessor continued and even became worse during his reign. The party of rebellious apostates chose a leader, Heraclius, who set up his spurious authority against that of Eusebius. This time Maxentius exiled both the pope and the antipope. Eusebius was banished to Sicily and died there shortly after.[60] On July 2, 311, he was replaced by Miltiades, an African priest, who finally obtained from Maxentius the restitution of the confiscated churches and cemeteries. We know of this official restitution from its mention by St. Augustine in his account of the Donatist controversies.[61]

In the East the persecution continued to rage without interruption. The historian Eusebius mentions the following among its chief victims: the learned Pamphilius, founder of the Christian library of Caesarea and compiler of critical editions of the Bible; Bishop Phileas of Thmuis in Egypt, a former magistrate, related to the leading families of the province; and Philoromus, one of the highest imperial officials of Alexandria.[62] Young men and young women were mercilessly tortured; executions grew in number. At Caesarea the outskirts of the city became a charnel house where birds of prey gath-

[59] *Lib. pont.*, I, 167.

[60] See the inscription in the *Liber pontificalis*, I, 167, and Marucchi, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

[61] St. Augustine, *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis*, III, 34–36.

[62] See the Acts of Phileas and of Philoromus in Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, II, 291–296. The authenticity of these Acts has been denied. Tillemont (*Mémoires*, ed. 1711, V, 777) says: "I see no ground for doubting that they are quite authentic."

ered.[63] But the characteristic feature of this phase of the persecution was the condemnation of Christians to labor in the mines of Cilicia, Palestine, and Cyprus. Eusebius says:

"It was impossible to tell the great and incalculable number of those that had their right eye dug out with the sword first, and after this seared with a red hot iron; those, too, whose left foot was maimed with a searing iron; after these, those who in different provinces were condemned to the copper mines, not so much for the service as for the contumely and misery they should endure." [64]

The Edict of Peace

An unexpected event suddenly put an end to this violence. The cruel Galerius, stricken with a terrible disease, half devoured by worms,[65] vainly resorted to the knowledge and skill of the best physicians and consulted the most renowned oracles. Finally he turned in desperation to the God of the Christians and drew up "that remarkable edict which begins by insulting the Christians and ends by asking them to implore their Divine Master for him." [66] He first abuses the followers of Christ for their "ill will, insubordination, madness," and for their atheism. Then, in words that reveal his arrogance, stupidity, and fear, he promises the Christians "his utmost clemency"; he pardons their crimes and permits "that there may be Christians again, and that they may restore their houses in which they were accustomed to assemble, so that nothing be done by them contrary to their profession. They are obligated to implore their God for our safety, as well as that of the State and their own." [67]

The edict was published in the spring of 311 simultaneously

[63] Eusebius, *De martyribus Palaestinae*, 9.

[64] *H. E.*, VIII, xii.

[65] For the details of this repulsive disease, see Eusebius, *H. E.*, VIII, xvi; Lactantius, *Death of the persecutors*, 33; Zosimus, *Historiae*, II, 11.

[66] De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'empire romain au IVe siècle*, I, 182.

[67] Eusebius, *H. E.*, VIII, xvii; Lactantius, *op. cit.*, 34.

in the States subject to Galerius, Constantine, and Licinius. Maximinus Daia also agreed to its provisions. Its promulgation would have been useless in the realm of Maxentius, where the Christians were no longer persecuted. Eusebius and Lactantius, who were eyewitnesses, describe the joy of the Christians: prisons were opened, the mines were emptied, the confessors of the faith forgot their wounds and infirmities and quickly returned to their own countries; processions of these mutilated heroes were to be seen along the highways, singing canticles. At sight of them, the weak took courage, those who had had the misfortune of lapsing under torture grasped the hands of their heroic brethren and besought them to obtain God's pardon for them. All eagerly gathered about their churches, which now began to rise from their material and moral ruins, and the pagans, seeing such things happen, cried out: "The God of the Christians is the only great and true God." [68] Meanwhile Galerius, the one responsible for all the sufferings of the Christians for almost ten years, was breathing his last in atrocious agony.

The death of Galerius led to an important repartitioning of the Empire. The provinces which he governed in the West were the portion of Licinius, but the more important states dependent on him in Asia became the portion of Maximinus, who thus became master of the whole East.

The Persecution under Maximinus

Maximinus was not whole-hearted in accepting Galerius' edict of peace. As open violation of it was not to be considered, he decided to circumvent it, and to recover, one after the other, the various concessions made in favor of the Christians. Although the edict gave them freedom, it allowed the repression of anything done by them "against good order." Maximinus

[68] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IX, i; Lactantius, *op. cit.*, 35.

purposed finding a means of attacking them as disturbers of the public order. In October, 311, an imperial ordinance forbade meetings by Christians held at sunset or at night by torchlight. The orgies of Maximinus were the scandal of his court;[69] but he pretended to regard the meetings of the followers of Christ as occasions of licentiousness. Theotecnus, one of his abject courtiers, curator of the city of Antioch, a violent and crafty man who, according to Eusebius,[70] was capable of any crime or offense, supplied Maximinus with the means of generalizing his measures of oppression.

The clever and detestable plan which Theotecnus carried out in agreement with Maximinus was this: somewhat ahead of the latter he would go to all the cities the Emperor intended to visit, suggest to the officials that the best means of courting the sovereign's favor was to make complaint against the Christians, to have petitions prepared for this purpose, to stir up meetings and conferences, if need be, to hire ringleaders, and thus work up public demonstrations against Christianity.[71] Old calumnies against the Christians, which had been long since spread abroad, but were now forgotten, were revamped. The municipal authorities posted bills containing infamous charges, in the form of an official report.[72] The so-called *Acts of Pilate,* a blasphemous parody of the Gospel, composed a few years before, was profusely distributed. Teachers were obliged to hand copies of it to their pupils, to use it as material for classroom recitations, commentary, written exercises, and oral declamations.[73] Later Julian the Apostate imitated these tactics, but neither he nor his officials ever attained to the shamelessness of Theotecnus and Maximinus.

[69] On the vices of Maximinus Daia, see Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs,* IV, 25–86.

[70] Eusebius, *H. E.,* IX, chap. 2.

[71] *Ibid.,* chaps. 2, 4, 6, 7, 9.

[72] *Ibid.,* chap. 5.

[73] *Ibid.,* chap. 1. Cf. I, chap. 9.

When the Emperor thought public opinion had been sufficiently prepared, he began a new persecution. Numbers of the common people were arrested *en masse,* sentenced without trial, and mutilated.[74] To terrify the followers of Christ, their leaders were seized and haled before the Emperor, who forthwith ordered their execution. Thus died Bishop Peter of Alexandria, Bishop Methodius of Olympus, who had refuted Porphyry and written a dialogue in Plato's style in honor of virginity, and one of the most famous members of the school of Antioch, a certain priest by the name of Lucian, who, after sharing the errors of Paul of Samosata, had humbly returned to the Church and devoted his talent to a revision of the Septuagint.[75] St. Athanasius relates that the hermit Antony, upon learning in his desert retreat that the persecution was beginning again, came from the banks of the Nile to strengthen his brethren in the faith and then, should God permit it, to receive the crown of martrydom. But Maximinus' police disdained to bother about this beggar dressed in coarse garments. The founder of the cenobitical life was able, after torture, to return to his solitude and there continued his life of penance and contemplation.[76]

Attempts to Revive Paganism

While thus striking the leaders of the Church, Maximinus, the more surely to abolish the religion of Christ, tried to re-

[74] Lactantius, *op. cit.,* 36.

[75] The Church venerates Lucian of Antioch as a saint, but the Arians claimed him as their patron. We know very little of his life. Of his writings almost nothing remains. Sozomen (*Ecclesiastical History,* bk. 3, chap. 5) says that the bishops assembled at Antioch on the occasion of the dedication of the Church of Or, in 341, had found a symbol of Lucian, which they adopted as the authentic profession of faith of their council. But Sozomen's statement is not well founded. A mystery hovers over the work of this personage, whom Arianism considered its precursor, and who gave his life in testimony of Catholic truth. (See Bardy, *"Le Symbole de Lucien d'Antioche,"* in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* 1912.)

[76] St. Athanasius, *Life of St. Antony,* 15.

vive the prestige of pagan worship. With great pomp he erected a statue of "Jupiter, the Friend of man" (*Zeus Philios*), instituted ceremonies of initiation and purification taken from the mysteries of the Oriental religions, attempted to organize pagan priests on the model of the Christian priesthood, wanted to make them preachers and missioners like the Christian priests, even became a preacher himself, and issued a sort of encyclical to all the officials of the Empire.[77] Although expiring paganism did not revive, yet the attempt stirred the zeal of a few pagan rhetors, moved more by hatred of Christianity than by any love for the national religion.

"While the executioners were doing their worst against the Christians, a certain sophist, whose name Arnobius has not preserved, attacked them in his lectures. An eloquent apostle of theoretical poverty, he could be seen walking about in a short mantle, with his hair in disorder; but it was well known that his possessions were constantly increasing, thanks to the favor of highly placed personages, that at his house a better dinner was served than in the imperial palace, and also that no kind of austerity was practised there. He preached to the public that the duty of philosophers was to correct the errors of men, and to guide them in the right way; he praised the emperors highly for having undertaken the defense of the old religion and violently attacked the new, of which he knew next to nothing, as was easily perceived. The public, moreover, agreed that the time was ill chosen for this kind of rhetorical display, and that it was discreditable to trample in this way on the fallen. The sophist was hissed." [78]

Presently another orator appeared. It was Hierocles, former governor of Phenicia (later governor of Bithynia), a very notable personage, and one of the Emperor's counsellors. He was held to be partly responsible for Diocletian's first persecution. This much is certain, that, as governor, he sentenced

[77] This curious imperial letter may be found in Eusebius, *H. E.*, IX, vii, 2–15.
[78] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, II, 43.

Christian virgins to what for them was worse than death. Eusebius relates that one day a brave Christian by the name of Aedesius, hearing Hierocles deliver a sentence of this sort, leaped toward the tribunal, slapped the judge, knocked him down, and stamped on him.[79] Hierocles, not satisfied with condemning Christians to torture and death, determined to destroy their beliefs. So exact was his knowledge of Scripture that Lactantius wonders whether he may not have been a Christian in his youth. He published two books entitled *The Discourse of a Lover of Truth against the Christians.* He was a disciple of Celsus and Porphyry, and was intent on showing the so-called contradictions in the Scriptures. He calls the sacred authors and the Apostles ignorant impostors, who exalted their Master's deeds beyond bounds, and goes so far as to declare that Christ was a leader of Palestinian robbers. His supreme insult was his detestable comparison of Jesus with Apollonius of Tyana, of the Christian religion with paganism. Christ's few miracles, reported by unlettered men, could not, he says, bear comparison with the innumerable prodigies which learned philosophers reported of Apollonius. As for Christianity, after meanly caricaturing it and representing it as a disguised atheism, he contrasts it with a purified paganism, which affirms all the beauties of nature and the nobility of man, and subordinates these to a supreme Being infinitely good and great. At this time Porphyry's writings were also circulated.

Christian Apologists

But the Christian religion had its defenders. Methodius of Olympus, the future martyr, and Eusebius of Caesarea, the future annalist of this epoch, had already refuted Porphyry. Their writings were spread, while Eusebius and two

[79] Eusebius, *De martyribus Palaestinae,* 5.

recent converts from paganism, Arnobius and Lactantius, took up the defense of Christianity against Hierocles.

St. Methodius of Olympus is not mentioned by Eusebius, probably from a prejudice in favor of Origen, whose tendencies were criticized by Methodius. Bardenhewer considers Methodius to be the greatest writer of his time. His writings bear witness to fine talent and classical culture.[80] St. Jerome says: "In brilliant and scholarly language, Methodius wrote a voluminous work *Against Porphyry,* the *Banquet of the Ten Virgins,* an excellent book *On the Resurrection* against Origen, and many others that are in everybody's hands." [81]

Eusebius of Caesarea's important work *Against Porphyry* was in thirty volumes—St. Jerome was acquainted with twenty of them—but has entirely disappeared. In his sharp reply to Hierocles,[82] after establishing the real character of the sources from which the sophist obtained his information, Eusebius shows that Hierocles' statements rest on a tissue of fables, and that the so-called miracles of Apollonius are pure inventions or diabolical illusions.

Arnobius was a pagan rhetor who was led to the Christian faith by the excesses of the persecutors and the courage of the martyrs. When he saw the officials ordering the destruction of the buildings that had sheltered only gatherings of people for prayer and charity, and consigning to the flames books that contained nothing but the loftiest and purest thoughts, while they allowed the continuance of theaters that were dishonored by obscene plays and did not interfere with the circulation of poems that outraged decency, his noble soul rebelled.[83] The sight of the martyrs' fortitude and, as St. Jerome says, a mys-

[80] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* pp. 175 ff.

[81] *De viris illustribus,* 83. We have only fragments of the work *Against Porphyry.*

[82] *Contra Hieroclem.*

[83] Arnobius, *Adversus nationes,* IV, 18–36.

terious vision, brought about his conversion.[84] The Christians, having been aware of his skepticism, at first distrusted the sincerity of his faith; but they were reassured when, in the very midst of persecution, early in the fourth century, he published a courageous work entitled *Adversus Nationes*. The pagans held Christianity to blame for all the calamities of the Empire, because it attacked the old national religion by which all the Roman institutions subsisted. Arnobius refuted this error, unmasking the allegories and myths by which the defenders of paganism strove to veil the indecency of their mythology and to idealize their religion, and setting forth the grandeur and harmony and benefits of the religion of Christ. When he is attacking the pagan religion, his criticism is sound and vigorous; but his apologetics is weak when he seeks to explain Christianity; his exposition abounds in obscurities and errors.

Far greater is the value of the apologetic writings of Lactantius, his disciple, like him converted by the sight of the persecutions. As a consequence of his conversion he resigned from his professorship of rhetoric in Nicomedia and "lived in poverty," says St. Jerome, "sometimes lacking even necessities." His pen he devoted to the defense of Christianity. In 308 he published his chief work, the *Divine Institutions*. It contains two parts: one part, polemical, is very short; the other, dogmatic, sets forth "the substance of the whole system of Christian doctrine." [85] His theology is more solid and he is much better informed than Arnobius, but at times lacks exactness and depth. "He is more comprehensive and versatile than Arnobius in his literary work, while his style is more chaste, natural, and pleasing than that of any of his contemporaries." [86] He has been called the Christian Cicero.[87]

[84] St. Jerome, *op. cit.*, 79.

[85] *Institutiones*, V, 4.

[86] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

[87] In 313 Lactantius wrote *De mortibus persecutorum*. There is no longer any doubt that he is the author of this work. Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 44; Michelet

Meletius of Lycopolis

The struggle against paganism was not the only trial the Church had to endure. Bishop Peter of Alexandria published a certain number of canons, marked by mercy and wisdom, to regulate the reinstatement of lapsed Christians in the Church.[88] In 306, vehement protest was made against these provisions by a bishop of upper Egypt, one Meletius of Lycopolis, who was known to be an uncompromising rigorist. According to him, the decisions of the Bishop of Alexandria were too lenient and also premature, since the question of rehabilitation affected those whose cases could be settled only after the end of the persecution. A little later Bishop Peter, following the example of his illustrious predecessor, St. Dionysius the Great, judged it prudent to withdraw to a place of retreat unknown to the persecutors. Thereupon Meletius boldly thrust himself into the government of the diocese of Alexandria, performed ordinations, and put men of his own choice in the place of pastors who were in hiding or imprisoned. Four bishops—Phileas, Theodorus, Hesychius, and Pachomius—had been imprisoned for the faith. The venturesome Bishop of Lycopolis assumed the right to exercise episcopal powers in their dioceses. At this the imprisoned bishops protested. The Bishop of Alexandria excommunicated the intruder. Peter's imprisonment and martyrdom, and also the martyrdom of the four previously imprisoned bishops, did not put an end to the intrigues of the rebellious Meletius. He was arrested and sent to the mines of Phoeno. But he soon returned, his

(*History of France,* bk. 1, chap. 3) says: "A more terrible picture has never been drawn than that left us by Lactantius, of this murderous strife between the hungry treasury and the worn-out people, who could suffer and die, but not pay." Chateaubriand, in book 18 of *The Martyrs,* does scarcely more than abridge and translate this picture of the cruelties of Galerius.

[88] See these canons in Allard. *Hist. des pers.,* V, 32, and in Hefele, *Histoire des conciles* (French trans.), I, 498.

heart no less inflamed and his spirit still haughtier. He bestowed the title of martyr upon himself and some of his fellow-prisoners, and even had the audacity to organize, against the churches occupied by the successors of Peter, Phileas, and their martyred colleagues, assemblies which he called "the churches of the martyrs." These small assemblies were intended to be the nucleus of a whole schismatic hierarchy.

The Plague

Decimated by the persecution, calumniated by the rhetoricians and philosophers, and torn by schism, the Catholic Church about the year 312 was overwhelmed with trials. Yet, more than ever, she remained the great moral force of the time. Upright and sincere souls soon perceived this. While Maximinus was boasting of having assured the Empire's safety and prosperity by the extermination of the Christians, famine and pestilence suddenly burst upon the Roman world. Lactantius and Eusebius depict the two frightful afflictions: wheat rose to exorbitant prices; poor people were reduced to the necessity of eating grass; fathers and mothers bartered their children for a little food; then the terrible carbuncle spread its infection from neighbor to neighbor with amazing rapidity; the streets and public squares were heaped with unburied corpses; the dogs became ferocious from eating human flesh.[89] The Christians took the same revenge as they did during the plague that devastated the Empire after the persecution of Decius.

"They continued the whole day, some in the care and burial of the dead, others collecting the multitude of those wasting by the famine throughout the city, distributed bread among all.[90] So that the fact

[89] Lactantius, *op. cit.*, 23, 37; Eusebius, *H. E.*, IX, viii.
[90] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IX, viii, 13 f.

was cried abroad, and men glorified the God of the Christians, constrained as they were by the facts to acknowledge that these were the only really pious and the only genuine worshippers of God." [91]

In the presence of this living apologetic, more effective than Arnobius' and Lactantius' refutations, the empty charges of the pagan rhetoricians vanished, and the persecution against the religion of Christ appeared as a mere political scheme, which would collapse as soon as its instigators were gone. That day was now near at hand. Eusebius tells us that in the same year 312 Maximinus had to go to the mountains of Armenia and there fight a nation formerly allied with the Romans, but which, entirely converted to Christianity, no longer wished any alliance with the persecutor. Soon he returned, humiliated by defeat.[92] Shortly afterwards, the standard of Christ, openly unfurled, triumphed in the West with Constantine, marking the end of the bloody presecutions and the beginning of a new era in the history of the Church.[93]

[91] *Ibid.*, no. 14; Allard, *op. cit.*, V, 195 f.

[92] Eusebius, IX, viii, 2–4. Cf. Vailhé, *"Formation de l'Eglise arménienne,"* in *Echos d'Orient,* March-April 1913.

[93] The early writers, who generally speak of ten persecutions, base their calculation less upon exact inquiry than upon an analogy with the ten plagues of Egypt and the ten horns of the beast of the Apocalypse. Lactantius counts only six great persecutions. Allard merely observes that "the Church endured in the first century six years of suffering; in the second, eighty-six; in the third, twenty-four; and thirteen years at the beginning of the fourth. She was thus persecuted in all during one hundred and twenty-nine years, and was allowed one hundred and twenty years of comparative peace. . . . But these years of peace were at best exceedingly precarious." (Allard, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs,* p. 81.) As to the total number of the martyrs, evidently this is not to be ascertained simply by adding the names of those who are mentioned in authentic documents. We know there were many mass executions and many victims of popular outbursts. If, as is just, we take account of these and if, to the martyrs sentenced to death, we add those who were condemned to banishment, deportation, or hard labor, we shall, without depending on legendary or doubtful accounts, reach a multitude that might well be called innumerable. (See Allard, *op. cit.,* lecture IV, on the Number of the Martyrs.)

PART III

The Peace Inaugurated by Constantine

Introductory Remarks

FORTIFIED with a strong hierarchy which neither persecution nor schism was able to shake, and still, despite all spoliations, disposing of considerable resources created by the charity of the faithful, the Church, after Galerius' edict of peace, thrust herself upon the attention of governments by her power and upon public opinion by her benefactions. All the means employed to lay her low did but make her greater. In her ranks was a large number of choice members, whose courage the persecution had raised to heroism and who were seasoned in intellectual conflict by debates with the rhetoricians. The Catholic Church was ripe to live her own life as a complete, self-sufficient society, and to render the State the indispensable moral service which the old national religion and the new philosophy showed themselves powerless to supply. The Emperor Constantine gave proof of a pliant mind able to grasp the duties laid upon him by such a situation, proof also of a will sufficiently firm to put them into practice as soon as political circumstances permitted.

To proclaim the right of the Church to complete freedom, to sustain her in the struggle against a painful schism, to attempt to reëstablish the religious unity of the Empire by favors to Christianity and by the gradual and prudent extinction of paganism: such was the work of Constantine in the first part of his reign. We must now consider the history of the Edict of Milan, of the struggle against Donatism, and of the general policy of the Emperor toward Christianity and paganism.

CHAPTER I

The Edict of Milan (313)

THE edict of peace of the year 311 had the appearance of a forced and precarious concession. The disturbed condition of the Empire did but add to its uncertainty. It satisfied neither the aspirations of the Christians nor the Empire's need of peace; but it was a decisive forward step toward the complete liberty of the Church and the final peace of the State.

When we express in modern terms the claims continually made by Christian apologists from St. Justin to Lactantius, we risk falsifying the sense of history. The liberty they demanded had nothing in common with that so-called right, inherent in each conscience, to make its religious faith for itself, regardless of any social direction or any divine revelation. First, the Christians were indignant that the worship of Christ had not its free place in the sun, when the impure worship of Jupiter, Venus, Serapis, and Mithra was given so large a place. Whenever they thought the emperors and officials were capable of understanding a more complete truth, they showed them what the State would gain by relying on the moral and doctrinal teaching of Christianity rather than on the fables and superstitions of pagan idolatry. Toward the end of the second century, Athenagoras wrote to Marcus Aurelius and to his son Commodus: "The Empire has made the peace of the world. Why exclude from that peace the Christians, who are neither atheists nor rebels? . . . You permit each one to live in accordance with the traditions of his homeland; and your authority excludes us Christians, although we are guilty of no crime and although our dispositions are the most religious and just

toward the Divinity." At the same period, Melito suggested to Marcus Aurelius that he "protect the Christian religion, which in a way is the foster-sister of the Empire and seems destined to share its prosperity with the Empire." In the measure that Christianity gained ground, these demands became more insistent and the reasons for them appeared more evident. In the middle of the third century, Dionysius of Alexandria felicitated Emperor Gallienus on the protection he granted the Christians, saying: "When I consider the days of the imperial years, I see that the illustrious princes, if they were impious, quickly became inglorious, while this one, holy and beloved of God, has already been reigning for seven years." At the beginning of the fourth century, Eusebius, speaking of the first years of Diocletian's reign, says: "As concerns the Roman Empire, so long as the rulers were favorable and peaceable toward us, what an abundance of good things there was, what prosperity!" The emperors, solicitous for the true well-being of the Empire, heeded that voice. The tolerant and protective measures of Alexander Severus, Gordian, Philip the Arabian, Gallienus, and Galerius prepared the way for the Edict of Milan. It is even mooted whether the decree of Galerius was not intended and calculated by its author as a prelude to the great edict of toleration.[1]

[1] In 311 Galerius lies dying, amidst frightful suffering. The magicians who are unable to effect his cure, he orders to be executed. As a last resort, by an act of superstition and dread rather than of faith and love, he turns to the God of the Christians—this seems all that is left for him to do. But at his side are his two colleagues, Licinius and Constantine. Both affix their signatures to the decree, along with the signature of Galerius. Why should we not suppose they had a hand in drafting it? Licinius had long been closely associated with the now dying Emperor, and exercised unlimited influence upon him. Constantine was a statesman already initiated into the art of politics; it may be he took advantage of the circumstances to insert into the lines of the decree the foundations of a general peace. The decree, if closely studied, will be seen to be cleverly written. The imperial edict says that, notwithstanding the persecutions, "a great number of the Christians held to their persuasion, and we saw that they neither gave due reverence to our gods nor worshipped their own god." In other words, it is said that the Christians, under the influence of the persecutions, lived in a state of

Whether purposed by Constantine or not, Galerius' edict was the starting-point of his religious policy. Of the sovereigns who shared the government of the Empire, he was the most conspicuous: Maxentius was unpopular; Licinius submitted to his ascendancy. The master of Gaul was scarcely thirty-six years old. He was tall, with fine, noble features, a supple and vigorous body, with something royal and commanding in his attitude. Men spoke of his deeds on the field of battle, the perils he had gone through, the enthusiasm of the Gallic troops who unanimously proclaimed him emperor at the death of his father, Constantius Chlorus, his moderation in the government of the great province beyond the mountains, the popularity he had won by his firm and gentle rule. When it was learned that Maxentius had declared war against him on the pretext of avenging the death of Maximian Hercules, but in reality through jealousy, public opinion was entirely with the son of Constantius.

We have no occasion to recount the early political and miltary phases of the campaign: the alliance of Licinius assured by his marriage to Constantine's sister; the accomplices cleverly disposed in the city of Rome; the crossing of the Alps just when Maxentius thought his adversary was on the Rhine; an army of one hundred thousand men debouching unexpectedly on the plains of northern Italy; Susa, Turin, Brescia, Verona, one after the other falling into the power of the intrepid general; his victorious march across Etruria along the Via Flaminia; and the encounter with Maxentius' main force on October 28, 312, at the Milvian Bridge, on the banks of the Tiber, two miles from Rome.

Religion had nothing to do with the origin of this war. Both

practical atheism. At first glance this seems to be a strange reason for the decree, but one worthy of Constantine's political spirit. The inauguration of a new policy must appear not to break with tradition. But what had been the traditional reason appealed to against the Christians? The defense of religion, the suppression of atheism. The persecutions were to be ended because they favored irreligion.

competitors had been alike favorable toward the Christians. Nothing in Constantine's past could lead one to suppose that he would some day become the champion of Christianity. No doubt, in the dissolute courts and military camps of that period, for a pagan ruler his example must have been very surprising: it was an example of absolute purity of morals.[2] Like his father, he always showed little liking for polytheism, and his religious soul was inclined to rise toward the sole Divinity whom he had learned from Constantius to call "the Heavenly Father." But this vague expression was one of the names which the pagans sometimes used to designate Jupiter, king of the gods and of the world.[3] The young ruler's lofty beliefs and pure life were such as might dispose him to a friendly tolerance toward the Christians. In his youth he had had a chance to inform himself concerning their faith, for, as Eusebius tells us, Constantine frequently consulted the bishops and priests of Gaul. But he set out on the campaign still a pagan, after offering the usual sacrifices to the protecting gods of the Empire.

The Apparition of the "Labarum"

But when the two rival armies came face to face, it was to be seen that Constantine's soldiers bore on their standards and shields the symbol of the name of Jesus Christ, and that the Emperor gave himself out as the defender of the Christian Church.

What had happened? One of the most notable events in the history of the world, since it was to transfer to the side of the Christians the formidable power which until then had perse-

[2] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, I, xix; *Paneg. vet.*, 5, 6, 7.

[3] Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme*, I, 19. On the use of this and other similar phrases, such as *Deus aeternus, Deus magnus, summum Numen, summus Deus*, see Batiffol, *"La Conversion de Constantin et la tendance au monothéisme dans la religion romaine,"* in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne*, April 1913.

cuted them. Eusebius relates the event, declaring that he received the story from the Emperor himself, who swore to its exactness.

At the outset of a campaign that might result in putting the government of the whole Roman world into his hands, the pious son of Constantius was deeply moved, and his religious soul turned to the supreme Master on whom the destinies of all men depend. Eusebius pictures him as disturbed, pensive, reminding himself that all the rulers who persecuted Christianity had died in agony and shame, whereas his father Constantius, kindly disposed toward the religion of Christ, was the only one that died in peace. The recollection of the priests and holy bishops whom he knew in Gaul, their virtues and worthy teachings, came to his mind. While marching toward the Eternal City at the head of his forces, he asked from God some light, a striking sign. Early one afternoon, while humbly avowing his own weakness, he perceived in the sky a burning cross with the words: "By this sign, conquer." [4] The following night Christ appeared to him in his sleep, showing him the same sign he saw in the sky, and ordering him to place it on his standards.[5] Constantine's first care was to obey this

[4] These words are often quoted in Greek, τουτῷ νίκα, because Eusebius, who wrote in Greek, reports them in that language, but they probably appeared in Latin, as reported by Nicephorus, Philostorgius, and Zonaras because Constantine and his soldiers spoke Latin.

[5] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* I, xxvii f. There is a slight difference of details in the accounts of Constantine's vision as related by Lactantius (*Death of the Persecutors,* 44) and by later writers, such as St. Gregory Nazianzen, Sozomen, Socrates, Philostorgius, Nicephorus. The most important testimony is evidently that of Eusebius. "As to the visions by day and by night," says Duchesne (*Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 47), "we have no reason to doubt Eusebius when he tells us that they were related to him by Constantine." But the Emperor may have somewhat dramatized the story of the apparition, when he said that the whole army witnessed it. Dutouquet (art. *"Conversion de Constantin,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.*) says: "We are inclined to think so. The striking event which he relates was of a sort to impress the imagination and would have received conspicuous notice in the contemporary accounts if, as Constantine says, it had been witnessed by the Emperor and the army." But is the silence of contemporary writers so absolute and certain? "It is true that we have no certain

command. At once he had the standard made after the model indicated to him. This is the origin of the famous *Labarum.* It was also marked on the soldiers' shields: later it appeared on the imperial coins.

Constantine's Victory

Eusebius does not tell us just where the apparition took place. Probably it was in Gaul.[6] When Constantine's army met that of Maxentius, there was no longer any doubt that a battle would take place.

"Never did Providence prepare the setting for a more solemn action. It was beside a little stream, called the Cremera, on the banks of which the three hundred Fabii had perished. From the heights which here look down upon the Via Flaminia, there was a view of the whole plain of Latium, the scene of the

early or contemporary testimony of any soldier who saw the cross in the sky." (De Rossi, quoted by Desroches, *Le Labarum,* p. 511.) But when an ancient panegyric to Constantine tells us that the haruspices murmured against the bad omen (*Paneg. vet.,* 6), may this not be a reference to the heavenly sign? And did not the orator who, a few years after Constantine's death, spoke of a heavenly troop seen by the whole army above the marching legions, voice a popular rumor? (*Paneg. vet.,* 7.) Whatever may be thought of this detail, anyone who does not *a priori* exclude the supernatural from history will regard the apparition of the labarum as proved so far as an historic event of this sort can be proved. And any Christian who realizes the importance of the battle of the Milvian Bridge and of Constantine's conversion, will regard a divine intervention as natural. Rationalist criticism notes a few passages difficult to reconcile in the accounts of Eusebius and Lactantius. But, as De Broglie says, "without this miracle we would have still greater difficulty in explaining the appearance of the famous labarum on most of the imperial coins, inscriptions, and insignia from that period onward." (De Broglie, *Histoire et diplomatie,* p. 217, and *Le Correspondant,* 1888, p. 594.) "Labarum" was the name that the Germans gave the military standard. See "Labarum" in Du Cange. Batiffol, in a communication (May 9, 1913) to the Société des Antiquaires, discusses the form of the monogram of Christ as it appeared on the shields of Constantine's soldiers. It was a Greek letter *chi,* crossed by a vertical line curving at the top to right and left, like a circumflex accent. This gave the emblem the appearance of a cross, and also of an inverted anchor.

[6] Perhaps in the vicinity of Chalon-sur-Saône. (Desroches, *Le Labarum,* Paris, 1894.)

hard fought battles that laid the foundations of Roman greatness. The outline of the City could be seen, encompassed by an amphitheater of mountains, and casting a reflection of its buildings on the yellow waters of the Tiber. Upon the summits of its seven hills, adorned with temples and palaces and laden with memories of the past, all the gods of the ancient world seemed to rise up and to perceive the standard of the cross in the distance." [7]

The battle took place on October 28, 312. Lactantius relates that Maxentius had consulted the Sibylline books as to the outcome of the battle. The pontiffs gave him an equivocal answer, as was their custom. They said: "The enemy of the Romans will perish wretchedly." [8] Maxentius, encouraged by this prophecy, mounted his horse and crossed the Tiber on a pontoon bridge. Constantine was already charging at the head of his troops. Soon Maxentius' cavalry gave way. The presence of their leader failed to restore their confidence, which was beginning to desert them. They started to recross the stream; but the retreating men overloaded the bridge and it broke down. Maxentius, armed as he was, fell into the river along with his horse. The rout was complete. The next day Constantine made his triumphal entry into Rome.

The Christians looked upon this victory as an intervention of Providence. Even the pagans were struck by it. On the triumphal arch erected to the Emperor's honor near the Colosseum, the Senate ordered an inscription saying that Constantine had acted "at the instigation of the Divinity *(instinctu Divinitatis)*." He himself never ceased thanking God for his victory. On the pedestal of his statue, which represents him holding a lance in the form of a cross, he had the following words inscribed:

[7] De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'empire romain au IVe siècle,* I, 228.
[8] Lactantius, *op. cit.,* 44.

"By virtue of this salutary sign, which is the true symbol of valor, I have preserved and liberated your city from the yoke of tyranny." [9]

At last the time seemed to have come to inaugurate a real and lasting religious peace. The very vagueness of the expressions used by the Senate and by the Emperor in their memorial inscriptions was an indication of this desire for peace. Constantine does not explicitly name Christ, and the Senate refrains from naming Jupiter.

The Edict of Milan

As a matter of law, religious peace already existed. The edict of 311, signed by Galerius, Licinius, and Constantine, had not been repealed or abrogated. But it was not complete, nor had it been put into effect everywhere. In the East the Christians were still afflicted under the despotic yoke of Maximinus; in the West they were not satisfied with a freedom limited by the arbitrary conditions of public order; in both parts of the Empire they had little confidence in a decree that contained harsh words in their regard. Constantine wrote a stern and threatening letter to Maximinus.[10] The latter had to yield, at least outwardly, and so directed his officials not to do violence to the Christians.[11] For the time being, Constantine was satisfied with this, but he was preparing a decisive act. He summoned his colleague Licinius to Milan, to confer with him about regulating the new direction of the Empire. And he also summoned the Emperor Diocletian, who was languishing in his retirement. Constantine would gladly have placed the new religious policy under the auspices of the old head of the imperial family.[12] But Diocletian excused himself on account of his ad-

[9] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* I, xl.
[10] Lactantius, *op. cit.,* 37.
[11] Eusebius, *H. E.,* IX, ix, 13.
[12] Aurelius Victor, *Ep.* 39.

vanced age. The two emperors met at the beginning of the year 313,[13] and the result of their deliberations was a decree in the form of a constitution, sent to the magistrates of the Empire. It is known in history as the Edict of Milan. It begins thus:

"Inasmuch as we, Constantine Augustus and Licinius Augustus, have met at Milan on a joyful occasion, and have discussed all that appertains to the public advantage and safety, we have come to the conclusion that, among the steps likely to profit the majority of mankind and demanding immediate attention, nothing is more necessary than to regulate the worship of the Divinity.

"We have decided, therefore, to grant both to the Christians and to all others perfect freedom to practise the religion which each has thought best for himself, that so whatever Divinity resides in heaven may be placated, and rendered propitious to us and to all who have been placed under our authority. Consequently we have thought this to be the policy demanded alike by healthy and sound reason—that no one, on any pretext whatever, should be denied to choose his religion, whether he prefers the Christian religion or any other that seems most suited to him, in order that the Supreme Divinity, whose observance we obey with free minds, may in all things vouchsafe to us its usual favors and benevolences.

"Wherefore, it is expedient for your Excellency to know that we have resolved to abolish every one of the stipulations contained in all previous edicts sent to you with respect to the Christians,[14] on the ground that they now seem to us to be unjust and alien from the spirit of our clemency.

"Henceforth, in perfect and absolute freedom, each and every person who chooses to belong to and practise the Christian religion shall be at liberty to do so without let or hindrance in any shape or form.

"We have thought it best to explain this to your Excellency in the

[13] It was in January, according to De Broglie and Herzberg; in March, according to Allard; in June, according to Boissier.

[14] This reference is to the decree of 311, signed by Galerius, Licinius, and Constantine, not another decree, as De Broglie (*op. cit.*, I, 240) supposes.

fullest possible manner that you may know that we have accorded to these same Christians a free and absolutely unrestricted right to practise their own religion.

"And inasmuch as you see that we have granted this indulgence to the Christians, your Excellency will understand that a similarly free and unrestricted right, conformable to the peace of our times, is granted to all others equally to practise the religion of their choice. We have resolved upon this course that no one and no religion may seem to be robbed of the honor that is their due." [15]

Constantine's thought, underlying the prolixity and repetitions of the edict, must have been quite clear to his subjects. The expressions he uses to set forth his intent are very apt. It put an end to that confusion of the religious with the political order which was the pretext or cause of all the persecutions. Henceforth the Christian conscience, with complete freedom, could render to Caesar what was Caesar's, and to God what was God's. But the State did not thereby become atheistic. It acknowledged and adored the Providence of the "Divinity," of the "God who is in Heaven." The fact that one of the two emperors at the head of the government was a pagan prevented more precise expressions than these. But everything points to the supposition that the Divinity to be adored was the God of the Christians. They alone are mentioned by name in the edict: the freedom granted to other religions appears as a consequence of the liberty which is due the Christians. Not a word is said about the old official cult. It is not abolished; by force of circumstances, its personnel and ceremonies for a long time remained more or less connected with the acts of civil and political life. The prudent statesman who drew up the edict had no idea of so upsetting the accustomed order that all progress would be impossible. But his silence regarding it shows

[15] It is certain that Licinius took no significant part in conceiving or drafting the decree. (We quote the text from John B. Firth, *Constantine the Great*, p. 107 f.—Tr.)

that he considered it a dying institution. Upon carefully reading the edict we note that it is well calculated to reassure the pagans and yet to prepare the way for the coming of a Christian policy. To look upon the Edict of Milan as a remote prelude to the Declaration of the Rights of Man is an anachronism which becomes evident even from a superficial examination of the document.[16]

The character of the edict stands out even more clearly in the second part. "The enacting clause forms a veritable act of reparation to the Christians. The meeting-places that had been confiscated, even if they were alienated, must be returned to them. Likewise all other property must be restored, whether it belonged to Christians privately or to the body of the faithful, *i. e.,* to the constituted churches. These last are, therefore, recognized as juridical persons competent to possess property. In short, the edict establishes two things: liberty of conscience, a liberty theretofore altogether unknown; and an official recognition of the Church, which it distinguishes from the Empire. This is an event of the first importance." [17]

[16] "It has been said that the Edict of Milan was written 'at the dictation of the bishops,' and in this connection we are reminded that the Christian apologists, demanding freedom for Christianity, did so in the name of the principle of tolerance, which they were the first to define and invoke as a principle of natural right. In the eyes of moderns, tolerance is the right of individualism to extend itself to the realm of religion. . . . The Edict of Milan does not presuppose this individualistic notion." (Batiffol, *"L'Edit de Milan,"* in the *Correspondant,* March 1913.) The words *"Ne cuiquam religioni auferri aliquid a nobis videatur,"* appealed to in behalf of the individualist thesis, seems to us merely to express the desire to respect religious consciences not yet sufficiently enlightened. "One must be blind not to see that the Edict of Milan, as a whole, is written by a Christian and in the interest of Christians. . . . In fact, it has only Christians in mind; they are the only ones explicitly named; and the decree says that the tolerance obtained by the other religions is only a consequence of that which is to be granted to Christianity." (Boissier, *"L'Edit de Milan,"* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* August 1887.)

[17] Chénon, *Les Rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat,* chap. 1, sec. 1. On one point the Edict of Milan goes farther than the Concordat (1801) between the Holy See and France. It dispossesses those who have acquired Church property even from the State treasury, whereas the First Consul required that the Holy See should not disturb those who had acquired Church property.

The pagans received the Edict of Milan without murmur. "Yet we may reasonably suppose it was not in good faith they accepted the pact which Constantine offered to all the religions of the Empire; that paganism hoped to recover the supremacy thus taken from it, that it did but await a favorable opportunity to impose that supremacy upon the other religions, and that, consequently, so long as paganism existed, Christianity would not be tranquil. . . . Symmachus, in his discourse on the altar of Victory, demands for his gods not tolerance, but a privileged status. He does not grant that any other religion should be placed on a level with his." [18]

The Christians were persuaded that Constantine was more than a liberator, that he was a friendly protector. Though he did not at once abandon all the pagan ceremonies to which an emperor was almost forced to submit, they considered that he was acting by necessity of his official position, but that such necessity would disappear in time.

Personally Constantine was a Christian.[19] But a Christian policy, *i. e.*, a policy based exclusively on Christian doctrine, could not be applied except with infinite precaution. Tertullian, who knew all the departments of the Roman administration, said: "It is impossible for anyone to be both Caesar and a Christian." [20] He was referring to those constituted bodies that surrounded the throne, that whole machinery of formalities and procedure intimately connected with the national religion, those pagan rites which mingled with most of the administrative acts, that title of Sovereign Pontiff which belonged to the emperor as the first of his constitutional rights and of which he could not rid himself without abdicating his political authority.[21]

[18] Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme,* I, 79.

[19] Constantine was a Christian by conviction, not by Baptism. He was baptized only a short time before his death.

[20] *Ad Scapulam,* 4; *Apol.,* 21.

[21] Furthermore, Licinius, the colleague of Constantine in the government of the

Constantine saw the difficulty of the enterprise; but this did not discourage him. He thought, as no doubt did the priests who assisted him with their advice, that, while not giving up any of his beliefs, he could make these prevail only in the measure that men's minds were prepared to accept them, that the pursuit of unattainable aims would but delay the obtaining of what was within reach, in a word, that politics is the art of approaching immutable principles to the extent that contingent circumstances permit. Along with this policy of prudence, there was probably mingled in his soul some weakness for the religion of his childhood, some ignorance of the demands of his new faith. Constantine continued to keep the title of Sovereign Pontiff and sometimes even exercised the functions of that office; coins bearing his image continued to display the image of the sun and the dedication *Soli invicto*.[22]

But the Emperor omitted no opportunity of showing that he esteemed the Christian religion as the only true religion. In 313 Pope Miltiades held a council in the Lateran palace, which was imperial property. At this period Bishop Hosius of Cordova was attached to the Emperor's person as his counsellor and performed the duties of an imperial almoner and even,

Empire, was still a pagan; and the East and West were one in the matter of legislation. (Cf. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, II, 49.)

[22] The fact that six of Constantine's successors, who were Christians openly, retained the pontifical title, leads us to suppose that it did not necessarily imply an abjuration of the Christian faith. De Broglie (art. *"Deux portraits de Constantin,"* in the *Correspondant*, 1888, pp. 589 ff.) shows how periods of transition are full of such queer compromises. (Cf. Dutouquet, art. *"Conversion de Constantin,"* in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.*) As regards the coins, Maurice, an acknowledged expert in these matters, says that the treasury officials enjoyed a considerable freedom and considered themselves authorized not to place Christian signs on the coins until they judged that such was, to some extent, the wish of the population. The mints of Tarragona made coins bearing Christian emblems as early as 314; those of the East did not do so until after the death of Licinius in 324. The mint at Arles did not place a Christian symbol on its coins until 335. Cf. Maurice, *Numismatique constantinienne*, and *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de France*, 1890, p. 382; 1901, p. 197 ff.

in a way, of minister of worship. Between 320 and 324 there appeared a series of enactments giving the Church civil personality. The Emperor's desire to further the spread of the religion of Christ was evidenced in many ways: the Christians were given the right to leave bequests to churches;[23] it was permitted to free slaves in church;[24] the Sunday rest was made obligatory upon courts and offices of the imperial government;[25] the Jews were forbidden, under penalty of death at the stake, to stone fellow-Jews who became converted to Christianity;[26] the clergy were exempted from taxes and from statute labor.[27] The abolition of Augustus' laws against celibacy,[28] the abolition of execution by crucifixion and of the breaking of the legs of criminals,[29] were a still more delicate evidence of Christian influence.[30] At length, in his edict to the Orientals, Constantine clearly called himself a Christian. He expressly informed his subjects that the freedom he so broadly granted to the pagan religion did not come from his indifference to all religions, but from a regard for consciences in which error was deeply rooted. He declared:

"Let every one be free to follow the bias of his own mind. Only let men of sound judgment be assured of this, that those only can live a life of holiness and purity who are called to an acquiescence in the holy laws. With regard to those who will hold themselves aloof from us, let them have, if they please, their temples of lies: we have the glorious edifice of truth. There are some who say that the rites of the heathen temples and the power of darkness have been entirely

[23] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, ii, 4.
[24] *Justinian Code,* I, xiii, 1 f.; *Theodosian Code,* IV, vii, 1.
[25] *Justinian Code,* III, xii 2.
[26] *Ibidem,* XVI, viii, 1.
[27] Eusebius, *H. E.,* X, vii.
[28] *Theodosian Code,* VIII, xvi, 1.
[29] Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus,* 41.
[30] Cf. Dutouquet, *loc. cit.*

removed. We should indeed have earnestly recommended such removal to all men, were it not that the rebellious spirit of those wicked errors still continues obstinately fixed in the minds of some." [31]

The great act of Constantine's religious policy is indeed the Edict of Milan, which proclaims equal freedom for the pagan and the Christian religions. But we must bear in mind these clear words and the whole Constantinian legislation, if we would fully appreciate the character of that important legislative document. Moreover, the Emperor declares his sentiments unmistakably by the manner in which, shortly after his famous edict, he intervened in the Donatist controversy.

[31] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* II, 56, 60. Two historians, Burckhardt (*Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen*) and Duruy (*History of Rome,* VII, 481), look upon Constantine as an ambitious skeptic, who was prompted in all his acts by selfish calculation. Their view has been attacked by Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme,* I, 32–36; Duchesne, *op. cit.,* II, 48, note, and fully refuted by Grisar (*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* 1882).

CHAPTER II

Donatism

The Beginning of the Schism

THE origin of the Donatist schism goes back to the persecution of Diocletian. Few disputes have been born of a meaner motive: here we do not meet anything like those great doctrinal controversies which stirred the East; yet nothing else has disturbed the Church more deeply, more extensively, and more lastingly. The schism of Donatus is the most striking example of the enlargement which passion can give to futile personal spite. At bottom, the Donatist schism was merely the outburst of a conflict smouldering from the time of Tertullian and breaking forth seventy years after his death, between the spirit of intransigence that held sway in the churches of Africa, and the spirit of wisdom and moderation which the Church of Rome tried to foster everywhere.

"On the soil of Africa, Christianity had always kept a trace of Punic harshness. In this land of sand and fire lived a wealthy people, impetuous, heartily devoted to its convictions and its pleasures. Even the faith there assumed an austere aspect. It was the country of Tertullian. The seeds of his doctrine were ever ready to spring up in that soil. Like Tertullian, the Christians of Africa frequently showed themselves provocative, to the point of recklessness, toward the Roman officials, and merciless toward their faint-hearted brethren whose faith weakened under torture. Their great bishop, St. Cyprian, felt obliged to give them the example of a prudent flight during the persecution, and he subsequently wrote a

whole book, *De lapsis,* to teach them to preserve a middle course between extreme rigor and excessive mercy." [1] During the persecution of Diocletian a number of Christians presented themselves before the Roman proconsul in a defiant attitude, declaring that they were in possession of the Sacred Scriptures which the imperial edict ordered to be given up, and protesting that they would never surrender them. It was reported that several of them, after this blustering public declaration, did secretly give up the Scriptures, and that this fact explains why they were not imprisoned.[2] If this was so, their offense was double.

Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, a self-possessed and holy man, protested against this conduct. He said he would refuse the title of martyr to all who, after leading a licentious life, would recklessly face the tortures before amending their morals.[3] During the persecution he himself had succeeded in saving both his life and the holy books by a clever ruse. Removing all the religious books from his basilica, he replaced them with heretical works. These the police seized without noticing the difference. Later, some decurions discovered the stratagem and denounced the Bishop to the proconsul; but the latter would not authorize a second search of Mensurius' house. Perhaps he was afraid he might make himself ridiculous by avowing that he had been so cleverly tricked. Thus was saved the library of the Church of Carthage. No doubt to this same able maneuver we owe the preservation of so many authentic Acts of the African martyrs.[4]

But the reckless enthusiasts and those "exploiters of martyrdom" who, loaded with crimes and debts, had themselves imprisoned to win the esteem of the unsuspecting Christians, to be maintained by them, and to begin imposing on

[1] De Broglie, *op. cit.,* I, 256.
[2] St. Optatus, *De schism. donatist.,* 1, 14.
[3] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 173.
[4] Allard, *Hist. des pers.,* IV, 208.

others,[5] did not forgive Mensurius for showing them up. They were the ones who denounced the Bishop to their fellow-Christians, accusing him of weakness and treason. A bishop of Numidia, Donatus of Casae Nigrae, repeated these recriminations. The Bishop of Carthage, he said, had no doubt given up the holy books, since he was not being attacked. Otherwise he had committed a flagrant deception. In any event, he was guilty of a serious offense.

This Donatus, bishop of Casae Nigrae, was the leader of Donatism, before that other Donatus, of Carthage. While appearing to be a friend of good order in the Church, he was a mischievous meddler, implacably severe toward others, and scandalously indulgent toward himself. Contrary to all the regulations, he was convicted of having imposed hands, for penance or for reordination, upon some bishops who had lapsed during the persecution.[6]

Mensurius' death (311) came soon after this campaign, in which all the personal resentments and private ambitions of his adversaries were let loose against him. His death should have marked the end of the quarrel; but in fact it became the starting-point of the schism. Two priests of Carthage, Botrus and Celestius, intrigued for the succession. But their hopes were disappointed. The electors chose the deacon Caecilian, the closest adviser of Mensurius. Bishop Felix of Aptonga and two other bishops from the vicinity of Carthage conferred episcopal ordination upon him.

One of the results of this election was the entrance upon the scene of a certain woman, named Lucilla. She was a Spaniard by birth, very rich, and, it was said, very devout. At least she had a great deal to do with affairs of the Church, and was not free from oddities in her piety. Caecilian, as a deacon, had occasion to make a public remark with regard to a supposed

[5] St. Augustine, *Brevic. coll. cum donat.*, III, 25.
[6] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 87.

relic of a martyr,[7] which she was in the habit of kissing before receiving communion. Lucilla was greatly humiliated and for that reason felt a keen resentment toward Caecilian, which was increased by his election to the episcopal office. She became the soul of the opposition to the new bishop. Her generous gifts won several Numidian bishops to her side. Secundus, the primate of Numidia, let himself be drawn into the party.

Caecilian was charged with having shared in the crimes of Mensurius, with being a "traitor." Furthermore, they said that his ordination was null and void because performed by an unworthy prelate, Felix of Aptonga, likewise a "traitor." The accusation had no canonical basis in law or in fact. There was no ecclesiastical law declaring invalid any Sacraments conferred by a sinner, and there was no proof that Caecilian or Felix had ever surrendered the sacred books to the persecutors. A certain Ingentius introduced a false document to back this charge, but he was forced to confess his crime.[8] A most interesting circumstance in this affair was the fact that, at the synod of Cirta (305), Secundus and his friends were convicted[9] of having themselves given up the Sacred Scriptures, and that, in this same synod, despite the protests of the most prominent citizens, they had consecrated as bishop of that city a certain Silvanus, who was likewise proved guilty of giving up the holy books.[10] But they protested all the louder, in the name of courage and loyalty. Sometimes, however, when they reached the end of so-called legal arguments, they fell into using opprobrious words. They assembled at Carthage

[7] St. Optatus, *op. cit.,* I, xvi. Caecilian, while still a deacon, forbade the veneration of the relics of martyrs who were not recognized by the Church. This information is contained in a text which is the earliest of those on which can be founded the existence of a *vindicatio martyrum,* analogous to our process of canonization.

[8] Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne,* I, 326; Duchesne, *op. cit.,* II, 92.

[9] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 128.

[10] St. Optatus, *op. cit.,* I, xiv.

to the number of seventy and summoned Caecilian to appear before them. But the Bishop, rejecting the jurisdiction of this conventicle, replied that if he had been invalidly ordained, they could remedy this defect of form by consecrating him over again. At this, one of them said: "Let him stand forth as if he were to be consecrated bishop, and let his head be well smacked in penance." [11]

Without any anxiety about the legality of their procedure, the sullen Numidians proclaimed the deposition of Caecilian and in his place chose a lector, named Majorinus, an intimate friend of Lucilla. The latter promised each of the electors a considerable amount of money, which was given them immediately.[12]

All this happened at the close of the year 312.[13] The schismatic council sent a circular letter to all the churches of Africa, setting forth its own version of the events. Since Carthage was "in a way the patriarchal see of Africa," [14] all the African provinces were concerned in the dispute. In nearly every city two parties were formed. In many cities there were two bishops, one Caecilianist, the other Majorinian. The dissident party, however, kept the name of Donatists, since Donatus' influence remained greater than that of Majorinus. Outside of Africa, Caecilian was everywhere regarded as the legitimate bishop.[15]

After the Edict of Milan Constantine began making some arrangements about the free temporal administration of the Church. One of his first acts was to communicate with

[11] *Ibid.*, chap 19. *"Exeat huc, quasi imponatur illi manus in episcopatu, et quassetur illi caput de poenitentia."*

[12] Four hundred *folles*. The *follis* of Constantine was worth about 13 cents. Duchesne estimates the total amount distributed by Lucilla at about 60,000 francs ($12,000). Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 85, note. Hefele (*Councils*, I, 177) figures a slightly different sum.

[13] This is the date fixed by Audollent, *Carthage romaine*, p. 512.

[14] Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, 177.

[15] *Ibid.*

Caecilian, sending him a large amount of money for his priests. The letter contains this passage:

"As I ascertained that some men, who are of no settled mind, wish to divert the people from the most holy Catholic Church, I have given the proconsul Anulinus and Patricius, the vicar-general of the prefects, when present, the following injunctions: that, among all the rest, they should particularly pay the necessary attention to this. . . . If thou seest any of these men persevering in this madness, thou shalt without any hesitation, proceed to the aforesaid judges and report it to them." [16]

In another letter, addressed to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa, Constantine exempts from all taxes the clergy of the Catholic Church of Carthage, "over which Caecilian presides." [17]

Bishop Hosius of Cordova

Was this attitude dictated by the Emperor's good sense, or was it suggested by the prudent bishop who was then his counsellor? All we know is that at that time the great Bishop Hosius of Cordova was at Constantine's court.[18]

For more than half a century the lofty personality of Hosius of Cordova represents the Church of Spain and exercises an influence that is often decisive upon Constantine's religious policy. Hosius was born in Spain, probably at Cordova, about 256. In 295 he was elevated to the see of Cordova, which he occupied for sixty years. By his solid faith and pure morals he gained the universal esteem of his compatriots. Sozomen says that he "was honored for his faith, his virtuous

[16] Eusebius, *H. E.*, X, vi.

[17] *Ibidem*, vii.

[18] The first letter from Constantine to Caecilian, at the beginning of 313, mentions the name of Hosius. (Nicephorus, *H. E.*, VII, xlii, in Mansi, *Conciliorum amplissima collectio*, II, col. 68.)

life, and his steadfast confession of truth." [19] The fire of persecution steeled his character. As a victim of the tyranny of Maximian Hercules, he faced torture with unshaken courage and later on was able to show his fellow-bishops assembled at Nicaea the scars of his wounds. Constantine, upon ascending the throne, wished to surround himself with prudent and well-informed men; he invited Hosius to court and testified the greatest esteem for him. We have reason, therefore, to suppose that Hosius had a decisive though discreet part in the Emperor's policy toward the Donatist sect.

But Caecilian's enemies were not idle. In April, 313, the proconsul of Africa was accosted on the street by a group of Majorinus' followers, who were joined by an excited crowd. They placed two letters in the proconsul's hands. One of them, which St. Augustine has preserved, bore a title sufficiently indicative of its tenor: "A document of the Catholic Church containing charges against Caecilian." [20] The other letter begged the Emperor, in view of the division of the African bishops, to send from Gaul some judges to decide between the Donatists and Caecilian. This letter, handed down to us by St. Optatus of Milevis, was signed by Lucian, Dignus, Nasutius, Capito, Fidentius, "and other bishops who adhere to Majorinus." [21]

Constantine promptly appointed three bishops of the Gauls to judge the dispute: Maternus, bishop of Cologne, Reticius, bishop of Autun, and Marinus, bishop of Arles. He transmitted to them all the documents sent him by Anulinus, and requested them to come to Rome, whither Caecilian had been

[19] Sozomen, *H. E.*, I, xvi; Theodoret, *History of the Church from* A. D. *322 to* A. D. *427*, I, vi.

[20] *"Libellus Ecclesiae catholicae criminum Caeciliani."* (St. Augustine, *Ep.* 88.)

[21] St. Optatus, *op. cit.*, I, xxii. Duchesne's *Le Dossier du donatisme* (in *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome*, 1890, 631 ff.) makes mention of the Acts produced in the inquiries and counter inquiries that began with this letter of the Donatists and that lasted and crossed one another for almost half a century.

summoned, along with ten bishops of his side and ten of the other.

St. Miltiades

At that time the Roman pontiff was Miltiades, or Melchiades, a native of Africa, according to the *Liber Pontificalis*. He had succeeded St. Eusebius in 310. St. Augustine calls him an "excellent" pontiff.[22] Thus far he had striven zealously to guard his flock against the influence of paganism and had his eyes open to the dangers menacing the Church from the Donatist sect. Constantine wrote the following letter to him:

"As many communications of this kind have been sent to me from Anulinus, the most illustrious proconsul of Africa, in which it is contained that Caecilianus, the bishop of Carthage, was accused, in many respects, by his colleagues in Africa; and as this appears to be grievous, that in those provinces which Divine Providence has freely entrusted to my fidelity, and in which there is a vast population, the multitude are found inclining to deteriorate, and in a manner divided into two parties, and among others, that the bishops were at variance. . . . Your gravity will read [the documents] and consider in what way the aforesaid cause may be most accurately investigated and justly decided. Since it neither escapes your diligence that I show such regard for the holy Catholic Church that I wish you, upon the whole, to leave no room for schism or division." [23]

The Council of Rome (313)

Miltiades invited fifteen Italian bishops to join the three bishops of Gaul. The council opened October 2, 313, in the imperial palace of the Lateran. The Pope presided. It was said

[22] St. Augustine, *Ep.* 162.

[23] Eusebius, *H. E.*, X, v. Constantine's letter is addressed, not only to Miltiades, but also to a certain Marcus, an unknown person, who was perhaps a priest holding some important office at Rome under the pope. (De Broglie, *op. cit.*, I, 267, note.)

that Nero had confiscated this superb edifice from the wealthy family of the Laterani in punishment for their having taken part in a conspiracy against his life. The palace was placed at the Pope's disposal by the Empress Fausta, Constantine's wife. From that time until its destruction by fire in 1308, it was used by the popes as their ordinary residence.[24] The gathering there assembled in 313 was the first council officially convoked and personally presided over by a pope, at the request of the civil power, to decide questions affecting the universal Church. The Lateran hill, where the council met under the auspices of a Roman emperor, was very close to the Palatine, opposite the Capitoline, and above the forum. Amidst these splendid memories of pagan Rome, Christian Rome was at last allowed to make her solemn voice officially heard.

The conferences lasted three days. They were marked by a calmness and seriousness that were a contrast to the tumultuous scenes which had given rise to them. At the very outset, all the accusers of proven ill-repute were excluded.[25] Likewise all testimony was refused which would amount to nothing more than an account of altercations, acts of violence, or popular uprisings. An investigation was begun about the conventicle of Carthage, at which the year before seventy bishops condemned Caecilian; but this was discontinued, as it would lead too far afield. The question of prime importance to be decided was this: Were there serious and juridically proven charges against Bishop Caecilian of Carthage and against the validity of his ordination? The clearness and determination with which the discussion was directed by Miltiades disconcerted Donatus and his followers, who counted on a tumultuous debate rather than on the justness of their cause. When called upon to introduce reliable witnesses or authentic documents against Caecilian, they were unable to present a single one. Further-

[24] See Lauer, *Le palais de Latran.*

[25] St. Optatus, *op. cit.*

more, it was proved that, while Caecilian was only a deacon, Donatus had sown division in the Church of Carthage, rebaptized persons already baptized, and reordained bishops guilty of "traditio" (giving up copies of the Sacred Scripture to the pagan authorities). On the third day it appeared that the council had heard sufficient evidence. Caecilian was declared innocent, and Donatus was condemned on the basis of his own testimony. With a desire for peace, the council did not pronounce judgment on the other bishops of the Donatist party. On the contrary, it declared that, if they were willing to remain in the unity of the Church, they could retain their sees; that, in all the cities where there were a Caecilianist bishop and a Donatist bishop, the one longer ordained would remain at the head of the Church, while the other would be put at the head of another diocese. The decision was proclaimed by the presiding bishop, Miltiades of Rome, and communicated to the Emperor.[26]

The Donatists' Appeal to the Emperor

This decision, which tempered justice with so much indulgence, failed to satisfy men who were seeking the triumph, not of right, but of a party. They said that the matter was ill judged. The question at issue was not whether Caecilian was an upright man, but whether his ordination had been conferred by an unworthy bishop—whether Felix of Aptonga was guilty of handing over the holy books to the magistrates. As heretical and schismatic sects did again and again in the history of the Church, these strict observers of ecclesiastical discipline appealed to the civil power from the conciliar decision which they themselves had invoked. Again they turned to Constantine and asked him to settle the question by himself. These complaints disquieted the Emperor. He was even more disturbed by the

[26] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 179. Cf. St. Augustine, *Ep.* 43, sec. 16.

reports which his officials sent him about the situation in Africa. There the division was greater than ever. Not a single one of the Donatist bishops or priests was willing to yield to his rival. The people of Majorinus' party, as recently those of Meletius' faction, called their church "the church of the martyrs," in opposition to what they styled "the church of the traitors." Religious rivalry sometimes degenerated into brawls. From the sanctuary the conflict passed to the street. Constantine thought that the interests of public order called for a prompt solution. After all, what question was involved? One of fact, not of doctrine. He considered that it was within the competence of the imperial officers to settle the question. He, therefore, directed the proconsul Aelianus, the successor of Anulinus, to investigate the case of Felix of Aptonga.

"Surely an odd sight and very significant for every one was this investigation of a bishop by a magistrate, in a purely religious matter which the Church alone could evaluate, regarding a deed which but shortly before had been, not merely permitted, but ordered by the civil law. The question was whether, during the persecution, Bishop Felix made the mistake of obeying the imperial edict and yielding to the threats of the magistrates. In the very court where but lately it was demanded by force, this submission was now imputed to him as a crime. Nothing could better attest the complete victory of the Church over the avowed powerlessness of the State. The civil authority did itself undertake to declare that a person did well in holding his own against it, and the fasces arose only to bow before the cross. That nothing might be lacking to this curious and utter contrast, some police officers were summoned and they testified, to Felix' honor, that he had had the courage to resist them. Alpheus, the edile of Aptonga, swore that when, ten years before, he presented himself at the church of the Christians, Felix was absent, and that only some trifling

letters were turned over to him.[27] The Donatist Ingentius, who contradicted his evidence, escaped torture only because his office of decurion saved him from infamous punishment.[28] Felix, treated as Caecilian had been, was formally acquitted of the crime of having burned the divine books (*instrumenta deifica*). The decision was dated February 15, 314." [29]

Now that the Donatists were condemned by the two supreme authorities to which they had appealed, it might be thought they would have to submit, or at least that the Emperor would now forcibly carry out the sentence pronounced by his own authorized officers. But he recoiled before an interference of this sort in an essentially religious question. He decided that the controversy should be definitively settled in a great assembly of the Catholic world, and he summoned the bishops of his Empire to meet in the city of Arles on August 1, 314.

The Council of Arles (314)

Arles, an ancient city of Gaul, the commercial rival of Marseilles, which had been embellished by Marius and by Augustus, ravaged by Chrocus in 260, but magnificently restored by Constantine, deserved to be called the Rome of the Gauls. It was on the Via Aureliana, which put it in communication with Milan and Rome, and the Via Domitiana, which led to Spain, and on the Rhone, which brought it the men and products of Germany. Thus, according to the expression of a certain Roman emperor, it was "the city which the Mediterranean and the Rhone seemed to have chosen as the meeting-place of the nations dwelling on their shores." [30] Constantine

[27] The Acts of the Vindication of Felix (in *The Works of St. Optatus against the Donatists,* Appendix I).

[28] St. Augustine, *Ep.* 68, sec. 4.

[29] De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'empire romain au IVe siècle,* I, 278. Cf. St. Augustine, *Contra Crescentium,* 78; *Contra donatistas post collationem,* 23.

[30] These are the words of Emperor Honorius in his decree of May 23, 418, designating Arles as the meeting-place of the seven provinces of Gaul. On Arles

liked it above all other cities. During his stay in Gaul he made Arles his residence.[31] It was a happy thought on his part to select it for the council of all the bishops of the Roman Empire.

Constantine himself could not come to the council. "When the council met (August, 314),[32] he was in Thrace at the head of his army. But he had arranged every detail in advance. Wishing this council to be very well attended, he invited the bishops from all parts of his empire, defraying their entire traveling expenses. This was called "the benefit of the public coaches," which became conspicuous in all the councils of that century and was a powerful and at times dangerous means by which the lay authority influenced the Church. The Emperor regulated the suite of each bishop, which was to consist of two priests and three servants.[33] The schismatic bishops, like the others, shared in this bounty. Owing to these facilities, bishops of the remotest cities, from Lerida and Capua to Treves and Cologne, came to the council.[34]

of the fourth century, see Véran, art. *"Arles antique,"* in the *Congrès archéologique de France,* 1876–77, pp. 267–297. Cf. Leclercq, art. *"Arles,"* in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.*

[31] A Provençal tradition has it that the apparition of the labarum to Constantine took place at Arles. Because of this tradition, the city of Arles for a long time had as its coat of arms a labarum with the inscription *"Arelas civitas."* It even struck a coin representing the same event. (Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* I, 157.) For a criticism of this tradition, see Desroches, *Le Labarum,* p. 313 ff.

[32] Duchesne, *"La Date du concile d'Arles,"* in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* 1890, 640 ff.; Hefele, *Councils,* I, 182.

[33] Eusebius, *H. E.,* X, v.

[34] De Broglie, *op. cit.,* I, 283. According to Duchesne, the following were the churches represented at the Council of Arles, either by their bishops or by other members of the clergy: *Italy:* Rome, Porto, Centumcellae, Ostia, Capua, Arpi, Syracuse, Cagliari, Milan, Aquileia; *Dalmatia:* a bishop whose name has not been preserved; *Gaul:* Arles, Vienne, Marseilles, Vaison, Orange, Apt, Nice, Bordeaux, Gabales, Eauze, Lyons, Autun, Rouen, Rheims, Treves, Cologne; *Britain:* London, York, Lincoln, perhaps a fourth church; *Spain:* Emerita, Tarragona, Saragossa, Basti, Ursona, and another Church of Baetica; *Africa:* Carthage, Caesarea of Mauretania, Utina, Utica, Thuburbo, Beneventum (?), Pocofeltis (?), Legis-volumini (?), Vera (?).

Most of the Western Church was, therefore, represented at Arles. "We may look on the assembly at Arles as a general council of the West (or of the Roman patriarchate). It cannot, however, pass for an ecumenical council, for this reason, that the other patriarchs did not take any part in it, and indeed were not invited to it; and those of the East especially, according to St. Augustine, almost entirely ignored the Donatist controversy." [35]

We have no documentary record regarding the proceedings of this assembly. Our conjectures have to be based on the twenty-two canons of the council and the synodal letter it addressed to the pope to report the results of its deliberations. Bishop Marinus of Arles seems to have presided; at least his name heads the list in the synodal letter. Apparently the attitude of the Donatist bishops produced a most unpleasant impression on the majority of the bishops. Their bearing and speech were inspired by wild rage.[36] They were dismissed or condemned because of their effrontery.[37] The question of principle was then regulated by the following decree:

"Whoever shall have given up the Holy Scriptures or the sacred vessels, or betrayed the names of his brethren, ought to be removed from the ranks of the clergy; always provided that the facts against him be confirmed by official documents,[38] and not by mere rumors. If any such person has conferred ordination, and there is no cause of complaint against those whom he has ordained, the ordination so conferred cannot prejudice him who has received it. And, as there are some people who against ecclesiastical rule claim the right of being admitted as accusers, while supported by suborned witnesses, such persons must not be admitted, unless, as we said before, they can produce official documents." [39]

[35] St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium*, IV, xxv; Hefele, *Councils*, I, 182.

[36] *"Effrenatae mentis homines pertulimus,"* says the synodal letter. (Mansi, *Concil.*, II, col. 469.)

[37] *"Aut damnati sunt aut repulsi."* (*Ibid.*)

[38] *"Actis publicis."*

[39] Council of Arles, canon 13; Hefele, I, 191.

"Nothing could be wiser. It was necessary to put a stop to the accusations by which, almost everywhere, the clergy were threatened by the discontented, to punish those who were really guilty, to secure peace to the innocent, and to pass condemnation in doubtful cases." [40]

But nothing could overcome the obstinacy of the Donatists. In vain the Pope sent two bishops, Eunomius and Olympius, to Africa to notify all that the party of Caecilian, in whose favor the council had decided, must alone be considered as Catholic. The two bishops agreed with Caecilian's clergy at Carthage, but the Donatists strove in every way to obstruct their mission.

The Emperor, too, intervened. He summoned the leaders of the two parties. Majorinus had just died,[41] and was at once replaced by a priest who bore the same name as the first instigator of the schism, Donatus. This new leader of Donatism is known as Donatus of Carthage, or the Great. "He was a man of real worth, of blameless morals, and of a bearing worthy of a better cause. He had a cultivated mind, was learned and eloquent, and dominated his whole party by his ability, ceaseless activity, and tireless energy. Unfortunately he was infatuated with himself and immeasurably proud." [42] He became the real organizer of the schism and launched the Church of Africa, for more than three centuries, upon the path of the worst misfortunes.

The two bishops debated the issue in the presence of the Emperor. Constantine decided in favor of Caecilian and transmitted his decision to Eumelius, the vicar of Africa.

A number of Donatist bishops submitted when this decision was received. But it would seem that they were induced to do so especially by the influence of the two bishops, Eunomius

[40] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 89.

[41] This took place in 316. Majorinus died about 315.

[42] Bareille, art. *"Donat,"* in the *Dict. de théol.;* cf. St. Optatus, *De schism. donat.*, III, 3.

and Olympius (sent by the Pope), who, though loaded with insults, continued their mission of peace in Africa. St. Augustine carefully notes the principal argument that led to the conversion of these Donatists, an argument that he himself developed eloquently. The argument was that those only are Catholics who are in accord with the Church throughout the whole world; but this was true only of Caecilian's party.[43]

But the great majority remained dominated by Donatus. The Emperor issued orders that the churches held by the Donatists be taken from them by force. Blood was shed.[44] The "Church of the martyrs" clung to this title more and more tenaciously. They succeeded in making the name prevail with the African people, ever ready to become excited. "The schism spread from one end of Roman Africa to the other. . . . In Numidia nearly everybody was Donatist, and the Catholics

[43] This argument, which Newman read by chance in a quotation from St. Augustine, fifteen years later led to his conversion from Anglicanism to the Catholic faith. His own comment (*Apologia pro vita sua,* part 5) is as follows: "The *Dublin Review* of that same August was put into my hands by friends who were more favorable to the cause of Rome than I was myself. There was an article in it . . . on the Donatists, with an application to Anglicanism. I read it, and did not see much in it. . . . But my friend, an anxiously religious man, now as then, very dear to me, a Protestant still, pointed out the palmary words of St. Augustine, which were contained in one of the extracts made in the *Review,* and which had escaped my observation. *'Securus judicat orbis terrarum.'* He repeated these words again and again, and, when he was gone, they kept ringing in my ears. *'Securus judicat orbis terrarum';* they were words which went beyond the occasion of the Donatists. . . . Not that, for the moment, the multitude may not falter in their judgment—not that, in the Arian hurricane, Sees more than can be numbered, did not bend before its fury, . . . but that the deliberate judgment, in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces, is an infallible prescription and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede. Who can account for the impressions which are made on him? For a mere sentence, the words of St. Augustine struck me with a power which I never had felt from any words before. To take a familiar instance, they were like the 'Turn again Whittington' of the chime; or to take a more serious one, they were like the *'Tolle, lege—Tolle, lege,'* of the child, which converted St. Augustine himself. *'Securus judicat orbis terrarum!'* By those great words of the ancient Father, the theory of the Via Media was absolutely pulverized."

[44] The imperial soldiers used great violence on this occasion. See Pallu de Lessert, *Fastes des provinces africaines,* II, 174–233; Duchesne, *op. cit.,* II, 93.

led a hard life. They were made to feel the emptiness of the official protection. Very few persons would have any dealings with them, not only in matters religious, but even in affairs of ordinary life. 'What is there in common,' people said, 'between the sons of the martyrs and the followers of the betrayers?' " [45] The Emperor then resorted to gentle measures, advised his officials to employ patience, and the bishops to forget the insults.[46] But the tolerance shown the Donatists merely led them to clamor the more, to seize the churches of the Catholics, and to terrorize the people. Three centuries were required to extinguish the fire of the African schism.[47]

Decisions of the Council of Arles

The urgency of the Donatist peril did not divert the Fathers of the Council of Arles from other important questions that were still disturbing Christians and might result in lamentable divisions. They did not wish to end the Council without settling the Easter controversy and the question of the Baptism of heretics, or without passing certain disciplinary regulations.

The Council required Easter to be celebrated at the same time, on the same day, throughout the world. Evidently the Fathers' intent was to have the Roman manner of fixing the date put into effect everywhere.[48] Later on the Nicene Council was obliged to issue new prescriptions on this point.

[45] De Lessert, *loc. cit.*

[46] Letter of Constantine to the bishops and people of Africa. (In Migne, *P. L.*, VIII, col. 491.)

[47] A comprehensive history of Donatism will be found in volume IV of Monceaux' *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne.* The dogmatic aspect is sketched briefly, but the social and political points of view are treated at length. Monceaux is of the opinion that Donatism was a cause of weakness and ruin for Africa. It brought disturbance everywhere, provoked religious war, encouraged social strife, and heaped up wretchedness. It divided Christian Africa in two. It lessened the expansive power of African Christianity and the resistant power of Roman civilization in Africa. The feebleness of Roman Africa in the presence of the Vandals, and perhaps of Byzantine Africa in the presence of the Arabs, was owing to Donatism, or, if you prefer, to what was more specifically African in the Christianity of Africa. (Cf. *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature,* 1912, pp. 225 ff.)

[48] Canon 1.

The Council declared that Baptism administered by heretics must be considered valid, provided it was administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,[49] since the validity of the Sacraments does not in any way depend upon the degree of faith or virtue of the person conferring them.

The second and twenty-first canons concerned clerics who leave the Church where they were ordained. The inconsistency of many ecclesiastics in this matter had led to some disorder in the Church. This abuse was first occasioned by the persecutions; the honors generally paid to outside ecclesiastics was another occasion, though less legitimate than the first. The Fathers of Arles decided that ecclesiastics who did not stay in their first church would be deprived of an office which they had received for that church only. Against such the penalty is deposition.[50]

Because of variants in the manuscripts, different interpretations have been given to the third canon: *"Qui arma projiciunt in pace [in bello?], placuit abstineri eos a communicatione."* Is the Council excommunicating "those who use arms in battle," or "those who, in time of peace, employ deadly weapons," for example, in gladiatorial combats? Cellier and Hefele offer another explanation, which follows the grammatical construction less closely, but is more naturally suggested by the political circumstances. They give the following meaning to the canon: Lately, in the times of persecution, there was an excuse for Christians who, through religious scruples, avoided armed service; but now that the Church enjoys peace, to evade military service is an offense deserving of excommunication.

[49] Canon 8.

[50] It is questionable whether the canon merely forbade a transfer from one diocese to another, or whether it also prohibited a change of parish. Canon 77 of the Council of Elvira, which shows us an irremovable clergy in each parish, would incline us to the latter interpretation.

Canons four and five excommunicate persons who make a business of entertaining the populace by spectacles.

Canons six and seven recall the prescriptions of the Council of Elvira facilitating the entrance of sick persons into the catechumenate, and stating the conditions under which officials in office could receive the Sacraments. Other canons repeat and supplement decisions of that same council with regard to marriage and usury. The fifteenth canon forbids an incredible abuse by certain deacons who, during the persecutions, arrogated the right to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice where there was no bishop or priest. The last canons treat of various conflicts of jurisdiction that may arise between ecclesiastics.

The Fathers of the Council of Arles used the expression, *"Placuit ergo, praesente Spiritu Sancto et angelis ejus"* ("it has seemed well to us, in the presence of the Holy Ghost and His angels"). They beg the Pope, as having a more extensive authority than theirs, to publish their decrees. Before the close of their sessions, they wrote him the following letter:

"Would, most beloved Brother, that you had deemed it well to be present at this great spectacle. We believe surely that in that case a more severe sentence would have been passed against them; and our assembly would have exulted with a greater joy, had you passed judgment together with us. But since you were by no means able to leave that region where the Apostles daily sit, and their blood without ceasing bears witness to the glory of God, it did not seem to us that by reason of your absence, most well-beloved Brother, we ought to deal exclusively with those matters on account of which we had been summoned, but we judged that we also should take counsel on our own affairs; because, as the countries from which we come are different, so events of various kinds will happen which we think that we ought to watch and regulate. Accordingly we thought well in the presence of the Holy Ghost and His angels that from among the various matters which occurred to each of us, we should make some

decrees to provide for the present state of tranquillity. We also agreed to write first to you, who hold the government of the greater dioceses, that by you especially they should be brought to the knowledge of all." [51]

Pope St. Sylvester I

The see of Rome was at that time occupied by Sylvester I. The *Liber Pontificalis* devotes an unusually long notice to this Pope. Abundant documents furnish us details about his private and public life. The mighty events in which he took part, the personal influence he appears to have had with Emperor Constantine, the rapid and brilliant advance which the Church made under his pontificate, have drawn to his person the attention of historians, hagiographers, and apologists. Unfortunately these last have too indiscriminately accepted legendary accounts which today can hardly be distinguished from true history. "Popular imagination invented numerous dealings between the first Christian emperor and the Pope who governed the Church in his time." [52] Events that happened later, but at dates that cannot be exactly determined, have been referred to his pontificate; and they have been dramatized and embellished. Such a literature does not develop except about the name of great men; but details of their life are often obscure. We will, therefore, leave to special studies the critical examination of the more or less legendary accounts of the pontificate of Sylvester I,[53] and will here simply set down the beginning of the official note written in the sixth century about this Pope: "Sylvester, a Roman by birth, was the son of

[51] Quoted in *The Works of St. Optatus against the Donatists,* p. 390. On the Council of Arles and the exact meaning of its canons, see *Hefele,* Councils, I, 180–199.

[52] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. II, bk. 2, part 1, chap. 7, sec. 1.

[53] See especially De Smedt, *Principes de la critique historique,* p. 137; Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, I, cix–cxx, 170–201.

Rufinus. He occupied the see for twenty-one years, ten months, and twelve days, from the kalends of February of the consulship of Volusianus and Anianus [314], to the kalends of January in the consulate of Constantine and Albinus [335]." [54]

The Council of Ancyra (314)

The Pontiff greatly rejoiced upon receiving the acts of the Council of Arles. The mighty questions that threatened to disturb the peace of the Church in the West were at length clarified and decided.

At almost the same time the Eastern bishops held a council in the city of Ancyra, now Angora. The Orient was spared the Donatist schism; but the question of the lapsed and the question of penance had caused a considerable stir there. And, as in the West, there was need of regulating several doubtful points of discipline.

The Council met in 314 [55] about Pentecost time, in Ancyra, the capital of Galatia. In the lists that we have of the bishops taking part in that assembly, are the names of Vitalis of Antioch, Basil of Amasea, Eustathius of Nicomedia, Leontius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Marcellus of Ancyra, who later became famous in the Arian dispute. A number of these

[54] *Lib. pont.,* I, 170. The *Liber pontificalis* says that Sylvester, "during a persecution in the reign of Constantine, was forced to seek asylum on Mount Soracte. Led back to Rome in triumph, he baptized Emperor Constantine, whom God cured of leprosy by the power of the Sacrament of Regeneration." This last detail is one of those which the Church has officially recognized as unhistorical. Under Pope Leo XIII the legend in the Roman Breviary was corrected on this point. There we read simply that St. Sylvester *"Constantinum a lepra infidelitatis sanavit."* Many writers, following Papebroch (*Acta sanctorum,* May, vol. V), hold that Constantine was not even baptized by Pope Sylvester. According to their contention, the Emperor was baptized on his death-bed by Eusebius of Nicomedia. This latter opinion is made historically certain by the explicit testimony of St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Eusebius, and the Council of Rimini. (On this point see a note by Pagi in Baronius, *Annales,* ed. 1734, V, 40 ff.)

[55] The reasons for adopting this date may be seen in Hefele, *Councils,* I, 199.

bishops, eleven years afterwards, took part in the first ecumenical Council of Nicaea. "They belonged to such different provinces of Asia Minor and Syria, that the Synod of Ancyra may, in the same sense as that of Arles, be considered a *concilium plenarium,* that is, a general council of the churches of Asia Minor and Syria. From the fact that Vitalis of Antioch is mentioned first (*primo loco*) and that Antioch was the most considerable seat of those who were represented at Ancyra, it is generally concluded that Vitalis presided over the Synod." [56]

Of the twenty-five authentic canons of the Council of Ancyra, nine relate to the lapsed, *i. e.,* the Christians who denied their faith during the persecution; [57] ten treat of the penance incurred by certain grave sins; [58] six concern various matters of discipline and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[59]

The first nine canons are very important for Church history. They supply precise information about the existence and regulation of canonical penance at the period of the persecutions. The various classes of penitents are mentioned: the *keimazomenoi,* who perform their penance outside the precincts of the church, exposed, as their name indicates, to all the inclemencies of the weather; [60] the *audientes,* or hearers; the *substrati,* or prostrate; and lastly the *consistentes,* who take part in the common prayer, but not yet in the offering or in the Holy Communion, these last two rites being the term and crown of the canonical penance. The guilty were treated differently according as they belonged to the episcopacy or the lower clergy or the laity. It is to be noted also that the discipline established by the Council was not so strict that it could

[56] *Ibidem,* I, 201.
[57] Canons 1 to 9.
[58] Canons 16 to 25.
[59] Canons 10 to 15.
[60] They are enumerated in canon 17.

not be mitigated by each bishop, who was the judge of the fervor of the penitents of his church.[61] We should also remark that, by a mitigation of the discipline previously observed by the churches, Holy Communion was thereafter to be accorded to any penitent who was in danger of death.[62]

The last ten canons concern certain crimes which, when committed by Christians, had at first led the heads of the churches to exclude the guilty ones permanently from the communion of the Church: sins against nature, rape, murder, forcible usurpation of ecclesiastical powers and the practice of magic. The Fathers of Ancyra, in a spirit of distributive justice and evangelical charity, declared all these crimes remissible, but they attached penances proportioned to the offense.

Canons 10 to 15, relative to the internal discipline of the Church, regulate various questions concerning the continence of the clergy,[63] the rights acquired by betrothal, the irregularity incurred by the offering of sacrifices to idols, the powers of the *chorepiscopi*,[64] and practices of false asceticism.

While in the East as well as in the West, the Church, in a spirit of prudent firmness, sought to heal the wounds made by the persecution, the vanquished paganism tried with a final effort to win back its former influence and again shed Christian blood in its desperate convulsions.

[61] Canons 1, 2, 21, 23.

[62] Canons 6, 22.

[63] Canon 10, inserted in the *Corpus juris canonici,* is, along with canon 33 of the Council of Elvira, a valuable landmark for the history of sacerdotal celibacy. There we see that, although in principle the Church still left the clergy the right to the use of a previously contracted marriage, celibacy was favored so far as possible, and most of the married clergy—bishops, priests, and deacons—practiced continence.

[64] On the delicate problems raised by canon 13 with regard to the powers of the *chorepiscopi* and of priests, see Le Bachelet, art. "*Ancyre* (*Concile d'*)," in the *Dict. de théol.,* I, cols. 1174 ff.

The Martyrdom of St. Salsa

One of the most moving episodes of this crisis was the martyrdom, at Tipasa, of the Christian maiden Salsa. "While the pagan shrines were being closed or were falling into ruins, it happened that the devotion of the followers of idolatry concentrated on some more living religion or some local superstition, where paganism took its last stand. In many cities the cult of Mithra was heir to all the other religions. But in the little Mauritanian town of Tipasa, between Iconium (Alger) and Caesarea (Cherchell), the scene of the events we are about to relate, the only sanctuary that remained standing was the chapel of Python, where the worship of the Serpent was practiced, a worship that was always cherished by the African population. An ancient historian has left a picture of the merry-making occasioned by that worship. He speaks, as one who may have been an eye-witness, of the dilapidated temple walls trimmed with laurel wreaths, the sanctuary of the impure idol adorned with tapestries, the incense-holders smoking on the altars, the choir of singers and dancers, the enthusiasm of the worshippers soon mounting to frenzy. Into the midst of this orgy there was forcibly brought, by her fanatically pagan parents, a pure and graceful fourteen-year-old girl, Salsa, who professed Christianity, which for some time had been flourishing at Tipasa. She was tremblingly forced to be present at the sacrifice and the sacrilegious meal that followed it. But, while those who brought her were taking their repose along with the others, after this meal, Salsa determined to avenge her humiliation and anguish upon the god. Quietly rising, she slipped into the chapel, snatched the gilded head of the Serpent, and threw it into the waves that beat at the foot of the hill. Emboldened by this success, Salsa entered the sanctuary, lifted in her weak arms the body of the dragon, and hurled it from the top of the cliff. But the noise of the

brazen monster rebounding against the rocks made the deed known to the pagans. The crowd gathered together, howling with rage. Some of them, crazed with fury and unaffected by her youth and charm, seized the fearless child and threw her into the sea, where she had intended to drown their god. Three days later, a ship from Provence entering the harbor of Tipasa, picked up the martyr's body. The Christians, with the help of the sailors, buried it on the shore, near the harbor. Soon a spacious basilica rose over her tomb; remains of it have been discovered in our own day." [65]

Events of this sort preceded the crisis of persecution which broke out in the East under Licinius. This colleague of Constantine signed the Edict of Milan only as a matter of policy and impulse. Before long Constantine's growing influence aroused his jealousy. Licinius' sole aim presently seemed to be to destroy the effects of the edict by relying on the pagan party. He began by removing the Christians from his court, then from his army. He reduced the number of Christian assemblies and imposed irksome regulations on them. Eusebius compared this deceitful foe of the Church to a serpent that, not daring a frontal attack, entwines itself about the limbs of its victim so as to envelop it with its coils and gradually crush out life.[66]

The Forty Martyrs of Sebaste

Several Christians, several priests and bishops, guilty of violating these regulations, were ill-treated, banished, massacred. St. Jerome's *Chronicle* mentions, among the martyrs of this persecution, Bishop Basil of Amasea in Pontus, who had been one of the prominent members of the Council of Ancyra. Many soldiers also were martyred. The most illustrious were the forty heroes of Sebaste, whom the Fathers of the Church

[65] Allard, *Hist. des pers.*, V, 290 ff.
[66] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, II, i.

vie with each other in praising.[67] Having refused to take part in an idolatrous sacrifice, they were sentenced to death by the prefect. "The manner of execution was horrible. One winter's night, the martyrs were stripped bare and placed on a frozen pond which was swept by the cold north wind and lighted by the glow from a house close by, where water was warmed for the baths. One of them, vanquished by his suffering, left his companions and dragged himself to the bath; no sooner did his frozen limbs feel the warmth than he died. A few moments more of perseverance would have won him the martyr's palm. Then an incident occurred which is not unique in the history of the persecutions. The apparitor in charge of the warm baths had observed the courage of the other condemned Christians, and had witnessed the defection of the one apostate; he saw in the snow those thirty-nine almost frozen bodies on which eternal rewards were descending, and in the bath that single dishonored corpse. Sudden emulation gripped him. Casting off his garments, he cried out: 'I am a Christian,' and took the place left vacant by the apostate. At daybreak he was found with the martyrs and with them was taken to the stake where their bodies were to be burnt. One of the condemned was overlooked by the lictors, who, seeing him still alive, hoped he would abjure. But his mother, who was present at this scene, took him in her arms and laid him in the cart near his companions: this heroic woman feared he might lose the palm or would have a solitary martyrdom, removed from the heroes whose combat he had shared." [68]

News of events like this brought sorrow to the West. As Eusebius says, "the part of the Empire that was plunged in darkness turned its eyes to that part which enjoyed great

[67] St. Basil, *Homily 20;* St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Homily on the Forty Martyrs;* St. John Chrysostom, in Photius, *Bibliotheca,* no. 274; St. Ephrem, *Orat.* 26, etc. The collation of these different homilies with the Acts of the martyrs (*Acta sanctorum,* March I, 19) makes it possible to reconstruct an exact account.

[68] Allard, *op. cit.,* V, 309.

light." Licinius received Constantine's complaint with ill grace, and he then found a pretext for declaring war on him. The battle of Chrysopolis (September 18, 323) and Licinius' death the next year, with which Constantine probably had something to do,[69] ended the despot's tyranny. Constantine, now sole master of the Empire, could everywhere carry out his policy of religious freedom.

[69] There is every indication that Constantine really instigated this crime. If such be the case, it is a blemish that history must lament in the life of that great man.

CHAPTER III

Religious Unity

Constantine's Policy

CONSTANTINE, after his victory over Licinius, issued a decree from which we quote the following passage:

"My design then was, first, to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the Deity to a condition, as it were, of settled uniformity; and, secondly, to restore a healthy tone to the system of the world, then suffering under the malignant power of a grievous distemper. Keeping these objects in view, I looked forward to the accomplishment of the one with the secret gaze of the mental eye, while the other I endeavored to secure by the aid of military power. For I was aware that, if I should succeed in establishing, according to my hopes, a common harmony of sentiment among all the servants of God, the general course of affairs would also experience a change corresponding to the pious desires of them all." [1]

Constantine's whole policy is set forth in these words. This great man is aware of a twofold duty: that of head of the State, charged with maintaining the unity of the Empire, and that of God's instrument whose mission it is to spread the Christian revelation.[2] These two duties appeared to him not merely reconcilable, but quite harmonious. The unity of the Empire and the unity of religion naturally strengthened each

[1] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, II, 65.

[2] His conviction that he was the instrument of God appears particularly in the proclamation to the Orientals. It is quoted by Eusebius, *op. cit.*, II, 55.

other. Does the Emperor thus disavow his programme of religious liberty so recently proclaimed at Milan? Not at all; for that régime of liberty did not exclude the desire to seek religious unity; and the pursuit of unity, so clearly manifested in this present decree, was not opposed to the broadest tolerance and respect for his word given in 313. In 323 he writes:

"Let those who are still blinded by error be made welcome to the same degree of peace and tranquillity which they have who believe. For it may be that this restoration of equal privileges to all will have a powerful effect in leading them into the path of truth. Let no one molest another in this matter, but let every one be free to follow the bias of his own mind. . . . Let none use that to the detriment of another which he may himself have received on conviction of its truth; but let every one, if it be possible, apply what he has understood and known to the benefit of his neighbor; if otherwise, let him relinquish the attempt. For it is one thing voluntarily to undertake the conflict for immortality, another to compel others to do so from the fear of punishment." [3]

These last words show the depth of Constantine's thought. He did not profess religious indifference. For him Christianity was the truth, paganism error; but he attempted to spread the truth only by persuasion and mildness, and pursued error by force only in so far as demanded by the requirements of morality and public order. This plan, it is true, was not followed in every instance. Impelled by resentment or exulting in success, Constantine did not always respect the limits he had so wisely laid down. Especially after the Nicene Council, elated over its triumph, he sometimes violated the rights of the Church and sometimes those of individual consciences. But our present purpose is to set forth the beginning of his religious policy. During this period he was faithful to the principles of his first decrees.

[3] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, II, 56, 60.

Basilicas

Constantine's chief concern was to promote the progress and magnificence of the Christian religion with all his power. After the Edict of Milan, the Christians' first thought was to raise up to God, on a soil so long defiled by idolatrous sacrifices, temples where at last their thanksgivings would resound without restraint. Until then their worship had to be celebrated in poor chapels; they had to seek protection in some friendly house, or, in times of great danger, to take refuge in the earth, near the tombs of the dead. On the remains of sanctuaries destroyed by the persecution, in places consecrated by the blood of the martyrs or the presence of their venerated relics, and on the site of the catacombs, there quickly arose temples of vast size, adorned with marvelous art. The ancient chapels and crypts would not have sufficed for the solemnity of public worship. The Emperor made most generous gifts to the churches and exempted from taxes the artists engaged in their construction. Architecture, sculpture, and painting, which figured to no small extent in the spread of immorality and superstition, were thus put at the service of the Church of Christ.

The *Liber Pontificalis* mentions the basilicas that were then built, like immense and superb shrines, over the tombs of St. Peter at the Vatican, of St. Paul on the Via Ostia, of St. Lawrence on the Via Nomentana, of SS. Peter and Marcellinus on the Via Labicana.[4] The basilicas erected over the tombs of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Lawrence were owing to the Emperor's munificence. Empress Fausta had already made a gift to the papacy of her Lateran palace, beside which was built the basilica of the same name. Constantine's mother, Helena, who had a villa on the Via Labicana, erected an elegant

[4] Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, I, 178–182.

basilica on the tombs of the martyrs Peter and Marcellinus; later, after her return from Palestine, she built near another of her villas, to house the relics of the Passion, the *Domus Sessoriana,* or Sessorian Basilica, which soon was called the Holy Cross of Jerusalem. Constantina, the Emperor's daughter, erected the basilica of St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana, beside another imperial villa which she especially liked; and it may be that the Church of St. Anastasia, built at the foot of the Palatine, owes its name to one of Constantine's sisters.

The Lateran Basilica

The most celebrated of these basilicas was that of the Lateran, first called the Constantinian Church, the mother church, consecrated to Christ the Savior, before being dedicated to St. John the Baptist in the tenth century. "During the celebration of the dedication, there appeared in clouds above the high altar the face of the Redeemer surrounded by rays of light: a majestic and gentle face. Its features were perpetuated in mosaic in the apse of the impressive basilica. Nothing remains of the first basilica, which was razed by an earthquake at the end of the ninth century. But the *Liber Pontificalis* enumerates the wonders of art that were contained in this temple, which had a rather austere exterior.[5] The baldachin of the high altar was the gift of the Emperor; it was a colossal piece of goldsmith's work, in which silver figures, five feet high, with jewels for eyes, represented the Savior surrounded by the Apostles and angels. The inner vaulting of this silver baldachin was of purest gold. A golden lamp weighing fifty pounds hung on chains of twenty-five pounds weight. The seven altars of the basilica were likewise

[5] Duchesne has shown the great archeological value of the document used by the *Liber pontificalis.* It gives specific details: the kind of metal, the number of precious stones, the size and weight of the sculptures.

of silver, and there was a prodigious number of liturgical vessels, many of them incrusted with jewels." [6]

The Lateran Basilica never was a special *title,* that is, it was not a parish church. It was the church of the bishop of Rome. There every Sunday the pope celebrated the liturgy in the course of which he sent part of the consecrated bread, the *fermentum,* to the priests of the titular churches, as a mark of their communion with him. At the Lateran it was that thenceforth took place the ordinations and the formal reconciliation of public penitents. Holy Saturday night the Baptism of catechumens was solemnly administered in its baptistry, the only one then existing for Rome.

The religious life of the people was displayed principally in the titular churches. Exact documents show that, in the fourth century, the Christians attended the Eucharistic oblation and received communion there; for it was the rule for no one to attend the Eucharist without participating in it.[7] The titular churches were also the places where the Sacrament of Penance was privately administered and marriages were celebrated; there also, on the days of penance, took place those particular prayer meetings that were called "stations." [8]

The Catacombs

Consequent upon the building of so many churches, the importance of the cemeteries or catacombs diminished; but they still figured in the organization of worship. No one could forget those venerable places, the cradle of the early Church. Even in the time of Pope St. Dionysius there was an undeniable relation between the cemeteries and the titles or parishes. After the edict of Gallienus, cemeteries and titles were

[6] A. Pératé, *Le Vatican,* pp. 412 f.

[7] Cardinal Rampolla establishes this point in his *Life of St. Melania the Younger.*

[8] On the "stations," see Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 228 ff.

divided among the priests, at the same time that parish lines were delimited, to the number of twenty-five. From that time forward the catacombs were served, not by a special clergy, but by the parish clergy, each title being responsible for one or more cemeteries.[9]

Moreover, the peace of the Church introduced new conditions for the catacombs. St. Miltiades was the last pope to be buried in the catacombs. St. Sylvester is buried in a basilica. Many of these basilicas were constructed above cemeteries, their base sometimes being at the level of the martyrs' tombs, sometimes at a higher level. But often this arrangement entailed the wrecking or destruction or disappearance of considerable parts of the ancient catacombs. At times the only change was an enlargement of a little room containing the saint's tomb or a provision to admit more daylight. Or the desire to honor an illustrious martyr would bring about more radical arrangements. In order to reach the level where the martyr's body rested, the catacomb was sometimes laid bare down to the first or second story underground. This expeditious method was used in several places, for example, for the tomb of St. Peter at the Vatican, of St. Paul on the Via Ostia, of St. Lawrence at the *Agro Verano,* and of St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana.[10]

Constantine's princely generosity reached to the provinces. At Ostium, at Alba, at Naples, at Capua, at Cirta in Numidia, imperial architects raised splendid temples to Christ and His saints. Eusebius describes several churches constructed in the East, notably the immense cathedral built at Tyre, with ceilings of cedar, vaultings of mosaics, altars sparkling with gold and gems, all of which aroused universal admiration.

The imperial favor was shown in a very particular way in

[9] Leclercq, art. *"Catacombes,"* in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.*

[10] *Op. cit.,* II, col. 2433. Pope St. Damasus devoted great care to remedying the ruinous effect of these undertakings.

the glorification of the holy places of Palestine. Pilgrimages to the Holy Land had been frequent before the persecution of Diocletian;[11] they greatly increased after peace was established. The exact spot of the crucifixion was identified, as also of the Ascension, the grotto of Bethlehem, and many other sites venerated as having witnessed the fundamental mysteries of Christianity; and memorial churches were erected there. At Antioch, the place where tradition located the first establishment of the Christians, a large basilica was erected.

Christian Architecture

Thus Christian architecture was born. Probably before Constantine the Christians possessed, besides the catacombs and private residences placed at the service of public worship, a certain number of churches. The edict of Gallienus (261) and Aurelian's decision (272) regarding the church in Antioch presuppose that the Christians possessed buildings especially intended for religious worship.[12] But historians have left us no data about their architectonic forms. From allusions in the *Didascalia,* the *Apostolic Constitutions,* and the *Testament of Our Lord,* we may suppose that the churches before Constantine's time were inspired by the profane basilica, a public edifice usually built on a forum, where the people met to discuss their legal or commercial affairs.[13] These churches contained a single nave, with an atrium, a peristyle, and two entrances, one for men and the other for women.[14] This is about all we know with regard to them.[15]

[11] Eusebius speaks of these pilgrimages in his *Proof of the Gospel,* VI, xviii. But that book was written before Constantine visited the East.

[12] This fact is evidenced by the mention of the destruction of the basilica of Edessa in 302, of the basilicas at Tyre and Nicomedia in 303, and, in the same year, the placing under seal of the churches of Heraclea and Cirta.

[13] See the word "Basilica" in Du Cange.

[14] *Didascalia,* chap. 12; *Constit. apost.,* bk. 2, chap. 57; *Testament of Our Lord (alias, Epistle of the Apostles).*

[15] Leclercq, art. *"Basilique,"* in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.*

The Constantinian church evidently adopted the basilica type. It was quite natural that it should. Thus there was no break with habits already formed. Besides temples, almost the only form of public edifice known to architects and builders was the basilica; its use for purely civic purposes did not make Christians feel that aversion which they felt for the pagan temples.

The ground plan of a basilica was an oblong, two or three times as long as it was wide. Two rows of columns divided it into three naves. Ordinarily its length was divided into three sections: the lower part of the naves was occupied by the general public; half-way up the naves was the transept, reserved for lawyers, court officers, etc.; at the far end of the central nave was the apse, where the judgment seat was located.

In the Christian basilica, the naves were for the laity. Separate parts were asigned to the men, the women, the penitents, and the catechumens. In the transept were the lower clergy; since they sang psalms there and chanted the office, that part of the edifice was called *chorus* (choir). At the far end of the apse was placed the seat reserved for the bishop, and on both sides of this were seats for the priests, whence the name *presbyterium,* given to this part of the basilica.

The altar was located at the entrance to the apse, or at the upper end of the choir. It consisted of an oblong marble slab, resting upon one, four, or five supports, and decorated with various ornaments.[16] Sometimes use was made of abandoned pagan monuments, which were covered by a marble slab.[17]

[16] Bour, in the *Dict. de théol.,* V, col. 1207; Leclercq, in the *Dict. d'archéol.,* I, col. 3158.

[17] De Rossi, *Bullett. di archeol.,* 1877, plates 3 and 4; Leclercq, *op. cit.,* I, cols. 3175 ff. When we say that the profane basilica was a prototype of the Christian basilica, we are not excluding other influences. We follow the traditional view, set forth in a scholarly way by Léon-Baptiste Alberti in the sixteenth century. The question of the architectural origin of Christian basilicas has been controverted ever since. Zestermann's contention, that the Christian basilica was something altogether new in architecture, has not won many supporters. Martigny

In a general way many fragments of former buildings were employed in the construction of the basilicas, for example, shafts and capitals. "The ancient Christian basilicas of Rome are merely a reassemblage of ancient fragments." [18] This statement seems a little too broad, but the truth contained in it may be verified by a study of the primitive parts of early basilicas, nearly all constructed or restored at periods more or less distant. But we should not, therefore, suppose that the use of foreign materials notably injured the purity of style of the Constantinian churches. De Broglie remarks that at that period, when pagan architecture experienced a notable decadence of taste, when art was characterized by the venturesome combination of diverse styles and by a search for a heavy and unlovely bigness, as in the baths of Diocletian and Constantine's arch of triumph, "the Christian churches preserved a particular and impressive character. Nearly all were built on a similar model, offering the symbol of order reborn in the midst of a general dissolution." [19] All the luxury which a converted civilization heaped up in these temples did not result in destroying their general simplicity, the spontaneous fruit of Christian inspiration. Thus, instead of adopting the model

was the last to hold that the Christian basilica owes its origin to the chapels in the catacombs. We cannot enter into a discussion of the theories that the basilica is to be traced back to the mortuary chapels or the Jewish synagogues. Nor has the explanation been accepted that the model of the basilica is to be found in the arrangement of certain rooms in private houses. De Lasteyrie, in his monumental history of religious architecture in France, after devoting a whole chapter to the discussion of these different theories, says: "The origin of the basilicas is more complex than is generally supposed. From the basilica of the ancient forum are taken the oblong shape, the division into parallel galleries, and especially the elevation of the middle gallery to facilitate the lighting of the interior from above. From public meeting-places, and perhaps from mortuary structures, was taken the idea of the apse. From private houses was borrowed the atrium and the long preserved practice of joining various subsidiary structures to the church building, without any concern as to whether the external appearance of the church would be harmed thereby." (Lasteyrie, *op. cit.*, I, 70.)

[18] Viollet-le-Duc, *Dict. d'architecture.*

[19] De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'empire*, II, 168.

of the vaulted basilica, the Church generally preferred that of the basilica with timbered ceiling supported on a line of arches. Thus "in its principal lines it kept the rural appearance of a vast barn. It might be looked upon as the stable of Bethlehem, enriched by the presents of the Magi." [20]

The Liturgy

The same character, at once solemn and sumptuous, marked the liturgical ceremonies, now openly displayed.

Baptism was conferred in separate chapels or baptistries, constructed near the churches. The Lateran baptistry received Constantine's most generous gifts. "The cover of the porphyry piscina was of silver; in the middle rose a porphyry column bearing a golden lamp, in which, during the Easter festivities, two hundred pounds of balm were burned. On the edge of the piscina was a golden lamb, from the mouth of which the water poured out; to the right of this was a silver image of the Savior, five feet high and weighing 170 pounds; to the left, a like statue of St. John the Baptist, holding a standard with the inscription, *'Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi';* in fine, seven silver statues of deer from which water likewise poured into the baptismal basin." [21] The deer symbolized the catechumens' desire to quench their thirst in the water of life and salvation. The basin sometimes was made in the shape of a tomb to symbolize the mystical death of the baptized.

The baptistries were spacious enough to permit the conferring of Baptism on a large number of catechumens at one time. At first this ceremony took place with great solemnity on the feasts of Easter and Pentecost only. Soon the feast of Epiphany was added; then Baptism was given on all the great

[20] *Idem*, II, 178.

[21] Pératé, *Le Vatican, les papes et la civilisation*, p. 413. Cf. Martigny, art. *"Baptistère,"* in the *Dict. des antiq. chrèt.*

feasts.[22] The catechumens who were judged worthy to enter the Church through the baptismal initiation had to prepare themselves by forty days of prayer and fasting, by special examinations called *scrutinia,* and by exorcisms. Solemn Baptism was conferred so far as possible by the bishop himself. The essential rite was always, following the primitive usage, the threefold immersion, in memory of the Holy Trinity and of the three days which Christ passed in the tomb. Yet there were exceptions to this rule, even aside from the Baptism of the sick: the Spaniards used only one immersion. Among the secondary ceremonies there was the placing of a little salt on the lips, the touching of the ears while uttering the word "Ephpheta," the anointing, the laying on of a white tunic, the recitation of the symbol of faith, and, in Italy, the offering of a coin, recalling the talent entrusted by God to the neophyte. It all combined to make the initiated understand the importance and greatness of the step he had just taken, of the graces he would receive. Now that the profession of Christianity no longer exposed a baptized person to martyrdom, and since, on the contrary, it might become in civil life a title to public consideration, it was more necessary than ever to remind all, by the most expressive ceremonies, of the eminent dignity of the Sacrament which makes us children of the Church, and the serious duties it imposes.

The Ceremonies of the Mass

Like reasons justified the new solemnity given to the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In the time of Constantine the Eucharist was no longer an impressive "breaking of bread," furtively celebrated among brethren, gathered for

[22] In the thirtieth year of Constantine's reign the practice was introduced at Jerusalem of baptizing on the day of the dedication of the Church of Calvary. Later on, Baptism was conferred on the feasts of the martyrs. (St. Leo, *Ep.* 168, no. 1.)

the "repast of love" in the upper room of a friendly house. It was no longer a sacrifice offered in the gloom of the catacombs by the light of smoky lamps, on the still fresh tomb of a martyr. It was the solemn action of the divine immolation, commemorated and renewed in a well-lighted basilica amid all the pomp of riches and art, laid at the feet of the Master of the world.

Archeological and patristic documents enable us to reconstruct the liturgy of a solemn Mass celebrated in the basilica of the Lateran in Constantine's time. No change was made in any of the essential ceremonies that we have already considered. There was a modification only in the setting and in a few accessory ceremonies.

As soon as a Christian, raising the light canvas curtain which covered the doorway, entered the basilica,[23] his eye was dazzled by thousands of lights from candelabra, lamps, and perfume-burners, sending forth their rays in various directions over his head, casting countless reflections on the gilded decorations, on the canopy of hammered silver over the high altar, on the precious stones that adorned the statues, altars, and sacred vessels.

At the far end of the nave, sitting in a chair of imposing dimensions, is the head of the Church of Rome, to his right and left are his priests seated, and his deacons standing. These last, clothed in simple *colobium,* a sort of light tunic held in at the waist by a *cingulum,* are ready to carry out the bishop's instructions for the direction of the ceremonies. "When thou callest the assembly of the church," says the *Apostolic Constitutions* to the bishop, "as one that is the commander of a great ship, appoint the assemblies to be made with all possible skill, charging the deacons to prepare places for the brethren with all due care and decency." [24]

[23] Constantine, by granting the "right of asylum" to the basilicas, intended that no door should stop the flight of a condemned person seeking refuge at the foot of the altar.

[24] *Apostolic Constitutions,* bk. 2, chap. 57.

The deacons leave the apse and go to and fro in the nave: they see that the "weepers" (Christians doing penance) remain in the outer porch; they assign places to the "hearers" at the rear of the basilica; they allow the "competents" [25] to come further up in the church; they keep an eye on the possessed persons, who are relegated to a far corner, and on all those who might fail to observe proper decorum.

During the Mass of the Catechumens, the first deacon dismisses successively the hearers, the possessed, and the competents until the faithful alone remain.[26]

After giving the kiss of peace to one another, men and women separately, they bring their offerings to the altar, thus carrying out the Savior's command:

"If thou offerest thy gift at the altar, and there thou rememberest that thy brother hath anything against thee, leave there thy offering before the altar, and go first to be reconciled to thy brother; and then coming thou shalt offer thy gift."

The crowd spreads out in a long, silent procession. First the men come forward, each one carrying his offering, more or less costly according to his wealth. The gifts are received in baskets or large amphorae called *amae*. From the *Liber Pontificalis* we know that Constantine gave the Lateran two *amae* of pure gold, weighing fifty pounds apiece, and twenty silver *amae,* weighing ten pounds apiece. Each person, as he passed by the baskets and *amphorae,* bowed, deposited his offering, and then resumed his place in the procession. After

[25] The name *"competentes"* was given to those catechumens who were being prepared for the reception of Baptism.

[26] For a long time it was supposed (without proof) that the penitents, like the catechumens, were dismissed after the didactic portion of the Divine Office (Petau, *De poenit. vet.*). This error was successfully refuted by Hugo Koch (*Theologische Quartalschrift,* 1900, pp. 481–534). But it is true that a special part of the church was assigned to the penitents. (D'Alès, art. *"Limen ecclesiae,"* in the *Revue d'hist. eccl.,* 1902, pp. 16–26.)

the men came the women, the deaconesses, the virgins. The married women generally wore a *stola,* the virgins a headband. The deacons, standing behind the *amphorae,* were vested in golden dalmatics. In the baskets and *amphorae* they carried the bread and wine needed for the consecration.

The most solemn moment of the sacrifice draws near. Two deacons stand before the altar, each of them holding a large fan, or *flabellum,* which they use to keep away the flies that might otherwise fall into the chalice. The celebrant wears a *paenula* (chasuble) over the cinctured tunic. He consecrates the bread and wine according to the rite which we considered above.[27]

The communion ceremonies varied but little. Communion is distributed at the "chancel," or communion table, located between the back of the nave and the transept. The floor in this part was inlaid work of precious marble.[28] The people stand to receive the consecrated bread, which the deacon puts in their hand, and they themselves place it in their mouth. The precious blood is distributed to them separately in a chalice.

While the people thus partook of the Eucharistic banquet in a manner at once informal and august, the choir sang the thirty-third Psalm of David: "I will bless the Lord at all times, His praise shall be always in my mouth. . . . Taste and see that the Lord is sweet." And the thanksgiving continued to the end of the liturgical ceremony.[29]

And it continued even outside the basilica, for we have numerous evidences that, "in the fourth century, Christians in the East as well as in the West, of all ages and conditions, sang psalms every day, whether in public or in private." [30]

[27] See *supra,* pp. 31, 89 f., 283 f.

[28] Cedrenus relates that, in the great church at Constantinople, Constantine paved this portion of the floor with onyx.

[29] See Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe;* Hoppenot, *La Messe;* Cabrol, *La Prière antique.*

[30] Martigny, art. *"Liturgie,"* in the *Dict. des antiq. chrét.*

Saint Paula relates that in her time "the farmer at his plow used to sing the *alleluia;* the sweating harvester lightened his labor with the singing of the psalms; the vintager, wielding the curved pruning-knife, chanted some snatch of Davidic poetry." [31]

This holy enthusiasm surely spread to the pagans. From Eusebius we learn that the crowd, charmed by the beauties of the liturgy, repaired to the baptistries, asking for and receiving "the mystic symbols of our Savior's Passion." [32]

The Roman Religion in the Time of Constantine

Yet the pagan peril continued. No doubt, "when Constantine placed Christianity on the throne with him, and changed the whole religious policy of the Roman Empire, the religion from which for the first time the sovereign publicly withdrew, was nothing more than a semblance of what it had been in previous centuries; and it would remain rather the respected symbol of Roman unity than the real religious center of the nations." [33] But, by becoming the capital of the world, Rome in a way became its Pantheon. The gods taken from the Sabines and from Latium, the more brilliant and less chaste divinities imagined by the genius of Greece, the Oriental Baals and the Alexandrian myths, all were mingled and confused in the popular imagination and worship. In this immense ambiguity which was then covered by the name of Roman religion, some chosen souls found the way of purification that led them to the portal of Christianity; but the masses found therein especially the means of more freely satisfying their passions. Sometimes the contrast of a life engaged in devout practices and at the same time stained with the most degraded

[31] St. Jerome, *Opera,* IV, 351. Cf. St. Augustine, *Enarr. in psalmos,* 85.

[32] Eusebius, *H. E.,* X, iii.

[33] Allard, *"Le Paganisme romain au IV^e siècle,"* in the *Revue des quest. hist.,* 1892, p. 345.

vices, was to be found in the same person. "This curious mixture is observed in studying the paintings and inscriptions of a famous profane catacomb on the Via Appia. On the tomb of a priest of Sabazios, an epitaph of the lowest and grossest Epicurean philosophy is carved at the side of paintings recalling the loftiest myths of paganism and even Christian symbols. Opposite are frescoes on a Mithraist's tomb, showing him invested with the rank of *miles,* the possession of which stirred the members' fervor to heroism and almost to martyrdom. But these same frescoes also contain one of the vilest symbols of the worship of the indecent Cotytto. A little farther on, the tomb of a priest of *Sol Invictus* has an epitaph in which this minister of a purification worship is praised for having given his pupils lessons in voluptuousness." [34] Notwithstanding heresies and schisms, the Christian religion, by its lofty doctrine and pure morals and solid hierarchy, appeared the firmest basis of society; at the same time and to that extent paganism, despite the character and high ideas of some of its members, became more and more the agglomeration of all superstitions and immoralities, and showed itself to be the most formidable influence of dissolution. This Constantine understood.

Without belying his pledged word given at Milan, to respect the liberty of paganism as a religion, he decided to attack whatever seemed to him manifestly immoral, scandalously superstitious, or seriously menacing to public peace in its manifestations. The temples of Aegae in Cilicia and of Aphaca in Phenicia were demolished because they were used for orgiastic celebrations; that of Heliopolis, because custom had transformed it into a "place of ill-repute." The temple of Delphi, probably for a similar reason, was stripped of its statues. Eusebius assures us that the Emperor went even farther. He mentions a law forbidding the setting up of idols,

[34] *Ibidem,* p. 350.

the practice of divination, and the offering of idolatrous sacrifice.[35] The text of this law has not been preserved. Apparently it was aimed at ceremonies performed in private houses, because worship was not abolished in the temples in any general way.[36] In many places, converted *en masse* to Christianity, the people of their own accord smashed their former idols and razed their temples. Stripping the statues of gems and precious vestments, they pointed out to the idols' remaining followers the decayed wood that was hidden beneath these splendid coverings, and repeated the verses of the Psalm:

"They have mouths and speak not; they have eyes and see not; they have ears and hear not. . . . Let them that make them become like unto them, and all such as trust in them." [37]

Legal Reforms

Constantine accomplished something more profound. He strove to inject the Christian spirit into the Roman law. Frederick Ozanam, in one of his most penetrating studies, notes the radical opposition between the pagan and the Christian law. In the pagan law he distinguishes three profound defects. First, the pagan law was the intangible and almost sacred domain of a small number of the initiated, the lawyers, who acquired a sort of mysterious and superstitious priesthood from such functions.[38] A second defect of the pagan law, consequent upon the first, was to give it a power, "not only over possessions and life, but also over souls and conscience. Rome be-

[35] *Life of Constantine,* I, xlv; IV, xxiii and xxv.

[36] De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'empire,* I, 462–467; Duchesne, *op. cit.,* II, 61. However, it is also true that Constantine tolerated superstitious practices and even issued decrees for their regulation.

[37] Eusebius, *op. cit.,* III, lvii.

[38] *"Jus est ars boni et aequi, cujus merito quis nos sacerdotes appellet."* (Ulpian, *Digest, "De justitia et jure,"* bk. I, tit. I, sec. I.)

ing deified, her will was divine, legitimate." [39] "A third serious defect of the pagan law was that frightful inequality which all the efforts of conscience were unable to overcome." [40] According to Roman law, woman was held in tutelage all her life; a son at birth was subject to the law of sale and even to abandonment; lower down the scale, slaves were without any rights at all.[41]

This Roman law, when codified by the immortal pen of Gaius and Ulpian, had the beauty of the finest monuments of old Rome. But, Ozanam concludes, it reminds one too much of the Colosseum, a fine structure, where men were thrown to the lions.[42]

The Constantinian law did not bring about a complete change in the prescriptions that violated Christianity and morality. A sudden transformation was impossible. But to Constantine we must trace the blessed juridical evolution which terminated in the Theodosian Code. "Constantine introduced three great novelties. First, an effort to give the law a character of publicity and sincerity. With Constantius disappeared the sacramental formularies of wills, of contracts, and of several acts of civil law. There also disappeared what the emperors called *aucupatio syllabarum,* that is, the sacramental syllables and the rest of juridical subtleties." [43] Secondly, the temporal and the spiritual were not confused. Constantine, when appealed to by the Donatists to adjudicate a religious question, wrote to the Catholic bishops:

"They have made an appeal, as is done in the law suits of the pagans. . . . They ask judgment from me, who am myself waiting

[39] Ozanam, *La Civilisation au Ve siècle,* I, 261.
[40] *Ibidem,* p. 265.
[41] *Ibidem,* p. 271.
[42] *Ibidem,* p. 276.
[43] Ozanam, *op. cit.,* pp. 176–277.

for the judgment of Christ. For I declare—as is true—that the judgment of bishops ought to be looked upon as if the Lord Himself were sitting in judgment." [44]

Constantine also began to rectify the inequality which looked upon women, children, and slaves as juridically incomplete persons. He gave mothers a more important place in the matter of inheritances from their children.[45] They became their children's legal guardians.[46] The marriage bond recovered part of its dignity by the limitation of legal grounds for divorce.[47] In May, 315, the Emperor wrote: "Let a law be promptly posted in all the cities of Italy, to deter parents from laying murderous hands on their newborn infants." A few years later (321), he wrote: "We have learned that in the provinces, because of the scarcity of food, people are selling and pledging their own children. We order that parents who are without personal resources be succored by our treasury." Henceforth the law punishes the murder of a son by a parent with the same penalty as provided for parricide. Lastly, the law punishes by death those who put one of their slaves to death.

Constantine in every possible way facilitated the freeing of slaves. Whoever, in the presence of the assembled people or in a church, declared his slave free, was considered to have fulfilled all the formalities by which Roman citizenship is conferred. By two imperial constitutions, "the Church was entrusted with a sort of official patronage for the enfranchisement of mankind. Consecrated localities were made places of refuge and exempt places. Now empowered to promote and to receive all kinds of emancipations, outside any legal formali-

[44] *The Acts of the Vindication of Felix* (in *The Works of St. Optatus against the Donatists,* Appendix 5, pp. 396 f.).

[45] *Theodosian Code,* bk. 5, tit. 1, *"De legitimis haereditatibus."*

[46] *Ibidem,* bk. 2, tit. 17, *"De his qui veniam aetatis impetrarunt."*

[47] *Ibidem,* bk. 3, tit. 16, *"De repudiis."*

ties or any legal hindrances, the bishops henceforth exercised the full weight of their religious authority in behalf of emancipation. Yet they had to be cautious not to wreck all the machinery of social life and to take into account deeply rooted habits which were maintained by men's passions as well as by their needs. The sudden abolition of slavery would have brought starvation upon ancient society, which depended upon the product of servile labor for the necessities of life. It would have let loose immense populations without guides or resources, incapable of governing themselves. The Church, at that solemn moment, accepted from God and from Emperor Constantine the task of freeing the world without upsetting it." [48]

St. Helena

The impulse given to the development of Christian worship, the repression of paganism, and the reform of legislation were, after all, merely external influences. They would not have been sufficient to give Christian society the internal force it needed to fulfil its divine mission at the dawn of the era just opening. This force came to it, as always, from a higher and more efficacious principle—holiness.

Holiness was to be found very close to the Emperor. Even when Constantine was surrounding the imperial office with greater pomp and splendor, the Christians used to see coming into their assemblies a humble woman, whose dress in no way distinguished her from the poorest subjects of the Empire. "Only the religious respect shown to her would enable any one to recognize, under these modest appearances, the mother of the mighty Emperor." [49]

Helena was born about the year 248 in Bithynia, of a lowly

[48] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, I, 306.
[49] Rouillon, *Sainte Hélène*, p. 101.

pagan family. St. Jerome tells us that in her youth she was a barmaid. But about 275, a Roman officer, passing through Bithynia with the expedition against the famous Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, fell in love with the charming girl and married her. The officer was Constantius Chlorus. Eighteen years later, having reached the highest ranks of military officialdom, he was called by Emperor Diocletian to share with him the government of the Roman Empire. This event resulted in separating him from her who until then had been his helpmate. Diocletian, to be sure of the new prince's fidelity, required him to repudiate Helena and to marry the daughter-in-law of his colleague, Maximian Hercules.

The experience was salutary for the poor repudiated wife; she tempered her soul in the endurance of unmerited suffering. When, later, the son of Constantius and Helena, Constantine, a convert to Christianity and now sole master of the Empire, called his beloved mother to him, Helena was ready to embrace the teachings of the religion of Christ. Eusebius informs us that the Emperor himself became its apostle. "He rendered her through his influence so devout a worshipper of God (though not previously so) that she seemed to have been instructed from the first by the Savior of mankind." We have no details as to the fruitful and prudent influence which Helena exercised upon her august son. We know that the Emperor opened the imperial treasury to her and that she made use of the opportunity to aid the poor and to build churches. We may justly suppose that her charitable inspiration had much to do with many of the laws enacted by Constantine for the benefit of the lowly, the suffering, slaves, and prisoners. When almost eighty years old, she journeyed to Palestine and enkindled in the Church the devotion to the Savior's cross. The voice of the people quickly venerated her with the title of saint.

The Fathers of the Desert

In the beginning of the fourth century, holiness, with exceptional vitality, spread out into the deserts of the East. There was no persecution shedding the blood of Christians; but the Church's reserves of heroism were not exhausted. Souls desirous of a more perfect life set out for the solitudes where Paul and Antony had fixed their abodes. "The persecution made less solitaries than did the peace and triumph of the Church. The Christians, simple and opposed to any softness, were more fearful of a peace that might be gratifying to the senses than they had been of the cruelty of the tyrants. The deserts became peopled with countless angels, who lived in mortal bodies without being of the earth." [50]

In 305, Antony of Heraclea, leaving the lofty aerie which he had made his retreat in the neighborhood of Memphis, founded the semi-eremetical life in the vicinity of the Red Sea.[51] Up to that time the hermits had lived isolated in mud huts, or in little cabins made of wood or stone. Some had found it simpler to use natural caves, burial grottos of the ancient Egyptians, or abandoned tombs outside of cities. Others there were who considered even the humblest habitation superfluous and lived in the open air.[52] Several of them who had visited Antony to ask his advice, were impressed by his wisdom. They came to him and settled in the vicinity. Antony became the chief and father of all the anchorites of the Thebaid, who found new stimulus for their fervor in the periodical gatherings held under his presidency.

The fame of the patriarch grew. Pagans, Platonic philosophers, consulted him and were struck by the depth of his re-

[50] Fénelon, *Discours sur les avantages et les devoirs de la vie religieuse* (*Œuvres,* Versailles ed., XVII, 396).

[51] At the spot where the Monastery of St. Antony still stands.

[52] Besse, *D'où viennent les moines,* p. 53; cfr. Besse, *Les Moines d'Orient.*

plies. The saintly hermit was fond especially of talking about the essence of God and the Trinity of the divine Persons, the Incarnation and death of one of those Persons for the salvation of the world. Emperor Constantine wrote to him as to a father, recommending the future of the Empire to his prayers. At sight of him popular enthusiasm broke out. Unbelievers and even priests of the idols ran after him, calling out: "Let us see the man of God!" [53] But he rarely appeared, and then furtively, in the midst of the crowds. He said: "As fish die if a man lift them out of the water, so, if we monks prolong our stay with men, do our minds become perverted and troubled; therefore it is meet that, as fish pass their lives beneath the waters, we also should let our lives and works be buried in the wilderness." [54] "He completed his life there in the midst of an always increasing stream of disciples and pilgrims, who received his instructions in the Egyptian language and who admired the unalterable beauty of his features, which age did not destroy,[55] and especially his gaiety, his joyous and winning affability, infallible signs of a soul which soars into serene regions." [56]

St. Athanasius, his contemporary and disciple, in his *Life of St. Antony,* gives a summary of the venerable patriarch's teaching. "He stressed perseverance in the exclusive service of God: not to grow lax or neglectful, not to look back toward the world, abandoned for good; one has left so little, even if the whole earth has been given up for solitude. We must do our daily task, without solicitude for the morrow, with trust in the grace of God." [57]

His rules for the discerning of spirits are quite remarkable. A thousand years later, St. Ignatius Loyola, condensing the

[53] St. Athanasius, *Life of St. Antony,* chap. 42.
[54] *Ibidem,* chap. 53.
[55] *Ibidem,* chaps. 13 and 40.
[56] Montalembert, *Monks of the West,* I, 308.
[57] Cavallera, *Saint Athanase,* p. 331.

fruit of his own reading and experience, sets down the same ideas, sometimes in the same words, as the Father of the Eastern monks. St. Antony's rules, as recorded by St. Augustine, are as follows:

"The discernment of good and evil spirits is possible and easy by the grace of God. The sight of the saints is not disturbing. 'He shall not cry, . . . neither shall his voice be heard abroad.' It takes place quietly and gently, at once bringing joy and confidence to the soul. This is because the Lord is with them, He who is our joy and the power of God the Father. The mind remains at peace, is unperturbed, in such wise that the soul beholds, in a calm light, those who appear to it. It is filled with a desire for divine things and future blessings, and a wish to be united with them, if it could go with them. If some persons, since they are human, feel a dread at sight of the good spirits, the apparition of the latter removes all fear by their charity. Thus it is that Gabriel acts toward Zachary; and thus the angel of the sepulcher in appearing to the holy women. The fear aroused by their appearance does not come from timidity, but from awareness of the presence of a higher being. Such is the vision of the saints. The sudden appearance of evil spirits, on the contrary, is disturbing. It is accompanied by noises, sounds, cries, as of rough boys or robbers. At once the soul becomes fearful. There is a distress and disorder in the mind, depression, hatred for holy persons, melancholy, sadness, remembrance of neighbors, fear of death, lastly a desire for evil, torpor in virtue, and an upsetting of character." [58]

St. Hilarion

Antony's work was continued by Hilarion and Pachomius

[58] St. Athanasius, *Life of St. Antony,* chap. 18. "What is known as the Rule of St. Antony is a work by some monk of a later period, who took its elements from the Saint's life, from the writings attributed to him, and from the sermons of Abbot Isaias." (Besse, art. *"Antoine,"* in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*)

from 305 to 320. About the year 310, Hilarion made Gaza, a city of Palestine, a center of the eremetical life, modeled on that which St. Antony had established in the Thebaid. "Hilarion," says St. Jerome, "was a native of the town of Tabatha, which is located five miles from Gaza in Palestine. His parents were idolators. They sent him to Alexandria, where he soon gave evidence, considering his age, of talent and character. He was beloved by all and showed a capacity for the art of speaking. Having embraced faith in Jesus, our Lord, he did not feel attracted by the excitement of the circus, or by the bloody games of the arena, or by the immodest dramas of the theater. His only pleasure was in the assembly of the faithful. Having heard mention of the famous Antony, he was kindled with a desire to know the servant of God and set out for the desert. For almost three months he contemplated the regularity of the holy Patriarch's life and the seriousness of his conduct. . . . When he came back home with a few monks, his parents were dead. His possessions he shared with his brethren and the poor, keeping nothing for himself. Thus stripped of everything, and clad only with the armor of Christ, he penetrated into that desert which, seven miles from Majoma, lies to the left as one goes into Egypt. His frail body he clothed in a skin cloak, which he had received from Antony when leaving him, and a peasant's coat. He settled down in a vast and frightful wilderness, between the sea and the marsh, limiting his daily food to fifteen dry figs, which he ate after sunset. The devil made appeal to his senses. But the young man struck his breast all the harder to drive away evil thoughts by bruising his body. He was assiduous at prayer; he sang psalms. He plowed the ground. He weaved grass baskets, after the example of the monks of Egypt and in accord with St. Paul's words: 'If any man will not work, neither let him eat.' "

Many temptations assailed him; and many were the snares which the demons laid for him night and day. But many also

were the miracles which God gave him the grace to perform: the curing of sick people, the driving out of demons, the taming of wild beasts.[59] The report of his miracles and virtues drew to him multitudes of visitors, who brought sick persons and demoniacs, or who merely asked him to bless them. But, continues his biographer, "he wept every day, remembering with inconceivable regret the solitary life which he used formerly to lead. 'I have returned to the world,' he said. 'Alas, I have received my reward in this life.' Let others admire his miracles," says St. Jerome, "let them admire his knowledge and his austerity. What amazes me is his contempt for glory and honors. Bishops and priests came to him in his retreat, clergy and monks flocked to him, and many Christian ladies, not to mention the common people of the cities and country. Men in high position and officials came, too. But he longed only for solitude." He died at the age of eighty years. "While his breast scarcely held a trace of warmth, he opened his eyes and said: 'Go forth, what do you fear, go forth, my soul, why do you hesitate? For nigh on seventy years you have been serving Christ, and do you dread death?' With these words he breathed forth his spirit." [60]

St. Pachomius

The manner of life adopted by St. Hilarion and the Palestinian monks who placed themselves under his leadership did not differ from the régime followed by St. Antony and his Egyptian monks. St. Pachomius marks a further step in the organization of the monastic life. To him we owe the foundation of the common or cenobitical life in Upper Egypt.[61]

Pachomius was born in the vicinity of Esna, not far from

[59] For these miracles, see St. Jerome, *Vita S. Hilarionis.*

[60] These fragments of St. Jerome's writings may be found in his *Vie d'Hilarion,* translated by De Labriolle.

[61] From *κοινός* (common) and *βίος* (life).

Thebes.[62] Entering the imperial army when he was twenty years old, he was impressed by the charity with which Christians gave away food that was indispensable to soldiers on the march. Never had he seen anything like this among the pagans. Taking pains to learn something about the character and the religion of his benefactors, he found that they devoted themselves to these works of mercy out of love for Jesus Christ, God made man, and the Savior of men. Then, says his biographer, Pachomius addressed the following prayer to God: "My God, who hast made Heaven and earth, if Thou wilt deign to make known to me how I ought to serve Thee, I promise to follow Thy will, and with love of all men, conformably to Thy commands, I will perform all the offices of charity toward them." [63]

As soon as he left the military service, Pachomius withdrew to the village of Shenesit, to a ruin called "the temple of Serapis." There he cultivated a few vegetables and, with the product of his labor, succored the poor of the district and travellers who passed along the highway. But upon hearing of a holy monk who lived not far from this village, he betook himself thither to put himself under his direction. This venerable monk was named Palamon. According to the narrative of an old biographer, Palamon opened the door of his cell a little and said to the stranger: "You cannot become a monk here. Go try elsewhere first. My rule is too severe for a beginner. I fast every day in the summer; during the winter I eat only bread and salt and every second day a vegetable; I pass half the night singing the psalms or meditating on the Scriptures; sometimes I even spend the whole night without sleeping." Pachomius said: "I hope from our Lord Jesus Christ, aided by your prayers, to persevere in this sort of life

[62] Now Latopolis.

[63] This quotation and the various details of St. Pachomius' life are taken from documents cited by Ladeuze, *Études sur le cénobitisme pakhômien*, Paris, 1898.

until death." He was then admitted to share the life of the saintly old man.[64]

Shortly afterwards Pachomius, venturing forth as far as the abandoned village of Tabennesi, heard a voice from Heaven calling to him: "Stay here and build a monastery, for many persons desiring to embrace the monastic life will come to you here." The village of Tabennesi was situated on the eastern bank of the Nile, near the place where the river makes a sharp turn, north of Thebes.[65] The event took place about 318.[66] Pachomius obeyed the mysterious voice, and things happened as he had been told.

Such was the origin of the first cenobitical community. Pachomius regarded it as an advance upon the anchoretic life practiced about him. "The life of a cenobite," he said, "is more perfect than that of an anchorite, by reason of the virtues which daily association with the brethren obliges him to practice. Moreover, the brethren are stimulated by seeing the labors and virtues of others. The imperfect exercise us in mortification, and the perfect show us the path we should follow." We must suppose that the isolated life had some disadvantages which were perhaps encouraged by odd or indiscreet practices.[67]

The evolution of the anchoretic into the cenobitical life took place gradually. Pachomius enlarged his dwelling in the measure that additional disciples came to live with him; but many were satisfied to put up huts close by. Pachomius gave them

[64] A few solitaries, who had settled in the neighborhood, seem to have lived under the spiritual direction of Palamon. But it is a mistake to regard this as a first organization of the cenobitic life. (Ladeuze, *op. cit.*, p. 164.)

[65] Leclercq, art. *"Cénobitisme,"* in the *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, II, col. 3092.

[66] Lacot, Introduction to the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius, p. iv.

[67] In the West the development was different. There the cenobitic life appears only as a step toward anchoretism. The Carthusian rule is regarded as a more perfect form of the Benedictine. No doctrinal contradiction is implied in the two movements. The contemplative life is *in se* the highest degree of perfection; but it needs to be safeguarded by protective institutions and probations.

rules as close to his ideal as possible. Thus he persuaded them to put the price of their labors into a common fund and to take their meals together.

When the number of disciples who were resolved to lead the common life reached one hundred, Pachomius built a church in his monastery. Soon, at a little distance from Tabennesi, a second monastery had to be erected at Pbow. A few years later, there were nine such monasteries. Pachomius then moved to Pbow. Thereafter the plenary gatherings were held at Pbow, the headquarters of the new congregation.

It was truly a religious congregation. Each monastery formed as it were a little city, encompassed with walls. Within the enclosure stood several houses, each containing about forty monks, grouped according to the nature of their work. There were also streets and quarters.

The biographer of St. Pachomius relates that one day his sister came to see him and expressed a desire to embrace the perfect life. Pachomius said to her: "Examine yourself, and if God calls you, my brethren will build a cell and a little altar for you near the village." Soon a monastery was needed, for several pious women placed themselves under the direction of Pachomius' sister. Such was the origin of monasteries for women in the East.

The rule which the new founder gave his monks was naturally milder than that which most of the ascetics imposed upon themselves. Wishing to render it uniform and accessible to all, he was obliged to take account of a certain average of physical strength and fervor. The austerity of the rule was moderated. Besides, it was pliant. "Know you not," said the kind Patriarch, "that certain brethren, especially the younger ones, have need of some relaxation and rest?" He also said: "To the generosity of each one leave the initiative of a greater mortification. Serve the table abundantly, that each one may deny himself and advance in virtue according to his fervor."

Palladius has preserved for us a summary of the Pachomian rule. Every one was allowed to eat according to the needs of his health. The labors were proportioned to the strength of the brethren. The food was eaten in a single place. When every one was ready to eat, a psalm was sung. The monks ate their meals in silence, their head being covered with a hood. Each one had to learn the New Testament by heart and be able to recite the entire Psalter without a book. A three years' novitiate was of obligation for any candidate who presented himself. During that time he was engaged especially in corporal works. At the end of the three years of probation he was admitted to the choir. Every one wore a sleeveless linen tunic, gathered in at the waist by a cincture, and over this a cloak of goatskin and a hooded cowl. They slept in a partly reclining position, covered by a blanket.[68]

Palladius says that soon several monasteries had thousands of monks.[69]

"When Athanasius went up the Nile to visit, as far as the higher Thebaid, these numerous communities whose fidelity appeared to him the principal bulwark of orthodoxy, Pachomius led an immense army of monks to meet the stranger, all chanting hymns, and burning with the spirit which should vanquish and bury all the heresies. This was the first review of the new army of the Church." [70]

This new army soon found its task for the defense of the faith and of discipline. The Constantinian peace did not remove every threat of storm. Constantine inaugurated the protection of the Church by the State. But this was neither gratuitous nor free from danger. The transfer of the imperial capital to the East might become an occasion of schism. The century that witnessed the birth of Antony and Pachomius,

[68] Palladius, *Lausiac History*, tr. by W. K. L. Clarke, chap. 32.
[69] *Ibid.*, p. 115.
[70] Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, I, 310.

likewise saw Arius appear. In the future, schisms and heresies would be the more formidable since they might hope to win to their side the imperial good will. But cenobitism was to increase. From the East it reached the West and spread over the Christian world. In its ranks the Church found her most devoted sons. From St. Athanasius to St. Augustine, from St. Augustine to St. Boniface, from St. Boniface to St. Gregory VII, monachism gave to the Church her most valiant apologists, her most profound scholars, her bravest missioners, and her greatest popes.

APPENDIX I

The Primitive Canon of the Mass

WHAT was the early canon of the Mass? Was there a primitive and essential formula from which all the liturgies sprang? Until recent years this problem seemed insoluble. The discovery of documents of great worth and the patient labor undertaken in their study by Dom Paul Cagin, a Benedictine of Solesmes, seem to furnish a solution.

By comparing five of these documents, in particular the *Canonum Reliquiae,* Latin palimpsest fragments of Verona, and the *Testamentum Domini,* a Syriac manuscript first published in 1899 by Monsignor Rahmani, patriarch of the uniate Syrians, Dom Cagin concludes that the original document, of which these are successive translations of one another, is a Greek text, the Verona manuscript being a Latin translation of it. The following is the Verona formula:

Gratias tibi referimus, Deus per dilectum puerum tuum Jesum Christum, quem in ultimis temporibus misisti nobis Salvatorem et Redemptorem et angelum voluntatis tuae, qui est Verbum tuum inseparabilem, per quem omnia fecisti, et beneplacitum tibi fuit; misisti de caelo in matricem Virginis, quique in utero habitus incarnatus est, et Filius tibi ostensus est ex Spiritu Sancto et Virgine natus; qui voluntatem tuam complens, et populum sanctum tibi adquirens, extendit manus, cum pateretur, ut a passione liberaret eos qui in te crediderunt; qui, cumque traderetur voluntariae passioni, ut mortem solvat et vincula diaboli dirumpat, et infernum calcet, et justos illuminet, et terminum figat, et resurrectionem manifestet, accipiens panem, gratias tibi agens, dixit: accipite, manducate: hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis confringetur. Similiter et calicem, dicens: hic

est sanguis meus, qui pro vobis effunditur; quando hoc facitis, meam commemorationem facitis. Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis ejus, offerimus tibi panem et calicem, gratias tibi agentes, quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare. Et petimus ut mittas Spiritum tuum Sanctum in oblationem sanctae Ecclesiae; in unum congregans, des omnibus, qui percipiunt sanctis, in repletionem Spiritus Sancti, ad confirmationem fidei in veritate, ut te laudemus et glorificemus per puerum tuum Jesum Christum, per quem tibi gloria et honor, Patri et Filio cum Sancto Spiritu, in sancta Ecclesia tua, et nunc et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

We give Thee thanks, O God, through Thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ, whom in the last times Thou hast sent us as Savior and Redeemer and messenger [angel] of Thy will; who is Thy Word inseparable, by whom Thou hast made all things and [in whom] Thou hast been well pleased; [whom] Thou didst send from Heaven into the womb of the Virgin, and who in her womb was incarnate and has been shown Thy Son, being born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin; who, fulfilling Thy will and winning for Thee a holy people, extended His hands when He suffered, to deliver by His Passion those who have believed in Thee; whom, when He was delivered to His freely accepted Passion, that He might destroy death and break the bonds of the devil and trample under foot hell and illumine the just and put an end and manifest the resurrection, said, taking bread [and] giving thanks: Take, eat, this is My body which will be broken for you. In like manner [He took] the chalice, saying: This is My blood which is shed for you; when you do this, you make commemoration of Me. We, remembering therefore His death and resurrection, offer Thee the bread and the chalice, giving Thee thanks, because Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and to minister to Thee. And we ask that Thou send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of the holy Church, that gathering [them] into one, Thou give to all the saints who receive [it] the fulness of the Holy Ghost for the confirmation of the faith in the truth, that we may praise and glorify Thee through Thy Son Jesus Christ, through whom may be to Thee glory and honor, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Ghost, in Thy holy Church, now and for all ages. Amen.

"This is evidently a preface; but it contains the principal elements of the Canon of the Mass in all the liturgies: the account of the Last Supper, the words of consecration, the *Anamnesis,* the oblation of the sacrifice, a rudimentary *Epiklesis* with a view to the people's communion, and the Trinitarian doxology. This prayer is, therefore, both a preface and a Mass; it is an embryonic Mass, in which the thanksgiving continues from beginning to end. This Mass is a Eucharist in the full sense of the term." [1]

How ancient is this formulary? The learned Benedictine whom we have just quoted refers it to Apostolic times. He regards as a well established fact that the formulary inserted in the *Testament of Our Lord* depends upon the primitive Greek text with interpolations conceived in the sense of the Monarchian heresy. Hence this interpolated text, by its archaisms, bears traces of a very early origin. It alludes to "charisms" which took place only in the first century. We read, for example, *"Eos qui sunt in charismatibus . . . sustine, . . . qui habent virtutem linguarum robora,"* etc. "This allusion to the charisms is equivalent to a birth-certificate for a text that so abounds in reference to them." [2]

[1] Souben, *"Le Canon primitif de la messe,"* in the *Questions ecclésiastiques,* April, 1909.

[2] Consequently little importance attaches to the date of the compilation which has inserted this early text. It bears in itself the evidence of its antiquity. (See also Cagin, *L'Eucharistia, canon primitif de la messe,* and *L'Anaphore apostolique et ses témoins.*)

APPENDIX II

Letter from the Churches of Lyons and Vienne to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia [1]

The servants sojourning in Vienne and Lyons in Gaul to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, who have the same faith and hope of redemption as you. Peace, grace, and glory from God the Father and Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The greatness of the persecution here, and the terrible rage of the heathen against the saints, and the suffering of the blessed martyrs, are more than we can narrate accurately, nor can they be put down in writing. For with all his might the adversary attacked us, foreshadowing his coming which is shortly to be, and tried everything, practising his adherents and training them against the servants of God, so that we were not merely excluded from houses and baths and markets, but we were even forbidden to be seen at all in any place whatever. But against them the grace of God did captain us; it rescued the weak, and marshalled against them steadfast pillars of men able by patience to draw to themselves all the attack of the enemy. They came together and endured every kind of abuse and punishment, they counted many things as few in their zeal for Christ, and did indeed prove that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us.

First they endured nobly all that was heaped upon them by the mob, howls and stripes and dragging about, and rapine and imprisonment and stoning, and all things which are wont to happen at the hands of an infuriated populace against its supposed enemies and foes. Then they were dragged into the market-place by the tribune and by the chief authorities of the city, were indicted and confessed, and at last

[1] This letter, written in 177, is one of the most perfect documents of Christian antiquity. Its authenticity is unquestioned. (Our English version is taken from Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* V, i, translated by Kirsopp Lake, in the Loeb Classical Library.—*Tr.*)

they were shut up until the coming of the governor. Then they were brought before the governor, and when he used all his cruelty against them, then intervened Vettius Epagathus, one of the brethren, filled with love towards God and towards his neighbor, the strictness of whose life had gone so far that in spite of his youth his reputation was equal to that of the elder Zacharias. He walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless and was unwearied in all ministrations to his neighbors, having much zeal toward God and being fervent in spirit. His character forbade him to endure the unreasonable judgment given against us and, overcome with indignation, he asked to be heard himself in defence of the brethren to the effect that there was nothing atheistic or impious among us. He was howled down by those around the judgment-seat, for he was a man of position, and the governor would not tolerate the just requests which he had put forward, but merely asked if he were a Christian himself. He then confessed in clear tones and was himself taken into the ranks of the martyrs. He was called the "Comforter of Christians," but had the Comforter in himself, the spirit of Zacharias which he had shown by the fulness of his love when he chose to lay down even his own life for the defence of the brethren, for he was and he is a true disciple of Christ, and he follows the Lamb whereso-ever He goes.

The rest were then divided and the first martyrs were obviously ready, and they fulfilled the confession of martyrdom with all readiness, but some others appeared not to be ready, and failed in training and in strength, unable to endure the strain of a great conflict, and about ten in number failed, as those born out of due time. They caused us great grief and immeasurable mourning, and hindered the zeal of the others who had not been arrested. Yet they, although suffering all the terrors, nevertheless remained with the martyrs and did not desert them.

But at that point we were all greatly terrified by uncertainty as to their confession, not fearing the threatened punishment but looking towards the end and afraid lest some one should fall away. Yet day by day those who were worthy went on being arrested, completing their number, so as to collect from the two churches all the zealous and those through whom the life of the locality was kept together.

There were also arrested certain heathen slaves of our members, since the governor had publicly commanded that we should all be prosecuted, and these by the snare of Satan, fearing the tortures which they saw the saints suffering, when the soldiers urged them, falsely accused us of Thyestian feasts and Oedipodean intercourse, and things which it is not right for us either to speak of or to think of or even to believe that such things could ever happen among men. When this rumor spread all men turned like beasts against us, so that even if any had formerly been lenient for friendship's sake, they then became furious and raged against us, and there was fulfilled that which was spoken by our Lord, that "the time will come when whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." Then at last the holy martyrs endured sufferings beyond all description, for Satan was striving to wring some blasphemy even from them.

All the fury of the mob and of the governor and of the soldiers was raised beyond measure against Sanctus, the deacon from Vienne, and against Maturus, who was a novice, but a noble contender, and against Attalus, a Pergamene by race, who had always been a pillar and support of the Christians there, and against Blandina, through whom Christ showed that things which are mean and obscure and contemptible among men are vouchsafed great glory with God because of the love towards Him shown in power and not boasted of in appearance.

For while we were all afraid, and her human mistress, who was herself one of the contenders among the martyrs, was in distress lest she should not be able, through the weakness of her body, to be bold enough even to make confession, Blandina was filled with such power that she was released and rescued from those who took turns in torturing her in every way from morning until evening, and they themselves confessed that they were beaten, for they had nothing left to do to her, and they marvelled that she still remained alive, seeing that her whole body was broken and opened, and they testified that any one of these tortures was sufficient to destroy life, even when they had not been magnified and multiplied. But the blessed woman, like a noble athlete, kept gaining in vigor in her confession, and found comfort and rest and freedom from pain from

what was done to her by saying, "I am a Christian woman, and nothing wicked happens among us."

Sanctus also himself endured nobly, beyond measure or human power, all the ill-treatment of men, for though the wicked hoped through persistence and the rigor of his tortures to wring from him something wrong, he resisted them with such constancy that he did not even tell his own name, or the race or the city whence he was, nor whether he was slave or free, but to all questions answered in Latin, "I am a Christian." This he said for name and city and race and for everything else, and the heathen heard no other sound from him. For this reason the governor and the torturers were very ambitious to subdue him, so that when they had nothing left at all to do to him, at last they fastened plates of heated brass to the tenderest parts of his body. His limbs were burning, but he continued himself unbending and unyielding, firm in his confession, refreshed and strengthened by the heavenly spring of the water of life which proceeds forth from the body of Christ. His body was a witness to his treatment; it was all one wound and bruise, wrenched and torn out of human shape, but Christ suffering in him manifested great glory, overthrowing the adversary and showing for the example of the others how there is nothing fearful where there is the love of the Father, nor painful where there is the glory of Christ. For when the wicked after some days again tortured the martyr, they thought that they might overcome him now that his body was swollen and inflamed if they applied the same tortures, seeing that he could not even endure to be touched by the hand, or that by dying under torture he would put fear into the rest. Yet not only did nothing of this kind happen, but, beyond all human expectation, he raised himself up and his body was straightened in the subsequent tortures, and he regained his former appearance and the use of his limbs, so that through the grace of Christ the second torturing became not torment but cure.

Biblis, too, one of those who had denied, did the devil bring to torture (thinking that he had already swallowed her up and wishing to condemn her through blasphemy as well), to force her to say impious things about us, as though she were already broken and weak. But she recovered under torture and, as it were, woke

up out of deep sleep, being reminded through this transitory punishment of the eternal torments in hell, and contradicted the blasphemers, saying, "How would such men eat children, when they are not allowed to eat the blood even of irrational animals?" And after this she confessed herself a Christian and was added to the ranks of the martyrs.

But when the tyrant's torments had been brought to naught by Christ through the endurance of the blessed saints, the devil thought of other devices, imprisonment in the jail in darkness and in the most horrible place, and stretching their feet in the stocks, separated to the fifth hole, and the other outrages which angry warders filled with the devil are accustomed to inflict on the prisoners. Thus most of them were strangled in the prison, being all those whom the Lord had chosen thus to depart manifesting His glory. Some were tortured so cruelly that it seemed impossible for them to live even if they had had every care, yet survived in the prison, bereft of human attention, but strengthened by the Lord and given power in body and soul, and looking after and comforting the rest. But the younger ones, who had lately been arrested, whose bodies had not become accustomed to it, did not endure the burden of confinement, but died in prison.

The blessed Pothinus, who had been entrusted with the ministry of the bishopric at Lyons, was over ninety years old and very weak physically. He was scarcely breathing through the physical weakness which had already come upon him, but was strengthened by zeal of spirit through urgent desire of martyrdom. He was dragged before the judgment-seat, and although his body was weakened by old age and disease, his soul was kept in him in order that through it Christ might triumph. He was brought by soldiers to the judgment-seat; the local authorities accompanied him, and all the populace, uttering all kinds of howls at him as though he was Christ Himself, but he gave noble testimony. When asked by the governor, who was the God of the Christians, he said, "If you are worthy, you will know." And then he was dragged about without mercy, and suffered many blows; for those who were near ill-treated him with feet and hands and in every way, without respect even for his old age, and those who were at a distance each threw at him whatever he had at hand,

and all thought that it would be a great transgression and impiety to omit any abuse against him. For they thought that in this way they would vindicate their gods. And he was thrown into prison scarcely breathing and after two days yielded up the ghost.

Then a great dispensation of God was given, and the measureless mercy of Jesus was so manifested, as has rarely happened among the brethren, but is not beyond the skill of Christ. For those who at the first arrest had denied were imprisoned themselves and shared in the terrors, for this time not even their denial was any advantage to them; but those who confessed, were imprisoned as Christians, no other accusation being brought against them, the others however were held as murderers and foul persons and punished twice as much as the rest. For the burden of the former was lightened by the joy of martyrdom and the hope of the promises, and by love towards Christ and by the Spirit of the Father; but the latter were greatly punished by their conscience so that they were conspicuous among all the rest by their faces when they were taken out. For some went forth gladly; glory and great grace were mingled on their faces, so that they wore even their fetters as a becoming ornament, like a bride adorned with golden lace of many patterns, and they were perfumed with the sweet savor of Christ, so that some supposed that they had been anointed with worldly unguents; but the others were depressed and humble and wretched and filled with every kind of unseemliness, and in addition were insulted by the heathen as ignoble and cowardly; they had gained the accusation of murder, but had lost the name which is full of honor and glory and gives life. When the others saw this they were strengthened and those who were arrested confessed without hesitation and gave no thought to the arguments of the devil.

After this the testimony of their death fell into every kind of variety. For they wove various colors and all kinds of flowers into one wreath to offer to the Father, and so it was necessary for the noble athletes to undergo a varied contest, and after great victory to receive the great crown of immortality. Maturus and Sanctus and Blandina and Attalus were led forth to the wild beasts, to the public, and to a common exhibition of the inhumanity of the heathen, for the day of fighting with beasts was specially appointed for the

Christians. Maturus and Sanctus passed again through all torture in the amphitheater as though they had suffered nothing before, but rather as though, having conquered the opponent in many bouts, they were now striving for his crown, once more they ran the gauntlet in the accustomed manner, endured the worrying of the wild beasts, and everything which the maddened public, some in one way, some in another, were howling for and commanding, finally the iron chair on which the roasting of their own bodies clothed them with its reek. Their persecutors did not stop even here, but went on growing more furious, wishing to conquer their endurance, yet gained nothing from Sanctus beyond the sound of the confession which he had been accustomed to make from the beginning.

Thus after a long time, when their life still remained in them through the great contest, they were at last sacrificed, having been made a spectacle to the world throughout that day as a substitute for all the variations of gladiatorial contests. But Blandina was hung on a stake and offered as a prey to the wild beasts that were let in. She seemed to be hanging in the shape of a cross, and by her continuous prayer gave great zeal to the combatants, while they looked on during the contest, and with their outward eyes saw in the form of their sister Him who was crucified for them, to persuade those who believe in Him that all who suffer for the glory of Christ have forever fellowship with the living God. Then, when none of the beasts would touch her, she was taken down from the stake and brought back into the jail, and was thus preserved for another contest, in order that by winning through more trials she might make irrevocable the condemnation of the crooked serpent, and might encourage the brethren. For small and weak and despised as she was, she had put on the great and invincible athlete, Christ; she had overcome the adversary in many contests, and through the struggle had gained the crown of immortality.

But Attalus was himself loudly called for by the crowd, for he was well known. He went in, a ready combatant, for his conscience was clear, and he had been nobly trained in Christian discipline and had ever been a witness for truth among us. He was led round the amphitheater and a placard was carried before him, on which was written in Latin, "This is Attalus, the Christian." The people were

very bitter against him, but when the governor learnt that he was a Roman, he commanded him to be put back with the rest, who were in the jail, about whom he had written to the emperor and was waiting for a reply.

But the intervening time was not idle or fruitless for them, but through their endurance was manifested the immeasurable mercy of Christ, for through the living the dead were being quickened and martyrs gave grace to those who had denied. And there was great joy to the Virgin Mother who had miscarried with them as though dead, and was receiving them back alive. For through them the majority of those who had denied were again brought to birth and again conceived and quickened again, and learned to confess, and now alive and vigorous, made happy by God, who wills not the death of the sinner, but is kind towards repentance, went to the judgment-seat, in order that they might again be interrogated by the governor. For Caesar had written that they should be tortured to death, but that if any should recant they should be let go, and at the beginning of the local feast (and this is widely attended by the concourse of all the heathen to it) the governor led them to the judgment-seat, making a show and spectacle of the blessed men to the mob. He accordingly examined them again, beheaded all who appeared to possess Roman citizenship, and sent the rest to the beasts. And Christ was greatly glorified by those who had formerly denied but then confessed contrary to the expectation of the people. For they were examined by themselves with the intention of then letting them go, but confessed and were added to the ranks of the martyrs. Those indeed remained without who had never had any vestige of faith, nor perception of the bridal garment, nor idea of the fear of God, but even through their behavior blasphemed the Way—they are the sons of perdition—but all the rest were added to the Church. When they too were being examined a certain Alexander, a Phrygian by race and a physician by profession, who had lived in Gaul for many years and was known to almost every one for his love toward God and boldness of speech (for he was not without a share of the apostolic gift) stood by the judgment-seat and by signs encouraged them to confession and seemed to those who were standing by as though he were in travail. But the crowd, angry that those

who had formerly denied were confessing again, howled at Alexander as though he were responsible for this. The governor summoned him and asked him who he was, and when he said "a Christian," he flew into a rage and condemned him to the beasts. And the next day he went into the arena together with Attalus; for to please the mob the governor had given Attalus back to the beasts. They passed through all the instruments of torture which were prepared in the amphitheater, and endured a great contest. Finally they too were sacrificed. Alexander uttered neither groan nor moan at all, but conversed with God in his heart, and Attalus, when he was put on the iron chair and was being burned, and the reek arose from his body, said to the crowd in Latin, "Lo, this which you are doing is to eat men, but we neither eat men nor do anything else wicked." And when he was asked what name God has, he replied, "God has not a name as a man has."

In addition to all this, on the last day of the gladiatorial sports, Blandina was again brought in with Ponticus, a boy of about fifteen years old, and they had been brought in every day to see the torture of the others, and efforts were made to force them to swear by the idols, and the mob was furious against them because they had remained steadfast and disregarded them, so that there was neither pity for the youth of the boy nor respect for the sex of the woman. They exposed them to all the terrors and put them through every torture in turn, trying to make them swear, but not being able to do so. For Ponticus was encouraged by the Christian sister, so that even the heathen saw that she was exhorting and strengthening him, and after nobly enduring every torture he gave up his spirit.

But the blessed Blandina, last of all, like a noble mother who had encouraged her children and sent them forth triumphant to the king, having herself endured all the tortures of her children, hastened to them, rejoicing and glad at her departure as though invited to a marriage feast rather than cast to the beasts. And after scourging, after the beasts, after the grid-iron, she was at last put in a net and thrown to a bull. She was tossed about a long time by the beast, having no more feeling for what happened to her through her hope and hold on what had been entrusted to her and her converse with Christ. And so she too was sacrificed, and the heathen themselves

confessed that never before among them had a woman suffered so much and so long.

Not even thus was their madness and cruelty to the saints satisfied, for, incited by a wild beast, wild and barbarous tribes could scarcely stop, and their violence began again in a new way on the bodies. For that they had been conquered did not shame them, because they had no human reason, but it rather inflamed their wrath as of a wild beast, and the governor and the people showed the like unrighteous hatred against us, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, "Let him that is unlawful be unlawful still, and he that is righteous be righteous still." For those who had been strangled in the jail they threw to the dogs, and watched carefully night and day that none should be cared for by us. Then they threw out the remains left by the beasts and by the fire, torn and charred, and for many days watched with a military guard the heads of the rest, together with their trunks, all unburied. And some raged and gnashed their teeth at the remains, seeking some further vengeance from them, others laughed and jeered, glorifying their idols and ascribing to them the punishment of the Christians, and the gentler, who seemed to have a little sympathy, mocked greatly, saying, "Where is their god and what good to them was their worship, which they preferred beyond their lives?" Their conduct thus varied, but in our circle great grief obtained, because we could not bury the bodies in the earth, for night did not avail us for this, nor did money persuade nor entreaty shame, but in every way they watched, as though they would make some great gain, that the bodies should not obtain burial.

Thus the bodies of the martyrs, after having been exposed and insulted in every way for six days, and afterwards burned and turned to ashes, were swept by the wicked into the river Rhone, which flows near by, that not even a relic of them might still appear upon the earth. And this they did as though they could conquer God and take away their rebirth in order, as they said, "that they might not even have any hope of resurrection, through trusting in which they have brought in strange and new worship and despised terrors, going readily and with joy to death; now let us see if they will rise again, and if their God be able to help them and to take them out of our hands."

And they carried so far their zeal and imitation of Christ, "who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," that for all their glory, and though they had testified not once or twice, but many times, and had been taken back from the beasts and were covered with burns and scars and wounds, they neither proclaimed themselves martyrs, nor allowed us to address them by this title. But if ever any one of us called them martyrs either in a letter or in speech, they rebuked him sharply. For they gladly conceded the title of marytrdom to Christ, the faithful and true martyr and first-born from the dead and author of the life of God. And they reminded us of the martyrs who had already passed away, and said, "they are already martyrs whom Christ vouchsafed to be taken up at their confession, and sealed their witness by their departure, but we are lowly and humble confessors." And they besought the brethren with tears, begging that earnest prayers might be made for their consecration. The power of martyrdom they actually showed, having great boldness toward the heathen, and they made plain their nobleness by endurance and absence of fear or timidity; but the title of martyr they refused from the brethren, for they were filled with the fear of God.

They humbled themselves under the mighty hand and by it they have now been greatly exalted. At that time they made defence for all men, against none did they bring accusation. They released all and bound none. And they prayed for those who had inflicted torture, even as did Stephen, the perfect martyr, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." And if he prayed for those who were stoning him, how much more for the brethren?

For their greatest contest, through the genuineness of their love, was this, that the beast should be choked into throwing up alive those whom he had at first thought to have swallowed down. For they did not boast over the fallen, but from their own abundance supplied with a mother's love those that needed, and shedding many tears for them to the Father, they prayed for life, and He gave it to them, and they divided it among their neighbors, and then departed to God, having in all things carried off the victory. They ever loved peace; peace they commended to us; and with peace they departed to God; for their mother they left behind no sorrow, and

for the brethren no strife and war, but glory, peace, concord, and love.

There was among them a certain Alcibiades, who was living a very austere life, and at first was not partaking of anything at all, but used merely bread and water and was trying to live thus even in the jail. But it was revealed to Attalus after the first contest which he underwent in the amphitheater that Alcibiades was not doing well in not making use of the creations of God, and offering an example of offence to others. Alcibiades was persuaded and began to partake of everything without restraint and gave thanks to God. For they were not without help from the grace of God, but the Holy Spirit was their counsellor.

APPENDIX III

List of the Martyrs of Lyons[1]

AT Lyons, in Gaul, these martyrs:

Pothinus, bishop; Zacharias, priest; Vittus, Macarius, Asclepiades, Silvius, Primus, Ulpius, Vitalis, Cominus, Octobres, Philemon, Geminus, Julius, Albinus, Grata, Potamia, Pampeia, Rodana, Biblis, Quartia, Materna, Elpis.

Those who were thrown to the beasts are: Sanctus, deacon; Martyrus, Attalus, Alexander, Ponticus, Blandina.

Those who died in prison are: Aristus, Cornelius, Zosimus, Titus, Julius, Zoticus, Apollo, Geminian, Julia, Ausonius, Emelia, Jamnica, Pompeia, Domna, Amelia, Justa, Trophima, Antonia.

All these servants of Christ were crowned in the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

And besides these: Vincent, Nina, Priscus, Sepaca, Hilary, Felix, Castula.

And also in the same city: Epagatus, Emelia, Donata.

[1] From the Hieronymian Martyrology (ed. De Rossi and Duchesne, 1894, p. 73).

APPENDIX IV

The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles [1]

CHAPTER I

1. There are two ways, one of life and one of death: and there is a great difference between the two ways.

2. The way of life is this: First, thou shalt love God who made thee; second, thy neighbor as thyself. And all things whatsoever thou dost not wish to be done to thee, those do not thou to another.

3. Now the teaching of these words is as follows: Bless those that curse you and pray for your enemies, and fast for those that persecute you. For what thank is it, if ye love them that love you? Do not even the Gentiles the same? But do ye love those that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy.

4. Abstain from fleshly and bodily desires. If any one give thee a blow on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and thou shalt be perfect. If a man compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. If a man take thy cloak, give him thy coat also. If a man take from thee what is thine, ask it not back, for, indeed, thou canst not.

5. Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask it not again; for the Father wills to give to all of his own gracious gifts. Blessed is he that giveth according to the commandment, for he is without guilt. Woe to him that receiveth. For if a man receiveth that hath

[1] This precious document, discovered and published in 1883 by Philotheus Bryennius, then metropolitan of Nicomedia, according to a manuscript in the library of the Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, is a writing of the earliest antiquity. Funk, Zahn, and Schaff date its composition between 80 and 100 of our era, probably "nearer 80 than 100" (Hemmer, *Les Pères apostoliques,* I, xxxv), "and perhaps even earlier" (Batiffol, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes,* p. 72). There is no document giving us more precise and reliable information about the life, customs, morals, and constitutions of Christianity at the period of its beginnings. (The English translation here given is taken from Cruttwell, *A Literary History of Early Christianity,* I, 63 ff.—*Tr.*)

need, he shall be guiltless. But he that hath no need shall be punished, because he received, and up to the amount; and being in durance, shall be examined as to his deeds, and shall not come out thence till he have paid the uttermost farthing.

6. Moreover it is laid down on his head. Let thine alms sweat within thine hands, until thou knowest to whom thou art giving it.

CHAPTER II

1. The second commandment of the teaching is:

2. Thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys, thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not deal in magic, thou shalt not make philtres, thou shalt not procure abortion, nor slay a child that is born. Thou shalt not covet that which is thy neighbor's.

3. Thou shalt not perjure thyself, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not speak ill of any one, thou shalt not bear a grudge.

4. Thou shalt not be double-minded or double-tongued. For a double tongue is a snare of death.

5. Thy word shall not be false or empty, but filled with accomplishment.

6. Thou shalt not be grasping nor greedy, nor a hypocrite, nor ill-natured, nor proud. Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbor.

7. Thou shalt not hate any one; but some thou shalt convince, and to some thou shalt give way, and others thou shalt love above thine own life.

CHAPTER III

1. My child, flee from evil, and from all that is like unto him.

2. Be not wrathful: for wrath leads to murder. Be not a zealot nor a wrangler nor passionate. For from all these things murders arise.

3. My child, be not lustful, for lust leadeth to fornication: nor of base converse, nor given to raising thy eyes, for from these things adulteries arise.

4. My child, be not a soothsayer: for this leadeth to idolatry;

nor given to charms, astrology, or lustrations, nor even be willing to look at them, for from all these things idolatry proceedeth.

5. My child, be not a liar: for a lie leadeth to theft; nor money-loving, nor vainglorious: for from all these things thefts arise.

6. My child, be not a murmurer, for it leadeth to blasphemy; nor conceited nor evil-thinking; for from all these things blasphemies arise.

7. But be meek, for the meek shall inherit the earth.

8. Be long-suffering and pitiful and guileless and quiet and good and reverencing continually the words which thou hast heard.

9. Thou shalt not exalt thyself, nor give rashness to thy soul. Thy soul shall not be joined with the lofty, but thou shalt hold converse with the just and the humble.

10. The troubles that befall thee receive as good things, knowing that nothing happeneth without God.

CHAPTER IV

1. My child, remember him that speaketh the Word of God to thee by day and by night. Thou shalt honor him as the Lord. For in whatsoever quarter the Lordship is spoken, there is the Lord.

2. Thou shalt seek out day by day the faces of the saints, that thou mayest rest in their words.

3. Thou shalt not make a division, but shalt set at one those that quarrel. Thou shalt judge justly, thou shalt not respect persons in convicting of transgressions.

4. Thou shalt not be of two minds whether a thing shall be or not.

5. Be not one to stretch out the hand for receiving and close it up for giving.

6. If thou hast money, thou shalt give it by thy hand as a ransom for thy sins.

7. Thou shalt not hesitate in giving nor murmur while thou givest: for thou shalt know who is the good recompenser of the reward.

8. Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in need, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are

thy own: for if we are sharers in the Immortal One, how much more in things mortal?

9. Thou shalt not remove thine hand from thy son or thy daughter, but shalt teach them from their youth up the fear of the Lord.

10. Thou shalt not command with bitterness thy slave or thy maiden, who hope in the same God, lest they fear not the God that is over you both. For He cometh not to call you by respect of persons, but those for whom He has made ready the Spirit.

11. And do ye, slaves, submit to your masters in reverence and fear as to a type of God.

12. Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy and all that is not pleasing to the Lord.

13. Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord, but shalt keep what thou hast received, neither adding thereto nor taking therefrom.

14. Thou shalt confess thy transgressions in the church, and shalt not come to thy prayer with an evil conscience.

CHAPTER V

1. And the way of death is this: First of all, it is evil and full of curse. Murders, adulteries, lusts, fornications, thefts, idolatries, magic, incantations, plunderings, false-witness, hypocrisies, double-heartedness, craftiness, pride, villainy, conceit, covetousness, base conversation, jealousy, rashness, loftiness, insolence.

2. Persecutors of good men, hating truth, loving a lie, not knowing the reward of righteousness, not joined to goodness nor to just judgment, asking not to do good but evil: far from whom is meekness and patience; loving vanity, pursuing compensation, not pitying the poor, not sorrowing over him that is in trouble, not knowing Him that made them, murderers of children, destroyers of the creation of God, turning away from him that is in need, grinding down the distressed, flatterers of the rich, unrighteous judges of the poor, full of all sin: may ye be delivered, my children, from all these.

CHAPTER VI

1. See that no one cause thee to wander from this way of doctrine, for such a one teaches thee apart from God.

2. For if thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect; but if not, do what thou canst.

3. In the matter of meat, bear what thou canst. But abstain strictly from meat offered to idols, for it is the service of dead gods.

CHAPTER VII

1. Concerning Baptism, baptize in this wise: Having said all these things beforehand, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in living water.

2. But if thou hast no living water, baptize in other water: and if thou art not able to use cold, use warm.

3. But if thou hast neither, pour water three times upon the head in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

4. Before Baptism, let the baptizer and the baptized fast with such others as can; and thou shalt require the baptized to fast one or two days beforehand.

CHAPTER VIII

1. Let not your fastings be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second and fifth days after the Sabbath: but do ye fast on the fourth and sixth days of the week.

2. Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in His Gospel, so pray ye: Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our offenses, as we also forgive our offenders. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the power and the glory for ever.

3. Use this prayer three times a day.

CHAPTER IX

1. Concerning the Eucharist, thus give thanks (or "celebrate the Eucharist").

2. First, concerning the cup—"We give Thee thanks, O Our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us by Jesus Thy Servant. Glory be to Thee for ever."

3. Concerning the broken bread—"We give Thee thanks, O Our Father, for the life and knowledge, which Thou hast made known to us by Jesus Thy Servant. Glory be to Thee for ever."

4. "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, and being gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power, through Jesus Christ, for ever."

5. Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist, except those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord. For concerning this the Lord hath said, "Give not that which is holy unto dogs."

CHAPTER X

1. After ye are filled, thus give thanks:

2. "We give Thee thanks, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name, which Thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou hast made known to us by Jesus Thy Servant. Glory be to Thee for ever."

3. "Almighty Lord, Thou hast created all things for the sake of Thy name. Thou hast given food and drink to men for enjoyment, that they may give Thee thanks, and Thou hast graciously given spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Servant."

4. "Before all things, we give thanks to Thee, because Thou art mighty. Glory be to Thee for ever."

5. "Lord, remember Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in Thy love, and gather it together, the sanctified one, from the four winds into Thy kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for it. For Thine is the power and the glory for ever."

6. "Let grace come, and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any is holy, let him come; if any is not so, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen."

7. Allow ye the prophets to give thanks as shall seem good to them.

CHAPTER XI

1. Whosoever shall come and teach you all these things aforesaid, receive him.

2. But if the teacher turn and teach another doctrine to destroy this, hear him not; but if he teach with a view to adding righteousness and knowledge of the Lord, receive him as the Lord.

3. Concerning the Apostles and Prophets, according to the decree of the Gospel, thus do.

4. Let every Apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord.

5. He shall remain one day, and if there be need, another day also; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet.

6. And when the Apostle cometh forth, let him not receive anything except bread until he go to rest; if he ask for money, he is a false prophet.

7. And every prophet that speaketh in the Spirit ye shall not try nor doubt: for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven.

8. Not every one that speaketh in the Spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the character of the Lord. By their characters a false prophet and a true prophet shall be known.

9. And every prophet that ordaineth a table in the Spirit shall not eat thereof: if otherwise, he is a false prophet.

10. And every prophet that teacheth the truth, if he do not what he teacheth, is a false prophet.

11. And every approved true prophet sacrificing at the earthly mystery of the Church, but not teaching to do what he himself doeth, shall not be judged of you: for he hath his judgment with God. For so also did the ancient prophets.

12. And whosoever shall say in the Spirit, Give me money or any other things, ye shall not hear him. But if he tell you to give in the matter of others that have need, let no one judge him.

CHAPTER XII

1. Let every one that cometh in the name of the Lord be received; and then, when ye have proved him, ye shall know him. For ye have the power of discernment on the right and on the left.

2. If he that cometh be a wayfarer, assist him so far as ye are able. But he shall not abide with you more than two days, or three, if there be a necessity.

3. But if he be willing to settle among you, being a crafstman, let him work and eat.

4. But if he have no handicraft, consider in your wisdom how he may not live with you as a Christian in idleness.

5. But if he will not do this, he is a trafficker in Christ. Beware of such.

CHAPTER XIII

1. Every true prophet who is willing to settle among you is worthy of his maintenance.

2. So also a true teacher is worthy, even as the laborer, of his maintenance.

3. Therefore all the firstfruits of the produce of the wine-press and the threshing-floor, and of the oxen and of the sheep, thou shalt take and give to the prophets. For they are your high-priests.

4. But if ye have no prophet, give it to the poor.

5. If thou makest a feast, take the firstfruits and give it according to the commandment.

6. Likewise, when thou openest a cask of wine or oil, take the first-fruits and give it to the prophets.

7. Of money also and of raiment, and of every possession take the firstfruits, and as it shall seem good to thee, give it according to the commandment.

CHAPTER XIV

1. On the Lord's day of the Lord gather together and break bread and offer the Eucharist, having first confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure.

2. Let every one that hath a dispute with his friend not come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not profaned.

3. For this is the word spoken by the Lord: "In every place and

time to bring to Me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles."

CHAPTER XV

1. Appoint to yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, meek men and without covetousness, true and approved. For they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers.

2. Do not therefore despise them; for they are those who are honored among you with the prophets and teachers.

3. Reprove one another not in wrath, but in peace, as ye have it in the Gospel: and to every one that misbehaveth against another let no one speak, nor let him be heard by you, until he repent.

4. Your prayers and your alms and all your actions so perform ye as ye have it commanded in the Gospel of the Lord.

CHAPTER XVI

1. Watch for your life. Let not your lamps be quenched, nor your loins be loosed, but be ye ready: for we know not the hour in which our Lord cometh.

2. Gather yourselves together frequently, seeking the things that are fitting for your souls; for the whole time of your faith shall not profit you unless ye be made perfect in the last time.

3. For in the last days shall the false prophets and corrupters be multiplied, and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall be turned into hate.

4. For by the increase of iniquity men shall hate and persecute and betray each other; and then shall the deceiver of the world appear as the Son of God, and shall do signs and wonders, and the earth shall be given over into his hands, and he shall do unlawful things which have never happened since the world began.

5. Then shall come the judgment of men into the fiery trial, and many shall be offended and perish. But those who remain in their faith shall be saved from the power of the curse.

6. And then shall the signs of the truth appear: first, the sign of the unrolling of heaven, then the sign of the voice of the trumpet, and the third shall be the resurrection of the dead.

7. Yet not of all the dead; but as it was said, "The Lord shall come, and all His saints with Him."

8. Then shall the world see the Lord coming above the clouds of heaven.

APPENDIX V

The Edict of Milan[1]

WHEN we, Constantine and Licinius, emperors, had an interview at Milan, and conferred together with respect to the good and security of the commonweal, it seemed to us that, amongst those things that are profitable to mankind in general, the reverence paid to the Divinity merited our first and chief attention, and that it was proper that the Christians and all others should have liberty to follow that mode of religion which to each of them appeared best; so that that God, who is seated in Heaven, might be benign and propitious to us, and to every one under our government: and therefore we judged it a salutary measure, and one highly consonant to right reason, that no man should be denied leave of attaching himself to the rites of the Christians or to whatever other religion his mind directed him, that thus the supreme Divinity to whose worship we freely devote ourselves might continue to vouchsafe His favor and beneficence to us. And accordingly we give you to know that, without regard to any provisos in our former orders to you concerning the Christians, all who choose that religion are to be permitted, freely and absolutely, to remain in it, and not to be disturbed any ways or molested. And we thought fit to be thus special in the things committed to your charge, that you might understand that the indulgence which we have granted in matters of religion to the Christians is ample and unconditional; and perceive at the same time that the open and free exercise of their respective religions is granted to all others, as well as to the Christians: for it befits the well-ordered State and the tranquillity of our times that each individual be allowed, according to his own

[1] The official text of this edict is recorded by Lactantius (*Death of the Persecutors,* 48), except the preamble, which we have only in Eusebius' Greek translation (*Ecclesiastical History,* X, 15). (The English translation here given is from volume XXII of the Ante-Nicene Library: *The Works of Lactantius,* tr. by William Fletcher, pp. 207 f.—*Tr.*)

choice, to worship the Divinity; and we mean not to derogate aught from the honor due to any religion or its votaries.

Moreover, with respect to the Christians, we formerly gave certain orders concerning the places appropriated for their religious assemblies; but now we will that all persons who have purchased such places, either from our exchequer or from any one else, do restore them to the Christians, without money demanded or price claimed, and that this be performed peremptorily and unambiguously; and we will also, that they who have obtained any right to such places by form of gift do forthwith restore them to the Christians: reserving always to such persons who have either purchased for a price, or gratuiously acquired them, to make application to the judge of the district, if they look on themselves as entitled to any equivalent from our beneficence.

All those places are, by your intervention, to be immediately restored to the Christians. And because it appears that, besides the places appropriated to religious worship, the Christians did possess other places, which belonged not to individuals, but to their society in general, that is, to their churches, we comprehend all such within the regulation aforesaid, and we will that you cause them all to be restored to the society or churches, and that without hesitation or controversy: provided always, that the persons making restitution without a price paid shall be at liberty to seek indemnification from our bounty.

In furthering all which things for the behoof of the Christians, you are to use your utmost diligence, to the end that our orders be speedily obeyed, and our gracious purpose in securing the public tranquillity promoted. So shall that divine favor which, in affairs of the mightiest importance, we have already experienced, continue to give success to us, and in our successes make the commonweal happy. And that the tenor of this our gracious ordinance may be made known unto all, we will that you cause it by your authority to be published everywhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume. The dates given are usually those of the latest edition. The abbreviations *P.G.* and *P.L.* stand for Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* and *Patrologia Latina.*

ABDIAS: *Historia certaminis apostolici* (in FABRICIUS: *Codex*).
ACHELIS, H.: *Virgines subintroductae,* 1902.
ACTA SANCTORUM, by the Bollandists.
ALBANÈS and CHEVALIER: *Gallia christiana novissima,* 1899.
ALÈS, Adhémar d': *La Théologie de Tertullien,* 1905.
La Théologie de saint Hippolyte, 1906.
ALLARD, Paul: *L'Art païen sous les empereurs chrétiens,* 1879.
Les Esclaves chrétiens, 1900.
Esclaves, serfs, et mainmortables, 1894.
Histoire des persécutions, 1903, 5 vols.
Ten Lectures on the Martyrs, tr. by Luigi Cappadelta, 1907.
ALLO, Bernard: *L'Evangile en face du syncrétisme païen,* 1910.
AMBROSE, St.: *De officiis* (*P.L.,* vol. 15).
De virginibus (*P.L.,* vol. 16).
Analecta Bollandiana.
Annales du Midi.
Apostolic Constitutions, tr. by Henry Tattam, 1848.
ARCHAMBAULT, Georges (ed.): *Justin's Dialogue,* 1909, 2 vols.
ARISTOTLE: *Politics,* tr. by W. L. Newman, 1887–1902, 4 vols.
ARNOBIUS: *Adversus gentes* (*P.L.,* vol. 5).
ASSEMANI, Giuseppe: *Bibliotheca orientalis,* 1719–28, 4 vols.
ATHANASIUS, St.: *De decretis nicaeni* (*P.G.,* vol. 25).
De sententia Dionysii (*P.G.,* vol. 25).
De synodis (*P.G.,* vol. 26).
Vita S. Antonii (*P.L.,* vol. 73).
ATHENAGORAS: *De resurrectione mortuorum* (*P.G.,* vol. 6).

AUBÉ, Benjamin: *Les Chrétiens dans l'empire romain,* 1881.
L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du III^e siècle, 1886.
Histoire des persécutions, 1875.
AUDOLLENT, Auguste: *Carthage romaine,* 1901.
AUGUSTINE, St.: *Breviculus collationis cum donatistis* (*P.L.,* vol. 43).
De civitate Dei (*P.L.,* vol. 41).
Confessiones (*P.L.,* vol. 32).
Contra Cresconium (*P.L.,* vol. 43).
Contra donatistas post collationem (*P.L.,* vol. 43).
Contra haereses (*P.L.,* vol. 42).
Contra litteras Petiliani (*P.L.,* vol. 43).
Enarratio in psalmos (*P.L.,* vols. 36, 37).
Epistolae (*P.L.,* vol. 33).
Sermo de Macch. (*P.L.,* vol. 39).
Tractatus in Joannem (*P.L.,* vol. 35).
AURELIUS, Marcus: *Meditations,* tr. by C. R. Haines, 1916.
AURELIUS VICTOR: *Historia Romana,* 1829, 2 vols.
AUSONIUS, tr. by H. G. E. White, 1919–21, 2 vols.
AZAMBUJA, Gabriel d': *Ce que le christianisme a fait pour la femme,* 1899.

BADET: *La Femme chrétienne au temps des persécutions,* 1901.
BALMES, James: *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe,* 1851.
BARDENHEWER, Otto: *Patrology,* tr. by Thomas J. Shahan, 1908.
BARNABAS, St.: *Epistle* (*P.G.,* vol. 2).
BARONIUS: *Annales ecclesiastici,* 1738–59, 38 vols.
BASIL, St.: *Homilies* (*P.G.,* vol. 31).
Letters (*P.G.,* vol. 32); tr. by Roy J. Deferrari, 1926–28, 2 vols.
BATIFFOL, Pierre: *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes; la littérature grecque,* 1897.
Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive, 1902–06, 2 vols.
Orpheus et l'Evangile, 1910.
Primitive Catholicism, tr. by Henri L. Brianceau, 1911.
BAUDRILLART, André: *La Charité aux premiers siècles du christianisme.*

BAUMGARTNER, Ephraem: *Eucharistie und Agape im Urchristentum,* 1909.

BELSER: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* 1901.

BENEDICT XIV: *De synodo dioecesana* (Migne, *Theologiae cursus,* vol. 25).

Opera, 1830–46, 18 vols.

BÉRENGER, Joseph: *Les Traditions provençales,* 1904.

BERGÈRE, Henri: *Étude historique sur les chorévêques,* 1905.

BERNARD, Auguste: *Le Temple d'Auguste et la nationalité gauloise,* 1864.

BESSE, J. M.: *D'où viennent les moines,* 1901.

Les Moines d'Orient, 1901.

BESTMANN, H. J.: *Geschichte der christlichen Sitte,* 1880.

BEURLIER, Emile: *Le Monde juif au temps de Jésus-Christ et des apôtres,* 1902, 2 vols.

Le Culte impérial, son histoire et son organisation depuis Auguste jusqu'à Justinien, 1891.

BOISSIER, Gaston: *Rome and Pompeii; Archaeological Rambles,* tr. by D. Havelock Fisher, 1905.

La Fin du paganisme, 1909, 2 vols.

La Religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins, 1892, 2 vols.

BOISSIEU, Alphonse de: *Inscriptions antiques de Lyon,* 1854.

BONNET, Max: *Acta sancti Thomae,* 1884.

BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne: *Continuity of Religion* (being part II of the *Discourse on Universal History*), tr. by Victor Day, 1930.

Œuvres (Guillaume ed.), 10 vols.

Œuvres (Lachat ed.), 1862–64, 31 vols.

Œuvres (Versailles ed.), 1815–19, 47 vols.

Œuvres oratoires, 1890, 6 vols.

BOUCHE, Charles F.: *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* 1785, 2 vols.

BOUCHE-LECLERCQ, Auguste: *L'Intolérance religieuse et la politique,* 1911.

BRÉHIER, Emile: *Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie,* 1908.

BROGLIE, Albert de: *L'Eglise et l'empire romain au IV^e^ siècle,* 1877–82, 6 vols.

Histoire et diplomatie, 1889.
BRUGÈRE: *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise.*
Bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1863–94.
BULLIOT, J. G.: *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Saint-Martin d'Autun,* 1849, 2 vols.
BURCKHARDT, Jacob: *Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen,* 1880.
BUXTORF, Joannes, *Synagoga judaica,* 1604.

CABROL, Bernard: *Le Livre de la prière antique,* 1921.
CAGIN, Paul: *Eucharistia, canon primitif de la messe,* 1912.
L'Anaphore apostolique et ses témoins, 1919.
Te Deum, ou Illatio, 1907.
CALIPPE, Charles: *Saint Paul et la cité chrétienne,* 1902.
CALMES, T.: *Comment se sont formés les Evangiles,* 1899.
L'Evangile selon saint Jean, 1904.
CANO, Melchior: *De locis theologicis* (Migne, *Theologiae cursus,* vol. 1).
CAPITOLINUS, Julius: *Historiae Augustae scriptores.*
CASSIAN: *Collationes* (*P.L.,* vol. 49).
Works, tr. by E. C. S. Gibson (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* vol. 11).
CAVALIERI, Franchi de': *Santa Agnese nella tradizione e nella leggenda,* 1899.
CAVALLERA, F.: *Saint Athanase,* 1908.
CÉZARD, Léonce: *Histoire juridique des persécutions,* 1911.
CHAMARD: *Les Origines de l'Eglise romaine.*
CHAMPAGNY, François de: *Les Antonins,* 1863, 3 vols.
Les Césars du III^e siècle, 1867, 4 vols.
La Charité chrétienne dans les premiers siècles de l'Eglise, 1856.
Rome et la Judée au temps de la chute de Neron, 1865, 2 vols.
CHATEAUBRIAND, François: *The Martyrs,* 1859.
CHENON, Emile: *Les Rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat,* 1913.
CHEVALIER and LEGENDRE: *Le Catholicisme et la société,* 1907.
Christus: Manuel d'histoire des religions (ed. by Joseph Huby), 1912.
CHRYSOSTOM, St. John: *De Babyla martyre.*
Homilies (*P.G.,* vols. 47–64).

CICERO: *De legibus,* tr. by Francis Barham.
Philippics, tr. by Walter C. A. Ker, 1926.
CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: *Excerpta a Theodoto* (*P.G.,* vol. 9).
Paidagogos (*P.G.,* vol. 8).
Rich Man's Salvation, 1919 (P.G., vol. 9), tr. by G. W. Butterworth.
Stromata (*P.G.,* vols. 8, 9), tr. by William Wilson, 1868.
CLEMENT OF ROME, St.: *Epistles to the Corinthians* (*P.G.,* vol. 1), *Homilies* (*P.G.,* vol. 2).
CORLUY: *Commentarium in Evangelium S. Joannis,* 1880.
CORNELY, Rudolf: *Introductio ad Novum Testamentum.*
Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum, 1888.
CRAMPON, Augustin: *La Sainte Bible.*
CRESCENZO, DI: *Un difensore di Nerone,* 1901.
CUMONT, Franz: *Texte et documents figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra,* 1896–99, 2 vols.
The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, 1911.
CYPRIAN, St.: *Opera* (*P.L.,* vol. 4).

DARBOY, Georges: *Œuvres de saint Denys l'Aréopagite,* 1896.
DAREMBERG (Victor) and SAGLIO (Edmund), editors: *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines.*
DELEHAYE, Hippolyte: *Les Origines du culte des martyrs,* 1912.
DENZINGER, Heinrich: *Enchiridion symbolorum,* 1908.
DESROCHES, J. P.: *Le Labarum,* 1894.
Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique.
Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne.
Dictionnaire d'architecture.
Dictionnaire de la Bible.
Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes.
Didache.
Didascalia Apostolorum: tr. into English, as *Horae Semiticae,* I and II.
DION CASSIUS: *Roman History,* tr. by Ernest Cary, 1914–27, 9 vols.
Diognetus, Letter to.
DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA: *Opera* (*P.G.,* vol. 10).
DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE, St.: *Opera* (*P.G.,* vols. 3, 4).

DÖLLINGER, Johann Joseph Ignaz v.: *Hippolytus and Callistus,* tr. by A. Plummer, 1876.

The First Age of Christianity and the Church, tr. by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, 1866, 2 vols.

The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple, tr. by N. Darnell, 1862, 2 vols.

DOULCET: *Essai sur les rapports de l'Eglise chrétienne avec l'Etat romain.*

DU CANGE, Charles: *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis,* 1733–36, 6 vols.

DUCHESNE, Louis: *Early History of the Christian Church,* 1909–24, 3 vols.

Christian Worship: its Origin and Evolution, tr. by M. L. McClure, 1912.

Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule, 1907, 2 vols.

Les Origines chrétiennes.

(ed.), *Liber Pontificalis,* 1892, 2 vols.

The Churches Separated from Rome, tr. by Arnold H. Matthew, 1907.

DUFOURCQ, Albert: *Avenir du Christianisme, première partie, le Passé chrétien,* 1910.

Saint Irénée, 1905.

DUGUET, Jacques Joseph: *Conférences ecclésiastiques,* 1742, 2 vols.

DUNCKER and SCHNEIDEWIN (eds.): *Hippolytus, Refutationis omnium haeresium libri decem,* 1856.

DURUY, Victor: *History of Rome and of the Roman People,* tr. by M. M. Ripley and W. J. Clarke, 1886, 8 vols.

EPHREM, St.: *Orationes* (*P.G.,* vol. 86).

EPIPHANIUS, St.: *Adversus haereses* (*P.G.,* vol. 41).

De mensuris et ponderibus (*P.G.,* vol. 43).

ESSER, *Gerhard*: *Wer war Praxeas?* 1910.

EUSEBIUS: *Chronicorum libri duo* (*P.G.,* vol. 19).

Contra Hieroclem (*P.G.,* vol. 22).

Demonstratio evangelica (*P.G.,* vol. 22); English trans., *The Proof of the Gospel,* by W. J. Ferrar, 1920, 2 vols.

Ecclesiastical History (*P.G.,* vol. 20).

Life of Constantine (*P.G.*, vol. 20).
De martyribus Palaestinae (*P.G.*, vol. 20).

FEDER, Alfred L.: *Justins des Martyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus, dem Messias und dem Menschgewordenen Sohne Gottes,* 1906.
FELIX, Célestin: *Progrès par le christianisme.*
FÉNELON, François: *Discours sur les avantages et les devoirs de la vie religieuse.*
FIRMILIAN, St.: *Epistles* (*P.L.*, vol. 3).
FLAMION, J.: *Les Actes apocryphes de l'apôtre André,* 1911.
FLEURY, Rohault de: *La Messe, études archéologiques,* 1883–89, 8 vols.
FOUARD, Constant: *Christ the Son of God,* tr. by George F. X. Griffith, 1908, 2 vols.
Saint John and the Close of the Apostolic Age, 1927.
Saint Paul and his Missions, tr. by George F. X. Griffith, 1895.
Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity, tr. by George F. X. Griffith, 1893.
FOUCART, Paul: *Les grands mystères d'Eleusis,* 1901.
FREPPEL, Charles Emile: *Clément d'Alexandrie,* 1865.
Les Apologistes chrétiens du II^e^ siècle, 1860, 2 vols.
Les Pères apostoliques et leur époque, 1859.
Origène, 1867, 2 vols.
Saint Irénée et l'éloquence chrétienne, 1861.
Saint Justin, 1886.
Tertullien, 1864, 2 vols.
FUNK, Franz Xaver: *Manual of Church History,* tr. by Luigi Cappadelta (*i. e.*, P. Perciballi), 1914, 2 vols.
(ed.): *Patres apostolici,* 1901, 2 vols.
FUSTEL DE COULANGES, N. D.: *Ancient City,* tr. by Willard Small, 1874.

GAMS, Pius B.: *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien,* 1862.
GARRIGUET, Léon: *The Gospel and our Social Problems.*
GENOULHAC: *Histoire du dogme catholique.*
GERBET, Olympe: *Esquisse de Rome chrétienne,* 1878, 3 vols.
GILMANN, F.: *Das Institut der Chorbischöfe im Orient,* 1903.

GONDAL, J. L.: *Au temps des apôtres,* 1904.
GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, St.: *Opera* (*P.G.,* vols. 35–38).
GREGORY OF NYSSA, St.: *Opera* (*P.G.,* vols. 44–46).
Vita Gregorii Thaumaturgi (*P.G.,* vol. 46).
GREGORY OF TOURS, St. *De gloria confessorum* (*P.L.,* vol. 71).
De gloria martyrum (*P.L.,* vol. 71).
History of the Franks (*P.L.,* vol. 71), tr. by O. M. Dalton, 1927, 2 vols.
GREGORY THAUMATURGUS, St.: *Opera* (*P.G.,* vol. 10).
GREGORY THE GREAT, St.: *In I Regum* (*P.L.,* vol. 79).
GRISAR, Hartmann: *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages,* tr. by Luigi Cappadelta (*i. e.,* P. Perciballi), 1911, 3 vols.
GROSSE-BRAUKMANN: *De compositione Pastoris Hermae.*
GRY, Léon: *Le Millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement,* 1904.
GUÉRANGER, Prosper: *The Liturgical Year,* tr. by Laurence Shepherd.
Life of St. Cecilia, 1866.
GUIGNEBERT, Charles: *La Primauté de Pierre et la venue de Pierre à Rome,* 1909.
Tertullien, 1901.
GUIRAUD, J.: *Histoire partiale, histoire vraie.*

HAVET, Ernest: *Le Christianisme et ses origines,* 1871–84, 4 vols.
HARNACK, Adolf von: *Die Apostelgeschichte.*
Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius.
Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, 1904, 2 vols.
The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries, tr. by F. L. Pogson, 1910.
History of Dogma, tr. by Neil Buchanan, 1897–1900, 7 vols.
The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, tr. by James Moffatt, 1908.
(ed.): *Patrum apostolicorum opera,* 1892.
What is Christianity? tr. by Thomas B. Saunders, 1912.
HEALY, P. J.: *The Valerian Persecution,* 1903.
HEFELE, Karl Joseph: *A History of the Christian Councils,* 1871–83, 3 vols.

HERGENRÖTHER, Joseph: *Kirchengeschichte,* 1884–86, 3 vols.
HERMAS: *Pastor* (*P.G.,* vol. 2).
HERODIANUS: *Historiarum romanarum libri octo,* 1829.
HILARY, St.: *Contra Arianos* (*P.L.,* vol. 10).
De synodis (*P.L.,* vol. 10).
HIPPOLYTUS, St.: *Canones;* ed. by D. B. de Haneberg, 1870.
Philosophumena (*alias, Refutation of all Heresies*), tr. by J. H. MacMahon, 1868.
HOPPENOT, Joseph: *La Messe dans l'histoire et dans l'art,* 1911.
HORACE: *Odes* and *Carmen saeculare.*
HURTER, J.: *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium,* 1893, 3 vols..

IGNATIUS, St.: *Acta.*
Epistles (*P.G.,* vol. 5).
IRENAEUS, St.: *Adversus haereses* (*P.G.,* vol. 7).
ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, St.: *De ortu et obitu Patrum* (*P.L.,* vol. 83).

JACQUIER, Eugène: *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament,* 1903–08, 4 vols.
La Doctrine des douze apôtres et ses enseignements, 1891.
JAFFÉ, Philipp: *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* 1851.
JEROME, St.: *Commentarium in Matthaeum* (*P.L.,* vol. 26).
De viris illustribus (*P.L.,* vol. 23).
Epistolae (*P.L.,* vols. 22, 30).
In Isaiam (*P.L.,* vol. 24).
In Zachariam (*P.L.,* vol. 25).
Liber de situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum (*P.L.,* vol. 23).
Apologia adversus libros Rufini (*P.L.* vol. 23).
Vita Hilarionis (*P.L.,* vol. 23).
Vita sancti Pauli primi eremitae (*P.L.,* vol. 23).
JOHN OF THE CROSS, St.: *Ascent of Carmel.*
JOSEPHUS: *Antiquities.*
Jewish War, tr. by H. Thackeray, 1926–28, 3 vols.
JUBARU, Florian: *Sainte Agnes, vierge et martyre,* 1907.
JUSTIN: *Dialogue with Trypho* (*P.G.,* vol. 6).
Apologies (*P.G.,* vol. 6).

JUSTINIAN: *Code and Digest.* (*Digest* tr. in part by Charles H. Munro, 1904–09, 2 vols.)
JUVENAL: *Satires.*

KIRSCH, J. P., *Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. I, 1930.
KNABENBAUER, Joseph: *Commentarium in Evangelium S. Joannis,* 1906.
KOCH, HUGO: *Cyprian und der römische Primat,* 1910.
KURTH, Godefroid: *Les Origines de la civilisation moderne,* 1912, 2 vols.

LABAUCHE, L.: *Leçons de théologie dogmatique,* 1908–21.
LABOURT (Jérôme) and BATIFFOL (Paul): *Odes de Salomon,* 1911.
LABRIOLLE, Pierre de: *La Crise montaniste,* 1913.
Les Sources de l'histoire du montanisme, 1913.
LACOUR-GAYET, Georges: *Antonin le Pieux et son temps,* 1888.
LACORDAIRE, Jean Baptiste: *Sainte Marie-Madeleine,* 1913.
LACTANTIUS: *Death of the Persecutors,* tr. by William Fletcher, 1871.
Divine Institutes, tr. by William Fletcher, 1871.
LADEUZE, Paulin: *Le Cénobitisme pakhômien,* 1898.
LASTEYRIE, Robert de: *Histoire de l'architecture religieuse en France,* 1912.
LAUER, Philippe: *Le palais de Latran; étude historique et archéologique,* 1911.
LAGRANGE, Joseph: *Le Messianisme chez les juifs,* 1909.
Saint Etienne et son sanctuaire à Jérusalem, 1894.
LALLEMAND, Léon: *Histoire de la charité,* 1903, 2 vols.
LAMPRIDIUS, Aelius: *Alexander Severus.*
LE BLANT, Edmond: *Catalogue des monuments du musée de Marseille,* 1894.
Les Actes des martyrs, 1882.
Les Sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule, 1886.
LEBRETON, Jules: *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité,* 1910–28, 2 vols.
LE CAMUS, Emile: *L'Œuvre des apôtres,* 1905, 3 vols.
Voyage aux pays bibliques, 1890, 3 vols.
LECLERCQ, Henri: *L'Afrique chrétienne,* 1904, 2 vols.
L'Espagne chrétienne, 1906.

Les Martyrs, 1902–05, 4 vols.
LELONG, Auguste: *Pasteur d'Hermas,* 1912.
LENORMANT, François (ed.): *Mélanges d'archéologie.*
LEO, St.: *Epistles* (*P.L.,* vol. 54).
LEPIN, Max: *La Valeur historique du quatrième Evangile,* 1909, 2 vols.
L'EPINOIS, Henri de: *Les Catacombes de Rome,* 1896.
LEVESQUE, E.: *Nos Quatre Evangiles,* 1917.
LHANDE, Pierre: *Jeunesse,* 1912.
Liber pontificalis (ed. Duchesne).
LIGHTFOOT, Joseph B.: *The Apostolic Fathers,* 1869–85, 5 vols.
LIPSIUS, Richard: *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten,* 1883–87, 3 vols.
LITTRÉ, Emile: *Etudes sur les barbares et le moyen âge,* 1874.
LIVY: *History of Rome.*
LOISY, Alfred: *Autour d'un petit livre.*
The Gospel and the Church, tr. by Christopher Home, 1912.
LOUIS: *Philo le Juif,* 1911.
LUCANUS: *Pharsalia,* tr. by H. T. Riley, 1853.
LUCOT, A. (ed.): *Histoire Lausiaque de Palladius,* 1912.
LUGAN, A.: *L'Enseignement social de Jésus,* 1908.

MABILLON, Jean: *De liturgia gallicana,* 1685 (*P.L.,* vol. 72).
MANSI: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 1901–27, 58 vols.
MANTEYER, Georges de: *La Provence du I er au XII e siècle,* 1908.
MARQUARDT, Karl J.: *Römische Staatsverwaltung,* 1881–85, 3 vols.
MARTIAL: *Epigrams,* tr. by R. R. Fletcher, 1893.
MARUCCHI, Orazio: *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* 1900–1903, 2 vols.
MARX: *Manuel d'histoire eccléstiastique,* 1913.
MAURICE: *Numismatique constantinienne,* 1908.
MICHELET, Jules: *History of France,* tr. by G. H. Smith, 2 vols.
MICHELS, A.: *L'Origine de l'épiscopat,* 1900.
MIGNE: *Patrologia Graeca,* 161 vols.
Patrologia Latina, 221 vols.
MINUCIUS FELIX: *Octavius,* tr. by D. Dalrymple, 1781.

MISTRAL, Frédéric: *Mirèio,* 1880.
MOMMSEN, Theodore: *History of Rome,* tr. by William P. Dickson, 1868, 4 vols.
MONCEAUX, Paul: *Saint Cyprien,* 1914.
Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne, 1901–05, 3 vols.
MONNIER: *Notion de l'apostolat.*
MONTALEMBERT, Charles: *Monks of the West,* 1861–67, 5 vols.
MONTESQUIEU, Charles: *Esprit des lois.*
MORIN, Germain: *Etudes sur saint Lazare et saint Maximin.*
De poenitentia.
MÜLLER, Karl Otfried: *Antiquitates antiochenae,* 1839.
MURATORI, Ludovico: *Liturgia Romana vetus,* 1748, 2 vols.
Constitutiones apostolici.

NEWMAN, John H.: *Apologia pro vita sua.*
Catholic Doctrine and Devotion with Respect to the Blessed Virgin; a letter to Dr. Pusey.
NICEPHORUS: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.,* vols. 145–147).
NORTHECOTE, James S.: *Roma Sotterranea, an Account of the Roman Catacombs,* 1869–79, 2 vols.
NOVATIAN: *De cibis Judaicis* (*P.L.,* vol. 3).
De Trinitate (*P.L.,* vol. 3).
Epistolae (*P.L.,* vol. 3).

OLIER: *Cérémonies de la grand'-messe.*
OPTATUS, St.: *Against the Donatists,* tr. by O. R. Vassall-Phillips, 1917 (*P.L.,* vol. 11).
ORELLI, Johann K.: *Inscriptionum Latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio,* 1828–56.
ORIGEN: *Commentarium in Joannem* (*P.G.,* vol. 14).
Commentarium in Romanos (*P.G.,* vol. 14).
Contra Celsum (*P.G.,* vol. 14).
Exhortatio ad martyrium (*P.G.,* vol. 11).
Homiliae (*P.G.,* vols. 12, 13).
OROSIUS: *Historiae adversum paganos* (*P.L.,* vol. 31).
Où en est l'histoire des religions, 1912, 2 vols.

OZANAM, Frédéric: *La Civilisation au V^e siècle.*
Letters, tr. by Ainslie Coates, 1886.
Œuvres, 1872–73, 11 vols.
The Franciscan Poets, tr. by A. E. Nellen and N. C. Craig, 1914.

PACIANUS, St.: *Letters.* (*P.L.,* vol. 13).
PALLADIUS: *Lausiac History* (*P.G.,* vol. 47).
PALLU DE LESSERT: *Fastes des provinces africaines.*
PASCAL, Blaise: *Thoughts,* 1850.
PASCAL, Carlo: *L'Incendio di Roma e i primi cristiani,* 1900.
PAUL of SAMOSATA: *Contra Apollinarium.*
PAUTIGNY, Justin: *Apologies,* 1904.
PÉRATÉ, André: *Le Vatican, les papes et la civilisation,* 1895.
PERROT, Georges: *De Galatia provincia romana,* 1867.
PERROT (Georges) and CHIPIEZ (Charles): *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité.*
PETAU, Denis: *De doctrina temporum,* 1757, 3 vols.
De poenitentia vetere.
PHILO: *On the Contemplative Life,* tr. by Frank W. Tilden, 1922.
PHOTIUS: *Library,* tr. by John H. Freese, 1920.
PILLET: *Histoire de sainte Perpétue,* 1885.
PIUS IX: Encyclical *"Quanto conficiamur"* (August 10, 1863).
PLINY: *Letters,* tr. by William Melmoth, 1915, 2 vols.
Natural History, 2 vols.
PLUTARCH: *Lives,* tr. by Bernadotte Perrin, 1914–26, 11 vols.
Polycarp, Martyrdom of.
PONTIUS: *Life of St. Cyprian.* (*P.L.,* vol. 3.)
POOLE, George A.: *The Life and Times of St. Cyprian,* 1840.
POURRAT, Pierre: *Christian Spirituality,* 1922–28, 3 vols.
Theology of the Sacraments, 1924.
PRAT, F.: *La Théologie de saint Paul,* 1908–10, 2 vols.
Origène.
PRUDENTIUS CLEMENS: *Peristephanon.*
PUECH, A.: *Les Apologistes grecs du II^e siècle,* 1912.

QUINTILIAN: *Institutio oratoria,* tr. by H. E. Butler, 1921, 4 vols.

RAMBAUD: *Le Droit criminel romain dans les Actes des martyrs.*
RAMSAY, William: *Saint Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen,* 1900.
Recherches de science religieuse.
Recognitions, by pseudo-Clement.
Regesta pontificum romanorum.
RÉGNON, Théodore de: *Etudes de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* 1898, 4 vols.
REINACH, T.: *Histoire des Israélites.*
RENAN, Ernest: *Antichrist.*
L'Eglise chrétienne, 1879.
Les Apôtres, 1866.
Les Evangiles et la second génération chrétienne, 1877.
Marc-Aurèle et la fin du monde antique, 1882.
RENIER, Léon: *Mélanges d'épigraphie.*
RÉVILLE: *Le Quatrième évangile.*
Revue bénédictine.
Revue biblique.
Revue catholique de Bordeaux.
Revue de l'histoire des religions.
Revue des questions historiques.
Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique.
Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse.
Revue du clergé français.
RIVIÈRE, J.: *Saint Justin et les apologistes du II^e siècle,* 1911.
Doctrine of the Atonement, tr. by Luigi Cappadelta, 2 vols.
Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries according to the Conclusions of Harnack, 1916.
RODRIGUEZ, Alphonso: *Practice of Christian Perfection,* tr. by E. Damphoux, 1834.
RAMPOLLA: *Vie de sainte Mélanie la Jeune.*
ROSSI, Giovanni Battista de: *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana,* 1863–94.
De origine et historia scrinii et bibl. Sedis Apost.
Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae, 1857–87, 2 vols.
Roma sotterranea, 1864, 3 vols.
—— and DUCHESNE: *Martyrologe hieronymien.*

ROUILLON, A.: *Sainte Hélène,* 1908.
ROUND, Douglass: *The Date of Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* 1906.
ROUSSEAU, Jean Jacques: *Émile,* tr. by Barbara Foxley, 1911.
ROUTH, Martin J.: *Reliquiae sacrae,* 1846–48, 5 vols.
RUFINUS: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.L.,* vol. 21).
RUINART, Thierry: *Acta primorum martyrum sincera,* 1689.
Préface à la Passion de sainte Perpétue.

SABATIER, Auguste: *The Apostle Paul; a Sketch of the Development of his Doctrine,* tr. by A. M. Hellier.
Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit, tr. by Louise Houghton, 1904.
SABATIER, Maxime: *L'Eglise et le travail manuel.*
SALEILLES: *L'Organisation juridique des premières communautés chrétiennes,* 1912.
SALTET: *Les Réordinations.*
SAVIO, Fedele: *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia,* 1899.
SCHEGG: *Evangelium nach Lukas,* 1863.
SCHWANE: *Histoire des dogmes,* 1903.
SEMERIA: *Il primo sangue cristiano,* 1901.
SENECA: *Consolation to Marcia.*
De beneficiis.
SERAPION: *Epistola* (*P.G.,* vol. 40).
Sibylline Oracles, tr. by Milton S. Terry, 1890.
SIMEON METAPHRASTES: *Vita S. Matthaei* (*P.G.,* vol. 115).
SMEDT, De: *Dissertationes selectae in primam aetatem Ecclesiae. Introductio generalis ad historiam ecclesiasticam critice tractandam,* 1876.
Principes de la critique historique, 1883.
SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.,* vol. 67).
SOUBEN: *Le Canon primitif de la messe,* 1909.
SOZOMEN: *Ecclesiastical History.*
SPARTIANUS: *Severus.*
STANTON, Vincent H.: *The Gospels as Historical Documents,* 1909.
STAPFER, Edmund L.: *Palestine in the Time of Christ,* tr. by Annie H. Holmden, 1886.

STEPHEN, St.: *Epistola* (*P.L.*, vol. 3).
STRABO: *Geography,* tr. by Horace L. Jones, 1917, 6 vols.
SUETONIUS: *The Lives of the Caesars,* tr. by J. C. Rolfe, 1914, 2 vols.

TACITUS: *Annals.*
Germania, tr. by Maurice Hutton, 1914.
History.
TAINE, Hippolyte: *Les Origines de la France contemporaine,* 1906–09, 12 vols.
TATIAN: *Adversus Graecos* (*P.G.*, vol. 6), tr. by B. P. Pratten, 1868.
TERESA, St.: *Way of Perfection.*
TERTULLIAN: *Opera* (*P.L.*, vols. 1, 2).
Testament of the Lord.
THEOPHILUS: *Ad Autolycum* (*P.G.*, vol. 6).
THOMAS AQUINAS, St.: *Summa Theologica.*
THOMASSIN: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise touchant les benefices,* 1725, 3 vols.
TIBULLUS: tr. by J. P. Postgate, 1912.
TILLEMONT, Louis: *Histoire des empereurs,* 1732–40, 3 vols.
Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles. 1693–1712, 16 vols.
TISCHENDORF: *Acta apostolorum apocrypha,* 1851.
TIXERONT: *Handbook of Patrology,* 1920.
History of Dogmas, 1910–1916, 3 vols.
TORRECREMATA: *De Ecclesia.*
TOUTAIN: *Les Cultes paiens dans l'empire romain,* 1907.
TREBELLIUS POLLIO: *Claudius.*
Gallieni duo.
TROPLONG: *Influence du christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains,* 1868.

VACANDARD: *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse.*
VACANT (ed.): *Dictionnaire de théologie.*
Vatican Council, *Acta et decreta.*
VIGOUREL, Adrien: *Synthetical Manual of Liturgy,* tr. by John A. Nainfa, 1907.
La Liturgie et la vie chrétienne, 1909.

VIGOUROUX: *Manuel biblique.*
(ed.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*
La Bible et les découvertes modernes, 1896.
VINCENT of LÉRINS, St.: *Adversus haereses.*
Commonitory, 1847.
VOGUÉ, Melchior de: *Le Temple de Jérusalem,* 1864.
VORAGINE, Giacomo de: *Golden Legend,* tr. by William Caxton, 1892, 3 vols.

WADDINGTON: *Fastes des provinces asiatiques,* 1872.
WALSH: *Marmor Hispaniae antiquum,* 1750.
WALTZING, J. P.: *L'Apologétique de Tertullien,* 1910.
WEBER: *Die Abfassung des Galaterbriefes vor dem Apostelconcil,* 1900.
WILLEMS, Pierre: *Le Droit public romain,* 1874.

ZAHN: *Acta Johannis.*
ZOSIMUS: *Historiae.*

Index

Abercius, Inscription of, 287 note
Abolition of slavery, 545
"Abomination of desolation," 124 and note
Abraham, honored by Alexander Severus, 321
Acacius, St. (bishop of Antioch in Pisidia), 386 f.
Academy, The, 235
Acci (Spain), Church of, 177
Achaia (*i. e.*, Greece), 108
  Alms from, 114
  St. Andrew, 172
Achamoth, 223, 265
Achilles, St. (martyr), 320
Achilleus and Nereus, Acts of SS., 201 note
Acilius Glabrio (martyr), 150
Acolytes, 426, 429
Acts of Paul and Thecla, 64 note
Acts of Phileas, 469 note
Acts of Philoromus, 469 note
Acts of Pilate, 472
Acts of St. Agnes, 466
Acts of St. Cecilia, 238
Acts of St. Felicitas, 233 note, 243
Acts of St. Justin Martyr, 243
Acts of St. Matthew, 171
Acts of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, 201 note
Acts of St. Perpetua, 316, 325 note
Acts of St. Pontius, 364 note
Acts of St. Thomas, 170
Acts of the martyrs, Destruction of, 208 note
Acts of the Scillitan martyrs, 244
Ado, Martyrology of, 177
Ad nationes (by Tertullian), 273
Adonis, Worship of, 100
Adoptionism, 438
Adultery, Forgiveness of, 253, 286, 356 f.
Advent, 290
Aedesius, St. (martyr), 475
Aegae, Temple demolished at, 541
Aelia Capitolina (*i. e.*, Jerusalem), 216 f.
Aelianus (governor), 509
Aemilianus (consul), 370
Aemilianus (governor), 421, 451
Aeons, 223
Africa, Carthage primatial see, 433
  Minor Orders, 429
  Montanism, 309, 324-326
  Persecution, 316, 381, 388 ff.
  Rebaptism, 404
  St. Simon, 172
Agabus (prophet), 66
Agada, 25
Agape, 31
  Abuses, 108
  In Didache, 89 note
Agapetae, 434 note, 450 note
Agapius, St. (martyr), 213
Agatha, St. (martyr), 383
Agnes, St. (martyr), 466 f.
  Acts of, 466
Agnes, St., Church of (Rome), 467, 529, 531
Agricola, and martyrdom of St. Marcellus, 455
Agrippa I, 49, 51
Agrippa II, and Jewish Temple, 15
Agro Verano, Church of St. Lawrence at, 531
Ainai (France), 240
Aix (France), Loss of documents, 185
Akiba (rabbi), 215, 217
Alaka, 25
Alba, Constantinian church at, 531
Albinus, St. (martyr), 572
Albinus (governor), 97
Alcibiades, imprisoned at Lyons, 571
Alcibiades (Montanist), 307 note
Aletheia, 222
Alexamenes' caricature, 313 f.
Alexander I, St. (pope), 207, 209 note, 300
Alexander, St. (bishop of Jerusalem), 338, 339, 348, 370

Alexander, St. (martyr), 209 note, 213
Alexander, St. (martyr, Lyons), 567 f., 572
Alexander (Gnostic), 265
Alexander (Judaizer), 78
Alexander (Montanist), 308
Alexander Severus (emperor), 321, 358 f.
  Stadium, 467
  Tolerance, 364, 485
Alexander the Charcoal Burner, St. (bishop of Comana), 372
Alexandria, 221, 303
  Ambrose (friend of Origen), 359
  Basilides (Gnostic), 221
  Church of, 141-145, 175
  Clement of, 331-336
  Council (231), 339
  Deacons, 429
  Didascalia, 167
  Doctrine of Logos, 437
  Easter controversy, 293
  Eusebius and siege of, 423
  Heraclas bishop, 432
  Intellectual center, 302 f.
  Jews at, 142
  Library, 142
  Metropolitan see, 432
  Origen, 337, 343
  Patriarchal see, 433
  Persecution, 320, 379
  Rebaptism, 404
  St. Dionysius bishop, 348, 438
  St. Hilarion (hermit), 550
  St. Mark, 144
  St. Peter bishop, 473, 478
  St. Philoromus (martyr), 469
  St. Potamiana (martyr), 320
Alexandria, School of, 377
  Clement, 332 f.
  Doctrines, 306
  Heraclas, 370
  Millenarianism, 327
  Organization, 304
  Origen, 337
  St. Dionysius, 370, 397
  School of Antioch, 437
Algeria, 522
Alms, Bishop distributer of, 430
  For Church of Jerusalem, 66
Alogi, 358
Alpheus (edile of Aptonga), 509
Alpheus (father of James), 25 note
Altar, Form of, 533 and note
Amadour, St. (*i. e.*, Zaccheus), 178 note
Amae (for offerings), 538
Amasea, Basil bishop, 519, 523
Amator, St. (of Autun), 178 note
Ambrose (of Alexandria), 339, 348, 358-360
Amelia (martyr, Lyons), 572
Amesha spenta, 143 note
Ammonius, bishop of Thmuis, 432
Ammonius Saccas (philosopher), 339, 341
Ampellius, St., martyred at Carthage, 463
Amphorae (for offerings), 538 f.
Ampliatus (of Rome), 111
Ampliatus (slave), Tomb of, 300 note
Anacletus, St. (pope), 139
Anamnesis, 559
Ananias and Saphira, 22, 53-55
Ananias (of Damascus), 28, 49, 64
Anastasia, St., Church of (Rome), 529
Anatolius, St. (bishop of Laodicea), 423
Anchorites, 435, 556
"Ancient," 85 (*See* Presbyteri)
Ancient world, 3
Ancyra, Marcellus bishop of, 519
Ancyra, Council of (314), 519-521
  Bishops at, 519, 523
  Canons, 520 f.
  Plenary council, 520
Andeol, St. (martyr), 320
Andrew, St. (Apostle), 148
  Crucifixion of, 172
  Evangelization by, 172
Andronicus, an "apostle," 81
Angora (*See* Ancyra)
Anicetus, St. (pope), 227
  Easter controversy, 292, 294
Anio (river), 214
Annas I (high priest), 18 and note, 35, 53
Annas II (the Younger), 53, 97
Anointing of converted heretics, 400
Anterus, St. (pope), 358, 361, 366
Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, 459
Anthony (*See* Antony)
Antichrists, mentioned by St. John, 78
Antioch (Pisidia), St. Acacius bishop, 386 f.
  St. Paul, 67
Antioch (Syria), Alms for Church at Jerusalem, 66

Aurelian and church at, 423
Basilica, 532
"Canons" of Council of, 77 note
Christian center, 67
Christians so called, 66
Church of, 61 f., 65, 77, 146
City of, 61
Council (341), 211
Doctors in Church of, 83
Fabius bishop, 396
Jews, 62
Judaizers, 74
Letter from Council of Jerusalem, 76
Metropolitan see, 432
Novatianism, 396
Origen, 339
Patriarchal see, 433
Paul of Samosata bishop, 369, 436, 439
Philip the Arabian, 363
Prophets, 82
Rebaptism, 404
St. Babylas bishop, 363, 385
St. Barnabas, 62, 65, 67, 69
St. Eleazar, 62
St. Firmilian, 438
St. Ignatius Martyr, 203
St. Paul, 65
St. Peter bishop of, 70 note
SS. Peter and Paul, 69 f.
School of, 437, 473
Serapion bishop, 329, 432
Theophilus bishop, 247, 249, 352
Theotecnus (curator), 472
Vitalis bishop, 519 f.
Worship of Apollo, 61
Worship of nymphs, 61
Writings of Geminius, 370
Antipopes, Heraclius, 469
St. Hippolytus, 321 f., 324, 351 note
Antithesis (by Marcion), 266
Antonia (martyr), 572
Antoninus Augustus (*i. e.*, Marcus Aurelius), 234 note
Antoninus Pius (emperor), Aristides' Apology, 248
Decree regarding Christians, 231 note
Gnosticism, 220
Religious policy, 231
St. Polycarp (martyr), 229
Slaves, 299
Antony, St. (hermit), 435 f., 473, 547 f., 550
Antony of Heraclea, St. (*See* Antony, St., hermit)
Antony, Mark, Alexandrian Library, 142
Anulinus (governor), 460, 504-506
Apelles (Gnostic), 271
Aphaca, Temple demolished at, 541
Aphrodite of Byblus, Worship of, 100
Apocalypse, 151-156
Docetism, 78
Doctrine of, 154 f.
Ebionitism, 78
Liturgy, 155
Number seven, 155 note
Apocryphal Gospels, 130
Apollina (in Decian persecution), 379
Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis (apologist), 250, 329
Apollo, Statue of, 61
Temple at Daphne, 386
Worship of, at Antioch, 61
Apollo (N. T.), 144
Apollo (martyr), 572
Apollonius, St. (philosopher), 245
Apollonius (apologist), 329
Apollonius of Tyana, 314
Compared with Christ, 475
Honored by Alexander Severus, 321
Apologeticus (by Tertullian), 273 f., 276
Apologies, Early Christian, 214
Apologists, 246 ff., 312, 329, 475-477
Apostasy, Forgiveness of, 253, 356
Apostates (*See* Lapsi)
"Apostles," in the Didache, 82 note, 579
In the early Church, 24, 81, 86
Apostles (the Twelve), Arrest, 35
Council of Jerusalem, 80
Evangelization by, 169-173
Infallibility, 80
Jurisdiction, 80
Prerogatives, 80
Apostolicity of the Church, Harnack on, 13 note
Aptonga, Felix bishop, 501 f.
Apulia, St. Felix at Venosa in, 460
Aquae trajanae, 210
Aquarians (*i. e.*, Encratites), 249, 410
Aquarii (*See* Aquarians)
Aquila (N. T.), 111, 208
Aquila (Jewish scholar), 216 f.
Version of Bible, 216 f., 344
Aquila (prefect), 320

Aquileia, Maximus at, 362
Arabia, Alms from Pope Stephen, 411
St. Pantaenus, 303
St. Paul, 64
Aratus, quoted by St. Paul, 110
Archdeacon, 429
Archiereus, 83 note
Architecture, Christian, 532-534
Archives, Destruction of papal, 461
Ardeatina, Porta, 138
Areopagite (*See* Dionysius)
Areopagus, St. Paul in the, 109
Aristides (apologist), 247 f.
Discovery of Apology of, 248 note
Aristo of Pella (apologist), 215
Aristobulus (N. T.), 111
Aristotle, 221
Aristus, St. (martyr), 572
Arles, Apparition of the Labarum, 511 note
Church of, 183 f., 365 note
City of, 510
Coins, 496 note
Devotion to St. Martha, 187
Early importance of, 184 note
Marcian bishop, 396, 403
Marinus bishop, 505, 512
Arles, Council of (314), 211, 510 ff.
Caecilian, 513
Canons, 512
Dioceses represented, 511 note
Easter question, 515
Letter to Pope Sylvester, 517
Not ecumenical, 512
Rebaptism, 516
Synodal letter, 512
"Traditio" of the Scriptures, 512
Travel expenses, 511
Armenia, Maximinus in, 480
Revolt, 462
St. Bartholomew, 171
Armentarius (chorepiscopus), 428
Army, Roman, Christians in, 305
Arnobius (apologist), *Adversus nationes*, 477
Conversion, 476
Idolatry, 440
Arnobius (Sophist), 474
Aromatics, in Christian burial, 296
Arson, Penalty for, 121 note
Artemas (*See* Artemon)
Artemon (heretic), Modalism, 438
Schism of Theodotus, 353
Arval Brethren, 364
Ascension, Date of, 53 note
Site of, 532
Ascetics, 434 ff.
Asclepiades and St. Pionius, 384 f.
Asclepiades (martyr, Lyons), 572
Asia Minor, Alexandrian culture, 144
Apocalypse addressed to Churches of, 153
Apostles in, 148
Bishops at Council of Ancyra, 520
Cerinthus, 162
Church of, 198, 239, 404
Decline of paganism, 198
Easter controversy, 291, 293
Influence of Origen, 371
Letter from Church of Lyons, 239
Novatianism, 396
Persecution, 151 f., 212, 316, 381
Praxeas, 330, 352
Rebaptism, 404
Reputation of Apollonius of Tyana, 314
St. Ignatius Martyr, 203
St. Paul, 99, 144
St. Peter, 144
St. Pothinus and St. Irenaeus, 240
Associations, Burial, 295 f.
Associations, Cemetery, 295
Assyria, Tatian, 248
Astyages (king of Media), 171
Asylum, Right of, 537 note
Athanacum (France), 240
Athanasius, St., Egyptian monks, 555
Life of St. Antony, 548
"Atheist," Legal meaning, 150 note
Athenagoras (apologist), 247, 249
To Commodus, 484
To Marcus Aurelius, 484
Athenodorus, and Origen, 371
Athens, Athenagoras, 249
Church of, 175
St. Dionysius bishop, 189 note
St. Hyginus, 227
St. Paul, 107 ff.
Athos, Mount, 350
Attalus, St. (of Pergamus), 241, 562, 565 f., 568, 572
Atticus (governor of Palestine), 202
Attitude at prayer, 87, 284
"Aucupatio syllabarum," 543
Audientes (penitents), 520
Augurius, St. (deacon), 421

Augusta (*i. e.*, Sebaste), 42 note
"Augusti," 453
Augustine, St., 337
Augustus (emperor), 42 note
  And city of Arles, 510
  Worship of, 239
Aurelian (emperor), 451
  And the bishops, 426
  Church in Antioch, 369, 423, 532
  Church property, 424
  Paganism under, 436
  Paul of Samosata, 369
  Persecution, 424
  Religion of *Sol Invictus*, 444
Aurelius, Marcus (*See* Marcus Aurelius)
Ausonius, St. (martyr), 572
Autun, Church of, 240
  Reticius bishop, 505
  St. Amator, 178 note
Aya Suluk, 168
Azotus, 46

Baal, in Roman religion, 100, 540
Babylas, St. (bishop of Antioch), 385
  And Philip the Arabian, 363
Babylonia, Manichaeism, 442
Bacchius (grandfather of St. Justin Martyr), 235
Bahram I (king of Persia), 442
Balbinus (emperor), 362
Banker, Theodotus the, 353
Baptism, Administration of, 28 note, 58, 282, 450, 535
  By deacons, 38, 280
  By immersion, 87, 282
  By pouring, 88, 282
  Elkesaites, 218
  Impeccability, 251
  In the Didache, 87, 577
  In the early Church, 28
  In the third century, 281, 283
  On eighth day, 410
  On Holy Saturday, 530
  Preparation for, 87, 536
  Primitive formula, 29
  St. Cyprian's doctrine, 310
  Scrutinia before, 536
  Times for, 535, 536 note
  Validity and efficacy, 401, 407
  (*See* also Rebaptism)
Baptismal controversy, 229, 398
Baptismal pools, 87
Baptistries, 282, 535
Baptistry of Lateran Basilica, 530, 535
Barbara, St. 358, 361
Barbarians, Early Church and the, 169 ff.
Bar-Cocheba, 215
Bar-Coziba, 215
Barnabas, St., 62 f.
  Alms to Jerusalem, 66
  Antioch (Pisidia), 67
  Antioch (Syria), 62, 65, 69
  "Apostle," 63 note, 81
  Council of Jerusalem, 74 f.
  Cyprus, 66
  Derbe, 67
  Epistle of, 125
  Galatia, 67
  Iconium, 67
  Judaizers, 70
  Lystra, 67
  St. Paul, 22, 65-68
  Tarsus, 65
Bar Nebuah (*i. e.*, Barnabas), 62
Bartholomew, St., Evangelization by, 171
Basilicas, 528 ff.
  Above cemeteries, 531
  Antioch, 532
  Constantine's generosity, 528
  Domus Sessoriana, 529
  Edessa, 523 note
  Form of, 533
  Holy Cross of Jerusalem, 529
  Lateran, 528-530, 537
  Nicomedia, 532 note
  Profane, 532
  Right of asylum, 537 note
  St. Agnes, 529, 531
  St. John Baptist (*i. e.*, the Lateran), 528-530, 537
  St. Lawrence, 528, 531
  St. Paul, 528, 531
  St. Peter, 528, 531
  SS. Peter and Marcellinus, 528
  Santa Croce, 529
  Tyre, 532 note
  Vatican, 528, 531
Basil (bishop of Amasea), Council of Ancyra, 519
  Martyrdom of, 523
Basilides, bishop of Merida, 403
Basilides (Gnostic), 163, 221, 264
Bassianus (*i. e.*, Caracalla), 311
Bassus (in Decius' persecution), 390
Batanea, 151
Baumgartner, on Agape, 89 note

Bearing arms, 516
Beautiful Gate, Miracle at, 16-20
Being, The Primal, *222*
Beirut (*See* Berytus)
Belzebuth, *223*
Benedict XIV, removes name of Clement of Alexandria from martyrology, 336
Benedictine rule, 553 note
Berbers, 388
Berea (Macedonia), 99, 107
Bergoiate, St. Andeol martyred at, 320 f.
Beroea (*See* Berea)
Berytus (Syria), 59
Besançon, Apostles of, 320
Bethel (Palestine), 40
Bethlehem, *208*
  Site of grotto, 532
Bible (*See* Scriptures)
Biblis, (martyr), 563, 572
Birth of Christ, Date of, 5 note
"Bishop," 85
Bishops, Administration of Church property, *296*
  Authority of, 426
  Distribution of alms, 430
  Election of, *211*, 280, 427
  Freeing of slaves, 544
  In the Didache, 83 note, 581
  In the early Church, 86, 125
  In the second century, *279*
  In the third century, *279*
  Right to depose priests and deacons, 280
  Valerian's edict against, 416
Bithynia, 99
  Church in, 198
  Hierocles (governor), 474
  St. Andrew, *172*
  St. Helena, 545
Blandina, St. (martyr), 241-243, 299 f., 562, 565-568, 572
Blessed Virgin (*See* Mary)
Bollandists, on tradition of Lazarus in Provence, 188
Book of Elchasai, *218*
Books, Destruction of Christian, 208 note
Botrus (priest), 501
Bourg-saint-Andéol, 321
Bread, offered at mass, 539
Breton tribes, Evangelization of, 369
Britain, Conversion of, *228*
  Julius Severus, *215*
  St. Simon, *172*
  Under Constantius, 465
Bryennius (bishop of Nicomedia), Discovery of the Didache, 573 note
Bull, Sacrifice of, in Mithraism, 443 note
Burial, Christian, *296*
Burial associations, 295 f., 368
Burrus (general), 113 f., 120
Byblus (Phenicia), 59
  Worship of Aphrodite, 100
Bythos, 220, 222
Byzantium (*See* Constantinople)

Cabala, *265*
Cadiz (Spain), 177
Caecilian (bishop of Carthage), and Lucilla, 501
  Charges against, 505-508, 513
  Council of Arles, 513
  Election of, 501-503
  Validity of ordination, 502
Caesar (Julius), at Alexandria, 142
Caesarea (Cappadocia), Leontius bishop, 519
  Pope Dionysius, 424
  St. Firmilian bishop, 403 note, 406-408, 424, 438
Caesarea (Mauretania), 522
Caesarea (Palestine), Eusebius bishop, 475
  Library, 469
  Origen, 343 f.
  Persecution, 469
  Protoctetus (priest), 360
  St. Paul imprisoned, 114
  St. Philip (deacon), 42 and note, 46
  Theoctistus bishop, 370
"Caesars," 453
Cagin (Dom Paul), Primitive canon of the mass, 557-559
Cainites, *265*
Caiphas, 18 and note, 35, 48 note
Caius, St. (pope), 425, 461
Caius (priest), and millenarianism, *327*
Cajetan, and form of baptism, 29 note
Calendar, Philocalian, 361
Caligula (emperor), 50
  Agrippa I, 51
  Philo, 143
  Worship of Isis, 100
Callistus I, St. (pope), 322-324, 356
  Cemetery of, 361, 366, 415, 417, 430, 461

Forgiveness of adultery, 357
Orthodoxy of, 356
Praxeas, 354 note
St. Hippolytus, 310, 351 note
Tertullian's charges, 324 note
Zephyrinus, 322
Calocerus, St. (martyr), 370
Camargue, 186
Campania, 227
Campus Martius (Rome), 103, 105, 119
Marcus Aurelius' monument, 306
Candace (queen), Eunuch of, 28 f., 44-46
Canon of Bible, 129, 344
Canon of the mass, 209
Primitive form, 557-559
Canonical hours of prayer, 288
Canonical penance, 520
Canons of Hippolytus, 283 note
Canonum Reliquiae, 557
Capito (Donatist), 505
Capitoline hill (Rome), 507
Cappadocia, Clement of Alexandria, 338
Influence of Origen, 371
Legio fulminata, 305
Montanism, 374
St. Andrew, 172
St. Dionysius (pope), 424
St. Firmilian, 406
Capua (Italy), Constantinian church at, 531
Caracalla (emperor), Ambrose of Alexandria, 359
And Christians, 321
Christian nurse of, 311
Military service, 382 note
Carénage, Valley of, 181
Caria (Asia Minor), 144
Carpocrates (Gnostic), 221, 251, 264
Virtue according to, 222
Carthage, Apostasies at, 389
Caecilian bishop, 501
Council (252), 399
Council (255), 401, 403
Council (256), 405
Cyprian bishop, 310, 375, 390-393
Deacons, 429
Donatus bishop, 388
Episcopal lists, 183
Father Delattre's discovery of inscription at, 319 note
Mensurius bishop, 500
Novatian Church, 396
Persecution, 312, 316, 420, 463
Preparation for baptism, 282
Primatial see, 433
Schism, 399
Schismatic council, 399, 502 f., 507
Scillitan martyrs, 245
Subdeacons, 429
Tertullian, 272
Worship of Virgin of, 100
Carthage, Church of, 388
Alms to Church of Numidia, 411
Archives, 500
Origin of, 174
Carthusian rule, 553 note
Casae Nigrae, Donatus bishop, 501
Cassian, St. (martyr), 455
Cassian (monk), 435
Castula, St. (martyr), 572
Catacombs, Roman, 138, 530-532
Administration, 296
Church on sites of, 528
Common, 430
Disuse of, 531
Earliest Christian, 368
History of, 138
Improvement of, 447
In time of Pope Miltiades, 468
Inscriptions, 430
Of Praetextatus, 417, 430
Of St. Callistus, 361, 366, 415, 417, 430, 461
Of St. Lucina, 430
Of St. Priscilla, 462
Profane, on Via Appia, 540 f.
Valerian persecution, 415 f.
Via Nomentana, 209 note
Via Salaria, 209, 415
Cathari (Puritans), 396
Catherine of Siena, St., 30
Catechumenate, 281
Council of Elvira, 517
Catechumens, Dismissal of, 282
Catholic Church, 431
Catholic Epistles, 129
Cecilia, St., 237 f.
Acts of, 238
Celerinus, pardoned by Decius, 387
Celestius (priest), 501
Celibacy, Imperial laws against, 281
Of clergy, 450 and note, 521 note
Celsus (Platonist), 347
Hierocles disciple of, 475
True Discourse, 345
Celts, Christianity among the, 182

Cemeteries (*See* Catacombs)
Cemetery associations, 295
Centumcellae (Cività Vecchia), 402
  Pope Cornelius, 409
Cenobitical life (*See* Monasticism)
Cephas (*See* Peter)
Cerealis Civica (senator), 150
Cerinthians, 204 f.
Cerinthus (heretic), 68 note, 161-163
  And St. John's Gospel, 167
Cestoi (by Julius Africanus), 370
Chaldea, Manichaeism in, 442
Chalons, Church of, 240
Chaos (in Gnosticism), 220, 222, 223
Charismata, 43, 58, 82
  At Confirmation, 30
Charita (martyr), 237
Chariton, St. (martyr), 237
Charity, Christian, and the Plague, 479 f.
Chasuble, 539
Cherchell (*i. e.*, Caesarea), 522
Chersonesus, Clement I exiled to, 201
  Conversions in the, 201
Children, in Roman law, 300, 543 f.
Chinese, Gospel preached to the, 369
Chlorus, Constantius (*See* Constantius)
Choir, at Mass, 539
Chorepiscopi, 427 f., 521
"Chrestus," mentioned by Suetonius, 102, 106
Christ, Date of birth, 5 note
  Divinity of, 438 f., 353
  Honored by Alexander Severus, 321
  Parables of, 7 f.
  Praxeas and Divinity of, 353
  Relatives of, 136
  The Savior, Church of (*i. e.*, Lateran Basilica), 529
Christian era, Date of, 5 note
Christianity, Spread of, 174 note, 304-306, 369 ff.
Christians, flee from Jerusalem, 124
  In high office, 370
  Legal status, 226
  So called at Antioch, 66
Christmas, Feast of, 290
  Midnight mass, 224
Christology of St. Irenaeus, 269 f.
  Of Paul of Samosata, 438
Chrocus, and city of Arles, 510
Chronicles, The (by Julius Africanus), 370
Chronology of St. Paul's life, 48 note
Chrysopolis, Battle of, 525
Church and State, 33-36
  Cyprian on unity of the, 398
  Legal status, 296 note
  Organization of, 125, 368, 425-433, 452
  Unity of, 399 note, 406
  Wealth of, 412
Church, Catholic, 431
"Church of the Martyrs," 509, 514
Church property, 365 ff., 422-424, 428 f.
  Administration of, 296
  Bishops and, 295
  In the third century, 294-298
  Restored by Maxentius, 469
Church, Western, Date of Easter, 291
Churches (*See* Basilicas)
Cilicia, Church of, 432
  Mines of, 470
  Temples demolished, 541
Circus Maximus, 119, 210
Cirta (Numidia), Churches of, 532 note
  Constantinian church, 531
  Council (305), 502
  Silvanus bishop, 502
Cittimus (martyr), 245
Civica Cerealis, 150
Civil government, Church and the, 33-36
Cività Vecchia, 402
Claudius I (emperor), 51, 106
  Expulsion of Jews from Rome, 102, 106
  Slaves, 299
Claudius II (Gothicus), emperor, Persecution under, 424
Claudius (tribune), 114
Clemens, Flavius, 140, 149 f.
Clement I, St. (pope), 139 f., 156-161
  Episkopoi, 84
  Epistle to the Corinthians, 140 f., 157 ff., 228
  Exile and death, 201
Clement of Alexandria, 83, 144, 331-336
  Cappadocia, 338
  Esteem for philosophy, 341, 350
  Exhortation to the Gentiles, 333
  Influence of, 310
  Logos, 352
  "Mater Ecclesia," 398 note
  Name removed from martyrology, 336
  Origen, 304, 337
  Pedagogue, 333
  St. Pantaenus, 303
  Stromata, 333

Subordinationism, 336
Theology, 349
Clementine (pseudo) literature, 83, 140
Cleophas (N. T.), 52, 136, 202
Clergy, attached to diocese, 516
Celibacy, 450 and note, 521 note
Exemptions, 497, 504
Support, 297, 429
Clerus, 426
Cletus, St. (pope), 139
Code, Theodosian, 543
Coins, Christian symbols on, 496 note
Colchis, St. Andrew in, 172
Colobium, deacon's vestment, 537
Cologne, Maternus bishop, 505
Colossians, Epistle to the, 77, 115, 164
Coma (near Heraclea), 435
Comana, St. Alexander bishop, 371
St. Greogory Thaumaturgus, 371
Cominus (martyr), 572
Commemoration of the dead, 290
Commodus (emperor), 244 ff., 323
Athenagoras to, 484
Military service, 382 note
Peace under, 279, 311
Persecution, 244 ff.
Communion, 539
In periculo mortis, 521
In the third century, 284
Reception of, 530
"Competentes" (catechumens), 538
Compostela, St. James of, 178 and note
Confession of sins, in the Didache, 580
In third century, 282, 286
Confines, The (in Gnosticism), 223
Confirmation (sacrament), 400 note, 450
Charismata, 30
In the early Church, 29, 281, 283
"Consignatio" (*i. e.,* Confirmation), 283 note
Consistentes (penitents), 520
Consistory of Diocletian, 452
Constantina, Basilica of St. Agnes, 529
Constantine (emperor), acclaimed, 467
Arles, 510
Baptism of, 519 note
Battle of Milvian Bridge, 486, 489-491
Character of, 487
Donatists' appeal, 543 f.
Edict of Milan, 491-498, 583 f.
Gaul, 487
Galerius' edict of tolerance, 485 note, 491
Generosity to Church, 528
Idolatry, 541 f.
Labarum, 487-489
Legal reforms, 542-545
Letter to Pope Miltiades, 506
Nicomedia, 465
Paganism, 541
Policy, 483, 526 ff.
Pope Sylvester, 518, 519 note
Proclaimed emperor, 486
St. Antony (hermit), 548
St. Helena, 546
Slaves, 546
"Sovereign Pontiff," 496
Statue of, 490 f.
Victory over Maxentius, 489-491
War with Licinius, 525
Constantinian Church (*i. e.,* Lateran Basilica), 529
Constantinople, Theodotus the Tanner, 352
Constantius Chlorus (emperor), 453 f., 465, 467, 486
And St. Helena, 546
"Consubstantial" (*See* Homoousios)
Corbie catalogue, 425
Cordova (Spain), Hosius bishop, 496, 504 f.
Corinth, Capital of Achaia, 108
Prophets at, 153
Quarrel in Church of, 156
St. Dionysius bishop, 228
St. Paul, 99, 107, 111
Corinthians, Clement's Epistle to the, 140 f., 157
Cornelius (martyr, Lyons), 572
Cornelius (pope), and alms, 411
Election, 391, 395
Exile, 402, 409
Holy Orders, 426
"Martyr," 229 note
Novatian schism, 396
Novatian's episcopal consecration, 427
Origen, 348
St. Dionysius of Alexandria, 397
Subdeacons, 429
Cornelius the centurion, 55-59, 67
Corybants, 306
Cotytto, Worship of, 541
Councils, Alexandria (231), 339
Ancyra (314), 519-521; bishops at, 519, 523; canons, 520 f.; plenary council, 520

Antioch (341), 211
Antioch, "Canons" of, 77 note
Arles (314), 211, 510 ff.; Caecilian, 513; canons, 512; dioceses represented, 511 note; Easter question, 515; letter to Pope Sylvester, 517; not ecumenical, 512; rebaptism, 516; "traditio" of Scriptures, 512; travel expenses, 511
Carthage (252), 399
Carthage (255), 401, 403
Carthage (256), 405
Carthage (schismatic), 399, 502 f., 507
Cirta (305), 502
Elvira (*cir.* 300), 177, 440, 448; catechumenate, 517; irremovable clergy, 516 note; celibacy, 521 note
Iconium, 330
Jerusalem, 68, 74-79; apostles at, 80; character of, 76 note; letter to Church of Antioch, 76; observance of its decree, 77 note; St. Thomas Aquinas on, 76
Lateran (313), 496, 506 f.
Nicaea (325), 224; bishops at, 520
Phrygia, 330
Rome, 395 f.
Rome, (*cir.* 232), 339
Rome (313), 506 f.
Sardica (343), 428
Sinuessa, 462 note
Sunnada (230), 330
Vatican, 347
Councils, Development of, 433
Couple, The divine (in Gnosticism), 222
Creator, in Gnosticism, 223
In Ophitism, 265
"Credibile est quia ineptum," 274
Creed, of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, 373
Crescens (Cynic), 174, 345
And Justin Martyr, 235 f.
Cross, St. Helena and the true, 546
Crucifixion, Site of the, 532
Ctesiphon, 442
Curubis, Cyprian exiled to, 414
Cybele, Montanus priest of, 307
Cyprian, St. (bishop of Carthage), 375 f., 390-393, 438
Aquarii, 410
Character of, 376
Condemns delayed baptism, 411
De unitate Ecclesiae, 398
Election of, 389
Flight of, 391, 397, 499
Influence of, 310, 409
Letter from Church of Rome, 391; from Lucian, 393; to the Church of Rome, 382
Letter to the Confessors and Martyrs, 419
Martyrdom of, 419-421
Novatianism, 397
Offering boxes, 295
Office of priest, 427
On Works and Almsgiving, 411
Origen, 348
Pope Stephen, 402 f.
Rebaptism, 310, 400 f., 405
Schism of Felicissimus, 393
Subdeacons, 429
Tertullian's writings, 331
Unity of the Church, 398, 436
Valerian persecution, 414, 416
Cyprus, 59
Mines, 470
St. Paul, 66
Tomb of Lazarus, 187
Cyrenaica, Churches of, dependent on see of Alexandria, 433
Cyrene, 59

Dacians, Evangelization of, 369
Trajan's victory over, 210
Daia, Maximinus (Caesar), 465
Galerius' edict of tolerance, 471
Dalmatia, Eugraphus of, 428
Titus in, 174
Dalmatics, 539
Damaris, 110
Damascus, St. Paul at, 46, 64 f.
Damasus, St. (pope), Cemeteries, 415
Inscriptions, 138 note
Damius, Memoirs of Apollonius of Tyana, 314
Daphne Apollo, Statue of, 61
Dativus, St. (martyr), 463
David, Descendants of, 151, 202
De praescriptione (by Tertullian), 273, 275
De spectaculis (by Tertullian), 276
Deaconesses, at mass, 539
Deacons, Administration of Church property, 296
At mass, 538 f.

At Rome, 426
Baptism by, 38
Council of Elvira, 517
Deposition of, 280
Duties, 280, 283, 428
In the Didache, 86, 581
In the early Church, 126, 279 f.
The seven, 24
Valerian's edict against, 416
Vestments, 537
Dead, Veneration for the, 296
Decius (emperor), 378 ff., 451
Decree of persecution, 379-381, 387, 389
Persecution under, 365, 367, 370, 378 ff.
Delphi, Temple at, 541
Demetrius, St. (bishop of Alexandria), 303
And Origen, 338 f.
Demiurge (in Gnosticism), 223
Denis, St. (bishop of Paris), (*See* Dionysius the Areopagite)
Derbe, SS. Paul and Barnabas at, 67
Desert, Fathers of the, 547, 556
Development of Church, Internal, 79-86
Diaconate, Institution of, 37, 54
Of divine institution, 38 note
Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus, 215
Diaspora, The, 10
Didache, The, 27, 79-84, 90, 95, 248
Composition of, 82 note
Discovery of, 80 note, 573 note
Text of, 573-582
Didascales, 83
Didascalia of Alexandria (*See* Alexandria, School of)
Dignus (Donatist), 505
Dijon, Church of 240
"Diocese," in the third century, 280, 452
Diocletian (emperor), 446 ff., 451 ff.
Abdication, 465
Constantius, 546
Destruction of Church registers, 227
Edict of Milan, 491
First edict of persecution, 456 ff.
Later edicts of persecution, 462 ff.
National defense, 453
Persecution, 208 note, 456 ff.
Plan of government, 453
Policy of, 446, 452
Tolerance, 447
"Dioecesis," 468
Diognetus, Letter to, 247, 377
Dionysius, St. (bishop of Alexandria), 397 f.
Called "The Great," 397
Decius' edict, 380 f.
Flight, 397
Gallienus, 422, 485
Influence of, 370, 409
Novatian, 397 f.
Origen, 348
Paul of Samosata, 438
Persecution at Alexandria, 379
Pope Dionysius, 424
Pope Stephen, 407
Writings of, 397
Dionysius, St. (bishop of Corinth), 228
Dionysius, St. (pope), 424
Cemeteries, 530
Church property, 426
Dionysius, St. (the Areopagite), 110, 175
And Denis, bishop of Paris, 189 note
Dionysius Exiguus, and the Christian era, 5 note
Disciplina arcani, 32 and note, 91, 259 f.
Divorce, in Roman law, 544
Docetae, 204 f.
Docetism, 266
Apocalypse, 78
Cerinthus, 163
"Doctors," in the Didache, 82 note
In the early Church, 83, 86
Doctrine, in the Didache, 94-96
Of the early Church, 25-27, 302
Of the Twelve Apostles (*See* Didache)
Dogma (*See* Doctrine)
Dolabella, 134
Doliche, Worship of Baal of, 100
Domitian (emperor), 137, 141, 161
Persecution, 148-151, 157
Slaves, 299
Tolerance of, 137 and note
Domitilla, Flavia, 150
Cemetery of, 138
Domna (martyr), 572
Domna, Julia (empress), 313-316
Domus Sessoriana, 529
Donata (martyr), 245, 572
Donatism, 499 ff.
Appeal to emperor, 508-510
Caecilian's ordination, 502
"Church of the Martyrs," 509
Council of Rome (313), 506 f.
Effects of, 515 note

In Numidia, 514
Lucilla, 501 f.
Origin of, 499 ff.
Pope St. Miltiades, 506
Donatists, and Pope Marcellinus, 462
Appeal to Constantine, 543 f.
Donatus, bishop of Carthage (*See* Donatus the Great)
Donatus (bishop of Casae Nigrae), 501
Donatus the Great, 388, 501, 514
Before Constantine, 513
Council of Rome (313), 507 f.
Doxology of the Lord's Prayer, 87
Dualism, 266
In Manichaeism, 442

East, Septimius Severus in the, 311
Easter controversy, 227, 291 ff., 433
Council of Arles (314), 515
Easter, Feast of, 289 f.
Easter tables, 358
Eastern world, Church and the, 132 ff.
Ebionites, 204, 217-219
Ebionitism, Apocalypse and, 78
Essenean, 218
Ecclesia ex Gentibus, 79
Ecclesia ex Judaeis, 79
Edesius (*See* Aedesius)
Edessa, Basilica at, 532 note
Kingdom of, 431
Tomb of St. Thomas, 170
Egypt, Church of, 432
Churches of, dependent on Alexandria, 432
Desert of, 435
Independent rulers of, 423
Jews, slaves in, 216
Monasticism in Upper, 551
Origenists, 373
Persecution, 424, 469
Rebaptism, 404
Roman province, 142
St. Simon in, 172
Egyptians at Rome, 104
Ekklesia, 23
Elagabal of Emesa, Temple of, 313
Worship of, 313
Elagabalus (emperor), 321
Elchasai, Book of, 218
"Elder," 85
Elders (*See* Presbyteri)
Eleazar, Martyrdom of, 62
Eleutherius, St. (pope), 228, 264
Montanism, 330
Elkesaites, 217 f.
Baptism among the, 218
Elpis, St., 213, 572
Elvira, Council of (*cir.* 300), 177, 440, 448
Catechumenate, 517
Celibacy, 521 note
Irremovable clergy, 516 note
Emancipation (*See* Slaves, freeing of)
Ember days, 289
Emelia (martyr), 572
Emesa (Syria), 227
Temple of Elagabal, 313
Worship of Elagabal, 100
Emmanuelli, and date of Christ's death, 5 note
Emperor (Roman), Worship of, 239
Empire (*See* Roman Empire)
Encratites, 248
Endaemon (bishop), Apostasy of, 383 f.
Eneas, Cure of, 56
Ennoia, 44
Eons (*See* Aeons)
Epagathus, Vettius (martyr), 241, 561, 572
Eparchies, Ecclesiastical, 431
Epenetus, 111
Ephesians, St. Ignatius' Epistle to the, 204
St. Paul's Epistle to the, 115
Ephesus, Apocalypse written at, 153
Cerinthus, 162
Church of, 144, 204; Apocalypse addressed to, 153; beginning of, 134
Jews in, 134
Metropolis of Roman province, 141, 144
Polycrates bishop, 148, 292
St. John, 134, 152, 161, 163
St. Timothy, 135
Tomb of Magdalen, 187; of St. John, 148, 168
Epicureanism, 109
Epigonus (Monarchian), 355
And Praxeas, 354 note
Epiklesis, 559
Epimenides, quoted by St. Paul, 110
Epirus, St. Andrew in, 172
Episcopal lists, 183, 279
Episcopate and presbyterate, 85 note
Episcopate in the third century, 279

"Episkopos," 80 note, 84 f., 126 note
Epistle to Diognetus, 247
Epistles, Catholic, 129
Epistles of St. John, 129
Epistles of the Captivity, St. Paul's, 115
Esna, St. Pachomius, 551
Essenean Ebionitism, 218
Essenes, 15, 23, 218
Ethiopia, 46
  Gospel preached in, 369
  St. Matthew in, 171
  St. Matthias in, 171
Eucharist, and impeccability, 251
  In St. Justin's Apology, 260
  In the Didache, 87, 89 f., 93, 577 f., 580
  In the early Church, 31 f., 281, 283
  Origen, 343
Eudoxia, 208
Eugraphus (chorepiscopus), 428
Euhemerus, criticism of idolatry, 387, 440
Eulogius, St. (deacon), 421
Eumelius (governor), 513
Eunomius (bishop), and Donatist schism, 513
Eunuch of Queen Candace, 28 f., 44-46
Eusebius, St. (pope), 469
Eusebius (bishop of Caesarea), 475
  Against Porphyry, 476
  Church of Gaul, 184 f.
  On John (in Papias), 132 and note
  Origen's orthodoxy, 349
Eusebius (bishop of Laodicea), 423
Eustathius (bishop of Nicomedia), 519
Eutychian (pope), 425, 461
Evaristus, St. (pope), 207 f.
Evaristus(bishop), at Carthage, 396
Evelpistus (martyr), 237, 299 f.
Evil, Origen and the origin of, 342
Exegesis of the Words of the Lord (by Papias), 147
"Exomologesis" (*i. e.*, confession), 285
Exorcists, 426, 429
Exposition of the Faith (by St. Gregory Thaumaturgus), 372

Fabian, St. (pope), 365, 382, 391
  Letters against Privatus, 388
Fabius (bishop of Antioch), 396
Faith, Rule of, 27, 340
  St. Irenaeus, 267
Fan, at mass, 539
Fasciola, 208
Fasting, before baptism, 282
  Days of, 577
  Lent, 224
Fathers of the desert, 547-556
Fausta (empress), 507
  Lateran palace, 528
Faustinus, St., 213
Felix I, St. (pope), 425
Felix, St. (martyr, Carthage), 463
Felix (martyr, Lyons), 572
Felix (bishop of Aptonga), 501
  Charges against, 502, 509 f.
  Council of Rome (313), 508
Felix, St. (bishop of Thibiuca), 460
Felix, Minutius (apologist), 276 f.
Felix of Valence, St., 320
Felicitas, St. (martyr), 233 f., 317-319
  Acts of, 233 note, 243
Felicissimus, 399
  Schism of, 393-395
"Fermentum," 530
Ferreol, St. (martyr), 320
Ferrutius (martyr), 320
Festus (governor), 97
Fidentius (Donatist), 505
Firmilian, St. (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia), 403 note, 406-408, 424
  And Origen, 371
  At Antioch, 438
Firstfruits, 294 f.
Flabellum at mass, 539
Flamen, and Council of Elvira, 449
Flavia Domitilla, 150
  Cemetery of, 138
Flavius Clemens, 149 f.
Flavius Sabinus, 149 f.
Flavius Severus (Caesar), 465
Flight from persecution, 328
Florinus (heretic), 146
Florus, Gessius (governor), 123
Follis, 503 note
Foreigners, Christian attitude to, 298
Forgiveness of sins, in the Didache, 88
  In the *Shepherd* of Hermas, 253
Formularies, Sacramental, in Roman law, 543
Fornication, Forgiveness of, 357
  Meaning of, in Jerusalem decree, 76 and note
Fortunatus (martyr), 320
Fortunatus (schismatic bishop), 399

Fortunatus (in Volusianus inscription), 180 f.
Fortunion (in Decius' persecution), 390
Forty martyrs of Sebaste, 523 f.
Forum, Roman, 507
Fourvières (Lyons), 240
France, Evangelization of, 365 note
Francis of Assisi, St., 30
Friday, day of penance, 289
Fronto, 345
Fructuosus, St. (bishop of Tarragona), 421
  Valerian persecution, 416

Galatia, 67 note, 99
  Ancyra, capital of, 519
  Cerinthus, 162
  Judaizers, 71, 152
  SS. Paul and Barnabas, 67
Galatians, Epistle to the, 71-74, 79
Galba (emperor), 123
Galerius (emperor), Character of, 453
  Danube frontier, 454
  Diocletian, 446, 465
  Hostility to Christianity, 455 ff.
  Maxentius, 468
  Mother of, 454, 456-458
  Persecution, 454
  Tolerance, 470, 485, 491
Galerius Maximus (governor), 420
Galilee, Church of, 79
Gallienus (emperor), 422-424
  And the bishops, 426
  Church property, 367, 369
  Edict, 530, 532
  Military service, 382 note
  St. Dionysius of Alexandria, 485
  Tolerance, 422, 485
Gallus (emperor), Persecution under, 409
  The Plague, 408 f.
Gamaliel, 65
Garizim, Mount, 41, 50
Gatian, St., 179 note
Gaul, Crescens in, 174
  Church of, Easter controversy, 293; episcopal lists, 183; Eusebius' text, 184 f.; founders, 178 note; origin of, 182 ff.
  Novatianism, 396
  Seven bishops sent to, 184
  Under Constantius, 465
Gaza, St. Hilarian at, 550
  Slave market, 215
Geminian (martyr), 572
Geminius (priest), 370
Geminus (martyr), 572
Gentiles (*See* Paganism)
German tribes, Evangelization of, 369
Germany, Marcus Aurelius' victories, 306
  Origin of Church in, 182
Gessius Florus (governor), 123
Getulius, St., 213 f.
Gitta (Palestine), 41
Glabrio, Acilius (martyr), 150
Glaucias, Basilides and, 221
Gloria in excelsis, 224
Gnosis, 223
  Carpocrates and, 221
  Clement of Alexandria, 333
Gnosticism, 219 ff.
  Acta sancti Thomae, 170
  Alexandrian Judaism, 41
  Ambrose (of Alexandria), 360
  Aquarii, The, 410
  Asia Minor, 144
  Clement of Alexandria, 332
  Dualism, 266
  Encratites, 248
  Judaism, 440
  Marcion, 265
  Mithraism, 444
  Origen, 342
  Origenists, 373
  Origin of, 195, 216, 219
  Origin of evil, 342
  St. Irenaeus, 264, 271
  Simon Magus, 44
  Tertullian, 273
  Two phases of, 219
"God-fearing" pagans, 62
Golden Legend, The, 186
Gordian III (emperor), 362
  Tolerance of, 485
Gospel of Peter (apocryphal), 432
Gospel of St. John, 163-168
  Authorship, 166 note
Gospel, The oral, 25
Gospels, Apocryphal, 130
Gospels, Synoptic, 128-131
Gothicus, Claudius (emperor), Persecution under, 424
Goths, Invasion of, 383
Government, Church and the, 33-36

Graecina, Pomponia, 105 f., 138
Grail, Holy, 178 note
Granada, 448 note
Granianus (governor), Letter from Hadrian, 212
Grata (martyr), 572
Gratianus (deacon), 403 note
Great Announcement, The, 44 note
Great Silence, 220
Greco-Roman world, Church and the, 99-131
Greece, Apostasies in, 383 f.
  Clement of Alexandria, 332
  Persecution, 381
  St. Ignatius Martyr, 203
"Greeks," The, 62
Gregory of Tours, St., 415
Gregory Thaumaturgus, St., 371-373, 438
  Church at Neocaesarea, 367
  Conversion of Neocaesarea, 369
  Creed of, 373
  Exposition of the Faith, 372
  Miracles, 371
  Origen, 344, 371
  Origen's orthodoxy, 349
Grekeinos, Pomponios, 106

Hadrian (emperor), 211 ff.
  Apology addressed to, 214
  Character of, 211
  Gnosticism, 220
  Letter to Granianus, 212
  Statue of, in Jerusalem, 216
Harnack, Apostolicity of the Church, 13 note
  "Mater Ecclesia," 398 note
  Millenarianism, 327 note
Harris (Rendel), discovery of *Odes of Solomon,* 336 note
"Hearers" (class of penitents), 538
Heaven, Kingdom of, 7 f.
"Heavenly Father," 487
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 141, 164
Hegesippus, 202
  Ecclesiastical History, 97
  Episcopal lists, 279
Helena (companion of Simon Magus), 43
Helena, St., 545 f.
  Basilica of SS. Peter and Marcellinus, 528 f.
  Sessorian Basilica, 529
Heliopolis, Temple demolished at, 541
Hellenist Jews, 56
  At Antioch, 62
Henoch, Book of, 308
Heraclas (bishop of Alexandria), 370, 432
Heraclea, 435
  Church buildings of, 532 note
  Saint Antony (hermit), 547
Heracleon (Gnostic), 271
Heraclius (antipope), 469
Hercules, Maximian (*See* Maximian Hercules)
Heresies, Judaizing, 144
Heretics, Reconciliation of, 400
Hermas, 247, 253
  Apologist, 247
  Brother of St. Pius I, 227
  "Doctors," 83
  Liberation of slaves, 300
  Shepherd, 252-255
Hermes (deity), 143 note
Hermes (N. T.), 111
Hermes, St. (martyr), 213
Hermias (philosopher), 250
Hermits, 435, 556
Herod Agrippa I (*See* Agrippa I)
Herod the Great, 5, 51
  Sebaste, 42 note
  Temple at Jerusalem, 15
Herodians, 15, 35
Herodias, 51
Herperus, St. (martyr), 213
Hesychius (martyr), 478
Hetairiae, 198
Hexapla (by Origen), 344
Hieracas (of Alexandria), 434
Hierapolis, Apollinarius bishop, 329
  Papias bishop, 147
  St. Philip (Apostle), 146, 148
Hierarchy in the early Church, 80, 279, 426, 451
Hierax (martyr), 237
Hierocles (governor), 474
  Eusebius of Caesarea, 476
  Scripture, 475
Hilarianus (governor), 318 f.
Hilarian, St. (boy martyr, Carthage), 463
Hilarion, St. (hermit), 549-551
Hilary (martyr, Lyons), 572
Hindu Christians, 170
Hindus, Gospel preached among the, 369

Hippolytus, St. (of Rome), 310, 349-355, 359
Antipope, 321 f., 324, 351 note
Callistus, 357
Canons of, 283 note
Chronicles, 103 note
Commentaries, 350
Mammaea, 321
Philosophumena, 350
Praxeas, 354 note
Refutation of All Heresies, 350 f.
Schism of, 356 f.
Statue of, 358
Trinitarian dispute, 351
Zephyrinus, 355
Hircanus, 134
Holy Ghost, and the early Church, 22
Council of Jerusalem, 76
Manifestations of, 30, 43, 58
Praxeas, 354
Prophets, 82
Tertullian, 327
Holy Grail, 178 note
Holy Land, Pilgrimages, 532
Holy Orders, 426, 429
Holy Saturday, Baptism on, 282
Holy water, 209
Homoousios, 438 f.
Origen, 342 note
Hosius (bishop of Cordova), 496, 504 f.
Hours of prayer, 86, 288
Hungary, Marcus Aurelius in, 305
Hyacinth (priest), 246, 323
Hyginus, St. (pope), 227
Hylists (in Gnosticism), 223
Hymeneus (N. T.), 78

Iconium (Algeria), 522
Iconium (Asia Minor), Council of, 330
SS. Paul and Barnabas in, 67
Idolatry, Arnobius and, 440
Constantine, 541 f.
Euhemerus, 440
Forgiveness of, 286
Idols, 542
Ignatius, St. (bishop of Antioch), 202 ff.
"Ancients," 85
Charity of Roman Church, 228
Death of, 202
Domitian, 151
Episkopoi, 84
Epistles, 146, 203
Papal supremacy, 206
Ignatius Loyola, St., 436
Discerning of spirits, 548
Illiberis (*See* Elvira)
"Illumination" (*i. e.,* baptism), 282
Immersion, Baptism by, 87
"Impiety," in Roman law, 413
Imposition of hands, for converted heretics, 400 (*See* also Confirmation)
Incarnation, Doctrine of the, 26
India, "Christians of St. Thomas" in, 170
Hindu Christians, 170
Mani, 442
St. Bartholomew, 171
St. Pantaenus, 303
St. Thomas (Apostle), 170
Infallibility of the Apostles, 80
Infanticide, in Roman law, 544
Ingentius (Donatist), 510
Charges against Felix, 502
Institution of diaconate, 37
Internal development of Church, 79-86
Ionia, 135, 144
Irenaeus, St. (bishop of Lyons), 263-271
Adversus haereses, 229, 264
Apologist, 247
Blessed Virgin Mary, 270
Christology, 269 f.
Easter controversy, 293 f., 407
Logos, 352
Redemption, 270 note
Rule of faith, 267, 340
St. Polycarp, 146
St. Pothinus, 240
Sent to Rome, 264
Theology, 349
Irrisio gentilium philosophorum, 250
Isis, Worship of, 100
Israel, Religion of, 6
Italy, Church of, dependent on see of Rome, 432
Clement of Alexandria in, 332
Persecution, 381
Ius gladii, in Palestine, 34

Jaldaboath (in Gnosticism), 265
James the Greater, St., 148
Compostela, 178
Death of, 178
Martyrdom of, 51, 66
Spain, 177
James the Just (*See* James the Less)

James the Less, St., 52 f., 96-98
Bishop of Jerusalem, 25, 136
Council of Jerusalem, 75
Epistle of, 96, 129
Judaizers, 68
Martyrdom of, 97
St. Paul, 66
Jamnica (martyr), 572
Jerusalem, Church of, 21-32; alms for, 66, 114; Church of Antioch, 62; Easter controversy, 293; growth of, 67
Council of, 68, 74-79; character of, 76 note; observance of its decree, 77 note
Destruction of, 123-125, 216
Judaizers at Antioch from, 69
Library, 370
Metropolitan see, 432
Rebaptism, 404
St. Alexander bishop, 370
St. James bishop, 25, 96-98
St. Narcissus bishop, 434
St. Paul, 65
St. Simeon bishop, 25
Siege of, 123
Jesus (*See* Christ)
Jesus, in Gnosticism, 221, 223
Jesus (son of Ananias), 123
Jewish Diaspora, 10
Jewish religion, 6
Jews, and converts from Judaism, 497
Early Church and the, 14-60
Expelled from Rome, 102, 106
In Alexandria, 142
In Ephesus, 134
In Marseilles, 182
In Roman Empire, 103
John the Ancient, in Papias, 128, 132
John, St. (Apostle), 133-135
Apocalypse, 151-156
Arrest of, 18-20
Blessed Virgin Mary, 133
Disciples of, 145-148
Easter, 291 f.
Ephesus, 134, 161, 163
Epistles, 78, 129
Exiled, 152
Gospel of, 163-168; and Cerinthus, 167; Authorship of, 166 note
Jerusalem, 66
John the Ancient, 132
Letter to the Seven Churches, 148, 153
Logos, 165
Miracle in the Temple, 16-20
Samaria, 29
Sebaste, 42
Tomb of, 168
Tortured at Rome, 151
John Malalas of Antioch, Chronicle of, 64 note
John the Baptist, St., Church of (*i. e.*, Lateran Basilica), 529
Joppa, Peter's miracle at, 56
Peter's vision at, 67, 69
Joseph (*i. e.*, Barnabas), 62
Joseph of Arimathea, St., 178 note
Judaeo-Christianity, 79
Judaism, 439 f.
And the early Church, 14-60, 439 f.
Cerinthus, 162
Christianity distinct from, 65
Mithraism, 444
Philo, 162, 441
Judaizers, after Council of Jerusalem, 77
And early heresies, 194
Antioch, 69, 74
Galatia, 71
Palestine, 78
St. Barnabas, 70
St. Simeon (bishop of Jerusalem), 202
Judaizing heresies, 144
Jude, St. (Apostle), Epistle of, 78, 129
Evangelization by, 171
Grandsons of, 151
Judea, Christians martyred by Jews in, 216
Revolt in, 215
St. Matthias' death in, 171
Julia (N. T.), 111
Julia (daughter of Drusus), 105
Julia (martyr), 572
Julia Domna (empress), 313-316
Influence on paganism, 313
Mithraism, 443 note
Julian, St., 178 note
Julian the Apostate, 345
At Antioch, 61
Julius, St. (martyr), 245, 572
Julius Africanus, *Cestoi*, 370
Chronicles, 370
Julius Severus (general), 215
Junias, an "apostle," 81
Jupiter, Statue of, in Jerusalem, 216
"Friend of man," 474
Pluvius, Marcus Aurelius' victory, 306

Terminus, 457
Jurisdiction of the Apostles, 80
Justa (martyr, Lyons), 572
Justin Martyr, St., 234-237
Acts of, 243
Apologist, 215, 255-263, 272
Conversion of, 235
Episkopoi, 84
Esteem for philosophy, 350
Logos, 352
Millenarianism, 327 note
Phrygians, 307

Kahal, 23
Keimazomenoi (penitents), 520
Kenoma (in Gnosticism), 223
Kephro (in Libya), Dionysius of Alexandria exiled to, 414
Kiddush, 89
Kingdom of heaven, 7 f.
Kiss of peace, 108, 262, 319, 538
Kochaba, 136

Labarum, Apparition of, 487-489, 511 note
Form of, 489 note
Lactantius (apologist), Divine Institutions, 477
Laetus (governor), 338
La Gayole sarcophagus, 181
Lambaesa, Privatus bishop of, 388, 399
Langres, Church of, 240
Laodicea, Church of, 135, 144; Apocalypse addressed to, 153 f.
Easter controversy, 292
Eusebius bishop, 423
St. Anatolius bishop, 423
La Porte, De, and date of Christ's death, 5 note
Lapsi, in Decian persecution, 381
Libelli pacis, 393
Novatus, 391, 395
Peter of Alexandria, 478
Lateran baptistry, 530, 535
Lateran Basilica, 528-530, 537
Not a "title," 530
Lateran Council (313), 496, 506 f.
Lateran palace, 506 f., 528
Latin Gate (Rome), 151
Lausiac History (by Palladius), 555
Law, Mosaic, 73
Of the secret, 32, 91
Pagan and Christian, 542 f.
Lawrence, St. (deacon), 417 f., 429
Basilica of, 528, 531
Valerian persecution, 416
Lazarus (monk), 187
Lazarus, St. (of Bethany), at Marseilles, 186
Journey to Gaul, 186
Tomb, 187
Veneration of, in Provence, 188
Lectors, in the early Church, 426, 429
Legal reforms, Constantine and, 542-545
Legio fulminata, 305
Lent, Season of, 290
Lenten fast, 224
Leon (diocese), 403
Martial bishop, 403
Leonides, St. (martyr), 320, 337 f., 348
Leonine Sacramentary, 295
Leontius (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia), 519
Letter to the Seven Churches (by St. John), 148, 153
Libellatici, The, 392
Libelli of indulgence, 392
Liber de rebaptismate, 407
Liber pontificalis, 227
Liberianus (martyr), 237
Liberty of conscience, 484
Library, at Caesarea, 469
At Jerusalem, 370
Libya, Church of, 433
Desert of, 435
St. Dionysius of Alexandria exiled to, 414
Licinius, and Constantine, 486
As Augustus, 467, 471
At Milan, 491
Constantine and death of, 525
Edict of Milan, 492
Galerius' edict of tolerance, 485 note, 491
Persecution, 523
War with Constantine, 525
Licinius Granianus (governor), 212
Linus, St. (pope), 138 f.
Litterae communicatoriae, 433
Liturgy, in the early Church, 27-32, 86-91, 287 ff., 535 f.
Apocalypse, 155
Mass, 536
Mozarabic, 178
Logos, Doctrine of, Alexandrian Church, 164, 437

Church Fathers, 352
Gnostics, 222
Hellenists, 164
Paul of Samosata, 437 f.
Philo, 143 note, 164
St. John, 165
St. Justin, 256 f.
Lord's Prayer, 87
Lord's Supper (*See* Eucharist)
Lucian (confessor), in Decian persecution, 390
Letter to Cyprian, 393
Libelli pacis, 391 f.
Lucian (Donatist), and Caecilian, 505
Lucian of Antioch, St. (martyr), 473
Profession of faith, 473 note
Lucilla, and Donatist schism, 501-503
Lucina (N. T.), 208
Cemetery of, 106, 138, 430
Lucius I, St. (pope), 402
Exile of, 409 f.
Lucius of Cyrene, 59 note
Luke, St. (Evangelist), 107, 129
Lusitania, 177
Lycopolis, Meletius of, 478
Lydda, Peter's miracle at, 56
Lydia (Asia Minor), 144
Lyons, Church of, and Churches of Asia Minor, 240; letter from, 228, 239, 560-571
Importance of, 239
Martyrs of (A. D. 177), 238 ff., 560-571; list of, 572
St. Irenaeus bishop, 146, 247, 264
St. Pothinus bishop, 564
Septimius Severus at, 311
Lystra, SS. Paul and Barnabas at, 67

Macarius (martyr), 572
Macedonia, St. Andrew in, 172
St. Ignatius Martyr in, 203
Machabees, Martyrdom of, 62
Macrianus (usurper), denounces the Church, 411
Hostile to Christians, 423
Persecution, 424
Valerian persecution, 411 f.
Macrina the Elder, St., 372
Magdalen, St., The Golden Legend, 186
Journey to Gaul, 186
Relics at Vézelay, 187
Tomb, 187
Veneration of, in Provence, 188
Magdalen (fifth century), Tomb of, 187
Magnesia, Church of, 204
Magnesians, Ignatius' Epistle to the, 204 f.
Majoma, St. Hilarion in desert near, 550
Majorinus, 505
Donatist schism, 503
Malachias, Sacrifice of, 90
Malalas of Antioch, John, 64 note
Malchion (priest), and Paul of Samosata, 439
Mammaea, confers with Origen, 339
Dealings with St. Hippolytus and Origen, 321
Manahen (N. T.), 59 note
Mani, 441 f.
Manichaeism, 441-443
Manifestations of Holy Ghost, 43
Mappalicus (in Decius' persecution), 390
Maravesar inscription, 177
Marcellinus, St. (pope), and Donatists, 462
Basilica of SS. Peter and, 528
Reported apostasy of, 462 note
Marcellus (governor), 51
Marcellus, St. (centurion), 454
Marcellus I, St. (pope), 467-470
Marcellus (bishop of Ancyra), 519
Marcia (slave and wife of Commodus), and Pope Victor, 246, 323
Marcian (bishop of Arles), 396, 403
And Novatianism, 403
Marcion (heretic), 163
Antitheses, 266
Gift to Church of Rome, 265
Tertullian writes against, 275 f.
Marcionism, 271, 390
Marcionites, 358
Marcus (Gnostic), 265
Marcus Aurelius (emperor), 231 ff., 246
Athenagoras to, 484
Break-up of the Empire, 232, 243
Commodus, 244
Disasters in reign of, 233
Melito to, 485
Monument to, 306
Philosopher, 232, 255, 311
Saved by the *legio fulminata*, 305
Slaves, 299
Mardinu, birthplace of Mani, 441
Marinus (bishop of Arles), 505, 512
Marius, and city of Arles, 510

Mark, St. (Evangelist), 128
At Alexandria, 144
Marriage, Second, 328
Marriages, Mixed, 449
Marquesia inscription, 177
Marseilles, Church of, 183 f.; origin, 174, 180, 182, 185 ff.
First bishop of, 185 ff.
Inscription of Volusianus, 180 f.
Jews in, 182
St. Paul at, 182
"Martha," 187
Martha, St. (of Bethany), Church of, at Tarascon, 187
Journey to Gaul, 186
Veneration of, in Provence, 188
Martial (poet), 141
Martial (bishop of Leon), apostate, 403
Martial, St. (bishop of Limoges), 178 note
Martianus, and trial of Acacius, 386 f.
"Martyr," 209 note, 229, 410, 414, 500, 570
Martyrology of Ado, 177
Of Usuard, 336
Martyrs, Anniversaries of, 290
In Judea, 216
Number of, 480 note
Of Lyons, 238 ff., 560-571; list of, 572
Of Scillium, 244 ff.
Of Sebaste, Forty, 523 f.
Relics of, 502 note
Martyrus (martyr), 572
Mary (mother of James), journey to Gaul, 186
Mary (mother of Mark), 63 note
Mary Magdalen (*See* Magdalen)
Mary, St. (Blessed Virgin), Death of, 133 note
St. Irenaeus, 170
St. John (Apostle), 133
Tomb of, 133 note
Mary, St. (a slave), 213, 299
Mass, at dawn, 225
Canon of, 209
Ceremonies of, 260, 262 note, 283 f., 288, 536
Choir at, 539
Christmas midnight, 224
Gloria in excelsis, 224
Hour of, 225
In the Didache, 577 f., 580
Offerings at, 538
Preface, 209
Priests, 427
Primitive canon, 557-559
"Mater Ecclesia," 398
Materna (martyr), 572
Maternus, St. (bishop of Cologne), 505
Matthew, St. (Apostle), *Acta*, 171
Basilides and, 221
Evangelization by, 171
Gospel of, 129; in Arabia, 303
Papias, 148
Matthias, St. (Apostle), 21
Basilides and, 221 note
Death in Judea, 171
Evangelization by, 171
Maturus (martyr), 241, 562, 565 f.
Mauritania, St. Salza of, 522
Maxentius (emperor), and Constantine, 486
Constantine's victory over, 489-491
Galerius' edict of peace, 471
Pope Marcellus, 469
Proclaimed emperor, 467
Restitution of Church property, 469
Maximian Hercules (emperor), Abdication of, 465
Constantine's divorce of St. Helena, 546
Division of the Empire, 453
Hosius of Cordova, 505
Persecution, 454
Resumption of office, 467
Maximilla, and Montanus, 308
Ecstasies of, 330
Influence of, 374
Maximin, St., Journey to Gaul, 186
Veneration of, in Provence, 188
Maximinus Daia (emperor), 451
As Caesar, 465
Decree of persecution, 357
Despotism, 491
Galerius' edict of peace, 471
In Armenia, 480
Persecution, 310, 348, 358-363, 471 ff.
Policy of, 380, 446
St. Felix, 460
The Plague, 479
Theotecnus, 472
Maximus, Galerius (governor), 420
Melchiades (*See* Miltiades)
Melchisedech, 353
Meletius of Lycopolis, 478
Melitene (in Cappadocia), 305

Melito, St. (bishop of Sardis), 250
To Marcus Aurelius, 485
Memphis, St. Antony at, 547
Menander, quoted by St. Paul, 110
Mensurius (bishop of Carthage), 500 f.
Merida, Basilides bishop of, 403
Mesopotamia, 99
Church of, 304
SS. Simon and Jude in, 171
Messalina, 105
Methodius, St. (bishop of Olympus), apologist, 475 f.
Death of, 473
Metrodorus (Marcionite priest), 385
Metropolis, 431
Metropolitan sees, 431 f.
In Spain, 451
Milan, Edict of, 491-498
And Concordat of 1801, 494 note
Licinius, 523
Text of, 583 f.
Miletus (Asia Minor), 152
Military service, Roman, 382 note
Millenarianism, 327 note
Justin Martyr, 259
Montanism, 326
Tertullian, 326
Miltiades, St. (pope), buried in catacombs, 531
Caecilian, 506
Church property, 468 f.
Council of Rome (313), 507 f.
Lateran Council, 496
Letter from Constantine, 506
Miltiades (apologist), 250, 329
Milvian Bridge, Battle of, 486, 489-491
Minor Orders, 426, 429
St. Hyginus, 227
Minutius Felix (apologist), *Octavius*, 276 f.
Minutius Timinianus (governor), 316
Miracle at the Beautiful Gate, 16-20
Miracles, Gift of, 24
Mishna, 440
Mithra (deity), 443
Mithraism, 443-445, 522
Aurelian, 377
Judaism, 444
Purification ceremony, 443 note
Worship of *Sol Invictus*, 100
Mithraist, Tomb of a, 541
Modalism, 354, 438
Origen, 342
Monad, Carpocrates and the, 221 f.
Monarchianism, 354 f.
Praxeas, 355
Monasticism, 551-556
Novitiate, 555
Spread of, 555 f.
Upper Egypt, 551
Monotheism, Jewish, 439
Montanism, 306-309, 374
Condemnation of, 330 f., 433
Flight in persecution, 390
In Africa, 309, 324-326
Millenarianism, 326
Origenists, 373
Praxeas, 354
Tertullian, 326-330
Montanist *Acta*, 325
Montanists, debate with Apollinarius, 329
Montanus, 307 f.
Flight from persecution, 328
Visions, 330
Morality, in Christian teaching, 91-94
In the Didache, 91 f.
Moses (priest), and Novatian schism, 394
"Mother Church," 398 and note
Mozarabic Liturgy, 178
Mulieres subintroductae, 434 note, 450 note
Murder, Forgiveness of, 253, 286, 356
Museum, at Alexandria, 142
Music, at mass, 539
Mutual benefit societies, 296
Mysia (Asia Minor), 144
Decius in, 383
Montanism, 306

Nablus (Palestine), 234
Naples, Constantinian church at, 531
Narbonnaise, Second, 182 note
Narcissus (bishop of Jerusalem), 434
Narcissus (N. T.), 111
Nartallus (martyr), 245
Nasutius (Donatist), 505
Natalis Invicti, 287 note
Neocaesarea, Church at, 367
Conversion of, 369
St. Gregory Thaumaturgus bishop, 371
Neoplatonism, 341, 441
Ammonius Saccas, 339
Nereus (N. T.), 111
Nereus and Achilleus, Acts of, 201 note
Nero (emperor), 123

Burning of Rome, 120
Christianity at Rome, 175
Marquesia inscription, 177
Persecution, 120-122, 200
Seneca and Burrus, 114
Slaves, 299
Nerva (emperor), 196
New Testament, memorized by monks, 555
Newman (Cardinal), Conversion of, 514 note
Nicaea, Council of, Bishops at, 520
Hosius at, 505
Lenten fast, 224
Nicodemus (N. T.), 28
Nicolaites, 152, 154
Nicolas (deacon), 59 note, 152
Nicomedia, Anthimus bishop, 459
Basilica at, 532 note
Bryennius bishop, 573 note
Church destroyed at, 457
Constantine at, 465
Eustathius bishop, 519
Lactantius at, 477
St. Barbara, 361
Nicostratus (confessor), 396
Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, 404 note
Nile River, St. Pachomius at, 553
Nina (martyr), 572
Nisan (Jewish month), 291
Nobility, Valerian's edict against Christian, 416
Noetus (Monarchian), 354 note, 355
Normans in Provence, 185
Nothing, The (in Gnosticism), 223
Nous, "spirit" (in Gnosticism), 222 f.
Novatian (heretic), and Novatus, 394, 396
Condemned, 396
De Trinitate, 394 note
Episcopal consecration of, 395, 427
Schism of, 395-398
Tertullian's writings, 331
Novatianism, at Antioch, 396
Arles, 403
Asia Minor, 396
Carthage, 396
Condemned, 396
Gaul, 396
Novatus (schismatic), 396
Begins schism, 389
Lapsi, 391
Novatian schism, 395
Rome, 394
St. Cyprian, 391
Schism of Felicissimus, 393-395
Novices, in monasteries, 555
Numidia, 501
Church at Cirta, 531
Church of, and St. Cyprian, 411; redemption of captives, 411
Donatism, 514
Rebaptism, 404
Nymphs, Worship of, at Antioch, 61

Octavia (wife of Nero), 120
Octavius (by Minutius Felix), 276 f.
Octobres (martyr), 572
Odenatus, and Eastern confederation, 423
Odes of Solomon, 336 note
Odium generis humani, 197, 200
Offering boxes, 295
Offerings at mass, 538
Ogdoad (in Gnosticism), 222
Olympus, St. Methodius bishop, 473, 475 f.
Olympus, Mount, 144
Oodeypore inscription, 170
Ophis, 265
Ophism, 271
Ophites, 265
Orders, Holy, 426, 429
Orders, Minor, 426, 429
Organization of the Church, 24 f.
Oriental religions, 232
And Christian mysteries, 287 note
Origen, 337-349
Ascetic, 434
Caesarea, 343 f.
Clement of Alexandria, 304, 337
Contra Celsum, 345-348
Dealings with Mammaea, 321
"Doctors," 83
Esteem for philosophy, 341, 350
Logos, 352
Maximinus' persecution, 359
Origin of evil, 342
Orthodoxy of, 349
Philip the Arabian, 364
Redemption, 343
Religious studies, 370
Rome, 339
St. Leonides, 320
Scholar, 331
School of Alexandria, 337-339

Scripture exegesis, 340
Severa (empress), 364
Theology of "The Principles," 341
Writings of, 310, 349
Zeal, 348 f.
Origenists, 373-375
Orontes River, 61
Orpheus, honored by Alexander Severus, 321
Ortus (Roman senator), 150
Osroene, Church in, 431
Ostium, Constantinian church at, 531
Otacilia Severa (empress), 363
Otho (emperor), 123
Ousia, 439 note
Ozanam, Pagan and Christian law, 542 f.

Pachomius, St. (hermit), 551-556
Pachomius (bishop), and Meletius, 478
Paenula (*i. e.,* chasuble), 539
Paeon (martyr), 237
Paganism, and the early Church, 99-101
At close of third century, 440 f.
Attempts to revive, 473-475
Constantine and, 541
Converts from, 56 f.
Decline of, 99-101, 198, 312
Influence of Julia Domna, 313
Influence on Christians, 374
Pagans, Admission of, 68
"God-fearing," 62
Palamon (hermit), 553 note
And St. Pachomius, 552
Palatine hill (Rome), 507, 529
Palestine, Cerinthus in, 162
Church in, 135 f.
Clement of Alexandria, 332
Holy places of, 532
Mines, 470
Origen, 339, 343
Origenists, 373
Origen's influence, 370
Rebaptism, 404
Roman protectorate in, 34
St. Helena, 546
St. Hilarion, 550
St. Justin Martyr, 234
Subdued by Severus, 215
Palingenesis (*i. e.,* baptism), 282
Palladius, *Lausiac History,* 555
Palmyra, Zenobia Queen of, 546
Pammachius (N. T.), 208
Pampeia (martyr), 572
Pamphilus of Caesarea, St., 469
Origen's orthodoxy, 349
Pandataria (island), 150
Pantheism, 266
Papal supremacy, in the third century, 211, 367, 426
Novatian schism, 399
St. Cyprian, 201 note, 405, 408 note
St. Ignatius of Antioch, 206
Papias (bishop of Hierapolis), 147
Composition of the Gospels, 147
"Disciples of the Lord," 148
Exegesis of the Words of the Lord, 147
John the Ancient, 132
Rule of faith, 128
St. Irenaeus, 240, 264
St. Mark's Gospel, 128
Parables of Christ, 7 f.
Paraclete, Kingdom of, 327
Montanus, 307
Tertullian, 327
Paradosis, 27
Paris, St. Denis bishop, 189 note
Parish, in the third century, 280
Parishes in Rome, 468
Paroecia, 468
Parousia, in the Didache, 95
Tertullian, 327
Parthenius, St. (martyr), 370
Parthia, St. Thomas in, 170
Parthians, St. Matthew among the, 171
Pasch, Jewish, 291
Passio Alexandri, 209
Passio Clementis, 201
Passio Perpetuae, 325 note
Passio Suzannae, 425
Patmos, Apocalypse written in, 153
St. John's exile, 152
Patras (in Achaia), St. Andrew's martyrdom, 172
Patriarchates, 433
Patricius (Roman official), 504
Patriotism, Roman, 451
Patripassians, 354
Paul, St. (Apostle), 63-74
Acquitted, 117
"Ancients," 85
Antioch of Pisidia, 67
Antioch of Syria, 65
Arabia, 64
Arrested in Jerusalem, 114
Asia Minor, 144
Basilica (Rome), 528, 531

Brings alms to Jerusalem, 66
Chronology of life of, 48 note
Circumcision, 79
Claudius, 114
Conversion of, 46-49; date, 48 note
Council of Jerusalem, 75
Cyprus, 66
Damascus, 64 f.
Derbe, 67
Dream at Troas, 107
Easter, Feast of, 292
Episkopoi, 84
Epistles: Colossians, 77, 115; Ephesians, 115; Galatians, 71-74; Hebrews, 141; Philemon, 115; Philippians, 115; Romans, 111-114; Thessalonians, 79; Timothy, 118; Titus, 118
Epistles of the Captivity, 115
Europe, 107-111
Galatia, 67
Iconium, 67
Imprisoned at Caesarea, 114
Inflammation of eyes, 64 note
Jerusalem, 65
Lystra, 67
Marseilles, 182
Martyrdom of, 122
Name changed from Saul, 67
Pastorial Epistles, 78
Rebukes St. Peter, 70
Returns to Tarsus, 65
Rome, 114-117
St. Barnabas and, 22, 65-68; at Jerusalem, 74
St. James the Less, 53
St. Peter and, at Antioch, 69 f.
Sees Peter, 65
Silas, 22
Spain, 118, 176
Paul and Thecla, Acts of, 64 note
Paul, St. (hermit), 547
Paul (in Decius' persecution), 390
Paul (martyr), and Lucian, 392
Paul of Samosata, 369, 436-439
Christology, 438
Debate with Malchion, 439
Deposed, 439
Logos, 437
Trinity, 437 f.
Paul of Thebes, St., 435
Paula, St., Sacred music, 540
Paulus, Sergius, 67
Pavia, Early importance of, 184 note
Pbow, St. Pachomius at, 554
Pedanius Secundus, Slaves of, 120
Pella (Palestine), Christians flee to, 124, 136
Pella, Aristo of, 215
Penance, Canonical, 520
Controversy, 250 ff., 324, 356 ff.
Penance, Days of, 289
Penance (sacrament), in third century, 285-287
In titular churches of Rome, 530
Origen, 343
Priests administer, 427
Penitents, 538
Classes of, 520
Pentecost, 10-13
Baptism on vigil of, 282
Feast of, 289
Pentapolis, Church of, 433
Perea, Christians flee to, 124
Pergamus, Attalus of (martyr), 241, 562, 572
Church of, 135, 144, 151
Library, 142
Perpetua, St., 316-319
Acts of, 316, 325 note
Persecutions, Attempt to justify, 382 note
Duration of, 480 note
Edict of Decius, 379-381, 389
In Africa, 388 ff.; Caesarea, 469; Carthage, 420; Egypt, 424, 469; Rome, 460 ff.
Number of, 480 note
Three phases of early, 194
Under Aurelian, 424; Claudius Gothicus, 424; Commodus, 244 ff.; Decius, 365, 367, 370, 378 ff., 387; Diocletian, 208 note, 456 ff., 462 ff.; Gallus, 409; Galerius, 454; Licinius, 523; Macrianus, 424; Maximinus, 310, 357-363, 471 ff.; Septimius Severus, 310, 314 ff., 328; Trajan, 201 ff.; Valerian, 413-416
Persia, Mani in, 442
SS. Simon and Jude, 172
St. Thomas, 170
Valerian (emperor), captive, 422
Persian religion, and Manichaeism, 442
Persians invade Cappadocia, 424
Pertinax (emperor), Religious peace under, 311

Peter, St. (Apostle), "Ancients," 85
And St. Marcellinus, Basilica of, 528
And St. Paul at Antioch, 69 f.
Arrest of, 18-20, 52
Asia Minor, 144
Basilica (Rome), 528, 531
Bishop of Antioch, 70 note
Cornelius the centurion, 55-59, 67
Council of Jerusalem, 75
Cures by, 24
Easter, Feast of, 292
Epistles, 78, 129
Founder of the Church of Rome, 99
Gospel of (apocryphal), 432
Joppa, Miracle at, 56; vision at, 57, 69
Length of pontificate, 102 note
Lydda, Miracle at, 56
Martyrdom of, 122
Papias, 148
Pentecost, 11-13
Primacy of, 9, 21, 64
Raises Tabitha to life, 56
Rebuked by St. Paul, 70
Rome, 101-106, 117-119
St. Paul sees, 65
Samaria, 29
Sebaste, 42 f.
Sends bishops to Spain, 177
Temple, Miracle in the, 16-20
"Years of," 102 note
Peter, St. (bishop of Alexandria, martyr), 473, 478
Peter (martyr under Diocletian), 459
Peter Lombard, and form of baptism, 29 note
Petilian, and Pope Marcellinus, 462 note
Pharisees, 15, 35
And St. James the Less, 97
Phenicia, Aphaca in, 541
Hierocles governor of, 474
Phenicians (in Africa), 388
Philadelphia, Apocalypse addressed to Church of, 153 f.
Ebionites, 204
St. John, 135
St. Paul, 144
Philadelphians, St. Ignatius' Epistle to the, 204 f.
Phileas, St. (bishop of Thmuis, martyr), 469, 478
Acts of, 469 note
Philemon, Epistle to, 115
Philemon (martyr, Lyons), 572
Philetus (N. T.), 78
Philip, St. (Apostle), 145 f., 148
And St. Philip the deacon, 145 note
Feast of Easter, 291 f.
Philip, St. (deacon), and St. Philip the Apostle, 145 note
Eunuch of Queen Candace, 29, 44-46
Evangelization by, 56
Samaria, 42
Sebaste, 42
Philip the Arabian (emperor), 362 ff.
A barbarian, 451
Antioch, 385
Cemetery of St. Callistus, 366
Christians in high office, 370
Favors to Christians, 378
Pagan practices under, 374
Spread of Christianity, 369
Tolerance of, 485
Philippi, St. Paul at, 99, 107
Philippians, St. Paul's Epistle to the, 115
Philo, 142 f.
Judaism, 162, 440 f.
Logos, 143 note, 164
Philocalian Calendar, 102 note, 361
Philologus (N. T.), 111
Philoromus (martyr), 469
Acts of, 469 note
Philosophumena (by Hippolytus), 350 f.
Authorship of, 350 note
Philostratus, Life of Apollonius of Tyana, 314
Philotheus Bryennius (bishop of Nicomedia), Discovery of the Didache, 573 note
Phlegon (N. T.), 111
Phoeno, Mines of, 478
Phrygia, Church of, letter from Church of Lyons, 239
Councils, 330
Easter controversy, 292
In Roman province of Asia, 144
Montanism, 306 f.
Persecution, 464
St. Alexander (martyr, Lyons), 567 f.
St. Philip (Apostle), 146
Piazza Navona (Rome), 467
Pilate, 37, 49
Acts of, 472
Pionius, St., 383-385, 431
Pisidia, Antioch in, 386
Pistis, St., 213
Pius I, St. (pope), 227, 252

Plague, under Emperor Gallus, 408 f.
Under Emperor Maximinus, 479 f.
Plato, Carpocrates' esteem for, 221
Platonism, Carpocrates and, 221
Clement of Alexandria, 332
St. Justin Martyr, 235
Plautius (Roman official), and Pomponia Graecina, 106
Plebs, 426, 429 f.
Pleroma (in Gnosticism), 223, 265, 267
Pliny, letter from Trajan, 199; letter to Trajan, 198, 224
Plotinus (philosopher), and Origen, 341
Empress Salonina, 422 note
Neoplatonism, 441
Pneumatists (in Gnosticism), 223
Poimen (The "Shepherd"), 252
Polemon (Roman official), and St. Sabina, 431
Arrests Pionius, 384
Polycarp, St. (bishop of Smyrna), 229-231
Easter controversy, 292, 294
Feast of, 290
Martyrdom of, 230 f., 307, 384
Papias, 128
St. Irenaeus, 147, 240
St. John (Apostle), 146
St. Pantaenus, 303
St. Pothinus, 240, 264
Polycrates, St. (bishop of Ephesus), Easter controversy, 292
St. John (Apostle), 148
St. Philip (Apostle), 145 note, 148
Polymius (king of Armenia), 171
Pompeia (martyr), 572
Pompey, Theater of (Rome), 461
Pomponia Graecina, 105 f., 138
Pomponios Grekeinos, 106
Pontia (island), 150
Pontianus, St. (pope), 324
Burial of, 366
Exile, 359
Resignation of, 361
Roman Council, 339
St. Hippolytus, 357
Ponticus (martyr), 242, 568, 572
Pontus (Roman province), Aquila of, 217
Church of, Easter controversy, 293; St. Peter, 99
Influence of Origen, 371
Persecution, 464
St. Basil of Amasea, 523
St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, 371
Spread of Christianity, 369
Poor, The, 298
Charity towards, 411
In the third century, 298-301
Offerings for, 295
Pope, Primacy of the, in the third century, 211, 367, 426
Novatian schism, 399
St. Cyprian, 401 note, 405, 408 note
St. Ignatius of Antioch, 206
Pope, Prerogatives of, 81
Popes, List of:
Peter (d. 67?), 101-106, 117-119
Linus (67-79?), 138 f.
Cletus (79-90?), 139
Clement I (90-99?), 139 f., 156-161
Evaristus (99-107?), 207 f.
Alexander I (107-116?), 207
Sixtus I (116-125?), 210 f.
Telesphorus (125-136?), 224 f.
Hyginus (136-140?), 227
Pius I (140-154?), 227
Anicetus (154-165), 227
Soter (165-174), 227 f.
Eleutherus (174-189), 228
Victor I (189-198), 246
Zephyrinus (198-217), 353 ff.
Callistus I (218-222), 322-324
Urban I (222-230), 324
Pontianus (230-235), 324
Anterus (235-236), 358
Fabian (236-250), 365
Cornelius (251-253), 391 ff.
Lucius I (253-254), 402
Stephen I (254-257), 402-405
Sixtus II (257-258), 416-419
Dionysius (259-268), 424
Felix I (269-274), 425
Eutychian (275-283), 425
Caius (283-296), 425
Marcellinus (296-304), 462
Marcellus I (308-309), 467-470
Eusebius (309), 469
Miltiades (311-314), 506 ff.
Sylvester I (314-335), 518
Popes, name their successors, 210
Porch, The, 235
Porphyry (philosopher), 441
Empress Salonina, 422 note
Hierocles, disciple of, 475
Refutation of, 473, 475

Porta Ardeatina (Rome), 138
Porta Capena (Rome), 103
Porta Latina (Rome), 151
Porter (minor order), 426, 429
Posthumus, ruler in Gaul, Britain, and Spain, 423
Posture at prayer, 284
Potamia (martyr, Lyons), 572
Potamiana, St. (slave, martyr), 320
Pothinus, St. (bishop of Lyons), 572
  Martyrdom of, 241 f., 564
  St. Eleutherius, 228
  St. Irenaeus, 240, 264
Poverty, Regard for, 297
Praetextatus, Cemetery of, 417, 430
Praxeas, Doctrine of, 352-354
Prayer, Attitude at, 284
  Formulas in the Didache, 90 note
  Hours of, 86, 288
  St. Clement's, 160
Preaching, duty of deacons, 280
Preface of mass, 209
Presbyter, 24, 80 note, 84, 126 note
  In St. Clement's Epistle, 159
Presbyterate and episcopate, 85 note
Presbyterial council, 279
Presbyterion, 85
Presbyterium, 533
Prescription, in Roman law, 275
Pretorian Guard, 467
Priesthood, St. Cyprian on, 398
Priests, and administration of Church property, 296
  Deposition of, in third century, 280
  In the third century, 279 f.
  Mass, 427
  Sacrament of penance, 427
  Valerian's edict against, 416
  (*See* also Presbyter)
Prima sedes, in Spain, 451
Primacy of Church of Rome, 267
Primacy of pope (*See* Pope, Primacy of)
Primacy of St. Peter, 9, 21
Primus (martyr), 572
Prisca (N. T.), 111, 208
Prisca (empress), 447, 454, 458
Priscilla, St., Cemetery of, 138, 462
Priscilla (Montanist), 308, 330, 374
Priscus (father of St. Justin Martyr), 234
Priscus (martyr), 572
Private inspiration, 308
Privatus (bishop of Lambaesa), 388, 399, 433
Probus (emperor), 451
Proculus Toparcion, and Septimius Severus, 311
Property, Church (*See* Church property)
Prophets, and the Holy Ghost, 82
  At Antioch, 82
  At Corinth, 153
  In the Didache, 82 note, 579
  In the early Church, 24, 81 f., 86
Prosopon, 439 note
Protoctetus (priest), and Origen, 348, 360
Provence, Church of, Origin, 179 ff., 185-189
  Holy places of, 188
  Loss of documents, 185
  Veneration of St. Lazarus and companions, 188
Provinces, Ecclesiastical, 431, 433 note
  Roman, 452
Psalter, memorized by monks, 555
Psychists (in Gnosticism), 223
Ptolemies, The, 62, 142
Ptolemy (philosopher), 265
Publius (prefect of Rome), 234
Pudens, Christian meetings in house of, 208
Pudens family, 138
Pupienus (emperor), 362
Pythagoras, Carpocrates' esteem for, 221
  School of, 235
Python, Worship of, 522

Quadi, Marcus Aurelius in country of the, 305
Quadratus, Apology by, 214
Quadratus, Statius (governor), 229
Quartia (martyr), 572
Quartodecimans, 292
Quaternion, The primal (in Gnosticism), 222
Quintus (apostate), 307
Quirinus, St., 213

Rebaptism, 398-405
  Council of Arles (314), 516
  St. Cyprian, 398
Recognitions (by pseudo-Clement), 218
"Reconciliation" (*i. e.,* baptism), 282
Red Sea, St. Antony near, 547

Redemption, Doctrine of the, 26
Origen, 343
St. Irenaeus, 270 note
Refutation and Overthrow of Knowledge so-called, 264 note
Registers, Destruction of, 208 note, 227
Relics of martyrs, 502 note, 569
Religion, Roman, 301, 540 ff.
Of Israel, 6
Renan, on Communism and the early Church, 54 note
Repostus, bishop of Saturnum (apostate), 389
Restitutus, St., 178 note
Reticius, bishop of Autun, 505
Revocatus, St. (slave), 316, 319
Rhode (Roman matron), 253
Rhosus (in Cilicia), Church of, 432
Riez, Armentarius of, 428
Ritual, 86-91
Rodana (martyr), 572
Roman army, Military service in, 382 note
Roman Empire, Barbarian rulers of, 451
Break-up of, 232
Christianity beyond the, 304
Jews in the, 10
Largest cities, 60 note
Roman law, Children in, 543 f.
Divorce, 544
Infanticide, 544
Slaves, 543 f.
Woman, 543 f.
Roman provinces, 452
Roman religion, 301, 540 ff.
Roman Senate, 451 f.
Romans, Epistle to the, 111-114
Rome, Burning of, 119 f.
Councils: (251), 395 f.; (*cir.* 232), 339; (313), 506 f.
Destruction of papal archives, 461
Epigonus at, 355
Jews expelled from, 102, 106
Jews in, 103
Mithraism, 443
Novatus, 393
Parishes, 468
Persecution at, 316, 381, 460 ff.
Piazza Navona, 467
Praxeas, 353
St. Agnes, Church of, 467
St. Ignatius' journey to, 203
St. Justin Martyr, 256
St. Paul, 114-117
St. Peter at, 101-106, 117-119; returns from, 66
Statue of St. Hippolytus, 358
Subdeacons, 429
"Tituli," 468
Vatican Basilica, 528
Worship of, 239
Rome, Church of, 125-127, 136 ff.
Charity of, 228
Destruction of registers, 227
Founded by St. Peter, 99
Marcion's gift to, 265
Moderation of, 499
Parishes formed, 208
Primacy of, 267
St. Felicitas, 233
St. Ignatius' Epistle to, 203
"Titles," 208
Rufinus (father of St. Sylvester), 519
Rufus (N. T.), 111
Rule of faith, 27, 340
Papias, 128
St. Irenaeus, 267
Rusticus (prefect), and St. Justin Martyr, 236

Sabatier (Paul), on St. Paul's conversion, 48 note
Sabazios, Tomb of priest of, 541
Sabbath, replaced by Sunday, 288 f.
Sabellianism, Pope St. Callistus and, 323
Pope St. Dionysius and, 424
Sabellius (Monarchian), 355
Sabina, St. (slave), 213, 362, 384 f.
Sabinus, Flavius (Roman official), 149 f.
Sabine country, Evangelization of, 214
Saccas, Ammonius (philosopher), 339, 341
Sacramentary, Leonine, 295
Sacraments, Administration of, 280
In *Epistle to Diognetus,* 278
Sacrificati, The, 392
Sadducees, 15, 18, 53
Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer, 186
Salmanasar (king of Assyria), 40
Salome (N. T.), journey to Gaul, 186
Salonina (empress), 422 and note
Salsa, St. (martyr), 522
Salvidienus (Roman senator), 150
Samaria, Church in, 79
City of, 42 note
Pilate and, 37

Religion of, 40
St. Philip (deacon), 42
SS. Peter and John, 29
Samaritans, Massacre of, 50
Samos (island), 135
Samosata, Paul of (*See* Paul of Samosata)
Sanctus (deacon, martyr), 241, 562 f., 565 f., 572
Sanhedrin, Apostles before the, 35
St. James the Less before, 97
SS. Peter and John before, 18-20
Saphira (N. T.), 22, 53-55
Sapor (king of Persia), conquers Emperor Valerian, 422
Sara (of Bethany), journey to Gaul, 186
Saracens in Provence, 185
Sardica, Council of (343), 428
Sardinia, Body of St. Pontianus, 366
Mines of, 246, 323 f., 357, 359, 361
Sardis, Church of, 135, 144; Apocalypse addressed to, 153 f.
St. Melito bishop, 250
Sarmatians, Evangelization of, 369
Satan, in Gnosticism, 223
In Manichaeism, 442
Satisfaction, Penitential, 287
Saturday, day of penance, 289
Saturnilus of Antioch (Gnostic), 220 f.
Saturninus, St. (bishop), 184 note
(priest, martyred at Carthage, A. D. 304), 463
(martyr, A. D. 203), 319
(Docetist), 163
(governor), 245
Saturnum, Apostasies at, 389
Repostus bishop, 389
Saturus (martyr at Carthage), 317-319
Acts of St. Perpetua, 316
Saul (*See* Paul)
Schism, of Felicissimus, 393-395
Of Novatian, 395 ff.
Scillium, Martyrs of, 244 ff.
Scriptures, Aquila's Version, 216 f.
Canon of, 129, 344
Ordered to be given up, 460
Origen's exegesis, 340
"Traditio" of, 502, 508, 510, 512
Scrutinia before Baptism, 536
Scythia, St. Andrew in, 172
Scythians, Evangelization of the, 369
Sebaste, Forty martyrs of, 523 f.
St. Philip (deacon) at, 42
SS. Peter and John at, 42
Secret, Discipline of the, 32, 91, 259
Secunda (martyr, Scillium), 245
Secundulus (*See* Secundus, martyr at Carthage)
Secundus, St. (martyr at Carthage), 317
Secundus (Gnostic), 264
Secundus, Pedanius (Roman official), 120
Seleucidae, The, 62
Seleucus, builder of Antioch, 61
Senate, Roman, 451 f.
Seneca, 113 f., 120
Sepaca (martyr), 572
Septimius Severus (*See* Severus)
Septuagint Version, 344
And Aquila's version, 216 f.
Revision of, 473
Seraphia, St., 213
Serapion (bishop of Antioch), 329, 432, 437
Serapis, adored by Septimius Severus, 311
Temple of, 142, 552
Seres, Gospel preached among the, 369
Sergius Paulus (governor), 67
Serrae (*See* Seres)
Sessorian Basilica, 529
Seven, The number, in Apocalypse, 155 note
Seven bishops sent to Gaul, 184
Severa (empress), and Origen, 363 f.
Severus, Alexander (emperor), and Ambrose of Alexandria, 359
Death of, 358
Domestic chapel, 321
Tolerance of, 364, 485
Severus, Flavius (emperor), 465, 467
Severus, Julius (general), 215
Severus, Septimius (emperor), and burial associations, 368
Cemetery associations, 295
Character of, 311
Christians at court of, 312
Decree of persecution, 315
In Syria, 315
In the East, 311
Peace under, 279, 311
Persecution, 264, 310, 314, 316 ff., 328
Policy of, 380
St. Andeol, 320
Shenesit, St. Pachomius at, 552

Shepherd (by Hermas), 252-255
Authorship of, 247, 255 note
Sichem (Palestine), 41, 234
Sicily, Pope Eusebius exiled to, 469
St. Pantaenus, native of, 303
Sidon (Syria), 59
Sidonius, St., journey to Gaul, 186
Sige (in Gnosticism), 220, 222
Silas (N. T.), 22
Silence, The Great (in Gnosticism), 220, 222
Silvanus (bishop of Cirta), 502
Silvester (*See* Sylvester)
Silvius (martyr), 572
Simeon, St. (bishop of Jerusalem), 25, 136
Death of, 202
Simon, St. (Apostle), Evangelization by, 171
Simon Magus, 39-44
Doctrines attributed to, 43 f.
Followers of, 96
Simon Niger, 59 note
Simony, 44
Sinai peninsula, St. Paul in, 64
Sinope (Asia Minor), Marcion native of, 265
Sins, Forgiveness of, in the Didache, 88; in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, 253
List of, in the Didache, 88
Sinuessa (Italy), Council of, 462 note
Sirmium, Temple of Sun at, 444
Sixtus I, St. (pope), 210 f.
Sixtus II, St. (pope), 416-419
Dionysius of Alexandria, 408
Valerian persecution, 417
Slavery, Abolition of, 545
Slaves, Antoninus Pius and, 299
Attitude of the Church, 299
Bishops and freeing of, 544
Constantine and, 546
Domitian and, 299
Egypt, Jewish slaves in, 216
Freeing of, 300, 544
Fugitive, 362
Gaza, Slave market at, 215
In Roman law, 300, 543 f.
In Roman world, 104
In the Didache, 576
Legal status, 299 note
Marcia, wife of Commodus, 246, 323
Martyrs of Lyons, 562
Nero, 299
Numidia, Church of, and redemption of captives, 411
Pedanius Secundus, Slaves of, 120
Rights of, 299
St. Peter's words to, 104 f.
Slaves, Christian:
Proculus Toparcion, 311
St. Blandina, 241-243, 299 f., 562, 565-568, 572
St. Cletus (pope), 139
St. Evelpistus, 237, 299 f.
St. Herperus, 213
St. Linus (pope), 138 f.
St. Mary, 213, 299
St. Potamiana, 320
St. Revocatus, 316, 319
St. Seraphia, 213
St. Zoe, 213
Smyrna, Church of, Cerinthians in, 204; in Apocalypse, 151, 153 f.
Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, 290
Noetus, 355
St. Irenaeus, 264
St. John, 135
St. Paul, 144
St. Polycarp bishop, 146, 229
St. Sabina, 384
Smyrnaeans, St. Ignatius' Epistle to the, 204 f.
Societies, Burial, 295 f.
Sol Invictus (deity), 496
Religion of, 444
Tomb of priest of, 541
Worship of, 100
Solomon, Odes of, 336 note
Sophia, St., 213
Soracte, Mount, 519 note
Soter, St. (pope), 227
Charity of, 228
Easter controversy, 292
Spain, Church of, metropolitan sees, 451; origin of, 173-178
Prima sedes in, 451
St. James the Greater, 177
St. Paul, 118, 176
Seven bishops sent to, 177
Under Constantius, 465
Spartianus (historian), 315
Speratus (martyr), 245
Spirits, Discerning of, 548 f.
Intermediate (in Gnosticism), 220
Sporades (islands), 152
Sportulae, 429

Spread of Christianity, 369 ff.
"Stations," in Rome, 530
Statius (poet), 141
Statius Quadratus (governor), 229
Stephen, St. (deacon), 22
  Martyrdom of, 36-39, 49 note; St. Paul at, 46
Stephen I, St. (pope), 402-405
  Alms to Churches of Syria and Arabia, 411
  Letter from St. Firmilian, 406
  St. Dionysius of Alexandria, 407
  Valerian persecution, 414
Stoicism, and the Roman religion, 301
  At Athens, 109
  Clement of Alexandria, 332
  St. Pantaenus, 303
Subdeacons, Pope Cornelius and, 426, 429
  Seven, at Rome, 365
Subordinationism, 424
  Clement of Alexandria, 336
  Origen, 342
Substrati (penitents), 520
Subura (Rome), 103
Suetonius, on ruler from Judea, 104
Sun (deity), Appolonius' devotion to, 314
  Temple of, at Sirmium, 444
Sunday, day of rest, 497
  Replaces Sabbath, 288 f.
  Sunnada, Council of (230), 330
Support of clergy, 297
Supremacy, Papal (*See* Papal supremacy)
Sylvester I, St. (pope), 518
  Buried in a basilica, 531
  Letter from Council of Arles, 517
Symbol (*See* Creed)
Symmachus, Quintus Aurelius, and paganism, 495
Symmachus the Ebionite, version of Bible, in the Hexapla, 344
Symphorosa, St., 213 f.
Synod (*See* Council)
Synoptic Gospels, 128-131
Syria, Basilides native of, 221
  Bishops at Council of Ancyra, 520
  Cerinthus, 162
  Church of, 432; alms from Pope Stephen, 411
  Rebaptism, 404
  Revolt in, 462
  St. Anicetus, native of, 227
  Septimius Severus in, 315
Syrians at Rome, 104
Syzygie (in Gnosticism), 222

Tabatha (Palestine), St. Hilarion native of, 550
Tabennesi, St. Pachomius at, 553 f.
Tabitha (N. T.), raised to life, 56
Taedium vitae, 100
Talmud, 440
Tangier (*i. e.,* Tingis), 454
Tanner, Theodotus the (Monarchian), 352
Tarascon (France), Church of St. Martha, 187
Tarragona (Spain), Coins, 496 note
  St. Fructuosus bishop, 421
  St. Paul, 177
Tarsicius, St. (martyr), 415
  Epitaph, 416 note
Tarsus, 46
  St. Barnabas at, 65
  St. Paul returns to, 65
Tatian (apologist), 247
  Apology of, 248
  Apostasy of, 248
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (*i. e.,* the Didache), Text of, 573-583
Telesphorus, St. (pope), 224 f.
Temple (at Jerusalem), Destruction of, 123
  In Jewish religion, 15, 439
  Martyrdom of St. James the Less, 97
  Miracle in, 16-20
  Site of, plowed up, 216
Temples, Destruction of pagan, 541 f.
Terebinth, Slave market of, 215
Teresa of Jesus, St., Mystical gifts of, 30
Terminalia, Festival of, 457
Tertullian (apologist), 247, 271-276, 310, 499
  Ad nationes, 273
  Apologeticus, 273 f., 276
  Apostasy of, 310, 321
  Caecilian, 375
  Character of, 272
  Charges against St. Callistus, 324 note
  Charges against St. Zephyrinus, 322
  "Credibile est quia ineptum," 274
  De praescriptione, 273, 275
  De spectaculis, 276

Flight from persecution, 328
Idea of the Church, 328 f.
Logos, 352
Millenarianism, 326
Montanism, 326-330
Office of priest, 427
Opinions regarding, 331
Parousia, 327
Passio Perpetuae, 325 note
Polemics of, 315
Praxeas, 354 and note
Profession of arms, 305
Rule of faith, 340
St. Callistus, 356
Spread of Christianity, 304
Trinity, Doctrine of, 352
Tertullianists, 329
Testamentum Domini, Canon of the mass, 557
Tetrarchy, 453, 465, 467
Tetrad, The primal (in Gnosticism), 222
Thaumaturgus (*See* Gregory Thaumaturgus)
Theater of Pompey (Rome), 461
Thebaid, The, 433
St. Athanasius in, 555
St. Anthony, 547, 550
Thebes, St. Pachomius at, 552 f.
Thecla, Acts of Paul and, 64 note
Themison (Montanist), 308
Theoctistus (bishop of Caesarea), 370
And Origen, 339
Theodore (*i. e.*, Gregory Thaumaturgus)
Theodore (bishop), and Meletius of Lycopolis, 478
Theodosian Code, 543
Theodota (*i. e.*, Sabina), 362
Theodotians, 358
Monarchians and, 355
Theodotion, version of Bible, 344
Theodotus (Gnostic), 265
Modalism of, 438
Theodotus the Banker, 353
Theodotus the Tanner (Monarchian), 352
Excommunicated, 353
Theophilus (bishop of Antioch), apologist, 247, 249, 437
Logos, Doctrine of, 352
Theotecnus (Roman official), and Maximinus' persecution, 472
Therapeutae, 23
Thessalonians, Epistle to the, 79
Thessalonica, St. Paul at, 99, 107
Thibiuca (*i. e.*, Tubzag), St. Felix at, 460
Thirty Tyrants, 423, 453
Thmuis (Egypt), Ammonius bishop, 432
St. Phileas bishop, 469
Thomas, St. (Apostle), Acta, 170
"Christians of," 170
Evangelization by, 170
Oodeypore inscription, 170
Papias, 148
Thomas Aquinas, St., and form of baptism, 29 note
On Council of Jerusalem, 76
Thomas (Nestorian missioner), 170
Thrace, 358
St. Andrew in, 172
Thyatira, Church of, 135, 144; in Apocalypse, 153 f.
Tiberius (emperor), and Palestine, 37
Death of, 50
Tibiuca (*See* Thibiuca)
Tigellinus, and Emperor Nero, 114, 120
Timinianus, Minutius (governor), 316
Timothy, St., and "ancients," 85
At Ephesus, 135
St. Paul's Epistles to, 118
Tingis (*i. e.*, Tangier), 454
Tipasa, Martyrdom of St. Salsa at, 522
Tithes, 294 f.
"Titles" (Roman churches), 208, 468, 530 f.
Titular churches (Rome), 530
Titus, St., in Dalmatia, 174
St. Paul's Epistle to, 118
Titus (martyr, Lyons), 572
Titus (emperor), 137
At Jerusalem, 66, 123
Tombs (in the catacombs), Inscriptions on, 430
Tonsure, 227 note
Toparcion, Proculus (slave), and Septimius Severus, 311
Torquatus, St. (bishop of Cadiz), 177
Tournus, Church of, and Church of Lyons, 240
"Traditio" of the Scriptures (*See* Scriptures)
Tradition as rule of faith, 27
Tralles, Church of, 204
Trallians, St. Ignatius' Epistle to the, 204 f.
Translation of Bible by Aquila, 216

Trastevere (Rome), 103
Trajan (emperor), 196 ff.
  Character of, 196
  Column of, 210
  Letter from Pliny, 198, 224; to Pliny, 199
  Martyrdom of St. Simeon, 136
  Organization of the Church, 368
  Persecution, 201 ff.
  Public offices, 382 note
  Public works at Rome, 210
  Rescript, 212, 316
  Roman unity, 197
  Victory over Dacians, 210
Treves, Early importance of, 184 note
Trias, in Theophilus, 250
Trier (*See* Treves)
Trinitarian controversy, 229, 323, 351, 424
Trinity, Doctrine of, in the Didache, 94
  First Christians, 26
  Novatian's *De Trinitate,* 394 note
  Origen, 342
  Ousia, 439 note
  Paul of Samosata, 437 f.
  Praxeas, 352
  Tertullian, 352
  Theodotus the Tanner, 352
  Theophilus, 250
Tritheism, 424
Troas, St. Paul's dream at, 107
Trophima (martyr), 572
Trypho, Worship of, 313 note
Tuburbium (Africa), 316
Tubzag (*i. e.,* Thibiuca), St. Felix bishop, 460
Tunic, 539
Turkestan, Mani in, 442
Twelve, The (*See* Apostles)
Tyana, Apollonius of (*See* Appolonius)
Tyrants, Thirty, 423, 453
Tyre, 59
  Basilica at, 531, 532 note

Ulpius (martyr), 572
Unitarians, 424
Unity of the Church, 399 note, 406
  St. Cyprian, 398
Urban I, St. (pope), 324, 357
Urbanus (N. T.), 111
Ursicinus (*See* Ursinus)
Ursinus, St. (bishop of Bourges), 178 note, 184 note
Usuard, Martyrology of, 336
Usury, 450

Valence, Apostles of, 320
Valentinianism, 271, 360
Valentinians, 252
Valentinus (Gnostic), 222, 264
  Docetism, 163
  Tertullian, 276
Valeria (daughter of Diocletian), 447, 454, 458
Valerian (emperor), 409 ff.
  Captive of King Sapor, 422
  Edicts of persecution, 413-416
  Plague, The, 408 f.
  Tolerance, 410
Valerian (husband of St. Cecilia), 237
Vatican Basilica, 528, 531
Vatican Council, 347
Vatican hill (Rome), 139
Venosa, St. Felix at, 460
Verona Manuscript, Canon of mass, 557
Vespasian (emperor), 137
  In Palestine, 123
Vestia (martyr), 245
Vettius Epagathus (martyr), 241, 561
Vézelay (in Burgundy), Relics of St. Magdalen at, 187
Via Appia, 238, 417, 541
  Aureliana, 510
  Domitiana, 510
  Labicana, 528
  Nomentana, 209 note, 528 f., 531
  Ostia, 138, 528, 531
  Salaria, 138, 209, 415
Vibia Perpetua (*See* Perpetua)
Victor I, St. (pope), and confessors in Sardinia, 246, 323
  Baptismal controversy, 229
  Easter controversy, 292 f.
  Excommunicates Theodotus the Tanner, 353
  Montanism, 330
Victory, Altar of, 495
Vienne (France), Church of, 228; letter from, 239, 560-571
  Pilate banished to, 50
  St. Sanctus, 562
Vincent (martyr), 572
Virgin of Carthage, Worship of, 100
Virginity, clerical ideal, 281
Virgins, Consecrated, 434
  At mass, 539

Virtue, according to Carpocrates, 222
Vitalis (bishop of Antioch), 519 f.
Vitalis (martyr, Lyons), 572
Vitellius, Aulus (emperor), 123
Vitellius, Lucius (governor of Syria), 50 f.
  Deposes Caiphas, 48 note
Vittus (martyr), 572
Void, The (in Gnosticism), 223
Volusianus inscription, 180 f.

Water, Holy, 209
Wednesday, day of penance, 289
"Weepers" (class of penitents), 538
Western Church, date of Easter, 291
Widows, in the early Church, 126
Wine, offered at mass, 539
Wisdom, Book of, written at Alexandria, 142
Woman, in Roman law, 300, 543 f.
Word (*See* Logos)
World, The ancient, 3

"Years of Peter," 102 note

Zachary (martyr), 241, 572
Zenobia (Queen of Palmyra), and Eastern confederation, 423
  Judaism, 439
  Paul of Samosata, 436
  War against, 546
Zephyrinus, St. (pope), and Artemon, 353
  Cemetery of St. Callistus, 366
  Hippolytus, 355
  Monarchianism, 355
  Montanism, 330, 354
  Praxeas, 354
  St. Callistus, 323
Zeus Philios, 474
Zoe, St. (slave), 213
Zoe (in Gnosticism), 222
Zosimus (martyr), 572
Zoticus (martyr) 572

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME TWO

315-475

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME TWO

PERIOD OF THE CHURCH FATHERS

(315-475)

M[illegible] C[illegible]
13th A[illegible] STREET
N[illegible] 3, NEW JERSEY

B. HERDER BOOK CO.,
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-507

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT
Sti. Ludovici, die 24. Aprilis, 1935,
F. J. Holweck,
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR
Sti. Ludovici, die 25. Aprilis, 1935,
✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1935
B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Third Printing, 1955

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

PREFACE

THE fourth and fifth centuries of our era were dominated by two momentous facts: the Roman Empire, repeatedly attacked by the barbarians and weighed down by its own corruption, crumbled into ruin and in its fall dragged down pagan idolatry; but the Catholic Church, purified by persecution and enriched by whatever it retained that was good and true and beautiful in the inheritance of the Greco-Roman world, organized to civilize the barbarian world.

The account of the first of these two facts supplies the general setting of our history. We see the last Roman emperors, in their endeavor to save the Empire, appeal to the aid of various forces: Constantine invokes the help of Christianity; Constantius relies upon heresy; Julian the Apostate has recourse to paganism; Theodosius returns to Constantine's design.

The second fact was a deeper undertaking, one less merely external. Men of learning and virtue, whom posterity would call the Fathers of the Church,[1] sought to develop the doctrinal and moral teaching and the spiritual life of Christianity. So fruitful was their influence that their name has been given to the two centuries which glory in their labors. By contrast with the age of the martyrs preceding them, the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era are commonly spoken of as the age of the Church Fathers.

That period did not embrace all the great men on whom Christians bestow this glorious title. Their long series goes

[1] They were called "Fathers of the Church" as early as the fifth century.

back to St. Clement of Rome, who lived in the time of the Apostles, and continues to St. Bernard, who illumined the twelfth century. But the group of ecclesiastical writers living during the period between the Edict of Milan and the fall of the Empire is distinguished by certain marks that set them apart in the history of Christianity.

First, the patristic literature of the fourth and fifth centuries is especially abundant, and in every domain is displayed with tireless activity. Apologetics, polemics, Scriptural exegesis, dogmatic theology, the science of morals, asceticism, history, and sacred poetry were cultivated with like earnestness and success. Following the peace of Constantine, with the fear of persecution definitely removed and the material life of Christian society apparently secure, cultivated minds turned with eager curiosity to the great religious speculations that were elaborated by the School of Alexandria. Their ambition was to employ the language and philosophical ideas of Greek learning in the formulation of the lofty mysteries of the faith. With greater zest at Alexandria, a more positive method at Antioch, and a more traditional tendency in Cappadocia, the Fathers of the East were outstanding leaders in this movement of religious scholarship. The full development of Latin activity came only later and in a more practical realm of ideas.

In the East such men as Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, and the Cyrils explored the notion of divine substance and worked out a science of God and of Christ; in the West a science of man and the Church was evolved by scholars like Ambrose, Jerome, Hilary, and Augustine, passionately devoted to questions of morality and discipline. Moreover, a broad current of ideas circulated between the Greek and the Latin world. St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, and St. Hilary were their providential bonds of union; St. Augustine built them

into a mighty synthesis. Through him the whole intellectual work of antiquity is transmitted to the Middle Ages and to modern times.[2]

The patrology of the fourth and fifth centuries had this special feature: it was more universal than any other movement of Christian learning. Previous to St. Athanasius, religious literature, which at first had been Jewish and then Alexandrian, was almost exclusively Eastern; after St. Augustine its chief development is in the West; during the classical period of the Fathers, it radiates everywhere.

Such being the case, the influence of the Fathers of this epoch was immense and beyond comparison with the influence of the groups of writers who preceded or who followed them. From their labors the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption, and grace come forth almost fully elucidated. The great councils of this period had simply, by virtue of their supreme authority, to promulgate the infallible definitions of those doctrines. The subtlest sophisms of heresy are clearly discerned by the Fathers. With regard to the principal errors that may attack the idea of God, the divinity of Christ, and the conditions of man's salvation, they furnish replies that, as a whole, can be regarded as final.

The "period of the Fathers" has also been called the "period of the great heresies." "There must be heresies," said the Apostle. There had to be, if only to stir the intellectual activity of the Church. St. Hilary begins his immortal treatise *On the Trinity* by saying that heresy spurred his mind. "The errors

[2] "Whoever would become an able theologian and a sound exegete should read the Fathers again and again. In a single one of their writings he will often find more of the principles and early vigor of Christianity than in several volumes of recent interpreters . . . because those great men were nourished upon this wheat of the elect, this pure substance of religion, and because, as they were filled with that primitive spirit which they received more directly and abundantly from the very source, often what they write is more nourishing than what was later elaborated." Bossuet, *Défense de la tradition et des saints Pères,* Part I, bk. 4, chap. 18.

of heretics and blasphemers force us to scale perilous heights, to speak unutterable words." [3] Heresies had to be, since God, desiring the development of His Church to the end of time, seems to will that it should always develop by struggle. In the era of bloody persecutions, the first pontiffs by their martyrdom cemented the movement of expansion and organization of the early Church. The doctors following them endured another sort of martyrdom, defending against sophistry and blasphemies and in the face of persecution, insult, and calumny, the Church which was attacked in its essential dogmas and calumniated in its purest morality. But from this crisis they saw Catholic doctrine arise triumphant, elucidated, and strengthened.

The strife against actual heresies was not the sole cause for the grief of those venerable Fathers. In the tendencies of some Eastern doctors, in the political acts of certain emperors, and in the jealous attitude of peoples grouped about Constantinople, they could foresee the remote causes of a great schism. Yet, although their souls groaned, their faith was never shaken.

Though all the dissident sects, in schism as in heresy, agreed on one point—hatred for the Roman Church—the latter remained steadfast in adherence to its earliest traditions and by its generosity, as in the time of Clement of Rome, ever deserved to be called the one "that presides over the charity." Whereas each of these sects assumed the name of its leader or of the locality where it was born, the common voice of all peoples reserved the name Catholic Church for that one group which was connected with Rome. While Arians, Donatists, Nestorians, and Eutychians divided and subdivided, forming independent branches, the Church, faithfully united to the Roman pontiffs, tightened the bonds of its hierarchy. The Roman Church, in its discipline as in its doctrine, was indeed

[3] St. Hilary, *On the Trinity*, II, 2. (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, IX, 52.)

the Church to which Christ foretold that "the gates of hell would not prevail against it."

The progress of events that we recount in the present volume has three phases, dividing the work into as many parts.

From 313 to 379, under emperors who now protect it and now persecute it, the Church affirms at Nicaea the contested points of its faith, and the Fathers energetically defend that faith, whether against the final assaults of pagan error or against the attacks of that half-pagan error, the doctrine of Arius. It is the end of paganism.

From 379 to 395, while Theodosius resumes and develops the protective policy of Constantine, the Fathers profit from the imperial good will to combat and expose the most varied and subtle forms of heresy. This is the triumph of Christianity as the State religion.

From 395 to 476, while Constantinople's rivalry of Rome prepares the way for the future schism of the East and while successive barbarian assaults weaken the Empire of the West, the Church enjoys a greater freedom from imperial tutelage and, relying only upon her own power for the defense of her doctrine and for the conversion of new peoples, faces the future with confidence.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE END OF PAGANISM

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Arian Heresy	3
	Condition of Paganism	3
	Arianism	7
	Paul of Samosata	7
	St. Lucian	8
	Arius	10
	Arianism at Alexandria	12
	St. Athanasius	13
	Council of Alexandria (320 or 321)	16
	Arian Doctrine	16
	Eusebius of Nicomedia	20
	Eusebius of Caesarea	20
	St. Alexander	22
	Emperor Constantine	24
	Hosius of Cordova	25
II.	The Council of Nicaea (325)	28
	Letter of Convocation	28
	Arrival of the Bishops	30
	First Meeting of the Council	31
	Pagan Philosophers at Nicaea	32
	Emperor Constantine at the Council	34
	Hosius of Cordova	36
	Parties in the Council	37
	Arius before the Council	38
	Procedure	40
	The Arian Controversy	41
	Marcellus	42
	Athanasius	43
	Eusebius of Nicomedia	44

CHAPTER PAGE

Homoousios in the Creed 46
The Nicene Creed 49
The Banishment of Arius 50
The Meletian Schism 51
The Easter Controversy 53
Disciplinary Canons 55
Constantine's Attitude 59

III. Eusebius of Nicomedia and St. Athanasius (325–337) 61
Eusebius' Plan 61
Exile of Eusebius 62
Eusebius of Caesarea 63
St. Eustathius 64
St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria 67
Attacks on St. Athanasius 69
Eutocius at the Imperial Court 71
Council of Tyre (336) 73
Marcellus of Ancyra 74
Death of Arius 76
Constantine's Last Days 78
Christianity and Roman Law 80
Constantinople 82
Evangelization of Abyssinia 83
Georgia 85
Armenia 86
Persia 88
The Goths 89
Constantine and the Barbarians 90
Christian Literature 91
Christian Poets 93
Liturgical Feasts 95
The Holy Land 96
St. Helena 96
Finding of the True Cross 97

IV. From Constantine's Death to the Council of Sardica (337–343) 100
Pope St. Mark 100
Pope St. Julius I 101
The Empire at Constantine's Death 101

CHAPTER PAGE

The Antinicene Movement 103
Pistus, Bishop of Alexandria 105
Eusebius, Bishop of Constantinople 106
Acacius, Bishop of Caesarea 107
Gregory, Bishop of Alexandria 107
Council of Antioch (341) 111
Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople 113
Photinus 114
Council of Sardica (343) 116
The Canons of Sardica 119
The Pagan Spirit 123
The Sons of Constantine 124
Rome and Persia 125
St. Simon 126
Sapor's Persecution 128

V. From the Council of Sardica to the Death of Emperor Constans (343–350) 130
Council of Antioch (344) 131
Return of Athanasius 132
Donatism in Africa 133
The Circumcellions 134
Banishment of Donatus 135
The Danger of Paganism 136
St. Athanasius' *Against the Arians* 138
St. Cyril of Jerusalem 139
St. Cyril's Doctrine 141
St. Aphraates 143
Persecution in Persia 144

VI. From the Death of Emperor Constans to the Coming of Julian the Apostate (350–361) 146
Political Disturbances 147
Photinus of Sirmium 148
Calumniation of St. Athanasius 150
Council of Arles (353) 152
Council of Milan (355) 153
Courage of Pope Liberius 155
Banishment of Bishop Hosius 156
St. Athanasius in Egypt 157

CHAPTER PAGE

St. Hilary 160
Disagreements among the Arians 165
The Anomoean Creed 168
Council of Ancyra (358) 168
Council of Sirmium (358) 169
Question of Pope Liberius 169
Antipope Felix 172
Symbol of Sirmium 174
Council of Rimini (359) 175
Council of Seleucia (359) 176
Council of Constantinople (360) 177

VII. The Church in the Reign of Julian the Apostate (361–363) 179
Julian's Education 180
Condition of Arianism 182
The Pneumatomachi 182
Apollinarianism 184
Schism of Antioch 185
Aerianism 187
Novatians 188
Recall of Exiled Bishops 189
Council of Alexandria (362) 192
Exile of St. Athanasius 195
The Donatists 196
Julian's Persecution 198
Seduction of Christians 199
Antichristian Argumentation 200
Attempts to Revive Paganism 201
Disqualification of Christians 202
Education Laws 203
Julian's School Legislation 204
Enforcement of the Decrees 205
Popular Uprisings 206
Martyrdom of St. John and St. Paul 207
Julian's Psychology 208
First Pagan Manifestation 209
Special Trait of Julian's Paganism 210
Adaptations from Christianity 211

CHAPTER PAGE

Philosophers and Rhetoricians 212
Shrine of Apollo 213
The Temple at Jerusalem 215
St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen 218
St. Ephrem 221
Death of Julian the Apostate 222

VIII. From the Death of Julian the Apostate to the Coming of Theodosius (363–379) 224
General View of the Period 224
Emperor Jovian 225
Emperor Valentinian I 226
The Patricians 227
The Papal See 228
Pope St. Damasus 230
Valentinian's Religious Policy 231
The Ursinian Schism 232
Valens' Policy in the East 233
Bishop Eudoxius 234
St. Athanasius 235
St. Aphraates 236
Decree against the Monks 237
Emperor Gratian 239
Eunomius 239
The Cappadocian School 241
St. Basil the Great 241
St. Basil's *Contra Eunomium* 243
St. Basil's *On the Holy Ghost* 244
The *Hexameron* 245
St. Basil and Monasticism 246
St. Basil as Bishop 248
Strife with Arianism 249
Defense of his See 250
Works of Mercy 251
Government of the Diocese 253
Ecclesiastical Writers 254
St. Hilary of Poitiers 255
St. Ambrose 256
St. Jerome 261

CHAPTER PAGE

St. Epiphanius 267
St. John Chrysostom 270
Pope St. Damasus 273
The Catacombs 274
Pilgrimages 275
Canon of Scripture 276
Roman Primacy 276
The Gothic Church 279
Ulfilas' Arianism 281
Paganism in Gaul 282
Druidism 284
St. Martin of Tours 285
Monastery at Ligugé 288
Martin, Bishop of Tours 289
Rural Parishes 290
Death of Emperor Valens 292
Theodosius 293

PART II

CATHOLICISM, THE STATE RELIGION

I. From the Death of Valens to the Council of Constantinople (379–381) 299
Condition of the Church 300
The Heretics 300
Authority of the Church 303
Theodosius' Religious Policy 304
Status of the Church 305
Priscillianism 307
Condemnation of Priscillianism 310
Appeal to Emperor Maximus 311
St. Gregory Nazianzen 312
Gregory in Constantinople 313
Attacks upon Gregory 314
Maximus the Cynic 315
Theodosius Evicts the Arians 316
St. Ambrose, Imperial Counsellor 318
Writings on Morals 319
Exegetical Works 320

CHAPTER PAGE

Dogmatic Works 321
St. Gregory of Nyssa 322
Doctrine about the Holy Ghost 323
Didymus the Blind 324
St. John Chrysostom 326
Ideal of the Priesthood 327
Deaconesses 330
Chrysostom's *On Consolation* 330
Council of Constantinople (381) 332
St. Meletius of Antioch 333
Maximus the Cynic 334
The Meletian Schism 335
St. Flavian 336
St. Gregory Nazianzen 337
Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople 339
The Creed 340

II. From the Second Ecumenical Council to the Death of Valentinian II (381–392) 345
Council of Aquileia (381) 345
Apollinarianism 347
Council of Rome (382) 348
St. Jerome 349
Council of Constantinople (383) 350
St. Jerome and Pope St. Damasus 351
The Luciferians 351
Helvidius 352
Jovinianus 353
The Latin Bible 354
St. Jerome on the Aventine 356
Pagan Morals 357
Death of St. Damasus 357
Empress Justina 358
The Altar of Victory 359
The Arians in Milan 362
Ambrosian Hymns 364
Pope St. Siricius 365
Council of Rome (386) 366
St. John Chrysostom 367

CHAPTER PAGE

St. Chrysostom's Preaching 368
Homilies on the Statues 371
St. Ambrose the Statesman 373
St. Ambrose and Theodosius 375
The Callinicus Synagogue 376
The Massacre at Thessalonica 376
St. Ambrose's Scriptural Writings 379
St. Jerome's Writings 380
The *Adversus Jovinianum* 381
St. Paulinus 383
Paulinus' Friends 385
Paulinus' Trials 387
St. Augustine 388
Augustine's Childhood 389
Internal Struggles 392
Augustine's Conversion 393
Augustine's Early Writings 394
Augustine's Apologetics 396
Christian Legislation 399
Disorders in the East 402
Arbogast's Treason 403

III. From the Death of Valentinian II to the Death of Theodosius the Great (392–395) 405
Emperor Eugenius 405
The Funeral Sermon 406
Attitude of Theodosius 407
Eugenius at Milan 408
Paganism in Rome 410
Theodosius Declares War 411
Death of Theodosius 412
St. Augustine and the Manichaeans 413
St. Jerome's *Commentaries* 414
St. Chrysostom's Preaching 416
Christian Life 418
The Catholic Hierarchy 419
Canon Law 421
The Office of Bishop 422
The Patriarchs 427

CHAPTER PAGE

The Priests 429
Deacons 430
Subdeacons 431
Acolytes 432
Exorcists and Porters 433
Readers 433
Ordination 434
Clerical Dress 435
Clerical Celibacy 436
The Basilicas 437
The Liturgy 438
The Mass 439
Ceremonies of Baptism 445
Confirmation 447
Sacrament of Penance 448
Extreme Unction 451
Sacrament of Matrimony 452
Liturgical Development 453
The Canonical Hours 454
Psalmody 456
The Liturgical Week 457
The Liturgical Year 459
The Monastic Life 462
Christian Life 464
Condition of Women 467
Slavery 467
Monasticism and Slavery 469
The Theater 470
Criminal Law 471
The Right of Asylum 473
Episcopal Administration 475

PART III

THE CHURCH FREED FROM THE EMPIRE

I. From the Death of Theodosius the Great to the Coming of Valentinian III (395–425) 479
The Barbarian Invasions 480
Pope St. Anastasius 481

CHAPTER PAGE

Pope St. Innocent I 482
Pope St. Zosimus 483
Pope St. Boniface 483
Pope St. Celestine 484
Origenist Controversy 485
St. Jerome and Rufinus 487
Paulinian 489
Nepotian 491
Translation of *Peri Archon* 493
Rufinus' *Apologia* 494
St. Jerome's *Apologia* 495
Theophilus of Alexandria 496
St. John Chrysostom 497
Synod of the Oak (403) 498
Banishment of St. Chrysostom 499
The Joannites 501
Death of St. Chrysostom 502
Donatism 503
St. Augustine and the Schismatics 505
Conference of Carthage (411) 507
The Pelagian Controversy 509
Grace and Free Will 511
Pelagius in Palestine 513
Caelestius in Africa 514
Paulus Orosius 515
Dispute between St. Jerome and St. Augustine . . . 516
Pelagius in the East 518
Council of Jerusalem (415) 519
Council of Diospolis (415) 520
Progress of Pelagianism 521
Councils of Carthage and Mileve (416) 521
Pope Zosimus and the Pelagians 522
Council of Carthage (418) 523
Pope Zosimus Condemns Pelagianism 523
Julian, Bishop of Eclanum 524
St. Augustine's Doctrine of Grace 525
St. Augustine as Bishop 527
St. Honoratus 529
St. Cassian 530

CHAPTER PAGE

Spiritual Writers 531

II. FROM THE COMING OF VALENTINIAN III TO THE DEATH OF POPE SIXTUS III (425–440) 534
The Roman World in 425 535
St. Augustine's *City of God* 537
Salvian and Orosius 538
The Bishop of Arles 538
St. Patrick 540
Faustus of Riez 541
St. Vincent of Lerins 542
Semi-Pelagianism 543
Death of St. Augustine 544
The Christological Problem 545
St. Cyril of Alexandria 547
Nestorius 550
St. Cyril Denounces Nestorianism 552
The *Anathematisms* of St. Cyril 554
Council of Ephesus (431) 556
Condemnation of Nestorius 559
John of Antioch 561
The Nicene Creed 562
Supremacy of the Holy See 563
Execution of the Decrees 564
Pope St. Sixtus III 566
Restoration of Peace 566
The *Bazaar of Heracleides* 568

III. FROM THE DEATH OF POPE ST. SIXTUS TO THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE (440–476) 569
St. Leo the Great 570
Heresies 571
Nestorianism 572
Monophysite Heresy 574
Eutyches 574
Dioscorus of Alexandria 577
Dangers of the Monophysite Heresy 579
Theodoret of Cyrus 580
Condemnation of Eutyches 582
The Robber Council of Ephesus (449) 585

CHAPTER PAGE

St. Leo's Tome 586
Illegal Depositions 588
Council of Chalcedon (451) 590
Decisions of the Council 592
St. Leo the Great 595
St. Leo's Reforms 597
St. Leo and Attila 599
St. Leo's Sermons 601
St. Leo and the Liturgy 604
Pope St. Hilary 606
Council of Rome (465) 608
Pope St. Simplicius 609

BIBLIOGRAPHY 613

INDEX 629

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume II

I. The End of Paganism

II. Catholicism the State Religion

III. The Church Freed from the Empire

PART I

The End of Paganism

CHAPTER I

The Arian Heresy

Condition of Paganism

In 313 paganism appeared to be mortally stricken. Euhemerus' criticism, the religious skepticism of pagan philosophers and poets, and the unanswerable objections by apologists of Christianity had weakened it radically as a belief. And it seemed that the Edict of Milan ruined it as a political institution. But the pagan spirit survived in private practices and in the public mind.

Popular superstitions were increasing. The Delphic oracle was in full activity in 325. It was Constantine who moved the the tripod of the Pythoness to Constantinople.[1] Licinius consulted Apollo.[2] When he turned against Constantine shortly after the Edict of Milan, on the march against his rival he was accompanied by magicians and had the images of the gods carried at the head of his legions. Upon the whole, perhaps never were divination, magic, and incantations more widespread than in the first part of the fourth century. Although, under the influence of Christianity, a few temples of the Greco-Roman religion had been razed or closed, the worship of Oriental divinities spread prodigiously in the West. An essential part of that worship was composed of magic, prophecy, charms, and very odd superstitions.[3] These practices grew more numerous in the private life of the family. A

[1] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 54; Zosimus, *Historia romana,* II, 31.

[2] Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 7.

[3] For a list of these curious practices, see Mommsen and Marquardt's *Manuel des antiquités romaines,* French trans., XII, 119–138.

fourth century inscription, found at Capua, gives us a glimpse of pagan holy days, which remained in vigor at that period in country districts: purification processions along the river banks, offerings of roses in memory of the manes, and vows to the genii of the fields accompanied the work of the harvest.[4] So deeply had these customs entered into the people's habits that even pious Christians had difficulty in refraining from them. "Thus when Fructuosus, Augurius, and Eulogius were burned at the stake, their friends, who came to collect the martyrs' ashes, sprinkled them with wine, 'to extinguish the fire which was still burning,' say the Acts, but more probably as a survival of the libations used by the ancients after the cremation of corpses." [5]

The philosophers and writers no longer believed in the Homeric gods or in those of ancient Rome, but, under the name of Hellenism, most of them professed a syncretism in which all the religious speculations of the East were mingled with those of Greece and Rome. Their speculative paganism was, in short, merely a transposition of the practical, popular paganism into the world of ideas.[6]

Public life still retained the pagan elements that had largely constituted it. We have already seen how Constantine, though converted to Christianity, was unable to give up the title of supreme pontiff. This title, closely bound up with that of emperor, placed him at the head of the Roman religion and

[4] *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum,* X, 3792.

[5] Allard, *Julien l'Apostat,* I, 82 f. Only water would have been needed for extinguishing the fire; a different significance seemed to be connected with the use of wine.

[6] In the regions which border the Mediterranean or which are in direct communication with it by the Rhone River, a large number of inscriptions (discovered at Nimes, Vence, Orange, Vaison, Valence, Lyons, etc.) refer to local divinities, more or less connected with the worship of the forces of nature, identified with the Roman gods that most closely resemble them. Cf. *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum,* XII, 43, 357, 358, 1222, 1311, 1567, 1569, 1744, 1745, 1782, 3096–3102, 4323, 4329, 5687, 5864, 5953.

made him a member of all the sacerdotal colleges.[7] The most Christian of his successors could not avoid the office. No doubt they tried to use this disciplinary power in a way contrary to the interests of idolatry. But the fact is significant that they could lessen the influence of paganism only by acting as its chief pontiffs.[8]

In the provinces municipal officers authorize special devotions to the city divinities; they interpret evil omens and regulate the manner of expiation. At the close of the fifth century, a vestal virgin is condemned for violation of her vow and is buried alive, by order of the college of pontiffs which was presided over by the prefect.[9] In many cities and villages inscriptions have been discovered showing that municipal offices and sacerdotal functions were inseparable. The title of *flamen perpetuus,* on the monuments discovered in Africa, is always joined with that of *curator reipublicae;*[10] and numerous indications prove that the like custom prevailed in Gaul, Spain, and Britain. The same fact is true of the East, especially of Palestine. After the last revolts of the Jews, the Romans did everything possible to establish pagan civilization there. Furthermore, the penetration of paganism into Palestine was favored by the nearness of Arabia and a closer contact with Phenicia to the north and the ancient country of the Philistines to the southwest. Yet in general the countries of the East had been more affected by Christian influence than

[7] Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* I, 496.

[8] Van Dale's opinion (*Dissert. antiq.,* II, 1 f), which is timidly followed by Aubé (*De Constantino imperatore pontifice maximo*) and by Bouché-Leclercq (*Les Pontifes de l'ancienne Rome,* pp. 406 f.), is that the sovereign pontificate of Constantine and his successors gave them the same power over the Christian religion as the pagan emperors had over the ancient religion. But this view is not tenable. No Christian writer gave Constantine the title of pontiff. See Allard, *Julien l'Apostat,* I, 354 f.

[9] Allard, *op. cit.,* I, 69 f.

[10] Renier, *Mélanges d'épigraphie,* p. 45; Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana,* 1878, p. 29; Allard, *op. cit.,* I, 74 f.

had those of the West, especially because of the large number of monasteries in the eastern part of the Empire.

On the other hand, although pagan ideas and customs continued in private practices and public institutions, the purity of Christian faith and morals notably weakened. Once the favor of government was on the side of Christianity, ambitious men became Christians out of self-interest, and weak men simply followed their example. Ecclesiastical writers of the time deplore the large number of the "half-converted," who had only a tinge of Christianity and with it mingled numberless pagan prepossessions.

In either case a large number of men seemed ready to accept a doctrine that offered itself to them as a semi-paganism or a diluted Christianity.

Already several heresies owed their success principally to this equivocal character. Gnosticism, semi-Judaic in the beginning, little by little became semi-pagan; but it split into countless sects. At the same time Montanism likewise spread and divided into several parties. Mithraism and the various schools connected with the Neoplatonic doctrines were too indefinite. Manichaeism was not yet precise and popularized. None of these sects had then at its head a man of power, able to stir the populace by his eloquence, to disconcert his opponents by his sophistry, to procure the support of those in high station by his scheming, or to gather about him, by the seduction of his deportment and the apparent austerity of his life, a nucleus of followers devoted to his undertaking.

Such a leader came. It was Arius. From all the doctrines around him he took the elements of his theory of the Word inferior to God and the first creature of the world, and cleverly set forth this theory in clear and precise terms which, by easily impressing the memory, succeeded in captivating the will. In the words of a keen-sighted historian of early Christian theology, "Arius accomplished a sort of rational recon-

ciliation between Eastern Gnosticism, Platonic philosophy, and Jewish theology." [11] St. Athanasius would demonstrate that its logical result was pagan polytheism. But the exceptional importance of the Arian heresy in the history of the Church obliges us to set it forth in detail, tracing it back to its early beginning.

Arianism

Like Protestantism in the sixteenth century and revolutionary philosophism in the eighteenth, so Arianism in the fourth century was one of those central errors which, after condensing in themselves nearly all the errors of their time, become a prolific source of new errors. The Arian heresy, by affirming that the Word is a mere creature, was connected with the numerous Trinitarian and Christological heresies of the first three centuries. It soon led to Apollinarianism, Pelagianism, and Nestorianism as its legitimate offispring.

Arius and his adherents—in this followed by many historians—always called the great School of Antioch their cradle, and a holy martyr priest, Lucian, their father.[12] But their origin is not at all so simple as that.

Paul of Samosata

The teachers of the School of Antioch had always been distinguished by their sound reasoning and positive methods, and readily became attached to Aristotelianism.[13] Sometimes this attitude placed them in opposition to the doctors of Alexandria, who were more accustomed to soar in the lofty realms of Platonic metaphysics. Therein did not lie the danger. One

[11] Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* III, 199.

[12] See Batiffol, *Étude d'hagiographie arienne, la Passion de saint Lucien d'Antioche,* in the report of the *Congrés scientifique des catholiques* of 1891, II, 181–186. Cf. *Analecta bollandiana,* XI, 471.

[13] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 437.

School was the more ardent, the other the more prudent; they seemed made to complement each other and to offer the world an integral exposition of Catholic doctrine in the full magnificence of its aspects and the full rigor of its dogmas. But a man of subtle mind, unbounded ambition, and a spirit disposed to intrigue and cabal, Paul of Samosata, did everything possible to pervert the theological movement of the School of Antioch.[14] He declared that he was prompted by a desire to conserve in the idea of God that dignity which belongs to Him. The more effectively to reconcile the doctrines of Christianity with reason, and especially to prevent the idea of the divine unity and simplicity from being harmed by any admission of a strictly so-called generation in God, Paul of Samosata considered the Word as an impersonal being, an attribute, not distinct from the Father. He regarded Christ merely as a man in whom the divine Word had dwelt and acted.

St. Lucian

One of Paul's disciples, an Antioch priest named Lucian, seduced by the lofty views on which the master claimed to rest his teaching, for a while became Paul's eloquent defender. For this reason he was excommunicated by his bishop. We do not know when or how he repudiated the false doctrines of Paul of Samosata. We know merely that he was received back into the Church of Antioch, that he there acquired considerable influence, and that he became famous by the publication of a corrected text of the Septuagint. In fine, his memory was publicly venerated after his glorious martyrdom under Emperor Maximinus.

"We have but few remains of the works of Lucian.[15] The Eusebian Council held at Antioch in the year 341 ascribed to him

[14] *Ibidem,* I, 436 ff.

[15] They are collected in Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae,* 2d. ed., IV, 1–17.

a symbol the text of which has been preserved by St. Athanasius, and which betrays an intentional lack of dogmatic precision; but its authenticity is very doubtful." [16]

Lucian's disciples (Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius of Antioch, Theognis of Nicaea, and even Arius), who were fond of calling themselves "Collucianists," attributed the essential elements of their doctrines to him. As the Origenists did with regard to their master, so these too subjected the ideas of the holy martyr to exaggeration and distortion. It is noteworthy that St. Athanasius, so prompt in challenging whatever was connected with Arianism, never attacked Lucian. Furthermore, the Creed which the semi-Arians declared to be his, except for the omission of the word *homoousios*—which omission is readily explained before the definition of the Nicene Council—is a strictly orthodox profession of faith.[17]

Yet, since St. Alexander bishop of Alexandria clearly regards him as partly responsible for the development of Arianism, we may suppose that Lucian, probably for the purpose of reacting against the modalism of Sabellius, was not firm enough in maintaining the dogma of the unity of God. With his lively and daring mind, he must have framed, for the explanation of the Trinity, some venturesome hypothesis that more or less openly favored Adoptionism. His followers made unsound use of the theory.[18]

[16] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 20.

[17] On January 7, 387 (the feast of St. Lucian) St. John Chrysostom delivered a panegyric on St. Lucian. But he made no reference to the saint's errors.

[18] St. Epiphanius, in his *Ancoratus,* chap. 43 (*P. G.,* XLI, 817), says that Lucian denied that Christ had a human intellect. But probably this erroneous doctrine should rather be attributed to Lucian's disciples. We know that the doctrinal criticism of St. Epiphanius is generally marked by severity. Baronius (*Annales,* A. D. 311, no. 12; A. D. 318, no. 75) tries to free Lucian from every suspicion of heresy; but he has to acknowledge that Lucian, in his writings against the Sabellians, makes use of incorrect expressions. On Lucian of Antioch and his theological doctrine, see Gwatkin, *The Arian Controversy,* pp. 18 ff.; Harnack, art. *"Antiocherische Schule"* in *Realencyklopädie,* I, 591–595; Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol,*

Arius

In the number of those followers was a man considerably older than most of his fellow disciples.[19] His imposing appearance, strict morality, and brilliant, agile mind at that period exercised an ascendency over those about him. It was Arius. He was born in Libya about the middle of the third century. His contemporaries describe him as being tall and thin, in character stubborn and turbulent. At first he was involved in the Meletian Schism, but later on left it abruptly. In 302 Bishop Peter of Alexandria ordained him deacon, but soon afterwards had to break with him. He even excommunicated him. After Bishop Peter's martyrdom (November 25, 310),[20] Arius became a party to intrigues which are variously related by historians, according to their sympathies. The Arian Philostorgius says that Arius decided the election of Alexander by turning over to the latter the support of those who intended voting for himself. Others, on the contrary, accuse Arius of plotting for the episcopal dignity and of nursing against his successful rival the rancor of his ungratified ambition.[21]

Arius seems to have been a man of endless resources. He

I, 255 f., 266 f.; II, 202 f., 739; Hefele, *Councils,* I, 237 f.; Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 21 f. The most reasonable conclusion, based on the various studies which have been published upon this subject, is that St. Lucian of Antioch was one of those teachers who are quick to set forth most original hypotheses in their teaching, who at times sail close to heresy in their expressions, but who always remain orthodox at heart. In this way we can explain the Arians' claims, St. Alexander's insinuations, St. Epiphanius' declarations, and also the veneration of the Church for the memory of St. Lucian, the praise bestowed on him by St. Chrysostom, and the discreet respect which St. Athanasius always maintained towards him.

[19] St. Epiphanius, speaking of Arius in connection with Alexander's election to the see of Alexandria in 311, calls him an old man. Historians reckon his age at that time as about sixty years.

[20] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 478.

[21] Le Bachelet, art. *"Arius"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1780.

was an adept in Aristotelian dialectics and had no equal, it was said, in the art of handling syllogisms. His remarkable qualities of mind led to his being placed, immediately after his ordination to the priesthood, at the head of a parish church in a district of Alexandria called Baucalis.[22] And he was appointed to expound the Sacred Scriptures.

About 319, after Arius had been filling these two offices for eight years, the holy bishop of Alexandria was grieved to learn that strange doctrines were circulating among his clergy and people regarding the adorable Person of the Son of God. Some men, so it was reported, were maintaining that the second Person of the Trinity did not exist from all eternity, that the Son of God was merely the firstborn of created men. Assertions like these were a matter of grave concern. Men who spoke thus regarded the Incarnation and Redemption, adorable mysteries of a God that became man and died for us, as nothing more than vain fancies; the economy of salvation was broken; the abyss, opened by pagan philosophers between wretched mankind and the inaccessible Divinity, again yawned as formidable as in ancient times; and the world was no farther advanced after the preaching of the Gospel than before the coming of the Savior.

Soon it became known that the one who was spreading this doctrine was none other than the pastor of Baucalis. Alexander sent for him, spoke to him with every consideration due to his learning and good fame, and in a fatherly way urged him to discontinue sermons that profoundly disturbed the faith of the people. At least such is the force of Sozomen's account,[23] which agrees with the assertions of St. Epiphanius.

[22] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* LXIX, 1. Hence it is evident that the city of Alexandria was at that time divided into parishes which were in charge of what today we call pastors.

[23] Sozomen says that "Alexander held Arius in high repute" and that some people "blamed Alexander for not opposing opinions which seemed at variance with the faith." Sozomen, bk. 1, chap. 15.

Arius replied with subtle arguments and ambiguous words. Cleverly mixing what belongs to Christ's human nature with what belongs to His divinity, he succeeded in quieting the bishop's conscience.[24]

Arianism at Alexandria

But the conflict soon broke out with violence. One day Alexander, purposing to warn his hearers against the poison of the false doctrines that had been pointed out to him, was preaching on the mystery of the Holy Trinity, forcibly insisting upon God's essential unity. Arius, knowing he would be seconded by several persons in the congregation, boldly began to speak. Indignantly he protested against a doctrine which, he said, repeated the error of Sabellius, by confusing the three divine Persons. "If the Father begot the Son," he said, "he that was begotten had a beginning of existence; and from this it is evident that there was a time when the Son was not." [25] The heresiarch's move was extremely clever. The accused boldly made himself the accuser, the sophistical but clear and vigorous language he employed in expressing his doctrine, was of a sort to impress the hearers while disconcerting the preacher. The meeting broke up in tumult.

"Arius would certainly not have created so much disturbance in the minds of the people, had he not found in Alexandria a field well prepared to receive this theory of subordination, even so far back as the time of Origen. A certain hostility had been created against the theology of equality (the doctrine of the equality of the Son with the Father), which was taught by Theognostus, Pierius, and Bishop Peter, and now anew by Bishop Alexander. The representa-

[24] Philostorgius and Eusebius do not mention this first conference between Alexander and Arius. But their silence does not outweigh the explicit assertions of Sozomen.

[25] Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 5 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., II, 3).

tives of the old Alexandrian tendency naturally linked themselves with pleasure to Arius; and thus it was that in later times the Arians earnestly appealed to the authority of Origen." [26]

The baleful tendency, however, can be traced back to a still earlier origin. It comes from a principle of pagan philosophy, which Philo did not eliminate from his system and which thus passed into the Alexandrian School. Ancient philosophy could not comprehend the creation of the world by God. God's supreme perfection prevented His entering into direct relation with the world; nature is too weak to sustain the immediate action of the Divinity. God could not create or act upon His creature except through an intermediary. In Philo's explanation, this intermediary is the Word or *Logos,* necessarily unequal to the supreme God. Such a concept not only contradicts the Bible and the Gospel, it is also self-contradictory. If the Word is a creature, how could God be in direct relationship with it? But a shifting and dividing of the problem gave the illusion that it was solved. The theory was favorably received by minds imbued with pagan philosophy. And the new doctrine seduced weak Christians. By lessening the majesty of the victim of Calvary, and hence the rigor of divine justice and the horror of sin, this new teaching was a sort of deliverance for sensual and easy-going souls.

St. Athanasius

Because of the ease with which it spread and the fundamental character of its essential errors, the danger of the doctrine preached by Arius was one of the most formidable that had menaced the Church. At the very first Bishop Alexander seems not to have grasped its full import.[27] But at the Bishop's

[26] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 239.

[27] This conclusion seems evident from Socrates' account, *loc. cit.*

side Providence placed a young man of clear, sharp mind, upright soul, and strong will, the deacon Athanasius. He was born at Alexandria in 295.[28] Educated from childhood in profane and sacred letters, he entered the ranks of the clergy and for six years exercised the office of lector. Then the bishop of Alexandria called him to the diaconate and appointed him his secretary. Athanasius was short and thin; his appearance was ridiculed by Julian the Apostate, who was enraged at seeing his cherished projects thwarted by this *"homunculus."* [29]

But that frail body housed an indomitable soul. When Arius began disturbing the city of Alexandria by his questionable doctrines, the deacon Athanasius, then not more than twenty-four years old, had already published, against the pagan spirit and the errors emanating from paganism, an important work of unusual vigor and clearness, the *Adversus Gentes.*[30] In this work of his youth, Athanasius analyses the intellectual and moral state of his time with astonishing sagacity. To his mind idolatry was the source of all the errors then disturbing the world.

He studies idolatry in its two chief forms. First he considers the earliest and most popular form, that of pagan mythology, which regards as objects of adoration, under the names of Jupiter, Neptune, Vulcan, Mercury, or Venus, either the forces of nature or deified human beings. He discloses the origin of this idolatrous worship, born of pride and voluptuousness. He attacks this old polytheism, sung by the poets and fostered by the emperors, which covered nearly the whole

[28] We follow the chronology given by Cavallera at the beginning of his *Saint Athanase,* p. ix. Cf. Bardy, *Saint Athanase,* p. 1.

[29] Julian the Apostate (letter 51) said: Μὴ δὲ ἀνὴρ, ἄλλ' *ἀνθωπίσκος* ("He is not even a man, but a miserable apology for one").

[30] *Adversum gentes libri duo* is the title which St. Jerome (*De viris illustribus,* chap. 87) gives to St. Athanasius' work. In agreement with the Benedictines, who entitle the two books respectively *Discourse against the Greeks* and *Discourse on the Incarnation* (*P. G.,* XXV), most writers cite these works as two distinct treatises. But in the mind of St. Athanasius and in reality they form a single work.

world with its shadow. The young athlete wrestles with it, strips it of the adornments with which ancient poetry clothed it. He brands it and, after repeating the forceful criticisms of the early apologists and the jibes of the pagans themselves, he covers it with ridicule and overwhelms it with his contempt.

But Athanasius was aware that in his native city idolatry had a more subtle and ethereal form. Neoplatonic philosophy recognized one supreme God. But what is His demiurge, the vague mediator between God and the world? What are those powers arranged at intervals between the Divinity and nature? Why these secondary agents? Does not an all-powerful God suffice? But all that is idolatry, an idolatry apparently less gross than the polytheism of the Greeks, yet an idolatry no less unreasonable, no less corruptive.

After thus exposing the error, Athanasius points out how one may leave the error and rise to the truth. The first way is the study of the human soul, which bears the imprint of God. The second is the study of nature, with its sovereign order, despite numerous contrasts and the complicated relationship of its component forces, attesting the infinite power of the only God who governs it. The third way is that of the inspired Scriptures. The Bible teaches us to see, beyond the magnificent panorama of the world, as also in the depths of our souls, the Thought of God, the eternal Word. With His Word and by His Word, God made all things; and by His Word all things remain subject to His supreme will.

But this is not the last utterance of true religion. Not only did God create us by His Word, but by His Word, says Athanasius, He has redeemed us from sin. To aid man rise from his sins, the Word took a body capable of suffering and dying; yet He remains God, that His sufferings and death might have an infinite value.

Such are the principal lines of the magnificent essay published by the young deacon in 318. There is reason to suppose

that a portion of it at least was written in the solitude of the Thebaid,[31] perhaps under the eyes of the great St. Antony, whose inspiration seems to be visible in several parts. The hypothesis is plausible, although it has no corroboration from any historical testimony. We simply know that for a while Athanasius led the life of an "ascetic." By this title he was acclaimed when he was elected bishop of Alexandria. He often boasted of being the friend of Antony. There is no reason why it may not be true that the relations between these two mighty leaders went back to the time when the deacon wrote his *Adversus Gentes*.

Council of Alexandria (320 or 321)

Enlightened by Athanasius, Alexander decided to proceed energetically against Arius. He summoned him to appear before the assembled clergy of Alexandria and there explain his doctrine. After two lengthy sessions, the assembly was convinced of Arius' guilt and approved the anathema which the Bishop issued against the new heretic. This sentence was confirmed by a council of all the bishops of Egypt and Libya, who also extended it to eleven deacons and two bishops, Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarica, who shared the views of Arius.[32]

Arian Doctrine

Inspite of Arius' omissions and ambiguities, Bishop Alexander, his clergy, and his fellow-bishops thoroughly penetrated the thought of the clever sophist.

[31] Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, IV, chap. 2, art. 2, no. 1. At the very beginning of his book, Athanasius says: "We have not at present the compositions of our teachers," *i. e.*, the early ecclesiastical writers. This statement is more explicable if we suppose Athanasius was writing in the desert.

[32] On this council, held at Alexandria in 320 or 321, see Hefele, *Councils*, I, 247–252.

His system was ably built up. From Neoplatonism and Gnosticism it took the idea of an intermediary between God and the world and tried to show that this intermediary was the Word or Son of God.

God is the supreme Being, ineffable, the only unbegotten, the only eternal, the only good, solitary from all eternity; between Him and created, fallen, defiled nature is the Word or Son of God, creator of the world. Strictly speaking, this Word of God is not God; this Son of God is not begotten of God. He is Son only by adoption. He is really quite unlike the substance and personality of the Father.[33] The Word is one of the many powers which God uses. He is, says Arius, simply a secondary cause, "like the locust and the caterpillar," an agent of the divine will.[34] But this mysterious being does not enter into the system of the world. Though truly created, he is not a creature like other creatures. He is a perfect creature, and God could not produce any that is superior to him. However, he increased in graces and merit and thus rendered himself worthy of the glory and even the name of God, which the Father and the Church have given him.[35]

The Word was not only God's instrument in creation; he was also His instrument in the Redemption; he became incarnate, and took a human body, but a body without a soul, for a soul is useless where the Word resides.[36] Mankind will be saved by learning from him the truth that he has transmitted to it from God.

As to the Holy Ghost, Arius was very explicit. He admitted that the person of the Holy Ghost, along with the Father and the Son, constituted a Trinity, but infinitely separated from

[33] *Thalia* (St. Athanasius, *De Synodis,* no. 15; *First Discourse against the Arians,* chaps. 5, 6).

[34] *Thalia* (*First Discourse against the Arians,* chap. 5).

[35] Letter to Alexander, in *De Synodis,* no. 16; *Thalia* (*De Synodis,* no. 15; *First Discourse against the Arians,* chap. 5).

[36] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 27.

the two other persons. Arius seems to consider the Holy Ghost a creature of the Son.[37]

This theological concept in three steps "presented a sort of beauty that was able to seduce both the proud and the simple: the proud philosophers, by its rational appearance and its way of dividing into three parts the effort of passing from the finite to the infinite; the simple faithful, by a fallacious conformity with their mental habits." [38] Speculative minds admired in this system the most seductive theories of the Neoplatonic school and of Gnosticism, set forth with all the apparatus of Aristotelian dialectics. And the people easily accustomed themselves to regarding the Son of God under the aspect of those emperors called Caesars, who governed the world only by obeying the will of the emperor who bore the title of Augustus.

Arius seems not to have tried to develop his system further. "His doctrine was, as it were, complete from the beginning, and did not develop." [39] But we may note that nearly all the heresies of the fourth and fifth century are in it in germ. Arius, by his notions on the inferiority of the Holy Ghost, prepared the way for the doctrine of Macedonius. His theory of Redemption through the mere influence of Christ's teaching and example, opened the way to Pelagius. His manner of conceiving the union of the Word with a soulless body contains the whole system of Apollinaris. His theory of the progressive deification of the Son of God, serves as a foundation for pure Nestorianism.

Once Arius had conceived his system, he devoted all his effort to recruit followers. St. Alexander, in one of his letters,

[37] *Idem*, p. 28.

[38] Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité*, III, 72.

[39] Tixeront, *op. cit.*, II, 28. A full exposition of Arius' doctrine will be found in Tixeront, II, 22–29; Le Bachelet, art. *"Arianisme"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 1784–1791.

mentions the frequent gatherings of the friends of Arius, their wary proselytism, and their schemings with bishops.[40] The Bishop of Alexandria was well informed. The heresiarch, driven from his church, was not satisfied merely to maintain continuous contact with the many friends he counted at Alexandria. He journeyed through the dioceses of Egypt, visiting the bishops on whom he hoped he might count. Among the latter was Meletius of Lycopolis who, long before excommunicated by St. Peter of Alexandria, had, in concert with a few followers, organized a veritable schism and for fifteen years past had been ceaselessly in strife with the hierarchical Church.[41] Arius also relied on his former school companions, disciples of Lucian of Antioch. Proud of their illustrious master, they ordinarily called one another "Collucianists," and pretended to form a sort of school of thinkers. Lastly, the heresiarch was too cunning not to exploit the jealousy of several Eastern Churches toward the see of Alexandria.

Arius profited by all these weaknesses. "Although his appearance was austere, giving the more charm to his sharp turn of mind, he excelled in the ability to win favor. Artfully he concealed the part of his doctrine that was most offensive to Christian hearts, enveloping every difficulty with a few wrongly applied verses of Scripture. He stressed his desire for peace, the sternness of his bishop, and especially of a young secretary who, he said, was of malicious and haughty mind and was making the good old bishop follow him.[42] Arius was ever going and coming, sending deputations; he was acquainted with each one's weak point, and openly flattered it." [43]

[40] *P. G.*, XVIII, 547 f.
[41] Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 478.
[42] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses*, LXIX, 7.
[43] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle*, I, 375 f.

Eusebius of Nicomedia

Arius' chief conquest was Eusebius of Nicomedia. This bishop, who was to play a leading part in the spread of Arianism, was formerly at the head of the Church of Berytus (Beirut) in Phenicia. But his ambition turned his eyes to a position of greater importance. By chicanery he succeeded in having himself named bishop of Nicomedia, where the imperial court resided since the time of Diocletian. There he sought to win the favor of Emperor Licinius and, so far as possible, he worked his way into close association with Empress Constantia, the sister of Constantine. One of his purposes was to lessen, by every means in his power, the authority of the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, to the advantage of that of Nicomedia, the Eastern capital of the Empire. This proud but clever and intelligent schemer could be of great aid to Arius. The latter wrote him a letter which begins thus: "To my Lord, the very faithful and very orthodox Eusebius, Arius, persecuted by Bishop Alexander for that Christian truth which you so ably defend, sends greetings." Eusebius at once invited Arius to come to Nicomedia. This valuable approbation, thus publicly given, carried with it the backing of a large number of bishops, among whom was Eusebius of Caesarea.[44]

Eusebius of Caesarea

The Bishop of Caesarea was renowned. In his great works, the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica,* he furnished valuable syntheses of the Catholic faith; by his polemical works he refuted Porphyry and Hierocles; in his *Chronicle* and *Ecclesiastical History* he gave proof of unequaled erudition in the matter of the first centuries of the

[44] On Eusebius of Nicomedia, see Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nikomedien.*

Church. Constantine esteemed him highly and often had recourse to his learning. But his theological scholarship was not on a level with his historical knowledge, and his character lacked firmness. Two reasons inclined him toward Arius. He was a follower of Origen, but did not hold the master's doctrine on the question of eternal creation, and therefore was without the Origenist argument in favor of the eternity of the Word. His lack of determination led him to follow in everything the fortune of his relative, the Bishop of Nicomedia.

Through Empress Constantia, over whom Eusebius of Nicomedia exercised considerable influence, it might be hoped to win even Emperor Constantine.[45] Arianism would surely flatter imperial ambition: by stripping Christ of His divinity, was it not lowering the Church to the rank of a human institution subject to the control of the State?

Fortified with all these supports and all these hopes, Arius' audacity increased. For a while he lived at Nicomedia with Eusebius, and published, probably at the latter's suggestion, a *Letter to Bishop Alexander,* really a clever, moderate manifesto; but its contents justified all the accusations made against him by the council that had condemned him. Shortly thereafter he published, under the title of *Thalia* or *The Banquet,* a sort of poem, a mixture of prose and verse, intended to be sung at feasts; it was based on the rhythm of poems in free verse that were familiar to everybody.[46] The poem began thus:

"According to faith of God's elect, God's prudent ones,
Holy children, rightly dividing, God's Holy Spirit receiving,

[45] St. Jerome wrote: "Arius, intent on leading the world astray, began by misleading the Emperor's sister." Letter 133, no. 4, to Ctesiphon (*P. L.,* XXII, 1153; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 275).

[46] This style was invented by the Egyptian poet Sotades, who was ill-reputed for his unmanly immorality. See Fialon, *Saint Athanase,* pp. 63 f. Cf. Bardy, *Saint Athanase,* pp. 13 f.

Have I learned this from the partakers of wisdom,
Accomplished, divinely taught, and wise in all things.
Along their track have I been walking, with like opinions,
I the very famous, the much suffering for God's glory;
And taught of God, I have acquired wisdom and knowledge."

In his songs, when he speaks of the Word, Arius does not use the same caution and reserve as in his *Letter to Alexander*. For instance, he says:

"By nature, the Word Himself is alterable, and remains good by His own free will, while He chooseth. . . . In consequence of His works foreknown, did God bring it to pass that He, being such, should come to be." [47]

Arius' words were even freer in the songs he composed at this time for the use of the people. "There were some for sailors, for travelers, for those who worked at the mill. Therein all sorts of things were spoken of, with here and there a phrase about the Word or the Trinity. Arius himself provided both the melody and the words." [48]

St. Alexander

In the presence of this propaganda, the holy Bishop of Alexandria did not remain inactive. Alexander, though not possessing Athanasius' quick penetration, had a love of God and of souls that led the Church to number him among her saints. As soon as he perceived a danger threatening his people, as soon as he judged that his conscientious duty was involved,

[47] Quoted from *First Discourse against the Arians,* chap. 5 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., IV, 308 f.).

[48] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siécle,* I, 378. Arius has been called the father of religious music in the Christian Church. But he does not merit this honor. St. Athanasius speaks quite otherwise of the *Thalia* and the Arian songs.

his usually gentle and affable character at once revealed unsuspected qualities of energy and firmness. From his hand we have two encyclical letters,[49] written at that time. They are filled with apostolic vigor and holy indignation.

The purpose of the first of these letters is to acquaint all the bishops with the condemnation issued against the heretics, their names, and their teachings, and also to warn the faithful against the schemes of the Arians and their powerful protectors. The second letter is fuller: it contains an orderly refutation of Arianism and sets forth the doctrine professed by the Bishop regarding the Word of God, His eternity, His absolute divinity, and His relations with God the Father and with the world. Although it does not possess the incomparable precision of the letters written later on by Athanasius, and although it is said [50] not to possess all the exactness and clearness that might be desired, yet this remarkable document states the broad lines of Catholic faith concerning the substance of the questions at issue.

Many bishops of Egypt, Libya, Syria, and other countries heeded Alexander's voice and subscribed to his conclusions. But the followers of Arius grew more numerous in their work of propaganda. A Cappadocian rhetorician, named Asterius, was especially conspicuous for his activity. This "many-headed Sophist," as St. Athanasius calls him, went from

[49] The second letter is usually referred to as a letter directed personally to Bishop Alexander of Constantinople, but it may have been an encyclical like the first (Tixeront, II, 29). The first letter may be found in Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 6; the second letter is quoted by Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 4. Both will be found in *P. G.,* XVIII, 548, 572.

[50] Harnack, though acknowledging that "the doctrine of Alexander is essentially the same as the doctrine posterior to Athanasius," mantains that it is not "clearly stated." (Harnack, *Précis de l'histoire des dogmes,* French trans., p. 178.) But Tixeront (II, 31) proves that "this exposition of the Christian faith in respect to the question raised by Arius, is lacking neither in precision nor in vigor." What Harnack particularly finds fault with, is the absence of the word ὁμοούσιος. But we find the words ἐκ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντος πατρός, which are almost the equivalent of ἐχ τῆς οὐσίας.

church to church and publicly read in them a writing in which he systematized Arianism.[51] The bishops who had been won to Arius' party held so-called councils. Two such councils are mentioned especially, one held in Bithynia, and the other in Palestine.[52] At the latter Eusebius of Caesarea presided. The strife became so sharp and the division between Christians so marked that the pagans made it an open subject of mockery in their theaters. Public tranquillity was disturbed as well as the discipline of the Church. Men turned to the two sovereign authorities, one of whom was guardian of the faith of the Church, the other of the security of the Empire: the Pope and the Emperor.

Emperor Constantine

Pope Sylvester was made acquainted with the affair by the Bishop of Alexandria, who had sent his first letter to the Pope. Before the latter took any steps in the matter, Emperor Constantine, perhaps urged by Eusebius of Nicomedia and also impelled to end a conflict seriously threatening to disturb public order, took a hand in the affair.

Having become master of the whole Empire by the defeat of Licinius in 323 at the battle of Adrianople, Constantine hastened to perform an act of sovereignty in the East. To Arius and Alexander he wrote a letter in which he calls upon them to cease disputing with each other over religious questions that are altogether secondary. He said that, since they were in agreement upon the leading doctrines, that should suffice. The Emperor therefore expected them to effect a prompt reconciliation and thus free him from a great anxiety.[53] If, as seems likely, the Bishop of Nicomedia urged

[51] St. Athanasius, *De Synodis,* no. 18.

[52] Hefele, *Councils,* I, 258 ff.

[53] Constantine's letter is to be found in Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* II, 163.

Constantine to intervene,[54] evidently he had not done much to enlighten the Emperor on the significance of the pending controversy.

Hosius of Cordova

For the better success of his plan of reconciliation, Constantine made the famous Hosius, bishop of Cordova, the bearer of his letter. This venerable bishop, whom the Emperor consulted habitually, was then sixty-seven years old. It was hoped that everyone would be impressed by his age, his virtues, his position at court, and the marks of wounds he had received for the faith in Diocletian's persecution.[55] To expect any such effect, however, was to misjudge the obstinacy of a sectarian and the firmness of a bishop convinced that he is defending the cause of the faith. It also indicated a failure to understand how the venerable messenger would purpose to accomplish his mission. Hosius, theretofore a stranger to the Eastern controversies, may for a while also have supposed that the dispute between Alexander and Arius was about questions of secondary importance.

But, after reaching Alexandria and receiving an explanation of the meaning of the Greek words that were foreign to him,[56] he grasped the mighty import of the dispute and realized that the office of conciliator at any cost, which had been entrusted to him by the Emperor, was no longer possible. We lack detailed information of what he did in Egypt. We simply know that he vigorously opposed Sabellianism by setting forth the Christian doctrine on the nature and persons of the Holy

[54] It is even held that Eusebius of Nicomedia had something to do with the composition of the imperial letter. (Hefele, I, 260.) Others think that the text of the letter as we have it is merely a paraphrase composed by Eusebius of Caesarea. (Le Bachelet, art. *"Arianisme"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1783.) At any rate, the substance of the letter is to be found in the character of Emperor Constantine. Cf. Bardy, *op. cit.,* p. 15.

[55] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 505.

[56] Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History,* III, 7.

Trinity.[57] Probably he wished to make clear the difference that separated the Sabellian teaching from the orthodox doctrine. We know also that his mission was a failure. If we are to accept the word of Sulpicius Severus,[58] Hosius, on his return to the Emperor, told him that only a general council could settle the weighty questions that were troubling the capital of Egypt.

"Even though so many centuries removed from the events, a Christian posterity which considers those religious disputes with an interest that time cannot weaken, understands the importance attaching to that intervention of a Western bishop at the very birth of the great Arian heresy. If, as often claimed by a criticism that takes doubt for knowledge, the dogma of the Trinity among Christians was a late product of the philosophical fancies of the Greek Fathers, unacquainted with the primitive teachings of the Gospel, if Christ presented Himself to His disciples merely as a superior man and a prophet, and if it was philosophy that thought of making Him a God, a Western bishop, who grew up far from any center of study and in the traditional faith, would have inclined in favor of Arius against Alexander. Of the two controverted opinions, he would surely have accepted that which offered the simpler and more human explanation of the dogma of the Trinity. But it was the contrary that occurred and was bound to occur. The tradition, among Christians, was the divinity of Christ; Jesus Christ man and God—this is what the child was taught to lisp in its mother's arms and to adore at the foot of the altar. It was philosophy, on the contrary, which, seeking to enlighten the mystery, attenuated it, distorted it. Hosius' simple faith did not for a moment misapprehend it." [59]

[57] *Ibidem.*

[58] Sulpicius Severus, *History,* II, 55.

[59] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* I, 385 f. De Broglie, in agreement with Baronius and Tillemont places at this period a sharp letter from Constantine to Arius and the Arians. It is quoted by Gelasius of Cyzicus in his

The Bishop of Cordova could also report to Constantine that the Arian controversy was not the sole cause of disturbance in the East. The Easter controversy and the Meletian Schism called for the intervention of a supreme authority. Bishop Alexander [60] and several other members of the clergy [61] as well as Hosius viewed this intervention as a council of the universal Church. That project, so full of grandeur, was sure to attract Constantine's genius. Eusebius says that the Emperor "resolved, therefore, to bring as it were a divine array against this enemy, convoked a general council, and invited the speedy attendance of bishops from all quarters." [62] The place which Constantine fixed upon for the assembly was Nicaea in Bithynia.

Actorum concilii Nicaeni commentarius, 3; and it is mentioned by St. Epiphanius in his *Haereses,* 9. The document is bizarre, and its genuineness is not beyond question.

[60] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* LXVIII, 4.

[61] *Ex sacerdotum sententia,* says Rufinus.

[62] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* bk. 3, chap. 6. According to Eusebius, Constantine declared that he convoked the Council of Nicaea of his own accord. (*Op. cit.,* bk. 3, chap. 12.) But we know that he consulted priests and bishops. Among these must have been the Bishop of Rome. Moreover, the fact that Pope St. Sylvester sent two legates to the council implies his ratification of the imperial convocation. This is the explanation given by Bellarmine, Hefele, Mazzella, Palmieri, Phillips, Wernz, and others. Funk (*Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen,* I, 39 f.) gathers several texts and arguments to show that Constantine acted of his own accord and in his own name. The numerous testimonies adduced by the learned author do not void those which show that Constantine consulted the clergy nor do they prevent it being true that the pope gave his tacit approval and explicit ratification. The sovereign pontiff's absolute and exclusive right to summon a council is not disputed by Catholics. See Hefele, *Councils,* I, 6. The sixth ecumenical council (A. D. 680) says: "Constantine and Sylvester summoned the Council of Nicaea." Hardouin, III, 1417; Mansi, XI, 661.

CHAPTER II

The Council of Nicaea (325)

In the fourth century the city of Nicaea, which today is a wretched little village called Isnik, was next to Nicomedia in importance among the cities of Bithynia. It was located on the shore of Lake Ascania, one of the affluents of the Propontis. Having commercial relations with a large number of countries and being within reach of the bishops of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, it was also relatively easy of access for the bishops of Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Germany. "Furthermore, on the shores of the Propontis and the Hellespont it was that Constantine's thoughts began to be fixed. From this time his imagination never lost sight of those districts so oddly broken and divided by gulfs and lagoons, where nature itself seems to have prepared the piers of a great bridge to connect the East and the West." [1]

Letter of Convocation

The letter of convocation which the Emperor sent to the bishops was drawn up in terms both urgent and respectful. He said: "Certainly all of you are aware that nothing is closer to my heart than pious devotion to God. Previously I had in mind to call a meeting of bishops in the valley of Ancyra in Galatia; but now, for several reasons, it seems to me advantageous to assemble a council in the city of Nicaea in Bithynia. It will be more accessible for the bishops of Italy and Europe.

[1] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, II, 16.

Its salubrious climate leaves nothing to be desired. And it will be easier for me to be present there and to take part in the assembly. Therefore, very dear brethren, I let you know that it is my wish that without delay you betake yourselves to the said city of Nicaea. That you may assist in person at the deliberations, each of you will be at pains to avoid any delay. May God keep you, very dear brethren." [2]

As in the recent instance of the Council of Arles,[3] the "public means of conveyance" were set in motion. All the countries conquered by Roman arms were connected to the center of the Empire by a fine system of highways, paved with large slabs. Their remarkable solidity is still attested by numerous remains. By following some one or more of these roads, the bishops would find at every stage chariots, coaches, mounts and beasts of burden, servants, and even rest houses, where employees of the imperial postal service placed themselves at their service by order of the Emperor.[4]

The whole episcopate of the Empire, and even from beyond the Roman frontiers, was in motion.

"Impelled by the anticipation of a happy result to the conference, by the hope of enjoying present peace, and the desire of beholding something new and strange in the person of so admirable an emperor," [5]

not only the bishops, but priests, deacons, and even some of the laity, brought along by the bishops as advisers and helpers, set out.

[2] Martin, *Anal. sacra,* IV, 224; Hefele, I, 268.

[3] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 511.

[4] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 6, 9. On the imperial postal service of that time, see Maury, *Les Postes romaines.*

[5] Eusebius, *op. cit.,* III, 6 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., I, 521).

Arrival of the Bishops

By the middle of May 325,[6] the bishops were gathered at Nicaea to the number of about three hundred.[7] "The first meeting of these devout men was marked by touching scenes. United by one and the same faith and by common trials, but separated by seas and mountains, they were personally unacquainted with one another, knowing only each other's merits and sufferings. . . . The most illustrious servants of God were pointed out. In the first rank were the survivors of the persecution, bearing on their bodies the stigmata of a glorious confession. There was Paphnutius, bishop of a city in the Thebaid; one of his legs had been rendered useless by mutilation when he was laboring in the mines, and one of his eyes had been gouged out. There was Paul, bishop of Neocaesarea on the Euphrates, one of whose hands had been mutilated by fire. When they entered, a feeling of compassion swept over the assemply, and many of those present ran up to them to kiss the scars of those holy wounds. The solitaries, whose remarkable austerities were favorite subjects of fireside tales in every Christian family, also attracted attention. There was James of Nisibis, recognized by his garment of camel's hair and goat's hair which made one think of John the Baptist. For years he had lived on the desert frontiers of Mesopotamia and Persia, subsisting on raw herbs and wild fruit. There was Spiridion, bishop of Cyprus, whose childlike gentleness and rustic manners were proverbial, who still kept sheep even after becoming a bishop; but he did not keep them very well and,

[6] Probably May 20. This date is discussed in Hefele, I, 274.

[7] St. Athanasius more than once speaks of three hundred bishops. In his *Epistola ad Afros,* chap. 2 (*P. G.,* XXVI, 1031) he explicitly says 318. The number must have varied between the opening day of the Council and its closing. Socrates, Theodoret, Rufinus, and Gelasius of Cyzicus accept the number 318, which St. Ambrose (*De fide ad Gratianum,* bk. 1, prologue) and several later writers compare with the 318 servants of Abraham.

when robbers were minded to steal them, he wanted to know why they did not take the trouble to ask him for them. At the head of the Western bishops walked the deputation from the Bishop of Rome, St. Sylvester, whose advanced age made the journey impossible for him. He was represented by two priests, Vitus and Vincent, and his deputation was under the direction of Constantine's friend, the light of Spain, Hosius of Cordova. Lastly, two barbarians, a Persian named John, and a Goth named Theophilus, completed this assembly of mankind. The mixture of accents and even of different languages made the oneness of sentiment even more striking. It was a reminder of the gift of tongues and the first Pentecost. All the nations which on that day had been scattered were now reunited after three centuries, proud of the trials they had undergone for the sign of the faith, and of the countless children they had brought forth in Jesus Christ." [8]

First Meeting of the Council

The first assembly of the venerable Fathers took place in the principal church of Nicaea,[9] a building which has disappeared, its site now marked by a solitary plane tree on the edge of the village of Isnik.[10] A few days later the Council moved to a large hall in the imperial palace at Nicaea, which Constantine placed at its disposition.[11]

The Emperor was detained at Nicomedia by festivities in commemoration of his victory over Licinius and was unable to come to Nicaea at the same time as the bishops. The latter

[8] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, II, 17–21.

[9] On this question, see the critical discussion by Leclercq in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, I, 403, 409 note.

[10] Stanley, *History of the Eastern Church*, p. 212.

[11] The imperial palace at Nicaea was only an occasional residence of the emperor, but it was large enough to accommodate the Fathers of the Council. Cf. Hefele, I, 279 note.

did not wish to begin their deliberations before Constantine's arrival. But a meeting of so many men, animated by varied dispositions regarding a question which passionately stirred them, inevitably produced an immediate exchange of views. Well instructed laymen, even pagan philosophers, with an interest of curiosity in the great intellectual discussion which they foresaw would take place at Nicaea, had followed the clergy thither. Gelasius of Cyzicus, an historian of the Council, relates that Arius brought with him professional debaters, ready to lend him assistance.[12] For the heresiarch was there, presumptuous and proud, confident that his learning would dazzle and his sophistry disconcert so many simple men, more accustomed, he thought, to catechize the people and relieve their distress than to argue according to the methods of Aristotle and Plato.[13]

Pagan Philosophers at Nicaea

If it be a fact that the pagan philosophers were invited by Arius to take his cause in hand, we can well suppose that many of them gave their assistance wholeheartedly. A Christian heresy might seem to them a happy issue for the old pagan idolatry, threatened on all sides. In Arius' doctrine, Jesus appeared as a demigod. Even though he is purer and nobler than the demigods of the old Greek mythology, popular superstition

[12] Gelasius of Cyzicus, *Actorum concilii Nicaeni commentarius,* II, 12, in Mansi, II, 826. The work of Gelasius, written in the fifth century at the beginning of the reign of Zeno, has been a matter of considerable discussion by certain scholars. (Lejay, *Ancienne philologie chrétienne,* in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* 1906, p. 280. Cf. Batiffol, *La Littérature grecque,* p. 224.) But a learned historian, Löschcke, in his *Das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzicus,* proves that Gelasius had many precious documents at hand. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles,* I, 393 f. note.

[13] The heretics pretended to make fun of the general ignorance of the members of the Nicene Council. Socrates says that Sabinus of Heraclea, one of these malicious defamers, did however commend one of the Fathers, Eusebius, the author of the *Ecclesiastical History.* Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 8.

might place at his side or beneath him others more or less adapted to the varied forms of his ideal; and the equivocation might mislead many ignorant Christians.

But these philosophers, and Arius too, were reckoning without the perspicacity and dialectical ability of the young deacon,[14] whom the Bishop of Alexandria brought with him to take part in the Council. From the very beginning it was evident to all, as Socrates says, that "Athanasius was the most forceful opponent of the Arians." [15] They reckoned also without the enlightened faith of the venerable Fathers of the Council, most of whom would not subject to the scrutiny of reason alone the foundations of a doctrine which depended chiefly on a supernatural revelation.

There is an interesting and curious contemporary story which, with its literary embellishments and its dramatic issue, has the semblance of a legend but which, according to the best critics, rests on some official reports.[16] This story recounts a dispute between a pagan philosopher and the principal bishops at Nicaea. After a few skirmishes, one of the latter said: "My dear friend, we have already warned you once for all that, when the question is one of divine mysteries, you must not ask how or why." [17] The philosopher thereupon abjured his errors and was converted.

Another story, with perhaps no greater historical validity, symbolizes still better and more touchingly the nature of these controversies, in which the traditional faith of upright and humble souls was brought face to face with the quibbles of proud learning. A certain philosopher, says Rufinus, was not convinced by the ablest of the Christians. Like a serpent, he

[14] Gelasius (Mansi, II, 808) and, in agreement with him, Hefele (*Councils,* I, 273) call him an archdeacon. On this title, see Leclercq's article in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 2733 f.

[15] Socrates, I, 8.

[16] Löschcke, *op. cit.*

[17] Gelasius, in Mansi, II, 829–975.

evaded all the proofs of the falseness of his doctrines. Finally an artless and untutored old man, quite without skill in the art of debate, but one who had confessed the faith in the days of persecution, said to him: "Listen, in the name of Jesus Christ." Then, in simple words and manner, as though he were instructing a child, he gave the philosopher an exposition of the Creed: the doctrine of God the Creator and Master of all things, and that of the eternal Word of God taking pity on the errors of mankind, becoming man, and dying for them so as to redeem them to their God. Lastly he said: "Philosopher, do you wish to believe these things?" The philosopher, touched by grace, answered: "I believe them." To this the old man replied: "Come, then, and follow me to the Lord, to receive the seal of the Christian faith." The philosopher turned to his followers and hearers, urged them to embrace the doctrine of Christ, and himself became a member of holy Church.[18]

Emperor Constantine at the Council

Meanwhile Constantine arrived in Nicaea. At once the Council celebrated the solemn opening of its deliberations. According to the most probable calculation, the date was June 14, 325.[19] Eusebius of Caesarea, who played an important part in the Council, describes the ceremony thus:

"On each side of the interior of the central building of the palace were many seats disposed in order, which were occupied by those who had been invited to attend, according to their rank. As soon, then, as the whole assembly had seated themselves with becoming gravity, a general silence prevailed, in expectation of the Emperor's arrival. And first of all, three of his immediate family entered in

[18] Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 3. Sozomen and Gelasius repeat Rufinus' account.

[19] See the discussion of this date in Hefele, I, 274 ff.

succession, and others also preceded his approach, not of the soldiers or guards who usually accompanied him, but only friends who avowed the faith of Christ. And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the Emperor's entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly rays of light, reflecting the glowing radiance of a purple robe, and adorned with the brilliant splendor of gold and precious stones. Such was the external appearance of his person, and with regard to his mind, it was evident that he was distinguished by piety and godly fear. This was indicated by his downcast eyes, the blush on his countenance, and the modesty of his gait. All these graces, united to a suavity of manner and a serenity becoming his imperial station, declared the excellence of his mental qualities to be above all praise. As soon as he had advanced to the upper end of the seats, at first he remained standing and, when a low chair of wrought gold had been set for him, he waited until the bishops had beckoned to him, and then sat down, and after him the whole assembly did the same." [20]

The bishop who was seated at the Emperor's right and who is not otherwise designated by Eusebius, perhaps because it was himself,[21] arose to compliment the Emperor. Then Constantine, in a calm and gentle tone, spoke the following words in Latin, which another present rendered into Greek:

"I feel myself bound to render thanks to God the universal King because, in addition to all His other benefits, He has granted me a blessing higher than all the rest, in permitting me to see you not only all assembled together, but all united in a common harmony of sentiment. . . . Intestine strife within the Church of God is far more evil and dangerous than any kind of war or conflict; and these our differences appear to me more grievous than any outward trouble. . . . I feel that my desires will be most completely fulfilled when I

[20] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 10.

[21] Tillemont, *Mémoires* (1732 ed.), VI, 356. This view, adopted by De Broglie and Duchesne, is opposed by solid arguments in a work by Cavallera, who maintains that the opening speech of the Council was delivered by St. Eustathius of Antioch. See Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioche,* pp. 34 f.

can see you all united in one judgment, and that common spirit of peace and concord prevailing amongst you all, which it becomes you, as consecrated to the service of God, to commend to others. By such conduct you will at the same time be acting in a manner most pleasing to the supreme God, and you will confer an exceeding favor on me who am your fellow-servant." [22]

"The Emperor had opened the Council as a kind of honorary president, and he continued to be present at it; but the direction of the theological discussions, properly speaking, was naturally the business of the ecclesiastical leaders of the Council, and was left to them." [23]

And Eusebius states that the Emperor, after his address, left the discussions in the hands of "those who presided in the Council." [24]

Hosius of Cordova

These words refer to those who were later called patriarchs or primates, and who already enjoyed an undisputed authority over their colleagues.[25] But we must not conclude from these words that the Council of Nicaea had several presiding officers. That title and office belonged only to Hosius, bishop of Cordova. In the lists of signatures of the Fathers of the Council, Hosius' name always comes first. A study of these lists and several reliable testimonies establish beyond doubt the historical fact that Hosius alone was the president of the Council.[26] It is equally certain that he exercised that office in the name of the Pope. Gelasius explicitly says that "the Bishop of Cordova came to Nicaea in the name of the Bishop of Rome, with Vitus and Vincent, priests." [27] Eusebius tells us that

[22] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 12.
[23] Hefele, I, 281.
[24] *τοῖς τῆς συνόδου προέδροις.* Eusebius, *op. cit.,* III, 13.
[25] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 433.
[26] For this evidence, see Hefele, I, 36 f., 281.
[27] Gelasius, *op. cit.,* I, 5; Mansi, II, 805.

Pope Sylvester, on account of his age, could not undertake the journey. Vitus and Vincent, who were only priests, could indeed speak in his name, but they could not preside over a meeting of bishops. For at least twelve years Hosius had been the Emperor's confidant. His recent mission to Alexandria drew upon him the attention of both East and West. Since then no European bishop was better acquainted with the Arian controversy than he was. All these reasons recommended him to the Pope's choice. Had he not been thus appointed by the Pope, the Council, in which the Eastern element predominated,[28] would not have been willing to place a simple Spanish bishop ahead of the great patriarchs of the East.[29]

Parties in the Council

From the very first session the followers of Arius, though only a minority, appeared to be full of confidence. The Council was clearly divided into two extreme groups. Gathered about Alexander of Alexandria, Marcellus of Ancyra, and the deacon Athanasius, were all those who wished unequivocally to follow the path of tradition. Eusebius of Nicomedia and Maris of Chalcedon were the leaders of those who demanded the reconsideration of the symbols of faith, however ancient

[28] The majority of the members of the Council were Greeks. Among the Latins, besides the papal legates Vitus (or Victor) and Vincent, we find only Hosius of Cordova, Caecilian of Carthage, Mark of Calabria, Domnus of Stridon in Pannonia, and Nicasius of Die (not of Dijon, as Hefele says). See Morin, *D'où était évêque Nicasius, l'unique représentant des Gaules au concile de Nicée,* in the *Revue bénédictine,* XVI (1899), pp. 72–75, and Lejay, in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* V (1900), p. 454.

[29] Schröckh (*Kirchengeschichte,* p. 336) and Duruy (*History of Rome,* VII, 538 note) hold the opinion that Hosius presided at the Council in Constantine's name. But this view cannot be maintained. Constantine never took the attitude of a president of the Council, even through a delegate. It is true that at a later date Pope Stephen V, in a letter to Emperor Basil, speaks to the Eastern ruler of "the council presided over by the Emperor Constantine"; but these words should be understood as referring to the presidency of honor, which we have mentioned.

these might be.[30] A moderate party fluctuated between the two.[31] The leader of this party was evidently Eusebius of Caesarea. The Arians counted on his instability of character to win him to their side. And they placed reliance upon Eusebius of Nicomedia's relations with influential circles at court and upon the memories of fellowship of the Lucianist school. This presumption caused their failure.

In substance, what was it they asked, at least for the time being? That Arius' ideas be regarded as a debatable opinion in the Church, with the right to be affirmed in opposition to the doctrine maintained by Alexander and Marcellus. Their demand seemed to receive sanction by one of Constantine's first acts. Eusebius relates that the Emperor, as soon as he arrived in Nicaea, was besieged by various complaints or accusations emanating from the different parties of the Council, incriminating several of its members. The Emperor commmanded the memorials to be burnt, saying: "I am but a man, and it would be evil in me to take cognizance of such matters, seeing that the accuser and the accused are priests." [32] He seemed thus to take an impartial stand between the Arians and their opponents.

Arius before the Council

Arius did not have a right to sit as a member of the Council. But he was ready to argue before it. Soon he was sent for, and went to the Council full of confidence. The innovator was infatuated with his role by the clamor being made over him,

[30] Sozomen, I, 17.

[31] According to the reckoning of historians, this group must have counted 12 to 15 bishops. (Hefele, I, 285.) The bishops who were clearly in favor of Arius' doctrine might have reached the number of seventeen.

[32] Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 17.

the great hopes stirred in him through the intrigues and high influence of the Bishop of Nicomedia, this gathering of all the bishops of the Catholic Church to discuss his ideas, and this movement of the whole world on account of him. He forsook every thought of prudence. In the presence of the Council he carried his views to their very limit, emphasizing the most daring affirmations of his poem *Thalia*. He maintained that the Word is not God, that "whereas all things were made out of nothing, so the Word of God was made out of nothing, and once He was not; that the Son is named Word and Son according to grace;" [33] that this so-called Wisdom was incapable of knowing the Father and did not know even His own substance.

When he finished, it was evident that his case was lost.[34] Venerable bishops there were who stopped their ears so as not to hear such blasphemies. Even in the ranks of the third party the greater number showed their displeasure. Both Eusebiuses had to use their influence with the Emperor to keep him from employing force against the heresiarch.

Thenceforth no one in the Council ventured to maintain pure Arianism. All the tactics employed by Arius' friends were directed toward getting the Council to sanction a formula that would leave the door open for speculation regarding the nature and origin of the Word. Both Eusebiuses endeavored with all their might to accomplish this. Hence, too, Athanasius and his friends strove to place the third party under the necessity of declaring themselves clearly either for or against the traditional doctrine. All the subsequent strife is to be explained by this double tactic.

[33] St. Athanasius, *First Discourse against the Arians*, chap. 5. St. Athanasius places all these blasphemies on the lips of Arius speaking before the Council. ταῦτα και τοιαῦτα λέγων ὁ Ἄρειος . . . ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν συνόδῳ. Cf. Socrates, I, 9; Sozomen, I, 17.

[34] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, I, 19 (*alias* 20).

Procedure

What was the plan of procedure of the First Ecumenical Council?[35] How were the daily program and order of business determined? What method of debate and of voting was in use at the sessions? What degree of initiative devolved upon the presiding officer, the papal legates, the metropolitans, and the simple members of the Council? On all these points we are left to vague conjecture.[36]

"The analogy which we may suppose to have existed between the Nicene and later Synods has caused the admission that at Nicaea the members of the Synod were divided into commissions or private congregations which prepared the materials for the general sessions.[37] But we find no trace of this fact in the ancient documents; and the accounts of Eusebius [38] and others leave us rather to suppose that there were no such commissions, but only general sessions of the bishops." [39]

The Emperor was present at all the sessions. But the part taken by him seems to have been simply to prevent the conflicts from becoming bitter, and to promote a spirit of harmony. Says Eusebius:

"The Emperor gave patient audience to all alike, and received every proposition with steadfast attention and, by occasionally assisting

[35] We have already observed (Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 76) that the assembly at Jerusalem in the year 42 should be regarded as a real council. But there could be no question of rules of procedure for that first gathering of the Apostles and their chief auxiliaries.

[36] Batiffol's article, *"Le Règlement des premiers conciles africains et le règlement du sénat," Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes* (January 16, 1913), gives some valuable indications. The meetings were public, each question was placed before the assembly by a *relatio* of the president; there was no voting in a strict sense of the word but, as in the Roman senate, the members took their places on one side or the other according as they were in favor of or opposed to the proposed resolution.

[37] Moehler, *Saint Athanase,* French trans., I, 229.

[38] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 13.

[39] Hefele, I, 284.

the argument of each party in turn, he gradually disposed even the most vehement disputants to a reconciliation. At the same time, by the affability of his address to all, he appeared in a truly attractive and amiable light, persuading some, convincing others by his reasonings, praising those who spoke well, and urging all to unity of sentiment, until at last he succeeded in bringing them to one mind and judgment respecting every disputed question." [40]

It may be that the biographer of Constantine somewhat exaggerates the part taken by his hero, but he does not substantially alter its character. All that we know of Constantine shows that he wished to reëstablish good order and peace.

Three chief questions, of unequal importance, became the subject of the Council's deliberations: the Arian controversy, the Meletian Schism, and the Easter question.

The Arian Controversy

Rufinus says that, with regard especially to the Arian controversy, "they did not want to decide so serious a matter without due consideration. Daily sessions were held. Arius' opinions were discussed profoundly and he himself was frequently summoned to the Council. Attentive consideration was given to the reasons that should be advanced against his views." Rufinus further tells us that the minds of the Fathers were quickly and unanimously determined "regarding the impious doctrine of Arius and that the confessors especially declared themselves vigorously in opposition to that heresy." [41] The fact is that Arius' first explanations left in the minds of all the conviction that his views were false. But we must admire the prudence of the venerable Council, which was unwilling to make a decision until it had examined the matter carefully and methodically.

[40] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, III, 13.
[41] Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History*, I, 2.

The sight of such an attitude must have deeply impressed the more serious minds of that time. "For more than three hundred years, at no place in the Empire had a free assembly met, not once had the voice of conscience been heard in a silence that prevailed under an absolute power, a silence which was broken only by the tiresome panegyrics of orators or by the groans of victims. For the first time in the memory of many generations, were to be seen upright and honorable men, conscious of their personal dignity and unafraid in their respectful independence, assembled in the presence of the master of the world, deliberating before him without let or hindrance. Honest and open discussion took the place of those hypocritical farces of legality and power which were continually being acted upon the disturbed stage of the Empire. A tone of truthfulness awakened men's conscience which had so long been forgetful of its freedom and its rights." [42]

At the official sessions of the Council it seems that, except the Emperor, no layman was allowed to address the assembly. Sozomen, mentioning the different speakers, names only bishops.[43] It is said, however, that there also took part in the debates certain ecclesiastics who were especially accredited to the bishops, such as the deacon Athanasius of Alexandria and the priest Alexander of Constantinople.

Marcellus

At the head of the defenders of the traditional faith, as we learn from St. Athanasius,[44] was the Bishop of Ancyra, Marcellus. In 314 he had taken a very active part in a council held in his episcopal city.[45] His intentions were beyond reproach, but his orthodoxy was more enthusiastic than it was safe. In

[42] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* II, 15.
[43] Sozomen, I, 20.
[44] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos,* chaps. 23, 32.
[45] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 519–521.

his desire to combat Arianism more effectively, this Marcellus of Ancyra later had recourse to a system approaching Sabellianism and, in his effort to avoid too great a distinction between the Father and the Son, he seems to have made no distinction at all between them. Probably, under pressure of attacks by his clever opponents, at the outset he let slip some imprudent expressions which the Eusebian party later made use of against the champions of orthodoxy. Nevertheless Athanasius always remained indulgent toward this valiant companion of his first struggles.[46]

Athanasius

The ideas of the young Alexandrian deacon were far more profound and his expressions more exact. As we are told by St. Gregory Nazianzen,[47] when the Arians saw this short and almost frail champion, with his bearing of assurance and his lofty brow, rise up to speak, there seemed to pass through their ranks a shudder of hatred. But the majority of the Council looked with pride upon him who would become the eloquent interpreter of their mind.

No one excelled Athanasius in ability to seize upon the main point of a difficulty, to set forth, in the truth under attack, the central idea on which everything else depended. He illumined this point in such a way as to shed light upon the faith at the same time that he exposed the heresy. Arius, in his system, begins with the idea of divine transcendence; Athanasius starts his theory with the concept of redemption. "The basis of the Christian faith," he says, "is nothing else but the mystery of the Word incarnated to redeem men and to make them children of God. But how could He divinize

[46] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* no. 72. Cf. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra;* Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 38–44.

[47] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *In laudem Athanasii, P. G.,* XXXV, 1081–1128.

them if He were not Himself God? How could He communicate a divine sonship, even an adoptive sonship, if He were not by His own nature the Son of God?"

Then, directly attacking the heretical doctrine, he says: "If the Word was created, how is it that God, who created Him, could not create the world? If the world was created by the Word, why could we not say it was created by God?" Throughout his life Athanasius adds new statements to these points of view; but the latter remain the basic inspiration of his whole polemic and his entire theology.[48]

Eusebius of Nicomedia

From the time that Arius uttered his first imprudent statements, the able Bishop of Nicomedia was careful not to defend the Arian expressions. He was the acknowledged leader of the third party. Relying upon his relations with those in high places and upon the favor of the court, and understanding Constantine's frequently expressed desire to end these religious controversies as quickly as possible, he sought merely to prevent, in the foreseen condemnation, any categorical formula and to save Arius' idea by toning down its expression.

If we consider the mental habits of a large number of the conciliar Fathers, who were more accustomed to catechize the unlearned than to discuss questions in the schools, we can appreciate that the danger was great. All of Athanasius' sagacity and firmness were needed to avert the peril.

The first symbol of faith offered by the Bishop of Nicomedia was promptly rejected by the bishops.[49] So far as we

[48] Tixeront, *op. cit.*, II, 67 f.; St. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, no. 51; *First Discourse against the Arians*, 16, 39; *Second Discourse*, 24, 26, 40, 69. Cf. Voisin, *La Doctrine christologique de saint Athanase*, in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, I (1900), 226–248.

[49] The order of what follows is conjectural. We give it in practical accord with the best historians of the Council—De Broglie, Hefele, and Tixeront. The proceed-

can make out, this symbol, while omitting Arius' most questionable formulas, contained certain inadmissible expressions. It seems the symbol said that the Word was the work of the Father (ποίημα κτίσμα),[50] that He was not immutable by His very nature (τρεπτῆς φύσεως).[51] A second symbol, which was vague and settled nothing, was proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea. Therein we find the Word is called "God of God, light of light, life of life, only Son, firstborn of every creature, begotten of the Father before all ages, by whom everything was made." Such a formula would have decided nothing. Constantine—so we are told by Eusebius—would have been satisfied with it, on condition that the word ὁμοούσιος (consubstantial) be added. But the majority showed themselves more exigent.

The Bishop of Nicomedia was resourceful. He considered a third subterfuge, suggesting that the symbol be made up almost exclusively of expressions taken from Holy Scripture. He hoped these expressions would be general enough to permit an interpretation favorable to the Arian ideas.

The orthodox majority was on the point of being caught in this new trap, when Eusebius' trick was foiled. The colorful vivacity with which St. Athanasius relates the incident has led historians to suppose he took the leading part.[52]

To indicate clearly that the Word did not come forth from nothing, as the Arians maintained, the Fathers were inclined to accept the expression, "The Word is from God, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ."

ings of the Council, if, in fact, they were drawn up in writing, have not been preserved. The creed, the twenty canons, and the synodal decree are the only extant documents of the Council. But, with considerable likelihood, we can fix the chief landmarks of the history of the Council from the narratives of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Rufinus, and from the data supplied by St. Athanasius in his *Epistle in Defense of the Nicene Definition* and his *Epistle to the Bishops of Africa.* On the sources of this history, see Hefele, I, 262 ff.

[50] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 7.

[51] St. Ambrose, *De Fide,* III, 7. Cf. Hefele, I, 286.

[52] St. Athanasius, *Epistle in Defense of the Nicene Definition,* sec. 20 f.

But presently the Eusebians were seen whispering together. "Is not everything from God," they said, "we and all other creatures? Did not St. Paul say that 'all things are of God,' [53] and did he not speak of God 'by whom are all things'?" [54] The Fathers expressed their idea more precisely by adding: "The Word is the power of God, the eternal image of the Father, perfectly like to the Father, unchangeable and true God." But, when this passage was read, the Eusebians were observed again exchanging signs of mutual understanding. They were caught saying to one another: "All these expressions are suitable for the Son of God, since, according to the Bible, they are applied to man. Is not man called the image and glory of God?" [55] Some, in irreverent pleasantry, said: "In the book of the prophet Joel, even the locusts are called a great host of God." [56] Others, in a more serious tone, quoted St. Paul's words: "Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ?" [57] And they then said: "Does it not follow that the words 'immutable' and 'eternal' may be applied to a creature?"

Homoousios in the Creed

To cut short these unfair interpretations, the Fathers declared that the Word was "of the very essence of God, ἐκ τῆς οὐσιας τοῦ θεοῦ." But would not advantage be taken of this expression? It seems that Athanasius would have been satisfied with it.[58] But one of the Fathers, perhaps Hosius, proposed a word that soon won the approval of the majority. It was the word *homoousios* (consubstantial). It had the advantage of being an expression that was positively condemned by the

[53] See II Cor. 5:18.
[54] See I Cor. 8:6.
[55] See I Cor. 11:7.
[56] Joel 2:25.
[57] Rom. 8:35.
[58] St. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, no. 41.

Bishop of Nicomedia. One day that leader of the third party had written: "If we say that the Son is true God and uncreate, then we are in the way to confess Him to be of one substance (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father." [59] How would the Eusebian party now dare to interpret the word ὁμοούσιος in conformity with their own doctrine?

The word itself seemed remarkably well chosen. Being made up of two words, one meaning "same" and the other meaning "substance," it implied two very subtle philosophical ideas: identity of substance and plurality of persons. The word "consubstantial" could apply to two beings only if they were distinct from each other. As St. Basil says: "Nothing is itself of like substance with itself, but one thing is of like substance with another thing." [60]

Moreover, the word was not a novel expression. Eusebius of Caesarea declares that "several bishops, who were learned and illustrious writers, had already used it." [61] Paul of Samosata had even tried to claim it as properly expressive of his doctrine, but he explained it in such a way that the Third Council of Antioch condemned its use.[62] St. Athanasius writes as follows:

"The bishops were compelled to resay that the Son is 'one in substance' with the Father, by way of signifying that the Son was from the Father and not merely like, but is the same in likeness, and of showing that the Son's likeness and unalterableness was different from such copy of the same as is ascribed to us, which we acquire from virtue on the ground of observance of the commandments. . . . The generation of the Son from the Father is not according to the nature of men. . . . The Word is ever in the Father and the Father in the Word." [63]

[59] St. Ambrose, *De fide*, III, 15 (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., X, 260).
[60] St. Basil, Letter 52.
[61] Eusebius, Letter 1, no. 7 (*P. G.*, XX, 1541).
[62] Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 439.
[63] St. Athanasius, *Epistle in Defense of the Nicene Definition*, sec. 20 (*Oxford*

In other words, the absolute divinity of the Son, the absolute unity of God, and the absolute distinction of the two persons in one identical nature were solemnly declared.

The seductiveness of Arius' heresy lay in its attempt to make more understandable both the unity of God and the person of Christ. What it really did was to undermine both mysteries, safeguarding the dogma of the divine unity only by a gross equivocation, and simplifying the idea of Christ only by stripping Him of His divinity. One single word, ὁμοούσιος (consubstantial), properly understood and profoundly examined, when applied to the Word and to God the Father, reëstablished the traditional faith in its purity. Jesus Christ the Word of God, consubstantial with His Father, remained the ineffable object of mankind's adoration. Jesus Christ, truly man, who died on the cross, remained friend and brother, bearing all our miseries. The consubstantiality was always a great mystery, but one that helped to explain all the other mysteries, one that spoke to the heart.

Over this word "consubstantial" long strife would take place. This fact sometimes surprises us. But we can understand the magnitude of these disputes when we reflect upon the incalculable import of this simple word.

Five bishops (Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicaea, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais) remained obstinate to the very end. They openly ridiculed the proposed term.[64] All the other members of the Council accepted the use of the word ὁμοούσιος to express the fundamental relationship of the Son with the Father. Hosius and Athanasius then drew up the celebrated Nicene Creed.[65]

Library of Fathers, vol. 8); *Epistle to Serapion,* III, 5 f.; *De Synodis,* nos. 39, 42, 48–54.

[64] Socrates, *op. cit.,* I, 8.

[65] St. Athanasius credits the Bishop of Cordova with a considerable influence in the formulation of the symbol. (*History of the Arians,* chap. 49.) But St. Hilary says that St. Athanasius was its author (*Fragments,* II, 33).

It was read in general session by the deacon Hermogenes, secretary of the Council and future bishop of Caesarea,[66] and was acclaimed by an almost unanimous vote of the Fathers.

The Nicene Creed

This symbol of Nicaea reads as follows: [67]

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only-begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of the same substance with the Father (ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί), by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate, was made man, suffered, rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens, and He will come to judge the living and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost." The symbol then terminates with the following anathema: "Those who say, There was a time when He was not, and He was not before He was begotten, and He was made of nothing (*i. e.,* He was created), or who say that He is of another hypostasis or of another substance (than the Father), or that the Son of God is created, that He is mutable, or subject to change, the Catholic Church anathematizes." [68]

With the exception of Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais, all the bishops finally signed the symbol. But an Arian writer, Philostorgius, reports another subterfuge by Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, and Maris when the symbol voted by their colleagues was presented to them for their

[66] St. Basil, Letter 244 (*P. G.,* XXXII, 924). Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires* (1782 ed.), VI, 280.

[67] Hefele, I, 294.

[68] The symbol and the anathema are preserved by Eusebius, Socrates, Gelasius of Cyzicus, and others; *P. G.,* XX, 1540; LXVII, 60 f.; Mansi, II, 916. Later we will note the successive additions to this symbol, which gave it the form which the Church now uses in the mass.

signatures. Perceiving that by the addition of a single letter the meaning of the word ὁμοούσιος (consubstantial) would be altered, they inserted in the middle of the word a scarcely perceptible iota. Thus the word ὁμοούσιος (of the same substance), became ὁμοιούσιος (of like substance).[69] By this trickery they escaped the anathema and exile, which were imposed on the two recalcitrant bishops. But they did not escape the contempt of their two friends, who bitterly reproached them for their lack of firmness. It is related that the Bishop of Ptolemais addressed the Bishop of Nicomedia in these words: "Eusebius, you signed so as not to be banished; but in less than a year you will share our misfortune." [70] Whether the anecdote be true or not, the orthodox never considered the signatures of the three bishops as sincere. This act may not have filled their life with remorse, but it did cover their memory with shame.

The Banishment of Arius

As soon as the symbol was reported to the Emperor, he was jubilant over it. Socrates tells us that "Constantine terms the decision of all those who were assembled there the will of God, and does not doubt that the unanimity of so many eminent bishops was effected by the Holy Spirit." [71] He immediately exiled Arius, the two bishops who refused to sign, and all the priests who were connected with them.[72] He ordered the writings of Arius and those of the heresiarch's friends to be burned. It seems also that he threatened with death all persons who concealed any of those writings.[73]

After imposing these sanctions, Constantine probably

[69] Philostorgius, *Supplement, P. G.,* LXV, 624.

[70] *Ibidem.*

[71] Socrates, I, 9.

[72] Philostorgius, *loc. cit.*

[73] Constantine's letter ordering this measure is of dubious authenticity. Cf. Hefele, I, 297.

thought the Arian controversy was forever at an end. But it had only started. At the very moment these severe measures were being carried out, the scheming Eusebius of Nicomedia was considering fresh plans to revive the conflict and to bring about the rehabilitation of Arius.

The Meletian Schism

Among the heresiarch's supporters were to be found some disciples of Meletius. The Council of Nicaea had been convoked, not only to settle the dispute about the Word of God, but also to end the Meletian Schism.

In the year 304 or 305,[74] while Bishop Peter of Alexandria was absent and while four other Egyptian bishops were in prison for the faith, Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis (in Egypt), despite protests by the lawful pastors, interfered in the governing of their dioceses. He performed ordinations there, in utter disregard of the most explicit ecclesiastical regulations.[75] St. Athanasius and Socrates mention also that Meletius was accused of sacrificing to idols during the persecution. But, on this point, Socrates seems merely to be copying Athanasius, who records what was probably a false rumor.[76]

It is beyond question, however, that the Bishop of Lycopolis, not satisfied with openly violating the precise regulations of canon law, contemptuously ignored the complaints of the four imprisoned bishops, refused to deal with them or with Bishop Peter, and, after Peter's martyrdom, went to Alexandria and there allied himself with Arius. He excommunicated the episcopal visitors who had been appointed by the martyr bishop, and ordained two others. Thus he became the center of a group

[74] For a discussion of this date, see Hefele, I, 347.

[75] Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 478. This Meletian schism should not be confused with one that broke out at Antioch half a century later.

[76] The documents in support of this view are set forth and discussed by Hefele, *Councils,* I. 345 f.

of malcontents who continually grew in number and were organized by him into a veritable hierarchical church.

At the time when the Council of Nicaea began its sessions, the Meletians in Egypt counted twenty-nine bishops. In Alexandria they had four priests and three deacons.[77] On account of the number of its members, its organization, the stubbornness of its leader, and its close relation with the Arians, the Meletian Schism took on the appearance of a serious danger. The Council promptly turned its attention to this question, especially since Constantine, who was always suspicious of movements that threatened disorder, requested the Fathers to make the peace of the Church their principal aim.

The Emperor's chief anxiety was for the outward good order of the Church. The bishops of the Council, however, placed the sacred interests of the faith ahead of all other considerations. As the Meletians did not deny any doctrine, the Council acted leniently toward them. To manifest its desire for conciliation and peace, the Council, after pointing out the grievous wrongs committed by Meletius, decided that the Meletian clergy should be kept in office, but fused with the clergy who had submitted to the Bishop of Alexandria; and they should always be ranked after the clergy ordained by the legitimate bishops, that is, by the bishops in communion with the bishop of Alexandria. Upon the death of one of these latter bishops, his place might be given to one of the Meletian clergy, but through a regular election and with the approval of the bishop of Alexandria. The sixth canon of the Council says: "The ancient order of things established in Egypt should be preserved, that is, the bishop of Alexandria should continue to exercise authority over the other bishops."

As regards Meletius, the promoter of the schism, his incorrigible habit of meddling everywhere and sowing disorder was well known. He was permitted to retain his episcopal title

[77] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, chap. 72

and to remain in the city of Lycopolis where he had been bishop. But he was deprived of all episcopal authority. He was forbidden to ordain or make clerical appointments there and he was not allowed to go to the environs or to any other city for a similar purpose.[78]

Conformable to the Council's decision, Meletius lived in Lycopolis. But, immediately after the death of Bishop Alexander, Eusebius of Nicomedia eagerly concluded with Meletius a sort of league which would subsequently foment grievous discord in the Church. The Meletian party brought to the Arians the backing of men long accustomed to strife and intrigue. This terrible Meletian party already numbered in its ranks Athanasius' most inveterate enemies: Bishop Callinicus of Pelusium who, later on at the Council of Sardica, stands out as Athanasius' declared adversary, also the hermit Paphnutius[79] and the false priest Ischyras, who became his accusers, and Bishop Arsenius who declared that one of his hands had been cut off by Athanasius.

The Easter Controversy

In the previous volume of this History, we saw the origin and chief phases of the Easter controversy.[80] It was not in any way related to the Arian question. But the serious disagreement which divided the Churches and which sometimes showed itself in the same country and even in the same city, led to continually renewed disputes. It profoundly disturbed Christian communities and at times even made them an object of ridicule by the pagans.[81] In its first canon, the Council of Arles ordered that henceforth Easter be celebrated "at the

[78] Socrates, *op. cit.*, I, 9; Theodoret, *op. cit.*, I, 8.

[79] He should not be confused with a bishop of the same name who, at the Council of Nicaea, defended the marriage of priests.

[80] Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 227, 291 ff., 433, 515.

[81] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, III, 5; St. Epiphanius, *Haereses*, LXX, 14.

same time, on the same day throughout the world." Evidently this decision was framed with a view to make the Roman custom prevail everywhere. But the Fathers of the Council purposely employed a vague formula so as not to wound the dissident Churches by too great exactness. For most of these latter the canon was a dead letter. Nothing but the decision of an ecumenical council would bring about uniformity.

It has often been repeated that the bishops at Nicaea decreed "that the feast of Easter henceforth be celebrated on the Sunday following the full moon after the spring equinox." This is indeed the rule that little by little came to be followed throughout the Church, but the Nicene Council did not make such a precise decision. It simply decreed, as we read in the Synodal Letter to the Church of Alexandria, as follows:

"All our brethren in the East who formerly followed the custom of the Jews are henceforth to celebrate the said most sacred feast of Easter at the same time with the Romans and yourselves and all those who have observed Easter from the beginning." [82]

Constantine wrote a long letter to all those who were present at the Council. With his usual emphasis, he says in this letter:

"It was resolved that this feast ought to be kept by all and in every place on one and the same day. We have it in our power to

[82] For a long time our only document on this question was a letter from the Council to the Church of Alexandria, quoted by Socrates (*op. cit.*, I, 9). But the very text of the decree has been discovered in a work known as the *Book of the Fifty Titles;* of this work we possess two manuscripts: one, coming from Mount Athos, is now in the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris; the other belongs to the Vatican Library. The former manuscript was published by Cardinal Pitra in his *Spicilegium Solesmense,* IV, 541. From this document we learn that, regarding the purely disciplinary question of the date of Easter, the most traditional rule is that the Church should celebrate this feast unanimously, on the same day. Provided it is Rome that determines this date, even though altering the established custom when occasion arises, and provided the faithful of the whole world all conform thereto, the desire expressed by the Council of Nicaea will continue to be realized. In this sense was conceived and should be understood an important letter from Cardinal Rompolla (Secretary of State of Leo XIII) to Father Tondini, May 6, 1897. This letter may be found in *Les Questions actuelles,* XXXV, 248–252.

prolong the due observance of this ordinance to future ages, by a truer order [than the Jewish practice], which we have preserved from the very day of the Passion until the present time. . . . Our Savior has left us one feast in commemoration of our deliverance, I mean the day of His most holy Passion; and He had willed that His Catholic Church should be one." [83]

The Nicene decision did not remove every divergence in the celebration of Easter. St. Epiphanius informs us that in his time (about the year 400), there were still many "Quartodecimans," that is, Christians who celebrated Easter in the Jewish manner on 14th Nisan, no matter what day of the week that might be.[84] He says further that a sect of these Quartodecimans, called Audians (from Audius,[85] the name of their leader, a man of original mind and strict piety), combined certain odd beliefs with practices of praiseworthy asceticism. For instance, they had an anthropomorphic idea of God, declaring that man's likeness to God was in his body as well as in his soul.[86] The sect originated in Mesopotamia. The laws of Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III prove that the Audians still existed in the fifth century. Theodoret describes the curious fashion in which they forgave sins. In the sixth century they completely disappear.

Disciplinary Canons

By condemning Arianism, by attempting to put an end to the Meletian Schism, and by making more precise the regulation about the celebration of Easter, the Nicene Fathers tried to ward off three great perils that were threatening the Church at the beginning of the fourth century. They wished to cure

[83] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 18.

[84] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* no. 50.

[85] St. Ephraim calls him Udo, a name which in Syriac means "owl." St. Ephraim, Sermon 24.

[86] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* no. 70. Cf. Hefele, I, 334–341.

other abuses and for this purpose enacted a number of disciplinary canons which have long been a matter of dispute among scholars. A regard for the mighty work accomplished by "the great council," as the Synod of Nicaea at once came to be called, so filled the popular mind that people attributed to that Council all the more important reforms that were accomplished after it.

Hefele gives another reason for the confusion that long prevailed on this subject. He says:

"We know, indeed, that the canons of various councils were at a very early period collected into one corpus; and in this corpus the canons of Nicaea always had the first place, on account of their importance. It happened afterwards that, either accidentally or designedly, some copyists neglected to give the names of the councils to those canons which followed the Nicene. We have already seen that even at Rome there was a copy containing *sub uno titulo* the canons of Nicaea and those of Sardica. When these copies were circulated in the East, that which might have been foreseen took place in course of time; *viz.*, from a want of the spirit of criticism, all the later canons which followed after the true canons were attributed to the Council of Nicaea." [87]

Today only twenty canons are regarded as authentic. The original text, inserted in Mansi's collection,[88] may be found, with a translation and scholarly commentary, in Hefele's *History of the Councils.*[89]

The purpose of some of these canons is merely to make more exact certain ancient regulations that were not well understood or well observed. Thus canons 1, 2, 9, and 10 exclude from sacred orders those who have mutilated themselves, as also the neophytes and penitents. Canon 17 forbids "any bishop, presbyter, deacon, or any one of the clergy whatever, to have

[87] Hefele, I, 367.
[88] Mansi, II, 668 f.
[89] Hefele, I, 375–434.

a *subintroducta* [90] dwelling with him, except only a mother or sister or aunt or such persons only as are beyond all suspicion." [91]

Another category of canons regulates special situations brought about by the recent crises which the Church had undergone from persecutions and heresies. Canons 11 to 14 determine the penitential conditions to be imposed upon the *lapsi* and *relapsi* of the last persecution of Licinius. Articles 8 and 19 concern the probation required of Novatians and followers of Paul of Samosata who might wish to return to the bosom of the Church.

There are five articles about the powers of priests, of ordinary bishops, and of metropolitans or primates. "They form

[90] On the *subintroductae,* see Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 435.

[91] Socrates, Sozomen, and Gelasius relate that the Fathers of Nicaea, like those of Elvira (canon 33) wished to enact a law regarding celibacy. This law would have forbidden all bishops, priests, and deacons, who were already married before their ordination, to continue living with their wives. But a very remarkable man, Bishop Paphnutius of Upper Egypt, said that too heavy a yoke should not be imposed on the clergy, that an absolute prohibition might endanger the virtue of the cleric's wife, who would be tempted to seek in a sinful way the satisfaction which theretofore she had licitly obtained. Paphnutius' speech was the more effective since he himself had always lived in the strictest continence. The scars of wounds which he had received for the faith made him venerable in the eyes of all. Several times Constantine had kissed the scar of that eye which Paphnutius lost during the persecution of Maximinus. The Fathers of Nicaea, regardful of these weighty words, instead of enacting the intended law, merely used the vague expression of article 3; evidently its spirit was to recommend the practice of continence, though it did not explicitly refer to the cleric's wife; it forbade him to have living with him any woman who was not beyond all suspicion. The reported speech of Paphnutius agrees well with the practice of celibacy in the Greek Church. The Latin Church already had clearly adopted the proposed practice. They would not yet venture to extend it to the whole Church. But the spirit of the Church was clear. The wording of article 3, so conformable to the spirit of continence, is most significant on the part of an assembly of bishops, who were mostly Eastern. Thomassin, basing his view on passages of St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, Eusebius, and St. Chrysostom, holds that article 3 was interpreted practically, even in the East, as meaning that the married clergy were to give up all marital relations with their wives. (Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 1, bk. 2, chap. 60, nos. 15 f.) But this interpretation can hardly be reconciled with the texts of the fifth and twenty-fifth Apostolic canons, the fourth canon of the Council of Gangra, and the thirteenth canon of the Council of Trullo.

a little code of Catholic hierarchy in five articles, forming not the least important work of the Council." [92]

We know that, from the beginning of Christianity, custom attached a particular preëminence to certain Churches. In this number were the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria. The Council explicitly confirmed their authority. Canon 4 decides that a bishop should be chosen by all the bishops of his province and that the metropolitan should have the right of approving or rejecting the choice. Canon 6 declares "the ancient customs should be observed, notably those concerning Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria should have jurisdiction over all these provinces, since it is a rule established by the bishops of Rome that the preëminences be observed in the Church." [93] "Thus," says an eminent scholar commenting on this text, "the Church of Rome confirmed the jurisdiction of the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch and, by guaranteeing individual primacies, affirmed its own universal primacy." [94]

The Council adds a sentence that appears to be a sort of amendment to the fourth canon. It was approved by the Fathers after the text of the canon had already been agreed upon. This sentence reads: "Likewise the ancient rights of the Churches of Antioch and the other provinces should be preserved." Canon 7 solves a special difficulty that arose regarding the successors of the bishops of Jerusalem. Since the destruction of the Holy City and the building of a new city on its ruins by Emperor Hadrian, the bishops of Jerusalem bore the title of bishop of Aelia Capitolina and yielded precedence to the bishop of Caesarea. The Council makes the following declaration: "Since custom and ancient tradition

[92] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain,* II, 55.

[93] This is a translation of the version which Leclercq proposes, by comparing the Greek texts with Syriac and Coptic manuscripts. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* I, 554 note.

[94] *Ibidem.*

have prevailed that the bishop of Aelia [*i. e.*, Jerusalem] should be honored, let him, saving its due dignity to the Metropolis, have the next place of honor." [95] These hierarchical regulations are completed by canons 15 and 16, which forbid the clergy to go from one place to another for the purpose of escaping from their rightful jurisdiction, and remind deacons that a great distance separates them from priests.

Constantine's Attitude

The Emperor could not restrain his joy at sight of the accomplishment of so many labors that were calculated to promote peace and order. Even before the end of the Council's sessions, by way of celebrating his twentieth year as emperor, he held a great festivity to which he invited all the bishops who were present at the Council. He gave them a banquet that excelled imagination in its magnificence. As the prelates passed by, the imperial guard presented arms. Eusebius relates that the bishops, seeing the gleam of drawn swords extended towards them, no longer as a threat, but by way of honoring them, said that "the scene was less like reality, than a dream." [96]

Constantine, seeing himself encompassed by so many prelates, who had assembled from all quarters of his Empire, was proud of this great Council, which he looked upon as his work. And he was charmed with the praise heaped upon him by Eusebius in an eloquent panegyric. The Emperor went from bishop to bishop, kissing the confessors' scars,[97] complimenting certain bishops, and repeatedly saying: "You are bishops whose jurisdiction is within the Church; I also am a bishop,

[95] *Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., XIV, 17.
[96] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, III, 15.
[97] Theodoret, I, 11; Socrates, I, 11.

ordained by God to overlook whatever is external to the Church." [98]

In the years that followed, Constantine let himself be seduced by this dazzle of his self-conceit. Throughout his life he vigorously defended the Nicene faith. But often he appeared to be defending something of his own rather than something of God. He took his office of "bishop in externals" too literally. So illusive may the proper limits become in these matters, that at times he even attempted to meddle in "internal affairs" to the detriment of the Church.

[98] Eusebius, *op. cit.*, IV, 24. Eusebius places these words on the lips of Constantine when the latter was giving a dinner to some bishops; but he does not indicate the date. With great probability it has been supposed that the words were used during this great festivity at Nicaea. That surely was the day when the great emperor would have been tempted to boast of this title of "bishop in externals."

CHAPTER III

Eusebius of Nicomedia and St. Athanasius (325–337)

Eusebius' Plan

THE authority of the universal Church, manifesting itself in the most imposing solemnity that the world until then ever witnessed, had anathematized Arianism. The terms of the condemnation left no room for evasion. Emperor Constantine, the supreme master of the East and the West, placed his formidable imperial power at the unqualified service of orthodoxy. One man, however, did not give up hope of making Arius' cause triumphant. This man was the astute Eusebius of Nicomedia. He knew Constantine. And he knew that the great emperor's loftiness of view and generosity of devotion were not always accompanied by perseverance in carrying out his plans. Moreover, Constantine was not well versed in the study of theological doctrines, nor did he always grasp their import. In fact, he was more concerned about assuring good order in the realm than he was about maintaining the purity of faith in souls.

Eusebius, being a sharp observer, also knew the strangely mixed ecclesiastical world of the fourth century. There were confessors bearing on their bodies the marks of wounds they received for the faith. And there were ambitious men, ever ready to follow whatever direction the Emperor's inclination would take. Then, too, there were utopian dreamers with vague doctrines, men who were imbued with Origenist and subordinationist ideas.[1] To inject into this world, under cover

[1] That is, placing the Son and the Holy Ghost in subordination to the Father. See Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 342.

of the imperial authority, an equivocally expressed doctrine with a semi-Arian foundation, did not seem to Eusebius an undertaking beyond the resources of his wile and scheming. To succeed, he must win Constantine: for this he would find valuable assistance in his relations with the near kin of the Emperor. Opinions would have to be changed. In the wreckage of the old schisms and the old heresies, ready accomplices would be found. But it was of the first importance that the good standing of Athanasius be ruined. To this task the Bishop of Nicomedia devotes his greatest personal efforts.

The first step he took seemed utterly to ruin his scheme. Two or three months after the Council, certain followers of Meletius, affected by the recent decisions of the Council, appealed to the Emperor's arbitration to settle some affair which the historian Eusebius refers to in vague terms.[2] These Egyptian Meletians might be of considerable help in the campaign which Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea planned to carry on in favor of Arius. Not only did Eusebius and Theognis welcome the petitioners, but openly favored them. And they haughtily pleaded in their behalf. But so great boldness was their ruin.

Exile of Eusebius

Constantine was annoyed by these tricks. Recalling Eusebius' former attachment to Licinius, the Emperor's rival, he ordered the arrest of the two bishops and banished them to Gaul. Then he wrote to their two Churches, directing them to choose new bishops. His letter to the Church of Nicomedia was terrible in its denunciation of Eusebius. Unmindful that he had pardoned the Bishop of Nicomedia for his close association with Licinius, he warned the people against

[2] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, III, 23.

"Eusebius, the coöperator in the cruelty of the tyrants. For that he was the agent of the tyrants has been clearly shown. . . . I shall not here give an account of my own wrongs, the seditions excited, or the spies employed against me. There is one thing which grieves me, that you are influenced by the doctrines of Eusebius, and have thus been led away from truth." [3]

So complete and sudden a change would have disconcerted anyone else. But Eusebius continued his intrigues from his distant place of exile. Perhaps his being so far away merely served the better to conceal his activity in a campaign in which he continued to be the leader.[4]

The clever plan of the Eusebians, as revealed by historical documents, was the following: they would not pose as opponents of the Nicene Council, which the Emperor defended as his own work; they would not take a stand as friends of Arius; but they would fuse themselves with a large mixed party, made up of all the malcontents that could be grouped together, a party in which pure Arians would not be numerous but which they would secretly direct; [5] they would not yet attack the deacon Athanasius, whose popularity was immense, but only the most vulnerable of his friends. This scheme of clever dissimulation was favored by the exile of the Bishop of Nicomedia, which left in the front rank of his party his relative of Caesarea, a docile tool in his hands, but a man who stood in high favor with the Emperor.

Eusebius of Caesarea

In the third party at the Council, whereas Eusebius of Nicomedia was a connecting link with the pure Arians, Eusebius of Caesarea represented the spirit of conciliation with

[3] Theodoret, I, 19 (*alias* 20).
[4] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 131.
[5] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 37 f.

the group that followed the lead of Athanasius. His loyalty to the Emperor had never faltered. At great functions, he it was who always delivered, in the Emperor's presence, those pompous discourses in which the imperial majesty was exalted even to hyperbole. Eusebius of Caesarea readily signed the Creed adopted by the majority of the conciliar Fathers, but with misgivings as to the Sabellian interpretations that might be given to the word *homoousios.*

St. Eustathius

One of the most earnest friends of Athanasius, one of the most vigorous defenders of the *homoousios* at the Nicene Council, Eustathius of Antioch, was supposed to lean toward the Sabellian error. But the suspicion seems to have been ill founded.[6] What was really dreaded in him was his ardor in combating the Arian doctrines in the provinces of Celesyria, Mesopotamia, and the two Cilicias, where he was charged with the execution of the conciliar decisions.[7] St. John Chrysostom relates that Eustathius sent orthodox teachers and learned controversialists to the most threatened cities.[8] He issued many refutations of the heresy in the form of tracts, sermons, letters, and exegetical commentaries. St. Athanasius informs us that Eustathius expelled from the ranks of his clergy all its members who were suspect.[9] Most of these were later made bishops to strengthen the Arian party.[10] But the hour had not

[6] "I do not see that what we possess of Eustathius' works gives any foundation for this charge. He strongly affirms the full divinity of the Word, but he also sets forth the distinction between the Word and the Father." Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioche,* p. 38 note. As to Eustathius' theology, see a lengthy note in Dupin, *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers,* II, 21 ff.

[7] Gelasius, *Actorum concilii Nicaeni commentarius,* II, 27.

[8] St. Chrysostom, *Laudatio sancti Eustathii,* no. 3.

[9] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* Part I, chap. 4.

[10] *Ibidem.* Among the bishops we can name Leontius and Stephen of Antioch, George of Laodicea, Theodore of Tripoli, Eudoxius of Germanicia, and Eustathius of Sebaste.

come for them to disclose their real intent. Eustathius wrote or uttered some vigorous statement to refute Arianism, and Eusebius of Caesarea used the statement as a basis for accusing him of Sabellianism, *i. e.*, of confounding the three Persons of the Trinity with one another.[11] A sharp exchange of letters followed between the two bishops. These doctrinal accusations were succeeded by others of a political nature. Eustathius was charged with a lack of dutiful respect to the Emperor's mother.[12] The ground was well chosen for the campaign which the Bishop of Nicomedia undertook. And it was pursued relentlessly.

We have now come to the year 328. Constantine extended his clemency to the Bishop of Nicomedia and recalled him from exile. This move seems to have been suggested by Princess Constantia, the Emperor's sister, who was still devoted to her former confidant and adviser. It may be she took advantage of the great festivities celebrated that very year in honor of the martyr St. Lucian of Antioch to ask the Emperor to pardon Eusebius, who claimed to be one of the martyr's most faithful disciples.[13]

The Bishop of Nicomedia took possession of his see again. But he devoted himself chiefly to organizing the campaign against Eustathius. Knowing well that trickery was the weapon he could employ most expertly, he contrived a snare. In a petition full of flattery, he begged Constantine for per-

[11] Socrates, *op. cit.*, I, 23.

[12] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* Part I, chap. 4. "In this there may well have been a foundation of truth. Helena visited the East in the time of Eustathius. We know that she had a great devotion to St. Lucian, the celebrated priest of Antioch. . . . She built a magnificent basilica in his honor. He had left a memory in Antioch which was the subject of controversy; the Arians held him in great veneration; their adversaries were less enthusiastic. It is quite possible that on this subject Eustathius may have let fall some indiscreet words." (Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 129.)

[13] Batiffol, *Études d'hagiographie arienne, La passion de saint Lucien d'Antioche,* in the Report of the *Congrès scientifique des catholiques,* 1891, 2d section, pp. 181–184.

mission to visit the magnificent buildings in course of construction at Jerusalem through the Emperor's piety. He first went to Antioch, accompanied by Theognis of Nicaea, and visited Eustathius, who gave him a fraternal welcome. After leaving Eustathius with every appearance of friendliness, he traveled through Palestine and Syria, gathering together all his followers, including Eusebius of Caesarea, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Aetius of Lydda. These he brought to Antioch, declaring that serious charges against Eustathius called for prompt solution by a synod. And a fresh denunciation was added. The private morals of the Bishop of Antioch were to be the subject of inquiry. A hastily convened synod pronounced Eustathius' deposition in his own city.[14] Theodoret, reporting the affair, says that soon afterwards the infamous creature who had dared calumniate Eustathius made a retractation during a grievous illness and declared that she had been hired by the Eusebians.[15] By that time, however, the decisions of the Synod of Antioch were already executed. Constantine had exiled the falsely accused insulter of his mother to Trajanopolis in Thrace, then to Philippi, where he died shortly after.[16] But this Eustathius would one day be honored by the Church as a saint.[17]

The following year (330) Euphronius, an avowed follower of the Bishop of Nicomedia, was chosen, not without some commotion, in place of Eustathius. He was installed in the see of Antioch in the presence of a representative of the Emperor. The most active of Athanasius' friends thus disappeared from the field of battle, and the important see of

[14] Duchesne, after summing up these details, says: "All this is very doubtful and reads like legend." *Op. cit.*, II, 129. But such is not the opinion of Cavallera, who makes a careful examination of the documents and holds them to be authentic. (Cavallera, *Le Schisme d'Antioche,* pp. 56–61.)

[15] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 20 (*alias* 21).

[16] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* Part I, chap. 4.

[17] *Acta sanctorum,* July, IV, 136.

Antioch was in the hands of the Eusebians. The schemes of the Bishop of Nicomedia were crowned with complete success.

St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria

Events in Egypt did not follow the same course. Alexander, the holy bishop of Alexandria, died on April 17, 328, after expressing a desire that the deacon Athanasius should be his successor. The faithful acclaimed this choice, the orthodox bishops of the province ratified it,[18] and the consecration of the new bishop took place on June 7, amidst the ovations of a whole people, who kept repeating: "Athanasius! Athanasius! He is a good Christian. He is an ascetic. He is a real bishop." [19]

Athanasius was only thirty years old. "In addition to his gifts as an experienced pastor, God had endowed him with a clear intellect and a wide vision of Christian tradition, of current events, and of men; and with all this, he possessed a character of absolutely undaunted courage, tempered by perfect sweetness of manner, but incapable of weakening before anything or anybody. The orthodoxy of Nicaea had found its representative. Already threatened at this time, it was soon to pass through many terrible crises. At certain times, it seemed to have no other support but Athanasius. But that was enough. Athanasius had against him the Empire, its police, the councils, and the episcopate; the parties were still equally balanced, while such a man stood firm." [20]

The new patriarch's first Easter letter to his people pointed out the threatening danger and referred to the intrigues of the

[18] Not all the bishops were as enthusiastic about it as were the people. Some of them were fearful that in electing Athanasius they were giving themselves a master. See Bardy, *Saint Athanase,* pp. 50 f.

[19] Sozomen, II, 17; St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos,* no. 6. We know that, according to tradition and the canons, when a Church lost its bishop, the neighboring bishops met to elect a successor; they took account of the voice of the clergy and people. See Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 427.

[20] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 133.

"heretics." But the principal object of his first pastoral instructions was the edification of his people by the practice of the faith and of the precepts of religion. In this letter he says:

"Let us look upon the priestly trumpets of our Savior, which cry out and call us, at one time to war, as the blessed Paul saith: 'We wrestle not with flesh and blood, but with principalities.' . . . At another time the call is made to virginity and self-denial and conjugal harmony, saying, To virgins, the things of virgins; and to those who are married, the things of an honorable marriage." [21]

One of Athanasius' first cares was to visit that cherished part of his diocese where the purest spirit of the Gospel was flourishing among groups of hermits. The Syriac preface to his *Easter Letters* speaks of his journeys to the Thebaid, Pentapolis, the Ammon oasis, and the lower districts,[22] as though he were reviewing his choicest troops on the eve of the great battle he was about to wage against Arianism. Bishops and throngs of people accompanied him. When he was approaching the Said, St. Pachomius with his religious came forth to meet him, singing Psalms.[23] Between the saintly patriarch and the great lawgiver of the cenobitical life there

[21] "It was an ancient custom of the bishops of Alexandria to send an annual letter to the churches of their dioceses. Such communications were known as Festal Letters, and were usually issued after Epiphany. They announced the date of Easter and the beginning of the preparatory fast; they also contained instructions concerning the Easter festival or other matters. . . . The original text of those composed by Athanasius has been lost, apart from some fragments. In 1847 a collection of these letters in Syriac was found in a monastery of the Nitrian desert; they were edited by Cureton in 1848. Cureton's manuscript was a mutilated one, and contained only fifteen entire letters, of the years 329–348. (Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* pp. 156, 258.) The Latin translation of the *Festal Letters* of St. Athanasius has been placed in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (XXVI, 1351 ff.). On the basis of the preface to these letters it has been possible to determine several dates in the life of St. Athanasius.

[22] *P. G.,* XXVI, 1352.

[23] *Histoire de saint Pakhôme et de ses communautés,* previously unpublished Coptic and Arabic documents, published and translated by Amelineau in the *Revue du Musée Guimet,* XVII (1889), 384 f.

were formed holy bonds which common strife against heresy would strengthen. The practice of the sternest virtues of the religious life prepared these monks to become intrepid champions of orthodoxy. Henceforth Pachomius shared all the joys and trials of the holy Patriarch, calling him "the Father of the orthodox faith," [24] "a Christopher" or "one who bears God." [25] At the close of Pachomius' life, among the farewell words addressed to his beloved brethren we hear him repeating: "In this world I have known three things that gratified God and flourished in Him: first, the holy Father Athanasius, who fought for the orthodox faith until his very death; secondly, the great Antony, who left us the model of his religious life; and thirdly, that dear community, which advances in the footsteps of those two fathers, under the commands of God." [26]

Attacks on St. Athanasius

After this journey, the Patriarch returned to Alexandria full of heavenly consolations, to resume possession of his episcopal see. The storm had already burst. The followers whom Arius left in the Egyptian capital were all stirred up. They contested the validity of Athanasius' election, maintaining that it was done under the pressure of a concerted popular movement. Eusebius exerted his influence with the Emperor. In a commanding letter—a fragment of which is preserved for us by Athanasius—Constantine ordered the Patriarch, under pain of being exiled himself from his episcopal city, to admit into his communion all those who would present themselves to him.[27]

Athanasius was quick at repartee. He at once drew up, for

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 268.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 642.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 678.
[27] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, no. 59.

presentation to Constantine, a memorial in justification of his conduct. But this document was barely written, when the Meletian party, at Eusebius' instigation, entered the campaign. They issued, in rapid succession, a series of mendacious and perfidious accusations to overwhelm the man of God. They charged that he encroached on the imperial powers by levying a contribution upon the faithful of the diocese for the profit of his Church; that he was guilty of high treason for supplying money to a rebel; that Macarius, delegated by Athanasius, undertook to bring back to his duty a certain false priest, Ischyras by name, who was usurping priestly functions, and that the occasion led to a violent scene during which Macarius upset the altar, broke the chalice, and burned the sacred books. This time Athanasius decided to defend himself, not by a written memorial, but in person. He therefore went to Nicomedia and had no difficulty, by a few clear and honest explanations, in dissipating all the calumnies invented against him. He returned to Alexandria bearing a letter in which Constantine calls him "a man of God."

But his enemies did not disarm. Eusebius of Nicomedia was very capable in swaying the populace. He worked the strings in all these plots. He knew that the sort of charge likely to strike the popular imagination and arouse public opinion against a man is not the most plausible accusation, but the most dramatic and startling. The Ischyras affair was taken up again and enriched with new details. And the Meletians openly accused Athanasius with having one of their number (Arsenius, bishop of Hypsele) assassinated. A human hand was paraded through the city as a convincing evidence. A judicial inquiry began. But it came to an abrupt end by the appearance of the supposed victim. Arsenius, paid by Athanasius' enemies, had hidden in a monastery. Athanasius succeeded in tracing his whereabouts, and the poor wretch begged forgiveness from the Bishop of Alexandria. Constantine again

wrote a friendly letter to the Patriarch, and John Arkaph, the leader of the Meletians, in alarm cast himself at the feet of Athanasius.

But this submission was merely a hypocritical maneuver. While the chief of the Meletians was making his apologies before the Patriarch of Alexandria, the latter's sworn enemies were hatching a vast conspiracy against him. The aim was to ruin Athanasius, rehabilitate Arius, and, in this double accomplishment, compromise both the Emperor and the episcopate.

Eutocius at the Imperial Court

Constantine's unchangeable attachment to the formulas voted at Nicaea was well known. He would not allow them to be called into question. But it was also known how easily he could be deceived as to the meaning and value of those dogmatic formulas.

The ex-empress Constantia, widow of Licinius, was ever devoted to Eusebius' cause. When dying in 333, she recommended to her brother Constantine a priest who was in her confidence, one Eutocius.[28] This priest, who was at once admitted to the Emperor's court, was an easy tool in the hands of the Bishop of Nicomedia. He persuaded Constantine that Arius was not so opposed to the decisions of "the great Council" as people said. Constantine was convinced. Moreover, Athanasius had in vain triumphed over all the accusations made against him: was it not true that, by continually stirring up intrigues around him, he was, whether guilty or not, a cause of disturbance? Under such circumstances, governments more solicitous about maintaining public order than about safeguarding justice lay the blame as readily upon the victim as upon the scoundrels. It is also probable that the Emperor, in his recent conversations with the fearless prelate,

[28] Gelasius, *op. cit.*, III, 12. Cf. Rufinus, I, 2.

noticed in him that firmness of character, the merest signs of which are instinctively dreaded by potentates. At any rate, the priest Eutocius, secret agent of Arius and Eusebius, cultivated these feelings in the Emperor's mind. In 334 Arius, having obtained an audience with the Emperor, offered him a profession of faith cleverly drawn up in vague terms. At first glance it appeared acceptable to Constantine, who immediately decided that Arius should be restored to his ecclesiastical functions and asked the patriarch Athanasius to receive him in his communion. Athanasius' refusal and the Emperor's consequent displeasure were noted by the Eusebian party, who quickly utilized the circumstances to their own advantage.

The time was approaching when Constantine, who had now reached the thirtieth year of his reign, decided to celebrate the event by a great religious solemnity. How better could this feast be enhanced, how better could his cherished aims be assured than by one of those conciliar assemblies which already at Arles and Ancyra and especially at Nicaea had assured both the peace of the Church and the glory of the Emperor? Constantine did not require much urging. He designated the city of Tyre as the meeting-place. The imperial letter of convocation is significant: the task of the Council was to be a work of pacification. If anyone should seek to avoid attending, he would, at need, be constrained to come by force.[29] In this expression everybody saw an allusion to Athanasius' attitude.[30] As though to show that the imperial threat was not an empty word, the priest Macarius, a close friend of the Bishop of Alexandria, was brought there in chains. Dionysius, a man of consular rank and high court official, was appointed by Constantine to designate the bishops who should come to the Council, to take the Emperor's place there, and in that

[29] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, IV, 42.

[30] The previous year (334) a fruitless attempt was made to have Athanasius appear before a synod held at Caesarea.

capacity to maintain good order at it.[31] This time there was no question of Pope Sylvester.

Council of Tyre (336)

The character of the Council was thus indicated from the start.[32] No doctrinal question was placed on the program, but all the complaints raised against Athanasius were taken up. The Eusebians assumed the role of judges; the part of accusers was taken by the Meletians. The Patriarch of Alexandria had the courage to plead his case before such adversaries. On the gravest of the charges brought against him, that of the assassination of Arsenius, which they had the effrontery to maintain, he was easily victorious. Arsenius was alive and could be seen in his diocese of Hypsele.[33] On some points the accused asked for an investigation. A commission of inquiry was appointed, at a special meeting, not in general session. But at the investigation both sides were not heard. It was conducted under the direction of the prefect of Egypt. No member of the clergy who had submitted to Athanasius was allowed to be present. The holy Bishop found himself confronted by a faction, whose prejudice showed itself only too clearly. He quit the Council, which, immediately after his departure, pronounced sentence of deposition against him.[34]

In vain Athanasius went to Constantinople, where Constantine had then established his imperial residence. The Euse-

[31] Eusebius, *loc. cit.*

[32] To foil his enemies' plans, Athanasius brought with him fifty Egyptian bishops. But they were barred from the council on the pretext that they had not been summoned.

[33] According to Rufinus (bk. 10, chap. 18), Athanasius confounded his foes by producing Arsenius before the council.

[34] Most critics question what Rufinus (bk. 1, chap. 17) says about a charge of incontinence and its tart refutation. Of this there is no mention either in St. Athanasius' account or in the council's *Acta* which have been preserved. (Mansi, II, 1123 ff.)

bians came there, too. Eusebius of Caesarea, at some festivity in the Emperor's presence, delivered one of those pompous orations in which he was most expert in flattering the sovereign's vanity.[35] Then Athanasius was charged with a new crime, a most unlikely one, indeed, but one well calculated to impress Constantine's self-conceit. The Patriarch of Alexandria had distributed generous alms. He was accused of having bought up the grain supply and attempting to starve Constantinople, the great city so gloriously founded by Constantine, the capital he was so proud of. The Emperor did not even wait for the accused to offer his defense. To cut short all discussion, he ordered Athanasius to be arrested and banished to Gaul, to the city of Treves, where he was interned.[36]

Marcellus of Ancyra

Would there now be peace? No, indeed; because Constantine, at the same time that he exiled Athanasius, also recalled Arius and his followers. The latter, instead of keeping quiet, profited by their triumph to resume the strife with increased activity.

At the Council of Tyre, conspicuous among the bishops who would not join in the campaign against Athanasius, was Marcellus bishop of Ancyra. In the Council of Nicaea he was seen to be among the most earnest foes of Arius. The doctrinal proceedings which they had not dared institute against Athanasius, whose faultless learning and cogent logic they feared, they resolved to undertake against his friend Marcellus.

With more zeal than theological exactness, Marcellus had defended the consubstantiality of the Word in a book in which the Eusebians claimed to discover Sabellianism, mixed with

[35] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos,* no. 9.
[36] *Ibid.,* no. 87.

Adoptionism. According to Eusebius of Caesarea, who devoted two books to the refutation of Marcellus,[37] the Bishop of Ancyra conceived God as an indivisible Monad, susceptible of a sort of unfolding and folding up again upon itself. This unfolding of the Divinity took place in three ways, and as it were in three distinct periods of time. The Thought of God, or His Word, expanded and was realized outwardly by the production of the world; this was creation. A second and more profound irradiation of the divine Word penetrated human nature itself: this was the Incarnation. A third development of the Word produced the Spirit, which, before Christ's breathing upon the Apostles, was contained in the Word and in the Father, but at that moment, according to Theodoret's expression, became "an extension of the extension." Thus did the Monad expand into the Trinity. But at the end of things, the Word and Spirit would return into the bosom of the Father, as they were there in principle and without ever having constituted veritable Persons.[38]

It is doubtful that Marcellus' doctrine contained such precise declarations. Almost our whole knowledge of it we get from Eusebius of Caesarea, who was more orator than theologian and who would find it to his advantage to interpret its language in the sense of the Sabellian heresy. As in the case of Eustathius' writings, so those of Marcellus would furnish the Eusebians with an occasion for posing as defenders of tradition against innovating errors.

[37] The two books *Against Marcellus* and the *Theology of the Church.*

[38] On the doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra, see Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 37–41. It is not easy to pass judgment on the doctrine of this bishop, whose life was worthy of veneration. He was defended by the Council of Sardica, Pope Julius I, and St. Athanasius, at least until 344; but it seems that he was compromised by the ideas of his disciple Photinus. Saint Basil, St. Hilary, St. John Chrysostom, and Sulpicius Severus were suspicious of his ideas. Tillemont and especially Petau call him heretical. Natalis Alexander, Montfaucon, and Moehler defend his orthodoxy. On his influence and activity in the Arian controversy, see a lengthy note by Leclercq in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* II, 841–844.

A synod held at Constantinople in 336 condemned Marcellus of Ancyra and proscribed his writings. The superficial character of the investigation and Marcellus' protests against the interpretation given to his doctrine would later on stir up long quarrels between East and West. But the conciliar decision was none the less another success for the friends of Arius.

They thought of crowning this series of triumphs by a public restoration of their leader into the Catholic communion. The heresiarch was presented to the Alexandrians, perhaps in the secret hope of taking the place left vacant by the banishment of Athanasius. But the hostility of the people, who were deeply attached to their exiled bishop, obliged Arius to withdraw. He then went to Constantinople to the Emperor, declaring to him under oath that he held the pure Catholic faith. Constantine said to him: "If your faith is truly orthodox, you are right in swearing to it. But if your faith is impious, may God judge you for your oath." The Emperor then sent for Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, and ordered him to receive Arius the next day into his communion.

Death of Arius

The next day was a Sunday. The Eusebians made ready a grand demonstration, threatening to carry out their plan by force if the clergy offered the least resistance. The holy Bishop then turned to God. Prostrate on the ground, in his church, he was heard saying:

"Lord, let me Thy servant depart and destroy not the pious with the impious. Take off Arius lest, if he enter into the Church, the heresy also may seem to enter with him and henceforward impiety be accounted for piety." [39]

[39] St. Athanasius, *Epistle to Serapion* (*Oxford Library of Fathers,* XIII, 212; *P. G.,* XXV, 688).

That very evening Arius was traversing the city accompanied by a numerous following, when, near the Forum of Constantine, a sudden necessity obliged him to seek a secluded spot. Soon he was found there under circumstances that prompted early historians to apply to him the Scriptural words that refer to the traitor Judas: *"Diffusa sunt viscera ejus."* [40]

St. Athanasius relates that this tragic event opened the eyes of several Arians and that Emperor Constantine was greatly impressed by it.[41] The banishment of John Arkaph, leader of the Meletians, who was everywhere sowing disorder, was perhaps an effect of this impression. But the Emperor did not forsake his policy, which seemed to consist in maintaining a balance between the two parties. A touching appeal to the Emperor by St. Antony, the patriarch of the monastic life, asking for the recall of Athanasius, was futile. The death of Bishop Alexander in August 336, during the Emperor's absence, was followed by the election of a devout and learned bishop, named Paul, to the see of Constantinople. But upon Constantine's return, Eusebius of Nicomedia prejudiced him against the newly elected bishop. Paul was banished to Pontus about the end of that year and was replaced by a friend of the Arians.

Thus the Eusebian faction, after eliminating from the combat the three great champions of the Nicene faith—Eustathius, Athanasius, and Marcellus—succeeded in placing one of their own number in the episcopal see of the new capital. But the Nicene symbol remained firm; Constantine never ceased defending it. Arius was able to sue for rehabilitation

[40] Acts 1 : 18. Such is the account given by St. Athanasius according to the report of the priest Macarius, who was in Constantinople at the time of the event. St. Athanasius, *Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya against the Arians* and *Epistle to Serapion.* (*P. G.,* XXV, 580, 685 ff.; *Oxford Library of Fathers,* XIII, 147.) Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret relate the same fact, with a few minor variations.

[41] St. Athanasius, *Letter to Serapion, concerning the Death of Arius,* no. 4; *History of the Arians,* no. 51.

only by outwardly subscribing to it. And Providence halted the audacious heresiarch at the threshold of the sanctuary by one of those strokes in which even the most lukewarm faith instinctively sees the hand of God.

Constantine's Last Days

Constantine had reached the sixty-fourth year of his age and the thirty-second of his reign. In that mighty soul, discouragement appeared. He had devoted his genius to the pursuit of two great aims: the unity of the Empire and religious peace. Both of these seemed gravely endangered. A year earlier, at the time of the festive celebration of his thirtieth year as emperor, despairing of preventing strife among his heirs, he divided his empire into three kingdoms. The eldest son, Constantine, was given the provinces located beyond the Alps: Gaul, Britain, and Spain; Constans, the youngest, with the aid of the Caesar Dalmatius, was assigned the government of the center of the Empire: Italy, Africa, and Illyricum; Constantius, the most beloved of the three, aided by the Caesar Hannibalianus, received as his share the entire East. In the religious realm, the Emperor's last acts likewise seemed to establish the existence of two irreconcilable parties. The great reign inaugurated by the victory of the Milvian Bridge and the Edict of Milan ended sadly in the fear of political and religious anarchy.

The thought of death followed Constantine everywhere. At the time of the celebration of his thirtieth year as emperor, he had his tomb constructed in the Church of the Holy Apostles.[42] Eusebius relates that he celebrated the feast of Easter 337 with particular devotion, passing the entire night in that church, close to his tomb. His health was already affected. Feeling the approach of death and of God's judgment,

[42] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* IV, 58.

he probably recalled the crimes that had stained his reign: the murder of his brother-in-law Licinius, of his son Crispus, and of his wife Fausta,[43] which had not yet been blotted out by the sacrament of baptism. He may also have blamed himself for his delay in receiving the sacrament that would have made him a Christian.[44] A few days later, his ill health became graver; the physicians advised that he go to the city of Helenopolis in Bithynia and take the hot baths. He did go there; but he was too weak to attempt the treatment and simply went to the newly built church. There he prostrated himself, confessing his sins aloud, and asked that, according to the rule laid down by the Council of Elvira, he might receive the imposition of hands,[45] that is, the ceremony that would make him a catechumen.[46] He was then carried to his palace at Aschiron, located in one of the environs of Nicomedia, and thither summoned a number of bishops to be present at the ceremony of his baptism. St. Jerome says that the baptismal rite was performed by Eusebius of Nicomedia. This statement appears to be well founded, since the Emperor was in Eusebius' diocese. Constantine received the sacrament with every sign of deep piety.[47] From that moment he refused to wear the im-

[43] On these murders, see De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* II, 97–133.

[44] Such a delay in receiving baptism was at that time not so unusual or surprising as it would be now. Eusebius (*op. cit.,* bk. 4, chap. 57) says that the reason given by the Emperor for these delays was that he wished to receive baptism in the Jordan River. At least this was his pretext. St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Martin were baptized comparatively late in life.

[45] Eusebius, *op. cit.,* IV, 61.

[46] Canon 39 of the Council of Elvira says: *"Gentiles, si in infirmitate desideraverint sibi manus imponi, si fuerit eorum ex aliqua parte honesta vita, placuit eis manum imponi et fieri christianos."*

[47] The fact of Constantine's baptism on his death-bed is attested by St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Eusebius, and the Council of Rimini. No one any longer maintains the story of the Emperor's baptism by Pope St. Sylvester, an account which was contested by Papebroch in the *Acta sanctorum,* May, vol. 5. On this question, see De Smedt, *Principes de la critique historique,* pp. 137–159; *Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne), I, cix-cxx, 170–201. The question has been raised whether the form

perial purple, and he prepared for death. On May 22, 337, he appeared before Him whose precepts he had not always followed, but whose law he had cherished, whose ministers he had honored, and whose Church he had defended, giving it that freedom and respect to which it has a right.

In short, Constantine's reign had been exceptionally favorable to the Church. Not only did it free the Church from persecution, but it permitted the Christian apostolate to spread freely to the utmost limits of the Empire; it enabled Christian literature to flourish without hindrance; and it allowed Christian worship to expand in all the magnificence of its ceremonies and its temples. And it infused the Christian spirit into the laws.

Christianity and Roman Law

Some legists date the decadence of Roman law from Constantine, because the great Emperor's legislation disturbed the scholarly logic of that law. Assuredly the old law of Rome, such as was made by enactments, plebiscites, magistrates' decrees, the "replies of the prudent," the *"senatus consultus,"* and imperial constitutions, from a certain point of view may be regarded as the result of the greatest effort which human reason had attempted before the appearance of Christianity. The genius of eminent jurisconsults, such as Ulpian and Gaius, had made it a monument in wonderful architectural form. But, if we consider the excellence of Roman law to have been expressed by that architecture, with the iron law of the Twelve Tables as its basis, we must trace its decadence further back than Constantine. The change dates from that equitable jurisprudence of the praetors who, by countless artifices, interpreted the old formulas in a spirit of clemency,

of baptism used by the semi-Arian Eusebius was valid. But the form used is unknown to us. On this point, see the article in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne* (I, 2818) regarding the rebaptism of Arians received into the Church.

gradually humanized the organization of the family and of property, and broadened the right to judge human contracts according to circumstances, and not in accord with the strict letter of their wording.

This tendency to equity, the complement of strict justice, was confirmed and completed by the spirit of Christianity and was progressively codified by the Christian emperors, especially by Constantine. We may say that, by thus making the law flexible, Christianity saved it. As an eminent historian remarks, "Christianity could save the Roman law only by modifying it, suiting it to the new needs of the world. The praetor still left much to be done by the Gospel. Equity is not enough. Mercy is needed, that justice may not weigh too heavily upon human weakness." [48]

By broadening the jurisconsults' right of interpretation [49] and by amplifying the juridical effects of custom,[50] Constantine broke the architectural lines of the old Roman law, but he humanized it. By elevating the dignity of women, children, and slaves,[51] he undermined its most ancient foundations, but he Christianized it. As Schlegel says:

"The Roman jurisprudence, as it deals in rigid formulas and adheres to the strict letter, inclines more towards rigid and absolute law. But human justice should necessarily be mild, indulgent, qualified by circumstances." [52]

[48] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, II, 275 f. On the Christianizing of Roman law by the Christian emperors, especially by Constantine, see Ozanam, *History of Civilization in the Fifth Century*, vol. I, chap. 5. See also De Broglie, *op. cit.*, II, 269–274, 446–448; Troplong, *Influence du christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains.* An article in *L'Ami du clergé* (November 30, 1913) summarizes the conclusions reached in these studies, as likewise the more recent works of three Italian scholars—Ferrini and Carussi of the University of Rome, and Riccobono of the University of Palermo.

[49] *Theodosian Code* (*de resp. prud.* t. 4). This constitution was discovered by Clossius in the nineteenth century.

[50] L. 2. C. *Quae et longa consuetudo* (8, 53).

[51] Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 544.

[52] Schlegel, *The Philosophy of History*, Lecture 9 (1883 ed., pp. 265 f.).

This beneficent evolution of Roman law was wonderfully favored by a custom that developed notably under Constantine. In obedience to St. Paul's counsel, the Christians had always, so far as possible, avoided having their differences adjudicated in the pagan courts. The bishops were already accustomed to sit in the tribunal of penance and assign canonical penalties. Hence it was natural for the faithful to come to them for an arbitral and extra-official judgment in all civil cases arising between them. Constantine gladly allowed this jurisdiction to grow stronger and to develop beside that of the civil magistrate with his jurisconsults.[53] If we are to credit a Constitution inserted in the Theodosian Code, Constantine not merely left the parties free to take their cases to the ecclesiastical tribunal, as Sozomen says,[54] but he imposed the jurisdiction of the bishop upon the recalcitrant party if the other party appealed to it. The genuineness of this Constitution, however, has been called in question, and such a decision is scarcely likely.

Constantinople

This sort of judiciary organization was able to develop especially in Constantinople. The new capital was an entirely Christian city. It even seems that the chief motive of its foundation in 329 was Constantine's desire to separate his administration the more freely from the old pagan cult, which was so deeply rooted in the institutions and customs of Rome. Constantinople, admirably served by a large roadstead and an excellent harbor and equally accessible from Europe and

[53] The ancient practice of Roman procedure, of leaving the decision in questions of fact to juries (*judices dati pedanei*), may have helped to make the introduction of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil cases more natural. In Roman custom, the intervention of a citizen not a judge to settle a dispute was not an unheard-of event. Cf. Meysenbug, *De Christianae religionis vi et effectu in jus civile.*

[54] Sozomen, I, 9.

Asia, was a strategic point for the defense of the district. But this advantage may have been only a secondary consideration.

However this may be, the political and religious consequences of the founding of Constantinople were incalculable. The transfer of the capital to the East had the effect of better detaching the imperial administration from paganism and of letting the pope more freely and evidently occupy the first place in the city of Rome. But "it had another consequence. The city of the emperor's residence would powerfully attract the attention of the whole Empire. The bishop of that place, living near the sovereign and having frequent and close relations with him, would thereby enjoy a privileged position. The Christians of the whole Empire, especially those in the regions near the capital, would regard this bishop as an intermediary with the ruler. If the bishop were to encourage this view, would he not seek to extend his power over a large portion of the Church? In short, by creating a capital other than Rome, was not Constantine, even unwittingly, aiding the formation of a second religious center?" [55] The future would justify these fears.

While the Church was infusing her spirit into the laws and customs, she was extending her frontiers. In Constantine's reign Ethiopia, Iberia (Georgia), Armenia, and Persia, as also the country of the Sarmatians and that of the Goths, received missioners of the Gospel.

Evangelization of Abyssinia

We are told by a learned Orientalist that "the traditions attributing the introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia or Abyssinia by the eunuch of Queen Candace or by the Apostles St. Bartholomew and St. Matthew, have long since been recog-

[55] Bousquet, *L'Unité de l'Église et le schisme grec*, p. 44.

nized as false." [56] The evangelization of that country took place in Constantine's reign and under the following circumstances. "Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre, returning from a journey to the Indies, in company with two relatives, the young brothers Frumentius and Edesius, landed on the coast of Northern Abyssinia. The barbarians of the district massacred the crew, sparing only Frumentius and Edesius. The two brothers were brought to the king, who appointed the former his treasurer and the other his cupbearer. At the king's death, the queen requested them not to leave the country until her son, the heir to the throne, should reach the age of maturity. They agreed to remain, and Frumentius, through the influence of his position, obtained assurance of the free exercise of the Christian religion for the Greek merchants who visited the country. He even urged them to erect chapels. According to Socrates, he then won some of the natives to Christianity. When the prince grew up, Frumentius, now free to depart, returned to Alexandria and informed Athanasius of the progress which the Christian faith was making in Abyssinia. He also asked that a bishop be sent there. Athanasius considered no one better fitted than Frumentius himself. He therefore consecrated him bishop. Frumentius, upon his return to Abyssinia, according to Rufinus, converted 'a countless number of the barbarians.' [57] A valuable document which St. Athanasius has preserved for us,[58] confirms Rufinus' ac-

[56] Guidi, art. *"Abyssinie,"* in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* I, 210. The same conclusions are set forth by Father Coulbeaux, C. M., a former provicar apostolic in Abyssinia, in his article *"Ethiopie"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 922 ff.

[57] Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History,* bk. 1, chap. 9. This account which Rufinus refers to Edesius himself, is the source used by later historians, such as Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret (*P. G.,* LXVII, 125, 996; LXXXII, 969). "It was probably at the beginning of his episcopate that St. Athanasius ordained Frumentius." Le Bachelet, art. *"Athanase"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2145.

[58] This is a letter written by Emperor Constantius in 355 to the kings of Aksum, Aizanas, and Sozanas, regarding Bishop Frumentius, ordained by St. Athanasius.

count." [59] Despite the efforts of Constantius and the preaching of an Arian missioner, Theophilus of Dibus, the young Christian community was entirely preserved from Arianism. "In the Tigre district, the horror of that heresy has remained proverbial up to this day. The word 'Arianism' or the execrated name of Arius still serves as an imprecation in the presence of some especially revolting proposal." [60]

Georgia

The introduction of Christianity into Iberia (Georgia) between Armenia and the Caucasus, is no less dramatic. According to an ancient tradition, reported by Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret,[61] it was in Constantine's reign that Iberia received the announcement of the Gospel from a woman captive whose name has not come down to us. The Iberians had taken her prisoner in one of their raids. Her wonderful modesty, the austerity of her life, and her assiduity at prayer aroused the admiration of these barbarians. They questioned her. She replied that she was serving Christ, her God. This name was as strange to them as was all the rest. Unable to rise to a loftier conception of religion, the barbarians wondered merely whether this worship of Christ might not be useful to them in some way. Now, it was a custom in that country for a mother with a sick child to carry it from house to house, to see if anyone knew a remedy for the sickness. A woman thus brought her dying child to the captive. The hum-

The letter is to be found in the *Apologia ad Constantium* (*P. G.*, XXV, 636; and *Oxford Library of Fathers,* XIII, 182).

[59] Guidi, *loc. cit.*

[60] Coulbeaux, *loc. cit.*

[61] Rufinus, I, 10; Socrates, I, 20; Sozomen, II, 24; Theodoret, I, 23. Cf. Moses of Chorene, *Histoire d'Armenie.* All these narratives are dependent upon Rufinus, who claims to have his account from Bacurius, an early king of Iberia who entered the service of the Romans and from them received the title of master of the militia, in the time of Theodosius. (Rufinus, I, 10.)

ble Christian woman replied: "I am ignorant of human medicine; but Christ whom I adore can, if He wills to do so, cure the sick and raise up the dead." She then placed the child upon the haircloth that was her bed, prayed to God for him, and gave him back cured to his mother. The report of this miracle straightway spread abroad. The queen of the country, who was grievously ill, was herself carried into the lowly hut of the stranger; she at once recovered her health. Shortly after, the king, while hunting, became lost in a dense fog and found his way again only after invoking Christ. Following these heavenly favors, the king and queen both embraced the Christian faith and sent an embassy to Constantine, asking for Christian teachers. Iberia was evangelized by missioners, and the faith spread from there into the neighboring countries, notably into Albania.

Toward the end of Constantine's reign the Christian communities of Iberia and Albania joined the Church of Armenia. This union was the work of Bishop Verthanes whose brother Aristakes took part in the Council of Nicaea as head of the Armenian Church.[62]

Armenia

"The beginning of Christianity in Armenia is very obscure. According to statements of the national historians, various Apostles went there to preach the Gospel; some of them, as St. Bartholomew and St. Thaddeus, died there. These traditions, however legendary, have historical significance.[63] They prove that the Christian faith passed from Syria into Armenia at an early date. But it is from St. Gregory the Illuminator (Lusarovich) that we must date, if not the birth, at least the

[62] Cuntz, *Patrum nicaenorum nomina.* Cf. Petit, archbishop of Athens, art. *"Armenie"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1894.

[63] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 171.

full flowering of Christianity in Armenia during the second half of the third century." [64]

Gregory was sprung from the royal race of the Arsacides and, in his infancy, was saved when the rest of his family was massacred. He took refuge within the confines of the Roman Empire during the occupation of his country by the Persians and was there instructed in the Christian faith. Upon returning to Armenia about 261, he baptized part of the nation, including the king himself. The high office of catholicos,[65] or archbishop of the country, which was conferred on him, was perpetuated in his family. The catholicos Aristakes, who was present at the Council of Nicaea, and the catholicos Verthanes, who later effected the union of the Churches of Iberia and Albania with the Church of Armenia, were his sons. This was the apogee of the Armenian Church in ancient times. We need not accept the glowing accounts left us by the national historians of that early Christianity.[66] But we should recognize that it was very flourishing in the time of Constantine. About 337, however, an end came to the union between the head of the Church and the head of the State. Iousik, the son and successor of Verthanes, paid with his life for his opposition to King Tiran. Later the Armenian Church had to defend itself against the oppression of Persian idolatry. This was the beginning of the terrible trials in the midst of which Armenia, the bulwark of Christianity, merited the name given it by one historian, the "Poland of the East." [67]

[64] Petit, *ibid.*, I, 1892 f.

[65] The title *"catholicos"* at first was given simply to the chief bishop of a district, metropolitan, archbishop, or exarch; only later on, in the time of the separation, was the meaning of independent patriarch attached to it. It is said that, until Narses the Great, Caesarea continued to exercise her supremacy over the Armenian Church. The religious chiefs of Iberia and Albania bore the title of *catholicos;* but the Armenians never had any idea of considering them as completely autonomous. (Cf. Petit, *loc. cit.*)

[66] Gelzer, *Zur armenischen Gotterlehre.*

[67] Cf. Vortabied, *Soulèvement national de l'Armenie chrétienne du V^e siècle contre la loi de Zoroastre.*

Persia

Sozomen credits the inhabitants of Armenia as also those of Edessa with the foundation of the Christian communities in Persia.[68] We may, however, believe that the entrance of Christianity into Persia dates much earlier. The Acts of the Apostles mentions, among eyewitnesses of the Pentecost miracle, "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and inhabitants of Mesopotamia." [69] "This passage shows, at the very least, that about the year 80 the Churches of the Greco-Roman world knew there were Christians in the distant countries of the East. . . . But we may rightly suppose that, before the coming of the Sassanian dynasty, the Persian Empire did not contain any organized Christian communities." [70] Not until about the year 250 were established Churches to be found on the banks of the Tigris.

The people of the Roman provinces who were deported by Sapor I collaborated in the evangelization of Persia.[71] The ruler of that great empire was fond of calling himself the Caesar of Asia,[72] and aspired to nothing less than driving the Romans out of the whole East. That Empire was the center of a powerfully organized religion. The Magi were its ministers; dualism was its principal dogma. Its moral teaching was clear and practical, adroitly mingling earthly, utilitarian considerations with the thought of a future reward.[73] For all these reasons the Persian religion threatened Christianity with a formidable rivalry.

[68] Sozomen, II, 8.

[69] Acts 2:9.

[70] Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse*, pp. 16 f.

[71] Labourt, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[72] De Sacy, *Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse.* "The Persian and Roman monarchies," said an ambassador of Narses, "are the two eyes of the universe; the world would be imperfect and mutilated if one of these should be removed."

[73] Carnoy, in *Christus*, p. 213.

The Persian kings, although firmly attached to the national religion, did not at first seem impelled to persecute the followers of other religions.[74] But for Eastern Christians, so ready to let their faith be corrupted by the most curious fancies, the contagion of the Persian doctrines might be more dangerous than an open persecution. Constantine, who always considered himself charged by God with the maintenance of the purity of the Christian faith, as well as with the duty of vigilance over the security of the Empire, could not close his eyes to this danger. Eusebius has recorded a letter which Constantine wrote to King Sapor. In this letter, after felicitating and thanking the ruler of the Persians for the liberty granted to the Christians, he asks him to let the worship of Christ be spread more and more. Referring to the Christians, he says to King Sapor:

"Cherish them with your wonted humanity and kindness; for by this proof of faith you will secure an immeasurable benefit both to yourself and us. . . . I cannot, my brother, believe that I err in acknowledging this one God, the author and parent of all things; whom many of my predecessors in power, led astray by the madness of error, have ventured to deny, but who were all visited with a retribution so terrible and so destructive, that all succeeding generations have held up their calamities as the most effectual warning to any who desire to follow in their steps." [75]

The Goths

This office of protector of Christians, even beyond the frontier of his Empire, which Constantine exercised with such hardihood toward the King of the Persians, he exercised also in the case of the Goths and the Sarmatians.

Like the Iberians, and in almost the very same manner,

[74] Labourt, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[75] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* IV, 11, 13. Cf. Sozomen, II, 15; Theodoret, I, 24.

"the Goths themselves were reached by the spreading of the gospel as soon as they began to live in the neighborhood of the Black Sea. We might almost say that the beginning of their Christianity dated from the terrible invasions by which they harassed the Empire toward the middle of the third century. From their expeditions into Asia Minor they brought back with them, amongst other captives, several Christians who taught them with success the doctrine of Christ.[76] Clergy were to be found amongst the captives; and these organized the first groups of converts. The Churches of Bosphorus and Cherson, as well as those on the Lower Danube, could not fail to serve as bases for propaganda. At the Council of Nicaea there was a bishop of 'Gothia,' called Theophilus." [77]

Constantine profited by his victory over the Goths and by the treaty of alliance which he concluded with them to spread Christianity in their midst.[78] To the Sarmatians, driven from their country by the Slavonians, Constantine offered lands in his province and distributed them in Italy, Scythia, and Macedonia to the number of 300,000.

Constantine and the Barbarians

The stern and uncompromising attitude of ancient times toward the barbarians had disappeared. Pagan writers, like Zosimus, found fault with Constantine for this new attitude, which they attributed to a disposition of cowardice. This same reproach they extended to all Christians in general and blamed them for the final ruin of the Empire. "But time proved that the men of Germany could receive the influence of the Roman laws. If Rome, even after its fall, was able to impose its customs upon the descendants of the Franks and of the Heruli,

[76] Philostorgius (II, 5) and Sozomen (II, 6) agree on this point. It may be that one of these captives was the Cappadocian Eutyches referred to in a letter of St. Basil (Letter 165).

[77] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 450.

[78] Socrates, I, 18.

why could not the Empire, still firm, in the fulness of its prestige and power, succeed with them? The evil came from a more distant source than Constantine's peaceful policy toward the barbarous races; its source was at a depth where it is scarcely given to human laws to reach. It was from its internal wounds and from the decomposition of all its vital powers that the Empire would perish." [79] It was precisely Constantine's policy—the wide spread of Christianity—that might have enabled the enfeebled Roman nation to recover its strength in the inspirations of a new faith before it was too late. But, with Constantine dead, unfortunately his successors would expect, from the dissolvent doctrines of a vanishing heresy and from a fallen paganism, that regenerative force which could be found only in Roman Catholicism.

Christian Literature

The Christian spirit, although trammelled by politics, could express itself in words. "The word of God is not bound," said St. Paul.[80] "The fourth century was the golden age of Christian literature. It was then it produced those sublime and brilliant geniuses whose only rivals are to be found among the sacred orators of the seventeenth century. But these latter were sustained by all the geniuses that encompassed them; in their language they reflected that brilliant magnificence which they considered blameworthy at the king's court. In the fourth century, the loftiness of Christian eloquence seems to grow and thrive in proportion to the decay of all the rest. It was in the midst of the debasement of minds and of courage that an Athanasius and a Chrysostom uttered the purest morality and loftiest eloquence. Their genius alone stands firm amidst

[79] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle*, II, 227 f.
[80] See II Tim. 2:9.

the Empire's decadence. They appear to be founders, in the midst of ruins." [81]

We have already become acquainted with Athanasius as a theologian and controversialist. We regret that his contemporaries did not preserve a few of those speeches which he delivered at Nicaea, some of those heartfelt discourses in which he defended his Catholic flock against the pitfalls of heresy, or when, driven from his see, he bade farewell to his beloved Church. "Therein we would seek to find by what means the primate of Egypt influenced those mixed races, that multiform population which filled Alexandria." [82] In the course of this history we shall have occasion to meet the vibrant and clear eloquence of the Alexandrian patriarch.

About St. Antony, the Father of the desert, the world knows hardly anything more than his austere life and his struggles with the demons. St. Athanasius has preserved some of his discourses. They possess a sober and pleasing eloquence and help us to understand the influence which that hermit had upon those who visited him.[83] To his devout visitors he said:

"You, as children, carry that which you know to your father; and I as the elder share my knowledge and what experience has taught me with you. The whole life of man is very short, measured by the ages to come, wherefore all our time is nothing compared with eternal life. Though we fought on earth, we shall not receive our inheritance on earth, but we have the promises in heaven. As if a man should despise a copper drachma to gain a hundred drachmas of gold; so if a man were lord of all the earth and were to renounce it, that which he gives up is little, and he receives a hundredfold. Let the desire of possession take hold of no one, for what gain is it to acquire these things which we cannot take with us? Why not rather

[81] Villemain, *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (1856 ed.), pp. 79 f.

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[83] St. Athanasius, *Life of Antony*, nos. 15–17 (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., IV, 200 f.).

get those things which we can take away with us—to wit, prudence, justice, temperance, courage, understanding, love, kindness to the poor, faith in Christ?"

Christian Poets

Athanasius spoke Greek, Antony spoke Coptic. But it was in Latin that a whole galaxy of poets expressed themselves. In Rome, Italy, Gaul, and Spain they hail the dawn of a new era. The date of the Edict of Milan marks the birth of Christian poetry in the West. Cyprian of Gaul, perhaps the first of all, in still untried verse, sang the divine epos of the Old Testament.[84] An anonymous writer, perhaps a compatriot of Cyprian,[85] shortly afterwards composed two Biblical poems, written in a freer style, purer diction, and more interesting manner: the first on the destruction of Sodom, the other on the saving of Nineveh.[86] A more literary Roman lady, Proba, goes farther and relates not only the history of Israel, but the life of the Savior from His birth to His ascension, in the language of Virgil, taking from the great poet now short expressions, now whole verses.[87]

The most original of these poets was a Spanish priest, Juvencus. In 330 appeared his *Historia evangelica,* a harmony of the four Gospels in which he strives to follow the sacred writers closely without losing the ease and spontaneity of his own language. The poem bears witness to a remarkable culture. Says the poet: "I have wished to adorn the majesty of the divine law with the ornamentations of earthly poetry. It is Christ who has given me this leisure by granting peace to our age." [88] In the prologue, the poet gives free rein to his

[84] Pitra, *Spicilegium,* I, 171–258.

[85] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 401.

[86] These poems are usually to be found in the apocryphal works of Tertullian and St. Cyprian. (*S. Cypriani opera,* Hartel ed., Part III, pp. 289–301.)

[87] Proba, *Centones Virgiliani, P. L.,* XIX, 803–818.

[88] Juvencus, *Evangelica historia,* bk. 4, verses 805 ff., *P. L.,* XIX, 57.

imagination. It is worthy of being quoted, and reads as follows:

"Nothing immortal exists in the world,
Neither earth nor the kingdoms of men;
Rome, even Rome, all encrusted with gold,
Will itself some day come to an end.

Deeds of the Christ, deathless deeds, do I sing,
And proclaim to the world the pure gift,
Free from the slightest imposture it is,
Which our God has made unto all men.

Even if vast conflagration should come
And the world should be threatened with doom,
Still would I be full of hope high and strong,
And would be without fear for my songs.

Christ the bright Sun of the Father supreme,
All in glory above flaming clouds,
Christ my great Judge, would then come, as I hope,
And would rescue me safe from the flames.

Spirit of God breathe life into my words;
Jordan's water give fruit to my song.
Naught can I say that is worthy of Christ,
Unless Thou grant me aid from on high." [89]

[89] Immortale nihil mundi compage tenetur,
Non orbis, non regna hominum, non aurea Roma.
Sed mihi carmen erunt Christi vitalia gesta,
Divinum in populis falsi sine crimine donum.
Nec metus ut mundi rapiant incendia secum
Hoc opus; hoc enim forsan me subtrahet igni,
Tunc cum flammivoma descendet nube coruscans
Judex, Alithroni Genitoris gloria Christus.
Ergo age, sanctificus adsit mihi carminis auctor
Spiritus, et puro mentem riget amne canentis
Dulcis Jordanis, ut Christo digna loquamur.
Evangelica historia, prooemium, *P. L.,* XIX, 57.

Liturgical Feasts

There was another kind of poetry, the series of liturgical feasts that henceforth are observed in magnificent churches which rose up on all sides. Eusebius depicts the enthusiasm that filled men's minds and hearts when so many religious buildings were consecrated. He says:

"There was an incessant joy, and there sprung up for all a certain celestial gladness, seeing every place, which but a short time before had been desolated by the impieties of the tyrants, reviving again, and recovering as from a long and deadly distemper, temples again rising from the soil to a lofty height, and receiving a splendor far exceeding those that had been formerly destroyed. . . . After this the convention of bishops, the concourse of foreigners from abroad, the benevolence of people to people, the unity of the members of Christ concurring in one harmonious body." [90]

"The idea of associating a particular solemnity with the taking possession of one of these sacred buildings was too natural to be overlooked, and we find, consequently, an expression of it at an early date. Immediately after the persecution of Diocletian we have notices of the dedication of churches, performed with a certain degree of pomp. Eusebius describes that of Tyre, which was celebrated in the year 314. A special rite did not yet exist. The neighboring bishops were called together, and an immense concourse of people assembled, giving solemnity to the first celebration of the holy mysteries. Addresses bearing on the subject were delivered. . . . Formularies for the dedication of churches are not found in either the Leonian Sacramentary or that of Adrian." [91]

The traditional customs do not become established as an official rite until the sixth century.

[90] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* tr. by Cruse, X, 2, 3.
[91] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 400, 403.

The Holy Land

In the erection of the new Christian temples, East and West entered upon a rivalry of zeal. But there was one sacred spot above all other places to which the thought of the faithful turned: this was the land of Palestine, where the Word became flesh and died on a cross. At the beginning of the fourth century the Holy Places seemed doomed to disappear. The rocky mound of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulcher were almost contiguous. The little depression between them had been filled in. Upon the extensive esplanade that encompassed their sides a temple had been built in honor of Venus. At Bethlehem, the grotto of the Nativity experienced a similar profanation. The abominations of the worship of Adonis were there established. Such was the state of affairs in 325. It would seem that the Council of Nicaea took the initiative in the steps undertaken for the restoration of the Holy Places. We are told that, at the closing of the famous Council, Constantine "thought it was his duty to glorify, before the eyes of the world, the blessed Sepulcher of the Savior." The Emperor's instructions were promptly sent to Jerusalem.[92] He ordered very careful excavations to be made on the presumed site of Christ's tomb. The work began in 326.

St. Helena

Soon it was rumored that the Empress was making a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Leaving Rome toward the end of 326, Helena passed through the Eastern provinces of the Empire amid popular ovations. Upon reaching Palestine, she venerated the places made sacred by our Savior's presence. She then purposed consecrating these spots by monuments. Euse-

[92] Rouillon, *Sainte Hélène,* p. 75.

bius of Caesarea makes particular mention of two basilicas which she had built. He speaks of them as "two noble and beautiful monuments of devotion, worthy of everlasting remembrance." One was at Bethlehem, over the grotto of the Nativity; the other, in honor of the Ascension, was near the top of the Mount of Olives, over the grotto where our Lord instructed His Apostles.

Finding of the True Cross

An early tradition, not recorded by Eusebius, but referred to by Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, St. Ambrose, and St. John Chrysostom, relates that Helena cleared the supposed site of Calvary and that soon the rock of Calvary, the Holy Sepulcher, was discovered, and in a cistern were found three crosses. Presumably these were the Savior's cross and the crosses of the two thieves. The sudden cure of a grievously sick woman in high station by the mere touch of one of the crosses miraculously identified the cross on which Christ died.[93]

The finding of the Savior's cross at Jerusalem in 327 is a fact attested by so great a number of agreeing evidences that we cannot seriously think of doubting it. Before the fourth century the Christian world had no hope of ever finding the sacred wood which Christ stained with His blood. Says a writer of that period: "O blessed cross, earth will not possess you; a day will come when your glance will embrace the immensity of the heavens." [94] But from the middle of the fourth century, that is, twenty years after St. Helena's journey to Palestine, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, preaching at the very site of the discovery, speaks of the worldwide diffusion of the relics of the true cross.[95] An inscription of 369, found in the

[93] Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History,* I, 7.
[94] *Sibylline Oracles,* VI, 26, 27, 28.
[95] St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures,* IV, 10; X, 19; XIII, 4.

neighborhood of Setif in Mauretania, contains an enumeration of relics, including a fragment of the wood of the cross.[96] From that time on the testimonies became increasingly numerous.[97]

The only complication is with regard to the circumstances that accompanied the discovery of the Savior's cross. The first difficulty arises from the variations we meet in the accounts by St. Ambrose and St. Chrysostom, and the later account of Rufinus, which is copied by Socrates and Sozomen. The former narrative says that St. Helena recognized "the cross of salvation" by its very position, between the two other crosses, and especially by the inscription "Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews," which was still on it.[98] Rufinus supposes that no outward mark identified the cross of Christ and that it was designated only by the miracle.

Some have even denied that the true cross was discovered by St. Helena, because Eusebius of Caesarea, a contemporary living close to the events he reports, says nothing about the discovery of the holy cross in his detailed account of the Empress' journey to Palestine. This historian, however, quotes a letter from Constantine to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, in which there is mention of "the monument of the Savior's most holy Passion, so long buried beneath the ground," and again: "a spot which has been accounted holy from the beginning in God's judgment, but which now appears holier still, since it has brought to light a clear assurance of our Savior's Passion." [99] That the event occurred before St. Helena's arrival in Palestine is the view of some Catholic historians.[100]

[96] *Mélanges de l'École de Rome,* X, 441.

[97] Most of these evidences are cited and critically discussed in Rouillon, *Sainte Hélène,* pp. 141–148.

[98] St. Ambrose, *De obitu Theodosii,* chap. 45 *P. L.,* XVI, 1401. St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on St. John,* 85; *P. G.,* LIX, 461.

[99] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 30.

[100] Rouillon, *op. cit.,* appendix 1. Cf. L. de Combes, *La Vraie Croix perdue et retrouvée.*

But this view nowise militates against the substance and historical genuineness of the event itself.

"At the news that Jerusalem was arising from its ruins, crowned with the true cross of Christ, a cry of joy broke from all Christian hearts. By a final miracle God had just consecrated the already wonderful triumph of His Church. What a sight, that instrument of divine suffering, issuing suddenly from the earth and becoming a sign of domination and victory! People might have thought they were witnessing the day of the final resurrection and seeing the Son of man, borne on the clouds and about to reward His servants." [101] But the cross is more than a sign of triumph; it is also the memorial of trial and immolation. Any Christian who may have forgotten this would soon be convinced of its truth during the days following Constantine's death.

[101] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, II, 125.

CHAPTER IV

From Constantine's Death to the Council of Sardica (337–343)

POPE St. Sylvester died before Constantine. The *Liber pontificalis* mentions the pope's death in unusual terms that bear witness to a great veneration for the holy pontiff:[1] *"catholicus et confessor quievit."*[2] In the next century the memory of St. Sylvester was consecrated at Rome by a religious edifice, and his name was associated with that of St. Martin, the great confessor of the West.[3]

Pope St. Mark

His successor, St. Mark, occupied the see of Rome only eight months. He died on October 7, 336, after having consecrated two new basilicas, one on the Via Ardeatina,[4] where his remains are laid, and the other within the city of Rome.[5] He encouraged and comforted the patriarch Athanasius and the episcopate of Egypt.[6] He watched over the execution of the Nicene decisions.[7] These are the only authentic facts that we know concerning his pontificate.[8]

[1] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 200, note 125.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 187.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 201, note 125.

[4] The cemetery of Balbina was discovered by De Rossi in 1867 near the cemetery of Callistus. See De Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana,* 1867, pp. 1 ff.

[5] This church is still standing. Its mosaics and paintings were referred to by Pope Hadrian I in 794, as documents testifying to the use of images in the time of the Council of Nicaea (Hardouin, IV, 812; Mansi, XIII, 801). Pope Gregory IV restored the church in the ninth century. De Rossi thinks that parts of the mosaic may go back to a date earlier than the restoration.

[6] Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* (ed. 1885–88), I, 30.

[7] Mansi, II, 1165; *P. L.,* VIII, 854.

[8] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 202–204.

Pope St. Julius I

Julius I replaced St. Mark in the see of Peter, February 8, 337. For more than fifteen years he would be the stalwart defender of St. Athanasius and the Nicene faith. He was a native of Rome. The *Liber pontificalis* notes that, in accordance with his predecessors' plans to Christianize the Eternal City in its monuments and to provide for the religious needs of the faithful, he built two basilicas and constructed three cemeteries.[9] But this work did not divert him from the general interests of the Church. In the quarrels stirred up by the party of Eusebius, in the conflicts that would divide the emperors, and in the schism that would take shape between East and West, we shall find this holy pontiff firmly guiding the universal Church confided to his care.

The Empire at Constantine's Death

The gloomy foreboding that darkened the last hours of Constantine's life was soon realized. It is not our task to relate the horrible tragedies that bloodied the imperial palace and the political disturbances accompanying those events: the assassination of the patrician Optatus, Constantine's brother-in-law; then the killing of the Emperor's brother, Julius Constantius; then of the two Caesars, Dalmatius and Hannibalianus; and of five other members of the imperial family; the complaints of the Romans, who were deprived of the great Emperor's remains and were jealous of Constantinople; the break-up of the coherent forces of the Empire; the new and necessary partition between the sons of Constantine, keeping the East

[9] *Idem,* I, 205. There were two kinds of churches: some were erected chiefly in honor of a saint; these were built over his tomb or over a fictitious tomb containing one of his relics; the others were chiefly places where the liturgical functions were carried out. Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 388. There remain only a few uncertain ruins of the basilica built by St. Julius. *Liber pontificalis,* I, 206.

under the rule of Constantius, and dividing the West between Constantine II and Constans.

At the same time the divisions within the Church became accentuated. None of Constantine the Great's three sons inherited his loftiness of view or greatness of soul. Constantine II and Constans did require adherence to the Nicene faith. This they did sincerely, but without courage. Constantius was the most powerful of the three, but the most narrowly despotic, the most jealous, and fundamentally the feeblest, the most subject to subaltern influences. By his own inclination, by the influence of his wife who was ruled by the Arian priest Eutocius, and by that of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who dominated the court, he became the center of the faction which sought to ruin the work of the great Council.

It is true that the semi-Arian party was divided: the right wing, which always recognized the Bishop of Nicomedia as its leader, declared that it fully accepted the Nicene symbol, except the word *homoousios* (consubstantial), which it replaced by the term *homoiousios* (similar); the left wing, composed of bolder and more logical men, rejected both the Catholics' *homoousios* and the Eusebians' *homoiousios;* its members thereby merited the name of Anomians, from the word *anomoios* (not even similar). Between the two factions, however, a union is formed through their common hatred of the Catholics. When Constantius becomes master of the Empire, the party of antinicene opposition will triumph and, by thirty years of scandalous broils in the Church, will prepare the way for the revival of paganism under Julian the Apostate.

We must acknowledge that this last result was neither intended nor foreseen by Constantine's sons. On the contrary, we shall see them carry out and extend the measures undertaken by their father against the pagan religion. Furthermore, less than a month after Constantine's death, they permitted all the exiled bishops, including Athanasius, to resume their

former offices in their respective dioceses.[10] But Constantius' growing preponderance in the government of the Empire, his mania for interfering in ecclesiastical matters, and the increasing influence of the Eusebian party at court, altered the direction of these measures.

The Antinicene Movement

The plan of the Eusebians had three objectives: 1. to quibble over words and profit by the elasticity which several theological terms still had, so as to evade the Nicene faith while appearing to accept it; 2. to seize quickly as many episcopal sees as possible, even if they had to do so by force; 3. to win the West and, if possible, the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, to their cause.

At first glance, nothing could be stranger than this energetic and persevering reaction of an entire section of the Eastern episcopate against the conciliar decisions which had been signed by more than three hundred Fathers, most of them Easterners. "Must we, in agreement with certain Protestants, say that the victory had been too rapid, that it was a surprise rather than a solid conquest? No." [11] Must we hold that this opposition to the Council was due solely to the perfidy or hypocrisy of the Eusebians? Again, no. The duplicity of the principal leader of the party and of several of his accomplices is undeniable. But many of those who were rebellious to the orthodox interpretation were prompted by other considerations. "If we take the Nicene condemnation on the Scriptural and traditional ground, where the Fathers took their stand, the victory of orthodoxy was a solid one. In its symbols the oppo-

[10] This is the conclusion to be drawn from several recent studies, cited by Le Bachelet in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1807. A letter of Constantine II supposes that Athanasius' return was decided upon by the late emperor. This return took place November 23, 337. (Duchesne, II, 156.)

[11] Le Bachelet, *loc. cit.*

sition never resumed the position of primitive Arianism: the affirmation that the Word is a creature derived from nothingness and having an altogether different essence from that of the Father.

"But the Arian controversy raised complex questions, philosophical and theological, which were not settled, at least not explicitly, by the Nicene definition." [12] For example, in the language of the early Greek Fathers the word *ousia,* which we now translate by "substance," and the word *hypostasis,* which we render by the word "person," were often confused. Mistakenly but with some plausibility, the learned Father Petau [13] has maintained that St. Epiphanius, St. Athanasius, and even the Council of Nicaea fell into the same confusion.[14] Eusebius and his friends insisted upon using, in preference to *ousia,* the word *hypostasis* which, because it was not clearly defined or because the idea of threefold was habitually attached to it, lent itself better to equivocation. "Three hypostases," they said; "therefore three beings. But there is only one single being who is God; hence neither the Son nor the Holy Ghost has a right to adoration." This was a deduction framed to mislead the uncritical.[15] The Arian ruse could not deceive the Westerners, for whom such a confusion of words was impossible. They expressed the principle of unity by the word *substantia* and kept, for the principle of threefoldness, the word *persona.*[16] But the snare succeeded with the Greeks.

[12] *Ibidem.*

[13] On this point Petau is refuted by Garnier, Preface to the Letters of St. Basil, *P. G.,* XXXII, 16, and Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* I, 146 f.

[14] The Council anathematizes those who hold that "the Word proceeds from another hypostasis or ousia." Petau considers the conjunction "or" in this passage as having a synonomous force, whereas St. Basil regards it as signifying an alternative. Letter 125, no. 1.

[15] Régnon, *op. cit.,* I, 152.

[16] This word is open to still another equivocation. Since the word *persona* has the primitive meaning of "mask," "face," "aspect," and since the Greeks translated it by *πρόσωπον,* some persons considered the three divine Persons as merely three

As a clever strategist, Eusebius did not place the Trinitarian question on the mere ground of pure dialectics. He knew instinctively that a doctrine has no serious chance of enduring unless it is supported by an organized institution. In 338 the Arians [17] began to form themselves into separate communities. The election of the Arian Pistus to the see of Alexandria, that of Eusebius of Nicomedia to the see of Constantinople, that of the Arian Gregory to replace Pistus, and that of the Arian Acacius to Caesarea, replacing Eusebius of Caesarea, were the chief events of this new campaign in the course of 338, 339, and 340.

Pistus, Bishop of Alexandria

Pistus, a priest of Mareotis, was one of Arius' first disciples. He was deposed and condemned by St. Alexander at the same time as the heresiarch. In the eyes of the Arians he possessed the halo which he derived from the master's friendship and the halo which he received from a so-called persecution. This appears to be the only prestige he had. But it was enough to single him out as the choice of the Arians of Alexandria for the most illustrious see of Asia, as successor to St. Athanasius. It is impossible for us to be sure whether he was elected before or after Athanasius' return.[18] We know simply that for more than a year Athanasius was in his metropolis face to face with his rival.[19]

The Arians left nothing undone to consolidate their candi-

aspects of the Divinity and thus fell into the Sabellian heresy. As a consequence of long and painful controversies over this subject, the meaning of all these terms became more precise, and thereby the sense of the orthodox doctrine.

[17] Following the practice of most historians, in the pages that follow we will frequently use the term "Arians" when speaking of semi-Arians. But we should bear in mind that, after the Council of Nicaea, pure Arianism no longer had any avowed followers about Eusebius of Nicomedia.

[18] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 157.

[19] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos.*

date's election. They wrote to various bishops for the purpose of getting them to agree that they would place themselves in communion with Pistus. To prevent any interference by the Emperor, several influences were set in motion: that of the eunuch Eusebius, palace chamberlain, that of various ladies in high station, and that of the Empress herself.[20] Overtures were made even to Pope Julius I, to whom a priest and two deacons were sent, commissioned to place before his eyes the Acts of the Council of Tyre, deposing Athanasius and consequently leaving the place open for Pistus. These precautionary steps were well calculated. But Athanasius was not easily caught unaware. He wrote immediately to all the bishops of Egypt, explaining the real import of the Synod of Tyre. By the hands of reliable priests, he transmitted this same document to Pope Julius.

Eusebius, Bishop of Constantinople

Upon receiving the various delegations, the Pontiff was able to learn that another usurpation was accomplished, under still more odious circumstances, at Constantinople, to the advantage of the Bishop of Nicomedia.

This scheming prelate, who had abandoned his canonical residence, for some time past was living at the court, where he was conducting the education of the two children of the imperial family: one was Gallus; the other was Julian the future Apostate. Even such an honor did not gratify his ambition. He aspired to nothing less than the see of the new capital. True, the see was then occupied. At Alexander's death in August 337, there were two opposing candidates for the succession: an Arian named Macedonius, and a Catholic, Paul. The latter was chosen. But the Arians merely waited for a suitable opportunity to recover the lost place. Some pretext

[20] Sozomen, III, 1.

or other was found. A charge against the Bishop was the cause for the meeting of a synod, made up of friends of Eusebius. It deposed Paul and obtained from Constantius an order for his deportation to Mesopotamia.[21] Eusebius was at once put in his place. This was the second time he changed his episcopal see for the capital of the Empire. These events occurred at the close of 338 or the beginning of 339.

Acacius, Bishop of Caesarea

On May 30, 339, according to some historians,[22] at the latest about the beginning of 340, the other Eusebius died, the illustrious bishop of Caesarea. He had just written two works against Marcellus of Ancyra, in which the desire to confound a friend of Athanasius was more evident than a care to defend orthodox doctrine.[23] His friends were in haste to have one of his disciples, Acacius the One-eyed, made his successor. This man was a priest of remarkable talent and learning. He had written seventeen volumes on the Book of Ecclesiastes, some Various Questions, and other essays, of which only a few fragments remain. But he had a scheming and versatile mind. Later on he would play an important part in Arianism and would become the leader of a sect taking its name from him, the Acacian party.

Gregory, Bishop of Alexandria

Affairs in Alexandria grew worse. The position of Pistus, who was too much compromised by his complicity with Arius and handicapped by grave defects of character, was no longer tenable. Eusebius suggested to the Emperor the idea of re-

[21] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* no. 7.

[22] Lightfoot, art. "Eusebius of Caesarea" in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography,* II, 318.

[23] Moehler, *Athanase le Grand,* French tr., II, 210 f.

moving him from office. With no concern for the regulations of canon law, which provided that a bishop be elected by his people and his clergy and that he be installed by the bishops of his metropolitan jurisdiction, Constantius offered the bishopric to a certain Eusebius, a native of Edessa. Upon the latter's refusal, he offered it to a certain Gregory, a native of Cappadocia, who accepted. Gregory was immediately consecrated at Constantinople and sent to Egypt under the protection of Philagrius, the prefect of the province. About the middle of March 339, the latter presented him to the people of Alexandria as the new bishop. But such cynical disregard of legal procedure stirred the animosity of the Christian population of Alexandria, where Athanasius continued to have devoted followers. The crowds went to the churches to defend them against the intruder. Escorted by a police force, he was obliged to take the churches by assault, one after another. Blood flowed. At some of the churches, some people were left wounded or dead.[24] Athanasius yielded to force.

This time, however, it was not merely to his brother-bishops of Egypt, but to the bishops of the whole world that he addressed his indignant protests. With holy daring he disclosed the person responsible for all these misdeeds, Eusebius of Nicomedia. He wrote:

"This then is the plot of the Eusebians, which they have long been devising and bringing to bear; and now have succeeded in accomplishing through the false charges which they have made against me before the Emperor. Notwithstanding, they are not content to be quiet, but even now seek to kill me; and they make themselves so formidable to my friends, that they are all driven into banishment, and expect death at their hands. But you must not for this stand in awe of their iniquity, but on the contrary avenge; and show your indignation at this their unprecedented conduct against me." [25]

[24] St. Athanasius, *Festal Letters,* Index.
[25] St. Athanasius, *Encyclical Letter* (*Oxford Library of Fathers,* XIII, 10).

After launching this manifesto, Athanasius, with great difficulty, evaded the surveillance placed over him, left Egypt, and set out for Rome, where he arrived soon after Easter.

To put an end to the petitions that were coming to him from the Eusebians, Pope Julius had sent two Roman legates to the East—Elpidius and Philoxenus. They were instructed to invite the petitioning bishops to come to Rome and there submit their claims before a council. The reply of the Eastern bishops, prompted if not actually drawn up by Eusebius, was haughty. They declined the invitation, protesting against the idea of having Eastern councils reviewed in the West and almost calling upon the Pope to choose between people like Athanasius or Marcellus of Ancyra and the communion of the Churches of the East. The Pope, deeply offended, went ahead and assembled the council. It was held at Rome in the summer or autumn of 340.

"Every bishop throughout the East who had been deposed and hounded out of his see, hastened to Rome at the first mention of the council. From Thrace, from Asia Minor, from Syria, from Phenicia, and from Palestine, the exiled bishops and priests alike poured into Rome. Marcellus of Ancyra made a long stay there. He also had been denounced to the Pope, who had invited his accusers, as he had invited those of Athanasius, to appear before him. In their absence, Marcellus explained his belief, and his language seemed satisfactory; Vitus and Vincent, the Roman delegates to the Nicene Council, testified to the zeal he had then displayed against the Arians. In short, he was restored to communion and to his episcopal dignity.

"These decisions were notified to the Eastern episcopate by a letter which Pope Julius addressed to those who had signed the one brought by the legates from Antioch.[26] The Pope's letter is one of the most remarkable documents in the whole affair. Although deeply wounded by the bitterness of the Orientals, and the insolent tone

[26] This letter is quoted by St. Athanasius in his *Apologia contra Arianos*, 20–25 (*P. G.*, XXV, 281 f.).

they had adopted towards him, he maintained an attitude in keeping with his position, and remained calm, pacific, and impartial. If he had summoned the Easterners, it was at the request of their own envoys; he would have done it, in any case, on his own motion, for it was natural to take cognizance of the complaints of bishops who said they had been unjustly deposed.

"A revision of the decisions of councils was not an unheard-of thing. When the Eastern Churches received Arius and his followers, did they not act in this way towards the Council of Nicaea? They contested his right, by alleging that the authority of bishops is not measured by the importance of their cities. A strange argument in the mouth of persons who are forever transferring themselves from one capital to another. . . . Yet his desire throughout has been to make a close and thorough examination of the whole question. He has decided the case upon the information at his command, and in particular upon the documents of the Council of Tyre, furnished by the Easterners themselves.

"If they think that they can prove that he is mistaken, let them appear; the accused are always ready with an answer. If they had been willing to conform to ancient usage and, since the matter concerned bishops of importance—the see of Alexandria—to address themselves at the outset to the Roman Church, with a request that she would decide what was right, things would not have come to this pass. They must get out of these scandalous quarrels, in which the bitter grudges of self-love give themselves rein at the expense of charity and of brotherly union." [27]

In short, the Eusebians' plan failed on one essential point of its program. By their theological subtleties they had been able to upset many minds, and by their trickery to lay hands on the government of many important Churches in the East. But when they attempted to gain the West by winning the Pope to their cause or at least by obtaining his sanction to pass final judgment upon their cause by themselves, the Pope, instead of yielding to their wishes, took a clear stand as their

[27] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 163.

judge and peremptorily required that they come to the See of Peter. The heresy had dashed itself upon the firm rock on which God built His Church.

At the time of these negotiations, in which the Eastern episcopate so haughtily claimed its autonomy in the face of Rome, an important political event more conspicuously marked the break that was taking place between the two parts of the Empire. In the midst of a fratricidal war that arose between Constantine II and Constans, the former perished in battle and left to his brother the inheritance of the whole West. Henceforth Rome and Constantinople faced each other as rivals, each having its own emperor.

Council of Antioch (341)

The Eusebians took courage. In the course of the year 341, the city of Antioch witnessed the consecration of a great church, called the Golden Church, which was begun by Constantine and finished by Constantius. Ninety-seven bishops were present at the ceremony. Under such circumstances it was customary for them to assemble in council to treat of the current interests of the Church. The majority of these bishops were not heterodox, but all were Easterners, including a minority of very clever and active semi-Arians. In this number were Eusebius of Nicomedia, now bishop of Constantinople, and Acacius, bishop of Caesarea. This was the Council of Antioch, commonly called the Synod in Encoeniis (*i. e.*, the Synod of Dedication). The complex character of this assembly has exercised the sagacity of critics.[28]

It published twenty-five disciplinary canons, which, in

[28] Some historians think we have here two distinct councils: one, orthodox, which enacted the twenty-five disciplinary canons; the other, Arian, which deposed Athanasius. This opinion is held by the learned Jesuit, Schelstraten; it is opposed by Tillemont. On the discussion of this question, see Hefele, II, 60 ff.

general, deserve admiration. Two of them, however, betray the influence of the Eusebians and their hostility to Athanasius. The fourth canon excluded from any hope of restoration a bishop who had dared continue his functions in spite of his deposition by a synod. The twelfth provided the same penalty for a bishop who, being condemned by a synod, would carry his case to the emperor. The Eusebians in the Council at once gave these canons a retroactive interpretation and declared the deposition of Athanasius. They hoped thus to cut short any attempt by Pope Julius to restore the Patriarch of Alexandria to his office.

Their influence appeared likewise in the wording of the three formulas or professions of faith, soon followed by a fourth, which was voted by a new gathering of Eastern bishops. These formulas have this in common, that, although abandoning pure Arianism, they omit the word *homoousios* (consubstantial). In them was also noticed a tendency to make the doctrines of Marcellus of Ancyra, which were suspected of Sabellianism, dependent upon the Nicene doctrines. Lastly, they began the era of dogmatic Creeds and, according to Socrates' expression, they formed the entrance of that labyrinth of Creeds in the turnings of which the belief of the Eastern Church would afterwards go astray.[29]

Soon, about the end of 341 or the beginning of 342, Eusebius of Nicomedia (now become Eusebius of Constantinople) died. Intelligent and capable, but ambitious and vindictive, he successfully insinuated and sustained doctrinal errors without ever being formally excommunicated. He remained the favorite of the Emperor and the friend of the heretics without breaking with the Roman pontiff. He died at the height of human honors, once more seeing his foe Athanasius in exile, but leaving to posterity only

[29] The four Creeds of Antioch are recorded by St. Athanasius, *De Synodis*, nos. 22–25. Hefele (II, 76–81) also quotes them and comments on them.

"the memory of an intriguing prelate, in whom one can find no single sympathetic feature, a memory that remains weighted with a heavy responsibility." [30]

Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople

Freed from the tyranny of Eusebius, the Catholic population of Constantinople was eager to recall their lawful bishop, Paul, from his unjust exile. He was reinstalled in his see. But the Arian faction, under the leadership of Theodore of Heraclea and Theognis of Nicaea, set up in opposition to him that Macedonius who had formerly been his rival and would one day be added to the list of the heresiarchs. Disturbances broke out. Blood was shed. A military officer, Hermogenes by name, sent by the Emperor to establish order, was slain. Constantius, who was absent from his capital at the time, returned in all haste, determined to ravage it all with fire and blood. The weeping people and suppliant magistrates went forth to meet him. He yielded to their entreaties and was satisfied merely to banish Paul. Although not confirming the election of Macedonius, he allowed him to celebrate the holy mysteries in the church where he had been consecrated. A little while later the intruding bishop, escorted by a group of his followers and by hired ruffians who were ready for any undertaking, returned to Constantinople and, after fresh scenes of savagery, took possession of all the churches of the city.

As for Paul, he was exiled to the depths of Mesopotamia, then to the mountains of Cappadocia. At first they tried to make him die of hunger. As he held out too long against this martyrdom, the prefect of the praetorian guard, Philip, fearing lest the Bishop might return to the midst of his people, had him strangled. The Church has placed him in the number of her saints.[31]

[30] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 169.

[31] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* no. 7; *Apology on his Flight,* 3; St.

Photinus

The violent methods of the Arian party had not altered. Eusebius of Nicomedia's spirit of intrigue also survived him in his see. In 342, when the lamentable events just described were taking place, word spread that the Bishop of Sirmium (or Sirmich) in Pannonia, Photinus by name, was uttering strange doctrines about the Trinity and about Christ. Photinus, in his concern to safeguard the idea of God's oneness, would not admit that in God there are three Persons properly so called. He thought to satisfy Catholic tradition by considering therein a Word that, at the first moment of its development, was merely the impersonal Reason of God, but which, by a second extension, became the Son of God. The Son of God penetrates, with His divine influence, the humanity of Jesus and thus raises it above all the prophets, even to the point of making it deserve the name of Christ, adoptive Son of God, and, in a certain sense, even the name of God. It was easy to perceive in this system a return to the errors of Paul of Samosata and Sabellius.[32]

But Photinus, a native of Ancyra, had been the deacon and disciple of Marcellus. It was evident from the outset what advantages the Eusebians were going to derive from his heresy. Marcellus of Ancyra had been the champion of the consubstantiality of the Word at Nicaea, the friend of Athanasius; his rehabilitation had just been accomplished at the same time as that of Athanasius, by Pope Julius. For the Eusebians, to strike Photinus was a way of reaching all their foes at one stroke.

Yet the impression prevailed that, so long as the West was

Jerome, *Chronica,* year of Abraham 2358; Socrates, II, 6, 7, 12; Sozomen, III, 3, 4, 7–9.

[32] Cf. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 41–43. Photinus considered that the Holy Ghost was merely a new extension of the Divinity.

not won over, no success would be solid in the East. Pope Julius had shown himself immovable. An attempt was made with the Emperor of the West. A deputation, composed of four bishops (Narcissus of Neronias, Maris of Chalcedon, Theodore of Heraclea, and Mark of Arethusa) [33] set out for Treves, where Constans resided. They brought with them the fourth Creed of Antioch, in which the most dubious of the Arian expressions were repudiated, but in which the procession of the Son was expressed in a vague manner.

While all these plots were under way, the exiled Athanasius was at Rome. From the beginning of his exile we see him following the life of an ascetic in company with two monks whom he brought from the desert. A general sympathy was felt for him and thereby for the great cause for which he was suffering. Soon he was able to count on the support not only of several eminent Roman families, like that of the virgin Marcella,[34] but also on that of the aunt of the Emperor of the East, Eutropium.[35] Did these influences affect the Emperor? The fact is that, in April or May, 342, Athanasius was summoned to Milan by Emperor Constans. The monarch, despairing of putting an end to so many conflicts by the means thus far employed, thought of assembling a universal council, as his father had done. Athanasius approved of the idea and went to Gaul to confer with Hosius.[36] At the same time Constans communicated his plan to Constantius, who was then much occupied with his war against the Persians and dared not show himself unwilling to oblige his brother. In concert with Pope Julius, the place selected for the council was the city of Sardica, now Sofia in Bulgaria. This city, under the rule of

[33] Narcissus and Maris had taken part in the Council of Nicaea.

[34] St. Jerome, Letter 127, to Principia (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 253 ff.; *P. L.,* XXII, 1090).

[35] St. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium,* 6 (*Oxford Library of Fathers,* XIII, 160; *P. G.,* XXV, 604).

[36] *Idem,* 4.

Emperor Constantius but forming part of the Roman patriarchate,[37] was located at the extreme limit of the two Empires and thus equally distant from the two Churches. It would be the bond of union between the East and the West.

Council of Sardica (343)

The synodal letter informs us that the Council of Sardica was convoked by the Emperors Constans and Constantius, at the wish of Pope Julius,[38] for three reasons: 1. to end the disagreements that were dividing the Church, particularly those relating to Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra; 2. to extirpate every error from religious teaching; 3. to make all profess the true faith in Jesus Christ. The Fathers of the Council would indeed go beyond this program. The most famous of their decisions, those regulating the right of appeal by individual Churches to the Roman Church, were outside the three points mentioned.

The Council of Sardica began its sessions in the closing days of 343.[39] The West was much more extensively represented than at the Council of Nicaea. The synodal letter sent to the Alexandrians mentions, among others, delegates from Rome, Gaul, Spain, Italy, Africa, Sardinia, Pannonia, Mysia, Dacia, and Noricum.[40] Thirty-five provinces, according to St. Athanasius, were represented. From this same source we learn that 170 bishops, Eastern or Western, were present. Of this number seventy-six belonged evidently to Eusebius' party. Therefore the orthodox numbered ninety-four.[41]

[37] Hefele, II, 91, note 2. Cf. Wiltsch, *The Geography and Statistics of the Church,* Vol. I, sec. 44, 80, 88.

[38] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos,* chap. 44. A misunderstanding of a text of Socrates has led some to consider that the Council was convoked by Pope Julius himself. See Hefele, II, 90, note 2.

[39] On the determination of this date, see Hefele, II, 86 ff.

[40] *P. G.,* XXV, 308 f.

[41] Hefele, II, 93.

Pope Julius was represented by two priests, Archidanus and Philoxenus. He justified his own absence by such cogent reasons that the Council considered his explanation satisfactory and the schismatics and heretics could not take advantage of his absence to work mischief.[42] In his place Bishop Hosius of Cordova, who had held the same office at Nicaea, presided over the assembly, introduced the canons, and was the first to sign the Acts of the Council. The two Roman priests, papal legates, as at Nicaea were evidently Hosius' assistants, for their names come immediately after the name of the Bishop of Cordova, in the list recorded by St. Athanasius. We note the presence of the following in the Council: among the Eusebians, Acacius of Caesarea, Marcus of Arethusa, Basil of Ancyra, and Macedonius of Constantinople; among the orthodox, the illustrious Maximinus of Treves (who had courageously given hospitality to St. Athanasius during the latter's first exile), Verissimus of Lyons, Januarius of Beneventum, Diodorus of Tenedos, Athanasius, and Marcellus of Ancyra. A third bishop under accusation, Asclepas of Gaza, was also present.

At first the hopes of the Pope were in a fair way to be realized. A majority of the Fathers, at the outset, took an independent stand, which the absence of imperial commissioners appeared to guarantee. This was precisely what alarmed the Eusebians. They were all lodged in the city palace, imperial property, under the protection of Count Musonianus, the same officer who had been present at the deposition of Eustathius of Antioch in 330. Soon, however, two of their number, Asterius of Arabia and Arius (*alias* Macarius) of Palestine, unable to endure the tyrannical yoke to which they were subjected, joined the orthodox and warned the latter of the plots of the Eusebian party. These defections, the presence of Athanasius, whose eloquent words the Eusebians always dreaded, and the presence of several priests who had been

[42] Hefele, II, 96. Cf. Mansi, III, 40, 66.

formerly tortured by them and who, it was said, were ready to accuse them in open council, greatly vexed them. After an understanding among themselves, they set forth, as a preliminary condition of their participation in the Council, that those bishops be excluded who had been condemned by any councils.

This proposal, directed especially at Athanasius, rested on no juridical foundation; for the decision of the Council of Rome, proclaiming his innocence in 340, was of quite as much worth as that of the Council of Antioch, which condemned him in 339. Further, the letter of convocation to the Council, sent by the Emperors, had ordered that the whole affair of Athanasius be reviewed from its beginning.[43] But the Eusebians cried aloud that their conscience did not permit them to partake of the sacraments with men officially condemned. Hosius has left us an account, pulsating with sincerity and feeling, in which he relates his attempts to overcome the obstinacy of these rebels. He says:

"I challenged the enemies of Athanasius, when they came to the church where I abode, that if they had anything against him they might declare it; desiring them to have confidence, and not to expect otherwise than that a right judgment would be passed in all things. This I did once and again, requesting them, if they were unwilling to appear before the whole Council, yet to appear before me alone; promising them also that, if he should be proved guilty, he should certainly be rejected by us; but, if he should be found to be blameless, and should prove them to be calumniators, that if they should then refuse to hold communion with him, I would persuade him to go with me into the Spains. Athanasius was willing to comply with these conditions and made no objection to my proposal; but they, altogether distrusting their cause, would not consent." [44]

[43] Mansi, III, 40.

[44] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* no. 44.

The prospect of being publicly convicted of calumny frightened them. On the pretext of a wish to go and congratulate Emperor Constantius upon his recent victory over the Persians, they quit Sardica during the night with the intention of not coming back.[45]

The orthodox bishops, the only ones now left at the Council, at once set to work. The documents relating to the charges against Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra from the beginning, were carefully assembled and examined. On all points, the calumnious character of the charges was evident. Marcellus of Ancyra explained the scandalous statements attributed to him, either by placing them in their context or by showing that he had set forth merely as uncertain hypotheses what were attributed to him as absolute principles. The Council was convinced that, in spite of certain vague expressions, substantially the Bishop of Ancyra had never taught that the Word was born of Mary or that it was not eternal. Asclepas of Gaza was likewise exculpated, as also various priests haled before the Council by the Eusebians on similar charges. All were officially declared restored to their titles and offices, and the principal leaders of the Eusebians, including Acacius of Caesarea, were anathematized and deposed.[46]

But these were only questions of fact. The Fathers of Sardica wished, before adjourning, to proclaim canonical regulations, the observance of which would henceforth prevent disturbances like those which had just afflicted the Church.

The Canons of Sardica

The most important and famous of the canons of Sardica concern the serious disciplinary question of appeals to Rome.

[45] St. Athanasius, *op. cit.*, no. 16. Cf. St. Hilary, *Fragmentum*, II, 16.
[46] Mansi, III, 55, 63, 66.

If by the word "appeal" we understand not merely a judicial procedure of recourse to a supreme tribunal against a supposedly unjust sentence, but the solicitation for personal intervention by the pope under any circumstances when it is judged necessary, the right of appeal to Rome, in the Church, rests upon an indisputable tradition, that goes back to the very beginning of Christianity.[47] The heretics themselves—Marcion, Basilides, Martial, Fortunatus, Privatus—either directly or through delegated agents had sought the moral support of and communion with the Apostolic See. But at Sardica in 343 the question was presented in a more precise way. The determining cause for the meeting of the Council lay in the numerous appeals addressed to Pope Julius by Eastern bishops who had been unjustly deposed. As the Arians denied, in this case, that the bishop of Rome had the right to absolve those whom their synods had condemned, it was a matter of importance to promulgate fixed and precise regulations on this question. That is what the Fathers did in three famous canons, the third, fourth, and fifth. Hefele, the learned historian of the councils, sums up these canons as follows:

"1. When a bishop has been deposed by his comprovincials at the Provincial Synod, but still thinks his cause a good one, he may, according to the fifth canon, either appeal to Rome himself, or through the judge of the first court.

"2. Rome now decides whether the appeal shall be allowed or not. In the latter case, it confirms the sentence of the first court; in the former, it appoints a second court.

[47] In this way we must solve the discussions that have arisen on the question whether the Council of Sardica introduced a disciplinary innovation, in regulating the exercise of the right of appeal to the pope. That the Council did so has been held by Peter de Marca, Quesnel, Dupin, Richer, and Febronius, as also certain Gallicans and Jansenists. Their arguments are refuted by Natalis Alexander (*Hist. eccles.*, fourth century, dissertation 28, proposition 1, pp. 461 f.). Hefele says: "The right of the pope to receive appeals was involved in the idea of the primacy as a divine institution." (Hefele, II, 122.) Cf. *Revue de l'école des Chartes,* IV (1853), 105–127; *Des appels en cour de Rome jusqu'au concile de Sardique.*

"3. Rome nominates as judges for the second court bishops from the neighborhood of the province in question.

"4. To this court the pope may, however, also send legates of his own, who will then take the presidency in his name.

"5. In case a bishop deposed by the first court appeals to Rome, his see may not be given to another until Rome has decided, that is, has either confirmed the sentence of the first court or appointed a court of appeal. In the latter case it is, of course, understood that the sentence of the second court must be awaited before anything can be decided as to any fresh appointment to the see." [48]

Thus the movements of revolt that came from the East brought about a firmer organization of the hierarchy. The bishops of the West, threatened by the Easterners in their faith and their desire to preserve the unity of the Church, felt more keenly than ever the need of a strong discipline; and they gathered more closely about the successor of St. Peter.[49]

Unfortunately at that very time the dissenting part of the Council was meeting in a city of Thrace, at Philippopolis, under the pretence of there continuing the Council by themselves. The Fathers of Sardica sent three letters communicating their decisions respectively to Pope Julius, head of the Roman Church, to all the Churches of Christendom in general, and to the Church of Alexandria in particular. At almost the

[48] Hefele, II, 128. The Greek and Latin text of the twenty canons of Sardica will be found in Hefele, II, 109–157. The Council of Sardica is famous in history chiefly because of these three canons. From the time of Hincmar of Rheims down to our own day, disputes have arisen with regard to their interpretation. Hincmar, and in agreement with him the Gallican Richer and the Jansenists Van Espen and Febronius, maintained that in these canons there is no question of an appeal in the strict sense, but simply of a review of the trial in the court of first instance. Edmund Richer maintained further that the right established in favor of Pope Julius did not pass on to his successors. For an exposition of these errors and their refutation, see Hefele, II, 122–124. On the question of the right of appeal, considered from the point of view of the East, see Bernardakis, *Les Appels au pape dans l'Église grecque jusqu'a Photius,* in the *Echos d'Orient,* 1903, pp. 30–42, 118–136, 248–257.

[49] At one time it was thought that the Fathers of Sardica formulated a Creed. The more recent view is that the Creed of Sardica was drawn up by Hosius, but not adopted by the Council. Cf. Mansi, VI, 1202.

same time that these letters appeared, there was issued a solemn encyclical drawn up by the bishops assembled at Philippopolis, written in such a way as to make it appear that it was the authentic conclusion of the council convoked at Sardica. It said: "We beg the Lord that the Holy Catholic Church preserve the bond of charity in the orthodoxy of the faith. . . . We ask that the holy tradition of our fathers and the rule of the Church remain firm and unshakable." The document closed with the anathema against Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, all the deposed bishops or priests who had appealed to Rome, and against Hosius and Pope Julius as guilty of having received those appeals. The document was probably dated, not from the city where it was written, but from Sardica so as to create a confusion and the better to appear as an authentic act of the Council.[50] The Eusebians' trick succeeded in Africa, where the Council of Sardica was looked upon as semi-Arian.[51]

The convocation of a universal council did not, then, bring peace.[52] The Council of Sardica definitely set forth the jurisdictional supremacy of the Church of Rome over all the Churches; yet, by the withdrawal of the Eusebians and the

[50] Tillemont, *Mémoires* (1732 ed.), VI, 142; Ceillier, *Historie générale des auteurs sacrés,* IV, 699.

[51] St. Augustine fell into this error. Seeing that a document of this council excommunicated Athanasius, whose orthodoxy was attested from other sources, St. Augustine concluded that the Council of Sardica was semi-Arian. (St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium, P. L.,* XLIII, 176, 516, 576.)

[52] Was the Council of Sardica ecumenical? It seems beyond question that Pope Julius and the emperors, when convoking it, intended to give it this character. Yet, in fact, at no period has any authority considered the Council of Sardica ecumenical. The single fact of the separation of the Eusebians was not enough to destroy its ecumenical character; otherwise we would have to grant to heretics the power of making an ecumenical council impossible. But the Church herself has not seen fit to give this authority to the Council of Sardica. A most venerable council it remains, but a particular one, notwithstanding the contentions of Baronius, Natalis Alexander, and Mansi. Alexander was expressly blamed by the Roman censors for maintaining the ecumenical character of the Council of Sardica. Cf. Natalis Alexander, *Historia ecclesiastica,* IV, 460.

perfidy of their tactics, it became the starting-point of the schism that would afflict Christendom, with occasional periods of calm, until the day of the final rupture.

The Pagan Spirit

Profiting by all these divisions, paganism again raised its head. Its mythology and worship were discredited, but it continued the propagation of its spirit through the circus, the school, and the practice of magic. The ancient circus, with its bloody gladiatorial combats, its indecent pantomimes, its licentious songs, and its ritualistic processions in which statues of the gods were carried, offended charity, modesty, and Christian faith. In the schools, of whatever grade, teachers seductively inspired the young with enthusiastic worship of the heroes of fable, who may not have been considered divinities to be adored, but at least were regarded as symbols of earthly beauty and sinful passions. Magic and superstition were widespread among the populace; and in 337 Firmicus Maternus, an astrologer, in a book dedicated to the Emperor, tried to raise astrology to the status of real science.[53] And there seems to have been some superstition in those sacramental formulas of the law which Constantine's two sons proscribed in 342 as a verbal trap for pleaders: *aucupatio syllabarum.*[54] Thus, while the intrigues and disputes of Arianism were rending the Church, pagan claims asserted themselves with greater boldness. Christian worship was caricatured in satires and here and there efforts were made to revive the worship of the ancient gods.

[53] Was this Firmicus Maternus, the pagan author of the *Mathesis,* the same person as Firmicus Maternus, the Christian author of *De errore profanarum religionum,* which appeared about 347? Mommsen (*Hermes,* XXIX, 468 f.) rejects the identity; Clifford H. Moore, in his doctorate thesis (*Julius Firmicus Maternus*), holds that they are one and the same person.

[54] *Justinian Code,* bk. 2, title 27 (*alias* 58).

The Sons of Constantine

In the presence of these attempts to resurrect the old idolatry, the attitude of Constantine's sons was dubious. The Christian Sozomen and the pagan Libanius both say that Constantine's sons closed all the temples.[55] But Symmachus, even while criticizing Constantius for removing the statue of Victory that stood in the Senate, praises him for favoring the pagan priesthood, for the respect shown the consecrated virgins, and the traditional ceremonies of the Roman religion.[56] In fact we see Constantius and Constans, under the impulse of diverse influences, now proscribe and now honor the pagan religion. In a law dated 341, the two Emperors ordered "that superstition cease and that the foolishness of the sacrifices be abolished." [57] A year later they commanded that the temples in the neighborhood of Rome be repaired at government expense, because, they said, "it was in connection with many of them that the games of the circus and certain celebrations had their origin, and we should not destroy what furnishes the Roman people with their customary pleasures." [58] A similar inconsistency is to be observed in the laws which the Emperors made in favor of Christianity. Although in accord with the Gospel teaching they protected the modesty of Christian virgins [59] and stigmatized certain infamies too long tolerated by the laws,[60] yet they yielded to base solicitations by their Arian flatterers in exempting from taxes those members of the clergy who engaged in business.[61]

[55] Sozomen, III, 17; Libanius, *Orations,* p. 591.
[56] Symmachus, *Epistolae,* X, 54.
[57] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, II, 10.
[58] *Ibid.,* IX, XVII, 2, 3.
[59] *Ibid.,* XV, VIII, 1.
[60] *Ibid.,* IX, VII, 3.
[61] *"Si qui . . . alimoniae causa negotiationem exercere volunt, immunitate patientur." Ibid.,* IX, II, 8.

Rome and Persia

Among the superstitions spreading through the Roman world, several seem to have originated in Persia. Between a magician and a magus the Latin made little distinction. In this verbal similarity we may perhaps see an historical indication. The great Constantine wisely saw, in the conflict that was bringing the Persian Empire to grips with that of Rome, a conflict of religion as well as of politics. Tillemont writes: "Constantine prepared for the war against the Persians, not only as an emperor, but also as a Christian." [62] As we have already noted, he was not satisfied with merely defending the purity of the faith in his Empire, but was solicitous for the security of Christians in the Empire of the Persians and to this end intervened energetically with Sapor.[63] But the sons of Constantine had neither his political penetration nor that perseverance in moderation which is a sign of real strength.

It is beyond our scope to recount the phases of the great war which broke out immediately after Constantine's death and placed the two empires in conflict for the whole duration of the reigns of Constantius and Julian the Apostate. One of the first acts of Sapor II was to impose a double tax upon "all the number of the Nazarenes," *i. e.,* all the Christians, because, says the edict, "they dwell in our territory and share in the dispositions of Caesar, our enemy." This accusation was one of the chief reasons for the terrible persecution that soon began in Persia against the Christians.[64]

It is fair to state that the Christians of Persia were, as a whole, clearly hostile to Sapor II. "Ground down by the Persians, regarded as belonging to a caste born for servitude, the Christians of Chaldea and Mesopotamia envied their neigh-

[62] Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs,* IV, 265.
[63] See *supra,* p. 89.
[64] Labourt, *La Christianisme dans l'empire perse,* p. 46.

bors, who were under the rule of the infinitely less arbitrary Roman legislation." [65] Therein the magi had an excuse for stirring the king of Persia against the Christians. And they made use of it with Sapor.[66] But mere religious fanaticism explains the pitiless repression which the king ordered in 339–340.

St. Simon

The edict subjecting the Christians to a double head-tax was followed by a second edict, ordering the confiscation of the churches and their destruction in case of resistance, then by a general decree of persecution against the Christians.[67] The chief victim of the persecution was the patriarch Simon bar Sabbae, who was put to death in 341. He occupied the see of the royal cities Seleucia-Ctesiphon for thirteen years and, by his rare qualities, merited the high esteem of the ruler. But, we are told by the historian of the persecution,[68] he was arrested at the instigation of the Jews, who enjoyed great credit with the queen mother, Ephra Hormiz. The Acts of his martyrdom recall the finest scenes of the great persecution of the preceding centuries.

The bishop, ordered to collect from his faithful and transmit to the government the double tax imposed by Sapor, declined to do so, saying that his community was poor and that it was not the part of a bishop to grind down his people. He was put in chains, along with two of the priests that formed

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[66] Duval, *Littérature syriaque*, p. 129.

[67] See the text of these decrees in Assemani, *Acta sanctorum martyrum*, and in Bedjan, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*.

[68] The account of King Sapor II's persecution of the Christians in Persia was written by St. Maruta (*alias* Maruthas), bishop of Maipherkad (*alias* Maipherqat, Martyropolis), who lived in the latter part of the fourth century and the early part of the fifth. (St. Maruta's *Acta of the Persian Martyrs* is translated by W. Wright in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, October 1865–January 1866. Tr.) Cf. Duval, *Littérature syriaque*, pp. 132 f.

his presbyterial council,[69] and was brought before the king. Sapor promised to spare his life if he would consent to adore the sun.

"I recognize only one God," Simon replied; "it is Jesus Christ, who died on the cross."

"How can you adore a dead God, who was hanged on the infamous gibbet? Come, now, adore the sun, by whose power everything subsists."

"The sun put on mourning when its Creator died, as a slave does at the death of his master."

"Your insolence is reason enough for me to put you to death, and so preserve your companions by terrifying them by your execution."

"I fear nothing. God will crown us."

Sapor ordered him imprisoned until the following day so as to give him time to reflect and change his mind.

The next day Sapor appealed to their former friendship. Simon was immovable. Order was given to lead him to his execution along with his two comrades. To scare him, the king commanded that the latter be slain in the presence of the bishop. The holy old man exhorted them to die with courage. But, at the last moment, Hanania, one of the two priests, at sight of the sword raised over him, trembled and was ready to yield. Then, from the midst of the royal officers, a voice was heard. "Hanania, put off all fear and close your eyes until you are in possession of the light eternal." It was the voice of the prefect of the royal workmen, Pusaik. The king, in anger, cried out: "Pusaik, have I not appointed you to high office?" "As for the office to which you have appointed me," replied Pusaik, "it matters little to me, for it is full of cares, and I prefer these men's suffering, because it is full of joy. I am a Christian, I believe in the God preached by Simon bar

[69] The martyrology of 412 gives us the names of all the priests who formed the presbyterium. Labourt, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

Sabbae." Shaking with rage, Sapor cried out: "Let this fellow not die like the others. Tear out his tongue through his neck, that this example may make all who live fear me." The king's order was carried out. Pusaik died instantly. His daughter, who was a nun, was likewise slain. Last of all, Bar Sabbae died. The day was Friday of the week of the Azymes, the anniversary of the Savior's death.[70]

Sapor's Persecution

The proceedings against the Christians were neither constant nor regular. Often the martyrs were denounced to the royal officers. More generally officials of any rank initiated the prosecution. Satraps or mere heads of villages, each one arrogating to himself the right to imprison clergy and laity at his own will. The Mazdean priests were especially conspicuous for zeal, which reached the point of fanaticism. The accused were subjected to precautionary imprisonment, which might last a few months or several years, at the will of the persecutors. As at Rome, the judges made use of torture. Usually the execution followed the last questioning. Most often the martyrs were put to death by the sword or were stoned to death.

But at times Oriental ingenuity devised more refined tortures. In some cases, as with Pusaik, the martyr's throat was slit in such a way that his tongue could be pulled through the opening. Again, as in the case of Tarbo, the martyr was cut in two or his joints were broken. This frightful torture was sometimes inflicted methodically and piecemeal. The executioners' ingenious cruelty invented the torture of the "nine deaths." It is described as follows in the Passion of St. James, one of the most genuine of the saints' Passions:[71] "First the

[70] Labourt, *op. cit.*, pp. 64–68.
[71] Bedjan, *op. cit.*, IV, 197.

fingers were cut off, then the toes, then the wrists, then the ankles, then the arms above the elbows, the knees, ears, and nose, and finally the head." [72] Beginning with the year 343, the persecution raged almost continually in the northern provinces, Beit Garmai and Adiabene. The presence of the royal armies was required there by the war against the Romans.[73] For forty years the blood of martyrs poured out on the soil of Persia. If we are to accept Sozomen's statement, in 379 sixteen thousand Christians gave their lives for the faith.[74] This figure must be only a guess. In any event, Sapor's persecution was not second, either in duration or intensity, to the persecutions undergone by the Churches of the Roman world.

In 343, the date when the Council of Sardica closed, less than seven years after the death of Constantine, not only was the religious unity of the Empire gravely endangered by the most perfidious of the heresies, not only was a group of Eastern bishops separated from Rome by a painful split, but the war of the Persians threatened both the security of the Empire and the future of Christianity at all points where the Persion influence would be victorious. Aided by a religious dualism which brought conflicting geniuses face to face in a world arena and by the occult practices which the magi's influence would spread, a new form of paganism seemed well on the way to the conquest of the nations which had been evangelized by the apostles of Jesus Christ.

[72] Labourt, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–61.
[73] Sozomen, II, 12.
[74] *Ibid.*, II, 14.

CHAPTER V

From the Council of Sardica to the Death of Emperor Constans (343–350)

THE Eusebians did not find peace by withdrawing from the Council of Sardica and from Rome and by proclaiming the autonomy of their Churches and their synods. The Council of Philippopolis was followed by an unprecedented agitation in the Eastern provinces. When they returned home, the dissenting bishops were generally ill received. They were blamed for abandoning their brother-bishops, for running away from the discussion, and were looked upon as deserters and cowards. They avenged themselves with cruelty. For Lucius, bishop of Adrianople, who had made complaint against them, they obtained from Emperor Constantius banishment in chains. For ten workmen who insulted them, they obtained a death sentence. For the two bishops, Macarius and Asterius, who had deserted them and gone over to the ranks of the orthodox, they obtained relegation to the depths of Libya. "The condition of affairs throughout the East amounted almost to a reign of terror." [1]

However, the work of pacification progressed. Constantius, ever absorbed by his war against the Persians, continued to depend upon his brother for the regulation of religious matters. Constans was less courageous and capable than Constantius, but he had a more upright character and more sincere faith. He willingly aided the work of conciliation which the very bitterness of the strife rendered urgent. The task was not an easy one. Before the Arian quarrel was settled

[1] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 181.

in the East, the Donatist quarrel revived in Africa, more intense than before. The ceaseless collision of pagan customs and Christian customs, more obvious in Rome than elsewhere, added to these conflicts. Yet the Emperor of the West, before dying, could say that he had helped to give the Christian leaders a few years of comparative peace, during which the Church was able to develop in her worship, her discipline, and the deep study of her doctrine, with relative freedom.

Council of Antioch (344)

All historians admit that Emperor Constantius' change of attitude in the Arian question was largely due to his brother's influence.[2] The excesses of the antinicene party seem also to have turned him against them. In 344 about Easter time,[3] he hurriedly convoked a synod at Antioch to pass judgment on the bishop of that city, Stephen, a tireless Eusebian who attempted in an infamous manner to entrap the two deputies of the Council of Sardica.[4] Stephen was deposed. It was probably this same council that drew up the new Creed which, because of its length, was called the macrostic Creed. It contained the Creed of Philippopolis, that is, the fourth symbol of Antioch, but with explanations and developments that marked a progress toward a doctrinal agreement. Thus, in speaking of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, it proclaimed the Son like to the Father in all things (τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιος) and declared that both have the same divine excellence (ἐν τῆς

[2] See Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 183, and Le Bachelet in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1816.

[3] Some authors say 345.

[4] When the two deputies, Vincent of Capua and Euphrates of Cologne, while on their journey were stopping at Antioch, Stephen had a woman of ill-repute enter their bed-room at night. At an appointed time she was to cry out and thus create a scandal. But the trick was discovered and turned to the discredit of its schemer. The event is related by St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* no. 20, and Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* VII, 8.

θεότητος ἀξίωμα). The absence of the word *homoousios,* a few expressions taken from Subordinationism, and especially the insistence that they should affirm all the points compromised by the real or supposed doctrines of Photinus and Marcellus of Ancyra, indicated a persisting hostility against the party of Athanasius.[5]

But the great Bishop preferred to see in this document only what tended to conciliation. He openly disavowed whatever compromising doctrines of Marcellus it might contain, and after that had no relations with him. As to Photinus, the reckless disciple of Marcellus, his views were evidently untenable. In a council held at Milan late in 344 or at the beginning of 345, the Westerners consented to pronounce anathema against him. His theory that the Word was simply a dilatation of God and consequently fundamentally indistinct from the Father, was unacceptable in every respect.

Return of Athanasius

In the summer of 344, Emperor Constantius, by a kindly act, encouraged the conciliatory movement. He allowed the exiled clergy of Alexandria to return to their city.[6] The death of the usurper Gregory (June 25, 345) enabled Constantius to go farther on the path of pacification. He wrote to Athanasius, inviting him to return to his diocese. Athanasius first went to Treves to consult Emperor Constans, his protector, then to Rome, where Pope Julius strongly urged him to accept the imperial invitation and even gave him a letter to the Alexandrians praising him highly. About midsummer 345, Athanasius went to Antioch and there saw Constantius. The Emperor gave him letters for the magistrates of Alexandria. These letters were most kindly toward Athanasius and revoked all

[5] St. Athanasius, *De Synodis,* no. 26.
[6] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* no. 21.

measures that had been taken against him. On October 21, 346, the holy Patriarch made his entry into his episcopal city amidst indescribable enthusiasm.[7] The people and the city officials went far beyond Alexandria to meet him. St. Antony, at sight of the passing throngs on their way to meet the Bishop, was unable to join them on account of his old age. But he sang his *Nunc dimittis,* happy at beholding finally the triumph of the cause for which he had offered so many mortifications and prayers.[8]

Donatism in Africa

While the Roman Pontiff received news of this triumphal entry, his heart was deeply afflicted by rumors coming to him for several months from the Churches of Africa.

The Donatist movement, since its condemnation by the Council of Arles in 314 and by Emperor Constantine, had passed from the arena of religious controversy to that of political opposition.[9] It did not become a kind of secessionist agitation against Roman domination; to say this would be to apply altogether modern notions to ancient times. In no sense did there exist at that time what we would now call an "African nationality." The members of the sect were not seeking to separate from Rome, but at home they wanted to be masters of the organization of their Churches and of the symbols of their belief; and, in the demand for these so-called rights, they felt a bitter stubbornness that reached the point of fanaticism. Following the Council of Sardica, their leader, Donatus the Great, whose subtle and cultivated mind might have shone in the religious controversy, maintained that the Fathers of the

[7] St. Athanasius, *Festal Letters,* Index, *P. G.,* XXVI, 1355.

[8] *Acta sanctorum,* May, III, 326; *Histoire de saint Pakhôme et de ses communautés,* previously unpublished Coptic and Arabic documents, published by E. Amelineau in the *Annales du Musée Guimet,* XVII (1889), 656 f.

[9] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 514 f.

Council thought as he did about those who gave up the Sacred Books.[10] Whether knowingly or not, he accepted, as an official document of the Council, the letter of the dissenters of Philippopolis. A little later, in a widely circulated letter, he maintained that baptism could be validly conferred only by the Donatists. But on the theological questions he was not followed. The Donatists preferred to make use of other arguments.

The Circumcellions

Abetted by the disorder which the long religious discussions of recent years had caused, a movement of popular clamor developed in the lowest ranks of African society. Bands of fanatics roamed through the country districts, pillaging everything on their way. In them the Donatists saw a power, and used them to defend their cause and to fight the "traitors." They decorated these brigands with the title "athletes of Christ." The Catholics dubbed them more fittingly, calling them "Circumcellions," or cellar-prowlers, because it was their practice to sack the cellars and granaries.

"Armed with stout cudgels, they appeared everywhere, on the public roads and in the markets, prowled about cottages, whence came their name of Circumcellions, and kept a strict watch over farms and country houses. It was not only in the quarrel of Donatus and Caecilian that they interested themselves. Sturdy redressors of wrongs, the enemies of all social inequalities, they eagerly took the part of small holders against proprietors, of slaves against their masters, and of debtors against their creditors. At the first call of the oppressed, or those who pretended to be so, and especially of the Donatist clergy when they found themselves hemmed in at close quarters by the police, the Circumcellions appeared on the scene in

[10] On the Donatist teaching regarding those who gave up the sacred books, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 502.

fierce gangs uttering their war-cry: *Deo laudes!* and brandishing their famous clubs." [11]

Donatus the Great himself adopted the tone of those who had become his most powerful auxiliaries. In 337, replying to Gregory, the praetorian prefect of Italy, he addressed him at the beginning of the letter thus: "Gregory, dirt of the Senate, shame of the prefecture."

Banishment of Donatus

These disturbances and brutal protests were only the prelude of the open revolt that broke out in 347. Emperor Constantius sent two legates to Africa, Paul and Macarius, commissioned to calm the mobs by a distribution of numerous reliefs and to labor for the general reconciliation. Donatus received the imperial envoys with these words: "What has the Emperor to do with the Church?" He meant the Church of the Donatists.[12] This was the signal for the revolt. In Numidia, Bishop Donatus of Bagai and the priest Marculus, at news of the arrival of Paul and Macarius, had the gates closed and called the Circumcellions to their aid. The imperial legates, less for the purpose of making an assault than with a view to protecting themselves from a sudden attack, asked for reinforcements. Bloody conflicts and veritable battles ensued. The imperial troops at length mastered the situation. Among the dead were Donatus of Bagai and Marculus, who were considered martyrs by the Donatists. Donatus the Great, Donatist bishop of Carthage, and certain other bishops of his party were exiled. Donatism appeared to be overcome; and so thoroughly that, in a Council of Carthage (349), Bishop Gratus, successor of Caecilian, proclaimed that God "had given reli-

[11] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 189.
[12] St. Optatus, *Against the Donatists,* III, 3.

gious unity to Africa." But Donatism was no more dead than was Arianism. Soon the two heresies reappear as perfidious and violent as in their worst days. From 347 onward, however, in Numidia as also in Egypt, the Church was able to enjoy a certain calm.

The Danger of Paganism

There was reason to think that in Italy also paganism was dying. Little by little, churches took the place of the temples, which were falling in ruins. Provided with official favor and dominating the imperial festivities, Christianity held an ever-growing place in public and private life. Priests and faithful alike seemed to be without any thought of insecurity, when, in 348,[13] their tranquillity was disturbed by the appearance of a certain spirited writing, entitled *De errore profanarum religionum*. It was written by one Julius Firmicus Maternus, a convert from paganism whom some critics have considered to be the author of the *Mathesis*. The work appears to have been written in Sicily.[14] It was addressed to the Emperors Constans and Constantius, urging them to destroy the remains of paganism. The style is vivacious, sharp, biting, sometimes harsh and even violent, when it denounces the vileness of paganism. Yet, in places, it is mild even to the point of unction, when there is question of the Christian mysteries.

Maternus was a man of extensive erudition. He attacks the pagan beliefs of the Greeks, the Romans, the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Persians, and the Africans. He ridicules the false gods and their credulous adorers. He makes fun of Adonis, who, though a god, did not know that snares were being laid for him; and Mars, who, to make himself loved by

[13] In chapter 30 an allusion to a defeat of the Persians in the strife with Rome, enables us to fix the date of the work, with great probability, as 348.

[14] This inference is based on the topographical details about Sicily, in chapter 17.

Venus, changes himself into a pig. He laughs at the Egyptians who wept over the death of Osiris, when they should have wept only at their own stupidity, and the Phrygians, who were quite right in calling the earth the mother of the gods, since their gods are merely a bit of dirt more or less well fashioned.

But the evil of pagan idolatry is deeper. Maternus says: "Let us not simply laugh at it. It should make us tremble, because it is the glorification of all man's evil passions." In vigorous and unvarnished words that cannot be quoted, he recalls the incredible debaucheries committed in honor of Juno. "Blush, therefore, ye wretches," he writes. "When you have to present your body before the great Judge, He will not recognize it as the body He made, for it will be so deformed by the devil himself." [15] "What infamy is there," he says, "which has not its model in the exploits of your false gods? He who is consumed by vice needs for his encouragement merely to look upon your Apollo, your Hercules, your Bacchus, and your great god Jupiter: bull, satyr, or indecent swan." [16]

By way of conclusion the author, on the basis of Old Testament texts, reminds the Emperors of their duty to extirpate the last roots of paganism in this world which God has confided to their rule. By thus doing, they will be watching over the true interests of those very ones whom they strike, because a sick man, when he is cured, is grateful to the physician for the painful operation that saved him. And God especially who has given them so many pledges of His protection, will bless their Empire with fresh victories, greater prosperity, and more stable and glorious peace.[17]

Several laws which the Emperors enacted against superstí-

[15] *De errore profanarum religionum,* chap. 4; *P. L.,* XII, 991.

[16] *Ibid.,* chap. 13; *P. L.,* XII, 1007.

[17] *Ibid.,* chap. 30; *P. L.,* XII, 1048–1050. Cf. Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés,* IV, 310–313.

tion and magic may have been the result of this earnest appeal of Firmicus Maternus. To his influence are attributed several popular movements, the destruction of many temples and even the degradation of some tombs. The sepulchers of the great families along the Roman roads were generally ornamented with pagan decorations. Some Christians, aroused by Maternus' invectives, pillaged them. Constans became angered. It is thought that the laws he made, providing severe penalties for violation and spoliation of tombs,[18] were prompted by these regrettable excesses of mistaken zeal.

St. Athanasius' *Against the Arians*

While Firmicus Maternus, a layman, was writing his vigorous denunciations, a more positive work was being undertaken by certain bishops—St. Athanasius in Egypt, St. Cyril of Jerusalem in Palestine, and St. Aphraates in Persia. Against the attacks by Arians and pagans, they established the veritable foundations of Catholic dogma and piety.

After returning to his diocese of Alexandria, Athanasius assembled a council to confirm that of Sardica. Then he profited by the calm he enjoyed to publish three important books: the work on *the Decrees of the Nicene Council,* a small work on the *Thought of Dionysius of Alexandria,* and, according to some authorities,[19] his four *Discourses against the Arians.* The purpose of the book on the Nicene Council was to show, according to his own words, that "the Council of Nicaea, in formulating its definitions against the Arian heresy, did what was needful and what was dictated by piety." The second book mentioned was written to vindicate the memory of a holy

[18] *Theodosian Code,* IX, XVII, 1–3. Cf. De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* III, 132–135.

[19] Cavallera, *Saint Athanase,* p. xi. Some critics place the writing of this work at a later date, 356 to 361; others prefer an earlier date, 338–339.

bishop of Alexandria; the Arians were interpreting in their own favor a certain letter, written by that bishop in 260.

The Discourses against the Arians is Athanasius' principal doctrinal work. Bossuet praises these discourses as "masterpieces of eloquence and learning" in which is to be found "a power and wealth of expression as well as that noble simplicity which makes a Demosthenes." [20] In these four discourses, which are closely connected with one another and really form a single work, Athanasius sets forth the Arian teaching and refutes all its arguments. But he chooses to consider the doctrine as a whole from the point of view of the Redemption. The truth which he wants particularly to safeguard is that we are redeemed beings, freed, and freed for eternity. But if Christ was not God, our liberation would not be a true redemption or an eternal one. If freed by a creature, we would fall under the domination of a created master; this would simply be a new enslavement. And this half-freedom would not be eternal.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem

Athanasius, even when expounding the faith, is always a controversialist, never forgetting the refutation of heresy or irreligion. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, at least during the early part of his life, is merely a catechist. But he is a catechist whose chief book (the *Catechetical Lectures*) is of the utmost importance for the history of the Church. In fact, it constitutes, next to the *Didache,* the earliest and most extensive work of this kind that we possess.[21]

Cyril was born in 313 in Jerusalem or near it.[22] At first he

[20] Bossuet, *Défense de la tradition et des Saints Pères,* Part I, bk. 4, chap. 12 (Lachat ed., IV, 148 f.).

[21] In the office of this saint (fourth lesson), the Church gives magnificent praise to St. Cyril's *Catecheses.*

[22] A recent biographer of this saint, J. Mader (*Der Cyrillus Bischof von Jerusalem*), after a critical and painstaking examination, adopts this date.

followed the monastic life.[23] St. Maximus, his predecessor in the see of Jerusalem, ordained him a priest in 343. Five years later he preached the instructions (catecheses) to the catechumens. The lectures have made his name immortal.

In the fourth century, by catechesis [24] was meant the oral teaching that served as a preparation for the reception of baptism. There were four kinds of catechesis: that which preceded admission to the catechumenate, that of simple catechumens, that of the "competent" catechumens (*i. e.,* those admitted to immediate preparation for the reception of baptism), and lastly that which was addressed to the newly baptized. This last was called Mystagogical catechesis. St. Cyril's catechesis belongs to these last two categories. He preached it, not from memory, but out of the fulness of his mind and heart, in Jerusalem before and after the feast of Easter, 348. We possess these lectures as they were stenographically recorded by his hearers.[25]

In these informal instructions, St. Cyril's words possess the qualities and defects of the spoken style: simple and lively, now encumbered by digressions and parentheses, now urgent and pathetic, but always practical, always suited to the mental and moral needs of his listeners. It has been noted, with a certain amount of scandal among Catholics, with undisguised joy among the enemies of our faith, that Cyril never speaks of Arius and his followers, that he never uses those expressions which in his day stirred up so much dispute. This was simple prudence on his part. His was a work of edification, not of controversy. It may also be that, when he was delivering

[23] *Catechetical Lectures,* Lecture 12, *P. G.,* XXXIII, 321.

[24] During the first two centuries, the word "catechesis" had a wider meaning. The organization of the catechumenate gave it a more precise sense.

[25] Le Bachelet, art. *"Cyrille de Jerusalem"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* III, 2534. The first eighteen catechetical lectures were delivered in Lent, the five Mystogogical lectures were preached during Easter week. On the stenographic methods of this period, see a curious work by Prosper and Eugene Guénin, *Histoire de la sténographie dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge.*

these lectures, he had not yet grasped the full bearing of the strife that was setting Eusebians and Nicaeans in violent conflict with each other. Later, after some fluctuation, not in his ideas but in his relations, he took his stand in the ranks of the moderate group that defended orthodoxy while avoiding phrases which were apt to shock the adversaries.

St. Cyril's Doctrine

The substance of his doctrine is faultlessly orthodox. He professes, with utmost clearness, the mystery of the Trinity, the consubstantiality of the Son and the Father, and the absolute authority of ecclesiastical tradition in matters of faith. He says: "Our hope is in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. We preach not three gods; let the Marcionites be mute. We neither divide the Holy Trinity, like some, nor do we as Sabellius introduce confusion." [26] The "some" are evidently the followers of Arius. Cyril says further: "He is a perfect Father of a perfect Son: who has delivered everything to Him who is begotten.[27] . . . Never let us say, There was a time when the Son was not." [28]

As to our Lord's real presence in the Eucharist, he speaks with unsurpassed vigor, saying: "In the figure of bread is given to thee His body, and in the figure of wine His blood; that thou, by partaking of the body and blood of Christ, mightest be made of the same body and the same blood with Him." [29] On the propitiatory value of the holy sacrifice of the mass, he is no less explicit. He says:

"Through the sacrifice of propitiation we entreat God for the common peace of the Church. . . . For all who stand in need of

[26] *Catechetical Lectures,* XVI, 4 (*Oxford Library of Fathers,* II, 204).
[27] *πάντα παραδούς, ibid.,* VII, 5 (*Oxford Library,* II, 81).
[28] *Ibid.,* XI, 17 (*Oxford Library,* II, 118).
[29] *Ibid.,* XXII, 3 (*Oxford Library,* II, 271).

succor we all supplicate and offer this sacrifice. Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us. . . . For those who have fallen asleep we offer up Christ, sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful God both for them and for ourselves." [30]

Cyril's doctrine about the Church is equally remarkable. He regards the Church as the infallible authority from which we have the canon of Scriptures and the symbol of faith which we must follow and practice.[31] The office of the Church is not merely to instruct us in the truths necessary for salvation; it trains us in our practical life by regulating our morals. In this connection the holy bishop draws an appealing picture of the moral ideal to which Christians ought to tend. He also gives us an interesting glimpse of many practices in use in the Church of his time: the continence of priests, the community life of virgins consecrated to God,[32] the penitential life of the ascetics, [33] the veneration of relics,[34] and of the cross,[35] the practice of exorcism,[36] and invocation of the saints.[37]

We must not expect to find in St. Cyril's *Lectures* a complete doctrine of the sacraments. He is concerned only with those for which he is preparing candidates: Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. Of these three sacraments he gives a detailed account in which the history of liturgy and of Christian piety can find most valuable documents.[38] In all these expositions Cyril carefully avoids any expression that

[30] *Ibid.*, XXIII, 8–10 (*Oxford Library*, II, 275 f.).
[31] *Ibid.*, V, 12; XVIII, 23.
[32] *πάντα παραδούς*, XII, 25.
[33] *Ibid.*, IV, 24 f.
[34] *Ibid.*, XVII, 30; XVIII, 16.
[35] *Ibid.*, IV, 10, 14; XIII, 4.
[36] *Ibid.*, XX, 3.
[37] *Ibid.*, XXIII, 9.
[38] Three catechetical lectures are devoted to the sacrament of baptism: the third, nineteenth, and twentieth. The twenty-first treats of Confirmation; the twenty-second and twenty-third, of the Eucharist.

might inject division into the minds of his hearers. Instead of the philosophical terms recently introduced in theology, he prefers the ancient phrases, thus avoiding occasion for vexatious disputes and limiting himself to instructive and pious treatment of the subject. Amid the militant and turbulent literature of the fourth century, it is restful to peruse these pages marked by so calm a tone and so simple and touching an accent.

St. Aphraates

St. Aphraates wrote in Persia during the persecution. His sermons appeared about the year 345.[39] We possess few precise data about his life and the date of his death. A marginal note, found in an old manuscript, says he lived in a monastery north of Mosul. Probably he was clothed with the episcopal dignity and died a martyr.[40] The theology of Aphraates, the "Persian sage," as he has been called, possesses neither the breadth nor depth of the theology of the Greek Fathers. He seems to have been unaware of Arianism and the Council of Nicaea. At the time he was preaching his sermons, the religious disputes agitating the Roman world had not yet passed the frontiers of Persia. His testimony is the more precious because of its agreement with the doctrines maintained by St. Athanasius. In this respect the study of his sermons has great interest for the theologian.[41] Aphraates taught the adoration of Christ, the Son of God, as "equal to God," [42] as "sharing in the nature of God." [43] He does say that "above

[39] The fourteenth homily refers to disturbances that occurred in February and March 344.

[40] *Acta sanctorum,* November, II.

[41] It will be found in Graffin and Nau's *Patrologia syriaca,* published by Parisot and entitled *Aphraatis demonstrationes.* (Eight of the "Demonstrations" are translated in *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., vol. 13. Tr.)

[42] Aphraates, *Demonstrations,* I, 8.

[43] *Ibid.,* VI, 10.

the Son is the Father"; [44] but we cannot regard this as a trace of the Arian heresy, which he did not know, but as one of those Subordinationist phrases which are to be met with in the antenicene Fathers and which come, not so much from an inexact concept of the Trinity, as from the limitations of a theological diction still in formation.[45]

The idea which the venerable Bishop [46] gives of the Church is very beautiful. He shows it made up of all peoples and founded by Christ upon Peter, "the faithful witness set in the midst of the nations." [47] The Apostles John and James he calls "strong pillars of the Church," but Peter is its foundation.[48]

Aphraates furnishes valuable evidence in favor of the doctrine of original sin, the necessity of good works and of public penance. He describes the ceremonies of Baptism and the Eucharist, and refers to the sacrament of Holy Orders.

Persecution in Persia

Persecution continued to decimate the Christians of the Persian Empire. In 343, Narses, bishop of Sahrgerd, was decapitated along with his disciple Joseph. That same year Bishop John of Arbel was seized with the priest James and put in prison, from which he was brought forth a year later only to have his head cut off. A most dramatic scene of the persecution of this period was in 347, when five nuns of the village of Bakasa were put to death. Two of them were named Mary, the three others were called Thecla, Martha, and Anna. They

[44] *Ibid.*, IV, 5.

[45] The theologians had not yet sufficiently distinguished the order of relation of the Persons and the absolute equality of the substance.

[46] Considering the esteem which Aphraates already enjoyed at the beginning of Sapor's persecution, we must suppose him to be advanced in age in 345. Cf. J. Parisot, art. *"Aphraate"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1458.

[47] *Demonstrations,* XI, 12. Cf. VI, 15; X, 4.

[48] *Idem,* XXIII, 12.

were arrested at the same time as a priest, named Paul, who possessed great riches. The governor began by confiscating Paul's possessions. Then he said to him: "I will restore your property to you if you adore the sun." The unfortunate Paul loved his wealth more than his soul. He apostatized. But the governor, who was hopeful of retaining Paul's wealth by his refusal, was disappointed. He then said: "I shall not believe in the sincerity of your apostacy unless you slay these five virgins with your own hand." Paul, whose soul was already stained by mortal sin and dominated by the devil, did not refuse to pay the forfeit which aroused the horror even of the pagans. But he did not recover possession of his property. The governor had him strangled the next night so as to be sure of the wealth he coveted. The Church honors St. Thecla and her four companions on June 6.[49]

Despite every difficulty, a revival of learning and piety was manifest in the bosom of Christianity, when Constans' tragic death [50] in 350 left the government of the whole Empire to Constantius. The sectarian tyranny of Constantine's second son would now be without any check. There was good reason to fear for the peace of the Church.

[49] Assemani, *Acta sanctorum martyrum,* I, 123–127. On the historic value of these Acts, see Duval, *Littérature syriaque,* pp. 129 f.

[50] A troop of cavalry, under orders of the usurper Magnentius, overtook him near the Pyrenees just as he was preparing to enter Spain, and drove him to take his own life. "Thus perished that son of Constantine, without a struggle, without resistance, without in that empire, still filled with his father's name, a single voice being raised in his defence." De Broglie, *op. cit.,* III, 199.

CHAPTER VI

From the Death of Emperor Constans to the Coming of Julian the Apostate (350–361)

THE ten years that followed the death of Emperor Constans were curiously diversified. From the mere consideration of outward events, we might regard them as the height of semi-Arianism. An all-powerful emperor placing his sovereign authority at the service of heresy; a pope bowing before this victory, with apparent defection; the venerable Hosius, formerly president of the Council of Nicaea, seeming to revoke his great work; the two most valiant champions of the great Council, Athanasius and Hilary, brutally exiled; the Christian people disturbed by so many boastful victories, so many apparent defections, and so many undeserved misfortunes: such is the picture which, at first glance, strikes our eye and disconcerts us.

But a closer and deeper examination reassures us. The Arian party, in its very triumphs, is hopelessly divided. In the orthodox camp, at St. Athanasius' side appears St. Hilary. Both of them, active even in exile, defend the Church with an experience enriched by strife and with a courage tempered by trial. Popular sympathy, for a moment misplaced, withdraws from the Arians and the various sects forming around them. We have seen the true aspect of their tactics. More and more manifestly their success comes especially from the protection with which the imperial power covers their plots. A change in the views of that power will be enough to turn their triumph into utter defeat.

Political Disturbances

The death of Emperor Constans upset both the Empire and the Church. The transfer of Constans' power to Constantius was not accomplished without terrible disturbances. While Magnentius succeeded in having himself acknowledged Emperor by the greater part of the West, Constantine's two daughters, Eutropia and Constantina, stirred up rivals in opposition to him. Eutropia presented her son Nepotian to the Romans; in Illyricum Constantina had an old general acclaimed, one Vertranion, a man of limited intelligence, but honest, brave, loyal to the memory of the great Constantine, and ready, it was said, to defend that emperor's work to the very death.

Constantius, who was carrying on a formidable war in the East against King Sapor, found himself in a critical situation. Whatever might be the outcome of the conflicts in Rome and Illyricum, he felt the West on the point of slipping from his hands. He presently learned, however, that Magnentius, after a sanguinary battle, had recovered Rome, that Nepotian had perished in the fight and that Eutropia had been slain. At length he was able to turn his steps toward the province occupied by Vertranion and won him to his cause. The old general, dazzled and disconcerted by his lofty dignity and crushed by the crown he had placed on his own brow, promptly laid it down at the feet of Constantine's son. Only Magnentius remained opposed to him. Constantius pursued him through Italy and into Gaul where, in 353, near Lyons, the usurper, abandoned by a large number of his soldiers, took his own life. The unity of the Empire was now established in favor of Constantius. But the memory of all this anguish and all these strifes would keep the Emperor's character embittered and suspicious, more than ever inclined to jealous despotism.

Furthermore, the semi-Arians, upon seeing Constans' power

fall, could not repress the expression of their joy. Even to the very heart and center of orthodoxy, the West was at last in the hands of a ruler devoted to their cause. And Constantius had no longer a brother or rival to consider. Their schemes would henceforth have an open field before them.

Photinus of Sirmium

After Vertranion's abdication, at the beginning of 351, Emperor Constantius fixed his residence at Sirmium in Pannonia. This city, thereafter the real capital of the Empire, became the chief scene of the sect's plotting. The Church of Sirmium was governed by one of the most earnest foes of Arianism, Bishop Photinus. But the excessive doctrines of this prelate were, as we know, compromising for the orthodox party. For a long time the semi-Arians had endeavored to exploit his errors so as to ruin the cause of Athanasius. A new campaign against Photinus might seem futile; the Western bishops, at the Councils of Sardica and Milan,[1] had clearly condemned his theological errors by separating him from their communion. But a fresh manifestation seemed opportune to the enemies of orthodoxy.

The outstanding charge brought against the Catholics was that of being Sabellians. Photinus was at least suspect in this matter. The Emperor, upon setting foot in the West, had to declare himself against the Sabellian error. During the winter of 351 the leaders of the Eusebian party (including Basil of Ancyra, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, and Marcus of Arethusa) went to Sirmium and there held a synod. At this council Photinus was again condemned and a symbol of faith, followed by twenty-seven anathemas, was promulgated. This is the document known in history as the first formula of Sirmium. This symbol, which is recorded by St. Athanasius,

[1] The council at Milan was held in 347.

St. Hilary, and Socrates,[2] has an orthodox appearance, but it avoids the use of the word *homoousios* (consubstantial) and, in a general way, the Nicene terminology. After the synod, Constantius expelled Photinus from the city of Sirmium and sent him into exile.[3]

This first incident was merely the prelude to a campaign of intrigues that would be continued under the pontificate of Pope Liberius. In 352, two events increased the confidence of the Eusebian party: the death of Pope Julius (April 12, 352) and, soon afterwards, the second marriage of Constantius, this time to a young noblewoman of Thessalonica, Aurelia Eusebia. Pope Julius had always shown himself to be Athanasius' firmest support. His successor, Liberius, a priest of irreproachable virtue, did not seem to possess the same sagacity or prudence.

The new empress was a woman of cultured mind, who prided herself on being a philosopher and was fond of taking part in intellectual discussions. She was easily seduced by a system of religion that accorded so much to reason, so little to authority. The Arians were always wonderful adepts in winning women to their cause. Eusebia, combining a gentle graciousness with the resources of a brilliant mind and ambitious will, soon exercised a powerful influence over Constantius. Militant and domineering souls are often the first to surrender to these subtle charms. From that hour the Emperor's religious policy becomes somewhat feminine in its clever evasions. The son of Constantine will never be willing to abandon the formulas consecrated at Nicaea. Like his father, he will ever regard them as the untouchable laws of the Empire as well as of religion. But he will ceaselessly labor

[2] St. Athanasius, *De Synodis,* no. 27. The twenty-seven anathemas will be found in Hefele, II, 194–198.

[3] Socrates, II, 30. The condemnation of Photinus was later confirmed by several councils, notably by the Second Ecumenical Council. (Mansi, III, 386, 560; XII, 41.)

to destroy the Nicene party, that resists him, to the advantage of the antinicene party, that flatters him. The famous "formulas of Sirmium," which are issued one after the other and are more and more misleading, will be the principal landmarks of that policy, which is inspired by Eusebia and always benefits the semi-Arian party.

Calumniation of St. Athanasius

But the question of doctrinal formulas was temporarily laid aside. At first the whole aim of the Eusebians was to bring about the condemnation of Athanasius and obtain ecclesiastical communion with the West.

With confident reliance on their new backing, they hurled themselves upon Athanasius as upon their prey. As formerly, there was an outburst of denunciations and atrocious calumnies. Pope Liberius and Emperor Constantius were won at the same time. The Bishop of Alexandria, so it was charged, had played the part of an agitator and traitor during the late political happenings. It was said that he was seen to have stirred up Constans against Constantius and was an accomplice of the usurper Magnentius. Thus despising the laws of the Church as well as those of the Empire, he had, so they said, celebrated the divine service upon imperial ground not yet consecrated and had thus committed an encroachment of lese-majesty as well as a sacrilegious profanation. But there was not the least truth in these charges. Certain views and certain deeds, altogether beyond blame, were altered and thus exploited: the relations of courtesy which Emperor Constans had with the Patriarch during these latter years; a deputation, unsuccessful though it was, which Magnentius sent to the Bishop of Alexandria, as to many other bishops, to beg his support; and the celebration of a liturgical function per-

formed, in a case of urgency, in a church that had not yet been solemnly consecrated.[4] But the Eusebians' emissaries were instructed to comment upon these events in such a manner as to ruin Athanasius in the mind of the Pope and of the Emperor.

If we may credit a letter contained in the works of St. Hilary, Liberius was at first tricked by the calumnies, summoned Athanasius to Rome, and, upon the latter's refusal to come, broke off communion with him and accepted that of the Easterners. But the best critics reject the genuineness of the letter.[5] Moreover, the friends of Athanasius did not remain inactive. Eighty bishops sent the Pope a memorial in favor of the Bishop of Alexandria. It seems Liberius then held a council at Rome to hear the case,[6] but the affair was of such great importance and had such widespread bearings in East and West that the Pope thought it well to settle it by a great council. He intended to have it meet at Aquileia and for this purpose asked the practically indispensable permission of the Emperor.

Beginning in October 353, Constantius had made his residence at Arles in Gaul. There it was he received the two papal legates: Marcellus, bishop of Campania, and Vincent, bishop of Capua. The latter is the one who, although only a priest then, had represented the Pope at Nicaea, along with Hosius.

[4] St. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium.*

[5] This is the famous letter *Studens pacis* (*P. L.* X, 678 f.). On the apocryphal character of this letter, see Coustant, the scholarly editor of the works of St. Hilary, *P. L.*, X, 679, and Hefele, II, 200 ff. Even were the letter authentic, as Duchesne and Feder are inclined to think, it does not furnish a proof of the supposed facts mentioned in it. For this letter, written several years after the event by the pope, or rather by one of his secretaries who was asking for the termination of the pope's exile, had as its purpose, as Duchesne remarks, to represent Liberius' recent rupture with Athanasius, as an old affair. (Duchesne, *Libère et Fortunatien,* in the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire of the École française de Rome,* 1908, p. 31.)

[6] St. Hilary, *Fragmentum* V, no. 2, *P. L.,* X, 683; St. Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium,* nos. 19 f.

Liberius' two envoys placed in the Emperor's hands the writings that Rome had received for and against Athanasius.[7]

Council of Arles (353)

Constantius would have been glad to see Athanasius' case promptly decided by a council, but on condition that he have the council under his hand and be able to make it declare a severe condemnation against the Bishop of Alexandria. The choice of Arles as the meeting-place quite agreed with his wishes. He had just appointed as its bishop one of his creatures, Saturninus, a man of ordinary ability, but an ambitious flatterer. A partisan of Arianism under the preceding emperors, he had shown himself a zealous propagator of the heresy as soon as Constantius, when sole master of the Empire, openly manifested his heterodoxical tendencies. It was through Saturninus and a few of his friends that Arianism won part of the Provençal population. This court prelate later on, after disturbing the Church of Gaul by his machinations, was deposed in a council held at Paris in 361 and was declared unworthy of the title of bishop.[8] In the Emperor's entourage were also two bishops, Ursacius of Singidunum [9] and Valens of Mursa, who would afterwards play an even sadder part.[10] Constantius told the papal legates he intended that the Council should meet in the city of Arles, not at Aquileia.

When the bishops were assembled, he offered them a decree all prepared and probably drawn up by Valens and Ursacius;

[7] Mansi, III, 200; St. Hilary, *Fragmentum* VI, nos. 2 f., *P. L.*, X, 687 f.

[8] *Histoire générale du Languedoc*, vol. I, bk. 3; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. I.

[9] Now Belgrade.

[10] It was said that Valens, bishop of Mursa in Mysia, when Magnentius suffered his decisive defeat, had reported the event to Constantius as though he received it from an angel, and thus won the emperor's favor. (Sulpicius Severus, *History*, chap. 38.)

it was the condemnation of Athanasius. In vain Vincent and Marcellus, the Pope's legates, protested, declaring that the doctrinal questions should take precedence over questions of individuals and asking that at least, before decreeing the personal condemnation of Athanasius, they should condemn the doctrine of Arius. Constantius intervened in person and urged with threats, even with force, that the bishops sign the document submitted to them. They all yielded, including the papal legates—all except one bishop. This was Paulinus of Treves, whom the Emperor banished to Phrygia. There Paulinus died in 368 amidst all sorts of privations and sufferings. Pope Liberius was much afflicted by the defection of his legates, in particular by that of Bishop Vincent, and he wrote to Hosius, saying: "I am crushed by the excessive grief which this weakness causes me. Would that I might die for God so that I too might not be taken for a traitor and might not seem to approve doctrines which the Church condemns." [11]

Council of Milan (355)

The Pontiff, to free himself from blame, addressed several bishops of the West to the same purpose. He did more; he sent to Constantius another delegation, commissioned to deliver a plain-spoken and dignified letter to the Emperor [12] and to ask that he assemble a new council. But it was soon evident that the Emperor's prompt acquiescence to the Pope's proposal concealed a desire to make his own sovereign will triumph again in a larger council.

At Milan the scenes of violence were still more outrageous than at Arles. Ursacius and Valens spoke as masters in the

[11] St. Hilary, *Fragmentum* VI, no. 3, *P. L.*, X, 688; Mansi, III, 201.

[12] This important letter will be found in Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, I, 871 f., note.

Council. Valens, when Dionysius of Milan was about to sign the Nicene symbol, rushed to his side and, snatching the pen from him, said: "That will not be done." After Lucifer of Cagliari declared that all the soldiers of the Empire would not make him sign an impious decree, and after the orthodox bishops had announced they would do nothing against the canons of the Church, Constantius said to them: "My will is the canon." This was a crude declaration of the Caesaro-papal thesis. He added that he put himself forward as the accuser of Athanasius. The orthodox bishops courageously replied: "How can you, who did not witness the incidents which form the grounds of the complaint, be his accuser, he being himself absent?"

But, as at Arles, threats and violence finally received the votes of the majority. Dionysius of Milan, Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, and the two other Roman envoys were the only ones that did not yield. They were at once loaded with chains and banished to different far-off regions. Seeing them pass, in chains like criminals, people generally showed them much sympathy and, in several places, did not conceal their hatred for a sect which thus treated the ministers of Christ. They were also comforted by a touching letter from Pope Liberius.[13]

The persecutions did not cease with the Council. For the purpose of making the lower clergy and the faithful consent to communion with the Arians, in most cities the municipal officials, acting under imperial orders, repeated the scenes of violence that had taken place at Milan. Many weakened. And yet, as Athanasius remarks, the people were not Arian. On the contrary, he says, "all avoid the antichristian heresy as they would a serpent." [14]

[13] *Idem*, I, 876.

[14] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians*, no. 41 (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., IV, 284).

Courage of Pope Liberius

Three men, however, still remained firm and free in the tyrant's presence: Pope Liberius, the venerable Hosius, then almost a hundred years old, and Athanasius. Constantius determined to make them bend before him or crush them.

First he addressed the Pope. He sent one of his closest intimates, the eunuch Eusebius, with orders to make the Pope condemn Athanasius and hold communion with the Arians. Liberius declined to obey either command. The eunuch insisted, offered gold, which was indignantly refused, and brought this gold into St. Peter's Church. The Pope forbade the treasurer of the basilica to accept the offering. Eusebius flew into a rage and set out for Milan after uttering direful threats.

Shortly after this, Liberius was seized at night and brought to the imperial court under heavy guard. Theodoret has left us a sketch of the dialogue that took place between the Pope and the Emperor.

Constantius: "We have judged it right, as you are a Christian and the bishop of our city, to send for you in order to admonish you to abjure all connection with the folly and wickedness of Athanasius. For it was in this light that his conduct was viewed by the whole world, when he was separated from the communion of the Church by the synod."

Liberius: "O Emperor, ecclesiastical sentences ought to be enacted with justice: therefore, if it be pleasing to your piety, order the judges to assemble; and if it be seen that Athanasius deserves condemnation, then let sentence be passed upon him according to ecclesiastical forms. No man ought to be condemned without being examined."

Constantius: "The whole universe has condemned him."

Liberius: "Those who signed the condemnation were not eyewitnesses of anything that occurred; but were actuated by the desire of glory, and by the fear of ignominy."

Epictetus the Bishop: "O Emperor, it is not on behalf of the faith, nor in defense of the ecclesiastical judgments, that Liberius is pleading; but merely in order that he may boast before the Roman senators of having, by his arguments, turned the Emperor from his purpose."

The Emperor (addressing Liberius): "What portion do you constitute of the universe, that you desire to destroy the peace of the whole world in order to defend one solitary wicked individual?"

Liberius: "If I were standing alone, the cause of truth would not be less important. There was once a period when only three persons could be found sufficiently courageous to resist the royal mandate." [15]

Liberius remained firm. He was granted three days in which to decide. This delay he declined, as also the pecuniary help which the Emperor, the Empress, and the eunuch Eusebius offered. The Emperor, hoping that Liberius' firmness would be overcome by exile, privations, and separation from all his friends, had him brought to the city of Beroea in Thrace, far from all his friends and from his companions in misfortune, and confided him there to one of the leaders of the Arian party, Bishop Demophilus. Then he gave orders to put the deacon Felix in Liberius' place in the pontifical see.[16]

Banishment of Bishop Hosius

Hosius, bishop of Cordova, so they thought, would be more easily persuaded. His great age, the important events in which he had participated, the wounds he had received for the faith, gave him a considerable influence in the Christian world. He was called "the prince of the councils," "the father of the Nicene symbol." Constantius sent for him and, by countless means, tried to seduce him. After listening to the Emperor, the venerable Bishop spoke. Not only did he refuse to make

[15] Theodoret, bk. 2, chap. 13 (*alias* 16). Sozomen, IV, 11, had at his hand the official report of this interview.

[16] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* chap. 75; Sozomen, IV, 11.

any concession, but he sharply rebuked the sovereign for his conduct. He spoke with such impressive authority that Constantius was deeply moved and allowed him to return to Spain.

Later the Arians, dissatisfied with this solution, were insistent in their urging of the Emperor. The latter wrote Hosius several letters, in the hope of persuading him to condemn the Bishop of Alexandria. The aged Bishop of Cordova finally replied to the Emperor. His letter begins as follows:

"Hosius to Constantius the Emperor sends health in the Lord. I was a confessor at the first, when a persecution arose in the time of your grandfather Maximian; and if you shall persecute me, I am ready now, too, to endure anything rather than to betray the truth. Cease to write thus; adopt not the cause of Arius, nor listen to those in the East. . . . Cease these proceedings, I beseech you, and remember that you are a mortal man. Be afraid of the day of judgment. . . . Intrude not yourself into ecclesiastical matters. God has put into your hands the kingdom; to us He has entrusted the affairs of His Church. It is written, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' " [17]

Constantius had Hosius brought to Sirmium and kept him there in exile, subjecting him to all kinds of ill treatment.[18]

St. Athanasius in Egypt

Athanasius remained to be dealt with. To subdue him by threats or promises seemed impossible. To seize him by force appeared no less hopeless. His popularity was immense. The feeling aroused by his arrest would be the greater since, as everybody knew, Constantius had solemnly agreed never to desert him. Athanasius would leave Alexandria only of his own accord or through the wish of his friends. Therefore one or other of these expedients must be resorted to. Early in

[17] St. Athanasius, *op. cit.*, chap. 44. Leclercq (*L'Espagne chrétienne*, pp. 112–116) gives us Hosius' letter complete.

[18] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

February, 356, an uprising was provoked in Alexandria. During the night of February 8, five thousand men, led by Duke Syrianus, who was devoted to the Arians, surrounded the Church of Theonas, where the Bishop was celebrating one of those night offices called vigils. Some people recruited from the dregs of the population, mingling with the soldiers, suddenly burst into the church. Several of the faithful were killed, many were wounded. Athanasius, sitting on his episcopal throne, refused to leave. But the people, driven back by the bandits, urged him. With great difficulty his friends extricated him and brought him, half-stifled, beyond the church precincts and thence outside the city. There he was kept hidden. The Emperor's purpose was attained. It was now possible to say that Athanasius had fled and to dispose of his see in favor of an Arian.[19]

A certain George of Cappadocia was installed in his place. He was a coarse, brutal fellow. At the feast of Easter 357 he entered one of the churches at the head of a body of soldiers, as one enters a citadel. For all Athanasius' friends in Alexandria there was a reign of terror during a period of eighteen months.

For some time it was not known what had become of Athanasius. He remained in hiding near Alexandria for a few days; then he went to the desert places of Upper Egypt. The monks welcomed as a father him whom St. Pachomius had so highly honored, to whom the dying St. Antony had bequeathed his tunic. Continually in flight, continually pursued, but always protected by the silent and unfailing loyalty of his hosts, many of whom suffered martyrdom rather than betray him,[20] he wandered from one desert place to another during all the rest of Constantius' reign, that is, for six years.

[19] See the account of this scene, written by St. Athanasius, in Leclercq, *Les Martyrs*, III, 48–57.

[20] *Acta sanctorum*, May, III, 330. Cf. *Annales du Musée Guimet*, XVII, 679 f.

More than once his enemies almost caught him. The devotedness of his friends, his own wonderful coolness, and a special protection of Providence rescued him from every danger. One evening, as he was going up the Nile in a little boat, he heard the sound of oars behind him. It was a galley of the imperial police force. Someone called out to him: "Have you seen Athanasius?" "I think so," he answered, disguising his voice; "he is ahead of you, row fast." The galley passed him, and he himself reached his place of retreat.

The holy Bishop gladly shared the life of the cenobites and hermits. Frequently invited to address them, he sometimes preached to them about love of the interior life and of study or he narrated his struggles against the Arians, or related some details from the life of their holy patriarch Antony whom he knew so well and loved so much. His picturesque *History of the Arians* and his simple, moving *Life of St. Antony* still preserve the flavor of the talks in which he sketched these two works. Other books also he wrote in the desert: the *Apology for his Flight,* the *Letters to Serapion,* the *Letter on the Death of Arius,* the *Letters to the Monks,* and the book *On the Synods,* in which he made advances to the moderate portion of his adversaries. Especially noteworthy is the *Apology to Emperor Constantius* in which, after adducing many arguments, facts and probabilities which belied the calumnies uttered against him, without complaining of his exile and sufferings he begs God to enlighten the Emperor's mind. We may form some notion of the spirit of this writing by the following passage in which he denies that he had corresponded with the usurper Magnentius: "You blame me for having written to that infernal Magnentius. Christ is my witness that I do not know him. And how could I have started a letter to that man? By saying: 'You have done well to kill him who heaped honors upon me'? or: 'I love you for butchering those at Rome who were so devoted to me'?"

St. Hilary

St. Athanasius' voice was not the only one heard by the Emperor to remind him of his duties toward the Church. In 355, at the worst period of the persecution, when Constantius had banished Liberius and Hosius and was planning to rid himself of Athanasius, an eloquent protest reached him from the West, in its form not so spirited as that of the Bishop of Alexandria, but equally strong and urgent. "Blessed Augustus," it said, "I implore you, not with words, but with tears, that you no longer permit the Catholic Church to be outraged. . . . It is not right that anyone should forcibly constrain men to submit to masters who everywhere sow the impure germs of adulterous doctrine. Bishops are imprisoned, the faithful enchained, virgins outraged. . . . From your Piety we especially ask that these eminent confessors, these bishops, who have been sent into exile or who have sought refuge in the desert, may resume their sees and that in this way liberty and joy may again reign everywhere." Then follows a eulogy of the chief victims of the persecution: Paulinus of Treves, Dionysius of Milan, Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Athanasius of Alexandria.[21]

The author of the courageous petition was a young bishop whom the choice of the people and clergy had just put at the head of the diocese of Poitiers. This champion of the faith, who would be called the "Rhone of Latin eloquence" and "the Athanasius of the West," was born between 310 and 320[22] in a small town of Gaul. His name was Hilary. He was descended from a noble family that educated him in the culture of ancient letters and the practices of idolatry. But one day the young patrician felt rising in his conscience a dread ques-

[21] St. Hilary, *Ad Constantium,* I, 6.

[22] Largent, *Saint Hilaire,* p. 1. St. Hilary must have been born in the vicinity of Poitiers.

tion: What is the purpose of life? In his book *De Trinitate,* he himself relates the inner drama that led him to the Christian faith.

"It is unworthy of humanity," he writes, "to hold that this life was granted without the power of progress towards immortality; a life, indeed, which then we should confidently assert did not deserve to be regarded as a gift of God. . . . My soul was inflamed with a passionate desire to apprehend God or to know Him." [23]

But where was he to find authoritative teaching about God? The young pagan consulted the teachings of paganism. "Some," he says, "speak of numerous families of gods. Others make a distinction between the great gods and the lesser gods. Most of them, while affirming the existence of a Divinity, declare it not concerned with human affairs or merely adore that nature which is revealed in the motion and chance of atoms. . . . But my soul regarded as certain that the eternal, divine Being is necessarily simple and unique and that He has no principle or element outside of Himself." [24]

"While I was considering these things within myself, my eyes fell upon books which the religion of the Hebrews hold to be writings of Moses and the prophets."

Hilary then relates how he found in these books the answer he was waiting for, how one after another were revealed to him the various attributes of the Divinity; His absolute unity, His eternity, His infinity, His supreme beauty, and His inexhaustible goodness.

Hilary's soul was not yet fully satisfied. The problem of God had its solution, but that of man's destiny and his relations with God was not yet answered. The reading of St. John's Gospel solved it for the young patrician, and did so in the very first lines of the sacred Book: "In the beginning

[23] St. Hilary, *On the Trinity,* I, 1 f.
[24] St. Hilary, *Ad Constantium,* I, 4.

was the Word, and the Word was with God. . . . And the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us." "Upon reading these lines," says Hilary, "my mind went beyond its own limits and grasped more than it dared hope about God. It learned that its Creator is God of God, that the Word is God from the beginning. It recognized that the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us, and that His glory was seen, full of grace and truth." [25] Hilary had found the full truth. He did not yet know the Arian heresy. But already he was in possession of the principles that would serve him for its refutation.

As to the exact date of Hilary's baptism or of his elevation to the bishopric of Poitiers, we are left to conjecture. According to his own testimony, in 355 he had been bishop for some time.[26] We know also, on his own authority, that when the acclaim of the people and clergy called him to the bishopric, he was married. The law of continency was at that time rigorously imposed upon the clergy. "Hilary's wife, giving an example that has found many an emulator, resolved never more to look upon her husband except when he was at the altar, transfigured in the flame of the sacrifice, and henceforth to love him only as a daughter or sister." [27]

The new bishop's first care was to give his people a solid knowledge of the Christian faith. His first work, a *Commentary on Matthew,* composed about 355,[28] contains his instructions preached at the beginning of his episcopate.[29] Soon the echo of the Arian disputes reached Poitiers. The Council of

[25] *Ibid.,* I, 10.

[26] St. Hilary, *De Synodis,* no. 91.

[27] Largent, *Saint Hilaire,* p. 19. See St. Hilary's charming letter to his daughter Abra, on pp. 55–59.

[28] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 407.

[29] Hilary initiated the science of exegesis in the West. The only commentators we know of before him are Victorinus of Pettau, Reticius bishop of Autun, and Fortunatian bishop of Aquileia. Of the writings of Victorinus we have nothing but St. Jerome's revision of his commentary on the Apocalypse. Reticius' and Fortunatian's commentaries are totally lost. St. Jerome read them; and he says he was not satisfied with them.

Arles, which condemned St. Athanasius in 355, and the activities of Bishop Saturninus of Arles, who wanted to follow up the success obtained by the Arian party and to force the error upon the whole Church of Gaul, aroused Hilary's zeal for the orthodox faith. The violent deeds of these heretics, no less than their doctrine, made Hilary indignant. He convoked an assembly of Gallic bishops and persuaded them to withdraw from the communion of the Arians. Then he wrote to Emperor Constantius the courageous letter we have mentioned.

Saturninus answered this excommunication by denouncing Hilary to the Emperor as a dangerous agitator; then, in agreement with Ursacius and Valens, he assembled a council at Beziers early in 356. Hilary and the orthodox bishops attended and there endeavored to defend the cause of Athanasius. But Saturninus and his friends would not listen to anything on this point. Says St. Hilary: "Those people would have tried to deceive Christ Himself." [30] The division of the Gallic episcopate into two parties continued. Soon afterwards Saturninus rejoiced at the publication of a decree by Constantius banishing Hilary of Poitiers and Rhodanius of Toulouse to Phrygia. Rhodanius died soon after reaching his place of exile. Hilary remained in banishment three years. During that period he matured his theological ideas, wrote his great work *On the Trinity,* and composed his first hymns. The original title of his work on the Trinity was *Concerning the Faith, against the Arians.* It was written between 356 and 359. Says Bardenhewer:

"The entire work is a sustained and intensely enthusiastic plea for the faith of the Church. In the domain of early ecclesiastical literature it is certainly the most imposing of all the works written

[30] St. Hilary, *Contra Constantium,* no. 2. On the Council of Beziers, see Douais, *L'Église des Gaules et le conciliabule de Béziers.*

against Arianism. He bases his arguments on the speculative thought of the Greek Fathers, but he does not, therefore, cease to be a writer of independence and originality. . . . His diction is always pithy and dignified. . . . It is true that the average reader of Hilary finds his language difficult, but this, however, is to be attributed not to obscurity of style, but to the depth and boldness of the ideas he is expressing." [31]

Hilary was a poet as well as a philosopher. In Phrygia, when listening to the singing of the Greek hymns, he was prompted to write his first lyrical compositions. Three recently discovered poetical works of Hilary [32] give us an idea of the measured elegance of his poetry. The following are a few strophes of his *Morning Hymn:*

"O Thou who art the morning star,
Not that whose paltry, feeble ray
Announces dawn's approach;

O Thou, more brilliant than the sun,
Thou light supreme, unclouded day,
Illumine all my soul.

Creator, beam of Father's light,
Our hearts inflood and penetrate,
With grace and holiness."

The *Evening Hymn* begins as follows:

"My eyes which heavy faults weigh down,
Unworthy I to raise aloft
And gaze upon the stars.

[31] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 405.

[32] They were published in 1887 by Gamurrini, *S. Hilarii Tractatus de mysteriis et hymni.*

O Christ, Thy tender pity show,
Thy gracious mercy now bestow
On souls by Thee redeemed.

Required good I've left undone,
And evil deeds I've oft performed.
O Christ, be Thou my aid."

Then follows this anathema of heresy:

"I curse the blasphemies, that spoke
Sabellius and Arius.
These Simons I heed not."

From the depth of exile, the voices of Hilary and Athanasius were still heard refuting and denouncing Arius. But, among the bishops still in office, none any longer dared echo these refutations and anathemas. Terror had spread through the whole Empire. Saturninus, Ursacius, and Valens in the West, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and George of Laodicea in the East, exercised a sort of insolent and annoying police surveillance over their fellow-bishops. Every prelate suspected of loyalty to the *homoousios* formula or of sympathy toward Athanasius, was denounced as guilty of Sabellianism and of treason to the Empire. Each denunciation was followed by prompt and terrible penalties. Striking examples of this were seen in the banishment of Pope Liberius, Paulinus of Treves, Athanasius, and many others. To all human seeming, the cause of orthodoxy was lost.

Disagreements among the Arians

Yet the victory of Arianism, in proportion as it appeared more assured, revealed deep splits among the heterodox. According as the bonds created and maintained by a common

campaign became relaxed, the diversity of tendencies and doctrines appeared among the enemies of Athanasius and Hilary. At first, in their ranks, were found out-and-out Arians, who denied none of the heresiarch's theories, but who were forced by circumstances to dissimulate their views. They reappeared with the logic of their heretical deductions, having at their head Aetius and Eunomius. Aetius was a former goldsmith or blacksmith. Having been caught in the flagrant theft of some valuable article and being obliged to quit his trade, he entered upon the study of medicine and Aristotle's philosophy. Finding that he possessed remarkable qualities as a dialectician, he used them to push Arius' most extreme ideas to their logical consequence. He openly opposed the leaders of the Eusebian party, Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste. Meanwhile he won the confidence of Caesar Gallus and became the catechist of Gallus' young brother Julian, the future Apostate.

Aetius was only a deacon. But soon his doctrines assumed considerable importance in the Church through the elevation of one of his disciples, Eunomius, to the episcopal see of Cyzicus in Mysia. Eunomius, in his youth, had tried various careers and decided upon the ecclesiastical state only after his first dealings with Aetius in 356. So great did his influence presently become that people began giving the name "Eunomians" to those who professed rigid Arianism and who previously were called "Aetians." They were also known as "Anomoeans" because they taught that the Son is unlike (ἀνόμοιος) God, "Heterousians" because they held that He is of another substance (ἑτέρας οὐσίας), and "Excocontians" because they held that He was drawn from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων). Fundamentally the Anomoeans would not admit any generation in God because they conceived Him in a purely abstract manner, as indivisibly one and absolutely simple, almost in

the same way as the eighteenth century philosophers conceive the Supreme Being.[33]

The semi-Arians recognized Basil of Ancyra, Marcellus' successor, as their leader. They were also called Eusebians because their party was connected, in origin, with Eusebius of Nicomedia. The name "Homeousians" or "Homoiousiasts" was likewise given them because they wished to substitute for *homoousios* (consubstantial) of the Nicene Council the word *homoiousios,* almost identical with the other word, but not indicating with the same exactness the nature of the relations between the Father and the Son. Although their system was not so far removed from orthodox doctrine, yet, because of their intrigues, their ambiguous formulas, and the favor they enjoyed at court, they were not less to be dreaded than the Anomoeans.

Closer to orthodoxy, and also called Eusebians, were men heartily devoted to the symbol of Nicaea, but persuaded that the word *homoousios* (consubstantial) was dangerous, as favoring Sabellianism. The affair of Marcellus of Ancyra, the condemnation of Photinus, and the lack of exactness in the words *ousia* and *hypostasis* (substance and person) at that time, seemed to confirm those assertions. Lastly, some people who were deceived by the calumnies about Athanasius, and some people accustomed to take their stand, without investigation, on the side of the government, made up a considerable remainder of the party that claimed connection with Eusebius and the Emperor. But these latter could not be counted on very solidly. When the Eusebians and the Anomoeans were battling each other, most of those who adhered to the sect only through misunderstandings, withdrew from it and swelled the ranks of the orthodox.

[33] Hefele, II, 219 ff.

The Anomoean Creed

The first manifestation of the rigid Arians was the profession of faith known as the second formula of Sirmium. It was drawn up by an assembly of exclusively Western bishops during Emperor Constantius' sojourn at Sirmium in 357. It rejected the *homoousios* of the Nicene Creed and the *homoiousios* of the semi-Arians. It declared that the Father is greater than the Son, that the Son is subject to Him in all things, and that the Holy Ghost exists only through the Son. From his exile Hilary called this formula simply blasphemy. As to Hosius, now almost a hundred years old, whom the Emperor still kept in exile at the court, advantage was taken of his weakened mind and will [34] to make him sign the new symbol. The former president of the Councils of Nicaea and Sardica yielded, it was said, to the brutalities exercised upon him by Constantius himself. It was an easy victory and not a very glorious one. Shortly afterwards the Bishop of Cordova, feeling the approach of death, publicly anathematized Arius and protested against the violence to which he himself had been subjected.[35]

Council of Ancyra (358)

The semi-Arians, however, not wishing to remain under the odium of the condemnation pronounced against them by the Council of Sirmium, decided at the suggestion of one of their number, George of Laodicea, to meet in council. The gathering, made up exclusively of Eastern bishops, took place in the city of Ancyra, on Easter 358, under the presidency of Basil of Ancyra, the most notable personage and most learned the-

[34] Hosius did not take part in the last councils. He was present neither at Arles in 353 nor at Milan in 355. Probably his poor health prevented his coming.

[35] Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne,* p. 130.

ologian of the party. It issued several anathemas against the Anomoean doctrines. Then it sent a delegation to the Emperor, still in residence at Sirmium, and obtained from him the summoning of another council to be held in Sirmium.

Council of Sirmium (358)

The council took place in the summer of 358 and adopted a declaration known as the third Sirmium formulary. This new profession of faith, directed against the Anomoeans, contained in its phrases nothing unorthodox, but, in defining the relations between the Father and the Son, it did not use the word *homoousios*. This council and its formulary would not require our attention except for the fact that the historian Sozomen mentions in connection with it an incident which history cannot pass over in silence. According to Sozomen, "who seems to have had first-hand and official documents on the matter," [36] a stranger arrived at the Council, which was almost exclusively composed of the bishops surrounding the Emperor.[37] This stranger's presence at once gave the synod a special importance. It was Pope Liberius, the exile of Beroea.

Question of Pope Liberius

Constantius had just terminated Liberius' banishment and requested him to take part in the Council of Sirmium. Perhaps it was convoked only on his account. They began by asking him—we are still following Sozomen's account—to condemn the doctrine of the *homoousios* (*i. e.*, the consubstantiality of the Word). The aged pontiff refused to do so. Then Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Eleusios of Cyzicus

[36] Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, I, 209.

[37] The court of Sirmium seems to have been constantly encumbered by numerous bishops.

explained that the word *homoousios* was very dangerous, that it had been used by Paul of Samosata and by Photinus to spread their errors, and that two Councils of Antioch had rejected it. The Pope yielded to these arguments and signed the formulary. Yet he thought it necessary to declare that "those who affirm that the Son is not like unto the Father in substance and in all other respects, are excommunicated." [38]

In the very words of the historian who is the most explicit on this subject, such is the famous incident of "the fall of Pope Liberius" at the third Council of Sirmium. The simple narrative of the events amply demonstrates that the old pontiff, by affixing his signature, through ignorance or fear, to a formulary drawn up by semi-Arians, did not abandon a particle of the orthodox faith. Still less could we say that he purposed setting forth an *ex cathedra* definition of faith. But was not this event preceded by a defection at Beroea? That is another question, and one far less clear.

St. Athanasius, in his *History of the Arians,* written for the monks of Egypt, declares that "Liberius, after he had been in banishment two years, gave way and from fear of threatened death, subscribed." [39] St. Hilary writes, in his *Contra Constantium:* "You have carried the war even to Rome, you have snatched away its bishop, and I know not whether you were not more impious in sending him back than in banishing him." [40] In the *Historical Fragments* of St. Hilary, which are probably merely the remains of a vast work on the history of the Councils of Rimini and Seleucia,[41] are found still more significant evidences.[42] From these documents we may conclude that Liberius, worn out by his exile and circumvented by the Arian Bishop Demophilus, obtained his freedom and

[38] Sozomen, IV, 15.
[39] St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians,* no. 41.
[40] St. Hilary, *Contra Constantium,* no. 11.
[41] Wilmart, in the *Revue bénédictine,* April and July, 1907.
[42] St. Hilary, *Fragmenta, P. L.,* X, 678–681, 683–695.

his return to Rome by promising to separate from Athanasius and hold communion with the semi-Arians.

Bossuet, along with Fleury and Tillemont, credited the importance of all this evidence. But he did not tremble for the honor of the Roman Church. In his *Second Pastoral Instruction on the Promises of the Church,* he writes: "What shall we say of the fall of Liberius? Did the Church preserve her succession when a pope rejected the communion of Athanasius, entered into communion with the Arians, and subscribed to a confession of faith in which the Nicene faith was suppressed? Can you believe that the succession of the Church was interrupted by the fall of one pope, when we are certain of the fact that he yielded only to open force and that of his own accord he returned to his duty? Every act extorted by violence is null. Moreover, it is certain that this pope, after straying for a few months, returned to his first dispositions and completed his pontificate, which was a long one, in communion with a St. Athanasius, a St. Basil, and the others of like merit and repute. We know he is praised by St. Epiphanius and by St. Ambrose, who twice calls him 'Pope Liberius of holy memory.' " [43]

Since Bossuet's time the documents on which Tillemont and Fleury depended have been critically reviewed. Hefele does not accept the authenticity of the fragments attributed to St. Hilary. This view is held by recent critics, who even see Arian interpolations in the testimony of St. Athanasius and other writers we have just cited. It seems to them that Constantius, in recalling Liberius from exile, was merely yielding to the demands of the Roman population, as Sozomen relates.[44] The enthusiastic welcome given the Pope on his return

[43] Bossuet, *Seconde instruction pastorale sur les promesses de l'Église* (Lachat ed., XVII, 217 f.). The Pope's temporary weakness or mistake was like that of Pope Pius VII at Fontainebleau.

[44] Sozomen, IV, 15.

from exile, according to Socrates, corroborates this view.[45] Would such a gala reception have been accorded a pope who owed his liberation to a doctrinal defection? In a word, the learned editor of the *Liber pontificalis,* although holding to the pope's defection at Beroea, acknowledges that the contrary opinion "may be defended." [46] This defection "is not proved by unanswerable arguments." [47]

Antipope Felix

After the conclusion of the Council of Sirmium,

"Constantius permitted Liberius to return to Rome. The bishops who were then convened at Sirmium wrote to Felix who governed the Roman Church, and to the Roman clergy, desiring them to receive Liberius; they directed that Felix and Liberius should share the apostolic throne and be associated together without dissension in the discharge of the ministerial functions, and that whatever illegalities might have occured in the ordination of the one or the banishment of the other, might be buried in oblivion. The people of Rome regarded Liberius as a good man and esteemed him highly on account of the courage he had evinced in opposing the Emperor,[48] so that they had even excited seditions on his account." [49] Theodoret supplies the following detail: "The edict of the Emperor was read

[45] Socrates, II, 37.

[46] Duchesne, *Libère et Fortunatien,* in the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* published by the *École française de Rome,* 1908, p. 64.

[47] Jacques Zeiller, *La Question du pape Libère,* in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne,* January 15, 1913, p. 51. Saltet (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* 1905, pp. 222 ff., 279 ff.), Fedele Savio, S. J. (*La Questione del papa Liberio*), and Chapman (*Revue bénédictine,* January, April, July, 1910) maintain that Liberius was free from any fall at Beroea and from desertion of Athanasius. The contrary view is held by Duchesne (*op. cit.*), Wilmart (*Revue bénédictine,* 1908, p. 360), and Feder, S.J., in his work preparatory to the *Fragmenta* of St. Hilary, published in the Vienna *Corpus.* Cf. Savio, *Novi studii sulla questione del papa Liberio,* and *Punti controversi nella questione del papa Liberio.*

[48] Καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν τὸν Λυβέριον καὶ ἀνδρείως ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος ἀντειπόντα τῷ βασιλεῖ. *P. G.,* LXVII, 1152.

[49] Sozomen, IV, 15.

in the race-course, and the multitude shouted, that the imperial regulation was just, that the spectators were divided into two factions, each deriving its name from its own color, and that each faction would now have its own bishop. After having thus ridiculed the edict of the Emperor, they all exclaimed with one voice: 'There is but one God, one Christ, one bishop.' " [50] Sozomen relates that "Felix survived but a short time; and Liberius found himself in sole possession of the Church. This event was, no doubt, ordained by God, that the seat of Peter might not be dishonored by the occupancy of two bishops; for such an arrangement, being contrary to ecclesiastical law, would certainly have been a source of discord." [51]

Although the semi-Arians could not boast of winning the pope, yet they had won a real victory over the Anomoeans, or rigid Arians. And they eagerly took advantage of it. Basil of Ancyra, making use of his influence with certain women of rank at court, had rigorous measures adopted. The principal leaders of the Anomoean party, Aetius and Eunomius, were sent to Phrygia; seventy of their followers were exiled. Following these events, several of those who professed radical Arianism abandoned it and joined the ranks of the semi-Arians. Of this number was Macedonius, the bishop of Constantinople, who later became the head of the sect bearing his name.[52]

Most of these rigorous steps were taken without the Emperor's knowledge. He did not approve of them. Such spirited disputes were bound to disturb the tranquillity of the Empire. He recalled the exiles and decided to convene the bishops of the different parties in a council, hoping thereby, if not to accomplish a complete union, at least to put down the quarrels. He was contemplating a second Council of Nicaea. But a trick of Basil of Ancyra, who persuaded Constantius to assemble the bishops in two separate councils, brought about greater

[50] Theodoret, II, 14 (*alias* 17).
[51] Sozomen, IV, 15.
[52] Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History,* IV, 8 f.

disunion out of this project which had been planned with a view to conciliation.

Symbol of Sirmium

However, the Anomoeans at the imperial court, rightly fearing that the semi-Arians were preparing to have their doctrines condemned, promptly proposed to the bishops, before leaving the capital, a symbol of faith with a double meaning. This was the fourth Formula of Sirmium. One of their ablest leaders, Marcus of Arethusa, wrote it out during the night of May 21, 359.[53] The chief passage in the new symbol is the following: "We believe that the Son is like the Father in all things, following the Scriptures." By the phrase "in all things" (κατὰ πάντα), did they mean a likeness of all the faculties, according to the Anomoean doctrine, or a likeness of the substance itself, the *homoiousios* of the semi-Arians? Therein was the equivocation. Basil submitted it and then prepared his arguments to contest the interpretation of his adversaries.[54]

While Anomoeans and semi-Arians were tearing each other to pieces, voices were heard in behalf of peace. They came from the orthodox. They came from places of banishment. From the deserts of Upper Egypt, Athanasius wrote:

"Those who accept everything else that was defined at Nicaea and doubt only about the *homoousios,* must not be treated as enemies. . . . We discuss the matter with them as brothers with brothers." [55] From his place of banishment in Phrygia, the Bishop of Poitiers echoed the sentiments of the Patriarch of Alexandria. He said: "The word *homoousios* can be understood in a wrong sense. Let us prove that it can be understood in a very good sense." [56]

[53] This symbol has been called the "dated creed."
[54] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* LXXXII, 12–22.
[55] St. Athanasius, *De Synodis,* no. 41.
[56] St. Hilary, *De Synodis,* no. 88.

But the Emperor, circumvented by Basil of Ancyra, decided to convene the two councils at the same time: one at Rimini in Italy, for the Westerners, the other at Seleucia in Isauria, for the Easterners. Basil's strategy was especially directed against the Anomoeans, whose forces would thus be divided. Its effects, however, were to emphasize still more the break between the orthodox, who were a majority in the West, and the semi-Arians, nearly all of them in the East.

Council of Rimini (359)

The Council of Rimini met in the summer of 359. Pope Liberius did not go to it in person, nor was he represented at it. It is doubtful whether he was even invited.[57] Valens presented to it the famous Formula of Sirmium which was signed by Liberius, but without the reservation which the Pope had added. The majority of the Council declared the Nicene symbol sufficient and maintained the word "consubstantial," as alone affirming without circumlocution the absolute divinity of Christ. The dissenting members then withdrew and held a meeting by themselves. Constantius, impatient at these long delays, constrained the bishops by violence and trickery to sign a symbol that was almost a verbatim copy of the third Formula of Sirmium. Twenty of the bishops, out of more than four hundred, resisted to the very end and gave their signatures only upon making certain additions which condemned Arianism. "The bishops went away, each party ascribing the victory to itself: the Arian party, on account of the symbol; the orthodoxy party, on account of the additions." [58]

[57] Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés,* V, 520.
[58] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 57.

Council of Seleucia (359)

At Seleucia, whither Hilary had gone, not hesitating to enter into communion with the semi-Arians, the discussions began about the middle of September. The most remarkable incident of the gathering was the intervention of the followers of Acacius the One-eyed, bishop of Caesarea.[59] They formed a sect under the name of Acacians. They separated from the orthodox by rejecting the word *homoousios* (consubstantial); from the semi-Arians, by rejecting the word *homoiousios* (similar in substance); and from the Anomoeans, by rejecting the word *anomoios* (unlike). They held to the term *omoios* (like), whence their name of Omoeans. And they declared that by this word they meant a likeness of will, not of substance. In other words, in their opinion, to say that Christ was God, is the same as saying that His will was completely in conformity and adapted to the will of God. Thus they formed a middle party between the strict Arians and the semi-Arians. And this third party, by force of intrigues, was finally victorious.

The situation became more and more complicated. The Emperor was more vexed than ever. His wrath was increased by the appearance of two violent writings, published in 359 or 360. They were entitled *De non consentiendo cum haereticis* and *De regibus apostaticis*. The former maintained that Catholics ought to shun dealings with members of the Arian sect; the other predicted for Constantius the lot of the impious and idolatrous kings of Israel. Both of them were written by a bishop of Sardinia, Lucifer of Cagliari, an impetuous orthodox bishop. At the Council of Milan he was one of the most fearless opponents of the Arians. A spirited orator and tireless polemist, he was successively banished to Cappadocia, Comagenia, Celesyria, Palestine, and lastly to Egypt. But

[59] See Le Bachelet, art. *"Acace."* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 291.

threats, imprisonment, violence, all were of no avail to overcome his determination in fighting heresy. He had vowed implacable hatred for the Arians and all their abettors or protectors. The moderation of Athanasius and Hilary seemed to him a weakness. Later on, when the Pope decided to reconcile the repentant Arians and leave them in office, Lucifer separated from the Church with great pomp and founded the sect of Luciferians.

The Emperor decided to obtain religious unity at any cost. By use of pressure, he made the bishops, both of the East and of the West, subscribe to one symbol, ambiguously worded. Since it was signed by the Western bishops at Nice or Nike in Thrace, it became known as the symbol of Nike. Only Pope Liberius and a few others refused to subscribe. It was in connection with this fact that St. Jerome wrote: "At that moment the term *Usia* was abolished: the Nicene Faith stood condemned by acclamation. The whole world groaned, and was astonished to find itself Arian." [60]

Council of Constantinople

The Acacians, who were the real victors, eagerly profited by their success. On the occasion of the dedication of a church in Constantinople, they convened a synod at which seventy-two bishops were present. At the side of Acacius and his lieutenants was the celebrated Ulfilas, who had introduced Arianism into the nation of the Goths. The Council solemnly confirmed the symbol of Nike in a slightly altered form. Then the Acacians disposed of the Anomoeans and the semi-Arians. First they obtained from the Emperor the exile of Aetius, the leader of the Anomoeans. Next they had the leaders of

[60] *"Tunc usiae nomen abolitum est; tunc nicaenae fidei damnatio conclamata est; ingemuit totus orbis et arianum se esse miratus est."* St. Jerome, *Dialogue against the Luciferians,* 19. (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 329.)

the semi-Arians banished: Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, Eleusius of Cyzicus, and Macedonius of Constantinople. But the Acacians' triumph was not longlived. Two or three years later, in the reign of Julian the Apostate, the party of Acacius, half disintegrated, joined the party of strict Arians. The victory of Arianism as a whole was not, despite appearances, fundamentally more solid. The death of Constantius, its powerful protector, in 361, deprived it of its strongest support and determined its ruin in the Roman Empire. The lack of consistency in its doctrine and organization were the better noted. The noise with which it had filled the world was often merely the clamor arising from its own internal strifes.

CHAPTER VII

The Church in the Reign of Julian the Apostate (361–363)

ARIANISM had profoundly disturbed the Roman world. Besides orthodox bishops, who were devout, charitable, beloved by the people, there were Arian bishops, court prelates. The latter followed the Emperor when he moved from place to place. Such was Eusebius of Nicomedia. They made their entry into the city seated in a chariot beside the prefect, as did Macedonius. Often they held their see, not by popular approval, but by favor of government powers, scarcely remained in residence at all, and engaged much more in political scheming than in the governing of their Church. No other circumstance so greatly favored the persistence of paganism as this decline of part of the Christian upper clergy.

When we consider this evil influence, we are not surprised at the lack of agreement, in the middle of the fourth century, between legislation and morals. Constantius enacted numerous prohibitions against the practice of the magical arts. Yet the inscriptions reveal the existence of colleges of augurs to the very end of his reign.[1] He repeated Constantine's prescriptions against gladiators.[2] Yet they were to be seen at official celebrations during the whole fourth century. He made numerous laws against idolatry. But "the very violence of the expressions used in the law makes them seem like vain threats of powerless denunciation." [3] At the very time when the legis-

[1] Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung,* III, 303. *Corpus inscript.,* VI, 1690, 1695, 1700, etc.

[2] *Theodosian Code,* XV, XII, 1 f.

[3] Allard, *Julien l'Apostat,* I, 59.

lative documents would lead us to suppose that all the temples were closed or abandoned, the epigraphical monuments show paganism displaying itself in the plain light of day.[4] In 360 the pagans no longer have a majority in the Roman Senate.[5] But their influence in that body is not less preponderant: almost by right of inheritance they divide among themselves the priestly titles and the huge revenues attached thereto.[6] Strange as it may seem, the legal penalties against paganism were terrible: yet we never hear of pagan martyrs.[7] The sword of the law grows dull against practices which custom continues to favor.

Julian's Education

There is one point on which the overthrow of Constantius' official Christianity is still more striking. The Arian Emperor took his young cousin Julian under his protection, confided his education to a bishop, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and had him baptized at an early age. All around the young Julian were to be seen ecclesiastical personages. Yet this prince, when he ascends the imperial throne to succeed Constantius, becomes the zealous propagator of paganism. True, special influences were added to those we have mentioned. While Eusebius and the priests of his entourage "were training Julian in the holy Letters," as Sozomen relates,[8] his preceptor Mardonius had him reading the ancient poets and philosophers. Furthermore, the recollection of the massacres of members of his family, responsibility for which he laid upon his cousin Constantius, made the latter and his policy hateful to him. His temperament inclined him to the mystical reveries

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 60.
[5] St. Ambrose, Letter 17, to Valentinian, no. 9.
[6] Marquardt, *op. cit.*, III, 217–220.
[7] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, II, 251.
[8] Sozomen, V, 2.

of the Neoplatonists, to the practices of theurgy, and to Greek sophism. Arian Christianity, which his teachers had imparted to him, would be powerless to protect him against those outer and inner temptations.

"It is true that these were distinguished members of the Arian group, and that, in this school of religious sophistry, the Gospel was largely concealed by metaphysics. Occupied incessantly with questions as to the divine relationships and processions, they lost sight of the message of Christ, of His history, and of His work of salvation. In the conflict of the creeds, in the intrigues of the court bishops, and their eagerness to overthrow each other, the Church lamentably frittered away its prestige. Men like Eusebius, George, and Aetius did but feebly commend Christianity." [9]

In 355 Constantius sent the young prince, as Caesar, to Gaul. Julian there showed himself to be an able and courageous general. His brilliant qualities, his serious and industrious life, brought him great popularity among the soldiers under his command. One evening during the year 360, while he was living at Lutetia, the soldiers came down from their camp, advanced to the imperial palace,[10] and proclaimed him Augustus. Julian decided to sustain this unexpected title by arms. At the head of his legions he marched to the East, there to fight Constantius. But he did not have to give battle to his cousin, for Constantius died at the foot of the Taurus Mountains on November 3, 361. On December 11 Julian made his entry into Constantinople amid the enthusiasm of the people, who acclaimed him as the sole and undisputed master of the Empire.

The new Emperor's political program was soon evident: to tear down whatever his uncle Constantine and his cousin

[9] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 255.

[10] Important remains of this palace still exist. The camp was located on the western slope of the elevation since called Montagne Sainte-Geneviève.

Constantius had built up. The former had sustained orthodox Christianity; the latter, Arianism. Julian will devote all his efforts to rebuild the old pagan religion upon the ruins of abolished Catholicity and Arianism.

Condition of Arianism

Arianism, profoundly injured by its violent internal strifes, tried to revive by appearing in new forms. In 359 Bishop Serapion of Thmuis informed Athanasius that a number of the priests and people, rejecting Arius' doctrine concerning the Word, were professing false notions about the Holy Ghost. They regarded Him as simply a creature, a Spirit in the service of the Divinity, not differing from the angels except by a superior degree of perfection.[11] Serapion called these heretics "Pneumatomachi," that is, enemies of the Holy Ghost. The principal leaders of the sect seem to have been two semi-Arian prelates: Macedonius, the former bishop of Constantinople, and Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia. Hence the name Macedonians and Marathonians by which the adherents of this doctrine are often called.

The Pneumatomachi

The Pneumatomachi defended their ideas, now by Scripture, now by metaphysics. They also resorted to sophistic arguments that failed to impress men of reflection, but of a sort to persuade the masses. Either of the following propositions must be true, they said: the Holy Ghost is not begotten, and then we have two "Unbegottens," that is, two First Principles, two Gods; or else He is begotten, either by the Father or by the Son. But neither of these hypotheses can be held: if the Holy Ghost is begotten by the Father, He would be the

[11] St. Athanasius, *Epistles to Serapion,* Epistle 1, no. 1; *P. G.,* XXVI, 532.

brother of the Son; and if He was begotten by the Son, He would be the nephew of the Father.

Athanasius in the four *Letters to Serapion,* which he wrote to lay bare the new heresy, also used dialectics. But he took a tone more becoming the important questions he was treating. He does indeed prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost by arguments taken directly from Holy Scripture and from tradition, and also by defending the whole dogma of the Trinity. But "the great doctor's perspicacity showed him a method that was more effective because it cast trouble into the camp of the Pneumatomachi, who were composed of heterogeneous elements. The Council of Nicaea, in defining the *homoousios,* had consecrated the idea of the divinity of the Son, and we know how greatly St. Athanasius contributed to that definition and with what courage he defended it. For him, the whole faith of the Church was contained in that symbol. He ceaselessly held it up before the Eastern quibblers. In his eyes a man was orthodox when he accepted it without reserve, and was not orthodox otherwise. But he also understood what a solid basis the definition of the *homoousios* supplied for confounding the adversaries of the Holy Ghost. It was enough, in fact, to show them the close relations between the Holy Ghost and the Son. Thus they were forced either to admit the divinity of the Holy Ghost, being thereby under the logical necessity of returning to orthodoxy, or to reject the *homoousios,* and hence being cast into the ranks of the discredited Arians.

"This cogent method was divided into two procedures. The first consisted in directly proving the consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost and the Son. Whence ensues the following argumentation: the Holy Ghost is consubstantial with the Son; but the Nicene faith teaches that the Son is consubstantial with the Father; therefore the Holy Ghost is consubstantial with the Father and the Son and, with them, is one and the

same God. The second procedure consisted in turning against the Pneumatomachi the parallelism of binary personal relations which the Arians employed unfairly, and saying to them: We both agree that the Holy Ghost is to the Son as the Son is to the Father. But the Council of Nicaea has defined that the Son has the same nature, the same eternity, the same divinity as the Father. Hence the Holy Ghost has the same nature, the same eternity, and the same divinity as both of them." [12]

Despite everything, the Macedonian heresy gained ground. At the time that Julian came into power, it had entered Constantinople, Thrace, Bithynia, the Hellespont, and the neighboring provinces. Whatever tended to reconstruct a mythology, an empyrean of demigods, pleased the masses, who were not yet rid of pagan influences. And the ambitious flattered these low instincts.

Apollinarianism

Another heresy took a part no less harmful to the Church than Macedonianism. It, too, originated in the last years of Constantius' reign. It was Apollinarianism, founded by Apollinaris the Younger. This man had a brilliant, cultivated mind, and was a theologian, polemist, exegete, and man of letters. We shall meet him with his father, Apollinaris the Elder, when we relate the strife of the Christians against Julian the Apostate. At first he was one of the champions of the Council of Nicaea, a brother-in-arms of Athanasius. He never lost his detestation of Arius.

Not satisfied with denying the latter's doctrine, as the Pneumatomachi did, he undertook to combat it. But to save the idea of the consubstantiality of the Word, he mutilated the notion of the person of Christ. Apollinaris said he could not

[12] Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* III, 7 f.

comprehend the coexistence of two perfect natures in one single person. Wishing to safeguard the integrity of the divine nature in Christ, he held that the Redeemer, though possessing a human body animated by a sensitive soul, did not have a human rational mind.[13] The conscience of true Christians rebelled at this. If the Word was united to a human nature stripped of its essential elements—reason and free will—how could we say, in keeping with tradition, that "He became man"? Until then the ancients had said that the Son of God took our nature in order to heal it. Did He, then, purpose excepting the intellect and will from this cure? And could we truly say, in keeping with the traditional teaching, that there were two natures in Christ? Such were the questions pondered by reflective men whose Christianity was deep in their souls. But those who were dazzled by Apollinaris' brilliant gifts and his fame for learning were easily seduced. St. Basil declares that almost all who read the works of Apollinaris were won by the charm of his thought and style.[14] His followers did not understand all his ideas in the same way, but, according to St. Epiphanius, they soon filled the whole East.[15]

The Schism of Antioch

Another conflict, which did not end in heresy but led to prolonged schism, broke out in the Church of Antioch just before Constantius' death. St. Eustathius, the valiant bishop of Antioch, had been expelled in 330, charged by his enemies with too ardently defending the Nicene faith. Since then the mother Church of Syria was occupied by Arian bishops. None

[13] Apollinaris, being a scholarly philosopher, recalled the Platonic trichotomy, embracing the νοῦς, the ψυχή, and the σῶμα. He denied that Christ possessed the νοῦς, which, he said, was replaced by the divine λόγος.

[14] St. Basil, Letter 263, no. 4.

[15] St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* LXVII, 2.

of them has left a name to history. Yet their unbroken influence for a period of thirty years resulted in the entrance of the mass of the population into the Arian communion.

There was, however, a small group of courageous Catholics who never recognized the authority of the usurpers and, in spite of persecutions, continued to practice their religion in private houses. They were called Eustathians. In 360, when the Arian Bishop Eudoxius exchanged his see for that of Constantinople, his friends chose in his place, with the Emperor's approval, a prelate of gentle manners and peaceful life. They hoped to make use of those qualities in the bishop to accomplish the success of their cause. His name was Meletius. He had already been bishop of Sebaste and, for some unknown reason, had resigned his office and, in his own home, led the life of a peaceful, virtuous priest.

Probably he was thought to be indifferent to the doctrinal disputes. But on the very day of his enthronement, Meletius, in his sermon clearly affirmed the consubstantiality of the Word. Yet he avoided using the expression consecrated by the Council of Nicaea. This profession of faith caused him to be exiled by Constantius less than thirty days after his election, and to be replaced in his see by a thorough Arian, Euzoios. The most heretical portion of the sect took their stand about the new bishop. The rest of the faithful were divided regarding Meletius. Many of them distrusted a man who was chosen by the Arians. But his outspoken profession of faith and his unjust exile seemed to others to assure the validity of his election. In short, when Julian entered upon the direction of the Empire, the Church of Antioch contained three parties: the Arians, the Meletians, and those who, recognizing neither Euzoios nor Meletius, kept the name of Eustathians. These last, without a bishop, were under the charge of a devout priest named Paulinus.[16]

[16] The real character of the Antioch schism has not yet become clear. According

Aerianism

Like the Meletian Schism, Aerianism sprang from a hierarchical conflict. Aerius, a priest of the diocese of Sebaste, in 360 withdrew from his bishop, Eustathius, whom he blamed for having abandoned his resolutions of the ascetic life. Giving up his position of hospital chaplain, to which his bishop had appointed him, he began to dogmatize, rejecting the Easter ceremonies as a Jewish rite, prayers for the dead as useless, and the Church fasts as an arbitrary regulation of a Christian's mortification. In justification of his rebellion he also maintained the equality of priests and bishops in the matter of jurisdiction and the right to ordain. Cardinal Bellarmine rightly accuses Protestantism of adopting certain theories of Aerius. The rebellious priest succeeded in drawing after him a certain number of the faithful. They used to meet in the open air, in woods, on hillsides, brazenly defying the authorities. "They professed to abandon all things," says Tillemont, "yet nearly all of them were given to excessive wine-drinking and gluttony." [17]

But Eustathius had already placed himself at the head of a group of dissenters. This strange man, one of the most

to Leclercq, "back of the question of persons, it was known that the real issue was the question of the numerical oneness of the divine substance and the Nicene ***homoousios.***" Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* I, 646, note 2. Cavallera, on the contrary, considers the conflict created by the Antioch schism to be a purely disciplinary question. (*Le Schisme d'Antioche,* p. 323.) The Protestants of Germany attempt to explain the schism as a result of conflict between two opposing theologies, one of them the Meletian, being merely a deformation of the doctrine of Nicaea. A Catholic writer, Father Bouvy, would explain the conflict by a duality of theological tradition, understood in a different way. See Bouvy, *La Methode historique et les Pères de l'Église,* in the *Revue augustinienne,* VI (1905), 171. Cf. Saltet, *Le Schisme d'Antioche au IV^e^ siècle* in the *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* VIII (1906), 123 ff.; Salaville, art. *"Eustathiens d'Antioche,"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 1574–1577.

[17] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* IX, 88. Tillemont's judgment is based on St. Basil, Letter 263.

unusual characters of the fourth century, at first appears as a priest of strict morals, irreproachable virtue, and great charity toward the poor. He was one of the earliest propagators of the monastic life and, by all these qualities, won the heart of St. Basil, who "recognized him as being something better than the common run of mortals." [18] But soon St. Basil speaks of him as "a cloud being borne according to the changes of the winds." [19] Eustathius' mind was incapable of becoming fixed and settled. "Of the numerous formularies which the disputes of that period produced, there was almost none that was not subscribed to by him." [20] In 340 the Council of Gangres noted that he already had followers, and these were condemned "for having perverted the exercises of the ascetical life and for arrogantly setting themselves above the common life." [21] After Constantius' death, Eustathius of Sebaste seems to have been associated with the party of the Macedonians, among whom he counted some close friends. From the moral point of view the Eustathians formed a complete contrast to the Arians. They represented rigorism in the presence of laxity. None of the early lists of heretics mentions Eustathius and the Eustathians. Nevertheless their sect constituted a disturbing element in the Church.[22]

Novatians

Besides the recently formed sects, there were a few older parties. In the neighborhood of Constantinople and Alexandria, groups of Novatians still taught that "the Church

[18] St. Basil, Letter 212, no. 2.

[19] St. Basil, Letter 244, no. 9.

[20] Allard, *Saint Basile,* pp. 123 f.

[21] Mansi, II, 1095. On the followers of Eustathius, see Salaville, art. "*Eustathiens*" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 1571–1574.

[22] These Eustathians, followers of Eustathius of Sebaste, should not be confused with the Eustathians of Antioch spoken of *supra.*

is the congregation of the pure," that any sin committed after baptism has the effect of excluding the sinner from this assembly, and that no one except God has the power to forgive such a fault.[23] In Africa the Donatists, at first affected by the death of Donatus of Carthage in 355, recovered their confidence under the guidance of a no less belligerent leader, Bishop Parmenius. When Julian the Apostate came into power, they wrote to the new emperor as "to him who alone possessed justice," begging him to restore their basilicas to them and to grant them the freedom of action which they enjoyed of old under Constantine.[24]

Recall of Exiled Bishops

The historian Ammianus Marcellinus says that one of Julian's first cares, after occupying the palace in Constantinople, was to convene there the principal leaders of the dissenting sects with their followers.[25] Consequently to the imperial court came Bishop Eudoxius whom the Arians had put in the see of Constantinople in 360 in place of the semi-Arian Macedonius, Macedonius himself who was now an heresiarch, the leading Novatians, Eustathians, and Aerians, and also the chiefs of the different parties that had sprung up in Antioch as a result of the election of Meletius.

To all the representatives of these different parties, Julian spoke in the same strain.

"He expressed his wish that, their dissensions being appeased, each without any hindrance might fearlessly follow the religion he preferred." [26]

[23] Socrates, II, 38; VII, 12.

[24] St. Optatus, *Against the Donatists,* II, 16.

[25] *"Dissidentes christianorum antistites cum plebe discissa in palatium intromissos."* (Ammianus, *Roman History,* XXII, 5.)

[26] Ammianus, *loc. cit.*

Toward the end of 361 or early the following year, an imperial edict recalled the bishops of every party who were exiled by his predecessor and restored their confiscated property.[27] Thus not only Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, Eleusius of Cyzicus, Photinus of Sirmium, and Aetius, but also Athanasius, Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Cagliari were able to return to their dioceses. Could the Catholic Church, then, count on the return of an era of liberty? Nothing of the sort.

The pagan Ammianus Marcellinus points out the snare which the new emperor held out to Christianity. He says:

"Julian did this the more resolutely because, as long license increased their dissensions, he thought he should never have to fear the unanimity of the common people." [28] Ammianus knew the Emperor's designs against the Christian sects. He says: "Julian found by experience that no wild beasts are so hostile to men as Christian sects in general are to one another." [29]

Of course he understood that such comparisons did not apply to men like Athanasius and his orthodox fellow-bishops. But he was sufficiently aware of their love of justice to know that, by recalling them from exile without at the same time expelling their rival usurpers from their sees, he would start endless conflicts. The Emperor also expected that the mingling of pagans in the religious disputes would make these still more bitter. The events that had just taken place in Antioch must have strengthened him in this view.

On November 30, 361, the pagans of the Syrian capital, when news arrived that Emperor Constantius was dead, rushed to the house of his protégé, the usurper Bishop George, had dragged him off to prison. This court prelate, whose en-

[27] Socrates, III, 1; Rufinus, I, 27.
[28] Ammianus, *loc. cit.*
[29] *Ibidem.*

thronement was accomplished by force and whose government was marked by cruelties, exactions, and delations, had made himself equally odious to pagans and orthodox Christians. The latter, respecting St. Peter's command, did not return evil for evil [30] to the wicked shepherd. But the pagans declared themselves satisfied only when, on the morning of December 25, they took the unfortunate bishop out of prison and hatefully put him to death. His corpse was dragged through the city, as were the bodies of two government officials of Constantius. When Julian learned of these crimes, the only penalty he thought of inflicting was to issue orders that a careful search be made for the rare books which might have disappeared in the pillage of Bishop George's library, which contained many precious volumes. As to the authors of this act of brigandage and these murderers, they were pardoned.

Happily the return of the exiles had results quite different from painful rivalries. Athanasius' entry into his episcopal city of Alexandria (February 21, 362) was a veritable triumphal procession. "The people, grouped by sex and by age, or following their society banners, went forth to meet him. From every part of Egypt people came to see him. Popular veneration for him was so great that, as he passed by, some tried to be touched by his shadow, persuaded that it would heal them, as in the case of St. Peter's shadow.[31] Athanasius advanced, seated on an ass, after the example of the Savior entering Jerusalem. As soon as he entered one of the streets, applause broke out. Perfumes were poured out or burned. In the evening the whole city was illuminated. Feasts were held in the houses, and in the public squares corporation dinners took place." [32] Julian took umbrage at such a popularity. On

[30] See I Peter 3: 9.

[31] Acts 5: 15.

[32] Allard, *Julien l'Apostat,* II, 298. Cf. St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* XXI, 27–29.

the ground that Athanasius had been exiled by several decrees and had escaped the penalties against him by flight, the Emperor decided, rather tardily, to declare him excluded from the amnesty and published a decree to this effect.[33]

Council of Alexandria (362)

But the fearless Patriarch, confident of the devotedness of his Alexandrians, and rightly thinking that the government would not venture to enter into conflict with a whole aroused population, decided to pay no attention to an edict that was manifestly unjust. He therefore quietly prepared the convening of a council in his episcopal city. He considered it urgently necessary to secure the decisions of authority regarding the recently incited quarrels. The Council assembled in the first part of 362, probably in the spring of that year. Only twenty-one bishops were present. But several of them had so considerable an influence upon the Church because of their virtues and the persecutions they had suffered for the true faith that, as Rufinus says, this assembly was called "the Council of the Confessors." Moreover, a majority of the bishops without delay gave their explicit approval to its declarations, and the entire Church did so tacitly.[34] The march of events was considerably affected by its decisions. These treated of the admis-

[33] See the text of this decree in Allard, *op. cit.*, II, 299 f.

[34] Why did not Pope Liberius personally concern himself with this council, instead of leaving the initiative and the direction of the council to Athanasius? Many writers think that, however slight we may suppose Liberius' weakness at Sirmium and however enthusiastic may have been the welcome of the people of Rome upon his return from banishment, he did not yet feel that, in the eyes of the Eastern bishops, his prestige was sufficient to lead back men who had strayed from the right way. A few years would have to elapse before he recovers in the whole Church the place occupied by his great predecessors. No doubt he preferred to leave the active part to Athanasius, whose prestige was immense. Moreover, the doctrinal decisions of the Council of Alexandria (362), accepted by the universal Church, could obtain and in fact have obtained the infallible authority attached to the *magisterium ordinarium* of the Church.

sion of repentant Arians into the Church, the errors of the Macedonians about the Holy Ghost, the meaning of the Greek words *ousia* and *hypostasis* in the expression of the doctrine of the Trinity, the false teaching of Apollinaris about Christ's humanity, and the extinction of the Meletian Schism at Antioch.

Despite opposition by a few rigorists of the school of Lucifer of Cagliari, the Council decided that all who, under duress or otherwise, had made common cause with the Arians, without professing the heresy, could resume their functions and offices in the Church. As to the leaders or defenders of heretical parties, upon manifesting their repentance they could return to the communion of the Church, but could not belong to the clergy. Athanasius and his friends, to further the acceptance of these decisions, appealed to the Savior's teaching about the return of the prodigal son. Pope Liberius expressly approved the resolutions,[35] which were soon accepted by the entire Church.[36]

The Council next declared that "the Spirit is of the same substance and divinity as the Father and the Son," and it attached so great importance to this declaration that it required every Arian wishing to return to the Church to subscribe to this formula.

The Council then considered the regrettable misunderstandings which were caused by the lack of clear definition of the Greek words *ousia, hypostasis,* and *prosopon.* When the Latins, considering *ousia* and *hypostasis* as synonyms, said there were three hypostases in the Trinity, they seemed to the Greeks to be admitting three substances and thus professing rank Arianism. On the other hand, when the Greeks said that in God there were three *prosopa,* they appeared to the Latins to be professing merely three aspects, three "visages,"

[35] Letter to Vincentius, *P. L.,* VIII, 1372.

[36] Mansi, III, 356; St. Jerome, *Dialogue against the Luciferians, 20.*

like the Sabellians. St. Athanasius, who knew both tongues perfectly, explained to the Fathers of the Council that, under different verbal forms, the Latins and the Greeks meant the same thing. It was decided that henceforth everyone could use the formula to which he was accustomed, on condition of meaning it in a way conformable to the Nicene doctrine.[37] Regardless of what Apollinaris the Younger said, the Council declared that the Word of God truly became man, taking not only a human body, but also a soul like to ours.[38]

Lastly the Council addressed to the faithful of Antioch an appeal for conciliation, in the form of a lengthy letter written by Athanasius, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Asterius of Amasia. Eusebius and Asterius were commissioned to deliver the letter to the Church of Antioch. But unfortunately this mission could not be carried out. The ardent Lucifer of Cagliari was beforehand. He had even refused to attend the Council of Alexandria so that he might better combat the extreme parties of Antioch. When Eusebius and Asterius reached the Syrian capital, Lucifer had already given the Eustathians a bishop in the person of the priest Paulinus. This promotion of Paulinus to the episcopacy prevented the solution of the pending difficulties. Besides, Lucifer expressed his dissatisfaction with the indulgent measures taken by the Council with regard to the Arians and announced his break with Athanasius and the latter's friends. He then placed himself at the head of a new schism, which was called the Schism of the Luciferians.

Aside from this last incident, the Council of Alexandria had a double consequence. On one hand, the measures of pacification voted at Alexandria had all the effects which Athanasius' sagacity hoped for. In a short time the conversions increased on all sides. In fact, Athanasius, a few years

[37] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* XXI.

[38] St. Athanasius, *Tome* or *Synodal Letter to the People of Antioch,* 3, 7.

later, could say that the Nicene faith was that of the whole world.[39] On the other hand, the stubborn Arians, aware of their relationship to the pagans, drew closer to the Emperor. Julian accorded his entire favor to Aetius, the leader of the Anomoeans, giving him as a present an estate on the island of Lesbos.[40] About the same time he wrote to the heresiarch Photinus as follows: "I praise you for denying that he who had been considered God could have taken flesh in the womb of a woman." St. Athanasius' words in his *Letter to the Monks of Egypt* were fulfilled: "There is no middle course," he said, speaking of the Arians; "they must admit the consubstantiality, or else give up the name of Christian."

Exile of St. Athanasius

Athanasius' success was not limited to converting Arians. Idolaters themselves, witnesses to so many virtues, went to him and embraced the Christian religion. Julian's anger was overflowing. To Aedychius, the governor of Egypt, he wrote:

"By all the gods, nothing could give me more pleasure than that thou shouldst expel from every corner of Egypt, Athanasius, that criminal who has dared, during my reign, to baptize Greek wives of illustrious citizens. He must be persecuted." [41]

Athanasius, resolved not to give occasion for any disorder, did not wait for the imperial armed force to expel him. The very day the edict of his banishment was published on the streets of Alexandria (October 23, 362), he left the city, saying to the friends that accompanied him: "Be of good heart; this is only a passing cloud, and will soon disappear."

[39] St. Athanasius, *Epistola ad Jovianum,* no. 2.

[40] Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History,* IX, 4.

[41] Julian, Letter 6; Allard, *op. cit.,* II, 302. See *Œuvres complète de l'empereur Julien.*

The cloud would disappear a few months later, at the death of Julian the Apostate. The holy Patriarch, after hiding a little while very near Alexandria, reached Memphis and from there wrote his Paschal Letter for 363. Then he went far into the Thebaid.[42] The deep solitudes of the desert and the silent, austere life of the monks had always been the consolation of his exiles. "When he was nearing Hermopolis, the bishops and clergy, Abbots Theodore and Pammon with their monks, came to meet him and received him with public solemnity. Then it was that Athanasius visited the island of Tabennisi and its famous monastery. He examined its rule and noted everything, taking interest in the minutest details of the monastic life. He retained a deep remembrance of this visit. When Abbot Theodore died in 368, Athanasius at once sent a letter of condolence and encouragement to Abbot Horsisius [43] and his monks." [44]

The Donatists

While Julian was thus banishing the greatest champion of orthodoxy, he extended his favor to the most violent of the schismatics. The Donatist bishops, exiled since 348 by Emperor Constans, were not included in the edict recalling those banished by Constantius. But they addressed a suppliant request to the Emperor in which they call him the one "who alone possessed justice." Julian understood that the greatest outrage he could inflict upon the Catholics would be to reestablish the terrible African schismatics in all their former offices. The wording of his rescript was most generous and benevolent toward the latter.

[42] *Chronicon syriacum,* year 363; *Chronicon acephalum,* no. 11; *P. G.,* XXVI, 1446.

[43] St. Athanasius, *Epistola ad Orsisium, P. G.,* XXVI, 978 f.; *Annales du musée Guimet,* XVII, 268 f., 293, 332, 704 f.

[44] Le Bachelet, art. *"Athanase"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2152.

His expectation was not disappointed. A frightful religious war soon broke out in Africa. Even before receiving the Emperor's reply, the Donatist prelates, accompanied by the usual mob of idlers, destitute farmers, and fugitive slaves, that formed the sect's army, tried to drive the Catholics out of their churches. After the reception of the imperial rescript, their audacity increased.

The scholarly Tillemont sums up the story of the cruelties of the Donatists against the Catholics in the year 362, in his concise and straightforward style, which often becomes eloquent. He says: "When the Donatists made themselves master of a few churches, they smashed the altars in them, on which the body and blood of Christ had reposed. St. Optatus relates that, for this purpose, they engaged a multitude of vile wretches who were given, as pay for their crimes, the wine intended for the holy sacrifice, or even already consecrated. This first indignity was followed by another—the destruction of the chalices. These they reduced to ingots which they sold to anybody.

"St. Optatus, returning to the story of their deeds of violence, gives horrifying accounts of them. First, he speaks of what was done at Lemellef in Mauretania Sitifensis by Felix of Diabe (or Zabe) and Januarius of Flumenpiscis in the same province. These two Donatist bishops, with a large crowd of people, went to Lemellef, where they found the basilica closed. The Catholics were in the church attending the holy sacrifice. Felix and Januarius directed their mob to climb upon the roof, make openings in it, and hurl tiles upon the people inside. This order was immediately carried out. The Catholic deacons attempted to protect the altar. Several of them were wounded, and two were killed by the tiles thrown at them. The slain deacons were Primus, son of Januarius, and Donatus, son of Nimy. Their names have been placed in

the Roman Martyrology as holy martyrs, under date of February 9.

"But the Donatists' best-known crimes are the ones they committed at Tipasa, a city of Mauretania Caesariensis. Two of their Numidian bishops came there, Urban of Forma and Felix of Indicra. They were assisted by some archers and backed by the governor of the province, who was there in person. The torn bodies of men, maltreated women, and massacred children were the bloody viands with which the bishops gratified the hunger of the Church of the Donatists. By way of violating all that is holiest and most sacred, they commanded the Eucharist to be cast to the dogs." [45] Thus, says St. Optatus, the hand that reopened the pagan temples, at the same time let loose a frightful tempest upon the Church of Africa.

Julian's Persecution

It does not seem that Emperor Julian positively wanted all this carnage. "In the strict and literal sense of the word," says Paul Allard, "Julian should not be reckoned among the persecutors." [46] At least we can say that, at the beginning of his reign, he did not intend persecuting the Christians to the point of bloodshed. No one surpassed Julian in hatred for the religion of Him whom he persistently refused to call anything but "the Galilean." But at first he thought he could abolish that religion by legal measures, by philosophical discussions, and by clever overtures to the Christians. The success thus obtained was merely partial and transient. The passions of the crowd, stirred up against the followers of Christ, broke loose. Christian blood was shed in uprisings which the Emperor failed to suppress. Later, "after beginning

[45] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* vol. 6, arts. 54, 55, 56 ***passim.*** Cf. St. Optatus, *Against the Donatists,* II, 16–26.

[46] Allard, *op. cit.,* III, 319.

his reign as a philosopher, he ended it as a persecutor." [47] And so his first move against Christianity was really "a mild and seductive persecution," according to St. Jerome's expression. This early phase of the persecution was cold and calculating. It was marked by the use of various tactics which we must now set forth.

Seduction of Christians

Julian was sufficiently acquainted with the Catholic world to perceive that it contained, especially since Constantine's conversion, a number of rather lukewarm Christians who had been impelled by ambition toward positions of authority. He was mistaken as to the number and importance of these weak members and thought he could destroy the power of the Church by appointing Christians to public office and positions of honor, by enticing promises, and even by gifts of money. As St. Gregory Nazianzen says, this was a veritable "bargaining." [48]

Some Christians were caught in the trap and, according to the words of the pagan Libanius, "led the choir at the altars of the gods." [49] In this number were Count Julian (the Emperor's uncle), Elpidius (a treasurer), Felix (an overseer), and even a bishop (Pegasius of Ilius) who obtained a high rank in the reorganized pagan clergy. But solid Christians had no fear.

"Tried in this furnace as it were, it at once became evident to all who were the real Christians, and who were merely nominal ones. Such as were Christians in integrity of heart, very readily resigned their commission, choosing to endure anything rather than deny

[47] Jules Simon, *Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie,* II, 338.
[48] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* VII, 11.
[49] Libanius, *Epitaphios Juliani.*

Christ. Of this number were Jovian, Valentinian, and Valens, each of whom was afterward invested with the imperial dignity." [50]

Antichristian Argumentation

Julian had great confidence in argumentation and particularly in his skill in handling it. It would seem that his philosophical discussions turned to his advantage in Gaul, where he dazzled his opponents. At least such was his claim. As we are told by Ammianus Marcellinus, the Emperor tried to win over the leaders of the Church by inviting them to his palace and attempting to ensnare them by questions regarding the most difficult texts of Scripture.[51] St. Cyril reports a long discussion by the Emperor with one of the wisest bishops about the sacrifice of Cain and Abel.[52]

But generally he encountered unyielding resistance. "Now, listen to me," he would say, "as the Alamanni and the Franks did." [53] One of the men that Julian for a while hoped to win by this method was the court physician, named Caesarius. This would have been a most brilliant victory. Caesarius, brother of the famous St. Gregory Nazianzen, was a man renowned and highly esteemed. The Emperor assailed him time and again. Caesarius was a sincere Christian or rather catechumen, for he was not yet baptized. His faith seemed to waver. His brother wrote him urgent letters, begging him to leave the court of the Apostate.[54] A day came when Caesarius saw the danger of a combat in which his soul was the stake. "I am a Christian," he declared, "and I will never cease being so." The Emperor terminated the discussion and postponed a continuance of the debate. But Caesarius did not wait. He left the court at once and went to Cappadocia to his

[50] Socrates, III, 13.
[51] Ammianus, XXII, 5.
[52] St. Cyril, *Adversus Julianum,* 10.
[53] Ammianus, XXII, 5.
[54] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Letter 7.

aged father and saintly mother, who were at last freed from their anxiety.

Attempts to Revive Paganism

Julian, however, was already putting his trust in another form of proselytism. Not merely did he combat Christianity by pointing out numerous supposed difficulties in its doctrine and worship, but he tried to snatch souls from it by drawing them to a paganism clothed in all the splendors of beauty. His *Discourse on the Sun-King,* written in the winter of 362, is a hymn full of poetry, deifying the powers of nature. "The Sun is my king," he says, "I am its servant. My trust in it rests upon secret reasons which I keep to myself. But this I can say without offense to the religion of my conscience: from my early years I have been struck by love for the brightness of the Sun." In the mind of the philosopher-emperor the Sun held a place between the higher gods, who live in the empyrean, and the lower divine powers, that have to do with creatures. It touches both heaven and earth. Aristotle was right when he said that, to make a man, it is necessary to have another man and the Sun. People are right in giving to the Sun the names Apollo, Bacchus, and even Jupiter. Viewed metaphysically, Julian's conception was weak, but it cleverly combined the naturalist ideas of the philosophers, the fictions of the poets, the heart of Oriental myths, and the traditional worship of the old national divinities.

The *Discourse on the Sun-King* was soon followed by the *Book against the Christians.* In this Julian claimed to consider side by side the greatness of the pagan religion and the pettiness of the religion of the Christians. Says Libanius: "The Emperor attacked the books that present a man of Palestine as a God, and he showed the absurdity and stupidity of what is adored in that man." [55] Judging from the fragments

[55] Libanius, *loc. cit.*

which St. Cyril of Alexandria has preserved of this work, we may say that it is connected with the old attacks by Celsus and Porphyry.[56] It has the same sarcastic tone, the same lack of sincerity in the interpretation of Scriptural texts, the same accumulation of gross insults.[57]

The book did not have the success which the royal author hoped for it. It possessed but little philosophical and historical value. Probably the pagans took no pains to spread it, and Christian opinion, as a whole, ignored it. In the West, it provoked neither protest nor reply. In the East no one before St. Cyril of Alexandria bothered to refute it.

Disqualification of Christians

Another tactical move by Julian to turn Christians from their faith was to exclude them from holding public office, whether civil or military. No doubt there were many defections among the imperial office-holders. Merely nominal Christians who, to tell the truth, professed not so much the religion of Christ as the religion of the sovereign, abjured Christianity for the sake of keeping their positions. But St. Gregory Nazianzen, a contemporary of these events, relates that a considerable number "not only among those in the lowest ranks, but also among illustrious leaders in high office," showed themselves as unyielding as a strong rampart being vainly assaulted by a frail war-machine." [58] With regard to government officials who defected, we are told by another contemporary, Asterius of Amasia, that they "bore disgrace on their brows and roamed the cities like objects of detestation. People used to point them out as traitors who had denied Christ for a little money." [59]

[56] See Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 347, 441.

[57] Nearly all that we have of Julian's work has been preserved for us in the refutation by St. Cyril of Alexandria, *P. G.*, LXXVI, 490–1064.

[58] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations*, IV, 65.

[59] Asterius of Amasea, Homily 3; *P. G.*, XL, 208.

Education Laws

Julian's most terrible weapon against Christianity was his school legislation. Previously teaching had been unrestricted in the Roman Empire. Says Cicero: "Our people have never wished to have any system of education for the free-born youth which is either definitely fixed by law or officially established or uniform in all cases." [60] The first Flavians, then the Antonines took a step in the direction of public education by endowing certain teachers at state expense,[61] but without restricting the freedom of the teaching. Some cities likewise established and endowed chairs of grammar, medicine, and law. The State encouraged these organizations by granting the teachers an exemption from many obligations, such as taxes, tutorage, military service, and quartering of soldiers. The details which Libanius and St. Gregory Nazianzen give about Athens in the fourth century and about its students divided by nationality, their riotous practices, their festivities, and their fondness for discussions and disputes, make one think of university life in Paris in the time of Robert de Sorbon and St. Louis.

Antioch, Alexandria, Caesarea in Palestine, Caesarea in Cappadocia, Constantinople, Rome, Autun, Treves, Bordeaux, and Carthage had their great schools, and there were Christian teachers in them. St. Basil's father taught rhetoric at Caesarea in Cappadocia. Basil himself, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, and the Apollinarises gave public instruction. We may know its spirit and method from St. Basil's fine homily on the *Manner of Reading the Profane Authors*. These Christian teachers, while presenting the pagan authors as models of literature, refuted their false ideas.[62] And two cen-

[60] Cicero, *The Republic*, IV, 3.

[61] Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars: Vespasian*, 18.

[62] A pupil's exercise has been found, refuting the fable of Adonis. Evidently it

turies before Constantine, the Christians possessed at least one free establishment of higher education, the School of Alexandria, founded by St. Pantaenus and made famous by Clement and Origen.

Constantine, after his conversion, did not attempt to restrict the freedom of teaching among the pagans any more than had the pagan emperors in the case of Christian teachers. Iamblichus and Libanius, both pagans, to mention only these two, taught freely under Constantine and under Constantius.[63]

Julian's School Legislation

By a law of June 17, 362, and by one or two more explicit decrees, Julian completely overthrew this custom. The law of June 17 allows cities to appoint professors for the chairs founded in them only on condition of the emperor's ratification.[64] The edict declares

"it is necessary that all those who devote themselves to teaching should have good morals [and by 'good morals' he means the public profession of paganism] and experience in their souls sentiments that do not differ from those they express in public." [65]

For Julian this meant belief in the divinities of paganism and hatred of Christianity. And he went still further. Says Socrates:

"He enacted a law by which Christians were excluded from the cultivation of literature: 'Lest,' said he, 'when they have sharpened their tongue, they should be able the more readily to meet the argu-

echoes a lesson by his teacher. See Jullien, *Les Professeurs de littérature dans l'ancienne Rome*, p. 305.

[63] De Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana*, 1863, p. 19.

[64] *Theodosian Code*, XIII, III, 5.

[65] This decree is numbered 42 in Julian's letters (ed. by Hertlein), pp. 544–547.

ments of the heathen.' " [66] This sentence may be an excerpt from another of Julian's decrees on education.[67]

A second fragment may be indicated in these words of the Emperor, quoted by St. Gregory Nazianzen: "To us belong the eloquence and art of Greece, as also the worship of the gods; to you, ignorance and boorishness, and nothing beyond these words, I think: this is your wisdom." [68]

Enforcement of the Decrees

Julian's decrees were carried out pitilessly. St. Chrysostom tells us that a large number of Christian physicians and rhetoricians left their professional chairs rather than give up their religion. Such were Victorinus in Rome, Prohaeresius in Athens. To lessen the effects of the law, the aim of which was to condemn the Christians to an intellectual inferiority, two former Christian teachers (Apollinaris the Elder and Apollinaris the Younger) undertook to write the Psalms in the form of odes, the Mosaic Books in the form of epic poems, and the teachings of the Gospel in the form of dialogues after the manner of Plato. But a classical literature cannot be improvised even by great scholars. The consequence of Julian's school legislation would have been disastrous if it had not been, in fact, abrogated by his death.[69] "On no point," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, "did Julian appear more detestable. Let all who love eloquence share my just indignation." [70]

[66] "Νόμῳ ἐκέλευε χριστιανοῦς παιδεύσεως μὴ μετέχειν, ἵνα μὴ φησὶν, ἀκονώμενοι τὴν γλῶτταν, ἑτοίμως πρὸς τοῦς διαλεκτικοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπαντῶσιν." Socrates, III, 12. Cf. Allard, *op. cit.*, II, 361.

[67] Bidez and Cumont, *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite des lettres de l'empereur Julien*, p. 14, note 4.

[68] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations*, IV, 102.

[69] Valentinian withdrew it officially in 364.

[70] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations*, IV, 100.

Popular Uprisings

Julian would gladly have destroyed Christianity without shedding a drop of blood. He wrote: "By the gods, I have no wish that the Galileans should be unjustly murdered or maltreated, or that they should suffer any loss." [71] Probably he was sincere in speaking thus. "He was not unaware," says Sozomen, "that it would have been supremely imprudent to employ torture to force unwilling men to sacrifice. He knew that violence is of no effect in matters that depend on free will." But he aroused popular passions against the Christians; and those passions broke loose. At Emesa and Epiphania, Bacchic processions entered the church with a statue of Dionysius, which was set up on the altar.[72] The Christian cemetery at Emesa was given to the flames.[73] The aged Marcus, bishop of Arethusa, the same one who had saved Julian at the time of the massacre in 337, was denounced to the Emperor as guilty of mistreating the pagans and destroying a temple. When sentenced to rebuild the temple, he refused to do so.

"He was then given over to the mob, who dragged him through the streets, tearing out his beard, and tormenting him in a thousand ways; then he was given over to the school children, who amused themselves by tossing him in the air to catch him on their sharp-pointed styluses; finally, he was smeared with honey, bruised as he was, and exposed to the wasps. Yet they did not finish him; he survived this abominable treatment. At Alexandria, Ascalon, Gaza, and Heliopolis, the pagan population was continually breaking out into disturbances. Priests and virgins were massacred with horrible refinements of cruelty. . . . Julian did not interfere." [74]

[71] Julian, Letter 7 (quoted in Negri, *Julian the Apostate,* II, 408. Tr.).
[72] *Chron. pasch.,* p. 296.
[73] Julian, *The Misopogon,* I, 272.
[74] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 265.

Martyrdom of St. John and St. Paul

Finally he himself took a hand in these tortures. We find this fact mentioned in several Acts of martyrs, notably in the case of John and Paul. These two saints were brothers. Their family name is unknown. We are informed merely that they held some office at court and belonged to the Palatine guard in the reigns of Constantine, Constans, and Constantius. When Julian came into power, they left the guard and retired to their home on the Coelian Hill. Their withdrawal had the appearance of a protest, and Julian ordered them to rejoin the guard. They refused. Foreseeing the outcome of the event, they distributed all their possessions among the poor. The Emperor commanded them to obey his orders within ten days. As they continued in their refusal, they were slain in a hall of their own house. Their bodies were buried secretly and the police spread a report that they had been exiled.

But some of the martyrs' acquaintances discovered their bodies. This started pious pilgrimages. Christians came to the martyrs' tomb and prayed for the courage needed in those trying times. Some miracles took place. The son of one of the Emperor's officers was suddenly cured there of a grievous disease. This led to other massacres. Several pilgrims were taken by surprise and decapitated on the spot. Two priests, John and Pigmentius, guilty of rendering funeral honors to these new victims, were then slain, and Senator Flavian, charged with the same offense, was banished. "The discovery of the martyrs' house on the Coelian Hill and the existence of their tomb there, as the Acts point out, have made the episode of their martyrdom one of the most certain and captivating events of archaeology." [75]

[75] Allard, *Études d'histoire et d'archéologie,* pp. 159–220. Cf. Grisar, in the *Civiltà cattolica,* 1895, I, 214–218; Batiffol, in the *Bulletin critique,* 1887, p. 476; Dufourcq, *Étude sur les gesta martyrum romains,* pp. 144–152, 309 f.

Among the other victims of Julian's persecution, we should mention St. Theodoret, a priest of Antioch, who was put to death by Count Julian, the Emperor's uncle; St. Juventinus and St. Maximinus, executed by order of the Apostate himself, for publicly deploring the condition of the Christians and the violence to which they were subjected; St. Basil of Ancyra, who died amidst most atrocious tortures, for encouraging Christians to reject the promises of the Emperor; the young martyr St. Theodore, caught near the sanctuary of Daphne while he was praying there at the tomb of St. Babylas; St. Cyril, a deacon, and his companions; the deaconess Publia, the young men of Pessinonte, and the virgins of Heliopolis.[76]

Julian's Psychology

In persecuting Christianity, Julian does not seem to have been prompted by the whimsical cruelty of a Nero or the cupidity of a Domitian or that misconceived devotion to the safety of the Empire, such as obsessed a Trajan, or the philosophical jealousy of a Marcus Aurelius. It was as a devotee of paganism that Julian harassed the Church. Before becoming the persecutor of his brothers in Christ, he was the victim of Greek sophistry, a prey of that idolatrous mysticism that sprang from the religious syncretism of all the Eastern and Western religions.

This young prince grew up without relatives and married without love. His natural faculties seem never to have been well balanced.[77] In his soul all the baneful influences of a period of decadence had a profound and disastrous effect. Brave on the battle-field without being a great general, serious and austere to the point of oddity, in his youth he engaged in

[76] See the Acts of all these martyrs in Leclercq, *Les Martyrs,* III, 71–118.

[77] *"Giuliano era un uomo squilibrato."* Negri, *L'Emperatore Giuliano l'Apostata,* p. 399.

practices of theurgy and occultism, surrounded himself with visionaries and magicians. Within the bounds of the Catholic Church his restless soul might have found the correctives needed by his very impressionable temperament. His great fault and misfortune was to apostatize from the faith of his childhood. Once he became emperor, left to himself and to self-seeking, flattering advisers, he inflicted incalculable harm upon Christianity in the space of two years. Moreover, his passion inclined him as eagerly to the restoration of the pagan religion as it did to the destruction of the Christian religion. At the outset of his reign, this was his chief aim; soon it became his fixed purpose.

First Pagan Manifestation

He manifested this idea only gradually.

"Although from his earliest childhood he was inclined to the worship of the gods, and gradually, as he grew up, became more attached to it, yet he was influenced by many apprehensions which made him act in things relating to that subject as secretly as he could. But when his fears were terminated, and he found himself at liberty to do what he pleased, he then showed his secret inclinations." [78]

His first pagan manifestation was cleverly calculated. The day when the body of Emperor Constantius was brought to Constantinople, after the funeral services in the Church of the Holy Apostles, "Julian approached the remains, touched the coffin with his hand, then, ordering suitable honors to be paid to the deceased in the name of the tutelary gods of the city, he himself inaugurated the worship of the gods." [79] In this way, on the occasion of the funeral of a Christian Em-

[78] Ammianus, XXII, 5.
[79] Libanius, *Orations,* 10.

peror, were celebrated the first official pagan sacrifices. Julian reëstablished paganism under such circumstances that a protest by the Christians could hardly have been made.

Special Trait of Julian's Paganism

Julian's paganism had a special character of its own. His religion was quite a different thing from the national religion of Trajan, Antoninus, Septimius Severus, or Diocletian. His religious thoughts tended to Athens rather than to Rome, to the gods of Homer rather than to the divinities of Latium. It is, indeed, hard to grasp the theology of the Apostate in its fluctuating and elusive outline. But, if we examine closely, we can discern his preferences for four principal divinities: Jupiter, who, Julian considered, personified the infinite power that governs the world; Minerva, who, in his eyes, is the symbol of his beloved Athens; Mars, whose name naturally comes to the lips of an emperor and warrior; and the Sun, the Sun-King. This last he sometimes considers the expression of the divine nature, but usually as the god of those Eastern religions whose mysteries captivated him.

Julian's theology was not merely "a sort of compromise between absolute polytheism and monotheism." [80] It was also a compromise between the religions of nature and the national religions, between philosophical religion and popular religion. Julian liked to quote Plato. Between the supreme Perfection and lower beings he conceived a series of intermediate beings by whom the divine life was poured out and thus gradually lessened. This system was probably suggested to his mind by the Neoplatonic theories.[81]

At the same time he somewhat resembled the masses by his fondness for superstitions, haruspices, and soothsayers. Says

[80] Naville, *Julien l'Apostat et sa philosophie du polythéisme*, p. 68.
[81] Julian, *Orations*, 4; St. Cyril, *Adversus Julianum*, 2.

Libanius: "Upon rising in the morning, his first care was to enter into communion with the gods by means of the victims. By blood he greeted the rising of the god; and with blood he led the god back again at the time of its setting; when the god had disappeared, he immolated to the genii of the night." [82] These practices show the influence of the Mithraic rites, of the crioboly and taurobolium ceremonies.[83] Therein the Apostate not only sought the gratification of his mystical instincts; but through them he tried to efface the indelible character of his baptism. It appears that he made use of special rites and formulas of execration composed for that purpose.[84] But it was especially by blood that he sought "to wash away the water of his baptism." [85] We are told by St. Gregory Nazianzen that "Julian strove also to profane his hands for the purpose of removing every trace of the unbloody sacrifice by which we enter into communion with Christ." [86]

Adaptations from Christianity

By an equally hateful outrage to the Christianity he had deserted, Julian took from the religion of his childhood and sought to utilize in the restoration of his paganism certain formulas and ceremonies, a hierarchical organization, and a method of propaganda.

An imperial decree ordered that the temples be reopened and that everywhere the sacrifices be resumed.[87] But the interior of the temples was at once arranged according to the model offered by the Christian churches. As in the *presby-*

[82] Libanius, *Epitaphios Juliani; Ad Julianum consulem* (Reiske ed.), I, 391.

[83] On these ceremonies, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 443 f.

[84] Sozomen, V, 2.

[85] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations*, IV, 52.

[86] *Ibid.* In the early Church, communicants received the Eucharistic bread in their hands.

[87] Ammianus, XXII, 5.

terium of the latter, there were kneeling-benches and stalls for priests, who must there recite the offices at various hours of the day. We have the rescript directing the prefect of Egypt to create a sort of conservatory of sacred music at Alexandria.[88] Out of the pagan priest, who was simply the performer of a traditional ceremony, Julian wanted to make a preacher, an apostle, a missioner. He planned a series of dogmatic, moral, and apologetical instructions, for the purpose of explaining the doctrines of pagan Hellenism and having them practiced.[89] The whole pagan clergy was organized into a hierarchical system with three grades. The priests of each single locality were placed under the jurisdiction of a municipal pontiff, a sort of archpriest, who was subject to the pontiff of the province. At the head of the whole hierarchy was the *pontifex maximus,* who was none other than the Emperor himself.[90]

Philosophers and Rhetoricians

To give his paganism a dogma, Julian appealed to the chief philosophers and rhetoricians of renown. He invited them to court and admitted them to his intimacy. In their first rank was one of his former teachers, Maximus of Ephesus, with whom he had always kept up correspondence.

But paganism and the governing personnel which Julian endeavored to impose on it did not relish these changes. Soon it was evident that the court philosophers were taking advantage of the imperial favor to obtain lucrative positions. Maximus, laden with honors and wealth, became a kind of chief minister, outshining everyone by his haughty magnificence.[91] The Gallic rhetorician Aprunculus was appointed governor of

[88] Julian, Letter 56 (Hertlein ed., p. 566).
[89] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* IV, 111.
[90] On this organization, see Allard, *Julian l'Apostat,* II, 179–185.
[91] Eunapius, *Vitae Sophistarum; Maximus.*

the Narbonnaise; the rhetorician Belee, governor of Arabia. The Sophist Himerius had a position at court. Priscus was attached to Julian's own person and accompanied him on his journeys. Libanius obtained the post of quaestor. This last, thinking to give high praise to Julian, says of him that "he gave eloquent men to the cities as governors." [92] The Emperor's doctrinal reform, in the end, amounted to entrusting statecraft and administration to sophists.

The old pagan clergy were not enthusiastic for the plans of the imperial reformer. The new men he introduced gave him even less satisfaction. St. John Chrysostom gives us a description of them that is not very flattering. "People who formerly were half-dead from hunger, escaped convicts, men who yesterday were barely earning their living at the lowliest trades, all at once became priests or haruspices and were encompassed with the greatest honors." [93] At Antioch might be seen a procession under the Emperor's direction, and in it "effeminate young men and courtesans drawn from their miserable abodes holding most shameless converse." [94] Even Julian's entourage suffered from his promiscuities and wearied of his superstitious devotions and endless sacrifices. Extensive ridicule, greater than that which accompanied the decay of the old traditional idolatry, hastened the ruin of this restored paganism.

Shrine of Apollo

Of all the humiliations which the Emperor had to undergo, the one he felt most seems to have been the failure of two desperate attempts he made, about the middle of 362 and the

[92] Libanius, *Epitaphios Juliani.*

[93] St. Chrysostom, *Liber in Sanctum Babylam,* chap. 14, in *Opera* (ed. 1734), II, 668.

[94] *Ibidem.*

early part of 363, to revive the worship of Apollo at Daphne and to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem.

In the pagan world there were few sanctuaries whose fame could rival that of the Daphne temple. Connected with the city of Antioch by roads bordered with jessamine and roses and encompassed by a sacred grove of aged cypresses and shady paths, it was, at the gates of the great cosmopolitan city, both a place of worship and a rendezvous of pleasure. "If the gods were to come down to earth," said the ancients, "it is Daphne they would choose for their stay." [95] But ever since the Antioch Christians had built, opposite the temple of Apollo, a church to which they brought the relics of the martyr Babylas, one of their holy bishops, the oracles had not been heard in the famous shrine.[96] Julian went to Daphne in the month of August, 362, and there saw only a few pagans celebrating the god's feast. At sight of the well-nigh deserted temple, he felt a bitter pang. Standing at the foot of Apollo's statue he addressed a spirited exhortation to those present. Thenceforth the purpose he followed out with tireless activity was to revive one of the most famous prophetic organs of the Greek world and to restore the splendor of a worship which, he said, had been the glory of Antioch.

But on October 22, "in a serene and cloudless sky," [97] the temple of Daphne caught fire. Some said it was caused by lightning, others said it was started by a spark carried by the wind to the wooden framework. However it may have begun, the fire soon reached the roof. From that point blazing beams fell on the colossal statue of the god. Apollo's image was quickly consumed. The people, notified by the priests of the shrine, rushed out from the city. The Emperor himself came. But, as Libanius relates, "crowds of spectators stood by la-

[95] Libanius, *Antiochius.*
[96] Sozomen, V, 19; Socrates, III, 18.
[97] Libanius, *Monodia super Daphnaei templum.*

menting but unable to assist, like those who from land beholding a shipwreck can afford no relief but their tears." [98] Julian blamed the fanaticism of the Christians for the destruction of the shrine. His retaliation was the pillage of the great church of Antioch and the martyrdom of the priest Theodoret. But he did not venture to repeat his attempt to revive the fame of Daphne. "Twenty years later the walls were still standing, as were all the columns except one, which had broken off at its base. The roof alone was lacking. They had not attempted to replace it. We cannot say what Julian was afraid of: whether the Christians or the lightning or the martyr Babylas or the wrath of Apollo." [99]

The Temple at Jerusalem

A few months afterwards, however, Julian made a similar attempt at Jerusalem. He did not manifest for the Jewish people that hatred which the Roman people had avowed toward them and which several emperors shared. He pretended to admire them, not as the nation chosen to spread in the world the idea of one only God and the hope of a Messiah, but as a valiant race watched over, he said, by one of the many gods ruling the universe. We may well suppose he especially valued, among the Jews, some of his best allies in his warfare on Christianity.

He summoned to his presence the principal leaders of the Hebrew nation and said to them: "Why should not you also offer sacrifices to your god for the safety of the Empire?" When they answered that they were not allowed to sacrifice elsewhere than in the Temple at Jerusalem, which was then in ruins, the Emperor replied: "Let not this be a hindrance; I will rebuild it."

[98] Libanius, *op. cit.*
[99] Allard, *Julien l'Apostat,* III, 82.

In the mind of the Apostate, besides the wish to gratify the Jews, there was a desire to disprove the words of Christ, who said: "There shall not be left here a stone upon a stone that shall not be destroyed." When Julian was setting out for his Persian expedition, he wrote to the Jewish people a long letter in which he said:

"As soon as I have brought the war against the Persians to a successful end, I hope that I may be able to rebuild, by my efforts, the holy city of Jerusalem, which you have founded and for so many years have desired to see and in which, together with you I may pay homage unto the Omnipotent." [100]

The Emperor appointed, as superintendent of the construction, an eminent personage, named Alypius, who had been administrator of Britain. Large sums of money were placed at his disposal. This stupendous undertaking easily stirred popular enthusiasm among the Jewish people. We are told by St. John Chrysostom that "the patriarch of the Jews offered the immense treasures that were deposited with him. And the people set to work with all their resources of daring, initiative, and skill." [101] Says St. Ephrem: "The circumcised were already blowing the trumpet." [102]

The work began. Frequent earthquakes soon hindered its progress, and sudden heavings of the ground and cave-ins gave the workmen unpleasant surprises. The fall of a colonnade crushed a group of excavators. "Despite these disasters the construction went on. Jewish tenacity and pagan persistence seemed to be struggling with raging nature. Presently a more terrible phenomenon occurred." [103] We will let the pagan writer, Ammianus Marcellinus, continue the account. He says:

[100] Matt. 24: 1 f.; Mark 13: 1 f.; Luke 19: 5 f.
[101] St. Chrysostom, *Contra Judaeos,* 16.
[102] St. Ephrem, *Hymn against Julian.*
[103] Allard, *op. cit.,* III, 143.

"Though Alypius applied himself vigorously to the work, and though the governor of the province coöperated with him, fearful balls of fire burst forth with continual eruptions close to the foundations, burning several of the workmen and making the spot altogether inaccessible. And thus the very elements, as if by some fate, repelling the attempt, it was laid aside." [104]

Twenty-five years later St. John Chrysostom, after reviewing these events, draws the following conclusions: "If you go to Jerusalem, you will see the empty excavations for the foundation of the Temple. And if you ask the reason for it being in that state, you will be told what I have just related. But you will bear in mind that it did not happen under Christion emperors. It took place when our affairs were in a lamentable condition. All freedom had been taken from us, paganism was flourishing. Then burst forth these events to confound the effrontery of our enemies." [105]

Assuredly, such prodigies were considered by the Christians as a pledge of providential relief in the midst of their trials. But so many profanations grieved them, and more than once they were unable to restrain the expression of their indignation. At Constantinople one day when Julian was immolating victims at the foot of a statue of Fortune in a consecrated church, a blind old man, led by a child, approached the Emperor and publicly rebuked him as an irreligious man, an atheist, and apostate.

"Thou art blind," Julian said to him. "The Galilean, thy God, will not cure thee." The blind man replied: "I thank God for my blindness, since it prevents me from beholding one who has apostatized from religion."

The Emperor made no further answer and, without retaliating against the courageous interrupter, went on with the

[104] Ammianus, XXIII, 1.
[105] St. Chrysostom, *Contra Judaeos,* V, 11.

sacrifice. This old man was Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, a distinguished Arian and long since a fiery enemy of St. Athanasius. But in his soul heresy had not stifled a deep feeling of respect for sacred things.[106]

St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen

More profound, active, and effective was the indignation of the orthodox bishops. This we have already noted in the words of St. Gregory Nazianzen. The holy bishop's grief was the more bitter since bonds of intimacy had united him in his youth with the wretched apostate. Julian, while studying under Greek rhetoricians in Athens, was already a pagan by inclination but distrustful of new acquaintances and perhaps tormented by doubt. In the crisis he was then experiencing in his belief, he sought the society of the two young Christians, both of them intelligent and, like himself, very fond of philosophy and literature. The fact that they devoted themselves to the same task and retained a persevering friendship for each other made the names of these two young men inseparable for posterity. They were Basil and Gregory.

Both of them were born in Cappadocia. Basil came of a noble family of Caesarea which reckoned martyrs among its ancestors, and bishops among its members. The head of the family was a brilliant teacher of eloquence in the province of Pontus. Gregory's birthplace was the little town of Arianzus. His saintly mother had married a pagan, but through her prayers and fasting made him a Christian, then a saint, and finally a bishop. Gregory's father, also named Gregory, somewhat late in life received baptism at Nazianzus, and following that was made a bishop.

Basil and the young Gregory, having met first at Caesarea and later at Athens, felt for each other one of those intense

[106] Sozomen, V, 4.

friendships which inflame youth. They possessed different natural dispositions: one austere, the other gentle; one more influenced by the teachings of science, the other more attracted by transports of divine love. But they both had the same earnestness in prayer, the same purity of morals, the same devotion to the memory of home, and, although far secondary to their fondness for Christian studies, the same enthusiasm for literature, poetry, and oratory. At a later date Gregory said: "How can I recall those days without weeping? We knew only two paths: the more cherished one led us to the Church and her doctors; the other, not so lofty a one, led us to the school and our teachers."

Julian, impelled by his eager curiosity, visited the retreat of the two young students. "Before completely breaking away from the faith of his childhood, perhaps he wished to turn one last look upon the depths of the Gospel." [107] They had in common an abundance of subjects for conversation; Gregory could discourse at great length about eloquence and poetry. But soon, in spite of the young prince's effort to hide his deepest feelings from his two friends, the conversation turned to moral and religious questions. This left a painful impression in the souls of Basil and Gregory. "I kept looking at him," the Bishop of Nazianzus wrote later, "and I saw that his head was all the time moving, his shoulders shaking and quivering, his look wandering, his step unsteady, his nose in the air breathing insolence and haughtiness. I said to myself: What monster is Rome nourishing in this man?" [108]

Basil left Athens in 355, at the age of twenty-six. He returned to Cappadocia and there for a while taught rhetoric at Caesarea. Following the advice of his sister Macrina, who was living as an ascetic with her widowed mother and a few companions on a family estate in Pontus, he decided to conse-

[107] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle*, III, 288–290.
[108] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations*, V, 23 f.

crate himself to God. Like his friend Gregory, he was as yet not baptized. He received baptism from the hands of Dianius, bishop of Caesarea. His thoughts then turned to the monastic life.

Beginning in 357, for two years he journeyed through Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, studying on the spot the life of the monks and anchorites. Upon returning home, he distributed his goods to the poor and sought a retreat at the gates of Neocaesarea with the idea of henceforth living only for God, in meditation and study. Some Christians of the neighborhood, who were making a trial of the ascetic life, joined him in his hermitage, which was transformed into a real monastery. He left it five years later to fight against Arianism and paganism with unequalled zeal and learning and, after having led the life of Antony in solitude, to take part in the combats of Athanasius against heresy.[109]

His friend Gregory stayed in Athens longer than he did and at first gave lessons in rhetoric. In 360 he returned to Cappadocia, dividing his time between his native Arianzus and Basil's solitude where he made frequent sojourns. Filial love and zeal for orthodoxy induced him only once to leave his life of prayer and labor. In 360 or 361, learning that his aged father had just subscribed to the semi-Arian formula of Rimini, he went to Nazianzus and persuaded him to make a profession of completely Catholic faith. A short time after this, despite his reluctance, he was ordained a priest by his father. He then stayed with him to assist him in the administration of the Church of Nazianzus.

Julian was now Emperor. At times by guile and again with violence, he was waging against the Church that war which Basil and Gregory, when they used to visit the young prince in Athens, felt would come. Julian did not like Cappadocia, where his efforts to establish paganism had not been success-

[109] Allard, *Saint Basile*.

ful. Vexed by the boldness with which the people of Caesarea greeted his coming by the destruction of a temple, he imposed an enormous fine upon the city and forcibly enrolled its clergy in the police force. The terrified people asked advice and encouragement from their shepherd. The Church of Caesarea was at that time governed by a bishop universally esteemed for his virtues, but a man lacking in decision and meagerly versed in theology. His name was Eusebius. This bishop, seeing his Church in peril, called Basil to him. Basil's vigilance, eloquence, spirit of prudence and firmness saved the cause of the faith in Caesarea.

These first activities of Basil and Gregory in the religious quarrels were only the forerunners of the great battles they would both wage later for the defense of the Catholic religion.

St. Ephrem

At this same time Syria gave the Church another eloquent defender, the deacon Ephrem. His father was a priest of the former gods of the district. He was born, in the early years of the fourth century, in the city of Nisibis, at the very frontier of Roman power, a city taken and retaken in turn by the Persians and the Romans. Like Basil and Gregory, Ephrem early became enthusiastic for literature and rhetoric. Like them, in his youth he followed the monastic life in that contemplative form which the East readily gives it. As in the case of Basil, he one day found himself charged with the task of reviving the courage of a city threatened by Julian's anger. It was in 363. The people of Edessa were terrified by the fear of seeing the army of the Romans arrive. Ephrem was a poet. His religious hymns, with their firm and gentle accent, were already popular. For this particular occasion he composed a song, which, when repeated by the people reanimated their courage.[110] The poet says:

[110] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, IV, 356–358.

"The sound of direful threats I hear,
A voice from out the West;
And groans of grievous torment come
To shake our very breast.

I tremble, God, because with Thee
No sinners can abide.
But I am filled with joy because
For sinners Thou hast died.

Jews, heretics, barbarians,
And pagans in accord,
Your forces join, that I may die
For Christ, my sovereign Lord.

Your deed, atrocious crime 'gainst God,
Will make my spirit weep.
But death I'll welcome heartily,
In Christ the Lord I'll sleep." [111]

Death of Julian the Apostate

Julian's army did not come to Edessa. Besides, the tyrant's end was near. June 26, 363, in a battle with the Persians, the Emperor was struck by a spear. The weapon entered his side and penetrated the liver. The wound was fatal. According to certain writers, the Apostate took some of the blood flowing

[111] St. Ephrem, *op. cit.*, 123. On St. Ephrem's life and writings, see Duval, *La Littérature syriaque,* pp. 332–337, and F. Nau, art. *"Ephrem"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 188–193. St. Ephrem wrote only in Syriac. Some of his works exist only in Greek translation. The Assemani brothers and Father Morabek, S.J., translated them into Latin; this translation, together with the original texts, they published in six volumes in 1737–1746. St. Ephrem wrote commentaries on the entire Bible. He composed sermons and hymns, which have but little difference between them: the former are doctrinal and controversial; the latter, ascetical and hortatory. Both exalt the Redeemer's divinity, the dignity of the Blessed Virgin, and the holiness of the priesthood. A large number of his poems have been introduced into the liturgy of the Eastern Churches.

from the wound and threw it up into the air, saying: "Galilean, thou hast conquered." [112] According to others, he cried out: "Sun, thou hast cheated me." Ammianus Marcellinus and Libanius say he died with the stoical calmness of the philosopher.[113] But the words attributed to him give the vague impression that "he expired with a clear perception that everything in his work had been artificial, and with a sudden revelation that it was already dead before him." [114] He had wanted to cover a pagan idea with a Catholic form; and he saw his undertaking fail before falling himself. The two friends of his youth, Basil and Gregory, as well versed as he was in the culture of ancient literature and customs, would, on the contrary, seek to clothe a deeply Christian idea with classic beauty; and they will prepare the way for one of the most brilliant epochs in the life of the Church, giving a foretaste of the purest masterpieces of Christian eloquence, poetry, and legislation.

[112] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* III, 20 (*alias* 25); Sozomen, VI, 2.
[113] Ammianus, XXV, 3; Libanius, *Epitaphios Juliani.*
[114] Allard, *Julien l'Apostat,* III, 283.

CHAPTER VIII

From the Death of Julian the Apostate to the Coming of Theodosius (363–379)

General View of the Period

THE sixteen years between the disastrous reign of Julian the Apostate and the glorious restorative government of Theodosius form a period of transition. After the reigns of Constantius and Julian, the fact is henceforth established that neither Arianism nor paganism, however much favored by the sovereigns, has power to regenerate a dissolving society. A return to the Catholic policy of Constantine seemed the only solution for the political and social crisis disturbing the Empire and the world. But where could a genius be found, capable of resuming the work of the great emperor? And would men be ready to follow him? The four rulers who transmitted or divided the power from 363 to 379—Jovian, Valentinian, Valens, and Valentinian II—pursued a wavering policy. The outstanding glory of their reigns is in the appearance of a few eminent geniuses whose influence, more effectively than any other cause, prepares the way for the clearly Catholic policy of Theodosius. In the East the fame of St. Athanasius, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nazianzen keeps growing. Along with them we find St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Epiphanius, and St. John Chrysostom. In the West, St. Ambrose and St. Jerome appear with St. Hilary.

Among the barbarous races, two facts are of the greatest interest to the history of the Church in this period. On the one hand, Arianism, forced back beyond the boundaries of the

Empire, wins the nations of the Gothic race; on the other hand, a real apostle, St. Martin of Tours, gives new life to orthodox Christianity in Gaul.

It may be that the historic period which is the subject of the present chapter does not claim attention by any impressive and sudden change or by any conspicuous event. But at least, by the worth of the great men it produces and the great events it preludes, it deserves the study of anyone who likes to trace the progress of the life of the Church and the march of civilization in the continuity of their development.

Emperor Jovian

Julian at his death left no natural heir, no successor designated in his will, no instruction of any sort. Under these conditions, says Ammianus, it occurred to no one that the new emperor could be named otherwise than by the soldiers. The higher officers decided that the armed forces commanded by Julian should be entrusted to the oldest of the generals. For the holding of an election, they would wait until these forces were joined by the army left in Mesopotamia. But a group of lower officers, unwilling to wait so long, chose one of their own, Jovian, chief officer of the guards, placed a purple cloak on his shoulders, and paraded him through the legions, while they proclaimed him emperor. It was said that many of the soldiers, misled by the similarity of the two names (Jovian and Julian), thought they were acclaiming the former emperor risen from the dead. The enthusiasm soon spread through the whole army.[1]

The newly elected at first protested against this unexpected enthronement. "Being a Christian myself," he said, "I cannot govern the troops of Julian." But his eager electors replied: "You will reign over Christians, over those who were brought

[1] Ammianus, XXV, 5.

up in the true religion. The oldest among us were instructed in doctrine by Constantine." [2] In these acclaims there was unconscious but only too real irony. The brave and easy-going old soldier, who put the imperial purple upon his tall and slightly bent body, did not resemble Constantine either in character or physique. The enthusiasm with which he was received was the more significant: in the case of many, it was owing to an aversion for the policy of the deceased emperor rather than to a liking for the person of the newly elected one.

Emperor Valentinian I

Jovian reigned only a few months. He was succeeded by another military officer, Valentinian, a man who was beloved by the army because he fought bravely in Gaul under Julian, and was liked by the Christians because, like Jovian, he had incurred the temporary displeasure of the Apostate for his loyalty to Christianity. Unfortunately, a month after his election, he associated in his government his brother Valens, who was devoted to the semi-Arians, and he entrusted him with the rule of the East, where dangers of heresy were most formidable. Further, Valentinian did not fulfil all that was expected of him.

Valentinian was a sincere, honorable, chaste man, uncompromisingly devoted to orthodoxy, fond of order and discipline in everything, but exceedingly jealous of his power. He always respected the Church as the organ of truth, but looked upon it with a suspicious eye as a power. The influence of the Church had, indeed, remarkably grown since the Edict of Milan. Constantine could boast of being its protector; Valentinian felt himself protected by it.

Immediately after arranging the division of the Empire, he went to Milan and made that city his capital. He hoped to be

[2] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* IV, 1.

in a better position there to watch the invasions of the barbarians from the north. He also thought that from there he could more effectively cure the disorders that had been introduced into that part of the Empire during the eight years of neglect in which the three preceding emperors had left it. But in those eight years a social power had grown little by little, under the influence of the Church, and apparently to the detriment of the imperial authority.

The Patricians

Slowly but profoundly "the Roman order of patricians had been won by Christianity. Whether by the influence of example or under the sway of a veritable conviction, old families in their entirety decided to pay homage to the new religion. Once they took this resolution, they were surprised at finding themselves strengthened in an unexpected source of glory and power. Christianity renewed and invigorated their influence. Alms, wisely distributed by the hands of the priests, elicited from poor Christian families a gratitude to their patrician benefactors, a gratitude less servile than that of the common people, but more lasting. Their slaves, gradually emancipated and prepared for freedom by pious training, formed a devoted armed band around them. Soon the influence of the Christian patricians extended beyond Rome. Once they had entered into the most extensive association of men and the only organized society subsisting in the Empire, they found themselves thereby placed at the head of a powerful party.

"Ever since Athanasius, in his days of exile, found asylum in the homes of Roman senators, the practice had developed among Christians of every country, even from the depths of Egypt or Asia, of appealing to illustrious families of the capital whenever they had a church to be built, a monastery to be founded, some ruin to be prevented, or some disaster to be

repaired. The alms, which were nearly always given, were abundantly repaid by popularity and gratitude." [3]

Among these noble representatives of the Christian aristocracy, the following are noteworthy: the prefect of the praetorian guard in 365, Sextus Petronius Probus, member of a family in which, so it was said, consulships passed from father to son, and which went back to the time of Marcus Aurelius; his wife, Anicia, who, in the old family palace of the Anicii, centralized the charitable works of the Roman matrons; the prefect of Rome, Olybrius, a close relative of the Julii and Emilii; the noble wife of Toxotius, named Paula, a descendant of the Scipios and the Gracchi and granddaughter of the consul Marcellus; Melania, who, upon a visit to the hermits of Egypt, for three days fed five thousand of them by her alms.[4]

The Papal See

The churches of Rome, and thereby the Pontifical See, were the first beneficiaries of these generous gifts. We have already seen that, in times of persecution, the Church of Rome, obliged to meet vast expenses, possessed considerable wealth. Eusebius quotes the following from a decree of Constantine:

"We ordain, therefore, that all things whatsoever which shall appear really to belong to the churches (whether the property consist of houses or fields and gardens, or whatever the nature of it may be), shall be restored in their full value and integrity and with undiminished right of possession." [5]

The magnificence of that naturally generous emperor nowhere appeared more glorious than in his liberality to the Church. In

[3] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* V, 23 f.

[4] This was St. Melania the Elder. See Goyau, *Sainte Mélanie,* p. 22. Cf. Rompolla, *The Life of St. Melania.*

[5] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* II, 39. Cf. chaps. 21, 36, 41; *Ecclesiastical History,* VIII, 1 f.; X, 5, etc.

all parts of the Empire, but especially in Rome, he built magnificent temples and provided considerable revenue for them. The *Liber pontificalis* contains an amazing list of the offerings made by that ruler to the Roman churches.[6]

The transfer of the imperial capital to Constantinople, to Sirmium, and to Milan, by increasing the tasks of the Roman pontiff, thereby drew to him more abundant resources from devout Christians. "Thereby," says a learned historian, "Rome was left free to the popes, who could now act with greater independence and make the city the base of their operations in far-off lands." [7] The Arian dispute, contrary to the plans of its promoters, merely strengthened this tendency.

"The need of a firm common center during the disorders was strongly expressed by the writers who then undertook to advocate the claims of the Roman See, whilst the measures taken by the popes, in response to the dictates of duty and carried out with a deep sense of responsibility, were eventually crowned with success, and issued in the complete, peaceful, and joyful submission to Rome of the two great halves of the Empire." [8]

It is indeed strange that Pope Liberius, the pontiff whose momentary weakness so grieved the Christian world, was the very one in whose person the Roman primacy was most clearly affirmed in this period. But his exile at Beroea and a solemn retractation of his error had expiated his weakness. His return to Rome was acclaimed with the cry: "One God, one Christ, one shepherd." His rival Felix, driven out by public disapproval, died in obscurity in a village of Campania. After Constantius' death, Liberius issued "general decrees" [9] pre-

[6] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 170–201.

[7] Grisar, *History of Rome,* I, 322.

[8] *Ibid.* So true is this that some writers have endeavored to assign to the fourth century the origin of the primacy of the pope. In trying to do this, they must close their eyes to the entire previous development of papal authority.

[9] These *decreta generalia* are mentioned by Siricius, *Regesta pontificum romanorum* (no. 220), I, 34.

scribing the manner of dealing with repentant Arians and semi-Arians and making decisions about baptisms administered by them. In 365, the last year of his life, he received a delegation of sixty Eastern bishops who addressed him as the head of the faith, and he admitted them to the communion of the Catholic Church but, as he himself declares, only after ascertaining the perfect agreement of their confessions of faith with his own and those of all the bishops of the West.[10] A papal epitaph, probably referring to Liberius,[11] speaks of him in enthusiastic terms; so greatly did the glory of the papal office—added to Liberius' personal repentance—make his contemporaries overlook his passing defection.

Pope St. Damasus

Such was the situation which aroused the jealous susceptibility of Emperor Valentinian. The election of Pope Damasus in 366, at Liberius' death, was not of a sort to reassure the Emperor's distrustful absolutism. Damasus, like his three immediate predecessors (Marcus, Julius, and Liberius), was of Roman parentage,[12] and was already well known through his connections with the Roman aristocracy. Valentinian, by a constitution written with his own hand and addressed to the new pope, forbade the clergy, ascetics and religious to visit houses of widows or of persons under guardianship, to receive gifts from them, even as bequests or deathbed donations. All donations, legacies, and trusts of this kind were declared null and void, and the property legally accrued to the imperial treasury.[13] As though to show that these provisions did not

[10] Socrates, IV, 12; Jaffé (no. 228), I, 35.

[11] See the epitaph and Duchesne's note in favor of the attribution to Liberius, in the *Liber pontificalis,* I, 209 f.

[12] The *Liber pontificalis* (see I, 213, note 1), which calls him a Spaniard, seems incorrect on this point.

[13] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, 11, 2.

imply a spirit of hostility to the Holy See, the Emperor at the same time promulgated a second constitution, ordering that all religious cases be henceforth submitted to the judgment of the bishop of Rome, even those in which other bishops should be involved, and all secular judges were forbidden to take part therein.

Valentinian's Religious Policy

All of Valentinian's legislation bore traces of the twofold tendency of his spirit, which was both absolutist and conscientious. These traces are to be seen in his interventions against paganism and against Western Arianism, in his civil legislation, and in his attitude toward the Ursinian schism.

He took from the pagan temples the property which Julian the Apostate had granted them. But he was careful not to let it revert to the Christian churches. He strictly forbade idolatrous sacrifices suspected of immorality. But he did not abolish the popular feasts and ceremonies and he was cautious in the matter of the famous mysteries of Greece.[14]

In Italy and Gaul a few strict Arians still clung to their errors. Auxentius, the bishop of Milan, became conspicuous by his clever intrigues. Valentinian, when he came to Milan in November 364, at once ordered the quaestor and the master of requests, assisted by ten bishops, to make an investigation. At the close of the inquiry, Auxentius, in the Emperor's presence, declared that he acknowledged Christ as truly God, as having the same divinity and substance as God the Father. The Bishop, however, when required to put the declaration in writing, did so in a formula plainly ambiguous. But the Emperor, as though fearful of giving too much gratification to the Catholics, announced he was satisfied with it.[15]

[14] *Ibid.*, X, I, 2; VIII, VIII, 1; IX, III, 3, 4; IX, XL, 8; Zosimus, IV, 3.

[15] The formula subscribed to by Auxentius was the following: *Christum ante omnia saecula et ante omne principium natum ex Patre Deum verum filium ex Deo*

"The introduction of Christian principles into the laws, although really dating from Constantine, did not clearly appear until the time of Valentinian." [16] As instances of measures wholly inspired by Christianity, we cite the following: the appointment of physicians at government expense for the poor in the large cities; the curbing of excessive demands by lawyers, by landowners upon farm-tenants, and by the Treasury upon tax-payers; [17] the right granted all cities to convene an assembly at regular intervals for deliberation concerning grievances to be addressed to the sovereign; [18] and the official establishment of a *defensor civitatis* (defender of the city), a sort of tribune of the people, whose duty it was to uphold local liberties against administrative tyranny.[19] But Valentinian's fiscal legislation, containing no less than twenty-eight different constitutions designed to secure the claims of the Treasury against individuals, was marked by a severity that at times provoked outcries of misery and despair from the over-taxed people.

The Ursinian Schism

Valentinian expressed great respect for the Sovereign Pontiff. But in the schism that sprang up in Rome after the death of Pope Liberius and the election of Damasus, there was a lack of steadiness and firmness in his attitude. Whereas the large majority of the clergy and faithful, assembled in the Basilica of St. Lawrence in Lucina, acclaimed Damasus as

Patre. According as we place a comma before or after the word *"verum,"* the meaning is Arian or Catholic. Cf. St. Hilary, *Adversus Auxentium,* 7.

[16] Dufourcq, *L'Avenir du christianisme,* IV, 84.

[17] *Theodosian Code,* XI, 1, 14; X, 1; I, VII, 3, 4; X, x, 9, 10; VIII, XIII, 3–6; XIII, VI, 7; X, 4.

[18] *Ibid.,* XII, XII, 3, 4, 6.

[19] We find mention of the *defensor civitatis* for the first time in 365. On the origin and duties of this new office, destined to play an important part later, see Abel Desjardins, art. *"Defensor civitatis"* in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* vol. II, part 1, pp. 47 f.

pope, a group of the people, led by seven priests and three deacons in the Basilica of Julius, elected one of the latter, Ursinus. No fault could be found with the private life of Damasus, whose superior virtue and intelligence were obvious to everyone. But a charge was made that, in the preceding pontificate, his attitude had been hesitant, since for a while he joined the party of Felix, Liberius' rival. The electors of Ursinus represented a faction of extreme, rigid Christians who were unwilling to condone any yielding or hesitation in discipline or doctrine and who maintained that the least of these faults rendered any ecclesiastical election null and void.

Valentinian wanted to keep a neutral position between the two parties. But sanguinary strifes broke out between the Ursinians and the Damasians. Viventius, the prefect of Rome, after verifying the regularity of Damasus' election, expelled Ursinus and the two deacons who sustained him. As the seven priests who remained at the head of the party continued to hold their schismatic meetings, Damasus appealed to the Emperor. The latter ordered them to be arrested and expelled from the city. The sequel showed the necessity for this appeal and for the Emperor's action. Toward the end of 366, on the pretext of neutrality, Valentinian allowed Ursinus to return to Rome. The disturbances began once more and were ended only when Ursinus was again expelled.

Valens' Policy in the East

Meanwhile Valentinian was at no pains to have the action of his brother Valens coincide with his own. Therefore the policy in the East followed a different course from that in the West.

Valens, at the time of his brother's elevation, held a minor post in the imperial treasury department. Contemporary historians praise the sincerity of his Christian faith, the austerity

of his life, and his simplicity of manners, a trait which he kept under the purple. But he possessed none of the gifts which recommend a leader to the populace. Julian had been a man of letters; Constantius, a warrior; the mere appearance of the great Constantine fascinated the crowds. But Valens hardly understood Greek; the simple rumor of a distant military expedition made him turn pale. He was a short man of dark complexion, with an unpleasant looking film over one eye. He possessed neither a spirit of justice nor firmness of character.

Bishop Eudoxius

At the outset of his reign his religious policy was dominated by Eudoxius, the usurping bishop of Constantinople, who was an unscrupulous schemer and had adopted all the shades of Arianism one after the other according as they were able to serve his ambition. Eudoxius was a native of Lesser Armenia, the son of one Caesarius who, we are told by Philostorgius, after a dissolute life won the palm of martyrdom under Diocletian.[20] He called himself a disciple of Lucian of Antioch. He took part in the Council of the Dedication, in the Councils of Sardica and Sirmium, in short, in most of the assemblies or conventicles of that time. Therein, according to his interests at the moment, he had maintained semi-Arianism and Anomoeism. At Constantinople, in 360, he was the most active plotter of the intrigues which led to the simultaneous rejection of the *homoousios* of Nicaea, the *homoiousios* of Basil of Ancyra, and the *anomoios* of Eunomius, by proclaiming simply, in a vague formula, that the Son is like (*homoios*) the Father. This ambiguous system was called homoiism or Eudoxianism. In this plausible but deceptive form Arianism would find its way among the barbarous nations.

Eudoxius was supposed to be a great peace-maker. Bishop

[20] Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV, 4.

Macedonius of Constantinople had just died. The see of the Eastern capital was the reward of Eudoxius' so-called services to the cause of good order and of the Empire. St. Hilary of Poitiers and the historian Socrates relate a few details of his insolent triumph. His first sermons from the episcopal pulpit were those of a stage-player rather than a bishop. He said: "God the Father has a Son, you say? You must, then, find a mother for Him also." [21] And again: "God the Son can be pious and reverential since He has His Father to revere. But the Father must be impious and irreverential. Whom can He revere?" The populace laughed at this sarcasm. Arius, in his drinking songs, was not coarser.

Such was the man who acquired an all-powerful influence over Emperor Valens. He it was who baptized Valens in 366 or 367 before the Emperor's expedition against the Goths. It was owing to him that a prohibition was issued against the holding of a great council which the semi-Arians of Asia, reconciled with Pope Liberius and the Nicene faith, planned to convene at Tarsus in 367. He did his utmost to prevent the Emperor from seeing Eunomius. When the Acacians, "jealous of his influence, wanted to complain of him to Valens, the latter refused to listen to them and curtly referred them to Eudoxius himself." [22] Meanwhile the Bishop of Constantinople was working to fill the episcopal sees of the East with his friends.

St. Athanasius

Eudoxius' hatred could not forget Athanasius. After the coming of Jovian, the Patriarch of Alexandria was officially authorized to resume possession of his episcopal see, and he was governing his diocese peaceably when, on May 5, 365,

[21] *"Nam si Filius, necesse est ut et femina sit, et colloquium,"* etc. St. Hilary, *Adversus Constantium,* 13.

[22] Jugie, art. *"Eudoxe"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 1486.

there appeared an edict of Valens banishing all the bishops deposed by Constantius and recalled by Julian. Athanasius was included in this measure. But the people of Alexandria tumultuously assembled, demanding that their bishop be left undisturbed. Athanasius himself, on October 5, probably forewarned of the plot being hatched, left the city. That same night the prefect of the city made an unsuccessful search for him to send him into exile. Athanasius remained in hiding somewhere in the country near Alexandria for four months. Soon popular demonstrations in his behalf assumed such proportions that Valens feared an uprising and gave orders that the Patriarch was not to be molested. Athanasius then returned to Alexandria, "henceforth too great to be persecuted or protected by the Empire." The few incidents which troubled the remaining years of his life were unimportant.

He was Pope Damasus' most faithful support and wisest counsellor. His old comrade in arms, Marcellus of Ancyra, sent a delegation to him, submitting his profession of faith. It was on Athanasius that St. Basil relied in beginning his glorious campaign against the new forms of heresy. "At length this man against whom so many powers had been invoked, this bishop who had spent so many years in exile, often amid the greatest dangers, died in his bed, according to the naïve expression of the Roman Martyrology, in the year 373, on the second of May." [23] Eudoxius died three years earlier, in the spring of 370.

St. Aphraates

If we are to accept Theodoret's account, the dominating influence of a simple monk made the tyrant's audacity halt. One day Valens, looking down from his balcony, saw the holy

[23] Le Bachelet, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2153.

monk Aphraates pass by. Old age made Aphraates' step slow, and his shoulders were stooped beneath a cloak of coarse material.

"The Emperor then said to him, 'Where are you going?' Aphraates with great wisdom replied, 'I am going to pray for the preservation of your empire.' 'But you ought,' said the Emperor, 'to remain at home, and to pray according to the monastic rules.' To this the holy man replied, 'Your observation, O Emperor, is just; and, indeed, while the flock of Christ remained at peace, I pursued the line of conduct which you recommend. But now that the flock is involved in so many perils from the attacks of wild beasts, I am compelled to use every effort for the rescue of the sheep. . . . I am running to extinguish the flames which you have kindled in my Father's house.' While he made these statements, the Emperor remained silent." [24]

Decree against the Monks

When under the sway of Eudoxius' suggestion, Valens knew no scruples of conscience. An imperial decree was published forbidding any government employee to embrace the eremitical life, unless he surrendered his possessions to the curia. The edict also directed imperial officers to "bring back to the civil life by force those who had left it out of laziness and had fled to the desert." [25] Such legal prescriptions were open to most arbitrary and mischievous interpretations, which were brutally applied to the Eastern monks and led to their expulsion. "Lucius the Arian with a considerable body of troops . . . drove them out of the oratories by force. Rufinus declares that he was not only a witness of these cruelties, but also one of the sufferers." [26] After the monks, the simple faithful were persecuted.

[24] Theodoret, IV, 23 (*alias* 26).
[25] *Theodosian Code,* XII, 1, 63.
[26] Socrates, IV, 24.

"The Emperor having issued an edict commanding that the orthodox should be expelled both from Alexandria and the rest of Egypt, depopulation and ruin to an immense extent immediately followed: some were dragged before the tribunals, others cast into prison, and many tortured in various ways." [27]

Frequently these measures produced unexpected results. At Edessa a bishop appointed by the Arians in place of St. Barses vainly called upon the imperial police. He failed to draw the people to his communion.[28] The populace of Samosata compelled two usurpers, one after the other, to leave the city.[29] In Caesarea, when the prefect Eusebius brought the bishop, Basil, before his tribunal, the people rose up. The men from the small-arms factory and from the imperial weaving-sheds demanded their bishop in a threatening manner. We are told by St. Gregory Nazianzen that women brandished their spindles like spears, crying out: "Death to the prefect! Choke him!" Eusebius in terror released the bishop, quit the city, and never set foot in it again.[30]

The Emperor and the Arian bishops who advised him were the more annoyed by such energetic resistance because the political situation in the East was seriously complicated. In 376 the Goths, being driven on by the Huns, obtained asylum within the Empire. But Valens' government treated them with so little humaneness that they rebelled. A regular war had to be waged against them. Valens, before setting out to repel the barbarian peril, wanted to avert by clemency the dangers he thought might arise from the Catholic population. He revoked all the sentences of banishment issued against ecclesiastical persons.[31]

[27] *Ibidem.*
[28] Theodoret, IV, 15 (*alias* 17).
[29] *Ibid.*, chap. 13 (*alias* 15).
[30] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* XLIII, 57.
[31] Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History,* II, 13.

Emperor Gratian

In the West, Gratian succeeded his father Valentinian, who died in battle on August 9, 375. The new emperor frankly took the side of orthodox Christianity. Zosimus relates that when Gratian, after his elevation to the Empire, was presented with the insignia of the sovereign pontificate by the flamen, contrary to what his predecessors had done, he would not accept them because he thought such an office was not suitable for a Christian.[32] From the vestals and the old pagan priests he took their privileges and estates. He appeared no less unfriendly to the Arian heresy than to paganism. After the tragic death of Valens in the battle of Adrianople in 378, it might well have seemed that the cause of Arianism was forever lost.

Eunomius

The two primitive forms of Arianism—the unmodified doctrine of Arius and the fluctuating theories enunciated by the Eusebian party—were effectively and finally destroyed. But Eunomius renewed the sect's spirit and methods.

He furnishes a remarkable example of the seduction that can be exercised, under an ugly exterior, by a man of brilliant and cultured mind. He was of peasant stock, awkward, and deformed; his face was disfigured by a sort of leprosy.[33] But when he quoted Plato's harmonious phrases or explained the mystical fancies of Plotinus, he acquired an incredible prestige. Julian the Apostate made Hellenism stylish; and Eunomius profited by this new vogue. From his lips and those of his chief adepts, Aetius and Asterius, people did not hear, as in

[32] Zosimus, IV, 30.

[33] *"Interius exteriusque morbo regio laborabat."* Rufinus, I, 25. On the *morbus regius,* see Du Cange, under the word *"morbus."*

the time of Arius, these blasphemies: "The Word is a creature; there was a time when the Son was not." They did not search the Scripture for every expression that seemed to lessen Christ; they did not purposely confuse what referred to God with what referred to man; they did not make a great ado over some figurative expressions so as to contradict the clearest and most decisive passages.

The new doctors of heresy succeeded in seizing upon the literary class by flattering the taste of that light-minded society for elegant discussions.[34] Plato, in his Phedra, calls the First Principle of things the "Unbegotten" or the "Innascible" (ἀγέννητος). This word came into favor. The literary circles doted on it. It was used in preference to the word "God," which, they said, was too gross and ordinary. The *Agennetos* was the divinity of superior, delicate minds. The clever and subtle Eunomius, when he had accomplished this first result, argued thus: "Innascibility is the special characteristic of God. From this let us not hastily conclude that the Son is not God, since He is begotten by the Father. This reasoning could be used formerly. But it is clumsy and crude; because someone might reply that the Son is begotten as a person, not as divine substance. This reply, however, is no longer possible if we show that the Son is begotten even as to His substance. And such is the profound thought of the mighty Plato." After reaching this point, Eunomius, according to St. Basil's expression, "confounded them with sayings of the great Plato." "If the notion of the Unbegotten is the definition of God," he said, "it is identical with God. Hence God cannot, from any point of view, personal or substantial, be begotten. Therefore the Son is not strictly God. The *homoousios* contains a contradiction. Plato has triumphed over the Council of Nicaea." [35]

[34] Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* III, 217 f.

[35] Régnon, *op. cit.,* III, 223. Eunomius' theories were set forth in his *Apologetica; P. G.,* XXIX, 497 ff.

The Cappadocian School

The most dangerous errors are those which, first attacking the heights, are not set forth in popular formulas until they have been clothed with the prestige of scholarship. Eunomius' reasoning might have reconquered, especially in the East, the ground lost by the propaganda of Arius and Eusebius, if God had not then raised up men who were able, by their philosophical and literary learning, to command the admiration of the most cultured minds. At the head of these new defenders of the faith were the three friends who are spoken of as the "Cappadocian doctors." [36] They are St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Gregory of Nyssa.

Between the School of Alexandria, which gave the Church St. Athanasius, and the School of Antioch, which would give her St. John Chrysostom, the School of Cappadocia formed a sort of via media, less inclined to allegorical interpretations than the former, and less confined to literal interpretations than the latter. The three great Cappadocian doctors would bring to the conflict, each the traits of his own originality. With Basil, philosophy and rhetoric are always subordinate to the spirit of government and to action; with Gregory Nazianzen, a theologian of wonderful clearness and exactness, but with a brilliant imagination and tender heart, everything is prompted by a poetic inspiration; with Gregory of Nyssa, who was first of all a philosopher, the dominant quality is a spirited dialectic faculty.

St. Basil the Great

The man to whom posterity gave the name of Basil the Great,[37] was a great theologian, a great orator, a great organizer of the monastic life, and a great bishop.

[36] Régnon, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

[37] St. Basil is the only one of the Greek Fathers on whom this title of Great has been bestowed.

Of all the doctrinal writings which St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Augustine attribute to the illustrious Cappadocian, there remain only the work *Against Eunomius,* which St. Basil published in 364 while he was assisting the bishop of Caesarea, and the work *On the Holy Ghost,* published eleven years later, when he was a bishop.

Against the outrageous blasphemies of Arius and the intrigues of Eusebius of Nicomedia, divine Providence had raised up Athanasius: against the crafty sophisms of Eunomius and Aetius, He raised up Basil. "Athanasius is the type of militant earnestness. Being exiled over and over again, and always returning to his post, he wrote books that filled the world. . . . His eloquence was popular. His beautiful Greek style is clear and without affectation. His style is somewhat prolix, because his first aim is to be understood. His method is to pursue, one by one, all the false or captious formulas. The Scripture passages so endlessly repeated by the Arians, he turns over and over in every direction. But he repeatedly comes back to the texts that clearly affirm the divinity, eternity, and consubstantiality of the Word. . . . You might call him a knight who drives his horse into the midst of a savage band, strikes all about him with his cudgel, and pursues those in flight, or who takes his stand against a rock, and, if pressed too hard, escapes in a long bound, but only to enter into the thickest of the fray." [38]

Basil, ever at his post in Caesarea, at first as a priest, then as bishop, "is calmer, more didactic. He manages his discourse artfully and with method. He avoids considerations that are debatable so as to confine himself to unanswerable arguments. He purposes, not so much to set forth the splendors of the faith, as to maintain its purity intact. Yet, when he needs to, he makes use of the erudition acquired in Athens. . . . He learned all the secrets of his language, and drew from rhetoric

[38] Régnon, *op. cit.,* III, 29, 218.

an eloquence that breathed fire. He excelled in argumentation, so that it would be easier to make one's way out of a labyrinth than to escape from the network of his arguments. As to geometry, astronomy, and the science of numbers, he learned what was necessary so as to have nothing to fear from the objections of men versed in those special studies. But his aim was the synthesis of the various branches of knowledge rather than the discovery of the unknown. His mind was powerful, broad, though serious and conservative." [39]

St. Basil's *Contra Eunomium*

In his argumentation against Eunomius, Basil recalls the discussion to the formal point at issue. He shows that in no way can the word "Unbegotten" (*Agennetos*) mean the very substance of God, embracing it as a perfect definition would. To identify the form of the concept with that of the known object is an error of Plato.[40] Basil remarks that, in one and the same object, reason distinguishes different things. Jesus is called the door, the way, the bread, the vine. We call God "unbegotten," as we call Him immortal, incorruptible, according to the aspects under which we are considering Him. Why should we cling to the first of these words by identifying it with the very substance of God? [41] Eunomius' error was the more serious since it applied his false theory about knowledge to the Divinity. What overweening pretense it is to suppose we comprehend God as He is, because our mind has the concept of one of His attributes! As opposed to this presumptuous rationalism, Basil shows that, although God's action reaches down to us, His Being remains inaccessible to us. "The cre-

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 28–30.

[40] St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa theologica,* I, q. 84, art. 1) says: "It seems that Plato strayed from the truth because he thought that the form of the thing known must of necessity be in the knower in the same manner as in the thing known."

[41] St. Basil, *Contra Eunomium,* I, 7.

ated world," he says, "makes us know the Creator's power and wisdom, but not His essence. Even the Creator's power is not necessarily revealed in its fulness. It may be that the arm of the divine Artist does not display its full power. . . . In any event, Eunomius' dilemma cannot bind us. He says that, if we do not know God's essence, we know nothing of Him. It is an easy matter to refute such a fallacy. If knowledge is not true unless it is full comprehension, what would we know even about finite things, which elude us in so many of their aspects? And yet we are dealing with the Infinite. To know the divine essence is first of all to know the unknowableness of God." [42]

St. Basil's *On the Holy Ghost*

The treatise *On the Holy Ghost* is a writing for a special purpose, but, for the history of dogma, it has great importance. Basil had been blamed for speaking in ambiguous terms of the divinity of the Holy Ghost. He said, for example, that "the Holy Ghost comes from God by the Son," that "the royal Majesty descends from the Father by the only Son, to the Holy Ghost." Basil maintains these expressions and holds that they are as orthodox as those of the Latins. The latter prefer to say that the Holy Ghost comes from the Father and from the Son, or that the divine Substance terminates in the three Persons of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. This, says Basil, is a question of words, or rather of points of view. The Latins, directly contemplating God in His eternal Substance, consider it as effused in three Persons; the Greeks, first contemplating the three Persons, equally in possession of the divine Substance in its entirety, seek then to see the order by which this Substance is communicated integrally from the Father to the Son, then to the Holy Ghost.[43] And these lofty

[42] *Ibid.*, II, 32; *Epistolae*, 233, 234.

[43] The Latins used the triangle to symbolize the Trinity. The Greek symbol, or, as modern scientific terminology would put it, "the schematic figure" of the Greeks,

metaphysical considerations are presented by the great doctor with confidence and an abundance of wonderful expressions. "We feel ourselves," says Duke de Broglie, "borne upon the open sea of philosophy. Platonism, Aristotelianism, Alexandrian eclecticism are familiar to the author's mind. He repeatedly borrows from them ideas, explanations, and definitions. By his luminous clarity of diction, his happy choice of expressions, and his wealth of comparisons, we perceive that this philosopher is a popularizer." [44]

The *Hexameron*

It has been said that St. Basil was the first orator that the Church reckoned. "Athanasius harangued the soldiers of the faith like a general making an assault. Origen taught doctrine to disciples. Basil was the first to speak at every moment and to all kinds of men a language both natural and learned, with an eloquence which simplicity or strength never diminished." [45] From this point of view it is interesting to consider him instructing the poor people of Caesarea and lifting their minds and hearts to God by the contemplation of nature. This is the subject of the homilies that are called the *Hexameron,*[46] because in them he explains the wonders of the seven days of creation. "If at times," says the eloquent preacher, "in the calmness of the night, raising attentive eyes to the inexpressible beauty of the stars, you have thought of the Creator of

was a straight line. The divine movement, arising from the Father to constitute the Son, drew the Son to constitute the Holy Ghost. See Régnon, *op. cit.,* I, 339 f.

[44] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* IV, 230. Cf. Nager, *Die trinitätslehre des heil. Basilius.* Nager defends the Bishop of Caesarea from the charge of neonicenism made against him by certain German writers. Neonicenism is a product of the imagination of certain Rationalist historians; it never existed in history. St. Basil always appeared as the defender of the Nicene "consubstantial," both of the word and of the fact. Harnack, to maintain the contrary view, had to rely on an apocryphal document.

[45] De Broglie, *op. cit.,* V, 90.

[46] *P. G.,* XXIX, 3 ff.

all things; if sometimes, during the day, you have studied the marvels of light; come, let me lead you through the wonders of the universe." Then, after a glowing description of the beauties of the earth, he says: "If things visible are so beautiful, what must be the invisible? This perishable but beautiful sun is an object of inexhaustible admiration for us. What, then, must be the Sun of divine justice in all its beauty?" Another time, after describing the wonders of the ocean, he continues thus: "If such is the beauty of the ocean, with its roaring and mounting waves, how much more beautiful is the movement of this Christian gathering where the voices of men, women, and children, mingled together and reëchoing, rise in prayer to God."

At other times the tone of his eloquence recalls the meditative solitary whose soul was trained in the monasteries. He says: "You sleep. Time is slipping by. You awaken and meditate, and life still escapes you. We are seized by an irresistible force. You pass in front of all things, and you leave all things behind. Along the way you have seen trees, fields, watercourses. For a moment you were charmed, and then you went on. You stumbled over stones, were halted by cliffs, fell over precipices, and found yourself encompassed by wild beasts and venomous reptiles. You suffered, and then all this, too, you left behind. Such is life. Neither its pleasures nor its pains are lasting."

St. Basil and Monasticism

The man who spoke thus had lived a deep mystical life and his keenest desire was to make the greatest possible number of souls profit from it. To this purpose, when he was in Caesarea he published his two collections of monastic rules, drawn up, at least in part, in his monastery on the bank of the Iris.[47]

[47] On the authenticity of these two collections, see Allard, art. *"Basile"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* II, 446. They have been republished in *P. G.,* XXXI, 889–1506.

Both collections are the development of a letter which Basil wrote to his friend Gregory Nazianzen. In this letter he describes the life which he and his companions followed in their retreat in Pontus.[48] The rules he gives were first practiced by himself. He also draws inspiration, in his directions, from what he saw in his Egyptian journeys.

For Basil the ideal of the monastic life is to be found neither in those vast colonies of monks that he visited in Upper Egypt nor in those isolated huts of anchorites that he met with in the desert. In the former he found too much activity and noise. In the latter, as he remarks, there was not sufficient occasion to practice charity and humility. "If you live cut off from men," he says, "how can you rejoice with the joyful and weep with the afflicted? . . . Our Lord washed the feet of His Apostles: if you are a hermit, whose feet will you wash? How will you train yourself in humility if you have nobody before whom to humble yourself?" Basil wishes that souls, prompted by a desire to consecrate themselves to God, should gather in a monastery of moderate size, where the superior could be in continued contact with each brother. Each one would choose a trade, but of a sort that does not disturb the peace of the religious life. And manual labor would be interrupted by so many prayers that it could not make the monks lose the interior spirit.

They are to rise at daybreak to praise God by prayer and the singing of hymns. They will read the Holy Books and will preserve the memory of the holy persons of the Bible, whom they will contemplate "as living statues and animated images." Prayer and study will each have its turn. Silence will not be imposed in an absolute way, but useless talking will be avoided. Before speaking they will reflect and will govern even the tone of voice, which should be neither too low nor too shrill. When embracing the religious life, they will not strip

[48] *P. G.*, XXXII, *223–233*.

themselves of their possessions, but will henceforth consider them as consecrated to God and will employ them only in good works, either by their own hands or by carefully chosen agents.

Such are the salient provisions of the Basilian rule. "We are particularly impressed by its moderation and wisdom. It leaves to the superiors the determination of the countless details of the local, individual, and daily life. But, while avoiding inflexible prescriptions, the lawmaker gently approaches the monk and so well entwines him in all the varied circumstances of his existence, as finally to place and keep him under the divine yoke." [49]

St. Basil as Bishop

The same prudence and firmness are to be noted in St. Basil's government. In 370, after the death of Bishop Eusebius, the people and clergy elected him, in spite of the unsettled state of his health, and after vigorous opposition on his part, to the important see of Caesarea. Its jurisdiction at that time extended over fifty suffragans, divided into eleven provinces. St. Gregory Nazianzen has left us a few descriptive details of his friend. He tells us that Basil "was a man of frail health, made thin by fasting and pale from vigils, having hardly any flesh or blood." [50] A manuscript in the Vatican Library, quoted by Baronius, furnishes a more precise description. It says he was tall, thin, wearing a full beard, his head half bald, his temples slightly sunken, his look pensive.[51] His speech was

[49] Besse, *Les Moines d'Occident antérieurs au concile de Chalcédoine,* pp. 90 f. It is hard to say to what extent the Basilian liturgy, still used on certain days in all the Eastern patriarchates, is the work of St. Basil. From St. Gregory Nazianzen we know that when St. Basil was at Caesarea he regulated "the order of prayers." (*Orations,* XLIII, 34.) The liturgy of St. Basil is to be found in *P. G.,* XXXI, 1630–1684. Cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 72.

[50] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Letters 42, 44; *Orations,* XLIII, 77.

[51] Baronius, *Annales,* year 378.

slow. This slowness he himself attributed to Cappadocian awkwardness.[52] His enemy Eunomius says that Basil trembled every time anyone entered the room where he shut himself in to work.[53] Philostorgius relates that Basil shrunk from public discussions.[54] The truth is that Basil "was one of those men who show intrepid courage when they feel morally obliged to act, but who, without some imperative duty, do not emerge from the retreat which is their delight." [55] Such men sometimes appear shy and incapable to superficial observers. But their action, prompted solely by the sense of duty or zeal, and not by an instinctive need for activity and noise, is the more effective and profound. So, too, old Bishop Gregory of Nazianzus, father of the illustrious doctor of the same name, at the time of Basil's election, wrote to the bishops who objected on the score of Basil's poor health: "What you need is not an athlete, but a doctor of the faith." [56]

The strife against Arianism, the defense of his see of Cappadocia against encroachments that he thought harmful to the welfare of souls, and the practice of works of mercy on behalf of his people, were the chief concerns of his episcopacy.

Strife with Arianism

St. Gregory Nazianzen records the dialogue between the Bishop and the prefect of Cappadocia who wanted Basil to yield to the religious whims of his master, Valens.

"What reason have you," said the prefect, "for alone resisting so great an emperor?"

"The Emperor is great, but he is not above God."

"Do you not know what torments I can inflict on you?"

[52] St. Basil, Letter 48.
[53] St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium,* no. 1.
[54] Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History,* IV, 12.
[55] Allard, *Saint Basile,* p. 154.
[56] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Letter 43.

"What sort of torments? Explain what you mean."

"I can inflict confiscation, exile, torture, death."

"Confiscation? Do so, if you want to lay hands on the few worn-out vestments and the few books that constitute my entire wealth. Exile? Why should I be afraid of that? Wherever a Christian may be, he considers himself a pilgrim and knows that the whole earth is God's. Torture at the very first stroke will ruin my body, which is so weak. And death will but hasten my return to God, to whom I yearn to go."

"Never before has anyone spoken to me with such unrestraint." "Perhaps," Basil replied, "you have never before met a bishop." [57]

Defense of his See

In defending the rights of his episcopal see, Basil found that he was facing not only the imperial power, but the opposition of a covetous, scheming prelate. In 371 Valens, for financial reasons, divided Cappadocia into two provinces and chose the city of Tyana as the capital of the second Cappadocia. But the see of Tyana was then occupied by an old bishop, Anthimus, who had formerly given evidence of devotion to the orthodox faith at Basil's side, but who was quickly dazzled by the splendor of his new situation. He wished to replace Basil as metropolitan of the whole former province. Certain malcontents, more or less secret foes of the Bishop of Caesarea, rallied to Anthimus' side. The new party even enlisted some real bandits. One day when Basil and his friend Gregory were crossing a narrow pass, followed by a caravan of mules laden with various provisions, they were attacked by an armed band that was directed by Anthimus in person. Basil and even the timid and peaceful Gregory had to take part in the fight.

[57] *Idem, Orations,* XLIII, 48–51.

To ward off attacks upon him, Basil thought it well to make the town of Sasima a bishopric. This town, only a short distance from Caesarea, commanded the various roads by which the tributes due the see of Caesarea reached him.[58] He entrusted this bishopric to his faithful friend Gregory, who almost in spite of himself was consecrated bishop by Basil. Gregory was a delicate and contemplative soul, preferring silence and solitude to everything else. He received the priesthood only out of regard for his father's wishes. We can picture him suddenly placed, like an outpost sentry, where he would daily have to contend against the hordes in Anthimus' service. He soon felt that such a mission was beyond his strength. A yearning for solitude overcame him. He fled to the desert and left it only upon the urging of Basil and his own venerable father. He then returned to his father's house in Nazianzus. "Alas," he said, "can I never realize my longing: to cross the ocean of life in a little boat, to build myself a little house on this earth before I depart for eternity?" [59] A compromise was finally concluded between Basil and Anthimus. The details of it are not known. But various texts lead us to suppose that, out of love for peace, the Bishop of Caesarea gave up to the usurper all or part of his rights in the second Cappadocia.[60]

Works of Mercy

Though less sensitive than Gregory, Basil had a tender heart. "At that period, when political disturbances were frequent and when citizens often remained exposed to the whims

[58] At that period there was nothing like regular appropriations for public worship. The churches, with their personnel of priests, clerics, and widows, and their various works of charity, could meet their expenses only by the income from their property, let out to farmers or placed in charge of managers.

[59] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* X, 1.

[60] St. Basil, Letters 97, 98, 102.

of officials without supervision or control, the councils laid upon bishops the duty of intervening in behalf of the lowly, the weak, people unjustly accused, and all victims of arbitrary rule or tyranny. To this duty Basil devoted himself wholeheartedly. Part of his correspondence is concerned with these matters of charity. For the purpose he activated his friends who were in the highest posts. Many are his letters asking for exemptions from taxes, rents, and other burdens on behalf of poor people, even of towns and cities.[61] If a master was angry with some erring slaves, Basil begged him to forgive them.[62] He wrote directly to the Emperor, asking for the construction of a bridge.[63] There was not any wretchedness, deserved or unmerited, not an interest, great or small, public or private, which had not Basil for its advocate." [64] In each district of his diocese, administered by a chorepiscopus, he established a hospice.

At the gate of Caesarea he built a vast charitable institution that was like a new city, constructed by alms. "It was hospitality in all its forms. There was a place of rest for the traveler, an asylum for the aged, a hospital for the sick, with a section reserved for those human ailments that involve contagion and shame. In the center of these buildings stood an immense church. Round about moved a large number of keepers, nurses, tradesmen, and carters, transporting things needed for the life of the establishment. Through the midst of all this activity, Basil would come and go at all hours, inspecting everything, speaking to everyone, filling all with his zeal. A century after him this whole district was still called the Basiliade." [65] This foundation aroused the distrust of the civil power, but Basil's influence kept growing. In fact the Em-

[61] *Ibid.*, 83, 84, 85, 88, 110, 303, 308, 309, 311, 312, 313.
[62] *Ibid.*, 73.
[63] *Ibid.*, 305.
[64] Allard, *Saint Basile*, pp. 107 f.
[65] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, V, 188 f.

peror, not only did not venture to censure him, but even commissioned him to go to Armenia for the purpose of establishing concord between the bishops there and to make provision for the vacant sees.

Yet at times Basil, by his devotedness, risked his liberty and his life. He acted in behalf of a widow who, when pestered by an official wanting to marry her against her wishes, took refuge in the Caesarea church. The Bishop gave her asylum in his house. The prefect, coming to the support of his subordinate, summoned Basil before his tribunal and even dared to utter most infamous insinuations against him. While Basil was calmly presenting his defense, the people rushed out into the streets. At their head were the workmen from the imperial factories, brandishing their work tools. At sound of the uprising, which was coming nearer the tribunal, the prefect was alarmed and had only time enough to free Basil, who generously protected the fleeing official against the fury of the mob.[66]

Government of the Diocese

These works of mercy did not make Basil neglect the good government of his diocese. He closely supervised the chorepiscopi's administration. To the end of his life and despite his poor health, he visited the most remote parishes, those most difficult of access, in the mountains.[67] The religious eccentricities indulged in by certain monks and country priests found no favor with him. This watchfulness does not imply any severity on his part toward his priests. Before the State he was careful to uphold the ecclesiastical immunities. From the civil power he demanded jurisdiction over offenses that were harmful to the churches.

[66] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* XLIII, 56 f.
[67] St. Basil, Letter 283.

Though weakened by age and by his austerities, an ardent love of God and souls sustained him in his preaching, which was very frequent, and in his pastoral journeys, which he never tired of. The coming of Gratian, the decree issued by that emperor in favor of religious liberty, and the election, in 378, of his friend Gregory to the see of Nazianzus, were St. Basil's last joys in this world. He died January 1, 379. The whole people of the province flocked to his funeral. Pagans and Jews mingled their tears with those of the Christians, for he had been the benefactor of all.

Ecclesiastical Writers

Along with Basil, after the death of Julian the Apostate, other valiant champions of the Church, though not exercising an influence like that of the Bishop of Caesarea, fought the good fight of the faith. His brother Gregory of Nyssa and his friend Gregory Nazianzen would not display their full activity until the reign of Theodosius. Three illustrious Fathers, however, illumined the Latin Church.

Hilary of Poitiers, before leaving this world, published two important works: his masterly writing *Against Auxentius,* in 365, and, the next year, his scholarly *Commentary on the Psalms*. Ambrose, prefect of Milan in 372, and bishop of that city in 374, prefaced the great part he would later take in the Church and in the Empire, by becoming the close adviser of Emperor Gratian. St. Jerome, a hermit in the Chalcis desert since 374, there gave the firstfruits of his vigorous talent by the publication, in 376, of his *Life of Paul of Thebes.*

In a less eminent rank, Ulfilas bishop of the Visigoths of the Upper Danube, drew the attention of the faithful about 376 by his *Commentary on St. Luke*. The exegete known under the name of Ambrosiaster [68] published his *Commen-*

[68] Dom Morin, in the *Revue bénédictine,* January 1914, ably maintains that the

taries on St. Paul. Optatus of Milevis, an original and profound writer, set forth in his *History of the Donatist Schism,* a doctrine the principles of which St. Augustine would adopt and develop. In the East the work of Christian scholars was no less fruitful. Between 374 and 377 Bishop Epiphanius of Salamis (Constantia), with earnest and at times too credulous zeal, laid bare all the heresies of his time in his *Ancoratus* and his *Panarion.* In 376 St. John Chrysostom began his apostolic career with his book *Against the Defamers of the Monastic Life.*

Above all these writers, dominating the East and West by his high station, Pope Damasus, restoring the monuments of the first Christian centuries and adorning them with elegant inscriptions, added to the renown of his virtues the glory of his zeal for the embellishment of the Eternal City.

St. Hilary of Poitiers

The book *Against Auxentius,* published by St. Hilary in 365, aimed at turning the bishops of Italy from the semi-Arian Bishop of Milan, Auxentius, who had been set over that important diocese by the will of Emperor Valentinian. The Bishop of Poitiers in his book, which is addressed to the bishops and the faithful, but also has in mind the sovereign himself, rises up forcefully against the interference of the civil power in the spiritual affairs of the Church on the pretext of protecting it.

He would prefer open persecution to such a regime. "The word 'peace' is a beautiful word," he says, "and the idea of unity is beautiful. But let us beware of the false peace of Antichrist. We must bewail the wretchedness of our age,

writer known as Ambrosiaster is Evagrius, patriarch of Antioch, who died in 393, who was known for his relations with St. Damasus and St. Jerome, for his Latin translation of the *Life of St. Antony,* which St. Athanasius wrote in Greek, and for several other writings.

when it is thought that men can protect God, when people work to defend the Church of Christ by worldly intrigues. . . . I ask you whether it was by decrees of a prince that Paul, made a spectacle of in the circus, formed a Church for Jesus Christ. By today, alas, earthly protections command the divine faith, and the Church glories in being beloved by the world, the Church which has been able to be Christ's only on condition that it be hated by the world." [69] Of course, by these words, the holy Bishop did not mean to deny the duty which every State has to protect the benevolent work of the Church, but he was simply contrasting the Church of the first centuries with the Church of the Arians.

A commentary on the Psalms (*Tractatus super psalmos*) was a sort of last breath from the soul of the great bishop. This writing, the fruit of a mind ripened by virtue and study, represents the height of Hilary's exegetical work. He determines to grasp the literal sense by comparing the different Latin and Greek translations and by referring to the authorized commentators. At the same time he endeavors to fathom the deep, mystical meaning of a book that he calls "the heavenly intercourse of human hope."

Like St. Athanasius, St. Hilary had a peaceful, gentle death. According to the most reliable conjectures, he died January 13, 368. Says Tillemont: "He died at Poitiers, in his fatherland, full of holiness and faith, after performing many miracles. Some manuscripts of his life note that, at the moment of his death, there entered his room a light so brilliant that no one could endure its brightness." [70]

St. Ambrose

Scarcely six years passed after the death of the illustrious Bishop of Poitiers, when another son of Gaul, Ambrose, called

[69] St. Hilary, *Contra Auxentium*, nos. 2–4.
[70] Tillemont, *Mémoires* (1700 ed.), VII, art. 18 (St. Hilary).

to a destiny no less great, ascended the see of Milan. Among the members of that class of Christian patricians already mentioned,[71] and among those frequenting the palace of the Anicii, a young man was pointed out in particular as giving promise of a brilliant future. He was the son of a former prefect of Gallia. Born at Treves in 340, he was brought to Rome by his devout mother after his father's premature death.[72] With them came his sister Marcellina, who would receive the veil from the hands of Pope St. Liberius, and his brother Satyrus, to whom he was always united in close and tender affection. Ambrose—such was his name—was distinguished by a clear intellect, an upright character, and a charming ease of speech. It was said of him, as of Plato, that in his infancy, while he was sleeping in his crib, a swarm of bees fluttered about his face and that some of them, without harming him, even slipped into his half-open mouth. His father, witnessing this prodigy, exclaimed: "This child, if he lives, will be something great."

Ambrose, destined to follow, like his father, the career of high public office, devoted himself assiduously to the study of Greek literature, philosophy, and especially law. First he entered the practice of law, as did his brother. He pleaded his cases so brilliantly that the praetorian prefect of Rome, Petronius Probus, appointed him his secretary. After a while, in 372, Probus recommended him to Emperor Valentinian, to be sent, with the title of "consular," to govern the provinces of Liguria and Aemilia, the capital of which was the important city of Milan. The story is told that, as Ambrose was leaving, the prefect, recommending the qualities of gentleness and moderation with which it was advisable to govern those important provinces, said to him: "Conduct thyself not as a judge, but as a bishop." These words soon appeared prophetic.

[71] See *supra*, p. 227.

[72] We do not know the name of St. Ambrose's mother.

In fact, two years later, after the death of the semi-Arian bishop of Milan, Auxentius, when the bishops were in the basilica deliberating about the choice of a successor, an impatient and excited crowd of people, divided into various camps, was stirred with an animosity that might easily degenerate into a riot. Ambrose came in haste to calm the disorder. His eloquent and sympathetic words soon quieted the tumult. The people were keeping silent to hear him, when a child's voice cried out over and over again: "Ambrose the bishop!" The words, coming from the lips of innocence, were regarded as a heavenly inspiration. The name of Ambrose was acclaimed by all the people and by all the clergy.

Following a regrettable custom that was then still rather general, Ambrose had not been baptized, nor was he even a catechumen. The canon law forbade the calling of a neophyte to the episcopacy. Further, he was a civil magistrate; and a law of Constantine forbade the magistrates of a city to belong to the clergy of that city. But so great was the enthusiasm that, despite the protests of Ambrose, who advanced this twofold incompatibility, besides other reasons, no notice was taken of these provisions.[73] The Emperor, and also the Pope, when informed of what had taken place, at once ratified everything. Ambrose, therefore, received baptism and, a few days later, took possession of the see of Milan. Basil, far off in the East, wrote him a letter of congratulation.

The event shortly proved how providential the choice of Ambrose had been. Immediately after his elevation his life, already simple and serious, became austere and penitential. All the money in his possession he distributed to the poor and assured them of the ownership of his landed property. The management of this he placed in the hands of his sister Marcellina. Simultaneously he carried on the ministry of almost

[73] *"Non valuit praeceptio, praevaluit impressio."* St. Ambrose, Letter 63, no. 65, To the Church at Vercellae (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., vol. 10).

daily preaching, the cares of an episcopal administration which the necessities of that period rendered extremely burdensome, and the deep study of the doctrine which it was now his duty to teach.

His voice was not strong, but his speech, skilful and clear, nourished upon the great classics of antiquity, harmonious and ornate like that of a disciple of Virgil, precise like that of an accomplished jurist, charmed both the educated and the common people. One of his young listeners, who was still in the bonds of heresy, but who in turn would become a master of Christian eloquence, says: "I hung on his words intently and I was delighted with the pleasantness of his speech." [74]

This same witness, Augustine—it is of him we are speaking—also mentions Ambrose's devotion to charity. He says:

"I had not the opportunity to make my demands unto him, what I would, or how I would; for that multitude of people full of business, whose infirmities he gave up himself unto, debarred me both from hearing and speaking with him." [75]

As we know, it had become customary to make the bishop the judge or arbiter, not only in matters of a spiritual order, but also in temporal affairs. When the bishop was, like Ambrose, a trained jurist and experienced administrator, who would not profit by so reliable and fatherly a jurisdiction? This was the truer since the Bishop, whenever the financial interests of his Church were in conflict with those of someone who was disinherited, would yield the episcopal rights. "The Church," he said, "never loses when charity wins."

Every moment which these occupations left free was devoted to study. We leave to St. Augustine, with his picturesque and living words, the description of St. Ambrose absorbed in the study of the sacred sciences.

[74] St. Augustine, *Confessions,* V, 13.
[75] St. Augustine, *Confessions,* VI, 3.

"When he was reading, he drew his eyes along over the leaves, and his heart searched into the sense, but his voice and tongue were silent. Ofttimes when we were present (for no man was debarred of coming to him, nor was it his fashion to be told of anybody that came to speak with him) we still saw him reading to himself, and never otherwise; so that having long sat in silence (for who durst be so bold as to interrupt him, so intentive to his study?) we were fain to depart. We conjectured, that the small time which he got for the repairing of his mind, he retired himself from the clamor of other men's businesses." [76]

Valentinian, when dying, entrusted to Ambrose his two young sons, Gratian and Valentinian II. Ambrose gave them wise counsel. He was especially dear to Gratian. "The greatest intimacy was at once established between the prince and the bishop. Presently Ambrose gave the spectacle—something new for the Church—of a bishop who was the confidant, almost the minister of an emperor, and was consulted not merely about matters of religion or good morals, but about political questions. Soon the effects of this influence were evident. From 378 to 381 Gratian lived almost constantly in Milan. In the legislative documents bearing his name the trace of Ambrose's influence can be easily recognized. Rigor is tempered with clemency in certain enactments about privileged corporations; in the distribution of the *annona* the spirit of order is combined with that of charity; there are prudently repressive laws against banditry. Less harshness is to be found in the prescription, less indication of violent measures than in the laws of Valentinian, less of sharp alternatives of powerlessness and weakness." [77]

[76] *Ibidem.*

[77] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, VI, 19 f. Cf. *Theodosian Code,* VII, XVIII, 2; XIII, V, 16; IX, 3; VI, XXVIII, 1; X, XX, 10; VII, XVIII, XLIV.

St. Jerome

While a former member of the Roman upper magistracy was thus using in the service of the Church the resources of a mind trained in the service of the State, another Latin, of high culture and noble birth, was severing his connections with the world and was withdrawing into the desert, there to follow a penitential life. His name was Jerome. Posterity would enshrine his name with no less veneration than that of Ambrose.

Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus came of a wealthy Christian family. He was born in the year 342 at Stridon on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia in a semi-barbarous country.[78] This origin he himself blames for the impetuosity of his character and the excess of his vehement feelings. When eighteen years old the young Dalmatian was sent by his father to Rome to pursue his studies. Under the direction of the famous grammarian Donatus and the celebrated rhetorician Victorinus,[79] he devoted himself earnestly to the study of the works of Aristotle, Plato, and Porphyry. Jerome was also very fond of Virgil, whose penetrating poetry went to the very depths of his loving soul, and of Cicero, whose flowing diction left its imprint upon the style of the future doctor of the Church. It was during this period of his life that he formed a large library by dint of persevering labor and by copying many entire books with his own hand.[80]

Unlike Augustine, Jerome never had to bewail a fall into heresy; but, like the great African doctor, he did not always succeed in protecting himself from the seductions of the great city. He refers to his faults only in passing, but he does so in

[78] St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus,* chap. 135.

[79] This is the Victorinus whose courageous conversion is related by St. Augustine, *Confessions,* VIII, 2.

[80] St. Jerome, Letter 22, no. 30, To Eustochium (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 35).

terms marked with a bitter remorse. He writes as follows to his friend Heliodorus:

"The advice that I give is that of no inexperienced mariner who has never lost either ship or cargo, and has never known a gale. Lately shipwrecked as I have been myself, my warnings to other voyagers spring from my own fears." [81]

From Rome, where he was baptized by Pope Liberius in 365, Jerome shortly afterwards went to the city of Aquileia, the metropolis of his native province. At that time religious studies and the monastic life were flourishing in Aquileia. There he formed friendships that would hold a large place in his life. He made the acquaintance of Heliodorus, Innocent, and Hylas, all of whom later accompanied him into the desert, and of Rufinus, from whom he became separated in consequence of painful quarrels.

Aquileia was but one stage in Jerome's migratory life. Says Tillemont: "Already he began to have enemies. Their persecution of him was so violent that word of it reached the ears of Pope Damasus." [82] Jerome decided to go to the East. The separation from his family and friends required painful efforts on his part. He writes: "I converse with your letter. As often as the lines—traced in a well-known hand—bring back to me the faces which I hold so dear, either I am no longer here, or else you are here with me." [83] To Heliodorus he writes: "I am not ignorant of the fetters which you may plead as hindrances. I have passed through troubles like yours myself." [84]

"Accompanied by Heliodorus, Innocent, and Hylas, he set out," says Tillemont, who quotes from the saint's writings,

[81] St. Jerome, Letter 14, no. 6, To Heliodorus (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 15).

[82] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* vol. 12, art. 4, *St. Jerome.*

[83] St. Jerome, Letter 7, no. 2, To Chromatus, Jovinus, and Eusebius (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 9).

[84] St. Jerome, Letter 14, no. 3, To Heliodorus (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 14).

"taking with him the library he had gathered in Rome. He visited a large number of provinces, passing through Thrace, Pontus, and Bithynia. He crossed Galatia and Cappadocia, suffered the intolerable heat of Cilicia, and finally in Syria found the rest he was seeking as a safe harbor after the shipwreck." [85]

Following a stay in Antioch, Jerome went into the desert of Chalcis. "Under a burning sky, amidst the desert sands where here and there a few monasteries arose, he came to find penance. There he found other sufferings besides. Heliodorus had gone back to the West; Innocent and Hylas were snatched from him by death. More bitter than these griefs, the recollection of his unrestrained youth troubled the peace of his soul." [86] By a trial that seems to have been spared Augustine after his conversion, Jerome, in the midst of his mortifications, was haunted by obsessing memories of pagan Rome. These agonizing obsessions he describes with a vibrant and chaste emotion that has not been equaled perhaps even by the immortal author of the *Confessions*. He says:

"How often, when I was living in the desert, in the vast solitude which gives to hermits a savage dwelling-place, parched by a burning sun, how often did I fancy myself among the pleasures of Rome! I used to sit alone because I was filled with bitterness. Sackcloth disfigured my unshapely limbs, and my skin from long neglect had become as black as an Ethiopian's. Tears and groans were every day my portion; and if drowsiness chanced to overcome my struggles against it, my bare bones, which hardly held together, clashed against the ground. Although in my fear of hell I had consigned myself to this prison, where I had no companions but scorpions and wild beasts, I often found myself amid bevies of girls. My face was pale and my frame chilled with fasting; yet my mind was burning with desire, and the fires of lust kept bubbling up before me when

[85] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, art. 5.
[86] Largent, *Saint Jérôme*, p. 11.

my flesh was good as dead. Helpless, I cast myself at the feet of Jesus, I watered them with my tears. I remember how I often cried aloud all night till the break of day and ceased not from beating my breast, till tranquillity returned at the chiding of the Lord. I used to dread my very cell as though it knew my thoughts; and, stern and angry with myself, I used to make my way alone into the desert. Wherever I saw hollow valleys, craggy mountains, steep cliffs, there I made my oratory, there the house of correction for my unhappy flesh. There also, when I had shed copious tears and had strained my eyes towards heaven, I sometimes felt myself among angelic hosts, and for joy and gladness sang: 'Because of the savor of thy good ointments we will run after thee.' " [87]

We may well suppose that the recollection of the classical authors of whom Jerome had lately been so fond, had a part in these temptations. He strove by more austere studies to divert them.

"I betook myself," he says, "to a brother who before his conversion had been a Jew and asked him to teach me Hebrew. Thus, after having familiarized myself with the pointedness of Quintillian, the fluency of Cicero, the seriousness of Fronto, and the gentleness of Pliny, I began to learn my letters anew and to study to pronounce words both harsh and guttural. What labor I spent upon this task, what difficulties I went through, how often I despaired, how often I gave over and then in my eagerness to learn commenced again, can be attested both by myself the subject of this misery and by those who then lived with me. But I thank the Lord that from this seed of learning sown in bitterness I now cull sweet fruits." [88]

Yet the enchanting pages of the favorite authors of his youth still returned to his mind. For most men of that time paganism was nothing more than a form of literature; but that literature was impressed with the sensuality of a world

[87] St. Jerome, Letter 22, no. 7, To Eustochius (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., VI, 25).
[88] St. Jerome, Letter 125, no. 12, To Rusticus (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., VI, 248).

that had not known the cross of Christ. "How blind I was," Jerome exclaims.

"When at times I began to read the Prophets, their style seemed rude and repellent. After many nights spent in vigil, I would once more take up Plautus. . . . Suddenly I was caught up in the spirit and dragged before the judgment seat of the Judge. Asked who and what I was, I replied: 'I am a Christian.' But He who presided said: 'Thou liest, thou art a follower of Cicero, and not of Christ. For where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.' " [89]

Jerome became more and more devoted to the study of the Sacred Books. He did not forsake the memory of his classical education; his style abounds in recollections of Virgil, Cicero, Terence, and Lucretius. He has been called the most literary of the Fathers of the Church.[90] But his literary culture now served merely to adorn the truth. In one of his letters he says: "I desire to make that secular wisdom a matron of the true Israel. . . . My efforts promote the advantage of Christ's family." [91]

The Arian disputes and the quarrels stirred up by the Schism of Antioch also disturbed the peace which he came to find in the desert. Because, when speaking of the Trinity, he made use of the Latin terminology, because he was loath to use the words "three hypostases" and preferred the expression "three persons," some monks accused him of Sabellianism and denounced him as a heretic. And an effort was made to force him to declare himself regarding the legitimate bishop of Antioch. Did he stand with Meletius or with Paulinus? Jerome became exasperated. To one of his friends he writes as follows:

"I am called a heretic, although I preach the consubstantial Trinity. I am accused of the Sabellian impiety, although I proclaim

[89] *Idem,* Letter 22, no. 30, To Eustochius.
[90] Villemain, *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (1856 ed.), p. 351.
[91] St. Jerome, Letter 70, no. 2, To Magnus (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 149).

with unwearied voice that in the Godhead there are three distinct, real, whole, and perfect persons. The Arians do right to accuse me, but the orthodox forfeit their orthodoxy when they assail a faith like mine." [92]

On this question, as on that of the Antiochene Schism, Jerome leaves the decision to the See of Rome. He wrote as follows to Pope Damasus:

"I think it my duty to consult the chair of Peter. . . . This I know is the rock on which the Church is built. . . . I know nothing of Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I have nothing to do with Paulinus. He that gathers not with you scatters. . . . Just now, those Arians, the Campenses,[93] are trying to extort from me, a Roman Christian, their unheard-of formula of three hypostases. And this, too, after the definition of Nicaea and the decree of Alexandria, in which the West has joined. . . . If you think it right that I should speak of three hypostases, explaining what I mean by them, I am ready to submit. . . . I implore your Blessedness, therefore, by the crucified Savior of the world and by the consubstantial Trinity, to authorize me by letter either to use or to refuse this formula of three hypostases." [94]

From this letter we might suppose that Jerome, distrusting the excesses of his vehemence, was merely seeking to shun the controversy. Later he was drawn into it and too often employed a vigor and an outburst of feeling that does not accord with the restrained polemics of Athanasius, Hilary, and Ambrose. Hard on himself, he showed the same severity toward those who disagreed with him, even very dear former friends like Rufinus of Aquileia, or venerable bishops like Augustine of Hippo. But everywhere and at all times the

[92] *Idem,* Letter 17, no. 2, To Marcus (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 21).

[93] *Campenses* (*i. e.,* "the field party. The Meletians were so called because, denied access to the churches of the city, they had to worship in the open air outside the walls." *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 19 note. Tr.).

[94] St. Jerome, Letter 15, To Damasus (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 18–20).

harsh solitary, whose lips let fall so many sharp words, remains an austere priest whose virtue disarms the most suspicious hatred; he remains the tireless investigator of the Sacred Books. Future exegetes will acknowledge him their master, the submissive son of the Holy See. Succeeding ages will fondly repeat his wonderful expressions of obedience and devotion to that see. And the Church, despite Jerome's excesses of language, will place on the brow of the fiery Dalmatian the halo of the saints.

St. Epiphanius

The separation of the East and West into two political and literary quasi autonomies was a great injury both to the Church and to the Empire. Hence arose misunderstandings, rivalries, and conflicts. St. Athanasius' banishment to Gaul and St. Hilary's to Asia Minor, and, during the latter half of the fourth century, the long sojourn of the Latin St. Jerome in the East, seem to have been providential means for bringing about a fusion of minds between the two sections of the Empire. Unfortunately the introduction of fresh elements of discord did not allow this fusion to bear all the fruit that might have been expected.

St. Epiphanius' character is somewhat analogous to that of St. Jerome. Like the hermit of Chalcis, the Bishop of Salamis is abrupt of speech; he is passionately devoted to orthodoxy and enamored of the penitential and studious life. But the Greek Bishop does not possess the penetrating genius or the pure, harmonious style of the Latin priest.

Epiphanius was born in 315 at Besanduk, near Eleutheropolis, in Judea. In his youth he became devoted to the sacred sciences. While still very young, he was sent to Alexandria to pursue his studies. We are told that, owing to his inexperience, he took part in the conventicles of the Gnostics. But,

having penetrated the perversity of their doctrines and morals, he withdrew from them instantly. Thereafter he conceived so keen a horror for heresy that he spent his whole life denouncing and fighting it in all its forms.

This was the time when the anchorite Hilarion, also disabused of the errors he had imbibed in the Egyptian capital, spread in Palestine the manner of life of the Egyptian hermits. Epiphanius placed himself under his guidance. Then, in 337, Epiphanius founded, near his native village of Besanduk, at a place called Old Ad, a cenobitical colony according to the type of St. Pachomius. History knows nothing about his life during the thirty years he spent in his monastic cell. But the writings he published in his maturity and old age bear witness to the silent labors of his solitude. Not satisfied with perfecting himself in the Greek language, he there learned Syriac, Hebrew, Egyptian, and even, in part, Latin, a rare accomplishment in the East. St. Jerome, his rival in studious austerity, called him "the pentaglot."

In 367 his repute for learning and holiness led to his being chosen Bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamis, metropolis of the Island of Cyprus. "But it seems that the scholarly monk was less prepared for the management of affairs than for dogmatic polemics. His disagreement with John, bishop of Jerusalem, and later his proceedings against St. John Chrysostom, indicate that he was not familiar with the canon laws and that he was unable to discern the plots of intriguing schemers." [95]

His campaigns against heresies were more justified. The death of St. Athanasius in 373 enabled the dissenting sects to raise their heads. Some Christians of Pamphylia asked Epiphanius for a statement of the orthodox faith on the chief doctrines that were being attacked or distorted. This was the origin of the holy doctor's first book, the *Ancoratus,*[96] which,

[95] Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* III, 24.
[96] *P. G.,* XLIII, 17–236.

for the faithful in the midst of the disputes, would be a sure "anchor" in the faith. The work ends with two remarkable confessions of faith, the latter of which was adopted in 381 by the Council of Constantinople as the Creed of the universal Church.

A few years later Epiphanius issued another work that was more important because of the extensive erudition it showed. It was entitled the *Panarion* or "Medicine-chest against Eighty Heresies." [97] This is the work usually referred to as the *Haereses*. It contains inexactitudes which at times indicate a lack of critical spirit or undue credulity. Besides, for Epiphanius the word "heresy" has not the precise meaning which the language of the Church gives it today. He regards as a heretic anyone who departs from a respected tradition or, following the etymology of the word, "chooses" such or such an individual opinion, such or such a personal point of view.

On this basis, Epiphanius considers Origen as the father of the principal heresies. His animosity toward the author of the *Peri Arkon* and toward all those whom he connects with his school, is evidently exaggerated. "Having little taste for philosophical speculation, Epiphanius judges that the traditional faith is sufficient and that men, by meddling with it, merely inject error into it. He therefore adheres solely to the official symbol of orthodoxy. This he repeats over and over again. He is like a smith who keeps a piece of iron on the anvil, not to give it some shape, but to hammer it until the last flaw is destroyed." [98] Such a work, however, filled a need at that period. And today Epiphanius' gigantic labor is still the most valuable repertory from which history can obtain a knowledge of the heresies and theological doctrines in Christian antiquity.

We must add that this strict polemist is, like Jerome, a

[97] *P. G.*, XLI, 173 ff.
[98] Régnon, *op. cit.*, III, 25.

mystic also. No one has spoken with greater precision and warmth about the close union which Christ contracts with His Church and about the life which He infuses into it. And no one has more lovingly celebrated her who is both the Mother of the Church and the Mother of God. He hails her with the title of Theotokos and thus, curiously enough, he is in agreement with Origen and the latter's disciples, the only ones who, before Epiphanius, gave this appellation to the Blessed Virgin.[99]

St. John Chrysostom

Regrettable though transient disagreements separated St. Epiphanius and St. Chrysostom. A native difference of genius seemed to keep these two great men apart, although both were animated by the same zeal. Both prefaced their apostolate by a sojourn in the desert. In 375 and 376, just when Epiphanius' *Panarion* appeared, John, in his solitude, wrote two treatises—*On Compunction* and *Against the Adversaries of the Monastic Life*. He was then not more than thirty years old.

Born in 347 (or perhaps 344),[100] in the city of Antioch, John, whom posterity would surname Chrysostom[101] or Golden-mouthed, was the son of Secundus, a high officer of the Eastern Empire. His mother, Anthusa, widowed at the age of twenty, shortly after the birth of her only son, gave him a finished classical education by the best teachers, while she herself brought him up in the purest piety.

"Anthusa had not, like Monica, to watch and correct the wanderings of an ardent nature, to bring back her son by patience to faith and virtue; she had only to assist, in a certain measure, at the har-

[99] Petau, *De incarnatione*, V, 15.

[100] Puech, *St. John Chrysostom*, p. 3.

[101] This is the name we shall use when referring to him. The practice of calling him Chrysostom does not go back earlier than the seventh century.

monious development of a pure soul, which seems never to have been disturbed by earthly passions." [102]

In accordance with a custom then rather prevalent, John was not baptized until 369, and was shortly afterwards ordained lector by Meletius bishop of Antioch.[103] The latter was an experienced, moderate man. He and Bishop Diodorus of Tarsus were Chrysostom's teachers in the sacred sciences.

Diodorus, the founder of that Antiochene School whose exegetical principles would be exaggerated by his disciple Theodore of Mopsuestia, exercised a lasting influence upon Chrysostom's mind. We discover traces of this in the great doctor's homilies, nearly all of them written in the form of commentaries on the Sacred Books. There was another teacher whose influence on Chrysostom's life was no less notable. His name was Carterius. At Antioch he directed what Sozomen calls "a school of ascetics." [104] It was while listening to him that the young son of Secundus and Anthusa became enthusiastic for the monastic life. But he satisfied his longing only after his mother's death in 374 or 375.

For a period of four years he followed the cenobitical life in the mountains near Antioch. Then for two years he lived as an anchorite in a cave until the hour when his health, seriously affected by austerities, obliged him to return to his native city. But, before leaving his solitude, the young monk wished, by the publication of three works in Apologetics, to defend the monastic state against the attacks made upon it. These three

[102] Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[103] There were several reasons for this delay. Probably some parents, who were half-hearted Christians, wished to let their children pass their youth in greater laxity. Others, without much reflection, followed a custom that went back to the earliest years of Christianity, when those who were Christians from childhood were necessarily few in number. Still others followed a loftier impulse: the idea of the greatness of baptism, and of the trials and preparatory penances which such a sacrament called for.

[104] Sozomen, VIII, 2.

writings are: *On Compunction, Against the Adversaries of the Monastic Life,* and *The Comparison of a Monk with a King.* Says Dom Ceillier: "The flowery style of these three books and the numerous examples and quotations from profane authors make us certain that St. Chrysostom wrote them while he was still young." [105]

The treatise *On Compunction* begins by roundly upbraiding the crime of those who railed against the religious state or despised it. Did not a certain Christian of Antioch go so far as to say that the sight of a free man turning monk was enough to make him lose his faith and offer sacrifice to the devil? The zealous apologist exclaims: "For a man to take a stand against the monastic state is to rebel against the Lord Himself, it is to follow in the footsteps of Nero." Then addressing pagan fathers and Christian mothers, he shows them they should be glad to see their sons, after joining the elite of men by embracing Christianity, join the elite of Christians by becoming monks.

"The work *Against the Adversaries of the Monastic Life* comes straight from the heart. It is written with marvelous warmth. . . . Chrysostom likes to describe the way time is spent in the monasteries. The prayers which the solitaries taught him he records as models. He eulogizes Egypt and those desert places with a beauty of Paradise, where, by thousands, dwell choirs of angels in human form, whole populations of martyrs, immense communities of virgins. He recommends that people go from time to time and visit the neighboring monasteries, there make a sort of retreat and especially admire the great ones of earth when they condescend to spend a few days in the midst of that equality to be found there." [106]

In a third treatise, much shorter than the other two,

[105] Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés* (1861 ed.), VII, 18.

[106] Puech, *Un réformateur de la société chrétienne au IV^e siècle, saint Jean Chrysostome,* pp. 257–259.

Chrysostom compares the monk to a king, and gives pre-eminence to the monk. "When you behold a powerful man," he concludes, "richly dressed, riding in a magnificent chariot, do not say: 'That man is blessed.' The truth is, that man's happiness is transient. But when you meet a poor hermit, with worn-out clothes, modest bearing, his face radiant with peace, say: 'This man possesses real blessedness; I want to be like him.' "

Thus, like Basil, like Gregory Nazianzen, like Jerome, like Epiphanius, like the majority of the doctors of the fourth century, Chrysostom started by experiencing the influence of monastic asceticism. Therein Basil had ripened his theological thought; Gregory Nazianzen, his tender piety; Jerome and Epiphanius, their passion for study. Chrysostom there found the first accents of an eloquence that would be unequaled among the men of his time.

Pope St. Damasus

Under the impulse of Pope Damasus the Eternal City was adorned with impressive Christian monuments, the study of the Scriptures spread among the faithful, and the Holy See, with growing ascendency, exercised its sovereign authority over all.

Amid the disputes raised by Arianism, Apollinarianism, the Antiochene Schism, and several other questionable movements, Damasus felt it necessary to renew among the faithful the veneration of the old Christian traditions. The holy Pontiff's regard for the ancient monuments extended even to those of non-Christian ages.

"In his person and energy, old came into touch with new. . . . Symmachus, the rhetorician, the champion of paganism, was accused of having unjustly punished Christians when city prefect, for the pretended crime of injuring the monuments of pagan cult. Pope

Damasus, on this occasion, gave evidence in favor of the accused prefect. He testified in court that no Christian had suffered any unfair treatment from Symmachus. The prefect on his side was able to confirm that, as a fact, no Christian had ever even faced such an accusation before his tribunal." [107]

The Catacombs

But the Pope's attention naturally turned to the monuments of Christian Rome.

"It was this pope who did most to maintain intact the monumental memorials of ancient Christian Rome. Over the catacombs he watched with especial care, and by means of epigraphs, particularly in metrical form, he preserved their traditions whilst also enriching their decoration." [108]

"St. Damasus had search made for the tombs of the martyrs in the old cemeteries. He removed the debris. He widened the important passageways, enlarged the light-shafts, had new ones made, and built stairways. He was also the poet of the martyrs, an elegant poet, in the judgment of St. Jerome the conscientious historian,[109] who cites his authorities,[110] and expresses reserve about events when he is not certain of their authenticity.[111] Damasus had to make historical researches, which were facilitated by his experience with the archives of the Church, and he was painstaking in assembling what he knew about the martyrs.[112]

[107] Grisar, *History of Rome,* I, 26, 261.

[108] *Ibid.,* I, 261.

[109] *"Elegans in versibus scribendis."* St. Jerome, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis,* 103.

[110] *"Percussor retulit Damaso mihi, cum puer essem,"* he says in one place (*P. L.,* XIII, 396). In another passage, he says: *"Fama refert"* (*Ibid.,* col. 402).

[111] *"Haec audita refert Damasus, probat omnia Christus."* (De Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana,* 1881, p. 26.)

[112] "Damasus' epigraphic work," says Duchesne (*Liber pontificalis,* I, 214), "is closely connected, as the *Liber pontificalis* says, with investigations regarding the shrines of the martyrs and their right to the veneration of Christians."

"The Damascene inscriptions are carved in marble in very beautiful lettering of special form, with characteristics that are quite peculiar to them. Attempts have been made to imitate them, but with indifferent success.[113] Damascene inscriptions, found in all the Roman catacombs,[114] preserve many pages of the history of the martyrs which otherwise would have been altogether lost. The prayers they contain are a further proof of the antiquity of belief in the communion of saints and of the worship paid to the martyrs. Lastly, they help us to determine, in each catacomb, the position of the most venerated tombs. They possess, therefore, a great dogmatic, historical, and topographical importance." [115]

Pilgrimages

St. Damasus' architectural work and lapidary inscriptions indirectly but effectively seconded the apologetic labors of Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome. They stimulated pilgrimages to the relics venerated since the first centuries. St. Jerome relates how, when he was living in Rome, he used to go every Sunday, with students of his own age, to visit the tombs of the Apostles and martyrs. He says: "These underground passages hold, on either side, the mortal remains of the dead. The darkness is barely relieved by a little daylight making its way through a very small opening. As we walked along these galleries, we would repeat the verse of Virgil:

"Luctus ubique, pavor, et plurima mortis imago." [116]

[113] The extremities of the letters always end in a curved line. The letters are chiseled deeply. Everywhere there is the same proportion between the width and the height. The outside lines of the letter "M" are vertical. De Rossi discovered the name of the artist whom St. Damasus commissioned to carve his verses.

[114] The complete collection will be found in De Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae,* vol. 2. The principal ones are given in Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 227, 235.

[115] Marucchi, *op. cit.,* pp. 225, 226, 228, 235.

[116] St. Jerome, *In Ezechielem,* XII, 11.

Upon leaving these catacombs, where rested the relics of the martyrs who died for their faith, the devout pilgrims took a resolution to maintain the religion of the olden times against all the daring novelties.

Canon of Scripture

The same wisely conservative and traditional spirit is to be noted in Pope Damasus' various acts regarding the canon of the Scriptures.

"The first decree was promulgated by the Pope at the Roman Council of 374. It is the earliest decision which gives a complete list of the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments, and is therefore deeply important in the history of the canon of the Bible. It serves to prove that, even then, the sacred books were recognized and read in the church, as having been written 'under the operation of God,' as those which are still accepted by Catholics as inspired or canonical. The list begins thus: 'The list of the books of the Old Testament which the Holy Catholic Church accepts and reveres, is as follows,' the formula implying that it is a rule of faith based on the earliest traditions, especially of the Roman Church, and teaching mankind in which books the word of God is contained. . . . Thus did the traditions of the See of Peter become an infallible compass by which other Churches might regulate themselves, testing their traditions by those of Rome." [117]

Roman Primacy

In relating the history of the heresies and schisms of this period, we have had occasion to notice that the position taken by Pope Damasus was always that of a chief. At the Council of Rome (369), the Pope and the Fathers drew up a declara-

[117] Grisar, *op. cit.*, I, 337 f. A decision of a council of Hippo (393) regarding the canon of Scripture, ends as follows: "For the confirmation of this list, agreement must be had with the Church across the seas." *P. L.*, LVI, 429. The canon of St. Damasus may be seen in Mansi, VIII, 15 f.

tion that would be regarded as a rule of faith.[118] At the Council of Antioch (378), this doctrinal writing was subscribed to by 146 bishops whose signatures are preserved in the archives of the Roman Church.[119] Recognition by the See of Rome made one accepted as a legitimate bishop.[120] Damasus also showed his supremacy by deposing the most notable bishops of the Empire when they adhered to Arianism.[121] And these decisions of the Roman Pontiff were accepted and acclaimed by the Eastern Fathers as well as by those of the West. "I communicate with none but your Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter," St. Jerome writes.[122] "Where Peter is," says St. Ambrose,[123] "there is the Church." In a recently discovered treatise, Priscillian declares that the bishop of Rome "holds supreme rank, is the first of all." [124] St. Basil addresses Pope Damasus as the sole authority able to settle a controversy,[125] begging him to use his special power to declare null, throughout the East, the decrees of the Council of Rimini.[126]

One of the most remarkable acts of Damasus was the declaration regarding the origin of the different patriarchates and their dependence upon the See of Rome.

"His emphatic utterance on the subject of the supremacy of the Roman Church, founded by Christ on Peter—a decree which sets, so to speak, the crown upon all previous pronouncements on the primacy—begins thus: [127] 'The entire Catholic Church spread over

[118] *"Tomus."* Cf. Jaffé, no. *232* (I, 37); Mansi, III, 443.

[119] Mansi, III, 461.

[120] St. Basil, Letter *263*, *P. G.*, XXXII, 979.

[121] See his attitude toward Maxentius of Milan (Mansi, VIII, 459), Maximus the Cynic (Mansi, VIII, 479), Nectarius (Mansi, VIII, 756), and Peter of Alexandria (Jaffé, no. *236*).

[122] St. Jerome, Letter 15, no. 2, To Damasus (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 18).

[123] *"Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia,"* St. Ambrose, *In psalmum* 40, *P. L.*, XIV, 1134.

[124] Schepss, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum,* LVIII, 34.

[125] Letter 70.

[126] Letter 69.

[127] Mansi, VIII, 158.

the globe is the sole bridal chamber of Christ. But the Church of Rome has been placed above all other Churches, not by decrees of Councils, but by the word of our Lord and Savior in the Gospel, who gave it the primacy when He said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." ' . . . Pope Damasus then goes on to state that Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome with Paul; that they had 'consecrated the Church of Rome to Christ the Lord,' and that 'by their presence and their triumph Rome had been raised above all other cities. . . . The second see was consecrated at Alexandria, in the name of St. Peter, by his disciple Mark the Evangelist. . . . The third chair of Peter, however, at Antioch, is of equally distinguished rank, for there Peter had dwelt himself before he came to Rome.' [128]

"Various views have been offered regarding the origin of the patriarchal dignity. The above papal decree has the great advantage of being the earliest, and of emanating from the best authority. . . . No more satisfactory explanation than that of Pope Damascus could be given regarding the existing preëminence of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. . . . The view was not excluded that the historical commencement of the preëminence of Alexandria and Antioch was also largely a result of the good work done by these churches for the spread of the faith throughout their wide spheres of influence. As a fact, both became parent-churches to numerous bishoprics of their own foundation. As regards the principle, however, it must be borne in mind that any preëminence above other bishops of patriarchs or exarchs or archbishops was merely an outcome of historical circumstances, and not of any divine ordinance. The only exception was the primacy of Peter. The Gospels and Tradition assure us of this one, but of this one only, that it is to continue by divine ordinance as a lasting office embodied in the heirs of Peter, the head of the whole Church." [129]

[128] Damasus names only two patriarchates. He does not speak of that of Constantinople, which was created in 381, and could not claim a close historical connection with St. Peter or any of the Apostles. He is also silent about the patriarchate of Jerusalem, which was not officially erected until the first half of the fifth century.

[129] Grisar, *History of Rome*, I, 339 f.

The Gothic Church

When Pope Damasus was thus proclaiming the fundamental laws of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Arianism had almost disappeared from the Empire, but it had won the barbarian races. Considering the decrepitude of the imperial institutions and the daring of the young races who were hurling themselves in assault upon the old Roman organism, the danger might be very great indeed. Happily, while the Arian Bishop Ulfilas was spreading heresy among the Goths, another bishop, St. Martin of Tours, was evangelizing the peoples of Gaul with the purest Catholic doctrine, thus preparing in the Church the most zealous champions of the faith. Furthermore, the Empire's political and religious situation was soon to recover by the advent of a truly Christian Emperor, Theodosius.

The mighty and warlike nation of the Goths in the third century formed, on the banks of the Danube, the advance-guard of the Germanic invasions. They were divided into two sections: the Visigoths to the west, the Ostrogoths to the east. Under Emperor Philip they had forced the Roman lines and invaded Mysia.[130] Later they ravaged Greece, Illyria, Troas, and Cappadocia, destroyed the temple of Ephesus by fire, made off with wagonloads of plunder from Nicaea and Athens, and drove before them throngs of captives in chains. Many of these captives were Christians, who preached the Gospel to their conquerors.

Thus was born the Church of the Goths, which was represented in the Council of Nicaea by Bishop Theophilus.[131] He was succeeded by Ulfilas who exercised a decisive influence upon the future of the Gothic race. This man's origin is obscure, as is the origin of his name Ulfilas (son of the wolf),

[130] Mourret, *op. cit.*, I, 383.

[131] See *supra*, p. 31.

by which he has always been known.[132] Probably he sprang from a noble family among the Goths, and was not of Cappadocian stock, as has been said. In 340 he was sent as a hostage to Constantinople. There he was seduced by the imperial majesty which in Constantinople shone in full splendor, and by Arian Christianity with its supple and vague formulas which the Homoeans professed. He was consecrated bishop in 341 by Eusebius of Nicomedia and belonged to the party which Valens and Ursacius represented in Pannonia and Mysia, attaching little importance to the doctrinal differences which divided the various Arian sects, unconcerned with religious metaphysics, but determined to give his people a national religion closely united with its political organization. His eloquent preaching of the doctrine of one eternal God, independent of the world, as opposed to the divinities of Germanic mythology, brought him great prestige. At the time of a reaction of the pagan party, he led away with him part of the Goths to the foot of the Balkans. This deed won for him the reputation of a national hero.

His brilliant learning crowned his renown. His translation of the Bible into Gothic was a work of intelligence and erudition, and established in his nation the conception he had formed at Constantinople of the Christian religion. It is said "that he never lost sight of the particular spirit of the Gothic people, and that he was always at pains to transpose the foreign ideas of the East into the Germanic spirit." [133] To express the gentle precepts of the Gospel, the old Runic tongue had to be softened. "The Runic alphabet in use among the Goths had sufficed for scratching omens on magical wands or inscriptions on tombs. It had to be enlarged for a more

[132] He was probably the son of a Goth and of a woman of Asia Minor who was a prisoner of war and a slave. Cf. Mangenot, art. *"Ulfilas"* in the *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* V, 2349.

[133] Kraus, *Histoire de l'Église,* French trans., II, 14.

scholarly usage; the number of letters was increased from sixteen to twenty-four. The Gothic language, fashioned in this manner, assumed a remarkable character of sweetness and majesty. It was evident that the fine qualities of the classical tongues would not perish with them. The translation of the Bible, that eternal book, began; it was the first work of modern literatures. When Ulfilas appeared, perhaps after a long retreat, radiant, bearing the Old and New Testaments to the people encamped in the plains of Mysia, he was like one descending from Sinai. The Greeks called him the Moses of his time. And it was the barbarians' opinion that "the son of the wolf could not do evil." [134]

Ulfilas' Arianism

A manuscript written by one of Ulfilas' disciples, Auxentius, Arian bishop of Silistria, and discovered by Waitz in the Louvre Library, contains the profession of faith left by the celebrated Bishop in the form of a will. In it he affirms his belief "in one God Creator of every creature, who has none other like to Himself. Hence there is only one God of all, who, according to us also, is God (*ideo unus est omnium Deus, qui et de nostris est Deus*), and one only Holy Ghost, who is neither God nor Lord, but minister of Christ." [135] Ulfilas' doctrine about the Holy Ghost is very clear: it is pure Macedonianism. But his doctrine about the Son is vague. No one has been able to give an exact meaning to the very obscure expression, *unus omnium Deus, qui et de nostris est Deus.* Probably this obscurity was intentional, leaving the way free

[134] Ozanam, *La Civilisation chrétienne chez les Francs,* 5th ed., p. 28. Cf. Philostorgius, II, 5; Socrates, II, 41; Sozomen, VI, 37; Jornandes, *De rebus geticis,* chap. 25; *P. L.,* LXIX, 1269 ff. Only fragments of Ulfilas' work remain. See Mangenot, art. *"Ulfilas"* in the *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* V, 2350–2355.

[135] Waitz, *Ueber das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila,* pp. 10 ff.

for every subordinational, semi-Arian, and Anomoean interpretation.[136]

The Arian heresy, implanted by Ulfilas among the Goths, spread among the Germanic peoples with whom the Goths were in contact: Gepidae, Rugians, Suevi, Vandals, Heruli, Burgundians, and Lombards. The Ostrogoths brought Arianism into Italy, to the very center of Christendom. Theodoric the Great, by taking it under his mighty patronage, at the very moment when Rome was greeting him as the restorer of the Empire, seemed on the point of entrusting to it the destinies of mankind. Providence, however, decided otherwise. At the end of the sixth century, after the battles of Tricamarum, Vesuvius, and Vouille, and after the tragic deaths of Theodoric, Totila, Teias, Sigismund, and Alaric II, all the Arian kingdoms, "the empire of the African pirates, the peaceful monarchies of Burgundy and Italy, the dread might of the Visigoths of Aquitania, the ill-defined realms of the Alani, Suevi, Heruli, and Gepidae, all had disappeared."[137] The work of the Arian Ulfilas, for a moment so brilliant, was reduced to nothing. The same cannot be said of the patient and laborious work of St. Martin in Gaul.

Paganism in Gaul

The first evangelization of Gaul goes back to the earliest times of Christianity.[138] At the close of the second century, in the time of St. Pothinus and St. Irenaeus, the faith and works of the Christians in Gaul shone with great brilliancy.

[136] Similar expressions are to be found in the few dogmatic evidences of Gothic Arianism that are extant. See Isidore of Seville, *Historia de regibus Gothorum,* no. 8 (*P. L.,* LXXXIII, 1060); Victor Vitensis, *De persecutione Vandalica,* IV, 1 (*P. L.,* LVIII, 236); Paul Warnefridus, *De gestis Langobardorum,* IV, 44 (*P. L.,* XCV, 581); St. Augustine, *Sermo Arianorum, Collatio cum Maximino* (*P. L.,* XLII, 677–742).

[137] Kurth, *Les Origines de la civilisation moderne,* I, 379.

[138] Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 178 ff.

But, after the death of the great Bishop of Lyons and following the grievous persecution under Septimius Severus, the spread of the faith among the Gauls was notably retarded. The evidence we possess regarding the middle of the fourth century shows us Christianity being practiced only in the big cities, which were very few in number.

While the rural peoples of the East then counted numerous devout and well instructed Christians, the peasants of the West, almost without exception, remained attached to their ancient divinities. The influence of the monastic institutions, which was very powerful in the East, whereas it was as yet unfelt in the West, may explain this difference. Especially in Gaul "the word *pagani*—inhabitants of the *pagus* or country district, peasants, as opposed to inhabitants of the cities—took on a religious meaning in the fourth century. Even at the close of the century, despite active preaching, there were large towns containing not a single Christian.[139]

The nation of the Gauls was divided into three classes: the priests, who were likewise magistrates and judges in civil and criminal cases; the knights, who formed a civil and military aristocracy; and the common people, who were excluded from the government and from any honors.[140] The Gallic clergy was made up of three categories: the druids, the bards, and the diviners. The druids had charge of the religious ceremonies in the ancient forests, where sacred plants were gathered: the mistletoe and the verbena. The bards played on the harp and sang hymns in honor of the gods. The diviners foretold the future by observing the flight of birds and by inspecting the victims offered in sacrifice. The doctrines of Druidism seem to have been rather lofty. Its fundamental tenets were belief in the immortality of the soul and in a future reward for brave warriors.

[139] C. Bayet, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* vol. II, part 1, p. 13.
[140] Caesar, *Gallic War,* VI, 13.

Druidism

In the middle of the fourth century Druidism, the national religion of the Gauls, was mingled with either Greco-Roman mythology or Eastern religions, introduced into Gaul with the Roman armies, or with various forms of the prevailing heresies. "Druidism had long since lost its vitality. But, out of a mixture of Roman and Celtic mythology, was formed a popular religion, the monuments of which abound in France, although their interpretation is still far from clear." [141]

"Rome not only introduced its national religion into Gaul; it also brought there and spread those strange cults which it had received from the East and which, by their mysterious and supernatural aspect, would be the more pleasing to the Celtic peoples. The traces of these cults are particularly frequent in the regions that were longest and most easily subject to Roman influence, such as the districts near the Mediterranean or the Rhone River. Especially abundant are the Mithraic monuments. A large number of inscriptions, brought to light at Die, Riez, Valence, Vence, Orange, Vaison, and Narbonne, show us in how great honor the ceremony of the taurobolium was held.[142] . . . All these influences were enemies that Christianity would have to conquer among these peoples." [143]

[141] Bayet, in Lavisse, *loc. cit.* The Parisians connected the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus with that of the old Celtic divinities Esus and Tarvus. At Nimes, Jupiter and Nemausus were honored together; at Apt, Mercury and Albianus. At Poitiers, they made a single god, called Mercury-Adsmerius, out of two divinities, one Roman and the other Celtic. In like manner there was a worship of Apollo-Cobledulitavus at Perigueux, of Mars Vincius at Vence, of Apollo Borva (Apollo of Bourbon) in Auvergne. The gods of the Celts were worshipped by themselves at Velleron (Vaucluse), Béziers, and in the vicinity of Orleans. Everywhere the people worshipped, besides these gods, the genii of streams and forests. Some gods and fairies were thought to dwell in the depth of mysterious springs and beneath the bark of large trees. See Dufourcq, *La Christianisation des foules.* Cf. Julian, *Gallia,* 2d ed., pp. 210 ff.

[142] On the ceremony of the bull sacrifice, see Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 443, note.

[143] Régnier, *Saint Martin,* pp. 19 f.

Christianity itself became altered. By the first half of the fourth century Arianism had entered Gaul and threatened to corrupt the evangelization of the country in its very source. To combat paganism in its different forms and to establish Christianity among the people by introducing the monastic life into Gaul, was therefore not enough. The Christian communities would have to be forewarned against the dangers of heresy. A man was raised up by God who quite by himself would assume this threefold mission: to evangelize the country districts of Gaul, to establish the monastic institution there, and everywhere to defend the purity of the faith.

St. Martin of Tours

His name was Martin. He was born at Sabaria in Pannonia at the end of the year 316 or the beginning of 317.[144] His father was a pagan who had attained the rank of military tribune. Martin was brought up at Pavia, where his father, at the close of his military service, probably obtained some land as a benefice. At an early age Martin gave evidence of a gentle, pious soul and soon was enrolled among the catechumens of Christianity. Its doctrinal and moral teaching appealed to his heart. Even at that early age he showed a desire to flee into the desert, where he could follow the solitary life. To remove him from the Christian influence about him, if we are to accept the statement of Sulpicius Severus,[145] and very likely in

[144] Régnier (*op. cit.*, pp. 28 f.) gives the reasons for accepting this date.

[145] Nearly all that we know about St. Martin we owe to Sulpicius Severus, whose *Vita Martini* was written before the saint's death. Babut, in his *Saint Martin de Tours*, tries to destroy the authority of Sulpicius Severus' *Vita Martini*. His reasons are as follows: 1. Except for Sulpicius Severus, St. Paulinus of Nola, and the Vienne epitaph of Foedula (written between 410 and 440), the name of St. Martin is not mentioned in the Gallic literature of the first half of the fifth century; 2. Sulpicius Severus, being favorably inclined toward Priscillianism, would unduly exalt the monk Martin, who was thought to be favorable to that little Church; 3. the *Vita Martini* abounds in marvels, some of them taken from St. Jerome, St. Hilary, and especially from the *Life of St. Antony* written by St. Athanasius. But these reasons do not seem conclusive: 1. the inferences drawn from the silence

obedience to an imperial edict which required veterans' sons to enter the army,[146] his father enrolled him in the cavalry despite young Martin's reluctance. Martin was then fifteen years old. He did not really become a member of the armed military forces until he reached the age of nineteen. As we are told by Sulpicius Severus, his biographer, so well did he reconcile his new duties with the aspirations of his soul, that he found a way to live as a monk and at the same time as a soldier, chaste and sober as well as courageous.[147]

Martin was charitable towards all. At Amiens, in the middle of winter, with a stroke of his sword he cut his cloak in two and gave half of it to a beggar. The next night, in a dream he saw the Savior, clothed in the part of the cloak with which he had covered the beggar. Christ said to him: "Martin, though as yet only a catechumen, clothed me with this mantle." Soon after this, at Easter time (339), he received baptism, being then twenty-two years old.[148]

Thereafter he thought only of consecrating himself entirely to God's service. In 341, at the time of an invasion of Franks, when summoned to receive a reward[149] from Em-

of contemporaries is excessive, the more so as this silence is not absolute; as De Labriolle says, "There is far more disconcerting silence in the history of the first centuries: Tertullian nowhere cites St. Hippolytus of Rome; St. Ambrose does not speak of St. Jerome, nor does St. Athanasius mention St. Hilary." Moreover, how are we to explain the extraordinary fame of St. Martin in Gaul if he was a mediocre person as Babut maintains? Would such a result have been brought about by Sulpicius Severus' literary work, however enthusiastic and able it may have been? 2. The Priscillianism of Sulpicius Severus is an arbitrary hypothesis. Says De Labriolle: "If we weigh each of the expressions by which Priscillianism is characterized by the author of the *Vita Martini* in his *Chronicles,* we shall see how harshly he speaks of it." 3. It is true that the *Vita Martini* abounds in marvels, and the account of these events may indicate that Sulpicius Severus was too trustfully credulous, but this circumstance does not at all weaken the substantial reality of the events. See De Labriolle in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne,* April 15, 1915, pp. 148 ff.

[146] *Theodosian Code,* II, CCLXX.

[147] Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Martini,* **2.**

[148] Régnier, *op. cit.,* p. 41.

[149] This gratuity, called *donativum,* was in principle the portion of the booty which

peror Constans, he declined it, saying: "Until now it is for you I have borne arms; permit me henceforth to do so for God." And he asked for his discharge from the army. The Emperor was vexed and accused him with seeking in religion an excuse for his failure in duty, saying: "You are prompted by cowardice; you want to avoid the battle that is expected tomorrow." "Since you attribute my conduct to cowardice," Martin replied, "and not to the faith, tomorrow I will take my stand in the front ranks of the line of battle and, in the name of the Lord Jesus, without arms, protected only by the sign of the cross, not by a shield or helmet, I will fearlessly make my way into the midst of the enemy." But Martin did not have to fulfil his promise. The next day the Franks sued for peace.[150]

Following this event Martin left the military service. A few years later,[151] we find him at Poitiers with St. Hilary, who trained him in religious discipline and ordained him exorcist. Then we see him in his native Pannonia, where he accomplished a large number of conversions among the pagans. But he was there pursued by the hatred of the Arian heretics. He was seized, mistreated, beaten with rods. In Milan, where he sought refuge, he received the same treatment from the fierce partisans of the heretic Auxentius. The zealous apostle, longing for solitude and no less solicitous for the sanctification of his soul than for the salvation of his neighbor, then retired to a little desert island, Insula Gallinaria, so named because it was visited only by sea birds. "This island was a rock rather than an island. It is located in the Gulf of Genoa, opposite

came to a soldier after the victory. The Emperor, feeling the need of encouraging his troops on the eve of a campaign that promised to be a severe one, advanced the distribution of the *donativum*.

[150] De Broglie (*op. cit.*, IV, 17 f.) places this scene in the reign of Julian the Apostate. A closer examination fixes it in the reign of Constans. (Régnier, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 f.)

[151] Tillemont, *Mémoires, Saint Martin*, art. 2; Lecoy de la Marche, *Saint Martin*, pp. 129 f.

Albenga, exposed to the sun's heat, without shade, without inhabitant, and lacking every human comfort." [152] In company with a holy priest, he there led a life of penance and meditation until the spring of 360, when, after Emperor Constantius recalled Hilary from exile, Martin rejoined the latter at Poitiers. The apostle of Gaul had so well studied men, prayed, meditated, and suffered, that he understood the important work to which God predestined him.

Monastery at Ligugé

Enlightened and encouraged by Hilary's advice, Martin at first thought of bringing into Gaul that monastic discipline which he had witnessed in the East. Five miles from Poitiers,[153] on the bank of the Clain, in a deserted region, now called Ligugé (Locoteiacus), he built a hut. Some Christians, desiring to be trained in the penitential life, joined him there and settled in huts like his, or merely lived in groves which they found nearby. They all met together for common exercises in a chapel located in the center of the monastic settlement. We have no exact information about the rule imposed by Martin upon his monks at Ligugé. It must have been like that of the Eastern monasteries, with which Martin was well acquainted.

"The Ligugé monastery was chiefly an asylum open to those who wanted to flee from the world. It was also a school. There candidates for baptism were received and were prepared for the probation of the catechumenate. Lastly, the Ligugé monastery was a nursery of apostles destined to evangelize the district, and this purpose may have been the principal aim in the mind of the holy founder. We are inclined to suppose so,

[152] Gervaise, *Vie de saint Martin,* p. 31. Reinkens thinks it was Gorgona, an island northeast of Corsica. Reinkens, *Hilarius von Poitiers,* p. 225.

[153] The Roman mile was about 4900 feet.

when we consider the subsequent course of his long life." [154]

It is, in fact, from Ligugé that we see Martin set out to undertake daring expeditions against paganism. "He ventured into the towns, into the country districts where Christianity was unknown. He attacked rich, ancient shrines, that were centers of worship still active, destroyed them, and replaced them with churches and monasteries. He ran many risks. In the neighborhood of Autun the peasants assaulted him; one of them had raised his sword when, according to Sulpicius Severus, it was miraculously dashed to the ground. His way was marked by marvelous cures. Throngs became converted and asked for baptism. It is difficult to determine with certainty what districts he evangelized. Too often Sulpicius Severus fails to supply exact indications. Martin's mission seems to have been particularly active in the center—Touraine, Anjou, the regions of Chartres, Autun, Sens, and Paris. According to Gregory of Tours, he also visited the provinces of Saintonge and Angoumois. He probably spent some time in Vienne, where the epitaph has been found of a woman baptized by him." [155]

Martin, Bishop of Tours

In 371, three years after the death of St. Hilary, the bishopric of Tours became vacant through the death of St. Litorius, and Martin was chosen to be bishop of that city. But he was unwilling that his new duties should stand in the way of his life as a monk. Whatever time was not required by his episcopal duties he spent two miles from Tours, in a deserted spot, called Marmoutier, between a certain hillside and the River Loire. Like Ligugé, Marmoutier became a center of religious life and apostolate. A large number of men,

[154] Régnier, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[155] Bayet, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, vol. II, part 1, p. 15.

who belonged to noble families and whose upbringing did not accustom them to that sort of life, came there and put on the coarse garments which Martin imposed upon his monks. Several, according to Sulpicius Severus' testimony, became bishops subsequently and spread about them the life of mortification and prayer, the habit of which they had formed at Marmoutier. Among these we find mentioned St. Maurilius bishop of Angers, St. Victorinus bishop of Mans, and St. Brice who succeeded St. Martin in the see of Tours. Among St. Martin's disciples history also mentions St. Patrick the apostle of Ireland, St. Corentius bishop of Cornouille (Quimper), another St. Martin archbishop of Lyons, St. Paulinus of Nola, St. Clair who, after his death, was seen in a dream by Sulpicius Severus, associated with the glory of his master, and Sulpicius Severus himself, who has left us the tenderest and most valuable recollections of the holy apostle of Gaul.

Rural Parishes

The Church of Gaul owes to St. Martin the establishment of rural parishes.[156] So long as Christianity was spread only in the cities there did not exist a clergy distinct from the episcopal *presbyterium*. Canon 18 of the Council of Arles which, in 314, mentions urban deacons (*diaconi urbici*), evidently supposes there were then "rural deacons," who probably preached and baptized in the country districts. Canon 21 of the same Council, obliging priests and deacons to remain in the place where they are attached, has seemed to some authors to allude to the existence of rural parishes. This in-

[156] It may be that some rural parishes existed in Gaul before St. Martin, and certainly a very large number were established after him, especially in the beginning of the fifth century. But he was the chief organizer of parish delimitations.

terpretation is not certain, because canon 21, as also canon 2 which is like it, may be referring to residence in the diocese, not in the parish.[157] But canon 77 of the Council of Elvira evidently supposes the existence, at least in Spain, of deacons whose duty it is to govern rural groups.[158]

Whatever this embryonic organization may have been, the creation of rural parishes, strictly so called, in Gaul seems to have been influenced by three causes: 1. when, as a result of St. Martin's preaching or that of his disciples, a considerable group of Christians was formed in the country, the bishop was led to replace the simple deacon by a priest or even by a resident chorepiscopus;[159] 2. old documents tell us that several wealthy converts of that period, concerned about their eternal salvation and reparation for their past sins, often gave the bishop, *pro remedio animae suae,* houses and land in the midst of which they built a chapel;[160] this chapel then became the center of a new group with a resident priest; 3. the economic movement, the extension and organization of farming, developing side by side with Christian civilization, brought about, at points distant from the cities, the formation of groups of farmers who could not easily be assembled for the Sunday and feast day offices. Here the building of a church and the appointment of a priest for the parish service was a consequence of the grouping itself. But, by reciprocal benefit, the erection of the rural parishes was "one of the elements that most contributed to delimit the agricultural association, the village."[161] It has been said that the rural churches of this period were generally built at the crossing of two Roman

[157] See Mourret, *op. cit.,* I, 516.

[158] This canon speaks of the *diaconus regens plebem.* Hefele, I, 169.

[159] In the East the institution of *chorepiscopi* was longlived; but in the West it never acquired much stability.

[160] Pardessus, *Diplomata ad res gallo-franciscas spectantia,* I, 137.

[161] Dareste de la Chavanne, *Histoire des classes agricoles en France,* p. 173.

roads, preferably in the *vici* and *castra,* sometimes in *loca deserta* when they were the work of the monks, very often on the site of some shrine of idolatry.[162]

Martin was as zealous in defending the purity of the faith as he was in spreading it. He warned the faithful against the snares of Arianism, but he distrusted the interference of Emperor Valentinian and his agents in the religious disputes. He feared lest the civil power, that at least which he had before his eyes, while seeming to protect the Church, should prove itself to be a jealous rival rather than a loyal helper. We shall soon see the holy Bishop expressing his views about it in the affair of Priscillian and his followers.

Death of Emperor Valens

While the holy Bishop of Tours was exercising his zeal in Gaul, preparing the nation to which he devoted his efforts to become one day "the eldest daughter of the Church," the Roman Empire experienced the most humiliating reverses at Adrianople. Emperor Valens fell in the battle, mortally wounded in the midst of the dead bodies of his best generals and half of his soldiers. This affected the whole defense of the frontiers. All the roads to Constantinople were now open to the barbarians. Says Ammianus Marcellinus: "Since the day of Cannae, never did the Republic suffer such a blow." Popular imagination at once named the cause of the disaster and pointed out the remedy. "The prince who brought the Empire to this great harm was a heretic; and by his example and his commands, heretics also were the barbarians under whose blows it was perishing. . . . No more paganism, no more heresy; let the law of the Church be the sole law of the

[162] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, x, 25. Cf. Dufourcq, *La Christianisation des foules;* Marignan, *Études sur la civilisation française,* vol. 2, *Le Culte des saints sous les Mérovingiens.* See Imbart de la Tour, *Les Paroisses rurales du IV^e au XI^e siècle.*

State: such were the cries of public distress and of the public conscience." [163]

Theodosius

The young Emperor Gratian, now left alone to bear the heavy responsibility for the defense of the Empire at that critical hour, turned to a general, but lately out of favor with Valentinian and whom he himself had sacrificed to his own advancement. His name was Theodosius. His father had given proof of rare military ability in Britain and Africa by driving back the barbarians from the frontiers, but, in consequence of intrigues and cabals, became suspect at court and was sentenced to death. From that time Theodosius lived in retirment in Spain, his native country, giving an example of every Christian virtue. It is to Gratian's honor that he turned to this noble servant, thus far so ill requited for his services, and, after the battle of Adrianople, entrusted the command of an army to him. The next year (379) he associated Theodosius in the government of the Empire. Both of them were of one mind in recognizing that they could not better assure the welfare of the State than by absolute faithfulness to the laws of the Church. The Arian or semi-Arian policy of Constantius and Valens had failed as egregiously as the pagan policy of Julian the Apostate. Gratian and Theodosius purposed making a firmly Catholic policy triumphant.

[163] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, V, 342 f.

PART II

Catholicism, the State Religion

PART II

Introductory Remarks

NEVER had circumstances seemed to presage a more prosperous future for the Church. When the genius of Constantine, with a sense of political realities and a loftiness of view which few statesmen have equaled, freed the Church from its fetters and prepared the way for its hegemony, the intellectual movement that was to give Christian thought incomparable teachers was scarcely outlined. Later, when men like Hilary, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, and Chrysostom appeared, the lusterless successors of the great emperor brought to the pursuit of his work neither his vast intelligence nor his unwavering fidelity.

The closing years of the fifth century offer a more wonderful sight. Greatness is everywhere, both in the Christian pulpit and on the imperial throne. True, Theodosius in his government does not apply Constantine's firm balance; but he possesses a Christian spirit more detached from pagan influences. And St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine reach the full maturity of their talent and give the world those treasures of scholarship, eloquence, and holiness which the Church has not again seen in such abundance in the course of the ages.

From 379 to 395 a series of more and more restrictive laws was enacted against paganism, concluding with an absolute prohibition of idolatrous practices. Eunomianism, Arianism, Apollinarianism, Priscillianism, Macedonianism, Manichaeism, all the heresies, are mercilessly condemned. The Christian religion triumphs in all the splendor of its worship and all the

purity of its orthodoxy. From the death of St. Basil (379) to St. Augustine's installation as Bishop of Hippo (395), St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Epiphanius, St. Paulinus of Nola, Didymus the Blind, Cassian, Rufinus, and St. Augustine himself fill the East and West with their masterpieces. In 381, the ecumenical Council of Constantinople confirms and completes the work of the Council of Nicaea.

Theodosius' death in 395 unfortunately arrests the advance of his work of Catholic propaganda and civilization. But the main results of his political and religious action do not perish. Although not every act of Theodosius the Great deserves the approval of a Christian conscience, there is no Roman emperor to whom the Church owes deeper gratitude, after Constantine the Great.

CHAPTER I

From the Death of Valens to the Council of Constantinople (379–381)

"THE promotion of Theodosius was received with universal approval. Although words of praise are not weighty on the lips of a poet, it is hard not to agree with Claudianus who says that the Empire would scarcely have arisen from the wretched state to which the inundation of barbarians reduced it, unless Theodosius had put his hand to the work and sustained it by his valor. Dacia, Thrace, and Illyberia were lost. The Goths, Alani, and Huns held part of them and had ravaged the rest. The Iberians, the Armenians, and the Persians were also in arms against the Romans." [1] "What evils are before our very eyes," exclaims St. Gregory, "and what evils that we learn of only by others' reports! Whole countries overturned from end to end, thousands of men put to death, the whole land red with blood, a foreign race traveling as master through a country that does not even understand their language! Let us not charge our soldiers with cowardice; they have given proof of their bravery; they have subjected the whole earth. But it is a punishment for our sins, for that Arian heresy which was so long dominant among us." [2]

Theodosius' first care was to repair the disaster of Adrianople, to rebuild and strengthen the frontier dikes which had been swept away temporarily by the barbarian flood, and to deal separately with the chiefs of the rebel tribes so as to bring them back into the framework of the Roman administration.

[1] Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs* (1701 ed.), V, 194.
[2] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration 14.

Condition of the Church

These undertakings were merely preliminary to a more difficult and more important work. Sozomen relates that Theodosius, shortly after being raised to the imperial office, asked for baptism from the holy Bishop of Thessalonica, Ascholius, and questioned the Bishop regarding the religious state of the Empire. Ascholius answered that the Churches of the West, as far as Macedonia, were united in the true faith, all of them adoring the Son and the Holy Ghost the same as the Father; but that all the Churches further east were divided into a large number of sects, that the Church was as much disturbed in that part of the Empire as was the State, and that the Arians were there in control of the churches in Constantinople, Antioch, and most of the big cities.[3]

Ascholius spoke truly. The countless fragments of the Arian heresies—Macedonian, Novatian, Apollinarian—were seething in convulsions that indicated vexation rather than vitality, but nevertheless were seriously disturbing the part of the Empire just confided to Theodosius.

The Heretics

At Constantinople the Eunomians appeared more active and insolent than ever. St. Gregory of Nyssa describes their clamorous propaganda. "Everywhere," he says, "in the public squares, at crossroads, on the streets and lanes, people used to stop you and discourse at random about the Trinity. If you asked something of a money-changer, he would begin discussing the question of the Begotten and the Unbegotten. If you questioned a baker about the price of bread, he would answer that the Father is greater and the Son is subordinated to Him. If you went to take a bath, the Anomoean bath-

[3] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, pp. 198 f.

attendant would tell you that in his opinion the Son simply comes from nothing. Must we say these people were out of their heads? At any rate heresy had upset their minds." [4]

At Constantinople and in the Asiatic provinces of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Phrygia, the Novatians still had many capable leaders. Valens was a well instructed Novatian. In his reign Marcian, to whom the Emperor entrusted the education of his daughters Anastasia and Carosa, profited by his favor with the sovereign to obtain a moderation of the severe measures taken against the Novatians; [5] and the latter were able to spread their rigorist doctrines.

The various grim sects connected with Montanism settled by themselves in Phrygia near Pepuza. The Theodosian Code mentions their members under the names of Phrygians, Pepuzians, and Priscillianists.[6] Other heretics, under the odd appellations of Saccophori, Apotactics, and Hydroparastates, indulged in the strangest practices. St. Epiphanius mentions, as belonging to the same school, the Messalians or Euchites, that is, "Praying folk."

"They were people who had renounced all their possessions; they lived entirely upon alms, and came and went, always praying and doing nothing else. When night came they slept anyhow, men and women together, and in the open air as far as possible. With the offices of the Church and the fasts they concerned themselves not at all. It was by prayer alone, and by an absolute detachment from the goods of this world, that they held communion with God and His saints—a communion so close that they did not hestitate to attribute to themselves the designations of angels, prophets, patriarchs, and Christs. According to them, baptism only effaces past sins; it does not prevent the indwelling in every man, from the time

[4] St. Gregory of Nyssa, *De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti.*

[5] Socrates, IV, 9.

[6] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, 5, 10, 40, 48, 57, 65. These were followers of the propheteess Priscilla. They are not the same as the Priscillianists of Spain, who will be mentioned *infra.*

of his birth, of an evil spirit with whom he has to struggle incessantly. This struggle against the evil spirits filled their minds to the exclusion of everything else; when it became very violent within them, they were seen to make gestures as though shooting arrows, or to jump into the air with enormous leaps, sometimes even beginning to dance." [7]

Neither the condemnations pronounced against the Messalians by Bishop Amphilochius of Iconium and by Bishop Flavian of Antioch nor the legislative measures following these condemnations overcame the sect. It continued to exist for a long time in Asia Minor.

Apollinarianism, which started as a scholastic dispute, had established itself at Antioch in the form of a party, when a friend of Apollinaris, named Vitalis, a priest of Meletius, decided to go over to the side of Paulinus. When Paulinus repulsed him because of his doctrines and Meletius would not take him back because of his defection, he organized a separate Church in the city and proclaimed himself its bishop. This made, along with Paulinus, Meletius, and the Arian Bishop Euzoios, four bishops in Antioch. From there, under the impulse of Vitalis and of Apollinaris himself, the Apollinarian party endeavored to spread out; it preached the doctrine of a Christ who was not perfectly man, founded two schismatic Churches in Berytus and Laodicea, and, after Valens' death, even tried to lay hands on the Church of Constantinople. The Council of Constantinople later separated it from the Catholic Church as heretical.

The Schism of Antioch became complicated by the election of Evagrius, whom Paulinus on his deathbed consecrated bishop without the presence of any other bishop. This irregularity and the mere fact that Evagrius obtained his election from Paulinus, caused him to be rejected by the followers

[7] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 461.

of Flavian. In spite of efforts by Theodosius, the Schism of Antioch survived the death of Evagrius and even that of Flavian.

Besides open schisms and heresies, other troubles here and there disturbed the Church. The barbarians, incorporated in the Roman armies, brought their vague Arianism with them. Diodorus of Tarsus, in his reaction against Apollinarianism, ushered in the opposite exaggerations of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Nestorius. Devout pilgrims to the Holy Land, such as Rufinus and Melania, were alarmed at seeing the Church of Jerusalem torn by internal strifes.

All in all, the danger to which all these disturbances exposed the Church was not formidable. Each day Arianism and Macedonianism were losing members. The Eunomians were divided among themselves. The oddity of the practices or tenets of several sects exposed them to ridicule. When the Arian Bishop Demophilus died, and his successor had a Syrian pastry-cook as his chief backer, the whole party was called the party of the pastry-cooks (*Psathyriani*).

Authority of the Church

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, was a compact organization, strongly hierarchical, universally respected. In the West there was no strong schism, no formidable heresy. The Roman Church more and more justified the hegemony it held from Christ and from tradition by the services it rendered to the peace of the individual Churches and to the civilization of the world. Pope Damasus fixed the grades of a hierarchy which extended as strictly to the East as to the West. In fine, the union just established between the Pope and the Emperor was a new pledge of proximate triumph.

That is why public opinion, taken as a whole and in spite of difficulties, demanded that there be religious unity, centered

in the Roman See. "An irresistible public cry, springing from the ranks, not of Church dignitaries, but of the masses, called for vigorous remedies against religious divisions." [8] After all, religious unity was in the imperial traditions themselves. "In spite of all professions of toleration, none of the emperors of the fourth century, and Julian no more than the rest, had ever renounced the dream of religious unity." [9] It was evident to all that this unity could not be realized around a heresy. "Theodosius, however, was in the number of those statesmen who know how to become energetic and capable interpreters of the needs of their time. His genius was not of such as impose their will upon their age. His was a simple, upright mind, but one that would not, in any way, show itself either inventive or original. He did not have a moment's doubt that in taking the crown he had assumed the task of freeing minds from error as well as the land from invasion, and that these two duties could not be accomplished the one without the other. This conviction of his found no one to disagree with it." [10]

Theodosius' Religious Policy

"Theodosius," says Tillemont, "thought he should act with great reserve. As he did not wish to employ severity toward the heretics, many zealous members of the Church feared that he was not capable of repairing the losses the Church had suffered from the attacks of Valens, his predecessor. Even St. Gregory Nazianzen, though much inclined to moderation, could not say whether the Emperor showed lack of zeal or excessive timidity or wise prudence. The event seems to have decided in Theodosius' favor. For he entirely reëstablished

[8] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, V, 362.
[9] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 498.
[10] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, V, 363.

the Catholic faith and accomplished the overthrow of the heretics, not by forcing people to abandon their errors, but by gradually winning them and especially by openly declaring himself in favor of the true faith." [11]

The Emperor's religious policy is found clearly expressed in the edict he published February 28, 380. "It is our wish," he says, "that all peoples subject to the government of our clemency should abide in the religion as the divine Apostle Peter transmitted it to the Romans, and, as everyone knows, such as is even yet followed by the Pontiff Damasus and Peter bishop of Alexandria, men of apostolic holiness: so that, following the discipline of the Apostles and the teaching of the Gospel, we may all believe in the sole divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, united in one equal majesty and one holy Trinity. We order that those who follow this law be the only ones to take the name of Catholic Christians, and that all others who depart therefrom, in spite of every reason, bear the infamy of being called heretics; that their meetings be not called Churches, and that they be obliged to suffer the divine punishment and such penalties as heavenly inspiration may prompt us to inflict." [12]

Theodosius did not forego favoring religion by wisely protective laws. But, for the spread of the Gospel, he counted mostly upon the Church, the zeal of its doctors, and the authority of its hierarchy.

Status of the Church

By granting official existence only to the Catholic Church and granting the heretics merely a legal tolerance, Theodosius was not introducing something new. Eusebius records an exhortation by Constantine addressed directly to the heretics

[11] Tillemont, *op. cit.*, V, 199.
[12] *Theodosian Code*, XVI, 1, 2.

(Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulinianists, Montanists, and others), urging them to return to the Church. This exhortation had in view a law by which the dissenters are forbidden to hold religious meetings, and their common property, that had been usurped from the Catholic Church, must be returned to it.[13] The law here referred to was not strictly and universally enforced. It was appealed to only when disturbances, incited by the heretics, seemed harmful to public order. Under such circumstances public opinion found government intervention quite natural. The Church protested only against what seemed to it to be an interference by the civil power in the ecclesiastical domain. The important fact was the official status granted to the great Church, the Catholic Church, and denied to the dissenting groups. "Hence came a State orthodoxy. The State was obliged to know which among the parties in conflict was the one that represented genuine Christianity, the one which it ought to acknowledge and to protect as such." [14]

Ever since Constantine we have seen the Christian rulers making inquiries, intervening in the disputes, and convening the bishops in council. Theodosius adopted a simpler and surer means. For him, anyone was Catholic who was in communion with "the Pontiff Damasus," bishop of Rome. Never does Theodosius of himself determine a formulary of faith; never does he claim the right to depose a bishop. Those are Church affairs. In certain administrative measures it may be found that the sovereign went beyond the limits of his authority. But in the seventy laws included under the title *De haereticis* in the Theodosian Code,[15] we do not meet with a single contradiction of these principles. Of those laws one of the earliest (dated August 3, 379) [16] merely enforces the old law forbid-

[13] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* III, 64–66.
[14] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* II, 520.
[15] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, v.
[16] *Ibid.,* XVI, v, 5.

ding heretics to hold meetings, a law which seems to have been suspended by Theodosius' predecessors.

It appears further that all of this religious legislation by Theodosius was more directive than coercive. The mere fact that several laws bear on the same subject is significant of this trait; at least it shows how leniently such decrees were executed. The same was not true of the laws whose direct purpose did not possess a penal character, those which merely sought to increase the respect due to Christ and His Church. Such, for instance, was the law which, in memory of the Savior's suffering, suspended the execution of any corporal punishment during Lent.

Moreover, it would be a mistake to attribute to Theodosius' laws the growing success of Catholicism toward the end of the fourth century.

"Henceforth its fate was sealed; the current was too strong for the State itself, with all its power, to be able to swim against it. Whether the emperor were favorable or not, Christianity was certain of success. When we remember that it did not cease to make progress in Africa, in spite of the stumbling-block of Donatism; that the Arian crisis, and bishops like Eusebius of Nicomedia, Stephen of Antioch, Gregory and George of Alexandria, and Eudoxius of Constantinople, did not prevent its conquest of the East, we can judge how much could be effected against it by official hostility or even by persecution." [17]

Priscillianism

In the West, under the rule of Emperor Gratian, the Priscillianist dispute confirmed this truth. There are few stories more dramatic than that of Priscillian and his teaching. Sulpicius Severus, who was a contemporary witness of the events he relates, says:

[17] Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 496.

"Priscillian was born in Spain. He was a man of noble birth, of great riches, bold, restless, eloquent, learned, through much reading, ever ready at debate and discussion—in fact, altogether a happy man, if he had not ruined an excellent intellect by wicked studies. Undoubtedly, there were to be seen in him many admirable qualities both of mind and body. He was able to spend much time in watchfulness and to endure both hunger and thirst. He had little desire for amassing wealth, and he was most economical in the use of it. But at the same time he was a very vain man, and was much more puffed up than he ought to have been with the knowledge of merely earthly things. Moreover, it was believed that he had practiced magical arts from his boyhood. He, after having himself adopted the pernicious system referred to, drew into its acceptance many persons of noble rank and multitudes of the common people by the arts of persuasion and flattery which he possessed." [18]

What was that pernicious doctrine? Sulpicius Severus connects it with Egyptian Gnosticism. If we are to accept the later testimony of Orosius, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and Pope St. Leo the Great, it gathered together the errors of almost all the heresies—Sabellianism, Marcionism, Manichaeism, Apollinarianism—and joined them, in a formless chaos, with several pagan superstitions. Eleven short writings of Priscillian were discovered by Dr. Schepss among the manuscripts of Würzburg University.[19] Their publication in 1889 greatly disconcerted the historians. In them Priscillian appears to be opposing precisely several of the doctrines that were attributed to him. Besides, he therein shows a remarkable, though at times, disturbing talent. The reading of these works is made hard and interest is dissipated by a pliancy

[18] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicles,* II, 46. Cf. Lavertujon, *La Chronique de Sulpice-Sévère;* Puech, *Les Origines du priscillianisme,* in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne,* 1912, pp. 81–95, 161–213.

[19] Schepss, *Priscilliani quae supersunt* (vol. XVIII of the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*).

that becomes subtlety, by shades of meaning that become a play of colors, a labored quest of allegories." [20] However, a real knowledge of the Scriptures gives Priscillian "a place along with those who, in small numbers and to such extent as was possible to the spirit of the fourth century, engaged in questions of erudition and criticism." [21]

But it was not long before the leading defects of the enchanting writer were discovered. Priscillian does not hide his claim to interpret the Scriptures by the aid of divine inspiration. But "people are not so determined to establish the right of private interpretation when they have not a special doctrine to defend." [22] That tendency makes this Spanish exegete a precursor of Wyclif and Luther. Priscillian was also fond of repeating that the Books recognized as canonical presuppose others, that the four Gospels do not contain all the words of Jesus. By this declaration, Priscillian prepares his followers to accept eagerly most of the dubious legends which the Gnostics had connected with this or that Apostle. In fine, with an obstinacy to be found only in the men of Port Royal, Priscillian wanted to remain Catholic at all cost. When he is charged with Sabellianism, he anathematizes the Patripassians; accused of Manichaeism, he curses Mani." [23] Thus we can understand the presence of so many protestations of orthodoxy which abound in his writings. And what we can likewise understand is that, in the time of St. Augustine and St. Leo the Great, even at the time when Sulpicius Severus wrote his Chronicles—about the year 400—Priscillian himself as well as his disciples appeared in an unfavorable light to the faithful who cherished orthodoxy.

[20] Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne*, p. 155.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[22] Puech, in the *Journal des savants*, 1891.
[23] Leclercq, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

Condemnation of Priscillianism

The foxy heretic was denounced and pursued by Idacius, bishop of Merida. The honest historian Sulpicius Severus sketches a far from flattering portrait of this prelate. He writes: "I can say that Idacius was without scruple or conscience. He was self-conceited, gossipy, brazen. So far did he carry his folly, that he incriminated, as an accomplice or disciple of Priscillian, any devout man who had a liking for study or who practiced long fasts. He even dared publicly to hurl a defamatory accusation of heresy against Martin, a man in every way comparable with the Apostles." Idacius accused Priscillian of using magical formulas. The accused protested vigorously. Two of his friends, Instantius and Salvianus, had recently been raised to the episcopacy; they backed Priscillian with all their might and even entered into a sort of conspiracy with him. Idacius then wrote to Pope Damasus. The Pontiff, probably distrustful both of the accuser and of the accused, replied with a strong recommendation that no steps should be taken against those who are not present and who have not been heard in their own defense (*ne quid in absentes et inauditos decerneretur*).[24]

A council, held at Saragossa in 380,[25] condemned Priscillian, the two bishops (Instantius and Salvianus), and a layman (Helpidius).[26] But the heretics refused to submit. And when the bishopric of Avila in Idacius' province became vacant, they even elected Priscillian, a layman, to be bishop of that see. Then, after inciting a movement against the Bishop of Merida, they denounced the latter to the Spanish episcopacy. The affair took on enormous proportions. It had more

[24] Schepps, *Priscilliani quae supersunt,* II, 35.

[25] On this council, see Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne,* pp. 172–175.

[26] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicles,* II, 47: Priscillian's account is different, but less trustworthy.

far-reaching consequences through a step taken by Idacius. In concert with another Spanish bishop, Ithacius of Ossabona, he asked the intervention of the secular power and obtained from Emperor Gratian a rescript expelling the Priscillianists from all territories of the Empire.

Appeal to Emperor Maximus

Instantius, Salvianus, and Priscillian met this appeal to the Emperor by an appeal to the Pope. They went to Rome, but reached there with such a cortege of scandalous followers that Damasus refused to see them. A series of intrigues was carried on between the two hostile groups until Emperor Maximus' entrance into the affair. After he had secured possession of the power in Britain, he invaded Gaul and settled victoriously at Treves. Through a clever memorial, filled with atrocious accusations, Ithacius forestalled Priscillian and won the new Emperor to his side. On a charge of magic, Priscillian was condemned to death and was executed along with six of his followers. A military commission was sent into Spain to hunt out his other accomplices and to inflict summary justice upon them.

Such severity aroused the indignation of the holy apostle of Gaul, Martin of Tours, at that time in the full prestige of his holiness. He was in Treves at the time of the trial. It may be that he went there for the purpose of trying to have justice administered with that prudence which Pope Damasus had advised.[27] He saw the Emperor and did not leave the city until he obtained Maximus' promise that no blood would be shed. After the execution, by way of protest he refused to hold communion with Ithacius and those of his party. Only once, says Sulpicius Severus, when urged to be present at the consecration of a holy bishop, Felix, did he decide to enter into

[27] Régnier, *Saint Martin*, p. 153.

communion with the Ithacians. But, until his death in 397, he regretted this misconstrued act of kindness. Although he was the most outstanding in the condemnation of the Priscillianist errors, he continually protested against an execution that was prompted by hatred rather than by a desire to defend the truth. Soon the Church, by solemn decisions of Pope Siricius and of the Council of Turin, gave striking approval to this conduct. Ithacius was deposed, and his followers were excommunicated.[28]

Without giving up her right to proscribe and repress heresies when they disturb the social order and the faith of her children, the Church has always thought that the first means she ought to use to assure the triumph of orthodox doctrine is the holiness of her ministers and the learning of her doctors. It was this same view that moved Emperor Theodosius to favor, with all his power, the holy bishops and scholarly defenders of the faith whom Providence raised up during his reign.

St. Gregory Nazianzen

In the foremost rank of these men was Gregory Nazianzen. In 372, yielding to his father's urgent request, Gregory consented to be his auxiliary in the government of the Church of Nazianzus. But after the death of his father and mother—his brother Caesarius and his sister Gorgonia were already dead—with no near relatives living, with his heart crushed, and his health uncertain, in 375 he retired to the monastery of St. Thecla at Seleucia in Isauria. He there tasted those joys of the contemplative life for which he had so long yearned. Four years later the news of the death of his friend Basil strengthened his resolve to bid the world an eternal farewell and not to leave his beloved retreat except for heaven.

[28] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicles*, II, 51.

"What am I doing here on earth," he said, "when the better half of me has been torn away? How much longer will my exile be prolonged?"

Gregory in Constantinople

Even as he was thus bewailing the loss of his friend, the people and clergy of Constantinople were asking him to come to them. The Christians of the capital, so long oppressed by the Arians, saw the hope of a better future at Theodosius' coming into power. Lacking the great Basil, whom God had just called to Himself, they implored the help of Gregory. The influence of his eloquence and virtues seemed to them capable of rallying the flock of the faithful, of fortifying their courage against the snares of the heretics. Asked to re-establish discipline and faith in the greatest Church of the East, the humble Bishop, who had dreaded the office of ruling over an obscure diocese, had to appeal to all his virtues in order to accept the invitation.

He went to Constantinople. As the Arians had deprived the Catholics of all their churches, Gregory lived in the house of one of his relatives and there assembled the faithful. He rarely went out, made but few visits, and liked to remain alone at home, spending much time in prayer and study. The people soon venerated him as a saint and when he appeared in the pulpit, his eloquence won their hearts. We possess the principal sermons he preached on these occasions. They are known as his *Theological Discourses*. Their solidity and vigor have given Gregory Nazianzen the title of "Theologus" (the Divine). He took up the defense of the Christian faith against current errors. The Catholics flocked to him, as he himself puts it, "like parched people seeking a spring to slake their thirst." [29] The heretics and pagans also came to hear him,

[29] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Poems*, I, 10.

some to learn, some to enjoy at least the charm of his words. In order to hear him at close range, people broke through the railing that enclosed the space where he was preaching.[30] His sermons were now and then interrupted by applause. While they were being delivered, they were written down by some of his hearers.[31]

In vain the Arians of every shade tried to sow discord among the faithful and thus offset the holy Bishop's influence. His thrilling eloquence triumphed over everything. His flock increased day after day, and the Catholic community in Constantinople breathed new life. Gregory turned the meeting-place into a chapel and called it the Anastasis, or the Resurrection. "It is this church," he said, "which has revived the word of God, so long despised in Constantinople. It is the place of our common victory. It is the new Silo, where at last the ark has found a fixed resting place." [32]

Attacks upon Gregory

A time came when the Arians' wrath broke out. Easter 379, a band of heretics, under the guidance of ringleaders, went to the Anastasis and assaulted the faithful with stones, crying out: "Down with those who adore the three Gods!" Thus did they add calumny to this brutal attack. Gregory was wounded, and one of his people was left for dead. The holy man kept his friends from appealing to the Emperor. He told them: "We think it an important matter to obtain penalties for those who have wronged us. But it is far greater and more Godlike to bear with injuries. For the former course curbs wickedness, but the latter makes men good." [33]

Frequently he employed such maxims. In one of his ser-

[30] *Idem, Orations,* 9, 32.
[31] *Idem, Poems,* 10.
[32] *Idem,* Oration 32.
[33] *Idem,* Letter 77.

mons, in which we sense that reciprocal sympathy uniting real preachers and their hearers, he said: "My children, do you know what is the best thing in the world? Let us examine the matter together. . . . I tell you it is peace. The Hebrews had a law forbidding the reading of certain books by people who were not yet very firm. Among us we should not allow anyone indiscriminately to be arguing all the time about the faith. We should not allow it especially in the case of those who are consumed with eagerness to lead the advance, those who flare up at the slightest difficulty, those who have a mania for talebearing. . . . To grasp divine things is so toilsome! To explain them is so laborious! Dear children, you do not know what a grace God bestows on you, enabling you to keep silent, whereas I am obliged to speak about subjects which are so great that they appal me." [34]

Maximus the Cynic

Gregory's kindliness was marked by frankness. Certain plotters took advantage of this. One day a strange man arrived in Constantinople. He wore the white cloak, long hair dyed red, and carried the big staff of the Cynic philosophers. His name was Maximus. He really belonged to the sect whose costume he wore. But at the same time, according to his own account, he professed the purest Christianity. He had, so he said, even confessed the faith in a persecution. Gregory accepted these declarations as true, received the newcomer at his table, surrounded him with veneration, and even lauded him publicly.[35]

But Maximus, while thus deceiving the unsuspicious holy bishop, hatched an infamous conspiracy against him. The impostor's scheme was nothing less than to supplant Gregory in

[34] *Idem,* Oration 32.
[35] See *Idem*, Oration 25.

the see of Constantinople. Having, by some means or other, previously won the confidence of the patriarch Peter of Alexandria, he had him send from the Egyptian capital seven chosen men, who were to guarantee his claims. At the same time he gathered about him a large number of sailors from the imperial fleet, bribed some intimate acquaintances of Gregory, and, choosing a time when the latter was sick, entered with his band of followers into the Anastasis church. There some bishops then started to consecrate him bishop. In the midst of such a gathering, the ceremony did not progress without tumult. Word of it spread in the city. The people came running. Maximus and his friends fled to the house of a flute-player and there the ordination was continued.

Once again Gregory found that, although he had all the qualities that attract the good will of upright souls, he had none of those gifts which enable one to foil the craftiness of the wicked. Mortified by his mistake, striking his breast, and heaping maledictions upon himself, he tried to return to his solitude. But he found himself opposed by the demands of his whole people, who begged him to remain at their head, exclaiming: "If you go away, the Trinity will go with you." He then consented merely to take a rest required by his ill health. Soon afterwards he came back to Constantinople and resumed his interrupted ministry. In November 380, Emperor Theodosius arrived in Constantinople. Coming up to Gregory and embracing him, he said: "God employs me to put you at the head of this Church. I think the body of the faithful would do me violence if I refused to grant their most earnest wish." [36]

Theodosius Evicts the Arians

The Emperor wished to preside in person at Gregory's installation.[37] First, however, he called upon Demophilus, the

[36] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Poems*, I.

[37] Gregory was already a bishop. Therefore no ordination ceremony was needed.

Arian bishop, to declare his adherence to the Nicene faith, or else, he and his priests, to abandon all the churches of the city. Demophilus refused to accept the Creed of the great Council. When all the churches occupied by the heresy had been vacated, Theodosius, in the morning of November 26, had the great Church of Saint Sophia occupied by his troops. Then, placing Gregory in the middle of an escort, he himself directed the procession to the church. Let us quote Gregory's own account of his feelings.

"A heavy fog covered the city like a sinister veil. Around the basilica, the throng of Arians, evicted from their temple, murmured as though preparing for an outbreak. Cries of rage against me were heard from the midst of the crowd. The Emperor, surrounded by officers, came out of the palace. I preceded him, pale, trembling, scarcely breathing. On all sides I saw nothing but angry and threatening looks, and I turned my own gaze steadfastly to heaven. Theodosius, calm and undisturbed, advanced. At length, hardly knowing how I reached there, I found myself within the basilica. Then prostrating myself and raising my hands to heaven, I intoned, with all the clergy, a canticle of thanksgiving. At that moment, by a heavenly favor, the sun, scattering the clouds, lighted up the temple with a radiant brightness. You would have said that the empire of darkness was at last yielding to the light of Christ. The tabernacle sparkled with a thousand flashes. A unanimous shout burst forth like thunder. 'Gregory the bishop,' said the throng, of a sudden converted. This cry was repeated continually."

"Gregory wanted to stand up to stop this outburst. But he had not the strength to do so. One of his priests, who was beside him, conveyed these words to those present: 'Enough shouting, my friends. Today is the time to offer thanks to God. Afterwards there will be time to think of the rest.' A murmur of approval greeted this final effort at resistance by van-

quished humility. The divine service was performed without further disturbance. It was on the following day that Gregory, while still protesting that he did not consider his selection final until it should be confirmed by a council, consented to take his place on the episcopal throne." [38]

From that day the Anastasis chapel was abandoned. Gregory's eloquence henceforth resounded in the Church of Saint Sophia. Shortly afterwards the ecumencial Council of Constantinople declared the nullity of Maximus' ordination and canonically proclaimed Gregory bishop of Constantinople. In that capacity, after the death of Meletius, he presided over the great council of 381.

Thus, after half a century of Arian usurpation, the churches of Constantinople were restored to the Catholic clergy without a drop of blood being shed. Only the preaching of St. Gregory Nazianzen made this result possible. In Milan, Nyssa, and Cappadocia, in the neighboring solitudes of Antioch, in Alexandria, and in the city of Constantinople itself, along with St. Gregory under the benevolent protection of Theodosius and Gratian, a similar work was performed by the preaching and writings of St. Ambrose, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus the Blind, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Jerome.

St. Ambrose, Imperial Counsellor

Since the death of Valens and the partition of the Empire between Gratian and Theodosius, Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, had become the confidant of the young Emperor of the West. It may well be that the desire to profit by the advice of Ambrose was the chief motive prompting Gratian to leave Treves and take up his residence in Milan. "Gratian brought to Milan all the anxieties of inexperienced youth and a timorous conscience. Ambrose, in consequence of the public offices

[38] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, V, 410.

he had held, combined sacerdotal authority and well-tried political ability. Soon the intimacy was complete between the Emperor and the Bishop. The imperial palace was familiarly open to Ambrose. The previously weak and hesitant conduct of the young prince assumed a consistency and firmness evidenced by his principal legislative acts. But Ambrose's influence is especially evident in certain measures of a religious character, the purpose of which was to free the Church from annoying prescriptions that still hindered her development or to remove from official acts whatever traces and memories of idolatry they retained." [39]

These responsibilities did not keep Ambrose from pursuing his intellectual labors. On the eve of the battle of Adrianople, he published some books on virginity and two books on the faith. Between 379 and 381, by the publication of two new books he completed his treatise *De Fide,* and he brought out three exegetical works on Genesis (*De Paradiso, De Cain et Abel, De Noe et arca*), and wrote his important book *De Spiritu Sancto.*

Writings on Morals

Throughout his life Ambrose liked to celebrate the merits of virginity. So true was this that, as he tells us, it brought him objections and complaints.[40] But these never kept him from proclaiming, in the midst of the pagan world, the praises of a virtue which he could not speak of without feeling. Says St. Jerome: "In his *De Virginibus* Ambrose has poured forth his soul with such a flood of eloquence that he has sought out, set forth, and put in order all that bears on the praise of virgins." [41] "A virgin," says Ambrose, "is a gift of God, the

[39] *Idem, Saint Ambroise,* pp. 38 f.

[40] St. Ambrose, *De virginitate,* chap. 5.

[41] St. Jerome, Letter 22, no. 22, To Eustachium (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 31; *P. L.,* XXII, 409).

joy of her parents; at home she exercises the priesthood of chastity." [42] Yet he never speaks disparagingly of marriage. "Marriage," he writes, "is lawful for all Christians; virginity is the portion of only a small number. And we must even acknowledge that virginity would lack subjects to enter into that state unless marriage supplied them." [43]

"St. Ambrose, the better to praise virginity, ridicules the luxury of the unchaste. The apostle becomes a satirist. He makes fun of those women who, by the use of facial paint, endeavor to appear different from what they are. See this one coming along, like a statue on a throne. People look at her as they would at some strange object. Her efforts to make herself attractive merely make her ugly. Her ears are torn and her head is bent as though under a burden. Her neck carries a chain, although the chain be of gold. Happy are you virgins, who are free from these tortures, you whose beauty is formed by modesty, a beauty that need not fear the weather, a beauty which is the only sort pleasing to God." [44]

Exegetical Works

In the writings on the earthly Paradise, on Cain and Abel, and on Noe and his ark, which appeared about 380, Ambrose endeavors to explain successively the literal and the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures. As Dom Ceillier remarks, "Ambrose does this with as much exactness as eloquence and nobility. His style is natural. The allegories are appropriate and interesting. The thoughts, living and elevated. Few of Ambrose's works are more finished than the book *De Noe et arca.*" [45] "St. Ambrose takes a great deal from Philo and the

[42] St. Ambrose, *De virginitate,* chap. 7. "From this we see," says Ceillier, "that Milan then had no convent for women; but there was one at Bologna, as appears later in St. Ambrose's work." Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés,* V, 447.

[43] St. Ambrose, *De virginibus,* I, 7.

[44] Thamin, *St. Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e^ siècle,* p. 345.

[45] Ceillier, *op. cit.,* V, 399.

Greek Fathers, which he read in their original language." [46] In numerous passages his imitation of the Alexandrian Jew is such that frequently it is possible to restore the rather ill-preserved text of Philo's writings by the aid of parallel passages from the Bishop of Milan. Philo, being of an eclectic mind, represented rather well what Christian theology could utilize from the Eastern philosophy. He offset and complemented the influence that Cicero exercised upon Ambrose. "The meeting of these two influences is a very exact though reduced image of the greatest moral fact of our history, the alliance brought about by Christian thought between the philosophy of the East and that of the West." [47] From this point of view, St. Ambrose continued the work of St. Hilary and St. Jerome, and prepared the way for that of St. Augustine.

Dogmatic Works

On the Trinitarian question the Bishop of Milan in his two works (*De Fide ad Gratianum* and *De Spiritu Sancto*), published between 378 and 384 at the request of Emperor Gratian, occupies the same intermediary position. The Easterners had said: "The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son."

> "The formula (*a Patre per Filium*) was susceptible of various interpretations. One might look upon the Son as a sort of medium through which the Father's substance is communicated to the Holy Spirit, or again might represent the Son as a true and active principle which, together with the Father, produces the Holy Spirit." [48]

Beginning with St. Augustine, the Latin theology unanimously adopted the latter interpretation, and reached the

[46] *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* I, 451.
[47] Thamin, *op. cit.,* pp. 94, 96.
[48] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 269.

following formula: "The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son." In Ambrose we do not yet find this clearness. He uses the word *procedere,* but this he does solely to express the Holy Ghost's mission *ad extra.*[49] He is satisfied to teach, after Hilary and Jerome, but more clearly than they do, that the Son is the *principium* of the Holy Ghost.[50]

In the East, under the auspices of Theodosius, the Cappadocian doctors performed a similar work. During the period we are now treating, Gregory of Nyssa was its most illustrious representative.

St. Gregory of Nyssa

In 372, against his inclination, Gregory was elevated to the see of Nyssa through the intervention of his brother Basil, at the same time that his friend Gregory Nazianzen was chosen Bishop of Sasima. He governed his little diocese in peace until an Arian conspiracy drove him out with violence. He then began a wandering existence in which he was much consoled by affectionate letters from Gregory Nazianzen.[51] Basil thought of enlisting his brother's coöperation in his apologetic labors. But the Bishop of Caesarea's wish was not fulfilled until after his death.

The Arians, upon the death of their dread foe, took courage and even were so bold as to attack his writings. "Gregory took up his pen and did not stop until he had written his *Hexameron* to defend and supplement his brother's *Hexameron.* And he wrote his *Books against Eunomius* to confirm Basil's *Books against Eunomius.* Basil had been foremost a theologian, taking Scripture and Apostolic tradition as his basis and not making any use of the classical philosophy of the schools ex-

[49] St. Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto, P. L.,* XVI, 762.
[50] *Ibid., P. L.,* XVI, 769, 800.
[51] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Letters 72, 73, 74.

cept insofar as it could be of use in refuting the sophists. Gregory, on the other hand, was a philosopher, delighting in subtle analyses, pushing reason as far as possible into the darkness of mystery. Such a nature had some relationship with that of Origen. He was not afraid to make daring attempts. He has been accused of holding the error of the great Alexandrian on the non-eternity of the pains of hell." [52] St. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, maintained that Gregory's writings were interpolated by the Origenists.[53] If this explanation is sound, Gregory's orthodoxy is vindicated.[54]

Doctrine about the Holy Ghost

It is particularly in his statement of the dogma of the Trinity that Gregory of Nyssa's thought seems to accomplish a happy fusion of the Greek conception and the Latin conception. Faithful to the Eastern tradition, he conceived the Trinitarian procession as developing, if we may so speak, along a straight line, the Father communicating His substance to the Son, and through Him to the Holy Ghost, in the manner of three flames, the first one communicating its light to the second and through this lighting the third.[55] But, by clearly contrasting the Holy Ghost with both the Father and the Son, he taught, almost as explicitly as the Latins, the procession *ab utroque.* He says:

"There is indeed no difference between one light and another light, qua light, when the one shows no lack or diminution of illuminating grace, but by its complete perfection forms part of the highest light of all, and is beheld along with the Father and the Son, though counted after them, and by its own power gives access to the

[52] Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* III, 41.
[53] *P. G.,* XLIV, 51, and 9 note.
[54] On this charge, see Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 304.
[55] St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Adversus Macedonianos,* 6.

light that is perceived in the Father and Son to all who are able to partake of it." [56]

With these first works Gregory of Nyssa's style takes on that splendor and harmony which posterity would admire in the writings of the great bishop. Says a critic who is a good judge of fine language, "No rhetorician uses so brilliant language, so agreeable to the ear, as the brother of the great Basil." [57]

Didymus the Blind

Endowed with less original and less brilliant talent, was a disciple of the Cappadocians, a man who holds a second rank in theology,[58] Didymus the Blind. But he made a notable contribution to the pacifying work in which Ambrose and Gregory of Nyssa were the most illustrious representatives.

Didymus never received holy orders. Born in 313 [59] at Alexandria, he was only four years old, according to the author of the *Lausiac History,*[60] when he lost his sight. Says Rufinus: "Didymus was able to combine study and prayer. He used his long vigils, not in reading, but in listening, so that his ear taught him what the eye teaches others. And when, in this night labor, sleep overcame the readers, Didymus, instead of profiting by their silence to take some rest himself, ruminated on what he had heard. Thus in his mind and memory he reconstructed the whole substance of the long readings he had been listening to. Everything he heard, he seemed to write on the tablets of his mind." [61] His contemporaries regarded

[56] *Idem, Against Eunomius,* bk. 1, chap. 36. Cf. Petau, *Dogmata theologica,* bk. 7, chap. 3, no. 3.

[57] Photius, in *P. G.,* XLIV, 45.

[58] This is what Gustave Bardy proves, against the excessive praise by Leitpoldt. Bardy, *Didyme l'Aveugle.*

[59] Bardy, *op. cit.*

[60] Palladius, *Lausiac History,* chap. 4. Cf. St. Jerome, *Chronicles,* year of Abraham 2388. The *Lausiac History,* relating the lives of early monks, is thus called from the name of Lausius, an officer of Theodosius the Younger, to whom it was dedicated.

[61] Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History,* II, 7.

his theological knowledge as wonderful. But aside from that, his writings reveal a certain acquaintance with profane sciences and a familiarity with the classical poets. His works abound in quotations from them. Palladius relates that St. Antony, the famous hermit, often consulted Didymus. Jerome and Rufinus went to him to learn the precepts and examples of the perfect life.

Didymus' principal guide was Origen, but, with his calm and moderate spirit, he liked also to follow the theology of the great Cappadocians. He was particularly devoted to the study of the dogma of the Trinity. "What especially characterizes Didymus is not a formula, but something better, a certain state of mind, a certain piety, which is reflected all through his work. The mark of that piety is the adoration of the one and indivisible Trinity. . . . His doctrine is primarily an expression of his piety, not at all an intellectual attempt to offer a rational explanation of his belief." [62]

The first of his works (*On the Holy Ghost*) appeared in 381, and was followed by his book *On the Trinity*. St. Jerome, requested by Pope Damasus to write an exposition of the Catholic doctrine on the Holy Ghost, thought the best he could do would be to translate the work of Didymus the Blind. Says Bardenhewer: "This work, is indeed, one of the best of its kind in Christian antiquity." [63] If Jerome's translation is a literal one, Didymus clearly proclaims the doctrine of the procession *ex Filio*.[64]

St. John Chrysostom and St. Jerome, as philosophers and theologians, do not rank with the doctors we have been citing. They occupy a secondary place in the history of dogma. But their place is incomparable in the history of the moral reformation of the fourth century. Between 379 and 381 Chrysostom

[62] Bardy, *op. cit.*, pp. 106 f.
[63] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.*, p. 308.
[64] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, II, 91.

brought out his *Treatise on the Priesthood,* his *Letter to a Young Widow,* and his *Consolation to Stagirius;* and Jerome published his translation and continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicles.*

St. John Chrysostom

The endless conflicts stirred up by the heresies of the fourth century not only disturbed men's minds; they also profoundly upset public and private morals in the bosom of the Church. The *Treatise on the Priesthood,* published (381) when the deacon Chrysostom fled from the episcopacy and the priesthood, aimed to show the clergy and laity the ideal of that holy ministry, of which he declared himself unworthy. Such a book came at the right time. The duties which burdened the clergy, especially the bishops, in the second half of the fourth century, had increased day by day. By his office of "defender of the city" and by the development which ecclesiastical jurisdiction underwent, the head of a Church became a sort of patron in things temporal as well as in things spiritual.

In one of his homilies, which is of great value to the historian, Chrysostom gives a list of the activities to which he must attend.[65] They obliged him to have a regular budget. The distribution of alms to the poor, the care of widows and virgins, the building of the first hospitals for the sick and the lepers, the construction of the first asylums, the visiting of prisoners, the intervention with government agents in behalf of the many victims of government tyranny, occupied every moment that was left to a bishop by the sacred ceremonies, the administration of the sacraments, preaching, and the spiritual management of his diocese.

The enormity of these burdens made Chrysostom recoil from the episcopacy. Certain unfortunate examples, showing

[65] St. Chrysostom, Homily 21 on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians.* (*P. G.,* LXI, 180; *Oxford Library,* IV, 293.)

him the dangers attached to such duties, made him the more apprehensive. True, all bishops were not like Theophilus of Alexandria, who spent in magnificent buildings the alms intended for the poor; nor like Gerontius of Nicomedia who reached the bishopric because he had acquired in the city a reputation as a capable and obliging physician and who gave the impression of being a man of the world rather than a bishop. The example of Basil of Caesarea making his metropolis a city of immense charitable works, was not an isolated instance. But we must admit that, since the time when Christianity came into honor, cabal and intrigue introduced into the ranks of the clergy more than one scandalous member. Later on, when Chrysostom deposed simoniacal bishops, he heard them declare, with unconscious cynicism, that, since they had expended large sums of money to obtain the episcopacy, they wanted to repay the money advanced to them. It was such immoral practices that Chrysostom determined to resist.[66]

Ideal of the Priesthood

His treatise *On the Priesthood,* divided into six books and written in the form of a dialogue between himself and Basil, is one of the most perfect of the great doctor's writings. He wants to repress the ambition of bad priests and, on the other hand, to restrain the intractability of the laity. With this twofold purpose in mind, he sets forth to both clergy and people, with impressive warmth of feeling and loftiness of thought, the greatness of the Christian priesthood. He says:

"The priesthood, though it be administered upon earth, is nevertheless to be placed in the rank of heavenly functions. No mortal man or any other created power, but the Holy Ghost Himself, hath

[66] On the condition of the clergy in St. Chrysostom's time, see Puech, *S. Jean Chrysostome et les mœurs de son temps.* From this valuable work we have taken some of these details.

established this sacred Order. . . . He, therefore, that celebrates the holy mysteries ought to be pure, as though he were even now standing in heaven, in the midst of those celestial powers. . . . When you see our Lord sacrificed and lying in open view; when you see the priest standing by the sacrifice and repeating over it the prayer of consecration; when you see the communicants tinged and reddened, as it were, with that precious blood; can you yet imagine yourself to stand upon earth and to be amongst men? . . . The priest brings not fire from heaven (like Elias), but the Holy Spirit; and he offers a long supplication, not that a torch let down from above may consume the gifts; but that grace, descending on the sacrifice, may thereby inflame the souls of all that are present, and make them brighter than silver purified in the fire. . . . As the priests ought to be more venerable in our eyes than kings and princes, so we should honor them with a greater respect than we pay even to our natural parents. . . . For the priests are authors to us of a divine birth, of that blessed regeneration, of true liberty, and the adoption of grace." [67]

Summing up the struggles which a priest must wage against the powers of evil, for self-sanctification and the sanctification of others, Chrysostom makes use of a comparison which shows him to be a great orator.

He says:

"Set before the eyes of your imagination a formidable army. Let the plains and mountains be covered with troops of horse and foot. Fancy that you see the splendor of shields and helmets, whose burnished brass reflects an illustrious blaze from the sunbeams. Let the rattling of spears and the neighing of horses strike the heavens with their noise. Opposite to these, let the enemy stand in battle array, men fierce and cruel. And let the time of the engagement be at hand.

"Then imagine that you see a country youth, one brought up to nothing but the shepherd's crook and pipe, snatched on a sudden

[67] St. Chrysostom, *The Priesthood,* bk. 3.

out of the field and accoutred with shining armor. Fancy that you see him carried through the army, and let everything there be presented to his view. Let him be shown the several companies and their leaders: the bowmen, the slingers, the tribunes and centurions, the heavy armed foot and light horse, the archers. Let them show him the adverse army, drawn up in order of battle. Let him see their terrible countenances, the various and vast collection of their arms. . . . Show him also the calamities of war: clouds of javelins; arrows falling like hail; dust blinding the eyes; blood running in streams; the groans of men dying and wounded; heaps of dead bodies; chariot-wheels dipt in blood; horses, with their riders falling headlong over heaps of human gore, javelins, and darts. . . . To these dismal scenes of war, add the miseries of captivity, a slavery worse than death itself.

"And, after he hath had a clear view of all these things, bid him mount on horseback and take upon him the command of the whole army. Do you think that so raw a youth would be equal to so great a charge, or would he not rather be ready to give up the ghost, at the very prospect of these things?

"Think not that by this description I exceed the truth. Could you discern the legions of the prince of darkness, and the furious onsets of the devil, you would see a warfare much greater and more terrible than that which I have now represented. Were it possible for us, either putting off this body of flesh or remaining with it, to see clearly and without fear the forces of that evil spirit drawn up, and the war which he wages against us, you would behold not rivers of blood, not dead bodies, but so many ruins of lost souls, and wounds so terrible, that all that description of war which I just now gave you would seem but a ludicrous thing, a mere sport and pastime of children.

"At this, Basil burst into tears more than before; and, rising up to go, I embraced him cordially; and, waiting on him to the door, I exhorted him to bear with courage what had befallen him. 'For I make no doubt,' said I, 'but, by the performance of this sacred ministration, you will obtain so great an interest with Christ, who

hath thus called you and set you over his flock, that at the last day you will be able to rescue even me also from the midst of my dangers and take me with you into the everlasting tabernacles.' " [68]

Deaconesses

Among those whom the priests assisted and whose services they also employed in the exercise of works of charity, were the widows. These were not all equally worthy of esteem. "Some there were who excelled in intrigue, who insinuated themselves into wealthy families and there artfully managed, by embroiling some and reconciling others, so as to turn it all to their own profit." [69] But many of them deserved the highest praise. Chrysostom, in his *Letter to a Young Widow,*[70] speaks of those "who quenched all the desires of the flesh; who not only restrained concupiscence, but trampled it under foot, cast it on the ground, and reduced it to utter powerlessness." He praises their resignation, their calmness of mind, their assiduity at church, and the edifying example of their life. "It was among these holy widows that the Church recruited its deaconesses, and among the deaconesses that Chrysostom found the most remarkable instances of devotedness. Before leaving Constantinople, just as he was giving himself up to the official who was appointed to take him into exile, it was to them he addressed his last advice and his farewell." [71]

Chrysostom's *On Consolation*

While the deacon Chrysostom was thus setting forth the ideal of priests and of women devoted to good works, he did not forget the evils affecting the faithful. Among Christians

[68] *Ibid.,* bk. 6.
[69] Puech, *op. cit.,* p. 241.
[70] *P. G.,* XLVIII, 599–610.
[71] Puech, *op. cit.,* p. 242.

of the leisured class in the fourth century, many were suffering from "that disease of advanced society, which arises from doubt and pride, an ailment that has been treated or rather described under the name of melancholy." [72] Stagirius, one of his friends, afflicted with this ailment, fell into a gloomy discouragement. Chrysostom, in his *Oratio adhortatoria ad Stagirium,*[73] endeavored to show him that melancholy is an evil more to be dreaded than the devil. Its germs he perceives in selfishness, and as a remedy for it he suggests the practice of good works.

He says to his friend: "Go to the one who is in charge of the service of strangers and arrange to be brought to the place where the sick are, that you may behold every kind of suffering. After that go to the prison. Go to the public baths and stop at the porch where you will see pitiful wretches stretched out almost naked, suffering from the cold and imploring pity from passers-by by the mere trembling of their body, because they have not strength to speak or stretch out their hand. . . . You will tell me that all these ills I am speaking of affect only the body, and that your malady is more severe because it reaches to the very soul. Alas, the maladies I speak of do indeed start with the body, but they do not stop there; they reach the very soul, disturbing it continually and impairing it through pain and dejection." In these touching words we already hear the eloquence of him who one day would become the fearless advocate of the poor before the wealthy class of Antioch.

To find inspiration for such views, Chrysostom needed merely to read the Scriptures attentively, calling to mind the charity of the first members of the Church. At that very time (about 380), Jerome, absorbed in the study of Christian antiquity, published, under the auspices of Emperor Theo-

[72] Villemain, *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (1856 ed.), p. 156.
[73] *P. G.,* XLVII, 423–494.

dosius, the Latin translation of the Bible with the greatest possible exactness.

In Rome, Pope St. Damasus was undertaking labors which, by direct exhortation or by recalling Christian antiquity, might bring about the tranquillity of minds and the reform of morals. He himself contributed to this end by celebrating the praise of the early saints and martyrs. In a Roman synod (380) he rejoiced at seeing the Emperors grant the divinely founded Church its proper freedom in matters of administration and other legitimate activities.[74]

The concern of the two Emperors, as also that of the Supreme Pontiff, was to pacify men's minds in the full truth of Catholic dogma and to reform the practices of the time by its pure moral teaching. To all three of them it seemed these aims could be fully realized only by the meeting of a council that would confirm and complete the decisions of Nicaea.

Council of Constantinople (381)

From the accounts of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret we learn that the first steps for the calling of a council at Constantinople were taken by Theodosius in 380.[75] According to those same authors, it had a threefold purpose: to confirm the faith of Nicaea;[76] to establish a bishop at Constantinople;[77]

[74] Mansi, III, 624.

[75] The document on which some historians base their opinion that Pope Damasus convoked this council, relates to the Council of Constantinople of 382, not to that of 381. See Hefele I, 9 f., II, 343. Yet it would be rash to say that the pope had nothing to do with the meeting of the council. It may well be that he positively sanctioned its convocation, or even suggested it. Theodosius had just formally declared the autonomy of the Holy See in spiritual matters, and a year later has recourse to the pope for the convocation of the council of 382. We may rightly suppose that he did not act without the pope's assent in 381. Further, Damasus presently confirms the decisions of the council of 381 and gives it a sovereign authority. He would hardly have acted thus for a council assembled contrary to or without his approval.

[76] Socrates, V, 8; Sozomen, VII, 6.

[77] Socrates, *loc. cit.;* Sozomen, *loc. cit.;* St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Poems,* 12.

to issue regulations calculated to strengthen the peace which the Church began to enjoy since the coming of Theodosius.[78] This ruler, to make the assembly as imposing as possible, sent letters to all the bishops of his realm, that is, of the East, directing them to come. In the hope of leading the Macedonians back to the Church, the Emperor invited their bishops to the Council. They came to the number of thirty-six. Nearly all of them belonged to the region of the Hellespont.[79] The most famous were Eleusius bishop of Cyzicus and Marcian bishop of Lampsacus.

The Council began its sessions in May 381.[80] It concluded its labors in July of that same year.[81] The number of orthodox bishops in attendance including those from Egypt, who were present only at the later sessions, was about a hundred and fifty.[82] The most celebrated orthodox bishops were the following: Meletius of Antioch, who reached Constantinople a little while before the Council began, to install Gregory Nazianzen in the see of that city; Ascholius of Thessalonica, who a short time before had baptized Emperor Theodosius; Helladius, recently made bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia; St. Basil's two brothers (Gregory of Nyssa and Peter of Sebaste), and his old friend Amphilochius of Iconium.

St. Meletius of Antioch

By right the presidency of the Council belonged to the patriarch of Alexandria, Timotheus. But, as he did not arrive in time for the first session, his place was taken by Meletius patriarch of Antioch without any opposition. The Emperor

[78] St. Chrysostom, Oration 45.

[79] Socrates, V, 8; Sozomen, VII, 8.

[80] Socrates, *loc. cit.*

[81] Mansi, III, 557; Tillemont, *Mémoires* (1728 ed.), vol. 9, *St. Gregory Nazianzen,* note 41, p. 1338.

[82] Socrates, *loc. cit.;* Sozomen, *loc. cit.* We have a list of the bishops who attended this council. It contains 147 names. (Mansi, III, 568–572.)

was present at the opening of the Council. He heaped honors upon the president. Theodoret relates that, when Theodosius was as yet only a general, in a dream he saw a bishop clothing him with the imperial mantle and placing a crown on his head. The features of the bishop remained fixed in his memory. When the bishops who had come for the Council were presented to him, Theodosius immediately recognized Meletius as the one who had mysteriously appeared to him. He greeted him respectfully and, after repeatedly embracing him according to Eastern custom, he told him his wonderful dream.[83] The Emperor accorded all sorts of honors to the other bishops and requested them to exercise a spirit of conciliation in discussing the questions that would engage their attention.[84]

Thereafter the Emperor did not again appear in the Council. It seems that he did not even have a representative there, unless perhaps a police officer who was present to maintain order. But even such a one is not mentioned by any historian. Outside the conciliar meetings Theodosius showed the same respectful discretion. To those who brought him denunciations against certain bishops, he replied: "That is not my affair. To summon a bishop to my tribunal would be to dishonor the priesthood." [85]

Maximus the Cynic

The first matter submitted to the Council was the question about the see of Constantinople. The scandalous ordination of Maximus the Cynic was pronounced null as being contrary to the canon law. The first consequence of this decision was a declaration of the invalidity of all the ordinations performed by him. As a further consequence, it seemed that charges

[83] Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History,* V, 6.

[84] *Ibid.,* V, 7.

[85] *Theodosian Code,* XI, XXXIX, 9. This law is the fragment of the report of one of the sessions of the imperial consistory.

should be preferred against the consecrating bishops. But those prelates were absent. Gregory Nazianzen, ever ready to plead the cause of mercy and pardon, said it was not fair to condemn them without hearing them, and that the Council should not, by a condemnation, sadden the beginning of the pacifying work it was about to undertake. The Council yielded to these arguments. But they invited Gregory himself to accept the post left vacant by the deposition of Maximus. Appealing to the desire for harmony which he had just expressed, they pointed out to him that, as bishop of the capital, he could more effectively help to end the Meletian Schism. Gregory, who had always declared that he left to the decision of a council the confirmation of his powers as bishop at Constantinople, could not avoid the responsibility which they laid upon him.[86]

The Meletian Schism

The crisis afflicting the Syrian capital threatened to assume disturbing proportions. The Greeks, for the most part, stood by Meletius; the Latins declared themselves for Paulinus. The peace, which was the object of such earnest effort, between East and West, might now be hindered by a petty question of persons.

An unexpected event suddenly complicated the situation of the Church of Antioch and that of the Council itself. This was the death of Meletius. By his personal qualities no less than by the authority which he derived from the Emperor's favor, he seemed to be the president intended by Providence for the forthcoming disputes. "Meletius," says St. Gregory Nazianzen, "won respect and induced others without compulsion, having as much honey in his character as in the syllables of his

[86] This was an exception to the rule that did not allow a bishop to pass from one see to another. Gregory had merely assisted his venerable father at Nazianzus, but he was bishop of Sasima.

name." The Council was about to begin the discussion regarding the divinity of the Holy Ghost and to try to bring back the semi-Arians on the basis of an orthodox formula. Just then Meletius, suddenly stricken with a severe fever, probably due to the accumulation of prolonged labors, died within a few days. The presidency of the Council was at once conferred upon Gregory. In making this choice, were the Fathers of the Council guided by regard for the personal qualities of the Bishop of Constantinople? Or did they intend applying to this instance the theory they would soon afterward proclaim in their third canon in which they declared the supremacy of the see of Constantinople over all the other sees of Christendom, after that of Rome? We cannot say. But, as a result of this discussion, the man who had trembled before the responsibilities of power, who had longed for silence and solitude, found himself, under most difficult circumstances, overwhelmed by the double burden of governing the greatest Church of the East and of presiding over a council in which partisan intrigues and strifes promised to be particularly bitter.

St. Flavian

The question of Meletius' successor presented a difficult problem. It was reported that Meletius and Paulinus had arranged together that the right to occupy the see of Antioch should go to whichever of them survived the other. What canonical value did this agreement possess? Was such an agreement really made? The generous and peace-loving Gregory, who had more reason than anybody else to complain of Paulinus, declared himself in his favor. He maintained the genuineness and validity of the pact attributed to the two rivals. He has preserved his eloquent plea in the form of charming Greek verses.[87] But unfortunately he alluded to the

[87] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Poem 11, *De vita sua, P. G.,* XXXVII, 1134.

support which Paulinus received from the West. At these words, among the younger members of the Council there arose a murmuring which Gregory compares to the buzzing of a swarm of bees and the croaking of a flock of jays.[88] Asiatic pride rebelled. Someone cried out: "Was it not in the East that Christ was born?" "Yes," answered Gregory, "but it was also in the East that He was put to death." The Council almost unanimously rejected Gregory's proposal and designated, to take Meletius' place, one of his friends, the priest Flavian.

St. Gregory Nazianzen

Gregory felt this defeat keenly. The cause of such a failure was easy to surmise. "Ever since the untoward venture of Maximus, although Gregory's virtues always commanded respect and his eloquence won admiration, his counsel ceased to inspire confidence. Little account was taken of his judgment since his perspicacity had been found at fault. . . . Gregory, with painful grief, observed how little weight his words carried, even with his best friends. Of what service would his continued presence be if important honors did not assure him any real credit? In his saintly and poetic soul, the least scruple became remorse. A sense of his own uselessness begot a sickly frame of mind so that he no longer appeared regularly at the sessions. He lived in a retired house where at length he confined himself. The Council, thus left without a guide, soon went on haphazardly, day by day deserving more the reproach of turbulence and disorder which Gregory, from his retirement, kept addressing to it." [89]

The arrival of the Egyptian bishops added to the difficulty. Gregory decided the hour had come to make a final decision. "For some time past," he says, "I had been like a horse shut in

[88] *Ibidem.*

[89] De Broglie, *op. cit.*, V, 433.

a stable. I kept pawing the ground and neighing in my bonds, longing for my pasture and solitude." In the midst of one of the conciliar sessions he unexpectedly appeared before his fellow-bishops. "Men of God," he said to them, "please take no account of what affects me. Stop your strifes and treat each other with brotherly regard. Like Jonas, I sacrifice myself for the safety of the ship, although I am not the cause of the storm." Not a voice was raised to beg him to reconsider his decision. Gregory, without another word, left the hall. A number of his friends, by way of protest against the coldness of the Council, left with him. Speaking of these events, Gregory Nazianzen himself remarks: "It is not my wish to scrutinize men's thoughts, for nothing but simplicity fills my heart. But I must say that they acquiesced in my decision with more readiness than might have been expected. Such is the gratitude which every country shows to those who have served it." [90]

Theodosius was more generous. When the holy Bishop told the Emperor of his intention to resign from the presidency of the Council and from the see of Constantinople, that he might return to his beloved solitude, Theodosius embraced him and endeavored to persuade him to remain, but without avail. The active career of Gregory Nazianzen was ended.

Before departing, he assembled the people and the Council in his church for one last time. "In the customs of that age," says Villemain, "interest in such a sight was very great, and the preacher's genius never seemed more brilliant or lofty. With simplicity he gave an account of his life, of his trials, of his faith, of his efforts for the welfare of the people. At the close of his discourse he greeted all the places that were present in his memory, all that he loved, all that he was about to leave." [91]

[90] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Poem 11, *De vita sua.*

[91] Villemain, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 f.

"Farewell," he said, "to you, Anastasis church, that acquired your name from our devout confidence; farewell, mighty and famous temple, our new conquest that owes its present greatness to the holy word; farewell, all you sacred abodes of the faith, that embrace the various parts of this city; farewell, all you ministers of the Lord at the Holy Table, you who approach God when He descends to you; farewell, sacred songs, harmony of psalms, gatherings of orphans and widows, the looks of the poor turned toward God and toward me; farewell, homes of hospitality, friends of Christ helpful to my infirmity. Farewell, East and West, for whom I have striven and by whom I am crushed. Farewell, guardian angels of this Church, who protected my presence and will protect my exile. And Thou, Holy Trinity, my thought and my glory. May they conserve Thee, and mayest Thou save them! O Trinity, save my people; may I learn each day that they are growing in wisdom and virtue! Children, may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." [92]

After this farewell Gregory Nazianzen went first to Caesarea, then to his native Arianzus, where he finished his life, far from courts and councils, in prayer and study and the writing of sacred poems which breathe all the religious tenderness of his beautiful soul.[93]

Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople

Upon the proposal of the bishops and the approval of the people, Theodosius designated, as Gregory's successor, a former praetor of Constantinople, Nectarius by name. Like Ambrose, he was as yet a simple catechumen; but, although he did not become an unworthy prelate, he did not bring to the see of Constantinople the lofty virtues with which Ambrose adorned the see of Milan.

[92] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration 42; Mansi, III, 582 f.
[93] See Guignet, *Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, orateur et épistolier.*

Under the presidency of Nectarius, the Council continued its labors. No satisfactory results came of the efforts to bring the Macedonians into union. Says Socrates: "These men would have preferred Arianism to the *homoousios*." Socrates fails to say that the disagreement which separated the Macedonians from the Church concerned not merely the consubstantiality of the Son of God, but also and especially the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

The same historian also says that the Macedonians withdrew from the Council, taking pains, by letters, to forewarn their followers against acceptance of the Nicene symbol. The hundred and fifty bishops who remained then reaffirmed the faith of Nicaea.[94] Sozomen and Theodoret give scarcely any further details about the holding of the Council.

The Creed

From the Acts of this Council we have a symbol of faith and seven disciplinary canons. Is the symbol that we possess only part of a longer and more detailed exposition of the faith? Tillemont thought so, relying upon a declaration by a council that was held at Constantinople the following year and upon a discourse delivered at the Council of Chalcedon.[95]

Regarding the symbol three hypotheses have been advanced. The traditional opinion regards it as a revision of the Nicene Creed. Tillemont identifies it with the one which St. Epiphanius inserted in his *Ancoratus*.[96] More recently Harnack and Duchesne have claimed that the so-called Symbol of Constantinople[97] has nothing in common with the council of 381.

[94] Socrates, V, 8; Sozomen, VIII, 7; Theodoret, V, 8.

[95] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* IX, art. 78, p. 221. Cf. Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés,* V, 646.

[96] *Ibid.,* p. 888.

[97] Or the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, which is now sung at mass.

That council, according to them, simply amplified the Jerusalem symbol with Nicene formulas, and it was not until a late date, after the Council of Chalcedon, that we have the theory —thereafter universally adopted—of a connection between the so-called symbol of Constantinople and the doctrinal decisions of the second ecumenical council.[98]

In defense of this hypothesis it is said that St. Gregory Nazianzen, some time after the close of the Council, writing about the rule of faith, speaks only of the Symbol of Nicaea, without mentioning that of Constantinople.[99] But, says Hefele, "it is somewhat remarkable, and probably only to be accounted for by the peculiar relation of Gregory of Nazianzus to this Synod, that this Father of the Church . . . only mentioned the Nicene Creed, and not that of Constantinople." [100]

It is also noteworthy that the third general council, held at Ephesus, makes no mention of the Symbol of Constantinople and refers solely to that of Nicaea. It is true the Nicene Symbol is the only one expressly named; but we can comprehend the omission of any reference to the Symbol of Constantinople. As it emanated from a council of Eastern bishops, it did not yet possess the authority of the symbol of 325, approved by a representation of the entire Church. Moreover, when the Fathers of Ephesus forbade the recitation in the churches "of a symbol different from the one that was in use," they may have been alluding to the Symbol of Constantinople.

The following is a translation of this symbol, as it is printed, along with the Acts of the second ecumenical Council of Constantinople, in all collections of the councils:

[98] Harnack, art. *"Constantinopel (Symbol)"* in the *Realencyklopädie*, 3d ed., XI, 12–28; Duchesne, *op. cit.*, II, 350 note. On this question, see Hefele, II, 348 f., and J. Bois, art. *"Constantinople (concile de 381)"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, III, 1229 f.

[99] St. Gregory Nazianzen, Letter 102.

[100] Hefele, II, 350.

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all time (ages), Light from Light, very God from very God, begotten, not created, of the same substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made Man; who was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the Prophets. And in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. We look for a resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen." [101]

The ancient Greek manuscripts give seven canons of the council of 381, but the old Latin translations contain only the first four, and these alone are regarded by critics as authentic.[102] The first one anathematizes the Eunomians or Anomoeans, the Arians or Eudoxians, the semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi, the Sabellians, the Marcellians, the Photinians, and the Apollinarians. The second canon forbids bishops to interfere in affairs of another diocese.[103] The third attributes to the bishop of Constantinople the preëminence of honor over the other bishops, after the bishop of Rome, because, it says, "Constantinople is the new Rome." The fourth canon

[101] *Ibidem.*

[102] Hefele, II, 352.

[103] On the meaning of the word "diocese" at that time, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, II, 22 f., note 2.

regulates the affair of Maximus the Cynic in the manner we have already indicated.

At its conclusion the Council addressed a letter to Theodosius, asking him to confirm its decisions. The Emperor replied by a decree ordering that the Churches, in the East, be turned over to the bishops in doctrinal agreement regarding the equal divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the orthodox prelates whose names he enumerates for each province.[104]

This synod, which later became officially recognized as the second ecumenical council, was a long time in being accepted by the universal Church. The bitterness of the discussions that arose between the East and West and the persistence of the misunderstandings that existed between those two parts of the Christian world were the causes of this long delay. The West was slow to accept the Acts of the Council of Constantinople without reserve. Photius declares that this council was approved by Pope Damasus shortly after it was held;[105] but he does not say under what conditions and within what limits. There is reason to suppose this approbation referred only to the profession of faith.[106]

At the Council of Chalcedon (451), all the Fathers, including the legates of the Holy See, acclaimed the Symbol of Constantinople; but, when there was question of the third canon (regarding the preëminence of the capital of the East), the papal legates protested and even left the session.[107] Popes Vigilius, Pelagius II, and Gregory the Great recognized the sovereign authority of the Council of 381,[108] but solely on the doctrinal question. Not until the thirteenth century (at the

[104] *Theodosian Code,* I, III, *De fide catholica;* Sozomen, VIII, 8.
[105] Photius, *De synodis,* Mansi, III, 596.
[106] Hefele, II, 371 ff.
[107] Mansi, VII, 441.
[108] St. Gregory the Great, *Letters,* bk. 7, letter 34.

Council of the Lateran, 1215) did the Church accept without restriction the disciplinary canons of the second ecumenical council.[109]

[109] The Council of Constantinople of 382 called the council of 381 ecumenical (*οἰκουμενή*); but this word should not here be taken in its strict sense. For the Easterners at that time it had the same meaning as the word "universalis" had for the Africans. (Theodoret, V, 9.)

CHAPTER II

From the Second Ecumenical Council to the Death of Valentinian II (381–392)

THE Council of Nicaea by condemning Arianism and proclaiming the consubstantiality of the Son of God with the Father, and the Council of Constantinople by reproving Macedonianism and affirming the divinity of the Holy Ghost, defined for all future ages the Catholic belief in the Holy Trinity. The Symbol of Nicaea-Constantinople, publicly chanted in our churches, remains even today the most perfect expression of Catholic belief in this essential dogma. But the shadow cast by Apollinaris the Younger on the divine person of Christ continued. The disturbance engendered in consciences by Priscillian was far from being allayed. After the Trinitarian question had been definitely settled, the Christological question and the moral question sprang up: they were no less violent and disturbing. The Church did not lack intrepid champions for her defense. In the first rank of these was Jerome. Interrupting the peace of his solitude and austere labors, he fought both the Apollinarian heresy and the various forms of sensualism with the full passion of his ardent soul, while Ambrose and Chrysostom defended the integrity of Catholic dogma and morals against those in high places, against the Empress, and against even the Emperor.

Council of Aquileia (381)

The fact that the Council of Constantinople was composed exclusively of Eastern bishops lessened its authority in the

eyes of the Western heretics. Arianism, which would soon spread in the western part of the Empire through the invasions of the barbarians, was never indeed as strong there as in the East. Yet Palladius and Secundian, two bishops of Illyria, whose sees we do not know, spread questionable doctrines, which were the more dangerous since they were hidden under orthodox formulas. In 379 Gratian, then sole emperor, in order to end the troubles caused by these prelates, decided to assemble a general council in the city of Aquileia. His adviser Ambrose dissuaded him from the project, showed him that the question was a purely local one, and persuaded him that it would suffice to convoke the bishops of the neighboring dioceses. The Emperor followed this advice.[1] During the summer of 381 thirty-two bishops, coming from different districts of the West (Italy, Pannonia, Gaul, and Africa), went to Aquileia. Rome, where Pope Damasus was then held in restraint by his rival Ursinus, was not represented at the Council, which began its sessions September 3, 381. Valerian of Aquileia presided, and Ambrose was its leading spirit.

The first important thing to be done was to remove ambiguities. On motion of Ambrose, there was read the letter of Arius to Alexander bishop of Alexandria. When Palladius was asked whether or not he joined in these blasphemies against the Son of God, he gave an evasive answer, made recriminations against Ambrose, and called for a general council. Bishop Secundian and the priest Attalus, his disciple, resorted to the same subterfuges. On the proposal of the Bishop of Milan, that same day, at one o'clock in the afternoon, the Council anathematized Palladius, Secundian, and Attalus, declared them heretical, and appealed to Emperors Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius, with a view to the immediate execution of its decisions. In particular they asked Gratian, who held Rome in his states, to place no credence

[1] Hefele, II, 375.

in the claims of the antipope Ursinus and his calumnies against Damasus.[2]

Apollinarianism

Thanks to Ambrose's energy and activity, Arianism, driven to its last intrenchments, was vanquished in the West as in the East. The same cannot be said of a more subtle heresy, which the Bishop of Milan intentionally handled with more circumspection. It was Apollinarianism. The great services rendered by Apollinaris the Younger and by his venerable father during the Trinitarian dispute, and their courage during the persecution under Julian the Apostate, called for consideration which Arian perfidy had not deserved. Further, the Apollinarian error, in its doctrinal statement, did not give rise to a scandal like that which Arianism provoked. Many of its followers were unquestionably in good faith.

It was said that Apollinaris' great concern was to establish that Christ is a God made man, and not a man made God. Contrary to the Arians, who would not consider Jesus as anything more than a man whose mind and will were penetrated by the Divinity, Apollinaris—so it was said—desired to show, in Christ, God taking a human body and animating it with His love, His will, and His intelligence in such a way as to make of Him only one Person, one being, one nature. The followers of Apollinaris, when saying this, did not notice, or pretended not to notice, that by thus explaining Christ's divinity they were really denying the integrity of His humanity.[3] In the Council of Alexandria, as early as 362, it had been declared against them that "the Savior did not have a soul-

[2] Mansi, III, 615 f.

[3] Cf. G. Voisin, *La Doctrine trinitaire d'Apollinaire de Laodicée,* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* II (1901), 33 ff.

less body, one without intelligence . . . , that He came to save not only our body, but our intellect, our soul."

In 374 in his *Ancoratus,* and again in 377 in his *Panarion,* St. Epiphanius denounced the new error, pointing out, in opposition to it, the symbol which catechumens of doubtful orthodoxy were obliged to recite, namely: "The Word became man, that is, took a perfect human nature: the soul, body, mind, whatever constitutes man, sin excepted." It was not yet remarked, but subsequently it could be seen that, by his insistence upon the oneness of the being and the nature in Christ, Apollinaris was preparing the way for the Monophysite heresy. In 382 what more especially drew attention to Apollinarianism was the plan which Apollinaris had been publishing for several years, of forming his followers into a separate community, of conferring the episcopal dignity upon his preferred disciples, and of disturbing the Church by his disputes.

Council of Rome (382)

Pope Damasus convened another council at Rome and invited to it the episcopate of the East as well as that of the West. The Greek bishops did not come, alleging, as excuse, that their duties obliged them to remain in their dioceses, and that they had just received from the Emperor an invitation to assemble in Constantinople. They did, in fact, meet there, confirmed the Acts of the council of 381, and probably added to those Acts two canons which later were reckoned as the fifth and sixth canons of the second ecumenical council. Three of these bishops, however, went to Rome and were present at the Roman Council of 382. The Acts of this council have not come down to us. All we know is that it condemned the heresy of the Apollinarians and that Jerome, at Damasus' request, played a decisive part in it.

St. Jerome

After Gregory Nazianzen's withdrawal, there was no strong bond to keep Jerome in Constantinople. The news that the Pope was going to assemble a council at Rome made Jerome decide to go to the Eternal City. He reached there, matured by age and study, by the penitential austerities of the desert, and by the experience of men and things which he derived from the great controversies of the East. Damasus probably had expressed his wish that Jerome return to Rome and was glad to make use of his vast erudition. The Pope presently made him his secretary. Jerome writes in a letter: "I was helping Damasus bishop of Rome with his ecclesiastical correspondence, and writing his answers to the questions referred to him by the councils of the East and West." [4]

The Pope wished to open a path of reconciliation for the Apollinarians, for those at least who, without much reflection, were seduced by the example of others and accepted Apollinaris' doctrine even though alarmed at its dangers. Damasus therefore commissioned Jerome to draw up a profession of faith to be signed by followers of the heresy upon their returning to the Church. The success of the move was thwarted by a trick of the irreconcilable Apollinarians. Rufinus informs us that, as Jerome, in his profession of faith, used the expression *"Homo dominicus"* to designate Christ, the heretics protested against this formula. The learned scholar then exhibited a writing of St. Athanasius which contained it. But his opponents, gaining possession of the manuscript, erased the contested words from it and rewrote them in such a manner as to make it appear that Jerome was guilty of fraud. This detestable procedure provoked a stinging diatribe in which Jerome did not hesitate to call the forgers the names

[4] St. Jerome, Letter 123, no. 10, To Ageruchia (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., VI, 233).

they deserved. But the deception poisoned people's minds, and the heretics' purpose was accomplished. The Council could do nothing but mercilessly condemn Apollinarianism.[5] Many of the Apollinarians remained unreconciled.

Council of Constantinople (383)

Two years later an attempt by Theodosius to obtain the return of the followers of Arius, Macedonius, and Eunomius into the Church met with no better success. The Emperor decided upon a council to be held at Constantinople, to bring about an agreement regarding the doctrinal teaching of the Church.[6] It was to be a great council in which the bishops of all parties would participate. It met in the month of June, 383. Demophilus, former bishop of Constantinople, represented the Arians; Eleusius of Cyzicus, the Pneumatomachi; Eunomius, the Anomoeans; Nectarius, the orthodox. Theodosius received them all kindly and asked each of them to submit his profession of faith to him. Instead of moderating their formulas, the representatives of the different sects declared their doctrine with insolence. Eunomius, after denying any participation by the Son and by the Holy Ghost in the divinity of the Father, threatened his opponents with the wrath of God.[7] Theodosius, enraged at these blasphemies, tore up the professions of faith of the heretics, who returned wrathful to their dioceses. Thereupon the Emperor commanded them to quit their Churches. But the imperial order was not executed. As Sozomen says, Theodosius intended merely to frighten the heretics.[8]

The Council also tried to end the Schism of Antioch. But

[5] Rufinus, *Apology against Jerome* (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., III, 435 ff.). Cf. Hefele, II, 381.

[6] Socrates, V, 10; Sozomen, VII, 12.

[7] Eunomius' profession of faith will be found in Mansi, III, 645–649.

[8] Sozomen, *loc. cit.*

it was impossible to bring about an agreement between Paulinus' followers, who came from Egypt, Arabia, and Cyprus, and Flavian's followers, who belonged to Palestine, Phenicia, and Syria.

St. Jerome and Pope St. Damasus

Neither the saintly Pope nor the mighty Emperor was disheartened by these failures. Henceforth Damasus had Jerome at his side, a man of watchful zeal and tireless devotion. Theodosius would meet Ambrose, the statesman-bishop who would help him defend the purity of Christian doctrine against his enemies, and, at need, against his own passions.

The Sovereign Pontiff requested Jerome to render a twofold service. The austere ascetic and vigorous polemist was asked to write a refutation of certain sects whose sensual tendencies were spreading in Rome, favored by the persistence of the pagan spirit in the capital of the world. Because of the endless discussions about the Bible, which was often altered by fraud or by ignorance, the industrious scholar was asked to make a reliable version of the Bible, the authenticity of which might be made official by the sovereign authority.

The principal sects about which Damasus was concerned were those that made appeal to the names of Lucifer of Cagliari, Helvidius, and Jovinianus.

The Luciferians

We know the views held by the Luciferians, not only through St. Jerome's refutation of them, but also from the petition addressed in their name to Emperors Valentinian and Theodosius in 383.[9] Lucifer of Cagliari had protested against the mildness of the regulations made by the Fathers of the

[9] This *Libellus precum ad imperatores* is to be found in *P. L.*, XIII, 81 ff.

Council of Alexandria about repentant Arians. The Luciferians, under the influence of the deacon Hilary and several others of their leaders, added most extravagant doctrines to Lucifer's ideas. According to them, the whole world was given up to the devil; the bishops who came back from Arianism were of no more worth than the priests of the idols, and they were led back to the Catholic Church by nothing else but the attraction of ecclesiastical wealth. They told strange fables about the divine punishment that would afflict apostates and the protectors of apostates. When a sect professes such harsh opinions in theory, it happens not rarely that, in practice, its members indulge in scandalous disorders.

In the *Dialogue against the Luciferians,*[10] which Jerome published in 382,[11] he does not mention any moral disorder in the Luciferian community of Rome, but he foresees the danger and indignantly refutes the exaggerated theories of those who claimed to be disciples of Lucifer. He takes up the defense of the Council of Alexandria, which, he says, "by its prudent regulations preserved a large number of people from the poison of Arianism and, by its salutary indulgence, rescued the world from the teeth of the infernal serpent."

Helvidius

Helvidius was a disciple of Auxentius, the usurping bishop of Milan. He seems to have been one of those turbulent spirits who are eager for notoriety and not very scrupulous about the means they use, provided they make a name in the world. In a book reeking with blasphemies and solecisms, Helvidius, basing his contention on Gospel texts, denied the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary. Then, taking occasion of this thesis, he maintained that the state of virginity has no advantage over the state of marriage.

[10] *P. L.,* XXIII, 155–182.

[11] Van den Gheyn, art. *"Jerome"* in the *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* III, 1305.

For a while Jerome resisted the requests that he take up his pen against the reviler. He did not want to give excessive publicity to the poor arguments of an unworthy calumniator. But when he saw weak Christians shaken by the incredible boldness of Helvidius and his gross fallacies, Jerome decided. His reply, which has come down to us under the title *Liber de perpetua virginitate Beatae Mariae,*[12] is overflowing with erudition and at the same time sparkling with animation. The sophist's arguments are taken up one by one, and dissected and refuted with a precision that leaves none of his statements intact. The author concludes his book as follows:

"Because I think that, finding the truth too strong for you, you will turn to disparaging my life and abusing my character (it is the way of weak women to talk tittle-tattle in corners when they have been put down by their masters), I shall anticipate you. I assure you that I shall regard your railing as a high distinction, since the same lips that assail me have disparaged Mary, and I, a servant of the Lord, am favored with the same barking eloquence as His mother." [13]

Jovinianus

A vagabond monk, named Jovinianus, was not satisfied with peddling Helvidius' errors; he said there was no merit in abstinence or in the monastic life; he maintained the equality of glory of all the saints and the identity of punishment of all the damned; he proclaimed that justification, once acquired, could not be lost. In short, his teaching was a forerunner of the worst errors which Luther and Calvin spread twelve centuries later. Ten years after, under Pope Siricius, when Jovinianus' followers had formed a sect and when the heretic gave his doctrines to the public, Jerome, with the same learning and vigor, refuted what he called "the Epicure of the New Law."

[12] *P. L.,* XXIII, 183–206.

[13] Chap. 22 (*alias* 24), *P. L.,* XXIII, 206 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 487).

The Latin Bible

The changes which these heretics and others made in the Biblical texts to uphold their doctrines, and the differences that had crept into the various manuscripts of the current Latin translation (the ancient Itala) rendered a thorough revision of the received text urgent. Jerome seemed to be the writer providentially prepared for that important work. Damasus asked him to do it. The learned exegete was not blind to the difficulties of such a labor. He foresaw the criticisms that it would arouse.

"The labor is one of love," he wrote, "but at the same time both perilous and presumptuous; for in guiding others I must be content to be judged by all. . . . How can I dare to change the language of the world in its hoary old age? Is there a man, learned or unlearned, who will not, when he takes the volume into his hands and perceives that what he reads does not suit his settled tastes, break out immediately into violent language, and call me a forger and a profane person for having the audacity to add anything to the ancient books, or to make any changes or corrections therein? Now there are two consoling reflections which enable me to bear the odium—in the first place, command is given by you who are the supreme bishop; and secondly, even on the showing of those who revile us, readings at variance with the early copies cannot be right." [14]

First Jerome translated the Gospels. Scholars are agreed upon the eminent merits of this version. They consider it "a work full of tact, marking a great step in the history of the textual criticism of the Bible and supplying the Latin world with a text of the Gospels based on solid criticism." [15] So as not to disturb the habits of the faithful more than would be necessary, the translator departed as little as possible from

[14] St. Jerome, Preface to the *Vulgate Version of the Four Gospels, P. L.,* XXIX, 525 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 487).

[15] Van den Gheyn, in the *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* III, 1307.

the text of the ancient Itala, changed it according to the Greek text only when the meaning seemed to him poorly rendered, and even in that case did not always translate directly from the Greek but chose, among the various Latin texts at his disposal, the readings that were closest to the Greek.[16]

After the four Gospels, Jerome translated the Psalms. The first translation, made from the Greek of the Septuagint, was the one that formed the *Roman Psalter,* which was in use in Rome until the time of Pius V. From a second translation, more carefully done and based on Origen's *Hexapla,* came the *Gallican Psalter,* so called because it was first adopted in Gaul.[17] In 392 Jerome made a third translation based on the Hebrew text.

As he had foreseen, his work became an object of hostile criticism. But his Scriptural labors brought him treasured friendships. Pope Damasus wrote to him as follows: "I know nothing finer than our conversations about the Scripture. There is nothing that nourishes my soul with more tasty food." [18] Other souls wanted to share in that pious banquet. In a palace on the Aventine certain patrician ladies, "enamored of the Gospel ideal, by their virtues courageously protested against the paganism which still flaunted itself and the frivolous customs of a large number of Christians. There was the mistress of that same noble home, Marcella, who, after being married a short time, vowed her widowhood to God, to the poor, and to the study of the Scriptures. There was Albina, Marcella's mother; and Asella, whose gentle-

[16] Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* p. 389; Grützmacher, *Hieronymus,* p. 217.

[17] The Gallican Psalter is the one which the Church uses in the Breviary; but the passages of the Psalms employed in the Missal, as also the *Venite exultemus* of the Invitatory, are taken from the Roman Psalter.

[18] Damasus to Jerome. See A. Condamin, *Les Caractères de la traduction de la Bible par saint Jérôme,* in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* 1911, pp. 425–440.

ness was praised by Palladius the biographer of St. John Chrysostom; and Furia, the heir of the Camilli; and Fabiola, who, less solidly established in goodness than were her pious companions, would one day repair the errors of her youth by penance and charity. We should note three women who were particularly dear to Jerome. Their names accompany his in history: Paula and two of her daughters, Blesilla and Eustochium." [19]

St. Jerome on the Aventine

The presence in Rome of the saintly and learned priest, whose virtues seemed to accord so well with the aspirations of this group of choice souls, gave Marcella the idea of making his acquaintance. Much insistence and perhaps Pope Damasus' intervention were needed to overcome Jerome's somewhat gruff aloofness. He went to the Aventine. He read the Sacred Books and commented on them to this group of wonderful women, in whom the noble dignity of the Roman patrician class was combined with the gentle humility of the Gospel. Soon the most distinguished members of the Roman clergy, such as the priests Domnio and Oceanus, and even laymen, such as the senator Pammachius and the magistrate Marcellinus, obtained the privilege of taking part in these pious and scholarly gatherings. "How much virtue and ability," Jerome wrote later, "how much holiness and purity I found in her (Marcella), I am afraid to say." [20] The better to follow the lessons of the learned teacher, his hearers resolutely began the study of Greek and Hebrew. Marcella excelled in these intellectual labors. "Whenever I think of her eagerness for study," says Jerome, "I confess my laziness,

[19] Largent, *Saint Jérôme,* pp. 28 f.

[20] St. Jerome, Letter 127, no. 7, To Principia, *P. L.,* XXII, 1091 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 255).

I who, with the Savior's crib ever before me, cannot do what this noble lady does, in the time she steals from the care of her home and the management of her many servants."

Pagan Morals

But when Jerome, coming down the slope of the Aventine, again witnessed the spectacle of pagan morals in the Rome consecrated to Christ, he was filled with spirited indignation, he breathed maledictions and vehement satires. He upbraided the avarice and intemperance and hypocrisy that, after the heroic virtues by which martyrs had amazed the world, slipped in among the baptized of Christ, among priests and monks. "It shames me to say it," he declares,

"but some men seek the diaconate and priesthood simply that they may be able to see women with less restraint. Their curling hair shows traces of the tongs; their fingers glisten with rings. When you see men acting in this way, think of them rather as bridegrooms than as clergymen." [21]

Death of St. Damasus

Jerome always found it hard to hold back sharp and stinging invective, whether from his lips or from his pen. But often he atoned for his unrestrained words by the cruel retaliation he had to suffer. Those who recognized themselves in his satires never forgave him for them. Sometimes he was calumniated among his friends. The death of Pope Damasus (December 10, 384) deprived him of his most solid support and occasioned a fresh outburst of attacks by his foes. Jerome decided to go back to his hermit's cell in Palestine. He set out for the East after addressing this tender farewell to one of the Roman laity who had attended his lessons. "Noble Asella,

[21] Letter 22, no. 28, To Eustochium, *P. L.*, XXII, 414.

I am writing these few words to you in haste before I embark. I am sad and my eyes fill with tears. I thank God that I have been found worthy to be hated by men. My enemies have cast disgrace upon me by falsely charging me with a certain offense. But by good report or ill report, we reach the kingdom of God. Salute Paula, Eustochium, Albina, Marcella, Felicitas. Tell them that some day all of us will be at God's judgment-seat, where each one will show the conscience he had during life."

Empress Justina

While Pope Damasus, seconded by Jerome, was working for the restoration of faith and morals in the Church, events of serious moment had disturbed the Empire.

Between the court of Milan, where Emperor Gratian established his residence, and the court of Constantinople, where Emperor Theodosius resided, Empress Justina, Valentinian's widow, established herself at Sirmium, impatiently waiting for the hour when her son Valentinian II, officially associated with Gratian's government, would be capable of exercising his power. Sirmium soon became a center of malcontents, where a third court was formed, secretly hostile to the court of Milan. The Arians were to be found there in large numbers. Justina found herself presently at the head of the Arian party. Policy seems to have been the decisive motive in this new attitude. For the same reason Ambrose, the inspirer of the Catholic policy of Gratian, became hateful to Justina. Between her and the Bishop of Milan many a conflict arose.

But in 383 an unforeseen event changed the face of things. Gratian, having hastened into Gaul at report of the sedition that raised Maximus to power, was assassinated at Lyons in an ambush. Justina, knowing that Ambrose was, even from the political point of view, the great power that had to be

reckoned with, went in haste to Milan, entered the Bishop's house leading her son by the hand, and placed the child in Ambrose's arms. Then she asked a favor of the Bishop. The usurper Maximus might agree to divide his power with the young prince. Maximus would be left Gaul and Great Britain, and the last survivor of the Valentinians would rule over Italy, Spain, and the Danubian provinces, where the memory of his father still lived. Let Ambrose deign to go to Maximus' court. His authority would doubtless succeed, while saving a distressed mother and her young son, in assuring the peace of the Empire by this agreement.

For Ambrose it was a question of rescuing the distressed and of forgetting an enmity. He accepted. "Thus it came about that the minister of a Master whose kingdom is not of this world was called upon, for the first time in the annals of the Church, to intervene in the partition of political sovereignties. It is not without interest for us to note that, if on that day the Church took a first step on a path on which previously nothing had led her to enter, it was in response to the appeal of a widow and an orphan. Is not this indeed a living and symbolic figure of the part she took later when it was the whole society, perishing at her feet, that urged her to come to its aid against the invasion of barbarism, and when thus she remained the sole guardian of right in the deluge of might?" [22]

By long, patient negotiations Ambrose obtained from Maximus all that could reasonably be hoped for: a provisional agreement on the proposed basis. But, during Ambrose's absence, the enemies of the Church had again become active.

The Altar of Victory

From time immemorial, in the meeting-hall of the Senate at Rome, there stood an altar of Victory, the protecting god-

[22] De Broglie, *Saint Ambroise,* pp. 67 f.

dess of the city and of the Empire. This altar had been removed by Constantine, put back by Julian, tolerated by Valentinian I, and again removed by Gratian. It had experienced all the vicissitudes of the emperors' religious policy. The pagan members of the Roman Senate thought that, in the absence of the Bishop of Milan, a fourteen-year-old prince could easily be persuaded to ratify a decision of the high assembly restoring the altar of Victory to its place.

The campaign was handled cleverly. The orator selected as spokesman for the pagan claims was one of the most notable men of the time, the senator Symmachus. In the course of a long life, he had filled the highest offices in the State. He had cultivated all the arts of the mind and, in performing the duties of public office, had always shown great fairness toward the Christians. In his writings he never used a single word of hatred for Christianity. But, with the full force of his patriotism, he clung to the maintenance of the traditional religion of old Rome. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he did not adopt new ceremonies from the Eastern religions.

His petition to the Emperor possessed that dignified and majestic eloquence which led people to compare him with Cicero and to regard him as the leading orator of his time. For the restoration of the altar of Victory, he did not appeal to the ancient mythologies or the traditions of the idolatrous priesthood or the teachings of the philosophers of Greece and Rome. In the discussion that ensued, for him the religious question was resolved into the patriotic question. He said: "We ask for a return of the system of religion that has so long been profitable to the commonwealth. Not to favor our request is to be a friend of the barbarians. Should we forget the homage due to the goddess, we ought, at any rate, respect the majesty of the Roman Senate. We are defending the traditions received in our childhood. In our old age we wish to hand them on to our posterity."

Symmachus' petition was referred to the imperial consistory, the members of which were easily persuaded. But Ambrose arrived in time. He grasped the seriousness of the decision which the Emperor was about to make. Overcome in the realm of its doctrines and worship, paganism was now going to reëstablish itself as a national bond and in this way start again to pervert men's souls. Constantine's work came close to being undone. Ambrose asked to see a copy of the petition. His request was granted. Soon the Emperor, the consistory, and the Senate had before their eyes, along with Symmachus' able plea, the ardent supplication of the Bishop of Milan.

The pagan senator evoked the glories of old Rome. These the Christian bishop did not deny. He declared that the bloody sacrifices of idolatry were not the cause of those glories. Rather the cause was to be found in the valor of the Roman warriors and in the stern virtues of ancient times. Tradition had been appealed to; but tradition is a forward movement, not a return to the past. The authority of ancient times should be regarded as merely a beginning. Symmachus, in an elegant rhetorical figure, called upon the Eternal City to speak; but the Eternal City really utters something different from what was asserted. Let us hear what it says: "I detest the religion of Nero. I am sorry for my past errors. In olden times I had this in common with the barbarians, that I did not know the true God. In my old age I am not ashamed to change with the whole world. No longer do I think to find God's will manifested in the entrails of victims. I want to learn the mysteries of heaven by the testimony of God who made it. Whom shall I believe about God, rather than God Himself?"

Ambrose's reply convinced the members of the consistory. The young Emperor, implored not to undo the work of his brother, condemned the pagans and their altar.[23]

[23] On this important dispute, see Beugnot, *Histoire de la destruction du paganisme,*

The Arians in Milan

But another struggle called Ambrose's attention to Milan. There it was that Empress Justina had just established her court, and there the Arians abounded. At their head they placed a bishop of their own choosing, a Goth by birth, like many of them. They gave him the name of Auxentius in memory of the former Arian bishop, Ambrose's predecessor. Valentinian, when urged by his mother, had not the courage to refuse them one of the city churches, the Portian Basilica. But, before carrying out the decision, the lawful bishop must be informed. Ambrose was summoned to the imperial palace. To the Emperor, who called upon him to give up the basilica, he replied: "I have no right to give it up to you, and you have no right to take it from me." While the discussion was becoming animated between the Bishop and the Emperor, the populace, sensing some danger for their bishop, surrounded the palace. Threatening outcries were heard. Justina became alarmed and quieted the tumult only by authorizing Ambrose to announce to the crowd that no basilica would be taken away from the Catholics.

Public order was restored. But Justina was angered. She held the Bishop to blame for the uprising which he quieted,[24] and she prepared to take her revenge. A month later she demanded for the Arians, not merely the Portian Basilica, which was located outside the city, but the High Basilica, which was of much greater importance. She met with the same resistance from Ambrose and encountered a more formidable uprising of the populace. In vain she proposed a compromise to him just when he was about to celebrate the holy sacrifice. The people who filled the church and surmised the meaning of the

bk. 8, chap. 6; Puech, *Prudence,* chap. 3; Thamin, *Saint Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e siècle,* pp. 18–21; Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme,* bk. 6, chap. 1.

[24] St. Ambrose, *Sermon against Auxentius.*

message, cried out with one voice: "No, Ambrose; do not yield anything." The exasperated crowd could not restrain its indignation. To quiet them, the Bishop started the prayers of mass. Later on he wrote as follows in a letter:

"I began to celebrate mass. Whilst offering the oblation, I heard that a certain Castulus, who, the Arians said, was a priest, had been seized by the people. I began to weep bitterly, and to implore God in the oblation that He would come to our aid, and that no one's blood be shed in the Church's cause, or at least that it might be my blood shed for the benefit not of my people only, but also for the unbelievers themselves." [25]

Justina then proceeded to use direct action on the people. Soldiers were mobilized. For three days there was the rumbling of sedition in Milan. With a view to pacification, Ambrose did not appear in the large basilicas, but officiated in an abandoned chapel. The faithful, however, gathered there in large numbers. On the evening of the third day a sound of arms was heard near the chapel. Were the imperial military forces about to attack the chapel? A band of soldiers did, in fact, appear; but they came to join in the common prayer. Moral force overcame the imperial power. Justina had called Ambrose a tyrant. "The power of a bishop," he said, "is his weakness. 'When I am weak,' says the Apostle, 'then I become strong.' " [26]

The conflict began over again a year later (389), in connection with a law granting freedom of worship to the Arians and providing a death penalty for anyone who interfered with the exercise of that freedom.[27] The law was aimed at Ambrose. But he did not change his attitude. "By refusing to surrender the inheritance of Jesus Christ," he said, "I am doing

[25] St. Ambrose, Letter 20, no. 5, To Marcellina.
[26] *Idem*, no. 23. *"Tyrannis sacerdotis infirmitas est."*
[27] *Theodosian Code*, I, IV, 14.

my duty as a priest. Let the Emperor do his duty as emperor." [28] Though asked to leave the city, he stayed at his post. For his better protection, his faithful locked themselves in the New Basilica with him and barricaded themselves there as if for a veritable siege. Valentinian II dared not force open the doors of the sacred edifice. At the end of a few days, to terminate the affair, he proposed that Ambrose come before him and there confer with the Arian bishop Auxentius. Ambrose refused. Instead, he had the church doors opened and solemnly consecrated the basilica, delivering a magnificent sermon in which he said: "The emperor is in the Church, not above it." [29] The imperial authority no longer protested.

Ambrosian Hymns

During this Arian persecution, to occupy the people enclosed in the basilica with him, Ambrose introduced the singing of hymns and psalms by two choirs.[30] He also composed hymns that were of such a special form that all hymns conceived on this new type have been called Ambrosian. One of the Bishop's purposes was to popularize the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and thus combat the Arians, who long since had put their teaching into songs and canticles. But St. Ambrose's work possessed a superior literary value. A competent judge regards them as the origin of all Christian lyricism, of all modern lyricism, "the ripest fruit of the assimilation of ancient culture by Christianity." [31] As to the alternate manner of singing, that seems to have been taken from the East. Ambrose was well acquainted with the practices in use there. This was one of the characteristics of the Ambrosian liturgy,

[28] St. Ambrose, Letter 31, no. 4.

[29] *"Imperator intra Ecclesiam et non supra Ecclesiam est."* St. Ambrose, *Sermo contra Auxentium,* no. 30.

[30] St. Augustine, *Confessions,* bk. 9, chap. 7.

[31] Ebert, *Histoire générale de la littérature du moyen âge en Occident,* p. 187.

which was also distinguished from the Roman and Gallican liturgies by the places used in public worship, the sacred utensils, the ecclesiastical vestments, the arrangement of the liturgical year, the administration of the sacraments, and especially by the canon of the mass.[32]

Pope St. Siricius

At this time the see of Rome was occupied by Pope Siricius. The *Liber pontificalis* says he was a Roman, the son of Tiburtius. His epitaph tells us that he had been a lector, then a deacon under Liberius, that he remained a deacon during the pontificate of Damasus, and that the faithful of Rome, until then divided by the schism, united in acclaiming him.[33] He was elected at the close of the year 384.[34] This election definitely eliminated the antipope Ursinus, who was left without any following. In a rescript dated February 23, 385, Emperor Valentinian II expressed his joy at the election of Siricius.[35] A few days before (February 11), the new Pope exercised his authority in an important matter. Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, had sent Pope Damasus a letter concerning various disorders afflicting the Church of Spain. Damasus was already dead, and Siricius had taken possession of the Apos-

[32] On all these points, see Lejay, in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* art. *"Ambrosien (rit),"* I, 1373–1442. On the Ambrosian chant, see *ibid.,* col. 1353–1373. The origins of the Ambrosian rite are obscure. Probst connects it with the Roman rite; Duchesne and Cagin, with the Gallican rite. The latter opinion seems to be better founded. But Duchesne has not succeeded in winning acceptance for his interpretation, which traces the origin of the rite back to the Arian Bishop Auxentius, predecessor of St. Ambrose. In this case, St. Ambrose merely revised the formulas, making them orthodox throughout. (*Christian Worship,* p. 93, and *Sur l'origine de la liturgie gallicane,* in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* V (1900), 31 ff.) Cagin adopts the hypothesis of a very early Roman rite preserved at Milan and in the Gallican countries, while at Rome itself, not only did it change, but it was replaced by a really different rite. (*Paléographie musicale,* vol. V, preface.)

[33] De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae,* II, 102, 138.

[34] Tillemont, *Mémoires* (1730 ed.), vol. X, part 2, p. 86.

[35] Tillemont, *loc. cit.*

tolic See when the letter reached Rome. Siricius answered with a series of decisions, some of which ought to find a place in a history of the Church.

The first article, resting on the authority of Pope Liberius, the Council of Nicaea, and the practice at Rome, maintained the validity of Arian baptism, which was contested by certain Spanish bishops. The seventh not merely reminded priests and deacons of the duty of continence, but deposed from all their ecclesiastical dignities any members of the clergy who should defend the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy. Siricius begged Himerius to make this reply known to all the bishops of Carthagenia, Boetica, Lusitania, Galicia, and to all his neighboring bishops. Says Tillemont: "This seems to include the bishops of Gaul." He threatened the bishops of those provinces with all the penalties judged useful by the Apostolic See, if they should fail to comply with these decisions.[36] "This letter is the first of all the papal decretals which scholars now recognize as genuine," says Tillemont. "It is also the first to be found in the ancient collections of the Latin Church." [37]

Council of Rome (386)

The following year (386) [38] Siricius, whose administrative and legislative activity was untiring, convened in council at Rome more than eighty bishops, to enforce several laws that were not being well observed. Canons were adopted to the following effect:

"1. No consecration of a bishop shall take place without the consent of the Apostolic See.

"2. No single bishop shall take upon himself to consecrate another.

[36] Jaffé, no. 255. Cf. Tillemont, *op. cit.*, pp. 87–89.

[37] Tillemont, *loc. cit.*

[38] Jaffé, no. 257.

"3. He who after baptism served in war, may not become a cleric.

"7. A deposed cleric may not be admitted into another Church.

"8. If Novatian clergy wish to enter the Church, they must not be actually re-ordained, but they must nevertheless receive a fresh imposition of hands, after the manner of laymen who have been baptized by heretics.

"9. We advise that the priests and Levites should not live with their wives." [39]

St. John Chrysostom

That same year (386), John Chrysostom, ordained priest at Antioch by Flavian, began his preaching career in that city. The fourth and fifth centuries did not possess a more eloquent preacher, and Pope Siricius had no mightier auxiliary in his work of reform. Jerome, ascetic and learned priest that he was, exercised his influence over a choice few whom he trained in study and the practice of the highest virtues. Ambrose, an accomplished statesman, exercised a preponderant influence upon the public authorities. But Chrysostom applied his activity and preaching ability to the moral reform of all classes of society.

Bishop Flavian of Antioch was advanced in years and little endowed with talent for preaching. He promptly relieved himself of the ministry of the pulpit and placed this duty in the hands of the new priest, who was then perhaps forty years old. His first published works showed that he possessed a remarkable experience of men and affairs.

"For twelve consecutive years at Antioch (386–398), and subsequently for six years at Constantinople (398–404), he preached almost uninterruptedly with inexhaustible talent and with constant

[39] *Ibid.* Siricius had spoken of this law in his letter to Himerius. Again in that same year 386 he refers to it in a letter to the Council of Telepta (or Zella), in proconsular Africa. See Vacandard, *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse* (2d ed., pp. 102 f.). See the canons of the Council of Rome (386) in Mansi, III, 670, and a discussion of them in Hefele, II, 387 f.

anxiety and care that his sermons should be efficacious, that he should not leave uncombated any contemporary weakness or superstition." [40]

St. Chrysostom's Preaching

Chrysostom was a born orator. Of all the masters of the spoken word, whether sacred or profane, he is one of the greatest. Says Villemain: "We are amazed at this man's prodigious labors, at the ready and ardent genius of this sublime orator, who saved Antioch, who disarmed the leaders of the barbarians, and who seemed to revive the decadent Empire. Chrysostom's scholarly but popular preaching nearly always gripped his hearers by the rhetorical figures connected with incidents of their life. The sermons of the priest of Antioch do not possess Bourdaloue's powerful method or his deep and close reasoning. The imagination of the Christian orator of Greece and Asia is freer. He has more ardor than logic, more pictures than arguments. He is less desirous of proving dogmas than of praising and inspiring virtues. For this purpose he is informal, persuasive; he and his audience understand each other. Now he is gratified at their pious attention; and again he complains of their coldness and their frequent absence. He is solicitous for their welfare outside of church. His is the office of a people's tribune and of the confessional, exercised in the forum and the sanctuary. It is a union of all that is loftiest in preaching and the most penetrating in the guidance of consciences." [41]

The most intimate details of daily life are before our eyes when we read these homilies. They have come to us as they were actually preached, written down by stenographers and not revised by the preacher himself. Let us turn to one of his sermons on prayer. "Among the Jews," he says, "to pray one

[40] Puech, *St. John Chrysostom*, p. 33.

[41] Villemain, *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle*, pp. 149, 179–181.

had to go up to the Temple, buy a dove, have wood and fire at hand, take a knife, go to the altar, and fulfil various other prescriptions. . . . Here we do not have anything of the sort. Nothing prevents a woman, while holding her distaff or twisting her flax, from raising her mind to heaven and fervently invoking God. Nothing prevents a man, who comes to the public square or who is traveling alone, from praying attentively. A man, sitting in his shop and sewing leather together, can offer his soul to the Master. A slave in the market or going to and fro or in the kitchen, if he is unable to go to the church, is free to pray attentively and earnestly. God will not be ashamed of the place." [42]

Under the Empire, Syria was a very rich country. Chrysostom, in his homily on the forty-eighth psalm, describes the palace of a wealthy Greek of the fourth century, the gardens surrounding it, with their elegant fountains and shady porticos. He also describes the embroidered cloth and sumptuous clothing that were admired in the agora, and those silk shoes which young men were so afraid of soiling. One time, in an outburst of off-hand impatience, he said to them: "Hang your shoes from your neck." [43]

But at Antioch the poor and the beggars were very numerous. Chrysostom knew that many had fallen into this wretchedness through their own fault, and that some were impostors and scarcely deserved help. But he would not grant that the rich should be indifferent to these misfortunes and do nothing to alleviate them or forestall them. One day he began his sermon with these words: "Today I come to you as an ambassador. I have not been sent by the Senate, but by the sight of cruel suffering. As I passed the public square and the street corner, I saw stretched on the ground some unfortunates

[42] *Œuvres de S. Jean Chrysostome* (Jeannin trans.), V, 514, *Homélie sur Anne la prophétesse.*

[43] St. Chrysostom, *On St. Matthew,* homily 49.

shivering with cold and suffering from hunger. In summer the mild weather is a comfort for a poor man. He is almost sure to find work. Those who build houses, who direct excavations, or who sail ships have need of the poor man's arms. A poor man's body is for him what lands, houses, and other properties are for the rich: it is his source of income; he has no other."

None of the vices or abuses prevalent in the rich Syrian capital escaped the clear-sighted solicitude of the holy priest: neither the harshness of masters toward their slaves, nor the softness and luxury of the rich, nor the worldliness of girls' education, nor the frivolousness of women, nor the severity of the imperial magistrates, nor the sophistry of the rhetoricians, nor the gross superstitions of the masses. Chrysostom's works furnish us with the most finished picture of the customs of the fourth century [44] and "the most complete course of moral sermons that Christian antiquity has bequeathed to us." [45]

But they are very especially concerned with one question: the relations of the rich and the poor. In that society, not yet freed from pagan individualism, one crime above all others stirred his wrath: the exploitation of the poor by the rich. "As you know, I am not against the rich," he exclaimed. "On the contrary, I am for the rich. I want to cure their disease. You rich men blame me because I never tire reproving you; the truth is that you never tire exploiting the poor." [46]

Chrysostom does not deny the right of private ownership. But often he praises, as an ideal, that first community in

[44] Montfaucon, while gathering texts of St. Chrysostom, wrote his learned work on *Les Modes et les usages du siècle de Théodose le Grand,* which has been placed in volume XIII of the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions.* A more extensive and interesting study is the work of Thamin, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et les mœurs de son temps.*

[45] Villemain, *op. cit.,* p. 169.

[46] Homily *In verba David.*

Jerusalem, in which the Christians of their own accord placed their individual possessions into a common treasury. He says: "How beautiful these words are, 'The multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul.'" He did not fail to recall that the charity of the rich should be discriminating. He it was who said: "One who gives to a truly poor man, gives to God; but one who gives to tramps and scalawags, is casting his alms to dogs." [47] Having made this reservation, he never wearied in his praise of almsgiving and charity. "Mercy," he said, "is the queen of virtues; it is the oil that was wanting in the lamps of the foolish virgins. For without virginity it is possible to see the kingdom, but without almsgiving it cannot be." [48] Again he says: "The very tears and grief of love are sweeter than any mirth and joy." [49]

"The effect of virginity, of fasting, of lying on the ground, is confined to those who practice them, and no other is saved thereby. But almsgiving extends to all, and embraces the members of Christ." [50] "It is extended to Christ Himself. For He it is who is embodied in the poor. Hear Him say to you: 'Though I am able to support Myself, I come about begging, and stand before thy door and stretch out Mine hand, since My wish is to be supported by thee. For I love thee exceedingly, and so desire to eat at thy table, which is the way with those that love a person. And I glory in this. And when the whole world are spectators, then am I to herald thee forth, and in the hearing of all men to display thee as My supporter.'" [51]

Homilies on the Statues

It was especially when speaking of charity that Chrysostom revealed the innermost depths of his priestly soul. But, in the

[47] Letter 151, To Amphilochius.
[48] *On St. Matthew,* homily 47.
[49] *On the First Epistle to the Corinthians,* homily 32.
[50] *On the Epistle to Titus,* homily 6.
[51] *On the Epistle to the Romans,* homily 15.

second year of his preaching, an unforeseen catastrophe gave him occasion to rise to the loftiest height of popular eloquence.

Antioch was one of the most turbulent and disorderly cities of the Empire. Toward the end of the winter of 387, when certain taxes were being collected, the crowd rushed to the agora and, in a sort of madness, overturned the statues of Theodosius, the deceased empress, and the two young princes, Honorius and Arcadius.

The crime of lese-majesty had been committed. The destruction of the city by fire might be the penalty for such an outrage. It was well known how severe Theodosius was when carried away by passion. Three years later he gave a terrible example of this in the Thessalonica massacre. In Antioch, the day following the uprising, there was indescribable stupefaction. Bishop Flavian, despite his great age, resolved to make a long journey to the very palace of the Emperor and implore his clemency. He left Chrysostom at the head of the Church.

Chrysostom sought to restore calm to a people mad with despair, to warn them against the unhealthy agitation of certain professional rioters, to make them wait patiently for the results of their bishop's mission, and to distract them from their obsessing anxiety by turning their thoughts to the truths of the faith. Such were the purposes of twenty-one sermons, known as the *Homilies on the Statues,* delivered by St. Chrysostom. "They are discourses unexampled in antiquity, and for us are a monument of history and eloquence." [52] Bossuet is more majestic, Demosthenes more captivating. But no other human discourse gives the impression of a closer contact between a speaker and his audience. Closely following the emotions of the irritable and changeable crowd, which shifted from dejection to rebellion, Chrysostom now implored, now adjured, now scolded, now implored again. He made them tremble, and he made them smile. When illness compelled him

[52] Villemain, *op. cit.,* p. 160.

to absent himself for a few days, the people's terror rose to the point of frenzy. Nothing but the intervention of a city magistrate halted the reckless excitement. The holy priest, when he returned to the pulpit, was filled with indignation, especially since the magistrate was a pagan. "I blushed and was ashamed," he exclaimed, "that after these long and frequent discourses you should have needed consolation from without." [53]

The final homily of the series informs us how Flavian at length obtained the desired pardon from Theodosius. In this account, Chrysostom mingles the outpouring of his joy with that of the people who heard him. One heart seemed to move both audience and preacher.

"The crisis of 387 is decisive in the history of Chrysostom's preaching. It was that which revealed to his public, and perhaps to himself, the power of his eloquence, and all the effort of which his zeal was capable; it was what established between himself and his public that sympathy which gave the one authority, henceforth, to say anything, and which inclined the other to hear everything." [54]

St. Ambrose the Statesman

In quelling the sedition in Antioch by his eloquence, Chrysostom had labored effectively for the general peace of the Empire. At the same time Ambrose, by his prudent policy, undertook a similar work in the West.

In the early days of 387, Emperor Valentinian II, who four years earlier had been obliged to make a partition of the West with the usurper Maximus, received a threatening letter from the latter. Maximus, assuming the role of zealous champion of the Catholic cause, reproached his colleague for not taking up its defense with sufficient courage and, as he

[53] *Homilies on the Statues,* or *To the People of Antioch,* 16.
[54] Puech, *St. John Chrysostom,* p. 51.

said, "for defying God and the primacy of the Church of Rome." [55] Maximus, who had reluctantly and with ulterior purposes agreed to a partition of the West, in reality was endeavoring to create a party in Italy on which he would rely for an invasion of Valentinian's States. The empress mother, Justina, who was still directing the court at Milan under her son's name, felt deeply wounded and humiliated at this move by the court of Treves. Only one man, she thought, was capable of negotiating successfully with the Emperor of Gaul; this was Ambrose. Once more she appealed to the Bishop's patriotism. He easily saw through Maximus' hypocrisy and, in behalf of her who was so recently his persecutor, accepted the difficult mission she now entrusted to him. Immediately after the Easter festivities of 387, he set out for Treves with an official commission to claim the remains of Gratian and the real mission of showing Maximus that his complaints were unfounded.

The circumstances made it possible for Ambrose to speak in a high-handed manner. Maximus, to display his religious zeal, had just put the heretic Priscillian to death, but he had pronounced judgment without consulting the bishops. We have already seen that St. Martin of Tours protested against the irregularity of such a procedure and the tyrant's bloody cruelty. This same attitude was taken by Ambrose. He refused to hold communion with the bishops who had referred the judgment of heresy to the secular arm. Then he charged Maximus with the murder of Gratian. "He admonished Maximus to do penance for having shed the blood of his master, and—what is worse—an innocent man." [56] Maximus trembled. The attitude of the statesman-bishop was as able

[55] Maximinus' letter is to be found only in Baronius, year 387, no. 33. Tillemont, considering its perfect accord with the information given by Rufinus (II, 16), Theodoret (V, 14), and Sozomen (VII, 13), admits its genuineness.

[56] Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii,* chap. 6 (*i. e.,* no. 19).

as it was dignified. Behind the ambassador's energy, the tyrant sensed a vigorous resistance by the court of Milan.

Unfortunately, soon afterward Justina had the weakness to recall Ambrose and replace him by a less perspicacious envoy. This laid bare the real weakness of her government. Maximus, now reassured, no longer hesitated to act with force, and about the end of August, invaded Italy. At the first report of the invasion, Valentinian and Justina were panic-stricken, left Milan, and took refuge in Thessalonica with Theodosius. Ambrose alone remained in the city and was unmolested by the invaders. But Maximus' victory was short-lived. Overcome by the army of Theodosius and brought bound by his own soldiers before his conquerer, he was executed July 28, 388.[57] Valentinian II was now sole emperor of the West, and the death of his mother Justina, which occurred at this same period, left him under the guardianship of Theodosius. The death of the empress mother deprived the Arians of their most powerful support, and Ambrose's influence again became preponderant in the Empire.

St. Ambrose and Theodosius

The great Emperor and the great Bishop met for the first time after the defeat of Maximus. They were constituted for understanding each other. The close union of Church and State was their common program of government. The pagan emperors of the second and third century looked upon Christianity as an enemy of Roman civilization. In contrast to them, Theodosius, like Ambrose, considered that the surest means of guarding the welfare of the Empire was to assure respect for the orthodox faith. Many a time, and in no uncertain manner, Theodosius had already declared his loyal

[57] For the chronology of all these events, we have followed Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs* (1701 ed.), V, 834–836.

submission to the laws of the Church. And Ambrose, again and again, had given proof of his devotion to the welfare of the State. Painful conflicts, instead of weakening that sincere agreement and mutual accord, did but solidify it.

The first of these conflicts arose in the summer of 389 while Theodosius, yielding to the wishes of the Senate and the Roman people, was living in Rome, engaged in making sure in the West of the fruits of his victory.

The Callinicus Synagogue

Rather serious disorders had broken out in several cities of the East. In some places Arians sacked and burned the houses of Catholics; in other places Catholics, even monks, pillaged Arian establishments and Jewish synagogues. Through the intercession of his young son Arcadius, Theodosius pardoned the Arians who set fire to a section of Constantinople. However, upon receiving the report of his agents, he sentenced the Bishop of Callinicus to rebuild, at his own expense, a Jewish synagogue which had been demolished in the course of an uprising. Ambrose protested in the name of Christian conscience which, he said, could not allow a bishop to erect a temple to a false religion.[58] One day when Theodosius came into church just as Ambrose was about to celebrate the holy sacrifice, the Bishop, standing up before the Emperor, would not begin the liturgical prayers until he obtained from the Emperor a promise that the order regarding the Bishop of Callinicus would not be carried out.

The Massacre at Thessalonica

A few months later a less serious incident occasioned very tragic scenes. About the beginning of 390, the people of

[58] St. Ambrose, Letter 41, nos. 25–29, To Marcellina.

Thessalonica, who were very fond of a certain rider in the circus, rioted because this rider, after being convicted of immorality, was imprisoned. The crowd, deprived of the public entertainment which they were expecting, put some magistrates to death, including the governor of the city, a man named Botheric, who was a personal friend of Theodosius. In the Emperor's temperament a fundamental trait was a tendency to violence which his piety did not always succeed in repressing. On this occasion his anger overwhelmed him. "Since the whole population of the city was accomplice in the crime," he declared, "let the whole population bear the penalty." Some of his officers, who may have been jealous of Ambrose's influence, urged upon him that this matter was a purely civil question in which the Emperor's authority might be exercised without any consultation of the Bishop of Milan. In obedience to Theodosius' order, the people of Thessalonica were invited to the circus, then brutally assaulted by soldiers, who, striking at random, left seven thousand dead bodies on the ground. The Emperor, alarmed at the probable consequences of his rash words, revoked his order, but too late. Ambrose, in a letter to him, said:

"When it was first heard of, there was no one who did not lament it, not one who thought lightly of it. . . . Blame for what had been done would have been heaped more and more on me, had no one said that your reconciliation to our God was necessary." [59]

To avoid too violent a shock, the Bishop, on the pretext of his health, left the capital for a few days. He then wrote the Emperor a letter full of eloquent feeling. In this he says: "What was done at Thessalonica finds no parallel in men's memory. Hence there is only one remedy: for you to give public testimony of your repentance. Why should you be ashamed to do what King David did, and say: I have sinned in the

[59] St. Ambrose, Letter 51, no. 6, To Theodosius.

sight of the Lord?" No particular penance was indicated, no reference was made to the canonical requirements of the Church. Evidently the Bishop wanted to leave to the Emperor's spontaneous choice the manner of expiation he would think compatible with his supreme authority.

Theodosius seemed not to notice this delicacy. Probably upon advice of the officers whose directions he had followed, and supposing the Bishop would not venture to accuse him face to face, Theodosius one day, accompanied by his whole suite, and as though nothing had happened, appeared at the door of the basilica.

"Ambrose prohibited his entrance, saying: How would you walk upon such holy ground? How could you lift up in prayer hands steeped in the blood of unjust massacre? How could you with such hands presume to receive the most sacred body of our Lord? How could you carry his precious blood to a mouth, whence the word of fury issued, commanding the wanton effusion of innocent blood? Depart, then, and do not by a second crime augment the guilt of the first. . . . The Emperor, who well knew the distinction between the ecclesiastical and the temporal power, submitted to this rebuke; and with many groans and tears returned to his palace." [60]

[60] Theodoret, V, 17 (*alias* 18). The Bollandist Van Ortroy questions Theodoret's account, for the reason that this scene is not mentioned in two very important documents: Ambrose's letter to Theodosius regarding the Thessalonica massacre, and the biographical account of Ambrose written by his secretary Paulinus. In this case, the scene mentioned would be merely a sort of dramatization of St. Ambrose's reproach of the Emperor, and the latter's repentance. See *Ambrosiana, Scritti varii publicatti nel XV*e *centenario della morte di S. Ambrosio; Les vies grecques de saint Ambroise et leurs sources,* by Van Ortroy. Father Van Ortroy's conclusions do not seem conclusive to De Broglie, who publishes his view in an appendix to his *Life of Saint Ambrose,* maintaining the historicity of the disputed event. 1. He sees no reason to doubt Theodoret's truthfulness on this point; this historian wrote thirty or forty years after the event, among people who were in a position to know the facts. "Would an historian, writing in 1900 attribute to Napoleon III and the authors of the Fourth of September deeds and words which were not at all theirs?" 2. This scene and the attitude of St. Ambrose and Theodosius, not only are not a contradiction to the letter of the Bishop of Milan, but are their natural sequence; "although, in the matter of ascertaining dates and verifying texts, it is right to grant the last word to profound scholarship, yet when the question concerns the

Eight months passed before Theodosius decided to perform the act of humility which would again open the door of the church for him. On Christmas Day, 390, he came before Ambrose. "What remedy have you applied to so severe a wound?" the Bishop asked. The Emperor replied: "It is your office to point out the remedy, and mine to accept it and comply with it." Ambrose simply asked that a law be drawn up to cancel henceforth all decrees passed in haste and fury; and that a decree be issued that, whenever sentence of death or banishment was signed against anyone, thirty days must elapse before the sentence be carried into execution. The Emperor drew up the decree on the spot and entered the church, where he prostrated himself with every sign of genuine repentance. At a later date, referring to this event in his life, he said: "Ambrose alone deserves the title of bishop." [61] As a certain historian writes, "This interference of a bishop in matters of secular justice is a scandal to statesmen. But this drama has a mighty aspect. The last word was not left to sheer might. In this instance Ambrose personified not only the Catholic Church, but human conscience. His victory is one of those which we may rightly call victories of mankind." [62]

St. Ambrose's Scriptural Writings

The political missions performed by Ambrose and the task of governing his important diocese did not make him neglect

likelihood of certain events, the appreciation which follows upon study and reflection by an historian who was for a long time intimate with political affairs, deserves a hearing." 3. Theodoret's account appears to be confirmed by St. Ambrose's most famous disciple, St. Augustine, who wrote, in his City of God: "What could be more admirable than Theodosius' religious humility when, compelled by the urgency of certain of his intimates, he avenged the grievous crime of the Thessalonians . . . and being laid hold of by the discipline of the Church, did penance?" *City of God,* V, 26; De Broglie, *Saint Ambroise,* pp. 203–227.

[61] Theodoret, V, 17 (*alias* 18).

[62] Thamin, *Saint Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e siècle,* p. 33.

his exegetical labors. In them he never lost sight of the moral teaching. Between 386 and 392 he published the following: his *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke,* which is ingenious and appealing, but often strays too far from the text; his *De Elia et jejunio,* full of fine, vigorous pictures that expose the morals of the day; the *De Nabuthe Iezraelita,* in which he reminds the greedy rich of the divine threats; the *De Tobia,* in which he describes and denounces usury; a *Hexameron,* in which he imitates St. Basil and, according to St. Jerome's testimony, makes use of works of Origen and St. Hippolytus that are now lost; the *De Abraham, De Isaac et anima, De bono mortis, De fuga saeculi, De Jacob et vita beata, De Joseph patriarcha,* and *De benedictionibus patriarcharum,* in which the hortatory element is predominant.[63]

St. Jerome's Writings

St. Jerome, in his retreat at Bethlehem, whither he withdrew in 386, did not remain inactive; he published several commentaries on the Scriptures, and did so with greater care for literal interpretation. For the better understanding of the Sacred Books, he again took up the study of Hebrew under the direction of learned Jews. He also studied Chaldaic. The book of Tobias and part of the book of Daniel were written in this language, the study of which cost Jerome endless hardship.[64]

Paula and Eustochium, initiated into the Hebrew language, helped Jerome in his work. They read the Bible with him and, by their pious and insatiable curiosity, provoked explanations which St. Jerome, as he himself acknowledges, took from the

[63] On these writings, see Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* pp. 433 ff.; Largent, art. *"Ambroise"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 943–945.

[64] St. Jerome, *Preface to the Book of Daniel* (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 492).

masters of doctrine. At their request, he commented on the Epistles to Philemon, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, and to Titus; for them he also finished the explanation of Ecclesiastes which Blesilla had formerly asked him to do.[65]

In 390, by the aid of a writing of Philo, Jerome composed his *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum,* and his work on the geography of the Holy Land, *De situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum.* At this same period he undertook another translation of the entire Old Testament, based on the original, "according to the Hebraic truth," as he says. He began with the Books of Kings, next took the Book of Job, then the Prophets and the Psalms. In 392, at the suggestion of a powerful Maecenas, the praetorian prefect Dexter, he decided to do for ecclesiastical literature what Suetonius had done for profane literature, and wrote his *De viris illustribus,* "a brief account," he says, "of all those ecclesiastical authors who have written on the Sacred Scriptures from the Crucifixion to the fourteenth year of Theodosius." "Although it contains gaps and errors, it blazed a trail and is an historical authority of the first rank." [66]

The *Adversus Jovinianum*

In Jerome's list of his own works, he places, immediately after his *De viris* his two books *Adversus Jovinianum.* This fact has led some to suppose he wrote them in the same year (392).[67] The heretic Jovinianus, who troubled the faithful of Rome in the time of Pope Damasus, not only spread his errors by word of mouth, but set them forth in a book that appeared in 390 and was at once condemned by Pope Siricius.[68] Some

[65] Largent, *Saint Jérôme,* pp. 43 f.
[66] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* I, 7.
[67] Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés,* V, 598.
[68] St. Ambrose, Letter 42, nos. 4 f.

Christians in Rome thought Jerome was the one best able to refute the new heresy. They sent a copy of Jovinianus' book to him in Palestine.

A few days later [69] appeared the two books *Adversus Jovinianum,* a turbulent work, overflowing with animation. It abounds in those excesses of language for which the spirited Dalmatian has been so much blamed. No doubt he does not always weigh his expressions; his enthusiastic praise of virginity at times seems to place too low an esteem on marriage; and his indignation against the heresy leads to violent invectives against the heretic himself. Jerome calls him a coarse barbarian and says that his

"style is so barbarous, and the language so vile and such a heap of blunders, that I could neither understand what he was talking about nor by what arguments he was trying to prove his points. At one moment he is all bombast, at another he grovels; from time to time he lifts himself up, and then like a wounded snake finds his own effort too much for him." [70]

At the end of the first book, Jerome paints women too black. Of course the work contains something besides these pictures and epithets. With sound arguments drawn from Scripture, the first book proves the preëminence of virginity over marriage, and the second book refutes Jovinianus' theses on the uselessness of fasting, the impeccability of a baptized person, and the equality of heavenly reward for all real Christians.

When this work appeared in Rome, it stirred up sharp criticism. Jerome's enemies charged him with condemning conjugal union, with repeating the errors of the Manichaeans and Eucratians. So great was the outcry that Pammachius the senator, a friend of Jerome, thought it well to withdraw from circulation all the copies he could obtain. He so informed

[69] St. Jerome, *Against Jovinian,* I, 1 (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d. ser., VI, 346).
[70] *Ibidem.*

the Bethlehem hermit. A young monk also wrote to Jerome, pointing out the passages he thought blameworthy in the work. This last letter did not at all appease Jerome. He considered the tone of the criticism insolent and he contemned this "hasty hot-head, this ignoramus, this idler" who dared pass judgment on propositions without understanding the first word of them.[71] His reply to Pammachius, however, contained a prudent elucidation of the hastily improvised work.

"I am not so fortunate," he says, "as are most of the writers of the day—able, that is, to correct my trifles whenever I like. When once I have written anything, either my admirers or my ill-wishers sow my work broadcast among the public." [72]

But he retracted nothing of the substance of his thought. He declared: "I wanted to show that virginity is golden, marriage silver, and fornication filth. What reply can be made to these propositions?" Yet he thanked Pammachius for the pains taken in withdrawing the copies of the work.

St. Paulinus

This Pammachius, whom Jerome made the confidant of his inmost thoughts, was Paula's son-in-law, having married her daughter Paulina. Four holy souls—Paula, Eustochium, Paulina, and Pammachius—represented to the holy priest "the mysterious four-horse car of Ezechiel, which Jerome represented as being drawn by Christ Himself." In 392 Pammachius placed the hermit of Bethlehem in touch with one of his relatives who, weary of the pleasures of the world and of profane letters, aspired to taste the strong and wholesome poetry of the Sacred Books. His name was Paulinus. By his gentle and tempered language, by his inclination to moderation

[71] St. Jerome, Letter 50, To Domnio (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 80).
[72] *Idem,* Letter 49, no. 2, To Pammachius (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d. ser., VI, 79).

in everything, Paulinus presents a striking contrast with Jerome.

Meropius Anicius Paulinus was born in Gaul, at Bordeaux, in 353 or 354, of a patrician family related to the Anicii.[73] The Paulini had extensive property in Aquitania. Sidonius Apollinaris gives a description of one of their villas. The manor house is elegantly adorned in marble and stucco, and surrounded by gardens containing many statues; there are large rustic buildings, extensive vineyards, and broad fields where hundreds of farm-laborers are at work.[74] "In those sumptuous residences life was magnificent and easy-going. A friendly tolerance prevailed. A rather accommodating religious attitude formed a common ground where pagans and Christians could meet without many clashes." [75] Representative of that state of mind was the rhetorician Ausonius, a man of refined mind, of courteous and smiling nature, but of such vague religious mentality that, after a close study of his writings, you might wonder whether he was pagan or Christian.[76]

Ausonius was Paulinus' first teacher and always remained his friend. The young patrician, under the tutelage of Ausonius and other able masters, was taught all the branches of knowledge of his time. At about the age of twenty-five he came to Rome, the cradle of his family. The Romans admired the culture of this son of Gaul, who was alike versed in poetry, oratory, philosophy, and law. One of the two consulates was vacant. Emperor Gratian named Paulinus to the Senate to hold that office until the end of 378. He who one day would edify the Church by his spirit of poverty and humility was the

[73] See Baudrillart, *Saint Paulinus, évêque de Nole.* For our sketch of St. Paulinus, we made considerable use of this excellent biography.

[74] St. Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmen,* 22. Cf. L. Joulin, *Les Etablissements gallo-romains de la plaine de Martres-Tolosane* in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions,* 1900.

[75] Baudrillart, *op. cit.,* pp. 4 f.

[76] *Ibid.,* pp. 9 f. From the most recent critical researches, it appears that Ausonius was a Christian, but his whole thought was nourished by pagan antiquity.

central figure in those triumphal ceremonies of consular inauguration, beside which, it was said, even imperial celebrations were dimmed. In rich apparel he proceeded along the streets of the Eternal City, which were decked with rich hangings, strewn with flowers, and perfumed with incense. His consulate was brilliant. Sixteen years later, when he revisited Rome, clothed in a coarse tunic and carrying a pilgrim's staff, the memory of his consulate was still in people's minds.

The first call of grace to a life of poverty and austerity was heard in his soul when he was near Nola in Campania—over which he had just been appointed governor—where he owned some family property. In touching poetry he relates how, during the festive celebration in honor of St. Felix, the patron of the district, the sight of several miracles, wrought before his eyes at the saint's tomb, raised his thoughts above things of earth to the love of Christ.[77]

Paulinus' Friends

His marriage to a Spanish noblewoman soon afterwards was the second stage of his conversion. A great human affection was to lead toward the pure love of God that chosen soul, not yet fully detached from the vanities of this world. It was to St. Felix of Nola, his beloved patron, that Paulinus attributed this second grace. "I had crossed the Pyrenees," he says in one of his poems, "and reached the land of the Iberians. There you vouchsafed that I should take a wife according to human laws. Thus, at one stroke, you won two lives. You employed the yoke of the flesh to make as one the salvation of two souls and, by the merits of one, you compensated the hesitations of the other." [78] Teresa, Paulinus' devout wife, has not been placed by the Church among the saints that are hon-

[77] St. Paulinus, *Poems*, **21**.
[78] *Ibidem*.

ored by public worship, but our limited information about her shows that she was a finished model of Christian womanhood, helping her husband climb the road of perfection where God called him.

Besides the poet Ausonius, to whom he continued sending poems, Paulinus reckoned in the number of his close friends Sulpicius Severus, like himself of noble birth, wealthy, and eloquent, a man who was then considered the light of the bar in Aquitania and who, after his widowerhood, would, like Paulinus, embrace a life of prayer and poverty. Paulinus was also acquainted with the holy Bishop of Tours, Martin, who, when Paulinus was suffering from a disease of the eyes, cured him miraculously by touching them with a little holy oil.[79] Paulinus himself tells us that Martin loved him and Teresa with fatherly affection.[80] Even closer relations existed between the noble patrician [81] and the saintly bishop of Milan. "Although I was baptized in Bordeaux by Bishop Delphinus," he writes, "still I regard the venerable Ambrose as my spiritual father since he it was who instructed me in the mysteries of the faith and even yet gives me counsel that I need to perform my duties worthily." [82]

In 389 Paulinus received baptism. A precious poem, long lost, but found again at the beginning of the nineteenth century, reveals Paulinus' whole soul at that period. "This poem, possessing great beauty by the loftiness of its feeling and, in certain places, by its form, is an admirable song of thanksgiving and hope. Its declaration of detachment from wealth and honors forecasts the abandonment of all earthly possessions that was soon to follow." [83]

[79] Sulpicius Severus, *St. Martin of Tours,* chap. 21.

[80] St. Paulinus, Letter 32.

[81] There is considerable evidence that St. Paulinus of Nola was a senator. For this evidence, see Lagrange, *Histoire de saint Paulin de Nole,* pp. 27–30.

[82] St. Paulinus, Letter 3, no. 1.

[83] Baudrillart, *op. cit.,* p. 37. Migne's *Patrologia* does not contain this poem. It may be found in Hartel's critical edition, Appendix (Carmen 3), p. 350.

Paulinus' Trials

Soon afterward, Paulinus suffered some trial which must have been very severe, although we are not definitely informed as to what it was. One of his brothers died a violent death. Was he involved in some political affair? or was he assassinated? We do not know. At once Paulinus' property was confiscated, and his life threatened. In one of his poems he attributes to St. Felix of Nola the grace of escaping death and ruin on this occasion. "Felix came to my assistance," he writes; "this I ascertained from what followed." [84] It has been supposed that he was pursued as the brother of one condemned for a political crime. Another text gives semblance to the view that a horrible calumny blamed him for his brother's death. He exclaims: "Grant, Lord, that I may never be accused of crime, or even suspected: there is so little distance between suspicion and condemnation." [85]

Paulinus and Teresa left Gaul and withdrew to a place at the foot of the Pyrenees in the neighborhood of Barcelona and Saragossa. There a child was born to them, but died at the end of eight days. The breaking of this bond was the signal for breaking all the other ties. By mutual agreement. Paulinus and Teresa resolved to strip themselves of all their earthly goods little by little [86] and to lead a monastic life. After that Paulinus and Teresa lived together as brother and sister in a union of prayer and almsdeeds. Their letters to eminent personages of the Church are signed: Paulinus and Teresa, sinners.

The renouncement would not have been complete unless

[84] *Poems*, 21.

[85] *Ibid.*, 5.

[86] It was not a pillage, as Ausonius says. Paulinus and Teresa merely regarded their wealth as a trust to be used in relief of the poor. Even at the time of his retirement at Nola, Paulinus still possessed a remnant of his property. In the end, he had nothing. Baudrillart, *op. cit.*, pp. 44 f.

Paulinus, like Jerome, gave up the cultivation of profane literature. Previously, in his poems, most of them addressed to Ausonius, he took his inspiration from pagan authors and chanted the beauties of nature. He writes again in verse to his friend, but says: "Why do you recall the muses that I have repudiated? My heart, now consecrated to God, has no longer any room for Apollo. A greater Divinity has subdued my soul." [87] At this time he wrote to Jerome, asking for advice as to what use he should make of his life and future studies. The hermit of Bethlehem answered:

"Make haste, I beseech you, and cut instead of loosing the hawser which prevents your vessel from moving in the sea. . . . Want of education in a clergyman prevents him from doing good to anyone but himself and much as the virtue of his life may build up Christ's Church, he does it an injury as great by failing to resist those who are trying to pull it down." [88]

We shall see how Paulinus profited from Jerome's advice.

St. Augustine

At the time the Gallic convert was turning to the perfect life, another convert, another ascetic, who became a priest a year before, was using his knowledge of Scripture for the edification of the Church and the refutation of heresy.

He was born, almost the same time as Paulinus, November 13, 354, at Tagaste [89] in Africa and was called Aurelius Augustinus. The Church, which honors him under the name of St. Augustine, has not known a single man, since St. Paul and St. John, who has exercised a deeper influence on theology and Christian piety.

The story of Augustine, from his childhood to his priest-

[87] St. Paulinus, *Carmen,* 10.

[88] St. Jerome, Letter 53, nos. 3, 11 (*alias* no. 10), To Paulinus.

[89] Now called Suk Ahras (in Algeria), about fifty miles from Bona. Tagaste, in the middle of the fourth century, was a small town of proconsular Numidia.

hood in 391, is not so much a history of events in which he took part as it is the story of his soul. In his case, the interior life was everything; at least we may say that everything centered therein. The stages of his conversion were not, as they were in the case of St. Justin, stages of a pilgrimage in search of the truth. Nor were they a succession of providential happenings, as they were in the case of St. Paulinus. Rather they were marked by the action of two loves: an infinite Love drawing the soul of its creature to itself, and that of the created love seeking God, even when it seemed to be fleeing from Him. Those stages were marked also by reciprocal acts of two spirits: "that of the human spirit, which in its own depths finds nothing but wretchedness, and that of the infinite Spirit, unchanging and blissful Truth." [90] In Augustine's life the search for happiness and the search for truth were mingled and fused together.

Augustine's Childhood

He was the son of a deeply Christian mother, Monica, and a pagan father, Patricius.[91] Growing up in the sensual and voluptuous atmosphere of the Africa of that period, he felt painfully within him, from boyhood, according to St. Paul's words, the struggle of the spirit against the flesh, the clash of the will against outward things.

Augustine writes:

"I had the will to signify what I would have, to those that should help me to it; but I could not yet clearly enough express my desires to them; for these were within me, and they without me; nor could the guess of their senses dive into my meaning. Thereupon would I flutter with my limbs, and sputter out some words, making some other few signs, like to my wishes." [92]

[90] Rousselot and Huby, in *Christus*, p. 809.
[91] Patricius was baptized and died a Christian about 371.
[92] St. Augustine, *Confessions*, I, 6.

And it seemed to him that "his mind was all upon playing," [93] because therein he found the satisfaction of an imperious need for activity. But, on the other hand, the thought of a Providence watching over the world,[94] of a Christ Savior,[95] and of an eternal blessedness [96] corresponded, he felt, to a deep need of his heart. He had a distaste for the labor connected with study, he was afraid of being chastised, and prayed to God "that he might not be beaten at school." [97] Yet he is proud to state that he learned to talk, not so much by the aid of a teacher as by the power of his own mind.[98]

In the schools of Tagaste, Madaura, Carthage, and Rome he sought the satisfaction of his need of loving and his need of knowledge in the most intoxicating pleasures of the senses and the most insidious errors of the mind. But his heart found no rest. He himself says: "Lord, Thou has created us for Thyself, and our heart cannot be quiet till it may find repose in Thee." [99] This sums up the whole content of his *Confessions*. At the age of sixteen he entered into an unlawful and sinful union. He himself speaks of it bitterly, saying: "I was with much joy bound with sorrow-bringing embracements, even that I might be scourged with the iron burning rods of jealousy and suspicions and fears and angers and brawls." [100] He felt that he must quit what he calls "the morass of the flesh."

When he was nineteen years old, having longed "to give up everything for truth," he fell into the snare of the Manichaean heresy. He was attracted by the promise held out by a philosophy claiming freedom from any restraint, by the hope of find-

[93] "Our mind was all upon playing." *Ibidem*, chap. 9.

[94] *"Magnum Aliquem qui posset subvenire," ibidem.*

[95] "This name of my Savior Thy Son, had my tender heart even together with my mother's milk devoutly drunken in," *ibidem*, III, 4.

[96] "I had heard, being yet a boy, of eternal life," *ibidem*, I, 11.

[97] *Ibidem*, I, 9.

[98] *Ibidem*, I, 8.

[99] *Ibidem*, I, 1.

[100] *Ibidem*, III, 1.

ing in it a scientific explanation of nature and a solution of the problem regarding the origin of evil, and by the feigned virtues of those initiated into the sect. Their doctrine denied that man possesses free will and attributed evil to an outside principle, thus destroying the idea of moral responsibility, and quieted self-esteem by giving free rein to the passions.[101] But Manichaean doctrine left many clouds and doubts in Augustine's mind. The frightful void of Mani's philosophy, "which demolished everything and built up nothing," [102] the immorality of his followers in contradiction to their affectation of virtue, and the intellectual weakness of their leader, Bishop Faustus, eventually freed Augustine from an illusion that lasted nine years.

At the age of twenty-nine, a new passion seized him, that of pure philosophy. He became enthusiastic for everything noble in the ideas of Plato and Plotinus. He noticed that, in the proportion that he freed himself from things of the senses, he entered into a knowledge of spiritual things. He then considered adopting a simple, chaste life, shared by a few friends who, like himself, were devoted to the unselfish search for the true, the beautiful, and the good.[103] A flood of light entered his soul from the reading of the Scriptures, which showed him two great truths unknown to the Platonists: namely, salvation by Christ, and victory by grace.[104]

He was appointed teacher of rhetoric in Milan. There he met Ambrose, whose sermons he listened to, first as an admirer of fine language, then with serious attention to the substance of the doctrine that was being preached. His mother joined him in Milan. Her gentle influence and the conversion to the Catholic faith of the celebrated Neoplatonic rhetorician Vic-

[101] "It much delighted my proud conceit, to be set outside of fault," *ibidem,* V, 10.
[102] St. Augustine, *De utilitate credendi.*
[103] At this time Augustine wrote a treatise *On Beauty,* which is no longer extant.
[104] *Confessions,* VII, 20 f.

torinus [105] prepared his soul for the mighty stroke of grace which overwhelmed him, when he was thirty-three years old, in the garden of his house in Milan, in the autumn of 386.

Ten years earlier, while Monica was bemoaning her son's misconduct "more than mothers are wont to do for the bodily deaths of their children," [106] an aged bishop, witnessing her grief, comforted her with these words: "It is not possible that the son of these tears should be lost." [107] The hope which entered that devout mother's heart was soon realized. We quote Augustine's own account of that inner drama which ended with his conversion to the Christian faith.

Internal Struggles

He says:

"Thus soul-sick I was, and in this manner tormented; turning and winding myself in my chain, till that which held me might be utterly broken; which, though but little, yet held it me fast enough notwithstanding. . . . I said within myself: Behold, let it be done now, let it be done now. And no sooner had I said the word, but that I began to put on the resolution. Now I even almost did it, yet indeed I did it not; yet notwithstanding, fell I not quite back to my old wont, but stood in the degree next to it. . . . The very instant of time wherein I was to become something else, the nearer it approached me, the greater horror did it strike into me.

"The very toys of all toys, and vanities of vanities (those ancient favorites of mine) plucked softly at this fleshly garment, and spoke softly in mine ears: Canst thou thus part with us? And shall we no more accompany thee for ever? And now I much less than half heard them, nor now so freely contradicting me face to face; but muttering as it were softly behind my back. Violent custom thus

[105] *Ibidem,* VIII, 2.
[106] *Ibidem,* III, 11.
[107] *Ibidem,* III, 12

whispered in my ear: Thinkest thou to be ever able to live without all that?

"On that side which I set my face towards, and whither I trembled to go, was that chaste dignity of continency discovered, stretching forth those devout hands of hers. There were in company with her very many both young men and maidens, a multitude of youth and of all ages: both grave widows and ancient virgins, and Continence herself in every one of them. And she was pleasant with me, as if she would have said: Canst not thou perform what these of both sexes have performed? Why standest thou on thyself, and on thyself standest not? Cast thyself on the Lord; fear not, He will not slip away and make thee fall. This was the controversy I felt in my heart, about nothing but myself against myself. I flung myself down, I know not how, under a certain fig tree, giving all liberty to my tears. I sent up these miserable exclamations, How long? How long still 'tomorrow and tomorrow'? Why not now?"

Augustine's Conversion

"Thus much I uttered, weeping, in the most bitter contrition of my heart; whenas behold I heard a voice from some neighbor's house, as it had been of a boy or girl, in a singing tune saying and often repeating: Take up and read, Take up and read. I began very heedfully to bethink myself whether children were wont in any kind of playing to sing any such words; nor could I remember myself ever to have heard the like. Hastily therefore went I again to that place where Alypius was sitting; for there had I laid the Apostle's book. I snatched it up, I opened it, and in silence I read that chapter which I had first cast my eyes upon: not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness . . . but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ. No further would I read; nor needed I. For instantly even with the end of this sentence, by a light as it were of confidence now darted into my heart, all the darkness of doubting vanished away. . . . From thence went we into the house unto my mother; we discover ourselves, she rejoices for it; she triumpheth,

and blessed Thee, who art able to do above that which we ask or think." [108]

In 387, on Easter, or at least at Easter time, Augustine was baptized by Ambrose.[109] In the autumn of that same year he lost his saintly mother. Not in all literature can be found pages of more exquisite feeling than the account of that blessed death and Augustine's grief.[110] The new Christian, wishing to realize his desire for the perfect life as soon as possible, sold his possessions, distributed the money to the poor, and withdrew to Tagaste to his already alienated estate, there to live in common with a few friends in poverty, prayer, and study.[111]

Augustine's Early Writings

But it was not an inactive solitude. In an ardent soul like Augustine's, there could be no interval between conversion and proselytism. By becoming a Christian, he became an apostle. Following his conversion to the faith, in the autumn of 386, he published his three books *Against the Academics.*[112] Therein he attacks the skepticism of the new Academy, from which he had suffered so much, and he shows that happiness is not in the search for truth, but in knowing truth.

In the course of that same year there appeared his two books *On Order,*[113] which examine the part played by evil in the plan of Providence. We can form an idea of his work from the *St. Petersburg Soirées.* It is a résumé of conversations at

[108] *Ibidem,* VIII, 11.

[109] There is no foundation for the tradition that the *Te Deum* was composed that day alternately by the bishop and the neophyte. The author of this hymn may be a bishop of the fifth century, Nicetas of Remesiana. Cf. Morin, in the *Revue bénédictine,* 1894, pp. 49–72. But this legend expresses exactly the joy of the Church receiving as a son him who would be its greatest doctor. According to Cagin, the *Te Deum,* in its original form, represents the first type of the Latin anaphoras or canons of the mass. See Cagin, *Te Deum ou Illatio?*

[110] *Confessions,* IX, 10–13.

[111] St. Augustine, Letter 126, no. 7.

[112] *P. L.,* XXXII, 905 ff.

[113] *P. L.,* XXXII, 977 ff.

Cassiaciacum between Augustine and some friends, in which Monica sometimes took part. Augustine desired to see his mother participate in these conferences which discussed the loftiest problems of philosophy, because he and his friends were inclined to apply only the effort of their minds to those questions, whereas Monica, with all the charm that exquisite purity gives a soul, brought them the accent of her heart.[114]

In 388, after his baptism, Augustine wrote two books: *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae* and *De moribus Manichaeorum.*[115] In these, by way of contrast and opposition to the Manichaeans' secret immorality, he sets forth the virtues of the Church in her religious, her clergy, and her laity. He also establishes the theory of charity, the source of all holiness. In 388, at Rome, Augustine started his treatise *On Free Will,*[116] which he completed at Hippo in 395. Therein he begins an examination of the problem of the accord of free will with divine foreknowledge. In 389 he published his *De magistro.* In this work he develops his celebrated theory of the Word, the only interior teacher.

From 389 to 392, three important works came out in succession: *De vera religione, De utilitate credendi,* and *De diversis quaestionibus.* As Father Portalié says: "The *De vera religione* [117] was the fruit of the retirement at Tagaste. It is a little masterpiece of apologetics, not only against the Manichaeans, whom he speaks of especially, but against all unbelievers. He proves that the true religion exists only in the Catholic Church, basing his proof on the history of religion and the prophecies. The *De utilitate credendi* [118] shows that the

[114] The charming scene is described in *De ordine,* I, 10–11. Cf. Bougaud, *History of St. Monica,* pp. 232 ff. See also (*De ordine,* II, 26–45) the passages on the union of reason and authority, and on the place of liberal arts in education.

[115] *P. L.,* XXXII, 1309–1378.

[116] *P. L.,* XXXII, 1221–1310.

[117] *P. L.,* XXXIV, 121–172.

[118] *P. L.,* XLII, 65–92.

faith is not accorded to the blind, but rests upon divine proofs of the infallible authority of the Church." [119] The *De diversis quaestionibus* [120] is a book of miscellanies in which are treated questions of all sorts, philosophical, exegetical, and especially doctrinal. All the works published by Augustine at this period are the fruit of colloquies with friends or of controversies with adversaries. These writings are all inspired by an apologetical purpose.

From its beginning the Church never lacked apologists. But their choice of arguments was nearly always determined by a particular point of view. In times of persecution Christian apologetics was forensic, exegetical against the Jews and theological against heresy.[121] But now, after the official triumph of the Church in society, it could be based on less restricted and more solid ground. It could be addressed, no longer especially to the persecutor, the Jew, the heretic, or the pagan, but to mankind in general. It could be based, no longer upon such or such a particular point of the Church's teaching, but upon the totality of her dogmas. It could be both defensive and constructive, dogmatic and psychological. Thus did Augustine's genius comprehend it.

Augustine's Apologetics

In his *De libero arbitrio* he states its role in a picturesque and striking formula: "Our task," he says, "is to show, so far as may be possible, in the first place that it is reasonable to believe, and then that it would be foolish not to believe." [122]

[119] Portalié, art. *"Augustin"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2291.

[120] *P. L.,* XL, 11–101.

[121] Cf. L. Maisonneuve, art. *"Apologetique"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1533–1535.

[122] *"Ostendatur, quantum potest, primo quod non sit stultum talia credere, deinde quod sit stultum talia non credere." De libero arbitrio,* bk. 3, chap. 21, no. 60.

We must not suppose that these two points of view imply two distinct parts in his proofs. In the argumentation which they arouse, they are constantly intermingled, since the apologist has a double purpose: to strengthen believers in their faith and to attract unbelievers to the faith.

Augustine takes up the extrinsic guarantees of Catholic doctrine and its intrinsic fitness. The better to reach every human soul, he does more than appeal to the miracles of the Old and New Testament, the fulfilment of the prophecies, and the marvelous spread of Christianity. "The great proof that seems to have impressed Augustine even more, is the holiness of Christianity embodied in the Church, and the moral transformation of the world.[123] In his *De vera religione,* after sketching a magnificent picture of the moral revolution accomplished, he concludes that if the great philosophers, Socrates and Plato, were alive to witness the transformation, they would become Christians.[124] To the Bishop of Hippo, as to the Fathers of the Vatican Council,[125] the Church seemed a proof within everyone's reach." [126]

As for Christian doctrines, "Augustine views them, not so much in themselves, but rather in their relationship to the soul and the great duties of the Christian life. Thus is explained, what at first glance seems strange, his division of theology in the *Enchiridion:* he relates all Christian doctrine to the three theological virtues. This he does because he considers in the dogmas the soul's three activities which must be nourished by them. Likewise, he is very brief in setting forth the divine mysteries and leisurely develops the anthropological dogmas of sin and grace. The starting-point of his inquiries

[123] *De utilitate credendi,* XVII, 37.

[124] *"Christiani fierent." De vera religione,* chaps. 3–4, no. 307.

[125] *Constitutio de fide,* chap. 3.

[126] Portalié, *op. cit.,* I, 2239 f. Cf. Louis de Montadon, *Bible et Église dans l'apologétique de saint Augustin,* in the *Recherche de science religieuse,* 1911, II, 209 ff., 441 ff., 546 ff.

in all his early works, as Eucken remarks,[127] is essentially human, psychological: it is happiness, the *Fecisti nos ad Te et irrequietum est cor nostrum* of the *Confessions.*" [128]

Our idea of Augustine's apologetics would be incomplete if we failed to note his conception of Providence in this world, his doctrine about the action of the Word in each of us, his theory regarding the place of love and humility in faith, and his idea concerning the force of conviction which is conveyed by the contact of the soul with truth. 1. At the basis of every proof he places the great principle of the knowledge of divine Providence. He says: "If the Providence of God preside not over human affairs, we have no need to busy ourselves about religion." [129] 2. Augustine considered that the intellect needs the light of God, the supreme Truth, to know the true, as it needs the grace of God, the supreme Good, to practice virtue. This is what he amply develops in his *De magistro,* and what he repeats again and again in almost all his writings.[130] 3. No moral or religious truth, however certain it may be *in se,* enters the soul except by love and humility. "It is love," he says, "that asks, love that seeks, love that knocks, love that reveals, love, too, that gives continuance in what is revealed." [131] Again he says: "For reaching truth, the first path is humility; the second, humility; the third, humility; and no matter how long you keep asking me, I will give you the same answer." [132] 4. St. Augustine also considers that a superabundance of proof reaches the soul by its contact either with error or with truth:

[127] Eucken, *The Problem of Human Life as Viewed by the Great Thinkers,* pp. 211 ff.

[128] Portalié, *op. cit.,* I, 2455.

[129] "*Si Dei providentia non providet rebus humanis, nihil est de religione satagendum.*" *De utilitate credendi,* 34; *Confessions,* VI, 5.

[130] Portalié, *op. cit.,* I, 2234–2237.

[131] "*Amore petitur, amore quaeritur, amore pulsatur, amore revelatur, amore denique in eo quod revelatum fuerit permanetur.*" *De moribus Ecclesiae,* I, 17, no. 31.

[132] Letter 118, chap. 3, no. 22.

for "error is recognized by its inability to comprehend all that it implies," [133] and "the light is its own witness, that it may be known as the light." [134]

Such, in its rich and fertile complexity, is Augustine's apologetic doctrine, as it is revealed in his first writings. As we go along, we shall have occasion to note the equally great wealth and fertility of his doctrine about God, man, sin, grace, Holy Scripture, and the Church.

Christian Legislation

At the time Augustine's genius was completing the last of his apologetic works of which we have been speaking (the *De utilitate credendi*), about the middle of 392, a sudden revolution upset the Empire. To grasp its causes and appraise its effects, we must take up the account of political events at the point we left them.

Since the memorable scene on Christmas Day, 390, Theodosius showed the sincerity of his repentance by continually manifesting his zeal for religion and the Church. It was, indeed, something unheard-of for an Emperor to expiate a political crime under the impulse of his religious faith. The penetration of the Christian conscience into public morals is one of the most remarkable stages of the spread of Christianity in society.[135]

Evidence of this sentiment is found in the laws Theodosius promulgated (March 12, 391), granting freedom to all children who had been reduced to servitude by parents oppressed

[133] *De ordine,* II, 3, no. 10.

[134] *"Sibi ipsa testis est ut cognoscatur lux." In Joan.,* tractate 35, no. 4. Cf. *De vera religione,* chap. 49, nos. 96 f.

[135] "We must insist upon this struggle against self, this close connection between moral and religious feeling, this redemption of offense by acceptance of humiliation, all new forms of the interior life; perhaps we should rather say that before them there was no interior life." Thamin, *Saint Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e siècle,* p. 33.

with destitution. Then there was the law (July 10, 391) authorizing the lowliest individual, who was the victim of attack by anyone in high position or by a soldier, to obtain justice himself by force of arms. From the juridical point of view, these two laws were a direct blow to the most basic and traditional principles of the "Roman order" regarding the untouchable rights of property and authority. They mark a turning point in the history of law. Generally assigned to this same period are two laws stigmatizing and condemning to terrible penalties certain infamous disorders that had theretofore been tolerated in the Roman world.[136]

The better to mark the Christian inspiration that prompted these measures, the Emperor at the same time published three laws directed against pagans, apostates, and heretics. One edict (February 27, 391) forbade all subjects of the Empire, especially those holding office, to frequent the temples of idolatry, "to raise their eyes to images made by human hands."[137] Another edict (May 5) deprived apostates of the right to bring legal suits or hold any office, whether acquired or hereditary. This forfeiture, joined to already existing provisions which made them incapable of bequeathing or inheriting by a will, rendered them legally dead.[138]

Lastly, another edict (May 15) forbade heretics to assemble in any place whatsoever for the purpose of holding a public meeting or a secret conference.[139] These prescriptions were framed in most absolute terms. The expressive language in which they were made known to the public emphasized their importance. Yet it is a remarkable detail that they are all addressed either to Albinus, the praetorian prefect, or to Flavian, the prefect of Italy, both of them being officials notoriously

[136] *Theodosian Code,* III, III, 1; IX, XIV, 2; II, 4; VII, 6, 7.
[137] *Ibidem,* XVI, X, 10.
[138] *Ibidem,* XVI, VII, 4, 5.
[139] *Ibidem,* XVI, V, 20.

attached to paganism. From this singular circumstance we may suppose that Theodosius, "though expressing his mind so decisively and peremptorily, intended making emphatic profession of principles rather than performing an act that would have practical consequences." [140]

In that same year 391, the Emperor convened a council at Capua. His purpose was to put an end to the Meletian Schism and to the propaganda of a bishop of Sardica, Bonosus by name, who, following the opinion of Helvidius and Jovinianus, was preaching against the perpetual virginity of the Mother of God. The divisions among the Christians of Antioch were loudly denounced, and Bonosus' errors vigorously condemned. But, along with the forceful condemnation, we again observe great moderation in the actual repression. The solution of the Anitoch conflict was submitted to the arbitration of Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria. The duty of condemning Bishop Bonosus, after investigation, was left to his neighbors the bishops of Macedonia, under the presidency of the Bishop of Thessalonica.[141] We do not know the results of these two affairs.

In all the acts of sovereignty we have been considering, the name of the young Valentinian II is joined with that of his brother-in-law, and the requirements of these enactments are addressed to all the subjects of the Empire, without any distinction between the East and the West.

But Theodosius was eager to return to Constantinople, from which he had been absent four years. He quit Milan, leaving Valentinian under the care of two advisers, in whom he had full confidence: Bishop Ambrose, who would enlighten the young prince about all political and religious questions, and the Frankish general, Arbogast, whose fidelity he regarded as no less reliable than his competency in the command of armies.

[140] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'État au IV^e siècle,* VI, 339.
[141] Mansi, III, 738; Hefele, II, 394.

Disorders in the East

Theodosius left Milan at the end of June and reached Constantinople on November 9. Serious difficulties awaited him there. However, they would soon appear insignificant when compared with the bloody drama that was about to disturb the Western Empire.

Palace intrigues, revolts here and there, and abuses everywhere; such was the sight that the East offered him after his four years' absence. At court, two men, the praetorian prefect Tatian and the Gallic officer Rufinus, had been engaged in bitter rivalry to control the government under the nominal royal authority of the young prince Arcadius. Tatian seized it and—so it was said—made use of his power to engage in all sorts of dishonesty and corruption. Rufinus was declared to be the instigator of the Thessalonica massacre. The lives of both of them were open to suspicion. Upon Theodosius' return, Rufinus succeeded in supplanting his rival. But he displayed such insolence in the exercise of his office of prefect that a favorite general of Theodosius, called Promotus, assaulted him with violence. Around these men the parties seethed with excitement.

Under such leaders, the magistrates gave an example of scandalous, compromising acts and weaknesses. Even the "defenders of the cities" betrayed their title and office, and too often became the pitiless oppressors of the people, whom it was their duty to protect.

The orator Libanius drew a picture of all these disorders and presented it to the Emperor in a series of addresses. In this history of the Church, it is not our place to set forth all the legislative measures that the Emperor took to remedy these evils. He devoted no little pains to them, and they occasioned him vexatious opposition in his entourage. He missed Ambrose's candid and imperious speech. "It is not easy," he said,

"to find a man capable of teaching me the truth. Ambrose alone deserves the title of bishop." [142]

Similar resistance was sometimes encountered among the people themselves, when the Emperor sought to pursue the consummation of religious unity by a progressive banning of paganism. At Apameia, then the second city of Syria after Antioch, the pagans, angered by the destruction of their temple, turned against the Christian churches, which had to be guarded by soldiers for several days. The churches were saved; but the bishop, held responsible for the so-called outrage to the gods, was seized by a group of pagans, who stripped him and seriously wounded him. To put a stop to such disorders, the population had to be terrified by more drastic laws.[143]

By good fortune, the Antiochene Schism was healed in 392 and did not add internal divisions to the external trials. After the death of Evagrius, who died in 392 without naming a successor, the episcopal tradition of the dissenters was interrupted, and the schism, without a directing hand, ceased to be a danger for the time being.

Arbogast's Treason

For some time Theodosius was in receipt of disquieting news from Valentinian. The Frankish officer Arbogast, whom the Emperor had placed at the side of the twenty-year-old prince to be his guide, showed himself more and more domineering. Soon it was evident that he aimed at seizing the power. Valentinian, opposed in all his projects and insulted by his insolent protector, not only kept Theodosius informed of the events, but also wrote Ambrose, begging for the assistance of his advice. The Bishop of Milan was the only one, he

[142] Theodoret, V, 17 (*alias* 18).

[143] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, v, 21; x, 12.

thought, capable of thwarting the machinations of the scheming general. He requested Ambrose to come to him at Vienne. "Come," he said, "and baptize me before I set out to fight the barbarians." But Arbogast was on watch. With Ambrose in Gaul, Arbogast foresaw that the courage of the young prince would be strengthened; he knew that there would be a bishop ready to talk to him face to face, a statesman able to see into his plots. The Bishop might be a rallying center for the whole episcopate of Gaul. In short, this would be the most formidable danger he had to fear in carrying out his schemes. At any price the event must be prevented.

On May 15, 392, a report spread suddenly that Valentinian II was dead. The official version was that the prince killed himself in a fit of rage. But nobody believed it. Not a single contemporary doubted Arbogast's responsibility in the death of the young ruler. But so well was the secret kept regarding the manner of this wicked deed, that historians gave different versions of it. Some of them said that Valentinian was strangled in bed by eunuchs of the palace; others declared that he was attacked by assassins while walking along the banks of the Rhone. A few days afterwards, Arbogast, who dared not take the scepter himself, had the soldiers acclaim one of his creatures, a former grammarian, Eugenius by name. Arbogast was a pagan. Thus was destroyed Theodosius' Christian policy in the West.

CHAPTER III

From the Death of Valentinian II to the Death of Theodosius the Great (392–395)

Emperor Eugenius

EUGENIUS was a Christian by baptism and by the outward profession of his faith. But he was a Christian in the manner of most rhetoricians of that period, nourishing his mind solely upon the lessons of pagan antiquity, drawing therefrom the expressions of his literary style and the inspirations of his life. He was another Ausonius, without the latter's talent, courtesy of manner, and dignity of conduct. He had enough Christianity to make himself accepted by a society now converted to the law of Christ; enough ambition to yield to every compromise suggested by an unscrupulous adviser. No choice could have better served Argobast's designs.

One of the first acts of the new government was to decide that Valentinian's body should be transferred to Milan immediately. There was fear of demonstrations by a populace that already mingled with its expressions of compassion threatening murmurs against those it held responsible for this tragic event. The funeral cortege was scarcely across the Alps when it met Ambrose. The Bishop had left Milan, accompanied by the prayers of the whole people, particularly the chief magistrates of the capital, who commissioned him to bring back the Emperor. He could bring back only the Emperor's mortal remains.

The Bishop of Milan's return with the body of the young sovereign occasioned scenes of grief which Ambrose himself describes. "Everybody wept," he says. "Those who did not

know him, those who feared him, even those who did not like him, all wept. The barbarians were affected in spite of themselves. The crowd, all in tears, seized upon me, saying that the calamity would not have happened if I had been there. But was I an Elias? Was I a prophet to know the future?" [1]

The Funeral Sermon

At the funeral of the prince, the Church must make her voice heard. Ambrose was appointed to be its interpreter. How would he acquit himself? The people were expecting an expression of their grief and of their indignation. And, assuredly, he shared in both of these feelings. But how was he to give voice to such feelings without pointing out and cursing the hand that had struck in the dark? "Never did oratorical art face a more delicate task and emerge more happily." [2] What deep and restrained feeling there is in these words of the exordium: "Valentinian comes back to us, but not as we hoped to see him return. Upon hearing that the Alps were threatened by the barbarians, he resolved to come and share our dangers. He fell, struck down by death, at his first steps in public life. I refer to the suddenness of his death, not to its manner, for I weep and do not accuse. . . . How much better it would be for bishops to be persecuted by the emperors than to be loved by them. I was happier when I was the one risking my life for my prince than now when I must lament his death." [3] For a whole hour the preacher kept an immense throng hanging on his words. The anxious and deeply affected people made him understand that their soul vibrated with his, although in his sermon not an offensive word could be found against the new ruler.[4]

[1] St. Ambrose, *De obitu Valentiniani*, 20, 23.
[2] De Broglie, *St. Ambroise*, p. 175.
[3] St. Ambrose, *op. cit.*, 33.
[4] Ambrose expresses an assurance that Valentinian may have been saved, al-

The new Emperor, or rather Arbogast in his name, timidly asked that Theodosius extend to Eugenius at least the tolerance which had been shown Emperor Maximus. And, in no small embarrassment, he notified Ambrose of the new imperial election. Says Ambrose in a letter to Eugenius: "At the commencement of your reign I did not reply when you wrote me, because I foresaw this would happen." [5]

Attitude of Theodosius

What the Bishop of Milan foresaw was the successful intervention of Theodosius. But the thing did not happen for two years. Theodosius was overwhelmed with many affairs and greatly saddened by recent mourning. Although not yet an old man, he no longer possessed the prompt ardor of his youth. He lacked the courage to risk a distant campaign. Arbogast, to enhance the prestige of the new ruler, brought him along with the army in a military expedition he made against the barbarians, that campaign which Valentinian was planning at the time of his death. The general's ability was crowned with victory. But, in the midst of his triumph, his imperial protégé met a troublesome reminder of Ambrose. A historian relates that, after concluding the treaty of peace, while he was receiving the leaders of the defeated army at dinner, one of them said to him: "Do you know the man who is named Ambrose?" "Yes," Eugenius replied, "and I am even one of his friends." Then the barbarian said: "I understand now what made you victorious. You are the friend of a man who can do everything. Let him but say to the sun, 'Stop,' and the sun would at once halt in its course." The usurper, in his attempts to restore paganism, will again encounter the Bishop

though he died without baptism: *"Si martyres suo abluuntur sanguine, et hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas."* This is one of the most valuable testimonies of Christian antiquity in favor of the baptism of desire.

[5] St. Ambrose, Letter 57, no. 11, To Eugenius.

of Milan and will find him an adversary no less to be feared than the Emperor of Constantinople.

Eugenius at Milan

Arbogast easily persuaded Eugenius to place his reliance upon a party. The pagan party, secretly resenting the destruction of a large number of their temples, and especially the suppression of the altar of Victory, appeared ready to withdraw from Theodosius' cause and rally to a new dynasty. A clever stroke of policy very soon brought this party definite promises.

The occasion presented itself without their seeking it. The head of the deputation sent to Gaul to convey the homage of the Eternal City to the new Emperor, was a personage very prominent in the pagan party, Nicomachus Flavian, a cousin and son-in-law of Symmachus. To promise him explicitly the reëstablishment of the altar of Victory seemed too daring. An expedient was resorted to. Eugenius promised to restore to the pagan senators all the salaries and all religious revenues that had been confiscated or suppressed by recent edicts. The senators might use them as they saw fit. No one misunderstood the meaning of this decision, as soon as it became known in Italy. Ambrose fully grasped its significance.

Shortly afterwards the Emperor sent word to Ambrose that he would soon arrive in Milan. This was a novel and critical situation for the great Bishop. He could not and did not wish to contest the legality of Eugenius' election, which, strictly speaking, did not violate any principle of the constitutional law of the Romans.[6] Yet for Ambrose, at the head of the Christian people, to greet the new Emperor, to take part in his triumphal entry into the capital of the West, right after

[6] Neither royal heredity nor popular consent had regulated the transmission of imperial authority. To determine by what law it was regulated, would be a difficult undertaking.

a decision that was ruinous to the work so patiently accomplished by the Christian emperors, was an attitude repugnant to the soul of the holy Bishop. Ambrose therefore decided to go away from the city, explaining to the sovereign, in a letter, the reason for his absence. We quote from this letter:

"Ambrose, Bishop, to the most gracious Emperor Eugenius. The cause of my departure was the fear of the Lord. I will not keep silence before you, O Emperor, as to things respecting which I have not kept silence before other emperors. Consider how great God is. He sees the hearts of all; He questions the inmost conscience. We are not scrutinizers of your liberality, nor envious of the advantage of others. Not many but will put their own estimate on what you have done, all will do so on your intentions. Whatever they do will be ascribed to you. I kept back and concealed my grief for a long time; now I may no longer dissemble, nor is it open to me to keep silence." [7]

Once again Ambrose speaks to an emperor in language befitting a bishop.

Ambrose's journey through Italy occasioned impressive manifestations at Bologna, Florence, in fact wherever he passed. In one place there was a shrine for him to consecrate; in another place, virgins to be blessed. Sick people were brought to him, that he might pray over them. Everywhere people wanted to hear the words of this real bishop and father, strengthening souls against the last assault of expiring paganism. Eugenius, on the contrary, at Milan received a cool reception from the Christian population. The churches he entered were empty. The priests refused the gifts he offered. The efforts of some zealous officials scarcely succeeded in provoking a meager acclamation by a few pagan groups. But this acclaim found no echo in the city as a whole.

[7] St. Ambrose, Letter 57, no. 11, To Eugenius.

Paganism in Rome

Paganism was humbled in Milan; but it took its revenge in Rome, where the memory of the old national religion was more alive than anywhere else. The senator Symmachus enjoyed considerable influence there. The activity of the praetorian prefect, Nicomachus Flavian, could be openly displayed. Not only was the altar of Victory solemnly restored, but the property of the temples was used for the celebration of the popular feasts in which all the pagan ceremonies were publicly resumed. A document discovered by Leopold Delisle in 1867 in the Bibliothèque nationale of Paris,[8] supplies some curious details about this restoration of paganism in Rome during the years 393 and 394. We are told therein that Flavian employed three whole months in the "lustration" or purification of the city. The purpose of this ceremony was to show that the public religion of the Empire was still the old idolatry.[9] All the feasts of the pagan calendar were celebrated. To make a deeper impression on the people, there were introduced also those foreign ceremonies of Egyptian or Asiatic origin, with their strange and mysterious rites which stirred the imagination. Flavian himself underwent the expiatory sacrifice of the taurobolium. Through the city streets pagan senators carried the statue of Cybele, mother of the gods, on their shoulders. The prefect even dared to offer honors and gifts to the Christians to induce them to give up their faith.[10]

[8] This is the *Invective against Nicomachus Flavian,* which Delisle discovered in a MS. of Prudentius. It was published in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1867. See De Rossi, art. *"Le Culte idolâtrique à Rome en 394, documents tirés d'un poème inédit découvert à Paris,"* in the *Bulletin d'archéologie chrétienne,* July and August 1868. From this article we have taken the details of our account.

[9] On this ceremony of lustration, see Bouché-Leclercq, art. *"Lustratio"* in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines.*

[10] For these details, see De Rossi, *loc. cit.*

Theodosius Declares War

When news of these abominations reached Constantinople, Theodosius' zeal was stirred. The revival of polytheism in Rome meant the ruin of his whole work. Ambrose had performed his duty as a bishop by declining to communicate with Eugenius. Theodosius thought that his own duty as emperor required that he should take up arms to save the religious unity of the Empire. Casting off the grief in which the recent events had plunged him, he declared war upon the protégé of Arbogast.

At once the struggle assumed a religious character. Theodosius prepared for the combat by seeking the aid, not so much of arms as of fasts and prayers. Sozomen relates that Theodosius, as he was leaving Constantinople, stopped in a church which he had built in honor of St. John the Baptist, and placed his cause under the protection of the Precursor of Christ.[11] Arbogast, who took command of Eugenius' army, placed the pagan standards at the head of the legions. A colossal statue of Hercules was erected on top of the fortifications defending the entrance into Italy. The auspices were consulted. "We shall come back victorious," said Arbogast, "and will turn their churches into stables."

The first clash of the two armies before the fortress of Aquileia was terrible. Arbogast was an able general. He skilfully directed the sally of his forces. Several of Theodosius' officers talked of falling back to wait for reinforcements. But the great Emperor, in the midst of the danger, had recovered his old-time energy. He exclaimed: "The cross must not retreat, even for a moment, before the image of a false god. Tomorrow we shall see what the God of Theodosius will do." The next day Arbogast gave way before a formidable attack by the Christian army. Eugenius, surprised in his tent, was

[11] Sozomen, VII, 24.

brought in amazement before the victor. Just as he was bending his knee to ask for pardon, a soldier struck him down with the sword. To escape a like end, Arbogast killed himself with his own sword.

Theodosius' first care was to notify Ambrose of the victory which he thought would forever assure the safety of the Empire and that of the Church in the Roman world. Those who had sustained his enemy, particularly the families of Flavian and Arbogast, he treated generously, promising them protection from any reprisals.

Death of Theodosius

Soon the Emperor's health was seen to be declining. The fatigues of the campaign had weakened him. The memory of the Thessalonica massacre still weighed heavily upon him with a remorse that every sanguinary sight revived. "We have shed too much blood," he said. When he reached Milan, he sent for his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, and divided the Empire between them. He assigned the East to Arcadius, the West to Honorius. On January 10, 395, he presided at a solemn feast celebrated in his honor. But he was obliged to leave before the end of the ceremony, and expired during the night.

The eminent services which this great man rendered the Church were fittingly celebrated by his saintly friend, the Bishop of Milan, who delivered the funeral sermon in the presence of an immense throng, setting forth Theodosius as the restorer of the Church and of the Empire.

An eminent historian, after quoting the chief passages of this sermon, adds the following eloquent lines: "The union of the Church and the Empire, of Christ and Rome, was never proclaimed in stronger language. If at that moment Ambrose surveyed his audience, he might have noted in the brilliant crowd of officers a young Goth who had taken part in Theo-

dosius' last campaign and was on the way back to Germany with his force of horsemen. It was a man whom his fellow-countrymen called Alaric and surnamed the Bal, the Daring One *par excellence*. The future destroyer of Rome was there, unknown and thoughtful, while the Empire was burying its last hero. . . . But it was not in vain that God raised up workers such as Ambrose and Theodosius. By consecrating to Christ the last days of dying Rome, Ambrose and Theodosius prolonged the Empire's existence scarcely a brief moment, but they preserved its heritage for future generations. By aiding the Church to extend her protection to all the achievements of reason and of human conscience which Rome, during ten centuries of power, had either produced or acquired, they did not, it is true, give to the Roman power the strength to revive, but they gave to the civilization of Rome the strength to survive after its domination had come to an end." [12]

St. Augustine and the Manichaeans

Among the chief contributors to the work of rescuing the treasures of Roman civilization for transmission to the modern world, three men were particularly distinguished in the period of Theodosius' government, from 392 to 395: Augustine, Jerome, and Chrysostom.

The Protestant Harnack, speaking of Augustine, says: "The wretched existence of the Roman Empire in the West seems to have been prolonged until Augustine to permit his influence upon world history." [13] In the preceding period, Augustine already appeared as a mighty apologist. By the publication of his *Contra Fortunatum* in 392 and his *Contra Adimantum* in 394, he showed that he was a controversialist not to be despised, and in his *Commentaries on the Psalms* and

[12] De Broglie, *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle*, VI, 423 f.
[13] Harnack, *Précis de l'histoire des dogmes*, French trans., p. 255.

his *Liber imperfectus de Genesi ad litteram,* he appears as a profound exegete of the Scriptures.

Fortunatus was a Manichaean priest. Adimantus was the most illustrious of Mani's disciples. The book against Fortunatus is merely the written report of a public discussion that lasted two days between Augustine and Fortunatus, at the end of August, 392. Augustine's reasoning was so conclusive that, on the second day, Fortunatus declared he had no reply to make, and left Hippo. The heretic held the existence of a principle of evil coeternal with God and limiting His power. Augustine proved to him that a God thus limited would be neither infinitely powerful nor infinitely good, and that evil is sufficiently explained by the free will of creatures.[14]

Adimantus endeavored to prove the existence of the two contrary principles of good and evil by showing them at strife in so-called contradictions between the Old and the New Testament. Augustine answered by explaining that there is no contradiction between the two Testaments, but a perfect harmony, that "the New is hidden in the Old," and that "the Old is disclosed in the New." The two books, *Contra Fortunatum* and *Contra Adimantum,* marked an epoch. For a long time, in the Greco-Roman world, the sophists had used the art of reasoning in the propagation of error; in Augustine's presence they were under the necessity of acknowledging that Christianity possessed not only the truth, but likewise all the resources of dialectics for its defense.

St. Jerome's *Commentaries*

In the ancient world the grammarian was likewise a power. With the coming of Augustine and Jerome, he was forced to see that the Church had assimilated all the learning necessary

[14] *City of God,* XXII, 1 f.

for the literal and figurative interpretation of the texts. Both acquitted themselves of their task with unprecedented penetration: Augustine with more concern for the moral purpose and practical actuality; Jerome with a deeper knowledge of the Eastern languages [15] and a greater concern for the literal sense. The former was more a philosopher; the latter, more a scholar.

In 392, at Paula's request, Jerome began his commentaries on the Prophets. We know his method of work. He started by procuring, thanks to funds supplied by Paula, all the commentaries thus far published. These he studied attentively, fused them with his own interpretation, and then set forth the results of his labor in an exposition as clear and simple as possible, because, he said, a commentator's interpretation should not be in need of other commentaries to make it understood. He purposed especially to expound the historical meaning, although in many places we see him rise to a moral interpretation, which he always sets forth with warmth, sometimes with great eloquence. While he was writing his commentary on Nahum's prophecy against Ninive, his thought led him to the trials of the saints, who, after being oppressed in this world, receive their reward in heaven. "This prophecy," he says, "teaches us to detach our hearts from all perishable things, things that will come to an end on that day when the true avenger of the people of God rises up against the real Assyrian." In his commentary on Sophonias, we have the famous passage about the destruction of Jerusalem, one of the most eloquent pages penned by the hermit of Bethlehem.[16] His short commentaries (*Commentarioli*) on the Psalms, were

[15] Recent studies by Schanz and Rottmanner show that St. Augustine had not studied Hebrew; but as he was familiar with Punic, a language kindred to Hebrew, he was able to understand the genius of the language used in the Old Testament. He read Greek, but with difficulty. (*Theologisches Quartalschaf,* LXVII, 1895, pp. 269–276.)

[16] *P. L.*, XXV, 1353 f.

also composed at this period.[17] Critics today fix the year 393 as the date of their composition.

In that year also began the relations between Jerome and Augustine, through the instrumentality of Alypius, who had come to Palestine. Alypius was that friend so lovingly described in the *Confessions*. "He saw Jerome and spoke to him about Augustine. The latter had some knowledge of Jerome through his writings. But this journey of Alypius united them much more. Jerome was fond of Augustine because of what he learned from the lips of Alypius; and Augustine, who greatly longed to see Jerome, to some extent gratified his desire by seeing him with the eyes of Alypius, who was but one heart and soul with him." [18]

St. Chrysostom's Preaching

From the old Greco-Roman world Jerome had taken the strictest methods of its scholarship. Chrysostom took from it the secrets of the loftiest eloquence. In the old cities of Rome and Athens, where people spent so much of their time in the forum or agora, the man endowed with a talent for public speaking, the orator, held a position difficult for us to imagine. Besides his prestige as a literary personage, he had that of a politician and to some extent, in social crises, of a director of consciences. In the highest degree Chrysostom was a litterateur, a politician, a director of souls. In Theodosius' reign, from 392 to 395, he produced his *Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians,* his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians,* his *Homilies on the Epistle to the Philippians* and on the *Second Epistle to Timothy,* and his Explanation of the Psalms.

[17] Vallarsi thought these commentaries, given orally, had been collected, not by St. Jerome, but by others. Germain Morin's discoveries and writings prove that they are in fact the work of St. Jerome himself. (*Anecdota Maredsolana,* 1895, vol. II, part 1.)

[18] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* art. 61.

Of ancient culture Chrysostom possessed all that a man of his day could acquire. His teacher, the celebrated Libanius, said on his deathbed: "Alas, I would have left my school in charge of Chrysostom if the Christians had not stolen him from us." It is true that our great orator was not a statesman like Ambrose, he but rarely had a hand in affairs of State; yet he neglected no opportunity to imbue public practices with Christian morality. The partiality of judges, the extortion of Treasury agents, and the violence of soldiers found him a severe censor.[19]

But he was foremost the director of the conscience of Antioch, of the East, and, in a way, of the whole Church of his day. No one was better acquainted with the morality of his time; no one had a nicer discernment of the strong and the weak, no one more strikingly and convincingly pointed out the evils and their remedies. In one of his homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians, he denounces avarice in these terms:

"How accursed is the altar of covetousness! When thou passest by this idol's altar here, thou shalt see it reeking with the blood of bullocks and goats; but when thou shalt pass by the altar of covetousness, thou shalt see it breathing the shocking odor of human blood. . . . Such for the most part are the sacrifices made at the altar of covetousness. They are not satisfied, they do not stop at men's blood; no, the altar of covetousness is not glutted unless it sacrifice the very soul itself also, unless it receive the souls of both the sacrificer and the sacrificed." [20]

In another homily on the same Epistle, the preacher denounces the shameful conduct of certain Roman matrons toward their slaves. He says:

"Does no recollection of hell come over thee? . . . And then after all these things forsooth, a woman will sit in state like any

[19] St. Chrysostom, *Homilies:* 82, *On St. John;* 14, *On the Epistle to the Romans;* 2, *On Penance;* 61, 69, *On St. Matthew; Priesthood,* bk. 1.

[20] *Homilies,* 18, *On the Epistle to the Ephesians.*

tyrant, and call her children, and summon her foolish husband, and treat him as a hangman. Ought these things to take place in the houses of Christians? 'Aye,' say ye, 'but they are a troublesome, audacious, impudent, incorrigible race.' True, I know it myself, but there are other ways to keep them in order. . . . 'But,' say ye, 'the whole tribe of slaves is intolerable if it meet with indulgence.' True, I know it myself. But then, as I was saying, correct them in some other way. . . . If she is a believer, she is thy sister. . . . 'What then, if she shall steal?' Take care of her and watch her. 'Extravagant,' thou wilt say; 'What, am I to be her keeper? How absurd.' And why, I pray, art thou not to be her keeper? Has she not a soul as well as thou? . . . 'But what then,' ye will say, 'if she shall be a railer or a gossip or a drunkard?' Yet how many free women are such? Now, God hath charged men to bear with all the failings of women. . . . Now, however, some are come to such a height of indecency as to uncover the head and to drag their maid-servants by the hair. Why do ye all blush? I am not addressing myself to all, but to those who are carried away into such brutal conduct." [21]

In all the annals of Greek and Roman eloquence can we find more living and effective language, more pathetic and human?

Christian Life

In the course of the fourth century the Church assimilated such elements of the ancient world as could be adapted to her doctrine and could assist in spreading it through the world. This she did by means of certain great men, and also by her institutions, ceremonies, and customs. Yet we must be careful to avoid exaggeration. Beginning with Ernest Renan,[22] Rationalist historians, unwilling to account for the wonderful development of Christianity by an inner force, have frequently

[21] *Homilies,* 15, *On the Epistle to the Ephesians.*

[22] Renan, *Marcus Aurelius,* pp. 34–50; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed.), I, 480–496. On this question, see Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism, passim;* Grisar, *History of Rome,* I. 316.

tried to show that the Catholic Church was the work of the Roman Empire. Their explanation is that Rome made the papacy; the administrative arrangement of the Empire created the episcopate; theology sprang from Platonism; Christian liturgy, from pagan ceremonies; the cult of the saints, from the worship of the gods.

But the whole history of the Church belies such a hypothesis. Catholicism with all its essential organs goes back to Christ; He is its sole author. The marvelous discernment with which the Church was able to assimilate from the Greco-Roman world (as later from the barbarian world) the elements susceptible of strengthening and enlarging her influence, is, on the contrary, as Cardinal Newman has shown,[23] an additional proof of her own vitality. This we can readily note by studying the development of her hierarchy, her worship, and her works.

The Catholic Hierarchy

So far as concerns the ecclesiastical hierarchy in general, no Father of the fourth century questions its divine origin. For St. Gregory of Nyssa, as for St. Ephrem and St. Ambrose, the Catholic Church, "the principle and reason of all things," [24] is "the heavenly Jerusalem that comes down from heaven"; [25] its bishops receive their keys from Peter, who received them from Christ; [26] their head is Christ, and Christ's head is God.[27] The emperors themselves speak in this same way.

[23] Newman, *Development of Christian Doctrine,* chap. 1, sec. 3, no. 5, and *passim.*

[24] Ἀρχὴ πάντων ἐστὶν ἡ καθολικὴ Ἐκκλεσία. St. Epiphanius, *Haereses,* bk. 1.

[25] Apoc. 21 : 2.

[26] *"Per Petrum episcopis dedit Christus claves coelestium honorum."* St. Gregory of Nyssa.

[27] Ephes. 5 : 23; I Cor. 11 : 3. Cf. Grea, *L'Église et sa divine constitution,* I, 41–61.

"In different ordinances of the civil power in favor of the Church or even of the primacy, what we find is always a recognition of the pre-existing rights or privileges of the Church; of a transfer or bestowal of new rights nothing is ever heard. In fact, it is often expressly stated that the spiritual power or the papal supremacy, having been founded by a higher and divine hand, rested upon a position impregnable to the secular power.[28] The Empire, after its conversion to Christianity, even accorded—a privilege we find expressed in its laws—a higher dignity to the Church than to itself, on account of her divine origin and divine aim. These laws lay it down that more honor is due to the spiritual than to the material, to the eternal than to the temporal, to heaven than to earth. Hence the place occupied by the monogram of Christ and the sign of the cross on the imperial coins." [29]

It is equally true that the close union established between the Church and the State considerably strengthened the Church.[30] While the spiritual power was preaching the duty of rendering to Caesar, above all to a Christian Caesar, the obedience and respect due him, the civil power was mindful of the duty of rendering what was due to God and His Church.

"Armed soldiers protect the monogram, which had become the ornament of the Labarum, or Victory displays it triumphant on her shield. The Cross floats above the Victor; it surmounts the orb; or Christian Victory, depicted as an angel, holds it aloft before the nations; or lastly, it glitters in reduced form on the imperial crown. . . . Christ is represented on artistic monuments as Highest Lord and Judge, and in public life also He is recognized as the Lawgiver. . . . The Emperor Valentinian accordingly describes the bearers of spiritual power as 'stewards of the Great King.' " [31]

[28] Grisar, *op. cit.*, II, 8.

[29] *Ibidem*, II, 3.

[30] In this account of Christian life at the close of the fourth century, we will repeat several details already mentioned in the course of this history. But it will be useful for the reader to find them gathered here in summary.

[31] Grisar, *op. cit.*, II, 5.

Canon Law

Between the lawmaking of the State and that of the Church a reciprocal influence operated. The laws of the State were more and more instilled with the Christian spirit, and the Church canons became laws of the State. The ecclesiastical legislation, in its formulas, at the same time took on some of the remarkable exactness and clearness of the Roman law. This happy collaboration made possible a notable improvement in political and social life. To it was due an amelioration in the treatment of prisoners and slaves, the suppression of gladiatorial combats, of the abandonment of new-born children, and of certain immoral public entertainments that had become customary.[32] Christian feasts could be celebrated in all their solemnity, Christian charity could be practiced without hindrance, the apostolate could develop more rapidly along all the highways of the Empire; and the voice of the head of the Church could be heard more often and more clearly in all the provinces of the East and the West.

The authority of the Roman Pontiff was not the only one to benefit by this fruitful union. The authority of the bishops, based, like that of the pope, upon the divine law, increased in effectiveness by its adaptation to the wise organization of the Empire. The great legal divisions of the State were a sort of framework in which the hierarchy of the Church was fitted for its more convenient functioning.

For purposes of administration,[33] at the close of the fourth

[32] *Theodosian Code,* VIII, xv, 1; IX, iii, 1; xxxv, 4, 5; XI, xxvii, 1; XV, xi, 1.

[33] The word "diocese" was in use in Cicero's time, meaning simply "district." It came into official use in the latter part of the third or the beginning of the fourth century, when courts were established with jurisdiction intermediate between that of the prefect and that of the governor. See C. Jullian, art. *"Diocèse"* in *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* vol. II, part 2, p. 226. In ecclesiastical usage, the meaning of "diocese" did not become definitely established until the second ecumenical council, in 381. See Fourneret, art. *"Diocèse"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* IV, 1363. Previously it signified a district subject to a bishop, and was almost synonymous with "paroikia."

century the Empire was divided into prefectures, dioceses, provinces, and cities. The four prefectures were under the jurisdiction of praetorian prefects, the dioceses had at their head vicars of the prefect, called eparchs in the East; the provinces were under governors. Each city was subject to a number of magistrates who were chosen from its own population; one of them was chief magistrate and was called dictator or defender of the city.

Upon Theodosius' death, the ecclesiastical divisions followed almost the same lines as the civil divisions. At the outset, when a town had a sufficient number of Christians, the Apostles established a religious magistracy there, corresponding to the governing body of the city. This was the magistracy of the bishops. Later on, when the Empire became Christian, the practice developed of giving to the bishop who lived in the capital of the province, that is, in the metropolis, a jurisdiction over the whole province. This was the origin of metropolitan jurisdiction.[34] Lastly, a higher jurisdiction, called patriarchal, tended to be modeled on that of the vicar or head of the civil diocese, but the parallelism of the two jurisdictions, ecclesiastical and civil, never became established.

The Office of Bishop

In this setting, the episcopacy did not lose its essential autonomy. The rule for the election of bishops was always the choice made by the clergy and people. Various councils of the fourth century even laid special stress on the necessity of having a certain number of bishops take part in this important

[34] Called also primatial jurisdiction. In Africa, by way of exception, the title of primate was not attached to the civil metropolis, but to that bishop of the province who had been a bishop the longest. An imperial document, which was commonly said to have been drawn up under Honorius and Arcadius, the *Notitia dignitatum utriusque imperii,* gives the parallel between the ecclesiastical and the civil constitutions as we have set it forth.

act.[35] But, according to differences of place, time, customs, and feelings of the day, the election of a bishop followed different forms. In some places the metropolitan, or more usually the bishops of the province, merely consecrated the person chosen by the people and clergy. In other places the bishops proposed three candidates to the clergy and people, or, conversely, made a choice from three candidates proposed by the electoral body. Or again, as in Milan, for the nomination of St. Ambrose, the election took place by popular acclaim, with the assent of the clergy. On some occasions, there was a wider departure from the normal practice. We see synods interfering in the nomination of bishops, emperors arrogating to themselves the right to choose them at pleasure, or at least to impose upon the clergy the candidate of their choice.[36] This last abuse was a consequence of the official status given to the episcopate. The public honors and temporal advantages attached to the office of bishop were also the occasion of regrettable corrupt practices. The investigation of disputed elections was subject to the metropolitan, who passed judgment with the assistance of the advice of a synod. In fine, the institution of a bishop was valid only through his consecration by three bishops, after approval by the metropolitan.[37]

Once enthroned, the bishop became a personage of note in the Empire. From the time of Constantine, a bishop possessed competence to judge not only matters of a religious nature,

[35] The following councils: Arles (314), canon 20; Nicaea (325), canon 4; Antioch (341), canon 16; Laodicea, canon 12.

[36] Staudenmaier, *Geschichte der Bischofswahlen.*

[37] See St. Hilary, Letter 16; Council of Rome (386), canon 1, in Hefele, II, 386; Mansi, III, 1033. By virtue of these regulations, no bishop could be instituted in Italy without the explicit approval of the pope. The sovereign pontiff did not take any direct part in the election in other portions of the Empire. He merely issued decrees, watched over their application, and reminded the people, clergy, and even the emperors of the respect due to the electoral laws; thus his intervention, though very discreet and indirect, was undeniable. The election of the pope himself was subject to the same regulations as the election of other bishops. He was chosen by the people and clergy of Rome.

but also civil suits whenever the parties wished to submit their case to his tribunal. Besides the title "bishop" (episcopus, inspector), which at first was given them by analogy with certain Athenian magistrates, the people called them "pontiff," sovereign priests. This title of "pontiff" was not exclusively reserved to the bishop of Rome until the beginning of the fifth century.[38]

Certain marks of honor were given only to bishops. From the testimony of St. Hilary and St. Chrysostom we know that the faithful of their time bowed to a bishop to ask his blessing, and that preachers asked for the bishop's blessing before beginning a sermon.[39] The dress of bishops also distinguished them from priests. The miter was so special to them that, according to St. Augustine, they used to swear by it.[40] At that period the miter was merely a sort of band or narrow strip of metal fastened around the head. St. Jerome calls it the crown (*corona*);[41] St. Gregory Nazianzen, the diadem.[42] The pastoral staff and the episcopal ring were also insignia of the episcopal dignity.[43]

Onerous burdens and duties corresponded to these honors. Several times we have already drawn attention to the heroic devotedness with which the great bishops of the fourth century performed their duties. We will here simply give a summary list of those functions. A bishop's chief duties were the

[38] Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes* (art. *"Évèques"*) p. 255. In the fourth and fifth centuries the word "pope" (papa) was a title common to all bishops. See De Labriolle, *Une esquisse de l'histoire du mot papa,* in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne,* 1911, pp. 215–220.

[39] St. Hilary, *Ad Constantium;* St. Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Statues,* or *To the People of Antioch,* 3, 4, and 11; Martigny, *op. cit.,* pp. 259, 551.

[40] St. Augustine, Letter 147.

[41] St. Jerome, Letter 26, To Marcella.

[42] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* 31. Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.,* X, iv. It was not until the sixth century that other ornamentations were placed on the miter.

[43] The pastoral staff is of very ancient origin. Baronius declares that, according to the most reliable authorities, bishops used it in the fourth century. (Baronius, *Annales,* A. D., 504, no. 38.)

following: 1. the religious instruction of his people, imparted by himself or through priests expressly approved by him;[44] 2. the conferring of holy orders;[45] 3. the visitation of his diocese;[46] 4. the administration of the sacrament of confirmation;[47] 5. the reconciliation of penitents;[48] 6. the blessing of virgins;[49] 7. a multiplicity of functions connected with the legislative, judicial, and executive powers that were conferred on him.[50] It also pertained to the bishop's office to issue letters of communion to clergy and laymen who were going on a journey, to make appointments to ecclesiastical offices, to punish offenses of a religious nature, in short, to administer his whole Church. Moreover, he was not allowed to be absent from his diocese for more than three weeks.[51] Journeys to the court could not be made without the approval of the metropolitan; in Italy, of the pope.[52] This was early called the obligation of residence.

To perform these various duties, the bishop had several auxiliaries about him. The archdeacon, who is not mentioned earlier than the fourth century, held second rank in the Church. He was chosen from among the deacons and was not, as today, clothed with the priesthood. He assisted the bishop at the altar, watched over the conduct of the lower clergy, managed the property of the diocese, and provided for the care of the poor, the widows, and the virgins.[53] At the end of

[44] St. Hilary, *De Trinitate,* VI, 2.

[45] St. Gelasius, Letter 14, no. 6.

[46] St. Chrysostom, *Priesthood,* III, 18; St. Augustine, Letter 56; Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Martini,* 11.

[47] St. Jerome, *Dialogue against the Luciferians,* 9.

[48] This reconciliation could be made by priests when the bishop, himself hindered from doing so, gave them the power to do so. Council of Carthage (390), canon 4. (Hefele, II, 390.)

[49] Council of Carthage, canon 3; Hefele, II, 390.

[50] St. Basil, Letters 141, 206; Council of Sardica, canon 11.

[51] Council of Sardica, canons 11 and 12.

[52] *Ibidem,* canons 7–9.

[53] St. Jerome, Letter 146, To Evangelus; St. Optatus, *Against the Donatists,* bk. 1.

the fourth century, besides the archdeacon we find the archpriest. St. Jerome is the first writer to mention this office.[54] At first this name was applied to the priest who was longest ordained. His duty was to preside at meetings of the clergy and to replace the bishop when the latter was prevented from being present by the celebration of the sacred mysteries in the principal church. Later on, this dignity was awarded on the basis of merit. The Greek Church and the Latin Church seem not to have had exactly the same discipline on this point.[55]

We have already spoken of the chorepiscopi. In the East, during the fourth century, they were valuable assistants to the bishops in the rural ministry. The thirteenth canon of the Council of Ancyra (314) and the tenth canon of the Council of Antioch (341) seem to suppose that the chorepiscopi possessed the episcopal character, since those canons attribute to them the right to ordain deacons and priests, in the bishop's absence or by his order. In the bishop's absence, they conferred minor orders, attended the councils, and signed the Acts.[56]

In the bishop's more immediate entourage, especially in the East, we note the following officers: the syncelli, who were chosen by the bishop from the most distinguished of the clergy, ate at his table, and were consulted in important affairs; the notaries, whose office it was to draw up official documents and take charge of them; the advocates or defenders, who maintained the rights of the Church even in civil courts; the archivists and sacristans; and the mansionarii (sextons), who had the care of certain churches or chapels. The personnel of the Western bishops was more limited. But in the East, where it was very numerous, intrigues were formed among

[54] St. Jerome, Letter 125, To Rusticus, no. 15.

[55] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'église,* part I, bk. 2, chap. 3.

[56] On the character and functions of the chorepiscopate and the controversies regarding it, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* II, 1197–1237.

them and ambitions were stirred. Some syncelli even schemed for the bishopric; sometimes protosyncelli, at the councils, claimed a right to walk beside the bishops; and the primicerius (chief) of the notaries was often a power to be reckoned with.[57]

The Patriarchs

The importance of this personnel was especially notable about the great metropolitans, who were later called patriarchs. Their eminence was derived from the Apostle Peter, not from the importance of their episcopal city. Only one such was recognized in the West; the bishop of Rome, head of the Church. But the East was proud to have its patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople.

The patriarch of Alexandria had Egypt, the Thebaid, and Libya dependent on him. The patriarch of Antioch had Cilicia, Isauria, Syria, Phenicia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Osrhoene. The patriarch of Jerusalem had under his jurisdiction only the three Palestines.[58] Out of consideration for the incomparable dignity of the Holy City, the Fathers of Nicaea raised it to the rank of a patriarchal see, although maintaining the metropolitans of Caesarea in their ancient rights. We know under what circumstances the Fathers of Constantinople in 381 conferred the patriarchal dignity upon the capital of the East, with rights extending over the provinces of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, with ever-increasing prerogatives that finally led its patriarchs to claim equality with the Roman Pontiff.[59]

This last, as patriarch, had under his jurisdiction Italy,

[57] See Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, bk. 2, part 1, chap. 12.

[58] For a time he had Phenicia and Arabia, which had been cut off from Antioch. See S. Vailhé, *Formation du patriarcat de Jérusalem,* in the *Échos d'Orient,* XIII (1910), 325–336.

[59] Cf. S. Vailhé, *Origines de l'église de Constantinople,* in the *Échos d'Orient,* X (1907), 287–295.

Gaul, Spain, Britain, Germany, and the two provinces of Eastern and Western Illyricum [60] (Macedonia, Crete, Thessaly, and the two Epiruses, the two Dacias, Dardania, and Prevalitana). But it was difficult to draw a sharp line marking the differences and limits in his twofold office as patriarch and as supreme pontiff in the West. Pope Damasus declares: "The Roman Church is above all the Churches, not by virtue of a conciliar decree, but by virtue of the words of the Lord: 'Thou art Peter.' " [61] In the fourth century, under the pope's sovereign authority, certain sees in the West were made metropolitan, such as Milan in Italy and Arles in Gaul.

In principle, the patriarch gave canonical institution to the metropolitans; the latter did so in the case of simple bishops. In the fifth century Theodoret protests against the claim of Patriarch John of Antioch to reserve to himself the consecration of the bishops, and criticized him for thus violating the rights of the metropolitans.[62] But such protests could not arise against the Pontiff of Rome. Pope Siricius, as we have seen, promulgated canonical decisions having obligatory force for the Churches of Spain and Africa.

We have also seen what was the position of the Roman Pontiff in the councils. He confirmed the decisions of the ecumenical or universal councils. Local councils, whether diocesan, provincial, or even general for the East or for Africa, lost all authority if the bishop of Rome was opposed to them. No other bishop could claim such a right.[63]

[60] On ecclesiastical Illyria and its varied vicissitudes, see Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* pp. 154 ff., and Vailhé, *Annexion de l'Illyricum au patriarcat œcuménique,* in the *Échos d'Orient,* XIV (1911), 29-36.

[61] Mansi, III, 158.

[62] Le Quien, *Oriens christianus,* II, 669 ff.

[63] From the beginning of the fourth century the presence of three consecrating prelates was required in the ordination of a bishop; but if the pope consecrated, no other prelates were required, because he represented the whole body of the episcopate. See Grisar, *History of Rome,* III, 280, and Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 361, 378.

The Priests

At the close of the fourth century, patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops were at the head of a vast array of clergy of every rank: priests, deacons, subdeacons, readers, acolytes, exorcists, and porters.[64]

The priest's functions had gone through three distinct phases. During the first three centuries, he had no other mission but to celebrate the sacred mysteries at the same time as the bishop in the cathedral and to aid him in the government of his Church, for which the bishop alone was directly responsible. In the fourth century, when other churches besides the cathedral were built in the large cities, priests were assigned to them as "titulars" or "cardinals." But their duties were limited to informing the bishop of what concerned the government of the Church, taking charge of burials and superintending the keepers of the cemeteries,[65] to giving the faithful the instruction necessary for the reception of baptism and for the absolution of their sins;[66] the administration of the sacraments and the liturgy of the holy sacrifice were reserved to the bishop.[67] When the head of the Church wished to celebrate the sacred mysteries in honor of a saint especially venerated in a church of his episcopal city, he went to that church accompanied by his clergy.

Perhaps the titular priests already had the power, within the confines of their territory, to administer the sacrament of

[64] We do not mention tonsured clerics. The tonsure of secular clerics does not go back beyond the sixth century. At first it was not a rite distinct from the conferring of the first minor order. Probably it was not at first a liturgical rite at all. As a special liturgical rite, distinct from minor orders, it seems not to go back earlier than the eighth century in the West and the twelfth century in the East. Cf. Many, *De sacra ordinatione,* pp. 37–40.

[65] De Rossi, *Roma sotteranea,* III, 520, ff.

[66] Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis,* I, 165 note.

[67] St. Athanasius, *Apologia ad imperatorem Constantium.*

extreme unction, to reconcile penitents in case of necessity and heretics in danger of death, to select "psalmists" or chanters to sing the psalms in their church. But the texts referring to these various functions are doubtful or are later than the fourth century.

A third phase of the priestly ministry began at the time of the formation of rural parishes. At the beginning, the priest in charge of the government of the parish, the parish priest properly so called, may perhaps, so far as concerned the celebration of liturgical functions, have merely obtained the Eucharist consecrated by the bishop in the city church and distributed it to the faithful of his district, and have served the bishop when the latter came to officiate in the rural parish. Only for the great feasts did the country parish priest, accompanied by his flock, go to the city church, where the bishop, assisted by all his clergy, officiated before all his people.[68]

Deacons

Below the priests, the deacons, as in the first centuries, occupied an important place. In the liturgical offices, they received the offerings of the faithful and placed them on the altar,[69] then ascended the pulpit to read the Gospel;[70] and they distributed the Holy Eucharist to the people.[71] It was also

[68] Imbart de la Tour, *Les Paroisses rurales du IV^e au XI^e siècle,* pp. 62 f. That the rural parishes in the fourth century did not yet have, or at least not always, the exercise of complete public worship, is evidenced by the fact that often a mere deacon assumed the government of the parish. But, as parishes became more completely organized, this situation became increasingly rare. (Imbart de la Tour, *op. cit.,* p. 619.)

[69] St. Jerome, *In Jeremiam,* XI, 15 f.; *In Ezechielem,* XVIII, 5 f.

[70] St. Jerome, Letter 147, To Sabinianus, no. 6; *P. L.,* XXII, 1200.

[71] Apparently certain deacons even undertook to consecrate the Blessed Sacrament. They were expressly forbidden to do this by the Council of Arles (314), canon 15. (Hefele, I, 193.) "Binterim gives another interpretation. By *offerre* he understands the administration of the Eucharist to the faithful; and he explains the canon in this sense: 'The deacons ought not to administer the communion to

their duty to direct the movements of the faithful present at the celebration of the holy offices. It was the deacons' voice that called out to the people during the ceremony: *Flectamus genua* (Let us bend our knees); *Procedamus in pace* (Let us proceed in peace); *Ite, missa est* (Go, it is time to leave).[72] With the bishop's permission, the deacons could also preach, baptize solemnly, and, in case of extreme necessity in the absence of any priest, hear a sinner's confession and impose a penance upon him. This is to be inferred from a famous text of St. Cyprian;[73] but we cannot deduce from this text that the deacons ever had the power to administer the sacrament of penance.

Subdeacons

The origin of the office of subdeacon seems to go back to the beginning of the third, or perhaps the end of the second century in the Latin Church and a little later in the Greek Church.[74] His functions in the ecclesiastical hierarchy were much more humble.[75] The Council of Laodicea admonished subdeacons not to occupy places in the *diaconicum* (the place reserved for the deacons), not to touch the sacred vessels during the divine office, and not to wear the *orarium* or stole, the

the faithful in various places, but only in the churches which are assigned to them.' " Hefele, I, 193.

[72] Many, *De sacra ordinatione,* p. 50.

[73] Many, *op. cit.,* p. 51. St. Cyprian's text reads as follows: "They who have received letters from the martyrs . . . may make confession of their sin before any presbyter at hand or, if a presbyter shall not be found, and death approaches, then even before a deacon; that so receiving imposition of hands unto repentance, they may go to the Lord with peace," St. Cyprian, Letter 18 (*Ad clerum*); *Oxford Library,* vol. XVII.

[74] Many, *op. cit.,* p. 30. Cf. A. Catoire, *Les Sous-diaconat dans l'Église grecque,* in the *Échos d'Orient,* XIII (1910), 22–25.

[75] The Greeks still regard the subdiaconate as a minor order. It was not until the twelfth century that the Latin Church reckoned it among the major orders. (Many, *op. cit.,* pp. 31–33.)

vestment belonging properly to the higher orders.[76] Their chief duties were to prepare the sacred vessels,[77] to keep watch at the church doors, to see that catechumens and penitents left the church at the proper time, and, in a general way, to see that good order was preserved during the ceremony. Several passages of St. Cyprian inform us also that the bishops had their letters carried by subdeacons.[78] The practice of having the Epistle read by the subdeacon at solemn mass seems to have originated in Spain in the fourth century; from there it spread to other countries.[79]

Acolytes

The acolytes, as the etymology of the word indicates, were the "companions" of the bishops and priests. In Africa their duties consisted simply in lighting the candles and presenting the wine for the celebration of the mass. In Rome they were, from their origin,[80] charged with the duty of carrying to the absent, not only the eulogia or blessed bread, but also the Eucharist.[81] The following were their functions during mass, at least in Rome. When communion time came, the acolytes, each wearing a little bag hanging from his neck, went up to the altar. There they stood, some on the right, others on the left. The subdeacons then stood before them and held open the little bags, into which the archdeacon put the bread consecrated for the people. Thereupon the acolytes separated. Some

[76] Hefele, II, 313.

[77] *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua,* in Bruns, *Concilia,* I, 141.

[78] St. Cyprian, Letter 18 (*Ad clerum*), *P. L.,* IV, 284.

[79] Martène, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus,* bk. 1, chap. 8, art. 8, no. 15.

[80] Their origin seems to go back to the middle of the third century. (Leclercq, art. *"Acolythe,"* in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 349.)

[81] The acolyte Tarcisius was martyred because he refused to give up the sacred Species which he was carrying to some absent Christians. This function of acolytes to bring the Eucharist to the faithful was abolished in the fifth century. (Leclercq, *loc. cit.*)

carried their bags to the bishops who were at the pope's right, if any such bishops were present. The other acolytes presented their bags to the priests on the left. The latter then broke the loaves upon two patens, which two subdeacons held before the acolytes.[82] This function was regarded as so essential to the order of acolytes that they were handed a bag at their ordination ceremony.[83]

Exorcists and Porters

The duties of exorcists were closely connected with the preparation for baptism. These clerics drove out the devil by imposing their hands upon possessed persons and reciting public prayers. The porters, considered the lowest rank of the hierarchy, were, as their name indicates, placed in charge of the doors of the church. Their duty was to assign the penitents and catechumens to their respective places. They announced to the faithful the days and hours of meetings. And they had the care of objects belonging to the church. This is why lodging was generally provided for them in rooms just outside the basilica.[84]

Readers

The reader's office was to read the Holy Scriptures publicly in the church. For this function young men or even boys were often chosen. In times of persecution this honor was also given to Christians who had confessed their faith before the executioners. To perform his function, the reader went into the pulpit—sometimes called "the readers' tribune." It was also his duty to have custody of the sacred Books.

[82] Martigny, art. *"Acolythe,"* in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 10.
[83] Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, I,* 353.
[84] No mention of exorcists or porters is found before the third century.

"In the fourth century this order was preëminently the first of the ministry, and constituted a sort of probationary stage. Young clerics began their career in it and remained lectors until they had reached an adult age, which was a necessary qualification for receiving superior orders. Most of the ecclesiastical careers of which the details are known to us began with the lectorate. Such was the case with St. Felix of Nola, St. Eusebius of Vercelli, the father of Pope Damasus, the Popes Liberius and Siricius. Their silvery voices penetrated the vast spaces of the basilicas and were heard by the most distant portions of the congregation. They even came to be constituted as a corporation (*schola lectorum*) at an early date, though the existence of this body at Rome, it is true, is not attested by any specific document. These *scholae,* however, were to be found in other Churches, and, at Rome, the *schola cantorum,* of which there is clear evidence from the seventh century onwards, consisted mainly of lectors." [85]

Ordination

Ordination to minor orders was performed by the touching of the insignia of the order accompanied by certain formulas which have been preserved in the *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua.*[86] The young clerics were trained in the schools of their respective bishops. Some studied in the monasteries or attended the classes in one of the great schools, such as the exegetical School of Antioch. But, up to the time of St. Augustine, we do not find any special organization for the spiritual training and the intellectual education of young clerics.

For advancement to major orders the candidates needed a public testimonial of the people, who ordinarily acclaimed them by these words: "You are worthy." [87] Ignorance of religion, the status of the neophyte, the fact of being married a second time or of having committed some grave crime, were reasons for exclusion. The ordination of subdeacons took

[85] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 334 f.

[86] See these *statuta* and a commentary on them in Hefele, II, 410 ff.

[87] Council of Hippo (393), canon 20, Hefele, II, 398.

place in the same manner as in the case of minor clerics. Deacons and priests were ordained by the imposition of the hands of the priests present at the ceremony.[88] Neither the *Statuta* nor the *Pontificale* as given by St. Isidore of Seville speaks of the anointing of the hands. This practice seems to have sprung up later, in England.[89] No one could be admitted to priestly ordination before the age of thirty, or at least twenty-five.[90]

Clerical Dress

All tradition, ever since Apostolic times, marked an essential distinction between the faithful and the clergy. But in civil life the clergy were not distinguished from the laity by any outward indication in dress. The earliest mosaics show the bishops of the fourth century wearing a long, wide mantle, sufficiently ample to envelop the whole body, with the lower part of the cloak held up by the arms or thrown over the shoulders. This was the *paenula,* the primitive form of the cope and chasuble. But monuments of unquestionable authenticity show laymen dressed in the very same manner.[91] This vestment does not have a liturgical character until later, when the *paenula* gradually disappeared as a profane garment.

The cleric also was undistinguished from the popular classes by his manual labor.

"Among the clergy," says Grisar, "manual labor was quite customary, and still more so was this the case among the monks. The clergy lived amongst the poor, sharing their toil. In heathen times people had left agricultural work, the crafts, and personal service to despised slaves, as occupations unworthy of a free citizen. Aristotle

[88] *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua,* canon 3.

[89] Many, *De sacra ordinatione,* pp. 445 f.

[90] The age required for the ordination of bishops was thirty-five; in some countries it was forty-five.

[91] For instance, in the engraving on a glass cup which is shown in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* I, 2275.

held that intellectual superiority and nobility of mind were incompatible with personal labor.[92] When, however, our divine Savior, during the long years He spent at Nazareth, had set an example of work; when the Apostles and saints had, by word and deed, raised manual labor to its original dignity in the world, Christianity hallowed and united the family by the bond of ready toil. In devoting themselves to manual labor the clergy were, therefore, acting partly from necessity and partly from voluntary devotion, seeking thereby to bring into honor among their contemporaries the principles of poverty and work inculcated by the Gospel. In the Frankish Church especially, ministers of the altar were noted for the zealous way they labored, and for their efforts to induce the people to do likewise. Christianity, by furthering in the West the principle and practice of work, accomplished two things. It overcame the handed-down habits of the ancient world, which wasted its strength, both mental and physical, in indolence and pleasure. At the same time it harnessed to useful work that wild craving for action shared by the new nations, whose vigor and inconstancy it tamed, making them settle down to a life of order and self-denial." [93]

Clerical Celibacy

There is, however, one point which generally distinguished the clergy, at least those in major orders, from the laity; it was the law of celibacy. At the close of the fourth century this law was so widely followed that St. Jerome might write in his book against Vigilantius:

"What are the Churches of the East to do? What is to become of the Egyptian Churches and those belonging to the Apostolic Seat, which accept for the ministry only men who are virgins, or those who practice continency, or, if married, abandon their conjugal rights?" [94]

[92] Aristotle, *Politics*, bk. 6, chap. 2.

[93] Grisar, *History of Rome*, III, 268. Cf. Max Sabatier, *L'Église et le travail manuel*, pp. 63–85.

[94] St. Jerome, *Against Vigilantius*, 2.

It was especially the consideration of the intimate relations of bishops, priests, and deacons [95] with the holy sacrifice of the mass that led the Church to transform into a law what had been, from the beginning of Christianity, an evangelical prompting. The ministers of the spotless Lamb must rise as high as possible above earthly things and sensual inclinations. The law imposing chastity upon these ministers corresponded to the innermost spirit of the Church.

The Basilicas

Public worship was magnificently developed in the course of the fourth century. A great number of basilicas was built. The comparative prosperity of the East, at the time when everything was collapsing in the West, made it possible to give them vast proportions and to adorn them with splendid decorations.[96] "From Constantine to Justinian the type of the 'civil basilica' was prevalent in the West and in the East for religious edifices." [97] But it would be a mistake to think it was not until the sixth century that Byzantine art began, if by this we mean the substitution of vaulting and cupolas for the timbered roofing of the Roman basilicas. This architectural type existed in Asia Minor in the fourth century. In a letter to Bishop Amphilochius of Iconium, St. Gregory of Nyssa describes with great exactness the details of a church in the form of a cross, built on an octagonal plan and crowned with a cupola.[98]

[95] The practice varied in the case of subdeacons, who were then considered as clerics in minor orders. At Rome they seem to have practiced celibacy at a very early date.

[96] It is sometimes said that the Christian emperors, especially Theodosius, gave the temples of paganism over to the Christians, to be changed into churches. But the earliest example of this sort occurs in the seventh century. "The transformation of the Pantheon, about the year 612, is the earliest fact of his kind which can be established." Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 507.

[97] Leclercq, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne,* II, 66.

[98] This letter will be found in Leclercq, *op. cit.,* II, 83 f.

Other innovations characterized the art which then prevailed and which blossomed out in all its magnificence in the Church of Santa Sophia. There were mosaics instead of paintings, a profusion of gilding, polychromatic decoration of statues and monuments. The Christian art of the first three centuries, timid and naive, was that of a trembling, persecuted society; that of the fourth century, from Constantine to Theodosius, was, in growing proportions, that of a society which the State protected, which triumphed with the Empire, which adopted from the State something of the latter's sumptuous splendor. The ornamentation of the Byzantine basilica and the ceremonies displayed in it were somewhat analogous to the large assembly of gorgeously dressed officials which the *basileus* of Byzantium gathered about his throne on days of great festivity.

The Liturgy

Under the direction of great bishops like St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, or St. Gregory of Nyssa, the religious character of the liturgy could not suffer from these innovations. It simply took on additional splendor.

The center of the Christian liturgy was always the Eucharistic sacrifice. A conspicuous fact seems to mark the development of the liturgy in the fourth century. Says Dom Cabrol: "If we may anticipate the future proofs and a deeper knowledge of liturgical data, we can already formulate this hypothesis: in the first three centuries a comparative unity in the liturgy, or, if you prefer, an absence of characteristics; beginning with the fourth century, an application of different methods, which will affirm the liturgical diversities." [99] The best known of the liturgical variations is the Syriac, used at

[99] Cabrol, art. *"Anaphore,"* in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie et de liturgie,* I, 1912.

Antioch and in the Churches dependent on the patriarchate of that ancient metropolis; the liturgies of Constantinople and of Caesarea as also the Armenian and Persian formularies seem to be connected with that source. In the West, the Roman liturgy prevailed. Yet, in addition to it, the Gallican liturgy, originating perhaps at Milan and passing from there into Gaul, offered many similarities to the liturgy of the East.

A study of the works of St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and other writers of the time makes it possible to reconstruct the essential features of the liturgy of the mass. These features have forms so perfectly identical that their study prompts us "to seek their origin much further back. It is not unreasonable for us to see therein a proof in favor of a certain primitive uniformity of the liturgy." [100]

The Mass

The distinction between the mass of the catechumens and the mass of the faithful is maintained in the fourth century. It would last as long as the institution of the catechumenate.[101] The mass of the catechumens began with the reading of some passages from the Bible and the singing of psalms. In the beginning the selection of these passages was reserved to the judgment of the bishop. Later it was determined by regulations. For example, it was decided that the Acts of the Apostles should be read from Easter to Pentecost, Genesis during Lent, Job and Jeremiah in Passion time.[102] Certain Churches also had the Acts of the martyrs read, and even letters from

[100] Cabrol, *loc. cit.*

[101] No trace of catechumens is found in the liturgical books of the eighth century. At that time there were no longer any adult catechumens.

[102] Several passages in St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine presuppose this regulation. (St. Chrysostom, Homily 24, *On the Epistle to the Romans;* St. Augustine, *In Joannem,* tr. 26.)

illustrious personages or bishops. Conciliar decisions put an end to this abusive extension.[103]

After a greeting to the people and a prayer, the sermon was delivered. It might be a simple exposition of the Scripture passage just read, a connected explanation of a book of the Bible, a discourse on the feast of the day or the life of a saint, or it might concern some extraordinary happening or some duty of the Christian life. The sermons of the most popular preachers were written down by stenographers, who were called tachygraphers. In the East the sermons were rather long and were frequently interrupted by applause. We have evidence of this particularly in the works of St. Chrysostom, who begs his listeners to stop their noisy demonstrations. Preaching was an episcopal function. But the bishops were assisted in this ministry by their priests. In the country churches this function was also confided to deacons. After the sermon, the unbelievers, catechumens, and *energumeni* were dismissed,[104] and the church doors were closed. The mass of the faithful then began." [105]

The mass was always the liturgical drama, having as its basis the Gospel account of the Last Supper, renewed and amplified in a majestic action, in which the celebrant, the

[103] Council of Laodicea, canon 59; Council of Hippo (393), canon 36.

[104] This dismissal was given by the words *Ite missa est.* Hence the name Mass, given to the sacred ceremony which followed immediately. (Vigourel, *A Synthetical Manual of Liturgy,* p. 93.) At the close of the mass of the faithful, there was another *Ite missa est;* this one has been preserved. Vigourel (*La Liturgie et la piété chrétienne,* p. 114) offers a mystical and broader interpretation of the *Ite missa est.* He says: "These words are often translated: 'Go, it is the dismissal.' But *missa* means 'mission.' Might we not see in these words a real mission which the Church gives to those who have come to the holy sacrifice to derive therefrom the light and strength and love of which they stand in need?" As Bossuet remarks, "No one was allowed to leave without the permission of the Church, which dismissed her children only after filling them with veneration for the mysteries and with the graces that accompanied their reception, admonishing them to fulfil their regular duties in the religious spirit called for by their vocation." Bossuet, *Explication des prières de la Messe* (Lachat ed., XVII, 6).

[105] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, bk. 2, part 2, chap. 14.

clergy, the people, the whole Church took part in turn, by dialogue, prayers, and chants of pathetic appeal and majestic greatness.

Aside from the accidental differences between the Western mass and the Eastern *"anaphora,"* [106] the various phases of the liturgical action followed one another in the following order.[107]

As did the mass of the catechumens, the mass of the faithful ordinarily began with a salutation to the people and an invitation to pray: *Dominus vobiscum, Oremus.* At first the prayer was said silently, then it became formulated in a dialogue, said aloud, between the celebrant and the people, or it was recited by a chanter, with interjections of popular acclaim, such as *Amen, Alleluia, Kyrie eleison, Quoniam in aeternum misericordia.*

What made up this alternating choral psalmody which, coming from Antioch, was introduced into Constantinople and thence into Milan where St. Ambrose acclimated it? St. Augustine, one of the first hearers of these chants, tells of the impression produced in him by those "accents which gave life to the words sung by a gentle voice, in which the feelings of the soul and their varied shades found each its own note in the inflections of the voice." Augustine's musical emotion was so keen that later he wrote:

"The safer way it seems to me, which I remember to have been often told me of Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, who caused the reader of the psalm to sound it forth with so little warbling of

[106] The Orientals give the name *anaphora* (elevation, offering) to the middle portion of the mass, from the Preface to the Communion. It corresponds almost exactly to what the Latins call the canon.

[107] Duchesne has made a detailed study of the Roman mass and the Gallican mass (*Christian Worship,* pp. 153–217); Cabrol has done the same for the Oriental *anaphora* (*Dictionnaire d'archéologie et de liturgie,* I, 1898–1918). Cagin undertakes to show the fundamental unity of all these liturgies. (*Paléogr. musicale,* vol. V.) In the summary we give here, we have made use of these various works.

the voice, as that it was nearer to speaking than to singing," [108] And in another place he says: "At hearing of those airs which thy words breathe soul into, whenas they are sung with a well tuned and well governed voice, I do, I confess, receive a little contentment." [109]

And now all the people start moving for the offertory. Slowly, religiously, each one of the faithful carries to the altar some bread and wine for the sacrifice, some oil for the lights, some incense, or even some wheat freshly harvested. At the end of the fourth century, the oblation was still made in silence. But in the time of St. Augustine, a chant, called the *Offertorium,* was introduced at Carthage during the oblation, to occupy the faithful during that exercise. A chanter intoned a few verses of a psalm, to which the people responded by repeating a few words of the same psalm in the form of a refrain. When the offertory was finished, the deacon gave a signal to stop the singing. In the East, the carrying of the offerings and placing them on the altar was done by a sort of procession, more solemnly than in the West. It was our Offertory.

After the deacon had separated the bread and wine intended for the sacrifice from the offerings reserved for the poor, another invitation to pray was addressed to the people: *Orate, fratres,* said the priest.

As in the mass of the catechumens, the prayer was at first said in silence, as in the case of our *Secreta* at present. But soon it changed into a dialogue said aloud: "The Lord be with

[108] *"Ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti."* St. Augustine, *Confessions,* bk. 10, chap. 33.

[109] St. Augustine, *Retractions,* bk. 2, chap. 11. Of what did this chant consist? We find no useful information on this point in the treatise *De musica* which St. Augustine published in 398. The treatise was never completed. The part that was written treats merely of the rhythm and the lyric meters. For early Christian music and song, see Gatard, *La Musique grégorienne;* art. *"Chant romain et grégorien,* in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie et de liturgie;* Gastoué, *Les Origines du chant romain.*

you.—And with your spirit.—Let your hearts be raised up.—We have raised them up to the Lord.—Let us thank the Lord our God.—It is right and just."

Then, in a particularly solemn tone, the celebrant began a prayer, called Eucharistic prayer or thanksgiving. Its form was almost invariable in the East, but in the West was adapted to the various feasts. The basis of it was everywhere the same. The prayer always began as follows: "It is truly worthy and just, right and profitable unto salvation, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O holy Lord." Such is the origin of our Preface. God was thanked for His works, for the creation, for the redemption of man after his sin, and above all for the institution of the sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

An acclaim, by the people, to the thrice holy God—our present *Sanctus*—came next, forming, in all the liturgies of East and West without exception, the connection between the prayers we have just spoken of and the liturgical act of consecration.

This essential part of the holy sacrifice was made up of words and manual actions. The words were the simple account of the Last Supper. In the Preface the celebrant could improvise, develop the traditional theme, and even add his own intentions. But in this part of the mass he no longer exercises that same freedom. First he prays the Lord to look favorably upon the oblation and to have the power of His Holy Spirit descend upon it,[110] to make it the body and blood of Christ. He next recites, according to the formula used in his rite, the account of the Last Supper, at which the Savior gave Him-

[110] Some consider this the Roman *epiklesis,* thus placing it before the consecration. The term *epiklesis* may be applied also to a prayer which, in the Roman rite, comes after the consecration, asking God that the sacrifice may bear fruit in the souls of the faithful. See Salaville, art. *"Epiclèse,"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 194 ff. Cf. De Puniet, *Le Canon de la messe d'après quelques travaux récents,* in the *Van Onzen Tijd* (vol. III, 1910), a Dutch review.

self to His disciples. This was an efficacious account which, by the repetition of the Savior's words, brought down, under the species of bread and wine, the body and blood, the soul and divinity of the immolated Christ. The Savior, present on the altar, was then adored by the Lord's Prayer. The manual actions usually included the elevation of the Host, the breaking of it, the mingling of the body and blood, and a final blessing. In the Eastern Churches, during this part of the mass, the sacred Species were veiled.

The liturgies of the East added to these ceremonies of the consecration a prayer to the Holy Ghost, which they called *epiklesis* and which some of those liturgies regarded as essential.[111] The *epiklesis* was almost completely absent in the Roman Church. This fact led the Greek Church, after its schism, to accuse the Roman Church of not consecrating validly.

After the ceremony of the consecration, in the East the altar curtains were drawn back and all present solemnly adored the Holy Eucharist. Then began the communion. The faithful still received communion under both species. Usually a priest gave the consecrated Host; a deacon, the precious Blood. While receiving the sacred Species the communicant usually stood up, inclining his head. The celebrant said: "Behold the body of Christ," "Behold the blood of Christ"; and the communicant responded; "Amen." During the distribution of the Eucharist, suitable verses of the Psalms were sung by the people. One of the most usual was the following verse from Psalm 33: "Taste, and see that the Lord is sweet."

After a prayer of thanksgiving and the blessing given by the celebrant, the deacon dismissed the people, saying, in the East: "Go in peace"; in the West: "Go, it is time to leave (*Ite, missa est*)."

[111] On the *Epiklesis* in the East, see the *Échos d'Orient,* XI, 101–112; XII, 129–136, 222–227; XIII, 132–135; XIV, 10–16; XVI, 28–31.

Such was the solemn mass, the only one celebrated at the beginning of Christianity. But, in the precise testimony of St. Ambrose, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Paulinus of Nola, and other Fathers, we have proof that during the fourth century priests and bishops also celebrated private (low) masses.[112] These masses were ordinarily said in private chapels; the laity did not receive communion at them. The ancient agapes, kept up on the feasts of martyrs in the form of funeral repasts, were forbidden on account of the abuses that had arisen in connection with them.[113] After the fourth century we find no evidence of them except at Rome and in Gaul; even there they were very rare.

The faithful received communion usually whenever they attended solemn mass. The practice of taking the sacred Species home or on a journey became very exceptional. It was seldom that communion was brought to the sick or to solitaries, and, in such case, they received communion only under the species of bread, since the Savior was considered entirely present under each species.

Ceremonies of Baptism

The changes introduced into the rites of baptism after the peace of the Church affected particularly the ceremonial of the catechumenate. The practice of reserving solemn baptisms to the two feasts of Easter and Pentecost apparently goes back to the fourth century.[114] However, Pope Siricius, when appointing those two solemnities, makes exception for children in danger of death and for the dying in general, who could be baptized at any time.[115]

[112] Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii;* St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* XVIII, 29, 38; Uranius, *Epistola de obitu S. Paulini.*

[113] Council of Gangra, canon 11; Council of Laodicea, canon 28; Council of Hippo (393), canon 29.

[114] Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians,* chap. 4.

[115] St. Siricius, *Epistola ad Himerium,* chap. 2. Cf. Mansi, III, 1137.

We are well informed about the ceremonies of baptism in the fourth century by three important documents: the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, the *Apostolic Constitutions,* and the *Peregrinatio Silviae.*

"With St. Cyril as our guide, we can follow the whole series of preparatory rites and those of the initiation itself. His catecheses are divided into two groups, one dealing with the ceremonies which precede, the other with those which follow, the initiation. The first, which is a kind of preliminary discourse, entitled *pro-Catechesis,* describes the catechumens as presenting themselves at the beginning of Lent to be enrolled as candidates for baptism. *The Pilgrimage of Etheria* (*Silvia*) gives a similar account of this preparatory stage. The names having been inscribed, a day was appointed on which the bishop, assisted by his priests and all the other clergy, proceeded to make a general scrutiny. The candidates, accompanied by their relatives, appeared before him one by one. The bishop made inquiries of the neighbors of each catechumen as to his conduct; if the candidate were a stranger, he had to show commendatory letters. In the case of his not being considered worthy to present himself for baptism, he was made to wait until a subsequent occasion. If the information given was satisfactory, he was accepted, and was thenceforth placed among the number of the competents (*competentes,* φωτιζόμενοι).

"During the whole of Lent the competents were summoned every morning to church, to be exorcised and to hear a sermon from the bishop or from some one appointed by him. The exorcisms were performed by the inferior clergy, and were accompanied by insufflation. Cyril seems to say that while the words of conjuration were being pronounced, the candidates had their faces covered.

"At the end of a stated time the *Traditio symboli,* or delivery of the Creed, took place. As it was the universal custom for the Creed to be taught by word of mouth, and not learned from a written copy, Cyril has not inserted the text of it in his *Catecheses.* After the *Traditio,* the teaching dealt with the articles of the Creed, and was continued till the beginning of Holy Week. It was then that

the *Redditio,* or recital of the Creed, took place, each candidate presenting himself before the bishop and reciting the Belief, which he had learned by heart. The catecheses during Lent were devoted to instruction in the doctrines of the Eucharist and baptism; and these also formed the theme of the teaching which the neophytes received during Easter Week.

"At Jerusalem the commemoration of the Passion was of too great an importance, and engaged too much time, to permit of the candidate for baptism receiving instruction during Holy Week, but they presented themselves on the night of Easter Eve for the ceremonies of initiation. They were received in the vestibule of the baptistery, and the service began by the renunciation of the devil. The candidate turned to the west, the region of darkness, and extending his hand, pronounced the formulary of rejection, addressing himself to the evil one, as if he were present: 'I renounce thee, Satan, thy works, thy pomps, and all thy worship.' He then turned to the east, the region of light, and recited the Creed for the second time. This ceremony, with its two corresponding parts, constituted what is called in the Greek, the ἀπόταξις (*apotaxis*) and the σύνταξις (*suntaxis*).

"The candidate then put off his garments and entered the baptistery. He was immediately anointed, from head to foot, with exorcised oil. In the case of the women, this anointing was performed by deaconesses.

"After this anointing, the neophyte entered the font, which had been previously blessed by the bishop. He once more confessed his faith, replying to the threefold questioning of the officiating minister, and was then plunged three times in the consecrated water." [116]

Confirmation

Scarcely had the newly baptized emerged from the piscina, when he received the sacrament of confirmation. In imitation of Christ who, after His baptism in the Jordan, received the

[116] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 327 ff. Cf. Corblet, *Histoire du sacrament de baptême.*

Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, the neophyte, upon leaving the baptismal font, was anointed with chrism, perfumed oil, symbolizing and efficaciously producing the presence of the Holy Ghost in the soul of the confirmed person.[117] He then put on new clothes of white color and, assisted by his godparents, presented himself before the bishop, who, according to the *Pilgrimage of Silvia,*[118] imposed hands on him and spoke a prayer over him. The pontiff next made the sign of the cross on the forehead of each neophyte, saying: *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti: Pax tibi.* "By this new rite," says St. Cyril, "the Holy Ghost marks the soul with a heavenly seal which makes the devils tremble; He arms it for the battle; He gives it strength; and He is ready henceforth to watch over the Christian as over His own soldier." [119]

The Sacrament of Penance

The solemn reconciliation of sinners by the sacrament of penance was still, in the fourth century, a function reserved to the bishop, as were solemn baptism on Holy Saturday and the consecration of chrism on Holy Thursday. St. Jerome says this in connection with the case of Fabiola; and the Council of Carthage (418), in its third canon, forbids simple priests to consecrate the chrism as also to reconcile anyone solemnly.[120] Furthermore a distinction must be made in the penitential procedure, according as there is question of very grave sins (*graviora*) or lesser sins (*leviora*). In the case of all these sins the Church granted reconciliation after a variable penance.[121]

[117] St. Cyril, *Catechetical Lectures,* XXI, 35–37.

[118] *Peregrinatio Silviae,* no. 133.

[119] St. Cyril, *op. cit.,* XXI, 35–37.

[120] Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive,* I, 164.

[121] In 385 Pope Siricius imposed a perpetual penance upon apostates. This is the only known instance of perpetual penance.

For very grievous faults, such as idolatry, homicide, and fornication, as a rule a penance was imposed, called plenary penance. This was the penance imposed on Fabiola after her fall. St. Jerome describes it as follows:

"As a public confession of her sin, she determined to wear sackcloth. In sight of all Rome, before Easter she took her place among the penitents outside the Lateran Basilica. With disheveled hair, with her head, face, and hands smeared with ashes, with tears flowing from her eyes, she bowed her head beneath the discipline of the Church in the presence of the Pope, the bishops, and the entire people. . . . She disclosed her wounds to everybody. It was not without tears that Rome looked at the signs of her grief marked upon her pale body so thin from fasting. She appeared with rent garments and bare head. She did not enter the church of the Lord, but stayed without the camp, separated from the others, like Moses' sister Mary, waiting until the priest who set her without should bid her return." [122]

This solemn penance, ordained and presided over by the bishop, for the expiation of great sins, constituted, at the end of the fourth century, a Holy Thursday ceremony, as solemn baptism was a Holy Saturday ceremony. But, just as along with solemn baptism there existed private baptism, so too, besides the public penance, a private penance was possible. It was intended for less grievous sins. It was administered by priests specially delegated for the purpose with the title of "priests penitentiary."

The historian Socrates relates that "during the persecution under Decius the bishops added to the ecclesiastical canon a presbyter of penitence in order that those who had sinned after baptism might confess their sins in the presence of the presbyter thus appointed." [123] This priest was chosen from

[122] St. Jerome, Letter 73, no. 2.

[123] Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History,* V, 19.

those who excelled in their morals, their discretion, and their wisdom. Says Sozomen: "It was his office to indicate the kind of penance adapted to each sin and then, when satisfaction had been made, to pronounce absolution." [124]

But in 396, after the scandal produced by the solemn confession of a woman in high station, who thought it her duty to reveal to the public the grievous sin of a deacon, her accomplice, the patriarch of Constantinople, Nectarius, suppressed the office of priest penitentiary in his diocese. This event influenced the general reorganization of the penitential discipline. Public confession was more and more relinquished. In the absence of the priest penitentiary, the faithful, for the absolution of their sins, turned to any priest they chose, from whom they received their penance. Yet the priests penitentiary continued in Italy and several other parts of the West,[125] where the ancient rules of penance were preserved, while they were relaxed in the East.

[124] Sozomen, VII, 16. Does the word ἀπολύειν, which Sozomen uses, mean that this priest absolves the penitent straightway, or that he postpones the absolution until the penance is performed, or that he refers the matter to the bishop, or that he leaves it to God to absolve? All these opinions have been held. It seems to us that the most likely is the view which, as held by Vacandard and Harent, "regards the absolution of the priest confessor as having the quality of really forgiving the sin." (Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 161.) But it is to be noted that "the Fathers of the first centuries seemed to regard penance in the ensemble of the ceremonies that composed it, leaving to future theorists the task of assigning to each element its particular power." (*Ibid.*) Hence the Fathers' vague expressions, some of which do not seem quite in agreement with our present theory, but none of which expressly contradicts it. See Vacandard, *Le Pouvoir des clés et la confession sacramentelle,* in the *Revue du clergé français,* 1898 and 1899; Batiffol, *Étude d'histoire et de théologie positive,* I, 145–195; Bondinhon, *Sur l'histoire de la pénitence,* in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* II, 306 ff., 496 ff.; Harent, *La Confession,* in the *Études,* LXXX (1899), 577 ff.; Funck, *Bussdisciplin,* in Welzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon.* On the question of the reconciliation of heretics, see Galtier, *Absolution ou confirmation? La réconciliation des hérétiques,* in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* May–June, 1914, pp. 201–235.

[125] Batiffol, *Les Prêtres pénitenciers romains au V^e Siècle,* in the *Compte rendu du 3^e congrès scientifique des catholiques,* Brussels, 1895, *Sciences religieuses,* pp. 277–290.

Extreme Unction

The evidence we have cited in relating the history of the first three centuries, and numerous patristic testimonies that may be found in special works,[126] sufficiently explain the disciplinary development of the administration of the sacrament of penance. No Protestant now holds that confession was introduced in the thirteenth century by Pope Innocent III. But some still claim that the sacrament of extreme unction dates only from the Middle Ages.[127] They cannot deny that the first Christians, for the solace of their diseases, made use of anointing with blessed oil. Evidences in favor of this practice are abundant both in the East and in the West.[128] And it is likely that anointing with blessed oil was practiced from those early times, outside the sacramental rite, as an exercise of purely personal and private devotion.

But the existence of the sacramental rite, strictly so called, performed by the priest and, as its effect producing grace, is attested by evidence that is beyond dispute. The so-called *Canons of St. Hippolytus,* which, according to the view of most scholars, are previous to the fourth century,[129] speak of a liturgical ceremony performed by the bishop upon the sick

[126] Cambier, *De divina institutione confessionis,* pp. 96–333. Recent works on the penitential discipline are inclining scholars to discard the notion of two parallel penitential institutions, one public, the other secret, functioning concurrently, at the choice of those concerned. "There was but one Christian penance, but it moved in complex circumstances and did not consist exclusively of what we call public penance. This latter is merely the most apparent and most rigid part, consequently the better known part of what was a single thing." This is the conclusion reached by D'Alès, *L'Édit de Calliste,* appendix 3 on the *Élément privé dans l'ancienne pénitence,* p. 454. Cf. Galtier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et la confession,* in the *Recherches de science religieuse,* I, 209 ff., 313 ff.

[127] V. G., Puller, *The Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition.*

[128] Ruch, art. *"Extrême-Onction,"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 1942 f.

[129] Cabrol, *Introduction aux études liturgiques,* pp. 11 f.; Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 534.

(canons 199, 200).[130] The *Apostolic Constitutions,* which give the practice of the fourth century, speak of a prayer which the bishop said over water and oil to accord to these elements "a power to restore health, to banish demons, and to disperse all snares." [131] *The Anaphora of Serapion* and the *Testament of the Lord* [132] give the text of this prayer, by which the bishop asks God to grant "by this oil good grace and remission of sins."

These testimonies seem conclusive. In a period when as yet the language did not clearly express the distinction between the sacraments with secondary ceremonies and the practices of private devotion, the vagueness of other patristic texts is easily explained. Notwithstanding this vagueness, the anointing of the sick for the remission of sins appears as a clearly defined rite in the fourth century. As St. Chrysostom,[133] following Origen, speaks of this rite in connection with the familiar text of St. James about the anointing of the sick there is no doubt but that he is there considering the sacrament of extreme unction, instituted by Jesus Christ.[134]

Sacrament of Matrimony

The liturgy of matrimony surrounded this sacrament with gracious and expressive ceremonies. Says Dom Cabrol: "In this the Church showed a delicate and judicious eclecticism. Some of the ceremonies she adopted were current among the Gentiles; she excluded only such of them as had a gross and impure character. She kept the veil, the ring, even the crown.

[130] For the text of these canons, see Duchesne, *op. cit.,* 525 ff.

[131] *Apostolic Constitutions,* VIII, 29.

[132] *Testamentum Domini* (Rahmani ed.), I, 48 f.

[133] St. Chrysostom, *Priesthood,* III, 6. Cf. Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae,* VII, 256 f.

[134] For further development of this subject, see Ruch, art. *"Extrême-Onction,"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* V, 1931–1952. To deny the probative value of the liturgical texts, Puller has to gratuitously suppose their interpolation.

And for the blessing of these different articles, she had prayers expressive of their symbolic character." [135] The ring was blessed with these words: "Bless, O Lord, this ring, that she who wears it in marriage may keep herself in Thy peace and may grow old in Thy love." Over the crown the priest said this prayer: "May this handmaid of God, N., be crowned for the servant of God, N. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The long prayer which the priest recites today for the bride and groom after the *Pater Noster* goes back to the first centuries.[136] The marriage ceremony concluded with a liturgical litany sung alternately by the deacon and the choir.

"Let us pray to the Lord in peace," said the deacon.

"Lord, have mercy," responded the choir.

"Let us pray to the Lord for the peace of this bride and groom, and for their salvation."

"Lord, have mercy."

"Let us pray for the peace of the whole world; let us pray for the prosperity of the Churches of God; let us pray for the union of all."

"Lord, have mercy."

Liturgical Development

The peace, salvation, and union of all in the charity of Christ are the dominant notes that resound through the whole Catholic liturgy. But the fourth century marks a very important period in the development of the liturgical life. Three chief innovations are to be traced to that period: 1. the distinction between two sorts of liturgy, one for the faithful in general, the other for the ascetics and virgins; 2. for

[135] Cabrol, *Le Livre de la prière antique,* pp. 446 f.

[136] It is found in the earliest liturgical books given by Martène, Gerbert, and others.

this latter group, the organization of a daily psalmody service; 3. a profound change in ecclesiastical psalmody.

The Canonical Hours

When we read the ascetical sermons of the Fathers of this period, two facts stand out conspicuously. First, the preachers complain that many of the faithful are neglecting the religious exercises, even those celebrated on Sunday with special solemnity. Secondly, they note with joy the formation of groups of more zealous people who, without leaving the world, promise by a sort of vow to remain chaste all their life, to fast all week long, and to pray every day.

"These consisted of men and women alike, living in the world, and without severing themselves from the ties and obligations of ordinary life, yet binding themselves by private vows or public profession to live in chastity all their life, to fast all the week, and to spend their days in prayer. They were called ascetics and virgins. They formed, as it were, a confraternity without a hierarchy and without organization, a connecting link between clergy and laity. While not as yet cenobites, they were already regulars." [137]

Their promises about chastity and fasting did not necessarily call for special organization. But the daily prayer to which they bound themselves and which, in the spirit of the Church, tended to become a collective prayer and did soon become so, required regulations. The basis for such rules was easily found. The piety of Christians had long since attached religious memories to certain hours of the day. The third hour (nine o'clock in the morning) was that of the Savior's condemnation; the sixth (noon), that of His crucifixion; and the ninth (three o'clock in the afternoon), the hour of His death. When the public clocks indicated these hours, fervent

[137] Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, p. 11.

Christians recollected themselves and prayed.[138] From this pious practice the ascetics made a rule for themselves. It was the origin of their daily offices: tierce, sext, and none. They took their night offices (vespers and lauds) from the ancient custom of vigils. On the eve of Sundays, of the martyrs' anniversaries, and of station days, the Christians, meeting either in the churches or in the cemeteries where the martyrs' bodies rested, recited public prayers, with the clergy presiding. These prayers were called vespers, nocturns, and lauds, and these designations became fixed and approved. The corresponding offices were celebrated by the ascetics, not merely on Sundays and feast days, but every day. Such was the origin of what later came to be called the canonical hours.[139]

A Spanish pilgrim visiting Jerusalem about 385 has left us a detailed description of the daily service celebrated in the great church of that city, the Anastasis.[140]

This is how she describes the celebration of the daily vigil, *i. e.,* of matins and lauds.

"Every day before cockcrow all the doors of the Anastasis are opened, and all the monks and virgins, as they call them here, go thither, and not they alone, but lay people also, both men and women, who desire to begin their vigil early. And from that hour to daybreak hymns are said and psalms are sung responsively, and antiphons in like manner; and prayer is made after each of the hymns. For priests, deacons, and monks in twos or threes take it in turn every day to say prayers after each of the hymns or antiphons. But when day breaks they begin to say the Matin hymns. Thereupon the bishop arrives with the clergy, and immediately enters into the cave, and from within the rails he first says a prayer for all, men-

[138] Tertullian, *De jejunio,* 10.

[139] For more detailed treatment of these beginnings, see Batiffol, *op. cit.,* and Baümer, *Histoire du breviarie* (French trans.).

[140] We refer to the author of the *Peregrinatio Silviae,* who, according to the conclusions of Dom Férotin, was not St. Silvia of Aquitania, but a Spanish virgin, named Etheria.

tioning the names of those whom he wishes to commemorate; he then blesses the catechumens, afterwards he says a prayer and blesses the faithful. And when the bishop comes out from within the rails, every one approaches his hand, and he blesses them one by one as he goes out, and the dismissal takes places by daylight." [141]

The following is her account of the offices of sext and none.

"At the sixth hour all go again to the Anastasis, and psalms and antiphons are said while the bishop is being summoned; then he comes as before, not taking his seat, but he enters at once within the rails in the Anastasis, that is in the cave, just as in the early morning, and as then he again first says a prayer, then he blesses the faithful, and as he comes out from within the rails every one approaches his hand. And the same is done at the ninth hour as at the sixth." [142]

In the description of vespers we also note the singing of psalms by all the faithful, and the prayer said by the bishop alone. But between the psalms and the prayer a short litany is inserted. It is said by a deacon, and the responses are made by the children.

Psalmody

In this description of the liturgical day, the devout pilgrim frequently speaks of psalm singing. Ecclesiastical psalmody had undergone a notable transformation since the peace of the Church.

[141] The liturgical part of the *Peregrinatio Silviae* is quoted by Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 492 ff., 547 ff.

[142] *Ibidem,* p. 548. The *Peregrinatio Silviae* makes no mention of Terce. But from other sources we know that the prayers of Terce were said before the celebration of mass. As for Prime, Cassian assigns it a rather prosaic origin. He says that an office was placed at sunrise to stimulate the morning rising of certain monks who used to awake only at the hour of Terce. (Cassian, *Collationes,* III, 4.) The Compline prayers were also monastic, devised to close the day with psalmody, since Vespers took place before the evening meal. Thus were formed all the parts of the divine office.

"The description of it is given by St. Augustine when speaking of St. Athanasius: 'He caused the reader to use such slight inflections of the voice, that he seemed to say the psalms rather than to sing them'; such was the most ancient method. But if a chant of this kind sufficed to fix the attention of a congregation of limited numbers, closely packed together, and to fill a small church, such could not be the case when there was a great crowd of people in a vast basilica. In congregations which St. Ambrose compares to a tossing and murmuring sea, there was need for a chant of greater power—powerful itself as the sound of mighty waters. There is no more solo singing: the whole congregation takes part in the chanting, being arranged in two choirs.

"More than this, the antiphonal chant manifests itself all at once as a melody of varied and pathetic character. The psalm-chant, having begun by being a simple recitative, assumed the form of an elaborate piece of music. When St. John Chrysostom became bishop of Constantinople, he introduced music into his church, giving the direction of the choirs into the hands of a eunuch of the Empress' household, holding some such position as the chief musician of the court. . . . The primitive simplicity of psalmody was no longer suited to the pomp of Christian worship in its triumph. Christian art of every sort was budding forth: architecture, painting, ceremonial. For these new multitudes of the faithful there was needed the attraction and the prestige of a powerful and ornate choral music, on a level with the eloquence of a St. John Chrysostom or a St. Ambrose." [143]

The Liturgical Week

Like the order of the liturgical day, that of the liturgical week became more precisely fixed in the fourth century. *The Pilgrimage of Silvia* tells us that, throughout the year, Wednesday and Saturday were fast days, even for catechumens, at least if the feast of a martyr did not fall on one of those

[143] Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary,* pp. 19–23.

days.[144] *The Testament of the Lord,* which belongs to this same period, informs us that Sunday rest was then everywhere definitely substituted for that of the Sabbath. And from other sources we learn that the Sunday rest had been sanctioned, since the days of Constantine, by several official decisions. By virtue of several laws enacted by Constantine, Theodosius, and the two Valentinians, on Sunday all military service was suspended,[145] all court trials and business ceased, even in case of suits for the collection of public debts,[146] and all theatrical performances were forbidden.[147] In cities the work of laborers was obliged to stop, but the same prohibition did not yet apply to laborers in the fields. The wretchedness and suffering consequent upon the wars and various other calamities seemed to justify this exception.[148] Moreover on Sunday it was lawful to perform whatever referred to the emancipation of slaves. For all, even those who did not share the Christian faith, the Lord's Day was a day of rest, recollection, and joy.

For Christians it became more and more the center of the week, the liturgical day preëminently. On Sunday the people not merely attended mass, but sang the psalms of the vigil with great solemnity. This office paralleled the office sung by the ascetics. The *Pilgrimage of Silvia* gives us a vivid description of this Sunday Office. "On the seventh day," she says,

"that is on the Lord's Day, the whole multitude assembles before cockcrow in as great numbers as the place can hold, as at Easter, in the basilica which is near the Anastasis, but outside the doors, where lights are hanging for the purpose. And for fear that they should not be there at cockcrow they come beforehand and sit down there.

[144] Duchesne, *op. cit.,* pp. 501, 555

[145] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* IV, 18, 19.

[146] *Theodosian Code,* VIII, VIII, 1–3; XI, VII, 10–13.

[147] *Ibid.,* XV, V, 2.

[148] This right of the peasants to labor every day continued until the ninth century. Cf. Pargoire, art. *"Argia,"* in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 2810.

Hymns as well as antiphons are said, and prayers are made between the several hymns and antiphons, for at the vigils there are always both priests and deacons ready there for the assembling of the multitude, the custom being that the holy places are not opened before cockcrow. Now as soon as the first cock has crowed, the bishop arrives and enters the cave at the Anastasis; all the doors are opened and the whole multitude enters the Anastasis, where countless lights are already burning."

"This office," says Cabrol, "seems not to correspond to any of the liturgical parts now in use." [149] Duchesne considers it a vestige of the gathering which, in the first centuries took place on Sunday nights and on station days. This office, arranged with a mass, may have been subsequently combined with that of matins. Whether or not we accept this conjecture, we know that, after the people had entered the church, a priest, a deacon, and a simple cleric each in turn recited a psalm, followed by a prayer. The censers were then lighted and the basilica was filled with their fragrance. The bishop was handed the Book of Gospels and from it read the account of the Savior's resurrection. After the singing of a final psalm and the reciting of a final prayer, the bishop withdrew. The ascetics alone remained in the basilica and sang psalms until daybreak. Some well-disposed members of the laity, men and women, joined with them.

The Liturgical Year

At the close of the fourth century, we see the liturgical year enriched with a large number of new feasts, all grouped in the Christmas cycle and the Easter cycle.[150] In that period, the feast of our Lord's nativity, which had been celebrated in

[149] Cabrol, *Étude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae,* p. 51. The passage is quoted in Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 543.

[150] Cf. H. Kellner, *L'Année ecclésiastique* (French trans.).

the East on January 6,[151] and in the West on December 25, came to be solemnized everywhere on the latter date. The feast of January 6, keeping the name of Epiphany (Manifestation), recalled the adoration by the Magi, our Lord's baptism, and His first miracle at the marriage feast of Cana. The feasts of St. Stephen (first martyr), St. John the Apostle, the Holy Innocents, and the Circumcision centered about the great solemnity of Christmas.

On Epiphany the clergy determined and announced to the people the date of the movable feast of Easter. This latter feast was preceded by a period of fasting, which varied in different places. In general the purpose was to imitate the Savior's forty days' fast. But the Eastern Christians, who did not fast on Sundays or Saturdays, prolonged this period for eight weeks so as to complete the number of forty days.[152] The liturgy of Lent at first was inspired by the single idea of penance. In the fourth century it was also dominated by the idea of preparation for baptism, which was conferred solemnly on Holy Saturday, and by the idea of preparation for the public reconciliation of sinners, which took place on Holy Thursday.[153]

Our present liturgy preserves remarkable traces of this ancient idea. Thus, all the prayers of Laetare Sunday—antiphons, responses, and lessons—have been chosen to celebrate the joy of the catechumen called by baptism to light and holiness; and the rite which today takes place for all the faithful on Ash Wednesday is merely a part of the ceremony in which, at the beginning of Lent, the public penitents took part, with

[151] Vailhé, *Introduction de la fête de Noël à Jérusalem,* in the *Échos d'Orient,* VIII (1905), 212–218.

[152] *Peregrinatio Silviae,* in Duchesne, *op. cit.,* pp. 499, 554.

[153] On the origin of Lent, see Salaville in the *Échos d'Orient,* XIII (1910), pp. 65–72; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* I, 549 note; Vacandard, art. *"Carême,"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* II, 1728.

ashes sprinkled on their head as a sign of humiliation and mourning.

The week before Easter (Holy Week or the Great Week) was a time of stricter penance. The offices were longer and more solemn, and contained lessons suited to the reconciliation of those great days.

The Easter liturgy was resplendent with the memory of Christ's resurrection and the joy of the newly baptized who, upon coming out of the baptismal font, dressed in white,[154] and went in procession from the baptistery to the basilica amid the acclamations of the people. The next days, that is, until Saturday *in albis,* when the baptized wore their white garments for the last time, and even the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, were considered as a continual feast.

Thus the memory of Christ's birth, death, and resurrection, in combination with the various stages of Christian life (baptism, penance, and reconciliation) celebrated by singing, spectacles, and supplications, penetrated the souls of Christian peoples and rescued them from the unwholesome influences which so many centuries of idolatry had exerted upon pagan society. The pious pilgrim of Jerusalem, whose valuable testimony we have already recorded, relates that, at the most impressive moments of the offices, when the ceremonies and singing recalled, for example, the death or resurrection of Christ, sobs burst forth and mingled with the liturgy with such emotion that "there is none who does not lament more than can be conceived." [155]

The cult of the martyrs, of the saints in general, and especially of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, received a

[154] A reminder of the newly baptized who laid aside their white garment on Saturday *in albis,* is found in the present-day response of Saturday in the octave of Easter: *"Isti sunt agni novelli, qui annuntiaverunt, alleluia: modo venerunt ad fontes, repleti sunt claritate, alleluia, alleluia."*

[155] *Peregrinatio Silviae,* in Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 566.

considerable development in the fourth century. In reply to the objections of pagans, Manichaeans, and other heretics, who attacked these devotions, the Church Fathers determined to show the difference which the Church held between the cult of *latria,* or adoration due to God alone, and the cult of *dulia,* or the homage due to those who, after being our models in this life, have become our protectors in heaven. St. Ambrose, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Augustine often preached on this subject.[156] In the time of Constantine, the Church of Constantinople gloried in the possession of the relics of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and St. Timothy.[157] Abuses occurred even with regard to relics, so that Theodosius had to forbid trafficking in them.[158]

At the same time the cult of the Blessed Virgin kept its place above that of all the saints and even above that of the angels.[159] It grew as the general devotion took on new developments in the liturgy. Two causes in particular contributed to this magnificence of devotion to Mary. There was, first, the increase in the number of communities of virgins, who naturally placed themselves under the patronage of the virgin Mother of Christ. Then there was the theological work of the Fathers, which more precisely determined the Blessed Virgin's part in the work of Redemption.[160]

The Monastic Life

The places of retreat, whence the ascetical and liturgical life derived its particular growth and vigor, were the monas-

[156] St. Ambrose, *De viduis,* chap. 9; St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations,* 24; St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum,* XX, 21.

[157] Theodore, *H. E.,* II, 61 f.

[158] *Theodosian Code,* IX, XVI, V, 2; XVII, 1.

[159] Lehner, *Die Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrhunderten.*

[160] St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures,* XII, 15, 29; St. Chrysostom, *Homilia in santum Pascha,* on Psalm 44, no. 7; St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Poems,* I, 2.

teries. There, too, it cannot be denied, the strangest abuses were encountered.

The number of monks had greatly increased in the East since St. Pachomius. In 372, Egypt alone counted almost a hundred thousand of them. And now they were to be seen, not only in the deserts, but in the very cities, where they mingled with the people in a way that was at times indiscreet. Two men there were who tried to lead them back to the primitive austerity of their rules: Eustathius of Sebaste and St. Basil. No contemporary raised the least question as to the incorruptible virtue of Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and the earnestness of his zeal in combating abuses. These qualities gave him great influence which he used to gather about him disciples whom he trained in strict asceticism. Clothed in tatters, like beggars, they fled from whatever gratifies sensuality, and embraced the oddest practices of mortification. Unfortunately the very excess of these practices and Eustathius' relations with the Arian party endangered the success of this reform, which was denounced by the Council of Gangra in 340.[161] More fruitful was St. Basil's reform. As we have already seen,[162] all he required of his monks was the curtailment of superfluities in matters of dress, food, and dwelling, constant vigilance, obedience to even the smallest prescriptions of their rule, and especially a perfect renunciation of their own will. The rule of St. Basil became for the East what the rule of St. Benedict later became for the West.

Basilian monks wore a sleeveless linen tunic, called a *colobium,* and a goat-skin cloak, called *melotes* or *pera.*[163] They practiced absolute poverty, working with their hands, shunning idleness as the most dread of vices, meditating on the

[161] Hefele, II, 326 ff.

[162] See *supra,* p. 247.

[163] Cassian, *De institutis cenobiorum,* I, 5; Rufinus, *Lives of the Fathers,* chap. 3; St. Jerome, *Introductio ad regulas Pacomii,* 4.

words of Scripture, and devoting themselves to contemplation. The monks who adopted this rule practiced open hospitality, welcomed pilgrims, gave lodging to poor people ruined by war or famine, and taught them labor by example. The fame of their holiness attracted great personages to them for advice. The secular clergy felt the happy influence of their rugged virtues. Their hours of prayer were exactly regulated. To them the Church owes the introduction of the prayers of prime and compline. And by them the cycle of the office would acquire its perfect harmony.

In 340 St. Athanasius, who was a refugee in Rome, there made known the cenobitical life as practiced by St. Antony. St. Eusebius of Vercelli, St. Ambrose, and St. Jerome made the first attempts to cultivate it. St. Martin of Tours was its propagator in Gaul, and St. Augustine, at the beginning of the fifth century, introduced it in Africa. The institution of the ascetics and the virgins had already prepared people for the practice of the monastic rule. In the fifth and sixth centuries they developed in the West with great brilliancy, but not without struggles. Already, toward the close of the fourth century, a Roman monk, Jovinianus, a Spanish priest, Vigilantius, a Roman layman, Helvidius, and a bishop of Sardica, Bonosus, had bitterly criticized the practices of the monastic life. But St. Jerome's mighty dialectics refuted their doctrines and Pope Siricius condemned them. The monks themselves, in concert with the secular clergy, were able to continue their work of regeneration in the midst of the Greco-Roman world then decaying.

Christian Life

This task was one of the heaviest the Church ever had to perform. True, with Constantine and Theodosius, the power of the State was officially placed at the service of the Church.

Constantine was called "the defender of the holy canons"; Valentinian, Gratian, and Theodosius took St. Ambrose for their adviser. But, while her means of action were enlarged, the Church saw her task growing.

"I am confident," said Constantine, "that, if I should succeed in bringing all men to adore the same God, this religious change would bring about a change in the Empire." [164] He was right, if by "adoring God" he meant that men should conform their whole life to their belief. The Christian basilicas were full of people, the pagan temples were empty. But a kind of official paganism persisted in the public institutions. The selling of children and even of adults was still practiced in the time of St. Basil. Woman did not yet have her due position in the family. The plague of slavery continued. Immoral and cruel entertainments still sullied the public festivities. Criminal justice was administered with inhuman harshness, and a perpetual wretchedness kept alive a constant incitation to revolt. From the Christian pulpit bishops and priests forcibly pointed to the abuses. Aided by the monks and the laity and sustained by the Christian rulers, they labored effectively to abolish these abuses.

From the beginning of the century, the Church, in her councils, imposed severe penalties on the criminal practices used by parents to rid themselves of their children.[165] But so hard were social conditions for the poor and so deep-rooted were the customs sanctioning such cruelties that in St. Basil's time these sights were still to be seen. The eloquent Bishop of Caesarea depicts a poor wretch pursued by the Treasury or by his creditor and seeking some expedient. "Money? He has none. A piece of furniture he might sell? His furniture is merely that of the poor. He has nothing to sell except his children. Witness the struggle between hunger and paternal

[164] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* II, 65.
[165] Council of Elvira, canon 60; Council of Ancyra, canons 20, 21.

love. He decides, then revokes his decision, and finally yields. . . . But which of the children will he sell? One of them, or two? What will the others think of him, suspicious that he may some day betray them in a like manner? Sell all of them? How could he any longer live in the house thus made empty by his own act? How could he sit at table, with its ample supply of food bought at such a price?" [166]

Emperor Constantine, Valentinian I, and Valentinian II tried to cure the evil by laws.[167] The remedy vainly sought for in the laws the Church alone found in the heart of her faithful, in the promises made in God's presence. Christians gather in the abandoned children and pledge themselves, at the foot of the altar, to bring them up as their own children if the parents who abandoned them do not reclaim them within a certain time. This practice was made definite and official and was regulated by a council held about the middle of the fifth century.[168]

The Church was also at pains to fortify the child against the pagan influences it would encounter in the public schools. In 376, after Emperor Gratian had given cities the right to choose their teachers of grammar and rhetoric,[169] many Christian schools were started. Following the method so eloquently set forth by St. Basil,[170] these schools sought to derive from the study of the great writers of antiquity not lessons in voluptuousness, but solely models in the art of speaking.

[166] St. Basil, *Homilies on St. Luke,* XLI, 4. Cf. St. Ambrose, who translates St. Basil, *In Tobiam,* 9–11, 16–20, 23 f.; St. Augustine, *On Marriage and Concupiscence,* bk. I, chap. 17 (*alias* 15).

[167] *Theodosian Code, De parricid., Ad legem com., De patribus qui filios, De infantibus expositis.*

[168] First Council of Vaison (422), canon 9. On Christian legislation about the *alumni* and abandoned infants, see art. *"Alumni,"* in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* I, 1301–1305.

[169] *Theodosian Code,* XIII, II.

[170] St. Basil, *On the Way to Read the Profane Authors.*

Condition of Women

We may say that the civil emancipation of woman was almost a debt which Christianity paid her. During the persecutions great numbers of women gave an example of wonderful courage. Since the peace of the Church numerous virgins and widows had been devoting themselves to the service of charity. Yet, according to Roman law, motherhood established nothing more than a simple bond of natural right, which the civil law did not confirm. The old jurisprudence assimilated the mother, in the government of the family, with her own children. She was in the position of their sister before the all-powerful paterfamilias of ancient Rome. Constantine merely gave her a tutelary right. Justinian for the first time proclaimed that the mother is legally her children's parent.[171] Happily the Church did not wait for these legal reforms before honoring woman as being the equal of man. The patrician noblewomen whom Jerome associated with his labors, by the lofty culture of their minds no less than by the virtues of their lives, showed that they were deserving of the honors which Christianity accorded their sex.

Slavery

The strife of Christianity against slavery was long and arduous. The moral and economic consequences of slavery were disastrous, directly in conflict with the principles of the Gospel. It resulted in the lowering of wages, in the almost complete crushing of the free workman, and in the stopping of all industrial progress. Considered in its moral aspect, it likewise debased both servant and master: the servant was reduced to the condition of a beast of burden, of a being without rights or duties; the master was puffed up in his pride and

[171] *Justinian Code, De successione liberorum.*

in his indecent and cruel caprices by the unrestrained power given him over human creatures. But in the fourth century, slavery was still a public institution on which, for ages past, all society rested, in the Empire and outside it.

It would have been perilous all at once to free the millions [172] of men who formed this pitiable caste. To lessen the rigors of slavery, to facilitate the individual emancipation of the slaves and inspire them with the just sense of their dignity, were the only feasible means. And these means the Church used simultaneously. In the matter of slavery, a difference can be observed between the language of the Latin Fathers and that of the Greek Fathers. The former did not deny in principle the lawfulness of the institution, understood in the sense of a hereditary servitude; [173] but they wanted the rights of Christian conscience to be always respected and the servant to be treated as an equal, a brother. St. Augustine said: "There are masters, and there are slaves; the words are different. But there are men and men; the two words are identical." [174] With the Greek Fathers the distinction between master and slave was not an empty word,[175] it was a wicked distinction,[176] the name of a crime against the natural law. St. Gregory of Nyssa, for example, declares: "How can you, a man yourself, call yourself the master of another man? . . . Do you say you bought him? Pray tell me, what price did you find that could equal the value of a man? At how much did you evaluate reason? How many oboli did you give for the image of God?" [177]

[172] Both Pompey and Caesar boasted of having sold or killed three million men. In three days Cicero obtained the equivalent of $400,000 from the sale of prisoners.

[173] St. Ambrose, *De Joseph patriarcha,* chap. 4; Letters 37–77; Ambrosiaster, *Commentarium in Coloss.,* IV, 1; St. Augustine, *City of God,* XIX, 15.

[174] *"Sunt domini, sunt et servi; diversa sunt nomina. Sed homines et homines; paria sunt nomina." In psalmos,* 124: 17

[175] St. Chrysostom, *De Lazario,* VI, 8.

[176] St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Poems,* XXIII, 133–140.

[177] St. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Ecclesiasten,* fourth homily.

Monasticism and Slavery

Fiery words like these were of a sort to hasten the movement of the emancipation of slaves. Monastic life, too, was a no less eloquent sermon to the same effect. The Basilian monasteries, according to their rule, offered asylum to slaves imperiled by the immorality or cruelty of their masters.[178] As St. Augustine said, "Not to admit them is a heavy sin." [179] Many of these slaves thus lived in the monasteries, mingling with personages of the highest rank, sometimes with their former masters, working in common, on a footing of perfect equality with them.[180] St. Ambrose even broke up the vessels of his Church and sold them to redeem captives.[181] The devout laity followed like impulses. We have numerous examples of wealthy Christians freeing their slaves out of regard for the dignity of man and the image of God, or to obtain some grace,[182] or to seek pardon for their sins.[183] The most famous example is that of the Roman lady of senatorial rank, St. Melania, freeing eight thousand slaves at one time.[184]

A law enacted some time after 367 notably ameliorated the lot of the slaves. "It forbids the selling of rural slaves without the sale of the estate to which they are attached.[185] In fact, the Christian emperors had felt the necessity of maintaining a sufficient agricultural personnel in the country.[186] At that

[178] St. Basil, *Regulae fusius tractatae,* 11.

[179] St. Augustine, *De opere monach.,* 25.

[180] Rampolla, *Santa Melania giuniore,* p. 222.

[181] St. Ambrose, *Duties of the Clergy,* bk. 2, chap. 28.

[182] De Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana,* 1874, p. 59.

[183] Le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule,* no. 374; vol. II (1865), p. 6.

[184] Goyau, *Sainte Mélanie,* pp. 90–93. See other examples in Allard, *Les Esclaves chrétiens,* p. 338.

[185] *Justinian Code,* XL, LXVII, 7.

[186] Accarias (*Précis de droit romain,* I, 97 ff.), G. Boissier (*Revue des Deux Mondes,* March 1, 1882), and Lacour-Gayet (*Antonin le Pieux et son temps,* p. 263) either deny or greatly lessen the credit belonging to the Christian emperors in the

time there were two classes of slaves: the city slaves, whose legal status was not changed and who continued to be sold as chattels; and the rural slaves, who thereafter could not be alienated without the land to which they were legally incorporated, and who became what the legal terminology called fixtures. Owing to economic circumstances, this law was an immense advance in the condition of a category of slaves forming the most numerous portion of the servile population. To this provision we can trace the origin of serfdom, which gradually became an intermediate state between slavery and freedom." [187]

The Theater

The comedian of ancient Rome was not really a slave. Yet few forms of servitude were more humiliating than his. "The theater was the most lively, the most ardent, the last passion of the Roman people. They continued to be pagans on the seats of the amphitheater when they were not so anywhere else. They clung to their actors as to the last remnant of the old Roman grandeur. To gratify this desire, the emperors did for the theatrical profession what they did for so many others: they made it compulsory. The actor, the comedienne, nay more, the actor's son and the comedienne's daughter were obliged to undergo the infamy until death. They had to dance on the stage or sing indecent songs or perform the obscenities of the thymele,[188] each according to his specialty, until their very last breath, however great might be their weariness or shame or disgust or remorse.[189] One day a comedienne fled

abolition of slavery. For the refutation of their assertions, see Allard, *Les Esclaves chrétiens,* and art. *"Esclavage"* in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique,* I, 1479–1482.

[187] Allard, art. *"Esclavage"* in the *Dictionnaire apologétique,* I, 1481.

[188] The *thymele,* in the Greek theaters, was a square platform in the middle of what we call the orchestra. There the *chorus* performed and the acting took place.

[189] St. Augustine, *De fide et opere,* 30.

from the theater and became a religious. The city prefect claimed her with armed force and besieged the convent that tried to shield her.[190] Another time the Emperor, in the exercise of his omnipotence, thought he might free some comedians of Carthage. The people, thus robbed, protested. The Emperor yielded and commanded that the unfortunate victims be subjected to the yoke a second time." [191]

The Church Fathers exhausted their eloquence against this passion for the circus, the mimes, and the amphitheater.[192] As in the case of the fugitive slaves, the Church received the comedians who escaped from the theater and offered them the bread of her alms.[193] She obtained the enactment of a law by which no comedian, after becoming a disciple of Christ, would be compelled to return to the stage.[194] Later laws extended the same benefit to the daughters of comedians if they were baptized, and even to pagan women whose conduct was upright.[195] But not until Emperor Leo do we see this principle proclaimed, that no woman, slave or free, could be enrolled in a theatrical troupe against her will.

Criminal Law

There was another remnant of ancient inhumanity. It seemed irradicable and resisted the repeated efforts of the Church. We refer to the criminal law. The sight of condemned persons tortured by the cross, the sword, the wooden horse, or the iron claws, was a spectacle which the people were very fond of. "Everything was against Christian gentleness: the populace, accustomed to the spectacle of torture; the

[190] St. Chrysostom, *On St. Matthew,* homily 67; *P. G.,* LVIII, 657.

[191] Champagny, *La Charité chrétienne dans les premiers siècles de l'Église,* pp. 228–231.

[192] St. Chrysostom, *On St. John,* homily 1.

[193] St. Augustine, *loc. cit.*

[194] *Theodosian Code, De scenicis,* 4, 8, 9.

[195] *Ibidem.*

judges, who regarded it as the guarantee of society; the whole pagan hierarchy of public prosecutors and palace officials; the rulers themselves, Christian though they were, who were too much imbued with the maxims of imperial despotism. When their power was threatened, it would seem that their faith left them. We have Constantine putting excessively rigorous penalties in his code; Constantius ascending the throne by putting his father's nephews to death; Theodosius signing the decree of proscription against Antioch and Thessalonica.

"Against this tenacious tradition of ancient harshness, the Church offered all the treasures of Christian clemency; against pagan inhumanity she offered what we might almost call an excess of mercy, a mildness that seemed to go beyond the limits of justice." [196] St. Ambrose and St. Martin refused to renew the bonds of communion with the bishops who contributed to the death of Priscillian. Some bishops even applied the same sanction to any judge who imposed a death sentence. To one magistrate who questioned him on this point, St. Ambrose replied:

"Many too abstain of their own accord, and are commended, nor can we ourselves but praise them, although we so far observe the Apostle's rule as not to dare to refuse them communion. . . . You will be excused if you do it, and praised if you do it not." [197]

"A bishop," writes St. Augustine, "detests the crime, but pities the man. The Lord intervened for the adulterous woman. Thus has He laid upon us the duty of intervening." [198] Constantine abolished three kinds of punishment: the combat in the arena, branding on the forehead, and execution on the cross. Valens, Valentinian, and Theodosius moderated the

[196] Champagny, *op. cit.*, p. 238.
[197] St. Ambrose, *Epistola ad Studium*, VI, 51 f.
[198] St. Augustine, Letters 50, 127, 158.

prison regulations. Among prisoners the two sexes were separated; a regular inspection was established over the regime of those imprisoned. Negligence by a judge was punished with exile, and a jailer's barbarity to a prisoner was subject to the death penalty.

The Right of Asylum

One of the priceless victories of the Church over the cruelty of the criminal law was the right of asylum. Even in pagan antiquity the magistrates halted at the threshold of the temples to which criminals had fled. Soon to the Christian churches there flocked the persecuted, the accused, the condemned, insolvent debtors, fugitive slaves. The clergy let them stay, but did not guarantee them safety nor claim a right to break the law, but tried to make it bend. The bishop or priest in charge of the church, taking a refugee under his temporary protection, had time to inquire, and to negotiate in his behalf. If he were a victim of political wrath, they obtained a sworn promise that his life would be respected. If he were a fugitive slave, they interceded with his master. If he were a debtor crushed by misfortune, often they paid his debts. We have a touching letter of St. Augustine asking the loan of seventeen bags of gold to pay the debt of one of these protégés of the Church. Little by little the office of "defender of the city," conferred upon bishops, gives them a real civil and criminal jurisdiction and, by a steady influence, introduces principles of equity and mercy even into secular justice.

The cause of many evils of that period was poverty; and the principal cause of poverty was idleness. A free man considered manual labor beneath his dignity; and as slaves labored only through fear, their labor was not very productive. Pliny said: "The earth is reluctant and indignant at being tended in such a manner as this . . . by slaves whose legs are

in chains." [199] The example of the labor of monks, clergy, and true Christians, working with their hands, elevated the idea of manual labor. But, while waiting for the fruit of these examples, something had to be done about the urgent destitution. The Church did not falter in this duty.

The first form of ecclesiastical assistance was hospitality. The monastery door, as also that of the bishop's house, was always open to the traveler. This hospitality was not blind. It had its rules and, in a way, its etiquette, which may be seen in the Apostolic Constitutions. The bishop or the head of the monastery, after reading the newcomer's letters of recommendation, treated him according to his needs, his deserts, and his dignity.[200] We know, from the testimony of St. Augustine,[201] St. Jerome,[202] and other fourth century writers, that this hospitality was often a heavy burden.

Some bishops, in order to fulfil this duty more adequately, erected special buildings, as St. Basil did.[203] Thus were founded the *xenodochia,* or pilgrims' hospices, in charge of a priest, more often a monk, who, having come from the desert, bore a closer resemblance to his guests. We find *xenodochia* at Constantinople, Bethlehem, Amasia, and on the coasts of Italy. *The xenodochium* was a sort of motherhouse of all the charitable institutions: the *nosocomium,* or hospital for the sick, the *orphanotrophium* for orphans, the *brephotrophium* for foundlings, the *gerontocomium* for the aged, and the *ptochotrophium* for the poor in general. From St. Jerome we know about the wonderful foundations of Fabiola, the wealthy patrician who we see, to the great amazement of high Roman society, collect the poor sick abandoned in the Forum, with her own hands bathe their sores which others were reluctant

[199] Pliny, *Natural History,* XVIII, 4.
[200] *Constitutio apostolorum,* II, 58.
[201] St. Augustine, *Sermons,* 49; Possidius, *Vita Augustini,* 22, 23.
[202] St. Jerome, *In Ezechielem, Epistolae* 13, 17.
[203] See supra, p. 252.

even to look at, and take such delicate care of them that these poor wretches became an object of envy to people who were quite well.[204]

Those without time or means to engage in these outward works, could at least aid them with alms. Such gifts, made as donations or legacies, in money or in kind, must have been very abundant, because the amount spent by the Church in charity was immense. For example, the Church of Constantinople, in the time of St. John Chrysostom, fed three thousand poor people whose names were in its register, besides a multitude of prisoners, of sick people in its hospitals, and of strangers in its hospices.[205] The administrator of all these works was always the bishop, but his juridical position at the close of the fourth century was quite differently defined from what it had previously been.

Episcopal Administration

Before the fourth century, Church property was owned by individuals, who placed it at the service of the community. Since then it had become the property of the body of Christians, who held ownership as "colleges" or religious corporations. The legal representative of these associations was the bishop.[206] But such a legal situation was not in agreement with the Christian notion of the Church. The Church is the mystical body of Christ, a holy institution founded by Jesus Christ upon the pope and the bishops. As such it is not a simple

[204] St. Jerome, Letter 30.

[205] St. Chrysostom, *On St. Matthew,* homily 66; *P. G.,* LVIII, 630.

[206] Legally the management of church property belonged to the bishop; and during the fourth and fifth century this legal right was always exercised. (Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Église,* VI, 509; Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II, 520.) But, in this management, the bishops were aided by deacons and priests, from whom they received reports. In the East, beginning in 451, the bishops entrusted this management to treasurers chosen from the clergy. (Thomassin, *op. cit.,* pp. 511, 515, 519 f.)

aggregation of the faithful. It is their mother, their fatherland, constituted for them, but not by them. In the course of the fourth century, legal expressions used by the Christian emperors finally and imperceptibly brought civil legislation into accord with ecclesiastical law. At the end of this development, Church property could be called not only, as it had been previously, the goods of the poor, the goods of God, but also the goods of the Church in the strictest sense which Christian speech attached to this word.[207]

Thus the growth of charity, the splendor of public worship, and the purity of doctrine advanced hand in hand. After less than a century of freedom, the dogma of the Church had withstood the attacks of the most perfidious heresies, piety expressed itself in magnificent and impressive ceremonies. In all sections of the Empire the charity of Christ had begun, against pagan egoism, the great strife that would decide the progress or decay of civilization in the world.

[207] See Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France,* pp. 1–3.

PART III

The Church Freed from the Empire

CHAPTER I

From the Death of Theodosius the Great to the Coming of Valentinian III (395–425)

FROM Constantine to Theodosius, despite almost ceaseless anguish and strife, the Church continually grew stronger in her dogma, her worship, and her discipline. In the midst of the Empire, which was breaking up under the tumultuous inrushing tide of barbarians, the Church remained the only power left. Unhappily, various influences accentuated the disagreements existing between the East and the West. The Eastern rulers, accustomed to interfere in religious affairs, more than once sustained the dissenting parties. Hence arose new inner disturbances which ended in a lamentable schism.

The partition of the Roman world, effected by Theodosius between his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, was for both Empires (Eastern and Western) the beginning of a rapid and definite decline. Arcadius, to whom fell the government of the East, was only eighteen years old. Honorius, who had to undertake the government of the West, was not yet eleven. Arcadius had a weak character. During the thirteen years of his reign he was dominated successively by the Gascon Rufinus, the eunuch Eutropius, the Gothic general Gainas, and the Empress Eudoxia. All of these strove to gratify their own ambitions, their personal interests, or their grudges. Theodosius II, Arcadius' son and successor, was sincerely religious; but his good qualities were merely those of a private individual and did not rise to the greatness of his task. The young Honorius never advanced beyond childhood during the eighteen years of his reign. For his guardian he had the

Vandal general Stilicho. This latter, a capable warrior, succeeded in restraining the barbarians for a while. But, suspected of betraying the cause of Rome and for this reason condemned to death, he left the Empire with no defense against the enemies from without.[1]

The Barbarian Invasions

Yet the two Empires were never in greater need of active, military rulers. Emperor Theodosius had hardly closed his eyes when the barbarians crossed the frontiers. Arcadius helplessly witnessed the ravaging of the finest provinces of the East by the Goths. Alaric, their chief, then led them to the West, took Rome by assault, and sacked it. Like Stilicho, he was one of those barbarian auxiliaries who, after entering the service of the Empire, often excelled Roman generals in military skill. They filled the ranks of the legions. Those who did not turn against their masters, as Alaric did, became the emperors' guardians, like Rufinus and Stilicho, and the result was the same.

Were it not for the disastrous state of the public finances in addition to the disorganization of the armies and the impossibility of reviving the old patriotism in the masses, the decline of the two Empires might have been, if not arrested, at least retarded. But the Treasury was ruined. The taxes, advanced by decurions, who afterward at their own risk and peril sought to reimburse themselves from the taxpayers, weighed heavily upon the people without enriching the State. The whole class of freemen, which formerly constituted the heart and center of the Roman people, scarcely existed any more in the country districts. A great number of small landowners, ruined by countless burdens and obligations, had been reduced to cultivating the lands of the great as *coloni,* and

[1] On these events, see Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs* (1701 ed.), V, 419 ff.

little by little fell into a state bordering on serfdom.[2] "The name of Roman citizen, once not only much valued but dearly bought, is now voluntarily repudiated and shunned, and is thought not merely valueless, but even most abhorrent." [3]

These are the words of Salvianus. Again and again we see the barbarians enter some populous city without meeting any resistance, the inhabitants being in such a state of discouragement that they no longer cared to defend themselves.[4] We see even Romans and Greeks seeking a refuge among the barbarians, preferring to live free among them that submit to the oppression of the imperial officials.[5]

This brief glance at the political and social situation of the two Empires will help to a better understanding of the importance and difficulty of the mission the Church undertook after the death of Theodosius.

Pope St. Anastasius

At the coming of Arcadius and Honorius, the see of Rome was still occupied by Pope Siricius. We are not acquainted with any document of this Pope which shows him taking an active part in the great political events of his time. We possess only a few of his letters, and these indicate that he was concerned, as at the outset of his pontificate, with the maintenance of order in the small details of the administration of the sacraments and of the life of the clergy.[6]

At his death, which occurred November 26, 398, the people and clergy of Rome chose as his successor the Roman Anastasius (Anastasius I), who occupied the Apostolic See three

[2] Fustel de Coulanges, *Colonat romain,* in his *Problèmes d'histoire.*

[3] Salvianus, *On the Government of God.* V, 5.

[4] *Ibid.,* V, 8.

[5] *Ibid.,* V, 5.

[6] See Jaffé, I, 41 f. (nos, 262–272), and *P. L.,* XIII, 1129 f., 1164; XVI, 1282; XXII, 1093; XXIII, 471; XXX, 485; LI, 588.

years and ten days. The *Liber pontificalis* says "he decreed that, during the reading of the Gospel, the priests should stand with bowed heads, he addressed a constitution to the Church, he built the Crescentian Basilica in Rome on Via Mamertina, and, when alarmed by the large influx of Manichaeans into Rome, he decided that no priest should any longer be admitted to ecclesiastical communion unless he presented a letter of recommendation signed by five bishops." The constitution mentioned by the *Liber pontificalis* is unknown. The Crescentian Basilica has not been positively identified, but certain ruins discovered on Via de Marforio between the Forum and Piazza Venezia are probably those of the church referred to. Despite what is said in certain editions of the *Liber pontificalis,* the testimonial letters spoken of concerned ecclesiastical communion or communication, and not ordination.[7] Pope Anastasius' letters show him in correspondence with the East and West, regulating cases of discipline about offerings made to bishops, and exercising his authority in the Origenist and Donatist disputes.[8]

Pope St. Innocent I

Anastasius' successor, Innocent I, was born at Albano. During the fifteen years of his pontificate he exerted even more effective influence in the great events of the universal Church. He interposed his supreme authority in the Pelagian controversy. Besides this intervention the official notice about his pontificate mentions the constitutions he addressed to the universal Church about Jews and pagans. We see his zeal against the heretical communities in Rome.[9] Several decretals of this pope are preserved. In the matter of general discipline

[7] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 218 f.
[8] Jaffé, I, 42 f. (nos. 273–284).
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 48 (no. 318).

the most important are addressed to Victricius bishop of Rouen,[10] Exuperius bishop of Toulouse,[11] the bishops of Illyricum,[12] Decentius bishop of Eugubium (Gubbio),[13] and Felix bishop of Nocera.[14]

Pope St. Zosimus

Pope Zosimus, Innocent's successor, reigned one year, three months, and eleven days. We possess his famous *Tractoria* against Pelagius, and his important disciplinary regulation about ordinations.[15] At his death a schism suddenly broke out. Probably it can be attributed to the abusive interference of the civil power in ecclesiastical elections. We know its details from official documents discovered and published by Baronius.[16]

Pope St. Boniface

On Friday, December 17, 418, after the obsequies of the dead pope, a mob, led by the archdeacon Eulalius and some members of the clergy, suddenly broke into the Lateran Basilica, drove out the priests there assembled for the election according to the regular procedure, and chose Eulalius himself as Bishop of Rome. But the evicted clergy presently met in another church, where they conferred the supreme authority upon the Roman priest Boniface, an old man who was venerated by all. Eulalius had on his side Symmachus, the prefect of Rome, who made every effort to win the Emperor's support for the usurper. But the electors of Boniface pleaded

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 44 (no. 286).
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 45 (no. 293).
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 46 (no. 303).
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 47 (no. 311).
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 47 (no. 314).
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 50 (no. 339); *P. L.*, LVI, 571.
[16] Baronius, *Annales*, years 418, 419. Cf. *P. L.*, XVIII, 397–406.

their case so forcefully that Honorius, after inquiry, declared himself against Eulalius. The audacious antipope, surrounded by his followers, barricaded himself in the Lateran Basilica. The use of armed force was required to dislodge him. Two days later (April 10, 419) the lawful pope was solemnly installed in the Pontifical See amid unanimous applause. The next year, when Boniface fell seriously ill, some ringleaders tried to stir up a fresh outbreak, but the Emperor's timely action prevented the uprising. In his oratory dedicated to St. Felicitas, Boniface put up an inscription attributing the success of his cause to that glorious martyr. It read:

"Si titulum quaeris, meritum de nomine signat;
Ne opprimerer dux fuit ista mihi."

We have letters of Boniface to the bishops of Gaul. From these it is evident that his sovereign supremacy extended over the episcopate of the whole world.[17] He also exercised his authority in the dispute raised by Pelagius.[18]

Pope St. Celestine

Pope Celestine was a native of Campania. According to St. Augustine,[19] he was elected unanimously immediately after the death of Boniface. At the very beginning of his pontificate he had to take a hand in a knotty question affecting the authority of the Roman See, an affair which regrettable misunderstandings rendered very confused. An African priest, Apiarius, who had been excommunicated by his bishop in Pope Zosimus' time, appealed his case to the Bishop of Rome. Did he have a right to do so? For the pope and for the bishops of Italy, Gaul, and Spain, the answer would be unquestionably

[17] Jaffé, I, 53 f. (nos. 349, 359). Cf. p. 53 (no. 350).
[18] *P. L.*, XX, 271.
[19] St. Augustine, Letter 209 (to Celestine).

that he did. The canons of Sardica, which had been joined to those of Nicaea and were even regarded as an integral part of the latter, were explicit about the right of appeal to the Roman pontiff. But when the latter invoked the canons of Nicaea, the Africans, who were not acquainted with the canons of Sardica, protested, even basing their contention on the Council of Nicaea. Celestine, resuming Zosimus' procedure, called up the case of Apiarius. But this priest was really guilty. A Council of Carthage (424) convicted him of the charges made against him. We have not Celestine's reply to the notice sent him by the Council of Carthage. It is certain, however, that Apiarius' appeal to the pope did the priest no good; he was guilty, not of appealing to the Supreme Pontiff, but of doing so in behalf of a bad cause.

These were the pontiffs who followed each other in the see of Rome from the death of Theodosius to the coming of Valentinian III. During this time Augustine, contending against Pelagius, illumined the most difficult problems of theology with the clearest light that had shone in the world since St. Paul; and Chrysostom, at the zenith of his fame, filled the East with the sound of his eloquence. Neither Siricius, Anastasius, Innocent, Zosimus, nor Boniface could lay claim to the genius of Chrysostom or Augustine. Yet, whenever there was need of settling a dispute or of ending a conflict, it was not to Chrysostom or Augustine, but to the Roman Pontiffs that rulers and people turned. It was before their doctrinal decisions that the genius of Augustine bowed.

Origenist Controversy

The state of disorder following the death of Theodosius favored many disturbances. In the Church three major disputes soon overshadowed all the others: the Origenist con-

troversy, in which St. Jerome and St. Chrysostom engaged, and the Donatist and Pelagian disputes, in which St. Augustine became especially active.

After Jerome's renunciation of the world, among the friendships he formed none was warmer or purer than that which bound him to Rufinus, a young priest of Aquileia. When he was ill in the Chalcis desert, he wrote to Rufinus, saying: "If only the Lord Jesus Christ would suddenly transport me to you as Philip was transported to the eunuch, and Habacuc to Daniel, how closely I would embrace you." [20]

A common love of solitude and the sacred sciences united these two souls. With the same earnestness they studied the writings of Origen, and in that study found a source of satisfaction for mind and heart. Jerome wrote: "Is not Origen the teacher of the Churches, after the Apostles?" [21] But Jerome's enthusiasm for the Alexandrian doctor later grew cool, and his sharp and positive mind was shocked at the singularity of certain of Origen's ideas, for instance, his opinion regarding the preëxistence of souls and other questions incautiously raised by him.[22]

Origen, during his life, was gentle and peaceful. But he was destined, after his death, to divide those who had recourse to his immense work. In the complex, profound, and daring thought of that powerful mind, each one instinctively chose what was agreeable to his own moral or doctrinal temperament. Whereas Epiphanius of Salamis and Eustathius of Antioch charge Origen with being a promoter of heresy, Gregory Thaumaturgus and Gregory of Nyssa glorify him as a master.

[20] St. Jerome, Letter 3 (to Rufinus); *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 4.

[21] *Idem, De nominibus hebraicis,* Preface.

[22] *Idem,* Letter 84 (to Pammachius and Oceanus); *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 175 ff.

St. Jerome and Rufinus

Jerome and Rufinus were separated by profound differences of character, that were not perceived in the first enthusiasm of youthful friendship, but were brought to light by time and circumstances. Jerome was ardent, sincere, spontaneous, vehement to the point of rudeness; Rufinus was polite but selfish, somewhat rigorous, extremely sensitive to offense, and ever ready to reply thereto with cold irony or clever sophistry. Jerome was the more violent; Rufinus, the more bitter.

Both men were free from worldly trammels, both nourished their souls on the Scripture, both were then living in Palestine where the Savior had left the trace of His footsteps and the echo of His peaceful words. At the very beginning more than one disagreement about details were evident between the two friends, yet their sincere piety allayed every danger of disunion between them. But, from 394 onward, various successive events led to a painful rupture between these two zealous defenders of the Church.

The first of these events was the arrival in the East of an obscure monk named Aterbius,[23] who held the anthropomorphist errors spread in some monasteries of that period.[24] Attributing a human form to God, the anthropomorphites particularly abhorred Origenism, with its exegesis that excessively spiritualized the meaning of Scripture. Upon learning that Origen was being studied in the monasteries of Palestine, Aterbius indignantly presented to the Bishop of Jerusalem a denunciation of Jerome and Rufinus, the two leaders of the cenobitical life in Palestine. Rufinus and John, the young bishop of Jerusalem, over whom Rufinus already had great influence, would not deign to take notice of the denunciation by an unauthorized monk. But Jerome, who was

[23] *Idem, Adversus Rufinum,* III, 23.
[24] Cassian, *Coll.,* X, 3.

not a man of cool calculation, was stung by the calumny and forcefully repelled the charge so far as it concerned him. This move was at least imprudent. Rufinus regarded it as a cowardly desertion and communicated his impression to the Bishop.

At this juncture Epiphanius came to Jerusalem. Ever on the watch in his Island of Cyprus, at the first report of an Origenist movement in Palestine he resolved to see for himself the extent of what he considered a supreme danger to the Church. In his eyes Origenism was a caprice in exegesis, it was an undermining of the fundamental doctrines about the origin of man and the future life. At Eastertime the old warrior, with the halo of sanctity, made his entry into the Holy City, in the midst of a throng that pressed about him, eagerly seeking his blessing and tearing off pieces of his garments to keep as relics. The Bishop of Jerusalem invited him to speak to the people assembled in the Anastasis church. Epiphanius preached, raising his voice against those who falsified the Scriptures and altered the dogma of the Church, in a word, against the followers of Origen. The evening of that same day, Bishop John ascended the pulpit and stigmatized those who, perhaps with the purpose of making the idea of God more exact, represented Him as having eyes, ears, and arms. As yet neither Rufinus nor Jerome was involved. But, in reality, the issue was their teaching and their monastic communities.

The opposition became more definite when the Bishop of Salamis, after taking leave of Bishop John, went to Bethlehem to Jerome, to whom he was bound by former relations. The break became public when Epiphanius, upon returning to his monastery of Ad, wrote to John, calling on him to condemn the theories of Origen, and to Jerome and his monks, warning them of the Origenist sympathies of their Bishop John.

Paulinian

Jerome hesitated to break with his own bishop and negotiated with the Bishop of Salamis. But the latter, when in his monastery at Ad near Eleutheropolis, one day received Jerome's brother Paulinian, who had been sent as negotiator, and settled the whole matter by ordaining Paulinian almost by force. Paulinian, once he was a priest, could procure for the Bethlehem monks all the religious helps which they had been obliged to ask of the Jerusalem clergy, because a holy awe always kept Jerome and his friend the priest Vincent from exercising the sacred functions. Epiphanius thought he was not at all infringing upon the rights of the bishop of Jerusalem by performing a sacerdotal ordination in a monastery over which Bishop John could not claim to have any rights. But such was not the view of Bishop John, who forbade the priests at Bethlehem to admit into the Church of the Nativity or into the Grotto anyone who regarded Paulinian as a priest. The doctrinal dispute thus became a conflict of jurisdiction. Jerome obtained reassurance from the thought that he remained in communion with Gelasius of Caesarea, the metropolitan of Palestine.[25] Paula and her convents followed Jerome's line of conduct. But Melania was won by Rufinus and joined the side of the Bishop of Jerusalem. This desertion affected Jerome deeply and he could not hide his feelings; he said in a letter: "Her name bears witness to the blackness of her perfidy." [26]

Thus far the civil authorities had not entered into the affair.

[25] It is certain that the see of Jerusalem, as the Council of Nicaea (canon 7) declares, enjoyed a "succession of honor"; but not until the first half of the fifth century was it made a patriarchate. The ecumenical Council of Chalcedon was the first to grant it the government of the three provinces of Palestine. (Hefele, III, 355, 382.)

[26] St. Jerome, Letter 133, no. 3 (to Ctesiphon). *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 274. "Melania," in Greek, means "black."

At Bishop John's request, the praetorian prefect, whose name was also Rufinus and who had been told the Bethlehem monks were schismatics, then took a hand in the matter and issued a decree of banishment against Jerome. But the decree was not carried out because of the invasion of the Huns and the fall of the prefect. But the result was to embitter men's minds. St. Jerome wrote:

"It is a monk, shame to say, who menaces monks and obtains decrees of exile against them; and that too a monk who boasts that he holds an Apostolic chair. But the monastic tribe does not succumb to terrorism. Is not every monk an exile from his country? Is he not an exile from the whole world? Where is the need for the public authority, the cost of a rescript? Let him but touch me with his little finger, and I will go into exile of myself." [27]

What Jerome demands is that the question be referred to higher ecclesiastical authority. He says:

"It is decreed in the canons of the Council of Nicaea that Caesarea is the metropolis of Palestine, and Antioch of the whole of the East. You ought therefore either to appeal to the bishop of Caesarea or . . . letters ought rather to be addressed to Antioch." [28]

But John and Rufinus preferred to address the Bishop of Alexandria, Theophilus. He was a friend of both of them. As head of the Church of which Origen was the glory, he did not venture to repudiate the great Alexandrian. It could not then be foreseen that some day Theophilus would accuse of Origenism the venerable monks known under the name of Tall Brothers, and their protector Chrysostom. For the moment, the Patriarch and the priest Isidore, his special envoy, at first showed themselves hostile to Jerome, whom they regarded as a rebel against his bishop. But the dauntless hermit defended

[27] St. Jerome, Letter 82, no. 10 (to Theophilus). *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 174.
[28] *Idem,* To Pammachius against John of Jerusalem, 37. *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 444.

himself and appealed to the authority of Epiphanius against what he considered the manifest error of Origenism as maintained by the Bishop of Jerusalem. He expressed his willingness to accept the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Caesarea or the metropolitan of Antioch or the Bishop of Rome. Epiphanius, in fact, did take the case to Pope Siricius. Finally, when Melania intervened with Rufinus, and Paula with Jerome, a reconciliation took place between the two venerable priests. On the feast of Easter, 397, they extended their hands to each other at the altar in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in the presence of the Bishop of Jerusalem, who revoked the prohibitions he had issued against the Bethlehem monks. It seemed that permanent peace had come. But it did not last long. Somewhat later the conflict between Jerome and Rufinus began again, more bitter and stubborn than ever.

Nepotian

At the very height of the strife which put him at odds with his bishop and with his former friend, Jerome received a hard blow from one whom he cherished with particular affection. One of his closest friends, among the companions of his first journeys, was Heliodorus whose nephew Nepotian was endowed with the rarest virtues. While in the emperor's service, Nepotian gave the court of Theodosius an example such as Francis Borgia and Aloysius Gonzaga later gave to the courts of Charles V and Philip II. Then, renouncing the world which had never ensnared him, he consecrated himself to the ministry of the altar. On that occasion Jerome wrote him a famous letter in which the hard duties of priestly life are enumerated. In this letter we read among other things, the following admonition:

"When teaching in church seek to call forth not plaudits but groans. Let the tears of your hearers be your glory. Be not a de-

claimer or a ranter; but show yourself skilled in the deep things and versed in the mysteries of God." [29]

The letter was written in 394.

Two years later death came to the young man whom Heliodorus expected would be his successor in the see of Attino. In an eloquent letter Jerome bemoans the friend who has gone and endeavors to console the one who remains. Therein, describing the serene death of the young priest, he says:

"His countenance shone with gladness, and while all around him wept, he and he only smiled. You would have thought that he was starting on a journey instead of dying and that in place of leaving all his friends behind him he was merely passing from some to others." [30]

"This funeral eulogy, the forerunner of so many masterpieces of Christian eloquence, contains a severe picture of the evils then ravaging the world." [31] Jerome depicts the terrible invasion of the Huns, and says:

"Civil wars have made almost greater havoc among us than the swords of foreign foes." The eulogy concludes with a melancholy return to the frailty of human beings. "Let us return to ourselves," Jerome writes. "Every day we are changing, every day we are dying. The very moments that I spend in dictation, in writing, in reading over what I write, and in correcting it, are so much taken from my life. . . . Charity never faileth. It lives always in the heart, and thus our Neoptian though absent is still present and, widely sundered though we are, has a hand to offer to each." [32]

As Jerome was writing these lines, the Origenist dispute was about to revive.

[29] *Idem,* Letter 52, no. 8 (to Nepotian). *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 93.
[30] *Idem,* Letter 60, no. 13 (to Heliodorus). *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 128.
[31] Largent, *Saint Jérôme,* pp. 72 f.
[32] St. Jerome, Letter 60, no. 18 f. (to Heliodorus). *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 130 f.

Translation of the *Peri Archon*

After the Easter reconciliation in 397, Rufinus set out for Rome. There he at once made the acquaintance of a certain Macarius, "a man distinguished by his faith, his noble birth, and his manner of life." Macarius had undertaken to justify the dogma of divine Providence against the attacks of pagan fatalism, and was looking for some scholars who would furnish him with the philosophical and Scriptural documents he needed for his thesis. Rufinus seemed to him the very man he wanted. The priest of Aquileia was assuredly one of the most erudite men of his age. Macarius did not know Greek. At his request Rufinus first translated the *Apology for Origen* by the holy martyr Pamphilus, then the great philosophical work of the illustrious Alexandrian doctor, the famous *Peri Archon,* suppressing all the propositions contrary to the decisions of Nicaea. In his preface he declared this procedure was sanctioned by the example of "one greater than he," one who had thus treated Origen's homilies. Everybody saw that he was referring to Jerome. By this daring stroke Rufinus attempted to rehabilitate his favorite author and at the same time compromise his recent opponent. The step was, to say the least, ill-considered.[33]

Jerome did not repudiate his former work. That the faithful might be able to profit from Origen's sublime teaching, he had expurgated the great doctor's *Homilies*. But now the situation was quite changed. Heretics appealed to the learned Alexandrian in justification of ideas that were destructive of the Christian religion. Was this the time to glorify him by presenting him as a guiding light; especially since Rufinus, by suppressing merely the propositions contrary to the Nicene decrees, seemed to accept and adopt a multitude of other dangerous tenets?

[33] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 453.

"Does any one," says Jerome, "wish to praise Origen? Let him praise him as I do. From his childhood he was a great man, and truly a martyr's son. He greatly abhorred sensuality. Covetousness he trampled under foot. He knew the Scriptures by heart and labored hard day and night to explain their meaning. Let us not imitate the faults of one whose virtues we cannot equal." [34]

Jerome thought his best answer to Rufinus' work would be to translate Origen's *Principia* unabridged. It would be better, he considered, resolutely to make known the errors and temerities of the Alexandrian doctor. He did more than this. Bishop Theophilus, under various influences that were not all praiseworthy, had turned sharply against Origenism. Jerome took a hand in the campaign by translating the Bishop's synodal letters. Perhaps he also translated a bitter pamphlet which, according to Facundus of Hermiane, a sixth century author, was written by the Patriarch of Alexandria. Says Tillemont: "For the sake of his honor, it is something we wish were not so." [35]

Rufinus' *Apologia*

Rufinus replied by the publication of his *Apologia*.[36] In this he accuses Jerome, not only of contradicting himself, but of being, at bottom, an incorrigible defamer: a defamer of St. Ambrose, a defamer of Rome, a defamer of the Christian people, a defamer of everybody. In fine he charges that Jerome, the so-called champion of austerity, who had once sworn never again to look at profane books, was studying Virgil and Cicero in his solitude, was explaining those authors to his companions, and was thus putting the ideas of the old

[34] St. Jerome, Letter 84, no 8 (to Pammachius and Oceanus). *Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., VI, 179.

[35] Tillemont, *Mémoires, Saint Jérôme*, art. 98.

[36] *P. L.*, XXI, 541–623.

paganism into the pure souls of the children who had been confided to him to be brought up in the fear of God.

It was a clever apology. That Jerome had altered his views about Origen, that again and again he let invectives flow too readily from his pen, that he did not spare the practices of Christians or the city of Rome or such and such members of the Catholic clergy, that he used to read the classical authors of Greece and Rome in his monastic cell—all these were undeniable facts. Jerome might simply have acknowledged them and explained them, showing that they did not lead to the abominable conclusions which Rufinus claimed to draw from them.

St. Jerome's *Apologia*

Jerome preferred to answer a pamphlet by another pamphlet. Considered as a literary product, Jerome's reply, published under the title of *Apologia,*[37] is a masterpiece. Says Thierry: "Rufinus' *Apology* bears the marks of great talent; Jerome's, the stamp of genius." [38] But personalities intrude themselves too often, and the tone is too bitter. Rufinus at the close of his pamphlet said: "I hope that you love peace." Jerome ended his with these words: "If you desire peace, lay down your arms. I can be at peace with one who shows kindness; I do not fear one who threatens me."

So sharp a controversy became a scandal for the Church. Augustine, who heard echoes of it in Hippo, lamented it.[39] At the beginning, Epiphanius appealed to Pope Siricius. But great prudence was required of the papacy in this affair, in which questions of persons were mingled with doctrinal questions. To condemn Origenism would be to give free rein to the audacity of Theophilus, whose antiorigenist campaign was

[37] *Apology in Reply to Rufinus* (*Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., III, 482 ff.).
[38] Thierry, *Saint Jérôme,* bk. 9.
[39] St. Augustine, Letter 73. *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., I, 329.

dominated by human views and feelings more than it was by reasoned conviction. One day he laid hands on a venerable monk, Ammonius by name, who was guilty of giving hospitality to a proscribed priest. This occurred in 399. The same year Pope Siricius died without having made any official decision in the dispute. The following year his successor Anastasius came out clearly against Origen, his writings, and his translator.[40] Steps were then taken to get the imperial sanction of the papal decree. Origen's work was banned from the Empire, on the same ground as the works of Porphyry and Arius.[41]

Jerome, in his solitude at Bethlehem, resumed his Scriptural labors. Rufinus, driven from Italy by an invasion of barbarians, withdrew to a corner of Sicily, where he translated into Latin Eusebius' *History,* the *Clementine Recognitions,* the *History of the Monks of Egypt,* and several homilies of the Greek Fathers. He died in 410. The continued friendship of St. Paulinus of Nola for him is a homage to the sincerity of his faith. History may call him imprudent and rash; it has no right to consider him a heretic.[42]

Theophilus of Alexandria

The storm had scarcely subsided at Jerusalem when a tempest arose at Constantinople. The condemnation of Origenism by the Pope and the Emperor in 400 enormously increased, as might easily have been foreseen, the power of

[40] St. Jerome, *Letters,* 95 (Pope Anastasius to Simplicianus). *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 186.

[41] Jaffé, I, 43 (no. 281); *P. L.,* XX, 68; XLVIII, 231; Mansi, III, 943. Van den Gheyn, in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses,* IV, 5.

[42] In 408, two years before Rufinus' death, St. Jerome, who was still quivering at the recollection of Rufinus' invectives against him, wrote a description of him under the name of Grunnius (the Growler), a portrait that would not be out of place in the writings of the greatest satirists. The sharpness of St. Jerome's language calls to mind a saying of Pope Sixtus V. This pope, chancing one day to pass a picture of Jerome striking his breast with a stone, remarked: "You do well to have that stone in your hand, for without it the Church would never have canonized you."

Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria. "He now felt the whole of Egypt behind him, the whole influence of the clergy, and all the enthusiasm of the monks." [43]

A certain number of monks refused to hand over to him the books of Origen which they had in their possession, declaring that they were quite able, by themselves, to discern the true from the false. He inflicted a real persecution on them. His vengeance reached in particular four brothers of lofty stature, known as the Tall Brothers: Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius. Finally most of the resisters yielded to the terrible Patriarch by means of more or less vague compromises. But the four Tall Brothers remained irreconcilable and determined to demand to the very limit, not only peace, but justice. They set sail with fifty monks and fled to Constantinople.[44]

St. John Chrysostom

Since 398 the see of Constantinople was occupied by John Chrysostom. His election disappointed the Patriarch of Alexandria, who was hoping to put one of his own creatures in the patriarchal see. The influence which John soon acquired by his zeal and eloquence did but arouse the resentment of his ambitious rival. Soon the new Patriarch was exercising a growing influence over the community of the faithful, and even over the groups of Arians, Novatians, Jews, and barbarians who lived in Constantinople.[45] One day the imperial minister Eutropius, banished by the Emperor and pursued by a mob, found safety only by seeking refuge under the protec-

[43] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* III, 57.

[44] Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius were certainly the chiefs of the expedition. Notwithstanding Socrates (VI, 9) and Sozomen (VIII, 13), we are not sure that Dioscorus made the journey with the others.

[45] On these early days of St. Chrysostom, see Puech, *St. John Chrysostom,* pp. 115–150.

tion of Chrysostom's pulpit in the Church of Saint Sophia, where nothing but the great Bishop's eloquence was able to rescue him from the people's wrath.[46]

These very successes aroused against the fearless Bishop enmities in high places, such as the hostility of Empress Eudoxia. She was vexed at seeing him place obstacles in the way of the exactions she tried to impose for her own benefit or that of her creatures. The arrival of the Tall Brothers and their companions complicated the situation and soon gave it a tragic turn.

"Chrysostom, like so many great Christians of his time, like St. Basil, like St. Gregory Nazianzen, without sharing the peculiar doctrines of Origen, was among those who admired him. He received the Tall Brothers, but with the necessary prudence, refusing to admit them to communion before having obtained exact information from Alexandria; he only offered them an asylum within the precincts of the Church of the Resurrection. He then began negotiations with Theophilus in the hope of effecting a reconciliation, but failed utterly. The Tall Brethren then conceived the idea of addressing themselves to the Empress; they presented a petition to her, and Eudoxia immediately took their cause in hand. She induced Arcadius to convoke a synod, which was to decide concerning the accusations which Theophilus had caused to be formulated against the Origenists by monks delegated by him for the purpose." [47]

Synod of the Oak (403)

But Theophilus was on the watch. From Alexandria he followed the affair of Constantinople and prepared to step in at the opportune moment. In the spring of 403, accompanied

[46] On this occasion St. Chrysostom preached his famous sermon, on the text: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

[47] Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

by an imposing array of Egyptian bishops, the Patriarch disembarked at Constantinople and, without calling on Chrysostom, presented himself at the imperial palace and succeeded in being installed there. At the end of three weeks he gathered, in the world and at court, from people who felt themselves aggrieved by the Bishop's rebukes, a collection of evidence, of more or less verified rumors, of more or less authentic reports, that he would use in drawing up a formal accusation. Suffragan bishops who had been displeased by their metropolitan, and two deacons whom Chrysostom had deposed, took sides with Theophilus. In short, one day it was learned that in the outskirts of Chalcedon, in a rich villa known as the Villa of the Oak, thirty-six bishops were assembled in council—the Patriarch of Alexandria presiding—with the Emperor's assent, to pass judgment on Chrysostom. The so-called Council violated both legality and fairness: it violated legality, because Theophilus had no right to interfere outside his jurisdiction; it violated fairness, because he seated among the judges four bishops who were known to be personal enemies of Chrysostom and were his chief accusers. The Patriarch of Constantinople, for these two reasons, refused to appear. He also prevented forty bishops, who of their own accord took his side, from holding a separate synod. But the Synod of the Oak went ahead and, upon complaints as numerous as they were groundless, Chrysostom was condemned.[48] He was deposed from his see, and the Emperor was asked to pronounce sentence of banishment against him.

Banishment of St. Chrysostom

Three days later the Bishop, learning that he was to be taken by force and put on board a ship, gave himself up to

[48] The enumeration of these complaints will be found in Puech, *op cit.*, pp. 158 f.

the imperial officer who was appointed to make the arrest. His exile did not last long. The very next night a severe earthquake, that was felt at Constantinople, spread terror. Empress Eudoxia, frightened by what she regarded as an ill omen and also troubled by the aroused feelings of the people, who missed their pastor, urged the return of him whom she had helped to exile. The Patriarch made a triumphal entry into his city.

This was but the first act of the drama. The peace lasted only two months. To console the Empress' pride, the courtiers and ladies of the palace, in the autumn of that year (403) organized a great festival. Its principal ceremony was the inauguration of a statue of Eudoxia in a large public square of the city. Chrysostom denounced this feast vigorously. He was even accused of saying: "Again Herodias raves; she dances again; and again desires to receive John's head in a charger." [49]

This led to another campaign which Theophilus directed without leaving Alexandria. All he needed to do was to supply Eudoxia with the canonical pretext on which she might base a fresh attack upon the Patriarch. Chrysostom was charged with violating the fourth canon of the Council of Antioch (341),[50] which forbade a bishop who had been deposed by a council to resume his office. A few days before Easter (404), the Emperor had the Bishop kept under guard in the episcopal palace. On the eve of the feast, armed forces entered the church. The crowd of the faithful, having decided to celebrate the offices elsewhere, were forcibly dispersed. Blood flowed. Soon after, Chrysostom, receiving orders to go into exile, again gave himself up to the officer sent by Arcadius, and set out under a strong escort, not knowing what place of residence was assigned him.

[49] Socrates, VI, 18; Sozomen, VIII, 20. On the genuineness of the words attributed to St. Chrysostom, see Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

[50] Hefele, II, 68.

The Joannites

These measures aroused the people's indignation. Chrysostom's enemies were all among the great and rich. The common people were on his side. The bravest of his followers grouped together and organized. They were called Joannites. Eudoxia, using as pretext a conflagration that in a few hours burned down the Church of Saint Sophia and the Senate Building, had the Joannites prosecuted as being responsible for the disaster and tried to terrify them by bloody repressions. They resisted. The Empress had an old priest, Arsacius, elected to replace Chrysostom. But he governed the Church for a few months only. After his death (November 11, 405), a certain Atticus was chosen. The Joannites would recognize neither Arsacius nor Atticus. They corresponded with the exile, who still considered himself their lawful pastor. Of the letters written by St. Chrysostom during his second exile, about two hundred are extant.[51]

This correspondence is most touching. Says Villemain: "You can have no true idea of the remarkable life of that time unless you read the letters sent to all parts of the civilized world by Chrysostom, defeated, destitute, a prisoner in his desert. The violent and feeble Empire was dissolving everywhere. But Christian society, united in its dispersion, rising up merely by its own power, and stronger than all the sufferings and schisms, was animated by the same zeal in every quarter of the world. The Christian centers of the East and West felt their enthusiasm grow by the misfortunes of the eloquent pontiff. He still watched over the missions which, in the days of his power, he had sent into Eastern Gothia, Arabia, and idolatrous Persia. By his letters he sustained the

[51] The extant correspondence of St. Chrysostom contains 238 letters. Most of them are short notes. Nearly all of them were written during his second and third exile. They will be found in *P. G.*, vol. 52.

zeal of the priests evangelizing the barbarians." [52] Chrysostom's great soul is especially revealed in the seventeen letters written to a noble widow, Olympias, who had entered the order of deaconesses. The heart of the exiled Bishop poured itself out freely and appeared as tender as it was brave. Two small writings also date from this exile. One is entitled: *Nothing Can Harm him who does not Harm himself.* The other is addressed *To Those who are Scandalized by the Recent Misfortunes.*

Death of St. Chrysostom

Pope Innocent was made acquainted with the situation by Theophilus and by agents of Chrysostom. He annulled the condemnation of the Bishop of Constantinople made by the Synod of the Oak and wrote a stern letter to the Bishop of Alexandria.[53] Finally he broke off communion with all Chrysostom's enemies. Neither this decision of the Roman Pontiff, however, nor Eudoxia's death about the end of 404 made any notable change in the situation. A bitter rivalry divided the two Emperors. The barbarians kept threatening the frontiers.

Chrysostom, at first brought to the city of Cocussus (Cucusus) on the borders of Cilicia in Lesser Armenia, was conducted, at the end of 407, along the eastern shore of the Black Sea toward the city of Pithysius, perhaps in the hope that, being there so far removed, he would lose some of his tireless energy. His physical strength was exhausted. He traveled slowly. The night of September 13, which he passed in the village of Comana near which the martyr Basiliscus was buried, he heard in a dream the saint saying to him: "Take comfort. Tomorrow we will be together." The next day, after a little more than an hour's march, he fell exhausted. His end

[52] Villemain, *L'Eloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle,* pp. 200 f.

[53] Jaffé, no. 288.

was near. He asked that he be carried into the chapel built over the martyr's tomb. His last words were these: "Glory be to God for all things." [54]

Donatism

In the great conflict that had stirred the East, a conflict in which Chrysostom had just died as a victim, the doctrinal question of Origenism faded into the background and then entirely disappeared. But in the West the Donatist schism entered upon a new phase, and the Pelagian heresy was born; the former disturbed society by its uprisings; the latter insinuated itself into men's minds by its sophistry. Both of them encountered the genius of Augustine. That genius was supple and powerful enough to face both the attacks of brutal violence and the niceties of subtle dialectics.

In 396,[55] Valerius, bishop of Hippo, feeling the burden of his labors and advanced age, decided to have a coadjutor. His plan was approved by Aurelius, the primate of Africa. Once this resolve was taken, there was no doubt about the choice of the new bishop. The unanimous vote of the clergy and people named Augustine. He had been a priest for five years [56] and took his venerable bishop's place in the ministry of preaching, fought the heretics, appeared with authority in the councils,

[54] The name Chrysostom, by which we have designated the patriarch John of Constantinople, came into use in the seventh century. It is the name used for him by most historians. Not until the Council of the Lateran, in 1215 (Mansi, XXI, 991), did the Roman Church officially acknowledge the title of patriarch as belonging to the bishops of Constantinople. But in the East it was commonly given them from the time of the council of 381. Several phases that we have merely touched upon in the life and works of St. Chrysostom are more fully considered in the following works: Baur, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire;* Placide de Meester, *La Divine liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome.* Cf. Jugie, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et la primauté de saint Pierre,* in the *Échos d'Orient,* XI (1908), 5–15, 193–203.

[55] This is the date accepted by Rauscher and Rottmanner, *Historisches Jahrbuch,* 1898, p. 894.

[56] He was ordained priest in 391.

published illuminating works on timely and difficult questions, and, in his monastery near the episcopal city, led the strict life of an anchorite. Megalius, primate of Numidia, consecrated him bishop. Shortly afterwards the aged Bishop of Hippo died.

Augustine was forty-two years old. Since his conversion, patient study had made him familiar with the deepest mysteries of Catholic teaching; experience had matured him; the assiduous practice of asceticism had freed him from nearly all the weaknesses of the "old man"; his soul had lost none of its first ardor for making converts; yet it was not without alarm that he entered upon his new office.

The power of the Donatists was formidable in Africa. Their insolence was boundless. Numidia and a large part of Africa were in their hands. At Carthage they had a primate, a rival of the Catholic primate. A short time before Augustine's episcopate, a single sect of the Donatists [57] had been able to send 310 bishops to the Council of Bagai. One of these bishops was the terrible Optatus of Timgad (Thamugadi), reminding us of a Musulman marabout of later times. He journeyed through Numidia and proconsular Africa at the head of armed bands, forcing the Catholics to be rebaptized. In Hippo the Donatist clergy forbade the bakers of their sect to bake bread for Catholics. When Augustine was in the pulpit, his sermons were disturbed by the shouting that came from a Donatist chapel nearby. Sometimes as he passed along the streets, he would be insulted by some Donatist calling out: "Down with the traitor; down with the persecutor!" At times, when he would be rebuking a young man who was disrespectful to father or mother, the young man would answer him:

[57] The Donatists were by no means in agreement among themselves. They were divided into Urbanists, Claudianists, Rogatists, Maximianists, etc. On the various sects, see Bareille, art. *"Donatisme"* in the *Dictionnaire de théologie,* IV, 1710 f.

"Very well, I will become a Donatist." And he would straightway go to the sect and be rebaptized by their priests, who would find him a place in their bands of pillagers.

St. Augustine and the Schismatics

Against such excesses Augustine had previously thought the only procedure was the practice of charity. "I knew from experience," he said, "how easy it is to be mistaken." In the pulpit he declared: "Brethren, your bishop's voice begs you, all you in this church, to refrain from insulting those who are not here, but rather pray that they enter your communion." At Hippo, at Carthage, in the councils of 397, 401, and 403 he tried to have measures of gentleness and moderation adopted. He wanted especially to find out whether Christian truth, clearly explained and sincerely practiced, might not result in dissipating misunderstandings and bringing back to the Catholic religion those who had gone astray in good faith.

First he published his *Psalmus abecedarius,* a popular refutation, in rhyme, of the Donatist error. Then, in 400, he brought out his *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* in three books, and his *De Baptismo contra donatistas* in seven books. The schismatics declined to answer him. With Christian gentleness he reproached them in his three books *Contra litteras Petiliani,* which appeared between 400 and 402. Yet he provoked them to two public discussions, one oral, the other epistolary, but without success. In vain he proposed a third. His opponents answered him with insults, and their acts of violence increased. While the Bishop of Hippo was preaching peace, the Donatist bishops were preaching war.

One of Augustine's most faithful followers, his future biographer Possidius, bishop of Calama (Guelma), driven into a house by the Donatist bishop Crispinus, sustained a

siege there and barely escaped death in it. Bishop Maximian of Bagai was stabbed while in his basilica, was left for dead, and survived only by a miracle. Augustine himself very narrowly escaped death. In the course of one of his pastoral visitations, along the road where he was to pass, a band of Donatists was posted in ambush to assassinate him. Happily he took the wrong road by mistake and owed his safety to that providential error. "Meanwhile the armed Circumcellions continued to pillage and set fire to farms. They tortured the owners to extort their money. Behind them the Donatist priests invaded the property and the churches of the Catholics. Forthwith they rebaptized the coloni. Then they 'purified' the basilicas, washed the floor with great quantities of water and, after smashing the altar, sprinkled salt over the place where it had stood. The Donatists treated the Catholics like pest-ridden people. Such deeds cried out for vengeance. Until then Augustine had been averse to asking prosecution by the government. But now he had to yield to the circumstances and to the insistence of his fellow-bishops. Councils held at Carthage called upon the Emperor for exceptional measures against the Donatists, who ridiculed all the laws against heretics. When they were brought to trial, they persuaded the magistrates (who were often pagans incompetent to judge the question) that they really belonged to the only orthodox Church. It was necessary to end any doubts in the matter and once for all bring about the categorical condemnation of the schism." [58]

Emperor Honorius, informed of what was happening in Africa, showed some hesitation at first. Two severe laws were enacted in 409, then abrogated the next year, then again put in force.[59] Finally, upon request of the Catholics, who wished to make one last effort at conciliation before resorting to repressive measures, the Emperor gave the tribune Marcellinus

[58] Bertrand, *Saint Augustin,* pp. 385 f.

[59] *Theodosian Code,* XVI, v, 46, 47, 51

full power to convene Catholics and schismatics in a joint conference.[60]

Conference of Carthage (411)

The conference took place in Carthage in 411, with Marcellinus presiding. St. Augustine defined the doctrinal point of the dispute. Were they or were they not willing to acknowledge that the Church, as it exists on earth, can include sinners in its membership without losing any of its holiness; that in such case it still remains an efficacious source of sanctification, nourished by the merits of Jesus Christ? Would they or would they not acknowledge that the sacraments, duly administered in the name of the Church, have their proper efficacy, independent of the holiness of the minister conferring them, because they derive their efficacy from Christ? The Donatists, driven by Augustine's argumentation, were obliged to confess that such was the true doctrine and that they themselves had applied it in their dealings with the Maximianists. Thereupon the question was settled. Marcellinus, in the name of the Emperor, decided in favor of the Catholics' contention at all points.[61]

The logical consequence of this decision was the confiscation, to the profit of the Catholics, of all the religious edifices occupied by the Donatists, and the guilt of heresy for the latter, who were thereby subject to the penalty of prison or exile. But the Catholics, by a generous offer, probably inspired by the Bishop of Hippo, declared that every converted Donatist might retain his see, that wherever the Donatist Church alone represented whatever Christianity remained, it would not be disturbed, and that wherever two bishops (one Donatist

[60] *Idem,* XVI, II, 1.

[61] Most of the documents of this conference will be found in *P. L.,* vol. XI. See also *P. L.,* XLIII, 815–842.

and the other Catholic) would remain in the same place, the Catholic one would admit the Donatist to share the honors of the bishopric with him on condition that he would no longer assemble schismatic meetings, that he would suppress the activities of the Circumcellions, in short, that he would conform to the laws regarding heresy.

Numerous conversions resulted from the Conference of Carthage.[62] But the rage of the obstinate Donatists only increased. In the diocese of Hippo they killed a priest (Restitutus) and tortured another priest (Innocent) by plucking out one of his eyes and cutting off one of his fingers.[63] Rigorous measures were then restored. A law of 411 even punished with death those who would take part in Donatist synods. Augustine protested against the severity of the penalties inflicted. He asked that the guilty should not receive capital punishment, but should simply be deprived of the power to do harm and be granted time to do penance.[64] Yet he recognized that for many a mild repression had been a means of salvation. He himself says:

"Many have found advantage (as we have proved, and are daily proving by actual experiment) in being first compelled by fear or pain, so that they might afterwards be influenced by teaching." [65]

The Donatist leaders, by every means, tried to keep their followers from reading the writings of the Catholics and, with the force of their authority, deceived them with abominable calumnies. Fear of the imperial sanctions offset the hateful pressure of those tyrannical measures. The misled schismatics could henceforth more easily read the new writings which Augustine published to enlighten them, notably his popular

[62] St. Augustine, Letter 144 (*Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., I, 494).

[63] *Idem*, Letter 133. *P. L.*, XXXIII, 509; *Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., I, 470.

[64] *Idem*, Letters 133, 134, 139.

[65] *Idem*, Letter 185, chap. 6 (*i. e., The Correction of the Donatists*). On St. Augustine's tolerance, see Jules Martin, *Saint. Augustin*, pp. 372–388.

summary of the Conference of 411, under the title of *Breviculus collationis cum donatistis,* and his work *Contra Gaudentium,* which he brought out in 420. The previous year he held a public conference with Emeritus, one of the Donatist orators of Carthage. A report of it has been preserved.[66] The Donatist error gradually disappeared. But the error of Pelagius was already demanding Augustine's active attention.

The Pelagian Controversy

Among the men of barbarous race who were becoming more numerous at Rome in the ranks of the army, of the magistracy, of the government officials, of the clergy (Catholic and dissenting), about the year 400 there was noticed a monk of considerable stature,[67] and austere morals.[68] He was a great spiritual director who, to aid sinners abandon vice and to lead the good on the path of perfection, appealed to the invincible strength that free will gives us. This monk was the center of a pious circle that called him, from the name of his native country,[69] Brito (the Britain), or the Man of the Sea, the Sailor, Pelagius. His real name was Morgan. Marius Mercator [70] declares that Pelagius obtained his doctrine from a certain Rufinus, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia. But this view is much disputed.[71] It is simpler and truer to consider Pelagius as the representative of a tendency rather common in the West in his day.

The pagan spirit, stripped of its idolatrous beliefs and cere-

[66] *Sermo ad Caesareensis ecclesiae plebem Emerito praesente habitus; P. L.,* XLIII, 689–698.

[67] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* III, 145.

[68] St. Augustine, *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins,* III, 1; Letter 186; *Retractations,* II, 23.

[69] St. Prosper, *Carmen de ingratis;* St. Jerome, *In Jeremiam,* bk. 1, preface; bk. 3, preface.

[70] Mercator, *Commonitorium,* 1 f.

[71] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, bk. 2, part 2, chap. 6.

monies, continued under various forms, of which Manichaeism and Pelagianism were the most significant aspects. In the one case man is considered the plaything of two irresistible forces to which he must simply abandon himself without incurring the burden of any responsibility; in the other case he is regarded as the supreme master of his destiny through the choice of his independent will. In both cases, it is still pride. In vain did Christian revelation show in man a will free and responsible, but subject to the supreme authority of God, without whose help it can do nothing profitable for salvation. The pagan tendencies entered the Church itself and became heresies. The Manichaean error, which for a time seduced Augustine's soul, met particular obstacles in the West. Pelagius set himself up as the foe of Manichaean determinism. His doctrine, then, was presented to the Roman world as a revival of Stoicism. It found secret accomplices. They professed to believe in the divinity of Christ, in the Church, in the totality of Catholic dogmas and ceremonies, but they kept their pride to accomplish their salvation by themselves.[72]

Pelagius possessed a vigorous, quick, and acute mind.[73] He accomplished at the same time his labors as spiritual director and the composition of several books. He published, one after the other, a treatise *On the Trinity,* a *Liber capitulorum* or collection of religious texts, a *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul,* and possibly a work *De indurationе cordis Pharaonis,* which was discovered only a few years ago.[74] But it was not from his hand that the exposition of Pelagian doctrine came. Perhaps he merely gave it its general inspiration. The

[72] Cicero said: "It is universally agreed that good fortune we must ask of the gods, but wisdom must arise from ourselves." The *Nature of the Gods,* III, 36. St. Jerome considered that the Pelagian errors had their source in the doctrine of the Stoics. (Letter 133, to Ctesiphon; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 272.)

[73] St. Augustine speaks of his *ingenium fortissimum, celerrimum et acutissimum.*

[74] This treatise was discovered by Dom Morin. See *Revue bénédictine,* XXVI (1909), 163.

spreading of the error and probably its systematic exposition were the work of a former lawyer who, as soon as he made acquaintance with Pelagius' ideas, became their zealous propagator. He was called Caelestius. Contemporaries speak of him as an earnest, daring, loquacious man, and, if not out and out mendacious,[75] at least rather free with the truth.[76]

Grace and Free Will

To justify the ascetical doctrine of his master, Caelestius boldly suppressed two traditional dogmas of Catholicism: the dogma of original sin and the dogma of grace. According to him, every man is born with the integrity of his nature and powers. The first man sinned only for himself alone. Nothing of his sin passed on to his descendants, unless his bad example which, if one insisted, might strictly speaking be called the original sin. According to Pelagius and Caelestius, man thus created could, by his own power and without the aid of divine grace, attain supernatural life and win the kingdom of God, unless we are willing to call grace the ensemble of Christ's teaching and examples, or this free will, this spontaneity which God has granted to man without antecedent merit on his part. From these two principles Caelestius derived the following consequences: that the effect of baptism is not to blot out a sin or to free us from a penalty, but solely to affiliate us with the outward society of Christians; secondly, that the Church is nothing more than the society of the just,[77] and that our prayers to God for our brethren or for ourselves are useless. He also held that bodily death is not the consequence of origi-

[75] *"Incredibili loquacitate,"* says Mercator, *Liber subnot.*, preface, 4.

[76] *"Iste mendacior, vel certe liberior,"* says St. Augustine, *On Original Sin,* chap. 13 (*alias* 12); *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., V, 241.

[77] According to Pelagius, a venial sin or even a simple imperfection suffices to exclude one from heaven and from the Church. Since all perfection is possible to man, it is of obligation. Like the Stoics, Pelagius recognized no distinction between precept and counsel. See Harnack, *Précis de l'histoire des dogmas,* p. 285.

nal sin, and that Adam would have died even if he had not transgressed God's command.[78]

Augustine did not wait for the first manifestations of Pelagianism before he expressed his ideas about free will, original sin, and grace. As well as Pelagius and Caelestius, and with a power and intensity of feeling that few men have equalled, he affirmed the existence in man of a free will by which, between the contrary solicitations of good and evil, man becomes master of his destiny. No one ever experienced a deeper feeling of the malice of sin, or remorse for sin. But, in his view, what makes sin is free will. "What the soul naturally does not know," he wrote in 390, "or what naturally it cannot do, is never imputed to it as a sin." [79] "Who made the devil? Himself; it is not his nature but his sin that made him a devil." [80] But this clear view of free will did not prevent Augustine from noting the existence of the two great powers that contend for man's heart: concupiscence, the fruit of original sin, and grace, the gift of God. In his book *De Genesi,* he conceived original sin as a consequence of Adam's pride; in his *De diversis quaestionibus* he declares, with perfect exactness, that "by original sin human nature sinned in the earthly paradise." [81] Yet he never forgot the powerful solicitations of divine grace, without which "no man can even seek God." [82] In his *Confessions,* published in 400, he writes: "Lord, give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt, *Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis.*" [83] But the moral attraction of

[78] On these doctrines, see St. Augustine, *De Haeresibus, in fine.* Cf. *Idem, On the Grace of Christ,* chaps. 7, 41. *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., vol. V.

[79] *De libero arbitrio,* bk. 3, chap. 22, no. 64. This work was written sometime between 388 and 395.

[80] *De Genesi contra Manichaeos,* bk. 2, chap. 28, no. 42. This work was written at Tagaste sometime between 388 and 390. Cf. Jules Martin, *Saint Augustin,* pp. 207 ff.

[81] *De diversis quaestionibus,* q. 66, no. 7.

[82] *"Deum nemo quaerit, nisi admonitur." Solil.,* bk. 1, chap. 1, no. 23. The *Soliloquies* was written in 387.

[83] *Confessions,* bk. 10, chap. 29.

grace, acting upon man, did not in any way, according to him, lessen man's power of action. Quite to the contrary. As he himself says later: "They are acted upon that they may act, not that they may themselves do nothing. *Aguntur ut agant, et non ut ipsi nihil agant.*" [84]

The whole subject of his *Confessions* is the drama of man's free will set in motion by solicitations from above and by those from below.

"Too late came I to love thee, O thou Beauty, both so ancient and so fresh, yea too late came I to love thee. And behold, thou wert within me, and I out of myself, where I made search for thee. . . . I tasted thee, and now do hunger and thirst after thee; thou didst touch me, and I even burn again to enjoy thy peace." [85]

It was at Rome, upon hearing a bishop quote Augustine's words, "Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt," that Pelagius, according to his own statement, protested for the first time against a doctrine that he considered destructive of free will.[86] The dispute, however, did not break out just then. The taking of the city in 410 by Alaric's forces obliged the two heresiarchs to flee. They went to Africa, where Caelestius remained. Pelagius then set out for Jerusalem. He would there encounter Jerome, while Caelestius in Africa would find himself face to face with Augustine.

Pelagius in Palestine

Pelagius had in mind to establish the center of his activity in Palestine, in an atmosphere that seemed to him apt to accept the inspirations of his strict asceticism. At Rome he had already made the acquaintance of the illustrious widow Melania

[84] *On Rebuke and Grace,* chap. 2 (*alias* 4) ; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., V, 473.
[85] *Confessions,* bk. 10, chap. 27.
[86] *On the Gift of Perseverance,* chap. 53 (*alias* 20) ; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., V, 547.

and several members of the Probi family. He thought these relations would assure him of Jerome's good will. But he underestimated the wonderful acuteness of the great solitary's Catholic sense.

Jerome, for the enlightenment of his judgment, had only a few vague rumors and a few ably calculated conversations with the newcomer. But these were enough to enable him to see through the heresiarch. As Jerome says in one of his letters:

> "If God's grace is limited to this that He formed us with wills of our own, and if we are to rest content with free will, not seeking the divine aid lest this should be impaired, we should cease to pray; for we cannot entreat God's mercy to give us daily what is already in our hands, having been given to us once for all. . . . Away with fasting, away with every form of self-restraint! For why need I strive to win by toil what has once for all been placed within my reach?" [87]

He thus exposed the error in its most disastrous consequence.

Caelestius in Africa

Caelestius established himself at Carthage and at once assumed a belligerent attitude. With the ability of a crafty lawyer, he centered the dispute upon the point which he thought was the most vulnerable in Augustine's doctrine. He said: "How can one hold that death is a consequence of Adam's sin? Is not mortality a condition of our nature?" But a priest, who was a native of Milan and former disciple of St. Ambrose, named Paulinus, succeeded, by his adroit argumentation, in making Caelestius confess the basis of his heresy. When this priest remarked that, according to Catholic doctrine, original sin merely deprived the first man and his

[87] St. Jerome, Letter 133, no. 5 (to Ctesiphon); *Nicene Fathers*, 2d ser., VI, 275.

descendants of an immortality attached to their supernatural vocation, Caelestius was led to deny both the existence of that supernatural vocation and the possibility of the transmission of a penalty by the offense of a single man. The heresy was evident. Paulinus denounced the heretic to Aurelius bishop of Carthage, who, in 411, convoked a council in his episcopal city to pass judgment on the question. It condemned Caelestius. On his refusal to retract, he was excommunicated.[88]

Augustine did not attend this Council, which was held outside his province (the province of Numidia). Moreover, he hesitated to attack Pelagius, who had been mentioned to him in terms of great praise,[89] and who, upon arriving in Africa, had written him a respectful letter.[90] But, urged by his faithful, he decided to refute the new errors in three writings. The first two appeared in 412, the third in 415. They are the *De peccatorum meritis,* the *De spiritu et littera,* and the *De perfectione justitiae.* Out of consideration for Pelagius, he did not mention him by name.[91] At the same time he sent one of his friends, Paulus Orosius, to Palestine to assist Jerome in his strife against the dangerous innovator.

Paulus Orosius

Paulus Orosius, a Spanish priest, cannot be ranked among those eminent men whom the Church recognizes as doctors or masters. Rather he appears to us as one of those men who are born disciples. Though not capable of original ideas or daring initiative, they can, when they devote themselves to the service of a great man, render priceless aid to his cause. Obliged to leave Spain because of some threatening danger, which he alludes to without being specific, he took ship and reached the

[88] Mercator, *Commonitorium. P. L.,* XLVIII, 69.
[89] St. Augustine, *On the Proceedings of Pelagius,* chap. 46 (*alias* 22).
[90] *Ibid.,* chap. 51 (*alias* 26).
[91] *Ibid.,* chap. 47 (*alias* 23).

coast of Africa. At once he attached himself to Augustine. It is to Orosius' solicitations that we owe St. Augustine's treatise *Contra Priscillianistas ad Orosium.*[92] His chief claim to authorship is a *Universal History* which he later wrote at St. Augustine's request as a complementary work to the *City of God.*[93] Paulus Orosius, by his intelligent activity, brought valuable assistance to the cause of orthodoxy in the Pelagian controversy.

Dispute between St. Jerome and St. Augustine

Orosius' mission was destined to render a more personal service to Augustine and Jerome. It brought about a reconciliation between them which both of them had been long desiring. In fact, a protracted and painful disagreement, arising from a Scriptural interpretation, divided these two great men for almost ten years.

In 395, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians,* Jerome, trying to explain the dispute at Antioch between St. Peter and St. Paul,[94] considered it as a scene agreed upon by the two Apostles, to repress, by a striking example, the intolerable claims of the Judaizers.[95] This interpretation shocked the Bishop of Hippo, who very frankly wrote to Jerome as follows:

"I have been reading some writings, ascribed to you, on the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. . . . To find there the defense of falsehood undertaken, whether by you, a man of such weight, or by any author (if it is the writing of another), causes me, I must confess, great sorrow. . . . If you once admit into such a high sanctuary of authority one false statement as made in the way of

[92] Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne,* p. 201.

[93] *Ibid.,* p. 265. Cf. Boissier, *La Fin du paganisme,* XII, 314. The title of the work is *Historia adversus paganos.*

[94] Gal. 2: 11–14.

[95] *In Epistolam ad Galatas,* I, 2.

duty, there will not be left a single sentence of those books which, if appearing to any one difficult in practice or hard to believe, may not by the same fatal rule be explained away as a statement in which, intentionally and under a sense of duty, the author declared what was not true." [96]

Not receiving a reply to this first letter, Augustine wrote a second, no less spirited.[97] The Palestinian hermit hesitated to reply. It was distasteful to him, as he said later, to engage in controversy with a bishop of his communion, with a bishop whose talent and virtues he so highly esteemed. It may be, too, that, knowing the unrestrained petulancy of his own character, he was afraid he might indulge in some of those excesses of language for which he had often been reproached.

But when he learned that Augustine's first letter in its round-about course had passed from hand to hand and been widely read and commented on, the old fighter could not contain his displeasure.

"I am not so foolish," he wrote to the young bishop, "as to think myself insulted by the fact that you give an explanation different from mine. . . . Do not because you are young challenge a veteran in the field of Scripture. . . . Lest it should seem that to quote from the poets is a thing which you alone can do, let me remind you of the encounter between Dares and Entellus, and of the proverb, 'The tired ox treads with a firmer step.' " [98]

Augustine replied mildly and respectfully, but still insisting upon his objection. For ten years the correspondence between these two great men was marked with a sharpness which was tempered as much as possible by the charity of Christ but which was kept acute by fresh clashes, inevitable between characters so unlike, although both were animated by the same

[96] St. Augustine, Letter 28 (to Jerome); *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., I, 251.
[97] Letter 67 (*apud Epistolas Hieronymi, 7*).
[98] St. Jerome, Letter 102; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., I, 324.

love of Christ. In this painful dispute additional fuel was supplied by Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible and the difficulties which the Bishop of Hippo encountered in it.

Ten years of silence passed. Yet both men were hoping for a full and entire reconciliation. Orosius' mission in Palestine in 415 was its occasion. Augustine's messenger was the bearer of letters in which the African bishop questioned the venerable hermit about various matters of exegesis and philosophy, the solution of which was made particularly important by the Pelagian controversy. Paulus Orosius had the joy of seeing that Jerome was glad to collaborate in Augustine's apologetical work. It was also evident that Jerome, profoundly admiring the recent books of the Bishop of Hippo, hoped that Augustine, whose letters had of old wounded him, would be the illustrious continuator of his own great Scriptural works. From that hour until Jerome's death five years later, the collaboration of these two geniuses was cordial and constant.

Pelagius in the East

The strife against the Pelagian error required, however, the united efforts of the Catholics. Pelagius, condemned by a Western council, came to the East looking for other support, consecrating, as it were, his person and his ideas at the Holy Places, and probably hoping to set the mighty name of Jerusalem against that of Rome. Success seemed to him the more likely since many of the holy women living in retirement in the Holy City were friendly to him and since Bishop John of Jerusalem, who was animated by a secret rivalry against Jerome and his monasteries, had promised Pelagius his protection.

But, in fighting him, Jerome no longer felt he was alone. In that very year (415) when he received the message of Oro-

sius, he published three dialogues against the innovator.[99] Therein, after appealing to the testimony of Holy Writ and the liturgy, he says:

"That holy man and eloquent bishop Augustine not long ago wrote two treatises on infant baptism, in opposition to your heresy. And he is said to have others on the anvil with special regard to you, which have not yet come to hand. Wherefore, I think I must abandon my task, for fear Horace's words may be thrown at me, 'Don't carry firewood into a forest.' . . . If we wished to say something fresh, we should find our best points anticipated by that splendid genius." [100]

The principal argument which Augustine and Jerome employed against Pelagius to prove the existence of original sin was a fact which by itself refuted his whole doctrine: this fact was the traditional, immemorial practice of infant baptism.

"The baptism of infants, like that of adults, was considered as involving remission of sin, *in remissionem peccatorum.* The sin of the new-born not being capable of being a sin of will, must necessarily be a sin of nature. This very simple reasoning, based on the Symbolum Fidei and on the institutions of the Church, established, as against Caelestius and his party, not only the original downfall, but original sin." [101]

Council of Jerusalem (415)

After Augustine and Jerome, Orosius also advanced this invincible argument along with many others. The new errors were losing ground. To put an end to the disturbance, John of Jerusalem convoked an assembly of the clergy, which met in July, 415. Jerome, whom they probably dreaded, was not invited. But Orosius and Pelagius were there. The former,

[99] *Dialogue against the Pelagians.*
[100] *Idem,* III, 19. *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VI, 482.
[101] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* III, 149.

with all the zeal of his youth and the warmth of his enthusiasm for his two masters, Jerome and Augustine, recalled how Pelagius had been refuted by those great doctors, while Caelestius had been condemned by a council of Carthage. Pelagius was ambiguous in his defense. But in his contempt for the Bishop of Hippo he showed his effrontery. "What does this Augustine matter to me?" he declared. And John of Jerusalem proclaimed: "It is I who am Augustine." It appears that by this he wished to arrogate to himself the right to pardon Pelagius for his impertinence. But the imprudent bishop thus drew upon himself this thrust from Orosius: "If you are Augustine, follow Augustine's doctrine." John of Jerusalem refrained from condemning Pelagius by having the assembly decide that, since the parties—Pelagius and Orosius—were from a Latin country, the case must be carried to Rome.

Council of Diospolis (415)

Soon the dispute was reopened in Palestine by the acts of two Gallic bishops (Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix) who had been driven out of their country and came on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. They denounced the heresy of Pelagius and Caelestius to Eulogius the bishop of Caesarea. Following this denunciation, fourteen bishops, assembled at Diospolis, the ancient Lydda, summoned Pelagius before them. By means of clever suppressions and captious sophisms, he escaped excommunication. But his teaching was condemned.[102] Hence have arisen varied estimates of the Council of Diospolis. St. Augustine appealed to its authority against Julian bishop of Eclanum,[103] whereas St. Jerome called it a wretched synod (*miserabilis synodus*).[104]

[102] Hefele, II, 450 ff.
[103] St. Augustine, *Contra Julianum,* I, 32.
[104] St. Jerome, Letter 143; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., I, 557.

Progress of Pelagianism

Pelagius had not, in any respect, disavowed a heresy that was spreading both in the West and in the East. Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius, favored it, even wrote against Jerome a book which he subsequently destroyed. The originator of the heresy which would lower Christ to the rank of a human person, instinctively favored a heresy that denied the divine efficacy of grace. "The practical naturalism of the Western heretics and the speculative rationalism of the East were drawn to each other." [105]

Pelagianism gained ground and became violent. Bands of desperate characters, like those who entered the service of the Donatist heresy, engaged in incredible outrages. St. Augustine relates that one night in the year 416 the monks and nuns living in Bethlehem under Jerome's guidance were attacked by these lawless fanatics. A deacon was slain; the monastery buildings were set on fire, and Jerome escaped death only by fleeing to a tower.[106] The Bishop of Jerusalem had done nothing to prevent this disaster and seemed to take no steps to repair it. Jerome thought the time had come to address his complaints to the Pope, and, through the metropolitan of Carthage, informed him of the events that had just occurred.

Councils of Carthage and Mileve (416)

Just then the Bishop of Carthage was presiding over a council of seventy-three bishops, who, being informed of the events in Palestine by Heros and Lazarus, repeated the excommunication against Caelestius and Pelagius. Shortly afterwards a council of sixty bishops, held at Mileve under the

[105] Largent, *Études d'histoire ecclésiastique. Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, p. 17.

[106] St. Augustine, *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*, chap. 66 (*alias* 34); *P. L.*, XLIV, 358.

presidency of Augustine and acquainted with the happenings in Palestine by Orosius, reached a similar decision. Almost at the same time Pope Innocent I received Jerome's letter, the synodal letters of the two African councils, and another letter signed by Augustine and four bishops of Africa explaining the situation in greater detail.

The Sovereign Pontiff's reply came without long delay. On January 27, 417, after examining the matter in a Roman synod, Pope Innocent solemnly ratified the decisions taken by the African councils against the Pelagian heresy and its authors. Upon receipt of the Pope's reply, Augustine declared: "About this affair two councils have been sent to the Apostolic See. The replies have arrived. The case is finished. May the error likewise be ended." [107]

Pope Zosimus and the Pelagians

But all this merely ended the first phase of the dispute. Augustine did not take into acount the craftiness of Pelagius who had despatched an ambiguous profession of faith to the Holy See.[108] Caelestius, having fled to Rome after being expelled from Ephesus, and having been condemned at Constantinople, employed the same procedure.[109] John of Jerusalem was dead. But the first act of his successor, Prailus, was to send to Rome an apology of Pelagius. When these documents reached Rome, Pope Innocent had been succeeded by Zosimus (March 18, 417). It seems that, at the outset of his pontificate, Pope Zosimus fell under the influence of a person somewhat suspect, Patroclus, bishop of Arles.[110] Patroclus, elected in the place of Heros after the latter's banishment, painted him in

[107] *Idem,* Sermon 131, no. 10. The above is the authentic form of the maxim so often quoted as, *"Roma locuta est, causa finita est."*

[108] *Libellus fidei Pelagii; P. L.,* XLV, 1715 f.

[109] *P. L.,* XLV, 1718.

[110] Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule,* I, 95 f.

the blackest colors, as he did also Lazarus bishop of Aix. Heros and Lazarus had been the chief denouncers of the heresiarchs before the councils. Everything conspired to dispose Zosimus in favor of Pelagius and Caelestius. At Rome the Pope subjected Caelestius to questioning, at which the latter showed no hesitation in condemning whatever the Pontiff condemned, and thus succeeded in deceiving him. Two letters from Zosimus to the bishops of Africa blamed them for their haste and asked them to send the accusers of Caelestius and Pelagius to Rome.[111]

Council of Carthage (418)

Augustine was placed in a delicate position. The problem was to reconcile the respect and obedience due the supreme pastor of the Church with the steps that were necessary to undeceive him of his error. The bishops of Africa assembled without delay and drew up a long letter denouncing the knavery of Caelestius and begging Zosimus to return to the decisions of Innocent I. This document, probably accompanied by other declarations, made the Pope reflect. On March 21, 418, he declared in a letter that he decided to leave everything as it was.[112] The papal document reached Carthage on April 29. Two days later, a general African council opened in that city. All the provinces of Africa and Spain sent delegates. No less than two hundred bishops attended.[113] They drew up eight canons [114] against the Pelagian doctrine.

Pope Zosimus Condemns Pelagianism

Meanwhile Zosimus at last perceived the trickery of Caelestius, who was summoned to appear before the Pope. Instead

[111] *P. L.*, XLV, 1719–1723.
[112] *P. L.*, XLV, 1725 f.; Jaffé, no. 342.
[113] Hefele, II, 458.
[114] Some documents give nine canons.

of doing so, he fled from Rome. The Pontiff then wrote a long circular letter, addressed to all the bishops of the Christian world, condemning the two heretics and their teaching. This important document is known under the name of *Tractoria.* We possess fragments of it in St. Augustine's works.[115] From the writings of St. Prosper we know the Pope defined in particular the dogma of original sin and that of the necessity of grace for every good act.[116]

The letter was received in Africa with demonstrations of joy. Nearly all the Churches of the Catholic world subscribed to it.[117] From that hour Pelagius and Caelestius disappeared almost entirely from the scene, and St. Augustine prepared, by new works, to enlighten men's minds regarding the harmful heresy.

Julian, Bishop of Eclanum

At this time a man highly regarded for his fine culture and, as a bishop, held in great esteem for his virtues, Julian of Eclanum,[118] of a sudden rose up against the Bishop of Hippo and charged him, Augustine, with being a twofold heretic. According to Julian, Augustine was heretical in the explanation he advanced to justify the transmission of original sin; and also in his admission of a principle of evil in the human soul. Thus the Bishop of Hippo was accused of Traducianism [119] and Manichaeism. At the same time Julian set forth a

[115] St. Augustine, Letter 190 (*alias* 152). Cf. Letter 201.

[116] St. Prosper, *Contra Collatorem, P. L.,* XLV, 1730 f.

[117] *"Per totum orbem missa, subscriptionibus sanctorum Patrum est roborata,"* says Marius Mercator. Cf. Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* vol. I, bk. 2, part 2, chap. 6.

[118] Eclanum or Eclane, now Mirabella, was a city of Italy located southeast of Beneventum.

[119] This theory is that human souls are not created directly by God, but are engendered by the parents' spiritual nature in the act of generation, as is the human body.

clever and learned exposition of Pelagius' system. If, to give Pelagianism a new life and expansion, it would have sufficed to possess a keen, lively mind, to handle Aristotelian dialectics masterfully, and to display unwearied activity in defending its ideas, Julian of Eclanum would have succeeded in the task.

But the Pelagian heresy was definitely discredited in people's minds. Julian's only accomplishment was to win to his cause seventeen Italian bishops who, along with him, refused to sign the *Tractoria.* They were at once canonically deposed by the Pope, and banished from the Empire by the Emperor. But in his exile Julian wrote pamphlet after pamphlet against Augustine. The saintly Bishop of Hippo, during the remaining twelve years of his life, had to strive unceasingly against Julian. The dispute was especially in the intellectual order; we may well suppose that, if he had not to deal with so keen an adversary, St. Augustine would not have given us so profound a theory regarding the economy of the supernatural life as that which won for him the title of doctor of grace.

St. Augustine's Doctrine of Grace

The reader must not expect to find here an exposition of all the questions illumined by St. Augustine's genius in the course of his many polemics.[120] We will merely set forth in summary the doctrine in which his thought is affirmed most forcefully and personally. After defending free will against the Manichaeans, and grace against the Pelagians, he synthesized these two truths by a profound explanation. Of this explanation we find no trace in the writings of his predecessors; but all his successors have made use of it. From it the Catholic Church has taken her formulas for defining the

[120] This is set forth in Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* II, 352–505, and Portalié, art. *"Augustin"* in the *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2268–2472. Cf. Martin, *Saint Augustin.*

dogma, and the heretics have appealed to it in support of their errors.

According to St. Augustine, as in the natural order the divine *concursus* envelops man and penetrates him in his acts, his life, and his being,[121] so in the supernatural order grace envelops and penetrates all his salutary activity. It is necessary for faith, necessary for practice, necessary for perseverance. It is both at the origin of our supernatural acts and at their last crowning. But man's free will is by no means annihilated or lessened by this action of grace.[122] On this point he carefully distinguishes the fact from the explanation of the fact. The fact is beyond dispute. The awareness of free choice, the awareness of merit and demerit are psychological facts that cannot be called into question. St. Augustine declared this against the Manichaeans, and maintained it in the face of the Pelagians. The spiritual life is the free cooperation of man's will with God's grace. It is the meeting and union of two loves: the love of God for man, and that of man for God. As to the explanation of this fact, St. Augustine does not hope to furnish an intellectual demonstration of it that removes the mystery. His profound analyses of divine knowledge and of human intellect and will throw light on the problem;[123] but after these efforts of his reason, he repeats that love alone understands the mysteries of love. He says: "Give me one who loves, and he will understand what I say."[124] No one has pushed the power of reason and of intellectual intuition further than he has.

"Nor does he appear unconscious of the fact that his utterances fall short of the truth which they should express, that divine mys-

[121] Following St. Paul's words: *"In Ipso vivimus, movemur et sumus."*

[122] The Pelagian controversy was about actual grace. We are not sure what doctrine he held about habitual grace.

[123] See a sketch of these analyses in Portalié, *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2389 f.

[124] St. Augustine, *On the Gospel of St. John,* tractate 26, no. 4; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., VII, 169.

tery cannot be encompassed in human formulas, and that consequently some room must be left in Christianity for the aspirations of piety and the intuitions of the heart." [125]

St. Augustine as Bishop

Augustine did not, for the sake of purely speculative studies, neglect the practical duties of his office as bishop. While he was fighting the Manichaeans, Donatists, and Pelagians, he administered his diocese as a most zealous pastor and introduced the monastic life into Africa.

Two heavy burdens weighed on the bishops of that time: the administration of the many properties of the Church and the exercise of important judiciary functions.

"By a cruel irony, Augustine, who had made a vow of poverty and had given his patrimony to the poor, Augustine, elected bishop of Hippo, became the proprietor of extensive possessions. The people of that time wanted the Church to be wealthy because they were the first to profit from that wealth, which consisted chiefly of houses and land. The diocese of Hippo had the administration of numerous houses and immense lands, on which lived a whole population of artisans and freed slaves, farm laborers and artists, metal-founders, embroiderers, silversmiths. Augustine, no doubt, had managers under his orders. But that did not dispense him from entering into the details of the administration and overseeing his agents." [126] Numberless indications, allusions, and rural comparisons, to be found in his sermons, prove that nothing was foreign to Augustine in the management of an estate, in the life of peasants and workmen. We observe that he knew

[125] Tixeront, *op. cit.*, II, 354. Cf. Paquier, *Le Jansénisme,* lesson 2: *"La Théologie de la grace dans St. Augustin,"* pp. 37–79. Cf. Gaillard, *Études sur l'histoire de la doctrine de la grace,* pp. 1–89.

[126] Bertrand, *Saint Augustin*, p. 332.

the forms of sale and of gift, that he was informed about the working of mills and presses.

"Among the episcopal functions was one that wearied Augustine to the point of disgust. Every day he must hear litigants and pass sentence. In the *secretarium* of the basilica or in the porch of the courtyard adjoining the church, Augustine would hold court. Quite rightly Theodosius extended the juridical competence of bishops in civil cases. Day after day Augustine heard cases until his dinner hour, sometimes, when he was fasting, all day long. As soon as he appeared, wranglers rushed to him tumultuously, surrounded him, pressed on him, and constrained him to consider their cases. Augustine yielded. But the next day, in a spirited sermon, he would say to them: *"Discedite a me maligni!* Depart from, you wicked ones, and let me study the commandments of my God." [127] "I can declare upon my soul," he said, "that, if I were to consult my personal convenience, I would much prefer, at certain hours of the day, as they do in well-regulated monasteries, to engage in some manual labor, and have the rest of the time free to read, pray, and meditate on the divine writings."

So far as the duties of his episcopal office allowed, the holy Bishop led the life of a monk. In 388, being then a layman, he had turned his patrimonial house into a monastery. After his ordination to the priesthood (391) he founded a second community of monks at Hippo. As bishop he led a veritable religious life along with all his clergy. His example was contagious. The episcopal residence in Hippo became a nursery of founders, who soon covered Africa with monasteries. In Possidius [128] we read the edifying examples of poverty, simplicity, charity, and austerity of life which the holy Bishop gave his clergy. Under his influence, virgins and widows also united in communities. For them he wrote, in 423, his famous

[127] *Ibid.*, pp. 335 f.
[128] Possidius, *Vita Augustini, 22.*

letter which thereafter was regarded as a rule for religious communities.[129]

The Rule of St. Augustine has exercised a notable influence on the monastic life in the West. It served as a basis for a large number of monastic institutions and was one of the sources from which St. Benedict derived the spirit of his rule. It is not the least glory of the monastic order that it can consider as one of its fathers him whom Bossuet calls "the most eminent of all the doctors," [130] "the greatest light of the Church." [131]

St. Honoratus

With the expansion of monastic life in Africa, there corresponded a flourishing development of monastic life in Gaul. In 410, a Roman nobleman of consular family reached a group of rocky islands that are near the coast of Provence, opposite what is now the city of Cannes. One of these islands he chose as a place where he might lead a life of prayer and study with a few friends. This island, which would later bear the name of the illustrious ascetic, Honoratus, in the time of the Romans was called Lerina (Lerins). Possessing wells of fresh water, it had in former times, according to Strabo, been dotted with habitations. About the beginning of the fifth cen-

[129] St. Augustine, Letter 221; *P. L.*, XXXIII, 960–965. There have been lengthy discussions as to whether St. Augustine founded an order of monks or a congregation of canons regular. He probably was little concerned with these distinctions, and all priests and laymen living in community in the practice of the evangelical counsels have a right to consider him their patron. On the curious discussions that have arisen over this question, see Chevalier, *Bio-bibliographie,* under the heading *"Augustin."*

[130] Bossuet, *Letter to Leibniz,* August 17, 1701. At the annual public meeting of the Académie des Inscriptions (November 15, 1913), Paul Monceaux read a paper on *Un Couvent de femmes à Hippone au temps de saint Augustin.* It is a scholarly and interesting account of the famous "Rule of St. Augustine," as carried out under the direction of St. Augustine himself.

[131] Bossuet, *Sermon for Pentecost,* 1654 (Lebarcq-Levesque ed., I, 552).

tury it was a desert. But Honoratus and his companions were austere monks and also tireless workers. Soon the appearance of the island was changed. Saint Eucherius describes its fertile, well-watered fields, adorned with flowers, fragrant with their perfume.[132] St. Hilary of Arles speaks of the venerable ascetic receiving, with a smile on his majestic features, sons of every land who came there to love Christ.[133] The wonders of the Thebaid were reënacted on the shores of Provence. The monastery of Lerins became a celebrated school of theology and Christian philosophy, and a nursery of bishops and saints for the upbuilding of Gaul, Ireland, and England. Among them are reckoned the following: Hilary of Arles, to whom we owe the first biography of St. Honoratus; Vincent of Lerins, the leading controversialist of his time; Lupus (or Loup), who stopped Attila at the gates of Troyes; Salvian, who was regarded as the most eloquent man of his age next to Augustine.[134]

St. Cassian

The Lerins monastery soon had a rival on the shores of Provence, the monastery of St. Victor at Marseilles. The latter was founded in 415 by the illustrious John Cassian, whom some historians say was born in Scythia, others in Syria or in Provence.[135] His literary culture was profound and extensive. While still a youth, he vowed himself to the monastic state in a monastery at Bethlehem. The disturbances at the close of the fourth century obliged him to leave Palestine and go to the deserts of the Thebaid, where he studied the

[132] St. Eucherius, *De laude eremi.*

[133] St. Hilary, *Vita sancti Honorati.*

[134] Recent studies on the so-called Creed of St. Athanasius show the existence of undoubted connection between that Creed and the School of Lerins. See Dom Morin in *The Journal of Theological Studies,* vol. XII (1911), and Paul Lejay, *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature,* 1912, pp. 45 f.

[135] See Godet, art. *"Cassien"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* II, 1823 f.

cenobitical life and became thoroughly familiar with it. In 401 we find him in Constantinople, imbuing himself with the spirit of St. Chrysostom; in 415 he was in Rome, whither he had come, in the name of the faithful clergy of Constantinople, to seek Pope Innocent's protection over the proscribed bishop. Having accomplished his mission, he stopped at Marseilles and there, over the tomb of St. Victor, a Roman officer who died for the faith at the end of the third century, he built a monastery in honor of the martyr. This monastery, like that of Lerins, would become, in the midst of the barbarian invasions, a citadel of peace, a center of intellectual life.

For the edification of his monks, Cassian wrote, between 419 and 439, two works that have won for him the title of "lawmaker of the monastic life"; the *Institutiones* and the *Collationes* (Conferences). The former of these works sets forth especially the external discipline of the monasteries, according to what the author saw in his travels. The second, his masterpiece, deals with questions that concern the interior life of the monks. St. Benedict, in his rule, obliged his disciples to read the *Conferences.*[136] The Greek Church, the diocese of Marseilles, and that of Digne, honor the memory of St. Cassian.

Spiritual Writers

The growth of the monastic life has nearly always been accompanied by a literary movement and a general development of the spiritual life. Around the chief work of Cassian, we find the following: a collection of monastic biographies published in 420 in Greek by Bishop Palladius and known as the *Lausiac History,* from the name of Lausus, an eminent personage to whom it was dedicated; the writings of St. Nilus on various subjects of piety; those of St. Eucherius and

[136] St. Benedict, *Monastic Rule,* 73.

Marcus the Hermit; and anonymous collections. These writings spread, among the monks and the laity also, the rules of a strict and prudent asceticism.[137]

At times these teachings took the form of poetry, as we have seen in the writings of St. Paulinus of Nola. The historian Evagrius mentions two Christian poets of this period in the East: Claudianus and Cyrus, about whom we know very little. The writings of three Western poets—the rhetorician Endelechus (a friend of St. Paulinus), the rhetorician Marius Victor of Marseilles, and the priest Sedulius, whose native country is unknown—show us an evidence of classical culture in the Gallic country. From Sedulius the Church has taken, for her liturgy, the Christmas hymn *A solis ortus cardine* and the Epiphany hymn *Hostis Herodis impie.*[138]

The foremost of the Christian poets of this period is Prudentius. He was born in 348 in a city of northern Spain, probably Saragossa. He became a lawyer, then a high official in the imperial government. When fifty-seven years old he determined to consecrate all the rest of his life to God alone. In 404 or 405 appeared his poetical work. It is made up of two distinct parts: didactic poems in hexameter, and lyric poems in which we see how thoroughly he had grasped all the forms of the versification of the ancients.

"The two characteristics of his poetry were gracefulness and force; the former appeared especially in passages wherein he showed the earth pouring forth her flowers to surround and veil the cradle of the Savior; or where he described the Holy Innocents as the flowers of martyrdom whom the sword had reaped as the whirlwind reaps the budding roses, and who play as children in heaven, and under the very altar of God, with their palm and their crown. . . . But the power of the poet appeared far more when he described the conflicts of the martyrs; and he caught, as it were, all their fire when

[137] On these various writings, see Bardenhewer, *op. cit.*, pp. 515 ff.
[138] *Ibidem*, p. 450.

he represented St. Fructuosus on the pile, St. Hippolytus at the heels of the untamed horses, or St. Lawrence on the gridiron." [139]

If we consider the greatness of the spectacle witnessed by the fourth and fifth centuries and the depth of the feelings that shook and transformed men's souls, we may think the poetry of that period rather weak. But, as Saint-Marc Girardin remarks, the spectacle may have been too close and the feelings too strong to stir up great poetical works at the time. The period had heroes and martyrs; it had few great poets. Between feelings and inspiration there must be an interval. A few centuries will mature the fertility of Christian poetry and Christian art.

[139] Ozanam, *History of Civilization in the Fifth Century*, II, 197.

CHAPTER II

From the Coming of Valentinian III to the Death of Pope Sixtus III (425–440)

THE taking of Rome by Alaric in 410 made a deep impression. It made men aware of the greatness of a danger that had been too long ignored. The barbarians' triumph was so quick because everywhere they were able to obtain secret information. The army, the magistracy, the court, all were peopled with Heruli, Vandals, Goths. The Western Empire felt itself done for, submerged by the tide of an invasion the more formidable because it took place, not by violent shocks, but by a slow, assured advance, that was scarcely felt. The confidence of the barbarians was stirred. In 425 the Western Empire had barely half a century to live. Fifty-one years later the last of the Caesars surrendered his power, without shock or clamor, to the insignificant chief of a foreign horde.

The Christian centers of the West shared the universal anguish. It was to reassure them that St. Augustine and Salvian wrote, from different points of view, the one his *City of God,* the other his book *On the Government of God.* And theological disputes subsided.

Conditions were quite otherwise in the East. The political situation there, while imperiled, was not so near a collapse. What old Rome lost in prestige, Constantinople gained by its splendor. The intellectual movement centered in that part of the civilized world, and there spirited disputes arose in which the civil authorities took part. This was an old habit with them. And this interference more than once gave the events a tragic character.

The Roman World in 425

At the death of Honorius in 423, a secretary of State, by the name of John, usurped the title of Emperor. When opposed by Theodosius II (the Younger), he tried to arouse the barbarians in his favor and perished miserably in 425. The armed forces of Theodosius then brought to Italy a grandson of Theodosius the Great, Valentinian III. But the young prince was a mere six-year-old boy. His mother Placidia governed the West in his name. But no woman, guardian of a child, was able successfully to confront the mighty dangers threatening the Empire. From Gaul to Pannonia, from Roman Germany to Africa, the barbarians kept going back and forth.

Around the regent, generals were plotting. One of them, Aetius, supplanted his rivals and forced the Empress Placidia to invest him with supreme command of the armies of the West. He seems to have possessed all the qualities of a valiant fighter and capable statesman.[1] If the Roman Empire could have been saved by arms or by diplomatic negotiations, Aetius would have saved it. He did at least hold off for a while the fall of that Empire by continually setting one barbarous nation against another.[2] Two groups of barbarians were massed at the frontiers: the Franks, Saxons, and Alamani on the banks of the Rhine; the Goths, strictly so called, the Vandals, Gepidae, Heruli, and Burgundians along the Danube. Aetius, knowing these tribes because he had been their hostage and had ties of friendship with several of their chiefs, overcame the Burgundians with the help of the Franks, attempted to establish the imperial authority in Spain with the aid of the Visigoths, and favored the formation of a Germanic kingdom on condition that it recognize the authority of the emperors.

[1] St. Gregory of Tours, *Historia ecclesiastica Francorum*, bk. 2, chap. 8.
[2] Moeller, *Histoire du moyen âge*, p. 65.

But the task he undertook was beyond human power. "The Empire dissolved under the action of that latent but irresistible force which poured all its vitality into the veins of the Church. Aetius and Stilicho did as much harm by their ambition as they did good by their victories. When society had to be defended againt the invaders, the bishops and priests were the ones who assumed that mission." [3]

"It was upon the bishops that there had devolved the task of intervening, so far as it was possible to do so, with the barbarian chiefs or even of imploring the aid of the Roman commanders. Peril and common misery brought the clergy nearer to the faithful: the latter felt more than ever the necessity of having as bishops men of intellect and of sympathy. They asked for them in many cases from the monasteries which, since the time of St. Martin, were being established almost everywhere. At other times—as in the case of the celebrated St. Germain of Auxerre, of St. Paulinus of Nola, of Sidonius Apollinaris and many others—their choice fell upon former officials whose merit they had been able to appreciate during their secular administration." [4]

But interceding with a barbarian king or saving a city from pillage was not all. The peril of the invasions brought with it general uneasiness. Seeing the Empire endangered, pagans and Christians blamed each other for being the cause of its destruction. Said the pagans: "Rome is being punished for denying its ancient gods." "Rome is punished," replied the Christians, "because it is still too pagan." The mass of the population was greatly disturbed. Rome, which men were accustomed to consider eternal; Rome, where pagan worship was still associated with that of the old national divinities; Rome, which still remained, in the eyes of the most skeptical, a sort of divinity herself; Rome, which seemed to be the keystone of universal order, was now at the mercy of a sudden

[3] Kurth, *Les Origines de la civilisation moderne* (1886 ed.), I, 269 f.
[4] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, III, 403.

attack. Patriotism, love of tradition and order, the noblest sentiments of the human soul, were shaken.

St. Augustine's *City of God*

The genius of Augustine, without waiting for the hour of supreme peril, considered the gravity of the problem. Ever since 412 he occupied the leisure moments of his busy ministry in the composition of a work that would require fourteen years of reflection and labor. He entitled it the *City of God.* It is the great Bishop's most important work. Along with the *Confessions,* the *City of God* holds a place by itself. The *Confessions* is the psychology of an individual soul; the *City of God* is the philosophy of the history of mankind. In face of the problem raised by the fall of the Roman Empire, Augustine broadens the scope of the problem and considers the destinies of mankind as a whole in relation to the Christian religion. Changing the meaning of the old word *civitas* (city),[5] which fascinated the citizen of the Empire by its prestige, he gives the title "City of God" to the society of all the servants of God in all times and in all countries; the term "Earthly City," or city of the devil, he gives to the society of all the enemies of the true religion. The City of God includes all those who love God to the point of despising the world; the Earthly City is composed of those who cherish the world to the point of despising God. Augustine's erudition may now be somewhat antiquated, but his general views dominate even the history of events and peoples that he did not know.[6]

[5] Hertling, *Augustin,* p. 100.

[6] Heinrich Scholz' work on *The City of God,* published in Berlin in 1911, contains views that are open to question. But it emphasizes St. Augustine's absolute historical honesty and his great work's dominant idea, namely, to make "a vast picture of the conflicts between the faith and unbelief through the history of mankind." Cf. Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte, ein Kommentar zu Augustins De civitate Dei.* Schilling, at about the same time, published a systematic collection of all the significant texts of St. Augustine on political and sociological questions.

Salvian and Orosius

Twelve years later a priest of Gallo-Roman race, Salvian by name, a disciple of St. Honoratus, in a less powerful work takes up the question of the future of the world and solves it clearly in favor of the barbarians.

"There are two kinds of barbarians in the world," he says, "that is, heretics and pagans. To all of these, as far as the divine law is concerned, I declare that we are incomparably superior; as far as our life and actions are concerned, I say with grief and lamentation, that we are worse. . . . The race of the Goths is treacherous but chaste, the Alans unchaste but not treacherous; the Franks are deceitful but hospitable; the Saxons savage in their cruelty but admirable for their chastity." [7]

In 417 Paulus Orosius, the disciple of St. Augustine, in his *Historia adversus paganos,* wrote these prophetic words: "You tell me the barbarians are the enemies of the State. I answer that the whole East thought the same thing about Alexander. The Romans seemed no better to the peoples whose peace and quiet they disturbed. The Germans are now upsetting the whole earth. But perhaps some day posterity will bestow the title of great kings upon those whom we cannot yet think of except as enemies." [8]

The Bishop of Arles

The bishops and monks did more than defend the cities of the Roman world against pillage by the invaders. They organized the Churches already founded among the barbarians and founded additional ones. The establishment of the ecclesiastical primacy of Arles and the conquest of Ireland to Chris-

Cf. Schilling, *Die Staats und Soziallehre des hl. Augustinus.* See also Jules Martin's *Saint Augustin,* and Portalié in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 2290 f.

[7] Salvianus, *On the Government of God,* IV, 13; VII, 15.

[8] Orosius, *Adversus paganos historiarum libri* VII, bk. 3. Cf. bk. 7.

tianity date from the time when St. Augustine, Orosius, and Salvian were writing the works we have just mentioned.

A decree of Emperor Honorius, dated May 23, 418, made Arles the meeting-place of the seven provinces of Gaul. In the confusion produced by the coming and going of the barbarians, Arles, located within reach of Spain and Italy, seemed to be the natural center, for the future, of Roman influence beyond the Alps. This eminent political position of the big Provençal city favored its religious supremacy. In 426 the election of Honoratus, the holy founder of Lerins, as bishop of Arles, increased its prestige still more. Honoratus was bishop only two years.

But he left behind him another self, the monk Hilary, likewise trained on the holy island. His repute for sanctity greatly impressed the clergy of Gaul. Hilary profited by this influence and strengthened ecclesiastical discipline around him. Not only did he give the clergy of his diocese lessons and models of the strictest virtues and most enlightened zeal, but at Riez, Orange, and Vaison (Vasio) he assembled provincial councils, at which the bishops of the Viennoise, the Second Narbonnaise, and the maritime Alps were present. In his desire to remove the election of bishops from human intrigue, he exerted his influence outside the limits of his canonical jurisdiction to make the episcopacy respect the rules of the Church.[9] Probably this concerned provinces that were still in the power of the Romans; for the Visigoths were not yet beyond the Cevennes and the Corbieres, the Franks were not across the Somme, and the Burgundians were quartered in the mountains near Lake Geneva.[10] But, after the death of Aetius, when the barbarians passed these boundaries, it was a safeguard for the Christian Churches of Gaul, to have been strongly organized under the direction of the bishops of Arles.

[9] Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule,* I, 110–113.
[10] Duchesne, *loc. cit.*

So intense was Christian life in the Churches of Gaul that it radiated into the Celtic countries. In 429 St. Lupus (or Loup) of Troyes and St. Germain of Auxerre went to Great Britain to pacify it, for it was disturbed by the heresy of Pelagius. About the same time, a Gallo-Roman, Patrick, who received religious training in the monasteries of Gaul, carried the Christian faith to Ireland.[11]

St. Patrick

Patrick's birthplace is a matter of dispute. But many authorities place it at or near Daventry, west of Northhampton, in central Britain. His father was a member of the town government. Patrick, when sixteen years old, was captured by Celtic pirates, then sold as a slave in Ireland. There for six years he experienced all the sufferings and horrors of slavery. But he escaped and went to Gaul. In his dreams he kept seeing the children of the Irish pagans extending their hands to him and asking him for baptism. He seemed to hear their plaintive voices saying: "Come to us; come and save us." [12]

After completing his ecclesiastical training [13] in the monasteries of Marmoutier and Lerins, he was ordained priest and bishop and, at his own repeated request, was sent as bishop to Ireland by Pope Celestine. His apostolate was long and painful. Generally it is said to have lasted thirty-three years. History and legend are so mingled in the accounts of his apostolate that it is hard to separate the two. What is beyond question is the marvelous success which finally crowned his mission. "In

[11] St. Prosper, in his *Chronicon* (404), praises Pope Celestine because he had saved the Roman island (Great Britain) to the Catholic faith and made the barbarous island (Ireland) Christian. According to St. Prosper, this same pope consecrated the deacon Palladius and made him the first Irish bishop. But the history of Palladius is quite obscure.

[12] *Acta sanctorum,* March, II, 535.

[13] Patrick was already a cleric when he was captured by the pirates.

the closing days of his life Patrick could rejoice himself with the sight of the Irish become a Christian people, whilst before him they knew no other gods but their idols." [14]

Faustus of Riez

The monasteries of Gaul did more than prepare reforming bishops like Honoratus and Hilary of Arles, missioners like Lupus of Troyes and Patrick. They became centers of learning, schools of theology. Of these the most celebrated was the school of Lerins. The years between the coming of Valentinian III and that of St. Leo the Great saw the publication of several works of Faustus of Riez, Hilary of Arles, and Salvian of Marseilles, all three of them trained in the school of Lerins.

Faustus, like Pelagius, was born in Britain. At an early age he came to southern Gaul. He became a monk in the Lerins monastery in 430. Three years later he was its abbot, and did not leave it until 452, when he was made bishop of the Church of Riez in Provence. Only at this latter date did he become conspicuous as the most zealous defender of semi-Pelagianism. His first works, written at Lerins, were confined to the refutation of Arianism and Macedonianism. In a style marked by force and life, but also not free from pomposity and obscurity, Faustus showed himself to be a man of ingenious and daring spirit, of the race of those who easily become masters. In a more modest book, *the Life of St. Honoratus,* published in 430, Hilary of Arles, another son of Lerins, appears rather as a doctor of the spiritual life. Independently of these works, many sermons, preached by the monks of Lerins and collected by the tachygraphers, were spread among the faithful and read with avidity.[15]

[14] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* III, 427.

[15] The *Life of Saint Honoratus* was merely a sermon by St. Hilary, preached on the anniversary of St. Honoratus' death.

St. Vincent of Lerins

But the success of all these works was surpassed by that which attended, in 434, a little book coming from the same monastery and entitled the *Commonitorium.* The author concealed his identity under the pseudonym of Peregrinus. Although in appearance it was merely an unpretentious memory-aid, intended to put within the reader's reach the teaching of the holy Fathers and the characteristic notes of true Catholic doctrine, it was in reality a scholastic manifesto in clear, measured terms. Its fundamental doctrine was expressed in two formulas that future ages would repeat and which the Vatican Council would insert, in part, in the first of its dogmatic Constitutions.[16] These were: 1. Catholic doctrine consists in being attached especially to what has been believed everywhere and always by the Church;[17] 2. this unchangeable deposit of faith is not an inert, motionless deposit; it is made "to grow and progress, in the intelligence, knowledge, and wisdom of each of the faithful and of the whole Church, while maintaining itself in the identity of one and same dogma, meaning, and thought."[18]

This exposition of a doctrine, in itself irreproachable, one that the future would find fruitful, seemed to be directed against a particular theory of grace that was considered novel and dangerous. The author speaks of certain "heretics" daring to teach the existence "in their Church of a grace of God . . . such that, without any effort, without asking, seeking, or knocking, all their fellow-members were favored with it."[19]

[16] Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* no. 1800.

[17] *"Magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est enim vere proprieque catholicum."* Chap. 2, alias 3.

[18] *"Crescat igitur . . . et proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium . . . intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, sed in suo duntaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate eodem sensu, eademque sententia."* Chap. 28.

[19] Chap. 26 (*alias* 38). Cf. St. Augustine, *On the Gift of Perseverance,* chap. 64 (*alias* 23); *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., V, 551.

The allusion to predisposing grace, taught by Augustine, was evident. It was regarded as an attack upon the illustrious African doctor.

The writing was the work of a priest named Vincent, whom the Church would later honor as St. Vincent of Lerins.[20] But, to understand the feeling he aroused, we must go back to the point where we left the history of the Pelagian controversy.

Semi-Pelagianism

It is true that Augustine, in his polemics against Pelagius, Caelestius, and Julian of Eclanum, used expressions that were too absolute, that disturbed a large number of Catholics. Grace that produced the act and the volition seemed to destroy the freedom of the will. What added to this scandal was the fact that, besides these absolute expressions about the power of grace, Augustine advanced theories that appeared equally shocking about predestination and original sin. The Pelagians glorified man by making him the author of his own salvation. Augustine answered them by showing this salvation as the fruit of a divine predestination.[21] The Pelagians denied original sin. Augustine answered them by showing human nature as corrupted in its very source.[22]

Of course, these expressions of Augustine should not have been taken in their full rigor. This fact was amply proven by his practice, by the doctrine he elaborated in his sermons to the people, when he was not facing some opponent to be refuted.[23]

[20] According to Poirel (*De utroque Common. lirin . . . dissertatio*), the work is that of Marius Mercator; but this identification seems not at all established, as the author himself declares in his preface.

[21] *"Certum est numerum electorum, nec augendum, nec minuendum." On Rebuke and Grace,* chap. 39 (*alias* 13). *"Ipsum hominis meritum donum est gratuitum ex gratia."* Sermon 169.

[22] He calls the race of Adam *massa luti, massa tota vitiata.* On this point, see Petau, *Dogmata theologica,* bk. 10, chap. 1, nos. 8, 9, Rottmanner, *Der Augustinismus,* p. 8.

[23] Rottmanner, *op. cit.,* p. 29.

Every time it was useful to do so, he himself repudiated a too strict interpretation of his words in the sense of a denial of free will. So, in 427, when the monks of a monastery at Hadrumetum were shocked by his letter to Sixtus, he wrote two treatises for them and several letters that quieted their apprehension.[24] But it was precisely in these two treatises that the monks of Lerins and the abbot of Saint-Victor at Marseilles, John Cassian, thought to discover even yet some exaggerated expressions. They protested. A certain layman, Prosper of Aquitaine, and a monk, Hilary, informed the Bishop of Hippo of these protests. Augustine, in 428, answered by the two books *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae*. The dispute went on until Augustine's death. And it even continued for a century longer.

Death of St. Augustine

So many labors and struggles exhausted the health of the great bishop. On November 13, 428, he was seventy-four years old. Four months later, terrible news reached him at Hippo. An army of 80,000 Vandals, led by their King Genseric, had entered Africa and was advancing, methodically sacking the African provinces. Priests and bishops were seized as hostages, forced to follow the barbarian troops and to carry burdens like slaves. Boniface, the Count of Africa, in whom Augustine put his trust, instead of defending the province, went over to the barbarians. At a later date he did become reconciled with the Empire. But the situation grew worse and more critical. The encircling line of the besiegers was drawn closer. By the end of May, 430, Hippo was hemmed in on the Mediterranean side as well as on the land side.

The aged Bishop, in his sermons and conferences with his

[24] *On Grace and Free Will, On Rebuke and Grace,* and various letters to Valentinus.

faithful, stimulated their courage. In the third month of the siege, weighed down by fatigue, he was confined to bed. "Until this last illness," writes his disciple Possidius, "he had continually preached to the people. Ten days before his bodily deliverance, he asked all of us present that no one should enter his room except at the time of the physicians' visit or when food was brought to him. His request was obeyed, and he employed all his time in prayer. Up to the very end he enjoyed the use of all his senses. It was in our presence, before our very eyes, while our prayers mingled with his own, that he fell asleep with his fathers." [25]

Augustine left this world on August 28, 430, at the age of seventy-six. But today, after the lapse of fifteen centuries, there is not perhaps in the Catholic Church a thought more living than his. In all religious families that claim dependence on his inspiration, in all the theological and philosophical doctrines that are connected with him, in all the intellectual horizons that his genius opened, in all the honors bestowed on him by this Catholic Church that he loved so much, in all the souls that are indebted to him for their return to God or the strengthening of their faith, in all those who are moved to tears by the touching pages of his *Confessions,* the great soul of Augustine still lives.

The Christological Problem

The barbarian invasions in the West often disturbed the theological disputes; the comparative tranquillity which the East enjoyed under Theodosius II gave them a chance to develop more freely. The spirited character of those controversies did not always bring joy to the Church. But at least, to pass judgment on them and to throw upon them the light

[25] Possidius, *Life of Augustine,* 31.

of her dogmatic definitions, she was able to assemble a general council of about two hundred bishops.

While the Latins were disputing about the relations of the human and the divine in man, the Greeks were arguing about the relations of the human and the divine in Christ. Neither of these questions could be called idle. The whole program which St. Augustine's genius undertook might be summed up in these words: "To know God and to know oneself, *Noverim Te, noverim me.*"

In its first two general councils the Church anathematized the two extreme opinions regarding the Savior, which had manifested themselves from the beginning of Christianity. At Nicaea against the Arians, who denied or beclouded His absolute divinity, she proclaimed Him consubstantial with the Father, absolutely God. At Constantinople against the Apollinarians, who mutilated the idea of His humanity, she declared Him to be perfectly man. Henceforth no one could call himself Catholic without acknowledging and adoring in Christ a Man-God, with all the consequences which that ineffable title implies. But another problem remained to be solved. Its apparent subtlety hid a deep meaning. The question was where to place the unity of the God-Man. Was Christ a man who by His merits had been elevated to divinity? Was He a God, who abased Himself even to being man? Two great Schools contended over this in the East.

The School of Alexandria, ever faithful to its Platonic beginnings, was inclined, in its conceptions, to start out from the idea of God, The School of Antioch, more dependent upon the Aristotelian method, inclined rather to consider everything from the point of view of man. Both gave holy doctors to the Church. Athanasius had been the glory of Alexandria; and Chrysostom, that of Antioch. Unfortunately the diversity of the tendencies, while explicable and legitimate and capable of being fruitful, was complicated in the latter times by a violent

antipathy between the two cities. Alexandria was aggrieved by the decree of 381, which dispossessed the see of Athanasius from its primacy and transferred that honor to Constantinople. And this latter city bitterly remembered the treatment accorded to Chrysostom by Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria. These circumstances contributed to embitter every dicussion that brought the two rival Schools face to face.

St. Cyril of Alexandria

The most conspicuous representative of the School of Alexandria at the begining of the fifth century was a nephew of the too celebrated Theophilus. His name was Cyril. We are without historic data regarding his youth. It has been surmised that he received his training in asceticism in the monasteries of the Thebaid.[26]

He was a native of Alexandria. The schools of that city probably furnished him with the elements of his vast theological knowledge. In the eyes of all, "Cyril was a man of great ecclesiastical learning and spotless life." [27] But, being too much involved in his uncle's life and activities, he could not help sharing some of the latter's prejudices and imitating some of the methods of his government. In 403, with Theophilus he took part in the Synod of the Oak, which deposed Chrysostom.[28] Nine years later, when called to succeed Theophilus as head of the Church of Alexandria, he manifested toward the Novatians and the Jews a rigor that perhaps was not free from passion.[29] But when Socrates pictures him as harsh and brutal in his conflict with Orestes the prefect and even insinuates that he inspired the murder of the learned Hypatia, the

[26] Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, p. 360.
[27] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, III, 209.
[28] St. Cyril, Letter 33; *P. G.*, LXXVII, 159.
[29] St. Isidore of Pelusium, *Letters* (*P. G.*, LXXVIII, 361, 369, 392).

prefect's friend, this evidently biased testimony cannot be accepted by history. That such is the fact is acknowledged even by writers who are the least favorable toward Cyril.[30] What is better attested is the loyalty with which, after recognizing the mistake of his first judgment regarding Chrysostom, he resumed friendly relations with him. We are told that he even consented to place the name of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the diptych of the Church of Alexandria.[31]

Following Origen's example, like all the Alexandrians Cyril honored the Virgin Mary with the title of Mother of God (theotokos). In accord with his master Athanasius, he held that Christ "is not a man in whom the Word descended, but is the Word Himself born in a flesh that is His own";[32] and also that Christ's humanity, howsoever complete, does not exist separately, does not belong to itself, but belongs to the Word who made it His;[33] and that from complete God and complete man there results a single Being—Cyril uses indifferently the expressions "single person," "single hypostasis," "single nature"[34]—which is the very being of God.

From a wholly different point of view, the doctors of Antioch considered in Christ first His humanity, and then rose to His divinity. Among them should be noted the names of Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius. Diodorus had the glory of restoring, at the end of the fourth century, the School founded by St. Lucian. Jealous to maintain, againt the Apollinarians, the integrity of the two natures in Christ, he vigorously distinguished in the Savior the Son of God from the Son of David, and even said that the Word

[30] "The accounts given by Socrates represent the reports credited at Constantinople and so admit a certain measure of exaggeration." Duchesne, *op. cit.*, III, 210 note. On the murder of Hypatia, see Schäfer, in the *Catholic University Bulletin*, VIII (1902), 441 ff.

[31] Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiastica Historia*, XIV, 28; *P. G.*, CXLVI, 1152.

[32] St. Cyril, Letter 4.

[33] This is the *ἰδιοποίησις* of St. Athanasius.

[34] *Φύσις, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον*. Cf. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, III, 58 ff.

is not the son of Mary.[35] St. Cyril, then, made no mistake in attacking this precursor of Nestorius. Although Diodorus never was anthematized, we find in the extant fragments of his writings certain expressions that were later condemned in the patriarch of Constantinople.[36]

Theodore of Mopsuestia was the theorist of the School. He seems to have been aware of the import of his doctrine much more than was his pupil Nestorius. He sustained the Pelagians, preceiving in them certain tendencies that harmonized with his own. Like Diodorus, the Bishop of Mopsuestia had in mind particularly the refutation of Apollinarianism. But he was more concerned than Diodorus was with preserving the traditional formulas in his language, although in reality he pushed the logical consequences of his principles further.

Theodore neglected no opportunity to declare that the two natures of Christ, the human and the divine, constituted one single person;[37] that consequently in Jesus there is only one Son, one Lord. Yet, "for the purpose of safeguarding the integrity and inconfusion of the two natures in their union, the Bishop of Mopsuestia speaks of these natures as two persons complete in themselves."[38]

He holds that it is Jesus who strove against temptation and, aided by the divinity, advanced toward perfection.

"It is the man only that is the historical Jesus. Theodore says that the union implies unity of will and action between the two natures. The unity referred to by Theodore is merely a moral harmony; the human will conformed to that of the Word, and subordinated its action to His."[39]

The practical consequence of this system was to condemn, as Apollinarian errors, all the expressions that attribute to

[35] Photius, *Bibliotheca,* 248; *P. G.,* CIII, 1560.
[36] Tixeront, *op. cit.,* III, 12.
[37] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *De Incarnatione,* 8; *P. G.,* LXVI, 969 f., 983 f.
[38] Tixeront, *op. cit.,* III, 18.
[39] *Ibid.*

the concrete man, in Jesus Christ, the qualities and acts of divinity. "It is foolish," he said, "to claim that God was born of a virgin." [40] Theodore seems not to have perceived another more serious consequence, for it destroyed the whole economy of the Redemption, and the leading reason which St. Athanasius placed at the basis of his argumentation against Arianism: namely, if the historical Jesus was not the very Person of the Word of God, how are we to explain the infinite value of the sacrifice of the cross and the deification of man by the immolation and resurrection of a God?

Nestorius made no addition to this system. "Theodore of Mopsuestia was a Nestorius before Nestorius." [41] But he was not attacked during his life. No one appears to have perceived the profound evils of his teaching. One of his pupils, by proclaiming it with brilliancy, drew to it the attention of the friends of Catholic tradition, particularly of Cyril of Alexandria.

Nestorius

The very year of Theodore's death (April 4, 428), after Sisinnius the patriarch of Constantinople also had died, when tumultuous rivalries threatened to occur over the choice of his successor, imperial influence set to work to bring about the election of a candidate from outside the capital city.[42] The person chosen was Nestorius,[43] the abbot of a monastery at Antioch. He was reputed to be an austere priest and an eloquent preacher. By the tendency of his mind he was not a metaphysician, but rather a trained exegete.[44] He was accustomed

[40] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Contra Apollinarium.*

[41] Bardenhewer, *op. cit.*, p. 321. "Theodore of Mopsuestia is generally regarded as the true Nestorius, *i. e.*, the theoretical exponent of the heresy to which the Patriarch of Constantinople gave his name." Tixeront, *op. cit.*, III, 13.

[42] Socrates, *H. E.*, VII, 20.

[43] Nau, *Nestorius d'après les sources orientales.*

[44] This fact seems to be made clear in the work of Junglas, *Die Irrlehre des Nestorius.*

to the literal interpretation of Scripture as then practiced in Antioch. Consequently he was chiefly concerned with Christ's human deeds and inclined to regard the divinity in Christ only as the moral acquisition consummated by His death. "He was a trained theologian, well versed in the method of literal exegesis and accustomed to weigh the meaning of Biblical texts, as was usual at Antioch." [45]

The new patriarch of Constantinople set himself up as a grim defender of orthodoxy against all heresies or dubious doctrines. Five days after his consecration, he had the police close a chapel which the Arians had kept in an old quarter of the city. Shortly afterwards, some Macedonian and Quartodeciman communities were dissolved. The Novatians escaped his rigor only through the powerful backing they had at court. Thereafter Nestorius turned his efforts against the heresy which his teacher Theodore had taught him to detest: the heresy of Apollinarianism.

The strife was begun, about the close of 428, not by the Patriarch himself, but by an Antioch priest, named Anastasius, whom he had brought with him and who, like himself, had been taught by the Bishop of Mopsuestia. In his sermons to the people, Anastasius attacked the title *theotokos* (Mother of God), given to the Virgin Mary, as implying an absurdity. This title was in current use. Protests were made. Nestorius took Anastasius' part in a series of sermons in which, by the theological theory of his teacher Theodore, he endeavored to justify the sermon of his priest Anastasius. In these first declarations Nestorius appears less radical than Theodore, more concerned with preserving the traditional expressions about the oneness of person in Christ. From this point of view "he is not as much of a Nestorian as Theodore." [46] And he maintained this concern to the end; but, on the other hand,

[45] Tixeront, *op. cit.*, III, 21.
[46] *Ibidem*, III, 33.

he always maintained his ideas with unbending obstinacy.[47]

The demonstration in connection with the word *theotokos* divided the population of Constantinople. People of the world and of the court took the Patriarch's side. But the masses, the monks, and part of the secular clergy declared themselves against him. Clamorous disputes followed.

St. Cyril Denounces Nestorianism

The Patriarch of Alexandria was notified of the danger by monks, who told him that Nestorius' ideas had reached even their places of solitude. Cyril merely wrote them a long letter, putting them on their guard against the new doctrines.[48] "Should Mary be called *theotokos?*" he said. "Yes, indeed, since she brought forth the God Word made man. The term is traditional. All the orthodox Fathers, both Eastern and Western, have accepted it." [49] Thereafter we meet the word *theotokos* in all St. Cyril's writings. For him it is the criterion of true Christological belief, as the word *homoousios* had been for Athanasius the test of the true Trinitarian belief.

In spite of the fact that he is not mentioned by name, Nestorius was vexed by this letter. Cyril wrote him directly in peaceful, friendly terms. "The faithful," says Cyril, "even Celestine the bishop of Rome, are greatly scandalized. . . . I beg you to grant Mary the title of *theotokos*. It is not a new appellation." [50] Nestorius answered with a contemptuous letter, and continued his sermons and propaganda. But he did more than this. He hired disreputable people to spread all kinds of lies about the Patriarch of Alexandria. Cyril complains of this in a second letter which is a full and exact doctrinal ex-

[47] *Ibidem*, III, 21–42.
[48] *Ad monachos Aegypti, P. G.*, LXVII, 9–40.
[49] *Ibid., P. G.*, LXXVII, 16.
[50] *P. G.*, LXXVII, 41.

position of the question. "Therein he explains the meaning of the words: 'The Word was made Flesh'; how the eternal Word was born in time; how it is true to say that God was born, died, rose from the dead, and that Mary is the Mother of God." [51] Nestorius replied in a sharp tone, and discussed the arguments advanced against him.

The Patriarch of Constantinople did not confine himself to these epistolary polemics. "There were at Constantinople some Alexandrian clergy who had been deprived by Cyril for certain misdoings; they made strong complaints against him alike to the bishop and to the magistrates." [52] Nestorius made a show of being interested in them. What move was he planning? Would he, by virtue of the supremacy of Constantinople, claim a right to summon the Patriarch of Alexandria before his tribunal? Anything might be expected from the audacity of such a man. But Cyril wrote: "Let him not imagine that I will allow myself to be judged by him. I will refuse to recognize his jurisdiction. And the roles will be reversed. I can force him to be on the defensive." [53]

Only one authority was competent to judge the case of Nestorius: that was the bishop of Rome, the head of the universal Church. Cyril was mindful of this. He wrote to Pope Celestine, reminding him of the tradition according to which grave questions should always be submitted to the Roman Pontiff.[54] Celestine's reply, discussed in a Roman Council (August 430), was such as might have been foreseen. Nestorius' doctrine was declared unacceptable, and the Patriarch of Constantinople was called upon, under pain of excommunication, to retract within ten days after receipt of the decision.[55]

To put an end to the activities of Nestorius and his follow-

[51] Mahé, art. *"Cyrille d'Alexandrie,"* in the *Dictionnaire de théologie,* III, 2479.
[52] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* III, 233.
[53] St. Cyril, Letter 10.
[54] *Idem,* Letter 11.
[55] Celestine, Letter 11 (to Cyril); *P. L.,* L., 463.

ers, Cyril at the same time addressed Emperor Theodosius II,[56] Empresses Pulcheria and Eudoxia, and the two princesses Arcadia and Marcina.[57] This second move, however, was not equally successful. Nestorius, at the very outset of the controversy, had been careful to make sure of the support of the court. Emperor Theodosius answered Cyril in a threatening letter, accusing him of disturbing the peace of the Empire.[58]

The *Anathematisms* of St. Cyril

Up to this point, in the minds of people of sound faith, Cyril's cause possessed the marks of truth and moderation; that of Nestorius had all the signs of error and revolt. In a conflict with the Emperor, Cyril had the whole Church behind him. An unfortunate imprudence on his part—but one hard to avoid—suddenly changed the situation and at once turned a number of bishops and laymen against him. We refer to the publication of the famous document known in history as the *Anathematisms of St. Cyril."*

Pope Celestine, when condemning Nestorius, confided the execution of the decision to Cyril. The latter, after convening a council at Alexandria, published a lengthy synodal letter, which was a masterly exposition of Catholic doctrine on the mystery of the Incarnation, followed by twelve anathema formulas, or anathematisms, to which Nestorius must agree to escape the penalty of excommunication.[59]

"These formulas show great theological acumen, and were framed in such a way as to make evasion on the part of Nestorius impossible. But they are open to two objections: they contain numerous details and precisions which the Pope had not required; and—what

[56] *P. G.*, LXXVI, 1133–1200.

[57] *Ibid.*, cols. 1201–1420.

[58] Mansi, IV, 1109 ff.

[59] Mansi, III, 2509–2511. Hefele (III, 31–34) gives the Greek text and translation of these anathematisms; Tixeront (III, 39 f.) gives a short summary of them.

is more important—they present the dogma of Christ's personality in distinctly Cyrillian concepts and terms, which, as we shall see later, were not free from imperfection and which Nestorius in particular could not accept. Thus, for instance, the second anathematism affirms that the union between the divinity and the humanity in Christ was καο' ὑπόστασιν.[60] Now, as has already been remarked, the word ὑπόστασις had not yet acquired a settled and definite meaning in the language of Christology. Nestorius understood it to mean a concrete substance, whilst Cyril used it sometimes for πρόσωπον, sometimes for φύσις. But it was the expression ἕνωσις φυσική in the third anathematism, that was to be the most regretted. I have translated this expression by 'physical union'—in opposition to moral union. This is the meaning St. Cyril attached to it, as he himself explained; but it was inevitable that prejudiced opponents should explain it in the sense that the divinity and the humanity formed but one nature in Jesus Christ. This, of course, was Apollinarianism, *i. e.,* the very same error which Nestorius and his followers had fought with all their might, and the fear of which had carried them to the other extreme.[61]

"Naturally, they were unwilling to subscribe to it. Nestorius issued twelve counter-anathematisms, in which he upheld his own teaching and condemned that of his opponent as Apollinarian. John of Antioch, and even those Antiochians who had first advised Nestorius to submit, changed their attitude. Andrew of Samosata, in the name of the bishops of the East,[62] and Theodoret, in his own name attacked Cyril's anathematisms, especially the third, which

[60] The meaning of the word "hypostasis" became established in the Arian controversy regarding the doctrine of the Trinity. In their Christological doctrine, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius identified the word "hypostasis" (person) and the word "physis" (nature). For them each of these words signified the concrete being, the "usia." See the *Livre d'Héraclide,* pp. 42 f., 136 f., 145, 148.

[61] On St. Cyril's anathematisms, see the article of Joseph Mahé, *"Les Anathematismes de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et les évêques orientaux du patriarchat d'Antioche,"* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* VII (1906), 505 ff.

[62] "We may recall that, in the fifth century, the word East designated especially the diocese of the East, *viz.,* that country which corresponded generally to the patriarchate of Antioch." Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* III, 41 note. This patriarchate had a vast extent, embracing, besides Syria, other territories, such as Arabia and Persia. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* II, 293.

seemed to teach only one nature in Jesus Christ. Cyril answered their criticisms and explained that in the expression ἕνωσις φυσική the word φυσική meant simply *true* and *real*.[63] However he felt that he ought to justify himself still more completely and later on published a third *Explicatio duodecim Capitum*[64] with the avowed purpose of warding off the charge of Apollinarianism brought against him.[65]

"At the beginning of the year 431, after all these proceedings, the condition of things was just as unsettled as before. Nestorius had not submitted; the Oriental bishops, if they did not approve his doctrinal excesses, upheld his person; so also did the Emperor. There was but one resource left: to hold a general council; and this is precisely what Nestorius had asked the Pope, and the monks of Constantinople had begged the Emperor to do.[66] Cyril himself had asked for it.[67] Theodosius II and his colleague Valentinian III convoked a general council to be held at Ephesus on Pentecost Day, June 7, 431.[68] The Pope sent two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, to represent the Roman Council, and a priest named Philip to represent himself personally; and demanded that Nestorius, though already condemned, be present at the Council." [69]

Said the Pope in his letter: "God wishes not the death of a sinner, but that he be converted." And he urged Cyril to make every effort to reëstablish peace in the Church and to win Nestorius to the truth.[70]

Council of Ephesus (431)

The day appointed for the opening of the Council was June 7, 431. Among the earliest arrivals was Nestorius, proud and

[63] *P. G.*, LXXVI, 332, 405.

[64] *Ibid.*, cols. 293–312.

[65] Cf. Jugie, *"La Terminologie christologique de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie"* in the *Échos d'Orient*, XV (1912), 12–27.

[66] Mansi, IV, 1101 ff., especially 1108.

[67] Evagrius, *H. E.*, I, 7.

[68] Mansi, IV, 1292. The Emperor sent a special invitation to St. Augustine (Mansi, IV, 1208); but the latter was dead when the imperial messenger arrived.

[69] Tixeront, *op. cit.*, pp. 40–42.

[70] Mansi, IV, 1292.

threatening, like a general arriving on the battle-field. He was accompanied by sixteen bishops and, says Socrates, "followed by a multitude of laymen of all classes, who formed his escort." [71] Shortly afterwards, Cyril arrived with fifty bishops. While waiting for the latecomers, the Patriarch of Alexandria in conformity with the Pope's advice tried, through Theodotus of Ancyra and Acacius of Mitylene, who were bound in friendship to Nestorius, to win him gently to the truth.

These efforts encountered the obstinacy of the heresiarch. It is surprising to see what contradictory statements historians place on the lips of Nestorius. The most acceptable explanation is that of a learned historian who speaks of Nestorius as "a sort of braggart, shifting from one extreme to the other, from orthodoxy to heresy, almost without being aware of so doing." [72] We are told by contemporaries that Nestorius was "a handsome man, of ruddy complexion, with large eyes and a strong, sonorous voice." [73] He was conceited and thought himself irresistible. He said: "Cyril runs away from me because he is afraid I will convert him." Acacius and Theodotus were hopeful of winning him over when they heard him say: "After all, I am quite willing to say that Mary is the Mother of God, if they agree not to interpret these words in an Apollinarian sense." But, when persuaded to assert himself upon the essential point of the question, he declared to Theodotus: "Never will I acknowledge as God a babe who is two months old." In speaking to Acacius, he was not less brutally sarcastic. He said: "If you insist on saying that the Word of God is the same Person as Christ, you must confess, since the Trinity is indivisible, that the Father and the Holy Ghost became incarnate." One of his followers, echoing his words and elaborat-

[71] Socrates, *H. E.*, VII, 34.
[72] Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, II, 294.
[73] Nau, *Nestorius d'après les sources orientales*, p. 12.

ing them, added: "It is wrong to regard the Jews as deicides. It was not a God they put to death, but a man." [74]

Yet John of Antioch and his suffragans had not arrived, alleging one reason after another which seemed mere pretexts. Finally two envoys from the Patriarch of Syria declared on his behalf that the opening of the Council should not be postponed on his account. From this it was inferred that John wanted to avoid being present at the condemnation of his friend Nestorius. Then Cyril, urged by his friends and exhibiting to the Council about to convene his delegation from the Pope for the execution of the sentence pronounced against Nestorius,[75] declared (June 22) the Council opened and took its presidency.[76]

Nestorius was invited to take part in the deliberations. First he replied "that he would think the matter over." Again he replied "that he would appear when all the bishops were assembled." When a third invitation was sent to him, the armed men guarding his house maltreated the Council's messengers.[77] The Patriarch felt himself sustained by the Emperor and probably counted on some interference by the imperial authority to prevent the holding of the Council. In fact, just as the prothonotary was proclaiming the purpose of the assembly, Count Candidian, captain of the Emperor's bodyguard, delegated as his representative at Ephesus, entered the Church of St. Mary,[78] where the meeting was being held, followed by

[74] Socrates, *H. E.*, VII, 34; Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.*

[75] We consider with Tixeront (*op. cit.*, III, 43 note) that this is the natural explanation of Cyril's action. Pope Celestine commissioned Cyril to execute the Roman sentence and advised him how he should act with Nestorius. The Acts of the Council speak of Cyril as "holding the place of the Bishop of Rome." (Mansi, IV, 1124.) Moreover, since the patriarch of Constantinople was the accused and since the patriarch of Antioch excused himself, the patriarch of Alexandria was given the presidency of the Council. The vague charges that had been made against him, outside of ecclesiastical regulations, could not furnish a reason for him to refuse to preside.

[76] Mansi, IV, 1131 ff.

[77] *Ibidem.*

[78] Instead of "St. Mary's Church," recent historians read "Mary's Church."

a band of soldiers, and announced to the bishops the command to disperse. There followed a tumultuous scene, which ended when the imperial legate withdrew. A number of bishops, on the side of Nestorius, then left. Cyril, disregarding this remarkable injunction, ordered the reading of the imperial letter of convocation, took official cognizance of Nestorius' refusal to attend, and at once declared that the business before the Council was the consideration of the doctrinal question raised by the Patriarch of Consantinople.

One hundred fifty-nine bishops and one deacon (representing the Bishop of Carthage) were present at this first session.[79] The papal legates had not yet arrived. The inquiry was conducted with method and precision.

Condemnation of Nestorius

First the Nicene Creed was read.[80] Then was read Cyril's second letter to Nestorius. All the Fathers declared that it was in agreement with the Creed. Nestorius' reply to Cyril was read; and all declared that it was opposed to the Nicene faith.[81] The consequence of these unanimous votes was the following decree, also approved by the unanimous vote of the Fathers: "That all who do not anathematize Nestorius be anathema, for he is anathematized by the true faith and by the holy council." [82] We should note that at this first session several other documents were read, notably Cyril's letter that ended with the famous anathematisms. But nowhere do the Acts of the Council say that these anathematisms received a special ap-

[79] The gathering was almost exclusively Eastern. There was a general abstention on the part of the West, which was ravaged by invasions and which was not greatly disturbed by the questions that would be discussed at the Council.

[80] That is, the Nicene Creed strictly so called, not the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople. Cf. The *Livre d'Héraclide,* pp. 125–163.

[81] Most of the bishops expressed their reasons for voting as they did. See Mansi, IV, 1139–1170.

[82] Mansi, IV, 1170 ff.

proval by the Council, as is the case with Cyril's second letter to Nestorius.[83]

To show how resolved they were to remain faithful to the tradition of the Fathers, upon Flavian's motion a series of Patristic passages was read touching upon the two natures in Christ. Peter of Alexandria, Athanasius, Popes Julius I and Felix I, Theophilus of Alexandria, Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, and others were brought forward in evidence against the heresy of Nestorius.[84] In opposition to these testimonies twenty passages of Nestorius were read. In these were found expressed the errors with which he was charged.

The only thing remaining to be done was the declaration of the sentence of deposition. The Fathers drew it up in the following terms: "Obliged by the canons and by the letters of our most holy Father and fellow-bishop, Celestine, bishop of Rome, we have had to come to this sad sentence: The Lord Jesus Christ, whom the impious Nestorius has blasphemed, decides, by this holy Council, that Nestorius is deprived of the episcopal dignity and the priestly communion." [85] This decree was signed by 198 bishops present. Others added their names afterwards.

"The session had lasted from early in the morning into the night, and the assembled population of Ephesus waited the whole day to hear the decision. When this was at last known, there arose an universal rejoicing; they commended the Synod, and solemnly accompanied the members, particularly Cyril, with torches and censers to their houses. The city was also illuminated in many places. This

[83] Denzinger's *Enchiridion* gives St. Cyril's twelve anathematisms in connection with the Council of Ephesus; and the fifth ecumenical Council, in its sixth session (Mansi, IX, 327–329), introduces them as belonging to the Acts of Ephesus, *"pars eorum quae Ephesi gesta sunt."* This means simply that they were read as documents to which no objection was made; it does not mean that they received special approval.

[84] These texts may be seen in Mansi, IV, 1183–1195. The most important of them will be found in Hefele, III, 49 ff.

[85] Mansi, IV, 1211; *Livre d'Héraclide,* pp. 235 f.

is joyfully related by Cyril in one of the three letters which he despatched at that time to the members of his Church of Alexandria, and to the monks of Egypt." [86]

The next day, upon receiving notification of the decree which condemned him, Nestorius gave way to an outburst of anger. He wrote to the Emperors in complaint. Count Candidian, equally wrathful, did the same, protesting against the decisions of a council which had met in spite of his explicit prohibition. Both of them were especially displeased since they were helpless in the presence of the whole population flocking to the churches to hear Cyril and his friends explain the decisions of the Council. Nestorius felt hurt by the terms employed in his regard: the Council had called him impious; and Cyril, in communicating to him the decree of deposition, called him Judas. He forgot the long consideration shown him and his own ceaseless provocations.

John of Antioch

At this juncture the arrival of John of Antioch and his suffragans revived Nestorius' hopes. Count Candidian told them, in his own way, about the holding of the Council despite the Emperor's orders. A few bishops devoted to Nestorius had declined to attend the session on the 22d. They joined the newly arrived bishops. Thus they formed a group of forty-three prelates. Immediately John of Antioch, with the dust of his journey still on him, assembled them in his house.[87] Delegates from the Council, sent to notify them of its decisions, were roughly driven back by the soldiers acting as an escort for John of Antioch and his group.[88]

[86] Hefele, III, 51; Mansi, IV, 1242 f.

[87] Mansi, IV, 1334.

[88] John of Antioch, in his account later on, says, on the contrary, that the delegation rushed upon him tumultuously. (Hefele, III, 56.)

"Then without waiting any longer, without citation, without discussion, they pronounced the deposition of the Patriarch of Alexandria and of the Bishop of Ephesus, as well as the excommunication of all their adherents." [89]

Cyril and Memnon (the Bishop of Ephesus) paid no attention to these illegal decrees. Memnon even closed his churches to the dissenting bishops. The Emperor, urged thereto by Candidian's reports, issued an imperial rescript (June 29) declaring his rejection of everything that had been done by the council over which Cyril presided. But in the beginning of July the legates of the Pope arrived and, when informed of the whole affair, subscribed, in the name of the Supreme Pontiff, to what had been decreed against Nestorius and his heresy. Strengthened by this approval, the Council which, since July 10, had been meeting in Memnon's episcopal residence or in St. Mary's Church, summoned John of Antioch and his followers, the "Easterners," as they were called. Upon their refusal to appear before the Council, it declared them excommunicated and deprived of any jurisdiction. A written report of this decision was sent to the Pope and to the Emperor.[90]

The Nicene Creed

The Council held two more sessions, the sixth and seventh. Considering the Nestorian question settled, it turned its attention to the regulation of certain special matters.

A decision of the sixth session deserves our attention, on account of the disputes it would later occasion. A Philadelphia priest, Charisius by name, related that Nestorians, taking advantage of the ignorance of certain converts, had them sign, instead of the pure Nicene Creed, a symbol containing the

[89] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, III, 247.
[90] Mansi, IV, 1361, 1364.

Nestorian errors. Following this report, the Council decreed, under threat of excommunication and deposition, the rejection of any symbol differing from that of Nicaea, in particular the one presented by Charisius.

It appears evident, when we read this decision in its context, that the Fathers of Ephesus had no thought of forbidding their successors to issue new definitions in opposition to new errors or to accept professions of faith more developed than that of Nicaea. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 did not hesitate to put the symbol of Constantinople in circulation, and later on the Church had no reluctance about inserting the word *"Filioque"* in the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople. But at different periods heretics or schismatics—the Monophysites and later the schismatic Greeks—have appealed to the Ephesus decree for the rejection of new decisions of the Church.[91]

When the Council of Ephesus was meeting, Pelagianism was at its end. Pope Zosimus had given it a final blow by his celebrated *Tractoria.* However, several bishops involved in the Pelagian heresy (*e. g.,* Julian, Florus, and Orontius) had appeared in Constantinople after the coming of Nestorius, and the Patriarch, contrary to his usual practice toward heretics, had given them a friendly welcome. The Fathers of Ephesus, therefore, deemed it well to condemn positively the heresy of Pelagius and Caelestius in two of their canons, the first and fourth.

Supremacy of the Holy See

It is noteworthy how energetically the Fathers of the Council professed their respect and obedience toward the Roman Pontiff. When approving the condemnation of Nestorius, the legate of the Holy See (the priest Philip) proclaimed, "as a

[91] It is to be noted that the Council of Ephesus forbade ἑτέραν πίστιν (a profession of faith different, unlike, contrary), not ἄλλαν πίστιν (another profession of faith). Furthermore the decree is disciplinary, not strictly dogmatic.

thing that was not questioned by anyone, as a fact recognized in all ages," the primacy of the Apostle Peter and his successors over the universal Church. He declared that the bishop of Rome was the prince, the chief, the head of all the Churches, that Peter lived in him and communicated his powers to him. In the circumstances of their declaration, these words did not of course have the value of a dogmatic definition, but in them we find the substance of the solemn definitions which were pronounced fourteen centuries later by the Vatican Council, which adopted as its own and inserted the very words of the priest Philip at the Council of Ephesus.[92]

Execution of the Decrees

The doctrinal work of the Council was finished. But peace would not be restored so long as the Emperor sustained the dissenters, so long as Nestorius' deposition was not actually carried out, so long as the Patriarch of Antioch refused reconciliation with the Patriarch of Alexandria, so long as, behind these two prelates, misunderstandings and passions continued to stir the masses. It was no easy matter to overcome these four obstacles.

For the welfare of the Empire, the reëstablishment of peace was a matter of great concern to Emperor Theodosius. He thought he could get it by force. For this purpose he sent to Ephesus a new representative, Count John, a stern man. As Count John himself tells us, his arrival filled the city with fear. He considered that he would get the upper hand of all by treating the leaders with severity. He therefore imprisoned Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius. But the orthodox were not

[92] Denzinger, nos. 1823, 1824, 1825. On the Council of Ephesus, see Jugie, art. *"Ephèse (Concile d')*, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* VI, 137–163. On the proofs of the ecumenicity of this Council, see *ibid.,* cols. 158–161. Cf. Jugie, *"La Primauté romaine au concile d'Ephèse,"* in the *Échos d'Orient,* XIV (1911), 136–146.

discouraged by the severity used toward their patriarch. Says Tillemont: "Even those who had never seen St. Cyril until this Council were ready to go into banishment with him if he should be exiled, and were willing to expose their lives for his life." [93]

The Emperor then tried to bring about an agreement or understanding by summoning to him a deputation of the two parties. It is altogether likely that, following the Eastern custom,[94] Cyril in the present case directed his deputation to bring presents to the court in his name. But it appears to be a pure calumny to say, on the testimony of Theodoret—whose partiality is well known [95]—that "Cyril scattered gold with an open hand along all the paths of the palace," [96] and to attribute to these bounties Theodosius' change of attitude in his relations with Nestorius. The scholarly Tillemont and the eminent historian of the councils, Hefele, adopt an explanation more in accord with the character of the Patriarch of Alexandria and that of the Emperor, namely, that the orthodox succeeded in making Theodosius see that right was on their side.[97] Nestorius' deposition was confirmed by the imperial authority, his succession in the see of Constantinople was given to a

[93] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* XIV, 463.

[94] Rampolla, in his *Life of St. Melania the Younger,* notes that the Saint, when admitted to audience with Honorius, "agreeable to custom, and not wishing to present herself empty-handed, brought valuable gifts of goldsmith's work and of elegant cloths worthy of a queen, as also garments of cloth of gold and of silk to be given to the courtiers." Rampolla, *Santa Melania Giuniore senatrice romana,* p. 9.

[95] Theodoret's violent pamphlet against St. Cyril's anathematisms was condemned by the fifth ecumenical Council.

[96] The document containing a list of St. Cyril's presents was not published until 1873 in the *Bibliotheca Casinensis,* I, 46. It is to be found also in Hefele (III, 133), in Nau's edition of the *Livre d'Héraclide* (pp. 368 f.), and in an article by Batiffol (*Bulletin d'ancienne littérature,* 1911, p. 251), who also gives a diplomatic transcription of the document by Dom Wilmart. As Batiffol remarks (*op. cit.,* p. 248), the memorandum of the presents offered by St. Cyril "comes to us by the hand of one of his enemies."

[97] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* XIV, 475; Hefele, III, 134. Hefele refutes the arguments advanced in support of the alleged corruption by St. Cyril.

mild, moderate orthodox, Maximian. Cyril was released and, at the end of October 431, returned to Alexandria.

Pope St. Sixtus III

Eight months later (July 27, 432) Pope Celestine died after a pontificate of nine years. His successor Sixtus, the third of that name, was a native of Rome. One of his first acts was to dedicate to the Virgin Mother of God and to decorate magnificently the church previously called the Liberian Basilica, but since then venerated under the title of St. Mary Major. "This venerable church is still, in its ensemble and despite many alterations, what it was in the fifth century. . . . The general idea of the decoration, as also the text of the dedicatory inscription, shows that it was intended to perpetuate the memory of the victory won at the Council of Ephesus by the dogma of Mary's divine maternity." [98] At the same time the new Pontiff expressed his desire that John of Antioch and his followers should be received into the communion of the Church, provided they would subscribe to the condemnations decreed by the Council of Ephesus.[99] In the same spirit of conciliation, Theodosius wrote to the dissenters with a like purpose in mind.[100]

Restoration of Peace

Most of the bishops wanted peace. The great obstacle was in the famous anathematisms of the Patriarch of Alexandria. Cyril consented to explain them. This he did in a sense excluding any Apollinarian idea. But the Easterners required that they be withdrawn. Finally an understanding was reached. The

[98] Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis,* I, 235. On the works done at St. Mary Major by order of Sixtus III, see Grisar, *History of Rome,* II, 33 ff., 117 ff. On the work of restoration at St. John Lateran, see *ibidem,* II, 26.

[99] Mansi, V, 374 f.

[100] Mansi, V, 278, 281, 828.

anathematisms were not disavowed, because Cyril feared that Nestorius would take advantage of such a disavowal to appear to triumph and to revive the dispute. But he agreed to subscribe to a profession of faith which was almost a copy of a declaration that the Easterners had formerly sent to the Emperor.[101] In this formula, in which it was necessary to include the precise points held in common by the two theologies of Antioch and Alexandria, by sacrificing their individual terminologies, John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria confess that "in Christ there is a union of two natures in one only Lord, in one only Son," and that "the holy Virgin is Mother of God, since the Word became man." [102] The expression "physical oneness or oneness of nature, *enosis physike,*" which in the *anathematisms* had been such a source of scandal, was omitted, but the word *theotokos* was accepted. "The disputants—at least the calmest—eventually acknowledged that, under different formulas, they had sought to express the same things," [103] and that the prolonged quarrels of the latter years were merely the result of a misunderstanding, exploited by Nestorius' factious and turbulent spirit.

Peace was concluded between the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. But, among the clergy and faithful of the two Churches, there was no cessation of the passions, antipathies, and prejudices stirred up or revived in the recent disputes. On Cyril's side certain ill-informed people like Isidore of Pelusium and certain real Monophysites like Acacius of Mitylene accused their leader of betraying the cause of orthodoxy. On the side of John of Antioch certain irreconcilables like Theodoret accused their patriarch with cowardly abandonment of Nestorius and alliance with a heretic. The explana-

[101] Mansi, V, 781–783. This declaration was probably Theodoret's work.

[102] Mansi, *loc. cit.*

[103] Joseph Mahé, *"Les Anathématismes de saint Cyrille"* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* VII (1906), 542.

tions given by the two patriarchs, the energetic intervention of Theodosius II, and especially the removal of Nestorius (first interned in a monastery, then exiled to Petra in Arabia, and finally to the Oasis of Egypt), gradually led to peace.

The *Bazaar of Heracleides*

In his last place of banishment, to justify his conduct Nestorius wrote the famous *Bazaar of Heracleides.*[104] Its discovery a few years ago should, according to some, cause a review of Nestorius' trial and should result in his rehabilitation; in short, it ought to lead history to declare that "Nestorius was not Nestorian." [105] But an attentive study of the document soon led scholars to doubt the absolute authenticity of the book,[106] or at least to question "whether the work in its present state should be attributed to Nestorius himself," [107] to recognize that the document teaches heretical doctrine,[108] and even to declare, as Harnack does, that "we should forego using the *Bazaar of Heracleides* in the history of dogma, because it lacks absolute guarantees." [109]

[104] Why was it entitled the *Bazaar of Heraclides?* Because the writings that bore the name of Nestorius were condemned to be burned and because, as the Syrian translator says, "the author feared lest his own name, abhorrent to many people, would prevent the book being read." Nau's translation, p. 3.

[105] This is the view maintained by Bethune-Baker in his *Nestorius and his Teaching.*

[106] J. Lebon, in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* XII (1911), 514–517.

[107] J. Labourt, in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétienne,* 1913, p. 145.

[108] Jugie, *Nestorius et la controverse nestorienne.*

[109] Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte,* vol. II (4th ed.). Harnack's opinion seems too radical.

CHAPTER III

From the Death of Pope St. Sixtus to the Fall of the Roman Empire (440–476)

THE decline of the Roman Empire, so manifest in the preceding period, was now accelerated. The gloomy apprehensions of Augustine, Jerome, and Salvian were realized. Under the pressure of the invading barbarians, the imperial power struggled as in the convulsions of its last agony. In the East, Theodosius the Younger, abandoning the last means of rescue, broke away from the orthodox Church and favored heresy. After his death in 461, the devout Empress Pulcheria vainly tried to save everything by giving her hand and her brother's crown to an upright and courageous general, Marcian. It was too late. The dissolving power of heresy had done its work at Constantinople. In the West, the Theodosian dynasty expired with Valentinian III in 455. After him the Latin Empire still counted nine Augustuses. But five of them were raised up or overthrown by the Gothic general Ricimer. In 476 the obscure leader of a barbarian band, without even striking a blow, was able to seize a scepter which an insignificant successor of the Caesars did not attempt to defend.

Yet, during this period, learning, eloquence, and the traditions of a wise Roman policy ascended the pontifical throne in the person of St. Leo the Great. This successor of St. Peter was a theologian like Augustine, a preacher like Chrysostom, a statesman like Ambrose. He put down a formidable heresy that was backed by all the power of the Empire and he halted, at the very gates of Rome, the most terrible of the barbarians, Attila. The broken unity of that Empire, where the barbarian

element was strangely mingled with the Roman and Eastern elements, reformed around him. His work was so solid that from 450, the date of his death, until 476, the date of the definite fall of the Western Roman Empire, his first successors, Popes Hilary and Simplicius, by merely continuing that work as begun by Leo, give the impression of a new world rising up, destined to replace the ancient world, under the egis of the papacy.

St. Leo the Great

According to the chronological reckonings of the best scholars, Sixtus III died August 19, 440.[1] After his death the unanimous voice of the people and clergy chose the deacon Leo as his successor. Although sprung from a family of Tuscan origin, he himself was born in Rome.[2] There it was he received a distinguished education, as evidenced in the breadth of his knowledge and the purity of his literary style. In 418 he brought to Bishop Aurelius of Carthage the letter of Pope Zosimus condemning the Pelagians.[3] Later, under Pope Celestine, it was he who persuaded John Cassian to write his book on the Incarnation.[4] He enlightened Pope Sixtus regarding the intrigues of Julian of Eclanum. In 439 we find him in Gaul, commissioned, perhaps by Empress Placidia herself, to settle a dispute that arose between two generals, Aetius and Alberius, and that threatened to degenerate into civil war. This is all we know about St. Leo before his elevation to the papacy. But these details are sufficient for us to grasp his personal worth and the influence he already exercised.

[1] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 237 note.

[2] The *Liber pontificalis* (I, 238) says, *natione tuscus;* but St. Prosper, who was his friend, calls him a Roman (*Chronicon, Valent. et Anatol. coss.*); and he himself speaks of being unable to leave "his country and the apostolic see." (Letter 31.)

[3] The "acolyte Leo," spoken of by St. Augustine (Letters 191, 194) in this connection, is probably the future Pope Leo.

[4] Gennadius, *Lives of Illustrious Men,* chap. 62; *Nicene Fathers,* 2d ser., III, 396.

Leo was aware of the immensity of the task confronting him and the heavy responsibilities it would lay upon him. "As the whole world," he said, "turns to the see of the Blessed Apostle Peter, and as we who occupy it are expected to show for the universal Church the love which our Lord recommended to that Apostle, our office is the more burdensome since we have the greater duties toward everybody." [5]

Heresies

What made the situation particularly painful for the Supreme Pontiff was the fact that, whereas the old Roman world, in the scheme of which the Church was established, was everywhere crumbling, most of the barbarians preparing to seize its remains were heretics or idolaters. The Vandals, who were ravaging Africa, the Alani and the Suevi, who had entered Spain in 409; the Goths, who about the same time invaded Gaul and Italy: all these were Arians.[6] The Huns and the Heruli still professed paganism. The general excitement provoked by the invasions had scattered the formerly local heresies and schisms into different countries. The Manichaeans, driven from Africa by the Vandals, had spread into Italy. The Priscillian heresy, born in Spain, was infesting Gaul. The Pelagians were to be found more or less everywhere. The Nestorians began to spread beyond the East.

The holy Pontiff's vigilance was at first awakened by the presence in Rome of numerous Manichaeans who, it appears, were scandalizing the Eternal City by practices of shameless immorality. He had the books of the Manichaeans gathered together and burned. Obstinate individuals he turned over to the

[5] *Sermons*, V, 2.

[6] In 440 the Burgundians, who were settled in Gaul since the beginning of the century, were mostly Catholics; the Lombards did not invade Italy until the middle of the sixth century.

secular arm, and he obtained from Emperor Valentinian III severe laws against the sect.[7]

Certain Pelagians, even after the decrees which the Council of Ephesus issued against them, continued to spread their doctrines. The Pope decided that, before they could enter the community of the faithful, they must make a formal retractation of their errors.[8] With regard to members of the clergy who had been seduced by this heresy, he forbade that, even after their conversion, they be raised to an order higher than the one they received before their fall.[9]

In Spain the heresy of Priscillianism continued its ravages and even won over some bishops. To Turibius, bishop of Astorga, in whom he had particular confidence, the Pope assigned the duty of assembling a general council. On this occasion he sent to all the Spanish bishops a doctrinal formula concerning the errors of Priscillianism. The disturbances of the invasion prevented a national council being held; but a partial synod met at Toledo and promulgated a symbol in eighteen anathemas.[10] A number of bishops who had strayed from orthodoxy returned to sound doctrine, and the faithful were secure from perversion.

Nestorianism

It was harder to reach the Nestorians, who, when expelled from the Empire, found refuge in one of the cities protecting the eastern frontiers, the city of Edessa.

[7] St. Leo, *Sermons,* 10; St. Prosper, *Chronicon,* year 447; Valentinian's decree of June 19, 445 (*P. L.,* LIV, 622). On the infamies of which the Manichaeans were guilty, see especially St. Leo's *Sermons,* XVI, 4, and LXXVI, 6 f.

[8] St. Leo, Letter 2.

[9] Letter 18.

[10] Hefele, III, 176. Generally a second council is cited, held in Galicia (Régnier, *Saint Léon le Grand,* p. 32; Grisar, *History of Rome,* II, 48). But Tillemont (*Mémoires,* XV, 893) seems to prove that the mention of this council is owing to the use of the words "conciliar assembly" as a translation of "conventus," which at that time signified a territorial circumscription, a judicial district.

"There was in that city a celebrated school, which was frequented not only by the Osrhoenian subjects of the Emperor, but also by the Christian Persians subject to the Sassanides; and for this reason it was called the Persians' School. There the name and teaching of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia were held in high esteem. True, Bishop Rabbulas, after championing the cause of John of Antioch, had passed over, during the winter of 431–432, to Cyril's side, and had even denounced to the latter Theodore of Mopsuestia as the real author of Nestorianism; nay, he had done his best to suppress Theodore's writings; but, both among the clergy and in the school, he met with a resistance which, silent as it was on account of his extreme severity, was all the more deep-seated.

"After he died (435), there ensued a reaction that brought to the episcopal see one of his opponents. Ibas was an orthodox theologian of Theodoret's type. Though he regretted very much that Nestorius did not accept the θεοτόκος, he was a sworn enemy of St. Cyril, and a determined supporter of Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose works he had translated into Syriac and spread among his friends. Besides, he had written, probably in the year 433, to Maris, bishop of Ardaschir, a famous letter in which he gave, from an Oriental point of view, a full account of the Council of Ephesus and the agreement between John and Cyril, and strongly protested against the fanatic zeal with which Rabbulas was hunting down Theodore's writings. Later on, we shall have occasion to study that letter, which brought much trouble on Ibas.[11] No wonder that under such a bishop, and in spite of the presence of a comparatively few resolute Monophysites recruited from the student-body, the school of Edessa was able to keep up its Nestorian sympathies." [12]

However, the Sovereign Pontiff soon perceived that the great danger was no longer in Nestorianism, but in a heresy which, on the pretext of combating it, fell into an opposite error. This was the Monophysite heresy.

[11] Cf. A. Ratel, *"L'Église nestorienne en Turquie et en Perse"* in the *Échos d'Orient,* VII (1904), 285–293, 348–353.

[12] Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* III, 51. Cf. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse,* pp. 131–162, 247–288.

Monophysite Heresy

The peace concluded in 433 between St. Cyril and John of Antioch gave the Eastern Church a comparative tranquillity and enabled Leo the Great to turn his first efforts against the various heresies we have just mentioned. The death of John of Antioch in 443 and that of Cyril of Alexandria the next year seemed to put a definite seal on the reconciliation of their followers. But such was not really the case. "The East and Egypt are henceforth united," Theodoret exclaimed when he heard of Cyril's death. But he added: "Hatred is dead, and the heresy is buried with it." [13] In spite of its peaceful appearance, this declaration was an expression of bitterness. Four years later, in 448, the dispute over the *theotokos* "suddenly flared up like the flame of a fire that is not thoroughly extinguished." [14]

Eutyches

In one of those monasteries which, around Constantinople, formed a sort of crown of sacred enclosures in which the liturgical psalmody was to be heard day and night, there lived a monk who, at the time Leo the Great became pope, was about sixty-two years old.[15] For thirty years past, with the title of Archimandrite [16] (or superior), he had been ruling one of the largest monasteries, counting not less than two hundred monks. He was a strict religious of edifying life, but a narrow-minded man, without perspicacity or flexibility, quite wanting in any theological culture. Having been consecrated to God immediately after his birth and entering the religious life

[13] Labbe, *Conciliorum collectio*, V, 508.

[14] Thierry, *Nestorius et Eutyches*, p. 195.

[15] Eutyches, in a letter to the Pope, says that he was 70 years old in 448. Mansi, V, 1015.

[16] Ἀρχή, *μάνδρα* (primacy, convent).

while still a mere child, he belonged to that class of monks who took a vow never to leave their cloister during the rest of their lives.[17] His name was Eutyches. His lack of education did not keep him from declaring himself emphatically, in the theological dispute dividing the Schools of Antioch and Alexandria, in favor of the latter party. And his vow seemed to him no hindrance when it came to arranging the great procession of monks that, under the leadership of another archimandrite, Dalmatius, went to the Emperor to ask for the freeing of Cyril and Memnon. He was one of those men who in their assertions are the more confident, the less they know, who act the more boldly since their limited mind is unable to perceive obstacles. If Nestorius had that knowledge which puffeth up, mentioned by St. Paul,[18] Eutyches possessed the ignorance that puffeth up. He boasted that he had defended the faith at Ephesus.[19] But he took no part in the Council. Those who claimed that he did, confused him with the deacon Eutyches who was in Cyril's suite.[20]

But he did not hesitate to say that the Council had accomplished only half of its task, and that it was for him, Eutyches, to complete it. In his view, the Fathers lacked vision and courage. Nestorius made too great allowance for Christ's humanity; the Fathers of Ephesus did not affirm His divinity strongly enough. Eutyches had read the Scriptures, and scarcely anything else. With the presumption of most half-educated men, he said that, since God made a book, He must have put in it everything we need to know. All we need do is read it and understand it; the views of the Fathers are no help. Eutyches kept repeating and stressing certain of Cyril's expressions and claimed he was defending the same ideas. But

[17] Labbe, IV, 199.
[18] See I Cor. 8: 1.
[19] Mansi, VI, 627.
[20] Tillemont, *Mémoires*, XV, 487.

when he was pressed, it was seen that he was distorting every one of those ideas. Cyril had said that the two natures constituted one single Christ; Eutyches, thinking he was explaining Cyril's statement, taught that before the union there had been two natures, and that after the union there remained only one nature. This was taking a double error from the words of the holy patriarch. Cyril, following St. Paul's expression, said that the first man, drawn from the earth, was earthly, and that the second man, coming from heaven, was spiritual.[21] Eutyches, to clarify the master's words, said that the body of Jesus had been formed of a substance eternal as God, belonging to the Divinity. Thus Eutyches was returning to the worst errors of Docetism and Gnosticism.

These declarations, delivered in a peremptory tone, misled a number of the monks of Eutyches' monastery and spread to other monasteries. Nestorianism had been the heresy of worldlings, who were incapable of rising above a mediocre, low-minded ideal. But Eutyches' doctrine was such as to please the exalted imagination of certain Eastern monks. We do, in fact, know that some of them, by a kind of spiritual pride, incited one another to be the most successful in destroying natural inclinations, as they said, without being careful enough to find out whether they were not thus lacking the virtue of discretion which the masters of the spiritual life so much recommended. Their minds were ready to accept the doctrine of a Christ who was hardly human at all.

If confined to these single influences, Eutyches' heresy would probably have been continued in the shadow of a few monasteries and would not have gone beyond the circle of some limited groups, like those ascetical fancies that spread in the Middle Ages without disturbing the higher spheres of the Church and State. But the intervention of two powerful personages suddenly gave it great publicity and made the archi-

[21] Letter 39, *P. G.*, LXXVII, 177 f.

mandrite of Constantinople a personage toward whom the whole East and then the entire Church turned its eyes.

The first event that made him conspicuous was the rise to power, in 441, of the eunuch Chrysaphius, whom he had held at the baptismal font and who, according to the custom of the time, looked upon him as his father. This Chrysaphius, whose noble and majestic bearing deceived the Emperor, so that he even made him his grand chamberlain and grand constable,[22] was a former slave, a barbarian by birth, who gradually rose to this high office by a rare talent for intrigue. His first care was to separate the devout Empress Pulcheria from the court, for she might become the center of a Catholic influence. His second scheme was to put his godfather Eutyches in the patriarchal see of Constantinople. In this latter project he did not succeed. In spite of pressure from the eunuch, the clergy chose, not the archimandrite of Constantinople, but a virtuous and intelligent priest, named Flavian, who had belonged to the moderate orthodox group at the Council of Ephesus. Chrysaphius never forgave Flavian for supplanting his protégé; but at the same time he resolved that, although Eutyches was not a bishop, he would make him, at any cost, thanks to the imperial power, "the chief of the bishops."

Dioscorus of Alexandria

In 444 Eutyches found another support. To replace St. Cyril in the see of Alexandria, the choice of the people and clergy fell upon the archdeacon Dioscorus, who had accompanied Cyril to Ephesus and who until then enjoyed a certain renown.[23] But no sooner was the new patriarch elected than, intoxicated with the honors, he showed himself hostile to the

[22] The Oriental title was *spatharios* or *protospatharios* (from the prefix προτο and σπάθη, sword).

[23] Theodoret, Letter 60; *P. G.*, LXXXIII, 1232.

memory of his predecessor, avaricious, ambitious, intriguing, immeasurably devoted to the cause of Monophysitism. He charged that Cyril had emptied the Alexandrian treasury to sustain his fight against Nestorius. For this reason, with the connivance of the minister, the eunuch Chrysaphius, he confiscated for himself all the property of him to whom he owed everything, reducing the Patriarch's heirs to destitution.[24]

By his insatiable rapacity Dioscorus was a scourge for Egypt. His episcopal visitations were as much dreaded by the provinces as an invasion of barbarians.[25] His exactions enabled him to pay his followers handsomely and to make himself popular in the city of Alexandria by the lavish distribution of bread and wine at ridiculously low prices. Dioscorus seems to have been a fanatical Monophysite, determined by any and every means to bring about the triumph of his doctrine. The first means was his attempt to establish his patriarchal see above all the episcopal sees of the East, even that of Constantinople. He succeeded in doing so at the time of the Robber Council of Ephesus.[26]

In the strength of such support, added to that of Chrysaphius, Eutyches now spoke as master, obtaining proscription or deposition, not only of all the clergy suspected of Nestorianism, but also of all the friends of Cyril, accusing them of weakness in their fight against the heresy. If we are to accept the evidence in the *Bazaar of Heracleides,* which on this point seems hardly exaggerated in its terms, "it was Eutyches who directed the affairs of the Church; he employed Flavian as a servant to execute the orders of the court; he expelled from

[24] Mansi, VI, 1012.

[25] Mansi, VI, 1008.

[26] The followers of Dioscorus later honored him as a saint. The Monophysites' state of mind with regard to the celebrated patriarch may be learned by reading the *History of Dioscorus* by his disciple Theopistus. The original is in Syriac. Theopistus calls himself a contemporary of Dioscorus, but some features of the document indicate a later date.

the Church all those who did not share his views; those who aided him he promoted and gave them assistance." [27] Hesitating at nothing, he even wrote to Pope Leo to win him over to his ideas, denouncing the reviving peril of Nestorianism.

Dangers of the Monophysite Heresy

The real peril, on the contrary, was in the ideas and proceedings of the truculent archimandrite. This the Pope comprehended, and endeavored so to inform Eutyches in the prudent and moderate reply he sent him.[28] "Under pretext of raising Christ as much as possible, of laying greater stress upon His divinity, Eutyches made of Him a being absolutely stranger to humanity." [29]

According to the Monophysite logic with its principles, not only was Mary not really the Mother of Christ, but there was no Redemption, since Redemption implied a mediator between God and the race of Adam. The reality of Christ Himself almost vanished.

"To leave Eutyches alone was to lay oneself open to the danger of seeing inculcated, from one end of the Empire to the other, a teaching in which the historical reality of the Gospel, often compromised by mystical fantasies, would have foundered altogether." [30]

Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, could not fail to see the seriousness of the danger. But, out of charity for the archimandrite, and from kindness of heart, he simply begged the reckless agitator "to have pity on the Churches of God, so much tried by the preceding troubles," [31] and to abide by

[27] *Livre d'Héraclide,* pp. 294 f.
[28] St. Leo, Letter 20.
[29] Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* III, 282.
[30] *Ibid.,* III, 277.
[31] *Livre d'Héraclide,* p. 295.

the peace of 433. The proud monk replied: "We did not condemn Nestorius just so as to let his doctrine spread." [32]

Theodoret of Cyrus

Eutyches' teaching encountered a more decided opponent in the person of Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus. The name of Theodoret closes the list of the great apologists of the Greek Church. He was beyond doubt one of the most striking personalities of his time. "Apologist, theologian, exegete, and historian, he was the last glory of the Christian School of Antioch. His character was attractive, stern, ardent; in it the light was ceaselessly mingled with shadows. Lacking the necessary balance, its exceptional qualities were unable to ward off storms and grief." [33] He wrote commentaries on the Scripture, an eloquent essay on *Curing the Ills of the Pagans,* in which he contrasts the pagan and the Christian solution of the great problems of philosophy, a *History of the Monks,* full of life and beauty, a *History of the Church,* which, making use of Rufinus and Philostorgius, is a continuation of Eusibius' *History,*[34] two books on the Trinity and on the Incarnation.

A correct and elegant style characterizes these writings. By them the Bishop of Cyrus reveals a genuine power of intuition and a remarkable depth of theological understanding.[35] Through excessive fondness for the teachings of the School of Antioch, he had been one of the most violent opponents of St. Cyril's anathematisms. Even after the decision of the Council of Ephesus he continued his campaign against maxims in which he thought he detected a revival of Apollinarian-

[32] *Ibidem.*

[33] Bardenhewer, *Les Pères de l'Église* (French trans.), II, 237 f.

[34] A critical edition of Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History* was published in 1911 by Léon Parmentier.

[35] Tixeront, *op. cit.,* III, 3.

ism. As a sincere partisan of the union, he drew up in 433, so it seems, the formula of agreement between Cyril and John of Antioch. Yet he refused to sign it, saying he did not wish, by publicly reproving the error of Nestorius, to appear to crush an unfortunate friend.[36] He became reconciled with Cyril in 435, when John of Antioch dispensed him from the necessity of explicitly agreeing to the condemnation of the former patriarch of Constantinople.

No one had a clearer grasp of the falsity of Eutyches' doctrines. In 447, under the strange title, *The Beggar or the Polymorph,* he published a work in four books wherein he shows that Monophysitism is nothing but a heap of stupidities taken from a number of old heretics: Simon Magus, Cerdo, Marcion, Valentinus, Arius, Eunomius; nothing but a chimera with a hundred different shapes. He then established in Christ the immutability of the divine nature, the union of the human and the divine without confusion or mixture, and the impassibility of the divinity.[37] Eutyches and Dioscorus were not mentioned by name, but they saw they were meant. The following year they revenged themselves terribly against their courageous opponent.

Besides Theodoret, another foe of Monophysitism was about to rise up with equal courage. He came from the ranks of Cyril's friends. It was the Bishop of Dorylaeum, Eusebius by name. He it was who, in 428, while still a layman and a lawyer, when Nestorius in a sermon stated his opinion about the title Mother of God given to Mary, interrupted the preacher and said in a loud voice: "It is the eternal Word that was incarnate in Mary." [38] After receiving holy orders, along with Eutyches he fought valiantly for the defense of Cyril's doctrine. But one day, in conversation with the archimandrite,

[36] Bossuet, *Remarques sur l'Histoire des conciles de M. Dupin,* chap. 4.
[37] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 372.
[38] St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Adversus Nestorium,* I, 5; *P. G.,* LXXVI, 41.

he perceived the poison of the latter's ideas.[39] Finding persuasion powerless to bring Eutyches back to orthodoxy, he decided to seize the first opportunity to make a public denunciation of a doctrine he considered apt to pervert men's souls. This occasion presented itself toward the end of the year 448.

Condemnation of Eutyches

A conflict between the metropolitan of Sardis and two of his suffragans, made Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, decide to convene (November 8, 448) a synod in his episcopal city. The first session, as it seems, sufficed to settle the affair. But just as the bishops were on the point of leaving, Eusebius handed Flavian a petition which he asked to have read. It caused great surprise. In his petition, which was cleverly worded and supplied with forceful reasons, the Bishop of Dorylaeum complained of the charges of Nestorianism which Eutyches had brought against him, and against several orthodox doctors. He asked that the archimandrite be summoned before the Council and required to offer proofs for his imputations. And Eusebius declared he was well able to prove that Eutyches did not deserve the name of Catholic, since he professed theories that were plainly heterodoxical.[40]

It was no easy matter to drag the old archimandrite from his monastery. Whether from simple obstinacy or from fear of seeing his ignorance exposed by a gathering of bishops whose theological learning he must have been aware of or from a desire to gain time to get word to his protectors, Eutyches kept asking for delay. Meanwhile he was moving heaven and earth for his defense. On November 22 Chrysaphius' protégé, at the end of his dilatory pretexts, finally appeared before the Council. But he came escorted by a large

[39] Mansi, VI, 655. Cf. *Livre d'Héraclide,* pp. 296–298.
[40] Mansi, VI, 651–654.

number of monks and soldiers. The latter said they were under orders to protect his freedom. At the same time Magnus the silentarius entered the meeting hall and, in the name of the Emperor, read a letter ordering that the patrician Florens should be present at the sessions that discussed any matters of the faith.[41]

Great excitement prevailed. In answer to various questions, Eutyches' replies were contradictory or inconsistent, betraying his ignorance and warped intelligence. After confessing the existence of two natures in Christ, he then declared he admitted them only before their union. After asserting that Christ was consubstantial with Mary, and that Mary was of the same substance that we are, he corrected himself and said that the body of Jesus is a divine body, then added that, nevertheless, if they wanted him to declare that the body of Jesus was of the same substance as ours, he would do so. "So, then," exclaimed Flavian, at the end of his patience, "it is from necessity and not of your own will that you confess your faith." [42]

The discussion showed no sign of coming to a conclusion. Then someone asked that, in order to terminate it, the accused should anathematize whatever was contrary to the Catholic doctrine set forth at the beginning of the session. "I will do nothing of the sort," Eutyches replied. Thereupon the whole Council shouted: "Let him be anathema!" Flavian in the name of the bishops and archimandrites present, then pronounced the following sentence: "Eutyches, quondam priest and archimandrite, is, by the acts of the preceding sessions and by his present declarations, fully convicted of being imbued with the error of Valentinian and Apollinaris. . . . Therefore, with tears and sighs for his loss, we declare, on behalf of Jesus Christ, outraged by these blasphemies, that he is deprived of any sacerdotal dignity, excluded from our communion, and

[41] Mansi, VI, 730–734.
[42] Labbe, IV, 226.

deposed from the government of his monastery. All those who hereafter knowingly hold converse with him or associate with him will be subject to excommunication." [43]

The blow struck the heresiarch with full force, but it did not crush him. As the bishops were leaving the meeting, Eutyches declared to the patrician Florens that he appealed to Leo the bishop of Rome. As he left the place the people, informed of his condemnation, cursed him as he passed. He addressed a petition to Theodosius. Against the sentence decreed by the Synod and against the attendant consequences, he appealed to the Pope and to the Emperor.

His letter to the Pope was cleverly conceived. Its wording was obsequious. But, on the doctrinal question, it abounded in things to be understood though not expressed. And Flavian acquainted the Roman Pontiff with the affair by sending him a detailed account. The Bishop of Rome replied to Flavian that he was preparing, on the disputed question, a complete exposition of the Catholic teaching. Chrysaphius, who nourished a special grudge against Flavian,[44] prejudiced the Emperor. The latter kept vexing the Bishop of Constantinople, vainly trying, by inquiries and synods, to invalidate the steps taken against Eutyches. After exhausting all expedients, in the spring of 449, at the instigation of Chrysaphius, Dioscorus, and Eutyches, Emperor Theodosius directed the metro-

[43] Mansi, VI, 748.

[44] Flavian, by accepting an office which Chrysaphius coveted for his protégé Eutyches, had vexed Chrysaphius, and had hurt his avarice. It was a general custom for every newly elected bishop to send to the Emperor's representatives, as a token of welcome, some "eulogiae" or blessed bread. But gradually the cupidity of the imperial agents transformed these offerings into presents of money. Flavian, wishing to oppose this abuse, sent to the court of Theodosius merely some wheat bread. Chrysaphius sent him word that "it is not bread that is sent to the emperor, but gold." The archbishop replied that the gold which the bishops possessed belonged to God and the poor. This reply but increased Chrysaphius' rage. (Nicephorus, *Ecclesiastical History,* XIV, 47.)

politans of his Empire to repair to Ephesus, the first of the next August, along with some of their suffragans, there to hold an ecumenical council.[45]

The Robber Council of Ephesus (449)

Soon various unusual measures convinced those who still entertained any illusions about it, that it was not a council that was about to be held, but that a "robbery" was going to be committed. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, whose anti-Monophysite tendencies were known and whose theological knowledge was dreaded, received word that he must not attend the Council.[46] Ibas, the bishop of Edessa, considered one of the staunchest in sustaining the Antiochene Christology, was imprisoned. The presidency of the Council was given ex officio by the Emperor to the terrible patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscorus. Theodosius, under Chrysaphius' advice, went further in the way of violence and illegality. A Syrian archimandrite, Barsumas (or Barsauma),[47] from the frontiers of Persia, was made grand executor of the laws against Nestorianism. He had been seen, at the head of an armed phalanx of real bandits, who were monks only in name and dress, hunting Nestorians in the valleys near the Euphrates, sacking the churches, and burning the monasteries that did not appear to him orthodox. The Emperor decided that Barsumas, though not knowing a word of Greek, should be present at the deliberations and that, though he was only a priest, he should have a vote in the Council.[48]

[45] Mansi, VI, 588 ff. The imperial letter of convocation, drawn up, as usual, in the name of the two emperors, Theodosius II and Valentinian III, was dated March 30, 449. (Hefele, III, 222.)

[46] Labbe, *Conciliorum collectio,* IV, 110 f.

[47] This Barsumas, an archimandrite, should not be confused with another Barsumas, who was bishop of Nisibis.

[48] Labbe, IV, 275, 530.

St. Leo's Tome

They could not avoid inviting Pope Leo. Perhaps, knowing that Attila was at the gates of Rome, they counted on his being unable to leave the Eternal City. Furthermore, even should he come in person or by his legates, his influence and his voice would surely be smothered by the assembly so artfully and cleverly composed. If the friends of Eutyches reasoned thus, they were not taking into account the energy and the lofty wisdom of the Sovereign Pontiff. When the invitation to the Council reached him (May 12), Pope Leo had completely drawn up the important exposition of the faith at which he had been working for some time.[49] We refer to the celebrated dogmatic letter later known as *St. Leo's Tome to Flavian.* Bossuet calls it

"the divine letter to Flavian, which was the admiration of the whole Church, wherein the mystery of Jesus Christ is so sublimely and so distinctly explained, that the Fathers of this great Council cried out at each word, 'Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo.' " [50]

This letter, subsequently approved by the fourth ecumenical council, would have the value of a symbol. The Pope communicated it to the members of the Council by his three legates: Bishop Julius of Puteoli, the priest Renatus of the title of St. Clement, and the deacon Hilary, who would one day succeed him on the papal throne. Setting forth in vivid style the Catholic Christology, founded on tradition, he explained with inimitable clearness and exactness the oneness of person and the duality of natures in Christ, thus rejecting at one stroke the error of Eutyches and that of Nestorius. "All know," says the Pope, "and confess to believe in God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord,

[49] Ibid., IV, 103.
[50] Bossuet, *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* XIII, 20.

who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. By these three propositions almost every heresy is overthrown. This only-begotten eternal Son of the eternal Father was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary. . . . The properties of both natures and substances remained uninjured, and united in one person . . . the one Mediator between God and man on the one side could die, on the other could not die. In the inviolate and perfect nature of a true man, true God is born, complete in His own (in His Godhead) and complete in ours (in the manhood). . . . For this reason that the two natures constitute only one person, we read that the Son of God took flesh of the Virgin; and also, that the Son of God was crucified and buried. . . . Eutyches' proposition that the only-begotten Son of God before the union had two natures, is as impious as the other, that after the Incarnation there was only one nature." [51]

The Council of Ephesus opened on August 8, 449, in St. Mary's Church. Dioscorus presided. One of the first acts of the papal legates was to call for the reading of the Pope's letter. "Very well," said Dioscorus. Taking the document in his hands, he very adroitly put it out of sight; then he handed the secretary another document. This was the imperial letter ordering that the monk Barsumas be admitted to the ranks of the Fathers of the Council. Such flagrant irregularity was a foretaste of other irregularities that were going to be committed. Without giving the legates time to protest, an imperial commissioner took the floor and declared that whoever should alter the true faith would receive a double condemnation: that of God and that of the Emperor.[52] Dioscorus at once interpreted this command as meaning that nothing must be added to the declarations of Nicaea and Ephesus. Addressing the members of the Council, he said: "Do you want to change the

[51] St. Leo the Great, Letter 28, quoted in Hefele, III, 233 f.
[52] Mansi, VI, 620.

faith of our fathers?" Some of his followers shouted: "Anathema to anyone who would change the faith of our fathers." "Do you want," continued Dioscorus, "to add anything to the faith defined at Ephesus and Nicaea?" "Anathema," cried the same voices, "to anyone who would change the faith of Ephesus and Nicaea." The secretaries wrote down that such were the shouts of the whole assembly. But the Council of Chalcedon later protested against this outrageous falsification.[53]

Illegal Depositions

The question of the faith having been thus settled, the only work left to be done was "a slaughter of bishops." [54] The Council decreed the deposition of Ibas bishop of Edessa, Theodoret bishop of Cyrus, and others not so well known, such as Daniel bishop of Haran, whose only crime was being Ibas' nephew, Aquilinus bishop of Byblos, condemned for the sole reason that he had refused to attend, Sophronius bishop of Constantina (Tella), accused, on the so-called testimony of a child, of engaging in practices of magic, but in reality suspect because he was related to the Bishop of Edessa. "None of the accused was heard or summoned to appear. From the beginning to the end of the Synod, the gravest sentences were pronounced without any form of trial being observed." [55] A shouting populace invaded the church and kept interrupting the deliberations with outcries, such as: "Ibas to the flames! Theodoret to the gallows! He who professes the two natures, let him be cut in two! As he divides, let him be divided!" Then it was the turn of the Council members to shout. "Long life to the Synod!" they cried; "long life to the Emperors! The

[53] Hefele, III, 244.

[54] Paulin Martin, *"Le Brigandage d'Ephèse,"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* XVI (1874), 17.

[55] *Ibid.,* p. 39.

Holy Ghost has spoken by Dioscorus. Those who keep silent are heretics." These last words give us to understand that, of the 135 members of the assembly,[56] some did not share the ideas of the Patriarch of Alexandria. In this number were Flavian, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the papal legates. The deacon Hilary was especially conspicuous by his unyielding energy. When the Acts of Nicaea and Ephesus had been read, Hilary exclaimed: "All that is in perfect agreement with the letter of the Apostolic See. Have it read and you will see." Again the demand was ignored. When Dioscorus said: "Know that the Emperors will be informed of everything done here today," Flavian cried out: "I appeal from you." [57] And Hilary, dominating the uproar of the assembly with a loud voice, immediately uttered the consecrated formula: *"Contradicitur,"* that is, "Objection is made to your decision."

This word, so clearly reminding the assembly of the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome, inflamed their passions. Dioscorus, his eyes gleaming, became excited; he was beside himself. Several of the bishops—Onesiphorus of Iconium, Maximian of Synosades, and others—on their knees besought him to use moderation, but in vain.[58] Annoyed by this scene and feigning that he was being attacked by those who were trying to calm him, he called out: "Where are the counts?" At this call, the two representatives of the Emperor (Elpidius and Eulogius) had the doors of the church thrown open. A detachment of soldiers, together with the rabble of Barsuma's companions, poured into the church. Hilary, who was keeper of the tablets on which Flavian had written his declaration of appeal, managed to escape during the tumult.

[56] This is the figure given in the Acts of the Council.

[57] The text of the appeal which Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum addressed to St. Leo was unknown until 1882. See Grisar, *History of Rome,* II, 54.

[58] Hardouin, *Conciliorum collectio,* II, 213.

Flavian sought to do likewise. But, just as he was about to slip through the doorway, Dioscorus reached him and struck him in the face. Barsuma with his bandits was there, shouting: "Kill, kill." [59] Flavian was thrown down and trampled on. Three days later he died in consequence of this infamous violence.[60] The Church honors him as a martyr. His feast day is February 18.

Pope Leo, two years afterwards, in a letter stigmatized this assembly with the name by which it has since been known in history, *"latrocinium ephesinum,"* the Robber Council of Ephesus." [61]

Council of Chalcedon (451)

With no small difficulty the brave deacon Hilary evaded the pursuit of his enemies and returned to Rome. It is thought he reached there at the beginning of October. When he related to the Pope the detestable scenes he had witnessed, Leo was deeply afflicted and enraged. He said: "What has been done with no regard for justice and contrary to the authority of all the canons, possesses no sort of validity." [62]

From all sides the clergy and faithful looked to Rome. We may say that the Patriarch Flavian expressed the feeling of the whole Church when he said, in the appeal entrusted to Hilary: "I beg your Holiness to come to the East to help, in its distress, the Truth which the Fathers planted in the sweat of their brow. . . . When I appealed in the Council to the Apostolic Throne of Peter, the chief of the Apostles, they sur-

[59] *"Barsumas ipse instabat et dicebat: Occide."* Labbe, IV, 524.

[60] Theophanis, *Chronographia, P. G.,* CVIII, 262.

[61] St. Leo, Letter to Pulcheria, June 20, 451. The Acta of this miserable synod were not known to Hefele, Hergenröther, or Amedée Thierry. They were discovered at London and published in 1873. See Martin, *"Le Brigandage d'Ephèse d'après les actes du concile récemment découverts"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* XVI (1874), 1–53.

[62] Letter 45. Cf. Letters 85, 89.

rounded me with soldiers and even prevented me from taking sanctuary at the holy altar. . . . Arise, then, defend the Faith of God, and restore the Church's laws. Send letters both to the people for their enlightenment and to the Emperor to explain to him the situation. . . . A Council summoned from both West and East should bring help in the ways God will suggest to you." [63]

The convoking of a council under his effective presidency was in fact the intention of the great Pontiff. But he foresaw the difficulties that might arise on the Emperor's side. And they did. In the meantime the Pope required that the Patriarch Anatolius, who had been elected to replace Flavian under the influence of Theodosius, should give full and entire approval to his dogmatic letter. During the winter of 450 the imperial family of the West made a journey to Rome. This gave an opportunity to advance the negotiations.

New light has been thrown on this last point by the discovery (in 1893) of certain unpublished documents. In February, 450, Emperor Valentinian III came to Rome with his wife Eudoxia (daughter of Theodosius) and his mother Galla Placidia. Valentinian decided to pray at the tomb of the Apostle Peter on the day of the feast of St. Peter's Chair (February 22). The Pope was there and, in the presence of the imperial court, preached a sermon marked by great loftiness of thought. "What a sight this is," he said. "An emperor, wearing a crown, with his suite of noble warriors comes and bows his head before the tomb of a sinner. The rich are greedy to enrich themselves with the merits of the poor. A poor, lowly man receives from Christ the government of the greatest city in the world." [64] Before the imperial family left St. Peter's,

[63] The text of this letter was discovered in 1882 by Amelli in a manuscript of the Chapter of Novare. It was published by Grisar in his *Analecta romana,* I, 322 ff. This passage is quoted in Grisar, *History of Rome,* no. 234.

[64] This homily, discovered in a manuscript of the British Museum, was published in part by Dom Morin in the *Anecdota maredsolana,* I (1893), 409.

Pope Leo set forth to them the misery of the Eastern Church. The Pontiff's emotion was so great that his voice was choked by sobs. He implored the sovereigns to influence Emperor Theodosius II, that he might favor the holding of an ecumenical council in Italy.

The Council opened on October 8, 451, under Marcian and Pulcheria, the successors of Theodosius II, not at Nicaea, where the Pope wanted it held, but at Chalcedon, where the new emperor convoked it somewhat unexpectedly.

Decisions of the Council

The East had never witnessed so imposing a gathering. About six hundred bishops were present. The representatives of the Roman Pontiff occupied the place of honor and, in accord with the Pope's wish, guided the deliberations.[65] The sovereigns of the East agreed that the Council should take as its task, "for the welfare of the faith and the peace of the Church, to reach decisions in the sense indicated by the Bishop of Rome and to pass judgment under his authority." [66]

The two chief decisions of the Council of Chalcedon were the following: 1. the drawing up of a dogmatic decree, a rather developed statement of Christian faith regarding the Incarnation, in which statement were inserted in full, as unchangeable rules of faith, the symbols of Nicaea and Constantinople; [67] 2. the solemn acceptance of Leo's celebrated dogmatic letter to Flavian, amidst the unanimous shouts of: "Peter has spoken by Leo." This letter would henceforth be regarded as "an unquestionable rule of faith." [68]

[65] St. Leo, Letters 89–95.

[66] Letters 77, 78.

[67] Mansi, VII, 108–118.

[68] Jaffé, no. 1381. The authority of this decision is expressed in the beautiful legend which was current at Rome in the time of St. Gregory the Great and was handed down during the Middle Ages. The legend relates that Pope Leo placed the

The Council of Chalcedon also promulgated some disciplinary decisions. Its 28th canon was the only one that elicited a protest from Rome. It repeated and aggravated the irregular canon of the second ecumenical council, which raised the episcopal see of Constantinople to the detriment of the old patriarchates of the East. Pope Leo was asked, by the Council and by the Emperor, to approve that conciliar decision. His reply bears witness to the high authority of the Bishop of Rome with regard to an ecumenical council. He says: "Whatever has been settled contrary to the decrees of the Nicene Council, we declare void, and the same, by the power of Blessed Peter the Apostle, we hereby quash." [69] He urged the patriarchs of the East, affected by this decision of the Council, openly to claim their traditional rights. This was not merely a question of commonplace rivalry between two cities. The issue was higher than that: Alexandria and Antioch held their primacy from the memory of the Apostle Peter; Constantinople's only claim rested on the presence of an emperor. "The Church of Alexandria," wrote Leo, "must not forfeit aught of the dignity which it received through the disciple of Peter, St. Mark the Evangelist. . . . The Church of Antioch, where St. Peter bestowed the Faith on those who were first to be called Christians, shall not lose her privilege. . . . The highest honor for each is the saving of his rights." [70]

The malice of the Eutychians profited by the Pope's attitude on the 28th canon, by representing him as opposed to the Council.[71] He answered these calumnies by confirming the great work of the Council against the Monophysites in a special encyclical (March 21, 453). Gelasius I, a few years

letter on the tomb of St. Peter and gave himself up to fasting and prayer for forty days, asking the Prince of the Apostles to correct it by his own hand. At the end of this period, Leo took the letter again, now improved by St. Peter himself.

[69] Letter 105, quoted in Grisar, *op. cit.*, no. 236.

[70] *Ibidem.*

[71] Letter 114.

later, was able to say: "Everything depends on the authority of the Apostolic See. What it has ratified in the decisions of the Council receives the force of obligation; what it has rejected is without force." [72]

Eutychianism, henceforth convicted as an explicit heresy, continued to live in Egypt and, here and there, in the neighboring provinces of Arabia and Persia. The doctrine, instead of becoming attenuated, grew more solid. The Monophysites, no longer having to exercise caution, exaggerated their theories. They openly separated from the "Cyrillians," on whose backing they lately relied. At the death of Dioscorus they proclaimed him a martyr and venerated some of his writings on a level with the Gospel. The Nestorians did in like manner. "Obliged to withdraw into Persia, they openly resumed the positions they had abandoned in the West. They raised up as a standard the name of Nestorius, about whom silence had been maintained since 433. By way of retaliation, there was no longer any question about the *theotokos,* and they spoke more clearly of the duality of the hypostases. This evolution toward more rigid Nestorianism showed itself between 457 and 482. It was consummated in 489 at the time of the definite closing of the School of the Persians at Edessa by the Monophysite Cyrus, followed by the formation of the School of Nisibis." [73]

For Monophysitism [74] as for Nestorianism, the sovereign

[72] Gelasius, *De anathematis vinculo* (*P. L.,* LIX, 107). On the Council of Chalcedon, see Jules Bois, art. "*Chalcédoine* (*Concile de*)," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* II, 2190–2208. Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte,* p. 368) is of the opinion that a majority of the Council of Chalcedon expressed themselves in the sense of St. Cyril's anathematisms and even of Monophysitism. But a simple reading of the Acts of the Council suffices to refute this hypothesis. A detailed refutation will be found in Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse,* pp. 257–259.

[73] Labourt, *op. cit.,* p. 261.

[74] Lebon (*Monophysisme sévérien*) shows that if we are to follow, in detail and without fear of error, the history of Monophysitism, we would do well to distinguish Monophysitism properly so called from Eutychianism. Doctrinally Monophysitism is something very complex. It goes beyond the questions of Christology and extends

decisions produced their result. It is true that certain rebellious minds, tearing asunder all the veils and abandoning all ambiguity, went to extremes. But at least all misunderstanding was henceforth removed. Heresy bore its indelible mark. With increased attachment, all faithful souls turned to Rome as to the ever-living center of orthodox teaching.

St. Leo the Great

With his political sense, the justice and depth of which the future would prove, Pope Leo resolved to draw a practical lesson from the lamentable events that had just taken place in the East. To forestall a return of such crises, he established at Constantinople an institution that would later play an important part in religious international politics. Julian bishop of Cos was appointed his chargé d'affaires in the Eastern capital. Henceforth all important negotiations with the court and the Eastern bishops would be transacted by him. He would send detailed reports about the ecclesiastical affairs of his jurisdiction. This was the origin of the *apocrisiarii* or papal legates at Constantinople. They led to the institution of apostolic nunciatures.

Leo was also able to take advantage, for the good of the Church and civilization in general, of a practice which obliged the popes to express their sentiments of deference and devotedness to the sovereigns on the occasion of important events occurring in the Church or in the State. In the midst of polite compliments and customary literary phrases, which he always observed most carefully, he never failed to mention their praiseworthy deeds in the life of the monarchs, and he also took a firm stand against what might be blameworthy.

This conduct was particularly evident in the affair of

to the theology of the Trinity. Eutychianism is a sort of Monophysitism embracing only every doctrine that compromises the immutability of the Word by atacking the reality and integrity of Christ's humanity. Cf. Jugie, art. *"Eutychianisme"* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* VI, 1596.

Timothy Aelurus. Emperor Marcian, desiring to win back the dissenters by negotiations and complacency that compromised the dogma, ended only in augmenting their boldness. A group of fanatical Monophysites, headed by a priest Timothy, surnamed the Cat (Aelurus), and a deacon Peter, called Mongus (the Hoarse), was disturbing the Church of Alexandria. They opposed the doctrine of the two natures, the Pope's dogmatic letter, and the Council of Chalcedon, and carried on unrelenting war against the Patriarch Proterius, who had to depose their two leaders. But on Holy Thursday (March 28, 457), an enraged mob poured into the basilica while he was officiating, massacred the bishop, and dragged his body through the city, while Timothy Aelurus took the place of the slain bishop. Emperor Marcian punished the assassins that could be found, but showed mildness in his attitude toward the usurping patriarch.

The Pope reminded Marcian of his duties to the Church. "I speak," he said, "to the Byzantine sovereign with the freedom which the faith gives me. The imperial power has been given you, not only to rule the world, but especially to defend the Church. Heretics should never be allowed to question decisions of the councils. With all the more reason should they be prevented from violently seizing episcopal sees like the see of Alexandria." [75] The letter contained expressions of esteem for the new Emperor, who was won by the Pope's energy and goodness. Timothy Aelurus was put out of the see he had usurped, and Leo the Great sent a letter of felicitation to Proterius' lawful successor, Timothy Salophaciolus.[76] "Imitate the Good Shepherd," he wrote. "As a good and zealous pastor of souls, labor to gather them all under the same roof." This is the last extant letter of St. Leo.[77]

[75] Letter 156.
[76] *I. e.*, "The White Turban."
[77] Letter 171.

"The style of Leo's chancery was largely imitated by Papal secretaries in later times, particularly so long as Greco-Roman culture prevailed, though occasionally they spoiled it by paying too great attention to Byzantine taste. An effort was also made to follow the tradition of the fine dignified rhythm of Leo's language, particularly the metrical movement at the end of the sentences, called after his name *Cursus Leoninus.*" [78]

St. Leo's Reforms

This great Pope's correspondence with the episcopacy shows him attentive to the smallest details that might disturb good order and peace. Writing to the bishops of Aquileia and Ravenna, he regulates the question of marriages troubled by the captivity of husband or wife, questions that arose from taking part in the idolatrous practices of the barbarians, and the question of giving the sacraments to victims of the persecution.[79] In Africa he watched over the observance of the canon laws in the election of bishops.[80] In Gaul he strengthened the vicariate apostolic of the bishop of Arles by declaring that this prelate "not only governs his province with his own authority, but also exercises a power of protection over all Gaul by virtue of a delegation from the Holy See." [81] In Illyricum, on the contrary, the Pope protected the rights of the bishops against the vicar of the Apostolic See, Anastasius, who was pitiless in his exactions. Nowhere did St. Leo use more solemn and forceful language than in the letter he sent to Anastasius, reminding him of his duty.[82]

[78] Grisar, *op. cit.*, no. 237. On the *cursus leoninus,* see Noël Valois, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1881, pp. 161 f., and Léonce Couture, *"Le Cursus dans la liturgie et la littérature"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LI (1892), 253 ff.

[79] Letters 159, 166.

[80] Letter 12.

[81] Letter 66. In the Middle Ages these powers conferred on the archbishops of Arles were a matter of prolonged discussion.

[82] Letter 3. Cf. letters 5, 6, 13. A complete picture of St. Leo the Great's work of administration and reform would also call for the study of the Councils of Orange,

The monasteries were likewise the object of the Pontiff's solicitude. Certain turbulent and fanatical Eastern monks frequently gave their support to heresy. Others, mindful of nothing but the fame of their austerities and outward mortifications, engaged in all sorts of extravagances. Leo was vigilant in repressing these two abuses. He employed all his authority to silence Palestinian monks who had been led astray by the doctrine of Nestorius and Eutyches.[83] He decreed severe penalties for moral failings of the monks.[84] In the neighborhood of Constantinople, at the end of the fifth century, enormous monasteries housed legions of monks.[85]

Near Antioch some ascetics, to cut themselves off more completely from the world, lived on the top of columns as solitaries, "standing up in the open air without protection against rain, wind, and the vicissitudes of the seasons."[86] These were the Stylites. The most celebrated of them was Simeon, who at first was a shepherd, then a monk in a monastery, then, to gratify his liking for austerities, he decided to live alone. Finally, to escape from the bother of visitors who were attracted by the fame of his penance, he had a masonry column built and on this he installed himself. In this fashion he lived for thirty-seven years on different columns: the first one was ten feet high; but, according to the report of Theodoret, who saw it, the last one was fifty feet high.[87] Such a way of living at first surprised and even scandalized the faith-

Vaison, Arles, Rome, Besançon, other councils of Gaul and Britain, and the Eastern Councils of Ephesus, Antioch, Berytus, Tyre, and Hierapolis, which were held in his pontificate. See Hefele, III, 159 ff.

[83] Jaffé, no. 500. Cf. Delau, *"Monastères palestiniens du V^e siècle"* in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature,* 1899, pp. 233 ff., 269 ff.

[84] Jaffé, no. 544.

[85] J. Pargoire, *"Les Débats du monachisme à Constantinople"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LXV (1899), 67–143.

[86] H. Delehaye, *"Les Stylites"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LVII (1895), 55.

[87] Evagrius, *History of the Church,* I, 13.

ful and the clergy. But the Stylite's virtue was so great and his words so wise that soon his sway over the masses was all-powerful. This man, who sought merely to flee from the world and draw near to God by prayer, soon exercised a social influence, not simply over his fellow-Syrians, but over visitors who came from every country. To those whom curiosity drew in throngs to the foot of his column he preached the truth of Christianity so gently and clearly that they went home converted. Disputes were brought to him for judgment. At his word creditors forgave the poor their debts, masters freed their slaves. The dye-workers of Antioch, oppressed by the prefect, came to him with their complaints; Leo I consulted him about the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon; Genevieve of Nanterre, the celebrated virgin of Gaul, communicated with him. Simeon had many imitators who, after his example, exercised a salutary influence around them.[88]

St. Leo and Attila

"The grand work which Leo achieved in the Church can be properly estimated only by taking into account all he did for the good of the State and of society. His bold and imposing encounter with Genseric saved the lives of the Romans and delivered the city from destruction by the Vandals, even though it was unavailing to prevent a partial sack. His meeting with Attila on the Mincio won him the credit of having delivered Italy from the Hunnish hordes threatening to overrun the distracted country." [89]

Attila, the Scourge of God, had led westward his hordes of Huns, who, united with the Ostrogoths under the command of Walamir, and the Gepidae, who were marching under the

[88] On the stylites, see Father Delehaye's important article, *"Les Stylites"* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LVII, 52–103.

[89] Grisar, *History of Rome,* II, 61.

orders of Ardaric, had reached the very heart of Gaul. The battle of the Catalaunian Fields (*i. e.*, the Plains of Chalon) in the summer of 451 obliged the barbarian army to retreat. But, after wintering in Pannonia, the terrible king of the Huns appeared in northern Italy, ready to avenge the disgrace of his defeat. Aetius had failed to protect the Alpine passes. The road to Rome was now open before Attila. Aetius and Valentinian for a while thought of fleeing to the East. But the very cowardice of such a plan made them abandon it.

After long deliberations, it seemed "to the Emperor, the Senate, and the Roman people" that the best thing to do was to send a deputation to the barbarian king to propose terms of peace. Pope Leo I, placing all his trust in God, undertook the difficult mission. He set out, accompanied by the Consul Avienus, the Prefect Trigetius, and certain others, with full powers for the negotiations. The embassy met the Hun, who was the terror of the world, in his camp not far from Mantua, at the confluence of the Po and the Mincio. "All fell out," says St. Prosper,

"as Leo had expected in his reliance upon the divine aid, which never forsakes the pious in their boldest enterprises. This conference with the Pope moved the dreaded foe to compassion. He expressed his pleasure at receiving a visit from the Supreme Pontiff. After this he withdrew his forces beyond the Danube. . . . If, as is possible, Leo the Great ordered the superstitious monarch to spare the hallowed walls of Rome, broadly hinting at the power of the great Prince of the Apostles, whose tomb they protected, this would have been in perfect keeping with his character. At any rate, he returned to his flock with the glad tidings that his mission had been a brilliant success. . . . Had Attila and his Huns succeeded in overrunning the West, all nations would have been plunged into savagery." [90]

[90] *Idem*, I, 94 f.

St. Leo's Sermons

Pope St. Leo the Great, by his works was a great statesman, a great administrator, a great defender of Christian civilization. But he was also, by his words and writings, a Father of the Church.

We possess 117 sermons attributed to St. Leo.[91] Of these, 97 are authentic, and 20 are apocryphal or doubtful. Literary critics have admired their pure classical form; theologians have praised their depth of thought.[92] All great pulpit orators have drawn from them. Bossuet and Bourdaloue owe to St. Leo many of their finest oratorical passages. Both of them used his beautiful exposition of the mystery of the Passion. Says Bossuet: "It is the mystery of Christianity that the great Pope St. Leo so wonderfully explains by this doctrine: There is, says he, this difference between the death of Christ and the death of others—the latter is individual, that of Christ is universal: that is, each of us is individually subject to death, and merely pays his own debt in dying; only Christ died really for others, because He owed nothing for Himself. This is why His death concerns all of us, and He is the only one in whom all men are buried, in whom all also are risen." [93] Bourdaloue, who in his four great Passion sermons and his ten Exhortations on the same subject, owes to St. Leo, "not only the beauty of the details he there spreads out, but the great ideas on which they are based." [94] A sermon that is considered one of his masterpieces, he ends as follows: "Therefore we con-

[91] The 116 sermons in the Ballerini edition (*P. L.*, LIV, 137–522), and one sermon discovered and published by Dom Morin (*Anecdota maredsolana*, I, 409).

[92] Maury, *Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire*, II, 221; *Fénelon, Dialogues sur l'éloquence;* Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés*, XV, 515.

[93] Bossuet, *Sermon pour le jour de Pâques*, 1660 (Lebarcq ed., III, 392). Cf St. Leo, *Sermon, De Passione Domini* (sermon 12, no. 3). Bossuet had already taken the same idea from St. Leo in a sermon in 1653 for the fifth Sunday after Pentecost. *Œuvres oratoires de Bossuet* (Lebarcq-Levesque ed., 1914, I, 377 f.)

[94] Barruel, *Journal ecclesiastique*, February 1788, p. 153.

clude, with St. Leo, that the Passion of the Son of God was the universal penance, the public and authorized penance, the perfect and consummated penance for all the sins of mankind." [95]

St. Leo's sermons are nearly all full of such thoughts. His language is clear and precise; his thought, limpid and deep. We feel the spirit of Christ living therein in its fulness. We also find valuable allusions to the moral life of Rome in the middle of the fifth century. He denounces those nominal Christians who think they are real Christians because the world they live in has abandoned the worship of idols, and he shows that it is possible to be an idolater with the appearances of a Christian.[96] He warns his hearers against the Alexandrian merchants who had just arrived in Rome and were trying to spread Monophysite ideas.[97] He fights the superstition of those who, before entering the porch of St. Peter's Basilica, when they reach the top of the steps, turn facing the square and salute the sun.[98] After the departure of Genseric and his Vandals, he refutes those who, through a remnant of idolatry, attributed the preservation of Rome to the stars.[99] He endeavored to show that all thanks are due to the Lord God and to the intercession of the Apostle St. Peter. When he speaks to the grandeurs of Christian Rome, his words assume particular magnificence. On June 29, the feast of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, he addressed the Eternal City thus: "O Rome, you who were a teacher of error, by these two saints have you received the Gospel. They are the ones who raised you to this glory of being the holy nation, the chosen

[95] Bourdaloue, *Premier sermon sur la Passion,* part I, in his *Œuvres complètes* (Lyons ed., 1864, IV, 212).

[96] Sermon 36.

[97] Sermon 96.

[98] Sermon 27.

[99] Sermon 89.

people, the priestly and royal city, the head of the universe, and the glory of extending your religious authority beyond the limits of your earthly dominion. However far so many victories have carried your power on earth and sea, the empire which warfare has won for you does not equal that which Christian peace has brought under your sway." [100]

"The correspondence of Leo amounts to 173 letters. Of these 143 bear the name of the Pope, and cover the period from 442 to 460. They are all official in character; most of them were evidently not written by Leo himself, but are the product of the papal chancery." [101]

The countless occupations of his Apostolic office did not allow St. Leo to undertake great writings. But he encouraged their composition. It was under his inspiration that St. Prosper of Aquitaine, between 445 and 455, wrote his *Chronicon vulgare* and his *Chronicon integrum,* the second half of which, in a very clear and concise form, is one of the best sources for the history of the fifth century.[102] In St. Leo's pontificate Socrates and Sozomen wrote their *Ecclesiastical Histories* in Greek. The former, more critical in the use of sources and gifted with a firmer historical sense for grasping the chain of events, published his work between 439 and 443. The latter, making extensive use of Socrates' work, sometimes copies it verbatim, but often also adds to it. Both happily corrected the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Eunomian Philostorgius. This *History,* which appeared after 425 and before the pontificate of Leo the Great, was, according to Photius, "not so much a history as a eulogy of the Arian heretics.

[100] Sermon 82.

[101] Bardenhewer, *Patrology,* p. 524.

[102] Cf. Léonce Couture, *"Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine"* in the *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (Toulouse), 1900, pp. 269 ff., 1901, pp. 33 ff.

St. Leo and the Liturgy

Liturgy and Christian art owe much to Leo the Great. Difficulties arose again in the fourth and fifth centuries about the celebration of Easter. St. Leo desired chiefly that the feast of the Resurrection be celebrated everywhere on the same day. After long investigation, he yielded to the view of Proterius, the venerable patriarch of Alexandria. Writing to Marcian, he says: "It was not the force of the argument that made me decide as I did, but rather the desire for unity, which it is important to preserve." [103]

In the same spirit of peace he refrained from absolutely forbidding the faithful to observe the traditional celebration of certain holidays of the pagan epoch. But he endeavored to give a Christian meaning to those celebrations to which the people were still attached.[104] The most curious of these transformations was that of the feast of the "collections." It originated as follows. Every year, from July 5 to 13, during the celebration of the *Ludi apollinares,* collections were taken up among the people to defray the expenses of the public games. The Christians had gradually changed the purpose for which these collections were used. The amount gathered in was distributed to the poor. St. Leo, in his sermons, often recommended the feast of the Collections; its date was kept in the period when the ancient pagan feast used to be celebrated.

The great Pope neglected no opportunity to associate the memory of the Apostles Peter and Paul with the memory of the true glories of old Rome. As the pillage of Rome by the

[103] Letter 137, no. 1. On the precise point of the discussion, see Régnier, *Saint Léon le Grand,* pp. 173–179.

[104] Some writers, exaggerating the bearing of these and similar facts, declare that "the saints were the successors of the gods." An historian whose eminent competence and critical strictness are beyond question, the Bollandist, Father Delehaye, thus concludes his scholarly work, *Les Origines du culte des martyrs:* "We are entitled to conclude that paganism had no appreciable influence upon the forming of the object of the cult of the saints."

bands of Genseric in 455 stopped on June 29, the feast of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, which was celebrated on that day, took on greater splendor. A few years later, Leo, complaining that the people were neglecting to honor the two patrons of Rome, said to them: "This forgetfulness fills me with sadness and fear. . . . Was it the circus entertainments that saved you from death by the sword? Was it not rather the intercession of the holy Apostles?" [105]

What connection is there between Pope St. Leo and the composition of the celebrated *Leonian Sacramentary,* which is the oldest form of the *Roman Missal?* Duchesne's opinion is that it was not written before the middle of the sixth century.[106] Probst and Batiffol, however, maintain the more widely accepted view assigning the date of the work to the fifth century.[107] As a result of prolonged discussions on the subject, it seems probable that the *Leonian Sacramentary* was not an official work of the Roman Pontiffs, but a private collection made up mostly of masses and other documents emanating from Pope St. Leo. This view is strengthened by the following facts: in most of the documents we find the cursus special to St. Leo, several allusions to things that preoccupied this pope (such as the sack of Rome, and the Eutychian, Nestorian, Manichaean, and Pelagian heresies), and the attributing of the *Sacramentary* to St. Leo the Great by a constant tradition.

The desire to see the beauty of the liturgical offices develop led Leo the Great to restore and even construct several churches, despite the menace of invasions. The restorations he made in the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul alone would be enough to glorify his name in the history of Christian art.[108]

[105] Sermon 84.
[106] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 137–139.
[107] Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie* (5th ed.), p. 355.
[108] On these works, see Grisar, *History of Rome,* II, 72–77, 103 ff.

St. Leo the Great died (November 10, 461) after a pontificate of twenty-one years.

"He was the first pope to be buried on the threshold of the apostolic shrine, a spot which became a favorite one with his successors. As Pope Sergius I observes in an epitaph of thanksgiving, it was fitting that Leo, one of the greatest of the successors of Peter, should, even in death, mount guard over the stronghold of the Prince of the Apostles." [109]

Pope St. Hilary

To take the place of the great Leo, one man was marked out by his services to the Church, by his courage and coolness at the Robber Council of Ephesus, and by the strictness of his life. It was the deacon Hilary. He was enthroned November 12, 461, at the very time that the Empire was presenting the spectacle of another brigandage. The tragic death of Valentinian III (March 16, 455) and the seizure of his widow and his two daughters at Carthage; the marriage of Princess Eudoxia to the barbarian king Humeric, mingling the blood of the great Theodosius with that of the Vandal kings; the anarchy in the army after the death of Aetius; the misery and desolation in Rome since the sack of Genseric; the acclaim in Gaul of the Arvenian Avitus, who was soon defeated and dethroned by the Suevian Ricimer; the latter's dominating sway in Italy under Majorian and Severus, although he dared not assume the title of king or emperor, yet by his role foreshadowed the great transformation that would take place four years after his death; all these events betokened the most lamentable and irremediable ruin for the Western Empire.

Hilary, faithful to the traditions of his predecessors, at the

[109] *Ibid.*, II, 62. See St. Leo the Great's epitaph in De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae,* vol. II, part 1, pp. 56, 98, etc.; Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis,* I, 379.

very hour when the power of imperial Rome was crumbling, engaged in raising the prestige of Christian Rome and in rallying the Churches of the West and of the East to this center of Catholic unity. Inscriptions and monuments—some still surviving—recall the great works he carried out in the Eternal City. Such are the beautiful chapels he erected at St. John Lateran's; the cloister, library, and hospice he built near the Church of St. Lawrence-outside-the-walls for the use of pilgrims; the two great monasteries erected with his encouragement, one near St. Lawrence's Church, the other in some undetermined part of the city; his bounteous generosity to the sacristies and treasuries of various basilicas in the way of goldsmith's and silversmith's work.

"We have here a page from the history of Roman art, which not only invites us to picture to ourselves all these treasures, but also shows the well-nigh inexhaustible wealth which found its way, at that time, into the coffers of the Roman Church and which was due to the munificence of the great senatorial families, and occasionally of the Court." [110]

Instinctively these great families made use of the fortunes that had accumulated in their hands in favor, not of public State institutions that were about to tumble down, but of the sole power in which an immortal survival could be expected.

"That the revival of art in the decoration of religious buildings went hand in hand with a genuine revival of religious feeling, seems evident from the statements in the *Liber pontificalis* regarding the Stations. Hilary paid special attention to this ancient religious practice in Rome. The Lateran Basilica and the Church of Our Lady on the Esquiline, appear to have been liturgical centers of the Station processions." [111]

[110] Grisar, *op. cit.*, II, 84.
[111] *Ibid.*, II, 83. Cf. *Liber pontificalis*, I, 242–248.

Increasing the splendor of Christian Rome was not all. In the midst of the political disturbances that desolated the West and in view of those that could be foreseen, it was more than ever important to keep the various different Churches strongly attached to the center of Christendom. Hilary accomplished this by intervening directly in several disputes which were dividing them and by convening councils for this purpose.

In 462 Rusticus, the archbishop of Narbonne, was denounced to the Pope for having designated his archdeacon Hermes as his successor. Such designations were declared null by the canons. Hilary commissioned Leontius of Arles, the primate of Gaul, to send him a report on the affair.[112] Then a Roman Council (November 19, 462), attended by Faustus of Riez and Auxanius of Aix-en-Provence, regulated the affair by a gentle and peaceful decision. The elevation of Hermes to the see of Narbonne was confirmed, because his predecessor had not really instituted him, but merely recommended him. But Hermes, in punishment for the irregularities marring his election, was deprived of the right to ordain other bishops. This same Roman Council issued various general decisions regarding the Churches of Gaul, among others a decree ordering annual meetings of great councils of the different provinces under the presidency of the archbishop of Arles. The most difficult questions, however, would be referred to Rome.[113] In 463 the Pope again intervened in the affairs of the Churches of Gaul, this time to settle a dispute between the archbishops of Arles and Vienne.[114]

Council of Rome (465)

Soon after this, Pope Hilary had to take a hand in the affairs of the Churches of Spain, where similar conflicts had

[112] Mansi, VII, 933; Jaffé, no. 554.
[113] Mansi, VII, 934 f.; Jaffé, no. 556.
[114] Mansi, VII, 936, 951; Jaffé, no. 557.

arisen. To settle them, he held a council of forty-eight bishops at Rome in November 465. Five disciplinary canons were adopted. The two principal ones were the following: "Canon 1: In the matter of ordinations, the prescriptions of the divine laws and the ordinances of Nicaea must be exactly observed. Canon 5: In Spain, some think that a bishopric can be inherited like any other property; and in that country many bishops desire, on their deathbed, to choose their successor, so that it is not possible to hold an election; this way of acting is altogether irregular." [115]

Pope Hilary, whom the Church would honor as a saint, died February 29, 468, after governing the Catholic world for six years, three months, and ten days.[116]

Pope St. Simplicius

He was succeeded, in the see of Peter, by the priest Simplicius, a native of Tibur (Tivoli), who governed the Church for fifteen years and seven days. The statement regarding him in the *Liber pontificalis* is vague and obscure, and there are gaps in the account. It bears trace of the disturbances at the time. Under Simplicius' lengthy pontificate, the Western Roman Empire was writhing in the last convulsions of its death agony. The condition of the Eastern Empire was politically more stable, but no less disquieting from the religious point of view. At Constantinople, schism and heresy were triumphant.[117] Under the usurper Basilicus, Timothy Aelurus was able to recover the see of Alexandria and there establish Monophysitism so strongly that after his death the patriarchal office passed to his friend Peter Mongus without any disturb-

[115] Mansi, VII, 959–964. In that same year (465), a council was held at Vannes in Brittany. In sixteen canons it regulated or renewed a number of points of discipline regarding the life of clerics, monks, and laymen. See Hefele, IV, 16 f.

[116] *Liber pontificalis*, I, 247 note.

[117] Grisar, *op. cit.*, II, 68 and *passim*.

ance. The see of St. Mark seemed to be definitely won by heresy. At this same period another heretic, Peter the Fuller, installed himself at Antioch in the see of the Apostle St. Peter. Both of them were backed by the imperial power. A decree of Basilicus condemned to the flames the letter from St. Leo to Flavian and the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Five hundred bishops, belonging to the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, subscribed to the imperial decree. To the calamity of the West, lost to civilization, was added the calamity of the East, lost to the orthodox faith.

Against these two dangers Simplicius strove persistently. Following the example of his two predecessors, he first added to the restorations and building of churches in Rome and gave an impulse to the liturgical life. In the three basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Lawrence, he instituted a complete weekly service and, for the carrying out of this service, he fixed upon a system of rotation so well planned that it lasted until the heart of the Middle Ages.[118]

In the East, Simplicius forcefully withstood the powers evoked by a despotic State and a submissive episcopacy. Under Basilicus he succeeded in withdrawing the clergy and monasteries of Constantinople from the schism and arousing them to resistance.[119] After the fall of the usurper and Emperor Zeno's enthronement, Simplicius saw the ecclesiastical hierarchy reëstablished. Timothy Aelurus and Peter the Fuller had to quit the sees they had usurped. True, this victory did not last long. The scheming Acacius of Constantinople soon won the favor of Zeno and, under the protection of the imperial authority, organized another schism.

At this point, August 23, 476, the chief of a Danubian tribe, Odoacer, who for several years had been the real ruler of Rome and Italy, thought the moment was at hand to suppress,

[118] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 250 f., note 5. Cf. *Acta sanctorum,* June, VII, 49, no. 134.
[119] Jaffé, no. 664.

in the person of the last emperor, a child named Romulus Augustulus, a title henceforth useless. He spared the life of the prince, but sent him, with a pension of 6000 crowns in gold, to end his years in Campania, in the country house of Lucullus. The Western Empire no longer existed.

To the eyes of anyone who took account only of outward forces, the situation of the Catholic Church must have appeared desperate. The Western Roman Empire, since the days of Constantine, had sustained it, and the Empire's framework and institutions had greatly aided it; but that Empire was dead. The Eastern Empire, without the power of Rome to offset it, seemed to be permanently won over to schism. But a more searching examination of the situation must have brought confident hope to the soul of the intrepid pontiff then guiding the Church. Neither the work of the popes, who had labored so perseveringly to gather the barbarian Church about the See of Peter, nor the work of the Fathers, who had, in their strife against error, built up the great synthesis of Catholic doctrine, was seriously shaken. In the might of her powerful hierarchy and a dogma now defined in its essential lines, the Church could confidently face the dangers of the new times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume. The dates given are usually those of the latest edition. The abbreviation *N.F.* stands for *Select Library of the Nicene and Postnicene Fathers; P.G.* and *P.L.* stand for Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* and *Patrologia Latina.*

ACCARIAS, Calixte: *Précis de droit romain,* 1891, 2 vols.

ACTA SANCTORUM, by the Bollandists.

ALÈS, Adhemar d': *L'Édit de Calliste.*

ALEXANDER, Natalis: *Historia ecclesiastica.*

ALLARD, Paul: *Les Esclaves chrétiens,* 1914.

Études d'histoire et d'archéologie, 1899.

Julien l'Apostat, 1900–03, 3 vols.

Saint Basile, 1899.

AMBROSE, St.: *Concerning Widows* (*P.L.,* vol. 16), tr. by Henry de Romestin, in *N.F.*

Ennarationes in psalmos (*P.L.,* vol. 14).

De fide ad Gratianum Augustum (*P.L.,* vol. 16).

De Joseph patriarcha (*P.L.,* vol. 14).

Letters (*P.L.,* vols. 16, 17), tr. in part by Henry de Romestin, in *N.F.*

De obitu Valentiniani consolatio (*P.L.,* vol. 16).

On Holy Virginity (*P.L.,* vol. 16), tr. by A. J. Christie.

On the Christian Faith (*De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos, P.L.,* vol. 17), tr. by Henry de Romestin, in *N.F.*

On the Death of Theodosius (*P.L.,* vol. 16), tr. by Sister Mary Dolorosa Mannix, 1925.

On the Duties of the Clergy (*De officiis, P.L.,* vol. 15), tr. by Henry de Romestin, in *N.F.*

On the Holy Ghost (*P.L.,* vol. 16), tr. by Henry de Romestin, in *N.F.*

De virginibus (*P.L.,* vol. 16).

Ambrosiana: Scritti varii publicati nel XV° centenario della morte di S. Ambrosio.

AMBROSIASTER: *Commentarius in epistolam ad Ephesios.*

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS: *Roman History,* tr. by C. D. Yonge, 1862.

APHRAATES, St.: *Demonstrations,* tr. in part in *N.F.*

Apostolic Constitutions, tr. by Henry Tattam, 1848.

ARISTOTLE: *Politics,* tr. by W. L. Newman, 1887–1902, 4 vols.

ASSEMANUS, Stephanus Evodius: *Acta sanctorum martyrum,* 1748, 2 vols.

ASTERIUS OF AMASEA: *Homilies* (*P.G.,* vol. 40).

ATHANASIUS, St.: *Against the Arians* (*P.G.,* vol. 26), tr. by J. H. Newman, in *N.F.*

Apology against the Arians (*P.G.,* vol. 26), tr. by M. Atkinson, in *N.F.*

Apology to the Emperor (*P.G.,* vol. 25), tr. by M. Atkinson, in *N.F.*

Arian History (*Historia Arianorum ad monachos, P.G.,* vol. 25), tr. by M. Atkinson, in *N.F.*

Circular to Bishops of Egypt and Libya (*P.G.,* vol. 25), tr. by M. Atkinson, in *N.F.*

Defense of his Flight (*P.G.,* vol. 25), tr. by M. Atkinson, in *N.F.*

Defense of the Nicene Council (*De Nicaenis decretis, P.G.,* vol. 25), tr. by J. H. Newman, in *N.F.*

Letter to Jovian concerning the Faith (*P.G.,* vol. 26), in *N.F.*

Letter to Orsisius (*P.G.,* vol. 26), in *N.F.*

Letter to Serapion, Concerning the Death of Arius (*P.G.,* vol. 25), in *N.F.*

Life of Antony (*P.L.,* vol. 73), tr. by H. Ellershaw, in *N.F.*

Synodal Letter (*Epistola ad Afros, P.G.,* vol. 26), tr. in *N.F.*

Synodal Letter (*Tomus ad Antiochenos, P.G.,* vol. 26), tr. by H. Ellershaw, in *N.F.*

De synodis (*P.G.,* vol. 26).

AUGUSTINE, St.: *City of God,* tr. by Marcus Dods, in *N.F.*

Confessions (*P.L.,* vol. 32), tr. in *N.F., Oxford Library of Fathers,* and *Loeb Classical Library.*

Contra Cresconium (*P.L.*, vol. 43).
Contra Julianum (*P.L.*, vol. 42).
De diversis quaestionibus (*P.L.*, vol. 40).
De fide et operibus (*P.L.*, vol. 38).
De Genesi contra Manichaeos (*P.L.*, vols. 35, 36).
De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum (*P.L.*, vol. 40).
De ordine (*P.L.*, vol. 32).
Homilies on the Gospel of St. John (*P.L.*, vol. 35), tr. by John Gibb and James Innes, in *N.F.*
Letters (*P.L.*, vol. 33), tr. in part in *Loeb Classical Library* and *N.F.*
On Grace and Free Will (*P.L.*, vol. 32), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On Marriage and Concupiscence (*P.L.*, vols. 42–43), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On Rebuke and Grace (*P.L.*, vol. 42), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On the Gift of Perseverance (*P.L.*, vol. 43), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On the Grace of Christ and on Original Sin (*P.L.*, vol. 42), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On the Morals of the Catholic Church and On the Morals of the Manichaeans (*P.L.*, vol. 32), tr. by Richard Stothert, in *N.F.*
On the Merits and Remission of Sins (*P.L.*, vol. 42), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On the Proceedings of Pelagius (*P.L.*, vol. 42), tr. by Peter Holmes and Robert Wallis, in *N.F.*
On the Profit of Believing (*P.L.*, vol. 41), tr. by C. L. Cornish, in *N.F.*
On the Work of Monks (*P.L.*, vol. 38), tr. by H. Browne, in *N.F.*
Reply to Faustus the Manichaean (*P.L.*, vol. 42), tr. by Richard Stothert, in *N.F.*
Retractationes (*P.L.*, vol. 32).
Schism of the Donatists, tr. by J. R. King, in *N.F.*
Sermo Arianorum, Collatio cum Maximino (*P.L.*, vol. 42).

Soliloquies (*P.L.*, vol. 38), tr. by C. C. Starbuck, in *N.F.*
De vera religione (*P.L.*, vol. 34).

BABUT, E. C., *Saint Martin de Tours*, 1912.
BARDENHEWER, Otto: *Patrology*, tr. by Thomas J. Shahan, 1908.
BARDY, Gustave: *Didyme l'Aveugle*, 1910.
Saint Athanase, 1914.
BARONIUS, Cesare: *Annales ecclesiastici*, 1738–59, 38 vols.
BASIL, St.: *Contra Eunomium* (*P.G.*, vol. 29).
Homilies (*P.G.*, vol. 31).
De legendis libris gentilium (*P.G.*, vol. 31).
Letters (*P.G.*, vol. 32), tr. by Roy J. Deferrari, 1926–30, 3 vols.
Opera (*P.G.*, vols. 29–32).
Regulae fusius tractatae (*P.G.*, vol. 31).
BATIFFOL, Pierre: *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes; la littérature grecque*, 1897.
Études d'histoire et de théologie positive, 1902–06, 2 vols.
L'Eucharistie, 1913.
History of the Roman Breviary, tr. by A. M. Y. Baylay, 1912.
Primitive Catholicism, tr. by Henri L. Brianceau, 1911.
BAUDRILLART, André: *Saint Paulin, évêque de Nole*, 1904.
BAUMER, Suitbert: *Geschichte des Breviers*, 1895.
BAUR, Christian: *Saint Jean Chrysostôme et ses oeuvres dans l'histoire littéraire.*
BAYET, Charles: *L'histoire de France*, 1903.
BEDJAN, Paul: *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, 1890–97, 7 vols.
BENEDICT, St.: *Regula monasteriorum.*
BERTRAND, Louis: *Saint Augustine*, tr. by V. O'Sullivan, 1914.
BESSE, J. M.: *Les Moines d'Orient avant le Concile de Chalcédoine*, 1901.
BETHUNE-BAKER, James F.: *Nestorius and his Teaching*, 1908.
BEUGNOT, Arthur: *Histoire de la destruction du paganisme en Occident*, 1835, 2 vols.
BIDEZ and CUMONT: *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite des lettres de l'empereur Julien*, 1898.
BOISSIER, Gaston: *La fin du paganisme*, 1909, 2 vols.

BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne: *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* 1829, 2 vols.
Œuvres (Guillaume ed.), 10 vols.
Œuvres (Lachat ed.), 1862–64, 31 vols.
Œuvres (Versailles ed.), 1815–19, 47 vols.
Œuvres oratoires, 1890, 6 vols.
BOUGAUD, Émile: *Sainte Monique,* 1873.
BOURDALOUE, Louis: *Œuvres complètes,* 1900, 6 vols.
BOUSQUET: *L'Unité de l'Église et le schisme grec.*
BROGLIE, Albert de: *L'Église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle,* 1877–1900, 6 vols.
Saint Ambroise, 1899.
BRUNS, Hermann: *Canones apostolorum et conciliorum saeculorum 4–7,* 1839, 2 vols.
Bulletino di archeologia cristiana (ed. by De Rossi), 1863–94.

CABROL, Fernand: *Étude sur la Peregrinatio Silviae,* 1895.
Introduction aux études liturgiques, 1906.
Le Livre de la prière antique, 1921.
CAESAR: *Gallic War.*
CAGIN: *Paléographie musicale.*
CAGIN, Paul: *Te Deum ou Illatio,* 1907.
CAMBIER: *De divina institutione confessionis.*
CASSIAN: *Collationes* (*P.L.,* vol. 49).
De institutis coenobiorum (*P.L.,* vol. 49).
Works, tr. by E. C. S. Gibson, in *N.F.*
CAVALLERA, Ferdinand: Saint Athanase, 1908.
Le Schisme d'Antioche, 1906.
CEILLIER, Remy: *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques,* 1729–63, 23 vols.
CHAMPAGNY, François de: *La Charité chrétienne dans les premiers siècles de l'Église,* 1856.
CHEVALIER, Cyr Ulysse: *Repertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge. Bio-bibliographie,* 1905–07, 2 vols.
Christus: Manuel d'histoire des religions (ed. by Joseph Huby), 1912.

Chronicon acephalum (*P.G.*, vol. 26).
Chronicon syriacum.
CHRYSOSTOM, St.: *Epistolae* (*P.G.*, vol 52).
Homilies, tr. in part by W. R. W. Stephens, in *N.F.*
Laudatio sancti Eustathii (*P.G.*, vol. 50).
On the Priesthood (*P.G.*, vol. 48), tr. by E. R. W. Stephens, in *N.F.*
Opera (*P.G.*, vols. 47–64).
De poenitentia (*P.G.*, vol. 49).
CICERO: *De natura deorum.*
De re publica.
Codex Justinianus.
Codex Theodosianus.
COMBES, Louis de: *La Vraie Croix perdue et retrouvée*, 1901.
CONDAMIN: *Les charactères de la tradition de la Bible par S. Jérôme.*
CONSTANT: *Hilaire.*
CORBLET, Jules: *Histoire du sacrement de baptême*, 1881–82, 2 vols.
Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, 1866–1932, 66 vols.
CUNTZ, Otto: *Patrum nicaenorum nomina*, 1898.
CYPRIAN, St.: *Epistles* (*P.L.*, vol. 4), tr. in *Oxford Library of Fathers*, 1838.
Writings, tr. by R. E. Wallis, 1869, 2 vols (in *Ante Nicene Christian Library*).
CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, St.: *Catechetical Lectures* (*P.G.*, vol. 33), tr. by E. H. Gifford, in *N.F.*
Contra Julianum (*P.G.*, vol. 77).
Epistolae (*P.G.*, vol. 77).

DARESTE DE LA CHAVANNE, Camille: *Histoire des classes agricoles en France*, 1858.
DELEHAYE, Hippolyte: *Les Origines du culte des martyrs*, 1912.
DENZINGER, Heinrich: *Enchiridion symbolorum*, 1922.
Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique.
Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne.

Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines (ed. by Daremberg and Saglier).

Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, 1909–32, 22 vols.

Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, 1912–32, 6 vols.

Dictionary of Christian Biography, 1911, 4 vols.

DU CANGE, Charles: *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis,* 1733–36, 6 vols.

DUCHESNE, Louis: *Christian Worship: its Origin and Evolution,* tr. by M. L., McClure, 1912.

The Churches Separated from Rome, tr. by Arnold H. Matthew, 1907.

Early History of the Christian Church, 1909–24, 3 vols.

Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule, 1907, 2 vols.

(ed.), *Liber pontificalis,* 1892, 2 vols.

DUFOURCQ, Albert: *L'Avenir du christianisme,* 1910, 4 vols.

La Christianisation des foules, 1903.

Étude sur les gesta martyrum romains, 1900.

DUPIN, Louis: *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers,* 1693–1706, 14 vols.

DURUY, Victor: *History of Rome and of the Roman People,* tr. by M. M. Ripley and W. J. Clarke, 1886, 8 vols.

DUVAL, E.: *Acta martyrum orientalium.*

DUVAL, Rubens: *Littérature syriaque,* 1900.

EBERT, Adolph: *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande,* 1887.

EPHREM, St.: *Opera* (*P.G.,* vol. 86).

EPIPHANIUS, St.: *Adversus haereses* (*P.G.,* vol. 41).

EUCKEN, Rudolf Christof: *Die Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker,* 1912.

EUCHERIUS, St.: *De laude eremitorum* (*P.L.,* vol. 50).

EUNAPIUS: *Vitae sophistarum,* 1822, 2 vols.

EUNOMIUS: *Apologia.*

EUSEBIUS: *Contra Marcellum* (*P.G.,* vol. 24).

De ecclesiastica theologia (*P.G.,* vol. 24).

Ecclesiastical History (*P.G.*, vol. 20), tr. in *N.F.* and *Loeb Classical Library.*
Life of Constantine (*P.G.*, vol. 20), tr. in *N.F.*
EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.*, vol. 86).

FÉNELON, François: *Dialogues concerning Eloquence in General,* tr. by William Stevenson, 1722.
FIALON, Eugène: *Saint Athanase, étude littéraire,* 1877.
FIRMICUS MATERNUS: *De errore profanarum religionum* (*P.L.*, vol. 12).
FUNK, Franz Xaver: *Manual of Church History,* tr. by Luigi Cappadelta (*i. e.*, P. Perciballi), 1914, 2 vols.
FUSTEL DE COULANGES: *Problèmes d'histoire,* 1885.

GAILLARD, A.: *Étude sur l'histoire de la doctrine de la grâce.*
GARNIER: *Préface aux lettres de Saint Basile.*
GASTOUÉ, Amedée: *Les Origines du chant romain,* 1907.
GATARD, Augustin: *La Musique grégorienne,* 1913.
GELASIUS OF CYZICUS: *Actorum concilii Niceni commentarius* (*P.G.*, vol. 85).
GENNADIUS: *Lives of Illustrious Men* (*P.L.*, vol. 58), tr. by E. C. Richardson, 1892, in *N.F.*
GELZER, H.: *Zur armenischen Gotterlehre.*
GERVAISE: *Vie de Saint Martin.*
GOYAU, Georges: *Sainte Mélanie,* 1908.
GRAFFIN and NAU: *Patrologia syriaca,* 1894.
GREA, Adrien: *L'Église et sa divine constitution,* 1908–09, 2 vols.
GREGORY NAZIANZEN, St.: *Carmina* (*P.G.*, vols. 37, 38).
Epistolae (*P.G.*, vol. 37).
Orations (*P.G.*, vols. 35, 36), tr. in part by C. G. Browne and J. E. Swallow, in *N.F.*
GREGORY OF NYSSA, St.: *Contra Macedonianos* (*P.G.*, vol. 45).
De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti (*P.G.*, vol. 46).
In Ecclesiasten (*P.G.*, vol. 44).
GREGORY OF TOURS, St.: *History of the Franks* (*P.L.*, vol. 71), tr. by O. M. Dalton, 1927, 2 vols.

GREGORY THE GREAT, St.: *Epistolae* (*P.L.*, vol. 79).
GRISAR, Hartmann: *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages,* tr. by Luigi Cappadelta (*i. e.*, P. Perciballi), 1911, 3 vols.
GRÜTZMACHER, Georg: *Hieronymus,* 1901–08, 3 vols.
GUÉNIN, Prosper and Eugène: *Histoire de la sténographie dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge,* 1908.
GUIGNET, Marcel: *Saint Gregoire de Nazianze orateur et épistolier.*
GWATKIN, Henry M.: *The Arian Controversy,* 1889.

HARDOUIN, Jean (ed.): *Concilia,* 1714–15, 12 vols.
HARNACK, Adolf von: *History of Dogma,* tr. by Neil Buchanan, 1897–1900, 7 vols.
HEFELE, Karl Joseph: *A History of the Christian Councils,* 1871–83, 3 vols.
HEFELE-LECLERCQ: *Histoire des conciles,* 1907–13, 10 vols. (a translation from the German, with notes and additions by Leclercq).
HERGENRÖTHER, Joseph: *Kirchengeschichte,* 1884–86, 3 vols.
HERTLEIN, Friedrich (ed.): *Iuliani imperatoris quae supersunt,* 1875–76, 2 vols.
HILARY, St.: *Adversus Constantium* (*P.L.*, vol. 10).
Contra Auxentium (*P.L.*, vol. 10).
Epistolae (*P.L.*, vol. 10).
Fragmenta (*P.L.*, vol. 10).
On the Councils (*P.L.*, vol. 10), tr. by L. Pullon, in *N.F.*
On the Trinity (*P.L.*, vol. 10), tr. by E. W. Watson and others, in *N.F.*
Tractatus de mysteriis et hymni.
Vita sancti Honorati.
Histoire générale de Languedoc, 1730–45, 5 vols.
Histoire littéraire de la France, 1733–1927, 36 vols.
Historia acephala.

IMBART DE LA TOUR, Pierre: *Les Origines religieuses de la France; les paroisses du IV^e^ au IX^e^ siècle,* 1900.
ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM: *Epistolae* (*P.G.*, vol. 78).

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, St.: *Historia de regibus Gothorum* (*P.L.*, vol. 83).

JAFFÉ, Philipp (ed.): *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* 1885–88, 2 vols.

JEROME, St.: *Chronicon* (*P.L.*, vol. 27).
Commentaria in Danielem (*P.L.*, vol. 25).
Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas (*P.L.*, vol. 26).
Dialogue against Jovinianus (*P.L.*, vol. 23), tr. by W. H. Fremantle, in *N.F.*
Dialogue against the Luciferians (*P.L.*, vol. 23), tr. by W. H. Fremantle, in *N.F.*
Dialogue against Vigilantius (*P.L.*, vol. 23), tr. by W. H. remantle, in *N.F.*
Letters (*P.L.*, vol. 22), tr. in part in *N.F.* and *Loeb Classical Library.*
Praefatio ad Regulam Sancti Pachomii (*P.L.*, vol. 23).
De viris illustribus (*P.L.*, vol. 23).

JULLIEN, Émile: *Les Professeurs de littérature dans l'ancienne Rome,* 1885.

JUVENCUS: *Evangelica historia* (*P.L.*, vol. 19).

KATTENBUSCH, Ferdinand: *Das apostolische Symbol,* 1900.

KELLNER, K. A. H.: *L'Anné ecclésiastique,* 1910.

KRAUS, Franz Xaver: *Kirchengeschichte,* 1887.

KURTH, Godefroid: *Les Origines de la civilisation moderne,* 1912, 2 vols.

LABBE, Philippe: *Concilia,* 1905–27, 20 vols.

LABOURT, Jérôme: *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse,* 1904.

LACOUR-GAYET, Georges: *Antonin le Pieux et son temps,* 1888.

LAGRANGE, François: *Histoire de saint Paulin de Nole,* 1882, 2 vols.

LARGENT, Augustin: *Études d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 1892.
Saint Hilaire, 1902.
Saint Jérôme, 1898.

LAVERTUJON, André: *La Chronique de Sulpice-Sévère,* 1896–99, 2 vols.

LAVISSE, Ernest: *Histoire de France,* 1903–11, 18 vols.

LE BLANT, Edmond (ed.): *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule,* 1856–65, 2 vols.

LEBON, Joseph: *Monophysisme Sévérien,* 1909.

LECLERCQ, Henri: *L'Espagne chrétienne,* 1906.

Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne, 1907.

Les Martyrs, 1902–05, 4 vols.

LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Albert: *Vie de Saint Martin,* 1895.

LEHNER, F. A. von: *Die Marienverehrung in den ersten Jahrhunderten,* 1886.

LEO THE GREAT, St.: *Letters* (*P.L.,* vol. 54), tr. by Charles Feltoe, in *N.F.*

LE QUIEN, Michel: *Oriens christianus,* 1740, 3 vols.

LESNE, Émile: *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France,* 1922–28.

LIBANIUS: *Antiochius.*

Monodia super Daphnaei templum.

Orationes.

Liber pontificalis (ed. by Duchesne), 1892, 2 vols.

LICHTENSTEIN, Adolf: *Eusebius von Nikomedien,* 1903.

LOESCHCKE, Gerhard: *Das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzsicus.*

MADER, Johann: *Der heilige Cyrillus, Bischof von Jerusalem,* 1891.

MANSI, Giovanni (ed.): *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 1901, 58 vols.

MANY, S.: *De sacra ordinatione,* 1904.

MARIGNAN, Albert: *Études sur la civilisation française,* 1899, 2 vols.

MARQUARDT, Karl J.: *Römische Staatsverwaltung,* 1881–85, 3 vols.

MARTÈNE, Edmond: *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus,* 1763, 4 vols.

MARTIN, Jules: *Saint Augustin.*

MARUCCHI, Orazio: *Élements d'archéologie chrétienne,* 1900–03, 2 vols.

MAURY: *Les postes romaines.*

MAURY, Jean: *The Principles of Eloquence,* tr. by J. N. Lake, 1807.
MEESTER, Placide de: *La divine liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome.*
MERCATOR, Marius: *Commonitorium de Caelestio* (*P.L.,* vol. 48).
Liber subnotationum in verba Juliani (*P.L.,* vol. 48).
MEYSENBUG, Heinrich von: *De Christianae religionis vi et effectu in jus civile,* 1828.
MIGNE, Jacques Paul (ed.): *Patrologia Graeca,* 1857–80, 166 vols.
Patrologia Latina, 1844, 221 vols.
MOEHLER, Johann Adam: *Athanasius der Grosse,* 1844.
MOELLER, J.: *Geschichte des Mittelalters,* 1844.
MONTFAUCON, Bernard de: *Les Modes et les usages du siècle de Théodose le Grand.*
MOORE, Clifford: *Julius Firmicus Maternus.*
MORIN, Germain (ed.): *Anecdota Maredsolana,* 1895–1903, 5 vols.
MOSES OF CHORENE: *Histoire d'Arménie,* 1841, 2 vols. (Armenian text and French translation).

NAGER, FRANZ: *Die Trinitätslehre des heiligen Basilius,* 1912.
NAU, François: *Histoire de Dioscore,* 1903.
Nestorius d'apres les sources orientales, 1910.
NAVILLE, Adrien: *Julien l'Apostat et sa philosophie du polythéisme,* 1877.
NEGRI, Gaetano: *Julian the Apostate,* tr. by Litta-Visconti-Arese, 1905, 2 vols.
NESTORIUS: *The Bazaar of Heracleides,* tr. by G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson, 1925.
NEWMAN, John H.: *Development of Christian Doctrine.*
NICEPHORUS: *Historia ecclesiastica* (*P.G.,* vols. 145–147).

OPTATUS, St.: *Against the Donatists* (*P.L.,* vol. 11), tr. by O. R. Vassall-Phillips, 1917.
OROSIUS, Paulus: *Historiae adversum paganos* (*P.L.,* vol. 31).
OZANAM, Frederic: *History of Civilization in the Fifth Century,* tr. by A. C. Glyn, 1867, 2 vols.

PALLADIUS: *The Lausiac History* (*P.G.,* vol. 34), tr. by W. K. L. Clarke, 1918.

PAQUIER, Jules: *Le Jansénisme,* 1908.
PARDESSUS, Jean (ed.): *Diplomata ad res gallo-francicas spectantia,* 1843–49, 2 vols.
PARGOIRE, J.: *Les debuts du monachisme à Constantinople.*
PARMENTIER, Léon: *Kirchengeschicte,* 1911.
PAULINUS OF NOLA, St.: *Epistolae* (*P.L.,* vol. 61).
Life of St. Ambrose (*P.L.,* vol. 20), tr. by Sister Mary Simplicia Kaniecka, 1928.
Poemata (*P.L.,* vol. 61).
PESCH: *Praelectiones dogmaticae.*
PETAU: *Dogmata theologica.*
De incarnatione.
PHILOSTORGIUS: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.,* vol. 63), tr. by E. Walford, 1855.
PHOTIUS: *Syntagma canonum* (*P.G.,* vol. 104).
Pilgrimage of St. Silvia of Aquitania to the Holy Places, tr. by John H. Bernard, 1891.
PITRA, Jean Baptiste: *Spicilegium Solesmense,* 1876–84, 5 vols.
PLINY: *Historia naturalis.*
POSSIDIUS, St.: *Life of St. Augustine* (*P.L.,* vol. 32), tr. by Herbert T. Weiskolten, 1919.
PROBA, Valeria: *Centones Virgiliani* (*P.L.,* vol. 19).
PROSPER, St.: *Carmen de ingratis* (*P.L.,* vol. 51).
Chronicon (*P.L.,* vol. 51).
Liber contra collatorem (*P.L.,* vol. 51).
PUECH, Aime: *Prudence; étude sur la poésie latine chrétienne au IV^e siècle,* 1888.
Un réformateur de la société chrétienne au IV^e siècle; Saint Jean Chrysostôme et les mœurs de son temps, 1891.
PULLER, F. W.: *The Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition,* 1904.

RAMPOLLA, Mariano: *Santa Melania Giuniore.*
Realencyklopädie für protestantische theologie und kirche, 1896–1913, 24 vols.

RÉGNIER, Adolphe: *Saint Léon le grand,* 1910.
Saint Martin, 1907.
RÉGNON, T. de: *Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité,* 1892.
REINKENS, Josef Hubert: *Hilarius von Poitiers,* 1864.
RENAN, Ernest: *Marcus Aurelius,* tr. by W. G. Hutchison, 1903.
ROSSI, Giovanni Battista de: *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana,* 1863–94.
Le cult idolatrique à Rome.
Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae, 1857–87, 2 vols.
Roma sotterranea, 1864, 5 vols.
ROUILLON, A. M.: *Sainte Hélène,* 1908.
ROUTH, Martin Joseph: *Reliquiae sacrae,* 1846–48, 5 vols.
RUFINUS: *Apologia in Hieronymum* (*P.L.,* vol. 21).
Historia ecclesiastica (*P.L.,* vol. 21).
Works, tr. by W. H. Fremantle, in *N.F.*

SABATIER, Maxime: *L'Église et le travail manuel,* 1900.
SACY, Isaac Silvestre de: *Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse,* 1793.
SALVIANUS: *On the Government of God* (*P.L.,* vol. 53), tr. by Eva M. Sanford, 1930.
SAVIGNY, Friedrich Karl von: *The History of the Roman Law during the Middle Ages,* tr. by E. Cathcart, 1829.
SAVIO, Fedele: *Novi studii sulla questione del papa Liberio.*
Punti controversi nella questione del papa Liberio.
La questione del papa Liberio.
SCHEPSS, Georg (ed.): *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum,* 1866–1932.
SCHILLING, Otto: *Die heiligen Staats-und Soziallehre des Augustinus,* 1910.
SCHLEGEL, Friedrich von: *Philosophy of History,* tr. by J. B. Robertson, 1883.
SCHOLZ, Heinrich: *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte; ein Kommentar zu Augustins De civitate Dei,* 1911.
SCHROCKH, Johann: *Kirchengeschichte,* 1772–1803, 35 vols.

Sibylline Oracles, tr. by Milton S. Terry, 1890.

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS: *Carmina* (*P.L.,* vol. 58).

Letters (*P.L.,* vol. 58), tr. by O. M. Dalton, 1915, 2 vols.

SIMON, Jules: *Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie,* 1845, 2 vols.

SIRICIUS, St.: *Epistolae* (*P.L.,* vol. 13).

SMEDT, de: *Principes de la critique historique.*

SOCRATES: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.,* vol. 67), tr. by A. C. Zenos, in *N.F.*

SOZOMEN: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.,* vol. 67), tr. by Chester D. Hartcranft, in *N.F.*

STANLEY, Arthur: *History of the Eastern Church,* 1884.

STAUDENMAIER, Franz Antonius: *Geschichte der Bischofswahlen,* 1830.

SUETONIUS: *Lives of the Caesars,* tr. by J. C. Rolfe, 1914, 2 vols.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS: *Works* (*P.L.,* vol. 20), tr. by Alexander Roberts, in *N.F.*

SYMMACHUS: *Epistolae* (*P.L.,* vol. 18).

TERTULLIAN: *Writings* (*P.L.,* vol. 1, 2), tr. by S. Thelwall, in *N.F.*

Testament of the Lord.

THAMIN, Raymond: *Saint Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e siècle,* 1895.

Saint Jean Chrysostôme et les mœurs de son temps.

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA: *Contra Apollinarium.*

THEODORET: *Ecclesiastical History* (*P.G.,* vol. 82), tr. by B. Jackson.

Letters (*P.G.,* vol. 83), tr. by B. Jackson.

THIERRY, Amedée: *Les Grandes hérésies du V^e siècle, Nestorius et Eutychès,* 1878.

Saint Jérôme.

THOMAS AQUINAS, St.: *Summa theologica,* tr. by Fathers of the English Domincan Province, 1911–17, 10 vols.

THOMASSIN, Louis: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Église,* 1779, 3 vols.

TILLEMONT, Louis Le Nain de: *Histoire des empereurs,* 1739, 16 vols.

Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique, 1706–28, 27 vols.
TIXERONT, Joseph: *History of Dogmas,* 1910–16, 3 vols.
TROPLONG, Raymond: *Influence du christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains,* 1868.

URANIUS: *Epistolae de obitu Paulini* (*P.L.,* vol. 53).

VACANDARD, E.: *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse,* 1905.
VACANT, Jean Michel (ed.): *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* 1909–32, 22 vols.
VAN ORTROY: *Les vies greques de Saint Ambroise et leurs sources.*
VORTABIED, Élisée: *Soulèvement national de l'Arménie chrétienne du V^e^ siècle contre la loi de Zoroastre.*
VICTOR VITENSIS: *De persecutione Vandalica* (*P.L.,* vol. 58).
VIGOUREL, Adrien: *A Synthetical Manual of Liturgy,* tr. by John A. Nainfa, 1907.
VIGOUROUX, Fulcran (ed.): *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* 1895–1912, 5 vols.
VILLEMAIN, Abel François: *Tableau de l'eloquence chrétienne au IV^e^ siècle,* 1856.
VINCENT OF LERINS, St.: *Commonitory* (*P.L.,* vol. 50), tr. by C. A. Heurtley, in *N.F.*

WAITZ, Georg: *Über das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila,* 1840.
WARNEFRIDUS, Paulus: *History of the Langobards* (*P.G.,* vol. 95), tr. by W. D. Foulke, 1907.
WETZER and WELTE: *Kirchenlexikon,* 1898–1901.
WILTSCH, Johann: *Handbook of the Geography and Statistics of the Church,* tr. by John Leitch, 1859–68, 2 vols.

ZAHN, Theodor: *Marcellus von Ancyra,* 1867.
ZOSIMUS: *History,* 1814.

Index

A solis ortus cardine, Christmas hymn, 532
Absolution, 450 and note
Abyssinia, Christianity in, 83-85
  St. Frumentius apostle of, 84
Acacians (heretics), *anomoios,* 176
  Council of Constantinople (360), 177
  Council of Seleucia, 176
  Eudoxius, 235
  Homoiousios, 176
  Homoousios, 176
  Join strict Arians, 178
  Omoios, 176
  Valens, 235
Acacius (bishop of Constantinople), organizes a schism, 610
Acacius (bishop of Melitene), at Council of Ephesus, 557
  St. Cyril, 567
Acacius the One-eyed (Arian bishop of Caesarea), 107
  Character of, 107
  Council of Antioch (341), 111; of Constantinople (360), 177; of Sardica, 117
  Deposed, 119
  Election of, 107
Acolytes, at mass, 432 f.
  Duties of, 432
  Meaning of word, 432
  Ordination of, 433
  St. Tarcisius, 432 note
Actors, Servitude of, 470
Acts of the Persian Martyrs (by St. Maruta), 126 note
Ad (Palestine), St. Epiphanius' monastery at, 268, 488 f.
Adiabene (Persian province), 129
Adimantus (heretic), debate with St. Augustine, 414
Adonis, Worship of, at Bethlehem, 96
Adoptionism (heresy), Marcellus of Ancyra, 74
  St. Lucian, 9
Adrianople, Battle of, 24, 239, 292
  St. Lucius bishop, 130
Adversus Gentes (by St. Athanasius), 14-16
Adversus Jovinianum (by St. Jerome), 381-383
Advocates, Office of, 426
Aedychius (governor), letter from Emperor Julian, 195
Aelia Capitolina, *i. e.,* Jerusalem, 58 f.
Aelurus, Timothy (*See* Timothy)
Aemilia (province), St. Ambrose governor, 257
Aerianism (heresy), 187 f.
Aerians (heretics), Julian the Apostate, 189
  Wine-drinking, 187
Aerius (heretic), Protestantism and errors of, 187
Aetheria (*See* Silvia)
Aetians (heretics), Arians, 166
Aetius (bishop of Lydda), at Antioch, 66
Aetius (heretic), Caesar Gallus and, 166
  Catechist of Julian the Apostate, 166
  Estate on Lesbos, 195
  Eunomius disciple of, 166
  Exiled, 173, 177
  Leader of Anomoeans, 195; of Arians, 166
  Opposes Eusebians, 166
  Recalled from exile, 190
  St. Basil, 242
  Study of Aristotle, 166; of medicine, 166
Aetius (Roman general), Alberius and, 570
  Ambition of, 536
  Attila and, 600
  Death of, 539
  Empress Placidia, 535
  Overcomes the Burgundians, 535
Africa, Acolytes, 432
  Aurelius primate of, 503

Caelestius in, 513-515
Council of Sardica, 116
Donatism in, 133 ff.
Donatists in, 504
Manichaeans driven from, 571
Monasticism in, 464
Primate of, 422 note
Religious strife in, 197
St. Siricius and Churches of, 428
Vandals invade, 544, 571
Against Auxentius (by St. Hilary), 254-256
Against Eunomius (by St. Basil), 242-244, 322; (by St. Gregory of Nyssa), 322
Against Marcellus (by Eusebius of Caesarea), 75, 107
Against the Academics (by St. Augustine), 394
Against the Adversaries of the Monastic Life (by St. Chrysostom), 270, 272
Against the Arians (by St. Athanasius), 138 f.
Against the Defamers of the Monastic Life (by St. Chrysostom), 255
Agape, at Rome, 445
Forbidden, 445
In Gaul, 445
Aged, Homes for the, 474
Agennetos, Eunomius, 240, 243 f.
Aix (France), Auxanius bishop, 608
Lazarus bishop, 520
Alamani, at the Rhine, 535
Alani, in Spain, 571
Salvian on the, 538
Alaric (Gothic chief), at Milan, 413
At Rome, 480
Military skill of, 480
Rome sacked by, 480, 513, 534
Albania, Evangelization of, 86
Albano (Italy), Pope Innocent I born at, 482
Albenga (Italy), 287
Alberius (general), and Aetius, 570
Albianus (pagan god), Cult of, at Apt, 284 note
Albina, St. (matron), 355
St. Jerome, 356, 358
Albinus (prefect), Theodosius, 400
Alexander, St. (bishop of Alexandria), admonishes Arius, 11
Arianism, 13 f.
Arius, 19
Character of, 22 f.
Council of Alexandria (320), 16; of Nicaea, 33, 37
Death of, 67
Deposes Pistus, 105
Election of, 10
Encyclical letters, 23
Harnack on doctrine of, 23 note
Letter from Constantine, 24; to Arius, 346; to Bishop Alexander of Constantinople, 23 note
Rebuked by Arius, 12
Refutation of Arianism, 23
St. Lucian, 9
Tixeront on doctrine of, 23 note
Alexander, St. (bishop of Constantinople), and Arius, 76 f.
Council of Nicaea, 42
Letter from St. Alexander of Alexandria, 23 note
Alexandria (Egypt), Arianism in, 12
Arians in, 69
Arius returns to, 76
Authority of see of, 58
Dioscorus bishop, 577 f.
Exiled clergy return to, 132
George bishop, 158
Gregory bishop, 107 ff., 132
Neoplatonism, 15
Opposition to Bishop Gregory, 108
Pagan disturbances in, 206
Parishes in city of, 11
Patriarchate of, 278, 427, 547; St. Leo the Great on, 593; St. Mark the Evangelist, 278, 593
Peter Mongus bishop, 609
Pistus bishop, 105
Platonism, 546
St. Athanasius returns to, 133
St. Athanasius' entry into, 191
St. Cyril bishop, 547 ff.
St. Didymus born at, 324
St. Epiphanius at, 267
St. Hilarion at, 268
St. Peter bishop, 316
St. Proterius bishop, 596
St. Timothy bishop, 333
School of, 241; Christian education, 204; Divinity of Christ, 546; Platonism, 7; St. Cyril, 547; School of Antioch, 7 f.
Schools in, 203
Theophilus bishop, 327, 401, 490, 496 f.

Uprising in (356), 158
Alexandria, Councils of:
(320), 16
(350), 138
(362), 192-195; Approval of, 192; Arianism, 352; Authority of, 192 note; "Council of the Confessors," 192; Decisions of, 192 f.; divinity of Christ, 347 f.; Effects of, 192-195; *Hypostasis,* 193; letter to Church of Antioch, 194; Pope Liberius' attitude to, 192 note; *Ousia,* 193; *Prosopon,* 193; repentant Arians, 352; St. Jerome defends, 352
(430), Synodal letter, 554
Alleluia, at mass, 441
Almsgiving, 475
St. Chrysostom on, 371
Altar curtains, at mass, 444
Altar of Victory, 359-361, 408
Restored, 410
St. Ambrose, 361
Altino (Italy), St. Heliodorus bishop, 262, 492
Alypius, St. (bishop of Tagaste), 393, 416
Alypius (Roman official), Jerusalem Temple, 216 f.
Amasea (*See* Amasia)
Amasia (Asia Minor), Hospices at, 474
Ambrose, St. (bishop of Milan), 256-260, 373-380
Adviser of Gratian, 254, 260, 318 f., 465; of Theodosius, 465; of Valentinian II, 260, 401
Altar of Victory, 361
Apollinarianism, 347
Arianism, 347
At Bologna, 409
At Florence, 409
At Rome, 257
At Treves, 374
Auxentius, 364
Baptism of, 258
Born at Treves, 257
Callinicus synagogue, 376
Character of, 257 f.
Church and State, 375, 412
Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, 380
Council of Aquileia, 346
De Abraham, 380
De benedictionibus patriarcharum, 380
De bono mortis, 380
De Cain et Abel, 319 f.
De Elia et jejunio, 380
De fide ad Gratianum, 319, 321
De fuga saeculi, 380
De Isaac et anima, 380
De Jacob et vita beata, 380
De Joseph patriarcha, 380
De Nabuthe Iezraelita, 380
De Noe et arca, 319 f.
De paradiso, 319 f.
De Spiritu Sancto, 319, 321
De Tobia, 380
De virginibus, 319 f.
Death of Priscillian, 472
Devoted to study, 259
Doctrine of Holy Ghost, 322
Dogmatic writings of, 321 f.
Election of, 258, 423
Envoy of Justina, 359
Estates of, 258
Eugenius, 407-409, 411
Exegetical works, 320 f., 379 f.
Finding of the True Cross, 98
Funeral of Theodosius, 412; of Valentinian II, 405 f.
Governor of Liguria and Aemilia, 257
Gratian, 321, 346, 358
Hexameron, 380
Hierarchy of the Church, 419
Hymns, 364
Influence of, 375
Influence over Gratian, 260, 319
Journey through Italy, 409
Judge, 259
Justina, 358 f., 362 f., 375
Lawyer, 257
Letter from St. Basil, 258
Literary style of, 259
Maximus, 359, 374
Monasticism, 464
Paulinus disciple of, 514
Philo Judaeus, 320 f.
Praises Pope Liberius, 171
Preaching, 259
Private mass, 445
Psalmody, 441
Redemption of captives, 469
Roman primacy, 277
St. Augustine, 259, 391
St. Augustine's baptism, 394
St. Paulinus, 386

Secretary of Petronius Probus, 257
Statesman, 375 f.
Studies, 257
Theodosius, 351, 402 f., 412 f.
Thessalonica massacre, 376
Valentinian I, 260, 465
Valentinian II, 359, 364, 403
Virginity, 319 f.
Withstands Theodosius, 378 f.
Worship of saints, 462
Writings of, 319-322
Ambrosian hymns, 364
Ambrosian liturgy, 364 f.
Ambrosian rite, 365 note
Ambrosiaster, same as Evagrius, 254 note
Commentaries on St. Paul, 254 f.
Amen, at mass, 441
Amiens (France), St. Martin at, 286
Ammianus Marcellinus (historian), on building of Jewish Temple, 216 f.
On Julian and the Christian sects, 190
Ammon oasis, St. Athanasius visits the, 68
Ammonius (monk), Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, 496
Ammonius (one of the Tall Brothers), 497
Amphilochius, St. (bishop of Iconium), at Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Condemns the Messalians, 302
Letter from St. Gregory of Nyssa, 437
Ananias, St. (*See* Hanania, Persian priest)
Anaphora, Eastern mass, 441
Anaphora (by St. Serapion), Extreme Unction, 452
Anastasia (daughter of Valens), 301
Anastasis (chapel, Constantinople), 314, 318, 339
Anastasis (church in Jerusalem), 455 f., 458
St. Epiphanius preaches in, 488
Anastasius I, St. (pope), 481 f.
Crescentian Basilica, 482
Donatist dispute, 482
Election of, 481
Letter of recommendation for priests, 482
Origenist dispute, 482, 496
Anastasius (papal vicar), letter from Pope Leo the Great, 597
Anastasius (priest of Antioch), Nestorius sustains, 551
Theotokos attacked by, 551
Anathematisms of St. Cyril, 554 ff., 566
Council of Ephesus, 559
Anatolius (bishop of Constantinople), 591
Ancoratus (by St. Epiphanius), 255, 268 f., 348
Creeds in, 269
Ancyra (Asia Minor), Basil bishop, 117, 165
Council of (314), chorepiscopi, 426; (358), 168 f.
Marcellus bishop, 117
Andrew, St. (apostle), Relics of, 462
Angers (France), St. Maurilius bishop, 290
Angora (*See* Ancyra)
Anicia Proba (patrician), 228
Anna, St. (Persian nun), 144 f.
Anointing, at baptism, 447
By deaconesses, 447
Anomoeans (heretics), Aetius leader of, 195
Arians, 166
Council of Ancyra (358), 169
Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Doctrine of, 166 f.
Eusebians and, 167
Exile of seventy, 173
Fourth formula of Sirmium, 174
Semi-Arians, 102
Anomoeism, Eudoxius, 234
Anomoios, Council of Constantinople, 234
Eunomius, 234
Rejected by Acacians, 176
Semi-Arians, 102
Anthimus (bishop of Tyana), St. Basil, 250 f.
Anthropomorphism, 487
Attacked by John of Jerusalem, 488
Anthusa, St. (matron), 270
Antinicene movement, 103 ff.
Constantius and, 102
Antioch (Syria), Arian bishops of, 185
Arian party, 186
Arianism in, 186
Church of, letter from Council of Alexandria, 194; pillage by Julian,

215; St. Peter (apostle), 278; three parties, 186
Consecration of the Golden Church, 111
Eudoxius bishop, 186
Eustathians in, 186
Euzoios bishop, 186
Evagrius bishop, 403
Fourth Creed of, 115
George bishop, 190
Liturgy at, 438 f.
Meletians, 186
Murder of two officials, 191
Nestorius at, 550
Pagans of, and Bishop George, 190 f.
Patriarchate of, 278, 427; authority of, 58; St. Leo the Great on, 593; St. Peter (apostle), 593
Paulinus bishop, 194
Peter the Fuller bishop, 610
Poverty at, 369
Psalmody at, 441
St. Chrysostom at, 417; born at, 270; preaches at, 367
St. Flavian bishop, 336 f.
St. Lucian priest of, 8
St. Meletius bishop, 186
Schism of, 185 f., 302 f.; close of, 403; doctrine of Trinity, 186 note; Evagrius, 403; *homoousios,* 186 note; nature of, 186 note; St. Jerome, 265
School of, 241, 434; Aristotelianism, 7, 546; Arius, 7; divinity of Christ, 546, 548; Paul of Samosata, 8; St. Diodorus, 271, 548; St. Lucian, 548; School of Alexandria, 7 f.; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 549; Theodoret of Cyrus, 580
Schools in, 203
Statue of Theodosius overturned, 372
Stephen bishop, 131
Theodosius' decree against, 472
Antioch, Councils of:
(268), *Homoousios,* 47
(330), deposes St. Eustathius, 66
(341), 8, 111-113; Acacius at, 111; called Synod in Encoeniis, 111; Canons of, 111 f.; chorepiscopi, 426; deposed bishops, 500; deposes St. Athanasius, 112; Eudoxius at, 234; Eusebius of Nicomedia at, 111; *homoousios,* 112; no restoration of deposed bishops, 112; professions of faith, 112
(344), 131 f.; Macrostic Creed, 131 f.
(378), Roman primacy, 277
Antiphons, at vigil office, 459
Antipopes: Eulalius (418-419), 483 f.; Felix II (355-365), 233; Ursinus (366-367), 233
Antony, St. (hermit), appeal to Constantine, 77
Influence of, 92
St. Athanasius, 16, 133, 464
St. Didymus the Blind, 325
Antony, Life of (by St. Athanasius), 159
Apameia (Syria), attack upon Christians, 403
Aphraates, St. (Persian bishop), 143 f.
Defense of Catholic dogma, 138
Valens, 236 f.
Apiarius (priest of Sicca, Africa), appeals to the pope, 484 f.
Convicted by Council of Carthage, 485
Excommunicated, 484
Apocrisiarii, 595
Apollinarianism, 347 f.
Arianism, 7, 18
At Antioch, 302
Condemned, 297
Council of Rome (382) condemns, 348
Nestorius attacks, 551
Opposed by Diodorus, 548
St. Ambrose, 347
St. Epiphanius, 348
St. Jerome, 345
Theodore of Mopsuestia opposes, 549
Apollinarians, Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Divinity of Christ, 347
St. Jerome, 349
Apollinaris the Elder, 184
Doctrine of the Trinity, 347
Julian the Apostate, 347
Religious poems, 205
Apollinaris the Younger, 184
Council of Nicaea, 184
Divinity of Christ, 184 f., 345, 347
Doctrine of the Trinity, 347
Foe of Arius, 184
Influence of writings of, 185
Julian the Apostate, 347
Precursor of Monophysitism, 348
Religious poems, 205
St. Basil on, 185
Teacher, 203

Apollinaris, Sidonius (*See* Sidonius)
Apollo (pagan god), consulted by Licinius, 3
Shrine at Daphne, 208, 213-215
Apollo of Bourbon (*See* Apollo-Borva)
Apollo-Borva, Worship of, 284 note
Apollo-Cobledulitavus, Worship of, 284 note
Apologia (by Rufinus), 494 f.; (by St. Jerome), 495
Apology for his Flight (by St. Athanasius), 159
Apology for Origen (by St. Pamphilus), 493
Apology to Emperor Constantius (by St. Athanasius), 159
Apostates, Laws against, 400
Perpetual penance, 448 note
Apostles, Church of the Holy, 209
Apostolic Constitutions, Baptism in, 446
Extreme Unction, 452
Hospitality, 474
Apotactics (heretics), 301
Apotaxis, baptism ceremonies, 447
Appeal to Rome, Right of, 119-121
Aprunculus (rhetorician), governor of Narbonne, 212
Apt (France), Pagan cults at, 284 note
Aquileia, Battle at, 411
Council of (381), 345 f.; Attalus condemned, 346; Palladius condemned, 346; Pope Damasus, 346; St. Ambrose, 346; Secundian condemned, 346; Valerian president of, 346
Fortunatian bishop, 162 note
Proposed council of, 346
St. Jerome at, 262
Aquilinus (bishop of Byblos), deposed, 588
Arabia, and Palestine, 5
Eutychianism in, 594
Missions of, 501
Patriarchate of Antioch, 427; of Jerusalem, 427 note
Paulinus' followers, 351
Arbogast (Roman general), adviser of Valentinian II, 401
Death of Valentinian II, 404
Emperor Eugenius, 404
Expedition against the barbarians, 407
Family of, 412
Pagan military standards, 411
Suicide of, 412
Theodosius, 407
Treason of, 403 f.
War with Theodosius, 411
Arcadia (princess), St. Cyril appeals to, 554
Arcadius (emperor), at Constantinople, 402
Becomes emperor, 412, 479, 481
Character of, 479
Convokes council, 498
Eudoxia dominates, 479
Eutropius dominates, 479
Gainas dominates, 479
Gothic invasions, 480
Intercedes for Arians, 376
Notitia dignitatum utriusque imperii, 422 note
Rufinus dominates, 479
St. Chrysostom exiled, 500
Statue at Antioch, 372
Archbishops, 278
Archdeacons, at mass, 432
Office of, 425
Archidanus, at Council of Sardica, 117
Archivists, Office of, 426
Archpriests, Office of, 426
Ardaric, chief of Gepidae, 600
Ardaschir (Persia), Maris bishop, 573
Arethusa (Syria), St. Mark bishop, 115, 117
Arian baptism, Church of Spain, 366
Pope Liberius, 366
Pope Siricius, 366
Rome, 366
Arianism (heresy), 3-27
Among the barbarians, 234, 346
Among the Goths, 279
Anomoeans, 166
Apollinarianism, 7, 18
Asterius helps spread of, 23
Burgundians, 282
Condition of, 182
Council of Alexandria (362), 352
Council of Nicaea, 41-51, 345
Council of Nicaea condemns, 103
Death of Constantius, 178
Decline of, 303
Doctrine of, 16-19
Eudoxius, 234
Eunomians, 166
Eusebius of Caesarea, 21
Exocontians, 166

Faustus refutes, 541
Gepidae, 282
Gnosticism, 17 f.
Goths, 224 f., 234
Gratian, 239
Heruli, 282
Heterousians, 166
Imperial policy, 224
In Alexandria, 12
In Antioch, 186
In Gaul, 285
In Italy, 282
In Provence, 152
Lombards, 282
Macedonianism, 18
Neoplatonism, 17 f.
Nestorianism, 7, 18
Origen, 12
Ostrogoths, 282
Pagan philosophy, 13
Palladius, 346
Pelagianism, 7, 18
Pope Sylvester, 24
Rugians, 282
St. Alexander, 13 f.
St. Alexander refutes, 23
St. Ambrose, 347
St. Athanasius refutes, 139, 550
St. Basil's strife with, 249 f.
St. Hosius of Cordova, 25 f.
St. Jerome on spread of, 177
St. Lucian, 7
Second formula of Sirmium, 168
Secundian, 346
Source of heresies, 7, 18
Sources of, 6
Suevi, 282
Theodoric the Great, 282
Ulfilas, 279, 281
Vandals, 282
Arians (heretics), Admission of repentant, 193, 230
At Sirmium, 358
Attack St. Basil's writings, 322
Campenses, 266
Council of Alexandria and repentant, 352
Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Conflagration in Constantinople, 376
Disunion among, 165-167
Eusebius (eunuch), 106
Eustathians in contrast to, 188
In Alexandria, 69
In Constantinople, 316 f.
In Gaul, 231
In Italy, 231
In Milan, 362-364
Julian the Apostate, 195
Justina (empress), 358
Justina's death, 375
Luciferians and repentant, 352
Pardoned by Theodosius, 376
Pope Liberius and repentant, 177, 193
Sack Catholics' houses, 376
St. Chrysostom, 497
St. Lucifer and repentant, 193, 351 f.
St. Martin mistreated by, 287
Theodosius evicts, 316 f.
Arianzus (Cappadocia), St. Gregory Nazianzen at, 339; born at, 218
Aristakes, St. (Armenian bishop), at Council of Nicaea, 86
Aristotelianism, School of Antioch, 7, 546
Aristotle, on manual labor, 435
Study of, 166
Arius, St., *alias* Macarius (bishop of Petra in Palestine), at Council of Sardica, 117
Arius (heretic), admonished by St. Alexander, 11
Age of, 10 note
Anathematized by St. Hosius, 168
Apollinaris the Younger, foe of, 184
At Constantinople, 76
At Council of Nicaea, 32, 38, 41
At Nicomedia, 21
Audacity, 21
Audacity at Council of Nicaea, 39
Character of, 10, 19
"Collucianists," 19
Council of Alexandria (320), 16
Death of, 76 f.
Dialectic ability, 11
Doctrine of, 17, 22, 39
Election of Alexander, 10
Excommunicated, 10
Exiled, 50
Favored by Eusebius of Caesarea, 21
Friends of, 19
Invited to Nicomedia, 20 f.
Letter from Constantine, 24, 26 note; from St. Alexander, 346
Letter to Bishop Alexander, 21
Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, 20
Meletian Schism, 10

Parish priest, 11
Rebukes Bishop Alexander, 12
Recalled from exile, 72
Religious music, 22 note
Returns to Alexandria, 76
St. Peter of Alexandria, 10
School of Antioch, 7
Songs, 22
Thalia, 21 f., 39
Travels in Egypt, 19
Writings condemned, 50
Arius, On the Death of (by St. Athanasius), 159
Arkaph, John (heretic), exiled, 77
Leader of Meletians, 71
Arles (France), Heros bishop, 520
Imperial capital, 151
Leontius bishop, 608
Made metropolitan see, 428
Patroclus bishop, 522
Political eminence of, 539
St. Honoratus bishop, 529 f., 539
Saturninus bishop, 152, 163
Vicariate apostolic, 597
Arles, Councils of:
(314), condemns Donatism, 133; Easter controversy, 53 f.; means of travel, 29; urban deacons, 290
(353), 152 f.; Constantius dominates the, 153; papal legates, 153; St. Athanasius condemned, 153
Armenia, Christians of Iberia and Albania unite with Church of, 86
Evangelization of, 86 f.
Eudoxius born in, 234
St. Basil in, 253
St. Chrysostom in, 502
Armenian liturgy, 439
Arsacius (anti-bishop of Constantinople), 501
Arsenius (bishop of Hypsele), accuser of St. Athanasius, 53
Alleged assassination of, 70, 73
Ascalon (Palestine), Pagan disturbances in, 206
Ascension, Basilica on Mount of the, 97
Ascetics, Vows of, 454
Aschiron (Asia Minor), Constantine at, 79
Ascholius, St. (bishop of Thessalonica), at Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Baptism of Theodosius, 300, 333
Asclepas, St. (bishop of Gaza), at Council of Sardica, 117
Vindicated at Council of Sardica, 119
Asella, St. (virgin), letter from St. Jerome, 357 f.
Praised by Palladius, 356
St. Jerome, 355 f.
Ash Wednesday, 460 f.
Asia Minor, Byzantine art, 437
Patriarchate of Constantinople, 427
St. Hilary exiled to, 267
Asterius, St. (bishop of Amasia), at Antioch, 194
Letter to Church of Antioch, 194
Asterius, St. (bishop of Petra in Arabia), at Council of Sardica, 117
Exiled to Libya, 130
Asterius (heretic), disciple of Eunomius, 239
Asterius (rhetorician), spreads Arianism, 23
Astorga (Spain), Turibius bishop, 572
Astrology, Firmicus Maternus and, 123
Asylum, Right of, 473
Asylums, St. Basil, 252
Aterbius (monk of Sceta), Origenist controversy, 487
Rufinus denounced by, 487
St. Jerome denounced by, 487
Athanasius, St. (bishop of Alexandria), Ability of, 43
Adversus Gentes, 14-16
Against the Arians, 138 f.
Alleged assassination of Arsenius, 70, 73
Alleged letter from Pope Liberius, 151
Apology for his Flight, 159
Apology to Emperor Constantius, 159
Argument against Arianism, 550
Arsenius' accusation of, 53
At Antioch, 132
At Constantinople, 73
At Council of Nicaea, 33, 37, 39, 42-44
At Council of Sardica, 117
At Council of Tyre, 73
At Hermopolis, 196
At Memphis, 196
At Milan, 115
At Nicomedia, 70
At Rome, 109, 115, 132, 227, 464
At Tabennisi, 196
At Treves, 132
Attacks on, 69-71

Author of Nicene Creed, 48 and note
Callinicus foe of, 53
Calumniation of, 150, 167
Character of, 67
Condemned by Council of Arles, 153; by pseudo-council of Philippopolis, 122
Confers with Hosius, 115
Constantine, 71
Constantius, 132, 150
Consults Emperor Constans, 132
Conversion of pagans, 195
Council of Alexandria (362), 192; of Sardica, 116; of Tyre, 106
Creed of, and Lerins monastery, 530 note
Deacon, 13-15
Death of, 236
Decrees of the Nicene Council, 138
Defection of Pope Liberius, 170
Defense of Catholic dogma, 138
Deposed by Council of Antioch (341), 112; by Council of Tyre, 73
Divinity of Christ, 43
Doctrine of Redemption, 550
Egyptian monks, 158
Elected bishop, 67
Eloquence of, 92
Encyclical letter, 108
Entry into Alexandria, 191
Eudoxius, 235 f.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 61-77
Eutropium, 115
Exiled, 74, 165, 195, 267
Fame of, 224
First Easter letter, 67, 68
History of the Arians, 159
"Homo dominicus," 349
Homoousios, 174
In hiding, 158 f., 196, 236
In the Thebaid, 196
Ischyras, 53, 70
Jovian, 235
Julian decrees exile of, 192
Leaves Alexandria, 158
Lector, 14
Letter from Constantine, 69, 71; to Abbot Horsisius, 196; to bishops of Egypt, 106; to Church of Antioch, 194
Letters to Serapion, 159, 183
Letters to the Monks, 159
Life of St. Antony, 159, 254 note
Literary style, 242
Macrostic Creed, 132
Magnentius, 150
Marcella, 115
Marcellus of Ancyra, 43, 75 note, 114, 132, 236
Maris foe of, 218
Meletians' charges against, 70
Memorial to Constantine, 70
Moderation of, 174, 177
Monasticism, 464
Neoplatonism, 15
On idolatry, 14
On the Death of Arius, 159
On the Holy Ghost, 183
On the Synods, 159
Paphnutius' accusation of, 53
Pneumatomachi, 183
Pope Damasus, 236
Pope Julius I, 106, 132
Pope Liberius, 149-151
Pope Mark, 100
Popularity of, 157
Psalmody, 441 f., 457
Recalled from exile, 102, 190
Rehabilitated, 114
Rejected by Pope Liberius, 171
Resumes his see, 235
Returns from exile, 191
Returns to Alexandria, 133
Ridiculed by Julian the Apostate, 14
Roman senators, 227
St. Antony, 16, 133, 464
St. Basil the Great, 236
St. Lucian, 9
St. Maximinus, friend of, 117
St. Pachomius, 68 f.
Study of monasticism, 196
Text of Festal Letters, 68 note
Thought of Dionysius of Alexandria, 138
Valens grants amnesty to, 236
Veneration for, 191
Vindicated at Council of Sardica, 119
Visits the Thebaid, 68
Athens, Julian studies at, 218
Students at, 203
Attalus (priest), condemned, 346
Atticus (bishop of Constantinople), 501
Attila (king of the Huns), Aetius and, 600
In Gaul, 599 f.
In Italy, 600

In Pannonia, 600
Leo the Great and, 599 f.
Audians (heretics), in fifth century, 55
Audius (heretic), 55
Augurius, St. (martyr), Death of, 4
Augurs, Colleges of, 179
Augustine, St. (bishop of Hippo), 388-399
Account of St. Ambrose studying, 259 f.
Accused of Manichaeism, 524; of Traducianism, 524
Adimantus' debate with, 414
Against Pelagius, 485
Against the Academics, 394
Alypius, 416
Apologetics, 396-399
At Carthage, 390
At Cassiciacum, 395
At Madaura, 390
At Milan, 391 f.
At Rome, 390
At Tagaste, 390, 394
Baptized, 394
Bishop, 527
Bishop Julian's charges against, 524
Born at Tagaste, 388
Breviculus collationis cum donatistis, 509
Caelestius, 543
Childhood of, 389 f.
City of God, 534, 537
Coadjutor of Valerius, 503
Commentaries on the Psalms, 413
Conference of Carthage, 507
Confessions, 390, 416, 512 f., 537, 545
Contra Adimantum, 413 f.
Contra epistolam Parmeniani, 505
Contra Fortunatum, 413 f.
Contra Gaudentium, 509
Contra litteras Petiliani, 505
Contra Priscillianistas ad Orosium, 516
Conversion of, 389, 392 f.
Conversion of Victorinus, 391
Correspondence with St. Jerome, 517
Council of Diospolis, 520
De baptismo contra donatistas, 505
De diversis quaestionibus, 396, 512
De dono perseverantiae, 544
De Genesi, 512
De libero arbitrio, 395, 396
De magistro, 395, 398
De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae, 395
De moribus Manichaeorum, 395
De musica, 422 note
De peccatorum meritis, 515
De perfectione justitiae, 515
De praedestinatione sanctorum, 544
De spiritu et littera, 515
De utilitate credendi, 395 f., 399
De vera religione, 395, 397
Death of, 544 f.
Death of St. Monica, 394
Debate with Emeritus, 509
Disagreement with St. Jerome, 266, 516-518
Donatists, 505 ff.
Early writings, 394
Enchiridion, 397
Escape from Donatist ambush, 506
Exegesis of, 415
Exegete, 413 f.
Fortunatus' debate with, 414
Harnack on, 413
Hebrew language, 415 note
Holy Ghost, Doctrine of, 321 f.
Idea of Providence, 398
Influence of, 545
Internal struggles of, 392 f.
Judge, 527
Julian of Eclanum, 520, 543
Letter to Pope Innocent, 522; to St. Jerome, 516 f.; to Sixtus, 544
Liber imperfectus de Genesi ad litteram, 414
Manichaeans (heretics), 413 f., 525
Manichaeism (heresy), 390 f.
Megalius consecrates, 504
Moderation toward Donatists, 507 f.
Monastery at Hippo, 527
Monasticism in Africa, 527
On free will, 512, 525, 543
On grace, 525 f., 543
On order, 394 f.
On original sin, 512, 519
On Priscillianism, 308
On the spiritual life, 526
Orosius, disciple of, 516
Patricius, father of, 389
Pelagians, 525
Pelagius, 543
Philosophy, 391
Plato, 391
Plotinus, 391
Possidius on death of, 545
Presides at Council of Mileve, 522

Priest, 388, 503
Psalmody, 441, 457
Psalmus abecedarius, 505
Punic language, 415 note
Reconciliation with St. Jerome, 518
Rule of, 529
St. Ambrose, 259, 391, 394
St. Jerome, 415
St. Jerome's Latin Bible, 518
St. Monica, 392 f.
St. Monica at Milan, 391
St. Monica, mother of, 389
St. Optatus' *History of the Donatist Schism,* 255
St. Possidius, biographer of, 505
Study of Scripture, 391
Tagaste, birthplace of, 388
Te Deum, 394 note
Teacher at Milan, 391
Worship of saints, 462
Writings against Pelagianism, 515
Augustinian Rule, 529
Aurelia Eusebia (empress), 149
Aurelius, St. (bishop of Carthage), 503
Council of Carthage, 515
Letter from Pope Zosimus, 570
Ausonius (rhetorician), and St. Paulinus, 384, 386, 388
Autun (France), St. Reticius bishop, 162 note
Schools in, 203
Auvergne (France), Cult of Apollo-Borva in, 284 note
Auxanius (bishop of Aix-en-Provence), at Council of Rome (462), 608
Auxentius Junior (intruding bishop of Milan, heretic), 362
St. Ambrose, 364
Auxentius of Milan (bishop of Milan), heretic, 362
Ambrosian rite, 365 note
Death of, 258
Formula signed by, 231
Made bishop of Milan, 255
Semi-Arianism, 255
Valentinian, 231
Auxentius (bishop of Silistria, heretic), disciple of Ulfilas, 281
Auxerre (France), St. Germain bishop, 536
Auxume (*See* Axum)
Aventine (Rome), St. Jerome, 355
Scripture study, 355
Avienus (consul), meeting with Attila, 600
Avila (Spain), Priscillian bishop, 310
Avitus, dethroned by Ricimer, 606
Axum (Abyssinia), St. Frumentius bishop, 84

Babut, *Saint Martin de Tours,* 285 note
Babylas, St. (bishop of Antioch), Tomb of, 208, 214
Bagai (Africa), Donatist bishops at Council of, 504
Donatus bishop, 135
St. Maximian bishop, 506
Bakasa (Persia), Martyrdom of five nuns, 144
Bal, Alaric the, 413
Balbina, St., Cemetery of, 100 note
Banquet, The (by Arius), 21 f.
Baptism, at Easter, 445
At Pentecost, 445
Caelestius' doctrine of, 511
Catechumenate, 445
Ceremonies of, 445-447; anointing, 447; *Apostolic Constitutions,* 446; *apotaxis,* 447; catechumens, 447; commendatory letters, 447; Creed, 447; deaconesses, 447; Easter eve, 447; exorcism, 447; insufflation, 447; *Peregrinatio Silviae,* 446; *redditio symboli,* 447; St. Cyril's *Catecheses,* 446; *suntaxis,* 447; *traditio symboli,* 446
Holy Saturday, 460
Of Christ in the Jordan, 447
Of the dying, 445
Practice of delayed, 271 note
Preparation for, 433, 460
Private, 449
Solemn, 449
Time of, 445
Baptismal font, blessed by bishop, 447
Barbarians, Arianism and the, 224 f.
Constantine's attitude to, 90
St. Chrysostom, 497
Barcelona (Spain), St. Paulinus, 387
Bards, in Gaul, 283
Barsauma (*See* Barsumas)
Barses, St. (bishop of Edessa), 238
Barsumas (bishop of Nisibis), 585 note
Barsumas (archimandrite), anti-Nestorian, 585
Council of Ephesus (449), 587

Bartholomew, St. (apostle), allegedly in Armenia, 86
Basil of Ancyra, St., Martyrdom of, 208
Basil of Ancyra (heretic), at Sirmium, 148
Council of Ancyra, 168; of Sardica, 117
Exiled, 178
Fourth formula of Sirmium, 174
Homoiousios, 234
Homoousios, 169 f.
Influence at court, 173
Leader of semi-Arians, 167
Opposed by Aetius, 166
Orthodox bishops, 165
Plan for a council, 173, 175
Recalled from exile, 190
Basil the Elder, St., teacher, 203, 218
Basil the Great, St. (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia), 218-220, 241-254
Aetius, 242
Against Eunomius, 242-244, 322
Anthimus, 250 f.
Arians attack writings of, 322
Asylums, 252
At Athens, 218
At Caesarea (Cappadocia), 219
At Caesarea (Palestine), 218
Bandits attack, 250
Baptism of, 220
Bishop, 248
Born in Caesarea (Cappadocia), 218
Character of, 219, 249
Character of Eustathius of Sebaste, 188
Charges against, 253
Charitable institutions, 474
Chorepiscopi, 252 f.
Clerical immunities, 253
Consecrates St. Gregory Nazianzen, 251
Death of, 312
Defender of the oppressed, 252
Defense of, at Caesarea, 238
Defense of his see, 250 f.
Description of, 248 f.
Dialectics, 243
Elected bishop of Caesarea, 248
Eunomianism, 242
False charges against, 253
Fame of, 224
Friendship for St. Gregory Nazianzen, 218 f.
Funeral of, 254
Hexameron, 245 f., 322
Homilies, 245 f.
Homoousios, 47, 245 note
Hospices, 252
Hospitality, 474
Hospitals, 252
In Armenia, 253
In Egypt, 220
In Mesopotamia, 220
In Syria, 220
Influence of, 252
Julian the Apostate, 218
Julian visits, 219
Letter to St. Ambrose, 258; to St. Gregory Nazianzen, 247
Literary style, 242
Liturgy, 438
Manner of Reading the Profane Authors, 203
Marcellus' orthodoxy, 75 note
Monastery at Neocaesarea, 220
Monastic rule, 247 f., 463
Monasticism, 246-248, 463
Neonicenism, 245 note
On Apollinaris the Younger, 185
On the Holy Ghost, 242, 244 f.
Orator, 245
Popular defense of, 253
Preaching, 254
Roman primacy, 277
St. Athanasius, 236
St. Emelia, 219
St. Gregory Nazianzen, 250
St. Gregory of Nyssa, 322
St. Macrina, 219
Sasima made bishopric, 251
Selling of children, 465 f.
Strife with Arianism, 249 f.
Study of monasticism, 220
Study of sciences, 243
Teacher, 203, 219
Title "Great," 241 note
Visitation of the diocese, 253
Works of mercy, 251-253, 327
Writings, 242
Basileus, 438
Basiliade, The, 252
Basilian liturgy, 248 note
Basilian monasteries, asylum to slaves, 469
Basilian monks, Habit of, 463
Basilian Rule, 247 f.

Basilica, 437 f.
Byzantine, 438
Civil, 437
Crescentian (Rome), 482
High (Milan), 362
Lateran (Rome), 483, 607
Liberian (Rome), 566
New (Milan), 364
Portian (Milan), 362
Roman, 437
St. Lawrence (Rome), 610
St. Mary Major (Rome), 566
St. Paul (Rome), 605, 610
St. Peter (Rome), 605, 610
Basilicus (usurper), 609
Basiliscus, St. (bishop of Comana), 502
Baucalis (parish of Alexandria), 11
Bazaar of Heracleides (by Nestorius), 568, 578
Beggar or the Polymorph (by Theodoret), 581
Beirut (*See* Berytus)
Beit Garmai (Persian province), 129
Belee (rhetorician), governor of Arabia, 213
Julian the Apostate, 212 f.
Belgrade, formerly Singidunum, 152 note
Benedict, St. (of Nursia), monastic rule, 463
Rule of St. Augustine, 529
St. Cassian's *Collationes*, 531
Beneventum (Italy), St. Januarius bishop, 117
Beroea (Thrace), Demophilus bishop, 156, 170
Pope Liberius exiled to, 156, 229
Pope Liberius' alleged defection at, 170
Berytus (Phenicia), Eusebius of Nicomedia bishop, 20
Schismatic Church, 302
Besanduk (Palestine), St. Epiphanius born at, 267
St. Epiphanius' monastery, 268
Bethlehem, Hospices at, 474
St. Epiphanius at, 488
St. Jerome at, 380
St. John Cassian at, 530
Worship of Adonis at, 96
Beziers, Council of (356), 163
Bible, Gothic translation, 280 f.
Itala version, 354 f.
Pope Damasus, 354
Private interpretation, 309
St. Jerome's translation, 331 f., 354-356
Textual criticism, 354
Vulgate, 354-356
Bible, Canon of, and Council of Hippo, 276 note
Council of Rome (374), 276
Pope Damasus, 276
Priscillian, 309
Bishops, Age for ordination, 435
Authority of, 421
Bless baptismal font, 447
Canonical hours, 456
Chrism, 448
Church property, 475
Confirmation, 448
Consecration of, 366, 423, 428
Constantius and election of, 108
"Corona," 424
Council of Antioch on deposed, 500
Court prelates, 179
Crozier, 424
Defenders of the Empire, 536
Defensor civitatis, 326, 473
Diadem, 424
Disputed election of, 423
Dress of, 424, 435
Duties of, 424 f.
Duty of preaching, 440
Duty of residence, 425
Election of, 58, 108, 422 f., 483
Emperors in choice of, 423
Exile of Donatist, 196
Exiled by Valens, 236
Hospitality, 474
Imposing of hands at Confirmation, 448
Insignia, 424
Judges, 82, 423 f., 527
Julian recalls exiled, 190
Marks of honor, 424
Metropolitans and simple, 428
Miter, 424
Office of, 422-428
Paenula, 435
Papal approval for Italian, 423 note
Pope as ordaining prelate, 428
Pope Damasus deposes Arian, 277
Recall of exiled, 173
Right of appeal to Rome, 120 f.
Ring, 424
Solemn baptism, 448
Status of deposed, 112
Synods in choice of, 423

Valens recalls exiled, 238
Bithynia, Arian council in, 24
Novatians in, 301
Blessed Virgin (*See* Mary)
Blesilla, St. (matron), St. Jerome, 381
Boetica (Spain), Pope Siricius, 366
Bologna (Italy), St. Ambrose at, 409
Bona (Algeria), 388
Boniface I, St. (pope), Election of, 483
Oratory of St. Felicitas, 484
Pelagianism, 484
Boniface (count), Vandal invasion, 544
Bonosus (bishop of Sardica), Council of Capua, 401
Criticism of monasticism, 464
Book against the Christians (by Emperor Julian), 201
Book of Gospels, 459
Bordeaux (France), St. Delphinus bishop, 386
Schools in, 203
Bossuet, on Pope Leo the Great, 601
On Pope Liberius, 171
Botheric (governor of Thessalonica), 377
Bourdaloue, on Pope Leo the Great, 601
Branding, as legal penalty, 472
Brephotrophium (foundling asylum), 474
Breviculus collationis cum donatistis (by St. Augustine), 509
Brice, St. (bishop of Tours), 290
Brictius, St. (*See* Brice)
Britain, Patriarchate of Rome and, 428
Pelagianism in, 540
St. Germain in, 540
St. Lupus in, 540
Brito (*See* Pelagius)
Burgundians, 539
Aetius overcomes the, 535
Arianism among, 282
At the Danube, 535
Catholics, 571
Byblos (Phenicia), Aquilinus bishop, 588
Byzantine art, 437
Byzantium (*See* Constantinople)

Cabrol, on development of liturgy, 438
On Sacrament of Matrimony, 452
Caecilian (bishop of Carthage), at Council of Nicaea, 37 note
Caelestius (heretic), 511 ff.
At Carthage, 514
At Rome, 522
Condemned by Council of Carthage, 515, 523; by Council of Ephesus, 563
Dispute with Paulinus, 514
Doctrine of grace, 511; of prayer, 511
Effect of baptism, 511
Excommunicated, 521
Expelled from Ephesus, 522
In Africa, 513-515
Leaves Rome, 513, 524
Nature of the Church, 511
Original sin, 511, 514 f.
Paulinus denounces, 515
Pope Zosimus condemns, 523 f.
Questioned by Pope Zosimus, 523
St. Augustine refutes, 543
Caesarea (Cappadocia), Dianius bishop, 220
Fined by Julian, 221
Helladius bishop, 333
Jurisdiction of see of, 248
Popular defense of St. Basil, 238
St. Basil the Elder, 203
St. Basil the Great bishop of, 218, 248; born in, 218
St. Eusebius bishop, 221, 248
St. Gregory Nazianzen at, 339
Schools in, 203
Caesarea (Palestine), Acacius bishop, 117
Council of (334), 72 note
Eulogius bishop, 520
Liturgy, 439
St. Athanasius and Council of, 72 note
Schools in, 203
See of Jerusalem and see of, 58 f.
Caesarius, St. (brother of St. Gregory Nazianzen), Death of, 312
Emperor Julian, 200
Caesarius, St. (martyr), father of Eudoxius, 234
Cagliari (Sardinia), St. Lucifer bishop, 154
Calama (Africa), Crispinus, Donatist bishop of, 505
St. Possidius bishop, 5 f.
Callinicus (bishop of Pelusium, heretic), foe of St. Athanasius, 53
Meletian Schism, 53
Callinicus synagogue, St. Ambrose and, 376
Theodosius, 376
Calvin, Jovinianus precursor of, 353

Camilli (Roman gens), 356
Campania (Italy), Pope Celestine born in, 484
Campania, or Castrium (Macedonia), Marcellus bishop, 151
Campenses (Arians), 266
Candidian (count), Council of Ephesus, 558, 561
Cannes (France), St. Honoratus, 529
Canon law, 421 f.
Canon of Scripture (*See* Bible, Canon of)
Canonical hours, 454-456
Canons of St. Hippolytus, Extreme Unction in, 451
Cappadocia, divided by Valens, 250
  Goths ravage, 279
  Julian's dislike of, 220
  St. Basil the Great, 218
  St. Gregory Nazianzen, 218
  St. Paul (bishop of Constantinople), exiled to, 113
  School of, 241
Cappadocia Secunda, 250 f.
"Cappadocian doctors," 241
Capua (Italy), Council of (391), 401; bishops of Macedonia, 401; Bonosus, 401; Meletian Schism, 401; Theophilus of Alexandria, 401
  Inscription found at, 4
  Vincent bishop, 131, 151
Carosa (daughter of Valens), 301
Cartagenia (Spain), Pope Siricius, 366
Carterius, teacher of St. Chrysostom, 271
Carthage (Africa), Caelestius at, 514
  Conference of, 507 f.; *Breviculus collationis cum donatistis*, 509; efficacy of the sacraments, 507; Marcellinus (tribune), 507; membership in the Church, 507; St. Augustine, 507
  Councils of: (349), 135
    (411), Caelestius condemned, 515
    (416), Caelestius excommunicated, 521; Pelagius excommunicated, 521
    (418), Caelestius denounced by, 523; Pelagianism condemned, 523; Spanish delegates at, 523
    (424), convicts Apiarius, 485
  Donatist primate at, 504
  Donatus bishop, 133
  Offertorium at mass, 442
  St. Augustine, 390
  St. Aurelius bishop, 515, 570
  St. Gratus bishop, 135
  Schools in, 203
Cassian, John, St., at Bethlehem, 530
  At Constantinople, 531
  At Rome, 531
  Birthplace of, 530
  Collationes, 531
  In the Thebaid, 530
  Institutiones, 531
  Monastery of St. Victor, 530 f.
  St. Augustine's doctrine, 544
  St. Chrysostom, 531
Cassiciacum (villa), St. Augustine at, 395
Castrium (*See* Campania)
Castulus (Arian priest), Arians in Milan, 363
Catacombs, of St. Balbina, 100 note
  Pope Damasus' care of, 274
  St. Jerome's visits to, 275
Catalaunian Fields, Battle of, 600
Catecheses (by St. Cyril of Jerusalem), 466
Catechesis, Meaning of, 140
  Mystagogical, 140
Catechetical Lectures (by St. Cyril of Jerusalem), 139-141
Catechumenate, 439
Catechumens, 140
  At mass, 432
  Competentes, 446
  Dismissal at mass, 440
  Exorcism of, 446
  Fast days, 457
  In Lent, 446
  Mass of the, 439 f.
Catholic policy, Constantine's, 224
  Theodosius', 224
"Catholicos," Title of, 87 and note
Catholics, attack Arian houses, 376
  Donatist violence to, 197 f., 506
  Favored by Gratian, 239
  In Constantinople, 313
  In Theodosius' decree, 305
  Pillage synagogues, 376
Celestine, St. (pope), 484
  Appeal of Apiarius, 484 f.
  Authority of papacy, 484 f.
  Born in Campania, 484
  Case of Apiarius, 485
  Death of, 566
  Reply to St. Cyril, 553

St. Cyril appeals to, 553
Sends St. Patrick to Ireland, 540
Theotokos, 552
Celesyria, St. Eustathius and Arianism in, 64
Celibacy, Clerical, 367
Council of Nicaea, 57 note
Law of, 437
Major orders, 436 f.
Pope Siricius, 366
St. Jerome, 436
Subdeacons, 437 note
Celtic gods, Cult of, at Velleron, 284 note
Cemetery of St. Balbina, Discovery of, 100 note
Centones Virgiliani (by Proba), 93
Cevennes (mountains), 539
Chalcedon, Council of (451), 590-593; Creed of Constantinople, 340, 343, 563; Decisions of, 592; dogmatic decree, 592; jurisdiction of see of Jerusalem, 489 note; patriarchate of Constantinople, 343; St. Leo's *Tome*, 592
Maris bishop, 115
Villa of the Oak, 499
Chalcis desert, St. Jerome, 254, 263, 486
Chaldaic, St. Jerome studies, 380
Chaldea, Treatment of Christians in, 125
Chalon (France), battle of the Catalaunian Fields, 600
Chanters, 430
Charisius (priest of Philadelphia), Council of Ephesus, 562 f.
Charity, St. Chrysostom on, 371
Chastity, Ascetics' vow of, 454
Chasuble, Early form of, 435
Children, Abandoned, 421, 466
Laws on, 399
Selling of, 465
Chorepiscopi, conferring of minor orders, 426
Office of, 426
Ordination of priests and deacons, 426
St. Basil, 252 f.
Chrism, at Confirmation, 448
Christ, Baptism of, in the Jordan, 447
Christ, Divinity of, 545 ff.
Apollinaris the Younger, 184 f., 347
Arianism, 16-19
Auxentius, 231
Council of Alexandria (363), 347 f.; of Nicaea, 345
Diodorus of Tarsus, 548
Eudoxius, 235
Eunomius, 240
Marcellus of Ancyra, 75
Meletius, 186
Nestorius, 548, 551
Paul of Samosata, 8
Photinus, 114
Pierius, 12
St. Cyril, 548
St. Epiphanius, 348
St. Leo's *Tome*, 586
St. Peter (bishop of Alexandria), 12
School of Alexandria, 546
School of Antioch, 546, 548
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 548 f.
Theodoret of Cyrus, 581
Theognostus, 12
Christian faith, Weakening of, 6
Christian literature, 91 ff.
Christian morals, Weakening of, 6
Christian poets, 93-95
Christian schools, 466
Christianity, influence upon Roman law, 80-82
Roman civilization and, 375
Christians, excluded from office, 202
Nominal, 6; in reign of Emperor Julian, 202; Pope Leo denounces, 602
Christmas, Date of, 459 f.
Liturgical cycle, 459
Christological problem (*See* Christ, Divinity of)
Chronicle (by Eusebius of Caesarea), 20
Chronicles (by Sulpicius Severus), 285 note, 309
Chronicon integrum (by St. Prosper), 603
Chronicon vulgare (by St. Prosper), 603
Chrysaphius (eunuch), Empress Pulcheria, 577
Eutyches godfather of, 577
Grudge against Flavian, 584
Instigates Robber Council of Ephesus, 584
Chrysostom, St. (bishop of Constantinople), 270-273, 326-331, 345, 367-373, 497 ff.
Admiration for Origen, 498
Against the Adversaries of the Monastic Life, 270, 272
Against the Defamers of the Monastic Life, 255

Anchorite, 271
Arians in Constantinople, 497
As name of St. John, bishop of Constantinople, 503 note
At Antioch, 367, 417
At Constantinople, 367
Baptism of, 271
Barbarians in Constantinople, 497
Born at Antioch, 270
Carterius, teacher of, 271
Charges against, 500
Comparison of a Monk with a King, 272 f.
Consolation to Stagirius, 326
Deaconesses, 330
Death of, 502 f.
Duties of a bishop, 326
Eudoxia, 500
Eudoxia's hostility to, 498
Eutropius protected by, 497 f.
Exiled, 499 f., 502
Explanation of the Psalms, 416
Extreme Unction, 452
Finding of the True Cross, 98
Flavian, 367
Homilies, 271, 416
Homilies on the Statues, 371-373
Ideal of the priesthood, 327-330
In Armenia, 502
In exile at Cocussus, 502
In the desert, 270
Jews in Constantinople, 497
Joannites, 501
Lector, 271
Letter to a Young Widow, 326, 330
Letters to St. Olympias, 502
Letters written from exile, 501
Libanius, teacher of, 417
Marcellus' orthodoxy, 75 note
Meaning of, 270
Missions of Arabia, 501; of Eastern Gothia, 501; of Persia, 501
Monasticism, 273
Novatians in Constantinople, 497
On almsgiving, 371
On building of Jewish Temple, 217
On Compunction, 270, 272
On Consolation to Stagirius, 330 f.
On St. Lucian, 9 note
On the Priesthood, 325-330
Origenist controversy, 486
Pope Innocent annuls condemnation of, 502
Preacher, 367 ff., 485
Preaching, 416 f.
Priest, 367
Psalmody, 457
St. Anthusa, mother of, 270
St. Basiliscus appears to, 502
St. Cassian, 531
St. Cyril's relations with, 548
St. Diodorus' influence on, 271
St. Epiphanius, 266, 270
St. Meletius, teacher of, 271
Secundus, father of, 270
Sermons applauded, 440
Simoniacal bishops, 327
Stagirius, 330 f.
Statue of Eudoxia, 500
Synod of the Oak condemns, 499
Tall Brothers, 498
Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, 490
Treatment of, by Theophilus, 547
Treatment of slaves, 417 f.
Church, Authority of the, 303 f.
Condition of (in 379), 300
Influence of the, 226
Membership in the, 188 f., 507, 511
Official status of the, 305
St. Cyril of Jerusalem's doctrine of the, 142
Church and State, 420 f.
Constantine, 464
Gratian, 293
St. Ambrose, 375, 412
St. Hilary, 255 f.
St. Martin, 292
Theodosius, 306, 375, 464
Church, Frankish, and manual labor, 436
Church music (*See* Psalmody)
Church property, Administration of, 475 f.
Bishops, 475
Constantine, 228
Religious corporations, 475
Churches, Dedication of, 95
Right of asylum, 473
Cilicia (Asia Minor), patriarchate of Antioch, 427
St. Eustathius and Arianism in, 64
Circumcellions, and Donatists, 134
Suppression of, 508
Violence of, 506
Circumcision, Feast of the, 460
Cities, Regular assemblies in, 232
City, political division, 422

City divinities, 5
City government, 522
City of God (by St. Augustine), 534, 537; Heinrich Scholz on, 537 note
City workers, Sundays, 458
Clain (river), 288
Clair, St. (priest of Tours), 290
Clarus (*See* Clair)
Claudianus (poet), 532
  On Theodosius the Great, 299
Clement of Alexandria, 204
Clementine Recognitions, translated by Rufinus, 496
Clerical celibacy (*See* Celibacy)
Clerical dress, 435
Clerical immunities, St. Basil, 253
Clerics, Education of, 434
Clergy, Celibacy of (*See* Celibacy)
  Manual labor, 435
Clermont (France), Sidonius Apollinaris bishop, 384
Cocussus, St. Chrysostom at, 502
Collationes (by St. Cassian), 531
Collections, Feast of the, 604
College of pontiffs, 5
"Collucianists" (heretics), 9
  Arius, 19
Colobium (Basilian habit), 463
Cologne (Germany), Euphrates bishop, 131
Coloni, Small landowners as, 480
Comana (Asia Minor), St. Basiliscus bishop, 502
  St. Chrysostom's death at, 502
Combat, as legal penalty, 472
Comedians, Servitude of, 470
Commendatory letters, 446
Commentaries (by St. Jerome), 414-416; *on St. Paul* (by Ambrosiaster), 254 f.; *on the Psalms* (by St. Augustine), 413
Commentarioli on the Psalms (by St. Jerome), 415
Commentary on St. Luke (by Ulfilas), 254; *on St. Matthew* (by St. Hilary), 162; *on the Epistle to the Galatians* (by St. Jerome), 516; *on the Epistles of St. Paul* (by Pelagius), 510; *on the Gospel of St. Luke* (by St. Ambrose), 380; *on the Psalms* (by St. Hilary), 254
Commonitorium (by St. Vincent of Lerins), 542
Communion, at mass, 444 f.
  Deacon, minister of, 444
  In both species, 444
  Of solitaries, 445
  Of the sick, 445
  Priest, minister of, 444
Comparison of a Monk with a King (by St. Chrysostom), 272 f.
"Competent" catechumens, 140
Competentes, Baptism, 446
  Exorcism of, 446
Compline (office), Monasticism and, 464
  Origin of, 456 note
Concerning the Faith, against the Arians (by St. Hilary), 163 f.
Conference of Carthage, 507 f.
  Breviculus collationis cum donatistis, 509
  Efficacy of the sacraments, 507
  Marcellinus (tribune), 507
  Membership in the Church, 507
  St. Augustine, 507
Confession, Deacons hearing, 431
  Public, 450
Confessions (by St. Augustine), 390, 416, 512 f., 537, 545
Confirmation, anointing, 448
  Bishops, 448
  Ceremonies of, 447 f.
  Imposing of hands, 448
  Sign of the cross, 448
Consecration, at mass, 443 note
Consolation to Stagirius (by St. Chrysostom), 326
Constans (emperor), at Treves, 115
  Attitude to paganism, 124
  Character of, 102, 130
  Constantius and, 115
  Consulted by St. Athanasius, 132
  Council of Sardica, 116
  Death of, 145 and note
  Partition of the Empire, 78, 102
  Sole ruler of the West, 111
  Summons St. Athanasius to Milan, 115
Constantia (empress), Eusebius of Nicomedia, 20 f., 65
  Eutocius, 71 f.
Constantia, *i. e.,* Salamis
Constantina (daughter of Constantine), 147
Constantina (Mesopotamia), Sophronius bishop, 588

Constantine the Great (emperor), altar of Victory, 360
Appeal of the Meletians, 62
Arius exiled, 50
At Aschiron, 79
At Council of Nicaea, 34-36, 38, 40-42, 50
At Helenopolis, 79
At Nicomedia, 31
Attitude to heretics, 305 f.; to Persia, 125; to the barbarians, 90
Baptism of, 79
Catechumen, 79
Catholic policy of, 224
Character of, 61
Church and State, 464
Church property, 228
Convokes Council of Nicaea, 27
Convokes Council of Tyre, 73
Crispus murdered, 79
Date of Easter, 54
Death of, 80
Defeat of Licinius, 24
Defender of orthodoxy, 61
"Defender of the holy canons," 465
Donatists, 189
Eusebius of Caesarea, 21
Eusebius of Nicomedia exiled, 62
Fausta murdered, 79
Freedom of teaching, 204
Holy Sepulcher, 96
Last illness of, 78
Legal penalties, 472
Letter to Arius, 24, 26 note; to Church of Nicomedia, 63 f.; to St. Alexander (bishop of Alexandria), 24; to St. Athanasius, 69, 71; to St. Macarius (bishop of Jerusalem), 90; to Sapor I, 89, 125
Liberality to the Church, 228 f.
Licinius murdered, 79
Memorial from St. Athanasius, 70
Murders by, 472
Orders Arius reinstated, 76
Partition of the Empire, 78
Recalls Arius from exile, 72
Recalls Eusebius of Nicomedia from exile, 65
Remains of, 101
Rigorous penalties, 472
St. Athanasius, 71
St. Athanasius exiled, 74
St. Eustathius exiled, 66
St. Hosius, 25
Sunday rest, 458
Theognis exiled, 62
Title of *Pontifex maximus*, 4, 5 note
Tomb of, 78
Upholds Nicene Creed, 77
Constantine II (emperor), Character of, 102
Death of, 111
Partition of the Empire, 78, 102
Constantinople, Acacius bishop, 610
Anastasis (chapel), 314, 318
Anatolius bishop, 591
Arian chapel closed, 551
Arians and conflagration in, 376
Arians in, 316 f.
Arius at, 76
Arsacius, anti-bishop of, 501
Atticus bishop, 501
Basileus of, 438
Catholics in, 313 f.
Christian city, 82
Church of Holy Apostles, 209
Creed of, Council of Chalcedon, 563; Council of Constantinople, 340; Council of Ephesus, 341 f.; Text of, 342
Demophilus bishop, 316 f.
Earthquake, 500
Eudoxius bishop, 186, 189, 234 f.
Eusebius (of Nicomedia) bishop of, 106 f.
Flavian bishop, 577
Funeral of Constantius, 209
Hospices at, 474
Imperial capital, 82 f., 229
Lateran Council and patriarchate of, 503 note
Liturgy, 439
Macedonius bishop, 113, 117, 189, 235
Maximian bishop, 565 f.
Maximus the Cynic at, 315 f.
Nestorius bishop, 550
Novatians in, 301
Patriarchate of, 278 note, 342 f.; Council of Chalcedon, 593; Lateran Council, 503 note
Poor relief, 475
Primacy of see of, 547
Psalmody at, 441
Relics of SS. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, 462
Religious center, 83

St. Athanasius at, 73
St. Cassian at, 531
St. Chrysostom bishop, 270-273
St. Chrysostom preaches at, 367
St. Flavian bishop, 560
St. Germanus bishop, 323
St. Gregory Nazianzen, becomes bishop of, 335; goes to, 313
St. Nectarius bishop, 339
St. Paul (d. 350), bishop, 106 f., 113
Saint Sophia (church), 317, 501
Schools in, 203
Senate building, 501
Sinsinnius bishop, 550
Tall Brothers at, 498
Theodosius at, 358, 402
Theophilus at, 499
Constantinople, Councils of:
(336), condemns Marcellus of Ancyra, 76
(338), deposes Paul (bishop of Constantinople), 107
(360), 177 f.; Acacius at, 177; *anomoios*, 234; Eudoxius, 234; *homoios*, 234; *homoiousios*, 234; *homoousios*, 234; Symbol of Nike, 177; Ulfilas at, 177
(381), 332 ff.; Anomoeans condemned, 342; Apollinarians condemned, 342; Arians condemned, 342; canons of, 342-344; Convocation of, 332 and note, 333; Creed, 269, 340-342; Dissension at, 337; doctrine of the Holy Ghost, 336, 345; Egyptian bishops arrive, 337; Eleusius of Cyzicus at, 333; Eudoxians condemned, 342; Eunomians condemned, 342; Helladius of Caesarea (Cappadocia), at, 333; *homoousios*, 340; Lateran Council, 344; Macedonianism, 345; Macedonians, 333, 340; Marcellians condemned, 342; Marcian of Lampsacus at, 333; Maximus the Cynic, 318, 334 f., 343; Meletian Schism, 336 f.; Number of bishops at, 333; patriarchate of Constantinople, 342; Photinians condemned, 342; Photinus condemned, 149 note; Pneumatomachi condemned, 342; Pope Gregory the Great, 343; Pope Pelagius II, 343; Pope Vigilius, 343; reproached by St. Gregory Nazianzen, 337; Sabellians condemned, 343; St. Amphilochius of Iconium at, 333; St. Ascholius of Thessalonica at, 333; St. Gregory Nazianzen, 318, 337-339; St. Gregory Nazianzen president of, 336-338; St. Gregory of Nyssa at, 333; St. Meletius of Antioch at, 333; St. Nectarius president of, 340; St. Peter of Sebaste at, 333; Semi-Arians condemned, 342; Theodosius confirms decrees of, 343
(382), Canons of, 348; Pope Damasus, 332 note; Theodosius, 332 note
(383), Demophilus at, 350; Eleusius at, 350; Eunomius at, 350; Nectarius at, 350; Schism of Antioch, 350; Theodosius, 350
(448), 582; Eutyches before, 582 f.; Eutyches excommunicated, 584
Constantius (emperor), against Sabellianism, 148
Antinicene movement, 102
Appointment of bishops, 108
At Arles, 151
At Sirmium, 148, 168
Attitude to Arianism, 131; to paganism, 124
Calumniation of St. Athanasius, 150
Character of, 102
Church of Abyssinia, 85
Constans and, 115
Council of Arles (353), 152; of Rimini (359), 175; of Sardica, 116; of Seleucia (359), 175
Death of, 181
Dominates Council of Milan, 153 f.
Dominates Council of Rimini, 175
Education of Julian, 180
Eusebia's influence over, 149
Funeral of, 209
Gladiatorial combats forbidden, 179
Idolatry forbidden, 179
Julian sent to Gaul, 181
Julian's feeling toward, 180
Letter from Pope Liberius, 153
Letters to Hosius, 157
Partition of the Empire, 102
Persian war, 115, 125, 147
Photinus exiled, 149
Pope Liberius, 155
Pope Liberius' return to Rome, 172
Practice of magic forbidden, 179
Recalls exiled bishops, 173
Religious unity, 177

St. Athanasius, 132
St. Hilary exiled, 163
St. Hosius, 156 f.
St. Meletius exiled, 186
St. Paul (bishop of Constantinople) exiled, 107, 113
St. Paulinus exiled, 153
St. Rhodanius exiled, 163
Second marriage, 149
Semi-Arians, 148
Sole emperor, 145, 147
Statue of Victory, 124
Treatment of St. Hosius, 168
Upholds Nicene Creed, 149
Constantius, Julius (brother of Constantine), Killing of, 101
"Consubstantial" (*See Homoousios*)
Contra Adimantum (by St. Augustine), 413
Contra Fortunatum (by St. Augustine), 413
Contra epistolam Parmeniani (by St. Augustine), 505
Contra Gaudentium (by St. Augustine), 509
Contra litteras Petiliani (by St. Augustine), 505
Contra Priscillianistas ad Orosium (by St. Augustine), 516
Cope, Early form of, 435
Corbieres (mountains), 539
Corentine, St. (*See* Corentius)
Corentius, St. (bishop of Cornouille), 290
Cornouille (France), St. Corentius bishop, 290
"*Corona*," Episcopal, 424
"Council of the Confessors," 192
Councils, List of:
Alexandria (320), 16; (350), 138; (362), 192-195, 347 f.; (430), 554
Ancyra (314), 426; (358), 168
Antioch (268), 47; (330), 66; (341), 8, 111-113; (344), 131 f.; (378), 277
Aquileia (381), 345 f.
Arles (314), 29, 53 f., 290; (353), 152
Bagai (394), 504
Beziers (356), 163
Caesarea (334), 72 note
Capua (391), 401
Carthage (349), 135; (411), 515; (416), 521; (418), 523; (424), 485; (451), 343, 590-593
Constantinople (336), 76; (338), 107; (360), 177; (381), 269, 318, 332 ff.; (382), 348; (383), 350; (448), 582
Diospolis (415), 520
Elvira (306), 291
Ephesus (431), 556-564; (449), 585-590
Gangra (340), 188, 463
Hippo (393), 276 note
Jerusalem (415), 519 f.
Lateran (1215), 344
Milan (344), 132; (347), 148; (355), 153 f.
Mileve (416), 522
Nicaea (325), 28-60
Orange (441), 539
Paris (361), 152
Riez (439), 539
Rimini (359), 175
Rome (340), 109 f.; (352), 151; (369), 277; (374), 276; (382), 348; (386), 366; (430), 553; (462), 608; (465), 608 f.
Saragossa (380), 310
Sardica (343), 53, 116-122
Seleucia (359), 176 f.
Sirmium (351), 148; (357), 168; (358), 169
Synod of the Oak (403), 498 ff.
Telepta (386), 367 note
Toledo (? 448), 572
Turin (*cir.* 400), 312
Tyre (336), 73 f.
Vaison (442), 539
Vannes (465), 609 note
Councils, Papal confirmation of, 428
Country workers, Sundays, 458
Court trials, Sundays, 458
Creed, baptism ceremonies, 447
Jerusalem symbol, 341
Macrostic, 131 f.
Nicaea-Constantinople, 340, 345
Nicene, 49, 341 f.
Of Antioch, 112, 115
Of Constantinople, 340-342; and Council of Chalcedon, 343, 563
Of Nike, 177
Of St. Athanasius, and School of Lerins, 530 note
Of Sardica, 121 note
Of Sirmium, 148-150, 168 f.
Creeds, Era of, 112
St. Epiphanius' *Ancoratus*, 269, 340

Crescentian Basilica, 482
Crete (island), patriarchate of Rome, 428
Criminal law, 471 f.
Crispinus (Donatist bishop of Calama), St. Possidius attacked by, 505 f.
Crispus (son of Constantine), Murder of, 79
Cross, Sign of, at Confirmation, 448
Cross, True, Finding of the, 97-99
  Identification of the, 98
  Letter of Constantine, 98
  Relics of the, 97 f.
Crozier, Episcopal, 424
Crucifixion, as legal penalty, 472
Cucusus (*See* Cocussus)
Curator reipublicae and *flamen perpetuus*, 5
Curing the Ills of the Pagans (by Theodoret of Cyrus), 580
Cursus Leoninus, 597
Cybele (goddess), Worship of, in Rome, 410
Cynic, Maximus the, 315 f.
Cyprian (poet of Gaul), 93
Cyprus (island), Paulinus' followers, 351
  Salamis, metropolis of, 268
Cyril, St. (bishop of Alexandria), 547 ff.
  Anathematisms of, 554 ff.
  Appeal to Pope Celestine, 553
  Arcadia (princess) appealed to, 554
  At Council of Ephesus (431), 557
  At Synod of the Oak, 547
  Becomes bishop of Alexandria, 547
  Blessed Virgin honored by, 548
  Born at Alexandria, 547
  Charge of bribery, 565
  Conflict with Orestes (prefect), 547
  Correspondence with Nestorius, 552 f.
  Council of Ephesus, 562
  Death of, 574
  Diodorus attacked by, 549
  Divinity of Christ, 548
  Empress Eudoxia appealed to, 554
  Empress Pulcheria appealed to, 554
  Explicatio duodecim Capitum, 556
  Hypatia's murder, 547
  Imprisoned, 564
  Jews treated severely, 547
  Letter from Theodosius II, 554
  Marcina (princess) appealed to, 554
  Nestorianism denounced by, 552 f.
  Nestorius spreads calumnies against, 552
  Novatians treated severely, 547
  Peace with John of Antioch, 567, 581
  Presides at Council of Ephesus, 558
  Refutation of Emperor Julian, 202
  Relations with St. Chrysostom, 548
  School of Alexandria, 547
  Theodoret reconciled with, 581
  Theodosius II appealed to, 554
  Theophilus' nephew, 547
  Theotokos, 548, 552
Cyril, St. (bishop of Jerusalem), 139-143
  Catecheses, 446
  Catechetical Lectures, 139-141
  Defense of Catholic dogma, 138
  Doctrine of, 141
  Procatechesis, 446
  Relics of the True Cross, 97
Cyril, St. (deacon), martyred under Julian, 208
Cyrrhus (*See* Cyrus in Syria)
Cyrus (poet), 532
Cyrus (Syria), Theodoret bishop, 580
Cyzicus (Asia Minor), Eleusius bishop, 333
  Eunomius bishop, 166

Dacia (Roman province), patriarchate of Rome, 428
  Represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Dalmatius (archimandrite), Eutyches, 575
Dalmatius (Caesar), 78
  Killing of, 101
Damasus, St. (pope), 273-278
  Canon of Scripture, 276
  Catacombs, 274
  Character of, 233
  Council of Aquileia, 346; of Constantinople (382), 332 note; of Rome (382), 348
  Cult of martyrs, 274, 332
  Death of, 357
  Decree on Roman primacy, 277 f.
  Deposes Arian bishops, 277
  Election of, 232 f.
  Father of, lector, 434
  Helvidius, 351
  Hierarchy, 303
  Inscriptions of, 275
  Jovinianus, 351, 381
  Luciferians, 351

Monuments of Rome, **273**
Patriarchates, 277 f.
Pilgrimages, 275
Priscillianists appeal to, **311**
Reply to Idacius, 310
Restorations in Rome, 255
Roman primacy, 276 f., 428
St. Athanasius, 236
St. Jerome, 325, 348, 351, 354 f., **357**
St. Jerome consults, 266
St. Jerome, secretary of, 349
Siricius, deacon, 365
Symmachus, 273 f.
Tombs of martyrs, **274**
Ursinus, 346 f.
Valentinian, **230**
Vulgate, 354
Daniel (bishop of Haran), deposed, 588
Danube (river), Barbarians along the, 535
Goths, 279
Provinces, 359
Daphne, Shrine of Apollo, 208, 213-215
Tomb of St. Babylas, 214
Dardania (Roman province), patriarchate of Rome, 428
Date of Christmas, 459 f.
Date of Easter, Council of Nicaea and, 53-55
Daventry (Britain), probable birthplace of St. Patrick, 540
De Abraham (by St. Ambrose), 380
De baptismo contra donatistas (by St. Augustine), 505
De benedictionibus patriarcharum (by St. Ambrose), 380
De bono mortis (by St. Ambrose), 380
De Cain et Abel (by St. Ambrose), 319 f.
De diversis quaestionibus (by St. Augustine), 396, 512
De dono perseverantiae (by St. Augustine), 544
De Elia et jejunio (by St. Ambrose), 380
De errore profanarum religionum (by Maternus), 136 f.
De fide ad Gratianum (by St. Ambrose), 319, 321
De fuga saeculi (by St. Ambrose), 380
De Genesi (by St. Augustine), 512
De indurationе cordis Pharaonis (perhaps by Pelagius), 510
De Isaac et anima (by St. Ambrose), 380
De Jacob et vita beata (by St. Ambrose), 380
De Joseph patriarcha (by St. Ambrose), 380
De libero arbitrio (by St. Augustine), 395 f.
De magistro (by St. Augustine), 395, 398
De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae (by St. Augustine), 395
De moribus Manichaeorum (by St. Augustine), 395
De musica (by St. Augustine), 442 note
De Nabuthe Iezraelita (by St. Ambrose), 380
De Noe et arca (by St. Ambrose), 319 f.
De paradiso (by St. Ambrose), 319 f.
De peccatorum meritis (by St. Augustine), 515
De perfectione justitiae (by St. Augustine), 515
De perpetua virginitate Beatae Mariae (by St. Jerome), 353
De praedestinatione sanctorum (by St. Augustine), 544
De spiritu et littera (by St. Augustine), 515
De Spiritu Sancto (by St. Ambrose), 319, 321
De Tobia (by St. Ambrose), 380
De utilitate credendi (by St. Augustine), 395 f., 399
De vera religione (by St. Augustine), 395, 397
De virginibus (by St. Ambrose), 319 f.
De viris illustribus (by St. Jerome), 381
Deaconesses, St. Chrysostom on, **330**
St. Olympias, 502
Deacons, 425
At mass, 431, 442
Forbidden to consecrate, 430 note
Hearing confessions, 431
Imposition of hands at ordination, 435
Not to wear the stole, 431
Office of, 430 f.
Ordination of, 426, 435
Preaching, 440
Rural, 290 f.; in Spain, 291
Urban, 290
Death sentence, St. Ambrose on, **472**
Debtors, Right of asylum for fugitive, 473

Decentius (bishop of Gubbio), Innocent I's decretal to, 483
Decius, Persecution under, 449
Decrees of the Nicene Council (by St. Athanasius), 138
Decretals, Papal, Siricius' letter, 366
Decurions, Taxation and, 480
Dedication of churches, 95
Dedication, Synod of (*i. e.*, Council of Antioch, 341)
"Defender of the holy canons," 465
Defenders, Office of, 426
Defensor civitatis, Bishop as, 326, 473
Office of, 232, 402, 422
Delphic oracle, 3
Delphinus, St. (bishop of Bordeaux), St. Paulinus, 386
Demonstratio evangelica (by Eusebius of Caesarea), 20
Demophilus (bishop of Constantinople, heretic), 316 f.
At Beroea, 156, 170
Council of Constantinople (383), 350
Death of, 303
Pope Liberius and, 156, 170
Deposed bishops, right of appeal to Rome, 120 f.
Determinism, Manichaean doctrine, 510
Dexter (prefect), St. Jerome, 381
Diabe (Egypt), Felix bishop, 197
Diaconium, 431
Diadem, Episcopal, 424
Dialogue against the Luciferians (by St. Jerome), 352
Dialogue against the Pelagians (by St. Jerome), 519
Dianius (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia), 220
Dictator, Office of, 422
Didymus the Blind, St. (theologian), 324 f.
Born at Alexandria, 324
Classical poets, 325
Doctrine of the Trinity, 325
On the Holy Ghost, 325
On the Trinity, 325
Origen, 325
Rufinus, 325
St. Antony, 325
St. Jerome, 325
Die (France), St. Nicasius bishop, 37 note
Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Diocesan councils, Papal confirmation of, 428
Diocese, political division, 422
"Diocese," Meaning of, 421 note
Diodorus, St. (bishop of Tarsus), Apollinarianism opposed by, 548
Divinity of Christ, 548
Esteemed at Edessa, 573
Influence on St. Chrysostom, 271
Nestorianism, 303
St. Cyril attacks, 549
School of Antioch, 271, 548
Teacher of St. Chrysostom, 271
Theodore of Mopsuestia, disciple of, 271
Diodorus (bishop of Tenedos), at Council of Sardica, 117
Dionysius, St. (bishop of Milan), at Council of Nicaea, 154
Exiled, 154
Dionysius (imperial legate), at Council of Tyre, 72 f.
Dioscorus (bishop of Alexandria), 577 f.
Archdeacon, 577
Confiscates St. Cyril's property, 578
Death of, 594
Instigates Robber Council of Ephesus, 584
Monophysite, 578
Monophysites' veneration of, 594
Presides at Council of Ephesus (449), 587
Rapacity of, 578
Violence to Bishop Flavian, 590
Writes to Leo the Great, 579
Dioscorus (one of the Tall Brothers), 497
Diospolis, Council of (415), 520
Condemns Pelagianism, 520
St. Augustine's estimate of, 520
St. Jerome's estimate of, 520
Discourse on the Sun-King (by Emperor Julian), 201
"Divine," The, St. Gregory Nazianzen, 313
Diviners, in Gaul, 283
Divinities, Local, 4 note
"Doctor of grace," 525
Dominus vobiscum, at mass, 441
Domnio, St. (Roman priest), St. Jerome and, 356
Domnus (bishop of Stridon), at Council of Nicaea, 37 note

Donatism (heresy), 503 ff.
Breviculus collationis cum donatistis, 509
Condemned by Council of Arles, 133
Contra Gaudentium, 509
In Africa, 133 ff.
Pope Anastasius I, 482
St. Augustine's writings against, 509
Donatist Schism, 503 ff.
Donatists (heretics), at Hippo, 504
Attempt to assassinate St. Augustine, 506
Confiscation of churches of, 507
Constantine, 189
Council of Bagai, 504
Crispinus (Donatist bishop of Calama), 505
Circumcellions, 134, 506, 508
Dominant in Numidia, 504
Donatist primate at Carthage, 504
Efficacy of the sacraments, 507
Emeritus of Caesarea, 509
Honorius issues laws against, 506
In Africa, 504
In Hippo, 508
Innocent (priest) tortured by, 508
Letter to Julian, 189, 196
Maximianists, sect of, 504 note, 507
Membership in the Church, 507
Optatus (bishop of Timgad), 504
Parmenius leader of, 189
Public discussions, 505
Restitutus killed by, 508
Rogatists, sect of, 504 note
Sacrileges of, 197
St. Augustine, 505 ff.
St. Augustine's moderation toward, 507
St. Possidius attacked by, 505 f.
Sects of, 504 note
Synods of, forbidden, 508
Urbanists, sect of, 504 note
Violence to Catholics, 197 f., 504
Donatus, St. (deacon), Death of, 197
Donatus (bishop of Bagai, heretic), Death of, 135
Donatus (grammarian), teacher of St. Jerome, 261
Donatus the Great (bishop of Carthage), Death of, 189
Exiled, 135
Gregory (prefect), 135
"*Traditores*," 133 f.
Dorylaeum (Asia Minor), Eusebius bishop, 581
Dress, Clerical, 435
Druidism, Doctrines of, 283
In Gaul, 284 f.
Druids, in Gaul, 283
Duchesne, on Creed of Constantinople, 340 f.
Dulia (worship), 462
Dying, Baptism of the, 445

Earthquake, at Constantinople, 500
East, Christian influence in, 5
Monasticism in, 5
Prosperity of the, 437
Easter, Baptism at, 445
Baptism ceremonies on eve of, 447
Date of, 27, 460; Constantine on, 54; Council of Arles, 53 f.; Council of Nicaea, 53-55; Pope Leo the Great, 604; Proterius of Alexandria, 604
Liturgical cycle, 459
Liturgy, 461
Eastern religions, 3; in Gaul, 284; in Rome, 410
Ecclesiastical History (by Eusebius), 20, 496, 580; (by Philostorgius), 603; (by Socrates), 603; (by Sozomen), 603; (by Theodoret of Cyrus), 580
Eclanum (Italy), Julian bishop, 520, 524 f.
Ecumenical councils, Papal confirmation of, 428
Edesius, St., apostle of Abyssinia, 84
Edessa (Mesopotamia), Arian bishop of, 238
Christianity in Persia, 88
Diodorus of Tarsus esteemed, 573
Ibas bishop, 573
Nestorianism at, 572 f.
Persians' School at, 573, 594
Rabbulas bishop, 573
St. Barses bishop, 238
St. Ephrem at, 221
Theodore of Mopsuestia esteemed, 573
Edict of Milan, 3
Education, freedom of teaching, 204
Of clerics, 434
Education laws, Emperor Julian, 203-205
Egypt, Arius in, 19
Athanasius' letter to bishops of, 106
Eutychianism in, 594
Monks in, 463

Patriarchate of Alexandria, 58, 427
Paulinus' followers, 351
Egyptian language, St. Epiphanius, 268
Eleusius (bishop of Cyzicus), Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Council of Constantinople (383), 350
Exiled, 178
Homoousios, 169 f.
Recalled from exile, 190
Eleutheropolis (Palestine), St. Epiphanius born near, 267
Elpidius (imperial officer), Council of Ephesus (449), 589
Elpidius, papal legate, 109
Elpidius (treasurer), apostate under Emperor Julian, 199
Elvira (Spain), Council of, on rural deacons, 291
Emelia, St. (mother of St. Basil), 219
Emerita (*See* Merida)
Emeritus of Caesarea (Donatist), St. Augustine debates with, 509
Emesa (Syria), Anti-Christian demonstration, 206
Emmein (*See* Anna, Persian nun)
Empire, Roman (*See* Roman Empire)
Enchiridion (by St. Augustine), 397
Endelechus (rhetorician), 532
Energumeni, dismissal at mass, 440
England (*See* Britain)
Entertainments, Public, 465
Eparch, Office of, 422
Ephesus (Asia Minor), Caelestius expelled from, 522
Goths burn temple of, 279
Robber Council of (449), 585-590
Saint Mary's Church, 587 f.
St. Memnon bishop, 562
Ephesus, Council of (431), 556-564
Acacius of Melitene at, 557
Anathematisms of St. Cyril, 559
Charisius (priest), 562
Convocation of, 556
Count Candidian, 558, 561
Creed of Constantinople, 341
Eutyches (deacon) at, 575
Heresy of Caelestius condemned, 563
John of Antioch, 558, 561 f.
Nestorius, 556-558
Nestorius condemned, 559 f.
Nicene Creed, 341, 562 f.
Pelagianism condemned, 563
Philip, papal legate, 563 f.
Roman primacy, 563 f.
St. Cyril at, 557; presides, 558
St. Flavian (bishop of Constantinople) at, 560
St. Mary's Church, 558
Theodotus of Ancyra at, 557
Ephesus, Council of (449), 585-590
Barsumas at, 587
Dioscorus presides, 585, 587
St. Mary's Church, 587
Ephra Hormiz (Persian queen), and St. Simon bar Sabbae, 126
Ephrem, St. (deacon), 221 f.
At Edessa, 221
Born in Nisibis, 221
Hierarchy of the Church, 419
Monasticism, 221
Poems, 222
Writings of, 222 note
"Epicure of the New Law," 353
Epiklesis, in mass, 443 note, 444
Epiphania (Syria), anti-Christian demonstration, 206
Epiphanius, St. (bishop of Salamis), 224, 267-270
Ancoratus, 255, 268 f., 348
Apollinarianism, 348
At Alexandria, 267
At Bethlehem, 488
At Jerusalem, 488
Appeals to Pope Siricius, 495
Attitude to Origen, 486
Becomes bishop of Salamis, 268
Born at Besanduk, 267
Character of, 267
Conflict with John of Jerusalem, 268
Devotion to Blessed Virgin, 270
Divinity of Christ, 348
Egyptian language, 268
Entry into Jerusalem, 488
Founds a monastery, 268
Greek language, 268
Gnostics, 267 f.
Haereses, 269
Hebrew language, 268
Latin language, 268
Meaning of "heresy," 269
Monastery at Ad, 268, 488
Mystic, 269
On St. Lucian, 9 note
Opponent of Origen, 269
Ordains Paulinian, 489
Origenism, 488

Panarion, 255, 269, 348
"Pentaglot," The, 268
Praises Pope Liberius, 171
Preaches in Anastasis church, 488
Quartodecimans, 55
St. Chrysostom, 268, 270
St. Hilarion and, 268
St. Jerome, 488
St. Jerome appeals to, 491
Syriac language, 268
"Theotokos," 270
Withdraws from Gnostics, 268
Writings of, 268
Epiphany, Feast of, 460
Epirus (Greece), patriarchate of Rome, 428
Episcopal administration, 475 f.
Esus (pagan god), Cult of, 284 note
Etheria (*See* Silvia)
Eucharist, Deacons forbidden to consecrate, 430 note
Doctrine of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 141
Eucharistic prayer, 443
Eucherius, St. (bishop of Lyons), Lerins described by, 530
Writings of, 531
Euchites (heretics), 301 f.
Eucratianism (heresy), St. Jerome charged with, 382
Eudoxia (empress), at Rome, 591
Death of, 502
Dominates Arcadius, 479
Exile of St. Chrysostom, 500
Hostility to St. Chrysostom, 498
Marries Humeric, 606
St. Chrysostom and statue of, 500
St. Cyril appeals to, 554
Statue of, 500
Tall Brothers, 498
Eudoxianism (heresy), 234
Among the barbarians, 234
Eudoxians (heretics), Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Eudoxius (bishop of Constantinople), 234-236
Acacians, 235
Arians, 189
Arianism, 234
Baptizes Valens, 235
Becomes bishop of Constantinople, 235
Bishop of Germanicia, 64 note
Born in Armenia, 234
Council of Constantinople (360), 234
Death of, 236
Divinity of Christ, 235
Doctrinal instability, 234
Influence over Valens, 235, 237
Leaves see of Antioch, 186
St. Athanasius, 235 f.
St. Eustathius, 64 note
So-called peacemaker, 234 f.
Valens, 234
Eugenius (emperor), 405-411
At Milan, 408 f.
Becomes emperor, 404
Death of, 411 f.
Favors the pagans, 408
St. Ambrose, 407-409, 411
Theodosius, 407
Theodosius at war with, 411
Eugubium (*See* Gubbio)
Euhemerus, criticism of paganism, 3
Eulalius (antipope), 483 f.
Eulogius, St. (martyr), Death of, 4
Eulogius (bishop of Caesarea), convokes Council of Diospolis, 520
Eulogius (imperial officer), Council of Ephesus (449), 589
Eunomianism (heresy), 240
Condemned, 297
St. Basil, 242
Eunomians (heretics), Arians, 166
At Constantinople, 300 f.
Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Divisions among, 303
Eunomius (bishop of Cyzicus, heretic), 239 f.
Aetius disciple of, 239
Agennetos, 240, 243 f.
Anomoios, 234
Appearance of, 239
Asterius disciple, 239
Council of Constantinople (383), 350
Disciple of Aetius, 166
Divinity of Christ, 240
Exiled to Phrygia, 173
Homoousios, 240
Leader of Arians, 166
Plato, 239 f.
Plotinus, 239 f.
St. Basil's *Against Eunomius*, 242-244
St. Basil's *On the Holy Ghost*, 242, 244 f.
Valens, 235

Euphrates (bishop of Cologne), at Antioch, 131
Euphrates (river), Barsumas, 585
Euphronius (bishop of Antioch), chosen to replace St. Eustathius, 66
Eusebia, Aurelia (*See* Aurelia Eusebia)
Eusebianism destroyed, 239
Eusebians (heretics), Anomoeans and, 167
At Council of Sardica, 117-119
Attack on Photinus, 114 f.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 167
Opposed by Aetius, 166
Plan of the, 63, 103
Pope Julius I, 109
Semi-Arians, 167
Eusebius, St. (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia), 221, 248
Eusebius, St. (bishop of Vercelli), at Antioch, 194
At Council of Milan, 154
Exiled, 154
Lector, 434
Letter to Church of Antioch, 194
Monasticism, 464
Recalled from exile, 190
Eusebius (bishop of Caesarea in Palestine), *Against Marcellus,* 75, 107
At Antioch, 66
At Constantinople, 74
At Council of Nicaea, 38 f.
Chronicle, 20
Court orator, 64
Creed proposed by, 45
Demonstratio evangelica, 20
Description of opening of Council of Nicaea, 34-36
Ecclesiastical History, 20, 496, 580
Emperor Constantine, 21
Eusebians, 63
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 21
Favorable to Arius, 21
Origen, 21
Praeparatio evangelica, 20
Refutes Hierocles, 20
Refutes Porphyry, 20
St. Eustathius, 65
St. Helena's visit to Palestine, 98
Theology of the Church, 75, 107
Eusebius (bishop of Dorylaeum), Charges against Eutyches, 582
Eutyches, 581
Interrupts Nestorius' sermon, 581
Opposes Monophysitism, 581
Eusebius (bishop of Nicomedia), association with Licinius, 62
At Antioch, 66
At Council of Antioch (341), 111
At Council of Nicaea, 37, 39, 48
Baptism of Constantine, 79
Bishop of Berytus, 20
Career of, 20
Character of, 112
Constantia, 20 f., 65
Court favorite, 112
Court prelate, 179
Death of, 112
Education of Julian, 180
Elected bishop of Constantinople, 106 f.
Eusebians, 167
Eusebius of Caesarea, 21
Exiled, 62
Favors the Meletians, 62
Homoiousios, 49 f.
Homoousios, 47
Influence at court, 38 f., 102
Invites Arius, 20 f.
Letter from Arius, 20
Licinius, 20
Meletius, 53
Proposed Creed, 44 f.
Recalled from exile, 65
St. Athanasius, 61-77
St. Eustathius, 65
St. Paul (bishop of Constantinople), 77
Scheme for semi-Arians, 61 f.
Semi-Arians, 102
Tactics at Council of Nicaea, 44
Tutor of Gallus and Julian, 106
Ulfilas consecrated by, 280
Visits St. Eustathius, 66
Eusebius (eunuch), Arians and, 106
Pope Liberius, 155 f.
Eusebius (of Edessa), and bishopric of Alexandria, 108
Eusebius (one of the Tall Brothers), 497
Eusebius (prefect), St. Basil, 238
Eustathians (Antioch), in Antioch, 186
Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, 186, 194
Eustathians (Sebaste), contrast to Arians, 188
Julian the Apostate, 189
Eustathius, St. (bishop of Antioch), accused of Sabellianism, 65
Anti-Arian writings, 64

At Council of Nicaea, 35 note
Attitude to Origen, 486
Exiled, 66
Expelled from Antioch, 185
False charges against, 66
Friend of St. Athanasius, 64
Sabellianism, 64 and note
Eustathius (bishop of Sebaste), Aerius, 187
And St. Eustathius, 64 note
Arians, 463
Character of, 187 f.
Council of Gangra, 188
Exiled, 178
Homoousios, 169 f.
Macedonians, 188
Monasticism, 188, 463
Opposed by Aetius, 166
Orthodox bishops, 165
Recalled from exile, 190
St. Basil's view of, 188
Eustochium, St. (Roman virgin), St. Jerome and, 358, 380, 383
Euthymius (one of the Tall Brothers), 497
Eutocius (priest), at Constantine's court, 71 f.
Influence of, 102
Eutropia (daughter of Constantine), 147
Eutropius (eunuch), dominates Arcadius, 479
Protected by St. Chrysostom, 497 f.
Eutropium (aunt of Constantine), and St. Athanasius, 115
Eutyches (a Cappadocian), and the Goths, 90 note
Eutyches (deacon), at Council of Ephesus, 575
Eutyches (archimandrite, heretic), 574 ff.
Accused by Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 582
Appeals to Theodosius, 584
Appeals to the pope, 584
Before Council of Constantinople (448), 582 f.
Character of, 575
Docetism, 576
Excommunicated, 584
Flavian's attitude to, 579
Gnosticism, 576
Godfather of Chrysaphius, 577
Instigates Robber Council of Ephesus, 584
Eutychianism (heresy), Doctrine of, 594 note
In Arabia, 594
In Egypt, 594
In Persia, 594
St. Leo's *Tome,* 586
Theodoret of Cyrus, 580
Evagrius (bishop of Antioch), consecrated by Paulinus, 302
Death of, 403
St. Damasus, 254 note
St. Jerome, 254 note
Same as Ambrosiaster, 254 note
Translator of *Life of St. Antony,* 254 note
Evagrius (historian), 532
Eve of martyrs' anniversaries, 455
Eve of Sundays, 455
Evening Hymn (by St. Hilary), 164 f.
Exarchs, 278
Excocontians (heretics), Arians, 166
Exorcism, of catechumens, 446
Exorcists, Duties of, 433
Imposition of hands, 433
St. Martin of Tours, 287
Explicatio duodecim Capitum (by St. Cyril), 556
Extreme Unction, *Anaphora of Serapion,* 452
Apostolic Constitutions, 452
Canons of St. Hippolytus, 451
Minister of, 430
Priest, minister of, 451
St. Chrysostom, 452
Testament of the Lord, 452
Exuperius, St. (bishop of Toulouse), Pope Innocent I's decretal to, 483
Euzoios (bishop of Antioch, heretic), Election of, 186

Fabiola, St. (Roman matron), charitable foundations, 474
Lateran Basilica, 449
Plenary penance, 449
Reconciliation of, 448
St. Jerome, 356
Facundus (bishop of Hermiane), Theophilus, 494
Faith, Weakening of Christian, 6
Fast days, 457
Fasting, 460
Ascetics, 454

Fausta (wife of Constantine), Murder of, 79
Faustus, St. (bishop of Riez), 541
Arianism refuted by, 541
At Council of Rome (462), 608
At Lerins monastery, 541
Born in Britain, 541
Defender of semi-Pelagianism, 541
Macedonianism refuted by, 541
Faustus (bishop of Mileve), St. Augustine and, 391
Feasts, New, 459
Febronius, on Canons of Sardica, 121 note
Felicitas, St. (martyr), Pope Boniface's oratory of, 484
Felicitas, St. (Roman matron), St. Jerome, 358
Felix, St. (antipope), appointed by Constantine, 156
Death of, 229
Pope Liberius and, 172
St. Damasus, 233
Felix, St. (bishop of Treves), Consecration of, 311 f.
Felix (bishop of Diabe, Donatist), persecution of Catholics, 197
Felix (bishop of Indicra, Donatist), Attack on Catholics, 198
Felix (bishop of Nocera), Innocent I's decretal to, 483
Felix of Nola, St., Lector, 434
St. Paulinus, 385, 387
Felix (overseer), apostate under Emperor Julian, 199
Festal Letters of bishop of Alexandria, 68 note
Filioque, Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, 563
Firmicus Maternus (*See* Maternus)
Flamen, and Emperor Gratian, 239
Flamen perpetuus and *curator reipublicae,* 5
Flavian, St. (bishop of Antioch), 336 f.
Condemns the Messalians, 302
Followers of, at Council of Constantinople (383), 351
Ordains St. Chrysostom, 367
St. Chrysostom, preacher, 367
Theodosius, 372 f.
Flavian, St. (bishop of Constantinople), 577
Appeal to the pope, 590
Attitude to Eutyches, 579
Convenes Council of Constantinople (488), 582
Council of Ephesus (431), 560, 577
Council of Ephesus (449), 589
Death of, 590
St. Leo's *Tome* to, 586
Sends report to Pope Leo, 584
Flavian, Nicomachus (prefect), Emperor Eugenius, 408
Family of, 412
Paganism in Rome, 410
Theodosius, 400
Flavian (senator), exiled, 207
Florence (Italy), St. Ambrose at, 409
Florens (patrician), at Council of Constantinople (448), 583
Florus (bishop, heretic), and Nestorius, 563
Flumenpiscis, Januarius bishop of, 197
Font, Baptismal, blessed by bishop, 447
Forma (in Numidia), Urban bishop, 198
Formulas of Sirmium, 148-150, 168, 174
Council of Rimini, 175
Council of Sirmium (358), 169
Fornication, plenary penance, 449
Fortunatian (bishop of Aquileia), exegete, 162 note
Fortunatus (heretic), debate with St. Augustine, 414
Foundling asylums, 474
Fourth formula of Sirmium, 174
Franks, 539
At the Rhine, 535
Free will, St. Augustine's doctrine, 512, 525, 543
Freemen, in country districts, 480
Fructuosus, St., 533
Fructuosus, St. (martyr), Death of, 4
Frumentius, St. (bishop of Axum), apostle of Abyssinia, 84
Fugitive debtors, Right of asylum for, 473
St. Augustine, 473
Fugitive slaves, right of asylum, 473
Furia (Roman matron), St. Jerome, 356

Gainas (general), dominates Arcadius, 479
Gaius (jurist), and Roman law, 80
Galicia (Spain), Pope Siricius, 366
Gallican liturgy, 365, 439
Gallican Psalter, 355
Gallus (Caesar), Aetius and, 166

Eusebius of Nicomedia teacher of, 106
Gangra, Council of (340), Eustathius of Sebaste, 188, 463
Gaul, Agape in, 445
Arianism in, 285
Attila in, 599 f.
Catholicity in, 225
Celtic mythology in, 284
Christianity in, 283
Classes of people, 283
Druidism in, 284 f.
Eusebius of Nicomedia exiled to, 62
Gepidae in, 599 f.
Goths invade, 571
Gratian in, 358
Greco-Roman mythology in, 284
Huns in, 599 f.
Julian in, 181
Liturgy, 439
Maximus (emperor) in, 311, 359
Monasticism in, 464
Ostrogoths in, 599 f.
Pagan priests, 283
Paganism in, 283-285
Patriarchate of Rome, 428
Priscillianism in, 571
Represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Rural parishes in, 290 f.
St. Athanasius exiled to, 267
St. Martin apostle of, 225
Gaza (Palestine), Pagan disturbances in, 206
St. Asclepas bishop, 117
Gelasius I, St. (pope), Roman primacy, 594
Gelasius (bishop of Caesarea), St. Jerome, 489
Gelasius of Cyzicus (historian), Council of Nicaea, 32
General councils, Papal confirmation of, 428
Geneva, Lake, 539
Genevieve of Nanterre, St., consults St. Simeon Stylites, 599
Genseric (Vandal king), 544
Pillage of Rome, 604 f.
St. Leo the Great and, 599
George (bishop of Antioch), Character of, 190 f.
Death of, 191
Enthronement of, 190 f.
Imprisoned, 190 f.
Library of, 191
Murderers of, pardoned, 191
George (bishop of Laodicea), Council of Ancyra (358), 168
Orthodox bishops, 165
St. Eustathius, 64 note
George of Cappadocia (bishop of Alexandria, heretic), reign of terror in Alexandria, 158
Georgia (in Russia), Evangelization of, 85 f.
Gepidae, Arianism among, 282
At the Danube, 535
In Gaul, 599 f.
Germain, St. (bishop of Auxerre), 536
In Britain, 540
Germanus, St. (bishop of Constantinople), writings of St. Gregory of Nyssa, 323
Germanus of Auxerre (*See* Germain)
Germany, patriarchate of Rome, 428
Gerontius (bishop of Nicomedia), 327
Gerontocomium, 474
Gladiatorial combats, 421
Laws against, 179
Gnosticism (heresy), Arianism, 17 f.
Priscillian, 308
Semi-paganism of, 6
Gnostics, Legends of, 309
St. Epiphanius and, 267 f.
God, Human knowledge of, 243
Gods, Disbelief in the, 4
Images of the, 3
Golden Church (Antioch), Consecration of, 111
Golgotha, Temple of Venus at, 96
Gorgonia, St. (sister of St. Gregory Nazianzen), Death of, 312
Gothia, Missions of Eastern, 501
Gothic translation of Bible, 280 f.
Goths, and the Huns, 238
Arianism, 224 f., 279
At the Danube, 535
Alaric, 480
Burn temple of Ephesus, 279
Cappadocia ravaged by, 279
Christian captives of, 279
Christianity among the, 89 f.
Gainas, 479
Gaul invaded by, 571
Greece ravaged by, 279
Illyria ravaged by, 279
In official positions, 534
Invasions of, 480

Italy invaded by, 571
Mysia invaded by, 279
Origin of Church of the, 279
Rome sacked by, 480
Salvian on the, 538
Treatment by Valens, 238
Troas ravaged by, 279
Governor, Office of, 422
Grace, Caelestius' doctrine of, 511
Pope Zosimus on necessity of, 524
St. Augustine on necessity of, 526
St. Augustine's doctrine of, 525 f., 543
St. Jerome on doctrine of, 514
Gratian (emperor), 346
Altar of Victory, 360
Arianism, 239
Assassinated, 358
At Lyons, 358
At Milan, 260, 318 f., 358
Catholic policy, 358
Church and State, 293
Favors Catholics, 239
Gentleness in laws of, 260
In Gaul, 358
Leaves Treves, 318
Maximus and murder of, 374
Pagan priesthood, 239
Priscillianists expelled, 311
Proposed council of Aquileia, 346
Rejects office of *pontifex maximus,* 239
St. Ambrose, 321, 346, 374
St. Ambrose adviser of, 254, 260, 318 f., 465
St. Paulinus, 384
School teachers, 466
Theodosius, 293
Vestal virgins, 239
Gratus, St. (bishop of Carthage), 135
Great Britain (*See* Britain)
Great week, 461
Greece, Goths ravage, 279
Greek language, St. Epiphanius, 268
Gregory, St. (bishop of Nyssa), 241, 254, 322-324
Against Eunomius, 322
At Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Attitude to Origen, 486
Becomes bishop of Nyssa, 322
Description of a church, 437
Doctrine of the Trinity, 323 f.
Fame of, 224
Hexameron, 322
Hierarchy of the Church, 419
Literary style of, 324
Origen, 323
Philosopher, 323
Slavery, 468
Teacher, 203
Gregory Nazianzen, St. (bishop of Constantinople), 218-220, 241, 254, 312-318
Anastasis (chapel), 314, 318
At Arianzus, 220, 339
At Athens, 218, 220
At Caesarea (Cappadocia), 339
At Caesarea (Palestine), 218
At Nazianzus, 312
At Neocaesarea, 220
At Seleucia, 312
Attacks upon, 314 f.
Becomes bishop of Constantinople, 335
Becomes bishop of Sasima, 251, 322
Born in Arianzus, 218
Caesarius brother of, 200
Character of, 219
Consecrated by St. Basil, 251
Council of Constantinople (381), 335, 337-339
Creed of Constantinople, 341
Dissension at Council of Constantinople, 337
Eloquence of, 314 f., 318
Fame of, 224
Farewell to Constantinople, 339
Friendship for St. Basil, 218 f.
Goes to Constantinople, 313
Julian the Apostate, 218
Julian visits, 219
Leaves Council of Constantinople, 338
Letter from St. Basil, 247
Liturgy, 438
Longing for solitude, 251
Maximus the Cynic, 315 f., 337
Nicene Creed, 341
On Theodosius' policy, 304
Ordained priest, 220, 251
Pact between Meletius and Paulinus, 336 f.
Preacher, 313-315, 318
Presides at Council of Constantinople (381), 336-338
Private mass, 445
St. Basil, 250
St. Basil and Valens, 249 f.
St. Basil's death, 312

St. Caesarius, brother of, 312
St. Gorgonia, sister of, 312
Teacher, 203, 220
Theodosius, 316, 338
Theological Discourses, 313
"Theologus," 313
Worship of saints, 462
Gregory Nazianzen the Elder, St. (bishop of Nazianzus), 218
Baptism of, 218
Conversion of, 218
Election of St. Basil, 249
Ordains Gregory Nazianzen the Younger, 220
Gregory Thaumaturgus, St., attitude to Origen, 486
Gregory the Great, St. (pope), Council of Constantinople, 343
Gregory the Illuminator, St., and Church of Armenia, 86 f.
Gregory (bishop of Alexandria), 107 ff.
Appointment of, 108
Death of, 132
Installation of, 108
Gregory (prefect), and Donatus the Great, 135
Gubbio (Italy), Decentius bishop, 483
Guelma (*See* Calama)

Hadrumetum (Africa), Monastery at, 544
Haereses (by St. Epiphanius), 269
Hanania, St. (Persian priest), 127
Hannibalianus (Caesar), 78
Killing of, 101
Haran (Mesopotamia), Daniel bishop, 588
Hardaschir (*See* Ardaschir)
Harnack, on Creed of Constantinople, 340 f.
On doctrine of St. Alexander, 23 note
On St. Augustine, 413
Hebrew language, St. Augustine, 415 note
St. Epiphanius, 268
St. Jerome studies, 380
Hefele, Authenticity of St. Hilary's *Fragments,* 171
On Nicene canons, 56
Helena, St. (empress), Basilica of St. Lucian, 65 note
Church of the Ascension, 97
Church of the Nativity, 97
Finding of the Holy Sepulcher, 97
Finding of the True Cross, 97-99
Olivet basilica, 97
Visit to the Holy Land, 96-98
Helenopolis (in Bithynia), Constantine at, 79
Palladius bishop, 324
Heliodorus, St. (bishop of Altino), 492
Letter from St. Jerome, 262
St. Jerome, 262 f.
St. Nepotian, nephew of, 491
Heliopolis, Pagan disturbances in, 206
Virgins martyred at, 208
Helladius (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia), at Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Hellenism, Vogue of, 239
Hellespont, Macedonians in region of, 333
Helpidius (heretic), condemned, 310
Helvidius (Roman layman), criticism of monasticism, 464
Disciple of Auxentius, 352
Perpetual virginity of Blessed Virgin, 352
Refuted by St. Jerome, 353
Heraclea (Thrace), Theodore bishop, 113, 115
Hercules, Statue of, 411
Heresies, Arianism a source of, 7, 18
Semi-paganism of, 6
Without capable leaders, 6
Heresies, List of:
Adoptionism, 9, 74
Aerianism, 187 f.
Anomoeism, 234
Apollinarianism, 7
Arianism, 3-27
Donatism, 133 ff.
Eucratianism, 382
Eudoxianism, 234
Eunomianism, 240
Eutychianism, 594
Gnosticism, 17 f.
Homoeanism, 280
Homoiism, 234
Macedonianism, 184
Manichaeism, 297, 308
Marcionism, 308
Monophysitism, 574
Montanism, 6
Nestorianism, 7, 18
Pelagianism, 7, 18

Priscillianism, 308 ff.
Sabellianism, *passim*
Semi-Arianism, 308 ff.
Subordinationism, 61
"Heresy," Meaning of, 269
Heretics, in Rome, 482
Laws against, 400
Reconciliation of, 430
"Heretics," in Theodosius' decree, 305
Heretics, List of:
Acacians, 176-178
Acacius, 107, 111, 117, 119, 177
Adimantus, 414
Aerians, 187 ff.
Aerius, 187
Aetians, 166
Aetius, 166
Anomoeans, 103, 166 f., 173 f.
Apollinaris, 184 f.
Apotactics, 301
Arians, *passim*
Arius, 10 ff.
Arkaph, John, 71, 77
Asterius, 239
Audians, 55
Auxentius (bishop of Milan), 231, 255
Auxentius (bishop of Silistria), 281
Basil (bishop of Ancyra), 170 ff.
Caelestius, 511 ff.
Callinicus of Pelusium, 53
Collucianists, 9, 19
Demophilus, 316 f.
Donatists, 504 ff.
Donatus (bishop of Bagai), 135
Donatus the Great, 133 ff.
Eleusius of Cyzicus, 169 f.
Euchites, 301 f.
Eudoxians, 342
Eunomians, 300 ff.
Eunomius, 234 ff.
Eusebians, 114 ff., 166 ff.
Eustathius of Sebaste, 187 ff.
Eutyches, 574 ff.
Euzoios, 186
Excocontians, 166
Florus, 563
Fortunatus, 414
George of Cappadocia, 158
Helpidius, 310
Heterousians, 166
Homeousians, 167
Homoiousiasts, 167
Hydroparastates, 301
Instantius, 310
Ithacians, 312
Jovinianus, 353
Julian (bishop), 563
Leontius of Antioch, 64 note
Luciferians, 351 f.
Lucius, 237
Luther, 309
Macedonians, 184, 340
Macedonius, 189, 235
Manichaeans, 571 f.
Marathonians, 182
Marathonius, 182
Marcellians, 342
Marcian, 301, 333
Maris of Chalcedon, 37, 48
Meletians, 70 ff.
Meletius of Lycopolis, 51 ff.
Messalians, 301 f.
Monophysites, 574, 593 f.
Novatians, 188 f.
Omoeans, 176-178
Parmenius, 189
Paul of Samosata, 7 f.
Pepuzians, 301
Photinians, 342
Photinus, 148 f.
Pistus, 105
Pneumatomachi, 182-184
Priscillian, 308 ff.
Priscillianists (of Phrygia), 301 note
Sabinus, 32 note
Saccophori, 301
Saturninus, 165
Salvianus (Spanish bishop), 310
Semi-Arians, *passim*
Stephen of Antioch, 64 note
Theodore of Heraclea, 115
Theognis, 48 ff.
Theonas, 16
Theophilus, 85
Ursacius, 163, 165
Hermes (bishop of Narbonne), designated by Bishop Rusticus, 608
Hermiane (Africa), Facundus bishop, 494
Hermits, Communion of, 445
Hermogenes (bishop of Caesarea), secretary of Nicene Council, 49
Hermogenes (imperial officer), slain in Constantinople, 113
Hermopolis (Egypt), St. Athanasius at, 196

Hero (*See* Maximus the Cynic)
Heros (bishop of Arles), denounces Pelagius, 520
Pelagianism, 523
Heruli, Arianism among, 282
At the Danube, 535
In official positions, 534
Pagans, 571
Heterousians (heretics), Arians, 166
Hexameron (by St. Ambrose), 280; (by St. Basil), 245 f., 322; (by St. Gregory of Nyssa), 322
Hexapla (by Origen), 355; and *Gallican Psalter,* 355
Hierarchy, St. Ambrose on, 419
St. Ephrem on, 419
St. Gregory of Nyssa on, 419
Hierocles (governor), refuted by Eusebius of Caesarea, 20
High Basilica (Milan), 362
Hilarion the Great, St. (anchorite), at Alexandria, 268
In Palestine, 268
St. Epiphanius and, 268
Hilary, St. (pope), 606-609
As papal legate, 586, 589 f.
Church of St. Lawrence, 607
Churches of Spain, 608 f.
Death of, 609
Lateran Basilica, 607
Robber Council of Ephesus, 606
Station processions, 607
Hilary, St. (bishop of Arles), at Lerins monastery, 530, 541
Biographer of St. Honoratus, 530
Influence of, 539
Life of St. Honoratus, 541
On Lerins monastery, 530
Hilary, St. (bishop of Poitiers), 160-165
Against Auxentius, 254-256
At Seleucia, 176
Church and State, 255 f.
Commentary on Matthew, 162
Commentary on the Psalms, 254
Concerning the Faith, against the Arians, 163 f.
Conversion of, 160-162
Death of, 256
Evening Hymn, 164 f.
Exegete, 162
Exiled to Asia Minor, 267; to Phrygia, 163
Historical Fragments, 170
Homoousios, 174
Hymns, 163-165
Marcellus' orthodoxy, 75 note
Moderation of, 174, 177
Morning Hymn, 164
On Pope Liberius, 170
On the Trinity, 161, 163
St. Martin of Tours, 287 f.
Second formula of Sirmium, 168
Semi-Arians, 176
Tractatus super psalmos, 256
Wife of, 162
Hilary (apostate deacon), Luciferians, 352
Hilary (monk), St. Augustine, 544
Himerius (Sophist), Emperor Julian, 213
Himerius (bishop of Tarragona), letter from Pope Siricius, 367 note
Pope Siricius, 365 f.
Hincmar, on Canons of Sardica, 121 note
Hippo, Council of (393), and canon of Scripture, 276 note
Donatist clergy, 504
Donatists in, 508
St. Augustine bishop, 388-399
St. Augustine founds monastery at, 527
St. Augustine's debate at, 414
Valerius bishop, 503
Vandals besiege, 544
Hippolytus, St., 533
Historia adversus paganos (*Universal History*), by Orosius, 538
Historia evangelica (by Juvencus), 93 f.
Historical Fragments (by St. Hilary), 170
History of the Arians (by St. Athanasius), 159
History of the Donatist Schism (by St. Optatus), 255
History of the Monks (by Theodoret), 580
History of the Monks of Egypt, translated by Rufinus, 496
Holy Ghost, Doctrine of, 182, 244, 321 f.
Arius, 17
Council of Alexandria (362), 193
Council of Constantinople (381), 336, 345
Marcellus, 75
St. Ambrose, 322
St. Athanasius, 183
St. Augustine, 321 f.

St. Basil, 244
St. Didymus the Blind, 325
St. Jerome, 325
Holy Ghost, On the (by St. Basil), 242, 244 f.
Holy Innocents, Feast of, 460
Holy Land (*See* Palestine)
Holy Saturday, Baptism, 448 f., 460
Holy Sepulcher, Church of, 491
Holy Thursday, Chrism, 448
Reconciliation of sinners, 460
Solemn penance, 449
Holy Week, 461
Homeousians (heretics), Semi-Arians, 167
Homeric gods, Disbelief in, 4
Homes for the aged, 474
Homes for the poor, 474
Homicide, Plenary penance for, 449
Homilies on the Statues (by St. Chrysostom), 371-373
"Homo dominicus," St. Athanasius, 349
Homoeanism (heresy), Ulfilas, 280
Homoiism (heresy), 234
Homoios, Council of Constantinople (360), 234
Homoiousiasts (heretics), Semi-Arians, 167
Homoiousios, Basil of Ancyra, 234
Council of Constantinople (360), 234
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 49 f.
Maris of Chalcedon, 49 f.
Rejected by Acacians, 176
Rejected by Council of Sirmium, 168
Semi-Arians and, 102, 167
Theognis of Nicaea, 49 f.
Homoousios, Acacians, 176
Basil of Ancyra, 169 f.
Condemned by Eusebius of Nicomedia, 46 f.; of Constantinople (360), 234; of Rimini, 175
Council of Sirmium, 168
Councils of Antioch, 47, 112, 170
Creed of St. Lucian, 9
Eleusius of Cyzicus, 169 f.
Eunomius, 240
Eustathius of Sebaste, 169 f.
Formulas of Sirmium, 149
Macrostic Creed, 132
Meletius, 186
Nicene Creed, 46-48
Paul of Samosata, 47, 170
Photinus, 170
Pope Liberius and, 169
Sabellianism and, 167
St. Athanasius, 174
St. Basil, 47, 245 note
St. Hilary, 174
Semi-Arians, 102, 167
Schism of Antioch, 186 note
Third formula of Sirmium, 169
Honoratus, St. (bishop of Arles), 529 f.
At Lerins, 529
Elected bishop of Arles, 539
St. Hilary, biographer of, 530
Salvian, disciple of, 538
Honorius (emperor), becomes emperor, 412, 479, 481
Character of, 479
Death of, 535
Eulalius (antipope), 484
Laws against Donatists, 506
Notitia dignitatum utriusque imperii, 422 note
Political eminence of Arles, 539
Pope Boniface I, 484
Statue at Antioch, 372
Stilicho guardian of, 479 f.
Horsisius, St. (abbot), letter from St. Athanasius, 196
Hosius, St. (bishop of Cordova), anathematizes Arius, 168
Author of Nicene Creed, 48 and note
Constantine, 25
Constantius, 156 f.
Council of Nicaea, 31, 36 f.
Council of Sardica, 117 f.
Exiled to Sirmium, 157
Letter to Constantius, 157
Letters from Constantius, 157
Mission to Alexandria, 25
Opposes Sabellianism, 25
Papal legate, 36 f.
St. Athanasius confers with, 115
Second formula of Sirmium, 168
Treatment by Constantius, 168
Hospices, 474
St. Basil, 252
Hospitality, *Apostolic Constitutions,* 474
Bishops, 474
Monasteries, 474
Monasticism, 464
Hospitals, 474
St. Basil, 252
Hostis Herodis impie, Epiphany hymn, 532

Hours, Canonical, 454-456
Humeric, marries Eudoxia, 606
Huns, and the Goths, 238
In Gaul, 599 f.
Invasion of, 490, 492
Pagans, 571
Hydroparastates (heretics), 301
Hylas, friend of St. Jerome, 262 f.
Hymns, Ambrosian, 364
At vigil office, 459
St. Ambrose, 364
Hypatia, Murder of, 547
Hypostasis, Council of Alexandria (362), 193
Meaning of, 104, 167, 193 f.
St. Jerome, 265 f.
Hypsele, Arsenius bishop of, 53, 70, 73

Ibas (bishop of Edessa), 573
Deposed, 588
Imprisoned, 585
Translates works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 573
Iberia (*i. e.,* Georgia), Evangelization of, 85 f.
Iconium (Asia Minor), Onesiphorus bishop, 589
St. Amphilochius bishop, 302, 333
Idacius (bishop of Merida), appeal to Gratian, 311
Character of, 310
Charges against St. Martin, 310
Denounces Priscillian, 310
Letter to Pope Damasus, 310
Idolatry, Laws against, 179, 297, 400
Plenary penance for, 449
St. Athanasius on, 14
Valentinian, 231
Ilius, Pegasius bishop of, 199
Illyria, Goths ravage, 279
Illyricum, Anastasius, papal vicar, 597
Patriarchate of Rome, 428
Pope Innocent I to bishops of, 483
Imposition of hands, 367
Deacons, 435
Exorcists, 433
Priests, 435
Incense, 459
Indicra (in Numidia), Felix bishop, 198
"Innascible," The, 240, 243 f.
Innocent I, St. (pope), 482 f.
Annuls St. Chrysostom's condemnation, 502
Born at Albano, 482
Condemns Pelagianism, 522
Decretals of, 482
Jews, 482
Letter from St. Augustine, 522; from St. Jerome, 522
Letters from African councils, 522
Pagans, 482
Pelagianism, 482
Rebukes Theophilus, 502
Innocent (priest), tortured by Donatists, 508
Innocent (friend of St. Jerome), 262 f.
Innocents, Feast of the Holy, 460
Inscriptions, Damascene, 275
Insignia, Episcopal, 424
Instantius (Spanish bishop, heretic), Council of Saragossa condemns, 310
Priscillian, 310
Institutiones (by St. Cassian), 531
Insula Gallinaria, St. Martin on, 287
Iousik (Armenian bishop), Death of, 87
Ireland, St. Patrick apostle of, 290
St. Patrick sent to, 540
Irenaeus, St. (bishop of Lyons), Christianity in Gaul, 282
Iris (river), St. Basil's monastery, 246
Isauria (Asia Minor), Patriarchate of Antioch, 427
St. Gregory Nazianzen in, 312
Ischyras (alleged priest), accuser of St. Athanasius, 53, 70
And Macarius, 70
Isidore, St. (bishop of Seville), *Pontificale,* 435
Isidore of Pelusium, St., St. Cyril and, 567
Isidore (priest), St. Jerome, 490
Theophilus of Alexandria, 490
Isnik (formerly Nicaea), 28, 31
Itala (version of Bible), St. Jerome, 354 f.
Italy, Arianism in, 282
Attila in, 600
Goths invade, 571
Hospices in, 474
Lombards in, 571
Manichaeans in, 571
Maximus invades, 375
Patriarchate of Rome, 427
Priests penitentiary, 450
Represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Valentinian II, 359

Ite missa est, 440 note
Ithacians (heretics), excommunicated, 312
Ithacius (bishop of Ossabona), appeals to Gratian, 311
Appeals to Maximus, 311
Deposed, 312
St. Martin, 311 f.

James, St. (bishop of Nisibis), at Council of Nicaea, 30
James, St. (Persian priest), Persian persecution, 144
James Intercisus, St. (Persian martyr), 128 f.
Januarius, St. (bishop of Beneventum), at Council of Sardica, 117
Persecution of Catholics, 197
Jerome, St. (hermit), 224, 261-267
Accused of Sabellianism, 265 f.
Adversus Jovinianum, 381-383
Answers Atrebius' denunciation, 487 f.
Apollinarianism, 345
Apollinarians, 349
Apologia, 495
Appeals to Epiphanius, 491
At Antioch, 263
At Aquileia, 262
At Bethlehem, 380
At Council of Rome (382), 348
At Rome, 349, 356
Attacks upon, 357
Attitude to Origen, 495
Aventine Hill (Rome), 355 f.
Baptism of, 262
Born at Stridon, 261
Campenses, 266
Chalcis desert, 254
Character, 261, 487
Classical authors, 495
Classical studies, 264
Clerical celibacy, 436
Commentaries, 414-416; on the Prophets, 415
Commentarioli on the Psalms, 415
Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, 516
Consults Pope Damasus, 266
Correspondence with St. Augustine, 517
Council of Diospolis, 520
De perpetua virginitate Beatae Mariae, 353
De viris illustribus, 381
Decree of exile against, 490
Defends Council of Alexandria (362), 352
Defense of monasticism, 464
Dexter, 381
Dialogue against the Luciferians, 352
Dialogue against the Pelagians, 519
Disagreement with St. Augustine, 266, 516-518
Doctrine of grace, 514
Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, 325
Doctrine of the Trinity, 265 f.
Donatus, teacher of, 261
Eucratianism, 382
Exegesis, 267, 415
Exegetical writings, 380
Fondness for Scripture, 487
Furia, 356
Gallican Psalter, 355
Gelasius (bishop of Caesarea), 489
Hebrew text of Psalms, 355
Helvidius refuted by, 353
Hexapla of Origen, 355
"Homo dominicus," 349
Hylas, friend of, 262 f.
Hypostasis, 265 f.
In Bithynia, 263
In Cappadocia, 263
In Chalcis desert, 263, 486
In Galatia, 263
In Pontus, 263
In Thrace, 263
Influence of, 367
Innocent, friend of, 262 f.
Invasion of the Huns, 492
Invectives, 357, 382, 495, 496 note
Isidore (priest), 490
Itala version, 354 f.
John of Jerusalem's rivalry, 518
Leaves Rome, 357 f.
Letter from St. Augustine, 516 f.; from St. Pammachius, 383; to Pope Innocent, 522; to St. Asella, 357 f.; to St. Heliodorus, 262; to St. Nepotian, 491; to St. Pammachius, 383
Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum, 381
Library of, 261
Life of Paul of Thebes, 254
Manichaeism, 382
Marcellinus, 356

Meletius of Sebaste, 266
Monasticism, 464
Narrowly escapes death, 521
Not at Council of Jerusalem, 519
Oceanus, 356
On marriage, 382 f.
On Priscillianism, 308
On virginity, 382 f.
Origenist controversy, 486
Origen's *Hexapla*, 355
Origen's *Homilies*, 493
Origen's *Principia* translated by, 494
Original sin, 519
Pagan morals, 357
Paulinus (bishop of Antioch), 266
Pelagius meets, 514
Perpetual virginity of Blessed Virgin, 353
Philo, 381
Pope Damasus, 348, 351, 354, 355, 357
Reconciliation with Rufinus, 491; with St. Augustine, 518
Remark of Pope Sixtus V about, 496 note
Roman primacy, 277
Roman Psalter, 355
Rufinus, 262, 266, 488
Rufinus accuses, 494
Rufinus friend of, 486
Rupture between Rufinus and, 487
St. Albina, 355, 358
St. Ambrose, 358 f.
St. Asella, 355
St. Augustine, 416
St. Didymus the Blind, 325
St. Dominic, 356
St. Epiphanius, 488
St. Eustochium, 358, 380
St. Fabiola, 356
St. Felicitas, 358
St. Heliodorus, 262 f.
St. Marcella, 355 f., 358
St. Melania the Elder, 489
St. Pammachius, 356, 382
St. Paula, 358, 380, 415
St. Paulinus, 383, 388
Schism of Antioch, 265
Secretary of Pope Damasus, 349
Septuagint, 355
Spread of Arianism, 177
Studies at Rome, 261
Study of Chaldaic, 380; of Hebrew, 380; of Origen, 486; of Scripture, 265
Textual criticism, 354
Theodosius, 331 f.
Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, 490
Theophilus' synodal letters, 494
Translation of the Bible, 331 f.; of the Old Testament, 381; of the Psalms, 355
Victorinus, teacher of, 261
Visits to catacombs, 275
Vulgate, 331 f., 351, 354-356, 518
Jerusalem, Anastasis church, 455 f.
Church of the Holy Sepulcher, 491
Commemoration of the Passion, 447
Council of Chalcedon and see of, 489 note
Council of Nicaea and see of, 489 note
John bishop, 268, 518 ff.
Matins and lauds at, 455
None (office) in, 456
Patriarchate of, 278 note, 427, 489 note
Rebuilding of Temple, 215-217
St. Cyril bishop, 139-143
St. Epiphanius at, 488
St. Epiphanius' entry into, 488
St. Maximus bishop, 140
See of Caesarea and see of, 58 f.
Sext in, 456
Vespers in, 456
Jerusalem, Council of (415), 519 f.
John (bishop of Jerusalem), 519 f.
Orosius at, 519 f.
Pelagius at, 519 f.
St. Jerome not at, 519
Jesus (*See* Christ)
Jewish Temple (*See* Temple)
Jews, rebuilding of Temple, 215-217
St. Chrysostom, 497
St. Cyril's attitude to, 547
St. Simon bar Sabbae and the, 126
Joannites, 501
John, St. (apostle), Feast of, 460
John, St. (Persian bishop), Death of, 144
John, St. (Persian), at Council of Nicaea, 31
John, St. (priest of Rome), Martyrdom of, 207
John (bishop of Antioch), Council of Ephesus, 558, 561 f.
Death of, 574
Peace with St. Cyril, 567, 581

Pope Sixtus III, 566
Theodoret and, 428
John (bishop of Jerusalem), Aterbius' denunciations, 487
Attacks anthropomorphism, 488
Council of Jerusalem, 519 f.
Pelagius, 518
Rivalry against St. Jerome, 518
Rufinus, 488
St. Epiphanius' conflict with, 268
Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, 490
John (usurping emperor), Death of, 535
John (count), at Ephesus, 564
John Arkaph (*See* Arkaph)
John Cassian (*See* Cassian)
John the Baptist, St., Theodosius and, 411
Joseph, St. (disciple of St. Narses), 144
Jovian (emperor), Character of, 226
Election of, 225
In reign of Julian, 200
St. Athanasius recalled, 235
Wavering policy, 224
Jovinianus (Roman monk, heretic), criticism of monasticism, 464
Doctrines of, 353
Helvidius, 353
Pope Siricius condemns book of, 381
Precursor of Luther and Calvin, 353
St. Jerome refutes, 381-383
Julian (bishop, heretic), and Nestorius, 563
Julian (bishop of Cos), papal legate, 595
Julian (bishop of Eclanum), 524 f.
Charges against St. Augustine, 524
Deposed, 525
Exiled, 525
Exposition of Pelagianism, 524 f.
Intrigues of, 570
St. Augustine, 520
St. Augustine refutes, 543
Zosimus' *Tractoria,* 525
Julian (count), apostate under Julian, 199
Julian the Apostate (emperor), 179 ff.
Aetius, catechist of, 166
Altar of Victory, 360
Alypius, 216 f.
Apollinaris the Elder, 347
Apollinaris the Younger, 347
Apostacy under, 202
Aprunculus, 212
Arians, 195
Book against the Christians, 201
Character of, 209
Christian teachers in reign of, 205
Christians excluded from office, 202
Church of Antioch pillaged, 215
Constantius' funeral, 209
Daphne Apollo, 213-215
Death of, 222 f.
Death of Bishop George, 191
Decrees exile of St. Athanasius, 192
Dialectics, 200
Discourse on the Sun-King, 201
Dislike of Cappadocia, 220
Education laws, 203-205
Education of, 180 f.
Entry into Constantinople, 181
Eusebius of Nicomedia and education of, 106, 180
Favors Aetius, 195
Fines city of Caesarea, 221
Hatred of Christianity, 198
Hatred of Constantius, 180
Himerius at court of, 213
Letter from Donatists, 189, 196; to Aedychius, 195; to Donatists, 196; to Photinus, 195
Libanius made quaestor, 213
Magicians, 209
Mardonius, preceptor of, 180
Maris, 217 f.
Martyrdom of St. Juventinus, 208; of St. Maximinus, 208; of St. Theodoret, 208
Mithraism, 211
Neoplatonism, 181, 210
Pagan hierarchy, 212
Pagan priesthood, 212 f.
Paganism of, 210-213
Pardons murderers of Bishop George, 191
Persecution of Christians, 198 f., 208
Philosophers at court, 212
Political program, 181 f.
Pontifex maximus, 212
Priscus at court of, 213
Proclaimed Augustus, 181
Property of pagan temples, 231
Rebuilding of Jewish Temple, 215-217
Recalls exiled bishops, 190
Refutation of, by St. Cyril, 202
Restoration of paganism, 209
Revival of paganism, 201
Rhetoricians at court, 212

Ridicules St. Athanasius, 14
St. Athanasius exiled, 195
St. Athanasius' popularity, 191
St. Basil the Great, 218
St. Gregory Nazianzen, 218
St. Theodoret of Antioch, 215
School legislation, 204
Schools, 203-205
Seduction of Christians, 199
Studies at Athens, 218
Superstitions of, 210 f.
Theology of, 210
Theurgy, 181, 209
Valentinian, 226
Visit to St. Basil, 219; to St. Gregory Nazianzen, 219
With army in Gaul, 181
Julian Basilica, Ursinian Schism, 233
Julius I, St. (pope), condemned by pseudo-council of Philippopolis, 122
Council of Sardica, 115 f.
Death of, 149
Eusebian bishops, 109
Letter to Eastern bishops, 109 f.
Marcellus of Ancyra, 75 note, 114
St. Athanasius, 101, 106, 114, 132
Julius (bishop of Puteoli), papal legate, 586
Julius, Basilica of, Ursinian Schism, 233
Julius Constantius, Killing of, 101
Jupiter (pagan god), Cult of, at Nimes, 284 note; at Paris, 284 note
Emperor Julian's regard for, 210
Juries, in Roman procedure, 82 note
Justice, Administration of, 465
Justin Martyr, St., Conversion of, 389
Justina (empress), Arians, 358
Arians in Milan, 362 f.
At Milan, 359, 362 f., 374
At Sirmium, 358
Death of, 375
Leaves Milan, 375
Mother of Valentinian II, 358
St. Ambrose, 362 f., 375
Justinian (emperor), Status of mothers, 467
Juvencus (poet), *Historia evangelica,* 93 f.
Juventinus, St. (soldier), 208

Kashas in Persia (*See* Bakasa)
Kyrie eleison, at mass, 441

Labarum, 420
Labor, Manual (*See* Manual labor)
Laboring work, Sundays, 458
Laetare Sunday, 460
Landowners, and tenants, 232
As *coloni,* 480
Lampsacus (Greece), Marcian bishop, 333
Laodicea (Asia Minor), Council of, on subdeacons, 431
George bishop, 165
Schismatic Church, 302
Lapsi, Nicene canons on the, 57
Lateran Basilica, election of Pope Boniface I, 483
Eulalius (antipope), 484
Pope Hilary, 607
St. Fabiola, 449
Lateran, Council of (1215), and Council of Constantinople, 344
Patriarchate of Constantinople, 503 note
Latin language, St. Epiphanius, 268
Latria (worship), 462
Lauds, canonical hour, 455
At Jerusalem, 455
Peregrinatio Silviae, 455
Lausiac History (by Palladius), 324, 531
Law, Criminal, 471 f.
Roman, Christian influence upon, 80-82
"Lawmaker of the monastic life," 531
Lawrence, St., 533
Lawrence in Lucina, Basilica of St., 232
Lawyers, Excessive fees of, 232
Lazarus (bishop of Aix), denounces Pelagius, 520
Pelagianism, 523
Lectors, Boys as, 433
Custodians of the sacred Books, 433
Duties of, 433
Pope Damasus' father, 434
Pope Liberius, 434
Pope Siricius, 434
Pulpit, 433
St. Eusebius of Vercelli, 434
St. Felix of Nola, 434
Schola cantorum, 434
Schola lectorum, 434
Legal penalties, branding 472
Combat, 472
Constantine, 472
Crucifixion, 472

Lemellef (Africa), Donatist violence at, 197
Lent, Catechumens in, 446
Liturgy of, 460
Leo the Great, St. (pope), 570 ff., 595 ff.
Ability of, 569
Arles, vicariate apostolic, 597
Attila, 569, 599 f.
Aurelius (bishop of Carthage), 570
Born at Rome, 570
Bossuet on, 601
Bourdaloue on, 601
Correspondence of, 603
Cursus Leoninus, 597
Date of Easter, 604
Death of, 606
Dioscorus writes to, 579
Emperor Valentinian III, 591
Genseric and, 599
In Gaul, 570
Julian, legate at Constantinople, 595
Julian of Eclanum, 570
Leonian Sacramentary, 605
Letter to Anastasius, papal vicar, 597; to Emperor Marcian, 596
Literary style of, 597, 601
Liturgy, 604 f.
Monasticism, 598
Nominal Christians denounced, 602
On Priscillianism, 308
Pagan holidays, 604
Patriarchate of Constantinople, 593
Reforms of, 597
St. Cassian, 570
St. Paul's Basilica, 605
St. Peter's Basilica, 605
Sermon before Valentinian III, 591
Sermons of, 601
Tome, 586
Leonian Sacramentary, 605
Leontius (bishop of Arles, heretic), and Bishop Hermes, 608
And St. Eustathius, 64 note
Lerins (island), St. Honoratus, 529
Lerins monastery, and Creed of St. Athanasius, 530 note
Faustus of Riez at, 541
St. Hilary of Arles, 530
St. Lupus, 530
St. Patrick, 540
St. Vincent, 530, 542 f.
Salvian, 530
School of theology, 530
Lesbos (island), Aetius' estate on, 195
Letter to a Young Widow (by St. Chrysostom), 326, 330
Letter to Bishop Alexander (by Arius), 21
Letters, Commendatory, 446
Libanius (rhetorician), and Theodosius, 402
Julian the Apostate, 213
Teacher of St. Chrysostom, 417
Liber capitulorum (by Pelagius), 510
Liber imperfectus de Genesi ad litteram (by St. Augustine), 414
Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum (by St. Jerome), 381
Liberian Basilica, 566
Liberius, St. (pope), Alleged defection of, 169-172
Alleged letter to St. Athanasius, 151
Antipope Felix, 172
Attitude to Council of Alexandria (362), 192 note
Baptizes St. Jerome, 262
Calumniation of St. Athanasius, 150 f.
Constantius, 155
Courage of, 155 f.
Declaration at Council of Sirmium, 170, 175
Demophilus, 170
Epitaph, 230
Eusebius (eunuch), 155 f.
Exiled, 165
Exiled to Beroea, 156, 229
General decrees, 229 f.
Homoousios, 169
Lector, 434
Letter *Studens pacis,* 151 and note
Letter to Constantius, 153
Memorial in defense of Athanasius, 151
Not represented at Council of Rimini, 175
Praised by St. Epiphanius and St. Ambrose, 171
Rejects St. Athanasius, 171
Rejects Symbol of Nike, 177
Repentant Arians, 177, 193
Returns to Rome, 171 f.
Roman primacy, 229
St. Athanasius, 149
St. Marcellina, 257
Semi-Arians, 171
Seized, 155
Signs formula of Sirmium, 170, 175

Siricius, deacon, 365
Vincent's defection, 153
Libya (Africa), Arius born in, 10
Patriarchate of Alexandria, 427
St. Asterius exiled to, 130
St. Macarius exiled to, 130
See of Alexandria, 58
Licinius (emperor), defeated by Constantine, 24
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 20, 62
Murder of, 79
Pagan practices of, 3
Lidorius (*See* Litorius)
Life of Paul of Thebes (by St. Jerome), 254
Life of St. Antony (by St. Athanasius), 159; translated by Evagrius, 254 note
Life of St. Honoratus (by St. Hilary), 541
Ligugé (France), Monastery at, 288 f.
Liguria (province), St. Ambrose governor of, 257
Literature, Christian, 91 ff.
Litorius, St. (bishop of Tours), 289
Liturgical development, 453 ff.
Liturgical feasts, 95
Liturgical week, 457-459
Fast days, 457
Saturday, fast day, 457
Wednesday, fast day, 457
Liturgical year, 459-462
Christmas cycle, 459
Date of Christmas, 459 f.
Easter cycle, 459
Epiphany, 460
New feasts, 459
Liturgy, 438 f.
Ambrosian, 364 f.
Armenian, 439
At Antioch, 438 f.
Caesarea, 439
Constantinople, 439
Easter, 461
Gallican, 365
Gaul, 439
Of Lent, 460
Persian, 439
Roman, 365, 439
St. Leo the Great, 604 f.
Syriac, 438
Local councils, Papal confirmation of, 428
Local divinities, 4 note
Locoteiacus (*See* Ligugé)
Logos, The, in Philo, 13
Logos (*See* also Christ)
Lombards, Arianism among, 282
In Italy, 571
Loup, St. (*See* Lupus)
Low mass, in fourth century, 445
Lucian of Antioch, St. (priest), Adoptionism, 9
Arianism, 7
Baronius on, 9 note
Basilica of, 65 note
"Collucianists," 9
Disciples of, 9
Eudoxius, 234
Feast of, 9 note
Festivities in honor of, 65
Orthodoxy of, 8
Sabellianism, 9
St. Alexander, 9
St. Athanasius, 9
St. Chrysostom on, 9 note
St. Epiphanius on, 9 note
School of Antioch, 548
Supposed Creed of, 9
Text of Septuagint, 8
Lucifer, St. (bishop of Cagliari), Council of Alexandria (362), 194
Council of Milan, 154, 176
De non consentiendo cum haereticis, 176
De regibus apostaticis, 176
Exiled, 154; to Cappadocia, 176; to Celesyria, 176; to Comagenia, 176; to Egypt, 176; to Palestine, 176
Hatred for Arians, 177
Luciferians, 352
Recalled from exile, 190
Repentant Arians, 193, 351 f.
Luciferians (heretics), 351 f.
At Rome, 352
Attitude to apostates, 352
Doctrines of, 352
Hilary (deacon), 352
Lucifer of Cagliari, 352
Repentant Arians, 352
St. Jerome's *Dialogue against the*, 352
Schism of the, 194
Theodosius, 351
Valentinian II, 351
Lucius, St. (bishop of Adrianople), exiled, 130
Lucius (Arian), expulsion of monks, 237

Ludi apollinares, 604
Luke, St., Relics of, 462
Lupus, St. (bishop of Troyes), at Lerins monastery, 530
In Britain, 540
Lusarovich (*i. e.,* Gregory the Illuminator)
Lusitania (Spain), Pope Siricius, 366
Lutetia, Julian proclaimed Augustus at, 181
Luther, Jovinianus precursor of, 353
Priscillian precursor of, 309
Lydda(*i. e.,* Diospolis)
Lyons, Gratian assassinated at, 358
St. Eucherius bishop, 530
St. Martin bishop, 290
Verissimus bishop, 117

Macarius, St. (bishop of Jerusalem), letter from Constantine, 98
Macarius, St. (bishop of Petra in Palestine), at Council of Sardica, 117
Exiled to Libya, 130
Macarius (priest of Alexandria), and Ischyras, 70
Macarius (priest), at Constantinople, 77 note
At Council of Tyre, 72
Macarius (imperial legate), in Africa, 135
Macedonia, Bishops of, and Bishop Bonosus, 401
Patriarchate of Rome, 428
Macedonianism (heresy), Arianism, 18
Condemned, 297
Council of Constantinople, 345
Decline of, 303
Faustus refutes, 541
In Bithynia, 184
In Constantinople, 184
In Thrace, 184
Ulfilas, 281
Macedonians (heretics), Council of Alexandria (362), 193; of Constantinople (381), 333, 340
Eustathius of Sebaste, 188
Macedonius, 173
Nicene Creed, 340
Pneumatomachi, 182
Withdraw from Council of Constantinople, 340
Macedonius (bishop of Constantinople, heretic), 189, 235
Council of Sardica, 117
Election of, 113
Election of Paul as bishop, 106
Exiled, 178
Joins semi-Arians, 173
Leader of Pneumatomachi, 182
Macedonius (bishop of Mopsuestia), at Sirmium, 148
Macrina, St., 219
Macrostic Creed, 131 f.
And St. Athanasius, 132
Council of Antioch (344), 131 f.
Madaura (Africa), St. Augustine, 390
Magi in Persia, 88, 126
Magic, Laws against, 137 f.
Priscillian charged with, 310 f.
Magicians, 3
Julian the Apostate, 209
Magnentius (usurper), 147
And death of Constans, 145 note
Maipherkad (Persia), St. Maruta bishop, 126 note
Major orders, Ordination to, 434 f.
Manichaeans (heretics), Books of, burned, 571
Driven from Africa, 571
Immorality of, 571
In Italy, 571
In Rome, 482, 571
Laws against, 572
St. Augustine, 391, 413 f.
Manichaeism, (heresy), condemned, 297
Determinism in, 510
Doctrine of, 391
Form of paganism, 510
Pelagius opposes, 510
Priscillian, 309
St. Augustine, 390 f.
St. Augustine accused of, 524
St. Jerome charged with, 382
Vagueness of, 6, 308
Manner of Reading the Profane Authors (by St. Basil), 203
Mans (France), St. Victorinus bishop, 290
Mansionarii, 426
Manual labor, Aristotle, 435
Attitude to, 473
Christian influence, 436
Clergy, 435
Frankish Church, 436
Monasteries, 474
Monks, 435

Slaves, 435
Marathonians (heretics), Pneumatomachi, 182
Marathonius (bishop of Nicomedia, heretic), leader of Pneumatomachi, 182
Marcella, St. (Roman widow), St. Albina mother of, 355
St. Jerome, 356, 358
Scripture study, 355
Study of Greek and Hebrew, 356
Marcella (virgin), and St. Athanasius, 115
Marcellians, Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Marcellina, St., at Rome, 257
Becomes nun, 257
Estates of St. Ambrose, 258
Pope Liberius, 257
Marcellinus (magistrate), St. Jerome, 356
Marcellinus (tribune), Conference of Carthage, 506 f.
Marcellinus, Ammianus (*See* Ammianus)
Marcellus (bishop of Ancyra), at Rome, 109
Attitude of St. Athanasius to, 43, 132
Charge of Sabellianism, 43, 74
Condemned by Council of Constantinople (336), 76; by pseudo-council of Philippopolis, 122
Council of Nicaea, 37, 42 f., 74, 114; of Sardica, 116 f.; of Tyre, 74
Denounced to the pope, 109
Eusebius of Caesarea's books against, 75, 107
Friend of St. Athanasius, 114
Nicene doctrines, 112
Orthodoxy of, 75 and note
Photinus disciple of, 114
Rehabilitation of, 114
Restored, 109
St. Athanasius, 236
Trinitarian doctrine, 75
Vindicated at Council of Sardica, 119
Marcellus (bishop of Campania), Council of Arles, 153
Papal legate, 151
Marcellus (consul), 228
Marcian (bishop of Lampsacus, heretic), at Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Marcian (emperor), convokes Council of Chalcedon, 592
Empress Pulcheria marries, 569
Letter from Pope Leo, 596
Timothy Aelurus, 596
Marcian (Novatian), Emperor Valens, 301
Marcina (princess), St. Cyril appeals to, 554
Marcionism, 308
Marculus (Donatist priest), Death of, 135
Marcus (*See* Mark)
Mardonius (eunuch), preceptor of Julian, 180
Maris (bishop of Ardaschir), 573
Maris (bishop of Chalcedon, heretic), Council of Nicaea, 37, 48
Emperor Julian, 217 f.
Foe of St. Athanasius, 218
Homoiousios, 49 f.
Trinitarian doctrine, 115
Marius Victor (rhetorician), 532
Marjorian (emperor), 606
Mark, St. (evangelist), Church of Alexandria, 278
Patriarchate of Alexandria, 593
Mark, St. (pope), St. Athanasius, 100
Mark, St. (bishop of Arethusa), at Sirmium, 148
Council of Sardica, 117
Fourth formula of Sirmium, 174
Leader of Anomoeans, 174
Torture of, 206
Trinitarian doctrine, 115
Mark (bishop of Calabria), at Council of Nicaea, 37 note
Mark the Hermit, Writings of, 532
Marmoutier monastery, 289; St. Patrick at, 540
Mars Vincius, Worship of, 284 note
Marseilles (France), monastery of St. Victor, 530 f.
Martha, St. (Persian nun), 144 f.
Martin, St. (bishop of Lyons), 290
Martin, St. (bishop of Tours), 285-292
Apostle of Gaul, 225
At Amiens, 286
At Milan, 287
At Poitiers, 288
At Treves, 311
Baptized, 286
Becomes bishop of Tours, 289

Born at Sabaria, 285
Church and State, 292
Consecration of Bishop Felix, 311 f.
Death of Priscillian, 472
Educated at Pavia, 285
Exorcist, 287
Idacius' charges against, 310
In Pannonia, 287
Ithacius, 311
Marmoutier monastery, 289
Maximus (emperor), 311, 374
Missionary activities, 289
Mistreated by Arians, 287
Monastery at Ligugé, 288 f.
Monasticism, 464
On Insula Gallinaria, 287
Rural parishes, 290
St. Hilary, 287 f.
St. Paulinus, 386
Soldier, 286
Spread of Catholic doctrine, 279
Sulpicius Severus, disciple of, 290
Martin, Basilica of St. Sylvester and St., 100
Martyropolis (*See* Maipherkad)
Martyrs, Cult of, 461
Maruta, *alias* Maruthas, St. (bishop of Maipherkad), *Acts of the Persian Martyrs*, 126 note
Mary, St. (Mother of Christ), Cult of, 461; in communities of virgins, 462
Helvidius, 352 f.
Perpetual virginity of, 352 f.
St. Cyril honors, 548
St. Epiphanius' devotion to, 270
St. Jerome on perpetual virginity of, 353
Mary, St. (Persian nun), Martyrdom of, 144 f.
Mass, 439-445
Acolytes at, 432 f.
Acts of martyrs, 439
Alleluia, 441
Altar curtains, 444
Amen, 441
Anaphora, 441
Archdeacon at, 432
Attendance at, on Sundays, 458
Bible passages, 439
Catechumens at, 432
Catechumens dismissed, 440
Communion, 444 f.
Consecration, 443 note
Deacon, minister of communion, 444
Deacons at, 431, 442
Doctrine at St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 141
Dominus vobiscum, 441
Energumeni dismissed, 440
Epiklesis, 443 note
Epistle read by subdeacon, 432
Ite missa est, 440 note
Kyrie eleison, 441
Letters read, 439
Low, in fourth century, 445
Of the catechumens, 439 f.; of the faithful, 439 f.
Offertory, 442
Penitents at, 432
Preface at, 443
Priest, minister of communion, 444
Private, in fourth century, 445
Psalmody, 441
Psalms, 439
Secreta at, 442
Sermon at, 440
Solemn, 445
Species, communion in both, 444
Subdeacons, 433
Unbelievers dismissed, 440
"Mass," 440 note
Massacre, at Thessalonica, 376-379
Maternus, Firmicus, astrology, 123
De errore profanarum religionum, 136 f.
Mathesis (by Maternus), 136
Matins, 459
At Jerusalem, 455
Peregrinatio Silviae, 455
Matrimony, blessing of ring and crown, 453
Cabrol on, 452
Ceremonies, 452 f.
Crown, 452
Ring, 452
Veil, 452
Mauretania Caesariensis (African province), 198
Mauretania Sitifensis (African province), Donatist violence in, 197
Maurilius, St. (bishop of Angers), 290
Maximian, St. (bishop of Bagai), attacked by Donatists, 506
Maximian (bishop of Constantinople), 565 f.
Maximian (bishop of Synosades), Council of Ephesus (499), 589

Maximianists (Donatist sect), 504 note, 507
Maximinus, St. (bishop of Treves), at Council of Sardica, 117
Friend of St. Athanasius, 117
Maximinus, St. (soldier), Martyrdom of, 208
Maximus, St. (bishop of Jerusalem), 140
Maximus (emperor), Altar of Victory, 359-361
At Treves, 311, 374
Death of Gratian, 358
Executed, 375
Execution of Priscillian, 374
In Gaul, 311
Invades Italy, 375
Ithacius appeals to, 311
Murder of Gratian, 374
St. Ambrose, 359, 374
St. Martin, 311, 374
Theodosius, 407
Theodosius defeats, 375
Valentinian II, 359, 373-375
Maximus (favorite of Emperor Julian), 212
Maximus the Cynic, Consecration of, 316
Council of Constantinople (381), 318, 334 f., 343
Peter (bishop of Alexandria), 316
St. Gregory Nazianzen, 315 f.
Medicine, Aetius studies, 166
Megalius (primate of Numidia), consecrates St. Augustine, 504
Melania the Elder, St. (matron), 228; at Jerusalem, 303
Emancipation of slaves, 469
Origenist controversy, 489, 491
Pelagius, 513
St. Jerome, 489
Meletian Schism (Africa), 19, 27
Arius, 10
Callinicus (bishop of Pelusium), 53
Council of Nicaea, 51-53
Meletian Schism (Antioch), 335 ff.
Council of Capua, 401; of Constantinople (381), 337
Meletius, 335
Paulinus, 335
Meletians (heretics), and John Arkaph, 71
Appeal to Constantine, 62
Charges against St. Athanasius, 70
Favored by Eusebius of Nicomedia, 62
In Africa, 52
In Alexandria, 52
Meletius, St. (bishop of Antioch), 186
At Council of Constantinople (381), 333 f.
Character of, 335
Death of, 335 f.
Dissension regarding, 186
Divinity of Christ, 186
Exiled, 186
Homoousios, 186
Pact with Paulinus, 336 f.
Recalled from exile, 190
Resigns as bishop of Sebaste, 186
St. Jerome, 266
Teacher of St. Chrysostom, 271
Theodosius, 334
Vitalis (priest), 302
Meletius (bishop of Lycopolis, heretic), at Alexandria, 51
Decision of Nicene Council regarding, 52 f.
Disciples at Council of Nicaea, 51
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 53
Excommunicated, 19
Melotes, Basilian habit, 463
Memnon, St. (bishop of Ephesus), Council of Ephesus, 562
Imprisoned, 564
Memphis (Egypt), St. Athanasius at, 196
Mercury, Worship of, 284 note
Mercury-Adsmerius, Worship of, 284 note
Merida (Spain), Idacius bishop, 310
Meropius (philosopher), journey to the Indies, 84
Mesopotamia, Audians in, 55
Julian's army in, 225
Patriarchate of Antioch, 427
St. Eustathius, 64
St. Paul (bishop of Constantinople), exiled to, 107, 113
Treatment of Christians in, 125
Messalians (heretics), 301 f.
Amphilochius condemns the, 302
Flavian (bishop) condemns the, 302
In Asia Minor, 302
Metropolitans, 427
And Patriarchs, 428
And simple bishops, 428
Jurisdiction of, 422
Milan (Italy), Arians in, 362-364

Auxentius of Milan, bishop, 231, 255, 362
Auxentius Junior, intruding bishop, 362
Edict of, 3
Eugenius at, 408 f.
Funeral of Valentinian II, 405 f.
Gratian at, 318 f., 358
High Basilica, 362
Imperial capital, 226-229
Justina at, 359, 362 f., 374
Liturgy, 439
Made metropolitan see, 428
Maximus at, 375
New Basilica, 364
Portian Basilica, 362
Psalmody at, 441
St. Ambrose bishop, 254, 258, 391
St. Augustine at, 391 f.
St. Dionysius bishop, 154
St. Martin at, 287
Theodosius at, 412
Valentinian I at, 231
Valentinian II at, 359
Milan, Councils of:
(344), condemns Photinus, 132
(347), condemns Photinus, 148
(355), 153 f.; dominated by Constantius, 153 f.; St. Lucifer of Cagliari at, 176
Mile, Roman, 288 note
Mileve (Africa), Faustus bishop, 391
St. Optatus bishop, 255
Mileve, Council of (416), St. Augustine presides at, 522
Orosius, 522
Military service, Sundays, 458
Mincio (river), Pope Leo and Attila, 599
Minerva (goddess), Julian's regard for, 210
Minor orders, Conferring of, 426, 434
Mirabella (*i. e.*, Eclanum)
Miter, Episcopal, 424
Mithraism, in Gaul, 284
Julian the Apostate, 211
Vagueness of, 6
Moesia (*See* Mysia)
Monad, in Marcellus' doctrine, 75
Monasticism, 462-464
Asylum to slaves, 469
Bonosus, 464
Care of the poor, 464
Compline (office), 464
Eustathius of Sebaste, 188, 463
Helvidius, 464
Hospitality, 464, 474
In Africa, 464
In Gaul, 464
In the East, 5
Jovinianus, 464
Lucius, 237
Manual labor, 435, 463 f., 474
Pope Leo the Great, 598
Prime (office), 464
Rule of St. Augustine, 529; of St. Basil, 463; of St. Benedict, 463
St. Ambrose, 464
St. Athanasius, 464
St. Augustine, 464, 527
St. Basil, 246-248, 463
St. Cassian, 530 f.
St. Chrysostom, 273
St. Eusebius of Vercelli, 464
St. Jerome, 464
St. Jerome's defense of, 464
St. Martin, 464
St. Vincent of Lerins, 542
Secular clergy, 464
Study of, by St. Athanasius, 196
Valens' decree against, 237
Vigilantius, 464
Monica, St., at Milan, 391
Death of, 394
St. Augustine, 389, 392 f., 395
Monks, in Egypt, 463
Number of, 463
Monks, Letters to the (by St. Athanasius), 159
Monophysites (heretics), Apollinaris precursor of, 348
Council of Chalcedon, 593
Separate from the "Cyrillians," 594
Monophysitism (heresy), 574
Dioscorus of Alexandria, 578
Doctrines of, 594 note
Eusebius of Dorylaeum opposes, 581
Redemption, 579
Timothy Aelurus, 609
Montanism (heresy), Divisions of, 6
Sects in Phrygia, 301
Morals, Pagan, 357
Weakening of Christian, 6
Morgan (*i. e.*, Pelagius)
Morning Hymn (by St. Hilary), 164
Mosaics, 435, 438

Mosul (Mesopotamia), St. Aphraates at, 143
Mothers, Status of, 467
Mursa (Greece), Valens bishop, 152, 165
Music (*See* Psalmody)
Musonius (count), at Council of Antioch, 117
At Council of Sardica, 117
Mysia (Greece), Arianism in, 280
Goths invade, 279
Represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Ulfilas in, 281
Mystagogical catechesis, 140
Mythology, Celtic, in Gaul, 284
Greco-Roman, in Gaul, 284

Narbonne (France), Aprunculus governor, 212
Rusticus bishop, 608
Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Narcissus (bishop of Neronias), Trinitarian doctrine, 115
Narses, St. (bishop of Sahrgerd), Death of, 144
Nativity, Basilica of the, 97
Nazianzus (Asia Minor), St. Gregory Nazianzen the Elder bishop, 218
Nectarius, St. (bishop of Constantinople), 339 f.
Council of Constantinople (383), 350
President of Council of Constantinople (381), 340
Priests penitentiary, 450
Nemausus, Worship of, 284 note
Neocaesarea (Asia Minor), St. Basil at, 220
Neonicenism, St. Basil, 245 note
Neoplatonism, Arianism, 17 f.
In Alexandria, 15
Julian the Apostate, 181, 210
Vagueness of, 6
Nepotian, St. (priest), Death of, 491
Letter from St. Jerome, 491
St. Heliodorus, uncle of, 491
St. Jerome on death of, 491 f.
Nepotian (grandson of Constantine), 147
Neronias, Narcissus bishop, 115
Nerses (*See* Narses)
Nestorianism (heresy), 550 ff.
And Arianism, 7, 18
At Edessa, 572
Council of Rome (430) condemns, 553
St. Cyril denounces, 552 f.
St. Leo's *Tome,* 586
School of Edessa, 573
Spread of, 571
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 550
Nestorians, in Persia, 594
Theotokos, 594
Nestorius, 550 ff.
Apollinarianism attacked by, 551
At Council of Ephesus, 556 f.
Bazaar of Heracleides, 568, 578
Becomes bishop of Constantinople, 550
Calumnies against St. Cyril, 552
Character of, 557
Closes Arian chapel, 551
Correspondence with St. Cyril, 552 f.
Council of Ephesus condemns, 558-560
Deposed, 565
Divinity of Christ, 548, 551
Exegete, 550
Exiled, 568
Imperial court friendly to, 554
Imprisoned, 564
Macedonians, 551
Monk at Antioch, 550
Novatians escape rigor of, 551
Quartodecimans, 551
Sustains Anastasius, 551
Theodore of Mopsuestia, teacher of, 521
New Basilica (Milan), 364
Nicaea (Asia Minor), Location of, 28
Theognis bishop, 113
Nicaea, Council of (325), 28-60
Alexander (priest) at, 30
Apollinaris the Younger at, 184
Arian baptism, 366
Arianism, 41-51
Arianism condemned, 103, 345
Arius at, 32, 38, 41
Arius' audacity, 39
Arrival of bishops, 30
Caecilian at, 37 note
Canons (*See* Nicene canons)
Clerical celibacy, 57 note
Constantine at, 34-36, 42, 50
Constantine's attitude, 38, 40 f., 45
Convoked by Constantine, 27
Creed (*See* Nicene Creed)
Creed proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea, 45; by Eusebius of Nicomedia, 44 f.
Date of, 34
Decision regarding Meletius, 52 f.

Disciples of Meletius at, 51
Disciplinary canons, 55-59
Domnus (bishop of Stridon) at, 37 note
Easter controversy, 53-55
Election of bishops, 58
Eusebius of Caesarea at, 38 f.
Eusebius of Nicomedia at, 37, 39, 48
Extant documents of, 45 note
First meeting, 31 f.
Freedom of discussion, 42
Hermogenes secretary of, 49
John (a Persian) at, 31
Legates of Pope Sylvester, 31
Letter of Convocation, 28 f.
Marcellus of Ancyra at, 37, 42 f., 74
Maris (bishop of Chalcedon) at, 37, 48
Mark (bishop of Calabria) at, 37 note
Means of travel, 29
Meletian Schism, 51-53
Moderate party at, 38
Number of bishops, 30 note
Opening of, 34-36
Pagan philosophers at, 32-34
Papal legate, 36 f.
Parties in, 37 f.
Paul (bishop of Neocaesarea) at, 30
Place of meeting, 31
Pope Sylvester, 27 note
Preëminence of certain Churches, 58
Presiding officer, 36 f.
Priests and others attending, 29
Procedure, 40 f.
Restoration of the Holy Places, 96
St. Alexander (of Alexandria) at, 33, 37
St. Aristakes (Armenian bishop) at, 86
St. Athanasius at, 33, 37, 39, 42-44
St. Eustathius at, 35 note
St. Hosius at, 31, 36 f.
St. James (bishop of Nisibis) at, 30
St. Nicasius at, 37 note
St. Paphnutius at, 30
St. Spiridion at, 30
Secundus (bishop of Ptolemais) at, 48
See of Jerusalem, 489 note
Synodal letter, 54
Tactics of Eusebius of Nicomedia, 44
Theognis (bishop of Nicaea) at, 48
Theonas (bishop of Marmarica) at, 48
Theophilus (Gothic bishop) at, 31, 90, 279
Victor (*i. e.*, Vitus, priest) at, 37 note
Vincent (priest) at, 31, 36 f.
Vitus (priest) at, 31, 36 f.
Nicaea-Constantinople Creed, 345
Filioque in, 563
Nicasius, St. (bishop of Die), at Council of Nicaea, 37 note
Nice in Thrace (*See* Nike)
Nicene Canons, and canons of Sardica, 485
Election of bishops, 58
Exclusion from sacred orders, 56
Hefele on, 56
Powers of the clergy, 57
Readmission of Novatians, 57
Self-mutilation, 56
Subintroductae, 56
The *lapsi*, 57
Nicene Creed, Authors of, 48 and note
Constantine upholder of, 61, 77, 149
Council of Ephesus (431), 562 f.
Homoousios in the, 46-48
Macedonians, 340
Secundus of Ptolemais, 49
Text of, 49
Theonas (bishop of Marmarica), 49
Nicetas (bishop of Remesiana), *Te Deum*, 394 note
Nicomachus Flavian (prefect), Eugenius, 408
Paganism in Rome, 410
Nicomedia (Asia Minor), Constantius at, 31
Eusebius bishop, 20
Gerontius bishop, 327
Imperial capital, 20
Marathonius bishop, 182
St. Athanasius at, 70
Nike, Symbol of, and Council of Constantinople (360), 177
Nilus "the Elder," St. (monk), Writings of, 531
Nimes (France), Pagan cults at, 284 note
"Nine deaths," Torture of the, 128 f.
Nisibis (Mesopotamia), Barsumas bishop, 585 note
St. Ephrem born in, 221
School of, 594
Nocera (Italy), Felix bishop, 483
Nocturns, 455

Nola (Italy), St. Paulinus bishop, 290, 383-388
Nominal Christians, 6
Non consentiendo cum haereticis, De (by St. Lucifer of Cagliari), 176
None, canonical hour, 455
  In Jerusalem, 456
Nonna, St., mother of St. Gregory Nazianzen, 218
Noricum (Greece), represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Nosocomium, 474
Notaries, Office of, 426
Notitia dignitatum utriusque imperii, 422 note
Novatians (heretics), 188 f.
  Escape rigor of Nestorius, 551
  Julian the Apostate, 189
  Nicene canons on readmission of, 57
  St. Chrysostom, 497
  St. Cyril's attitude to, 547
  Valens, 301
Numidia, Donatists dominant in, 504
Nyssa (Asia Minor), St. Gregory bishop, 254
Nyssa, St. Gregory of (*See* Gregory)

Oak, Synod of the (403), 498 ff.
  St. Cyril of Alexandria at, 547
  Theophilus of Alexandria at, 547
Oasis of Egypt, Nestorius exiled to, 568
Occultism, Emperor Julian, 209
Oceanus (Roman priest), St. Jerome, 356
Odoacer, becomes ruler of Italy, 610
  Romulus Augustulus pensioned by, 611
Offertorium, at mass, 442
Offertory, in the mass, 442
Office, Daily, 455
  Sunday, 458
Old Testament, translation by St. Jerome, 381
Olivet basilica, 97
Olympias, St. (matron), St. Chrysostom's letters to, 502
Omens, Evil, 5
Omoeans, *i. e.*, Acacians
Omoios, Meaning of, 176
  Used by Acacians, 176
On Compunction (by St. Chrysostom), 270, 272
On Consolation to Stagirius (by St. Chrysostom), 330 f.
On Order (by St. Augustine), 394 f.
On the Government of God (by Salvian), 534, 538
On the Holy Ghost (by Didymus), 325
On the Priesthood (by St. Chrysostom), 325-330
On the Trinity (by Didymus), 325; (by Pelagius), 510
Onesiphorus (bishop of Iconium), Council of Ephesus (449), 589
Optatus, St. (bishop of Milevis), account of Donatist violence, 197 f.
  History of the Donatist Schism, 255
Optatus (Donatist bishop of Timgad), 504
Optatus (patrician), Assassination of, 101
Orange (France), Council of, 539
  Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Orarium (stole), 431
Orders, Exclusion from sacred, 56
Ordination, age for bishops, 435
  Age for priests, 435
  Anointing of hands, 435
  Deacons, 435
  Major orders, 434 f.
  Minor orders, 434
  Priests, 435
  Subdeacons, 434 f.
Oresiesus, St. (*See* Horsisius)
Orestes (prefect), St. Cyril's conflict with, 547
Orient (*See* East)
Oriental (*See* Eastern)
Origen, and Origenists, 9
  Arianism, 12
  Character of, 494
  Epiphanius' attitude to, 486
  Eustathius' attitude to, 486
  Hexapla, 355
  Homilies, 493
  Peri Arkon, 269, 493
  Preëxistence of souls, 486
  Principia, translated by St. Jerome, 494
  Rufinus studies, 486
  St. Chrysostom's admiration for, 498
  St. Epiphanius, opponent of, 269
  St. Gregory of Nyssa's attitude to, 486
  St. Gregory Thaumaturgus' attitude to, 486
  St. Jerome studies, 486
  St. Jerome's attitude to, 495

St. Pamphilus' *Apology*, 493
School of Alexandria, 204
"Theotokos," 270
Origenism, condemned, 496
Eusebius of Caesarea, 21
Pope Anastasius I, 482
Origenist controversy, 485 ff.
Aterbius, 487
Pope Anastasius, 496
Pope Siricius, 491, 495
Rufinus, 494 f.
St. Chrysostom, 486
St. Epiphanius, 488
St. Jerome, 486, 495
St. Melania the Elder, 489
St. Paula, 489
Theophilus of Alexandria, 490, 495-497
Origenists, and Origen, 9
Writings of St. Gregory of Nyssa, 323
Original sin, Caelestius, 511, 514 ff.
Pope Zosimus, 524
St. Augustine, 512, 519
St. Jerome, 519
Orontius (bishop), Nestorius, 563
Orosius, Paulus (Spanish priest), 515 ff.
At Council of Jerusalem, 519 f.
Disciple of St. Augustine, 516
Historia adversus paganos (*Universal History*), 538
In Palestine, 518
Leaves Spain, 515
On Priscillianism, 308
Pelagian controversy, 516
St. Augustine and St. Jerome, 516 ff.
Universal History, 516
Orphanages, 474
Orphanotrophium, 474
Orsisius, St. (*See* Horsisius)
Osrhoene (Mesopotamia), patriarchate of Antioch, 427
Ossabona (Spain), Ithacius bishop, 311
Ostiarii (minor order), Duties of, 433
Ostrogoths, Arianism in Italy, 282
In Gaul, 599 f.
Ousia, Council of Alexandria (362), 193
Meaning of, 104, 167, 193 f.

Pachomius, St. (monk), 268, 463
And St. Athanasius, 68 f.
Paenula, bishop's dress, 435
"Pagan," Meaning of, 283
Pagan holidays, Leo the Great, 604
Pagan morals, 357
Pagan philosophers, at Council of Nicaea, 32-34
Pagan priesthood, 212
Under Emperor Julian, 213
Pagan superstitions, 3 f.
Pagan temples, Property of, 231
Pagan tombs, at Rome, 138
Paganism, attitude of Constans, 124
Attitude of Constantius, 124
Closing of temples, 180
Condition of, 3-6
Danger of, 136 f.
Disbelief in the gods, 4
Heruli, 571
Hierarchy of, 212
Huns, 571
Imperial policy, 224
In Gaul, 283-285
In Palestine, 5
In public life, 4
In Rome, 410
In the schools, 123
Julian's, 210-213
Laws against, 297, 400
Of heresies, 6
Official, 465
Persistence of, 84, 179, 509 f.
Public schools, 466
Restoration of, 209
Revival of, 123
Revival by Emperor Julian, 201
Ridiculed by Maternus, 136 f.
Speculative, 4
Valentinian, 231
Palestine, Alypius in, 416
And Arabia, 5
And Phenicia, 5
Arian council in, 24
Flavian's followers, 351
Holy Places in, 96
Paganism in, 5
Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 427, 489 note
Pelagius in, 513 f., 518
Rufinus in, 487
St. Helena's visit to, 96-98
Palladius (bishop of Helenopolis), *Lausiac History*, 324, 531
Praises St. Asella, 356
Palladius (Illyrian bishop, heretic), Arianism, 346
Condemned, 346

Pammachius, St., friend of St. Jerome, 382 f.
Letter to St. Jerome, 383
Paulina, wife of, 383
St. Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum*, 382
Pammon (abbot), St. Athanasius, 196
Pamphilus, St. (priest), *Apology for Origen*, 493
Pamphylia (Asia Minor), 268
Panarion (by St. Epiphanius), 255, 269, 348
Pannonia (province), 261
Arianism in, 280
Attila in, 600
St. Martin in, 287
Pannonia, Church of, represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Pantaenus, St., School of Alexandria, 204
Pantheon (Rome), 437 note
Papacy, Authority of (*See* Roman primacy)
Wealth of the, 228 f., 607
Papal legates, at Council of Sardica, 117
Papal see (*See* Papacy)
Paphlagonia (Asia Minor), Novatians in, 301
Paphnutius the Great, St. (African bishop), at Council of Nicaea, 30
Clerical celibacy, 57 note
Paphnutius (hermit), accuser of St. Athanasius, 53
Paris, Pagan cults at, 284 note
Paris, Council of (361), deposes Saturninus, 152
Parishes, in Alexandria, 11
Rural, 430; in Gaul, 291; St. Martin of Tours, 290
Parmenius (bishop of Carthage, heretic), leader of Donatists, 189
Pastry-cooks, Party of the, 303
Patriarch of Antioch, St. Peter (apostle), 593
Patriarch of the West, 427
Patriarchate, of Alexandria, 593
Of Constantinople, 503 note; Council of Chalcedon, 593
Of Jerusalem, 489 note
Patriarchates, 427 f.
Origin of, 278
Pope Damasus, 277 f.
St. Leo the Great, 593
St. Peter, 427
Patriarchs, and metropolitans, 428
Jurisdiction of, 422
Patricians, alms, 227 f.
Influence of, 227 f.
Slaves, 227
Patricius, father of St. Augustine, 389
Patrick, St. (apostle of Ireland), 290, 540 f.
At Lerins monastery, 540
At Marmoutier monastery, 540
Birthplace of, 540
Captured by pirates, 540
Daventry, birthplace of, 540
In monasteries of Gaul, 540
Sent to Ireland, 540
Success of his apostolate, 540
Patroclus (bishop of Arles), and Heros, 522 f.
Lazarus (bishop of Aix), 523
Pope Zosimus influenced by, 522
Patrophilus (bishop of Scythopolis), at Antioch, 66
Paul, St. (bishop of Constantinople), and Bishop Macedonius, 113
Charges against, 107
Deposed, 107
Election of, 77, 106
Exiled, 77, 107, 113
Murder of, 113
Paul, St. (of Rome), Martyrdom of, 207
Paul (bishop of Neocaesarea), at Council of Nicaea, 30
Paul (apostate priest of Persia), 145
Paul (imperial legate), in Africa, 135
Paul of Samosata (bishop of Antioch, heretic), 7 f.
Doctrine of, 114
Homoousios, 47, 170
School of Antioch, 8
Paula, St. (Roman widow), 228
Origenist controversy, 489, 491
St. Jerome, 358, 380, 415
St. Pammachius, 383
Paulina, wife of St. Pammachius, 383
Paulinian (brother of St. Jerome), St. Epiphanius ordains, 489
Paulinus, St. (bishop of Nola), 285 note, 290, 383-388, 536
Anicii (gens), 384
Aquitania, 384
At Nola, 385
At Rome, 384

Ausonius, 384, 386
Baptized, 386
Born at Bordeaux, 384
Consul, 384
Conversion of, 389
Cured by St. Martin, 386
Friend of Rufinus, 496
Friends of, 385 f.
Gratian, 384
Letter to Ausonius, 388
Private mass, 445
St. Ambrose, 386
St. Delphinus, 386
St. Felix, 385, 387
St. Jerome, 383, 388
St. Martin, 386
Sidonius Apollinaris, 384
Senator, 386 note
Sulpicius Severus, 386
Teresa, wife of, 385 f.
Trials of, 387
Writings of, 532
Paulinus, St. (bishop of Treves), at Council of Arles, 153
Death of, 153
Exile of, 153, 165
Paulinus (bishop of Antioch), and Eustathians, 186
Consecration of Evagrius, 302
Elevation of, 194
Eustathians, 194
Followers of, at Council of Constantinople (383), 351
Pact with Meletius, 336 f.
St. Jerome, 266
Vitalis, 302
Paulinus (priest), Caelestius denounced by, 515
Disciple of St. Ambrose, 514
Dispute with Caelestius, 514
Paulus Orosius (*See* Orosius)
Pavia (Italy), St. Martin educated at, 285
Pegasius (bishop of Ilius), apostate under Emperor Julian, 199
Pelagianism, 509 ff.
And Arianism, 7, 18
Condemned by Council of Carthage, 523; by Council of Diospolis, 520; by Council of Ephesus, 563; by Council of Rome, 522
End of, 563
Exposition of, by Bishop Julian, 524 f.
Form of paganism, 510
In Britain, 540
Orosius, 516
Pope Boniface I, 484
Pope Innocent I, 482, 522
Pope Zosimus condemns, 524
Prailus (bishop of Jerusalem), 522
Roman Council condemns, 522
St. Augustine's writings against, 515
Stoicism, 510
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 521, 549
Violence of, 521
Pelagians, Readmission of, 572
Pelagius II (pope), Council of Constantinople (381), 343
Pelagius (heretic), 509 ff.
At Council of Diospolis, 520
At Council of Jerusalem, 519 f.
Called also Brito, 509
Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, 510
De induratione cordis Pharaonis, 510
Doctrine of Rufinus, 509
Excommunicated, 521
Heros denounces, 520
In Palestine, 513 f., 518
Lazarus denounces, 520
Leaves Rome, 513
Liber capitulorum, 510
Membership in the Church, 511 note
Morgan, real name of, 509
On the Trinity, 510
Opposes Manichaeism, 510
Pope Zosimus condemns, 523 f.
Pope Zosimus' *Tractoria* against, 483
Probi family, 514
St. Augustine against, 485, 543
St. Jerome's meeting with, 514
Pelusium (Egypt), Callinicus bishop, 53
Penance, Plenary (*See* Plenary)
Penance, Presbyter of, 449
Public, 449
Penance, Sacrament of, absolution, 450
Bishop, minister of, 448
Development of, 451
Grave sins, 448
Lesser sins, 448
Reconciliation of sinners, 448
Penitents, at mass, 432
Public, 460
Reconciliation of, 430
"Pentaglot," The, St. Epiphanius, 268

Pentapolis (Africa), and see of Alexandria, 58
St. Athanasius visits, 68
Pentecost, 461
Baptism at, 445
Pepuza (Phrygia), Montanist sect at, 301
Pepuzians (heretics), 301
Pera, Basilian habit, 463
Peregrinatio Silviae, ceremonies of baptism, 446
Matins and lauds, 455
Sext and None in Jerusalem, 456
Peregrinus (*i. e.,* Vincent of Lerins)
Peri Arkon (by Origen), 269, 493
Condemned, 496
Translated by Rufinus, 493
Perigueux (France), Cult of Apollo-Cobledulitavus at, 284 note
Perpetual penance, apostates, 448 note
Pope Siricius, 448 note
Persecution of Catholics, by Valens, 238
Persecutions, by Julian, 198 f., 208
Persia, Constantine's relations with, 125
Constantius at war with, 115
Early Christianity in, 88
Eutychianism in, 594
Liturgy, 439
Magi in, 88, 126
Missions of, 501
Nestorians in, 594
Religion of, 88
Treatment of Christians, 125 f.
War with Roman Empire, 125
Persia, Church of, Armenia and, 88
Persecutions, 126, 128, 144
St. Hanania, 127
St. James Intercisus, 128
St. Pusaik, 127 f.
St. Simon bar Sabbae, 126-128
St. Tarbo, 128
"Persian sage," St. Aphraates, 143
Persians' School at Edessa, 573
Closing of, 594
Persona, Meaning of, 104
Pessinonte, Martyrs of, 208
Petavio (*See* Pettau)
Peter, St. (apostle), Church of Antioch, 278
Gold offered to Basilica of, 155
Patriarchate of Antioch, 593
Patriarchates, 427
Peter, St. (bishop of Alexandria), and Arius, 10
Excommunicates Meletius, 19
Maximus the Cynic, 316
Trinitarian doctrine, 12
Peter, St. (bishop of Sebaste), at Council of Constantinople (381), 333
Peter Mongus (bishop of Alexandria), 609
Deacon, 596
Peter the Fuller (heretic), bishop of Antioch, 610
Deposed, 610
Peter the Hoarse (*See* Peter Mongus)
Petra in Arabia, Nestorius exiled to, 568
St. Asterius bishop, 130
Petra in Palestine, St. Macarius bishop, 130
Petronius Probus (*See* Probus)
Pettau (in Styria), St. Victorinus bishop, 162 note
Phenicia, and Palestine, 5
Flavian's followers, 351
Patriarchate of Antioch, 427
Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 427 note
Philagrius (prefect), and Gregory of Alexandria, 108
Philip (emperor), 279
Philip (papal legate), at Council of Ephesus, 563 f.
Philip (prefect), Murder of St. Paul (bishop of Constantinople), 113
Philippi (Macedonia), St. Eustathius exiled to, 66
Philippopolis, Pseudo-council of, 121 f.
And Council of Sardica, 121 f.
Encyclical, 122
Marcellus condemned, 122
Pope Julius I condemned, 122
Popular attitude toward, 130
St. Athanasius condemned, 122
St. Hosius condemned, 122
Philo Judaeus (writer), pagan philosophy, 13
St. Ambrose, 320 f.
St. Jerome, 381
Logos, 13
Philosophers, Julian the Apostate, 212
Pagan, at Council of Nicaea, 32-34
Philostorgius, *Ecclesiastical History,* 603
On Arius, 10
Philoxenus, papal legate, 109
At Council of Sardica, 117

Photinians, Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Photinus, bishop of Lyons (*See* Pothinus)
Photinus (bishop of Sirmium, heretic), 148 f.
  Attacked by Eusebians, 114 f.
  Born at Ancyra, 114
  Condemned by Council of Constantinople (381), 149 note; by Council of Milan (344), 132; (347), 148; by Council of Sardica, 148; by Council of Sirmium, 148
  Disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra, 75 note, 114
  Doctrinal views, 132
  Doctrine of the Trinity, 114
  Exiled, 149
  Homoousios, 170
  Letter from Emperor Julian, 195
  Recalled from exile, 190
Phrygia (Asia Minor), Aetius exiled to, 173
  Eunomius exiled to, 173
  Montanist sects in, 301
  Novatians in, 301
  Priscillianists of, 301 note
  St. Hilary exiled to, 163
  St. Paulinus exiled to, 153
  St. Rhodanius exiled to, 163
Physicians, for the poor, 232
Pierius (exegete), Trinitarian doctrine, 12
Pigmentius, St. (priest), Martyrdom of, 207
Pilgrimage of Silvia (*See Peregrinatio*)
Pilgrimages, Pope Damasus, 275
Pilgrims' hospices, 474
Pistus (bishop of Alexandria, heretic), Arians' esteem for, 105
  Deposed, 105, 107 f.
  Election of, 105
Pithysius (Asia Minor), St. Chrysostom on way to, 502
Pityus (*See* Pithysius)
Placidia, Galla (empress), at Rome, 591
  Mother of Valentinian III, 535
Plato (philosopher), expounded by Eunomius, 239 f.
  St. Augustine, 391
  The "Unbegotten," 240
Platonism, School of Alexandria, 7, 546
Plenary penance, 449
  St. Fabiola, 449
Pliny, slave labor, 473
Plotinus (philosopher), expounded by Eunomius, 239
  St. Augustine, 391
Pneumatomachi (heretics), 182-184
  Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
  St. Athanasius, 183
Poets, Christian, 93-95
Poitiers (France), St. Hilary bishop, 160-165
  St. Martin at, 288
  Worship of Mercury-Adsmerius, 284 note
Polychromatic decorations, 438
Pontifex maximus, Constantine and title of, 4, 5 note
  Gratian rejects office of, 239
  Imperial title of, 4 f.
  Julian the Apostate, 212
"Pontiff," 424
Pontiffs, College of, 5
Pontificale, Ordination in, 435
Pontus (Asia Minor), patriarchate of Constantinople, 427
  St. Basil the Elder, 218
  St. Paul of Constantinople exiled to, 77
Poor, Homes for the, 474
Pope, Confirmation of councils by, 428
  Election of, 423 note
  In consecration of bishops, 428
  Patriarch of the West, 427
  Right of appeal to, 484 f.
  Supremacy of (*See* Roman primacy)
"Pope," 424
Popes, List of:
  Sylvester (314-335), 27
  Mark (336), 100
  Julius I (337-352), 101
  Liberius (352-366), 133
  Damasus (366-384), 230
  Siricius (384-398), 365
  Anastasius I (398-401), 481
  Innocent I (402-417), 482
  Zosimus (417-418), 483
  Boniface I (418-422), 483
  Celestine I (422-432), 484
  Sixtus III (432-440), 566
  Leo I (440-461), 570
  Hilary (461-468), 606
  Simplicius (468-483), 609
Popes, Primacy of (*See* Roman primacy)

Porphyry (philosopher), refuted by Eusebius of Caesarea, 20
Porters (minor order), Duties of, 433
Portian Basilica (Milan), 362
Possidius, St. (bishop of Calama), death of St. Augustine, 545
Donatist attack upon, 505 f.
Pothinus, St. (bishop of Lyons), Christianity in Gaul, 282
Poverty, 473
Pozzuoli (*See* Puteoli)
Praeparatio evangelica (by Eusebius of Caesarea), 20
Praetorian prefect, Office of, 422
Prailus (bishop of Jerusalem), Pelagianism, 522
Prayer, Caelestius' doctrine, 511
Daily, by the ascetics, 454
Preface, at mass, 443
Prefect, Praetorian, Office of, 422
Prefecture, political division, 422
Presbyter of penance, 449
Prevalitana (Albania), patriarchate of Rome, 428
Priesthood, St. Chrysostom on, 327-330
Pagan, 212; Emperor Gratian, 239; in Gaul, 283; under Julian, 213
Priests, age for ordination, 435
Anointing at ordination, 435
"Cardinals," 429
Extreme Unction, 430, 451
Functions of, 429
Imposition of hands at ordination, 435
Ordination of, 426, 435
Penitentiary, 449; in Italy, 450; suppressed, 450
Private penance, 449
"Titulars," 429
Primacy, Roman (*See* Roman)
Primate, in Africa, 422 note
Jurisdiction of, 422 note
Prime (canonical hour), monasticism, 464
Origin of, 456 note
Primicerius of the notaries, 427
Primus, St. (deacon), Death of, 197
Principia (by Origen), 494
Priscillian (bishop of Avila, heretic), 310, 345
Born in Spain, 308
Character of, 308
Charge of magic against, 310 f.
Death of, 374, 472
Egyptian Gnosticism, 308
Executed, 311
Exegesis, 309
Idacius denounces, 310
Manichaeism, 309
Roman primacy, 277
Sabellianism, 309
Sulpicius Severus on, 307 f.
Writings of, 308 f.
Priscillianism (heresy), 307-312
Condemned, 297, 310 f.
In Gaul, 571
In Spain, 572
Sulpicius Severus, 285 note
Priscillianists (heretics), appeal to Damasus, 311
Expelled by Gratian, 311
Of Phrygia, 301 note
Priscus, at Julian's court, 213
Prison reform, 472 f.
Private baptism, 449
Private interpretation of Bible, 309
Private mass, in fourth century, 445
Proba (Roman poet), *Centones Virgiliani*, 93
Probi family, Pelagius and, 514
Probus, Petronius (prefect), 228
St. Ambrose, secretary of, 257
Procatechesis (by St. Cyril), 446
Prohaeresius (philosopher), teacher, 205
Promotus (general), and Rufinus, 402
Prosopon, Council of Alexandria (362), 193
Meaning of, 104 note, 193 f.
Prosper of Aquitaine, St., *Chronicon integrum*, 603
Chronicon vulgare, 603
St. Augustine, 544
Proterius (bishop of Alexandria), date of Easter, 604
Massacre of, 596
Protestantism, Aerius' doctrine and, 187
Protosyncelli, 427
Provence, St. Honoratus, 529
Province, political division, 422
Provincial councils, Papal confirmation of, 428
Prudentius (poet), 532
Psalmists, 430
Psalmody, 456 f.
At mass, 441
St. Athanasius, 457
St. Augustine, 457

St. Chrysostom, 457
Psalms, at mass, 439
Gallican Psalter, 355
Origen's *Hexapla*, 355
Roman Psalter, 355
St. Jerome's translation, 355
Psalmus abecedarius (by St. Augustine), 505
Psathyriani (pastry-cooks), 303
Ptochotrophium, 474
Publia, St. (deaconess), martyred, 208
Public confession, 450
Public penance, 449
Public penitents, 460
Public schools, Paganism in, 466
Pulcheria (empress), 592
Chrysaphius, 577
Marries Marcian, 569
St. Cyril appeals to, 554
Pulpit, 433
Punic language, 415 note
Pusaik, St. (officer of King Sapor), 127
Puteoli (Italy), Julius bishop, 586

Quartodecimans, Audians a sect of, 55
Odd beliefs, 55
Quimper (*See* Cornouille)

Rabbulas (bishop of Edessa), favors John of Antioch, 573
Favors St. Cyril, 573
Readers (*See* Lectors)
Readers' tribune, 433
Reconciliation of sinners, 448
Holy Thursday, 460
Perpetual penance, 448 note
Redditio symboli, 447
Redemption, Doctrine of, and Monophysitism, 579
St. Athanasius, 550
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 550
Regibus apostaticis, De (by St. Lucifer of Cagliari), 176
Relics of saints, 462
Religions, Eastern, 3
Remesiana (Servia), Nicetas bishop, 394 note
Renan, Ernest, Development of the Church, 418 f.
Renatus (priest of Rome), papal legate, 586
Restaces (*See* Aristakes)
Restitutus (priest), killed by Donatists, 508
Resurrection (church in Constantinople), 498
Reticius, St. (bishop of Autun), exegete, 162 note
Rheticus (*See* Reticius)
Rhetoricians, Julian the Apostate, 212
Rhine, Barbarians at the, 535
Rhodanius, St. (bishop of Toulouse), exiled, 163
Richer, Edmund, on Canons of Sardica, 121 note
Ricimer (Gothic general), Avitus dethroned by, 606
Power of, 569
Riez (France), Council of (439), 539
Faustus bishop, 541
Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Right of appeal to pope, 119-121, 484 f.
Canons of Sardica, 485
Right of asylum, 473
Rimini, Council of (359), 175
Dominated by Constantius, 175
Homoousios, 175
Pope Damasus and, 277
Pope Liberius not represented at, 175
Valens at, 175
Ring, Episcopal, 424
Marriage, 452
Rite (*See* Liturgy)
Robber Council of Ephesus (449), 585-590
Rogatists (Donatist sect), 504 note
"*Roma locuta est*," 522 note
Roman citizenship, 481
Roman civilization, Christianity and, 375
Roman Empire, Decline of, 569
Education in the, 203
Partition of, 78, 101, 226, 412, 479
Schools in the, 203
Roman law, Christian influence on, 80-82
Christian principles, 232
Constantine and, 80
Decadence of, 80
Equity in, 81
Roman liturgy, 365, 439
Roman mile, 288 note
Roman Missal, *Leonian Sacramentary*, 605
Roman primacy, 484 f.
Council of Antioch (378), 277
Council of Ephesus, 563 f.

Origin of, 229 note
Pope Celestine, 484 f.
Pope Damasus, 276 f., 428
Pope Gelasius, 594
Pope Liberius, 229
Priscillian, 277
St. Ambrose, 177
St. Basil, 277
St. Jerome, 277
Roman Psalter, 355
Roman religion, Emperor head of, 4 f.
Rome, Alaric at, 480
Alaric's sack of, 513, 534
Acolytes at, 432 f.
Agape at, 445
Arian baptism, 366
Caelestius at, 522
Crescentian Basilica, 482
Heretics in, 482
Julian Basilica, 233
Lateran Basilica, 483, 607
Liberian Basilica, 566
Luciferians at, 352
Manichaeans in, 482, 571
New churches in, 229
Paganism in, 410
Pantheon, 437 note
Patriarchate of, 427
Peril of barbarian invasions, 536
Right of appeal to (*See* Right)
Rufinus at, 493
Sacked by Alaric, 513, 534; by Genseric, 604 f.; by Goths, 480
St. Ambrose at, 257
St. Athanasius at, 464
St. Augustine, 390
St. Cassian at, 531
St. Jerome at, 261, 349
St. Lawrence in Lucina (basilica), 232
St. Lawrence's Basilica, 607, 610
St. Marcellina at, 257
St. Mary Major's Basilica, 566
St. Paulinus at, 384
St. Paul's Basilica, 605, 610
St. Peter's Basilica, 605, 610
St. Sylvester and St. Martin (basilica), 100
Schools in, 203
Theodosius at, 376
Rome, Church of, represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Right of appeal to (*See* Right)
Rome, Councils of:
(340), 109 f.
(352), 151
(369), rule of faith, 276 f.
(374), canon of Scripture, 276
(380), rights of the Church, 332
(382), Apollinarianism condemned, 348 f.; St. Jerome at, 348
(386), Canons of, 366 f.; consecration of bishops, 366
(417), Pelagianism condemned, 522
(430), Nestorianism condemned, 553
(462), 608
(465), 608 f.
Romulus Augustulus (emperor), pensioned, 611
Rossi, de (archeologist), discovery of Cemetery of St. Balbina, 100 note
Rouen (France), St. Victricius bishop, 483
Rufinus (disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia), 509
Pelagius' doctrine from, 509
Rufinus (imperial officer at Constantinople), 402
Rufinus (minister), dominates Arcadius, 479 f.
Rufinus (prefect), decrees St. Jerome's exile, 490
Rufinus of Aquileia, *Apologia,* 494 f.
Apology for Origen translated by, 493
At Jerusalem, 303
At Rome, 493
Aterbius denounces, 487
Character of, 487
Clementine Recognitions translated, 496
Didymus the Blind, 325
Eusebius' *History,* translated by, 498
Expulsion of monks, 237
Finding of the True Cross, 98
Fondness for Scripture, 487
Friend of St. Jerome, 486
History of the Monks of Egypt translated by, 496
In Palestine, 487
In Sicily, 496
John of Jerusalem, 488
Macarius, 493
Peri Archon translated by, 493
Reconciliation with St. Jerome, 491
Rupture between St. Jerome and, 487
St. Jerome, 262, 266, 488
St. Jerome accused by, 494

St. Paulinus of Nola, friend of, 496
Study of Origen, 486
Theophilus of Alexandria, 490
Rufinus Tyrannius (*See* Rufinus of Aquileia)
Rugians, Arianism among, 282
Rule of St. Augustine, 529; of St. Basil, 463; of St. Benedict, 463
Runic alphabet, Ulfilas and, 281 f.
Rural deacons, 290 f.
Rural parishes, 430
In Gaul, 291
St. Martin of Tours, 290
Rusticus (bishop of Narbonne), designates successor, 608

Sabaria (Hungary), St. Martin born at, 285
Sabbath rest, 458
Sabellianism (heresy), 308
And *prosopon,* 104 note
Charge against the Catholics, 148
Charges of, 165
Eusebians, 167
Homoousios, 167
Marcellus of Ancyra, 43, 74
Photinus, 114, 148
Priscillian, 309
St. Eustathius, 64 f.
St. Hosius of Cordova, 25
St. Jerome accused of, 265 f.
St. Lucian, 9
Sabellians, Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Sabinus (bishop of Heraclea, heretic), and Nicene Fathers, 32 note
Saccophori (heretics), 301
Sacramentary, Leonian, 605
Sacraments, Efficacy of, 507
Sacred Books, Lectors custodians of, 433
Sacristans, 426
Sahrgerd (Persia), St. Narses bishop, 144
St. Lawrence's Basilica, 610
Pope Hilary, 607
St. Leo's *Tome,* and Council of Chalcedon, 592
Legend concerning, 592 note
Saint Martin de Tours (by Babut), 285 note
St. Mary Major (basilica), 566
St. Mary's Church (Ephesus), 558, 587
St. Paul's Basilica, 605, 610
St. Peter's Basilica, 605, 610
Saint Sophia (church), 317, 438, 498
Destroyed by fire, 501
St. Victor, Monastery of, 430
Saints, Cult of, 461
Paganism and the, 604 note
Saints, List of:
Albina (matron, d. *cir.* 400), 355
Alexander (bishop of Alexandria, d. 326), 9 ff.
Alexander (bishop of Constantinople, d. 340), 76 f.
Alypius (bishop of Tagaste, d. *cir.* 430), 393
Ambrose (bishop of Milan, d. 397), 256-260, 373-380
Amphilochius (bishop of Iconium, d. *cir.* 400), 302
Ananias (Persian priest, d. 344), 127
Anastasius (pope, d. 401), 481 f.
Anna (Persian nun, d. 348), 144 f.
Anthusa (matron, fourth century), 270
Antony (hermit, d. 356), 16, 77, 92, 133
Aphraates (Persian bishop, d. *cir.* 350), 143 f.
Aristakes (Armenian bishop, d. 372), 86
Arius, *alias* Macarius (bishop of Petra, d. 350), 117
Ascholius (bishop of Thessalonica, d. 383), 333
Asclepas (bishop of Gaza, d. 348), 117, 119
Asella (virgin, d. 406), 355 ff.
Asterius (bishop of Amasia, d. *cir.* 400), 194
Asterius (bishop of Petra in Arabia, fourth century), 117, 130
Athanasius (bishop of Alexandria, d. 373), *passim*
Augurius (deacon, martyr, d. 259), 4
Augustine (bishop of Hippo, d. 430), 388-399
Aurelius (bishop of Carthage, d. 423), 503
Babylas (bishop of Antioch, d. 251), 208, 214
Barses (bishop of Edessa, d. 378), 238
Bartholomew (apostle), 86
Basil of Ancyra (priest, d. 363), 208
Basil the Elder (father of St. Basil the Great, d. 330), 203, 218
Basil the Great (bishop of Caesarea in

Cappadocia, d. 379), 218-220, 241-254
Basiliscus (bishop of Comana, d. 307), 502
Benedict (monk, d. 543), 463
Blesilla (matron, d. 387), 381
Boniface I (pope, d. 422), 483
Brice (bishop of Tours, d. 444), 290
Caesarius (brother of St. Gregory Nazianzen, d. 369), 200, 312
Caesarius (martyr, d. *cir.* 300), 234
Cassian (abbot, d. 433), 530 f.
Celestine (pope, d. 432), 484
Chrysostom (bishop of Constantinople, d. 407), 270-273, 326-331, 361-373
Clair (priest, d. 399), 290
Corentius (bishop of Cornouille, fifth century), 290
Cyril (bishop of Alexandria, d. 444), 547 ff.
Cyril (bishop of Jerusalem, d. 386), 139-143
Cyril (deacon, d. 362), 208
Damasus (pope, d. 384), 273-278
Delphinus (bishop of Bordeaux, d. 403), 356
Didymus the Blind (theologian, d. 396), 324 f.
Diodorus (bishop of Tarsus, d. 392), 271
Dionysius (bishop of Milan, d. 365), 154
Domnio (priest, d. *cir.* 400), 356
Donatus (deacon, d. 362), 197
Edesius (apostle of Abyssinia, fourth century), 84
Emelia (mother of St. Basil, fourth century), 219
Emmein (Persian nun, d. 348), 144 f.
Ephrem (deacon, d. 379), 221 f.
Epiphanius (bishop of Salamis, d. 403), 267-270
Eucherius (bishop of Lyons, d. 449), 530
Eulogius (deacon, d. 259), 4
Eusebius (bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, d. 370), 221, 248
Eusebius (bishop of Vercelli, d. 370), 154
Eustathius (bishop of Antioch, d. 360), 64 ff.
Eustochium (virgin, d. 419), 358
Exuperius (bishop of Toulouse, d. *cir.* 410), 483
Fabiola (matron, d. *cir.* 400), 448 f.
Felicitas (martyr, d. ? 160), 484
Felicitas (Roman matron, d. *cir.* 400), 358
Felix (bishop of Treves, d. *cir.* 400), 311 f.
Flavian (bishop of Antioch, d. 404), 336 f.
Flavian (bishop of Constantinople, d. 449), 577
Fructuosus (martyr, d. 259), 4
Frumentius (apostle of Abyssinia, fourth century), 84
Gelasius I (pope, d. 496), 594
Germain (bishop of Auxerre, d. 448), 536
Germanus (bishop of Constantinople, d. 733), 323
Gorgonia (sister of St. Gregory Nazianzen, d. 372), 312
Gratus (bishop of Carthage, d. *cir.* 350), 135
Gregory Nazianzen (bishop of Constantinople, d. 389), 218 ff., 312 ff.
Gregory Nazianzen the Elder (bishop of Nazianzus, d. 374), 218
Gregory of Nyssa (bishop of Nyssa, d. 394), 322-324
Gregory Thaumaturgus (d. 270), 486
Gregory the Great (pope, d. 604), 343
Gregory the Illuminator (apostle of Armenia, d. 332), 86 f.
Hanania (Persian priest, d. 344), 127
Helena (empress, d. 330), 96-98
Heliodorus (bishop of Altino, d. *cir.* 410), 262
Hilarion the Great (anchorite, d. 372), 268
Hilary (pope, d. 468), 606-609
Hilary (bishop of Arles, d. 449), 530
Hilary (bishop of Poitiers, d. 367), 160-165
Honoratus (bishop of Arles, d. 429), 529 f.
Horsisius (abbot, d. 380), 196
Hosius (bishop of Cordova, d. 357), 36 f., 115 f., 156 f., 168
Innocent I (pope, d. 417), 482 f.
Irenaeus (bishop of Lyons, d. *cir.* 200), 282
Isidore (bishop of Seville, d. 636), 435

Isidore of Pelusium (d. *cir.* 450), 567
James (bishop of Nisibis, fourth century), 30
James (Persian priest, third century), 144
James Intercisus (Persian martyr, d. 421), 128 f.
Januarius (bishop of Beneventum, d. 305), 117
Jerome (hermit, d. 420), 261-267
John (apostle), 460
John (Persian bishop, d. 344), 144
John (a Persian, fourth century), 31
John (Roman martyr, 362), 207
John Chrysostom (*See* Chrysostom)
Joseph (disciple of St. Narses, d. 343), 144
Julius I (pope, d. 352), 100
Justin Martyr (d. 167), 389
Juventinus (soldier, d. 362), 208
Leo the Great (pope, d. 461), 570 ff.
Liberius (pope, d. 366), 169 ff.
Litorius (bishop of Tours, d. 371), 289
Lucian (priest of Antioch, d. 312), 7 ff.
Lucifer (bishop of Cagliari, d. 371), 176
Lucius (bishop of Adrianople, d. 348), 130
Luke (evangelist), 462
Lupus (bishop of Troyes, d. 479), 530
Macarius (bishop of Jerusalem, d. 335), 98
Macarius (bishop of Petra in Palestine, d. 350), 117, 130
Macrina (sister of St. Basil, d. 380), 219
Marcella (widow, d. 410), 355
Marcellina (sister of St. Ambrose, d. 398), 257
Mark (evangelist), 278
Mark (pope, d. 336), 100
Mark (bishop of Arethusa, d. 362), 174
Martha (Persian nun, d. 348), 144 f.
Martin (bishop of Lyons, fourth century), 290
Martin (bishop of Tours, d. 399), 285 ff.
Maruta (bishop of Maipherkad, d. *cir.* 420), 126 note
Mary (mother of Christ), 352 f., 461 ff.
Mary (Persian nun, d. 348), 144 f.
Maurilius (bishop of Angers, d. 427), 290
Maximian (bishop of Bagai, fifth century), 506
Maximinus (bishop of Treves, d. 353), 117
Maximinus (soldier, d. 362), 208
Maximus (bishop of Jerusalem, d. 351), 140
Melania the Elder (matron, d. 410), 228, 303
Meletius (bishop of Antioch, d. 381), 335 f.
Memnon (bishop of Ephesus, d. 444), 562
Monica (widow, d. 378), 389 ff.
Narses (bishop of Sahrgerd, d. 343), 144
Nectarius (bishop of Constantinople, d. 397), 339
Nepotian (priest, d. 396), 491
Nicasius (bishop of Die, fourth century), 37 note
Nilus (monk, d. 430), 531
Nonna (matron, d. 374), 218
Olympias (matron, d. 408), 502
Optatus (bishop of Milevis, fourth century), 197 f.
Oresiesus (*See* Horsisius)
Orsisius (*See* Horsisius)
Pachomius (monk, d. 346), 68 f.
Pammachius (senator, d. 410), 356, 382 f.
Pamphilus of Caesarea (priest, d. 309), 493
Pantaenus (teacher, d. *cir.* 200), 204
Paphnutius (African bishop, d. 356), 30
Patrick (apostle of Ireland, d. 493), 290, 540 f.
Paul (bishop of Constantinople, d. 350), 106 f., 113
Paul (Roman martyr, d. 362), 207
Paula (widow, d. 404), 358, 383
Paulinian (priest, d. *cir.* 400), 489
Paulinus (bishop of Nola, d. 431), 285, 290, 383-388
Paulinus (bishop of Treves, d. 358), 153, 165
Peter (apostle), 278
Peter (bishop of Alexandria, d. 310), 10 ff.
Peter (bishop of Sebaste, d. 391), 333
Pigmentius (priest, d. 362), 207

Possidius (bishop of Calama, d. *cir.* 430), 505 f., 545
Pothinus (bishop of Lyons, d. 177), 282
Primus (deacon, d. 362), 197
Publia (deaconess, d. 362), 208
Prosper of Aquitaine (d. 463), 603
Proterius (bishop of Alexandria, d. 457), 596
Publia (deaconess, d. 362), 208
Pusaik (Persian r[illegible]yr, d. 344), 127
Reticius (bishop of [illegible]utun, d. 334), 162
Rhodanius (bishop of Toulouse, d. *cir.* 356), 163
Satyrus (lawyer, d. 392), 257
Serapion (bishop of Thmuis, d. *cir.* 362), 182
Simon bar Sabbae (bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, d. 344), 126-128
Simplicius (pope, d. 483), 609-611
Siricius (pope, d. 399), 365
Sixtus III (pope, d. 440), 544
Sylvester (pope, d. 335), *passim*
Tarbo (Persian nun, d. 345), 128
Thaddeus (apostle), 86
Thecla (Persian nun, d. 348), 144 f.
Theodore (priest, d. 362), 208
Theodore the Sanctified (abbot, d. *cir.* 368), 196
Theodoret (priest of Antioch, d. 362), 215
Timotheus (bishop of Alexandria, d. 385), 333
Verthanes (Armenian bishop, d. 339), 87
Victor (martyr, d. 304), 531
Victorinus (bishop of Pettau, d. 294), 162
Victricius (bishop of Rouen, d. 409), 483
Vincent of Lerins (monk, d. 445), 542
Zosimus (pope, d. 418), 522
Salamis (Cyprus), St. Epiphanius bishop, 255, 267-270
Salophaciolus, Timothy (*See* Timothy)
Salvian (writer), at Lerins monastery, 530, 541
Disciple of St. Honoratus, 538
On Roman citizenship, 480
On the Government of God, 534, 538
Salvianus (Spanish bishop), Council of Saragossa condemns, 310
Priscillian and, 310
Samosata (Asia Minor), Usurping bishops expelled, 238
Samosata, Paul of (*See* Paul of Samosata)
Santa Sophia (*See* Saint Sophia)
Sapor I (king of Persia), and Roman Empire, 88
Constantine's letter to, 89, 125
Sapor II (king of Persia), and Constantius, 147
Martyrdom of St. Simon, 126-128
Persecution of Christians, 128 f.
Tax on Christians, 125 f.
Saragossa (Spain), Council of (380), condemns Priscillianism, 310
Prudentius born at, 532
St. Paulinus, 387
Sardica (Bulgaria), Bonosus bishop, 401
Location of, 115 f.
Sardica, Council of (343), 116-122
Acacius at, 117; deposed, 119
Basil (bishop of Ancyra) at, 117
Callinicus at, 53
Canons of, 119-121; and canons of Nicaea, 485; Hincmar on, 121 note; right of appeal to Rome, 485
Convoking of, 116
Creed, 121 note
Diodorus at, 117
Ecumenical character of, 122 note
Eudoxius at, 234
Eusebians at, 117-119; meet at Philippopolis, 121 f.
Macedonius of Constantinople at, 117
Marcellus of Ancyra at, 116 f.; vindicated, 119
Marcellus' orthodoxy, 75 note
Mark (bishop) at, 117
Number of bishops at, 116
Papal legates, 117
Photinus condemned, 148
Pope Julius I and, 116
Pseudo-council of Philippopolis, 121 f.
St. Arius at, 117
St. Asclepas at, 117; vindicated, 119
St. Asterius at, 117
St. Athanasius, 116 f.; vindicated, 119
St. Hosius at, 118; president of, 117
St. Januarius at, 117
St. Maximinus at, 117
Synodal letter, 116
Verissimus at, 117
Western bishops at, 116

Withdrawal of Eusebians, 118 f.
Sardinia, represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Sarmatians, Constantine and the, 90
Slavonians and the, 90
Sasima (Cappadocia), made a bishopric, 251
St. Gregory Nazianzen bishop, 251, 322
Saturday, fast day, 457
Holy, Baptism on, 460
In albis, 461
Saturninus (bishop of Arles, heretic), and orthodox bishops, 165
Arianism, 163
Council of Beziers, 163
Court prelate, 152
Deposed by Council of Paris, 152
Excommunicated, 163
Satyrus, St. (lawyer), at Rome, 257
Saxons, at the Rhine, 535
Salvian on the, 538
Schepss, on writings of Priscillian, 308
Schism, Antiochene (*See* Antioch, Schism of)
Donatist (*See* Donatism)
Meletian (*See* Meletian)
Ursinian (*See* Ursinian)
Schola cantorum, 434
Schola lectorum, 434
Scholz, Heinrich, on the *City of God,* 537 note
School legislation, under Julian, 204
School of Alexandria (*See* Alexandria, School of)
School of Antioch (*See* Antioch, School of)
Schools, Christian, 466
Emperor Julian, 203-205
Pagan influences in public, 466
Scripture, Canon of, and Council of Hippo (393), 276 note; Council of Rome (374), 276; Pope Damasus, 276; Priscillian, 309
Private interpretation of, 309
Sebaste (Asia Minor), Eustathius bishop, 165, 187
Meletius bishop, 186
St. Peter bishop, 333
Secreta, at mass, 442
Sects, without capable leaders, 6
Secundian (heretic), Arianism, 346
Condemned, 346
Secundus (bishop of Ptolemais, heretic), 16
At Council of Nicaea, 48
Exiled, 50
Nicene Creed, 49
Secundus (father of St. Chrysostom), 270
Sedulius (poet), *A solis ortus cardine,* 532
Hostis Herodis impie, 532
Seleucia (Asia Minor), St. Gregory Nazianzen at, 312
Council of (359), 176 f.; Acacians at, 176; Constantius, 175
Seleucia-Ctesiphon, St. Simon bishop, 126
Self-mutilation, Nicene canons on, 56
Semi-Arianism, Audentius, 255
Condition of, 146
Eudoxius, 234
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 61 f.
Semi-Arians, Admission of repentant, 230
Anomoeans and, 167
Basil of Ancyra leader of, 167
Constantius, 148
Council of Constantinople condemns, 342
Eusebians, 167
Factions among, 102
Homoiousiasts, 167
Homoiousios and, 167
Homoousios and, 167
Macedonius joins the, 173
Pope Liberius and, 171
Proposed Council at Tarsus, 235
St. Hilary and, 176
Valens, 226
Semi-paganism of heresies, 6
Semi-Pelagianism, 543 f.
Faustus, defender of, 541
Senate (Roman), Altar of Victory, 359-361
Pagans in the, 180
Senate building (Constantinople), 501
Septimius Severus (*See* Severus)
Septuagint, *Roman Psalter,* 355
St. Jerome's translation of, 355
St. Lucian's text of, 8
Sepulcher, Holy, Constantine and, 96
Finding of the, 97
Serapion, St. (bishop of Thmuis), *Anaphora,* 452

And Pneumatomachi, 182
Serapion, Letters to (by St. Athanasius), 159, 183
Serfdom, Beginning of, 481
Slavery, 470
Sergius I (pope), Leo the Great's epitaph, 606
Sermons, Applause at, 440
At mass, 440; deacons, 440; episcopal function, 440; stenographers, 440
Serrae (*See* Synosades)
Setif (in Mauretania), Inscription found near, 98
Severus, Septimius (emperor), Persecution by, 283
Severus, Sulpicius (writer), character of Idacius, 310
Chronicles, 285 note, 309
Disciple of St. Martin, 290
On Priscillian, 307 f.
Priscillianism, 285 note
St. Paulinus, 386
Vita Martini, 285 note
Seville (Spain), St. Isidore bishop, 435
Sext (canonical hour), 455; in Jerusalem, 456
Sextons, 426
Shapur (*See* Sapor)
Sibylline Oracles, on the True Cross, 97
Sicily, Rufinus in, 496
Sick, Care of the, 474; Communion of the, 445
Sidonius Apollinaris (bishop of Clermont), 536; Paulini villa, 384
Sign of the cross, Confirmation, 448
Silistria, Auxentius bishop, 281
Silvester (*See* Sylvester)
Silvia, *Peregrinatio,* 336, 355 f.
Simeon Barsabae (*See* Simon bar Sabbae)
Simon bar Sabbae, St. (bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon), 126-128
Simeon Stylites, St., 598
Genevieve of Nanterre consults, 599
Simplicius, St. (pope), 609-611; born at Tibur, 609; St. Lawrence's Basilica, 610; St. Paul's Basilica, 610; St. Peter's Basilica, 610
Singidunum, Location of, 152 note
Ursacius bishop, 152, 165
Sins, Forgiveness of, 189
Siricius, St. (pope), 353, 365-367
Arian baptism, 366
Baptism of the dying, 445
Churches of Africa, 428; of Spain, 428
Clerical celibacy, 366
Council of Telepta, 367 note
Death of, 496
Election of, 365
Epiphanius appeals to, 495
Himerius (bishop of Tarragona), 365 f.
Jovinianus' book condemned, 381
Lector, 434
Letter to Himerius, 367 note
Letters of, 481
Origenist controversy, 491, 495
Perpetual penance, 448 note
Priscillianists, 312
Sirmich, *i. e.,* Sirmium
Sirmium, Arians at, 358
Constantius at, 148
Councils of: (351), condemns Photinus, 148; Creed, 148 f.; (357), formula, 168; (358), Pope Liberius at, 169; third formula, 169
Formulas of, 148 ff.: First, 148; Fourth, 174; Second, 168; Third, 169 f., 175
Imperial capital, 148, 229
Justina at, 358
Photinus bishop, 114, 148
St. Hosius exiled to, 157
Sisinnius (bishop of Constantinople), Death of, 550
Sixtus III, St. (pope), basilica of St. Mary Major, 566
Death of, 570
John of Antioch, 566
St. Augustine's letter to, 544
Sixtus V (pope), remark about St. Jerome, 496 note
Slavery, 465, 467-470
Amelioration of, 468
Basilian monasteries, 469
Cicero, 468 note
Economic consequences of, 467
Greek Fathers on, 468
Julius Caesar, 468 note
Latin Fathers on, 468
Monasticism, 469
Moral effects of, 467
Pompey, 468 note
St. Ambrose and redemption of captives, 469

St. Gregory of Nyssa, 468
Serfdom, 470
Slaves, 227
Emancipation of, 468; on Sundays, 458
In cities, 470
Labor of, 435, 473
Right of asylum for fugitive, 473
Rural, 469 f.
St. Chrysostom and treatment of, 417 f.
St. Melania and emancipation of, 469
Treatment of, 421
Slavonians, and the Sarmatians, 90
Socrates (historian), *Ecclesiastical History,* 603
Sofia (formerly Sardica), Council at, 115 f.
Solemn baptism, 449
Solemn mass, in fourth century, 444 f.
Solitaries, Communion of, 445
Somme (river), 539
Sophronius (bishop of Constantina), deposed, 588
Sotades (poet), 21 note
Souls, Preëxistence of, 486
Sozomen (historian), account of Pope Liberius at Sirmium, 169
Ecclesiastical History, 603
On absolution, 450 and note
Spain, Alani in,
Arian baptism, 366
Pope Hilary and Churches of, 608 f.
Epistle read by subdeacons, 432
Patriarchate of Rome, 428
Pope Hilary and Churches of, 608 f.
Pope Siricius and Churches of, 428
Priscillianism in, 572
Represented at Council of Sardica, 116
Rural deacons, 291
Suevi in, 571
Valentinian II, 359
Visigoths in, 535
Species, Communion in both, 444
Spiridion, St. (bishop of Tremithus), at Council of Nicaea, 30
Spiritual life, St. Augustine's doctrine of, 526
Stagirius, St. Chrysostom and, 330 f.
Station days, Eve of, 455
Station processions, Pope Hilary, 607
Statues, Homilies on the (by St. Chrysostom), 371-373
Statuta ecclesiae antiqua, 434 f.
Stenographers, Sermons, 440
Stephen, St., Feast of, 460
Stephen (bishop of Antioch, heretic), and St. Eustathius, 64 note
Deposed by Council of Antioch, 131
Stilicho (general), Ambition of, 536
Death of, 480
Guardian of Honorius, 479 f.
Stoicism, Pelagianism and, 510
Stole, Subdeacons not to wear, 431
Stridon (Dalmatia), St. Jerome born at, 261
Studens pacis, letter of Pope Liberius, 151
Stylites, 598
Subdeacons, at mass, 433
Carry bishops' letters, 432
Celibacy, 437 note
Council of Laodicea, 431
Functions of, 431 f.
Major order, 431 note
Minor order, 431 note
Not to sit in the *diaconium,* 431
Office of, 431
Ordination of, 434 f.
Read Epistle at mass, 432
Subintroductae, Nicene canons on, 56
Subordinationism, 61
"Substantia," Meaning of, 104
Suevi, Arianism among, 282
In Spain, 571
Suk Ahras (*i. e.,* Tagaste)
Sulpicius Severus (*See* Severus)
Sun (divinity), Julian's regard for, 210
Sunday office, 458
Sunday rest, 458
Sundays, attendance at mass, 458
Emancipation of slaves on, 458
Suntaxis, baptism ceremonies, 447
Superstitions, Julian's fondness for, 210 f.
Laws against, 137 f.
Pagan, 3 f.
Popular, 123
Spread of, 4
"Supreme Pontiff," as imperial title, 4 f.
Sylvester, St. (pope), Arianism, 24
Basilica of, 100
Convocation of Council of Nicaea, 27 note
Council of Tyre (336), 73
Death of, 100
Delegates at Council of Nicaea, 31
Symbols of faith (*See* Creeds)
Symmachus (prefect), Eulalius and, 483

Symmachus (rhetorician), Pope Damasus, 273 f.
Symmachus (senator), Altar of Victory, 360 f.
Influence in Rome, 410
Nicomachus Flavian, 408
Petition to Valentinian II, 360 f.
Synagogue, at Callinicus, 376
Syncelli, Office of, 426 note
Synod in Encoeniis (*See* Antioch, Council of, 341)
Synod of Dedication (*See* Antioch, Council of, 341)
Synod of the Oak (403), 498 ff.
Condemns St. Chrysostom, 499
Theophilus presides, 499
Synods, On the (by St. Athanasius), 159
Synosades (Macedonia), Maximian bishop, 589
Syria, and Church of Armenia, 86
Flavian's followers, 351
Patriarchate of Antioch, 427
Poverty and riches in, 369
Syriac language, St. Epiphanius, 268
Syriac liturgy, 438
Syrianus (duke), uprising in Alexandria, 158

Tabennisi (island), St. Athanasius visits monastery on, 196
Tachygraphers, 440
Tagaste (Africa), St. Augustine, 390, 394
St. Augustine born at, 388
Tall Brothers, 497 f.
Tarbo, St. (Persian nun), Martyrdom of, 128
Tarcisius, St., acolyte, 432 note
Tarragona (Spain), Himerius bishop, 365
Tarsus (Asia Minor), Proposed council at, 235
Tarvus (god), Cult of, at Paris, 284 note
Tatian (prefect), 402
Taurobolium, inscriptions found in Gaul, 284
Nicomachius Flavian, 410
Taurus mountains, Constantius' death near, 181
Taxation, Heavy, 480
Te Deum, 394 note
Teachers, Christian, under Julian, 205
Exemptions of, 203
Telepta, Council of (386), Pope Siricius, 367 note
Tella (*See* Constantina)
Temple, Rebuilding of Jewish, 215-217
Temples, Pagan, Closing of, 124, 180
Interior arrangement, 211 f.
Property of, 231
Tenedos (Cyclades Islands), Diodorus bishop, 117
Teresa, wife of St. Paulinus, 385 f.
Testament of the Lord, Extreme Unction, 452
Sunday rest, 458
Testimonial letters, 446
Thaddeus, St. (apostle), allegedly in Armenia, 86
Thalia (by Arius), 21 f., 39
Thamugadi (*See* Timgad)
Theaters, 470 f.
Sundays, 458
Thebaid (Africa), patriarchate of Alexandria, 427
St. Athanasius, 16, 68, 196
St. Cassian in the, 530
Thecla, St. (Persian nun), Martyrdom of, 144 f.
Thecla, St., Monastery of, 312
Thelepte (*See* Telepta)
Theodore, St. (martyr under Julian), 208
Theodore (bishop of Heraclea, heretic), and Macedonius of Constantinople, 113
Trinitarian doctrine of, 115
Theodore (bishop of Mopsuestia), Apollinarianism opposed by, 549
Death of, 550
Disciple of St. Diodorus, 271
Divinity of Christ, 548 f.
Esteemed at Edessa, 573
Ibas translates works of, 573
Nestorianism of, 550
Pelagianism, 521
Pelagians sustained by, 549
Rufinus, disciple of, 509
School of Antioch, 549
Teacher of Nestorius, 521
Theory of Redemption, 550
Theodore (bishop of Tripolis), and St. Eustathius, 64 note
Theodore the Sanctified, St. (abbot), Death of, 196

St. Athanasius, 196
Theodoret, St. (priest of Antioch), Martyrdom of, 215
Theodoret (bishop of Cyrus), Agreement between St. Cyril and John of Antioch, 581
Character of, 580
Continuation of Eusebius' *History*, 580
Curing the Ills of the Pagans, 580
Deposed, 588
Dialogue between Liberius and Constantius, 155 f.
Divinity of Christ, 581
Ecclesiastical History, 580
Eutychianism, 580
History of the Monks, 580
John of Antioch, 428, 567
Not at Council of Ephesus (449), 585
Opposes Monophysitism, 581
Reconciled with St. Cyril, 581
St. Cyril's *Anathematisms*, 580
The Beggar or the Polymorph, 581
Theodoric the Great, Arianism, 282
Theodosius I (emperor), 346
Apostates, 400
Arbogast, 407
Arians in Constantinople, 316
At Constantinople, 316 f., 358, 402
At Milan, 412
At Rome, 376
At Thessalonica, 375
Baptism of, 300, 333
Becomes emperor, 299
Callinicus synagogue, 376
"Catholic Christians," 305
Catholic policy, 224
Character of, 297, 304
Church and State, 293, 306, 375, 464
Convocation of Council of Constantinople, 332 f.
Council of Capua, 401
Councils of Constantinople: (381), 334; (382), 332 note; (383), 350
Death of, 412, 422
Defeats Maximus, 375
Dream of, 334
Eugenius, 407
Evicts Arians in Constantinople, 316 f.
Funeral of, 412
Gratian, 293
Heretics, 400
Idolatry, 400
Laws of, 399 f.
Leaves Milan, 401
Pagan temples, 437 note
Pagans, 400
Pardons Arians, 376
Partition of the Empire, 479
Prison regulations, 472 f.
Proscriptions, 472
Public penance, 378 note
Religious policy, 304-307
Repentance of, 399
St. Ambrose, 351, 402 f., 412 f., 465; adviser of, 465; withstands, 376, 378 f.
St. Gregory Nazianzen, 316, 338
St. Jerome, 331 f.
St. John the Baptist, 411
St. Meletius, 334
St. Nectarius, 339
Statue at Antioch, 372
Thessalonica massacre, 376, 412
Valentinian II, 375, 403
War against Eugenius, 411
Theodosius II (emperor), 535
Character of, 479
Convokes Council of Ephesus, 556
Favors heresy, 569
St. Cyril appeals to, 554
Sends Count John to Ephesus, 564
Threatens St. Cyril, 554
Theodosius the Great (*See* Theodosius I)
Theodosius the Younger (*See* Theodosius II)
Theodosius (general), 293
Theodotus (bishop of Ancyra), at Council of Ephesus, 557
Theognis (bishop of Nicaea, heretic), and Macedonius of Constantinople, 117
At Antioch, 66
At Council of Nicaea, 48
Favors the Meletians, 62
Homoiousios, 49 f.
Theognostus (writer), Trinitarian doctrine, 12
Theological Discourses (by St. Gregory Nazianzen), 313
"Theologus," St. Gregory Nazienzen, 313
Theology, of Julian the Apostate, 210
Theology of the Church (by Eusebius of Caesarea), 75, 107
Theonas (bishop of Marmarica, heretic), 16

At Council of Nicaea, 48
Exiled, 50
Nicene Creed, 49
Theophilus (Arian bishop), and Church of Abyssinia, 85
Theophilus (Gothic bishop), at Council of Nicaea, 31, 90
Theophilus (bishop of Alexandria), 327
Ammonius and, 496
At Constantinople, 499
At Synod of the Oak, 547
Council of Capua, 401
Isidore (priest), 490
John of Jerusalem, 490
Origenism, 490
Origenist controversy, 494-497
Persecution of monks, 497
Pope Innocent rebukes, 502
Presides at Synod of the Oak, 499
St. Chrysostom, 490
St. Cyril, nephew of, 547
St. Jerome, 490
Synodal letters, 494
Tall Brothers, 490, 498
Treatment of St. Chrysostom, 547
Theotokos, 567
Anastasius attacks the title, 551
Dispute over, 574
Disputes at Constantinople, 552
Nestorians, 594
Origen, 270
Pope Celestine, 552
St. Cyril, 548, 552
St. Epiphanius, 270
Thessalonica, Bishop of, and Bishop Bonosus, 401
Massacre at, 372, 376-379, 412; Rufinus, 402; St. Ambrose, 377 ff.; Theodosius, 377 ff.
St. Ascholius bishop of, 300, 333
Theodosius' decree against, 472
Valentinian II at, 375
Thessaly, patriarchate of Rome, 428
Theurgy, Julian the Apostate, 181, 209
Third formula of Sirmium, at Council of Rimini, 175
Thmuis (Egypt), St. Serapion bishop, 182
Thought of Dionysius of Alexandria (by St. Athanasius), 138
Thrace, patriarchate of Constantinople, 427
Pope Liberius exiled to, 156
Thursday, Holy, Reconciliation of sinners on, 460
Thymele, Indecencies of the, 470
Tiburtius, Pope Siricius, son of, 365
Tierce, canonical hour, 455
Tigré (district of Abyssinia), Christianity in, 85
Tillemont, on cruelties of Donatists, 197 f.
Timgad (Africa), Optatus bishop, 504
Timotheus, St. (bishop of Alexandria), at Council of Constantinople, 333
Timothy, St. (disciple of St. Paul), Relics of, 462
Timothy Aelurus (bishop of Alexandria), 596
Deposed, 596, 610
Monophysitism, 609
Timothy Salophaciolus (bishop of Alexandria), letter from Pope Leo, 596
Timothy the Cat (*See* Timothy Aelurus)
Tipasa (Numidia), Donatist violence at, 198
Tiran (king of Armenia), 87
Tivoli (*See* Tibur)
Tixeront, on doctrine of St. Alexander, 23 note
Toledo, Council of, 572
Tombs, Pagan, at Rome, 138
Tome of St. Leo, 586
Tonsure, Clerical, 429 note
Torture, Use of, 471 f.
Toulouse (France), St. Exuperius bishop, 483
Tours (France), St. Brice bishop, 290
St. Litorius bishop, 289
St. Martin bishop, 225, 285-292
Toxotius (patrician), 228
Tractatus super psalmos (by St. Hilary), 256
Tractoria against Pelagius (by Pope Zosimus), 483, 524, 563
Bishop Julian refuses to sign, 525
Traditio symboli, 446
"Traditores," Donatus the Great, 133 f.
Traducianism, St. Augustine accused of, 524
Trajanopolis (in Thrace), St. Eustathius exiled to, 66
Treasury, Imperial, and tax-payers, 232
Ruined, 480
Tredicius (*See* Reticius)
Treves (Germany), Constans at, 115
Gratian leaves, 318

Maximus at, 311, 374
St. Ambrose born at, 257
St. Athanasius exiled to, 74
St. Felix bishop, 311 f.
St. Martin at, 311
St. Maximinus bishop, 117
St. Paulinus bishop, 153
Schools in, 203
Tricamarum, Battle of, 282
Trier (*See* Treves)
Trigetius (prefect), meeting with Attila, 600
Trinity, Doctrine of, 104 and note
Antioch Schism, 186 note
Council of Constantinople, 345; of Nicaea, 345
Didymus the Blind, 325
Marcellus, 75
Nicaea-Constantinople Creed, 345
Photinus, 114
St. Gregory of Nyssa, 323 f.
St. Jerome, 265 f.
Ulfilas, 281
(*See also* Christ *and* Holy Ghost)
Trinity, On the (by St. Hilary), 161, 163
Trinity, Symbol of the, 244 note
Tripolis (Syria), Theodore bishop, 64 note
Troas (Asia Minor), Goths ravage, 279
Troyes (France), St. Lupus bishop, 530
Turibius (bishop of Astorga), Spanish council, 572
Turin, Council of, and Priscillianists, 312
Twelve Tables, and Roman law, 80
Tyana (Asia Minor), Anthimus bishop, 250
Capital of Cappadocia Secunda, 250
Tyre, Council of (336), 73 f., 110
Convocation of, 72
Deposes St. Athanasius, 73
Macarius (priest) at, 72
Marcellus of Ancyra at, 74
St. Athanasius, 73, 106

Udo (*i. e.*, Audius, heretic), 55 note
Ulfilas (Gothic bishop), 279-282
Arianism, 279, 281
At Constantinople, 280
At Council of Constantinople (360), 177
Auxentius, disciple of, 281
Commentary on St. Luke, 254
Consecrated by Eusebius of Nicomedia, 280
Doctrine of Trinity, 281
Gothic translation of the Bible, 280 f.
Homoeanism, 280
In Mysia, 281
Macedonianism, 281
Prestige of, 280
Profession of faith, 281
Runic alphabet, 281 f.
Ulpian (jurist), and Roman law, 80
"Unbegotten," The, 240, 243 f.
Unbelievers, dismissal at mass, 440
Unity, Religious, Popular demand for, 303 f.
Universal History (by Orosius), 516
Urban (Donatist bishop of Forma), attack on Catholics, 198
Urbanists (Donatist sect), 504 note
Ursacius (bishop of Singidunum, heretic), and orthodox bishops, 165
Council of Arles, 152; of Beziers, 163
In Pannonia, 280
Ursicinus (*See* Ursinus)
Ursinian Schism, 237 f.
Valentinian, 231 f.
Ursinus (antipope), Election of, 233
Election of Siricius, 365
Expelled from Rome, 233
Pope Damasus, 346 f.
Returns to Rome, 233
Usia (*See Ousia*)

Vaison (France), Council of, 539
Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Valence (France), Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Valens (bishop of Mursa), Council of Arles, 152; of Beziers, 163; of Milan, 154
Defeat of Magnentius, 152
Valens (emperor), Acacians, 235
Amnesty to St. Athanasius, 236
Anastasia, daughter of, 301
And Eunomius, 235
And orthodox bishops, 165
Baptized, 235
Carosa, daughter of, 301
Character of, 234, 237
Council of Rimini, 175
Death of, 239, 292
Decree against monasticism, 237

Division of Cappadocia, 250
Eudoxius, 237
Eudoxius' influence, 235, 237
Exile of bishops, 236
In reign of Julian, 200
Novatianism, 301
Novatians, 301
Persecution of Catholics, 238
Prison regulations, 472 f.
Recalls exiled bishops, 238
Religious policy of, 233 ff.
St. Aphraates, 236 f.
Semi-Arians, 226
Treatment of Goths, 238
Valentinian I, 226
Wavering policy, 224
Valentinian I (emperor), Absolutism of, 230
Altar of Victory, 360
Appoints St. Ambrose to office, 257
At Milan, 231
Auxentius, 231, 255
Death of, 239
Fiscal laws, 232
General in Gaul, 226
In reign of Julian, 200
Julian the Apostate, 226
Justina, widow of, 358
Milan the capital, 226 f.
Partition of the Empire, 226
Pope Damasus, 230
Prison regulations, 472 f.
Religious policy, 231-233
St. Ambrose, 260
St. Ambrose, adviser of, 465
Theodosius, 293
Ursinian Schism, 232 f.
Valens, 226
Wavering policy, 224
Valentinian II (emperor), 346
Altar of Victory, 359-361
And Theodosius, 401
Arbogast, adviser of, 401
Arbogast, and death of, 604
Arbogast's treason, 403 f.
Arians in Milan, 362
At Milan, 359
At Thessalonica, 375
At Vienne, 404
Becomes sole emperor of West, 375
Death of, 404
Funeral of, 405 f.
Justina, mother of, 358
Leaves Milan, 375
Maximus, 359, 373-375
Pope Siricius, 365
St. Ambrose, 359, 364, 403 f.
St. Ambrose adviser of, 260, 401
St. Ambrose and funeral of, 405 f.
Theodosius, 375, 403
Wavering policy of, 224
Valentinian III (emperor), at Rome, 591
Convokes Council of Ephesus, 556
Death of, 569, 606
Laws against Manichaeans, 572
Placidia, mother of, 535
Pope Leo the Great, 591
Valerian (bishop of Aquileia), Council of Aquileia, 346
Valerius (bishop of Hippo), Death of, 504
St. Augustine coadjutor of, 503
Vandals, Africa ravaged by, 571
Arianism among, 282
At the Danube, 535
Besiege Hippo, 544
Drive out Manichaeans, 571
In official positions, 534
Invasion of Africa by, 544
Stilicho, 480
Van Espen, on Canons of Sardica, 121 note
Vannes (France), Council of, 609 note
Vasio (*See* Vaison)
Vaucluse (*See* Velleron)
Velleron (France), Cult of Celtic gods, 284 note
Vence (France), Cult of Mars Vincius, 284 note
Taurobolium inscriptions at, 284
Venus, Temple of, at Golgotha, 96
Verbum (*See* Christ)
Vercelli (Italy), St. Eusebius bishop, 154, 434
Verissimus (bishop of Lyons), at Council of Sardica, 117
Verthanes, St. (Armenian bishop), early Church of Armenia, 87
Vertranion (general), and Constantius, 147
Vespers, canonical hour, 455
In Jerusalem, 456
Vestal virgin condemned, 5
Vestal virgins, Gratian, 239
Vesuvius, Battle of, 282

Vicar, Office of, 422
Victor, St. (martyr), Tomb of, 531
Victor (*i. e.*, Vitus, priest), at Council of Nicaea, 37 note
Victor, Marius (rhetorician), 532
Victorinus, St. (bishop of Mans), 290
Victorinus, St. (bishop of Pettau), exegete, 162 note
Victorinus (rhetorician), Conversion of, 391
Teacher of St. Jerome, 261
Victorinus, Caius, teacher, 205
Victory, Altar of, 408
Restored, 410
Victricius, St. (bishop of Rouen), Pope Innocent I's decretal to, 483
Vienne (France), Valentinian II at, 404
Vigilantius (Spanish priest), criticism of monasticism, 464
Vigilius (pope), Council of Constantinople (381), 343
Vigils, 455
Deacons, 459
Hymns, 459
Priests, 459
Vincent (bishop of Capua), at Council of Nicaea, 31, 36 f.
At Antioch, 131
Council of Arles, 153
Marcellus of Ancyra, 109
Papal legate, 151
Vincent (priest), St. Jerome, 489
Vincent of Lerins, St., 542 f.
At Lerins monastery, 530
Commonitorium, 542
Development of doctrine, 542
Virgin, Condemnation of Vestal, 5
Virginity, St. Ambrose on, 319 f.
Visigoths, 279, 539
In Spain, 535
Ulfilas bishop of, 254
Vita Martini (by Sulpicius Severus), 285 note
Vitalis (priest), Antiochene Schism, 302
Paulinus, 302
Vitus (priest), and Marcellus of Ancyra, 109
At Council of Nicaea, 31, 36 f.
Viventius (prefect), Ursinian Schism, 233
Vouillé, Battle of, 282
Vows, of ascetics, 454
Vulgate, 354-356
Itala version, 354 f.
St. Jerome, 331 f., 351, 354, 518

Walamir (Ostrogoth), 599
Wednesday, fast day, 457
Western Empire, End of, 611
Women, Status of, 465, 467
Word, The (*See* Christ)
Wulfila (*See* Ulfilas)
Wyclif, Priscillian precursor of, 309

Xenodochium, 474

Zabe (*See* Diabe)
Zella (Africa), *See* Telepta
Zeno (emperor), 610
Zosimus, St. (pope), 483
Appeal of Apiarius, 484
Caelestius condemned, 523 f.
Caelestius questioned by, 523
Encyclical, 524
Influenced by Patroclus, 522
Letter to African bishops, 523
Letter to Aurelius of Carthage, 570
On doctrine of grace, 524
On original sin, 524
Pelagianism, 522
Pelagius condemned, 523 f.
Tractoria, 483, 524, 563

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME THREE

B. HERDER

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME THREE

PERIOD OF THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

MONASTERY OF SAINT DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH 10th STREET
NEWARK 3, NEW JERSEY

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.
1946

MONASTERY OF SAINT DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH 10th STREET
NEWARK 3, NEW JERSEY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 5. Dec., 1936,

F. J. Holweck,

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 7. Dec., 1936,

✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*

Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1937

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Seventh Impression

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

CONTENTS

PART I

THE PAPACY

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

CHAPTER

I. FROM THE FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE TO THE COMING OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT (476–590) 13

St. Sidonius Apollinaris 15
Poverty 16
Immorality 17
Superstition 18
St. Severinus 21
Eastern Difficulties 23
Fivefold Mission of the Papacy 25
Pope St. Simplicius 25
Pope St. Felix III 28
Pope St. Gelasius 30
Suppression of the Lupercalia 31
Authority of the Apostolic See 35
Pope St. Anastasius 36
Pope St. Symmachus 36
Pope St. Hormisdas 40
Formula of Hormisdas 41
Patrimony of St. Peter 42
The Pragmatic Sanction 45
Pope Pelagius I 45
The Monks of the West 47

II. ST. GREGORY THE GREAT (590–604) 54

Condition of Rome 55
St. Gregory's *Dialogues* 61
Incident of the English Slaves 63
St. Gregory's Monastic Life 64
The Byzantine Court 65

CHAPTER PAGE

Religious Despotism of the Emperor 67
St. Gregory in Constantinople 69
The *Book of Morals*. 71
Gregory's Diplomatic Mission 73
Various Calamities 74
Gregory Elected Pope 76
Condition of Christendom 79
The *Pastoral Rule* 81
Legend of the Thirteenth Guest. 82
Varied Activities 83
Relations with Emperor Maurice 84
John the Faster 86
The Church in Asia and Africa. 90
The Church in Europe 91
St. Gregory's Sermons 92
St. Gregory Patriarch of the West 95
St. Gregory Metropolitan of Italy 97
St. Gregory Bishop of Rome 98
Gregorian Chant 99
Works of Charity 101
The Papal Patrimonies 102
Slavery 105
Papal Supremacy 107
Heresies 110
Death of St. Gregory. 112

III. From the Death of St. Gregory to the Coming of St. Zachary (604–741). 114
Pope Sabinianus 114
Pope Boniface III 115
Pope St. Boniface IV 115
Sergius Patriarch of Constantinople 116
Pope Honorius 117
Monothelitism 118
St. Sophronius 123
St. Maximus the Confessor 126
Pope St. Martin I 127
Pope St. Agatho 130
Council of Constantinople (680) 130
Pope Honorius Anathematized 132

CHAPTER PAGE

Emperor Justinian II 134
The Quinisext Synod 134
Pope St. Sergius 135
Leo the Isaurian 138

PART II

THE CHURCH AMONG THE BARBARIANS

IV. The Barbarian World 145
The Germans 148
Early Christianity among the Germans 152

V. The Church among the Franks 156
The Franks 156
St. Remigius 158
Clotilda 160
Christianity in France 162
Influence of Monasticism 166
St. Laumer 168
St. Ebrulf 168
St. Marculf 169
The Salic Law 171
Political Institutions 173
Social Institutions 175
St. Eligius and St. Leodegar 176
The Rural Clergy 178
The Popes and the Frankish Church 179

VI. The Church among the Anglo-Saxons 182
St. Augustine of Canterbury 183
Conversion of Ethelbert 187
Britons and Anglo-Saxons 189
The Anglo-Saxons 192
Conversion of England 196
St. Theodore 198
Venerable Bede 200
The Popes and the English 202

CHAPTER PAGE

VII. THE CHURCH AMONG THE GERMANS 204
St. Boniface 204
St. Boniface at Rome 206
St. Boniface in Germany. 208
Monasticism in Germany 212
St. Boniface and the Frankish Church 214
Founding of Fulda Abbey 218
Death of St. Boniface 221

VIII. THE CHURCH AMONG THE SAXONS AND SCANDINAVIANS . 223
The Saxons 223
Religion of the Saxons 225
Form of Government 225
St. Lebwin 226
Charlemagne and the Saxons 227
Widukind and the Saxon Revolt 229
The Capitulary of Saxony 231
St. Ludger 233
Charlemagne's Clemency 233
The Corvey Monastery 234
St. Ansgar 235
The Normans. 236

IX. THE CHURCH AND THE ARIAN NATIONS 240
The Goths in Italy 240
The Reign of Theodoric. 241
Ennodius 242
Dionysius Exiguus 242
Cassiodorus 243
Boethius 244
The Lombards in Italy 246
The Bobbio Monastery 250
Restoration of Monte Cassino 252
The Royal Edict of Rotharis 253
The Visigoths 255
Euric King of the Visigoths. 256
The *Lex Visigothorum* 259
St. Caesarius of Arles 259
The Burgundians 262
St. Avitus. 264

CHAPTER PAGE

Burgundian Law 265
Vandals in Spain. 267
Visigoths in Spain 271
St. Hermengild 273
St. Leander 274
The Councils of Toledo 276
St. Isidore of Seville. 282
Decline of Visigothic Spain. 283

X. The Church among the Slavs. 288
Slavs in the Empire 289
Conversion of King Boris 290
Pope Nicholas' *Responsa ad Bulgaros* 292
Missions in Moravia. 294
St. Cyril and St. Methodius. 296
St. Methodius in Pannonia 300
Moravia under Swatopluk 302
The Russians 304
Conversion of Vladimir 306
Jaroslav the Russian Charlemagne. 307
Poland 308
The Hungarians 310
Conversion of Duke Geza 312
St. Stephen of Hungary. 313
Hungary the Bulwark of Europe 315

PART III

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

XI. Formation of the Papal States (741–757) 319
The People of Rome. 321
The Holy Roman Empire 323
Pope St. Zachary. 325
Aistulf the Lombard King 326
Pope St. Stephen II. 328
Pepin the Short 330
Pope Stephen and Pepin. 333
The Coronation of Pepin 335

CHAPTER PAGE

Pepin's Victory over Aistulf 337
The "Donation" of Pepin 338

XII. The Carolingian Empire (757–800) 341
Mohammedanism 342
Mohammedan Conquests 344
Charlemagne 346
Pope St. Paul I 348
The Roman Aristocracy. 351
Pope Stephen III 353
Pope Adrian I 355
Pope Adrian and Charlemagne. 358
Pope St. Leo III. 360
Leo III and Charlemagne 362
The Holy Roman Empire 365

XIII. Charlemagne and the Church 369
Political Instability 369
Principles of Government 371
Attitude to the Church 374
Charlemagne and the Bishops 375
St. Chrodegang 378
Monasticism 379
St. Benedict of Aniane 380
Church Revenue 383
Agriculture and Industry 386
Commerce 387
Right of Sanctuary 387
Schools 389
Alcuin 390
Church Architecture 391
Clerical Dress 392
The Sacraments 394
Matrimony 396
The Liturgy 397
Preaching 398
Iconoclastic Dispute 399
St. John Damascene and St. Theodore of Studium . . 403
Adoptionism 404
Elipandus of Toledo 405

CHAPTER PAGE

Felix of Urgel 405
Condemnation of Adoptionism 406
The *Filioque* 407

XIV. Beginning of Feudalism 412
Partition of the Royal Patrimony 412
Growing Power of the Nobles 413
Louis the Pious 416
Treaty of Verdun 417
Spread of Feudalism. 418
Death of St. Leo III. 420
Pope Stephen IV. 421
Pope St. Paschal I 421
Pope Eugenius II 424
Council of Rome (826) 425
Pope Gregory IV 426
Papal Intervention 427
Council of Compiègne 429
Pope Sergius II 430
Pope St. Leo IV. 433
Feudal Anarchy 435
The Apocrisiary Arsenius 441
Election of St. Leo IV's Successor. 442
Pope Benedict III 444

XV. Pope St. Nicholas I (858–867). 446
The Papacy and the Empire 446
Lothaire's Divorce 448
The Rothade Affair 450
Archbishop John of Ravenna 450
The Pope's Popularity 452
Photius of Constantinople 454
Photius' Hypocrisy 455
Pope Nicholas and Emperor Michael 458
Papal Primacy 461
Letter to the Bulgarians. 464
Hincmar of Reims 465
Clerical Life 467
Ratramnus of Corbie. 468
St. Paschasius Radbertus 469

CHAPTER PAGE

Scotus Erigena 470
Question of the Real Presence 471
Question of Predestination 474

XVI. The "Century of Iron" (867–962) 478
Pope Adrian II 480
The Church in Bulgaria. 482
Arsenius 485
Bishop Formosus. 487
Pope John VIII 487
Crowning of Charles the Bald 489
Photius of Constantinople 490
Empress Engelberga. 492
Pope Marino I 495
Pope Adrian III 495
Pope Stephen V 496
Pope Formosus 497
Popes Boniface VI and Stephen VI 499
Popes Romanus and Theodore II 501
Pope John IX 501
Pope Sergius III. 502
Influence of Marozia 504
Pope John X 506
Dictatorship of Alberic 508
Cluny Abbey 509
Pope John XII 510

APPENDICES

Appendix I. The False Decretals 515
Appendix II. Fable of Popess Joan 521
Bibliography 525
Index 541

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume III

I. The Papacy

II. The Church Among the Barbarians

III. The Holy Roman Empire

Introduction

THE period of history extending from the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 is called the Middle Ages, to designate the transition from ancient to modern times. This important period has been in turn the object of excessive contempt, unmitigated abuse, and exuberant praise.

The Renaissance scholars were chiefly literary men, who looked upon those ten centuries, when Latin was spoken so incorrectly, merely as an epoch of gross ignorance. To their eyes it was a thousand years of darkness between two eras of light: the era of pagan antiquity, in which they considered only the golden age of its literature, and that of the Renaissance of antiquity, which they heralded with enthusiastic hopes.[1]

The eighteenth century passed from an attitude of contempt to one of hatred. The Encyclopedists regarded the Middle Ages as beginning with the burning of the Alexandrian Library, a destruction of mankind's intellectual heritage, and as ending with the pyres of the Inquisition, which, they said, burned alive the men who had been laboring to rebuild that heritage. These philosophers considered the Middle Ages as the accursed period of ecclesiastical tyranny, of ignorance, and of unalloyed barbarism.

[1] The expression "Middle Ages" seems to have been taken by history from the philology of the humanists. The language studied by Du Cange in his *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* is precisely that of the period extending from the fifth to the sixteenth century. The earliest history of the Middle Ages is one by the German, Christopher Keller (Cellarius), *Historia medii aevi,* 1688. The expression "Middle Ages," used in passing by Voltaire, did not become current until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Romanticists made it fashionable. Cf. Kurth, *Qui est-ce que le Moyen Age?*

The studies of national history, fostered by German patriotism at the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, produced Romanticism and with it the cult of the Middle Ages. Starting in Germany with the work of Wackenroder, Romanticism spread in England with Walter Scott and in France with Chateaubriand. Thereafter everyone thought and spoke about Gothic cathedrals, armored knights, and elegantly dressed ladies. Even the most unconventional "children of the age" were haunted by visions of monks and knights. "How charming it is to behold, at a feudal baron's threshold, near an austere monastery, the white cross and the holy water font," wrote Alfred de Musset in 1828.

The strict methods of historical criticism developed in the French Ecole des Chartes and the German universities in the course of the nineteenth century and thence adopted by the scholarly world, gradually led historians to a juster view of medieval times. Today eminent scholars consider the Middle Ages "one of the most fruitful periods of history, a period in which the nations of the new Europe were formed, in which we see the creation of a civilization very different from the Graeco-Roman civilization, but in certain aspects not inferior to it." [2]

To be more explicit, we may say that historical science, better informed than that of the Humanists, less prejudiced than that of the Encyclopedists, and more profound than that of the Romanticists, in our day regards the period from the fifth to the fourteenth century as an epoch of most intense intellectual and political activity. That activity, under the direction of the Roman Church, resulted in the formation of modern Europe and its deep penetration by the Catholic spirit.

The deciphering of numerous early documents and the pub-

[2] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 1. Auguste Comte regards the Middle Ages as "the epoch when the world was best organized," as "the Roman Empire reviving spiritually." Cf. Faguet, *Politicians and Moralists of the Nineteenth Century,* 2d series; Brunetière, *Les chemins de la croyance: l'utilisation du positivisme.*

lication of a great number of monographs have enabled us to visualize this prodigious development of intellectual activity which fills the Middle Ages. We are better informed than we were before about the monastic, episcopal, and palace schools which Charlemagne's activity established. We possess more documents concerning those ninth century disputes in which such men as John Scotus Erigena and Hincmar of Reims were renowned. We are better informed with regard to the vast labors of Peter Lombard and that center of learning, mysticism, and poetry—the Abbey of St. Victor. We can now picture the Paris University of the thirteenth century, with its large number of young students grouped by nationality. No one any longer denies the existence of an intellectual movement extending from Charlemagne to Petrarch, no one hesitates to connect it with the brilliant Renaissance of the sixteenth century.

The scholarly labors of the last century have likewise established the fact of a remarkable political and social activity during the Middle Ages. The many barbarian laws which the Church strove to imbue with a Christian spirit, the many national assemblies and councils where parliamentary life began to take form, the many political enterprises undertaken by the popes to assure harmony among Christian peoples and to fortify them against the infidels, the great energy expended to safeguard communal rights and corporative franchises, the many persistent efforts to maintain the distinction between things spiritual and things temporal, a distinction unknown to pagan antiquity—all these considerations assuredly justify our regarding the Middle Ages as the incubation period of modern times. Says Lavisse:

> The Middle Ages sketched the main outlines of the nations which have become distinct entities in the course of our times. The Middle Ages and our age are the two most important periods in the political history of Europe.[3]

[3] Lavisse, *Vue générale de l'histoire politique de l'Europe,* p. vii.

The history of Europe would have been altogether different, our ancestors would have found different political ideas, as also different feelings and passions, if the Church and the papacy had not proposed an ideal that dominated them. . . . If you suppress the part played by the papacy, by the same stroke you wipe out that oneness of ecclesiastical and Christian civilization in which the nations remained so long merged. . . . In such case the history of the ancient world is forgotten: Charlemagne is not the successor of the Caesars, Otto does not found the Holy Empire. The contest between the spiritual and the temporal, which was the great civil war of the Middle Ages, has then no reasonable basis, nor has the accord of the Christian world against the infidel: the knight's sword is not blessed by the priest, and history will not relate the poem of the crusades.[4]

During these ten centuries the Church made particular effort to imbue the barbarian world with her spirit. "Imagine what our modern thought and our modern literature would be if we were to leave out the history of those councils and religious orders, those popes who for a thousand years by means of bulls governed that world which the old Romans, with their emperors and their legions, had difficulty in keeping subdued." [5]

Undoubtedly this movement was also marked by painful clashes, backward tendencies, and deplorable failures. Men of that time sometimes sinned grievously through outbursts of unrestrained passion, sometimes they erred through childlike idealism and a disregard for critical standards. In the time of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Louis, men were still too much given to settling intellectual questions by appeal to Aristotle, and to solving political or religious questions by threat of the stake. But to complain that the transformation was not speedier shows a misunderstanding of the laws by which ideas and human institutions develop.

[4] *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* December 15, 1886: "L'entrée en scène de la papauté," by E. Lavisse, p. 843.

[5] Silvestre de Sacy, Preface to the letters of St. Francis de Sales, pp. vi–ix.

As fully revealed by the history of our day, the Church was ever heedful of these abuses and was tireless in her patient efforts to suppress them. In glowing words the historian Taine describes this work of the Church as teacher of the barbarian world. He says:

The clergy, for over five hundred years, saves what it can still save of human culture. It sends missionaries to the barbarians or converts them directly after their entrance. . . . Before the bishop in his gilded cope, before the monk, "emaciated, clad in skins," the converted German stood fear-stricken as before a sorcerer. In his calm moments, after the chase or inebriety, the vague divination of a mysterious and grandiose future, the dim conception of an unknown tribunal, the rudiment of conscience which he already had in his forests beyond the Rhine, arouses in him through sudden alarms half-formed, menacing visions. At the moment of violating a sanctuary he asks whether he may not fall on its threshold with vertigo and a broken neck. Convinced through his own perplexity, he stops and spares the farm, the village, and the town which live under the priest's protection. On the other hand, among the warrior chiefs with long hair, by the side of kings clad in furs, the mitred bishop and abbot with shaven brows, take seats in the assemblies; they alone know how to use the pen and how to discuss. Secretaries, councillors, theologians, they participate in all edicts; they have their hand in the government; they strive through its agency to bring a little order out of immense disorder; to render the law more rational and more humane, to reëstablish or preserve piety, instruction, justice, property, and especially marriage. . . . In its churches and in its convents, the Church preserves the ancient acquisitions of humanity, the Latin tongue, Christian literature and theology, a portion of pagan literature and science, architecture, sculpture, painting, the arts and industries which aid worship, the more valuable industries which provide man with bread, clothing, and shelter, and especially the greatest of all human acquisitions, and the most opposed to the vagabond humor of the idle and plundering barbarian, the habit and taste for labor. . . . To food for the body they add food for the soul, not less essential; for, along with aliments, it was still necessary to furnish man with inducements to live, or, at the

very least, with the resignation which makes life endurable. . . . Down to the middle of the thirteenth century the clergy stands alone in furnishing this. Through its innumerable legends of saints, through its cathedrals and their construction, through its statues and their expression, through its services and their still transparent meaning, it rendered visible "the kingdom of God," and set up an ideal world like a magnificent golden pavilion at the end of a miry morass. . . . The clergy thus nourished men for more than twelve centuries, and in the grandeur of its recompense we can estimate the depth of their gratitude. Its popes, for two hundred years, were the dictators of Europe. . . . Let us not believe that man counterfeits gratitude, or that he gives without a valid motive; he is too egotistical and too envious for that. Whatever may be the institution, ecclesiastical or secular, whatever may be the clergy, the contemporaries who observe it for forty generations are not bad judges; they surrender to it their will and their possessions, just in proportion to its services, and the excess of their devotion may measure the immensity of its benefaction.[6]

It is not within the scope of the present volume to relate the complete triumph of the Christian spirit over the barbarian world. The five centuries that form the subject of our study show us only the patient, painful, and sometimes tragic elaboration of that ideal of Christianity which the Church pursued through many vicissitudes.

Three classes of workers took part in this endeavor: popes, bishops, and Christian rulers. The first task, to strengthen the Church at its center, engaged the attention of the popes, especially of St. Gregory the Great.[7]

Once the power of the Holy See was firmly established, the Church could safely be spread by its missioners in the barbarian world. This was the task of those great bishops who not

[6] Taine, *The Ancient Régime,* pp. 3–5.

[7] This strengthening of the Church in its center and this growth of the temporal power of the papacy were the result of providential events rather than a premeditated plan of the popes. When St. Gregory the Great entered upon his pontificate, he was alarmed at the responsibility laid upon him, and his first impulse was to escape from the burden.

only "made France," as someone has said, but also England, Germany, and the other nations.[8] The type of these missionary bishops is St. Boniface the apostle of Germany.

When the barbarian tribes were converted, the Church undertook to group the Christian nations into a mighty federation that was called the Christian Republic or Christendom. In this work the popes and bishops were aided by the Christian rulers, the greatest of whom was Charlemagne.

Just when these three tasks seemed to be completed, the dismemberment of Charlemagne's empire and the political and social upheavals that followed in the course of the ninth and tenth centuries led to a religious crisis from which the papacy had much to suffer. But God did not abandon His Church. In the darkest hours of this crisis we see the lofty and majestic figure of Pope St. Nicholas I, who asserted the rights of the Holy See with a sovereign authority. It was during the weakest and most abject of the pontificates that Charlemagne's great work was restored. The unworthy John XII became the instrument of Providence in re-establishing the Holy Empire in the person of Otto I. That mighty institution, by again bringing into alliance the pope, the bishops, and the Christian rulers, would, in spite of painful strifes, safeguard the political unity of the West for several centuries and, to some extent, would preserve the ideal of Christendom.

[8] Cf. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;* De Maistre, *The Generative Principle of Political Constitutions.*

PART I

The Papacy

CHAPTER I

From the Fall of the Western Empire to the Coming of St. Gregory the Great (476–590)

On August 23, 476, an officer of the guards, Odoacer a Herulian, dethroned the last Roman emperor, Romulus Augustulus, placed him in seclusion in the villa of Lucullus (near Naples), and, with the consent of the Senate, proclaimed himself king.[1] This palace revolution appeared not to affect the feelings of the people of Rome and Italy very greatly.[2] They did not lament the removal of the handsome emperor,[3] who bore two glorious names, the one recalling the founder of Rome, the other that of the founder of the Empire. They accepted the barbarian, who promised them peace and tolerance and who kept his promises pretty well. Not until fifty years later does Marcellinus in his *Chronicon*[4] mention for the first time the event of August 23, 476, as if historians needed half a century to perceive how great a change had taken place at that date in the political organization of the West.

Such a revolution did, in fact, have an immense historical

[1] He is commonly spoken of in history as king of Italy. But he called himself simply "king," without qualification. See Grisar, *History of Rome,* Vol. I, no. 73. [Tr.]

[2] Le Nain de Tillemont speaks of Romulus Augustulus only in his history of Odoacer. He says: "We are obliged to place three Roman emperors under the heading of a barbarian prince, a barbarian whose country and nation are unknown to us. But these emperors are Glycerius, Nepos, and Augustulus, whom we may call unknown, or as known simply for having buried with themselves the Roman Empire in the West." Tillemont, *Histoire des empereurs,* VI, 422.

[3] *Pulcher erat* ("he was handsome"), says the anonymous author published by Valois, *Rerum francarum,* Vol. III. The same testimony is given by Procopius, *PG,* Vol. CXXXVII, and *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae.* Tillemont (*op. cit.,* VI, 434) says: "This ruler is praised for his beauty. Such pitiful commendation is the only praise bestowed on the last of the emperors."

[4] Marcellinus, *Chronicon* (*MGH, auctores antiquiss.,* IX, 91).

significance. Henceforth Rome would no longer see an emperor residing within her walls; the imperial emblems would again appear there only with Charlemagne. On the other hand the pope's influence, which had continued to grow since the time of Constantine, became dominant. Even the phantom of an Augustulus or an Olybrius carried with it the remembrance and the title of imperial majesty and, in the eyes of the old ceremonious Romans, placed legal limitations to the papal power. The new master of Rome and Italy, uncouth and half-ashamed of his success, who dared not wear the gold-bordered triumphal toga of the *imperatores* [5] and who sent back to Zeno, the emperor of the East, the insignia of the imperial office, could not wield such influence.

Hence it became particularly imperative for the papacy to strengthen itself in the Eternal City. At the very time when the Empire was falling, urgent appeals for more apostles came from all parts of Europe—Germany, Spain, Gaul, Britain—where missioners had already gone but where the Christian centers had recently been laid waste by invasions and the Arian heresy.

But, to engage with security in this work of fresh expansion, the Church had first to become more and more purified in its center and to become more closely bound to its supreme head, the Roman pontiff. This twofold task was the object of the popes' constant anxieties. They devoted themselves to it even while continuing the work of spreading the faith among the pagans.[6]

[5] On the imperial dress and the gorgeous ornaments added to it in the latter period of the Empire, see Cagnat, art. "imperator" in Daremberg and Saglio, *Dict. des antiquités grecques et romaines,* III, 426 f.

[6] In this first chapter we shall only incidentally mention the government of the popes in matters of Church discipline, public worship, or the repression of existing heresies. All that is treated in the history of the early Church. Here we shall consider the action of the popes only in so far as it was a direct preparation for the Middle Ages. Later on we shall speak of the dealings of the Holy See with the barbarian nations when we relate the history of each of those nations.

Before beginning the narration of those prolonged efforts, we must cast a glance on the city of Rome and consider the effect which contact with the barbarian world had upon its bishops and priests, and also upon its practices of public worship.

St. Sidonius Apollinaris

Two authors of this epoch provide us with most exact information about the condition of the Christian world at the end of the fifth century. These two writers are the Gallo-Roman Bishop Sidonius Apollinaris and a humble monk of Lower Noricum, Eugippius, the author of the *Life of St. Severinus.*

But alas! all that was only a brilliant and deceptive appearance. Poverty, immorality, and superstition were the deep-seated evils of fifth century Rome, which was then in the hands of the barbarians.

Caius Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius was born at Lyons about 430 and died at Clermont in 482. His father was an imperial prefect, and he himself was prefect of Rome, a count, a patrician, a son-in-law of Emperor Avitus. During his lifetime his statue was placed in the Forum of Trajan. In short, he is one of the most notable personages of that period. After a varied career in the world, he received holy orders and, in 470, as bishop of Clermont in Auvergne (France), he entered upon the task of Christianizing that semi-barbarous district. There he displayed so many great virtues that the Church soon placed him on her altars. If we wish a description of the Rome of that time, we can find no more reliable testimony than his. Recent discoveries show that it is correct and exact.[7]

The outward appearance of the city and of its principal monuments was unchanged. The barbarians had destroyed

[7] On Sidonius, see Tillemont, *Mémoires,* XVI, 195–284.

scarcely anything. They were satisfied with plundering it.[8] In a letter to a Gallic nobleman whom he was inviting to come to Rome, Sidonius wrote: "Rome is the abode of law, the training-school of letters, the fount of honors, the head of the world, the motherland of freedom, the city unique upon earth, where none but the barbarian and the slave is foreign." [9]

The Senate was still enacting laws in accordance with the ancient formalities, which were scrupulously observed.[10] The immense imperial baths were still the Romans' most elegant meeting-places.[11] The streets were gay with the costumes of antiquity. At the sports in the Circus the people continued their enthusiastic partisanship for the four colors of the rival contestants: white, blue, green, and red.[12]

Poverty

"Since the end of the Antonines' reigns, the resources of the economic life were being consumed by almost ceaseless military revolts, unbridled greed, unpunished thievery, disdain for voluntary labor, and the hideous plague of slavery." [13] As the government obtained its chief revenue from land taxes, agriculture was abandoned. Whole provinces were left uncultivated. The Campania, which the barbarians had not ravaged or even passed through, contained 300,000 acres on which not a single person or farm house was to be found. The mining

[8] "It is a perfect anachronism to speak of Rome being destroyed during the fifth century or even the sixth century. The destruction of ancient Rome was the slow work of later centuries, beginning perhaps about the seventh and lasting to the so-called Renaissance, and even well into the later period." Grisar, *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages,* I, 122.

[9] Sidonius, Letter 6 (to Eutropius); *PL,* LVIII, 455; *MGH, auctores antiquiss.,* VIII, 9.

[10] Sidonius, Letter 7; *PL,* LVIII, 459; *MGH, ibid.,* pp. 11 f.

[11] Sidonius, *Carmina, 23*; *PL,* LVIII, 744; *MGH, ibid.,* p. 261.

[12] *Micant colores, albus vel venetus, virens rubensque.* Sidonius, *Carmina, 23*; *PL,* LVIII, 739; *MGH, ibid.,* p. 257.

[13] Robiou and Delaunay, *Les institutions de l'ancienne Rome,* III, 307.

business had been transferred from private or municipal management to the Treasury Department of the government and even to the emperors' personal control. But the mines were now exhausted.[14] As there was a shortage of metal for coinage, the value of money increased. Thereafter usury became the great business and the great calamity. Three years' interest doubled the amount of a debt. The rich kept growing richer, and the poor poorer. More than ever the Circus was the usual place where the clamor of the people was heard, asking for bread. Sidonius says that, when he passed near the Circus, he dreaded hearing the awful shout of the Roman people's poverty and distress.[15] Worse, however, than the suffering of poverty was the evil of immorality.

Immorality

That Roman world, which had only one great detestation, namely, an aversion to poverty,[16] seemed to have only one great desire, that of pleasure. If the Gallo-Roman Sidonius Apollinaris, while passing near the Circus, feared hearing the outcries of poverty, he also dreaded to hear the sounds of pleasure-seeking sensuality when he drew near the imperial baths. He informs us that his friend Consentius took care to visit only those baths where Christian modesty was respected.

Barthold Georg Niebuhr, who knew ancient Rome so well, says:

In conjuring up the life of that epoch we cannot, in spite of our admiration, repress a shudder. Side by side with great virtue, the most fearful vices, from the earliest times, have had full sway; insatiable

[14] Mispoulet, *Les institutions politiques des Romains,* II, 252–255.

[15] *Vereor ne famem populi romani theatralis caveae fragor insonet.* Sidonius, Letter 10; *PL,* LVIII, 465; *MGH, ibid.,* VIII, 16.

[16] "Under the Empire, Rome was the abode of a society of which Theodor Mommsen could write: 'At Rome, poverty was no longer the greatest disgrace and the worst crime, but the only one.'" Grisar, *op. cit.,* I, 187.

ambition, reckless disregard for the rights of others; callous indifference to human suffering; avarice—which later grew into rapacity—and class distinctions, whereby not only slaves and foreigners, but even freemen of the city, were treated with inhuman harshness.[17]

Claudius Rutilius, the pagan prefect of Rome in 417, when leaving Rome to return to Gaul, addressed to the Eternal City an invocation in which he connected the goddess Rome and the goddess Venus.[18]

Superstition

Superstitions never thrive more than in times of decadence. At the close of the fifth century they flourished at Rome in multiple form: pagan superstitions that continued after faith in the Olympian gods had been lost, superstitions imported from the East, popular superstitions born spontaneously of credulity, self-interest, or fear. Says Gaston Boissier: "When the Empire came to an end, paganism was dead or was on the point of breathing its last." [19]

Euhemerus' criticism, adopted by the Stoics, popularized at Rome by the works of Ennius and often made use of by Christian apologists, had contributed much to the destroying of faith in the pagan religion; and the defenders of paganism themselves sometimes furthered this work when they tried to defend their gods from the reproach of immorality by allegorical interpretations. But, says an eminent student of Roman antiquity, Joachim Marquardt, "such a skeptical attitude could not last. If in the depth of man's soul there is any ineradicable feeling, it is most certainly the feeling of his relations with the Divinity. Man's religious cravings were not satisfied. Other

[17] Quoted by Grisar, *loc. cit.*
[18] Claudius Rutilius, *De reditu suo,* Bk. I, verses 47 ff.
[19] Gaston Boissier, *La fin du paganisme,* ed. 1894, II, 427.

nourishment had to be found for them. Tendencies in this direction appeared among the learned as well as among the rank and file." [20]

The Roman policy was to extend hospitality to all religions; it favored a sort of mythological and religious eclecticism so that, in the time of the Empire, there poured into Italy the religions and idolatries of the whole world. As Petronius says, "Many a province so abounds in divinities that it is easier to meet a god there than a man." [21]

The first of these idols was the emperor. In most cities the worship of Rome and Augustus had its temples and municipal priests, and also its religious societies. "It tended to become the universal religion of the whole civilized world. You may, indeed, say that it was a merely external religion, but it was present everywhere, drawing to it the homage of the towns and, by the active propaganda of societies of *augustales,* reaching to the lowest strata of society." [22]

It is true that, in the last years of the Empire, the worship of the emperors had lost its prestige; but the worship of Rome persisted. "Hear me, O Rome, mother of men and mother of the gods," says Claudius Rutilius in the fifth century.[23] At the end of the same century a decree of Theodoric still calls Rome *"sacratissima urbs."* [24] This superstition of Eternal Rome was so powerful that the Christians had no small difficulty in guarding themselves against it. The Christian kept a sort of religious respect for old Rome, if only through patriotism and fidelity to old traditions, from which he could rid himself only with the

[20] Marquardt and Mommsen, *Manuel des antiquités romaines,* XII, 89.

[21] S. Reinach, *Manuel de philologie classique,* according to Freund, *Triennium philologicum,* p. 351. Cf. Dufourcq, *La christianisation des foules.*

[22] Bouché-Leclercq, *Manuel des institutions romaines,* p. 556. Cf. Beurlier, *Le culte imperial.*

[23] Rutilius, *op. cit.,* Bk. I, verse 49.

[24] Cassiodorus, Letters, Bk. VI, letter 18; *PL,* LXIX, 698; *MGH, ibid.,* XII, 190.

utmost difficulty. And this was the case not merely for those who, like Sidonius, were Romans by birth; it was also true of Christians of barbarian origin. Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe in Africa, who had been a high officer in the Vandal kingdom, came to Rome in 500. Dressed in his humble monastic habit, he joined the crowd attending some celebration in the Forum. In admiration he gazed upon those temples, those triumphal arches, and those memorials of great deeds, and, as his thoughts rose higher, he exclaimed: "If earthly Rome is so splendid, how beautiful the heavenly Jerusalem must be." [25]

Among the Oriental religions, that of Mithra or the Sun seemed to triumph. It had a kind of baptism, a form of communion, and bloody purification ceremonies. Julian the Apostate gave it an ecclesiastical organization.[26] In connection with this religion and many others, such as the worship of Adonis of Byblos, of the *Virgo coelestis* of Carthage, and the *Mater Magna* of Pessinonte, popular superstitions multiplied. Each spring had its sprite, each locality its tutelar divinity, certain ceremonies and formularies had a sacred value in the eyes of the people.

In a word, what Bossuet says is quite true: Rome kept her monuments, but she had lost her empire. "The worship of the Roman gods had left deep impressions in the mind of the common people; but the majesty of the Roman name vanished. The Empire was broken up, and each barbarous race carried off some part of the wreckage. Rome herself, the very mention of whose name formerly inspired terror, now that she was seen to be vanquished, became the plaything and the prey of all the barbarians." [27]

[25] *Quam speciosa potest esse Hierusalem coelestis, si sic fulget Roma terrestris. Life of St. Fulgentius,* chap. 13; *PL,* LXV, 131.

[26] Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra,* tr. by Thomas J. McCormack; *Textes et documents figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra.*

[27] Bossuet, *Explication de l'Apocalypse,* chap. 3, no. 9.

St. Severinus

Just as the works of St. Sidonius Apollinaris inform us regarding the situation of the Church in the Roman world, the *Life of St. Severinus,* written by one of his disciples a short time after his death, supplies us with valuable data on the relations of the Church with the invading races.

Little is known about this apostle of Noricum. His humility, we are told, succeeded in hiding the secret of his noble birth from his closest disciples. But, says Tillemont, "there is every reason to suppose that Severinus was of the Latin race and of illustrious birth." [28] The desire for perfection prompted him to go to the desert places of the East. His biographer says that, following a divine revelation, he returned and settled in the Danube valley.[29] There he remained until his death in 482. Thus Providence placed him on the route of the great hordes of barbarians. The account of his relations with these new races is of the greatest interest to history. "We have few saints in antiquity whose history we can be more sure of than that of St. Severinus." [30]

"The *Life of St. Severinus of Noricum* is a priceless work for the historian. It contains a treasury of information regarding the situation of the barbarians and the Romans in the eastern part of the Empire." [31] The account of St. Severinus' life shows him having dealings with the Rugians, the Goths, the Suevi, the Heruli, the Alamanni, and the Turcilinges. His vir-

[28] Baudrillart, *Saint Séverien,* p. 39.

[29] "Lower Noricum, where the saint settled, included all the districts along the southern shore of the Danube, from Passau to Vienna and a little beyond." Tillemont, *Mémoires,* XVI, 168.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Auguste Molinier, *Manuel de bibliographie historique, les sources de l'histoire de France,* I, 410. Hermann Sauppe in 1877 (*MGH, auct. antiquiss.,* Vol. I) published a new critical edition of the *Vita Severini.* It differs but little from the Bollandists' edition (*Acta sanctorum,* January 8), as the learned editor declares, *MGH,* I, xv. This Life may be found also in *PL,* LXII, 1167–1199.

tues, his learning, his supernatural gifts, and his miracles won for him the respect of the most savage. At a word from the saint, barbarian chiefs turned aside from their intended route, stopped a pillaging, or spared a monastery. We see him intervening in conflicts between the barbarians themselves. God sometimes gives him a revelation about their future. "One day," relates his biographer, "Severinus saw entering his cabin a very tall young man dressed in the coarsest garments. As the young barbarian, to avoid striking the roof of the poor hut, stood with bowed head before the saint, God revealed to the latter the glorious destiny of the stranger. After a little conversation with the visitor, Severinus said to him: 'Go forward. Today you are still clad in the worthless skins of animals, but soon you shall make gifts from the treasures of Italy.' " [32]

The barbarian was Odoacer. In consequence of this meeting with the saint of Noricum, the conqueror of Romulus Augustulus always had a religious respect for holy things. He professed a special esteem for Severinus. After the apostle's death, Odoacer, when transferring the people of Noricum into Italy, respected the last wish of his holy friend, who had asked that his remains never be separated from his people. The venerated body of St. Severinus was buried in an Italian villa, *Mons Feletus* (Montefeltro), which has never been exactly identified. Some years later it was removed to the villa of Lucullus where the last Roman emperor, Romulus Augustulus, banished by Odoacer, had just died.[33]

But the barbarians did not always prove themselves so grateful. Moreover, it is not recorded that St. Severinus con-

[32] Eugyppius, *Life of St. Severinus,* chap. 2; *PL,* LXII, 1176.

[33] The disciples of St. Severinus changed the villa of Lucullus into a monastery. Today it is called Pizzofalcone. "The picture of the saint and his pious monks inheriting the lavish splendor of Lucullus, is one well in keeping with that of St. Benedict taking possession of Nero's villa on the Upper Anio, or that of St. Columban settling with his followers in the ancient baths of Luxovius." Grisar, *op. cit.,* III, 233.

verted a single one of them.[34] Certain idolatrous practices, which seemed forever uprooted, sprang up again even among Christians;[35] some barbarian ruler, who had promised to respect holy things, would be found pillaging the goods of the poor and of captives.[36] Says an ancient writer who knew them well: "A Rugian counts a day wasted if he has not committed some evil deed."

These barbarians were, indeed, children, capricious, cruel, proud, overbearing, and fickle. They flew into a rage over nothing and carried their fury to the last extreme. Excessively impressionable, they shook with fear as suddenly as they poured out threats. Without any interval they passed from insults to prayers. They were crafty, treacherous, able to conceal the vilest designs under a gentle and friendly manner. We do not mean that they were always insincere when they made a promise, but they seemed unable to resist a temptation; invariably their cupidity was stronger than faithfulness to a promise.[37]

The biographer of St. Severinus tells us the story of a certain Fava, king of the Rugians, and his wife Gisa. Our saint obtained very fine promises from them, but the promises were scarcely ever kept.[38] The papacy would have many such experiences with the barbarians. Centuries must pass before these new races give the world a St. Louis of France, a St. Elizabeth of Hungary, and a St. Adelaide of Germany.

Eastern Difficulties

The great obstacles which the Church encountered in the decadent civilization of the Roman people were therefore in-

[34] Tillemont, XVI, 170.
[35] *Acta sanctorum,* January 8, p. 488.
[36] *Ibid.,* p. 494.
[37] Baudrillart, *Saint Séverin,* pp. 28 f.
[38] *Acta sanctorum,* January 8, p. 492.

creased by the difficulties that arose from the brutal barbarism of the new races. Added to these were endless conflicts which the East, so resourceful in subterfuges, stirred up, sometimes to prolong the subtle ramifications of the Christological heresies, sometimes to set up, in opposition to the old Rome now stripped of its emperor, the claims of the new Rome and its pompous *basileus*.[39]

In vain had the Council of Chalcedon (451) declared the necessity of confessing one only Lord in two natures, thus condemning the two errors of Nestorius and Eutyches; the spirit of schism and revolt did not consider itself vanquished. In 481 the crafty Acacius patriarch of Constantinople, on the pretext of solidifying the peace, in agreement with Peter Mongus patriarch of Alexandria, drew up a new Creed which, while reproving Eutyches and Nestorius, abrogated the Council of Chalcedon. The next year Emperor Zeno's arrogant intervention backed the revolt of the two patriarchs. In opposition to the definition of the fourth ecumenical council, the Byzantine autocrat issued his famous Henoticon (Act of Union), which gave the force of law to the Creed of Acacius. The imperial edict, instead of calming the religious dissensions, did but increase them. The Pope protested against the abrogation of the Council of Chalcedon and excommunicated Peter Mongus. And the most zealous followers of Eutyches preferred to withdraw from their leader Peter Mongus rather than give up their Monophysite doctrine; they were called Acephali (headless) and soon became subdivided into numerous sects with no discernible difference between them. Such was the origin of the Acacian Schism. Even after the death of the scheming prelate (489), his name continued to be a rallying-sign for all the enemies of the Catholic faith in the East, until the celebrated Formula of Pope Hormisdas who, in 519, issued a solemn anathema against Acacius and members of his party.

[39] This was the title taken by the emperors of Constantinople.

Fivefold Mission of the Papacy

The popes whom divine providence placed at the head of the Church at this period recognized the seriousness of the situation. To ward off the most pressing dangers, to preserve Christians from the perils that came to them from the Roman corruption, from the barbarian incursions, and from Byzantine encroachments—such was the first task, in a way defensive, of the pontiffs from the fall of the Roman Empire until the coming of St. Gelasius. Next we see four great popes accomplish a more positive work: they were St. Gelasius, St. Symmachus, St. Hormisdas, and Pelagius I. By his abolition of the Lupercalia and by his liturgical institutions, St. Gelasius gave the final blow to the pagan practices and renewed the Christian life; in the famous Palmary Synod, St. Symmachus saw his disciplinary supremacy universally acknowledged; by the celebrated formula since known as the Formula of Hormisdas, the pope of that name affirmed, before both the East and the West, his supreme doctrinal authority; and Pelagius I, by his organization of the papal patrimony, outlined the rules which his successors would follow in the administration of the temporal domain of the Holy See. While these major events were taking place, God was preparing about the Holy See a sort of peaceful and courageous army of auxiliaries by the foundation of the monks of the West. Before relating these five glorious episodes in the history of the papacy, we must give an account of the patient efforts that made them possible.

Pope St. Simplicius (468–483)

Simplicius [40] (468–483), who witnessed the fall of the Empire, seems to have combined a firmness of character with great practical sense. He was especially engaged in organizing

[40] The *Liber pontificalis* (I, 249) says he was a native of Tivoli and the son of Castinus.

the ecclesiastical service, which had been so often disturbed by the barbarian "tumults." [41]

In the fifth century the religious service in Rome was celebrated in twenty-five "presbyteral" churches, called "titles" (*tituli*), to which priests were especially assigned. This number of twenty-five *tituli* remained unchanged until the year 1000.

But in addition to these titular churches, there arose, both within the city and in the Roman rural district, a considerable number of places of worship, burial chapels, and monuments erected in honor of the martyrs. Thither the Christians were fond of going, to pray for the strength they needed to practice the Gospel precepts amid the scandals of pagan Rome.

It was to Rome also that people came from all parts of the Christian world to venerate the glorious memorials contained in the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Lawrence.[42] They came from Africa with St. Fulgentius, from Italy with St. Paulinus of Nola,[43] from Gaul with St. Hilary,[44] from Ireland with St. Magniscius, a disciple of St. Patrick.[45] To Rome they came that they might imbibe the Christian spirit at its very source.[46] But the frequent incursions of barbarians led to a disordering of the exercise of public worship. The catacombs, which had been so venerated by Christians, who called them "the cemeteries of the martyrs," [47] were considerably damaged by the enemy; lack of security in the environs of

[41] The Romans used the word *tumultus* for the state of siege declared on the occasion of sudden attacks that endangered the state.

[42] These are the three basilicas mentioned by the *Liber pontificalis* in the life of St. Simplicius (468–483). *Liber pont.*, I, 249.

[43] St. Paulinus, Letters; *PL*, LXI, 235, 247, 382.

[44] *Acta sanctorum*, April 6.

[45] *Op. cit.*, September 3.

[46] Guiraud, "Rome, ville sainte au V^e^ siècle," in the *R. H. et L. Rel.*, 1898, pp. 55 ff.

[47] This popular phrase, *coemeteria sanctorum martyrum*, led to the belief that all the catacombs were filled with martyrs' bodies. In reality the vast multitude of the bodies buried there were those of ordinary Christians. The bodies of martyrs in the catacombs were very rare.

Rome had in some places interrupted the traditional liturgical worship in those venerable catacombs. Furthermore the Roman clergy, at that time including only parochial priests, called titular or cardinal priests,[48] was not numerous enough for the service of the catacombs and the open-air cemeteries that had been constructed quite close by. These cemetery shrines became likewise places of worship for the country people of the neighborhood. In particular the service of the three churches of the catacombs outside the city walls—the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Lawrence—had grown extensively. For those three basilicas Simplicius organized a weekly service to be supplied by the parochial priests of neighboring titles. They attended these basilicas in turn and there prepared the faithful for the sacraments of penance and baptism.[49] The psalmody of the choir office continued to be entrusted to monks living near these basilicas.

Simplicius was no less zealous in the conservation and administration of Church property. He issued regulations that thenceforth the income of the Churches and the offerings of the faithful be divided into four parts: only one part would revert to the bishop; the three other parts would be used for

[48] Cardinals, that is, attached to a church, *incardinati.* This epithet given to all parochial priests has nothing in common with our present word "cardinal," a member of the Sacred College. It was not until the eighth century that the Lateran Basilica was under the charge of bishops of the environs of Rome. This was the origin of the cardinal-bishops, or suburbicarian bishops. Cf. Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* I, 250.

[49] *Hic constituit ad Sanctum Petrum apostolum et ad Sanctum Paulum apostolum et ad Sanctum Laurentium martyrem ebdomadas ut presbyteri manerent, propter penitentes et baptismum* (*Lib. pont.,* I, 249). The first edition of the *Liber pontificalis* says: . . . *Propter baptismum et poenitentiam petentibus.* This text is one of the most important for the history of the sacrament of penance. If we compare this text with a similar text in the note on Pope Marcellus (*Lib. pont.,* I, 164) and with the evidence in Socrates and Sozomen (*PG,* LXVII, 613 f., 1457 f.), we see that the baptismal and penitential ministry here referred to is merely the preparation of catechumens for baptism and of penitents for their public reconciliation; because at that time, except in case of necessity, the celebration of baptism and the reconciliation of penitents required the presence of the bishop. These ceremonies were performed at a general meeting, not for one parish at a time. Cf. *Lib. pont.,* I, 165.

the support of the lower clergy, for the relief of the poor, and for the maintenance of the churches (*ecclesiasticis fabricis*). This seems to be the origin of the *fabrica ecclesiae.* The word *fabrica,* meaning construction or repairs, came to signify the income intended for the work of repairs and maintenance, then the administration of this income.[50] "It would be hard to say exactly when the practice began of dividing the whole revenue of the Church into four equal parts. . . . The same use was made of Church property during the first three or four centuries; but it does not seem that the canons had prescribed this exact division into equal portions. Pope Simplicius is perhaps the first to speak of it, although he refers to it as an old custom." [51]

Were these regulations poorly observed? The zealous Pontiff employed the utmost energy to make offenders disgorge, even if they were in the highest ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Gaudentius bishop of Auffinium allowed some sacred vessels to be sold, and appropriated to himself the money thus obtained. Simplicius ordered the alienated objects to be returned to the Church treasury; and, as Gaudentius had dared to perform illicit ordinations, the Pope took from him the right to ordain.[52] The same prohibition was applied to John archbishop of Ravenna, who had been guilty of a similar offense.[53]

Pope St. Felix III (483–492)

Simplicius' successor, Felix III,[54] was a member of the Roman patrician family of the Anicii. Everywhere he defended

[50] It seems that the council of the *fabrica* was not instituted until the thirteenth century. A council held in 1287 regulated the appointment of its members. Imbart de la Tour, *Questions d'histoire,* p. 273.

[51] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* Part III, Bk. II, chap. 13.

[52] Jaffé, *Reg. pont. rom.,* I, 570.

[53] *Ibid.,* I, 583.

[54] Or Felix II, if we do not admit in the list of popes the Felix II whom the *Liber pontificalis* places between Pope Liberius and Pope Damasus. See Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* pp. cxxiii, cxxv, 209 note 17.

the cause of the Church with the soul of an apostle and the attitude of a true Roman of the old stock. He called Emperor Zeno his son and showered on him testimonials of paternal affection; but when he saw the Emperor's obstinacy in the heresy of Acacius, he wrote to him as follows: "The highest power in temporal matters has been bestowed upon you, together with the obligation of leaving the direction of spiritual affairs in the hands of those whom God has appointed for the purpose. Your government has everything to gain by allowing the Catholic Church to govern itself in accordance with its own laws." [55]

The character and virtues of this great pope fitted him for mighty deeds. But he was rendered almost powerless by the evil of the times. His great-grandson, St. Gregory the Great, would accomplish his work.[56]

The pontificate of Felix III was, in fact, much disturbed by the Ostrogoth invasion of Italy and by the Vandal persecution in Africa. It was in the autumn of 488 that Theodoric, king of the "Eastern Goths," after gathering all the men of his race on the banks of the Danube, turned his steps toward Italy, at the head of an army of 200,000 warriors. As we are told by a contemporary writer, "he brought with him a whole horde of barbarians who dwelt in carts, who pillaged and carried off everything they could lay hands on as they went along." [57]

[55] Jaffé, I, 612.

[56] Felix III lost his wife while he was a deacon. De Rossi discovered and identified the epitaph of St. Felix' noble wife.

Levitae conjux Petronia, forma pudoris,
His mea deponens sedibus ossa loco.
Parcite vos lacrymis, dulces cum conjuge natae
Viventemque Deo credite flere nefas. (De Rossi, *Inscr. christ.*, I, 371.) St. Gregory speaks of his ancestor Felix (Homily 38 on the Gospels). In the fifth century the Church law simply required that clerics in major orders should live in continence. St. Leo the Great wrote: "If they are married, they are not obliged to dismiss their wives. . . . Let their carnal marriage be transformed into a spiritual union." St. Leo, Letter 167; *PL*, LIV, 1204.

[57] Ennodius, *Panegyricus Theodorici.*

From the autumn of 489 until the assassination of Odoacer by Theodoric in 493, there was nothing but scenes of warfare and devastation. Yet Rome escaped being sacked. At Ravenna, when the Bishop appeared before the King of the Ostrogoths "with a procession of priests and clerics, with crosses, censers, and the holy Gospels, Theodoric promised to spare not only the people of Ravenna, but also all the Romans." [58]

At that same time the Christians of Africa experienced a terrible persecution by the Vandal King Huneric. History records few persecutions that were bloodier. Felix III was powerless to stop it. He requested Emperor Zeno to use his influence with Huneric to obtain a respite in the persecution. Zeno sent an envoy for this purpose, but the attempt was fruitless. Nothing but the tyrant's death put an end to the persecution.

Pope St. Gelasius (492–496)

What Felix III hoped to accomplish, Gelasius I (492–496) [59] began to carry out. When the new Pontiff entered upon his office, the Christians of Africa had again found peace under the Vandal King Thrasamund (484–496); Theodoric would soon give peace to Italy. The King of the Ostrogoths, free of any rival by Odoacer's death in 493, wanted to deserve the name of great by his government, as he had merited it by his victories. Of this great statesman, this strange and mighty genius, Amédée Thierry says, with some exaggeration, that "Attila had more feelings of pity than Theodoric the barbarian, but few Romans of his time surpassed Theodoric the civilized in generous ideas." During the first half of his reign

[58] *MGH, scriptores rerum longobardarum et italicarum,* p. 303.

[59] Gelasius was a native of Africa, the son of Valerius, says the *Liber pontificalis,* I, 255. In a letter to Emperor Anastasius (Jaffé, 632), he calls himself a Roman. The two statements are not necessarily contradictory. He might call himself a Roman because, at the time of his birth, Africa, or at least the city of Carthage, was under the Roman power. Duchesne surmises that Gelasius was rather old at the time of his election to the papacy. *Lib. pont.,* I, 256 note.

the King of the Ostrogoths, so far as he was not led astray by pride, was greatly pleased to become the defender of the Church and of public order. Gelasius profited by these good dispositions. The Pope was clear-headed and energetic. Perhaps of all the popes who came before St. Gregory, none had a clearer perception of the future or prepared for it with more watchful solicitude. He comprehended, better than Simplicius and Felix did, that the work which Providence destined for the papacy could not be performed without a preliminary work of social pacification.

His astounding activity and his marvelous power of work enabled him, while attacking the Acacian dispute with rare energy, to extend his watchful protection to all the oppressed, so numerous at that period of continual disturbances. This fact is evidenced by his numerous dealings with bishops and those who held worldly power, whenever rights, freedom, and poverty were outraged in any manner. The *Liber pontificalis* says that "he saved the city of Rome from the danger of famine." [60] We have no details of this incident. But we may suppose that he relieved the needs of the indigent by a wise distribution of relief, thanks to the revenue of the Church's patrimony and to alms collected through his care.[61] From him comes this maxim in which we can see the principle of the whole social activity of the Church: "Nothing is more befitting the priestly office than the protection of the poor and the weak." [62]

Suppression of the Lupercalia

One of the outstanding events of his pontificate was the blow he gave to the old Roman paganism by abolishing the feast of the Lupercalia.

[60] *Lib. pont.*, I, 256.

[61] This seems indicated by a letter from Gelasius to Rusticus bishop of Lyons. Jaffé, I, 634.

[62] Jaffé, I, 629, according to a letter recently discovered in the British Museum.

The famine just mentioned had led a number of Christians, influenced by some remnant of pagan superstition, to invoke Castor and Pollux. This attachment to the old ceremonies of paganism seems to have been true of several members of the Roman nobility. Through patriotism or through devotedness to old traditions, they continued the practice of ceremonies which their Christian conscience should have made them reject. Gelasius needed all his energy to fight this serious danger, which would have resulted in altering the purity of Christian doctrine and morals.

This strange aberration of patriotism and of the traditional spirit was evident especially on the occasion of the Lupercalia. Following an ancient custom, established in honor of the god Pan, the destroyer of wolves, or perhaps in memory of the legendary wolf that suckled Romulus, on the fifteenth of the kalends of March, i. e., February 15, groups of young men, half-naked after the ancient manner, ran about the city to drive out evil, as one hunts wolves. These *luperci,* as they were called, struck whatever women they met with their sacred whips, and indulged in various kinds of licentious conduct.[63] A papal decree had ordered the suppression of these feasts. But, in Gelasius' pontificate, a pestilence that fell upon the city was ascribed to the discontinuance of the Lupercalia. A group of Christians, with Senator Andromachus at its head, wanted to re-establish the old licentious ceremony. If we are to judge by the tone of Gelasius' reply, the memorial presented by these Christians must have been haughty to the point of insolence. These partisans of paganism and of tradition went so far as to charge the Pope with weakness, laxity, and even heresy. A long letter from Gelasius to Senator Andromachus and his partisans shows us the depth of the evil and makes us ac-

[63] Marquardt and Mommsen, *Manuel des antiquités romaines,* XIII, 173–183. Art. "Lupercales" in Daremberg and Saglio, *Dict. des antiquités grecques et romaines.* The purifying whips were called *februae.* From this was derived the word *februare,* "to purify." The month of February (*Februarius*) was the month of the purification.

quainted with the difficulties which the influence of the Church encountered in the upper classes of society at that period.

The Supreme Pontiff begins with an outspoken denunciation of those "who make charges without acquainting themselves with the facts, who would teach what they have not learned, who, without adequate inquiry, are in a hurry to find fault, seeking only to utter insults regarding matters of which they are ignorant." [64] Says the Pope: "You, forsooth, are the ones who charge us with being easy-going and lax in censuring the vices of the Church.[65] But who are you? You are, indeed, neither Christians nor pagans, but are rather people devoid of faith or morals." [66] The letter closes with an absolute and most forceful prohibition against any Christian taking part in the Lupercalia.

The last portion of the document is of great historical interest, showing us that this ban of a pagan feast was only an episode in the unremitting strife which the supreme pontiffs had to maintain in their efforts gradually to free Christian practices from ancient superstitions. "You tell me," says Gelasius, "that this practice has been carried on for ages past and therefore may not be suppressed." [67] In substance the Pope goes on thus: "I know well enough how long the evil has endured. And other things have been tolerated among Christians. Even idolatrous sacrifices. Each of my predecessors, little by little, according to his prudence or his courage, has eliminated the most dangerous evils. Have they done well? Have they done ill? God is their judge. But I am responsible only for my own conduct. I reject and condemn your pagan Lupercalia." [68] An old tradition credits Pope Gelasius with establishing the

[64] *Qui, studio cacologiae, quae nesciunt arguentes.* Gelasius, *Adversus Andromachum; PL,* LIX, 111.

[65] *Qui nos arguunt segnes esse censores in vitiis Ecclesiae coercendis. Ibid.*

[66] *Dicite nobis nec christiani nec pagani, ubique corrupti, nusquam integri. PL,* LIX, 114.

[67] *Sed dicitis tot saeculis rem gestam non oportere secludi. PL,* LIX, 116.

[68] *Idem.*

feast of the Purification of Our Lady (Candlemas) and says that it was instituted, with its procession of candles, the more effectively to abolish the Lupercalia procession. But we know the feast of the Purification existed in the East at the end of the fourth century, since the pilgrim Etheria (Silvia) witnessed it in Jerusalem in 386,[69] and it was celebrated there on February 15. True, there is no mention of it at Rome before the seventh century. Perhaps its introduction in the West goes back to St. Gelasius. In any event, the identity of date between the feast of the pagan purification and the feast of the Christian Purification is striking and may allow us to suppose some connection between the two.[70]

But Pope Gelasius did, in fact, very actively engage in the work of making the regulations of the liturgy more precise, and enriching the mass with new collects and new prefaces. This was an indirect but effective way of combating the last remains of the pagan superstitions. It was likewise a means of safeguarding the purity of dogma, since the law of prayer naturally becomes the law of belief, *lex orandi lex credendi.* To what extent the Sacramentary bearing the name of Gelasius

[69] Cabrol, Study on the *Peregrinatio Silviae.*

[70] A practice which the Church commonly adopted was to alienate the Christians from the pagan feasts by replacing those feasts with solemnities that had some analogy to them. Thus the St. Mark's procession, which was held on April 25 in the Roman campania, replaced the pagan custom of the *robigalia.* The feast of the Chair of St. Peter, father of the Christian family, was instituted and fixed on January 22 because on that day the pagans celebrated the feast of *cara cognatio,* or feast of the family, which was an occasion for banquets that Christians should abstain from. Even the feast of Christmas, *Natale,* seems to have been put on December 25 because that was the date of a profane feast, *Natalis invicti,* the feast of the invincible god of the Sun. The Ember Days at first were celebrated only three times a year (in June, September, and December) and their liturgical texts explicitly refer to the different periods of farming; according to the conjectures of Dom Germain Morin, they probably took the place of the three pagan *feriae* (the *feriae messis,* the *feriae vindemiales,* and the *feriae sementinæ*). *Revue bénédictine,* 1897, p. 340; Grisar, *History of Rome,* III, 281. Cf. Cabrol, *Les origines liturgiques;* also two articles by Dom Cabrol in the *Revue pratique d'apologétique:* "Le paganisme dans la liturgie," November, 1906, and "L'idolatrie dans l'Église," October, 1907.

is really his work remains a moot question;[71] but we know he composed a sacramentary as well as several hymns and homilies on liturgical subjects. These have been preserved.[72]

Authority of the Apostolic See

The memory of St. Gelasius has always been highly honored in the Church. Says Bossuet: "No one has spoken more magnificently of the greatness of the see occupied by the popes." The Vatican Council took from his writings several of its expressions in its constitution *De ecclesia,* in the matter of the primacy of the see of Rome.

One of St. Gelasius' most remarkable sayings is this, which we find in a letter from him to Emperor Anastasius: "The Apostolic See's confession of faith is unassailable; it is impossible for it to be stained by any false doctrine or be contaminated by any error."[73] To that same emperor he wrote: "Know that the world is ruled over by two great powers: that of the pontiffs and that of the kings, but the authority of the pontiffs is far the greater since they must, on judgment day, give account to God of the souls of the kings."[74] He also says: "When the see of Blessed Peter has decided, no one is allowed to pass judgment on its decision; it may be appealed to from all parts of the world, but from its decision no one can appeal."[75] Two of St. Gelasius' successors, St. Symmachus and

[71] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 101.

[72] The famous decree *De libris recipiendis,* which at a very early date was attributed to Pope Gelasius, is now generally regarded as not authentic. Its valuable indications about the canon of Scripture and the apocryphal books are still an important evidence of the belief of the Church at that period. Cf. Grisar, *op. cit.,* III, 236 f.; Roux, *Le Pape Gélase,* pp. 169 ff.; *Lib. pont.,* I, cvii, cxiv.

[73] Jaffé, *Regesta,* I, 615.

[74] Labbe, *Conc.,* IV, 1122.

[75] Jaffé, I, 664. *Neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio, si quidem ad illam de qualibet parte canones appellari voluerint, ab ea autem nemo sit appellare permissus.*

St. Hormisdas, would soon have this doctrine of his acclaimed by the whole Catholic Church.

Pope St. Anastasius

Between the death of Gelasius (496) and the coming of Symmachus (498) the Holy See was occupied by Anastasius II, a Roman by birth. To end the schism that separated Constantinople from Rome, he exercised deference to the utmost limits. By this policy he succeeded only in making himself very unpopular with the Romans. An opposition party, perhaps the same group for which Senator Andromachus was spokesman under Pope Gelasius, accepted the rumor that the Pope had died suddenly, overtaken by the judgment of God. The author of the note on Anastasius, inserted in the *Liber pontificalis,* reports this rumor.[76] Legend seized upon it and added tragical details. Thus the name of Pope Anastasius II, which the Church has placed in her list of saints, comes down to us laden with the poet's curse. Says Dante:

> "We drew ourselves aside behind the cover
> Of a great tomb, whereon I saw a writing
> Which said: 'Pope Anastasius I hold
> Whom out of the right way Photinus drew.' " [77]

Furthermore, in the pontificates of Anastasius' two immediate successors (Symmachus and Hormisdas), the very schemes of the enemies of the papacy provoked two superb glorifications of the papal power, perhaps the most superb ever recorded.

Pope St. Symmachus (498–514)

Anastasius was succeeded by Symmachus (498–514).[78] Scarcely had he been consecrated in the Lateran Basilica, when

[76] *Lib. pont.,* I, 258, *qui nutu divino percussus est.*

[77] *Inferno,* canto 11, verses 6–9; Longfellow's trans.

[78] Son of Fortunatus and native of Sardinia. *Lib. pont.,* I, 260.

an antipope, supported by a Roman faction with a certain Senator Festus at its head, had himself consecrated bishop of Rome in the Basilica of St. Mary Major.[79] It was the archpriest Lawrence, of whom they hoped to make a pope devoted to the Byzantine emperor and the Monophysite sect.

The attempt failed, at least for the moment. The barbarian King Theodoric, more powerful at Rome than the Eastern emperor, would recognize only the pope chosen by a majority of the electors. Lawrence had to withdraw.

Thereupon the rage of the faction turned against the lawful Pope. False witnesses were suborned, who accused the Pope of imaginary crimes. He was charged with having immoral relations with women, with illegal alienation of Church property, with celebrating Easter contrary to the established regulations of the liturgy. The most elementary rules of Roman legal procedure were violated by having the Pope's own slaves testify against him. The Catholic party, with the approval of the Pope and of King Theodoric, invited the bishops of Italy to meet at Rome for the purpose of ending the conflict. In May, 501, one hundred fifteen bishops convened in the Julian Basilica (Santa Maria in Trastevere). But while Symmachus was on his way to the synod, he was brutally assaulted by members of Festus' party. He barely escaped with his life and had to barricade himself in St. Peter's Basilica. The *Liber pontificalis* and contemporary writings furnish an account of the unprecedented scenes of violence instigated by the senatorial party. Convents were broken into, and the virgins outraged. It was no longer safe for the clergy to appear on the streets of Rome.[80]

In the circumstances the Pope declared that he could not take

[79] *Loc. cit.*

[80] *Lib. pont.*, I, 261. *Omni die pugnas contra ecclesiam in media civitate gerebant . . . sanctimoniales mulieres et virgines deponentes de monasteria vel de habitaculis suis, denudantes sexum femineum, caedibus plagarum adflictas vulnerabantur . . . ut nulli esset securitas die vel nocte de clero in civitate ambulare.*

part in the council.[81] Theodoric protested that he was unwilling to make a decision in ecclesiastical matters.[82] The assembly of bishops was in a critical position. And it was well aware of the fact. The bishops wrote to the King, saying: "It is an unheard-of thing and quite unprecedented that the pontiff of this see should be brought up for trial and judgment." [83]

Thus the Pope, the King, and the assembly of bishops held the same view. "The case was to be the touchstone of the monarchical organization of the Church." [84]

There seemed no way of solving the problem. Yet a decision had to be made, for the factional fights continued, and the streets of the city ran with blood. A handful of evil-doers, in the pay of the ambitious plotters, were terrorizing the populace, which sided with Symmachus.

The council voted its decision on October 23, 501. Nothing could have been nobler and more worthy. It declared that, "after examining all the details of the case, they judge Pope Symmachus, titular of the Apostolic See, to be free before men of all the charges brought against him." Therefore, so far as concerns the temporalities, by virtue of the powers conferred by King Theodoric, they pronounce the restoration of the Pope in the exercise of all his rights; but, so far as concerns the spiritual authority, they can, out of regard for the supreme authority of the Church, only "leave the whole matter to the judgment of God, urging everyone to return to the communion of Symmachus, begging all to be mindful that God loves peace and wishes to give peace to all men." [85]

[81] For the acts of these synods, see *MGH, auctores antiquiss.*, XII, 416.

[82] *Quia non nostrum judicavimus de ecclesiasticis aliquid censere negotiis. MGH, auctores antiquiss.*, XII, 424.

[83] *Causa nova est, et pontificem sedis istius apud nos audiri nullo constat exemplo* (*ibid.*, p. 423).

[84] Grisar, *op. cit.*, II, 242.

[85] *MGH, ibid.*, p. 431. See the decision *in extenso* in *MGH, ibid.*, pp. 426–437.

Either because the decree was published in that place in the Roman Forum which was called *ad palmam,* or because the council was held in a part of St. Peter's atrium called *ad palmata,* the council which made this decision is known as the Palmary Synod.

The principle that the Holy See is subject to no judge, thus triumphed completely at Rome. It was enthusiastically received especially by the bishops of Gaul. At first word of this strange trial, the famous and learned bishop of Vienne, St. Avitus, perhaps having only vague reports of it, was shocked at the thought of a council of bishops preparing to judge a pope. He wrote a stirring letter to Rome, in which he says: "If the authority of the Pope of Rome may be impugned, it is not one bishop, but the whole episcopate which becomes unstable." [86]

In Italy, Ennodius of Pavia wrote an eloquent defense of the Palmary Synod, against the opponents of that council.[87]

This peaceful victory enabled Symmachus to address the Eastern Emperor with greater authority than ever. He said to him: "Compare the dignity of the emperor with that of the head of the Church. Consider, O Emperor, the long list of those who, since the beginning of Christianity, have persecuted the faith. They have perished; but the true religion has shone forth with greater splendor the more it has been oppressed." [88]

But Emperor Anastasius, to whom this letter was addressed, was becoming more and more committed to the Eutychian heresy. The joy of concluding the peace was reserved to the future emperor, Justin I, and the successor of Symmachus, Pope Hormisdas.

[86] *Si papa Urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus jam videbitur, non episcopus, vacillare.* St. Avitus, Letter 31; *PL,* LIX, 249; *MGH, ibid.,* VI, 65.

[87] *PL,* LXIII, 183–208.

[88] Jaffé, 761.

Pope St. Hormisdas (514–523)

Symmachus died July 19, 514, and his successor Hormisdas was consecrated the next day. The situation at Constantinople had become intolerable. The sectarian spirit of Emperor Anastasius brought about a condition of lawlessness. Some monks who, as Hormisdas said, "were monks only by the habit they wore,[89] who lacked the two basic virtues of the religious life, obedience and humility," were terrorizing the countryside. In the lead of these disturbers were the Acephali monks. They were given this name Acephali (ἀκέφαλοι, headless) after deserting their leader Peter Mongus, whom they accused of approving a compromise with the Pope. Opposed to these fanatics were the Acoemetae monks (ἀκοίμητοι, sleepless), so named because of their long vigils. It was one of these Acoemetae who had denounced to the Pope the heresy of Patriarch Acacius. It was one of them who, at the risk of his life, had fastened to Acacius' cloak the sentence of excommunication issued by the sovereign pontiff. In 469 these zealous defenders of the Holy See, led by their abbot, entered the hippodrome, with a concourse of people following them. There they publicly protested against a prince suspected of heresy being raised to the rank of Caesar.[90] In the heat of the strife they sometimes yielded to the temptation that appeals to the impatience of men of action in time of disturbance: to defend a good cause by the use of the worst methods of its adversaries.[91]

[89] *Epist. ad Possessorem episcopum,* Jaffé, I, 850. In this letter the Pope relates how a group of rebellious monks came to Rome with the intention of coercing the Holy See into granting an approval of one of their errors. He says they stirred up the crowds in the streets, *ad concussionem quietis circa regum etiam statuas inclamantes.*

[90] Marin, *Les moines de Constantinople, de Constantin à Photius;* see the words "acémète" and "acéphale" in Vacant's *Dict. de théologie catholique.*

[91] Several Acoemetae monks, in their detestation of the Eutychian heresy, fell into the Nestorian heresy (Hefele, *His. des conciles,* III, 131) and were excommunicated by John II in 534 (Mansi, VIII, 798 f.). See Marin, *op. cit.*

In the time of Hormisdas the great majority of the people of Constantinople, as also the people of Rome under Symmachus, earnestly desired peace. So when, in 519, the news spread that a final union was effected between the see of Constantinople and the see of Rome, between the new Emperor Justin and Pope Hormisdas, by acceptance of the formula of faith proposed by the Supreme Pontiff, it occasioned an unexampled demonstration. We learn the details from the reports of the papal legates.[92] The people went in procession from the imperial palace to the church. There the papal document was read, in which Nestorius, Eutyches, Acacius, with all their followers and associates, were anathematized, and in which all the letters of Pope Leo the Great were approved. St. Peter, the Pope as the center of unity, and the Emperor as the glorious protector of that unity, were acclaimed with prolonged shouts. The people wept for joy.

Formula of Hormisdas

But the healing of a quarrel that had lasted thirty-five years was not the most important result of that great historic event. By one of those wonderful compensations of Providence, with which the history of the Church abounds, that city of Constantinople, the center of so many plots against Rome, acclaimed, and soon the whole East acclaimed with her, the most perfect formula that had ever been given of the primacy and doctrinal infallibility of the see of Rome.

The formula subscribed by the Patriarch, accepted by the Emperor, and applauded by the people contained these words: "We wish to follow in everything the Apostolic See, in which is the full, true, and perfect solidity of the Christian religion. . . . For the Catholic religion has been preserved ever immaculate in the Apostolic See." [93]

[92] For these details, see Mansi, VIII, 453.

[93] *Sequentes in omnibus apostolicam Sedem . . . in qua est integra et verax*

Such is the wording of the famous Formula of St. Hormisdas. It was signed by 2,500 Eastern bishops,[94] and enthusiastically recorded by several Western councils. Popes Agapetus, Nicholas I, and Adrian II appealed to it as to a rule of faith. Bossuet, in his *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani,* refers to it, Fenelon cites it in opposition to the Jansenists, and the Vatican Council embodied its chief expressions in the decree on the Roman primacy.[95]

Thus it happened that, from so many doctrinal and disciplinary disputes, the papal authority emerged strengthened and enlarged. At the same time a concurrence of providential events resulted in the gradual formation, to the advantage of the Holy See, of a temporal domain, the guaranty of its spiritual authority. It was an Eastern emperor, Justinian, successor of so many potentates who had opposed Rome, who gave this temporal power of the Church its first general and official sanction.

Patrimony of St. Peter

From the very beginning, the confidence of the faithful prompted them to place generous alms in the hands of the popes, for use in works of charity. Under the liberal legislation inaugurated by Constantine, these offerings enabled the supreme pontiffs to acquire, with a view to their diverse undertakings, important domains at Rome, in Italy, in Sicily, and in Sardinia. These were called the patrimonies of the Holy See.

christianae religionis et perfecta soliditas. . . . Quia in Sede apostolica immaculata est semper servata Catholica religio. See the full Latin text in Mansi, VIII, 451; *PL,* LXIII, 444; and Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* no. 171.

[94] This is the figure given by the deacon Rusticus, who wrote in the time of Justinian. Rusticus, *Contra Acephalos disputatio; PL,* LXVII, 1251.

[95] Pope Hormisdas, so firm on principles, was tolerant to persons. Many of the opposing party had been in good faith. Some Christians who died during the schism and in the Acacian Schism have been canonized. Such were St. Flavian of Constantinople and St. Elias of Jerusalem. Cf. Thomassin, *Dissert. XVI in Synod.*

Even as early as the fifth century the bishop of Rome was probably the wealthiest landowner of Italy.[96]

Moreover, amid the barbarian invasions the popes, like most of the bishops, came to be invested with the duties of *defensores civitatis*. The functions of the *defensor,* pertaining to the judicial and the administrative order, were very extensive.[97] The powers of the lay *defensores* were lessened in the sixth century. But the same was not true in the case of ecclesiastical *defensores*. The Eastern emperors, who had not given up their claims to the suzerainty of Rome and the whole West, and for whom Odoacer and Theodoric were merely lieutenants, were resolved to exercise their authority there directly. But soon they saw that no intermediary could be more useful for them than the bishop of Rome: he alone possessed sufficient moral authority to keep mutinous subjects at peace; to him alone could be entrusted the management of the public funds, which an imperial officer might squander. Finally, the pope had become not only the richest landowner of Italy, but the greatest social and political authority in Italy.

To organize the temporal administration of the papal domain had been the major concern of the great Pope Gelasius. We know from John the Deacon that the farm and tax lists drawn up by Gelasius were still in use under Gregory the Great for the administration of the patrimonies.[98] His writings and the extant documents of his chancery enable us to note the great efforts of this pontiff to safeguard what he calls the patrimony of the poor.[99] But his successors had not the means to pursue his work. Symmachus and Hormisdas were absorbed by the higher and more pressing question of the disciplinary

[96] Diehl in Schrader's *Atlas historique,* explanation of map 16, "L'Église au temps de saint Grégoire le Grand."

[97] Daremberg and Saglio, *Dict. des antiquités grecques et romaines,* under the word "defensor civitatis." Chénon, "Études historiques sur le Defensor civitatis" in the *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger,* 1889, pp. 551 ff.

[98] John the Deacon, *Life of St. Gregory the Great,* Bk. II, chap. 24; *PL,* LXXV, 97.

[99] Jaffé, I, 684.

and doctrinal primacy of the Holy See. The pontificates of the five popes who occupied the Roman See between 523 and 536 (John I, Felix IV, Boniface II, John II, and Agapetus) were disturbed by Theodoric's persecution, which we shall speak of later on. The pontificates of Silverius and Vigilius [100] were too much disturbed by the Eastern disputes to allow the Holy See to resume the work of organization undertaken by St. Gelasius.

Emperor Justinian, under the influence of his wife, the scheming Theodora, revived the Monophysite quarrel by stirring up the question of the Three Chapters. Empress Theodora was a clever, intelligent woman; but she sought to subordinate the religious questions to her venturous political ideas. She persuaded Justinian that the powerful political party of the Monophysites of Arabia could easily be rallied to the Empire, if they were given a token of good will. That token was the condemnation of the three ecclesiastical writers who had attacked Monophysitism, while inclining to Nestorianism: Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas. The condemnation of the doctrine of these three men, which was called the condemnation of the Three Chapters, was not fundamentally heterodoxical, since the three accused writers had maintained erroneous opinions. What vitiated this condemnation, however, was that it was issued by an altogether incompetent authority. Pope Vigilius was not a man of determination. In consequence of certain intrigues, he had the weakness to subscribe to the anathema of the Three Chapters at the request of the Emperor. True, he retracted and suffered a grievous expiation for his fault. Although the events amid which Vigilius had to govern the Church offer attenuating circumstances and although he safeguarded his orthodoxy by certain reservations,[101] yet his conduct must be blamed. But it

[100] Silverius was born in Campania. His father was Pope Hormisdas, who was married before he received holy orders. (*Lib. pont.*, I, 290.) Vigilius was a Roman, the son of the consul John. (*Lib. pont.*, I, 296.)

[101] In approving the condemnation, Pope Vigilius added: *Salva in omnibus*

would be highly unjust to draw from his action an argument against the infallibility of the pope.[102]

The Pragmatic Sanction

In 554, during the pontificate of this same Pope, Emperor Justinian, that strange monarch whose policies, as also his private life, were made up of contrasts, published his Pragmatic Sanction, which confirmed and considerably increased the temporal power of the popes. Henceforth the bishop of Rome had a say in the appointment of the administrators of the provinces, received their oath of office, inspected the performance of the instructions they received when entering into office.[103] In case of their transfer, he had the right to audit their accounts; in case of their dismissal, he had, for a period of fifty days, the right to cite them before his tribunal on charges of corruption in office.[104] Along with three citizens he had charge of all the municipal affairs, such as the maintenance of the baths, aqueducts, bridges, and walls, as also the inspection of the prisons and markets.[105] On a day of combat he must be the first upon the ramparts. Henceforth he was the legal protector of each and every one against the demands of the soldiers, the vexations of the Treasury, and the fraudulent practices of judges.[106]

Pope Pelagius I (556–561)

The next pope was Pelagius I. His experience in political and administrative affairs prepared him for the delicate task

reverentia Synodi Chalcedonensis. Says Duchesne: "These reservations were so clear and exact that no Monophysite could sign them without thus making a complete abjuration." *Revue des questions historiques,* 1884, p. 406. Cf. Grisar. *op. cit.,* I, 163 ff.

[102] Döllinger, writing under the pseudonym Janus, did so in his pamphlet *The Pope and the Council,* p. 59.

[103] *Novellae* 149, c. 1; 8, c. 14; 17, c. 16.

[104] *Op. cit.,* 128, c. 24; 8, c. 9.

[105] Code, *De episcopali audientia, 22, 25, 26.*

[106] *Ibid.,* 18, 26; *Novella* 8.

of profiting by this favorable legislation of the Byzantine Emperor.[107] Says Grisar:

His Regests indeed afford us an insight into a singularly strenuous life. A glance at his letters shows us how Pelagius intervened in the regular administration of justice, and, for instance, removed cases in which the clergy or the monasteries were concerned, from the secular tribunals of Italy and set them to be tried by his bishops; how he called in the secular arm against usurping or unruly bishops, demanding, at the same time, the presence of a few clerics, in order that "the military may not appear to be acting alone."

In some of this Pope's letters a strong secular element is noticeable. This was called for by the particular risks of the period; especially when it became necessary to put in order the property and revenues of the Roman See. Pelagius displayed a prudence which overlooked nothing.[108]

In one of the zealous Pontiff's letters we see the real motive of so great watchfulness. The question concerns the *res pauperum* and, to safeguard the "goods of the poor," no pains are to be spared.[109] Pelagius must be considered the principal organizer of the temporal administration of the papal domain.

Under his three successors (John III, Benedict I, and Pelagius II) [110] the Lombard invasions, more terrible than those of the Heruli or the Ostrogoths, permitted attention to be given only the most urgent matters in the administration of the papal lands. But the development of the temporal power of the popes was not so much their personal work as it was the result of providential events. The very disturbances we have just mentioned brought out the great ascendancy of the popes, gave them opportunities to act as arbitrators in the most acute conflicts, and thus contributed to the increase of their sovereign

[107] Pelagius was born in Rome. He belonged to a family of the aristocracy. Procopius, *De bello gothico*, III, 16, 17, 20, 21; *Lib. pont.*, I, 304.

[108] Grisar, *op. cit.*, III, 54.

[109] Mansi, IV, 736.

[110] John III, Benedict I, and Pelagius II were Romans. *Lib. pont.*, I, 305, 308 f.

prestige, even in the social and political order. "The popes now become the real masters of Rome." [111] And so, when Pelagius II's successor, St. Gregory the Great, is elected pope, he is alarmed at seeing himself burdened with so many external affairs, so many political and social cares. "I wonder," he wrote, "whether being pope at this time is to be a spiritual head or a temporal king." [112]

The social life of the papacy was indeed beginning, the Middle Ages were opening. We can understand the holy Pontiff's fright at sight of his great and heavy mission. But, for the performance of his task, the new Pope found at his side new workers, prepared by Providence; they were the monastic family to which he himself had belonged, the spiritual sons of St. Benedict. They play an important part in the history of the period we are about to consider.

The Monks of the West

In 480, four years after the fall of the Roman Empire, there was born at Nursia in Campania one whose work was destined to exercise a great influence. We read in the words of his saintly biographer:

> There was a man of venerable life, blessed by grace and blessed in name, for he was called Benedictus: who, from his younger years, carried the mind of an old man; for his age was inferior to his virtue: all vain pleasure he contemned. . . . He was born in the province of Nursia, of honorable parentage, and brought up at Rome in the study of humanity. But for as much as he saw many by reason of such learning to fall to dissolute and lewd life, he drew back his foot, which he had as it were now set forth into the world.[113]

[111] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 231.

[112] St. Gregory the Great, *Epistolae,* Bk. I, ep. 25; *PL,* LXXVII, 476. *Hoc in loco quisquis pastor dicitur curis exterioribus graviter occupatur, ita ut saepe incertum fiat, utrum pastoris officium an terreni proceris agat. MGH, Reg.,* I, 24; p. 35.

[113] St. Gregory, *Dial.,* Bk. II, preface.

Forty miles from Rome, beyond Tivoli, in those gorges where the foaming Anio flows, overlooking the desolate ruins of an old imperial villa built by Nero, the young man found a solitary grotto. "With a resolute mind only to serve God, he sought for some place where he might attain to the desire of his holy purpose." [114] This solitary spot was called Subiacum. Today the devout traveler who visits the Sacro Speco of Subiaco is moved no less by the mighty memories connected with the place than by the picturesque and wild beauty of this venerated corner of the earth.

When a soul full of God seeks to flee from the world, other souls sometimes come to it, attracted by the virtues that are the more radiant as they are more interior. The stylites of the East saw flocking to the foot of their pillars throngs of pilgrims, sometimes people of the highest worldly station, who came to seek edification from the sight of those austerities or to ask for guidance. The first who felt Benedict's influence were some poor shepherds. "At the first when they espied him through the bushes, they verily thought that it had been some beast: but after they were acquainted with the servant of God, many of them were by his means converted from their beastly life to grace, piety, and devotion." [115] Finally a few individuals placed themselves under his guidance. Shortly afterward "a certain Goth, poor of spirit, that gave over the world, was received by the man of God." [116] Barbarians and Latins mingled together under the guidance of the holy patriarch. Before long, near his grotto, he founded twelve monasteries, with twelve monks in each. "At another time also many noble and religious men of Rome came unto him and committed their children to be brought up under him for the service of God. Then also

[114] *Ibid.*

[115] *Op. cit.*, Bk. II, chap. I.

[116] *Alio quoque tempore Gothus quidam pauper spiritu ad conversionem venit. Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 6. *Conversio* means entrance into the monastic life.

Evitius delivered him Maurus, and Tertullius the Senator brought Placidus, being their sons." [117]

Maurus later established Benedictine monasticism in France, and Placidus in Italy.

But the chanting of the divine praises was not heard very long near the Neronian villa and ancient Tivoli. The spirit of evil, that continued to pursue the servant of God, stirred up against him the priest Florentius, who spread so many calumnies about the young community that St. Benedict thought it well to leave the locality.

He moved to the side of the magnificent mountain which dominates the little town of Castrum Cassinum, whence the view spreads over that rich Campanian Plain which the Italians now call Terra di Lavoro. The old paganism, that no longer had any legal existence in the Roman Empire, had there found a secret refuge. Within the confines of an old Pelasgic colony, with its Cyclopean walls made of great rough-hewn blocks, piled one upon the other forming a sort of colossal fortress, "there was an ancient chapel in which the foolish and simple country people worshiped the god Apollo Pitosyrus, the Sun-god. Round about it likewise upon all sides there were groves for demon worship." [118]

Was the saint attracted by the majestic beauty of the site, by a desire to purify one of the last retreats of the expiring paganism, or by some mysterious voice in which he recognized the divine call? All we know, from his biographer, is that "the man of God coming thither, beat in pieces the idol, overthrew the altar, set fire on the woods, and in the temple of Apollo he built the oratory of St. Martin and, where the altar of the same Apollo was, he made an oratory of St. John: and

[117] *Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 3.

[118] *Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 8. *Ubi vetustissimum fanum fuit, in quo, ex antiquorum more gentilium, a stulto rusticorum populo Apollo colebatur. Circumquaque etiam in cultu daemonum luci succreverunt.*

by his continual preaching he brought the people dwelling in those parts to embrace the faith of Christ." [119] But, says St. Gregory, "the old enemy of mankind, not taking this in good part, did in open sight present himself to the eyes of the holy father and appeared visibly unto him most fell and cruel." [120]

There it was, upon those serene heights and upon the ruins of the false god of light, that Benedict drew up the wonderful Rule which, until the thirteenth century, almost alone would govern the monastic life in the West. The saint did not think he was producing a new work, nor did he purpose doing so. Again and again he refers to St. Basil, whom he calls his father; he takes maxims from Cassian; he appeals to the rules that were in use in the good monasteries of his time. In fact, the monastic life was flourishing, even in the western part of the Empire, before St. Benedict. St. Martin at Ligugé, St. Honoratus at Lerins, and St. Cassian at Marseilles had but recently offered fine examples of it. Yet it is St. Benedict who must be regarded as the father of Western monks, and his work must be considered a new creation.

Basil and Cassian gave general maxims, enlightening views emanating from the soul of the saints, aphorisms that summarized long experience. But what St. Benedict drew up was a veritable code of laws. Previous to him, the purity of the religious spirit in a monastery depended largely upon the personal influence of a holy abbot. The Benedictine Rule was so firm and pliable that by itself it sustained the religious life and bound together as in a common soul all the monasteries of the West. Especially did it penetrate the synthesis of the ancient rules with an evangelical spirit so pure that we can feel a breath of life and invigoration pass into all the monasteries where it was introduced. A finished model of discretion, of moderation, and of clearness, it appears, even to those least

[119] *Ibid.*
[120] *Ibid.*

inclined to favor it, as one of the most perfect masterpieces of Roman wisdom inspired by the Christian spirit.

In the very first lines of its prologue we feel ourselves breathing a pure, luminous air, like that which blows on the slope of Monte Cassino.

Says the holy patriarch:

> Hearken continually within thine heart, O son, giving attentive ear to the precepts of thy master. Understand with willing mind and effectually fulfil thy holy father's admonition; that thou mayest return by the labor of obedience, to Him from whom, by the idleness of disobedience, thou hadst withdrawn. . . . Let us with astonished ears listen to the admonition of God's voice daily crying out and saying: Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts.[121]

Such is the beginning of that famous Rule. Bossuet says of it that "it is a summary of Christianity, a learned and mysterious abridgment of the whole teaching of the Gospel, of all the institutions of the holy fathers, of all the counsels of perfection. Therein appear prudence and simplicity, humility and courage, strictness and gentleness, freedom and submission; therein correction possesses its full firmness, condescension its full attractiveness, command its vigor and subjection its restfulness, silence its gravity and speech its grace, strength its exercise and weakness its support." [122]

According to this Rule the abbot, mindful of his title (*abbas,* father), should exercise a wholly fatherly authority. He should never undertake anything of importance without first consulting his brethren. The principal virtues of the Benedictine monk are to be obedience, silence, and humility. His chief duties are to be the recitation of the divine office, the education of youth, reading, and manual labor. At the end of a certain period of probation, the monk is to make a promise of stability

[121] *Rule of St. Benedict,* prologue.

[122] Bossuet, *Panégyrique de saint Benoît.*

in his monastery. The habit may vary according to differences of country and climate.

This Rule, which, at least in Europe, would gradually absorb not only the rules of the Eastern monks, but also the Rule of St. Columban, was remarkably suited to the work which the Church had to undertake in the midst of the barbarian world. By the suppleness of its organization, the Benedictine Order was marvelously adapted to the missionary rôle which its monks soon began to fill in France, England, Germany, and the most remote countries. By the grouping of its members in monasteries permanently established upon the soil, which the monks would cultivate, it would give the barbarian world lessons of stability and labor. Its work of teaching would produce the monastic schools. But especially, for those races perpetually agitated by migrations and wars, it would give, through the example of its monks, the taste for and habit of that deeper and more fruitful life, which the holy patriarch, from the outset, made the rule of his own life and which he set forth to his disciples as the essential aim of the religious life, namely, the interior life or, as he himself said, "life with oneself in the sight of God."

Very likely many persons of that time and perhaps many a novice upon entering the monastery, may have asked the abbot the question which St. Gregory the Great places on the lips of the deacon Peter. Says Peter: "I understand not very well what you mean, when you say that he dwelt with himself." To this Gregory replies: "So often as we are carried too far from ourselves, we remain the same men that we were before and yet be not with ourselves as we were before: because we are wondering about other men's affairs, little considering and looking into the state of our own soul. . . . I said that this venerable man did dwell with himself, because carrying himself circumspectly and carefully in the sight of his Creator,

never did he turn the eyes of his soul away from himself, to behold aught else whatsoever." [123]

The barbarian world would finally understand this lesson. The Middle Ages would be not only the epoch of Charlemagne and Godfrey of Bouillon, but also the age of St. Bruno and of the author of the *Imitation of Christ*. A great mystical current flows through it, nourishing all the knightly heroisms. And that current will be spread in the world especially by the monks.

[123] St. Gregory, *Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 3.

CHAPTER II

St. Gregory the Great (590–604)

UPON the death of Pelagius II, the Roman people, senate, and clergy elected as his successor a disciple of St. Benedict. The deacon Gregory, who for fourteen years would bear the responsibility of governing the Church, was a frail monk, worn out by the austerities of the cloister,[1] but animated by the fervor of the monastic spirit which had been instilled by the holy patriarch of the monks of the West.

In Gregory that spirit was combined with a veneration for the old Roman traditions, which he received from his ancestors. He was descended from the *gens Anicia,* one of the oldest and most illustrious senatorial families, and numbered among his forebears a pope, St. Felix IV.[2] His father, the senator Gordianus, who was a man of considerable wealth, owned extensive estates in several provinces of Italy and Sicily. After holding various high offices in Rome, Gregory's father entered the ranks of the clergy and at his death was one of the seven deacons having the care of the poor and the hospitals in Rome. Gregory's mother, Silvia, was a gentle, devout woman; she withdrew to a little oratory and there ended her days in practices of piety and charity. The Church honors her on November 3. Gregory's aunts St. Trasilla (Tharsilla) and St. Emiliana are praised in his homilies and his *Dialogues.* Thus did holiness, mingled with the last splendor of Roman greatness, watch over his cradle.

[1] See St. Gregory's own statements in several of his letters and in the prologue of his *Book of Morals, Fortasse hoc divinae Providentiae consilium fuit, ut percussum Job percussus exponerem.* Throughout his pontificate St. Gregory was often obliged to remain in bed for part of the day. Several times he almost died.

[2] Tillemont, *Mémoires,* XVI, 339.

St. Gregory the Great is one of the most important personages of history. Both by his noble birth and by his character he is the last representative of the ancient world; by the nature and significance of his work he must be regarded as the founder of the Middle Ages. Being successively prefect of the city of Rome, Benedictine monk, ambassador to the court of Constantinople, and head of the universal Church, he had experience of the most varied environments. To picture these, while narrating the story of his life, is to depict the figure of a great saint and to describe the spectacle of a decisive period in the life of the Church.

Condition of Rome

We do not know the exact date of Gregory's birth. It cannot be earlier than 540.[3] His childhood must have witnessed the most lamentable scenes. Within the space of sixteen years (536–552) Rome was taken and retaken six times, and all the sieges experienced by that city were the occasion of numberless calamities. Gregory, in his *Dialogues,* relates some of the incidents. In 537, Vitiges, while besieging the city, massacred the senators whom he was holding as hostages. Later Totila removed to the fortresses of Campania a large number of the survivors. The Greeks, who were the natural protectors of Rome, were at times as cruel as the barbarians. We see the commanding officer of the imperial garrison seize the food supplies and sell them at a high price to the starving people.[4] But the atrocities of the Goths and Byzantines were surpassed by those of the Lombards. St. Gregory's *Dialogues* tell of forty prisoners who were massacred because they refused to adore a goat's head consecrated to the devil, and of certain

[3] By 546 he must have reached the age of discernment, because he retained the memory of Totila's terrible siege of Rome, which he relates in his *Dialogues,* Bk. III, chap. 11.

[4] Muratori, *Scriptores rerum italicarum,* Vol. I. Procopius, III, 22.

brave peasants who were seized by the Lombards and, upon their refusal to eat food that had been sacrificed to idols, were likewise put to death.[5] For Gregory's devout soul the height of these calamities was probably the destruction of the monastery of Monte Cassino, which was invaded at night by the Lombards and sacked from top to bottom. At any rate the monks were able to escape, carrying off with them the book of their holy Rule, some articles of furniture, and a few manuscripts.[6] The impression which these events left in the mind of the young patrician must have given him a disgust for things of this world and a deep-seated sadness, which transpire in his homilies, his letters, and all his writings, and which only his solid piety prevented from becoming discouragement.

Possibly Gregory was not present at all the disasters that took place in Rome. There is evidence that his father, along with the other members of the family, for some years withdrew to his estates in Sicily. In that event the boy, while passing through Italy, could see to what a deplorable state it had been reduced by the invasions: the ravages committed by the Franks when they came down from the Alps in 554, the plague that spread from Liguria to all the provinces, the peasants starving to death in their huts, wolves and other wild beasts coming down from the mountains and invading the cities, all work at a standstill, the villages deserted. As Paul the Deacon says, "you might see the world brought back to its ancient silence."[7] Then, amid this terrifying solitude, the few survivors, deranged by their sufferings, thinking they heard in the clouds the sound of the heavenly trumpets and the sound of a marching army. The *Dialogues* preserve a naïve and vivid picture of these popular terrors.

Gregory must have been 12 or 14 years old when the im-

[5] *Dial.*, Bk. III, chaps. 27, 28.
[6] *Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 17.
[7] Paul the Deacon, *History of the Lombards*, Bk. II, chap. 4 (p. 57); *PL*, XCV, 480.

perial power was re-established at Rome. Again he was living in the family palace on the Coelian Hill. From there he could gaze upon the superb sight of those last monuments of Roman grandeur, which the barbarians' hasty greed, in a hurry to grab the small works of art and anything made of gold or silver, was obliged to leave unharmed. Opposite his father's palace was the septizonium of Severus with its three rows of columns of precious marbles; all about there stood an amazing multitude of statues and in their midst murmured the waters of monumental fountains; in the background arose the magnificent palace of the Caesars, the ruins of which even today form the most striking ornament of the Palatine. And the eye could take in, to right and left, like a frame to this picture, the triumphal arches of the Circus Maximus, the lofty arcades of the Claudian aqueduct straddling the Via Triumphalis, Constantine's arch, and the great Flavian amphitheater.[8] These reminders of imperial Rome never left Gregory's memory. When he sees their prestige vanish, he wonders whether the whole world is not going to disappear and undergo the last judgment.

Intellectual culture, interrupted for a time, returned to favor in Rome. In the Forum, near the Gordian palace, Virgil was again being read, and even Christian poetry tried to praise the greatness of the new Rome in verses which the Senate honored with public reward.[9] The schools of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics were reopened. Gregory attended them. There, according to John the Deacon, he won brilliant success. It is likely that Gregory never learned Greek very well; he even seems to pride himself on not knowing it at all, after six years spent in Constantinople; but we may suppose he disdained learning it and declined to speak it because it was the language

[8] On the topography of Rome at this period, see Grisar, Bk. I, chap. 4, "Roman Buildings: their Alleged Destruction by the Barbarians"; and chap. 5, "The So-called Wonders of Rome."

[9] Fortunatus, *Carmina,* III, 20; VI, 8.

of the Byzantine masters.[10] But he was glad to take up the study of law, which the famous collections of Emperor Justinian, the Institutes, the Code, and the Novellae, raised to a position of honor. In 554 a pragmatic sanction of the Emperor made obligatory in Italy the teaching of law according to the new collections.[11] Gregory must have attended the public schools, where capable jurisconsults endeavored to revive the splendor of the ancient private schools of Labeo, Sabinus, Paulus, and Ulpian. These law studies were agreeable to a mind gifted with firm logic and good sense, as Gregory's was. In those studies he also found a means of more securely defending the rights of those whom religion commanded him to call his brethren, at a period when justice and equity were so often trampled under foot. But his special predilection was for religious studies. In his writings, although it is evident he was acquainted with Stoicism [12] and was not a stranger to Plato,[13] we see that, as he himself says, "he assiduously drank of those deep and clear waters that come from the blessed Ambrose and the blessed Augustine." [14]

For a while the young patrician hesitated about his vocation. He was not seduced by the spirit of the world, but was influenced by a desire to be useful to his fellow-citizens in the ranks of the government officials, where his ancestors had rendered so great services.[15] From Emperor Justin II he accepted, in 574, the office of praetor or rather prefect of Rome.[16]

[10] *Nos nec graece novimus, nec aliquod opus aliquando graece conscripsimus. Epist.* XI, 74; *PL,* LXXVII, 1213; *MGH, Reg.,* XI, 55. But in his works St. Gregory sometimes quotes Greek words and translates them.

[11] Ortolan, *Explication historique des Institutes de Justinien,* I, 498.

[12] *Book of Morals,* II, 16; *PL,* LXXV, 569.

[13] Bk. III, ep. 54; *PL,* LXXVII, 649; *MGH, Reg.,* III, 65.

[14] *De beatorum patrum Ambrosii et Augustini torrentibus profunda ac perspicua fluenta assidue bibere.* Homilies on Ezech., preface; *PL,* LXXVI, 785.

[15] *Morals,* prologue, chap. 1; *PL,* LXXV, 511.

[16] St. Gregory's *Registrum* (IV, 2) has the words *urbanam praeturam gerens.* The same expression is used in John the Deacon (I, 3). But the city praetorship no longer existed in the fifth century. Perhaps what was meant was the praetorship of the

The *praefectus urbis* possessed all the administrative and judicial powers in the city of Rome. But he did not exercise military authority; under the Lower Empire that jurisdiction belonged to the *dux* and the other officers of the *exercitus romanus*.[17]

Notwithstanding the increase of power given to the head of the imperial army, the *praefectus urbis,* even as late as the eighth century, in the time of Adrian I, possessed criminal jurisdiction. It is mentioned in the *Liber pontificalis*.[18] In the sixth century the prefect of the city was, therefore, beyond question the chief government official of Rome, and his powers were very extensive.

We have no information regarding Gregory's administration of this office. But we may surmise that, having a hand in all the important affairs of the city and charged with supervising all the works of charity required by the misfortunes of that period, he found in his official duties a providential initiation for the difficult pontificate which God intended for him. We like to imagine him passing through various parts of the city, wearing the robes adorned with gold and gems spoken of by his contemporary Gregory of Tours,[19] yet jealously preserving in his heart that treasure of interior life which was the matter of greatest moment for his soul; and perhaps a certain passage in his *Book of Morals* [20] contains a recollection of this period of his life. As we are told by Gregory of Tours, one day

people, *praeturam plebis,* instituted by the *Novella XIII* of September 16, 535, or perhaps the vicariate of the city of Rome, because Cassiodorus speaks of a *vicarius urbis Romae* existing at that time (*Variae,* VI). It is more likely that the reference is to the prefectship of Rome, and that we should prefer the reading in one MS, *praefecturam,* instead of *praeturam.*

[17] Cf. Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* I, 515 note 12.

[18] *Lib. pont.,* I, 490.

[19] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* Bk. X, chap. 1 (p. 425); Paul the Deacon, *Life of St. Gregory the Great,* chap. 4; *PL,* LXXV, 43.

[20] *Si vero prematur aliquis corporaliter popularibus turbis et tamen nullos curarum saecularium tumultus in corde patiatur, non est in urbe. Morals,* XXX, 16; *PL,* LXXVI, 553.

the prefect of Rome changed his rich dress for the coarse clothes worn by the rustic peasantry, the habit which had been adopted by the sons of St. Benedict. Gregory turned his palace on the Coelian Hill into a monastery, and placed it under the patronage of St. Andrew. In Sicily he founded six monasteries on his family estates, endowed them out of his own resources, and gave the rest of his wealth to works of charity.

Vocations of this sort were not unheard-of in the city of Rome at that period. Men could still remember seeing, on the Aventine, the scions of the greatest Roman families gathered about St. Jerome and there following a life of prayer and poverty. Even more recently the noblewoman Galla, whose father and husband had been consuls, after her husband's death withdrew to a convent near St. Peter's Basilica; and the virgin Proba, who, like Gregory, belonged to the Anicii family, like him gave her wealth to the poor and entered a convent. An illustrious personage of the time, Cassiodorus, after directing the affairs of the Ostrogoth kingdom as Theodoric's minister, withdrew to his Vivarium estate in Campania and there followed a life of labor and prayer in company with a few disciples. It may be that all these great souls were prompted, amidst the disturbances and decline of the ancient world, by a desire to safeguard the purity of their spiritual life; but thereby they were conserving in themselves, for the future, the germ that would give vitality to a new world.

The deed of Gregory's gift of his family palace to the Benedictine monks has been preserved. It bears the date of the year 587. Therein Gregory calls himself "servant of the servants of God." This title he kept when, three years later, he was raised to the papacy. This same humble title he used in contrast with the pompous title of "ecumenical (universal) patriarch" assumed by the patriarch of Constantinople. And it was afterwards adopted habitually by the sovereign pontiffs.

St. Gregory's *Dialogues*

We know but few details about St. Gregory's life as *praefectus urbis*. And we are equally uninformed regarding his monastic life. It was in that life of peace and calm that he met several monks who had known St. Benedict. He mentions by name four of them, who told him what they knew of the holy patriarch, either personally or by hearsay. The new monk eagerly collected these sincere narratives and set them forth in his *Dialogues* with unsurpassed grace and freshness.[21] Though not at all questioning the pious author's honesty, modern criticism charges him with unsuspecting credulity. The old monks, who used to relate to their younger brethren whatever they had seen or heard reported about their blessed father, no doubt were fond of accumulating the most marvelous stories without always investigating the sources. But, as with the *fioretti* of the followers of St. Francis of Assisi, even though many of the stories are legendary, there breathes from them the spirit of piety, mildness, and serene wisdom inspired by St. Benedict. They impress us as the accounts of a life abounding with the supernatural and the miraculous. The occasional embellishments added by filial piety do not lead us to doubt the historical reality. How charming is St. Gregory's story of St. Maurus walking on the water! He says:

On a certain day, as venerable Bennet was in his cell, the foresaid young Placidus, the holy man's monk, went out to take up water at the lake, and putting down his pail carelessly, fell in himself after it, whom the water forthwith carried away from the land so far as one may shoot an arrow. The man of God, being in his cell, by and by knew this, and called in haste for Maurus, saying: "Brother Maurus, run as fast as you can, for Placidus, that went to the lake to fetch water, is fallen in, and is carried a good way off." A strange thing, and since the time of Peter the Apostle, never heard of. Maurus, craving

[21] The life of St. Benedict makes up Book II of the *Dialogues*.

his father's blessing, and departing in all haste, at his commandment, ran to that place upon the water, to which the young lad was carried by force thereof, thinking that he had all that while gone upon the land: and taking fast hold of him by the hair of his head, in all haste returned back again: and so soon as he was at land, coming to himself he looked behind him, and then knew very well that he had before run upon the water: and that which before he durst not have presumed, being now done and past, he both marvelled, and was afraid at that which he had done. Coming back to the father and telling him what had happened, the venerable man did not attribute this to his own merits, but to the obedience of Maurus; but Maurus on the contrary, said that it was done only upon his commandment, and that he had nothing to do in that miracle, not knowing at that time what he did. But the friendly contention proceeding of mutual humility, the young youth himself that was saved from drowning did determine; for he said that he saw, when he was drawn out of the water, the Abbot's garment upon his head, affirming that it was he that had delivered him from that great danger.[22]

Says Bossuet: "To what shall I attribute so great a miracle? We can answer that obedience carries with it the grace to accomplish what is commanded, and that the command carries with it the grace to make obedience effective." [23]

A moral lesson, a lesson of labor, is taught by the chapter entitled: "Regarding the iron part of a tool that returned to his use from the depth of the water."

At another time a certain Goth, poor of spirit, that gave over the world, was received by the man of God; whom on a day he commanded to take a bill, and to cleanse a certain plot of ground from briars for the making of a garden, which ground was by the side of a lake. The Goth as he was there laboring, by chance the head of the bill slipped off, and fell into the water, which was so deep that there was no hope ever to get it again. The poor Goth, in great fear, ran unto Maurus and told him what he had lost, confessing his own fault and negligence.

[22] *Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 7.
[23] Bossuet, *Panégyrique de saint Benoît.*

Maurus forthwith went to the servant of God, giving him to understand thereof, who came straightways to the lake, and took the handle out of the Goth's hand, and put it into the water, and the iron head by and by ascended from the bottom, and entered again into the handle of the bill, which he delivered to the Goth, saying: "Behold here is thy bill again, work on, and be sad no more." [24]

Incident of the English Slaves

It was in these early days of St. Gregory's monastic life that occurred the touching incident related in almost identical words by Paul the Deacon, John the Deacon, and Venerable Bede. Gregory was crossing the Forum. He noticed there some young slaves that were being sold. Their tender, pure beauty moved him greatly. He asked whence they came. He was told they were Angles. "Angles?" he replied; "Say rather angels. What a pity it is that the grace of God does not dwell within those beautiful brows!" We are told that the monk bought these young slaves, housed them in his monastery, instructed them in the Christian religion, and wished then to take them with him to preach the Gospel to their fellow-countrymen. But the people of Rome, upon learning of Gregory's departure for Britain, set out in pursuit of him and forced him to turn back.

Criticism has raised doubts as to the historical genuineness of this story. The three historians who record it depended evidently, we are told, upon an earlier account, recently discovered at St. Gall and published, in part, in 1886. But the author of the story, probably a Northumbrian monk who wrote at the beginning of the eighth century, evinces a complete lack of criticism and even avows so candidly. "I am not sure," he says, "of all the facts I relate. It might be that such or such a miracle is

[24] *Dial.*, Bk. II, chap. 6. The *Dialogues* were not written until about 593, but St. Gregory composed them according to the recollections of the early days of his monastic life. Probably he merely put in writing the accounts which he had often repeated orally.

not St. Gregory's. It may be that of some other saint. This however matters little. The saints form a single body, and what is said of one can be said of the others." [25] Such a declaration reveals a disposition of mind which may have been common to many biographers of that time.[26] Moreover the account goes on with details that have the mark of legendary embellishments.[27] But the detail related in the narrative is substantially so conformable to what we otherwise know about St. Gregory's fondness for the little slaves of the kingdom of the Angles,[28] it so well agrees with his smiling good nature prompt in action, that it would seem to us rash to doubt its substantial genuineness.[29]

St. Gregory's Monastic Life

St. Gregory himself in his *Dialogues,* though not furnishing any precise detail regarding that period of his life, gives us a wonderful description of his state of soul at that time. He says: "I remember with sorrow what I once was in the

[25] *Civilta cattolica,* V (1890), 31. Ewald, *Hist. Aufsätze dem Andenken an G. Waitz,* pp. 25, 38.

[26] Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques,* pp. 29–41.

[27] The narrator, gratified with the first play on words, keeps adding to it. And it becomes more and more artificial.

"From what country do you come?" Gregory asks.

"From Deira."

"You will be freed from the *Dei ira* (wrath of God). And what is the name of your king?"

"Oella."

"Alleluia? The praises of God will be sung in his kingdom."

When Gregory, in flight, is overtaken by the throng that wishes to bring him back to Rome, he meets a butterfly (in Latin, *locusta*). *"Locusta!"* he exclaims, *"in loco sta!* Let us stop right here. It is the voice of God." And he did not go ahead any farther.

[28] From a letter we know that in 595 St. Gregory had some young Angles bought in Gaul. He intended to have them brought up in his monastery. *Ep.* VI, 7; *MGH, Reg.,* VI, 10; *PL,* LXXVII, 799.

[29] This is the conclusion of F. H. Dudden. *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought,* I, 196. It is also the view of Dom Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands,* p. 53.

monastery, how I rose in contemplation above all changeable and decaying things, and thought of nothing but the things of heaven; how my soul, though pent within the body, soared beyond its fleshly prison, and looked with longing upon death itself as the means of entering into life." In another passage he says that he envies the holy life of his brethren still in the monastery, who have not lost, in the entanglements of this world, "the youth of their soul." [30]

But he was not spared infirmities and suffering. We are told by Paul the Deacon that "Gregory's zeal for abstinence, his assiduity at prayer, and the austerity of his fasting brought on such stomach pains that he was scarcely able to stand up. Often he was taken by those crises which the physicians, in their Greek language, call syncope: at times the suffering was such that Gregory seemed on the point of breathing his last." [31] His mother Silvia, who had retired to a convent close by, sent him some boiled vegetables in a silver dish, the only thing left of her former wealth.[32]

The Byzantine Court

But that world, which the devout monk endeavored to flee from and to forget in the life of contemplation, remembered the wise administration of its *praefectus urbis*. In response to the unanimous desire of the people, Pope Benedict I took the deacon Gregory almost by force from his beloved solitude. He confided to him the management of ecclesiastical matters in one of the seven districts of Rome. Shortly afterward, Pelagius II decided to utilize Gregory's talents in a wider field. He

[30] *Dial.*, preface. Frequently it has been remarked that St. Gregory supplies very few data for the historian. That is true, if we mean precise details, verified dates and facts. But few writers have, by their spontaneity and sincerity, better revealed the depths of their own life and of the lives of their contemporaries. St. Gregory always speaks and writes with his whole soul.

[31] Paul the Deacon, *Life of St. Gregory the Great*, chap. 5; *PL*, LXXV, 43.

[32] John the Deacon, I, 9; II, *22*; *PL*, LXXV, 66, 96.

called him to fill the office of apocrisiarius (nuncio) at Constantinople, at the court of Emperor Tiberius Constantinus. Such an office at that period was one of the highest and most important in the Church.

The new nuncio must have found a striking contrast between the humble monastic cell he had just left and the splendid imperial palace in which he was lodged.[33] Byzantium then shone with all the brilliance that Emperor Justinian and Empress Theodora had given it. Byzantine art, at its highest point, encouraged by the lavish munificence of the sovereigns, adorned vast monuments with an abundance of gold, silver, precious marbles, enamels, and gems. The marvel of these marvels was the Church of Saint Sophia, rebuilt by Justinian, with its vast cupola more than a hundred feet in diameter. The story is told that on the day of its dedication (December 27, 537), Justinian, in the fulness of joy, declared: "Solomon, I have vanquished you!" The ceremonies that were displayed in those palaces and temples were in keeping with those ancient monuments. Many barbarian chiefs, come to Constantinople to treat of the political affairs of their country, were fascinated by this magnificence. When the "divine emperor" appeared on days of solemn receptions, enthroned in the great triclinium of the throne-room, clad in the purple, gold-embroidered chlamys, his forehead shining with the sparkle of gems in the imperial crown, and when the courtiers, the barbarian princes, and the foreign ambassadors, following a ceremonial that was precisely established in every detail, bowed their heads three times at the feet of the *Basileus,* it must have been a most magnificent sight.[34]

[33] The nuncio was lodged in the emperor's palace. *Morals,* preface, chap. 1; *PL,* LXXV, 511.

[34] On the magnificence of Constantinople in the sixth century, see Diehl, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI^e siècle.* See the detail of these ceremonies in the book of the *Ceremonies, PL,* CXII, 79 f., 1047. Cf. *MGH, script.,* III, 338. Kurth (*Les origines de la civilisation moderne,* I, chap. 6, "Byzance") describes them. And

But this resplendent appearance hid wretchedness which Pelagius' apocrisiary soon discovered. Emperor Justinian, by his magnificence, had emptied the public treasury. When his successor, Emperor Justin II, appeared for the first time at the Circus, he was greeted by the outcry of the crowd, saying: "Have pity on us!" Justin paid back the forced loans which Justinian had imposed; but, on the other hand, he refused to pay the customary tributes to the barbarians. The latter thereupon turned against the Empire. The Avars, an unconquered tribe, belonging to the same race as the Huns, had encamped in Pannonia and were making repeated incursions into imperial territory. The Lombards were ravaging Italy; the Persians were invading Syria.[35] When, in 578, Tiberius Constantinus, Justin's captain of the guards, ascended the throne at the death of Justin, he understood how chimerical it would be to try to maintain Justinian's work in full. He refused to undertake any intervention in Italy against the Lombards and limited his military activities to a vigorous campaign against the Persians.

Religious Despotism of the Emperor

A third affliction, consequent upon the other two, desolated the East. This was the hierarchical system of the Eastern Church, which little by little had put the whole episcopate under the domination of the patriarch of Constantinople, and the latter at the feet of the emperor. The Persian wars and the internal disturbances of the eastern provinces of the Empire, where the people were tearing each other in pieces in the doctrinal disputes of Monophysitism, had ruined the prestige of the patriarch of Alexandria. The situation of the patriarch of

we find a striking reminder of them in two mosaics that are in the Church of St. Vitalis in Ravenna.

[35] Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse,* pp. 177 ff.; Diehl, *Justinien,* p. 215.

Antioch was perhaps worse. To become bishop of that see it was henceforth necessary, as we see from the examples of Stephen III and Calandion, "to pass through the Caudine forks of the approbation given by the bishop of Byzantium." [36] The latter was the emperor's creature. As Duchesne says, "that tendency began to vary as soon as there existed out of Antioch a Christian court and a court-bishop. The latter becoming naturally the counsellor, the confidential director of princes or princesses, his influence, little by little, predominated over all other influences in the Eastern Churches." [37] The patriarch of Constantinople then drew all the bishops of the East in his train.

> To give its true name to this episcopal body we ought to call it "the emperor's episcopate." . . . A sort of permanent Council, composed of members who varied in number, was constantly assembled within reach of the imperial palace. If the sovereign found it useful to bring them into direct communication with the bishops of the West, as he did in 343 for the great Council of Sardica, he would send them off in a body to the place of meeting in a long line of post-carriages and under the protection of an official overseer. If the emperor himself went to sojourn elsewhere, the whole episcopacy moved with him, even far from the East, as was seen at Sirmium, at Milan, and at Arles. It would be difficult to imagine an episcopal body better organized, easier to guide, and easier to be transported from place to place.[38]

Such a situation dazzled the emperor and the patriarch. At the council of 381, the New Rome of the East had claimed for its bishop the same honors as for the bishop of ancient Rome.[39] From a claim of equality they went on to a claim of superiority. The famous argument was repeated: "It was not in the West, but in the East that the Savior was born." To this St.

[36] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* p. 115. Vailhé, art. "Constantinople" in the *Dict. de théologie.*

[37] Duchesne, *loc. cit.*

[38] *Ibid.,* pp. 115 f.

[39] *Ibid.,* p. 118.

Gregory Nazianzen had already replied, with a spiritual implication: "It was also in the East that He was put to death."

Pope Gregory, by his own observations, could verify these words, written some years before by the bishops of Italy to the Frankish envoy just before the fifth ecumenical council in 552: "The Greek bishops have large and wealthy Churches. . . . But they bow to the wishes of the princes and agree, without demur, to whatever these ask of them." [40]

St. Gregory in Constantinople

St. Gregory's correspondence shows that his attention was at that time turned to the famous Patriarch John, called the Faster, with whom he would later engage in a long conflict for the honor of the Holy See. This bishop, shabbily dressed, sleeping on the bare ground, scattering alms about him in profusion, continually fasting, was a schemer seeking then to win the people's confidence. For a time he won even the confidence of Gregory, who later on corrected his erroneous judgment. We find these words from his pen: "Would it not be better for him to eat meat than to soil his lips with falsehood? Of what use is it to fast, if one is puffed up with pride; or to dress shabbily, if one is clothed in vanity; or to appear like a lamb, if one really has the teeth of a wolf?"

The young diplomat could also observe at Byzantium, better than he could anywhere else, the strength and the weakness of the barbarian races. He saw there the chiefs of the Gothic tribes (Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Vandals) eagerly ask for and gratefully receive that bestowal of titles and insignia which the emperors showered upon them, place their children in Eastern schools where they were prematurely introduced to a brilliant and subtle knowledge that would dazzle them with-

[40] *Sunt graeci episcopi habentes divites et opulentas ecclesias. . . . Secundum voluntatem principum quidquid ab eis quaesitum fuerit sine altercatione consentiunt.* Mansi, IX, 153.

out training them, and where they were habituated to easy-going and soft habits of living which would enervate them. He saw them asking for the baptism of Arianism, of that semi-Christianity that would become one of the chief causes of their future decline. He could form loftier hopes with regard to the Frankish and Anglo-Saxon barbarians. Two Frankish embassies appeared at the court of Constantinople. One, sent by Chilperic of Neustria, was there from 578 to 581; the other was sent in 590 by the regents of Austrasia. The later conduct of Gregory leads us to suppose that at this earlier date he was informed regarding the two hundred monasteries that had been founded there, and regarding the forty-five councils that had been held there since the conversion of Clovis, regarding the virtues of St. Caesarius of Arles and St. Germain of Paris, regarding the literary works of St. Gregory of Tours and of St. Fortunatus. It is even more likely that he had close relations with the Anglo-Saxon ambassadors from England, for we see him later announcing to his Eastern friends with particular expressions of joy the conversion of that kingdom. But Gregory had particularly close relations with the Spanish ambassador, Leander bishop of Seville, who came to Constantinople in 584 to ask the Emperor's support in behalf of his nephew, King Hermengild. Providence, before entrusting the government of the universal Church to the humble son of St. Benedict, thus brought him into contact with all the great social and political forces he would one day have to direct or oppose.

The papal apocrisiary must also have had dealings with the notable personages of Byzantine society. Theoctista and Gurdia (Emperor Maurice's sisters), several other members of the imperial family, the patrician Narses, two physicians (Theotimus and Theodore), all these must be reckoned among his friends. We see this pale and sickly monk taking part in the imperial procession on the great official feasts that were celebrated at Saint Sophia. Duty obliged him to be present. But

his heart inclined him to a calmer and more interior life. At a later date, in a letter to his friend St. Leander, he reminds him of the time when, to escape from worldly distractions, they both furtively left a church that was full of clamor and went off to hold pious discourse with a few brethren about God. Gregory had, in fact, brought a few monks with him to Constantinople. It was in their company and that of the devout Bishop of Seville that he passed the best hours of his life.

The *Book of Morals*

He was more and more worn out by his excessive burdens and poor health. At a later date he writes: "For many a long year I have been afflicted with frequent pains in the bowels, and the powers of my stomach are so broken that I am always in bad health. I also suffer from a constant succession of slow fevers." [41] He took up his preferred book, the Book of Job, and in the presence of his friends commented on it line by line, letting his heart freely expand in that holy intimacy. From these friendly and informal conferences came the *Book of Morals on Job,* St. Gregory's first literary work. It was dedicated to Leander bishop of Seville. In this commentary we must not look for illumination on the literal sense of the text. The author gives no attention to that. Rather he goes deeper. At each sentence, almost at every word, mystical views rise from his soul, outbursts of love, joy, and adoration come forth from his heart.

A few quotations will acquaint us with the method and style of the pious commentator. Says Job: "That the Almighty may hear my desire." [42] St. Gregory remarks:

> It requires to be noted that it is not said, "my prayers," but "my desire, that the Almighty might hear." For true beseeching does not

[41] *Crebris viscerum doloribus crucior, lentis quidem sed tamen continuis febribus anhelo. Morals,* Dedication to St. Leander bishop of Seville, chap. 5; *PL,* LXXV, 515.

[42] Job 31:35.

lie in the accents of the lips, but in the thoughts of the heart. For the stronger accents in the deepest ears of God it is not our words that make, but our desires. For if we seek eternal life with the mouth, but yet do not desire it with the heart, in crying out we keep silence. But if we desire in the heart, even when we are silent with the mouth, in being silent, we cry out.[43]

It is not surprising that, even at that date, this monk was consulted by several monasteries of the East as a master of the mystical life.

Another passage will show us what fragrance of purity and charity the conferences of the monk-diplomat must have left in that cultured atmosphere of the Byzantine world. Reaching this verse: "Thou shalt know that thy tabernacle is in peace, and visiting thy image thou shalt not sin," [44] a mystical sense appears to Gregory's mind. The tabernacle, he says, is the body; the tabernacle in peace is the body in purity. He says further:

For that chasteness of the flesh is as nothing, which is not recommended by sweetness of spirit. Whence after the "peace of thy tabernacle" it is fitly subjoined, "and thou shalt visit thy likeness, and shalt not sin." For the likeness of man is another man. For a fellow-creature is rightly called our "likeness," in that in him we discern what we ourselves are. Now in the visiting of the body we go to our neighbor by the accession of steps, but in the spiritual visiting, we are led not by the footstep but by affection. He then "visits his likeness," whoever directs his way to one whom he sees to be like to himself in nature, by the footsteps of love. . . . What advantage is it to restrain the

[43] *Aeternam vitam si ore petimus, nec tamen corde desideramus, clamantes tacemus. Si vero desideramus ex corde, etiam cum ore conticescimus, tacentes clamamus. PL,* LXXVI, 258.

[44] Job 5:24. This Vulgate translation is not literal. The meaning of the original text is this: "You will know that peace is beneath your tents and, visiting the place where your flocks are grazing, you will see that nothing is wanting." But Gregory, in his commentary, is concerned only with finding a mystical sense in the verses of the Latin translation.

flesh by continence, if the mind is uninstructed to expand itself by compassion in the love of our neighbor? [45]

This tender charity never degenerated into weakness. The patriarch Eutychius professed an erroneous doctrine about the impalpability of bodies after the resurrection. The nature of the risen body he reduced to so little that it was questionable how the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh was safeguarded in his doctrine. The apocrisiary Gregory opposed Eutychius in several debates. In his *Book of Morals* he relates various incidents of this theological dispute. His account is of great dogmatic and exegetical interest. Therein we also see that Eutychius abjured his error before dying. On his deathbed he grasped the skin of one of his hands and said: "I profess that we will all rise in this flesh." [46]

Gregory's Diplomatic Mission

We are not informed regarding Gregory's diplomatic mission at Constantinople. The only extant document is a letter of Pelagius II, written in 584 to his apocrisiary. "Speak and act," says the Pope. . . . "If the most pious prince does not deign to grant us a *magister militum* and a *dux,* we are reduced to the last extremity." [47] Pillaged by the Lombards, drained by taxes, troubled by factions, Italy and Rome looked for a savior. The exarch Longinus, imperiled in Ravenna by the barbarians, announced that he was unable to protect the territory of Rome.

[45] *Quid prodest per continentiam carnem restringere, si mens se per compassionem nesciat in proximi amore dilatare. Morals,* Bk. VI, chap. 34 (*alias* 23), *PL,* LXXV, 758.

[46] *Morals,* XIV, 74; *PL,* LXXV, 1079. Cf. Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine de 527 à 847,* p. 42. The doctrine maintained by Eutychius is known as Aphthartodocetism. The Aphthartodocetae were opposed to the Phtarolatrae. Both sects were sprung from the Monophysite heresy. Emperor Justinian, at the end of his life, fell into Aphthartodocetism.

[47] Letter quoted by John the Deacon, I, 32.

Emperor Maurice, who had just succeeded Tiberius when Pelagius' letter arrived, was an intelligent and energetic man. But, aware of his powerlessness, he merely replaced his exarch Longinus with a more courageous official, Smaragdus, and, with the aid of the Franks, attempted a diversion, which was not crowned with the expected success. This was the whole fruit of Gregory's nunciature. When shortly afterward, recalled by the Supreme Pontiff, the apocrisiary set out for Rome in company with the exarch Smaragdus, he might well have told himself that his mission had been almost a failure. But he now had a thorough acquaintance with the secrets of the Byzantine policy. He had put his finger on the radical powerlessness of the Eastern emperors to come to the aid of Italy. He comprehended that, if God willed to save Rome and the world, one only power, the papacy, was capable of accomplishing that great work.

Various Calamities

But did God will to save the world? Was not the end of time close at hand? What the Benedictine monk perceived upon returning to his monastery of St. Andrew prompted him to consider the latter prospect. Tempests, floods, and earthquakes spread consternation everywhere.[48] People recalled a popular tradition reported by Pliny the Elder: "The city of Rome never experienced a shock, which was not the forerunner of some great calamity." [49] The sons of St. Benedict called to mind especially the prophecy of their patriarch, who said: "Rome shall not be utterly destroyed by strangers: but shall be so shaken with tempests, lightnings, whirlwinds, and earthquakes, that it will fall to decay of itself." [50] But would not the ruin

[48] Paul the Deacon, *History of the Longobards,* Bk. III, chap. 23; *PL,* XCV, 525.

[49] *Nunquam urbs Roma tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id praenuntians esset.* Pliny, *Natural History,* Bk. II, chap. 86 (*alias* 84).

[50] St. Gregory, *Dialogues,* Bk. II, chap. 15.

flesh by continence, if the mind is uninstructed to expand itself by compassion in the love of our neighbor? [45]

This tender charity never degenerated into weakness. The patriarch Eutychius professed an erroneous doctrine about the impalpability of bodies after the resurrection. The nature of the risen body he reduced to so little that it was questionable how the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh was safeguarded in his doctrine. The apocrisiary Gregory opposed Eutychius in several debates. In his *Book of Morals* he relates various incidents of this theological dispute. His account is of great dogmatic and exegetical interest. Therein we also see that Eutychius abjured his error before dying. On his deathbed he grasped the skin of one of his hands and said: "I profess that we will all rise in this flesh." [46]

Gregory's Diplomatic Mission

We are not informed regarding Gregory's diplomatic mission at Constantinople. The only extant document is a letter of Pelagius II, written in 584 to his apocrisiary. "Speak and act," says the Pope. . . . "If the most pious prince does not deign to grant us a *magister militum* and a *dux,* we are reduced to the last extremity." [47] Pillaged by the Lombards, drained by taxes, troubled by factions, Italy and Rome looked for a savior. The exarch Longinus, imperiled in Ravenna by the barbarians, announced that he was unable to protect the territory of Rome.

[45] *Quid prodest per continentiam carnem restringere, si mens se per compassionem nesciat in proximi amore dilatare. Morals,* Bk. VI, chap. 34 (*alias* 23), *PL,* LXXV, 758.

[46] *Morals,* XIV, 74; *PL,* LXXV, 1079. Cf. Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine de 527 à 847,* p. 42. The doctrine maintained by Eutychius is known as Aphthartodocetism. The Aphthartodocetae were opposed to the Phtarolatrae. Both sects were sprung from the Monophysite heresy. Emperor Justinian, at the end of his life, fell into Aphthartodocetism.

[47] Letter quoted by John the Deacon, I, 32.

Emperor Maurice, who had just succeeded Tiberius when Pelagius' letter arrived, was an intelligent and energetic man. But, aware of his powerlessness, he merely replaced his exarch Longinus with a more courageous official, Smaragdus, and, with the aid of the Franks, attempted a diversion, which was not crowned with the expected success. This was the whole fruit of Gregory's nunciature. When shortly afterward, recalled by the Supreme Pontiff, the apocrisiary set out for Rome in company with the exarch Smaragdus, he might well have told himself that his mission had been almost a failure. But he now had a thorough acquaintance with the secrets of the Byzantine policy. He had put his finger on the radical powerlessness of the Eastern emperors to come to the aid of Italy. He comprehended that, if God willed to save Rome and the world, one only power, the papacy, was capable of accomplishing that great work.

Various Calamities

But did God will to save the world? Was not the end of time close at hand? What the Benedictine monk perceived upon returning to his monastery of St. Andrew prompted him to consider the latter prospect. Tempests, floods, and earthquakes spread consternation everywhere.[48] People recalled a popular tradition reported by Pliny the Elder: "The city of Rome never experienced a shock, which was not the forerunner of some great calamity." [49] The sons of St. Benedict called to mind especially the prophecy of their patriarch, who said: "Rome shall not be utterly destroyed by strangers: but shall be so shaken with tempests, lightnings, whirlwinds, and earthquakes, that it will fall to decay of itself." [50] But would not the ruin

[48] Paul the Deacon, *History of the Longobards,* Bk. III, chap. 23; *PL,* XCV, 525.

[49] *Nunquam urbs Roma tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id praenuntians esset.* Pliny, *Natural History,* Bk. II, chap. 86 (*alias* 84).

[50] St. Gregory, *Dialogues,* Bk. II, chap. 15.

of Rome be the end of everything? It was Lactantius who wrote: "When that capital of the world shall have fallen . . . who can doubt that the end has now arrived to the affairs of men and the whole world?" [51] Tertullian had frequently expressed the same feeling of religious terror.[52]

Irregularities entered the monastery itself, the blessed retreat to which Gregory returned so full of joy, hoping there to find the holy peace of Christ. There were no grievously scandalous disorders. But during Gregory's absence an excessive attachment to the goods of this world had crept into St. Andrew's monastery. The extent of the holy abbot's grief may be judged from the gravity of the penalties he felt called upon to impose. A monk, Justus by name, under the promptings of final repentance, had declared on his deathbed, in the presence of all his brethren, that he was keeping hidden away three gold coins. Gregory decided to mete out a penalty that would impress upon the hearts of all a salutary horror for a sin that recalled that of Judas. "When Brother Justus is dead," said Gregory, "let not his body be buried amongst the rest of the monks, but make a grave for him in some dunghill or other, and there cast it in, together with the three crowns which he left behind him, crying out all with joint voice: 'Thy money be with thee unto perdition'; and so put earth upon him." [53]

Affected by these events, the tendency to melancholy, which we have remarked in Gregory's soul, increased. Yet no feeling could make him hesitate in the presence of some duty to be performed. At this very time he carried out various missions which Pope Pelagius entrusted to him, notably certain

[51] Lactantius, *Institutes,* Bk. VII, chap. 25.

[52] Tertullian, *Apol.,* chap. 32; *Ad Scapulam,* chap. 2.

[53] *Dialogues,* Bk. IV, chap. 55. St. Gregory adds that the guilty monk died contrite and repentant and that he himself, out of compassion for that soul, celebrated thirty masses for its intention. On the thirtieth day Brother Justus appeared to one of his brethren and announced that he was delivered. This is the origin of the so-called Gregorian masses, that is, thirty masses said on consecutive days for a departed soul.

difficult negotiations regarding the affair of the Three Chapters.

Disasters of all sorts, however, continued to pour upon Rome and the neighboring regions. After the floods, earthquakes, and famine, the pestilence broke out. Pope Pelagius was one of the first victims of it. Rome was now without a bishop, the Church without a head, at a time when the guidance of a wise and strong pontiff had become so necessary.

Gregory Elected Pope

All eyes turned to the abbot of St. Andrew's monastery. The Senate, the clergy, and the people unanimously chose him without delay despite his objections. He accepted, on condition of receiving the approbation of Emperor Maurice. He was hopeful that the Emperor, yielding to his entreaties, would refuse a confirmation that, in the practice of the period, was regarded as necessary. But Germanus, the prefect of Rome, intercepted the letter written by the deacon Gregory to the Emperor, and he himself wrote, begging for a prompt reply of confirmation.[54]

Events forced Gregory, despite his reluctance, to act as leader. The pestilence increased in violence. To calm the people, he decided to ascend the pulpit of St. Peter's Basilica. With that poor, feeble, impaired voice which often during his pontificate compelled him to have his sermons read aloud by others, he delivered a moving discourse, which Gregory of Tours has preserved for us. Then he organized a general procession to

[54] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* p. 426. All the incidents connected with St. Gregory's election are related in this chapter of Gregory of Tours' *History,* with details that cannot reasonably be called into question. They were related to the historian by one of his deacons who was at Rome and witnessed all these events. Pope St. Gregory's letters supply confirmation of the account of Gregory of Tours.

obtain from God the cessation of the plague. Says Gregory of Tours: "The clergy set out from the Basilica of SS. Cosmas and Damian; the monks, from the Basilica of SS. Gervasius and Protasius; the nuns, from the Basilica of SS. Marcellinus and Peter; the children, from the Basilica of SS. John and Paul; the men, from the Basilica of St. Stephen; the widows, from the Basilica of St. Euphemia; the married women, from the Basilica of St. Clement." When the long procession of these seven groups of the faithful, each led by one of the priests of the seven regions of the city, slowly and devoutly advanced, singing the Kyrie eleison, some old Roman, who had formerly witnessed the great pagan festivals, might have observed how profoundly the city had been transformed. The Christian Rome of the Middle Ages was manifested for the first time.

The prayers lasted three days. "Our deacon, who was present," says Gregory of Tours, "declared that in the space of a single hour, while the people were pouring forth the voice of their supplication to the Lord, there fell dead no less than eighty persons." [55]

It was related that, at the moment when the procession was passing before the Mausoleum of Hadrian, the archangel Michael was seen returning a flaming sword to its sheath, in token that the plague was about to cease; and the plague ceased. But this account is more than two centuries later than the events,[56] and contemporary writers make no reference to these miraculous details.[57] The Benedictines of St. Maur, therefore,

[55] St. Gregory of Tours, *op. cit.*, Bk. X, chap. 1 (p. 428).

[56] This miraculous event is not mentioned by Paul the Deacon, who wrote in the eighth century, or by John the Deacon, who, at the close of the ninth century, wrote the life of St. Gregory at the request of Pope John VIII, as he states in the preface. *PL*, LXXV, 61.

[57] St. Gregory of Tours' deacon, who was present at the procession, makes no mention of this miracle; or, at least, Gregory of Tours, giving his deacon's account, does not speak of it. Yet we know how carefully the author of the *History of the Franks* sought out the smallest miraculous incidents and how enthusiastically he related them.

in their scholarly edition of St. Gregory's works, regard them as doubtful.[58]

However, the news of deacon Gregory's election reached Constantinople. It was received by Emperor Maurice, by members of the court, and by the Patriarch with unanimous joy. Gregory alone was fearful. Learning that his letter to the Emperor had been intercepted, he thought to avoid by flight the burden of the supreme pontificate. The city gates were guarded by a watchful crowd. He won over some foreign merchants, who conveyed him in a wicker basket. Thus he escaped, and he wandered from cave to cave in the forests and mountains. At the end of three days, the crowd found him and brought him back to Rome in triumph.[59]

On September 3, after previously being ordained priest, Gregory was consecrated bishop of the city of Rome. An immense throng, filling the five naves of St. Peter's Basilica, acclaimed the new Pope.

Gregory was about fifty years old. He was of medium height, thin face, pallid complexion. He had a fine, broad forehead, his nose was slightly upturned, his chin prominent, his eyes clear, his whole features marked with a gentle, noble expression.[60]

[58] *Quae narrantur de viso angelo et sedata peste dubiae videntur fidei, PL,* LXXV, 280. This is the view adopted in the *Civilta cattolica* (1890), Vol. V: "Il pontificato di S. Gregorio Magno nella storia della civilta cristiana," pp. 29 f. The article in the *Civilta* is unsigned, but it was written by Father Grisar, S.J., professor at Innsbruck University. Cf. *Civilta,* January 1, 1893, p. 191. The Benedictine editors of St. Gregory's works are mistaken in tracing to this procession of 590 the origin of the Great Litany or St. Mark's procession. The earliest document referring to the Great Litany is of the year 598 (Jaffé, I, 1153). Cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 276.

[59] St. Gregory frequently alludes to his flight. See *Ep.* VII, 4; *PL,* LXXVII, 855; *MGH, Reg.,* VII, 5; and *Pastoral Rule,* preface.

[60] John the Deacon (Bk. IV, chaps. 83, 84), in this very precise way, thus describes the picture of St. Gregory, which he saw in the ninth century in the monastery *ad clivum Scauri.* This portrait was made a short time before Gregory's elevation to the papacy. See Angelo Rocca, *De imaginibus S. Gregorii Magni,* in *PL,* LXXV, 461–478.

Condition of Christendom

If, beyond the crowd that hailed him with their joyous shouts, his thought carried him to the vast field which Providence presented to him for the exercise of his apostolic zeal, he may have felt passing before him one of those clouds of sadness which sometimes overshadowed him. The schism of the Three Chapters was still stirring up the provinces of Venetia and Istria, Nestorianism persisted in Asia, Monophysitism in Egypt, Donatism in north Africa; in Spain the last disturbances of Arianism were dying out under King Leovigild; the Lombards were threatening Rome and filling the length and breadth of Italy with dread; on all the frontiers of the Roman world floods of barbarians, coming nobody knew from where, were ceaselessly pouring in, bringing with them future trouble; to the south, compliant but enervated races; to the north, proud but unconquerable races; the Emperor manifestly unable to dominate the situation; one power alone uncrushed and ceaselessly growing, that of the bishop of Rome, that power precisely which had been placed in the hands of that trembling soul and frail body. Who would not have been alarmed at the sight?

The apprehensions and fears of the new Pope appear on every page of his correspondence at this period. Learning that the patrician John of Constantinople encouraged the Emperor to confirm his election, he writes to him, saying: "See where your favor has brought me. I find fault with your friendship, I blame you for drawing me away from the repose you knew I sought. May God give you eternal reward for your good intention, but may He free me, as pleases Him, from so many perils." [61] He wrote to a certain notable, Andrew, as follows: "Upon hearing of my elevation to the episcopacy, weep if you love me, for I find here so many temporal occupations that I

[61] *Reg.*, I, 20; *PL*, LXXVII, 483.

feel myself almost separated from the love of God." [62] To Theoctista, the Emperor's sister, he writes: "Under color of episcopacy, I have been brought back to the world. . . . Even though I have no fear for myself, I am greatly afraid for those who have been committed to me. On every side I am tossed by the waves of business. After business I long to return to my heart; but, driven therefrom by vain tumults of thoughts, I am unable to return. From this cause, then, that which is within me is made to be far from me." [63]

If the souls most suited to carry out a mission are at times those who most dread its burden, probably this is because they perceive the difficulties and dangers better. This is also true when they are deeply religious, because they abandon themselves more confidently to divine providence. The new Pope was one of these souls.

Gregory, for a moment, was fearful of seeing his monastic spirit lost in the atmosphere of the papal court. But the world would soon be amazed at seeing the papal court penetrated by the monastic spirit. One of Gregory I's earliest decrees aimed at excluding laymen from the *cubiculum pontificis*. He surrounded himself with the holiest and most learned monks and made them his counselors. John the Deacon speaks enthusiastically of that court of monks installed in the Lateran Palace.[64] Evidently this was a most timely political step. The time would come when the popes deliberately place the management of political affairs in lay hands. But just at present a particularly urgent work was to make the purest spirit of Christianity reign at the center of the Catholic Church. Where better could it be found than in that young Benedictine family where the spirit of the patriarch of Subiaco was living in all its fervor?

Then began for Gregory that vast correspondence, of which

[62] *Reg.*, I, 29; *PL*, LXXVII, 483.
[63] *Reg.*, I, 5; *PL*, LXXVII, 448.
[64] John the Deacon, II, 13 f.; *PL*, LXXV, 92 f.

the 848 letters that remain are merely the fragments.[65] There is no pope, until the time of Gregory VII, who has left us a similar monument of his activity. Month by month, almost week by week, we can follow him in the varied political, social, canonical, theological, and moral concerns that absorb his life.[66]

The *Pastoral Rule*

While he was thus pouring out his activity in the practical realm, he set forth the theory of the pastoral ministry in his *Liber regulae pastoralis.* Less brilliant than St. Chrysostom's treatise *On the Priesthood,* less lifelike than St. Bernard's *De consideratione,* the *Pastoral Rule* of St. Gregory is more precise, it more completely and more closely examines the various duties of the pastoral office. The first part, *qualiter veniat,* studies the marks of vocation to the priesthood; the second part, *qualiter vivat,* describes the life of a true pastor; the third, *qualiter doceat,* gives rules for apostolic preaching; the fourth and last, *qualiter se cognoscat,* crowns this remarkable theory of the priestly life by showing that its source is to be found in a profound interior life. The entire work is inspired by this thought, that the government of souls is the art of arts—*ars artium regimen animarum.*

St. Gregory's *Pastoral Rule* became, in the Middle Ages, the code of the clerical life, as the Rule of St. Benedict remained the code of the monastic life. Soon it was spread in Spain by Leander of Seville. In England King Alfred the Great had it translated into the Saxon tongue. Old Italian translations of it have been found.[67] In Gaul, in the ninth century, the bishops

[65] This is Ewald's view in the *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtskunde,* III, 431–625. The *Registrum* of St. Gregory's letters forms two volumes of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica.*

[66] John the Deacon, II, 5.

[67] In 1869 Cerruti, curator of the Ambrosian Library in Milan, published a thirteenth century Italian translation of it.

took their oath on the collection of the canons and on the *Pastoral Rule*.[68] The Second Council of Reims (813) declares that St. Gregory's *Pastoral Rule* and St. Benedict's *Rule* have been read in the presence of all the fathers.[69] Next to the Gospel and the conciliar decisions, no book exercised a greater influence upon the Church of the Middle Ages.

The *Liber regulae pastoralis* was written in 591.[70] It was about the same time that a popular tradition, taken by John the Deacon from the Anglo-Saxon biographer, seems to place the fact of a miraculous apparition that resulted in finally quieting the saint's apprehensions about the duties of his office.

Legend of the Thirteenth Guest

One day, we are told, Gregory gave orders to his steward to invite twelve poor men to his table. This was a practice with Gregory. But that day, when he entered the dining-room, instead of twelve poor men, he saw thirteen. "Why are there thirteen?" he asked the steward. "Most honored father," the latter replied, "there are only twelve." St. Gregory however still saw thirteen. But one of them, during the meal, kept changing the appearance of his face from moment to moment. Now he was a handsome youth, and now a venerable old man. Gregory, taking him aside, asked him his name. "Why do you ask me my name," said he, "which is admirable? Do you recall that one day, while you were at St. Andrew's monastery, an unfortunate merchant came to you, saying that he had lost everything in a shipwreck? You gave him twelve pieces of money, and at length the silver dish in which your food was brought to you, the treasured souvenir of your beloved mother.

[68] Second Council of Chalons, Third Council of Tours.

[69] Labbe, *Conc.*, VII, 1255.

[70] Bardenhewer's, *Les pères de l'Église* (French trans.), III, 202. In a letter to St. Leander bishop of Seville, St. Gregory says: *Librum regulae pastoralis, quem in episcopatus mei exordio scripsi. Reg.*, V, 53; *PL*, LXXVII, 778.

I am that merchant to whom you gave your mother's dish, or rather I am the angel whom God sent to you to prove your mercy." When Gregory, who, as the narrator remarks, "had never beheld an angel of God," was trembling with amazement, his mysterious visitor said to him: "Fear not; it is for the alms of that silver dish that God has given you the chair of St. Peter. And now behold, God sends me to be your guardian as long as you remain in this world. Whatever you ask, will be granted you through me." Thereupon the holy Pope, now reassured, said: "If, for my little alms, God has made me supreme pastor of His holy Church and has sent me an angel to keep me, what will He not grant me if I set to work to perform, with my whole strength, whatever He wishes of me?" [71]

Varied Activities

What is beyond question, what is evidenced by all the most authentic documents, is that the holy Pontiff, after being hesitant at first, set to work to perform with his whole might what God wished of him. The register of his letters [72] shows him, from the very first year of his pontificate, taking a hand in ecclesiastical affairs in Spain, where King Recared had just

[71] John the Deacon, II, 23; *PL,* LXXV, 96. The historical genuineness of this story, which remained one of the best known episodes of the legends of St. Gregory in the Middle Ages, has been questioned. Some consider it as simply a repetition of another incident related by the Pope in one of his homilies (*Hom. 23 in Evang.,* Bk. II; *PL,* LXXVI, 1183). This is the view maintained by Father Grisar, S.J., in the *Civilta cattolica,* VI (1890), 418. The great Jesuit scholar says: *Questa legenda non e che la repetizione a verbo di un fatto gia conosciuto a tempi di Gregorio, anzi da lui medesimo raccontato al populo come avenuto ad un padre di famiglia.* We would not venture to share the opinion of the eminent historian of the popes of the Middle Ages. The two narratives are not identical, and there seems to us to be nothing that indicates they refer to the same event.

[72] St. Gregory's letters are the safest documents for his life. The note on him in the *Liber pontificalis* is exceedingly brief. His Life by Paul the Deacon was written in the eighth century; that of John the Deacon, at the end of the ninth century. Both of them are largely dependent upon a biography written in Northumbria at the beginning of the eighth century and not to be relied upon as exact.

died and where the Third Council of Seville had just been held,[73] in Africa, which was still disturbed by the Donatists,[74] in Sicily, which was stirred up against the Jews,[75] in Gaul in connection with the same Jewish question.[76] In February, 591, he assembled a council at Rome.[77] That same year he reorganized the administration of the patrimonies of the Roman Church,[78] established the budget of his works of charity,[79] regulated and modified, according to the requirements of the situation, the rights of jurisdiction of the bishops of Italy.[80] "Like an Argos with a hundred eyes," says John the Deacon, "the holy Pontiff saw everywhere." [81] But it was with anguish that he turned his gaze to the East. Two great disputes would soon arise in that part of the Christian world, one raised by Emperor Maurice, the other by the patriarch of Constantinople.

Relations with Emperor Maurice

Gregory I deemed it an honor to be one of the humblest subjects of the Empire and one of the most loyal friends of Maurice. He was effusive in thanking the Emperor for his generous alms and for his zeal in defending the purity of the faith against the poison of heresy.[82] But, whenever the Byzantine autocrat attempted to infringe upon the rights of the Church or of Christian conscience, he found opposing him the Pope who wrote to Sabinianus, his nuncio at Constantinople,

[73] *Ep.*, I, 43; *PL*, LXXVII, 496.
[74] *Ep.*, I, 74, and II, 64; *PL*, LXXVII, 528, 581.
[75] *Ep.*, I, 35; IX, 36; XI, 30, 37; *MGH*, pp. 47, 445.
[76] *Ep.*, I, 47; *PL*, LXXVII, 510.
[77] *Ep.*, I, 25; *PL*, LXXVII, 468.
[78] *Ep.*, I, 72; VII, 18, 19, 20, 21; *PL*. LXXVII, 526, 872–875.
[79] *Ep.*, I, 18, 39, 46; *PL*, LXXVII, 463, 493, 508; John the Deacon, II, 24; *PL*, LXXV, 96.
[80] *Ep.*, I, 15; II, 16, 18, 31, 35; *PL*, LXXVII, 460, 551, 552, 565, 575.
[81] John the Deacon, II, 55; *PL*, LXXV, 112.
[82] *Ep.*, V, 30; VI, 16, 65; *PL*, LXXVII, 755, 808, 848.

these lofty words: "Thou art well acquainted with my ways, that I bear long; but if once I have determined not to bear, I go gladly in the face of all dangers. . . . I was before prepared rather to die than that the Church of the blessed Apostle Peter should degenerate in my days." [83]

The most celebrated of the conflicts that arose between the Pope and the Emperor was the one that occurred in connection with the admission of soldiers into the monasteries. By an edict of 592, Maurice forbade any official or any soldier to enter the ranks of the clergy or any monastic community. Gregory, though recognizing the good grounds for certain legislative precautions of the decree, protested against the unqualified character of the imperial prohibitions. He saw therein a violation of the freedom of ecclesiastical vocations. He wrote as follows:

> I am speaking, not as a bishop nor as a subject, but simply from the right which I find in my heart as a man. . . . Hearken, O Emperor, to what Christ says to you through me, his humble servant, and keep it in mind: "I raised you from being a clerk to the post of captain of the guards, from that position to the rank of Caesar, from Caesar to emperor. I have confided my priests to you. And you seek to ban soldiers from my service." . . . In the name of that terrible judge I implore that your piety find the means, whether by a favorable interpretation or by a suitable modification, to soften the rigor of this law.

He concludes the letter thus: "I have now performed my twofold duty. I have paid to my emperor the tribute of my obedience, which is due to my emperor, and to God the testimony of my conscience, which belongs only to God." [84] At the end of five years Maurice agreed to modify the law in the way Gregory asked. Government officials were allowed to enter the

[83] *Ep.*, IV, 47; *PL*, LXXVII, 721.
[84] *Ep.*, III, 65; *PL*, LXXVII, 662, 665.

monasteries, provided they had made their reports, and soldiers after undergoing a three years' novitiate.

John the Faster

The disagreements with the Patriarch of Constantinople were longer and more serious. They concerned the title "ecumenical patriarch" which John the Faster publicly conferred on himself. The issue was more than a question of words. Gregory was not mistaken as to that. True, the title was neither novel nor precisely defined. It is to be found in several earlier documents, applied to the patriarchs and to the popes.[85] This word of itself, following the language of the Eastern Church of that time, did not imply a claim to universal supremacy, any more than does the term "catholicos" even today used by the head of the Armenian Church and of the Chaldean Church. But the former apocrisiary was not deceived as to the real tendencies that were hidden beneath John the Faster's obstinacy in giving himself the title of ecumenical patriarch. Gregory wrote as follows: "If we do not go beyond the mere words, it is simply a question of syllables; but if we consider the evil purpose that prompts their use, we see a universal danger in them." [86] He was mindful of the movement of independence which little by little was separating Constantinople from Rome. Says Duchesne:

The bishops of Constantinople, far from being satisfied with the preponderant and antitraditional situation, which they held from the assemblies of 381 and of 451, nourished but one ambition—that of becoming the absolute heads of the Church. Infatuated by the magnitude of their city, by their preponderance in the Councils of the Emperor, incapable of realizing the importance of aught outside the Greek

[85] See the examples cited by Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine,* p. 50, and by Vailhé, art. "Constantinople" in the *Dict. de théologie.*

[86] *Si quantitatem sermonis attendimus, quae sunt syllabae; si vero pondus iniquitatis, universa pernicies. Ep.,* VII, 33; *PL,* LXXVII, 891.

sphere of influence, they came to look upon themselves as the center of Christendom.[87]

The bishop occupying the see of Constantinople at the close of the fourth century was that John IV, called the Faster, whom Gregory had already met during his nunciature. By the harshness of his character, by the imperial favor which he had acquired, by the widespread reputation for holiness which won the populace to him, he seemed the very one to stir up a schism. His earnest zeal in the repression of heretics gave him a reputation for pure orthodoxy. It is not unusual to find such traits in the fomenters of schism and the authors of heresies. They become despots and rebels from the same tendency, namely, excessive attachment to their own ideas. The people, often measuring a man's orthodoxy by his eagerness in suspecting the orthodoxy of others, are easily deceived. At a council held in 588, John IV had called himself "ecumenical patriarch"; according to St. Gregory, he had done so in such terms that he changed the traditional meaning of the title, reserving it to himself alone, to the exclusion of all others.[88] Unfortunately we have not the acts of this council and therefore are unable to confirm the view taken by the Roman Pontiff. Furthermore, John IV soon manifested the spirit of unrestraint that animated him. In July, 593, Gregory learned that a priest named John and some monks of Isauria, one a priest, had been accused of heresy by the Patriarch and that the priest monk had been beaten with a rod in a church at Constantinople. Gregory complained. The Patriarch replied that he knew nothing of the affair. In answer to this, Gregory sent an indignant reply, saying: "I have received a letter bearing your name, but I am un-

[87] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome*, p. 140.

[88] *Ad hoc perductus es, ut despectis fratribus episcopus appetas solus vocari.* Mansi, IX, 1217. The *Liber pontificalis* gives the same interpretation. In the note on Pope Boniface III (607), it is said: *Ecclesia constantinopolitana prima se omnium ecclesiarum scribebat. Lib. pont.*, I, 316.

willing to believe that it comes from you. What could be worse than that servants of God be treated thus and the pastor not know it? It is certainly a strange sort of preaching that exacts faith by blows of a rod." [89] The letter ends with a request that the Patriarch explain his conduct to the papal apocrisiary Sabinianus, who is prepared to decide the question according to justice.

After several parleys, Gregory succeeded in having the affair settled justly; and the accused priests and monks were reinstated. But in his correspondence John the Faster, in almost every line, took pains to assume the title of ecumenical patriarch. Gregory then wrote to the Patriarch John, to Emperor Maurice, to Empress Constantina, and to the apocrisiary Sabinianus four letters that were remarkable for prudence, eloquence, and depth of piety.[90] Gregory's complaint was that the Bishop of Constantinople was disturbing the Church with regard to an old title, that he was fomenting a spirit of division which might lead to the worst calamities, that he was ignoring the decisions of Pelagius II, who had proscribed that pompous title, that he did not imitate the bishops of Rome who, at the Council of Chalcedon, refused the title lest they might seem to be attributing the episcopacy to themselves alone and refusing it to their brother-bishops.[91] It was called a question of words. But they were words that were rending the Church. Gregory said: "A mere affair of a title, a simple question of words! That is easily said. When antichrist calls himself God, then dare to say: A mere affair of a title, a simple question of words." Thereafter Gregory, in public documents, always called himself "the servant of the servants of God." [92]

[89] *Nova vero atque inaudita est ista praedicatio, quae verberibus exigit fidem. Ep.*, III, 53; *PL*, LXXVII, 649.

[90] Jaffé, 1357, 1360, 1352, 1358.

[91] *Ep.*, V, 18; *PL*, LXXVII, 738.

[92] Gregory took this title in the document donating his family palace to the Benedictine monastery. His successors have preserved this title of *servus servorum Dei.*

Soon after this, Eulogius the patriarch of Alexandria, in a letter to the Pope, calls him ecumenical pontiff, although Gregory had forbidden that he be addressed by this title. He reproached Eulogius in these remarkable terms: "I said that you should give this pompous title neither to me nor to anyone else. I cannot accept an appellation which, by elevating me beyond measure, seems to lower the others. Let us seek to elevate ourselves in virtue, not in words. I do not wish to glorify myself in a way to lessen the glory of my brothers. My honor is the honor of the universal Church. My greatness is the greatness of my brothers in the episcopate. I feel myself truly honored only when I see that no one is refused the honor due to him. . . . Away with words that puff up vanity and that wound charity." [93]

But Gregory's example and his efforts in the matter were fruitless. Boniface III, in 607, obtained from Emperor Phocas a constitution withdrawing the title "ecumenical" from the Patriarch Cyriacus. This, however, was for a short time only. Cyriacus' successors resumed the title, and the emperors no longer stopped granting it to them.[94] From these great disputes Gregory gained nothing except the satisfaction of having performed his duty, and the conviction, henceforth quite definite, that the Roman Church could hope for nothing from the power of the Eastern emperors, and that it had everything to fear from the patriarchs of Constantinople.[95]

Nevertheless Gregory was pleased to maintain throughout his life most friendly epistolary relations with the devout laity and the monks of Byzantium who had put themselves under his spiritual guidance when he was nuncio there. His spiritual letters to Empress Constantina, to the physician Theotimus, to several princesses of the court, and especially to the patrician

[93] *Ep.*, VIII, 30; *PL*, LXXVII, 933.

[94] Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine*, p. 51.

[95] On this whole question, see Vailhé, "Saint Grégoire le Grand et le titre de patriarche oecumenique" in the *Échos d'Orient*, May, 1908, pp. 161 ff.

lady Rusticiana, reveal a gentle, fatherly soul, experienced in the knowledge of the human heart, at times merry, and again easily rising to the realms of the loftiest mysticism.[96]

The Church in Asia and Africa

Gregory's apostolic zeal did not forget those regions of the Far East where his friend the patrician Narses, before whom the children of the Persians trembled, had just established on his throne the representative of the Sassanian dynasty, Chosroes II.[97] Chosroes, in gratitude for the help he had received from the Byzantine army, "proclaimed liberty of conscience in his states. At the instigation of his Christian wives (the Armenian Siriu and the Roman Mary), he made donations to the churches. He showed special devotion to the martyr Sergius. . . . It was said that Sergius fought for Chosroes at the head of the Byzantine army, and this legend was piously retained in popular tradition." [98] These events brought joy to Gregory. Learning that Bishop Domitian, metropolitan of Armenia and relative of the Emperor, took advantage of Chosroes' decree of tolerance to preach a mission in the Persian Empire, Gregory felicitated him and encouraged him. "I regret," he said, "that the Emperor of the Persians has not been converted, but your preaching will receive its reward. The Ethiopian comes forth from the bath as black as he entered; but the bathkeeper is paid." [99]

[96] He pleasantly discusses with Theotimus a certain opinion of Plato (III, 54); he twits Rusticiana about her preference for Constantinople and her exaggerated fears with regard to the dangers of Rome (II, 27; IV, 46). A certain lady of the Empress' household, when Gregory was raised to the papacy, asked him to send her in writing an absolution of all her sins; Gregory answered her with spirited pleasantry (VII, 25). A patrician lady, Clementina, whose correspondence is unfortunately very incomplete, was perhaps a most original character, worthy of a place beside Rusticiana, and almost in the same class as St. Jerome's famous correspondents, Paula and Eustochium. (I, 11; III, 1; X, 15, 18; *PL*, LXXVII, 457, 603, 1076, 1078.)

[97] Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse*, pp. 204–206.

[98] *Op. cit.*, pp. 208 f.

[99] *Ep.*, III, 67; *PL*, LXXVII, 668.

It was likewise by Byzantine relations that Christianity penetrated to the heart of Arabia. But it had no small difficulty in maintaining itself and taking root there. Mundhir, prince of Hira, the capital of Persian Arabia, adored the Semitic divinities and had four hundred Christian virgins immolated to the goddess Ouzza, the Arabian Venus.[100] But finally, about the year 594, Naaman, Mundhir's successor, was converted to the true faith.

The success of the imperial armies Gregory regarded as a pledge of the spread of the Gospel. To the patrician Gennadius exarch of Africa, he wrote as follows: "It is said that you wage war, not to shed blood, but to enlarge the commonwealth where we see the name of God honored. You understand that, whereas outward virtues win this world's glory, only interior qualities of a pure heart make us worthy to share in the joys of heaven." [101]

The Church in Europe

Gregory's thoughts turned especially to the people of Spain, about whom he was informed in letters from his friend Leander, and to the people of Gaul, many of whom he had known in Constantinople, and to his beloved Anglo-Saxons, whose misfortune had so deeply affected him years before. Whether he is felicitating King Recared of Spain for his zeal and giving encouragement to those important councils of Saragossa and Toledo, at which the civil and canon law of the Middle Ages is roughly outlined; [102] whether he is stimulating the zeal of Vigilius of Arles and Serenus of Marseilles in Gaul to reform certain abuses that bore the marks of simony and of practices that foreshadowed the heresy of the Iconoclasts; [103] whether

[100] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome*, p. 202.
[101] *Ep.*, I, 75; *PL*, LXXVII, 528.
[102] *Ep.*, VII, 122; *PL*, LXXVII, 1052.
[103] *Ep.*, VI, 49; XI, 13; *PL*, LXXVII, 834, 1128.

he is writing to Brunehilde letters in which salutary advice is mingled with felicitations; whether he is following, with fatherly concern, that English mission which seems to have been his most cherished apostolic undertaking; everywhere we see the holy Pope devote himself so completely to whatever matter he is treating that he seems to have no other concern.[104]

However, the incursions and depredations of the Lombards increased. It was the period when, to use the words of an inscription of that time, we might say it was necessary to labor *gladios hostiles inter et iras.*[105] The Lombards were imperiling Rome, which lacked troops for its defense and bread to eat. The population was on the verge of discouragement. The Pontiff, who had written in his *Pastoral Rule* that a bishop's first duty is preaching, then mounted the pulpit and read or, when his voice failed him, had someone else read, before the assembled faithful, his famous homilies on the prophet Ezechiel.

St. Gregory's Sermons

The twenty-two homilies on Ezechiel, along with the forty homilies on the Gospels, form St. Gregory's oratorical work. No writings of the fathers were more promptly and universally popular. A large number of the lessons of the liturgical office have been taken from the *Homilies on the Gospels.* St. Gregory's sermons have not the sonorous breadth of St. Chrysostom's or the impulsiveness of St. Augustine's or that critical tone which was St. Jerome's personal characteristic. They did not attain that friendly clearness which accounts for the success of St. Caesarius' preaching; they scorned those literary embellishments in which the delicate taste of St. Gregory

[104] The detailed history of the Churches of Spain, Gaul, and England will be found later in this volume.

[105] "Amid swords and hatreds." De Rossi, *Inscriptiones,* II, 157. *Mosaici,* fasc. 3, 4. This inscription may still be seen near the Basilica of St. Lawrence.

Nazianzen delighted;[106] but they are so eminently communicative, so living, so pastoral, they are so well adapted to the dispositions of men of that time, that we can understand their rapid popularity. He says:

Often, when I am alone, I read the Holy Scripture and fail to comprehend it. I come into your midst, dear brethren, and suddenly I understand. This sudden understanding makes me desire another. I wish to know who are those persons by whose merits the comprehension comes to me on a sudden. It is granted to me for those in whose presence it is bestowed on me. So, by the grace of God, while the understanding increases within me, pride is lowered. For it is in your midst that I learn what I teach you. I declare to you, my dear children, that most of the time I hear in my ear what I tell you at the very moment when I tell you.[107] All I do is repeat. When I do not comprehend Ezechiel, then I recognize myself; it is indeed I, it is the blind one. When

[106] "I am not at pains to avoid the confusion of barbarisms, I disdain constructions, word order, the cases with prepositions, because I find it supremely unworthy to make the words of the heavenly oracle comply with the rules of Donatus" (*Morals,* preface, chap. 5; *PL.,* LXXV, 516). We should not take these words too literally. While affecting to despise the elegance of profane literature, nevertheless Gregory does not write in a way devoid of all literary merit. Although his writing is not labored, but rather fluent, natural, spontaneous; yet the style of this patrician, who made the acquaintance of classical studies in his youth, and later on, through his official position, mingled in the highest society of Rome and Constantinople, is never banal.

[107] St. Gregory, by these words, seems to allude to a supernatural grace. This is probably what gave rise to the legend of the dove, symbol of the Holy Ghost, speaking in his ear. In support of the historical character of this event, appeal is sometimes made to the testimony of Peter the Deacon, a close friend of St. Gregory. Clausier, *S. Grégoire le Grand,* p. 284. This testimony comes to us in the following manner. John the Deacon, writing about three centuries after the period when the event is supposed to have occurred, relates (*Vita Gregorii,* IV, 69; *PL,* LXXV, 221 f.) that, according to a tradition of the ancients (*sicut a majoribus traditur*), after St. Gregory's death some of his enemies wished to burn his manuscripts. But it is thought (*creditur*) that Peter the Deacon, his close friend, protested, saying that to do so would be a sacrilege because, said he, "I have often seen the Holy Ghost resting over his head in the form of a dove." And, after saying that he was willing to die in confirmation of his statement, Peter ascended the pulpit with the holy Gospels, and died. To Baronius (*Annals,* year 604) and to the Benedictines of St. Maur (*PL,* LXXV, 221, note 1), this story seems the more dubious because, they say, "no testimony is adduced from any author by name and because neither St. Ildefonsus nor St. Isidore nor Paterius (a disciple of St. Gregory) alludes to any such event."

I comprehend, then it is the gift of God that comes to me on your account. Sometimes, too, I comprehend the Scripture in secret. At such moments, I weep for my faults; only tears please me. Then am I enraptured on the wings of contemplation.[108]

The homilies on the prophet Ezechiel were not finished. The siege of Rome by Agilulf compelled St. Gregory to interrupt them. Furthermore, so many calamities and disturbances led the Romans to question whether the end of the world might not be imminent. Gregory shared these popular apprehensions and became their pathetic interpreter. "Where is the Senate?" he said; "where is the people? All I see are ruined buildings and crumbling walls. . . . Let us despise this present world as a torch henceforth extinct, and let us enter into our earthly desires in the death of the world itself." [109]

Like most popular orators, Gregory possessed the gift, at once valuable and dangerous, of feeling keenly in his heart the passions that stirred the crowd of his hearers. This fear of the approaching end of the world and of the coming of the dread Judge, filled his last homilies on Ezechiel. Nevertheless that dread came less from a conviction than from an apprehension.[110] It never succeeded in discouraging him. Never did it keep him from laboring for the salvation of his people and for the future of the Church. Even while he was exhorting the faithful to prepare for the end of the world, he was negotiating with the Lombards,[111] and was interceding with the Emperor.[112] A great apologist of the papacy says:

Gregory saw the world falling into ruin, he thought the last days were at hand. Yet he did not decline the labor. He kept Rome from

[108] Homilies on Ezech., II, 2; *PL*, LXXVI, 949.
[109] *Ibid.*, II, 6; *PL*, LXXVI, 1010.
[110] *Ep.*, V, 36; *PL*, LXXVII, 760.
[111] *Ep.*, V, 40; *PL*, LXXVII, 765.
[112] In any event, that apprehension of the approaching end of the world, which, as the theologians say, affected him only as a private doctor, was never the subject of dogmatic teaching given under the conditions that guarantee papal infallibility.

disappearing; and he planted overseas the seed from which would soon spring a new Catholic people. He strove against the pestilence, against the earthquakes, against heretical barbarians and idolatrous barbarians, against a paganism that was dead and decaying, but not yet buried. He strove against his own body crushed by sickness. We might say that Gregory's soul was the only thoroughly healthy thing in all mankind.[113]

In the life of that great man nothing is more remarkable than this: supposing that he was laboring only for the preservation of the ancient world, he became, by the mere fact of performing his duties of state and being obedient to Providence, the initiator of the new times.

St. Gregory Patriarch of the West

Head of the universal Church, patriarch of the West, metropolitan of the Roman prefecture, bishop of Rome, "Gregory gave the world a perfect model of ecclesiastical government." [114]

As head of the universal Church, we see him repress the budding vanity of the patriarch of Constantinople. As patriarch of the West, he had dependent upon him the metropolitans of Milan, Ravenna, and Aquileia in Italy, all those of Africa, Greece, Gaul, and Spain.[115] With firmness and discretion, he everywhere won recognition for the rights of his authority. In Italy he received an appeal of the suffragan bishops of Milan against their metropolitan; in Greece he sustained the rights of the bishops of Thebes against the claims of the archbishops of Larissa; in Africa he vigorously urged the bishops to repress the Donatist heresy; in Gaul and in Spain he was in continuous correspondence with the episcopacy. The most am-

[113] Louis Veuillot, *Le Parfum de Rome,* I, 101.
[114] Bossuet, *L'Histoire universelle,* eleventh period.
[115] Pingaud, *La Politique de S. Grégoire le Grand,* chap. 4.

bitious of the metropolitans in his patriarchate was the Archbishop of Ravenna. Basing his claim on the fact of the emperors' sojourn in that city and the fact of the exarch's residence there, John of Ravenna arrogated to himself honors that would have raised him above the metropolitans. Toward him Gregory showed himself the most intrepid defender of his hierarchical rights. "You should conform to the practice of all the metropolitans," Gregory wrote to him, "or show a privilege from the pope, if you claim to possess such. . . . I have had a search made through the archives. . . . I have questioned. . . . But nothing have I found that authorizes you to wear the pallium in processions or your deacons to wear the maniple at Rome. You put the honor of the episcopacy in outward show and not in inner virtues." [116] Yet the holy Pontiff was at pains to respect, at Milan, the traditions of the Ambrosian Church,[117] and his letters to the bishops of Africa indicate his intention of interfering as little as possible in the internal affairs of the dioceses.[118] Wherever he can do so without harm to discipline, he effaces his authority. He honors the other patriarchs with extreme delicacy. He wrote to Eulogius patriarch of Antioch:

> Your Holiness has told me many things which have been pleasing to me on the see of Peter, prince of the Apostles. I have heard all that the more gladly, since he who speaks thus to me about the see of Peter, does himself occupy the see of Peter. I, who like not honors that are addressed only to me, rejoiced, because, most holy father, you bestow upon yourself what you attribute to me. Although there are many Apostles, only the see of the Prince of the Apostles has obtained the primacy, that see of one only that was established in three places, for Peter exalted (*sublimavit*) the see of Rome where he deigned to rest and to end his earthly life; he honored (*decoravit*) the see of Alexan-

[116] *Ep.*, II, 54, 55; IV, 11, 15.
[117] *Ep.*, X, 29.
[118] *Ep.*, II, 47; VI, 64; VII, 2; VIII, 3.

dria, where he sent his disciple St. Mark the Evangelist; he established (*firmavit*) the see of Antioch, where he lived seven years.[119]

How well, with this ingenious use of words, he hides his own greatness. The hierarchy is indicated merely by nuances in the expressions "established," "honored," and "exalted," marking three degrees of that see, which is threefold and one, from which the Vicar of Christ governs Christendom.[120]

St. Gregory Metropolitan of Italy

As metropolitan the bishop of Rome, at the close of the sixth century, had under his jurisdiction the suburbicarian provinces: Campania, Tuscany, Umbria, suburbicarian Picenum, Apulia, Calabria, Corsica, Lucania, and Valeria. Over this portion of the Church, which was very especially connected with him, the zealous Pontiff watched with particular care. Three times he assembled his suffragans in provincial councils—in 591, 595, and 601. We have the proceedings of the council of 595 and that of 601. The object of the former was to assure a good supply of priests and a prudent administration of the Churches.[121] The council of 601 was concerned especially with safeguarding a wise independence of the monasteries with regard to the bishops in the election of their abbots and the management of their individual affairs.[122] With unwearied zeal Gregory saw to the execution of these laws in the dioceses dependent on him.

This great Pope considered it his duty always to respect the freedom of episcopal elections. Says Thomassin: "From a great number of this holy Pontiff's letters it appears that he

[119] *Ep.*, VII, 40; *PL*, LXXVII, 899.
[120] E. Lavisse in *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, December 15, 1886.
[121] Hefele, *History of the Councils*, IV, 426 f.; Mansi, IX, 1226; X, 475.
[122] Hefele, IV, 431; Mansi, X, 486 f.

never wished to have anything to do in the selection of bishops for vacant sees and that he always preserved for all the Churches the ancient liberty of electing their bishops. . . . But, as Churches often suffered from an extreme lack of subjects capable of bearing the burden of so high an office, this Pope supplied that want and gave them those he was holding as it were in reserve." [123] On such occasions he intervened with remarkable tact. He acted in the same way when the need of the parishes obliged him to provide for some vacant parish appointment in an outside diocese. To Bishop Importunus he wrote: "I venture to believe that your Fraternity will gladly accept what we are doing for the good of your diocese." [124]

St. Gregory Bishop of Rome

It was particularly as bishop of Rome that Gregory displayed a ceaseless pastoral solicitude. There, in his own diocese, he felt he was a true father, whose office it was to distribute bodily as well as spiritual nourishment. This Roman of the old stock, who considered that he was simply respecting the traditions of his fathers, was in fact a feudal prelate, whose social and political activities, along with his spiritual mission, formed an integral part of his episcopal duties. St. Gregory was very conscious of this social duty. Upon learning one day that a poor man had died of hunger in the city of Rome, Gregory, by way of penance, refrained from celebrating the holy sacrifice for several days.[125]

But his most particular concern was the spiritual welfare of souls. He watched over the conduct of the clergy; so exigent was he in the matter of ecclesiastical learning that Bishop Licinianus of Cartagena wrote to him, saying: "If you require

[123] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* III, 471.
[124] *Ep.,* II, 10.
[125] John the Deacon, II, 29.

such learning of priests, we shall never find any candidates." [126] He was also fond of being in the midst of his Roman people and opening his soul to them in friendly discourse. He re-established and reorganized the custom of the stations, which the disturbances of those times had interrupted. On the occasion of these stations, part of the clergy and the faithful, with the Pope presiding, gathered in one of the Roman churches. There, in the midst of his people, Gregory's words found their most penetrating accents. It was always a matter of regret to him when the weakness of his tired voice obliged him to have his sermons read by someone else. "The living word," he said, "moves the heart more than a reading, which requires an intermediary." [127] This custom of the stations had a notable influence upon the liturgy. With it was connected the composition of the Sacramentary that bears his name.[128]

Gregorian Chant

The tradition which attributes to St. Gregory the definite fixation of the liturgical chant should be respected. The most recent critical works seem at all points to confirm the statements of St. Gregory's biographer, John the Deacon. "Like another wise Solomon, moved by the penitential quality and the sweetness of the music, the most zealous of the chanters compiled a very useful Antiphonary. He also formed the *schola cantorum,* which still sings in the holy Church and does so according to the same principles." [129] In fact, it is only starting with St. Gregory that any mention is made of the *schola can-*

[126] *Ep.,* II, 54; *PL,* LXXVII, 601.

[127] *Ep.,* VII, 11.

[128] Duchesne, who attributes the final revision of the Sacramentary to Pope Adrian I, grants that several of the prayers in it go back to St. Gregory. In any event, "it is essentially a stational Sacramentary." *Christian Worship,* p. 123. Duchesne's opinion is opposed by Probst, *Les plus anciens sacramentaires et ordres romains expliqués.*

[129] John the Deacon, II, 6.

torum in papal documents. What is said by John the Deacon is confirmed by two documents dating from a century after St. Gregory's death: one of these emanates from Venerable Bede, the other from Egbert archbishop of York.[130] John the Deacon declares that St. Gregory presented to the *schola cantorum* several fields and two houses, one near St. Peter's and the other near the Lateran. "There we find preserved," he goes on, "with proper veneration, the authentic Antiphonary, the couch on which he used to chant, and the rod with which he disciplined the boys."

It has been noted that the memory of the musician-pontiff is preserved even in stone. Forty years after him, on the tomb of Pope Honorius, was engraved this inscription: "Excellent pastor in the divine chant, he was the worthy successor of Gregory." [131]

The saintly Pope, however, never wished to provide for the fine execution of the singing to the detriment of ecclesiastical dignity. The first canon of the Roman Council of 595, proposed by Gregory and acclaimed by the bishops, is worded as follows:

It has long been the custom in the Roman Church to ordain cantors as deacons and, still further, to use them for singing, instead of for preaching and caring for the poor. This has the consequence that, at divine service, more is thought of a good voice than of good life. Consequently no deacon may, henceforth, sing in the church except the

[130] All this evidence, confirmed by the consideration of several circumstances of St. Gregory's life, is set forth in Gastoué, *Les origines du chant romain, l'antiphonaire Grégorien.* Gastoué sees three elements in the origin of the Gregorian chant: the first Hebraic, the second Gnostic, and the third Graeco-Roman. St. Gregory denied that he imported any Byzantine practices into Rome. Jaffé, 1550; *Reg.,* IX, 26 (IX, 12).

[131] Gevaert refused to admit that the Gregorian chant goes back to St. Gregory the Great and maintained that John the Deacon, a man of uncritical mind, must have confused Gregory I with Gregory II or Gregory III (*Les origines du chant liturgique de l'Eglise latine*). Dom Germain Morin thereupon defended the traditional view (*L'Origine du chant grégorien*). Cf. Dom Pothier, *Musica sacra,* pp. 38 f.

Gospel in the mass. The remaining lections and psalms shall be sung by subdeacons, or, if it is necessary, by those in minor orders.[132]

Only a few churches are mentioned as having been built by St. Gregory. As his biographer remarks, he was much more engaged in erecting spiritual than material temples.[133] The period of the barbarian invasions was not favorable to the building of churches.

Works of Charity

The most pressing need of that period was the care of the poor. Wars and disasters of all sorts had caused frightful misery. Destitute fugitives, driven out by the Lombards, sought refuge in Rome. A letter from the Pope to Theoctista, sister of Emperor Maurice, tells us that in 593 he had three thousand nuns dependent on him for their sustenance.[134] Gregory's charity appears at the height of this terrible distress. Through his deacons and by himself he distributed very large alms. At every great feast day and on the first day of each month he presided at the distribution of wheat, wine, vegetables, meat, fish, and clothing.[135] Says John the Deacon: "The Church had become like a magazine, to which everybody came." [136] The Pope himself said that these sufferings of the poor and the alms of the rich would be the means of saving the city.[137]

But this charity was not exercised blindly. It was governed by perfect order. Deacons, chosen from among honest and upright men, were in general charge of it: vidames were delegated to provide hospitality in the bishop's name; pious women, called *matriculae* or *mulieres de matriculis,* were placed in

[132] Mansi, IX, 1226; Hefele, III, 599.
[133] Paul the Deacon, *Life of St. Gregory,* chap. 16; *PL,* LXXV, 49.
[134] Jaffé, 1469.
[135] John the Deacon, II, 26.
[136] *Ibid.*
[137] Jaffé, 1469.

charge of charitable institutions.[138] Several of these hospices received contributions from the public and from the imperial Treasury, and Gregory watched over the regular payment of these contributions.[139] John the Deacon declares that in his time at the Lateran Palace could be seen a register of all the persons to whom the Pope had made regular distributions.[140]

The Papal Patrimonies

Such social needs were an additional reason for Gregory to watch carefully over the proper administration of the papal patrimony. The management of this patrimony, or rather these patrimonies (*patrimonia*) as they were called, is perhaps the masterpiece of St. Gregory's organizing genius. Indications to be found here and there in his letters enable us to reconstruct almost entirely the plan and functioning of this admirable work of social foresight and moral education.

First, we can see the great importance of these patrimonies.[141] In addition to the generous gifts of Constantine and the many offerings of the faithful, which had accumulated for centuries past, monasticism had added a considerable contribution. Persons who gave themselves to God began ordinarily by distributing their goods to the poor; often the bishop of Rome was the one delegated to carry out their charitable intentions.

[138] On the office of deacons, vidames, treasurers, and *mulieres de matriculis,* see Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* Part III, Bk. III, chap. 29.

[139] *Ep.,* VIII, 20.

[140] John the Deacon, II, 30.

[141] "In the sixth century the Roman Church possessed a very large number of estates, so that the pope was the wealthiest landowner of Italy. . . . In the time of Gregory the Great the most important of these patrimonies were the one in Sicily made up of two groups, Syracuse and Palermo, and those of the neighborhood of Rome, Appia, Labicanum, Sabina, Careolanum, Germanicanum, and Tuscany. The other patrimonies of St. Peter were, in Italy, those of Bruttium, Calabria, Samnium, Naples, Campania, Picenum, Ravenna and Istria, Liguria, and the hither Alps; beyond the peninsula, those of Corsica, Sardinia, Dalmatia, Gaul, and Africa. Diehl, "L'Église au temps de Grégoire le Grand" in the *Atlas historique* (Schrader), map 16.

St. Gregory's correspondence acquaints us with the organization of these *patrimonia* or *massae.* At the head was a steward (*rector*). The Pope reminded these stewards that they were charged, not merely with the management of the property, but with using the revenue in works of charity. To the *rector* of Campania he writes: "Remember that your duty is not limited to the administration of the patrimony, but that I have placed you there to assist the poor." [142] Under the *rector* were the *defensores,* whose duties were rather complex: they were legates whom Gregory in one place calls "soldiers of St. Peter." [143] In this capacity they assisted in the meeting of councils and, if needs be, admonished bishops in the pope's name. They were also examining magistrates for the conduct of inquiries, police officers who returned fugitive slaves, justices of the peace who summoned to a reconciliation pastors and faithful in case of conflict, legal guardians who took under their protection strangers seeking refuge on the domains of the pope; in short, they were universal executors of the orders of the supreme pontiff.[144] Below the *defensores* were the *tonsuratores,* put in charge of the direct surveillance of the *coloni.* They were not clerics, but were tonsured as a sign of dependence. Gregory reproved them when they encroached upon the functions of the *defensores.*[145] The *conductores massarum* or farmers managed the estates by means of an annual rent. It was especially in watching over their management that Gregory showed he was a most vigilant and capable landowner. The good ones he encouraged by granting them improvement leases which, by attaching them to the soil for three generations, gave greater stability to the families and favored a more prudently productive labor. Such farmers as were open to suspicion he watched over very closely. In districts where thoroughly up-

[142] *MGH, Reg.,* I, 53 (I, 55).
[143] *Ep.,* I, 36.
[144] *Ep.,* I, 84; III, 89; IX, 20, 22; XI, 37, 38, 71; XII, 28, 29; XIII, 26, 27; XIV, 4.
[145] *Ep.,* IX, 42.

right farmers could not easily be obtained, he replaced the renting plan by direct management, entrusted to priests or monks, who administered the domain in the paternal manner.[146]

To all—*rectores, defensores,* and farmers—Gregory repeated the same maxims, namely, that the patrimonies were the goods of the poor (*res pauperum, bona pauperum, utilitates pauperum*), that the thing to be most sought after was, not gold, but eternal justice,[147] that a soldier of St. Peter should fight solely for St. Peter, that is, for justice and truth,[148] and that the treasure of the Church should not be allowed to be stained by selfish manipulation.[149]

Gregory was watchful that the revenue be not diverted from its normal use, which was to redeem prisoners of war, emancipate slaves, maintain poor monasteries, at times to grant assistance to some high personage of the Byzantine court who had fallen into poverty, and, by way of exception, to obtain from the barbarians, in default of other means, peace or a truce in return for money payment.

The holy Pontiff's solicitude was extended most especially to poor people, whether *coloni* or slaves, who labored in the sweat of their brow upon the domain of St. Peter.

The *coloni* were a class of men that appeared after Constantine. They were neither slaves nor freemen, but were attached to the land where they labored. Their legal status was regulated by the Christian emperors Valentinian and Gratian. Gregory sought to ameliorate the condition of those living on his lands. He asked that the labor required of each one be apportioned to his strength; he allowed them to marry freely within the bounds of the colony. He granted them the important right of sending their complaints to the Holy See when they considered they were victims of injustice on the part of

[146] See his letter to the farmers of the patrimony of Gaul, *Ep.*, V, 31.
[147] *Ep.*, XIII, 24; *MGH, Reg.*, XIII, 37.
[148] *Ep.*, I, 36; *MGH, Reg.*, I, 39.
[149] *Ep.*, I, 44; *MGH, Reg.*, I, 42.

the farmers or of the *rectores* and *defensores*. In cases of such appeals his decisions were examples of prudent equity. He ordered the *defensor* Scholasticus that a certain *colonus* of the Church of Catania, in accordance with his claim, be paid a just price.[150] In the case of a *colonus* of Sicily, who had been forced to pay twice the legal tax, he ordered that the excess amount and the objects he had pawned be returned to him. And the Pope adds: "Do not forget to return her father's cup to his daughter." [151] This cup was probably an object which the daughter especially claimed.

Slavery

Large numbers of slaves were employed on the patrimonies of the Holy See, as well as on the monastery lands and diocesan domains. Slavery was still a legal institution. At Rome itself there was a slave-market. Gregory bought slaves, received slaves as gifts, and sent slaves as gifts to friends.[152] The work of Christian civilization has had reason to be glad of this wise attitude of the Church. On ecclesiastical lands the slaves were regarded as the equal of their master before God. There it was they received the moral training that made them fitted for freedom. Gregory then was eager for them to be freed. Most of the time he considered the wiser procedure would be to have them pass from the status of slaves to that of *coloni*. But when he judged them worthy of leading the life of free men, he freed them completely. In such case he often performed the emancipation ceremony in a church. In accordance with the Justinian Code, this ceremony gave them complete freedom.[153]

[150] *Ut mercedem sicut dignum est accipiat, secundum laboris modum. Ep.*, VIII, 32; *MGH, Reg.*, IX, 43.

[151] *Ep.*, I, 44; *MGH, Reg.*, I, 42. *Cui etiam baciolam patris sui restitui volumus.*

[152] *Ep.*, III, 18; XII, 46.

[153] Justinian Code, Bk. I, tit. 13, *De his qui in ecclesiis manumittuntur.*

The letter by which he freed Thomas and Montana, slaves of the Roman Church, begins thus: "Since our Redeemer, the author of every creature, deigned to take human flesh only that He might break the bonds of our servitude and restore the ancient liberty to us, we in our turn can do no better than have pity upon those men whom nature made free and whom the law of nations has made slaves, that we, by emancipating, restore to them the liberty for which they were born." [154] Gregory saw to it that bishops and abbots should treat their slaves with the same gentleness. The Bishop of Ravenna, for acting unjustly toward his slaves, drew down upon himself a vigorous rebuke. The Bishop of Syracuse received a severe admonition because he failed to reprove a landowner who had separated a woman-slave from her children. "If such a thing happens again," says the Pope, "I shall feel obliged to treat the matter sternly and prosecute, according to the canons, not the layman guilty of the injustice, but the bishop who let the deed be committed." [155] And so the fugitive slaves fled to the Church domains. If they were in great want, the generosity of the pastors came to their relief; if they were being unjustly pursued, the ecclesiastical authorities defended them energetically. If they were guilty of nothing more than a slight offense, Gregory wished that they be returned to their masters only after the latter have granted their pardon.[156]

Another category of persons began to populate the patrimonies of the Holy See; these were the *commendati* or *clients*. Free men fleeing before the Lombards, came and placed themselves under the protection of the Church, *se commendare Ecclesiae*. Gregory charged the *defensores* with the patronage of these new subjects. The words patronage, protector, recom-

[154] *Ep.*, VI, 12; *PL*, LXXVII, 803 f.

[155] *Ep.*, IV, 12; *PL*, LXXVII, 681 f.

[156] *Ep.*, III, 1; *PL*, LXXVII, 604. *Si vero venialem culpam commiserint, dominis suis, accepto de venia sacramento, sine mora reddantur.*

mendation, defense (*tuitio, commendatio, defensio*) come more and more into use. It is the beginning of feudalism.[157]

We have just used the word "subject" in connection with the pope. It is not yet quite justified. However, the patrimony of St. Peter, as constituted under St. Gregory, is almost a state. "By the growth and administration of the patrimonies, Gregory the Great was laying the foundations of the temporal power, that was established when the papacy became freed from the imperial authority."[158]

Papal Supremacy

Gregory was also a forerunner of the Middle Ages by the authority he exercised over the converted barbarian races and their Churches. According to the views of Harnack and Fustel de Coulanges, from the fifth to the ninth century no properly so-called papal supremacy existed, with regard to the Christian kings or even the national Churches. According to these historians, the power of the popes came from the outside and, so to speak, from the social framework in which the Church was situated. So long as the framework of the Roman Empire lasted, the papacy profited by it, then it profited by the powerful centralization accomplished by Charlemagne, but between those two political régimes there was, we are told, a veritable interregnum of the papal authority. "At that time," says Fustel de Coulanges, "Rome held a pre-eminence, not a power, . . . the

[157] Salvian had remarked this fact in the midst of the invasions. He says: "The weak give themselves to some powerful person, so that the latter may defend them." *De gubernatione Dei,* V, 8. But the importance of the papal lands and the people's confidence in the goodness of the Supreme Pontiff accelerated this movement and made it general. It took place in spite of the resistance of the jurisconsults, because, as Fustel de Coulanges says, "the Roman law, which had been created by the state, could not admit an institution that was the opponent of the state. . . . Under the Roman Empire, therefore, patronage and clientage were extra-legal institutions." "Les origines du système féodal" in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* August 1, 1874.

[158] Diehl in Schrader's *Atlas,* map 16.

Christian Church was then a federation of cities, of Churches, each of which was a little monarchy." [159] And Harnack maintains that in the Merovingian period the juridical primacy of the bishop of Rome did not exist. Therefore it must be that it was not essential to the Church, that it had its basis in external circumstances, and St. Gregory the Great in no wise exercised it.[160]

These assertions will best be answered by the simple account of the Christian origins of France, England, Germany, and Spain.[161] For the present let it suffice for us, in opposition to the two illustrious historians, to cite the contrary statements of the learned author of the *History of Rome in the Middle Ages* and the eminent editor of the *Liber pontificalis*. Says Grisar:

> At the same time we must beware of exaggeration, and not insist unduly on the crisis through which Rome had then to pass. Rome dealt, without any great display of effort, with the problems presented by a world in decay.
>
> The bishops of the Church were educated as Romans, so far as the times allowed of any education whatsoever, her missionaries, too, made their settlements real nurseries of Roman civilization. Canon Law was cast in the mold of Roman jurisprudence, and, under the Church's influence, Roman law found its way into the codes of the new nations. Everywhere the Church's representatives laid stress on the need of union with Rome, the metropolis, which, thanks to Peter's keys, was more than ever, and in a far higher sense, the capital of the world.[162]

Duchesne says that the power of the popes, such as exercised by St. Gregory VII, "is guaranteed not only by right but by

[159] Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France. La monarchie franque*, p. 522.

[160] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, II, 149 ff.

[161] See *infra*, pp. 156–287.

[162] Grisar, *History of Rome*, III, 340.

tradition," especially the tradition that goes back to St. Leo and St. Gregory the great.[163]

It is true that Gregory always considered himself a faithful and loyal subject of the Roman Empire of Byzantium. "If the popes," says Grisar, "were unswervingly faithful to the imperial conception now incorporated in Byzantium, this was out of respect for tradition and for old-established right and was therefore a result of that conservative spirit which so strongly characterized their rule, and which the Church even fostered on religious grounds." [164]

But we have seen that the Pope opposed Emperor Maurice when the latter encroached upon the rights of the Church. It is true that in 602, when the adventurer Phocas had himself proclaimed emperor after slaying Maurice and his family, Gregory sent the new ruler a letter of felicitation upon his elevation. But the Pope had been informed of that revolution only by the letters of Phocas himself and of Empress Leontia.[165] Gregory's death soon afterward prevented his protesting against the crimes of Phocas as he had done against the encroachments of Maurice.[166]

[163] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* p. 107. Vaes concludes a study on the *Papauté et l'Église franque* with the following lines: "We rightly conclude that the precise and special features of the relations of the papacy with the Frankish Church in the time of Gregory corresponds to a real power of the Roman see, exercised without contest over Frankish Christendom." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 1905, p. 783. A study on the Churches of England, Germany, and Spain would lead to the same conclusions.

[164] Grisar, *op. cit.,* III, 338.

[165] John the Deacon, IV, 20.

[166] In this connection St. Gregory has sometimes been accused of flattery and servility toward the Emperor. We are asked how it was possible for a pope to congratulate on his elevation a sovereign who reached the throne by assassination. Precisely because such an act would be despicable, we must not lightly attribute it to St. Gregory. The most likely hypothesis is that the Pope did not know the truth about the elevation of Phocas or that the news reached him only by way of vague rumors, which did not enable him to see the deception in the Emperor's official letter. News took a long time to come from Constantinople to Rome. In the middle of the ninth century, the author of the note on Pope St. Nicholas, inserted in the *Liber pontificalis,* had not yet learned of the assassination of Emperor Michael the Drunkard

Heresies

On the question of papal supremacy, Gregory I's policy paved the way for that of Gregory VII, and it laid down the principles in which Innocent III would find his inspiration in the repression of heresies. No one has more clearly affirmed the right possessed by the Church to judge heretics, and the duty of the state to repress them as disturbers of the social order.[167] From St. Gregory we have the following words, which might easily be misapplied by a faulty conception of religion and which the Middle Ages inserted in the *Decretum Gratiani:* "that the torture of the body should serve at least to obtain the good health of the soul." [168] He wishes punishment to be meted out to those who, in the patrimony of St. Peter, have fallen into Manichaeism, so as to restore them to the Church.[169] He urges the African bishops to prosecute the Donatists, and encourages the exarch of Africa to repress them vigorously. According to an expression often found in his writings, heretics are "spiritual lepers" who contaminate the flock of the faithful.[170] Yet, from several passages in his writings and from his general way of acting, it seems that he meant these principles to be applied only to heretics in bad faith.[171] Gregory recognized that "purity of heart may exist in those who maintain perverse doctrines"; in such cases, he says, we should act toward them with much gentleness.[172] Even

and the fall of Photius, which took place thirteen days before the death of St. Nicholas. The official news of these events, which occurred in September, 867, did not reach Rome, according to Duchesne's calculations, until the spring of 868. *Lib. pont.*, II, 172 note 80.

[167] *Quod in religionem divinam committitur, in omnium fertur injuriam.* Justinian Code, I, 5, *de haereticis; MGH, Reg.*, VIII, 4.

[168] *Ep.*, IX, 65; *MGH*, IX, 204; *Decr. Grat.*, XXVI, q. 5, c. 10.

[169] *Ep.*, V, 8; *MGH, Reg.*, V, 9; *Ep.*, VIII, 18; *MGH, Reg.*, VIII, 19; *Ep.*, III, 62; *MGH, Reg.*, III, 59.

[170] *Ep.*, I, 74.

[171] *Morals*, V, 11; XVI, 50; XVIII, 26; XXXV, 18.

[172] *Sunt qui cordis quidem puritatem habent, sed tamen doctrinae eorum dogmata perversa suscipiunt. MGH, Reg.*, XI, 28.

in the case of the most ill-willed he thinks that severity is not always the most suitable policy and that "often it is better to tolerate the evil patiently." [173]

He mistrusted men of extreme rigor, fiery or fanatical. In St. Gregory's time there were in Rome many such impetuous champions of the good cause, who by untimely zeal against heresy sought to acquire a reputation for orthodoxy whereas they were no better than the heretics they were denouncing. The wise Pontiff placed no reliance upon those false brethren, for, as he said, they had not the spirit of Christ.[174] Gregory applied these principles to the Donatists, the Manichaeans, the infidels, and especially to the Jews, who at that time were to be found in large numbers in the cities of Italy and even in Rome. There they frequently practiced usury, and the angered population at times engaged in violent retaliation against their synagogues, their private houses, or their person. Again and again the Pope intervened to have their synagogues respected.[175] He sharply rebuked the Bishop of Terracina, who had disturbed the Jews' freedom of worship and violated their property.[176] He protested against the zeal of a neophyte who annoyed the Jews at their prayers.[177] He was indignant upon learning that some people wanted to force certain Jews to be baptized.[178] All he ventured to do was to order compensation paid for the material damage that might have resulted for converted Jews from the hostility of their former coreligionists. He granted them a partial release from their taxes.[179] Fur-

[173] *Quaedam conpescendo, quaedam tolerando mitigare . . . quaedam mansuete corrigere, quaedam vero quae corrigi nequeunt aequanimiter tolerare. Ep.*, XI, 46.

[174] *Quia vero sunt multi fidelium, qui imperito zelo succenduntur et saepe, dum quosdam quasi haereticos insequuntur, haereses faciunt. Ep.*, XI, 45.

[175] *Ep.*, IX, 6; I, 10; IX, 55.

[176] *Ep.*, I, 35.

[177] *Ep.*, IX, 6.

[178] *PL*, LXXVII, 710.

[179] *Ep.*, V, 8. This letter contains an expression which, in St. Gregory's mind, in all likelihood did not have the significance given it by Cardinal Ximenes in Spain and Madame de Maintenon in France, who thus considered they had good authority

thermore, he saw to it that the Roman law was observed, which forbade Jews to own Christian slaves.[180]

The Church of the Middle Ages followed these wise traditions. Facing the unpopularity of formulas, she never hesitated to proclaim clearly that the truth alone has rights and that the Catholic Church alone possesses the truth in fulness. But, out of regard for the rights of conscience, the Church as a whole showed, even in favor of her worst enemies, a respect for the human person, which was rarely practiced toward her by those who separated from her while making a banner of the words "tolerance" and "liberty."

Death of St. Gregory

But the great Pontiff's health kept declining. Since 598 he was obliged to remain confined to bed almost continually.[181] In January, 604, mastering a painful exhaustion, he dictated a last letter to Theodelinda queen of the Lombards, to felicitate her upon the peace which King Agilulf had just accorded to Italy and upon the baptism of a young Lombard prince.

Two months later, thinking perhaps that the Empire and the world were going to disappear soon after him, but aware that he had performed his duty to the very end, he rendered his soul to God on March 12, 604. As Bossuet says: "This great Pope had instructed the emperors, consoled Africa, strengthened in Spain the Visigoth converts from Arianism, converted England, reformed Church discipline in France, appeased the Lombards, saved Rome and Italy, repressed the pompous vanity of the patriarchs, enlightened the whole

for advising methods of conversion that were far from the spirit of the Gospel. "If it happens that Jews come to us with a doubtful faith, at least their children will be baptized in the true faith." *Etsi ipsi minus fideliter veniunt, hi tamen qui de eis nati fuerint jam fidelius baptizantur.*

[180] Code, Bk. I, title 10.

[181] Letter to the patrician Venantius.

Church by his doctrine, governed both the East and the West with no less vigor than humility." [182] Further, all these things he had accomplished with apostolic zeal in the name of a social justice of which he considered himself the responsible defender; he had brought words of justice, right, and liberty to the ears of the emperors, exarchs, Lombard kings, bishops, abbots, and peoples, as no one had done before him. "My ministry," he wrote, "obliges me to hasten wherever justice requires." [183] To the exarch Gennadius he said: "What I wish is to make justice and freedom flourish together, *ut possit florere cum libertate justitia.*" [184] He ordered the councils in Sicily to meet annually "to come to the relief of the oppressed." [185] "The kings of the nations," he said, "are masters of slaves, but he who rules the Romans should be a master of free men. Whatever you do, first of all safeguard the rights of justice, then respect the rights of freedom. Give to those who are subject to you the liberty that your superiors give to you." [186] Therein was "the great voice of the popes of the Middle Ages becoming, when the soul of the nations was still sleeping, the living conscience of the world of the spirit, perceiving and following with eagle-eye the acts of emperors and kings, of nobles and bishops." [187] The breath that animated the words we have been quoting is already the breath of chivalry and of the Crusades.[188]

[182] Bossuet, *L'Histoire univ.,* Part I, eleventh period.

[183] *Ep.,* I, 37; *MGH, Reg.,* I, 35.

[184] *Ep.,* I, 61; *MGH, Reg.,* I, 59.

[185] *Ep.,* VII, 363.

[186] *Ep.,* X, 51.

[187] Edgar Quinet, *Œuvres complètes,* Vol. III, *Le christianisme et la Révolution française,* p. 102.

[188] Cf. *Ep.,* IX, 48; *MGH, Reg.,* IX, 34; *Ep.,* IX, 55; *MGH, Reg.,* IX, 55; *Reg.,* IX, 4, 5, 16; Jaffé, 1558, 1577, 1540, 1709, 1528, 1529, 1578. On St. Gregory, see Francesco Tarducci, *Storia di san Gregorio e del suo tempo.*

CHAPTER III

From the Death of St. Gregory to the Coming of St. Zachary (604–741)

For a century and a half the supreme pontiffs seemed to have no other task than to continue the work of St. Gregory the Great. The first popes after him, Sabinianus (604–606), Boniface III (607), Boniface IV (608–615), Deusdedit (615–618), and Boniface V (619–625), in the comparative tranquillity left them by outward events, were especially engaged in developing the disciplinary and liturgical work of the great Pontiff. The task of those coming afterward would be to carry on his dogmatic work and his social policy. The Monothelite dispute, starting with Pope Honorius (627–638), ended with an impressive declaration of the spiritual authority of the papacy; and the strifes stirred up by the emperors, from Leo II (682–683) to Zachary (741–752), in connection with the Quinisext Synod and Iconoclast heresy, would be the Holy See's occasion to manifest the supremacy of its temporal power.

Pope Sabinianus (604–606)

Sabinianus, whose pontificate lasted about two years, and Boniface, who occupied the Holy See less than nine months, were, like Gregory, trained in the papal diplomatic service.[1] The former had been nuncio at Constantinople to Emperor

[1] Sabinianus, born in Tuscany, had been nuncio to Constantinople, at the court of Emperor Maurice. Boniface, a native of Rome, had represented the Holy See at the court of Emperor Phocas.

Maurice, the latter to Phocas. The *Liber pontificalis* says of Sabinianus that "he opened the granaries of the Church and sold wheat to the people, giving three bushels for one solidus." [2] But the people, who could not forget the generosity of the late Pope, were perhaps not well satisfied with this distribution of food which they must pay for. In fact, a popular legend, recorded by John the Deacon, relates that Pope Gregory, appearing one day to his successor, found fault with him for not being charitable enough and, when unable to make him change, struck him on the head and thus caused his death.[3]

Pope Boniface III (607)

Boniface III [4] reaped the fruit of St. Gregory's peaceful diplomacy with Phocas, and of his firm attitude toward the patriarch of Constantinople: the *Liber pontificalis* tells us that he obtained from the Emperor the acknowledgment "that the see of Blessed Peter should henceforth be regarded as the head of all the Churches, in opposition to that of Constantinople, which made claim to the same title." [5] But, whether because the Pope lacked the energy to keep the acquired result or because circumstances thwarted his efforts, the satisfaction given to the claims of the Roman See was only momentary.

Pope St. Boniface IV (608–615)

Boniface IV,[6] who occupied the papal see for six years, had to defend and develop St. Gregory's liturgical work. The note in the *Liber pontificalis* says that "he obtained from Phocas the temple called the Pantheon and turned it into the Church of St. Mary and All the Martyrs." [7] This is the first known in-

[2] *Lib. pont.*, I, 315.

[3] Paul the Deacon, *S. Gregorii magni vita*, chap. 29; *PL*, LXXV, 58.

[4] Boniface III was a Roman.

[5] *Lib. pont.*, I, 316.

[6] Boniface IV was born in what is now the diocese of Pescina. His father was a doctor named John. *Lib. pont.*, I, 317.

[7] *Lib. pont.*, I, 317.

stance of a Roman temple changed into a church.[8] But it is not quite exact to say—as was long believed, because of certain misinterpreted texts of Bede, of Rabanus Maurus, and of the Martyrology of Ado—that on that occasion Boniface IV instituted the feast of November 1 in honor of all the saints.[9] Under Boniface IV a liturgical dispute arose in Gaul over the Irish custom of celebrating Easter, a custom brought into Gaul by St. Columban. When the latter was accused of falling into the Quartodeciman schism,[10] he sent to the bishops of Gaul and, in 606, to the Pope himself a written defense of his practice. He asked for the continuance of a custom, the grounds for which had been set forth to Pope Gregory. The reasoning must have been satisfactory. We have not Boniface's reply, but evidently it was favorable to St. Columban, because the holy abbot kept his liturgical practice without ceasing to remain in communion with the Roman See.[11]

And so the authority of St. Gregory, continuing after his death, appealed to by the people and by great saints, was able to sustain the weakness of his successors, who were less clear-sighted or less energetic.

Sergius Patriarch of Constantinople

But even that authority did not always suffice. In the pontificate of Boniface IV, in 610, there was elected patriarch of Constantinople a young deacon of that city, Sergius by name,

[8] *Idem.*, note 3.

[9] On this question, see Dom Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen Age*, pp. 638 ff. Dom Quentin says: "The origin of All Saints remains obscure. . . . The feast was in existence at the beginning of the ninth century. Does the document of 775 refer to a custom existing in Italy or simply to a private devotion? It does not seem that this little problem can be settled at the present time."

[10] The Irish celebrated Easter according to the computation of Sulpicius Severus, whereas the Gauls followed the computation of Dionysius the Little; the Irish custom might bring Easter on the fourteenth day after the new moon. Hence the charge brought against it, that it shared in the error of the Quartodecimans.

[11] Mabillon, *Analecta Bened.*, I, 253, 261; Hefele, art. "Colomban" in Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon.*

who stirred up long and painful strifes in the Church. It is related that, on the day of his consecration, he cast himself at the feet of the great miracle-worker of the East, Theodore the Syceote. The saint embraced him and said: "My son, God has laid this burden upon you who are so young, that you may have the greater strength to endure the misfortunes threatening you." [12] But the young Byzantine Patriarch did not correspond with God's designs upon him. Dazzled by his precocious elevation and relying too much on human means, which his fertile mind suggested to him, Sergius was more statesman than churchman. By resorting to diplomacy and intrigue for the pacification of the Empire, he would profoundly afflict the Christian world.

Seven months after Sergius' consecration, there ascended the throne of Byzantium the young son of an exarch of Africa, Heraclius. This was in October, 610. Having reached the sovereign power, like Phocas, by the murder of his predecessor, the new *basileus* for thirty years gave the world the spectacle of a soul often capable of heroism, but ever shifting and feverish, with a temperament active but not steady, passing from indolence to restlessness, from restlessness to apathy. Such a man was a valuable and powerful tool in the hands of the energetic Sergius.

Pope Honorius (625–638)

A few years later, after the pontificates of Deusdedit (615–618) and Boniface V (619–625),[13] which were marked by important liturgical and disciplinary reforms,[14] the govern-

[12] The life of Theodore the Syceote was written shortly after his death by George Eleusios.

[13] Deusdedit was a Roman, says the *Liber pontificalis* (I, 319), the son of the subdeacon Stephen. Boniface V was a native of Naples (*Lib. pont.*, I. 321).

[14] The first successors of St. Gregory tended to increase the privileges of the monks to the detriment of the clergy. Deusdedit reacted against this tendency and, says the *Liber pontificalis*, "brought back the priests to their former positions." *Lib. pont.*,

ment of the Church of Rome and of Christianity passed into the hands of Honorius. He was born in Campania, the son of the Consul Petronius, and occupied the Apostolic See for twelve years (625–638). The *Liber pontificalis* praises his benevolence and his zeal for the education of the clergy.[15] Jonas of Bobbio,[16] who saw him at Rome, praises the sagacity of his mind and the extent of his learning, and says that he himself was powerfully attracted to him because of his humility and gentleness. Those qualities, however, did not keep him from falling into the snares prepared by Sergius and from giving the Church the scandal of a momentary defection.

Monothelitism

Sergius, Heraclius, and Honorius were the first personages involved in that great dispute of Monothelitism which would last half a century, a dispute in which we see one pope yielding, not in the faith, but in the government of the Church, then a pope dying for his faith, and finally a pope bringing victory to the faith and to his sovereign authority in a general council.

The defection of Honorius, the martyrdom of St. Martin I, and the holding of the Sixth Ecumenical Council by St. Agatho are the three outstanding episodes of that dispute.

The theological controversy, from which it all started, was not a matter of mere Byzantine subtlety. At the end of the sixth century, the Christological question, which had so stirred the Church, was almost settled and defined in its main lines. After the Council of Nicaea (325) that so clearly affirmed the absolute divinity of Christ, and the Council of Constantinople

I, 319. Boniface promulgated important rules about the formalities of wills received by ecclesiastical notaries, about the right of sanctuary, and about the prerogatives of acolytes. *Lib. pont.*, I, 321 note 1.

[15] *Lib. pont.*, I, 323.

[16] On Jonas of Bobbio, see *Hist. litt. de la France*, III, 603 f. His testimony is found in his *Vita S. Bertulfi; PL*, LXXXVII, 1063.

(381) that so energetically defended His perfect and integral humanity, the Council of Ephesus (431) defined the unity of His person, and the Council of Chalcedon (451) the duality of His nature. But a secondary problem remained. In the concrete reality of Christ, God and man in one single Person and in two natures, were there one or two wills, one or two activities? The question might and should have been discussed exclusively in the schools of theology, where, moreover, it would easily have been settled in the sense of the duality of the activities; political interests turned it into an external and clamorous strife.

Upon ascending the throne, Heraclius found the Empire in a lamentable situation. Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia were open to the Persians by the taking of Daras. The capture of Edessa in 609 put the Christian East in extreme danger. The new Emperor was dismayed, but remained inactive. Apparently nothing could draw him out of his apathy, neither the capture of Caesarea in 611 and of Damascus in 613, nor the pillage of Jerusalem in 614, nor the burning of the Anastasis Basilica and the carrying off of the true cross—momentarily saved by the devotedness of a Christian, then snatched from his hands and carried off with the booty of the Persian king.[17]

Heraclius, in despair, thought of withdrawing to Carthage with his treasures, which he had already loaded on his ships.

Sergius Patriarch of Constantinople

The energetic intervention of Patriarch Sergius changed the face of things. Making himself the spokesman of a popular movement, which in fact he himself had provoked, he brought Heraclius into a church and made him swear to live and die in the midst of his people.

From that moment on, Heraclius was transformed. He

[17] Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse,* pp. 232 f.

raised three armies. By means of two of them he withstood the Avars and the Bulgarians, whom Chosroes II had won to his side. At the head of the third army, he marched toward Persia. He had the Croats and Serbs accompany him. Persia was invaded, Chosroes was overcome in a battle near Ninive, then declared deposed by the notables of his kingdom, imprisoned in his palace, and assassinated by his son Siroes, who was proclaimed king. The new monarch promptly concluded peace, giving back all the conquests of the Persians and restoring to Heraclius the wood of the true cross.

When, in September, 628, the victorious armies made their entry into Constantinople, with the singing of psalms, carrying the miraculous images to which they attributed the victory, Emperor Heraclius was acclaimed as savior of the Empire and of Christianity; but, except in the official acclamations, everybody spoke the name of the Patriarch Sergius, the real author of that triumph.

Sergius, being a wise statesman, did not let himself be dazzled. Of what use would so brilliant a triumph be if the results of the victory could not be assured? In reality the peoples of the Empire were divided. The scattered fragments of Monophysitism formed so many religious groups, ready to be changed into political groups. Acephali of Cyprus, Paulianists of Egypt, Severians of Alexandria, who were still called Phtartolatrae, because they adored in Christ a real flesh, and Julianists of Syria, called also Aphthartodocetae because they did not believe in the reality of the body of the risen Christ: who could say whether all these factions might not some day unite in a formidable coalition against the Empire? Already the Monophysites of Egypt affected the use exclusively of the national Coptic language and called themselves Coptic Christians; and the Monophysites of Armenia, or Jacobites, as a clear indication of their political opposition, gave to the Catholics, as did the Egyptian Monophysites, the name of Mel-

chites, that is, partisans of the emperor. The danger was particularly threatening in the provinces recently conquered from Persia.

For several years past Sergius had perceived the danger and, being an unscrupulous statesman, had considered removing the peril by a dastardly maneuver. Recent scholarship no longer has much doubt but that the clever Patriarch fabricated out of whole cloth, in the very first years of his pontificate, a pretended letter from his predecessor Patriarch Menas, which would serve as a basis for his whole campaign.[18] Then, when he had prepared the way by underhand schemes, he persuaded the Emperor to enter upon negotiations with the dissident religious groups. He thought he had found a basis of understanding. To the Monophysites it would be granted that in Christ there was only one activity, μία ἐνέργεια.

In 626 began a politico-religious campaign, with Sergius as its heart and soul, as he was the soul of the military campaign against the Persians. Heraclius negotiated with Cyrus, the Monophysite bishop of Phasis, with Athanasius the patriarch of the Jacobites of Antioch. It was Sergius who dictated the conditions of this last agreement; it was he who directed the conferences between Cyrus and the Church of Armenia;[19] and he showed himself so broad that, in the presence of his concessions, the most fiery of Severus' partisans cried out: "It is not we who are going to the Council of Chalcedon; it is the Council of Chalcedon that is coming to us."[20]

The appearance at Constantinople of a Palestinian monk, renowned for learning and virtue, suddenly disturbed Sergius' plans. The monk Sophronius, from the monastery of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem, had already in 633, at the time of the negotiations with the Monophysite Church of Armenia, pro-

[18] Hefele, *Hist. des Conc.*, III, 11; Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, I, 669; Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine*, p. 158.

[19] Pargoire, *loc. cit.*

[20] Mansi, XI, 561–568.

tested in the name of the orthodox faith. When the agreement had been concluded despite his efforts, he came to Constantinople to implore the Patriarch to be watchful over the maintenance of the integrity of the faith.

Sophronius had a mystical, poetic soul. He was well known through his ἀνακρεόντεια, poems in anacreontic form and of purely religious inspiration, through his sermons, through his collaboration in John Moschus' legends of the saints, but especially through his eminent holiness.[21] Of a sudden he appears as a profound theologian and mighty controversialist.

In the presence of this dread foe, Sergius hesitated. He considered it prudent, at least temporarily, to alter his tactics. No longer was there mention of one energy or of two energies. Against an opposition that he felt was formidable on the part of men like Sophronius, he needed merely to win to his cause the supreme authority, that of the pope. To the Supreme Pontiff the Patriarch Sergius wrote a very clever letter, filled with lying insinuations and decisive affirmations: that expression "two energies" or "two wills" was a great scandal to the faithful, he said, by suggesting to them the idea of an internal conflict in Christ; the formula adopted by the Monothelites, on the contrary, had pacified the whole Empire. Moreover, it was in perfect conformity with tradition: not a single Church father, he said, had taught the doctrine of two wills; that of one single will was current, as the letter of Menas would prove.[22] Honorius let himself be circumvented. This "humble, gentle" man, as his contemporary Jonas calls him, undoubtedly erred by excessive condescension; but quite likely, as Hefele thinks,[23] his fault was owing mostly to ignorance. He failed to perceive the theological import of the question; he did not take into account the political scheming of Sergius. He replied:

[21] See the works of St. Sophronius in *PG,* Vol. LXXXVII.

[22] This letter is to be found complete in Mansi, XI, 530 f. Hefele gives excerpts from it in his *History of the Councils,* V, 27–29.

[23] Hefele, *loc. cit.*

We have learned that the monk Sophronius has started new disputes over words. . . . We acknowledge that the divine Master Jesus Christ is the author of divine operations and of human operations . . . but, because of the ineffable union of the divine nature with the human nature, . . . we confess one single will. . . . Furthermore, whether it is proper to suppose one or else two energies, is an idle question that we leave to the grammarians who, to attract youth to their schools, sell them formulas of their own invention.[24]

This letter of the Pope has not all the exactness we might desire. May it not be that the oneness of will, which Honorius speaks of, was in his intent a simple moral oneness?[25] However this may be, Rome's answer was interpreted as giving approval to Sergius and his party, which began to be called the Monothelite (*μόνον θέλημα*, one will) party.

St. Sophronius

Just when the Pope's answer reached Constantinople, there was also received there a long letter from Sophronius. The lat-

[24] *Novas vocum quaestiones cognovimus introductas per Sophronium quemdam, tunc monachum . . . confidentes dominum Jesum Christum operatum divina, media humanitate Verbo Deo naturaliter unita . . . eumdemque operatum humana. . . . Sed propter ineffabilem conjunctionem humanae divinaeque naturae . . . unam voluntatem fatemur domini nostri Jesu Christi . . . utrum autem propter opera divinitatis et humanitatis, una an geminae operationes* (*ἐνέργεται*, in the Greek text of the council) *debeant derivatae dici vel intelligi, ad nos ista pertinere non debent, relinquentes ea grammaticis qui solent parvulis exquisita derivando nomina ventitare.* Mansi, XI, 537–542.

[25] This interpretation seems to follow from the passage in which Honorius gives, as a reason for the unity of will, that the Word took a human nature not stained by sin, of which the will consequently adhered to the divine will to the point of forming only one with it (Mansi, IX, 630). This is quite true, but the question then was about moral unity. However, certain other passages seem to indicate that he intended speaking of a physical unity, as the theologians say, that is, a real unity. Honorius reasons thus: Where there is a single person, there is a single actor, a single will; for unity of person and unity of will, he says, are essentially correlatives. Honorius forgets that in the Trinity there are three persons and yet not three wills. Theology already supposed this principle, that the will is specifically connected with the nature and that the person is merely its center of attribution. At bottom, as Honorius avows, he wished to avoid raising quarrels; he was afraid of appearing Eutychian by affirming one will, Nestorian in affirming two wills. But neither equivocation nor silence settles a real difficulty, once it is proposed.

ter meantime had been elected patriarch of Jerusalem; this document was his first synodal letter. With admirable logic, force, and clearness, and taking his stand on theological reasoning and on tradition, the new Patriarch set forth the doctrine of the two wills. His chief argument was the need of safeguarding in Christ the integrity of His humanity. "If that humanity of Christ," he said, "was raised in one sense above men, it is not in this sense that it was mutilated or lessened, but in this sense that God freely became man and that, being man, He willed whatever there was human, not by necessity or constraint, but by His own good pleasure." [26] To take the will from this humanity of Christ, or to absorb it in the will of God, was therefore, in the mind of Sophronius, to commit an error like that of the two Apollinarises, who cut off from that humanity the superior part, the spirit, the νοῦς.

Pope Honorius wrote a second letter. This was less emphatic in the sense of Monothelitism, at least so far as we can judge from the fragments we have of it. The Pope makes a distinction between the works of the divinity and those of the humanity. He says: "The divine nature operates in Christ what is divine; the human nature, what is of the flesh." But he continues the prohibition against using the words "one energy" or "two energies," "one will" or "two wills." [27]

The Pope was obeyed. Sophronius died shortly afterward, with an aureole of holiness which the Church soon confirmed. The mass of the faithful, the crowd of those whom passion did

[26] *PG*, LXXXVII, 3147 f.

[27] With Hefele, we must admit that Pope Honorius, in a document that did not have the import of a dogmatic definition, did not express any heterodoxical doctrine and that "it would be unjust to charge him with heresy." But "a too persistent concern to preserve peace, added to a defect of clearness, made him reject the truly orthodox expression and thereby led him to favor heresy" (Hefele, *Histoire des conciles*, III, 42). He then exposed himself to be later called heretical; the word "heretic" was not then reserved to persons who taught heresy, but was applied to all who, directly or indirectly, in a manner more or less occasional, might have contributed to the birth or the spread of a heresy or a schism.

not blind and whom government pressure did not dominate, instinctively turned to the doctrine that best safeguarded the integrity of the human faculties of the God-man. There circulated from hand to hand a collecton of 600 texts of the Church fathers, which the holy Patriarch of Jerusalem had collected before his death and which unanimously testified against Monothelitism.[28]

Then it was the obstinate Patriarch of Constantinople decided to employ a supreme means of action, which he was keeping in reserve for a long time. In 638 he had published by the Emperor, who gave it the force of an imperial edict, a dogmatic thesis of which he himself was the author. It was the Ecthesis (ἔκθεσις, profession of faith).

This edict forbade the preaching of one energy or two energies in Christ, but it proclaimed one single will and prescribed that only one will must be admitted. A synod, which met at once at Constantinople, acclaimed the Ecthesis: all the Eastern patriarchs subscribed to it, and Sergius, meanwhile stricken by death in 639 shortly after Pope Honorius, could say as he was dying that Monothelitism had conquered.

But this stroke of daring and of authority had a result precisely contrary to what its authors expected. Rome opened its eyes. From that hour there was, on the part of the supreme pontiffs, a resistance that never deviated and that went even to martyrdom. Popes Severinus, John IV, Theodore I, and Martin I were the heroes of this struggle.

The imperial edict prescribed that no papal election would be confirmed until the pope-elect subscribed to the Ecthesis. Severinus [29] refused to sign it, and one of his first acts was to

[28] Mansi, X, 895 f. This collection of St. Sophronius is now lost. But we can see another collection of passages of the fathers in favor of the *dyothelism* in the works of St. Maximus. *PG,* XCI, 267 ff.

[29] The *Liber pontificalis* tells us nothing of his origin except that he was a Roman (p. 328).

anathematize Monothelitism. John IV,[30] as soon as he was enthroned, repeated his predecessor's anathema. Heraclius was terrified and, shortly before his death (February 16, 641), declared that he had nothing to do with the writing of the Ecthesis, which was exclusively the work of Sergius. Theodore I,[31] finding himself in the presence of the two emperors, Constantine III and Heracleonas, who seemed peacefully disposed, tried to bring them to the Catholic faith, but, a few months later, when Constantine had been poisoned and Heracleonas expelled, the dreadful Emperor Constans II ascended the throne.

Clergy and faithful, more and more enlightened by the events, courageously gathered about the Roman See. Not merely from the West, but from the East as well, now more and more undeceived, there came expressions of adherence to the faith of the See of Peter. From Cyprus and from Palestine in 643 came indignant protests against the trickery of the Byzantine heresy.[32] The successor of Sergius, Patriarch Pyrrhus, having resigned his see and being disillusioned, for a time returned to the Catholic faith.[33] From Constantinople there came to Rome one who would take up the good fight of St. Sophronius, with equal ardor and deeper learning, Maximus the Confessor.

St. Maximus the Confessor

Born about 580, of a noble Byzantine family, former chief secretary of Emperor Heraclius, Maximus, whom posterity would honor with the name of Maximus the Confessor and

[30] He was a Dalmatian, and his father Venantius was *Scholasticus,* that is, a lawyer (*Lib. pont.,* I, 330). Du Cange, *Glossarium,* see the word "Scholasticus."

[31] Theodore was a Greek by birth. His father, a native of Jerusalem, had been a bishop. *Lib. pont.,* I, 331.

[32] See the letters of Sergius of Cyprus and Stephen of Dora in Mansi, X, 900, 913–916.

[33] *Lib. pont.,* I, 332.

whom the Church would place on her altars, had renounced earthly honors in 630 and made his religious profession in the monastery of Chrysopolis on the shore of the Bosporus. He had been seen in 633 at Alexandria, at the time of the negotiations between Sergius and the Monophysites, taking up the defense of the true faith at the side of St. Sophronius. He it was who, in a memorable conference held in Africa, the acts of which are preserved,[34] had shaken the convictions of Pyrrhus, former patriarch of Constantinople, and brought him to confess the doctrine of the two wills.

Under these circumstances, Constans II, even though attached to the Monothelite heresy, did not think he could maintain the Ecthesis. He replaced it, in 648, by another decree, called the Type (τύπος, rule). It was henceforth forbidden to dispute, not only about the two energies, but about the two wills, and that under the severest penalties. But Maximus was not caught in this new trap.

Pope St. Martin I (649–655)

There had just been elected to the Roman See, in 649, a pontiff of stalwart soul, Martin I.[35] As a priest he had been conspicuous for learning and virtue. As apocrisiary at Constantinople he had been in a position to appraise the tortuous policy of the patriarchs and the emperors. Encouraged, assisted, and inspired by Maximus, he convened, in October, 649, the famous Lateran Council at which five hundred bishops, under his presidency, anathematized the Ecthesis, the Type, and Monothelitism entirely, with its leaders, followers, and accomplices, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and Honorius.[36]

[34] These acts are very detailed. They may be found in Mansi, X, 709–760, and *PL*, XCI, 287–354. Hefele gives a complete summary of them in *Histoire des conciles*, III, 62–79.

[35] He was born at Tudertum (Todi) in Tuscany, and had been legate at Constantinople. *Lib. pont.*, I, 336.

[36] Mansi, IX, 1157 f.; Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, no. 272.

The Emperor's displeasure was now unbounded. It turned upon the Bishop of Rome, Martin I, upon his intrepid counselor Maximus, upon the principal spirits of the resistance. Before the meeting of the Lateran Council, the exarch Olympius, ordered to force the Type on the Pope, or to seize him, had failed wretchedly. The exarch Calliopas was more successful. He invaded the Lateran Church and palace, seized the sick Pope, embarked secretly on the Tiber the night of October 18, 653, and then for almost a year led him from prison to prison, from the coasts of Calabria to Naxos, from Naxos to Constantinople. Condemned, September, 654, on the testimony of suborned witnesses, as a usurper of the Holy See, traitor to the Emperor, accomplice of the Saracens, and blasphemer of the Blessed Virgin, Pope Martin was deported to the Chersonesus and there, overwhelmed by ill treatment, exposed to all the horrors of cold and hunger, he left this world December 15, 654. The Church honors him as a martyr.[37] Maximus the Confessor likewise suffered martyrdom for his faith. Arrested with two of his disciples (the monk Anastasius and the apocrisiary Anatasius), he was sent to Bizya on the Black Sea, then to the fortress of Perberis at the extremity of the Empire, then brought back to Constantinople. His tongue was torn out, his right hand cut off, he was beat with whips while being led through the city; lastly he was cast into a prison located at the foot of the Caucasus, and there he died on August 13 of the same year. His two disciples underwent the same tortures.

The blood that was shed for the true faith bore fruit. The tombs of the martyrs became places of pilgrimage. In the Chersonesus people went in crowds to pray near the remains of Pope St. Martin. A feeling of sympathy for the victims swept through the Christian world.[38] Constans II halted on

[37] *Lib. pont.*, I, 338; Mansi, X, 851–854; Leclerc, *Les martyrs*, IV, 234–245.

[38] At the end of the eighth century (in 787), a letter from Gregory II to Leo the Isaurian states that pilgrimages to the tomb of St. Martin continue to be frequent and obtain miraculous cures. *Beatum esse Martinum testatur civitas Chersonis, in quam*

the path of persecution. The most determined and fiery characters become powerless when faced by a profound movement of public sentiment. Popular opinion declared itself on the side of the martyrs, which was also that of doctrinal good sense and logic. Pope Eugenius,[39] elected during the exile of St. Martin I, was able with impunity to declare himself in favor of the doctrine of the two wills.[40] In the pontificate of his successor Vitalian,[41] the Emperor decided to come to Rome to negotiate the peace there. His intentions were not so disinterested as they appeared. Constans, critically endangered by the Arabs and unpopular at Constantinople, sought to establish the center of his government in Italy and dreaded opposition on the part of the pope. The latter did not refuse him the honors due to the imperial majesty. But, shortly afterward, while at Syracuse, Constans II received the punishment of his crimes and his bad faith: he was assassinated in his bath by one of his servants (October, 668). His successor, Constantine IV (668–685) maintained good relations with Popes Adeodatus (672–676) and Donus (676–678).

Constantine IV, surnamed Pogonatus or the Bearded, was one of the greatest emperors of Byzantium. Attacked on all sides, obliged to fight against one of his own armies, which set up a rival, besieged for several years in Constantinople by the Arabs, harassed by bands of Bulgarians on his frontiers, he withstood all these dangers. The execution of the usurper Miziz, the defeat of the Arab fleet by the use of Greek fire, which is said to have been invented by the Syrian Callinicus,[42] the ceding to Bulgarian hordes of the region thereafter called

relegatus est, et Bosphori totusque septentrio et incolae septentrionis, qui ad monumentum ejus accurrunt et curationes accipiunt. Mansi, XII, 972.

[39] He was born in Rome, on the Aventine Hill, and had been a cleric since boyhood, *clericus a cunabulis. Lib. pont.*, I, 343.

[40] *Lib. pont.*, I, 341.

[41] He was a native of Campania. *Lib. pont.*, I, 343.

[42] According to Hesseling (*La civilisation byzantine*, p. 151), Callinicos did nothing more than perfect a means of defense known for centuries past.

Bulgaria, gave outward peace to the Empire. The Emperor thought of establishing religious peace, in concert with Pope Donus, and later with Pope Agatho.[43]

Pope St. Agatho (678–681)

Agatho, a Sicilian by birth, occupied the Apostolic See two years and six months. According to his contemporaries, "he charmed everyone by his gentleness and smiling good-nature." [44] The acts of his pontificate show that he was also a man of wisdom, and his virtues would place him in the ranks of the saints. The Pope and the Emperor soon agreed. Agatho convened several preparatory provincial councils. Then, in the middle of the year 680, at the close of a Roman synod, he sent to the Emperor legates who were bearers of a letter in which the Pontiff, after affirming the doctrine of the two wills in Christ, said: "Consider therefore, most clement prince, that the Lord and Savior of all, from whom the faith comes, having promised that Peter's faith should not fail, told him to confirm his brethren. And so, as everyone knows, the Apostolic Pontiffs, predecessors of my infirmity, have never failed in this duty." [45] This last phrase, written forty years after the death of Pope Honorius, on the eve of the council that would anathematize him, is remarkable; it declares that none of the Roman Pontiffs, therefore not even Honorius, failed in his duty as pope.

Council of Constantinople (680)

September 7, 680, in the great cupola hall of the sacred palace, under the honorary presidency of Emperor Constantine IV

[43] The letter written to Pope Donus reached Pope Agatho, who had been elected in the meantime.

[44] *Tantum benignus et mansuetus fuit ut etiam omnibus hilaris et iocundus comprobaretur. Lib. pont.,* I, 350.

[45] *Quod apostolicos pontifices meae exiguitatis praedecessores confidenter fecisse semper, cunctis est cognitum.* Hardouin, *Acta conciliorum,* III, 1079–1083.

and the active presidency of the papal legates, who directed the discussions, met the council which was the Third Council of Constantinople and the Sixth Ecumenical Council. Its acts are preserved in the original Greek text and in two ancient Latin translations. The discussions concerned solely the question of Monothelitism. It was soon clear that the sophism on which the Monothelite error attempted to base its doctrine was a confusion between *subordination* of the human will to the divine will, and *absorption* of the human will in the divine will. Macarius of Antioch, the spirited champion of the oneness of will, declared: "How can you admit the possibility of a conflict of two wills in Christ? That would be to divide Christ in two. As for me, I prefer to be cut into pieces and cast into the sea rather than admit such a doctrine." [46] Sophronius had already given definite answers to these questions. They were now repeated, but without success. The council deposed the obdurate Patriarch.

Then, when the discussions were concluded, in the seventeenth session, the one before the last, the fathers of the council voted a dogmatic decree, as follows: "We declare that there are two natural θελήματα [47] and two natural energies in Christ. The two natural wills are not opposed to each other—God forbid—as the impious heretics said, but His human will followed, and it does not resist and oppose, but rather is subject to, the divine and almighty will." In the eighteenth and last session were voted the following anathemas: "Therefore we punish with excommunication and anathema Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, also Cyrus, and with them Honorius, formerly Pope of Rome, as he followed them (καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς Ὀνώριον τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἡγούμενον ὡς ἐκείνοις ἐν τούτοις ἀκολουθήσαντα)." [48] "We anathematize the inventors of the new

[46] Mansi, XI, 350–358.

[47] Θέλημα means rather the volition, or act of the will, than the will, or power of willing.

[48] Mansi, XI, 665.

error . . . and also Honorius, who did not attempt to sanctify this Apostolic Church with the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery, permitted its purity to be polluted." [49]

Pope Honorius Anathematized

These anathemas voted by an ecumenical council against a pope as a heretic, seemed so unlikely to Pighi, Baronius, and several other historians, that they called into question the genuineness of the passages relative to Honorius. Honorius' name, ΟΝΩΡΙΟΝ, they say, must have been read in place of ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΝ (Theodore), the name of the patriarch who was convicted of Monophysitism. This explanation is not tenable. The evidence of different manuscripts and the multiplicity of the allusions to Pope Honorius, which we find in the earliest documents, does not allow any doubt as to the authenticity of the text that we have just quoted.[50] We should, however, remark—and this will suffice to show that the dogma of papal infallibility is quite beyond attack on this score—that nowhere is Pope Honorius condemned as having taught heresy *ex cathedra.* The solemn approval, voted by the fathers of the council, of Pope Agatho's letter in which it is said that none of his predecessors failed in the duty of confirming his brethren in the faith, would, if need there were, corroborate this interpretation.[51]

[49] Mansi, XI, 733.

[50] Hefele, *History of the Councils,* V, 170 ff.

[51] The fathers of the council, when transmitting the acts of the council to Pope Agatho, wrote as follows: "We willingly leave what should be done to you, as occupying the first See of the Universal Church and standing on the firm Rock of the Faith, having read through the writings of the true confession sent by Your Paternal Highness to our most religious Emperor; which we recognize as divinely written from the chiefest Head of the Apostles, and by which we have put to flight the dangerous opinions of the heresy which lately arose." Quoted from Sidney H. Scott, *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy,* p. 282. [Tr.] Cf. Mansi, XI, 683. Of most important significance to clarify the "question of Honorius," is a fact often overlooked, that, in the whole course of the Monothelite dispute, the faith of the Eastern as likewise of the Western Church in the indefectibility of the see of Peter

Thus ended the last of the great Christological heresies.[52] The East, where most of them originated, had witnessed the meetings of all the great councils that condemned them. The patriarchs of Byzantium, by rising up against Catholic orthodoxy, had merely increased the spiritual authority of the bishops of Rome. We shall see that the emperors, by attacking the person and territory of the popes, made the popes' temporal power clear to all and strengthened it more than ever.

is affirmed as strongly as ever. Honorius' yielding in no way disturbed it. It was not felt to be affected by the Pontiff's deplorable weakness. In 643, five years after Honorius' death, Sergius bishop of Cyprus wrote to Pope Theodore: "You are Peter . . . destroyer of profane heresies . . . doctor of the orthodox and spotless faith" (Mansi, X, 913). Three years later, the bishops of Africa, then a Byzantine province, wrote to the same Pope: "Your apostolic see has received by divine decree the office of examining and inspecting the holy dogmas of the Church" (Mansi, X, 921 f.). In 648, Sophronius of Jerusalem led Stephen of Dora to Calvary and said to him: "Swear to me that you will go at once to the apostolic see where are the foundations of the orthodox doctrine" (*PG,* LXXXIV, 314). Cf. *Bolland.,* II, 65 f. Other citations might easily be adduced. We merely add that the fathers of the council that condemned Honorius said, in an address to the Emperor: "The supreme head of the Apostles assisted us. It was Peter who spoke by Agatho" (Mansi, XI, 665). At the close of the council, it was before Pope Leo II that Patriarch Macarius and his condemned friends wished to plead their case (*Lib. pont.,* I, 354–359).

On the question of Honorius, see especially Hefele, *op. cit.,* V, 176 ff., and Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. II. See also Weil and Lot, *La cause d'Honorius,* original documents. For the complete literature of this question, which gave rise to the publication of a large number of writings at the time of the Vatican Council, see Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age,* I, 2174.

[52] A few stubborn Monothelites took refuge in the Lebanon Mountains. Were they the ancestors of the Maronites? Such is the declaration of St. Germain of Constantinople and of the Nestorian patriarch Timotheus in the eighth century (*PG,* XCVIII, 82; Labourt, *De Timotheo I patriarcha,* p. 18), of Theodore Abukara in the ninth century and of Eutychius of Alexandria in the tenth century (*PG,* CXI, 1078, 1091, 1095 f., etc.). But the valiant Maronite nation, so jealous of the purity of its Catholic faith, so proud of having defended Christendom against the Saracens with indomitable courage, denies such a heritage. And in fact learned scholars like Faustus Nairon (*Dissertatio de origine Maronitarum*), Simon Assemani (*Bibliotheca orientalis,* Vol. II), Wouters (*Hist. eccles.,* II, 425) have contested the conclusions that are drawn from the ancient authors. The view that the Maronite nation is descended from Monothelite heretics has recently been maintained by Pargoire (*L'Église byzantine,* p. 169) and by Wailhé (*Échos d'Orient,* 1906, pp. 257 f., 344 f.), who appeals to St. John Damascene (*PG,* XCIV, 143). This view has been opposed by Archbishop Debs, the Maronite archbishop of Beirut (*Échos d'Orient,* V, 285).

Emperor Justinian II

In passing from the hands of Constantine IV to those of Justinian II, the imperial power experienced a decline. Justinian II was a detestable emperor. Presumptuous and unskilful, he passed the years of his reign dreaming of stupendous enterprises and meeting with the most complete reverses. Of all his misadventures the most humiliating came to him from his religious policy. Infatuated with the title of supreme pontiff, which his official canonists pretended to justify by alleging that it legally appertained to his pagan predecessors, Justinian II took seriously, even tragically, those titles of "doctor of the orthodox faith," "arbiter of heaven and earth," which were showered on him by the flattery of his courtiers. To defend the orthodox faith, he revived the bloody edicts which the pagan emperors long before issued against the Christians, he subjected to torture and punished at the stake the Manichaeans in conformity with the laws of Emperor Diocletian.[53] The immoderate zeal of the Eastern monarch was not satisfied with defending the existing dogmas by fire and sword, he presumed to add to them.

The Quinisext Synod

To complete the work of the fifth and sixth ecumenical councils, which he considered insufficient, Justinian, on his own authority, convoked another general council which, because of its claim to be a continuation of the fifth and sixth councils, was called the Quinisext (*quinisextum*) Council or Penthect Council (πενθέκτη). It is known also as the Trullan Council or the Council in Trullo from the name of the palace where it met. From its very start the Latins nicknamed it *Synodus erratica,* to indicate that it could not claim rank in the series of lawful synods and councils of the Church. Of the 102 canons of this

[53] Petrus Siculus, *Historia Manicheorum,* chap. 27 (*PG,* CIV, 1281 f.).

pseudo-council, several betray the purpose, not only of emphasizing certain practices peculiar to the Eastern Church, but even of imposing them upon the Universal Church. Such were the prescriptions regarding the marriage of priests and deacons, the Lenten fast, abstaining from the blood of animals. Canon 36 seemed to place the see of Constantinople on a par with the see of "Old Rome."

But what was especially repugnant to Christian conscience was the attempt to force the acceptance of the Byzantine regulations under the severest penalties.

Excommunication was pronounced against such of the Roman laity as fasted on the Saturdays in Lent, and dismissal was the penalty for any clerk guilty of a similar practice. Deposition was also the penalty incurred by any priest or deacon refusing to cohabit with his wife, as well as by those who denied the lawfulness of such cohabitation. It is clear from what we have seen that even the pope—indeed, I may say, especially the pope—was attainted with such threats of deposition. Refusal to accept the Byzantine ruling in place of the ancient customs of the Roman Church, would warrant the pope's being dispossessed of his see and of his sacerdotal dignity.[54]

Pope St. Sergius (687–701)

It was the year 692. For five years past the Holy See had been occupied by Pope Sergius I. After the very short pontificates of Leo II (682–683), Benedict II (684–685), John V (685–686), and Conon (686–687), each of which lasted scarcely a year, interrupted by much disturbed interregnums, Sergius was elected amid scenes of tumult. In opposition to him, popular factions set up two rivals, the archpriest Theodore and the archdeacon Paschal. The former submitted. Paschal, a turbulent and obdurate character, was imprisoned in a monastery in consequence of plots in which, so it was alleged,

[54] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* p. 141.

certain suspicious practices of sorcery were involved. He died impenitent.[55] The popularity which sustained Sergius from the outset against the claims of the two antipopes, was increased by the disfavor into which the latter had fallen. He felt himself fortified by that general esteem. The Romans, who had seen him, in the *schola cantorum,* mount all the steps of the ecclesiastical hierarchy,[56] then, when he became a priest of the title of St. Suzanna, zealously devoting himself to the regular service of the Roman cemeteries,[57] knew him and valued him long since. By the very force of events the power of the papacy continued to grow under his immediate predecessors, although their pontificates were short and therefore little suited to big undertakings.

The imperial militia of Rome, the *exercitus Romanus,* which for some time the emperors had failed to pay,[58] became indigenous, almost entirely unconnected with Constantinople. The imperial military force even at Ravenna, in the presence of the growing discredit of the exarch, followed the trend of public opinion, detached itself from the Empire, and joined itself to Rome. Throughout the Italian peninsula, in fact, and even beyond,

the peoples were seeking in the Church the support they needed. Against governors' vexations or Lombard attacks they had no more reliable defenders than their bishops, especially the Roman pontiff. And so, from the whole Byzantine East, from the towns of Italy, from the islands of the Mediterranean, and even from Africa the people solicited the protection of the bishop of Rome. . . . Between the representatives of the emperors and the pope, their choice was made

[55] *Lib. pont.,* I, 371 f.

[56] *Quia studiosus erat et capax in officio catelenae, priori cantorum pro doctrina est traditus . . . et acolitus factus, per ordinem ascendens . . . presbiter ordinatus est. Lib. pont.,* I, 371.

[57] *Hic tempore presbiteratus sui impigre per cymiteria diversa missarum sollemnia celebrabat. Lib. pont.,* I, 371.

[58] *Lib. pont.,* I, 320 note 1.

in advance. In the seventh century Rome knew in reality no other sovereign than the pope.[59]

Plan to Seize the Pope

In the presence of Justinian's bold undertaking, Sergius was conscious of his strength, as he was of his rights. He refused to sign the acts of the pseudo-council, although the Emperor sent them to him for the very purpose of obtaining his signature to them. The imperial autocrat's anger was beyond bounds. Immediately orders were issued to the protospatharius Zachary, the exarch, to seize the Pope and bring him to the Bosporus. Was there to be a repetition of the scenes attending the martyrdom of St. Martin, or would the Pope be intimidated and yield? As Justinian probably anticipated, neither of these happened. Scarcely were the people apprised that a military force was advancing to seize the Bishop of Rome, when an uprising *en masse* took place. The imperial troops at Ravenna, reinforced by the garrisons of the Pentapolis and neighboring regions, hastened to join the popular movement and came to Rome to defend the Pope.[60] Zachary's small band of soldiers was panic-stricken and dispersed. The only thing left for the protospatharius to do was to rush to the papal apartments. There he was found, all atremble, crouching under the Pope's bed, sobbing and entreating the Pontiff to spare his life.[61] The Pope's magnanimity saved him from the fury of the multitude and let him flee to Constantinople. There he could report to his most mighty emperor that he had met in Italy a protection more effective than the emperor's, the protection of the Roman pontiff.

As though the imperial haughtiness must suffer, blow after blow, the worst humiliations, shortly afterward Justinian was

[59] Diehl, *Étude sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne, de 568 à 751*, pp. 334 f.

[60] *Lib. pont.*, I, 373.

[61] *Zacharias spatarius, perterritus et trepidans . . . in cubiculo pontificio tremebundus refugiit, deprecans lacrimabiliter ut sui pontifex misereretur, nec permitteret quemquam ejus animae infestari. Lib. pont.*, I, 373.

dethroned by the patrician Leontius, who exiled him to the Chersonesus, after cutting off his nose. When Justinian recovered the imperial power, of his own accord he abandoned those canons of the Quinisext Synod which had displeased Rome. To preserve something of his legislative work, he entered upon negotiations with Pope John VII and Pope Constantine I. But it was now the turn of the pontiffs to show him the superiority of their power. The emperors had to wait until the end of the eighth century to see Roman approbation give the force of law "to such canons of the Quinisext Council as were not opposed to the orthodox faith, good morals, and the decrees of Rome." [62]

The successors of Sergius continued to exercise and develop their protective mission over Rome and Italy. John VI (701–705) halted a Lombard invasion; [63] John VII (705–707) received from Aribert, king of the Lombards, as a donation the patrimony of the hither Alps; [64] Sisinnius (708) was engaged in repairing the walls of Rome; [65] Constantine I (708–715) took charge of the city police; [66] Gregory II (715–731) resumed the work begun by Sisinnius for the defense of Rome.[67] Under Gregory II fresh encroachments by the imperial authority and new acts of violence enabled the papacy to manifest more emphatically than ever its temporal authority over Italy.

Leo the Isaurian

Says Theophanes the Confessor, a Byzantine chronicler of the time: "In 726 Emperor Leo, the impious, began to make

[62] Expressions of Pope John VIII when, at the end of the ninth century, he confirmed the limited approbation given to the council in 786 by Adrian I. Mansi, XII, 982, 1079.

[63] *Lib. pont.*, I, 383 and 384 note **2.**

[64] *Ibid.*, pp. 385 and 387 note 8.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 388.

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 389, 392.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 396.

a discourse on the overthrowing of the holy and venerable images." [68] Leo III the Isaurian, having become emperor in 716 in the midst of a period of veritable anarchy, showed that he was a statesman of the highest order. He may rightly be considered the reorganizer of the Byzantine Empire.

In proscribing the worship of images, was he influenced by contact with Mohammedanism and Judaism? Was he merely yielding to a personal schismatic tendency, derived in childhood from the midst of the terrible sect of Paulicians? Those heretics, springing from Manichaeism and related to Marcionism, had, at the beginning of the sixth century, terrorized Syria, Armenia, and Mesopotamia, setting fire to churches and demolishing the sacred icons. Or was he simply ambitious to extend to matters of the sanctuary the reform which he was proud to have accomplished in military, administrative, and social affairs? Certainly he did not foresee the consequences of that iconoclast dispute which would occasion the definite rupture of Constantinople from Rome and would bring about the alliance of the Holy See with the Franks.

Gregory II, by his firm and paternal rule, won the friendly gratitude of the peoples of Italy. Thus far he had enjoyed friendly relations with the Byzantine emperor, as he had with the king of the Lombards. But, upon receiving Leo III's edict ordering him to remove the images, under the penalty of losing his title of bishop of Rome,[69] he protested and, by letter to the Emperor, signified his refusal to obey an order contrary to his conscience.[70] This solemn protest was the signal for a general uprising in Italy. The population of the Pentapolis and the troops of Venetia rejected the Emperor's decree and an-

[68] Theophanes, *Chronographia, PG,* CVIII, 816.

[69] *Lib. pont.,* I, 464.

[70] Duchesne thinks that the two letters of Gregory II to Emperor Leo, which figure in the collections of councils, are not authentic. They contain such anachronisms and confusions that a pope or even any Roman of the period could not have written them. "They must have been fabricated at Constantinople by some defender of images to supplement the genuine letters." *Lib. pont.,* I, 413 note 45.

nounced that they would fight for the defense of the Pope. The Byzantine government officers were driven out and new leaders were chosen. The people cried: "Anathema against the exarch, against the one who sent him, against those who obey him." [71] Exhileratus the duke of Naples vainly tried to bring Campania into obedience. It was learned that he spoke of assassinating the Pope: at once his house was assaulted by the mob, and he was put to death along with his son.[72] The Lombards joined in the movement. They united with the Romans, according to the expression of the *Liber pontificalis,* "as with brothers by the chain of faith, asking merely that they might meet a glorious death fighting for the Pontiff." [73] There was even question of electing a new emperor and conducting him to Constantinople. Then it was that the Pope intervened a second time to save the Emperor and perhaps the Empire. While thanking the people for their attachment, Gregory II exhorted them to obedience and, by his prayers and admonitions, gradually restored peace.

There was a brief revival of the quarrel under Gregory III (731–741) who, from the first days of his pontificate, protested against the iconoclast heresy.[74] But Pope Zachary (741–752), who took possession of the Holy See after the death of Leo the Isaurian and just before the coming of Constantine V (Copronymus), received from the new Emperor assurances of peace.

Constantine V, who would so violently revive the iconoclast war in the interior of the Empire, gave up any idea of violating consciences in those regions where he felt he was henceforth powerless. In fact, as Hergenröther says: "The authority of the Holy See was now at its height in the West, whereas the

[71] *Lib. pont.,* I, 404.
[72] *Op. cit.,* I, 405.
[73] *Ibid.,* p. 406.
[74] *Ibid.,* p. 415.

imperial power was there visibly lessening, and whatever was left of it was owing to the pope." [75]

However, was the danger of a schism removed? No, it was merely postponed. Under the last sovereigns of the house of Heraclius, political and religious conceptions had experienced an evolution. The cosmopolitan ambitions of Justinian II were abandoned. The thought of propagating the Byzantine rites at Rome was given up. Those rites became isolated in the Greek world. But more than ever they wanted to bind the government to a national church. Henceforth the popes found themselves confronted, not so much by a Roman Empire of the East, as by a Greek Empire, and not so much by a Greek Empire as by a Greek Church. The monarch was called *basileus* and *autocrator;* but he began to prefer the title *isapostolos* (like the Apostles).[76] "It was then not race but the faith that made a Roman of Byzantium: from whatever people he might be sprung, it sufficed to enter the pale of the Church in order to enter that of the state; orthodox baptism conferred citizenship." [77] The schismatic spirit, in a different but no less sure manner, continued to spread and still threatened, for a more or less distant future, a rupture with the Church of Rome.

But, on the other hand, a new alliance seemed possible to the Church, an alliance with the barbarians. In the very midst of the iconoclast conflict and the disturbances caused by the Lombards, Gregory III appealed to the duke of the Franks, Charles Martel. The latter had at his disposal considerable forces in Gaul, and his princely protection had been highly valued by St. Boniface in Germany. But at the time he could not promise the Pope any effective assistance. From that time on, however, the idea of appealing to the Franks was not forgotten. One of the presents which Gregory III sent to Charles

[75] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, 51.

[76] Constantine had already taken this title. Eusebius, *Life of Constantine,* Bk. IV.

[77] Rambaud, *Hist. gén.,* I, 202.

Martel in 739 was the keys of the tomb of the holy Apostles. Was not this expressive of the hope that some day the leader of the Franks, either himself personally or through some one of his race, would be constituted the defender of that tomb? [78]

[78] In itself the gift of these *claves confessionis cum vinculis sancti Petri,* spoken of by the Chronicle of Fredegarius (chap. 110), was not, as might be supposed, a symbol of homage and submission. It was merely a question of "reliquary-keys," containing a piece of the chains of St. Peter. A specimen is in the treasury of the Holy Cross at Liége (Reussens, *Archéologie,* I, 103). But the fact of sending this present by an embassy is significant, and in the object itself Charles Martel was able to see a symbol.

PART II

The Church Among the Barbarians

CHAPTER IV

The Barbarian World

"THE man of God, Bennet," says St. Gregory the Great, "being diligent in watching, rose early up before the time of matins (his monks being yet at rest) and came to the window of his chamber, where he offered up his prayers to almighty God. Standing there, all on a sudden in the dead of the night, as he looked forth, he saw a light, which banished away the darkness of the night and glittered with such brightness that the light which did shine in the midst of darkness was far more clear than the light of the day." [1] The whole world was the field reserved by Providence for the zeal of the Benedictine monks. They journeyed through its length and breadth as missioners, enlightened it as scholars, at times governed it as statesmen.

At the time of St. Benedict's vision, that is, following upon the fall of the Western Empire, the sternest patriots of Rome at length began to comprehend that the *orbs romanus* was not the universe. From all directions new races had crossed the frontiers, sometimes by slow infiltrations, sometimes by brutal and bloody invasions. In Italy were to be found the Heruli mingled with the Rugians; in Africa were the Vandals; in Spain the Suevi and the Visigoths; in old Gaul, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, the Franks, and the Britons; in England, the Britons and the Anglo-Saxons: in the region of the North Sea, the Frisians and the Saxons; between the Vistula and the Elbe, the Slavs.[2]

[1] *Dialogues,* Bk. II, chap. 35.

[2] Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* pp. 74 ff.; Schrader's *Atlas historique,* map 15, note by Paul Guiraud.

Whence came these peoples? Graeco-Roman antiquity knew nothing of them. For a long while the Greeks supposed the world ended at the Danube. Beyond that was the land of the Hyperboreans, the polar region, peopled with darkness and ghosts. The most learned of the old Greek historians, Herodotus, was evidently not acquainted with the course of the Danube, for he places its source in the Pyrenees Mountains. The Romans, at least in the time of Tacitus, suspected that beyond their frontiers moved a whole unknown world. In the first zone of that *terra ignota* was a race of barbarians whom they knew only too well, the Germans, those half-clad, blue-eyed warriors of gigantic stature, whom they had seen fighting and facing death. Beginning with the time of Marius, these Germans had to be reckoned with. But, thought the Romans, that race formed merely a sort of cordon around the Roman world. Beyond was that land of the yellow amber spoken of by Tacitus, the land of the Chauques; then, farther to the north, the mysterious region where men had horses' feet and ears so long that they covered the whole body.[3]

Such were the illusions. In reality, around the Roman world were three zones of barbarians, occupied by three different races: Germans, Slavs, and Mongolians.

The first zone, Germany, included the region extending between the Danube, the Rhine, the North Sea, and the Vistula. It was the country of those hardy soldiers who had driven back the legions. A migration of this race had peopled Scandinavia. Later on they extended beyond that region; their life of seacoast fishermen altered their domestic and political institutions at the same time that it toughened their physical constitutions.[4] The Romans never had any contact with the

[3] Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne,* I, 61.

[4] H. de Tourville, *Histoire de la formation particulariste. Origine des principales nations modernes.*

Scandinavian branch of the German race. Those were the men they spoke of as having horses' feet and enormous ears.

The second zone, east and north of Germany, was the country of the Slavs. They were unsettled tribes, ever on the move, ever engaged in warfare and raids. They occupied the region between the Vistula and the Don.

The third zone, still farther east, embraced the Mongols, the Huns, the Avars, the Magyars, the Turks, and others. Even more savage, more nomadic, more cruel than the Germans, they had more than once been seen, riding their swift horses, on the southern frontiers of Europe. Like a living wedge, they later pushed into the very midst of the Germanic and Slavic races, into Hungary and, even to our own time, continue to be a source of disturbance and instability in that region. Their original country was east of the Ural Mountains and reached to the Altai Mountains in central Asia.

The Germans and the Slavs belonged to the race which modern ethnographers call Indo-Iranian or Aryan. The Mongols and the other yellow-skinned groups living in their vicinity, belonged to a special race usually called the Ural-Altaic race.

The Church reached each of these peoples, one after the other. At the close of the fifth century she converted the Franks; a hundred years later the Anglo-Saxons; then, in the course of the eighth century, the Alamanni, the Bavarians, the Thuringians, and the Saxons; lastly, during the first half of the ninth century, the peoples of Scandinavia. All the principal nations of the Germanic race were by that time won to the Gospel. During the second half of the ninth century, Christianity was preached to the Slavs of Moravia and passed from there to the Slavs of Russia. Only the Ural-Altaic race then remained unevangelized. The group of Hungary received the Christian faith in the tenth and eleventh centuries; but the groups in Asia were not seriously affected until the

Dominican and Franciscan missions in the thirteenth century and especially, in the sixteenth century, the preaching of St. Francis Xavier and his disciples.[5]

For the present we are concerned only with the conversion of the peoples of the Germanic race, in particular those that have since formed France, England, Germany, and the Scandinavian states.

The Germans

This race, which came from Asia but had sojourned on the shores of the Baltic and the Black Sea, where Pytheas the Greek geographer of Marseilles met them,[6] reveals an originality and a general similarity in its institutions.[7] For an understanding of the ecclesiastical institutions of the Middle Ages, we must say a word about those Germanic institutions. Certain customs, which some writers would attribute to Christian tradition, are often a survival of some old Germanic usage.

The religion of the Germans, if we consider merely its substance, appears to be a great poem deifying the forces of nature. The German had neither temple nor idol, but he adored the Sun, Moon, Fire, Lightning, the Trees of the forest, and, higher than all these, an infinite Power, that soared above all others, and was called Wodan or Odin.[8]

The religion of a German was, however, not a mere poetic

[5] We have no occasion at this point to speak of the Celtic race. Its influence was not less, in the formation of Europe and of Christendom, than that of the Germanic and Slavic races. But the Celts had for a long time been connected with the Roman world, they had long since been reached by the preaching of the Gospel. The ancient world and the Church already were acquainted with them. They were not a new people. For the same reason we have not introduced into our picture the peoples of Semitic race.

[6] Lelewel, *Pythéas de Marseille et la géographie de son temps.*

[7] The Germans belonged to the great Indo-European family. According to Tacitus, this name "brothers" (*Germani*) was given them when their first tribes crossed the Rhine in the second century before our era, by the inhabitants of Belgic Gaul. Tacitus, *Germ.*, chap. 2.

[8] Tacitus calls him *regnator omnium deus. Op. cit.*, chap. 39.

fancy or simply a philosophical abstraction, as the religion of a Roman, according to the criticism of Euhemerus, might be at that period. It was a faith and a worship entering into his private life as also into his public life. The follower of Odin did not undertake anything of importance without first consulting his gods.[9] The public assemblies of Germany were held in the sacred places. The priest of Odin had very extensive powers, not merely in matters of the liturgy and religious discipline, but also in questions of civil administration, police regulations, and criminal jurisdiction.[10]

A more profound difference is to be seen between the Roman and the German, if we consider their political and social institutions. As Chateaubriand says: "Independence was the whole basis of these barbarians, as the fatherland was the whole basis of a Roman." [11] Any political authority, outside that of the state, was forbidden by the law of Rome. For the German there was, we might say, no public authority. The free men of Germany were grouped into small cohesive communities that were, so to speak, concentric. They were formed by the family, nearness, common interest, or free choice. These confederations were real powers. They distributed escheats among their members; a sort of superior ownership by the collective group prevented an individual from disposing of his property without the consent of the confederation.[12] On the other hand, if one of them were wronged, all were obliged to rise up in his defense.[13]

These voluntary confederations did not absorb the rights of the individuals. The community was not a legal person; as such, it did not possess anything; it was instituted simply to

[9] *Op. cit.*, chap. 10.

[10] "Capital punishment, imprisonment, even a blow are permitted only to the priests." Tacitus, *Germ.*, chap. 7.

[11] Chateaubriand, *Études historiques*, Study VI, Part I.

[12] Tacitus, *op. cit.*, chap. 20.

[13] *Op. cit.*, chap. 21.

guarantee the rights of the individual. If a dispute arose between Germans, the question was settled in the following manner. Each of the litigants swore that he had acted honorably, and he brought with him the greatest possible number of friends, who swore that his action was that of a man of honor. The assembly, weighing the number and value of these testimonies, would pass judgment. If the question could not be solved by this peaceful method, there would be individual combat.[14] At an early date, however, pecuniary compromise or wergeld was allowed.[15] Criminal charges were tried in much the same way. The primitive law—blood for blood—soon was replaced by "composition." [16]

The confederation not only did not absorb the individual, but it did not destroy the unity of the nation. National questions were decided in plenary assemblies.[17] These congresses decided upon peace and war, punished crimes regarded as public. Some of the groups had kings, always chosen by election, but generally selected from the same family. Other groups elected a king only when about to engage in war.

The army was modeled on the nation. Young men chose a leader, formed warrior bands,[18] and placed themselves at the service of the emperors.[19] But, in case of a national peril, all the free men fit to bear arms were summoned. They set out on the march, often accompanied by their families,[20] under the auspices of the god of the nation. Their courage was terrifying. They faced death with a smile. In time of battle their

[14] Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne,* I, 85.

[15] Or *werigeld* or *widrigeld.* Cf. Tacitus, *op. cit.,* chap. 12.

[16] Part of this money went to the family of the injured person, part to the society.

[17] "When they all think fit, they sit down armed. . . . If a proposal displease, the assembly reject it by an inarticulate murmur; if it prove agreeable, they clash their javelins." Tacitus, *Germania,* chap. 11.

[18] The warrior band is what Tacitus calls *comitatus. Ibid.,* chaps. 13–15. Cf. Caesar, *Gallic War,* VI, 15, 23.

[19] Tacitus, *op. cit.,* chap. 15.

[20] *Ibid.,* chap. 7.

shouting was fearful. Says Tacitus: "A harsh, piercing note, and a broken roar, are the favorite tones; which they render more full and sonorous by applying their mouths to their shields." [21] They encouraged each other by singing the war songs of the bards, saying, for example: "We have fought with the sword. Life's hours are passing. We will laugh when we have to die." [22]

Inclined to drunkenness, with a passion for gambling, cruel to the point of sacrificing human victims to their divinities, the Germans in private life, however, possessed a purity of morals and nobility of feeling which the Romans could not help but admire. Says Salvian: "The race of the Goths is treacherous but chaste; the Alans unchaste but not treacherous; the Franks are deceitful but hospitable; the Saxons savage in their cruelty but admirable for their chastity." [23] What especially characterized the Germans everywhere and at all times, in peace as well as in war, was a daring and sometimes naïve initiative. Tacitus mentions several instances of this.

Two barbarian chieftains had proceeded to Rome, where, while they waited for access to Nero, who was engaged in other affairs, amongst the several sights which are usually shown to barbarians, they were conducted into Pompey's theater, that they might observe the immensity of the Roman people. Here, while they gazed round them—for indeed they took no delight in scenic representations which they understood not—asking about the mass of people seated in the pit, the distinction of orders, "which were the Roman knights, and where sat the senate," they spied certain persons in a foreign habit, sitting upon the benches of the senators, and asked who were these?

[21] *Ibid.*, chap. 3.

[22] *Pugnavimus ensibus,*
Vitae elapsae sunt horae:
Ridens moriar.
The Scandinavian text of this war song has been published by Wormius in his *Littérature runique*, p. 197.

[23] Salvian, *De gubernatione Dei*, Bk. VII. Cf. Tacitus, *Germania*, chaps. 16, 17; Caesar, *Gallic War*, VI.

When they had learnt that this was a distinction conferred upon the ambassadors of such nations as signalized themselves by their merit and friendship toward the Romans; "There is not a nation upon earth," they exclaimed, "which surpasses the Germans in prowess and fidelity," and down they came and took their seats among the senators; a proceeding viewed indulgently by the spectators, as a specimen of ancient simplicity, and the effect of an honest emulation. Nero bestowed upon both the privileges of Roman citizens.[24]

The Catholic Church, which in the first centuries so wonderfully assimilated the philosophical spirit of the Greek world and the organizing genius of the Roman people, would find, in her divine vitality, the means of incorporating, while purifying it, the robust initiative of this new race.

That native vigor existed unequally in the two groups of peoples that formed the Germanic race. The northern or Teutonic group included the Franks, the Angles, the Alamanni, the Saxons, etc., and the southern or Gothic group was made up of the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Burgundians, Suevi, Vandals, and, according to some historians, the Lombards. The former group, after a prolonged stay on the coasts of the North Sea and the Baltic, became more hardened to fatigue. The second group, on the contrary, was softened by contact with the Roman and Byzantine civilization.

Early Christianity among the Germans

From the Gothic tribes, that Arianism soon won, the Church had little to hope, although for a considerable time past the efforts of the missioners had brought the Gospel to the regions occupied by the Teutonic race.

As early as the middle of the second century St. Justin spoke of the Christian faith of those barbarians who live in carts and sleep under tents or even under the simple shelter of the

[24] Tacitus, *Annals,* Bk. XIII, chap. 54.

sky.[25] At the close of that century St. Irenaeus spoke explicitly of the Churches of Germany.[26] Tertullian, a little later, names the Germans among the peoples that have received the faith of Christ.[27] In the fourth century the acts of the councils of Arles and of Sardica, by their mention of the presence of the bishops of Trier, Cologne, Metz, Toul, and Chur, reveal the existence of many hierarchically established Christian communities in Germany.

About the same period, two providential events contributed to the spread of the Christian faith in those regions: the sojourn of the Roman armies beyond the Rhine, and the religious persecution by the emperors. Episodes like the instance of the Theban legion show that, at the end of the third century, the Roman armies quartered in Germany counted many Christians, and heroic Christians. A half-century later, exiles like St. Athanasius, who boasted of the friendships he had formed at Trier, brought to those same regions the example of their eminent virtues.

What was the history of those ancient Christian centers? A few epitaphs or inscriptions, some popular legends, and the great name of St. Maximinus of Trier, who was said to be the light of his time and the glory of Germany in the fourth century, but whose writings are entirely lost—that is all we have left of that period.

In the fifth century two equally destructive calamities afflicted those young valiant Christian communities of Germany: the barbarian invasion and the contagion of the Arian heresy.

The movement that turned the first ranks of the Germans southward was never completely halted. In the fifth century the push was formidable. It made the Roman frontiers yield

[25] *Dialogue with Trypho,* chap. 117.
[26] *Adv. haeres.,* I, 10.
[27] Tert., *Adversus judaeos,* chap. 7.

at three points. On the east, the Danube valley gave passage to the Goths who hurled themselves on Thrace and Asia Minor. On the west, the Rhine valley was open before the Franks, Alamanni, and Burgundians, who thronged into Gaul. In the middle section of the frontier, the Inn valley gave passage to the Heruli and Lombards, who occupied Italy. These brutal hordes of pagan barbarians trampled underfoot most of the young Christian communities of Germany.[28]

At the same time another danger came to them from the Graeco-Roman world. Arianism, that diluted form of Christianity which the emperors and heretical bishops of the East had clothed with unparalleled splendor, was sure to seduce those peoples of Gothic race, more smitten than were their brethren by the brilliancy of the Graeco-Roman civilization. The personal influence of a man of genius, perverted by the heresy, aided this movement. The Gothic nobleman Ulfilas, who was taken to Constantinople as a hostage in the fourth century, there embraced the errors of Arius. Upon returning home, he spread the heresy through his preaching and through a Gothic translation of the Bible, impregnated with his doctrine. If we are to accept what the historians Theodoret and Sozomen say,[29] Ulfilas was commissioned to negotiate an alliance between the Arian Emperor Valens and the Visigoths, and rallied the latter to the standard of Arianism. From the Visigoths the error passed to the Ostrogoths, the Heruli, the Vandals, the Burgundians, the Gepidae, and the Rugians.[30]

It would seem that the Church had vainly counted on these Germanic tribes that Paul Orosius and Salvian shortly before had greeted as a last hope, when the Roman Empire was seen to be falling. If discouragement did seize upon some souls, this

[28] We know how the intervention of many saints, such as St. Genevieve, St. Aignan, St. Lupus, preserved from this invasion several provinces of the region that would later form France.

[29] Theodoret, IV, 37; Sozomen, VI, 37.

[30] See Le Bachelet, art. "Arianisme" in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*

feeling did not last long. The fifth century had not yet come to its close when the news spread that the leader of one of the bravest tribes of the Frankish people, Clovis, had received baptism at the hands of the bishop of Reims. At this news, one of the bishops who had most earnestly longed for that conversion, St. Avitus of Vienne, wrote: "The West now has its emperor sharing our faith. O king, may you bear this treasure of the faith, which you have in your heart, to the peoples who are settled beyond your frontiers." [31]

[31] St. Avitus, *Ep.*, 41.

CHAPTER V

The Church among the Franks

UPON the land that later would be France, three peoples were established at the close of the fifth century: the Franks, the Burgundians, and the Visigoths: the Franks in the northern portion, the Burgundians in the southeast, the Visigoths in the southwest. The Franks, of Teutonic race, had generally kept the national worship of Odin; the Burgundians and the Visigoths, of Gothic race, had, as a whole, embraced Arianism.[1]

The Franks

The Franks, unlike the others, did not constitute a real ethnical group. The etymology of the word "frank" is difficult to ascertain. The word is met with as early as the third century. It is applied indiscriminately to all the peoples inhabiting the right bank of the Rhine, from the Main River to the sea. Beginning in the third century, we find these tribes in frequent relation with the Empire, either as slaves or as allied soldiers, even as consuls, such as Ricimer. In the reign of Valentinian II it was Arbogast, a Frank, who really directed the imperial government.

The Salic Law declares that the Franks bore "the hard yoke of the Romans." Among this people so very proud of its race, those frequent contacts with Roman civilization had only a

[1] Druidism, the religion of the Celts, was introduced into northern and central Gaul. Caesar, in his *Commentaries,* has much to say about the religion of the druids. It is not correct to say that the druids brought a new religion to Gaul. Rather they gave a new ritual and a theology to the existing religion. Maurice Bloch in Lavisse, *L'Hist. de France,* I, 55 ff.

superficial influence. It is true that the monarchical institution seemed to take a sudden and excessive increase among them: but the change appears to have taken place especially in the protocol formularies, in the title of *Dominus gloriosissimus, Excellentia,* and *Sublimitas,* which the notaries of the royal entourage took from the Roman language and the usages of the imperial court.[2] The national assemblies, called *campus, placitum,* or *conventus,* continued, at least to a large extent, the free traditions of old Germany. Another trait of the Frankish institutions was that strange régime of the statute or personal right, which made the application of the law dependent upon the place of birth. The right of the individual was paramount even though the good order of the state should suffer thereby.[3]

The Franks, who since the third century had been continually moving southward and westward, were divided into two groups: those living along the Rhine or Ripuarians, and those established near the mouth of the Rhine, near the Issel or Sala: these were the Salians.

The Salians as also the Ripuarians were divided into tribes and, in 476, at the time of the fall of the Empire, the chief of one of these tribes of the Salians was King Childeric. By his generous good will toward the Christian religion, he won the gratitude and confidence of the representatives of the Church.

After Childeric's premature death at Tournai in 481, the warriors chose his young son Clodowech or Clovis, fifteen years old.[4] According to the law of the Salians, he had reached

[2] However, opinions are divided on this point. Cf. Fustel de Coulanges, *Institutions,* VI, 640; Moeller, *Hist. du Moyen Age,* pp. 330 f.

[3] *In judicio interpellatus, sicut lex loci continet ubi natus fuit, respondeat. Lex ripuaria,* XXI, 3. *Quod si damnatus fuerit, secundum legem propriam, non secundum ripuariam, damnum sustineat. Lex. rip.,* XXXI, 4.

[4] We shall call him simply Clovis. Says Fustel de Coulanges: "I beg to be allowed to write 'Clovis'; I might, like some others, write 'Clodowech,' and I would thus appear more learned; but we do not know how Clovis wrote his name, and still less do we know how he pronounced it. The accepted form has this in its favor, that

his majority three years before,[5] had made his acquaintance with public life, and bore the spear since that time. The young ruler therefore already knew how to conciliate public esteem. By chance the letter written to him at that time by the Bishop of Reims, the metropolitan of Belgic Gaul, the great ecclesiastical personage of that country, has been preserved. The prelate wrote to him as follows:

A great rumor has reached us, to the effect that you have just taken in hand the administration of the second Belgium. . . . Be watchful that the good favor of God abandon you not. Be chaste and honorable. Show yourself deferential toward your bishops. If you are in agreement with them, your country will be well. Relieve the afflicted, protect the widows, feed the orphans, so act that everyone may love you and fear you. May the voice of justice be heard from your lips. . . . With what your father bequeathed to you, ransom the captives from the yoke of slavery. If you would reign, show yourself worthy to do so.[6]

St. Remigius

This letter contains a whole plan of Christian government. The Bishop who penned it was barely forty-two years old.[7] His name was Remigius or Remi. He was born of a noble family in the district of Laon and was educated in the famous schools of the city of Reims. We are told by Sidonius Apollinaris and Gregory of Tours that Remigius soon excelled all his contemporaries by the maturity of his mind and the extent of his

everybody knows what personage I am speaking of." Achille Luchaire, *Leçon d'ouverture du cours d'hist. du Moyen Age,* 1890.

[5] Pardessus, *Loi salique,* pp. 451 f.

[6] *MGH, Epistolae merowingici et Karolini aevi,* I, 113; Kurth, *Clovis,* pp. 240 f.

[7] This is the conclusion set forth in the *Histoire littéraire,* III, 156. On the basis of a letter of St. Remigius written in 512 and a testimony of St. Gregory of Tours, it places the birth of St. Remigius in 439.

learning.[8] At the age of twenty-two he was elevated to the episcopal see of Reims.[9] But this nobleman, this man of letters, this accomplished orator was not one of those who, like Sidonius, persistent in their grief over the decline of ancient Rome, could not tolerate the speech, the bearing, and the odor of the barbarian;[10] like Salvian and Paul Orosius, Bishop Remigius was one of those who, "forgetting their nobility and literature and their old Rome, went to this barbarian, vulgar race that was arriving, that was going to hold the scepter of the world, that would hold in its hands the destinies of the Catholic Church." [11]

The Catholic Church remained more prosperous in the country occupied by the Franks than in the other regions peopled by the Germanic race. The terrible invasions of the fifth century had been unable to destroy the Christian centers of northern Gaul, and Arianism had not crossed the Loire. The purest holiness was personified at that time in Paris in St. Genevieve. This venerable virgin, born in 423 near Nanterre, was about sixty years old when King Clovis succeeded his father. She survived the Frankish King by a few months. She was the saintly friend of the Bishop of Reims, the pious confidante of St. Clotilda, and the liberator of Paris. Although she did not, in any ostensible way, take part in the great events of the history we are about to relate, yet, in her prudent obscurity, Genevieve's influence should not be forgotten. Because of her beneficent influence over Queen Clotilda and King Clovis, no less than her heroic devotedness in the midst of the barbarian invasion, St. Genevieve of Paris should retain in history the

[8] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.*, IX, 7; St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, p. 80.

[9] This was an exception to the canons, which forbade the ordination of a bishop before the age of thirty years. *Hist. litt.*, III, 156.

[10] Sidonius Apollinaris, XII, 13.

[11] Kurth, *Clovis*, pp. 302 f.

title "mother of Christian France" which popular veneration has given her.

Clotilda

Theodoric, the mighty king of the Ostrogoths, asked the King of the Franks for one of his sisters in marriage. Clovis, when he extended his conquests to the Loire in 492, also wished to be joined with a princess of royal blood. His choice turned to Clotilda, niece of Gondebad king of the Burgundians.

Clotilda was a Catholic. This marriage realized the longings of the episcopacy of Gaul, particularly of the bishop of Reims, St. Remigius, and the bishop of Vienne, St. Avitus. But to suppose this marriage was the work of the bishops' politics,[12] is a hypothesis unsupported by any document; and, if by politics, we mean a base intrigue, that is a calumny refuted by the character of the two great prelates.[13] If any political considerations influenced the event, they were, on Clovis' part, the hope that through his marriage to a Catholic princess, he might attach his subjects of Roman origin more closely to himself, perhaps also the desire to make the Burgundians his allies against the Visigoths; on the side of Gondebad, it might have been the thought of obtaining a pledge of peace and security from the Franks and of counting on Clovis as a future ally in the event of conflict with his brother, against whom he had a grievance.[14]

It does not appear that either Clotilda or Remigius employed direct exhortations to urge Clovis to be converted. During four consecutive years the daily influence of the virtues of the young queen was added to the effect produced by the lofty

[12] Aug. Thierry, *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre,* I, 41–44; Henri Martin, *Histoire de France,* I, 430.

[13] Gorini, *Défense de l'Église,* I, 291.

[14] Kurth, *Sainte Clotilde,* pp. 30 f.

qualities of the Bishop of Reims.[15] These influences finally conquered the soul of the barbarian King. One day during a great battle, seeing his soldiers giving way before an attack of the Alamanni, he invoked the "God of Clotilda" and promised to be baptized if he should be victorious.[16] He was victorious and he kept his promise. The proud Sicambrian bowed his head, promised to adore what he had burned, and to burn what he had adored.[17] On this occasion St. Avitus wrote to him, saying: "Your faith is a victory for all of us. . . . Your forebears prepared a great destiny for you: you have resolved to prepare even greater destinies for those coming after you. . . . The East will no longer be alone in having an emperor sharing our faith." [18] "It was this Catholic baptism that made possible a fusion between Germans and Romans, that allied the

[15] "Chroniclers say that it was Remigius who had the King restore to him a valuable vase stolen from his church. This is utterly unlikely." Kurth, *Sainte Clotilde,* p. 42.

[16] Kurth, *Clovis,* pp. 312 ff. The tradition placing the famous battle at Tolbiac (Zulpich) near Cologne, goes back only to the sixteenth century.

[17] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* Bk. II, 28 (31). According to the custom of the time, immediately after the threefold immersion of his baptism, Clovis received the sacrament of confirmation. A ninth century legend, confusing the confirmation anointing with the royal anointing, here adds the account of the marvelous appearance of a dove carrying the ampulla of holy oil. This legend brought to the bishops of Reims the honor of consecrating all the kings of France. Kurth, *Clovis,* p. 848.

[18] St. Avitus, *Ep.,* 41. Sometimes, besides this letter of St. Avitus, a letter of Pope Anastasius II is cited (e. g., in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 122, and Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Église,* I, 626, note by the French translator). Julien Havet (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1885, XLVI, 205 ff.) shows that this letter is apocryphal. It was fabricated by Jerome Vignier (d. 1661), the author of eight other false documents connected with the period of antiquity and the early Middle Ages, namely: an epitaph in verse of St. Perpetua, the acts of a conference held in the presence of Gondebad by the Catholic and Arian bishops of the kingdom in 499, a letter of Leontius bishop of Arles to St. Hilary in 462, a letter of St. Lupus of Troyes to St. Sidonius Apollinaris in 472, a letter of Pope St. Gelasius to St. Rusticus of Lyons in 494, a letter of Pope St. Symmachus to St. Avitus of Vienne in 501, the last will and testament of St. Perpetua, a deed of Clovis giving lands to two bishops. The anachronisms and juridical errors in this last document put Julien Havet on the track of the fraud.

Merovingian royalty to the episcopate, prepared for the alliance of the Carolingians with Rome . . . and led to the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire, the keystone of the whole Middle Ages." [19]

Christianity in France

All the preparations were made; but everything was still to be done. Nothing resembled less the France of St. Louis or even the France of Charles the Bald, than the France of King Clovis. Neither the swift conquest of the kingdom of the Burgundians and that of the Visigoths [20] nor the transfer of the capital to Paris nor the numerous conversions of the Franks following that of the King, visibly altered the aspect of the nation. It was still a barbarous nation, that is, a permanent state of personal violence, of religious superstitions, and of social insecurity. Seemingly these disorders would disappear only by favor of solid political institutions. These latter, on the other hand, would become possible and acceptable only through a profound reform of the individuals. The necessity of this twofold simultaneous task of social progress was never more evident than after the conversion of the barbarians. To repress the brutal instincts and disruptive tendencies by con-

[19] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 121.

[20] The same writers who accuse the episcopacy of Gaul with having, for political reasons, negotiated the marriage of Clovis with the daughter of the King of the Burgundians, look upon these first steps merely as the preliminaries of a more perfidious policy, the purpose of which was to bring under the sway of a Catholic king, Clovis, the Arian kingdoms of the Burgundians and the Visigoths. In consequence of this design, those bishops, particularly St. Avitus, are said to have favored the conquest of their country by the King of France. The character of the bishops of Gaul and especially that of St. Avitus protest against this charge. Says Kurth: "Anyone can see what a loss it would have been to the Archbishop of Vienne to pass under the yoke of the Franks, three-quarters of whom were still pagans. He was the friend of his sovereign and was seeing the Burgundians, won by the example of their royal prince, daily coming to the faith in growing numbers." *Clovis,* p. 368. Gorini (*Études pour la défense de l'Église,* I, 256–376) adduces texts in refutation of the assertions of Augustin Thierry on this subject.

tinued efforts carried on day after day, and to prevent their return by the establishment of good customs and wise institutions—such was the mission of the Church. After the work of conversion, that of Christian civilization was of the utmost importance.

The account of the murders that stained the last years of Clovis' life, and of the violent deeds that upset the reigns of his successors, as presented in St. Gregory of Tours' *History of the Franks,* bears the marks of legends dramatized by popular imagination.[21] However, it is not certain that the crimes attributed to Clovis, if they really occurred at all, were not previous to his baptism. In any event, the penalties decreed by the Salic law reveal a people that is violent and brutal, among whom attacks by roving bands upon persons and property are frequent, and harvests, animals, slaves, even free men are stolen. What is equally undeniable is the fact that whenever a barbarian, even though it be the king or queen, commits a crime of this sort, he may find himself face to face with the accusing figure of a representative of the Church. In the *Chronicon* of Fredegarius the following story is told:

> One day it happened that St. Columban went to Brunehilde. The Queen, seeing him enter the courtyard, brought to him the children whom her grandson Thierry had by his irregular unions. The saint asked what they wanted. Brunehilde said to him: "These are the King's sons; give them the favor of your blessing." Columban replied: "Know that never will they bear the royal scepter, for they have issued forth from an evil place." She was angered and ordered the children to withdraw. Then she laid a trap for the saint.[22]

The chronicler says further that King Thierry dared not molest the saint "for fear of provoking the anger of God by offending one of His servants."

Nor were the practices of superstition abolished by the con-

[21] Kurth, *Hist. poét., des Mérov.,* pp. 295–317.
[22] *Chronicle of Fredegarius,* chap. 31.

version of Clovis and of his Franks. Gregory of Tours relates that a certain anchorite used to pray and fast that the people in the region of Trier might decide to overturn a statue of Diana.[23] The early author of the life of St. Vedast relates that King Clotaire, invited to dinner by one of his vassals, perceived at one side the vessels of blessed beer for the Christians, and on the other side the vessels that were prepared for the pagan libations.[24] Sometimes, says the biographer of St. Amandus, it happened that a Christian community, impressed by some portent or a fearsome panic or a suggestion of the demon, suddenly quit the priest and the church and returned to their former superstitions.[25] Sorcery seems to have been frequently resorted to, and sorcerers were numerous, even among populations converted to Christianity. The Salic law punished with a fine of 100 sous anyone causing the death of a person by a drink made from magical herbs. Some Christians secretly wore amulets, offered sacrifice at the side of springs, met together in open places and there shouted terrible cries when an eclipse of the moon occurred. The Church patiently strove against these survivals of barbarism as she had done against the vestiges of Roman paganism. The worship of local saints, which she spread throughout the territory,[26] devotion to their holy relics, numerous pilgrimages to the tomb of St. Martin of Tours, the building of basilicas and chapels, such as the Basilica of St. Denis at Paris, built by order of Clovis and at the suggestion of St. Genevieve, the splendors of the liturgy displayed in the churches and prompting these barbarians to ask "whether this was not the heaven that had been promised them," such were the chief means by which bishops, priests, and monks little by little turned the faithful away from their superstí-

[23] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* p. 339.
[24] *Vita S. Vedasti; Acta sanctorum,* February 6, p. 782.
[25] *Vita S. Amandi, op. cit.,* p. 815.
[26] St. Gregory of Tours, *De gloria martyrum* and *De gloria confessorum.*

tious practices. But we must by no means suppose that the Church, under these circumstances, forsook her primitive ideal or changed her traditional organization. She was considerate, as she always had been; she was resigned to see her children gradually, step by step, rise to the perfection of holiness. She pardoned a great deal in those who had done much to come to her. She often repeated these words addressed by St. Remigius to the detractors of Clovis: "Much must be pardoned in him who has become the propagator of the faith and the savior of the provinces." Who would dare say that the Church, by acting thus, repudiated the spirit of the Gospel? [27]

After Clovis' death a social unrest was added to the interior distress that troubled men's souls. In the disorders following the death of the great conqueror, divergent movements appeared among the populations he had brought under his sway. Over and above the petty rivalries of one group against another, two tendencies in particular became evident among these barbarians, some of whom were attracted by the splendor of the Roman civilization, and others jealously clung to their personal independence which they inherited from their German ancestors. And perhaps the terrible strife between Neustria and Austrasia, in which two women, Fredegonda and Brunehilde, played so infamous a part, was prolonged and embittered because it was an expression of all the hatreds imperceptibly stirred up by the two rival tendencies. As a remedy for these disintegrating tendencies, the Church applied her principle of spiritual unity. Says Guizot:

[27] Marignan (*Études sur la civilisation française,* I, 13, 249, and *passim*) charges the Church with having, at this period, given up its primitive ideal and its early organization. He says it became idolatrous and hierarchical. To this Kurth replies: "The Christian faith and the Christian Church remained what they had been in the catacombs, except, of course, what can be called the progress of growth. The pagan residue fermented a long time in the bottom. But it is not the comparative barbarism of the neophytes that one should appeal to in falsely claiming that the Church became barbarian like them." *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVIII (1900), 212.

This is a glorious and powerful fact. . . . The mere fact of the unity of the Church maintained some tie between countries and nations, some sentiments of a vast sympathy continued to be developed; and from the very heart of the most frightful confusion that the world has ever known, arose perhaps the most extensive and the purest idea that has ever rallied mankind, the idea of that spiritual society.[28]

The idea of that spiritual society was such as to satisfy the two great tendencies dividing those men. By its organization, its laws, and its public worship, the Church gave them, in the way of majestic orderliness, everything the Roman civilization could offer; by its regard for the individual soul and by its doctrine concerning the independence of the Christian conscience, it safeguarded their legitimate concern for the rights of the human person.

Influence of Monasticism

So long as spiritual unity is not incorporated in a custom and established in an institution, it simply creates an unstable group, at the mercy of every threatening peril.

Nothing could be assured until the newly converted nation would be given, along with habits of manual and intellectual labor, a permanence of family and village groups on the soil. This task was undertaken by the monks.

They came from southern Gaul, from Italy, and from Ireland. The hard conditions imposed by the Roman fiscal legislation had rendered farming very difficult: the inroads of the barbarians completed its ruin. At the end of the fifth century, the forests, gradually encroaching upon the cleared land, finally here and there became united. Irish monks, trained under the strict Rule of St. Columban, came thither seeking, in a log-cabin, in a cave, in the shelter of the ruins of some Roman *castra,*[29] a secluded place for prayer. Probably these monks

[28] Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* lesson 12.

[29] St. Columban first stopped in the Vosges at a place called Anagray, where there were ruins of a Roman *castrum.*

found, as St. Bernard did, that the forest sometimes speaks to the pious soul better than a book, that trees and rocks have speech more penetrating than the discourses of renowned orators.[30] A lost traveler or a wandering peasant would meet the hermit and, impressed by his holiness, would beg the favor of living under his guidance. The hermit would become a cenobite and abbot. Men, whole families, fearing attacks of brigands, would come and seek a bit of security near the little group. The monk becomes transformed into the head of a village. Under his direction humble dwellings arise, clearings are opened in the forest, rude plows cultivate the soil. Sometimes the village becomes a city. When, at the close of the seventh century, the excessively stern Rule of St. Columban had been replaced by the more adaptable Rule of St. Benedict, the monks increased in number and varied their labors; the village was encompassed by gardens. It has been reckoned that three-eighths of the cities and villages of France owe their existence to the monks.[31] "It is by thousands," says Giry, "that place-names of religious origin are to be found on the map of France." [32] Most of these places owe their names to the settlement of Benedictine monks there. St. Theodulph, after being a great nobleman, became a monk, farmer, and architect. After his death, a village founded by him kept his plow and hung it in the church as a relic.[33] Says Montalembert: "It seems to me that we should all contemplate with emotion, if it still existed, that monk's plow, doubly sacred by religion and by labor, by history and by virtue. For myself, I feel that I should kiss it as willingly as the sword of Charlemagne or the pen of Bossuet." [34]

The biographies of the holy monks of that period abound in

[30] *Aliquid amplius invenies in sylvis quam in libris. Ligna ac lapides docebunt te quod a magistro audire non possis.* St. Bernard, *Ep.*, 106.

[31] Martin, *Les moines et leur influence sociale*, I, 82.

[32] Giry, *Manuel de diplomatique*, pp. 394 ff.

[33] *Acta sanctorum*, May 1, pp. 95 ff.

[34] Montalembert, *The Monks of the West*, II, 233.

marvelous accounts in which the desire to edify and interest may have added certain pious embellishments. But these stories show the prodigious influence exercised over the barbarian world by those heroes of virtue and faith.

St. Laumer

St. Laumer, at first a shepherd, then a student, came seeking "peace and freedom" in the forests of Le Perche. But the crude hut he built for himself attracted the attention of brigands who frequented those forests. His presence irked them. They decided to kill the hermit. When he saw them appear before his cabin, the saint, perhaps enlightened by God, surmised their design. He said to them: "My children, what have you come to do?" His voice was so calm and gentle, his bearing so noble, that the brigands in consternation hesitated. The saint smiled on them, and his smile, aided by divine grace, won those untutored souls, that a mere trifle would arouse and a mere nothing would soften. "May God have mercy on you," said the hermit. "Go in peace. Give up this banditry, that you may deserve God's pardon. I possess no treasure; for I have chosen Christ for my only inheritance." At these words, says the biographer, the brigands fell at the hermit's feet, begging his mercy.[35]

St. Ebrulf

St. Ebrulf went deep into the forest of Ouche, now in the diocese of Bayeux. He was brought before the leader of a bandit band that occupied the district. Said the bandit chief to him: "Monk, what is it that brings you to this place? Do you not see that it is made for bandits, and not for hermits? To

[35] *Vita Launemari, Acta sanctorum,* January 19; Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* I, 335 ff.; *Histoire littéraire,* III, 411 f. St. Laumer died in 590, according to some writers; according to others, in 594.

exist here, one must live by theft and by the goods of others. We will not tolerate here those who purpose living by their own labor, and besides, the ground is too barren: it will be vain for you to cultivate it, it will yield nothing." To this the saint replied: "I have come here to bewail my sins. Under the protection of God, I do not fear the threats of any man or the roughness of any labor. The Lord can set a table in this wilderness for His servants, and you, too, if you will, may sit down at it with me."

To this the outlaw made no answer. The next day he came back with loaves of bread baked in ashes and a honeycomb, to join Ebrulf. He and his fellow-outlaws became the first monks of the new monastery, which has since become celebrated under the name of its holy founder.[36]

St. Marculf

Montalembert, who quotes this incident from the biography of St. Ebrulf, also relates the following episode from the life of St. Marculf:

Marculf was of a rich and powerful race, established in the country of Bayeux, and the union of the proud independence of the Frank with the rigorous austerity of the monk is everywhere apparent in the narrative of his life. He had devoted the first half of his existence to preaching the faith to the inhabitants of Cotentin; from thence we see him set out, mounted on his ass, to meet King Childebert on the day of a great festival, in the midst of his feudal lords, and asking of him a grant of land on which to build a monastery where the king and the commonwealth of the Franks might be prayed for. It was not the habitual adulation of the Romans of the Lower Empire which he used to gain the monarch's ear. "Mercy and peace to thee from Jesus Christ," he said, "illustrious prince; thou art seated on the throne of royal majesty, but thou shouldest not forget that thou art mortal,

[36] *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.*, I, 360. St. Ebrulf died in 596.

and that pride must not make thee despise thy fellow-creatures. . . . Be just even in thy clemency, and mix pity even with thy justice." Childebert granted his request.

But scarcely had he accomplished this first foundation, when, for the better enjoyment of the charms of solitude, Marculf took refuge in an island on the coast of Brittany, inhabited only by a handful of fishers. A numerous band of Saxon pirates having made a descent upon this island, the poor Bretons came trembling and kneeling to the Frank monk. "Be of good courage," he said to them; "if you trust my counsel, take your weapons, march against your enemy, and the God who overthrew Pharaoh will fight for you." They listened to him, put the Saxons to flight, and a second foundation marks the spot of that victory achieved over the piratical pagans by innocence and faith, inspired by the courage of a monk.[37]

Not only against bandits, but against wild beasts the monks protected the people and even the domestic animals. St. Martin of Vertou, says the legend, forced a bear, who had devoured his horse, to take the horse's place and thus bring him to Rome.[38] St. Herveus, the patron saint of the popular singers of Brittany, required a wolf, that had eaten his dog, to take the latter's place, and the wild beast, suddenly tamed, from that time followed on leash the roving bard on all the highways of Armorica.[39] St. Laumer, seeing a hind being pursued by wolves, wept with pity and forced the wolves to abandon their victim.[40] The Bollandists are careful to warn us not to interpret legends like these too literally.[41] Scholars have pointed out their real origin. Says Montalembert:

After the gradual disappearance of the Gallo-Roman population, the oxen, horses, and dogs had returned to a savage state, and it was in the forests that the British missionaries had to seek these animals to

[37] Montalembert, *Monks of the West,* II, 142. Cf. *Acta sanctorum,* May 1; *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* I, 128. St. Marculf died in 560. *Hist. littéraire,* III, 550.

[38] *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* I, 362.

[39] H. de la Villemarqué, *Légende celtique,* p. 264.

[40] *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* I, 319, 324.

[41] Bollandists, *Comment. praev.,* no. 9.

employ them anew for domestic uses. The miracle consisted in restoring to man the empire and use of the creatures which God has given for instruments. This redomestication of animals which had relapsed into a savage condition is one of the most interesting episodes in the civilizing mission of the ancient cenobites.[42]

While monks were clearing the ground, bishops of the Latin race [43] were spreading a taste for letters. St. Avitus of Vienne composed a poem on the fall of our first parents; Guizot compares it with Milton's *Paradise Lost* and, in the case of some passages, considers the Gallo-Roman bishop superior to Milton. St. Fortunatus of Poitiers became a sort of official poet of the Merovingian kings. And St. Gregory of Tours, in his *History of the Franks,* gives us a vivid account of all Gaul in the sixth century, while popular songs, in an uncultured but spirited tongue, prefaced the national epics of France.

The Salic Law

It is in a Latin abounding with barbarisms and solecisms but replete with learned expressions and choice epithets, that Gregory of Tours and the poets sometimes wrote. In Latin, too, the Merovingian kings, who prided themselves on fine language, had their law drawn up. The law of the Salian Franks, the Salic law, is the oldest and most original of all those which have governed the peoples of Germany. It is the compilation, begun by Clovis, of a body of previously unwritten customs regulating private law. It seems to have received its final form under King Dagobert. The influence of Christianity did not greatly affect this legal monument, which the Franks regarded as something almost sacred. The Church merely had the traditional regulations applied, so far as possible, in a Christian spirit.

[42] Montalembert, *Monks of the West,* II, 226.

[43] Many monks' names (Marculf, Ebrulf, Laumer, Herveus, Thierry) indicate Germanic or Celtic origin.

But many medieval customs are clarified by the reading of this first document of French national legislation. The whole symbolism of land rents, at times fantastical, appears in those graphic regulations for the gift of land or for freeing a person from the ties of kinship. Anybody wishing to make a donation of all or part of his possessions threw into the lap of the person to receive the donation a piece of a bush, a reed, a blade of grass, or any like object, while specifically naming the thing being given.[44] Whoever wished to withdraw from the rights and obligations of relationship came before the court with three alder switches, which he then broke upon his head and cast away in the four directions.[45]

Another symbolism was taken from that "horrible poetry," spoken of by Livy in connection with the law of the Twelve Tables.[46] A murderer who was too poor to pay the required compensation, had a means of forcing his relatives to pay for him. He enters their house, piles up, in each corner, a little dirt or dust, as though requesting them to gather up their smallest savings; he squeezes the dust in his fist, then throws it over the shoulders of three of his relatives. Next he removes his shoes and nearly all his clothes, and climbs upon the hedge or whatever enclosure surrounds his relatives' house. If these kinsfolk do not pay his wergeld, he is put to death.[47] Apparently other provisions of the law show the Germanic origin of ordeals or judgments of God. A lawsuit might be settled by the ordeal of the caldron full of boiling water, that of hot iron or cold water or the crossed arms, or by private combat.[48]

[44] Title 48, Baluze, *Capitularia,* I, 313 f.; Pardessus, *La loi salique,* p. 309.

[45] Title 63, art. 1, Baluze, *op. cit.,* p. 321; Pardessus, p. 318.

[46] *Lex horrendi carminis.* Livy.

[47] Title 61, Baluze, *op. cit.,* pp. 320 f.; Pardessus, pp. 317 f.

[48] The Salic law mentions only one sort of ordeal, that of the caldron of boiling water (*aeneum,* Livy, LV). But, says Pardessus, "it would not be correct to conclude that no other ordeals were used" (Pardessus, *op. cit.,* p. 632). Cf. Du Cange, *Glossarium.* The use of private combat is attested among the Franks by chapter 28 of the *Capita extravagantia* and by St. Gregory of Tours (Pardessus, p. 634). Cf.

Lastly, the money compensation for various physical injuries, by the payment of six solidi, thirty, forty-five, etc., enables us to understand the similar tariffs in the penitential books.

The Salic law gives only indirect and vague indications as to the political organization and social institutions.[49] In this realm, the Church felt freer to act. The changing conditions in the life of the Frankish people required corresponding modifications in the laws and institutions. The kings themselves asked the Church to help them govern. "The founder of the Merovingian dynasty could not do without the Church for the governing of Roman Gaul. For the training of the Franks themselves and of the German people, his auxiliaries or his vanquished subjects, he was equally in need of the Church." [50] The Church answered the appeal. Under her influence, the character and rôle of royalty and of the national assemblies were altered, the condition of persons and property underwent important modifications.

Political Institutions

"The Church elevated and transformed the pagan concept of royalty. She obtained the acceptance of the idea of a divine institution. But she did not, for this reason, reject the popular idea of election; she could not have done so and had nothing to gain by doing so. Although the power comes from God, the divine choice may assume variable forms. It is as well adapted to pure democracy as to absolute and hereditary monarchy. In the latter, God manifests His will by bringing about the birth of an heir to the throne; in popular government or an oligarchy, He does so by insuring the electors." [51] Says Hincmar

De Smedt, *Les origines du duel judiciaire. Congrès des sav. cath. Sc. hist.*, pp. 333 ff.

[49] No rule for the royal succession has been found in the Salic law.

[50] Flach, *Les origines de l'ancienne France*, III, 245. Cf. *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, IV, 439.

[51] Flach, *op. cit.*, III, 237; *Revue d'hist. eccl.*, IV, 433. In the period previous to the invasion, was the kingship hereditary or elective? Wilhelm Sickel has tried to

of Reims: "Some are made rulers directly by God, as in the case of Moses; others are likewise chosen by Him, but indirectly through designation by men, as in the case of Josue; still others, by men themselves, but not without a divine approbation." [52] Later on, coronation confirmed the sacred character of royalty, but did not create it.[53]

Was the power of the Merovingian kings originally limited by assemblies? Long discussions on this subject seem to show that the first kings of the Merovingian race were not subject to any regular control by a national deliberative assembly. The texts advanced in opposition to this view [54] may be explained either by the occasional institution of advisory bodies, or by the mutiny of an army in revolt trying to impose its will upon the king.[55] It was the influence of the clergy that seems to have established, in the latter period of the Merovingian royalty, the regularity of national assemblies. The periodical meeting of national councils, where the bishops considered not only questions of dogma and ecclesiastical discipline, but also matters of education and public relief, gave the lay nobility the idea of holding meetings of their own. The bishops joined them. By their intellectual culture and the loftiness of their character, the bishops soon became the chief personages of these assemblies.[56] In case of abuse of royal power, the kings found that the bishops were the opponents they had to fear most. The lay nobles were mostly government officials remov-

prove that it was elective. Achille Luchaire inclines to the contrary opinion. Luchaire, *Institutions monarchiques de la France,* I, 61.

[52] *Quidam a Deo in principatu constituuntur ut Moyses. . . . Quidam vero a Deo per hominem ut Josue. . . . Quidam autem per hominem, non sine nutu divino.* Hincmar, *De divortio Lotharii,* q. 6; *PL,* CXXV, 758.

[53] Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 233 f.

[54] For example, St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* p. 93.

[55] These are the conclusions reached by Fustel de Coulanges, III, 98, and Pfister, in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* II, p. 174.

[56] Pfister in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* II, 174.

able at the king's pleasure. A bishop was, in principle, irremovable.[57]

Social Institutions

At the same time that the Church was moderating the royal power and imbuing the national assemblies with a Christian influence, she was also elevating and alleviating the condition of the people.

Among the Franks, as among the Romans, she found the institution of slavery. The word "slave" seems to come to us from that period, because many of those unfortunates belonged to the Slav race. The Church took pains to remind the slaves of their spiritual rights and duties, and to admonish the masters of their responsibility before God. In 517 the Council of Epaon decreed a two years' excommunication against anyone killing a slave who had not been condemned by a court, declared the marriage of slaves lawful, forbade the separation, through sale, of a husband from his wife or from his children.[58] The Church gladly received enfranchised slaves into her hierarchy. St. Gregory of Tours proudly relates the story of a slave of the Auvergne district, one Portianus, who fled to a monastery. His master, coming there to recover him, was stricken with blindness and gave up the slave. Partianus became a monk, then abbot; and King Thierry, when preparing to devastate Auvergne, on his way met Portianus, who reproved the King and made him go back.[59] The Church raised

[57] Cf. Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* p. 335.

[58] This city of Epaon has not been identified. But the council bearing this name was certainly held in the year 517. *Histoire littéraire,* III, 91–93. The Council of Epaon was not the only one that considered the question of slaves in France during the Merovingian period. We should add the following councils: Orleans (511), Reims (525), Orleans (fourth and fifth, 541 and 549), Paris (615), Reims (625), Chalons (647, 649), and Rouen (650). See the texts in Sirmond, *Conc. antiq. Galliae,* Vol. I.

[59] St. Gregory of Tours, *Vitae patrum; PL,* LXXI, 1026.

Portianus to her altars. The city of Saint-Pourçain in the Allier district preserves the memory of the former slave who, through the kindness of the Church, became the savior of the district.

The progressive amelioration in the condition of serfs and *coloni,*[60] the evolution of jurisprudence, which wiped out the legal inequality between a man of Salian origin and one of Roman origin,[61] the transformation which replaced the old caste nobility of the Franks [62] and the Gallo-Roman aristocracy by a new social hierarchy based on "recommendation," [63] into which bishops and abbots entered; [64] all these advances of a social progress, without being the exclusive work of the Church, were greatly aided by her and at that time probably would not have been possible without her. Moreover, the Church "supplied the state with its principal officials, had access to the council, to the court; there it held the first place and, in the great annual assemblies, exercised a preponderant influence." [65]

St. Eligius and St. Leodegar

The Frankish Church was especially the Frankish episcopate. Two great men, two great saints, are particularly conspicuous among the bishops of the Merovingian epoch: St. Eligius bishop of Noyon and St. Leodegar bishop of Autun. Born in the neighborhood of Limoges, Eligius (or Eloi) was at first a member of the "palace school," which at that period

[60] Fustel de Coulanges, "Le colonat romain" in the *Recherches sur quelques problèmes d'histoire.*

[61] Pfister, *op. cit.,* pp. 198 f. The Salic law evaluated the Salian franc at 200 sous, and the Roman franc at only 100 sous.

[62] According to Roth, the old caste nobility disappeared after the invasions, or rather it was reduced to a single family, that of Merovius. Roth, *Geschichte des Beneficialwesens* and *Feudälität und Underthassen verband.*

[63] Waitz, *Ueber die Anfänge der Vassalität.*

[64] We should not conclude from this that thereby the Church became a sort of nationality vassal to the Frankish nationality. Says Flach: "Rather I think there was a religious Francia beside a lay Francia." *Origines de l'ancienne France,* III, 244.

[65] Flach, *op. cit.,* III, 245.

seems to have been merely the group of officers attached to the court.[66] He therefore belonged to that moving capital, that itinerant government which the royal court of the first dynasty really was. Besides working as a goldsmith, he negotiated, in the king's name, a peace treaty with the Breton King Judicael, founded monasteries, engaged in the work of the redemption of slaves, took an active part in the Council of Chalons, organized hospices for the poor and for pilgrims, went as a missioner to the Frisians and barbarian tribes of the seacoast. His influence was preponderant under Clotaire and Dagobert, and became still greater in the regency of St. Bathilde. The renown of his virtues and the miracles that followed his death soon set his name beside the names of St. Martin of Tours and St. Genevieve of Paris, among the names of the great popular saints of France.

More involved in political activities and more dramatic was the life of St. Leodegar; more spirited were the admiration and the enmity he aroused. The courage with which, as minister of Chilperic II, he reproached the king for his incestuous marriage, and the holy daring with which he opposed the policy of the cruel Ebroin, led to his imprisonment and death amid terrible suffering. The churches of France disputed with one another for the possession of the relics of "this martyr who died for his fellow-citizens," [67] "this heavenly man whom the aging world could not endure," [68] "this tutelary patron of the kingdom of France." [69] For a time his cult almost equaled that of St. Martin.[70]

[66] Vacandard, "La schola du palais mérovingien," in *Rev. des quest. historiques;* Prou, *Les monnaies mérovingiennes;* Paul Parsy, *Saint Eloi,* pp. 74 f.

[67] *Martyr . . . non tantum sibi sed et civibus.* S. Marc Taurin, homily 31.

[68] *Virilitatem viri coelestis senescens mundus non valuit sustinere.* Anon. oeduens, *Historiens de la Gaule.* II, 614.

[69] *Tanti sibi tutelaris patrocinium demereri universum Galliarum regnum praecipua devotione adlaboravit. Menolog. Benedict.,* October 2.

[70] Kurth, "Glossaire toponymique de la commune de Saint-Léger" in the *Compte-rendus du congrès archéologique de Namur,* 1886, p. 302. Cf. Pitra, *Histoire de saint Léger.*

Upon a more restricted field of action we may point out two other bishops of Gaul, St. Ouen and St. Amandus. The former at Rouen and the latter at Bourges, Ghent, and Tournai, labored with unwearied zeal for the Christian civilization of France.

The Rural Clergy

Laboring under the direction of the bishops and at the side of the monks, the humble secular country clergy should not be forgotten. In the fourth century a most important event occurred in the history of the Church: the rural parish was born. It made its appearance in the Narbonne part of Gaul,[71] and spread from there among the Burgundians and the Franks. Near a chapel erected to the memory of some saint, a priest took up his residence; with the offerings placed on the altar, a patrimony was constituted to the venerated saint.[72] The people formed the habit of coming to the chapel to receive the sacraments, listen to the preaching, and attend the holy sacrifice. It became their meeting place. Thus the parish was founded. In the sixth century the bishops recognized the autonomy of this new organization. The priest serving the chapel, who at that time was called the "priest rector," "diocesan priest," "priest of the people," [73] was nearly always, from that time on, designated at a public meeting by the archdeacon, with the approval of the inhabitants.[74] He himself belonged to the popular classes.

The chronicles of the time have little to say about him. The monastic annalists tell mostly of the labors of the monks. The activities of the bishops, who for the most part belonged to

[71] Mansi, II, 275.

[72] See the following councils: Orleans (511), Carpentras (527), and Orleans (538).

[73] *Presbyter regens ecclesiam, presbyter dioecesanus, presbyter plebius.* The word "curé" in Vacant's *Dict. de théologie.*

[74] Imbart de la Tour, *Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse,* p. 271.

the great Gallo-Roman families and were more or less engaged in the public affairs of the nation, could not pass unobserved. But no one thought of transmitting to posterity the names of those village pastors who, in a hidden, uneventful ministry, were administering the sacraments, reforming popular morals by the rough discipline of penance, were prudently and wisely distributing the bread of the apostolic word and that of the Eucharist, while the monks, most of them simply tonsured, did not go beyond instructing the barbarians and offering the edification of their own virtues. These humble priests were also the originators of public liberties. It was in the "parish meetings," presided over by the pastor, that the people might become acquainted with the management of public funds and learned to discuss matters of general interest to the community. The village movement of the Middle Ages owed more to the Christian parish than to the Roman municipium. Unknown heroes, whose names are not found even in the list of the saints, as though humility must cover them in life and in death, these hard-working pastors of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, deserve the praise and homage which history has so often failed to give them.

The Popes and the Frankish Church

Above the work of monks, priests, and bishops, that of the papacy must not be forgotten. The period before the coming of St. Gregory the Great offers us indeed but little direct evidence of papal intervention in the discipline of the Church in France. But the paucity of documents concerning this period is well known. All the letters addressed to the Holy See by the Frankish episcopacy and the royalty have been lost.[75] And we cannot doubt but that a large number of papal letters of this

[75] St. Gregory's *registrum* mentions several of these letters. See V, 58; VI, 55; VIII, 4; XI, 10, 40, 44, 47, 49, 50; XIII, 7, 9.

period have been lost also. Furthermore, the publication, in the fifth and sixth centuries, of several codifications of canonical regulations rendered less frequent, for one or two centuries, the requests addressed to the Holy See for disciplinary intervention. A few instances cited by St. Gregory of Tours show sufficiently, nevertheless, in what relation of respectful dependence the Frankish episcopacy was toward the Holy See.[76] Similar considerations ought to be made on the Merovingian period that followed the death of St. Gregory the Great. After Gregory of Tours we no longer find any history written from even a slightly general point of view. Some chroniclers and a few hagiographers with a view limited to the province or the monastery where they wrote: these are the only sources from which we can obtain information.[77] Moreover, the seventh century was marked by a powerful influence of the Benedictine monks upon society, and we know the close ties that always bound the Benedictine Order to the Holy See.

But St. Gregory the Great's correspondence, in spite of its big gaps, abundantly shows how effective the influence of the papacy was upon the Frankish Church. "St. Gregory exercised the powers that had strengthened the authority of the Apostolic See in the fifth century and had been made more precise at the beginning of the sixth century in southern Gaul." [78] He was vigilant in the matter of the strict observance of ecclesiastical laws;[79] he called to mind, in a letter to the Frankish bishops, the laws about episcopal nominations, about women and clerics living together, and about the holding of

[76] *MGH,* II, 1; V, 20; X, 1.

[77] Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* V, viii–xx; Pitra, *Histoire de saint Léger,* pp. vi f.

[78] Vaes, "La papauté et l'église franque," in *Rev. d'hist. eccle.,* VI, 782. We have merely summarized two scholarly articles by Vaes in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain), 1905.

[79] It is generally admitted that in the fifth century the pope exercised a supreme legislative and judiciary authority in Gaul. Loening, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts,* II, 62.

provincial councils.[80] He judged and censured the conduct of several members of the episcopacy.[81]

St. Gregory's paternal solicitude did more than contribute to making the Frankish nation a Christian nation, it also succeeded in making it an apostolic nation. When, in 596, he sent the monk Augustine to carry the faith to England, St. Gregory recommended him to the bishops of Aix, Lyons, Autun, and Tours, and asked for him the protection of the Frankish princes.[82] It was in Gaul that Augustine received episcopal consecration; it was with the help of Frankish priests that he faced the barbarian tribes of England, whose incomprehensible language dismayed him. And St. Gregory could write later to Queen Brunehilde and to her grandson that the triumph of the faith in England was due mostly to assistance given by the Franks.[83] This was the beginning of the fulfilment of St. Avitus' wish that he expressed in a letter to King Clovis. "May you be able," he said, "to carry this treasure of the faith, that you have in your heart, to those peoples that are settled beyond your frontiers."

[80] *MGH, Reg.,* IX, 218.

[81] He passed judgment on the conduct of Mena of Toulon, Virgilius of Arles, Soacre of Autun, Theodore of Marseilles, Serenus of Marseilles, Desiderius of Vienne, and others. Cf. *MGH, Reg.,* I, 45; VI, 51; IX, 208, 223 f.; XI, 34, 38; XIII, 7. See also VIII, 4; IX 213, 215, 218; XI, 10, 46.

[82] *MGH, Reg.,* VI, 49, 57; Jaffé, I, 1432, 1433.

[83] *MGH, Reg.,* XI, 48. On the civilizing influence of the Frankish Church, see especially Vacandard, *Vie de saint Ouen;* Jaud, *Vie de saint Filibert;* Allard, "L'esclavage au lendemain des invasions" in *Revue des quest. hist.,* April 1, 1911; De la Borderie, *Histoire de Bretagne,* Vol. I.

CHAPTER VI

The Church among the Anglo-Saxons

THE island of Great Britain, in the sixth century, was inhabited by two rival races: the Britons, belonging to the Celtic family, and the Anglo-Saxons, sprung from the German family. The Britons were the primitive inhabitants of the island.[1] At an early date they had been converted to the Christian faith. They were proud of their apostle St. Patrick and their martyr St. Alban, proud of the part taken by their bishops at the councils of Arles and of Sardica, proud also of their race, which they thought unconquerable.[2] A great heresy originated in their midst.[3] The Briton Pelagius had disturbed the West and the East, exalting the power of the natural virtues and lessening the part of divine grace; perhaps some of them were proud of this also.

But the Britons were now, in England, merely a handful of mountaineers who had sought refuge in Wales. During the second half of the fifth century three warlike tribes—Saxons, Angles, and Jutes [4]—had driven the Britons before them with

[1] Caesar, *Commentaries,* V, 12.

[2] Says Tacitus: "The Britons cheerfully submit to levies, tributes, and the other services of government . . . but such treatment they bear with impatience, their subjection only extending to obedience, not to servitude, if they are not treated injuriously." *Life of Agricola,* chap. 13.

[3] Some scholars suppose that Pelagius composed his system at Rome. Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne,* p. 32.

[4] A large party of Jutes settled on the peninsula since called Jutland. Four Saxon chiefs founded four kingdoms, namely, Kent, Sussex, Wessex, and Essex. The Angles founded three kingdoms: Northumbria, East Anglia, and Mercia or West Anglia. The seven kingdoms constituted what has been called the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy. It embraced what is now England (except Wales) and the southern part of Scotland.

great violence. One of the witnesses of this disaster, the monk Gildas, in his strange style, says: "The fire of vengeance, justly kindled by former crimes, spread from sea to sea, fed by the hands of our foes, in the east; and did not cease until, destroying the neighboring towns and lands, it reached the other side of the island and dipped its red and savage tongue in the western ocean." [5] "The priests were slain," says Venerable Bede; "the bishops with their flock were cut off by sword as well as by fire without respect to their dignity, nor was there any that would give burial to them that had been cruelly slain." [6] Theonus bishop of London and Tadioc bishop of York reached the mountains of Wales with the remnants of their Christian communities. A large number, crowding into their boats of animal hides, with their priests and their minstrels, came to Amorica,[7] and even to Spain. Of the numerous monuments of the Christian faith erected by the old Britons on the soil of their country, scarcely one remained except the little church, later dedicated to St. Martin, which Christian piety still venerates at Canterbury.

St. Augustine of Canterbury

The new race brought to England the customs of the peoples of Germany, their political organization and their mythology, with certain traits that were particularly fierce and brutal, but also remarkably sturdy. These tall, blue-eyed men,[8] were proud of repeating verses of their poets, "celebrating battlefields where blood flowed, and the meals at which they ate the hearts of their foes, and the cursed places where the black

[5] Gildas, *De excidio Britanniae,* chap. 24; *PL,* LXIX, 345; Petrie, *Monumenta historica britannica,* p. 14.

[6] Bede, *History of the Church of England,* Bk. I, chap. 15; *PL,* XCV, 44.

[7] This was a blessing for Brittany, which has reverently preserved the cult of the holy bishops who brought it the faith: St. Brieuc, St. Pol, St. Corentinus, and St. Machutus (Malo).

[8] *Coerulei oculi, magna corpora,* says Tacitus, *De mor. Germ.,* chap. 4.

waves reached up to the clouds," but they also liked the poems in which the solemn thought of death contained nothing dreadful; and when they sang of love it was of a deep and faithful love that would easily become knightly love.[9]

This is why their appearance, ferocious in the heat of battle, when in repose awakened feelings of liking. St. Gregory, seeing some young Anglo-Saxons in the Roman Forum, lamented the fact that "the grace of God did not dwell within those beautiful brows." Being unable himself to carry the faith to them, he selected forty monks from St. Andrew's monastery to bring those people the light of the Gospel. These monks were all of humble origin. They were "monks fearing the Lord," says Venerable Bede. We have no details as to the origin and vocation of him who, after being prior of St. Andrew's, became the head of this mission to England. His name was Augustine. From St. Gregory's letters we know that the little band, when crossing through Gaul, where the Pope recommended them to several holy bishops, suddenly became disheartened. Terrifying rumors were current among the people around them, regarding those awful conquerors of Britain, whom the historian Procopius speaks of as being half fantastic and very wicked. The good monks, accustomed to the tranquil life of their monastery, were disturbed. Augustine, their leader, had to go back to Rome for further instructions. He returned with the following letter, and the missioners were strengthened by its calm, confident energy. Says the Pope:

You must needs, my beloved sons, now fulfil the good work which by the help of God you have taken in hand. Let therefore neither the travail of the journey nor the talk of evil-tongued men dismay you. Be you in all points humbly obedient to Augustine your provost, that now returneth to you. . . . The Almighty God grant that . . . though I cannot myself labor with you, I may be found to enjoy part

[9] See several of these songs in Augustin Thierry, *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*, I, 131.

of your reward along with you, for that surely I have a will to labor. God keep you in safety, my dear beloved children.[10]

Augustine was the bearer of other letters from St. Gregory. One was addressed to Queen Brunehilde, then at the height of her power. The Pope, in deferential terms,[11] recommended his forty missioners to the sovereign protection of the Queen of Austrasia. The whole winter of 596 was used in crossing Gaul. In the spring of 597 a boat, carrying Augustine, his monks, and some Frankish priests who were to serve as interpreters, entered the mouth of the Thames River and landed on the island of Thanet. A letter was at once sent to Ethelbert, king of Kent, telling him that the messengers from Rome had come, bringing to him and his people the glad tidings of the kingdom of God.

Augustine, informed in Gaul, knew the history of this young Anglo-Saxon King, spirited and proud, ambitious and upright, who seven years before had sought a marriage among the Catholic princesses at the court of the kings of France. A great-granddaughter of St. Clotilda, worthy descendant of Bertha the wife of Clovis, and only daughter (an orphan) of Charibert I (king of Paris) and the unfortunate Queen Ingoberga, had consented to unite her destiny with that of the pagan monarch. She brought to England with her, as chaplain, the pious bishop of Senlis, Luidhard. In the little Canterbury chapel, last remains of the Briton Church, which the

[10] *MGH, Reg. Gregor.,* VI, 15; *PL,* LXXVII, 836; Bede, *History of the Church of England,* Bk. I, chap. 23.

[11] The general tone of St. Gregory's correspondence with Queen Brunehilde has astonished many historians. They ask how a pope could shower praises upon the terrible and bloody Queen of Austrasia. But a better informed criticism has rehabilitated, if not Brunehilde's political régime, which was that of royal absolutism, at least her character, which was noble, and her private life, which was blameless. See Kurth, "Brunehaut" in *Revue des questions historiques,* I (1891), 5 ff., and Pfister in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* II, 148 f. Moreover, St. Gregory's letter was written before the period in which took place the crimes for which the Queen of Austrasia is blamed.

King placed at her disposal and which she dedicated to St. Martin the patron saint of her own country, Queen Bertha had the consolation of worshiping according to the religion of France.

The King, who probably had been disposed in favor of Christianity by his conversations with the Queen and Bishop Luidhard, judged all these religious questions with his barbarian prejudices. He agreed to a conference with the Roman messengers; but it must be held in the open air, he said, lest he be the victim of some evil influence which the strangers might cast upon him.[12] The Venerable Bede gives this account of the meeting. "On the appointed day, the King came to the island of Thanet and sat down, surrounded by his warriors." Probably, according to custom, "they came each one armed with spear or sword, wearing a helmet of boar's head, a coat of mail, and a wooden shield with iron bosses." [13] The ancient historian of England continues his account thus:

The monks came not armed with the force of the devil but with the strength of God, carrying before them in place of a banner a cross of silver and the image of the Lord Savior painted in a table, and singing the litanies, prayed the Lord both for their own eternal salvation and that of them as well to whom and for whose sake they had come thither.[14] And when they sitting down, as the King did bid them, preached unto him the word of life and also to all his household there present, he answered them, saying: "The words and promises you give us are fair; but yet, for that they are strange and uncertain, I cannot rashly assent unto them, forsaking those things which this long time I have observed with all the people of the English. But for so much as you are come hither so far and, as I seem to have dis-

[12] Bede, *op. cit.*, Bk. I, chap. 25.

[13] Brou, *Saint Augustin*, p. 54.

[14] "In the history of the Church there is nothing more beautiful than the entry of the holy monk Augustine into the Kingdom of Kent with his forty companions who, preceded by the cross and the image of the great King our Lord Jesus Christ, made solemn vows for the conversion of England." Bossuet, *L'Histoire universelle*, Part I, eleventh epoch.

cerned, have longing to impart to us also such knowledge as you took to be right good and true, we will not seek your trouble." He allowed them therefore a lodging in the city of Durovernum (Canterbury) . . . and did not withhold the licence of preaching.[15]

This scene, described by Venerable Bede, is characteristic. It reveals, even at that early date, the prudent calculation and wise breadth of view that would later be manifested in the genius of the great English nation. In the uproar of a battle-field the first Christian king of France, Clovis, decides his future and that of his people with a spontaneous and enthusiastic act; the Anglo-Saxon king, seated on his grassy knoll, has the appearance of promulgating, after calm deliberation, a charter of civil and religious liberty.[16]

Conversion of Ethelbert

Bertha's gentle influence and Luidhard's learned explanations accomplished, in the soul of the King and his warriors, what Augustine's discourse had begun. In the year 597, on Pentecost, 101 years after the baptism of the King of the Franks, the King of Kent was baptized in the old Church of St. Martin at Canterbury.[17] On Christmas Day of that same year, ten thousand of his subjects followed his example.[18] At the cradle of Christian England as at that of Christian France, a pious wife had prepared the way for the minister of the Church. This scene would be repeated more than once in the history of the conversion of barbarous nations "as if," says an old his-

[15] Bede, Bk. I, chap. 25; *PL,* XCV, 55 f.

[16] Lord Granville had a monument placed at the spot where tradition assigns this meeting.

[17] In St. Martin's Church is the baptismal font which, according to a respectable tradition, was used at the baptism of King Ethelbert.

[18] Meanwhile Augustine went to Arles to be consecrated. Since Rome was too remote, St. Gregory indicated the city of Arles, "from which the faith radiated throughout Gaul" and which would be a sort of second Rome. *Reg. Greg.,* VI, 53.

torian, "Providence wished to place woman at the side of every cradle."

St. Gregory the Great, who was then revising his *Book of Morals,* was impelled to insert this expression of his joy:

> Lo! the tongue of Britain, which knew only how to grate barbarian sounds, has begun long since to resound in the divine praises the Hebrew Alleluia. Behold the ocean, which before was swelling, is now calmed beneath, and subject to, the feet of the saints; and its barbarous motions, which the princes of the earth had been unable to control with the sword, do the mouths of priests bind with simple words through fear of God.[19]

The Pope wrote to Queen Bertha that she was the Helena of the new Constantine. The new Constantine, like the other, abandoned his city and his palace to Augustine, and withdrew to the northern coast, to Reculver. This was his "donation." Says Duchesne: "It may be that Ethelbert acted thus under the influence of the account given him of the story of Constantine the Great. His wooden palace was his Lateran, Augustine his Sylvester, and Reculver his Byzantium." [20] Canterbury became a little Rome. Its abbey was exempted from taxation, it received the *Infangentheof,* or the right to try robbers apprehended *flagrante delicto,* and the privilege of coining money. Its civil jurisdiction extended to certain quarters of the city and over more than ten rural parishes. Thus, under the influence of the same causes, ecclesiastical feudalism sprang up on the soil of England as on that of France and of Italy. Shortly afterward the Pope sent Augustine the pallium, which made him primate of England, with the mission of organizing the hierarchy in the kingdom.[21]

[19] *Morals,* Bk. XXVII, chap. 21.

[20] Duchesne, *Églises séparées,* p. 5.

[21] *MGH, Reg. Gregor.,* XI, 65. On the pallium, see Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne,* pp. 317–319.

The Britons and the Anglo-Saxons

In their joy at the conversion of the great Anglo-Saxon nation, did Augustine and Gregory entertain any illusions about the difficulties which the civilizing of that people would encounter? The Pope's letter, prematurely authorizing Augustine to organize the hierarchy throughout the realm, would lead us to think so. Those instructions could not be carried out. As was natural in a Roman missioner, Augustine's attitude also showed lack of acquaintance with the dispositions of the Anglo-Saxon people. Little by little the Archbishop of Canterbury, profiting by the lessons of experience and the advice of the Pope, applied to the work of civilizing England that prudence and discretion, prompted by the purest charity, which would assure its complete success.

Despite the unity of faith henceforth acquired, a repressed antipathy continued between the vanquished race of Britons and the victorious race of Anglo-Saxons. St. Augustine's first blunder was to disregard that opposition. To bring about the conversion of the Angles, he appealed to the priests of that Welch Church which, having withdrawn to its rugged mountains, could not forget the memory of the cruel invasions. If we are to judge from Venerable Bede's way of speaking, it seems that Augustine did not sufficiently consider the somewhat proud and susceptible character of the rough Welch mountaineers. A conference held on the banks of the Severn River, between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the delegates of the Welch Church, failed to produce any result. The Britons maintained a distrustful silence. Another conference was agreed upon. Did the Britons see in the imposing attitude of the Roman prelate, who was head and shoulders taller than they were, a sign of pride? [22] The fact is that they would not attend

[22] *Beati Augustini formam et personam patriciam, staturam proceram et arduam adeo ut a scapulis populo superemineret. Vita sancti Augustini monachi, auctore Gocelino monacho,* chap. 45.

a second conference without seeking the advice "of a certain holy and wise man who used to live amongst them an anchorite's life." They asked him whether they ought to listen to the Roman envoy.

He replied: "If he be a man of God, follow him." "And how can we prove this?" said they. The anchorite answered: "If this Augustine be meek and lowly of heart." They said again: "And how have we power to discern this?" "Marry," quoth he, "if, when ye approach near, he ariseth courteously to you, hear him obediently; but if he despise you nor will vouchsafe to rise at your presence, let him likewise be despised by you."

But when the appointed day arrived, seven Briton bishops, accompanied by several monks from the Bangor monastery, came to the place. Augustine had arrived ahead of them. Either through inadvertance or because he was unaware there were bishops among the Briton delegates, he did not at once stand up. "The seven bishops," says Bede, "and a greater number of monks, straightways waxing wroth, they noted him of pride and endeavored to gainsay all that he said." Augustine's proposals did but increase the spirit of disunion. That old Church in England, so separated from the continent, had permitted the introduction into the liturgy of particular practices, notably with regard to the celebration of Easter and the administration of baptism. Augustine asked them, not only to help him in preaching Christianity to the Anglo-Saxons, but also to conform to the Roman rite in administering baptism and to celebrate Easter on the same date as the Catholics of other countries. To each of the requests from him whom they called "the bishop of the English," that is, the bishop of their oppressors, the proud Britons replied with a firm refusal. They even said, according to Bede, that they did not recognize Augustine as having any authority over their Churches.[28] Thereupon Augus-

[28] *Neque se illum pro archiepiscopo habituros.* Bede, Bk. II, chap. 2; *PL,* XCV, 83.

tine stood up and addressed them as follows: "Know that, if you are unwilling to assist me in showing the Saxons the way of salvation, these Saxons, by a just chastisement of God, will be ministers of death unto you." Eight years later a pagan king of Northumbria invaded Wales with an army and slew more than eight hundred of those monks of Bangor, who had been the heart and soul of the opposition to Augustine's authority.[24]

We have related this incident at length because Protestants often consider those old Britons their forebears. Augustine, for these Protestants, is the Church of Rome, stern, tyrannical, and intruding; the little Welch Church stands for the Christian conscience rebelling against the encroachment of the Roman Church. Catholics, on the other hand, have at times too much attenuated, almost effaced, the import of this unfortunate incident. Impartial history, it seems to us, belies both of these extreme views. Bede's account, if we add what we know from other sources of the life of St. Augustine, does not leave any room to doubt the missioner's evangelical spirit. Furthermore, there has been nothing discovered by historical research concerning the origins of the Welch Church, showing us therein an organization essentially different from the Church of Rome. There is no basis for attributing Presbyterian doctrines to the Welch Church.[25] The rigid stubbornness of that Welch race, an opposition that erected an impassable barrier between the souls of the conquered Britons and those of the conquering Saxons,[26] a real alteration of the faith of that people through the influence of local superstitions, some remnant perhaps of the Pelagian heresy among these untutored Britons,[27] and on St. Augustine's

[24] Cf. Lingard, *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church,* chap. 2; Thierry, *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre,* I, 82 ff.

[25] Kraus, *Kirchengeschichte,* sec. 64, nos. 3 and 4.

[26] Bede, I, 22; II, 20.

[27] Bede relates how, a few years before the invasion of the Angles, "the Pelagian heresy (being brought in by Agricola, the son of Severian, a Pelagian bishop), had stained the faith of the provinces of Britain with that vile pestilence. But the Britons were unable by controversy to refute their wily and wicked persuasions; they devised

part an unfortunate misunderstanding or a fatal oversight of those popular tendencies which he failed to be considerate of and consequently certain imprudent steps and untimely demands: all this suffices to explain the thwarting of the attempt by the holy apostle of England. St. Augustine was in continual correspondence with Pope St. Gregory. The great Pontiff's consummate prudence came to the help of the inexperience of the missioner. The latter would need that assistance for the work of Christian civilization that was still to be accomplished in the Anglo-Saxon nation itself.

The Anglo-Saxons

The morals and customs of the Anglo-Saxons were not transformed at once after their conversion. The long, violent conflicts between the Celts and the Saxons had exasperated the barbaric instincts of them both. In the eighth century, of fifteen kings of Northumbria, thirteen died a violent death. The laws of Ethelbert, drawn up about the year 600, were made for a people among whom attacks upon the person are the most frequent crimes. The Penitential Book of St. Theodore which gives, at the end of the seventh century, a list of penances assigned for each sin, indicates practices of revolting immorality.[28] Drunkenness, that passion of misty countries and idle races, sometimes carried those brutal instincts to the point of a fit of madness. The slave-trade continued openly, disappearing only in the eleventh century, through the heroic efforts of Wulfstan bishop of Worcester.

this wholesome counsel, to seek for aid of the bishops of Gaul in their spiritual warfare." Bk. I, chap. 17. St. Germain of Auxerre and St. Lupus of Troyes answered this appeal. It was on their way to Britain that they met St. Genevieve at Nanterre.

[28] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England,* pp 314, 317, 318; *PL,* XCIX, 968–972. According to Paul Fournier, the use of the penitentials, that is, the list of penances tabulated for each sin, arose in the Celtic Church and from there passed to the Anglo-Saxon Church. *Revue d'H. et de L. rel.,* IX, 102. Cf. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche.*

Christian faith itself seemed to disappear for a time. Ethelbert's son and successor, Eadbald, cruel and dissolute, revived the pagan religion. Numerous defections occurred. An altar of Odin was erected at Canterbury.[29] Devout Christians had liturgical customs very different from those of Rome. From the Churches of Wales they had taken the practice of litanies, processions, numerous lections, and a very complicated liturgy of the mass. But the opposition of the two races to each other continued: and after two centuries of contact it remained almost as insoluble as at their first meeting.[30] The Britons would put no trust in the Anglo-Saxons, and the latter regarded the Briton Church as schismatic.

St. Gregory, when consulted in the matter, was of opinion that the greatest condescension and gentlest kindness should be employed toward that people. He recalled the maxim he had written in his *Books of Morals:* "Love stimulates inactive souls to work." [31] He wrote to Augustine, saying: "I wish that, from all the usages of Rome, of Gaul, or of any other Churches, you choose what seems to you most befitting the Almighty. Take what is devout, religious, and sound, and therewith make as it were a bouquet that may be the custom of the English." [32] At first the Pope had counseled King Ethelbert to demolish the temples. Shortly afterward he wrote as follows: "After re-

[29] Bede, Bk. II, chap. 5.

[30] *Ibid.,* chap. 20. Abbot Beino, so celebrated in legend, when he heard the voice of an Angle outside the monastery walls, said to his Briton monks: "Take up your frocks and your shoes, and quick, let us depart; this man's nation speaks a language abominable to me: they come to invade us, and take away our goods forever." Montalembert, *Monks of the West,* II, 419 (Bk. VIII).

[31] *Machina quippe mentis est vis amoris. Morals,* VI, 37.

[32] *MGH, Reg. Greg.,* XI, 56. This long letter is known as the *Responsiones Gregorii.* Duchesne regards it as spurious (*Christian Worship,* p. 99 note). Its authenticity is admitted by Hartmann (*MGH, Reg. Greg.,* II, 331) and by Jaffé (*Regesta pontif.,* I, 699). The view of Mommsen and Grisar is that it is comparatively authentic. If this be true, it is a collection of excerpts from letters or a revision made afterwards, based on instructions given orally by the Pope (*Civilta cattolica,* 1892, II, 46). For our present purpose, this discussion is of little importance. Nobody denies that these instructions show the practice followed by St. Augustine.

flection, I have decided that it was not suitable to destroy the temples. Sprinkle them with holy water and put altars in them. The nation will be mollified at seeing that we leave the shrines standing and will the more readily come to the places which they formerly frequented." [33] "The English offer sacrifices of bulls to the demons. The custom should be turned into some Christian festival." [34] St. Gregory went farther; he advised that banquets be combined with the religious festivals.[35] Experience showed that in this the condescension was excessive: abuses, provoked by the national vice, led the Council of Clovesho in 747 to suppress these semi-liturgical repasts.

But the spirit of St. Gregory continued to preside over the civilizing work of the Catholic missioners. "The Church," says Godefroid Kurth, "treated the soul of the barbarians as a wild sapling full of sap and vigor, on which it merely grafted the elements of a purer life, leaving to time and toil the completion of the work. The succeeding ages have confirmed the wisdom of that policy." [36] "Provided there be unity of faith," said St. Gregory, "the customs are of no moment." [37] And he was at great pains to acquaint himself with those customs. He wrote: "He is very stupid who places his primacy in being unwilling to inform himself on what best can be done." [38] In this same spirit St. Augustine, when consulted by King Ethelbert as to the reform of the country's laws, advised, notwithstanding his personal preference for the Roman law, that the national institutions be respected. The great bishop, moreover, had received from the Supreme Pontiff, for the religious government of England, very extensive powers, that made him a sort of pope

[33] *Reg.*, XI, 76.
[34] *Reg.*, I, 56.
[35] *Loc. cit.*
[36] Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne*, II, 34.
[37] *Reg.*, *IX*, 12.
[38] *Reg.*, I, 45.

in that distant realm:[39] power to create, in the southern part of the great island, twelve episcopal sees, dependent on the metropolitan see of Canterbury; even power for the north, where twelve other sees were to be connected with the metropolitan see of York.

Augustine did not have time to carry out this program. The date was 601, four years before his death. He chose one of his most zealous disciples, Lawrence, to be his successor, and consecrated him bishop. Additional helpers had come to him from Rome. He conferred the episcopal office on Justin and Mellitus. The former was put at the head of the Church of Rochester, the latter over the Church of London. These two Romans of the old stock continued Augustine's wise policy. Sebert king of Essex received baptism and, in concert with his uncle, Ethelbert king of Kent, built St. Paul's Cathedral in London, Mellitus' see.[40]

Now Mellitus was troubled with infirmities of the body, that is to say, with the gout, yet, notwithstanding, the walking of his mind was sure and sound, and passing over speedily all earthly things he hied him fast to heavenly things, which are ever to be loved, to be wished and to be sought for. . . .

In a word I will rehearse one token of his good power by which the rest may be understood. When upon a certain time the city of Canterbury was from fault or negligence taken with fire and began to consume away by much increasing of the flames, so that no man by casting of water was able to stay it, the greatest part of the city being at length near burnt and the furious flashes extending themselves to the bishop's palace, the bishop trusting in God's help, where the help of man now failed, commanded that he might be carried out of his house and set against these fierce flaws of fire flying all round about. . . .

[39] This was the expression used by Urban II at a council, when introducing one of St. Augustine's successors: *Includamus in orbe quasi alterius orbis papam.*

[40] Of this early church there still remain, near the walls of the vast present church, two or three bases of columns in a garden.

When the bishop by the hands of his servants was brought thither, he began with prayer, sick as he was, to drive away the peril which the stout strength of strong men with much labor could not before bring to pass. And behold, the wind that blew from the south, first drew off the blast of his fury from hurting the places right over in the other side, and straightway sinking utterly to rest, stayed his blowing, while the flames in like manner were quieted and died out.[41]

Conversion of England

The conversion of the pagans remained as the last part of St. Gregory's program. He had said to St. Augustine: "Instruct the ignorant, strengthen the weak by persuasion, correct only evil-doers by authority." [42] King Ethelbert conformed to these instructions. "He had learned," says Bede, "of the masters and authors of his salvation that the service of Christ must be voluntary and not forced." [43] The kingdom of Northumbria was won to the faith in 625 by the monk Paulinus. Venerable Bede gives us an epic account of the weighty and solemn assembly following which Northumbria abjured paganism. King Edwin, already convinced by private conversations with Paulinus, decided, before he would allow Paulinus to preach, to ask the advice of the notables of his kingdom. He therefore assembled them. When he had set forth the purpose of the meeting, one of the leaders, as spokesman for all, rose up and said:

O king, you perhaps remember that, when you were seated at table with your captains and men of arms, when a good fire was lighted and your hall became warm, but outdoors was cold with wind and rain and snow, there came a little bird that flew across the hall, entering by

[41] Bede, Bk. II, chap. 7; *PL*, XCXV, 93.

[42] *Indocti doceantur, infirmi persuasione roborentur, perversi auctoritate corrigantur. Reg.*, XI, 56.

[43] *Didicerat enim a doctoribus auctoribusque suae salutis servitium Christi voluntarium, non coactitium debere esse.* Bede, Bk. I, chap. 26; *PL*, XCV, 57.

one door and going out by another. For that bird the few moments of that flight were full of sweetness, he no longer felt the rain and the storm; but those moments were brief. The bird passed in the twinkling of an eye; from winter it passed again into the winter. Such, it seems to me, is the life of man on earth, and his short course compared to the length of time preceding him and following him. We are tormented by the impossibility of knowing about it. . . . If this new doctrine can teach us anything with a little certainty, it is right that we should follow it." The King thereupon directed the missioner to speak about the God he was announcing. After Paulinus finished, the chief of the warriors spoke, saying: "Up to this present, the more I searched for truth, the more it seemed to flee from me. But as I was listening to this man, I kept understanding better that his doctrine is able to give us life, salvation, and happiness."

All at once they began to pull down the idols and build altars to the true God.

Birinus preached the Gospel in Wessex, Felix in East Anglia, Aidan in Mercia, Wilfrid in Sussex; Jaruman brought the East Saxons to the faith. By 685 the triumph of Christianity was complete in England. A little while later the seven states of the Heptarchy, united in the bond of faith, were able to form a solid political unity under King Egbert the Great, the real founder of the English monarchy.

The Church meanwhile had been laboring to pacify the racial rivalries persisting between the Celts and the Saxons. A letter of St. Gregory, instead of considering the Britons as schismatics, placed their bishops under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury.[44] The animosity between the two races did not completely disappear, but little by little it moderated. As Rome became more tolerant, Britain became more trustful. The Britons' customs in connection with the observance of Easter, baptism ceremonies, and other matters, were abolished in a council held in 664. Ireland and Scotland adopted the Roman

[44] *Ep.*, XI, 64.

practice forty years later; then at last it was the turn of Wales.[45]

Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* contains an account of the discussion that preceded the adoption of the Roman practices by the Northumbrians. The controversy between the Northumbrian Bishop Colman and the monk Wilfrid, who had been educated at Rome, concerned the date of Easter. The discussion took place in the presence of King Oswin. Colman appealed to the authority of the Apostle St. John, Wilfrid to that of St. Peter. Wilfrid quoted our Lord's words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church."

When Wilfrid thus concluded, the King said: "Were these things, Colman, indeed spoken to that Peter of our Lord?" And the Bishop said: "They were indeed, my lord king." Whereat the King saith: "Can you bring forward any so special authority given your Columba?" Whereon the Bishop said: "No." Again the King said: "Whether do ye both agree in this without any question, that these words were principally spoken unto Peter, and that unto him the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given of thy Lord?" They answered: "Yea, certainly." Whereon the King thus concluded and said: "And I say unto you, that I will not gainsay such a porter as this is; but as I know and have power, I covet in all points to obey his ordinances; lest it may be, when I come to the doors of the kingdom of heaven, I find none to open unto me, having his displeasure who is proved to hold the keys thereof."

When the king so spoke, all that sat or stood by, the greater along with them of mean degree, gave their consent thereto; and abandoning their former imperfect usage hastened to change over to those things which they had learned to be better.[46]

St. Theodore

It was not till the middle of the eighth century that the Celtic bishops finally entered into relations with their metropolitan of

[45] Kraus, *Kirchengeschichte,* sec. 65, p. 257.

[46] Bede, *History of the Church of England,* Bk. III, chap. 25; *PL,* XCV, 162 f.

Canterbury, who was then Archbishop Frithona, better known as Deusdedit.[47] His zeal prepared the way for his illustrious successor, St. Theodore, who is rightly called the second founder of the Church in England. He was born at Tarsus in Cilicia. Consecrated bishop of Canterbury at the age of sixty-six, Theodore, during the twenty-three years of his episcopate, brought about the definite religious union of all the dioceses of Great Britain.

He died at the age of eighty-eight. Few lives have been so fruitful in good works as was the venerable old age of the holy archbishop. In 675 he assembled the first council of England, which was followed by a large number of others. The introduction of parish life, the reform of monastic life, and the beginning of an intense intellectual life in Great Britain, are his chief claims to the gratitude of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Until his time religious services in England had been performed by wandering missioners. At the foot of a cross in some field they celebrated mass, preached the Gospel, and administered the sacraments. Henceforth priests were assigned to the service of the church, put in charge of a defined territory, and obliged to residence. The churches, built mostly by charitable nobles, who endowed them and in return obtained the right of nominating the incumbents, were the center of parish life.[48] The demands of a very active and extended apostolate had altered in the monasteries that life of silence and recollection in solitude which St. Benedict was especially concerned to safeguard for his monks. Theodore remedied this situation by wise, firm counsel.[49] He also prevented encroachment by the monasteries upon the functions special to the parish clergy.[50]

Theodore, who had been educated in the schools of the East,

[47] Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,* I, 131.

[48] *Ibid.,* p. 159.

[49] *Rules of the Council of Hertford* (673); Bede, Bk. IV, chap. 5.

[50] Theodore, *Poenitentiale,* chap. 6; *PL,* XCIX, 930 f.; *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England,* p. 306.

knew from experience the help which a well directed intellectual culture could give to Christian civilization. It is said that in his monastic traveling-bag he carried a Homer, which he read every day.[51] Aided by his faithful companion, the monk Adrian, who came from the monastery of Nisida in Thessaly, he spread, along with the study of the sacred sciences, the study of the ancient classical languages. As Bede informs us, sixty years after Theodore's death, monks were speaking Greek and Latin with as much facility as Anglo-Saxon.[52] The seven liberal arts were also taught in the monasteries.[53] Theodore sent to Rome for masons to teach the Roman manner of building. Big churches began to rise up beside the humble primitive chapels.

Venerable Bede

In this atmosphere the famous Bede was educated. His learning and virtues won for him the title of Venerable; the title of saint, which the Church bestowed upon him, has not effaced that other glorious title of Venerable. Born in 673, four years after St. Theodore's arrival in England, he was a descendant of that strong race of the Angles to which he was proud to belong.[54] This "father of English history and of English learning," [55] was educated in the monastery of Wearmouth and in that of Jarrow, which St. Benedict Biscop had just founded. As he himself tells us, at an early age he was fond of consulting all the testimonies, all the traditions, all the books.[56] Chronology, cosmography, theology, poetry, history, Bede explored all the branches of human knowledge: in each and all he ex-

[51] Godwin, *De praesulibus Angliae,* p. 41.
[52] Bede, Bk. IV, 2.
[53] *Ibid.*
[54] Bede, *De temporum ratione,* chap. 15.
[55] This is the title given him by Burke, *Essay on English History,* Bk. II, chap. 2.
[56] *History of the Church of England,* preface.

celled. Says Lavisse: "Bede is first of all an historian. And, as he shows in his *Ecclesiastical History of England,* he had an ability in gathering and weighing evidence, in grouping facts, in understanding and explaining the sequence of events, in rising above things in order to judge them." [57] Says Auguste Molinier: "Bede wrote an excellent summary of the national traditions of England, and in this work the form is of equal merit with the contents. Bede's example is there to prove what a small group of active, enlightened people can do for civilization. Converted less than a century before by a handful of Italian missioners, Great Britain became an intense home of learning and faith, and soon paid back to the continent the services it received from Italy." [58]

Learning and faith, a passion for knowledge and a thirst for prayer, accompanied this great man to his last hour. Nothing could be more touching than the account of his death, which one of his disciples has left us in a letter. We quote from it as follows:

On the last day of his life one of his close friends, who remained at his side to give him any needed care, said to him: "Beloved master, one chapter more is needed to complete your book. Would it tire you to speak longer?" Bede answered, with a voice weakened by suffering: "I can still speak. Take your pen, cut its point, for time is urgent." The vesper hour having come, the disciple again said to him: "Beloved master, there is left one verse not yet written." "Write it quickly," he replied. The young man wrote down what was dictated and then declared: "Now it is finished." To this Bede answered: "You say well, it is finished. Raise my head with your hands and turn me so that I may have the comfort of looking toward the spot where I have prayed so much." Thus stretched out on the floor of his cell, he began chanting for the last time in the customary tone of the Gregorian melody: Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost; and

[57] Lavisse, *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* December 15, 1886, p. 867.
[58] Molinier, *Les sources d l'histoire de France,* V, xxiv f.

while he was uttering these divine names, his soul left his mortal body.[59]

The Popes and the English

The principles of Christian civilization, preached by the Church, gradually became incorporated in the laws. After the laws of Ethelbert which, at the beginning of the seventh century, were scarcely more than a penal code listing and fining various bodily injuries,[60] after the laws of Lothaire and Edric which, at the end of the seventh century, marked a progress in the social organization and the conception of right and wrong,[61] the laws of Witraed, at the beginning of the eighth century, indicate the appearance of a better regulated parliamentary life.[62] The laws of Alfred the Great, at the close of the tenth century, perfect that legislation and bring it into accord with the Christian spirit.[63]

But this social movement had its origin in the Christian missions begun by St. Augustine and inspired by St. Gregory the Great. One scholar has written that in his opinion England owes to that early preaching of the Gospel regard for the rights of the family and for the rights of the individual.[64] A more recent historian even declares that St. Gregory's letters to St. Augustine deserve a place in the national archives of Great Britain ahead of the *Declaration of Rights* and ahead of the *Magna Charta*.[65] The great island that, at the end of the sixth century, had such a reputation for barbarity as to halt the companions of St. Augustine, the island where so many pagan customs persisted, produced marvelous fruits of holiness.

[59] *PL*, XC, 65; *Acta sanctorum*, May, Vol. VI.
[60] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, pp. 1–10.
[61] *Ibid.*, pp. 11–15.
[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 16–19.
[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 20–44.
[64] Mignet, *Mémoire sur l'introduction de la Germanie dans la société civilisée.*
[65] Pingaud, *La Politique de saint Grégoire le Grand*, p. 260.

Great Britain became the "Island of Saints." Those Anglo-Saxons and Britons, so jealous of their independence, gradually were imbued with gratitude to that Latin world, that Christian religion, that Rome, from which the blessing of civilization had come to them. A time came when "all eyes were turned toward the capital of the world. Each year large numbers of Anglo-Saxon pilgrims set out: monks and nuns, priests, bishops, and nobles. When they came in view of the holy city, they stopped to contemplate the sight and knelt in prayer. Their first visit was to the tomb of St. Peter. So strong did the attraction become that even kings yielded to it. In 689 the Saxon King Kadwal went to Rome with the purpose of ending his days in a monastery there. Twenty years after Kadwal's death, Conrad of Mercia and Otto of Essex followed his example. Thus did kings consider it a supreme glory to go to Rome, be clothed in the monastic habit, and there die where a hundred years before a Roman monk met some young Anglo-Saxons in the slave-market. A century sufficed for Britain, conquered by priests, to become a papal province,[66] as a century had sufficed for Gaul, conquered by the legions, to become one of the most Roman of the imperial provinces." [67]

When the English set out for Rome, it was not always with the idea of dying there. They went also to obtain the light and strength they needed to bear to their pagan brethren the treasure of faith which they had received from the Eternal City.

It was from England there went to Rome, to receive instructions from Pope St. Gregory II, the greatest perhaps of the missioners of the barbarian world, St. Boniface.

[66] A century was enough to arouse in the faithful this devotion to Rome, but not to extirpate all paganism from the island.

[67] Lavisse, *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* December 15, 1886.

CHAPTER VII

The Church among the Germans

HE who would devote his life to the conversion of Germany, organize the Christian communities situated beyond the Rhine, exercise there a sort of vice-papacy,[1] he, "whose influence upon the destinies of the German people would have no equal except in the case of Charlemagne," [2] was born about the close of the seventh century in the kingdom of Wessex in England.

St. Boniface

The exact place and date of his birth are unknown. It has been conjectured that he was born in 680 in the town of Crediton (or Kirton). His name was Winfrid. His family must have belonged to the nobility, for his letters show that he was connected with personages of high rank. When Winfrid was not more than five years old, he first manifested his vocation to the life of a missionary monk. At that time churches were rare in the kingdom of Wessex and, in all likelihood, southern England had no priests attached to definite places. Big crosses, erected by noblemen on their domains, were the usual centers for public worship. The faithful came there to pray. Monks came along from time to time, preached to the people at the foot of these crosses, and there administered the sacraments. The boy's imagination was stirred by these sights. He declared that

[1] Substantially this is what several popes said. Gregory III called him: *Bonifacium, nostrum agentem vicem* (Jaffé, no. 2247). Pope Zachary wrote to him as follows: *Tua sanctitas sedis apostolicae et nostram praesentat vicem.* Jaffé, *Monumenta moguntina,* p. 190.

[2] Kurth, *Saint Boniface,* p. 173.

he wanted to share the apostolic life of these itinerant priests. When seven years old, he entered Exeter Abbey as an oblate; from there soon afterward he went to Nutshalling Abbey near Winchester. Here he successfully studied letters and sciences. We are told by his earliest biographer [3] that he excelled in the interpretation of Scripture and in poetry.

Soon Winfrid became a brilliant teacher in that Nutshalling Abbey where he had been a brilliant student. But the idea of his boyhood kept pursuing him. Perhaps he heard mention of that Mellifont monastery,[4] located in the heart of Ireland, the monastery which a group of young Anglo-Saxons made a sort of missionary seminary.[5] One of those monks, the most earnest of them, St. Egbert, had taken a vow never to set foot again on his native soil. The objective of the young apostles was that land of Frisia, reputed to be one of the most pagan of all countries, where English ships, which set out from the Thames or the Humber for the continent, were accustomed to stop.[6] It was toward that damp and swampy coast of Frisia that the eyes of the young Nutshalling professor persistently turned. "It is the land of our forefathers," he said. Later, upon reaching the frontiers of Saxony, he recommended to the prayers of his friends in England these pagan brethren "who are of the same flesh and blood." The wisdom of the young monk's superiors let that vocation mature and when, at the age of thirty, the monk Winfrid received ordination to the priesthood, he was able to set out with three of his brothers in religion.

It was the year 716. The political situation in Saxony was as unfavorable as possible for the undertaking of a mission. The Christian centers which the zeal of a few Anglo-Saxon monks

[3] The monk Willibald, who wrote the life of St. Boniface at the request of and upon information received from St. Lullus, the disciple and successor of the apostle of Germany. *PL,* LXXXIX; Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* third century.

[4] Bede, *History of the Church of England,* V, 9.

[5] St. Boniface declared that in him was united a great fondness for traveling with religious zeal: *Nos timor Christi et amor peregrinationis separavit.* Jaffé, II, 86.

[6] Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* p. 445.

—including St. Wilfrid and St. Willibrord—had founded under the protection of Pepin of Heristal, had just been laid low by a great calamity. In 714 Ratbod the duke of Frisia had profited by Pepin's death to stir up the people against the Franks. The Christian Churches were wiped out and Willibrord was obliged to return to England.

Most historians suppose that Winfrid's idea was to go to Frisia merely to reconnoiter. In any event, he must have noted, with the positive spirit of his race, that effective activity would be impossible for him until he was furnished with a formal commission from the head of the Church and was supported by the powerful authority of the chief of the Franks.[7] This was also the view of his superiors. Two years later, at the beginning of the winter of 718, the monk Winfrid, bearing a letter from his bishop, Daniel of Winchester,[8] left England with a caravan of pilgrims who went to Rome, and presented themselves to Pope Gregory II.

St. Boniface at Rome

Worthy successor of St. Gregory the Great, Pope St. Gregory II, who was elected in 715 to succeed Pope Constantine, was just the one to grasp the project of the Anglo-Saxon monk. "His morals were pure," says the *Liber pontificalis,* "his mind cultivated, his courage full of constancy, his fearlessness remarkable in defending the rights of the Church against the attacks by her enemies." [9] The Pope listened to the ardent missioner, asked him to come again, kept him in Rome for a whole year, and had frequent conversations with him. Then, understanding what he might expect from such an auxiliary, and convinced that Winfrid was the man destined by Providence

[7] Kurth, *Saint Boniface,* pp. 18 f.
[8] *MGH, Epistolae merowingici et Karolini aevi,* Dümmler ed., I, 257.
[9] *Lib. pont.,* I, 396.

for the conversion of the last German peoples, he said to him: "Go; henceforth you shall be called Boniface, he who does good." And the Pope gave him a bull conferring on him all the powers necessary for organizing the mission of Germany. Boniface—thus we will now call him, because from this time on he signs all his letters with this name—had had ample leisure to study the prudent traditions of papal policy while he was close to Gregory II in that old Rome, which seemed to have preserved the administrative genius of the old Roman people. To the tenacity of the Anglo-Saxon, Boniface added, in the performance of the great mission entrusted to him, the organizing spirit of the Roman. Moreover he resolved to make no important decision without first referring the matter to the Holy See.

A vast and difficult mission it was to preach the Gospel throughout Germany, to organize the German Church, to reorganize the Frankish Church, to bring the faith into Frisia and, if God permitted, into Saxony.

The Romans gave the name Germany to the portion of land between the Rhine and the Danube. It was also called Roman Germany. It embraced three nations: in the middle was Thuringia, at the west was Alamannia, which occupied both banks of the Rhine, in the southeast Bavaria, which also extended to the other side of the Danube. This eastern part, located beyond the river, had not felt the Roman influence. Christianity had been preached in Thuringia by the Irish monk St. Kilian, in Alamannia by disciples of St. Columban, the most famous of whom was St. Gall, in Bavaria by Frankish bishops, such as St. Emmeran of Poitiers and St. Corbinian of Chartres.

But a pagan reaction, provoked by the nearness of Saxony and favored by dissensions and wars, had to a great extent destroyed the work of those missioners. Christianity no longer existed in Roman Germany except in a sporadic condition, and

the Churches there were without any regularly constituted hierarchy. In barbarian Germany, that is, in Frisia and Saxony, the situation was even more deplorable. A relative peace had enabled St. Willibrord to return to Frisia, where he attempted to reconstitute the fragments of his little Christian foundation. Saxony, by its remote location at the northern extremity of Germany and by its frequent relations with the peoples of the Scandinavian peninsula, remained the classical country of paganism.

Boniface was not dismayed by the danger. He went directly to Frisia, the land that had aroused his first zeal. There he found Willibrord, who desired to take him as coadjutor bishop. Boniface, whether frightened by this honor or whether for some other reason he thought his undertaking would be premature in Frisia, judged it better, since the Pope had given him powers for all of Germany, to withdraw, at least temporarily, to central Germany.

St. Boniface in Germany

The life of St. Boniface, written by Willibald, gives us but few details about this first period of his mission, extending from 719 to 722. From his letters, however, we know that his two major concerns were to strive against the paganism and to recruit helpers. In all his perplexities of conscience he consulted his old bishop, Daniel. From a letter of Bishop Daniel we learn what method Boniface followed in preaching to the pagans. It may be summed up in three rules: (1) not to make a violent attack upon the pagan errors, but, after letting the infidels freely explain the dogmas of their religion, to show them, calmly and quietly, the contradictions and lacunae therein; (2) in opposition to their beliefs, to set forth a simple general view of the Christian religion, "that they may be confounded rather than exasperated"; (3) to be careful never to assume a tone of

provocation or insult, but rather that of gentleness and moderation.[10]

The enlisting of apostolic workers must have been hard. We see Boniface appealing to two natives, Dettic and Deoric. Christians by baptism but half-idolatrous in the practice of their religion, they showed in Boniface's service a genuine good will, which the missioner utilized. It seems that he made them catechists.

Very near Trier the apostle profited by an altogether providential vocation, that of a young prince of the Merovingian family. The many pilgrimages of Christians from England led to the foundation of monasteries on the main highways of Germany. These religious houses had, as their chief function, the providing of hospitality to devout travelers on their way to and from Rome. In the Moselle valley one of these hospices had as abbess Addula. One day Boniface stopped at the convent. There with the holy and noble abbess was her grandson, a fourteen-year-old boy. Just as the sight of the itinerant monks of England had aroused the vocation of the young Winfrid, so the sight of Boniface and conversation with him touched the heart of the young Frankish prince. He said to his grandmother: "I want to follow my father Boniface, become his disciple, and learn from him the explanation of the divine books." The abbess offered objections to this idea, but he replied: "If you are unwilling to give me a horse, I will go on foot." The boy's insistance succeeded. He left with Boniface and never quit him thereafter. "They labored together," says his biographer, "until the day when martyrdom crowned the apostle's glorious career." [11] The boy's name was Gregory; the Church

[10] *Non insultando aut irritando, sed placide et magna cum moderatione. PL,* XXXIX, 707–709; *MGH, ibid.,* p. 272.

[11] *MGH, Scriptores,* XV, Part I, p. 63. Father Mershman, O.S.B. (*Catholic Encyclopedia,* VII, 21) says: "On account of the similarity of names . . . Addula has been frequently confounded with Adala, daughter of Dagobert II of Austrasia, thus falsely making Gregory a scion of the royal house of the Merovingians. [Tr.]

honors him as a saint. "There are many stains of blood and dirt upon the Merovingian dynasty, but a page like that of the vocation of this boy brightens it with the smile of divine grace." [12]

Boniface was in Germany about three years when the Pope called him to Rome. The first result of Boniface's apostolate had proved to the Supreme Pontiff that the Anglo-Saxon missioner was ready to labor in a vaster field and with broader authority. Gregory II consecrated him bishop of Germany, without any definite episcopal see, as St. Gregory the Great had done in the case of St. Augustine. Boniface took the oath of the suburbicarian bishops, which placed him in immediate and very special subordination to the bishop of Rome. Provided with a collection of the conciliar canons and letters of recommendation to the princes and bishops whose territories he would cross, he went forward to the northeast of the region he had evangelized, toward Hesse and Thuringia, where paganism was more powerful and the state of the Christian communities more seriously disordered.

This second mission, longer, harder, and more important than the preceding one, lasted from 723 to 745. As soon as he reached there, Boniface realized that the means of the apostolate previously employed would be insufficient. Two new procedures marked this second phase of his apostolic life: appeal to the protection of the Frankish princes and the foundation of monasteries.

Upon reaching Hesse, at sight of the humanly insurmountable obstacles that rose up before him the new Bishop of Germany seems to have been momentarily dismayed by the perspective of his isolation and the fear of his powerlessness. He questioned whether the intervention of the secular power would be necessary for him to correct the bad Christians and repress the audacity of the pagans. One of the natural sons of

[12] Kurth, *Saint Boniface*, p. 26.

Pepin of Heristal, Duke Charles, later called Charles Martel, had just driven back the Saxons to the mouth of the Weser. It was to him that Boniface turned. To his spiritual adviser, the old Bishop Daniel of Winchester, he wrote: "Without the favor of the prince of the Franks, I feel myself unable to govern my people; without the backing of his orders and the dreaded influence of his name, I will never succeed in putting an end to the sacrilegious ceremonies of the pagans." [13] The prudent Bishop answered that Boniface must put his hope above earthly princes, in God alone, and reminded him of the example of the Apostles, of the martyrs, and of our Lord Himself.[14]

Boniface soon understood how wise this counsel was. We rightly regard Charles Martel as the armed champion of the Christian cause, and perhaps he deserves to be called the savior of the Church in France and Germany. What would have happened to it if he had not stopped the advance of Mohammedanism in the south and the incursions of pagans in the north? But no less attested than his services, is his brutal seizure of property and persons of the Church, and the corrupt influence of his court upon the prelates and priests he drew to that court. Boniface soon became aware of this. Having been received at the prince's court, he was shocked at the licentious speech and all sorts of scandals he observed there. In a letter to Bishop Daniel he wonders whether it is right for him to set foot in that wicked place.[15] His holy counselor warns him against this other extreme.[16] To the limited extent solicited or accepted by Boniface, Charles Martel's protection was useful to the Church. A former bishop of the country, who had done nothing before the arrival of the new missioner, now sought to profit by Boniface's labors and was not disposed to recognize the latter's jurisdiction. Charles Martel placed his authority at the service of the

[13] *MGH, ibid.*, p. 329.
[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 330–333.
[15] *PL*, LXXXIX, 700–702; *MGH, ibid.*, p. 329.
[16] *PL*, LXXXIX, 703 ff.; *MGH, ibid.*, pp. 331 f.

rightful cause, and Boniface was victorious.[17] It was also owing to the prestige which Charles Martel's favor gave him, that the saint was able, from the beginning of his mission in Hesse, to deliver a mighty blow, to cut down a sacred tree, cherished by the pagans, the Oak of Geismar. Boniface and his companions might have paid dearly for their boldness, if they had not been protected by the safe-conduct given them by the mayor of Austrasia, who made the pagans tremble.[18]

Monasticism in Germany

But the holy missioner never wished to use the power of the Frankish prince to force conversions. His habitual procedure was the peaceful foundation of monasteries. The monks cleared the ground, opened schools, helped the poor, the sick, and travelers, and gave work to the people of the neighborhood. Little by little the population of their own accord settled around the monastery. A village, a city was founded.

Such was the method of conversion followed by Boniface during his second mission. But to carry it out he needed a large number of fellow-laborers. These he asked from his native land. His countrymen answered his appeal. For several years from southern England a continual stream of priests, monks, and school-teachers flowed to Thuringia and Hesse. There came Lullus, his dear little Lullus, as he called him, his former pupil at Nutshalling Abbey, who would be his successor in the see of Mainz. There came Burchard, whom he made bishop of Würzburg, and Denehard, who became his tireless messenger, and many others.

With the aid of these valuable helpers, he founded several monasteries for men: the most important were those of Amöneberg in Hesse and Ohrdruf in Thuringia.

[17] *PL, ibid.*, col. 706; *MGH, ibid.*, p. 274.
[18] *PL, ibid.*, col. 699; *MGH, ibid.*, pp. 270 f.

Not only men, but women, too, widows or maidens, came in large numbers from England, eager to share in the apostolate of Germany. Under Boniface's direction they founded three big convents. The most famous was that of Bischofsheim. Its abbess was a young relative of Boniface himself, the devout and scholarly Lioba. We possess some of her charming letters and of her well composed Latin verses.[19] She brought to the midst of semi-pagan Germany a fragrance of gentle graciousness and exquisite mildness. It seems that it was to her St. Boniface dedicated a poem of two hundred verses in which he introduces the principal Christian virtues.[20]

These monasteries and convents spread a taste for letters in Germany. To England were sent various products of the country—cloth woven of goats' hair, a fur garment for the aged Bishop of Winchester, shields and falcons for King Ethelbald, an ivory comb and silver mirror for the Queen.[21] But the abbots and abbesses, and Boniface himself, asked to have copies of scholarly books sent them, and works of poetry and piety that were published in England. "Copy for me," wrote Boniface, "some of Bede's writings; send me a few sparks from the torch that illumines your country." [22]

An exchange of more weighty letters was that kept up by the Bishop of Germany with Gregory II, acquainting the Pope with all his labors, consulting him about all doubtful questions. A reply from Gregory II, dated November 22, 726, solves twelve cases of conscience. It enables us to obtain an intimate view of the monastic, liturgical, domestic, and social life of those first Christian centers in Germany.[23] Less important

[19] *PL*, XCIX, 720; *MGH, ibid.*, pp. 280 f.

[20] *Oenigmata de virtutibus, quae misit Bonifacius ad sororem suam. PL*, XCIX, 887–892.

[21] *PL, ibid.*, col. 750; *MGH, ibid.*, p. 337.

[22] *PL, ibid.*, col. 736; *MGH, ibid.*, p. 347.

[23] *PL, ibid.*, col. 524–526; *MGH, ibid.*, pp. 275, 277. These cases of conscience concern impediments of marriage, the administration of baptism and confirmation, the procedure to be followed in cases of denunciations brought against a cleric, the

than the correspondence between St. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine, that of St. Gregory II with St. Boniface merits comparison with it. It had the same purpose and the same result: the conversion and Christian civilization of a great nation.

St. Gregory III, who occupied the papal see from 731 to 741, and St. Zachary, who succeeded him from 741 to 752, continued to aid Boniface with their counsel and to strengthen him with their encouragement. In 732, Gregory III sent him the pallium and directed him to create new dioceses in Germany.[24] Boniface consecrated as bishops those of his monks who gave the best evidence of zeal and intelligence in their apostolate. The sees of these bishoprics were so well distributed that the ecclesiastical organization of Germany since then has undergone only minor modifications. "The Church of Central Germany," says the Protestant historian Hauch, "is the work of St. Boniface." [25]

St. Boniface and the Frankish Church

Boniface was also the reformer of the Frankish Church. Charles Martel died in October, 741, leaving the Frankish Church safe from the outward perils of a Mussulman or Saxon invasion, but a prey to lamentable internal disorders. The disturbances that continued after the death of the great Frankish warrior, the strife that arose between the last representatives of the expiring Merovingian race and the precursors of the Carolingian race, who were grasping for the power, the upris-

régime of the lepers, the frequentation of scandalous Christians, and the like. The Pope's replies are very firm, and yet are impressed with a fatherly condescension.

[24] *PL,* LXXXIX, 577 f.; *MGH, Ep.,* I, 278. The formation of new bishoprics has been reserved to the pope only since the year 1000 (Thomassin, *Ancienne and nouvelle discipline,* I, 371). Previously the metropolitans erected them. But the supreme pontiffs always had reserved to themselves a right of control and of superior jurisdiction (Thomassin, *op. cit.,* I, 311).

[25] Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands,* 2d ed., I, 466.

ings of Bavaria and Aquitania, that for the time nearly rent the Frankish nation, aggravated the intensity of the crisis. Intellectual culture was perforce abandoned or much neglected. A curious document of the time, known as the *Indiculus superstitionum* [26] and sometimes called the *Syllabus of popular errors* of the seventh century, shows us how many gross superstitions, springing from ignorance, had become prevalent among the faithful. St. Boniface's letters have left us a gloomy picture of the conduct of the clergy. "Religion is trod under foot," he says. "According to what the elders say, the Franks have not held a council for eighty years.[27] They have no metropolitan archbishop. The majority of episcopal sees are given to avaricious laymen or adulterous clerics. And those who boast of being without these faults are often drunkards, huntsmen, or soldiers, who shed the blood of Christians like that of the pagans." [28] The letter containing these lines was addressed, in 742, to Pope Zachary, who had just succeeded Gregory III. The two princes to whom Charles Martel left a very real power, without a definite title,[29] Carloman and Pepin, had asked Boniface to reorganize the Church of Austrasia.[30] Carloman and Pepin had been educated in a monastery. Carloman was deeply religious and four years later entered the monastery of Monte Cassino. Pepin was an experienced statesman, and understood the importance of a well-ordered Church in a state that perhaps he was already aspiring to rule with the title of king. Boniface, in the letter just quoted, asked Pope Zachary for the necessary powers to answer the appeal of the Frankish princes. Those

[26] Baluze, *Capitularia,* I, 150 ff.

[27] St. Boniface makes this assertion only as an echo of the popular tradition. But it is an exaggeration. A few councils were held in Gaul during the second part of the seventh century. Cf. Vacandard, *Vie de saint Ouen,* p. 222 note.

[28] *PL,* LXXXIX, 744; *MGH, Epist.,* I, 300.

[29] In their capitularies they take the title of *dux et princeps Francorum.*

[30] According to Willibald, it was Boniface himself who suggested this request to Carloman.

powers were granted him at once.[31] But the strife was bitter. Two schemers, Clement a Scot and Adelbert a Frank, made the populace fanatical by laying claim to extraordinary powers. Adelbert adduced in his favor a letter which he alleged was written by Christ and had fallen from heaven to Jerusalem. He found an ignorant bishop to consecrate him. Great multitudes, forsaking the churches, assembled at crosses that Adelbert set up beside a spring. There the people strove with one another for possession of bits of his hair or fingernails as relics.[32] Boniface did not relax his attack upon the two impostors until he succeeded in putting them both in prison.[33] Then in several councils, some provincial, others plenary or national, he had decrees issued ordering the stability of the country clergy, its subordination to the bishop, the dependence of the latter upon the metropolitan, and of the metropolitan upon the bishop of Rome. As an insignia of this organization and of the dependence of the entire hierarchy upon the Holy See, the pallium, which in the East was simply a sign of archiepiscopal powers, took on a symbolical meaning, that of a jurisdiction received from Rome with the insignia.[34] Two other measures of significance should be noted among the decisions of these councils. One was a sort of consolidation of rural parishes, for the benefit of which the land tithes were established or made general.[35] This measure freed them from dependence upon the noblemen and landowners who had established them. The other was a regulation of the clergy's contribution to the expenses of the state in case of war or urgent need. Under such circumstances the state would have a right to keep part of the revenues of the churches, but only as *precaria,* that is, on condition of restitution at the death of

[31] Dunzelmann, Hahn, and Kurth admit that by error the Pope's reply was dated April 1, 743, and that in reality it was 742. Kurth, *Saint Boniface,* p. 23; Dunzelmann, *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte,* XIII, 8; Hahn, *ibid.,* XVI, 52.

[32] *PL,* LXXXIX, 751–753; *MGH, Epist.,* I, 314–318.

[33] *PL, ibid.,* col. 753 f.; *MGH, ibid.,* p. 314.

[34] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 384 f.

[35] Jaffé, no. 2288; *PL, ibid.,* col. 941.

the beneficiary and with the obligation of paying, during that use, an acknowledgment annuity of one silver solidus.[36] This regulation was a preventive measure against unjust seizure of Church property, an infringement which Charles Martel had so unfairly practiced on the pretext of financial need. This decision, made in a mixed assembly of bishops and lay lords, has been called the first of the concordats.[37] That wise freeing of Church property and hence of the Church herself, with regard to the big landowners and the state, was of capital importance. These regulations, if well observed, would have spared many an abuse in the Middle Ages. When St. Gregory VII seeks to remedy the evil of clerical incontinence and simony, he proceeds as did St. Boniface: he shakes off the yoke of abusive interference by the civil power in the Church. Moreover, the independence demanded by St. Boniface had no resemblance to rebellion or hostility. In the creation of new dioceses and in the selection of persons who were to occupy the new sees, he always sought first an understanding with the secular powers, and Pope Zachary approved his acting in that way.[38]

The warfare upon popular superstitions was another purpose of the conciliar decisions. The acts of the Council of Leptines (743), almost wholly concerned with combating these vain beliefs, furnish very curious details of the superstitious practices. The danger of those extravagances made Boniface watchful to suppress all odd opinions. He learned that an Irish priest, named Virgilius, was disturbing men's minds by preaching the existence beneath the earth of another world with an-

[36] *Concilium Germanicum I; PL,* LXXXIX, 807 f. *Concilium Lepinense,* Mansi, XII, 371. Leptine was a royal domain, near Binche, within the bounds of the present diocese of Cambrai.

[37] Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* p. 427. This concordat was approved by Pope Zachary.

[38] For example, in the foundation of the dioceses of Strasburg, Ratisbon, and Passau. *Cum consensu Odilonis ducis eorumdem Bajoiorum, seu optimatum provinciae illius,* Zachary wrote to him, *tres alios ordinasses episcopos . . . bene et prudenter egisti. MGH, Epist.,* I, 293 (Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* I, 305 f.).

other sun and another moon. Boniface wrote about the matter to Pope Zachary, who replied: "If it is well proved that Virgilius has spoken thus, you must convene a council and expel him from the Church. . . . We are addressing to this same Virgilius letters of evocation, so that he may be minutely questioned in our presence and, if found guilty of holding false doctrine, he may be sentenced to canonical punishment." [39] We do not know what happened after this, whether the charge was dropped or whether Virgilius was exonerated. We are informed simply that Virgilius was later raised to the office of bishop of Salzburg and that Pope Gregory IX canonized him. His feast is on November 27.[40]

Boniface's influence upon the Frankish Church bore fruit. Soon the great responsibilities of the Church and of the state were in the hands of prelates and abbots very unlike those who had frequented the court of Charles Martel. Among them we must mention Fulrad the abbot of St. Denis, who took an important part in the substitution of the Carolingian dynasty for that of the Merovingians, and Chrodegang bishop of Metz, whose famous Rule, published in 755, exercised so deep an influence upon the future of the clergy of France.[41]

Founding of Fulda Abbey

Beginning in 745, Boniface made his permanent residence at Mainz. He had considered fixing his see at Cologne, a city

[39] *MGH, Epistolae merowingici et Karolini aevi,* I, 360.

[40] Mabillon, *op. cit.,* third century. Such is the incident that gave rise to so many charges against the Church. As d'Alembert and Bayle remark, many historians have called Virgilius "a martyr to science and free thought," persecuted by the Pope. But we should note the following facts: 1. it is not true that Virgilius was condemned by the Church; 2. it is very probable that what stirred St. Boniface and St. Zachary was the interpretation given by the people to Virgilius' views, rather than his opinion itself; because Venerable Bede, whose writings were eagerly read by St. Boniface, taught the rotundity of the earth (*De natura rerum,* chap. 46; *PL,* XC, 264 f.); 3. even if St. Boniface and St. Zachary were mistaken about a scientific matter, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church would in no way be involved.

[41] Of this we will speak later.

closer to that barbarian Germany which he so longed to convert. Some mysterious plots, base revenge by lying prelates whose influence had been ruined by Boniface's reform, caused this project to fail, as likewise the hierarchical organization of the dioceses of Gaul, a plan he had begun to carry out. The holy Archbishop at least had the consolation of crowning his work by the foundation of the Abbey of Fulda. He wrote to Pope Zachary as follows:

It is in an extensive wilderness, in the midst of the nations to whom I have preached, a quiet place suited to recollection; there I have built a monastery. And there I have gathered some monks who, under the Rule of our Father St. Benedict, live happily by the work of their hands. There it is, with the permission of your Piety, I would like to go and give some repose to my old age and sleep after my death. The four peoples to whom, by the grace of God, I have preached the word of Christ, are in the vicinity. With the aid of your prayers, I may still be able to be of some use to them.[42]

This letter is dated 751. Four years later Boniface's wish was partly realized. His glorious remains, stained with the blood of his martyrdom, were borne in triumph to the Fulda monastery, there to sleep the last sleep. The ten years he passed in the government of the Church of Mainz were ten years of quiet and assiduous labor. His last strength he devoted to the editing of his sermons and the administration of his diocese. He conferred episcopal ordination upon his beloved disciple Lullus and made him his chorepiscopus.[43] Carloman's entrance

[42] *PL*, LXXXIX, 778; *MGH, Epist.*, I, 368 f.

[43] The chorepiscopi (from χώρα "region," and ἐπισκόπειν "supervise") at that time held a position between that of bishops and that of priests. Says Jacques Zeiller: "The institution of the chorepiscopate has lately been closely studied. Efforts have been made to ascertain its precise nature, which for a long time remained rather vague. From these studies it appears that the chorepiscopi, or country bishops, at first exercised complete episcopal power and were later subordinated to the city bishops. In the fourth century the canons of various councils restricted their powers and reduced them to the condition of lower members of the hierarchy. But these con-

into the monastery of Monte Cassino left Pepin sole ruler of the Frankish people; and Pope Zachary's death was followed by the election of Stephen II. Boniface wrote to Stephen and to Pepin, asking their authorization for him to name Lullus his successor. A letter from him to the Pope in 753 is a sort of last testament: "I beg your Holiness," he says, "to accord me the friendship of the Apostolic See and union with it. In the course of the thirty-six years during which I have filled the office of Roman legate, I have been able to render some services to the Church of God. For the faults and mistakes I may have committed, I declare that I submit to the judgment of the Church."

But a sadness filled his apostolic soul. The longing of his youth was not fulfilled. Saxony and Frisia, to which he had formerly directed the first efforts of his apostolate, were not converted. And yet, it was the ancestral land. He wrote to his Anglo-Saxon countrymen: "Have pity on these men, who say to you: We are your flesh and blood." And an English bishop said in reply: "I have learned that night and day you think of the conversion of the Saxons. . . . Delay not in gathering so fine a harvest." [44]

clusions hold true only for the East. In the West we find the chorepiscopate under a different aspect at the time it appeared there, chiefly in Gaul, as a regular institution, while it was disappearing in the East, that is, in the eighth century: the Western chorepiscopi, vested with the episcopal character, were then the coadjutors of the bishop. He delegated his powers to them in a region of the diocese remote from the episcopal city. Thus they possessed a lesser authority than that of the Eastern chorepiscopi of the early period, who were really independent bishops and greater than those of the later period who had lost the episcopal character." Zeiller, in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* January 15, 1906, p. 28. Cf. Parisot, "Les chorévêques" in the *Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* VI (1901), 157; Jugie, "Les chorévêques en Orient" in the *Echos d'Orient,* VII (1904), 263; Gilmann, *Das Institut des Chorbischofe im Orient.* In the Middle Ages the title "chorepiscopi" (*chori episcopi*) was given to simple choir masters. Cf. Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* II, 339 ff. On the chorepiscopi, see a long and scholarly dissertation by Leclercq, in his new edition of Hefele's *Histoire des conciles,* II, Part II, pp. 1197–1237.

[44] *MGH, Epist.,* I, 296.

Death of St. Boniface

The aged Archbishop of Mainz, who was then about seventy-five years old, had no hope of reaping the harvest. He gathered all his strength. For Lullus, his chorepiscopus, he wrote his last instructions, which have been preserved for us by the monk Willibald.[45] Then he embarked on the Rhine accompanied by fifty priests, clerics, monks, and a few armed servants. The flotilla reached the middle of those marshy plains which four centuries later would be partly engulfed and would form the Zuyderzee. The little boats advanced on the canals and small streams that cut through the country. As they went along the missioners preached to the almost savage inhabitants of the districts. Early in June, 755, the flotilla anchored in the neighborhood of Dokkum, the place which Boniface designated to which the newly baptized of the region were to come to receive the sacrament of confirmation from him.[46] But on the appointed day, at early dawn, just as the apostle was preparing to celebrate the holy sacrifice, instead of the expected neophytes, an army of pagans suddenly appeared, shouting cries of death. The few servants that were escorting the mission rushed to arms. Boniface stopped them. Then, turning to his companions, he said: "Take courage: all those weapons cannot harm souls." While he was speaking, the pagans fell upon the missioners and massacred them. One who witnessed the scene relates that Boniface, as he received his mortal blow, raised over his head a book he was holding in his hand. The barbarian's axe at one stroke cut through the book and the martyr's head.

[45] Willibald, chap. 21; *PL,* LXXXIX, 659. A few years earlier, foreseeing his coming death, he bade farewell to Abbess Lioba, his relative, and her nuns, begging them to continue laboring with perseverance upon that soil of Germany, which he thought he was about to leave. *MGH, Epist.,* I, 335 f.

[46] After the fifth century, at least in the West, confirmation became gradually separated from baptism.

Thus died the apostle of Germany. His longing was partly realized. He did not witness the conversion of Saxony; that work was accomplished under the hard sword of Charlemagne. On that Saxon land, which would soon be wet with the blood of terrible executions, Boniface poured out the pure, peaceful blood of the martyr, the first fruits of the future Christianity.

CHAPTER VIII

The Church among the Saxons and Scandinavians

WHAT especially marks this new stage in the advance of the Church through the barbarian world, is the positive intervention of the secular power in the work of spreading the faith. Charlemagne's terrible army enveloped the peaceful group of the monks. The Saxony expedition was both a conquest and a missionary undertaking. Yet it would not be quite exact to say that Saxony was converted by force. The use of force, regrettable in so far as it exceeded the requirements of national defense, and for this reason criticized by the most outstanding spokesmen of the Church at that period, was preceded, accompanied, and followed by peaceful missionary methods. The preaching and virtues of four great missioners—St. Lebwin, St. Sturmio, St. Willehad, and St. Ludger—did more, as we shall see, to change the hearts of these barbarians, than did the sword of Charlemagne. But we can soundly evaluate this work of conversion and conquest only if we take into account the events and the needs of that period.

The Saxons

Charlemagne had succeeded Pepin the Short. More and more the Carolingian dynasty considered itself, and rightly so, as entrusted with a civilizing mission in Europe. Charlemagne was particularly conscious of this providential rôle. If we take this point of view, we may say that the conquest and conversion of Saxony was a matter of necessity. Until the close of the eighth century, the Saxon country had been the support

of every opposition to Roman, Frankish, and Christian influence. In the minds of the Romans that country was confounded with Scandinavia; they called it a factory of nations, *officina gentium.*[1]

The conquest and conversion of this race promised to be particularly difficult. The Germans of Saxony and Frisia were the descendants of those "long-sworded" men [2] whose audacious coming to the continent was related in a symbolic legend. Says the old popular tradition:

One day, some sailors carrying gold asked an inhabitant of the country for food, offering a heap of gold in payment. The native contemptuously handed them in exchange a handful of dirt and went away, satisfied at having deceived the strangers. But at dawn the next day the chieftain of these mariners was seen going back and forth across this vast plain, sowing about him the handful of earth he had been given. His companions at once pitched tents on the ground where the earth had been scattered and, drawing long knives, declared to one another that they were prepared to defend their land. A bloody strife followed, as a result of which the Saxons remained masters of the field.[3]

More profoundly than the authentic facts of history, popular legends often express the soul of a nation. This legend reveals what boldness this race boasted of.[4] In any event, of this we are certain, that, as in the case of the Roman generals, neither

[1] Cf. Demolins, *Les routes du monde moderne,* pp. 455 f. Henri de Tourville, *Histoire de la formation particulariste,* chap. 5. *Scandza insula quasi officina gentium* (Jornandès, *The Origin and Deeds of the Goths,* p. 7).

[2] According to the monk Widukind (a ninth century annalist), the word "Saxon" comes from the word "Sahs" which, in his time, still meant "knife." Widukind, *Res gestae Saxoniae,* in *MGH, Scriptores,* Vol. IV.

[3] Widukind, *op. cit.,* pp. 4–7.

[4] Frederick le Play and especially Henri de Tourville and Edmond Demolins attribute the bold energy of this race to the profession of coastal fishermen which had been followed by their ancestors in Norway. Demolins, *Les routes du monde moderne,* pp. 470 ff.; H. de Tourville, *Histoire de la formation particulariste, origines des grands peuples actuels,* chap. 3.

Pepin of Heristal nor Charles Martel nor Pepin the Short was able to subject the Saxons.

Religion of the Saxons

With no political or religious center, divided into three regions (Osphal, Westphal, and the Engern district), they preserved the religion of their ancestors more jealously than did the other Germans. Their nomadic brethern more easily broke away from their gods: those gods, connected with the land, did not move with them, but resided in the big trees of their forests, in the caves or on the cliffs of their hill. But the Saxons, a sedentary people, lived in the shade of their sacred woods, especially about that huge tree trunk which they called the pillar of the world, Irminsul.[5] Moreover, they were not far from Scandinavia, whence their divinities originated. In their sea voyages they could take part in the old mysterious and bloody ceremonies, which were perpetuated on the Scandinavian coasts. Their morality was marked by stern austerity. Their penalties for immorality, especially for adultery, were frightful. St. Boniface, in a letter to the Anglo-Saxon King Ethelbald, tells him, to make him ashamed of his lax morals, what happened in Saxony to a woman or girl who had failed in her duty. Driven from town to town, she was pursued by all the women along her way; these women, armed with whips and pointed knives, struck her and pricked her without let-up, followed her and hounded her until she fell, bleeding and exhausted.[6]

Form of Government

In time of peace everybody lived inviolable in his house and on his land. The Saxons did not have a national dynasty nor,

[5] *Translatio sancti Alexandri,* chap. 3, in *MGH, Scriptores,* I, 676. This document was written in 863–865, published first in the Göttingen historical library, and included in the *Monumenta* of Pertz. It contains much valuable information about the customs of the Saxons and about the Saxon war.

[6] *PL,* LXXXIX, 759 f.

so it seems, did they have a general assembly of the nation, unless perhaps in case of extraordinary danger.[7] Local chieftains governed, with an altogether military discipline, the free men (Frilingen) and the *coloni* (Lazzi). How was it possible for a people so poorly organized for common action to hold out so long against Charlemagne's formidable army? Einhard points out two causes of that long resistance: the incorrigible perfidy of the Saxons, who so many times violated the most solemn oaths, and the unwearied magnanimity of the Emperor, who would never consent to the extermination of this people, but wished simply to win them to Christianity and civilization.[8]

St. Lebwin

Charlemagne's military expedition was preceded by an attempt at peaceful conversion. A monk named Liadwin or Lebwin, like Boniface of Anglo-Saxon origin, had "vowed his life," says his biographer, "to the accomplishment of the union of the Franks with the Saxons in one single Christian faith and charity." At the very boundary between the two states he built a monastery where Saxons and Franks were welcomed as equals and brothers.[9] Not satisfied with thus preaching to the common people, Lebwin determined to carry the word of God to gatherings of the nobility. One day, when these nobles were assembled at Marclo, as the idolatrous sacrifices were about to begin they saw the monk enter, dressed in his priestly robes and carrying in his hands the cross and the Gospel. He entered their midst and said to them: "Your idols are not living, feeling beings. They are the work of men. They can do nothing for themselves or for anyone else. The true God, the good and just God, sends me to you. If you reject Him, be-

[7] Those extraordinary assemblies were then held either at the foot of the Irminsul or at Marklo. *Vita Lebuini,* in *MGH, Scriptores,* II, 362.

[8] Einhard, *Vita Karoli,* chap. 7; *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 91 f.

[9] *MGH, ibid.,* p. 361; *PL,* CXXXIII, 883–886.

ware; for the King of heaven can send against you a mighty king of the earth." At these words the angered assembly cried out in rage and wanted to put the missioner to death. But a counselor, named Buto, arose and said: "Listen, you who are the weightiest in this assembly. Whenever there has come to us an envoy of some neighboring country, whether Norman, Slav, or Frisian, we have received him in peace, we have listened to him in silence, and we have sent him back with gifts. Now, this man, whom you have just heard, presents himself to you as the ambassador of a great God. You will not put him to death." This appeal addressed by Buto to the traditions of honor of the Saxon people, was heeded, and Lebwin was able to return safe and sound.[10] He was even allowed to preach his doctrine to the people, and he brought about a large number of conversions.

Charlemagne and the Saxons

But the Saxon raids did not cease. Easily crossing a frontier that was in level country, as favorable to invasions as it was difficult to defend, they kept repeating their devastations on Frankish territory. In 772, Charlemagne, in a field of May at Worms, assembled the high officers, bishops, and heads of the chief monasteries of the kingdom. He asked the assembly if it did not consider the hour had come to repress the pagan nation of the Saxons and thus, with the help of God, conquer it for the kingdom of Christ. The entire assembly approved the plan. Then Charlemagne asked the clergy for the help of their prayers. Taking with him a large number of priests and monks, as an ancient chronicler says, "cultivators of the faith, able to place on those people the light sweet yoke of Christ," [11] he set out at the head of his army. The purpose of this first expedition seems to have been merely to terrify the Saxons by

[10] *PL,* CXXXII, 888–890.

[11] *Vita S. Sturmii,* chap. 23; *PL,* CV, 441.

a bold stroke. They at once entered Westphalia, where Irminsul was venerated. The idol was overthrown and the treasury of the shrine was pillaged. Disconcerted by the fall of their god, the Saxons let Charlemagne return peacefully to his paternal domain at Heristal and even gave him hostages as pledge of the protection he demanded for the Christian missioners.[12]

But the very next year the raids began again. The Fritzlar monastery, founded by St. Boniface, was sacked, the church pillaged and turned into a stable. Charlemagne, who was then in Italy, rushed back, and his sudden arrival surprised the Saxons, who asked for a parley.

The King of the Franks decided to hold these negotiations in a setting of solemnity that would impress the barbarians. He set the time of the conference for the date of the field of May, 777, which he held that year at Paderborn in Westphalia. The assembly was marked by a display of magnificent ceremonies. The King decided to receive there, in the presence of the Saxons, the envoys of the Saracens of Spain, who came to beg his help. Then he called upon the monk Sturmio to speak, asking him to set forth to the pagans the doctrines of the Catholic faith. Sturmio abbot of Fulda, a scion of a noble Bavarian family, had been one of St. Boniface's most cherished and valuable helpers. His character combined great austerity with great gentleness toward others. He was trained in the monastic life by a long stay at Monte Cassino where he went to obtain at its source the spirit of St. Benedict, a brother by race of those men whom he wished to convert. Sturmio addressed them with an eloquence that is always persuasive when the speaker's life and character plead for him as forcibly as do his words.[13] Most of the Saxon chieftains had just sworn allegiance to Charlemagne and many of them asked for baptism, which they

[12] Einhard, year 772, *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 201.
[13] *Vita S. Sturmii,* chaps. 3 ff.; *PL,* CV, 426 ff.

received in the rivers, say the chroniclers, dressed in white tunics.[14]

Widukind and the Saxon Revolt

Not all the Saxon chieftains had come. Says the *Annals of Lorsch:*[15] "To the Paderborn conference came all the Saxons except Widukind, who with certain others continued rebellious and sought refuge in Normandy with his companions." This Widukind, whose name appears here for the first time, was a native of Westphalia and belonged to a rich noble family. He personified the Saxon soul in its refractory attitude to Christian civilization. By his prodigious activity he gave Saxony, or rather that federation of separate groups of Saxons, jealously autonomous and independent, a momentary union in a common feeling and under the action of a single influence.

He withdrew into Denmark to his friend Sigifridus, and there waited for the propitious hour for a revolt. The next year (778), when a rumor spread in Saxony, that Charlemagne along with all his valiant knights had perished at Roncesvalles at the foot of the Pyrenees, Widukind went hither and thither in Saxony, and stirred up the tribes with the hope that they would receive the support of their Danish brethren. In the autumn of that same year "the long-knife men" invaded, ravaged, and covered with blood, not only the borders of Saxony, but Hesse and Thuringia, and even ventured as far as the left bank of the Rhine.

When marauders were passing near Fulda, the monks in the famous abbey were greatly disturbed. Says the author of the life of its holy abbot:

[14] Einhard, year 777, *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 203.

[15] Molinier (*Les sources de l'histoire de France,* I, 226) says: "The *Annals of Lorsch* were regarded in the ninth century as the official history of the Frankish monarch. . . . They were written by clerics of the royal chapel who had access to the archives of the monarchy."

Our father Sturmio, being a man of God, went to the direction from which the danger threatened, for the purpose of attempting to ward off the peril. We, his brethren and disciples, taking the body of the holy martyr Boniface in the coffin where it had rested for twenty-four years, placed it on our shoulders and carried it away to a distance of two days' journey. From there we brought it back to Fulda when quiet was restored.[16]

But Charlemagne was not dead. In the spring of 779, returning with his army like a whirlwind, he drove back the Saxons to the depths of Westphalia and the country of the Engrians and forced Widukind once more to flee into Denmark. Then he asked some monks to resume their peaceful missions in Saxony. Among these monks was St. Willehad, who was an Anglo-Saxon like Boniface and, like that great apostle, had heard in his youth an inner voice calling him to spread the faith in Frisia and Saxony. For two or three years Willehad was able not only to preach the word of God to the Saxons, but to build churches and ordain priests, who aided him in his mission.[17]

Yet Widukind did not sleep in his retreat. For more than two years he waited patiently for a favorable opportunity, merely sustaining the grudge of the Saxons by frequent messages. In 782 the hoped-for occasion presented itself. Some Slav tribes had invaded Germany at several points. Widukind reappeared. At sight of him the Saxons took up arms and surprised the Franks, making a great slaughter among them. This was the terrible battle of Suntal. All the missioners dispersed. Willehad was obliged to withdraw and went to Rome, there to wait for better days.

[16] *Vita S. Sturmii,* chap. 24; *PL,* CV, 442; *MGH, Scriptores,* II, 36; *Annales Fuldenses, Historiens des Gaules,* V, 329.

[17] *Vita sancti Villehadi, PL,* XCIX, 1017. *Praefato tempore . . . servus Dei coepit ecclesias construere ac presbyteros super eas ordinare, qui libere populis salutis ac baptismatis conferrent gratiam.*

The Capitulary of Saxony

This time Charlemagne could not restrain his wrath. At Verden on the Aller he assembled the Saxon chieftains, who had sworn allegiance to him, and ordered a thorough investigation. The Saxons themselves delivered 4,500 guilty persons into his hands, and these were beheaded that very day. Shortly afterward, in 782, he published the famous Capitulary of Saxony, which inflicted the death penalty not only upon traitors, murderers, and incendiaries, but also upon any Saxon who would reject baptism or refuse to observe the law of fasting by way of showing contempt for Christianity.[18] The Verden execution and the Capitulary of Saxony are regarded as two blots upon the reputation of the great Christian Emperor. But we should not exaggerate the import of those acts. The Verden execution was not a butchery of prisoners, as many historians have called it, but the issue of a veritable criminal trial, carried out according to the summary procedure of military justice.[19]

As to the penalties for failure to keep the Lenten regulations, they were to be inflicted only after inquiry by a priest as to the necessity which might have impelled the accused person to eat meat.[20] It may be that this right of preliminary inquiry, by which the priest could attenuate the rigor of the law, had been inserted by the King for the purpose of increasing the authority of the clergy in Saxony. Nevertheless official spokesmen of the Church protested loudly. Alcuin wrote to one of Charlemagne's officers: "Faith is an act of the will and is not a forced act. Conscience may be appealed to, it must not

[18] *Si quis jejunium pro despectu christianitatis contempserit.* Baluze, *Capitularia regum francorum,* I, 251 f.; *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae,* arts. 4 and 8.

[19] Cf. Ozanam, *Études germaniques,* II, 295; Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. II, Part I, p. 288.

[20] *Sed tamen consideretur a sacerdote, ne forte causa necessitatis hos cuilibet proveniat ut carnem comedat,* Baluze, I, 253.

be constrained by violence. Preachers, not brigands, should be sent to the Saxons." [21] A few years later Alcuin wrote to Charlemagne himself, begging him not to crush the Saxons with burdens, but rather to imitate the Apostles, who gave "the milk of the gentle precepts" to peoples whose hesitant faith needed to be dealt with prudently.[22]

In 786 Charlemagne requested Pope Adrian to regulate the penance of Saxon *lapsi.* The Pope gave the Emperor wise counsel, asking him to let the priests regulate those penalties of conscience, for in such cases it is necessary to make allowance for the free consent of the will.[23]

In fact, neither the merciless execution nor the terrible capitulary brought peace. On the contrary, the Saxons were stirred to reprisals by these rigors and were enthused by the victory of Suntal. They took up arms again with increased fury. For almost three years, each side waged war without quarter. In 785 both nations were exhausted, and Charlemagne offered peace to Widukind, who asked for and received baptism.

Pope Adrian, when informed of this news, ordered that three days of public processions be held in every Christian country [24] as an act of thanksgiving.

[21] *PL,* C, 205 f. This letter of Alcuin is of uncertain date, but is certainly later than the Verden execution and the Capitulary of Saxony. In the Latin there is a play of words which is lost in translation: *Mittantur praedicatores et non praedatores.*

[22] *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 612; *Epistola Alcuini ad Carolum Magnum, anno 798.*

[23] *Oportet sacerdotes partibus illis pastoralem circumdare vigilantiam, et in eorum arbitrio indicere poenitentiam, considerantes piaculum tam voluntatis quam extra voluntatem coactis ad suum revertentis vomitum. PL,* XCVIII, 591; *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 568.

[24] *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 568 f. The rest of Widukind's life is lost in legend. In the thirteenth century the minstrels used to sing *The Song of Widukind the Saxon;* some individual churches honored him as a saint; some genealogists made him the ancestor of Robert the Strong. The Saxons also had their legend. According to them, Widukind was converted not by the arms of the Franks nor by the arguments of their missioners, but by a miracle performed by God Himself in the Holy Eucharist.

St. Ludger

The peaceful missions started again. The principal missioner of this period was St. Ludger, a native of Frisia. He was trained in piety and studies by St. Gregory of Utrecht, whom St. Boniface had met near Trier and made his disciple. Ludger finished his studies at York under the guidance of Alcuin. Ordained priest in 778 at the age of thirty, he wished, out of veneration for St. Boniface whose footsteps he sought to follow, to make his habitual residence at Dokkum, the place made sacred by the martyrdom of the apostle of Germany. But the disturbances of the war, during which he saw Bishop Alberic of Utrecht die of grief, forced him to withdraw beyond the frontiers. He returned after the peace, and in 795, at the boundary between the Franks and the Saxons, founded the monastery of Werden. He died as Bishop of Munster in 809. He was the last of the great apostles of Saxony.

Charlemagne's Clemency

Certain wise legislative acts of Charlemagne seconded his apostolate. An act of Speyer (788), written in lofty terms, declared that Charlemagne, grateful to God for the victory that he owed to Him, granted freedom to the men of Saxony and wished them to be subjects of God alone.[25] A capitulary of 797, drawn up after a fresh revolt of Saxons and Frisians, must have been more severe. But the magnanimous Emperor abolished the death penalty in most cases for which it was formerly prescribed, stipulated that the Saxons henceforth were to be judged according to Saxon law, and left to Saxony a large degree of autonomy.[26]

Thus, says the Saxon poet, Charlemagne's piety and gener-

[25] Baluze, I, 249 f.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 275, 280, 405 ff.

osity in a short time accomplished what terror had been unable to do in thirty-three years:

"Plus regis pietas et munificentia fecit
Quam terror." [27]

The Corvey Monastery

The measures of pacification were strengthened by the foundation of several monasteries, the principal one being the monastery of New Corbie. Among the young Saxons that Charlemagne used to bring to France and have educated in his schools, a number had made their religious profession in the celebrated monastery of Corbie near Amiens. In the ninth century this monastery was one of the chief centers of civilization. It was governed at that time by the holy abbot Adalhard, a relative of the King, like him a grandson of Charles Martel.[28]

To these young monks Adalhard and Charlemagne appealed for the founding of a monastery in Saxony. One of the monks, Theodrat, a Saxon of noble birth, indicated where the new foundation should be located. "I know," he told them, "on my father's property a suitable place, provided with an abundant water supply." It was at the mouth of the Weser, in a splendid location. Charlemagne died without seeing his project realized. But Louis the Pious favored the execution of the plan. A brother of Adalhard, Wala by name, who had earlier been in Saxony at his royal relative's side in command of the armies of Germany, returned there in the habit of a Benedictine monk and was in charge of the foundation, with another monk, named Adalhard. That was in 815. The beginning was difficult. But in 823 Emperor Louis royally endowed the monastery, which took the name of *Corbia nova,* from which the Germans made the name Corvey. Corvey was for Saxony what

[27] *Poeta saxo; PL,* XCIX, 719; *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 167. The *Poeta saxo* (ninth century) put into verse the *Annales regii,* or *Annales de Lorsch.*

[28] *Vita sancti Adalhardi;* Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* fourth century, p. 710.

Fulda had been for northern Germany and St. Gall for southern Germany. Its efforts were directed to the education and training of the people, the cultivation of the arts and sciences, and the propagation of Christianity among the pagans of northern Europe. The scholarly teachers that came from the old Corbie soon gave it a fame that kept growing: such were Paschasius Radbertus, renowned for his learning, Gislemar, who subsequently baptized Harold king of Denmark, and Ansgar the apostle of the Danes and Swedes.

St. Ansgar

Ansgar (or Anscharius), born in Picardy in 801, had taken the monastic habit at the Corbie monastery. He was schoolmaster at Corvey and had just been ordained priest in 826 when King Harold of Denmark sought the help of Louis the Pious. It was a prompting of mistaken zeal that led the Emperor hastily to propose baptism to the Danish envoys, who frequently, from a desire to be agreeable or from interested motives, consented to receive instruction and be baptized. These conversions were sometimes scandalous. The monk of St. Gall relates the following incident: "One day an old Dane to whom a somewhat worn garment was given by way of a neophyte's robe, handed it back, saying: 'This is the twentieth time I have received baptism among you, and all the other times I was given a suitable garment. This rag is fit for an ox-driver, not for a warrior.' "[29] King Harold, instructed by Bishop Ebbo of Reims, was baptized in the month of May in the palace at Ingelheim, along with his wife, his son, and four hundred of his warriors. He later returned to paganism. Ansgar, who was present at the baptismal ceremony, may have been dubious about the King's perseverance. At any rate, he understood that the Normans,[30] as they were called, would

[29] *Monach. sangallensis, PL,* CXXIX; *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 134.

[30] At that period the men of the North were generally called Normans.

have to be reached by a more serious apostolate. He asked leave to depart with the King to bring the Gospel into the countries of the North.

The Normans

Even with the King's favor, the undertaking faced great perils. Charlemagne himself was alarmed at the thought of the dangers which he foresaw were in store for Christianity at the hands of these Norman pirates. "One day," says the monk of St. Gall, "as Charlemagne was at a window facing the sea, he perceived some ships of these terrible marauders. Thereupon the great man began weeping as he said: 'If, while I still live, they dare approach this coast, what will they do to those who come after me?' " [31] In their small oaken ships, sometimes in little boats made of willows lined with animal skins, they terrorized the shores of western Europe. Writing to a friend, Sidonius Apollinaris says:

> Sometime you may meet the curved ships of the Saxons, in whose every oarsman you think to detect an arch-pirate. Captains and crews alike, to a man they teach or learn the art of brigandage; therefore let me urgently caution you to be ever on the alert. For the Saxon is the most ferocious of all foes. He comes on you without warning; when you expect his attack he makes away. Resistance only moves him to contempt. Shipwrecks to him are no terror, but only so much training. His is no mere acquaintance with the perils of the sea; he knows them as he knows himself.[32]

The songs of their poets, which they were fond of repeating in the midst of storms or the confusion of battles, breathed a daring and ferocity unequaled. Says one of them: "I was born in the high lands of Norway, among a race that is clever in handling the bow; but I preferred to raise my sail, a terror to

[31] *Monach. sangallensis,* CXXII; *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 130.
[32] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.,* Bk. VIII, 6.

the farmers of the coast." Another song says: "I want to hold in my hand the heart of Hogui. It was torn bleeding from his breast, it was cut out with a blunt dagger. I look upon the heart of Hogui the dauntless; it shakes a little on the platter where it has been laid; it did not tremble when it was in the hero's breast." [33]

To these terrible men it was that the monk of New Corbie yearned to preach Christian peace and mercy. His predecessors' failures did not dismay him. Before him St. Willibrord and St. Wilfrid of York had made unsuccessful attempts to preach the faith in Denmark. In 822 Pope St. Paschal, in accord with Louis the Pious, entrusted a second mission to Ebbo archbishop of Reims, accompanied by the monk Halitgar. This Ebbo is a curious figure. He had experienced the extremes of human vicissitudes. Son of a slave of the royal domain, freed by Charlemagne, educated in the palace school, promoted to the government of the important diocese of Reims, he was treated as a friend by the Emperor, whose schoolmate he had been. A few years later, in 833, he covered himself with disgrace by his shameful conduct toward his benefactor. The results of the mission of Ebbo and Halitgar, which lasted from 822 to 824, were doubtful, as was their mission itself. As imperial ambassador and papal missioner the apostle-diplomat negotiated an accord between Harold and his rivals, then baptized a number of the notables of the kingdom. It was a repetition, at the Danish court, of the fruitless ceremonies of the Frankish court.

The monk of New Corbie Abbey had a different ambition. Ansgar was a saint. His sole desire was to shed his blood for Christ. Martyrdom was not granted him, but no sort of persecution was spared his apostolic soul. Says his biographer:

[33] A song taken from the *Edda,* a collection of Scandinavian mythology; Chateaubriand, *Études historiques,* sixth study; Allen, *Histoire du Danemark,* I, 8–33.

"The austerities of his penitential practices, joined to his apostolic labors, took the place of martyrdom in his case." [34] He was accompanied by the monk Autbert, who soon became exhausted, had to quit him and return to New Corbie, where he died in 830. Ansgar devoted himself especially to preaching the Gospel, redeeming slaves, instructing children, and catechizing the poor. Not satisfied with preaching the faith in Denmark, he turned his steps toward Sweden. Attacked by pirates and stripped of everything he was taking with him, he reached there destitute of resources. Obtaining his livelihood by manual labor after the example of the Apostle St. Paul, he preached by example even more than by his words, the Christian virtues to the Swedes. In 834 he was consecrated archbishop of Hamburg and was appointed papal legate for the whole region of the North. He was beginning to build churches, open schools, and form a library when, in 837, pirates invaded the city and set it on fire. The young Christian community of Sweden was dispersed.

Ansgar had to wander from Sweden to Denmark, from Denmark to Sweden, until the day when the Pope entrusted to him the government of the Church in Bremen. He who has been called "the apostle of the northern peoples," watched over all the missions of the northern region until the end of his life. He endeavored particularly to train priests who would be able to carry on his work. But an activity of thirty-four years in the most painful labors had worn out his constitution, which at best was not strong. He died at Bremen on February 3 or 4, 865, at the age of 64. His memory should be sacred among the Danes. Few nations have had the favor of receiving the Gospel from an apostle so gentle and yet so austere, so filled with evangelical devotedness and kindness.[35]

[34] *Histoire littéraire de la France,* V, 282; *Vita sancti Anscharii; MGH, Scriptores,* II, 683 ff.; *PL,* CXVIII, 1008.

[35] Allen, *op. cit.,* I, 60; Bril, "Les premiers temps du christianisme en Suéde" in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* January 15, 1911, XII, 17–37.

Through St. Ansgar's apostolate the Church reached the most formidable of all the barbarians of the Germanic race, the people from whom the other tribes so long obtained the inspiration of their resistance and perhaps the people whence all the Indo-European races issued forth.[36]

During this period another family of nations, in contact with Charlemagne's Empire, received the Gospel—the family of Slavic peoples.[37] However, before entering upon the account of that conversion, we must consider what had become of another branch of the Germanic race, a branch which, for the sake of orderly treatment, we have had to pass over in silence—the Gothic race.

[36] This is the conclusion of the latest ethnographers. See Herman, *Hist. Die Indogermanen;* G. M. Bolling, "The Home of the Indo-Europeans" in *The Catholic University Bulletin,* April, 1907, pp. 211 ff., and Cabrol in the *Revue des questions historiques,* January 1, 1908, p. 277.

[37] The Bulgarian King Boris was baptized in 864, one year before the death of St. Ansgar.

CHAPTER IX

The Church and the Arian Nations

At the time when in the icy North the last groups of the Teutonic race were converted to the Catholic faith, ready to form a great and powerful nation, the final remnants of the Gothic race, undermined by the Arian heresy, were about to disappear on the shores of the Adriatic and the Mediterranean. They were to be met with in Italy, Gaul, and Spain.

The Goths in Italy

Three peoples of Gothic race and Arian religion succeeded one another in Italy after the fall of the Roman Empire. They were the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards.

Odoacer king of the Heruli seemed the very man to take in Italy the place left vacant by the empire he had overthrown. But in reality he was not. It has been said that the entire providential rôle of that daring, uncivilized giant was to give to the imperial edifice the little blow that would bring about its final ruin. The kingdom of the Heruli lasted but a short time. The forces of Turcilinges, Rugians, and Scirri, along with the Romans, formed Odoacer's army, but they were not a homogeneous body of soldiers. Those barbarians, prematurely mingling in a cultured civilization and adopting its vices more readily than its good qualities, were soon more degenerate than the Romans of the decadence. Another barbarous race would give them the fatal blow. These were the Ostrogoths, who found themselves without enough room in Pannonia, where they were settled at the time of the fall of the Hun Empire (454).

Since 474 their leader was a remarkable man, Theodoric, who was brought up at the court of Zeno in Constantinople and there embraced Arianism. Theodoric asked the Emperor for authorization to settle in Italy and drive out Odoacer. In this undertaking he found a means of extending his domination and also an occasion to avenge an insult which the King of the Heruli had offered his relative Frederick, son of the King of the Rugians. Zeno, glad to perform an act of sovereignty over Italy at slight expense, readily granted his permission. The whole nation of the Ostrogoths, warriors and their families in carts, set out across the country of the Gepidae and over the Julian Alps. Odoacer opposed them with all his might. After four years of strife, from 489 to 493, a treaty was signed, leaving Theodoric his conquests and granting Odoacer the title of king. Soon, however, Theodoric, having invited the King of the Heruli to a banquet, slew him with his own hand.

From that moment no one spoke of the kingdom of the Heruli. They scattered and were to be found mingled with various other peoples. They no longer existed as a nation.

The Church had small reason to lament the fall of Odoacer. Despite his declarations of good will, he combined in his own person the defects of the uncultured barbarian and of the degenerate Roman.

The Reign of Theodoric

The Church placed more hope in the people that had just been victorious and especially in their King Theodoric. The period of Ostrogoth domination did, in fact, mark, in the history of Italy, an epoch of brilliant civilization. Perhaps that brilliancy was due less to Theodoric's genius than to his ability in employing men of talent who governed under his supreme authority. This conjecture seems to be justified by the acts of savage brutality that covered with blood the beginning and the

close of his reign. The great reforms were the work of Theodoric's chief minister, the Roman Cassiodorus. The King of the Ostrogoths appears to have been before all else a statesman. This Arian barbarian had the good sense to respect the two institutions that seemed to him the best guaranty of the social order, namely, the Roman legislation and the Catholic Church. The *Edictum Theodorici* is taken entirely from Roman law. As to the Church, he did more than merely leave it free, he protected it many times against violence and schism. He took the side of Pope Symmachus against the antipope Lawrence. In 502 he favored the meeting of the council that exonerated the Pope from the charges made against him. In his reign great men flourished, such as St. Benedict of Nursia, St. Ennodius of Pavia, Dionysius Exiguus, Cassiodorus, and Boethius. St. Benedict we have already spoken of at some length.

Ennodius

Ennodius bishop of Pavia was a rhetorician, the most cultured of the rhetoricians. His prose, overloaded with quotations from Sallust and Cicero, "is often so labored as to be unintelligible";[1] but genuine feeling is to be found in it, and beneath the wordy rhetorician we perceive the man, the Christian, and the bishop. In defense of Pope Symmachus, he expressed a lofty indignation. Although persecuted for his loyalty to the Holy See at the time of his second embassy to Constantinople, he endured insult and contempt with the heroic patience of a true minister of Christ.[2]

Dionysius

The monk Dionysius, who from humility called himself "the Little" (Dionysius Exiguus), is well known as the one who

[1] Boissier, *La fin du paganisme,* I, 251 ff.

[2] See his works in *MGH, Auctores antiquiss.,* Vol. VII. Sirmond's edition is to be found in *PL,* LXIII, 13–364.

introduced the use of the Christian era.[3] To him we owe also the first collection of conciliar documents. It begins with the famous *Canons of the Apostles,* which were later inserted by Gratian in his *Decretum* and in the Middle Ages were looked upon as truly Apostolic documents. Today all scholars are agreed that they were composed in the fifth century, probably in Syria or Palestine. Dionysius found them in the East. He himself says he is doubtful of their genuineness.[4] But the fact that they were put in the place of honor in the collection led to their being accepted without investigation.

Cassiodorus

Cassiodorus belonged to an illustrious family of Calabria. He was successively quaestor, private secretary of the King, praetorian prefect, and consul. He was the heart and soul of Theodoric's government. Under the rule of the Ostrogoth King, the development given to general civilization is owing chiefly to him. Ecclesiastical studies and the Christian life are likewise indebted to him. About 540, when he was sixty years old, he withdrew to his Vivarium estate in Calabria, to live there in retirement, study, and prayer, with the monks he had attracted to him. Perhaps he himself became a monk. In any event, this great man's influence upon the development of the monastic institution was considerable.

He was the first one to conceive the monastery as a place of study as well as a place of seclusion for the cultivation of the spiritual life. In the days of his career in the world he had formed, in concert with Pope Agapetus, the project of founding a school for the advanced study of Christian sciences.[5] As

[3] We know that his reckoning was incorrect by several years in fixing upon the year of Rome 754 as the year of the Savior's birth. Our Lord was born at least five years earlier than that date.

[4] Mansi, I, 59 ff.

[5] *Nisus sum ergo cum beatissimo Agapito papa urbis Romae ut . . . collatis expensis in Urbe romana professos doctores scholae potius acciperent christianae. Institutiones,* preface; *PL,* LXX, 1105 f.

circumstances hindered the execution of his plan, he wished at least to carry out the idea to some extent by the organization of the studies in his monastery at Vivarium. The program is outlined in his famous work, *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum,* a veritable *Introduction* to the study of the sacred and profane sciences. In the schools of the Middle Ages it became the guide of higher studies.

One of his most original innovations, particularly adapted to the needs of that time, was the training of writers especially occupied in copying ancient books. They formed a separate category in that sort of monastic academy. From Cassiodorus they received their regulations and their technical method. He considered this the noblest and most useful of all manual labors, and looked upon it as something sacred. He says: "Satan receives a blow every time the writer transcribes one of the Lord's words." [6]

Boethius

Of lesser genius, but more illustrious through misfortune, was another high official of Theodoric's government, Boethius. His book, *Consolations of Philosophy,* was the comforter of many a scholar and many a saint in the Middle Ages. Alfred the Great translated it into Anglo-Saxon, and St. Thomas Aquinas wrote a commentary upon this lofty and melancholy testament of a scholar who, reserving the thoughts of the faith for the intimacy of heart to heart converse with God,[7] sought, before men, to find simply in his conscience as man, the strength to remain firm and calm in the presence of death. Dante who, like all his literary contemporaries, was nourished with the *Consolations of Philosophy,* sees among the loftiest

[6] *Tot vulnera Satanas accipit, quot antiquarius Domini verba describit. Institutiones,* chap. 30; *PL,* LXX, 1145.

[7] Since Usener's publication (in 1877) of a fragment of Cassiodorus' work which explicitly refers to Boethius' theological writings, the latter's sound Christianity can no longer be questioned. Cf. Bardenhewer, *Les pères de l'Église,* III, 161.

representatives of human thought, between St. Ambrose and Venerable Bede, a globe of pure light,

> "By seeing every good therein exults
> The sainted soul, which the fallacious world
> Makes manifest to him who listeneth well;
> The body whence 'twas hunted forth is lying
> Down in Cieldauro, and from martyrdom
> And banishment it came unto this peace." [8]

The poet is here alluding to the tragic end of Boethius, who was shamefully put to death by Theodoric. A mere incident was enough to awaken and release the most cruel instincts in that barbarian soul. Emperor Justin, by one of those excessive measures which the civil power usually employs when it interferes in religious questions without authorization, had deprived his Arian subjects of their churches and the exercise of their civil rights. Theodoric was angered by such a measure against his coreligionists and perhaps was disturbed at seeing many of his own subjects becoming Catholics. He thereupon suddenly became a persecutor. The reprisals he employed were terrible.

He ordered Pope John I to go to Constantinople and there obtain from Justin the withdrawal of his edict and the return of the recently converted Arians to Arianism. The holy Pontiff did not refuse to be a messenger of peace and conciliation. It was the first time a pope had entered Constantinople. He was received with unparalleled magnificence, and without difficulty obtained the restoration of the Arian churches to their owners and the restoration of civil rights to the Arians. But the Pontiff could not think of asking that the recent converts return to their heresy.[9]

Theodoric, enraged at the partial failure of this mission and piqued at the honor shown to the Pope by the Eastern Em-

[8] Dante, *Paradiso,* canto 10, verses 124–129, Longfellow's translation.
[9] *Lib. pont.,* I, 277 note 5.

peror, became exasperated. In an outburst of rage he ordered the execution of Boethius and the aged Senator Symmachus, Boethius' father-in-law, whom he accused of treason. He watched for Pope John's return, arrested him at Ravenna, and cast him into prison. The Pontiff, worn out by mental and physical torture, soon breathed his last in his dungeon, a martyr to duty. On his tomb, where miraculous cures presently bore witness to his holiness, the Christians engraved these lines: "Pontiff of the Lord, you fall the victim of Christ; thus have the popes been pleasing to almighty God." [10]

The holy Pontiff died May 18, 526. Theodoric exerted all his power to bring about the election of a candidate of his own choosing, Felix by name,[11] and published an edict of persecution. But the King died (August 30, 526) without having time to carry out his decree.

During the last years of his life, Theodoric alienated the two great powers with which he should have reckoned: the Catholic Church by the persecution of Pope John, the Roman party by the execution of Boethius and Symmachus. In the might of the Ostrogoths the people of Italy saw merely a heretical and barbarian power. But its days were numbered. It ended with Teja in 553, having lasted sixty years (493–553).

The Lombards in Italy

The question now was, who would take the place of the fallen kingdom. In 555 it seemed for a while that it might be the emperor. The Byzantine general Narses, after a battle in

[10] *Antistes Domini procumbis victima Christi;*
Pontifices summo sic placuere Deo.
This epitaph was discovered and published by De Rossi, *Inscript. christ.*, II, 57.

[11] In the first edition of the *Liber pontificalis*, the reading preferred by Mommsen is: *ordinatus est in jusso Theodorici regis* (*Lib. pont.*, Mommsen's ed., I, 138). See a further testimony to the same effect in Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, I, 280 note 5. The election of St. Felix was canonically confirmed afterward by general consent. St. Felix closes the series, unbroken thus far, of the canonized popes.

which he defeated the Ostrogoths, declared Italy a province of the Eastern Empire. But the Empire was not in condition to exercise effective sway over Italy. Thirteen years later (568) a sturdier barbarian race, whose assistance Narses had asked for his expedition and who had developed a thirst for conquest on their own account, the longobardi ("men with long beards"), or Lombards, under the leadership of their King Alboin, took possession of a greater portion of the Italian peninsula. Of the Ostrogothic kingdom, which Theodoric thought would be the successor of the Roman Empire, scarcely anything remained except the Catholic works so intelligently fostered by the great minister Cassiodorus, the collections and reforms of Dionysius Exiguus, the monks of St. Benedict, and the writings of Boethius.

The Lombard invasion was most terrifying. Those barbarians pillaged and slew everything along their way. St. Gregory the Great, writing twenty-five years after Alboin's entrance into Italy, speaks of them as follows:

> The barbarous and cruel nation of the Lombards, drawn as a sword out of a sheath, left their own country and invaded ours; by reason whereof the people, which before the huge multitude were like to thick cornfields, remain now withered and overthrown: for cities be wasted, towns and villages spoiled, churches burnt, monasteries of men and women destroyed, farms left desolate, and the country remaineth solitary and void of men to till the ground, and destitute of all its inhabitants.[12]

The very appearance of these men, "with long beards falling on their vigorous breasts," as Paul the Deacon says,[13] was frightening.

> They shaved the neck and left it bare up to the back of the head, having their hair hanging down on the face as far as the mouth and parting it

[12] *Dial.*, Bk. III, chap. 38.

[13] "Long was the beard that grew down on his vigorous breast." Paul the Deacon, *History of the Langobards*, Bk. III, chap. 19.

on either side by a part in the forehead. Their garments were loose and mostly linen, such as the Anglo-Saxons are wont to wear, ornamented with broad borders woven in various colors.[14]

Abominably idolatrous,[15] they were worshipers of Odin, offered sacrifice to the god of goats, and had a superstitious cult of snakes.[16] According to St. Gregory the Great, it was at the time of this invasion that Redemptus bishop of Ferentino north of Rome, while making a visitation of his parishes, was overtaken by nightfall near the tomb of the martyr Eutychius. He there awaited the coming of daylight. About midnight the saint appeared to him and said: "Art thou awake?" When Redemptus answered, the saint continued: "The end of all flesh is come." [17] The people of Italy, panic-stricken, fled: some sought refuge in the lagoons of Venetia, others on the islands along the coast, others on the seashore ready for flight. Inland the people crowded into a few fortified cities, in Rome, and in Naples.[18]

Once established in the land, the Lombards, who chose a king only in time of war, resumed their republican form of government.[19] In each tribe an elected chieftain administered justice. It was not till later that the Lombards had a dynasty of kings. In 585, when they had to repel an attack of the imperial forces, they elected Autaris. The latter's marriage to Theodelinda, a Catholic Bavarian princess, had a great influence upon the destinies of the Lombard people. To Queen Theodelinda the Church owes the erection of numerous churches, among others that of St. John the Baptist at Monza, where the iron

[14] *Ibid.*, Bk. IV, chap. 22.

[15] Jaffé, no. 1048; St. Gregory, *Dial.*, II, 17; *Regist.*, II, 4.

[16] The worship of serpents continued at Benevento. See the hymn to St. Barbatus; Borgia, *Memorie storiche di Benevento*, II, 277.

[17] *Dial.*, Bk. III, chap. 38.

[18] The account of this invasion forms the second book of the work of Paul the Deacon, *De gestis Longobardorum; PL*, Vol. XCV.

[19] Paul the Deacon, II, 27–32; *PL*, XCV, 498–502.

crown of the Lombard kings was later deposited. To her also is due the founding of the celebrated Bobbio monastery, where St. Columban ended his days, and perhaps the conversion of her second husband, King Agilulf.[20] The accession of her nephew Aribert in 653 placed in power a Catholic branch, that put an end to Arianism and established the unity of the faith in Italy.[21] The Lombard kingdom, however, was destined to disappear. The aversion of the people of Italy to the Lombards because of their outward appearance, the weaknesses of the Lombards' political constitution, too favorable to the formation of independent duchies and thereby too much opposed to national unity, above all the ambition of their princes who, in their desire to seize the city of Rome, alienated the papacy and drove it to seek support from the Frankish princes: such were the various causes that brought the Lombard rule to an end. It lasted two centuries (568–774).

But this domination, like that of the Ostrogoths, left a deep trace in history. Monastic institutions such as the erection of the Bobbio monastery and the restoration of the Abbey of Monte Cassino, juridical monuments like the royal Edict of Rotharis, a political and social evolution like that which the Lombards' sojourn in Italy determined, deserve our attention.[22]

[20] The contemporary documents are contradictory. The *Epistola Columbani,* no. 5 (*PL,* LXXX, 259 ff.) supposes that the king was a Catholic. A letter of Sisebut king of the Visigoths seems to indicate that he was Arian. *Epist. Visigoth.,* no. 9.

[21] Outside of Arianism, this unity of the faith had been broken in Italy by the schism of Aquileia. After the theological disturbances in which Pope Vigilius was compromised, the metropolitan of Aquileia withdrew from communion with Rome. Theodelinda, incorrectly informed, was for a while seduced by the schism. St. Gregory had no difficulty in detaching her from the schism. Cf. *MGH, Reg. Gregor.,* IV, 4, 38. The schism of Aquileia did not end until 628, under Pope Honorius. Cf. Jaffé, no. 2016; *Lib. pont.,* I, 325, 381.

[22] The Life of St. Columban by Jonas of Suza, who was a Bobbio monk, in 618; *PL,* LXXXVII, 1011–1046. There is a critical edition by Krusch in *MGH, Script. rerum merowingicarum,* IV, 108 ff. Cf. E. Martin, *Saint Colomban.*

The Bobbio Monastery

In 612 St. Columban, exiled from his abbey at Luxeuil on account of the lofty freedom of his speech, then taken from the shore of Lake Constance in consequence of the excessive zeal of one of his monks, arrived in Italy and received a most hearty welcome from the great Queen Theodelinda. In the Trebie valley the Bobbio estate was given to him that he might build a monastery there. The fame for holiness that clung to the steps of the famous Irish monk, the report of his influence with the aged Queen Brunehilde and of his courageous invectives against King Thierry, the strict discipline of his monastic colony, which had followed him from Ireland to Burgundy, from Burgundy to Austrasia, from Austrasia to Italy, a colony in which he appeared as a clan chieftain rather than as the father of a family of monks, all this gave Columban the features of a prophet, like the seers of Israel.

Of all the Gothic peoples, the Lombards were the most imbued with the Germanic spirit. Among them, the coming of the Anglo-Saxon apostle, who seemed to incarnate the national pride and wild daring of the northern races, soon bore fruit. The Bobbio monastery presently became a center of active strife against the last champions of Arianism. Columban settled down there and, until his death in 615, there maintained in its full rigor that famous Rule, derived largely from the monks of Bangor. Seeming to take no account of human weakness, it punished infractions by fasts, imprisonment, and scourging, gave superiors the exercise of authority without appeal, supposed in all members—abbots, priors, and simple monks—unbounded self-denial and loyalty, bodies of iron and souls of heroes.[23]

But with Columban dead, his Rule appeared hard. At the beginning of the ninth century, when the Lombards were min-

[23] See the Rule of St. Columban in *PL*, LXXX, 209–224. Cf. Malnory's doctorate thesis, *Quid luxovienses monachi ad regulam monasteriorum contulerint.*

gled with the population of Italy, it became inapplicable. All the monasteries founded under the influence of Luxeuil and Bobbio adopted most of the Benedictine Rule. In 817 the Council of Aachen ordered the adoption of the Rule of St. Benedict in all the monasteries of the Carolingian Empire. Finally Luxeuil and Bobbio also adopted it.

The Rule of St. Columban had fulfilled its providential mission. As the amazing life of the fathers of the desert had done in the midst of the Graeco-Roman world, as at a later date the sublime folly of St. Francis of Assisi's poverty would do in the very height of feudalism, so the austere Rule of St. Columban had shown, in the heart of the barbarian world, so selfish and jealous of personal rights, how far the enthusiasm of heroism could go in obedience and self-denial. Even those who were unable to endure that strict discipline, with jealous care kept the sacred relics of the great monk, his chalice and his staff of thorny palm. These are still venerated in the St. Columban Church at Bobbio. With favors heaped upon it by the kings of France and the emperors of Germany, the Bobbio Abbey in the Middle Ages became one of the most important centers of intellectual life. The Bobbio manuscripts have been the basis of many literary and historical discoveries of modern times.[24]

To St. Columban and his Rule has been attributed a still more important influence upon ecclesiastical institutions. It has been said that to him the Church owes the introduction of private penance and private confession. According to this view, they are merely the extension of a monastic practice, the accusation of faults which monks make to their abbot. It is said that the influence of the celebrated Irish monk introduced this custom among the laity, and it then became a universal ecclesiastical institution.[25] Says Duchesne: "This thesis is re-

[24] Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana,* III, 376.
[25] Lorning, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts,* Vol. II.

futed by the following considerations: first, it does not take into account the practice of private penance among the Greeks and other Easterners, who were not affected by Irish and Anglo-Saxon influences; the same may be said of Rome, southern Italy, and Spain; secondly, it cannot be admitted that the bishops of the Frankish countries, who were generally not favorably inclined to St. Columban and his monks, let the latter impose so serious a disciplinary change upon them." [26] It seems more likely that St. Columban and his monks became apostles of private confession, which was little in use about them, and that, to facilitate the use of it, they replaced penance with imposition of hands, and public reconciliation with private penance, as practiced in the monasteries.[27]

Restoration of Monte Cassino

While the Benedictine Rule was spreading through all the countries of Europe, the cradle of the Benedictine family at Monte Cassino, ruined by the invasions, remained deserted. The venerated remains of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica had been removed from there in 679.[28] In 716 a wealthy resident of Brescia, one Petronax, aided by some Roman monks, undertook, with the encouragement of Pope Gregory II and the backing of the Lombard Duke Gisulf of Benevento, to raise the Abbey of Monte Cassino from its ruins. God blessed the pious enterprise. Petronax died abbot of the monastery. In 748 Pope St. Zachary consecrated the new church, exempted the monastery from any episcopal jurisdiction, and deposited there the original text of the Rule of St. Benedict.

[26] *Bulletin critique,* 1883, pp. 366 f.

[27] E. Martin, *Saint Colomban;* art "Colomban" in *Dict. de théol,* III, 374.

[28] The incident is related by Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Long.,* VI, 2. Was St. Benedict's body brought to the monastery of Fleury (Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire)? Is it now there or at Monte Cassino? This question is a matter of controversy between the Benedictines of Italy and the Benedictines of France. See Mabillon, *Dissertatio in translatione S. Benedicti; Acta sanctorum O.S.B.,* II, 337; Chamard, *Les reliques de S. Benoît;* Cuissant, "De reliquiis S. Benedicti" in the *Benedict. Studien,* 1884.

The glorious destinies of the famous abbey are well known. The Lombard King Ratchis and Carloman the brother of Pepin sought retirement in its cloister. There, too, toward the close of the eighth century, the monk Paul Warnefridus, better known as Paul the Deacon, wrote his *Historia Longobardorum,* which "enjoyed extraordinary and, by and large, well-deserved favor in the Middle Ages." [29] No other people has found in its national historian so faithful an echo of its life, so understanding an interpreter of its feelings.[30]

These traces of the Lombard domination are to be found also in the original style of the churches of that period. "The Lombard style is a heavy modification of the Byzantine style. It should have a place in the history of art." [31]

The Royal Edict of Rotharis

The Lombard people survived also in their legislation. The *Royal Edict* of Rotharis, promulgated in national assembly during the year 683, contains 388 articles; [32] it is different from the other barbarian laws in three remarkable particulars. It surpasses them all in the extent and complexity of its provisions. It embraces not only public and criminal law, but also private law which, in the Edict of Theodoric, scarcely existed, each person being judged according to the laws of his own locality. No law of that period is marked by so fundamentally Germanic a character.[33] The national law of the Lombards has survived most other national legislations. Amplified and

[29] Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* I, 82.

[30] Kurth, *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens,* p. 37.

[31] Molinier, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* p. 308. On Lombard architecture, see Rivoira, *Le origini della architettura lombarda.*

[32] Pertile, *Storia del diritto italiano,* I, 131 note 10; *MGH, Leges,* Vol. IV.

[33] But we should not exaggerate this trait. Traces of Roman law have been noted in the Edict of Rotharis. See Del Giudice, "Le tracce del diritto romano nell' editto Longobardo" in *Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti,* 1886, pp. 513 ff.

amended by Rotharis' successors and by the Carolingian rulers, it continued far into the Middle Ages. Thanks to its wonderful adaptation to the people for whom it was made, for a long time it kept its own character alongside the Roman and the canonical legislation. Interpreted by jurists, in Italy it maintained a juridical activity,[34] which procured for the Italian schools, at the time of the renaissance of Roman law, a distinguished rank among the other schools of Italy. This, so it seems, was its chief rôle, for the Roman law, as promulgated by Emperor Justinian, never ceased to exercise a preponderant influence in Italy. Ecclesiastics followed it and appealed to it as their law, subsidiary to the canonical regulations. In 887 Leo IV, writing to Emperor Lothaire I, felicitated him on the fact that the Roman law until then had "remained unharmed by the universal tempests" and asked that it might continue "to be maintained in its strength and vigor." [35]

Thus little by little, at the same time that the various races were intermingling, the strongest institutions and the most autonomous legal systems were being founded among the Gothic races, in the unity of the Church and of the Roman traditions.

A more lasting and far more serious result of the Lombard domination was the profound change it made in the political geography of Italy and in its social conditions. Thenceforth the Italian peninsula was made up of two regions: Lombard Italy occupying the north and central portions, and Byzantine Italy embracing the coast and a few cities of the central portion, the chief city being Rome. Moreover, in Lombard Italy

[34] In the tenth century, when law studies seem to have been everywhere abandoned, the Lombard law was still studied. The monks of La Cava monastery, near Salerno, published (1871) a tenth century manuscript containing the Lombard laws. *MGH, codex diplom. cavensis.* It will be found in the *Leges,* IV, 31. Pertile, *Storia del diritto italiano,* I, 133–139.

[35] *Vestram flagitamus clementiam, ut, sicut romana lex viguit absque universis procellis, ita nunc suum robur propriumque vigorem obtineat. Corp. jur. can., Decret.* Part I, dist. 10, chap. 13. *Leo IV Lothario Augusto.*

as in Byzantine Italy the need of defense against the barbarians and against the ambitious scheming of imperial officials gave birth to a new feudalism, powerful and restless.

Nowhere more than at Rome, a Byzantine enclave in the midst of Lombard Italy, were the difficulties inherent in this situation more keenly felt: a radical powerlessness of the imperial authority to maintain order, incessant rivalries of the seignorial families, perpetual conflict between the military aristocracy and the ecclesiastical aristocracy. Rome continued to suffer for a long time from this internal unrest. The powerful sword of Charlemagne ended it for a while, but the disturbances sprang up again with extreme violence in the tenth century under the baneful influence of the house of Theophylactus, and in the fourteenth century through the agitation of tribunes like Rienzi. To free Rome entirely from these disturbances there was need of the establishment of a very solid and powerful temporal power. The popes and the Christian princes would provide it.

When the arms of the kings of France overthrew the power of the Lombards, the brilliant and ephemeral Burgundian and Visigoth kingdoms had long since disappeared from the soil of Gaul, but they, too, survived through their great men and their jurisprudence.

The Visigoths

The Visigoths and the Burgundians, Gothic in race and Arian in religion like the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards, were different in this particular, that they did not introduce themselves by force into the regions they would occupy; they were invited there by the imperial power itself.[36]

[36] Before they were appealed to by the emperors, the Visigoths had already penetrated into Gaul. According to Fustel de Coulanges, this penetration was peaceful and almost unobserved. *Histoire des Instit.,* I, 347–351. Julien Havet thinks it had a warlike and conquering character. *Rev. hist.,* IV, Part I, pp. 88 ff.

At the beginning of the fifth century the people of Rome at least three different times (406, 408, and 409) saw a throng of pillaging barbarians pass by. Tall men they were, *septipedes* (seven-foot men), as Sidonius Apollinaris called them, men who filled the Romans with terror. They were the Visigoths, led by their King Alaric I. It seems established that they had been called into Italy, first by Stilicho, the chief minister of Emperor Honorius of the West, to fight Arcadius: then by Rufinus, chief minister of Emperor Arcadius of the East, to defend him against the forces of Honorius. These barbarians, who were being paid by both sides, then thought of taking for themselves that empire over which the two brothers were at strife.

In 414, Alaric's successor, Ataulfus, clothed with the insignia of *magister militum,* seems to have had the idea of making his residence at Rome. But the Emperor gave him a new commission: to fight, in the name of the Empire, the barbarians who were threatening the Roman provinces of Gaul and Spain. He went thither, drove out the barbarians, and established himself strongly on his own account between the Rhone, the Garonne, and the Pyrenees. His capital was Toulouse. The Visigoths were a people perpetually restless. Until the time when Clovis drove them back beyond the Pyrenees, they continued to be a cause of disturbance in southern Gaul. The emperors made use of their restless disposition, employing them to fight the Huns and Vandals or to put down revolts in the Empire.

Euric King of the Visigoths

The greatest of the Visigoth kings was Euric. In his reign the kingdom of the Visigoths, extending into Gaul and Spain, reached the height of its power. "Euric might have assured

the Visigoths the domination of Gaul if he had won the Church to his cause." [37]

But Euric was a persecutor of the Church. After reaching the throne by fratricide, he governed with intelligence and consistency in his ideas, but he dishonored himself by disloyalty, treason, and murder. Says St. Gregory of Tours:

> Euric, king of the Goths, began a grievous persecution of the Christians in Gaul. Everywhere he beheaded those who would not conform to his perverse doctrine; he cast priests into prison. . . . The doors of the holy churches he ordered to be blocked with briers, that only a few might enter and the faith might pass into oblivion. It was chiefly the cities of Novempopulana and Aquitania that were wasted by this storm. There is today extant a letter on this subject written by the noble Sidonius to Bishop Basilius, in which these facts are recorded.[38]

In the letter which Gregory of Tours mentions, Sidonius Apollinaris says that Euric might be taken for the head of a religious sect rather than the ruler of a nation.[39] Euric, observing the ineffectiveness of his bloody measures of persecution, thought of a more insidious plan, the disorganization and gradual extinction of the clergy. He forbade vacant sees to be filled and further hindered the ordaining of additional priests. Public worship had to be discontinued in many places. Euric died in 484. His son Alaric II and his successors did not carry out his tyrannical measures. But the kingdom was in the hands of the Arians, emboldened by the favor which the previous reign had granted them. Here and there, in the cities, a handful of heretics might be seen oppressing the Catholics. It was an era of local persecutions. In the life of St. Caesarius it is related that, on pretext of hunting boars, the Visigoth

[37] Cf. Bayet in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* II, Part I, p. 83.
[38] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* Bk. II, chap. 25, p. 64.
[39] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.,* VII, 6; *PL,* LVIII, 570 f.

Arians ravaged the monastery lands, lodged in the houses of the monastery peasants and used them in their hunting expeditions, and were the cause of great disturbance in the monastic communities. The Bishop of Arles, in the presence of the ill-will of the government, vainly tried to be protected by the Romans. He then turned to God in prayer. The boars disappeared from the monastic lands as if by miracle.[40] There followed a comparative calm, for which the saint praised God.

The persecution by the populace sometimes assumed a political character. After the conversion of the Franks, the Catholics were accused of making a pact with them. St. Gregory of Tours gives an account of the uprising that nearly cost the life of Quintianus bishop of Rodez.[41] Caesarius himself, the great bishop who, in the city of Arles, was regarded with general veneration, did not escape their suspicion. He was a Burgundian by birth. They charged him with treason in favor of his former kings: Caesarius, they said, wanted to turn the city of Arles over to the Burgundians. He was removed from his see and exiled to Bordeaux.[42]

In a way these persecutions served the cause of the Church. The people of southern Gaul, indolent and vivacious, fond of idleness and of noisy pleasures, adapted themselves too easily to the coming of the new rulers. But they rose up at the outrage. Then it was observed that their carefree manner was only superficial. As Kurth remarks, "their faith became precious to them when they saw it oppressed, and the most indifferent persons among them felt a certain political ardor for it. And the Aquitanians clung to their bishops. The war upon the episcopate awoke the proudest and most generous impulses of their souls." [43] The Visigoths, defeated at Vouillé by the troops of Clovis, departed amid general execration.

[40] *Vita S. Caesarii*, I, 36; *PL*, LVII, 1019.
[41] St. Gregory of Tours, *ibid.*, p. 75.
[42] *Vita S. Caesarii*, I, 16; *PL*, LXVII, 1008 f.
[43] Kurth, *Clovis*, p. 403.

The *Lex Visigothorum*

It cannot be denied that Euric and even Alaric possessed a real political sense which, except when sectarian passion misled them, brought about results that were useful to general civilization. Such was the code of laws known as the *Lex Visigothorum* or *Breviarium Alaricianum.* It is impossible to know exactly what part of this Code goes back to Euric, because it was modified by Leovigild and Recared, the Visigoth kings of Spain. Some historians have thought they could distinguish the part due to Euric.[44] What is certain is that the *Lex Visigothorum* is "the mildest of the barbarian laws." [45] In it we find no trace of legal dueling. We may suppose that the influence of religion was felt in the laws even of Euric. At that period "only one really strong power existed in Gaul, the power of the episcopate." [46] When, in any state, the Church constitutes a real social force, a statesman like Euric reckons with it: when the Christian spirit pervades the surrounding atmosphere, even the persecutors are penetrated by it.

St. Caesarius of Arles

But in southern Gaul the Christian spirit already had a powerful center, thanks to the great bishop who has quite justly been called the preceptor of the Frankish Church,[47] St. Caesarius of Arles. He was one of those men who gave the Merovingian Church doctrine, exhortation, discipline, and culture.[48] We do not mean that the Bishop of Arles was a theologian of great capacity. His doctrine was that of his master, St. Augustine. He held to it with scrupulous, almost obstinate,

[44] Esmein, *Histoire du droit français,* p. 98. Blumme in *MGH, Leges,* Vol. III.

[45] Gautier, *Histoire du droit français,* p. 109.

[46] Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* II, Part I, p. 92.

[47] Paul Lejay, "Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles" in the *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. rel.,* X (1905), 616.

[48] *Ibid.*

fidelity. Frequently he condensed it in clear maxims, short and didactically arranged. But he moderated the rigor of the expressions by an unusual sense of the practical life. St. Caesarius was a catechist. The title that perhaps most becomes him is that of catechist of the Church of the Merovingian period. He possessed also the feeling of real life. Several of his writings have the tenor of a symbol of faith. Dom Morin attributes to Caesarius the authorship of the so-called Athanasian Creed.[49] He might thus be considered the catechist of the universal Church. His sermons, written down by tachygraphers as they were delivered, were preached throughout the whole Frankish Church and even beyond.[50] On the great questions of predestination, the Trinity, and the incarnation, the Bishop of Arles enunciated his doctrine at the six councils over which he presided or which he inspired: Agde (506), Arles (524), Carpentras (527), Orange (529), Vaison (529), and Marseilles (523).

But in his sermons he dealt with the most ordinary questions of daily life. As he lived in the midst of his flock, daily associating with the people he was instructing, his discourses abounded in practical advice based upon exact observations. Thus his oratorical work became a genuine picture of the Christian life of that period. He mentions the reception of holy communion at the approach of the great feasts.[51] He threatens to refuse the blessing of a marriage by way of ecclesiastical penalty,[52] proof that at that time the nuptial blessing was regarded as independent of the validity. He gives us

[49] Germain Morin, "Le symbole d'Athanase et son premier témoin, saint Césaire d'Arles" in the *Revue bénédictine,* XVIII (1901), 337–363.

[50] St. Cesarius had no hesitation in taking an entire sermon from some confrère. At that period there was evidently no idea of what we call literary ownership. Lejay, *R.H.L.R.,* X, 611; *Revue bénédictin,* XVI, 342.

[51] *PL,* XXXIX, 1974 f. Migne inserts the sermons of St. Caesarius in the appendix to the sermons of St. Augustine.

[52] *PL.* XXXIX, 2291.

one of the earliest authentic references to the sacrament of extreme unction.[53] These sermons contain definite precepts about almsgiving, fixed at not less than a tenth of one's income.[54] And we there find one of the earliest enumerations of the works of mercy, which are spoken of as capable of wiping out small sins (*peccata minuta*).[55] Caesarius saw about him the practice of private penance and he recommended the use of it.[56] His doctrine on purgatory possesses an exactness that is hardly to be found in writings before his day.[57] All these teachings and counsels are given with a kindliness and a condescension for human weakness, a carefulness of detail, a tone of sly sagacity, and a Burgundian good nature, that make this Gallo-Roman, born in the district of Chalon-sur-Saône, one of the most engaging figures of the Merovingian period.[58]

There has been some scholarly discussion as to whether the Christian life found expression in southern Gaul at that period in a special architecture, in a sort of "pre-Romanesque" art, which developed into Gothic art.[59] Such a theory has not been satisfactorily proved. Probably the art of the Middle Ages was called "Gothic" simply because the word was synonymous with "barbarian";[60] and it is also probable that the Visigoths had but an insignificant part in the evolution of religious architecture.

[53] *PL,* XXXIX, 2238 f. Cf. Boudinhon, *Revue catholique des Églises,* II (1905), 403.

[54] *PL,* XXXIX, 2268.

[55] *Ibid.,* 1948, 2219. The sacramental number seven occurs only later. Poncelet in *Analecta bollandiana,* XXII (1903), 187.

[56] *PL,* XXXIX, 2227.

[57] *Ibid.,* col. 2212.

[58] St. Caesarius was born in 470 or 471, and died in 543. Malnory, *Saint Césaire, évêque d'Arles.*

[59] This view is maintained by Courajod in his lectures at the *École du Louvre,* 1899, Vol. I. Brutails (*L'archéologie du Moyen Age et ses méthodes*) opposes Courajod's opinion. Cf. Leclercq, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne,* II, 128.

[60] Rabelais was one of the first to give the word "Gothic" the disparaging implication which it has long retained. Lemonnier, in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* V, 312.

The Burgundians

Of all the men of Gothic race, the least barbarous, the most easily assimilated to the Roman civilization, were the Burgundians. In the fourth century, according to Ammianus Marcellinus, they boasted that they were sprung from the same stock as the Romans, *sobolen se esse romanam Burgundi sciunt.* The emperors had a large number of them in their pay, stationing them along the Rhine to protect Trier, and placing them in the Alps as a safeguard for Provence. But these barbarians, building fortresses, or "burgs," at various intervals, came to be called, says Paulus Orosius, "Burgundians," or "men of the burgs." [61]

The history of the events which led them to occupy southeastern Gaul is obscure. Probably they came at the request of the Gallo-Romans and settled there permanently. "So far as we can ascertain, the Burgundian kingdom was bounded on the side of the Franks by the Langres plateau; on the side of the Alamanni by the Belfort gap, the Aar, and the northern Jura; on the side of the Ostrogoths by the Alps; on the west by part of the lower course of the Rhone, the upper course of the Loire, the Morvan mountains, and the Côte d' Or; on the south the Durance separated them from Gothic Provence, but the Burgundians repeatedly crossed that boundary." [62]

[61] Orosius, *Hist.,* Bk. VII, chap. 32; *PL,* XXXI, 1144. Thus the Christians of Asturia who, as they recovered foot by foot the ground invaded by the Mussulmans, built fortresses to secure their conquests, and received the name of Castilians. Thus the warlike race charged with defending the borders of Germany won the name Habsburg.

[62] Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* II, Part I, p. 87. Some historians, such as Pitra, following St. Gregory of Tours, state that the Burgundians seized Provence. But this is not correct. At the Council of Agde (506) there were present the bishops of Aix, Arles, Digne, and Fréjus. Agde certainly was subject to the Visigoths and, since it was at that time unheard of that bishops should go outside of their kingdom to take part in a council, there is no doubt that Aix, Arles, Digne, and Fréjus were in Visigoth country, not Burgundian. The holding of councils thus gives us reliable geographic indications.

Their conversion to the Catholic faith must date from the time of their sojourn near Trier, where they were in contact with the first missioners of Germany.[63] Their Arianism came to them from their dealings with the Visigoths. It affected especially the upper classes of society. But in Burgundy there was always a notable part of the population strongly attached to the Catholic faith. It was the Burgundian Clotilda who converted the King of the Franks at the close of the fifth century; a hundred years later Queen Bertha's chaplain, Bishop Luidhard, who contributed to the conversion of King Ethelbert of England, was a Burgundian. We know that St. Caesarius was a native Burgundian. King Guntram of Burgundy is honored with the title of saint.[64] It was through fear of his subjects, says St. Gregory of Tours, that King Gondebad did not abjure Arianism.[65] His son Sigismund was converted by St. Avitus, but, being a weak character, he let himself be guided by the Roman Avitus, and Clodomir the Frankish king had him and his family put to death in 524. The kingdom of the Burgundians was thenceforth doomed. Sigismund's brother Gondemar vainly tried to rescue his country's cause by force of arms. He was defeated in 534 by the Frankish kings Clotaire and Childebert. That was the end of Burgundy. The kingdom had lasted scarcely more than a century, from 413 to 534.

It is not, therefore, by the duration of its national life or the glory of its arms that this race acquired a fame in history. Rather it is by the brilliancy of its intellectual life. A race that gave the sixth and the seventh centuries their best historians, that possessed the most celebrated schools of rhetoric in Gaul,

[63] Orosius in 417 said: *Providentia Dei omnes (Burgundii) modo facti catholica fide. PL,* XXXI, 1144.

[64] On this King Guntram, see St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* Bk. IX, chaps. 20, 21, pp. 389 ff.

[65] St. Gregory of Tours, *ibid.,* Bk. II, chap. 34, pp. 72 f. We know that the so-called conference organized at Lyons by Gondebad between Catholics and Arians is spurious. It was made up by Jerome Vignier. Havet, *Bibliotheque de l'École des Chartes,* XLVI (1885), 233–250.

that inspired and probably outlined the epic poem of the Niebelungen, that was able to grasp the lofty thoughts of a St. Avitus and that expressed its life and morals in the Gombetta Law, was a valuable contribution to Christianity.

Born in the region of Autun about 530, the chronicler Marius of Avenches "kept himself informed regarding the minor events of Greek politics, questioning pilgrims and traveling merchants," and has left us "a concise, dry work, but one of considerable value." [66] To Burgundy belonged also the three authors of the so-called *Chronicle of Fredegarius,* composed between 584 and 642. It is written in unusually barbarous Latin but contains "almost as many useful items of information as it has words." [67]

Burgundy had its schools of rhetoricians. The most famous was that which Viventiolus conducted at Lyons. The school at Valence, directed by Sabaudus, was highly praised by Sidonius Apollinaris. There it was that St. Avitus probably received his training in eloquence.

The pseudo-Fredegarius declares that he wrote his memoirs *ab illustro viro Niebelungo.*[68] This is the name that would give its title to the German epic of the twelfth century. The Neibelungen, an epic account of the deeds of Burgundy, was composed upon the basis of popular songs which probably go back to the period immediately following the ruin of the Burgundian kingdom.

St. Avitus

But the great poet of the kingdom was the bishop of Vienne, St. Avitus.[69] Alcimus Ecditius Avitus, born probably at Vienne

[66] Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* I, 170; V, viii.

[67] *Op. cit.,* I, 63.

[68] *Histoire de la Gaule,* II, 456; *PL,* LXXII, 683.

[69] The works of St. Avitus will be found in *PG,* Vol. LIX. A critical edition has been published in *MGH, Scriptores antiquiss.,* Vol. VI. The most scholarly edition is that of Ulysse Chevalier, *Œuvres complètes de S. Avit.*

in 450, died about 520. He was not merely the far-sighted statesman who, in his letters to Clovis, foretold so exactly the future rôle of the Frankish monarchy, the energetic bishop who became the heart and soul of the Council of Epaon, the defender of the Holy See, whose vigorous protest resounded amid the strife of antipope Lawrence against Symmachus. St. Avitus was also an eloquent poet whose remarkable *De spiritalis historiae gestis,* in Guizot's opinion, is a sort of *Paradise Lost,* almost deserving a place beside the great work of Milton.[70] He is also a worthy theologian, defending the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Patre et Filio,*[71] and affirming the divinity of Christ with so much exactness that Agobard of Lyons appealed to his doctrinal explanation in opposing the adoptionism of Felix of Urgel.[72] He is likewise an enlightened canonist, bewailing the abusive interference of seculars in the election of bishops,[73] protesting against the clergy being dependent upon lay justice,[74] and striving for the abolition of ordeals.[75]

Burgundian Law

The life of a people is revealed by its great men; and it is manifested also by its juridical institutions. The historian

[70] Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* lesson 18, Vol. II, p. 68 ff. (2d ed.). After quoting St. Avitus' and Milton's description of Eden, Guizot adds: "The description by St. Avitus is superior. The description of the beauties of nature appear to me more varied and more simple."

[71] *PL,* LIX, 386; Chevalier, *op. cit.,* p. 278.

[72] *PL,* CIV, 65, 97.

[73] *PL,* LIX, 274 f.; Chevalier, *op. cit.,* p. 210.

[74] *PL,* LIX, 272; Chevalier, *op. cit.,* p. 220. The councils had rigorously maintained the electoral right of the clergy and people. Legally all the clerics and all the faithful were electors. But in practice the inhabitants of the cities and the higher clergy directed the electoral operations, and this custom sometimes led to violent protests: the populace then imposed its candidate. These abuses caused the civil power to interfere. Then analogous abuses led the popes to limit the powers of the rulers. Cf. Vacandard, *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse,* pp. 121–187: "Episcopal elections under the Merovingians."

[75] *PL,* CIV, 124 f.

Socrates says that the Burgundians were men of prudent mind and good humor.[76] From Paulus Orosius we learn that their lives were gentle and kindly.[77] This is the very impression we receive from reading their Code, a masterpiece of common sense and moderation for that period. True, St. Avitus did not succeed in effecting the abolition of legal dueling, and in the ninth century Agobard attacked the remains of barbarism which were sanctioned in the Code.[78] Nevertheless it is an important document, marking a considerable advance in the progress of civil and criminal law.

The prologue of the Code contains a forceful protest against the venality of the courts. A judge who accepts money gifts in connection with the exercise of his office, is to be punished by death.[79] A judge guilty of a denial of justice, that is, who refuses to judge, is subject to a fine.[80] Among the severest penalties are those regarding marital infidelity. In case of adultery, the guilty man and woman are both punished by death.[81] The wife who abandons her husband is to be choked to death in mud.[82] Most of the other penalties do not possess this terrible character. A free man accused of a crime exonerates himself by declaring his innocence under oath and having twelve other free men swear with him. If his opponent declines to take an oath, the question is settled by duel.[83] Those who are without fuel have a right to cut wood in the forests, provided they spare fruit-trees and fir-trees. Certain penalties show that the Burgundians were possessed of truly Gallic

[76] Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History,* VII, 30.

[77] Orosius, VII, 19, 32; *PL,* XXXI, 1144: *Blande, mansuete innocenterque vivant.*

[78] *PL,* CIV, 125.

[79] *Lex burg.,* preface. *Hist. des Gaules,* IV, 256; *MGH, Leges,* III, 527.

[80] *Ibid., MGH,* III, 527.

[81] *Si adulterantes inventi fuerint, et vir ille occidatur et femina. Lex burg.,* sec. 68; *Hist. des Gaules,* IV, 274; *MGH, Leges,* III, 561.

[82] *Si qua mulier maritum suum, cui legitime juncta est, dimiserit, necetur in luto. MGH, Leges,* III, 546.

[83] *MGH, Leges,* III, 536 f., and sec. 8.

humor, as, for instance, the punishment imposed upon dog-thieves.[84]

The Law of Gondebad or Gombetta Law (*lex gundobada*) soon became very popular. After the Burgundians were merged with the Visigoths, some groups continued to profess the Gombetta Law in legal matters; they were called *Gundobadi;* it was against them that Agobard wrote in the ninth century. Burgundy offers a remarkable example of a people politically abolished that survived in its legislation and its national traditions. At the close of the sixth century and during the seventh century, in the great strife dividing France into Neustria and Austrasia, the Burgundians were the ones who, almost at their pleasure, were able to turn the scales: from the day when they abandoned the party of Brunehilde, that was a lost cause.[85] Almost three centuries later, when Charlemagne's empire broke up, Burgundy was the first part with enough cohesion to form a kingdom; and for two centuries that kingdom shone with great brilliance.[86] In the tenth century when Otto I, the restorer of the Empire, married the Burgundian Adelaide, the saintly daughter of King Rudolph astonished the imperial court of Germany by the extent of her knowledge no less than by the eminence of her virtues.

Vandals in Spain

However, south of the Pyrenees, where the arms of Clovis and the popular reprobation of southern Gaul had driven them back, the Visigoths continued to cherish that hope of a great Gothic and Arian kingdom which, in Italy and Gaul, had vainly haunted the ambitions of Theodoric, Autharis,

[84] *Hist. des Gaules,* IV, 280. *Si quis canem . . . praesumpserit involare, jubemus ut convictus coram omni populo posteriora ipsius osculetur. Lex burgond.,* sec. 10; *MGH, Leges,* III, 572.

[85] Pitra, *Histoire de saint Léger,* p. 262.

[86] Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man,* pp. 509 f.

Euric, and Gondebad. But neither the Visigoths of Spain nor their neighbors the Vandals of Africa would found anything stable; and once again the dream would elude the race that was attainted with the Arian heresy.

This Iberian peninsula, where the Roman influence had been preponderant for a long time past, was the country from which came the philosopher Seneca, the poets Lucan and Martial, the rhetorician Quintilian, and four Roman emperors, Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius and Theodosius. There the Visigoths at first encountered rivals, the Vandals, and joined hands with the Romans in opposing them. The Vandals, accompanied by the Alani and the Suevi, invaded Spain at the beginning of the fifth century. This race, whose name has become synonymous with devastator, and whose people seemed to possess an exuberant activity, had just crossed Gaul, ravaging it with a fury that no other barbarian hordes ever equaled. But as soon as the Vandals thought they could settle down unmolested on Spanish soil, they abandoned the sword for the plow. In a short time, according to the testimony of a contemporary, Paulus Orosius,[87] the appearance of the territory occupied by them was transformed. The land was covered with crops, and was peopled with flocks and herds. If we are to accept the accounts of Paulus Orosius and Salvian at face value, a more amazing thing happened; into their laws and morals these barbarians introduced such equity, and especially such respect for their pledged word, that the vanquished people became attached to them and did not regret the loss of the government of the Romans.[88]

Such a people might have become a dread rival for the Visigoths. But an unexpected event removed them from the peninsula. In 422, Boniface, the last count of Africa, appealed to

[87] Orosius, *Histoire,* chap. 40; *PL,* XXXI, 1165 f.
[88] *Ibid.,* chap. 41; *PL,* XXXI, 1168; Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne,* II, 169–171.

the Vandals in his struggle with the Roman forces. The Vandals replied *en masse* and invaded Africa as they had invaded Spain. Contemporary writers—Procopius of Caesarea, Possidius, Victor Vitensis, and St. Augustine—recount the terrible persecution by Genseric. Huneric, Genseric's son, who ascended the throne in 477 after the fall of the Roman Empire, at first granted some liberty to the Catholics, but soon, under the influence of the Arian Bishop Cyrilla, he decreed the severest penalties against them. The chronicler Victor Vitensis, in his archaic and vibrant style, has left us a picture of the countless atrocities amid which the Church of Africa, greatly enfeebled by prosperity and pleasures, recovered the courage of the martyrs of the first centuries. One should read the description of that crowd of martyrs in an infected prison, which the chronicler himself visited. He says: "They had been thrown in there as heaps of grasshoppers are shoveled together, or rather, like grains of precious wheat. They stifled, and when we barely entered the place, we were almost suffocated." [89]

And we have accounts of an exodus of Christians, exiled to the country of the Moors. The Bishop of Vita heard an old woman, who was painfully leading her infant grandson by the hand, urge him to hurry his step. When she saw the Bishop, she said to him: "Bless me, and pray for my grandson. I go into exile with this child, fearful lest the devil might find him alone after my death and would make him leave the right path." Says Victor: "We were unable to hear her words without weeping, and we wished nothing but the accomplishment of God's holy will." [90] Victor Vitensis also relates the miracle of Tipasa where certain men, whose tongues had been cut out at the root, recovered their speech. And the chronicler adds: "If there is anyone who does not believe my testimony, let him

[89] Victor Vitensis, *De persecutione vandalica,* II, 10; *PL,* LVIII, 211.
[90] *Ibid.,* II, 9; *PL,* LVIII, 210.

go to Constantinople; there he can see a survivor, the subdeacon Reparatus, who still speaks today quite correctly without the least effort." [91]

Under King Gunthamund there was a period of peace. But King Thrasamund, from 496 to 523, repeated the old cruelties against the Catholics. One hundred and twenty African bishops were exiled to Sardinia. In this number was St. Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe. Fulgentius, sprung from one of the most prominent families, had at first served the Vandal kingdom as an official in some government office. The reading of a page of St. Augustine withdrew him from the world.[92] As monk, abbot, and bishop, Fulgentius remained faithful to the teaching of St. Augustine. Says Bossuet: "It was for his attachment to St. Augustine and St. Prosper that St. Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe has been so celebrated among the preachers of grace. His replies were respected. When he came back from exile, which he had suffered for belief in the Trinity, all Africa looked upon him as another Augustine, and every church received him as its own pastor." [93]

With Hilderic the son of Thrasamund, peace did, in fact, return. But, shortly afterward, in 534, an expedition of Belisarius put an end to the Vandal domination, which had lasted a hundred years.[94] For a while it had the semblance of a great empire. In the interval between persecutions, the Vandal kings developed their navy prodigiously. This race, which in Spain had been an excellent agricultural population, in Africa was

[91] *Ibid.*, V, 6; *PL*, LVIII, 243; Leclercq, *Les martyrs*, III, 392. On the miracle of Tipasa and analogous events of a natural order, which have been observed, see Newman, *History of My Religious Opinions.*

[92] Explanation of psalm 36 (Vulgate).

[93] Bossuet, *Défense de la tradition*, Bk. V, chap. 21. Another victim of the persecution was the poet Dracontius who, in his captivity, wrote a poem in three strains, *Carmen de Deo.* Says Gaston Boissier: "This poem compares favorably with the poem of St. Avitus. In places it has even more brilliance and a keener feeling of the beauties of nature." *L'Afrique romaine*, pp. 309 ff.

[94] The Church of Africa called that period "the hundred years' captivity." Labbe, *Concil.*, IV, 1755.

on the point of becoming a formidable naval power. It fell under the weight of its faults, of the rivalry of the African Moors, of the Roman reprisals, and undoubtedly also of the divine justice. In its own way it had been also "the scourge of God." The purifying results of this terrible providential mission—the theological works of St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, the dramatic accounts of the chronicler Victor Vitensis, the poem of Dracontius, and a trace of the Vandal name left in Spain in the province of Andalusia—are all that remain of the domination of this barbarous people, that was endowed with so powerful a vitality.

Visigoths in Spain

It would seem that the passing of the Vandals to Africa should have allowed the Visigoths to establish themselves more firmly in Spain. But internal defects continued to disturb their kingdom. From the death of Alaric II in 507, to the coming of Recared in 586, nearly all its kings were stabbed to death. Most of them, before dying in this wretched manner, had lived in a wretched manner. The immediate successor of Alaric, Gisaldic, the King's natural son, was, according to St. Isidore, "as detestable for his loose morals as he was base by birth." [95] Another king, Theudis, was assaulted and massacred in the midst of a feast by the notables of the kingdom whose homes he had dishonored.[96]

In this connection, Gregory of Tours says: "The Goths had adopted the hateful custom of killing in this way such of their kings as did not please them, and appointing the person on whom their fancy fell." [97] When we recall that these monarchs, by virtue of the organization of the Arian Churches, were the

[95] *PL*, LXXXIII, 1067 ff.
[96] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, p. 107.
[97] *Ibid.*

chiefs of the episcopacy and of the clergy, we can easily explain the internal disorder of the kingdom.

However, besides the heretical population, there were numerous Catholics, the fruit of the old Roman preaching of the faith. These offered a contrast of example to the heretics by the ardor of their faith. In 542, in a war against the Franks, the Catholics had saved Saragossa by the intercession of St. Vincent.[98] A few years later there arrived in Galicia a holy missioner from Pannonia, called Martin, like his illustrious countryman the Bishop of Tours. St. Gregory of Tours praises his learning and holiness. A short while afterward Theodomir I or Carraric,[99] king of the Suevi, following the miraculous cure of his son by a relic of St. Martin of Tours,[100] abjured Arianism and named St. Martin archbishop of Braga, where a council was held in 572.[101] The conversion of the head of that ephemeral kingdom of the Suevi, which disappeared less than a half century later, of itself did not have a great influence upon the destinies of the Church in Spain. But the impulse was given. After St. Martin of Braga, a monk, Donatus, also preached the perfect spiritual life in Spain and founded a monastery at Jativa.[102] It was about this period that the number of hermits in Spain grew rapidly. The most famous was St. Emilian the Hooded (*Oemilianus cucullatus*), whom the Spanish people honor under the name of St. Millan.[103] A more and more powerful expansion of Catholic life encircled the Arian Church, which was disorganized, exhausted, and spiritless. The conversion of the King of the Visigoths gave it the final blow.

[98] *Op. cit.*, p. 106.

[99] St. Gregory of Tours says Carraric; St. Isidore of Seville, better situated to be well informed, says Theodomir, successor of Carraric.

[100] St. Gregory of Tours, *De miraculis S. Martini*, I, 11; *PL*, LXXI, 923 ff.

[101] Villanano, *Summa conciliorum*, I, 126.

[102] Mariana, *Histoire de l'Espagne*, Vol. I, Bk. V, chap. 55.

[103] *Ibid.*, chap. 51.

St. Hermengild

The story of this conversion is mingled with a bloody family tragedy which the chroniclers John of Biclaro, Isidore of Seville, and Gregory of Tours, all contemporaries of the events, relate at considerable length.

Hermengild, the son of King Leovigild (who by his successful wars and his legislative work was one of the greatest rulers of Visigoth Spain), had married a Frankish princess, Ingundis, daughter of King Sigebert and Brunehilde. The presence of the young Catholic princess at the Spanish court, and shortly afterward the conversion of Prince Hermengild under the influence of his relative St. Leander archbishop of Seville, stirred the wrath of Queen Goswintha, the second wife of Leovigild and a fanatical Arian.[104] Urged on by his wife, the King decreed a violent persecution. The firmness of the Christians in the presence of the threats was at first admirable. Gregory of Tours mentions the torture of a priest who, in the midst of his torments, confessed the dogma of the Trinity.[105] A few Christians, however, won by the King's munificence, weakened. Of this number was Vincent bishop of Saragossa. Then Leovigild's tactics changed. People were no longer forcibly rebaptized. Even insistence upon rebaptizing was abandoned. Simply an ambiguous formula was required: "Glory be to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost." [106] Many defections took place.

Then it was that Hermengild, not without an internal struggle, took a resolve of serious import.[107] Some groups of faithful

[104] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* V, 39.

[105] St. Gregory of Tours, *De gloria martyrum,* I, 82; *PL,* LXXI, 778 f. St. Isidore of Seville; *PL,* LXXXIII, 1071.

[106] This formula was orthodox in earlier times, and was even current among the Greek fathers. We find it in St. Basil (see De Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la Trinité,* III, 31). But the interpretation given it by the Arians made it unacceptable.

[107] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* VI, 29 (43).

Catholics, desolate at seeing the Catholic faith being lost, were eager to shake off the yoke of tyranny. Hermengild placed himself at their head, won to his side the Suevi of Galicia, the Basques of the Pyrenees, the Roman garrisons of the sea-coast, and, at the head of a powerful army, marched against his father.[108] But through treason he was seized in a church,[109] and was thrown into a dungeon, where he refused to receive the Eucharist from the hand of an Arian bishop. He was beheaded by the stroke of an axe.[110] The Church honors St. Hermengild with the title of martyr and celebrates his feast on April 13.

St. Leander

It is said that a short time after this, in 586, King Leovigild, on his deathbed was touched by remorse and called Bishop Leander, asked forgiveness for his crimes, and begged the Bishop to do for his second son Recared what he had done for Hermengild, that is, convert him to the Catholic faith.[111] The saintly Bishop carried out his mission. He instructed Recared. Says St. Isidore: "Recared, unlike his father, was endowed with a very gentle character, and with a wise and prudent mind." In the tenth month of his reign, in 587, he publicly abjured the heresy, confessed the equality of the three divine Persons,[112] and received the anointing with holy chrism.[113] On this occasion the King returned to the Catholics the churches which Leovigild had taken away from them and he also built other churches, several of them at his own expense. We see him

[108] It was on this occasion that St. Leander went to Constantinople, where he formed a great friendship with St. Gregory the Great. See *supra*, p. 70.

[109] St. Gregory of Tours, *op. cit.*, V, 39.

[110] St Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, III, 3; Paul the Deacon, III, 214.

[111] St. Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, III, 31.

[112] St. Gregory of Tours, *op. cit.*, IX, 15, p. 383.

[113] On this ceremony of anointing converted Arians with holy chrism, see Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 324 f., 340.

gather wise counselors about him, the chief of them being his uncle, St. Leander.[114]

Leander, belonging to a family of the high nobility of Cartagena, was the eldest of a family of saints. St. Isidore, who succeeded him as bishop of Seville, and St. Fulgentius, who became bishop of his native city, were his brothers. His sister was St. Florentina, for whom he composed his *Institutio virginum.* This work of St. Leander, together with a magnificent discourse delivered at the Third Council of Toledo, are all we possess of his writings. The quality of the *Institutio* makes us regret the loss of his two polemical books against the Arians and of his correspondence with St. Gregory the Great. But his political work is known to us. He has rightly been called the St. Remigius of Spain. Until his death (596), he sustained King Recared with his advice.

Leander was the soul of that great Council of Toledo, the third in the series of councils bearing that name, in which the Spanish nation, represented by its king, its queen, sixty-four bishops, seven representatives of bishops, and the great personages of the realm, *primores gentis gothicae,* solemnly abjured the Arian heresy. In a profession of faith to which the whole assembly subscribed and which is preserved in the official report of the Council, King Recared declared his belief, not only in the equality of the divine Persons, but also in the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Patre Filioque.* This new precision of the doctrine, expressed by the word *Filioque,* which was destined to be the occasion of so many disputes, began therefore to be regarded as essential to the faith.[115] From Spain it passed to France and was later of obligation throughout the universal Church.

This council of 589 was followed by fifteen other national

[114] St. Leander was the brother of Leovigild's first wife.

[115] This is the second time that it is found in a profession of faith. It was used in a council of Galicia, held in 447.

councils of Toledo. It has quite justly been said that they made Spain.[116]

The Councils of Toledo

The Spanish councils of Toledo had this special feature, that they sprang from the national assembly, or rather they were at the same time national councils and national assemblies. Ordinarily questions of dogma and ecclesiastical discipline were treated during the first three days. The bishops and abbots alone were then in attendance.[117] But on the morning of the fourth day the doors were opened to the high officers, dukes, counts, and judges, and, as they used to say, the judgment of the people was joined to the judgment of God; after the *vox Dei,* the *vox populi* was heard.[118]

Guizot, in his *History of Civilization in Europe,* sums up in a few strokes the work of the councils of Toledo from the standpoint of general civilization. He says:

> In Spain, a different power, that of the Church, endeavored to restore the work of civilization. Instead of the ancient German assemblies of warriors, the assembly that had most influence in Spain was the Council of Toledo and in this council the bishops bore sway, although it was attended by the higher order of the laity. Open the laws of the Visigoths, and you will discover that it is not a code compiled by barbarians, but bears convincing marks of having been drawn up by the philosophers of the age—by the clergy. It abounds in general views, in theories, and in theories, indeed, altogether foreign to barbarian manners. Thus, for example, we know that the legislation

[116] In France it seems that the principal source of civilization was the personal influence of certain great bishops. In Germany the chief influence was rather that of a few great monasteries. In England, especially from Bede to Alcuin, we note the influence of the schools. In Spain the preponderant part in the work of civilization unquestionably was the work of the national councils. The eighteenth and last council of Toledo was held in 701. It is the only one whose acts are lost.

[117] At the Third Council of Toledo (589) we see, for the first time, the abbots seated in a conciliar assembly.

[118] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* chap. 28.

of the barbarians was a personal legislation; that is to say, the same law only applied to one particular race of men. The Romans were judged by the old Roman laws, the Franks were judged by the Salian or Ripuarian code; in short, each people had its separate laws, though united in the same government, and dwelling together in the same territory. This is what is called personal legislation, in contradiction to real legislation, which is founded upon territory. Now this is exactly the case with the legislation of the Visigoths; it is not personal, but territorial.[119] All the inhabitants of Spain, Romans, Visigoths, or what not, were compelled to yield obedience to one law. Read a little further and you will meet with still more striking traces of philosophy. Among the barbarians a fixed price was put upon a man, according to his rank in society—the life of the barbarian, the Roman, the freeman, and vassal, were not valued at the same amount—there was a graduated scale of prices. But the principle that all men's lives are of equal worth in the eyes of the law, was established by the code of the Visigoths. The same superiority is observable in their judicial proceedings: instead of the ordeal, the oath of compurgators, or trial by battle, you will find the proofs established by witnesses, and a rational examination made of the facts, such as might take place in a civilized society. In short, the code of the Visigoths bore throughout evident marks of learning, system, and polity. In it we trace the hand of the same clergy that acted in the Council of Toledo, and which exercised so large and beneficial an influence upon the government of the country.[120]

Such principles of equality before the law and of respect for justice were bound to favor the abolition of slavery. The Church of Spain did not leave to the mere influence of ideas and of general principles the progress of the work of emancipation which it had begun at the Council of Elvira at the outset of the fourth century. The councils of Toledo intervened directly to defend the cause of the slaves. Jews engaged in the slave traffic. The councils forbade the sale of baptized slaves

[119] This personal legislation is found in the law of Euric (Esmein, *Histoire du droit français,* p. 57). But the councils of Toledo abolished it, at least in the civil law.

[120] Guizot, *History of Civilization in Europe,* third lesson, p. 77.

to Jews, sometimes authorizing any of the faithful to redeem them, sometimes declaring them free without any price to be paid. Says the Tenth Council of Toledo: "We cannot be unmindful that these slaves have been redeemed by Jesus Christ. One ought rather buy them than sell them." [121] The fourth and ninth councils of Toledo declare that the slaves or serfs of the Church domains must be freed by the bishop before they receive sacred orders.[122] At that period it seems that the following formula was in use; it was discovered and published in the last century:

To all the inhabitants of this province let it be known that I, N., of the place called N., contemplating the salvation of my soul and that of my parents and kindred for the love of Christ who delivers us from the tyranny of Satan, have resolved to free from the irksome yoke of human servitude one of my slaves, called N., so that, bound to the divine service, with a free and tranquil soul he may continually pray for the remission of his sins, for me, and for mine; and that, ascending the steps of the sacred hierarchy, day by day nearer and more intimately he may have the means of imploring the divine mercy for us. And that this act of my will be the more valid, fixed and of perpetual duration, I have signed it in the presence of competent witnesses.[123]

Little by little the clergy were performing the labors of servile origin. Says Guizot: "This circumstance is perhaps not one of the least that contributed to the efforts of the Church to ameliorate the condition of the serfs." [124] Later on, it is true, at the beginning of the feudal wars, the lords—the bishops and abbots were also lords—had a tendency not to strip themselves of their personnel of serfs and slaves; [125] but notwithstanding

[121] The Tenth Council of Toledo, canon 7; Mansi, XI, 37. Third Council of Toledo; Mansi, IX, 996.

[122] Mansi, X, 637; XI, 29.

[123] *Revue historique du droit français,* 1863, p. 422.

[124] Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* twelfth lesson, I, 325.

[125] The Church had also to safeguard the rights of property and of justice which rebellions of serfs and slaves endangered at times. Marcel Fournier, basing his findings upon texts and upon events which these preoccupations explain, published (*Revue*

this temporal interest, the idea of justice and fraternity, always preached by the Church, eventually prevailed. Authentic history attests the truth of this fact. St. Isidore's definition of royal power was incorporated in the law of the Middle Ages by the capitularies of Charlemagne, the canonical treatises of Jonas, of Hincmar, and of Abbo, the councils of Paris (829) and of Trosly (909), and was appealed to in the eleventh century by St. Gregory VII. St. Isidore wrote as follows:

> The king's special office is to govern his people with equity and justice. He should be the defender of the Churches, of the servants of God, of the widows, of the orphans, of all the poor, of all those who are without earthly backing. So far as he can, he should employ his zeal and his might in preventing injustice and, if such has been committed, in repressing it. He who is the judge of judges, ought also permit to reach his ears the plaint of the poor, for fear that those who are appointed by him and who take his place among the people, oppress the lowly by their neglect or injustice.[126]

This is the same thought that we have already seen clearly proclaimed by St. Gregory the Great: he who is in a position of authority is above all else the servant of right and justice.

The work of the Spanish Church, therefore, in the sixth century, from the standpoint of the social institutions, had

historique, January–February, 1883) a study entitled, *Les affranchissements du V^e^ au XIII^e^ siècle.* He concludes that the Church was not favorable to enfranchisement and to the enfranchised. This view is refuted by Allard, *Esclaves, serfs et mainmortables,* chap. 11. Renan wrote as follows: "The condition of the slave was even aggravated by one circumstance, the impossibility of disposing of the property of the Church. Who was his owner? Who could set him at liberty? The difficulty of deciding this question perpetuated ecclesiastical slavery" (Renan, *Marcus Aurelius,* pp. 300 f.). It is easy to answer this charge. Although the Church could not sell a slave, it could free him; and the Council of Agde, held in 506 under the Visigoths, declared that "if the bishop has given liberty to some slaves . . . his successor must respect that decision."

[126] *PL,* LXXXIII, 718–725. Note what St. Augustine says in *City of God,* Bk. V, chap. 24; *PL,* XLI, 170 f.

a very lofty and lasting significance. The laws framed by the councils of Toledo had a considerable part in forming the collection of edicts known at first under the name of *Forum judicum,* which was translated in the thirteenth century by King St. Ferdinand under the title of *Fuero juzgo,* and long remained the basis of Spanish law.

Assuredly we have no wish to pretend that there are no shadows in the picture. On that Spanish soil, where in ancient times was erected the first altar to the divinity of the emperors and where later the Inquisition assumed a character too political and too merciless, we regret to find a too complete fusion of the Church and the state. The very composition of the councils of Toledo favored this abuse. The bishop was too much a political personage, and politics was overmuch mingled in the affairs of the Church. The Church continued to be proclaimed Catholic, but often people acted as though they thought it Spanish; and the Spanish state, with surprising candor, did not hesitate to use force to maintain the faith, as it would do in defense of a national institution. King Sisebut forcibly obliged converted Jews to remain Catholics. True, St. Isidore of Seville rose up against this policy, and the Fourth Council of Toledo (633) blames Sisebut by name and protests its respect for liberty of conscience.[127] As we are told by Leclercq, the recent historian of Christian Spain, the Jews were, nevertheless, "the perpetual drudges" of the Spanish state.[128] They were pursued, hunted out. However guilty they may have been on some points, we cannot help pitying their lot. However sincere those who persecuted them, we must acknowledge that, if pushed to these limits, the repression of

[127] *Sicut enim homo proprii arbitrii voluntate sequenti obediens periit, sic vocante gratia Dei propriae mentis conversione homo quisque credendo salvatur. Ergo non vi, sed libera arbitrii facultate, ut convertantur suadendi sunt, non potius impellendi.* Fourth Council of Toledo, sec. 57; Mansi, X, 663.

[128] Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne,* p. xxxiv.

infidels is nothing else but the survival in a Christian country of a pagan conception of religion.[129]

We should have unqualified admiration for the work of the councils of Toledo when, in their purely ecclesiastical canons, they proclaim, in lofty words, the obedience that is due to Catholic dogmas and endeavor to restore in all bishops, priests, and laymen a regard for the purest Christian morality. The first canon of the council of 589, which closely followed Recared's abjuration, proposes as the rule of faith of Catholic Spain, "the maintenance in full vigor of all the canons of the councils and of all the synodal letters of the bishops of Rome." [130] Then follows the order to sing at mass, before the communion, the symbol of Nicaea and Constantinople.[131]

Previously this practice had been special to the East. It is through Spain that the custom was introduced into the West.

Then come the canons about the life of bishops and clerics, who are particularly reminded of the holy duty of clerical continence,[132] and prescriptions for the simple faithful, which they strove to connect with the old regulations of penance. The faithful were ordered, before returning to communion with the Church, to do penance for their sins.[133] The fathers of the Fourth Council of Toledo (633) even reminded the kings of their duty, and this they did with remarkable political sense. "With all due humility," they beg the Spanish sovereigns present and future to bear in mind that their power is limited: (1) by the higher rights of justice and charity; [134] (2) by un-

[129] "This survival of the pagan concept and its use by the Spanish councils are worthy of attention," says Leclercq. "It would be possible to show the transitions and, as it were, the genealogy of this concept." Leclercq, *op. cit.*, p. xxxiii.

[130] Mansi, IX, 992.

[131] Chap. 2; Mansi, IX, 992.

[132] Chaps. 3, 5, 7, 13, 18; Mansi, IX, 993–997. The clerics are there called *religiosi.* At that period the word *"religiosus"* was often synonymous with *"clericus."*

[133] Chap. 11; Mansi, IX, 995.

[134] *Cum justitia et pietate populos regatis.* Mansi, X, 640.

touchable constitutional laws;[135] (3) by the control of the people or their representatives, in the exercise of a public justice regularly constituted.[136]

While the bishops and abbots, in the councils of Toledo, inspired Christian laws, scholars and saints gave noble examples. There was no one of outstanding genius; but the names of St. Leander of Seville, of St. Fulgentius of Cartagena, of St. Fructuosus of Braga, and of St. Braulio of Saragossa cannot be passed over in silence.

St. Isidore of Seville

The most eminent of all these bishops was St. Isidore of Seville. The Eighth Council of Toledo proclaimed him "the great doctor of his age and the glory of the Church."[137] and this judgment agrees with the conclusions of modern scholarship. Says Bardenhewer: "St. Isidore surveyed and explored in every direction the field of knowledge of the seventh century; among the early ecclesiastical writers of Spain, there is no pen to rival the fecundity of his."[138]

Of course, we must not deceive ourselves. Isidore of Seville was a tireless worker, but he was chiefly a compiler. His principal work is a vast encyclopedia, at which he labored almost all his life, until the very eve of his death. He called it the *Book of Etymologies*.[139] In fact, he begins by giving an etymology, often bizarre, of the word he is studying; then,

[135] *Si quis contra reverentiam legum.* Mansi, *ibid.*

[136] *Ne quisquam vestrum solus, in causis capitum aut rerum, sententiam ferat; sed consensu publico cum rectoribus ex judicio manifesto deliquentium culpa patescat.* Mansi, X, 640. On the councils of Toledo and in general on the councils of Spain, see the large collection of Cardinal Aguirre, *Collectio maxima conciliorum omnium Hispaniae . . . cum notis et dissertationibus.*

[137] *Nostri saeculi doctor egregius, Ecclesiae catholicae novissimum decus . . . et in saeculorum fine doctissimus.* Mansi, X, 1215.

[138] Bardenhewer, *Les pères de l'Église,* III, 218.

[139] *Etymologiorum seu Originum libri XX.* This work forms Volume LXXXII of Migne's *Patrologia latina.*

beyond the word, he goes to the thing. Isidore must have stripped whole libraries. He gives us the state of knowledge of his time. The Scholastic writers drew extensively upon this work. St. Isidore has been called the last of the Church fathers.[140] It is true that after him and until St. Bernard, scholarship is silent over a period of four centuries. Perhaps it would be more just to say that, with Cassiodorus and Boethius, who preceded him in Italy, with Bede, who followed him in England, with Hincmar of Reims, Paschasius Radbertus, and Rabanus Maurus, who continued his work in France in the ninth century, Isidore formed the principal link of a chain connecting the literature of the fathers to that of the Scholastics. The author of the False Decretals, to give his famous collection the prestige of a great name, placed it under the name of St. Isidore of Seville.[141]

Decline of Visigothic Spain

When the saintly bishop died, in 636, it seemed that everything was preparing a brilliant and enduring destiny for the Visigothic kingdom of Spain. But half a century later we find it in full decline. The nobility became more and more divided, the power passed back and forth, at the pleasure of the factions, into unworthy hands. License knew no bounds.[142] The councils continued their lawmaking, but they went beyond reasonable moderation. The Seventeenth Council of Toledo, taking action against the Jews, even those outwardly baptized, decreed confiscation of their property, their reduction to a state of slavery, and the taking of their children away from

[140] Rauschen-Ricard, *Éléments de patrologie et d'histoire des dogmes,* pp. 341 ff.

[141] The work of St. Isidore may be usefully consulted for the history of dogma, of canon law, and of the liturgy. In his *Etymologies* he reckons three sacraments: baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist (*PL,* LXXXII, 255). Penance is listed elsewhere, between fasting and the litanies. In the *De officiis* he enumerates, on the same line, baptism, the consecration of kings, and confirmation.

[142] Aguirre, *Concil. Tolet.,* XVI.

them. Corruption entered the ranks of the clergy. Perhaps we should seek the origin of the whole evil in the decline of clerical morals. Says Cardinal Bourret: "The Church was profaned by blameworthy intrusions and the growing depravity of her ministers; the salt of the earth lost its savor; the clergy dishonored itself by serving every unworthy ambition and approving every violence." [143]

"The misfortunes of Spain," writes Cardinal Pitra, "came likewise from the rapid decadence of its monastic institutions. Ill-advised attempts, double and mixed monasteries, families withdrawing from society *en masse* out of selfishness and cupidity, the scarcity of genuine vocations, and the forcible filling of monasteries with mercenary novices, all these disorders are indicated by the documents of the time." [144] Perhaps this clerical and monastic decline should be attributed to imprudent methods of recruiting clerics and monks, prematurely transferring episcopal and abbatial authority from the hands of the Spanish-Roman race, whose Christianity had been proved, into the hands of the Visigothic race, which was still too much imbued with barbarian morals and infected with the poison of Arius.

In any event, when in 711, under King Roderick (or Rodrigues), a certain rebellious nobleman, Count Julian, abetted by a bishop who was a traitor to his country, Oppas by name, called the Saracens into Spain, the country offered no resistance. At the battle of Guadalete the followers of King Witiza, Roderick's predecessor, withdrew without fighting, and the Spanish army disbanded.[145] Only the valiant Pelayo, along with a few warriors, remained unconquered in the cavern of

[143] Bourret, *L'école chrétienne de Séville,* p. 196.

[144] Pitra, *Vie de saint Léger,* p. xix. Cf. Aguirre, *Dissertatio de antiqua disciplina Ecclesiae Hispaniae circa clericos lapsos in peccatum carnis. Collectio maxima,* IV, 163 ff.

[145] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 475–477; Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne,* p. 383.

Our Lady of Cavadonga, where he began the great struggle which lasted eight centuries and ended with the expulsion of the Moors and the re-establishment of the Spanish kingdom. But it is not easy to determine to what extent this second conquest was the work of the Visigothic race.

Thus, while the peoples of Teutonic race were founding France, England, Germany, and the three states of Scandinavia, of all the peoples of Gothic race none had succeeded in forming themselves into a stable organization. The most brilliant successes of the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, the Lombards, the Burgundians, the Vandals, and the Visigoths had been followed by lamentable catastrophes. Must such eventualities be attributed to external and fortuitous events? I am not aware that anyone has ever maintained that such is the case. It can scarcely be held that nations die except by internal causes. In a people animated by a common ideal, the will to live makes it live. Should we, in agreement with the school of Count de Gobineau, trace back the whole problem to a question of racial inequalities? [146] Or rather, in accord with Rohrbacher, must we consider these events merely as the effect of the dissolving influence of Arianism, in opposition to the vivifying power of the Catholic Church? [147] Or is it all simply a question of social organization, the Teutonic race triumphing solely because, during a long stay on the coasts of Norway, it had acquired that particularist form which makes nations powerful and prosperous? This is the view of Henri de Tourville and Edmond Demolins, who appeal to the authority of Le Play.[148] Is Kurth nearer the truth when he adds to the influence of Arianism that of a premature contact with the refined civilization of the Empire? [149] Bearing in mind the hegemony of the

[146] Count de Gobineau, *De l'inégalité des races humaines, passim,* especially chap. 14, and the dedication to the king of Hanover, I, vi–viii.

[147] Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Église.*

[148] *La science sociale* XXIX (1900), 124; XXX, 511–516.

[149] Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne,* Vol. I, chap. 7, pp. 415–450.

Assyrians over the Babylonians, of the Macedonians over southern Greece, of the Castilians in Spain, of the Piedmontese in Italy, of the Prussians in Germany, must we appeal to that law of history which, in every conflict of peoples, points to the infallible triumph of the race that has lived in the roughest climate and endured the hardest manner of life? [150] Or, lastly, is the problem reduced to a question of a more or less potent and coherent national ideal, which is the impelling idea of a people? [151]

It seems reasonable to suppose that each of the assigned causes has exercised some influence upon the historical phenomenon we are considering. Yet it would appear that the primordial cause must be sought in the peaceful contact of the Goths with Roman civilization. Although it is true that, on a battle-field or in the fatigues of a siege or of a campaign, the hardiest people, therefore ordinarily the one most toughened by climate, has all the chances of triumph, the same is not true in the peaceful contact of barbarous people with a civilized people, that is, with a people that has a literature, a philosophy, and some form of administration. The former very rapidly loses what constitutes its strength, and only very slowly acquires what constitutes the might of the civilized people, which, according as its civilization is beneficial or injurious, raises it in its rise or drags it down in its fall. This last was the case of the Gothic peoples, too soon introduced into the governmental administration and to the Roman army and thus contaminated by the morals and customs of the decline. Like individuals, peoples do not with impunity rush through the halting-places without stopping.

Softened by the decadent civilization of the Empire, the Goths easily embraced that weakened form of Christianity—Arianism. And for them Arianism became an additional

[150] Hubault, *Histoire générale*, p. 31.
[151] Fouillée, *Psychologie du peuple français, passim.*

element of atrophy and dissociation. Arianism, denying the incarnation of God, the divinity of Christ, and the survival of Christ in the Church and in the human soul, was unable to engender a real proselytism or give rise to a theological movement. The Arian peoples had neither of these. Endless discussions and violent persecutions are not a theology and an apostolate. Those little national Churches, with bishops appointed and recalled by the civil power, possessed none of the breadth and independence of the great universal Church, obedient to the representative of Jesus Christ. The Churches suffered from all the ailments of the states, and the states from all the ailments of the Churches.

Hence gradually the Arian Churches and the Gothic kingdoms disappeared, one after the other, stifled by real Catholic life.[152]

[152] Magnin, *L'Église Wisigothique au VII^e siècle.*

CHAPTER X

The Church among the Slavs

In 711, just when Visigothic Spain was succumbing at the battle of Guadalete, Constantinople was threatened by new barbarians.[1] A Bulgar army was encamped before its walls. The latest of the great invaders, the Bulgars were mingled with those Slavic bands, those Slavenes as they were called, who, about the close of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh century, had unobtrusively slipped into the Balkan peninsula, into the midst of the Thracian-Illyrian population. The latter, as we know, had long since been Romanized and converted to Christianity. But Slavs and Bulgars gradually supplanted the old inhabitants of the soil, destroyed their churches, and almost everywhere replaced the Christian religion by the idolatrous worship which they brought with them from beyond the Danube. The Bulgars, a practical race adapted for the work of government, gave cohesion and unity to the dreamy Slavic race, which was dispersed in numerous tribes. In 678, between the Danube and the Hemus, King Isperikh founded the Bulgar state, which thereafter continually disturbed Byzantium. In 708 he repulsed an army of Justinian II; in 711, under Philippicus Bardanes, he took the offensive and advanced his army to the very walls of the capital of the Empire.

For the Church and for the Empire there was cause for alarm, the more so because, beyond the Bulgar kingdom, in the vast plain stretching from the Caucasus to the White Sea and from the Baltic to the Ural, a multitude of other Slavic tribes

[1] Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine*, p. 177.

was stirring, disunited, indeed, and cut in two from east to west, by the repeated invasions of Ural-Altai races, but restless, threatening, terrible. The Magyar people had remained like a wedge sticking into its living flesh. But the Slav race remained united by the memory of a common origin and by the hope of a universal domination; and this twofold bond was stronger than the particular patriotism of the different national groups.

Slavs in the Empire

The Slavs (so called from *slawa,* "glory," or from *slawo,* "word") belonged to the Indo-European race. The emperors and the popes, from the very beginning of relations with them, did everything to hasten their assimilation with the Roman world and convert them to Christianity. Heraclius permitted the Serbs and the Croatians to settle in Illyricum, then solicited Pope John IV, whose patriarchate extended to that province, to send them some missioners. The results of this mission, undertaken in a way by imperial order, with a Byzantine officer behind the Latin preacher, were rapid but not lasting.[2] The Slavs liked to serve in the army as mercenaries; it was through the army that the influence of Christianity reached them. "There a thoroughly Christian atmosphere impressed them. By becoming imperial soldiers, they became brothers in arms of those for whom the Blessed Virgin fought at Constantinople, St. Demetrius at Thessalonica, St. Andrew at Patrae. In the camps they were in continual contact with the numerous clerics who performed the duties of military chaplains for the Byzantine contingents.[3] And so, when the day came for their discharge, many of them had abandoned idolatry. It was sometimes as neophytes, often as apostles, that

[2] Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio; PG,* CXIII, 284.
[3] *Acta Maximi; PG,* XC, 136–172.

they returned home." [4] But the nation as a whole, especially its leaders, remained pagans, ferocious pagans. St. Theodore of Studium considered it a sacrilege to give them hostages.[5] Frequently their Christian captives were compelled to choose between apostasy and death.[6]

Conversion of King Boris

The appearance of things was changed by the conversion to the Catholic faith, of the chief of the Bulgarians, Boris (not Borgoris), in 864. We have no exact details about the circumstances of this conversion. Some writers have mentioned the influence of Boris' sister who was converted at Constantinople and who upon her return is supposed to have convinced her brother of the truth of the Christian religion. She is made out to be the St. Clotilda of the Bulgarians, and the monk St. Methodius as the St. Remigius. In any case, this latter cannot be the St. Methodius who was the apostle of Moravia. We shall speak of him presently.[7] In his conversion, was King Boris yielding merely to the power of the truth? Was he influenced by political considerations, a desire to set up, in opposition to the magnificence of the Byzantine emperors, the pomp of Catholic worship, with its priests and Levites assembled about his sacred person? Was not this the first manifestation of that great ambitious longing of the Slavic race, which we see take shape in Bulgaria with Tsar Symeon, in Moravia with the great Swatopluk, in Russia with Jaroslav the Great, and which perhaps gives us the key to the whole history of that race, at least in the heart of the Middle Ages? At any rate this ambitious motive may have existed along with

[4] Pargoire, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

[5] *Acta sanctorum*, January, III, 54.

[6] *Vita Germani patriarchae*, no. 29, in Μαυροκορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη, *L'Église byzantine*, p. 363.

[7] *Acta sanctorum*, October, XI, 120; Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège*, pp. 102 f.

loftier and more intimate reasons in the soul of the Bulgarian king.[8]

Those who compare Boris to Clovis, and also the Bulgarians who honor him as a saint, must acknowledge that, as in the case of Clovis, King Boris at his baptism did not put off the cruel practices of barbarism. He was baptized in 864[9] by a Byzantine bishop, with Emperor Michael the Drunkard as godfather. One of his first acts was then to order his subjects to be converted, too. When several of them rebelled on this occasion, Boris had fifty-two families of *boiards* or noblemen massacred, including the women and children. Pope Nicholas I severely reproved this act of savage cruelty.[10]

Very strange is the life of this converted barbarian, whose Christianity, we are told, "at times savored more of the steppe than of the Gospel."[11] He gladly took conspicuous part in public festivals and in giving mighty blows with his lance, but in the evening he often put on sackcloth, furtively slipped into a church, and there spent the whole night on the stone pavement.[12] Boris did more than practice these mortifications and engage in these prayers; he abdicated his power in favor of his eldest son, shaved his head, and became a monk.[13] And then of a sudden he cast off his monastic habit. Learning that his son Vladimir, dissolute drunkard, had adopted the old religion of the ancestors and the customs of festivals, "at which wine was drunk out of a skull of a dead enemy," the monk Boris left his cell, again put on the heavy sword and the bronze belt of the Bulgarian warriors, pursued his son, seized him, and ordered his eyes to be dug out. Then he returned to

[8] Lapôtre, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[9] According to the *Acta sanctorum, loc. cit.*, this was in 866. Lapôtre prefers the date 864.

[10] Hincmar, *Annales*, year 866, pp. 473 f.; *PL*, CXIX, 983.

[11] Lapôtre, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

[12] *Acta sanctorum, loc. cit.*

[13] *Ibid.*

his monastery and resumed in peace the interrupted course of his prayers.[14]

Pope Nicholas' *Responsa ad Bulgaros*

What was the political inspiration of this Clovis of the Bulgarians? We can find none other than the naïve and violent desire to be a king in the grand style, to dazzle the world, to become a sort of emperor of the East. He, too, was a victim of that Byzantine fascination, which afflicted nearly all the peoples of the Gothic race, a fascination which in no small measure accounted for their adherence to Arianism. So it is we see Boris at the same time turning to the Pope, to the Patriarch of Constantinople (Photius), to Emperor Louis the German, to all from whom he might hope to receive help in his attempts to reach a splendid eminence. Finally it was the Pope's side that he took. And he did so with energy. Grasping his hair, he exclaimed: "I swear that all my life I will be the servitor of St. Peter." His Christian conscience, which remained untainted by ambition, led him to inquire of the Church of Rome about various questions of doctrine and liturgy. He knew that Rome was strict on these points. He set forth his doubts. King Boris' questionnaire occasioned one of the most valuable documents of canon law, the famous *Responsa Nicolai ad Bulgaros*. We will speak of it again later on. Besides other questions, Boris asked Pope St. Nicholas I what should replace the usual Bulgarian oath upon the sword, the horse's tail which they raised as a flag or standard, and the broad national pantaloons worn by Bulgarian women.[15] Then again this

[14] *Ibid.*, and Lapôtre, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[15] *Responsa Nicolai ad Bulgaros*, nos. 33, 59, 67; *PL*, CXIX, 992, 1002, 1005. The wise Pontiff replied that it was improper to swear on a sword or on any other created object, but oaths should be taken only on God and holy things such as the Gospel. He said that swearing by a horse's tail should be replaced by swearing by the cross. With regard to the third question, he says: *Quod de femoralibus sciscitamini super-*

scrupulous Christian would suddenly go to the extreme of audacity. He abruptly changed the liturgical language and the diocesan organization of his kingdom; in short, he treated the Church in Bulgaria as if Rome did not exist.[16] These were serious indications. They became accentuated under his successors and ultimately led Bulgaria into the Greek Schism.

Vladimir, Boris' successor, fulfilled the forebodings of his earlier years. He was followed by his brother Symeon (892–927), who, although avoiding the brutalities of his elder brother, fell into habits of indolence and luxury. In his case the desire to imitate the *basileus* of Byzantium was an obsession. He was the first to assume the pompous title of tsar. He was also fond of being called the semi-Greek. He wore the purple cloak and, so it seems, was treated as an emperor by the chancery of Constantinople.[17] This was the height of Bulgarian power. But its decline came very soon. At the end of the tenth century, Borises, the second successor of Symeon, allowed Bulgaria to be annexed to the Greek Empire. Leo the Deacon says that Borises exchanged the royal mantle for the dress of a Byzantine schoolmaster.[18] In 1015 Emperor Basil, the Bulgaroktonos or Slayer of the Bulgars, captured Achrida, the capital, and shortly afterward completely subjugated Bulgaria.

A reawakening of ambition and autonomy again stirred the Bulgar nation in the twelfth century. Pope Innocent III gave it an independent hierarchy; but at the same time from Bulgaria came the heresy of the Bogomili. This heresy, sprung from ancient Manichaeism, gave birth to the errors of the

vacuum esse putamus. Nam sive vos sive feminae vestrae sive deponatis sive induatis femoralia, nec saluti efficit, nec ad virtutum proficit incrementum. Sane quoniam diximus jussa fuisse femoralia fieri, notandum est, quia nos spiritualiter induimur femoralibus, cum carnis libidinem per abstinentiam coarctamus.

[16] Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* p. 73.

[17] Rambaud, *L'empire grec au X^e siècle,* pp. 342 f.

[18] Leo the Deacon, *Historia,* Bk. IX; *PG,* CXVII, 885.

Cathari and the Albigenses.[19] Not long after that, the Bulgar nation fell into the Greek Schism. Still later (1453), abandoned by the West which it disdained and by the East which was powerless to defend it, Bulgaria fell beneath the Mussulman yoke, and a large part of the country's nobility embraced Mohammedanism.[20]

Missions in Moravia

The ambitious longing of the Slav race, which came to nothing in Bulgaria, seemed for a moment to be realized in Moravia. If we take into account only the duration of the converted nation and of the constituted Church, the conversion of the Moravians holds the last rank in the history of Christian origins in Europe. The Slav Church of Moravia had but an ephemeral existence. We may say that it was non-existent before the arrival of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, and that it ceased to exist after their death. As to Moravia, in the middle of the ninth century it was merely a little Slav tribe subject to the domination of Germany. At the end of the ninth century, under the great Swatopluk, it became an empire, but that empire collapsed in the tenth century under the blows of the Magyar invasion. However, the history of the conversion of Moravia assumes a capital importance if we consider the work of the two apostles, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, and the bearing of that work upon the future of the whole Slav race. Says Hilferding, a Russian historian: "No other hero of our race can be compared to Cyril and Methodius from this point

[19] Bossuet's opinion, that the heresy of the Albigenses descended from Manichaeism through the Bulgarians, although contested by Rébelliau (*Bossuet historien du protestantisme*, p. 475), is now admitted by historical criticism. See *Bulletin critique*, 1895, p. 109. The words Bulgari, Bulgri, Bulgres then began to be used to indicate the heterodox. St. Louis advised his son to mistrust the evil Bulgres.

[20] In 1860 a return movement to the Church appeared in Bulgaria. At present there are about 60,000 Catholics there (Michel, *L'Orient et Rome*, p. 22). But the national vice—subordination of religion to politics—persists more than ever.

of view: their influence was panslavic, and this can be said of no one else." [21]

Before them, missioners of Latin race and of Greek, and especially of Germanic race, had preached the Gospel on the confines of Moravia. There, in the Danube valley, were the Avars, to whom the Slavic tribe was vassal. Missions were organized by Charlemagne for the conversion of the Avars and, it is said, were directed by Arno, a brother of Alcuin. They reached the tributary Slavs as well as the ruling Avars. In a papal bull (824) Eugenius II congratulated the Moravians and their prince for their fidelity to religion. This prince was called Moimir. But at that very time the nation had just freed itself from the Avars, whose empire had collapsed. But was not this merely a change of oppressors? The imperial missioners, who were unacquainted with the language of these Slavs, appeared to be importing foreign customs and laws along with their religion. Besides, the Frankish princes were not satisfied with sending them priests and monks to convert them; from these same princes came also the soldiers who pillaged the land, the counts who levied payments upon them, the settlers who took their best lands. King Moimir, who was a very good Christian, protested in the name of national independence.

In 846, Louis the German deposed him and forced upon the Moravians the nephew of Moimir, one Wratislaw, hoping to find in him a more docile tool. But Louis was mistaken. Wratislaw and his people wished to remain Christians, but not to become subjects of the Germans. Then it was that the King and the leaders of the Moravian people conceived a bold and clever project that would reconcile their attachment to the Christian faith with their instincts of independence: it was to appeal to the Eastern emperor for missioners. In 862, King Wratislaw sent to Michael III an embassy entrusted with

[21] Hilferding, *Cyrille et Méthode, Œuvres complètes,* I, 299.

the following message: "Many Christian preachers have come to us from Italy, Germany, and Greece, bringing us diverse doctrines. But we Slavs are a simple people, and we have no one to teach us where is the truth. Therefore, generous monarch, choose for us a man able to speak to us according to reason, for from you issues the good faith, to be spread throughout the whole universe."

St. Cyril and St. Methodius

Michael III, notwithstanding the defect which gave him the name of Michael the Drunkard, was not without wisdom. For the spreading of the faith in Moravia, he chose two men who seemed providentially prepared for this important mission. They were two brothers, Constantine and Methodius. The former later took the name Cyril.

By the holiness of their life, by their learning, by their misfortunes, by the apparent failure of their mission, and by the extent of the remote results of their labor, St. Cyril and St. Methodius must be reckoned among the noble and great men of history. The two brothers were born at Thessalonica, a maritime city famous for its commerce and for its active and cosmopolitan population. "Thessalonica was one of the best schools of the East for anybody to make acquaintance with the languages and customs of Westerners and of Slavs. On the land side, in whatever direction he turned, a Thessalonian could not walk an hour without finding himself in the midst of people of the Slavic race. Everywhere were Slavonians, subjects or vassals of the Empire." [22]

Sons of a high imperial officer, Constantine and Methodius received an exceptionally fine education. Methodius, the elder, had an active, serious, prudent disposition, sturdy good sense, and unconquerable tenacity. At first he followed in his fa-

[22] Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège*, p. 95.

ther's footsteps and for several years was governmental administrator of a "slavinia." Then he resigned from his high office and withdrew to a *laura,* where he led the life of an ascetic. Charged with the direction and reformation of an important monastery, he there had occasion to reveal, more than he had in the civil administration of his district, the resourcefulness of his character.

Constantine had an altogether different nature. Mild, thoughtful, mystical, he was especially fond of solitude and of study. He was called "the philosopher," and was pleased with the title. When a schoolmate of the young Prince Michael, the future Emperor Michael III, he studied under the finest teachers of poetry, history, mathematics, and dialectics. To avoid the honors that were offered him by the empress mother Theodora, who loved him like a son, and by the great logothete [23] Theoctistus who wished to give him his daughter in marriage, Constantine fled to an island in the Sea of Marmora. There he was found hidden in a monastery. Ordained priest, he had to accept from his imperial friend Michael III a chair of philosophy at Constantinople, where he charmed his hearers by the precision of his argumentation, the elegance of his speech, and the loftiness of his teaching.

Between the characters of the two brothers there was only one trait in common, but in both of them this trait was deeply marked: it was a burning zeal for the salvation of souls.

In the middle of the ninth century a twofold peril threatened the Church upon the frontiers of the Byzantine Empire: the Mussulman peril and the Jewish peril. The audacity of the followers of Islam increased with the strengthening of the dynasty of the Ommiads. In 838, the Anatolian city of Amorion yielded before the flood of a Mussulman army. Besides material destruction there was moral ruin. The prestige of Arab

[23] The great logothete was a sort of chief minister. Diehl, art. "logothète," in the *Grande Encyclopèdie.*

learning at that time equaled that of Byzantine learning and led to defections among the Christians. To fight this evil the Emperor appealed to the brilliant professor of philosophy in his capital. In the lands of the Calif of Bagdad, Constantine met an adversary whose intellectual culture was on a level with his own, the scholarly Calif Mutawekkil. Although the Christian scholar did not succeed in converting him, at least he had the honor of sustaining the Christian religion before him.

The Jewish peril existed to some extent in all parts of the Empire. The war against images had emboldened the Israelites. Having returned into favor, they abused their influence to bring about apostasies among Christians. In 812, Patriarch Nicephorus charged their doctrine with invading the Empire like gangrene.[24] A movement of earnest proselytism appeared chiefly among the Jews living along the Black Sea.[25] The nation of the Khazars was on the point of being won to Judaism. Men of learning and courage were needed to dispel the danger. Michael turned to Constantine and Methodius. These apostles not only preserved the faith of this people living on the borders of the Empire, but also influenced them to make an alliance with Byzantium.

When Constantine was returning from his mission, weakened with fatigue and already afflicted with the ailment that would later carry him off, the ambassadors of Rastiz duke of Moravia reached Constantinople begging for missioners. Once again the Emperor appealed to the devotion of Constantine and Methodius.

Constantine was a priest. But Methodius, a simple monk, had received only clerical tonsure. Upon their arrival in Moravia, the two apostles were the recipients of an enthusiastic welcome. Everything commended them to the friendly good

[24] *Vita Nicephori,* quoted in Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine,* p. 283.
[25] Rambaud, *L'empire grec au dixième siècle,* p. 273.

will of the Moravian people: their gentle and polished manners which so strongly contrasted with the rudeness of the German missioners,[26] the grave solemnity of their chant and of their liturgical ceremonies in which the Hellenic genius had left its harmony, and lastly and especially the use of the Slavonic language which Constantine and Methodius knew thoroughly and which they employed not only in preaching, but also in the liturgical offices. Their perfect knowledge of this tongue enabled them in a few days to compose a practical system of writing Slavonic and of starting a translation of the Bible. "From the banks of the Danube to the high valleys of Moravia, there was a sort of enchantment and deliverance." [27] But the work of God was to be promptly marked with the seal of trial.

The German imperial authority, at news of the success of the two missioners, took alarm. It feared that these Easterners would finally supplant the German clergy and that the Empire would thus find itself deprived of its best auxiliaries. A German army, led by Louis the German in person, marched along the left bank of the Danube and laid siege to Dowina the great fortress of Moravia. Duke Wratislaw avoided complete ruin only by renewing his oath of vassalage to the Emperor.[28] Other difficulties and conflicts, more painful to the hearts of the two apostles, awaited them. Cyril and Methodius, having gone to Italy to have some of their fellow-laborers ordained priests—neither of them was yet a bishop—stopped at Venice. Here their practice of celebrating mass in Slavonic greatly scandalized the Latin clergy. Canonists and theologians held

[26] Says Lapôtre: "Those German bishops, those abbots who posed as devoted to the work of conversion, had been seen on the battlefield by the Moravians, who were better acquainted with the power of their weighty armor than with the power of their preaching. In 849 an expedition against the Bohemians was led by abbots. In 871 the warlike Bishop Arno of Würzburg appeared, warring against the Moravians, accompanied by the no less warlike bishop of Fulda, Sigehard." Lapôtre, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 106 f.

[28] *Annales de Fulda,* year 864; *Hist. des Gaules,* VII, 171.

that by divine right only three languages had the privilege of being employed in the liturgical offices, namely, those that had been represented in the written inscription on the cross—Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. It was useless for the missioners to explain that they thought they were doing something quite natural, since they came from the East where they were accustomed to seeing mass celebrated in Greek, Persian, Armenian, Syriac, and Coptic. Denounced to the Pope, they were obliged to go to Rome to exculpate themselves before Nicholas I.

In Rome they were received by Pope Adrian II, who had just succeeded Nicholas I and who heard the two accused missioners with friendly attention. Moved by their piety and zeal and by the fruits obtained in Moravia by their apostolate, Adrian II, disregarding the trilingual theory of the Venetian theologians, authorized the missioners to keep their Sacred Books in the Slavonic language, ordained Methodius priest, and was on the point of consecrating Constantine bishop when the latter died from the disease he had contracted during his mission among the Khazars. Before dying, the holy priest wished to make his profession as a monk. It was on this occasion that he took the name of Cyril under which he is honored in the Churches of the East and West. The Pope then conferred episcopal ordination upon Methodius and assigned to him as his circumscription, not only Moravia, but also Pannonia. In Moravia the aged Duke Wratislaw was deposed and was surrendered to the Germans by his nephew Swatopluk. The political disturbances obliged Methodius to proceed directly to Pannonia where fresh tribulations awaited him.

St. Methodius in Pannonia

The province of Pannonia, located on the shores of Lake Balaton near Bavaria, had already been converted by the

Germans. When Methodius celebrated mass there in Slavonic, the same scandal arose as had occurred in Venice. But, in the presence of these lord bishops and these lord abbots, "who savored more of horse trappings than of the altar," [29] and who were more at home in the use of arms than in the handling of Aristotelian syllogisms, there could be no question, as in Italy, of attempting to treat the dispute by a scholastic argumentation or of waiting for a reply from Rome. The Bavarian prelates soon assembled a national council (870) in the presence of Louis the German. What took place in this pseudo-council, the nature of the arguments employed by the bishops of Passau, of Salzburg, and of Freising against the Bishop of Moravia and Pannonia, we know from authentic letters. Imperturbable even when struck and slapped in the face,[30] Methodius exasperated his adversaries. Pope John VIII, in one of his letters, says that one day the Bishop of Passau, Ermenrich, was seen to enter the council's meeting-place in riding-dress, a whip in his hand, and to attack the Bishop of Pannonia, intending to strike him in the face. The other bishops stopped him in time.[31] In short, Methodius was thrown into a prison that was open to all the inclemencies of the weather and there, for two years, suffered horribly.[32] But this did not prevent their sending to Rome a formal denunciation, charging Methodius with two offenses: the introduction of a new tongue into the liturgy, and the omission, from the recitation of the Creed, of the word *Filioque,* which the whole West had adopted at that period.

We have now reached the year 872. Pope Adrian II was

[29] Lapôtre, *op. cit.,* p. 107.

[30] *Colaphis affligentes,* Jaffé, I, 2976.

[31] *In episcoporum concilium tractum equino flagello percuteres, nisi prohibereris ab aliis.* Letter of John VIII to Ermenrich of Passau. *Neues Archiv.,* V, 303; Jaffé, I, 2977.

[32] *Sub divo, acerrima hiemis immanitate.* Letter of John VIII to Ermenrich. *Neues Archiv.,* V, 303; Jaffé, I, 2978.

succeeded by John VIII. Once again Rome, less exacting than the pretended defenders of its rights, decided in favor of the Bishop of Moravia and Pannonia. However, it asked him to employ the Slavonic tongue only in his sermons.[33] What were the circumstances that, six years later, made Methodius think he was authorized to celebrate mass in the national language? We do not know. We simply know that, when denounced for so doing and summoned to Rome by Pope John VIII, he so justified his conduct that the Supreme Pontiff, testifying to Methodius' perfect orthodoxy, solemnly declared in a letter to King Swatopluk (June, 878) that there was no objection to having the mass sung in Slavonic, since God was the author of that tongue as well as of any other.[34]

Moravia under Swatopluk

Moravia was then near the height of its power. Swatopluk, after being supported by the Germans in dethroning his uncle, broke away from them. His empire soon stretched to the north over all Bohemia, to the south over all Pannonia as far as the Danube. This great man seems to have been endowed with a remarkable political sense. He grasped the importance of Methodius' work for maintaining the national independence and the autonomy of his race. It appears that his perspicacity penetrated still farther. As if he had an intuition of the preponderant part which the papacy would play in the organization of the Middle Ages, Swatopluk decided to place his empire under the immediate dependence of the Holy See, thus withdrawing his state from the eventual domination of any other suzerainty. History should retain the name of the Slav monarch who was the first Christian ruler to place his people under the direct vassalage of the Roman pontiff. Moreover, we know that

[33] Jaffé, I, 2970, 2975–2980.
[34] *PL*, CXXVI, 906.

the chief significance of this act was that of a great example. The Moravian empire did not survive the great Swatopluk. The very year of his death (894), Moravia was attacked on the West by the imperial troops and on the east by the Hungarian hordes, and was torn internally by the rivalries of the two sons of the defunct king, Moimir II and Swatopluk II. Soon after this it became the prey of Hungary and Bohemia.

On the very eve of this national catastrophe, the work of the saintly Bishop was stricken by an even greater misfortune, so it seems, because it appeared to affect the religious future of the whole Slav race. It was in consequence of a most commonplace incident that the result of so many efforts was going to be a failure.

The German party had not disarmed. In his determination to exclude the liturgical use of the Slavonic tongue, an unworthy prelate of German origin, Wiching by name, who by intrigue had become bishop of Passau, went so far as to resort to forgery. By scheming that would take too long to recount,[35] Wiching succeeded in substituting for the genuine letter of John VIII a forged letter, which absolutely forbade the Slavonic liturgy, ordered the return to all the rites and practices of the Latin Church, exempted Wiching from the jurisdiction of Methodius, and commissioned him to see to the execution of the papal letters in Moravia. At first the imposture was a complete success. Swatopluk, cleverly circumvented by Wiching, fell into the trap. For Methodius this was the beginning of a series of distressful humiliations and tribulations which were not definitely dissipated by a further letter of John VIII, a letter that was too vague, misunderstood, and not well interpreted. In 885, the apostle of Moravia rendered his soul to God, fearing the worst calamities for his work. In fact, a year later Pope Stephen V, likewise deceived by Wiching, who had been appointed to succeed Methodius, explicitly forbade the

[35] See the detail in Lapôtre, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 ff.

Slavonic liturgy, basing his proscription on the forged letter of John VIII. For a period of four centuries the popes, victims of the same error, continued to interdict the use of the national tongue in the Slav liturgy. It was not until the beginning of the thirteenth century that they partly revoked the prohibitions, when the Register of John VIII's letters, brought from Monte Cassino to the papal library, enabled them to establish the criminal trickery of Wiching.

Despite all difficulties, the work of the apostles of Moravia had been fruitful to an extraordinary degree. The Russian historian Hilferding says that no hero of his nation did more than Cyril and Methodius for the future of the Slav races. They gave a fixity to the language now spoken by millions of men. Their civilizing influence was also extended to the whole race; they exercised this influence at a time when, with the distinction between the various peoples not yet well marked, it was able easily to make itself felt in the whole great Slav family. A history of the Church should take note of the fact that almost all the Christians who, in the Slav world, are attached to the Roman Church, go back, directly or indirectly, to the Church of Moravia. Bohemia, whose Duke Borziwoi, brother-in-law of Swatopluk, was converted by St. Methodius, Poland, which received from Moravian fugitives after the fall of their country the first rudiments of the faith, and Hungary, where the influences of the Bohemian and Polish missioners was preponderant, owe to these Latin origins their escape from the Byzantine influence which would lead the other Slav nations into the Greek Schism.

The Russians

Early in the tenth century, while Moravia was disappearing from the political map of Europe, partitioned between the Bohemians and the Hungarians, a new center of Slav power

was founded more to the north and east, in the middle of a vast plain that was beginning to be called the country of the Rous, or Russia. The enterprising conqueror Oleg, son of Ruric, after taking by assault the city of Kieff on the Dnieper, said: "Let Kieff be the mother of Russian cities." [36] He who spoke thus was a Scandinavian, of the tribe of the Vareghi. But the nation whose capital he established was indeed a Slav nation. It seemed to be in the destiny of this race that it should find organization and unity only at the hands of men of foreign race. Who brought about the unity of the Slavs in the Balkan peninsula if not the Bulgarian Boris, and the empire of Moravia if not the Macedonians Cyril and Methodius? The father of Oleg was Ruric of the tribe of the Vareghi. He it was who made Russia. That nation had special need of a foreign and dominating element if it be true, as has been said, that the vast, bare plain it inhabits, adding its influence to that of the race, inclined the imagination of this people "to dreams vague and empty like itself, rather than to mighty conceptions and living images." [37]

The Vareghi, like the Slavs, were pagans. Upon mingling together, the dominant tribe and the vast nation merged their religions. The Scandinavian god Thor became identical with the Slav god Perun. But Christianity was spread among the people from the very beginning. When, under Igor the successor of Oleg, the Russians concluded a treaty with the emperor of the East, "some ascended the hill of Perun and performed the vows in the ancient way; others went to the chapel of St. Elias, and laid their hands on the Gospel." [38] But the leaders were refractory to Christian teaching. Says Nestor, the old Russian chronicler: "When one of the warriors of the great Prince decided to become a Christian, he was not prevented,

[36] Rambaud, *History of Russia,* I, 49. "Rous" was the name of a band of Vareghi who penetrated into Russia about 862, invited, it is said, by the Slavs.

[37] Fouillée, *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens,* p. 396.

[38] Rambaud, *op. cit.,* I, 52.

but he was laughed at." Olga, the widow of Iror, was baptized at Constantinople in 955, but her influence did not have any religious consequences among the great ones of Russia.

Conversion of Vladimir

The movement of conversion was brusque and complete, at least in appearance, under Vladimir in 998. Russia was tortured by a religious crisis. From the merging of the religion of the Slavic gods with that of the Scandinavian gods there arose a practical skepticism, against which the deeply religious soul of the Slavs protested. Where was the true religion to be found? Vladimir made an inquiry. His agents' description of the religious majesty of the functions at St. Sophia and the memory of his grandmother Olga removed his doubts. He resolved to become a Christian. But the proud Vareghus was not going to "beg for baptism." He determined to win it by conquest. To the Greek emperors Basil and Constantine he sent envoys to declare that, unless they would give him the hand of their sister Anna, he would march upon Constantinople. The emperors laid down the condition that Vladimir must be baptized. He received baptism and brought with him from Constantinople, besides his wife, some Christian priests, relics of the saints, and Church vestments, as one might carry off captives, as one makes off with booty after a victory. Then he had the statue of Perun publicly whipped and cast into the river.

From the old accounts gathered by Nestor and perhaps already altered by popular imagination, it is hard to judge what was the real character of him who has been called the Clovis of Russia. Like the Clovis of France, he seems not immediately to have divested himself of barbarism. Once he became a Christian, he thought he might command baptism for his people, as he would have commanded a military maneuver for his army. As we read in the old annals, "then, by Vladimir's order,

all the Kievans plunged into the waters of the . . . stream, while the Greek priests standing on the bank with Vladimir read the baptismal service." [39]

Amid this scene, where Greek priests baptized by order a race that lined up at the word of command, we regret not to see, in the new Clovis' entourage, a St. Remigius, a St. Clotilda, and a St. Genevieve, living models of the purest and gentlest Christian virtues.

Yet it appears that subsequently grace accomplished wonders in the soul of the converted king. Nestor marvels at this inner transformation. We see the monarch distributing his goods to the churches and to the poor; he was faithful to his Greek wife, he was no longer fond of war. He disliked to exercise severity even to punish criminals, and the bishops were obliged to remind him of his duties to justice. Says Leroy-Beaulieu; "There is between the Russian temperament and Russian nature, as manifested in the opposition of the seasons, a likeness not easily to be denied. Both are immoderate, both easily rush from one extreme to another.[40] Vladimir founded schools where the children of the common people studied the Scriptures in the Slavonic translation of St. Cyril and St. Methodius. But they had to be won to this sort of study. Their parents tried to turn them from it, looking upon writing as a kind of sorcery. Belief in soothsayers and sorcerers persisted for a long while among the people. In the twelfth century we find it still mingled with the practices of the Christian faith.

Jaroslav the Russian Charlemagne

The Russian Charlemagne, Jaroslav the Great, at the beginning of the eleventh century completed the work of the Russian Clovis. Jaroslav's legislative work is remarkable. He drew

[39] Rambaud, *op. cit.*, I, 60.
[40] Leroy-Beaulieu, *L'empire des tsars*, I, 174.

up the first code of his nation, the Rouskaia Pravda (the Russian *law* or *truth*). Throughout it bears a Scandinavian imprint. This legislation sanctions the judgment of God, legal duels, money composition or *wergheld,* which the Russians call *vira.* Jaroslav's political success was still more important. He brought his dynasty into the family of Christian rulers, marrying his sister to Casimir king of Poland, one of his daughters to Harold the Brave king of Norway, another to Henry I king of France, the third to Andrew I king of Hungary.

But Russia remained cut off from the West. Christianity and civilization came to it from Byzantium, not from Rome. Therein was its weakness. It was from Byzantium that it received its intellectual culture. "The numerous schools endowed by Vladimir and Jaroslav were founded by Greeks, after Byzantine models. This is what one of her writers calls by the name of 'the first of her intellectual bondages.' " [41] Also from Byzantium she received the type of her social organization. "The first social type which civilization held out to the young Russian Empire was the autocracy of the Lower Empire, a state without political rights, ruled by Imperial Omnipotence, aided by a close hierarchy of functionaries and employees." [42] Lastly, it was from Byzantium that she received the form of her Church. The first personnel of her priesthood and her episcopate were Greeks. But, in the Byzantine Church, the tendency to schism was widespread. When the day of the open declaration of the schism comes, the Church of Russia lets herself be drawn into it as if the act were quite of her own accord.

Poland

Very different were the circumstances leading to the conversion of Poland. The slow labor of preaching the Gospel, begun there by exiled Moravians among the popular classes, ac-

[41] Kaveline, quoted by Leroy-Beaulieu, *op. cit.,* I, 231.
[42] *Ibid.*

complished real progress only at the close of the tenth century, following the marriage of Duke Mieczyslaw (or Mieszko) in 965 to a young Bohemian princess, Dombrowka (or Dobrawa). She was a daughter of King Boleslaus and niece of St. Wenceslaus.[43] Dobrawa (the Good) was the good angel of Poland. By her gentleness and untiring condescension, she succeeded in touching the heart of her husband, who was still involved in the errors of paganism. Our most important testimony as to these events comes from Dithmar of Merseburg.[44] He relates that Dobrawa began by performing most austere penances to obtain her husband's conversion. Seeing that her manner of life merely frightened him and made Christianity odious to him, the devout princess changed her tactics. She determined to conquer him by kindness, amiably yielding to all his requests whenever her conscience would allow. One day, however, it seemed that she had really gone too far. She had consented to eat meat on a fast day. Says the gentle chronicler at this point: "You have now learned her sin, O kind reader. Learn also the fruit of her good will. She labored with kindness for her husband's conversion and she was heard by the goodness of her Creator, whose unspeakable mercy stirred reflection in the heart of a fiery enemy who, obedient to the remonstrances of his wife, rejected the poison of his inherited unbelief and washed away his original sin in the waters of his baptism." [45]

Mieszko's successor was Boleslaus the Mighty (Chrobry), who reigned from 992 to 1025. He assured the complete triumph of Christianity by calling into his states the Benedictines and the Camaldolese, who spread about them a serious Christian life. From that moment two traits distinguished the

[43] Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* p. 792 note.

[44] Dithmar (or Thietmar) bishop of Merseburg, born in 976, rendered a most valuable service to the history of the Middle Ages by the publication of his *Chronicon.* See *MGH,* V, 723 ff.

[45] Dithmar, *Chronicon,* IV, 35; *MGH,* Vol. V.

Church of Poland: a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and an earnest loyalty to the Holy See. The famous canticle to the Blessed Virgin, attributed to St. Adalbert of Prague, stirred the enthusiasm of the Poles. As is well known, "the close union between Poland and the papal court has remained one of the special marks of this people's history." [46]

Later on, amid countless misfortunes, caused not simply by the weaknesses of her constitutional régime, Poland became the invincible bulwark of Europe against invasions and gave evidence of a vitality and nobility that have few examples in history. Without rashness we may attribute the merit of this to those two traits of her faith. Alfred Fouillée, an author by no means prejudiced in favor of the Church, writes as follows: "Russia and Poland are of the same race, but they have opposite religions and civilizations. It was from Byzantium the former received her religion, preached by Greek missioners; the latter received Roman Catholicism, preached by missioners who came from Rome; . . . whence there came a double current of civilization; in one case, Byzantine and sterile; in the other case, Graeco-Roman and infinitely fertile. So true is it that moral and social influences are superior to ethnical influences." [47]

The Hungarians

The Hungarians (or Magyars) belonged to an entirely different race. They were the very ones who, by seizing Moravia and pushing their incursions from all sides, had split the Slav world into several fragments, of which Russia and Poland were the chief ones. They entered the Catholic Church at the same time as the Poles, at the close of the tenth century. No nation was more terrible in battle; but none developed a more

[46] E. Denis, in the *Histoire générale,* I, 726.
[47] Fouillée, *op. cit.,* p. 421.

tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and a more knightly loyalty to the supreme pontiff.

The Magyar duke who, at the end of the ninth century, came down from the Carpathians and invaded Pannonia, was said to be sprung from the noble and ferocious Attila.[48] Five centuries before, so it was said, while Attila, not satisfied with the vast empire he had carved out with his sword in eastern Europe, turned his steps toward the Eternal City, a heavenly angel appeared to him and said: "Hear what the Lord Jesus Christ commands you: Enter not into the Holy City where the bodies of my Apostles rest. Turn back, and some day, at Rome itself, as a reward for your obedience, I will give to one of your descendants the crown of a kingdom that will last forever." This was the crown which Duke Almos with his 20,000 warriors came to find in the land which his ancestor Attila had conquered long before. The country occupied by the Magyars of Duke Almos thenceforth took the name of Magyaria or Hungary. With them they brought the religion of their ancestors, the worship of the god Isten, whom they called more especially the *god of the Magyars,* and of several secondary divinities, the principal of which was the god of war, Hadur, a belief in fairies, and the practice of divination and sorcery.

In times of peace, each tribe was independent. But in time of war, they elected a chief. Gathered about a sacred cup, the chieftains of the seven tribes, with their left arm extended before them, opened an artery with their dagger and, while their blood poured into the cup, they took a terrible oath: "Thus may pour out to the last drop the blood of anyone who revolts against the chief chosen by the tribes! Thus may pour out the blood of the chief if he violates the conditions of our pact!" Then the chosen leader, upon his horse, brandished his saber

[48] The Hungarians, in their traditions, give Attila a very noble and honorable character.

to the four cardinal points, in this way signifying that he would defend his country from whatever side it might be attacked.[49]

Conversion of Duke Geza

A century after the occupation of Hungary by the Magyar forces, on Christmas Day, 973, Duke Geza, a descendant of Duke Almos, received baptism from the hands of St. Adalbert of Prague, along with five thousand of his warriors. This conversion was in very large part the work of his wife Sarolta, daughter of Gyula duke of Transylvania, who had been baptized at Constantinople and brought his daughter up in the Christian religion. Faith in Christ had not at all extinguished the native and somewhat savage energies of the young princess. The Hungarians liked to see this fearless amazon "subdue the most restive horses without bit or saddle, empty the foaming cups, and cast herself into the battle, where her valor equaled that of the most dauntless warriors." [50] She had a considerable influence over her people and over her husband.[51] The Duke, himself impressed by the grandeur of the doctrines and moral teaching of Christianity, allowed his wife to build churches and to call Christian missioners to Hungary.

A saint, of gentle and pious soul, accomplished the work which the valiant amazon had begun. St. Adalbert of Prague who later died a martyr of the faith, near Königsberg in 997, slain with a lance by an idolatrous priest, was the son of a nobleman of Bohemia. In childhood he was especially consecrated to the Blessed Virgin. Raised to the see of Prague at the age of twenty-seven, endowed with an earnest zeal for the

[49] *Gesta Hungarorum,* VI. Quoted by Horn, *Saint Étienne de Hongrie,* pp. 12 f. The custom of brandishing the sword to the four cardinal points is preserved in the ceremonial of the coronation of the kings of Hungary.

[50] Horn, *op. cit.,* p. 31.

[51] *Totum regnum viri manu tenebat,* says De Sarolta, the biographer of St. Adalbert of Prague. *Acta sanctorum,* April, Vol. III.

glory of God, but filled with a great mistrust of himself, he determined to entrust his episcopal see to an auxiliary, thinking himself incapable of winning to God his untutored Czech fellow-countrymen. He went to Rome and there retired to the monastery of St. Alexis, where he led a life of penance and prayer. A deputation of Bohemians and the Pope's order induced him to return to his country. He became the apostle, not only of Bohemia, but also of Hungary and Prussia.[52]

The conversion of the people was the work of Piligrim of Passau, of the monk Wolfgang, and of some other Greek and Latin missioners.

St. Stephen of Hungary

Six years after the baptism of her husband, Sarolta gave birth to a son who at baptism received the name of Stephen and whom the Church would place in the number of the saints. The zeal displayed by St. Stephen of Hungary in building churches and monasteries, his vigorous promptness in suppressing an attempt at revolt by the old followers of paganism, the prudence and moderation which he practiced in all things in the government of his country, the noble simplicity with which he rendered justice to his subjects and instructed the poor,[53] the spirit of justice and loyalty which he brought to his diplomatic relations with other peoples, his filial piety toward the Blessed Virgin, to whom he vowed his kingdom and whom he liked to call the *Great Lady of the Hungarians,* the remarkable counsels which he drew up for the instruction of his son, justifies us in placing him among the greatest Christian kings, not far from St. Louis king of France. But his two chief titles of glory are his legislative work and the direction he gave to the general policy of Hungary.

[52] On St. Adalbert of Prague, see *Acta sanctorum,* April, Vol. III.

[53] Pope Sylvester II said: "I am apostolic, but King Stephen, by the grace of Christ, is apostle. *Ego sum apostolicus; ille vero, merito Christi, est apostolus.*

Stephen himself said: "Let the laws and traditions of our fathers be something sacred for us, because it is difficult for a people to exist and to continue if it disowns those who have gone before." For him, however, this cultivation of tradition seems to have been merely the condition for a more assured and progressive advance. By some he has been reproached, whereas he has been honored by others, for resolving to advance beyond his age. In the constitution that he drew up for his country, Stephen, whenever he judged it fitting, did not fear to depart from the practices most cherished by his race. Courageously and inexorably he forbade duels and private warfare. Whoever should draw his sword to avenge a personal offense would be condemned to perish by the sword.

He made notable alterations in the constitution of his country. Out of what had been merely a sort of military power, he made a monarchy. But at the same time he rejected the ancient conception of monarchy, which absorbed into the state every individual initiative. Through the development of the institution of the *comitats,* or autonomous provinces, he established a wise administrative and social decentralization. He wished that in each province the speech, the customs, and the manner of dress should be respected. "Feeble is the state," he said, "which has only one tongue and uniform customs." [54] Between the high nobility and the common people he favored the formation of a lesser nobility, easily accessible, that of the knights, from whom he hoped for much in the defense of the public liberties and the national independence. He wanted the royalty to be elective, but maintained in the same family. He intended that foreigners should enjoy extensive liberties in his states and that they should be called, not strangers or foreigners, but guests, *hospites.* To facilitate the relations between his subjects and other nations, he founded at Jerusalem, Rome, Constan-

[54] *Unius linguae uniusque moris regnum imbecille et fragile est. Sancti Stephani Decret., LI, Monit. IV.*

tinople, and Ravenna hospices intended to receive Hungarian travelers. He professed absolute regard for private property. No one could be deprived of his possessions, even to the advantage of the state, by a process of confiscation. In case of desertion, or treason, or of lese majesty, the criminal's property would pass to his children "that the innocent son might not be deprived of his patrimony on account of the guilty father."

Many of the reforms of this great lawmaker did not have the result which they seemed to promise. Some of them were not well enough understood; in the case of others, the people were not advanced enough to support them. It is a just cause of pride for Hungary that one of its kings, and for the Church that one of her saints, nine centuries ago proclaimed principles of so lofty a moral and social import.

Through the connections of St. Stephen's maternal grandfather, Gyula the duke of Transylvania, who had been converted at Constantinople, and through the missioners whom his mother Sarolta had invited to come, Christian Hungary at first found itself orientated in the direction of the Byzantine Church. The Christian understanding of the saintly King made him see that the full truth and the future were in the direction of Rome. He openly turned in that direction. Pope Sylvester II, who perceived what eminent services might be rendered to Christianity by a Catholic kingdom located in the eastern part of Europe, placed the royal crown on Stephen's head in the year 1000, bestowed upon him the title of *apostolic,* and granted him exceptional privileges regarding the organization of dioceses and the conferring of benefices.

Hungary the Bulwark of Europe

The destinies of Hungary were determined. Throughout the Middle Ages the Hungarian nation, steadfast at its post of combat, was the bulwark of Europe against the Tartar and Turkish invasions. "For Westerners, what should be upper-

most is gratitude for the services which Hungary rendered to civilization by placing its body across the path of barbarism." [55] Says Michelet: "When shall we pay our debt of gratitude to this blessed people, the savior of the West?"

By the conversion of Hungary the formation of Christian Europe was completed. After a thousand years of effort, not only was paganism vanquished throughout Europe; it was also reached in the other parts of the world. Christianity entered Africa by way of Roman Africa, Egypt, and Nubia; [56] it spread in Asia as far as the island of Socotra, Ceylon, and the Malabar coast; a few missions were to be found at intervals across Tartary to the very heart of China; [57] by way of Iceland, which became Christian in the year 1000, and by Greenland, it soon reached America.[58]

While bishops and missionary monks were laboring at this great expansion, the popes and the Christian princes did not remain inactive. The idea of a vast confederation of the converted nations had taken form, the temporal domain of the Holy See was legally constituted, Charlemagne had founded the Holy Empire, feudalism was born, Pope St. Nicholas I had proclaimed the Christian law of the new society, and, after violent blows that shook the See of St. Peter mightily, a German prince resumed the work of Charlemagne. These are the facts we must now set forth.[59]

[55] Sayous, *Histoire générale des Hongrois.*

[56] Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* pp. 182 ff.

[57] The famous stone of Si-ngan-fu, discovered in 1625, leaves no doubt as to the preaching of the Gospel in China in the seventh century. Cf. Havret, *La stèle chrétienne de Si-ngan-fou.*

[58] Gaffarel, *Études sur les rapports de l'Amérique et de l'Ancien Continent avant Colomb;* Gravier, *Découverte de l'Amérique par les Normands au X^e siècle.*

[59] On the origin of the Slavic Churches and liturgy, see Petrovic, O.F.M., *Disquisitio historica in originem usus slavici idiomatis in liturgia apud Slavos ac praecipue Croatos.* Petrovic's conclusions, in accord with those of Lapôtre, have been questioned. See Zeiller in the *Revue des questions historiques,* July 1, 1909, p. 374. On the Bulgarian Church in particular, see Vailhé, "Formation de l'Église bulgare" in the *Échos d'Orient,* March, 1911, pp. 80–89, and May, 1911, pp. 152–161.

PART III

The Holy Roman Empire

CHAPTER XI

The Formation of the Papal States (741–757)

THE task imposed upon the Roman pontiffs by the conversion of so many nations was overwhelming. To maintain their contact by ceaseless correspondence with the missioners and with the converted rulers, to solve the most unexpected cases of conscience arising from altogether novel situations, to pass final judgment in ecclesiastical disputes, even to intervene, at the request of rulers and of nations, in the conflicts of private rights, public law, and international law: such was the mission which the papacy had to assume after the first conversions of the barbarian races. St. Nicholas I and St. Gregory VII later on set forth and to some extent codified this mission of the papacy of the Middle Ages;[1] to say that they inaugurated this mission is to contradict the genuine facts of history. It was determined by providential circumstances and by social needs which the popes neither created nor foresaw.

Moreover, such a mission was no less delicate for them than it was formidable. The lofty impartiality that should rightly be expected from that supreme jurisdiction implied a moral independence difficult to reconcile with the political dependence from which the conservative loyalty of the bishops of Rome

[1] Concerning the work of St. Nicholas I, Henri Martin, in his *Histoire de France* (4th ed., II, 455), writes: "The papacy had never tried anything so daring: the whole Church discipline was upset for the sake of an altogether new despotism. Popular approval ratified a usurpation that acted in the name of justice and Christian morality." The whole history of the popes, as we have been relating it according to authentic documents, protests against such a declaration. In the *Vie de saint Nicolas Ier* by Jules Roy (pp. xxx–xxxiii), see the enumeration of the chief facts proving that the supreme authority of the popes was exercised among the converted barbarian nations from the very outset.

did not wish to withdraw. The situation became most critical when the duties of their position made it necessary for them to take a stand for or against the emperors of the East, their official rulers, for or against the Ostrogoths, the Lombards, or any other nation at whose mercy their temporal domain did in fact find itself. The exercise of the popes' spiritual jurisdiction, which came to them from Christ, as also the accomplishment of their civilizing mission, which they held from the confidence of the peoples, required their territorial independence.

But what sword could guarantee this territorial independence? To put the sword into the hands of the pope or into the hands of any king, was to fall back into the danger that they wished to avoid. A powerful protector, in very high station, who would make himself the temporal defender of the Church, not by the title of king, but by a semi-sacred title which he would hold from the pope himself, which would be regulated, in its exercise, by a solemn pact and which the confederation of the Christian nations would confirm: such was the solution.

This was the whole conception of the Holy Roman Empire. The popes and the bishops of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, in all probability, did not envisage this ideal. Certainly there is no evidence that would lead us to suppose so. Neither St. Gregory, surprised at finding himself a temporal prince upon taking possession of the Holy See, nor St. Avitus greeting in Clovis the future emperor of the West, nor St. Leander celebrating at the Council of Toledo the fraternity of Christian peoples, had a clear vision of the Holy Empire. A concurrence of events, that the papacy and the episcopate underwent rather than provoked, realized this work, which continued, so to speak, in three different periods. Under Stephen II, the papal state was constituted as the nucleus around which the new world would be organized. Under St. Leo III, the Empire was established in the person of Charlemagne. Later, beginning in the tenth century, almost the whole of

feudalism was arranged hierarchically under the double supreme authority of the pope and the emperor.

The People of Rome

If we wish to find, outside the multiple and anonymous causes that gradually brought about the temporal independence of the Holy See, some human agency aware of this great work, we must consider the people of Rome.

A recent historian,[2] basing his conclusions upon the scholarly labors of Duchesne, says:

> The popes of the eighth century, who came to Rome from the most diverse provinces, some Italians, others Greeks,[3] still others Syrians, called to the supreme pontificate at an advanced age and exercising their power for a short period of a few years, seem to have too easily accepted the *status quo*. . . . On the other hand not enough attention has been given to the part taken by the people of Rome in these events, that people over whom the pope was the religious shepherd but who did not cease having their own political aspirations and accordingly exerted pressure upon the line of conduct of the papacy.

Since Rome had ceased to be the center of an empire, it no longer contained that immense cosmopolitan throng, made up of provincials and freed men, that the conquest of the world ceaselessly brought within its walls. Here, as elsewhere, a new generation had arisen, invigorated in the strifes and trials that accompanied the fall of the Empire. Rome was no longer the city of the Caesars; it remained the city of the Prince of the Apostles; and, in a period when religious thought excelled any other thought, it was still an enviable superiority to possess within its walls the tomb of St. Peter and the see of his successors. The Romans of Rome soon witnessed a new influx of foreigners, coming from distant countries where the Roman eagles had never penetrated. These people were not merely pilgrims; they

[2] Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age*, pp. 497 ff.

[3] "In the course of a century and a half, thirteen Greek popes governed the Latin Church." Diehl, *Étude sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne*, p. 159.

were also foreign colonies, permanently settled around the Basilica of St. Peter—Saxons, Franks, Frisians, Lombards—[4] who attested by their presence the extent of this new empire of souls, which was equally as precious as the other.

Furthermore, along with the faithful, there poured in donations in every form, but especially in land, donations which made the Prince of the Apostles the largest landowner of Italy, with patrimonies no less extensive in Sicily, Corsica, in the Alpine region, and even in Gaul. The pope had the free disposal of the income from these patrimonies; but it was the people of Rome that derived the chief advantage from them. Most of the expenses for the needs of public worship, the construction and repair of churches and shrines, the manufacture of sacred utensils, furnished labor and wages for a whole population of artisans. Upon the treasury of the Church fell also the relief of the poorest, who received therefrom regular food allotments.

But, more and more, the pope, as a good shepherd, could not neglect other needs of his flock. He assumed a considerable part of the administrative services of Rome: the maintenance and repair of the city's fortifications, the care of highways and aqueducts, the provisioning of the markets, the protection of the lowly against oppression by imperial officials. All these occupations were very expensive and required a great amount of attention,[5] as St. Gregory the Great remarked when complaining that his Apostolic See was assailed by this growing flood of secular affairs. The Church of Rome did not yet exercise any of the prerogatives of sovereignty, but it was already bearing all the obligations of it.

We can surmise the enthusiastic devotedness with which the people of Rome surrounded so beneficent an authority. And we can understand the indignation with which they witnessed the violent moves undertaken by the emperors against the person of their shepherd. That indignation was not able always to remain passive. In the presence of the Lombard peril, the inhabitants of the cities had of necessity again taken up the military profession, of which the Romans of the decline had lost the habit. City militias were everywhere organized;

[4] These four *scholae* of Germanic origin formed the *Borgo* of St. Peter, located outside the boundaries of the city.

[5] Diehl, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

at Rome it was the *exercitus romanus,* with its twelve *scholae* corresponding to the twelve sections of the city. This military revolution was a new and considerable step on the path of political autonomy. Of course the army obeyed the dukes and military tribunes sent or appointed by the emperor; but, following the iconoclast decrees, when the imperial officers decided to resort to acts of violence against the pope, the inhabitants drove them out, by one stroke freeing Rome and the papacy. They grouped themselves around the pope under native dukes and tribunes. They became the defenders of orthodoxy and of St. Peter who is its guardian.

Therefore, according to a conception familiar to the Middle Ages, incarnating the institution in its patron, they came to consider the Prince of the Apostles as the prince of the Romans; the Roman people was considered the special people of St. Peter.[6]

The Holy Roman Empire

Then it was that appeared in the letters of the popes to the Christian princes, as also in various other documents of the period, altogether novel expressions to designate the duchy of Rome and the patrimonies of the Holy See. Rome, the duchy around it, and agricultural colonies dependent on it in Italy and beyond, all are called the *Respublica romana,* the *Respublica Romanorum,* the *Sancta Respublica.*

"The word *Respublica* has a curious history. By itself, it means the state, consequently the empire. . . . But the epithet *holy* which the pope adds to it is perhaps more than a mere chancery formality: *Sancta Respublica* is not just the same as *Respublica* pure and simple. In time, the expression becomes more and more involved and complicated: we find *Sancta Respublica romana,* or *Sancta Respublica Italiae.* It would be rash to regard these expressions as exact definitions, because

[6] *Sancti Petri peculiaris populus.* This expression recurs again and again in the letters of Pope Gregory III to Charles Martel, and of Pope Stephen II to Pepin. See Jaffé, *Monumenta carolina, Codex Carolinus,* pp. 14, 16, 17, 58, etc. *PL,* XCVIII, 66, 68. Cf. col. 106, 120, 248, 262.

the men who spoke thus did not precisely grasp what their words signified. They felt that something new was about to take place, but they did not see it; they were gropingly feeling their way in the dark; their speech was obscure like the things." [7]

Who was the real sovereign of this *Respublica?* It was the Apostle St. Peter. The popes and the princes are quite agreed on this point. When Gregory wrote to Liutprand, demanding back four fortresses that had been taken from him, he makes his claim in the name of St. Peter.[8] When the Lombard King returned the Sutri fortress to the Holy See, he declared that he was making his donation to the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul.[9] Stephen II goes farther. In calling Pepin the Short to his aid, he employs a celebrated rhetorical personification in which he has St. Peter come down from heaven; he words his letter as though it were dictated by the Prince of the Apostles; and, after the campaign, the Frankish King replies to the envoys of the Emperor of the East that he has fought only for St. Peter and for the remission of his own sins. Says Duchesne: "I do not think it was all merely an oratorical fiction. It was in this manner that the pope should have spoken to his world. Assuredly he had the right to do so. And substantially it was in this manner the Romans themselves understood him. They felt that, in the crises that were developing, they had more to expect from the pope and from St. Peter than from the distant and not very sympathetic emperor of Constantinople." [10]

If, indeed, the pope had the right to govern that state, it was

[7] *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* Dec. 15, 1886, pp. 874 f.

[8] *Quatuor castella Beato Petro erepta,* Jaffé, 1734. When Liutprand made this donation, did he mean to withdraw the fortress of Sutri from the Emperor? We think not. But he constituted this fortress in a very special juridical condition; he made of it a *sacred land* in the Empire.

[9] *Sutriense castrum Beatissimis Apostolis Petro et Paulo rex restituit atque donavit. Liber pontificalis,* I, 407.

[10] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical,* pp. 28 f.

solely as legitimate successor and representative of St. Peter. But, thus viewed, his political situation was without comparison.

In theory, unquestionably the pope was a subject, for everyone is subject or sovereign, and in the Empire there was no sovereign but the emperor. But in reality the emperor did not appoint the pope; he did no more than ratify his election, which took place at Rome and was made by the Romans. . . . The authority he exercised did not come to him from the emperor. . . . The succession from St. Peter, the see of St. Peter, the authority of St. Peter—to these the "Apostolic lord" laid claim and these constituted his prestige. . . . In a period when people were not so jealous as now to draw the line between the spiritual and the temporal . . . he frequently mixed in worldly affairs, in the making of treaties, in the appointment of officials, in protecting the finances of the state, in undertakings of a governmental nature. . . . He took a hand in the political and even military affairs of Ravenna and Naples. . . . He even reached beyond the frontiers and spoke to the Visigoths, the Franks, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Bavarians.[11]

But *the sacred domain* properly so called, *the States of St. Peter,* were, by the very force of things, restricted to the district about Rome. "Around the Apostolic holy place a sort of special environ was formed, its boundaries marked spontaneously, furnished by the frontier of the duchy of Rome as determined by the halting of the Lombard invasion." [12]

Pope St. Zachary

Before Pepin the Short's intervention, such was the political situation of the bishop of Rome, the head of the universal Church. We should not, therefore, be surprised at seeing, in the middle of the eighth century, Pope St. Zachary without any

[11] *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical,* pp. 21–23.

[12] Duchesne, *ibid.,* pp. 23 f. See (p. 24) the detailed delimitation of the duchy of Rome.

contest exercise all the prerogatives of sovereignty. This mild and gentle Pontiff, who seemed to have no other policy than to live at peace with everybody,[13] "governed the States of St. Peter, as they were called, with the same independence as that with which he governed his Church." [14] Consecrated almost immediately after his election, he did not bother to obtain imperial confirmation. When the Lombards were threatening Rome or the exarchate of Ravenna, Zachary on his own motion, without consulting Constantinople, found it quite natural to negotiate a treaty with Liutprand before the walls of Rome. From the King he obtained the evacuation of the exarchate, and from his successor Ratchis the raising of the siege of Perugia. He was at no pains at all to consult the emperor in the administration of the duchy of Rome, the States of St. Peter, to which for ten years, according to the expression of the *Liber pontificalis,* he gave "an era of prosperous and joyous security," [15] such as had been unknown for a long time. It was this same mild and peaceful Pontiff who was the first to exercise an act of supreme jurisdiction over the legitimacy of kings.[16] Men's personal qualities counted for little in that great movement which ended in the constitution of the papal sovereignty.

Aistulf the Lombard King

Shortly after St. Zachary's death, a violent outrage, which at first seemed likely to arrest the development of the authority of the bishops of Rome, on the contrary brought about the legal, official, and definite recognition of it and transformed

[13] *Vir mitissimus atque suavis, omnique bonitate ornatus, tardus ad irascendum, nulli malum pro malo reddens, sed pius ac misericors. Liber Pontificalis,* I, 426.

[14] Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* p. 503.

[15] *Hujus denique temporibus in magna securitate et letitia populus a Deo illi commissus degens vixit. Lib. pont.,* I, 435.

[16] See *infra* the consultation of Zachary on the legitimacy of Pepin the Short.

into an institution of public international law what had previously been merely a situation of fact. In like manner we see the heresies, attempting to shatter the traditional belief, actually bring about new precision in the dogma of the Church.

We know the political situation caused in Italy by the invasion of the Lombards. But henceforth Lombard Italy, which developed in the middle of the peninsula, is distinguished from Byzantine Italy which, day by day driven back and compressed by the expansion of the barbarian invaders, nevertheless still embraced the greater part of the littoral and, in the center, a few enclaves, the chief of which was the duchy of Rome. In 750, the Lombard King Aistulf (or Astolphe), who succeeded Ratchis the year before, thought the moment had come to profit by the powerlessness of the emperor of the East and to invade the Byzantine possessions. Was not the imperial army recruited from natives of the country? Were not the dukes elective? Had not the authority of the exarch lost all its prestige? Aistulf judged he could seize a territory that was almost without claimants. Although we have no historical document referring to this military campaign, it seems that Aistulf occupied the imperial positions between the Po, the Adriatic, and the Apennines. The exarch Eutychius fled at the first report of the taking of Ravenna. In 751, the Lombard King was installed in the palace of the imperial exarchs.[17]

But public opinion was moved when in June, 752, Aistulf's army, drunk with its success, threatened the duchy of Rome. The duchy of Rome was indeed still imperial territory, but it was also sacred territory, the untouchable domain of the Apostle St. Peter. Besides, the Romans had never liked the Lombard people. Neither the protection which their chiefs often gave to the supreme pontiffs nor the royal gifts they made to the states of St. Peter had been able to overcome the deep antip-

[17] *Reg. Farf.*, no. 18, quoted by Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical*, p. 35.

athy felt by the Romans toward those men with untrimmed beards and with strange attire, who were said to have a bad smell and to spread leprosy.[18] There were no marriages between Romans and Lombards. This popular repulsion did not abate; on the contrary it grew sharper as the Lombards mingled more in Roman life. A rumor spread that Aistulf was intending to transfer his capital from Pavia to Rome. Popular exasperation was at its height.

Pope St. Stephen II

At this juncture Pope Zachary died (752). In the Church of St. Mary Major the people elected as his successor a man who, better than anyone else, was able to grasp the seriousness of the situation and to impress upon papal policy the orientation demanded by the events. It was the deacon Stephen, the second of that name to occupy the see of Peter.[19] Stephen II was of Roman origin. Orphaned in childhood, he had been reared in the Lateran Palace, in the entourage of the popes. The *Liber pontificalis* sums up his character in a few very precise traits: "Energetic and zealous defender of the Churches of God and of the Christian people, determined preserver of the ecclesiastical traditions," the deacon Stephen was also possessed of a kindly and charitable soul, "fond of visiting the widows and orphans." [20]

The new Pope's first care was to negotiate with Aistulf, as his predecessor had done with Liutprand and Ratchis, the ces-

[18] *PL,* XCVIII, 256.

[19] Jaffé, in his remarkable collection of the *Regesta pontificum,* is mistaken in reckoning as Stephen II one of this name who was elected but who died before being consecrated. He thus calls our pope Stephen III. This designation made by Jaffé has not been followed by Church historians. But we should recall this mistake so as to avoid confusion when consulting the *Regesta* of a pope named Stephen.

[20] *Amator ecclesiarum Dei . . . fortissimus etiam ovilis sui cum Dei virtute defensor . . . traditionem etiam ecclesiarum firma stabilitate conservans . . . viduas et pupillos multo melius visitans. Lib. pont.,* I, 440.

sation of hostilities. A delegation, made up of deacon Paul, (brother of the Pope) and Ambrose the primicerius of the notaries, obtained from the Lombard King a forty years' truce. But in less than four months Aistulf, false to his oath,[21] violated the truce and commanded the inhabitants of Rome to pay a personal tribute of one gold solidus for each person. The Roman people were angered at this. The Pope, to show the King that the interests which he was defending were not those of one nationality, but the general interests of the Church, sent to Aistulf two new ambassadors, this time chosen, not from the ranks of the Roman clergy, but from the clergy subject to the King of the Lombards: they were the abbot of Monte Cassino and the abbot of St. Vincent of Volturno. Aistulf received them with insolence, and ordered them to return directly to their monasteries without going to Rome to make a report to the Pope.[22]

The emperor of Constantinople, however, who was at that time Constantine Copronymus, finally decided to act. But his move, if not inspired by a complete ignorance of the gravity of the danger, was a most humiliating avowal of his weakness. The news of the failure of the embassy of the abbots of Monte Cassino and St. Vincent had scarcely reached Rome, when a messenger from the Emperor arrived there. He was an official of high rank, the silentiarius [23] John, who came to implore the Pope to intervene with the Lombard King to halt his incursions. Stephen II attempted to disillusion the imperial ambassador as to the effectiveness of any diplomatic undertaking. To show the soundness of his opinion beyond the least question of doubt, he consented to have his brother Paul go with the

[21] *In periurii incidens reatu. Lib. pont.*, I, 441; Jaffé, 2307.

[22] *Obtestans eos minime ad praefatum sanctissimum papam declinari. Lib. pont.*, I, 442.

[23] The *silentiarii* were at first the thirty officers of the imperial palace whose duty it was to maintain silence. Practically they had become departmental chiefs. The first *silentiarius* held the office of cabinet head.

silentiarius to Aistulf. After the foreseen failure of this new mission, in clear terms he notified the Emperor that, to stop the insolence of the Lombards, no means would be effective except the sending of an army to Italy.

However, consternation kept growing at Rome and became a veritable panic. Sinister rumors came from Ravenna. It was said that "the atrocious King of the Lombards, shaking like a lion, kept uttering the most terrible threats against the Romans; he spoke of cutting off the heads of all the inhabitants of Rome." [24]

Deprived of all human succor, the holy Pontiff invited his people to turn to God by public prayers. Many processions and litanies were held. Says the Roman annalist, with great pomp were carried the most sacred *mysteries,* that is, the most precious relics and statues, and the *acheropite* [25] image of Christ. By this last expression we should probably understand the "Holy Face" preserved in the Lateran Church. When the procession reached St. Mary Major's, each person covered his head with ashes in sign of penance, and prayers were offered to God before the stational cross, at the foot of which was fastened a copy of the treaty violated by the King of the Lombards.[26]

Yet the imperial army, asked for by the Pope from Emperor Constantine Copronymus, did not arrive.

Pepin the Short

Then it was that Stephen II resolved to turn to the Franks. His predecessors, Gregory III and Zachary, had already asked of Charles Martel, Pepin, and Carolman, that they should be-

[24] *Atrocissimus rex . . . fremens ut leo, pestiferas minas Romanis dirigere non desinebat, asserens omnes uno gladio jugulari. Lib. pont.,* I, 442.

[25] *Cum sacratissima imagine . . . quae acheropsita nuncupatur. Lib. pont.,* I, 443. This word *acheropsita* means "not touched by human hands."

[26] *Lib. pont.,* I, 443.

come the pope's auxiliaries in the work of Christian civilization. The situation was now far graver and more important. In his first letter, which was brought to Pepin by a pilgrim, Stephen II sets forth to the Frankish prince the situation of the Church of Rome. Then, probably after receiving a favorable answer, he sent a second letter in which he said to Pepin: "Send some envoys to me to Rome, and I will set out with them to visit you." [27]

Pepin had a debt of gratitude to pay to the papacy. Thanks to the papacy he had been able, two years before, to carry out a political change required for the good of France. Says Einhard: "For a long time past, the family of the Merovingians gave no proof of any virtue. The ruler was satisfied with having long-flowing hair, and a long beard, with sitting upon his throne and issuing replies that had been dictated to him or even commanded by others." [28] But, adds the *Annals of the Franks,* "in 751, Burchard bishop of Würzburg and Fulrad a priest were sent to Rome to Pope Zachary, to consult the Pontiff regarding those kings who possessed merely the name of kings without having any genuine royal power. The Pope replied that it was better that the one who held the authority should also have the title, and enjoined that Pepin should be made king." [29] The annalist then proceeds to relate how, after Pepin's coronation by St. Boniface, archbishop and martyr of happy memory, the new King was raised on the throne according to the custom of the Franks, in the city of Soissons; the last of the Merovingians, Chilperic, was then confined in the monastery of St. Bertin at Saint Omer. The change of dynasties thus

[27] Jaffé, 2311.

[28] Einhard (Eginhard), *Vita Karoli,* chap. 1; *Historiens des Gaules,* V, 89.

[29] *Ann. Franc.; Hist. des Gaules,* V, 63. The authenticity of this consultation of Zachary, contested by Mury (*Rev. ques. hist.,* 1867), rests upon the evidence of four independent literary texts: the continuer of Fredegarius, the *Annales Francorum,* the *Vita Karoli,* and a text (dated 767), found by the Bollandists in 1886, the *Clausula de unctione Pippini.*

took place without any disturbance. Did the King of the Franks suspect that he would now have to settle, apropos of the temporal power of the popes, a similar case of conscience, namely, whether a long continuity of services can found a legitimacy of power and whether the abandonment of duties is not equivalent to abdication?

In any event, the emperor of Constantinople rid himself more and more of his duties of protection over the duchy of Rome and cast its whole burden upon the supreme pontiff. Almost at the same time that Bishop Chrodegang of Metz and Duke Autchar, the two envoys of Pepin the Short, reached Rome,[30] a Byzantine embassy, with John the silentiarius at its head, also arrived. Its mission was, not to inform the Pope of the proximate arrival of the much desired imperial army, but to implore Stephen II again to intervene with Aistulf in the Emperor's name, to obtain from him the return of Ravenna and the cities dependent upon it. On the other hand, the Frankish ambassadors invited the Sovereign Pontiff to visit King Pepin. It was the autumn of 753. After mature consideration, the wise and brave Pontiff took a resolve that at first alarmed his entourage; but he held to it with energy: to accept the invitation of the Frankish King, but first to appear in person before Aistulf at Pavia, accompanied by the two embassies. Vainly he was told of the snares which the perfidious Lombard King would surely lay for him, the danger of death to which he would be exposing himself. On October 14, 753—the *Liber pontificalis* expressly records this memorable date—the Sovereign Pontiff, accompanied by the imperial legate John the silentiarius, Chrodegang bishop of Metz, the Frankish Duke Autchar, and a suite of notables from Rome and neighboring cities, bade farewell to his people and set out. An immense

[30] Duke Autchar, so celebrated in the *Gestes* of the Middle Ages under the name of Oger or Ogier. His card games made the name popular.

crowd accompanied him for some time on the way, "weeping, sighing, and attempting to keep him back," say the papal Annals, because they foresaw the great dangers awaiting him at Pavia.[31]

Pope Stephen and Pepin

Aistulf, informed of the Pope's approach, sent a deputation to meet him and to caution him not to say a word about the Lombard conquests in Italy. Stephen took no notice of the admonition. When he reached Pavia, he set forth his complaints both in the name of the Empire and in the name of the Church. Aistulf, though perhaps not much intimidated by the imperial envoy, was otherwise impressed by the attitude of the two Frankish ambassadors, who were able to back up the Pontiff's discourse with a few clear words. To the Emperor's demands about the exarchate, Aistulf returned a categorical refusal. He next tried, by every means, to dissuade the Pope from his journey to visit Pepin. But neither the exhortations nor threats affected the firmness of Pope Stephen, who dismissed the imperial embassy and all the laymen of his suite and, taking with him only a few clerics, turned his steps toward France. The *Liber pontificalis,* in its account, which seems to be the work of some member of the papal escort, shows us the Pope leaving Pavia on November 15, 753, reaching the Aosta valley, crossing over the St. Bernard pass, and coming down to the Abbey of St. Maurice in Valais. There he had hoped to confer with Pepin. But instead, he found merely two messengers of the Frankish King, who requested him to continue his journey and accompanied him as far as the neighborhood of Langres. There they met first the King's young son Charles, a boy about

[31] *Flentes, ululantes, et nequaquam eum penitus ambulare sinebant. Lib. pont.,* I, 445.

twelve years old, who would be the great Charlemagne, then King Pepin himself, who came forward three miles from his residence to the villa of Ponthion.[32]

The account of this interview given in the *Liber pontificalis* should be supplemented by the account of the Frankish chroniclers. The papal annalist insists especially upon the homage which Pepin paid to Stephen, dismounting from his horse at sight of the Pope, prostrating himself, then taking hold of the stirrup of the Pope's horse and walking for some distance beside him in the manner of equerry.[33]

Several Frankish chronicles—those of Moissac, of Metz, and of the continuator of Fredegarius—lay particular stress upon the homage paid to the King by the Pope. They say that Stephen and his clerics, clothed in haircloth, with ashes on their heads, and imploring mercy, prostrated themselves before Pepin.[34]

The two narratives are not necessarily contradictory. We may suppose there were prostrations on both sides and that the chroniclers, according to their nationality, emphasized either those of the King or those of the Pope.

After the ceremonial formalities were concluded, the Pope stated his claims. He begged the King of the Franks to take in hand the defense of the cause of St. Peter and of the Republic of the Romans;[35] but he also asked him to effect the restoration of the exarchate of Ravenna to its lawful possessor.[36] This was the supreme act of the Sovereign Pontiff's condescension toward Constantinople.

Pepin gladly yielded to these demands and, out of consider-

[32] *Lib. pont.*, I, 447.

[33] This is the first example of the *officium stratoris*, that was later appealed to as a precedent in the dispute between the popes and the emperors.

[34] *Hist. des Gaules*, V, 2, 67.

[35] *Ut causam Beati Petri et reipublicae Romanorum disponeret. Lib. pont.*, I, 448.

[36] *Ut illi placitum fuerit exarchatum Ravennae et reipublicae jura seu loca reddere. Lib. pont.*, I, 448.

ation for the recommendation of the Pope, who, says his biographer, abhorred the shedding of blood, attempted to settle the question through diplomacy. Three successive embassies and the generous offer of 12,000 gold solidi to Aistulf were ineffective to induce the latter to abandon his claims. The tricky Lombard even tried to exploit against Pepin and the Pope certain family strifes and the prestige connected with the former duke of Austrasia, Carloman, who had become a monk at Monte Cassino. Through the abbot of Monte Cassino, who was a subject of the Lombard kingdom, he had the prince-monk come out of the monastery to defend his so-called rights against Pepin and Stephen. It was a surprise and even a scandal to see reappear on the political scene, in conflict with the pope, the prince who had resolved to hide his life in the seclusion of a monastery. The surprise and scandal did not last long. Carloman was captured and perhaps compelled to take up the religious life again, but this time outside the Lombard frontiers. He had to retire to a monastery of Vienne in Dauphiny, where he died the next year.[37]

The Coronation of Pepin

Military action was becoming urgent. It was decided upon at a national assembly held in March, 754, in the vicinity of Soissons.[38] A second assembly, held on April 14 of the same year at Quierzy-sur-Oise, set forth the precise aim of the expedition, which was to give, or rather to restore, to the Apostle St. Peter a certain territorial zone, the limits of which were probably exactly delimited; in fact, for a long time we find reference to the *Charter of Quierzy*. But the loss of this im-

[37] *Annales regii*, year 755; *Histoire des Gaules*, V, 63.

[38] *Chronique de Moissac*, year 754; *Fredegarius*, chap. 120; Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, chap. 6; *Hist. des Gaules*, V, 2, 67, 89.

portant document prevents us from knowing its contents precisely.[39] At a third assembly, held on July 28 of the next year at Saint-Denis, the Pope renewed the coronation of Pepin, associated with him in the coronation his two sons who had also signed the Charter of Quierzy, and declared all three of them *patricians of the Romans.* This unprecedented coronation of a king and his sons by the Pope not merely confirmed the legitimacy of Pepin's kingship and that of his dynasty, but seemed to raise the royalty of the Franks above other royalties of Europe.[40]

The title of patrician, which had often been given by the emperors, but without anything added, as a mere honorary distinction, suggested, in this expression *patrician of the Romans,* the idea of a right of effective protectorate over the Papal States. Henceforth the office of duke of Rome became useless and, in fact, after 754, it does not again appear.[41] And there was now no reason for the restoration of an exarch. The Holy Roman Empire was in germ in the acts of the assembly of Saint-Denis.[42]

[39] The purport of this pact of Quierzy, called the *donation* or the *restitution* or the *promise* of Quierzy, has given rise in France and Germany to endless discussions. See Moeller, *Histoire du Moyen Age,* pp. 506 f. The document has the form of a donation, since Pepin in it gives and in return asks only for prayers; it is a restitution, because what he gives is in fact already possessed by St. Peter, that is, by the pope; and it is a promise, because what Pepin gives, he has not yet conquered.

[40] Stephen II calls Pepin the anointed of St. Peter (. . . *beatum Petrum, qui vos in reges unxit*). Jaffé, *Codex carolinus,* no. 6, p. 26; no. 7, p. 41. *PL,* XCVIII, 105.

[41] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical,* p. 65.

[42] Several questions have arisen about these assemblies of 754. Martens considers them a fiction. But in that case how are we to explain the agreement of the independent sources which speak of them, the Annals of Metz, the continuer of Fredegarius, the *Liber pontificalis,* and Einhard? True, these sources do not clearly distinguish between the first two assemblies, a circumstance which has prompted certain writers to reduce them to a single assembly (Kleinclausz, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* II, Part I, 273). Other writers, basing their conclusion on Fustel de Coulanges, maintain that these assemblies had no deliberative power and merely registered the decisions of the King. According to this view, the aid given to the Pope was not the work of the national representation of France, but the act of the personal decision of the King. The letter of Stephen II, addressed to the lords of the assembly, *ad proceres Francorum* (Sirmond, *Concilia antiqua Galliae,* II, 10) seems to make this opinion un-

Pepin's Victory over Aistulf

After a final summons, the Frankish army set forth. Aistulf decided to resist. But, defeated in the Susa valley, routed, besieged in Pavia, he had to yield and swear to restore the invaded territories. This oath of the Lombard King was kept no better than the previous oaths. Scarcely had Pepin returned to France, when he received from the Pope letters full of alarm and more urgent than ever, Aistulf, not satisfied with keeping the conquered provinces, besieged Rome with three armies. It was mid-winter, 756, a season when a new expedition of the Franks seemed difficult.

The Romans resisted the siege heroically for two months, and the time for the assembly which the Franks usually held in the spring was approaching, when a papal delegation, composed of the Bishop of Ostia and two Roman noblemen, after passing the investing lines, reached Pepin's court. They brought three letters. The first was addressed to the King by the Pope; the second was sent to the Frankish nation by the Roman people; the third, more solemn and pressing, was supposed to have been written by St. Peter himself and was addressed to the King and the nation. When the national assembly of the Franks heard that cry of distress, uttered by the oppressed people to the powerful nation, and that appeal of the Prince of the Apostles promising his defenders to assist them "as if he were alive in their midst," an outburst of indignation stirred the Franks, who once more advanced on the Alpine route, cut the Lombards to pieces, and repaid them ravage for ravage, relieving Rome and besieging Pavia. Aistulf felt he was lost. He considered himself happy to purchase peace by abandoning to Pepin a third of his royal treasury and by promising him an annual payment of 1,200 gold solidi. The

tenable. Furthermore, the idea of Fustel de Coulanges is not so absolute as it is claimed to be.

faithful keeping of the preceding treaty was guaranteed by the giving of several hostages and by an armed contingent which Pepin left there under command of his best officers.

While Pepin was besieging Pavia, another Byzantine embassy, with John the silentiarius at its head, appeared before the King of the Franks, urgently asking him for the restoration of the exarchate to the Empire. Pepin replied: "I have armed only for love of St. Peter and the forgiveness of my sins." Refusing to consider the matter further, he drew up the famous donation, by which he transferred to the Roman Pontiff as representing the Prince of the Apostles, the greater part of the lands that had become his by right of conquest. We no longer possess the text of Pepin's donation. But from the *Liber pontificalis* we know that Pepin *restored* to the States of St. Peter almost all the cities won by him from the Lombards: the exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis,[43] that is, the country situated between the Apennines and the sea, from the course of the Po to Ancona, in other words, the duchy of Rome, besides the lands of the States of St. Peter invaded by Aistulf.

The "Donation" of Pepin

Thenceforth a new state existed in the international law of Europe. In the official papal documents it began to be called the *States of the Church, Sanctae Ecclesiae Respublica.*[44] Furthermore, King Pepin, the patrician of the Romans and protector of this new state, had just acquired by his brilliant victories a dominance that made him the arbiter of Italy. When Aistulf died in 756 shortly after his defeat, a strife broke out between

[43] Pentapolis was the name given to a province made up of five chief cities: Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, and Ancona.

[44] Jaffé, *Monumenta carolina, Codex Carolinus,* no. 6, p. 35; no. 11, p. 65. However, until Charlemagne's conquest of Italy, the popes continued giving to the Eastern emperors outward marks of official dependence. The first papal medal was probably struck about 786. H. de l'Épinois, *Le gouvernement des papes au Moyen Age,* 2d ed., p. 14.

two candidates, Ratchis the brother of Aistulf, who had become a monk, and Desiderius (Didier) the duke of Tuscany. The influence of Pepin and of the Pope brought about the choice of Desiderius. Ratchis returned to his monastery, and Desiderius expressed his gratitude to the Church by turning over to it all the districts lost by the Church through the conquests of Liutprand, the predecessor of Aistulf.

Such was the origin of the temporal power of the Holy See. Quite rightly Pepin called his act of donation or cession a restitution. "The revolution which put the pope in the place of the exarch concerned rather theoretical forms than the real condition of affairs." [45] For a long time the popes had assumed the burden and responsibility of these states in very difficult circumstances and had rescued them from the barbarian invasions. Being practically abandoned by the Byzantine emperors, they were clearly left to the rule of the popes. That sacred land, those monuments erected in honor of the holy Apostles, those treasures slowly accumulated through the piety of the faithful with a view to the needs of the Church and of the poor, the unanimous and express will of the faithful of Rome and of Italy did not want to see administered by anyone except the lawful successor of St. Peter.

A formal treaty, drawn up and agreed to after a most lawful conquest, officially confirmed this situation. As the Gallican Fleury writes: "Most sovereigns have no other title of legitimacy." [46] And Joseph de Maistre says: "In all of Europe there is no sovereignty more justifiable." [47] Says Bossuet: "God, who willed that the Roman Church, the common mother of all kingdoms, should thereafter not be dependent upon any kingdom for its temporalities and that the see where all the faithful must keep the unity, at length was placed above the partialities which

[45] Quoted by A. Berthelot in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.*, I, 301.
[46] *Histoire ecclésiastique,* Vol. XVI, fourth discourse, no. 10.
[47] *Du pape,* Bk. II, chap. 6.

the diverse interests and jealousies of governments might cause, laid the foundations of this great design through Pepin and Charlemagne. It was by a happy consequence of their liberality that the Church, independent in its head from all temporal powers, was seen in a condition more freely to exercise that heavenly power of ruling souls; and that, holding the just balance, amid so many empires often mutually hostile, it maintained the unity in the whole body, sometimes by strict decrees and sometimes by prudent accommodation." [48] "Render the ancient and necessary patrimony of the clergy sacred and inviolable," said Montesquieu; "let it be fixed and eternal like that body itself." [49]

[48] *Discours sur l'unité de l'Église.*
[49] *The Spirit of Laws,* Bk. XXV, sec. 5.

CHAPTER XII

The Carolingian Empire (757–800)

THE formation of the Papal States was of concern not only to the faithful of Rome, but also to the faithful of the whole world. Around the "Republic of St. Peter" would be formed that vast federation of the converted nations which was called the "Christian Republic." At the Third Council of Toledo (589), St. Leander bishop of Seville said, in the course of an eloquent address:

> Holy Church of God, rejoice! Knowing how sweet is charity and how delightful is unity, you preach nothing but the alliance of the nations, you sigh after nothing but the union of the races. Rejoice in the Lord; because your desires will not be disappointed. . . . Pride divided the races by the diversity of tongues; charity must reunite them. The natural order wishes that all nations, sprung from one man and united in their origin, should be united by faith and charity. . . . The owner of the universe is one, the things owned ought also to be allied in unity.[1]

The imperial notion was ever a living idea. The empire appeared always to the literary men of that time as the ideal and definite form of the political organization of the world. Christian preachers, by reminding rulers of the examples of the great emperors, kept up the enchanting memory of them. And Rome always appeared as the head of that ideal empire. Although it was no longer as the city of Romulus, it was, with a much more venerable title, as the city consecrated by the martyrdom of St. Peter.

[1] Mansi, IX, 1003 f.

Mohammedanism

Growing perils on the frontiers suggested to the Christian nations the idea of a closer union and of a firm and lasting organization for the defense of their faith and their national autonomy.

In the north of Europe the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian pirates, who received a bloody defeat in the sixth century from Theodoric the elder son of Clovis,[2] suddenly reappeared in the eighth century on the seacoast of Gaul and in the coastal islands of Great Britain, pillaging, terrible, elusive. The seacoast population was terrified by their savage cries, their wild songs, the mere look of the frightful heraldic animals surmounting the prows of their warships.[3]

In the south the danger was no less serious. The Saracens, masters of Spain, in 732 had encountered the Frankish army of Charles Martel in a formidable encounter. Their pirates were making numerous raids in Sicily, Italy, and Provence. Says De Hammer, a scholar learned in things Arabic: "Among the Arabs, pillage was looked upon as a lawful method of gain: it was the lot reserved for the valiant." [4] In the seventh century, however, a religious revolution, the primary purpose of which seems to have been merely purification of the old popular beliefs, gave this race a coherence and a rallying cry and thus made its power more fearful. In less than a hundred years the irresistible enthusiasm aroused by Mohammed had created an empire extending from China to the Pyrenees, twice the size of the Roman Empire, six times as extensive as that of Charlemagne, ten times as large as that later founded by Napoleon.[5] The greatness of that empire, the formidable power

[2] St. Gregory of Tours, III, 3.

[3] For a description of the Danish fleet of King Canute, see *Cnutionis regis gesta,* I, chap. 4; II, chap. 4.

[4] J. de Hammer, *Mines de l'Orient,* I, 372 ff.

[5] In the middle of the eighth century the Arabian empire had reached the limits

of its arms, the fierce proselytism of its religion, and the captious prestige of its philosophy constituted the greatest external danger to the Church throughout the Middle Ages. This politico-religious institution was the work of a man whose obscure and complex psychology has not yet been completely analyzed and grasped.

Mohammed (or Mahomet) was born in Mecca, April 20, 571. Arabia was then a prey to gross polytheism. In 611, when he was forty years old, following a pretended apparition of the angel Gabriel to him, Mohammed thought of restoring his country to the purity of primitive monotheism. Such seems to have been his aim at first. From the Old and New Testament he gathered lofty maxims, which he mingled with the traditions of his country and with his own imaginings. From them he made a doctrine. Its moral application is summed up in *Islam,* that is, in abandonment, in submission to an almighty God, placed very high above the world. At the outset, the new prophet's character appeared gentle and calm. Yet strange phenomena and convulsive crises frequently were evident in him. His exaltation increased.

His doctrine lost its earlier simplicity. In his *suras,* or maxims, the collection of which forms that unequal and incongruous book known as the Koran (Reading), he taught the oneness and omnipotence of God, sanctioned polygamy, and offered, as reward to the faithful of Islam, the eternal joys of paradise where, far from all sin, under the cool shade of trees, they would enjoy delicious drinks in silver goblets and would eat exquisite fruit. He prescribed prayers, fasting, ablutions, pilgrimages to Mecca with processional encircling of the Kaaba. He recommended union and solidarity among the believers of

of its rapid expansion. "On the north it reached the Caucasus, and even penetrated that region; on the east it took in the middle Indus and the best part of the Turanian plain; on the west it encircled Asia Minor, spread over the whole stretch of northern Africa as far as the Sahara and the Atlantic Ocean, and occupied the entire Iberian peninsula." Wahl, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 478.

Islam. He said: "O believers, give alms from the best things you have acquired, from the fruits which you have made the earth bring forth. . . . You will attain perfect piety only when you have given alms of what you cherish most." As to non-believers, his teaching varied. At times he counseled tolerance, saying: "Listen not to the infidels or the hypocrites; but do them no ill." More often he ordered a war to the death. "Make war on those who do not believe in God or in the last day," he says. . . ."When you meet any infidels, kill them, to the point of making a great carnage, and you will tighten the shackles." Probably the *suras* recommending tolerance and mildness date from the early days of Mohammed's preaching. But his character changed. Obliged to flee from Mecca in consequence of the violent opposition of his countrymen, he withdrew to Yatreb, which became Medina, the city par excellence. There he arrived September 24, 622. This date marks the beginning of the Mohammedan era, which starts with the hegira, that is, Mohammed's flight.

Mohammedan Conquests

In his exasperation, the prophet completely forgot his teachings about patience and resignation. Henceforth his words were all warlike. Terrible, sanguinary, merciless, he exclaims: "Slay the infidels wherever you find them, hide in ambush against them." From the ranks of his followers he formed an army. He promised paradise to all his soldiers who would die on the battle-field from a wound received in front. Freely or under compulsion, all Arabia rallied to the fierce prophet. For many, might itself became an argument of truth. Islam is mighty, they said: Islam has its might from the Almighty. Furthermore, in this doctrine of Islam, the whole content, its errors as well as its truths, seemed to favor its spread. By its fundamental dogma of the oneness of God, by the respect it

inspired toward the Divinity, Islam corresponded to the deep-rooted religious aspirations in the Arab race. By the absence of any mysteries and of any really supernatural element in its doctrine, by its easy morality, remarkably adapted to the customs of the country and of the period, it was mindful of the pride, sensuality, the warlike and conquering instincts of the race to whom it was addressed.

Islam's progress was rapid. The prophet died in March, 632. But he said to his disciples: "After I am gone, you will accomplish the conquest of Syria and Persia." His successor, Abu Bekr, fulfilled his prediction. At one and the same time he attacked the two neighbors of the Arab empire: namely, the Persian Empire and the Byzantine Empire. Mohammed, in whom the foresight of delicate political sense was joined with religious enthusiasm, was aware of the weakness of these two empires and had no need of a revelation to forecast their proximate fall. Persia, since the time of Chosroes, had been given up to political anarchy. The religious anarchy, a result of the numerous issues springing from the Monophysite heresy, had enfeebled the administrative efficiency of the Eastern Empire. Syria, Egypt, and Persia one after the other fell under the blows of the Arab army, which a strict discipline directed and which the memory of the prophet animated in battle. The dynasty of the Ommiads, which in 680 succeeded the dynasty of the Alides, carried forward the conquests of Islam. It invaded Africa, also Spain, where the Visigoth people no longer had any vitality.

After the fall of the Ommiad dynasty, supplanted in the middle of the eighth century by the Abbassides, the Arab empire in Africa and Asia did indeed experience a political and religious crisis which has been compared to the crisis of the Carolingian Empire after the death of Charlemagne. But the Mussulman fanatics tried to make up for this by pillaging the shores of Europe; and, in spite of all difficulties, the caliphates

of Bagdad and Cordova were resplendent.[6] A brilliant civilization, enriched by contact with Hellenism and with Persia, soon fascinated Europe. The Christian nations, weakened by the crisis of formation which they were experiencing at that moment, had great need to unite and find a leader.

Charlemagne

Divine providence revealed this leader to the world. It was the son and successor of Pepin the Short. He is known to history as Charlemagne. Poetry and art, with their inclination to transfer to the physical qualities of great men the character of their works, have represented Charlemagne as of gigantic stature, with a magnificent beard, a thundering voice, and a terrifying look that miscreants could not face. Quite different is the portrait which Einhard gives us. He says: "Charles was large of body, robust, and tall, but his height did not exceed seven times the length of his foot. He had a short, thick neck, and a protruding stomach; but the proper proportion of the rest of his body concealed these defects. His voice, though penetrating, appeared too thin for so large a body. He walked with a firm step, and all his movements were virile." [7]

Of his work, art and poetry have noted mostly its outward and brilliant aspect; they have viewed him especially as a warrior and conqueror. An impartial study of the historical documents leads to a very different conclusion. Charlemagne was above all a civilizer and a pacifier.[8] When he resorted to arms,

[6] The caliphate of Bagdad was founded by Abu Bekr in 632; the caliphate of Cordova was established by Abderam in 756; the caliphate of Cairo was established later by the Fatimites in 909. On the life of Mohammed, see H. Lammens, S.J., *Fatima et les filles de Mahomet,* critical notes for the study of the *Sira.*

[7] Einhard, *Vita Karoli,* chap. *22*; *Hist. des Gaules,* V, 98; *PL,* XCVII, 46 ff.

[8] "Examine his reign under its different aspects; and you will see that the darling object of his life was to civilize the nations he governed. Let us regard him first as a warrior. He was always in the field, from the south to the north-east, from the Ebro to the Elbe and Weser. Perhaps you imagine that these expeditions were the effect

it was almost always to put down elements of social disturbance or to open the way for the preaching of the Gospel. If we except the terrible execution at Verden, which is the stain upon his public life, we see him constantly engaged in rendering the battles less bloody.[9] His usual procedure was to terrify his opponents by an enormous display of military force. Generally this method succeeded. Charlemagne had merely to show himself to make everyone yield before him.

If we also recall that this great man was, by the studies of his palace school, imbued with the memory of the Roman emperors and that he even contemplated, toward the end of the eighth century, marrying the Empress of the East, it will not be rash for us to suppose that, with a view to European pacification even more than in a spirit of personal ambition, he entertained the idea of some day becoming the heir of the Caesars. Under his sway he had grouped peoples of different races and of interests that were often contrary to one another. To force them to accept him as sovereign arbiter in their disputes would be a difficult matter so long as he spoke to them merely as king of the Franks. But if he could speak with the august and dread title of emperor, of the successor to the Caesars of Rome, consecrated by the Church after the manner of the sovereigns of the East, he would have the advantage of a great prestige in the civilizing mission which he longed to accomplish.

It may well be that, at the end of the eighth century, the vague idea of a restoration of the Empire occupied the mind of the popes, too. At that time St. Leo III adorned the great hall of the Lateran Palace with a mosaic representing on one side Pope St. Sylvester beside Emperor Constantine,

of choice, and sprung from a pure love of conquest? No such thing. . . . What he did sprang from necessity, and a desire to repress barbarism." Guizot, *General History of Civilization in Europe,* Lecture 3.

[9] Einhard and the monk of St. Gall return to this idea again and again. Cf. Einhard, *Vita Karoli,* chaps. 8, 9, 11, 13; Mon. Sangal., II, 17.

and on the other side Leo III himself beside Charlemagne.[10]

True, we find no exact trace of any of these notions in the succession of events that led to the restoration of the Empire. If we should consider merely the bare facts and not take into account the currents of opinion which give them their significance and their bearing, we would suppose that the whole affair was nothing more than a palace quarrel, accompanied by the bloody uprising and a far-reaching trial, determining that great historic event.

Pope St. Paul I (757–767)

Pepin's donation assured the "Republic of St. Peter" of security against enemies from without. Stephen's successor, his brother Paul I, whose energy and prudence could be appraised in the various diplomatic missions he had filled, profited by the situation to develop the religious and political institutions of the city of Rome. At the Pope's side the twenty-five cardinal-priests, attached to as many presbyteral churches, formed his great official council. The influence of the seven deacons, who were in charge of the administration of the seven ecclesiastical regions, was perhaps more effective. Their chief, the archdeacon, had control of the entire ecclesiastical personnel.

Among other important officials, whom we shall soon see playing their part in history, were the vidame or governor of the papal palace, the *vestiarius* or keeper of the treasury, the *sacellarius* or general paymaster, and the notaries. The chief of these notaries, called the *primicerius,* along with the archdeacon and the archpriest, constituted the triumvirate whose office it was to govern the Church at the pope's death, until the election of his successor. The clergy was recruited either through the *schola cantorum,* a sort of seminary or orphanage, as it was sometimes called, where the children of the peo-

[10] *Lib. pont.,* II, 35.

ple were brought up, or through the *cubiculum sacrum,* where we find concentrated the services of the chancery and of the administration, and where we find the sons of the Roman aristocracy.

In addition to this ordained clergy, made up of priests, deacons, subdeacons, and those in minor orders, all of them observing celibacy from the time of their entrance into the higher orders, was to be found a whole world, at times turbulent and scheming, of clerics not ordained, who were distinguished from the laity simply by their tonsure. Usually they were married and held administrative offices. It was from these clerics that the hardest trials of the Church came.

The Church was also to experience other tribulations, coming from the lay and military aristocracy. As head of the *Respublica Romanorum,* the pope had under his orders the army, divided into twelve *scholae* or regional groups. The peasants of the agricultural colonies or *domus cultae* of the States of the Church had likewise formed militias, recognizing the Roman pontiff as their supreme chief. There was no longer any question of a commander-in-chief of the army [11] or of an exarch, or of any other official responsible to an authority outside Italy. But the danger arose again under another form.

In the Rome of that period were to be found elements of discord which the development of the temporal power had not calmed, which it had, in some ways, even nourished. The danger was not now from the outside, but had passed within. From the moment when the pope held in his hands all the great offices of the state as well as those of the Church and thus became a sort of distributor of fortune and power, the lay aristocracy felt the need of taking a more active part in the papal election.[12]

[11] We still find dukes in the papal states. But the title is one altogether new, taken by the lords.

[12] Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 209 f.

We have already seen that aristocracy in command of the army, in which it kept the highest ranks for itself, become organized into a kind of privileged caste, rivaling the clerical order. Henceforth the conflict becomes sharper. "Woe to the pope, if he dares to choose the chief collaborators of his government outside that aristocratic circle. Woe to him if, born in a humbler rank, he enters the *patriarchium* escorted by poor relatives who are eager to enrich themselves. . . . The political power of the Holy See was scarcely founded when there began that sad rôle of certain papal families, of that nepotism from which the papacy at times has suffered so much." [13]

It was necessary to describe in some detail the state of the personnel in the entourage of the Holy See. This explanation enables us the better to understand what sort of difficulties the popes had to contend with in the lamentable events we must presently relate.

Probably Stephen II foresaw these painful conflicts when he bestowed upon Pepin the Short and his sons the title of patrician of the Romans. But the office of patrician was too ill defined to be accepted by an arrogant and jealous aristocracy or to repress the cupidity of a rapacious and scheming nepotism. Sooner or later the restoration of the empire appeared as the liberating institution of the papal domain, as the necessary complement to the donation of Pepin the Short. It may well be that such an institution at first was not grasped and accepted by the people of Rome. But events would prove its imperative necessity by showing the Romans that, in the period of disturbance through which they were passing, they could not rely upon their own institutions without running the risk of anarchy, and could not accept the protection of a neighboring ruler without surrendering themselves to all the arbitrary whims of Caesarism.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 210 f.

The Roman Aristocracy

Stephen II's brother and successor, Paul I, who was elected on May 22, 757, had been brought up with him in the Lateran Palace. Says the *Liber Pontificalis:* "He was a mild and charitable man. There is considerable evidence that in the silence of the night, accompanied by his servants, he used to visit the homes of the poor, especially the sick who could not leave their homes, and that he gave them food in abundance, as likewise all other assistance they needed. He was also a most energetic defender of the Catholic faith." [14] From the very outset of his pontificate, Paul I understood the dangers which the Holy See might encounter from the claims of the nobility and, in the management of the Roman state, he gave a marked preponderance to the clergy.

Unfortunately the party of the clergy at that time had at its head a clever schemer, one of those unordained clerics who yielded to all the incitements of greed and ambition and who were beginning to be the scourge of the Church. This man was the primicerius Christopher. He played an important part under Stephen II, whom he accompanied on his journey to France. We find him in most of that Pope's negotiations with King Desiderius and the court of Constantinople. When Paul I became pope, Christopher held the principal offices in his own hands. To ignore him or dispense with his services was well-nigh impossible. Christopher took advantage of his high position. He was harsh and disdainful toward his rivals. In the ranks of the military aristocracy there spread against the government of Paul I a hidden hostility which, so it has been said, was directed by the ambitious primicerius.

In 767, when the Pope fell seriously ill, the opposition was openly manifested. The heart and soul of the party was a cer-

[14] *Fortissimus enim erat orthodoxae fidei defensor. Lib. pont.,* I, 463 f.

tain Duke Toto (or Theodore), associated with his three brothers. The revolt broke out at the death of Paul I in June, 767. The conspirators, recruited especially among the nobility of the country districts and the small towns, burst into the Lateran Palace. "Now that the pope is sovereign of the whole duchy of Rome," they exclaimed, "it is right that all his subjects take part in the election." Then, as though they by themselves represented the whole people, they at once chose Toto's elder brother Constantine, a soldier who was not even a cleric. The Bishop of Preneste, who was present, was forced to give tonsure to the newly elected. The next day and the day after, Constantine was ordained subdeacon, deacon, and priest, and lastly was consecrated bishop of Rome on July 5.[15] One of the first acts of the spurious Pope was to imprison the primicerius Christopher in a monastery.

Such a deed of violence was likely to provoke a reaction and called for energetic repression. Under Christopher's influence, the repression was unfortunately excessive and the reaction insolent. The astute primicerius succeeded in escaping from the monastery where he was imprisoned. He betook himself to Desiderius king of the Lombards and asked his support. Desiderius at the head of his army, thanks to the treason of some followers of Constantine, entered Rome. Duke Toto was struck from behind during the fracas; the false pope, Constantine, was found crouching in a chapel and was dragged forth. He was forced to undergo ridicule in a cavalcade in the streets of the city, and was degraded. His eyes were put out; his election was declared null; and it was decided to choose a successor.[16]

But this was not the end of the disturbances. Christopher and his friends had a candidate ready, a good and gentle monk, named Stephen. But Desiderius, who had so greatly assisted in crushing the party of the nobility, had his own candidate,

[15] *Op. cit.*, I, 468 f.
[16] *Op. cit.*, I, 471.

a priest who, it seems, was possessed of no less commendable piety, Philip abbot of St. Guy. Profiting by a momentary absence of Christopher, the Lombards had Philip acclaimed by the people and installed him in the Lateran. But Christopher returned to Rome. He was more influential in Rome than Desiderius was and experienced no difficulty in ridding himself of Philip. He had Philip seized by a certain Gratiosus, one of Toto's assassins, who surprised him in the Lateran Palace and quietly brought him back to his monastery of St. Guy. Then the primicerius circulated among the clergy, the nobility, and the people, and presented them with his candidate, who was elected on August 1, 768, by the entire population, assembled in the ancient Forum near the Church of St. Adrian.[17]

Pope Stephen III (768–772)

The new pope, Stephen III, was a Sicilian by birth. He was a scholarly and pious priest. Says the *Liber pontificalis:* "He was very learned in the Holy Scriptures and ecclesiastical traditions, and very faithful in their observance."

At first a monk in the monastery of St. Chrysogonus, founded by Gregory III, then called to the Lateran by Pope Zachary, he had edified everyone by his purity of life. During Paul I's illness, he assisted the ailing pontiff to the very end with admirable devotedness. Christopher, who counted on his virtues to have him accepted by the people and the clergy, also counted on his excessive kindliness, so that he himself might govern in his name. He did not altogether succeed; but he did obtain from him certain regrettable measures, and under his patronage carried out detestable revenge against his vanquished foes.

Under the influence of the intriguing and vindictive primicerius, Stephen III turned to the two Frankish princes, Charles

[17] *Op. cit.*, I, 471.

and Carloman, and requested them to send to Rome a certain number of Frankish bishops.[18] Thirteen prelates answered the summons and, along with about forty Italian bishops, in 769 formed a council at the Basilica of St. John Lateran. Before this gathering Christopher haled the wretched Constantine, fallen, humbled, blind. He was charged with every sort of crime. As we read in the Annals of the Papacy, the poor blind man "suddenly sank to the ground, stretched out his arms, and cried for mercy." [19] The decision was postponed to a later session. At this second session, the accused recovered his courage. As he was charged with being elected pope while he was a simple layman, Constantine turned to his judges, whom he was unable to see but whom he called by name, and, as he named them one by one, he exclaimed: "You, Sergius of Ravenna, were you not a simple layman when you were made archbishop? And you, Stephen of Naples, were you not also a layman when you were raised to the episcopacy?" Says the *Liber pontificalis:* "When it was seen that he would continue in this fashion, some of the judges, losing their restraint, hurled themselves upon him and forced him to bow his head beneath their blows.[20] Then he was driven out of the basilica. A *Kyrie eleison* was sung to ask God's pardon for obedience having been shown to such a man; they declared null and void all the acts of his pretended pontificate. Lastly they imprisoned him in a monastery.

The assembly of bishops closed with the promulgation of an important and very useful decree regarding pontifical elections. The decree forbade, under pain of anathema, the elevation to the papacy of "any layman, or of any cleric who had not attained the rank of cardinal-deacon or cardinal-priest," [21]

[18] Jaffé, I, 285 (no. 2380).

[19] *Corruens in terra, manibus extensis in pavimento, petens misericordiae veniam. Lib. pont.,* I, 475.

[20] *Alapis ejus cervicem cedere facientes. Lib. pont.,* I, 475.

[21] *Ibid.,* p. 476. There were not yet any cardinal-bishops (Thomassin, *Ancienne et*

that is, who was not attached to a title. Furthermore, under the same pain of anathema, it was forbidden "for any layman, whether of the militia or of the other forces, to be present at a papal election, which must take place by the bishops and the whole clergy. Before a pope is brought to the patriarchal palace, the entire army, the citizens, and the people of Rome will come to salute him. Then the decree of election will be presented, and all will subscribe to it." [22] In fine, the assembly forbade anybody to come to Rome from the castles of Tuscany or Campania during the time of the papal election. In other words, once a pope was elected and installed, the act of his election must be ratified by the laity, but by Roman laity only. We shall see how this wise decree, after being for a while the rule of papal elections, was afterward abandoned.

Two years later, Desiderius king of the Lombards, in anger against Christopher, whom he blamed for the defeat of his candidate Philip and for the appeal to the King of the Franks, had the timid Pope Stephen surrender the primicerius to him. Christopher's eyes were then put out in so cruel a manner that he died as a result a short time afterward.[23] A few months later (February 3, 772), Stephen III departed this life. The election raised to the papal see a man of invincible energy, of solid intelligence, and of irreproachable honesty, the deacon Adrian, a member of one of the noblest families of Rome.

Pope Adrian I (772–795)

Adrian I's chief concern was to avoid a recurrence of scenes like those which clouded the government of his predecessor. In-

nouvelle discipline, II, 440). The election of the pope by the cardinal-bishops was regulated later by Nicholas II in the eleventh century and by Alexander III in the thirteenth century.

[22] Mansi, XII, 710.

[23] The event is related by Stephen III himself in a letter to Bertrade and to Charles king of the Franks. See Jaffé, I, 2388.

triguers had obtained from the weakness of Stephen III decrees of banishment against several men of merit. The first act of the new Pope was to recall all these exiles.[24] This decisive act, so prompt and firm, was effective. Adrian was consecrated amid general rejoicing. A short time later, following a speedily conducted inquiry in April, 772, the new Pope did justice upon the murderers and their accomplices.

Adrian's political sense made him understand that the peril was not permanently removed. The power of the military aristocracy and that of the upper clergy were almost equal: irritation against both parties was extreme. If a pope of weak character should come into power, the danger of anarchy would arise again. Another able statesman made a similar reflection, but with very different intentions in mind. It was King Desiderius. Besides the violent temperament of King Aistulf, he possessed the qualities of a consummate diplomat. Ever since his coming to the throne of the Lombards, he endeavored in every way to acquire a preponderant position in Europe. One of his daughters he married to Charlemagne; another to Tassilon of Bavaria who had been a most formidable opponent of Charlemagne. He entered into relation with the Emperor of the East, promising him his alliance.

The dream of empire seems to have haunted his ambition. Perhaps he foresaw that Charlemagne would be a terrible rival. After Carloman's death when the Frankish nobility was divided, he welcomed at his court the widow and the children of the dead prince, and the dissatisfied noblemen who gathered about them, such as Duke Autchar. But the internal divisions at Rome suggested to him especially the hope of becoming the arbiter of the Roman state. Powerfully seconded by a papal chamberlain, Paul Afiarta, he thought he might gain Pope Stephen III to his side. But Stephen himself rebelled against

[24] *In ipsa electionis die, confestim eadem hora qua electus est, reverti fecit illos. Lib. pont.*, I, 486 f.; Jaffé, p. 289, no. 2391.

his insolent interference. Escape from anarchy was of little use if that simply meant falling under the tyranny of a Caesar. Desiderius was more cautious with regard to the new Pope; he entered upon long negotiations with Adrian, offering him his services with tireless persistence. The well informed Pontiff rejected the King's repeated solicitations with effective constancy, demanding of him, as a preliminary condition to any friendly agreement, the restitution of all the territories of the papal states recently annexed by the Lombards.

In 773 Desiderius attempted to force the Pope's hand. Escorted by Duke Autchar and the sons of Carloman, he set out for Rome. He sent word ahead to the Pope that he was coming as a pilgrim, not as a foe. But Adrian, rightfully distrustful of this strange pilgrim, was not fooled by the trick. At the first report of Desiderius' approach, he summoned the militias of the neighboring cities, put the ramparts in a state of defense, and sent to the Lombard King three bishops who were instructed to forbid him to enter Roman territory, under pain of anathema.[25] This is the first time the word "anathema" was pronounced in connection with temporal power. Desiderius, who was at Viterbo, retraced his steps and went back to Pavia. Charlemagne was not unmindful of the events in Italy. And the Pope kept him informed of the perils threatening his domain.[26]

While Desiderius, by his emissaries, tried to deceive the King of the Franks by interpreting the facts to his own advantage, Charlemagne, before interfering, decided to acquaint himself with the state of affairs through his own legates. To Rome and then to Pavia he sent two agents: Bishop George of Amiens and Abbot Vulfrad of St. Martin of Tours. They reported to Charlemagne that the situation was just as the Pope declared and that Desiderius declined to make any concession.

[25] Jaffé, 2401 f.
[26] Jaffé, 2402 f.

Pope Adrian and Charlemagne

Charlemagne thereupon began one of those vigorous campaigns which usually resulted in terrifying his foes by the display of immense forces and by the rapidity of the movements, in a manner to put his enemies to flight almost without striking a blow. Two army corps passed over the Alps, one by Val d'Aosta and the other by Mount Cenis. The Lombard army was routed at Susa, the cities of northern Italy submitted one after the other, and the Emperor encamped before Pavia in 773. The monk of St. Gall has preserved the epic account of the arrival of the Carolingian army before the capital of Lombardy and of the consequent terror. "When Charles, the iron emperor, wearing an iron helmet, his sturdy breast covered by a breastplate of iron, advanced as though in the midst of a harvest of iron, Duke Autchar grew pale at sound of the metal and fell to the ground as though lifeless." [27]

While the siege of Pavia was being continued, Charlemagne, seeing the feast of Easter approaching, went to Rome to celebrate it. This was the occasion of an important interview between the King of the Franks and the head of the Church. In the *Liber pontificalis* we read:

Upon receiving news of the approach of the King of the Franks, Pope Adrian was greatly surprised. He sent all the magistrates of Rome out to meet Charles, to a distance of about thirty miles, where they received him with the standard. When the King reached a point one mile from Rome, the Pope sent forth all the companies of the militia with their commanders and all the children that were being taught in the schools, carrying branches of palm and olive, acclaiming King Charles and singing his praises. The Pope decided that the venerable crosses should be carried before him, as used to be done at the reception of a patrician or an exarch. King Charles, as soon as he saw the crosses borne toward him, dismounted from his horse and proceeded

[27] Mon. Sangal., *De rebus bellicis Karoli Magni,* II, 26; *Histor. des Gaules,* V, 131.

on foot as far as St. Peter's Church. The Pope had already come to the church and was there awaiting the King's arrival, attended by the clergy, at the top of the steps. The King ascended the steps on his knees, kissing each step in turn. Then he embraced the Pope and took him by the hand. Thus they entered the church, while the clergy sang: Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord.[28]

This first meeting presaged the great political acts that took place a few days later, on April 6, 774. We read in the *Liber pontificalis:*

On Wednesday the Pope, accompanied by representatives of his clergy and his militia, held a conference with the King in the Church of St. Peter. He asked the King to confirm the donation which his father King Pepin and Charles himself and his brother Carloman had made at Quierzy to Pope Stephen. The King had the act read to him and, after approving it, along with all the lords, he ordered a like one to be drawn up by Etherius his chaplain and notary, and signed it with his own hand.[29]

This donation was ampler than that of Pepin. The Pope became sovereign, not only of the exarchate of Ravenna and of Pentapolis, understood in their widest limits, but also of the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, of Tuscany, Corsica, Venetia, and Istria. It is true that difficulties soon arose, either with the dukes of these latter territories or with the archbishop of Ravenna, and the Pope had to give up the duchies of Spoleto and Tuscany, as also Corsica.

The important conferences of April, 774, did more than add to the donation of Pepin the Short. They also prepared the way for the restoration of the empire. Charlemagne, who had been received at Rome as an exarch and a patrician, was thenceforth much concerned about the rights and duties attached to his protectorate. Furthermore, after the fall of Pavia, he took the title of King of the Lombards. With these various titles he

[28] *Lib. pont.*, I, 496 f.
[29] *Op. cit.*, I, 498.

now assumed a rôle with limits hard to define, for they were probably only vaguely indicated in that "pact of love and fidelity" which the Pope refers to in his letters. Charlemagne, without requiring that the subjects of the Pope take an oath of fidelity to him,[30] demanded at least that they remain faithful to the Frankish alliance and never enter into an alliance with the enemies of the Franks. He assumed the right to receive appeals from any official or any Roman nobleman who might have a complaint to make, even were it against the pope himself.[31] Yet he gave up the right, formerly exercised by the exarchs, of participating in the nomination or confirmation or installation of the sovereign pontiff. At Adrian I's death, he permitted the election and installation of Leo III without making use of any privilege.

This ill-defined rôle soon merged and was amplified in the title of emperor. But before we relate the glorious events of Christmas Day in the year 800, we must give an account of the painful scenes of the drama that was triumphantly concluded by St. Leo's coronation of Charlemagne.

Pope St. Leo (795–816)

The very day of Adrian I's burial (December 26, 795), his successor, Leo III, was elected. The *Liber pontificalis* says:

He was born at Rome and from childhood had been brought up in the patriarchal palace of the Lateran. There he studied the Psalter, the Sacred Scriptures, and all the ecclesiastical sciences, and was ordained subdeacon and then priest. His morals were pure, his speech eloquent, his mind firm. Whenever he met some eminent monk or some good servant of God, he joined him in godly conversation and in prayer. He visited the sick and practiced almsgiving gladly and cheerfully. He was beloved by all. And so he was elected pope by a

[30] Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 213 f. See also Viollet, *Histoire des institutions politiques et administr. de la France,* I, 265.

[31] Jaffé, 2413, 2442, 2478.

unanimous vote on St. Stephen's Day, by all the bishops, the nobility, the clergy, and the people of Rome. Although he was very mild he was also very firm in defending the rights of the Church.[32]

The conditions under which the new Pope reached his high office, his prompt and spontaneous election, the universal good will he enjoyed, the prestige of a holy life and a long acquaintance with public affairs, seemed to assure him a great and solid authority.

Yet those who knew the undercurrent of Roman politics were not without fear. Relatives and officials of the deceased Pope, disappointed in their schemes of ambition or greed, secretly complained and bestirred themselves. A conspiracy was spoken of. We find indications of these rumors in a letter to Alcuin from an archbishop of Salzburg, named Arno, who was in Rome in 798.[33] Leo III himself, from the very first days of his pontificate, seems to have had some inkling of the plots being hatched around him. One of the first things he did was to ask Charlemagne to keep an imperial legate permanently at Rome as a pledge of special protection and a guaranty of security.[34]

The conspiracy broke out (April 25, 799) in circumstances which the Pope's biographer relates in detail.[35] Leo, accompanied by his usual escort, was on his way in a procession to the station church of St. Lawrence *in Lucina*. When he was in front of the monastery of St. Sylvester, recently founded by Pope Paul I, suddenly armed men, who had been lying in wait, fell upon him. The Pope's unarmed retinue was taken by surprise and fled, and the Pope himself was thrown to the ground. But two men were seen to leave the retinue and rush to the Pontiff: one stood at his head, the other at his feet. These two

[32] *Lib. pont.*, II, 1.
[33] Jaffé, *Monumenta Alcuiniana*, 445.
[34] Einhard, *Annales*, year 796. *MGH, Scriptores*, I, 183. *Hist. des Gaules*, V, 212.
[35] *Lib. pont.*, II, 4 f.

men, who acted with the connivance of the band of attackers, were the primicerius of the papal palace, Paschal, a nephew of the preceding Pope,[36] and the sacellarius Campulus. The two traitors had joined the Pope's suite, after accosting them with friendly words. They are the ones who gave the signal to the prearranged conspirators.

A horrible scene followed. In the presence of the sacellarius and the primicerius, who were in charge of the outrageous proceeding, some ruffians tried to gouge out Leo's eyes and to tear out his tongue, while others heaped blows upon him and stripped him of his garments. They abandoned him in the middle of the street, thinking they had made him blind and dumb. Paschal and Campulus then returned to the attack. They dragged the Pontiff into the monastery and there, before the altar, again they attempted to tear out his tongue and to gouge out his eyes. Then, fearing that friends of the Pope would come to free him, they had him secretly removed, after nightfall, to the monastery of St. Erasmus.

Pope Leo III and Charlemagne

But the traitors were mistaken. The Pope had lost neither his sight nor his speech; or at least he recovered them.[37] Thanks to the aid of a loyal chamberlain, during the night he was able to escape from the narrow prison where he was confined and to go to St. Peter's. There he found a Frankish *missus* of Charlemagne. Accompanied by this *missus* and a few faithful followers, he had strength enough to go to the King of the Franks

[36] That Paschal was Adrian's nephew appears from a letter of Adrian himself. Jaffé, I, 2424.

[37] According to the martyrology, St. Leo III recovered his sight and speech miraculously. In a sermon preached in St. Peter's (December 23, 800), St. Leo III said: *Auditum et divulgatum est per multa loca, qualiter homines mali adversus me insurrexerunt et debilitare voluerunt.* Jaffé, *Mon. Carolina,* 378. Contemporaries were divided about the miraculous nature of Leo III's cure. See Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 211 f.

who was then at Paderborn. Charlemagne received him most warmly and promised to give him justice.

However, the conspirators, angered by the failure of their outrage, pillaged the papal properties and set them on fire. Of a sudden they altered their procedure, changing from rioters to accusers. It is hard to ascertain clearly the charges which Paschal and Campulus brought against Leo III in the presence of Charlemagne. In vague terms the Pope's morals and sincerity were attacked. This was an opportunity for the King of the Franks to exercise his office of patrician. He had the Pope escorted to Rome with great honor and gave orders that an inquiry should be started without waiting for his arrival. The affair was dragging on for months when (November 29, 800), Charlemagne himself arrived in Rome. He began by paying his homage to the Sovereign Pontiff; then he summoned the bishops present, the abbots, the Roman nobility, and the Frankish nobility to meet in St. Peter's Church in public assembly.

When called upon to set forth and prove their charges against the Pope, the accusers were silent. The assembly dared not make a decision in any sense whatever, declaring, as another council three centuries before had done in a similar matter, "that the Apostolic See has the right to judge everyone, but that it can be judged by no one." [38] A noble act by the Roman Pontiff put an end to the trial. Leo III arose and said: "I intend to follow in the footsteps of my predecessors. I am ready to justify my conduct by an oath." The next day, in the presence of the whole people, the Pope solemnly declared, from the pulpit in St. Peter's that, freely and spontaneously, without being forced thereto by any law or custom, and without establishing any precedent for the future, he swore, with his hands upon the holy Gospels, that he was innocent of the crimes with which he had been charged. Says his biographer: "Then all the arch-

[38] *Ab ipsa Sede nos omnes judicamur: ipsa autem a nemine judicantur, quemadmodum et antiquitus mos fuit. Lib. pont.*, II, 7.

bishops, bishops, and abbots, and all the clergy chanted a litany and praised God and our Lady Mary ever Virgin, and blessed Peter Prince of Apostles, and all the saints of Paradise." [39]

It was evident that in this affair Charlemagne's intervention was decisive. It alone had succeeded in repressing the audacity of the calumniators. The powerful and impartial protector that Rome needed justified the high hopes which the Pope and the Roman people had placed in him.

Two days later the King of the Franks and the Supreme Pontiff were again in St. Peter's Basilica to celebrate the feast of Christmas. They were surrounded by the élite of the Frankish and Roman nobility, in the midst of an immense throng of the people. Charlemagne prostrated himself. While Charlemagne was kneeling in prayer before the confession of St. Peter, the Pope placed a precious crown on his head. The crowd, apprised of the event, with one voice shouted: "To Charles, Augustus, crowned by God, great and peaceful emperor of the Romans, long life and victory" [40]

[39] *Loc. cit.*

[40] The account of this great event is given by all the chronicles of the period. A few slight divergences are barely discernible in the narrative. The Roman source (the *Liber pontificalis*) emphasizes the Pope's initiative in the matter (*Lib. pont.*, II, 7). The Frankish sources (*Annales de Lorsch, de Moissac*) remark that Charlemagne was crowned as the lawful successor of the Roman Empire, and that the Pope "adored" him, that is, rendered him the homage due to a sovereign (*Hist. des Gaules,* V, 78 f.). Einhard's account stresses the acclaim of the Roman people. Einhard, a man of letters, seems to take pleasure in seeing the old Rome acclaim the new Empire. Perhaps we would be resorting to a forced interpretation of these various texts if we thought to see, even as a tendency, in this event the manifestation of the doctrines which later divided the Middle Ages: the Roman doctrine of St. Gregory VII, the imperial doctrine of Henry IV, and the democratic doctrine of Rienzi. But it is interesting to note these significant divergencies.

Some writers have maintained that the re-establishment of the Empire was the work of Leo III's policy, that he hastily placed the crown on Charlemagne's head so as to mark his supremacy and the dependence of the king of the Franks. Thus, so we are told, we should explain Einhard's passage which says that, if Charlemagne had known that he was to be crowned, he would not have entered the church (*Hist. des Gaules,* V, 100). But this interpretation is unlikely. It does not accord with the character of St. Leo III and of Charlemagne. Furthermore, Einhard and Paul the Deacon allude to preliminary negotiations. Charlemagne's displeasure, mentioned by

The Christmas Day of the year 800, which closed the eighth century, not only opened a new century;[41] it would begin a new era in the history of the Church and of the world.

The Holy Roman Empire

The Holy Roman German Empire was founded. Let us weigh these four words; they sum up the whole political organization of the Middle Ages. The new power had something holy and sacred about it. It was a pope who conferred it by coronation. This institution of coronation was destined to develop. When it reached its definite form, it became the expression and guaranty of a social harmony in which the rights of the Church and the rights of the people were reconciled with the urgent need for unity and authority.[42] Charlemagne's empire was likewise holy in the mission it assumed to protect holy things. This idea formed the substance of a discourse delivered by the Emperor in 802 at the assembly of Aachen.[43]

Furthermore, the power created on Christmas Day in the year 800 was a true empire, that is, a universal power. It is beyond question that Leo III intended to institute not an emperor of the West, but an emperor of Christendom.[44] And ap-

Einhard, may be simply a formula of humility, or it can be explained by the Frankish King's desire to postpone the ceremony until the close of the diplomatic negotiations he was then undertaking with the Eastern Court. St. Leo's eagerness is to be explained by a desire to avoid a repetition of scenes like those of 799.

An altogether opposite view is expressed by Sickel, that Charlemagne was invited to assume the office of emperor by an election of the Roman people. Wilhlem Ohr successfully refutes this legend. *La leggendaria elezione di Carlo Magno imperatore.*

[41] The year then began on December 25.

[42] See Luchaire, *Les institutions monarchiques de la France,* I, 71 f., for the form of oath drawn up under Philip I. The coronation was also useful as a means of obtaining the continuity of the work of the kings at a time when the principle of heredity was not yet definitely accepted (it did not prevail until the end of the twelfth century). The possible succession was assured by having the heir presumptive crowned and thereby accepted by the nation. Luchaire, *op. cit.,* I, 66 f., 86 f.

[43] *MGH,* III, 101 f.

[44] Kleinclausz, *L'Empire carolingien, ses origines et ses transformations,* pp. 199, 206 f., 209. Cf. *Le Moyen Age,* January–February, 1904. France and England re-

parently it was Charlemagne's intention, reversing what Constantine had done, to bring back the capital of the Empire from Constantinople to Rome. But the Byzantine emperors would not give up their claims; throughout the Middle Ages two emperors, with very different influences, claim to rule over the entire Christian world.[45]

By its capital, which was Rome, by its political organization and the bonds uniting it to the bishop of Rome, the new Empire was indeed Roman. Bryce, in his *Holy Roman Empire* says:

These vast domains, reaching from the Ebro to the mountains of Hungary, were the conquests of the Frankish sword. But the conception of the Empire, that which made it a state and not a mere mass of subject tribes like those great Eastern dominions which rise and perish

mained outside the imperial organization after the restoration of the Empire by Otto I. These nations, submissive to the pope, did not accept the domination of the emperor: "The king of France is emperor in his kingdom" ("Tract on the papal, imperial, and royal power," in Goldart, *Monarchia,* I, 44). It is also a fact that the popes continued to deal with the Byzantine sovereigns as with real emperors. This is evidenced by their whole correspondence in the ninth and tenth centuries.

[45] Apparently this conflict between the East and the West was the occasion for the composition of the so-called *Donation of Constantine,* by which the Christian Emperor, cured of leprosy by the prayers of Pope St. Sylvester, invested him and his successors with the sovereignty of Italy and assigned to them a series of dignities and privileges, such as the right to wear the diadem, the neckband, and the purple mantle, and to receive from the emperor the service of equerry (*officium stratoris*) when mounting his horse (*Corpus juris canonici, Decreti prima pars, distinctio 96, cap. 13, 14*). The apocryphal character of this document, inserted in the *Corpus juris,* is beyond doubt. In the sixteenth century, Cardinal Baronius regarded it as a fabrication from end to end. In fact, the document is not mentioned anywhere before the ninth century. It is contradicted by important evidence, such as that of Ammianus Marcellinus who in 379 was acquainted with only one source of the wealth of the popes, the gifts of the faithful. This document first appears inserted in a *Vita Sylvestri,* which all scholars now regard as a legendary work. The intrinsic characteristics of the document make it suspect: the decree itself, probably drawn up in the East in the fourth century, shows evidence of having been rewritten in the West in the eighth or ninth century: offices and dignities are mentioned which were known only in the West; the *officium stratoris,* which it speaks of, is a Western practice and certainly posterior to Constantine. It speaks of "Italy or the Western provinces"; but this expression is comprehensible in the eighth or ninth century, not in the fourth. For a complete discussion, see Döllinger, *Papstfäbeln.*

in a lifetime, was inherited from an older and a grander polity, and had in it an element which was Roman rather than Teutonic—Roman in its striving after the uniformity and precision of a well-ordered administration, which should subject the individual to the system and realize perfection through the rule of law. And the bond, too, by which the Empire was chiefly held together was Roman in its origin, although Roman in a sense which would have surprised Trajan or Severus, could it have been foretold them. The unity of the Empire was a reflection of the unity of the Church.[46]

In certain respects this Holy Roman Empire deserved to be called a German empire. It was German in the customs and practices that prevailed at court and among the people. At court Charlemagne kept up the German dress, language, and usages. Only twice, and on those occasions at the suggestion of Adrian and of Leo III, Charlemagne dressed in the chlamys and the shoes of patricians. He preferred to wear an otter skin doublet. He composed a Teutonic grammar and a national calendar, was fond of hearing in his palace barbarian songs that celebrated the heroes of the North, and ordered a collection to be made of those heroic poems for posterity.[47]

The Carolingian Empire was German in its actual capital. Charlemagne did not fix his capital at Rome or Pavia or any of the big cities of Gaul. He preferred to live in his palace at Aachen, in the heart of Austrasia, close to the old paternal domain of Heristal. There it was he had brought the marble art treasures from Ravenna.

Charlemagne's Empire was German also in its private law. It is true that in the new Empire the public law and the administrative law were Roman, but civil and penal law, as also civil and criminal procedure, were inspired by the old usages of the Germans. Charlemagne wished it so. He gradually altered the old barbarian laws, but he did not abolish them. With

[46] James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 73.

[47] On Charlemagne's fondness for using the national dress, see the Monk of St. Gall, *Hist. des Gaules*, V, 121.

his deep and prudent regard for tradition, in his laws he preserved the practice of the wergeld or money compensation. He did not suppress even the judiciary combat or the "judgment of God" in general.[48] Frederick Ozonam, referring to this matter, says: "It was the mark of a great mind to be able to exercise restraint, even in good, to be able to wait and to let ferment for a few centuries more that leaven of barbarism which would be the vigor of the new nations." [49]

The Holy Roman German Empire, inaugurated by Charlemagne, did not last long. We shall presently see it break up, shortly after the great Emperor's death, in the lamentable fratricidal strifes, which were as harmful to the Church as they were to society in general.

But the work of the Holy Roman Empire did not altogether perish. The barbarian races attached to the soil and introduced to a strong social organization, the idea of the revived empire, the possibility of a confederation of the Christian peoples of Europe, the actual merging of the Roman, German, and Christian elements—this much remained from the Carolingian Empire: it was the whole Middle Ages; in germ, it was the whole of modern civilization.

[48] Einhard, *Vita Karoli,* 23, 26, 28, 29; *Hist. des Gaules,* V, 98–100.

[49] Ozanam, *Études germaniques,* II, 427. But Charlemagne did not hesitate to suppress customs that were too openly contrary to Christian morality, such as the *faida,* a sort of vendetta among the Germans (Esmein, *Hist. du droit français,* p. 92). He spread the use of the judiciary oath (Esmein, p. 98 f.).

CHAPTER XIII

Charlemagne and the Church

CHARLEMAGNE himself set forth his mission with regard to the Church. In a letter to Pope Leo III, he says: "It is my office, with the aid of the divine goodness, to defend the holy Church of Christ against the attacks of infidels from without, and to sustain it within by the profession of the Catholic faith." [1] This sentence might serve as an epitaph of his reign.

Political Instability

Against external foes, Charlemagne gave the Church the territorial, political, and social security which it needed to fulfil its divine mission. When he ascended the throne, it could truthfully be said that, in spite of the persistent efforts of Pepin the Short, disorder and insecurity prevailed everywhere. The piracy of the Normans and the raids of the Saxons on the northern frontiers, the ceaseless movements of the Slavic and Mongolian races on the east, and the Saracen invasions on the south were a ceaseless menace to the very existence of Christianity. Charlemagne's remarkable military campaigns, followed by the establishment of military "marches" along the frontiers, soon reassured Europe against these dangers. But the stirrings of anarchy that persisted in the political and social institutions created other obstacles to Christian life.[2] The power

[1] *Nostrum est, secundum auxilium divinae pietatis, sanctam ubique Christi Ecclesiam ab incursu paganorum et ab infidelium devastatione armis defendere foris, et intus catholicae fidei agnitione munire. MGH, Epistolae Karolini aevi,* II, 93.

[2] Now accepted as proved, is the fact that the institutions of Europe in the eighth century were a chaos of all the elements out of which the future societies would be

of the kings was ill defined; theoretically it was unlimited.[3] True, the power of the assemblies, of the nobles, and of simple subjects was likewise vague.[4] The old individualist spirit of the German races often led to conspiracies and revolts. Social inequalities, based on the old distinction between the *romanus homo* and the *francus homo* [5] and complicated by the titles and distinctions which the beginning of feudalism created,[6] a tangled maze of property rights,[7] a chaos of laws and customs

formed. What proves this fact, as Guizot (*History of Civilization in Europe,* p. 66) long ago observed, is the discussion among historians about the question of determining what system of organization was dominant at that period. The discussion which Guizot speaks of is still going on and has divided scholars like Waitz, Fustel de Coulanges, Esmein, Viollet, each of them advancing authentic texts in favor of his view. We must conclude that the elements which they speak of coexisted in a changing and unstable equilibrium, hard to grasp, impossible to define. The age was witnessing a fermentation of the feudal régime, of monarchical institutions and communal liberties, amalgamated with the Roman law in decline and the Frankish law in formation.

[3] Under the Merovingians the royal power did not yet possess a fixed character. Some have held that it was hereditary (Fustel de Coulanges) and that it was elective (Wilhelm Sickel). The truth seems to be that the matter was far from being clearly defined. Luchaire with exactness sums up the results of the latest labors of Fustel, Sickel, Waitz, and Flach. He says: "Nothing was more indeterminate or fluctuating during that period of beginnings, than the relations of royalty and feudalism from the point of view of the election of the ruler." *Les institutions monarchiques de l'Ancienne France,* I, 60 f.

[4] Ozanam maintains that the authority of the fields of March or of May was real. Fustel de Coulanges asserts that it was not real, although he acknowledges that, when the king proposed a law to his assembled people, "he must have heeded their wishes. . . . A sort of tacit and unexpressed vote took place in the midst of that throng. . . . These men had to be reckoned with." *Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France,* I, 487. *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* January 1, 1876, p. 139. Possibly the public law varied. Those fields of March may have been sometimes mere reviews, as Fustel thinks they were. At other times they may have really passed laws.

[5] This distinction of Frank and Roman stirred up disputes (Fustel de Coulanges, *op. cit.,* pp. 548, 609). Perhaps we should hold, with Paul Fournier, that the terms *francus* and *romanus homo* had different meanings in different periods. Much inconsistency seems to have existed on this point as in many other matters.

[6] The Roman clientage (*clientela, fidelitas, defensio*) combined with the Germanic maimburg (Mundeburg). Below the rank of marquises or margraves, were counts and dukes, freemen, vassals, freedmen, and slaves. But we should note that these classes were not fixed, that men easily passed from one class to another, and that the reciprocal relations of the classes were ill defined.

[7] At this period we find three types of land ownership: 1. collective ownership, of Germanic origin; but in the time of Charlemagne it was becoming more and more

—all these were additional obstacles to the influence of the Church. The situation was fortunate when the public officials did not abuse their power by injecting trouble in the hierarchy.[8]

Charlemagne's clear-sighted and firm genius soon untangled all these evils that were afflicting Christian society and applied suitable remedies.

Principles of Government

After his elevation to the imperial dignity, one of his first acts was to require of all his subjects a new oath of allegiance, not now as their king, but as Caesar. He explained that this new oath implied broader duties than those to which they had formerly pledged themselves. He said that what they must especially promise him was to live as good Christians.[9] For some time Charlemagne had been reading chiefly St. Augustine's *City of God* and therein had found the ideal of his empire. He thought the best guaranty of loyal and faithful service to their king and their country was a loyal and faithful service to their God. It is to be noted that he always undertook a reform of morals before attempting a reform of the laws. Even when he had to put down a restless or rebellious aristocracy,

precarious, until, according to Esmein's expression, it formed "only islets lost in the midst of a country constituted in the Roman manner" (*Histoire du droit français,* pp. 90 f.); 2. independent private ownership, of Roman origin; this becomes the allodial tenure or freehold, which continued through feudal society as an anomaly, an exception to the rule of "no land without a lord"; 3. dependent or feudal ownership.

[8] Says Kurth: "The Church had so much wealth and influence that it was certain to arouse the jealousy of the kings. . . . They were alarmed at the prodigious growth of the Church. It was impossible for them to check it; to do so would have been to resist the universal tendency of society. . . . What was easier, or at least more tempting, was to put it under their tutelage. This was the policy of the Merovingian kings, and in that period the Church was exposed to no greater danger than to become the plaything and tool of their despotism." *Les origines de la civilisation moderne,* II, 144 f.

[9] *Primum ut unusquisque et persona propria se in sancto Dei servitio, secundum Dei praeceptum et secundum sponsionem suam, pleniter conservare studeat. MGH, Capitularia* (Boretius ed.), p. 92.

he tried to conquer savage and sullen hearts by a moderate terror,[10] tempered with Christian charity.

At more frequent intervals he held the national assemblies, to which he invited the whole population.[11] This close contact with the nation was one of the chief means of government used by Charlemagne. There he sounded public opinion and ascertained the state of mind of his people. As we are told by his cousin Adelard, "he might be seen passing from group to group, light-hearted with the young people, sympathizing with the griefs of the old people, talking to one and all with the utmost affability." [12]

There was no law putting limits to the monarch's power, but the power itself fixed such limits and respected them. Charlemagne wished in all matters to act only with the consent of the people. . . . In his mind the law should be merely the result of an accord between the ruler and the subjects, and the expression of their united will. It was this view of his that prompted one of his successors to utter this fine principle: *lex consensu populi fit et constitutione regis.*[13] When we com-

[10] Nithard, I, 1; *MGH, Scriptores,* II. Yet Charlemagne, when he thought the public welfare was involved, did not hesitate to adopt most energetic measures. He suppressed the duchies of Bavaria and of Aquitania, and turned them into simple provinces of the Empire.

[11] On the presence of the people and the part taken by them, Waitz and Fustel de Coulanges are not in accord. Waitz attributes an active rôle to the popular element. Fustel de Coulanges maintains that the people exercised no influence. It seems that the king could not neglect to take account of a popular opinion which he himself solicited and which he provoked to show itself.

[12] *Compatiendo senioribus, congaudendo junioribus . . . occupatus erat.* Hincmar, *De ordine palatii,* chap. 35.

[13] "The law is made by the consent of the people and the constitution of the king." Baluze, II, 177. Mention is made of the *consensus populi* in several other documents. Cf. Hincmar, *De ordine,* chap. 8; Boretius, *Capitularienkritik,* p. 53. This notion of the law was already in the *Etymologies* of St. Isidore of Seville, Bk. II, chap. 10; Bk. V, chaps. 10, 21. Some writers hold that we should not take this word *consensus* literally, because in the language of the time "to consent" meant almost "obey" (Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. II, Part I, p. 312). But the documents seem to attach a real importance to this popular consent. Thus, when some of the people concerned were unable to be present at the capitular assembly, traveling agents then

pare this Christian formula with the famous definition of the Digest (*quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem*),[14] we can form some idea of the progress realized for human liberty under the auspices of the Gospel, since the dark days when Ulpian codified the axioms of pagan government for the use of despotism.[15]

It was from these assemblies that issued Charlemagne's celebrated capitularies. To persons accustomed to the rigid systematization of modern codes, at first glance these capitularies seem a shapeless mass of regulations, counsels, and maxims of prodigious and surprising diversity. But we must remember that contemporaries found in those laws the end of many a conflict, the solution of many practical problems. From the multitude of those concrete decisions, looking to the needs of daily life, Christian customs became fixed in the nation. If we imagine ourselves in the social environment of that period, among those German warriors, so ready to turn discussions into bloody fights, so jealous of letting anyone else avenge a personal affront, we can appreciate the influence of the Church when we see such men accept, in a certain Field of May, the absolute prohibition against carrying arms,[16] and hear them acclaim this thoroughly Christian maxim: No person shall be put to death except by virtue of the law.[17] The application of these laws and regulations was supervised by royal commissioners, called *missi dominici.*

went to obtain their approbation at home, *ut populus interrogetur de capitulis quae in lege noviter addita sunt* (Capitulary of Aix, 803, *Reg. Carol.*, no. 396). If the notification was not given, the people refused to obey and regarded the capitulary as null and void (*Epist. Carol.*, no. 27). At other times, the people took the initiative in the matter of the capitulary, which the king accepted. Capitulary of Pavia, 856. *Populus noster nobis quasdam petitiones obtulit, quas nos . . . capitula conscribi fecimus.*

[14] "Whatever the prince is pleased to decree has the force of law."

[15] Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne,* II, 256 f.

[16] Baluze, I, 449; Boretius, I, 156.

[17] *Non occidatur homo nisi jubente lege,* Boretius, p. 59.

Attitude to the Church

In the capitularies and in the instructions given the *missi,* it is evident that the Emperor was much concerned with ecclesiastical matters, that he was somewhat excessive in watching over the life of the clergy and correcting them, that he regulated Church ceremonies in a manner that was at times unwise. By and large, however, the clergy gladly accepted the interference of him who was called "the defender and auxiliary of holy Church in all her needs," [18] and who never forgot the principle of the independence of the spiritual power. Alcuin, his adviser, writes: "Altogether distinct are the temporal power and the spiritual power; the one carries in its hand the sword of death, the other bears on its lips the keys of life; to the priest belongs the office of preaching, to the others the duty of listening humbly and of following the admonitions given; it is the office of secular princes to defend the Church; it is the office of the Church to draw down upon them the graces of God." [19] In general Charlemagne adapted his conduct to these principles. Wishing to attach to his person, as chaplain, a certain bishop of his kingdom, he did so only after obtaining the authorization of Pope Adrian I.[20] Having respect for ecclesiastical rights and privileges, "he never established new dioceses, never changed dioceses into archdioceses, never allowed a bishop to exercise episcopal functions outside his own diocese, without permission of the local bishop. He himself asked for authorization in such cases.[21]

Although sometimes his addresses to the people were in the

[18] Baluze, I, 189; Boretius, I, 44.

[19] *PL,* C, 155.

[20] *Capitul. reg. francor.,* chap. 53. Baluze, I, 270; Boretius, I, 78.

[21] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* VII, 303 f. The following words of an eminent historian seem to be an exaggeration: "Charlemagne is the head of the Church as he is the head of the state; he is the head of the bishops as well as the head of the counts. Between the Church and the state he made no distinction." Kleinclausz, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. I, Part I, p. 316.

manner of real sermons, yet this was because the great statesman thought that social peace depended largely upon each person living as a faithful Christian. Several of his capitularies end with an exhortation to belief in the almighty Father, the incarnate Word, the light-giving Spirit, and the Catholic Church. In 802, at the great assembly at Aachen, he declared: "Beloved brethren, listen. We have been sent here for your salvation, to urge you to follow exactly the law of God, and to turn you, in justice and mercy, to obedience to the laws of this world." In a clear, brief summary, he sketched what must be believed and practiced in order to be saved and then enumerated the chief duties of the poor and the rich, of bishops and abbots, of counts and dukes. Then he concluded his address thus: "This life is short, and the hour of death is uncertain. . . . Lord, grant us success in this life, and the eternity of the future life with your saints. May God keep you, beloved brethren." [22]

Charlemagne considered that he had a mission within the Church, but this he understood as a mission of respectful and devoted aid. In the capitularies promulgated by him, in the decisions of the councils that he convoked, in the instructions he gave his *missi,* Charlemagne often took up the question of the internal organization of the Church, its hierarchy, its public worship, its property, its works of charity and education, and even its theological discussions. For the most part he did this with admirable prudence.

Charlemagne and the Bishops

He paid the greatest honors to the popes, bowing before their spiritual supremacy and, in matters of faith, considering his sole duty to see that due respect was shown for the faith that came from Rome. He restored to ecclesiastical authority the appointment of bishops. In his first capitulary of 803, he says:

[22] *PL,* XCVII, 239–242.

Aware of the sacred canons and purposing that, in the name of God, holy Church may freely exercise her privileges, we have given our assent that bishops be elected, according to the canonical statutes, by the choice of the clergy and people, in the diocese itself, without any regard for persons or gifts, simply for the merit of their life and wisdom, so that, by their example and their discourses, they may be able to direct fully those who are subject to them.[23]

Even after this decree, it is true that the Emperor was not unconcerned with the choice of bishops: the election took place before an imperial *missus,* and often the latter named a candidate in behalf of the Emperor. In any event, the bishop-elect was never consecrated until the imperial approbation had been received.[24] But the Emperor rarely abused his influence for the appointment of bishops to the hurt of ecclesiastical discipline.[25] And so the Church did not protest against his interference. It was even willing that he should make use of his great authority for the correction of abuses in the ranks of the episcopacy. In one capitulary we read: "Our *missi* must diligently learn whether there be any complaints against a bishop, an abbot, an abbess, a count, or any other official, and inform us." Another capitulary (812) says: "Let bishops, abbots, counts, or any others in high position, if they have any disputes among them which they cannot settle, come before us." [26]

Charlemagne's acts of interference in ecclesiastical affairs, although at the time favorable to the interest of the Church and therefore tacitly approved by her, had harmful consequences. They created precedents which other rulers, less well disposed toward the papacy, took abusive advantage of. Louis XIV and

[23] Baluze, I, 779; Boretius, I, 276.

[24] Thomassin, *op. cit.,* Part II, Bk. II, chap. 20; *Des élections épiscopales sous l'empire de Charlemagne,* IV, 278 ff.

[25] See the anecdotes related by the monk of St. Gall, I, 4, 6; *Hist. des Gaules,* V, 107–109.

[26] Capitulary of 812, Baluze, I, 497; Boretius, I, 176.

Napoleon I appealed to Charlemagne's conduct to justify their own.

Under the episcopacy was the body of priests. Ordinarily they lived in community, some of them with the bishop, others in a *presbyterium* under the guidance of a priest of advanced years.[27] The number of rural parishes increased, and city parishes were established.[28] The chorepiscopi consecrated the country churches that were most remote from the episcopal city and there confirmed children and adults and reconciled the penitents.[29] The rural parishes were grouped into archdeaconries, governed by archdeacons and probably subdivided into deaneries.[30]

In accord with Charlemagne, thirty-three councils discussed the questions of clerical discipline. They reminded priests of their duty to give the people simple, informal instruction, to visit the sick, to treat penitents in the confessional in a fatherly manner, to watch over the maintenance of public penance. In enforcing this penance the civil officers, in case of need, were to lend their assistance. When he judged it useful, the Emperor personally took a hand in the matter to remind the clergy of their duties of state. But even when he addressed the lower clergy, who had no prestige but that of their spiritual office, Charlemagne did so with religious deference. At the beginning of one capitulary, addressed to the priests of his states, he says: "My brethren and my sons, I commend to your attention these few chapters which I have had drawn up." [31] When

[27] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* II, 482 f.

[28] Until recently, writers maintained that the urban parishes dated only from the twelfth or thirteenth century. Schöfer has proved from texts (in *Römische Quartalschrift,* first and second trimester of 1905) that the city parishes date from the Frankish period. Cf. *Rev. quest. hist.,* October, 1905, p. 645.

[29] Public penance was still in vigor in the time of Charlemagne. Half a century later, Hincmar protested against its decline. *PL,* CXXV, 802.

[30] The first mention of deans is found in the works of Hincmar of Reims. Probably they existed before him. *PL,* CXXV, 771 ff.

[31] *PL,* XCVII, 275.

there was question of taking some step of major importance, he consulted the supreme pontiff. In 799, with regard to an accusation against some priests, he informed the bishops that he had consulted the Pope and that he would conform to the decisions that would come from Rome.[32]

St. Chrodegang

The most effective of these reform measures was the encouragement which Charlemagne gave to the Rule of St. Chrodegang. This saint belonged to one of the noblest of the Frankish families. He had been a chancellor of Charles Martel and ambassador of Pepin the Short to Aistulf king of the Lombards. As bishop of Metz, Chrodegang succeeded in gathering about his cathedral the clergy of his episcopal city and organizing them into a religious community. Recitation of the divine office in common, enclosure for their residence, sleeping in a common dormitory, study and teaching in the time left free from the ministry, in all things the practice of humility—such were the main provisions of the Rule drawn up in thirty-four chapters by the holy reformer of the clerical life in the eighth century. The clergy who lived according to this Rule were called "regulars" (*canonici,* canons),[33] and their manner of life was called *vita canonica.*

Charlemagne was sure to be interested in an institution of this sort. He should have liked to see all the clergy become

[32] *Unde ad consulendum Patrem nostrum Leonem papam sacerdotes nostros mittimus. Et quidquid ab eo vel a suis perceperimus, vobis . . . renuntiare non tardabimus.* Baluze, I, 327. We do not see how Guizot could write without qualification: "To speak truly, we must say that, from Pepin the Short to Louis the Debonnaire, it was the temporal power, king or emperor, that governed the Church." *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* II, 294 (lesson 26).

[33] We find this word *canonicus* taken in this sense for the first time in a constitution of St. Boniface, art. 15. Mansi, XII, appendix, p. 108. St. Eusebius of Vercelli and St. Augustine had already gathered about them in a common life the clergy of their episcopal cities. Primitively the word *canonicus* signified simply a cleric whose name was inscribed in the *canon* or tablet of a church. Council of Nicaea, canon 16.

monks or canons.[34] After the example of St. Chrodegang, some bishops of France, Germany, England, and Italy instituted chapters of canons regular in their cathedrals. The Rule of St. Chrodegang, supplemented by Amalarius a priest of Metz, was approved and recommended by the Council of Aachen in 816.[35]

Monasticism

Charlemagne was a friend of the monks even more than he was of the canons. Einhard relates that Charlemagne should have liked to end his days in the habit of St. Benedict. At least he did carry out the happy thought of introducing the Benedictine Rule into all the monasteries of his Empire. But his inspiration was less lofty when he wanted to provide for the government of the abbeys with a political end in view. Thus it happened that after his victory over Tassilon duke of Bavaria, he turned the Bavarian abbeys over to Frankish bishops. He distributed certain wealthy monasteries to his friends and to officers that he wished to reward. Alcuin, for example, had five abbeys.[36]

Those warriors, those men of the world, did not always give to the monks an example suited to the duties of their holy state. Of these monks, several had entered the monastery to avoid the burdens of the military and civil life. In the diocese of Orleans, the holy Bishop Theodulph bewailed the sight of the St. Mesmin monastery being vacated by real monks and occu-

[34] Capitulary of 805; Baluze, I, 296.

[35] On the spread of the canonical life and its development, see Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* Vol. V. The institution of the canonesses, approved by the same Council of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle), made its appearance, at almost the same time, as a mitigation of the religious life.

[36] The French Benedictines have always held that the Rule of St. Benedict was implanted at Glanfeuil the very year of his death by his disciple St. Maurus. Molinier and Helphen, opposing this view, maintain that the Maurus whose sarcophagus was discovered at Glanfeuil is not the Maurus who was St. Benedict's disciple. Cf. *Rev. hist.,* July–August, 1905; *Rev. quest. hist.,* October 1, 1905.

pied by seculars of scandalous life.[37] The monks of Ile-Barbe near Lyons, which the pious Archbishop Leidrade edified by his learning and virtues, was seduced by the errors of the Spaniard Felix of Urgel regarding the divinity of Christ.[38] Those of St. Denis near Paris had forsaken the monastic habit and adopted the rule of the canons, finding that more convenient.[39] St. Aldhelm, in his valuable work, *De laudibus virginitatis,* paints an unflattering picture of the life of an abbess of his time.[40] One of Charlemagne's capitularies, published in 789, alludes to the most serious abuses: forced or insufficiently tested vocations, the vagabondage of the monks, the avarice of the cellarers, and other evils of this sort.[41] Such disorders could not be repressed by disciplinary sanctions; an internal reform was the only thing capable of overcoming them.

St. Benedict of Aniane

It was from Charlemagne's entourage, from the ranks of his restless nobility, that the reformer would arise. Among the nobles whom Charlemagne had made his intimates, there was then a young lord, descended from the noble counts of Maguelone. His name was Benedict Witiza and at the Emperor's court he held the office of cupbearer. Valiant in war and brilliant at court, he was the hope of the army and the ornament of the palatine academy. A providential event abruptly changed the course of his life. In 774, during the Lombardy campaign, one of his brothers, a soldier like himself, imprudently attempting to cross a river, was carried away by the current. Benedict, seeing the danger, rode his horse into the stream and snatched his brother from death. But in so doing he himself risked the

[37] Theod., *Carmina,* II, 6; *PL,* CV, 312.
[38] Alcuin, *Epist.,* 90; *PL,* C, 287–294.
[39] Mabillon, *Annales,* II, 548.
[40] *PL,* LXXXIX, 105 ff.
[41] Baluze, I, 241 f.; Boretius, I, 63.

greatest peril. He, too, was swept along and was drawn down under the water. When he saw himself so near death, the vanity of earthly things suddenly became apparent to him, and he promised God that, if he should be saved, he would consecrate his life to Him in the monastic life. He kept his word. From that moment his austerities became almost incredible.

They have been recounted by his faithful disciple and successor, Smaragdus, who sketches a lifelike portrait of that virile face, worthy of being placed between that of St. Benedict of Nursia and that of St. Bernard. We will merely translate a few passages from this account.

At that time there was a holy monk, named Vidmare, who was deprived of the light of day, but who shone with the light of the heart. Benedict told him his secret and received good advice from him. Setting out with his retinue as though intending to return to Aachen and reaching the monastery of Saint Seine, he dismissed his suite and entered the cloister to serve Christ. He had his hair cut off and received the monastic habit.

Then, for two years and a half, the new monk practiced amazing fasts. He strove against his body as one might against a wild beast. . . . While his brethren slept, he very quietly cleaned their shoes. . . . His long fasts made him pale and thin; his skin touched his bones or hung loose like the fetlock of cattle. . . . He was gentle and kind toward all; he had the gift of tears; he was especially kind to travelers, children, and the poor. Upon the death of the father abbot the monks elected Benedict unanimously to be their abbot. But he, dreading this honor, returned home and there, on his estate, beside the Aniane brook, built a small abode for himself and Vidmare, the saintly blind man.

People now flocked to him to share his holy life. Again the humble monk was alarmed. He wanted to flee once more, but Vidmare chided him and persuaded him to remain. The number of his disciples increased. The valley became too small. It was necessary to erect a monastery nearby. Benedict worked with the others in putting up the building; at times he prepared their food. He also wrote some books.

Because they had no cattle, the monks often had to carry the building material on their shoulders. Some serfs came to assist the builders, but the holy abbot would not admit them to his service and ordered them to be freed. Yet the novices grew in number, and the life of the brethren was one of perpetual love.[42]

Any commentary would only weaken the strong colors and naïve grace of this picture. Soon Benedict, the holy abbot of Aniane, became celebrated. The report of his fame reached the ears of the Emperor, who summoned him to his court, profited by his wise counsel, and in 799 sent him to Spain to combat the heresy of adoptionism. Several bishops, likewise moved by his repute for holiness, asked him for monks to serve as an example in their monasteries. He sent twenty monks to Leidrade archbishop of Lyons, to reform the monastery of Ile-Barbe. Theodulph bishop of Orleans obtained from him four monks, who restored to the abbey of St. Mesmin its former renown. Alcuin, who was united to St. Benedict of Aniane in bonds of friendship, with twenty of his disciples founded the abbey of Cormery in Touraine. To assure the fruits of his work, Benedict drew up the *Codex regularum* or *Concordantia regularum,*[43] a collection made up of the primitive Rule of St. Benedict and the various rules given to the monasteries since the beginning of the monastic life. The *Concordantia regularum* later became as famous as the first Rule of St. Benedict. Louis the Pious called St. Benedict of Aniane to the Council of Aachen and commissioned him to visit all the monasteries of his empire. Thus his work extended to most of the abbeys of the West.

One of the most famous colonies of Aniane was the monastery of Gellone or St. William of the Desert, founded by the celebrated William of Aquitaine, the conqueror of the Saracens, the friend and perhaps a relative of Charlemagne. When

[42] *PL,* CIII, 353 ff.
[43] *PL,* CIII, 703–1380.

the valiant soldier, moved by grace, told his sovereign that he was going to end his days in the peace of the cloister, the Emperor embraced him and wept. But the Duke remained faithful to the divine call and withdrew to Gellone, where he edified all the monks by his spirit of poverty and humility.[44] The Frankish nobility, who were largely to blame for the decadence of the monastic life, owed a debt to the Church: Benedict of Aniane and William of Aquitaine paid it nobly.

Church Revenue

The high Church dignitaries were steadily becoming real seigneurs. In the eighth century, bishops and abbots were administrators of considerable property and income, which the firstfruits, the tithes, various dues established by custom and especially the free gifts of the faithful had put in their hands. Charlemagne decided to regulate the sources of these revenues, their administration, and the rights that were derived from them. He let fall into desuetude the old practice of the firstfruits, offerings in kind made by the faithful at the offertory. This custom was in full decline in the ninth century.[45] But he regulated the collection and division of the tithes and imposed this tax upon new converts. He declared that, in accordance with a decree of Pope Gelasius, the revenue must be equally divided between the bishop, the priests, the *fabricas* of each diocese, and the poor. He allowed the continuance of the practice of offerings by the people in connection with funerals, ordinations, and masses. In connection with funerals, Hincmar of Reims forbade the clergy to exact any payment, but permitted them to accept a voluntary offering. Charlemagne's attention was directed particularly to the fourth source of Church

[44] Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.*, sec. 4, part I; and *Acta sanctorum* (Bollandists), May 28.

[45] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* Part III, Bk. I; Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 183.

income, the gifts and legacies of the faithful. With solicitude and in a spirit of justice he saw to it that no one should be excessively generous to the Church to the harm of his natural heirs, and strictly forbade the clergy to divert Church property and income from the use originally intended for the benefit of their relatives. With particular care he organized two special forms of gifts made to churches: that of royal benefice and that of the *precaria.*

The Merovingian kings had often made unconditional grants of land to the churches. Charlemagne preferred to make these gifts under the title of benefice, that is, with a prohibition against their being alienated, disposed of, or transferred to others without restriction. Under the last of the Merovingians, individual landowners, endangered by the invasions, transferred the ownership of their property to some powerful protector, reserving to themselves the usufruct under the title of *precarium.* Under Charlemagne these *precaria* titles were often made in favor of churches, the heads of which appeared to be particularly paternal and generous. Some poor churches had formed *precaria* to powerful nobles. Charlemagne wished to prevent the alienation of Church property under this form and prohibited this kind of contract. At times the *precarium* took another form. An individual might ask of a bishop or abbot a piece of land to be cultivated; at his death, or after ten or twenty years, according to the terms of the contract, the land returned to the Church.[46] In this way considerable property was acquired by the Church. Certain prelates, such as Leidrade archbishop of Lyons, held several abbeys as benefices; Theodulph bishop of Orleans possessed the abbeys of Fleury and of St. Benedict (on the Loire); Alcuin, who was a simple cleric, not a bishop, received from Charlemagne the abbeys of

[46] Esmein, *Histoire du droit français,* 131–136. We should not confuse the *precaria* of the Middle Ages with the *precarium* of the Roman Law, an act by which a person ceded something to another while retaining the right to withdraw it at will. Esmein, *op. cit.,* pp. 132 f.

Ferrières, St. Loup of Troyes, St. Martin of Tours, and St. Josse, in the country of Ponthieu; Einhard was abbot of St. Peter of Ghent, St. Servais of Maastricht and of Fontenelle. It has been calculated that in the ninth century a third of the land was Church property.[47]

But we should not forget that this property was sacred in its intended use as well as in its origin. It was the property of the poor, *res pauperum.* One of Charlemagne's capitularies contains the following: "We know that, according to the tradition of the holy fathers, the property of the Church, gifts of the people's piety and the price of the redemption of their sins, is the patrimony of the poor. Therefore we decree that never, whether in our reign or in that of our successors, is it to be permitted to diminish this property or alienate it to any extent whatever." [48] Certain ecclesiastical laws regulated the use of the Church revenue. A council of Aachen, held in 816, decreed that a hospital be founded beside each monastery and that it be placed in the charge of a man "to whom avarice is hateful and hospitality cherished, a man capable of giving to the poor all the care and relief that they need." [49] Again and again Charlemagne reminded the monks of their obligation to nourish the poor and travelers, and to admit them to their table; if they should squander the possession of the Church, they would be guilty of an abominable crime, because "he who does not nourish the poor is their murderer." [50]

[47] Roth, *Beneficialwesen,* p. 250; Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungs-geschichte,* 2d ed., II, 219 note; Lesne, *La propriété ecclésiastique en France aux époques romaine et mérovingienne.*

[48] Baluze, I, 717 f.

[49] *Quia res Ecclesiae oblationes sint fidelium, pretia peccatorum et patrimonia pauperum . . . ad portam monasterii . . . sit hospitale pauperum, cui etiam praesit talis qui et avaritiam oderit et hospitalitatem diligat . . . unde pauperes ibidem recreentur et foveantur.* Mansi, XIV, 276 f.

[50] Baluze, I, 503, 524, 534, 1171, 1293, etc.; 946, 1003, 1007, 1115; Boretius, I, 94, 96, 106, 332, 347, etc. A capitulary enumerates the principal institutions of public relief established at cathedrals and monasteries. They are the xenodochium, where travelers were received, the ptochotrophium, where the poor were fed, the nosoco-

Agriculture and Industry

These vast properties belonging to dioceses and abbeys were not only, in the eighth and ninth centuries, large establishments of public assistance; they stimulated agriculture by the *precarium* contracts and the perpetual emphyteutic leases (i. e., improvement leases) granted to small farmers.[51] They were also a great encouragement to industry.

Industry prospered especially in the abbeys. At St. Peter of Corbie, under Adelard's administration, several "rooms" were occupied by different workers; in the first were three shoemakers, two saddlers, and one fuller; in the second were six blacksmiths, two goldsmiths, two shoemakers, a cutler, and a parchment-maker; in the others were masons, carpenters, and the like.

At first these workshops were located within the monasteries, and they supplied merely what was needed by those living there. But soon the abbots saw that profit might be derived by having things produced in excess of the amount needed for the monastery itself. Consequently they organized, outside the monastery boundaries, veritable industrial towns. The earliest we know of is the town of St. Riquier; its forges acquired a great reputation at the end of the eighth century. In 831, it was divided into eleven sections, each of which was inhabited by the workers of a single trade. Some groups counted several thousand persons. Many of our present cities owe their origin to this interesting development. The artisans were grouped into corporations. The existence of communities called guilds (*geldoniae*) or confraternities (*confratriae*) is proved by several capitularies and by the decrees of councils. They were charitable institutions and mutual insurance societies: their members pledged themselves under oath to give alms and

mium, where the sick were cared for, the orphanotrophium, where orphans were received and taken care of, the gerontoconium, where the indigent old people were given asylum, and the brephotrophium, where young children were cared for. Baluze, I, 446 f.

[51] Esmein, *Les baux perpétuels des formules d'Angers et de Tours, Mélanges,* pp. 393 ff. See especially Imbart de la Tour, "Les colonies agricoles et l'occupation des terres désertes à l'époque carolingienne" in *Questions d'hist. soc. et rel.,* 1907, pp. 31–68.

mutual assistance in case of loss of their property by shipwreck or fire; each guild had its own feast day.[52]

Commerce

Commercial transactions were also favored by the abbeys, by the population movements which centered around these houses, and by the feasts celebrated there.

In the neighborhood of the cities, abbeys, and important villas, public markets (*mercata publica*) were held, on any day except Sunday. The fairs coincided with the most celebrated pilgrimages, and began at the same time as the feast of the saint. Those of Champagne and Flanders do not go back that far. But the fair of St. Denis, confirmed by a charter of Pepin (October 3, 759), was flourishing. It was called *forum indictum*. It lasted four weeks to enable merchants of Spain, Provence, Lombardy, and other regions to attend. . . . Anglo-Saxon pilgrims passing through France under the protection of the Emperor were useful commercial agents. The chief ports through which they passed were Ghent, Duerstede, Ecluse, Boulogne, whose lighthouse guided the course of ships, and especially Quentovicus, which today is called either Etaples on the estuary of the Canche, or St. Josse-sur-Mer. A custom house, centralizing the taxes received in the various ports and maritime towns, was installed there under the direction of Gervold abbot of St. Wandrille.[53]

Among the advantages which the people derived from these large patrimonies of the clergy, must be mentioned those that resulted from the right of sanctuary and from ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

Right of Sanctuary

Of all the privileges which the Merovingian kings granted to Church property, the principal one was immunity. Im-

[52] Kleinclausz, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. II, Part I, p. 336.

[53] *Ibid.,* pp. 337 f. The Jews, who were not allowed to own land, at this period, rendered real services to commerce. But their traffic in slaves provoked the protests of Agobard archbishop of Lyons.

munity was not merely a partial or total exemption from financial obligations and military service; it was also the right to administer justice on ecclesiastical land.[54] Charlemagne made general what, under the Merovingians, had been granted by way of exception. He habitually added to every donation to the churches the privilege of immunity. The first consequence of this practice was the extension of the right of sanctuary. In all ages persons charged with crime who sought refuge in temples were considered free from arrest. But now lay justice was halted at the entrance to every domain of a diocese or abbey, made doubly sacred by its destined use and by the imperial immunity. To this refuge fled poor people pursued by the arm of the law.

At first this right of sanctuary was a salutary restraint upon outbursts of violence. Before long, however, it became an abuse. Charlemagne corrected this. He limited the right of sanctuary to the church building and its dependencies. He decided that a criminal seeking refuge on ecclesiastical land could be driven off it, that the lay count had a right to go there and make the arrest, and that the bishop who should oppose the exercise of such right would be subject to a fine.[55] He declared murderers undeserving of this benefit and ordered that they be forced to go out of the churches by their being refused food. Sanctuary rescued an accused from death, but did not exempt him from canonical penance or from episcopal jurisdiction. Charlemagne's purpose seemed to be to control and soften by the justice of the bishops the excessively harsh and impassioned justice of the lay counts.[56] This aim was partly attained by his

[54] In the acts this right is expressed in the following way: *audire causas, de fredo exigere* (*fredum,* that is, money composition, the old *Wergeld*). Cf. Fustel de Coulanges, who has thrown light on this point in his "Étude sur l'immunité mérovingienne," *Revue historique,* 1883, p. 249. Flach supplements the study of Fustel de Coulanges in *Les origines de l'ancienne France,* I, 183, 437.

[55] Capitulary of 803, arts. 2 and 3; Baluze, I, 388 f.; Boretius, I, 113.

[56] This is what he declares in his capitulary of 779, art. 11; Baluze, I, 197. On the

regulation of the right of sanctuary and by the extension he gave to the competence of episcopal jurisdiction.

In consequence of a feudal custom introduced at this period, the right to administer justice became inherent in land ownership. By this title the bishops [57] could claim a right to administer justice on their lands. Charlemagne ratified and broadened that jurisdiction. He extended it even to crimes involving capital punishment. The bishops found it necessary to surround themselves with police officers and auxiliary judges, who were called *judices privati, villici, advocati.* Charlemagne was glad to make use of this personnel, in whom he found guaranties of knowledge and equity and to whom complainants and accused gladly gave their confidence. The *advocati* of the churches held an annual court of justice at which they administered justice, assisted by notables called good men, *boni homines.*[58] Thus "as the bishops and other ecclesiastics had the greatest authority in the courts of justice . . . the mild humaneness of the ecclesiastical laws overcame the rigor of the civil laws; in place of bloody punishments, merely salutary penalties began to be imposed." [59]

Schools

On the lands of the Church, the two chief centers of civilization were the school and the church. In 789, Charlemagne, re-

right of sanctuary, see Baluze, I, 98, 251, 539, 729, 840, 854, etc. See also Many, *De locis sacris,* pp. 94 ff., and Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* V, 482 ff.

[57] The property of each diocese was administered by the bishop. In each individual church the clergy of that church had merely the administration of the revenue assigned for the repair of the churches (*fabrica*). The beneficiaries had a certain right of administration of their benefice; but they had a right only to the usufruct. The only juridical personality of common right was the bishop. He was assisted by his priests and his deacons; but, in principle, he was supposed to count only upon God. Such was the law until 800. Charlemagne decided that the bishop must not withdraw anything from the treasury of the Church without the consent of the clergy, even to aid the poor or the serfs of the Church (Council of Tours, canon 11; Baluze, I, 503). In exceptional cases, the provincial councils examined the administration of the bishop. Thomassin, V, 534 ff.

[58] Flach, *Les origines de l'ancienne France,* I, 183, 347.

[59] Thomassin, V, 481.

newing a provision of a Vaison council (529), ordered priests to hold school in their parishes, to open it not only to the children of the serfs, but also to the children of freemen, and to teach them the psalter, chant, computation, and grammar.[60]

Above these parish schools, which increased somewhat irregularly, rather numerous in some dioceses, almost none in others, were the episcopal schools and the monastic schools, where, until the Council of Aachen (817), outsiders were admitted to share in the instruction given to the novices. Beginning in 817, there were two kinds of monastic schools, some being for the novices and oblates, the others for the clerics and laity.[61] The most famous of the episcopal and monastic schools were those directed by Theodulph at Orleans, Leidrade at Lyons, Gervold at St. Wandrille, Angilbert at St. Riquier, St. Benedict at Aniane. We know of the famous palatine school where, beside members of Charlemagne's family, were to be seen the most celebrated men of the time. These schools possessed a large number of books. It is well established that under Charlemagne the libraries contained many works of classical antiquity.[62] It was Charlemagne's intention to found a new Athens, more beautiful than the ancient one, "the Athens of Christ."

Alcuin

The soul of this whole scholastic reform movement was an English cleric, Alcuin, whom Charlemagne met at Parma in 781 and attached to his person. Alcuin was born at York in 735 and made his studies at the episcopal school in the time of Egbert, a disciple of Venerable Bede. To the Gallic schools he brought the traditions and tried methods of the English schools. Strictly speaking, Alcuin was not a litterateur or a

[60] Baluze, I, 237; Boretius, I, 50–60.

[61] Baluze, I, 585; Boretius, I, 346.

[62] Boutaric, "De la connaissance des auteurs de l'antiquité pendant le Moyen Age," *Rev. des quest, hist.*, XVII, 20 ff.

philosopher or a learned scholar or in any sense an original thinker. He was a pedagogue, but a pedagogue who possessed a wonderful ability to adapt himself to his time and his pupils, the first of whom was Charlemagne himself. It has been truly said that "he was ahead of his times without ever separating from them." [63] His method consisted in giving to those inquiring minds, unacquainted with intellectual labor, a wealth of ideas, facts, and views, and in explaining them in a brief, clear manner easy to retain, even if in so doing it was necessary to employ a paradoxical, enigmatic, or pedantic form. This movement has received the name of Renaissance. It was especially a grammatical renaissance. Minds were not yet prepared for philosophical speculation. Besides, there were no means for promoting such speculations. Probably Alcuin had no knowledge of Greek, or at most very little. Aristotle was known only through Boethius' translation, and we are not sure that Boethius knew Aristotle completely. In any case his philosophy seems not to have been assimilated. But there was intense interest in St. Augustine. By the study of that great doctor, metaphysical reflection awoke. History was a more accessible study. Einhard, a former student at the abbey of Fulda, became renowned by his *Life of Charlemagne.*

Church Architecture

In Alcuin's mind, as in that of Charlemagne, the school was simply the vestibule of the Church. It was in the churches, by the sermons heard, by the liturgical ceremonies witnessed and performed, by the paintings and statues there seen, that the complete education of minds and hearts would take place. Charlemagne built, repaired, and raised from their ruins a great number of churches. Religious architecture had no special and characteristic style at that epoch. The Carolingian

[63] Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* II, 180 (lesson 22).

church marks a transition from the ancient basilica, Roman or Byzantine, to the Romanesque church. The ground plan was oblong or in the shape of a cross, rarely circular or polygonal. The building had arched windows and was often embellished with Byzantine ornamentation. The lantern of the Merovingian period was retained and developed, and in it were put the bells, the use of which was taken from Italy. The windows remained open or were closed with lattice-work of stone or wood, as in the Church of St. Germain-des-Pres at Paris. Before long, glass windows added a new and original ornament to these openings.[64] Inside, the main altar was brought forward to the middle of the choir and was encompassed by other altars at the base of the pilasters.

A church without a relic was not to be thought of. A council held in 816 orders that, lacking any relics, a church must have a consecrated host deposited in it.[65] Henceforth we have the fusion of the cemetery church of the first centuries, erected upon the tomb of a martyr to honor him, and the church as a place of worship, built to meet the needs of the people. The practice developed of holding regular meetings in the cemetery churches and not to consecrate any church for the needs of worship without placing therein some souvenir of a martyr or of our Lord, though it be a fragment of the Gospel or the Holy Eucharist.

Clerical Dress

In these churches, a respectful crowd of people, feeling much at home, kept coming and going, staying to pray or to talk, and, in spite of the canons, sometimes to sell their mer-

[64] The first mention of stained glass is found in the note on St. Leo III in the *Liber pontificalis: Fenestras de absida (basilicae Salvatoris) ex vitro diversis coloribus decoravit atque conclusit* (*Lib. pont.*, II, 25). But stained glass has been found that seems to go back to the fourth century. Leclercq, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne,* II 499. The leading of glass does not appear until the eleventh century.

[65] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 403.

chandise. And there the clergy officiated and preached. Their daily dress was now altogether distinct from that of the laity. In the time of St. Jerome it could be said that to become a priest was to change one's habits, not one's dress.[66] This was no longer true. The tunic and the Roman toga were well suited to the gravity of the clergy in the first centuries. Such was no longer true of the Franks' costume, which consisted of a woolen or fur jerkin, breeches of cloth or leather, and a tunic with short, tight sleeves. Over this was worn the *sagum,* a short cloak held in place by a clasp. St. Boniface forbade the clergy to wear the *sagum,* which was a military garment.[67] In the middle of the ninth century conciliar decisions were needed to compel priests and monks to keep their hair cut short instead of having it long, a mark of nobility among the Franks. Certain clerics of the Narbonne and Vienne districts had adopted the black cloak made of coarse material and the rope cincture of the Eastern monks. Pope St. Celestine found fault with them and advised rather the Roman toga, which the clerics in Frankish countries began to wear.

Finally clerical dress, in the time of Charlemagne, seems to have consisted of four principal articles: the soutane or cassock, which recalled the *vestis talaris* worn by the priest in the performance of his sacred functions, and also the dress of the Gallic young women;[68] the alb, mentioned by Alcuin in his *De officiis divinis,* which was worn outdoors as well as in the church;[69] the cloak, also called chasuble or cope (*casula*), which covered the whole body and which the councils strove

[66] St. Jerome to Nepotian. Cf. Thomassin, I, 30–128.

[67] *Interdiximus servis Dei ne pompato habitu, vel sagis, vel armis utantur. Epist.,* 101. Du Cange, the word *sagum.*

[68] Du Cange, the words *sottanum, soutane, subtaneum.* In a Frankish chronicle we read: *Ante nuptias tunica de pignolato, quae dicebatur sottanum, erant contentae.* Muratori, *Script. rerum italic.,* XII, 1033.

[69] Du Cange, under the word *alba,* says: *Promiscue in ecclesia et extra ecclesiam.* St. Nicholas I calls it *linea toga.* Of a more or less considerable length, it was not essentially different from the surplice.

to substitute in place of the *sagum;* [70] lastly upon the head and shoulders, a camail with pointed capuche, which, at least in its form, seems to have been taken from the dress of soldiers, who used the camail as defensive armor,[71] or from the dress of the Eastern clergy.[72]

The Sacraments

The priest's principal functions were the administration of the sacraments, the ceremonies of the liturgy, and preaching. In each of these functions important changes took place in the Carolingian period.

Up to the eighth century, baptism was administered, in the West as well as in the East, by immersion, if not complete immersion, at least partial, accompanied by pouring. The ceremony was performed either in streams or in baptisteries. But at the time of which we are speaking, priests were satisfied to use simple pouring. Immersion became more and more abandoned; there was no longer any question at all of total immersion.[73] Instead of the baptisteries of early days, baptismal fonts or *putei sacri* were built in the churches.

The public penance of early times also disappeared. Conservative men like Hincmar of Reims with good reason protested against the spirit of laxity that led to its abandonment. But their protests were not sustained officially by the Church, and little by little the movement which they deplored brought about the final suppression of public penance. These conserva-

[70] *Presbyteri vel diaconi,* says a Council of Leptines, *non sagis, laicorum more, sed casulis utantur, ritu servorum Dei.* Quoted by Du Cange, under the word *casula.*

[71] Froissart says: "The weapon extended outside the cape, which was of good mail."

[72] The use of the cape (*camelaucum*) had passed from the East to Rome. The *Liber pontificalis,* in the life of Constantine, says: *Apostolicus pontifex cum camelauco, ut solitus est Roma procedere. Lib. pont.,* I, 390.

[73] Iconography does not furnish a single example of total immersion after the eighth century.

tives were more thoroughly right in their forceful complaint against the abuse that had arisen in connection with the sacrament of penance, the penitential books. The Germanic custom of the wergeld, or pecuniary composition, gave some people the idea of making a price list of canonical penances imposed for certain sins. Then was introduced the practice of avoiding the penance by payment of the amount of money stipulated in the price list. The hierarchical Church protested. The Council of Clovesho in 747, of Chalon-sur-Saône in 813, and of Mainz in 847 even ordered the destruction of the penitential books.[74]

A like evolution took place in the administration of the Eucharist. In the ancient basilicas only solemn public masses were celebrated. Whereas in the East this usage persisted, in the West an increasing number of priests celebrated private mass at any hour of the morning, regardless of whether any people were present or not. At sight of this practice, many of the faithful were astonished, many bishops promulgated prohibitions, considering as essential the participation of the people in the sacrifice. But the custom of private masses, tolerated by the Church, spread. At the same time, despite the protests of the Easterners, the use of unleavened bread for the hosts became general; a special ceremonial became fixed for masses said for the dead; communion was still given under both species, the precious blood being taken by means of a tube; but, from the inconveniences of this practice, it could be foreseen that some day it would be abolished.

[74] Hardouin, IV, 1038. In 760, the Rule of St. Chrodegang speaks of confession made *proprio sacerdoti,* or rather *suo sacerdoti,* and later the bishop of Basel, Otto (802–822), says more clearly that the faithful *a proprio episcopo aut sacerdote ligandi aut exsolvendi sunt, non ab extraneo* (*Rev. quest. hist.,* October 1, 1905, p. 644). It is true that, along with priest confessors, deacons and the simple faithful were allowed to hear confessions which St. Thomas later calls *quodammodo sacramentales.* Cf. Mansi, XVIII, 148; *PL,* XC, 629 ff.; XCIII, 39. Cf. Paul Laurain, *De l'intervention des laiques dans l'administration de la pénitence,* pp. 15, 97 ff.

Matrimony

The canonical legislation about marriage became more precise, by a clearer affirmation of its indissolubility, but amid many obstacles on the part of the barbarian society. Most of the old Frankish, Visigothic, and Burgundian laws allowed divorce.[75] In 1613 Jerome Bignon discovered the celebrated formulary of Marculf, giving, in the middle of the seventh century, a formula of divorce by mutual consent.[76] A century later local councils or rather the diets of Verberie in 753 and of Compiègne in 756 or 758, presided over by King Pepin, at which the lay element mingled with the ecclesiastical element, seem to have permitted, in case of incestuous adultery, that the innocent husband or wife might remarry during the lifetime of the other partner.[77] But, in conformity with the ancient traditions, the most authentic spokesmen of the Church continually proclaimed the absolute indissolubility of the marital bond.[78] A capitulary of Charlemagne, published in 789, forbids husband and wife, though separated from each other, to contract a new marriage.[79] Another capitulary (802), renewing a law

[75] *Lex burgund.*, 34. Baluze, IV, 205. *Lex Visigot.*, Bk. III, a. 4; Baluze, IV, 321 f.

[76] *Dum . . . discordia regnat et ab hoc pariter conversare minime possunt, placuit utriusque voluntas ut se a consortio separare deberent . . . ut unusquisque sive ad servitium Dei in monasterio aut ad copulam matrimonii se sociare voluerit licentiam habeat.* Baluze, II, 423; Zeumer, 94, 145, 248.

[77] Hardouin, *Acta conciliorum*, III, 1990 ff., 2006.

[78] The following councils: Nantes (650), canon 2; Hereford (673), canon 10; Friuli (791), canon 10; Paris (829), canon 2. Mansi, XI, 130; XIII, 849; XIV, 596; XVIII, 169 f.

[79] Baluze, I, 231. Against the indissolubility of the marriage bond, a so-called decree of Pope Zachary is sometimes cited, giving the same solution as the councils of Verberie and Compiègne. Gratian, *Decret.*, c. 23, *caus.* 32, *quaest.* 7. But the authenticity of this decree is disputed. Its origin is unknown. The first mention of it is found in the eleventh century, in Burchard, *PL*, CXL, 965. Moreover, it has not the form of a decree, but rather of an extract from a penitential. Against the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage, appeal is also made to a reply of Gregory II to St. Boniface; according to this reply, the husband of a woman who is suffering from an ailment that prevents her from performing her marital act, is permitted to marry another. *PL*, LXXXIX, 524 f. But we have no right to argue from the solution of a

of Pepin (755), decides that all marriages must be contracted publicly, after serious inquiry as to the degree of consanguinity of the future couple.[80]

The Liturgy

Charlemagne was zealous in the promotion of plain chant and the liturgy. From Rome he obtained chanters to introduce the Gregorian traditions into Germany. The first organs, a present from the court of Constantinople to Pepin the Short, were brought to France in the middle of the eighth century; Charlemagne had one made for the Aachen cathedral, and the new instrument contributed much to the liturgical splendor of the feasts. Feast days increased in number. The notable development of the cult of the saints, which has its theological justification in the dogma of the communion of saints, is also to be explained at this period by the need to combat numerous local superstitions and pagan feasts. The shrines of St. Martin of Tours, St. Denis, St. Remigius, St. James of Compostela were the goals of many pilgrimages.

The Church and the Emperor were even obliged to place a restraint upon the popular enthusiasm. New saints, canonized by the acclaim of their fellow-townsmen or fellow-countrymen, arose on all sides, their statues were to be seen everywhere along the highways, their virtues and their miracles were celebrated in fanciful and exaggerated accounts. In a capitulary of 794, Charlemagne, in accord with the bishops, forbade the "honoring of new saints or the erection of monuments to them along the roads unless they are particularly well known for

case of conscience, when we have not the statement of the case. The woman's incapacity may have been previous to the marriage and hence a cause of nullity. On this question, see Boudinhon, *Rev. du cl. fr.*, May 15, 1909, pp. 470–474.

[80] Marriage was forbidden by Gregory II only within the fourth degree. *PL*, LXXXIX, 524 f. But legislation regarding causes of nullity of marriage was still rather fluctuating. This circumstance may explain why Charlemagne's irregular unions aroused so little astonishment among contemporaries.

their sufferings or their virtues." [81] A few years later, probably because this capitulary proved ineffective, the Emperor decreed that "no new saint shall be honored without the approbation of the bishop and without regard for all the canons of the Church." [82]

We know how successful was the work of liturgical reform begun under the auspices of Pepin, continued by Charlemagne, and completed by Louis the Pious. Its effect extended to almost the whole Church. According to Duchesne, this is how the change took place:

> The individuals who were charged by the Frankish kings—Pepin, Charlemagne, and Louis the Pious—with the execution of the liturgical reform did not regard themselves as prohibited from supplementing the Roman books or from combining with them whatever seemed worth preserving in the Gallican rite. Hence arose a somewhat composite liturgy, which from its source in the imperial chapel spread throughout all the Churches of the Frankish Empire, and at length, finding its way to Rome, gradually supplanted there the ancient use.[83]

Only Milan seems not to have been affected by the Carolingian reform.

Preaching

Charlemagne is rightly honored for the reform in preaching brought about in the ninth century. The clergy, for the most part recruited from the barbarians, were not yet well enough instructed to suffice by themselves for the demands of regular preaching. They had to take and learn by heart sermons already composed. By Charlemagne's orders, Alcuin, Paul the Deacon, Florus of Lyons, and several others made up collections of

[81] Baluze, I, 269.

[82] Baluze, I, 427. Not until later, at the end of the tenth century, was the canonization of saints reserved to the pope alone. The first canonization by a pope was that of St. Ulrich bishop of Augsburg, who was declared a saint in 993 by Pope John XV.

[83] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 104.

homilies, in which they added to the works of the fathers a few more modern compositions. The Emperor had these collections distributed in the different dioceses of his Empire. They had the advantage of leading the preachers to the imitation of the models of ancient times.[84] Further, the people needed to be addressed in their ordinary language, which was the Romance or the Frankish tongue. Before the clergy the preaching continued to be in Latin, but the Frankish or Romance tongue was used before the laity.[85] From a pulpit raised a few steps above the floor level, no longer *in plano* as in the first centuries, the preacher delivered to the people at times an informal homily, at other times a formal sermon. A new phase had begun in the history of popular preaching.

Iconoclastic Dispute

At times the tone of these popular preachers must have risen to theological considerations. The hour had not yet arrived when Hincmar, Gottschalk, and Scotus Erigena would stir up the most difficult problems about the real presence and predestination. But, already in Charlemagne's reign, three theological questions were being considered; the question of the worship of images, that of adoptionism, and that of the procession of the Holy Ghost (the *Filioque* question).

We have seen how the attacks of Leo the Isaurian against the pope during the iconoclast dispute directly brought about the rupture between the papacy and Constantinople, and the alliance of the papacy with the Franks. The persecution, interrupted for a while, revived in the East under Constantine (V) Copronymus. In 754 a pseudo-council of 338 iconoclast bishops, nearly all of them from the patriarchate of Constantinople,

[84] Lecoy de la Marche, *La chaire française au Moyen Age,* p. 9.

[85] Adalhard abbot of Corbie preached in Latin, in German, and in the vulgar tongue. *Acta sanctorum,* January 2, I, 416. Cf. *Hist. littéraire,* IV, 8, 337; introduction, pp. x f.

again forbade any image, and promulgated against whoever "should make, venerate, expose, or reveal the least icon," the penalty of deposition for the clergy and excommunication for the laity, without prejudice thereby to pursuit by the secular arm.[86] The latter soon proceeded with rigor. With savage brutality, Copronymus, not satisfied with burning the images and casting the relics into the sea, sacked the churches, destroying some from roof to floor, turning others into barracks and stables, declaring war without quarter upon those whom he called "the abominable," that is, upon the monks. Many of these paid with their life for their fidelity to the Catholic tradition.

But, outside the Empire, the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem protested against these acts of violence and from their pulpits anathematized the heresy of the Byzantines.[87] Pope Stephen III in a Roman synod condemned the doctrines of the iconoclast pseudo-council.[88] Finally in 787, at the request of the imperial regent Irene and of the patriarch St. Tarasius, Pope Adrian I approved the meeting of a general council. Bishops to the number of 350, all from the Byzantine Empire, assembled at Nicaea under the presidency of the papal legates, and once again condemned the iconoclast heresy. Yet they clearly distinguished between the veneration of images (προσκύνησις), which they declared lawful, and the adoration (λατρεία), which they absolutely forbade.[89]

The distinction was not superfluous. More than one Easterner may have fallen into blameworthy excesses in the cult he rendered to the venerated icons. In consequence of a remarkably expressive liturgy that made use of numerous pros-

[86] Mansi, XIII, 327–356.

[87] Mansi, XII, 680.

[88] Mansi, XII, 720, 722, 900; *Lib. pont.*, I, 476 f.

[89] See the acts in Mansi, Vols. XII and XIII. They are summarized in Hefele, *History of the Councils*, V, 365.

trations before the objects of worship, and by virtue of a metaphysical tendency that led them to see a mysterious power in the holy images, some Easterners may have given the impression of an adoration strictly so called in which a simple veneration was proper, and thus occasioned the appellation "adorers of images." Hence the violent reaction of the image smashers, whom contact with the Mussulmans, enemies of any representation of the Divinity, was able to stir up, or whom a desire to make Christianity more acceptable to their infidel neighbors may have encouraged.

But those were special conditions, formed by the Eastern customs. How did the iconoclast dispute, after the clear decision of the Second Council of Nicaea, arise again in the West, and there lead to the holding of various councils, the intervention of Charlemagne, and the scandal of violent strife?

It was the result of regrettable misunderstandings, in which the perfidy of the Eastern heretics played a part. Very different from the mentality of the faithful of the East was the attitude of Westerners with regard to the veneration of images. Instead of showering upon the images those outward marks of veneration which had furnished a pretext for the scandal of the iconoclasts, or of attributing a mystical power to the representations of the saints, the Westerners seemed to value them from the point of view of their artistic merit and honored them because of the religious memory which they recalled.

Great, therefore, was their surprise when, upon receiving the acts of the Council of Nicaea, they read therein that, with regard to the holy images, the cult prescribed by the council was that of adoration. In fact, it was by the Latin word *adoratio* that the Greek translators of the acts of the council had translated the word προσκύνησις, "veneration." In this translation Bishop Constantine of Cyprus used the following sentence: "Just as I adore the Trinity, I adore the images,"

whereas the Greek text said: "I adore the Trinity, and I love the images." [90] Charlemagne and the Frankish bishops were then stirred. A great council of 300 bishops, held at Frankfort in 794, declared clearly that they took a stand between the council of the iconoclasts, which ordered the destruction of the images, and the Council of Nicaea, which "commands them to be adored the same as the Trinity." There followed the famous Caroline Books, memoirs drawn up by Charlemagne or by his command, in which we find proclaimed in a spirited style that, "rendering to God alone the worship of adoration, and unwilling to adore the images with one council and equally unwilling to prohibit them with the others, we reject the writing of the inept synod, *ineptissimae synodi.*" [91] Pope Adrian, no doubt seeing that the divergence in no way bore upon a question of doctrine, but rested solely upon a misunderstanding, was wise enough to specify nothing in his reply and to leave to time the care of clarifying the matter. A fresh outburst of the iconoclast dispute in the East a few years later reawakened the sensibilities of the Franks and delayed the settlement of the quarrel.

In the reign of Leo the Armenian (813–820) another heretical pseudo-council brought on a new era of persecutions, exile, and tortures, that were continued under Michael (II) Balbus (820–829) and under Theophilus (829–842). The loyal Catholics were unable to breathe freely until the reign of the regent Theodora. Following the example of the regent

[90] Mansi, XII, 1148; Hardouin, IV, 151; Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* French trans., V, 129. M. D. Serruys, master of conferences at the École des Hautes Études, has recently discovered, in an unpublished work of Nicephorus patriarch of Constantinople, the original Greek text of certain evidence transmitted to Charlemagne by the Byzantine emperors. It is now evident that the texts of iconoclast origin had been chosen for the purpose of leading Charlemagne into error. Serruys, *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscript. et Belles-Lettres,* 1904.

[91] *PL,* XCVIII, 995 ff. On the authenticity of the Carolinian books, see Hefele, V, 118–143, and Kraus, *Kirchengeschichte,* sec. 73, no. 3. The Frankish bishops and Charlemagne did not consider the Second Council of Nicaea as ecumenical. Pope Adrian, in his reply, declares that this council has not yet been given approval.

Irene, she restored the cult of images in 842. Methodius, the new patriarch of Constantinople, elected in 843, accomplished the work of restoration, which took place amid popular acclamations; "nothing was left of iconoclasm in the East except an increase of love for the images and even an exaggeration of their veneration." [92]

St. John Damascene and St. Theodore of Studium

Two great saints became illustrious during this dispute, St. John Damascene and St. Theodore of Studium. The former, whom the Council of Nicaea proclaimed one of the champions of the cult of images,[93] was poet, mystic, orator, theologian, and polemic. Posterity has especially admired and studied his two books, *The Fountain of Wisdom* and *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith.* In these he sums up in a comprehensive picture the whole theological tradition of the Eastern fathers; a masterpiece that has been compared to the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas. Theodore of Studium, a poet at times and a polemic when the defense of the Church called for it, was first of all a mystic, a renowned director of souls. Of his letters more than five hundred are extant; they are an inexhaustible mine of information for a knowledge of men and things of his time. In the persecution of Michael Balbus, he it was who, to put an end to the dispute, asked that, "in keeping with immemorial tradition, they should conform to the declaration of the Roman Church, *suprema ecclesiarum Dei.*" [94]

The Emperor tried to win Louis the Pious to his cause and wrote to him for this purpose. Some Frankish bishops, assembled in Paris in 825, replied that in their opinion the images in the churches, "for educated people were only an ornament and a pious reminder, for the uneducated a means of instruction";

[92] Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine,* p. 271.
[93] Mansi, XIII, 357.
[94] Theodore of Studium, Bk. II, *epist.* 86; *PG,* XCIX, 1331.

but they protested also that they wished to be free to honor them or not, to possess them or not, *in colendo vel non colendo, in habendo vel non habendo.* This view was in keeping with the decisions of the Council of Frankfort. At the same period, Claude bishop of Turin, who had been won over to the iconoclast heresy, even ordered the images to be smashed and the crosses to be broken up. But, condemned by the Pope, he was not followed.

Finally, however, agreement was reached. At the close of the ninth century, after prolonged controversies, in which Agobard of Lyons,[95] Jonas of Orleans,[96] Hincmar of Reims,[97] and Walafrid Strabo[98] participated, the misunderstandings and prejudices that had led the Frankish bishops astray, were dissipated, and the Second Council of Nicaea was everywhere accepted without reserve.

Adoptionism

Closely allied with this question of the veneration of images was the question of adoptionism. Claude of Turin, the iconoclast, was also an adoptionist, and the Council of Frankfort in 794 had to declare its attitude on both questions.

The new heresy arose in Spain. About 782, a certain Migetius, reviving the error of Sabellius about the Trinity, taught that the Divinity had been successively revealed to men, as the Father by David, as the Son by Christ, and as the Holy Ghost by St. Paul. Further, Christ was confused with the Word, who was born at a given moment in time, namely, on the very day of the incarnation.[99]

Two Spanish bishops, Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of

[95] *Contra Tempestarios; PL,* CIV.
[96] *De cultu imaginum, PL,* CVI.
[97] His work is not extant.
[98] *De exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum.*
[99] Letter from Elipandus to Migetius, *PL,* XCVI, 859.

Urgel, undertook to refute this Trinitarian heresy by making a distinction between the eternal sonship of the Word and the temporal sonship of Christ. But they failed to provide against an equally harmful Christological error.

Elipandus of Toledo

Elipandus, who seems to have been especially a dialectician, but one with a narrow and rigid logic, made this distinction between the two sonships: that the first should be called natural since the Word, consubstantial with His Father, possesses the same nature, whereas the second can be called only adoptive since Christ is man and since God could merely elevate to Himself, could merely assume, merely adopt the humanity. Lastly, he maintained that there were two Sons of God, one by nature, and the other by adoption. He forgot that in the incarnate Word there can be only one center of attribution, as the Schoolmen express it, only one person, and that this person is that of the Word.

Felix of Urgel

What Elipandus claimed to prove by logic, Felix of Urgel defended as a critic. The attention to the correction of manuscripts began to develop in Spain, as in France, a taste for textual criticism. Felix of Urgel first noted that the qualifying term *advocatus* is several times attributed to Christ. But, he said, this word is synonymous with *assumptus, adoptatus* and from this consideration he attempted to derive proofs by the study of the texts.[100] He also appealed to Scriptural passages which he advanced as decisive against the theory of natural sonship as applied to Christ. It is not admissible, he maintained, that he who is the Son of God by nature should have had the instances of "not knowing," which we find in the life of Christ.

[100] *PL,* CI, 194, 1333.

Because Christ, as such, did not know the day of judgment, He did not know what the disciples of Emmaus were discussing, or where the body of Lazarus had been laid, or whether He was beloved by Peter more than by the rest, and other such instances.[101] Felix' criticism was as narrow as the dialectic of Elipandus. For the point at issue was to know whether this ignorance of Christ as man—the very existence, nature, and cause of this ignorance needed to be determined—cannot be reconciled with the unity of a divine person, the center of attribution of all the qualities and actions of Jesus Christ.

The Spanish error, as it has been called, aroused the protest of Alcuin, who wrote seven books against Felix of Urgel, and the protest of Agobard archbishop of Lyons, who wrote a learned treatise on the question.

Condemnation of Adoptionism

It is more interesting to note the position taken, from the very outset, by Alcuin's good sense and Catholic instinct. Upon the first report of the heresy, he wrote to Charlemagne: "What? Christ, the son of the Virgin, is not God's own Son? What a rash assertion!" [102] In the step by step discussion with his opponent, never did he lose sight of the general economy of religion; all the conclusions of his arguments he brought back to that consideration. One long controversy with Felix he terminates in these words: "This is what I want you to state with definite finality; yes or no, do you agree to adore as God Him who was crucified, who died, and who rose from the dead?" [103]

[101] *PL,* CIV, 37.

[102] *PL,* C, 168 ff.

[103] Alcuin's Catholic sense thus avoided the danger so justly pointed out by a critic of our time. "We may say that all the heresies were born from deductions pursued in a single direction, starting out from a principle of tradition or science, isolated from all context, erected into an absolute truth, and carrying in its train, by a process of reasoning, conclusions that were incompatible with the general harmony of religion and of the traditional teaching." Alfred Loisy, *L'Évangile et*

At the Council of Frankfort (794), the adoption heresy was the subject of exhaustive examination, after which the bishops of Italy drew up an exposition of the proofs furnished by the Bible against the theories of Elipandus and Felix.[104] The bishops of Germany, of Gaul, and of Aquitaine, in a synodal letter, discussed the Patristic texts appealed to by the innovators and clearly established the Catholic thesis.[105] The council, in its first canon, pronounced the adoption theory heretical, and Charlemagne sent a letter to Elipandus and the other bishops of Spain in which, after offering them a fine profession of faith, he urged them to abandon their personal opinions and take their stand with the doctrines of the universal Church.[106]

The *Filioque*

The question of the *Filioque* did not have any direct connection with the questions of iconoclasm and adoptionism. But it revealed the same spirit of opposition. A number of men of the period professed all three errors relative to these questions.

It was at the Council of Toledo (589), at the very time when Spain publicly abjured Arianism, like a song of victory over the vanquished heresy and like an affirmation of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, there appeared the addition to the Creed of the word *Filioque*.[107] This liturgical addition, corresponding to a traditional dogmatic doctrine, had

l'Église, 1st ed., p. 143. The author of these lines became separated from the Catholic Church because he forgot that principle.

[104] *PL,* CI, 1131; Mansi, 873.

[105] Mansi, XIII, 883.

[106] *PL,* XCVIII, 899; Mansi, XIII, 899 ff. Adoptionism sprang up again in the twelfth century with Abelard, in the fourteenth with Durandus of Saint-Pourçain and Gabriel Biel, in the eighteenth century with Ysambert.

[107] "I believe in the Holy Ghost who proceeds from the Father *and from the Son.*" The word *Filioque* is to be found in another council of Toledo (447).

passed from Spain into France. Perhaps this did not take place without stirring up some protests, for Einhard mentions that, in a council held in 767 at Gentilly, there was question of the Holy Trinity as well as of the venerations of images.[108]

The dispute flared up in consequence of a regrettable incident. In a Palestinian monastery on the Mount of Olives, some Western monks, following the custom of Charlemagne's chapel, chanted the *Filioque* in the Creed. They were attacked by some Greek monks, who tried to expel them as heretics. They were charged with being doubly culpable for introducing into the Nicene symbol a new formula contrary to a decision of the Council of Ephesus and for thereby intimating a grave heresy, namely, the existence in the Trinity of a twofold principle, of a double *spiratio*. The charge was groundless, because the prohibition decreed by the Council of Ephesus had never been regarded by the Church as a perpetual one,[109] and the oneness of principle and of *spiratio* was quite reconcilable with the denounced formula.[110]

But the mistake was not without some excuse. The Greek fathers, notably the three great Cappadocian doctors (St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Gregory of Nyssa) had not considered the divine life from the same point of view as the Latin fathers did. The former considered especially the distinction and the hierarchy of the three divine hypostases, which they then endeavored to reconcile in the unity and the consubstantiality. The Latins, on the contrary, set out from the point of view of the divine unity and consubstantiality. Hence arose the diverse manners of expressing their faith. The Easterners, accustomed to consider the hierarchy of the

[108] Hefele, *History of the Councils,* V, 330.

[109] For proof of this fact, see Duchesne, *The Churches Separated from Rome,* pp. 50 ff.

[110] At the Council of Florence several of the Greeks were surprised to learn that the Latins admitted only one principle and only one "spiration," and that the Father and the Son communicate being to the Holy Ghost by what they have in common, and not by that by which they differ.

persons, preferred the formula that made the Holy Ghost proceed *from the Father by the Son,* and the Westerners, accustomed to consider in the persons what was common to them, spoke of the Holy Ghost as proceeding *from the Father and from the Son.* Thus we can see how the misunderstanding arose. The first mistake of the Easterners was to adopt violent measures; their second mistake later on—and unfortunately it is still that of our separated brethren of the East—was to refuse their submission to the authority of the supreme pontiff and to the evidence of long established tradition.[111]

The attitude of Pope Leo III, before whom the case was at once taken by the Latin monks, was most conciliatory. That of Charlemagne, to whom the monks also turned since he was their suzerain,[112] was as firm as it was prudent. The Emperor commissioned Theodulph bishop of Orleans to collect the principal patristic texts in favor of the Latin usage, for the purpose of enabling his Palestinian protégés to defend themselves against the charge of heresy. At Aachen he assembled a great synod (809), which approved the writing of Theodulph. Two deputies were commissioned to bear the acts of this council to Rome. In January, 810, Pope Leo III gave his decision. He clearly distinguished the dogmatic question from the liturgical question, so unfortunately confused by the Easterners. From the dogmatic viewpoint, he fully approved the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost through the Father and the Son. He said: "Whoever does not believe according to this faith is condemned by the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." The encyclical containing these words was addressed by the Pope to all the Eastern Churches, to instruct them, "as also the

[111] We know that this question of the *Filioque* was Photius' chief pretext for declaring the schism, and that it is still the first of the grievances uttered against the Roman Church by the Eastern schismatic Church. See the encyclical published September 29 (October 11), 1895, by Patriarch Anthimus of Constantinople and by his synod.

[112] Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* V, 173–176.

whole world, in the true Catholic faith." It has all the extrinsic and intrinsic marks of an act given *ex cathedra*. In the matter of the liturgical dispute, the Pope, probably supposing that it would be imprudent to embitter it by an immediate decision, judged it well to temporize. To Charlemagne's ambassadors he declared that, if his advice were asked, he would counsel that the *Filioque* be not introduced. He added that now the best would be not to sing the Creed any more in the imperial palace, since it was not sung at Rome. Then, to give the Christian world a visible evidence of the community of faith between the East and the West, he had engraved on two tablets of silver, without the word *Filioque,* the identical texts of the Nicene Creed in Greek and in Latin. These tablets were placed in the Basilica of St. Peter.[113]

The Pope had not explicitly forbidden the Frankish Churches to add the word *Filioque*. This addition gradually spread by a sort of popular impulse which Charlemagne did not oppose. In 1014 Emperor St. Henry, by his insistent request and as a protest against the obstinate denial of the Greeks, brought it about that the *Filioque* was sung at Rome even in solemn mass. We find it admitted by the Greeks and by the Latins at the ecumenical councils of Lyons and Florence.

In this matter Charlemagne's attitude seems not to have exceeded the proper measure that became a respectful son of the Church, in the mission that he set before himself, to defend the Church against her external enemies and to protect her within in her hierarchy, in her worship, and in her dogma. Greater than Constantine, Charlemagne in his public life can be considered the type of Christian emperor. Popular admiration went further; it canonized him; and the decree of an antipope confirmed that canonization.[114] But the Church has never

[113] *Liber pontif.* I, 46 note; Hefele, V, 177 f.

[114] The antipope Guido who took the name of Paschal III. Ever since, the Church has tolerated the cult of Charlemagne at Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) and in a certain number of dioceses. But Pius IX forbade its extension. See a letter from Pius IX

proposed his veneration to the faithful, and impartial history must be satisfied to consider Charlemagne as one of the greatest benefactors of the Church and of civilization.

to Cardinal de Geissel archbishop of Cologne, in 1850 (Ketterer, *Karl der Grosse und die Kirche,* p. 256). Benedict XIV, in his treatise *De servorum Dei beatif.,* I, 9, 4, thinks this tolerance assures to Charlemagne the title of Blessed. In any event, it does not involve the infallibility of the Church. The gravest blame laid upon Charlemagne is that which concerns his private morals. He had nine wives (Einhard, *Vita Karoli,* chap. 18; *PL,* XCVIII, 257). Even if we consider that those whom Einhard calls Charlemagne's concubines were morganatic wives, it would be difficult to explain so many widowhoods. It is more natural to suppose repudiations, which could have been in some degree of good faith, because the principles about marriage impediments were not well established at that period among the barbarians. In fact, no contemporary blamed Charlemagne's morals. The first to attack them was Walafrid Strabo, in the middle of the ninth century. See, in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne,* the two articles by Dom Cabrol: "The cult of Charlemagne," and "Charlemagne and the liturgy."

CHAPTER XIV

The Beginning of Feudalism

"WHEN men's existence extends hardly beyond the place where they live and die, when the absence of commerce, of industry, of intellectual activity, and the non-existence or rareness of material and intellectual communications straiten their thought within a compass as limited as the scope of their actual sight, how can a great society subsist? What ideas, what relations, what interests would form its bond and nourishment? The only society then possible is a narrow society, local as the mind and the life of its members. And if by some mighty accident, by some passing cause, a vaster society is formed for a moment, it soon dissolves, and in its place is born a multitude of little societies, formed according to the degree of the men's development, that soon produce, each in its limits, a government of the same dimension. . . . Charlemagne permanently halted the invasion of the barbarians, and new disorders no longer came incessantly to add to the immense disorder that already reigned between the Rhine and the Ocean. Society was able to begin in France. But it began only by drawing in its lines more closely." [1]

Partition of the Royal Patrimony

The Carolingian Empire was, in fact, neither the transfer of the Eastern Empire, from which nothing that it possessed had been taken away, nor the restoration of the Roman Empire, which had been founded upon principles quite differ-

[1] Guizot, *Essais sur l'histoire de France,* third essay, 9th ed., p. 69.

ent from those of the Carolingian Empire. And it had not become the real empire of the Middle Ages, the keystone of the whole feudal hierarchy. Charlemagne's Empire fulfilled what was essential in its providential mission. Against its continuance were the traditions and customs of the Germanic races, the present necessities, and, to a certain extent, the Church herself.

In the Frankish traditions, royalty was less a supreme power than a sort of patrimony, which must be divided among the children of the one it belonged to. As Clovis had divided his kingdom between his sons, it was natural that Charlemagne should in turn divide his: this was the first cause of weakness. Further, a Frankish king, following the national customs, must be surrounded by numerous companions living at his court, whom he attached to himself by presents and benefices and who, through the very effect of those benefices, became a menace to him: this was the second danger. Lastly, unlike the emperors of Rome and of the East, the Frankish kings had no revenues from regular taxes. To irregular contributions coming to them from free gifts and from tributes levied upon conquered peoples, they added taxes conceived on the basis of the Roman law; but they encountered resistance, as evidenced by the royal edicts, and were obliged to abandon them.[2] The Franks had no permanent army or paid soldiers. Upon the king's summons, the free men had to gather under the standards, the wealthy equipping themselves at their own expense, the poor grouping themselves about a big landowner, who provided the equipment. It was with these big landowners that the king was obliged to reckon.

Growing Power of the Nobles

In addition to the weakening influence of the political traditions, there were the elements of dissolution existing in the

[2] Clotaire ed., in 614; *MGH, Leges,* I, 15.

very depth of the character of the Germanic races. The Roman was ever ready to sacrifice his person to the sovereign state; quite to the contrary, the German was accustomed to put his personal independence in the first place. Hence in the collection of taxes and in the call to arms, there arose difficulties, revolts, and perpetual threats of anarchy. The situation was aggravated by the afflictions of the time.

Above the slaves, the petty farmers, the tenants, the laborers, were the *poor* who were simply small landowners, having allodial tenure, that is, freeholders. These were the ones who suffered most. They were without the security of the serf, who was under the protection of his powerful master. They were daily threatened in their freedom and in their property. The public authority should have defended them; but, on the contrary, the depositaries of authority were the ones who oppressed them. . . . Suppose the Normans made an incursion. . . . The royal power, without a permanent army, without fortresses of its own, without any of those things that protect a great social body, was unable to defend the population. It was no longer obeyed. Then all eyes and hopes turned to the lords. They were sure to be found in the hour of danger; they did not have to come from afar; they lived in the threatened province or canton. Between the count and the population of the county a bond of interest was visible. The lord was well armed; he had a watchful eye over all. Strong or feeble, he was the sole defender and the sole hope of the men. That was the epoch when the fortified castles were built. Six centuries later, men were seized by an immense hatred against those seignoral fortresses, but at the time they were built men looked upon them with fondness and gratitude. Each castle was the safety of a canton.[3]

Such was the birth of feudalism. The Church, with all its power, favored the movement: she saw in it the safety of those whom she most particularly loved, the poor, the weak, the oppressed. She herself entered into it at the start, and to a very considerable extent. To her the poor by preference commended

[3] Fustel de Coulanges, "Les origines du régime féodal" in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* August 1, 1874, pp. 575–578.

themselves.[4] "It was good to live beneath the cross." To bishops and abbots the kings granted the most immunities. At first the greatest lords were the Church prelates. It has been rightly said that the Church "contributed to the making of feudalism, rather than became subjected to a feudalism already formed."

Yet the origin of the feudal movement did not always have this beneficent character. St. Gregory of Tours speaks of a certain Cautinus "who laid hands on any lands adjoining his own," [5] and of one Pelagius "who continually committed thefts, covert and open attacks, violent assaults, and divers other crimes." [6] Charlemagne, in several capitularies, forbade the powerful (*potentiores*) "to oppress the free men who are poor, in contempt of all justice, in such manner as to force them to sell or cede their lands." [7] Besides the lord protector, there was the lord despoiler; and often the *recommendation* made to a single great personage was the means of escaping from the oppression of the others.[8]

The formation of all these little autonomous groups, a consequence of the powerlessness of the Empire, in turn became a cause of disintegration. Once the Empire was broken up, ambitions, greed, and the rivalries of those little states encouraged anarchy. The Church then tried to save the threatened social order. By the unity of beliefs that she preached, by the strongly disciplined hierarchy that she maintained among her

[4] We have some formulas of *commendation.* Ordinarily they were framed in this form: "The village will pay to the viscount five solidi by way of *commendation* and, in consideration of this sum, the viscount agrees to save always and in all places the men of the village." Another form: "I receive you," said the warrior, "in my saving and defense, you and your possessions." And the farmer declared "that he made acknowledgment that he was under the protection and guardianship of the lord." In such and such a village, the lord stipulates that he be given "for each house having a plow a setier [34 gallons] of oats." Fustel de Coulanges, *Rev. des Deux-Mondes,* August 1, 1874, pp. 578 f.

[5] St. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks,* Bk. IV, chap. 12.

[6] *Op. cit.,* Bk. VIII, chap. 40.

[7] Capitulary of 805, art. 16; Baluze, I, 427.

[8] Caesar says that among the Gauls "each man gives himself to one of the powerful so as not to be at the mercy of all the powerful."

members, she offset the dissolving influences of this spontaneous movement; by her preaching, by the ideas of justice and equity that she spread in souls, she strove to bend and discipline the scattered forces of that seething and suffering feudalism. In the free play of those forces of anarchy with the moral ideas of Christianity, the new society had to be worked out, the mighty structure of the medieval régime had to be formed. But the most beneficent social transformations rarely take place without painful convulsions.

In the trials we shall presently relate, the papacy itself was the victim of those crises. But the trials would be hard to comprehend without a brief sketch of the political events of that period.

Louis the Pious

According to the Germanic custom, Charlemagne, before his death (814), partitioned his states among his sons (Louis, Pepin, and Charles). Pepin and Charles having died, he made a second partition between Pepin's son Bernard, to whom Italy was allotted, and Louis, who had the rest with the right of succession to the Empire. Said Charlemagne's will: "If disputes arise, they will be settled by the trial of the cross,[9] and not by war. Let no one slay my grandsons or mutilate them or tonsure them against their will." The great Emperor's peaceful spirit was manifested in the very last expressions of his wishes.

The foreseen disorders soon broke out. Louis the Pious (or the Debonnaire), in taking possession of his father's throne, found himself confronted by a turbulent nobility that was jealous and divided. Louis was pious, sober, modest, generous, and irreproachable in his morals. But a weak and fickle soul

[9] *Hist. des Gaules,* V, 773 f. Charlemagne had always maintained judicial trials by the *judgment of God.* The ordeal of the cross consisted in holding the arms extended for the longest possible time during divine worship.

was hidden beneath an outward appearance of firmness. He was not of a stature to sustain the work of Charlemagne, at the moment when that work was menaced on all sides.

A well intentioned but clumsy reform of the imperial palace provoked the displeasure of the nobility.[10] They were further exasperated when those who had been Charlemagne's chief councilors, among them Wala and Adalard, were dishonored and banished.[11] The revolt of Bernard king of Italy and his tragic death brought the disorder to its climax. The principal effect of the Emperor's public penance at the Council of Attigny was to discredit the imperial authority. His marriage to Judith of Bavaria, the plots of the new Empress, in whose favor Louis violated the constitution of 817 that he might endow his son Charles, brought about three successive rebellions of his other sons. Louis the Pious died June 20, 840, during a campaign against his son Louis the German, saying: "I forgive my son Louis, but let him know that he is the cause of my death."

Treaty of Verdun

There followed a relentless strife among the three brothers. Lothaire king of Italy, associated in the imperial rule by the act of 817, not satisfied with the title of emperor that came to him after his father's death, resolved to seize the states of Louis the German and of Charles the Bald. The latter, in league against their brother, waged against him (June 25, 841) the sanguinary battle of Fontenay, near Auxerre. This was the first time that Franks fought against Franks in a large war. Lothaire was beaten. Two years later at Verdun was signed the treaty that definitely dismembered Charlemagne's Empire. Charles the Bald obtained the western part, that later became France; Louis had the eastern part, that be-

[10] *Hist. des Gaules,* VI, 137 f.
[11] *Ibid.,* VI, 79.

came Germany; Lothaire had Italy and in addition a strip of land between the possessions of his two brothers. This was named after him Lotharingia (Lorraine).

This arrangement, in some respects a happy one, since it allowed three different races to develop henceforth in keeping with laws more fitted to their genius and within limits that seemed defined by the physical geography of the country, ended a state of things on which contemporaries had built great hopes. We are therefore not surprised to read in the chronicles of the time by writers who still cherished the old imperial idea, outbursts of despair like those provoked by the fall of the Roman Empire. The deacon Florus exclaims: "Weep, France, for the Empire has lost both its name and its glory. . . . Instead of a king, we have only a kinglet; instead of a kingdom, we now have only some fragments of a kingdom. . . . Weep, you mountains and hills; weep, you fountains and rocks. No longer does that empire exist whose mission it was to unite by the faith races stranger to one another." [12]

Spread of Feudalism

Upon the ruins of the Empire, feudalism continued to grow. From all that the central power lost, that of the lords increased. Vassalage was imposed on all free men. No one was sure of being protected unless he was "the man" of some lord. No one was certain of being obeyed unless he was the lord of some domain. Hence the counts, formerly simple public officers, needed to become endowed with an estate. But that domain became something handed on to their heirs, and the exercise of the public office followed it. Charlemagne appointed and re-

[12] Florus, *Carmen de divisione imperii;* Mabillon, *Analecta,* I, 388; *Hist. des Gaules,* VII, 301–304.

moved his counts; his successors could no longer do so. The capitulary of Quierzy (or Kiersy) in 877, although it did indeed institute the heredity of offices and of benefices, purposed in reality to confirm a state of affairs already in existence. Henceforth public law did not really exist any more. It became confounded with private law: whoever was a landowner, was sovereign.[13]

From this new condition no one suffered more and no one benefited more than the men of the Church, bishops and abbots. Land ownership, giving them the jurisdiction and the social authority which they needed, placed them in the categories of suzerains and vassals. This situation gave rise to scheming, rivalry, and jealousy. From it no one suffered more than the pope. Nowhere was the nobility so turbulent as in Italy, so audacious, so adept in conspiracy and intrigue, so ready for anarchy on account of the old rancors. Some day, under favor of these internal disorders, let an unbridled schemer, a shameless woman, seize the power and force upon Rome the yoke of a despotic suzerainty, and then, aiming at the conquest of the highest of sovereignties, they will succeed in placing simony and corruption in the see of St. Peter. For the Church this will be the supreme trial and humiliation. Not even under Nero or Julian the Apostate, not even when confronted by Attila, was the Church in so great danger. But out of this trial the Church emerged with her doctrine spotless, still fertile in saints and heroes, ready with new ardor to take up again her work of civilization and sanctification in the world. The unworthy John XII is followed by Gregory VII and Innocent III. Have we not, in this spectacle, a living and miraculous proof of the divine vitality of the Church?

[13] Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* lesson 3. Bourgeois, in his *Le capitulaire de Kiersy-sur-Oise,* lessens the significance which, since Montesquieu, has been given to this capitulary. Apparently it introduced nothing new, but rather recognized a state of affairs going back to Charlemagne.

Death of St. Leo III

St. Leo III survived Charlemagne only two years. But in that short space of time he had the grief of observing the powerlessness of the new Emperor, the turbulence of the Roman nobles, the might of the dukes in Italy. In 815 some people of the nobles' party formed a plot to remove the Pope by assassination.[14] Leo III discovered the conspiracy, arrested the plotters and, without consulting the Emperor, had them condemned to death for the crime of lese majesty, according to Roman Law. The Pope was exercising a right that seemed to flow from his sovereignty. Louis the Pious, doubly humiliated that at the very outset of his reign such a revolt had broken out in a state of his protectorate and that the Pope had suppressed it without recourse to him and by applying the Roman law, was greatly displeased. An embassy, having at its head the Emperor's nephew Bernard king of Italy, came to present his complaint to the Pope. Leo III appealed to the urgency of the situation, which called for prompt action, and to the authority of Charlemagne, who had never imposed on the Roman state the practice of German law. At that very time terrible rebellions were taking place in the agricultural colonies of the Papal States. To put down the nobles' conspiracy, the Pope had appealed to his royal rural militia. Groups of malcontents, probably hired by the plotters, traversed the papal farms, stirring up the people to reprisals against the militia, spreading fire and pillage in all directions, arousing the peasants against the papal officers, exploiting some chance abuses to represent the officers of the Holy See as tyrants. There was word of a march upon Rome by the insurgents. The intervention of Winigis duke of Spoleto, sent by King Bernard, halted the rebels. Scarcely was the outburst quieted, when the great and

[14] Einhard, *Annales,* year 815; *Hist. des Gaules,* VI, 175; the Astronomer, in the *Chron. de Saint-Denys; Hist. des Gaules,* VI, 139.

holy Pontiff, undoubtedly foreseeing many new trials for those States of St. Peter which he had so strongly governed, rendered his soul to God, June 12, 816.

Pope Stephen IV (816–817)

The clergy of Rome, considering the dangers which a too rigid policy might invite upon the Papal States, chose as pope a man of peaceful disposition. It was the deacon Stephen, universally esteemed for his piety, the purity of his life, and the conciliatory spirit of his character. He belonged to a noble family and had passed his youth in the patriarchal palace of the Lateran under popes Adrian and Leo.[15] As soon as he was elected, Stephen IV made the whole Roman people take an oath of allegiance to the emperor.[16] No precedent required this step.[17] But there is no ground for supposing that the Pope meant thereby to abdicate his sovereignty. On the contrary, there is every reason to think that it was an oath taken to the emperor as protector, not as sovereign, as Pope Sergius II later explained under similar circumstances. The immediate result of this policy was a sudden lessening of the tension in the relations between the Pope and the Emperor. After his consecration, Stephen sent word of his election to Louis the Pious. The two sovereigns met at Reims and, in a thoroughly cordial interview, settled several questions of ecclesiastical policy.[18] On this same occasion the Pope crowned both the Emperor and Queen Ermengarde.

Pope St. Paschal I (817–824)

Stephen IV reigned only a few months. Elected June 22, 816, he died January 25, 817. On the very day of his death his

[15] *Lib. pont.*, II, 49.
[16] Thégan, *Vita Ludovici*, chap. 16.
[17] Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège*, p. 213 note.
[18] *Lib. pont.*, II, 49; *Hist. des Gaules*, VI, 140.

successor was chosen, the priest Paschal, the first of his name. He was a Roman by birth, like his predecessor raised in the Lateran Palace. But he did not belong to the nobility. His application to prayer and mortification led St. Leo III to entrust to him the government of the Abbey of St. Stephen, which was located near St. Peter's. Paschal ruled the Church for more than seven years. The quieting down of the turbulence, accomplished by the conciliatory attitude of his predecessor, enabled Paschal to start a firm policy. He did not require the people of Rome to renew the oath of allegiance to the emperor, and merely sent Louis the Pious word of his election by a special embassy. The most important result of his diplomacy was that he obtained from the Emperor a written Constitution, called the Constitution of 817, which confirmed and guaranteed the sovereignty of the pope over Rome, the exarchate, the Pentapolis, and all the districts he had previously been granted possession of. It was further agreed that the emperor was not to interfere in papal elections, which would take place according to the regulations of canon law. The emperor's intervention in the temporal government of Rome would be limited to cases of disturbance or of oppression by the powerful, the *potentiores*.[19] Was it intended to include the pope in this last word? Was the expression purposely left vague so as to permit later negotiations or custom to settle irreconcilable divergencies between emperor and pope? [20]

The unfortunate events following upon the promulgation of this important constitution did not allow Paschal's firm and capable diplomacy to produce all the fruit that might be expected. From 817 to 824, the date of the holy Pontiff's death,

[19] Baluze, I, 791 ff.

[20] This act of 817 is the first written constitution that we have on the respective rights of the priesthood and the empire. Formerly its authenticity was questioned. Fleury (*Hist. ecclésiastique,* VII, 122) regards several clauses as dubious. Dom Bouquet, in the *Recueil des historiens des Gaules,* considers it spurious and merely gives a summary of it. Today we have no hesitation in considering it authentic.

the history of the Empire was one of continual wars and disturbances of all sorts. The quarrels started by the partition of 817, the revolt and tragic death of Bernard in 818, the plots of Judith of Bavaria, the wretched scenes preceding and following the Emperor's public penance at the Council of Attigny in 822, the act associating Lothaire king of Italy in the Empire in 823; the unceasing chicanery of this new imperial power, that was called the Italian Empire, a power with its seat too near Rome, and the monarch, devoid of his father's piety or his grandfather's greatness of soul, incapable of maintaining order in Italy: such were the lamentable incidents of this period. Disorder and unrest were everywhere prevalent; but perhaps nowhere more than in Rome. The populace which, like a child, blames everything around it for its deceptions and misfortunes, then turned against that Pope whom they had so enthusiastically acclaimed at the beginning of his pontificate. Paschal I experienced all the disappointments of unpopularity. Some of the lords took advantage of this to make themselves independent. One of these was Ingoald abbot of Farfa, who succeeded in getting an admission of his absolute autonomy and in excluding the intervention of the pope in the appointment of the abbot of his monastery. A coalition of malcontents was formed, headed by two important personages of the papal court, the primicerius Theodore and his son-in-law Leo, nomenculator of the Roman Church. Their plan was to oppose the Pope, while relying upon Emperor Lothaire, who secretly encouraged them. The loyal pontifical militia of the agricultural colonies again interfered, seized the two leaders, put out their eyes, and executed them. Lothaire complained loudly. The Pope under oath gave assurance that he had no hand in the execution, but he refused to surrender the authors of the deed. So great was the excitement that the Pope no longer felt he was master even of his own followers. He fell grievously ill at the beginning of the year 824, and died February

11. The people were stirred to such a high pitch that the Pope's body could not be taken to St. Peter's Basilica. It was feared that some sacrilegious outrage would be attempted upon the body by those whose hatred pursued him even after his death.[21]

Pope Eugenius II (824–827)

The election of his successor was held amid considerable disturbances. The party of the rural militia and that of the military aristocracy were at odds with each other. If we are to accept the words of Paschasius Radbertus, the influence of the celebrated monk Wala decided the election in favor of the candidate backed by the nobility and the Emperor.[22] On June 5, 824, Eugenius, archpriest of St. Sabina, was chosen pope. He was a Roman by birth. His biographer says that he was "equally commendable by the humility and simplicity of his life, the prestige of his learning and eloquence, the generosity of his soul, and the noble bearing of his body." [23] His short pontificate was marked by one of the most important acts in the diplomatic history of the papacy, the Constitution of 824.

One of Eugenius' first cares was to provide, so far as possible, against disturbances like those that had afflicted the pontificates of his predecessors. Their principal cause was to be found in the state of confusion and anarchy which then prevailed almost everywhere in Europe, in the lack of clear delimitations of the respective rights of lords and sovereigns, of ecclesiastical authorities and civil powers, of the pope and the emperor. Eugenius II opened conversations with Louis the Pious, who delegated for the negotiations his son Lothaire accompanied by the monk Wala. These negotiations resulted in a series of peace measures, such as the recall of several ex-

[21] Thégan, *Vita Ludovici*, 30; *PL*, CVI, 418.
[22] Paschasius Radbertus, *Vita Ven. Walae*, chap. 28; *PL*, CXX, 1604.
[23] *Lib. pont.*, II, 69.

iled personages,[24] the assigning of indemnities to the widows of massacred dignitaries, and especially the drawing up of the famous Constitution of 824, called the Constitution of Lothaire.

The basis of this accord was still the régime instituted by St. Leo III and Charlemagne, but various litigated points were now regulated. Thus the Constitution granted the Romans the right to be judged according to their law before the tribunals. The oath of allegiance was to be taken to the emperor, but with the reservation of the fidelity promised to the pope. Two *missi,* one appointed by the pope, the other by the emperor, would reside in Rome to receive the complaints of subjects against the public officers. These would first be referred to the pope and, if justice were not done, then to the emperor by way of final appeal. Death penalty was enacted against anyone who should inflict injury upon persons placed under imperial protection, and the penalty of exile against those who should disturb a papal election, which was reserved solely to the Romans. Lastly, each Roman must take an oath not to allow the consecration of the newly elected pope until he had sworn, before the imperial *missus,* to observe the present pact.[25]

Council of Rome (826)

The Constitution of Lothaire gave the Church a period of peace and security. Eugenius II took advantage of this to assemble at Rome in 826 a council of sixty-two bishops. It published thirty-eight canons, most of them affecting the discipline of the clergy and the reform of the Christian life of the laity.[26] The first article, in most forceful terms, forbade

[24] *Loc. cit.*

[25] For the text of the Constitution of Lothaire, see *MGH, Leges,* IV, 545; *PL,* XCVII, 459.

[26] Mansi, XIV, 999 ff.

simoniacal elections. The next articles concerned priests and bishops. Ignorant priests were to be warned by the bishop and, if need be, declared suspended; following the decisions of popes St. Celestine and St. Leo, bishops should not be consecrated without the consent of the clergy and people of the diocese for which they are intended. They must not be absent from their see more than three weeks without the authorization of their metropolitans. Other articles are about churches and schools. Church edifices destroyed by wars and pillage are to be rebuilt. Schools must be opened at all episcopal residences, in all parishes, and wherever else there is need of them. Priests are admonished not to appear in public unless dressed in sacerdotal garb. They are to live in common in cloisters under the guidance of capable superiors who are responsible to the bishop.

Pope Gregory IV (827–844)

When Eugenius II left this world (August 27, 827), there was reason for thinking that peace was assured for a long time. But such was by no means the fact. The passions that aroused so many disturbances were not appeased. Two clauses of the imperial Constitution would give them free scope. The provision restricting voting at papal elections to Romans alone, unlike the Constitution of 769, made no distinction between the clergy and the laity; and the clause putting off the pope's consecration until the taking of his oath before the imperial legate would serve as a pretext for the emperors to take a hand in the government of the Church.

The pontificate of Valentine (827) lasted only six weeks. He was a native Roman of noble birth, brought up in the Lateran under the guidance of Eugenius, who loved him as a son. He died in October, 827, and was followed by the priest Gregory, also of Roman birth and noble family. Two serious

facts marked these two elections: the lay nobility took an active part in both of them, and Gregory IV was ordained only after verification of the election by an imperial legate. A precedent had been established; a breach was opened for the most harmful abuses.

However, the very force of circumstances led the popes to take an increasingly preponderant place in civil society. According to the testimony of all contemporary authors, Gregory IV was timid and hesitant; yet his memory is connected with the first fortresses built on the domain of St. Peter, and the first attempt made by a pope to take a direct hand in the temporal affairs of the nations.

While the Frankish rulers were quarreling among themselves, the Saracens were making more frequent raids upon the coasts of Provence and Italy. Already they had ravaged Nice and Civitavecchia.[27] In 831 they made themselves master of Palermo and advanced into Sicily. The whole seacoast of Italy was threatened. Who would rise up to undertake the defense of the alarmed population. Emperor Lothaire was absorbed by the strife with his brothers; the petty principalities of Italy, unwilling to submit to any common authority and nearly always at war with one another, were practically unconcerned with the defense of their country and of Christendom. The pope alone represented in Italy, not only the Church, but the Italian fatherland. The eyes of the people turned to him. Gregory IV answered this call. He fortified the city of Ostia and there constructed the fortress of Gregoriopolis, which is still standing. He had started to fortify the city of Rome on the side of St. Peter's, when death overtook him.

Papal Intervention

Meanwhile the affairs of the Frankish rulers called for his intervention. The breaking of the act of partition of 817 by

[27] *Annales regni,* anno 813.

Louis the Pious, under the influence of Judith of Bavaria, in favor of their young son Charles, the unpopularity of the young Empress, who was charged with most abominable crimes, and the blundering demarkation of the new allotment made to Charles,[28] rallied almost the whole population on the side of Louis the German and Lothaire. Until the excesses of the rebellious sons of the Emperor elicited public sympathy for the unfortunate monarch, their revolt seemed to be the cause of justice and morality and likewise the people's cause. Then this party was favored by the almost unanimous pronouncement of the most eminent members of the priesthood and of the episcopacy, the Archbishop of Reims as also the Archbishop of Lyons, the Bishop of Vienne and the Abbot of Corbie. The place of the head of Christendom seemed indicated. Gregory IV did not interfere until the very last extremity. We might say he was led to this intervention, rather than say he interfered. On an Alsatian plain near Colmar in 833, the two armies were face to face, ready to hurl themselves on each other, when the Supreme Pontiff, accompanied by Lothaire, arrived on the scene. He had sent ahead a noble and dignified letter, in which, replying to some bishops of the Emperor's party who had sent him a disrespectful and threatening note, he said: "You should not forget that the government of souls, which belongs to the supreme pontiff, is greater than the imperial power, which is temporal." [29] When intervening in the discord of the rulers, Gregory was aware that he was acting only in the interest of peace; he thought that no rôle was more fitting to his mission as father of all Christian peoples.

We know how his noble hopes were frustrated. The party

[28] The portion granted to Prince Charles, who later became Charles the Bald, included the two banks of the Upper Rhine, Alamannia, Rhetia, Alsace, and part of Burgundy; thus some of the Germans were separated from their racial kindred and were amalgamated with the Gauls and Romans.

[29] *PL*, CIV, 299.

defending the Pope was victorious, but by means quite different from those which the Pope intended to employ, means that dishonored the cause of the Emperor's rebel sons. Gregory left this field of Colmar, which history rightly calls the Field of Lies, with an embittered heart.[30] From that hour popular sympathy returned to the unhappy Emperor. Shortly afterward, the very excess of his misfortune and the detestable conduct of Lothaire detached from the latter's cause his warmest partisans.

Council of Compiègne

Three months after the scene on the Field of Lies an assembly of lords and prelates chosen by Lothaire met at Compiègne and declared Emperor Louis dethroned. The weak sovereign bowed before the decision of this unauthorized assembly. In St. Medard's Church at Soissons he knelt before the altar upon a haircloth stretched on the floor, and in trembling voice recited the formula of a public confession that had

[30] Voltaire (*General History and State of Europe,* chap. 22) and later Henri Martin (*Hist. de France,* II, 395 ff.) sharply criticized Gregory IV's intervention in the political affairs of the Empire. They maintain: 1. that this intervention was decided by motives of personal ambition; 2. that, to oppose it, the angered Frankish bishops thought of substituting for the régime of the papal monarchy the régime of an ecclesiastical aristocracy; 3. that, to defend his cause, Gregory IV relied upon spurious documents, the very ones that were used in forming the False Decretals. But an impartial study of the documents proves, on the contrary: 1. that the Pope intervened, not of his own volition, but upon the advice of serious men, and that for a time he even resisted their urgent entreaties; this is the explicit testimony of Paschasius Radbertus (*Vita Walae; PL,* CXX, 1635); 2. that the Frankish bishops, as a whole, did not at all take the attitude which these critics allege; it was only the party of Louis the Pious, assembled by the Emperor at Worms, that protested in violent language against the coming of the Pope and threatened to depose him; as a biographer of Louis the Pious says, they even spoke of excommunicating him (*si excommunicaturus adveniret, excommunicatus abiret*); *PL,* CIV, 299; it was precisely on the occasion of these threats, that the Pope wrote the letter mentioned above; 3. that Pope Gregory IV, in defending his rights, had no need to employ the False Decretals or spurious documents; the spiritual and temporal authority of the Holy See was sufficiently established by the most authentic texts and traditions. We will return to this last point when we take up the question of the False Decretals.

been written out by his accusers. Then, after taking off his military baldric and receiving from Bishop Ebbo the gray robe of penitents, he was led as a prisoner to the monastery of St. Denis. But a majority of the clergy rose up in favor of the deposed Emperor. Indignation broke out against the cowardly prelates who had condemned him. Nothing could be more bitter than the invectives of the historian Thegan against the infamous Ebbo, that son of a serf, freed by Charlemagne, whom Louis had loved as a brother and who was made a traitor by his despicable ambition. Louis the Pious was restored to his rights, and a meeting of prelates, assembled at St. Denis, annulled the acts of what it called the conventicle of Compiègne.

Louis was unable to maintain his authority. New partitions led to new quarrels. He died in 840, leaving the Empire a prey to the worst feuds. Three years later, four armies, in which nearly all the nations of Christendom were represented, met in conflict at Fontenay. Again we see the intervention of Gregory IV, still striving to prevent a fratricidal war. But the negotiations were fruitless and the formidable conflict could not be avoided. At Gregory's death (January 11, 844), the dismemberment of the Empire was consummated by the Treaty of Verdun.

Pope Sergius II (844–847)

Fifteen days later, the notables and the people met,[31] and chose as his successor the archpriest Sergius. He was an old man. Born in Rome and in childhood left an orphan by the deaths of his father and mother, Sergius was brought up in the *schola cantorum* of the pontifical palace. Popes St. Leo III, Stephen IV, Paschal I, and Gregory IV showed much confidence in him. No sooner was his election ended, than a group

[31] *Cum proceres et romanae urbis optimates universusque Ecclesiae populus pro eligendo pontifice in unum coissent. Lib. pont.*, II, 86.

of the common people acclaimed a certain deacon John as pope, rushed to the Lateran Palace, broke open the doors, and invaded the place with armed force. The crowd was driven out by the nobles, who took Sergius to his church of St. Martin and installed him with great honors in the Basilica of St. Peter. In the disorder of the political and social institutions, the papal office had remained the power most coveted. It aroused the cupidity of the different parties.

Sergius' first acts, such as his biographer records them, indicate a firm resolve to defend the rights of the Holy See with energy. Emperor Lothaire, angered because the Pontiff had been consecrated and installed without his participation, sent an embassy to Rome, with his oldest son Louis and his uncle Drogon bishop of Metz at its head, to protest against the violation of his pretended rights. The embassy was accompanied by a large armed force, that began by terrorizing with pillage the inhabitants of the Roman campagna. When the embassy appeared at St. Peter's Basilica, Sergius ordered all the doors closed. Advancing to King Louis, he said to him: "If you come with an honest purpose, for the good of the state and of the Church, I will open the doors to you; otherwise I will not let them be opened." And he allowed the monarch to enter only after receiving a peaceful answer. The King demanded an inquiry, which resulted in the recognition of the regularity of the procedure that had raised Sergius II to the supreme pontificate. Sergius then crowned Louis king of the Lombards. Then Louis asked that the oath be taken as ordered by the Constitution of 824. The aged Pope replied: "If we are asked to take an oath of allegiance to Lothaire, who is emperor, I willingly consent thereto; but if we are asked to take it to Louis, who is only king, neither I nor this Roman nobility can agree to it." [32] He thus clearly indicated that Lothaire's right over Rome was merely a right of protectorate, attached

[32] *Lib. pont.*, II, 90.

to the imperial office, and not a right of sovereignty, connected with the title of king. But often it is easier to resist a threatening potentate face to face than to hold out against the perpetual solicitations of a friendly and daily influence. Sergius had a brother, ambitious and rapacious, who knew how to bend the none too firm will of the aged Pontiff and also to win the favor of Emperor Lothaire. He was appointed bishop of Albano by the favor of the Pope and given the full powers of *missus* by the favor of the Emperor. His name was Benedict. Says the *Liber pontificalis:* "He was boorish, ignorant, and coarse." [33] He governed the Roman States despotically under his brother's name. It was a reign of simony at Rome. During the three years of this régime, civil and ecclesiastical offices were sold to the highest bidder.[34] Then, continues the *Liber pontificalis,* "as no one had the courage to rise up against this tyranny since everyone trembled before it, since no one seemed to remember that it is better to die with honor than to live in shame, the Lord, looking upon the infamy of the Church which He had redeemed with His own blood, manifested His justice by sending the scourge of the infidel races." [35]

In 846 the Saracens of Africa came to the very gates of Rome, sacked the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, both of them at that period outside the walls, ravaged the Roman campagna, near Gaeta routed an army under the command of the Duke of Spoleto, and encamped at the foot of Monte Cassino. They were diverted from that memorable holy place by a torrential rain. But, says the monastic chronicle, "as they

[33] *Pontificis frater, nomine Benedictus, brutus et stolidus valde, qui propter imbecillitatem illius pontificis curam ecclesiasticam et publicam immerito usurpaverat. Cum esset insulsus et operibus rusticis deditus. Lib. pont.,* II, 97.

[34] *Per triennium, haeresis nefandissima simoniaca, et in tantum viguit ut publice venumdarentur episcopia, et qui plus daret ille susciperet episcopatum. Lib. pont.,* II, 98.

[35] *Lib. pont.,* II, 98 f.

went off they gnashed their teeth and bit their fingers," [36] as though meditating atrocious reprisals against heaven.

All Christendom was shaken with indignation at news of this. The Apostle St. Peter had been assailed in his own sanctuary by the soldiers of Mohammed; the ancient basilicas that Rome was so proud of had been polluted by the presence of the crescent. Truly Christian souls bowed before the divine justice. A great assembly of the Franks decided that a three days' fast must be performed by all the faithful to draw down the blessings of God upon a general expedition against the Saracens. The prayers of the Christian people were heard. The expedition took place in 847. The Saracens were driven from Italy, if not finally, at least completely. The weak Pope Sergius died on January 27, 847, and on Easter Sunday (April 10) was succeeded by the holy and great Leo IV.

Pope St. Leo IV (847–855)

Leo IV was good, generous, zealous for justice, combining the simplicity of the dove with the wisdom of the serpent.[37] He was a Roman and had been brought up in St. Martin's monastery, where he became the most regular of the monks. Gregory IV, impressed by his merits, called him to him. Sergius II ordained him priest and made him pastor of the Church of the Four Crowned Martyrs. There it was the clergy and people sent for him and, on the day after Sergius' death even before the deceased Pope's body was buried, entrusted the government of the Church to him.[38] Fear of an imminent irruption of the Saracens brought about this precipitate elec-

[36] *Chron. Cass.*, Bk. I, chap. 27. Cf. *Annales fuldenses; Hist. des Gaules*, VII, 64, 158, 161.

[37] *Extitit largus, pius . . . , amator justitiae . . . , in cujus beatissimo pectore et serpentis astutia et simplicitas inhabitabat columbae. Lib. pont.*, II, 106.

[38] *Lib. pont.*, II, 107.

tion, which Rome had no reason to regret. The throng was instinctively drawn to him who was the most capable of defending it in the midst of the perils. But his consecration was delayed. Should confirmation by the Emperor be obtained first? The recollection of the Emperor's grievous complaints when Pope Sergius was elected and of the devastations by his army at the very walls of Rome, made many incline rather to an affirmative solution, which violated the Christian conscience of others. During the period of hesitation, the report spread that the Saracens were approaching. This was the cause or pretext for the consecration that was as hasty as was the election and that took place on April 10, Easter Sunday.

These popular panics were not groundless. By the mouths of five big rivers (the Tiber, the Rhone, the Loire, the Seine, and the Rhine), the Saracens and the Normans, encouraged by the internal disorder of the Empire, were invading Europe. In 846, Norman pirates made themselves masters of nearly all of Frisia.[39] Others carried on their raids along the Seine and advanced toward Paris.[40] By the Loire, others reached Tours, driving back the frightened people toward the Midi. At the same time, Danish forces, passing round Spain, entered the mouth of the Rhone and established their headquarters in the Camargue.[41] Some years later (860), in company with the Saracens, they set out from there to pillage the city of Pisa and to lay waste the Italian coast.

Even more menacing were the Saracen bands that, in 842, sailed up the Rhone to Arles and the Tiber to Rome, settled down in Apulia in 840 at Bari,[42] and spread out from there, bearing terror in all directions.

[39] *Annales Bertiniani,* year 841; Nithard, Bk. IV; *Hist. des Gaules,* VII, 64, 152, 164, 380.

[40] *Ann. Bert.,* year 857.

[41] Poupardin, *Le royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens,* p. 25.

[42] *Chronicon salern.,* pp. 72–81.

Feudal Anarchy

The feudal anarchy did but increase. Only Charlemagne's strong hand had been able to maintain a little order in that chaos. In 845, the Duke of Provence and Count of Arles, Solocrat, and all the nobles of the district withdrew from the Empire and declared their independence, under the leadership of the celebrated Gerard de Roussillon, whose *chansons de geste* made him the hero of feudalism.[43] At the same time Nomenoe the duke of the Bretons proclaimed himself independent and was crowned king.[44] Others, without withdrawing from their suzerain, refused to march under his orders, as, for example, Eundachar, that vassal of Carloman, who, after swearing faith to Emperor Louis and his sons upon the relics of St. Emmeran, declined to move when the hour of departure came, saying: "St. Emmeran, on whose relics I swore, is keeping my shield and lance." [45] Sometimes the feudalists went farther, even to the point of felony and treason. In 835, two Italian lords, Siconulfus and Radelgisus, both claimed the duchy of Benevento and, to defend their cause, even appealed to the sworn enemies of the Christian name. Radelgisus called to his aid the Saracens of Africa. Seeing this, Siconulfus asked the help of the Saracens of Spain.

Emperor Lothaire became more and more unconcerned with Christendom, in particular with the city of Rome, and began a life of debauchery, the scandal of which broke out in 853 at the death of Empress Ermengarde.[46] The Romans com-

[43] Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* I, 192 f.

[44] The declaration of independence took place in 845. Nomenoe was not crowned until 848, a year after the coming of St. Leo IV.

[45] Quoted in Monnier, *Histoire des luttes politiques et religieuses dans les temps carolingiens,* p. 232.

[46] *Defuncta christianissima Ermengarda, duas sibi ancillas ex villa Vegia copulavit . . . aliique filii ejus similiter adulteriis inserviunt. Annales Bertiniani; Hist. des Gaules,* VII, 70.

plained of this neglect.[47] The betrothal of Louis the German with the famous Engelberga, celebrated in 851,[48] aggravated the situation by making the Easterners unfriendly to the West [49] and especially by placing intrigue and misconduct on the throne.

The harmful influence of Benedict, brother of Sergius II, had put unworthy ministers into ecclesiastical offices. The disciplinary canons promulgated by Pope Eugenius II, after the Council of 826, were no longer observed by a large number of the clergy.

The threefold aim of Leo IV's pontificate was to defend Rome and Christendom against enemies from without, to resist the plots and violence of the imperial power, and to restore ecclesiastical discipline.

The greatness of St. Leo IV's part in the defense of Rome against the Saracens evoked the admiration even of Voltaire. He says:

In this critical conjuncture Pope Leo IV, assuming an authority which the emperor Lotharius' generals seemed to abandon, showed himself in defending Rome worthy of being its sovereign. He employed the treasures of the Church in repairing walls, raising towers, and stretching iron chains across the Tiber. He armed the militia at his own expense, engaged the inhabitants of Naples and Gaeta to come and defend the coasts and port of Ostia, without neglecting the prudent precaution of taking hostages of them, knowing perfectly well that those who have sufficient strength to assist, are frequently powerful enough to hurt. He visited every post himself and received the Saracens at their descent, not in a military equipage, as Goslin bishop of Paris had done on a more pressing occasion, but as a pontiff that

[47] *Romani quoque arctati Sarracenorum Maurorumque incursionibus, ob sui defensionem omnino neglectam apud imperatorem Lotharium conqueruntur. Hist. des Gaules,* VII, 70.

[48] Boehmer-Mühlbacher, *Regesta,* no. 1148.

[49] *Graeci concitantur contra Ludovicum propter filiam imperatoris constantinopolitani. Annales Bertiniani; Hist. des Gaules,* VII, 70.

exhorted a Christian people, and as a king that watched over the security of his subjects. He was a Roman by birth, and the courage of the early ages of the republic seemed to be revived in him at a time of cowardice and corruption, like one of the beautiful monuments of ancient Rome, which are sometimes found in the ruins of the ancient city.[50]

Emperor Lothaire, who showed himself so insistent upon appearing whenever there was any question of being honored, made no move to appear in person for the defense of Rome and Italy. He merely sent to the Pope, at the latter's request, a money aid to help in the work of fortifications. Leo IV, not content with protecting the city of Rome, rebuilt and fortified several cities in Italy, such as Centumcellae, thereafter called Leopolis, and the city of Porto, where he welcomed a colony of Corsicans who had been despoiled by the Saracens. In 849, to fight the pirates, he favored the expeditions organized by the Italian lords. He tried also to arouse the Frankish lords against the infidels. For this purpose he wrote to them, saying: "Put aside all fear, and fight with courage against the enemies of the faith and the foes of all religion. . . . The Almighty knows that if any one of you dies, it is for the truth of the faith, for the salvation of the fatherland and the defense of Christendom. This is why He decrees the heavenly reward for such a one." [51] Following these measures, the Saracens abandoned their incursions in the direction of Rome and Italy. In a letter written by the Pope in 854 there is a bare mention of some supplementary works.[52] Rome and Italy were saved by St. Leo IV from the Mussulman danger.

But Lothaire and Louis II were not satisfied with giving Christendom, in those painful circumstances, the spectacle of a deplorable inactivity. Inspired perhaps by the sad influence

[50] Voltaire, *General History and State of Europe,* chap. 28.
[51] *PL,* CXV, 655–657.
[52] *Lib. pont.,* II, 126; Jaffé, no. 2620.

of Engelberga, they turned against the Pope with attacks, sometimes underhand and sometimes open, with an opposition that showed itself especially in the matter of the imperial *missi* and in that of the pretended Byzantine conspiracy.

Leo IV's correspondence reveals the Pope's repeated complaints against certain legates of Louis II, who strangely abused their diplomatic authority. They exacted ransom from pilgrims going to Rome and endeavored to corrupt the papal officials by money or threats. Two of them, Peter and Adrian, in concert with a certain Duke George, brother of the Bishop of Ravenna, conducted themselves as real brigands, not stopping at pillage or murder.[53] They were convicted of assassinating the papal legate to the court of Lothaire. Leo IV protested, demanded that justice be done; then, seeing his complaints futile, he decided to act. He ordered the arrest of Peter, Adrian, and their chief accomplices, who were judged according to Roman law and condemned to death.

The Emperor presented a bitter protest that the Constitution of 824 was not observed. The Pope halted the carrying out of the death sentence, but withdrew none of his lawful claims to the right to render justice in the Papal States. Writing to Emperor Louis the German, he says: "You must know that we do not allow anyone to oppress our subjects, but, if the need arises, we inflict prompt punishment for outrages inflicted upon them, because in everything we must be the defenders of the flock confided to our care." [54]

This was in 853. Two years later another incident revived the conflict. Although powerless to maintain order in that section known as Byzantine Italy, although largely abandoned by their vassals or allies, whose dependence had become purely nominal, the Byzantine emperors saw their connection with

[53] See the letters to Duke George (Jaffé, 2627); to King Charles the Bald (Jaffé, 2625); to the Bishop of Ravenna (Jaffé, 2628).

[54] *PL*, CXV, 669. Cf. *ibid.*, 657.

the Italian peninsula strengthened in another way. "If recent figures are to be accepted, 50,000 priests, monks, or laymen, who had emigrated from the East during the iconoclast quarrel, strengthened the Greek element in Italy. In Calabria alone about two hundred Basilian monasteries date from this period. The Emperor attached to the patriarchate of Constantinople the bishoprics of this district, and the monasteries, centers of literary culture, spread the Byzantine culture about them." [55]

The Greek influence was further spread in Italy by the big commercial cities, such as Naples, Amalfi, Gaeta, and Venice, which, by their banks in the East, were clients of the Empire. Venice furnished the Emperor with auxiliary troops and even with fleets to help him in his fight against the Saracens. Cordial relations with the court of Constantinople were therefore not to be neglected. They were seriously endangered in 851 by the betrothal of Louis II and Engelberga, an agreement that was notorious because of the contempt for a promise of marriage given to the daughter of Emperor Michael III. In the meantime a report spread that one of the great dignitaries of the Roman court was conspiring in favor of the Greeks against the Empire. The governor of the papal palace, Gratian, was reported as saying: "The Franks are good for nothing. Why not call in the Greeks and, with their help, drive out the Franks and their kings?" Louis II arrived unexpectedly at Rome, furious and threatening, without sending word of his coming to the Pope or the Roman aristocracy.[56]

Without excitement, Leo IV requested and obtained the introduction of a judicial inquiry, which was conducted according to the rules of Roman procedure. This was his right, according to the Constitution of 824. Following this inquiry, the denouncer of Gratian, a certain Daniel, master of the militia,

[55] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 649.

[56] *Sine litteris etiam ad romanum directis pontificem et senatum,* says the *Liber pontificalis* (II, 134). This mention of the senate indicates here the place taken in Rome by the aristocracy.

was convicted of false testimony. Out of deference to the Emperor, who interceded in behalf of the convicted man, the Pontiff granted him pardon. But it was the complete collapse of the conspiracy. The favor subsequently extended to Daniel by the Emperor and the Empress leads us to suppose that the imperial couple were not strangers to this machination worthy of the wicked genius of Engelberga.

These weighty matters never diverted the holy Pontiff from his dominant purpose: to preserve holy Church from the corruption of the age, more and more to imbue bishops and priests with the spirit of the Gospel. We find valuable traces of this purpose in two councils, one held at Pavia in 850, the other at Rome in 853. The Roman council did little else than repeat the thirty-eight canons of the Roman council of 826.[57] It added only four new canons regarding minor disorders. The Council of Pavia,[58] held in the presence of Emperor Louis, regulated the duties and rights of bishops, archpriests, deans, city priests, and country priests. It was remarked that many worldly bishops used to give sumptuous dinners, accompanied by entertainments in which jesters took part. The council reminded bishops that their place was in the midst of the poor and the lowly when they were not in their church for prayer or in their house for work and for conference with their priests. Terrible anathemas were issued against usurers. A layman guilty of usury was to be excommunicated, a cleric was to be removed from office.

The Pope's health was exhausted by so many labors; his approaching end could be foreseen. Then it was that an idea seems to have formed in the resourceful mind of the intriguing Engelberga: to put in the papacy a candidate favorable to the Empire.

[57] Mansi, XIV, 997 ff.
[58] *Ibid.*, 929 ff.

The Apocrisiary Arsenius

Among the officials of the papal court, where the shameful dominance of Sergius II's brother had introduced several men who were capable of playing the unworthy part which the Emperor needed, was found a prelate whose morals were utterly removed from such as become a cleric, but whose outward bearing was as correct as was necessary to disarm his defamers. His name was Arsenius. He belonged to one of the greatest families of the Roman aristocracy. Bishop of Orta, holding the office of *missus,* for some time past he had been Louis II's agent at Rome. For him was created the office of apocrisiary of the Holy See, and in his hands were placed all the affairs of state. Hincmar of Reims, whose perspicacity had thoroughly penetrated that vile soul, spoke indignantly of his trickery and cupidity.[59] Arsenius had two sons, whom we shall see playing a very important part in the pontificates of Benedict III, Nicholas I, and Adrian II. One of them, Eleutherius, remained in the world. The other, Anastasius, intended for the ecclesiastical state, received a most careful training, thanks to which he became one of the best educated men of his time. Already he had been promoted to the first sacred orders when Leo IV was raised to the supreme pontificate. The new Pope ordained him priest in 848 and made him pastor of the Church of St. Marcellus. Anastasius thus became a cardinal-priest and, according to the canons of the Church, eventually a candidate for the papacy. It may very well be that already his family had definite ambitions for him.

[59] *Annales Bertiniani,* years 867, 868. John the Deacon and St. Nicholas I give the same testimony; *PL,* LXXV, 207; CXIX, 1178. The *Annales Bertiniani* are one of the most reliable sources for the history of the ninth century and fortunately supplement the *Liber pontificalis* and the *Regesta* of the popes. They have had three revisers: from 830 to 835, an unknown person; from 835 to 861, St. Prudentius bishop of Troyes; from 861 to 899, Hincmar archbishop of Reims. The best edition is that of Father Dehaisnes, in the collection of the *Société de l'hist. de France.*

But, from the time of his ordination until the death of Leo IV, his life offers a mystery that is still unexplained. Scarcely had he entered into possession of his title, when Anastasius left Rome and sought refuge in the states of Louis II. The Pope repeatedly urged his return to Rome. But still he did not come back. Louis II, obliged to surrender him, took refuge in delays and insincere excuses. Anastasius was anathematized, excommunicated by several councils, but still could not be found. Was he engaged in hatching plots? Evidently at Rome they supposed so, because an anathema was published against anyone who would dare to aid Anastasius in seizing the papacy.[60] To give greater solemnity to its decrees and probably to forewarn the clergy and faithful against any electoral campaign by Anastasius, Leo IV posted, above the principal door of St. Peter's in Rome, around a large image of Christ and the Blessed Virgin, the condemnations successively pronounced against the contumelious priest.

On July 15, 855, after a painful but fruitful pontificate of eight years, St. Leo IV was called to God.

Election of St. Leo IV's Successor

The *Liber pontificalis* tells us that, after Pope Leo's death, the electors unanimously called to the papacy the priest Benedict, pastor of the Church of St. Cecilia. What is likely is that the partisans of Anastasius made some showing in favor of their candidate, if only to sound out the general opinion. At any rate, two deputies, Nicholas bishop of Anagni and Mercury master of the militia, set out to notify the Emperor of the new election. On the way they met Bishop Arsenius, who tried to win them over to the cause of his son Anastasius. After all, Benedict had not yet been consecrated; there was

[60] *Annales Bertiniani,* year 868.

time to reconsider the election and to make a better choice. The deputies were disturbed. The Emperor decided that he would give his reply by a special embassy. This embassy, having reached a point forty miles from Rome, also met Arsenius, accompanied by some followers, clergy and warriors. Partly by scaring them and partly by persuasion, Arsenius completely won the imperial ambassadors to the cause of his son. A little farther on, Anastasius himself joined them. As they proceeded their numbers increased by the addition of all the partisans of the imperial régime, all the malcontents, whom Arsenius and his followers seduced. Some envoys of Benedict whom they met, were handled roughly. In short, it was with an escort of followers that Anastasius arrived before Rome. His entry was triumphal and insolent. When passing before St. Peter's, Anastasius took an axe and hurled it violently against the image of the Blessed Virgin, around which were posted the decrees of excommunication against him. They poured into the Lateran Basilica, where they found the pope-elect. He was seized, stripped of his vestments, and placed in the custody of two priests, John and Adrian, who had already been deposed by Pope Leo IV.

It was Saturday. The next day the bishops, clergy, and people were convoked in the Emilian Basilica. The Emperor's legates attended. They were seen in the apse, then circulating among the electors with raised sword, and crying out: "Proceed and take Anastasius for pope." In the presence of such violence, the clergy and people recovered their spirit and gave an example of remarkable firmness. In sight of the threatening swords, an immense throng cried out: "Anastasius is an excommunicated priest, Anastasius is not eligible." Some bishops exclaimed that they would be cut in pieces rather than violate the laws of the Church. Then, says the biographer of Benedict III, the people of the Emperor's side were seen exchanging a few words in German and then withdrawing.

Pope Benedict III (855–858)

Three days later Benedict was again elected. The next Sunday (September 1, 855) he was consecrated at St. Peter's in the presence of the imperial legates. Benedict reigned two and a half years. He was a gentle, pious pontiff. The throng of people that brought him the news of the election found him at prayer. Although his private virtues were praised by his foes as well as by his friends, he was without that remarkable energy possessed by his predecessor, and the early days of his pontificate seemed to retain the impression of the scenes of terror that marked his election. He kept the Bishop of Orta in the office of *missus* and of apocrisiary. He had Anastasius again condemned by a synod, but he admitted him to lay communion and provided him with the Abbey of St. Mary in Trastevere. After three years passed in the exercises of the religious life and in study, Anastasius reappeared in public life where, without further hope of obtaining the tiara, he attempted at least to rule the papacy.

Among the first acts of Benedict III's short pontificate we must cite the conditional approval given to the decisions of the Council of Soissons, held in 853 under the presidency of Hincmar of Reims.[61] Some expressions of this council seem to grant to a metropolitan certain powers without appeal, independent of the authority of the supreme pontiff. St. Leo IV had refused to approve it, and St. Nicholas I condemned it severely. Benedict III judged it proper to confirm it with reservations as to the rights of the Holy See.[62]

Other acts, in which we may see the influence of his faithful collaborator the deacon Nicholas, are the expression of a firmer policy. He summoned before him a brother of Queen Teutberga, who had invaded the monasteries of St. Maurice

[61] Mansi, XIV, 977 ff.
[62] Jaffé, 2664.

and of Luxeuil;[63] he protested against the laity of Great Britain, who had driven bishops from their sees;[64] he ordered Patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople to send him the documents of a trial brought against the Archbishop of Syracuse;[65] he invited all the Christian princes to compel Ingeltruda, wife of Count Boso, to return to her husband's roof.[66]

Benedict III died August 17, 858. Before dying, he foresaw the tempest that was preparing for the Church in the East, where the machinations of Emperor Michael the Drunkard and his uncle, the unworthy Bardas, had just placed in the patriarchal see of Constantinople that gifted impostor whose name was Photius.

The Eastern Emperor might suppose that the success of his policy was assured. His candidate for the papacy was all ready. The imperial favor was now extended to a man whose learning and morals could give offense to no one. It was the deacon Nicholas, who had been Benedict III's chief helper and who, in the exercise of his office, had shown very high diplomatic qualities.[67] The name of the deacon Nicholas rallied the support of all. And the Christian people had no reason to regret this choice. St. Nicholas I was one of the most untiring defenders of the rights of the Church, one of the purest glories of the papacy.

[63] *Ibid.*, 2669.
[64] *Ibid.*, 2671.
[65] *Ibid.*, 2667.
[66] *Ibid.*, 2673.
[67] On the official character of this candidature, the testimony of St. Prudentius bishop of Troyes is explicit: *Praesentia magis ac favore Ludovici Regis et procerum ejus quam cleri electione substituitur. Annales Bertiniani,* year 858.

CHAPTER XV

Pope St. Nicholas I (858–867)

THE new Pope, whom the Emperor treated as a friend,[1] was the son of a government official and was connected with the upper Roman aristocracy. In the earliest account of his life, we read: "He had a noble bearing, distinguished features, learned speech, and an air of modesty. Strict with himself, he was fond of living in prayer and fasting; he was generous to the poor, and the welfare of the people always found him their earnest defender." [2] At St. Peter's, amid enthusiastic acclamations, the people understood that they had obtained from Providence the energetic leader, the kind father, the saint, which the Christian world needed at that hour.

Besides the imperial danger, which was still threatening, besides the feudal danger, which was continually growing, there was now, since the elevation of Photius to the see of Constantinople, a Byzantine danger that had an altogether new gravity. Nicholas I withstood these three dangers.

The Papacy and the Empire

After so many negotiations, crowned by several solemn pacts, the relations between the papacy and the Empire remained poorly determined and were subject to dubious interpretations. When the emperor tried so earnestly to confirm the election of the pope, when the pope demanded so keenly the privilege of crowning the emperor, the precise question at

[1] The *Liber pontificalis* (II, 152) relates that the Emperor, after the consecration ceremony, ate with him, and they embraced each other with great affection.

[2] *Lib. pont.*, II, 162.

issue was to know which of the two was the vassal of the other; and, under the last popes, when the office of legate and of apocrisiary of the Holy See were exercised by a creature of the emperor, it seemed that the part of sovereign belonged to the emperor.

In the first days of his pontificate, Nicholas I, simply by his way of acting, without infringing in any respect, by observing all the diplomatic forms, took an independent attitude that excluded any idea of his being a vassal.

Ascending the pontifical throne, his mind graven with memories of the past, the attitude assumed from the very first by Nicholas will also be intelligible to us. From the outset his firm resolve seems to have been to do away with the uncertainty, the vagueness, that he was painfully conscious of in the existing situation. . . . The Emperor, who had but just left Rome, hurried back. . . . It was his influence that decided the election. The *Liber pontificalis* graphically depicts the independent attitude, that of a superior, at once assumed by the newly-elected Pontiff. The city was wreathed with garlands of flowers, the people, the clergy rejoiced. The Pontiff admitted the Emperor to private conference by inviting him to partake of dinner with him. In this privacy, he is said to have lavished marks of affection on the Emperor, and to have embraced him with a father's love for a son. The past was set aside; the new order, the new relationship had begun. Today, it is not vassal and suzerain who meet; or, if vassal there be, it is the Emperor. The dinner over, the Emperor withdraws to his camp, but the Pope, in his affection, quickly follows to pay him a visit.

Louis receives him with the utmost friendship, loads him with gifts and, not only goes out to meet him when he arrives, but holds his horse's bridle and accompanies him as far as the flight of an arrow, both when he arrives and when he departs. No pope since Adrian I has been so honored by an emperor. All the nobility of Rome witness the scene; all understand that the Pope, "beautiful of face, tall of stature, severe of life, generous of custom," has assumed the rank he means to hold in the world.[3]

[3] Jules Roy, *St. Nicholas I*, p. 52.

But this was merely the initial gesture of a policy that would lead to more effective acts.

Lothaire's Divorce

Lothaire king of Lorraine, son of Emperor Lothaire I and consequently nephew of Emperor Louis the German, had divorced his wife Teutberga, the daughter of Boso, and married Waldrade. In justification of his conduct, he claimed that his first marriage was null on account of the incestuous relations of Teutberga with one of his brothers. No proof whatever was adduced to support this charge. But the King was set upon winning his case at any cost. He gained part of the Frankish nobles to his side. A court, made up of the notables of the kingdom (859), sentenced Queen Teutberga to the ordeal of boiling water. This ordeal, however, was favorable to her.[4] Lothaire by his promises then succeeded in seducing two bishops, Gunther of Cologne and Thietgaud of Trier, who in turn corrupted several of their fellow-bishops. In 860 an assembly of bishops, at Aachen, extorted from the unhappy Queen an avowal of her supposed crime and sentenced her to confinement in a convent. But soon Teutberga escaped, retracted her confession, denounced the coercion practiced upon her, and appealed to the pope. A large number of independent bishops honorably complained of the methods of intimidation employed against the Queen.

Hincmar of Reims, despite his well-known attachment to

[4] The ordeal of boiling water consisted in plunging a finger or hand or the arm into a caldron of hot water and lifting out of the caldron a ring or some other object that had been thrown into the water. The accused person was allowed to undergo the ordeal by proxy. Thus it was in the case of Teutberga, who obtained a substitute for the ordeal. These ordeals, which Charlemagne recommended for the purpose of ending wars and quarrels, which Hincmar championed, but which Agobard vigorously attacked, were plainly condemned by the popes in the twelfth century. Vacandard, "L'Église et les ordalies," in *Études de critique et d'hist. rel.*, pp. 191–215.

the national dynasty, had the courage to place the question before the bar of public opinion by the publication of his book *De divortio Lotharii.* In this he took up the defense of Queen Teutberga and openly declared that in such an affair nothing could be decided without the assent of the Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all the Churches.[5] The Pope sent two legates, who took part in the national council convoked at Metz by Lothaire to settle the question. The method of governmental coercion, which previously had made almost everyone acquiesce, got the upper hand even of the legates. They made common cause with the bishops. The decision reached at Aachen was confirmed. The cause of public morality seemed lost.

But they had failed to take into account the energy of Pope Nicholas. The Pontiff summoned the case to his tribunal and assembled a council at Rome, which quashed the decisions of the Council of Metz. The Bishop of Cologne and the Bishop of Trier (Gunther and Thietgaud) were deposed. Neither the pleas of Lothaire, whose urgent petitions were inspired by the ardor of a guilty passion, nor the arrival at Rome of an army which Emperor Louis commanded in person and which lay siege to the city, shook the Pope's determination. Lothaire dismissed Waldrade and took back his lawful wife.

But soon the unhappy Teutberga, overwhelmed with insults and ill treatment by her husband, asked the Pope to declare the rupture of a bond which she regarded as intolerable. Nicholas was mindful that he had taken up the defense of Lothaire's marital bond not for the satisfaction of a queen, but for the safeguarding of a superior principle of justice. He did not yield to the Queen's entreaties. To his very last hour he fought and died in the struggle. After the Pope's death, Lothaire made reparation at Monte Cassino.

[5] *PL,* CXXV, 623.

The Rothade Affair

In the matter of Lothaire's divorce the Pope had on his side the finer portion of the episcopacy, notably the illustrious Hincmar of Reims, the glory of his age. It was against the great bishop that the Pope had to contend in the affair of Rothade.

In 861, at a provincial council, the Archbishop of Reims suspended from office his suffragan Rothade bishop of Soissons, guilty of having unjustly deposed a priest and of having mismanaged the property of the Church. Rothade appealed his case to Rome. Nicholas I, in spite of a very able and learned defense by Hincmar, in spite of the support which the Archbishop of Reims received from Charles the Bald, obliged Hincmar to restore Rothade to office and directed him to proclaim that a bishop can never be deposed without the assent of the Holy See. Hincmar, in relating this incident in his *Annals,* is unable to refrain from expressing his bitter resentment.[6] But again the cause of the papacy and of justice was victorious.

Hincmar has sometimes been called the father of Gallicanism and the Bossuet of the ninth century. May we not consider the issue of these two affairs of Lothaire's divorce and of the trial of Rothade as a victory of the papacy over the first two manifestations of Gallicanism? May we not perceive Caesarian Gallicanism in the affair of the royal divorce, and episcopal Gallicanism in the trial of the Bishop of Soissons?

Archbishop John of Ravenna

In Italy, closer to the pope, the feudal lay lords and sometimes the feudal ecclesiastical lords took advantage of the

[6] *Rothadum a Nicolao papa non regulariter sed potentialiter restitutum. Annales Bertiniani,* year 865.

anarchy to terrorize the country, to fight against one another, and to extort money from the poor people. The most dreaded of all was John archbishop of Ravenna, who had the bearing of a warrior rather than of a prelate. According to his whim he seized the property of the clergy and of laymen, despoiled beneficiaries of their titles, deposed clerics without any legal formality, laid violent hands upon property of the Holy See, stubbornly refused to present himself at councils, and utterly flouted the Pope's authority, bragging that he had the Emperor's support. Nicholas had no hesitation in starting a contest with him. Upon John's repeated refusal to attend a synod, the Pope issued major excommunication against him.

The *Liber pontificalis* gives us a picture of the city of Ravenna after the papal decree; it shows us what was then the moral authority of the supreme pontiff and the respect for the spiritual penalties inflicted by the Holy See. Everybody turned aside from the excommunicated person and closed his door against him; tradesmen refused to serve him; from as far away as he could be seen on a street or a public square in company with an escort of his followers, people cried out: "Here are the excommunicated ones." [7] John then turned to the Emperor, who at first advised him to submit to the Pope, "whom the whole Church obeys." However, at John's urgent request, Louis II agreed to intercede for him with the Pope. But this was in vain. John then feigned to submit. Like all men whose conscience has been stifled by ambition, with hypocritical exaggeration he made his submission, which the Pope deigned to accept. But soon it was evident that no real change had taken place in the government of Ravenna. Large groups of the oppressed people of Ravenna brought their grievances to Rome.

Nicholas then came to an energetic decision. He went in person to Ravenna and there, exercising the right of direct

[7] *Lib. pont.*, II, 156.

and immediate intervention which the Church has always recognized as belonging to the pope, he received the complaints of the laity and clergy, passed judgment as a final court of appeal upon the cases brought before him, ordered the restitution of stolen property, changed the administrative personnel wherever he judged it useful to do so: in short, he commanded as master in Ravenna. Crushed by this bold stroke, John again submitted. But it appears that this second submission was no more sincere than the first. His contumacy was overcome only by his deposition at the Council of the Lateran.

The Pope's Popularity

While St. Nicholas made unworthy princes of the Church tremble, he became more and more cherished by the faithful. The people, understanding that love of justice was the sole motive of the Pontiff's decisions, came to him from all sides and set forth their grievances to him or asked his counsel. St. Nicholas was a great administrator of justice, as were St. Gregory the Great and St. Louis.

In the measure in which the Carolingian Empire broke up, that of Constantinople shone with new brilliancy. In 856, after the quieting of the iconoclast dispute by the great Empress Theodora, when Michael the Drunkard, her unworthy son, succeeded her on the throne, the Byzantine Empire experienced a veritable political, literary, and artistic renaissance. By favor of the Western decadence, the Eastern statesmen hoped again to grasp the rule of the world, and the writers made a pretense of restoring the high culture of ancient Hellenism. Caesar Bardas, Theodora's brother, became a patron of scholarly studies. Platonists and Aristotelians engaged in earnest disputes. The most brilliant and active of the frequenters of those literary contests was, at the advent of Mi-

chael III, a young diplomat, thirty-nine years old, who was called Photius.

He was the son of an officer of the imperial guard, grandnephew of the patriarch St. Tarasius, related to the family of the Emperor through one of his uncles who had married the sister of Theodora and Bardas. Thus Photius enjoyed a considerable influence. But he was prouder of the prestige that came to him from his learning. His extant works—the prodigious *Library of Ten Thousand Books,* as he called it, a general and critical summary of all the books he read, a sort of literary journal that has served as a model for many scholars and has never been surpassed—gives us an idea of the extent of his knowledge and the penetration of his mind. Circumstances led him into statecraft. The unmeasured resources displayed by his adaptable and tenacious intellect have prompted some to say that politics and ambition were the great mainsprings of his existence. But, in fact, such was not the case. Photius was a man who considered himself, first of all, an infallible scholar, a superior mind, that everyone had to admire.

We may suppose he was honest in saying that he never had an ambition for the patriarchate. The great passion of his soul was a longing to be esteemed and admired, but for his personal qualities, not from any glory that would accrue to him from outside. He was convinced that he honored the patriarchal see, not that the patriarchal see honored him. It is true that he lied shamelessly, that he falsified texts, that he practiced hypocrisy in the means he employed; yet all this was rather to justify his acts and ideas, that he might avoid humiliation to his vanity, that he might not lose even a particle of the admiration that he judged due him, rather than because he wished to climb a step higher in the career of honors. Such immeasurable and stubborn pride of intellect brings about havoc in a soul and disturbance in a society, no less than do

the madness of sensual passion or the grasping ruthlessness of ambition.[8]

Photius of Constantinople

The man really devoid of morals, the commonplace schemer, was not the eunuch Photius, but Caesar Bardas. Intelligent but skeptical, gifted with real talents as a statesman but vindictive, spiteful, carrying debauchery to the point of cynicism, he made it his great task to corrupt his royal nephew. The court of Constantinople became the scene of orgies impossible to describe.[9] Bardas, raised by Michael to the highest offices, publicly advertised his incestuous relations with his daughter-in-law. On Epiphany, 857, St. Ignatius patriarch of Constantinople, another John the Baptist, reproved him for his crime and, following the rules of the Church, refused him holy communion. Bardas' vengeance burst forth. He extorted from the young Emperor a decree of banishment against Theodora, the empress mother, whom he accused of conniving with the courageous Patriarch, obtained St. Ignatius' exile to an island of Propontus, and had Photius named to replace Ignatius.

Photius always protested that he had done everything possible to avoid that high office. Showered with honors, protospatharius, that is, superior officer in the guard, intimate adviser of the Emperor, universally honored for his learning, Photius, as an expert canonist, also knew quite well that his appointment to the see, which was not lawfully vacant, was null and void. The attempts to make Ignatius resign met with a determined refusal. Finally Photius yielded. He was a layman, it is true, but already it had happened several times that

[8] This psychology of Photius, somewhat different from that usually attributed to him, seems evident from a minute study of his life and writings by Father Lapôtre. See *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 65 f.

[9] This is alluded to in the first edition of Rohrbacher's *History of the Church.* The passage had to be eliminated from the subsequent editions.

laymen were elevated by the emperors to the patriarchal see.[10] The designated successor of Ignatius was tonsured on December 20, 857, and on the days following received all the orders. The second day before Christmas, he was officially elected patriarch by a conventicle held in the imperial palace.

For his consecration, on Christmas Day, there was found an interdicted bishop by the name of Gregory Asbestas. This son of the former Emperor Leo the Armenian was remarkable for haughty pride rather than for apostolic humility. As archbishop of Syracuse he had abandoned his post, following Saracen invasions. He withdrew to Constantinople and there was vexed that Ignatius should forbid his taking part in his consecration. In the Church of St. Sophia he was seen contemptuously to throw down the candle he was holding. From that moment Gregory Asbestas did nothing but conspire. As leader of a little band of malcontents, to which Photius also belonged,[11] Gregory continually opposed the government of the holy Patriarch; hence his interdiction *ab officio* by Pope Benedict III.[12] The rebel Bishop profited by a new occasion that offered, to take revenge upon his former patriarch by consecrating the usurper.

Photius' Hypocrisy

If it is true that Photius accepted his new office against his will, once he was consecrated he completely changed his tactics. Never did anyone maintain his prerogatives more fiercely or pursue his aims with more hypocrisy and greater contempt for honesty and justice.

If we are to take the word of Metrophanes,[13] most of the

[10] Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* V, 440.

[11] Mansi, XV, 415.

[12] Hefele, V, 442.

[13] Metrophanes, in Mansi, XVI, 415. Metrophanes bishop of Smyrna, a contemporary of Photius, is known through the fragmentary remains of a work on the Trinity and from an important letter on the events of his time.

bishops at first declared themselves against the newly elected. Ignatius' rights were so evident that it could not be otherwise. However, by all sorts of means these bishops were won over, one after the other. Finally there remained five bishops who still opposed. Photius disarmed their opposition by proclaiming and declaring in writing that he regarded Ignatius as the most spotless of men, and he would never do anything against him. The first assertion was hypocrisy; the second statement had a dubious significance, letting it be understood that Photius recognized Ignatius' rights and regarded himself merely as a coadjutor subject to Ignatius. The latter, out of love for peace, had said that he would yield to force, if he were given a coadjutor regularly appointed.[14] This equivocation is the only explanation of the great scandal of a whole episcopacy taking the side of the usurper.

But Photius, elated by his triumph, broke his word. He pronounced Ignatius' deposition. The Greek episcopacy then divided into two parties. All the monks followed the party faithful to Ignatius; and the holy Bishop uttered the words that should put an end to every dispute in the Church: "I appeal to the pope, *Ad papam provoco.*" [15] The clever Photius did not intend to remain behind hand. Appeal to the Pope? He himself addressed a cordial letter, a masterpiece of hypocrisy in which, after a profession of purest Catholic faith, he took from the writings of St. Gregory the Great the most touching expressions to deplore his own unworthiness and prostrated himself before the Roman Pontiff, asking for his prayers. Photius was perhaps the most irresistible charmer of men who has appeared in history. He knew it. He could boast that his friends loved him more than they did their parents.[16] A saint like Cyril, the apostle of the Slavs, who had been his pupil and had ex-

[14] Hefele, V, 444.
[15] Cf. Wouters, Vol. II, diss. 28, p. 235.
[16] Photius, Letters, Bk. I, letter 2; *PG,* CII, 601.

perienced the captivating influence of his words, never freed himself from a lively personal sympathy for this man, whose errors he deplored. Photius knew his strength. What he had obtained from the Greek bishops, might he not also obtain from the pope?

While an embassy, sent in the Emperor's name and that of the Patriarch, set out for Rome, loaded with rich gifts, Michael III falsely informed the Supreme Pontiff that the unfortunate Ignatius, under the blow of vague suspicions weighing on him, had withdrawn to a monastery. In short, the Pope was left to surmise that terrible divisions, as aftermaths of the iconoclast dispute, were on the point of breaking out in Constantinople, that a council would be necessary there, that there was urgent need for two delegates to be sent there. The machination was cleverly contrived. If the Pope could be circumvented, they would be able, so they thought, easily to win over his two representatives.

The cautious Pope, as is evident from his reply, was not at first glance able to separate what was true from what was false in these cleverly vague letters. He praised Photius for his orthodoxy, but he blamed him for violating the canons, and he sent to Constantinople two bishops especially commissioned to gather reliable information about the affair of Ignatius. The Pontiff reserved to himself the settlement of the question.[17]

Photius' next important step was to corrupt the legates, Rodoaldus of Porto and Zachary of Anagni. He succeeded in doing so, but not without difficulty. Presents, trickery, threats, all were employed; the two bishops withstood all these efforts. But at last their firmness was overcome by hypocrisy and sophism. In the spring of 861 they passed over to the side of the usurper. The gifts of the Emperor and of Caesar Bardas

[17] St. Nicholas calls these bishops legates *a latere*. It is the first time this expression is met with. Even today the title "legate *a latere*" is applied to a legate chosen from the pope's entourage, *a latere pontificis*, a cardinal legate. Caprara, in 1801, was a legate *a latere*. Jaffé, 2681, 2682, 2683.

crowned their defection. These recreant servants of the Holy See even allowed the falsification of the Pope's letter which they had brought with them.

Photius then hastened to assemble a council of 318 bishops, whom he led into error by having Pope Nicholas' falsified letter read to them. Thus it was thought that the Pope approved the deposition of Ignatius and the election of Photius. In this council, which the Emperor compared to the First Council of Nicaea, Photius was declared to be the lawful patriarch, and Ignatius was condemned as having violated the canons of the Church. Severe measures were then decreed against the monks, who remained the most loyal supporters of the lawful Patriarch. The astute Photius, at the same time that he thus attempted to paralyze the activity of his most dreaded foes in the East, endeavored to strengthen his relations with the Western bishops censured by Pope Nicholas. Some monks of Sicily, won over to his cause, journeyed through Europe. A writing insulting to the Supreme Pontiff was circulated at Rome in 865. It was a kind of siege against the papacy, ably engineered by the resourceful and malevolent genius of Photius.

Pope Nicholas and Emperor Michael

But the great Pope, informed of what took place at the pseudo-council of 861, had already made the Emperor, the false Patriarch, and the bishops of the East acquainted with his indignant protest. The Pope's first letter, addressed in 862 to all the bishops and metropolitans of the East, set forth the truth of the facts, condemned the deposition of Ignatius and the usurpation of Photius.[18] In a letter to Photius, the Pontiff complained of the falsification of his writings and maintained the rights of his primacy.[19] In a third letter, addressed to the

[18] Jaffé, 2690; *PL*, CXIX, 783.
[19] *Ibid.*, 2691; *PL*, CXIX, 785.

Emperor, he declared that he refused any confirmation of what had been done in the East, until the truth should be made public.[20]

The plan of knavery, trickery, and deception had failed. There remained violence and insult. And these were used. Michael the Drunkard wrote the Pope an insolent letter in which he scoffed at the Bishop of Rome, charging him with using "a barbarous and Scythian language," and threatened him, swearing to level the Eternal City to the ground.

The fearless Pontiff was no more moved by the menace of violence than he was by perfidy. His reply to the Emperor is a masterpiece.[21] In the first part the Pope firmly uttered his stand on the pending question: he declared that the Emperor's judgment was utterly incompetent in what concerns the internal affairs of the Church. Let the documents of the case be sent to him to Rome and let them be submitted to a regular procedure, and an independent tribunal would decide. Then the Pope's thoughts rose to considerations of the gravest eloquence. He says:

> Do not dwell upon threats against us, O Emperor, for, with God's help, we do not fear them. . . . Rather consider what you yourself ought to do. Think upon the past time, consider eternity. Reflect what happened to the emperors who have persecuted the Church of God and especially the Roman Church. See Nero, Diocletian. How execrable their names are among Christians! See, on the other hand, Constantine, Theodosius the Great, Valentinian. With what respect their memory is recalled in our holy mysteries!

The Pontiff says further that incumbent upon sovereigns is the duty of not interfering in the internal affairs of the Church and of protecting her in the free expansion of her spiritual authority, and the great Pope gives two reasons for this duty; first, the Church is independent in her domain; since the time

[20] *Ibid.*, 2692; *PL*, CXIX, 790.
[21] *PL*, CXIX, 926 ff.

of Christ, the Church and the state, having each its own office, should not infringe upon each other: to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's; secondly, the Church is a source of peace for the state.

No doubt St. Nicholas entertained no false expectations about the immediate result of this letter. At Constantinople no account was taken of it. The next year (866) Nicholas profited by an embassy he was sending to Bulgaria, to place in its hands urgent letters written to the Emperor, the Empress, and several eminent personages of the Empire. Photius prevented the legates from passing the frontiers and brutally sent them back to Rome, still carrying their letters.[22]

A little while later, the usurper even had Pope Nicholas' deposition proclaimed by an assembly of Eastern bishops. But his triumph was shortlived. The pseudo-council was held in 867. That same year, in the month of September, the chamberlain Basil, who, in the presence of the Emperor, had Caesar Bardas assassinated in 866, had the Emperor himself put to death and, seizing the throne, started a new policy. Photius in vain publicly joined the assassin of his benefactor Bardas.[23] He fell into disfavor and was confined in a monastery, while Ignatius was reinstalled (November 26, 867) in the see of Constantinople.

St. Nicholas died thirteen days before, without being aware of this victory of justice.[24] The rôle of this great Pontiff seems to have been less to triumph over the enemies of the Church, than to proclaim, after a period full of disturbances and on the eve of an epoch still more disturbed, the rights of the papacy

[22] These letters are still preserved. They bear the date of November 13, 866. Jaffé, 2813, 2821.

[23] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, 247.

[24] The writer of the note on St. Nicholas I, inserted in the *Liber pontificalis,* probably Anastasius the bibliothecarius, had not yet certain knowledge of Ignatius' reinstatement. He mentions it as a rumor, *sicut fama se habuit. Lib. pont.,* II, 165, 180 note.

that cannot be impaired by any hostile attack. To furnish the real portrait of Nicholas' pontificate, we must now sketch this doctrine of his.

Papal Primacy

St. Nicholas did not set forth in a special treatise his idea of the papal power in the Middle Ages. But, if we peruse his bullarium and his correspondence, we soon become convinced that this conception is the most complete that we can find from St. Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII. What characterizes his views, is that they emanate from a mind whose practical tendencies are found harmoniously supplemented by philosophical aptitudes. Most of the time he sets forth his ideas in connection with a particular affair, but always he endeavors to connect them with a great principle of religion or of government.

Theologians and canonists generally reduce to three the prerogatives that constitute the papal primacy: they are the primacy of the priesthood, the primacy of doctrinal teaching, and the primacy of government, or, to employ the classical terms, primacy in the ministry, in the magisterium, and in the disciplinary power (*in ministerio, magisterio, et imperio*). St. Nicholas affirmed these three powers with the greatest precision.

In the face of Photius and of the Eastern bishops, as well as in the presence of the episcopacy of the West, he proclaimed the supremacy of his sacerdotal ministry with unequaled force and clearness. He writes: "The pope holds the place of Jesus Christ in the universal Church; divine providence has placed him at the head of the universal Church and has made his apostolate the corner stone of the Church; the Roman Church is the mother of all the Churches." [25]

As to the primacy in doctrinal teaching, which raised more

[25] *PL,* CIX, 813. Cf. cols. 785, 821, 864, 909, 915.

difficulties in his time, he affirmed it, if not with greater energy, at least with more insistence. In all the disputes agitating the Church in his day, he appealed to his right of supreme intervention. In the iconoclast quarrel, which some wanted to revive, he authoritatively recalled the decisions of his predecessors. In the predestination controversy, he ordered the monk Gottschalk and Hincmar of Reims to appear before the legates of the Holy See; for the difficulties that were stirred up by the writings of Scotus Erigena, he maintained the right to examine them and pass judgment on them.[26]

In the exercise of his primacy of government he met the greatest obstacles. In the Church the three branches of governmental authority—the legislative power, the judiciary power, and the executive power—have distinct organs, but all of them are connected with the supreme head, who possesses them in their source and plenitude. St. Nicholas declared himself to be, not the sole legislator, but the supreme legislator of the Church. Before the heads of the state as before the bishops, he claimed the power to make and promulgate laws binding upon all Christendom.[27]

As supreme judge of ecclesiastical cases, St. Nicholas affirms the following three principles: 1. in every ecclesiastical case, each party has the right of appeal to the pope, and the pope always has the right to summon the affair to his tribunal, whether the question is one judged by secular tribunals or one before ecclesiastical tribunals, by bishops or by metropolitans, by primates or by patriarchs; it is the application of the ancient principle: the pope judges everybody, and is judged by no one; 2. the cases of bishops, as being major cases, can be judged at Rome by the pope, even as a court of first instance; 3. even the decisions of general councils, concerned with con-

[26] *PL*, CIX, 786, 1019, 1119.
[27] *PL*, CIX, 828.

demning a person or of censuring a doctrine, have no value without the pope's assent.[28]

St. Nicholas decreed regulations about the organization of the tribunals, the respective rights of the judges, the accusers, the witnesses, and the accused, the steps to be followed in the procedure, the publicity of the hearings, the value of the proofs, and the right of appeal.[29]

As head of the executive power, St. Nicholas, while favoring the tendency to soften penalties, maintained his right to order canonical penances.[30] In his pontificate we see the continued practice, so vigorously disapproved later by St. Louis, of having ecclesiastical sentences executed by the civil power. That practice became a civil law two years after St. Nicholas' death by virtue of a capitulary of Charles the Bald (869).[31] The holy Pontiff endeavored to moderate these penances. A letter from Nicholas I to Rodolphe bishop of Bourges in 864, contains these lines: "Penitents who return to military service act contrary to the rules; but, since you testify that this prohibition drives them to despair and others to seek refuge among the pagans, we leave you free in this matter to do whatever seems most suitable in the particular circumstances." [32] Three years later (867), just before his death, he wrote to another bishop about a parricide condemned to public penance: "If his life, if his tearful repentance results in truly good works, let your solicitude appear humane and gentle toward him." [33] Such directions and such encouragements given to the

[28] *PL,* CIX, 882, 947. Cf. cols. 821 f.

[29] For details, see Jules Roy, *St. Nicholas I,* pp. 132 ff.

[30] *Op. cit.,* pp. 141 ff.

[31] Baluze, II, 213. A large number of previous capitularies treated of the performance of public penance under the constraint of the civil power, e. g., the capitulary of 822, *apud* Baluze, I, 629. The innovation of the capitulary of Charles the Bald consisted in giving to the Church the right to call in the civil power.

[32] *PL,* CIX, 884.

[33] *PL,* CIX, 1129.

bishops, little by little led to public penance being replaced by almsgiving, prayers, mortifications, and pilgrimages, then to the complete disappearance of it.[34]

Letter to the Bulgarians

One of the most treasured monuments of the legislative, judiciary, and administrative work of Nicholas I is the collection of decisions published under the title of *Replies to the Bulgarians*. The recently converted King Boris turned to Pope Nicholas for the purpose of bringing his laws into accord with the laws and traditions of the Church. The Pontiff's reply touched on the most varied questions.[35] We find, for example, the enumeration of the feasts that should be observed by abstention from labor, exact directions as to the way of observing fasting, almsgiving, and Sunday rest. The Pope insisted upon the absolute liberty that ought to be accorded young men to enter a monastery or to enter the state of matrimony. He reminded the King that marriage is indissoluble. He prohibited marriage between blood relatives of any degree whatever, as soon as the relationship is established.[36] However, in another place, he fixed the marriage prohibition at the seventh degree of relationship; this is evident proof that the law was not yet quite settled on this point. The Pope says that, in the case of a man accused of a crime, his confession should be free; it is unjust to subject him to torture, which produces only a forced confession and often leads a poor wretch to declare his guilt, although in truth he is innocent. There is no law, either human or divine, says the Pontiff, that can permit such a practice.[37]

[34] Gosselin, *Pouvoir du pape sur les souverains au Moyen Age*, pp. 404 ff.

[35] *PL*, CIX, 978 ff.

[36] *PL*, CIX, 994.

[37] *Quam rem nec divina lex nec humana prorsus admittit, quum non invita sed spontanea debeat esse confessio. PL*, CIX, 1010.

We are not surprised that a pope so solicitous for the unfortunate professes a particular love for the poor. Says the *Liber pontificalis:*

He ordered to be drawn up a list of all the blind, crippled, paralyzed whose infirmities prevented their going to the various establishments where food and alms were distributed. The Pope appointed persons to bring them help to their homes.[38] His pious attention extended to all the Churches of the universe, everywhere protecting the weak, defending the oppressed, solacing all wretchedness. It appeared that the city of Ostia was not well enough fortified. The people had reason to fear a surprise attack by the Saracens; the great Pope provided it with fortifications and war machines; so that the city became for the whole neighboring country a safe refuge against all hostile attacks.[39]

Hincmar of Reims

Amid the political preoccupations of his pontificate, St. Nicholas I did not neglect to patronize the progress of art and science. Says a German historian: "It is certain that Nicholas preserved that love for the arts and science which he received from his father. As in Greece, so in his reign much attention was given to illuminating and adorning with paintings of gold the magnificent copies of the Sacred Scripture. We may cite the example of an abbot of Monte Cassino, Bertharius, who has left works on the Old and New Testament, and on grammar and medicine." [40] St. Bertharius, said to be of royal blood, died a martyr, slain by the Saracens in 884. He was one of the lights of his time, but we have scarcely any details of his life. More illustrious were Hincmar of Reims, Ratramnus of Corbie, Paschasius Radbertus, and Scotus Erigena. St. Paschasius Radbertus died two years before St. Nicholas. Hincmar, Ratramnus, and Scotus Erigena survived the Pope for a

[38] *Lib. pont.*, II, 161.
[39] *Ibid.*, II, 164.
[40] Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste von Gregor I bis Gregor VII*, II, 3.

short time. Through them the Carolingian Renaissance revived.

We have already met Hincmar of Reims. At first he was a monk in the monastery of St. Denis, then elected archbishop of Reims, in 844; for nearly forty years he was the intellectual arbiter of the Church of France. He has been compared to Bossuet. He was a lesser genius, but, like the Bishop of Meaux, he became the perpetual defender of tradition. The unwearied defense of tradition in all its forms is perhaps what best characterizes the whole life and work of Hincmar. When in the teaching of a German monk, Gottschalk, he discovered a doctrine marked with a spirit of novelty, he condemned the doctrine and the man with an earnestness sometimes excessive, but always sincere. When he became bishop of Reims, which preserved the memory of the royal anointing of Clovis by St. Remigius and of the crowning of Pepin and Charlemagne by two popes, he endeavored to perpetuate the traditions of his episcopal see by becoming in a way the tutor of the Frankish king. Thus we understand how at one time, as defender of the Church in France gathered about its king, he confronted the Pope, and at another time, as shepherd with the duty of admonishing the king in the name of the Church, he wrote to Louis III as follows:

> Emperor Louis did not live as long as his forebear Charles; Charlemagne, your ancestor, did not attain the age of his father; your father did not reach the years of his father; when you are in the same condition as your father and grandfather were at Compiègne, turn your eyes toward the spot where your father lies. You and yours will soon disappear; and holy Church, with its chiefs, will continue to exist under the rule of Christ, in accordance with His promise.

Out of devotion to tradition, Hincmar defended the practice of public penance, even though it was being abandoned. He tried to justify ordeals against the stand taken by St. Agobard

of Lyons, who condemned these bloody trials as being a living contradiction of the Gospel. Through a mistaken zeal for tradition, Hincmar maintained against the pope the supposed rights of metropolitan bishops; but his opposition to the decline of clerical life was prompted by a praiseworthy devotion to the traditional customs of the Church. We have five capitularies of the Archbishop of Reims. They have this particular trait in common, that they were issued after investigations and the assembly of synods. Hincmar is rightly reputed to be the author or at least the first promulgator of synodal laws in France.[41]

Clerical Life

Revival of studies, reform of morals, and the proper performance of the liturgy were the chief aims of Hincmar's synodal regulations. His practical mind entered into such details that, by the help of these regulations, we are able to reconstruct the daily life of a priest at that period.

Every morning, after Lauds, the priests, who usually lived under the guidance of an elder priest, chanted the canonical hours of Prime, Tierce, Sext, and None in the church. Then they celebrated mass, after which they devoted their time to the labor of the fields. They remained fasting until the midday meal. The hour of this meal varied according to the season. Hincmar says this fast is necessary so that the priest may be in condition to assist the sick and the transient pilgrims and to bury the dead. From earlier capitularies we know that the priest had to be fasting for the performance of most functions, notably for administering baptism. In Hincmar's time, however, this rule was gradually being relaxed.

The priests used to meet on the first day of each month for conference together. Thus appears the custom of clerical con-

[41] Vidieu, *Hincmar de Reims*, pp. 167 ff.

ferences. Hincmar was watchful that these gatherings should not become the occasion of a meal at which "too many goblets would be emptied in honor of the angels and saints." He also concerned himself with the meals that were celebrated on the occasion of the anniversary of a deceased person, when sometimes comic plays were given, with a bear, dancers, and representations of devils. Difficulties arose over churches built on the lands of the lords. These latter had the right of appointment. Hincmar forcefully protested against the consequent abuses. Priests are to be watched over by their deans, the deans by the archdeacons, these by the bishops, and the bishops by their metropolitan.

Hincmar died in 882. He was neither a philosopher nor a great writer. His literary style is diffuse, and his theological method consists especially in connecting a certain number of ideas with texts of the Church fathers. Despite his defects and errors, Hincmar is rightly considered one of the glories of the French Church.

Ratramnus of Corbie

Hincmar's celebrated adversary, Ratramnus of Corbie, was a man of alert and venturesome mind, ready to embrace new views. His extensive learning and the elegance of his style won him the friendship of the most renowned men, such as Lupus abbot of Ferrières, Odo of Beauvais, and Hildegard of Meaux. About his life we know very little. He was ceaselessly at odds with Hincmar, whom he blamed for uncritically accepting all the old traditions.[42] It is said that he took unfair advantage of his high standing at the court of Charles the Bald to discredit the Archbishop of Reims. If this really is true, it did not destroy the esteem in which he was held. In 868, Pope St. Nicholas, shortly before his death, asked all the

[42] For example, the tradition of the holy ampulla of Reims, mentioned for the first time in the writings of Hincmar.

bishops of France, in fact all the bishops of the West, to draw up a reply to Photius. The latter, in a declaration addressed to the Bulgarians in 866, then in the acts of the pseudo-council of Constantinople in 867, cleverly summed up all his grievances against the Roman Church. Ratramnus, a simple monk, was chosen to be spokesman for the West. His work, divided into four parts, is remarkable for its animation, scholarship, and logic. He ignores none of the nine charges that Photius made against the Roman Church; but he especially clings to the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost through the Father and through the Son, which he demonstrates in the first three books. Next he defends the celibacy of priests, the insertion of the *Filoque* in the Symbol, and the primacy of the bishop of Rome. He concludes with these words: "We have replied as best we could to what you have written. If you are satisfied with it, let us thank God. If you are not pleased with it, I await your criticism." [43] Photius was unable to take up the challenge. At the very time that Ratramnus' work appeared, Photius was exiled to a monastery by Basil the Macedonian. Not long after the publication of his work, Ratramnus died (868).[44]

St. Paschasius Radbertus

That he might be free to devote himself more fully to learning and piety, Ratramnus wished to remain a simple monk. His abbot, Paschasius Radbertus, resigned from his office in 851 for the same reason. In the famous Corbie Abbey, where, under the direction of St. Adalard and his brother Wala, were to be found Ratramnus the scholarly monk, Ansgar the apostle of the Scandinavians, Warin abbot of New Corbie, Hildemann and Odo of Beauvais, the monks were fired with zeal for learning and for the apostolate. Paschasius Radbertus was an exact

[43] *PL*, CXXI, 316.
[44] *Histoire littéraire*, V, 332 ff.

and penetrating theologian, a temperate and clear writer without fanciful flights. Perhaps more than any other writer, he represented the theological learning of his time, a scholarship that still consisted in compilations and recapitulations, that rested mostly upon the authority of Scripture and the fathers, without much enthusiasm for originality or philosophy, but a scholarship in which at times the spirit of inquiry awoke and pursued practical questions eagerly. Paschasius' commentaries on St. Matthew and Jeremias, his treatises *On the Body and Blood of the Lord* and *On the Parturition of the Virgin,* his biographies of St. Adalhard and Wala, are marked with the stamp of a solid, scholarly mind, full of pious unction.

Scotus Erigena

In the ninth century one man opened the way to metaphysical speculations, and he did so with an impetuosity and daring that disconcerted the minds of his time and brought him to the border of heresy. He was Scotus Erigena. This solitary genius, who founded no school, built up a system that had a powerful originality which astounds the thinkers even of our own day.

The beginning and the end of the life of Scotus Erigena are full of mystery. He came from Scotland or Ireland, was favorably received at the court of Charles the Bald, "that prince who was early taught by a mother whose erudition surprised the bishops, along with that Frank of energy and Byzantine imagination, who took delight in subtle theological discussions as in the designs of manuscripts illuminated with purple and gold." [45] Scotus Erigena's speculative genius, acute and mystical, unfolded freely. He translated from the Greek the works of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. That translation of the

[45] Saint-René Taillandier, *Scot Erigène,* pp. 48 f.

profound Neoplatonic philosopher of the fifth century [46] disturbed Pope St. Nicholas. It aroused the astonishment of the most eminent men of the time. Says the learned Anastasius: "How was a man, born on the very confines of the world, able to grasp so well the meaning of that book, unless by an inspiration of the Holy Ghost?" [47] In his chief work *De divisione naturae,* Scotus sets forth a gigantic system, of a pantheistic sort, that has led to his being regarded by some as the father of the anti-Scholastics,[48] by others as the forerunner of German philosophy,[49] and by still others as the originator of the orthodox mysticism of the Middle Ages.[50] He says: "There is a sure way of reaching God—by studying our own thought. Let us consider our soul, let us there devoutly seek the supreme God, and, full of goodness, He will smile upon us." [51] The Church condemned the *De divisione naturae.* According to a legendary account, Scotus died in 877 at a very advanced age, slain by his own pupils. Hence the insertion of his name in some martyrologies.[52]

Question of the Real Presence

Hincmar, Ratramnus, Paschasius Radbertus, and Scotus Erigena engaged in two great disputes which may serve to indicate the progress of theological thought from Charlemagne to Charles the Bald: the dispute about the real presence, and the one about predestination.

The dispute about the real presence was a transfer to the

[46] The pseudo-Dionysius could not have appeared earlier than about the year 500.

[47] Usserius, *Antiquitates rerum britannicarum,* p. 45.

[48] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* I, 131.

[49] "Die Lehre vom göttlichen Ebenbilde im Menschen," *Tübinger Quartalschrift,* 1830; quoted by Saint-René Taillandier, *loc. cit.,* p. 269.

[50] Staudenmayer, professor of theology at the Catholic University of Friburg, *Scot Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit.*

[51] *De divisione naturae,* Bk. II, chap. 24; *PL,* CXXII, 579.

[52] *Perpétuité de la foi,* Bk. XII; Saint-René Taillandier, *Scot Erigène.* p. 47.

Middle Ages of a conflict that, in early days, had divided Christian thought into two currents on the subject of the Eucharist: the Ambrosian current and the Augustinian current. How are Christ's body and blood present in the sacrament? By a real presence, St. Ambrose said, without denying the special conditions of that reality; by a spiritual presence, said St. Augustine, whose sole aim was to repel a gross "Capharnaite" interpretation, without denying the reality of Christ's body and blood. But in 831 Paschasius Radbertus wrote a treatise *On the Body and Blood of the Lord* and published it in 844 with a dedicatory letter to Charles the Bald. In this book, following the Ambrosian current, he seems, in his barbarous argumentation, less varied than that of the Milan doctor, and perhaps with a more naïvely curious mind, to pass beyond his master. What is present in the Eucharist, he said, is really the body and blood that were born of the Virgin, it is the flesh that was hanged on the wood of the cross, it is the blood that poured from Christ's side.[53] The only thing this flesh and blood lack is visible and tangible appearance.[54] This flesh and this blood are truly in contact with our digestive organs, they are our true nourishment as the liturgical texts say.[55] When he was asked what this nourishment becomes in our body, Paschasius, without going so far as the gross theory of the "stercoranists," evaded the question rather than solved it.[56]

This doctrine at once aroused the liveliest opposition. The learned Rabanus Maurus, a monk of Fulda Abbey and future archbishop of Mainz, unable to accept the view that Christ's body can be digested, went so far as to deny that it is the same

[53] Here Paschasius Radbertus appeals to a text which he supposes is from St. Augustine, but which a better informed criticism attributes to some unknown person after St. Augustine's time. Cf. Batiffol, *Études de théologie positive*, 2d series, 3d ed., p. 367.

[54] *De corpore et sanguine*, XIII, 2; *PL*, CXX, 1315.

[55] *Corpus tuum, Domine, haereat in visceribus nostris* (*PL*, LXXII, 315).

[56] *De corpore et sanguine*, Bks. I and III; *PL*, CXX, 1267, 1275.

that was born of the Virgin Mary.[57] Scotus Erigena even declared that the Eucharist is merely a figure.[58]

Ratramnus' treatise, *De corpore et sanguine Domini,* like that of Paschasius Radbertus, was dedicated to Charles the Bald, who encouraged the dispute. According to Ratramnus, the bread and the wine do not undergo the least change. They remain what they were. They and they only are what is digested, what nourishes us.[59] As to Christ's body and blood, they supervene and persist in substance, but *spiritaliter,* whereas the bread and wine subsist *corporaliter.* Ratramnus appealed to the texts of St. Augustine, interpreting them with an excessively narrow logic. And he eventually admitted that this impalpable and invisible body is not the historic body of Christ; what we see is one thing, what we believe is another.

This became a fresh scandal. The scholarly Hincmar, with whom speculation was not a strong point but who was firm in preserving the whole traditional doctrine, that of St. Ambrose as well as that of St. Augustine, although not clearly seeing how these two doctrines agreed, exclaimed: "What now! If what we see is not what we believe, then what we see is merely a figure, merely a commemorative remembrance of the body and blood of Christ." [60]

Finally Paschasius' view won the day, but theological language had not reached its perfection. Later, a more thorough doctrine of transubstantiation, the distinction between the identity *quoad essentiam* and the identity *quoad speciem,* the admission of a sacramental presence, which is halfway between simply natural presence and purely symbolic presence—though not explaining a mystery that remains beyond human

[57] *Epistola ad Heberardum; PL,* CXII, 1554.

[58] According to a work now lost, quoted by Berengarius, *De sacra causa adversus Lanfrancum;* Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 347.

[59] *Panis et vinum nihil habent in se permutatum. De corpore et sanguine,* p. 14; *PL,* CXXI, 133.

[60] Hincmar, *De praedestinatione,* chap. 31.

comprehension—removed the scandals provoked by the somewhat reckless affirmations of a theology just beginning.

Question of Predestination

While the Eucharistic dispute was engaging men's minds, a still more spirited dispute was carried on amid tragic vicissitudes. About the middle of the ninth century, a report spread that a Saxon monk with stirring eloquence was sowing trouble in various parts of Germany and Italy, without hesitation raising, before the people, the most formidable problems of predestination, of free will and grace, and solving them by discomforting assertions. Rabanus Maurus abbot of Fulda wrote to Count Heberard of Verona, as follows: "We know that a certain quasi-scholar (*sciolum*) by the name of Gottschalk stopped with you, and there discoursed on doctrine, maintaining that the divine predestination is so necessitating that even a person who wishes to be saved and labors by a right faith and by his good works to obtain eternal life with the help of God's grace, is losing his time and labor, if God has not predestined him to life; as though God could predestine men to eternal death, God who is the author of our salvation, and not of our perdition." [61]

Protestants and Jansenists have called Gottschalk their ancestor. Jansenius, Guizot, Ampere, and Michelet represent him as a martyr, the victim of Hincmar's rigor.[62] Among Catholics, while the Benedictines of St. Maur,[63] Cardinal Noris,[64] and the learned theologian Berti [65] claim to exonerate the celebrated monk from any conscious error, other theo-

[61] *PL,* CXII, 1554.

[62] Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France,* lesson 28.

[63] *Histoire littéraire,* Vols. V and VI, *passim,* especially in the *Notice sur Hincmar,* V, 544 ff.

[64] *Historia Gothescalci,* in *Opera,* IV, 681 ff.

[65] *De theologicis disciplinis,* Bk. VI, chap. 14, prop. 3.

logians and critics, such as Sirmond,[66] Petau,[67] Natalis Alexander,[68] and Tournely,[69] attempt to show that he really professed the predestinarian heresy.

We must recognize that Gottschalk's doctrines and life are not without analogy with those of Luther. The son of the Saxon Count Berno, vowed from childhood to the monastic life in Fulda Abbey, Gottschalk, upon reaching manhood, with difficulty supported the yoke of the monastery, for which perhaps he had no vocation. He attacked his vows and had them annulled by the Council of Mainz in 829. But his abbot, Rabanus Maurus, with the backing of Louis the Pious, constrained him to remain a monk,[70] having him merely change to another monastery. He withdrew to France, to the Abbey of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons. Eager for study, he then devoted himself to the reading of the works of St. Augustine and, from the holy doctor's polemical treatises against Pelagianism, gathered the most rigid statements on the weakness of man and of his free will, on the all-powerful efficacy of grace and of divine predestination. During a journey to Rome in 847 he preached to the people along his way, attempted to win disciples for his gloomy doctrine, and solicited the backing of Count Heberard.

Then it was that Rabanus Maurus his former abbot had Gottschalk condemned in 848 by a council of Mainz, which sent him before Hincmar archbishop of Reims, his metropolitan. An opportunity was offered to the ardent defender of metropolitan jurisdiction to exercise its rights in all their fulness. In 849 a council at Quierzy-sur-Oise declared the monk of Orbais heretical and incorrigible, and sentenced him to be publicly flogged, following the Rule of St. Benedict.[71] But the

[66] *Hist. praedestinatiana,* chap. 11.
[67] *De incarnatione,* Bk. XIII, chap. 9.
[68] *Dissertat. V, saec. 9.*
[69] *De gratia,* I, 244 ff.
[70] *Hist. littéraire,* V, 352.
[71] *Regula S. Benedicti,* art. 28 (Solesmes ed., p. 101).

penalty which the holy patriarch intended to be employed merely as a fatherly correction, was apparently inflicted with utmost brutality. According to the account by St. Remigius archbishop of Lyons, the heretical monk was continually beaten until, half dead, he agreed to cast his writing into the flames. The monk then asked that the ordeal of fire should decide the dispute between Hincmar and himself. This was the most solemn ordeal. For this ordeal two combustible piles are erected in such fashion that the flames of one almost touched those of the other. The accused and his accuser, carrying the host in their hand, must traverse the narrow passage between the two piles.

Gottschalk's request was denied. But the excessive severity of the repression and especially the fear of seeing St. Augustine's doctrine involved in the condemnation of the unfortunate monk, led several powerful personages to take up their pen against the Archbishop of Reims. In this number were Servatus Lupus abbot of Ferrières, St. Prudentius bishop of Troyes, and Ratramnus monk of Corbie. Hincmar, better acquainted with canonical regulations than with the ideas of dogmatic theology, in attacking Gottschalk's doctrines had committed several errors. He also imprudently took as defender of orthodoxy a very subtle ally, but one who was dangerous, Scotus Erigena. The latter refuted Gottschalk's predestinarianism in a strange way. How can God, he said, predestine a man to sin and evil, since sin and evil do not exist? Since they are simple negations of being, how can they be the results of God's will? The sole cause of sin is the deficient free will of man, and its only punishment is remorse.

A council of Valence (855) decided against Hincmar's erroneous theses and against what was called the Scottish hodgepodge (*pultes Scotorum*) of Scotus Erigena.

The religious question now had its reverberation in politics. The cause which was approved by a council of the North and

in the jurisdiction of Charles the Bald, was condemned by a council of the South and in the jurisdiction of Lothaire. Opposed to Hincmar the metropolitan of Reims, was Remigius the metropolitan of Lyons. In a great national Frankish council (859) at Savonnières near Toul, attended by the three kings of France, Lorraine, and Provence, an attempt was made, in conformity with the wishes of Pope St. Nicholas, to come to an agreement. But men's minds were still very much stirred up. The solution was postponed to quieter times.

Later on, Scholastic theology would, so far as human reason could do so, solve the burning questions agitated by the imprudent monk of Orbais. Has God predestined certain men to damnation? No, answered a better informed theology, if we are speaking of an absolute divine decree; yes, if we speak of a decree consequent upon a prevision of the sin. Petau says this distinction was not far removed from the inner thought of Gottschalk.[72] He made the mistake of maintaining it in a tone of disobedience and revolt. He died (868 or 869) unyielding, without making a retractation, in the prison of the Hautvillers monastery in the diocese of Reims, to the very end nursing a hatred for Hincmar and, with bitter sarcasm, jeering at the inexactitudes that had slipped from the pen of the Archbishop, who was not a deep theologian.

When, in 867, Pope St. Nicholas found fault with Hincmar for his cruelty, perhaps he was alluding not only to certain measures taken against Rothade, but also to Hincmar's behavior to Gottschalk. Thus, above the political disturbances and doctrinal disputes, the soul of the holy Pope soared in the serene realm of impartial justice. Between St. Gregory the Great, who laid the foundations of the Christendom of the Middle Ages, and St. Gregory VII, who crowned the edifice, there was not, in the history of the popes, a greater figure than that of St. Nicholas I, who gave the new world its laws.

[72] Petau, *De incarnatione*, Bk. XIII, chap. 9, no. 9.

CHAPTER XVI

The "Century of Iron" (867–962)

A FEW days after the death of St. Nicholas I, Anastasius the bibliothecarius wrote to Ado of Vienne, the famous author of the martyrology bearing his name, the following lines:

I send you very sad news: our father and pope of venerable memory, Nicholas, passed to a better life, on the ides of November, and has left us desolate. . . . I beg of you to notify all the metropolitans of Gaul. . . . In God's name resist what they are trying to do against Pope Nicholas. It would be to destroy the authority of the Church.[1]

This enigmatic Anastasius who, before he became a wise statesman, had been an able conspirator, was quite correct in his view of things. Like forces long suppressed, but their strength not crushed, all the jealousies and hatreds and brutal passions of this sad period were ready to break loose. The pontificates of Adrian II and John VIII held them in check for a little while longer. But after those two popes, there followed unbridled absence of restraint. The learned and pious Cardinal Baronius, in his *Annals,* calls this period "the century of iron." He says:

This century is rightly called the century of iron, for its grossness and its barrenness of any sort of good; a century of lead, for the abomination of evil that flooded it; a century of darkness, for the lack of writers. Let faint-heart souls not be scandalized at seeing the abomination of desolation invade the sanctuary; rather let them admire the power of God, who did not allow, as He did formerly, the abomination of the temple to be followed by its destruction, but preserved it through

[1] *PL,* CXXIX, 742.

Jesus Christ. Secular rulers, even tyrants, seized the Apostolic See and placed hideous monsters in it.[2]

It would be impossible to describe more freely and vividly the evils that afflicted the Church at this period. Yet we shall see that Baronius' description is exaggerated. Says the learned Hefele: "Baronius committed an error that does great honor to his sincerity. Although a decided ultramontane and ever ready to break a lance in favor of the Holy See, yet with scrupulous exactness he gathered all the wicked remarks about the popes, all that he found in the sources. But, with too much credulity, he preferred to sacrifice one or another pope rather than apply the knife of criticism to doubtful sources." [3] Historians coming after Baronius have made this critical study of the sources. The result of the labors of Mabillon, Moehler, Hefele, and Hergenröther has been, not to blacken the picture, but to scatter some of the shadows and, at least partially, to rehabilitate several of the popes caluminated by two prejudiced annalists. We refer to Liutprand of Cremona and Ratherius of Verona, whose friendliness to the imperial power and bias against the popes are beyond doubt. The most impartial historians and most exacting critics now recognize that Liutprand "was gratifying some grudges," [4] that he "adorned with chronological errors his *Antapodosis* on the papacy of the first half of the tenth century," [5] and that Ratherius, "a surly, restless, contemptible man," [6] was prompted more by passion than by love of truth, whereas Flodoard of Reims, whose *Chronicle* is less unfriendly to the popes of the tenth century, "contains a wealth of precise and well dated information." [7]

[2] *Visu horrida intrusa sunt monstra.* Baronius, *Annales,* Introduction to the tenth century.

[3] Hefele, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte,* I, 227 ff.

[4] Molinier, *Sources de l'hist. de France,* I, 274.

[5] Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* II, xii.

[6] Vogel, *Batherius von Verona,* II, 434.

[7] Molinier, *Sources de l'hist. de France,* I, 279.

Pope Adrian II (867–872)

St. Nicholas I's successor was Adrian II, elected December 13, 867. He was seventy-five years old at the time. His lofty soul and generous heart were accompanied by a lordly bearing. He was born at Rome, the son of Talarus, who was subsequently a bishop. Adrian belonged to the family of popes Stephen VI and Sergius II. He was married, his wife Stephania was still living,[8] and he had a daughter. It seems that he had been elected after the death of Leo IV and again after the death of Benedict III. Both times, however, he succeeded in giving some acceptable reasons for not assuming the papal office.[9] Adrian began by profiting from the firm policy of his predecessor. Lothaire II came to Monte Cassino and there made his submission to the Supreme Pontiff, who gave him communion with his own hand.[10] The new Pope had another consolation: Emperor Louis II, who had been betrayed and imprisoned by the Duke of Benevento, fled to Adrian and asked the Pope to enhance his prestige by a new coronation. Adrian, probably foreseeing the dangers that threatened the peace of the Church from the East and in the Papal States, had nothing so much at heart as the maintenance of friendly relations with the imperial power of the West.

One of his first concerns was to profit from the reestablishment of Ignatius in his see and from the good will of Basil the Macedonian, to assemble a council at Constantinople. The undertaking was not without difficulty. Photius had introduced into the ranks of the episcopacy several of his devoted fol-

[8] In the ninth century, sacred orders were still conferred on married men, who after ordination were obliged merely to abstain from all marital relations, under penalty of deposition. Council of Worms, canon 9; Mansi, XV, 871.

[9] *Lib. pont.*, II, 173.

[10] A letter of John VIII, recently discovered, proves that this communion was a veritable ordeal. John VIII, enumerating the different forms of the *judgment of God,* cites this communion administered to Lothaire by his predecessor. Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii,* p. 156. Cf. *Annales Bertiniani,* anno 869.

lowers, who were sure to form a tenacious opposition to the Pope's projects. Other bishops, won over to the side of Photius or terrified by the audacity of the hostile Easterners, dared not declare themselves. At the outset we find not more than a dozen bishops faithful to the lawful Patriarch. Later on this number grew to more than a hundred. The patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, placed under Mussulman domination, at first were not free to take part in the council. The preliminary demand, which the papal legates addressed to all the fathers, that they subscribe to the formulary of Hormisdas, aroused protests. Finally, in face of the legate's persistence, the refractory members yielded.

The first sessions were spent in receiving submissions and hearing protests. At the fifth session, Photius appeared, summoned by the representatives of the Holy See. Haughty and disdainful, the Patriarch remained silent, not answering even the formal questions put to him to record his identity. "Do you accept the decisions of Pope Nicholas and Pope Adrian?" the legates asked him. As he remained silent, thus refusing to profess his submission to the Church, they said to him: "You are, then, a malefactor and an adulterer in the Church." To this, Photius replied: "I remain silent, but God hears me." His questioners then said to him: "Your silence will not save you." And he answered: "Jesus, too, was silent, and He was condemned." This likening of himself to Christ, by so proud a man, stirred the wrath of the assembly. The legates, in the name of the symbol, begged him to submit. "My right is not on earth," he replied. The council granted him a delay for consideration, and dismissed him.[11]

The tenth and last session was held February 8, 870. It was most solemn. In presence of Emperor Basil the Macedonian and his eldest son Constantine (who were acclaimed honorary presidents), of ten or eleven deputies of the King of Bulgaria,

[11] Mansi, XVI, 74, 339; Hefele, V, 624–626.

and of three envoys of Emperor Louis II (Suppo a relative of Engelberga, Eberard the imperial majordomo, and Anastasius the bibliothecarius of the Holy See), the canons decreed by the fathers of the council were read. It was the Eighth Ecumenical Council. The decrees condemned Photius, his doctrines, and his sect. Then, applying the remedy to the source of the evil, they reproved the encroachments of the lay power upon the rights of the Church and of the hierarchy. In the fourteenth canon we read; "Bishops must not any more go forward to meet the great ones of the world; when meeting them, the bishops must not bend their knee to them, but must have the courage to blame them, if that is necessary for the amendment of their ways." Rulers may be admitted to a council, but it would be false to claim that their presence is requisite (canon 17; in the Greek, canon 12). No great one of the world may, under pain of anathema, interfere in any way in the election of a bishop (canon 22). Every election held under the pressure of secular powers will be tainted with nullity (canon 12). Pope Adrian II, to show his friendliness toward the Eastern Church, accorded to the five patriarchs certain prerogatives that St. Leo the Great and St. Nicholas had refused them: for example, enlarged rights of jurisdiction over the metropolitans, and the privilege of convoking patriarchal councils and presiding at them (canon 17).

The Church in Bulgaria

A cloud remained on the horizon. The court of Constantinople was not yet consoled at seeing the Bulgarians pass from the Byzantine influence and take their stand under the dependence of the patriarch of Rome. Photius' mind was always oppressed by the failure of his encyclical to the Church of Bulgaria.[12] It was in Bulgaria that he encountered the fiercest of

[12] Photius, Letters, Bk. I, letter 13; *PG*, CII, 724 ff.

his foes, Bishop Formosus, who, ardently denouncing whatever came from Byzantium (the Photian heresy, the marriage of priests, and the Greek rite), waged relentless warfare upon the persons and the institutions of the East. For a while King Boris even hoped to put Formosus at the head of his Church, making him a sort of patriarch whose emperor he would be, and thus setting up, in the face of the Byzantine Empire and patriarchate, the Bulgarian Empire and patriarchate. But Pope Nicholas did not lend his approval to the realization of that ambitious design and abruptly terminated Formosus' mission in Bulgaria.[13] Hence arose a coolness between the King of the Bulgarians and the court of Rome. Constantinople profited by this. It had invited to be present at the council the envoys of Bulgaria, sent by the Bulgarian King. Three days after the closing of the council's labors, there took place in the imperial palace, between the Emperor, Patriarch Ignatius, the delegates of the Eastern patriarchs, the Bulgarian deputies, and the papal legates, a meeting that was a sort of revenge by the Byzantine court and Photius against the victory of the Roman cause at the council.

The Emperor, the representatives of the Eastern Church, and Patriarch Ignatius, who was perhaps too complacent under the circumstances, all maintained that Bulgaria, having formerly belonged to the Greek Empire and having received the first preaching of the Gospel from Greek priests, ought to be subject only to the patriarchate of Constantinople. In vain the legates objected that Bulgaria had freely submitted to the Roman Church, that it was part of the Illyrian provinces, a dependence of Rome from time immemorial, that its full conversion was the work of Latin missioners, and that the pope, supreme head of the Church, could not make his decisions dependent upon purely political considerations. The conference decided that henceforth Bulgaria would be attached to the

[13] *Lib. pont.*, II, 165.

diocese of Constantinople, and the report of this decision was fraudulently annexed to the acts of the ecumenical council.[14]

And this was not all. The papal legates, while on their return journey, were set upon and plundered by Slav pirates. The followers of Photius, profiting by this incident, circulated falsified acts of the council, thinking that they alone were in possession of the genuine acts. But the sharp statesman Anastasius, who was present at the council as legate of Louis II, had taken the precaution to copy the genuine documents for his own personal use. Through him the authentic acts of the ecumenical council of 869 have come down to us.

This unusual person, who had insolently intrigued to obtain the papacy, this priest excommunicated by St. Leo IV, had reformed in his retirement. Secretary of Nicholas I, who used his eminent abilities in diplomacy and administration, this former rebel became the most capable defender of the papal power. His private life is a mystery. In many respects his public career was a blessing. In the Pope's disputes with Photius, it was generally Anastasius who held the pen and placed the abundance of his erudition in the service of orthodoxy. Adrian II kept him in office as chief secretary of papal letters and appointed him *bibliothecarius* of the Roman Church.[15] Under the authority of a Pontiff whose perspicacity and firmness were not those of St. Nicholas, did Anastasius' old ambition revive? Were his father and his brother the only ones to blame for the mysterious and bloody drama that clouded Adrian II's last years and so seriously injured the prestige of the papacy?

[14] Mansi, XVI, 11; *PL*, CXXIX, 21 ff.; Baronius, year 869; Hefele, V, 657–661.

[15] *Annales Bertiniani*, year 868. The bibliothecarius of the Roman Church was a very important personage: he was the one to whom people had to go when, for the decision of weighty affairs, the early documents must be consulted. The *Liber pontificalis* makes frequent mention of the bibliothecarius of the Holy See. The first known bibliothecarius is Gregory, who afterward became Gregory II. *Lib. pont.*, I, 396, 10. Cf. Ducange, *Glossarium*, under the word *Bibliothecarius*.

Arsenius

For some time Anastasius seemed to be free from the dominance of his father Arsenius. The latter, still apocrisiarius of the Holy See, was too zealous a partisan of the imperial power. Anastasius had thwarted him on this point.[16] St. Nicholas, who made use of the services of Arsenius as also of his son, did not spare him on occasion. One day when the pompous Bishop of Orta entered a procession, clothed in a gorgeous pelisse in the Jewish style, the Pope, in great displeasure, ordered him to remove the garment.[17] Another time the Pope, having grounds for supposing that certain monies, intended for the papal treasury, had in reality passed into the cash-box of the apocrisiarius, called upon him for a strict accounting.[18]

Under Adrian II the ambition of Arsenius knew no bounds. He had failed to place his son Anastasius in the see of St. Peter. He attempted to make his son Eleutherius a member of the papal family by marriage. Pope Adrian, who was married before receiving major orders, had a daughter. If Eleutherius were to be married to the Pope's daughter, the position of the apocrisiarius would be strengthened and enhanced. But Adrian, having already promised his daughter in marriage to another suitor, refused his consent. Then Eleutherius tried a coup de force. He seized the daughter and the wife of the Pope. When Emperor Louis, at Adrian's request, sent soldiers in pursuit of the ravisher, the latter, tracked by the imperial police, assassinated both the wife and the daughter of the Pontiff. Meanwhile Arsenius went to Southern Italy, where the imperial court then was, to intercede with it and there to intrigue with some Frankish princes. But he was taken suddenly ill and died without receiving the last sacra-

[16] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'État pontifical*, p. 246.

[17] John the Deacon, *Life of St. Gregory the Great*, Bk. IV, chap. 50.; *PL*, LXXV, 207.

[18] *PL*, CXIX, 1178.

ments. His servants, purposing to carry his body back to Rome, reached the neighborhood of Monte Cassino and were there so hampered by the nauseating stench that came from the coffin that they hurriedly buried the body of the apocrisiarius in a field of the abbey. The monks, who witnessed the scene, recorded the event in their archives.[19]

Eleutherius, arrested and condemned, was put to death. Anastasius, suspected of having advised the crime, was excommunicated by Adrian. But in the presence of an assembly of the Roman clergy, he succeeded in freeing himself from blame, and the Pope restored him to his office.

This scandal, in which Adrian was merely the unfortunate victim, affected the popular opinion regarding the Pope and the papacy. Later, under John VIII, even in the monasteries people were still talking of the bloody affair and disrespectfully introducing into the scandal the name of the worthy pope. Adrian's successor was obliged to send to Bertharius abbot of Monte Cassino this vigorous remonstrance: "Who are you, to speak in such a way about so great a pope, to gnaw his body like a dog?" [20]

In the Pope's entourage, making a sort of perpetual assault upon the sovereign pontificate, were other personages far from commendable, such as that Sergius master of the militia, who had married a niece of Nicholas I and, at her uncle's death, had laid hands on the money intended for works of charity.[21] And there was that other master of the militia, George of Aventino, a dissolute robber and an assassin, who had entered the family of Pope Benedict III, and who later, convicted by papal justice, had his eyes gouged out.[22]

[19] *Bibliotheca cassinensis,* III, 139 f.; *Annales Bertiniani,* year 868.

[20] Loewenfeld, *Epistolae pontificum romanorum ineditae,* p. 25. Quoted by Lapôtre, p. 223.

[21] *PL,* CXXVI, 678.

[22] Jaffé, p. 427, no. 3400; *MGH, Scriptores,* III, 199. These two documents speak of Gregory of Aventino. In other documents this same person is called George of Aventino. *PL,* CXXVI, 677 f.

Bishop Formosus

Of an altogether different moral character was a man on whom Adrian kept his eyes to the end of his life. It was the bishop of Porto, Formosus, whom Pope Nicholas had sent in 866 to the King of the Bulgarians, and whom the latter wished to make a patriarch. Ordered to return to his diocese of Porto, Formosus obeyed, but swore that some day he would leave it to fight against the wicked influence of the Eastern priests. Intelligent, clever, overbearing, and obstinate, the Bishop of Porto continually kept his mind on Bulgaria. His thin features and his austere morals gave him the prestige of holiness. Never had he been seen to eat meat or drink wine. Later on it was learned that throughout his life he wore a haircloth the warp of which became incrusted in his flesh. The Bishop of Porto was a power. Pope Adrian had the courage to refuse his transfer to Bulgaria.[23] Such a transfer would have been against the canon law of the period, which forbade the transfer of a bishop from one diocese to another. Furthermore, with his narrow views, and his absolute antipathy toward the Eastern rites, his overbearing and unbending manner, Formosus, despite his real virtues, risked endangering the cause of the Latin Church. But, by keeping him in Italy, the Pope had not avoided all peril. Around the Bishop of Porto there gathered a party of malcontents. Even very close to him were to be seen men of notoriously evil repute, but much feared, like George of Aventino. When, in November 872, Adrian II died, the worst catastrophes were to be feared.

Pope John VIII (872–882)

Pope Adrian's successor, elected in December, 872, was the archdeacon John, a native of Rome, the son of Guido. This is all the *Liber pontificalis* tells us of him. From another source

[23] *Lib. pont.*, II, 185.

we know he was old and frequently sick. John VIII deserves to be reckoned among the great popes. The failure of his undertakings should be blamed upon the evils of his time, but not upon the weakness of his character. The new Pope, glancing over the Christian world after his elevation to the papacy, would have found a few reasons for consolation. In the North, in Great Britain, Alfred the Great, after establishing peace in his kingdom, introduced a revival of learning and gave his people the benefit of laws prompted by the spirit and teachings of Christianity; in the South, Christian Spain, which had just erected the provinces of Navarre and Castile into a kingdom, was continuing its heroic struggle against the Moors. But in France and in Italy the strife was ceaselessly continued between the descendants of Charlemagne. For a quarter century past, the cause of the Frankish Empire, by the very force of things, became more and more bound to the cause of the papacy. Soon the latter would have the heavy responsibility of deciding between Charles the Bald and Louis the German. While the Saracens and the Normans were ravaging Gaul and Italy, Photius in the East and the friends of Formosus at Rome were hatching fresh plots. John VIII has frequently been judged unjustly. What was really flexibility of mind in his case was called fickleness of character; what was prudence was called weakness. True, finally the rising flood of greed and hatred overwhelmed him. But the sick old man who, shaking with fever, mounted his horse and rode at the head of his troops against the Saracen pirates, was not a cowardly soul. The builder of fortresses, the tireless negotiator, the terrible administrator of justice—John VIII was all this—had nothing about him that could suggest, even to wickedness and envy, the absurd fable of the Popess Joan.[24]

[24] Weighty historians, such as Baronius, Mai, Hergenröther, have thought the fable of Popess Joanna originated in the evil impression produced by the weakness and fickleness of John VIII. This opinion is no longer tenable.

We can connect the whole history of John VIII's pontificate with four principal episodes: the crowning of Charles the Bald, the restoration of Photius to the see of Constantinople, the excommunication of Formosus, and the struggle against the Saracens.

Crowning of Charles the Bald

Like Nicholas I and Adrian II, John VIII at the very outset seemed to perceive that the one power most suited to aid him in his work, to help him drive the Saracens out of Christendom, to put down the activities of Italian dukes and the plots of the Roman factions, was a well consolidated imperial power, free from every compromising suspicion, entrusted to an energetic and capable man. Following the example of his two predecessors,[25] he turned his eyes to Charles the Bald, who seemed to possess the qualities of an emperor. When, after the death of Louis II, the choice fell between Charles the Bald and Louis the German, Adrian did not hesitate. He called the King of Western France to Rome and (December 25, 875) [26] in St. Peter's Basilica anointed him and placed the imperial crown upon his head.

Historians have considered Charles the Bald as a timid and craven king,[27] surrendering to the pope all his essential rights of emperor and letting his nobles strip him of all the most important prerogatives of his title of king. Some historians have

[25] St. Nicholas and Adrian already planned to crown Charles the Bald emperor. Cf. *PL,* CXXVI, 669, and CXXII, 1320.

[26] *Annales Bertiniani,* year 876. These *Annales,* following the custom of the time, began the year on Christmas Day. Therefore they reckon December 25, 875, as the first day of 876.

[27] These are the expression of the Fulda annalist (*Annales Fuldenses,* years 875, 876), who detested Charles the Bald. The labors of Father Lapôtre and Emile Bourgeois show the character of Charles the Bald in a more favorable light. Cf. Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 265 ff.; Bourgeois, *Le capitulaire de Kiersy-sur-Oise,* chaps. 5 and 6; Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. II, Part I, p. 389; De Smedt, "Le pape Jean VIII" in the *Rev. des quest. hist.,* 1896, pp. 180 ff.

passed a severe judgment upon John VIII's initiative, and others regard it as a problem. A more exact knowledge of Charles the Bald's warlike and administrative qualities justifies the measures taken by John VIII and gives us a better comprehension and fairer appreciation of the new conception, or, to use the Emperor's words, "the renewal of the Empire" [28] which Charles elaborated in Italy and which he had approved on June 30, 876, at the assembly of Ponthion. Italy was to enter into the imperial system on a par with France, directly subject to the emperor, but protected along its frontiers by the three great marquisates of Friuli, Spoleto, and Tuscany, and by the pope himself, who, as a sort of margrave, would watch over the southern part of the peninsula. The imperial organization, amplified and unified, would thus be more closely connected with the Eternal City as with its center; and the new Emperor, to symbolize the new ideal, would dress in dalmatic, would carry the scepter and wear the diadem, and would take the title of Augustus. The course of events showed that Europe was not ready for such an ideal, but the plan, though not free from vain display, possessed a certain grandeur.

Fifteen months after the assembly of Ponthion, where Charles the Bald appeared in all the pomp of his new costume, he was suddenly stricken with fever and died in a hut at the foot of Mt. Cenis, October 6, 877. He was fifty-four years old.

At the very time when the great projects of imperial revival were failing in the West, John VIII's attention was called to the East.

Photius of Constantinople

St. Ignatius patriarch of Constantinople died October 23, 877, and Photius, who finally had won the favor of Emperor

[28] "The leaden seal, bearing the inscription *Renovatio imperii romani,* was long attributed to Charlemagne. Unquestionably it should be attributed to Charles the Bald." Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* II, 388.

Basil by flattering his vanity,[29] again took possession of the patriarchal see. The Eastern episcopacy was half won over. Cleverly Photius declared that he gave up all doctrinal opposition, confining himself solely to contesting what the popes themselves, he said, had accepted only with difficulty, the unlawful insertion of the *Filioque* in the symbol. Was the Pope deceived by Photius? Did he act knowingly and with a view to the successful outcome of his plans relative to the Bulgar Church?

John VIII declared his willingness to accept the state of affairs that had been brought about, on condition that the new Patriarch, after asking pardon for his past errors,[30] should promise not to interfere in the organization of the Church of Bulgaria. Very likely the penetrating mind of John VIII had seen the depth of Photius' soul. Only one thing seemed utterly objectionable to that man: to recant in the face of an injunction, in a word, to humble himself. But, of his own accord, he declined to enter into any doctrinal dispute; as to the attempt to interfere in the Bulgarian Church, that had been the work of his rival Ignatius, and not his. His self-conceit allowed him to grant the demands of the Pope. Shortly afterward, the two legates, commissioned by the Pope to handle this matter in Constantinople, informed the Pontiff that the two conditions were carried out. John VIII profited by this to attach to Rome the whole hierarchy of the Bulgarian clergy. It was an important success, for which he expressed his thanks to Emperor Basil. But the result was not lasting. We know that later on, the Church of Bulgaria, fascinated by Byzantium, abandoned the Roman Church, thus preparing itself for the schism against which John VIII had wished to preserve it.

Although Photius, as he agreed, refrained from any discus-

[29] Photius had sent the Emperor a scholarly work of genealogy, in which the Emperor is made a descendant of Tiridates, first king of Armenia.

[30] *Misericordiam quaerendo.* Letter of John VIII to the clergy of Constantinople; *PL,* CXXVI, 866.

sion of the Trinitarian doctrines, he did not make the submission required by the Pope. At any rate, John was not satisfied with a vague profession of humility made at a synod assembled by Photius in 879. Furthermore, at that synod the Patriarch, by the reading of falsified letters of John VIII,[31] obtained the condemnation of the Eighth Ecumenical Council.[32] A little while later, on March 13, 880, the bishops of the East, presided over by Photius, declared that they rejected the addition of the *Filioque* and proclaimed the principle of the primacy of Byzantium over Rome.[33]

This was overt schism. John VIII, informed of everything by the able and courageous Bishop Marino, whom he had sent to Constantinople for that very purpose, disavowed and condemned his papal legates, who had dared to take part in such deliberations and such declarations. Once again the projects of the Pope's wise and prudent policy failed miserably.

That policy has sometimes been charged with weakness. Says Hefele:

> But we should not fail to note that John VIII, as he himself declared, thought his duty was to yield to the circumstances. The existence of the States of the Church was threatened by the attacks of the Christian princes and at the same time by the Saracens. He may well have hoped that a schism would be avoided, that Bulgaria would be won back, and that help would be obtained for the defense of his States. True, his condescension had pitiful consequences; but these could hardly have been foreseen.[34]

Empress Engelberga

The aged Empress Engelberga, widow of Louis II, displeased with the act by which John VIII made Charles the Bald emperor, continually plotted. Having obtained from the

[31] Hefele, VI, 39.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

Pope a few days of audience in Provence, she almost persuaded the aged Pontiff to place a crown on the head of her son-in-law Boso and on that of her daughter Irmengarde, who longed to be empress.[35] At Rome she favored the party of those who were called Formosians. It was a strange party with the very austere Bishop of Porto at its center, a party of men the most vicious, of perjurers and assassins, like George of Aventino, and a considerable portion of the upper aristocracy, both lay and ecclesiastical, among whom you might see the patrician noblewoman Constantina, daughter of the nomenculator[36] Gregory, Sergius the master of the militia, and Stephen the *secundicerius* of the Roman Church. John VIII took a bold and courageous step. Excommunication and banishment scattered the group, and famous letters denounced to the Christian nations the abominable crimes that were committed in that circle of factious men.[37] A day would come, after John VIII's death, when they would return to favor and would make use of their standing with Martin I to tear up the papal registers containing the traces of their crimes. If copies of those letters had not come to us from other sources, by way of those to whom they were addressed, we would not have dared believe that the Holy See was assailed by such a flood of corruption and wickedness.

When he turned to the nobility of the Italian provinces, the old Pope found scarcely any greater consolation. For defense against Saracen incursions, Italy could count only on herself. Charles the Bald had been succeeded by the weak Louis the Stammerer. In 879, John VIII resigned himself to recognize as king the incapable Charles the Fat. The Pope tried to form with the dukes of Benevento, Salerno, Capua, Naples, and Amalfi a league against the common enemy. But instead of

[35] *Annales Bertiniani*, year 879.

[36] The nomenculator of the papal court was a sort of master of ceremonies. Du Cange, *Glossarium*, under the word *nomenclator*.

[37] *PL*, CXXVI, 675–679; Jaffé, 3041.

support, he often met with defection and treason. Duke Lambert of Spoleto and Adalbert of Tuscany openly declared themselves the enemies of the Pope. The prince-bishop of Naples, Athanasius, who made an alliance with the Mussulmans, had to be excommunicated. Overwhelmed by age and infirmities, John VIII multiplied himself wherever Italy was in peril. More than once in the early days of his pontificate he took command of a fleet and directed the attack against the Saracens.[38] But now he merely completed the fortifications of Rome. The enclosure which he fortified, he called after his own name, Johannipolis. But on all sides he saw only wretchedness, unfaithfulness, disaster. His supreme humiliation was his acceptance (February, 881) of King Charles the Fat as emperor. On December 15, 882, after a life of effort and sacrifice, that were almost never crowned with success, he breathed forth his soul to God, the victim of a horrible attack. As we are told by the *Annals* of Fulda, "some conspirators, among whom were his close relatives, coveting his money and his position, had poison administered to him. Then, as the poison was not acting fast enough to suit them, they beat him with a hammer until he expired." [39]

In a letter addressed at the outset of his pontificate to Empress Engelberga, John VIII wrote these words: "When the supreme Judge comes, He will ask both of us whether we have left His Church in a better state than the state in which we received it, freer, more tranquil, more prosperous." [40] In the sad times in which Providence placed him, could he possibly hope to give a better testimony to himself before God? John VIII could truly render such an account when he appeared before the supreme Judge.

[38] For example, in February, 875. Jaffé, 3008.
[39] *Annales Fuldenses,* year 883; *Hist. des Gaules,* VIII, 47 f.
[40] Jaffé, 3028.

Pope Marino I (882–884)

After the death of John VIII, three popes followed in nine years, from 882 to 891. They had not time, perhaps also they had not the courage or the power, for any great undertakings. We see all of them start out with acts of firmness; but you would say that soon, weighed down by the pressure of frightful burdens and thwarted by formidable oppositions, they grew weary and yielded. Marino I, elected December 23, 882, was that clear-sighted and courageous prelate who at Constantinople had exposed and denounced the knavery of Photius. It was said his election was by way of compensation for the outrages he suffered on that occasion. He had been a disciple of the great Pope St. Nicholas, and was consecrated bishop of Caere by John VIII. His election was the first instance of the transfer of a bishop to the see of Rome. His letters show him in close relations with the great king of England, Alfred, whom he encouraged in the work of Christian civilization. He repeated his predecessor's condemnation of Photius. Is it true that he became convinced that the condemnation of the usurping patriarch would result in the rehabilitation of Photius' most earnest adversary, Formosus? Or was he simply seduced by Formosus' renown for austere virtue? Or did he yield to a change in public opinion? Formosus was freed from his censures and re-established in his bishopric. When Marino I died (February 24, 884), the party of the Formosians was triumphant.

Pope Adrian III (884–885)

Adrian III, a Roman by birth, was elected March 1 of the same year. He was not devoid of energy. He it was who ordered the eyes of a conspirator (George of Aventino) to be

put out, and one of his accomplices to be publicly flogged.[41] But it was also in his pontificate that Photius wrote a very clever and scholarly memorial against the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost,[42] and that Emperor Basil in a letter, written probably under Photius' dictation, protested against the so-called violation of the laws of the Church in the election of Pope Marino, irregularly transferred, said Basil, from one bishopric to another.

Pope Stephen V (885–891)

Stephen V, belonging to a noble Roman family, elected six days after his predecessor's death (July 15, 885), was consecrated bishop by Formosus himself, whose influence was increasing. Pope Stephen, by his negotiations, persuaded Emperor Leo the Wise, who had just succeeded Basil, to expel Photius from the see of Constantinople. But Stephen, who reluctantly crowned Duke Guy of Spoleto emperor in 891, thus opened an era of new tribulations for the papacy. He died in August or September, 891, just when Photius was dying in the Armenian monastery of Bordi, after five years of silent retreat that we would like to believe were five years of repentance.

The house of Spoleto, which attained to the imperial dignity at the end of the ninth century, boasted that it was the equal of the Carolingian family in the nobility and the antiquity of its origin. The head of the family, Guy, a man of notoriously testy temper, had married the famous Agiltrude, daughter of Adalgis of Benevento who boasted that he had slapped Emperor Louis II. Preponderant in Italy and allied to the houses of Tuscany and Benevento, the house of Spoleto, at the death of Charles the Fat in 888, proposed its candidate for the throne

[41] *Lib. pont.*, II, 225.
[42] *PL*, CII, 280 ff., 564 ff., 793 ff.

of France. Guy, strengthened by certain alliances in that country, even succeeded in being crowned at Langres. But Odo count of Paris, who inaugurated the line of the Capetians, supplanted him. Guy, urged on by his wife the ambitious Agiltrude, at the same time plotted to become emperor. But Queen Irmengarde of Provence, daughter of Louis II, ever haunted by the memory of imperial splendors, also wanted that honor for her son. Her most formidable rival was a natural son of Carloman, Arnulf duke of Carinthia, a valiant warrior about whom gathered almost all the nobility of France and Germany and in whom were placed the hopes of all those who, in Rome, had a real care for the true interests of the Church. Arnulf seemed the only person capable of holding the great sword of his ancestor Charlemagne, of halting the Norman and Saracen invasions, and of protecting the papacy without oppressing it. The house of Spoleto, on the contrary, located in the center of Italy close to the States of the Church, involved in all the factional strifes that agitated the peninsula, and inspired by the insatiable ambition of the haughty and implacable Agiltrude, would bring nothing but humiliation and disturbance to the Church.

Pope Formosus (891–896)

This was grasped by the new Pope, who succeeded Stephen V (September 21, 891); it was Formosus. Probably there was not at Rome a man of more worth, of more extended culture, and of more ascetic bearing. He was elected almost unanimously. The good acclaimed him for his virtues, the others for his revolutionary past and for his dubious compromises.

Councils convoked by him or at his instigation at Vienne in 892, at Rome on March 1, 893, at Chalon-sur-Saône on May 1, 894, at Tribur in 895, show that the new Pope had an enlightened concern about the evils afflicting the Church and a

sincere resolve to cure them. The question considered at the Council of Vienne, held at Formosus' order and under the presidency of his legates, was the intrusion of the laity into the affairs of the Church. They usurped ecclesiastical property (canon 1), mistreated clerics (canon 2), took advantage of the death or sickness of a bishop or priest to seize the funds intended for the poor (canon 30), and exacted a payment for the conferring of ecclesiastical offices (canon 4).[43] The acts of the Council of Rome are lost; but Flodoard's summary shows that it was aimed at curing the evils from which the Churches of the East and of Africa suffered.[44] The council that was held in the imperial palace at Tribur not far from Mainz in 895, acquaints us with the customs of the time by the numerous allusions we find to blows and wounds (canons 20, 24, and others), to sacrilegious thefts (canon 7), to the murder of priests (canon 5), to armed invasions of churches (canon 6), in short, by the scenes of pillage and of murder that it evokes. Canon 18 forbids the use of wooden chalices in the celebration of mass. It says that we should not misunderstand the words of St. Boniface the martyr, that "formerly priests of gold used chalices of wood, and now priests of wood use chalices of gold": the honor due to holy Church and to the body of Jesus Christ makes it a duty for us to choose the most precious metals for our sacred vessels.[45] Formosus' letters, several of which are preserved, indicate a peaceful and conservative policy. He called upon Odo count of Paris not to attack Charles the Simple, the lawful king, and wrote to the bishops of France to the same end.[46]

His superior intelligence showed him that the safety of the Church and of society would be served best by the crowning of Arnulf; but his former dealings made him a sort of pris-

[43] Mansi, XVIII, 122; Hefele, VI, 126.
[44] Mansi, XVIII, 126; Flodoard, *Historia Remensis,* IV, 2; *PL,* CXXXV, 267.
[45] Mansi, XVIII, 129 ff.
[46] Mansi, XVIII, 108 f.

oner of the Italian faction. Through weakness he crowned as emperor the duke of Spoleto, Lambert, the son of Guy; then, perhaps upon the advice of those around him, he made the culpable blunder of trying to repair that weakness by a double-faced policy, asking Arnulf to come and free him from the "wicked Christians" who surrounded him.[47] The fearless King of Germany answered the appeal and marched upon Rome at the head of an army. Guy's widow, the mother of Emperor Lambert, had seized the government of Rome. Except for a chance incident that opened the St. Pancratius gate to the German army, a bloody encounter would have taken place between the King of Germany and the empress mother of the house of Spoleto. Arnulf, received by Pope Formosus on the steps of St. Peter's, was crowned emperor on February 22, 896. The terrible Agiltrude never forgave the Pontiff for what she called his treason. Her vengeance was wreaked even upon the corpse of Formosus.

The threats of the Empress were unavailing, and the sudden death of the new Emperor Arnulf, stricken with paralysis just as he was marching upon Spoleto, may have hastened the death of the unfortunate Pontiff, who died April 4, 896.

Popes Boniface VI (896) and Stephen VI (896–897)

Says Cardinal Hergenröther: "With the death of Formosus there begins an era of deepest humiliation for the Holy See." [48] In the space of eight years (896–904) nine popes followed one another. All were more or less under the domination of the house of Spoleto, under the fatal influence of Agiltrude; and their successors withdrew from that domination only to fall under a still sadder influence, that of the house of Theophylactus and of the infamous Marozia.

[47] Jaffé, 3481, 3486, 3500, 3501.
[48] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, 202.

Boniface VI, who earlier in his career had been twice deposed (first from the subdiaconate and later from the priesthood), occupied the papal throne only fifteen days. Then (May 22, 896) the influence of the Spoleto party brought about the election of the bishop of Anagni, Stephen VI. It was said that the real sympathies of the new Pope were for the Emperor of Germany, but his powerful electors gave him no freedom of action and, except for the essential interests of the Church, which Providence safeguards against every attack, he was a tool in the hands of Agiltrude. To this woman must be traced the final responsibility for the sacrilegious outrage committed by Pope Stephen VI against Pope Formosus.

The body of the former Pope was disinterred. It was clothed in its papal vestments and set up on a sort of throne. Then it was subjected to a sham trial; it was questioned, and a lawyer was assigned to answer for it. Following this lugubrious parody, Formosus was declared unlawful pope; the decrees issued by him, and the holy orders conferred by him were declared null. The three fingers which he used in giving his blessing were cut off. Lastly he was degraded, his vestments and insignia were stripped from the corpse. But they stopped at the hairshirt, which they found incrusted in his flesh.[49] The populace, so difficult to restrain once their evil passions have been aroused, wanted even more. They demanded the corpse, which they dragged to the Tiber and threw into the river.[50]

Shortly afterward, Stephen VI, the victim of a conspiracy,

[49] *Corporeo siquidem suco haeserat busto, unde non tam facile discerni poterat.* Vulgarius, *De causa formosiana;* Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius,* p. 131.

[50] The chief sources for this event are: 1. the account by Liutprand bishop of Cremona, in his *Antapodosis* (*PL,* CXXXVI, 804); 2. the books composed by the Frankish priest Auxilius and by the grammarian Vulgarius (Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius,* p. 95), both of them contemporaries of the events; 3. the acts of a council held at Rome in 904, under John IX (Mabillon, *Museum italicum,* Part II, p. 86, and Mansi, XVIII, 222 ff., and other documents simply mentioned by Hefele, *Hist. des conciles,* VI, 136 f.).

was arrested, was degraded, as the dead Formosus had been, imprisoned, then strangled in his prison during the summer of 897.

Popes Romanus (897) and Theodore II (898)

So many outrages seem to have produced a slight reaction and brought to power (September 17, 897) Pope Romanus, who quashed all that Stephen had done against Formosus, but was obliged to recognize Lambert as emperor. He died at the end of four months (February 8, 898). His successor, Theodore II, governed only twenty days. Flodoard praises his piety and courage. During his short pontificate, it is said that the ghost of Formosus appeared to a monk in a dream and informed him of the place where Formosus' body would be found. The body of the unfortunate Pontiff, which had been carried over the banks by an overflow of the river, was triumphantly deposited in St. Peter's Basilica. On that day of solemn rehabilitation, the Roman populace was as enthusiastic as it had been ferocious on the day of the degradation. In the papal basilica, which had been richly adorned by the wise zeal of Pope Formosus, many declared that, at the moment when his body entered in triumph, the holy images, placed there by his care, bowed their heads in greeting as his body passed.

Pope John IX (898–900)

Eight days after the death of Theodore II (March 12, 898), John IX, formerly a Benedictine monk, was elected. He had been ordained priest by Formosus. In various councils he rehabilitated the memory of that Pope and, to avoid the disturbances that often arose at the consecration of the supreme pontiffs, decided that the ceremony would take place only in the presence of the imperial legates. But the young

Emperor Lambert, on whom John IX was counting, died soon after from a hunting accident. The papal elections were exposed to the most excited competition and the most humiliating passions that history has had to record.

Benedict IV who was set over the government of the Church from 900 to 903, Leo V who, a month after his election, was supplanted by Christopher and imprisoned by him, and Christopher who, six months later, received the same treatment from Sergius III, have left but little trace in history. The first two had real personal qualities, but their efforts were fruitless.

Pope Sergius III (904–911)

At the advent of Sergius III (June 9, 904) began a period of about sixty years, summed up by a monk of Monte Soracte in a barbarously worded Latin phrase, which was perhaps a current popular saying: *Subjugatus est Romam potestative in manu feminae.*[51] For almost sixty years a woman's utterly shameless passions weighed heavily upon the Eternal City and ruled it. Says Cardinal Bellarmine: "Perhaps God wished to show that the Roman pontificate owes its conservation not to human direction nor to human prudence, and that the stone on which it rests is so provided with the special protection of God that the powers of hell will never prevail against it." [52]

Amid the disorder of political institutions and the failure of the constituted powers, we see taking place at Rome the spectacle which is to be noted nearly everywhere else: local families emerged, acquired influence, and seized the power. But, whereas north of the Alps the valiant Robert the Strong saved the monarchy and remade France, in Italy the intrigues of

[51] Benedict of St. Andrew, *Chronicon; MGH, Scriptores,* III, 714. This curious Latin may be literally translated as follows: "One was under the yoke at Rome, despotically, under the hand of a woman."

[52] Bellarmine, *De romano pontifice,* preface.

the house of Theophylactus would have forever destroyed the papacy, if the papacy could have been destroyed.

Under Pope Formosus one of the most important posts in the papal court, that of *vestararius* (master of the wardrobe), was given to a certain Theophylactus, already duke and commander of the militia. The master of the wardrobe was charged with watching over the government of Ravenna and of the neighboring provinces. For this reason, if for no other, Theophylactus was a considerable personage in Rome. But this did not satisfy the ambition of his wife Theodora and of his two daughters Theodora the Younger and Marozia. First, Theodora obtained for herself the position of mistress of the wardrobe, which enabled her to interfere directly in Roman affairs. Being of easy morals, she then made her passions serve her ambitious projects. As a price for her sinful relations with the most eminent personages, what she required was not jewels and finery, but villas and fortresses. Theophylactus soon became the richest personage in the city of Rome. The clever and unscrupulous Theodora profited by this to acquire a preponderant political sway. Between the party of the dukes of Spoleto, which was declining, and the German party, that was growing in strength,[53] her vacillating policy made her the arbiter of the situation. The papal elections were in her hands. The papacy, in spite of the miseries of the last pontificates, was still the highest power in the world. Her whole aim was to seize the papacy.

Quite possibly her intervention was manifested as early as the last years of the ninth century, notably at the time of the election of Benedict IV, who had as competitor a certain Sergius, probably the future Sergius III. The two enigmatic persons that we see pass rapidly upon the papal throne in 903, that Leo V who was not a cardinal-priest and who was

[53] This was the beginning of the Guelph and Ghibelline parties, which disturbed the whole Middle Ages with their strifes.

called *sacerdos forensis,* and that Christopher who, after throwing Leo into prison, was himself cast into prison by Sergius, were very probably creatures of Theodora. But her proved candidate in 904 was Sergius III. Recently discovered letters prove that, under Pope Sergius, Theophylactus and Theodora acted as almost absolute masters in the Papal States.[54]

Influence of Marozia

The scandal did not stop there. Theodora, as we have noted, had a daughter, Marozia. More corrupt, more clever, and more daring than her mother, Marozia appeared as the evil genius at the beginning of the tenth century. Married in 905 or 906 to Alberic marquis of Camerino, having illicit relations with the principal lords of Rome, she increased the wealth of her family and the number of her villas and fortresses by the same means as used by her mother. She made the Castle of Sant' Angelo her home. She was called Madam Senator (*Donna Senatrix*). From some passages of Liutprand and of Flodoard and from an expression in the *Liber pontificalis* in the statement about John XI, it has been inferred that she corrupted even Sergius III. This is the first pope on whom so grave a charge has rested.[55] Intellectually the new Pontiff,

[54] *Neues Archiv.,* IX, 517.

[55] That Pope John XI was the son of Marozia seems evident from the testimony of a large number of contemporary writers (Liutprand, Flodoard, and others) and is generally admitted by historians. Cf. Hergenröther, Hefele, Moehler, and Rohrbacher. But Liutprand and the *Liber pontificalis* declare further that his father was Pope Sergius: *Johannes, natione romanus,* says the official note, *ex patre Sergio papa, sedit annos IV, menses X* (*Liber pont.,* II, 243).

If we admit this paternity, may we attribute it to a lawful marriage? No. John XI was elected pope in 932, according to the *Liber pontificalis;* but, according to all the historians, he was very young when he was raised to the papacy. Generally he is spoken of as a youth from twenty to twenty-six years old during this period (Hefele, VI, 150). Hence he was born in 906 or 907. But, in 907, Marozia was already married to Alberic. Most historians assign the year 905 as the date of Marozia's marriage to Alberic. Even if we suppose that she was not yet married to Alberic, how could

sprung from the counts of Tusculum, was remarkably endowed. Consecrated on June 9, 904, he governed the Church for seven years and three months. He repaired the Lateran Basilica, adorning it with much magnificence and excellent taste. This Pontiff, of whom Cardinal Bellarmine says: "He sinned by very bad example, but not by false doctrine," [56] defended the purity of the faith against the errors of Photius,[57] the integrity of morality against Bishop William of Turin, and the holiness of the ecclesiastical state by fostering community life among the clergy. The greatest event of his pontificate was unquestionably the founding of the monastery of Cluny. September 11, 910, William the Pious duke of Aquitaine, son of Bernard count of Auvergne and son-in-law of Boso king of Provence, signed the following charter, which history should piously record:

Desiring to employ for the good of my soul the wealth which God has given me, I believe I cannot do better than to win the friendship of His poor. That this work may be perpetual, I have decided to support a community of monks at my expense. Therefore, out of love for God

Pope Sergius, her husband, have allowed her union with the Marquis of Camerino? How would he have had with Alberic those friendly relations which everyone affirms?

If culpable relations existed between Sergius and Marozia, would they have constituted sacrilege? They certainly would have. From the book of one of the defenders of Formosus, the priest Auxilius, a contemporary of Sergius III (*Hist. litt.*, VI, 122 ff.), it is evident that Sergius was raised to the subdiaconate by Pope Marino (882–884), to the diaconate under Stephen V (885–891), to the episcopate by Formosus (891–896). His name figures in a Roman council in the year 898 (*Lib. pont.*, II, 568). To free him from sacrilege, we would have to place John XI's birth as early as 885 or even 884, because subdeacons were bound to celibacy in the West ever since the fifth century (Vacandard, *Études de critique et d'histoire*, 2d ed., pp. 104 f.). This calculation would make him fifty years old at the time of his elevation to the papacy and would thus contradict the authors who speak of the youth of John XI. Moreover it is hardly probable that Marozia gave birth to a son in 884. We know that her third marriage took place in 932. To suppose that she was the mother of John in 884 would be to attribute to her an unlikely age at the time of her third marriage.

[56] *De romano pontifice*, Bk. IV, chap. 12.

[57] Council of Trosly (near Soissons), canon 14; Mansi, XVIII, 304.

and for our Lord Jesus Christ, I give to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, of my own estate, the land of Cluny and its dependencies; the whole situated in the county of Macon. I give it for the soul of my lord King Odo, and for the souls of my parents and my servants.

These monks and all this property will be under the authority of Abbot Berno, so long as he lives; but after his decease the religious will have the right to elect for abbot, according to the Rule of St. Benedict, whomever they choose, without any power hindering the regular election.

From that day they will be subject neither to us nor to our relatives nor to the king nor to any earthly power. Secular princes, counts, bishops, even the pope, I beg them all in the name of God and of the saints and of judgment day, not to lay hands on the property of these servants of God, not to sell it, exchange it, lessen it, or give it in fief to anyone, and not to impose on them a superior against their will.[58]

It was from this monastery of Cluny, founded under Sergius III, that the reform of the Church arose.[59]

Sergius' two immediate successors, Anastasius III and Lando, were only passing figures. They appear to have been creatures of the house of Theophylactus, who governed the temporalities in their name. No grave charge has been brought against their private life.

Pope John X (914–928)

Lando's successor, John X, formerly archbishop of his native city, Ravenna, was elected March 24, 914. He occupied the Holy See fourteen years, and not without some splendor. The romantic details which Liutprand gives about the passion he is supposed to have aroused in Theodora are purely imaginative. The scholarly editor of the *Liber pontificalis* points

[58] Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum O.S.B.*, V, 77.

[59] Chénon, "L'ordre de Cluny et la réforme de l'Église" in *La France chrétienne*, pp. 187 ff.

out their anachronisms and improbabilities.[60] What seems certain, however, is that he owed his elevation to the all-powerful influence of Theodora or of Marozia. But he was an active, energetic pope. His great work was the expulsion of the Saracens. He was able to form a confederation against them, made up of the nobles of the peninsula under the direction of Berengarius, the former foe of the house of Spoleto, whom he crowned emperor in December, 915. And he himself paid with his person, charging the enemy at the head of his troops.[61]

This independent way of acting on the part of the Pope embroiled him with Marozia. She had lost her father Theophylactus and her husband Alberic and married Marquis Guy of Tuscany. She made use of him to avenge herself upon the Pontiff. Aided by her husband, Marozia provoked an uprising and had the Lateran Palace broken into. The Pope's brother was assassinated; John X was seized and thrown into prison, where shortly after (928) he was smothered by having a pillow pressed tightly over his mouth.[62] No one could, with impunity, withdraw from the protection of Marozia.

The arrogant ruler of Rome promptly disposed of the tiara in favor of Leo VI, who reigned six months and fifteen days (928), then Stephen VII, who occupied the Holy See for two years, one month, and fifteen days (929–931), then in favor of her own son, who was John XI.

This was the height of Marozia's power. Mother of the reigning Pope, she dreamed of becoming queen and empress. Again widowed by the death of Guy of Tuscany, she married (932) Hugh of Provence, one of the claimants for the Empire. Would her son refuse to place an imperial crown upon the brow of her to whom he owed everything?

[60] *Lib. pont.*, II, 240 f.

[61] Jaffé, 3556.

[62] Flodoard, noting the tragic end of John X, relates various rumors about it. He says that, according to some reports, the Pope died of fright; and according to others, he met a violent death. *PL*, CXXXV, 439 f.

Providence did not permit the realization of this supreme ambition. The solemn nuptials of the newly married couple, celebrated in the hall of the Castle of Sant' Angelo, took place but a short time before the catastrophe which hurled Marozia from the pinnacle of her might. A vulgar family scene was the occasion of that fall. The daughter of Theophylactus had a second son, Alberic. One day he was publicly insulted by his stepfather and, gathering some followers about him, he led an attack upon the Castle of Sant' Angelo. Hugh had time to escape through a window by a rope ladder, abandoning Marozia, who was made prisoner by her son and shortly afterward died without it being known precisely what were the circumstances of her death.

Dictatorship of Alberic

The trials of the papacy did not end with the removal of Marozia. Alberic exercised a dictatorical power, first over his own brother John XI, then, after John's death (936), over Leo VII (936–939), Stephen VIII (939–942), Marino II (942–946), and Agapetus II (946–955). None of these popes was a temporal ruler, unless, as has been said, in the way in which the last Merovingians were kings. Alberic gave himself the title of "prince of all the Romans" and had his name placed beside that of the reigning pope on all the coins of the period. The four popes who owed their consecration to him were men whose private lives were as blameless as was their doctrine.

In the year 956 we see Alberic begin a firmly conservative policy. He remained a dictator; he kept all the ways and methods of a dictator; but he used his authority to carry out many useful reforms. Says Cardinal Hergenröther: "Alberic's dictatorship was generally well liked. He respected the freedom of ecclesiastical elections. He honored the clergy, endowed several monasteries, and was much concerned with their re-

form." [63] What happening was able thus to modify the policy of Marozia's son? The coming of a saint to Rome.

Cluny Abbey

In 936 Alberic patrician of the Romans and King Hugh of Provence, both of them hoping to acquire the imperial power or at least a preponderant position in the Christian world, had resolved to submit their differences to arbitration. Cluny Abbey, recently founded under Sergius III by William of Aquitaine, was beginning to spread about it a fragrance of virtue and piety. The lords of the neighborhood offered it their lands; warriors came there to lay down their swords and follow a life of retreat and silence. There, among those souls, who were masters of their passions, raised above all the paltry considerations of earth, Alberic and Hugh thought to find the impartial arbiter they needed. As head of the abbey, the pious Berno had been followed by one whom the Church would place on her altars under the name of St. Odo. Born in the Maine country in 879, at first a brilliant officer under the command of Foulques the Good, count of Anjou, then of William the Pious, duke of Aquitaine, Odo gave up the career of arms and joined the canons regular of St. Martin of Tours. There one day, as he was reading Virgil, he was touched by grace. From that moment the reading of the Latin poet, that he had been passionately fond of, seemed to him insipid in comparison with meditation upon the Rule of St. Benedict, in which he thereafter took his chief delight. He entered Cluny monastery. There his virtues and learning marked him for the choice of his brethren, who in 927, just when Marozia's power was most impudently spreading itself over the Church, elected him their abbot.

To him the King of Provence and the Patrician of the Ro-

[63] *Kirchengeschichte,* II, 206.

mans turned to end their dispute. Odo came to Rome in 936; he came again in 938 and 942. He not only brought about peace between the two rulers, but also won the confidence of Alberic, who frequently was influenced by the advice of the saintly abbot. The death of St. Odo of Cluny in 942 was a great loss for the Church, a great loss for the "Prince of the Romans." The presence and the counsel of the holy abbot would undoubtedly, a few years later, have kept him from the regrettable act that was the great fault of his life. Blinded by paternal affection, Alberic persuaded the kindly Pope Agapetus II that the surest way to avoid disturbances when the question of succession to the Holy See should arise, would be to have the future Roman pontiff acclaimed by the people even then. And for this high office he designated his young son Octavian. Gathered in St. Peter's Basilica, the clergy and the people swore to elect for pontiff, upon the death of the reigning Pope, the son of Alberic. Nothing was more contrary to canon law; no choice was more disastrous.

Pope John XII (955–963)

When Alberic died (924), Octavian was proclaimed prince and senator of all the Romans. The next year, after the death of Pope Agapetus, he was acclaimed bishop of Rome and head of the universal Church. He was a young man, only sixteen years old. Nothing in his life marked him for this office, and everything should have kept him from it. He was rarely seen in church. His days and nights were spent in the company of young men and of disreputable women, in the pleasures of the table and of amusements and of the hunt, or in even more sinful sensual enjoyments. It is related that sometimes, in the midst of dissolute revelry, the prince had been seen to drink to the health of the devil. Raised to the papal office, Octavian changed his name and took the name of John XII. He was the

first pope thus to assume a new name. But his new dignity brought about no change in his morals, and merely added the guilt of sacrilege.[64] Divine providence, watching over the Church, miraculously preserved the deposit of faith, of which this young voluptuary was the guardian. This Pope's life was a monstrous scandal, but his bullarium is faultless. We cannot sufficiently admire this prodigy. There is not a heretic or a schismatic who has not endeavored to legitimate his own conduct dogmatically: Photius tried to justify his pride, Luther his sensual passions, Calvin his cold cruelty. Neither Sergius III nor John XII nor Benedict IX nor Alexander VI, supreme pontiffs, definers of the faith, certain of being heard and obeyed by the whole Church, uttered, from the height of their apostolic pulpit, a single word that could be an approval of their disorders.

At times John XII even became the defender of the threatened social order, of offended canon law, and of the religious life exposed to danger.

In 950, Berengarius II marquis of Ivrea, grandson of Emperor Berengarius who had been crowned in 901 by Pope Benedict IV, seized the kingdom of Italy and was there exercising a tyrannical domination. John XII, in reply to the wishes of the people, implored the help of the German King Otto, who came down to Italy, drove out Berengarius, and gave peace to Rome and to the peninsula. The savior of Italy was received as a new Charlemagne. On February 2, 962, Pope John XII placed the imperial crown upon him, and upon Adelaide, who seated holiness upon the imperial throne. Otto's coronation was followed by an important treaty. An authentic copy of it is still preserved in the Vatican archives. It is the celebrated *Privilegium Ottonis*. By the new pact, the Emperor guaranteed to the Sovereign Pontiff all his possessions or temporal claims; the Pope promised that his successors, be-

[64] Hefele, VI, 187 ff.; Mansi, XVIII, 465; *MGH, Scriptores,* III, 342.

fore their consecration, would renew in the presence of the reigning emperor or of his legates, "the promises made by Pope Leo." This act, dated February 13, 962, revived purely and simply the right of the ninth century. Otto's successors, even Otto himself, soon misused certain clauses of the treaty and interfered arbitrarily in the election of the popes. But, all in all, the re-establishment of the Empire was a blessing for the Church and for society. It freed the papacy from the baneful yoke of Italian feudalism.

The next year (963) the first conflict broke out. Emperor Otto, abusing his powers and avenging himself for some act of John XII, had the Pope deposed by a synod and in his place had the protoscriniarius Leo elected under the name of Leo VIII. But John succeeded in assembling a regular council, which quashed the decisions of the assembly held by Otto. Those decisions were null for two reasons: in condemning and deposing the supreme head of the Church, the pseudo-council violated the principle that the pope cannot be judged by anyone; and in electing the protoscriniarius Leo, who was not in sacred orders, it violated an ancient tradition, that the pope must be taken from the cardinalitial clergy, that is, from the clergy attached (*incardinatus*) to a church.

True, the young Pope, in defending his case, was defending his own personal interests; and these were also the interests of justice. He was considering his spiritual interests when he took sides with the monks, favored their progress and their reform, and asked them to implore the divine mercy for him. When confirming the venerable monastery of Subiaco in its property and its rights, he requested, by a special bull, that the monks of the monastery should "every day chant, for the health of his soul, a hundred Kyrie eleisons and a hundred Christe Eleisons." [65] Out of sixteen bulls or letters of John

[65] *PL,* CXXXIII, 1024. Are we to regard this as a sign of some feeling of repentance? Or was it merely a chancery formula?

XII that we still possess, nine have for their object to safeguard the rights and prerogatives of the monasteries. Therein lay the future of the Church. Under the direction of St. Majolus, who continued the traditions of St. Odo and whose work would be carried on by St. Odilo and St. Hugh, the Cluny Abbey saw priories grouping about it, affiliated itself with other abbeys, and united numerous monasteries under its jurisdiction. A new form of monastic life appeared in the Church. In place of houses individually autonomous, a federation of monasteries, under the direction of a mother-abbey and of an archabbot, a religious order properly so called was born, exempt in temporal matters from all civil powers as sovereign freehold, exempt in spiritual matters from all ecclesiastical authority except that of the pope; a considerable power which, by virtues and learning, would acquire over lords and populace, over simple clerics and over popes, a profound reforming influence.[66] The monastic institution, which the papacy, even in its decline, had always encouraged and blessed, will in turn restore the honor of the decadent papacy. Thus the Church will find in herself the regenerating power that she needs: from one of these monasteries protected by John XII, will come forth St. Gregory VII.

[66] Chénon, "L'ordre de Cluny et la réforme de l'Église" in *La France chrétienne dans l'histoire,* p. 191.

APPENDIX I

The False Decretals

ACCORDING to some historians, Pope St. Nicholas, in his legislative work, made a twofold mistake: altering from top to bottom the constitution of the Church and, for the execution of his plan, relying upon a forgery, written expressly in the interest of the papacy. This view has been maintained with no more learning and brilliancy than by the famous author of the pamphlet *Rome and the Council,* which appeared in 1869 under the pseudonym of Janus. He says:

> In the middle of the ninth century—about 845—arose the huge fabrication of the Isidorian decretals, which had results far beyond what its author contemplated, and gradually but surely changed the whole constitution and government of the Church. . . . About a hundred pretended decrees . . . were then fabricated in the west of Gaul, and eagerly seized upon by Pope Nicholas I at Rome, to be used as genuine documents in support of the new claims put forward by himself and his successors.[1]

This is the celebrated question of the False Decretals. This term is applied to a collection of ecclesiastical laws pretending to give the conciliar decrees and the papal decretals of the first seven centuries. The Middle Ages, from the ninth century on, generally accepted this collection as genuine and attributed it to St. Isidore of Seville. However, as early as the twelfth century, Peter Comestor, Stephen of Tournai, and Godfrey of Viterbo expressed doubts about it. The apocryphal character of the collection is today proved beyond possible question. But

[1] Janus (Döllinger), *The Pope and the Council,* chap. 3, sec. 7.

we can establish: 1. that the False Decretals introduced nothing new in the matter of papal rights; 2. that the popes had nothing to do with their composition and that St. Nicholas I's only mistake, if it was one, was sometimes to use expressions taken from the new collection in defense of his traditional rights.

1. It would be easy to show that St. Nicholas and the popes of the ninth century had no need to resort to the aid of the pseudo-Isidore to establish their rights of sovereignty whether over the ecclesiastical hierarchy or, in spiritual matters, over civil society, or in the temporal domain, over the Roman Papal States. Their right to pass final judgment in all ecclesiastical cases and to be judged by no one was an immemorial tradition in the Church: the popes had affirmed it, the bishops had recognized it, and the rulers had proclaimed it. Innocent I and Leo I had claimed the right to judge major cases, following the ancient custom.[2] The bishop-patriarch St. Cyril of Alexandria,[3] St. Avitus of Vienne,[4] the Palmary Synod apropos of Pope Symmachus, and the episcopal assembly held at Rome under Pope Leo III, openly attested the pope's right of supreme jurisdiction. Emperors Gratian and Valentinian accepted its principle,[5] and Charlemagne inserted in his capitularies this ancient canon: "The supreme pontiff will be judged by no one." [6] The pope's spiritual supremacy over rulers was a right admitted by all. Charlemagne called himself "the devoted defender and the humble auxiliary of holy Church." [7] Hincmar of Reims, who has been called the father of Gallicanism, wrote: "God has willed that Christian kings should

[2] Hardouin, I, 1000.
[3] Mansi, IV, 1012.
[4] *PL*, LIX, 248.
[5] Hardouin, I, 843.
[6] *Neque summus Praesul a quoquam judicabitur.* Labbe, I, 1555.
[7] *Devotus sanctae Ecclesiae defensor humilisque adjutor.* Baluze, I, 475.

have need of the pontiffs for eternal life." [8] We have already sufficiently established the ancient origin of the right of the pope over his temporal domain, and therefore have no need to repeat the evidence here.

2. The view formerly held by Theiner and Eichorn, that the False Decretals were composed at Rome, is today universally abandoned. We must seek their origin in the Frankish Empire. Their place of origin has been fixed at Mainz, where Benedict Levita at that very time composed the *False Capitularies,* a juridical monument that was for the civil legislation what the *False Decretals* were for the ecclesiastical legislation; then in the vicinity of Reims, where it was supposed that the trials of Rothade of Soissons, of Ebbo of Reims, or of Hincmar the Younger of Laon suggested the idea. But the recent works of Paul Fournier seem to eliminate these two suppositions. Between the False Decretals and certain apocryphal documents, certainly composed at Le Mans about the middle of the ninth century, there is so close a relationship that the learned author does not hesitate to attribute them to the same forger.

Who is this forger? The name of a deacon Leobald has been mentioned. Says Moehler: "Possibly this mighty man lived unknown and in seclusion. . . . He was assuredly a man of great knowledge, perhaps the most learned of his contemporaries, a man of penetrating mind, sagacious and in a rare degree initiated in the spirit and needs of his time." [9] To safeguard the independence of bishops against the encroachments of the temporal power, to exempt ecclesiastical cases from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, to oppose the exorbitant rights which certain metropolitans claimed for themselves, to augment the strength and inner cohesion of the Churches, to

[8] Hincmar, *De potestate regia et pontificia,* chap. 1.
[9] Moehler, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, 172.

eliminate the chorepiscopi, whose vague, indetermined, and disputed jurisdiction was a source of disturbance, especially to hinder the spoliation of the bishops, for which their destitution, obtained by arbitrary procedure, was the prelude, and, as assurance of all these results, to group the whole hierarchy strongly about the pope: such was the aim pursued by the great scholar, the clear-sighted statesman who was the author of the *False Decretals.*

He did not make the materials with which he worked, but took them from authentic documents. He simply believed that reasons of state or, if we may so speak, reasons of Church, gave him a right to enhance the authority of these documents by giving them an antiquity which they did not possess. He falsely attributed them to popes of the first centuries, as people then used to refer to the first centuries the origin of such or such a monument, such or such a legend, when they wished to render the traditions of a church more venerable. Of course, although offering excuses for the barbarous customs of that period, Christian conscience cannot approve such methods.

And such methods were not necessary. Critical scholarship places the composition of the *False Decretals* at a period anterior to the pontificate of St. Nicholas. But the great Pope never needed to depend upon the new collection in maintaining his rights. Says Father de Smedt:

> Never did it occur to Nicholas I to recommend the pseudo-Isidore collection or to take the least citation from it. Further, when writing to Hincmar in 863, he mentions the popes whose constitutions ought to serve as a rule for the decisions of bishops. But the most ancient in the list is St. Siricius, whose letters are perfectly authentic. And here is something still more remarkable. In a large number of letters written subsequent to the restitution of Rothade, and consequently when he must have had at hand the complete collection of the pseudo-Isidore, Nicholas I cites phrases that are found almost textually in this collection, but always attributing them to their real authors and

not to the much earlier popes under whose names the forger had published them.[10] . . .

Why, you may say, be satisfied with this silence, however significant it may be, that was altogether ineffective to hinder the success of the imposture? Why not go a step farther and solemnly protest against the unfair use of the venerable names of the first popes and expose the forger to the contempt of the Christian world? This question would not be propounded by a real scholar. And it is easily answered. Nicholas I lived in the second half of the ninth century, and no man of that time could consider, in connection with a publication such as that of the False Decretals, undertaking the work which today would be considered indispensable and which would have resulted in establishing the fraud beyond doubt. It would be unfair to blame St. Nicholas and his successors for not doing what Hincmar and Gerbert did not think of doing, although they certainly possessed far greater resources and leisure for that critical work.[11]

In a word, following Paul Fournier, we may say that the collection of pseudo-Isidore was able, among the Franks, to aid the movement of concentration about the see of Rome;[12] it was not an element utilized by Nicholas I to accelerate it, much less to justify it. The literary influence of the *False Decretals* upon Nicholas I is undeniable; but it is not proved that they exercised any influence upon his ideas. Until the eleventh century the popes, although they did not repudiate the work of pseudo-Isidore, observed extreme caution with regard to the celebrated compilation. Only from the end of the eleventh century on did that collection, spread throughout Europe, become a convenient vehicle for several of the lead-

[10] However, the False Decretals supplied St. Nicholas with some expressions and metaphors which we find in his letters. Fournier cites some instances of them. *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.*, 1907, pp. 24 f.

[11] De Smedt, *Les Fausse Décrétales, l'épiscopat franc et la Cour de Rome.*

[12] Although the influence of the False Decretals at Rome has not been proved, their influence in the Frankish world is undeniable. The texts of the pseudo-Isidore are quoted by Hincmar of Reims, Hincmar of Laon, the councils of Kiersy, Cologne, Mainz, Metz, etc. Cf. Villien, art. "Fausses Décrétales" in the *Dict. de théologie.*

ing ideas on which was founded the work undertaken at that period by the papacy.[13] Ferdinand Lot [14] is of opinion that the *False Decretals* originated in the Reims district and that its author may have been Wulfrad, the most learned of the clergy deposed by Hincmar. Villien [15] thinks "that the discussion appears limited to the province of Reims and that of Tours, and that, in favor of one of the two opinions, it is at present impossible to establish a proof that would exclude all probability for the other."

[13] "Etude sur les Fausses Décrétales" in the *Revue d'hist. ecclésiastique,* January 15, 1907.

[14] *Revue historique,* July–August, 1907.

[15] Art. "Fausses Décrétales" in Vacant's *Dict. de théologie catholique.*

APPENDIX II

The Fable of Popess Joan

In various writings of the Middle Ages, none of them earlier than the twelfth century, we find the romantic story of a young woman whom most of the writers call Joan, although others call her Agnes, Gilberta, Jutta, or Theodora. This woman, born at Mainz, is said to have gone to Athens, disguised as a man, and there to have made a brilliant course of studies and subsequently to have come to Rome, where her learning won her a chair of philosophy. Upon the death of St. Leo IV in 855, the unanimous vote of the clergy chose as pope the brilliant philosopher, or rather the clever young woman, who governed the Church for more than two years. But one day, when she was presiding at a solemn procession, to everybody's stupefaction she gave birth to a child and died immediately afterward. She was buried at the very spot of her death, at St. John Lateran, but it was decided to omit her name from the list of the popes.

Formerly some historians thought this account might be considered historic,[1] and in favor of its historicity they cited the following: 1. the authority of the Dominicans Martin of Poland and Stephen of Bourbon, who lived in the thirteenth century and who relate the event; 2. several manuscripts of the *Liber pontificalis,* which contain the story of the popess; 3. two lists of popes, that seem to be drawn up at the close of the twelfth century and contain these words: *Papissa Johanna non numeratur* ("Popess Joan is not reckoned"); 4. the exist-

[1] Only one historian of the nineteenth century, Kist, has ventured to maintain the existence of Popess Joan. Cf. Kraus, *Kirchengeschichte,* sec. 78, no. 1.

ence at Rome, at Sienna, and at Bologna of statues erected in honor of the Popess. Dietrich of Niem, papal secretary in the fifteenth century, affirms that he saw the statue which was at Rome. The pedestal bore the following inscription: Pa. P. P. P. P. P., which was translated thus: *Parce, Pater Patrum, paruit Papissa Papellum;* 5. lastly, the avowal of the popes themselves, notably, in the thirteenth century, that of Pope John, who should have called himself John XX, but who, no doubt to give place to the Popess Joan in the papal chronology, decided to call himself John XXI.

Today no serious historian any longer believes in the story of Popess Joan. But since sometimes the story is put forward against Catholics, it will be well to set forth briefly the reasons showing its falsity.

1. The first authentic traces of the account appear in the thirteenth century, or at the very earliest in the twelfth. Those who would gladly have used it as a reproach to the Roman Church—such as the Eastern emperors, so often at odds with the popes, or such as Photius, so clever in exploiting the weak sides of his opponents and so well informed about things of the West—say not a word about it. To the Latins, who reproached them for raising a woman to the office of patriarch,[2] they do not reply by citing the story of the popess.

2. Contemporary testimony is not only silent about the so-called popess, but proves peremptorily that in 855 Pope Benedict III followed immediately after Pope St. Leo IV. The writer of the *Annals* of St. Bertin, at that time St. Prudentius bishop of Troyes, says: "In the month of August, Pope Leo died and Benedict succeeded him." [3] Lupus abbot of Ferrières wrote to Pope Benedict III that he was deputed to his predecessor Leo. Odo of Vienne relates that Benedict III became

[2] The romance of this female patriarch will be found in *MGH, Scriptores,* III, 481. Leo IX alludes to it in a letter to Michael Caerularius, *PL,* CXLIII, 760.

[3] *Annales Bertiniani,* year 855.

pope at the death of Emperor Lothaire (d.855). Hincmar of Reims relates in 866 that messengers, sent by him to Rome to Leo IV, learned on the way of the death of the Pontiff and found Benedict installed upon their arrival.[4] A coin represents Pope Benedict III and Emperor Lothaire; but we know that Lothaire died in 855; then, in that year, the date of Leo IV's death, Benedict was elected. Lastly, a series of letters, documents, and acts of certain date, whether of Leo IV or of Benedict III leave no room for the so-called two years' pontificate of the popess.

As to the opposing arguments, they are of little worth. Martin of Poland and Stephen of Bourbon, who lived four centuries after the pretended events and whose writings are totally lacking in critical value, cannot adduce any evidence worthy of consideration. The two lists, which are said to be of the twelfth century, are not of certain genuineness, and would prove nothing more than the existence of a legend at that time. The account in the *Liber pontificalis* would have more weight were it not evident, from the reading of the most ancient manuscript, that the passage about Popess Joan is an intercalation of the fourteenth century made upon a manuscript of the twelfth century, as appears from an examination of the characters of the two writings.[5] As to the statues in Sienna and Bologna, if they existed, they were probably dependent upon the legend. The Roman statue, representing a pagan divinity with a little child, may have been, according to some authors, the occasion of the fable. In any event, the inscription Pa. P. P. P. P. P. should be translated: *Pap. P. P. propria pecunia posuit* (Pope P. P. put up this statue at his own expense).

The argument taken from the avowal of John XXI has little significance. If this pope shared, in the thirteenth cen-

[4] *PL*, CXXVI, 85.

[5] Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, II, xxvi.

tury, the error of Martin of Poland and Stephen of Bourbon, the fact would be of no consequence. Duchesne supposes that he called himself John XXI and not John XX because of the doubling of John XV, which is found twice in some catalogues.[6] Moreover, we know that the numbering of the popes was often done in haste and without any concern for historical criticism. In the thirteenth century, for example, the successor of Nicholas III took the name of Martin IV, although he was preceded by only one pope of the name of Martin, because he misread the names of Popes Marino I and Marino II, of the ninth and tenth centuries.

The question of the origin of the fable is obscure. Some have regarded it as a satire upon John VIII (Baronius), as a malicious interpretation of a Roman statue with its inscription (Döllinger), as a myth intended to deride the acceptance by the papacy of the *False Decretals,* which may have been composed in Mainz and spread first in Greece (Blasco and Doderlein), lastly, as a simply popular fancy without any significance (Lapôtre). We are inclined to consider it as a coarse pleasantry elaborated by the people's imagination in connection with the influence of Marozia upon the papacy,[7] without denying that the Roman statue and perhaps the story of the *False Decretals* may have furnished some secondary elements in the development of the popular story.[8]

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 457 note.

[7] It was during this period that, according to the words of the monk of Monte Soracte, "a woman was seen imposing a despotic yoke upon Rome." Perhaps this was the first source of the popular story of Popess Joanna.

[8] See Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège,* pp. 359 f.; Duchesne, *Lib. pont.,* II, 26; Döllinger, *Les fables papales au Moyen Age.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume. The dates given are usually those of the latest edition. The abbreviations *PG* and *PL* stand for Migne's *Patrologia graeca* and *Patrologia latina.*

Acta Sanctorum, by the Bollandists, 1643–1931, 67 vols.

ADALHARD, St.: *Vita.*

AGOBARD: *Contra tempestarios* (*PL,* vol. 104).

AGUIRRE: *Collectio maxima conciliorum omnium Hispaniae,* 1753.

ALCUIN: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 100).

ALEXANDER, Natalis: *Dissertationes.*

ALLARD, Paul: *Esclaves, serfs, et mainmortables,* 1883.

ALLEN, Carl F.: *Histoire du Danemark,* tr. by Eugene Beauvoise, 1878, 2 vols.

Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, 1840.

Annales Bertiniani, 1883.

Annales Fuldenses, 1826 (in *Monumenta Germaniae historica*).

ASSEMANI, Simone: *Bibliotheca orientalis Clementino-vaticana,* 1719–28, 4 vols.

Atlas classique de géographie ancienne et moderne, 1905, ed. by Schrader.

Atlas de géographie historique, 1896, ed. by Schrader.

AUGUSTINE, St.: *City of God.*

AVITUS, St.: *Epistolae* (*PL.* vol. 59).

Œuvres complètes, ed. by U. Chevalier, 1890.

Opera, 1883.

BALUZE, Étienne: *Capitularia regum francorum ab anno 742 ad annum 922.*

(joint author with Labbe): *Sacrosancta concilia.*

BARDENHEWER, Otto: *Les pères de l'Église* (French trans.), 1898–9, 3 vols.

BARONIUS, Cesare: *Annales ecclesiastici,* 1738–59, 38 vols.

BATIFFOL, Pierre: *Études de théologie positive.*

BAUDRILLART, André: *Saint Séverin,* 1908.

BAXMANN, Rudolf: *Die Politik der Päpste von Gregor I bis auf Gregor VII,* 1868–9.

BEDE, The Venerable: *De natura rerum et temporum ratione.*

Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum (*PL,* vol. 95).

Historical Works (Loeb Library), tr. by J. E. King, 1930, 2 vols.

Works, in the original Latin, accompanied by a new English translation of the historical works (*Patres ecclesiae Anglicanae*), 1843–4, 12 vols.

BELLARMINE, St. Robert: *De romano pontifice.*

BENEDICT, St.: *Regula monasteriorum,* ed. by Dom Butler, 1928.

Rule of St. Benedict, tr. by Cardinal Gasquet, 1925.

BENEDICT XIV: *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione,* 1766, 7 vols.

Heroic Virtue: a Portion of the Treatise of Benedict XIV on the Beatification and Canonization of the Servants of God, tr. from the Latin, 3 vols.

BENEDICTUS (Sancti Andreae monachus): *Chronicon* (in *Monumenta Germaniae historica,* vol. 5, i. e., *Scriptores,* vol. 3; *PL,* vol. 139).

BERENGARIUS: *De sacra causa adversus Lanfrancum.*

BERNARD, St.: *Epistolae.*

Some Letters, tr. by Eales, 1904.

BERTI, Giovanni Battista: *De theologicis disciplinis,* 1792, 10 vols.

BEURLIER, Émile: *Le culte imperial, son histoire et son organisation depuis Auguste jusqu'à Justinien,* 1891.

Bibliotheca cassinensis.

Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes.

BOEHMER, Johann F.: *Regesta archiepiscoporum Maguntinensium,* 1877–86.

BOISSIER, Gaston: *La fin du paganisme: étude sur les dernieres luttes religieuses en Occident au IV^e^ siècle,* 1909, 2 vols.

L'Afrique romaine, 1901.

BORETIUS, Alfred: *Capitularienkritik,* 1874.
BORGIA, Stefano: *Memorie storiche di Benevento,* 1763–9, 3 vols.
BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne: *Continuity of Religion* (portion of *Histoire universelle*), tr. by Victor Day, 1930.
Défense de la tradition.
Discours sur l'unité de l'Église.
Explication de l'Apocalypse.
Histoire universelle, 1844.
Panegyrics of the Saints, ed. by D. O'Mahony, 1924.
BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ: *Manuel des institutions romaines,* 1886.
BOUCHER: *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence.*
BOURGEOIS, Émile: *Le capitulaire de Kiersy-sur-Oise,* 1885.
BOURRET, Joseph Christian Ernest: *L'École chrétienne de Séville sous la monarchie des Visigoths,* 1855.
BROU, Alexandre: *Saint Augustin du Canterbury et ses compagnons,* 1897.
BRUNETIÈRE, Ferdinand: *Les chemins de la croyance: l'utilisation du positivisme,* 1905.
BRYCE, James: *Holy Roman Empire,* 1907.
BURKE: *Essay on English History.*

CABROL, Fernand: *L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands,* 1909.
Étude sur la "Peregrinatio Silviae," 1895.
Les origines liturgiques, 1906.
L'idolatrie dans l'Église.
CAESAR, Julius: *De bello gallico.*
CAESARIUS, St.: *Vita* (*PL,* vol. 57).
CASSIODORUS: *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium lectionum.*
Letters (condensed translation of the *Variae epistolae*), 1886.
Opera (*PL,* vols. 69, 70).
Variae epistolae (*PL,* vol. 5).
CHAMARD, François: *Les reliques de S. Benoît,* 1882.
CHATEAUBRIAND, François: *Études historiques,* 1831.
Œuvres complètes (vols. 4–7 contain the *Études*).
CHEVALIER, Cyr Ulysse: *Repertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age,* 1905–07, 2 vols.

CLAUSIER, Edouard: *S. Grégoire le Grand,* 1886.
Cnutionis regis gesta, 1865.
COLUMBAN, St.: *Regula coenobialis* (*PL,* vol. 80).
Corpus juris canonici, 1783.
Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae, 1828–97, 50 vols.
COURAJOD: *L'archéologie du Moyen Age et ses méthodes,* 1900.
CUMONT, Franz: *The Mysteries of Mithra,* tr. by Thomas J. McCormack, 1910.

DANTE: *Divina Comedia* (English trans. by Longfellow).
DAREMBERG AND SAGLIO: *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines,* 1877–1919, 9 vols.
DELEHAYE, Hippolyte: *Les legendes hagiographiques,* 1927 (English trans.: *The Legends of the Saints*).
DEL GIUDICE: *Le tracce del diritto romano nelle leggi longobardi,* 1886.
DEMOLINS, Edmond: *Les routes du monde moderne* (being vol. 2 of *Les grandes routes des peuples, essai de géographie sociale,* 1901–03).
DENZINGER, Heinrich: *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum,* 1922.
Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne.
Dictionnaire de théologie (ed. by Vacant), 1909–32, 22 vols.
DIEHL, Charles: *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne,* 1888.
Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI^e^ siècle, 1901.
DITHMAR (or Thietmar): *Chronicon* (*PL,* vol. 139).
DÖLLINGER, Johann Joseph von: *Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages,* tr. by A. Plummer, 1872.
The Pope and the Council, 1869.
DU CANGE, Charles: *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis,* 1733–6, 6 vols.
DUCHESNE, Louis: *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution,* tr. by M. L. McClure, 1919.
Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical, 1904.
(ed.) *Liber pontificalis,* 1886–92, 3 vols.
The Churches Separated from Rome, tr. by A. H. Mathew.

DUDDEN, Frederick Homes: *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought,* 1905, 2 vols.

DÜMMLER: *Auxilius und Vulgarius.*

(ed.) *Gesta Berengarii.*

DÜNZELMANN: *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte.*

DUFOURCQ, Albert: *La christianisation des foules,* 1903.

EINHARD (Eginhard): *Annales des rois Pepin, Charlemagne, et Louis le Débonnaire* (*Collection des mémoires de France,* vol. 3), 1824.

Vita Karoli (*PL,* vol. 97).

ELEUSIOS, Georges: *Vie de saint Theodore de Sykeon* (i. e., Theodore the Syceote).

ENNODIUS: *Opera,* 1885.

ESMEIN, Adhémar: *Histoire du droit français,* 1921.

Les baux perpétuels des formules d'Angers et de Tours.

EUGIPPIUS: *The Life of St. Severinus,* tr. by George W. Robinson, 1914.

EUSEBIUS: *Life of Constantine,* tr. by E. C. Richardson (Nicene and Postnicene Fathers).

EWALD: *Historische Aufsätze dem Andenken,* 1886.

FAGUET, Émile: *Politicians and Moralists of the Nineteenth Century,* tr. by Dorothy Galton, 1928.

FLACH, Jacques: *Les origines de l'ancienne France,* 1886–1917, 4 vols.

FLEURY, Claude: *Histoire ecclésiastique,* 1720–38, 36 vols.

FLODOARD: *Historia Remensis* (*PL,* vol. 135). In French, *Collection des mémoires de France,* 1823, 31 vols., vol. 5.

FORTUNATUS: *Carmina* (*PL,* vol. 88). In *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi,* vol. 4.

FOUILLÉE, Alfred: *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens,* 1903.

La France chrétienne dans l'histoire.

FRANCIS DE SALES, St.: *Lettres* (in *Œuvres complètes,* 1851, 5 *vols.*).

Spiritual Letters, 1926.

FREDEGARIUS: *Chronicon* (*PL*, vol. 71).

FREUND, Wilhelm: *Triennium philologicum*, 1906–11, 2 vols.

FULGENTIUS: *Vita.*

FUSTEL DE COULANGES: *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, 1888–92, 6 vols.

Les origines du systeme feudal (in *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, vol. 5).

The Origin of Property in Land, tr. by Ashley, 1892.

GAFFARRI: *Études sur les rapports de l'Amérique et de l'Ancien Continent avant Colomb*, 1889.

GASTOUÉ, Amédée: *Les origines du chant romain, l'antiphonaire Grégorien*, 1907.

GAUTIER: *Histoire du droit français.*

Gesta Hungarorum.

GEVAERT, François: *Les origines du chant liturgique de l'Église latine*, 1890.

GIBBON, Edward: *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 1906–07, 12 vols.

GILDAS: *De excidio Britanniae*, 1899–1901.

Old English Chronicles, 1906.

GILLMANN, F.: *Das Institut des Chorbischofe im Orient*, 1903.

GIRY, Arthur: *Manuel de diplomatique*, 1894.

GOBINEAU, Arthur de: *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*, 1884, 2 vols.

GOCELINUS: *Vita sancti Augustini monachi.* (*PL*, vol. 80).

GODWIN, Francis: *De praesulibus Angliae*, 1743, 2 vols.

GOLDAST, Melchior: *Monarchia S. Romani Imperii*, 1611–4, 2 vols.

GORINI, Jean: *Défense de l'Église*, 1866, 4 vols.

GOSSELIN, Jean Edme Auguste: *Pouvoir du pape sur les souverains au Moyen Age*, 1845.

GRATIAN: *Decretum* (*PL*, vol. 187).

GRAVIER, Gabriel: *Découverte de l'Amérique par les Normands au X^e siècle*, 1874.

GREGORY THE GREAT, St.: *Book of the Morals* (Oxford Library of Fathers), 1845–52, 4 vols.

Book of Pastoral Rule and Selected Epistles, tr. by J. Barmby (in Nicene and Postnicene Fathers, 2d ser., vols. 12–13).
Dialogues, tr. by P. W., 1911.
Opera (*PL,* vols. 75–79).
Registrum epistolarum, 1891. Also in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae,* vols. 1, 2.
GREGORY OF TOURS, St.: *De gloria confessorum* (*PL,* vol. 71).
De gloria martyrum (*PL,* vol. 71).
De miraculis S. Martini (*PL,* vol. 71).
History of the Franks, tr. by O. M. Dalton, 1927, 2 vols.
Opera (*PL,* vol. 71).
Vitae patrum (*PL,* vol. 71).
GRISAR, Hartmann: *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages,* 1911–2, 3 vols.
GUIZOT, François: *Essais sur l'histoire de France,* 1858.
Histoire de la civilisation en France, 1872, 4 vols.

HAMMER: *Mines de l'Orient,* 1809.
HARDOUIN, Jean: *Conciliorum collectio,* 1714–5, 12 vols.
HARNACK, Adolf von: *Dogmengeschichte,* 1894. English trans., *History of Dogma,* tr. by Buchanan and others, 1894–9, 7 vols.
HAUCK, Albert: *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands,* 1911–29, 6 vols.
HAVRET, Henri: *La stèle chrétienne de Si-ngan-fou,* 1897.
HEFELE, Karl: *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte,* 1864.
Conciliengeschichte, 1873–90, 9 vols. French trans., *Histoire des conciles;* English trans., *History of the Councils of the Church,* tr. by W. R. Clark and others, 1876–96, 5 vols.
HERDER, Johann G. von: *Philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité,* 1861–2, 2 vols.
Sämmtliche Werke, 1877–1913, 33 vols.
HERGENRÖTHER, Joseph: *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (revised by Johann Kirsch, 1924–5, 4 vols.).
HESSELING, Dirk Christian: *Essai sur la civilisation byzantine,* 1907.
HINCMAR: *Annales.*
De divortio Lotharii.
De ordine palatii.

De potestate regia et pontificia.
De praedestinatione.
Opera (*PL,* vols. 124–126).
Histoire littéraire de la France, 1733–1927, 38 vols.
Historiens des Gaules, 1738–1904, 25 vols.
HOOK, Walter: *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,* 1860–84, 12 vols.
HORN, Émile: *Saint Étienne, roi apostolique de Hongrie,* 1899.
HUBAULT, Gustave: *Histoire générale, notions sommaires,* 1899.

IMBART DE LA TOUR: *Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse,* 1907.
IRENAEUS, St.: *Adversus haereses* (*PG,* vol. 7).
Writings, tr. by Roberts and Rambaut, in Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vols. 5, 9, 1867–73.
ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, St.: *De officiis.*
Etymologiorum seu originum libri XX (*PL,* vol. 82).

JAFFÉ, Philipp: *Codex carolinus* (*PL,* vol. 98).
Monumenta Alcuiniana, 1873 (vol. 6 of *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum*).
Monumenta carolina, 1867 (vol. 4 of *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum*).
Monumenta moguntina, 1866 (vol. 3 of *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum*).
Regesta pontificum romanorum, 1885–8, 2 vols.
JAUD, Léon: *Saint Filibert,* 1910.
JOHN THE DEACON: *S. Gregorii Magni vita* (*PL,* vol. 75).
JONAS (of Orleans): *De cultu imaginum* (*PL,* vol. 106).
JORDANIS: *De Gothorum origine* (in Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* vol. 1). English trans., *The Origin and Deeds of the Goths,* tr. by C. C. Mierow, 1908.
JUSTIN MARTYR, St.: *Dialogue with Trypho,* tr. by A. L. Williams, 1930 (in *Translations of Christian Literature*).
Opera (*PG,* vol. 6).
Works (Oxford Library of Fathers).
Writings (Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vol. 2).
Justinian Code (in *Corpus juris civilis,* 1868, 3 vols.).

KELLER, Christophe: *Historia medii aevi,* 1688.
KETTERER, Johann Adam: *Karl der Grosse und die Kirche,* 1898.
KLEINCLAUSZ: *L'Empire carolingien, ses origines et ses transformations.*
KRAUS, Franz Xaver: *Kirchengeschichte,* 1896. French trans., *Histoire de l'Église,* 1904, 3 vols.
KURTH, Godefroid: *Clovis,* 1901, 2 vols.
Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens, 1893.
Les origines de la civilisation moderne, 1898.
Qu'est-ce que le Moyen Age, 1905.
Saint Boniface, 1902.
Sainte Clotilde, 1897.

LABBE, Philippe: *Conciliorum collectio,* 1714–5, 11 vols.
LABOURT, Jerome: *De Timotheo I, Nestorianorum patriarcha,* 1904.
Le christianisme dans l'empire perse, 1904.
LACTANTIUS: *Divinae institutiones.*
Opera, 1782, 2 vols.
Works, tr. by William Fletcher (in Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 7).
LAMMENS, Henri: *Fatima et les filles de Mahomet,* 1912.
LAPÔTRE, Arthur: *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque carolingienne,* 1895.
LAURAIN, Paul: *De l'intervention des laiques dans l'administration de la pénitence,* 1897.
LA VILLEMARQUÉ, Hersart de: *La légende celtique,* 1859.
LAVISSE, Ernest: *Histoire de France jusqu'à la Révolution,* 1900–11, 18 vols.
Vue générale de l'histoire politique de l'Europe, 1892.
LAVISSE and RAMBAUD: *Histoire générale du IV^e^ siècle à nos jours,* 1893–1904, 12 vols.
LECLERCQ, Henri: *L'Afrique chrétienne.*
Les martyrs, 1903–13, 9 vols.
L'Espagne chrétienne.
Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne, 1907, 2 vols.
LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Albert: *La chaire française au Moyen Age,* 1868.

LELEWEL, Joachim: *Pythéas de Marseille et la géographie de son temps,* 1836.

LEO THE DEACON: *Historia.*

L'ÉPINOIS, Henri de: *Le gouvernement des papes au Moyen Age.*

LEROY-BEAULIEU, Anatole: *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians,* tr. by Z. A. Ragozin, 1893–6, 3 vols.

LESNE, Émile: *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France,* 1922–8, 2 vols.

LINGARD, John: *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church.*

LIUTPRAND: *Antapodosis* (*PL,* vol. 136).

Works, tr. by F. A. Wright, 1930.

LOENING, Edgar: *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts,* 1878, 2 vols.

LOEWENFELD, Samuel: *Epistolae pontificum romanorum ineditae.*

LOISY, Alfred: *The Gospel and the Church,* tr. by C. Home, 1909.

LORAIN, Prosper: *Histoire de l'abbaye de Cluny,* 1845.

LUCHAIRE, Achille: *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France,* 1883, 2 vols.

MABILLON, Jean (ed.): *Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti,* 1733.

Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, 1703–39, 6 vols.

(and Michael Germain): *Museum italicum, seu collectio veterum scriptorum,* 1724, 2 vols.

MAGNIN, Étienne: *L'Église wisigothique au VII^e siècle,* 1912.

MAISTRE, Joseph de: *Du pape,* 1881.

Essay on the Generative Principle of Political Constitutions, 1847.

MALNORY, Arthur: *Saint Césaire, évêque d'Arles,* 1894.

Quid luxovienses monachi ad regulam monasteriorum contulerint, 1894.

MANSI, Giovanni: *Sanctorum conciliorum collectio,* 1748–1817, 6 vols.

MANY, S.: *De locis sacris,* 1904.

MARCELLINUS: *Chronicon* (*PL,* vol. 51).

MARIANA, Juan de: *Histoire de l'Espagne* (French trans.), 1725, 6 vols. English trans., *General History of Spain,* tr. by John Stevens, 1699.

MARIGNAN, Albert: *Études sur la civilisation française,* 1899, 2 vols.
MARIN: *Les moines de Constantinople, de Constantin à Photius,* 1897.
MARQUARDT and MOMMSEN: *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer,* 1843–67, 9 vols. French trans., *Manuel des antiquités romaines,* 1888–95, 17 vols.
MARTIN, E.: *Saint Columban.*
MARTIN, François: *Les moines et leur influence sociale,* 1880, 2 vols.
MARTIN, Henri: *Histoire de France* (up to 1789), 1855–60, 17 vols.; (1789 *à nos jours*), 1878–85, 8 vols.
MARTIN OF TOURS, St.: *Homilies.*
MICHEL, Pierre: *L'Orient et Rome,* 1894.
MIGNE, Jacques Paul (ed.): *Patrologia graeca,* 1857–80, 166 vols. *Patrologia latina,* 1844, 221 vols.
MIGNET, François: *Mémoire sur l'introduction de la Germanie dans la societé civilisée* (in *Mémoires historiques,* 1854).
MISPOULET, Jean Baptiste: *Les institutions politiques des Romains,* 1882, 2 vols.
MOEHLER, Johann: *Kirchengeschichte,* 1870, 4 vols.
MOELLER, Charles: *Histoire du Moyen Age,* 1898–1902.
MOLINIER, Auguste: *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* 1906, 6 vols.
MONACHUS SANGALLENSIS: *De rebus bellicis Karoli Magni.*
MONNIER, François: *Histoire des luttes politiques et religieuses dans les temps carolingiens,* 1852.
MONTALEMBERT, Charles: *Monks of the West,* 1896, 6 vols.
MONTESQUIEU, Charles de: *The Spirit of Laws,* tr. by Frederick R. Coudert, 1900, 2 vols.
Monumenta Germaniae historica.
MORIN, Germain: *L'origine du chant grégorien,* 1891.
MURATORI: *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* 1723–51, 28 vols.

NAIRON, Fauste: *Dissertatio de origine Maronitarum,* 1679.
Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtskunde.
NEWMAN, John Henry: *Apologia pro vita sua,* 1927.
NICEPHORUS: *Vita.*

NITHARD: *De dissensionibus filiorum Ludovici Pii* (*PL*, vol. 116).
NORIS, Enrico: *Historia Gothescalci* (*Opera*, 1729–32, 4 vols.).

OHR, Wilhelm: *La leggendaria elezione di Carlo Magno imperatore*, 1903.
OROSIUS, Paul: *Historia* (*PL*, vol. 31).
ORTOLAN, Joseph: *Explication historique des Instituts de Justinien*, 2 vols.
OZANAM, Antoine Frederic: *Études germaniques* (in *Œuvres*, vols. 3–4).

PARDESSUS, Jean Marie: *Loi salique*, 1843.
PARGOIRE, J.: *L'Église byzantine de 527 à 847*, 1905.
PARSY, Paul: *Saint Eloi*, 1907.
PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, St.: *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (*PL*, vol. 120).
Vita Walae (*PL*, vol. 120).
PAUL THE DEACON (*See* Warnefredus).
PERTILE, Antonio: *Storia del diritto italiano*, 1896–1902, 8 vols.
PETAU: *De incarnatione*.
PETRIE, Henry: *Monumenta historica britannica*, 1848.
PETROVIC: *Disquisitio historica in originem usus slavici idiomatis in liturgia apud Slavos ac praecipue Croatos*, 1908.
PINGAUD, L.: *La politique de S. Grégoire le Grand*, 1872.
PITRA, Jean Baptiste: *Histoire de saint Léger*, 1846.
PLINY: *Natural History*, tr. by Bostock and Riley, 1855, 5 vols.
PORPHYROGENITUS (i. e., Constantine VII): *De administrando imperio* (*PG*, vol. 113).
POTHIER: *Musica sacra*.
POUPARDIN, René: *Le royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens*, 1901.
PROBST, Ferdinand: *Die altesten römischen Sacramentarien und Ordines*, 1892.
PROCOPIUS: *De bello gothico*, with an English translation, by H. B. Dewing, 1928, 7 vols. (Loeb Library).
PROU, Maurice: *Les monnaies mérovingiennes*, 1892.

QUENTIN, Henri: *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen Age,* 1908.

QUINET, Edgar: *Le christianisme et la Révolution française* (in *Œuvres complètes,* vol. 3).

RAMBAUD, Alfred Nicolas: *Histoire générale du IV^e siècle à nos jours,* 1893–1904, 12 vols.

L'Empire grec au dixième siècle, 1870.

The History of Russia from Earliest Times to 1877, tr. by Leonora B. Land, 1886.

RAUSCHEN, Gerhard: *Eléments de patrologie et d'histoire des dogmes.*

Real istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere, Milan; *Rendiconti.*

REBELLIAU, Alfred: *Bossuet historien du protestantisme,* 1891.

Recherches sur quelques problèmes d'histoire.

Règlements du Concile d'Hertford (673).

RÉGNON: *Études de théologie positive sur la Trinité,* 1892.

REINACH, Salomon: *Manuel de philologie classique,* 1883–4, 2 vols.

RENAN, Ernest: *Marcus Aurelius,* tr. by W. G. Hutchison, 1903.

REUSSENS: *Archéologie.*

RIVOIRA: *Le origini della architettura lombarda,* 1903–07, 2 vols.

ROBIOU and DELAUNAY: *Les institutions de l'ancienne Rome,* 1883–8.

ROHRBACHER, René: *Histoire universelle de l'Église catholique,* 1857–61, 29 vols.

ROSSI, Giovanni Battista de: *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae,* 1922, 2 vols.

ROTH, Paul: *Feudälität und Unterthassen verband,* 1863.

Geschichte des Beneficialwesens, 1850.

ROUX, A.: *Le Pape saint Gélase,* 1880.

ROY, Jules: *St. Nicholas I,* tr. by Margaret Maitland, 1901.

RUSTICUS: *Contra Acephalos* (*PL,* vol. 67).

RUTILIUS NUMATIANUS: *De reditu suo,* 1870.

SALVIANUS: *On the Government of God* (*PL,* vol. 53), tr. by Eva M. Sanford, 1930.

SAYOUS, Edouard: *Histoire générale des Hongrois,* 1876, 2 vols.
SCHRADER: *Atlas historique.*
SCOTUS ERIGENA: *De divisione naturae* (*PL,* vol. 122).
SEVERINUS, St.: *Vita* (*PL,* vol. 62). English trans. by George W. Robinson, 1914.
SICULUS, Petrus: *Historia Manicheorum.*
SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS: *Carmina* (*PL,* vol. 58).
Epistolae (*PL,* vol. 58).
Letters, tr. by O. M. Dalton, 2 vols. (in Oxford Library of Fathers).
SILVIA: *Pilgrimage of S. Silvia of Aquitania to the Holy Places,* tr. by John H. Bernard, 1891. Quoted extensively in Duchesne, *Christian Worship.* The *Peregrinatio* is in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum,* vol. 39.
SIRMOND, Jacques: *Concilia antiqua Galliae,* 1629.
Historia praedestinatiana, 1844.
SMEDT, De: *Les origines du duel judiciaire.*
SOCRATES: *Ecclesiastical History* (in Nicene Library, 2d series, vol. 2).
SOZOMEN: *Ecclesiastical History* (in Nicene Library, 2d series, vol. 2).
STAUDEMAYER: *Scot Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit.*
STURMI, St.: *Vita* (*PL,* vol. 105).
SUZE, Jonas de: *Vita S. Columbani* (*PL,* vol. 87).

TAILLANDIER, Saint-René: *Scot Erigène.*
TAINE, Hippolyte: *The Origins of Contemporary France,* tr. by John Durand, 1931, 6 vols.
TARDUCCI, Francesco: *Storia di san Gregorio e del suo tempo,* 1909.
TERTULLIAN: *Ad Scapulam.*
Adversus judaeos.
Apologia (in Oxford Library of Fathers).
Opera (in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum,* vols. 20, 47).
Select Works, 1876.
Writings, tr. by S. Thelwall (in Ante-Nicene Fathers, vols. 3, 4).

Textes et documents figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra, 1896–9.
THEGANUS: *Vita Ludovici.*
THEODORE (abbot of Studium): *PG,* vols. 80–84.
THEODORET: *Carmina.*
THIERRY, Augustin: *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans,* tr. by William Hazlitt, 1856, 2 vols.
THOMASSIN, Louis: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Église,* 1779, 3 vols.
TILLEMONT, Le Nain de: *Ecclesiastical Memoirs,* tr. by Thomas Deacon, 1733–5, 2 vols.
Histoire des empereurs, 1739, 16 vols.
Mémoires, 1712.
TIRABOSCHI, Girolamo: *Storia della letteratura italiana,* 1805–13, 15 vols.
TOURNELY: *De gratia.*
TOURVILLE, H. de: *Histoire de la formation particulariste; origine des principales nations modernes,* 1905.

USSERIUS (Usher), James: *Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates,* 1639.

VACANDARD: *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse.*
Vie de saint Ouen, 1902.
VALOIS: *Rerum francarum,* 1646, 1658.
VEUILLOT, Louis: *Le parfum de Rome,* 1899, 2 vols.
VICTOR (bishop of Vita): *De persecutione vandalica* (*PL,* vol. 58).
VIDIEU, Auguste: *Hincmar de Reims,* 1875.
VILLANANO: *Summa conciliorum.*
VILLEHADUS, St.: *Vita.*
VIOLLET, Paul: *Histoire des institutions politiques et administratives de la France,* 1890–1903, 3 vols.
VOGEL, Albrecht: *Ratherius von Verona und das zehnte Jahrhundert,* 1854, 2 vols.
VOLTAIRE, François: *The General History and State of Europe from the Time of Charlemagne to Charles V,* 1754–7.
VULGARIUS: *De causa formosiana.*

WAITZ, Georg: *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte,* 1885, 8 vols.
Ueber die Anfänge der Vassalität, 1857.

WALAFRID STRABO: *De exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum* (*PL,* vols. 113, 114).

WARNEFREDUS (i. e., Paul the Deacon): *Vita S. Gregorii Magni* (*PL,* vol. 95).
History of the Langobards, tr. by William Foulke, 1907.

WASSERSCHLEBEN, Hermann: *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche,* 1851.

WEIL and LOT: *La cause d'Honorius,* 1870.

WETZER and WELTE: *Encyklopädie der katholischen Theologie,* 1882–1901, 12 vols. French trans., *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la théologie catholique,* 1864–8, 26 vols.

WORMIUS: *Littérature runique.*

WOUTERS, Henry: *Historia ecclesiastica,* 1863, 3 vols.

WULF, Marie Charles de: *History of Medieval Philosophy,* tr. by P. Coffey, 1925–6, 2 vols.

ZEUMER, Carl: *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi,* 1877.

Index

Aachen: Charlemagne's capital, 367
Councils: (809), Trinitarian doctrine, 409; (816), hospices, 385; Rule of St. Chrodegang, 379; St. Benedict of Aniane at, 382; (817), Benedictine Rule, 251; monastic schools, 390; (860), Lothaire's divorce, 448
Abbassides (caliphs), 345
Abbo, St. (abbot of Fleury), on duty of kings, 279
Abbots: in Benedictine Rule, 51
Charlemagne and appointment of, 379
Abelard: adoptionism, 407 note
Abu Bekr (caliph), 345
Acacian Schism: Acephali, 24
Anastasius II, 36
Gelasius I, 31
Hormisdas, 41
Justin (emperor), 41
Origin of, 24
Acacians (heretics), condemned, 24, 41
Acacius (patriarch of Constantinople), 24, 41
Acephali (monks): Acoemetae, 40
At Constantinople, 40
In Cyprus, 120
Monophysitism, 24
Peter Mongus, 40
Achrida (Bulgaria), Basil seizes, 293
Acoemetae (monks), 40
Adalbert of Prague, St. (bishop), 310, 312 f.
Adalbert of Tuscany, John VIII and, 494
Adalgis of Benevento, Louis II (emperor) and, 496
Adalhard, St. (abbot of Corbie), 234
Addula (abbess of Pfalzel), St. Gregory of Utrecht and, 209
Adelaide, St. (empress), 23
Coronation of, 511
Marries Otto I, 267
Adelbert (bishop, impostor), 216
Ado, St., Martyrology of, 116
Adonis, temple at Byblos, 20
Adoptionism, 404 ff.
Abelard, 407 note
Alcuin, 406
Claudius of Turin, 404
Durandus, 407 note
Elipandus of Toledo, 405
Felix of Urgel, 265, 405
Frankfort, Council of, 404, 407
Gabriel Biel, 407 note
Migetus, 404
Origin of, in Spain, 404
St. Agobard, 265, 406
In Spain, 382
Ysambert, 407 note
Adrian I (pope), 355 ff.
Baptism of Widukind, 232
Charlemagne, 357
Desiderius, 356
Donation of Charlemagne, 359
Exiles recalled, 356
Gregorian Sacramentary, 99 note
Iconoclasm, 402
Meeting with Charlemagne, 358 f.
Nicaea, Council of (787), 400
Protests to Charlemagne, 232
Adrian II (pope), 480 ff.
Anastasius, bibliothecarius, 484
Arsenius, 485
Born at Rome, 480
Character of, 480
Daughter of, 485
Declines papacy, 480
Formosus, 487
Formula of Hormisdas, 42
Lothaire II (emperor) and, 480
Louis II (emperor) crowned by, 480
St. Methodius consecrated by, 300; ordained by, 300
SS. Cyril and Methodius, 300
Stephania wife of, 480
Talorus father of, 480
Wife of, 485
Adrian III, St. (pope): born at Rome, 495
George of Aventino and, 495

Adrian (legate of Louis II), 438
Adrian (priest), deposed by Leo IV, 443
Adrian of Canterbury, St., 200
Adultery, Burgundian penalty for, 266
Advocati, 389
Aedric. *See* Edric
Aemiliana, St. *See* Emiliana
Aemilianus Cucullatus, St. *See* Emilian
Aethelbald. *See* Ethelbald
Aetheria. *See* Silvia
Afiarta, Paul (papal chamberlain), 356
Africa: Church of, and Council of Rome (893), 498
  Donatists in, 79, 84
  Huneric persecutes Christians, 30
  Saracens invade, 345
  Vandal persecution in, 30
  Vandals in, 145
  Vandals invade, 269
Agapetus I, St. (pope), 44
  Cassiodorus and, 243
  Formula of Hormisdas, 42
Agapetus II (pope), Alberic and, 508, 510
Agatho, St. (pope), 130 f.
Agde, Council of (506), 260, 262, 279 note
Agiltrude (empress), 497, 499 f.
Agilulf (Lombard king): Conversion of, 249
  Peace with Italy, 112
  Rome besieged by, 94
  Theodelinda wife of, 249
Agnes. *See* Joan, popess
Agobard of Lyons, St. (bishop): Adoptionism, 265, 406
  Burgundian Code, 266
  Felix of Urgel, 265
  Gundobadi, 267
  Iconoclasm, 404
  On ordeals, 466 f.
Agriculture: Abandonment of, 16 f.
  In Campania, 16
  Church property, 386
Aidan, St. (bishop of Lindisfarne), in Mercia, 197
Aignan, St. (bishop of Orleans), 154
Aistulf (Lombard king): Death of, 338
  Exarch Eutychius and, 327
  Italy invaded by, 327
  In Pavia, 337
  Pepin and, 333, 337
  Rome besieged by, 337
Aix-la-Chapelle. *See* Aachen
Alamanni: Conversion of, 147
  Gaul invaded by, 154
  St. Severinus and, 21
Alamannia, Location of, 207
Alani in Spain, 268
Alaric I (Visigoth king), in Italy, 256
Alaric II (Visigoth king), 257, 271
Alb (ninth century), 393
Alban, St. (protomartyr of England), 182
Albano (Italy), Benedict bishop, 432
Alberic I (duke of Spoleto), Marozia wife of, 504
Alberic II (duke of Spoleto), 508
  Agapetus II and, 508, 510
  Death of, 510
  Hugh (king of Provence) and, 509
  John XI and, 508
  Leo VII and, 508
  Marino II and, 508
  Marozia imprisoned by, 508
  Octavian son of, 510
  Papal elections, 510
  "Prince of all the Romans," 508
  St. Odo and, 510
  Stephen VIII and, 508
Alberic of Utrecht, Death of, 233
Albigenses (heretics), Bogomili and, 293 f.
Alboin (Lombard king), in Italy, 247
Alcuin, 390 ff.
  Abbot of five monasteries, 379
  Adoptionism, 406
  Born at York, 390
  Charlemagne meets, 390
  Charlemagne's adviser, 374
  On Church and state, 374
  De officiis divinis, 393
  Education and, 391
  Greek language, 391
  Letter from Arno, 361
  Monasteries, 384 f.
  Monastery of Cormery founded by, 382
  At Parma, 390
  Pedagogical method, 391
  Protests to Charlemagne, 232
  St. Benedict of Aniane friend of, 382
  St. Ludger and, 233
  Sermon books, 398
Alexander Natalis. *See* Natalis Alexander

Alexandria: Cyrus patriarch of, 121, 131
Destruction of library, 3
Eulogius patriarch of, 89
Patriarchate of, loss of prestige, 67
Severians in, 120
Alfred the Great (king of England): Boethius' *Consolations of Philosophy* translated by, 244
Laws of, 202
Marino I, 495
Reign of, 488
St. Gregory's *Pastoral Rule*
Aller (river), Verden execution, 231
All Saints, Feast of, 116
Origin of, 116 note
Almos (Hungarian duke), 311
Alphabet, Slavonic, St. Cyril and, 299
Altai mountains, 147
Altars, in churches, 392
Amalarius of Metz, Rule of St. Chrodegang, 379
Amalfi (Italy), Greek influence, 439
Amandus, St. (bishop of Maastricht), 178
Ambrose, St. (archbishop of Milan): on real presence, 472
St. Gregory and writings of, 58
Amiens (France), George bishop, 357
Ammianus Marcellinus (historian), on fall of Roman Empire, 13
Amöneberg Abbey, St. Boniface founds, 212
Ampere, on Gottschalk, 474
Amphitheater, Flavian, 57
Anastasiopolis (Galatia), St. Theodore the Syceote bishop, 117
Anastasis (church, Jerusalem), Burning of, 119
Anastasius II, St. (pope), 36
Supposed letter to Clovis, 161 note
Anastasius III (pope), 506
Anastasius I (emperor), 35, 39
Anastasius, St. (apocrisiary), Death of, 128
Anastasius (bibliothecarius), 478
Adrian II and, 484
Arsenius father of, 441, 485
Cardinal, 441
Condemned, 444
Council of Constantinople (869), 482, 484
Election of Benedict III, 443
Excommunicated, 443, 484
Leaves Rome, 443
Leo IV and, 443
Louis II and, 442
Nicholas I and, 484
Papacy, 484
Priest, 441
Anastasius, St. (monk), Death of, 128
Andrew I (king of Hungary), Jaroslav and, 308
Andrew, St. (apostle), battle of Patrae, 289
Andrew, Letter of St. Gregory to, 79
Andromachus (senator), Gelasius and, 32 f.
Angilbert, St. (abbot), 390
Angles, England invaded by, 182
Anglo-Saxons: Attitude to Britons, 189, 193
Barbarism of, 192
Character of, 183 f.
Conversion of, 147
Customs of, 183, 192
Embassies to Constantinople, 70
In England, 145, 182
Heptarchy, 182 note
Procopius on, 184
Angrians. *See* Engrians
Aniane (abbey): Founding of, 380 f.
School at, 390
Anianus, St. *See* Aignan
Anicii (*gens*): Felix III, 28
Proba, 60
St. Gregory the Great, 54
Anio (river), St. Benedict, 48
Anna, wife of Vladimir the Great, 306
Annales Bertiniani, 441 note
Annals, by Hincmar, 450
Annals of Lorsch Abbey, 229 note
Anschar. *See* Ansgar
Ansgar, St. (apostle of Scandinavia), 235
Apostle of Denmark, 235
"Apostle of the North," 238
Baptism of King Harold, 235
Bishop of Bremen, 238
Bishop of Hamburg, 238
Conversion of Denmark, 235, 238
At Corbie Abbey, 235, 469
Death of, 238
In Sweden, 238
Anskar. *See* Ansgar
Antapodosis, by Liutprand, 479, 500 note
Anthimus VII (patriarch of Constantinople), 409 note

Antioch (Syria): Athanasius, Jacobite bishop of, 121
Eulogius bishop, 96
Patriarch of, and patriarch of Constantinople, 67 f.
Antipopes: Constantine II (767), 352
John (844), 431
Paschal III (1164-68), 410 note
Philip (768), 353
Aosta (Italy), Charlemagne's army, 358
Aphthartodocetae, 120, 73 note, 120
Apocrisiary, St. Gregory as, 65 f.
Apollinaris, Sidonius. *See* Sidonius
Apollo Pitosyrus, Worship of, 49
"Apostle of the North," 238
Apostolic See. *See* Papacy
Apulia (Italy), Saracens in,
Aqueduct, Claudian, 57
Aquileia, Schism of, 249 note
Arab empire, Extent of, 342 note
Arabia: Christianity in, 91
Mohammed and, 344
Monophysites in, 44
Polytheism in, 343
Arabs: besiege Constantinople, 129
Constantine IV defeats, 129
See also Saracens
Arbogast, a Frank, 156
Arcadius (Byzantine emperor), 256
Archabbot, Office of, 513
Archdeacon, in Rome, 348
Archdeaconries, 377
Archdeacons, 377
Architecture: Ecclesiastical, 391 f.
Origin of Gothic, 261
Archpriest, in Church of Rome, 348
Arianism: among the barbarians, 70
Burgundians, 156, 263
In Spain, 79
Theodoric the Great, 241
Ulfilas, 154
Visigoths, 156, 275
Arians: Emperor Justin and, 245
John I and, 245
Aribert (Lombard king), 249
Donation to papacy, 138
Aripert. *See* Aribert
Aristotle: Authority of, in Middle Ages, 6
Boethius' translation, 391
Arles: Augustine of Canterbury consecrated at, 187 note
Caesarius bishop, 70, 259
Councils of: (314), 182; (524), 260
Honoratus bishop, 50
Saracens at, 434
Vigilius bishop, 91
Armenia: Monophysites in, 120
Paulicians in, 139
Armenian Church, *Catholicos,* 86
Arno (archbishop of Salzburg): Conversion of Moravia, 295
Letter to Alcuin, 361
Arno (bishop of Würzburg), 299 note
Arsenius (bishop of Orta), 441, 443 ff.
Adrian II and, 485
Ambition of, 485
Anastasius son of, 441, 485
Apocrisiary, 441, 443 ff.
Character of, 441
Death of, 485
Election of Benedict III, 443
Eleutherius son of, 441, 485
Missus, 441
Nicholas I and, 485
Art, Gothic, 261
Asia, Germans originally from, 148
Asia Minor: Goths invade, 154
Nestorianism in, 79
Asparukh. *See* Isperikh
Astulf. *See* Aistulf
Asylum, Right of. *See* Sanctuary
Ataulfus (Visigoth king), Toulouse capital of, 256
Athanasian Creed, St. Caesarius, 260
Athanasius of Alexandria, St., at Trier, 153
Athanasius of Antioch (Jacobite bishop), Monothelitism and, 121
Athanasius of Naples (bishop), 494
Attigny, Council of, 417
Attila (king of the Huns), Hungarians and, 311
Aubert (monk), St. Ansgar and, 238
Audoenus, St. *See* Ouen
Auffinium, Gaudentius bishop, 28
Augsburg, St. Ulrich bishop, 398 note
Augustales, Society of, 19
Augustine of Canterbury, St., 183 ff.
Authority of, 194
Baptism ceremonies, 190
Bishop of Canterbury, 188
At Canterbury, 185
And Church of Wales, 189
Conference with King Ethelbert, 186
Consecrated at Arles, 181, 187 note

Augustine of Canterbury (*continued*)
Date of Easter, 190
In Gaul, 185
Gregory the Great's letter, 184 f.
Primate of England, 188
St. Andrew's monastery, Rome, 184
Augustine of Hippo, St.: Fulgentius and doctrine of, 270
On Genseric's persecution, 269
Gottschalk studies writings of, 475
Pope Gregory and writings of, 58
On real presence, 472
Study of, 391
Augustulus (emperor): Death of, 22
Odoacer dethrones, 13
And papal power, 14
Villa of Lucullus, 13
Austrasia: Brunehilde queen of, 185
Conflict with Neustria, 165
Embassy to Constantinople, 72
St. Boniface and Church of, 215
St. Columban in, 250
Autchar (duke): Desiderius and, 356
Envoy of Pepin the Short, 332
Autocrator (imperial title), 141
Auvergne (France), Sidonius in, 15
Auxerre (France), Battle of Fontenay, 417
Avars (tribe): Chosroes II and, 120
Heraclius at war with, 120
Invasions of, 67
Location of, 147
Moravians and, 295
In Pannonia, 67
Avenches (Switzerland), St. Marius bishop, 264
Aventine Hill (Rome), St. Jerome, 60
Avitus, St. (bishop of Vienne), 264
Authority of papacy, 39
On baptism of Clovis, 155
Born at Vienne, 264 f.
Burgundian Code, 266
Clovis, 320
De spiritalis historiae gestis, 265
Divinity of Christ, 265
Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, 265
Epaon, Council of (517), 265
Lawrence (antipope), 265
Letter to Clovis, 161
Letter from Pope Symmachus (forgery), 161 note
Palmary Synod, 39
Papal supremacy, 516
Poem of, 171
Poet, 264 f.
St. Sigismund converted by, 263
Symmachus and, 265
Avitus (emperor), Sidonius Apollinaris son-in-law of, 15

Bagdad, Caliphate of, 346 note
Balkans: Bulgarians in the, 288
Slavs in the, 288
Bangor Abbey: Monks of, massacred, 191
St. Columban's Rule, 250
Baptism: Administration of, 27 note
Ceremonies of, 190, 394: Church in England and, 190, 197
Confirmation and, 221 note
Immersion, 394
Infusion, 394
Minister of, 27 note
Priest administering, to be fasting, 467
Baptismal fonts, 394
Barbarians: Arianism among, 70
Character of, 23
Church and the, 6 ff.
Civilizing influence of the Church, 7 f.
Location of, 145
Roman catacombs, 26 f.
Rome not destroyed by, 15 f.
St. Severinus and the, 21 ff.
Taine on Church and the, 7 f.
Bardanes, Philippicus. *See* Philippicus
Bardas, Caesar, 452
Assassinated, 460
Communion refused to, 454
Incest of, 454
Photius, 445
Bari (Italy), Saracens at, 434
Basil I (emperor), 481
Bardas assassinated, 460
As chamberlain, 460
At Council of Constantinople (869), 481
Election of Marino I, 496
John VIII and, 491
Michael III assassinated, 460
Photius, 491
Basil II (emperor): seizes Achrida, 293
St. Vladimir and, 306
Basileus (imperial title), 24, 66, 141
Basilian monasteries, in Calabria, 439
Basilicas, Roman, 26

Bathilde, St. (queen), 177
Baths, at Rome, 16 f.
Bavaria: Location of, 207
  St. Corbinian, 207
  St. Emmeran, 207
Bavarians, Conversion of, 147
Bede the Venerable, St., 200 f., 283
  An Angle, 200
  Death of, 201
  Disciple of St. Benedict Biscop, 200
  Ecclesiastical History, 198, 201
  At Jarrow Abbey, 200
  Lavisse on, 201
  Molinier on, 201
  At Wearmouth Abbey, 200
Belisarius (general), end of Vandal rule, 270
Benedict I (pope): born at Rome, 46 note
  Gregory the Great deacon, 65
  Lombard invasions, 46
Benedict II, St. (pope), 135
Benedict III (pope), 444
  Character of, 444
  Consecration of, 444
  Election of, 442 f.
  Gregory Asbestas, 455
  Nicholas (deacon), 444
  Re-election of, 444
  St. Ignatius of Constantinople, 445
Benedict IV (pope), 502
  Berengarius the Younger crowned by, 511
  Theodora and election of, 503
Benedict (bishop of Albano), Corruption, 432
Benedict (brother of Sergius II), Corruption, 436
Benedict of Aniane, St., 380 ff.
  Alcuin friend of, 382
  Austerities of, 381
  Charlemagne and, 382
  Codex regularum, 382
  Concordantia regularum, 382
  At Council of Aachen, 382
  Founds monastery, 381
  Louis the Pious and, 382
  Monastic reform, 382
  At St. Seine Abbey, 381
  School at Aniane, 390
  Vocation of, 380
Benedict Biscop, St.: Bede disciple of, 200
  Founding of Jarrow Abbey, 200
Benedict Levita (the Deacon), false capitularies, 517
Benedict of Nursia, St., 47 ff.
  Body of, 252
  Florentius calumniates, 49
  Founds twelve monasteries, 48
  Incident of St. Maurus, 61
  Miracle of the scythe, 62
  Monte Cassino Abbey, 49
  Order of. *See* Benedictines
  Prophecy about Rome, 74
  Rule of. *See* Benedictine Rule
  Sacro Speco, 48
  St. Basil, 50
  St. Cassian, 50
  Studies at Rome, 47
  At Subiaco, 48
  Theodoric, 242
  Vision of, 145
Benedict Witiza. *See* Benedict of Aniane
Benedictine habit, 52
Benedictine Rule, 50-52
  Abbot in, 51
  Bossuet on, 51
  Charlemagne and, 379
  Council of Aachen (817) and, 251
  Council of Reims (813) and, 82
  Monastic activities, 51
  Monastic habit, 52
  Monastic virtues in, 51
  Original of, 252
  Recitation of office, 51
  Rule of St. Columban and, 52
  St. Basil, 50
  St. Cassian, 50
  St. Odo, 509
  Spirit of, 50 f.
  Vow of stability, 51
Benedictines: in Gaul, 167
  Gottschalk, 474
  Gregory the Great's donation to, 60
  Manual labor, 52
  Missioners, 52
  Monastic schools, 52
  In Poland, 309
  Spiritual life, 52 f.
Benefices: Charlemagne and, 384
  Nature of, 384
Benevento (duchy), Donation of Charlemagne, 359
Berengarius II (king of Italy), 511
Bernard (count of Auvergne), 505

Bernard (king of Italy), 416
Death of, 417, 423
Leo III and, 420
Berno, St. (abbot of Cluny), 506
Berno (count), Gottschalk son of, 475
Bertha (queen of Kent): Luidhard and, 185
St. Gregory's letter to, 188
Wife of St. Ethelbert, 185 f.
Bertharius, St. (abbot of Monte Cassino): John VIII and, 486
Martyred, 465
Writings of, 465
Bible: illumination of manuscripts, 465
Mohammed and, 343
Slavonic translation, 299
Bibliotheca, by Photius, 453
Bibliothecarius, Office of, 484 and note
Biel, Gabriel, adoptionism, 407 note
Birinus, St. (bishop of Dorchester), Conversion of Wessex, 197
Bischofsheim (convent), St. Lioba abbess, 213
Bishoprics, Erection of new, 214 note
Bishops: Administration of confirmation, 221 note
Church property, 289 note
Consecration of, 426
Deposition of, 450
Duty of residence, 426
Election of, 265 note: Charlemagne and, 375 f.; Council of Constantinople (869), 482; *Missi,* 376; St. Gregory, 97
As judges, 389
St. Gregory and Italian, 84
Subservience of Eastern, 68 f.
Bizza (Thrace), St. Maximus the Confessor exiled to, 128
Black Sea, Jews, 298
Blessed Virgin. *See* Mary, Blessed Virgin
Bobbio Abbey: Founding of, 250
Library of, 251
St. Columban and, 249 f.
Theodelinda and, 249
Boethius, 283
Consolations of Philosophy, 244
Dante's reference to, 244
Executed by Theodoric, 245 f.
Theodoric and, 244 ff.
Translation of Aristotle, 391
Bogomili (heretics), 293 f.
Bogoris (Bulgarian chief). *See* Boris
Bohemia: Moravian rule, 302
Partition of Moravia, 304
Boleslaus I (Bohemian king), 309
Boniface II (pope), 44
Boniface III (pope), 115
Title "ecumenical patriarch," 89
Boniface IV, St. (pope), 115
Feast of All Saints, 116
Pantheon, Rome, 115
St. Columban and date of Easter, 116
Boniface V (pope), 117 and note
Boniface VI (pope), 499
Boniface, St. (apostle of Germany), 203 ff.
Adelbert (impostor), 216
Amöneberg Abbey founded by, 212
Bishop of Mainz, 218
Body of, at Fulda Abbey, 230
Born in Wessex, 204
Charles Martel and, 211
Church of Austrasia, 215
Church and state, 216 f.
Clement (impostor), 216
Clerical dress, 393
Consecrated bishop, 210
Consecrates Lullus bishop, 219
Coronation of Pepin the Short, 331
Council of Leptines, 217
Daniel (bishop) and, 206
Denehard and, 212
Destroys oak tree at Geismar, 212
Education of, 205
First mission in Germany, 208 f.
First visit to Frisia, 206
Formation of dioceses, 217
Founds monasteries, 212
Frankish Church and, 214 f.
Fritzlar Abbey founded by, 228
Fulda Abbey founded by, 218 f.
German bishoprics, 214
Gregory II and, 206, 210, 213
Gregory III and, 214
In Hesse, 210, 212
Last instructions to Lullus, 221
Last mission, 221
Letter from Bishop Daniel, 208
Letter to King Ethelbald, 225
Letter to Pope Stephen II, 220
Letter to Pope Zachary, 215, 219
Life of, by St. Willibald, 208
Makes St. Lullus chorepiscopus, 219
Martyrdom of, 221, 233

Boniface, St. (*continued*)
Method of apologetics, 208
Ohrdruf Abbey founded by, 212
Organizes heirarchy, 216
Pepin (son of Charles Martel), 215
Priest, 205
Probable birthplace, 204
Resides at Mainz, 218
At Rome, 206 f.
Rural clergy, 216
St. Burchard and, 212
St. Carloman and, 215
St. Gregory companion of, 209
St. Lioba, abbess, 213
St. Lullus, 212
St. Sturmio disciple of, 228
St. Virgilius, 217 f.
St. Willibrord, 208
Second mission in Germany, 210
Second time in Frisia, 208
Sent to Germany by Gregory II, 207
Sets out for Frisia, 205
So called by Gregory II, 207
Studies at Exeter Abbey, 205
Studies at Nutshalling Abbey, 205
Tithes, 216
Winfrid, Saxon name of, 204
"Wooden chalices," 498
Zachary (pope) and, 214, 217
Boniface (count of Africa), appeals to Vandals for aid, 268 f.
Bordeaux (France), St. Caesarius exiled to, 258
Bordi Abbey, Photius dies at, 496
Boris (Bulgarian king), 290 ff.
Becomes monk, 291
Church of Bulgaria, 483
Conversion of, 290, 464
Forced conversions, 291
Louis the German and, 292
Massacre by, 291
Michael III godfather of, 291
Nicholas I and, 291, 464
Photius (emperor) and, 292
Questions to Pope Nicholas, 292
Responsa Nicolai ad Bulgaros, 292
Borziwoi (duke of Bohemia), St. Methodius converts, 304
Boso (king of Provence), 505
Engelberga and, 492 f.
Bossuet, on Benedictine Rule, 51
Boulogne (France): Anglo-Saxons, 387
Lighthouse, 387
Bourges (France): St. Amandus at, 178
St. Rodolfe bishop of, 463
Braga (Portugal): Council of (572), 272
St. Fructuosus bishop, 282
St. Martin bishop, 272
Braulio, St. (bishop of Saragossa), 282
Bread, Unleavened, in mass, 395
Bremen: St. Ansgar bishop, 238
St. Willehad bishop, 223
Brephotrophium, 386
Breviarium Alaricianum, 259
Brieuc, St., in Brittany, 183 note
Brioc, St. *See* Brieuc
Britain. *See* England
Britons: Attitude to Anglo-Saxons, 189, 193
Conversion of, 182
In England, 145, 182
In Gaul, 145
St. Patrick and conversion of, 182
Tacitus on the, 182 note
In Wales, 182 f.
Brittany, 183 note
Brunehaut. *See* Brunehilde
Brunehilde (Frankish queen), 165
Burgundians and, 267
Ingundis daughter of, 273
Letter from St. Gregory, 185
St. Columban and, 163, 250
St. Gregory and, 92, 185 note
Bulgaria: Bulgarians settle in, 129 f.
Church of, 491: Council of Constantinople (869), 483; Formosus, 483, 487; Patriarchate of Constantinople, 483; Photius, 482 f., 491
Mohammedanism, 294
Bulgarians: in the Balkans, 288
Chosroes II and, 120
Constantinople attacked by, 288
End of kingdom of, 294
Fight against Constantine IV, 129
Greek Schism, 293
Heraclius at war with, 120
Innocent III and hierarchy, 293 f.
Isperikh chief, 288
Justinian II and, 288
Pagans, 288
Burchard, St. (bishop of Würzburg), 212
Pepin the Short and, 331
St. Boniface and, 212

Burgundians: Administration of Justice, 265
Adultery, 266
Arianism among the, 263
Arians, 154, 255
Become Catholics, 263
Brunehilde and, 267
Character of, 266
Code, 266
Divorce, 396
Franks defeat the, 263
In Gaul, 145, 156
Gaul invaded by, 154
Historical importance of, 263 f.
Location of kingdom of, 262
Luidhard bishop of Senlis, 263
Near Trier, 263
Origin of, 262
St. Caesarius, 263
St. Clotilda, 263
In southeastern Gaul, 262
Visigoths and, 263, 266
"Burgundians," Origin of name, 262
Burgundy (kingdom): End of, 263
Gondebad king of, 263
Guntram king of, 263
Rudolph II king of, 267
St. Columban in, 250
St. Sigismund king of, 263
Buto (Saxon noble), and St. Lebwin, 227
Byblos (Phenicia), Temple of Adonis, 20
Byzantium. *See* Constantinople

Caere (Cervetri, Italy), Marino bishop, 495
Caesarea (Palestine), Persians take, 119
Caesarius, St. (bishop of Arles), 70, 259 f.
Athanasian Creed, 260
Catechist, 260
Doctrine of St. Augustine, 259
Exiled to Bordeaux, 258
Sermons of, 260 f.
Visigoths and, 258
Writings of, 259 f.
Caesars, Palace of the, 57
Cairo, Caliphate of, 346 note
Calabria: Basilian monasteries, 439
Bishops of, and Roman See, 97
Cassiodorus in, 243
Martin I on coast of, 128
Calama (Africa), St. Possidius bishop, 269
Calendar, by Charlemagne, 367
Caliphates, 345 f.
Callinicus of Heliopolis, "Greek fire," 129
Calliopas (exarch), seizes Martin I, 128
Camaldolese, in Poland, 309
Cambrai (France), Halitgar bishop, 237
Campania (Italy): abandoned, 16
Bishops of, and Roman See, 97
Pope Silverius born in, 44 note
Campulus (saccellarius), attack on Leo III, 362
Campus, Frankish assembly, 157
Candelmas. *See* Purification, Feast of
Canonesses, 379 note
"Canonicus," Meaning of, 378 note
Canonization, reserved to pope, 398 note
"Canons," Rule of St. Chrodegang, 378
"Canons of the Apostles," 243
Canons Regular, in cathedrals, 379
Canons Regular of St. Martin of Tours, St. Odo joins, 509
Canterbury: Baptism of Ethelbert, 187
Conflagration in, 195
Donation of, by Ethelbert, 188
St. Adrian abbot of, 200
St. Augustine bishop, 183 ff.
St. Martin's Church, 183, 186
St. Lawrence bishop, 195
St. Mellitus bishop, 195
St. Theodore bishop, 192, 198 f.
Worship of Odin at, 193
Capitularies, False (by Benedict Levita), 517
Capitularies of Charlemagne: Baptism made obligatory (782), 231
Divorce (789), 396
Duties of kings, 279
Ecclesiastical affairs, 374
On marriage (802), 396
Monastic reform (789), 380
Saxon legislation (797), 233
Veneration of saints (794), 397
Capitularies of Charles the Bald (869), 463
Capitularies of Hincmar, 467
Capitularies of Quierzy (877), 419
Capitulary, Saxon (782), 231
Cara cognatio (pagan feast), 34 note

Cararic. *See* Theodosius
Cardinal-bishops, *27* note, 354 note
Cardinal-priests, *27*
"Cardinals," *27* note
Carloman, St. (son of Charles Martel), *215*
  At Monte Cassino, *219*, *253*, 335
  St. Boniface and, *215*
  At Vienne, 335
Caroline Books, 402
Carolingian dynasty, *223*
Carolingian Empire, 341 ff.
  Army of, 413
  Finances of, 413
  Weakness of, 413 f.
Carpentras (France), Council of (*527*), *260*
Cartegena (Spain): Licinianus bishop, 98
  St. Leander born at, *275*
Carthage, Worship of *Virgo coelestis*, *20*
Casimir I (king of Poland), Jaroslav and, 308
Cassian, St., Monasticism and, 50
Cassiodorus, (Roman writer), 60, *242* ff., 283
Cassock, 393
Castel Sant' Angelo. *See* Sant' Angelo
"Castilians," Origin of name, *262* note
Castles, 414
Castor and Pollux, Worship of, *32*
Castrum Cassinum, Monte Cassino monastery, 49
Catacombs (Roman), *26* f., *26* note
Catalonga. *See* Cavadonga
Cathari (heretics), Bogomili and, *293* f.
Catholicos, Title of, 86
Cavadonga, Our Lady of, 285
Celestine I, St. (pope), Clerical dress, 393
Celibacy, Clerical: *29* note
  Council of Constantinople (*692*), 135
  Holy orders and, 480 note
Celts, Christians, 148 note
"Cemeteries of the martyrs," *26*
Centumcellae (Italy), 437
Cervetri. *See* Caere
Ceylon, Christianity in, 316
Chalcedon, Council of (*451*), *24*
  Nestorianism condemned, *24*
  Title of ecumenical patriarch, 88
Chaldean Church, *Catholicos*, 86
Chalons, Council of (644), 177
Chalon-sur-Saône, Councils of: (813), 395; (894), 497
Chant, Ecclesiastical: Charlemagne and, 397
  Gregory the Great, 99-101
Chapters of canons, 379
Charibert I (king of Paris), Bertha, daughter of, 185
Charlemagne, 346 ff.
  At Aachen, 365
  Aachen, capital of, 367
  Act of Speyer, *233*
  Administration of justice, 389
  Adrian (pope) and, 358
  Adrian (pope) protests to, *232*
  Affability of, *372*
  Alcuin adviser of, 374
  Alcuin meets, 390
  Alcuin protests to, *232*
  Appointment of abbots, 379
  Baptism of Saxons, *231*
  Benedictine Rule, 379
  Canonization of, 410
  Canonized, 411 note
  Capitularies, *279*, 373 f.: (789), 396; (794), 397; (797), *233*; (802), 396
  Capitulary of Saxony, *231*
  Character of, 346 f.
  Church building, *392*
  Church revenue, 383 f.
  Confirms Charter of Quierzy, 359
  Consults the pope, 378
  Conversion of Saxony, *223* ff.
  Coronation of, as emperor, 364
  Corvey monastery, *234*
  Councils, 377
  Death of, 416
  Desiderius, 357
  Dismemberment of empire of, 417
  Donation of, 359
  Dress of, 367
  Ebbo, *237*, 430
  Einhard's description, 346
  Election of bishops, 375 f.
  Engrians and, *230*
  Episcopal jurisdiction, 389
  Episcopal schools, 5, 390
  Expedition against the Saxons, *227*
  George of Amiens envoy of, 357
  German law, 367
  Holy Roman Empire, *320*
  Idea of law, *371* f.
  Intellectual movement, 5

Charlemagne (*continued*)
Interference in Church matters, 374
King of the Lombards, 359
Legate of, at Rome, 361
Letter to Leo III, 369
Libraries, 390
Liturgical reform, 397
Marches established by, 369
Meeting with Pope Adrian, 358 f.
Military policy of, 346 f.
Missi dominici, 373
Monastic schools, 5, 390
Monasticism and, 380
National assemblies, 372
National calendar, 367
Normans and, 236
Oath of fidelity, 371
Organ at Aachen, 397
At Paderborn, 228, 363
Palace school, 390
Papal elections and, 360
Papal supremacy, 516
Parish schools, 390
At Parma, 390
Partition of empire of, 416
At Pavia, 358
Plain Chant, 397
Preaching and, 398
Repels Saxons, 230
Respect for the pope, 377
Rights of the Church, 374
At Rome, 358, 363
Royal benefices and, 384
Rumored death of, 229
Saracen envoys, 228
Saxons executed at Verden, 231
Schools, 5, 390
Spiritual addresses, 374
St. Benedict of Aniane and, 382
Stephen II and, 333
Teutonic grammar, 367
Trinitarian doctrine, 409
Verden executions, 347
Vulfrad envoy of, 357
In Westphalia, 228
Widukind and, 232
Wives of, 411 note
At Worms, 227
Charles II the Bald (emperor): Assembly of Ponthion, 490
Capitulary (869), 463
Coronation of, 489
Death of, 490
Eucharistic controversy, 472
Gregory IV and, 428
Imperial idea, 490
John VIII, 489 f.
Louis the German and, 488
Predestinarianism, 477
Ratramnus, 468
Scotus Erigena, 470
War against Lothaire, 417
Charles III the Fat (emperor), 494, 496
Charles III the Simple (king), Odo and, 498
Charles Martel: Death of, 214
Defeats the Moslems, 211
Gregory III appeals to, 141
Moslems and, 342
Pepin father of, 211
St. Adalhard grandson of, 234
St. Boniface and, 211
St. Chrodegang and, 378
Saxons repelled by, 211
Saxons unconquered by, 225
Charter of Quierzy, 335
Chartres, St. Corbinian bishop, 207
Chasuble, 393
Chateaubriand, Romanticism of, 4
Chersonesus: Justinian II exiled to the, 138
Martin I imprisoned in the, 128
Childebert I (Frankish king), Burgundians defeated by, 263
Childeric I (Frankish king), 157
Chilperic II (Frankish king), 70, 177
China, Christianity in, 316
Chlamys, 66
Chorepiscopi, Office of, 219 note, 377
Chosroes II (king of Persia), 345
Assassinated by Siroes, 120
Avars and, 120
Bulgarians and, 120
Devotion to St. Sergius, 90
Religious liberty, 90
Christ, Date of birth of, 243 note
Christ, Divinity of: Council of Chalcedon, 24
St. Avitus on, 265
See also Adoptionism
Christ, Personality of, 118 f.
Christian era, Dionysius Exiguus, 242, 243 note
"Christian Republic," 341
Christmas, Date of, Feast of *Natalis invicti* and, 34 note

Christopher (pope), 502, 504
Christopher (primicerius): Death of, 355
Desiderius, 352, 355
Imprisoned, 352
Influence of, 353
Paul I, 351
Stephen II, 351
Stephen III, 353
Chrodegang, St. (bishop of Metz), 218, 378
Charles Martel and, 378
Pepin the Short and, 332, 378
Rule of, 218, 378
Chronicle, by Flodoard, 479
Chronicon Fredegarii, 163, 264
Chrysopolis (Asia Minor), St. Maximus the Confessor at, 127
Chur (Switzerland), Church of, 153
Church: and the barbarians, 6 ff.
Civilizing influence of, 7 f.
Judge of heretics, 110
Taine on barbarians and the, 7 f.
Church administration, Simplicius, 26
Church bells, 392
Church, Eastern, Hierarchical system of, 67 f.
Church, Frankish, Condition of, 214 f.
Church lands, Immunity of, 387 f.
Church music, Gregory the Great, 99-101
Church, Patrimony of the. *See* Papal States
Church property, 384
Agriculture, 386
Benefices, 384 f.
Extent of, 384
Gaudentius (bishop), 28
Patrimony of the poor, 385
Precaria, 384
Simplicius (pope), 27 f.
Church revenue, 383 f.
Firstfruits, 383
Gelasius, 383
Offerings, 383
Precaria, 384
Simplicius regulates use of, 27 f.
Tithes, 383
Use of, 27 f., 385
Church and state, 216 f.
Alcuin on, 374
Among the barbarians, 7 f.
Council of Constantinople (869), 482
Eugenius II, 424 f.
Felix III, 28 f.
Gregory VII, 217
In the Middle Ages, 5
Nicholas I, 446 ff., 459, 463
Privilegium Ottonis, 511 f.
St. Boniface, 216 f.
Sergius II, 431
In Spain, 280
Zeno, 29
Church, States of the. *See* Papal States
Churches: Altars in, 392
Lantern tower, 392
Maintenance of, 28
Relics in, 392
Style of, 391 f.
Cincture, 393
Circus, at Rome, 16 f.
Circus Maximus (Rome), 57
City parishes, 377 note
Civilization, Papacy and, 6
Civitavecchia, Saracens raid, 427
Claudius (bishop of Turin), 404
Clement (impostor), and St. Boniface, 216
Clementina (patrician), 90 note
Clergy: Conferences of, 467
Costume of, 392 f.
Length of hair, 393
Life in ninth century, 467 f.
"Unordained," in Rome, 349
Clergy, Rural, 178 f., 377
In Frankish Church, 216
And St. Boniface, 216
Clerical dress. *See* Clergy, Costume of
Clermont (France), Sidonius Apollinaris bishop, 15
Clodomir (Frankish king), Death of St. Sigismund, 263
Clodowech. *See* Clovis
Clotaire I (Frankish king), 164
Burgundians defeated by, 263
Clotilda, St. (queen of France), 159
Clovis marries, 160
Conversion of Clovis, 263
King Gondebad uncle of, 160
St. Genevieve friend of, 159
Clovesho, Council of (747), 194, 395
Clovis: Baptism of, 155
Becomes king, 157
Church of St. Denis (Paris), 164
Conversion of, 160 f., 187
Death of, 165

Clovis (*continued*)
Defeats Visigoths, 258
Donation of (forgery), 161 note
Legend of the holy oil, 161 note
Letter of St. Avitus, 161
Letter of St. Remigius, 158
Marriage of, 160, 162 note
St. Avitus, 320
Salic law and, 171
Supposed letter from Pope Anastasius, 161 note
Theodoric and, 160
Cluny Abbey: becomes an order, 513
Donation by William of Aquitaine, 505
Founding of, 505
Influence of, 509, 513
St. Hugh abbot, 513
St. Majolus abbot, 513
St. Odilo abbot, 513
St. Odo abbot, 509, 513
Code, Burgundian, 266
Code of Jaroslav, 308
Code, Justinian, 58
Codex regularium (by St. Benedict of Aniane), 382
Coelian Hill (Rome), St. Gregory, 57, 60
Coire (Switzerland). *See* Chur
Coliseum (Rome), 57
Colman, St. (bishop of Lindisfarne), 198
Colmar (Alsace), Gregory IV at, 429
Cologne (Germany): Church of, 153
Gunther bishop, 448
Coloni, 104
Columban, St., 249-251
At Anagray, 166 note
Date of Easter, 116
King Thierry and, 163, 250
Monks of, 166
Queen Brunehilde, 163
Rule of, 52, 250 f.
Commendati, Patrimony of St. Peter, 106
Commerce, Monasteries and, 387
Communion, Reception of, 260
Under both species, 395
Compiègne, Council of, 396, 429
Comte, Auguste, on the Middle Ages, 4 note
Concordantia regularium, by St. Benedict of Aniane, 382
Concordat, The first, 217
Conductores massarum, Patrimony of St. Peter, 103
Confession, Private, 394 f., 395 note
Origin of, 251: Duchesne on, 252
Confirmation, Baptism and, 221 note
Conon (pope), 135
Conrad of Mercia, at Rome, 203
Consanguinity, matrimonial impediment, 397 note
Consensus populi, 372 note
Consentius of Narbonne, on Roman baths, 17
Consolations of Philosophy, by Boethius, 244
Alfred the Great translates, 244
St. Thomas Aquinas' commentary, 244
Constance, Lake, St. Columban at, 250
Constans II (emperor), 126
Martyrdom of St. Maximus, 128
Murder of, 129
Persecution of Pope Martin I, 128
At Syracuse, 129
Typus of, 127
Visits Rome, 129
Constantina (empress), Letters from Gregory the Great, 88 f.
Constantina (patrician), Formosus and, 493
Constantine I (pope), 138
Constantine II (antipope), 352, 354
Constantine I the Great (emperor): Arch of (Rome), 57
Donation of, 366 note
Papal domains, 42
Constantine III (emperor), 126
Constantine IV (emperor), Adeodatus (pope) and, 129 f.
Constantine V Capronymus (emperor): Churches profaned, 399
Iconoclasm, 140, 399
Stephen II and, 329
Constantine VIII (emperor), Vladimir and, 306
Constantine (i. e., Cyril, apostle of the Slavs)
Constantine (bishop of Cyprus), Council of Nicaea (787), 401
Constantine the Bearded. *See* Constantine IV, emperor
Constantine Pogonatus. *See* Constantine IV, emperor
Constantinople: Acephali at, 40

Constantinople (*continued*)
Arabs besiege, 129
Basileus of, 24
Bulgarians attack, 288
Court of, 66
Hungarian hospice, 314
John I at, 245
Martin I imprisoned at, 128
Patriarch of, 67 f., 483
Patriarchs: Acacius, 24; Cyriacus, 89; Flavian, 42 note; Ignatius, 445; John the Faster, 86; Menas, 121; Methodius, 403; Nicephorus, 298; Paul, 131; Peter, 131; Photius, 490 f.; Pyrrhus, 127, 131; Sergius, 116 ff., 131; Tarasius, 400, 453
Philippicus Bardanes attacks, 288
Photius, usurping patriarch of, 446, 454 f.
Primacy of, 492
Pseudo-council of (754), 399
Religious strife, 40
Renaissance, 452
St. Ennodius at, 242
St. Gregory at, 67
Theodoric the Great at, 241
Ulfilas at, 154
Constantinople, Councils of:
(588), ecumenical patriarch, 87
(638), Heraclius' *Ecthesis,* 125
(680), 130 ff.
(692), 134 f., 138
(861), St. Ignatius condemned, 458
(867), Pope Nicholas deposed, 460
(869), 480 ff.: Acts of, 484; Anastasius bibliothecarius, 484; Basil the Macedonian, 481; Church of Bulgaria, 483; Church and state, 482; Election of bishops, 482; Formula of Hormisdas, 481; Papal legates, 483; Photius condemned, 481 f.
Constitution of 817, 422
Constitution of 824, 424
Constitution of Lothaire, 424
Conventus, Frankish assembly, 157
Cope (ninth century), 393
Copronymus. *See* Constantine V, emperor
Coptic language, Monophysites, 120
Copyists, Cassiodorus and, 244
Corbie Abbey: St. Adolard abbot, 234, 469
St. Ansgar at, 235
Corbie, New. *See* Corvey
Corbinian, St. (bishop of Freising), 207
Cordova (Spain), Caliphate of, 346 and note
Corentinus, St. (bishop of Quimper), 183 note
Cormery Abbey, Alcuin founds, 382
Corsica: Bishops of, and Roman See, 97
Donation of Charlemagne, 359
Corsicans, at Porto, 437
Corvey Abbey, 234 f.
Cosmas and Damian, SS. (basilica), 77
Council of Trullo. *See* Constantinople, Council of (692)
Councils: Charlemagne and, 377
In Gaul, 70
Power to judge a pope, 39
Councils, List of:
Aachen (809), 409; (816), 379, 385; (817), 251, 390; (860), 448
Agde (506), 260, 262 note, 279 note
Aix-la-Chapelle. *See* Aachen
Arles (314), 182; (524), 260
Attigny, 417
Braga (572), 272
Carpentras (527), 260
Chalons (644), 177; (647), 175 note; (649), 175 note
Chalon-sur-Saône (813), 395; (894), 497
Clovesho (747), 194, 395
Compiègne (756), 396
Constantinople (588), 87; (638), 125; (680), 131 ff.; (754), 399; (861), 458; (867), 460; (869), 480 f.
Epaon (517), 175 and note, 265
Florence (1438-1445), 410
Frankfort (794), 402, 404
Friuli (791), 396 note
Gentilly (767), 408
Hereford (673), 396 note
Lateran (649), 127; (863), 449
Leptines (743), 217
Mainz (829), 475; (847), 395
Marseilles (533), 260
Metz (863), 449
Nantes (650), 396 note
Nicaea (787), 400, 404
Orange (529), 260
Orleans (511, 541, 549), 175 note
Paris (615), 175 note; (825), 403; (829), 279, 396 note
Pavia (850), 440

Councils, List of (*continued*)
Quierzy (849), 475
Ratisbon (870), 301
Reims (525, 625), 175 note; (813), 82
Rome (501), 37-39; (591), 84, 97; (595), 97, 100; (601), 97; (680), 130; (769), 354; (826), 425 f., 440; (853), 440, 497; (904), 500 note
Rouen (650), 175 note
Saragossa (592, 593, 599), 91
Sardica, 182
Savonnières (859), 477
Seville (590), 84
Soissons (853), 444
Tribur (895), 497
Toledo (447), 407 note; (589), 275, 276 note, 407; (597), 91; (633), 281; (653), 282; (694), 283 f.; (701), 276 note
Trosly (909), 279
Vaison (529), 260, 390
Valence (855), 476
Verberie (753), 396
Vienne (892), 497
Counts, 418
Crediton (England), St. Boniface's probable birthplace, 204
Creed, Athanasian, St. Caesarius and, 260
Creeds: Acacius of Constantinople, 24
Peter Mongus, 24
Cremona, Liutprand bishop, 479, 500 note
Criticism, Textual, in Spain, 405
Croats: Emperor Heraclius and, 120, 289
In Illyricum, 289
John IV and, 289
Cross, True: Relic of, returned to Heraclius, 120
Taken by the Persians, 119
Cubiculum sacrum, in Church of Rome, 349
Cyprus: Acephali in, 120
Constantine bishop, 401
Cyriacus (patriarch of Constantinople), Title of ecumenical patriarch, 89
Cyril, St. (apostle of the Slavs), 296 ff.
Adrian II's approbation, 300
Born at Thessalonica, 296
Character of, 297
Death of, 300
Denounced to Nicholas I, 300
Education of, 296 f.
Empress Theodora, 297
Importance of work of, 304
Khazars, 298
Methodius brother of, 296
Michael III and, 296-298
Monk, 300
In Moravia, 298 f.
Photius, 456
Priest, 297
At Rome, 300
Slavonic language, 299
Slavonic liturgy, 299
Slavonic translation of Scripture, 299, 307
Teacher at Constantinople, 297
Theoctistus, 297
At Venice, 299 f.
Cyril of Alexandria, St., Papal supremacy, 516
Cyrus (patriarch of Alexandria): condemned, 127, 131
Monothelitism, 121, 131

Dabrowska. *See* Dobrawa
Dagobert I (Frankish king), and Salic law, 171
Damascene, John, St. *See* John Damascene
Damascus (Syria), Persians take, 119
Danes: at Camargue, 434
Incursions of, 342
Pisa pillaged by, 434
Daniel (bishop of Winchester), St. Boniface and, 206, 208
Daniel (*magister militum*), Charges against Gratian, 439
Danish envoys, Baptism of, 235
Dante: on Anastasius II, 30
Reference to Boethius, 244
Danube (river): Ancient Germany, 146
Bulgarians, 288
Goths cross the, 154
Herodotus, 146
Ostrogoths at the, 29
Daras (Mesopotamia), Persians capture, 119
De corpore et sanguine Domini, by Paschasius, 470, 472
De divisione naturae, by Erigena, 471
De divortio Lotharii, by Hincmar, 449
De laudibus virginitatis, by Aldhelm, 380

De libris recipiendis, Authorship of, 35 note
De officiis divinis, by Alcuin, 393
De partu Virginis, by St. Paschasius, 470
De spiritalis historiae gestis, by St. Avitus, 265
Deacons: Care of the poor, 101
Chant the gospel, 100 f.
Council of Rome (595), 100
Marriage of, 135
In Rome, 348
Deaneries, 377
Deans, 377 note
Decretals, The false, 515 ff.
St. Isidore of Seville and, 283
Decretum Gratiani, 243
Heretics and torture, 110
Defensor civitatis: Functions of, 43
Pope as, 43
Defensores, Patrimony of St. Peter, 105
Demetrius, St., Battle of Thessalonica, 289
Denehard, St. Boniface and, 212
Denis. *See* Dionysius
Denmark: Halitgar preaches in, 237
St. Ansgar apostle of, 235, 238
St. Walfrid in, 237
St. Willibrord in, 237
Widukind in, 229
Desiderius (Lombard king): Adrian I and, 356
Autchar and, 356
Charlemagne and, 357
Christopher (primicerius), 351, 355
Policy of, 356
Ratchis and, 339
Stephen III and, 356
Deusdedit, St. (pope), 117 and note
Deusdedit, St. (archbishop of Canterbury), 199
Dialogues, by Gregory the Great, 54, 61-63
Diana, Statue at Trier, 164
Didier. *See* Desiderius
Dioceses, Erection of new, 214 note
Dionysius (the pseudo-Areopagite), Scotus translates, 470
Dionysius Exiguus: "Canons of the Apostles," 243
Christian era, 242 f.
Dithmar (bishop of Merseburg), 309
Divination, Hungarians, 311
Divorce: Burgundians, 396
Capitulary of Charlemagne (789), 396
Church councils on, 396 and note
Decree of Pope Zachary, 396 note
Formulary of Marculf, 396
Franks, 396
Lothaire (king of Lorraine), 448 f.
Visigoths, 396
Dnieper (river), 305
Dobrawa, wife of King Mieszko, 309
Döllinger, *The Pope and the Council* by, 515
Dokkum, St. Boniface martyred near, 221, 233
Dombrowka. *See* Dobrawa
Dominus gloriosissimus, 157
Domitian, St. (bishop of Melitene), preaches in Persia, 90
Don (river), Slavs between the Vistula and the, 147
Donatism, in Africa, 79
Donation: of Charlemagne, 359; of Constantine, 366 note; of Pepin, 348; of Quierzy, 359
Donatists, in Africa, 84
Donatus (monk), Jativa monastery, 272
Donna Senatrix (i. e., Marozia), 504
Donus (pope), Constantine IV and, 129
Dorchester (England), St. Birinus bishop, 197
Dowina, Louis the German besieges, 299
Dracontius (poet), 270 note, 271
Dress, Clerical, 392 f., 426
Drogo (bishop of Metz), Pope Sergius and, 431
Dubrawka. *See* Dobrawa
Duchesne: on origin of private confession, 251 f.
On papal supremacy, 108
Duerstede (Holland), Anglo-Saxons, 387
Dunwich (England), St. Felix bishop, 197
Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (theologian), Adoptionism, 407 note
Durovernum (Canterbury), St. Augustine at, 187
Dux (military officer), 59

Eadbald (king of Kent), Paganism, 193
Eadric. *See* Edric

East Anglia, Kingdom of, 182 note
St. Felix preaches in, 197
East Saxons, Jaruman preaches to, 197
Easter, Date of: England, 190, 197
Ireland, 116 and note, 197
Northumbria, 198
St. Columban, 116
Scotland, 197
Wales, 198
Eastern Church: Jews and, 298
Saracens and, 297
Eastern Empire: St. Gregory and, 109
Khazars' alliance with, 298
Papacy and, 324
Renaissance in, 452
Eastern religions, Mithraism, 20
Eastern Schism, Bulgarians and, 293
Eastern superstitions, at Rome, 18
Ebbo (archbishop of Reims), 517
Charlemagne and, 430
Charlemagne emancipates, 237
Disgrace of, 237
Halitgar and, in Denmark, 237
Instructs King Harold, 235
Louis the Pious, 430
Made bishop of Reims, 237
Paschal I and, 237
Slave, 237
Eberard (majordomo), at Council of Constantinople (869), 482
Ebroin (mayor of the palace), St. Leodegar and, 177
Ebrulf, St. (abbot), and the bandits, 168
Ecclesiastical courts, 389
Ecclesiastical History, by Bede, 198, 201
Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 389
Ecclesiastical property. *See* Church property
Ecija (Spain), St. Fulgentius bishop, 275
Ecluse, Anglo-Saxon merchants at, 387
Ecole des Chartes, Historical methods, 4
Ecthesis of Heraclius, 125
Lateran Council condemns the, 127
"Ecumenical patriarch," 60, 86
Boniface III and, 89
Council of Chalcedon and, 88
Pelagius II and, 88
Edessa (Mesopotamia): Ibas bishop, 44
Persians take, 119
Edict of Rotharis, 249
Edictum Theodorici, 242
Edric (king of Kent), Laws of, 202
Education: Alcuin, 391
In Middle Ages, 5
See also Schools
Edwin, St. (king of Northumbria), Conversion of, 196
Egbert, St. (monk), 205
Egbert the Great (king of England), 197
Eginhard. *See* Einhard
Egypt: Monophysites in, 79, 120
Moslems conquer, 345
Paulianists in, 120
Eichstätt (in Franconia), St. Willibald bishop, 208
Eighteenth century, attitude to the Middle Ages, 3
Einhard (historian): Description of Charlemagne, 346
Life of Charlemagne, 391
Monasteries of, 385
Elbe (river), Slavs between the Vistula and the, 145
Elections, Episcopal, *Missi* at, 376
Elections, Papal: Council of Rome (769), 354
Lay aristocracy, 349
Ratification of, 355
Eleutherius (son of Arsenius), 441
Execution of, 486
Murders Adrian II's wife and daughter, 485
Elias of Jerusalem, St., 42 note
Eligius, St. (bishop of Noyon), 176 f.
Elipandus (bishop of Toledo), Adoptionism, 404 f.
Elizabeth of Hungary, St., 23
Eloi, St. *See* Eligius
Elvira, Council of, Slavery, 277 f.
Emancipation, Formula of, 278
Ember days, Origin of, 34 note
Emilian Cucullatus, St. (monk), 272
Emiliana, St. (St. Gregory's aunt), 54
Emmeran, St. (bishop of Poitiers): and conversion of Bavaria, 207
Eundachar and relics of, 435
Emperor, Worship of, 19
Emperors, Eastern: Claims of, 43
Odoacer and, 43
Papacy and, 43
Religious dominance of, 67 f.
Theodoric and, 43
Empire, Holy Roman. *See* Holy Roman Empire

Encyclopedists, attitude to the Middle Ages, 3
End of the world, St. Gregory and, 94
Engelberga (empress), 439
  Betrothed to Louis the German, 436
  Boso, 493
  Influence of, 437 f.
  John VIII and, 492-494
  Papal elections, 440
England, Ancient laws of, 202
  Angles invade, 182
  Anglo-Saxons in, 145, 182
  Baptism ceremonies, 190, 197
  Britons in, 145, 182
  Conversion of Britons, 182
  Date of Easter, 190, 197
  Itinerant monks, 204
  Jutes invade, 182
  Origin of Church in, 191
  Paganism in, 193
  Pilgrimages to Rome, 203
  Popes and civilization of, 202 f.
  Romanticism in, 4
  St. Augustine apostle of, 183 ff.
  St. Augustine primate of, 188
  St. Germain in, 192 note
  St. Gregory and Church in, 184
  St. Gregory and conversion of, 193
  St. Gregory and missions in, 92
  St. Lupus in, 192 note
  Saxons invade, 182
  Slavery in, 192
English slaves, St. Gregory and, 63
Engrians (Saxon tribe), Charlemagne, 230
Ennius, Quintus (poet), on paganism, 20
Ennodius, St. (bishop of Pavia): at Constantinople, 242
  Defense of Palmary Synod, 39
  Defense of Pope Symmachus, 242
  Literary works of, 242
Epaon, Council of (517), 265
  On slavery, 175 and note
Ephesus, Council of, Nicene Creed, 408
Episcopal jurisdiction, 389
Episcopal schools, 390
  Charlemagne and, 5
Equitius (senator), St. Maurus son of, 49
Era, Christian, 242 f.
Era, Moslem, 344
Ermengarde (empress): Arnulf and, 497
  Coronation of, 421
  Death of, 435
Ermenrich (bishop of Passau), 301
Essex: Kingdom of, 182 note
  Sebert king of, 195
Etaples (i. e., Quentovicus), 387
Ethelbald (Anglo-Saxon king), 213
  Letter from St. Boniface, 225
Ethelbert, St. (king of Kent): Bertha wife of, 185
  Conference with St. Augustine, 186
  Conversion of, 187 f.
  Laws of, 192, 202
  Leaves Canterbury, 188
  Luidhard and conversion of, 263
  Reculver capital of, 188
  St. Augustine, 185
  St. Paul's Cathedral, 195
Etheria. *See* Silvia
Etherius (chaplain of Charlemagne), 359
Etymologiae, by St. Isidore, 282
Eucharist, 395
  Controversy on real presence, 471 ff.
Eudes. *See* Odo
Eugenius I, St. (pope), 129 and note
Eugenius II (pope), 424
  Moravia and, 295
Eugippius (monk), *Life of St. Severinus* by, 15, 21
Euhemerus, on paganism, 18
Eulogius (patriarch of Alexandria), Title of ecumenical patriarch, 88
Eulogius (patriarch of Antioch), St. Gregory and, 96
Euric (Visigoth king), 256 f.
  Ambition of, 267 f.
  Code of, 259
  Death of, 252
  Persecutes the Church, 257
  St. Gregory of Tours on, 257
  Sidonius Apollinaris on, 257
Europe, Formation of modern, 5 f.
Eutyches (archimandrite), condemned, 41
Eutychianism: Council of Chalcedon condemns, 24
  Emperor Anastasius, 39
Eutychians: condemned, 41
  Peter Mongus and, 24

Eutychius (patriarch of Constantinople), Resurrection of the dead, 73
Eutychius (exarch), Aistulf and, 327
Eutychius, St. (martyr at Ferentino), and St. Redemptus, 248
Eutychius (senator). *See* Equitius
Evroult. *See* Ebrulf
Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, by St. John Damascene, 403
Excellentia (title), 157
Exercitus romanus, 136, 323
Exeter Abbey, St. Boniface at, 205
Exhileratus (duke of Naples), Murder of, 140
Extreme Unction, 261

Fabrica ecclesiae, 389 note
  Simplicius (pope) and, 28
Fair of St. Denis, 387
Fairies, Hungarian, 311
Fairs, 387
False capitularies, by Benedict Levita, 517
False decretals, The, 515 ff.
  Author of, 517, 520
  Godfrey of Viterbo, 515
  Leobald (deacon), 517
  Nicholas I, 515, 518
  Origin of, 515
  Peter Comestos, 515
  Purpose of, 517 f.
  St. Isidore, 283, 515
  Stephen of Tournai, 515
  Wulfrad, 520
Fasting: Administration of baptism, 467
  Lent, 135
Fava (Rugian chief), and St. Severinus, 23
Februae, 32 note
Felix III, St. (pope), 28-30
  Anicia gens, 28
  Church and state, 20, 31
  Huneric (Vandal king), 30
  St. Gregory, great-grandson of, 29
  Wife of, 29 note
  Zeno and, 29
Felix IV (pope), 44
Felix, St. (bishop of Dunwich), and conversion of East Anglia, 197
Felix (bishop of Urgel), 380
  Adoptionism, 265, 405
  St. Agobard and, 265
Ferentino (Italy): St. Eutychius, martyr at, 248
  St. Redemptus bishop, 248
Ferrières Abbey, Alcuin abbot of, 385
Festus (senator), Antipope Lawrence and, 37
Feudal customs, Origin of, 172
Feudalism: Causes of, 412 ff.
  Church encourages, 414
  Origin of, 106 f.
  Papacy and, 419
  Spread of, 419
"Field of Lies," 429
Field of March, 370 note
Field of May, 227
Filioque, Question of, 407 ff.
  Anthimus (patriarch of Constantinople), 409 note
  In Church of Rome, 410
  Council of Florence, 410
  Council of Lyons, 410
  Council of Toledo (447), 407 note; (589), 275, 407
  Leo III, 409
  Mount of Olives monastery, 408
  Photius, 491
  Ratramnus, 469
  St. Henry (emperor), 410
  St. Methodius, 301
Firstfruits, 383
Flavian, St. (bishop of Constantinople), 42 note
Flavian amphitheater (Rome), 57
Fleury (abbey), Theodulph abbot of, 384
Flodoard (historian), *Chronicles* by, 479
Florence, Council of, *Filioque,* 410
Florentina, St., 275
Florentius (priest), calumniates St. Benedict, 49
Florus (deacon), Sermon books, 398
Fontanel. *See* Fontenay
Fontenay (France), Battle of, 417, 430
Fontenelle Abbey, Einhard abbot of, 385
Fonts, Baptismal, 394
Formosians, excommunicated, 493
Formosus (pope): Adrian II, 487
  Agiltrude, 499
  Arnulf crowned by, 498
  As bishop of Porto, 483, 487, 495
  Body of, disinterred, 500
  Burial of, 501
  Character of, 487

Formosus (pope) (*continued*)
Church of Bulgaria, 483, 487
Death of, 499
Election of, 497
Formosian party, 493
Lambert crowned by, 499
Letters of, 498
Marino I reinstates, 495
Nicholas I, 483
Odo, 498
Photius, 483
Stephen V consecrated by, 496
Theophylactus (vestararius), 503
Formula of emancipation, 278
Formula of Hormisdas, 41 f.
Acacians condemned, 24
Adrian II, 42
Agapetus, 42
Council of Constantinople (869), 481
Eastern bishops sign the, 42
Nicholas I, 42
Papal infallibility, 41 f.
Roman primacy, 41 f.
Vatican Council uses, 42
Fortresses, Development of, 414
Forum judicum, basis of Spanish law, 280
Forum of Trajan, Statue of Sidonius Apollinaris, 15
Foulques the Good (count of Anjou), St. Odo and, 509
Fountain of Wisdom, by St. John Damascene, 403
Four Crowned Martyrs (church, Rome), Pope Leo IV, 433
France, Romanticism in, 4
Frankfort, Council of (794), Adoptionism condemned, 404, 407
Iconoclasm, 404
Frankish Church: Condition of, 214 f.
And the papacy, 179 f.
Reform of, 216
St. Boniface and, 214-216
Superstitions, 215
Tithes in, 216
Frankish language, Preaching in, 399
Franks, 156 ff.
Arbogast, 156
Assembly: at Quierzy, 335; at St. Denis, 336; at Soissons, 335
Barbarism of, 162
Charles Martel duke of, 141
Chilperic II king of, 70
Civilizing influence of the monks, 166 f.
Conversion of, 147
Divorce, 396
Dress of, 393
In Gaul, 145, 156
Gaul invaded by, 154
Italy ravaged by, 56
National assemblies, 174
Pagans, 156
Pepin sole ruler of, 220
Personal law, 157
Political institutions, 157, 173 f.
Ripuarian, 157
Roman Empire and, 156
In Rome, 322
Royal power among, 173
Salian, 157
Slavery, 175
Social institutions, 175
Superstitions among, 164
Worship of Odin, 156
"Franks," Origin of word, 156
Fredegarius, *Chronicon* of, 163, 264
Frisia: Missions in, 206
Normans invade, 434
Pepin and conversion of, 206
Ratbod and missions in, 206
St. Boniface's first visit to, 206
St. Boniface's second visit to, 208
St. Ludger born in, 233
St. Wilfrid in, 206
St. Willibrord apostle of, 206, 208
Frisians (tribe): in region of North Sea, 145
In Rome, 322
St. Eligius and, 177
St. Lebwin apostle of, 223
Frithona, i. e., Deusdedit (archbishop of Canterbury), 199
Fritzlar Abbey: St. Boniface founder of, 228
Saxons pillage, 228
Friuli, Council of (791), 396 note
March of, 490
Fructuosus, St. (bishop of Braga), 282
Fulda Abbey: Body of St. Boniface, 230
Gottschalk at, 475
Location of, 219
St. Boniface founds, 218 f.
St. Sturmio abbot of, 223
Fulgentius, St. (bishop of Ruspe), 270
Doctrine of St. Augustine, 270
Exiled, 270
Monk, 270

Fulgentius, St. (of Ruspe) (*continued*)
At Rome, 20, 26
Fulgentius of Cartagena, St. (bishop of Ecija), 275, 282
Fulrad, St. (abbot): Abbot of St. Denis monastery, 218
Pepin the Short and, 331
Funerals, Offerings permitted, 383

Gabriel (angel), Mohammed and, 343
Gaeta (Italy): Greek influence, 439
Saracens rout Roman army, 432
Galicia (Spain), St. Martin of Braga in, 272
Gall, St. (monk), Conversion of Alamannia, 207
Galla, St. (widow), 60
Gaudentius (bishop of Auffinium), Pope Simplicius and, 28
Gaul: Alamanni invade, 154
Barbarism in, 162 ff.
Benedictines in, 167
Bishops of, and St. Gregory's *Pastoral Rule,* 81 f.
Britons in, 145
Burgundians in, 145, 156, 262
Burgundians invade, 154
Churches of, and the papacy, 179 f.
Civilizing influence of the monks, 166 f.
Councils in, 70
Franks in, 145, 156
Franks invade, 154
Irish monks in, 167
Jews in, 84
Monasteries in, 70
St. Augustine of Canterbury in, 185
St. Augustine of Canterbury consecrated in, 181
Vandals ravage, 268
Visigoths in, 145, 156
Geismar (Germany), Oak of Thor at, 212
Gelasius, St. (pope), 30-36
Acacian Schism, 31
Averts famine in Rome, 31
On Church revenue, 383
Decree *De libris recipiendis,* 35 note
Defends the oppressed, 31
Feast of the Purification, 33 f.
Letter to Andromachus, 32 f.; to Emperor Anastasius, 35; to St. Rusticus (forgery), 161 note
Liturgical activity of, 34
Lupercalia suppressed, 32-34
New collects, 34
Papal infallibility, 35
Roman primacy, 35
Sacramentary, 34 f.
Temporal power, 43
Theodoric and, 31
Gellone Abbey, William of Aquitaine founds, 382
Genevieve, St., 154 note, 159, 192 note
Gennadius (exarch), Letter from St. Gregory, 91, 113
Genseric, Persecution by, 269
Gentilly, Council of (767), 408
George (bishop of Amiens), envoy of Charlemagne, 357
George (duke), Leo IV and, 438
George of Aventino (*magister militum*), 486, 493, 495
Gepidae (tribe), Arians, 154
Gerard (count of Roussillon): and Frankish Empire, 435
And Lothaire, 435
Germain, St., 70, 192 note
Germania romana, Location of, 207
Germans: Asiatic origin, 148
Character of, 146, 151
Customs of, 149
Goths, 152
Individualism of, 414
Military institutions, 150
Political institutions, 149
Religion of ancient, 148
St. Justin Martyr on, 152
In Scandinavia, 146
Social institutions, 149
Tacitus on character of, 151
Teutons, 152
Two groups of, 152
"Germans," Origin of term, 148 note
Germanus (prefect of Rome), Election of St. Gregory, 76
Germany: Bishoprics in, 214
Christianity in ancient, 152 f.
English missioners, 212
Extent of, 146
Historical methods at universities, 4
Location of ancient, 207
Origin of Romanticism, 4
St. Boniface apostle of, 203 ff.
St. Boniface's first mission in, 208 f.
St. Boniface's second mission in, 210
Slavs invade, 230

Gerona, John of Biclaro bishop, 273
Gerontoconium, 386 note
Gervasius and Protasius, SS. (basilica), 77
Gervold (abbot of St. Wandrille): Custom houses, 387
School at St. Wandrille, 390
Geza (Hungarian duke), 312
Ghent (Belgium): Anglo-Saxons at, 387
St. Amandus at, 178
Ghibellines, Origin of, 503 note
Gilberta (i. e., Popess Joan)
Gisa (a Rugian), and St. Severinus, 23
Gisaldic (Visigoth king), 271
Gislemar, St. (monk), King Harold baptized by, 235
Gisulf (duke of Benevento), Restoration of Monte Cassino, 252
Glanfeuil Abbey, Benedictine Rule, 379 note
Glycerius (Roman emperor), 13 note
"God of the Magyars," 311
Godefroid. *See* Godfrey
Godfrey of Viterbo, False decretals, 515
Gombetta Law, 267
Gondebad (Burgundian king): Ambition of, 267 f.
Arianism of, 263
Colloquy (forgery), 161 note, 263 note
Law of, 267
St. Clotilda niece of, 160
Gondemar (king of Burgundy), 263
Gontran. *See* Guntram
Gordianus (senator), St. Gregory's father, 54
Goswintha (Visigoth queen), wife of Leovigild, 273
Gothic art, Origin of, 261
Gothic Bible, of Ulfilas, 154
Goths: Asia Minor invaded by, 154
Failure to establish lasting kingdoms, 285
In Italy, 240
St. Severinus' dealings with, 21
Thrace invaded by, 154
Gottschalk of Orbais: Ampere on, 474
Benedictines of St. Maur, 474
Berti on, 474
Councils of Mainz (829, 848), 475
At Fulda Abbey, 475
Guizot on, 474
Hautvillers monastery, 477
Heberard, 475
Hincmar and, 466, 474 ff.
Imprisoned, 477
Jansenists and, 474
Louis the Pious, 475
Michelet on, 474
Natalis Alexander, on, 475
Nicholas I, 462
Noris (cardinal) on, 474
At Orbais monastery, 475
Petau on, 475, 477
Predestinarianism, 474 f.
Protestants, 474
Rabanus Maurus, 475
At Rome, 475
St. Augustine's writings, 475 f.
Scotus Erigena, 476
Sirmond on, 475
Tournely on, 475
Gratian (emperor), Status of *coloni*, 104
Gratian, *Decretum*, 243
Gratian (papal officer), Charges against, 439 f.
Great Britain. *See* England
"Greek fire" (gunpowder), 129
Greek language: Alcuin, 391
St. Gregory the Great, 57
Greek Schism. *See* Eastern Schism
Greenland, Christianity in, 316
Gregorian chant, 99-101
Gregorian masses, 75 note
Gregoriopolis (fortress), 427
Gregory I the Great, St. (pope), 54 ff., 320
Anicii (gens), 54
Apocrisiarius at Constantinople, 69
Apparition of St. Michael, 77 f.
Approaching end of the world, 94 f.
Attitude to heretics, 110
Attitude to slaves, 105 f.
Benedictine monk, 61
Birth of, 55
Bishops of Italy, 84
Book of Morals by, 71 ff.
Briton bishops, 197
Brunehilde, 92, 185 note
Care of the poor, 101 f.
Church and heretics, 110
Commentary on Job, 71 ff.
At Constantinople, 66 f.
Deacon, 65
Death of, 112
Description of, 78
Dialogues by, 54, 61-63
Dispute with Eutychius, 73

Gregory I, St. (*continued*)
Donation of palace to Benedictines, 60
Donatism in Africa, 95
Eastern Empire and, 109
Education of the clergy, 98
Election of, 76-79
Election of bishops, 97
England, 92
English slaves, 63
Felix III great-grandfather of, 29
Flight from Rome, 78
Fugitive slaves and, 106
Gordianus father of, 54
Greek language, 57
Gurdia, 70
Health of, 54 note
Homilies on Ezechiel, 92
Homilies on the Gospels, 92
Hospices in Rome, 102
Importunus (bishop), 98
Jews in Gaul, 84; in Sicily, 84
John (bishop of Ravenna) and, 95 f.
John the Deacon's account, 82
John the Faster and, 86 f.
Legend of the dove, 93 note
Legend of the thirteen beggars, 82 f.
Leontia (empress), 109
Letters: to Andrew, 79; to Constantina (empress), 88 f.; to Domitian, 90; to Gennadius (exarch), 91, 113; to John (patriarch), 87 f.; to Maurice (emperor), 88; to Queen Bertha, 188; to Queen Brunehilde, 185; to Rusticiana, 892f.; to Sabinianus (apocrisiarius), 88; to St. Augustine, 184 f.; to Theoctista, 80; to Theodelinda, 112; to Theotimus, 89
Licinianus (bishop of Cartegena), 98
Literary style, 93 note
Liturgical chant, 99-101
Lombards in Italy, 92-247
Maurice (emperor), 70, 84 ff.
Metropolitan of Italy, 97 f.
Milan (see of) and, 95
Missions in England, 184, 193
Monasteries founded in Sicily, 60
Monastic life of, 64 f.
Monks at court of, 80
Monks at Isauria, 87
Narses (patrician) friend of, 70, 90
Nuncio at Constantinople, 65 f.
On pagan temples in England, 193
Papal supremacy, 107
Pastoral Rule: Council of Reims (813) and, 82; Gallic bishops and, 81 f.; Influence of, 81 f.; King Alfred and English translation of, 81
Patriarchates, 95
Patrimony of St. Peter, 102-105
Paulus Diaconus on, 65
Pelagius (pope), 75 f.
Phocas felicitated by, 109
Place in history, 55
Plato, 68
Preaching of, 92-94
Prefect of Rome, 55, 58 note, 59
Priest, 78
Procession in Rome, 76 f.
Ravenna (see of) and, 95
Recared felicitated by, 91
Regula pastoralis, 81 f.
Religious studies, 58
Resurrection of the dead, 73
Roman primacy, 96
Sabinianus apocrisiarius, 84
Sacramentary, 99
St. Ambrose's writings, 58
St. Andrew's monastery, 60, 74 f.
St. Augustine of Canterbury, 183 ff.
St. Augustine of Hippo, 58
St. Emiliana aunt of, 54
St. Leander and, 70, 81, 91
St. Serenus and, 91
St. Silvia mother of, 54
St. Trasilla aunt of, 54
Schola cantorum, 99
At school in Rome, 57
"Servant of the servants of God," 60, 88
In Sicily, 56
Smaragdus (exarch) and, 74
Soldiers becoming monks, 85
State and heretics, 110
Stations, 99
Status of *coloni,* 104
Stoicism, 68
Study of law, 58
Suburbicarian churches, 97
Temporal power, 43, 47, 84, 107
Thebes (see) and see of Larissa, 95
Theoctista, 70
Theodore (physician), 70
Theotimus (physician), 70
The thirteen beggars, 83 note
Three Chapters, 76, 79
Title of ecumenical patriarch, 86

Gregory I, St. (*continued*)
Treatment of Jews, 111
Vigilius (bishop of Arles) and, 91
Voice of, 76
Gregory II, St. (pope), 138, 206
Character of, 206
Gives Winfrid name of "Boniface," 207
Protest to Emperor Leo III, 139
Restoration of Monte Cassino, 252
St. Boniface and, 206, 210, 213
Sends St. Boniface to Germany, 207
Gregory III, St. (pope), 214
Appeals to Charles Martel, 141
Letter to Liutprand, 324
Opposes Iconoclasts, 140
St. Boniface and, 214
St. Chrysogonus monastery founded by, 353
Gregory IV (pope), 426 ff.
Born at Rome, 426
Election of, 426
Intervention of, at Battle of Fontenay, 430
Leo IV and, 433
Ostia fortified, 427
Gregory VII, St. (pope); Duty of kings, 279
State interference in the Church, 217
Gregory (*magister militum*). *See* George of Aventino
Gregory (nomenculator), John VIII and, 493
Gregory Asbestas (bishop of Syracuse), 455
Gregory Nazianzen, St., Trinitarian doctrine, 408
Gregory of Nyssa, St., Trinitarian doctrine, 408
Gregory of Tours, St., on Euric, 257
History of the Franks by, 163, 171
St. Hermengild, 273
Writings of, 70
Gregory of Utrecht, St. (abbot): Companion of St. Boniface, 209
St. Ludger and, 233
Grisar, Hartmann, on papal supremacy, 108
Guadalete (Spain), Battle (711), 284
Guelphs, Origin of, 503 note
Guido of Crema (Paschal III antipope), 410 note
Guilds (ninth century), 386
Guizot: on Councils of Toledo, 276
On Gottschalk, 474
Gundobadi, Agobard writes against the, 267
Gundobald. *See* Gondebad
Gunpowder ("Greek fire"), 129
Gunthamund (Vandal king), 270
Gunther (bishop of Cologne): deposed, 449
Lothaire's divorce, 448
Guntram, St. (king of Burgundy), 263
Gurdia (sister of Emperor Maurice), St. Gregory and, 70
Guy of Spoleto: Agiltrude wife of, 496
Stephen V crowns, 496
Gyula (duke of Transylvania): Baptism of, 312
Conversion of Transylvania, 315

Habit, Benedictine, 52
"Habsburg," Origin of name, 262 note
Hadrian (emperor), Mausoleum of, 77 f.
Spaniard, 268
Hadrian. *See also* Adrian
Hadur (deity), Hungarians, 311
Halitgar (bishop of Cambrai): and conversion of Denmark, 238
And Ebbo in Denmark, 237
Hamburg: attacked by pirates, 238
St. Ansgar bishop, 238
Harald. *See* Harold
Harold I (king of Denmark), 235
Harold the Brave (king of Norway), 308
Hautvillers Abbey, Gottschalk at, 477
Heberard (count of Verona): Gottschalk and, 475
Letter from Rabanus, 474
Hegira of Mohammed, 344
Henoticon, Acacius' Creed, 24
Henry II, St. (emperor of Germany), *Filioque,* 410
Henry I (king of France), Jaroslav and, 308
Heptarchy, Anglo-Saxon, 182 note
King Egbert the Great, 197
Heracleonas (Byzantine emperor), expelled, 126
And Theodore I, 126
Heraclius (emperor): Avars at war with, 120
Bulgarians at war with, 120
Character of, 117
Croats and, 120, 289

Heraclius (emperor) (*continued*)
Death of, 126
Ecthesis of, 125
John IV and, 289
Murder of Phocas, 117
Persian war, 119 f.
Serbs and, 120, 289
Triumph of, 120
Hereford, Council of (673), Divorce, 396 note
Heretics: Attitude of St. Gregory to, 110
Church, the judge of, 110
Duty of the state to suppress, 110
Justinian II's attitude to, 134
Use of torture, 110
Heristal (Belgium), 367
Pepin of, 206, 211
Hermengild, St. (prince), 273
Conversion of, 273
Ingundis wife of, 273
Leovigild father of, 273
Martyrdom of, 274
Revolts against Leovigild, 273 f.
St. Leander and conversion of, 273
St. Leander uncle of, 70
Herodotus (historian), Danube River, 140
Heruli (tribe): Arians, 154
In Italy, 145, 154, 240
Odoacer king of, 13
St. Severinus' dealings with, 21
Herveus, St., Legend of, 170
Hesse (duchy): Amöneberg Abbey in, 212
St. Boniface in, 210, 212
Saxons ravage, 229
Hilary, St. (bishop of Poitiers), Letter from St. Leontius (forgery), 161 note
At Rome, 26
Hildegard of Meaux, Ratramnus and, 468
Hildemann of Beauvais, at Corbie Abbey, 469
Hilderic (Vandal king), 270
Hincmar (archbishop of Reims), 5, 283, 466, 523
Annals, 450
Arsenius, 441
Capitularies of, 467
Clerical discipline, 467
Council of Soissons (853), 444
Council of Valence (855), 476
De divortio Lotharii by, 449
Defender of tradition, 466
Duty of kings, 279
Funeral offerings permitted, 383
Gottschalk, 465, 475 f.
Iconoclasm, 404
Letter to Louis III, 466
Letter from Pope Nicholas, 518
Monk at St. Denis, 466
Nicholas I and, 450, 462, 477
On ordeals, 466
Papal supremacy, 516 f.
Public penance defended by, 466
Ratramnus and, 468, 476
On real presence, 473
Reformer, 465 f.
Remigius (bishop of Lyons), 477
Rothade (bishop of Soissons), 450
St. Prudentius and, 476
Servatus Lupus and, 476
Hincmar the Younger (bishop of Laon), 517
Hira (Arabia): Mundhir prince of, 91
Naaman prince of, 91
History of the Franks by St. Gregory of Tours, 163, 171
History of the Longobards by Paul the Deacon, 253
Holy Ghost, Doctrine of: Council of Toledo (589), 275 f.
Greek Fathers, 408
Latin Fathers, 408
Photius, 496
Ratramnus on, 469
St. Avitus, 265
See also Trinity
Holy Orders, Celibacy and, 480 note
Holy Roman Empire, 320, 336, 365 ff.
Holy See. *See* Papacy
Holy See, Patrimony of the. *See* Papal States
Honoratus, St. (bishop of Arles), Monasticism, 50
Honorius I (pope), 117 ff.
Character of, 118
Council of Constantinople, 131
Death of, 125
Epitaph of, 100
Infallibility and, 132
Jonas of Bobbio on, 118
Lateran Council (649) condemns, 127
Monothelitism, 122
Question of defection of, 132 note
Sergius and, 122

Honorius (Roman emperor), 256
Hood (clerical costume), 394
Hormisdas, St. (pope), 40-45
  Acacian Schism, 41
  Formula of, 24, 41 f., 481
Hospices: Council of Aachen (816), 385
  For pilgrims, 209
Household, Papal, 348
Hugh, St. (abbot), Cluny Abbey, 513
Hugh (king of Provence): Alberic son of Marozia and, 509
  Marozia marries, 507
  St. Odo and, 509 f.
Hugh of Tuscany, Marozia marries, 507
Humanists, Contempt for the Middle Ages, 3
Huneric (Vandal king), 30, 269
Hungarians, 303, 311 f.
Hungary: Conversion of, 147
  Decentralized administration, 314
  Knighthood, 314
  Partition of Moravia, 304
  St. Stephen king of, 313-315
  St. Stephen's constitution, 314
  Tartar invasions, 315
  Turk invasions, 315
Huns (tribe): Fall of empire of, 240
  Location of, 147
Hyperboreans (a mythical people), 146

Ibas (bishop of Edessa), Three Chapters, 44
Iceland, Conversion of, 316
Iconoclasm (heresy): Adrian I, 402
  Agobard of Lyons, 404
  Beginning of, 138 f.
  Caroline Books, 402
  Claudius, bishop of Turin, 404
  Constantine V (emperor), 140
  Constantine Copronymus (emperor), 399
  Councils: Constantinople (754), 399; Frankfort (794), 404; Nicaea (787), 400; Paris (825), 403
  Hincmar of Reims, 404
  Jonas of Orleans, 404
  Leo the Armenian, 402
  Leo the Isaurian, 399
  Michael II (emperor), 402
  St. John Damascene, 403
  St. Methodius of Constantinople, 403
  St. Serenus, 91
  St. Theodore of Studium, 403
  Stephen III, 400
  Theodora (empress), 402, 452
  Theophilus (emperor), 402
  Walafrid Strabo, 404
Iconoclasts, Paulicians, 139
Ignatius, St. (patriarch of Constantinople), 480
  Appeals to the pope, 456
  Benedict III, 445
  Council of Constantinople (861) condemns, 458
  Death of, 490
  Deposed, 454
  Exiled, 454
  Gregory Asbestas, 455
  Photius deposes, 456
  Refuses communion to Bardas, 454
  Reinstalled, 460
Igor (prince), 305
Ile-Barbe (monastery): Laxity in, 380
  Reform of, 382
Illumination of manuscripts, 465
Illyricum: Croats in, 289
  Patriarchate of Rome, 289
  Serbians in, 289
Images, Veneration of, 399 ff.
Immersion, Baptism by, 394
Immorality, in Rome, 17 f.
Immunity, Clerical, 387 f.
Importunus (bishop), St. Gregory aids, 98
Indiculus superstitionum, 215
Indo-Iranian (race), 147
Industries, in monasteries, 386
Infallibility, Papal: Agatho and, 130
  Council of Constantinople (680) and, 132
  Formula of Hormisdas, 41 f.
  Gelasius and, 35
  Honorius and, 132
  Vigilius and, 45
Infangentheof (right to imprison) granted to Canterbury, 188
Infusion, Baptism by, 394
Ingelheim (Germany), Baptism of King Harold, 235
Ingeltruda (wife of Count Boso), 445
Ingoald (abbot of Farfa), Paschal I and, 423
Ingoberga (Frankish queen), Bertha daughter of, 185
Ingundis (Frankish princess), wife of St. Hermengild, 273

Inn (river), 154
Innocent I, St. (pope), Papal supremacy, 516
Innocent III (pope), Bulgarian hierarchy, 293 f.
Inquisition, Close of the Middle Ages, 3
Institutes by Justinian (emperor), 58
Institutio virginum by St. Leander, 275
Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum by Cassiodorus, 244
Intellectual activity, in Middle Ages, 5 f.
Ireland, Date of Easter, 116 note, 197
  Mellifont Abbey, 205
  Monks of St. Columban, 166
Irene (empress), Council of Nicaea (787), 400
Irmengarde (queen of Provence), 493
Irminsul (sacred tree), 225, 228
Iron Crown of Lombardy, at Monza, 248
Isapostolos (imperial title), 141
Isauria (district), Monks of, 87
Isidore, St. (bishop of Seville), 274
  Council of Toledo (653) on, 282
  On duty of kings, 279
  Etymologiae by, 282
  False Decretals, 283, 515
  Learning of, 282
  Question of converted Jews, 280
  St. Florentina sister of, 275
  St. Fulgentius brother of, 275
  St. Hermengild, 273
  St. Leander brother of, 275
Islam. *See* Mohammedanism
Isperikh (chief of Bulgaria), 288
Isten (deity), 311
Istria: Donation of Charlemagne, 359
  Three Chapters, 79
Italy: Aistulf invades, 327
  Byzantine province, 247
  Franks ravage, 56
  Goths in, 240
  Greek influence in, 439
  Heruli in, 145, 154, 240
  Jews in, 111
  Lombards in, 46, 67, 73, 79, 92, 154, 247
  Lombards and political geography of, 254
  Narses (general) in, 247
  Ostrogoths in, 29, 241
  Papal domains in, 42
  Pepin in, 337
  Pestilence in, 56
  Rugians in, 145
  St. Gregory and bishops of, 84
  Saracen pirates raid, 342
  Theodoric in, 29 f., 241
  Visigoths in, 256

Jacobites (Monophysites), 120
Jansenists, Gottschalk, 474
Janus (i. e., Döllinger)
Jaroslav the Great, 290, 308
Jarrow Abbey, Bede at, 200
Jaruman (bishop of Mercia), 197
Jativa Abbey, Founding of, 272
Jerez de la Frontera (battle), 284
Jerome, St., Aventine hill, 60
Jerusalem: Feast of Purification in, 34
  Hungarian hospice, 314
  Monastery of St. Theodosius, 121
  Pillage of, 119
  St. Elias patriarch of, 42 note
  St. Sophronius patriarch of, 121-125
Jews: Apostasy of Christians, 298
  Baptism not to be forced upon, 111
  Black Sea, 298
  Christian slaves and, 277 f.
  Council of Toledo (694) and, 283 f.
  Eastern Church and, 298
  Emperor Leo III and, 139
  In Gaul, 84
  In Italy, 111
  King Sisebut and converted, 280
  Moslem invasion of Spain, 284
  Not to have Christian slaves, 112
  In Rome, 111
  St. Gregory and, 84
  St. Gregory's treatment of, 111
  In Sicily, 84
  In Spain, 280 f.
Joan (fabled popess), 488 and note, 521-524
Joannipolis, John VIII, 494
Job, Book of, St. Gregory's commentary, 71 ff.
John I, St. (pope), 44, 245 f.
John II (pope), 44
John III (pope), 46 and note
John IV (pope), 125 f.
John V (pope), 135
John VI (pope), 138
  Conversion of Croats, 289
  Conversion of Serbs, 289
  Emperor Heraclius and, 289
  Monothelitism condemned, 126

John VII (pope), 138
John VIII (pope), 487 ff.
Adalbert of Tuscany, 494
Approbation of St. Methodius, 302
Basil (emperor), 491
Born at Rome, 487
Charles the Bald, 488, 492
Charles the Fat, 494
Church of Bulgaria, 491
Engelberga (empress), 492-494
Forged letter of, 303
Formosians excommunicated, 493
Johannipolis, 494
Lambert of Spoleto, 494
Letters falsified, 492
Marino, 492
Murder of, 494
Photius, 491 f.
Poisoned, 494
Policy of, 492
Rome fortified, 494
Saracens and, 488, 493 f.
Slavonic liturgy, 302
Swatopluk and, 302
John IX (pope), Papal coronations, 501
John X (pope), 506 f.
John XI (pope): Alberic and, 508
Election of, 507
Marozia mother of, 504 and note, 507
Sergius III father of, 504 and note
John XII (pope), 510-512
Monasticism, 512
Otto crowned by, 511
John XV (pope), First papal canonization, 398 note
John XXI (pope), Story of Popess Joan and, 522
John (antipope), 431
John (bishop of Ravenna, fifth century), Pope Simplicius and, 28
John (bishop of Ravenna, sixth century), St. Gregory and, 95 f.
John (bishop of Ravenna, ninth century), 451
John (patrician of Constantinople), St. Gregory's election, 79
John (priest), deposed by Leo IV, 443
John (silentiarius), envoy to Stephen II, 332
John of Biclaro (bishop of Gerona), St. Hermengild, 273
John Damescene, St. (monk), 403
John the Deacon (ninth century), Account of St. Gregory, 82
John the Faster (patriarch of Constantinople), 69
Character of, 86 f.
Council of Constantinople (588), 87
Monks of Isauria and, 87
St. Gregory and, 86-88
Title of ecumenical patriarch, 86
John Moschus (monk), St. Sophronius and, 122
John Scotus Erigena. *See* Scotus
Jonas (bishop of Orleans), Duty of kings, 279
Iconoclasm, 404
Jonas of Bobbio (monk), on Honorius I, 118
Judaism, Khazars, 298
"Judgment of God," 416 note
Judicael, St. (Breton king), and St. Eligius, 177
Judices privati, 389
Judith of Bavaria (empress): Louis the Pious marries, 417
Plot of, 423
Unpopularity of, 428
Julian (Visigoth count), Moslem invasion of Spain, 284
Julian the Apostate (emperor), Mithraism, 20
Julian Basilica (i. e., Santa Maria in Trastevere), Palmary Synod, 37
Justice, Charlemagne and administration of, 388
Justin I (emperor): Acacian Schism, 41
Anti-Arian measures, 245
Justin II (emperor): Barbarians and, 67
Fiscal dealings of, 67
St. Gregory prefect of Rome, 58
Justin (bishop of Rochester), 195
Justin Martyr, St., on the Germans, 152
Justinian I (emperor): Aphthartodocetism, 73 note
Code, 58
Institutes of, 58
Laws of, 254
Monophysitism, 44
Novellae, 58
Patron of art, 66
Pragmatic Sanction of, 45, 58
Rebuilds Church of St. Sophia, 66
Temporal power of papacy, 45

Justinian I (emperor), (*continued*)
Three Chapters, 44
Treasury ruined, 67
Vigilius (pope), 44
Justinian II (emperor): Attitude to heretics, 134
Bulgarians defeat army of, 288
Character of, 134
Constantine (pope) and, 138
Dethroned, 137 f.
Exiled, 138
John VII and, 138
Justus (monk), St. Gregory and, 75
Jutes: England invaded by, 182
In Jutland, 182 note
Jutta (i. e., Popess Joan)
Juventiolus. *See* Viventiolus

Kaaba, 343
Kadwal (Saxon king), 203
Kent: Kingdom of, 182 note
St. Ethelbert king of, 185
Khazars: Judaism, 298
Alliance with Empire, 298
SS. Cyril and Methodius, 298
Kieff, 305
Kiersy. *See* Quierzy
Kiev. *See* Kieff
Kilian, St. (Irish monk), in Thuringia, 207
Kings, Duty of, St. Isidore on, 279
Kirton (England), St. Boniface, 204
Koran, 343

Labeo (jurist), 58
Laity, and papal elections, 349
Lambert I (duke of Spoleto), John VIII, 494
Lambert II (duke of Spoleto): Death of, 502
Formosus crowns, 499
Romanus (pope) and, 501
Lando (pope), 506
Langres (France), Guy of Spoleto crowned at, 497
Lantern (Frankish architecture), 392
Laon (France), Hincmar the Younger bishop, 517
St. Remigius born at, 158
Lapsi, Charlemagne and Saxon, 232
Lateran Basilica: Sergius III restores, 505
Symmachus consecrated in, 36
Lateran Council: (649), 127; (863), 449, 451
Lateran Palace, 347
Latin language, Preaching in, 399
Laumer, St., Legend of, 168, 170
Lavisse, on Venerable Bede, 200
Law, Gombetta, 267
Law, Teaching of, in Italy, 58
Lawrence (antipope), 37, 242, 265
Lawrence, St. (archbishop of Canterbury), 195
Lay usurpations, Council of Vienne (892), 498
Leander, St. (bishop of Seville), 274 ff., 282
Born at Cartagena, 275
Councils of Toledo, 275, 320
Hermengild's conversion, 273
Institutio virginum, 275
King Recared and, 274 f.
Leovigild and, 274
St. Gregory and, 70
St. Gregory's *Pastoral Rule,* 81
St. Isidore brother of, 275
St. Florentina sister of, 275
St. Fulgentius brother of, 275
Unity of Christendom, 341
Lebwin, St. (apostle of the Frisians), 223
And Buto (Saxon noble), 227
And conversion of Saxons, 226
At Marclo, 226
Legati a latere, 457 note
Leger, St. *See* Leodegar
Leidrade (archbishop of Lyons), 380
Reform of Ile-Barbe Abbey, 382
Schools at Lyons, 390
Le Mans (France), Apocryphal documents written at, 517
Lenten fast, 135
Leo I, St. (pope), Papal supremacy, 516
Leo II, St. (pope), 135
Leo III, St. (pope), 360 ff., 420
Attack upon, 361
Bernard (king of Italy) and, 420
Born at Rome, 360
Character of, 360
Charges against, 363
Conspiracy against, 361, 420
Coronation of Charlemagne, 364
Death of, 421
Education of, 360
Filioque, 409

Leo III, St. (pope) (*continued*)
Holy Roman Empire, 320
Lateran Palace, 347
Letter from Charlemagne, 369
Louis the Pious and, 420
At Paderborn, 363
Papal supremacy, 516
Trinitarian doctrine, 409
Leo IV, St. (pope), 433-443
Anastasius and, 441, 484
Born at Rome, 433
Character of, 433
Conflict with Lothaire, 438
Conflict with Louis II, 438
Consecration of, 433
Death of, 440, 442
Election of, 433
Gratian (papal officer) and, 439
Gregory IV and, 433
Legates of Louis II, 438
Lothaire I and, 254, 437
Louis the German and, 438
Priest, 433
Reforms of, 440
Rome defended by, 436 f.
St. Martin Abbey, 433
Saracens, 436 f.
Leo V (pope), 502
Pope Christopher imprisons, 502, 504
Theodora and, 503
Leo VI (pope), Marozia and election of, 507
Leo VII (pope), Alberic and, 508
Leo VIII (antipope), 512
Leo III the Iconoclast (emperor), 138 ff.
Gregory II's protest to, 139
Iconoclast dispute, 399
Jews and, 139
Lombards oppose, 140
Moslems and, 139
Pentapolis opposes, 139
Venetia opposes, 139
Leo V the Armenian (emperor): Gregory Asbestas son of, 455
Iconoclasm, 402
Leo VI (emperor), Photius deposed by, 496
Leo (nomenculator): Death of, 423
Paschal I and, 423
Leo the Isaurian. *See* Leo III the Iconoclast
Leo the Wise. *See* Leo VI, emperor
Leobald (deacon), False Decretals, 517
Leodegar, St. (bishop of Autun), 177
Leontia (empress), 109
Leontius (bishop of Arles), Letter to St. Hilary (forgery), 161 note
Leontius (Byzantine emperor), Justinian II dethroned by, 137 f.
Leopolis (Italy), formerly Centumcellae, 437
Leovigild (Visigoth king): Arianism, 79
Code of Euric, 259
Lex Visigothorum, 259
Persecutes Catholics, 273
St. Hermengild revolts against, 273 f.
St. Leander and, 274
Leptines, Council of (743), on superstitions, 217
Lerins Abbey, St. Honoratus, 50
Lex Gundeboda, 267
Lex orandi, 34
Lex Visigothorum, 259
Liadwin. *See* Lebwin
Liafwin, St. *See* Lebwin
Liber pontificalis, on Popess Joan, 521
Libraries (eighth century), 390
Library of Alexandria, Destruction of, 3
Libri Carolini, 402
Licinianus (bishop of Cartagena), St. Gregory and, 98
Life of Charlemagne by Einhard, 391
Life of St. Severinus by Eugippius, 15, 21
Ligugé Abbey, 50
Liguria (Italy), Pestilence in, 56
Lindisfarne (England): St. Aidan bishop, 197
St. Colman bishop, 198
Lioba, St. (abbess), 213
Liturgy: Charlemagne, 397 f.
Gelasius (pope), 34
Louis the Pious, 398
Pepin, 398
Reform of, at Rome, 398
Simplicius (pope), 25 f.
Spread of Gallican reform, 398
Liudger, St. *See* Ludger
Liutprand (bishop of Cremona), 479
Antapodosis by, 479, 500 note
Letter from Gregory III, 324
Pope Zachary and, 326
Logothete (i. e., chancellor), Theoctistus, 297
Loire (river), Norman invasion, 434
Lombard, Peter. *See* Peter

Lombards: Agilulf king of, 94
Alboin king of, 247
Aribert king of, 249
Attitude of Romans to, 327
Autaris king of, 248
Charlemagne king of the, 359
Description of, 247
Form of government, 248
In Italy, 79
Italy invaded by, 46, 67, 73, 92, 154, 247
Massacres by, 55
Narses (general) and the, 246
No permanent king among, 248
Oppose Emperor Leo III, 140
People terrorized by, 248
Pillage of Monte Cassino Abbey, 56
Political geography of Italy, 254
Religion of, 248
In Rome, 322
Rule in Italy, 249
St. Gregory on, 247
Smaragdus exarch, 74
Theodelinda queen of, 112
Tiberius Constantinus and, 67
Worship of Odin, 248
Lombardy, Iron crown of, 248
London: St. Mellitus bishop, 195
St. Paul's Cathedral, 195
Theonus bishop, 183
Longinus (exarch of Ravenna), Barbarians and, 73
Longobards. *See* Lombards
"Lorraine," Origin of name, 418
Lorsch Abbey, Annals of, 229 note
Lothaire I (emperor): Battle of Fontenay, 417
Conflict with Leo IV, 437
Constitution of, 424
Council of Compiègne (833), 429
Eugenius II, 425
As king of Italy, 423
Leo IV, 436 f.
Letter from Pope Leo IV, 252
Louis the Pious dethroned, 429
Paschal I and, 423
Protests Sergius' installation, 431
Rome and, 435, 437
War against Louis the German and Charles the Bald, 417
Lothaire II (king of Lorraine): Adrian II and, 480
Council of Aachen (860), 448
Divorce of, 448 f.
At Monte Cassino, 449, 480
Teutberga wife of, 448
Waldrada and, 448
Louis I the Pious (emperor), 416 ff.
Baptism of Danish envoys, 235
Character of, 416
Constitution of 817, 422
Coronation of, 421
Corvey Abbey and, 234
Council of Attigny, 417
Council of Compiègne, 429
Council of St. Denis, 430
Death of, 417
Dethroned, 429
Ebbo, 430
Endows Corvey Abbey, 234
Eugenius II and, 424
Gottschalk, 475
Harold of Denmark and, 235
Imprisoned, 430
Leo III and, 420
Letter from Michael II Balbus, 403
Liturgical reform, 398
Marries Judith of Bavaria, 417
Meeting with Stephen IV, 421
Partition of Charlemagne's empire, 416, 427 f.
Paschal I and, 237
St. Benedict of Aniane and, 382
St. Denis Abbey, 430
St. Medard's Church, Soissons, 429
War against Louis the German, 417
Louis II the Stammerer (emperor), 493
Adalgis of Benevento, 496
Adrian II crowns, 480
Anastasius and, 443
Conflict with Leo IV, 438
At Council of Pavia (850), 440
Election of Nicholas I, 446
Imprisoned, 480
John of Ravenna, 451
Lothaire's divorce, 449
Marches on Rome, 449
Michael III (emperor) and, 439
Nicholas I, 446 f.
At Rome, 439, 447
Louis I the German (Frankish king): betrothed to Engelberga, 439
Boris and, 292
Charles the Bald and, 488
Council of Ratisbon (870), 301
Deposes Moimir, 295

Louis I the German (*continued*)
Dowina besieged by, 299
Leo IV and, 438
War against Lothaire, 417
War against Louis the Pious, 417
Louis III (Frankish king), Letter from Hincmar, 466
Louis IX, St. (king of France), 23
Louis le Debonnaire. *See* Louis I, emperor
Low mass. *See* Mass, Low
Lucan (poet), Spaniard, 268
Lucania (Italy), Bishops of, and Roman See, 97
Lucullus (villa): Augustulus at, 13
Body of St. Severinus, 22
Ludger, St. (bishop of Münster), 223
Luidhard (bishop of Senlis): chaplain of Queen Bertha, 185
Conversion of King Ethelbert, 263
Luitprand. *See* Liutprand
Lullus, St. (bishop of Mainz): chorepiscopus, 219
Consecrated bishop, 219
St. Boniface and, 212
St. Boniface's last instructions to, 221
Lupercalia, Suppression of the, 32-34
Lupus (abbot of Ferrières), 522
Ratramnus friend of, 468
Lupus, St. (bishop of Troyes), 154 note, 161 note
In England, 192 note
Letter to St. Sidonius Apollinaris (forgery), 161 note
Luxeuil Abbey, St. Columban, 250
Lyons: Council of (1245, 1274), 410
Leidrade bishop, 380
St. Agobard bishop, 265, 404
St. Remigius bishop, 476
St. Rusticus bishop, 161 note
St. Viventiolus bishop, 264
School of rhetoric, 264
Schools at, 390
Sidonius Apollinaris born at, 15

Maastricht (Holland), St. Amandus bishop, 178
Macarius (bishop of Antioch): defends Monothelitism, 131
Deposed, 131
Machutus, St. (bishop of Aleth), in Brittany, 183 note
Magic, Magyars' religion, 311
Maguelon, St. Benedict of Aniane, 380
Magyars, 289
God of the, 311
Location of, 147
See also Hungarians
Mahomet. *See* Mohammed
Mainz: Council of (829), 475; (847), 395
Rabanus archbishop, 472 f.
St. Boniface archbishop, 218
St. Boniface resides at, 218
St. Lullus archbishop, 212
Majolus, St. (abbot of Cluny), 513
Malabar coast (India), Christianity, 316
Malo, St. *See* Machutus
Manichaeism, Bogomili and, 293 f.
Mans, Le (France). *See* Le Mans
Manual labor: Benedictines, 52
Disdain for, 16
Manuscripts, Illuminated, 465
Marcellinus and Peter, SS. (basilica), 77
Marches, Charlemagne establishes, 369
Marclo (Saxony), St. Lebwin at, 226
Marculf, St. (abbot), King Childebert and, 169 f.
Marcus Aurelius (emperor), Spaniard, 268
Marino I (pope), 492, 495 f.
Marino II (pope), 508
Marius Aventicus, St. (bishop of Avenches), Chronicles of, 264
Markets, Monasteries and, 387
Marmora, St. Cyril at Sea of, 297
Maronites, Monothelites and, 133 note
Marozia (daughter of Theophylactus), 503
Alberic (her son) imprisons, 508
Ambition of, 507
Character of, 504
Death of, 508
John X and, 507
John XI and, 504, 507
Leo VI and, 507
Marries Guy of Tuscany, 507
Marries Hugh of Provence, 507
Papacy and, 499
Papal elections, 507
Sergius III and, 504
Stephen VII and, 507
Wife of Alberic, 504
Marriage, of priests and deacons, 135
Marriage blessing, 260

Marseilles: Council of (533), 260
St. Cassian's monastery, 50
St. Serenus bishop, 91
Martel, Charles. *See* Charles Martel
Martial (poet), Spaniard, 268
Martin I, St. (pope), 127 f.
Martin, St. (bishop of Braga), 272
Martin of Tours, St.: Monasticism, 50
Pilgrimages to tomb of, 164
Martin of Troppau, (chronicler), on Popess Joan, 521
Martin of Vertou, St. (monk), Legend of, 170
Martinus Polonus. *See* Martin of Troppau
Martyrology of Ado, 116, 478
Mary (Blessed Virgin): Feast of Purification, 33 f.
Hungarians' devotion to, 311
Poles' devotion to, 310
St. Stephen's devotion to, 313
Mary (wife of Chosroes II), 90
Mass: Collects by Pope Gelasius, 34
Communion under both species, 395
Low, 395
Offerings for, 383
Requiem, 395
Solemn, 395
Unleavened bread, 395
Masses, Gregorian, 75 note
Mater Magna, Worship of, 20
Matriculae, Hospices in charge of, 101
Matrimony: contracted publicly, 396
Impediment of consanguinity, 397 note
Indissolubility, 396
Nicholas I on, 464
Maurice (emperor): Death of, 109
Decree on monasteries, 85
Lombards in Italy, 73
St. Gregory and, 70, 76, 84 ff.
Smaragdus exarch of Ravenna, 74
Maurus, St. (abbot), 49, 61
Maurus, Rabanus. *See* Rabanus
Maximinus, St. (bishop of Trier), 153
Maximus the Confessor, 127 f.
Mayeul, St. *See* Majolus
Mecca (Arabia), Mohammed born at, 343
Medina (Arabia), Mohammed flees to, 344
Melchites, Origin of name, 120 f.
Mellifont Abbey, Missioners from, 205
Mellitus, St. (archbishop of Canterbury), 195
Memorial chapels, at Rome, 26
Menas (patriarch of Constantinople), Forged letter of, 121
Mercia: Kingdom of, 182 note
St. Aidan and conversion of, 197
Mercurius (*magister militum*), Election of Benedict III, 442
Mercy, Works of, Venial sins remitted by, 261
Merseburg, Dithmar bishop, 309
Mesopotamia, Paulicians in, 139
Methodius, St. (apostle of the Slavs), 296 ff.
Adrian II and, 300
Approbation by John VIII, 302
Born at Thessalonica, 296
Borziwoi (duke) converted by, 304
Character of, 296
Charges against, 301
Conversion of Boris, 290
Council of Ratisbon (870), 301
Death of, 303
Denounced to Nicholas I, 300
Education of, 296
Ermenrich and, 301
Filioque, 301
Iconoclasm, 403
Importance of work of, 304
Imprisoned, 301
Khazars, 298
Michael III and, 298
In Moravia, 298 f.
In Pannonia, 300 f.
At Rome, 300
Slavonic language, 299
Slavonic liturgy, 299, 302 f.
Slavonic translation of Scripture, 299, 307
At Venice, 299 f.
Wiching and, 303
Methodius (patriarch of Constantinople), 403
Metrophanes (bishop of Smyrna), 455 and note
Metz (Lorraine): Church of, 153
Council of (863), 449
Drogo bishop, 431
St. Chrodegang bishop, 218, 332, 378
Michael II Balbus (emperor), Iconoclasm, 402 f.
Michael III the Drunkard (emperor), 454
Assassinated, 460

Michael III the Drunkard (*continued*)
Embassy to Nicholas I, 457
Godfather of King Boris, 291
Louis II and, 439
Nicholas I and, 459
Photius, 445
St. Cyril and St. Methodius, 296-298
Wratislaw and, 295 f.
Michael, St., Apparition of, 77 f.
Michael the Phrygian. *See* Michael II Balbus
Michael the Stammerer. *See* Michael II Balbus
Michelet (writer), on Gottschalk, 474
Middle Ages: Attitude to the, 3-5
Beginning of, 47
Character of the, 4 f.
Church and the barbarians, 6
Church and state, 5
Education in, 5
Extent of, 3
Formation of modern Europe, 5 f.
Humanists' contempt for the, 3
Importance of the, 4-6
Intellectual activity in the, 5
Origin of term, 3 note
Political activity in the, 5
Schools, 5
Mieczyslaw. *See* Mieszko
Mieszko I (king of Poland), 309
Migetius (heretic), Adoptionism, 404
Milan, Church of, Liturgical reform, 398
Millan, St. *See* Emilian Cucullatus
Mines, Abandonment of, 16 f.
Minor orders, Council of Rome (595), 101
Missal, Collects by Pope Gelasius, 34
Missi dominici, 373, 376, 438
Missus: Arsenius, 441
Benedict bishop of Albano, 432
Mithraism, 20
Miziz (usurper), Death of, 129
Modern Europe, Formation of, 5 f.
Mohammed: Arabia and, 344
Bible and, 343
Born at Mecca, 343
Death of, 345
Doctrine of, 343
Flees to Medina, 344
Gabriel and, 343
Hegira of, 344
Mohammedan era, 344
Mohammedanism, 343 f.
Abu Bekr, 345
Alides dynasty, 345
Almsgiving, 344
Bulgaria and, 294
Doctrines of, 343 f.
"Infidels," 344
Mohammedans, Emperor Leo III and, 139
Moimir I (king of Moravia), 295
Moimir II (king of Moravia), 303
Molinier, on Venerable Bede, 201
Monasteries: Charlemagne and, 379
Commerce and, 387
In Gaul (sixth century), 70
Industries in, 386
Public markets, 387
St. Boniface founds, 212
Workshops in, 386
Monastic schools, 390
Benedictines, 52
Charlemagne, 5
Monasticism: Acephali (monks), 40
Acoemetae (monks), 40
Admission of soldiers, 85
Benedictine Rule. *See* Benedictine
Cassiodorus and, 243
Civilizing influence in Gaul, 166 f.
Decline of Spanish, 284, 379 f.
In England, 199
In Gaul (sixth century), 70
Isaurian monks accused of heresy, 87
John XII, 512
Lerins Abbey, 50
Ligugé Abbey, 50
Monks of St. Columban, 166
Monte Cassino Abbey, 49
Relief of the poor, 385
St. Benedict, 47 ff.
St. Cassian, 50
St. Gregory, 54, 64 f.
St. Honoratus, 50
St. Martin of Tours, 50
Schools, 5
Soldiers not to become monks, 85
Travelers, 385
See also Benedictines
Money, Scarcity of (fifth century), 16 f.
Money-lending (fifth century), 17
Mongols, Location of, 147
Monophysites: Antipope Lawrence, 37
Arabian, 44
In Armenia, 120
In Egypt, 120

Monophysitism (heresy): Acephali, 24
In the East, 67
In Egypt, 79
Justinian (emperor), 44
In Persia, 345
Three Chapters, 44
Monothelitism (heresy), 118 ff.
Agatho (pope), 130
Council of Constantinople (680) condemns, 131
Eugenius I, 129
Heraclius' *Ecthesis*, 125
Honorius (pope), 122
John IV condemns, 126
Lateran Council (649) condemns, 127
Maronites and, 133 note
St. Sophronius, 124
Severinus (pope) condemns, 125 f.
Typus of Constans II, 127
Mons Feletus. See Montefeltro
Mont Cenis, Charlemagne's army, 358
Montana (slave), St. Gregory and, 106
Monte Cassino Abbey: Carloman at, 219 f., 253, 335
Destruction of, 252
Exemption, 252
King Ratchis at, 253
Lombards pillage, 56
Lothaire at, 449, 480
Paul the Deacon at, 253
Pope Zachary and, 252
Restoration of, 249
St. Benedict's monastery, 49
St. Petronax abbot of, 252
Saracens at, 432
Montefeltro, Body of St. Severinus at, 22
Monza (Italy): Iron Crown of Lombardy at, 248
St. John the Baptist Church, 248
Moors: Spain and, 488
Vandals and, 271
Morals, Book of, by St. Gregory, 71 ff.
Moravia: Bohemia under rule of, 302
Christianity in, 294
Conversion of, 147, 294
End of, 303
Eugenius II, 295
Hungarians attack, 303
Louis the German attacks, 299
Magyar invasion, 294
Moimir king of, 295
Origin of, 294
Pannonia under rule of, 302
Partition of, 304
SS. Cyril and Methodius in, 298 f.
Swatopluk king of, 302
Vassal state of papacy, 302
Wratislaw king of, 295
Moravians, Avars and, 295
Moschus, John. *See* John Moschus
Moslem era, 344
Moslems: Africa invaded by, 345
Alides dynasty, 345
Charles Martel and, 211, 342
Egypt conquered by, 345
Empire of, 342
Italy raided by, 342
Ommiad dynasty, 345
Persia conquered, 345
Provence raided by, 342
Sicily raided by, 342
Spain invaded by, 345
Syria conquered by, 345
See also Mohammedans *and* Saracens
Mount of Olives, *Filioque* in monastery at, 408
Münster (Germany), St. Ludger bishop, 223
Mundhir (prince of Hira), Paganism of, 91
Murderers, Right of sanctuary, 388
Music, Ecclesiastical, St. Gregory and, 99-101
Musset, Alfred de, Romanticism, 4
Mutawekkil (calif), 298
Myriobiblion by Photius, 453

Naaman (prince of Hira), becomes Christian, 91
Nanterre (France), St. Genevieve born at, 159
Nantes, Council of (650), Divorce, 396 note
Naples (Italy): Boniface V born at, 117 note
Exhileratus duke of, 140
Greek influence, 439
Stephen bishop, 354
Narses (Byzantine general), in Italy, 247
Narses (patrician), and St. Gregory, 70, 90
Natalis Alexander (historian), Gottschalk, 475
Natalis invicti (pagan feast), Date of Christmas, 34 note

National assemblies, Charlemagne and, 372
Naxos (island), Martin I prisoner on, 128
Nepos (Roman emperor), 13 note
Nepotism, Papacy and, 350
Nerida Abbey, and St. Adrian of Canterbury, 200
Nero (emperor), Villa of, 48
Nestor (Russian historian), 305
Nestorianism: in Asia Mino-, 79
Council of Chalcedon condemns, 24
Nestorians, condemned, 41
Neustria: Chilperic king of, 70
Conflict with Austrasia, 165
New Corbie. *See* Corvey
Nicaea, Council of (787): Acts of, falsified, 401
Iconoclasm, 400
St. John Damascene, 403
Universally accepted, 404
Nice (France), Saracens sack, 427
Nicene Creed, Council of Ephesus, 408
Nicephorus, St. (patriarch of Constantinople), on Jewish peril, 298
Nicholas I, St. (pope), 446-477
Anastasius (bibliothecarius), 484
Arsenius, 485
Boris king of Bulgaria and, 260, 464
Born at Rome, 446
Canonical penances, 463
Character of, 446
Church and state, 446 f., 459, 463
Council of Constantinople (867) deposes, 460
Death of, 460
Election of, 446 f.
Embassy from Michael III, 457
Erigena and, 471
False decretals, 515
Formosus, 483
Formula of Hormisdas, 42
Gottschalk, 462
Hincmar, 450, 462, 477, 518
John of Ravenna excommunicated, 451
Legates of, halted by Photius, 460
Legates sent to Constantinople, 457
Letter to Eastern bishops, 458
Letter falsified, 458
Louis II and, 446 f.
Matrimony, 464
Michael III and, 457-459
Ostia fortified by, 465
Papal authority, 9
Patron of scholarship, 465
Photius and, 458
Predestinarianism, 477
Public penances, 463
At Ravenna, 451
Responsa ad Bulgaros, 292, 464
Roman primacy, 461 ff.
Rothade (bishop of Soissons), 450
Rudolf of Bourges and, 463
SS. Cyril and Methodius denounced to, 300
Torture of accused, 464
Works of charity, 465
Writings of Scotus Erigena, 462
Nicholas (bishop of Anagni), Election of Benedict III, 442
Nicholas (deacon), on Benedict III, 444
Niebelungen, Burgundians and, 264
Niebuhr, on Roman immorality, 17 f.
Nineteenth century, attitude to the Middle Ages, 4
Nisita. *See* Nerida
Noel Alexandre. *See* Natalis Alexander
Nomenculator (official), 493 note
Nomenoe (king of Brittany), 435
Noricum (province): Location of, 21 note
St. Severinus apostle of, 21
Noris (cardinal), on Gottschalk, 474
Normans: Character of, 236
Charlemagne and, 236
Ferocity of, 236
Frisia invaded by, 434
Incursions of, 342, 488
Sidonius Apollinaris on, 236
Theodoric defeats, 342
Use of term, 235
North Sea: Ancient Germany, 146
Frisians in region of, 145
Saxons in region of, 145
Northumbria: Kingdom of, 182 note
Date of Easter, 198
St. Edwin king of, 196
St. Paulinus and conversion of, 196
Norwegians, Incursions of, 342
Nosocomium, 385 note
Novellae, of Justinian, 58
Noyon, St. Eligius bishop, 176
Nursia (Italy), St. Benedict born at, 47
Nutshalling Abbey (England), 205, 212

Oath of allegiance, Charlemagne, 371
Ochrida. *See* Achrida
Octavian (John XII), Alberic father of, 510
Odilo, St. (abbot of Cluny), 513
Odin (German deity), 148, 156, 248
  Worship of, at Canterbury, 193
Odo (bishop of Beauvais), 468 f.
Odo, St. (abbot of Cluny), 509 f.
  Alberic (son of Marozia) and, 509 f.
  Benedictine Rule, 509
  Canons of St. Martin of Tours, 509
  Cluny Abbey, 509, 513
  Death of, 510
  Elected abbot of Cluny, 509
  At Rome, 510
Odo (count of Paris), 497 f.
Odoacer: Army of, 240
  Assassination of, 30, 241
  Dethrones Romulus Augustulus, 13
  Eastern emperors and, 43
  Esteem for St. Severinus, 22
  Imperial insignia, 14
  Peace treaty with Theodoric, 241
  Roman Senate, 13
  Theodoric makes war against, 241
  Title of "king," 13 note
  Visits St. Severinus, 22
  Zeno and, 14
Office, Recitation of the, Benedictine Rule, 51
Oger (i. e., Autchar), 332 note
Ohrdruf Abbey, St. Boniface founds, 212
Oleg (Russian prince), 305
Olga, St. (Russian queen), Baptism of, 306
Olybrius (Roman official), and papal power, 14
Olympius (exarch), and Martin I, 128
Ommiad dynasty, 297, 345
Oppas (bishop of Toledo), Moslem invasion of Spain, 284
Orange, Council of (529), 260
Orbais (monastery), Gottschalk at, 475
Ordeals: Boiling water, 172 note, 448 note
  Fire, 476
  Hincmar on, 466
  Origin of, 172
  St. Agobard on, 466 f.
Order of St. Benedict. *See* Benedictines
Ordinations, Offerings, 383
Organ, at Aachen, 397
Organs, Pepin the Short, 397
Origines, by St. Isidore, 282
Orleans: Councils (511, 541, 549), 175 note
  Jonas bishop, 279, 404
  Schools at, 390
  Theodulph bishop, 379, 384
Orphanotrophium, 386 note
Orta (Italy), Arsenius bishop, 444
Ostia (Italy): Defense of, 436
  Gregory IV fortifies, 427
  Nicholas I fortifies, 465
Ostrogoths: Arians, 154
  Assembled at the Danube, 29
  In the East, 69
  Fall of kingdom of, 246
  Invade Italy, 241
  In Pannonia, 240
  Theodoric king of, 29, 241
  Vitiges, 55
Oswin (king of Northumbria), Date of Easter, 198
Otto I (emperor of Germany): Berengarius and, 511
  Crowned emperor, 511
  John XII and, 511
  Papal elections, 511
  Privilegium Ottonis, 511 f.
  St. Adelaide marries, 267
Otto (king of Essex), at Rome, 203
Ouen, St. (bishop of Rouen), 178
Ouzza (deity), Worship of, in Arabia, 91

Paderborn (Germany): Assembly at, 228
  Charlemagne at, 228, 363
  Leo III at, 363
Paganism: Adonis, 20
  Arabian polytheism, 343
  Bulgarians, 288
  Castor and Pollux, 32
  Decline of, 18
  Emperor as divinity, 19
  In England, 193
  Ennius on, 18
  Euhemerus' criticism, 18
  Franks, 156
  Hungarians, 311
  Mater Magna, 20
  Mithraism, 20
  Ouzza (deity), 91
  In Russia, 305

Paganism (*continued*)
Slavs, 288
Venus, 91
Virgo coelestis, 20
Worship of Rome, 18
Palace school, Charlemagne, 390
Palermo (Sicily), Saracens in, 427
Pallium, Significance of, 216
Palmary Synod (502): Ennodius' defense of, 39
Explanation of name, 39
Papal supremacy, 516
Pannonia (province): Avars in, 67
Conversion of, 300 f.
Hungarians invade, 311
Location of, 300
Moravian rule, 302
Ostrogoths in, 240
St. Martin of Braga born in, 302
St. Methodius in, 300 f.
Pantheon (Rome), Boniface IV and, 115
Papacy: Agiltrude and, 499 f.
Authority of, 35
And civilization, 6
Decline of, 499
Donation of Pepin, 338
Eastern Empire and, 324
Emperor and, 446 f.
Expenses of, 322
Feudalism and, 419
House of Spoleto dominates, 499 f.
Hungarians' loyalty to, 311
Independence of, 339
Influence of, 14, 43
Marozia and, 499
Mission of the, 25
Need of a strong, 14
Nepotism, 350
Olybrius and power of, 14
Poland devoted to, 310
Political independence of, 319
Political situation of, 326
Respublica Romanorum, 349
Revenue of, 322
Sede vacante, 348
Slavs and the, 289
Strengthening of the, 14
Theophylactus and the, 499
Wealth of the, 43, 102 note
Papal elections, 349, 502
Alberic (son of Marozia), 510
Charlemagne and, 360
Constitution of 824, 425
Council of Rome (769), 354 f.
Engelberga, 440
Leo VIII (antipope), 512
Otto I and, 511 f.
Ratification of, 355
Theodora (wife of Theophylactus), 503
Papal household, 348
Papal infallibility. *See* Infallibility
Papal palace, Officers of, 348
Papal States, 42-44
Benevento (duchy), 359
Commendati, 106
Constitution of 817, 422
Corsica, 322, 359
Defensores, 105
Domains in Italy, 42
Donation of Aribert, 138
Donation of Pepin, 338
Formation of, 319 ff.
Formula of Hormisdas, 42
In Gaul, 322
Gelasius (pope), 43
Government of, 351
Istria, 359
In Italy, 322
Justinian's Pragmatic Sanction, 45
Militia, 349
Origin of, 42, 338
Papal domains, 42
Pelagius I, 46
Pentapolis, 359
Ravenna (exarchate), 359
Rector, 105
Revenue of, 322
Revolt in, 420
St. Gregory, 43, 47, 84, 102-105
In Sicily, 322
Slaves, 105 f.
Spoleto, 359
Stephen II, 320
Tonsuratores, 103
Tuscany, 359
Use of revenue from, 104
Venetia, 359
Papal supremacy. *See* Pope, Supremacy of
Paris: Charibert, king of, 185
Councils: (615), slavery, 175 note; (825), Iconoclasm, 403; (829), divorce, 396 note; duty of kings, 279
St. Germain bishop, 70
St. Germain-des-Pres (church), 392
University in thirteenth century, 5

Parish priests, at Rome, 27
Parish schools, Council of Vaison (520), 390
Parishes, City, 377 note
Parishes, Rural, 377
  Origin of, 178
Paschal I, St. (pope), 421 ff.
  Abbot of St. Stephen's, Rome, 422
  Burial of, 424
  Death of, 423
  Ebbo, bishop of Reims, 237
  Ingoald (abbot) and, 423
  Leo (nomenculator) and, 423
  Lothaire and, 423
  Louis the Pious and, 237
  Theodore (primicerius), 423
  Unpopularity of, at Rome, 423
Paschal III (antipope), Charlemagne canonized, 410 note
Paschal (archdeacon), Election of Sergius I, 135
Paschal (primicerius), Attack on Leo III, 362 f.
Paschasius Radbertus, St., 283, 465, 469 f.
  Corvey Abbey, 235
  De corpore et sanguine Domini by, 470, 472
  De partu Virginis by, 470
  On real presence, 472
  Theologian, 469
  Writings, 470
Passau: Ermenrich bishop, 301
  Piligrim bishop, 313
  Wiching bishop, 303
Pastoral Rule by St. Gregory, 81 f.
Patrae, Battle of, 289
"Patriarch, Ecumenical," 60, 86
"Patrician of the Romans," 336, 350
Patrick, St., Conversion of Britons, 182
Patrimony of the poor, 43, 385
Patrimony of St. Peter. *See* Papal States
Paul I, St. (pope), 348, 351
  Character of, 351
  Christopher (primicerius), 351 f.
  Church of Rome, 348
  Deacons in Rome, 348
  Death of, 352
  Founds St. Sylvester Abbey, 361
  Government of Papal States, 351
Paul (patriarch of Constantinople), condemned, 131
Paul (deacon, brother of Stephen II), 329
Paul Afiarta (papal chamberlain), 356
Paul Aurelian, St. (bishop of Léon), 183 note
Paul the Deacon: Description of the Lombards, 247
  History of the Longobards, 253
  At Monte Cassino, 253
  On St. Gregory the Great, 65
  Sermon books, 398
Paulianists, In Egypt, 120
Paulicians (heretics), 139
Paulinus, St. (bishop of Nola), at Rome, 26
Paulinus, St. (bishop of York): Conversion of King Edwin, 196
  Conversion of Northumbria, 196
Paulus (Roman jurist), 58
Paulus Diaconus. *See* Paul the Deacon
Pavia: Charlemagne besieges, 358
  Council of (850), and usury, 440
  Ecclesiastical discipline, 440
  Pepin besieges, 337
  St. Ennodius bishop, 39, 242
  Stephen II at, 333
Pelagius I (pope), 45, 46 and note
Pelagius II (pope): born at Rome, 46 note
  Death of, 76
  Lombard invasions, 46
  St. Gregory and, 65 f., 75 f.
  Title of ecumenical patriarch, 88
Pelagius (heretic), a Briton, 182
Pelagius (Visigoth chieftain). *See* Pelayo
Pelayo (Visigoth chieftain), Moslem invasion, 284 f.
Penance, Sacrament of, 394
  Minister of, 395 note
  St. Columban and, 251
Penance, Public, 377 note, 394
  Hincmar defends, 466
  Modification of, 463
  Nicholas I and, 463
Penitential, by St. Theodore of Canterbury, 192
Penitential books, 395
  Condemned, 395
  In England, 192 note
Pentapolis (Italy): Donation of Charlemagne, 359
  Donation of Pepin, 338
  Emperor Leo III opposed in, 139
Penthect Council (692), 134

Pepin of Heristal: Charles Martel son of, 211
Death of, 206
Conversion of Frisia, 206
Saxons unconquered by, 225
Pepin the Short (king of the Franks), 223
Aistulf and, 333
Aistulf defeated by, 337
Coronation of, 331, 336
Donation of, 338 f., 348
Fair of St. Denis, 387
Forum indictum, 387
In Italy, 337
Liturgical reform, 398
Lombards defeated by, 337
Meeting with Pope Stephen, 333
Patrician of the Romans, 350
Pavia besieged by, 337
"Restitution" of, 338
Saxons unconquered by, 225
Sole ruler of the Franks, 220
Stephen II and, 324, 331, 333 f., 337
St. Boniface and, 215
St. Chrodegang and, 378
Perberis (Thrace), St. Maximus exiled to, 128
Peregrinatio Silviae, Feast of the Purification, 34
Perpetua, St.: Epitaph (forgery), 161 note
Testament of (forgery), 161 note
Persia: Chosroes II king of, 90
Christianity in, 90
Heraclius invades, 120
Monophysitism in, 345
Moslems conquer, 345
Religious liberty, 90
St. Domitian preaches in, 90
Persians: Syria invaded by, 67
Tiberius' campaign against, 67
Perugia, Siege of, 326
Perun (deity): Scandinavian god Thor, 305
Vladimir and, 306
Pessinonte: Martyrs of, 208
Worship of *Mater Magna,* 20
Pestilence: in Italy, 56
At Rome, 76
Petau, Gottschalk and, 475, 477
Peter, St. (apostle), Patriarchates, 96
Peter (patriarch of Constantinople), condemned, 131
Peter (legate of Louis II), 438
Peter Comestor, False Decretals, 515
Peter Lombard, 5
Peter Mongus, 24, 40
Petrarch, Francesco, Intellectual movement, 5
Petronax, St. (abbot), Restoration of Monte Cassino, 252
Phasis (Asia Minor), Cyrus of Alexandria bishop of, 121
Philip (antipope), Election of, 353
Philippicus Bardanes, attacks Constantinople, 288
Phocas (emperor), becomes emperor, 109
Murder of, 117
Romany primacy, 115
St. Gregory felicitates, 109
Title of ecumenical patriarch, 89
Photinus (heretic), Marino I condemns, 495
Photius (patriarch of Constantinople), 454 f., 480 ff.
Approved by Council of Constantinople (861), 458
Bardas, 445
Basil (emperor), 491
At Bordi monastery, 496
Bulgarians, 469
Character of, 453 f.
Church of Bulgaria, 482 f., 491
Condemned, 481 f.
Death of, 496
Doctrine of Holy Ghost, 496
Eastern bishops and, 456
Eunuch, 454
Filioque, 491
Formosus, 483
Gregory Asbestas consecrates, 455
Holy orders, 454 f.
Hypocrisy of, 455 f.
Imprisoned, 460
Influence of, 453
John VIII, 491 f.
Leo the Wise deposes, 496
Marino I, 495
Michael III, 445
Myriobiblion by, 453
Nicholas I, 446, 456, 458
Protospatharius, 454
Ratramnus, 469
Regains see of Constantinople, 491
St. Cyril pupil of, 456

Photius (of Constantinople) (*continued*)
St. Ignatius deposed by, 456
Schism, 492
Sergius III and doctrines of, 505
Phtartolatrae (heretics), 73 note, 120
Picenum (province), Bishops of, suffragans of Roman See, 97
Pilgrimages: St. Denis (shrine), 397
St. James of Compostela (shrine), 397
St. Martin (shrine), 128 note, 164, 397
St. Remigius (shrine), 397
Pilgrims, Hospices for, 209
Piligrim (bishop of Passau), Conversion of Hungary, 313
Pisa (Italy), Pillage of, 434
Pizzofalcone (Italy), site of Villa of Lucullus, 22 note
Placidus, St. (monk), 49, 61
Placitum, Frankish assembly, 157
Plato (philosopher), St. Gregory and, 68
Poets, Christian, 57
Poitiers (France), St. Emmeran bishop, 207
Poland: Benedictines in, 309
Camaldolese in, 309
Church in, 308 f.
Conversion of, 308 f.
Devotion to Blessed Virgin, 310
Loyalty to the papacy, 310
Political activity, in the Middle Ages, 5
Pollux, Worship of Castor and, 32
Polytheism, in Arabia, 343
Ponthion, Assembly of, 490
Poor, Care of the: Deacons and, 101
St. Gregory and, 101
Pope: Authority of, 35
Coronation of the, 501
Councils and the, 39
Defensor civitatis, 43
Eastern emperors and, 43
Election of. *See* Papal elections
Infallibility of. *See* Infallibility
Missioners requested from, 14
Nicholas I and authority of, 9
Patrimony of the. *See* Papal States
Political independence of, 319
Protector of the people, 136
Real sovereign of Rome, 136
Temporal power of the. *See* Papal States
Pope and the Council by Döllinger, 515
Pope, Primacy of, 461 f.
Council of Constantinople (692), 135
Councils, 462
Phocas (emperor), 115
Ratramnus defends, 469
Right of appeal to pope, 462
St. Gelasius, 35
St. Gregory on, 96
St. Nicholas I and, 461 ff.
Pope, Supremacy of the, 38, 363, 447
Charlemagne, 516
Council of Soissons (853), 444
Deposition of bishops, 450
Duchesne on, 108
Gratian (emperor), 516
Grisar on, 108
Hincmar, 516 f.
Palmary Synod, 516
St. Avitus of Vienne, 516
St. Cyril of Alexandria, 516
St. Gregory the Great, 107
St. Innocent I, 516
St. Leo I, 516
St. Leo III, 516
Valentinian (emperor), 516
Popes. *See also* Papacy
Popes, List of:
Simplicius (468-483), 25 ff.
Felix II (483-492), pp. 28-30
Gelasius I (492-496), 30-36
Anastasius II (496-498), 36
Symmachus (498-514), 36-39, 242
Hormisdas (514-523), 40-45
John I (523-526), 44
Felix III (526-530), p. 44
Boniface II (530-532), 44
John II (532-535), 44
Agapetus I (535-536), 42, 44
Silverius (536-537), 44
Vigilius (537-555), 44
Pelagius I (556-561), 45 f.
John III (561-574), 46
Benedict I (575-579), 46
Pelagius II (579-590), 46
Gregory I the Great (590-604), 54 ff.
Sabinianus (604-606), 114
Boniface III (607), 115
Boniface IV (608-615), 115
Deusdedit (615-618), 117
Boniface V (619-625), 117
Honorius I (625-638), 117 ff.
Severinus (640), 125
John IV (640-642), 126
Theodore I (642-649), 126

Popes, List of (*continued*)
Martin I (649-653), 127-129
Eugenius I (654-657), 129
Vitalian (657-672), 129
Adeodatus (672-676), 129
Donus (676-678), 129
Agatho (678-681), 130
Leo II (682-683), 135
Benedict II (684-685), 135
John V (685-686), 135
Conon (686-687), 135
Sergius I (687-701), 135 f.
John VI (701-705), 138
John VII (705-707), 138
Sisinnius (708), 138
Constantine I (708-715), 138
Gregory II (715-731), 138 ff., 206
Gregory III (731-741), 140, 214
Zachary (741-752), 140, 214
Stephen II (752-757), 220, 328
Paul I (757-767), 348 ff.
Stephen III (768-772), 353 f.
Adrian I (772-795), 355-360
Leo III (795-816), 360 ff.
Stephen IV (816-817), 421
Paschal I (817-824), 237, 421 ff.
Eugenius II (824-827), 424-426
Valentine (827), 426
Gregory IV (827-844), 426 ff.
Sergius II (844-847), 430-433
Leo IV (847-855), 433-443
Benedict III (855-858), 444 f.
Nicholas I (858-867), 446-477
Adrian II (867-872), 480 ff.
Popess Joan, Legend of, 521 ff.
Portianus, St. (abbot), King Thierry and, 175
Porto (Italy): Corsicans at, 437
Rodoald bishop, 457
Possidius, St. (bishop of Calama), on Genseric's persecution, 269
Potentiores, in Constitution of 817, 422
Pouring, Baptism by, 394
Poverty, in Rome, 16 f.
Praefectus urbis, Office of, 59
Pragmatic Sanction of Justinian, 45, 58
Prague (Bohemia), St. Adalbert bishop, 310, 312
Preaching, 398 f.
Precaria, 384 and note, 386
Predestinarianism, 474 ff.
Charles the Bald, 477
Erigena, 476
Gottschalk, 474 ff.
Lothaire, 477
Nicholas I, 477
Rubanus Maurus, 475
Presbyterium, 377
Priests: Cardinal, 27
Functions of, 394
Life in ninth century, 467 ff.
Living in *presbyterium,* 377
Marriage of, 135
Parish, at Rome, 27
Primacy, Roman. *See* Pope, Primacy of
Primicerius notariorum, 348, 351
Private mass. *See* Mass, Low
Privilegium Ottonis, 511 f.
Proba (Roman virgin), 60
Procession of St. Mark, 78 note
Procopius of Caesarea (historian): on the Anglo-Saxons, 184
On Genseric's persecution, 269
Property, Ecclesiastical. *See* Church property
Protospatharius, 454
Provence (France), Saracens, 342, 427
Prudentius, St. (bishop of Troyes), 522
Hincmar and, 476
Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. *See* Dionysius
Pseudo-Isidore decretals. *See* False Decretals
Ptochotrophium, 385 note
Public penance. *See* Penance, Public
Pulpit, in ninth century, 399
Purgatory, Doctrine of, 261
Purification, Feast of the, 33 f.
Putei sacri, 394
Pyrrhus (patriarch of Constantinople), condemned, 127, 131
Pytheas (Greek geographer), 148

Quentovicus, Anglo-Saxons at, 387
Quierzy: Capitulary of (877), 419
Charter of, 335, 359
Council of (849), 475
Donation of, 359
Frankish assembly at, 335
Quimper (France), St. Corentinus bishop, 183 note
Quinisext Council (692), 134
Quintianus, St. (bishop of Rodez), 258
Quintilian (rhetorician), Spaniard, 268

Rabanus Maurus (bishop of Mainz), 283, 472 f.
All Saints (feast), 116
Gottschalk, 475
Letter to Heberard, 474
Predestinarianism, 475
On real presence, 472
Radbod. *See* Ratbod
Radelgisus (prince of Salerno), aided by Saracens, 435
Rastiz. *See* Wratislaw
Ratbod (duke of Frisia), 205
Ratchis (Lombard king): Desiderius and, 339
At Monte Cassino, 253
Pope Zachary and, 326
Siege of Perugia, 326
Rathier of Verona, Papacy and, 479
Ratisbon (Germany), Council of (870), 301
St. Wolfgang bishop, 313
Ratramnus (monk of Corbie), 465, 468 f.
Charles the Bald, 468
At Corbie Abbey, 469
Doctrine of Holy Ghost, 469
Filioque, 469
Hildegard of Meaux friend of, 468
Hincmar and, 468, 476
Lupus of Ferrières friend of, 468
Odo of Beauvais, 468
Photius, 469
On real presence, 473
Roman primacy, 469
Ravenna (Italy), 332
Donation of Charlemagne, 359
Donation of Pepin, 338
Exarch of, 136
Hungarian hospice, 315
Imperial militia at, 136
John I imprisoned at, 246
John X born at, 506
John bishop of (fifth century), 28
Longinus exarch of, 73
Sergius bishop, 354
Smaragdus exarch of, 74
Theodoric spares inhabitants of, 30
Theophylactus (vestiarius), 503
Real presence: Controversy about, 471 ff.
Hincmar on, 473
Rabanus on, 472
Ratramnus on, 473
Scotus on, 471 f.
St. Ambrose on, 472
St. Augustine on, 472
St. Paschasius on, 472
Recared (Visigoth king), 271
Code of Euric, 259
Conversion of, 274
Council of Toledo (589), 275 f.
Death of, 83 f.
Doctrine of the Holy Ghost, 275
Lex Visigothorum, 259
Profession of faith, 275
St. Gregory felicitates, 91
St. Leander and, 274 f.
Rector, Patrimony of St. Peter, 105
Reculver, King Ethelbert's capital, 188
Redemptus, St. (bishop of Ferentino), 248
Regula pastoralis by St. Gregory, 81 f.
"Regulars," Rule of St. Chrodegang, 378
Reims: Ampulla of, 468 note
Councils: (813), 82; (525, 625), 175 note
Ebbo bishop, 235, 237
Hincmar bishop, 279, 404
Legend of the holy oil, 161 note
Louis the Pious at, 421
St. Remigius: bishop of, 155, 159; studies at, 158
Stephen IV at, 421
Relics, in churches, 392
Religions: Eastern, 20
Roman policy, 19
Religious liberty, in Persia, 90
Remigius, St. (archbishop of Lyons): Gottschalk and, 476
Hincmar and, 477
Remigius, St. (archbishop of Reims), 158 f.
Born at Laon, 158
Clovis baptized by, 155
Detractors of Clovis, 165
Letter to Clovis, 158
Pilgrimages to shrine of, 397
St. Genevieve friend of, 159
Studies at Reims, 158
Renaissance: Carolingian, 391
Constantinople, 452
Contempt for Middle Ages, 3
In Eastern Empire, 452

Reparatus (subdeacon), Vandal persecution, 269 f.
Responsa Nicolai ad Bulgaros, 292, 464
Responsiones Gregorii, 193 note
Respublica, Meaning of, 323
Respublica romana, 323
Respublica Romanorum, Pope, head of, 349
Respublica, Sancta, 323
Respublica Sanctae Ecclesiae, 338
Rhine (river): Ancient Germany, 146
Barbarians cross the, 154
Burgundians along, 262
Norman invasion, 434
Rhone (river), Saracen invasion, 434
Rienzi (tribune), 255
Right of asylum. *See* Sanctuary, Right of
Ripuarian Franks, 157
Robert the Strong (count of Anjou), 502
Robigalia (pagan festival), 34 note
Rochester (England), Justin bishop, 195
Roderick (Visigoth king), Moslem invasion, 284 f.
Rodez, St. Quintianus bishop, 258
Rodoald (bishop of Porto), papal legate, 457
Rodolphe of Turenne, St. (bishop of Bourges), Nicholas I and, 463
Rodrigo. *See* Roderick
Roman Empire: Fall of, 13 f.
Franks and, 156
Roman law, Theodoric and, 242
Roman primacy. *See* Pope, Primacy of
Romance language, Preaching in, 399
Romans, attitude to Lombards, 327
Romulus Augustulus. *See* Augustulus
Romanticism, 4
Romanus (pope), Lambert emperor, 501
Rome: Aistulf besieges, 337
Arch of Constantine, 57
Arnulf marches on, 499
Barbarians damage the catacombs, 26 f.
Basilicas, 26, 77, 505
Baths, 16 f.
Cardinal priests, 27
Castle of Sant' Angelo, 77 f.
Charlemagne at, 358, 363
Church services, 25 f.
Circus, 16 f.
Circus Maximus, 57
Claudian aqueduct, 57
Condition of (sixth century), 55
Constans II at, 129
"Destruction of," 16 note
Eastern superstitions, 18
Famine averted by Pope Gelasius, 31
Feast of Purification at, 34
In fifth century, 17 f.
Flavian amphitheater, 57
Forum of Trajan, 15
Franks in, 322
Frisians in, 322
Gottschalk at, 475
Hadrian's mausoleum, 77 f.
Hospices in, 102
Hungarian hospice, 314
Immorality in, 17 f.
Jews in, 111
John VIII fortifies, 494
Lombards in, 322
Memorial chapels, 26
Not destroyed by the barbarians, 15 f.
Pagan superstitions, 18 f.
Palace of the Caesars, 57
Papacy and government of, 322
Papal domains in, 42
Parish priests, 27
Patriarchate of, 289
Paulinus of Nola at, 26
Pestilence in, 76
Pope the real sovereign of, 136
Poverty in, 16 f.
Praefectus urbis, 59
Religious policy of ancient, 19
St. Andrew's Abbey, 60, 74 f., 184
St. Alexis' Abbey, 313
St. Benedict studies at, 47
St. Boniface at, 206 f.
St. Fulgentius at, 20, 26
St. Hilary at, 26
St. Martin's Church, 431
St. Mary and All the Martyrs (church), 115
St. Odo at, 510
St. Pancratius (gate), 499
Saracens at walls of, 432
Saxons in, 322
Schools (sixth century), 57
Septizonium of Severus, 57
Sidonius Apollinaris prefect of, 15
Sieges of (sixth century), 55
Statue of Popess Joan, 522
Superstitions at, 18 f.
Titular churches, 26

Rome (*continued*)
Worship of, 18 f.
Rome, Church of: Archdeacon, 348
Archpriest, 348
Cubiculum sacrum, 349
Deacons, 348
Filioque, 410
Liturgical reform, 398
Paul I, 348
Primacy. *See* Pope, Primacy of
Schola cantorum, 348
"Unordained" clergy, 349
Rome, Councils of:
(501), Pope Symmachus vindicated, 37-39
(591), 84, 97
(595), 97; deacons at mass, 100
(601), 97
(680), 130
(769), papal elections, 354 f.
(826), 425 f., 440
(853), disciplinary canons, 440
(893), Churches of Africa, 497 f.
(904), body of Pope Formosus, 500 note
Roncesvalles (battle), 229
Rotari. *See* Rotharis
Rothadius (bishop of Soissons), 517 f.
Hincmar and, 450
Rotharis (Lombard king), Edict of, 249, 253
Rouen (France): Council of (650), 175 note
St. Ouen bishop, 178
Rouskaia Pravda, 308
Royal benefices, Charlemagne and, 384
Royal power, Idea of, 173
Rudolph II (king of Burgundy), St. Adelaide daughter of, 267
Rufinus (Byzantine minister), Visigoths and, 256
Rugians (tribe): Arians, 154
In army of Odoacer, 240
In Italy, 145
St. Severinus' dealings with, 21
Rule of St. Benedict. *See* Benedictine Rule
Rule of St. Chrodegang, 378 f.
Rule of St. Columban, 250 f.
Rural clergy, 178 f.
In Frankish Church, 216
St. Boniface and, 216
Rural parishes, 377
Ruric (Russian prince), 305
Ruspe (Africa), St. Fulgentius bishop, 20, 270
Russia: Byzantine influence, 308
Conversion of, 147, 306 f.
Origin of, 304 f.
Paganism in, 305
Superstition, 307
Russians, Character of, 305
Rusticiana (patrician), Letters from St. Gregory, 89 f.
Rusticus, St. (bishop of Lyons), Letter from Gelasius (forgery), 161 note
Rutilius (prefect of Rome), 18 f.

Sabert. *See* Sebert
Sabinianus (pope), 114
As apocrisiary, 84, 88
Born in Tuscany, 114 note
Letter from St. Gregory, 88
Sabinus (jurist), 58
Saccellarius (papal official), 348
Sacramentary, Gelasian, 34 f.
Sacramentary, Gregorian, 99 and note
Sacro Speco (at Subiaco), 48
Sagum (garment), 393 f.
St. Alexis (monastery, Rome), St. Adalbert at, 313
St. Andrew (monastery, Rome), 60
Conversion of England, 184
Laxity in, 75
St. Benedict on the Loire (monastery), Theodulph abbot, 384
St. Bertin (monastery), 331
St. Cecilia (church, Rome), 442
St. Chrysogonus (monastery): Gregory III founds, 353
Stephen III as monk, 353
St. Columban (church, Bobbio), 251
St. Denis (France), Frankish assembly at, 336
St. Denis (church, Paris), Clovis and, 164
St. Denis (monastery, Paris): Laxity in, 380
Louis the Pious imprisoned, 430
St. Fulrad abbot, 218
St. Denis (shrine), Pilgrimages, 397
St. Denis, Council of, and Council of Compiègne, 430
St. Elias (church, Kieff), 305
St. Erasmus (monastery), Leo III imprisoned in, 362

St. Germain-des-Pres (church, Paris), 392
St. Guilhem-du-Desert (monastery). *See* Gellone
St. Guy (monastery), Philip abbot, 353
St. James of Compostela (shrine), Pilgrimages to, 397
St. Josse (monastery), Alcuin abbot, 385
St. Josse-sur-Mer (town, France), 387
St. Lawrence (basilica, Rome), 26
St. Lawrence in Lucina (church, Rome), 361
St. Loup (monastery, Troyes), Alcuin abbot, 385
St. Marcellus (church, Rome), 441
St. Mark's Day, procession, 34 note, 78 note
St. Martin (church, Canterbury), 183
St. Martin (church, Rome), 431
St. Martin (monastery): Alcuin abbot, 385
Vulfrad abbot, 357
St. Martin (shrine), Pilgrimages to, 397
St. Martin, Canons of, St. Odo joins, 509
St. Mary and All the Martyrs (church, Rome), 115
St. Mary Major (basilica, Rome), 330
Antipope Lawrence consecrated in, 37
St. Mary in Trastevere (church), 444
St. Maurice (monastery, Switzerland), Stephen II at, 333
St. Medard (church, Soissons), Louis the Pious, 429
St. Mesmin (monastery, Orleans): Reform of, 382
Theodulph and, 379
St. Omer (France), St. Bertin's monastery at, 331
St. Pancratius (gate, Rome), 499
St. Paul (basilica, Rome), 26
St. Paul (cathedral, London): King Ethelbert and, 195
King Sebert and, 195
St. Peter (basilica, Rome), 26
Consecration of, 444
St. Peter (monastery, Corbie), Industries in, 386
St. Peter (monastery, Ghent), Einhard abbot, 385
St. Peter, Patrimony of. *See* Papal States
St. Peter's Chair, Feast of, 34 note
St. Pourçain (city, France), and St. Portianus, 176
St. Riquier (monastery): School, 390
Workshops in, 386
St. Sabina (church, Rome), 424
St. Seine (monastery), St. Benedict of Aniane at, 381
St. Sequanus. *See* St. Seine, monastery
St. Servais (monastery, Maastricht), Einhard abbot, 385
St. Sophia (church, Constantinople): Dedication of, 66
Rebuilt by Emperor Justinian, 66
St. Stephen (monastery, Rome), St. Paschal abbot, 422
St. Suzanna (church, Rome), Sergius pastor of, 136
St. Sylvester (monastery, Rome), 361
St. Theodosius (monastery), St. Sophronius monk of, 121
St. Victor (monastery, Paris), 5
St. Vincent (monastery, Volturno), 329
St. Wandrille (monastery): Gervold abbot, 387
School, 390
St. William of the Desert (monastery). *See* Gellone
Saints, List of:
Abbo (abbot of Fleury, d. 1004), 279
Adalbert (bishop of Prague, d. 997), 310, 312
Adalhard (abbot of Corbie, d. 827), 234
Addula (abbess of Pfalzel, d. *ca.* 734), 209
Adelaide (empress, d. 999), 23, 267
Adeodatus (pope). *See* Deusdedit
Adrian III (pope, d. 885), 495
Adrian (abbot of Canterbury, d. 709), 200
Agapetus I (pope, d. 536), 42, 44
Agatho (pope, d. 681), 130
Agobard (bishop of Lyons, d. 840), 265
Aidan (bishop of Lindisfarne, d. 642), 197
Aignan (bishop of Orleans, d. 453), 154 note
Alban (protomartyr of England, d. *ca.* 304), 182

Alberic (bishop of Utrecht, d. 794), 233
Amandus (bishop of Maastricht, d. 679?), 178
Anastasius II (pope, d. 496), 36
Anastasius (apocrisiary, d. 666), 128
Anastasius (monk, d. 662), 128
Andrew (apostle), 289
Angilbert (abbot of St. Riquier, d. 814), 390
Ansgar (apostle of Scandinavia, d. 865), 235
Augustine of Canterbury (d. 605), 183 ff.
Augustine of Hippo (d. 430), 269 f.
Avitus (bishop of Vienne, d. 525), 39, 155, 263
Bathilde (queen, d. 680), 177
Bede the Venerable (d. 735), 200 f.
Benedict II (pope, d. 685), 135
Benedict of Aniane (abbot, d. 821), 380 ff.
Benedict Biscop (abbot, d. 690), 200
Benedict of Nursia (d. 543), 47 ff.
Berno (abbot of Cluny, d. 927), 506
Bertharius (abbot of Monte Cassino, d. 884), 465
Birinus (bishop of Dorchester, d. *ca.* 650), 197
Boniface IV (pope, d. 615), 115
Boniface (apostle of Germany, d. 754), 203 ff.
Braulio (bishop of Saragossa, d. *ca.* 651), 282
Brieuc (monk, d. 502), 183 note
Burchard (bishop of Würzburg, d. 754), 212
Caesarius (bishop of Arles, d. 543), 70, 259
Carloman (son of Charles Martel, d. 754), 215
Cassian (abbot, d. 433), 50
Chrodegang (bishop of Metz, d. 766), 218, 378
Clotilda (queen of France, d. 545), 159
Colman (bishop of Lindisfarne, d. 676), 198
Columban (abbot, d. 615), 249
Corbinian (bishop of Freising, d. 730), 207
Corentinus (bishop of Quimper, d. 490), 183 note
Cyril (apostle of the Slavs, d. 869), 296 ff.
Demetrius (martyr of Salonica, d. 306), 289
Deusdedit (pope, d. 618), 117
Deusdedit (archbishop of Canterbury, d. 664), 199
Domitian (bishop of Melitene, d. 601), 90
Edwin (king of Northumbria, d. 627), 196
Egbert (monk, d. 729), 205
Elias (patriarch of Jerusalem, d. 518), 42 note
Eligius (bishop of Noyon, d. 660), 176
Elizabeth of Hungary (d. 1231), 23
Emilian Cucullatus (hermit, d. 574), 272
Emiliana (St. Gregory's aunt), 54
Emmeran (bishop of Poitiers), 207
Ennodius (bishop of Pavia, d. 521), 39, 242
Ethelbert (king of Kent, d. 616), 185
Eugenius I (pope, d. 657), 129
Eutychius (martyr at Ferentino), 248
Felix III (pope, d. 492), 28-30
Felix (bishop of Dunwich, d. 646), 197
Flavian (patriarch of Constantinople, d. 449), 42 note
Florentina (virgin, d. 633), 275
Fructuosus (bishop of Braga, d. *ca.* 665), 282
Fulgentius (bishop of Ecija, d. *ca.* 633), 275, 282
Fulgentius (bishop of Ruspe, d. 533), 20, 270
Fulrad (abbot, d. 784), 218
Gall (monk, d. 627), 207
Galla (matron, d. 546), 60
Gelasius (pope, d. 496), 30-36
Genevieve (virgin, d. 512), 159
Germain (bishop of Paris, d. 576), 70
Gislemar (monk, ninth century), 235
Gregory I the Great (pope, d. 604), 54 ff.
Gregory II (pope, d. 731), 206
Gregory III (pope, d. 741), 140, 214
Gregory VII (pope, d. 1085), 279
Gregory (bishop of Tours, d. 594), 70
Gregory of Utrecht (abbot, d. 780), 209
Guntram (king of Burgundy, d. 592), 263
Henry II (emperor, d. 1024), 410

Hermengild (prince, d. 585), 70, 273
Herveus (monk, d. 568), 170
Hilary (bishop of Poitiers, d. 367), 161 note
Honoratus (bishop of Arles, d. 429), 50
Hormisdas (pope, d. 523), 40-45
Hugh (abbot, d. 1109), 513
Ignatius (patriarch of Constantinople, d. 877), 445
Innocent I (pope, d. 417), 516
Isidore (bishop of Seville, d. 636), 275
John I (pope, d. 526), 44
John Damascene (monk, d. *ca.* 780), 403
Judicael (Briton king, d. 658), 177
Justin Martyr (d. 165), 152
Kilian (monk, d. 689), 207
Laumer (monk, d. 594), 168
Lawrence (archbishop of Canterbury, d. 619), 195
Leander (bishop of Seville, d. *ca.* 600), 70, 273 f.
Lebwin (apostle of the Frisians, d. *ca.* 773), 223
Leo I (pope, d. 461), 516
Leo II (pope, d. 683), 135
Leo III (pope, d. 816), 360 ff.
Leo IV (pope, d. 855), 433-443
Leodegar (bishop of Autun, d. 678), 177
Lioba (abbess, d. 772 or 779), 213
Louis (king of France, d. 1270), 23
Ludger (bishop of Münster, d. 809), 223
Lullus (bishop of Mainz, d. 768), 212
Lupus (bishop of Troyes, d. 479), 161 note
Machutus (bishop of Aleth, d. 620), 183 note
Majolus (abbot of Cluny, d. 994), 513
Malo. *See* Machutus
Marculf (abbot, d. 558), 169 f.
Marius (bishop of Avenches, d. 594), 264
Martin I (pope, d. 655), 127-129
Martin (bishop of Braga, d. 589), 272
Martin (bishop of Tours, d. 399), 50
Martin of Vertou (monk, d. 601), 170
Maurus (abbot, d. *ca.* 584), 49
Maximinus (bishop of Trier, d. 353), 153
Maximus the Confessor (abbot, d. 622), 126 f.
Mellitus (archbishop of Canterbury, d. 624), 195
Methodius (apostle of the Slavs, d. 885), 296 ff.
Millan. *See* Emilian Cucullatus
Nicephorus (patriarch of Constantinople, d. 829), 298
Nicholas I (pope, d. 867), 42, 446-477
Odilo (abbot of Cluny, d. 1048), 513
Odo (abbot of Cluny, d. 942), 509
Olga (Russian queen, d. 969), 306
Ouen (bishop of Rouen, d. 684), 178
Paschal I (pope, d. 824), 237, 421 ff.
Paschasius Radbertus (abbot, d. *ca.* 860), 235, 469 ff.
Patrick (apostle of Ireland, fifth century), 182
Paul I (pope, d. 767), 348 ff.
Paul Aurelian (bishop of Léon, d. 579), 183 note
Paulinus (bishop of Nola, d. 431), 26
Paulinus (bishop of York, d. 644), 196
Petronax (abbot of Monte Cassino, d. 747), 252
Placidus (monk, sixth century), 49
Portianus (abbot, sixth century), 175
Possidius (bishop of Calama, d. *ca.* 430), 269
Prudentius (bishop of Troyes, d. 861), 476, 522
Quintianus (bishop of Rodez, d. 525), 258
Redemptus (bishop of Ferentino, d. 586), 248
Remigius (archbishop of Lyons, d. 875), 476
Remigius (bishop of Reims, d. 535), 155
Rodolphe of Turenne (archbishop of Bourges, d. 866), 463
Rusticus (bishop of Lyons, d. 501), 161 note
Scholastica (sister of St. Benedict, d. *ca.* 542), 252
Serenus (bishop of Marseilles, d. 604), 91
Sergius I (pope, d. 701), 135 f.
Sergius (soldier, martyr, d. 290), 90

Severinus (apostle of Noricum, d. 482), 21 ff.
Sidonius Apollinaris (bishop of Clermont, d. 482), 15
Sigismund (king of Burgundy, d. 524), 263
Silverius (pope, d. 537), 44
Silvia (mother of St. Gregory, d. 592), 54
Simplicius (pope, d. 483), 25 ff.
Siricius (pope, d. 399), 518
Sophronius (patriarch of Jerusalem, d. 638), 121-125
Stephen (king of Hungary, d. 1038), 313-315
Sturmio (abbot of Fulda, d. 779), 223
Symmachus (pope, d. 514), 36-39
Tarasius (patriarch of Constantinople, d. 806), 400
Theodore (archbishop of Canterbury, d. 690), 192, 198 f.
Theodore of Studium (abbot, d. 826), 290, 403
Theodore the Syceote (bishop of Anastasiopolis, d. 613), 117
Theodulph (abbot, d. 590), 167
Theophanes the Confessor (chronicler, d. 818), 138
Trasilla (St. Gregory's aunt), 54
Ulrich (bishop of Augsburg, d. 973), 398 note
Vedast (bishop of Arras, d. 540), 164
Vincent of Saragossa (deacon, d. 304), 272
Virgilius (bishop of Salzburg, d. 789), 217 f.
Vitalian (pope, d. 673), 129
Viventiolus (bishop of Lyons, d. 524), 264
Vladimir (Russian ruler, d. 1014), 306 f.
Wala (abbot, d. 836), 234
Wenceslaus (duke of Bohemia, d. 935), 309
Wilfrid (archbishop of York, d. 709), 197 f.
Willehad (bishop of Bremen, d. 789), 223
Willibald (bishop of Eichstätt, d. 781), 208
Willibrord (bishop of Utrecht, d. 739), 206
Wolfgang (bishop of Ratisbon, d. 994), 313
Wulfstan (bishop of Worcester, d. 1095), 192
Zachary (pope, d. 752), 140, 214
Saints, Worship of, 397
Salian Franks, 157
Salic law, 172 note
  Clovis and, 171
  Dagobert and, 171
  Franks and Romans, 156
Salzburg: Arno bishop, 361
  St. Virgilius bishop, 218
Sancta respublica, 323
Sanctae Ecclesiae respublica, 338
Sanctuary, Right of, 387 f.
Sant' Angelo (castle, Rome), 77 f., 508
  Marozia at, 504
Santa Maria in Trastevere (church), Palmary Synod, 37-39
Saracens: Amorion taken by, 297
  In Apulia, 434
  At Arles, 434
  Athanasius (bishop of Naples), 494
  At Bari, 434
  Civitavecchia raided by, 427
  Eastern Church and, 297
  Envoys to Charlemagne, 228
  Expelled from Italy, 437
  Incursions of, 488
  John VIII and, 488, 494
  John X defeats the, 507
  Leo IV and, 436 f.
  At Monte Cassino, 432
  Nice raided by, 427
  Outside walls of Rome, 432
  In Palermo, 427
  Pisa pillaged by, 434
  On Provençal coast, 427
  St. Bertharius martyred by, 465
  St. Paul's Basilica pillaged by, 832
  St. Peter's Basilica pillaged by, 832
  In Sicily, 427
  Victory at Gaeta, 432
  See also Moslems
Saragossa: Councils of (592, 593, 599), 91
  Frankish war, 272
  St. Braulio bishop, 282
  St. Vincent bishop, 273
Sardica, Briton bishops at Council of, 182

Sardinia: Papal domains in, 42
Thrasamund exiles bishops to, 270
Sarolta (duchess of Hungary), 315
As warrior, 312
Sassanian dynasty, 90
Savonnières, Council of (859), condemns predestinarianism, 477
"Saxon," Origin of term, 224 note
Saxon Capitulary. *See* Capitularies of Charlemagne (782)
Saxons: Act of Speyer, 233
Baptism of, 228 f., 231
Capitulary of 797, 233
Character of, 225
Charlemagne repels the, 230
Charlemagne's expedition against, 227
Charles Martel repels, 211
Conversion of, 147
Customs of, 225 f.
England invaded by, 182
Execution at Verden, 231
Fasting laws, 231
Fritzlar Abbey pillaged by, 228
Hesse ravaged by, 229
Incursion near Fulda, 229
Invasions by, 227
Irminsul (sacred tree), 225
Legend of the coming of, 224
Political organization of, 225 f.
Punishment of adultery, 225
In region of North Sea, 145
Religious organization of, 225
In Rome, 332
St. Lebwin, 226
St. Willehad, 230
Thuringia ravaged by, 229
Widukind incites, 229
Saxony: called *officina gentium*, 224
Capitulary of (782), 231
Conversion of, 223 ff.
Location of, 208
Scandinavia: German migration, 146
St. Ansgar apostle of, 235
Scandinavians: Character of, 236
Conversion of, 147
Schism: Acacian, 24
Of Aquileia, 249 note
Eastern, 293, 492
Spirit of, in the East, 141
Schola cantorum, 99, 348
Scholastica, St., Body of, 252
School, Palatine. *See* Palace school
Schools: Charlemagne and, 5
Episcopal, 5, 390, 426
In Middle Ages, 5
Monastic, 5, 52, 390
Parish, 390, 426
Scirri (tribe), in army of Odoacer, 240
Scotland, Date of Easter, 197
Scotus Erigena, 5, 465
Charles the Bald, 470
Council of Valence (855), 476
De divisione naturae by, 471
Gottschalk, 476
Nicholas I and, 471
On predestinarianism, 476
Pseudo-Dionysius translated by, 470
On real presence, 473
Writings of, 462
Sebert (king of Essex): Conversion of, 195
St. Paul's Cathedral, 195
Seine (river), Northmen's invasion, 434
Senate (Roman), 16
Odoacer accepted as king, 13
Seneca (philosopher), Spaniard, 268
Senlis (France), Luidhard bishop, 185
Septipedes (Visigoths), 256
Septizonium (Rome), 57
Serbs: Heraclius and, 120, 289
In Illyricum, 289
Serenus, St. (bishop of Marseilles), 91
Sergius I, St. (pope), 135 f.
Council of Constantinople (692), 138
Election of, 135
Schola cantorum, 136
Zachary attempts to seize, 137
Sergius II (pope), 430-432
Antipope John, 431
Born at Rome, 430
Church and state, 431 f.
Leo IV, 433
Lothaire protests, 431
Louis crowned king of the Lombards, 431
Oath of fidelity to emperor, 421, 431
Sergius III (pope), 502-505
Christopher (pope) imprisoned by, 502, 504
Doctrines of Photius, 505
John XI son of, 504 and note
Lateran Basilica restored, 505
Marozia and, 504
William of Turin and, 505

Sergius (patriarch of Constantinople), 119 ff.
Character of, 117
Council of Constantinople condemns, 131
Forged letter of Menas, 121
Heraclius' *Ecthesis*, 125
Lateran Council condemns, 127
Monophysites and, 121
Pope Honorius and, 122
Popularity of, 120
St. Theodore the Syceote and, 117
Sergius (bishop of Ravenna), at Council of Rome (769), 354
Sergius (*magister militum*): Embezzlement by, 486
Pope Formosus, 493
Sergius, St. (soldier, martyr), King Chosroes' devotion to, 90
"Servant of the servants of God," 60, 88
Servatus Lupus (abbot of Ferrières), 476
Severians, in Alexandria, 120
Severinus (pope), 125 f.
Severinus, St. (apostle of Noricum), 21-23
Severinus, Life of, by Eugippius, 15, 21
Severn (river), St. Augustine's conference, 189 f.
Severus, Septimius, Septizonium of, 57
Seville (Spain): Council of (590), 84
St. Leander bishop, 70, 273 f.
Sicily: Jews in, 84
Monasteries founded by St. Gregory, 60
Papal domains in, 42
Pope Agatho born in, 130
St. Gregory in, 56
Saracens in, 342, 427
Siconulfus (prince of Salerno), aids Saracens, 435
Sidonius Apollinaris, St., 15
On Euric (Visigoth king), 257
Letter from St. Lupus (forgery), 161 note
On the Normans, 236
Sigebert (Frankish king), Ingundis daughter of, 273
Sigehard (abbot of Fulda), 299 note
Sigifridus (king of Denmark), Widukind and, 229
Sigismund, St. (king of Burgundy), 263
Silentiarius, Office of, 329 note
Silverius, St. (pope), 44 and note
Silvia, *Peregrinatio* by, 34
Silvia, St. (mother of St. Gregory), 54, 65
Simplicius, St. (pope), 25 ff.
Born at Tivoli, 25 note
Church administration, 25 f.
Church property, 27 f.
Church services in Rome, 25 f.
Fabrica ecclesiae, 28
Gaudentius (bishop) and, 28
John bishop of Ravenna, 28
Organizes church services, 27
Use of Church revenue, 27 f.
Simony, 432
Council of Rome (826), 425 f.
Si-ngan-fu, Stone of, 316 note
Sinners, Reconciliation of, 27 note
Siricius, St. (pope), 518
Siriu (wife of Chosroes II), 90
Sirmond, Jacques, on Gottschalk, 475
Siroes (king of Persia), Chosroes II assassinated by, 120
Sisebut (Visigoth king), Jewish converts, 280
Sisinnius (pope), 138
Skepticism, Pagan, 18
"Slave," Origin of the word, 175
Slavery: Church Councils and, 175 note
Clergy and servile labor, 278
Council of Agde (506), 279 note
Council of Elvira, 277 f.
Council of Epaon (517), 175 note
Councils of Toledo, 277 f.
In England, 192
St. Wulfstan, 192
Slaves: Council of Elvira, 277
Ebbo bishop of Reims, 237
Freed before ordination, 278
Jews, owners of Christian, 277 f.
Patrimony of St. Peter, 105 f.
Of Pope Symmachus, 37
St. Portianus, 175
St. Gregory's attitude, 105 f.
Slavonic language, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, 299
Slavonic liturgy, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, 299, 302 f.
Slavs: in the Balkans, 288
Between the Vistula and the Elbe, 145
Character of, 147
Church among the, 288 f.

Slavs (*continued*)
Conversion of, 147
Germany invaded by, 230
In imperial army, 289
John IV and, 289
Location of, 147
Moravians, 295
Origin of the word, 289
Pagans, 288
Popes and the, 289
St. Cyril and St. Methodius apostles of, 296 ff.
Unity of, 289
Smaragdus (exarch of Ravenna), 74
Smaragdus, Ardo (abbot of Aniane), on St. Benedict of Aniane, 381
Smyrna (Asia Minor), Metrophanes bishop, 455 and note
Socotra (island), Christianity, 316
Soissons (France): Council of (853), 444
Frankish assembly at, 335
Pepin's coronation at, 331
Rothade bishop, 450
St. Medard Church, 429
Soldiers, not to become monks, 85
Solocrat (duke of Provence), and Lothaire, 435
Sophronius, St. (patriarch of Jerusalem): Character of, 122
At Constantinople, 122
John Moschus and, 122
Monothelitism, 121-125
St. Maximus the Confessor and, 127
Synodal letter, 123 f.
Soutane. *See* Cassock
Spain: Adoptionism in, 382, 404
Alani invade, 268
Arianism in, 79
Church and civilization, 276 f.
Church and state in, 280
Corruption among the clergy, 284
Decline of monasticism, 284
Decline of Visigothic kingdom, 283 ff.
Hadrian (emperor), native of, 268
Jews in, 284
Lucan, native of, 268
Marcus Aurelius, native of, 268
Martial, native of, 268
Moslems in, 488
Moslems invade, 284 f., 345
National assemblies, 276
Quintilian, native of, 268
Recared king of, 83 f., 91
Roman influence in, 268
St. Leander, 91
Seneca, native of, 268
Suevi in, 145
Suevi invade, 268
Theodosius, native of, 268
Trajan, native of, 268
Treatment of Jews in, 280 f.
Vandals in, 267 f.
Visigoths in, 145, 267 f., 271
Speyer, Act of, 233
Spiritual life, Benedictines, 52 f.
Spoleto (duchy), 490
Donation of Charlemagne, 359
Spoleto, House of, Papacy dominated by, 499
Spoleto, March of, 490
Stability, Vow of, in Benedictine Rule, 51
State: Church aid to, 216 f.
Duty to suppress heresy, 110
Station churches, 99
Stephania, wife of Adrian II, 480
Stephen II (pope): Aistulf and, 330-332
Appeals to Pepin, 337
Character of, 328
Charlemagne and, 333
Christopher (primicerius), 352
Constantine Copronymus and, 329
Coronation of Pepin, 336
As deacon, 328
Decision about Pepin the Short, 331
Election of, 328
Meeting between Pepin and, 333
Papal States, 320
At Pavia, 332
Pepin and, 324, 331, 333 f.
Pepin, "patrician of the Romans," 350
St. Boniface and, 220
At St. Maurice Abbey, 333
Stephen III (pope): Carloman and, 354
Christopher (primicerius) and, 353 f.
Death of, 355
Desiderius and, 355
Election of, 353
Iconoclasm condemned, 400
At St. Chrysogonus monastery, 353
Stephen IV (pope), 421
Stephen V (pope), 303, 496
Stephen VI (pope), 500 f.
Stephen VII (pope), Marozia and election of, 507
Stephen VIII (pope), Alberic and, 508

Stephen (bishop of Naples), at Council of Rome (769), 354
Stephen, St. (king of Hungary), 313-315
Crowned by Sylvester II, 315
Devotion to Blessed Virgin, 313
Duelling forbidden, 314
Hospices in foreign cities, 314 f.
Knighthood, 314
Laws of, 314
Political administration, 314
Private property, 315
Stephen (secundicerius), 493
Stephen of Bourbon, on Popess Joan, 521
Stephen of Tournai, False Decretals, 515
Stilicho (minister of Honorius), Visigoths in Italy, 256
Stoicism, St. Gregory and, 68
Sturmio, St. (abbot of Fulda), 223, 228
At Monte Cassino, 228
At Paderborn assembly, 228
St. Boniface and, 228
Saxon invasion, 230
Stylites, Pilgrims visit the, 48
Subdeacons, Council of Rome (595), 100
Subiaco (abbey): John XII, 512
St. Benedict at, 48
Sublimitas (title), 157
Suevi (tribe): St. Severinus' dealings with, 21
In Spain, 145, 268
Vandals and, 268
Sun god, Worship of, 20
Suntal (battle), 230
Superstitions: Council of Leptines, 217
Frankish Church and, 215
Franks, 164
Pagan, at Rome, 18 f.
At Rome, 18 f.
In Russia, 307
Suras, in the Koran, 343
Susa (Italy), Lombard army routed, 358
Sussex (kingdom), 182 note
St. Wilfrid and conversion of, 197
Sutri (Italy), Papal States, 324
Swatopluk I (king of Moravia), 294, 300, 302
Death of, 303
John VIII and, 302
Moravia in reign of, 302 f.
Political policy of, 302
Slav ambitions, 290
Swatopluk II (king of Moravia), 303
Sweden, St. Ansgar apostle of, 235, 238
Swedes, Incursions of, 342
Syceote, Theodore the. *See* Theodore
Sylvester II (pope), St. Stephen crowned by, 315
Sylvia, St. *See* Silvia
Symeon (tsar of Bulgaria), 290, 293
Symmachus, St. (pope), 36-39
Charges against, 37
Consecration of, 36
Council of Rome (501) vindicates, 38
Emperor Anastasius and, 39
Letter to St. Avitus (forgery), 161 note
St. Avitus and, 265
St. Ennodius defends, 242
Slaves of, 37
Theodoric and, 37, 242
Symmachus (senator), Execution of, 246
Synodus erratica (i. e., Council of Constantinople, 692), 134 f.
Syracuse (Sicily): Constans at, 129
Gregory Asbestas bishop, 455
Syria: Paulicians in, 139
Persians invade, 67
Saracens conquer, 345

Tachygraphers, 260
Tacitus: on the Britons, 182 note
Character of the Germans, 151
Terra incognita, 140
Tadioc (archbishop of York), 183
Taine, on the Church and the barbarians, 7 f.
Talarus, Adrian II son of, 480
Tarasius, St. (patriarch of Constantinople), 400, 453
Tarsus (Asia Minor), St. Theodore of Canterbury born at, 199
Tartars, in Hungary, 315
Tassilon (duke of Bavaria), Desiderius and, 356
Teja (Ostrogoth king), 246
Temporal power of the popes. *See* Papal States
Terra incognita, 146
Tertullus (patrician), St. Placidus son of, 49
Teutberga (queen of Lorraine), 444
Lothaire's divorce, 448 f.
Teutonic Grammar, by Charlemagne, 367
Thames (river), St. Augustine, 185
Thanet (island), St. Augustine, 185
Tharsilla, St. *See* Trasilla

Thegan (historian), Ebbo, 430
Theoctista (sister of Emperor Maurice), 70, 80
Theoctistus (logothete), St. Cyril and, 297
Theodelinda (Lombard queen), 112, 248-250
Theodomir (Suevian king), 272
Theodora (empress of Justinian): influence over Justinian, 44
Monophysites of Arabia, 44
Patroness of art, 66
Theodora (empress of Theophilus): exiled, 454
Iconoclasm, 402, 452
St. Cyril and, 297
Theodora (i. e., Popess Joan), 521 ff.
Theodora the Elder (wife of Theophylactus), 503, 507
Theodora the Younger (daughter of Theophylactus), 503
Theodore I (pope), 126
Theodore II (pope), 501
Theodore, St. (archbishop of Canterbury), 192, 198-200
Theodore (bishop of Mopsuestia), Three Chapters, 44
Theodore (bishop of Pharan), condemned, 131
Theodore (archpriest), Election of Sergius I, 135
Theodore (physician), St. Gregory and, 70
Theodore (primicerius): Death of, 423
Paschal I and, 423
Theodore of Nepi (duke), Election of antipope Constantine, 352
Theodore of Studium, St. (abbot), 403
Christians as Slav hostages, 289
Iconoclasm, 403
Letters of, 403
Theodore the Syceote, St. (bishop of Anastasiopolis), 117
Theodoret (bishop of Cyrus), Three Chapters, 44
Theodoric the Great (Ostrogoth king), 30
Ambition of, 267
Antipope Lawrence, 242
Arianism of, 241
Boethius executed by, 245
Cassiodorus and, 242 f.
Character of, 30
Clovis and, 160
At Constantinople, 241
Death of, 246
Eastern emperors and, 43
Edict of, 253
Gelasius (pope), 31
Government of, 241
In Italy, 30
Invades Italy, 29, 241
John I and, 245 f.
Odoacer assassinated by, 30, 241
Ostrogoth king, 241
Peace treaty with Odoacer, 241
Persecutor of Catholics, 245
Protector of the Church, 242
At Ravenna, 30
Rejects antipope Lawrence, 37
Roman law, 242
Rome, the "sacred city," 19
St. Benedict of Nursia, 242
Symmachus (pope), 37, 242
Symmachus (senator) executed, 246
War against Odoacer, 241
At Zeno's court, 241
Theodoric (son of Clovis), Norman pirates defeated by, 342
Theodosius (emperor), Spaniard, 268
Theodrat (monk), Corvey monastery and, 234
Theodulph (bishop of Orleans), 379
Monasteries of, 384
Reform of St. Mesmin monastery, 382
Schools at Orleans, 390
Trinitarian doctrine, 409
Theodulph, St. (abbot), 167
Theonus (bishop of London), 183
Theophanes the Confessor, St. (chronicler), 138
Theophilus (emperor), Iconoclasm, 402
Theophylactus, 507
Becomes vestararius, 503
Papacy and, 499
Wealth of, 503
Theophylactus, House of, and papacy, 503
Theotimus (physician), St. Gregory and, 70, 89
Thessalonica: Battle of, 289
Location of, 296
SS. Cyril and Methodius born at, 296
Theudigisel (Visigoth king), 271

Theutberga. *See* Teutberga
Thierry (Burgundian king), St. Columban and, 163, 250
Thietgaud (bishop of Trier); Lothaire's divorce, 448
Deposed, 449
Thietmar. *See* Dithmar
Thomas Aquinas, St., Commentary on Boethius' *Consolations of Philosophy*, 244
Thor (deity), Slav god Perun, 305
Thrace, Goths invade, 154
Thrasamund (Vandal king), 30
Bishops exiled, 270
Hilderic son of, 270
Three Chapters, 44, 79
Thuringia (district, Germany): Location of, 207
Ohrdruf monastery in, 212
St. Kilian, 207
Saxons ravage, 229
Thuringians, Conversion of, 147
Tiberius II (emperor), 66 f.
Tibur. *See* Tivoli
Tipasa (Numidia), Miracle at, 269
Tiridates (king of Armenia), Emperor Basil and, 491 note
Tithes, 261, 383
In Frankish Church, 216
St. Boniface and, 216
Tituli, Roman churches, 26
Tivoli, Pope Simplicius born at, 25 note
Toledo: Elipandus bishop, 405
Oppas bishop, 284
Toledo, Councils of, 276 ff.:
(447), *Filioque*, 407 note
(589), 275: Abbots at, 276 note; *Filioque*, 275, 407; St. Leander, 320, 341
(597), St. Gregory and, 91
(633), Rights of conscience, 280
(653), on St. Isidore, 282
(694), Jews and, 283 f.
(701), 276 note
Tonsuratores, Patrimony of St. Peter, 103
Tonsure, 349
Torture: Nicholas I on, 464
Use of, against heretics, 110
Totila (Gothic king), at Rome, 55
Toto of Nepi (duke), Election of antipope Constantine, 352
Toul See of, 153
Toulouse (France), Ataulfus' capital, 256
Touraine (France), Cormery Abbey, 382
Tournai (Belgium): Death of Childeric at, 157
St. Amandus at, 178
Tournely (theologian), on Gottschalk, 475
Tours (France): Normans at, 434
St. Gregory bishop, 70
Trajan (emperor): Forum of, 15
Spaniard, 268
Trasamund. *See* Thrasamund
Trasilla, St. (St. Gregory's aunt), 54
Treasury, ruined by Justinian, 67
Trebur. *See* Tribur
Treves. *See* Trier
Tribunes, Roman, 255
Tribur (Germany), Council of (895), 497 f.
Trier: Burgundians near, 262 f.
St. Athanasius at, 153
St. Maximinus bishop, 153
Statue of Diana, 164
Thietgaud bishop, 448
Trinity, Doctrine of: Charlemagne, 408
Church fathers, 408
Council of Aachen (809), 409
Council of Gentilly (767), 408
Leo III, 409
Theodulph of Orleans, 409
See also Filioque *and* Holy Ghost
Trosly, Council of (909), Duty of kings, 279
Troyes (France): St. Lupus bishop, 154 note, 161 note
St. Prudentius bishop, 476, 522
Trullan Council (692), 134
"Tsar," Title of, 293
Turcilinges (tribe): in army of Odoacer, 240
St. Severinus' dealings with, 21
Turin (Italy): Claudius bishop, 404
William bishop, 505
Turks: Hungary, 315
Location of, 147
Tuscany (Italy), 490
Bishops of, and Roman See, 97
Donation of Charlemagne, 359
March of, 490
Sabinianus born in, 114 note

Typasa. *See* Tipasa
Typus, of Constans II, 127

Ulfilas (apostle of the Goths), 154
Ulpian (jurist), 58
Ulrich, St. (bishop of Augsburg), 398 note
Umbria (province, Italy), Bishops of, suffragans of Roman See, 97
Universities, Historical methods at German, 4
Ural mountains, 147
Urgel (Spain), Felix bishop, 265, 405
Usury, 17
  Council of Pavia (850), 440
Utrecht (Holland): St. Alberic bishop, 233
  St. Willibrord bishop, 206

Vaast, St. *See* Vedast
Vaison, Council of (529), 260
  Parish schools, 390
Valais (canton, Switzerland), 333
Valence (France): Council of (855), 476
  School of rhetoric, 264
Valentine (pope), 426
Valentinian I (emperor): Papal supremacy, 516
  Status of *coloni,* 104
Valeria (Italy), Bishops of, and Roman See, 97
Vandals: in Africa, 145, 269
  Agriculture in Spain, 268
  Alani and, 268
  Arians, 154
  Belisarius ends rule of, 270
  Christians exiled by, 269
  Count Boniface appeals to, 268 f.
  In the East, 69
  Gaul ravaged by, 268
  Huneric king of, 30
  Moors and, 271
  Navy of, 270 f.
  Persecution by, in Africa, 30
  St. Fulgentius (bishop of Ruspe), 20
  In Spain, 267 f.
  Suevi and, 268
  Thrasamund king of, 30
  Victor Vitensis on persecution by, 269
Vareghi (tribe), 305
Vassals, 418
Vatican Council: Formula of Hormisdas, 42
  Formulas of Gelasius, 35
Vandrille, St. *See* Wandrille
Vedast, St. (bishop of Arras), 164
Venetia (Italy): Donation of Charlemagne, 359
  Emperor Leo III opposed in, 139
  Three Chapters, 79
Venice: Eastern emperors and, 439
  Greek influence, 439
Venus (deity), in Arabia, 91
Verberie, Council of (753), Divorce, 396
Verden (Germany), Execution of Saxons at, 231, 347
Verdun, Treaty of, 417, 430
Vestiarius (officer of papal palace), 503
Victor Vitensis, on Vandal persecution, 269
Vidmar (monk), 381
Vienne, St. Avitus bishop, 39, 155, 263-265
Vienne, Council of (892), 497
  Lay usurpations, 498
Vigilius (pope), 44 f.
  Born at Rome, 44 note
  Condemnation of Three Chapters, 44 note
  Infallibility, 45
  Retractation, 44
  Temporal power of the papacy, 45
  Three Chapters condemned, 44
Vigilius (bishop of Arles), St. Gregory and, 91
Vignier, Jerome, author of forgeries, 161 note
Villici (ecclesiastical judges), 389
Vincent (bishop of Saragossa), King Leovigild and, 273 f.
Vincent of Saragossa, St. (deacon), 272
Virgilius, St. (bishop of Salzburg), 217 f.
  Charges against, 217 f.
  Letter from Pope Zachary, 218
  St. Boniface and, 217 f.
Virgin Mary. *See* Mary, Blessed Virgin
Virgo coelestis, Worship of, 20
Visigoths: Alaric II king of, 271
  Arianism abjured, 275
  Arians, 154, 156, 255
  Burgundians and, 263
  Burgundians fused with, 267
  Clovis defeats, 258
  Decline of kingdom of, 283 ff.
  Divorce, 396
  In the East, 69

Visigoths (*continued*)
Euric king of, 256 f.
In Gaul, 145, 156
In Italy, 256
Join with the Romans, 268
Kings of, massacred, 271
Laws of, 277
Recared king of, 91, 271
Rufinus and, 256
In Spain, 145, 267 f., 271
Stilicho and, 256
Vouillé (battle), 258
Vistula (river): Ancient Germany, 146
Slavs between the Don and the, 147
Slavs between the Elbe and the, 145
Vitalian, St. (pope), Constans visits Rome, 129
Vitiges (Ostrogoth king), Massacre of hostages, 55
Vivarium: Cassiodorus, monk at, 60
Estate of Cassiodorus, 243
Monastery at, 243
Viventiolus, St. (bishop of Lyons), 264
Vladimir (Bulgarian king), 291, 293
Vladimir, St. (Russian ruler), 306 f.
Vouillé (battle), 258
Vow of stability, in Benedictine Rule, 51
Vulfrad (abbot of St. Martin of Tours), 357

Waast, St. *See* Vedast
Wackenroder, Rise of Romanticism, 4
Wala, St. (abbot of Corvey): at Corbie Abbey, 469
Corvey Abbey, 234
Election of Eugenius II, 424
Exiled, 417
Walafrid Strabo (abbot), Iconoclasm, 404
Waldrada, Lothaire's divorce, 448
Wales: Britons in, 182 f.
Date of Easter, 198
St. Augustine and Church of, 189
Wandregisil, St. *See* Wandrille
Warin (abbot of Corvey), 469
Wearmouth Abbey, Venerable Bede at, 200
Wenceslaus, St. (duke of Bohemia), 309
Werden Abbey (Germany), St. Ludger founds, 233
Wergeld: among ancient Germans, 150
In Frankish law, 368
Penances and, 395
Weser (river): Charles Martel, 211
Corvey Abbey, 234
Wessex: Kingdom of, 182 note
St. Birinus and conversion of, 197
West Anglia, Kingdom of, 182 note
Westphalia (Germany), Charlemagne in, 228
Wiching (bishop of Passau): Forged letter of John VIII, 303
St. Methodius and, 303
Wido Rabies (i. e., Guy of Spoleto), 496
Widukind (Saxon chief), 229 f.
Adrian I and baptism of, 232
Battle of Suntal, 230
Charlemagne and, 232
In Denmark, 229
Incites Saxons, 229
Legends of, 232 note
Native of Westphalia, 229
In Normandy, 229
Revolt of, 230
And Sigifridus, 229
Wilfrid, St. (archbishop of York): Conversion of Frisia, 206
Conversion of Sussex, 197
Date of Easter, 198
In Denmark, 237
Willehad, St. (bishop of Bremen), 223
Conversion of Saxons, 230
At Rome, 230
William (bishop of Turin), Sergius III and, 505
William (duke of Aquitaine), founds monastery of Gellone, 382 f.
William the Pious (duke of Aquitaine): Donation of Cluny, 505
St. Odo and, 509
Willibald, St. (bishop of Eichstätt), Life of St. Boniface, 208
Willibrord, St. (bishop of Utrecht), 206
Conversion of Denmark, 237
In Frisia, 208
Returns to England, 206
St. Boniface and, 208
Winchester (England), Daniel bishop, 206
Winfrid, Saxon name of St. Boniface, 204
Winigis (duke of Spoleto), Leo III, 420
Witiza (Visigoth king), Moslem invasion of Spain, 284
Witraed, Laws of, 202
Wladimir. *See* Vladimir

Wodan, German deity, 148
Wolfgang, St. (bishop of Ratisbon), Conversion of Hungary, 313
Worcester (England), St. Wulfstan bishop, 192
Works of mercy, Sins remitted by, 261
World, End of the, 94
Worms (Germany), Charlemagne at, 227
Wratislaw (duke of Moravia), 295
  Deposed, 300
  Emperor Michael III and, 295 f.
  Louis the German and, 299
Würzburg (Germany), St. Burchard bishop, 212
Wulfrad, False Decretals, 520
Wulfstan, St. (bishop of Worcester), Slavery abolished, 192

Xativa. *See* Jativa
Xenodochium, 385 note
Xeres. *See* Jerez

Yatreb (i. e., Medina), 344
York (England) : Alcuin born at, 390
  St. Ludger studies at, 233
  St. Paulinus bishop, 196
  St. Wilfrid archbishop, 197 f., 206, 237
  Tadioc archbishop, 183
Ysambert (theologian), Adoptionism, 407 note

Zachary, St. (pope), 140
  Divorce, 396 note
  Liutprand and, 326
  Monte Cassino Abbey, 252
  Political independence of, 326
  Ratchis and, 326
  St. Boniface and, 214 f., 217, 219
  St. Virgilius and, 218
Zachary (bishop of Anagni), papal legate, 457
Zachary (exarch), attempts to seize the pope, 137
Zeno (emperor) : Acacius and, 24
  Church and state, 29
  Felix III and, 29
  Henoticon, 24
  Huneric, Vandal king, 30
  Odoacer and, 14
  Peter Mongus supported by, 24
  Theodoric at court of, 241

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME FOUR

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME FOUR

PERIOD OF THE LATER MIDDLE AGES

MONASTERY OF SAINT DO[illegible]
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH 10th STREET
NEWARK 3, NEW JERSEY

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

AND

33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.

1947

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in U.S.A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 22. Nov., 1940

F. J. Holweck

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 23. Nov., 1940

✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*

Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1941

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Second Impression

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

PART I

THE IMPERIAL PROTECTORATE

CHAPTER

I. FIRST YEARS OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE (962–99) . . 10
Otto King of Germany 11
Coronation of Otto I 13
Lay Investiture 16
Cluny Abbey 18
Otto's Ambition 20
Policy of Pope John XII 22
Pope Benedict V 26
Pope John XIII 28
Pope Benedict VI 31
Emperor Otto II 33
Pope Benedict VII 36
Pope John XIV 40
Pope John XV 43
The Truce of God 44
The Capetian Dynasty 46
Otto III 49
Pope Gregory V 51

II. POPE SYLVESTER II (999–1003) 56
The Antecedents of Sylvester II 56
Noble Projects 58
Arnulf and the See of Reims 62
Restoration of the Roman Empire 64
Poland and Hungary 65
The Holy Land 67
Italian Difficulties 68
Conditions in Germany 70

CHAPTER PAGE

Scholarship of Sylvester II 72
Romanesque Architecture 79
Music 82
Cluny Abbey 85

III. Domination by the Italian Factions (1003–49) . . 89
The Holy Land 91
Political Situation in Germany 94
St. Henry II 95
The Charta of 1014 99
The Truce of God 101
St. Henry II and the Church 104
King Robert the Pious 107
Pope John XIX 109
Emperor Conrad II 112
Manichaean Heresy 114
Camaldolese Order 115
Chivalry 117
Church Music 119
The House of Tusculum 120
Pope Benedict IX 121
Pope Gregory VI 124
Hildebrand 127
Emperor Henry III 130

PART II

THE LIBERATION OF THE CHURCH

IV. From St. Leo IX to St. Gregory VII (1048–73) . . . 140
Pope St. Leo IX 140
Councils 143
Reform Movement 146
Berengarius 148
Eastern Schism 152
International Affairs 158
Normans in Italy 162
Pope Victor II 164
Pope Stephen IX 168
Antipope Benedict X 174

CHAPTER PAGE

Pope Nicholas II 175
Pope Alexander II 181

V. The Pontificate of St. Gregory VII 186
The Election 186
Simony 189
Clerical Reform 192
Cluny Abbey 197
St. Hugh of Cluny 200
New Religious Congregations 201
Carthusian Order 203
Lay Investiture 205
Excommunication of Henry IV 215
Gregory VII at Canossa 219
Rudolf of Swabia 224
Henry IV in Italy 227
International Affairs 229
Crusade Projects 232
Death of Gregory VII 234

VI. From the Death of St. Gregory VII to the Death of Urban II (1085–99) 237
Pope Victor III 237
Election of Pope Urban II 242
Antipope Guibert 244
Law of Excommunication 245
Third Orders 247
The Schismatics 248
Countess Matilda 249
Emperor Henry IV 250
King Philip's Divorce 255
King William Rufus of England 260
St. Anselm 261
Moors in Spain 266
Sicily 269
The First Crusade 271
Council of Piacenza 274
The Turks 277
Council of Clermont 280
"God Wills It" 282

CHAPTER PAGE

Peter the Hermit 285
Crusade of the Common People 286
Peter the Hermit's Contingent 288
The Crusade of the Barons 292
Godfrey of Bouillon 293
First and Second Armies 294
Third and Fourth Armies 295
Crusaders' Victories 298
The Taking of Jerusalem 300
Intellectual Movement 302
St. Anselm 304
Canon Law 308
St. Ivo of Chartres 310
Monastic Foundations 314

VII. Paschal II to Callistus II (1099–1124) 316
Emperor Henry IV 318
Lateran Synod (1102) 319
Revolt of Henry V 321
Henry V's Hostility to the Pope 323
Henry V at Rome 325
Treaty of Sutri 326
Imprisonment of Pope Paschal II 327
Henry V's Peaceful Advances 329
Pope Gelasius II 331
Council of Reims (1119) 331
Concordat of Worms 333
Investiture Quarrel in France 335
The Investiture Quarrel in England 336
Concordat of London (1107) 338
The Christian States of Palestine 339
Dangers to the New States 342
The Military Orders 343
Clerical Life 346
William of Champeaux 348
Canons Regular of St. Victor 349
St. Norbert 351
The Premonstratensians 352
The Order of Cluny 354
Peter the Venerable 356

CHAPTER PAGE

The Order of Citeaux 360
St. Bernard 361
Intellectual Movement 366
Roscelin 367
Peter Abelard 369
Theology 371
Tanchelm 372
Peter of Bruys 373
Communal Movement 375
The Confraternities 376
The Christian Life 380
The Hierarchy 382

PART III

THE ORGANIZATION OF CHRISTENDOM

VIII. From Honorius II to Frederick Barbarossa (1124–52) 391

Pope Honorius II 392
Emperor Lothair 394
The Church in England 395
The Church in France 396
Sicily 398
Papal Elections 399
Pope Innocent II 400
Council of Etampes 401
The Antipope Anacletus II 402
Gerard of Angoulême 405
Pope Innocent II at Pisa 407
Council of Pisa 408
Guelphs and Ghibellines 410
Lateran Council (1139) 411
Sicily 412
Italian Cities 413
Arnold of Brescia 415
Pope Celestine II 417
Pope Lucius II 418
Pope Eugene III 420
Revolutionary Disturbances 421

CHAPTER PAGE

The Crusades 423
St. Bernard 426
Difficulties of the Crusade 427
Defeat of the Crusaders 428
Religious Reform 429
Abelard 430
Heresies 434
Hugh of St. Victor 437
Peter Lombard 441
St. Bernard 443
St. Hildegard 447
Gratian 448
Monasticism 450
The Clergy 450
St. Malachy 451
Suger 452
Death of Pope Eugene III 454

IX. From Frederick Barbarossa to Innocent III (1152–98) 456
Frederick Barbarossa 456
Pope Anastasius IV 458
Pope Adrian IV 458
Barbarossa in Italy 460
Chancellor Rainaldi 462
The Legists 464
The Code of Roncaglia 466
Pope Adrian's Protests 468
Pope Alexander III 469
Pseudo-council of Pavia (1160) 472
The Italian Cities 473
Antipope Victor IV 475
Diet of Würzburg (1165) 476
League of Verona 477
The Lombard League 478
Treaty of Venice 480
The Church of England 480
St. Thomas à Becket 482
King Henry II of England 484
Death of St. Thomas à Becket 487
The King's Penance 489

CHAPTER PAGE

Third Lateran Council 490
Heresies 491
Repression of Heresies 493
Richard of St. Victor 495
Adam of St. Victor 497
Pope Lucius III 499
Pope Urban III 503
Pope Gregory VIII 504
Pope Clement III 505
The Third Crusade 505
Pope Celestine III 510

X. The Pontificate of Innocent III (1198–1216) . . . 516
Order and Peace in Rome 517
German Domination in Italy 520
Repression of Heresy 523
The Albigenses 526
The Crusade against the Albigenses 530
Simon de Montfort 532
The Fourth Crusade 536
State of Christendom 545
The Papacy and the Empire 547
The Holy See and Spain 550
The Holy See and England 553
The Holy See and France 556
The Holy See and Hungary 560
The Holy See and the Slavs 562
Innocent III and Christian Civilization 563
St. Francis of Assisi 564
The Friars Preachers 569
The Trinitarians 572
Fourth Lateran Council 572

XI. From Innocent III to Alexander IV (1216–54) . . . 578
Pope Honorius III 579
Pope Gregory IX 583
The Crusade in Spain 586
France and the Crusades 587
Emperor Frederick II 590
Intellectual Activities 593

CHAPTER PAGE

The Inquisition 597
Dominicans and Franciscans 599
Pope Innocent IV 600
First General Council of Lyons 603
Emperor Frederick II 604
St. Louis and the Crusade 606

XII. From Alexander IV to Boniface VIII (1254–94) . . 611
Pope Alexander IV 612
Pope Urban IV 613
Pope Clement IV 614
Pope Gregory X 618
Second General Council of Lyons 619
Popes Innocent V, Adrian V, and John XXI 621
Popes Nicholas III and Martin IV 622
Popes Honorius IV and Nicholas IV 624
Pope Celestine V 625
Religious Orders 626
The Universities 629
The Mendicant Orders 631
St. Thomas Aquinas 632
St. Bonaventure 634
The Study of Law 636
The University of Oxford 642
Secondary and Primary Education 645
Preaching 646
The Liturgy 648
Religious Architecture 650
Literature 654
Chivalry 655
The Guilds 658
Piety 664
The Christian Century 666

Bibliography 668

Index 681

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume IV

I. The Imperial Protectorate

II. The Liberation of the Church

III. The Organization of Christendom

Introduction

NEVER did Christianity see a closer approach to the full development of its constitution[1] than during the political and social regime founded and organized by the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. True, at times the conflict between good and evil appeared very embittered. Powerful interests clashed violently. Unprecedented crimes are found side by side with the loftiest virtues. But, as Schlegel remarks,

> the most careful consideration and profound investigation of the history of those ages invariably discovers that all that was then great and good in the state, as well as in the Church, proceeded from Christianity and from the wonderful efficacy of religious principles. Whatever was imperfect, defective, and hurtful . . . was in the character of men, we might almost say in the character of the age itself.[2]

Among the persons laboring in that epoch for what was good and right, we find three classes of men: popes, monks, and knights. In the ranks of the popes, stand out the noble figures of Sylvester II, St. Gregory VII, and Innocent III. St. Bruno, St. Bernard, St. Dominic, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Bonaventure are the most illustrious monks of the period. St. Henry in Germany, St. Ferdinand in Spain, and St. Louis in France are the accomplished types of knights.

The concurring influence of the monarchical institution and of knighthood was always subordinate to the supreme authority of the papacy. In the thirteenth century the pope's spiritual and temporal power reached the highest point it ever attained.

[1] Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise*, p. 251.

[2] *Philosophy of History* (1848 ed.), p. 364.

This influence had a twofold aim: to free the Church from all powers of evil, particularly from every oppression by earthly powers, and more and more to make the things of earth subject to the things of heaven by bringing about everywhere the triumph of the law of Christ over societies as well as over individuals.

Which of these two aims was the one more directly and immediately sought? Some historians, viewing the whole effort of the Church in the Middle Ages, have regarded that effort merely as a gigantic struggle for the liberation of Christian souls and have referred the entire inspiration of the popes to that motto of John of Salisbury, "Religion and liberty," [3] or to Peter de Blois' saying, "To defend the freedom of the Church is the first duty and the greatest honor of its pastors." [4] The conquest of preponderance by the spiritual power over the temporal power was, according to this view, simply a means for attaining this first aim. Other writers have declared that, from the outset, the Church was influenced by the analogy of the relations between the soul and the body and sought the preponderance of the spiritual power over the temporal as the normal state of a perfectly constituted society. An impartial study of the facts and of the papal declarations seems to show that both aims, regarded as interdependent, were pursued simultaneously.

However that may be, in the task valiantly projected by Sylvester II, heroically undertaken by St. Gregory VII, and gloriously crowned by Innocent III, we are obliged to recognize a vast work of reform and liberation. This fact is acknowledged by writers who are utterly unconcerned with doctrinal beliefs. In the words of Auguste Comte, "the highest point in the Middle Ages was the epoch when the world was best organized." [5]

[3] John of Salisbury, *Ep.* 193; *PL,* CXCIX, 207.

[4] Peter de Blois, *Ep.* 10; *PL,* CCVII, 27.

[5] Auguste Comte, cited by E. Faguet, *Politicians and Moralists of the Nineteenth Century.*

According to Uhlhorn, it was "a time that can be compared with no other from the viewpoint of the organization and fervor of Christian charity, both public and private." [6]

A Catholic cannot help being proud to note the coincidence of that moral triumph with the deepest influence that the papal power ever exercised upon society.

A learned historian, surveying events from this viewpoint, has attempted to show, in the history of the medieval Church, the most living apologetic of Catholicism. Says Léon Gautier:

> The Catholic Church could bring about a triumph of its ideas only at the time of its domination. But when was this time of the dominance of the Church? All are agreed that it was the Middle Ages. Therefore it was in the Middle Ages the Church saw the triumph of its ideas. But either you are a Christian or you are not. If you are a Christian, you will look upon the Middle Ages as the epoch that established on earth the reign of the True and of the Good. If you are not a Christian, you ought to detest this period, because the ideas of the Church, which were then triumphant, are for you false and antinatural. Hence the question of the Middle Ages is really the question of the truth of Christianity.[7]

The history of medieval Christianity may conveniently be divided into three main phases.

Deeply disturbed, even at the center of its work, by the Italian factions, the papacy first sought support in the imperial protection. King Otto of Germany, appealed to by Pope John XII, who revived the Western Empire for him, laid the foundation for an agreement which gave the Church, from 962 to 1049, a century of comparative security. The highest point of this period was marked by the glorious pontificate of Sylvester II. But the emperors' unjust interference in ecclesiastical government stirred up the conflict of the priesthood and the empire.

From 1094 to 1124 a series of popes, among them the il-

[6] Uhlhorn, cited by Marx, *Kirchengeschichte,* IV, 5, § 93.

[7] Léon Gautier, *Etudes et tableaux historiques,* p. 103.

lustrious St. Gregory VII, vigorously fought for the liberation of the Church. This was the second period.

During the third period (1124–1294) the organization of Christendom and at length its liberation from the imperial yoke formed the chief concern of the popes. Of these pontiffs the most renowned was Innocent III.

PART I

The Imperial Protectorate

Introductory Remarks

THE period forming the subject of this first part was, in certain of its aspects, one of the most humiliating in the history of the Church. It opened with the pontificate of a pope who came into power through the ambition of his family; and it closed with the reign of two pontiffs imposed on the Church by the will of an emperor. With almost unbroken constancy, the abusive interference of the civil powers shackled the freedom of the Church. Simony and moral corruption were the results of this regime. The house of Theophylactus and of Marozia tried to exploit the Holy See as they would a family fief and gave the Church the two popes whose personal misconduct has been the shame of Christendom: John XII and Benedict IX.

But God did not abandon His Church. Under the influence of a great monk, St. Odilo, the Order of Cluny spread the influence of its edification to the numerous monasteries connected with it. St. Romuald founded the austere Camaldolese Order. Between 999 and 1003 a great pope, Sylvester II, laid the foundation of the mightest institutions of the Middle Ages. From 1002 to 1045 a saint, Henry II, held the scepter of the Empire. With the election of the last pope of this period, in 1045, we see enter upon the scene, along with St. Peter Damian, the most ardent of the apostles of reform, the one whom God predestined to bring about reform in the see of St. Peter, the monk Hildebrand.

CHAPTER I

First Years of the Holy Roman Empire (962-99)

FOR anyone who placed his whole trust in the combinations of a political organization, the supremacy of the papacy was assured in the middle of the tenth century. John XII was not merely pope; as heir of Alberic, he was the head of the most prominent family of the Roman aristocracy, and also a sort of temporal prince in the Eternal City. His father, with the tacit approval of the people, had acted as a potentate in Rome. He bestowed on himself the titles of *Princeps* and *Senator omnium Romanorum*. His name appeared on the coins along with that of the supreme pontiff, replacing the name of the Byzantine emperor.[8] John XII, by the mere fact that he obtained the supreme ecclesiastical power at the very time when he became the head of the most powerful Roman family, seemed to extinguish that antagonism which had caused so many disturbances. Furthermore, the new Pope was not lacking in intelligence and political sense, and seemed resolved to yield to no one the rank that fell to him.

These very qualities of intelligence and political sense showed John XII the peril of the situation. The condition of affairs was lamentable. Perhaps never was anyone in a better position to observe the influence of morality upon the political and social order. While the papacy, without esteem because of the vices of the reigning pontiff and of his court, was daily losing its prestige, the people, more and more dominated by concern with material interests and worldly pleasures, developed a growing taste for factions and disquieted the government by perpetual threat of revolt or conspiracy.

[8] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical* (2d ed., 1904), p. 331.

John XII understood that by himself he could not cope with such a menace. The papacy needed a powerful protector as in the time of Pepin and Charlemagne. But where was this protector to be found? In a somewhat different situation, but one no less dangerous, John XI had sought it in the East. The Byzantine Empire was then being governed by Romanus Lecapenus. On February 2, 933, four papal legates, two of them bishops, had solicited the friendship of the imperial upstart of Constantinople, by offering him marriage alliances with the family of Marozia. But the attempt failed.[9] Moreover, the emperor of Constantinople was too far away to be an effective protector; the religious separation between the East and the West was becoming more and more acute; the papacy could scarcely hope to find in that direction the moral support it needed. Public opinion turned rather toward the restoration of Charlemagne's Empire. Amid civil wars and invasions, the thoughts of all instinctively turned to the memory of the great Emperor. Magnificent legends formed around his name and revived his memory.[10] Was he not there, with his big sword, to defend the cause of the Church and of justice?

Otto King of Germany

At that very hour King Otto of Germany aspired to nothing less than to take up the role of Charlemagne. He was then in the prime of life.[11] Such an ambition seemed justified by his brilliant qualities of mind and body, the extent of his knowledge, his intrepid courage, and the majesty of his bearing.

[9] Our information of this affair comes from a document discovered by Cardinal Pitra and published in his *Analecta novissima*, I, 469.

[10] On these legends, see Gaston Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, 1865; Léon Gautier, *Les epopées françaises*, Vol. III (2d ed., 1880). About 968 the monk of Monte Soracte gave an account of a journey by Charlemagne to Palestine (*Monumenta Germaniae, Scriptores*, III, 708).

[11] Otto was born November 22, 912.

He had already bestowed exceptional glory upon the Saxon throne. He had put down the revolts of the German nobles. With equal success he had fought against the Danes, the Hungarians, the Northern Slavs, and the Lombard forces of Berengarius. After the latter's defeat, Otto had himself crowned king of Italy.[12] By his mother St. Matilda, by his wife St. Adelaide, and by his brother St. Bruno, holiness was added to his greatness as a kind of halo.

A story is told that on the Merseburg battlefield, where Otto broke the power of the Hungarians, the German army suddenly turned to its victorious king, exclaiming with one voice: *Imperator Augustus, pater patriae.*[13] Pope John XII offered to ratify this popular acclaim by his supreme religious authority, if Otto would agree to place his sword at the service of God's Church. Otto at once accepted the Pontiff's offer. His decision was prompted by his sincere desire to serve the Church and also by motives of political interest.

The most serious difficulties the German King had to deal with in the government of his realm sprang from the resistance of the feudal nobles. The establishment of the feudal hierarchy in Germany in the tenth century had been a forward step from the anarchy of the time. But it created almost insurmountable obstacles to the regular functioning of the monarchical power. The upper nobility, including the dukes and the three Rhenish archbishops, did not grant to the king the power of taking a hand in their jurisdiction, of hindering them from making war, or of forming alliances. Often they conspired to obtain the crown and sometimes openly opposed the one who wore it. When Otto undertook the Italian campaign which resulted in Berengarius' defeat, the higher feudal lords not only refused to join the expedition, but attempted to oppose it. Nothing but terrible penalties overcame their ill

[12] We have medals of this period, on which Otto takes the title of king of Italy.
[13] Witikind, *Annales,* in Pertz.

will. The nobility of second rank, including the counts, the margraves or marquises, and the landgraves, carried on the same sort of strife against the crown.[14] Below these two classes, the barons and simple knights, under obligation to serve their suzerains in certain circumstances, also endeavored to withhold their assistance unless they could foresee some material advantage for themselves.

Otto, by becoming emperor, would exercise a greater sway over that powerful feudalism. Coronation at the hands of the Roman pontiff would give him the right to speak and command in the name of a higher authority than that which came to him as suzerain of feudal domains. He would be speaking as protector of the faith, as commissioned by the Church with a temporal mission. An inevitable result of the new regime would undoubtedly be to give the clergy, in the public administration and at court, a greater importance than they previously enjoyed. And the clever statesman saw that this very consequence would give him the advantage of counterbalancing the influence of the military nobility by that of the ecclesiastical nobility.

Coronation of Otto I

Otto's coronation by Pope John XII took place on February 2, 962, the Feast of the Purification. Queen Adelaide was crowned at the same time as her husband. We should like to know the details of the ceremony which made the first emperor of Germany. Contemporary annalists, in their very brief accounts, mention the Pope's initiative and the people's acclaim.[15] Apparently the latter was regarded as essential for

[14] James Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* chap. 8 (1932 ed., pp. 122 ff.).

[15] The continuator of Réginon: *Acclamatione totius romani populi imperator vocatur et ordinatur* (*PL,* CXXXII, 137). Ditmar (Thietmar) says: *Benedictionem a domno apostolico Joanne cujus rogatione huc venit, cum sua conjuge promeruit imperialem* (*PL,* CXXXIX, 1207). Hermannus Contractus says: *A papa*

the election, and the former as inherent to the coronation ceremony.[16]

We have more information about the reciprocal agreements entered into by the Pope and the Emperor. They were inscribed in a celebrated document, the *Privilegium Ottonis,* dated February 13, 962. Its authenticity is undisputed.[17] The Emperor promised

to procure the exaltation of the pope and of the Roman Church, never to inflict harm upon the person and office of the pope, never to hold at Rome any *placitum* without first consulting the pope, to return to the pope whatever he held from the Patrimony of St. Peter, and lastly to require from the governor to whom he had confided the Kingdom of Italy an oath to protect the pope and the possessions of St. Peter.

In reply to this oath, the Pope and the Romans swore on the body of St. Peter, that they would never give aid to the enemies of the emperor; and they all agreed that in the future the canonically elected pope could not be consecrated until, in the presence of the emperor or his *missi,* he made promises indicating his good intentions.[18]

---

imperator ordinatur, non solum romano sed et paene totius Europae populo acclamante (*PL,* CXLIII, 219).

[16] The ceremonies of the imperial consecration were not clearly fixed until the twelfth century.

[17] Von Sickel (*Das Privilegium Ottos I für die römische Kirche*) has established that the Vatican Archives have a contemporary copy of this document. The text of the *Privilegium Ottonis* may be found in the *Monumenta Germaniae, LL,* 2, 29, 159–66; § IV, 1, 20 f.; DD Reg. et imp., 1, 324. It was put in the *Corpus juris canonici,* dist. LXIII, c. 33. Jaffé gives it in his *Monumenta gregoriana* (1865), p. 13, placing it after three spurious formulas. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 792–97.

[18] If we closely study this formula in its context and if we compare it with the earlier acts regulating the relations of the papacy with the imperial authority, we are led to conclude with Duchesne (*op. cit.,* pp. 344 f.), that "as regards the papal election, they simply and purely put into effect the law of the ninth century" and that consequently "in its general tenor the Privilegium Ottonis does not indicate any advance of the imperial authority at Rome, whether regarding the elections or anything else." Evidently Bayet (Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* I, 540) is exaggerating when he says that "by the *Privilegium Ottonis*

When these solemn promises had been exchanged and when the official record of them, written in letters of gold on purple parchment with a golden seal affixed, had been deposited in the papal archives, the people might well have thought that a glorious era was opening for the Church. "More, too, than the royal name could have done, did the imperial name invite the sympathy of the commons. For in all, however ignorant of its history, however unable to comprehend its functions, there yet lived a feeling that it was in some mysterious way consecrated to Christian brotherhood and equality, to peace and law, to the restraint of the strong and the defense of the helpless." [19] Such is the impression that transpires from the accounts of contemporary annalists. One hundred sixty years earlier, in the porch of the Lateran Palace, Pope Leo III had constructed a mosaic depicting Christ, having at His right Pope Sylvester and at His left Emperor Constantine, handing to one the keys of heaven and to the other a banner surmounted by a cross. Around the picture was inscribed the legend: *Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis.* Was not this the cry that would henceforth rise from every breast?

These bright expectations were shared by those at the papal court. Otto, perhaps because he was less loyal, was less confident. We are told that, as he was being crowned, he said to one of his close followers, Ansfried of Louvain: "Today when I kneel at the tomb of St. Peter, do you be sure to hold your raised sword above my head, because I know all that my predecessors have had to suffer from the Romans. A wise man avoids evils by foresight. You will have time to pray as much

---

the papacy became a vassal of the Empire." The truth is that, in principle, the papal elections escaped from the influence of the Italian factions. This was the immediate end that was sought for. Was this end actually attained, and did not the remedy have its own dangers? These are two different questions; subsequent events supply the answer.

[19] Bryce, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

as you like when we are at Monte Mario in the midst of our army."

We do not know with certainty what were John XII's personal impressions. He was an out-and-out statesman and may have thought he was applying a sufficient remedy to political ills by the diplomatic arrangement which had its beginning at the tomb of the Apostles. Very likely the son of Alberic was not able to grasp the extent and depth of the moral plagues afflicting the Church. But Providence held in reserve, to heal them, other remedies besides this restoration of the Empire.

Lay Investiture

The unfortunate Pontiff who had been raised to the summit of ecclesiastical honors by the intrigues of an ambitious family and who brought with him, along with the scandal of the most despicable traffic, the scandal of notorious misconduct, embodied in his own person the three evils from which the Church was then suffering almost everywhere: lay investiture, simony, and incontinency.

In the language of the Middle Ages the term "investiture" was given to the juridical act by which the owner or proprietor of a church confided it, by title of benefice, to the ecclesiastic who was to serve it. The historical evolution by which lay lords and princes acquired the disposal of this right, goes back to the Carolingian period. Let us recall that, at this time, most of the rural churches were private property. Upon a large estate arose a church that was an accessory of the domain, quite like a mill, a bakery, or a brewery. In these circumstances naturally the owner, builder, and benefactor of this country church had a say in designating the priest who would serve the church and who would live on his land.[20] Often his

[20] On the question of these origins, see Fournier, "Yves de Chartres et le droit canonique" in the *Rev. des quest. his.*, XIX (1898), 51–98, 384–405. Cf. *Nouv.*

wish was supreme and decisive. Gradually this assumed prerogative extended even to cathedral churches; and nobles and kings seemed to consider themselves the owners of dioceses.

According to the practices of German law, this investiture took place by means of a symbol. In the case of bishoprics, the symbol employed was the crosier and the ring. Rather generally, when a bishopric was vacant, this is how the affair was conducted. Directly or indirectly the king or the nobleman selected the new bishop, at times prompted by considerations quite alien to those that were for the greater good of the Church and of souls; then he invested the appointee by conveying to him the crosier and the ring. Thenceforth, so far as the temporalities were concerned, the new incumbent was ruler of his diocese; all he lacked was the consecration that would enable him to perform the spiritual functions of the episcopal office. To obtain this consecration he turned to the metropolitan and the bishops of the province. Generally they were unable or unwilling to risk a serious conflict by refusing approval. Thus the consecration took place as an accessory ceremony. In reality such a regime was organized to spread everywhere the impression that the prince "made the bishop" and communicated his spiritual and temporal powers to him.[21]

This practice inevitably led to simony. The right of ownership which the princes and nobles arrogated to themselves over rural parishes and then over the most renowned bishoprics led them to exploit their pretended domain, either by selling the appointment or by reserving for themselves part of the income which the Church procured.

---

hist. du droit français et étranger, XXI (1897), 486–506; Leclercq, art. "Chapelle" in the *Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de liturgie;* Paul Thoman, *Le droit de propriété des laiques sur les églises et le patronage laique au moyen age.*

[21] Fournier, *op. cit.* We should note that the crosier, a shepherd's staff, and the ring, a sign of fidelity due to the Church, appeared to be the symbols of the bishop's spiritual power.

We can easily surmise what was the virtue of the titular of a church who had purchased his benefice and who became the liege man of a lay patron. Incontinency was the fatal consequence of lay investiture and of simony. In the case of many persons, well-grounded Christian habits and a deeply rooted faith were an effective preservative. But throughout Christendom the threefold plague made regrettable ravages.

In some respects the re-establishment of the Empire aggravated the evil. One of the good results of the agreement of 962 was to withdraw papal elections from interference by the Italian nobles and from the consequent abuses. On the other hand, Otto, by endowing the bishops of his Empire and introducing them into the feudal hierarchy, rendered them more dependent upon his authority. Henceforth the union in one person of the two offices of temporal lord and pastor of souls made the situation more inextricable.

Cluny Abbey

No solution could be obtained except by the intervention of a mighty moral force. This moral force was found in the monastic life, particularly in the Cluny monastery.

In September, 909, the aged Duke William of Aquitaine resolved to found, on the Mâconnais estates in his Cluny domain, the monastery that was to make that name so famous in history. He stipulated "that the monks there will have the right and freedom of electing an abbot, according to God's good pleasure and the Rule of St. Benedict, without any power thwarting or hindering that religious election." His declaration contains the following lines: "From this day the monks gathered at Cluny will not be subject to the fasces of the royal greatness or to the yoke of any earthly power. By God, in God and all His saints, and under the threat of the last

judgment, I beg and implore that neither secular prince nor count nor bishop . . . will presume to place over them a head against their will." [22]

Thereafter the transmission and collation of offices in the Cluny Order never was involved in any traffic. Simony was not introduced in any form whatever. Purity of morals was there maintained without stain; [23] and loyalty to the papacy was manifested constantly. Twice, in the pontificates of Leo VII and Stephen VIII, the holy Abbot Odo of Cluny, summoned to Rome to act as arbiter between the rival factions, succeeded in bringing about a spirit of conciliation and peace. In several bulls the two pontiffs expressed their gratefulness to the young congregation and its abbot.[24]

Pope John XII and Emperor Otto were not unaware of the treasures of holiness and of fruitful apostolate contained in the monastic institution. But John XII, at times when grace urged him to reform his life, was satisfied with humbly recommending himself to the prayers of the monasteries.[25] And Otto thought he was doing everything for them when he heaped temporal honors and favors upon them. Neither the Emperor nor the Pope seemed to grasp that the genuine reform of the Church would come from these blessed asylums of God where the Christian life was conserved in its pristine purity.

[22] The foundation charter of Cluny has been published in several collections, notably in the *Bibliotheca cluniacensis* and in the *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny,* published by A. Bruel in 1876, I, 124 f.

[23] Udalricus Cluniacensis Monachus, *Consuetudines cluniacenses* (*PL,* CXLIX, 731 f.).

[24] Jaffé, *Regesta,* I, 3598–3600, 3603, 3605; *PL,* CXXXII, 1068, 1074, 1082 (this last text should be corrected according to the indications of Jaffé, no. 3600); CXXXIII, 64, 93.

[25] On May 10, 958, John XII asked the monks of Subiaco to offer masses for the salvation of his soul and to recite daily for the same intention the invocations *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison,* one hundred times (Jaffé, I, 3684).

Otto's Ambition

Otto was wholly devoted to his ambitious projects. He contemplated the resumption and extension of Charlemagne's work. John XII, by placing the imperial crown on the King of Germany, had no end in view except to protect the Holy See from the Italian factions. The title of emperor he regarded simply as a supreme honor, like those titles which the last Carolingians and the dukes of Spoleto had boasted of. But from the very beginning Otto intended to exercise all the prerogatives of his new office and he understood that office as giving him title to the dominance of the world and to suzerainty over the Holy See. The pursuit of these two aims filled his whole reign. "He was already a German king; and the new dignity by no means superseded the old. The union in one person of two characters, a union at first personal, then official, which became at last a fusion of the two characters into something different from what either had been, is the key to the whole subsequent history of Germany and the Empire." [26]

Following his coronation, the titles that he assumed seemed to indicate his desire to make the king disappear behind the emperor. Formerly he had called himself *Rex Francorum orientalium* or *Rex Francorum* or simply *Rex;* now he employed no title but *Imperator Augustus.* But, if we examine his policy closely, we see that in his mind the Empire was merely the extension of Germany. None ever labored more steadily than did this first Emperor to effect the unity of the Kingdom of Germany. "It was Otto who made the Germans, hitherto an aggregate of tribes, a single people and, welding them into a strong political body, taught them to rise through

[26] Bryce, *op. cit.,* p. 121.

its collective greatness to the consciousness of national life, never thereafter to be extinguished." [27]

But, in Otto's mind, the nation of the Germans or of the "Eastern Franks," [28] was to be merely the center of a vaster circle that would form the domain of the Empire. His ambition extended particularly over Italy, Hungary, the Scandinavian states, France, and even the Orient. His plan failed in part. We have already seen that he obtained important successes in Italy, Hungary, and the countries of the North. But his attempt in France was abortive. The most he obtained was the occupation of Lotharingia (Lorraine), without being able to assimilate it.[29] The Western Franks would soon, with Hugh Capet, inaugurate modern France, where the claims of the Holy Empire would no longer be admitted,

Otto's scheme was to continue the work of Charlemagne. He wished to secure permament relations with the East. In 968 he sent Liutprand, bishop of Cremona, to ask from Emperor Nicephorus Phocas the hand of Theophano, the daughter of Romanus II, for his son Otto II. Liutprand relates the picturesque discomfitures of his embassy: the haughty reception by Nicephorus Phocas, his railing comments of German gluttony, and his contemptuous answer: "If your master wishes to obtain the great favor that you request, let him be-

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 130. When historians speak of the Middle Ages in general, they usually confuse the two ideas of Germanic royalty and of empire. The absorption of the second title in the first or vice versa has always existed in the tendency of the German sovereigns. But this tendency has always met with opposition. Mario Krammer, *Der Reichsgedanke des staufischen Kaiserhauses* (1908), and A. Leroux, in the *Bibl. de l'Ec. des Chartes*, LXX (1909), 370–4.

[28] Liutprand calls the eastern Franks *Franci teutonici*, to distinguish them from the Romanized Franks of Gaul, western Franks, *Francigenae* or *Franci latini*.

[29] Parisot, the latest and most learned historian of Lorraine, has established beyond question the fact that Lorraine remained distinct from Germany by its more advanced civilization, its customs and aspirations, its individualist spirit, its use of French speech, and its traditional feelings. On this question see J. Flach, "La première réunion à l'Allemagne de la Lorraine et de l'Alsace était-elle fondée en droit public" in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, October 1, 1914, pp. 281–94.

gin by giving us what belongs to us—Rome, Ravenna, and all dependent thereon." [30] However, three years later, Nicephorus Phocas was assassinated, and his murderer, John Zemisses, succeeded him. The new Emperor offered no objections to confiding the young and scholarly Theophano to another embassy from Otto. She was crowned by the Pope on April 9, 972.[31]

Otto wished also to enter upon relations with the Arabs and, from 953 to 956, received from the caliph of Cordova, Abd-er-Rahman II, humiliations as unwelcome as those he had been obliged to endure from the Emperor of the East.[32]

Among the Arabs as among the Byzantines and the Western Franks, the imperial dignity conferred on Otto stirred up more rivalry than deference. The same was not true in the States of the Church, where the new Emperor was acclaimed as a providential protector amid the anarchy that was desolating the domain of St. Peter. Unhappily the chief promoter of these disorders was John XII himself.

Policy of Pope John XII

We have already had occasion to remark [33] how, by a manifest protection of Providence, the doctrine of the Church never suffered from the faults of this unfortunate Pontiff. More than once, as in the protection he granted to the most

[30] *PL,* CXXXVI, 910–38.

[31] Schlumberger, *L'epopée byzantine à la fin du X^e siècle,* 1900. We should not confuse this Empress Theophano with another Empress Theophano, the wife of Leo the Wise, mentioned in Diehl's *Figures byzantines* (1906), pp. 217–43, and in the *Regards historiques et littéraires* by de Vogüé (1892), p. 189.

[32] The incidents of this negotiation are related in the life of the monk John of Gorze, who was the pope's ambassador in this affair. See *PL,* CXXXVII, 239 f.; *Monum. Germ., SS.,* IV, 335 f. The biography of the Blessed John de Vendière, abbot of Gorze, is one of the most remarkable writings of the tenth century in the talent it shows and in the valuable historical information it supplies. On this work see the *Histoire littéraire de la France,* VI, 428 f.

[33] Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* III, 511.

regular monasteries, he was the instrument of a religious revival. But his political attitude, like his private life, was always without consistency. Scarcely had Otto reached Upper Italy after his coronation, when John XII, disregarding his explicit promises, entered into relation with the Emperor's bitterest enemies, particularly with Adalbert, the son of Berengarius II.[34] The Emperor, when he heard this news, besieged Berengarius in the castle of Montefeltro near Rimini. His anger was extreme. The Pope sent him ambassadors, among whom was the protoscriniarius Leo, the future antipope Leo VIII. They declared to the Emperor: that John XII, led on by his youth, had acted without consideration and in the future would not repeat the like offense; that the Emperor, since he was guilty of equivalent offenses—such as treating as his own property the possessions of the Roman Church and welcoming to his court faithless servants of the Pope—could not reasonably complain about the Pope's attitude, especially since the Pope himself was ready to disavow it. But Otto challenged these arguments, and the conferences became more bitter. On November 2, 963, the Emperor was before the walls of Rome at the head of an army. Part of the city declared itself on his side; part, on the Pope's side. John XII, at the side of Adalbert, put on helmet and breastplate.[35] But the papal forces were beaten, and the Romans had to promise under oath "never to elect and consecrate a pope except by the consent and choice of the Emperor and of his son King Otto." [36]

The first consequence of this capitulation of the Romans was the assembling of a pseudo-council, presided over by Em-

[34] Baronius, *Annales,* year 963, no. 4.

[35] Jaffé, no. 3696.

[36] Baronius, *ibid.,* no. 11; Watterich, *Pontificum romanorum vitae,* I, 52 f. On the insertion of this formula in the text of the *Privilegium Ottonis* and on the critical problems presented by this insertion, see Duchesne, *op. cit.,* 2d ed., pp. 344–48.

peror Otto. Without the Pope's approval, the council began its sessions (November 6, 963) in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome. Liutprand, bishop of Cremona, who took an important part in it, has left an account of the event. Present were forty bishops, clerics of all ranks, Church officials, laymen of every class, soldiers, and a so-called "deputy of the people." Liutprand's vivid narrative gives us an idea of the tumult of such a gathering.[37] The Emperor called for specific charges against Pope John. At once shouts arose on all sides. Some called out that the Pope had ordained priests in return for money payments; others shouted that he had publicly gone hunting. One declared that the Pope was living in debauchery; another, that he had drunk to the health of the devil while playing dice. The Emperor had Bishop Liutprand administer an oath to them that they would present no accusations except such as were based on reliable testimony. The people and the clergy present then shouted with one voice: "If Pope John has not committed all the crimes enumerated, if he has not committed many others even more shameful and execrable, may Peter the Prince of Apostles close the gates of heaven against us." John XII, who was not present in Rome, was summoned to appear before the pseudo-council to defend himself. He merely replied: "We have learned that you wish to elect another pope. If you do so, we excommunicate you in the name of the Almighty, so that none of you may henceforth ordain or celebrate mass." [38]

This reply irritated the assembly. On December 4, 963, with the Emperor's approval, it declared the deposition of John XII, and elected as pope the protoscriniarius Leo, a

[37] Natalis Alexander (*Hist. eccles.*, § 10, diss. 16; VI, 434 f.) and Floss (*Die Papswahl unter den Ottonen*, pp. 7–9) have not taken the trouble to prove that this assembly was not a council and could not have any canonical authority.

[38] Jaffé, no. 3697.

simple layman.[39] Two days later he received holy orders and took the name of Leo VIII. Says Hefele: "There is every reason to think that Otto devised the election." [40] By this unlawful act, suggested to an irregular assembly, Otto inaugurated the worst uprisings of the Empire. True, a heavy responsibility falls upon the unworthy Pontiff, whose life had made possible the terrible charges against him. But, however guilty he may have been, he was the legitimate pope. Otto, by deposing him and by having another pope elected, created a precedent that would become a tradition for his successors. These would attempt to treat the Holy See as a simple bishopric of Germany. The Holy Empire, in its admirable Christian conception, does not date from Emperor Otto. It dates from the papacy's triumph over the old imperial spirit. It will be the work of the popes; not of the Germanic emperors.

Two months after the deposition of John XII, the Roman clergy and people rose up from their dejection. At the council of December, 963, Otto had wounded both national feeling and Catholic feeling. He, an outsider, had come with armed forces and had deposed the head of the States of St. Peter. And he had presumed to judge him who, however unworthy, occupied that Apostolic See, "which has the right to judge everyone, but can be judged by no one." [41] On January 3, 964, the Romans, taking advantage of the Emperor's departure and the absence of a large portion of his troops, rose up, and erected barricades on the Sant' Angelo Bridge. The rebellion was at once suppressed by the prompt return of the imperial forces. The barricades were removed and the rebels were massacred in great numbers. But soon the reaction took another form. On February 26, 964, an assembly of bishops, cardinals,

[39] Perhaps he was tonsured, as Duchesne surmises. Certainly he had not received holy orders.

[40] Hefele-Leclercq, *Conciles*, IV, 810.

[41] See Mourret, *op. cit.*, III, 363.

and ecclesiastics of various orders, most of them having taken part in the assembly of 963, met at St. Peter's under the presidency of John XII. Considering that Pope Leo had been elected in violation of the laws of the Church, this council declared his election null and void.[42] The Emperor, informed of the event, prepared to march upon Rome, when he learned of the death of John, who was mysteriously stricken in bed, some said by the devil,[43] others said by a personage whom he had shamefully outraged.[44]

Pope Benedict V

Immediately after the death of John XII, the Romans, without sending word to the Emperor and without concerning themselves with the agreement of 962, proceeded to the election of a new pope. Their choice was the deacon Benedict. This monk of Monte Soracte boasted of his learning. His extensive knowledge of grammar had won him the name of Benedict the Grammarian. And he was a cleric of good repute. The fluctuations which some historians have noted in his conduct, can be explained. In the council of 962 he was the spokesman for the accusers of John XII; then, in the council of 963, he energetically defended the authority of that same pontiff. In all likelihood he thought that a pope's crimes do not authorize an emperor to depose him and to replace him with one of his own creatures. The newly elected Pope was consecrated May 22 under the name of Benedict V.

The Emperor was displeased with the turn of events and besieged Rome. The city, reduced by famine and pestilence, surrendered Benedict to the victors. He was deposed, de-

[42] The acts of this council have not been preserved. See Mansi, XVIII, 471.

[43] This is Liutprand's version, quoted by Baronius: *Quadam nocte, extra Romam, dum se cujusdam viri uxore oblectaret, in temporibus a diabolo est percussus* (Baronius, *Annales,* year 964, no. 17).

[44] Bower, *History of the Popes,* II, 320; Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 351.

prived of the exercise of his priestly office, and sent to Germany in the custody of the Bishop of Hamburg, who treated him with every kind of consideration. There he died shortly afterward, with sentiments of great piety. Benedict V has no numerical designation in the generally received list of popes; but many historians consider him a legitimate pope,[45] and we can see no reason for refusing him this title.

A gathering of bishops, assembled by the Emperor about the end of June, 964, to depose Benedict V, restored to office the antipope Leo VIII, who survived his restoration only a short time. He died at Rome in March, 965.[46] In the pseudo-pontificate of Leo VIII, only one important act is mentioned: a bull, inserted by Gratian in the *Corpus juris canonici,*[47] granting to the emperor of Germany the right to choose his own successor with the title of king of Italy, and also the right to give investiture to the pope and to bishops. The authenticity of this bull has long been a matter of dispute. The studies of Floss and of Bernheim have shown the apocryphal character of the document. The basis of this writing is said to be an authentic bull of Leo VIII, excluding the Roman people from the papal election and from the election of a king or a patrician. An eleventh century forger, a partisan of antipope Guibert, is said to have altered the document by adding the exorbitant privileges conceded to the emperor. The chroniclers of the time do not find any fault with the personal conduct of antipope Leo VIII. But up to his death he was the liege man of Otto, and he died without revoking the sacrilegious act that had made him a rebel. He deserves the reprobation that attaches to those who have stained the office of their priesthood with ambition or cowardice.

[45] Rohrbacher, *Hist. univ. de l'Eglise cath.*, Bk. 61 (1885), V, 486; H. Hemmer, art. "Benoît V" in the *Dict. de théol,* II, 649.

[46] Baronius, year 964, nos. 16 f.; Mansi, XVIII, 477.

[47] *Corpus juris canonici,* dist. 63, c. 23; Jaffé, nos. 3704 f.; *Lib. pontif.*, I, 250 note 1; Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 820–24.

Pope John XIII

The people and clergy of Rome this time did not dare to proceed to the election of a new pope without, in conformity with the act of 962, first notifying the Emperor. He designated for their choice a relative of John XII, a certain John, Bishop of Narni, son of Theodora the Younger, consequently nephew of the celebrated Marozia. Thus, with the Emperor's assent, the papacy returned to the house of Theophylactus.[48] Otto, seeing the national feelings of the Romans rebelling more and more against his interference, probably hoped, by this political combination, to satisfy the most powerful of the opposition parties. He was too late. John of Narni was elected without difficulty and was installed October 1, 965, under the name of John XIII. But within three months a revolt broke out. We are told that it was caused by the severity of the new Pope toward the Roman nobility; in reality it was directed against the imperial power. At its head was Count Rodfred, a certain Peter, prefect of the city, and one Stephen, a member of the papal household. It was a sort of coalition of all parties, but set in motion at the same time. John XIII, regarded as a cooperator in Otto's policy, was arrested, imprisoned in Castle Sant' Angelo, and then exiled. Soon, however, news that the imperial army was on the march for the fourth time against Rome, spread terror in the city. John XIII himself, at the head of important forces, presented himself on November 14, 966, before the city and was received without protest. The monk of Monte Soracte, who saw the terrible army pass by, closes his chronicle with this event, as though he saw therein the end of the independence of the Church and of his nation.[49]

[48] See the genealogy of the house of Theophylactus in Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.*, I, 253.

[49] *PL*, CXXXII, 173. Cf. Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical*, pp. 384 f.

This alarm was well founded. The reprisals taken by the Emperor were cruel. Peter, the prefect of the city, was hanged by his hair from the famous equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, then paraded through the city, seated backwards on an ass, holding the animal's tail in his hands, and wearing on his head a leather bottle as a sort of diadem. Finally he was exiled. Count Rodfred had been assassinated; the cleric Stephen perished, we know not how. Otto had their bodies dug up and thrown into a ditch.

The murderer of Count Rodfred was a certain John Crescentius, son of the famous Theodora the Younger. By this murder the family of the Crescentii, which subsequently took so lamentable a part in papal elections, made its entry upon the scene of world affairs.[50]

John XIII governed the Church for almost seven years. Peace was not again seriously disturbed during his pontificate. He was an upright pope, pious and active. At a council held soon after Easter, 967, the Emperor put him in possession of the city and district of Ravenna, which had for a long time been withdrawn from the authority of the Holy See. On Christmas Day of the same year, Emperor Otto I's son, thirteen years old, received from John XIII the imperial crown and was associated with his father's throne.[51] This news was conveyed to the dukes and prefects of Saxony in these terms: "Our son has been raised by the Apostolic Lord to the imperial office." [52] This was a recognition of the pope's right in the choice and coronation of the emperors.

Otto's most formidable rivals, Berengarius II and his son Adalbert, had died the year before. A comparative peace now reigned in the Empire and in the Church. The Emperor and

[50] On the genealogy of the Crescentii, see Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 826 f., and *Lib. pontif.*, I, 253.

[51] Mansi, XVIII, 529 f.; Jaffé, no. 3713.

[52] Widukind, *Res gestae Saxoniae,* Bk. III, chap. 70; *PL,* CXXXVII, 207; *M. G., SS.,* III, 465.

the Pope profited by it to reform, with common accord, a number of abuses. John XIII's register, made up of thirty-three documents preserved in their entirety, shows us an interesting picture of these reforms. We see the Pontiff command, under pain of anathema, all the dukes, marquises, counts, and judges of the district of Bologna to cease their unjust vexations against the clergy;[53] send into Germany a sentence of excommunication against Archbishop Herold of Salzburg, who had joined with the Magyars for the pillage of the cities, monasteries, churches, and countryside of his own district.[54] In a general way, he kept up a strife against the designs of laymen upon churches or monasteries, and against the spirit of laxity among the clergy and even in the monasteries as well as among the people. In all these reforms, he declares and wishes all Catholicism to know, that "the Apostolic See, so long given over to the rage of the impious, owes its deliverance, after God, to the generous efforts of Emperor Otto."[55]

The Pope expressed a like gratitude to the King of England, Edgar I, writing to him as follows: "We congratulate you for having understood that the friendly solicitude which you bestow upon the churches is the best proof you can give to your subjects of your fatherly tenderness in their regard."[56] In fact, King Edgar, in a council held at Brandford about 964, restored to the bishops and the monasteries all the property that had been taken from them; and he revoked the decrees hostile to the Church, issued by his brother Edwin.[57] In 969, in agreement with his friend Dunstan,[58] archbishop of Canterbury, he convoked an important national council, which

[53] *PL*, CXXXV, 931.
[54] *Ibid.*, col. 954.
[55] *Ibid.*, col. 931.
[56] *Ibid.*, col. 985.
[57] Mansi, XVIII, 475.
[58] St. Dunstan was born in 925, became archbishop of Canterbury in 959, and died May 19, 988.

effected a general reform in the English clergy, both regular and secular.[59]

John XIII died September 6, 972. On his tomb in St. Paul's Basilica was inscribed this epitaph: "He was a wise and watchful pastor. He was ever thoughtful of the hour of his death and, during his life, selected this place for his burial. . . . May heaven be opened to him through the merits of the sublime Paul." [60]

Pope Benedict VI

We have no information about the way the election of John XIII's successor took place. All we know is that he was a Roman cardinal-deacon by the name of Benedict and that his ordination did not occur until January, 973. He took the name of Benedict VI. Some have supposed that this long delay was owing to an exchange of communications between Rome and Germany for the purpose of obtaining ratification by the Emperor. Others consider that "this long vacancy is a proof of imperial intervention on this occasion." [61] A few months later (May 7, 973) Otto I died. The Germans, regarding him as the founder of the German nation, have given him the name of Otto the Great. He did indeed have such an ambition, as also the ambition to be the protector of the Church. But, in these two respects, his work was more brilliant than lasting. In Germany a powerful feudalism had planted its roots so deep that it could not be brought under subjection to a central power. At Rome so heavy had been Otto's hand that secret rebellion was stirred against his authority. One German historian sees the whole glory of Otto the Great in his warlike

[59] Mansi, XIX, 15; Lingard, *History of England* (1912 ed.), I, 266 ff.; *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, II, 288 ff.

[60] See the text of the epitaph in Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.*, I, 254. The original epitaph is now in the abbey museum.

[61] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical*. p. 356.

and conquering virtues.[62] We, on the contrary, prefer to see the greatness of his reign in the protection he accorded to literature and learning and in the examples of holiness that shone about his throne.

Otto knew scarcely any Latin. But he encouraged Latin scholars. Among them should be mentioned the renowned Liutprand. At the Emperor's court he composed his *Antapodosis,* in which he recounts the happenings in Italy since 888. Later, rewarded for his services by appointment to the bishopric of Cremona, he showed, in his *Vita Ottonis* and his *Legatio Constantinopolitana,* that he was a servile courtier of the imperial power. But we must pay tribute to his subtle mind, rare scholarship, and spiritual style. Apart from his evident partiality, his accounts are one of the most valuable sources for the history of the time. Cardinal Baronius made considerable use of them in writing his *Annals,* and even went too far in the reliance he placed in them. Of lesser talent was Bishop Ratier of Verona, no less a sycophant, who wrote some curious and lively accounts of the events and customs of his day. In the monasteries enriched and patronized by Otto, the monk Widukind of Corvey Abbey (New Corbie) wrote the *Res gestae saxonicae,* a history of Saxony from the earliest times to his own day. Abbess Hroswitha of the Gandersheim convent wrote, in a style imitating Vergil and Terence, some poems and plays about the legends of the saints.[63] But Otto the Great's chief title to the gratitude of the scholarly world is that he encouraged and patronized the young monk who became the illustrious Gerbert, the great Pope Sylvester II.

Another scholar was Otto's younger brother Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, who wrote a *Lives of the Saints* and a *Commentary on the Evangelists and on the Books of Moses.*[64]

[62] Giesebrecht, quoted by Bayet in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.,* II, 548.
[63] *PL,* CXXXVII, 939 f.; *M. G. SS.,* IV, 302–5; Magnin, *Théâtre de Hroswitha.*
[64] Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques,* XIX, 621 f.

He was likewise a saint. Says his first biographer: "In him were found qualities seldom united in one person: the splendor of rank and office, the fulness of knowledge, along with a humility of heart and gentleness of character such as are never seen to a more profound degree." [65] St. Bruno was the worthy son of the queen mother, St. Matilda, who, while the Emperor was with his armies in Hungary, Italy, and the Northern countries, went from city to city, from village to village, settling strifes, repairing injustices, and scattering alms with generous hand.[66] The son of a saint and the brother of a saint, Otto also had the blessing to marry a saint. To Empress Adelaide, Germany and Italy owed numerous foundations and countless works of charity.

Probably St. Adelaide's most remarkable deed was her act of generosity when, at the fall of the house of Berengarius, she brought to her own court the two daughters of her enemy and became a mother to them.

Certain political acts of Otto the Great may have been very blameworthy. Yet influences emanating from his court helped to maintain in men's consciences that sense of Christian virtues which would enable a reform movement to find some points of support in souls on the day when God stirs up that movement in His Church.

Emperor Otto II

Otto the Great's son and successor, Otto II (the Red), was not devoid of intelligence and courage. Educated by capable teachers, he surpassed his father in intellectual culture, but was inferior in his character, which was not steady or strong or lofty. As he was only eighteen years old when he ascended the imperial throne, the advice of his saintly mother Adelaide

[65] *Acta sanctorum,* October, V, 698 f.; *M. G., SS.,* VI, 252–75.
[66] *Ibid.,* March 14; *M. G., SS.,* IV, 282–302.

might have saved him from many perils. But scarcely had he assumed the crown, when the intrigues of the young Empress Theophano, sustained by a faction of courtiers, brought about the disgrace of the queen mother. She was obliged to leave the court and seek refuge in Italy. With the departure of Otto the Great's pious widow, the genius of the Empire seemed to vanish. Then followed the manifest decline of the two great works of the first German emperor.

Immediately after the death of Otto I, all the ambitions and plots that had been held in check by his powerful hand now had free rein. While Henry of Bavaria, in alliance with the dukes of Bohemia and Poland, sought his own advantage by ruining the supremacy of Saxony, the descendants of the former dukes of Lorraine raised their heads, and the Danes on the north and the Slavs on the east again began their invasions. The first part of Otto II's reign (972–80) was occupied in suppressing these uprisings.

Other concerns then drew him into Italy. There, too, the passions that had been repressed by the firmness of the first Otto and temporarily restrained by the wise moderation of Pope John XIII, now broke out. A party, calling itself national because it was opposing the German influence in Italy, but in reality was working to gratify the ambition of certain nobles, had at its head that Crescentius or Censius whom we met at the time of John XIII's election. To put down the imperial dominance in Italy, the plan, as in 965, was to attack him who was looked upon as the Emperor's tool, Pope Benedict VI. They had someone to put in Benedict's place. It was a cardinal-deacon, Boniface Franco, who had been conspicuous for the ill treatment he inflicted upon Benedict V. What sort of drama was devised by Crescentius we know from the brief and bitter note about Benedict VI in the *Liber pontificalis,* which reads as follows: "Benedict, born at Rome, the son of Hildebrand, so it is said, occupied the see one year and six months. He

was seized by a certain Cencius, son of Theodora, and was imprisoned in the Castle Sant' Angelo, where he was strangled at the instigation of the deacon Boniface, who had already been made pope while Benedict was still alive." [67]

From the register of Benedict VI we know that he encouraged the monastic life and defended the rights of the Churches against the encroachments of the nobles. In a rescript to Eldrad, abbot of Vézelay, the Pope said: "If any king, bishop, priest, abbot, judge, or count infringes the present regulations, let him be anathematized, deprived of his office, and refused participation in the sacred body of our Lord Jesus Christ, until he atones for his injustice." [68] To Bishop Frederick of Salzburg he wrote: "The power to govern the whole Church was given, not only to the blessed Apostle Peter, but to all his lawful successors." [69] In this same letter, the Pope appeared to foresee the sad end awaiting him. He said: "Our most earnest desire is to maintain the laws enacted by our predecessors, so far as we are enabled to do so by the malice of the men of this time." [70]

The tragic event that ended Benedict VI's pontificate occurred in July, 973. For a while Crescentius was able to enjoy the fruit of his crime. Bonizo informs us that Crescentius arrogated to himself the title of patrician and in Rome exercised a tyrannical authority.[71] But his power did not last long. Franco, enthroned under the name of Boniface VII, soon became the object of popular indignation, which changed his name from Boniface ("the doer of good") to Maliface ("the doer of evil").[72] When the Emperor learned of the events, he sent a representative, Count Sicco, to Rome. Sicco rallied the

[67] *Lib. pontif.*, I, 255.
[68] *PL*, CXXXV, 1086.
[69] *Ibid.*, col. 1081.
[70] *Ibid.*, cols. 1081 f.
[71] *Ibid.*, CL, 815.
[72] *Lib. pontif.*, I, 257.

people, laid siege to Castle Sant' Angelo, took it, and had the usurper deposed in the usual forms.[73] But the antipope was able to flee to Constantinople,[74] taking the Vatican treasury with him and planning fresh crime. Later he came back to Rome and there created new difficulties for Benedict VI's lawful successor, Benedict VII.

Pope Benedict VII

The new Pope, formerly Bishop of Sutri, was elected in October, 974, with the assent of Otto II.[75] He governed the Church for nine years with remarkable activity and energy. His first care was to assemble a Roman council, which anathematized Boniface Franco.[76] Two other councils, held at Ravenna (974) and Rome (981), issued a vigorous condemnation of simony.[77] The Pope was aware that simony was the essential evil of this sad period. By simony, mercenary shepherds entered the Church, ravaging the flock of Christ while they divided it by their scheming and scandalized it by their immoral conduct. And the tragic scenes that had stained the papal throne with blood had consequences throughout the Church. In Italy some nobles, following the example of Crescentius, expelled the imperial officials, formed themselves into independent states, and therein exercised despotic power. In France the evils resulting from the secular infeudation of the bishoprics was complicated by the crisis from which the reigning dynasty was suffering. The old Carolingian race was de-

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 257 note 1.

[74] Jaffé, no. 3823.

[75] Some chroniclers mention a pope named Domnus or Donus between Benedict VI and Benedict VII. This name is not found in the earliest and best list of the popes. These chroniclers have probably taken the expression *Domnus papa,* which in the documents designates Benedict VI, for the proper name of a pope. Neither Jaffé nor Hefele nor Duchesne admits the existence of Pope Domnus. See Jaffé, no. 3778; Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 833; Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.,* I, 256 note 4.

[76] Mansi, XIX, 57; Jaffé, no. 3778.

[77] Mansi, XIX, 59, 71 f.

crepit and unable to defend the country; the young house of the dukes of France was gaining favor. Between these two the best men of France, including the bishops, were divided. In England, amid sanguinary wars that broke out for the succession to the throne after the death of King Edgar, the clergy who had been deposed for misconduct or simony revolted and, sustained by a numerous political party, drove out a large number of monks who had been put in their places. In Germany disturbances stirred up after Otto the Great's death, had not been put down. The Slavs of the east and north were secretly conspiring. In the East, antipope Boniface, who had fled there, devised new plots, endeavoring to exploit the old Byzantine jealousy against his rival. Both the Empire and the Church were menaced together.

Otto II pretended to take up the defense of both sides. His private life made him less and less worthy of so lofty a mission. The scandals of his immoral conduct now came into open light. In 980 he directed his steps toward Italy. At Pavia he met his saintly mother Adelaide, whose grief touched his heart, and he became reconciled with her. When he reached Rome, early in 981, calm had been restored there, owing to Pope Benedict VII's firmness and prudence. The pacification of Lower Italy required greater effort and met with less success. The Greeks and the Saracens joined hands to drive Otto from southern Italy, while the Slavs, profiting by his absence, pillaged Hamburg, ruined the bishoprics of Havelburg and Brandenburg, and destroyed the foundations of Otto the Great.

Benedict VII's action was more peaceful and more fruitful. While four Roman councils, held under the presidency of his legates (974 to 981), regulated the affairs of Italy and the general interest of the Church,[78] other councils, held at his suggestion in France, England, and Germany, worked for the re-establishment of order and discipline in those countries. In

[78] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 834–36.

974, he sent a special legate to France, the deacon Stephen, who presided over a council at Reims. This council deposed Theobald, bishop of Amiens, who had usurped the see.[79] The archbishops of Reims, because of the prerogative they enjoyed of crowning the kings of France, exercised a preponderant influence over the whole country. The see of Reims at that time was occupied by a man of eminent worth, Adalbero, who was greatly attached to Otto. Adalbero had enthusiastically welcomed the restoration of the Empire. He regarded it as the most effective means of defending the Church against the tempestuous flood of feudalism, and protecting the papacy from the aggressions of the Italian princes. But the Archbishop of Reims was first of all a churchman. In his mind all other cares were secondary to the extirpation of abuses, the reform of ecclesiastical and monastic institutions, and the restoration of piety. We still possess forty-one of his letters, which show the extent and purity of his zeal and also his feeling of humble obedience to the Roman pontiff.[80] His decoration of the cathedral of Reims and the glory he bestowed upon the school of Reims by putting it under the direction of the scholarly Gerbert, would alone have made his name famous.[81]

England too, in the see of Canterbury, had its great reformer, St. Dunstan. Four councils (Winchester in 975, Kirlington in 977, Calne in 978, and Ambresbury in 979) took steps to cure the evils afflicting the English Church.[82] At the Council of Winchester, when some bishops were speaking of revoking certain penalties, considered too severe, a crucifix on the hall of the council chamber—so an old tradition relates—

[79] Mansi, XIX, 132.

[80] *PL,* CXXXVII, 503 f.

[81] *Hist. littéraire,* VI, 444; Ceillier, *Hist. des aut. ecclés.* (1754 ed.), p. 675; Marius Sepet, "Adalbéron et l'Eglise de Reims" in *La France chrétienne dans l'histoire,* pp. 119–32.

[82] We possess the acts only of the councils of Winchester and of Calne. Mansi, XIX, 61–64.

spoke aloud, saying: *Non fiet, non fiet: judicastis bene, male mutaretis* ("This will not be, this will not be; you have judged well, you will do ill to change it"). The Council of Calne ended tragically. The floor of the meeting place collapsed, with consequent injury to all the members of the council except Dunstan, who suffered no harm. Many persons regarded this event as proof that God was with the Archbishop and that the reform, which he so warmly advocated, should be accepted and carried out.

Benedict VII did not have to intervene directly in the policy of the Eastern rulers. To meet the encroachments of the Greeks in southern Italy, he firmly maintained there the organization of the Latin provinces which John XIII had established at Capua, Benevento, Salerno, Naples, and Amalfi. And apparently God Himself undertook to inflict a providential punishment upon each outrage of the Eastern emperors against the popes. In 975, the Basileus Zemisses, disdaining any assistance from the West, planned to drive back the empire of the crescent to the Arabian deserts, its birthplace. He entered Syria, where the Arabs had settled and fortified themselves, seized Apameia, Emesa, and Baalbek, received the submission of the Emir of Damascus, entered Phenicia and conquered it. He then made ready to take Jerusalem by assault, proud in the expectation of accomplishing by himself alone the gigantic work for which Otto the Great had asked the assistance of the whole West. Just then, however, his victories and his life were terminated by his chief minister Basil, who put poison in his drink.[83] Under his successor Basil II, a Greek governor recovered the cities of Brindisi and Taranto (Tarentum) from the Saracens in Lower Italy. Profiting by this victory, he withdrew the Churches of these two cities from the jurisdiction of the pope and placed them under the authority of the Byzantine patriarch. This time

[83] Cf. Schlumberger, *L'epopée byzantine à la fin du X^e siècle.*

the punishment came from the Bulgarians, who revolted along the whole extent of their territory and for four years held in check all the forces of the Empire.

Benedict VII's register, one of the most complete that has come down to us from the disturbed period of the tenth century, shows us how solicitous this pope was for all the needs of the Church. A number of the great monasteries of Gaul, Germany, and Italy (Vézelay, St. Pantaleon of Cologne, Monte Cassino, St. Peter of Perugia, Corbie, St. Valéry, Subiaco) received his particular favor. But in a very special manner he turned to Cluny, as the chief source of the religious restoration that he desired. To its abbot he wrote: "The congregation under your direction has no more devoted patron than this Roman Church, which desires to spread it in the whole world and is resolved to defend it against all its foes." [84]

Benedict VII died July 10, 983. His tomb, in the Church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, bears this inscription: "In this sepulcher lie the mortal remains of Benedict, the seventh of that name. He defeated the pride of the cruel usurper Franco. . . . He struck the despoilers of the holy Roman Church. . . . He was the support of widows and the father of the poor; he regarded the friendless as his own children." [85]

Pope John XIV

The successor of Benedict VII was the imperial chancellor Peter, bishop of Pavia, who, out of respect for the Prince of the Apostles, changed his name to John, and became John XIV.[86] After obtaining from the Romans the election of the chancellor

[84] *PL*, CXXXVII, 332.

[85] *Lib. pontif.*, I, 258. Duchesne remarks that this epitaph is a cento made up from the epitaphs of Benedict VII's predecessors: Stephen VI, Sergius III, and Benedict IV (*ibid.*).

[86] This is the second instance of a pope changing his name upon becoming pope. We have already seen that Octavian took the name of John XII.

of his Empire, Otto and likewise those who relied on the effectiveness of political calculations, probably supposed they had at length realized the ideal of a Holy Empire triumphant and at peace. The illusion was a natural one. No prelate was more experienced in the conduct of public affairs; none was better informed about questions of international policy, the secret machinations of Constantinople, and the strength of the Mohammedan world; none was better able to settle the numerous difficulties in the government of southern Italy. Since he possessed the confidence of the Roman clergy and that of the Emperor, his pontificate might be expected to stifle in their germ all possible conflicts between the priesthood and the civil powers. However, the events did not correspond to these expectations. Otto II had but a few weeks to live, and John XIV's pontificate ended, seven months later, by a tragedy like that which put an end to the days of the unfortunate Benedict VI.

Of the correspondence of Pope John XIV, we possess only one letter (December 6, 983), in which he grants the pallium to the metropolitan of Benevento. He says: "Show that you are merciful, be the support of the oppressed, oppose the violence of oppressors with calmness and moderation. . . . After the bitter griefs of this life, may we both attain to eternal blessedness." [87]

The Pope was not spared the bitter griefs which he mentions in this letter. The very next day he was called to Otto's deathbed. "The Emperor, after holding a diet at Verona, had left his venerable mother, Empress Adelaide, at Pavia and had gone to Rome. Early in December, 983, he fell seriously ill. Some attributed this sickness to his chagrin over a defeat at Taranto; others said that a wound, received in that disastrous battle, opened again. He felt he was about to die. His imperial treasury he divided into four portions: one portion was assigned to the churches; the second to the poor; the third to his beloved sister

[87] *PL*, CXXXVII, 360.

Princess Matilda, a devoted servant of Christ in Quedlinburg Abbey; the fourth was distributed by his own hands to his soldiers and servants, who burst into tears. Then, in a loud voice, in Latin he made the confession of his faults before the apostolic lord, the bishops, and the priests. He asked from them and received absolution. On December 7 he was taken from the light of this world." [88]

John XIV not only lost his protector. With alarm he glimpsed the future that was opened by the death of Otto II: the minority of an emperor in the cradle, the dangers of a regency, and perhaps the civil wars that were about to break out on all sides. The chronicler Dithmar, archbishop of Prague, tells us that immediately after the Emperor's death the ambitious Henry of Bavaria, imprisoned for having twice plotted for the crown, was freed by the Bishop of Utrecht, usurped the regency, and seized the young Otto III.[89] Presently Germany, divided into two hostile camps, was inflamed.

The result of these disturbances was felt in Italy. From Bobbio Abbey, which he then governed, Gerbert wrote to John XIV as follows: "In what direction shall I turn my steps, most pious father? An appeal to the Apostolic See would be futile: armed enemies occupy all the highways." [90] The moment was favorable for antipope Boniface to carry out his criminal plans. The Greeks, his protectors, having become masters of southern Italy by the victory of Taranto, seconded his schemes. In the month of April, 984, Boniface, accompanied by Crescentius and escorted by a detachment of Byzantine soldiers, made his entry into Rome. The Pope was at once arrested and imprisoned in Castle Sant' Angelo, where for four months he suffered atrociously from sickness and hunger and, if we are to credit what was reported, he was assassinated.[91]

[88] Dithmar, *Chronicon,* Bk. III, no. 15; *PL,* CXXXIX, 1241; *M. G. SS.,* III, 767.
[89] Dithmar, *loc. cit.; PL, loc. cit.*
[90] *PL,* CXXXIX, 205.
[91] *Lib. pontif.,* I, 259.

Boniface's triumph was insolent. One of his first acts was to rent to a wealthy private individual, for an annual payment of ten gold *solidi,* an extensive domain of the Papal States.[92] This rapacity, besides other faults which he manifested for a year, aroused popular indignation against him. He died suddenly in July 985. "So greatly did the Romans hate him that they leaped upon his corpse, pierced it again and again with a lance, and, stripping it of all clothing, dragged it by the feet to Constantine's horse, that is, to the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius. The next day some clerics gathered up the frightfully mutilated remains and buried them." [93]

Pope John XV

In the history of the papacy the period following the death of antipope Boniface is particularly obscure.[94] John XV, son of Leo, who seems to have been elected in August or September, 985,[95] may have owed his promotion to the choice of the clergy and people of Rome, as Hefele thinks,[96] or to the choice of Crescentius, as Duchesne inclines to believe.[97] Between the pontificate of John XV and that of his predecessor, should we put that of another John, son of Robert, who is supposed to have died before being consecrated? [98] These problems have not been settled with finality. John XV held the Apostolic See for eleven years. He assembled several councils which are of no great importance for the general history of the Church. His extant letters [99] testify to his zeal for the prosperity of the

[92] Jaffé, no. 3825.
[93] *Lib. pontif.,* I, 259.
[94] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical,* p. 360.
[95] Jaffé, no. 3825.
[96] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 836.
[97] Duchesne, *loc. cit.* The question would refer to the son of Crescentius, who has been mentioned above.
[98] Hefele-Leclercq, *loc. cit.*
[99] *PL,* CXXXVII, 825–52.

monastic institutions. The biographer of St. Adalbert of Prague, the first apostle of the Prussians, who died a martyr to his zeal in 997, says that Adalbert received John XV's replies as the very words of God.[100] To this pope we owe the earliest bull of canonization that has come down to us. It declares (June 11, 993), as worthy of public cult in the Church, St. Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg.[101]

The Truce of God

In 990, out of love "for almighty God and for Blessed Peter Prince of the Apostles," the Pope obtained from King Ethelred of England and from Richard, duke of Normandy, the conclusion of a peace treaty,[102] which is considered the inauguration of the institution known as the truce of God. In acting thus, John XV was responding to a universal desire of Christendom. A council held at Carroux near Poitiers in 989 and a council held at Narbonne in 990 had declared anathema against those who pillage the property of the poor.[103] About the year 994 the annalist Ademar of Chabannes relates that the Bishop of Limoges, "to punish the wicked actions of the nobles, ordered the churches and the monasteries to discontinue divine worship." [104] At this same period Gerbert wrote to a great lord, saying: "We beg you to consider that the peace of the Church cannot exist without peace between the princes." [105] The important act of the Supreme Pontiff powerfully encouraged the movement that

[100] *Ibid.*, col. 872. This biographer, probably John Canaporius, wrote the biography about the year 1000.

[101] Mansi, XIX, 169; *PL*, CXXXVII, 845. The word *canonizatio*, however, does not appear in this bull. This word seems not to have been used before the twelfth century. See Du Cange, *Glossarium* (Henschel ed., 1850), II, 107, and *Dict. de théol.* (Vacant-Mangenot), under the word "Canonisation," II, 1635.

[102] *PL*, CXXXVII, 843.

[103] Labbe, IX, 733.

[104] Adémar of Chabannes, *Historiae*, III, 35; *PL*, CXLI, 52.

[105] Gerbert, *Ep.*, 97 (Olleris ed., p. 54). On the origin of the Truce of God, see *Revue d'hist. ecclés.*, XIV (1913), 350–54.

was taking form. Before dying, in 996, he received the joyful news that nine bishops of southern France—Guido of Le Puy, Peter of Viviers, Guido of Valence, Bego of Clermont, Raymond of Toulouse, Deodatus of Rodez, Fredelo of Perpignan, Fulcran of Lodève, and Guy of Glandèves—assembled in council with a large number of the great nobles, had drawn up the first solemn formula of the "Pact of Peace, or truce of God": "In the name of God, sovereign and indivisible Trinity. . . . From this day forward let no person break into a church, . . . let nothing be taken from its lawful owner, . . . let no one molest a villager or hold him for ransom. . . . If any cursed despoiler breaks this institution of peace, let him be excommunicated, and let no priest chant mass for him or give him communion." [106] Such was the first promulgation of the Truce of God: *Charta qua treuga Dei confirmatur.*[107]

Another great institution of social benevolence began in the pontificate of John XV. The son of a nobleman in the neighborhood of Annecy, Bernard of Menthon archdeacon of Aosta, witnessing in his apostolic journeys the dangers encountered by pilgrims from England, France, and Germany on their way to Rome amid Alpine snow and glaciers, founded, at the summit of the Penine Alps between Valais and the valley of Aosta, and at the summit of the Graian Alps between Savoy and the valley of Aosta, the two celebrated monasteries of the Great and the Little St. Bernard. He was the first superior of these monasteries and died there in 1008, at the age of eighty-four.

[106] *PL,* CXXXVII, 854–56. Cf. Viollet, *Histoire des institutions politiques et administratives de la France,* II, 143.

[107] This is, in fact, the first time we meet the expression *Treuga Dei,* "Truce of God." But have we here, in these councils of Carroux, Limoges, le Puy, and in the letter of John XV to King Ethelred, reference to the Truce of God in the sense of the expression as it was later understood and as we now commonly understand it? Apparently not. John XV asks for a treaty of peace in the name of the God of peace, and the councils merely republish, with greater insistence, the complaints already heard and the measures already taken by earlier councils. Rather we regard these documents as preliminaries of the Truce of God.

John XV at length had the happiness of seeing in his pontificate two events of great importance for general civilization and for the future of Christianity: the complete conversion of the Russians to the Christian faith and the coming to power in France of a dynasty that would give the Church several of its staunchest defenders.

The Christian faith had been preached in Russia in the preceding century and counted many followers there. But in the middle of the tenth century the Russian Christians underwent a severe persecution at the hands of the rulers. Czar Vladimir, called the Great, who reigned from 980 to 1015, was the first Christian ruler of the Russian Empire. Unfortunately that great nation yielded to the influence of Constantinople, followed it in the schism of Michael Caerularius, and, although retaining belief in the Savior Jesus Christ, withdrew from His earthly minister, the supreme pontiff.

The Capetian Dynasty

A new royal dynasty was founded in France in 987 with Hugh Capet. Some historians have regarded the coming of the third dynasty of the kings of France as a victory of French nationality. Stated in these terms, the assertion seems too absolute. The Merovingians and the Carolingians were Frenchmen as well as were the Capetians. But the Merovingians were unable to form a durable centralized power in the Frankish country, and the Carolingians had embraced a much vaster object: the restoration of the Western Empire. The breakup of that Empire under the blows of the pirates of the North and of the Saracens, led to the first development of a new organization, the idea of a Frankish royalty, capable of giving the nation that cohesion which the race of Merowig had been unable to procure for it, and of defending, in a narrower but firmer circle,

the frontiers which Charlemagne's successors had allowed to expand.

For a century past, ever since the death of Charles the Fat in 887, one family had appeared equal to such an enterprise. According to some, this family was of German origin, related to the famous Widukind; according to others, it had no foreign connection.[108] Its warlike exploits and its vast possessions raised it to the first rank. From it came valiant men, such as their first ancestor Robert the Strong, who defended France against the Norsemen, and his son Odo (Eudes), who saved Paris from destruction. These and other heroic members of that family had, amid internal discord and barbarian invasions, assured peace to the cities, the monasteries, and the whole country. Three of its members received the title of king, but of each of them you might say what the monk Gerbert wrote in 995 about its last scion, Hugh, surnamed Capet: "He is king in reality. The Carolingian, King Lothair, is king only in name." [109]

Indeed the Carolingians, almost entirely stripped of any territorial power, at a time when all authority rested on land ownership, felt all power slipping from their hands little by little. At length the Church of France, by the voice of its mightiest bishop, Adalbero of Reims, and of his most illustrious monk, Gerbert, decided to take its stand on the side of Hugh.[110] This

[108] We can reconcile these two views if, as Luchaire does, we suppose that "in reality the freeholds were merely benefices conferred, like so many others, by Charlemagne's orders upon one of those Saxon families which the Frankish king had transplanted in large numbers to the interior of the Gallic country, where they became connected with the most powerful families of the region" (Luchaire, *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France,* I, 3).

[109] Olleris, *Œuvres de Gerbert,* letter 48, p. 32.

[110] With regard to the conduct of Adalbero and Gerbert on this occasion and in their relations with the Germanic Empire, some historians have impugned their patriotism. For replies to these various imputations, see Sepet, "Adalbéron, l'Eglise de Reims et l'avènement de la monarchie capétienne (*La France chrétienne dans l'histoire,* pp. 119–32) and Ulysse Chevalier, "Gerbert, le premier pape français" (*La France chrétienne,* pp. 133–47). Cf. F. Lot, *Les derniers Carolingiens,* pp. 239–

fact was the determining cause that brought about the fall of the former dynasty and the rise of the new. "All the circumstances concurred to assure the elevation of the person who was in fact the representative of the nation of the Western Franks, the only person able to direct its destinies and to defend it against the foreigner." [111] At an assembly of the magnates of the realm, held at Compiègne in 987, Hugh Capet was elected king. He was crowned and consecrated on July 3 of that same year, probably at Noyon.[112] Such was the origin of the Capetian dynasty, which gave the Middle Ages the holiest of its kings, the strongest and wisest of the defenders of the Church, St. Louis.

The coming of this dynasty in France coincided with a decline of the imperial dynasty in Germany. The reign of Otto II did not equal that of Otto the Great; and Otto III showed himself inferior to his father.

Following Otto II's death, Empress Theophano, excluded from the guardianship of her son, went to Pavia to her mother-in-law Adelaide.[113] The two princesses, temporarily reconciled to each other, mingled their tears. In reality the ambitious Theophano, being denied any hand in the government, was seeking some support for her intrigues. But she was mistaken. The pious Adelaide, in whom exile had but strengthened the simple and upright virtues which she had formerly practiced, was more and more averse to lending herself to such projects. Theophano then turned her steps to Rome.

42. We agree with Bayet (Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 413), that "to speak of nationality on this occasion is to attribute to the men of the tenth century the sentiments of other historic periods and distort history," and with F. Lot (*op. cit.,* p. 240), who says that "at the close of the tenth century the bishops and some learned clerics, the only ones who had any political ideas, did not regard the domination of the Ottos as a German empire, but as simply the continuation of the Christian Roman Empire founded by Constantine.

[111] Luchaire, *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France,* I, 20.

[112] Julien Havet, "Les Couronnements des rois Hugues et Robert" in *Revue historique,* XLV (1891), 290.

[113] Ditmar, *Chronicon; PL,* CXXXIX, 1241.

Crescentius, the old rival of the emperor, had just died.[114] But he left a son, likewise called Crescentius, who brazenly took the title of "Patrician of the Romans." There is good reason for supposing that the Empress made an agreement with him and did not dispute his title of patrician.[115] Crescentius, in turn, seems not to have contested the title of sovereign, which she took at Rome. She declared that her purpose was to maintain the authority of the Holy Empire in the Italian peninsula. In documents of that time, we find the name of Crescentius, patrician, and of Theophano, empress of the Romans.[116]

However, the regent Henry of Bavaria, because his insolent claims displeased the nobles, was obliged to withdraw before a coalition of the feudal lords. Adelaide and Theophano again took their place at the court of the young Emperor, the one edifying him by her holiness, the other impelling him to the most foolhardy undertakings.

Meanwhile, in April, 996, Pope John XV died. Shortly before his death, worn out by the doings of Crescentius, he had invited the Emperor to come to Rome. Otto set out at once. He had reached Pavia, when he learned of the Pope's death.

Otto III

The Emperor of Germany was then not more than sixteen years old. His reign was

short, sad, full of bright promise never fulfilled. His mother was the Eastern princess Theophano; his preceptor the illustrious Gerbert of Aurillac, archbishop first of Rheims and afterwards of Ravenna: through the one he felt himself connected with the legitimacy of the Eastern Empire, and had imbibed its absolutist spirit; by the other he had been reared in the dream of a renovated Rome, with her memo-

[114] He died in the monastic habit. His epitaph asks for prayers for him; *ut tandem scelerum veniam mereatur habere.*

[115] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical,* p. 360.

[116] *Ibid.*

ries turned to realities. . . . It was his design, now that the solemn millennial era of the birth of Christ had arrived, to renew the majesty of the city and make her again the capital of a world-embracing Empire, victorious as Trajan's, despotic as Justinian's, holy as Constantine's. His young and visionary mind was too much dazzled by the gorgeous fancies it created to see the world as it was—Germany rude, Italy unquiet, Rome corrupt and faithless.[117]

We read that, before setting out for the Eternal City, he went to Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle), that there he had Charlemagne's tomb opened, that he beheld the great Emperor seated on a marble throne, clothed in his royal robe and crown, and that, touching the hand of the dead ruler and removing the golden cross from about his neck, thus had himself, as it were, invested with the Empire by him whom he considered his great precursor.

Upon reaching Ravenna, Otto received an embassy that came to him in the name of the Roman princes and the whole senatorial order. As we read in the words of a contemporary author who wrote the life of St. Adalbert, "the princes expressed the grief they felt at the death of the apostolic lord and begged the Emperor to inform them regarding his intentions about the choice of a successor. Among the clergy of the royal chapel was a grandson of Otto the Great, named Bruno. His literary culture—he spoke three languages: Latin, German, and the vulgar Romance or Gallic tongue—and his lofty birth assured him of great consideration. His character was noble and open. His single drawback was his youth: he was only twenty-three years old. His cousin Otto, who was very fond of him, designated him to the envoys as the candidate of his choice. The election took place according to the royal wish, and on May 3, 996, Bruno was proclaimed pope.[118] Eighteen days later the new Pope solemnly crowned his cousin. As recently the Italian house

[117] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* chap. 9 (1932 ed., p. 144).
[118] *PL,* CXXXVII, 880.

of Theophylactus, so now the German house of the Ottos held in its hands the supreme powers of the priesthood and the empire. But the new political combination was no more successful than the former one. The Emperor's candidate had none of the vices of John XII; but Otto III was the last emperor of his race.

Pope Gregory V

The newly elected Pope, in testimony of his veneration for St. Gregory the Great, took the name Gregory V. Personally he was virtuous, zealous for justice and equity, well educated and full of those vast projects that had inspired Gregory the Great and Nicolas I.[119] Two mighty cares dominated his pontificate: the freeing of Rome from the plots of Crescentius and the ending of a painful conflict that involved the highest dignitaries of the Church of France.

Upon the Emperor's arrival in Rome, the so-called "patrician of the Romans" understood that his cause was lost unless he could save it by trickery. Putting on a hypocritical semblance of repentance, he placed himself in the hands of Otto, who by a regular trial convicted him of usurping power and of other misdeeds, and merely sentenced him to banishment. Then, yielding to the Pope's intercession, Otto pardoned him. But, three months later, after the Emperor had recrossed the Alps, a revolt broke out in Rome. Crescentius, exploiting the national feelings of the Italians and representing Gregory V as the tool of the German party, tried to recover his lost power. The Emperor, when this news reached him, was engaged in a war against the Slavs. Gregory, obliged to leave Rome, withdrew to Pavia and there, at the beginning of 997, held a council at which the rebels were excommunicated.[120]

Crescentius replied to Gregory's excommunications by set-

[119] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 883.
[120] Mansi, XIX, 207.

ting up a rival. His choice was a certain Philagathus, archbishop of Piacenza, a Calabrian of Greek origin. The previous year he had been sent to Constantinople to negotiate the marriage engagement of Emperor Otto III with Princess Helena, the daughter of Constantine VIII. "The family of Crescentius had always endeavored to obtain the backing of the Byzantine influence, then powerful in southern Italy, and to set it up in opposition to the interference of the German rulers." [121] With good reason we may suppose that at the time of this journey the unworthy prelate, already sold to Crescentius, entered into a plot with the government of Constantinople. Crescentius, master of the power in Rome, was to act as viceroy of the Byzantine sovereigns.

Upon driving the Pope out of Rome, the patrician took possession of Castle Sant' Angelo. From that point of vantage he dominated the city. The large sums of money which Philagathus brought back from Constantinople as the price of his treason [122] served to buy up a certain number of the clergy and of the people, who acclaimed the usurper under the name of John XVI. The time was April, 997.

But soon a rumor spread that Emperor Otto, victorious over the Slavs, was on his way to Italy. Philagathus, as knavish as his accomplice, tried to win over the Pope by declarations that were pure hypocrisy. He said that only under violent pressure from Crescentius had he accepted a title that was unwelcome to him and that he was merely waiting for a chance to escape from its burden.[123] The holy Abbot Nilus, a hermit of Calabria, persuaded by these declarations, came to Rome to intercede for his wretched countryman.[124]

The Pope and the Emperor spared his life on condition that

[121] Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.*, I, 262.

[122] *Episcopum de urbe Constantinopolitana cum magna pecunia redeuntem in papatum intrusit* (*Lib. pontif.*, I, 263).

[123] Bonizo, *Historia pontificia; PL,* CL, 867.

[124] *Acta sanctorum,* September 26.

he agree to spend the rest of his days in a monastery as expiation for his offenses. The wretch was panic-stricken. While he was fleeing, the crowd, which overtook him on the Campagna road, seized him and, less merciful than the Pope, tore out his eyes and his tongue, cut off his nose and ears. Thus mutilated and seated on an ass, he was brought back to Rome. There he was deposed. He lived about fifteen years longer and died probably at Fulda Abbey.

While these terrible scenes were being enacted, Crescentius, more daring, barricaded himself in Castle Sant' Angelo. There he constructed a lofty tower, like an eagle's nest, that he thought impregnable. After a siege and the use of war machines, a successful assault was made upon the fortress (April 29, 998). Crescentius was taken prisoner. He was beheaded on the battlement in sight of all the people; then his body and the bodies of twelve fellow conspirators were hanged on gibbets. But the Crescentius family was not extinguished. The patrician left collateral relatives and a son who, like himself, was called John Crescentius. The latter soon resumed the sinister traditions of the family.

The revolution that resulted in the substitution, in France, of the dynasty of the Capetians for that of the Carolingians, was largely the work of Gerbert,[125] Adalbero's favorite adviser who was always listened to by him.

At the death of Adalbero, who named Gerbert as his successor in the see of Reims, Hugh Capet decided to confer this archbishopric upon a natural son of Lothair, one Arnulf, a young man without talent or virtue, whose only title to that office was his scandalous birth. Later Arnulf, in violation of his oaths, surrendered the city of Reims to Charles of Lorraine. A national council, if we can so designate an assembly attended by only thirteen bishops, held in St. Basil Abbey near Reims on June 17 and 18, 991, deposed Arnulf and put Gerbert in his

[125] Chevalier, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

place. Gerbert made the mistake of accepting this uncanonical election, but he was perhaps the most eminent churchman of his day and the Emperor's friend. Arnulf certainly did not deserve any sympathy on account of his personal qualities, but his position appeared to be canonically more regular.

For the solution of this question, John XV entered upon proceedings which at the end of six years were still unfinished. Gregory V found a way to maintain the principles while treating with consideration all the persons involved. At the time of Arnulf's deposition the Frankish bishops had imperiled both the authority of the Holy See and the unity of the Church.[126] The time now came to show that the primacy of Peter was strong enough to declare itself in spite of all foes.[127] For these reasons, at a council held in St. Peter's Basilica in the presence of Otto III (May, 996), the Pope published a decree re-establishing Arnulf in the archbishopric of Reims. Then, early in 998, of his own motion he raised Gerbert to the see of Ravenna, one of the chief sees of Christendom.[128] Thus ended a dispute which, for almost ten years, had bitterly stirred both the Church and the state in France and Germany.

Throughout this affair the king of France, Hugh Capet, vigorously defended Arnulf's cause. At the assembly of St. Basil, the bishops who so vehemently sustained what in later times would be called the Gallican tradition, spoke under the King's inspiration.

His son Robert the Pious succeeded him in 996. He was more conciliatory. Was his attitude a matter of conviction? Did he hope thus to conciliate the Pope and obtain a papal ratification of his marriage to a relative within the forbidden degrees, Bertha, the daughter of the Count of Bloise? But Gregory V did not bend the laws of the Church to gratify the French King.

[126] Excerpts from the address delivered on this occasion may be found in Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 856 f.

[127] *Ibid.*, p. 884.

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 889.

A council held at St. Peter's with the Pope presiding, in which Gerbert the new Archbishop of Ravenna took part, declared the union null, condemned Robert and Bertha, under pain of anathema, to perform seven months of penance, and suspended Archbishop Erchembald of Tours and all the bishops who had accepted this incestuous union, until they should appear at Rome to give a satisfactory account of their conduct.[129]

Shortly afterward (February 18, 999), Pope Gregory V died in the prime of life, being only twenty-six years old. An unsubstantiated report declared that he was poisoned.[130]

We must acknowledge that the pontificate of the first German pope, Gregory V, was worthy and fruitful. It prefaced the great pontificate of the first French pope, Sylvester II.

[129] Mansi, *Concilia, Supplem.*, I, 1207.
[130] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 801.

CHAPTER II

Pope Sylvester II (999–1003)

The Antecedents of Sylvester II

THE metropolitan of Ravenna, Gerbert, who was presented to the clergy and people of Rome by Emperor Otto III as the candidate of his choice and who was elected pope under the name of Sylvester II in the first days of April, 999,[1] was a native of Aurillac in Aquitaine. He was born in 945.[2] The ranks of the Catholic clergy had nobody of more renowned scholarship and more eminent statesmanship. The Emperor was persuaded that the Church had no cleric more devoted to his cause. Gerbert's scholarship was deep and broad: this learning he had imbibed, not, as has been said, at the Moslem schools of Granada and Cordova, but at the episcopal school of Ausona (now called Vich) in the march of Spain.[3] In mathematics and astronomy his learning was such that his enemies easily made credulous people look upon him as a magician. His thorough acquaintance with the works of Victorinus, Martianus Capella, and especially Boethius, won him the titles of rhetorician and philosopher. His fame soon reached the ears of the Archbishop of Reims, Adalbero, who commissioned him to take charge of the school

[1] Jaffé, no. 3899.

[2] Richer, *Hist.*, III, 43; *PL*, CXXXVIII, 101.

[3] Olleris, *Œuvres de Gerbert*, p. 28. Racial and religious hatreds had created a wide gulf between the Spaniards and the Mussulmans. "But possibly, by secret and unknown ways, the writings of the Arabs of the peninsula may have crossed the frontiers of the caliphate." The Arabs' scientific activity was at that time remarkable. At Cordova one palace contained a library of 600,000 volumes. A catalogue in forty-four volumes was drawn up to facilitate the work of research. (Olleris, *loc. cit.*)

established in the episcopal city. The monk Richer says: "At once legions of disciples hastened to his scholarly classes." [4]

Gerbert's teaching method deserves a few words of explanation. Says Richer: "This was the method which he followed in his classes. He began with dialectics. . . . In his opinion, this preliminary labor was a necessary initiation to the study of rhetoric, strictly so called. As to the latter, his principle was that no one can reach the perfection of oratorical art unless he begins by forming his style through reading the great poets, such as Virgil, Statius, Terence, Horace, and Lucan. He then entered upon the study of rhetoric according to the manual of Victorinus. Lastly he set his pupils the task of grappling with sophism in public discussions, where each one had to sustain his thesis with so great art that the art should not be perceived. This constitutes the highest point of perfection that an orator can attain." [5] Herein we recognize the whole powerful method that would triumph in our great universities of the Middle Ages.

Gerbert's disciples, who came from all sides, spread his reputation in all the monasteries and all the courts of Europe. Emperor Otto II had remarked the young monk (then only twenty-five years old) at Rome, where he was studying the exact sciences. The Emperor decided to attach him to the imperial court and confided to him the education of his son Otto III.

Gerbert's eager fondness for the study of the abstract sciences never lessened his warmheartedness or his clear view of the affairs of actual life. His gratitude to the Ottos and his conviction that the imperial power should be a pacifier and protector amid the distresses of Christendom, inclined him toward the cause of the Empire.

He labored for the triumph of Hugh Capet. Probably this

[4] Richer, *Hist.*, III, 45; *PL*, CXXXVIII, 102. Translating as exactly as possible the expressions of the chronicler, we here sum up Richer's text.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 46–48.

was because he regarded the family of Robert the Strong as a providential instrument for the revival of France. As we learn from his letters, he favored this triumph also because it was agreeable to the imperial power.

Otto III's ambitious schemes did not grow weaker under the blow of repeated failures, but rather became more pretentious. When he saw his illustrious preceptor in the see of St. Peter, he was unable to put any bounds to his grandiose plans. This son of Theophano and friend of Gerbert visualized his Empire, supported by both Byzantium and Rome, as spreading throughout the civilized world, with himself as the supreme representative of that civilization.[6] Subsequent events would undeceive him. As to the monk who had just ascended the see of St. Peter, he must henceforth regard before anything else the interests of the Church and the primacy of Rome. Although in a moment of carelessness he had accepted the decisions of the wretched Synod of St. Basil and although until then Otto could count on him as a political adviser, the sense of his new office and the graces attached to his supreme responsibility transformed him. Pope Sylvester II would blot out the memory of the momentary weakness of the monk Gerbert.[7]

Noble Projects

If we are to trust a very old portrait preserved by Ciacconius, the new Pope's features were sharp and contained a stamp of intellectuality and tenacity, mingled with that shade of melancholy and that expression of benevolence which highborn souls derive from experience of the things of human life. "Besides the good sense and tenacity of the people of Auvergne, Sylves-

[6] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* chap. 9, p. 147.

[7] For the life of Gerbert before he became pope, see the works indicated in the *Revue des questions historiques,* December, 1869, pp. 440–523. Cf. *Etudes,* III (1869), 83–110, 248–79, 451–62, 602–17; Chevalier, *op. cit.,* pp. 133–42.

ter II possessed the cleverness and adaptability which was never wanting to them." [8]

Upon assuming supreme power, Otto's former tutor also had his dream, less chimerical but not less magnificent than that of the Emperor. His chief aim was to revive the true spirit of the Gospel in clergy and people; it was to arouse in the upper classes of society that cultivation of the higher branches of learning by which the Arab world was then attempting to dazzle the West. True, Sylvester turned his eyes to the East, but he did so mainly to conquer the Holy Sepulcher. And, like Otto, he wished, in a more magnificent Rome, to strengthen the bonds that joined the pope and the emperor. But this he did for the purpose of more effectively combining them in the struggle on behalf of these holy causes.

The new Pope's noble and firm attitude was soon evident. Three affairs, begun in the preceding pontificates, were still undecided at the time of Gregory V's death. They were the cases of Guido of Le Puy, of Adalbero of Laon, and of Arnulf of Reims.

Without waiting for the death of the venerable Wido (Guido) bishop of Le Puy, whose noble efforts for the abolition of private wars we have already noted, his nephew Stephen, with the support of certain lords who had been bribed, made sure he would succeed Guido. Immediately after Guido's death and in spite of the opposition of clergy and people, he seized the bishopric by armed force. A council (998), presided over by Gregory V, had condemned Stephen's usurpation and ordered the holding of a canonical election. Thus was chosen a virtuous priest, Theodard by name. But Stephen held out. A powerful and threatening aristocracy declared they were prepared to defend him by every means. Some neighboring bishops, won over

[8] Olleris, *Vie de Gerbert, premier pape français,* p. 343. This biography is merely Olleris' preface to his *Œuvres de Gerbert.*

by fear or by gifts, took the side of the usurper. Sylvester II had no hesitation in taking a stand against this formidable opposition.

To Theodard he wrote as follows: "Ecclesiastical cases are settled by the decrees of councils. A Roman council has condemned the usurper Stephen. . . . You have been canonically elected by the clergy of Le Puy-en-Velay. We confirm your election by virtue of our apostolic authority. Relying upon this, withstand all the empty decrees of excommunication which the intruder, in his reckless audacity, may issue against your person or against your Church." [9] By this act of vigorous authority, which made Stephen and his followers pause, Sylvester II showed his resolve to impose the authority of the Holy See in spite of any local opposition that might arise against it.

The case of Adalbero, bishop of Laon, who was known also as Ascelin, brought the Pope into opposition, not to a group of turbulent lords, but to a man formidable on account of his violence and trickery as also on account of his episcopal office which won for him the reverential fear of the Christian population, on account of his caustic pen which he exercised in pamphlet writing, and on account of an incredible boldness which led him to defy everyone.

In a poetical satire, in which he represented himself as discoursing with King Robert the Pious, Adalbero, the unworthy bishop of Laon, even tried to cast discredit upon the monastic institution, particularly upon the holy abbot of Cluny, the illustrious Odilo. Sensing that true reform would come from the famous monastery, he made himself the spokesman of all those who might be menaced by a re-establishment of good morals. Cleverly he represented the episcopacy, the guardian of the old traditions, as opposed to what he called "the horde of monks, boorish, unrefined, lazy." [10] This former pupil of Gerbert, from

[9] Olleris, *Œuvres de Gerbert,* letter 216, pp. 146 f.
[10] *PL,* CXLI, 771–86.

whom he had learned the art of writing, thus made use of the talents cultivated by his learned teacher.

In the political events that brought the Capetian dynasty into power, Adalbero of Laon had taken an equally despicable part. Although a protégé of the Carolingians and a friend of Charles of Lorraine, he shamefully betrayed the latter in a plot which is related by the monk Richer. He says:

One night, while everyone was asleep in the palace where the Duke of Lorraine lived, Ascelin removed their swords from the bedside of Charles and of Arnulf and hid them. Then, calling the unsuspecting doorkeeper, he ordered him to find at once some of his party, promising that he himself would guard the door. Ascelin took his stand in the doorway, holding his sword under his cloak. Presently, assisted by fellow conspirators, he admitted his whole band. Charles and Arnulf were sleeping heavily. When they awoke, they beheld their foes gathered in a band around them. Leaping from bed, they reached for their weapons, but of course did not find them. Ascelin said to them: "You forced me into exile from this city; now we are going to drive you out, but in a different way: I have remained my own master, and you will pass to the power of another." Charles hurled himself furiously upon the traitor. But armed men encircled him, thrust him on his bed, and held him there. They also seized Arnulf, who had witnessed the scene in speechless stupor. Then the two prisoners were dragged to a tower and were there locked in behind guarded doors. But the outcries of the women and the clamor of children and servants awakened and alarmed the burghers of Laon. Charles' followers hastily took to flight. They were none too soon, because Ascelin had ordered all the city gates to be closed. A son of Charles, two years old, also named Charles, was successfully hidden and thus escaped capture.[11]

In 995, three years after the death of Charles of Lorraine, his son Louis served as a pretext for a vile plot by the Bishop of Laon and Count de Blois to turn France over to Otto III.[12]

[11] Richer, Vol. IV; *PL,* CXXXVIII, 143 f.

[12] Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 150.

The people now spoke of Adalbero as "the old traitor" (*vetulus traditor*). The triumph of the dynasty for which he had conspired and the elevation of his former teacher to the supreme pontificate did not put an end to his criminal practices. Sylvester II had been ruling the Church scarcely a year [13] when Ascelin was denounced to him for a fresh treason. Receiving the King's soldiers, to whom he was to hand over the towers of his metropolis, he had them arrested and put in chains. Sylvester did not tremble before this monster of perfidy, any more than he had trembled before the lords of Le Velay.

The Pope's letter to him began thus: "Sylvester, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Ascelin of Laon. Do not be surprised that at the head of our letter you find neither greeting nor apostolic blessing. Under the name of bishop, you have, by your crimes, ceased to be a man. If loyalty raises a man even to God, perfidy degrades him to the level of brutes." The Pontiff then summoned the traitor to come to Rome in Holy Week to explain his conduct, informing him that neither the length of the journey nor the dangers of the way would excuse his absence. If he made a plea of sickness, this fact must be attested by trustworthy witnesses. Should he fail to exonerate himself from the charges made against him, he must submit to the decision of the judges.[14] History does not say how the affair terminated. Probably the "old traitor" submitted or at least made a pretense of doing so, for we find him in the episcopal see of Laon until the time of his death in 1030.

Arnulf and the See of Reims

The affair of Arnulf and the archbishopric of Reims was a delicate question. Would Sylvester II break with his past, blame the Council of St. Basil that had elected him bishop in place of

[13] Olleris, *op. cit.*, p. clxxxvii.
[14] *Ibid.*, letter 221, pp. 151 f.

Arnulf? Would he revoke the decision of his predecessor Gregory V, who had restored his rival in the metropolitan see of Reims? In accord with the tenor of the papal rescript (which has been preserved), we may surmise that the Pope required, as a preliminary condition, that Arnulf write a letter of submission and repentance. Pope Sylvester's letter in reply says:

Beloved son in Jesus Christ. To the apostolic see belongs the office, not only of receiving sinners in mercy, but also of raising those who have fallen and of restoring penitents to the degree of honor from which they have fallen. . . . Therefore we extend our hand to you, Arnulf, archbishop of Reims. On account of certain excesses, you had been deprived of the episcopal dignity; but your abdication was not approved by Rome, and we are resolved to show that the charity of the Roman Church is able to cover all faults and to rehabilitate all falls. . . . Already the crosier and the ring have been sent to you; by this present privilege, we grant you the right to perform all the archiepiscopal functions, to enjoy all the prerogatives attached to the see of Reims. . . . If anyone, which God forbid, attempts to violate our present decree, issued from the Apostolic See of Rome, let him be anathema.[15]

In his letter to the Bishop of Laon, Pope Sylvester showed his indomitable vigor. In the letter he wrote to the Archbishop of Reims he displayed, besides his charitable condescension, the remarkable adaptability of his spirit. He made no decision about the gravity or the character of the motives [16] that had provoked Arnulf's deposition and thus he avoided reopening the awkward question of the Council of St. Basil. But, for the ratification of the restoration of the Archbishop of Reims, he appealed to only one reason, that the archbishop's abdication did not have the approval of Rome (*tua abdicatio romano assensu caruit*); in this manner he implicitly but categorically acknowledged his former mistake in taking advantage of such an

[15] *Ibid.*, letter 225, p. 145.

[16] In his letter he refers merely to "certain excesses."

abdication. On this point, Pope Sylvester nobly corrected the error of Gerbert.

Restoration of the Roman Empire

All this was merely a negative side of Sylvester's pontificate. The bonds of friendship between him and Emperor Otto gave him reason to hope that, in concert with Otto, he would be able, in a Catholic spirit, to undertake a restoration of the Roman Empire (*restauratio imperii romani,* as we read on the medals of the time) that would enable the pope and the emperor, both of them living in the city of Rome, to agree upon giving the Eternal City a new splendor and to spread afar the Christian faith.

According to the terms of the agreement between the two high contracting parties, the emperor, as ruler of the world, was to govern in the common interest, to look after the welfare of the weak, and to establish at his court a governmental ministry of the poor and forsaken. "In the minds of Sylvester and Otto, the renewal of the Empire was bound up with the idea of protecting the frontiers against the barbarian invasions from the north and east of Europe by the creation of allied kingdoms that would receive civilization along with the doctrine of the Gospel." [17] We have two fragments [18] of a document describing the ceremonial regulations that were to be observed at the court of the new Christian Caesar.

This document is especially interesting, not so much because it repeats the old ceremonies taken from the Theodosian Code, but because it supposes that the emperor and the pope will both live in Rome and will continue the alliance of the two supreme powers for the pacification of the world. Nothing was lacking to enhance the pomp of the new court. The Caesar, in his palace on the Aventine Hill, was surrounded by the protospatharius, the hyparch, the protovestiarius,

[17] Olleris, *op. cit.,* pp. clxxi f.

[18] *Blume rheinisches Museum für Jurisprudenz,* V, 125.

and the count of the sacred palace. The officials included a logothete, an archilogothete, a master of the imperial militias, a prefect of the fleet. At the reception of a judge, the emperor made him swear to be incorruptible. He clothed him in a purple mantle and, transmitting to him a copy of the laws of Justinian, said to him: "Judge Rome, the Leonine City, and the whole world."

In this agreement, we can easily pick out the part that was owing to Sylvester and the part owing to Otto III. To Sylvester belongs the conception of an Empire devoted to the defense of religion and of the poor. The son of Theophano was the one who fancied the introduction at Rome, about the pope and the emperor, of an Oriental pomp that would surely revive against both of them the smoldering jealousies of the Italian nobility.

With an appearance of generosity, Otto, declaring his affection for Sylvester II, had already granted to the Church eight counties of the march of Ancona, previously in dispute between the pope and the emperor. But, in the preamble of the document, he assumed toward the papacy the tone of a haughty, almost insolent, protector. He said: "The popes have lost their possessions through their own fault, and then have accused the emperors. The Church's titles to greatness were blotted out by the carelessness and ignorance of the popes, who sold what belongs to St. Peter and what they had received from the emperors." [19]

An understanding based on such half-truths or misstatements was calculated to produce both good and evil results. Sylvester's wisdom was able to strengthen the good and, to a large extent, avert the evil.

Poland and Hungary

The "renewal of the Empire" was the starting-point for new peaceful conquests for the Christian faith. With this we must

[19] The genuineness of this document has been attacked by some modern writers, but Pertz reprints it as authentic (*Monum. Germ. hist., Leges,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 162). Cf. Olleris, *op. cit.,* p. cxlviii.

connect notably the Christian beginning of the kingdoms of Poland and Hungary. Those two countries had already received missioners, who founded several bishoprics there. To the chief city of one of these bishoprics (Gnesen) Boleslaus, duke of Poland, removed the remains of the apostle of Prussia, St. Adalbert, massacred by the people to whom he was preaching the Gospel. One of Emperor Otto III's first acts was to go to Gnesen and there venerate the relics of the saint who had been his friend. The Duke of Poland honored the august pilgrim with a brilliant welcome. Otto freed him from the bonds of vassalage that connected him with Germany; then a papal bull erected the city of Gnesen into an archbishopric, with the dioceses of Cracow, Kobberg, and Breslau as suffragans, dependent directly upon the Holy See.[20] This was the origin of the Polish nation, destined to exhibit so much heroism and to endure so many afflictions.

The origin of Hungary, that other highway of Christendom in the Middle Ages, is also connected with the intervention of Sylvester II. In the work of an old chronicler, we read: "The Pope had prepared a golden crown which he intended to place on the head of Boleslaus. But during the night an angel of the Lord appeared to him and said: 'Keep this crown for another duke, whose ambassadors will call on you tomorrow.' " [21] The next day the Pope was informed of the arrival of the venerable bishop of Kalocsa, Astericus, who was accompanied by a deputation of Hungarians. He came to ask the Pontiff to bless Hungary, to receive it as a gift made to St. Peter, to raise the Church of Gran to the rank of metropolis, to confirm the foundation of certain abbeys, and to bestow the title of king upon the duke of Hungary, Stephen, who, recently converted by St. Adalbert of Prague, had himself zealously spread the faith of Christ among his subjects. Sylvester accepted the offering of the kingdom.

[20] *Scriptores hist. polon.*, pp. 60 f.
[21] *Acta sanctorum*, September 2, life of St. Stephen.

But to Stephen and his successors he left the free government of the kingdom. The Duke was created king. From the Pope he received a crown bearing an image of Christ surrounded by the twelve Apostles. This crown, joined with another which one of his predecessors had received from Constantinople, was henceforth looked upon as the sacred palladium of Hungary.

The Holy Land

The eyes of Pope Sylvester had always turned, beyond the nations of Europe, to the Holy Land, in the possession of the infidels. Just when he was rejoicing over the progress of the faith and civilization in Europe, news reached him that pilgrims to the Holy Land were victims of violent attacks by Mussulman fanaticism. The indignation of the Christian world was stirred by these reports. The Pope implored the charity of the faithful and, if there should be need, the help of their arms. His appeal took the form of a letter from the Church of Jerusalem to the Church of Rome. The Holy City recalled its past splendor and, from the depth of its misery, begged the universal Church to come to its aid: "To the task, soldier of Christ! Take the standard and fight. If you are unable to do so with arms, come to our aid by your advice, by your money. What is it you are giving, and to whom are you giving? By your generosity you are, after all, merely giving a little to Him who has freely given you all you have. He does not receive it gratis, but increases the offering. He recompenses it in the future." [22]

[22] Olleris, *op. cit.*, letter 219, pp. 149 f. Some authors (e. g., Jaffé) have questioned the authenticity of this document. Chevalier considers that "their reasons are not convincing" ("Gerbert" in *La France chrétienne dans l'histoire*, p. 143). Olleris keeps the document in the *Œuvres de Gerbert*. Julien Havet also retains it. He says: "It has been called into doubt, but without sufficient reasons." He offers the hypothesis that it was "a sort of circular intended to be carried about by a collector of alms who was begging for the Christian establishments of Jerusalem" (Havet, *Lettres de Gerbert*, p. 22 note 3). But this is nothing more than a hypothesis.

Europe was not yet prepared to answer this appeal; but Pope Sylvester has the honor of being the first who issued the call to the crusades.

Italian Difficulties

The Italian nobles, ever jealous of their independence and now feeling their sway threatened by the growing power of the Empire and the papacy, were stirred and seized upon every pretext to thwart the Pope and the Emperor. Disorders took place in the very States of the Holy See and in the neighboring domains of the nobility.

"At the close of the tenth century the possessions of the Church of Rome, not reckoning the benefices scattered through Christian Europe, extended in western Italy from Terracina to Tuscany. Orvieto belonged to it. To the east, these possessions embraced part of Romania and of the march of Ancona. . . . Sylvester was gentle and benevolent; he was concerned about the welfare of his subjects.[23] However, although the Pope's intentions were fine, his agents did not always conform to them. Hence disturbances arose." [24] About the year 1000, the city of Cesena revolted, and the Pope had to lead an army in person to bring it into submission.[25] Another time, in Rome the complaints of a poor woman against her judge embittered the malcontents. At word that she insulted the count, swords were unsheathed in the holy place.[26]

Outside the States of the Church, more serious disturbances occurred at the instigation of certain great lords. We are acquainted with the hereditary ambitions that were handed down

[23] We should like to find documents concerning Sylvester's administration of the property of the Holy See. But the establishing of the Archives for the preservation of the bulls and letters of the Holy See dates from the end of the twelfth century, in the pontificate of Innocent III.

[24] Olleris, p. clxxviii.

[25] St. Peter Damian, *Vita S. Mauri; PL,* CXLIV, 950.

[26] Olleris, p. clxxix.

in the family of Tusculum. "Various branches of the family of Theophylactus had carved out extensive domains for themselves. Of these Tusculum on Monte Albano, Praeneste (Palestrina), Arci in Sabina, Galera on the road to Tuscany, were the chief centers and fortresses." [27]

But just at this time the gravest difficulties did not come from that direction. On account of the preservation of ancient municipal institutions that went back to ancient Tibur and especially on account of the activity of its Bishop Gregory, Tivoli was then the proudest and most prosperous of the cities. In 1001, for some reason not exactly known to us, the people of Tivoli rebelled against the Emperor. He took up arms to punish them, and the Romans took part in the expedition. The conflict might be terrible. In a spirit of peace, the Pope persuaded the Emperor to pardon the rebellious city. Otto merely destroyed part of the city walls and demanded hostages as a guaranty of the people's fidelity.[28] But the Romans, displeased at the gentleness shown to their formidable rivals, revolted. The city gates were closed, barricades were erected in the streets, and the court was besieged in the palace on the Aventine. Nothing less than the approach of an army under command of Henry of Bavaria restored peace. Otto pardoned the rebels. But with sad bitterness he said to them: "Are you not my Romans? Out of love for you I forsook the Saxons, all my Germans, my own blood. I adopted you as my own children. My preference for you has aroused against me the hatred of all my subjects; and now you have rejected your father." [29]

After this discourse, Otto left Rome, taking Pope Sylvester with him. They went north. On the way both of them gave and confirmed privileges to the churches and monasteries for the purpose of winning heaven's favor.[30] The previous year the Em-

[27] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical,* p. 366.
[28] Thangmar, *Vita S. Bernwardi,* col. 25; *PL,* CXL, 413.
[29] *Ibid.; PL,* CXL, 414.
[30] Muratori, *Antiquitates italicae medii aevi,* V, 489.

peror had met at Monte Gargone the great hermit St. Nilus who had been driven from Calabria by the Saracen invasion, and at Ravenna another monastic patriarch, St. Romuald. The Emperor now recalled the conversations he had had with these men of God and considered, so we are told, giving up the crown and entering a monastery.

Conditions in Germany

The news he received from Germany was such as to confirm his idea of bidding farewell to worldly affairs. An interminable legal suit between the bishop of Mainz and the abbot of Hildesheim regarding the celebrated monastery of Gandersheim [31] had assumed enormous proportions and divided the ecclesiastical and lay nobility of Germany. Besides, the feudal lords, profiting by the Emperor's absence, had covered Germany with their castles and fortresses from which they ruined all safety and security by their private wars, deeds of violence, and jealousies. In such circumstances, the Slavs of the north and east and the Saracens of the south, following their old custom, crossed the frontiers and renewed their bold incursions. Otto issued orders to the German bishops, that before Christmas they should come to Italy with troops. He said a council would settle the difficulties about Gandersheim. Then they would march against the enemies of the Empire.

The council opened at Todi on December 27, 1001, but only three German bishops were present. Otto, whose strength was exhausted by a slow fever, fell into a state of discouragement. He saw his magnificent projects dissolve like a dream. Rome closed its gates against him; the dukes and the German counts were hatching a plot against him that was approved by the bishops.[32]

[31] It was at Gandersheim that Hroswitha cultivated poetry so successfully.
[32] Olleris, p. 183; Ditmar, *Chron.*, IV, 30; *PL*, CXXXIX, 1267.

Otto turned his steps to southern Italy. As his illness grew worse, he was forced to stop not far from Rome, at Paterno at the foot of Monte Soracte. Says the chronicler: "His disease became worse each day. He received the body and blood of the Lord; then, with bishops at his side, amid the grief of all, gently and humbly he breathed his last." [33] The date was January 23, 1002. Otto was not yet twenty-two years old. The chronicler does not set down the name of any of the prelates who were present at this deathbed. Some writers have supposed that Pope Sylvester must have been present and that the Emperor, before appearing in the presence of his Judge, received viaticum from the hands of him to whom, after God, he owed most. With Otto III the male line of Otto the Great became extinct.

Sylvester II survived Otto III a short time. We are not informed about his last days. He died at Rome on May 12, 1003, after governing the Church only four years and three months. However, few pontificates have been more fruitful. One of his successors, Sergius IV, in the epitaph he placed on Sylvester's tomb, sums up his work thus: "By him every age rejoiced, and every crime was crushed."

True, many causes for sadness lived after him in the Christian world, and every evil did not disappear with him. But, by his cultivation of the arts and of learning, he prefaced the great scientific, literary, and artistic movement of the thirteenth century; by his zeal in proclaiming the rights of the Church and in defending the purity of clerical morals, he was the worthy predecessor of St. Gregory VII and of Innocent III. "Gerbert is one of those privileged men who should be ranked by the impartial history of civilization among those whose names it should retain." [34] The extent and value of his work well deserves more than passing notice.

[33] Thangmar, *op. cit.*, no. 37; *PL*, CXL, 422.
[34] Picavet, *Gerbert, un pape philosophe*, p. vii.

Scholarship of Sylvester II

Learning, art, and virtue, the true, the beautiful, and the good, were Gerbert's passions early in life; to his last breath he strove for these three noble causes.

Graeco-Roman culture, transformed by Christianity, was transmitted to the Middle Ages by the Byzantines, the Arabs, and the Westerners. Later these three currents merged. Gerbert drew his learning exclusively from the Western current,[35] which was marked in its principal stages by the names of Boethius, Isidore of Seville, Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, Servatus Lupus, Scotus Erigena, and Odo of Cluny. Odo, before he became abbot of Cluny, was at the head of the monastery of St. Gerold of Aurillac, where Gerbert, in 972, studied logic.

"To Gerbert's contemporaries his extensive knowledge, superior to the most learned of them, was evident chiefly from his teaching, his letters, and his writings. Alcuin had timidly shown that the seven arts can serve practical life and become valuable auxiliaries for religion. Rabanus Maurus had taught especially the sacred sciences; Servatus Lupus, profane literature; John Scotus Erigena was a remarkable humanist. Eric (Heiric) and Remigius of Auxerre to some extent preserved the heritage handed down to them, but let it diminish. Gerbert recovered it and increased it." [36]

The sciences principally cultivated by Gerbert were theology, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, physics, and medicine.

For Gerbert, whose orthodoxy was always faultless, theology was the first of the sciences, and he liked to connect the others with it. He regarded theology as a philosophy of the gifts of faith and, although bowing before the authority of revelation, he proudly asserted the role of reason. To Arnulf he wrote: "The Divinity has made a priceless present to men by giving

[35] On this point, see Picavet, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–19, 34–38.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

them faith; but it never denied them science. Faith gives life to a just man, but he does well to add science thereto, since those devoid of it are said to be dolts." [37] In his treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini,*[38] while correcting unsound expressions and too venturesome ideas, he repeats the theory which Paschasius Radbertus had taught on the Eucharist. In this connection he sets forth, regarding the Trinity, the incarnation, the person of Christ, and the resurrection, doctrines that evidence a deep acquaintance with the fathers of the Church. He loved the Church passionately. He says that "he would gladly give his life to keep the Church united to the Lord." [39] Like Hincmar of Reims, from whom he often drew inspiration in his writings, he declared that the unity of the Church is symbolized and guaranteed by the unity of authority; that the latter resides in the successor of St. Peter, the head of all the bishops and superior to kings in the spiritual realm. Yet, more explicitly than Hincmar, he admits that the emperors, charged with the defense of the Church and exercising their powers in its name, have no right to require from bishops and abbots assistance, fidelity, and especially obedience except in the measure stipulated by the feudal contract.[40]

Of Sylvester II's philosophical work we have only fragments, including the *Libellus de rationali et ratione uti,* where, besides questions that seem futile to us, we find a true conception of philosophy, understood as "the science of things human and divine." Hauréau considers it a curious attempt to reconcile Platonism and Aristotelianism. Says Picavet: "We may add that Gerbert employed a method destined to have a great future; that he treated fully and discusses from every point of view a problem raised but not solved by Porphyry; that in this manner he

[37] Letter 190, to Arnulf.

[38] Olleris, p. 279.

[39] Letter 181.

[40] Letter 183, to Otto III. Cf. Jaffé, pp. 496–99; Havet, *op. cit.,* p. 33; Picavet, *op. cit.,* pp. 195–97; Olleris, pp. 556 f.

doubly pointed out the way to those who, a century later, broached the question of universals." [41]

We know that Sylvester wished to make mathematics an auxiliary of theology and philosophy, that he demonstrated its theoretical and practical usefulness to Otto I, Otto III, and John XIII.[42] Says his pupil, the monk Richer: "He devoted no small labor to the study of mathematics." [43] Of his mathematical writings, three remain: *Regula de abaco computi, Libellus de numerorum divisione,* and *Liber abaci.* This last was written after his elevation to the papacy.[44] To what extent was Sylvester II, in mathematics, an initiator or even an inventor? Quite divergent answers have been given to this obscure question.[45] But all agree that, in the history of mathematics, the labors of Gerbert form an important stage; no one denies that he was a forerunner of modern science.[46]

The monk Richer had a profound admiration for his master's teaching in astronomy. He says:

It is fitting to relate what pains he took in explaining astronomy, to note the wisdom of so great a man, and to enable the reader better to appreciate the might of his genius. This science is scarcely intelligible; yet he explained it, by means of certain instruments, to the general astonishment. First, he represented the world by a wooden globe which, in its small proportions, was an exact image of ours. He placed the line of the poles in an oblique direction with reference to the horizon and, near the upper pole, he represented the northern constellations; near the lower pole, those of the south. He regulated this position by means of what the Greeks call "horizon." His globe thus placed on the horizon, in such a way that he could show, in a practical

[41] Picavet, *op. cit.,* pp. 157 f.

[42] *Ibid.,* p. 181.

[43] Richer, III, 49.

[44] Olleris, p. 357.

[45] Chasles, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences,* 1839–43; T. H. Martin, *Histoire des mathématiques;* Victor Mortet and Paul Tannery, *Un nouveau texte des traités d'arpentage et de géometrie d'Epaphroditus et de Vitravius Rufus.*

[46] Picavet, p. 181.

and convincing manner, the rising and setting of the stars, he initiated his pupils in the disposition of the things and taught them to know the constellations. On clear nights he spent his time studying the stars, and noted them both at their rising and at their setting, passing over the various parts of the world.[47]

In Picavet's study of this pope, we read the following appreciation:

On the basis of these observations we have no reason to say that Gerbert, by the use of a telescope, anticipated Galileo. What is beyond question, is that he observed the stars and their respective positions; to perceive them more easily and to follow their course better, he made use of tubes well fastened together on the inside.[48] Physics and medicine completed his scientific studies. He read Pliny and Celsus. As a man observing them at close range, he described meteorological phenomena, for which he sought merely natural explanations. Although he did not practice the art of the physicians, he knew the science on which they relied. He described diseases, and discussed the way sick people and their ailments ought to be examined. And he even sought remedies for their cure.[49]

This scholar was fond of the beautiful: oratory, music, poetry. Like Cicero, he wished that an orator be trained by the study of the dialecticians and poets, that he reason, grasp, argue, and demonstrate. With St. Augustine, he considered that an orator should be more concerned with convincing, with moving, and with persuading to action than with displaying the art he has studied. In his own discourses and letters, he cites Paralipomenon after Horace, the Psalms after the Aeneid, St. Paul after Lucan.

As to Sylvester's musical knowledge, we have little in the way of documentary evidence. To him is attributed a hymn in honor

[47] Richer, III, 50.
[48] Gerbert's letter to Constantine (Olleris, p. 479) is characteristic on this point.
[49] Picavet, pp. 190 f.

of the Holy Ghost, a prose in honor of the angels.[50] He offered to give instruction in all that concerned music in general and particularly in organ playing. He distinguished the symphonies into tones, semitones, ditones (major third) and diesis (half-ditone). He classified sounds into the different tones. We know that John XIII and Otto the Great were impressed by his musical knowledge. But is he to be credited with any innovation in music? Did he merely gather what was known in his time? On this question we are reduced to surmises.

"Of Sylvester as a poet, we have little to cite. The verses that precede the *Libellus de rationali,* also perhaps those he composed on Boethius, deserve to be mentioned. But as a prose writer he is, like Scotus Erigena, a remarkable humanist, whose letters and addresses would supply curious pages for an anthology of the Latin writers in the Middle Ages. He could be eloquent and pathetic. But in him what dominated was energy, precision, at times even a conciseness and restraint approaching atticism." [51]

Passionately fond of science and art, but convinced that the true and the beautiful have their whole splendor in the good, Gerbert always subordinated science and art to virtue, and sought virtue in union with God and the Church.

In Sylvester II character was at least at the high level of his intelligence; the Christian, the pontiff, were as important as the scholar. "At a time when bitter and often well-founded complaints were voiced against the morality of the clergy, his most pronounced enemies did not allege any failings in his life." [52] Says his biographer:

His morals were blameless. He spoke of austerity in terms the more expressive as they were in perfect accord with all his acts. As abbot he wished that his monks, as also his vassals or his powerful tenants, should faithfully follow the rule; but he was greatly displeased at see-

[50] Olleris, p. 568.
[51] Picavet, p. 132.
[52] Olleris, p. cciii.

ing them lack food and clothing; he did not exercise his full rights against them. As archbishop he generally inclined toward indulgence in case of the lowly and the poor. As pope he proclaimed that one of the attributes of the papal see was to raise up those who had fallen.[53]

For Sylvester II, justice did not consist merely in respect for private rights, in the dealings with persons whom circumstances bring into our presence. He pursued the realization of justice in the organization of a social state that would facilitate and guarantee respect for all rights. This social organization he thought was to be found in feudal society, such as he observed it in the country of the Franks. The feudal contract, by which a vassal pledged his faithfulness to the suzerain, while the latter obliged himself to maintain the vassal in his benefice and to protect him, seemed to Gerbert the ideal of social justice in the actual society where he was. Therefore he endeavored to introduce into Italy the feudal system of the Franks. But this importation of Frankish practices would do violence to local customs, and the system of land concessions by improvement-lease or of farming by *coloni* established on the soil, continued in vigor in Italy.[54]

The feudal system was preferred by Sylvester II because he considered it a more effective protection of the rights of the lowly, a safer guaranty of the performance of the duties of the powerful. He favored it especially because he regarded it as a vast hierarchy with Christ at its head, and at each of its degrees the regulating and beneficent power of the Church to bring about the realization of the kingdom of Christ. From this viewpoint also Sylvester must be considered a forerunner of the society of the Middle Ages, which stamped on its coins the famous exergue, *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat.*

History has not always rendered just tribute to this great

[53] Picavet, pp. 191 f.

[54] See H. de l'Epinois, *Le gouvernement des papes dans les Etats de l'Eglise,* p. 35; Sartori, *Storia, legislazione e stato attuale dei feudi;* Poggi, in *Archivio storico,* new ser., VI, 27.

pope. Baronius, misled by the calumnies of some old chroniclers, judged him severely. But the nineteenth century recognized the greatness of his work. One of the historians who have studied Sylvester II most attentively and most impartially, Julien Havet, writes: "He was always good and generous, as well as loyal and honorable. In all the offices which he held one after the other, I think nobody can cite a single act of his authority or of his influence which was not prompted solely by a sense of duty, by zeal for justice, or by solicitude for the public welfare." [55]

Sylvester II was the most illustrious, but not the sole representative of learning, art, and holiness at the end of the tenth century. The religious and intellectual revival of this period has sometimes been attributed to the security that followed the supposed universal panic of the year 1000. But, as we shall see, it preceded that date. With better reason, this honor has been given to the dynasty of the Ottos. The three emperors of that name, prompted by an ambition to imitate Charlemagne, endeavored to draw to their court the eminent men of their time. As Alcuin, Theodulf, Clement, Claudius of Turin, and Paul Warnefrid gathered about the great Frankish Emperor, so we see coming to the court of the Ottos the Italian Gunzan, the Englishmen Faranol, Mark Allan, Fingard, and Meinwerk, the Frenchmen Adalbero and Gerbert. But they merely made an appearance there. The centers of the movement were elsewhere, were formed about the great abbeys of St. Gall, Cluny, and Fleury, and especially about Gerbert. To this last belongs its chief glory.

When Sylvester II took possession of the see of St. Peter, Labeo Notker, almost as celebrated as his ancestor Notker the Stammerer, was acquiring an immortal renown by his works on mathematics, music, and poetry, in the monastery of St. Gall.[56]

[55] Havet, *Lettres de Gerbert,* Introd., p. xxxviii.

[56] We have only part of the works of Labeo Notker. They hold the first rank among the sources of High German. Cf. Wetzer and Welte, *Dict. de théol,* IX, 268.

St. Odilo, "the incarnation of all the virtues of his order and his times," [57] was at the head of the Cluny abbey, and Abbo, as celebrated for learning as for holiness, was directing the monks of Fleury near Orleans. But the school of Reims, where the echo of Gerbert's voice still resounded, was then a center of more brilliant learning.[58] There, about the year 1000, a former pupil of Gerbert, the monk Richer, was writing his *Historiae* in a style remarkable for vivacity and color. The discovery of this work in 1833 [59] has revived the history of the tenth century.[60]

Romanesque Architecture

According to the view of most archeologists, Romanesque architecture began at the close of the tenth century. Its origin is thus described: "With their lofty towers, which drew down upon them the fire of heaven, their exposed beams and their hangings, which helped the rapid spread of the flames, the best built Carolingian churches even in times of peace were always exposed to the danger of being reduced to ashes." [61] The invasions of the Normans, who for more than a century spread pillage and fire in the richest provinces; then the feudal wars, which in the tenth century plunged Europe into a state of insecurity and barbarism out of which Charlemagne's genius had drawn it; lastly, the wretched construction of most of the edifices rebuilt or repaired hastily after the passage of the Normans: all these circumstances aggravated the peril. The chronicles of the last part of the tenth century are filled with accounts of the catastrophes that wiped out the most beautiful monu-

[57] Baudrillart, "Cluny et la papauté" in *Rev. prat. d'apol.*, XI (1910), 14.

[58] *Hist. litt. de la France,* VI, 24.

[59] The text which Pertz discovered at Bakberg in 1833 is to be found in Migne, *PL,* Vol. CXXXVIII.

[60] In the year 1000 the Basilian monk St. Nilus founded the monastery of Grottaferrata, which was destined to become a center of Oriental studies. On this foundation, see *Acta sanctorum,* September, VII, 282.

[61] R. de Lasteyrie, *L'architecture religieuse en France à l'époque romane,* p. 226.

ments in a few hours. In 975, fire devastated the famous St. Martial Abbey at Limoges; in 988, the abbey of Charroux in Poitou was the victim of a like disaster; in 992, fire consumed the abbey of Mont St. Michel; in 997, the basilica of St. Martin of Tours and twenty-two other churches perished in the same way.[62]

The number and seriousness of these disasters, which sometimes cost the lives of hundreds of persons, suggested the idea of attempting to prevent the fires by covering the churches with vaulted stone roofs. This was the origin of Romanesque art. The closing years of the tenth century witnessed, besides the building of other churches, the construction or restoration of the churches of Bourgueil,[63] St. Peter of Melun,[64] of Lagny,[65] of St. Riquier,[66] of Fécamp,[67] of St. Ouen of Rouen,[68] and of Ile-Barbe.[69] Personally King Robert the Pious founded or restored numerous churches, with the aid of subsidies generously granted to those who would restore them. To mention only those that have not totally disappeared, we might cite St. Benedict-on-Loire, Notre Dame d'Etampes, Notre Dame de Melun, the church of Poissy, St. Aignan of Orleans, and St. Germain-des-Prés of Paris.[70] This movement of religious and artistic fervor continued throughout the eleventh century. It even increased after Philip I with the progress of the building art, and reached the highest point in the twelfth century under Louis VII and Philip Augustus, after covering France with countless edifices, each of which marked an advance over the preceding.[71]

[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 226 f.
[63] *Gallia christiana,* XIV, 654.
[64] *Ibid.*, XII, 171.
[65] *Ibid.*, VII, 30.
[66] *Ibid.*, X, 1248.
[67] *Ibid.*, XI, 202.
[68] Willelmi-Gernetii, *Hist. Norman,* IV, 19 (*Recueil des hist. de France,* 184).
[69] *Ibid.*, IV, 225.
[70] R. de Lasteyrie, *op. cit.*, p. 229.
[71] *Ibid.*

A long time was required to give the vaulted roofs their definite form; the eleventh century did not suffice, and part of the twelfth century was spent in groping about. But this very groping developed the ability of the workers, stimulated the genius of the architects, led them to break loose from the old traditions and to replace old-fashioned practices by a multitude of ingenious inventions that gave birth to an art full of life and originality.

As the formation of this art coincided with the period when the Romance languages were beginning to separate from Latin, the happy idea arose to give the name Romanesque to this new art, sprung from the Latin art considerably mixed with Byzantine and barbarian elements.[72]

"Romanesque architecture," says Enlart, "coordinates, purifies, simplifies, and develops the elements that Carolingian art furnished it. It has been rightly compared to the Romance languages. It rests on a Latin basis and, like the Romance tongues, admits a certain share of foreign elements. It forms several schools comparable to the dialects of the Romance languages." [73]

"Carolingian church buildings contained the following: a central nave with two lower and narrower side aisles; a transept forming the arms of the cross; a choir separated from the nave and from the transept by a stone enclosure and slightly elevated so as to permit at a lower level the vaulted crypt where the saints rested; an entry located opposite the choir. All these essential elements of basilica construction the Romanesque architect had merely to take as starting-points. He did not need to imagine the vault, which, in its various forms, appeared in the monuments of Latin art. But he adapted it to the requirements of religious construction, using especially the lengthened semicircular arch which is called the *voûte en berceau,* and that system of compartments resting on salient corners, which constitutes the *voûte d'arêtes.*

[72] *Ibid.,* p. 227.

[73] Camille Enlart, *Manuel d'archéologie française,* Vol. I, *arch. religieuse,* p. 199.

To meet the difficulties arising from the pressure of the vaults upon the side walls, these walls had to be made thicker and the window openings had to be made smaller and fewer, and the vault had to be supported on the inside by stone binding arches; the interior pillars had to be strengthened on the outside by symmetrical buttresses, and the number of clustered pilasters and columns had to be increased: in a word, the amount of air and space had to be reduced for the sake of solidity. The needs of defense explain the construction of those massive church towers, at first round, then square or polygonal, veritable church donjons, where the watchman could see the enemy from afar and where, at need, protection could be found and an attack withstood for some time. Yet the Romanesque construction displayed buoyancy that clearly revealed the loftiest aspirations of religious thought. Those arches and vaults rose up, even though they became rounded and interrupted. Accustomed formerly to the horizontal lines of the early temples, the eyes found a greater attraction in the vertical line, vigorously rising toward heaven. Already we see a beginning of that ascent of stone which, in the period of Gothic art, became prodigious in its daring attempts.[74]

Music

In these restored churches was heard a liturgical chant which the genius of a monk of St. Gall, Notker the Stammerer, enriched with new elements, full of grace and harmony. His works were composed about the end of the ninth century. To these works is attributed the preservation of the purity of religious chant, especially of plain chant, through the Middle Ages. Certainly to him we owe the development of the sequences and proses.[75]

After the word *Alleluia,* which follows the Epistle, a melody of varying length was vocalized; it was called *jubilus* because

[74] Luchaire, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 200.

[75] A. Gastoué, *L'art grégorien,* pp. 77, 182. Cf. Léon Gautier, *La poésie liturgique,* pp. 19 f.

it expressed the joyful feelings of the soul, and *sequence* because it was like a continuation of the *Alleluia.* These long series of grouped notes were hard to remember. At the Jumièges Abbey they thought to join words to these neumes. To each group of sounds corresponded a word having as many syllables as the group had notes. Notker composed a large number of texts thus adapted to the primitive melody, and also developed this melody musically, thus allowing the chanted text to be made longer. In this way he composed literary pieces that were called proses. They constituted successive phrases of a prose in rhythm and sometimes in rhyme, but not a metrical prose like a piece of verse. The *Victimae paschali laudes* gives us an idea of them.[76]

After the way had been paved by Notker,[77] numerous Christian artists supplied other parts of the divine office with new words and melodies. The close of the tenth century was marked by a flowering of anonymous musical compositions remarkable for melodic feeling and expression. The offertory *Elegerunt,* various antiphons for the Palm Sunday procession, the Alleluia versicles: *Justus germinabit, Pretiosa,* the office of the Trinity, and the magnificent *Libera* of the office of the dead, belong to this period.[78] Robert the Pious, king of France, who was sometimes seen at the St. Denis Basilica directing the rendition of the offices with his scepter in place of a choirmaster's baton, composed the words and music of several responses. The *Chronicles of St. Denys* relate how with one of these responses (*Cornelius centurio*) he paid homage to Pope Sylvester II. "One day he was at Rome," we read in the *Chronicles,* "the day of the feast of St. Peter. Also present were the apostolic lord and the car-

[76] Later on, beginning with the eleventh century, proses were composed with much more regular rhythm, which became a special form of versification, such as the *Veni sancte Spiritus,* the *Lauda Sion,* the *Dies irae,* the *Stabat.*

[77] Notker's musical works have been collected by Pertz and published in the *Monumenta Germaniae, Scriptores,* Vol. II.

[78] Gastoué, *op. cit.,* p. 83.

dinals. The King, going up to the altar, made a semblance of presenting an offering of some great thing: it was a scroll on which were written the response and the music." [79]

In this same period some musical theorists, who taught their art to pupils, also wrote out what they were teaching. Their works, largely unpublished, contain many interesting details about tonality and rhythm. We can easily note three different currents: that of the Graeco-Roman music, which, as part of the quadrivium, had entered the schools with arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy; the current of liturgical music, coming from earlier music, but, like the Romance languages, derived from the Latin; and the current of polyphonic and measured music, which arose from the popular songs and, entering the chant schools, gradually drove out the unmeasured plain chant with notable detriment to the Gregorian rhythm.[80]

The popular tongues, during their formation, gave birth to a musical art based on their own traits. The rhyming poetry of the popular songs, replacing meter by rhyme, was less concerned with maintaining the movement of the verse than with close attention to the ending of the verse. This trend affected popular religious art. These poems were sung by the minstrels in front of the churches as the people came out after the liturgical functions. And, in the ears of clergy and people, the rhymes mingled with the memory of the sequences and hymns which had just been sung in the church. Thus came about, between liturgical chant and profane song, that fusion which would show its effect in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

The rise of the cantilena was not the only result of the development of the Romance languages. The close of the tenth century saw the birth of the romance and the epic poems. Says Dom Rivet: "At the end of the tenth century almost all the provinces of France had their composers of epic poems and of romances.

[79] *Recueil des historiens de la France,* X, 305.
[80] Cf. Leclercq, art. "Chant grégorien" in *Dict. d'arch. chrét. et de lit.,* I, 315.

Languedoc, Dauphiné, and Aquitaine were the parts of France where they first appeared. The troubadours of Provence were the princes of romance composition, which in time spread from France to neighboring countries. From the French this secret was learned by Italy and Spain, which have been so productive in the art of composing romances." [81] At the outset, cantilena, romance, and epic had this trait in common, that they were religious compositions.

The epic was the offspring of the cantilena and the romance. We have good reason to suppose that the tenth century possessed some heroic songs.[82] From the early years of the eleventh century we have a single great composition, the *Life of St. Alexius* (*Alexis?*).[83] It is a real poem. Beginning solemnly after the manner of a long poetic narrative, it possesses that skilful arrangement of parts and that studied unfolding which are traits of literary works. Although we may perhaps not rightly call it an epic, yet we may consider it an epic song, a sort of transition between the popular romance and the epic.

Cluny Abbey

We scarcely need to recall that, for all these progressive movements of religious architecture, of church music, and of popular hymns, the chief centers were the monasteries of the tenth century. This they were especially through the Christian sentiment that inspired all these works. Among those places of refuge, which one historian (Mignet) calls "concentrations of Christianity," Cluny always held the first rank. From Pope John XII to Pope Sylvester II its social importance and its religious influ-

[81] *Histoire littéraire de la France,* VI, 15. Cf. Gaston Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne,* pp. 47 f.; Léon Gautier, *Les epopées françaises,* pp. 64 f.

[82] Gautier, *op. cit.,* p. 67.

[83] *Ibid.,* p. 83. From the tenth century we have the *Vie de saint Léger,* a popular lamentation in six-foot strophes. It has been published by Gaston Paris in the periodical *Romania,* II, 252.

ence continued to grow. In 999, Gregory V, after granting the Cluny congregation a bull confirming its privileges, enumerated the properties it possessed in the districts of Auvergne, Autun, Mâcon, as also in the dioceses of Viviers, Uzes, Troyes, Orange, Gap, Valence, Vienne, Lyons, and Lausanne.[84]

But Cluny's territorial power was the least of its glories. Its renown was unsullied. Its strict rule permeated its members with its vigor; their souls expanded with a lively piety and a joyous religious spirit. Its abbots seemed to hand on the quality of holiness along with the symbols of their office. After St. Odo, whose virtue was venerated by the whole Church, St. Majolus (Mayeul) held the abbatial crosier for a period of forty years (954–94), majestic and kindly, always equable, always self-possessed even in the face of the worst opposition. So influential was his prestige that his successor St. Odilo wrote of him: "Earthly kings and princes called him lord and master; and he was truly the prince of the monastic religion." Throughout Christendom, the declaration, "I am a Cluny monk," was uttered with the same pride as, centuries before, marked the proud boast, "I am a Roman citizen."

In physical appearance, unlike his predecessor, Odilo was short, with a pallid, thin face, but equally imposing in his whole bearing, and equally aware of the importance of his office and the extent of his duties.[85] He governed the monastery for fifty-five years (994–1049), during which its influence and possessions continued to increase. St. Odilo at Cluny promoted scholarly pursuits and perseveringly upheld the strictness of the early days. In short, under his rule, in the time of Pope Sylvester, Cluny was already in the Church the great institution that, under the hands of the popes, appeared to be capable of regenerating Christendom.

[84] Jaffé, no. 3896; *PL*, CXXXVII, 932

[85] Baudrillart, "Cluny et la papauté" in *Rev. prat. d'apol.*, XI (1910), 14. Cf. Hefele, art. "Cluny" in Wetzer and Welte, *Dict. de théologie.*

Thus in the arts as in the various branches of learning, in the realm of social institutions as in that of ecclesiastical, the great Catholic reform which later blossomed forth in full vigor in the century of Innocent III already had its germ in the century of Sylvester II.[86]

[86] We have given an account of the religious, political, and intellectual movement that took place under the pontificate of Sylvester II without taking any notice of the emotion which is supposed to have been produced by the coming of the year 1000 which, we are sometimes told, was looked forward to as the date of the end of the world. Since this "legend of the year 1000" is still maintained by some historians, we have thought fitting to quote here the excellent criticism of it made by C. Pfister in a few condensed pages. He says: "Between the years 960 and 970 a few 'enlightened' men expressed the opinion that the world was soon to founder. But their error, opposed by the Church, had no followers. From 970 to the year 1000, absolutely not a single text authorizes us to say that men, abandoning all labor, were simply awaiting the final catastrophe and that, according to the expression of a great historian, Michelet (*Histoire de France,* II, 132), they had the frightful hope of the last judgment. We possess about 150 papal bulls issued in this interval, and we declare that in none of them do you find the least allusion to a proximate end of the world. We have also bulls that followed the year 1000, and in none do we find an expression of thanksgiving to God for having turned aside the dread evil. Numerous synods were held during the same period from 970 to 1000; in their acts never do we see a reference to the annihilation of the earth. So little did any such belief prevail that in 998 the Council of Rome imposed on King Robert a penance of seven years (Labbe, *Concilia,* IX, 772). By way of objection, we are referred to the canons of the Council of Trosly: 'In its terrible majesty approaches that day when all the shepherds will appear with their flocks before the eternal Shepherd. And what will we then allege?' (Labbe, IX, 523.) But the Council of Trosly was held in 911. We are also referred to deeds by private individuals, giving their property to churches or monasteries, because 'ruin is being multiplied,' or because 'the end of the world is approaching' (*appropinquante mundi termino*). But expressions of this sort were used in the eighth century (Marculfe, *Formulae,* II, no. 3), and from that date on we find them in the documents of central and southern France (Deloche, *Cartulaire de Beaulieu;* Germer, *Cartulaire du chapitre de l'église cathédrale de Nîmes,* nos. 27, 34, 41, 44, 78); these documents were drawn up in 925, 928, 930, 943, and 984. If we pass from documents to the chroniclers, we read in Godelle: 'In several places on the earth the rumor was current, casting fear and depression into the hearts of many men, that the end of the world was imminent. The wisest, turning their attention to the question of their salvation, strove more attentively to correct their life' (*Recueil des historiens de la France,* X, 262). But this passage refers to the year 1010, not the year 1000. After the emotion caused in Europe by the news of the taking of the Holy Sepulcher, true Christians reflected and thought more about eternity. Furthermore, Godelle was writing after the year 1145. Rodulphus Glaber remains to be considered. After describing a terrible famine, he writes:

Unfortunately those who were unsubmissive to any work of reformation were many and powerful. After Pope Sylvester's death, they again arose and set up so many obstacles to the work of the papacy that a few years later it seemed more endangered than ever and, for its resumption, required all the genius of the monk Hildebrand.

'People thought that the order of the seasons and the laws of the elements which formerly governed the world had fallen into an eternal chaos and people feared the end of the human race' (Glaber, IV, 4; *Rec. des. hist. de la France,* X, 49). But Rodulphus places the story of this famine at about 1033, long after the fatal year had passed. In another place he says: 'About the year 1003 it happened that almost throughout the world and chiefly in France and Italy people began to rebuild the churches, although many of them, solidly constructed, had no need of rebuilding, but each Christian nation wished to possess the most beautiful; as though the world, recovering from old age, had put on the white garment of the churches' (Glaber, III, 4; *Rec. des hist. de la France,* X, 29). What conclusion may be drawn from this passage? Simply that at the beginning of the eleventh century many churches were constructed. In the eighteenth century some archaeologists wondered what were the causes of this artistic movement, and then, carelessly interpreting the texts we have just quoted, they invented the legend of the terrors preceding the year 1000 and the joy which the nations felt when the dread time had passed. This joy, they said, was expressed outwardly by the construction of fine churches. If they studied their subject more closely, perhaps they would have seen that many of these churches were built shortly before the coming of the year 1000. Perhaps they may also allege the prose of Montpellier: 'Hearken, O earth. . . . It comes, it is near, the day of the supreme wrath.' But, even supposing that this chant belongs to the tenth century, what does it prove? What is proved by the *Dies irae;* that Christianity believed in the end of the world and in the last judgment, as it still does. The Church did not believe in a universal conflagration that would embrace the world in the year 1000. Between the years 960 and 970 a few intellectuals did indeed teach that the world was about to come to an end, but their heresy did not present any danger" (C. Pfister, *Etudes sur le règne de Robert le Pieux,* pp. 322 f.). The question is more fully treated in Duval, *Les terreurs de l'an mille* (3d ed., 1908).

CHAPTER III

Domination by the Italian Factions (1003–49)

AMONG the powerful families whose ambition had until then disturbed the rule of the popes, we note particularly two great rival houses: the family of the Crescentii and that of Tusculum. Both of them were connected with the great Alberic, and through him with Theophylactus and Marozia.

Immediately after the death of Otto III, a certain John Crescentius got the Romans to bestow on him the title of patrician. "We may well suppose that this Crescentius, son of the criminal executed in 998, was not a stranger to the revolt of 1001, and that the Romans then placed the supreme authority in his hands. The tradition continued: for thirty years the power had passed alternately from Otto to Crescentius, from Crescentius to Otto. But it was always the same conflict between the national leader and the foreign prince. Says Duchesne:

Opposed to the Crescentii was the growing influence of the counts of Tusculum. In the time of Otto III the head of the family (Gregory) appeared with the title of *praefectus navalis*. Probably he is the one who had restored the long-abandoned acropolis of the old Latin city and made it into a fortress. He had three sons, Alberic, Romanus, and Theophylactus. The last one was a cardinal. For a long time this powerful family aspired to succeed the Crescentii in the government of the Roman state. But to do so was not easy. The Crescentii were in possession of the power and represented the tradition of independence, so far as independence could prevail after the coming of the Saxon kings upon the Italian scene. According as the German authority was strong or weak, present or absent, the Crescentii yielded or opposed, accepted or protested. In one way or the other, they gave

expression, as exactly as possible, to the feelings of the people, or rather of the aristocracy, the only class which counted at that time. The Tusculans, to thwart them, assumed a special devotion to the German interests. But at bottom they cared little more for the Germans than did their rivals; yet they were held in higher regard north of the Alps.[1]

We are poorly informed about the events which, after the death of Sylvester II, placed on the papal throne Pope John XVII,[2] who reigned only six months, then John XVIII, who occupied the Papal See until 1009, and lastly Sergius IV, who died May 12, 1012. What we know leads us to believe that these three popes were elected under the influence of the Crescentii. All three enjoyed a good repute. John XVII, whose name was Sicco, was elected June 13, 1003.[3] According to an inscription found in 1750 at Santa Maria de Ripagnano in the March of Ancona, this pope was born of noble parents at the Ripagnano castle and made his studies at Rome in the house of a consul named Petronius. The inscription adds that he occupied the Apostolic See a very short time and soon went to reign in heaven.[4] No other document gives us any information about his pontificate. John XVIII, named Phasianus, was consecrated pope December 25, 1003. He was a devoted friend of the monks, to whom he granted many privileges.[5] At Bamberg, at the request of Henry II, he founded a diocese which was destined to render, in southeastern Germany, the same services as Magdeburg, Merseburg, and Meissen did in the northeastern part of

[1] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical,* pp. 368–71.

[2] Historians differ in the designation of this pope and of the two following popes who bore the name John. This difference depends on whether the historian reckons John XV (the son of Robert) and John Philagathus. Beginning with John XXI all the historians are again in accord. See R. Poupardin, "Note sur la chronologie du pontificat de Jean XVII" in the *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist. de l'Ecole française de Rome,* XXI (1901) 387–90.

[3] Jaffé, no. 3940.

[4] Novaes, II, 209.

[5] Jaffé, nos. 3941, 3944, 3945, 3948, 3950, 3952, 3956, 3962, 3963, 3965.

the Empire.[6] In his pontificate the union of the Roman and Greek Churches was re-established. We know this because, as Baronius proves,[7] the Pope's name was again inserted in 1004 in the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople. But in what circumstances this union was concluded, we are wholly uninformed. John XVIII did not die as pope. An old Roman catalogue relates that, "after a reign of five years and a half, he withdrew to the monastery of St. Paul Outside the Walls and there ended his days in the monastic habit." [8] John XVIII's epitaph calls him pious and learned.

His successor (Buccaporci) was elected in July, 1009, and took the name of Sergius IV. Through the merits of his private and public life,[9] he had been raised to the rank of bishop of Albano. His epitaph, which can still be read in St. Peter's Basilica at Rome, encased in one of the pilasters of the right side nave not far from the epitaph of Sylvester II, recalls that he was "the bread of the poor, the raiment of the naked, the teacher of the people, the revered shepherd of all." [10]

The Holy Land

Sergius' elevation to the papacy coincided with a disaster that was felt throughout Christendom. The memory of it was a notable influence in the later movement of the Crusades. This disaster was the destruction of the Holy Sepulcher. The following account of this sacrilege we quote from Bréhier's work on the Church and the Orient in the Middle Ages.

The revolution that put Palestine under the rule of the Fatimite caliphs of Egypt (969) at first seemed not to alter the situation of

[6] Hefele, IV, 909 f.; Jaffé, nos. 3954 f.
[7] Baronius, *Annales,* year 1009, Bk. II.
[8] *Lib. pontif.,* I, 266.
[9] *Fuit sanctae vitae et conversationis* (*Lib. pontif.,* I, 267).
[10] See the text of the epitaph in *Lib. pontif.,* I, 267.

the Christians or to endanger the safety of the pilgrimages. Early in the eleventh century the relations between the West and the Orient were in full activity. Then an unexpected event brought an end to the peaceful regime that had prevailed ever since the time of Charlemagne. A crowned madman, Caliph Al-Hakim, well known for the excessive cruelty of his decrees, suddenly ordered the governor of Syria, the Turk Yaruk, to demolish the Holy Sepulcher, to remove all Christian emblems at Jerusalem, and to destroy all the relics.

Yusuf, son of Yaruk, went to the Holy City, seized all the offerings that had accumulated in the Basilica of the Holy Sepulcher, razed the church completely, although he did not succeed in removing the substructure. In his fury he did not spare even Golgotha. The convent established near the Holy Sepulcher and the Church of St. Mary the Latin met the same fate. The populace was invited to pillage. The monks were driven out, and all the monastic edifices were destroyed. At the same time a violent persecution, lasting several years, affected all Christians subject to the Fatimite caliph. Pilgrims from the West were not spared. Bishop Peter of Vercelli was seized in Egypt and thrown into prison. His life was spared only because of the intervention of an Italian monk, St. Bononius, who had lived in the East for many years and who, in what way we do not know, obtained Peter's release.

Then of a sudden the dispositions of Al-Hakim changed. Whether on account of a new whim or because of a desire to resume relations with the Byzantine Empire, he discontinued the persecution of the Christians and even gave a favorable hearing to their requests. The situation of the Holy Land Christians then became tolerable, but Al-Hakim's persecution inflicted a hard blow upon the Latins in the East. The Frankish protectorate established by Charlemagne was wiped out, and another power, that of the emperors of Constantinople, succeeded to it for a time.[11]

This persecution had two further consequences. It revived Christians' devotion to the Holy Sepulcher, so that pilgrimages to it increased; and it led to a popular uprising against the Jews,

[11] Louis Bréhier, *L'Eglise de l'Orient au Moyen Age,* pp. 35–37. Cf. Schlumberger, *L'epopée byzantine,* II, 442–44.

who were suspected of having provoked Al-Hakim's measures of persecution.

We read in the words of the chronicler Raoul Glaber:

As soon as word spread that Al-Hakim's mother, Mary, a devout Christian, had obtained from her son an order to rebuild the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, a general rejoicing re-echoed through the West. On all sides incredible multitudes of pilgrims set out for Jerusalem, bearing offerings to help in the reconstruction of the house of God.[12] Once the impulse was given, a general movement took place, such as would not have been thought possible. The initiative had been taken by the populace. Persons of higher rank then followed suit. Then the kings, counts, bishops, all in turn were aroused. So lively was the faith of the pilgrims that many of them asked the Lord for the grace of dying near the Holy Sepulcher, thus making the sacrifice of their life to the God who gave His blood for the redemption of the world. Such was the case of a pilgrim from Burgundy, Lethbold by name, of the diocese of Autun, who went to Jerusalem to find there the heavenly fatherland and there slept in a blessed death.[13]

Raoul Glaber also relates that the Jews were accused and convicted of inciting Caliph Al-Hakim to destroy the Holy Sepulcher. A certain Jew, the bearer of a compromising letter on this matter from his fellow Jews, is said to have confessed his crime and to have suffered the penalty of death by fire. At that period the Jews were exceedingly powerful. Ownership of land was forbidden them, but commerce and banking had put considerable capital in their hands. Wealthy Jewish privateers chartered numerous vessels at Marseilles, Arles, and Narbonne. Their ships traded among the Bretons and the Slavs, in Africa, Asia Minor, even as far as China. They bought spices and sold slaves. This slave trade aroused the Christians against them toward the end of the ninth century. Several of them were stripped of part of their possessions. The movement that broke

[12] Glaber, *Hist.*, Bk. III, chap. 7; *PL*, CXLII, 659.
[13] Glaber, IV, 6; *PL*, CXLII, 680.

out against them at the beginning of the tenth century was more general and more terrible. They were objects not only of national hatred, of jealousy aroused by their vast wealth, and of bitterness springing from the memory of the extortion practiced by some of them in their banking operations, but also of the indignation of religious feelings. They were driven from the cities; they were hunted out in the country districts; they were put to death by fire and sword; some had themselves baptized so as to escape death; others took their own life in despair.[14] Scenes of this sort took place in the course of the Middle Ages; again and again the popes intervened to repress excesses.[15]

At the very time when popular fury was thus breaking out, the papacy was undergoing a painful crisis. Within a few weeks of each other, the patrician Crescentius and Pope Sergius IV died. Since the death of Otto III, Italy had accepted a national king, Arduin, marquis of Ivrea, and was now all in a state of excitement. The two rival parties that were intriguing for the tiara became especially active. The Crescentii advanced the candidacy of a certain Gregory; the Tusculans urged the acceptance of the third son of the count of Tusculum, Theophylactus. In the actual state of affairs, the great power, even at Rome, was that of the emperor. Each of the Italian parties at the same time turned to the successor who had been chosen by the German lords in the place of Otto III.

Political Situation in Germany

The transfer of the imperial power was not accomplished without difficulty. Otto III, at his death, left Germany in a state of unrest. The nobility was sharply divided, and the rules of succession to the throne were not yet well defined. In principle,

[14] *Ibid.*, III, 7.

[15] Was the Christians' accusation well founded? The harsh treatment which Caliph Hakem inflicted on the Jews, confounding them with the Christians in the persecution, seems to absolve the Jews from the crime which the people had imputed to them.

the sovereign obtained his crown by election; but the elective principle was more and more tending to yield before the right of heredity. Henry I, Otto I, and Otto II handed on the royal power to their sons without arousing complaint. Moreover, from the example of France, advantages were recognized in the hereditary system, which spared the country the competitions and disturbances ordinarily aroused by an election.

Nevertheless three candidates presented themselves for the imperial office. Eckhard, margrave of Meissen in Saxony, famous for his warlike exploits in Poland and Italy, laid claim to the crown by reason of his renown and his Saxon nationality; Hermann, duke of Swabia, who enjoyed no less fame for valor and who had just married the daughter of the King of Burgundy, considered that his high connections entitled him to receive the office. From the very first, however, the situation developed rather in favor of Duke Henry of Bavaria who, besides a reputation for wisdom, integrity, and courage, had the advantage of direct descent from King Henry I and consequently was the nephew of Otto the Great.

But at first Henry hesitated to advance his claims. Either on account of a lack of self-confidence or of a fear to enter upon open strife with candidates who might carry the day against him, he judged that someone more worthy ought to be elected.[16] But the insistent counsel of several members of the upper nobility and of the episcopacy removed his scruples. He presented himself as a candidate, aware that he was defending the cause of right and of the tranquillity of the Empire.

St. Henry II

Henry of Bavaria, who later received the title of saint by popular acclaim and by the voice of the Church, was the son of that Henry the Quarrelsome who under Otto II had intrigued

[16] H. Lesêtre, *Saint Henri*, no. 33.

for the crown of Germany. On this account he had been regarded with suspicion from his birth. But his mother Gisela, aware of the danger, prudently had him brought up in a monastery. In accordance with a custom of that time, which left to a child the free choice of his vocation when he reached the age of discernment, she vowed him to the life of the canons regular in the Hildesheim monastery in Saxony. The boy did not follow the religious vocation, but from this monastic training he acquired a deep, tender piety. Furthermore the apprehensions of Otto II vanished. The subsequent conduct of the young prince was not of a sort to revive them. At first, under the direction of St. Wolfgang, bishop of Ratisbon, Henry followed the course of serious studies and lived in the company of the greatest writers and in the cultivation of sacred and profane letters. He then married Cunigundis, the daughter of Sigfrid, count of Luxemburg in the duchy of Upper Lorraine. By her deep piety she was a worthy wife of the saintly prince. During the seven years that he governed the duchy of Bavaria, Henry was a loyal and devoted ruler, used his influence to settle the turbulence of the feudal lords around him, and accompanied Emperor Otto III in his military expeditions.

In a diet at Werla (1002) the nobles decided that Henry should reign "with the help of Christ and by virtue of his hereditary right." His rivals tried to oppose him with other diets, but Eckhard was assassinated on April 29 of that year. The Duke of Swabia took up arms, and the Duke of Bavaria did likewise. But, before anything was decided by this resort to arms, Henry was elected, and was crowned in the month of June at Mainz. The following months he employed in having his royal rights acknowledged.[17]

Certain aspects of Henry's character formed a striking contrast with that of his predecessor, Otto III. Otto, a utopian dreamer, in seeking to carry out his majestic projects dissatis-

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 42–51.

fied Germany and lost Italy. Henry, with a prudent and practical spirit, acted only after mature reflection. Otto's religious faith was mingled with blustering demonstrations and acts of pride. Henry's faith was prudent and firm; by wisely studied combinations, he always attempted to reconcile the interests of the Church with those of the state.

The first acts of the new King of Germany showed the dominant idea that would govern his policy. He endowed several monasteries in Bavaria, and founded new ones. In his latest biography we read as follows:

> We must not suppose that in thus promoting monasticism Henry was simply performing an act of piety. At that period the monastic order appeared as an organism wonderfully suited to the work of civilization. The monastery was a living city. Around it were grouped whole populations, to whom the monks assured welfare through labor. The monastic lands bounded and separated the large domains of the counts and other vassals of the kingdom, preventing these lords from acquiring a territorial preponderance that might prove threatening for the sovereign. Then, too, each monastic center constituted a home of prayer, study, and civilizing influence. The monk, by his life of rule and by his practice of mortification and labor even amid great possessions, continually gave to the peasant this great practical lesson, that man has another future to prepare for besides that of the earth, and that he should keep his eyes raised to heaven if he is to have an understanding of the present life. King Henry took account of the moral power of the monks and, by utilizing it, he was acting as a good and wise statesman.[18]

These general views did not lead Henry's clear-seeing mind to ignore the concrete difficulties which his authority would encounter in the government of the Empire. These difficulties arose on three sides: from Poland, where King Boleslaus Chrobry gathered all the malcontents about him; from his own house, where his wife's five brothers, already turning greedy eyes upon

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 50 f.

the succession, filled the palace with plots; and from Italy, where King Arduin tried to stir up the national feeling against the Empire.

In 1003 a strife began between the King of Germany and the formidable ruler of the Poles. The first two expeditions resulted in Henry's favor; but the third expedition had a less happy issue. Yet Henry succeeded (1018) in making a peace treaty that gave him sufficient satisfaction: several provinces between the Elbe and the Oder were ceded to Boleslaus, who yielded his claim to the royal crown, which had been the chief object of his ambition.

Henry had difficulty in foiling the plots of his brothers-in-law and several other members of his family. These, in accord with the Bishop of Würzburg, had cleverly schemed a new arrangement of the dioceses in a plan that would deprive the archbishop of Mainz of supremacy over the frontier districts of Bohemia. This measure would have ruined the work of St. Boniface and, in their plan, would have been the forerunner of a dismemberment of the Empire to their profit. To defeat these projects, the King negotiated with the Pope the erection of the diocese of Bamberg, which was placed under the direct protection of the Holy See, but without being withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Mainz.[19] Finally, in 1017, the Bishop of Würzburg was placated by receiving the title and power of duke. The Emperor's brother Bruno, who was looked upon as a pretender to the throne, received holy orders, and thus helped to end the conflicts that arose on that score.

A campaign in northern Italy (1004) failed to overcome Arduin and his followers. But the self-styled national king displeased many of his subjects by his brutality and blunders. The Italian people began to turn their eyes to King Henry, who wisely waited for a favorable occasion before attempting a positive intervention. This occasion presented itself when the

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 91 f.

followers of the family of Tusculum and those of the family of the Crescentii asked his support. Henry at first reserved his decision and took pains to become well informed about the situation. Theophylactus had been elected first, under the name of Benedict VIII, in circumstances that seemed normal, and his authority was daily becoming strengthened. The King of Germany then decided in his favor and marched into Italy. The time was the close of the year 1013. Arduin, seeing his cause lost, withdrew to his castle of Ivrea and promised to give up his claim to the crown, provided he would be given a countship.

The partisans of the antipope Gregory had abandoned him. Benedict VIII therefore governed without opposition. When Henry reached Rome (February, 1014), the Pope, accompanied by a large suite of prelates, presented him with a golden globe, ornamented with precious stones and surmounted by a cross. This was the symbol of the power which the sovereign should exercise over the world as a loyal soldier of Christ. Henry took the globe, admired it, and said: "No one is more worthy of possessing such a gift than those who, far from the world, devote themselves to following the law of Christ." And he sent the globe to the monks of Cluny.

The King manifested the same Christian sentiments when (February 14), in St. Peter's Basilica, the Pope crowned him and his wife Cunigundis, and consecrated him emperor. The sovereign at once presented his crown as a gift to the basilica, asking that it should be placed on the altar of the Prince of the Apostles.[20]

The Charta of 1014

From the hour of Henry's coronation, the defense of the Church and a zeal for the purity and spread of the Christian faith assumed a greater place in the Emperor's life.

[20] Glaber, *Hist.*, I, 5; *PL*, CXLII, 626. Cf. Ditmar, VII, 1; Jaffé, no. 4,000.

His first act was to deliver to Pope Benedict VIII a charta of privileges that was an exact repetition of that which Otto the Great had granted to Pope John XII. Besides other matters, this charta stipulated that "all the clergy and all the nobility of Rome should swear not to proceed to a papal election without observing the canonical regulations, and that the new pope, before being consecrated, should promise, in the presence of the emperor's envoys or in the presence of the whole people, to preserve the rights of all." [21] This formula cannot reasonably be considered a declaration of the principle of an imperial guardianship over the papacy. It was merely a confirmation of the right, which the popes reserved to the emperors, of exercising vigilance as defenders of the Roman Church, so that the papal election should take place canonically and so that the new pope should swear to preserve the rights of everyone. Such an agreement was justified by the recent untoward events, the rival claims by the Crescentii family and by the family of Tusculum. In the existing circumstances, nothing but the authority of an emperor seemed powerful enough to make the Italian factions observe a respectful attitude.[22]

The entente, thus sealed between the Pope and the Emperor, did not deviate for a moment throughout the duration of their dual government. It enabled them to labor effectively together for the welfare of Christendom. Peace prevailed in Italy. The Crescentii party seemed to have given up all its claims. Arduin, the dethroned king of Pavia, learning from misfortune, withdrew in 1015 to the monastery of Fruttuaria, founded near Turin the year before by one of his nephews, Abbot William. There Arduin died three years later in pious dispositions.[23] Saracen incursions upon the coast of Italy in 1016 were quickly suppressed by a naval expedition; and disturbances caused by

[21] *PL*, CXL, 236 f.
[22] See Bayet in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.*, I, 560.
[23] Ditmar, VII.

the Greeks in southern Italy came to an end after a descent of the imperial army.

Pope Benedict VIII entrusted the temporal government of the States of the Church to his brother Romanus, upon whom he conferred the title and powers of "consul and senator of the Romans." His plan was to devote himself entirely to the spiritual government of the Church. Convinced of the futility of any religious reform in the midst of the political and social disturbances that were desolating Europe, he considered the great project of proclaiming a universal peace, in agreement with the German emperor, the king of France, and the king of Burgundy. Then a thoroughgoing reform of morals would be undertaken by a general council held in the West.[24] Benedict VIII could do no more than outline this vast enterprise; but he devoted himself to it with all the earnestness of his zeal and was powerfully aided by Emperor Henry II, King Robert the Pious of France, and King Rudolf III of Burgundy.

The Truce of God

In a council at Poitiers (February or March, 1000), an important decision was voted, namely, "that in the future all private conflicts should be settled according to law, and not by brutal force." [25] Thus publicly and in the name of the Church was proclaimed the principle of the Peace and the Truce of God.[26] The Church had perceived that the prescriptions of the earlier assemblies had remained insufficient, because they lacked united action and strict sanction. The measure voted at Poitiers in 1000 was the starting point of a league to maintain peace and was called *pactum pacis*. Each member of the league agreed to defer to the justice of the bishop or of the count all violations

[24] Lesêtre, p. 161; Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 137.

[25] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 893; Mansi, XIX, 265.

[26] The purpose of the Peace of God was to shield from violence certain categories of victims; the Truce forbade war during certain fixed periods.

of peace committed on his territory; and, in case of refusal of justice by the count or the bishop, to summon an intervention by all the associated members of the league, so that law and justice should triumph. The better to assure the execution of the pact, a solemn and explicit oath, sworn upon the relics of the saints, was required of the members of the league.[27]

Such was the effort of the Church to obtain peace. This undertaking could have no definite and serious result unless it was supported by the authority of the rulers. In the very first years of the eleventh century, Henry visited the provinces of Germany, proclaiming the local peace (*Landfrieden*) in large assemblies, like those of Zurich in 1005 and Merseburg in 1012, where all, from the lowest to the mightiest, swore "that they would maintain the peace, that they would not be accomplices in brigandage." Many lords and bishops followed this example. Burchard, bishop of Worms, published an edict of peace that his subjects, "rich and poor," should be subject to the same law. Others opposed the movement. The Emperor, judging that in this matter he was dealing with a question of the highest public concern, proceeded with rigor against them, even depriving some margraves of their office.

In France, with energy perhaps less severe, but with equally firm patience, King Robert gave much attention to convoking assemblies of peace.[28] No longer were belligerents forbidden to use violence merely against churches, clerics, and farmers; they were now required to respect the rights of all inoffensive persons. At Verdun the peace agreements were for seven years; at Beauvais, for six years. In one council the agreement was probably without time limitations.[29]

In the Kingdom of Burgundy, then usually called the Kingdom of Arles, the peace movement went back to the last years

[27] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 134.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[29] Pfister, *op. cit.*, pp. 170 f.

of the tenth century. The memory of the oaths previously taken may have begun to fade out. In several councils about the year 1020, notably at the council of Verdun-sur-le-Doubs, at which (1016) the eminent personages of Burgundy and the bishops of the first Lyonnaise assembled, a proposal was considered to "re-establish" and confirm the peace.[30] After that council the practice became general to take an oath containing a detailed list of forbidden things. In the peace oath presented to King Robert in 1023, by Bishop Warin of Beauvais, we read:

I will in no manner invade churches or the cellars of churches, except to seize a malefactor who has violated the peace or committed a murder. . . . I will not attack clerics or monks who are not bearing secular arms. I will not carry off either ox or cow or any beast of burden. I will not seize any peasant or merchant; I will not take their money, and I will not force them to give ransom. I will not so act that they lose their possessions on account of their lord's war. From the first day of May to All Saints I will seize neither horse nor mare nor colt in the pasture. I will not destroy or burn down houses; I will not root up a vineyard or gather grapes in it on the pretext of war.[31]

The peace of God was enthusiastically received by all the oppressed. Raoul Glaber describes how throngs of people came to the councils and, with hands stretched out to heaven, cried: "Peace, peace, peace," while the bishops held their crosiers aloft. The institution grew and assumed unexpected proportions. The Church excommunicated noblemen who violated the peace and also interdicted the whole extent of their feudal jurisdiction.[32] In a conference at Mouzon Abbey in the diocese of Reims, Emperor Henry II and King Robert of France studied the means to render this peace universal. Many lords, however, were still stubbornly opposed to the plan. Even the papacy was

[30] R. Poupardin, *Le royaume de Bourgogne* (888–1038). *Etudes sur les origines du royaume d'Arles,* p. 301.

[31] Luchaire, *op. cit.,* pp. 134 f.

[32] *Ibid.*

unable to direct the enterprise until the latter part of the eleventh century.

In this half-pacified Christendom, Benedict VIII could accomplish only a half-reform. The general council of the West, which he planned to assemble with the concurrence of Henry II, could not be held. But he succeeded in convoking an important council at Pavia in 1018.[33]

This council holds a considerable place in the history of Church reform in the eleventh century.[34] The Pope presided at it in person, and probably the Emperor was present. The seven canons promulgated at it all refer to the reform of morals in the clergy, particularly the observance of clerical celibacy.[35] These canons the Emperor made laws of the state [36] and tried to have them applied by relying upon the bishops and the monasteries.

St. Henry II and the Church

Henry II has been blamed for abusive interference in the appointment of bishops. By virtue of the right and practice then prevailing, the privilege of electing the head of a diocese belonged to the principal members of the local clergy. But the ruler's wish ordinarily had the force of law for the electors, and their choice was then confirmed by the same ruler, who transmitted to the newly-elected the symbols of his office: the crosier and ring. This interference by the temporal ruler is to be explained by the fact that the bishops at that time combined in their own person the spiritual power and a notable part of the temporal power, and that they were the head of a diocese and also the lord of the territory attributed to their see. The

[33] Duchesne says 1020; but Hefele's arguments for maintaining the date of 1018 seem conclusive (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 919).

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Mansi, XIX, 343.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 381.

Ottos almost always employed their influence wisely. Rarely did the right of investiture involve anything but advantages in the hands of a ruler like Henry II, who was especially solicitous for the honor of the Church and the welfare of souls. Nearly all the bishops chosen in his time were men of high worth and exemplary life. Among them we may mention Tagino of Magdeburg, Meinwerk of Paderborn, Eberhard of Merseburg, Meginaud of Trier, and Dithmar of Merseburg.[37]

The monasteries supplied the Emperor with collaborators no less useful in his undertakings for social regeneration. In his journeys through his Empire, he liked to tarry in the monasteries and spend time in the midst of the monks. He was edified by the regularity of the good; but, when he observed abuses, he was ready to interfere courageously for the purpose of effecting reform. He maintained relations with the great reforming monks of his time. He had a particular friendship for St. Odilo, the illustrious abbot of Cluny; no exaggeration is to be found in the saying that, in the work of monastic reform, Odilo was the head, and in Germany Henry was the right arm.[38] Owing to this unbroken collaboration of two saints, the purity of the Cluny rule reached into most of the monasteries of Lorraine; the powerful monasteries of Hersfeld, Reichenau, Fulda, and Corvey accepted it. Strengthened with Odilo's approval, Henry did not hesitate, when necessity required, to crush resistance, to remove unworthy prelates, and to place over recalcitrant monks superiors that he knew were able to govern them according to the spirit of their state. This he did at Monte Cassino, and in the two great monasteries of Stavelot and Malmédy in the diocese of Liège, both of which he placed in the hands of Poppo, a monk of St. Vaast whose learning and holiness he knew.

By acting thus, the saintly Emperor was working for the

[37] Lesêtre, pp. 170 f.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 173.

good of his states and for that of the Church. Germany, which had just emerged from barbarism, was located on the frontiers of Christian civilization and was in contact with races imperfectly won to the teachings of the Gospel. More than any other nation, it needed to keep intact the deposit of faith and of Christian morality. Henry II grasped this important truth. He thought he would not be fully performing his office of "sergeant of Christ" if he did not endeavor to extend the domain of the Gospel. When he asked the Pope to establish the diocese of Bamberg, he had in mind to destroy the paganism of the Slavs. If the cares of the internal government of his Empire had left him time to do so, he would have attempted to open new paths for the missioners of Christ.

Upon Henry II the Church has bestowed the title of saint because of the noble purposes of his rule and the lofty virtues of his private life. He married a wife worthy of him. Both of them, at their marriage, vowed to sanctify their union by the practice of absolute continence. The mention of this royal virtue by the old chroniclers has provoked the skepticism of some historians, and the ironical smile of others. But the fact has all the certitude vouched for by reliable history,[39] and every person

[39] "Some have refused to St. Henry and St. Cunigundis the honor of having reached that summit where man and angel meet. The chroniclers of the eleventh century, we are told, do not speak of it. Furthermore, in the acts of the foundation of Bamberg, Henry declares that, 'being without hope of having anyone of his race to succeed him, he chooses Christ as his heir.' But the historians who were contemporary with the saint could not have spoken. The most complete of them all, Dithmar, bishop of Merseburg, died six years before St. Henry. Of the work of Adalbold, bishop of Utrecht, we possess only a fragment. The other annalists of the period, whose accounts are very succinct, scarcely mention anything but external happenings. Their silence on the point in question is the more naturally explained since St. Henry was not a man to parade his virtue and to take everyone into his confidence about his personal conduct. This matter was that 'secret of a king' which Scripture (Tob. 12:7) says should be hid. The prince's manner of mentioning it in the act of Bamberg is sufficiently discreet so as not to reveal the loftier motive which had prompted his resolve. But later, for the edification of the Church, the mystery was revealed either because, as some think, Henry let it be known on his deathbed, or because the depositary of the secrets of his conscience or even St. Cunigundis herself spoke of it to the glory of the saint. At the end of the eleventh century, Leo, cardinal of Ostia,

solicitous for Christian regeneration should recognize that such a virtue was in its right place upon the throne of an emperor and an empress at the beginning of the eleventh century. That period, when sensual passions invaded even the sanctuary, could well profit by seeing, even at court, the brightness of the virtue which makes men resemble angels. The holy Emperor died on July 13, 1024. With him the house of Saxony came to an end. By its first representative, Henry the Great, it had mightily labored to group the Germanic peoples about it: [40] by its last representative, Henry the Saint, it had nobly served the Church.

King Robert the Pious

King Robert the Pious of France, without giving so heroic an example of virtues as that of the German Emperor, placed at the service of the Church an earnest piety and sincere devotion. We have remarked his efforts to convoke everywhere assemblies of peace. He was much concerned with keeping unworthy candidates out of the episcopacy. Says Raoul Glaber: "When an episcopal see became vacant in his states, his sole concern was that the new bishop be chosen on the basis of merit and virtues, not of birth and rank. In this matter he was often forced to strive against the great nobles of his realm." [41] His zeal was no less concerned with maintaining the purity of the faith. In 1019, Richard V, duke of Normandy, made known to

set down the fact in the Chronicle of Monte Cassino. Other writers mention it subsequently. Finally, in the bull of canonization Pope Eugene III declares, in 1145, that a serious inquiry was made . . . and he praises Henry II for having sanctified his marriage by a chastity preserved intact to the end of his life" (Lesêtre, *Saint Henri*, pp. 187 f.).

[40] We say, "had labored"; not, "had succeeded." The ambition of the house of Saxony had been too vast. In the time of St. Henry the Empire, outside of the Germanic countries, included Belgium, the Netherlands, almost all Switzerland, and some provinces of Italy and of France. Such an agglomeration was essentially unstable, and even the union of the Germanic countries was destined to perish.

[41] Glaber, *Hist.*, III, 2; *PL*, CXLII, 649.

him the existence at Orleans of a mysterious sect which, maintaining the eternal coexistence of a good principle and an evil principle, rejected the authority of the Old Testament, denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the virginity of the Mother of God; it seemed to be one of the links connecting the old Manichaeism with the Albigensian heresy.[42] King Robert assembled a council at Orleans, summoned the heretics to appear there, and, after finding them guilty of pernicious errors, had thirteen of them condemned to the stake. The devout King thought that whatever attacked Catholic doctrine and morals, the foundations of the social edifice, was an attack upon the whole of society. His severity toward those whom he regarded as corrupters of souls, was merely a form of his charity. His contemporary biographer tells us that in King Robert this virtue was ardent and tender.

He had a special predilection for the lepers. In imitation of his divine Master, he permitted them close approach to his person and, when he was asked where he derived his courage, he replied: "I remember that I am but dust and that I shall return into dust." God rewarded this heroic virtue by the gift of miracles. He restored sound health to some lepers by making the sign of the cross upon them.[43]

To Robert the Pious is supposed to go back the tradition that the kings of France, on certain days, touched persons afflicted with scrofula, saying to them: "The king touches you; may God heal you." In spite of opposition by certain political interests, Robert the Pious and Henry II always joined hands in any project for promoting the welfare of the people and for maintaining respect for religion. In 1023 they met at Ivois in Lorraine to agree upon means for assuring universal peace and for assisting the Church in the reform of its clergy. The two rulers, accompanied by a numerous suite, gave each other the

[42] See J. Guiraud, "Le consolamentum cathare" in *Rev. des quest. hist.*, LXXXV (1904), 112; Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 924–34; Pfister, *op. cit.*, pp. 325–31.

[43] Helgaud, *Vita Roberti; PL*, CXLI, 931.

kiss of peace, heard mass together, dined at the same table. Although their noble ideal could not be realized, it was the object of their best efforts to the very end of their lives.

A year after the Ivois meeting, Pope Benedict VIII breathed his last. According to some calculations, his death probably occurred on June 11, 1024.[44] The last son of the count of Tusculum was an irreproachable pope, whose character equaled the height of the great duties of his office. Says Duchesne: "Scarcely anything but good can be said of Benedict VIII." [45] The pontificate of his brother John XIX and especially that of his nephew Benedict IX would be less fortunate for the Church.

Pope John XIX

The office and authority which Benedict VIII conferred upon his brother Romanus rendered the election of his successor a delicate matter. To suddenly strip the "Senator of the Romans" of his title and of the temporal government of the Church, would gravely displease the most powerful family in Italy, and perhaps stir up a revolt. If a member of the Sacred College were made pope, he would be placed in tutelage or would be condemned to ceaseless strife. A third plan seemed possible: to confer the spiritual power upon the one who already held the temporal power. But Romanus was a layman. True, this circumstance would make the election irregular, but would not nullify it beyond remedy. It could be ratified by implicit consent subsequent to his ordination. This solution seemed to involve the least disadvantages; at any rate, it was the only one practically available. Romanus, the younger son of Count Gregory of Tusculum, was elected and, after receiving all the sacred orders in rapid succession, was enthroned under the name of John XIX.[46]

[44] Jaffé, I, 4059.

[45] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical*, p. 372.

[46] The enthronement took place between June 24 and July 15 (Jaffé, I, 4059).

No one can deny that John XIX was a capable administrator and a prudent statesman. He had given proof of these qualities for many years under the guidance of his brother. His morals were altogether free from blame. He has been charged with cupidity and with unconcern about things religious. To be quite just, we must say that, when deprived of his brother's counsel, he too often let human considerations influence his policy and did not vigorously pursue the reform work so courageously undertaken in the preceding pontificate.

The coming of such a pope, coinciding with the vacancy of the Empire, left by the death of Henry II, revived the ambitions of the Eastern Emperor Basil II, who always coveted the hegemony in southern Italy and had not given up the design to raise the patriarchal see of Constantinople to the level of that of Rome. The Byzantine potentate's conspicuous victories over the Russians and the Saracens, his recent massacre of the Bulgarians, which led to his being called Bulgaroktonos, greatly exalted his pride and that of his subjects. Two years before, when they were besieged in Troja by the German army, they threatened their enemies with the proximate arrival of the great monarch of the East and declared that the Emperor of the Romans would be forced to kiss his feet.[47] Says Raoul Glaber:

In the year of the Lord 1024, the head of the Church of Constantinople [48] and Emperor Basil decided that, as the Roman pontiff was called universal pontiff in the whole world, the pontiff of Constantinople should be called ecumenical pontiff in the Greek world. But he failed to obtain the pope's assent. To Rome they sent ambassadors bearing a large number of valuable gifts, both for the pope and for whatever personages they thought might be able to serve their cause.

[47] Glaber, *op. cit.*, III, 1; *PL*, CXLII, 647.

[48] The person referred to is the patriarch Eustathius, who governed the Church of Constantinople from 1019 to 1025.

Our choronicler proceeds to exclaim:

Alas, we are living at a time when gold is king of the world, and at Rome this ruler seems to have established the seat of his power. The rich presents of the Greeks disturbed the heart of the Romans, who tried to find some subterfuge by which they might grant what was asked of them. But in vain. No one could overcome the word of truth, which says of the Apostolic See: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The plots that were being contrived in the conclave promptly leaked out; the report of them became widespread all over Italy. Wrathful clamor and cries of revolt were heard on all sides.

The venerable Father William, abbot of St. Bénigne of Dijon, wrote to Pope John XIX about the matter. His letter, short but eloquent and expressive, was as follows: "The Apostle of the Gentiles tells us to respect persons in high office; but this did not keep him from writing also: 'I am become foolish; you have compelled me.' [49] We, too, out of a sense of filial love, feel impelled to exhort your Paternity to recall at this moment the Savior's conduct and to put to some one of your friends the question which our Lord put to St. Peter when he asked him: 'Who do men say that I am?' [50] The reply you receive, provided it is sincere, will deserve your attention. If it is clearly favorable, take care to justify it by our conduct; if it is embarrassed and obscure, beg the Father of lights to scatter the clouds so that you may guide all the faithful children of the Church in the fulness of the light and in the way of the divine commandments. We have received news that scandalizes all who hear it and deeply troubles men's souls. Although the ancient Roman Empire, which once extended over the whole world, is today divided into a countless number of separate monarchies, the supreme power of binding and loosing on earth as in heaven has remained one; as always, it now belongs, by the Lord's gift, to the inviolable magisterium of Peter. Therefore the Greeks are entirely unjustified in presuming to claim a privilege which, we are told, they have obtained from you. We implore you to show more vigor for the correction of abuses and the

[49] See II Cor. 12: 11.
[50] Mark 8: 27.

maintenance of discipline in the bosom of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. This is the duty of a universal pontiff. Thus may you reign happily here on earth and in eternity." [51]

We have no evidence that the Pope had, as St. William believed, yielded to the urgent request of the Byzantine envoys; at least he broke off the negotiations.[52] Following this rupture, the patriarch of Constantinople, so we are told, removed the name of the Pope from the diptychs, and the sparks of schism, which were never extinguished in the East, again flared up. Thus John XIX's policy, in his dealings with the East, displeased popular opinion and likewise the Eastern Emperor. His diplomacy with regard to the Western Emperor, notwithstanding the apparently brilliant results of its beginning, was no less unfortunate for the Church.

Emperor Conrad II

The last emperor of the house of Saxony was succeeded by the first monarch of the house of Franconia. The founder of the new dynasty, Conrad II, was the son of a daughter of Otto the Great and of Conrad the Red, who was one of the most valiant warriors of the Emperor. He married a daughter of Rudolf III, king of Burgundy, who was a descendant of Charlemagne. Personally the new Emperor was brave, solicitous for orthodoxy, but fond of magnificence and display. He boasted of his descent from two great races. But the trait which he possessed especially was their vast ambitions; in him was not to be found the humble piety of Henry II. To thwart the schemes of the Byzantine emperor in Lower Italy, to conquer Bohemia, to annex Burgundy to his domain, to crush the upper nobility

[51] Glaber, *Hist.*, IV, 1; *PL*, CXLII, 671. St. William's letter, with more extensive corrections, following various manuscripts, has been published by Pertz in the *Monum. Germ.*, VII, 66.

[52] Bréhier, *Le schisme oriental du XI^e siècle*, pp. 9–12.

of Germany by himself becoming the protector of the lesser feudal lords: these were his first projects. He carried them out in part.

Before accomplishing these designs, he went to Italy in 1026 to put on the royal crown of Pavia; then to ask the imperial consecration from the Pope, for Easter, 1027, which that year fell on April 26. John XIX did for Conrad II what Benedict VIII had done for St. Henry, John XII for Otto the Great, St. Leo III for Charlemagne. The coronation ceremony surpassed in splendor all that had been seen before. In the account by the chronicler Wippo, we read: "Upon leaving St. Peter's Basilica, the Emperor and Empress Gisela were escorted by two kings, Rudolf of Burgundy and Canute the Great of England, who conducted them in great pomp to the triclinium of the Lateran." [53] John XIX, regarding the new Emperor and the dynasty as a mighty power, was eager to be associated with it.

But the former "Senator of the Romans," suddenly raised to the priesthood and the papacy after his brother's death, seemed not to grasp that a protectorate dominated by pride, however devoted it might proclaim itself, could not labor for the welfare of the Church. And he did not foresee that the powerful house of Franconia would soon oppose the papacy in the most violent struggle that the Church ever experienced since the persecutions of the first centuries, and that Conrad II himself would take the first steps in that strife. Says Hefele:

> Emperor Conrad II's policy was to place the Church in the service of the Empire. . . . Under this brutal and tyrannical ruler, the German episcopate was reduced to dependence upon the crown and was diverted from its true vocation to a political or military end. Consequently, in the matter of obtaining a bishopric, talent was a better recommendation than virtue, and the Emperor was more concerned with acquiring external luster for the Church than with promoting that internal reform which was preached by the order of Cluny. In-

[53] Wippo, *Vita Conradi; PL,* CXLII, 1235.

vestiture helped him to enrich the treasury, and he rarely made an appointment without receiving payment for it. This manner of domineering over the Church carried with it in germ the terrible strife which his son and his grandson later waged against the Roman Church.[54]

We should here repeat that no feeling of systematic hostility animated the first Franconian emperor, while he thus enslaved the episcopacy. The idea of crushing a high feudal power seems to have been his chief motive; even this purpose was not amply justified. But his chief mistake was to subordinate the sacred interests of religion to his purely political motive. By the very declaration made on the day of his coronation, he proclaimed himself the defender of those interests. Religion suffered greatly from this state of affairs. The old abuses, for a time suppressed by the combined efforts of Benedict VIII and Henry II, sprang up again with new strength.

Manichaean Heresy

Germany was not the only one to suffer.

A fresh appearance of Manichaean heretics prompted the assembling of a council at Arras in 1025. At the beginning of that year, Bishop Gerhard of Cambrai, according to his practice, was visiting his second see of Arras. There he learned that some heretics from Italy were settled in the neighborhood. They rejected baptism and the Eucharist, denied the usefulness of penance, looked upon marriage with horror, set aside the Church, declared that, except the Apostles and the martyrs, no saint should receive veneration, and held that salvation depended solely upon good works. Bishop Gerhard ordered their immediate arrest [55] and summoned them to appear before a council at Arras the following Sunday. He regarded them as Pelagians, because they placed so much emphasis upon good works. Up to a

[54] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 977.
[55] *PL*, CXLII, 1270.

certain point they were Pelagians. But the real dogmatic basis of their errors was that unwholesome spiritualism already noted at Orleans, a religious attitude that for centuries to come would disturb many districts of the West.[56]

The acts of the Council of Arras set forth how Bishop Gerhard refuted the doctrines of the heretics point by point. The latter acknowledged themselves vanquished, abjured their errors, made a profession of orthodox faith, and signed it with their own hand, marking a cross beside their signatures.[57]

Councils in the East (1026, 1027, 1028, and 1029) bore witness to the sad condition of the Church in that region. These councils lamented the frightful cupidity which stripped the churches of their possessions and led to monasteries being deserted; they stigmatized the bishops who administered ecclesiastical property in their own personal interest; and they threatened with anathema anyone who should take part in an uprising or revolt.[58]

Camaldolese Order

Such were the plagues afflicting the East and the West. As the Emperor was unmindful of the ills of the Church and thought only of the interests of his personal power, and as the Supreme Pontiff seemed not fully aware of the gravity of the peril, who would cure these distressful conditions? Providence, never abandoning the Church, supplied the remedy. In some respects John XIX's pontificate was lamentable. But during it, besides the Order of Cluny, whose influence continued to be felt in many monasteries, another and even stricter order, that of the Camaldolese, sprang up. From the very heart of a feudalism which was now turbulent and now submissive, arose

[56] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 940 f.
[57] Mansi, XIX, 423–60; Pfister, *op. cit.*, pp. 335 f.
[58] Mansi, XIX, 461–78, 491.

the first elements of chivalry. And in the churches sacred music, receiving new life through the genius of a Benedictine monk, Guido of Arezzo, revived the people's piety.

The Order of the Camaldolese became for Italy what the Order of Cluny was for France, a center of regeneration. It was founded in 1024 by St. Romuald. The life of this holy patriarch, as related by his disciple St. Peter Damian, is particularly informative about the disturbed period in which he lived. Romuald was born in Ravenna in the ducal family of the Honesti. Until he was twenty years old, his heart and will fluctuated between the keenest passions of youth and the inspirations of grace which drew him to a life of solitude and prayer. His witnessing of a terrible duel, in which he saw his own father kill his adversary with a sword thrust, awoke in him a remorse that inclined him definitely to the call of grace. He withdrew to Monte Cassino, where he soon took the monastic habit. But even in the monastery he found the spirit of the world, and his conduct and maxims were a continual reproach to some of the lax monks. They persecuted him and even planned to assassinate him.

Romuald fled to the neighborhood of Venice to a holy hermit named Marino. There some companions, wishing to share his austere life, joined him and chose him for their master. With them, near Arezzo in a solitude of the Apennines, called Camaldoli, he founded a community, the cradle of his order. He and his first disciples followed the eremitical life, fasting on bread and water, abstaining absolutely from meat and wine, letting their beards grow long, having their heads shaved, going barefoot, and wearing a white robe. The Benedictine Rule, with more austere practices added, was the basis of their observances. Later, besides the Camaldolese hermits, cenobites were established, with a mitigated rule. Romuald, after witnessing the first developments of his work, left this world in the peace

of the Lord on June 19, 1027. When the foundation of the Camaldolese Order was confirmed by Pope Alexander II (1072), it counted nine monasteries subject to the prior of Camaldoli. It had already given to the Church the learned Guido of Arezzo and the great reformer of the clergy, St. Peter Damian.[59]

Chivalry

The period that saw the birth and development of the Camaldolese Order witnessed also the beginning of chivalry. We cannot assign a precise date for this beginning.

Chivalry had nothing in its origin that reminded one of the foundation of a religious order. One may in fact declare that every single monastic order had been conceived in the mind of an individual. The great Benedictine Order arose out of the intelligence of St. Benedict, and the Franciscan Order from the heart of St. Francis. There is no parallel to this in the case of chivalry, and it would be useless to search for the place of its birth or for the name of its founder. What a great archaeologist of our day has said of Romance architecture is scientifically applicable to the birth of chivalry. It was born everywhere at once, and has been everywhere at the same time the natural effect of the same aspirations and the same needs. There was a moment when the Christians in the East experienced the necessity of sheltering themselves at prayers in churches built of stone which could not be burned; and then, to use the graceful terms of Raoul Glaber, the Christian soil was everywhere covered with the white robes of new churches. Hence the Roman architecture. There was another moment when peoples everywhere felt the necessity of tempering the ardor of old German blood, and of giving to their ill-regulated passions an ideal. Hence chivalry.[60]

[59] Hélyot, *Hist. des ordres rel.*, V, 236 f.; St. Peter Damian, *Vita S. Romualdi; PL*, CXLIV, 953 f.; Mabillon, *Annales ordinis S. Benedicti*, Volumes III and IV; *Revue bénédictine*, IV (1887), 356–63.

[60] Léon Gautier, *Chivalry*, p. 1.

When the Church, after all her efforts to establish the "peace of God," became convinced that she could not entirely prevent war, she undertook to Christianize the soldier. Many volumes have been written upon this noble subject, and a few words will suffice for a clear definition of chivalry and knighthood. "Chivalry is the Christian form of the military profession: the knight is the Christian soldier." [61] But how was the soldier to be Christianized? This the Church accomplished by Christianizing an old ceremony going back to the origin of the German peoples. Tacitus relates that, when a German boy reached the age of manhood, he was brought into the midst of an assembly of warriors, and there the chief of the tribe solemnly handed him a spear and a shield. "Such was the manly dress of this race," says Tacitus.[62] The barbarian ceremony was the starting point of an elaborate military ceremonial, Christian and liturgical, which included the vigil of arms, the blessing of the sword and of the knight himself, and his resolve to devote himself to the welfare and honor of religion.[63] The ceremonies observed in the consecration of kings and emperors may have influenced the origin of chivalry. If a ruler could take a vow to defend the Church, why could not a simple vassal do likewise? Why could not every warrior? [64]

The institution of chivalry did not prevent the Church from seeking to promote the establishment of the peace of God. The year 1027 is precisely the date from which we trace the origin of the truce of God strictly so called, which forbade warfare during certain carefully designated periods. "The Council of

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[62] Tacitus, *Germania*, XIII.

[63] Gautier, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

[64] "Chivalry is clearly distinct from feudalism. . . . The feudal system soon became hereditary. Chivalry . . . had never been hereditary. . . . Feudalism has disputed with the Church over and over again, while chivalry has protected her a hundred times. Feudalism is force—chivalry is the brake" (Gautier, pp. 15 f.). Montalembert and other historians, too, are mistaken when they confuse chivalry with feudalism.

Elne, which met that year, confirmed the ordinary provisions about the protection of clerics, monks, and women, but it added the following measure: 'In the entire countship or bishopric of Elne, every inhabitant is forbidden to assault his enemy between the ninth hour of Saturday and the first hour of Monday.' " The council gave its reason for this prohibition in these words: "This is decreed so that every man may render what he owes to God during the Lord's Day." Here in germ we have the truce of God, limited to Sunday. Before long the idea advanced, and the truce was lengthened.[65]

Church Music

While thus protecting the observance of Sunday prayer, the Church gave its public devotions a new brilliance by the renewal of the sacred chant. The promoter of this progressive step was a disciple of St. Romuald, a Camaldolese monk, Guido of Arezzo.

Says one historian of the Gregorian art:

At the beginning of the eleventh century, in the length and breadth of Italy we can cite the name of only one artist, but this name has filled the following centuries by its importance: Guido of Arezzo.[66] He was born in 990, probably at Arezzo, where we find him again in his advanced age. Some writers have thought he was of French origin. Probably he owed part of his learning to the musical teaching of the Parisian abbey of St. Maur des Fossés at the time when Odo the Younger was teaching there. That Guido spent some time in Eng-

[65] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 136.

[66] In recent years the life and works of this musician have given rise to a number of writings. See Germain Morin in the *Revue de l'art chrétien* (1888), pp. 133 f., and in the *Revue des quest. hist.,* April 1, 1891, pp. 547 f.; Michel Brenet in the *Tribune de Saint-Gervais* April, 1902, p. 126; Henri Stein in the *Bull. des antiq. de France,* 1900, Part III, p. 237; Terrasse in the *Rev. du clergé français,* April 15, 1902, p. 439; Vacandard in the *Rev. du clergé français,* May 15, 1902, p. 550; Vivell and Gastoué in the *Tribune de Saint-Gervais,* 1910, nos. 7 and 8.

land is also likely. He then returned to Italy. When he was abbot of the Camaldolese at Avellana near Pomposa, he was called to Arezzo by Bishop Theodulus to teach his method in the episcopal *schola.* He presented to Pope John XIX a copy of the Gregorian antiphonary with the notes written on lines for the first time. Again we find Guido at Pomposa, where he ended his career on May 17, 1050.

Guido's part in the reform of teaching and of musical notation is enormous. In his *Micrologus* he propagated the method of Odo, freeing it as much as possible from the philosophical considerations that encumbered it. The process of adapting the six notes of the major hexachord to the syllables of the hymn *Ut queant laxis,* which Guido praised and spread, is not his invention, although he is often credited with it. His two chief innovations are the fixation of the musical staff, with the arrangement of the notation signs on lines suitably spaced, then the absolute suppression of whatever was not diatonic in the Church chants. So well did he succeed in his work, so completely did the notation of unstable and fluctuating notes, which he proscribed, disappear after him from the treatises and books, that a great number of musicians have doubted that the liturgical chant was ever regulated by other methods than the rigid diatonism in which Guido fixed it.[67]

The House of Tusculum

The partial regeneration of the clergy by the foundation of the Camaldolese, the moral raising of feudalism by the beginning of chivalry, the increase of peace in the country districts by the truce of God, and the edification of the faithful by the restoration of ecclesiastical chant were providential events in the hour when the Church was about to experience what was perhaps the most humiliating trial it has known in the course

[67] The works of Guido of Arezzo are: *Micrologus de disciplina artis musicae; Regulae rythmicae;* a letter to the monk Michael, *De ignoto cantu; Tractatus correctorius,* which perhaps is interpolated; *Quomodo de arithmetica procedit musica; De modorum formalis;* a revision of a work of Odo the Younger. Guido's works will be found in Migne, *PL,* CXLI, 375–444.

of the ages: the spectacle of a twelve-year-old boy, who was thoroughly immoral, placed by intrigue in the see of St. Peter, and the scandal of an ambitious and rapacious family placing its hands upon the government of Christendom, attempting to seize for its own profit the outward prestige recently added by the pontificates of Sylvester II and Benedict VIII to the supreme authority of the Roman pontiff.

Of the three sons of Gregory of Tusculum, the youngest, Theophylactus, then the second, Romanus, had successively been popes. The eldest son bore the name of the famous ancestor, Alberic. Instead of taking the power for himself, he preferred to divide it between two of his sons. One of these, as was the case with several members of his family, was to have the temporal government under the titles of senator and consul; the other was to wear the tiara. The latter, like his distant ancestor and like his uncle Benedict VIII, was named Theophylactus. He was twelve years old. Even at that early age he had scandalized those about him by his licentious immorality. But a corrupt boy could be a docile tool in the hands of the Count of Tusculum and of the German Emperor, who were in agreement in this matter. The gold profusely bestowed by some and the intimidation exercised by others overcame all resistance.[68] Theophylactus of Tusculum was elected pope sometime in the year 1033,[69] under the name of Benedict IX.

Pope Benedict IX

As we read in the chronicles of Raoul Glaber, "this was a horrible beginning of a pontificate that would end even more

[68] On the character of this election, all contemporary chroniclers are agreed: Glaber, Bonizo, St. Peter Damian, the author of the *Annales romani*, Pope Victor III. See *PL*, CXLII, 679–98; CXLV, 428; CXLIX, 1003; *M. G., SS.*, V, 468; XI, 575.

[69] On the date of the election of Benedict IX, see Jaffé, I, 4107.

shamefully." [70] The deplorable consequences of such a scandal were soon felt. "From the Supreme Pontiff to the lowliest porter, traffic and bargaining invaded all ranks of the clergy.[71] Following the example of those in high places, people of the lowest rank and those of the middle classes indulged in the most abominable excesses.[72] What was to be done? The plague came from the see of Rome, where, against all law and regulation, a twelve-year-old boy had just been elected, where gold and silver counted more than age or holiness." [73]

Was such a personage, elected under such conditions and by such means, a lawful pope? Some have maintained that he was not.[74] The Church, which has kept his name in the official lists and which has regarded as antipopes those who later attempted to contest his power, no doubt considered his election tacitly ratified by the prolonged acceptance of his authority by the clergy and people of Rome, his lawful electors, and by the whole Christian Church. Such is the interpretation of the learned Cardinal Baronius. He says: "The Christian world by acknowledging the jurisdiction of this pope conferred on him, after the event, an authority which he did not have in the beginning. So great at that time was the veneration of the Catholic world for the Roman Church! Whoever was raised to the throne of St. Peter, in his person the world honored the Prince of the Apostles, whom he represented." [75]

The dignity of the supreme power did not alter the morals of the newly elected Pope. In his private life the pursuit of pleasures and the love of wealth remained his great passions; in his public life he became the willing tool of his family's greed and the Emperor's despotism. But, as in the case of John XII,

[70] *PL,* CXLII, 698.
[71] *Ibid.,* col. 697.
[72] *Ibid.,* col. 679.
[73] *Ibid.,* col. 698.
[74] Darras, *Hist. gén. de l'Eglise,* XX, 572–83.
[75] Baronius, *Annales,* year 1033.

we should observe that Benedict IX never tried to give doctrinal approval to his conduct. His official teaching was the condemnation of his life. God, to make conspicuously clear that sinister consequences follow when the civil power interferes in the choice of His pontiffs, allowed corruption to reach even to the throne of St. Peter in the person of an unworthy pope. But He did not permit that a single line of such a pope's bullarium should bring the least discredit upon the Church. Benedict IX's bull proclaiming the honors of canonization for the recluse Simeon of Trier "was written in a truly Apostolic style." [76] When he extended the jurisdiction of Adalbert, archbishop of Hamburg, over the northern regions of Europe (Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and the neighboring islands),[77] the purpose and the happy effect of his decision were to facilitate the spread of the Gospel among the peoples of the North. His making the Churches of Poland dependent upon the bishop of Cracow [78] was prompted by an intelligent solicitude for the religious needs of that country. In dispensing Casimir, the son of Mieczyslaw II, from the vows of religion so as to enable that prince to save Poland from anarchy by accepting the royal crown, he was not exceeding the rights of the Apostolic See. This act accorded with the wishes of St. Odilo of Cluny and led to beneficial results: Casimir I upon the throne kept the virtues that won the great regard of St. Odilo and brought to Casimir the honor of being inscribed in the Benedictine menology with the title of Blessed.[79] Says Cardinal Hergenröther: "Benedict had ample gifts of mind and often showed good practical sense; had he been better brought up and had he been accustomed to curb his passions, he might have become an excellent pope." [80] Unfortunately those whose duty was to train him, depraved him;

[76] *Acta sanctorum*, June, I, 97. This bull will be found in *PL*, CXLI, 1362.
[77] Jaffé, 4119.
[78] *Ibid.*
[79] Mabillon, *S. Odilonis elogium; PL*, CXLII, 885.
[80] Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Eglise* (French trans.), III, 260.

those who should have taught him to repress his passions, stirred them up instead. And so his life was spent amid tumultuous disturbances.

Twice (in 1036 and 1044) [81] he was driven from Rome by popular uprisings; he returned at the head of the vassals of Tusculum. The second time he barricaded himself and his followers in Trastevere, while the city was in the power of the rebels. The old dissensions, which formerly had led to clashes between the house of the Crescentii and the house of Tusculum, were revived. The resort to arms at first favored Benedict. But his foes, by their profuse gifts of money, succeeded in having an antipope elected, Bishop John of Sabina, who took the name of Sylvester III. Benedict's party then invested Rome on all sides and, on April 10, 1044, forcibly reinstated him in the Lateran Palace. Sylvester, after forty-nine days of ephemeral power, returned vanquished to his diocese of Sabina.

Pope Gregory VI

A year later (May 1, 1045) Benedict IX, fearing a fresh revolt, abdicated in favor of his godfather, the archpriest John Gratian, who is spoken of by all contemporaries as commendable. He was accepted by the clergy and people and took the name of Gregory VI. Benedict, however, withdrew only after stipulating with his successor that he should receive a large sum of money by way of indemnity,[82] which Gregory, to avoid excessive evils and to end the shame of the Church, agreed to pay. This simoniacal contract did not prevent Benedict, two years later, after the death of Clement II, from again seizing the power and holding it from November, 1047, to July 16, 1048, when Emperor Henry III drove him from Rome by

[81] Jaffé, 4107, 4116.

[82] The data regarding the value of this sum vary between 1,000, 1,500, and 2,000 livres. See Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* III, 345; Watterich, *Rom. pontif. vitae,* I, 70; *Lib. pontif.,* I, 270; *M. G., SS.,* XX, 244.

force. The circumstances of his death are clouded in mystery. Some writers hold that he was moved by repentance and took the religious habit in the Abbey of Grottaferrata, where he died shortly afterward; others think that he died impenitent and that his premature end was a consequence of his dissolute life.[83]

The manner of Gregory's elevation to the papacy was exploited against him subsequently by his enemies; but the most eminent personages in the Church applauded his election. Peter Damian from his solitude at Fonte-Avellana, where he hid his glory under the white robe of the Camaldolese, wrote to him as follows:

I offer thanks to Christ the King of kings. God alone can thus change the times and transfer kingdoms. Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be thrilled. The head of the venomous serpent is crushed. The false Simon no longer coins false money in the Church. May the golden age of the Apostles now return and, under your prudence, may the discipline of the Church flourish. The hour has come to repress the avarice of those who aspire to the episcopal office, to overturn the seats of the merchants in the Temple.[84]

Peter Damian was born of very poor parents in Ravenna in 1007. This future cardinal of the Roman Church was, in childhood, a swineherd. The devotedness of one of his brothers, who perceived Peter's inclination for study, enabled him to go to school. As soon as Peter finished his schooling, he himself became a teacher. His reputation spread throughout Italy. But

[83] Bonizo, bishop of Sutri, adds to the account of these events, a strange story. According to this story, Benedict IX's effrontery went to such a point that, even though pope, he intended to get married, taking as his wife the daughter of his cousin, Count Gerhard of Saxony. But the count required that he resign from his office. Benedict sold the papacy to Gregory VI. When Gerhard then refused to give his daughter to Benedict, the Tusculum party again placed Benedict on the papal see. (Bonizo, or Bonitho, *Ad amicum;* Jaffé, *Monum. gregoriana,* p. 628.) Bonizo's account is highly doubtful (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 983 f.).

[84] *PL,* CXLIV, 205.

the young teacher's virtue was equal to his talent. He was attracted by the strict life of the Camaldolese monks and, amid the loud praise of his growing renown, he withdrew to a retreat where, according to Dante's poetic expression,

> 'Twixt either shore
> Of Italy, nor distant from thy land,
> A stony ridge ariseth; in such sort,
> The thunder doth not lift his voice so high.[85]

The words of the monk of Fonte-Avellana voiced the feelings of the noblest portion of Christendom; but the abuses that had accumulated under the preceding regime had increased the causes of disturbance. Says the chronicler William of Malmesbury: "When Pope Gregory, a man of deep religious spirit and great austerity, assumed the government of the Church, as a result of the recklessness of his predecessors he found himself almost without resources. The cities and the possessions belonging to the Church had been the prey of the ravishers. In the whole extent of Italy the highways were infected with brigands. At Rome itself, in the forum, assassins strolled about without hindrance. Swords were drawn even above the bodies of the holy Apostles; and no sooner were offerings placed on the sacred altars than they were snatched away." [86]

Gregory tried at first to cure these evils by gentle methods, by warnings. These measures were futile. He then acted with greater sternness. He excommunicated the greatest criminals and any persons who should thereafter hold social intercourse with them. These malefactors in their rage organized uprisings and raised troops. Gregory was obliged to repulse force with force. Aided by a young monk, Hildebrand, he bought arms and horses, equipped an army, with which he occupied the Basilica of St. Peter, forced the rebels from the positions they

[85] These lines of Dante occur where he is speaking of St. Peter Damian.
[86] *PL*, CLXXIX, 1183.

were holding in Rome, and, encouraged by this first success, carried his expedition beyond the city and gained possession of several fortresses that had recently been wrested from the domain of the Church.[87]

Hildebrand

The monk here mentioned for the first time would become, along with Peter Damian, one of the early workers in the reform of the Church. He belonged to a monastery founded by St. Odo on the Aventine.[88] He was born about 1020[89] in the little town of Sovana in the southern part of Tuscany not far from the city and lake of Bolsena. According to Benzo, bishop of Alba, his father was a poor goatherd married to a woman of the Roman campania.[90] Entrusted to his uncle, abbot of St. Mary's Abbey on the Aventine, who undertook the care of his bringing-up and education, he had as fellow students some young men of the Roman aristocracy. Early, at least in a distant way, he became acquainted with the spirit of intrigue which was agitating the upper ranks of Roman society in the time of Benedict IX. But at St. Mary's on the Aventine he learned especially to know and love the monastic life which was there maintained in all its purity by constant relations of the Roman monastery with the order of Cluny. If we are to accept the statements of Cardinal Beno, the young Hildebrand was there taught by the learned Archbishop Lawrence of Amalfi,

[87] William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum Anglorum; PL,* CLXXIX, 1183. The fact that the monk Hildebrand took part in this warlike expedition in company with Gregory VI would later be made a matter of bitter reproach against him by his enemies. See Guido of Ferrara, *De scismate Hildebrandi; M. G., SS.,* XII, 69.

[88] Now Santa Maria del Priorato. On the founding of this monastery, see *M. G., SS.,* XI, 536.

[89] On Hildebrand's date of birth, his family, his native country, and his name, see O. Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* I, 393–97.

[90] *M. G., SS.,* XI, 660.

whose lofty culture is praised by Peter Damian,[91] and by the archpriest John Gratian, who later became Pope Gregory VI. Both of these men were pupils of Sylvester II; through them the young Hildebrand was introduced to the whole intellectual movement of his time.

Upon reaching young manhood he went to France,[92] and perhaps spent some time at Cluny. Next he visited Germany and preached before the German court. We are told that the King was impressed by his eloquence. Upon returning to Rome, his only thought was to engage in the work of his own spiritual perfection. This may have been the period when he embraced the monastic life.[93] But, we are told by one of his earliest biographers, "he soon found out that at Rome he had dangerous enemies. He experienced the truth of the proverb that no one is a prophet in his own country. Wishing to remove all jealousy, he decided to return to Germany and Gaul. However, he reached no farther than Acquapendente in Etruria. In that city he had a dream in which the Apostle Peter appeared to him. Thereupon he decided to return to Rome and remain there." [94] The opposition and jealousy mentioned by his biographer were probably provoked by some protest on the young monk's part against the morals of the time.

Says the most complete of the historians of St. Gregory VII: "Such are the most reliable data regarding the early

[91] St. Peter Damian, *Vita Odilonis; PL,* CXLIV, 944.

[92] Bernried, *Vita Gregorii VII* in Watterich, *Rom. pontif. vitae,* I, 477.

[93] W. Martens (*Greg. VII, sein Leben und Werkes,* Vol. I) has maintained that Hildebrand never was a monk. His arguments have not convinced all scholars. Along with Duchesne, Leclercq, and most of the historians, we hold that Hildebrand was a monk. See Berlière, "Grégoire VII fut-il moine?" in the *Revue Bénédictine,* X (1893), 337–47; Delarc, "Hildebrand jusqu'à son cardinalat" in the *Correspondant,* Vol. X; Grisar, "Una memoria di S. Gregorio VII, e del suo stato monastico in Roma" in the *Civiltà cattolica,* III (1895), 205–10. Leclercq concludes that "Gregory VII's monastic profession is certain" (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 992 note 5).

[94] Bernried, *loc. cit.*

youth of Hildebrand. Other items of information are to be found, but they are of a legendary sort or such as cannot be harmonized with the established dates in Hildebrand's life." [95]

Gregory VI, when he accepted the supreme pontificate, remembered his former pupil and made the young Tuscan monk his private secretary, or, to use the expression in vogue, his chaplain.[96]

Strengthened by the support he received from Peter Damian and from Hildebrand, confident that he would fulfil the wishes of St. Odilo, with whom he at once entered into relation,[97] and of the entire Order of Cluny, whose rights and privileges he promptly confirmed,[98] Gregory VI at the very outset undertook to restore the Roman churches, particularly St. Peter's, which had fallen in ruin through the neglect of his predecessors. In a letter to the universal Church on this occasion, he says:

Beloved brethren. Some emperors, kings, princes, and persons of other rank, incited by a wretched cupidity, have invaded the possessions of the holy Roman Church and have turned them to their own use. Behold the Church which possesses the bodies of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, from which the light spreads out to the entire world, now threatened with ruin. Some clerics filled with the spirit of religion and also some laymen have volunteered to give us annually, for the restoration of St. Peter's Church, a portion of the offerings they receive.[99]

[95] Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* I, 9.

[96] We should not attach to this title the meaning that it has today. At that period Hildebrand was not yet a subdeacon. A bishop's chaplain, *capellanus episcopalis,* was primitively the cleric who had the care of the bishop's chapel and who assisted him at ceremonies. Later he was a confidential, private secretary. We see *capellani* represent their bishop in councils, in important missions, and in other weighty affairs. See Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexikon,* art. "Kaplan." Cf. Du Cange, under the word "capellanus."

[97] Jaffé (1st ed.), no. 3136. We do not know why the second edition omits mention of the bull of Gregory VI in this place.

[98] *Ibid.*

[99] Mansi, XIX, 621.

The Pope then promised the suffrage of his prayers and the blessing of God to all who would contribute to this holy work.

But the work undertaken by the courageous pontiff soon encountered various difficulties. Although the devout Duke of Aquitaine heeded Gregory's appeal and had contributions collected among his subjects, most of the other princes remained deaf to the Pope's appeal. Some of them, such as Count Gehard of Saxony and the heads of the house of Crescentius, openly opposed the new Pope.

Gregory turned to the ruler who, by the titles which he assumed, should have been the protector and defender of the Roman Church and who, calling himself the successor of Charlemagne, should have continued the services of the illustrious emperor.

Emperor Henry III

Emperor Conrad II died in 1039. His successor, Henry III the Black, twenty-two years old at his elevation and endowed with a surprising maturity, brought the Empire to the culminating point of its power. But his conduct toward the Church presented a singular contrast. He was a man much given to all the practices of piety, a friend of the clergy and the monks, an avowed enemy of simony. But he allied himself to the Church only with the idea of ruling it; and he dislodged the Tusculum family from the position it had assumed toward the Roman Church only that he might attempt to confiscate the papacy for his own profit.[100]

The Emperor promptly answered the appeal which the Pope sent him. His desire to reform the abuses of the Churches may

[100] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* chap. 9, p. 151; Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 977 f.; Delarc, I, l–lii. Hefele and Delarc express a more favorable judgment of this emperor. We do not think this judgment is well founded. Hefele acknowledges that "Henry III considered himself the master of the Church, with the right to confer and to revoke the office of bishop and even of pope" (*op. cit.,* p. 978).

have been sincere. But what he most desired was to come to Rome to have himself crowned there.

First he went to Pavia. There, October 25 and 26, 1046, he assembled a well-attended council. Many German bishops of the royal suite participated in the council at the side of the Italian bishops. This council apparently was the place where he delivered [101] the famous discourse against simony. This address has been highly praised by certain historians [102] and would deserve our full admiration if it had served as the Emperor's guide during the rest of his reign. He declared:

With tears I address you, you who hold in this Church the place of Jesus Christ. . . . The Word of God, when sending forth His Apostles to preach the Gospel to the whole world, said to them: "Freely have you received, freely give." Why, then, do you let yourselves be dominated by cupidity and avarice? My own father, for whose salvation I am much disturbed, during his life also evidenced reprehensible avarice. . . . Ask God, in His gracious mercy, to pardon him. As for myself, just as, solely through the Lord's mercy, He has freely given me the crown, so I will freely give what concerns the worship of the Lord. I wish that you act in like manner.[103]

A short time after this, King Henry III and Pope Gregory VI held a conference at Piacenza. Together they went to Sutri, eight leagues from Rome, and there, in comformity with the King's desire, Gregory convoked a new council, over which he presided in person, on December 30, 1046. This wish of the King was a trap, which neither the Pope nor his confidential secretary Hildebrand was able to discern at the very first. Only later, through the experience of life, did Hildebrand learn to mistrust men's words, and even then excessive confidence in his enemies always remained the noble weakness of this grand

[101] This is the opinion of Steindorff (*Iahrb. des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III*, I, 307 f.). Hefele agrees with it (*op. cit.*, p. 985).

[102] Delarc, *op. cit.*, pp. l–lii.

[103] Glaber, *Hist.*, V, 5; *PL*, CXLII, 697.

character. The King's purpose in having this council assembled was to have it pass judgment, according to his own views, upon the question of the lawfulness of Gregory's election and to place Gregory, in the assembly over which he would officially preside, in the position of one accused.

First, the election of Sylvester III was declared null. The case of Benedict IX, who had refused to attend the council, was reserved. Then they came to the election of Gregory VI. Says the chronicler Bonizo:

> The Pontiff, a simple and unsuspecting man, without any evasions set forth the account of his election. He enjoyed a large fortune, which he was willing to employ for the welfare of the Church. Seeing how the party of the nobility was disposing of the Holy See in utter contempt for the canonical regulations, he considered he was performing a good work in purchasing and in restoring to the clergy and people of Rome the right to elect the pope. The members of the council told him that such subtlety had been dictated to him by the serpent and that what could be bought should not be considered holy. Gregory replied: "God is my witness that, in acting as I did, I believed I was meriting the pardon of my faults and the glory of God." To this the bishops answered: "It would have been better for you to be poor as Peter than rich like Simon Magus. Pronounce your own condemnation." Then Gregory pronounced against himself the following sentence: "I, Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, judge that, having made myself guilty of the shameful crime and heresy of simony, ought to be deposed from the Roman bishopric." [104]

After such a sentence, Henry III should have been satisfied. This pretended defender of the canons and of morals, who for

[104] Jaffé, *Monumenta gregoriana,* pp. 626 f. A sharp controversy has arisen among historians over the question whether Gregory VI was deposed at the Council of Sutri or whether he abdicated. Bonizo's simple account seems to furnish the solution. Gregory abdicated, as in the course of the ages many kings have abdicated, bowing before a successful rebellion. In this sense we can understand the words of St. Peter Damian, who was present at the council, and who, thinking of the substance of things rather than the form, says that Gregory "was deposed."

seven years had remained silent in the presence of the scandals of Benedict IX, at length broke the power of a pope who was animated by the purest intentions; but Henry had imposed his wishes in the matter of a papal election. In an assembly held at Rome on December 23 and 24, 1046, Benedict IX was also deposed. On December 24, Henry informed the Roman clergy and people of the candidate of his choice, Suidger, bishop of Bamberg, who was consecrated the next day under the name of Clement II. That same day the new Pope at Rome crowned Emperor Henry III and Empress Agnes. The German monarch also received the title of Roman patrician. Gregory was sent to Germany with his chaplain Hildebrand and was treated as a state prisoner in the custody of the Archbishop of Cologne.

Henry had accomplished his purpose: he took the place of the counts of Tusculum and was ready to play the part which that family had so long filled in the elections to the papacy. We shall see four transalpine popes, one after the other, imposed on Rome: the bishops of Bamberg, of Brixen, of Toul, and of Eichstätt: Clement II, Damasus II, Leo IX, and Victor II. But in all truth we must say that none of these popes repeated the scandal of the popes that sprang from Tusculum; on the contrary, more or less effectively, all labored for reform. But the principle of the imperial supremacy remained a danger which the sharp mind of a Hildebrand did not lose sight of and from which he later attempted to free the Church of God. When, on April 22, 1073, Hildebrand was raised to the supreme pontificate, he took the name Gregory VII as a protest against the removal of Gregory VI from the list of the popes and against the decision of the Council of Sutri.[105]

Although it is true that the new Pope, Clement II, was chosen

[105] Cf. Delarc, "Hildebrand jusqu'à son cardinalat" in the *Correspondant,* LXXXVI (1874), 587. In the account we have just given of the events preceding and following the Council of Sutri, we depart from the chronology followed by a large number of historians and take that which Hefele has adopted and which he justifies in the second edition of his *Histoire des conciles,* IV, 983–90.

upon the proposal of Emperor Henry III, it is equally true that this election took place according to the canonical regulations. We are told that the consent of the people and clergy was unanimous; and Suidger, a worthy and pious bishop, did not consent to accept until the council of Rome plainly manifested its wishes.

"On January 5, 1047, Clement II assembled at Rome, in the Emperor's presence, a great council against various abuses, particularly against simony. Whoever should accept money for consecrating a church, for ordaining a cleric, for conferring a benefice, an ecclesiastical office, an abbey, or a provostship, is to be anathematized. Whoever, without being personally guilty of simony, receives holy orders from a simoniacal bishop, must do penance for forty days, but he will keep his office. To put an end to discussions between the archbishops of Ravenna and Milan and the patriarch of Aquileia, Pope Clement II decided that, in the emperor's absence, the bishop of Ravenna should take the first place at the pope's right." [106]

Clement II died October 9, 1047. The pontificate of his successor was even shorter. When requested to designate a new pope for them, Henry III named Poppo, bishop of Brixen, who was elected and took the name Damasus II. This was the third German to ascend the throne of Peter. His consecration could not take place for six months after his election. Immediately upon being elected, he was obliged to place himself at the head of an army to drive out the deposed pope, Theophylactus, the former Benedict IX, who had again been enthroned at Rome. The Tusculum family made a last attempt to recover its power. Less than a month later (August 10, 1048), Damasus II died a mysterious death. The Tusculan party, Theophylactus himself, were accused of poisoning him.[107]

The trials of the Church were not over. We might ask whether

[106] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 991. Cf. Mansi, XIX, 617–27, supplem., I, 1275–78.
[107] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 993.

they were not going to become even more dreadful than ever. The imperial power, which had just so boldly declared its pretended right to interfere in the papal elections, was carried by Henry III to its highest point. At the time when the yoke of such a power seemed insupportable, what force would be able to shake it?

Peter Damian was at the head of the monastery of Fonte-Avellana; and Hildebrand, after his return from exile, was studying the Cluny rule to make it the basis of his future reforms. Besides them, God was increasing, in Italy, two new forces: the house of Tuscany and the Norman people.

The house of Tuscany held the pre-eminence in northern Italy. Founded in the preceding century by Azzo, the lord castellan of Canossa, the generous protector of Queen Adelaide, this family was enriched by the munificence of the Saxon emperors with the territories of Mantua, Ferrara, Brescia, Reggio, and Modena, and with the important marquisate of Tuscany. It was at this time represented by a man of energy, Marquis Boniface, who in the recent political events courageously took sides against Emperor Henry III.

The Normans occupied southern Italy. "Solid warriors, eager for gain, not very scrupulous," coming to the country in successive bands, they had continued "to engage in the service of anyone who paid them and made permanent settlements for themselves. Two of these they had already founded: at Aversa near Capua, and at Melfi between Benevento and Byzantine Apulia." [108]

These two new powers, the Tuscans and the Normans, soon play a notable part in the strife engaged in by the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for the liberty of the Church against the German emperors. From the house of Tuscany comes Countess Matilda; from the Norman people comes Robert Guiscard.

[108] Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical*, p. 386.

PART II

The Liberation of the Church

For almost a century, from John XII to Clement II, the great concern of the Church had been to elude the tyranny of the Italian factions by relying on the imperial power. Emperor Henry III, so it seemed, at last gave that tyranny its coup de grâce; but in doing so he replaced the influence he had just overthrown by his own dominance.

The Church could not think of attacking the Holy Empire in its essential constitution. In the mind of the Church that institution still remained the guaranty of the union that ought to exist between Christian nations. But, while respecting that great power and even attempting to strengthen it on firmer foundations, the Church considered the possibility of limiting its prerogatives, of clarifying the limits of its lawful jurisdiction, and of better safeguarding the independence of the Church against the alleged rights of the Empire.

This work of liberation was the chief concern of the popes from St. Leo IX to Callistus II.

The three principal undertakings of this period were the investiture conflict, the elaboration of autonomous Church legislation by the holding of several councils, and the Crusades. By the investiture conflict the Church freed herself from the Empire and from feudalism; by the doctrinal and disciplinary work of the councils she strengthened her own life; by her part in the Crusades she displayed her supreme influence with regard to Christendom as a whole.

CHAPTER IV

From St. Leo IX to St. Gregory VII (1048–73)

IN the brief course of two years, five popes in succession ascended the Apostolic throne under tragic circumstances. Benedict IX, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI were deposed; Clement II and Damasus II died in a mysterious manner. The peace of the Empire no less than the tranquillity of the Church was concerned in the election of a pope who would offer well-grounded hope of stability. Emperor Henry III appointed Christmas, 1048, as the date for the meeting of a large assembly at Worms. We know that the monk Hildebrand was there, either personally invited or coming of his own accord so as better to serve the interests of the Church. From the outset of the meeting, the eyes of all turned to Bishop Bruno of Toul as the person most worthy to occupy the vacant see.

Pope St. Leo IX

Bruno was the son of Count Hugh of Egisheim and of Heilwig (the only daughter of the Count of Dagsburg). He was also closely related to the Emperor. His devotion to the Apostolic See was well known. Since on his father's side he was German, and on his mother's side a Gallo-Roman, he seemed destined to pacify those nationalist conflicts that had so largely contributed to the disturbance of the Church and the Empire during the preceding regimes. Born June 21, 1002, in the country of "mild Alsace," as his biographer tells us,[1] he had by this

[1] *In dulcis Elsatiae finibus,* says Wibert, *Vita S. Leonis,* Bk. I, chap. 1; *PL,* CXLIII, 457.

time reached mature age and was capable of conducting successfully the formidable undertaking in the office which he was asked to assume. A residence of two years at the imperial court as chaplain of Emperor Conrad II had made him acquainted with public affairs. His part (in 1026) in an expedition against the rebellious Milanese showed his courage, his prudence, and his resolute character. For more than twenty years his government of the diocese of Toul— "in that artificial kingdom of Lorraine, its eastern portion dependent on the Holy Empire, its western part gravitating in the French orbit" [2]—showed that Bruno was a prudent and vigorous administrator and an austere and devout bishop, not concerned about perishable interests, but wholly devoted to the interests of God and God's Church.[3]

When Bruno was asked to accept the papacy, he replied: "I will go to Rome. There, if the clergy and people spontaneously choose me for their pontiff, I will yield to your wishes. Otherwise I will not accept election." [4] Under other circumstances and from anyone except his close relative, Henry III would perhaps have shown his dissatisfaction with such a reply. Bruno's election had to be accepted. The unanimous vote of the assembly acclaimed him.[5] Dressed in a plain pilgrim's cloak,[6] he set out for the Eternal City. After a month's hard journey, he arrived in Rome at the end of January, 1049. He was already known there on account of the many pilgrimages he had made to the tomb of the Apostles while he was bishop of Toul.[7]

[2] E. Martin, *Histoire des diocèses de Toul, de Nancy et de Saint-Dié* (1900–2).

[3] E. Martin, *Saint Léon IX*, pp. 33–68.

[4] Bruno de Segni, *Vita S. Leonis IX*, in Watterich, I, 96.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Wibert, Bk. II, chap. 2, in Watterich, I, 150. Bonizo and Otto of Freising are mistaken when they say that Leo again assumed the papal insignia at Worms. See Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII*, I, 106–8 and note.

[7] His biographer's assertion that he made the pilgrimage to Rome every year, need not be taken literally. But it indicates at least the frequency of his pilgrimages. Cf. E. Martin, *Saint Léon IX*, p. 63.

On the Feast of the Purification (February 2) the metropolitan of Trier, Eberhard, presented him, in the Emperor's name, to the immense throng gathered in the Basilica of St. Peter. A unanimous acclaim was their reply. Ten days later (February 12), which was the first Sunday of Lent, Bruno was enthroned. He took the name Leo IX.

Probably the new Pope had brought the monk Hildebrand to Rome with him.[8] But we are certain that he who would be the Pope's best adviser was in the Eternal City very soon after him,[9] that thereafter he had the Pope's full confidence, and that presently he was made cardinal-subdeacon of the Roman Church.[10] "The mild and firm Pontiff and the energetic and tenacious monk would rely on each other and would supplement each other in the hard strife that was being waged." [11]

To appreciate fully the bitterness of that strife, one must read the *Liber Gomorrhianus,*[12] which Peter Damian wrote and dedicated to Pope Leo IX in the early part of his pontificate. In frank and plainspoken terms, the austere Camaldolese monk made a candid exposure and opened all the sores, denouncing to the Pope and to the whole Christian world the crimes committed among the clergy. He found fault with the inadequacy of the measures thus far employed to cure these disorders and begged Leo IX to be uncompromising in removing all clerics guilty of such offenses. The Pope, probably following the publication of this work, appointed Peter Damian prior of the Ocri monastery in the district of Saxeno.[13] However, the vehemence of such a

[8] Delarc holds this as certain (*op. cit.*, I, 109 note 2).

[9] See the evidence in Delarc, *loc. cit.*

[10] *PL*, CL, 821; Mansi, XIX, 921.

[11] E. Martin, *Saint Léon IX*, p. 74.

[12] *PL*, CXLV, 159–190. Cf. Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, XIII, 312.

[13] Delarc, *op. cit.*, I, 127. Peter Damian's little work, *Liber Gomorrhianus ad Leonem IX*, is undated, but every reason leads us to believe it appeared at the very beginning of the pontificate of St. Leo IX. This is the view of Delarc (I, 126 f.) and Bareille (art. "Damien" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, IV, 42).

reformer destined him rather to utter cries of alarm than to be closely associated with the government of the Church, as was Hildebrand already. Leo IX, although continuing to esteem Peter Damian and generously encouraging him, gently removed him from the papal entourage. The outspoken hermit, thinking he was a victim of unjust denunciations, wrote proudly to the Pope, saying: "I do not seek the favor of any mortal; I fear no one's anger; I appeal only to the testimony of my own conscience." [14] This frankness was not displeasing to Leo IX. But the hour had not yet come for the ardent reformer to be introduced into the councils of the papacy; age and experience must first moderate his holy outbursts.

The Pope declined to apply rigorously the penalties proposed by Peter Damian against the disorders in the Church. But he felicitated the zealous monk and showed, by his conduct, that he understood the timeliness of the zeal. The new Pope's first care was vigorously to undertake the reform of the clergy.

In his deep spirit of faith, the holy Pontiff resolved to place this painful campaign under the protection of the archangel Michael and of the patriarch of Western monastic life, St. Benedict. During Passion Week he went on pilgrimage to Monte Gargano. He returned by way of Monte Cassino, where he prayed at the tomb of St. Benedict. He designated the week following Low Sunday of that same year as the date for an assembly of all the bishops of Italy and several bishops of neighboring regions. The purpose of this synod was to provide for the reform of morals.

Councils

Present at this Roman council, besides a number of Italian prelates and abbots, were the Emperor's delegate Eberhard,

[14] See Leo's letter to Peter Damian, felicitating him on his *Liber Gomorrhianus; PL,* CXLV, 159 f.

who had not left Rome, and Halinard, the archbishop of Lyons. Directly attacking the two great vices afflicting Christian society, clerical simony and incontinence, the Pope began by proposing to the council that it declare the deposition of all who obtained their sacred offices by a simoniacal pact and furthermore that it declare null any ordination conferred by them. Part of the assembly hesitated to approve the second penalty. Gregory VI, Sylvester III, and Benedict IX, in different ways and with various degrees of responsibility, had given money on the occasion of their elevation to the Apostolic See. Should all the ordinations of bishops and clerics performed by those pontiffs therefore be held as null?

After long discussion, the synod declared that it abided by a decision of Clement II. That decision merely imposed a penance of forty days on clerics ordained by simoniacal bishops. But the measures adopted against the latter were extremely severe. Upon the Pope's order, each member of the council was required publicly to declare whether he had received or conferred orders in consideration of some temporal payment. The Bishop of Sutri, guilty of this crime, was on the point of trying to exculpate himself by introducing false testimony; but, as he began to speak, he collapsed suddenly, another Ananias, in the presence of the successor of St. Peter. This example overawed the assembly, which declared that every simoniacal cleric would be deposed. Next they renewed all the former laws regarding clerical celibacy.

But a matter of prime importance was that these enactments should not remain a dead letter, that they should pass beyond the limits of the council chamber and of the city of Rome. Often similar decisions of councils had been rendered ineffective by the inertia of some persons and the timidity or weakness of others. Would bishops and abbots, more or less involved in these disorders, have the necessary courage, strength, and moral authority to repress them? Who would be capable of promulgating

and applying these decisions in Italy, France, Germany, Spain, England, and Hungary?

Leo IX made an energetic resolve. He himself took the pilgrim's staff and journeyed through Europe to make known, respected, and carried out the penalties decreed by the Roman synod. Few popes have traveled so extensively as Leo IX; few journeys have been as fruitful as his.

In the week after Pentecost (1049) he was at Pavia, gathering the bishops of Lombardy in a council. The official report of the proceedings of this council have disappeared, but what we know indicates that the canons of the Roman council were there renewed and were applied without delay. On September 3, the Pope was at Mainz, presiding over an assembly of German bishops. No sooner had he succeeded in having that council pass similar decrees, than he convoked the French prelates to meet at Reims, where he intended to consecrate the abbey church of St. Remigius and to hold another council.

He reached Reims on September 29, the feast of St. Michael. A vast throng was awaiting him. Clerics and laymen, lords and peasants, Frenchmen from Île-de-France, Normans, people from Lorraine and from Champagne, all filled the streets of the city. Says a chronicler of the time: "It seemed that the whole world had sent pilgrims." [15] On October 2, in the presence of the reliquary of St. Remigius, which the Pope ordered to be placed on the altar so that the great apostle of the Franks might, as it were, preside over the council, twenty bishops and fifty abbots, along with a large number of priests and deacons, began their deliberations. Following the procedure inaugurated at the Roman synod, each bishop in turn arose and publicly declared whether he had received or conferred holy orders in a simoniacal manner. The ones who were most guilty were deposed; those who had merely profited by an agreement of which

[15] Anselm, *Historia dedicationis ecclesiae Sancti Remigii* in Watterich, I, 113, and in *PL*, CXLII, 1410–42.

they were unaware and which they regretted, benefited by the Pope's indulgence.[16] Then the council put into force certain canons that had fallen into neglect, and decreed new canons regarding the holy laws of marriage, laxity in the monastic life, usurpation of Church property by laymen, the sin of Sodom, certain "heretics recently appearing in Gaul," [17] the oppression of the poor, the immoderate desire of certain clerics for combats.[18]

Knowing well that all these decrees would not be fully effective unless the rulers supported them with their authority, the Pope appealed to the zeal of King Henry I of France, Emperor Henry III of Germany, King Edward the Confessor of England, and King Ferdinand of Castile. Henry I, circumvented by advisers who had reason to dread a reform council, avoided the interview which the Pope proposed to him at Reims; but he did not oppose the execution in France of the council's decrees. Henry III of Germany attended a large council at Mainz (1050) that renewed the canons about the duties of clerics; Edward of England and Ferdinand of Castile favored the movement of religious restoration. To this end, Ferdinand assembled the bishops of his states at Coyaca (1050).

Reform Movement

Leo IX did more than travel everywhere and urge the reform. He mobilized the army of the monks. Under his influence, the character of monastic activity was transformed.

At that time the monasteries were like those defensive fortresses which merely prevented the enemy from taking possession of the country. With Leo IX the monastic citadels opened their gates; the soldiers whom they had trained in the combat for God, sallied forth

[16] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1019–23.
[17] *PL*, CXLII, 1437.
[18] Hefele-Leclercq, pp. 1023 f.

armed with spiritual weapons and took the offensive against evil. They no longer merely prayed in solitude; they preached; they exhorted the common people and the great; they reminded priests and bishops of their forgotten duties; everywhere they made known the decrees (without appeal) which St. Peter's successor had issued and confirmed and which the selfish lack of vigor on the part of faithless pastors left unknown to their flocks. The monastic order became a sort of army, acknowledging the pope as its commander-in-chief and ready to march, under the guidance of its abbots, who themselves received their guidance from the Holy See.[19]

Leo IX's reform work was powerfully aided by the appearance, in 1050, of a collection of Church laws, known as the *Collectio 74 canonum,* which became the basis for the important *Collectio canonum* of Anselm of Lucca, a contemporary of Gregory VII, which was considerably utilized by Gratian's *Decretum.* This collection contained decrees about the rights and obligations of clerics, the privileges and obligations of churches, the accusatory procedure, the right of appeal, and the primacy of the Apostolic See. It was the first manifestation of a juridical movement which, as it progressed, would exercise a preponderant influence in the reform of dicipline and morals.[20]

With St. Leo IX's work of reform we should connect what he did for the construction and adornment of the churches and for the better execution of the sacred chant. "He was honored by his contemporaries, especially by the people of Beneventum, as a heavenly patron, because of the churches he built." [21] A capable singer, particularly qualified to execute the "circumvolutions of the quilisma," [22] says his epitaph, he was also a composer. "To him is credited the composition of the responses for the feasts of St. Gregory the Great, St. Odilo, and St. Gorgo.

[19] Brucker, *L'Alsace et l'Eglise au temps de S. Léon IX,* I, 227.

[20] The *Collectio 74 canonum* is studied by Fournier in Vol. XIV of the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* published by the Ecole française de Rome in 1894.

[21] Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Eglise* (French trans.), III, 269.

[22] An ornamental neume.

Leo IX's compositions were for a long time famous in the churches of Alsace and Lorraine." [23]

The task undertaken by the holy Pope was the more difficult because, in addition to the old ills of the Church, new trials arose. Berengarius' heresy, the schism of the Eastern Churches, and the deeds of violence by the Normans in Lower Italy were the chief of these trials.

Berengarius

We have reason to suppose that the Council of Reims, when it condemned "certain heretics recently appearing in Gaul," [24] had in mind Berengarius and his followers. He was a rhetorician, with a vacillating mind and versatile character. He gathered about his person and won to his teaching a mass of restless souls who were intolerant of any yoke and eager for every novelty; such persons form the nucleus of every heresy in every period of history. Berengarius did not at all possess the powerful personality of an Arius, a Pelagius, or a Luther.

Born at Tours about the year 1000, a pupil of Fulbert of Chartres, but even then considered by that teacher as an unsound and dangerous spirit,[25] he rose rapidly, through the brilliance of his talent and his intrigues, to the offices of *scholasticus* at Tours and archdeacon of Angers.[26] His ambition was further stirred by the elevation of his friend Eusebius Bruno to the see of Angers in 1047, the protection offered him by Godfrey Martel, the count of Anjou, and the success of his own teaching. From the first teachers of Gnosticism to John Scotus, most of

[23] A. Gastoué, *L'art grégorien,* p. 89. To Leo IX is also attributed the *Gloria in excelsis* which is placed as no. 1 *ad libitum* in the Vatican edition of the Roman Gradual.

[24] *PL,* CXLII, 1437.

[25] Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres au Moyen Age,* p. 105.

[26] *L'Anjou historique,* II, 3–18.

the great heresiarchs who have appeared in the Church conceived and taught a new metaphysics. Berengarius was not capable of doing so. "To assume a theatrical manner, to strive particularly to win praise for what is most striking and brilliant in the teaching office rather than for what is staid, to pretend long meditations, to speak with impressive modulations of voice, in short, to deceive undiscerning minds in such a way as to win a reputation for learning without being learned": according to the description by one of his contemporaries,[27] such is the truest account of his talent. We may consider the portrait exaggerated. But what we know of the heresiarch's life and writings shows that the picture is substantially true.

What will this schemer do? He will try to combine, with the current doctrines being spread around him by the new Manichaeans [28] about baptism, marriage, and the Eucharist, the most brilliant and daring teaching of Scotus Erigena; he will attempt to cover his imprudent statements with isolated texts from St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine; and he will adopt an attitude of haughty independence toward the Holy See, calling the pope *pompifex* and *pulpifex*.[29] If it is true, as Guitmund, bishop of Aversa, relates, that afterward he hired poor students and sent them into all parts of France that they might spread his popularity, we more easily understand the nature and promptness of his success.

On account of the blatant propaganda of his followers and the boldness of his statements Berengarius' heresy appeared as one of the greatest dangers that had threatened Christian society. The doctrine of the Eucharist, which was the object of the heresiarch's most violent attacks, was, in the eleventh century, not only the center of faith and Catholic piety, it was also the

[27] Guitmund, bishop of Aversa, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in Eucharistia,* Bk. I; *PL,* CXLIX, 1428.

[28] See *supra,* p. 108.

[29] *PL,* CXLVIII, 1456; CXLIX, 1422; CL, 426, 442.

center of the whole social life. Precisely in honor of the Eucharist so many masterpieces of architecture were built and religious music revived; in the presence of the Eucharist, agreements concluded for the peace of families and of society took on a sacred character; to the judgment of God present in the Eucharist appeal was made, with a faith sometimes mixed with superstition, by an accused person who alleged that he was the victim of a false charge. Although Berengarius did not altogether deny the doctrine of the Eucharist, he obstinately attacked the dogma of transubstantiation, gave the doctrine of the real presence an interpretation so idealistic that in the minds of the uneducated it amounted to a negation, and rejected the theory of the "material" *manducatio corporis Christi* in communion so vigorously that communion appeared to be nothing more than the symbol of a nourishment that was wholly spiritual.[30]

Pope Leo IX, informed of the proportions which the new doctrine was assuming, judged that the vague condemnation decreed in 1049 by the Council of Reims was not sufficient. In a council held at Rome in 1050, he pronounced sentence of excommunication against Berengarius. However, he summoned Berengarius to appear before a council that would open at Vercelli in September of the same year, so as to give him an opportunity to make a public retraction or, if possible, to explain his opinion in an orthodox sense.[31]

Ever solicitous to win the support of the temporal powers, the heresiarch first went to see William, duke of Normandy, the future conqueror of England, whose favor he hoped to gain. He went also to Paris to obtain the good will of King Henry I. But Henry, either distrustful of the innovator or prompted by

[30] Such is the interpretation that results from a close study of the writings of the heresiarch. For a full study of these writings, from this point of view, see Vernet, art. "Bérenger" in Vacant's *Dict. de théologie*, II, 728–36. See also the scholarly study by Renaudin, "L'hérésie anti-eucharistique de Bérenger" in the *Université catholique*, XL (1902), 415–47, and a work by Heurtevent, *Durand de Troarn et les origines de l'hérésie bérengarienne*, 1912.

[31] *PL*, CXLVIII, 1454; CL, 413.

political calculation,[32] did not let Berengarius set out for Vercelli. He imprisoned him. This imprisonment, however, did not last long. Berengarius bought his way out and sought refuge with the Count of Anjou.

The Council of Vercelli, after mature examination and long discussion, condemned both the doctrine of Berengarius and Scotus' book to which he appealed.[33] The heresiarch inveighed against "the band of simpletons," against the "council of vanity" that had condemned him, he said, without understanding him.[34]

The movement took a revolutionary turn. The King of France was alarmed for the peace of his kingdom. Without consulting the Pope, he assembled at Paris (October 16, 1051) a national council to pass judgment on Berengarius. The latter, foreseeing that the decision of the council would be against him, did not attend and was condemned.

But the Pope could not let this interference by the King in ecclesiastical matters pass without a protest, at least an implicit protest. To solve the problem, he turned to the monk Hildebrand, who was living in Rome in obscurity and retirement, engaged with his usual ardor in the temporal and spiritual restoration of the monastery of St. Paul Outside the Walls,

[32] At that time Henry I was in conflict with his powerful vassal, Count Geoffroy of Anjou. He knew that Berengarius was a protégé of the count. Perhaps his imprisonment of Berengarius was simply to irritate Geoffroy. See Ebersolt, "Bérenger de Tours et la controverse sacramentaire au IX^e siècle" in the *Rev. de l'hist. des rel.*, 1903, p. 32. Probably King Henry I was prompted by both reasons. The sequel shows us that he had no liking for Berengarius, and that he dreaded the disturbances which Berengarius' heresy might stir up in his kingdom. But he preferred to condemn the heretic himself rather than see him judged by the pope. Henry was always excessively jealous of his authority as related to the authority of the Holy See.

[33] John Scotus had said: "The Eucharist is the figure, the sign, and the pledge of the body of Christ." Scholars are not agreed about Scotus' doctrine in his *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (*PL*, CXXI, 125–70). Bossuet (*History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, Bk. IV, no. 32) speaks of this work as "an ambiguous book, where certainly the author did not always understand himself." Cf. Vernet, *op. cit.*, col. 731.

[34] *De sacra coena*, pp. 46 f.; Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1058 f.

leaving his monastery only to fulfil missions entrusted to him by the Pope. Leo IX asked him to go to France along with Cardinal Gerard and there to treat of affairs of the Holy See. The chief affair was that of Berengarius. The Count of Anjou's reconciliation with the Pope had made the heresiarch lose all his confidence. Hildebrand, with his usual resoluteness, convoked a council at Tours (1054). Berengarius, feeling that the decisive combat was going to be against him, went, but resolved to employ every subterfuge, to invoke every right of appeal. But, from the very first, Hildebrand imposed on him the choice of immediate recourse to the direct judgment of the Pope or of letting the French council, assembled in the Pope's name, pass judgment on the main point at issue. The whole assembly favored the latter alternative and desired to hear the innovator's explanations. Under Hildebrand's vigorous direction, the discussion began. Berengarius was called upon to declare, yes or no, whether he subscribed to the following proposition: "After the consecration, the bread and wine of the altar are the body and blood of Jesus Christ." Berengarius, as he himself avows, subscribed to this formula and swore that such was his faith, from the bottom of his heart.[35]

The heresiarch later revoked this declaration, distorted it while pretending to explain it. Thus began that confused series of affirmations and retractions that fill his career up to his last abjuration, made at the Council of Bordeaux in 1080, which seems to have been sincere and final.

Eastern Schism

The final result of Berengarius' heresy was an increase of devotion to the Eucharist in the whole Church. That same year

[35] *Ibid.* (ed. 1834), pp. 49–53. "The Council of Tours was certainly held in 1054. Lanfranc is mistaken when he puts off the date of this council until some time in the pontificate of Victor II. He is confusing the Council of Tours of 1054 with a council held in 1055 by Hildebrand in a city of the province of Lyons" (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1109 note 2).

(1054) a painful conflict broke out at Constantinople, with very different results: it led to the withdrawal of the Eastern Churches from the Roman communion.

Most futile pretexts were alleged as justification of this grievous break. In the ninth century Photius had attempted to proclaim the independence of the Church of Constantinople by blaming the Latins for certain liturgical practices, especially for the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed. Thanks to the council held at Constantinople in 869, thanks also to the firmness shown by Emperor Leo VI after Photius was again placed in the patriarchal see, the schismatic attempt failed. But the causes of misunderstanding between the East and the West were by no means removed. Constantinople still regarded Rome and its pontiffs with a jealous and distrustful eye; and we must confess that for a century the conduct of certain popes was scarcely such as to inspire respect. The schismatic tendencies of the East had an even deeper cause. The great misfortune of the Easterners was always the confusing of the spiritual and the temporal in the person (which they considered sacred) of their basileus, making their monarch more than the head of a state, and of their patriarch more than the head of a Church. And they felt that this confusion would always be opposed by Rome, that it could be solidly established only in the complete autonomy of their Church.[36]

The step taken in 1024 jointly by the patriarch Eustathius and Emperor Basil to win John XIX, a move happily frustrated by the abbot of St. Bénigne, was prompted by this twofold feeling of jealousy toward the Roman See and of Caesaropapist autonomy.

[36] The famous Russian philosopher Vladimir Soloviev gives this tendency as the essential cause of the Eastern Schism, and even as the explanation of the whole history of Byzantium. He says: "People confused the divine and the human in the sacred majesty of the emperor. . . . Therein lay a principle of death for the Byzantine Empire. It was the real cause of the Empire's ruin. That it perished, and also that it perished at the hands of Islam, was but just. Islam is Byzantinism logical

Yet all hope of an understanding did not seem lost. The relations between Easterners and Latins increased in the course of the Middle Ages. Ever since Charlemagne became the protector of the Holy Land large numbers of people went there on pilgrimage. Latin monasteries were established in Palestine and even at Constantinople, and Greek monasteries were built in Italy. Leo IX, upon receiving notification of the election of Patriarch Peter III to the see of Antioch, thanked him and felicitated him for his cordial feelings toward the Roman Church.[37]

But when a determined and obstinate man revived the old causes of antipathy, the result might be a division that would even become a definite rupture. This man was the patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Caerularius. He was sprung from a noble Byzantine family. All the bitterness and all the prejudices of his race seemed to be transmitted to him. The prolific and versatile writer Psellus, his contemporary and intimate, relates that Caerularius "from his youth manifested a solitary spirit"; that "he was inclined to political meditations and even then indicated what he would some day be." [38] Austere as an ascetic, a dreamer and mystic, and also imperious and dogmatic, but more than all else ambitious, in 1040 he was the heart and soul of a conspiracy to overthrow Emperor Michael IV, whom he hoped to succeed. The plot was discovered, and Michael Caerularius was exiled. The exile's meditations and the death of his only brother, to whom he was much attached, seemed for a while to turn all his activity toward religious asceticism. He became a monk. But soon the truth was perceived, that, beneath the monastic habit, the old man was by no means dead. After his return from exile, following the death of Michael IV, under Constantine IX Monomachus he became the most influential

and unequivocal, freed from every contradiction" (*La Russie et l'Eglise universelle*, Introd., p. xlvi).

[37] Jaffé, no. 4297; *PL*, CXLIII, 769.

[38] *PG*, Vol. CXXI.

personage of the Empire. He was consecrated patriarch of Constantinople on March 25, 1042. At once he took first place both in the Church and in the state.[39]

From that hour, according to the words of his panegyrist, his overbearing disposition knew "neither measure nor bounds." [40] However, open hostility against Rome did not break out until eleven years later, in 1053. At the instigation of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Archbishop Leo of Achrida (Ochrida) in Bulgaria published a manifesto which he said was intended "for all the princes of the priests, the priests of France, the monks, the peoples, and the most reverend pope." [41] Four errors were imputed to the Latins: the use of unleavened bread in the celebration of mass; the custom of fasting on Saturdays; the use of meat from strangled animals; the practice of not singing the *Alleluia* during Lent. Declared the impetuous Archbishop: "anyone who thus observes the Sabbath and the use of unleavened bread, is neither Jew nor pagan; he resembles a leopard. . . . Why are you laboring at the reform of the people? Labor first at reforming yourselves." About this same time a monk of Studium, by name Nicetas Stethatos (in Latin, Pectoratus, "the man with the big chest"), was circulating all through the Greek Church a diatribe even more violent. To the earlier complaints, he added two others. He blamed the Latin Church for its alleged heresy about the Holy Ghost and for the obligation of celibacy imposed on priests. The fiery monk exclaimed: "Whence do you derive the custom of forbidding and dissolving the marriage of priests? What doctor of the Church has taught you this abomination?" [42] He thus appealed to the lowest instincts in defending the cause of the separation.

Michael Caerularius was the one who instigated this second manifesto as he had the first. The plan of campaign had been

[39] J. Bousquet, *L'unité de l'Eglise et le schisme grec*, pp. 173–75.
[40] Psellus, funeral oration; *PG*, Vol. CXXI.
[41] *PL*, CXLIII, 929. Cf. *PG*, CXX, 385 f.
[42] *Ibid.*, col. 981.

cunningly devised by him to progress step by step. He reserved to himself the adding of further charges in addition to those that were launched at his order. Meanwhile he thought the time had come to confront the clergy and faithful with an irreparable situation. "Of his own authority, without any plausible pretext, he closed the Latin churches of Constantinople. He ordered all the priests living in the Latin monasteries to adopt the Greek rite at once and, upon their refusal to do so, anathematized them. Then ensued scenes of violence and savagery that he made no attempt to hinder. Nicephorus, the chancellor of the patriarchate, even threw on the ground and trod under foot consecrated hosts on the pretext that, as they were made of unleavened bread, their consecration was not valid." [43]

Leo IX realized that the hour had come for him to raise his voice. This he did with a dignity and gravity that was in contrast with the bitter language of the rebellious Greeks. Passing over questions of little moment, he went straight to the essential question: Which was the Church whose practices had most right to the respect of all? Was it not that Roman Church, so venerable in its origin, ever indefectible in its doctrine, and so tolerant in its government, that it was seen in Italy not merely permitting Greek monasteries to retain their customs and rites, but even exhorting them to do so? [44]

The principle of the Roman primacy, which the Pope thus recalled to mind, was precisely the principle that Caerularius wished to destroy. But, at least for the moment, he had to submit. Just then the Normans were in conflict with the Byzantines for the possession of Lower Italy. The imperial forces were defeated (June 17, 1053) at Civitella. The Emperor considered the moment ill chosen for a break with the West. By some unknown means he influenced the Patriarch so that the latter sent a respectful and conciliatory letter to Rome.

[43] Bousquet, *op. cit.*, p. 178.
[44] *PL*, CXLIII, 764.

The Pope felicitated the Patriarch for his declarations of loyalty, but was not deceived by his promises. He sent three legates to Constantinople, instructing them to settle with the Emperor and the Patriarch all the difficulties that had arisen. One of these legates was the chancellor of the Roman Church, Frederick, who later became pope under the name of Stephen IX.

When the envoys reached Constantinople (June, 1054), Leo IX was no longer of this world. Michael Caerularius received them with insolence, declared his purpose of persisting in all his positions, and, as though he were the supreme pontiff of the Universal Church, ordered the Patriarch of Antioch to remove the name of the Pope from his diptychs.

The legates (July 16, 1054), in the Church of St. Sophia, pronounced a sentence of deposition and excommunication against Michael Caerularius. Four days later, Caerularius, assembling a number of bishops in council at Constantinople, pronounced anathema against the Pope. The schism was consummated.

Up to the time of his death in 1059, the life of Michael Caerularius was much agitated. But he had established the "Orthodox" Church as it would continue for centuries.

Less learned but more practical than Photius, he left in the background the disputed theological questions, which affect the mass of the faithful very little, and gave more emphasis to the outward differences in matters of discipline and ritual, those matters which impress the people. He was able to stir the popular imagination by interpreting the practices of the West in the most abominable sense. Furthermore, he won over a power which previously had been by choice at the service of the Catholic Church and of the papacy: that of the monks, who were very numerous at Constantinople and throughout the East. In the course of the tenth century, some maneuvers by Roman envoys gave them scandal; Michael succeeded in winning them to his side and turning them against Rome. Thereafter the

monks became the most fanatical partisans of Byzantine autonomy and the most intense enemies of whatever was Roman. . . . For those various reasons the work of Michael Caerularius still perdures.[45]

International Affairs

The last years of St. Leo IX's pontificate were taken up with various international questions. One after the other, the republic of Pisa, the king of England, the king of Scotland, the king of Hungary, the duchess of Tuscany, the king of France, and the emperor of Germany turned to Leo IX to ask his counsel, his arbitration, or his support.

In 1050 a dreaded Saracen corsair, Muset, captured Sardinia from the republic of Pisa and was threatening all the seacoast cities. The Pisans, then at strife with Lucca, were unable to confront two foes at once. They acquainted the Pope with their distress, and he arranged a truce between the two states in Italy and enabled Pisa not only to recover Sardinia, but also to overcome the terrible Saracen, make him a prisoner, and free Europe from a pressing danger.

The next year (April, 1051) Leo IX received a solemn embassy sent by the king of England, Edward the Confessor. This ruler the Church venerates as a saint. Although history has not given him the title of "Great," [46] he deserves to be called a just and good king. Says David Hume: "The English bore him great affection on account of his humanity, justice, and piety, as well as the long race of their native kings from whom he was descended." [47] He was banished from his country during the reigns of the conquering Danes, Canute the Great and Canute II. For obtaining the recovery of the kingdom of his fathers he made a vow to observe perfect continence and, once re-estab-

[45] Bousquet, *op. cit.*, pp. 187 f.

[46] *Erat Eduardus mitis ingenii minimeque sagacis, et apprime bellorum ac caedis abhorrens* (*Acta sanctorum*, January, I, 291).

[47] David Hume, *History of England*, year 1041 (1866 ed., I, 137).

lished in his states, to make a pilgrimage of thanksgiving to the tomb of the holy Apostles. God heard his prayer. Upon the death of King Hardicanute in 1041, the English, shaking off the yoke of Denmark, called to the throne the descendant of the old royal Saxon race.

The new King showed himself worthy of this confidence. "To preserve peace and promote religion, to enforce the ancient laws, and to diminish the burthens of his people, were the chief objects of his government." [48] The collection of laws published by him still serves as the foundation of the constitution of the English people. But when the King spoke of going on pilgrimage to Rome in fulfilment of his vow, his advisers, fearing the disorders that might be provoked by his absence, begged him to obtain from the pope a dispensation from his vow. The embassy which was sent to the Pope in the King's name accomplished its mission. The Pope gave them for transmission to the King a letter full of fatherly kindness. In this letter he says: "As evidently your presence is necessary in the midst of the English nation, we free you from the vow made by you and from the obligation of performing it. But, in return for this dispensation, we command, in the name of holy obedience, that you distribute to the poor the amount of money which you have set aside for your journey to Rome and that you erect and endow, in honor of the Prince of the Apostles, in your capital city, a monastery for the glory of God and for the instruction and edification of your people." [49] In carrying out this command, King Edward undertook to re-establish the old monastery of St. Peter, founded near London at the beginning of Christianity in England. It was named Westminster (monastery of the West) because of its location.[50] Such was the origin of the famous Westminster Abbey, which was enlarged and embel-

[48] Lingard, *History of England,* year 1043 (1912 ed., p. 328).

[49] St. Leo IX, *Ep.*, 57; *PL,* CXLIII, 674.

[50] Henry III and Edward I had already started the construction of the monastery that would become Westminster Abbey (Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1069 note 2).

lished by King Edward's successors and became the burial place of the kings and other eminent men.

At about this same time (1050) King Macbeth of Scotland made the pilgrimage to Rome. This monarch, whose tragic adventures supplied Shakespeare with the subject of his most pathetic masterpiece, came to Rome, tortured with remorse, there to expiate his crimes at the tomb of the Apostles. On that occasion he distributed immense alms in the Eternal City.[51]

In 1052 the King of Hungary, besieged in Presburg by the Emperor of Germany, turned to Leo IX, begging him to act as mediator between himself and his terrible foe. Since the death of King St. Sephen in 1038, Hungary had suffered many painful blows. King Peter was able to remain on the throne only by taking an oath of vassalage to the German Emperor. That was an unwise step. From then on, the emperors sought to make the land of the Magyars a fief of the Holy Empire. King Andrew, whom the national Hungarian party raised to power in 1041, continued in power only by subscribing to conditions that were humiliating for his country. In 1050 a sudden and brutal incursion of the Germans into Hungary started open war. Attacked in Presburg by an army which Henry III commanded in person, Andrew remembered that the holy King Stephen had placed his kingdom under the suzerainty of the Holy See. He wrote to Leo IX to put his imperiled kingdom under the safeguard of the papacy. We know that Leo answered this appeal by himself going at once to Hungary and proceeding to meet Henry III in the imperial camp. We are less precisely informed about the outcome of the affair. Hermann Contractus maintains that King Andrew refused to agree to the conditions of peace proposed by the Pope,[52] but Wibert declares that the Kingdom of Hungary recovered its autonomy.[53] Of this we are

[51] Baronius, *Annales*, year 1050, no. 15.
[52] Hermann Contractus, *Chronicon*, year 1052; *M. G., SS.*, V, 131.
[53] Wibert, *Vita Leonis IX*, Bk. II, chap. 8.

certain, that "Hungary developed along the path opened by St. Stephen and, when in 1077 he had a successor worthy of him, St. Ladislaus, a period of power and progress began for the Magyar state." [54]

Tuscany was governed, not by a king, but by a duchess, a simple woman. But Beatrice, duchess of Tuscany and Mantua, the excellent mother of Countess Matilda, had a virile and noble soul equal to that of the greatest kings. In 1053, at the Council of Mantua, a number of Lombard prelates, whom history has stigmatized with the name of "Lombard bulls," emboldened by the death of Duke Boniface and fearing a reform that would oblige them completely to alter their lives, invaded the council and there brought on a sanguinary brawl. Beatrice was not a woman to let the ducal authority or that of the Church be compromised. She prepared to punish the guilty; but she wished to have the Pope's advice. Leo IX requested and obtained a full amnesty for the guilty prelates. The manifestation had been directed chiefly against his personal authority; he resolved to pardon.

On the other hand, he was unbending in settling a dispute where justice seemed to him to be manifestly wronged. One Bertrand, archdeacon of Mende, who was a simoniacal priest but powerfully backed by the Count of Toulouse and by King Henry I of France, was claiming a right to the crosier against a certain Peter, who was the lawfully elected bishop of Puy-en-Velay. The Pope without hesitation decided against the protégé of the French King and in favor of Peter, who had justice on his side.[55]

At Worms (1052) Leo IX concluded with the Emperor a treaty that was important from the standpoint of the development of the temporal power of the Holy See. The Pope agreed to abandon the rights accruing to him by title of foundation from the bishopric of Bamberg and the monastery of Fulda; in re-

[54] Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.*, I, 722.
[55] E. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

turn, the Emperor gave to the domain of St. Peter the district of Benevento and the other possessions of the German crown located south of Rome.[56] Further, as a guaranty of the tranquil possession of these domains, the Emperor promised to put a contingent of troops at the Pope's disposal.[57]

Normans in Italy

Besides the notable advantages which this treaty assured to the papacy for the future, it enabled the Pope immediately to repress the turbulent incursions of the Normans in southern Italy. The Norman nation, which later on rendered the Holy See eminent services (intermittent services, interrupted by many a quarrel and revolt), had continued, ever since the establishment of its settlements on the Italian shores in 996, to fortify itself there and to grow.[58] Still impetuous with an ill restrained barbarian vigor, the Norman warriors frequently indulged in scenes of pillage and devastation. Leo IX was grieved at this. But he thought the best policy, unless he should be driven to extremities, was not to undertake a military expedition, and for a long time counted on the intervention of the Greek troops for the repression of these excesses.[59] However, the scenes of pillage increased. According to the report of Bruno of Segni, some people of Apulia came to Rome, their eyes gouged out, their noses cut off, their feet or hands mutilated, lamentable testimony of a shameless barbarism.[60] At the end of May, 1053, Leo IX decided that the time had come for him

[56] *M. G., SS.*, VII, 685.

[57] Poncelet, *Anal. bolland.*, XXV (1906), 284. Subsequently the Emperor gradually withdrew these forces from the pope. Cf. Chalandon, *Hist. de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, I, 134 f.

[58] On the settling of the Normans in Italy, see Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII*, I, 48–72.

[59] *PL*, CXLIII, 779.

[60] Bruno de Segni, *Vita S. Leonis IX; PL*, CLXV, 1116.

personally to take the direction of an expedition against the Normans.

Unfortunately the troops which the Emperor placed at his disposal were purposely made up of adventurers and vagabonds who regarded the campaign merely as an occasion for booty. In the first big battle, which was fought near Civitella, the papal troops fell back. After the defeat the Pontiff, however, when appearing in the presence of the terrible victors, was able to impress them with the prestige of his majesty. He appealed to their loyalty and, says a witness, obtained from them not only the promise that they would end their deeds of brigandage, but even a promise under oath that they would remain faithful to him and that they would replace from their own numbers the soldiers he had just lost.[61] "Such abrupt change of front was not rare in those times of violent contrasts. Leo IX's dignity in his distress, his firmness tempered with gentleness, his calm valor as father and pope, thus procured for him and for the Holy See more than he could have hoped to obtain by military success. Instead of unconquerable enemies, ever inclined to revolt, he now had vassals who came to him spontaneously." [62] However, the holy Pope seems to have retained a deep grief over the defeat of his forces at Civitella. And perhaps his feelings were tinged with bitterness toward the Emperor, whose conduct had done him such a disservice, and with doubt as to the perseverance of those who had just declared their subjection. A few days after these events, as though the great physical and moral effort he had just made had shattered his strength, he felt himself stricken by approaching death. With difficulty he returned to Rome. On April 19, after making his confession, hearing mass, and receiving holy communion, in a saintly manner he rendered his soul to God.[63]

[61] *Anonymus benevetensis* in Watterich, I, 102.
[62] E. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 169.
[63] Bruno de Segni, *op. cit.; PL,* CLXV, 1119.

Pope Victor II

At the first news of Leo IX's death, Hildebrand, who was then at Tours, returned to Rome. He had an important part to play there. Day after day the likelihood appeared more evident that, although the emperor's assistance could render real services to the action of the popes, his abusive interference in their election was of a sort to place them in a position of dependence upon him, which was humiliating for the Church and harmful to the rightful freedom of their spiritual mission. The Romans appreciated this fact so well that their idea was this time to name, without any recourse to the emperor, a pope of Italian nationality. Hildebrand's name was on everyone's lips. That such a procedure would exceedingly displease Henry III, was undeniable. To satisfy the two rival susceptibilities: on the one hand, to obtain from the clergy and people of Rome recourse to the emperor and the abandonment of a national candidate; on the other hand, to induce the emperor to renounce the exercise of his right of patrician of Rome and thereby of the imposition of his own candidate: such was the mission which Hildebrand undertook.

To obtain the required sacrifices from the Romans and from the Emperor required all the prestige and confidence which the monk enjoyed with the Romans, the promise that the new pope would be proposed by Hildebrand himself, and a guaranty that the imperial authority would not interfere with the freedom of their votes. Henry III at length renounced the abusive exercise of his rights as patrician, on condition that the pope should be of German nationality. Probably the able negotiator gave him to understand that a rupture with Rome, at the very time when southern Italy was slipping from him and when even in Germany his star was beginning to grow dim, would be disastrous for his personal authority. But when Hildebrand proposed his candidate, new difficulties arose. The one whom he named was

the Emperor's most valued counselor, Bishop Gebhard of Eichstätt, of the family of the Bavarian counts of Tollenstein and Hirschberg. He was a man in the prime of life. A real statesman, experienced in handling affairs, he was, upon several questions of international concern, in disagreement with Leo IX, but his unqualified devotion to the Church, the perfect correctness of his private life, these qualities nobody doubted. Henry III protested that he could not do without such a counselor.

Gebhard himself, fully understanding the formidable difficulties of the office to which they wished to raise him, resisted all entreaties for five months. He yielded only at the diet of the princes held at Ratisbon in March, 1055. Henry III had to agree to the conditions that were clearly laid down by the future pope. Said the Bishop of Eichstätt to the Emperor: "I give myself body and soul to St. Peter, and I bow before you; but on condition that you also will render to St. Peter what is his due." "By these words he was certainly alluding to the possessions of the Roman Church, but also to its rights and freedom, especially to the participation of the clergy and people in papal elections." [64] Gebhard, after being canonically elected by the Romans, was consecrated at Rome, April 13, 1055, and took the name of Victor II.

Of all the diplomatic successes won by Hildebrand in his career as monk and pope, this one was the most characteristic. The clear view of the difficulties, the perfect unselfishness, all the gifts that would characterize St. Gregory VII in his government of the Church, were revealed in these negotiations which resulted in the election of Victor II.[65]

During his short pontificate, scarcely two years long, the new Pope fulfilled the hopes that had been placed in him. In his relations with rulers, he succeeded in having the freedom of

[64] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1116.

[65] On this election, see Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1113–16; Delarc, *op. cit.*, II, 5–10.

the Roman Church respected; in the reform of the clergy, he was able with a firm hand to repress the abuses of his time.

He profited by the Emperor's journey in Italy during the summer of 1055 to remind him of his promises regarding the protection of the domains of the Holy See. From him the Pope obtained not only the restitution of certain property wrongly retained, but also the concession of the duchy of Spoleto and of the countship of Camerino.[66] Then, commissioning Hildebrand to restore the papal finances, the Pope himself reduced to obedience several castles that claimed to be exempt from such obedience. In this undertaking he had to oppose even the Emperor.[67]

The next year Victor visited the Emperor at Goslar in Saxony, to obtain from him sufficient troops to hold in respectful submission the Normans and Tusculans, who were again being stirred up. At this interview, various other important matters were treated.[68] One question settled was an acute conflict between Henry III and the Duke of Lorraine. The Emperor, the year before, had been displeased at seeing his relative Beatrice, the duchess of Tuscany, marry Duke Godfrey of Lorraine, whose political interests were opposed to those of the Emperor. This marriage he regarded as a sort of conspiracy to rob Germany of its preponderance in southern Italy. So violent was his irritation that he brought to Germany and kept prisoners at his court Duchess Beatrice and her young daughter Matilda. Pope Victor's intervention dissipated the Emperor's unjust suspicions. The Emperor's two relatives returned to Italy. But Countess Matilda later, at the hands of Henry III's son, had to atone for the measures of his father.[69]

The Pope and the Emperor cherished some new projects for the good of the state and of the Church. But on October 5, 1056, after a few days' fever, Henry III died. He was thirty-nine

[66] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1119 note 2.
[67] Anonymus Haserensis; *M. G., SS.*, VII, 265.
[68] Delarc, II, 17.
[69] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

years old. He breathed his last piously, in the Pope's arms, asking aloud pardon of those whom he had offended. "He left as his successor, under the tutelage of Empress Agnes, a six-year-old boy. This was Henry IV, who was born November 11, 1050, and crowned July 17, 1054. The dying Emperor, thoughtful of the future of the mother and the child under such critical circumstances and with a turbulent nobility, commended them to his friend Pope Victor. The Pope it was who, following Henry III's death, governed for some time in the name of the Empress and of the young Henry IV. His presence at such an hour was a priceless blessing for the country. That Germany at that period escaped anarchy and civil war was owing to the wisdom and authority of the Pontiff." [70]

What the Pope, at the time of this intervention in the political affairs of that country, witnessed in Germany, made him see that he should less and less count on the crown of Germany to come to the succor of the Holy See. Therefore, on his return to Italy, he strengthened the bonds of friendship with Duke Godfrey and Duchess Beatrice. The people of Lorraine and Tuscany seemed to him to be more reliable supports. Did he already foresee the hostile attitude that Henry IV would one day take?

Personally or by his legates, Victor II held several councils which had as their aim the reform of the Church, particularly the suppression of simony. Among these councils we should mention those of Chalon-sur-Saône and Toulouse in France, Llandaff in Wales, Santiago de Compostela in Spain, and the Lateran in Rome.[71] Hildebrand, Peter Damian, Archbishop Raimbaud of Arles, and Archbishop Ponce of Aix were his chief auxiliaries in this work of reform. Hildebrand later related to his friend Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino (the future Victor III) how, at one of these councils, God Himself

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 19.
[71] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1120–25.

by a miracle seconded the campaign undertaken by the Pope against the simony of clerics. Says Hildebrand:

It was in Gaul. The bishop of the city where I had gathered a council was accused of having obtained his bishopric for money. As he kept denying the charges against him, I adjured him in these words: "I call upon you, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to answer, yes or no, whether you are guilty of the crime with which you are charged; and, if you are really guilty, may Heaven make you unable to pronounce the name of the Holy Ghost, whose gifts you have purchased for money." The Bishop began to speak, saying: "In the name of the Father, of the Son . . ." But he was unable to go farther. All those present thereupon were convinced that the wretch was stained with the crime of simony. He himself trembled and confessed his fault.[72]

According to Bonizo, the council here referred to was held at Embrun in 1057.[73] In fact, in 1057 Archbishop Hugo of Embrun ceased to administer that diocese and was at once replaced by Winimann.[74] In any event, Hildebrand must have left Gaul soon afterward, because he was at Arezzo on July 28, 1057, at the deathbed of Victor II.

Pope Stephen IX

As soon as the news of the Pope's death became known at Rome, the clergy and the people assembled to choose his successor. Since Hildebrand had not yet come back from Tuscany, many proposed that they wait for his arrival. Others advanced various names, among which was that of Hildebrand himself. On the third day unanimous agreement was reached on the name of Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine. As the day was the feast of St. Stephen, pope and martyr, he took the name of Stephen IX.[75]

[72] Victor III, *Dialogi,* Bk. III; *PL,* CXLIX, 1013.

[73] Bonizo, *Ad amicum,* Bk. VI; *PL,* CL, 826.

[74] Jaffé, no. 4369; Bouche, *Hist. de la Provence,* II, 74.

[75] Others say Stephen X, because in the list of popes they reckon Zachary's suc-

This election, which took no account of the emperor's approval, was significant for its spontaneity and for the person chosen. Cardinal Frederick of Lorraine, abbot of Monte Cassino, was the brother of Duke Godfrey, the brother-in-law of Duchess Beatrice. He represented the great house of Tuscany, in which the preceding popes had recognized a powerful auxiliary, and Emperor Henry III a rival. The new Pope's past was without reproach. His devotion to the reform of the Church was known to everyone. Several diplomatic missions, particularly one to Constantinople at the time of the schism of Caerularius,[76] had shown the prudence and firmness of his political sense.

Stephen's pontificate was very short, lasting less than eight months. But it marked an important hour in the history of the warfare against simony. We may rightly consider it the starting point of the strife against lay investiture.[77]

The raising of Peter Damian to the cardinalate and his appointment to the bishopric of Ostia were the signal for the beginning of a vigorous campaign against clerics guilty of concubinage and simony. The hermit of Fonte-Avellana, the courageous author of the *Liber Gomorrhianus,* by his new office became the chief dignitary of the papal court.[78] Attempts have been made, by appeal to a few somewhat sharp expressions in Peter Damian's letters, to picture him as a rival of Hildebrand. Such an inference is wholly unjustified. The austere Camaldolese monk wrote to his illustrious friend as follows: "In all your

cessor, Stephen, who was elected in 752 and died three or four days after his election without having been consecrated. Cf. Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* III, 328 note 19.

[76] See *supra,* p. 157.

[77] "The part played by this pope in the investiture dispute seems to have escaped the attention of all who, in recent years, have had occasion to treat this question. . . . Gregory VII so attracted the attention of his period upon himself that, in this dispute, the part taken by other popes, except Callistus II, is quite lost sight of." U. Robert, "Le Pape Etienne X (IX)" in the *Rev. des quest. hist.,* XX (1876), 49.

[78] At this period the bishop of Ostia had become the first of the cardinal-bishops of the Roman Church.

combats, in all your victories, I have eagerly joined your following, not merely as a comrade in arms or a squire, but as your thunderbolt. Your wish I have regarded as equivalent to the authority of the canons." [79] Peter Damian was, above all else, a great agitator; Hildebrand, a great diplomat. The former, relying more upon measures imposed by authority, was rather inclined to look for aid from the Empire; Hildebrand, more zealous for the freedom of the Church, placed more hope in spiritual arms. To use an expression that is of a later date, Peter Damian was rather Ghibelline, and Hildebrand was rather Guelph. But they were one in their aims; because they differed from each other in their procedure, they supplemented each other.

Cardinal Peter Damian was no sooner clothed with his new office than he wrote to his colleagues of the Lateran a letter as outspoken as the letters he had recently sent from his monastic retirement.[80] In this letter he says:

> Brethren, excuse my boldness. But, since this church of the Lateran is regarded as the church of churches, let our life be a radiance. Let us announce to the people words of life, not only by word of mouth, but by the strictness of our morals. . . . Towering headdress made of sable or of fur of animals obtained beyond the seas does not make a bishop, nor does a numerous military escort scarcely able to control their foam-covered mounts. What makes a bishop is holiness of life, unceasing efforts to acquire the virtues of his state.

In the Sacred College the voice of Peter Damian found echoes. One of the most important events in Stephen IX's pontificate was the appearance of a book written against simony by the scholarly Cardinal Humbert, bishop of Silva Candida.[81]

[79] St. Peter Damian, *Ep.*, II, 8; *PL*, CXLIV, 273.

[80] St. Peter Damian, *opusc.*, 18; *PL*, CXLV, 409. The seven cardinals of the Roman Church were attached to the Lateran Basilica.

[81] Humbert, *Adversus simoniacos; PL*, CXLIII, 1007 f.

Going more deeply to the root of the question than had been previously done, Humbert, after describing the ravages of simony and opposing it with the most solid theological considerations and the most explicit scriptural texts, showed the source of this evil in the part granted to the laity in the election of clerics, in the custom assumed by nobles and kings to invest bishops and abbots of their choice by the crosier and the ring.[82] He thus pointed to the remedy for the evil in the strife against lay investiture.

Was this writing inspired by Stephen IX? We do not know. He himself was so convinced of the evil produced by the interference of the German emperors in the affairs of the Church, that he was on the point of venturing upon a most daring attempt. Even after being raised to the supreme pontificate, he purposed retaining the title of abbot of Monte Cassino. In March, 1058, he ordered John, the provost of the monastery, to bring him in secret and without any delay whatever gold and silver was in the abbey treasury. According to the *Chronicle of Monte Cassino*—in all matters concerning Stephen IX its testimony is trustworthy—the Pope intended to join his brother Godfrey in Tuscany, to bestow the imperial crown upon him, then, in concert with him, to introduce a reign of order in Italy.[83] The monks of Monte Cassino were grieved at the Pope's request, but they had to obey. They set out on the road to Rome with their treasure. Pope Stephen, upon receiving it, says the *Chronicle,* began to tremble and, upon learning that the monks of Monte Cassino obeyed him but sadly, regretted that he had made such a request of them.[84]

Perhaps what made the Pope tremble was also the risks of the undertaking and the responsibility for so formidable a project. As a learned biographer of Stephen IX supposes, "Godfrey's success might have changed the face of things and, out

[82] *Ibid.,* cols. 1148 f.

[83] *Chronicon Montis Cassini* in Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* IV, 411.

[84] *Ibid.*

of gratitude to Rome, which would have given him the imperial crown, he might have become the defender of the Church and perhaps thus the investiture quarrel would have been, if not permanently stifled in its germ, at least postponed for a long time." [85] The sincere piety of Duchess Beatrice and of her daughter Matilda was weighty guaranty of the happy outcome of such a political transformation. Under the regency of Empress Agnes the weakness of the imperial government offered chances of success. But the Pope finally judged that a wiser policy would be not to involve the authority of the Holy See in an adventure of this sort and to confine himself to striving for the reform of the Church on the terrain offered by the actual circumstances.

Beyond question, the people were with him. Wherever a speaker appeared, preaching against the abuses that sullied the sanctuary, he aroused the populace. At Milan a young priest, Anselm of Baggio, who preached outdoors against unworthy clerics, in the name of the rule of Cluny and in the name of his master Hildebrand, attracted throngs of people.[86] In that same city, under the direction of two clerics, Arialdo and Landulf, a league was formed for the purpose of expelling from their positions all scandalous clerics, either through the pressure of popular indignation or even by force. As the league was made up, for the most part, of persons from the ranks of the common people, the implicated clerics and the nobles who were their protectors called the leaguers contemptuously Patari (i. e., peasants, ragamuffins).[87] But these Patari caused them terrible panics. Forcing their way into the houses of clerics, they drove out suspected persons with sticks and clubs, pursuing them even

[85] U. Robert, *loc. cit.*, p. 76.

[86] On the preaching of Anselm of Baggio, see Landulf, *Hist. mediol.; M. G., SS.*, VII, 76.

[87] Unless this name came to them from the district where they used to meet. We should not confuse the Patari of the eleventh century with the Patarines of the twelfth.

into their churches. At Capua the citizens took away from the monks the Church of St. Vincent, which was in their possession, and gave it to a priest whom they judged more worthy. A Roman council issued an interdict against the citizens of Capua.[88] A council at Fontanetto, in the province of Novara, excommunicated Arialdo and Landulf, the leader of the Patari. Pope Stephen IX ordered an inquiry into the matter, blamed the excesses committed by the followers of Arialdo and Landulf, and reproved them, but he revoked the decision of the Council of Fontanetto and allowed the league to continue the struggle for the reform of morals, on condition that they avoid inciting lawlessness and deeds of violence.[89]

While Stephen IX was thus laboring to appease the strifes in Italy and at the same time to spread reform there, his legate Hildebrand was journeying through other parts of Europe, carrying out a like mission. At Christmas, 1057, in an interview at Goslar in Saxony with Empress Agnes and King Henry IV, he finally obtained from the German sovereigns the official recognition of the election of Stephen IX.[90] One of the Pope's letters gives us reason to suppose that Hildebrand undertook a second mission in France.[91] When he returned to Italy, he found Rome mourning its pontiff. Stephen died at Florence on March 29. Foreseeing that a violent reaction of the unworthy clerics and their powerful protectors would take place after his death, he had ordered the Romans to await Hildebrand's return before electing another pope. He said: "I know that after my death self-conceited men among you will attempt to seize this holy see with the aid of laymen and in contravention of the decrees of the ancients." [92]

[88] Mansi, XIX, 865.

[89] C. Pellerini, *I santi Arialdo e Erlembaldo, storia di Milano nella metà del secolo XI; Acta sanctorum,* June, V, 279–81; *Anal. bolland.,* XVI (1897), 527–29.

[90] Lambert, *Annales,* year 1058; *M. G., SS.,* V, 159.

[91] *PL,* CXLIII, 870.

[92] Giesebrecht, *Kaiserzeit,* III, 1085.

Antipope Benedict X

This last fear of the pope was soon realized. In the night of April 4, 1058,[93] Count Gregory of Tusculum, with a band of armed men, slipped into the city; then, the next day, after a lavish distribution of money in the inns, he had a member of his own family proclaimed pope. It was John Mincius, bishop of Velletri, who took the name of Benedict X. This time the Tusculum party and that of the Crescentii combined, bringing in their train all the nobility. To count upon the Empire to repress the scandal, was useless: the regent Empress, rendered powerless by the factions that were in restless agitation around the six-year-old King, could offer no help; an agitation on the part of the Patari would have been, just then, too perilous. But the triumphant revolt found itself confronted by two men who were not accustomed to flee before a duty to be performed, however formidable it might appear to them: Peter Damian and Hildebrand. Peter Damian, who as cardinal-bishop of Ostia exercised a preponderant influence over the clergy and people,[94] remained in the city. He became the leader of an opposition party, which included the best members of the clergy, the mass of the population, and some members of the nobility.[95] With his untiring zeal, he enlightened some, encouraged others, laid bare the schemes of the factious, "those satellites of Satan," he said, "who have compelled a priest of Ostia to raise to the height of the apostolate a man so worthless, and so devoid of intelligence that he has been unable to appreciate what is taking place around him." He said further: "Anyone acquainted with the canons of the Church, knows that such an ordination is radically null." [96]

[93] On this date see Neukirch, *Das Leben des Petrus Damiani*, p. 64.

[94] By his title he had the privilege of consecrating the new pope. He refused to give consecration to the so-called Benedict X.

[95] E. g., the Pierleoni, whom we encounter in the history of the next century.

[96] *PL*, CXLIV, 291. This passage does not apply to the election of Cadalous, as Migne's text indicates, but to that of Mincius. Cf. *PL*, CXLIV, 104.

Pope Nicholas II

While Peter Damian was thus discrediting the usurper, Hildebrand without delay prepared for the canonical election of a pope worthy of the supreme pontificate, capable of continuing the reform work undertaken by the three preceding pontiffs. He turned his eyes to the bishop of Florence, Gerard, who was regarded by all as worthy of respect because of the uprightness of his life and the extent of his learning. By an embassy, promptly despatched to the German court, Hildebrand made sure that the Empress regent would not be opposed to him.[97] From Godfrey, duke of Lorraine and Tuscany, he obtained a promise that, if need should arise, his troops would support him. He rallied the cardinals who, in the first moment of perturbation, had fled from Rome. Then at Sutri he assembled the representatives of the Roman clergy and people, who solemnly elected Bishop Gerard as pope under the name of Nicholas II.[98] The antipope's followers resisted for a while, withdrawing to one of the regions of Rome, hoping to make him take the part once played by Benedict IX, to harass the new Pope, to contest with him the fidelity of the Roman people. But they failed to reckon with the energy of Hildebrand.

Hildebrand's plan was to gather about the papacy, as a substitute for Germany and, if necessary, against it, the two young forces that had recently been formed in Italy: the Tuscans and the Normans; at the same time, to draw up definite rules for the papal election, in such a way as to assure its independence in the future. The alliance of Tuscany was obtained; the two chief acts of the pontificate of Nicholas II were the alliance with the Normans in 1059 and, in the course of the same year, the famous decree of the Lateran Council about the election of the popes.

[97] *M. G., SS.*, V, 159, 470.
[98] *PL*, CL, 827.

The Norman tribes established in southern Italy had again and again caused disturbance there. Stephen IX even considered taking up again the struggle against them. But their power was now so strong that to defeat it or shatter it seemed henceforth impossible. As the Normans were recognized by the papacy as masters of the country, would not their own interests incline them to favor the action of the Roman Church? They were turbulent but sincere Catholics and furthermore they were "too prudent not to see that the Roman reformers, enthused in a merciless struggle against the native aristocracy and the simoniacal clergy, would no longer care to render Italy to the Byzantines." [99] The intermediary between the Pope and the Normans was Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino.

In a synod held at Melfi (July, 1059), Robert Guiscard, the leader of the Normans, received from the Pope the title of duke and the recognition of his sovereignty over Calabria, Apulia, and some domains of Lazio. Then he took the following oath: "I swear to remain faithful to the Roman Church and to the lord pope. . . . I will, without wavering, lend my support to the Holy Roman Church to maintain and to claim the royal rights of St. Peter and his possessions, and I will remain a faithful vassal toward all the true successors of the lord Pope Nicholas, who will confirm the investiture which has just been accorded me." [100] One of the first results of this alliance was the abdication of the antipope. At Galeria, fifteen miles south of Rome, he received hospitality from one of his followers, Count Girard. At news of the Pope's approach with an escort from the Norman army, Girard begged his guest to flee. We read in the *Roman Annals:* "The antipope stood on the ramparts and, as soon as he perceived the Romans, he cried out to them: 'It was in spite of myself that I was made your pontiff.

[99] Jules Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'Empire byzantin,* p. 516.

[100] Baronius, year 1059, no. 70. This text is taken from the *Liber censuum.* See Duchesne, *Liber censuum de l'Eglise.*

Promise that my life will be spared, and I will renounce the papacy.' Three representatives of the city of Rome swore that his life would be respected. Pope Nicholas reached Rome with his army; the antipope, stripped of his papal insignia, went to live with his mother" [101] near the Church of St. Mary Major.

"This scene," says the *Roman Annals,* "occurred at harvest time." Four months earlier, in April, without waiting for the result of his negotiations with the Normans, Nicholas assembled at Rome a large council at which the question of papal elections was regulated.

We can reduce the essential provisions of the decree to five chief points. 1. In the future, the right to choose the pope will belong exclusively to the cardinals. "After the death of the pope, the cardinal-bishops will meet to consider the election; they will then call the cardinal-clerics; and lastly the clergy and the people will give their consent thereto." 2. The new pope must be chosen from the Roman clergy, unless no suitable subject can be found among them. 3. If the election cannot be held at Rome, it will take place wherever the cardinals judge proper. 4. If, owing to some hindrance, the ceremony of enthronement is delayed, the newly elected pope will nevertheless enjoy complete jurisdiction. 5. Care must be taken to safeguard the honor and respect due to King Henry, by virtue of concessions to him made, and also the honor and respect that may be due to his successors because of eventual and personal concessions.[102]

[101] *Annales romani,* in Watterich, I, 217. Cf. Delarc, "Le pontificat de Nicholas II" in *Rev. des quest. hist.,* XL (1886), 391 f.

[102] "We have two editions of this decree. The one in which the rights of the emperor are the more emphasized, is according to *Vatic.* 1984, in *M. G., Leges,* II, app., p. 177, and in Watterich, II, 229. The other has been handed down by the canonists of the eleventh century and is found in the collections of the councils. The latter is the better of the two. That of the *Vat.* 1984 is merely a text revised by the partisans of antipope Guibert" (Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical,* p. 399). See a scholarly comparison of the two texts in Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1139–65. The summary of the canons of the council may be found in the encyclical by which the Pope promulgated its decisions (Mansi, XIX, 897), in the papal letter

In these important decisions, Nicholas was prompted not only by the violent conduct of the Italian princes and the intimidating measures of the German emperors; he also had in mind the possible interference in papal elections by the new protectors of the papacy, the Tuscans and the Normans. When the Church was acquiring new allies, it made provision against the dangers of these alliances. The law of April, 1059, was a stage in that well-calculated and well-balanced policy inspired by Cardinal Hildebrand.

To him also should be attributed the attitude which Nicholas II adopted toward France. A penetrating mind like his could not fail to grasp the future reserved to that nation, which, while stubbornly refusing to enter into the organization of the Holy Empire, showed itself ready to take the part of "knight of God." Following negotiations which we are unable to trace exactly but which appear by their results, we see Henry I's distrustful attitude weaken and change. He promulgated the decisions of the council of 1059,[103] favored the holding of reform synods at Vienne, Tours, Avignon, and Toulouse,[104] and when (May 23, 1059) he had his young son Philip, seven years old, crowned at Reims and associated him with himself in the kingship, he had him, in the presence of the legates of the Holy See and of sev-

---

to the bishops dependent on the metropolitan of Amalfi (Mansi, XIX, 907), and in another letter addressed to the Churches of Gaul, Aquitaine, and Gascony (Mansi, XIX, 873). These three summaries do not completely coincide, as in each instance the Pope selected what more particularly interested the country concerned. The question has been raised whether the assent of the people, although required only secondarily, was strictly demanded under pain of nullity. Hefele seems to maintain that it was. The opposite view will be seen adopted and upheld by an important text of St. Peter Damian in Ortolan, art. "Election des papes" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, IV, 2313. The cardinal-bishops at that time numbered seven, and their bishoprics were those of Ostia, Albano, Porto, Silva Candida or St. Rufinus, Sabina, Preneste or Palestrina, Tusculum or Frascati. Callistus II later united St. Rufinus with Porto. These bishops were already in very close relations with the pope; they were often summoned to assist in his functions. The decree of Nicholas II increased their importance.

[103] Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII*, II, 136.

[104] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1192–1204.

eral bishops, make the following declaration: "I, Philip, soon, with the help of God, to become King of the Franks, promise to maintain the canonical privileges for each of you and for the Churches entrusted to you." [105]

We should not forget that the ultimate purpose of the measures we have been speaking of was the reform of the Church in its discipline and its morals, and the confirmation of its doctrine. The Roman Council of 1059, after voting its decree about papal election, and the reformation of Christian life according to the canons,[106] reaffirmed against fresh quibbles of Berengarius the dogma of the real presence,[107] and issued severe penalties against clerical misconduct and simony.[108]

Nicholas II communicated the decrees of the council of 1059 to the Christian world by an encyclical.[109] He urged execution of the decrees in letters to the bishops of Gaul, Aquitaine, and Gascony,[110] and the metropolitan of Amalfi,[111] and by means of special legates whom he sent to certain provinces where the reform needed to be watched more closely. Thus Peter Damian was sent to Milan to remedy the deplorable situation of the clergy, who were gathered around the simoniacal Archbishop Guido and were seconded by an excited populace. There Peter had to display all his qualities of courage and composure, withstanding the storm with incredible fearlessness, presenting himself before the most furious, haranguing them, and finally succeeding in making the Archbishop and the chief members of the clergy sign a declaration by which they promised not to tolerate in the diocese clerics notorious for their misconduct.[112]

At the same time another storm, arising in Normandy, was

[105] *Historiens des Gaules,* XI, 32.
[106] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1172.
[107] *Ibid.,* pp. 1169–77.
[108] *Ibid.,* pp. 1167–69.
[109] *PL,* CXLIII, 1315.
[110] *Ibid.,* col. 1314.
[111] *Ibid.,* col. 1317.
[112] *Ibid.,* CXLV, 89–98.

calmed by the prudence of the Holy See. Duke William, the future conqueror of England, had been excommunicated for marrying, without dispensation from the impediment of consanguinity, his cousin Matilda (daughter of Baldwin V, Count of Flanders). But he obstinately refused to submit and defied the interdict upon his states. Negotiations undertaken by Lanfranc, prior of the Abbey of Bec, ended in a peaceful solution. Nicholas II granted a dispensation to legitimate the marriage of William, who agreed to establish and endow two monasteries. This was the origin of the two masterpieces of architecture of the eleventh century, which still adorn the city of Caen: the church of St. Stephen and that of the Trinity.[113]

The hostile movement manifesting itself at this same period in Germany was less violent, but in reality more lasting. Certainly Henry III could blame his policy and that of his predecessors for the opposition which the papacy was bringing about to the detriment of the imperial supremacy. The alliance concluded with the Normans, the closer relations with France, the friendly feeling shown to Duke Godfrey, the decree of the Roman council about papal elections, all these were manifestations that were turning the Holy See away from the Empire. Lastly, Nicholas II, who was of Burgundian race, did not have the same bonds of attachment to Germany as did his predecessors. Cardinal Stephen too, sent as legate to Germany, failed in his mission there. A schismatic conciliabulum, held by a few bishops and some representatives of the German government, declared null all the decrees issued by Pope Nicholas II.[114]

This attitude was a foreboding of the great strifes that were preparing on the part of Germany. The Pope and especially Hildebrand, his adviser, faced the coming struggle courageously and persisted in their line of conduct.

Shortly afterward, about the end of July, 1061, Nicholas II

[113] *Vita Lanfranci; PL,* CL, 35.
[114] *PL,* CXLIX, 463; *M. G., SS.,* XI, 672; *PL,* CXLV, 79.

died at Florence. We are without detailed information concerning his last hours. His political testament had been made when, in the autumn of 1059, he gave Hildebrand a mark of the highest confidence by naming him cardinal archdeacon of the Roman Church, that is, his coadjutor for the government of the diocese of Rome and his most authorized representative for treating of the affairs of Christendom.[115]

Pope Alexander II

The death of Nicholas II was a signal for the Italian factions to lift up their head again. To back antipope Benedict X, the two rival houses of Tusculum and of the Crescentii joined hands. To combat the new pope, whoever he might be, who would be chosen by the cardinals, both of these parties, followed by most of the great Roman families, turned to their hereditary enemy, the German Emperor.

No time must be lost. At any price something must be done to prevent the arrival at Rome of a pope imposed by the Roman nobility and by the king of Germany. Hildebrand cast his eyes upon Bishop Anselm of Lucca, had him accepted by the cardinals, and, while a troop of Normans was summoned to Rome to maintain order, went to Lucca and brought his candidate back with him. Anselm was elected pope September 30, 1061, by the unanimous vote of the cardinal-bishops. He took the name of Alexander II.

The newly elected Pope was a man of piety and of learning, a diplomat and a man of action. Born at Reggio near Milan, he had been the first instigator of the popular movement that we have seen fighting so fiercely against simony and clerical misconduct. He was a former pupil of Lanfranc in the Abbey of Bec; and, from the lessons of his illustrious teacher, he had kept a taste for sacred studies. Archbishop Guido, who dreaded

[115] Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* II, 146; *PL,* CXLIII, 1525.

his reform propaganda, sent him away from Milan. In a diplomatic mission to the German court and in the government of the diocese of Lucca, he showed himself the friend of Duke Godfrey of Tuscany and of Duchess Beatrice, without offending Henry III. With him the formidable association of the Patari, held within the bounds of prudence, would form, along with the Normans and the Tuscans, a powerful army ready to defend the papacy in times of crisis. Peter Damian and Hildebrand, the one as cardinal-dean of the Sacred College, the other as archdeacon of the Church, both of them as personal friends of the new Pope, would be preferred advisers of Alexander II. Thus, under the prudent and firm hand of Hildebrand, all the Catholic forces were organized around the Roman pontiff. The daring of such a plan might encounter the assault of a violent and desperate opposition on the part of the enemies of the Holy See; but it likewise gave hope of a pontificate productive of works of reform and liberation. These fears and these hopes were both fulfilled.

Twenty-eight days after Alexander II's election (October 28, 1061), Henry IV, surrounded by a number of Lombard bishops, gave political investiture, by the crosier and the other insignia of the papacy, to Cadalous, bishop of Parma, who took the name of Honorius II. Says the chronicler Bonizo: "He was rich in money and poor in virtues." Another writer assures us, with some irony, that the Lombard bishops wished to choose a pope "who would have consideration for human weakness."

The schism came to an end only with the death of the antipope. But it appeared formidable and disturbed the Church seriously only for a few months. Cadalous' first attempt to seize Rome by force at the end of 1061 failed before the Tuscan troops, commanded by Duke Godfrey and his wife Beatrice. A second expedition, undertaken in April, 1062, was more successful for the antipope. His army entered Rome by the Leonine City and crossed the Tiber. The fighting went on in the streets

of the city. Alexander fortified himself in the monastery of the Capitol, and Cadalous took up his position in the Cencius tower near the bridge of St. Peter.[116] But at that very time a palace revolt occurred at the German court. Archbishop Anno of Cologne, tutor of the young King Henry IV, supplanted the Empress regent, who withdrew to a convent and, abandoning the cause of Cadalous, began parleys in favor of Pope Alexander. On October 27, 1064, a German and Italian synod, held at Mantua, acknowledged the legitimate pope and excommunicated Cadalous; finally his authority was acknowledged only in his diocese of Parma.[117]

Alexander II did not wait for this issue of the conflict before laboring actively for reform. His reform work differed from that of his predecessors in this respect, that he not merely made his decrees known to the guilty persons, but he vigorously saw to the execution of the decrees. He deposed the simoniacal Archbishop of Milan, expelled a usurping bishop of Chartres, deposed at Capua clerics guilty of concubinage. His work also reached all classes of the clergy and of the faithful. He forced the metropolitans to maintain contact with the Roman court; [118] he demanded the freedom of episcopal elections; [119] he forbade people to attend mass said by a scandalous priest; [120] he forbade clerics to accept any church from the hands of laymen, even without simony; [121] he was watchful over the rigorous observance of the regulations about marriage between relatives.[122] That he was able to speak and act with this vigor was owing to the support he received from the Romans, the Tuscans, and the Patari.

His personal authority and the worth of the men he chose as

[116] *M. G., SS.*, V, 472; Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1224.
[117] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1234–55.
[118] Jaffé, no. 4507.
[119] *Ibid.*, no. 4535.
[120] *Ibid.*, no. 4501.
[121] Gratian, *Decretum*, caus. XVI, q. 7, can. 20.
[122] Jaffé, no. 4525.

legates made possible his speaking also to rulers with an authority that was not possessed by the popes before him. He admonished Philip I of France to regard the papal decrees as on a par with the canons; he directed King Harold of Norway to have a care that the bishops of his realm were consecrated by the archbishop of Hamburg, vicar of the Holy See for the North, and not by any other;[123] he demanded tribute from King Sweyn of Denmark.[124] In Italy he encouraged Count Roger of Sicily in his conflict with the Saracens, and sent to William of Normandy a blessed standard for his campaign of conquest in England. In 1069 he obtained from King Henry IV of Germany a promise not to break his marriage with Bertha of Savoy,[125] and felicitated him upon it. But as the young ruler's counselors had trafficked in ecclesiastical offices and installed in the see of Milan an archbishop imposed by the King, the Pope in 1073 fulminated a sentence of excommunication against them.[126]

This last measure, which the Pontiff felt he was obliged to take out of regard for his duty as supreme guardian of discipline, revived all the old hatred on the part of the imperial courtiers against the reforming papacy. Sad forebodings clouded the last days of Alexander II. Among the prelates raised to power by the favor of the German government, was the Archbishop of Ravenna, Guibert. This Guibert, who recently, as chancellor of the Kingdom of Italy, had powerfully contributed to the election of the antipope Cadalous, was always, in spite of his later protestations of loyalty, looked upon with suspicion by the Pontiff. But he succeeded in deceiving Hildebrand's confidence. Alexander, yielding to the urging of his archdeacon, finally consented to accept Guibert as archbishop of Ravenna. But the Pope derived no comfort from this decision. A few days

[123] *Ibid.*, no. 4471.
[124] *Ibid.*, no. 4495.
[125] Delarc, *op. cit.*, II, 490 f.
[126] *Ibid.*, p. 525.

before his death, weakened by the progress of a slow disease and foreseeing the approaching end, Alexander II, referring to the incident of Guibert, said to his faithful counselor these words, which later came back to the mind of Gregory VII: "I am about to die; the hour is near for me to be freed from the griefs of this world; but you will learn what bitterness is in that man." [127] On April 21, 1073, Alexander II went to receive from God the reward for his labors and sufferings. Two days later, Hildebrand was chosen as his successor. He took the name of Gregory VII.

[127] *Tu vero ejus senties acerbitatem* (Bonizo, *Ad amicum,* Bk. VI; *PL,* CL, 835).

CHAPTER V

The Pontificate of St. Gregory VII

The Election

DURING the quarter century that had just passed, from the election of Leo IX to that of Gregory VII, the papacy energetically undertook and partially realized two great tasks. By the canons of its councils, by the preaching of its monks, by popular agitations, especially by the initiative of its popes, it exposed, pursued, and at times in exemplary manner punished incontinent and simoniacal clerics and their powerful protectors. In the second place, even amid this strife, its hierarchy became more strongly contralized about the Holy See. Under the impulse of the papacy the reform councils held their deliberations, under its control the monks denounced abuses; the patriarch who sought to set up his authority in opposition to that of the Roman pontiff ended by producing a schism; lastly, the authority of the metropolitans became clearly defined.

This twofold task had been vigorously conducted in all nations: in Italy as well as in Germany, in France as also in England; in Spain no less than in the northern countries. Although scandals and disorders had been everywhere combated, nowhere were they entirely overcome. From this fact a new danger arose. Driven to their last retreats, incontinence and simony and the spirit of insubordination, all the bitterness and all the vices, were prepared to combine for a supreme and desperate attempt.

No one was better acquainted with this situation than Hildebrand. For twenty-five years he had repeatedly avoided assuming the burden which the voice of people and clergy offered him

at the time of each vacancy in the Holy See. But, after the death of Alexander II, the acclaim was irresistible. On April 22, 1073, immediately after the funeral of the Pontiff, a unanimous cry suddenly broke out: "Hildebrand pope!" The cardinal-bishops, the priests, the clergy of every rank, then shouted, according to custom: "St. Peter has chosen Hildebrand for pope." At once the people seized him and dragged him into the Church of St. Peter in Chains, where he was installed almost by force.[1] But this election filled him with deep anxiety. He wrote later that at that decisive hour a sort of terror seized him, and he seemed of a sudden to be enveloped in darkness. Seven years later he was still bewailing it.[2] However, we shall see that few leaders have shown, in their government, a firmer resoluteness or a more constant assurance than Gregory VII. In that saintly soul a boundless trust in the divine assistance combined with a distrust of his own powers. The feeble Hildebrand felt himself overwhelmed; but the vicar of St. Peter was utterly fearless. In a letter written in 1080, he says: "As you know, Blessed Peter, you have placed me on your throne in spite of myself, in spite of my grief and my tears. By you I was called; by you, despite my groaning, the terrible weight of your Church has been placed upon me." [3]

Gregory VII was small in stature, corpulent, with short legs.[4] He was imposing, not by his physical qualities,[5] but by his intellectual and moral worth. That worth has been disputed by no one. Some have denounced Gregory VII as a despot; others

[1] Gregory VII himself gave an account of this election two days after the event in a letter to Desiderius of Monte Cassino (*PL,* CXVIII, 285). Gregory's election was not altogether regular in its form. But those who later contested its validity were quite wrong. Never did the free choice of an electoral body manifest itself in a more unanimous and more deliberate manner. The report of the election which is at the head of Gregory VII's *Registrum* (*PL,* CXLVIII, 283) is a later revision.

[2] *Ep.,* I, 9; II, 49; III, 10; VII, 22; *PL,* CXLVIII, 291, 400, 439, 566.

[3] *Ep.,* VII, 14, in Jaffé, *Monumenta gregoriana.*

[4] Benzo calls him *homuncio ventre lato, crure curto* (*M. G., SS.,* XI, 659).

[5] In a passage of William of Malmesbury we find Hugh of Cluny referring to Hildebrand as *homuncio exilis naturae* (*M. G., SS.,* X, 474).

have glorified him as a hero; nobody has ever questioned his genius. The special trait of this genius was an unconquerable firmness in the conception and realization of a plan of government which subordinated everything to the triumph of justice. The words spoken on his deathbed, "I have loved justice and have hated iniquity," was the motto of his whole life. To his mind this triumph of justice required the freedom of the Church. To free the Church from its internal enemies by war on misconduct and simony; to free it from its external enemies by war against lay investiture: this was the work of his pontificate.[6] But this work of liberation could at that time be accomplished only by the exaltation of the Holy See above all other states. The Protestant writer Voigt says: "If the ministers of the Church were to be rescued from the supremacy of temporal powers, the Church itself had to be raised above the state." [7] Says another non-Catholic historian: "In the Middle Ages the independence of the state was not possible; it would have involved the dependence of the Church, and brute force would have dominated the power of the soul." [8] Edgar Quinet is right when he portrays Gregory VII with eyes fixed upon a spiritual ideal, exercising his moral authority over political kingdoms only to the extent that they departed from that spiritual ideal.[9]

What St. Gregory's ideal was and what his work was, will appear from a study of the events of his reign.

The man who, under six successive popes, had been the heart and soul of the reform of the clergy, at the time of his election to the papacy was still only a deacon. On May 22, 1073, he was

[6] Says Voigt: "Gregory's great idea, and he had but one, is plain to our eyes: it is the independence of the Church. That is the point on which all his thoughts centered, all his writings, all his deeds" (Voigt, *Hist. du pape Grégoire VII et de son siècle,* based on original documents; French trans., p. 605).

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 606.

[8] F. Laurent, *Etudes sur l'hist. de l'humanité,* VI, 199.

[9] E. Quinet, *Œuvres complètes,* III, 102.

ordained to the priesthood.[10] On June 30 he was consecrated Bishop of Rome, and was enthroned at St. Peter's.[11]

The chief of the evils afflicting the Church, the one most urgently in need of cure, because it was a perpetual scandal for souls, was the incontinence of the clergy. In spite of the severe penalties decreed in the preceding pontificate, the evil still prevailed in Italy, Germany, France, Spain, and Hungary,[12] and in a manner even more scandalous. The clergy most involved in the evil, in their effort to alter popular opinion, boldly attempted, with a great din of arguments, to justify their guilty conduct. To this end, they appealed to the Gospel [13] and St. Paul,[14] to a mysterious Council of Tribur and the words of Paphnutius at the Council of Nicaea,[15] the example of the Greeks, and an alleged privilege of the Church of Milan. In short, they maintained that nobody could be held to observe a law against nature, and they charged with hypocrisy whoever did not publicly proclaim conduct like theirs. The vice, exposed, became impudent and aggressive.

Simony

The insolence of the guilty clerics went further. Alexander II had deprived several of them of their benefices and offices. They juridically contested the papacy's right to this power. Their benefices and their spiritual offices were their possessions, they said, and for them to be deprived of these possessions was an injustice. Had they not bought them with their money? We have already spoken about the origin of simony. At this point we should explain how the traffic in holy things, condemned in

[10] Bonizo, *Ad amicum,* Bk. VII; *Monum. Grégor.,* p. 657.
[11] *M. G., SS.,* III, 203.
[12] Vacandard, art. "Célibat" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* II, 2085.
[13] "All men take not this word" (Matt. 19: 11).
[14] Cf. I Cor. 7: 2, 25; I Tim. 3: 2.
[15] Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* II, 57.

the early Church as on a par with the most shameful crimes, became considered, in the time of Henry IV, not only as a general practice, but, according to the words of St. Peter Damian, "as a legally established right." [16] For this lamentable change in Christian feeling, princes and bishops and abbots, even some popes, bore a more or less notable share of responsibility. The ambition and cupidity of the lay princes, desiring to put their hands upon Church property and to grab for their own advantage the social influence of the high dignitaries of the Church, were the primary causes of this abuse. But would this eager cupidity have developed if it had not been provoked by the lure of the excessive riches of certain bishops and abbots? Would it have continued if it had not been protected by the culpable tolerance of certain popes who were guilty of the same vice?

In any event, once introduced into the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the evil invaded it throughout. If a prelate paid the king or the nobleman a high price for his benefice, he attempted to recover the amount thus expended by the sale of even the least offices to his subordinates. This universal triumph of injustice profoundly altered the notion of right, or at least obscured it in many minds. And simoniacal clerics, in their sharp polemics, took shameless advantage of this general obscuring of consciences.

If we consider these circumstances, we understand what courage was displayed by Gregory VII when, about the end of the first year of his pontificate, in the first synod he held at Rome (March, 1074), he decreed, against scandalous and simoniacal clerics, the four following provisions: [17] "1. Whoever has become guilty of simony, that is, of obtaining for money a sacred order or an ecclesiastical office, by this very fact becomes incapable of performing any office in the Church. 2. Whoever has

[16] *PL,* CXLV, 140.

[17] The acts of the synod of March, 1074, are lost, but several letters of the pope, carrying out the application of its decrees, enable us to fill the gap. See Mansi, XX, 404; *PL,* CXLVIII, 752; Jaffé, *Monum. greg.,* p. 525.

obtained a church in return for money, loses that church; in the future, no one will be permitted to sell or buy a church. 3. Whoever has on his conscience the crime of fornication must abstain from saying mass or exercising at the altar the functions of the minor orders. 4. The people should not, in any way, be present at the functions of clerics who do not observe the foregoing ordinances, identical with the ordinances of the fathers; thus the fear of the people and of their blame will bring back to duty those whom the love of God and regard for the dignity of their state leave indifferent."

The most immediate effect of these decrees was a fresh outburst of wrath on the part of several guilty clerics affected by them. The vicar of Christ, taking the scourge, as his Master had done, to drive out the sellers from the Temple, aroused by his act all the hatreds that would one day make him their victim. From these very first days of his pontificate, we see a group of malcontents forming in Italy around Archbishop Guibert of Ravenna. This future antipope Clement III was in many respects the antithesis of Gregory VII.[18] According to some writers, he was descended from an obscure family; others say his ancestors were the counts of Augsburg. He had a brilliant, cultured, eloquent mind, but a soul without greatness and without uprightness; for him truth, justice, and honor were nothing when the interests of his ambition were at stake. He went from the party of the Italian princes to the party of the emperor when he saw that his own advantage lay in that direction.[19]

Thereafter Guibert put all his activity in the service of the imperial cause. He was rewarded by being made archbishop of Ravenna and chancellor of the Empire. In the time of Alexander II he was one of the most ardent champions of antipope Cadalous. He was, more or less openly, always opposed to Hildebrand's policy. At the Roman synod of 1074, he desired to play

[18] Delarc, *op. cit.*, III, 67.
[19] Moroni, *Dizionario de erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, II, 191.

a part. Refuted and confounded by an opponent,[20] humiliated and irritated by this defeat, he at once turned to the party of dissatisfied clerics who were disturbed by the reforms of the new Pope. However, to beguile Pope Gregory's vigilance, he cunningly hid his desertion, promising the Pope that he would bring some troops to subdue the south of Italy. Gregory at first apparently did not see the significance of Guibert's hypocritical moves, which made Bonizo call him a new Catiline.[21]

Clerical Reform

Henceforth nothing could divert Gregory from the work of reform to which he vowed his life when accepting the supreme pontificate. Even before assembling the synod of 1074 and as though to preface the new laws with works, by his personal action he promptly put an end to certain abuses which prevailed in Rome and St. Peter's Basilica. Even some cardinals, whose spirit of greed had scandalized the faithful, were obliged to submit to his just reprimands.[22]

After the synod, Gregory enlarged the scope of his zeal. He made efforts to have his reform decrees accepted and applied in various nations. He began with Germany. A papal embassy, whose duty was to make sure of the application of the measures decreed at Rome, reached Germany at Easter time (April 20, 1074) and was well received by the young King of Germany, Henry IV, who had just gone through some hard trials. Warred against by the Saxons and betrayed by the great ones of his kingdom, he asked for nothing better than to establish friendly relations with the Pope. He promised everything that was asked of him.[23]

But the German clergy, upon learning that the papal legates

[20] Jaffé, *Monum., greg.*, p. 20.
[21] Bonizo, *Ad Amicum*, Bk. VII.
[22] On these various reforms, see Bonizo, Bk. VII.
[23] Jaffé, *op. cit.*, p. 106; *PL*, CXLVIII, 357.

intended to hold a reform council, rose up in opposition. A general outcry was made. Archbishop Liemar of Bremen was especially conspicuous by his violence.[24] On the advice of the legates, some courageous bishops then tried to convoke synods in their respective provinces. But they met with the same opposition. Sigfrid of Mainz assembled his suffragans and clergy at Erfurt and, to those whose conduct was irregular, he gave six months to choose between their licentious practices and their sacred offices. But so great was the uproar that the prelate had to bring the assembly to a close without adopting any firm decision.[25] Altmann, bishop of Passau in Bavaria, showed more courage. In the presence of a similar revolt, he dispensed with their deliberations and himself promulgated the papal decrees. But he escaped massacre only by the devotedness of a few lords, who rescued him from the hands of his foes.[26] Gregory then turned to the secular princes. He begged Henry IV,[27] Rudolf of Swabia,[28] and Berthold of Carinthia,[29] to help him repress the scandal. But soon he perceived that he could not rely on their aid.[30] As he faced the frightful difficulties of his task, an immense sadness, a sort of discouragement, seized him. To his friend Hugh, abbot of Cluny, he wrote as follows:

If you knew how many tribulations I am exposed to, you would ask the Lord that that poor Jesus, by whom, however, everything was made and who rules over all things, would deign to stretch out His hand to me and deliver wretched me with His habitual charity. . . . When I survey in thought the east and the west, the north and the south, scarcely do I see a few bishops who are governing the Christian people out of love of Christ and not for reasons of personal

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 140; *PL,* CXLVIII, 382 f.
[25] Lambert, *Annales,* year 1074; *PL,* CXLVI, 1168.
[26] *PL,* CXLVIII, 878.
[27] Jaffé, nos. 4903, 4904, 4963.
[28] *Ibid.*, no. 4922.
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] He wrote to Duchess Beatrice that Henry IV is *ambigua fide* (Jaffé, no. 4966).

ambition. When I consider the Christian princes, I do not know which of them prefer the glory of God to their own, and justice to lucre. If finally I enter into myself, I feel so overwhelmed by the weight of my own life, that the only hope of salvation I have left is in the mercy of Christ.[31]

In France, where King Philip I, disregarding the oath which his father had him take,[32] added to the crime of lay investiture the crime of simony, not to mention his well-known immorality.[33] For the purpose of bringing about an enforcement of the laws against simony and incontinence, the Pope appointed Bishop Hugh of Die as legate to France. This bishop was an austere prelate who in a recent conflict with the Count of Die showed himself capable of remarkable energy.[34] Gregory VII at the same time sent to the French bishops an encyclical to stimulate their zeal. In this he says to them:

In consequence of the weakening of the royal power, a weakening which dates back several years in your country, the laws and the government are powerless to prevent acts of injustice or to punish them. Your king, who should be the defender of the laws and of equity, is the first to violate them. As to you, my brethren, you are in fault in not resisting the detestable acts of this man. . . . Let us not speak of fear; united and armed for justice, you will be strong enough to turn him from his evil path and to place your souls in safety. Even should you have grounds for fear or for danger of death, you ought not to abdicate the independence of your priesthood.[35]

The dependence of the French clergy upon the king was too solidly established for this letter to obtain in full the desired effect. A council, meeting in Paris in 1074 for carrying

[31] Jaffé, *Monum. greg.*, pp. 163 f.; *PL*, CXLVIII, 400.
[32] See *supra*, p. 179.
[33] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 217.
[34] *PL*, CXLVIII, 343.
[35] Jaffé, p. 113; *PL*, Vol. CXLVIII.

out the reform, encountered the same violent opposition as took place at Erfurt and Passau. Confident of being backed by the King, nearly all the bishops, abbots, and clergy, in the face of the ordinances of the Pope about ecclesiastical celibacy, proclaimed the papal orders absurd and declared that no one should or could conform to them. Gautier, abbot of Pontoise, was the only one who had the courage to protest. He declared that, according to St. Gregory, a superior ought to be obeyed even when the reasons for his commands are not evident. Gautier's words stirred up a tumult. He was assailed from every side, beaten unmercifully, and dragged to the King's prisons, from which some friends later succeeded in freeing him. He then returned to his abbey of Pontoise.[36]

Hugh of Die did not let himself be intimidated. Making use of the full powers which the Pope had granted him, he pronounced suspension and deposition in the case of several simoniacal bishops. But the latter appealed to Rome and implored pardon. Gregory VII was never inflexible except when duty obliged him to be so; his heart was easily moved and was ever inclined to have confidence in men. Trusting in their promises, he pardoned them. Hugh bitterly complained of this. He wrote: "The deposed clerics rush to Rome and obtain your absolution; they come back worse than they were before." To this Gregory replied: "The custom of the Roman Church is to tolerate certain things and to feign not to notice certain others. For this reason we have thought we should temper the rigor of the canons with the mildness of discretion." [37]

[36] *Acta sanctorum,* April, I, 753; Mansi, XX, 437; Suppl., II, 6.

[37] If we compare this maxim and the facts just spoken of, with Gregory VII's condescension toward Berengarius, his tireless patience with regard to King Philip I of France (Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 217), and the readiness with which he accepted the pretended repentance of Guibert (see *supra,* p. 192), we must conclude, with Luchaire, that to charge Gregory VII with "passionate intolerance" (*op. cit.,* p. 216) is utterly unjust and that "his real policy is summed up in the short sentence that we have just quoted from his correspondence with Hugh of Die" (*op. cit.,* p. 217).

In England a synod, held at Rouen in 1074, probably before the decisions of the Roman council were known, rigorously forbade simony.[38] The Pope placed great reliance on the good will of William the Conqueror, who, when he ascended the throne, took an oath to enforce respect for the canonical law of sacerdotal celibacy. But when Archbishop John of Rouen, in another synod, held in his archiepiscopal city about the end of 1074, transmitted the Roman decrees to his clergy, he was stoned out of his church; [39] and the synod held at Winchester in 1076, under the presidency of Lanfranc, did not dare apply the reform to its full extent. The collegiate clergy were strictly held to the observance of chastity. As to the priests of the rural parishes, many of whom had been ordained without any reminder of the law of celibacy, the council considered that their deposition would entail, as an immediate consequence, the suppression of public worship and the privation of the sacraments in the greater part of England. Therefore it decided not to urge the execution of the law, and for the time being to tolerate the actual state of affairs.[40]

Pope Gregory's efforts for a rigorous observance of the law of clerical celibacy in Hungary, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark seem not to have accomplished any important results.[41] We do not know what were the consequences of the steps he took for the same purpose in Russia, Poland, and Bohemia. In Spain the campaign undertaken in 1056 by the Council of Compostela [42] and pursued in 1068 by the councils of Gerona, Barcelona, and Leyra,[43] had already borne fruit. We have no indication that this campaign stirred up, in the time of Gregory VII, outbursts like those in Germany, France, and England.

[38] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 112.

[39] Mansi, XX, 442.

[40] Mansi, XX, 459; A. du Boys, "Lanfranc et Guillaume le Conquérant" in the *Rev. des quest. hist.*, XXX (1881), 352–54.

[41] Jaffé, *Mon. greg.*, pp. 167, 199, 298, 364, 384, 412.

[42] Hefele-Leclercq, IV, 1124.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 1268.

The Pope, with regard to Spain, was concerned more particularly with regulating Christian life according to the canons.[44]

Cluny Abbey

Gregory VII was aware that no profound reform could be effected merely by legislative enactments. For the realization of his aim he placed great reliance upon the beneficial influence that radiated from the monasteries, particularly upon the influence of the monastery of Cluny.

Under the government of its sixth abbot, Hugh, the illustrious abbey saw its discipline strengthened and its influence more widely spread. The purest examples of holiness flourished there, and learning was cultivated with brilliance. A new art, which some historians have called Cluny art, adorned its cloisters

[44] The decree of Gregory VII on the life of canons has been published by Germain Morin, "Règlements inédits du pape Grégoire VII pour les chanoines réguliers" in the *Revue bénédictine,* XVIII (1901), 177–83. It will be found likewise in Hefele-Leclercq, V, 94–96. This decree, pointed out by Montfaucon in his *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum mss.,* as a *Regula canendi Gregorii papae,* had been regarded as having for its purpose a reform of liturgical chant. The misunderstanding arose from the interpretation of an abbreviated word, *"can,"* which was taken as referring to chant, whereas it ought to be understood as referring to canons. This decree was also thought to be connected with the abrogation of the Mozarabic rite; but this view is equally wrong. Florez (*España sagrada,* III, 308–36) has related in detail the history of the abolition of this rite by Gregory VII and of its re-establishment in the fifteenth century. He even reports the story of a curious liturgical duel in which we see a knight of Castille and a knight of Toledo at combat against each other in the lists in behalf of the Roman liturgy and of the Mozarabic respectively (*op. cit.,* p. 311). Cf. "Duel judiciaire entre des communautés religieuses" in the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes,* I (1840), 552–64. After centuries of strife and of varying vicissitudes, today we see peace between the two liturgies. That of Rome is followed generally in Spain, "but the old Mozarabic, that which had comforted the Spanish people during the long days of their servitude, that which had celebrated its renaissance of freedom and had sung its first victories, still is heard, with the approval of the Holy See, in the Toledo cathedral" (Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* III, 94. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 284). Says Duchesne: "There is no difficulty in the identification of the liturgy of the Churches of Spain, or Mozarabic liturgy, up to the eleventh century, with that which was followed by the Churches of Gaul before Charlemagne, and with that which obtained in the British Isles before the Roman missions of the seventh century" (*Christian Worship,* p. 88).

and churches. From all sides poor and rich, peasants and lords, came and put themselves under its law: some to find the calming of their agitated life, others to ask for the secret of rising higher in the way of mystical contemplation.

Ten thousand monks [45] there practiced those Cluny customs which, collected in 1085 by the monk Udalric,[46] regulated the daily life of the monks, their prayers, their studies, their liturgical functions, their meals, their sleep, and their recreations. These practices disciplined men's souls, accustomed them to leave nothing to caprice, trained them in constant effort, and especially kept them in a disposition of perpetual union with God.[47]

Around the mother-abbey a score of large abbeys were grouped. The principal ones were Moissac, St. Martial, Uzerche, St. Germain of Auxerre, Vezelay, Figeac, Montierneuf, St. Jean d'Angely, St. Bertin, and Baume. Some of these abbeys were under the government of an abbot appointed directly by Cluny or with its approval; others elected a pro-abbot without any outside control; but all these heads of monasteries, to a greater or less degree, rendered to Cluny an account of their administration. Most of these houses, vassals with regard to the mother-abbey, were themselves suzerains over groups of priories. Under the government of St. Hugh, which marked the apogee of the institution, this vast hierarchy, with Cluny as its center, counted more than two thousand monasteries, located in all the provinces of France, Germany, Italy, Spain, England, and Poland. To this number should be added three hundred fourteen churches (collegiate or monastic) connected with Cluny.[48]

From this mighty metropolis, inhabited, at the close of the

[45] Orderic Vitalis, Bk. XI.

[46] *PL*, CXLIX, 731.

[47] See a summary schedule of the day of a Cluny monk, in Chénon, *L'Ordre de Cluny et la réforme de l'Eglise* (*La France chrétienne dans l'histoire*, pp. 193–97).

[48] Cabrol in *Etudes*, CXXIV (1910), 456.

eleventh century, by about four hundred monks, an intense life radiated. St. Peter Damian, the great ascetic, the dread foe of all forms of corruption, calls Cluny an earthly paradise, a garden of lilies and roses, the arena of heavenly combats, the harvest of heaven. St. Gregory VII, in a Roman council (1077), declares that in the whole world no monastery exists that can rival Cluny: all its abbots, he says, have received the honors of canonization, and thus far not one of its monks is known to have bent his knee to Baal. Study was there held in honor; the abbey supplied the cathedral schools with their teachers; philosophy, mathematics, medicine, and music were studied there with eagerness; architecture, sculpture, and painting were no less in honor. Viollet-le-Duc and many historians of art have even maintained that Cluny was, through its monk-architects, the center of a new architectural school which possessed original traits.[49]

A countless number of documents testify that the "black monks" [50] of Cluny, as they were called, exercised a preponderant influence upon the reform movement of the eleventh century even beyond the confines of the monasteries and priories that were dependent on the mother-abbey and besides the schools which they supplied with teachers. But Gregory VII gave to the Cluny Order a still more important role than it received from his predecessors. Three Cluny monks (Anastasius, a Venetian nobleman whom Gregory sent on a special mission to Spain; the pious and learned Gerald, whom he made cardinal-bishop of Ostia; and Odo, a young lord of Cham-

[49] Viollet-le-Duc, *Dict. d'architecture,* I, 130, and *passim;* Pignot, *Hist. de Cluny,* II, 490–565. Lasteyrie, while not denying that Cluny gave a great impulse to architecture, maintains that it did not create a special school (R. de Lasteyrie, *L'architecture religieuse en France à l'époque romane,* pp. 235–38).

[50] The Cluny monks wore, as undergarments, a woolen shirt and drawers. The scapular reached to the ground, and to it was attached the hood. Their outermost garment was the cowl. The novices did not wear a scapular, but had their hood fastened to the cowl. These latter garments were black, whence the name "black monks," which the people gave to the religious of Cluny.

paigne, who later became Pope Urban II) held the first rank among these tireless legates, sent out by Gregory to spread and plant his reform work in Europe. But the Pope placed his special confidence in the venerable Hugh. Even after St. Odo, St. Majolus, and St. Odilo, Hugh of Cluny, who entered upon the government of the abbey in 1049, found the means to raise the part taken by his order still higher than his predecessors had done.

St. Hugh of Cluny

Hugh was born in 1024 at Semur in Burgundy, of a family of the upper nobility. His father, Count Dalmatius, brought him up for the world, whereas his mother, Aremberge, cultivated his natural inclinations for piety. When fifteen years old, Hugh obtained admission to the Cluny monastery. With him he brought, along with dispositions of the tenderest devotion, the lofty distinction that attached to his education and his family. As we are told by contemporaries, he was of tall stature and fine speech.

He was only twenty-five years old when the unanimous vote of his brethren raised him to the abbatial office. Thereafter Hugh took part in almost all the important affairs of the Church. At the councils of Riems and Mainz he courageously fought against simony and clerical misconduct. At the Council of Rome, which condemned Berengarius, he occupied second place, although he was the youngest of the abbots. When sent to Hungary by Pope Leo IX to arrange peace between King Andrew and the Emperor, he succeeded in that delicate mission. At the Council of Autun in 1055, he persuaded Robert II, duke of Burgundy, to pardon the murderers of his son. Emperor Henry III, besides other marks of esteem, asked Hugh to be godfather for one of his sons, the future Henry IV.

Well liked by princes and kings because of his lofty wisdom

and the urbanity of his manners, he could, nevertheless, address them in a tone of blame when they were in fault. To King Philip I of France he wrote: "Open your soul to the fear of God. Alter your way of living, correct your morals. Death comes in all manner of forms; it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God." To William the Conqueror, who offered to pay a very high price for the monks that Hugh would send to England, he replied: "My dear lord, what profit is it for a man to gain the whole world, if he loses his soul? At no price am I willing to sell mine. But I would be selling it if, in return for money, I sent a single one of my brethren where I am convinced he would be lost." [51] Gregory VII never entered upon an important undertaking without consulting Hugh of Cluny; never did he suffer a profound pain without pouring out his heart into that of this faithful friend. He regarded him as, in a way, his permanent legate in France.[52]

New Religious Congregations

Besides the great Order of Cluny, new congregations, deriving inspiration from the same spirit of reform, were ready to supply the papacy with the auxiliaries it needed. Gregory VII, during his pontificate, witnessed the growth of the young congregations of Vallombrosa in Italy and Hirschau in Germany and, shortly before he left this world, he blessed, as the prelude of a new regeneration of Christian life, St. Bruno's foundation of the Order of the Carthusians.

In 1039, not far from Florence and Camaldoli, in a smiling valley abounding in trees and shade, John Gualbert, lord of Pistoia, founded a hermitage which developed and became the Abbey of Vallombrosa. But the holy founder did more than re-

[51] *PL*, CLIX, 927–32.

[52] On St. Hugh of Cluny, see *Acta sanctorum*, April 19; Mabillon, *Annales*, Bks. LVII, LXXI; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, IX, 465–87; Ceillier, *op. cit.*, XIV, 50–55.

establish the primitive austerity of the Rule of St. Benedict in his monastery; he labored zealously to extirpate around him the leprosy of simony.

His long and painful struggles on this account with Bishop Peter of Florence, whose conduct was far short of exemplary, had already ended with the deposition of the unworthy prelate when Gregory VII ascended the Apostolic throne. John Gualbert died soon afterward. But his spirit was perpetuated in his order, which gave the Church twelve cardinals, more than thirty bishops, more than a hundred canonized or beatified monks, and an almost equal number of notable writers.[53]

The Hirschau monastery in Germany, founded, or rather restored, at almost the same time, deriving its inspiration more directly from the rule of Cluny, exercised a no less militant and fruitful activity. Hirschau, after fifty years of abandonment, was reoccupied in 1066 by a dozen monks from Einsiedeln. Soon, under the direction of the illustrious and holy Abbot William, it became one of the leading monastic establishments of Europe. "Ninety-seven monasteries, founded or reformed by the monks of Hirschau, all located in the south of Germany, formed around the great Swabian abbey a powerful and magnificent congregation. Twenty-three of these houses of God owed their creation to Hirschau; the other seventy-four monasteries already existing were regenerated by its salutary influence. The holy Abbot William, author of the greater part of these reforms and of these foundations, rebuilt both the monastic edifices and the monastic consciences. He also labored to establish a bond of union and of common activity between all these monasteries." [54] In the whole Christian world, Hirschau was the monastic house that counted the largest number of monks from the ranks of the nobility.

[53] Hurter, *Hist. d'Innocent III*, IV, 163.
[54] Montalembert, *Les moines d'Occident*, VI, 484 f.

Carthusian Order

Another nobleman, like William of Hirschau and like John Gualbert, was the founder of the Carthusian Order in 1084. But the institution of Bruno Hartenfaust had a character different from the foundations or monastic restorations of his time. The other founders or reformers gave to their monks or took themselves a more or less militant attitude and sent the monks forth from their cells for the work of preaching or polemics or even for diplomatic negotiations with great personages. But the new order, as far as possible, avoided the active life and devoted itself to pure contemplation. Its ideal was to resemble that eremetical life which was the first form of the religious life in the East. However, to avoid the hindrances that prevented the work of St. Antony from continuing in its first form,[55] the life of the cell was tempered by a certain participation in community life. Says the pious Lansperge: "In our order you have the eremetical life and the cenobitical life, both so moderated by the Holy Ghost that whatever in either of them might be a danger, no longer exists." [56] "The Carthusian is a cenobite in the choir, in the chapter, in the refectory, and at recreation. Outside these gatherings, he is a hermit. The life in the cell is the chief duty of a Carthusian." [57] At the door of his cell all the noises of the outer world die away.

The founder of the new order, Master Bruno, as the early documents call him, was born at Cologne about 1032, of the noble family of the Hartenfausts. At an early age he came to France and there, according to a well-founded tradition, had as his teacher Berengarius of Tours. He was appointed teacher in

[55] See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* I, 553.
[56] Lansperge, *Enchiridion,* chap. 49.
[57] Autore, art. "Chartreuse" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* II, 2288.

the Church of Reims and thus had before his eyes the grievous spectacle of the misconduct of the archbishop of that city, Manasses de Gournay, a simoniacal prelate. We are told by Guibert de Nogent that the scandals of heresy and simony made the brilliant professor decide to retire, with some noble clerics of Reims, to the deepest solitude.[58] A touching letter of Bruno written later to the provost of the Church of Reims seems to confirm this surmise. In it he says: "Do you recall a conversation we had in the garden adjoining the house where you received hospitality? We were speaking about the seductions of this world and of its perishable goods, and then about the joys of eternal glory. Led on by the divine love, we vowed to quit this world with its fleeting shadows and consecrate ourselves to the eternal things in the monastic life." [59]

Bruno's withdrawal to solitude was carried out in various stages. First he retired to Molesmes, under the guidance of St. Robert, the future founder of Citeaux, and there he assumed the Benedictine habit. His attraction to the solitary life led him later to join with two of St. Robert's disciples who, with the same attractions, had made an attempt at this sort of observance. But this solitude seemed to him not profound enough. He turned his steps to Grenoble, where his former pupil St. Hugh was bishop, and, with six companions, settled in a solitary wilderness, called the Chartreuse. He did not elaborate any written rules; but he fixed the customs and practices, which his fourth successor, the venerable Guigues, put in writing. A special trait of these customs is that, taken as a whole, they are not connected with the rule of St. Basil or the rule of St. Augustine or the rule of St. Benedict, although the

[58] Guibert de Nogent, *De vita sua,* Bk. I, chap. 11; *PL,* CLVI, 853.

[59] *PL,* CLII, 420 f. The Bollandists do not consider reliable the legend, immortalized by the brush of Lesueur, of the dreadful declaration made by a damned doctor. The biography of St. Bruno which relates this event supposes the existence at Paris in 1082 of a fully functioning university (*PL,* CLII, 483). This biography therefore cannot be earlier than the thirteenth century.

holy founder drew part from each of these rules. Another special trait of these customs is that everything in them is conceived in a way to favor the most solitary sort of life, the most silent and the most contemplative.

Thereafter, while the army of monk-preachers carry on a combat for the respect of the holy laws of the Church under the supreme authority of the papacy, groups of contemplative monks second their efforts by the suffrage of an uninterrupted prayer.

Lay Investiture

When St. Bruno settled at the Chartreuse with his first six disciples, Gregory VII's reform campaign had entered upon a new phase. We must now give an account of this.

In Germany, France, and England the first measures adopted for the restoration of clerical morals encountered violent resistance which showed that, by attacking incontinence and simony, the reformers had not reached the root of the evil. As a shrewd observer, Cardinal Humbert in 1058 pointed out that the root of the evil was in the lay "investiture" of Church dignitaries.

In the legal language of the eleventh century, "investiture" meant placing a person in possession of an office or of any property. This investiture always took place, in accordance with an old tradition, by the symbolic delivery of some object: of a tuft of grass or a clod of earth to signify the putting of a person in possession of a domain; of a key, for the possession of a house. In the case of a bishopric or an abbey, the objects symbolic of the office were the crosier and the pastoral ring.

In consequence of juridical situations which we have already mentioned,[60] kings and lords, notable benefactors of some chapel, church, or cathedral, put the titularies of these religious edifices into possession by the traditional symbols; these latter

[60] See *supra*, pp. 16 f.

persons were of course regularly elected by the clergy and people, and were canonically confirmed by their hierarchical superiors. Gradually, however, the preponderant will of the temporal prince reduced the election and the canonical confirmation to mere empty formalities or even suppressed them altogether. This serious juridical transformation was hastened by the fact that meanwhile certain Church dignitaries, bishops and abbots, had become feudal lords through the importance of the domains in their possessions and by the administrative and judiciary offices which they held. In the course of the eleventh century, a bishop had, from the temporal point of view, the powers of a count. The kings, making no distinction between this temporal authority and the pastoral office, placed both under the "high domain," *altum dominium,* which public law gave them over the possessions and functions of their vassals.

Such a condition of affairs had serious consequences. As a result of this abuse, the regular election and the canonical confirmation by the metropolitan, the only method provided by the law of the Church for the selection of bishops, were suppressed. Most of the time, in the mind of the king who appointed him, as also in the mind of the cleric who was promoted, the care of the pastoral office was overshadowed by care for the secular preoccupations. This practice readily led to traffic in the sacred offices and to misconduct on the part of those who were raised to these offices. Simony and clerical incontinence were the almost inevitable results of lay investiture.

The same cause made the evil almost incurable. In their resistance to the reform decrees of the Church, the simoniacal bishops and abbots were upheld by the princes and kings who had appointed them. Often, too, for their defense against the reform decrees, they found a power in their good faith. During the proceedings in the eleventh century against simoniacal

clerics, many of the latter advanced arguments based on their perfect sincerity. In 1045 "a very religious personage of well-known holiness," [61] gave money to rescue, he said, the Holy See from the unworthy pontiffs whom the Roman barons had set up.[62] How could the secular princes be persuaded that they ought to give up their rights of investiture of prelates who, by their temporal situation and political influence, were placed in the rank of the greatest lords? The astute genius of Cardinal Humbert in 1058 pointed out the solution. It consisted in proclaiming and having admitted by all "that the spiritual office is the essential of a bishopric, that the patrimony attached to his office is simply a dependence thereon, and that to reverse the terms and to regulate the spiritual as a function of the temporal, as lay investiture did, was not right and just." [63] Cardinal Humbert wrote: "The episcopal office demands the temporal; the temporal office does not require the episcopal office." [64] Therefore Gregory VII, in his struggle against lay investiture, does not separate the question of the freedom of the Church from the question of the pre-eminence of the spiritual over the temporal.

Gregory VII did not hide from himself the vastness of the strife he was about to undertake. In a Roman synod (February 24 to 28, 1075), he promulgated the following famous decree, which most of the sovereigns regarded as a declaration of war: "Whoever in the future receives from the hand of a layman a bishopric or an abbey will not be reckoned among the bishops and abbots. We forbid him the communion of

[61] *Vir religiosissimus ac sanctitate perspicuus,* says Glaber, V, 25.

[62] See *supra,* p. 124. On the question of the investitures, see E. Lesne, art. "Investiture" in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.,* II, 1090.

[63] *Ibid.,* col. 1095.

[64] Humbert, *Contra simoniacos,* Bk. III, chap. 2, in Jaffé, *Mon. gregor.,* I, 200, and in *PL,* CXLIII, 1142. St. Ivo of Chartres later supplemented this notion by pointing out that the supremacy of the spiritual element over the temporal element was not the absorption of the latter by the former.

Blessed Peter and entrance into the church until he resigns from his office. We issue the same prohibition regarding lower offices. If an emperor, duke, marquis, count, or any lay power or person dares to give investiture of a bishopric or of any other ecclesiastical office, let him know that he is subject to the same condemnation." [65]

The struggle against lay investiture took place chiefly in France, England, and Germany. In France the two papal legates, Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron, mindful of the violent opposition encountered by the application of the decrees of the Roman council of 1074 against simony, did not insist upon the publication of the decrees of the Roman council of 1075 against lay investiture. They followed the advice given them in a letter (January 5, 1075) from Pope Gregory: "You do better to expose yourselves to reproaches for your kindness, than to make yourselves hateful by too great severity. Your children are still ignorant and uncultured; you must improve them little by little." [66]

At the Council of Clermont (1076) and at the Council of Dijon (1077) nothing was said about investitures. The papal decree was not promulgated by Hugh of Die until a synod of Autun in September, 1077. There he encountered very sharp opposition; but the legate disregarded it and, in virtue of his plenary powers, he suspended *ab officio* the powerful archbishop of Reims, Manasses I, who was convicted of simony and usurpation. Another council, held at Poitiers in 1078, in spite of the opposition of King Philip I, but with the support of the Duke of Aquitaine, recalled that "a bishop must receive investiture only from his metropolitan; a cleric, only from his

[65] Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon,* in *M. G., SS.,* VIII, 412, and *PL,* CLIV, 277. Such is indeed the sense, if not the very letter of the decree, for evidently Hugh of Flavigny has not transmitted the authentic text.

[66] St. Gregory VII, *Registrum,* II, 14, in Jaffé, *Monum. greg.,* p. 156, and in *PL,* CXLVIII, 394. This letter was addressed to Hugh, bishop of Die, and concerned directly only the government of his diocese; but it was a direction for its whole conduct.

bishop." [67] Several prelates, instituted solely by the authority of the King, were deposed. Manasses protested, tried to stir the Roman court and the court of France in his behalf, even attempted to defend himself by force of arms. But, weakly backed by Philip I, who did not wish to identify his own cause with that of a personage so suspect, he yielded. "This was an important victory for Rome and for the legates. They had been successful in a conflict with the primate of Gaul, with him who consecrated the kings. What bishop could henceforth resist them?" [68]

In England, William the Conqueror maintained toward the Holy See the attitude he had already adopted as Duke of Normandy. Respectful in his diplomatic relations with the Roman court, favoring the reform of morals in the clergy, but excessively jealous of anything that seemed to him an encroachment upon his royal prerogatives, he retained control over every decision made by a council, the confirmation of every censure pronounced against a cleric dependent upon the crown, and appointed the bishops after consulting the upper clergy. The relations between King William and the Pope continued to be strained. Gregory VII patiently endured this situation. In the war declared against Gregory VII by the antipope Guibert, William at first forbade his subjects to acknowledge any pontiff without the king's previous authorization; afterward, however, he accepted Gregory and rejected the legate whom Guibert sent.[69] But the religious quarrels soon broke out in Great Britain with unprecedented vivacity.

The conflict in Germany gave promise of reaching vast proportions. The head of the Holy Empire, unlike a king of France or of England, appealed not only to the prerogatives of his crown, the independence of his temporal authority, the

[67] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 231.

[68] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. II, Part II, p. 214.

[69] On the religious policy of William the Conqueror, see Lingard, *History of England,* I, 540 ff.

bonds of vassalage that connected lord-bishops to the throne; he considered himself the head of the religious society. Deprived, by the act of Nicholas II, of the right to interfere in the election of the Roman pontiffs, he was the more energetic in defending his alleged right of intervention in the election of bishops and abbots.[70]

The character of the young King of Germany was of a nature to embitter the conflict. Born in 1050, proclaimed king in 1056, declared of age in 1063, the young King Henry IV was twenty-five years old and had been ruling twelve years at the time of Gregory VII's decree about the investiture of clerics. Henry was not devoid of intelligence and valor. One biographer of Pope Gregory says:

> Henry's first misfortune was that he received a detestable education. A mere child at the time of the death of his father Henry III and soon removed from the tutelage of his mother, Empress Agnes, he grew up between Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, who transmitted to him all his conceits for the maintenance of his power, and Archbishop Anno of Cologne, whose austere virtue frightened him.
>
> Even in childhood Henry IV was immoral; when he reached manhood he soon became dissolute. He was no better after his marriage to the Princess of Savoy. All the authority of St. Peter Damian, legate of the Holy See, was needed to oblige him to take back his wife, whom he had shamefully repudiated. Without any regard for the well-being of his people, the security of his states, or his own high office, Henry IV almost always followed his whims, gave free rein to his hatreds and grudges, even to the point of exasperating both his subjects and his own children. His relations with the Holy See were utterly inconsistent.[71]

He was friendly to the Holy See whenever his enemies threatened his crown, and turned from it, forgetful of his

[70] On the political claims of the German emperors, see Stengel, *Der Kaiser macht das Heer Studien zur Geschichte eines politisches Gedaenkens.*

[71] Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* I, lxxxiv–lxxxv.

promises and oaths, as soon as the danger passed. In August, 1073, impelled by a formidable revolt of the Saxons, he wrote to the Pope as follows: "My very dear lord, we confess that we have not always manifested to the priesthood the justice and respect rightly due it. Touched by God's mercy, we acknowledge our faults to your most indulgent paternity." [72]

Gregory put trust in the sincerity of these declarations. After promulgating the decree of 1075 on investitures, he wrote a very friendly letter to the King of Germany, saying that he had decided to regulate, in common accord with the King and for the greater advantage of the Empire and of the Church, all the difficulties that might arise from the reform.[73] Henry IV had an additional reason for manifesting friendliness to the Pope: he cherished the project of being crowned emperor. Without delay he sent to Rome two ambassadors, commissioned to discuss the question of the investitures and also that of the coming coronations. In his letter he wrote: "I desire that no one shall know what I have informed you of through them, no one except yourself, my mother, my aunt Beatrice, and her daughter Matilda." [74] The mention of these two princesses, whose devotedness to the Holy See was known, was made to rejoice the heart of the Pontiff. Gregory VII opened his soul to all the most consoling expectations. In reality this secrecy, so strangely requested of the Pope, hid a detestable plot. The negotiations just mentioned took place in December, 1075. But in September of that same year Henry IV had decided to conclude nothing with the Holy See except with the concurrence of the nobles of his realm, that is, those who had the greatest interest in defeating the Pope's reforms.

The King's duplicity soon became evident. Gregory, while

[72] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* I, 29, in Jaffé, *op. cit.,* p. 46, and in *PL,* CXLVIII, 312.

[73] See this letter in *Registrum,* III, 10; *Mon. greg.,* p. 220; *PL,* CXLVIII, 439–42.

[74] Delarc, *op. cit.,* III, 160.

entertaining the most roseate hopes, learned that the King of Germany had, on his own authority, invested Bishop Huzmann at Spires, Bishop Henry at Liège, and Bishop Tebaldo at Milan. This Tebaldo, a nobleman and a cleric of Milan who, according to Bonizo, "had more corpulence than virtue," [75] received the royal investiture while the lawful bishop, Godfrey, was still living. At this same time, Guibert of Ravenna publicly withdrew from Gregory; and a counselor of the King, Eberhard of Nellemburg, sent on a mission to Lombardy, declared that the Patari were public enemies. A despicable outrage climaxed this series of treasons and plots.

During the night of Christmas, 1075, while the Pope was celebrating the sacred mysteries in the church of St. Mary Major, at that hour rather deserted, a band of armed men rushed upon him as they shouted terrible cries, struck him fiercely, seized him, and brought him, bleeding and fastened to a horse, to a tower near the Pantheon, the property of the Censius family. A member of this family, a man of shameful vices, well known for his relations with Henry IV and with Guibert of Ravenna, was at the head of the bandits, urging them on by words and acts. But, although the drama was quickly acted, the people present at the function in St. Mary Major, had time to scatter in the city and spread the tragic news. This they did so effectively that at daybreak Cencius saw, from the windows of his tower, where he had just joined the Pope, an immense tumultuous throng, preparing an assault upon his place to deliver the Pontiff. Cencius thought his last hour had come. He lost his arrogance. Casting himself at the Pope's feet, he begged for pardon and implored that his life be spared. Gregory promised him both, succeeded in rescuing him from the mob; then, escorted by an immense throng that surrounded him, returned to St. Mary Major and there, amid

[75] Bonizo, *Ad amicum*, VII, in Jaffé, p. 664.

universal thanksgiving, concluded the interrupted holy sacrifice.

So many crimes called for prompt punishment. Early in January, 1076, three papal messengers summoned the King, in the Pope's name, to come to Rome on the twenty-second of the following February to appear at a synod there and clear himself of several charges. If he should fail to appear, on that day the Apostolic anathema would separate him from the body of the Church.[76]

Henry IV's wrath was terrible. To anticipate the Pope's move, he convoked, for Septuagesima Sunday, which that year fell on January 24, a national council at Worms. Almost all the German bishops attended. The undisguised purpose of the council was the deposition of Pope Gregory VII. The affair was conducted by the King and his counselors with unusual vigor. Everybody knew that Gregory was without guile, trustful, much inclined to let himself be won by a hypocritical declaration; but once the justice of a cause became clearly evident to him, he was capable of defending it with indomitable energy. The King needed, at any cost, to obtain an almost unanimous vote of deposition against him. In the pursuit of this purpose nothing was neglected. As soon as the prelates were assembled in the council chamber, under the presidency of the King, a cardinal of the Roman Church entered. He was called Hugh Candidus. Candidus belonged to the race of the great traitors. Historians have compared his part to that of Admiral Coligny in the time of the religious strifes of the sixteenth century and to that of Cardinal Loménie de Brienne in the French Revolution.

Born at Remiremont in the diocese of Toul, appointed cardinal by the saintly Pope Leo IX at the same time as Peter Damian on account of his remarkable qualities of mind, he

[76] *M. G., SS.*, V, 241, 280, 431.

sustained the antipope Cadalous, then rallied to Gregory VII and even obtained from him a confidential mission in Spain. Of a sudden he turned against his benefactor, entered upon dubious negotiations with Robert Guiscard, the duke of the Normans, and finally joined the cause of Tebaldo of Milan and of Guibert of Ravenna. In 1076 he was deposed for misconduct. With imposing self-assurance and with a preciseness of fabricated details, which his habitual practice in the Roman curia made easy for him, he made in the presence of the council, according to Hefele's picturesque expression, "a sort of melodrama" on Hildebrand's origin, his alleged youthful misconduct, his crimes of riper age, his usurpation of the papacy, his hateful tyranny, and his infamous morals.[77] In an assembly where many prelates had everything to dread from the reforming Pope, these calumnies found an echo.

William, bishop of Utrecht and personal friend of the King, then rose up and, in a commanding tone, declared that the members of the assembly had merely to choose one of two attitudes: to condemn the Pope or to abandon the King. To close the matter promptly and to prevent the bishops faithful to the Pope from shielding themselves behind reservations, the following declaration was submitted for each one's signature: "I, N. . . . , Bishop of N. . . . , notify Hildebrand that, from this moment, I refuse him submission and obedience and I will no longer acknowledge him as pope and will no longer give him this title." Says the chronicler Bruno: "Only a few persons there subscribed to this declaration wholeheartedly; most of them obeyed only through fear, as they afterward declared to the Pope." [78]

[77] Lambert of Hersfeld, *Annales,* year 1076, in *M. G., SS.,* V, 242, and in *PL,* CXLVI, 1211.

[78] Bruno, *De bello saxonico,* in *M. G., SS.,* V, 351.

Excommunication of Henry IV

After the conciliabulum of Worms, Henry IV sent to Gregory VII a letter beginning with these words: "Henry, King, not by usurpation but by the will of God, to Hildebrand, who is no longer Pope, but only a false monk." The King closes his letter pathetically as follows: "And now, since you are condemned by our judgment and by that of our bishops, descend from that Apostolic See which you have usurped. . . . Descend, descend, you who are condemned forever." [79]

When the Emperor's envoys brought this letter to Rome, the Pope was holding the announced council in the Lateran Basilica. One of these envoys, Roland, a cleric from Parma, was so bold as to accompany this communication with grave insults that aroused the assembly. Some laymen present in the council chamber fell upon Roland and would have slain him if the Pope had not shielded him with his own person.[80] The council declared unanimously that Henry had amply deserved excommunication. Gregory could not postpone the decision any longer. In the presence of Empress Agnes, who was at the council and who with desolate heart declared that she bowed before a measure which the duty of his supreme office obliged the Pope to take,[81] Gregory VII pronounced King Henry's excommunication and consequently released his subjects from their oath of allegiance. Several bishops involved in the King's cause were also excommunicated.[82]

To inform the Catholic world of so important an act, the Pope issued a special bull, which explained to the faithful the

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 352.

[80] Paul Bernried, *Vita Gregorii VII,* in Watterich, I, 512, and in *PL,* CXLVIII, 71.

[81] See the letter written on this subject by the Empress to the Bishop of Passau (Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon; PL,* CLIV, 308).

[82] For the solemn formula of this excommunication, see *Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne), II, 282, and Jaffé, pp. 222–24.

reasons for this condemnation and its import. Therein he set forth that the King had merited such a sentence by a threefold infraction of the laws of the Church: not merely had Henry IV frequently associated with notorious excommunicated persons and obstinately refused to heed numerous paternal warnings, but he had attempted to effect a schism in the Church.[83] He had thereby excluded himself from the Catholic body. By his conduct he obliged the head of the Church either to abandon the Holy See to the King's caprices or to adopt the severe measures which he had just employed. As to the sentence releasing Henry's subjects from their oath of allegiance, Gregory, without precisely saying whether he issued it in virtue of a direct right or of an indirect right, based it upon the power belonging to him, from Christ, "to bind and to loose" princes and peoples.[84]

The excommunication of the King of Germany and of his chief partisans was like a thunderbolt which, as Bonizo says, made the whole Roman world tremble.[85] Henry IV was at Utrecht when the news reached him on Holy Saturday of the year 1076. Bishop William of Utrecht was one of Henry IV's warmest supporters. At once he ascended the pulpit and declared, in the King's name, that the excommunication pronounced by the Pope should be considered null, and he burst out in invectives of the grossest sort against Gregory. Shortly after this the King, in a long letter accusing the Pope of seeking to unite the two powers, spiritual and temporal in his own hands, invited the bishops of the kingdom to meet at Worms on May 15.[86] But so many deeds of violence were far from helping the royal cause. Every thoughtful person saw that Henry IV had been the first to attempt the use of the two

[83] Bernried, *op. cit.*, p. 68, in Watterich, I, 517.

[84] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* III, 6; *PL,* CXLVIII, 454. Cf. IX, 1; *PL,* CXLVIII, 451–53.

[85] Bonizo, *Ad amicum,* Bk. VIII; *Mon. greg.,* p. 670.

[86] *Mon. greg.,* p. 106.

swords, spiritual and temporal. The sudden death of the Bishop of Utrecht, who died in remorse, impressed the popular imagination, which looked upon it as a punishment from God.[87]

The Pope's act releasing the King's subjects from their oath of allegiance was a watchword respectfully followed by sincere Catholics; for most of the others it was a signal of revolt. The feudal world rested especially upon the sacredness of an oath. This was the barrier separating that world from barbarism. Saxony almost entirely rose up, and the number of bishops who went to Worms was so insufficient that the King was obliged to postpone the solution of the conflict to another assembly, which met at Mainz on June 29 of that year.

The assembly at Mainz brought to light especially the anxieties of conscience of the bishops, who consented to declare that the King's excommunication was null because of a defect of form, but they refused to designate a successor of Gregory VII.[88]

However, Henry's enemies exploited to their advantage the sentence of deposition pronounced against him. His castles were pillaged. Defection created a solitude around him. Gregory VII seized upon the occasion to bring back, by one stroke, political peace and religious peace in Germany. He wrote "to all his brethren in Christ, bishops, abbots, priests, dukes, princes, and knights living in the Roman Empire," an urgent letter in which he said to them: "We beg you, as most beloved brothers, to exert yourselves to arouse in the soul of King Henry feelings of true repentance, to rescue him from the hands of the demon, so that we may be able to restore him to the bosom of our common mother." [89]

These instructions arrived opportunely. Nearly all the ecclesiastical and lay nobility, having at its head Duke Rudolf

[87] Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon,* Bk. II; *M. G., SS.,* V, 361.

[88] Lambert, *Annales,* year 1076, in *M. G., SS.,* V, 243 f.; *PL,* CXLVI, 1218.

[89] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* IV, 1, in Jaffé, *Mon. greg.,* p. 238; *PL,* CXLVIII, 451–53.

of Swabia and Duke Welf (Guelph) of Bavaria, decided to assemble at Tribur on the following October 16 to cure the increasingly disturbed situation of the Empire. Two papal legates, Sieghart of Aquileia and Altmann of Passau, went to the assembly and there in the name of the Pope, against the impulsive desires of the nobles, who wished to depose Henry IV immediately, advocated a moderate course. At the legates' urging, the assembly decided that the King's case should be judged, after free discussion, in a great national diet, to be held at Augsburg under the presidency of the Pope, and that a new king should be elected only if Henry refused submission.

This was a splendid victory for the cause of justice and of the papacy. Thus Gregory, invited by the whole aristocracy of the Holy Empire, Swabians and Saxons, Bavarians and Lorrainians, momentarily united in a unanimous thought, was going, in the very heart of Germany and amid the general friendliness of the people, to act as master in the case of him who a few months before had stirred Germany against his supreme authority.

Before adjourning, the Tribur assembly decided that if at the end of a year Henry was still by his own fault under the weight of excommunication, he would be, according to the ancient law, stripped of all his claims to the kingship. If he chose to submit, he must revoke the pseudo-council of Worms, give the Pope written amends, and, until a final decision was reached, must live at Spires as a private person, without military suite, must not enter any church, and must abstain from any act of government. Should he fail in a single one of these points, the princes would be freed from all obligation toward him.

Henry IV saw that his cause was lost. By carrying violence too far he had turned against himself all the forces of the Empire. Clearly of all his adversaries the most exorable was

the Pope. From that hour Henry's resolve was to do everything to put his cause in the hands of Gregory VII.

His first move, to have his cause judged at Rome and not at Augsburg, was rejected by the Pope, who declared that he would abide by the decisions voted at Tribur: the King would be judged at the diet of Augsburg, and not elsewhere.[90] After writing this letter, the Pope set out for Germany. On December 28, 1076, he was at Florence. Provided with the necessary safe-conduct by Countess Matilda, he crossed the Apennines in the first days of 1077. On January 8, he reached Mantua. In this city he was waiting for the escort which he needed to resume his journey, when he received news that was as grave as it was unexpected. King Henry IV, defying the prohibition against his leaving Spires, had set out for Rome. He had already crossed Mont Cenis pass and was then in Lombardy. What was the Pope to do? To turn back to Rome would be to fail in his promise to the princes that he would go to the diet; to continue on to Augsburg, would be to abandon Rome to the German King, who might stir Rome to revolt by joining the factions, perhaps even by allying himself with those terrible and mysterious Normans, whose uncertain attitude had always been a source of anxiety to Gregory. Countess Matilda,[91] aware of the Pope's perplexity, proposed that he withdraw to her fortress of Canossa and there await the turn of events. The Pope accepted. Neither of them foresaw that they would thus furnish the crafty monarch the occasion for realizing a plan more perfidious than any he had previously devised.

Gregory VII at Canossa

The fortress of Canossa, built on an impregnable rock ten miles from Reggio in the marquisate of Tuscany, already had

[90] Bruno, *De bello sax.; M. G., SS.*, V, 361; Mansi, XX, 379.

[91] Her mother, Beatrice, died on April 18, 1076.

a history. The widow of the last Lombard king, the future Empress of Germany, St. Adelaide, took refuge there under the protection of an ancestor of Countess Matilda, to escape from the persecution of the last king of Italy, Berengarius II. Encompassed by a triple fortified wall, from the heart of which arose a group of towers, the Canossa castle seemed destined to become the stage of one of the most dramatic scenes recorded in history.

As soon as the Pope was installed in the castle, a group of German bishops and laymen arrived, men recently excommunicated for their close relations with Henry IV. They came to ask that their censures be removed. After they had undergone a few days of penance, the Pope granted the absolution which they requested. But at the same time he learned that this group was the herald of the King himself.

In fact, a few days later a royal messenger arrived with word that his master, who was then a short distance from the castle, requested an interview with Countess Matilda and with one of her guests, Abbot Hugh of Cluny. The interview was granted. The excommunicated King was humble, penitent, suppliant. He begged the intercession of the devout princess and of the holy abbot to obtain his pardon. Gregory's position was full of anguish. By his priestly character and the inner feelings of his soul, he was inclined to mercy. But would it be right for him to anticipate a decision that was reserved to the diet of Augsburg? He also remembered the inconstancy of the young King's character. For a long time he resisted. Countess Matilda increased her urging.

In the morning of January 25, 1077, the King resolved to precipitate the issue. He rapped on the gate of the castle. He was barefoot, in the snow, clothed in the woolen garb of penitents. There he remained until evening, groaning, weeping, begging for his pardon. The same scene was repeated on the two following days. In the evening of the third day he went to

a little chapel dedicated to St. Nicholas, and there he found the Abbot of Cluny and Countess Matilda at prayer. He renewed his supplications to them. At first Countess Matilda, then the Abbot of Cluny, were greatly moved and agreed to intercede with the Pope. Gregory himself was won over and promised that on the next day he would admit King Henry to communion, but on the following conditions: 1. Henry should appear at the diet of the princes and should there answer the charges brought against him; 2. until his case was decided he should take no part in the government of the kingdom and should give whatever guaranties would be demanded of him. The Pope, foreseeing that his decision might give rise to interpretations unfriendly toward him, at once sent to the German princes an exact account of all that had just occurred.[92]

Gregory's solution of the conflict was most wise. It foiled Henry IV's plan and the cupidity of his followers as also the schemes of some of his foes who sought in this affair their own interests rather than the good of religion and the peace of the Empire. Neither Guibert of Ravenna nor the German party in Lombardy, who expected to see the Pope humbled, was satisfied. We are told that Guibert was greatly displeased and ad-

[92] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* IV, 12; Jaffé, *Mon. greg.,* p. 256; *PL,* CXLVIII, 465–67. This report has been our chief guide in our narrative. It is supplemented by the reports of two Italian cardinals, Bonizo and Donizo, both having close dealings with Countess Matilda; Donizo was living at Canossa (see Bonizo in *Monum. greg.,* p. 672, and Donizo in *M. G., SS.,* XII, 382). The following assertions are utterly false: that Gregory himself imposed the penance on the King; that the King had been condemned to pass three days and three nights without food, in the open air, clothed only in a shirt; that the Pope used the Eucharist as a judgment of God. Such statements in vain attempt to find support in a version of Lambert of Hersfeld (*M. G., SS.,* V, 256 f.). This version is contradicted by the entirety of the other documents. It disagrees with the character of Gregory VII and with that of Henry IV. Most historians reject it (Hefele-Leclercq, V, 191–200; Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* III, 267–78; Hergenröther, *Hist. de l'Eglise,* III, 555–57). Hefele says: "What we can say is that the whole Canossa scene was a comedy played by the King, who came to Canossa to seek, not absolution, but a way out of the political entanglement into which he had put himself" (*loc. cit.,* p. 200). Nowhere do we find a report that the King stood three days in the snow dressed merely in a shirt. The woolen robe of penitents was worn outside the ordinary clothes.

vised the King to seize Gregory at any cost, by trickery or by force.[93] The Lombards, who were displeased both with the Pope and with the King, spoke of promptly designating as king the younger son of Henry and of marching on Rome, there to elect another pope.[94] The German barons who rallied to Rudolf of Swabia and who were much more concerned with the fall of Henry IV than with political and religious pacification, did not hide their dissatisfaction with a solution that sought a totally opposite purpose. Henry IV himself, who had resolved to obtain his political rehabilitation rather than his religious reconciliation, noted bitterly that Gregory had sought only this latter issue, even to the detriment of the former. The King's hypocritical cleverness turned against him. From the very first days that followed the interview at Canossa, no one could fail to see that the King of Germany was going to destroy his promises as though, to use the expression of Lambert of Hersfeld, they were mere cobwebs.[95]

Although the King now had public opinion against him, yet his former counselors, the most involved of his followers, and the habitual companions of his debauchery gathered more closely about him. The "Lombard bulls" begged him to assume the iron crown at Monza. Cencius, the bandit lord who had so cruelly outraged the Pope on Christmas night, 1075, offered his services to him.[96] And Guibert, while awaiting the hour for his elevation to the first rank, remained in the background, inciting rancor and hatred in the King's mind. Says Lambert of Hersfeld: "In the numerous conversations between Henry and his friends, the King indulged in recriminations against the Roman Pontiff, held him to blame for the violent storm

[93] Donizo, in *M. G., SS.*, XII, 382.

[94] Lambert, in *M. G., SS.*, V, 260; *Monum. greg.*, p. 245.

[95] Lambert, *Annales*, year 1077; *PL*, CXLVI, 1245.

[96] According to Bonizo (*Ad amicum*, Bk. VIII), the King had several secret meetings with the bandit. But the latter's sudden death in 1077 put an end to the plot.

disturbing the state, and asked that everyone should gather about him so that he might avenge so many insults." [97]

On the other hand, the devoted friends of the Pope in Italy and Henry IV's political foes in Germany increased their activity. The Patari of Milan sent a deputation to Rome and, encouraged by Peter Damian, they brought about a triumph of orthodoxy in their province.[98] As to the German nobles who gathered around Rudolf of Swabia, their mind was made up. At an assembly held at Forchheim (March 13, 1077), they decided that the election of a new king was urgent.

The undertaking was rash. The electors, both lay and ecclesiastical, had experienced the need of finding protection under the supreme authority of the Pope and had invited him to their assembly. The Pontiff, who was the defender of the Church and of justice in Christian society, saw the imprudence of letting so grave a step be taken without his participation and control. Therefore he delegated two legates to represent him at Forchheim. He also wrote to Henry IV, requesting him to attend the diet and there present his defense. But the King, perhaps thinking his cause already lost, refused to go.[99]

The assembly chose Duke Rudolf of Swabia, who was elected king of Germany. The event showed how useful the presence of the legates had been. They required that the new King subscribe to the two following conditions of capital importance: 1. that he would not distribute bishoprics for money or according to his whim; that each Church should be free canonically to elect its bishop from its own members; 2. that the royal dignity should no longer be transmitted by inheritance, as usage was tending to establish, but, in accordance with the ancient law, by election.[100] By this double reservation, the

[97] Lambert, *Annales,* year 1077, in *M. G., SS.,* VIII, 31.
[98] Arnolfo, *Gesta archiepiscoporum mediolanensium,* Bk. V; *M. G., SS.,* VIII, 31.
[99] Watterich, I, 517 f.; Bernried, *op. cit.,* chap. 7; *PL,* CXLVIII, 87–90.
[100] Bruno, *De bello saxonico,* 91; *M. G., SS.,* V, 365.

sense and bearing of the election at Forchheim were well defined: it was not merely a counterattack of the aristocracy against the hereditary monarchy; it was a new guaranty of respect for the Church and its laws.

Rudolf of Swabia

Unfortunately circumstances did not permit this measure to bear fruit. This sudden election offended too many interests, the spirit of rancor was too evident in many of those who were its authors, and the grave mission with which Rudolf of Swabia was entrusted was too heavy for his shoulders.

On the other hand, Henry IV, after a moment of amazement, recovered and conducted the war against his foe with uncommon vigor. Therein he displayed activity and valor, and a cleverness in taking advantage of the faults of his enemy; in short, the tactics of a statesman and warrior, which show what this prince could have become if an evil education and an evil entourage had not morally depraved him. Abandoned by a large part of the nobility, he found support in the big cities, which furnished him an army. The coalition that brought Rudolf to power was without solid cohesion. Several of the nobles had no bonds of union except the bitterness animating them against King Henry. Defections occurred. The two rivals came to grips with equal forces. After a doubtful battle at Melrichstädt in 1078, Rudolf was victorious at Mülhausen in January, 1080, but in October, on the banks of the Elster, he was seriously wounded and died shortly after.

Gregory, in spite of urging by both sides, refrained from declaring himself in favor of either rival. At a Roman council (February 25 to March 3, 1078) he declared that the best solution seemed to him to be to gather in Germany, under his presidency or that of his legates and without the presence of the two kings, an assembly of prelates and eminent men of the

state, for the purpose of succoring the Empire so cruelly torn.[101] In another Roman council (November, 1078) ambassadors of Henry and of Rudolf swore, in the name of their masters, not to hinder the projected conference.[102] In a third council, which opened at Rome on February 11, 1079, the Pope obtained from the ambassadors of the two parties an agreement that the decision pronounced by the legates after inquiry would be accepted by both. We still have the form of the oath that was taken on that occasion.[103] Lastly, on March 7 of that same year, Gregory VII, ascertaining that Henry IV, besides other offenses, was guilty of opposing the meeting of the conference, which was decreed to assure the peace of the Empire, declared him deprived of his rights.[104]

Henry IV had foreseen this eventuality of a deposition pronounced by the Pope. In concert with his counselors, he prepared to reply at once by a pitiless war to the death; its chief stages seem to have been decided on in advance. Among the King's advisers were two whom we have met already, at the most tragic moments of the strife against Rome. On the political stage, they again played a preponderant part: Cardinal Hugh Candidus and Archbishop Guibert of Ravenna. The plan of the war embraced the execution of three decisive acts: the election of an antipope, the coronation of Henry IV as emperor, and the taking of Rome. A conciliabulum (June 25, 1080) at Brixen, a small town of Noricum, today in the Aus-

[101] Mansi, XX, 603; suppl., II, 27; Delarc, III, 403–14.

[102] Jaffé, no. 5084.

[103] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* VI, 17; *Mon. greg.,* p. 352; Delarc, III, 461.

[104] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* VII, 14; *Mon. greg.,* p. 401. See the complete allocution which St. Gregory pronounced on this occasion. Taking isolated phrases of this allocution, you might suppose that Gregory was arrogating to himself the right to dispose of the crowns (Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.,* II, 101 f.). The meaning of the document, taken in its totality, seems to us quite otherwise. With Gosselin (*Pouvoir du pape au Moyen Age,* 1845 ed., p. 441), we think that "the Pope's sentence was really only a confirmation of the judgment already pronounced by the German lords in the diet of Forchheim." See the discussion of this opinion in Gosselin, *op. cit.,* pp. 441 f.

trian Tyrol, declared the deposition of Gregory VII, who was accused of "upsetting the established order of the Church, destroying the harmony of the Empire, and waging war upon the body and soul of a peaceful Catholic king." We possess the text of the odious act of accusation containing these insults. At the head of twenty-seven signatures of German or Lombard bishops, is that of Cardinal Hugh Candidus, the traitor, who probably was the writer of the document. The twenty-seven bishops agreed to elevate at once to the supreme pontificate the archbishop of Ravenna, Guibert, who was forthwith clothed with the insignia of the papacy and received the homages due to the head of Christendom.[105] The King bent his knee before the newly elected antipope and announced that in the following spring he would go with an army to receive the imperial crown from the Pontiff at Rome itself.

The military qualities displayed by Henry IV in his strife against Rudolf gave reason to dread the invasion of his troops into Italy. Gregory thought the moment had come to make an alliance with the Normans, even though he must sacrifice some possessions of the Papal States. By the intermediary of Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, he concluded a treaty with Duke Robert Guiscard, assuring the Normans of "the lands granted to them by the preceding popes and tolerating the possession by them of Salerno, Amalfi, and part of the March of Fermo, although these lands had been unjustly acquired." [106] In return the Duke renewed the oath previously taken to Nicholas II, to defend against all attack the domain of St. Peter. Already assured of the cooperation of Countess Matilda in northern Italy, the Pope planned to make use of the Normans in forcibly subduing the antipope Guibert, who had installed himself at Ravenna and was there recruiting and

[105] *M. G., SS.*, VIII, 99; *Mon. greg.*, p. 676.

[106] Such are the terms of the treaty. See Gregory VII, *Registrum*, VII, 7; *Mon. greg.*, p. 426.

organizing his party. But, owing to various circumstances, the Ravenna expedition could not take place. The Norman troops entered upon the campaign by fighting the Emperor of the East.

Henry IV in Italy

Toward the end of March, 1081, word came to Rome that Henry IV had crossed the Alps at the head of his forces. Owing to the treason of several vassals of Countess Matilda, he was able to cross through upper Italy and be crowned at Milan as King of Lombardy. In this supreme peril, Gregory showed his heroism, giving his attention to the smallest needs of the Church, even striking the great whenever justice required, and resisting all who implored him to seek a reconciliation with Henry. He wrote (April 8, 1081) to the people of Venetia, admonishing them to refrain from any dealings with the excommunicated persons.[107]

Henry, however, after ravaging the possessions of Countess Matilda and taking the antipope Guibert with him, advanced toward Rome. He reached there on the Saturday before Pentecost (May 21 or 22, 1081), but a disappointment awaited him. Made confident by the preceding successes of his army and feeling certain that under the walls of the Eternal City he would encounter neither the Tuscan troops, who had been defeated in Upper Italy, nor the Norman troops, who were engaged in the East, he expected that the Romans would be eager to open their gates to him, and had not brought any siege equipment with him. But, following the Pope's advice, the population of Rome barricaded themselves, and Henry IV was obliged to retire in June, 1081. To give satisfaction to his soldiers, he let them ravage the environs of Rome. Coronation

[107] *Registrum*, VIII, 31 (alias IX, 8); Jaffé, no. 5210.

at the hands of Gregory was impossible. But he had himself crowned emperor by Guibert in the midst of his camp, with all possible solemnity.[108]

A second disappointment awaited Henry in Germany. His foes there had elected a new king, Count Hermann of Luxemburg, who, on August 11, defeated the imperial army at Hochstadt on the Danube. But Hermann was unable to maintain his success, and his party soon broke up.

Then Henry again turned his steps toward Rome, still accompanied by the antipope, who had taken the name of Clement III. This time every measure and precaution were taken: considerable military forces enabled him to spread devastation and terror along his route, and large sums of money were profusely distributed to the Tuscans, the Normans, and even the Romans, to win them over to his side. However, he succeeded merely in seizing (June 2, 1083) the Leonine city, where he fortified himself, and the Basilica of St. Peter, where he installed the pseudo-Clement III. Gregory VII remained in possession of Trastevere on the right bank of the Tiber, and of the city, strictly so called, on the left bank, as also of Castle Sant' Angelo.

Hypocritical peace negotiations were then undertaken by Henry IV. The mass of the Roman population, won by the King's bounty, went over to his side. The steadfast Gregory repeated (June 24) the sentence of excommunication against Henry.

The latter, four days later, replied by enthroning the antipope in St. Peter's Basilica. On March 21, 1084, through the use of abundant largess furnished by the Eastern Emperor, Henry was able to bribe some Romans, who opened the gates of Rome to him. There he held a synod that proclaimed the deposition of Gregory, and he had Guibert consecrated in the Lateran. Then he vigorously pressed the siege of Castle Sant'

[108] Benzo, *M. G., SS.*, XI, 656; *Mon. greg.*, p. 677.

Angelo, Gregory's last refuge, where he was still resisting. We have now reached the month of May.

Of a sudden a report spread that Robert Guiscard was at the city gates at the head of a formidable army of Normans. Henry sensed a weakening of the loyalty of the Romans whom he had won by his gifts of money. His own troops were worn by a long campaign, and their ranks were thinned by disease. Feeling that he was not in a condition to resist, he left Rome in haste. The Pope was safe; but the Roman people cruelly atoned for the guilt of their betrayal. The city was pillaged by the Normans; thousands of Romans were massacred; thousands were sold into slavery. Gregory issued this final appeal to the universal Church: "Out of love for God, all you who are real Christians come to the aid of your father St. Peter and of your mother Holy Church, if you wish to obtain grace in this life and eternal blessedness in the next." [109]

International Affairs

Even in the most critical period of the strife against the King of Germany, Gregory VII never forgot that he belonged to all the Churches of the world. We have already spoken of his intervention in France and England. The Scandinavian states, Poland, Russia, Hungary, Bohemia, Spain, northern Africa, Armenia, and, in a general way, the Eastern Churches, were the object of his pastoral solicitude.

In several cordial letters to Sweyn Estridson, King of Denmark, and to his son Harold Hein, the Pope requested the establishment of regular diplomatic relations with the Danish nation, and reminded these rulers of the part that should be taken by royal sovereigns, which is to protect justice and to aid the work of the Church. He said: "A king should be the constant defender of widows, of the poor, and of the or-

[109] Jaffé, no. 5273. Cf. *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes,* VI (1865), 560.

phans." [110] He asked Olaf III, king of Norway, "to send to the Apostolic court some young noblemen of his nation so that, carefully brought up in the sacred and divine laws, they might afterward be able to make them known in their country." [111]

In Poland, Boleslaus II (the Cruel), after proclaiming the political independence of his kingdom from Germany, with his own hand killed St. Stanislaus, the bishop of Cracow. Gregory VII excommunicated him for this crime. Then he sent legates into his kingdom to organize the dioceses.[112] In Russia he favored the interests of Dmitri Isaiaslaf, who promised fidelity to the Holy See.[113] In Hungary he strove to maintain the rights of the papacy over that kingdom, to end the civil wars, and later to encourage the holy King Ladislaus.[114] In Bohemia he carried on a friendly correspondence with Duke Wratislaw.[115] In Spain he maintained respect for marriage, the celibacy of the priests, and accord between Christians, recalled the bonds that united the Spanish kingdom with the Holy See,[116] and urged King Alfonso of Castile to fight the Saracens. He detached Dalmatia from the Greek Empire and sent legates there. In Armenia he watched over the maintenance of the purity of the faith. Everywhere he strove, he reproved, he sustained, he negotiated with indomitable energy; everywhere he pursued the same end: to maintain in the Church the purity of its faith and of its life, by freeing it from the numerous princes and nobles who entwined it, enslaved it, and degraded it, by attaching it more closely to Rome, which would give its hierarchy strength and unity. It may

[110] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* II, 51, 75; V, 10; VII, 5, in *Mon. greg.,* pp. 167, 199, 298, 384.

[111] *Ibid.,* VI, 13, in *Mon. greg.,* p. 343.

[112] *Ibid.,* II, 73; *Mon. greg.,* p. 196.

[113] *Ibid.,* II, 74; *Mon. greg.,* p. 198.

[114] *Ibid.,* II, 63, 70; IV, 25; VI, 29; in *Mon. greg.,* pp. 183, 192, 279, 265.

[115] *Ibid.,* II, 6, 7, 8, 53, 71; in *Mon. greg.,* pp. 118, 171, 193.

[116] Hefele thinks that Gregory was alluding to the *Donatio Constantini;* Delarc, that he had in mind positive and undeniable traditions, whose titles have not come down to us. Cf. Delarc, *op. cit.,* III, 21–23; *Registrum,* III, 18.

truly be said that "Gregory VII was not only a soldier, a logician, a statesman; he was an apostle. Of his apostolic zeal for the Church of Christ and for justice and peace, his letters bear abundant witness, whether he is encouraging and consulting his friends or is hurling anathema at his foes." [117] Gregory was also a saint. Many of his letters breathe the deepest and warmest piety. To the devout Countess Matilda he wrote:

> Among the arms which are most useful to us in fighting the prince of this world, I have already mentioned to you the two principal ones: the frequent reception of the Lord's body and a full and confident trust in His holy Mother. . . . For a long time past I have recommended you to the Mother of the Lord, and I will not fail to continue doing so, until you have the blessedness of seeing in heaven that Queen whom heaven and earth are unable to praise fittingly.[118]

We can understand that the solicitude of so apostolic a soul turned to the missions. From the beginning of his pontificate, Gregory cherished the project of enlarging the kingdom of Christ, of advancing its frontiers in Africa and Asia.

In Africa, Anazir, king of Mauretania, had invited him to consecrate as bishop for the see of Buzea the African priest Servandus. Gregory at once replied as follows:

> Your request is just and equitable. And I know that you have ransomed Christians who were in captivity in your country. The generous act was certainly suggested to you by God, without whom we can accomplish nothing or even think a good thought. . . . Two Roman noblemen, with whom we are closely connected, wish keenly to establish friendly relations with you; they are sending you some of their men; we commend them to your grandeur. . . . From the depth of our heart we pray God that He receive you, after a long life, in the bosom of the blessedness of the holy patriarch Abraham.[119]

[117] A. Dufourcq, *L'avenir du christianisme,* VI, 28.
[118] Gregory VII, *Registrum,* I, 47.
[119] *Registrum,* III, 21, in *Mon. greg.,* p. 236.

"Perhaps no Roman pontiff ever more cordially manifested his friendliness for a Mussulman ruler." [120]

Crusade Projects

Although in the direction of northern Africa the horizon was bright, in the direction of western Asia it was clouded. In 1064 the Turks had begun to threaten the frontiers of the Byzantine Empire. Four years later they seized Caesarea in Cappadocia; in 1070 they took Jerusalem. The next year they defeated the army of Emperor Romanus Diogenes in a pitched battle. "One by one, the Asiatic metropolises, illustrious through the memory of the Apostolic age or of the great doctors of the Church, fell into the hands of the Mussulmans. The Westerners could not remain indifferent to these calamities. Not merely was the safety of the pilgrimages to the Holy Land endangered, but the very existence of the Holy Sepulcher and of the Latin establishments in Jerusalem was imperiled.

"Apparently the idea of an expedition for the relief of Constantinople was born in the West at the time of the first disasters. And this idea was furthered by the Byzantine emperors themselves. In 1073, Michael VII wrote to Pope Gregory VII in this vein, promising the reunion of the Greek Church with the Holy See.[121] At first the Pope was favorably inclined to this invitation. In a letter to Count William of Burgundy (February 2, 1074), Gregory urged him to go to the defense of Constantinople, which was threatened by the infidels.[122] A month later, in an encyclical addressed to all the faithful, he announced the danger facing 'the Christian Em-

[120] Mas-Latrie, *Traités de paix concernant les chrétiens et les Arabes au Moyen Age*, p. xxiii.

[121] The letter is known from Gregory's reply (July 9, 1073); *Registrum*, I, 18; *PL*, CXLVIII, 300.

[122] *PL*, CXLVIII, 325. On these letters and their authenticity, see Riant, *Archives de l'Orient latin*, I, 56.

pire,' and asked them to inform him through embassies of the resolutions they take.[123] The Pope at once received proposals of aid. In his letter to William VI, count of Poitiers, the Pope thanks him for his offers; but the report of a victory over the Turks caused the expedition to be postponed.[124] On the other hand, in a letter to Henry, king of the Romans (December 7), we find evidence of a fresh enthusiasm for the holy war; he announces that Italians and those beyond the Alps have answered his appeals, and that he is ready to march in person at the head of an army of fifty thousand men to deliver the East and the Holy Sepulcher, bringing about the return of the separated Churches to Christian unity." [125] Gregory's letters contain

> the first plan for a holy war that was conceived in the West. The feudal world of the eleventh century was marked by diversity and division; and in the midst of the disunion the Pope alone preserved the awareness of Christian unity and of the interests common to all the faithful. To withstand the dangers threatened by the Mussulman aggressions, not only in the East, but also in Sicily and Spain, he wished to constitute a force capable of saving Christendom. And he considered the reunion of the separated Churches as the necessary condition for a general entente of all the Christian powers.[126]

Unfortunately two events prevented Gregory from realizing his lofty idea. The war against lay investiture did not leave him enough time to organize such an enterprise; and the emperors who followed Michael VII (Nicephorus Botaniates and Alexius Comnenus) displayed hostility to the reunion of the Churches. Pope Gregory seems for a moment to have considered a project to give free rein to the ambition of Robert Guiscard, who thought of assuming the crown of the Eastern

[123] *PL,* CXLVIII, 329.
[124] *Ibid.,* col. 360.
[125] Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au moyen age,* p. 51.
[126] *Ibid.,* p. 53.

emperor, and to count upon the Normans, under the direction of the papacy, for accomplishing the twofold undertaking: the expulsion of the Turks from western Asia and the union of the Christian Churches. But the Normans had given too many proofs of inconstancy, selfishness, and duplicity for anyone to place further reliance on them.

After driving the Emperor and the antipope out of Rome, they abandoned themselves to unbridled brigandage. They attempted an attack upon Tivoli, where the so-called Clement III had taken refuge; but the attack failed against the strong walls of the city. Then, loaded with booty, Guiscard, rather than undertake a regular siege, decided to withdraw to the south of Italy with his forces.

Death of Gregory VII

In these conditions, while the antipope was at Tivoli and while Henry IV was still in Italy, Gregory VII judged he could not prudently stay in Rome. He decided to follow his terrible protector into southern Italy, intending to return to his beloved Rome in more propitious times. But his exile was ended by death.

In September, 1084, Guiscard again left Italy, once more to attempt his chimerical enterprise: the conquest of Constantinople. He said he would come back victorious, with the imperial crown on his head, and would give the Church the support of his mighty arm. He did win several victories; but Byzantine gold, lavishly given to his barons, detached many of them from his cause. Disorganization began in his army, which had to go back to Italy. A second expedition, undertaken and conducted with rare tenacity, at first won some brilliant victories, but was interrupted (July 17, 1085) by the death of the intrepid Norman chief. When the remnants of his troops reached southern Italy in disorder, Pope Gregory VII was no longer of this world.

On May 25, 1085, he died at Salerno, where he had taken refuge. He was aware of the fatal ailment at the beginning of the year; and thereafter he longed only for the possession of eternal justice, which he hoped to obtain in the next life after suffering hunger and thirst for it on earth. As he was drawing his last breath, he was heard to utter these words: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile." A bishop who was present replied to these words, saying: "My lord, a pope cannot die in exile, because he has received from God all the nations as his inheritance." Gregory expired after granting absolution to all whom he had excommunicated, with the exception of Henry IV and the antipope Guibert.[127]

Non-Catholic historians have expressed diverse opinions about Gregory VII. According to some, he was an absolute theocrat, subordinating everything to his ambition for universal domination;[128] others hail him as a great "forerunner of the French Revolution,"[129] relying on the people for the destruction of royal despotism. Even Catholics have not always agreed in their appreciations of this great pope. Some, dominated by the Gallican and Jansenist spirit, charge him with encroaching on the lawful power of sovereigns.[130] Evidently both views are wrong in regarding Gregory as a theorist.[131] He was first of all a man of duty, filled with a sense

[127] Bernried, *op. cit.*, in Watterich, I, 340.

[128] G. Monod, *Revue critique*, 1873, Part II, p. 176.

[129] E. Quinet, *Œuvres complètes*, III, 100.

[130] On the opposition of the Jansenists, the Gallicans, the Parliament of France, and some European governments to the introduction of the office of St. Gregory VII in the Breviary, see Guéranger, *Dissert. sur l'off. de S. Grégoire VII*, extract from the *Institutions liturgiques*, inserted in *PL*, CXLVIII, 234–80.

[131] In support of this contention, some have referred to expressions that are indeed in the works of St. Gregory VII, but that have not, if compared with their context, the absolute sense attributed to them. Thus, when he uses the comparison of the sun and the moon to express the relations which ought to exist between the Church and the state (*Registrum*, VIII, 21; cf. VII, 25; IX, 21; III, 8), when he says that princes ought to submit to "the empire of Christ" (IV, 3), and to regard the Church as a mother, he has especially in mind the spiritual powers of the Church, secondarily the social authority which flows from those powers or which

of his responsibility, desirous of completely following his conscience as a Christian, as a priest, and as the head of the Church. His natural disposition inclined him to trustfulness of men; this he showed in his relations with Berengarius, Hugh Candidus, Henry IV, Guibert, and Robert Guiscard. Only after painful conflicts between his conscience and his heart, did he accept the necessity of fighting them or condemning them. That these strifes were the martyrdom of his life, is evidenced in all his correspondence. The Church, which has placed him on her altars, honors him as one of her most fearless champions.[132] Every sincere mind must acknowledge that he was a great defender of justice.

---

the public law of the Middle Ages granted to it. When he speaks of "the diabolical origin of monarchies" (letters of August 25, 1071, March 15, 1081, etc.), he is simply alluding to wicked monarchies; perhaps also in one or two texts, to the monarchical form in general, in the sense that the power of kings, such as it existed in his time, had in most cases for its origin usurpation and violence. (On this point, see *Analecta bollandiana,* XIV (1895), 220 f.; *Stimmen aus Maria Laach,* 1891, p. 112; *Rivista storica italiana,* 1896, Vol. I, new ser., pp. 185 f.) But more than once he adduces, in favor of his right to depose kings, arguments that seem to indicate his belief in a direct power in this matter. At the Roman Council of 1080, he declared: "If you can bind and loose in heaven, you can on the earth take away from each one and grant to each one kingdoms, principalities, marquisates." Taking up a comparison of Cardinal Humbert, he declares that "as the soul rules the body, so the priestly dignity is superior to the royal dignity." (On this subject, see Fliche, *Etudes sur la polémique religieuse à l'époque de Grégoire VII.*) Despite all appearances, what is certain is that St. Gregory explicitly professed that the civil power comes from God, as does the spiritual power, and that the law which should regulate the relations of the two powers is concord. (*Registrum,* I, 19, 75; II, 31; III, 7; VII, 21, 23, 25; IX, 28.) On this question, see A. Cauchie in the *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.,* V (1904), 588–96, and Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles,* V, 78–86 note. For the purpose of attributing a political system to St. Gregory VII, appeal is often made to the series of twenty-seven celebrated sentences known under the name of *Dictatus papae* (*Registrum,* II, 55–56). This collection has given rise to several disputes. Many authors, such as Hefele (Hefele-Leclercq, V, 131) have rejected its authenticity. No one of the propositions contained in it is, if interpreted without prejudice, blameworthy. Cf. F. Rocquain, "Quelques mots sur les Dictatus papae" in the *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes,* 1872, pp. 278–85. On its defenders and opponents, see Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, 369–72.

[132] *Acerrimus Ecclesiae defensor* (sixth lesson of the office of St. Gregory VII in the Roman Breviary, May 25).

CHAPTER VI

From the Death of St. Gregory VII to the Death of Urban II (1085–99)

Pope Victor III

THE death of Gregory VII, shortly followed by that of Robert Guiscard and that of Anselm of Lucca [1] (counselor of Matilda and papal legate for Upper Italy), was an occasion for the antipope Guibert to raise his head. His royal protector resumed the strife with fresh ardor. Some bishops devoted to the Pope had been forced by the persecution to flee to Denmark; Henry handed out their sees to his creatures. To consolidate his party in Germany, he founded, on the borders of Saxony and Bavaria, the Kingdom of Bohemia in favor of a national duke, Wratislaw, who for ten years had given him pledges of a faithful alliance.[2] Meanwhile Guibert returned to Rome, there to take the place left vacant by Gregory VII.

But Gregory, foreseeing that disturbances might arise after his death, in his last days expressed to the cardinals his wishes about the choice of his successor. He named his friend Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino. Desiderius, a cardinal-priest of the Roman Church, was universally esteemed for his wisdom and piety. Henry IV himself had shown deference toward him, and his influence over the Normans was well known. Generally the clergy and people were inclined toward Desiderius. Although Rome was still divided into two camps, the imperial party was without its natural leader since the prefect of Rome

[1] That is, Anselm the Younger, who should not be confused with Anselm the Elder, of Lucca, who was pope under the name of Alexander II.

[2] C. Giraud, "Grégoire VII et son temps" in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* CV (1873), 146–48.

had been made a prisoner by the Normans. The antipope Guibert, driven from Rome by the populace, withdrew to Ravenna.

Desiderius, however, could not decide to accept the office which he was asked to take. He recalled that Pope Gregory's wish in his regard had not been expressed by way of a command. The Pope had, in fact, added: "If Desiderius refuses his consent, you should choose Anselm of Lucca or Odo of Ostia or Hugh of Lyons." [3] To conclude the matter more promptly, a party with Jourdain of Capua at its head considered that they might impose the tiara on Desiderius by force. Thereupon he abruptly left Rome and returned to Monte Cassino. The uncertainty continued until Easter, 1086. Then the cardinals present in Rome, fearing that the antipope would take advantage of this delay to sow dissension in the Church, begged Desiderius to come from his retreat to Rome, if not to accept the supreme pontificate, at least to help them make a firm decision in the matter.

On May 23 (Pentecost) a plenary session of the cardinals, meeting in the Church of St. Lucy at the foot of the Palatine, urged the Abbot of Monte Cassino to consent to his election. But their efforts were futile. Upon his advice, the cardinals were disposed to elect Odo, bishop of Ostia.[4] However, one of the members of the conclave remarked that, as Odo was a bishop, he could not pass from one Church to another. This was a vain pretext. Such transfers took place whenever sufficient reasons appeared. Yet the cardinals seemed to attach great importance to this argument. Then Desiderius, despite his opposition, was robed in the red mantle and was proclaimed pope under the name of Victor III.[5]

[3] Hugh of Flavigny, *Chron.*, Bk. II. This Hugh of Lyons is none other than the former bishop of Die, papal legate, who became archbishop of Lyons.

[4] Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, I, 291.

[5] In the eleventh century the popes did not themselves choose a new name; they received it either from the prince or from the people, although sometimes it was agreed upon in advance. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 34 note 3.

But the painful negotiations were not yet ended. The new chief of the Normans, Roger son of Guiscard, had his candidate, a priest of Salerno, whom he favored. Displeased at seeing him set aside, he attacked the election of Victor III, which he declared had been tumultuous. The newly elected pontiff, under favor of this argument, put aside the insignia of the papacy and again fled to Monte Cassino. Then, using his authority as legate for Lower Italy, he convoked a council at Capua to procure the election of the pope. At this point the cardinals, recently unanimous, became divided in opinion. The antipope Guibert profited by this division and re-entered Rome. But Countess Matilda arrived with an army and drove out the intruder to the great joy of the population, which remained loyal for the most part to the side of Desiderius. Then the prefect of Rome, Prince Jourdain of Capua, and Duke Roger himself, yielding to the wishes of the people and clergy, were so insistent with Desiderius that they persuaded him to be consecrated on May 9, 1087. The interregnum had lasted about a year.

The new Pope belonged to a princely family of Benevento. Successively a monk in the hermitage of St. Agatha, then in the Abbey of St. Sophia in Benevento, and lastly in Monte Cassino, he was elected abbot of this last in 1058. The next year Pope Nicholas II made him a cardinal. He was entirely devoted to the greatness of his Abbey of Monte Cassino. There he built a rich library, an immense chapter hall, a grandiose basilica, and enriched it with statues, mosaics, and art objects of every sort. By the construction of defense works he was able effectively to protect his monastery against the pillages of the Normans, who were settled in southern Italy and were there carrying on repeated devastation.

The situation of the Church at the time when Victor III took possession of the Holy See was such as to give rise to serious anxiety. The relations with King Philip I of France

were of a friendly sort, and William the Conqueror of England, in spite of many encroachments upon the spiritual domain, gave the Holy See reliable evidence of attachment. In Italy, Pope Victor's taking possession of the papal throne was accomplished only through the intervention of the Norman arms. Germany was divided into two distinct camps: the region of the East, loyal to the Roman Church; that of the West, stubbornly attached to the side of Emperor Henry IV.

The new Pope in his policies strove to follow the glorious traditions of Gregory VII. But, during the four months that elapsed between the day of his consecration (May 8, 1087) and that of his death (September 16), he was continually sick. Thus he did not have time to leave his imprint on the work of reform.

If we accept the statements of the chronicler Peter the Deacon, Victor III in a council at Benevento (1087) formulated a vigorous program of government: to refuse any compromise with the antipope Guibert, to decline any agreement with Emperor Henry IV, and, all other persons and circumstances notwithstanding, to carry on the entire work of Gregory VII. But the chronicler's veracity in his account of this Council of Benevento has been questioned. It is inserted in a context containing several manifestly legendary accounts. However, that the council was held seems beyond doubt. Other annalists, including the editor of the *Annales Beneventini,* mention it explicitly.

The latest biographer of Victor III writes as follows:

> Any judgment about this pope would be rash. According to certain historians he broke away from the directions of his predecessor. Whereas Gregory VII strove to impose the domination of the Holy See upon the world, Victor retreated a step and was modestly satisfied to condemn lay investiture. Other historians consider that he clearly expressed his purpose to continue the work of Gregory VII, while bringing to the work a different temperament and employing diplo-

macy rather than spiritual or temporal arms. In short, Victor III is a rather inconspicuous personage, a dim figure between Gregory VII and Urban II. His coming to power nearly proved fatal to the Church by provoking an internal crisis that was very serious; owing to the spirit of discipline, manifested by real "Gregorians," such as Hugh of Lyons and Odo of Ostia, not only was every danger removed, but the unity of the Church was magnificently affirmed and the work of Gregory remained intact.[6]

Trusting in the ideas of Gregory VII, Pope Victor, amid the attacks upon his power and his person, could not forget the Mussulman peril. Says the chronicler of Monte Cassino: "This truly apostolic man burned with the desire to break the power of the Saracens of Africa. After consulting the bishops and cardinals, he gathered an army made up of almost all the Christian peoples of Italy. These warriors received from his hand the standard of St. Peter. The Pontiff granted them absolution from all their sins and sent them to fight the Saracens on the African coast. Under the auspices of God, their fleet reached the infidel coast. The capital of the country was taken by assault after a fight in which two thousand Saracens met their death. The divine intervention in the Christians' victory was so manifest that the news of it miraculously reached Italy the very evening of that glorious day." [7]

But Victor III was no longer of this world. During the Council of Benevento he was stricken with a fatal fever. Three days before the close of the council he withdrew to the monastery of Monte Cassino. There he died on September 16, 1087, after receiving from the cardinals gathered about him a promise to choose Odo of Ostia as pope, in conformity with the admonition of Gregory VII.[8] In 1727 Pope Benedict XIII authorized the celebration of the feast of Victor III in the

[6] Augustin Fliche, "Le pontificat de Victor III" in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* July-October, 1924, p. 411.

[7] Peter the Deacon, *Chronicon Casinense,* III, 71; *PL,* CLXXIII, 808.

[8] *Ibid.,* III, 73; *PL,* CLXXIII, 811.

monastery of Monte Cassino and in a few other specified places. The Church honors him with the title of Blessed.[9]

Election of Pope Urban II

Like Gregory VII and Victor III, Odo of Ostia was a monk. He belonged to the Order of Cluny, where the preceding popes had gone to find their best inspirations of reform and where they had found their most devoted auxiliaries.

Of the French race, Odo was born about 1042 at Châtillon-sur-Marne in the territory of Reims, of a knightly father.[10] He made his first studies at Reims under the direction of St. Bruno. While still a young man he became a canon, then archdeacon of the Church of Reims. Soon, after the example of his teacher Bruno, he bade farewell to the world to lead the life of a humble and austere monk in the Cluny monastery, then in the monastery at La Cava. In 1078 Pope Gregory VII, who was much given to entrusting Churches to monks trained at Cluny, appointed him bishop of the diocese of Ostia, recently made illustrious by St. Peter Damian. Thereafter he was one of the most intimate advisers of the great pontiff.[11]

The physical contrast between Hildebrand and Odo of Ostia was striking. Odo was tall and spoke with a strong voice; these two traits were lacking in Gregory VII. Their characters also presented some differences: that of Odo was less stern, containing an element of greater gentleness and friendliness, which at once captivated those who came near him. But Gregory's ideas and those of Odo about the government of the Church were identical. At a later date Odo declared: "Resolved to walk in the footsteps of our blessed father, Pope Gregory, I reject whatever he rejected, I condemn whatever

[9] *Acta sanctorum,* September 16.

[10] Paulot, *Urbain II,* pp. 2 f.

[11] His enemy Benno charged him with having been the lackey of Hildebrand (*M. G., SS.,* II, 375).

he condemned, I love whatever he loved, and in all things I associate myself with his thoughts and acts." [12]

The Chronicle of Monte Cassino gives us the following account of Odo's election to the supreme pontificate. On March 9, 1088, the cardinals and the Roman bishops together with forty other bishops or abbots met at Terracina in Campania in the church of the Prince of the Apostles. The Bishop of Tusculum, rising in the midst of the gathering, recalled in order all that Pope Gregory, and after him Pope Victor, had decreed regarding papal elections. The assembly then decided that the three days following would be devoted to fasting, to prayer, and to almsgiving, so that almighty God might deign to enlighten the assembly. The next Sunday the three cardinals of Tusculum, Porto, and Albano ascended the pulpit and, amid general silence, unanimously declared that they were agreed upon choosing Bishop Odo for the supreme pontificate. All then exclaimed, with wonderful accord, that Bishop Odo was worthy to occupy the Apostolic See.[13] The Bishop of Albano added that they wished to call him Urban, the second of that name. It was March 12, 1088.

Urban II is known especially as the promoter of the First Crusade. In fact, the Crusade was the most characteristic undertaking of his pontificate. But his work may be considered from a more general viewpoint. It supplemented that of Gregory VII and prepared for that of Innocent III. Between Gregory VII, who strove for the freedom of Christendom, and Innocent III, who organized it, Urban II labored to establish its firm unity. This unity was effected mainly through the Crusade. By the Crusade the feudal regime of a Europe parceled into small fragments, before becoming a cause of anarchy, found its cohesion under the inspiration of a com-

[12] Letter of March 13, 1088, to the bishops of Germany; *PL*, CLI, 283.

[13] *Repente mirabili ac summa concordia omnes magna voce hoc sibi placere . . . conclamant* (*Chron. Mont. Cas.*, IV, 2; *PL*, CLXXIII, 825).

mon thought; and provinces and nations formerly hostile to one another, at the voice of the Roman pontiff rallied to the same standard.

But this enterprise could be realized only after the strengthening of the work of liberation begun by Gregory VII. An audacious antipope still threatened the Holy See; ambitious princes had not yet entirely given up their alleged rights of investiture; the ravages of simony and incontinence still prevailed in the ranks of the clergy. These three evils were the first to appeal to the solicitude of Urban II before he aroused Christendom against the infidels for the conquest of the tomb of Christ.

Antipope Guibert

Of all the men whom the popes have seen rise up against them to dispute their lawful authority, none equaled the antipope Guibert in activity and tenacity and boldness. Twice driven out of Rome, with the faithful people applauding his expulsion, he returned in 1089 to defy the new Pope and, with the cooperation of a few bishops who joined his side, in the month of June held a pseudo-council which excommunicated Urban II, relieved Henry IV of the sentence of anathema issued against him, and also condemned the simony and misconduct of the clergy.[14] At the same time the followers of the intruder indulged in every violence. Bonizo, bishop of Piacenza (formerly bishop of Sutri), was imprisoned by the schismatics. His eyes were plucked out, and he was massacred after countless tortures.[15]

Similar outrages occurred in Germany. Burchard, bishop of Halberstadt, surprised at Goslar where he had been ne-

[14] In disagreement with some authors and in accord with Jaffé (*Regesta,* no. 5328) and Hefele (Hefele-Leclercq, V, 346), we place this synod in 1089, for it has all the marks of a reply to the letter written by Urban II on April 18 of that year.

[15] Ughelli, *Italia sacra,* II, 211.

gotiating with the imperialists, was attacked with stones and spears; a few days later he died at Ilsemburg Abbey in consequence of his wounds, while singing a hymn to the Prince of the Apostles.[16] His death, soon followed by the deaths of Wigold of Augsburg and Gebhard of Salzburg, left in Germany not more than four bishops on whose loyalty the Holy See could rely: Hermann of Metz, Adalbero of Würzburg, Altmann of Passau, and Gebhard of Constance.

Law of Excommunication

Gebhard was the person on whom Urban, II chiefly depended for the religious restoration. Urban, when apostolic legate in the country, had consecrated Gebhard; and he appointed him apostolic legate for all Germany, Bavaria, Saxony, and the neighboring districts. The Pope's letter containing this appointment is dated April 18, 1089. It has special importance on account of the gravity of its decisions. In it the Pope first confirmed the sentence of excommunication which Gregory VII issued against the antipope Clement III, King Henry, and their abettors. The regulations which the letter set forth about the measures to be taken with regard to excommunicated persons have since then become law in this matter. In subsequent councils the Church did not seek any legal rules of higher authority. Ivo of Chartres and Gratian inserted them in their *Decreta.*[17] Berthold calls this letter a decretal; and Baronius calls it a synodal letter, because it was written in synod. Therein the Pope declares that he wrote it after consulting his brethren and maturely reflecting upon the question of excommunication. Thus we may judge the considerate prudence and the gentle firmness which Urban II manifested.

In those times of misfortune, when frenzy was in all minds, great prudence was needed so as not to weaken ecclesiastical discipline by a too great facility in receiving the "fallen," and, on the other hand, moderation was needed so as not to be excessive in punishing those

[16] *Annales saxonnes,* April 6, 1088.

[17] Ivo of Chartres, *Decret.,* VI, 406; XIV, 15; Gratian, *Decret.,* causa IX, q.1, c.4; causa IX, q.3, c.110.

who might have been weak or thoughtless rather than perverse. We can understand that thoughtlessness or weakness was possible when the members of Guibert's party made use of money and seduction to enlist followers, to such an extent that social relations became extremely difficult on account of the unfortunate increase of censures. And so the wise Pontiff decided to classify different sorts of excommunicated persons: the stubborn and the timid. To each category he assigned different penances. Thus he says that "those who communicate with the anathematized, we do not excommunicate, but, since they have contracted a stain by their conduct, we cannot receive them into our Christian society without penance and absolution. The holy canons carry anathema against those who have relations with the excommunicated. Wishing, however, to moderate the forms of penance and of absolution, we decide that whoever through ignorance or fear or necessity may have had contact or commerce with the excommunicated, or who may contract a stain through the effect of their prayers or of their marks of affection, may recover the favors of the society of the faithful with a lesser penance and absolution. But in the case of those who fall freely or through grave negligence, we will that the disciplinary measures be applied to them in full rigor, so as to inspire a salutary fear in others." [18]

Furthermore, Urban II declares that, in thus determining various degrees of penance, he is merely walking in the footsteps of Gregory VII, and that he confirms Pope Gregory's decisions about the way the excommunicated are to be treated; [19] but, with the divine assistance, he determines their spirit and practical application. Certainly, in the mind of Pope Urban II, this was a spirit of moderation.[20]

This spirit is manifest in the following letter, written to Archbishop William of Rouen: "To your fraternity we recommend that you employ mercy toward our sons, the bearers of this letter; when they have completed in exile a year of the penance

[18] Mansi, XX, 715.
[19] *Ibid.*
[20] Paulot, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 f.

that is imposed on them, send them back to their own country to complete what remains, adding some penance additional in compensation for the exile. The fact is that their wives, their children, even their widowed mothers, have great need of their support, as they have told me with tears." [21]

Third Orders

In the same spirit of prudent peace-making and apostolic zeal, Pope Urban II encouraged his tireless auxiliary in Germany, Gebhard of Constance, not to be satisfied with fulminating anathemas, but to labor to spread the Christian life among the faithful about him. At this period, about the Hirschau monastery where Gebhard had established his residence, a new and noteworthy form of religious life arose. Numerous laymen of every rank and of both sexes became affiliated with the monasteries, kept up continual relations with them, from them received spiritual directions for the organization of their life and of their good works. Says Bernold: "Without being either clerics or monks, these laymen at times equaled clerics and monks in merits and virtues." [22] This was the first outline of the organization which in the thirteenth century received its definite form in the third orders.

But this new way of life found unfriendly critics. Urban II without hesitation took up its defense. To the prelates of the monasteries he wrote as follows: "I am told that certain persons venture to attack the practice, existing among you, of admitting some of the simple faithful to monastic obedience. But with our own eyes we have observed the wonderful effects of this practice, and we judge it the more commendable as it renews the customs of the early Church, we approve it as

[21] *Collectio britannica, Epist. Urbani II* (manuscript; British Museum, ep. 43).
[22] Bernold, *Chronicon,* year 1091; *M. G., SS.,* Vol. V.

Catholic and holy, and we confirm it with all our Apostolic authority." [23] Under the auspices of the zealous Pontiff, the pious institution developed rapidly. Whole villages of Swabia placed themselves under the dependence of the monastic institutions, and a deep spirit of piety, austerity, and regularity penetrated the families and society.

The Schismatics

This movement exasperated the King of Germany. The monks had always been the best supporters of the papacy against the schism. This extension of their influence might bring about a fatal blow to the cause of Henry IV and of Guibert. The violence of the schismatics knew no bounds. A certain Luitprand, a priest of Milan, was put to death in almost the same manner as Bishop Bonizo. The schismatics, with a refinement of cruelty, cut off his nose and ears.[24] At Strasburg, Count Hugh of Egenthein was assassinated beside the bishop. Spiritual arms and measures of religious propaganda, anathemas and confraternities, were not enough to prevent and to repress such outrages. Only material force could be a barrier to these deeds of violence. Urban II recalled some words written by the martyr Bonizo shortly before his death: "No injustice is committed in using arms to fight armed bandits; no crime in striking down criminals." [25] The Pope turned to the Normans and the Tuscans.

The two Norman leaders were at that time the son of Guiscard, Roger, to whom Urban II had renewed the investiture of the duchies of Apulia and Calabria, and a brother of Guiscard, another Roger, who became count of Sicily.[26] The latter

[23] *Anal. bened.*, Vol. V, Bk. 68, no. 18.

[24] Paulot, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[25] Bonizo, *Ad amicum*, Bk. IX; *PL*, CL, 854–56. Cf. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, II, xxi.

[26] Chalandon, *op. cit.*, I, 296.

has remained a legendary hero in the chronicles, which depict him as "big and handsome, able in speech and terrible in war, brandishing his sword in battle like a scythe that mows down the green grass and driving back his enemies as a strong wind might do." [27]

Urban conferred with the two Norman princes several times in Apulia, at Bantino and at Troina in Sicily.[28] But the Norman army, then much engaged in separate conquests, was not ready at once to enter a campaign for the Pope's cause. All that Urban obtained from the Norman chiefs for the moment was a promise of devotion to the Holy See.

Countess Matilda

With more ardent zeal, in Tuscany the young widow of Duke Godfrey III, the valiant Countess Matilda, whom the chroniclers call the Italian Debbora and whom the Florentine painter Cimabue pictures with the features of a virgin attired as a warrior, carrying in one hand a pomegranate, symbol of purity, and with the other hand leading a spirited horse. But Matilda's power was indeed much reduced. Henry IV had confiscated her Lorraine possessions and paralyzed her forces in northern Italy by the strong positions he held there.

Meanwhile Welf (or Guelph) IV, duke of Bavaria, a prince sincerely devoted to the defense of the Church, set before Pope Urban the project of an alliance destined to strengthen the bonds uniting the champions of the Holy See. He proposed to unite in marriage his young son Guelph V with Countess Matilda. The difference in age between the prince (then only eighteen years old) and the widow of Godfrey (who was over forty years of age) was the sole obstacle to the projected

[27] Malaterra, *Roberti Viscardi et Rogerii ejus fratris . . . res gestae,* Bk. I, chap. 4.

[28] Chalandon, *loc. cit.*

union. The Pope, knowing the Countess' loftiness of mind and purity of feelings, advised her to consent to the marriage, which was to remain merely nominal, but which, from the viewpoint of the organization of the Catholic forces, offered the immense advantage of confederating Bavaria and Tuscany, that is, South Germany and Upper Italy. In this way the encroachments by the German rulers would be opposed by an almost invincible rampart. Perhaps the Pope had a presentiment of the great historic part that would be played by the party of the Guelphs in favor of the papacy.[29]

The projected marriage took place. But we must at once say that this first intervention of the Guelphs in papal policy did not obtain the happy results that were hoped for. The young Guelph V, when he learned that the Countess, by a will (dated 1077) had disposed of her possessions in favor of the Roman Church, and that he thus did not obtain the material advantages which he expected from the union, abandoned his wife. King Henry was exasperated by this marriage. And Pope Urban, deprived of the succor on which he counted, found himself opposed by foes more enraged than ever.

Emperor Henry IV

At the time of Countess Matilda's marriage to the Duke of Bavaria (1089), the antipope Guibert had been driven from Rome,[30] and King Henry, discouraged, was on the point of abandoning the cause of his protégé.[31] But the schismatic party made him reject this plan. In the spring of 1090, attaching the ducal house of Carinthia and Istria [32] to himself by favors, he invaded Italy, laid waste the states of Matilda,

[29] Muratori, *Annali d'Italia,* year 1089, VI, 252.
[30] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 347.
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *M. G., SS.,* V, 450.

besieged Mantua, gained possession of it through a betrayal, re-established Guibert in Rome,[33] and appointed a large number of intruding bishops. Urban II was obliged to flee from the Eternal City. Countess Matilda, yielding to the outcries of her crushed subjects and of her decimated troops, entered into parleys with Henry IV and finally decided to recognize the authority of the Emperor on the one condition that he would abandon the cause of Guibert. But she did not, in fact, carry out this project and did not have occasion to resume it, because soon fortune turned in her favor.

King Henry had a son, Conrad, who had been crowned King of the Romans at Aachen (May 30, 1087) and whom he destined for the government of Italy. Conrad at the time was a young man twenty years old. The Saxon annalist describes him as gentle, full of pity for the afflicted, and fond of things of the mind, yet gifted with a strong will, capable of initiative and daring, and especially attached to the Catholic religion and devoted to the Holy See. Henry hoped that the fine qualities of the young prince and the merited popularity which he enjoyed would win good will for him in Italy. But the King failed to reckon with his son's upright character and purity of conscience. The vile and scandalous doings which the latter witnessed at the court and even in his father's family circle, were revolting to him.[34] He fled from the court. As the King endeavored to have him seized, he sought refuge with Countess Matilda. Shortly afterward Anselm, archbishop of Milan, crowned him at Monza as king of Italy. Thereafter Henry's foes had a leader around whom they could gather.[35]

About the close of that year (1093) Queen Praxedes of

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 451–53.

[34] On these countless scandals, see the evidence cited by Baronius, *Annales* (Theiner ed.), XVII, 606. Cf. *M. G., SS.*, II, 330. Henry is said even to have ordered the young prince to outrage his mother-in-law (Paulot, *Urbain II*, p. 107).

[35] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 382.

Germany, a Russian princess [36] whom Henry IV married (his second marriage) in the summer of 1089 and whom he thereafter mistreated, escaped from imprisonment at Verona where her husband was keeping her confined and sought refuge with Countess Matilda. During Holy Week, 1094, she went to the council which Gebhard of Constance held in his episcopal city, as a papal envoy, and there made complaint of the ill treatment she had received from her husband. In this way she contributed notably to the stirring of men's minds against the King.[37]

These events gave the Catholic party fresh enthusiasm. Milan, Cremona, Lodi, and Piacenza formed a league that lasted twenty years. The troops loyal to the Pope occupied the gorges of the Alps for the purpose of preventing the passage of the imperial armies that would be sent from Germany as reinforcements to those of Lombardy. Again Countess Matilda mounted her horse and, as one chronicler says, "she, a mere woman, led to battle masses of men of iron." [38]

The Emperor,[39] in desperate straits, withdrew to a fortress, lived there a while in hiding, and very nearly committed suicide there. But the deed was prevented in time.[40] The hour was most critical for him. His enemies' enthusiasm had risen to a frenzy. Very likely this was the time when Pope Urban intervened to moderate the eagerness of the soldiers, by a re-

[36] The Germans changed her foreign name Eupraxia or Praxedes, and called her Adelaide. Cf. Donizo, in *M. G., SS.,* XII, 394; Bernold, *M. G., SS.,* V, 457. On the shameful treatment which the queen declared she had received, see *M. G., SS.,* VII, 458; XVII, 14; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 383 note 1.

[37] Mansi, XX, 795.

[38] *Ferrata virorum agmina in bellum agebat femina,* William of Malmesbury, Vol. III.

[39] Henry took the title of emperor after he had been consecrated by Guibert.

[40] Bonizo, year 1093, *M. G., SS.,* V, 456. The choniclers who report this attempted suicide speak of it with horror. Suicide was a crime almost unheard of in the Middle Ages. Says Hurter: "In 1206, in the little town of Stein, a man, disgusted with life, committed suicide. This instance is perhaps the only suicide in all Europe in the course of a century" (Frederick Hurter, *Würdigung des Mittelalters und der Kirche*).

script which Ivo of Chartres and Gratian insert in their *Decreta.* In this the Pope says that although in a just war, as this one was, men who slay their enemies are not to be considered murderers, still a suitable penance should be imposed because of the possible perversity of their intentions.[41]

About the end of 1093, the Pope decided that the hour had come for him to take possession of Rome again. On Christmas Day of that year, accompanied by Ivo of Chartres,[42] he made his peaceful entry without having need to resort to arms and without this return being an occasion for any reprisals against his enemies. But the latter, still numerous in Rome, did not disarm. To escape from their plots, Urban had to withdraw to the house of the Frangipani. This family, like that of the Crescentii, had become a real power. Installed on the Palatine, it had, by transforming several ancient monuments into feudal towers, established a vast fortified enclosure which, besides the Palatine, included the Coliseum, the Via Sacra, the arches of Constantine and Titus, and the Circus Maximus. Guibert's followers could not hope to dislodge the Pope from this strong position; nor could they hope to bring back to Rome the antipope, who had fled to Henry IV.

The situation of the two parties was apparently at an impasse. The greed of the Guibertists found a solution. A few days before Easter, 1094, the captain to whom Guibert had entrusted the guarding of the Lateran palace and basilica offered to give them up to the Pope in return for a sum of ready money. But the Holy See was impoverished. Urban appealed to France, the perennial treasurer of the papacy.[43] The aid came to him from several collections ordered by the French

[41] A council held at Reims in 924 (Mansi, XVIII, 346) imposed a penance on those who had taken part in the battle of Soissons, between King Charles and his opponent King Robert, for the reason that civil wars can hardly be fought solely for the public welfare. On this question, see Isidore of Pelusium, *Collationes,* Bk. IV, ep. 200.

[42] Ivo of Chartres, *Epist., 27;* Bernold, *Chronicon, M. G., SS.,* V, 457.

[43] *Recueil des historiens de la France,* XIV, 697.

bishops,[44] especially from the celebrated Abbot Godfrey of Vendôme, who had already crossed the Alps a dozen times and had been three times imprisoned for the cause of the Roman Church,[45] and who, upon learning of the Holy Father's plight, sent him twelve thousand gold sous, that is, the value of a hundred silver marks.[46] In May, 1094, Urban II was at length able again to take possession of the Lateran, which had not seen a legitimate pontiff within its walls since the day when Gregory VII was driven from it by Henry IV with the money of the Byzantines.

A fresh calamity, the plague, which raged through nearly all Europe in the year 1094, contributed not a little in leading souls back to God and in bringing princes to peace. This scourge was particularly severe in Germany. In the single city of Ratisbon 8,500 victims of the plague died in the space of three months. According to the chronicles, in one town 1,100 men perished in six weeks; in another, 40 men in a single day. The biographer of Urban II says:

This bodily calamity was the source of a great good for souls. Those who contracted the disease saw death so close that they could scarcely fail to prepare for it in earnest. The survivors were so impressed by the sight of this scourge, which left them standing in the midst of so many victims, that of their own accord they completely renounced sin. Conversions abounded. Most of the schismatics returned from their straying. Urban II had given, particularly to the canons of Marbach, who had just been founded by Manegold of Lautenbach, the faculty to receive those who had gone astray back into the communion of the Church. People came in throngs to Marbach to receive absolution. Then a new breath of Christian life passed

[44] Ruinart, *Vita Urbani II*, no. 138; *PL*, CLI, 115.

[45] See Métais, *Urbain II et Geoffroy Ier;* L. Compain, "Etudes sur Geoffroy de Vendôme" in the *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes*, 1891, Vol. LXXXVI.

[46] The mark, as a weight of gold and silver, was introduced into France by Philip I. The mark was reckoned at one-half a livre, and was divided into eight ounces, or sixty-four gros, 192 scruples, 4,608 grains. Cf. Chéruel, art. "Marc" in *Dict. des instit. de la France.*

over those indifferent or perverted districts, abbeys increased in number, and unworthy clerics, whose sacrilegious ministry had been refused, were more than ever placed under the ban of society.[47]

King Philip's Divorce

The period of calm which began in 1094 enabled the Pope to engage more actively in the reform of the Church in the various nations. He had never been diverted from it by the weighty concerns that came to him from Germany. France, England, Spain, and Sicily had been the object of much of his preoccupations.

Naturally a large part of Urban's affectionate attention was given to the eldest daughter of the Church. France was also his fatherland. But the king of France, Philip I, afflicted his heart by a double scandal. Not only did he oppose ecclesiastical reform in his government; he gave an example of misconduct in his private life. We have already seen King Philip, backed by part of the French episcopate, trying to repel the reform which Gregory VII preached and ordered. His opposition was more emphatic under Urban II. "The King of France found many advantages in the practice of simony, and he also understood that the triumph of the reform ideas would fatally lessen the royal power over the Church domains. . . . Deriving his chief source of revenue from the bishoprics and abbeys of his realm, living on his clergy much more than on his lay vassals, he was unwilling to favor a change that would have impoverished him." [48] His opposition became especially violent when the Pope, not satisfied with opposing the alleged interests of the kingdom, condemned the scandals of his domestic life.

From the pen of the chronicler Orderic Vitalis we have the following account. "In 1092 France was the scene of a

[47] Paulot, *Urbain II*, p. 119.

[48] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 172.

scandalous event which greatly disturbed the kingdom. The countess of Anjou, Bertrade de Montfort, fearing to see herself treated by her husband as he had treated, before her, two other women whom he had married, and to be repudiated as a vile courtesan; also persuaded that she possessed enough beauty to please King Philip and enough nobility to be queen, sent him a message and disclosed the passion that she had in her heart. She said that she preferred to abandon her husband so as to marry another, than to be shamefully cast off. The King was not insensible to this declaration of a voluptuous woman. He consented to the crime and received Bertrade with great cordiality as soon as she arrived in France. He repudiated his own wife Bertha, the daughter of Florent, count of Holland, a noble and virtuous queen who had born to him Louis and Constance." [49]

The sound portion of the French clergy, still very numerous, was indignant. Hugh of Flavigny exclaimed: "Let no one be angry at me if I dare to censure bitterly the conduct of the prince, without consideration for the name and the majesty of the throne. If we should be prevented from writing, all of France would raise its voice, and the whole West could not remain ignorant of Philip's crime." To give the affair an apparent legality, the King tried to win the great canonist Ivo of Chartres to his cause. He alleged a pretext of relationship, pretended to have on his side the Pope's approval and that of several bishops, and invited Ivo to come to Paris for the solemnization of the marriage. Ivo replied that he was not aware of the authorization by the bishops and by the Pope, and declared that he would attend the marriage only if the causes of the divorce were canonically established in a regular council. He said further: "I should prefer being cast into the water with a millstone about my neck rather than be a stumbling-

[49] Orderic Vitalis, *Hist. eccles.*, Part III, Bk. 8, no. 19; *PL*, CLXXXVIII, 616.

block for the weak." [50] At the same time the Bishop of Chartres sent to all the invited bishops a copy of his letter addressed to the King. To these bishops he said: "I beg you not to remain like mute dogs who have not the courage to bark," but be "like watchful sentries and blow the trumpet." [51] To the Archbishop of Reims, who had the exclusive right to bless the royal marriage, he wrote: "I rely on your sense of religious duty that, in so perilous a question, you will neither say nor do anything that is not based on authority and reason." [52]

In these circumstances the Pope as always gave evidence of a fatherly and patient firmness. Says Orderic Vitalis: "The pious Pontiff sent apostolic legates to France and, by his letters and the voice of the priests, he admonished, implored, and reproved this wayward King, who had repudiated his lawful wife to contract with another an adulterous union contrary to the divine law." [53] "I have seen letters," said Ivo of Chartres, "which the lord Pope Urban sent to the archbishops and bishops of the realm, asking them to bring the King to sound reason or, should he refuse, to constrain him to amend his ways by the threat of ecclesiastical censures." [54]

The King disregarded all this. Since the Archbishop of Reims refused to bless the marriage, the King had the Bishop of Senlis do so. And he had Ivo of Chartres arrested. But the Pope wrote to Archbishop Raynald of Reims blaming him for letting his suffragan, the Bishop of Senlis, obey the whims of the King and asking the Archbishop to see to it that the Bishop of Chartres be set at liberty. Said the Pope: "Be insistent with the King for the liberation of your brother bishop of Chartres. If the one who holds him captive does not listen

[50] Ivo of Chartres, *Epist.*, 15; *PL*, CLXII, 27.
[51] *Ibid.*, 14; *PL, loc. cit.*
[52] *Ibid.*, 5; *PL, ibid.*, col. 15.
[53] Orderic Vitalis, *loc. cit.*
[54] Ivo of Chartres, *Epist.*, 23; *PL*, CLXII, 35.

to you, excommunicate him and issue an interdict upon his castles and his lands." [55]

By way of reply, the King assembled at Reims a synod of three archbishops and eight bishops, whom he had succeeded in drawing into his party by heaping honors on them. "This council opened September 18, 1094. Were the fathers attending it in favor of the royal divorce? We cannot hold that they were, since the documents are lacking. All we can say is that they employed great moderation. But the Council of Autun, a month later, took up the matter." [56]

The Council of Autun met October 25, 1094, with Hugh of Lyons presiding. At the request of Ivo of Chartres, Bishop Hugh was appointed papal legate for France. The former Bishop of Die, who in earlier times had been so earnest in the defense of the rights of the Holy See, had, under Victor III, manifested a momentary lack of loyalty; [57] for this reason he was set aside and had no hand in affairs. But now Ivo of Chartres was at his side to stimulate his zeal. He wrote to him: "Do not be one of those timorous physicians who like their tranquility more than the saving of the sick. . . . Even though Herodias should dance before Herod, should ask for John's head, and should obtain it from the detestable King, John's duty is to cry out: *Non licet.*" [58] Hugh did not remain deaf to this advice. In the presence of thirty-two bishops and several personages of high rank assembled,[59] he repeated the anathema against Henry IV and Guibert and pronounced the excommunication against the King of France, who was guilty of a second marriage while his first wife was still living.[60]

Gaul was greatly stirred. At the close of the eleventh cen-

[55] Mansi, XX, 686; Jaffé, no. 5469.

[56] Paulot, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

[57] On this incident, see Hefele-Leclercq, V, 333, and Paulot, p. 55.

[58] Ivo of Chartres, *Epist.*, 24; *PL*, CLXII, 35.

[59] Autun, belonging to the duchy of Burgundy, was outside Philip's domination. The choice of this city assured greater freedom for the members of the synod.

[60] Mansi, XX, 799; Suppl., II, 131.

tury the force of excommunication had not received the precise meaning which it acquired in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, quite distinct from suspension and interdict. When it was pronounced in a very formal manner, in a weighty matter, and without restriction, it stripped the excommunicated person of every office, even temporal, released his subjects from all obligations of obedience and of allegiance to him, until such time as he satisfied the Church by receiving absolution.[61]

Thenceforth, wherever the King of France passed, the public offices of the Church were immediately interrupted; in the steeples and towers of churches and monasteries the bells ceased ringing. At his approach the choirs of monks became silent. A deathly silence accompanied him everywhere. The joyous ringing of the church bells and the church singing were resumed only as he left a city or an abbey or even a castle. William of Malmesbury relates that one evening, as King Philip was leaving a city in company with Bertrade and as the church bells were starting to ring merrily, he turned to her and said: "Bertrade, do you hear how these people are driving us out?" [62]

From the day when the anathema was imposed on him, Philip no longer wore the insignia of royalty. "For almost fifteen years," [63] says Orderic Vitalis, "King Philip never wore the crown, did not put on the royal purple, and did take part in any festival as sovereign." [64] However, he was allowed to keep a chaplain in his residence and there to hear mass,

[61] Gosselin, *Pouvoir du pape au Moyen Age,* p. 416. Cf. Gratian, *Decretum,* Part II, causa 15, q.6, can. 4 and 5; *Decretal.,* Bk. V, tit. 37, cap. *Gravem,* 13. Gregory VII had mollified this penalty by permitting at first the wife, children, and domestic servants to communicate with him, then by extending this permission to all those whose presence was not calculated to keep the excommunicated person in his evil dispositions. Cf. Labbe, *Concilia,* X, 371.

[62] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta reg. angl.,* Bk. V, no. 404; *PL,* CLXXIX, 1360.

[63] Exactly twelve years.

[64] Orderic Vitalis, Bk. VIII, year 1092; *PL,* CLXXXVIII, 617.

without any solemnity, along with his family.[65] Urban II also showed that he was inclined to indulgence, informed the King that the settlement of the affair was to be referred to a council that would soon meet at Piacenza.[66] Then at Piacenza he granted the King a further delay.[67] But the King of France and his adulterous partner showed themselves deaf to these advances, as also to the anathemas that were repeated against them by the Council of Clermont in 1095 and the Council of Tours in 1096. Philip I and Bertrade did not submit to the laws of the Church until December 2, 1104, in the presence of a legate of Pope Pascal II.

King William Rufus of England

Urban II had no occasion to fulminate excommunication against the King of England as he had done against the kings of Germany and France. But the opposition which he encountered from the ruler of Great Britain was very painful to his fatherly heart.

The chronicler Orderic Vitalis relates that William the Conqueror on his deathbed, when thinking over the deeds of violence and injustice he had been guilty of, implored the Blessed Virgin to obtain mercy for him in memory of the many monastic foundations he had made on both sides of the Channel.[68] His successor, William Rufus, showed less regard for the rights of the Church and of the Holy See. But a monk, who came from one of the monasteries favored by his father, displayed invincible resistance to him.

William the Conqueror, while inflexibly maintaining the alleged rights of the crown over the Church and while practicing investiture, cooperated more than many others did with

[65] *Ibid.*
[66] Paulot, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
[67] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 388.
[68] Orderic Vitalis, Part III, Bk. VII, no. 12; *PL*, CLXXXVIII, 548.

Pope Gregory's plans of reform. He insisted upon observance of clerical celibacy, forbade simony, and habitually followed the advice of the venerable Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury. William Rufus sought to remain noncommittal between Urban II and the antipope Guibert; and he shamelessly revived simony and all the consequent abuses. He took counsel of an unworthy prelate, Rannulf Flambard, a lackey who had become bishop of Durham and who owed his surname to the brutality of his extortions. Anselm calls this courtier the chief and basest of the publicans.[69] William Rufus, because of Lanfranc's influence over him, at the outset of his reign restrained his passions to some extent. But the death of the pious Archbishop in 1089 soon gave free rein to the King's tyranny. David Hume says:

> All orders of men found reason to complain of an arbitrary and illegal administration. Even the privileges of the Church, held sacred in those days, were a feeble rampart against his usurpations. He seized the temporalities of all the vacant bishoprics and abbeys; he delayed the appointment of successors to those dignities, that he might the longer enjoy the profits of their revenue; he bestowed some of the Church lands in property on his captains and favorites; and he openly set at sale such sees and abbeys as he thought proper to dispose of.[70]

St. Anselm

Among the vacant sees was that of Canterbury. For almost four years the King prolonged the vacancy, thus subjecting the primatial Church of England to every kind of exaction and disorder. Ecclesiastical offices were put up for public sale, in more than thirty parishes the cemeteries were turned into

[69] St. Anselm, *Epist.*, IV, 2.

[70] David Hume, *History of England,* year 1089 (1886 ed., I, 239), according to Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury, and the Saxon chronicle.

game preserves. The popular voice designated, as Lanfranc's successor, Abbot Anselm of Bec in Normandy.

Anselm was born in 1033 in the city of Aosta in Italy, of a noble and wealthy family. While very young he showed a fondness for study and for literary glory and went to the Abbey of Bec, attracted by the fame of Lanfranc, whose choicest pupil he soon became. Love of study led him to love for solitude and for the monastic observances. When twenty-seven years old (1060), he became a monk in Bec Abbey. Eighteen years later his brethren at Bec unanimously, in spite of his earnest resistance, elected him their abbot. Anselm was then forty-five years old. He had shown himself, in his cloistered life, an exemplary religious; in his work of education, a most prudent teacher; in two books written by him, a profound philosopher. As a great director of souls, he knew how to adapt himself to all ages and to be all things to all men. He extended afar the fame of the monastery already made illustrious by Lanfranc. The Norman knights, says Anselm's biographer,[71] regarded him as the firstborn among them, and the nobles of England entrusted the education of their sons to him, vying with one another in expressing their veneration of him and their strong friendship for him.

In March, 1093, while Anselm was in England, where he had gone at the request of a high nobleman of the country to found an abbey at Chester, King William fell grievously ill. The prelates and barons of the realm, gathered about the bed of the dying King, persuaded him to summon Anselm and receive from him some final counsel. The holy Abbot demanded and obtained from the dying King three things: a full confession, a solemn promise that he would amend his private life, and a promise that without delay he would carry out the measures of restoration which the bishops requested for the

[71] Eadmer, *Vita S. Anselmi.* This life of St. Anselm by his secretary and most intimate confidant, is eminently reliable. The text may be found in *PL,* CLVIII, 49–120.

good order of the Churches of England. The King's entourage did not content themselves with that. All the honest people present lamented that the primatial Church was without a bishop. The King replied that he wished to end this situation. Although he had previously sworn that the Abbot of Bec would never govern a Church of the kingdom, William pronounced the name of Anselm. This declaration met with unanimous acclaim. Anselm alone was pale with fright and protested with all his might. Then a crosier was brought in and was carried to the side of the bed where the King was lying. Anselm was forced to receive it from the King's hands. The humble monk finally gave in. But he bewailed it. In fact, he continued to bewail it throughout his life. "Do you know what you have done?" he said to his fellow bishops; "you have wished to put under the same yoke a wild bull and a poor lamb. . . . And what will happen? The mad bull will drag the lamb through thorns and thickets and will tear it to pieces." [72] By these words Anselm was alluding to the collaboration, which he judged would be full of difficulties, of the king of England with the primate of Canterbury.[73]

The consecration of the new Archbishop took place on December 4, 1093. The difficulties arose very promptly. Eight days after his consecration, Anselm was summoned to court. A practice had come into use, that the bishops, after their appointment, should make an offering to the king. The new prelate, conforming to this usage, but not wishing to give a present of such sort that he would seem to be paying for the investiture, offered the King 500 pounds. This gift was considered insufficient and was refused. "Keep your money and your lessons," the King said to him in anger. "Anselm arose and went out, saying to himself that perhaps a warning from heaven was to be seen in the fact that on the day when he took

[72] St. Anselm, *Epist.*, III, 1.

[73] On St. Anselm, see Raget, *Hist. de saint Anselme.*

possession of his see the Gospel of the mass contained these words: 'No one can serve two masters.' " [74] Shortly afterward Anselm asked permission to go to Rome to receive the pallium from the Roman pontiff. "What pontiff do you mean?" said the King. The Archbishop answered: "Pope Urban II." At this the King went into a rage, saying that he had not yet recognized Urban as pope and that neither he nor his father was accustomed to let anyone pronounce the name of the pope without his consent. Then he exclaimed: "Be assured that never will you be able to reconcile the obedience you owe me with the obedience you wish to render to the pope against my wishes." To this the Archbishop replied: "Prince, if you wish, convoke an assembly of the bishops and the great ones of the kingdom to decide this question; but know that if this assembly should decide that I cannot reconcile these two obediences you speak of, I would prefer to exile myself from your realm rather than renounce, even for an hour, the obedience I owe to the successor of St. Peter." [75]

The King thought he had only one means for overcoming the fearlessness of Anselm: it was to gather an assembly where no one would dare contradict him and where he would dictate the decisions. Therefore he convoked the prelates and nobles of his kingdom to Rockingham Castle on March 11, 1095. The King's hopes were partly realized. The majority of the bishops, guided by a too human prudence, abandoned Anselm and advised him to obey the King. The Archbishop replied that he would always obey his sovereign in civil matters, but that he would never forget the Master's words: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's." The bishops then advised that the King should take the crosier and the ring from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Most of these bishops owed their elevation to the

[74] Eadmer, *Hist. nov.*, Bk. I.
[75] Raget, *op. cit.*, II, 62.

royal favor. The lay nobility, more independent, showed themselves less submissive and declined to join in this advice. Public opinion was of the same mind. The King judged that delay would be more prudent. The noble resistance of one man had awakened the Catholic conscience of the nation, made the sovereign give way, and prevented a schism that was ready to break out. One historian has rightly said that to Anselm's courageous attitude in this instance, England owed its last five centuries of Catholicity.[76]

In 1097 the King again began his persecutions. On the pretext that the Archbishop of Canterbury had supplied him with poor soldiers to fight against those of Wales, he threatened him with a trial before the High Court. Anselm declared his intention of going to Rome to consult the Pope and, despite the King's threats, went there at the beginning of April, 1098. From the Pope he received a most friendly welcome. His misfortunes, the brilliance of his learning and virtues, the renown of his courage, an expression of nobility and holiness that shone from his face, won him extraordinary veneration at Rome. He was called "the saint." According to his biographer, one day some men hired by the followers of the antipope to seize him were so overcome by his look that, mingling veneration with terror, they put down their arms and prostrated themselves at his feet, asking his blessing.[77]

The prudence and generosity of his character appeared particularly at the Council of Bari, which opened in October, 1098. At the Pope's request, Anselm attended it. After regulating several questions of doctrine and discipline, the fathers began speaking of the King of England. From the pen of an eyewitness we have the following details: "The Pope spoke, reproaching King William. Among other grievances, he mentioned the sale and oppression of the Churches and the insults

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[77] Eadmer, *op. cit.*, Bk. II.

to Anselm. Then he asked the bishops for their opinion. They replied: 'Without hesitation we judge that William, three times invited to submit and three times having refused to obey you, should be anathematized.' At these words Anselm, who had remained seated during the discussion, with lowered eyes, knelt before the Pontiff and by his entreaties succeeded in averting from the King the punishment which the fathers of the council unanimously demanded." [78] Was Anselm, in this move, prompted by a fear that excommunication, by exasperating the King, would provoke persecution and schism? Probably he was. At any rate he showed that vengeance had no place in his noble heart and perhaps, by his magnanimous patience, he again saved the Catholicity of England.

Moors in Spain

While the papacy was overcoming the attempts of schism in Germany, France, and England, in southern Europe it directed the reconquest of Spain and Sicily from the infidels. Ever since the Moorish invasion drove back the faithful Christians into the mountains of northern Spain,[79] the energetic leaders of this little group had persistently extended their possessions and covered their conquests with fortresses. Hence the name "Castile," given to the first of the states founded by them. The ruin of the Ommiads in 1031 opened a wider field of action to the Christians. Beside the Kingdom of Castile, appeared the Christians of Navarre and Aragon. Thereafter the offensive against the infidels took on new enthusiasm. It made gigantic strides under Alfonso VI, king of Castile and Leon, with the taking of Toledo in 1085. "This conquest gave him a solid foothold in the center of the Tage valley. The old capital of the Gothic kings, so well defended

[78] *Ibid.*, Bk. II; William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum Anglorum*, Bk. I.
[79] See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, III, 284.

by the strength of its location, became the bulwark of northern Spain beyond the formidable rampart of the Guadarrama. Behind this double intrenchment, the people of Castile and León, who previously were satisfied with driving off the Mussulmans and destroying the cities, could now think of reoccupying them. The taking of Toledo marked the beginning of the work of colonization of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries." [80]

It also opened the era of the reorganization of the Spanish Churches. The Arab invasion had brought about the destruction of a large number of religious edifices. However, in many places, treaties had assured the conservation of the temples, provided the promised tribute continued to be paid. At Toledo the churches had been left to the Christians, except the cathedral, which was converted into a mosque. Several bishops, including the Bishop of Toledo, regarded as untenable the situation in which they were placed by the invaders; they fled to the mountains, where their successors kept the titles of the dioceses that had fallen into the hands of the infidels. After the taking of Toledo, King Alfonso VI planned to re-establish that metropolis with all its ancient privileges. But the circumstances did not permit the proclamation and recognition of that primacy, according to the former custom, by the clergy and by the King; several of the suffragan bishops were still under the yoke of the Arabs; the others were scattered among various Christian states. Pope Urban II, when appealed to, promulgated (October 15, 1088) a bull in which, for the first time, the Holy See officially proclaimed the rights of the primacy of Toledo.[81] This act contributed largely to the reconstitution of the national unity of Spain.

The Mussulman emirs temporarily delayed the advance of the Spanish conquest. They summoned to their aid the Almora-

[80] Mariéjol in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. générale*, II, 675.
[81] Jaffé, no. 5370; *PL*, CLI, 290. Cf. *ibid.*, col. 388.

vides [82] of Morocco, and at Zallaca (October 24, 1086) inflicted upon the Spaniards a costly defeat, which was followed by several other Moorish victories. But, five years later, Alfonso VI repaired these disasters by resuming a vigorous offensive. In the course of this campaign a Spanish officer, Rodrigo Diaz of Bivar, by his prowess brought such glory to his country that legend made of him, under the name of the Cid [83] Campeador (champion),[84] the personification of the heroism of medieval Spain. Critical history has lessened the legendary figure of the Cid; it considers him merely a gang leader, brave, brutal, and bloody; [85] but the Cid of the national epics and of the popular songs, that type of loyal and unselfish knight, advancing from exploit to exploit, wonderfully well symbolizes and personifies the enthusiasm, the daring, and the prolonged efforts of the Spanish people in the work which they have proudly called their *reconquista,* their "reconquest."

The Christian "reconquest" of Sicily was the work of the Normans. It required thirty-two years of warfare, from 1060 to 1092, by the pious Count Roger, brother of Robert Guiscard. "This conquest of Mussulman Sicily by the Normans is one of the most moving pages in the history of the Middle Ages. It, too, is worthy to inspire a great poet. The struggle between two races and two religions, the stirring battles where Normans and Saracens fought hand to hand amid that tempest and those great sword thrusts, a heroine, a Norman woman, that Judith, wife of Count Roger, celebrated by the old heroic songs of Sicily, all that poetry loves to sing of, all that can

[82] From the Arabic *mrabatim* or *almrabatim* ("the devoted"), from which we have formed the word *almoravides.*

[83] "Cid," from the title which the Arab prisoners gave him (*Seid,* "lord").

[84] *Campeador* ("champion"), because he was always engaged in war or because one day he had, in the lists, defied the bravest of the enemy army.

[85] Mariéjol, *op. cit.,* pp. 679–81. Cf. H. Forneron, "Le Cid de l'histoire" in the *Correspondant,* CXXXIV (1884), 668 f.

inspire a masterpiece, is there gathered together; but the genius has not yet passed that way." [86]

The scope of this history does not call for a detailed account of that campaign.[87] We mention merely the great victory of the battle of Cerami, won by Roger in 1063, after which the Pope sent a blessed flag to the Normans, "that under the protection of St. Peter they might advance without fear against the Saracens"; [88] the occupation of Catania and Palermo in 1072; the taking of Trapani in 1077; the capitulation of Girgenti in 1086; and the fall of Noto in 1091.

Sicily

But the reconquest of Sicily in the name of Christendom was to be only the preliminary of the organization of the Churches. Says the chronicler Malaterra: "Roger pursued a double aim; one spiritual, the other temporal. He desired to bring back to the worship of the true God a land in the possession of idolators, and he planned to seize the possessions of the infidels, intending that then they were to be utilized for the divine worship." [89] In accomplishing his spiritual mission, Roger did nothing without the pope's detailed and continual advice. Under the direction of the Holy See he installed at Messina, Girgenti, Mazzara, Catania, and Syracuse carefully chosen bishops, some of whom were Norman monks. He built or restored several abbeys, the most famous being the Abbey of St. Bartholomew in the Lipari Islands. A kind of foundation which the Pope encouraged Roger to undertake in Sicily was that of abbot-bishops and abbey-bishoprics. Urban II decided that, in such and such localities, for instance

[86] Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII,* II, 239.
[87] See Chalandon, *op. cit.,* I, 189–211, 327–54.
[88] Malaterra, *Historia Sicula,* II, 33; *PL,* CXLIX, 1142.
[89] *PL,* Vol. CLXIX.

at Catania, the person who would be elected by the monks would have authority over the people as bishop; the same ruler would govern the monks according to the monastic institutions, and also the clergy and people according to the canon laws.[90] This reorganization, prudently carried out, produced excellent fruit. One of its most interesting results was the substitution of the Latin rite for the Greek rite among the Greek populations of southern Italy and thereby the restoration of connection with the Roman Church on the part of those populations that were following the disciplinary traditions of Constantinople.[91]

To strengthen these important reforms, Urban II confided to Bishop Robert of Troina the duties of papal legate in Sicily; but soon afterward, informed that this appointment was displeasing to Count Roger, he revoked it. According to Godfrey Malaterra, the Pope felt a strong liking for that frank Norman, who had so generously fought for the Church; "his life was of priceless value for Rome and for Italy." [92] With a view to testifying his gratitude to Count Roger for the eminent services rendered to the Holy See, Urban II sent him (July 5, 1098) the following bull, which later raised so many difficulties between Rome and the rulers of Sicily:

Fully trusting in the sincerity of your dispositions, we repeat to you in writing what we promised you orally; that, during the whole period of your life or that of any other who becomes your lawful heir, we will not place any legate of the Roman Church, contrary to your wishes and your good pleasure, in the lands subject to your rule. Furthermore, what we do by a legate, we wish that you maintain by your zeal, even when we send you a legate *a latere,* in the interest of your Churches and for the honor of the Holy See, to which you have been perfectly obedient and which you have courageously assisted in all its needs. If a council is held and if I order

[90] *Acta sanctorum,* February, I, 655.

[91] Rocco Pirro, *Sicula sacra.*

[92] Malaterra, cited by Baronius, *Annales.*

you to send to it bishops and abbots from your lands, you will send those whom you wish and will retain the others for the service and safeguarding of the Churches.[93]

Later on, claim was made that this bull gave unlimited spiritual jurisdiction to the kings of Sicily. In the sixteenth century at Salerno a tribunal was formed which, in the name of the "Monarchy of Sicily," arrogated to itself the twofold power, spiritual and temporal, claimed a right to judge ecclesiastical cases as a court of last resort, without any sort of appeal to the Holy See, and assumed the right to invalidate papal constitutions. Evidently the bull of Urban II could not have this import, for such a meaning would have tended to nothing less than the destruction of the unity of the Church. The Pope's words, if interpreted according to the circumstances and the well-known doctrine of Urban II and of the Church, in all likelihood were addressed only to Count Roger and his immediate successors, in so far as they should be animated by the same devotion as he had manifested to the cause of the Church. Their import could not be to legalize the intolerable abuses of the strange Sicilian tribunal of the sixteenth century.[94]

The First Crusade

In the mind of Urban II, the two expeditions of Spain and of Sicily against the Mussulmans were merely the preliminaries or first episodes of a vaster undertaking, to which posterity has rightly attached his name. This undertaking was the Crusade.

The idea of a mass movement of Europe against the peril

[93] Jaffé, no. 5706; Mansi, XX, 659.

[94] The subsequent strifes between the court of Sicily and the Holy See were numerous. They were especially sharp under Clement XI, Benedict XIII, and Benedict XIV. Not until the nineteenth century did they come to an end. The concordat of 1818 between Ferdinand I, king of the Two Sicilies, and Pope Pius VII contributed notably to the appeasement of the quarrels.

of Islam had engaged the mind of Sylvester II, Gregory VII, and Victor III. But this great design was not yet mature in the time of Pope Sylvester. Pope Gregory was diverted from it by the investiture quarrel, and circumstances prevented Pope Victor from realizing it except by the defense of the Italian coasts.

A purely defensive war appeared more and more as something ineffective. The perpetual invasions of the Saracens could be halted only by striking them at their source. The continual vexations which beset the pilgrims to the Holy Land would not cease until the day when a mighty Christian army should appear in the East. Moreover, the public spirit so ardently demanded the liberation of the tomb of Christ that it would have impelled even an indolent pope. And such was not the character of Urban. The acuteness of his political sense, not less than his faith, showed him the lofty import of a general action in the East. No better relief could be found for the ceaseless strifes that were desolating the Christian world, no more powerful activity to lift souls above the wretched grudges and petty rivalries, no more effective means to reconstitute around the Roman pontiff, under the egis of religion, that unity which the Holy Empire had so failed to assure and at times had so much endangered.

Did Urban II clearly grasp that the great expedition which he contemplated was the necessary complement of the whole civilizing work that had thus far been undertaken by the papacy? This work included the Truce of God, the spiritual and moral reform, the pacification of Europe, the unity of the Christian world, the consolidation of the papal power. No man of the eleventh century, even though gifted with genius, could have analyzed these possible results of the Crusades with the exactness which only the later gaze of history, looking back on events, has been able to give us. But that such consequences, so perfectly in harmony with the general policy of the papacy,

were vaguely foreseen by Urban II, we may surmise without rashness. In any event, these were the clearest results of the great movement that carried the Christian world toward the Holy Land; they were independent of the conquest of the tomb of the Savior, and they were able to subsist even with the failure of that conquest.

Less noble motives and promptings were indeed mingled with these lofty ideas and at times perverted them. A liking for distant expeditions, a love of adventure, and a desire to carve out for themselves fiefs or kingdoms in that mysterious East with its dazzling prestige were the motives of many crusaders. The rivalries of lord against lord, of prince against prince, which the Pope desired to abolish in the West, became evident in the armies. Certain knights broke away from vicious habits contracted in their homeland, only to succumb to more subtile temptations in Asia. However, a breath of enthusiasm and faith raised souls above their ordinary level; a spirit of heroism entered the masses also; not in vain did the bells of all the steeples ring in unison the summons to war; with a single heart rich and poor, nobles and peasants, clerics and laymen, of every district, set out with a purpose free from any personal interest or any material concern: the deliverance of the tomb of Christ, in the name of the Catholic Church.

Such, in fact, was the essential aim of the Crusades. One of the historians who have most thoroughly studied the history of these warlike expeditions says that, by "Crusade" we should understand "a religious war, preached in the name of the Church, stimulated by the solemn grant of ecclesiastical privileges, waged by a more or less cosmopolitan army, and purposing directly or indirectly the recovery of the Holy Land." [95] As one biographer of Urban II says, "the real Crusade has the twofold character of a holy war preached in the name of the Church, and an armed expedition for the purpose

[95] Riant, *Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des croisades,* Introd., p. 2.

of recovering the Holy Land." [96] This is undeniably the viewpoint which at the outset dominated the thought of Urban II. The most reliable contemporary chroniclers are unanimous in proclaiming this fact. To pacify the West while freeing the East is the great thought which, according to Foucher de Chartres, "determined Pope Urban to cross the Alps and come into Gaul," [97] there to address a supreme appeal to Christendom.

Was this idea suggested by Alexius Comnenus, emperor of Constantinople, as some have said, or by the Picard ascetic Peter the Hermit, as others maintain? The latest studies of this question oblige us to refer to Pope Urban II the entire initiative of the Crusade. The supposed letter of Alexius Comnenus, appealed to in support of the first opinion, "contains details so curious, so little in conformity with the practices of the Byzantine chancery, that they are enough to invalidate its authenticity." [98] As to the supposed solicitation by Peter the Hermit, who is said to have induced the Pope to undertake the conquest of the Holy Land, no really contemporary document of the First Crusade mentions it; the legend does not appear until the middle of the twelfth century.[99] But we do not mean to say that the Emperor of Constantinople and Peter the Hermit played no part in the enterprise of the First Crusade.

Council of Piacenza

The question of a military expedition to the East was spoken of in two councils: that of Piacenza (March, 1095) and that

[96] Paulot, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

[97] Foucher of Chartres, *Hist. Hierosol.*, Bk. I, chap. 1; *PL*, CLV, 825.

[98] This question is treated by Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age*, p. 57; Paulot, *op. cit.*, pp. 282–84; Riant, *Arch. de l'Orient latin*, I, 71–89; Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Comnène*, p. 155. For a detailed criticism of the document attributed to Emperor Comnenus, see Riant, *Alexii Comneni ad Robertum I epistola spuria.*

[99] See Bréhier, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–60; Riant, *op. cit.*, I, 94; Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremit.*

of Clermont (November, 1095). The Pope's purpose in convoking a great council at Piacenza, for the middle of Lent, 1095, was especially to carry on vigorously the general reform of the Church undertaken by Gregory VII. The assembly was held from March 1 to 7. Bernold tells us that almost four thousand clerics and more than thirty thousand of the laity were present.[100] As no church was large enough to hold them the meetings took place in the open. Anathema was pronounced upon all the enemies of the holiness of the Church: on traffickers in sacred things, on those who dishonored their priesthood by their misconduct, on those who had knowingly received holy orders from sacrilegious hands, on those who still adhered to the heresy of Berengarius, already several times condemned, and by name upon the antipope, the false Clement III, the heresiarch Guibert.[101] The Christian rulers were represented at the assembly by Empress Praxedes of Germany, by an embassy of the King of France, and by an embassy of the Emperor of Constantinople. Empress Praxedes again complained of the ignominious treatment which she received from her husband. The French envoys excused the absence of their prince, who, they said, was prevented from coming to the council.

The Byzantine ambassadors, in their master's name, begged Urban II and all the Christians "to grant them some help against the pagans for the defense of holy Church." These are the expressions used by Bernold, a contemporary writer generally well informed. All the known facts lead us to believe that the Emperor, by these words, was simply repeating a request already addressed to the Pope, whom he had several times implored to favor the enlisting of mercenaries that he wanted to recruit for the East.[102] "This idea was far from the plan to set in motion the great armies of knights who later directed

[100] Bernold, *Chronicon* in *M. G., SS.*, V, 461.

[101] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 388–96; Mansi, XX, 801; suppl., II, 131.

[102] Chalandon, op. cit., p. 155.

their steps toward Constantinople. But probably these repeated requests for help acted upon Urban's mind and inspired him with the idea of a general appeal to the whole West." [103] The success obtained by the Emperor's petition at the assembly of Piacenza, where numerous persons arose and swore to go to the help of the Greek Emperor, may have removed any hesitation from the Pontiff's mind.[104]

Not long after the closing of the Council of Piacenza, the Pope (July, 1095) went to France and there at once decided upon another great council, which should be held at Clermont in Auvergne, on the octave day of St. Martin, November 18, 1095. In the meantime he journeyed through southern and eastern France. His presence is indicated, in August at Le Puy, La Chaise-Dieu, and Romans; in September at Saint-Gilles, Tarascon, and the monastery of Montmajeur near Arles; in October, at Lyons, Cluny, Mâcon, and Autun.[105] We have good reason to suppose that the purpose of these journeys was the preparation for the new great council, to which the Pope wished to give a very special importance.

This choice of French soil as the place for issuing an appeal to arms, addressed to all Christendom, was remarked by the earliest historians of the Crusades. Guibert de Nogent writes: "The old custom of the Apostolic See was, when a danger threatened it, always to seek help from the people of the Franks. This is what Pope Stephen and Pope Zachary did, under Pepin and Charlemagne." [106]

[103] Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[104] At the Council of Piacenza was made obligatory for the whole Church the Preface which is still sung in honor of the Blessed Virgin. Its composition is attributed to Pope Urban II (Watterich, I, 571).

[105] Crégut, *Le Concile de Clermont et la première croisade;* Paulot, *op. cit.*, pp. 292–302.

[106] Guibert de Nogent, *Hist. Hieros.*, in Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, I, 478.

The Turks

When Urban II was so actively engaged in the preparation of a military expedition against the Mussulmans for the deliverance of the Holy Land, he was not unaware of the difficulties of the enterprise. The Turkish invasion had infused new blood into Islam. The caliph of Bagdad and the caliph of Cairo continued to be jealous of each other. But in reality the caliphs possessed merely a nominal sovereignty; the real masters of the country were the Turks, who had come from Turkestan and entered the service of the caliphs of Bagdad. One of their leaders, Seljuk, had united them into a people called, after his name, the Seljukian Turks or Seljucides. The Turkish sultan, honored with the title of "commander of the faithful," soon became the sovereign of the caliph of Bagdad, whom he had aggrandized by his conquests. At the end of the eleventh century, the sway of the caliph of Bagdad extended over the whole of near Asia and over Syria; the rule of the caliph of Cairo, or of Egypt, was reduced to Egypt, Palestine, and northern Africa. But, in a common danger, the Turkish sultans of the country of the Euphrates formed the natural center of a confederation of all the princes and all the warriors of Asia Minor and Syria.[107]

The organization of this state was entirely military. The princes, who bore the title of emir or commandant, were principally war chiefs. They resided in citadels, guarded by bands of armed soldiers. The Mussulman warriors, like the lords in the West, formed a caste; they also had their squires, their manual of arms, their point of honor. But the liberal gifts of land which they received from the princes were not hereditary, and thus they were more strictly dependent on the chief who maintained them. They fought on horseback, "riding swift steeds and fighting with light arms, the saber with thin, sharp

[107] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.*, II, 294–97.

blade and the spear of reed, and a wooden bow. In their ranks were enlisted adventurers of every race. As the Mussulmans were without racial prejudices, the only requirement for admission to their ranks was to be a Mussulman." [108] A Christian, Catholic or schismatic, had no rights. As farmer, artisan, or merchant, he took part in the political life of the nation only in paying the heavy taxes which were laid on him arbitrarily.

The Byzantine emperors had tried to restrain the Mussulman fanaticism. But, after the establishment of Turkish hegemony, they were forced to confess their powerlessness. We have already seen Emperor Alexius Comnenus turn to the West to recruit mercenary soldiers for his fight against the Turks.

Alexius I (Comnenus) was a brave ruler, a prudent statesman. With great vigor he had fought against the Normans of southern Italy on the shores of the Adriatic; and in Thrace against the Petchenegs and the Kumans.[109] But the constitution of the Byzantine Empire had in it incurable defects. No well-established law regulated the imperial succession. The emperors reached the throne not, as in France, by inheritance, nor, as in the Holy Empire, by election, but most of the time by intrigues and conspiracies. The only rule that seemed to be recognized was the emperor's right to name his successor. But frequent coups d'état released popular passions which were not effectively restrained by measures of ferocity toward the rebels.

The foreign relations of the Byzantine Empire aggravated its domestic ills. The Croats, the Dalmatians, and the Serbs, its closest neighbors, had already shaken off its yoke and were turning toward the European powers. Bulgaria remembered that, a century before, it had with its Czar Simeon contested supremacy with the Greek Empire. The Rumanians felt them-

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

[109] Cf. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis Comnène.*

selves racially even more alien to the Byzantine world. Venice was no longer in the period when its doge was a member of the Byzantine hierarchy and when its citizens called themselves "the slaves of the basileus." Its ambitions had grown with the prosperity of its commerce. In 1082 Alexius Comnenus conceded to Venice an entire section of Constantinople, with a quay of its own.[110] There Venice established a colony that recognized only Venetian law and, to defend itself against possible encroachments by the imperial power, constructed a fortified enclosure. The more daring Normans had adopted a clearly aggressive attitude toward the Empire.

From the time of the schism of Caerularius, the Eastern Churches were separated from Rome and acknowledged only the authority of their patriarch and of their emperor, the jurisdiction of the two powers being mingled and confused. The patriarch and the bishops took a hand in the temporal affairs; and the emperor regulated and controlled their appointments. At the beginning of the schism, they showed but little concern about the See of Rome. But since the reform of Gregory VII, as whole kingdoms (Hungary, England, the Two Sicilies) professed vassalage to the papacy, the latter now seemed a power with which they would have to reckon, with which some day they would perhaps find it prudent to be allied. At any rate they found it useful to let the papacy think so. And the Byzantine diplomacy was remarkably skilful in keeping up this insidious ambiguity.

Such was the situation of the various states of the East when Pope Urban II was planning to direct the armies of Europe toward Asia. Europe was ready to hear his call. Ever since the Turkish invasion had violently put an end to the protectorate of the Holy Land, first exercised by Charlemagne and his successors, then by the emperors of Constantinople, grievances emanating from the Christian settlements of Syria

[110] The Venetians obtained docks in several other harbors.

came frequently to remind the Christians of Europe of the lamentable condition of their Latin brothers living in the East or of Western travelers who went as pilgrims to visit the most precious memorials of Christian origins. Devastated churches, Christians driven from their homes, pilgrims seized, imprisoned, tortured: such were the reports brought back by travelers returning from Asia, and their hearers were enraged at so many injustices committed on the very soil that had been sanctified by the Savior's presence and miracles.

An armed expedition to the Holy Land seemed easy of realization. The frequent pilgrimages of Westerners had made the route familiar. Noblemen had already visited it with imposing escorts of warriors. The brilliant deeds of arms performed in Spain and Sicily against the infidels seemed a pledge of success. True, along with the spirit of faith, other motives, less noble, manifested themselves. Merchants were attracted by the prospect of opening new outlets for their commerce; and some knights were drawn to the East only by the prospect of pillage and battles. But the papacy, restored by the genius of Gregory VII, seemed now strong enough to rally about it all the forces of the West and also to prevent the elements of disorder from being an obstacle to the religious character of the expedition.

Council of Clermont

The great council decreed by Urban II met at Clermont on the appointed day, November 18, 1095. Bernold informs us that it comprised 13 archbishops with their suffragans, and included no less than 205 crosiers. Other writers report even larger numbers. Sybel calculates that the council must have been attended by 14 archbishops, 250 bishops, and 400 abbots.[111]

[111] Heinrich von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreussugs,* p. 184.

In convoking the bishops of Christendom at Clermont, the Pope's chief aim [112] was to have the council decree an armed expedition against those who held the tomb of Christ in their hands. But as, in his mind, this expedition was inseparable from the reform of morals and the pacification of Christendom, he first submitted to the council a collection of reform measures and a new regulation of the Truce of God.

The decrees of Piacenza were first renewed, made more precise, and supplemented. Thus, according to Ivo of Chartres, Pope Urban explained that the Church, by forbidding to princes the investiture of ecclesiastical benefices as such, that is, the collation of spiritual jurisdiction, in no way forbade their taking a hand in the election of bishops as chiefs of the people.[113] Urban II thereby prepared the formula of accord which a quarter century later triumphed in the concordat of Worms. Among the decrees of the Council of Clermont we should also note one that determined the manner of administering the Eucharist. The custom, still observed among the Greeks, of dipping the consecrated host in the precious blood and distributing it thus in communion, had been introduced into some Western Churches. This custom was now forbidden, at least in a general way, either because of a fear that accidents might result from this practice or because of a fear that the faithful might believe that Christ was not entire under each of the sacred species.

The question of the Truce of God received particular attention from the fathers of the council. The Pope wished, before preaching the holy war, "to preach the gospel of peace." William of Malmesbury quotes the first canon passed by the council in the following words: "From Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from Septuagesima Sunday to the octave of Pentecost, and from sunset on Wednesday to sunset on Monday, the

[112] In fact, France, Italy, and Spain were the only countries represented at Clermont. The bishops of Germany and Hungary did not appear at the council.

[113] Ivo of Chartres, *Epist.*, 60; *PL*, CLXII, 73.

Truce of God will be observed." [114] "This decree has a particular importance. The Truce of God seems here for the first time to be imposed on the whole Church, whereas previously it had been adopted only by provincial assemblies." [115] Thus, at the very time when the Pope was about to call upon Christians to draw their swords in defense of the cause of Christian civilization and to conquer the most sacred soil of the world,[116] he commanded them to make a truce to all hostility that sprang from private interests. Thus the very notion of war was altered under the influence of the Roman Pontiff.

"God Wills It"

But the great question for which the Pope had convoked the council had not yet been publicly mentioned. The Pope held it in reserve for the closing of the council. When the affairs of the Church were terminated, the Pope proceeded to a very spacious place,[117] because no church could hold the numberless throng that surrounded him; and with captivating eloquence he addressed all present. From this address we quote the following excerpts, taken from the account by a contemporary chronicler: [118]

Frenchmen, beloved and elect of God, to you I address my discourse and my exhortations, to you I wish to make known the sad circum-

[114] The acts of the Council of Clermont have not come down to us in full. They have been largely reconstructed by the use of fragments which were preserved by William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis, and Lambert of Arras. See Mansi, XX, 827, 912; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 399–406.

[115] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 400 f.

[116] "The Christian world," writes Gabriel Monod, "merely defended itself by attempting to recover the places that it regarded as the most sacred and that had been taken from it" (Monod in the *Encycl. des sc. relig.*, III, 481–83, 486).

[117] Crégut (*op. cit.*, p. 123) has identified the spot.

[118] Robert the Monk, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, Bk. I, year 1095, in Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, I, 31. Proof has been adduced that the author of this history is not Robert the Monk, but Albert, canon of Aachen (d. 1120), who made use of original Lorraine chronicles (Hefele-Leclercq, V, 420).

stances which have brought me into your country. From Jerusalem bad news has reached Constantinople. A cursed people has invaded the lands of the Christians, has laid them waste by sword, pillage, and fire. It profanes and smashes altars; it tortures Christians; it violates women. . . . Who will avenge these outrages? Upon you, Frenchmen, falls this duty, upon you whom God has raised above all peoples by valor. Recall the exploits of your ancestors. Recall the greatness of Charlemagne, that of his son Louis and of your other kings who fought against the empire of the Turks. But what should especially move you is the sacred tomb of the Savior, the holy places ravaged and stained by an impure people. Brave soldiers, descendants of those who were never vanquished, mark out a path all the way to the Holy Sepulcher and snatch the Holy Land from that abominable people.[119]

Before the Pope finished his discourse, the people were already shouting: "God wills it! God wills it!"

Raising his eyes to heaven, the Pope gave a sign that he wished to add a few words. "Those words: 'God wills it, God wills it,' will be your rallying cry in battle. I do not wish the old men, the infirm, or the women to take part in the expedition. Any women who go must be accompanied by their husbands or their brothers; otherwise they would be more harmful than helpful. Furthermore, no cleric should set out without his bishop's permission. The laity should not begin the expedition without the blessing of a priest. Whoever intends to offer himself to God in this manner should wear on his breast the sign of the cross." [120]

Baudry of Bourgeil, an eyewitness, relates that Ademar of Monteil, bishop of Le Puy, a man of great repute, of an imposing presence and noble character, then approached the Pope

[119] Urban's address has been published in different words but substantially the same by Baudry de Bourgueil, William of Tyre, Guibert de Nogent, William of Malmesbury, and several others. The Pope, to be better understood by the crowd, spoke in the Romance tongue. Each chronicler has translated his words, more or less freely, into Latin.

[120] Bongars, *op. cit.*, I, 32.

and, kneeling before him, asked for permission to join the holy undertaking. After him, upon a sign from Cardinal Gregory (the future Innocent II), the entire people knelt down. The cardinal, in the name of all, recited a public confession of sins, the Pope gave to all those who were disposed to set out the Apostolic absolution.[121]

These, as a distinctive sign, fastened to their garments a piece of cloth cut in the shape of a cross.[122] Hence came the term "crusaders," which was at once given them. The next day the Pope appointed Ademar of Monteil, bishop of Le Puy, his legate for the Crusade, declared inviolable for three years the kinsmen and property of the crusaders, ordered all the faithful, or perhaps merely the clergy, to recite every Saturday the office of the Blessed Virgin [123] to assure the protection

[121] This was not a sacramental absolution, given to the hundred thousand who were present, for all their sins, without previous confession; it was the remission of the temporal penalty which was promised to repentant and pardoned sinners who should undertake the holy war. The Council of Clermont had just declared in clear terms: "Whoever, simply in the spirit of faith, without vain desires of avarice and ambition, will set out for the deliverance of the Church of God at Jerusalem, for him that journey will take the place of penance" (*PL,* CLXII, 717). A few months later, Urban II himself, undoubtedly to forestall misunderstandings, explained this point in a discourse to the faithful of Bologna: "Know that all who undertake the holy journey, not from motives of earthly ambition, but solely for the salvation of their souls and the deliverance of the Church, will obtain the full remission of the penance after a true and perfect confession of their sins" (*PL,* CLI, 483). (Cf. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils,* p. 436. Tr.)

During the Crusades, the Latin clergy regarded as real martyrs, and consequently as thereby saved, the crusaders who had fallen in arms while fighting against the infidels. But this was only a particular application of a common belief of the Church. Probably we should see an allusion to this belief in the words which Robert the Monk (Albert of Aachen) puts on the lips of Urban II: *Arripite igitur viam hanc in remissionem peccatorum vestrorum, securi de immarescibili gloria regni coelorum* (Bongars, *op. cit.,* I, 32). At a period when a great faith was associated with great passions, the hope of these spiritual favors must have exercised a powerful influence on great criminals, who entered on the Crusade to redeem their past life.

[122] This piece of cloth, cut in the form of a cross, was sewed on the breast or right shoulder, sometimes fastened on the front of the helmet. *M. G., SS.,* VII, 765.

[123] St. Peter Damian had already introduced this practice among the monks. The Hours of the Blessed Virgin had existed for three centuries both in the Greek

of the Mother of God upon the Crusade, and declared the council dissolved.

The day fixed for the departure of the Crusade was August 15, 1096, and the city of Constantinople was appointed as the concentration point of all the forces. Urban II, after stirring the popular movement, then began to spread it and organize it. By letters sent in every direction, by synods in which he presided personally at Limoges, Angers, Tours, Nîmes, Pavia, and Rome, he aroused the zeal of the faithful. Popular preachers, under his direction, preached the Crusade. The most celebrated of all was Peter the Hermit.

Peter the Hermit

A native of the city of Amiens, or at least of Picardy, a monk and a solitary, but without anyone knowing to which order to connect him,[124] Peter, surnamed the Hermit, had certainly undertaken a journey to the East to venerate the Holy Sepulcher, and had there been the victim of ill treatment by the Turks. That he was present at the Council of Clermont is probable, although the historians of the council make no mention of him. Did the account of his misfortunes have some influence upon the Pope, for the same reason as the stories about other pilgrims to the East? That such was the case is not unlikely, although contemporary writers say nothing about it. This much is certain, that Peter the Hermit very soon took a considerable part in the Crusade. Immediately after the Council of Clermont, he appeared as exercising an extraordinary influence over the people. Thin, with emaciated face framed in a long gray beard, wearing a monk's cowl over his woolen tunic, he traveled through Berry, Lorraine, and northern

Church and in the Latin Church. Cf. Card. Bona, *Tract. de div. psalm.*, chap. 12, § 2; Martène, *De ant. Eccles. rit.*, IV, 82.

[124] *Conjectures sur Pierre l'Ermite* by F. Balme in Ingold, *Miscellanea Alsatica*, 2d ser., pp. 39–55.

France seated on an ass, which received part of the veneration shown for its master.[125]

Other preachers, not so well known, among whom we should mention Robert of Arbrissel, carried the Pope's word to other provinces. Everywhere the call of Urban II awoke enthusiastic echoes. Says Domnizo: "The French received Urban's appeal as the words of St. Peter in person." [126] "All at once," relates Sigebert, "we see dukes, clerics, monks, old men, young men, and boys set out, without anybody able to stop them. A countless army arose to go to Jerusalem." [127] William of Malmesbury writes: "No people or tribe was so remote that it did not send someone to represent it." [128] "The robbers and pirates," says Orderic Vitalis, "criminals of every sort, moved by grace, came forth from the abyss of their wretchedness, disavowed their crimes and forsook them, and as atonement for them departed for the far-off country." [129]

Crusade of the Common People

This popular enthusiasm had happy results. All Europe was moved. Nobody was unaffected. All eyes suddenly turned toward the cross of Christ, as to the object most worthy to arouse the sacrifice of a man's life. The most commonplace and vilest souls found themselves of a sudden raised up from earth and attached only to the invisible realities of the supernatural world: Christ ever living, the mysteries of His passion, of His grace, of eternal salvation. But good order suffered from this universal excitement. Urban had contemplated an expedition wisely organized and well disciplined. Popular

[125] *De ejus mulo pili pro reliquiis rapiebantur,* says Guibert de Nogent, *Gesta Dei,* II, 8, in the *Rec. des hist. des crois.,* IV, 142.

[126] Domnizo, *Vita Mathildis;* cf. Catalan, *Pontif. roman.,* II, 531.

[127] *Infinitus exercitus Jerusalem ivit. Ann. S. Ben. Div.; M. G.,* V, 43.

[128] William of Malmesbury, *De Willelmo secundo,* Bk. IV, chap. 2, p. 75.

[129] Orderic Vitalis, *Hist. eccles.,* Bk. IX; *PL,* CLXXXVIII, 652.

groups formed spontaneously and started out, so numerous and animated by such divergent motives that they could not be embraced in a regular army. Some, prompted by trustful and naïve piety, set forth with the sole hope of undergoing martyrdom and gaining heaven. Others, less regardless of worldly things, rushed into the unknown with the prospect of escaping from the wretched life which they had undergone from hunger and the brigandage of private wars. In their minds Jerusalem was the end of all the ills afflicting them. Guibert de Nogent says: "A most touching sight was to behold these poor crusaders shoe their oxen like horses, harness them to a two-wheeled cart on which they put their poor baggage and their little children. At every castle and city which they saw along their route, they held out their hands and asked whether it was not that Jerusalem to which they were marching." [130]

The lack of discipline and order was the least of the evils from which these improvised troops suffered. Certain seriously perilous elements were to be found there. "As in the field of the householder," says Ekkehard, "an enemy sowed cockle, so the devil sowed false prophets in the bosom of the Crusade." [131] The chronicler is referring to William Chamberlain, viscount of Melun, who, at the head of a band of French and English, laid waste everything along his route; and to the German priest Gottschalk, who, "under the appearances of a feigned piety, betrayed the God whose servant he was"; [132] and to the impostor Folkmar, whose troops, recruited in Saxony and Bohemia, pillaged the Jews and appropriated their wealth for themselves; to a still more terrible adventurer, the bandit Count Semicho, who, appealing to alleged heavenly visions, succeeded in gathering about him a force of twelve thousand pilgrims and, under the pretext of avenging the death of

[130] Guibert de Nogent, Bk. II, chap. 6, in Bongars, I, 482, and in *Recueil des hist. des croisades, Hist. occid.*, IV, 142.

[131] Ekkehard, *Libell. Hierosolim.; PL*, CLIV, 970.

[132] *Ibid.*, col. 971.

Christ, had multitudes of Jews put to death at Spires, Worms, Mainz, and Prague. The bishops of Worms and Mainz, who had given refuge to some Jews in their own homes, were there assailed by these false crusaders, who sacked their palaces and there massacred the unfortunate refugees without pity.[133] Several of these sacrilegious profaners of the cross of Christ received punishment in this world. Folkmar's soldiers, while they were crossing through Pannonia, laden with booty, were surrounded by the native population and, almost to the last one, were slain or made slaves;[134] Semicho's bands met with the same fate before the walls of Merseburg, which they were besieging; the cruel leader, upon returning to his castle on the banks of the Rhine, died there, leaving an execrated memory. Popular ballads of the Rhenish province told that every night, round about the gloomy fortress, wandered the mournful soul of the hideous murderer.

Such misdeeds dishonored the Crusade and before long provided the leaders of the Greek army with a pretext for abandoning and even betraying the cause of the crusaders and the noble Christian idea of Urban II.

Peter the Hermit's Contingent

The only group of the popular Crusade which corresponded with the views of the Roman Pontiff was the one that was formed around Peter the Hermit. "Nothing was more unselfish," says Marquis de Vogüé, "than those crusaders of the first hour. The French peasant who rose up at the voice of Peter the Hermit; the members of the lesser nobility in Provence and Picardy who sold their modest domains so as to take

[133] On these bands of robbers, who took the cross merely in order to exercise their brigandage, see Ekkehard and Albert of Aix, in *PL,* CLIV, and Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos,* I, 193–96.

[134] Ekkehard, *op. cit.; PL,* CLIV, 971.

the cross, hardly thought to carve out for themselves a fief in the unknown lands of the East; they obeyed the impulses of their generosity and their faith; the only land they conquered was that where their remains rested, forgotten and abandoned, beside the long route they marked out with their whitened bones, from the Loire to the Jordan." [135] The authority which Peter the Hermit exercised over this army seems to have been considerable. Says Guibert de Nogent: "I do not know that any man ever was venerated and obeyed to the same degree that he was. He possessed a gift for settling disputes, for reconciling foes. In his least acts and in his words something divine was felt. He went barefoot. Bread was his sole food. Hardly could he be persuaded now and then to take a little fish. He never drank any wine." [136]

The group led by Peter the Hermit did not form a real army. Rather it was a band of pilgrims whom the austere preacher undertook to lead to Constantinople by way of the Rhine and Danube valleys, as far as the foot of the Balkans, then along the valleys of Thrace, crossing through Philippopolis and Adrianople.

Several regrettable incidents troubled the march of this expedition. First some soldiers of the vanguard, that was marching under the orders of Gauthier de Poix, were attacked by people of the country while they were crossing Hungary, and were despoiled of their provisions, arms, and clothing, and were compelled to undergo most detestable treatment. The crusaders' first impulse was to stop and to inflict an exemplary vengeance for this brutal aggression. "But," says William of Tyre, "after reflection, they said to one another: 'For Christ we took up arms; let us leave to Christ the avenging of the of-

[135] Marquis de Vogüé, *Les croisades,* in *La France chrétienne dans l'histoire,* p. 212.

[136] Guibert de Nogent, *op. cit.,* Bk. II, chap. 8; *Histor. des croisades, Hist. occid.,* IV, 142; *PL,* CLIV, 705.

fense offered His servants.' And continuing on their way, they arrived in sight of Belgrade." [137]

The main part of the army, under the orders of Peter the Hermit, followed them a few days later. As they advanced, the Franks were joined by the Swabians, Bavarians, Franconians, Lombards, Austrians, people from all parts of Germany. This mixture of races, speaking various languages and with great difficulty understanding one another, added to the hardships of the expedition. While crossing Bulgaria, a group of about a hundred Germans, who had remained in the rear, separated from the troop, started a quarrel with a Bulgarian about the purchase of food and, to avenge themselves upon "those sons of Belial," as William of Tyre called them,[138] they set fire to seven mills on the banks of the Nichava. At sight of the flames, the inhabitants of Nyssa rose up, summoned to their aid bands of Bulgarians, Hungarians, and Petchenegs, fell upon the rear ranks of Peter the Hermit's army, seized the food provisions, pillaged the carts loaded with the army treasures and the baggage, made a frightful slaughter of the pilgrims, and led into captivity all whom weariness forced them to spare. In Albert of Aachen's account we read: "The others fled, like sheep pursued by wolves, some of them into the forest, others into the mountains of the neighborhood. Peter the Hermit that evening reached the top of a mountain, accompanied by only five hundred men. At first he thought this number was all that was left of his troop of forty thousand. But, during the following night, he had the trumpets sounded and fires lighted as rallying signals. Seven thousand fugitives soon answered his call. Twenty-three thousand came back during the next few days. The total loss was not more than seven

[137] William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum,* Bk. I, chap. 18, in *Historiens des croisades, Hist. occid.,* Vol. I, Part I, p. 48.

[138] William of Tyre, *loc. cit.,* chap. 11; *Hist. des crois.,* I, 52.

thousand men. But the carts, the equipment, and the provisions had disappeared." [139]

Emperor Alexius Comnenus came to the rescue of the unfortunate pilgrims. The success of the expedition was not indifferent to him. He counted on the crusaders' victories to save the Byzantine Empire from the Turkish danger. And he was eager to make the acquaintance of the illustrious hermit whose fame had reached him. He furnished him with food supplies, but on condition that nowhere would he stop more than three days, and begged him to come with all haste to Constantinople.

Peter the Hermit arrived on August 1, 1096, before the walls of the Byzantine city and immediately went to the imperial palace. Says the chronicler Albert:

> His smallness of stature was in contrast to the greatness of his eloquence and his heart. The monk, presenting himself with a noble assurance, greeted the Emperor in the name of Jesus Christ, set forth the origin and aim of his enterprise, related the vicissitudes of his journey, and announced to the Emperor the proximate arrival of an army composed of dukes, counts, and knights, who, like himself, had but one aim, to venerate the tomb of Christ and deliver it from the hands of the infidels.[140]

The Emperor appeared to be deeply moved by these words. He advised Peter to wait at Constantinople for the arrival of the regular army organized by the barons and to undertake nothing without it. Unfortunately Peter the Hermit was powerless to restrain the impatience of his followers, who began to pillage the city. Alexius made them cross to the other side of the Bosphorus. But their entrance into Asia was the signal for a general disbanding. Peter the Hermit's troop had given the example of great ardor of faith; but the lack of discipline

[139] Albert of Aachen, *Histor. Hierosol.*, Bk. I, chap. 12; *Hist. des crois., Hist. occid.*, IV, 281.

[140] Albert of Aachen, *loc. cit.*, chap. 15; *Hist. des crois.*, IV, 283.

ruined it. Most of these first crusaders perished later under the blows of the Turks or died of hunger and thirst.[141]

The Crusade of the Barons

The regular army announced by Peter the Hermit was in reality made up of four distinct and independent armies. Men from Lorraine and northern France as well as some Germans marched under the leadership of Godfrey of Bouillon and his brother Baldwin. Bands of Normans and French advanced under the orders of Count de Blois and Count de Vermandois. The French from the south had as their leader Count Raymond of Toulouse; and the Normans of southern Italy were led by Bohemund and Tancred, the former being the eldest son of Robert Guiscard, the latter being Guiscard's nephew.

In solemn terms and an epic tone William of Tyre begins the account of the expedition led by Godfrey of Bouillon: "The year of the incarnation of our Lord 1096, the fifteenth day of the month of August, the illustrious and magnificent knight Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorraine, having assembled all his warriors and concluded all his preparations, set out on the march to Jerusalem. Here are the names, deserving eternal memory, of the principal lords gathered under his flags: Baldwin of Boulogne, his uterine brother; Baldwin of Mons, count of Hainault; Hugh, count of St. Paul," etc.[142] In speaking thus, the historian of the Crusades gives, at the very beginning, to the person of Godfrey of Bouillon an importance

[141] Albert of Aachen, *loc. cit.*, chaps. 18–20; *Hist. des crois.*, IV, 286–88. The failure of this first expedition should not be laid on the shoulders of Peter the Hermit. His part was to maintain at a high moral level the ideal of his band, considered as a whole, and by the ascendance of his personal authority to prevent many disorders that would have occurred without him. If he had not put himself at the head of this popular movement, another would have done so, because nobody could think of holding back the masses of people who were pouring forth toward the East. Peter accepted a work that was full of perils, and the unfortunate issue of that work cannot rob him of the merit of his initiative.

[142] William of Tyre, *op. cit.*, Bk. II, chap. 1; *Hist. des crois.*, I, 71.

which in fact did not belong to him until later. The Duke of Lower Lorraine, who became celebrated in so many epic songs and poems as the great hero of the Crusades, at first enjoyed only a somewhat insignificant part. The forces raised by him were not distinguished at the outset from those raised by many other barons, unless perhaps by their numbers; according to Anna Comnena, they counted 10,000 knights and 70,000 foot soldiers.[143]

Godfrey of Bouillon

Godfrey of Bouillon was born in French Brabant of one of the most valiant captains of Belgium, Eustace II, count of Boulogne and Lens, and of the pious Countess Ida, daughter of Godfrey the Bearded, duke of Lower Lorraine and Bouillon. From his father Godfrey inherited a fondness for battles, and from his mother a deep piety. The paternal instinct at first prevailed in his life. Attached to the party of Henry IV in the war of investitures, he took part in most of the combats engaged in by the imperial troops against the Holy See and, we are told, in 1082 was the first knight to enter Rome, the gates of which he opened to the besiegers.[144] When he retired to his castle after the war, he spent his time fighting against his neighbors.[145] The proclamation of the Crusade awoke in him the feelings of tender devotion which his mother had cultivated in his soul. To deliver the tomb of Christ and to prostrate himself on the soil made sacred by the Savior's footsteps, were henceforth his sole ambition. His sudden recovery from a lingering fever, the cure coming immediately after taking the vow to be a crusader, increased his fervor. Before setting out, he made peace with his foes, left his Bouillon castle in the

[143] Anna Comnena, *L'Alexiade,* X, 9.
[144] *Hist. litt. de la France,* VIII, 603.
[145] *Ibid.,* p. 603.

hands of the Bishop of Liège, and sold all his patrimonies.[146] Contemporaries picture Godfrey of Bouillon as a robust knight, with a broad chest and manly bearing, but with a kindness that shone in the mildness of his blue eyes, in the delicately sharp and light-complected features, in the gracious harmony of his voice. His brother Baldwin, with his black beard, his dark skin, his aquiline nose, rather harsh and severe features, was a sharp contrast to Godfrey. Although his character was more unbending and less refined than Godfrey's, he was not without loftiness and unselfishness and tact.

First and Second Armies

The army commanded by these two brothers followed almost the same route of march as the army of Peter the Hermit, through Germany, Hungary, and Bulgaria. It encountered similar difficulties, but overcame them more easily, owing to the strict discipline which Godfrey strove to maintain. On December 23, 1096, it arrived before the walls of Constantinople. Later it formed the most solid nucleus of the Crusade. In fact, none of the other armies reached the Byzantine capital with forces so intact and under so capable a leader.

The second army, recruited in the royal domain and in the neighboring fiefs, contained, from the viewpoint of warlike valor, elements of the highest quality. But its principal leader, Hugh, count of Vermandois, brother of the King of France, was fickle and meddlesome. None of the nobles who accompanied him—neither Robert Curthose (Courte Heuse), the bravest of all, nor Stephen of Blois, the most literary—had the persevering and prudent courage needed for the success of the rude campaign. The plan they adopted was to make part of the journey by sea: to cross the Alps, to embark at the ports of Apulia, then to pass by way of Epirus, Macedonia, and

[146] *Ibid.*, p. 604.

Thrace. But Hugh of Vermandois, made a prisoner as soon as he disembarked at Dyrrachium, was immediately brought to Constantinople under a strong escort. The troops of Robert Curthose and of Stephen of Blois, pursued in Italy by the followers of Guibert,[147] were exhausted when they reached Apulia. From there a large number of the discouraged soldiers returned home.[148] A ship carrying four hundred crusaders sank near Brindisi; others were drowned while crossing a river.[149] When the rest of the army arrived at Constantinople in March, 1097, it was composed only of fragments.

Third and Fourth Armies

The third army, which followed almost the same route, contained the most hardened soldiers, accustomed to those coasts. It was made up of 10,000 knights and 20,000 foot soldiers, all Normans, most of whom had fought continually in southern Italy; many of them had carried their invasions even into the Byzantine Empire. But the memory of the depredations recently committed by them along their route, made the population hostile to them. Their leaders, Bohemund and Tancred, "half-Norman, half-Sicilian, displayed the qualities and the defects of their double origin: crafty and contentious, thinking only of themselves and unscrupulous in their greed, but in other respects excellent soldiers, especially Bohemund, 'the tall, pale-skinned warrior, with bluish green eyes' who is thus described by Anna Comnena the daughter of the Greek Emperor." [150]

The impetuous populations of the Midi formed the fourth army, which took the land route, by way of Lombardy and Dalmatia. Its leader, Raymond of St. Gilles, count of Tou-

[147] Foucher of Chartres, in *Hist. des crois., Hist. occid.*, III, 329.
[148] *Ibid.*
[149] *Ibid.*
[150] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. II, part 2, p. 235.

louse, duke of Narbonne, and marquis of Provence, had made a solemn vow never to return to his states and to consecrate the remainder of his life to fighting the infidels. Anna Comnena speaks of him as "brilliant among the Latins like the sun in the midst of the stars." He was called king of the Midi district of France. His somewhat boisterous vanity lessened the influence which his bravery and talents would have merited for him, and led especially to the jealous enmity of Tancred. This fourth army contained a large number of clerics, among whom was the papal legate, Ademar of Monteil, bishop of Le Puy, one of the noblest figures, along with Peter the Hermit and Godfrey of Bouillon, of the First Crusade. Ademar, son of a count of the Valentinois,[151] had, before receiving holy orders, led the life of a brave and courageous knight. As legate of the Holy See, he was the official leader of the Crusade. But he knew the turbulent independence of the barons and tactfully refrained from injecting his authority in the direction of military operations.

All historians of the holy war recognize that he was the heart and soul of the Crusade and that no other person was more effective in settling conflicts, in maintaining concord, and in giving confidence to all. The example of his piety radiated from his person, in particular the example of his devotion to the Blessed Virgin, whose banner he had borne before him.[152] The best understanding seems to have prevailed between him and Count Raymond of Toulouse. Both of them intervened vigorously, either to moderate the fretfulness of the southern soldiers or to repel the attacks of the ferocious populations whom they encountered while crossing Slavonia and Dalmatia. In the neighborhood of Achrida, Ademar was

[151] Up to the fourteenth century his family possessed the château of Montélimar and gave its name to it (*Montilium Adhemari*).

[152] To Ademar of Monteil is attributed the composition of the *Salve Regina*. *M. G., SS.*, XXIII, 828. Cf. Bréhier, art. "Adhémar" in the *Dict. d'hist. ecclés.*, I, 552.

wounded by the Petchenegs. At length, in the month of April, 1097, the army of the Provençals arrived at almost the same time as that of the Normans before the city of Constantinople, where the two other armies had preceded them.

A great danger awaited the Christian army there. The magnificence of Constantinople had always exercised an almost irresistible fascination over Westerners. In the midst of that city, with its marble palaces and gilded domes, where works of art and all sorts of riches were amassed, the uncultured Western knights were suddenly dazzled and were tempted to forget Jerusalem and to leap upon this prey, which seemed so easy to them. Bohemund, heir of Robert Guiscard's power and policy, stirred up this covetousness. Some haughty and untactful acts by Raymond of Toulouse aggravated the danger. This was brought to a climax by the attitude of Alexius Comnenus. The ambitious Emperor of the East had always hoped to make use of the crusaders to deliver himself, without striking a blow and without expending any funds, from the incursions of the Turks. He let his selfish designs become evident. The lofty wisdom of Godfrey of Bouillon and the earnest exhortations of Ademar of Monteil overcame these difficulties and restored the crusaders' enthusiasm for the unselfish conquest of the Holy Land.

Emperor Alexius, with an eagerness that some regarded as suspicious, then declared his wish to join the crusaders, on condition that they would swear to turn over to him the cities of Asia Minor and Syria that would fall into their hands. The oath was taken by all the leaders except Raymond of Toulouse, who, more directly influenced by Ademar of Monteil, declared "that he had not come to the East to serve any other master than the one for whom he had left his country." He would agree to nothing more than this, that he would not undertake anything against the honor and life of the Eastern Emperor.

Crusaders' Victories

The first result of the alliance between the Emperor and the crusaders was the siege and capture of the city of Nicaea. Says William of Tyre:

> This metropolis of Bithynia brought to mind the most illustrious memories of the history of the Church. In that city, in the time of Pope Sylvester (325), was held the first ecumenical council, where the 318 fathers confounded the impiety of Arius. Around Nicaea, one after the other, arrived all the contingents of Raymond of Toulouse, Robert of Normandy, Stephen of Blois, and Eustace of Boulogne. These leaders of the army of God might then have made an enumeration of their legions. The number reached a total of 600,000 on foot (including the pilgrims of both sexes) and 100,000 knights in armor.[153]

The siege of the city, begun on May 14, 1097, was going on for more than a month when the crusaders resolved to attempt a decisive assault. Great was their surprise upon seeing the flag of the Greek Empire flying above the walls. Alexius had secretly negotiated with the inhabitants, and the whole benefit of this conquest remained with him. The imperial troops entered the fortified town, but the crusaders were refused admittance. However, the Emperor distributed to them the booty conquered from the Turks and, by this largess, silenced the displeasure of the attackers.

The remainder of the expedition was the distinct work of the crusaders. The victory of Dorylaeum, the taking of Antioch and that of Jerusalem, were its glorious stages.

The battle fought on July 1, 1097, in a plain near Dorylaeum showed that the crusaders had maturely combined a

[153] William of Tyre, Bk. II, chap. 23; *Hist. des crois.*, I, 108. The figures given by William of Tyre are the same as those of Foucher of Chartres. The latter adds that, without the disasters of the preceding expeditions, the number would have been three times as large (Foucher of Chartres, Bk. I, chap. 10; *Hist. des crois.*, III, 333).

plan of campaign and a strategy. The gaining of possession of this plain opened the route to the south for them. Nothing was neglected to assure them of this victory: a wise choice of the battlefield, protected by a marsh, strict prohibition of any separate action, the formation of a body of reserves ready, at any desired moment, to execute a flank movement. The success of this tactic was complete. At once the march toward Antioch was begun. It was painful in all respects. Advancing under a blazing sun, harassed continually by the Turks, often betrayed by their guides, who purposely misled them, the crusaders soon saw the good understanding between their leaders undergo a change. Tancred and Baldwin separated from the main body of the army: the former captured the fortified places of Cilicia; the latter became master of Edessa, married an Armenian princess and, giving a sad example which other nobles later followed, carved out for himself a principality in the East, to the great detriment of the very purpose of the Crusade.

However, on October 20, the Christian army arrived before Antioch. The city, on the slope of a mountain and on the bank of the Orontes River, strongly defended by a high citadel and by 450 towers, seemed impregnable. Bohemund's valor and craftiness, alternately exercised, were eventually successful in taking the city. But the cunning Norman, in spite of his promises to the Emperor, wished to keep the city for himself. The barons, hard pressed by a Turkish army, had to agree to this demand. Soon the army of the infidels besieged them in the conquered city. Pestilence and famine decimated their ranks. The vision of a Provençal priest, Peter Bartholomew, to whom the Apostle St. Andrew appeared to reveal the place where the holy lance was, and the finding of the precious relic at the designated spot, revived the courage of the besieged. Under Bohemund's command they made a general sally and routed the army of the besiegers.

Antioch was the last stage on the way to Jerusalem. But the rivalry that sprang up between Raymond of Toulouse and Bohemund for the possession of Antioch delayed the triumphant march of the army. Ademar of Monteil, to whom the barons intended to entrust the settlement of the conflict, died of the pestilence. Fresh disputes arose. Instead of battles, diplomatic actions were started between the leaders of the crusaders and the Eastern princes, but without any previously concerted plans. In short, twenty months after the taking of Antioch, which was left in the hands of Bohemund, the crusaders were before Jerusalem. The date was June 7, 1099.

The Taking of Jerusalem

The sight of the Holy City revived the feelings of faith which had started these multitudes of knights and pilgrims on the march to the East. As soon as their eyes beheld the walls of the city where the Savior had been crucified, a shout burst from all lips: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem!" All these warriors fell to their knees; they wept and kissed the ground trod by the steps of the Son of God.[154] At that moment, all quarrels disappeared and all private and separate interests merged into a single common aspiration: to deliver the tomb of Christ.

The siege began June 7. But soon they knew that Jerusalem would offer a resistance as great as that they had encountered at Antioch. The solid ramparts of the city were defended by a formidable garrison. The wells and springs within a wide radius had been destroyed. To the horrors of thirst were added the tortures of hunger. Many of those who ventured far from the camp in search of water or food were slain by the Turks. Others fought among themselves over a piece of bread or a few drops of cool water. In the absence of human resources, only God could succor His people. An immense procession was

[154] William of Tyre, Bk. VII, chap. 25; *Hist. des crois.*, I, 318.

organized. "The bishops, the priests, the clerics of all ranks, in their sacred vestments, preceded by crosses and banners and relics of the saints, and followed by the whole people, went barefoot to the Mount of Olives. There Peter the Hermit and a Norman priest, named Arnold, preached to the crowd." [155]

After this ceremony, the date for the assault was fixed for the next Thursday, July 14. A clever maneuver by Godfrey of Bouillon and Raymond of Toulouse, who during the night of the 14th, moved their camp from the west to the south of the fortifications, disconcerted the besieged. In the morning of July 15, a movable tower, which was brought up to the walls, enabled Godfrey of Bouillon and his brother Eustace of Boulogne to set down a drawbridge on the ramparts and thus to enter the city. At the same moment Tancred and Robert Curthose opened a breach at another point, and Raymond of Toulouse obtained the surrender of the Tower of David by negotiating with the Egyptian garrison. We are told by the chronicler Albert of Aix: "Godfrey's first care was to remove his armor and, wearing the penitential woolen garment, to go to the Savior's sepulcher and there prostrate himself. Several others followed him." [156]

But the mass of the crusaders, exasperated by so many days of fasting and so many nights of sleeplessness, could not control their rage against the infidels. Scenes of carnage followed. The chroniclers estimate at 10,000 the number of the Saracens slain in the streets of Jerusalem. An official letter, addressed two months later by the cardinal-legate Daimbert, Godfrey of Bouillon, and Raymond of Toulouse to Pope Urban II, states that the crusaders rode their horses through the blood of the victims and that in certain places the blood came up to the horses' knees. Thus the First Crusade ended as it began, by the manifestation of an ardent faith and by violent

[155] *Ibid.*, chap. 11; *Hist. des crois.*, I, 341.
[156] Albert of Aachen, Bk. VI, chap. 35.

passions ill restrained by that faith. Unbridled barbarity was to be found at the side of the purest heroism. The Church had still much labor to perform to bring about a complete triumph of the Christian spirit in morals.

Intellectual Movement

The importance of the outward events that filled the pontificate of Urban II, the long struggles he had to sustain against the princes, and that great expedition of the Crusade, the vicissitudes of which he followed with anxiety after organizing it with care, seemed to make impossible any intellectual movement. Yet this pontificate saw Scholastic theology born and organized with St. Anselm, and the science of canon law take an unprecedented progress with Ivo of Chartres.

We have already noted the importance of St. Anselm's political, social, and religious place in Anglo-Saxon history. His part in the intellectual development appears even greater. "He reminds one of Gregory VII, who, in the religious and political order of things, organized the Church and prepared the ground for the work of a Gregory IX or an Innocent III: Anselm was the Gregory VII of Scholasticism." [157] To organize a synthesis of all the religious speculations attempted before his time, and to try to define the relations of faith with reason, of the sciences of God with those of nature: this was the twofold object of Anselm's work. He has rightly been called the last of the fathers of the Church and the first of the Scholastics.

By the Scholastic movement, we mean the ensemble of the efforts made in the Middle Ages to seek an accord between the teachings of the faith and the data of ancient philosophy, by relying principally on the doctrine and method of Aristotle.[158]

[157] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, I, 169.

[158] *Ibid.*, pp. 136 ff. A large number of historians erroneously identify Scholasticism with the philosophy of the Middle Ages. The latter included, besides two cur-

Two kinds of minds had already laid the foundations of these efforts. Some, like Isidore of Seville in the seventh century and Gerbert in the tenth, had endeavored especially to assemble the materials of the vast synthesis; others, such as Rabanus Maurus, Ratramnus and Lanfranc, had devoted their efforts more particularly to elucidation of certain theological questions, including those of the real presence and of predestination. A systematic general view had been undertaken in the ninth century by the genius of Scotus Erigena. But that brilliant attempt, undertaken too soon by a mind too rash, had satisfied neither the requirements of reason nor those of faith. The work was still to be done. It called for a mind both powerful and well informed, acute and prudent, as docile in accepting from revelation all the mysteries that depend on God's authority, as it is insistent upon submitting to the control of reason whatever belongs to that domain. At Bec Abbey, Anselm had seen Lanfranc, his teacher, in his strife against Berengarius, take for the basis of his polemic an ensemble of coordinated speculations, make use of logic, not, as his predecessors had done, merely for the refutation of error, but for the construction of a system intended to satisfy the mind.

Moreover, the movement of scientific curiosity, so much encouraged by Sylvester II, had not ceased to spread. While striving against the schisms of the Christian princes and against the violence of the infidels, Urban II continued to favor the monastic life. Like St. Jerome, he said that the monks are the best soldiers, because from them emanate the manly virtues that make men invincible. His bullarium abounds in evidences of his friendliness to the monasteries of all orders. Wherever a new monastery was established, there a school was founded, a new home of science appeared. These monastic schools became, in

---

rents of Eastern philosophy (Byzantine and Arabic-Jewish), also several currents of Western antischolastic philosophy, bordering on pantheism, skepticism, false mysticism, and other systems.

turn, a forcible stimulant for the episcopal schools. In both, the study programs were enlarged. Legions of copyists worked there preparing and sending out the manuscripts of antiquity. In the *trivium* (embracing grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics), grammar had become, according to the definition of a contemporary, "the art of interpreting the historians and the poets." In the *quadrivium* (embracing arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music), the invention of Guido of Arezzo had given a considerable importance to music. The need of corresponding with adventurous minds, such as the new Manichaeans and the followers of Berengarius, that fought against dogma in the name of reason, had led to an enlargement of the domain of dialectics.

St. Anselm

This third branch of the *trivium* took on a particular development in the teaching of the school at Bec in Normandy, which acquired a fame that, in the second half of the eleventh century, by its brilliance outshone that of the other episcopal or monastic schools. A large cosmopolitan gathering of hearers, composed especially of French and English, thronged at first about Lanfranc, the brilliant adversary of Berengarius, the teacher par excellence, in whose case no one could decide which to admire the more, the erudition of his mind, the subtlety of his thought, or the elegance of his language. But the enthusiasm increased when Lanfranc yielded his place to the most brilliant of his pupils and, using a privilege which some professors of that period still assumed, chose the subject of his teaching, the philosophy of dogma.[159]

The new professor's success was owing less to the originality of his doctrines than to the opportune daring of his method; and we may rightly say that although, in the history of Catholic

[159] Ragey, *Hist. de saint Anselme*, I, 123.

scholarship, the name of St. Anselm is the greatest between that of St. Augustine and that of St. Thomas, his great fame arose especially because of his method. The essential character of that method is expressed in the title of his chief work: *Monologium, seu exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei* ("Monologue, or model of the way we can set about taking account of our faith"). His motto was, *Fides quaerens intellectum.* "It was the application of reason, with all its resources, to the study of the faith; this has since been called the Scholastic method." [160]

Lanfranc entered upon this path with timid step. According to him, philosophy should not be introduced into dogma except with the greatest reserve. He said: "God is my witness, that I would desire never to introduce questions of dialectics into the exposition of revealed truths." [161] Anselm had none of these apprehensions. He did not confuse faith with reason, he did not put them on the same footing, but he never separated them. He held as acquired the data of faith, and he gave them as such to his pupils, but he did not set forth a single one of these truths to his young students without saying to them: "You believe this truth; but do you know why you believe it? Do you understand its meaning, its relation to the other truths, whether natural or supernatural truths? We have questioned revelation; let us now question reason." [162] Regardless of what anyone said, he went to the very limits of his reasoning, having immense confidence in the power of dialectics and metaphysics.[163] "This is the Scholastic method in its essentials. He has rightly been called the Father of Scholasticism, and the Church with good reason speaks of him as being a model for all theologians who have treated of dogma according to the method of the School." [164] St. Anselm merits the title of "Father of Scholas-

[160] Bainvel, art. "Anselme" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* I, 1343.
[161] Lanfranc, *De corpore et sanguine Domini,* chap. 7.
[162] St. Anselm, *Cur Deus homo,* chaps. 1, 2, 11.
[163] See the preface of the *Monologium.*
[164] Roman Breviary, April 21, sixth lesson. Bainvel, *loc. cit.*

ticism" the more since he sums up all its aspects and since all the currents of the School can be recognized in him.[165] Like St. Thomas, he grants much to intellectual speculation; but, like St. Bonaventure, he gladly gives free course to love; and often, in the study of a dogma, after reason has exhausted all its resources, it is transformed into loving contemplation. In one of his philosophical *Meditations,* he exclaims: "Lord, grant that I may feel by love what I have just understood by reason." [166]

St. Anselm's principal writings are the following: the *Monologium,* a philosophical study about God, of which one writer has said that "neither the fathers nor St. Augustine contain anything so powerfully reasoned on the divine essence, and since the appearance of this work nothing has been written comparable to it as a summary of theodicy"; [167] the *Prologium,* in which we find the famous ontological argument adduced to prove the existence of God; [168] the *Cur Deus homo,* "the saint's most elaborated work, and also one of the boldest efforts of the human mind considering the things of faith with a view to understanding them"; [169] and the *Meditations,* real outbursts of the soul, so sincere and profound and eloquent that competent critics place them in the same rank as St. Augustine's *Confessions* and St. Teresa's *Elevations* and Bossuet's *Elevations,* and not far below the *Imitation of Christ.*

St. Anselm did more than leave a method and communicate a fresh stimulus to theological studies. Several of his formulas have passed into the language of dogma: for example, the formulas used to express the manner of transmission of original sin,[170] the purity of the Mother of God,[171] the role of Mary

[165] Cf. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode.*
[166] St. Anselm, *Contemplations,* 11; *PL,* CLVIII, 769.
[167] Bainvel, *op. cit.,* col. 1335.
[168] On the value of this argument, see Bainvel, *loc. cit.,* cols. 1350–60.
[169] *Ibid.,* col. 1338.
[170] St. Anselm, *De conceptu virginali,* chap. 23; *PL,* CLVIII, 457.
[171] *Ibid.,* chap. 18; *PL,* CLVIII, 451.

coredemptrix.[172] In his writings we find for the first time the thoroughly examined notion of the unity of the divine essence compared with the distinction between opposed relations.[173] He is the first to show clearly the infinite element in sin and the need of a God-man for a suitable atonement for sin. On original sin, his explanations have become classical; his distinctions regarding the different kinds of necessity, between the two wills (antecedent and consequent), still throw light on the problems that concern man's free will under the influence of God's grace. Even in a question that is debatable and debated, as in the famous ontological argument, where he attempts to prove the existence of God by the existence in us of the idea of perfect being, he had the gift of attracting and arousing the mightiest minds.[174] Even though his formula of God, *Ens quo majus cogitari non potest* ("the Being such that a more perfect being cannot be conceived"), is less rigorous than that of *Actus purus,* he had the merit of being the first to set forth practically the problem of what was later called the metaphysical essence of God.[175]

[172] St. Anselm, *Orationes,* 52; *PL,* CLVIII, 956.

[173] St. Anselm, *De processione Spiritus Sancti,* chap. 2; *PL,* CLVIII, 288 and *passim.*

[174] Suffice it to name Descartes (*Discourse on Method,* Part IV and *passim*) and Leibnitz (*New Essays Concerning Human Understanding,* Bk. IV, chap. 10, § 7, and *passim*).

[175] Bainvel, *loc. cit.,* col. 1348. See the life of St. Anselm by Domet de Vorges and one by Cochin. Rousselot (*Etudes sur la philosophie du Moyen Age*) and Bouchitté (*Le rationalisme chrétien à la fin du XI^e siècle*) have tried to make St. Anselm a precursor of rationalism, or at any rate of Cartesianism. A gulf separates him from Descartes and from the modern rationalists. St. Anselm always based himself on faith and he sought merely to establish its foundations or to explain its formulas by the effort of reason. Yet we must recognize that, in certain passages when, for example, he tries to prove by reason the mystery of the Trinity or the necessity of the incarnation, here and there his expressions are exaggerated and evidently go beyond his thought. The Protestants who consider St. Anselm a forerunner of Luther, basing their view on certain of his expressions in which he commits himself "solely to the merits of Christ," are likewise in fault. Such expressions are thoroughly Catholic if they are taken in their context. Harnack is more correct in regarding St. Anselm as one of the most genuine representatives of Catholicism (Harnack, *History of Dogma*); but this Protestant historian then proceeds to declare that Anselm did not know what faith is. Probably, however, Harnack has in mind the Protestant notion of faith.

Canon Law

If at first glance we are surprised at the existence of a great theological movement at the time of the war of investitures and the Crusades, the same is not the case with the movement of law studies, of which Ivo of Chartres was the outstanding representative. The claims of princes regarding the property and persons of the Church, the rivalries that arose between regulars and seculars, and on the part of both the inclination toward independence of the Holy See, were the occasions and the stimulants of these studies. These were, however, neither of the same value nor of the same character. Some of these studies, published in the heat of conflict—letters, invectives, and pamphlets—are largely polemical works and only now and then rise to the calm height of science.[176] Quite different is the monument erected by Ivo of Chartres. This merits the attention of history because of its importance and because of the influence it exercised on the development of ecclesiastical institutions.

Ivo was born in Beauvaisis about 1040 and was successively canon at Nesles, abbot of St. Quentin of Beauvais in 1075, then bishop of Chartres in 1091. He was educated in Bec Abbey, where he had Lanfranc as his teacher and St. Anselm as a fellow student. There he received an early training in the study of law and of Catholic tradition. His works and his letters bear witness to the vast extent of his knowledge. We have already remarked the firmness of his attitude with regard to the encroachments of the kings of France upon the rights of the Church. His written work is more significant. The Church at the close of the eleventh century, in a period when it had par-

[176] All these polemical works will be found gathered together in the *Monumenta Germaniae* under the title of *Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis XI et XII conscriptis* (3 vols.). Migne published some of them in *PL,* Vols. CXLIII, CXLV, CLVI, CLXII, etc. See Imbart de la Tour, "La polémique religieuse et les publicistes à l'époque de Grégoire VII" in *Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse, époque féodale,* pp. 225–66.

ticular need of order and peace, owes to him three valuable collections of ecclesiastical laws, prudent regulations for the execution of these laws, and an application of these principles to the pending question of investitures.

Two kinds of legislative collections were at the disposal of the Church at the close of the eleventh century. Some were chronological, such as the collection of Dionysius, in the form it had taken in the Carolingian epoch, and such as that of pseudo-Isidore in its various forms, more or less altered by additions and suppressions. The others were methodical. Of these the most famous was the collection in twenty books, published at the beginning of that century by Burchard, bishop of Worms, under the title of *Decretum.*[177] But the chronological collections, very inconvenient for consultation, were little used. As for Burchard's collection,

> it fell far short, at the close of the eleventh century, of corresponding to the needs and aspirations of Christian society. By the nature of the sources that furnished its elements, it reflected especially the laws of the Carolingian epoch. It summarized the history of a time when the dominant influence in the Church belonged to the leaders of the Frankish Empire and their entourage. But the second half of the eleventh century witnessed a revival of society: upon the ruins of the Carolingian world was raised a new world, with its center no longer the emperor, but the Roman pontiff. Naturally the codes that governed Christian society were changed at the same time.[178]

Besides, a general movement led the canonists of the eleventh century to the study of Roman law, previously almost entirely neglected. The collection of Anselm of Lucca made extensive use of the decisions of the emperors, taken from the various

[177] The text will be found in *PL,* CXL. Cf. Paul Fournier, *Etudes critiques sur le Décret de Burchard de Worms* (taken from the *Nouvelle Revue hist. du droit français et étranger*) and "Le Décret de Burchard de Worms, ses caractères, son influence," in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.,* XIII (1912), 451–73.

[178] Paul Fournier, "Yves de Chartres et le droit canonique" in the *Rev. des quest. hist.,* LXIII (1898), 387.

compilations of Justinian: from the *Institutes,* the *Code,* and the *Novellae.*[179] When Ivo became bishop of Chartres in 1091, Italian and French canonists had tried, in new collections, to fuse the ancient and the modern elements. But none of these collections won acceptance because of its intrinsic value or because of the renown of its author. To Ivo was reserved the honor of giving the Church the work so long awaited.

St. Ivo of Chartres

At almost the same date (in 1094 and 1095) he published three different collections. Although the hypothesis rests on no positive evidence, we may with some likelihood suppose that, when Pope Urban II came to France at this period for the holding of several councils, the meeting of these councils was the occasion for Ivo to compose his work.[180]

This work includes three collections: the *Tripartita,* a collection still unpublished, which seems to have been a mere essay; the *Decretum,* a more extensive collection where, in 3,760 chapters, Ivo inserted, besides nearly all Burchard's fragments, some texts taken from the decretals, the councils, the fathers, the Church historians, the *Breviarium* of Alaric, the Law of Justinian, and the capitularies of Charlemagne; lastly, the *Panormia,* Ivo's real methodical collection, the most widespread and the most used. "The great superiority of the *Panormia* over the *Decretum* is that the texts, divided into eight books, are arranged within these books in a methodical manner, in such a way that their location and examination are comparatively easy. Thus was available the chief texts of canon law in a short collection, convenient for consultation." [181] Ivo's collection soon

[179] *Ibid.,* p. 390. On this collection, see Fournier, "Le premier manuel canonique de la réforme du XI^e siècle," published in the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* of the Ecole française de Rome, XIV (1894), and also issued separately.

[180] Fournier, *loc. cit.,* p. 398.

[181] *Ibid.,* p. 404.

spread into all the countries of Western Europe, where it greatly facilitated the efforts of those who in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were undertaking to erect the Scholastic edifice of canon law beside that of theology.

Ivo of Chartres was not merely a scholar and a legal theorist. He was, in the fullest sense of the term, a jurist, engaged in the interpretation and application of the laws more than in their texts. Jurisprudence is indebted to him as greatly as is the theoretical science of law, and the principles formulated by him on this subject are perhaps the most remarkable part of his work.

In the mind of the Bishop of Chartres, one principle dominates all canon law: it is that, along with contingent laws which it contains, it includes unalterable rules, placed above the reach of any authority. These rules are the precepts "sanctioned by the eternal law," and the prohibitions concerning things that are intrinsically evil. Outside this category, the precepts of ecclesiastical law possess no character of necessity. Furthermore, they should not be unalterable. Ivo, following Isidore of Seville,[182] repeats again and again that laws need to be not only just; they must harmonize with the age and the country where their application is to be made, because the laws of the Church, instead of being an end in themselves, are simply means of assuring the salvation of souls.[183] But in practice how are we to reconcile this necessary accomplishment of the law with respect for the ancient texts? Ivo perceived the whole difficulty. He says: "Derogation from ancient usages is a serious thing for priests." Yet he recognizes that, "if the strict law were to be applied everywhere, the ministers of the Church would have no choice but to abandon their office and withdraw from the world." [184]

[182] Ivo of Chartres, *Ep.*, 189; cf. *Decret.*, IV, 168.
[183] *Ibid.*, 60.
[184] *Ibid.*, 190.

Ivo sees the remedy in the "dispensation." To the subject of dispensation he devotes his only doctrinal exposition of an institution of canon law. He speaks of it repeatedly. The practice of dispensations granted by superiors is probably as ancient as the Church; but Ivo of Chartres was the first to enunciate the theory of dispensations. He showed their necessary part in the functioning of institutions and in the juridical life of societies. Moreover, dispensations must not be subject to the whim of the persons concerned; they depend upon the lawful superior: abbot, bishop, metropolitan, primate, and especially the supreme pastor, the pope.

In broaching this last question, Ivo was touching upon one of the most burning controversies of his time, a question that soon was much discussed in connection with the investiture quarrel.

To avoid any ambiguity, Ivo resolutely takes up the question of investitures and applies his principles to it. As clearly as the most ardent defenders of the Holy See, he decides for the supremacy of the Church over the state. In writing to King Henry I of England, he says: "As the body can do nothing unless governed by the soul, so the temporal power can do nothing unless it lets itself be enlightened and guided by the teaching of the Church." [185] But Ivo bitterly deplores the consequences of the quarrel that divided the two powers. The Church and the state are made to be united and to go ahead in concert. Their law is good understanding, not war. Therefore Ivo endeavors to remove the ambiguities that arose in the famous quarrel. For the sake of peace, he would even leave to the princes the ceremony of investiture with the crosier and the ring, provided these rulers admitted that they were not conferring any spiritual power.[186] Although he states that investiture with the crosier

[185] *Ibid.*, 106.

[186] *Quae concessio, sive fiat manu, sive nutu, sive lingua, sive virga, quid refert, cum reges nihil spirituale se dare intendunt?* (*Ep.*, 60; cf. 236.)

and the ring is an evil because of the external symbol it expresses, he repeats his favorite thesis. Rather than the risk of disturbing the peace of the world, would not the better procedure in specific cases, of which the pope would be the judge, be to make use of that dispensing right which the Church often had occasion to employ? He says: "When the salvation of nations is at stake, we should moderate the strictness of the canons and use sincere charity for the cure of mortal ailments." [187] Such words prepared the way for the movement of ideas which was successful in the Concordat of Worms.[188]

At the time when the great Bishop was writing these lines, several symptoms gave hope of a proximate peace. The Crusade seemed to have given a mortal blow to the schism of Guibert. Rather than appear to range themselves under the command of the pope, the schismatic barons at first kept apart from the movement. Later, changing their tactics, they attempted to organize a separate expedition, under the direction of the antipope's brother, Albert II, count of Parma.[189] But this attempt did not win them any favor. The fortresses which they had long held at Rome were all recovered from their hands.[190] Pope Urban II at length found in Rome a tranquillity which he had not enjoyed for a long time past, but which, alas, would be of short duration, because presently he became afflicted with the grievous illness that brought him to the grave.

[187] *Ep.*, 60.

[188] We have merely given a summary of Ivo's ideas regarding questions of major importance from the historical point of view. A more detailed study would show that he opened the way for canonists in the solution of the most important questions of private law. Thus, in contrast to Hincmar, he teaches firmly that "marriage is indissoluble once the conjugal pact is perfect" (*Ep.*, 246), that is, he holds that marriage exists by the consentient contract of the parties, and not by its consummation. On the extent of the powers of bishops, metropolitans, prelates, and the pope, he expressed ideas that lighted the way for later canonists. In our whole exposition of the teaching of Ivo of Chartres, we have been greatly aided by the scholarly study of Fournier, frequently mentioned above.

[189] *Revue des quest. hist.*, XXXIV, 247 f.

[190] Ruinart, *Vita Urbani papae*, chap. 345; *PL*, CLI, 258.

Monastic Foundations

The founding of the monastery of Fontevrault in 1096 by Blessed Robert of Arbrissel, and of Citeaux in 1098 by St. Robert of Molesme, were two of his last spiritual joys. The Breton Robert of Arbrissel (born in 1047) had at first been coadjutor of the Bishop of Rennes, and later professor of theology at Angers. Drawn to the contemplative life, he then withdrew into the Craon forest near Anjou to live there as a hermit. Urban II, who was aware of the extent of his learning and the ardor of his zeal, had him leave his retreat and ordered him to preach in the neighboring dioceses. He preached in Normandy, Brittany, Anjou, and Touraine, denouncing the vices of the age with unprecedented boldness and drawing after him penitents of both sexes. The effect was a sort of new crusade of people who, unable to take part in an expedition to the Holy Land, asked of him that they might lead a penitential life in their own country. Robert assembled them in a wilderness, called Fontevrault, in the diocese of Poitiers. There they lived at first in crude huts, men and women separately in two different quarters, under the guidance of the holy missioner. The generosity of the neighboring lords enabled Robert to build a double monastery there, which Pope Paschal II approved in 1106. By way of homage to the Blessed Virgin, the monks, so it was established, were to recognize the supremacy of the abbess of the nuns, considered as superior general of the new order.

Two years after the foundation of Fontevrault, Robert of Champagne, abbot of a monastery dependent on Cluny, saddened by his lack of success in leading his monks back to an austere life, withdrew with twenty companions to the neighborhood of the city of Dijon, to a solitary place called Citeaux (*Cistertium*) because, we are told, of the many cisterns in the

district. There, under his guidance, the virtues of poverty and humility flourished.[191]

But Urban saw scarcely the beginnings of this new monastery, destined to so great fame. He died on July 29, 1099, fourteen days after the crusaders' entry into Jerusalem, at the moment when at length, after so many difficulties and hardships, the enterprise triumphed, to which he had devoted so much of his life.

[191] Cf. Ursmer Berlière, "Les origines de Citeaux et l'ordre bénédictin au XII^e siècle" in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.*, I (1900), 448–71; II (1901), 253–90.

CHAPTER VII

Paschal II to Callistus II (1099–1124)

THE great and strenuous pontificate of Urban II finally produced all its fruits under his three immediate successors: Paschal II, Gelasius II, and Callistus II. The Concordat of Worms, in 1122, put an end to the investiture quarrel. In Palestine, conquered from the Turks, Christian states were organized. With St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable the monastic life and the sacred sciences flourished again as in the finest days of the Church. In 1123 the First General Council of the Lateran, the ninth of the ecumenical councils, sanctioned all these reforms and progressive movements. But these beneficent results were attained only amid severe trials. A perfidious emperor who was a traitor to the Holy See, the episcopate of a great country temporarily in revolt, the dissension insinuating itself among the conquerors of the Holy Land, heresy raising its head with Abelard and Peter de Bruys: these were the spectacles that saddened the pontificates of Paschal II, Gelasius II, and Callistus II. Like their divine Master, the vicars of Christ are victorious only by the passion and the cross.

Cardinal Rainier, who was elected pope on July 29, 1099, and enthroned [1] under the name of Paschal II, was a native of Tuscany. He was a monk,[2] whom Gregory VII had remarked at

[1] The *Liber pontificalis*, in connection with Paschal II, gives a summary description of the ceremonies of papal election and consecration at the beginning of the twelfth century. For these ceremonies, see Duchesne, *Lib. pont.*, II, 306 note 4. Cf. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 362.

[2] Commonly Paschal II is said to have been a monk at Cluny. But the earliest writer who names his monastery (Orderic Vitalis, *Hist. eccles.*, X, 1), says: *Rainerius, Vallis Brutiorum monachus* (Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.*, II, 306 note 3).

the time of a business visit to Rome,[3] and whom Urban II on his deathbed recommended to the choice of the electors.[4] Therefore every reason justified the hope that he would zealously continue the reform work that had been commenced. But, although he possessed the purity of principles of those two illustrious pontiffs, he did not have to the same degree that knowledge of men and that firmness of character which distinguished both of them. He has been blamed, sometimes bitterly, with too easily letting himself be lured at the outset of his pontificate by the promises of Henry V, then later with not resisting vigorously enough the Emperor's deeds of violence. But he brought an end to the schism of England, firmly recalled the King of France to the observance of the laws of the Church, encouraged the struggle against heresies, favored the development of the religious life, labored for the reform of morals, and, until his death, which took place on January 21, 1118, never lost sight of the great objective of the Crusades, which he encouraged to be resumed.

His successor, Gelasius II, occupied the see of St. Peter only from January 24, 1118 to January 29, 1119. He was called John of Gaeta and had been a monk of Monte Cassino, then cardinal-deacon and chancellor of the Roman Church for forty years. At the time of his election he was very old. The violence of Emperor Henry V, who was sustaining an antipope, obliged him twice to leave Rome. In September, 1118, he even left Italy and went to France, where he had a conference with Louis the Fat and where the people "welcomed him as though they were beholding St. Peter in person." He died January 29, 1119, in Cluny Abbey, and was buried there. Gelasius, by his timely flight, not only placed the papacy beyond the reach of the German Emperor; he also taught the papacy henceforth to seek its reliance on France.

[3] *Lib. pontif.*, II, 296.
[4] Ekkehard, *Chronicon universale*, year 1099; *PL*, CLIV, 976.

Guido of Burgundy, who succeeded Gelasius II on February 2, 1119, under the name of Callistus II, had the consolation and the glory to seal the work of peace and the work of reform by the Concordat of Worms and by the First Council of the Lateran. He was related to the kings of England, of Germany, and of France. He was able to escape from the traps laid for him by Henry V, successfully intervened in the conflicts that were dividing France and England, ended the schism of the antipope Gregory VIII, and, after the two great acts of his pontificate, the Concordat of Worms and the Lateran Council, died on December 13 or 14, 1124, amid the preparations for a Crusade.

Emperor Henry IV

At the death of Urban II, the situation of the antipope Guibert was critical. From Ravenna, where he resided, the false Clement III had seen nearly all the fortified towns of the exarchate successively fall into the hands of his foes. Pope Urban's return to Rome, the papacy's recovery of Castle Sant' Angelo, and the renewal by a Roman council (1099) of all the condemnations issued against the schism, brought about his discredit. Probably the month of October, 1100, at a date that cannot be exactly established, he died suddenly, stricken with a relentless disease. Before his death, according to some, he gave signs of repentance;[5] according to others he remained stubborn and impenitent, "taking his anathema with him," as Domnizo says, "into eternity."[6]

This death lessened the strength of Henry IV's party. The Emperor was at that time much occupied with his political situation in Germany. After the deposition of his eldest son Conrad, he had the royal crown bestowed upon his second son Henry,

[5] Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon,* Bk. II; *PL,* CLIV, 380.
[6] Domnizo, *Vita Mathildis,* Bk. II, chap. 12; *PL,* CXLVIII, 1018.

January 6, 1099. He took no hand in the election that was held in September by the followers of Guibert. The newly chosen antipope Theodoric was at once imprisoned by the followers of Paschal and was confined in La Cava monastery.[7] Henry IV even spoke of coming to a friendly understanding with the Pope and of assembling the German princes to conclude a reconciliation with the Holy See.[8] But Conrad's death, which occurred at Florence (July, 1101), suddenly changed the Emperor's attitude. He again became arrogant toward the papacy. Ekkehard maintains that the Emperor then conceived the idea of sustaining the new antipope Albert, whom the Guibertists had elected, and of overthrowing Paschal.[9]

Lateran Synod (1102)

The Pope's duty was clearly marked. Paschal convoked a great council at the Lateran, for Lent, 1102. It was attended by several bishops of Campania, Tuscany, Sicily, Apulia, and nearly all the regions of Italy. Many bishops from beyond the Alps were represented at it. The council took up the question of the schism, which it declared "the most detestable of heresies," and drew up the following formula, which each of those present was called upon to sign: "I anathematize every heresy, in particular the one which at present is disturbing the Church and which declares that anathema and ecclesiastical penalties are without value. I promise obedience to Pope Paschal and to his successors, accepting or rejecting what the holy universal Church accepts or rejects." [10] Henry IV was again personally anathematized; but no attention was paid to the antipope. Albert, three months after his election, had been given up to the

[7] Jaffé, no. 6630.
[8] *M. G., SS.*, III, 107.
[9] Ekkehard, *op. cit.*, year 1102; *PL*, CLIV, 985; Jaffé, no. 6630.
[10] Mansi, XX, 1147.

Holy See by one of his friends and was confined in the monastery of St. Lawrence at Aversa.[11]

A sudden change was then effected in the Emperor's attitude. He returned to his protests of peace and of loyalty to the Holy See. In a diet of the Empire held at Mainz at the beginning of 1103, he declared his intention of abdicating in favor of his son Henry V and, after being reconciled with the Pope, of undertaking a Crusade [12] for the expiation of his sins. He wrote to his godfather Hugh of Cluny, begging him to convey his intentions to the Holy Father. In this same diet of Mainz, Henry had his nobles swear to a perpetual peace, in which they promised to respect and protect not only monks, women, children, and old men, but also the Jews, then being persecuted by the crusaders in Palestine.[13]

Many clerics and laymen, moved by these declarations, put on the cross to accompany the Emperor to the Holy Land.[14] But the Pope, instead of crediting the Emperor's sincerity, did everything possible to keep the faithful from joining the project. To the Count of Flanders he wrote: "We point out to your piety a much greater object. Everywhere, according to your strength, pursue Henry, the leader of the heretics. We command this undertaking to you and your vassals for the remission of your sins and as a means of winning the heavenly Jerusalem." [15] At the same time the Pope endeavored to turn from Henry IV's cause several nobles, ecclesiastical and lay, who had rallied to him, among them Duke Guelph of Bavaria and Duke Berthold of Zahringen.[16]

[11] Jaffe, no. 6630.

[12] *Annales Augustani,* in *M. G., SS.,* Vol. III; Ekkehard, *op. cit.,* year 1103; *PL,* CLIV, 987.

[13] *M. G., SS.,* VI, 224.

[14] Ekkehard, *loc. cit.; PL, loc. cit.*

[15] Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 479 f.; Cauchie, *La querelle des investitures dans les diocèses de Liége et de Cambrai;* G. Morin, "Un épisode inédit du passage de l'empereur Henri IV à Liége en 1103" in the *Rev. bénéd.,* LXXVII (1910), 412–15.

[16] Jaffé, nos. 5970–73; *PL,* CLXIII, 108–21.

Revolt of Henry V

But an unforeseen event suddenly changed the political situation of the Empire and also, so it seemed, the religious situation of all Christendom. In December, 1104, the Emperor's own son Henry V, he whom he had but lately raised to the royalty power and to whom he declared he was ready to turn over the imperial crown, abruptly left the imperial camp and withdrew to Ratisbon. From there he wrote his father that he refused obedience to him. Gathering his friends about him, he told them he could no longer serve the cause of one excommunicated. Then, manifesting a delicacy of religious feelings that he was not previously known to possess, he wrote to the Pope, asking that he be relieved from an oath which he had formerly taken never to aspire to the Empire without his father's permission. In reality, Henry V had no need to be released from his oath; Henry IV, since his solemn excommunication by Gregory VII, was no longer, in the eyes of the Church, a legitimate sovereign. But Henry V needed to be absolved from the excommunication he had incurred for maintaining relations with his excommunicated father. The Pope received favorably his recourse to the Holy See. Distrustful of the old King, he believed in the sincerity of the young prince,[17] and declared to him that God would pardon him his past faults if he were resolved to be a just king and a loyal defender of the Church.

Provided with this approbation, Henry V recruited numerous followers for his cause. Thuringia and Saxony supplied him with powerful reinforcements. During the summer of 1105 he attended a council at Nordhausen in Thuringia, where his modesty and reserve won him the friendliness of the ecclesiastical world. He called upon God and the heavenly court to witness that he was not aiming at power, that he desired only the reestablishment of religious peace, so grievously disturbed by

[17] Henry V was then twenty-three years old.

his lord and father. "Let him submit to St. Peter," he concluded, "and I will eagerly submit to him." The council, deeply moved by these words, chanted the *Kyrie eleison* and recited other prayers for the conversion of the unfortunate Henry IV.[18]

But Henry IV did not remain inactive. Aided by some great vassals, he had raised a considerable army, against which Henry V advanced at the head of his partisans. Influential princes prevented a decisive battle. Henry V then used trickery. With unequaled duplicity he presented himself in his father's camp and, with tears in his eyes, promised that henceforth he would conduct himself as a dutiful son and faithful subject, if his father would be reconciled with the Church. Henry agreed at least to deliberate on this point with the bishops in a council which would soon meet at Mainz. In fact, he went to it with a small escort. But on December 23, 1105, he suddenly saw himself surrounded by the men-at-arms of his perjured son and was brought to a citadel near Kreuznach, where he was kept in close imprisonment. When the sovereign appeared before the Council of Mainz, he did so as a prisoner. The council, dominated by his son, obliged him to remove the insignia of his office. On January 5, 1106, Henry V was proclaimed king and crowned as such by the Archbishop of Mainz.

At this same time the imperial party attempted a similar coup at Rome against the Pope. On November 18, 1105, Margrave Werner of Ancona, profiting by Paschal II's absence, had the priest Maginulf proclaimed pope in the name of Emperor Henry IV. The antipope took the name of Sylvester IV.

Neither of the two criminal attempts was crowned with success. At the end of a few days Paschal II succeeded in seizing the usurper.[19] As to Henry IV, having escaped from the prison where his son was confining him, he made known everywhere the violence to which he had been subjected, wrote to the kings

[18] *M. G., SS.*, III, 108.
[19] *Annales romani*, in *M. G., SS.*, V, 477.

of France, England, and Denmark, appealing for their support, revoked his abdication as having been extorted from him through violence, and marched against his son at the head of an army. A big battle was about to take place between Liège and Aachen, when Henry IV died (August 7, 1106) after a short illness. Before drawing his last breath, he showed deep feelings of repentance in the matter of his conduct toward the Church, and he received the last sacraments piously. But ecclesiastical burial was given his body only five years later in the cathedral of Spires, when the sentence of excommunication against him was removed.[20]

Henry V's Hostility to the Pope

By his father's death, Henry V became the undisputed head of the Empire. But this son who embittered his father's last days, this perjured prince who violated his most sacred promises, could not be a protector of the Church. He had made use of the papacy so far as he had need of it; he turned from it as soon as he attained his purpose. Less than a month passed before he shamelessly removed the mask, declaring that he had no other religious policy than that of his august father.

Henry V had none of those gifts of mind, of courage, of military and administrative authority which would have made of Henry IV, if an evil education had not corrupted such brilliant qualities, one of the greatest kings of Germany. But he possessed more cunning and penetration, and these traits made him more formidable to his foes. Paschal II seemed incapable of that inexorable firmness with which Urban II was able to

[20] This refusal of religious burial has been a subject of recrimination against the Church on the part of rationalist and Protestant writers. We should bear in mind that excommunication, like all censures, has only juridical effects and deprives the Christian of spiritual goods only of the external forum and that these effects can be prevented only by a juridical act of the external forum. Hence an excommunicated person may die in dispositions that will obtain God's pardon for him and yet be lawfully deprived of ecclesiastical burial.

arm himself when he saw the essential interests of the Church in peril. On the contrary, Pope Paschal professed, as a maxim of conduct, that when we wish to raise up a man who is prostrate, we must bend over to him without losing our balance. This comparison sums up the policy of his pontificate.

As the first testimony of his fatherly condescension, Paschal II at a council (October 22, 1106) in the city of Guastalla,[21] in the presence of royal deputies, had a proclamation issued, that a general pardon was granted to all the clerics of the Empire who had been declared schismatic or excommunicated during the recent conflicts. He even planned to go in person to Germany and bring to the King the decisions of the council, when he heard of a complete change in Henry V's attitude. Instead of proceeding to Germany, he went to France. In the spring of 1107, at St. Denis, he had an interview with Louis the Fat and his son, whom he begged to protect the Church against the tyrants, after the example of Charlemagne.[22] But at Châlons-sur-Marne he was joined by an imperial embassy, which called upon him to agree to the investitures. At the head of this embassy marched Duke Guelph of Bavaria, Countess Matilda's second husband who, when his greed was deceived, abandoned his virtuous wife and the cause of the pope, and became the tool of the imperial cupidity. "Wherever he went," says Suger, "he had a sword carried before him and used to speak very arrogantly." [23] The ambassadors, through their spokesman the Archbishop of Trier, pleaded that "the right of investiture was inseparable from those regalian rights (*regalia*) which bishops and abbots obtained over the cities, castles, and various domains, and which constituted for the Church a very appreciable source of revenue." Paschal, without stooping to discuss this pecuniary side of the question, answered them

[21] In northern Italy, between Verona and Mantua.

[22] Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros, annales de sa vie et de son règne,* p. 26.

[23] Suger, *Vita Ludovici Grossi,* chap. 9; *PL,* CLXXXVI, 1269.

through the Bishop of Piacenza: "The Church, redeemed by the blood of Christ, cannot become a servant. Such it would become if its pastors could not take possession of their offices without the assent of the king." The angry Germans, barely restrained by the presence of the French, replied: "Not here, but at Rome and with the sword this quarrel will be settled." [24] And they went off and returned to their master.

Henry V at Rome

Henry V, notwithstanding the Pope's protests, continued to give investiture to his protégés. Wars that he had to wage in Poland, Bohemia, Moravia, and Hungary occupied his attention throughout the year 1109. But in midsummer, 1110, he announced his coming to Rome soon. He appeared there at the head of a large army. He was followed by numerous scholars, as though to give the impression upon his arrival that he would defend his cause by arguments as well as by the sword. Henry's ambassadors entered upon conferences with a commission appointed by the Pope. The question of the investitures was at once taken up. The King's representatives repeated, in a milder form, the argument based upon the so-called regalian rights.

"We recognize," they said, "that these rights cannot be alienated, because they are worthy of all respect and are necessary for the Church. But, since they are located on domains that come from Charlemagne and his successors, to the successors of Charlemagne belongs the right to give the investiture of them." The sophistry of this reasoning had already been exposed. Ivo of Chartres, even Gregory VII, had answered the argument by distinguishing between the collation of the spiritual powers and the transmission of feudal rights. But the Pope's representatives, conforming to the well-known ideas of Paschal

[24] Such is the account of Suger, who was an eyewitness of this discussion. Suger, *loc. cit.*

II, had a more spirited reply. They said: "That does not bind us. The prelates will render to the king the goods and the regalian rights received from Charlemagne. The servants of the Church can be satisfied with the tithes and the offerings of the faithful." Trained by their master, the German ambassadors replied: "The King will not allow such a violence to be done to the Church; he will not tolerate this theft." Their purpose, by these words, was to cast on the Pope all the odium of a measure that was felt to be full of difficulties and that, if need be, would be made impossible of execution. The papal envoys, without seeing the trap, answered: "Next Sunday [25] the Pope will order the prelates to renounce the regalian rights."

Treaty of Sutri

A treaty was concluded on this basis and was presented for the signature of King Henry, who ratified it at Sutri [26] on February 12, 1111. Hence the name "Concordat of Sutri" given it. The King gave up the right of investiture and in addition promised to respect the Patrimony of St. Peter, as also the immunity of the pope and of the legates; but at the same time he received official acknowledgment of the Pope's promise regarding the abandonment of the regalian rights.[27] Ekkehard adds that at the last moment the King, to make his promises more certainly illusory, set forth a new condition and required a modification in the text of the treaty. No longer does he, as previously, make his renunciation of the investitures dependent on the publication by the Pope of an edict ordering the abandonment of the regalian rights, but dependent upon the approval of the execution of this edict by the German prelates.[28] Again

[25] It was Quinquagesima Sunday, February 12, 1111.

[26] Sutri, in the district of Viterbo, province of Rome.

[27] *M. G., Leges,* II, 66–69.

[28] Ekkehard's text is explicit: *Praebuit rex assensum, sed eo pacto, quatenus haec transmutatio . . . concordia totius Ecclesiae ac regni principum stabiliretur: quod*

the papal ambassadors were tricked by the perfidious craftiness of the King. The *Chronicle of Monte Cassino* adds a detail which renders the monarch still more detestable and which is not unlikely. It reports that the King swore in German "that he would do whatever he wished." Some Romans heard these words and took refuge in the city.[29]

Imprisonment of Pope Paschal II

The King's coronation by the Pope was to follow the conclusion of the treaty. This was Henry V's great objective. For this very purpose he had schemed so many deceptions. But just when the ceremony was about to begin, when the Pope asked him plainly whether he renounced the practice of investiture in consideration of the conditions stipulated in the first Sutri agreement, Henry vainly tried to evade the question by vague words, then by threats, and lastly by changing the subject of conversation. Paschal showed himself more alert and energetic than the King had supposed he was. The King had only one expedient left: brutal violence. And he resorted to this. The Pope was seized and made a prisoner. But soon the Romans rose up. Blood flowed in the streets of Rome. The fight lasted throughout one whole day. The Romans, at first victorious, then repulsed, at last forced the Germans to withdraw to their intrenchments. The King then decided to retreat, but he took the Pope with him. Paschal was confined in the fortress of Trabico in Sabina. No Italian was allowed to speak to him. He was guarded and served by the Germans.

At first Paschal was very firm. But, at the end of two months, no longer expecting aid from any of his friends and knowing that the valiant Countess Matilda had been rendered powerless, beset by continual and urgent solicitations, afflicted by the griefs

etiam vix aut nullo modo fieri posse credebatur (Ekkehard, *op. cit.*, year 1111; *PL*, CLIV, 1021).

[29] *M. G., SS.*, VII, 779; Watterich, II, 54.

of the Romans and by the lamentations of the prisoners held as hostages, he pronounced these words: "For the deliverance of the Church, I yield to force; I do what I would have wished to avoid even at the price of my blood." [30]

It was April 10, 1111. The Emperor promised to release the hostages on the next day or the day following, to restore what he had taken of the Patrimony of St. Peter, and in everything to obey the Holy Father, in everything, "save the honor of the kingdom and of the Empire." Paschal swore to pardon the Emperor for all the outrages he had received from him, never to pronounce anathema against him, and "never to disturb him in the matter of the investitures." [31] But Henry was not satisfied with this formula. He had a notary come from Rome the next night and had him draw up a formula which the Pope signed at once. This is the celebrated formula known as the "Privilege." It says that the bishops and abbots elected without violence or simony will receive investiture from the Emperor by the crosier and the ring, and that no bishop-elect will be consecrated before being invested.[32] On April 13, while the antipope Maginulf, the false Sylvester IV, before the gates of the city solemnly renounced the papal office and swore obedience to Paschal II,[33] Henry V was crowned in the Basilica of St. Peter; then he returned to Germany. There, after celebrating his father's magnificent obsequies, he invested with the archbishopric of Mainz, the chief episcopal see of the Empire, his chancellor Adalbert, the principal instrument of his policy of trickery and violence in his strife against the papacy.

But the recriminations foreseen and provoked by the Emperor soon broke out. A considerable party of the faithful blamed the Pope for his weakness. The German prelates refused to cede their regalian rights. Eminent personages of the

[30] *Annales romani,* in *M. G., SS.,* V, 475.
[31] *M. G., SS.,* VI, 250.
[32] The text may be seen in Baronius, *Annales,* year 1111.
[33] Watterich, II, 68–90.

Church (Archbishop John of Lyons, Archbishop Guido of Vienne, Bishop Gualo of St. Pol de Leon, Bishop Ivo of Chartres) showed the Pope their deep grief. About the end of the year 1111, Paschal decided to withdraw his concessions. He wrote to Ivo of Chartres and to Guido of Vienne that "he had yielded only to force," that "he rejected what he had unjustly conceded." [34] Since then he thought of nothing but the means of expiating his fault and of recovering, by an official act, the concessions he had made to the Emperor. To expiate his act of weakness, he resolved to abdicate, then to retire to the island of Portia south of Rome and there live an ascetic life. His entourage dissuaded him from this project.[35] To accomplish the official revocation of the concession, he convoked a council, which met at the Lateran, March 18, 1112. Upon the proposal of Bishop Gerard of Angoulême, the council, made up of 12 archbisops, 114 bishops, 15 cardinal-priests, and 8 cardinal-deacons, unanimously signed the following declaration: "The *Privilegium,* which should rather be called a *Pravilegium,* extorted from the Pope by King Henry, is rejected by us all, assembled in this holy council with Pope Paschal." [36]

Henry V's Peaceful Advances

Gerard of Angoulême undertook the delicate mission of notifying the King of the council's decision. As he remarked to the monarch that this declaration did not annul the oath taken by the Pope "never to disturb the Emperor for his attacks upon

[34] Mansi, XX, 1008; Baronius, year 1111, no. 24; year 1112, no. 3. We may compare this momentary weakness of Paschal II with the momentary weakness of Pope Liberius at Beroea in the fourth century (Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* II, 169 ff.) and that of Pope Pius VII at Fontainebleau.

[35] See Suger, *Vita Ludovici Grossi,* chap. 9; *PL,* CLXXXVI, 1272; *Gesta episcop. Engolismensium,* chap. 35; *M. G., SS.,* XXI, 52. Godfrey of Viterbo dramatizes the scene and represents the Pope as setting down his miter and mantle in the midst of the Lateran Council, in the presence of the fathers, who rejected his abdication.

[36] Mansi, XXI, 49–67.

the Holy See and for the right he arrogated to himself to give investitures," Henry refrained from any recrimination, temporized, and, according to his custom, at first by trickery sought to win back the lost ground. Moreover, he saw the number of his enemies increase in Germany, and would profit by a reconcilation with the Pope and with Italy.

Already he had gone to Tuscany to visit Countess Matilda, whom he called his mother and whom he made vice-queen of Italy.[37] In Upper Italy he gathered an important assembly of bishops and abbots, to deliberate on the means of re-establishing a lasting peace between the priesthood and the Empire. We must suppose that this assembly did not give him the satisfaction he hoped for, because in the spring of 1117, on the pretext of ending a conflict that had arisen between the Pope and the Romans, he appeared suddenly before Rome. He was there welcomed by the shouts of people paid in advance; but the clergy received him coldly. At the feast of Easter, no cardinal was willing to place the crown on his head, as was the custom whenever an emperor was at Rome on a great feast day of the Church. For this ceremony Henry was obliged to resort to an archbishop of Braga, Mauricio Burdinho, who had come to Rome on account of his difficulties with the primate of Toledo. As to Pope Paschal, he had left the city at word of the Emperor's approach and had gone to Benevento. From that city he excommunicated Burdinho and summoned the Normans to his aid. But the small Norman forces that answered his appeal were overcome and dispersed.[38] Nevertheless, thanks to the assistance of several cities and especially to the loyalty of the Romans, Paschal was able to return to Rome in January, 1118. But he was worn out and there fell sick and died on the twenty-first of the same month. As he was dying, he summoned the cardinals about him and recommended union to them; then he

[37] Domnizo, *Vita Mathildis.*, II, 18.

[38] Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, I, 320.

had them promise to resist with all their might the "Teutonic enormity" (*enormitati teutonicae*).[39]

Pope Gelasius II

This advice was heeded by the cardinals and by the Pope they elected, Gelasius II. In vain Henry V employed promises and then threats to obtain from the new Pope concessions like those he had momentarily extorted from Paschal II. In the vain hope of scaring Gelasius, he had his faithful Burdinho solemnly consecrated (March 8, 1118) and attempted to impose him on the Church as pope, under the name of Gregory VIII. On April 7, Gelasius pronounced sentence of excommunication against Henry and his creature. The followers of Burdinho then resorted to violence and even in Rome engaged in violent strife against the Christians faithful to the lawful pope. Gelasius put an end to these sad scenes by quitting Rome. To his friends he said: "Let us leave Sodom." Passing by way of Pisa and Genoa, he went to France, reaching there at the end of October, 1118. He intended to assemble at Reims the bishops of France and Germany in a great council of peace, far removed from noisy provocations and impassioned disputes. But death overtook him at Cluny, January 29, 1119.

Council of Reims (1119)

The next day the cardinals and the Roman clergy and laity who had followed Pope Gelasius in his exile chose as his successor Archbishop Guido of Vienne. When this choice was approved by the cardinals who stayed in Rome and by the Roman people, the new Pope was crowned at Vienne (February 9, 1119) under the name of Callistus II. His first care was to

[39] Peter of Pisa, *Vita Paschalis II*, no. 27; *PL*, CLXIII, 27; *Acta sanctorum*, May, II, 314.

assemble at Reims the great peace council planned by his predecessor. Louis the Fat, king of France, the chief prelates of France, Germany, Italy, and England, promised to attend. The tactic was, without negotiating with the Emperor or the antipope or any of their representatives, to oppose to them the authority of an immense council forcibly proclaiming what was right. This tactic had the more chance of success since the Emperor, engaged with internal strifes that were more and more desolating his Empire, was vainly seeking a solid support for his throne. He took the initiative in proposing to the Pope a formula of conciliation. He said that he would agree to renounce "any investiture over the Churches." [40]

The council opened on October 20, 1119. Present were 15 archbishops, more than 200 bishops, and many abbots and ecclesiastical dignitaries, in all 430 prelates. After the regulation of several special matters and the passing of several important decrees regarding the Truce of God, the great question of the investitures was then taken up. Not to be again tricked by the treachery of the Emperor, the Pope himself went to the imperial camp at Mouzon and again asked the Emperor for exact statements as to his intentions about the investitures. From his conferences with the Emperor, Callistus remained convinced that a new trap was set for him; that, in promising to renounce "the investiture of clerics," as heads of the Churches, the King meant to invest them as possessors of fiefs and thus to resume his former practices without any modification. When the Pope, upon returning to the council, reported the results of the conferences held at Mouzon with the Emperor, the 430 members of the council pronounced solemn anathema against the Emperor.[41]

The purpose of the great council was attained: Henry V understood the futility of further attempts to deceive the Pope

[40] *M. G., Leges,* § 4, *Const. et Acta,* I, nos. 104 f., pp. 157 f.
[41] Mansi, XXI, 233–55.

by dubious formulas. He knew that now he must reckon with a formidable opposition of the great Churches of Christendom, all ranged about the Pontiff to defend his rights. Various events showed him that what he had to face was not a passing manifestation. Public opinion, weary of so many quarrels, took its stand on the Pope's side. In April, 1121, the population of Sutri seized the unfortunate antipope Burdinho, seated him backwards on a camel, and in this guise led him to Rome, where the populace would have torn him in pieces if the Pope had not rescued him from the popular fury and confined him in the monastery of the Trinity at La Cava.

In the month of December the Emperor invested one of his creatures as bishop of Würzburg. Thereupon a large part of the clergy and people openly opposed the imperial appointee and at once elected someone else. The princes, who, in the diet at Würzburg in September, had decided that the Emperor should promise obedience to the Pope, took the side of the one chosen by the clergy and people. The Emperor was driven to a corner. A kindly and affable letter from Callistus facilitated the act of frank and definite submission which all the circumstances obliged the Emperor to make. Said the Pope: "The Church does not seek to claim anything whatever that is yours. Let the Church possess what is Christ's, and let the Emperor keep what is his, and let each party be satisfied with its own office." [42]

Concordat of Worms

The Pope proposed to deliberate about the conditions of an accord in a diet at which the bishops and lay princes of the Empire would take part. The meeting place was fixed first at Mainz, then, out of consideration for the Emperor's feelings, at Worms, a city particularly devoted to him. The discussions

[42] Callistus II, *Bullarium,* II, 6.

were long and several times painful. But the representatives of the Holy See, by their patience and good will, finally overcame all the difficulties. By the treaty concluded on September 23, 1122, known as the Concordat of Worms, the Emperor renounced investiture by the crosier and ring, and promised to let the Church freely choose its bishops and abbots. The Pope conceded to the Emperor the right to preside at these elections and to give the elected candidate an investiture by the scepter.[43]

Thus, by a royal peace and a clearly worded formula, ended the conflict that began fifty years before. Some have said that the Concordat of Worms was a compromise. This is not quite exact. It was the triumph of the true Catholic doctrine and fundamentally of the ideas of Gregory VII. A distinction was established between the bishop as a pastor of souls by his ordination, and the bishop as a vassal of the Empire by his fief. In the former capacity he was invested by the Church, by means of the crosier and ring, symbols of spiritual authority; in the latter capacity he was invested by the Emperor, by means of the scepter, the symbol of temporal authority. The duty of the bishop as bishop was thus, in the eyes of all, withdrawn from the jurisdiction of a secular authority. To God was given what belongs to God, without taking from Caesar what belongs to Caesar. The Church could not desire anything else.

The concordat was beneficial for the Church, and it was equally so for the Empire, from the political and social point of view. The regime inaugurated by this great act assured the independence of the ecclesiastical principalities, thereby placing a check on the power of the emperors and preventing the Holy Roman Empire from being built, as several times it showed a tendency to be, upon the model of the pagan Empire of Rome. While seeking first the triumph of the kingdom of God, the Church, as always, had labored for the prosperity of the earthly city.

[43] See the documents in *M. G., Leges,* XI, 75 f.

Investiture Quarrel in France

The termination of the investiture quarrels in France and England was of like import. In France several causes rendered the conflict less acute than in Germany. First, political authority was less centralized, and a number of the higher nobility, such as the dukes of Aquitaine and Normandy and the counts of Champagne and Anjou, arrogated to themselves the rights of investiture in concurrence with the king; naturally the king was the less eager to defend those rights. Furthermore, France had no great ecclesiastical domains comparable to the rich fiefs of the Church in German countries, with an opulence that aroused cupidity. Lastly, the clear genius of the French canonists of that time early perceived a sound conclusion of the conflict. We have already noted the ideas of Ivo of Chartres. One of his contemporaries, Godfrey of Vendome, said with even greater exactness: "One thing is the investiture which makes a bishop, another thing is the investiture which feeds him. The former is of divine right; the latter, of human right." [44]

The investiture quarrel in France was not marked by the dramatic episodes that characterized it in Germany. We cannot point to the public document that ended it, or even the date when it ended. The accord took place gradually in the practice, by successive modifications introduced into the ceremonies, the formulas, and their interpretations. Although we can hardly follow this development step by step, at least we can point out the principle stages.

Lay intervention and the canonical election altered in a parallel manner. The kings and the nobles ceased giving investiture by the crosier and ring. They even ceased using the formula: "To give the bishopric" (*dare episcopatum*); they delivered simply "the regalian rights attached to the bishopric" (*regalia dimittere*). At length the oath of allegiance, taken by

[44] *PL*, CLVII, 219; *Libelli de lite*, II, 691.

the bishop as a subject to his sovereign, replaced the liege homage which classified him as a vassal. To the king and to the nobles remained only two rights, which the Church tolerated: the right of administering the temporalities of the bishopric and of receiving its revenues during the vacancy of the see, and the right of presiding at the election of the prelate. These were called the right of regale and the right of patronage. Thereafter the Church merely attempted to keep within just limits, ordinarily determined by custom, these rights of regale and of patronage. As to the forms of the canonical election, they were also modified. At first the laity were excluded from taking part in it; then the lower clergy were excluded. Finally the electoral right was confined to members of the cathedral chapter. The king merely confirmed it after inquiry.[45]

The Investiture Quarrel in England

We can more easily mark the phases of the quarrel in England. It took place almost entirely between King Henry I and St. Anselm. Henry I, called Henry Beauclerc, who succeeded his brother William Rufus in the month of August, 1100, began his reign with two measures, which seemed to introduce an era of peace for his kingdom and for the Church of England. He cast into prison his predecessor's evil counselor, the detestable Raoul Flambard, and he recalled St. Anselm from exile. But soon the King showed that the despotic instincts of his father and of his brother were again alive in him, and they were the more to be dreaded since they were not tempered, as in the case of William the Conqueror, by faith and by greatness of soul, nor accompanied, as with William Rufus, by a brutal candor. A boundless desire for absolute power, joined to hypocritical deception, was the basis of the new King's character.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, as soon as he reached Eng-

[45] Cf. E. Lesne, art. "Investitures" in the *Dict. apolog. de la foi*, II, 1097 f.

lish soil, was invited by the monarch to take the ordinary oath of vassalage and to receive from the royal hands the archiepiscopal benefice. Anselm openly declared that he would not and could not obey the King in this matter, alleging that Pope Urban II had forbidden any ecclesiastic to pay homage to any layman. And he added: "I have not returned to England to see the King disobey the pope." We are told by the chronicler Eadmer that "the King, upon hearing these words, was greatly disturbed. To lose the homage of the prelates of the kingdom seemed to him an affair of great moment; but to let Anselm depart from the kingdom before he himself was solidly established there, seemed to him also something to be feared. Might not the Archbishop of Canterbury go to Normandy to his brother Robert and assist in having him proclaimed king of England?[46] Therefore he exhibited no displeasure toward the prelate. But Anselm surmised what resentment this apparent calm concealed.

The prelate soon had occasion to show the King his loyalty. The next year Robert, duke of Normandy and elder brother of the King, invaded England. Anselm, amid the defection of several nobles, remained firmly loyal to King Henry. He also approved and favored the King's marriage to the Scottish Princess Matilda, in spite of the advice of many prelates who saw some canonical impediments to that union.[47] But he refused to consecrate the bishops invested by the King. During the summer of 1101, Henry tried again to bear down on Anselm. He called upon him to quit England or to take the oath of vassalage and to consecrate the invested bishops. But, as the Archbishop was preparing for the deportation, the King begged him to delay, planning to send an embassy to the Pope about the matter. Anselm himself sent to Rome envoys commissioned to furnish the Holy See with the necessary explanations. The ne-

[46] Eadmer, *Hist. nov.*, Bk. III; *PL*, CLIX, 426.
[47] Ragey, *Hist. de saint Anselme*, II, 272 f.

gotiations continued amid incidents that were more or less dramatic. One day in 1103, in a public audience, the ambassador of King Henry, for the purpose of attempting intimidation, boldly exclaimed: "My master will not let himself be deprived of the investitures, even should it cost him his kingdom." To this the Pope replied: "And I will never give them to him, even though it should cost me my head." [48] The conversation ended in a more peaceful tone; but the Pope did not retreat; by a letter dated November 23, 1103, he informed the King, in gentle and benevolent terms, that he regretted he could not accede to the King's desires. Anselm, placed in the alternative of obeying the royal order or of going into exile, chose the latter. The King sequestered the property of the archbishopric and, toward the end of 1104, even confiscated all its revenues.

Concordat of London (1107)

Fresh negotiations were begun between the Holy See on one side, and the King and the Archbishop on the other. The pious Queen Matilda, Countess Adela of Blois, sister of the King and an admirer of the prelate, intervened with both. Pope Paschal II, by a letter dated March 23, 1106, officially declared that he agreed to tolerate the homage of vassalage on condition that the King would renounce the investiture and that thereafter the freedom of election should be re-established. On the basis of these conditions a concordat was concluded (August 1, 1107) between the King and the Archbishop, in a diet held at London at which the barons sat beside the bishops. According to the terms of this agreement, henceforth no ecclesiastic could receive investiture by the crosier and ring; but, on the other hand, no person elected to an ecclesiastical see could be consecrated without first taking the oath of vassalage to the king.[49]

[48] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 485.
[49] Mansi, XX, 1227.

The fruits of this peace were lasting. The monarch, not content with religiously observing the clauses of the treaty, strove to second the primate of England in his work of evangelization. His relations with the saint and the sight of his heroic virtues had transformed him. "In the choice of prelates," Anselm wrote, "the King does not follow his own will, but he takes counsel with pious people." [50] During a stay in Normandy, Henry I even entrusted to the Archbishop of Canterbury the administration of his kingdom.[51] Nowhere was the victory of the Church more complete. To use an analogy employed by St. Anselm himself, "the weak old sheep had ended by prevailing over the ungovernable bulls yoked with him to the plough of the English Church." [52]

The Christian States of Palestine

Thus, after so many strifes, this great investiture quarrel ended for the good of the Church and for that of the state, and the first council that met in the East was able, in 1123, to assemble in the midst of a pacified Christendom.

But, since the conquest of Palestine, Christendom had enlarged its domain. It now was extended beyond the West. Around Jerusalem a Christian colony was established, Christian states were constituted. In some respects, this new Christendom seemed to have a more solid cohesion than the old. It was grouped, not about a pope and an emperor often in disagreement, but only about the pope. "The Latin states of the East owed their existence to the repeated efforts of Urban II and his successors. We are not surprised, therefore, that the Holy Land was closely attached to the authority of the popes." [53] If any particular nation could lay claim to some pre-

[50] Eadmer, *loc. cit.*, Bk. IV.
[51] Ragey, *op. cit.*, II, 473.
[52] Montalembert, *Monks of the West,* Bk. XX, chap. 6.
[53] Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age,* p. 89.

ponderance in the midst of these new states, it was France, which had furnished the largest contingent of the Crusade. But the chief representative of France was most ardent in submission to the papacy.

Two Frenchmen had especially distinguished themselves during the Crusade: Raymond of Toulouse and Godfrey of Bouillon. But, when the question arose of choosing a leader to organize the conquest, no hesitation was felt in selecting Godfrey of Bouillon. In his person valor and piety were combined. He was offered the title and insignia of king of Jerusalem. He declined the title and consented to be called merely "the defender of the Holy Sepulcher." He likewise refused the royal crown, "because no one should wear a crown of gold," says a chronicler, "in that place where the King of kings Jesus Christ, the Son of God, wore a crown of thorns on the day of the passion." [54] In fact, however, he exercised all the functions of the royal office and made everyone respect his authority. But he liked to consider himself chiefly as the servant of Christ and the agent of the Church. Daimbert, who was elected patriarch of Jerusalem, was equally convinced that the Roman Church alone could be sovereign of the Christian states of the East. The power of the patriarch of Jerusalem was considerable; on him depended the four metropolitans of Tyre, Caesarea, Bessan, and Petra, seven suffragan bishops, and a large number of abbots.

Besides the king of Jerusalem, three other leaders had, as symbol of their political independence, the right to coin money: they were the prince of Antioch, the count of Edessa, and the count of Tripoli. Along the coast certain Italian cities exercised considerable influence. In a word, the supreme head of the feudal federation that was established in Palestine was not so much the king of Jerusalem, but rather the general assembly of

[54] *Recueil des historiens des croisades; assises de Jérusalem. Livre de Jean d'Ibelin,* chap. I, p. 22.

the feudatories, which alone could vote "the assizes," or fundamental laws, and which sat as a supreme court of appeal, and to which even the king was amenable.[55]

This form of organization contained the first causes that weakened the Christian federation of the Latin states of the East. The continual attacks of the Bedouins, the presence of the Turks in some of the maritime cities, the progress of the Byzantine Empire in Asia Minor, and especially the evident rivalries between some of the crusader princes, and the quarrels that divided Tancred, Baldwin of Edessa, Bertrand and William of Toulouse, were even graver dangers.

Godfrey of Bouillon's personal prestige, his vigorous firmness, his well-known valor, and his capable diplomacy maintained unity in the Christian colony of the East until his death, at the age of forty-two. While his body was being buried at the foot of Calvary and while the herald-at-arms cried out: "King Godfrey is dead," even the Saracens, says the chronicler Albert of Aix, mingled their tears with those of the Christians.[56] His brother Baldwin, who succeeded him, possessed a less humble faith, a policy dictated more by human considerations. Instead of rejecting the insignia of royalty, he paraded them with ostentation. But he had the essential qualities of a ruler: a clear view of attainable conquests, perseverance in carrying out plans, and the art of dealing with men.

One of his happiest maneuvers was the drawing to Palestine, for the purpose of populating it, of the Christians scattered beyond the Jordan. Most of those whom heresy had separated from the Catholic Church (Jacobites, Nestorians, Monothelites of Lebanon) abjured their errors and formed, in the cities, an intelligent middle class whose industrial and commercial activity was encouraged by privileges wisely dispensed. In all

[55] The *Assises de Jérusalem,* drawn up in the thirteenth century, are the collection of its judicial decisions.

[56] Albert of Aachen, *Hist. Hierosol.,* Bk. VII.

the ports the Genoese, Venetian, and Marseilles merchants enjoyed even greater prerogatives, so that soon the Italians and Marseillians possessed the monopoly of the commerce of the Levant. At the outset, Godfrey of Bouillon had tried to conciliate the native population, at least its most important element, the Syrians, an agricultural, mercantile, and industrial race. Baldwin continued and developed this policy. "In the friendliness uniting the crusaders and the native Syrians we may perhaps find the secret of the long resistance which the Christian states of the East were able to maintain against the dangers threatening them on all sides." [57]

Dangers to the New States

These dangers came first from the Mussulmans, still firmly established at Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus, and Mossul. As a remedy for this peril, Baldwin appealed to those who had been behindhand in the Crusade. New forces of Italian, French, and German crusaders, a sort of rear guard of the great expedition, landed in Palestine, but without success. A first army, more tumultuous, at first captured Ancyra; but, worn out by the march across the desert, it was routed by the Turks at Ramleh on May 31, 1102. A second army, better disciplined, was almost entirely massacred shortly afterward.

The Christians found a further danger in their too intimate relations with the natives. "That brilliant civilization of the East, so novel for the Christians, so different from the narrow and monotonous life which was led in the castles of the West, soon vanquished them. The Eastern dress, with its ample flowing robes, appeared to them more fitted to the climate than their own national dress. They eagerly adopted silk garments, ornamented with gold or pearls, and accustomed themselves to the delicate cuisine, the luxurious appointments, and the sumptu-

[57] Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient*, p. 100.

ous feasts of the Easterners." [58] King Baldwin, dressed in a burnoose of cloth of gold, took his meals seated on a carpet, his legs crossed, after the Eastern manner. Says the chronicler Foucher de Chartres: "See our Westerners transformed into people of the East. The man of Reims or of Chartres has become the man of Tyre or of Antioch. We have already forgotten our native country: nobody hears it spoken of any more. Such and such a one has married, not one of his countrywomen, but a Syrian, an Armenian, sometimes even a baptized Saracen. He who was poor back home, is here opulent. Why return to the West, since the East more than gratifies our wishes?"

The material prosperity, so ably overcome by the policy of Godfrey and Baldwin, became a third danger. The barons established in the Holy Land were henceforth not satisfied with forgetting Europe and the great cause which started them on the march to the East. Their chief aim became the defense and increase of their personal conquests, the turning to their own profit the success of an expedition which they had undertaken to deliver the tomb of Christ from the hands of the infidels. At least such became the great temptation of the nobles settled in Palestine; and many of them succumbed to the temptation, at least temporarily.

The Military Orders

A new institution, especially at its beginning, contributed to raise their ideals again: the institution of the military orders. This original creation succeeded in giving to the Christian states of the East their distinctive features. At first it included the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem and the Knights of the Temple. The Knight of St. John and the Templar were related both to the monk and to the warrior. Even their costume mani-

[58] *Ibid.*

fested this twofold character. They wore the armor of the soldier, over which the Hospitaller wore his black cloak with the white cross; the Templar, his white cloak with the red cross.

A guest-house, built at Jerusalem in 1048 by some merchants of Amalfi and tended by some French nobles, who formed a congregation for the reception of pilgrims and the care of the sick: such was the cradle of the Hospitallers of Jerusalem. Pious gifts and collections taken up in Christendom were the first resources of the charitable work. Godfrey of Bouillon ceded to it part of his domains.[59] Baldwin, to express his thanks to God after a great victory, gave it further gifts of considerable size.

A Provençal nobleman, Gerard de Tenque, born in the island of St. Geniez, today Martigues, for several years had been directing the work in a spirit of admirable piety and charity. He now decided to give it a greater extension by assigning to the Hospitallers the task of defending the pilgrims against the infidels. Many of the Hospitallers who had consecrated themselves to the peaceful service of the sick after having waged war against the Mussulmans, gladly took up again the lance and the sword which they had laid aside. In 1113 Pope Paschal II, in a bull addressed "to his venerable son Gerard," confirmed the new order under the name of the Order of St. John and placed it under the immediate patronage of the Roman Church.[60] At that period the Jerusalem house already counted six additional houses located on the Mediterranean shores: at St. Gilles in Provence, Pisa, Bari, Otranto, Tarento, and Messina.[61] In these places sick pilgrims were cared for with tender and respectful compassion; they were served before the Hospitallers themselves, whose food had to be taken from what was left after the pilgrims had been fed.[62] But the Knights of

[59] Vertot, *Hist. des Chevaliers de Malte,* I, 47.
[60] Paschal II, *Epist.,* 357; *PL,* CLXIII, 314.
[61] *Ibid.*
[62] L. de la Birère, *L'Ordre de Malte,* p. 2.

St. John of Jerusalem, later called Knights of Rhodes and Knights of Malta, always remained fighters.[63]

Such was also the role of another congregation of soldier monks, founded in 1118, although it did not receive its complete organization until 1128: the Order of Templars. Two knights, Hugh des Payens [64] and Godfrey of St. Omer, distressed at seeing defenseless travelers attacked and often put to death by bands of brigands, thought they would be fulfilling the vow they had taken in becoming crusaders if they devoted their courage and their arms to defending pilgrims against these dangers. They united with six other knights, and a few years later were joined by Hugh of Provence. To the activity of knights, they wished to unite the austere and humble life of monks. To the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, they added that of consecrating their life to the protection of pilgrims. King Baldwin assigned to them as their residence a wing of his palace, built on the site of the Temple of Solomon: whence the name of Knights of the Temple, or Templars.

At first they had no special costume, living in the strictest poverty, wearing indifferently whatever clothing was given them. But soon rich noblemen, such as Count Foulques of Anjou, afterward king of Jerusalem, associated themselves with the order and endowed it. In 1128, at the Council of Troyes, St. Bernard gave them a rule, composed according to the Rule of Citeaux. Their first grand master was Hugh des Payens. The order included the following: knights (all noblemen) for fighting; sergeants, taken from the middle class, who performed the duties of squires or stewards; and clerics, serving as chaplains. The knight, upon joining the order, took an oath never to flee if not more than three enemies were facing him; in fact, he never retreated in battle except upon the order of the master.

[63] Several villages of Provence claim to possess relics of the Venerable Gerard Tenque, founder of the Hospitallers.

[64] The village of Payens is on the Seine, above Troyes.

Modeled after the Hospitallers of Jerusalem and the Templars, several military orders were founded later. The most famous were the Teutonic Knights, who were subsequently established in Germany; the Knights of Calatrava and the Knights of St. James of the Sword, who defended Spain and Europe against the Moors. At the end of the twelfth century, the military orders possessed a countless number of fiefs and castles in Palestine and Europe. Always armed, always on the watch, even during time of truce, they formed a sort of permanent Crusade against the infidels.[65]

Clerical Life

The beginning of the twelfth century was marked by a particular development of the monastic life. In 1113 William of Champeaux established at Paris the Order of Canons Regular of St. Victor, and in 1120 St. Norbert founded near Laon the Order of Premonstratensian Canons, while Peter the Venerable was renewing the religious life at Cluny, and St. Bernard was reviving at Clairvaux the purest traditions of the Cistercian life.

The work of William of Champeaux and of St. Norbert has some analogy to that of Gerard de Tenque and Hugh des Payens. The latter two had undertaken to train a choice body of warriors in monastic discipline; the former tried to group under a like rule a choice body of priests. All four considered the monastic spirit as a leaven capable of regenerating the world.

The great popes of the eleventh century, while laboring for the reform of the clergy by repressing misconduct and simony and by the strife against lay investiture, continued to encourage their priests to live in community near their churches. At the Roman council of 1050, Nicholas II recommended to the

[65] On the military orders, see Hurter, *Würdigung des Mittelalters und der Kirche.*

priests, deacons, and subdeacons who had returned to the observance of the duties of their state, "that they live together near the churches for which they had been ordained and that there they have in common their table, sleeping quarters, and Church revenues." [66] Alexander II in 1063, Gregory VII in 1078, and Urban II in 1096, repeated similar recommendations.[67] Ivo of Chartres [68] and several other holy priests labored for the success of these recommendations by the restoration of an old and somewhat vague so-called Rule of the Apostles, or of directions given to the clergy of Hippo by St. Augustine, or of constitutions promulgated at Metz about the middle of the eighth century by St. Chrodegang.

These efforts resulted merely in some partial and temporary reforms. The direct influence of the monks, in particular those of Cluny, upon the clergy had no better results. The papacy, by exempting the monastic clergy from episcopal jurisdiction, had put them outside the scope of the hierarchy. Hence arose inevitable conflicts between the monasteries and the parishes. Under the pretext of reform, the secular clergy, sometimes unceremoniously, were replaced by monks in a number of churches, even in cathedrals. Here and there this procedure made those conflicts very bitter. With some reason, especially if we bear in mind the discipline of that time, the secular clergy declared that "the monk sprang from the lay order of the Church; that, in the nature of monasticism or its traditions, nothing definitely vowed it to the clerical order; that ordinarily nothing in a monk's vocation destined him to the government of souls." [69] As for what particularly concerned the Order of Cluny, the hierarchical clergy felt some envy at seeing Cluny's vast territorial possessions increasing from day to day. All these reasons

[66] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise,* Part I, Bk. III, chap. 11; Mansi, XIX, 897.

[67] Fourier Bonnard, *Hist. des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Victor,* I, xvii–xix.

[68] *Ibid.*

[69] Bonnard, *op. cit.,* p. xv.

explain how the direct influence of the Cluny reformers, effective over the episcopate, hardly reached the lower ranks of the hierarchical clergy.

Therefore some wise men attempted to reform this latter part of the clergy by the infusion of the monastic spirit into its life, but without the direct intervention of the monks. This method was entirely in conformity with the recommendations of the popes. The parochial and cathedral clergy used to think of the "canonical" order as contrasted with the "monastic" order.[70] These secular clergy were asked simply to take a "rule" such as the apostolic clergy and the clergy trained by St. Augustine exemplified; in other words, to become "canons regular." This proposal was made especially to the canons properly so called, that is, to those who composed the cathedral chapters, whose importance had become so great in the eleventh century. This importance was consequent upon the considerable property which they administered and upon the right to choose the bishops, which was granted them in many places; at the same time the proposal was addressed to all priests having charge of a church under a bishop's authority.

William of Champeaux

To William of Champeaux belongs the honor of being the first to conceive and realize the type of canon regular. The study of the man is no less interesting than that of his work. William, born at Champeaux near Melun about the year 1070, in early youth attended the schools of Paris and Compiègne. There his teacher was the famous Roscelin, the daring philosopher who, we are told, was the first to venture beyond the circle of pure dialectics to take up the famous question of uni-

[70] Gréa, *De l'Eglise et de sa divine constitution*, p. 438. Etymologically and historically, the primitive meaning of the word "canon" (*canonicus*) is: inscribed in the "canon" of a church, attached to a church.

versals, that is, the metaphysical problem of the relations of the objective world to the subjective world. In 1095 he was invited to take the chair of dialectics of the Paris cathedral. Later he was advanced to the office of archdeacon and at the same time he was appointed general director of the Paris schools. Before enthusiastic young students, William, more prudently than Roscelin, discussed the most difficult problems of philosophical speculation. Among his listeners was the earnest and reckless Abelard, who later on in his *Historia calamitatum* relates his dialectical controversies against the teaching of the master. But, one day in 1108, a surprising report circulated in the world of the Parisian schools: Master William had resigned his archdeaconship and withdrew, with some of his pupils, to a humble hermitage, dedicated to St. Victor, there to subject himself, though remaining a simple cleric, to a regular discipline.[71]

Canons Regular of St. Victor

"The little chapel of St. Victor stood not far from the banks of the Seine, on a level piece of land where the last slopes of Mount St. Genevieve came to an end, at that time covered with woods and vineyards. This chapel, erected at that spot, says a charter of Louis the Fat, in honor of the soldier martyr of Marseilles, served as a retreat for a few solitaries or recluses who led the eremetical life in its shade." [72] But the studious young men could not be resigned to losing the learned lessons of the master. Every day groups of students, lay and clerical, set out on the roads, so often trod since then, which led from the Notre Dame quarter or "the Mount" to William's scholarly retreat. Unable to resist their earnest solicitations, he continued to teach them the principles of dialectics and metaphysics, but

[71] *Recueil des hist. de la France,* XIV, 279.
[72] Bonnard, *op. cit.,* I, 6 f.

more than one student, touched by the life of intimate prayer and religious silence that was led at St. Victor, joined William's following and shared his eremetical life.

In the summer of 1113, William, after three times refusing the episcopacy, yielded at the King's insistence and accepted the bishopric of Chalon; but, in return, he obtained from Louis the Fat a royal charter giving legal existence and granting an endowment to the new monastery.[73]

The rules of the monastery of St. Victor are preserved in a precious manuscript, the *Liber Ordinis*.[74] The ordinary habit of the Victorines is a long linen tunic, or surplice with wide sleeves, falling almost to the feet and covered by a black cloak to which is attached a cowl large enough to cover the head and shoulders. The lay brothers have a tunic of gray wool, coming halfway down the legs, and a cloak of the same color, a few inches shorter than the tunic. The hierarchy of the monastery included an abbot, a grand prior, a chamberlain, a cellarer, a grand guest-master, a grand chanter, a librarian, and other usual officials. The abbot was elected by six or seven canons, chosen for this purpose by the chapter or general assembly of the canons, who subsequently ratified the election.

The life of a canon regular of St. Victor (or Victorine) included the following duties: the liturgical offices devoutly celebrated at the canonical hours of the day and night, manual labor, and intellectual labor. One of the best organized occupations was that of the copyists, who labored, under the direction of the librarian, in a separate part, well-lighted, tranquil, and silent. From there came forth several of the most precious manuscripts of the Middle Ages.[75] The Abbey of St. Victor likewise became a school of theology and mysticism.

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 13 f.; Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros*, no. 150.

[74] *Bibl. Ste Genev.*, MSS 1636 and 1637; British Museum, MSS latin, 14,673 and 15,059. A summary of the *Liber Ordinis* will be found in Bonnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 56–83.

[75] A. Franklin, *Recherches sur la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris;* L. Delisle, *Inventaire des mss latins de Saint-Victor conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale.*

St. Norbert

Prompted by the same inspiration as the reform of St. Victor, the reform of Prémontré differed from it in its orientation. William of Champeaux, when he became a canon regular, remained a man of learning, and his work shared that same trait. St. Norbert, the Prémontré reformer, was rather a preacher and an apostle, and he communicated an analogous imprint to his work.

"St. Norbert, whom the almost unanimous opinion of his age regarded as the equal of St. Bernard and whom the latter considered his master, was born, according to the authors of the *Histoire littéraire de la France,* at Santen, a small town of the duchy of Cleves, about the year 1080. His family was a very old one and was the peer of the most illustrious families of Germany. To the advantages of his birth, he added brilliant qualities of body and mind. His teachers improved his talents, but they did not succeed in inspiring him with a solid liking for virtue. He cultivated the sciences as a voluptuous philosopher. The ecclesiastical state, which he embraced through human views, produced no reform in his morals. The court of Emperor Henry V, his relative, where he went next, accomplished his perversion. There for several years he filled the office of chaplain and distinguished himself by all the loose vices which the courtiers boasted of.[76]

A grace, like that which converted the Apostle St. Paul, of a sudden transformed him. One day he was in a pleasure party, riding on horseback, when a bolt of lightning struck in front of him, killed his horse, and left him unconscious on the ground. Upon his recovering consciousness, "grace illumined his eyes at the same time as the light of day. This blind man perceived his wretchedness. The illusion of creatures was dissipated, and

[76] *Hist. litt. de la France,* XI, 243.

divine love took the place of profane love." [77] He broke off his connections with the court, clothed himself in haircloth, retired to the monastery of St. Sigebert near Cologne, was ordained priest (he had been only a subdeacon), and thereafter devoted himself to prayer, vigils, fasting, and the assiduous study of Holy Scripture, finding compensation for all his hardships in the celebration of the holy sacrifice.

Soon the work of his personal sanctification did not suffice for him. He traveled through the country districts, preached in the churches and in public squares, recalling to sinners the hour of God, the hour of death and judgment. He was charged with preaching without authorization, of wearing the monastic habit without being a monk. He then left his country, came to France to see Pope Gelasius II, whom he met at St. Gilles in Languedoc, and from him obtained permission to proclaim the divine word wherever he wished. Provided with this power, he traveled through France and Hainaut, where his words produced most abundant fruit. When he came near villages or castles, the shepherds left their flocks and ran ahead to announce his coming. As soon as he entered a village, the church bells were rung. But what most rejoiced the apostle's heart was to see the numerous conversions that followed his preaching. He longed to multiply himself for the preaching of the Gospel truths.

The Premonstratensians

He associated in his work some priests animated by the same zeal as his own. Bartholomew, bishop of Laon, to whom Pope Callistus II recommended him, offered to build a monastery for him in whatever place he should indicate. Norbert chose, in the forest of Coucy, a solitary valley, called Prémontré (*Premonstratum, Pratum monstratum*). There on Christmas,

[77] L. C. Hugo, *La vie de saint Norbert*, p. 31.

1121,[78] with a few clerics of the Laon diocese who had been won by his words, he founded the first abbey of the Canons Regular of Prémontré. By the austerity of life, promptness of obedience, and the spirit of prayer and recollection, the canons regular equaled the most edifying of the monks. A garment of white wool reminded them that they should be the representatives of the angels on earth. At the slightest sign from their master, who did not overlook a bitter word spoken by them or even a gesture offensive to another, they fell to their knees and asked pardon. They observed silence, not only within their monastery, but even in the midst of noisy crowds. Vocations arose on all sides. Less than four years after the foundation of Prémontré, Norbert was at the head of nine abbeys founded by him.[79] "The appearance of Prémontré and the rapid multiplication of its branch houses in France and in Europe, during the thirty years after 1120, were one of the prodigies of the time, almost as wonderful as the work of St. Bernard and the Cistercians." [80]

Norbert's insatiable zeal was not content with these first results. He had the idea, which was so wonderfully developed by the mendicant orders in the thirteenth century, of affiliating with his abbeys men and women living in the world and thus in an indirect manner benefiting by the graces attached to community life. Thus, under these different forms, by the religious orders properly so called, by the communities of clerics who were inspired by their principles and their disciplines, by the associations of laymen, the rough draft of the later third orders, which profited by their spiritual experiences, a single spirit of the Gospel penetrated all Christendom. A matter of

[78] The date of the foundation of the Order of Prémontré is often given as 1120, which is the date of the taking possession of Prémontré. But the first religious profession of Norbert and his disciples was on December 25, 1121. Cf. Hugo, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

[79] *Hist. litt.*, XI, 246.

[80] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 255.

first importance was that this spirit be kept free from any alteration at its chief sources. At the period when William of Champeaux and Norbert were founding the Canons Regular of St. Victor and of Prémontré, the Order of Cluny was experiencing a sad crisis. Fortunately divine Providence raised up, for its regeneration, a great reformer, Peter the Venerable.

The Order of Cluny

"The excess of power and wealth, the pride of an abbot, and the disunion of the brethren, the almost inevitable consequences of a long sustained greatness and prominence": [81] these were the causes of the decline of Cluny.

At the beginning of the twelfth century, the Order of Cluny counted 10,000 monks.[82] Its possessions, which are listed at length in a bull of Pope Victor II (June 11, 1055),[83] were immense. The church of Cluny, a masterpiece of Romanesque architecture, was the biggest church in the world; five hundred years later the Basilica of St. Peter in Rome exceeded its colossal dimensions by a few feet. The relations between the order and the popes had become intimate and almost habitual. Gregory VII sought at Cluny the inspiration of his reform; Urban II and Paschal II came from its cloisters; Gelasius II was buried under its stone floor; Callistus II increased its privileges, even giving its abbots, in 1120, the right to perform the functions of cardinal and conceding to its church the faculty of celebrating the office even during an interdict, behind closed doors.[84]

Saints, like the great abbots who had founded and maintained the austere traditions of Cluny (Odo, Majolus, Odilo, Hugh) could have guaranteed the monks of the order against

[81] Baudrillart, "Cluny et la papauté" in the *Rev. prat. d'apol.*, XI (1910), 22.
[82] Hefele, art. "Cluny" in Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexikon.*
[83] *PL,* CXLIII, 803.
[84] Pignot, *Hist. de l'ordre de Cluny,* III, 29–32.

the temptation of wealth and pride. But Pons de Melgueil, who in 1100, though still in his youth, received the abbatial crosier of St. Hugh, lacked the strong virtues of his predecessors. Sprung from a rich family of Auvergne, with a brilliant and distinguished mind, he had at first appeared worthy of his high office by the regularity of his life, by the adaptability of his mind, and by the lofty distinction of his literary culture. In the negotiations, so often broken off and so often resumed, of the investiture quarrel, he had served as a capable intermediary between the pope and the emperor. He had also given a strong impulse to studies. History has kept the names of three remarkable copyists encouraged by him: Albert, Oppizo, and Duranne. But a restless and proud disposition spoiled his brilliant qualities. From the very beginning of his government he seemed to place in the forefront of his concern the defense of the privileges of his order. The new prerogatives granted him by Callistus II seem to have upset him. He contested for the first place with the abbot of Monte Cassino; he longed for the title of "abbot of abbots." In his journeys he displayed a princely retinue. His luxury, his prodigality, his laxity, at first aroused murmurs, then open discord in the monastery. The austere life of Cluny had been the starting point of the reform of the monks, of the clergy, and of the faithful; now it was no longer a model for the Church.

We should at once note that at this period moral disorder had not penetrated the illustrious monastery. "St. Bernard's silence on this subject is the best praise we could wish for the morality of Cluny." [85] But, in the picture which the terrible censor makes of the softness and luxury of the monks of his time, we are forced to recognize the pompous Abbot Pons. Says St. Bernard:

In all truth, I declare that I have seen an abbot with a retinue of sixty horses and more. On seeing these heads of monasteries pass

[85] Vacandard, *Vie de saint Bernard*, I, 117.

by, you would say they were, not directors of souls, but governors of provinces. As soon as they are eight miles from home, they need all their household articles: drinking vessels, jugs, candelabra, large cases filled with all their bed clothes. . . . Why all this encumbrance? That you may be less burdensome to your hosts? Then take with you also your food, so as to spare them all expense.[86]

The divisions provoked in the monastery by the activities of Pons went so far that the abbot, yielding to the advice of prudent friends, went to Rome and resigned his office in the hands of Callistus II. The monks, freed from Pons' imperious levity, at first elected in his place an old man, Hugh II, who died almost immediately; then, on the octave of the Assumption (1122), they chose a young monk, thirty years old, Peter Maurice of Montboissier, who was destined to remain the highest personification of the Cluny Order under the name of Peter the Venerable.

Peter the Venerable

In spite of his youth, Peter of Montboissier was not unknown in the various houses of the order, even the most distant ones. The prudence and learning with which for ten years in the Vézelay monastery he filled the important offices of guardian of the order and doctor of the ancients,[87] had drawn attention to him. As guardian of the order, he took the place of the grand prior in the latter's absence, and at all times watched over the proper maintenance of discipline with the most edifying zeal. As doctor of the ancients, his duty was to direct the studies of all the monks. He filled this office so well that, according to the expressions of his biographer, his gentle, grave words, like a dew, made the land of Vézelay fruitful.[88] As con-

[86] St. Bernard, *Apologia,* chap. 11.
[87] Rodulphus, *Vita Petri Venerabilis; PL,* CLXXXIX, 17.
[88] *Ibid.*

temporaries said, one sight was sufficient to keep living in your memory "the noble and gentle features of this young monk, whose imposing stature and simple and worthy attitude so well expressed the perfect ordering of his soul and his life." [89] His election was welcomed in the order with universal joy. Peter of Poitiers exclaimed: "Blessed monks of Cluny, applaud and rejoice. A new St. Hugh is given you. He equals the poets of antiquity by the penetration of his genius. In prose he is a second Cicero; in verse, a new Vergil; and he argues like Aristotle, while his words have the sweetness of those of Gregory, the fulness of those of Ambrose; and he examines the most profound mysteries with a genius equal to that of Augustine." [90]

In these emphatic praises the panegyrist of Peter the Venerable indicates the distinctive character of the new abbot's learning. Born in Auvergne about 1092,[91] of a noble family perhaps native of Burgundy,[92] brought up from early boyhood as an oblate in the Benedictine monastery of Sauxillages, where the most varied branches of profane and sacred studies were taught with ardor according to the program of the *trivium* and the *quadrivium,* Peter of Montboissier sketched his own portrait when he spoke of St. Bernard as "adorning himself with the spoils of the Egyptian and mingling them with the riches of the Hebrew." [93] His contemporaries bestowed on him the title "Venerable." This was rightly given him "as much for his eminent knowledge of divine and human sciences as for the uprightness of his life." [94] A nineteenth century writer compares him to Fenelon.[95] Although his style does not possess the exquisite elegance of the author of *Télémaque,* he has the same fondness for ancient literature, the same nobility of character,

[89] *Bibliotheca cluniacensis,* p. 589.
[90] Peter of Poitiers; *PL,* CLXXXIX, 49.
[91] Cellier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques,* XIV, 500.
[92] Pignot, *Hist. de Cluny,* III, 607.
[93] Peter the Venerable, *Epist.,* I, 28; *PL,* CLXXXIX, 112.
[94] *Gallia Christiana,* IV, 1137.
[95] Rémusat, *Abélard,* I, 250.

and the same unction. To a former companion of his monastic life, he wrote: "Happy times when, in pious conversations, we urged each other to the desire for eternal things! Ardent charity that made us on fire one for the other! In the beginning, the mere movement of nature drew me to you; in the end I loved you only in God and because of God." [96] In fact, what Peter especially acquired from his monastic training was a liking for gentle piety, which continued growing ever since the day when as a mere boy he was offered to the Order of Cluny.

The new Abbot was not unaware of the difficulties of the task that was his. Pope Callistus II, in his letter to the monks of Cluny confirming the election of Peter, testified that he did not misunderstand the seriousness of the situation. He encouraged the monks to show themselves docile toward their new superior, and threatened with ecclesiastical penalties those who "should dare to disturb the congregation." [97]

To aid him in his reform work, Peter appealed to a monk whose great experience and supernatural energy he knew, the prior Matthew, of St. Martin-des-Champs. Thanks to this collaboration, he was able to correct many abuses. In the matter of eating and drinking, excess was suppressed; many comforts, several of which had become habitual, were given up. Peace had returned to the monastery when of a sudden Pons, who had retired to Palestine, landed in Europe. To defeat the calculations of those whom he wished to deceive, he declared that he wished simply to change his place of retirement. In truth, the demon of ambition had again seized upon him. Choosing a moment when Peter the Venerable was absent from Cluny, he appeared at the monastery, accompanied by an armed troop of his followers and of some hired bandits, who broke down the doors, invaded the cloisters, and scattered or imprisoned the monks. They seized the gold and silver reliquaries containing the

[96] Peter the Venerable, *Epist.*, I, 16; *PL*, CLXXXIX, 85.
[97] Callistus II, *Epist.*; *PL*, CLXXXIX, 1256.

relics of the saints, even the sacred vessels; nothing was spared. The villages and fortifications around the monastery were invaded; for three months pillage and murder reigned at Cluny.[98] A condemnation by Pope Honorius, declaring Pons and his accomplices perpetrators of sacrilege, schismatics, and excommunicated, put an end to this abominable disorder; and he who during fourteen years had carried the abbatial crosier of St. Odo and St. Hugh, died, separated from the Church, without expressing any repentance and without being absolved.[99]

Calm returned to Cluny; but a crisis of this sort could not occur without reawaking in the community certain internal dissensions which the zeal of Peter had momentarily pacified. A struggle against the old abuses, which several months' excitement had revived, had to be started over again. Peter the Venerable in a dream saw St. Benedict lamenting the forgetfulness of his rule. "Alas," Peter exclaimed, "when the holy patriarch wrote his constitutions, he was living in a robust age; the world has grown old since then; let us avoid sudden shocks, that would destroy the institutions; they are shaking on their foundations; let us give them some props to hold them up." [100] He employed prudence. For fear of self-deception, he looked about him. Citeaux, "which had dependent on it sixty-five abbeys, whose monks did not wear rich habits, observed strict enclosure, and fasted daily, except Sundays, from the ides of September to Easter," [101] seemed to him a model to be followed. But a vague jealousy animated the two mighty orders. The Abbot of Cluny was criticized for taking from the Cistercians the principle of a reform that ought to derive its inspiration

[98] Orderic Vitalis, XII, 15; *PL,* CLXXXVIII, 894.

[99] Some time later, Honorius, "out of respect for the illustrious monastery," had the mortal remains of Pons transported to the abbey of Cluny. Cf. Honorius II, *Epist.,* 48; *PL,* CLXVI, 1266.

[100] Peter the Venerable, *Epist.,* I, 34; *PL,* CLXXXIX, 168.

[101] Orderic Vitalis, VIII, 25; *PL,* CLXXXVIII, 641.

only from the traditions of the order founded by St. Odo. A brief of Innocent II, dated 1137, ended these difficulties by giving to Peter the Venerable the faculty to modify the statutes of his order, to decree whatever he judged useful, without anyone having the right to protest or appeal.[102] The venerable reformer could then freely take his inspiration from the example of Citeaux.

The Order of Citeaux

The illustrious order founded by Robert of Molesme had, at its beginning, its hour of distress. In their desire to assure a perfect austerity in their cloisters, had the superiors of Citeaux gone beyond just bounds? Had this movement toward holy observance been too much deprived of that pious unction which would have made the sacrifices accepted with joy? We do not know. The fact is that from day to day the monastery was being depopulated. The old monks who died were not replaced by young recruits. The trial, though different from that afflicting Cluny, was not less grave. It might easily turn into disaster. Stephen Harding, the venerable abbot who had been at the head of Citeaux since 1109, was greatly concerned over the situation. Discouraged and perhaps blaming himself for having contributed to the sad crisis by the rigidity of his rule, he entertained doubts as to his mission. We are told that the abbot, who confided his anxieties to one of his monks about to appear before God, a few days later received this prophetic reply: "Be of good heart. Soon God will send you many disciples, some of them men of noble birth and high station; and they will so fill your house that, like an overflowing hive, it will have to send out its swarms to various parts of the world." [103] At Easter

[102] Demimuid, *Pierre le Vénérable,* p. 102.

[103] *Exordium magnum ordinis cisterciensis,* Dist. I, chap. 16; *PL,* CLXXXV, 1013; *Acta sanctorum,* April, II, 499.

time, 1112,[104] the arrival at Citeaux of thirty gentlemen, with a young Burgundian nobleman at their head, Bernard of Fontaines, seemed to be a pledge of the accomplishment of the heavenly prophecy.

St. Bernard

At the name of Bernard of Fontaines, who soon became Bernard of Clairvaux, history should pause, because he was one of the most complete geniuses, one of the most stirring and appealing souls, that it has to depict. Orator, polemic, diplomat, poet, mystic, reformer, the latest of the fathers of the Church, and also as great as the greatest of them.[105] His teaching, as Pope Alexander III said, would illumine the universal Church.[106] All Christendom was thrilled at his words; princes and kings chose him to arbitrate their differences; four centuries after his death, Luther and Calvin sought shelter under his great name.[107] His writings kept a fragrance of piety so tender and pure that we have no liturgical prayers and hymns which the Christian people still repeat with greater devotion than certain prayers and hymns that sprang from his saintly heart.[108]

He who was to fill so lofty and pure a destiny was born in 1090 in the feudal castle of Fontaines in Burgundy, near the city of Dijon, of an illustrious and wealthy family. Among the relatives of the lord of Fontaines, his father, the chronicles and documents mention viscounts of Dijon and lords of Chatillon, and among his mother's ancestors, the former dukes of Bur-

[104] On this date, see Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* I, 32 note 2, and 34 note 1.

[105] Mabillon says: *Ultimus inter Patres, sed primis certe non impar* (*PL,* CLXXXII, 26).

[106] Jaffé, no. 12,330; *PL,* CLXXXV, 622.

[107] Luther in his *Table Talk,* nos. 490, 793; Calvin in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* Bk. IV, chap. 11, pp. 438 ff.

[108] We refer especially to the *Memorare* (the beginning of it was composed by St. Bernard) and of the hymn *Jesu, dulcis memoria* which, if not composed by him, was evidently inspired by one of his sermons (Sermon 4, *De diversis,* no. 1).

gundy.[109] From this high and mighty lineage Bernard derived the lofty distinction and spirited courage which characterized his moral traits; and from his mother, Aleth of Montbard, he derived especially a kindly and solid piety. Even in early boyhood, so we are told by his biographers, he was a contemplative.[110] A quiet and timid student, withdrawing from the noisy company of other youths and going to some secluded spot for recollection, to the eyes of the world he gave no indication of that fiery zeal for making converts, which he later displayed. But he was preparing the foundations of that zeal by cultivating the spirit of faith.

For him religion was soon the whole of life. He was barely twenty-two years old; the world smiled upon the gifts of his youth. But, not satisfied with turning his eyes toward the life of the cloister, he acquainted one of his uncles, five of his brothers, and several of his young friends with his attraction for a life wholly consecrated to the service of God. At that period two traits already distinguished Bernard's soul: an earnest devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and a sort of filial cult toward his pious mother, whom he lost in his early youth, but whom he constantly remembered [111] and whose inspirations he always endeavored to follow in his hours of doubt. One day, when he was momentarily shaken in his vocation by the entreaties of his friends, upon thinking of his mother he finally and permanently renounced any worldly career.[112] Soon afterward we find Bernard, accompanied by thirty young noblemen, at Chatillon-sur-Seine, with them leading a common life of prayer and austerity. Six months later, in the spring of 1112, the thirty gentlemen asked admission to the austere life of Citeaux. Before his de-

[109] Jobin, *Saint Bernard et sa famille.*

[110] *Mire cogitativus* (William of Saint-Thierry, *Vita Bernardi,* Bk. I, chap. 1, no. 3; *PL,* CLXXXV, 228).

[111] "He always had what I would call the feeling of the *real presence* of his mother near him" (Vacandard, *op. cit.,* I, 18).

[112] Vacandard, *op. cit.,* p. 23.

parture, Bernard went to the Fontaines castle, embraced his venerable father and his youngest brother Nivard, who was too young to consider accompanying his brothers to the cloister. Bernard said to him: "Hereafter all this domain will belong to you alone." The boy replied: "You are taking heaven and leaving me the earth." Nivard wanted to follow his brothers; his youthful age prevented him from doing so; but when he reached his sixteenth year, the doors of Citeaux were opened for him also.[113]

With the aid of scattered details furnished by contemporaries,[114] we can sketch a portrait of the young Bernard at the time he entered Citeaux. His height was above medium, he had blond hair, the beginning of a blond beard, blue eyes, a serene look, a charm "that came from the spirit, not from the flesh." [115] Citeaux, the monastery where the austerities frightened the roughest and most rugged men, was the place where the young son of the lord of Fontaines asked for admission.

While in other places woolen tunics with narrow sleeves and fur hoods protected the monk against severe cold, the Cistercian monk wore, as his only garment, a close-fitting serge habit, which extended halfway down the legs, and a woolen cowl, which in the hours of manual labor was replaced by the scapular, tied at the waist by a leather cincture. At Citeaux the food was extremely simple. Vegetables, fresh or dried, oil, salt, and water constituted the entire victuals. In a common dormitory, lighted by a pale candle-light, the Citeaux monk took his rest on a simple cot, all dressed, his loins girded, so as to be ready to rise at the first signal [116] in the middle of the night to chant the night office in a cold and dim chapel.

[113] Gaufridus, *Fragm.; PL,* CLXXXV, 525.

[114] William of Saint-Thierry, *Vita Bernardi,* Bk. I, chap. 3, no. 6; Bk. III, chap. 1; *PL,* CLXXXV, 230–303.

[115] *Apparebat in carne ejus gratia quaedam, spiritualis tamen potius quam carnalis* (*ibid.,* col. 303).

[116] For further details, see Vacandard, *op. cit.,* I, 40–44.

The Cistercians' public prayers took about six hours a day; the rest of the time was devoted to manual labor. At Citeaux they scrupulously observed the maxim that "the monk should live by the labor of his own hands." [117] But the entire time left free from the Sunday office and that of feast days, and the time between the end of sext and the first meal (*prandium*), that is, from nine o'clock to eleven o'clock in the morning, and during the winter also the interval between the evening meal (*caena*), which ended at six o'clock, and the office of vespers, which began at nine o'clock, was reserved for the *lectio divina.*[118] This exercise was conceived, at Citeaux, rather as a meditation than as a simple reading. St. Bernard later recommends, not to read, but to "ruminate" the psalms.[119] He is alluding to the practice which he had followed in his monastery, a practice revealed to us also by the use he makes of Scripture in his writings. Besides, the well-known manual labor, performed in silence, favored, outside the hours of meditative reading, the prolongation of that pious "rumination"; and when Bernard declares that he never had any teacher but the beech-trees and the oaks,[120] perhaps he is referring to that habit of considering in his heart, amid the fields and forests, the words of God or those of the fathers which had more particularly touched him in the *lectio divina.*[121]

The arrival of Bernard and his companions at Citeaux was the starting point of the movement of renaissance and expansion that had been announced to Abbot Stephen Harding.[122] "When the eyes of all," says a chronicler, "could see that the Citeaux rule, reputed to be impracticable, was accessible to all

[117] *Rule of St. Benedict,* chap. 48.

[118] *Ibid.*, chap. 48; *Coutumes bénédictines,* chaps. 60 and 71.

[119] St. Bernard, *In festo SS. Petri et Pauli,* sermon 2, no. 2.

[120] *Experto crede: aliquid amplius invenies in silvis quam in libris. Ligna et lapides docebunt te* (St. Bernard, *Epist.,* CVI, no. 2). Thus speaks St. Bernard.

[121] We should note that the slow and metrical recitation of the office, such as practiced at Citeaux, was a sort of meditation. Cf. *Rule of St. Benedict,* chap. 19.

[122] *Acta sanctorum,* April, II, 109.

these young noblemen, men of every age came, from various districts, and asked to be admitted." [123] In June, 1115, all the empty places were filled. To provide for all the new vocations that declared themselves, Citeaux swarmed. After the foundations of La Ferte and Pontigny, Abbot Stephen Harding commissioned Bernard to go and found a new monastery on the banks of the Aube at Clairvaux, on land offered by the generosity of the Count of Troyes. The new house was blessed by the Bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne, the illustrious founder of the Canons Regular of St. Victor, William of Champeaux. From that day forth an intimacy, which afterward continued to grow, was formed between the eminent prelate and the holy founder of Clairvaux. The beginning of the foundation was rough. A grievous distress forced Bernard to make the austerity of the regime harder than it was at Citeaux. But the courage of the monks was admirable. It became contagious. In less than three years Clairvaux testified to its vitality by founding three monasteries: that of Trois Fontaines in the Luiz forest; that of Fontenay in the neighborhood of Montbard, and that of Joigny near Vervins.

On December 23, 1119, a bull of Pope Callistus II confirmed the progress of the whole Order of Citeaux by approving the charter of union known as the *Charta Caritatis,* established between all the Cistercian houses. Unlike the Cluny monasteries, which recognized a supreme power in the motherhouse, the Cistercian monasteries kept their autonomy of administration and were subject to the authority of the ordinaries.[124] In other matters also the viewpoints were different or even opposite. Whereas the churches of the Cluny Order were distinguished by their splendid architecture and the richness of their ornamentation, those of the Citeaux Order were notable for simplicity and poverty. These differences and oppositions were the

[123] *Exordium parvum cisterciense,* quoted in the *Acta sanctorum,* April, II, 109.
[124] Guignard, *Les monuments primitifs de la Règle cistercienne,* p. 82.

occasion, between the two orders, of controversies in which Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux exchanged their views, at times in a rather lively manner, but never to the detriment of supernatural charity. The papal authority left the two tendencies free to develop, considering that each of them had a place in the Church of God.

Intellectual Movement

An expansion of true monastic life never took place in the Church without a corresponding expansion of intellectual and moral progress. Men like William of Champeaux, Peter the Venerable, and Bernard of Clairvaux possessed a vigor of intellect equal to their strength of virtue. Their place is in the history of general civilization as well as in that of the Church.

Ever since St. Anselm, in his teaching and writings, gave so considerable a place to rational speculation, the Scholastic movement had not paused. In it we can distinguish two currents, although they are often mingled and confused: one, more strictly philosophical, which appears especially in the discussion of the problem of universals; the other, more especially theological or mystical, which appears in the controversies aroused by the heresies of Abelard and Peter of Bruys.

A Greek philosopher, Porphyry, who died at the beginning of the fourth century, in his *Izagoge* wrote this sentence: "I will not examine whether genera and species exist in themselves or only in the mind, or whether they exist separate from the sensible objects or in those objects and as part of them: this problem is too difficult." [125] This problem, which one of the last philosophers of the ancient world declared not yet solved,[126]

[125] Cf. V. Cousin, *Fragments philosophiques,* p. 68.

[126] Plato had considered universals as ideas pre-existing in the divine intellect, as archetypes, according to which all corporeal beings had been formed. Aristotle regarded them as creative forms which, by uniting with matter, gave birth to all beings. But the problem had not given rise to any great controversy.

was the one which stirred the leading metaphysicians of the Middle Ages. Do realities exist distinct from the individual beings whose existence we perceive? Have beings alike in species a real element, common to them all, distinct, but not separate from them? Besides the men that I meet, is humanity something? Or is it only a vain word? This problem has brought a smile to many historians, but in it many deep minds have thought to see "the inevitable problem" of metaphysics,[127] "the very problem of philosophy." [128] It is known as "the problem of universals." Toward the end of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth, three celebrated men took up the question, discussed it earnestly before enthusiastic youth, and gave it three different solutions. These three men were Roscelin, William of Champeaux, and Abelard.

Roscelin

A strange figure is that of Roscelin, that Breton innovator who, by the venturesome boldness of his thought and the shiftiness of his conduct, seemed, in his disconcerting complexity, to foreshadow in outline both Lamennais and Renan. The exact place of his birth in Brittany is unknown. Provided with a canonry at Compiègne, he taught there, probably as *écolâtre* of his chapter. The elegance of his language, the extent of his knowledge, and especially the censorious audacity of his assertions gathered about his professorial chair a numerous and attentive audience. Did he teach positively that "humanity" is only a concept of our mind, that genera and species are merely fictions, names, words without corresponding realities, *flatus vocis?* The paucity of our documents about him [129] do not permit us to

[127] Cantu, *Hist. univ.*, X, 490.

[128] Cousin, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[129] The only contemporary documents that we possess on the life and ideas of Roscelin are: a letter addressed to Abelard (*PL*, CLXXVIII, 357–72); a few passages of his works, quoted by St. Anselm, Abelard, John of Salisbury, and Otto of Freising.

say that he did. De Wulf, the noted historian of medieval philosophy, considers him "a destroyer." [130] He professed for the abstract and the transcendental a contempt that gave him an appearance of common sense, that made the young men regard him as a robust mind, with sufficient self-mastery so that he reckoned only with visible and palpable realities.[131]

He became the great man of the day.[132] In the strength of his popularity he even applied his theory to the fundamental dogmas of Christianity. According to St. Anselm's testimony, he declared "that the three divine Persons are three separate beings, like three angels, and that we might correctly say that they are three Gods, if custom permitted the expression." [133] In 1092 a council of Soissons condemned him. He abjured his error; but he soon resumed the teaching of his first doctrine Driven from France, he spread his errors in England and at Rome, came back to Paris, employed cunning and audacity in turn, at times trying to deceive his superiors by artful evasions, at other times insulting them brutally. If we accept the statements of certain chroniclers, he died, as Berengarius did, reconciled to the Church, devoting the last years of his life to the service of the poor.[134] But his work remains, and the doctor of nominalism [135] came to be appealed to as a forerunner by many rationalists at a later date.[136]

But, among the listeners of the doctor of Compiègne, one priest had been shocked at his teaching, even to the point of embracing, for the purpose of combating it, a diametrically opposite system. This was William of Champeaux, the future

[130] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* § 145, p. 159.

[131] Michaud, *Guillaume de Champeaux et les écoles de Paris au XII^e siècle,* p. 76.

[132] D'Argentré, *Hist. de Bretagne,* fol. 186.

[133] St. Anselm, *De fide Trinitatis,* chap. 3.

[134] *Hist. littér. de la France,* IX, 363.

[135] The terms "nominalism" and "realism" were not yet in use at the time of Roscelin, but they were much in use about the end of the twelfth century. Did Roscelin create nominalism? Did he not have for master and precursor a certain John the Deaf? Cf. De Wulf, *loc. cit.*

[136] See especially Rousselot, *Etudes sur la philosophie dans le Moyen Age,* I, 209.

founder of the Canons Regular of St. Victor. In the school of Notre Dame cloister, where he occupied a professorial chair, then at St. Victor, William of Champeaux taught that, instead of being a pure fiction of our mind, the universal essence (for example, humanity, that is, human nature, the human species) is the great reality, which brings about that such or such a man is truly man, and that all men are a single whole, a single species, identical by their essence and multiple by their individual qualities.[137]

Peter Abelard

But William of Champeaux in turn met, in one of his pupils, an earnest opponent. The latter was called Peter. Like Roscelin, he came from Brittany, where he was born in 1079, in the domain of Le Palet, not far from Nantes, of a family of gentlemen. Soon he was known by the surname Abelard (*baiare lardum*), owing to a pleasantry by one of his teachers, Thierry of Chartres.[138] He was an elegant young man, of keen and inquiring mind, earnest and fluent in speech, possessing an amazingly varied knowledge. He used to interrupt his studies to sing gracefully some verses in the vulgar tongue, which he himself had composed, or to break a lance in the tournaments. He was one of those whom Roscelin's theories had seduced. Listening to the lectures of William of Champeaux, he hoped to enter the lists against him who was called "the first dialectician of the world." [139] The first objections he raised against the teaching of the master revealed his reckless and presumptuous spirit.

[137] Such, in main outline, is the theory of William of Champeaux. In the course of his teaching was it modified in such a manner that it was more radical at the outset and more attenuated at the end? As the information we have on this point comes from Abelard, his pupil, and as Abelard boasts of having provoked these successive modifications, we should not too readily accept his testimony. Cf. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, § 164, p. 179.

[138] A. Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres au Moyen Age*, p. 192.

[139] Abelard, *Historia calamitatum; PL*, CLXXVIII, 115 f.

A party of students gathered about him. In 1102 he thought he was strong enough to found at Melun, a royal residence, an independent school, which he soon transferred to Corbeil. The clamorous success which his oratorical eloquence obtained there, the very temerity of his attitude, merely stirred his pride the more. This young professor, only twenty-four years old, even harassed with his arguments his former teacher in his retreat at St. Victor, then went to Laon to establish there a school in rivalry with that of Anselm.[140] A greater triumph awaited him. In 1113 the successor of William of Champeaux in the great school of Notre Dame at Paris ceded to Abelard the chair of his master.

For the twenty-three-year-old teacher, this was the beginning of a period of glory, the brilliancy of which, attested by all the contemporaries, seems fabulous.[141] Thousands of listeners thronged about his professorial chair. This unheard-of success finally intoxicated him. We know of the culpable and cruelly expiated passion that led him to embrace the monastic life. But his pride of intellect did not submit. He criticized the nominalism of Roscelin, which he found hesitant and timid, and the realism of William of Champeaux, which he tried to ridicule by exaggerating it. The doctrine which he propounded in opposition to them and which later was given the name of conceptualism, shows a real penetration of mind. Abelard held that the universal exists in the individual, but he does not clearly point out the abstracting process of the mind which disengages it. Consequently we may say that, although his theory is "a definite step toward Thomism, it remains incomplete." [142]

Abelard went astray particularly in the field of theology. Under pretext of opposing Roscelin's tritheism, he taught Sabellianism; to refute the theory which regarded the Trinity as

[140] We are here speaking of Anselm of Laon, who died in 1117. Pope Eugene III called him the restorer of theological studies in France.

[141] C. de Rémusat, *Abélard,* I, 44.

[142] De Wulf, *op. cit.,* § 174, p. 193.

composed of three Gods, he identifies the three Persons with the divine essence. He makes claim to render understandable all the mysteries and declares "that we can believe only what we have previously comprehended." [143] Thus, after ruining the Catholic notion of the Trinity, he ruins the Catholic notion of faith. A council of Soissons in 1121 condemned him to burn with his own hands the famous book containing those two grave errors, the *Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina.*[144]

Despite everything, the controversy over universals contributed to the progress of philosophical studies. The realists, even the extreme ones, by their attention to the substantial reality of things, "powerfully promoted the development of metaphysics"; [145] and the nominalists, by their earnest rejection of chimerical entities from philosophy and by their critical studies of abstraction and reflection, gave an undeniable stimulus to psychological studies.[146]

Theology

The heresies of Roscelin and Abelard were connected with philosophical errors. Other heresies, which sprang up in the domain of theology and piety, disturbed the Church no less in the first quarter of the twelfth century. Whereas nominalism and exaggerated realism, carried into the interpretation of dogma, misrepresented the meaning of dogma in the world of the schools, the Manichaean heresy, secretly propagated in the popular masses, there spread the most dangerous doctrines.

Several times we have already met the Manichaean sect, and

[143] *Nec credi posse aliquid, nisi primitus intellectum* (*Historia calamitatum,* chap. 9; *PL,* CLXXVIII, 142).

[144] Was the book condemned at Soissons the *Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina,* discovered and published by Stolzle in 1891 at Fribourg, or was it a short work on the Trinity mentioned by Abelard in his letter 14 (*PL,* CLXXVIII, 357)? See Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles,* V, 596.

[145] De Wulf, *op. cit.,* § 147, p. 161.

[146] *Ibid.*

will meet it again. Bossuet, in his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,*[147] pointed out the chief stages of that disastrous heresy which, with its amazing art of disguising itself and even of having itself forgotten when it found need of doing so, passed from Asia into Europe in the third century and reached France through Thrace and Bulgaria. Lacordaire compares it "to those monsters that, in the depth of the ocean, follow unknown routes and at times raise their ancient heads above the waves." [148] At the beginning of the twelfth century, the heresy appeared first in the north, around Antwerp and Bruges, and in the south, in Dauphiné, Provence, and Languedoc.

Tanchelm

In the north a certain Tanchelm (or Tanchelin), a layman who called himself a bishop consecrated by the pope, very cleverly practiced the art of seducing the populace. He began by speaking mildly, making use especially of women, whom he indoctrinated, to spread his errors among the men. Then he started preaching in the open air. "Let us flee," he said, "from the darkness of the churches, which encourages fraud and crime. The priests in the churches do not consecrate the body of Christ and they commit crimes there. The true doctrine must be sought in the light of day with Tanchelm, because Tanchelm bears in him the fulness of the Holy Ghost: like Christ, he is God." When Tanchelm ascended a pulpit in a public square, he appeared in royal pomp, all covered with gold and purple. Guards carried before him a standard and a sword. An army of three thousand men surrounded him. The people, in wonderment, listened to him as though he were an envoy from heaven.

The heresiarch told them they must at once reject the ecclesi-

[147] Bossuet, *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* Bk. XI, nos. 7 ff.

[148] Lacordaire, *Vie de S. Dominique,* chap. I, p. 19.

astical hierarchy and the sacraments. But soon people learned that this man, abusing his followers' confidence, was given to the most shameless debauchery. After a journey to Rome and to Germany, he tried in 1115 to reappear in Flanders; upon his arrival there he was slain by a cleric.[149] But his party continued, ardent, fanatical. The Bishop of Cambrai, for the enlightenment of consciences, then called the venerated founder of Prémontré, St. Norbert, who, with the assistance of several of his disciples, succeeded in extirpating the heresy. In doing so he employed extreme gentleness. "Have no fear," he said to the people of Antwerp; "you erred only through ignorance; listen to the true doctrine." This mildness and the examples of holiness given by the missioners, touched the people's hearts. Men and women were converted and brought back the sacred hosts which, in obedience to the heresiarch, they had hidden in cellars or caves.[150]

Peter of Bruys

We cannot easily determine the precise extent to which Tanchelm's doctrine was connected with Manichaeism. The denial of the hierarchy and of the sacraments, the claim to a direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the union of an extreme spiritualism and immoral conduct, are at any rate traits of his heresy which are common to it and to the Manichaean heresy. A connection with the doctrine of Mani is more evident in the teaching of Peter of Bruys, the heresiarch who disturbed the south of France.[151] He not only attacked the hierarchy and the sacraments; he also condemned the baptism of children, denied any

[149] *Epistola Trajectensis Ecclesiae de Tanchelmo; PL,* CLXX, 1312.

[150] *Acta sanctorum, Vita S. Norberti,* June 6. On Tanchelm, see Baronius, *Annales,* year 1126.

[151] The connections between Peter of Bruys and Manichaeism are admitted by Döllinger (*Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte,* p. 75), Mabillon (*Bernardi opera,* general preface, no. 73), and by Bossuet (*History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* Bk. XI, nos. 36 ff.). Vacandard (*Vie de S. Bernard,* I, 229) doubted the existence of this relationship, because "we have no evidence that Peter of Bruys

value, even symbolic, to the sacrifice of the mass, turned to ridicule any prayers for the dead, other prayers, and all good works, and forbade crosses, because they recalled the suffering of Christ.[152] The Provençal heretic was more sophistical and more brutal than the Flemish heretic. He reasoned and attempted to base all his assertions on Scriptural texts or on principles of common sense. Furthermore, joining action to words, he had monks and priests seized and flogged, overturned altars, tore down crucifixes.

For twenty years, from 1104 to 1124, he journeyed through the Pyrenees, Provence, Languedoc, and Gascony, where he made many disciples. But his iconoclastic violence finally brought about his ruin. Near the city of St. Gilles in Provence, a crowd, exasperated by his sacrilegious attacks, leaped on him, seized him, and dragged him to the stake, where he perished. His successor was a former Cluny monk, Henry of Lausanne, who spread the heresy in Switzerland, Savoy, and the diocese of Le Mans. The followers of Peter of Bruys and of Henry, commonly called Petrobrusians and Henricians, were condemned in 1148 by a council of Reims. A number of them were converted by St. Bernard's preaching; the others allied themselves in 1184 with the sect of the Waldenses.

St. Norbert and his Canons Regular had combated the errors of Tanchelm. To Peter the Venerable and his monks of Cluny fell the task of fighting against the errors of Peter of Bruys.

---

professed all the Manichaean errors, for instance, that he condemned the use of meat." But we know, and Vacandard acknowledges, that "Peter of Bruys might have veiled not only the esoteric part of his system," that is, the part which he judged opportune to hide from the crowd he was addressing, for "that is indeed the method of the Manichaeans" (Vacandard, *loc. cit.*). Furthermore, the *Exordium magnum cistercienne* (Dist. I, chap. 17; *PL*, CLXXXV, 427, 1025) and the *Gesta pontif. cenoman.* (*Historiens des Gaules*, XII, 554) apply to Henry, a disciple of Peter of Bruys, the epithet "Manichaean," and nothing proves that they were mistaken on this point.

[152] All our information about Peter of Bruy's doctrine is furnished us by a letter of Peter the Venerable (*Contra Petrobrusianos; PL*, CLXXXIX, 720 f.).

The holy abbot wrote, in this connection, to the archbishops of Arles and Embrun, and to the bishops of Die and Gap: "To you belong the right and duty of pursuing error in the retreats where it hides and of attacking it by word and even, at need, by the secular arm. However, Christian charity seeks to convert the heretics rather than to exterminate them. Let us, therefore, try to speak to them in the name of authority and of reason." [153]

This advice was followed. Numerous preachers, monks and clerics, pursued the error wherever it showed itself; they preached not only in the churches and cloisters, but in the public squares and in the fields. That the masses might better understand them, they had to speak, no longer in Latin, but in the Romance tongue.[154] At the same time sacred eloquence assumed a less formal character and became more animated and dramatic. Under certain circumstances the exhortation was changed into a dialogue. Pulpit eloquence lost something of its gravity, but it was more flexible and penetrated the populace; the French language, then in the period of formation, was enriched with idioms and animated expressions that became elements of its originality.[155]

Communal Movement

From the summit to the base of its hierarchy, the Church recovered, in the midst of so many crises, not only the order essential to its functioning, but a powerful vitality: and this vitality was evidenced in the preponderant influence it exercised on civil society. While the papacy gave proof of its influence over noblemen and kings by organizing the Crusades,

[153] *PL,* CLXXXIX, 721.

[154] Mabillon has established that St. Bernard himself spoke to the monks in Latin, to the people in Romance (*S. Bernardi opera,* preface, §§ 8–15).

[155] Bourgain, *La chaire française au XII^e siècle.*

the lower clergy manifested its influence over the people by its part in the communal movement.

The country clergy did not create the communal movement. Its origin goes back to political and economic causes historically assignable. In the communal franchises of certain regions of Italy or of southern France we can recognize the survival of Roman communal institutions; [156] and the commercial prosperity of certain regional groups following the Crusades was obviously one of the chief stimulants that led them to organize in an autonomous manner. The advance of communal emancipation has its starting point in the regions that felt the Roman influence most and it followed the direction of the great commercial currents. We must also note that the upper clergy did not always comprehend or favor this movement of enfranchisement. The words of Abbot Fulbert de Nogent are often cited: "Commune! a novel name, a detestable name!" And the words of Bishop Ivo of Chartres: "A communal pact cannot oblige, because it is contrary to the canon law." [157] The excesses committed by certain popular uprisings harmed the movement, so that the reprobation due to these excesses fell on the institution itself; and such or such an ecclesiastical lord might see especially in this emancipation the suppression of the feudal rights belonging to him. But this could not be the viewpoint of the rural clergy, who, living the life of the people and being the daily confidant of their sufferings, had no difficulty in understanding that the time was at hand for such or such an agglomeration to organize for the defense of its rights.

The Confraternities

Two facts seem to have exercised an important influence on the communal movement: the increasing number of religious confraternities and the associations formed for the Truce of

[156] Cantu, *Hist. univ.*, X, 314.

[157] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.*, II, 427.

God. The merchant, the artisan, or the laborer, associated with his fellows to benefit from a spiritual mutual aid, acquired the habit of common action, of professional or local solidarity. The commune of Chateauneuf near Tours was organized by a confraternity of St. Eloi; at Poitiers the city corporation was recruited in a confraternity of St. Hilary; we are told that the commune of Mantes was created by a confraternity of the Assumption.[158] As to the form of oath taken for the maintenance of the Truce of God, it formed between the members certain agreements more directly connected with the mutual defense of their civil rights: "In favor of every associate who summons me to his aid, and against all those who refuse to keep the truce, I will take up arms; I will bear succor to all those whom I can assist." In the Roman council of 1102 a decision was adopted "that the people, in the presence of the clerics, will take an oath to pursue the violators of the peace." The Council of Clermont, in its ninth canon, made a similar decision. William, papal legate and archbishop of Auch, wrote in 1102: "If anyone attempts to violate the peace, let his prince and his bishop, with the clergy and the people, compel him to repair the damage caused."

Semichon, in his work on the Truce of God, says:

> Frequently when we passed by the foot of the old castle towers—their remains still amaze us—or when from the high dismantled walls we turned our eyes to the lowly cottages which the eye can scarcely pick out, hidden as they are in the woods around the base of the towers, we asked ourselves: "How was the inhabitant of the humble cottage able to win equality of rights with the proud lord of the castle tower?" The answer is in our history: the Church and the associations. Henceforth the townsmen of the middle classes and the peasants are strong: they have right on their side; the Church has told them so. They have strength through the association.[159]

[158] *Ibid.*, p. 431.

[159] Semichon, *La paix et la Trêve de Dieu*, p. 128.

An eleventh century chronicler, Andrew by name, a monk of St. Benedict, shows us how the Truce of God, the initiative of which had been taken by the bishops and the abbots of Aquitaine, was established at Bourges.

The Archbishop of that great city assembled the poor and the clerics, all the weak and the oppressed of his diocese; he bound them together against the oppressors by an oath which he himself pronounced first of all; and he urged them to form a commune, *ut commune faciant,* that is, a league, a warlike and armed community with the aim of aggression and defense. The league was formed, in fact, by the care of Archbishop Aimoin and his suffragans.[160] Thereafter social conditions changed. Did war break out between two nobles? If they resolve, as formerly, to appeal to force and to lay waste the countryside, at once the people appeal to the bishop, and he, in virtue of the Truce of God, first stops the war for a period of forty days, then summons the two nobles before the peace tribunal; for peace has its tribunals, its judges, its taxes, and its police, which is everybody.[161] But if the nobleman refuses to appear before this ecclesiastical and popular tribunal, if as formerly he decides to appeal to arms, he is excommunicated; and, in case this penalty, at that time so terrible, does not suffice, the plebeian association moves forward at the bishop's word and, led by the curés and elected chiefs, it marches to the assault of the feudal manor.[162]

This was in the first years of the twelfth century. The people of all condition gathered together under the banners of the association of the Truce of God, besieged the castle of Le Puis, with the aid of King Louis VI. "The assault was languishing," relates the monk Suger; "the King's knights were weakening, when a poor bald-headed priest, who arrived with the communities of the parishes of the district, made possible what was

[160] See de Certain, *Miracula S. Bened.,* Bk. V, chaps. 1 f.
[161] Semichon, *op. cit.,* pp. 315–30.
[162] Labbe, *Concilia,* IX, 781.

thought impossible. This man, with unprotected head, carrying before him as his only defense a wretched plank, climbed up rapidly, reached the palisade, and tore it down piece by piece, while crouching under the boards arranged to cover the opening. Rejoicing to see that he succeeded easily, he signaled for aid to those of his people who were hesitating to follow him and were staying in the plain, without taking part in the combat." [163]

From the association for the truce to the association for the oath-bound commune or for the town liberty, was only a step; this step was taken easily. The day when the people met together by commune or by parish instead of assembling by district and diocese, the communal movement began. This change is perceptible under Louis VI. Says the chronicler Orderic Vitalis: "Then a popular community was established in France by the bishops, and the priests accompanied the king for the combats or the sieges with their banners and all the parishioners." [164]

At this same period the word "commune" appears in public documents; but the word "peace" continues for a long time, and we meet it in many cities. This fact is remarkable because the first communes are called indifferently "communes" or "peace"; the sworn members are called *paciarii* ("men of the peace"); the communal oath is called "the oath of peace." Lastly, to make the likeness more complete, the appearance of the first communes exactly coincides with the generalization, the solemn consecration, of the peace associations by the entire Church.[165]

[163] Suger, *Vita Ludovici Grossi,* chap. 18; *PL,* CLXXXVI, 1292.

[164] Orderic Vitalis, Bk. IX.

[165] E. Demolins, *Le mouvement communal et municipal au Moyen Age,* pp. 45–49. Semichon in his work *La Paix et la Trêve de Dieu,* from which we have taken several details of our account, has established that the communes were a transformation of the associations for the Truce of God, rather than a survival of the guild and of the Roman *municipium.* Cf. Luchaire, *Les communes françaises sous les Capétiens directs;* René Bourgeois, *Du mouvement communal en Champagne aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles.*

The Christian Life

Peace is indeed the inspiration that seems to dominate the concern of the Church, in the tendencies of the piety of the faithful as also in the canonical legislation of the popes. The Eucharist is more and more in honor. Paschal II moderates the penances and criticizes the violence of the customs; the rights and the duties of the clergy become more precise; and Callistus II crowns this general peace movement by the meeting of the ecumenical council of the Lateran.

Though often repeated, the statement is not exact, that the elevation of the host at mass was instituted immediately after the condemnation of Berengarius of Tours as a protest against his heresy.[166] This ceremony appears only at the end of the twelfth century. But we can note that at the beginning of the twelfth century the Eucharist took a large place in the Christian life. Undeniably Berengarius' heresy, through the reaction that followed, stimulated the people's faith. Communion was better understood. It was recommended with a warmth and delicacy of feeling that foretold the outbursts of piety of a St. Bonaventure and a St. Thomas Aquinas toward the sacrament of the altar. At the same time the rites of penance were moderated. In place of the petition formula of absolution, which in general prevailed up to that time, the indicative form became general. "I absolve you," said the priest; he no longer said: "May the Lord absolve you." [167] Concessions of indulgences increased in number. In 1116 Pope Paschal II granted the first general indulgence. Urban II conceded to the Church of St. Nicholas at Angers the privilege *in perpetuum* of an indulgence for all who should make a visit to it. Callistus II accorded a like favor to the Church of Fontevrault.[168] To put an end to private quarrels or to legal trials, a strange procedure was still in honor: it was

[166] See Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, IV, 2322. Cf. II, 740.

[167] Vacandard in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, I, 167.

[168] Galtier, art. "Indulgences" in the *Dict. apol de la foi. cath.*, II, 733.

the "judgment of God." A person was thought to prove his innocence or the justice of his cause by walking through the flames, by walking barefoot over hot iron, by being thrown, with arms and legs tied, into a large vessel of water (cold or boiling hot). Paschal II declared in clear language that he disapproved all these practices, taken from a gross superstition.[169]

In the ecclesiastical organization an element of order and peace was progressively formed. In the course of countless conflicts which filled the eleventh century, many occasions were furnished to regulate the respective rights and duties of clerics with regard to one another and to the laity. The juridical condition of the pastor, the canon, the bishop, was better determined, as also the supreme authority of the pope.

The bonds of vassalage that existed between the heads of the parishes and the nobles almost disappeared. The feudal suzerainty was followed by the patronage, a milder regime which conferred on the nobles only the right of presentation and sometimes homage.[170] The parish at times was governed by a chaplain, more often by a pastor, by a chapter, or by a monastery. The parish clergy gained in morality and in public regard after the breaking of the close bonds of dependence on the lay lords. Now the pastor was required to possess certain moral and physical qualities, canonical age, and a sufficient degree of education.[171] At the same time the landed property of the parishes increased. Gradual restitution was made of possessions usurped by the nobles, and many pious donations augmented the parish patrimony. A fewer number of pastors, driven by the meagerness of their resources, engaged in the practice of law and medicine.

The communities of the clergy serving the churches were called chapters; their members were called canons. Cathedral

[169] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 480.

[170] Luchaire, *Manuel des institutions françaises. Période des Capétiens directs*, p. 7.

[171] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

chapters served the cathedral church of the episcopal city; collegiate chapters were charged with the public worship and prayer in the other churches of the city and in those of cities and villages which had no pastor of their own.[172] In general, the chapter had at its head a dean or provost, elected by it, then a chanter, etc. It was lord of the lands constituting the capitular domain, which was administered by the provost. A large number of chapters embraced the rule of St. Victor or of Prémontré; but others resisted vigorously: for example, the Paris chapter, sustained in this by Louis the Fat, and the chapter of Compiègne.[173]

The cathedral chapters henceforth had a considerable importance. From the middle of the eleventh century they had in their hand the election of bishops. Sometimes they themselves elected new members to fill vacancies in the chapter; and then they constituted a power that might rival the authority of the bishop. But in many places the bishop was able to reserve to himself the appointment of the canons, with the approval of the chapter for each appointment.

The Hierarchy

The nobles and the kings had excessively augmented the prerogatives of the bishops' power when they endeavored to make the bishops their liege men. But at the beginning of the twelfth century the episcopal power lost some of its importance. The chapters and the pope recovered some of its prerogatives; but its essential rights were firmly maintained. Even when the pastor was presented by the lord in virtue of a right of patronage, the bishop was the one who instituted him, who received his oath of fidelity, and who had him installed by the dean. The pastor could introduce no personnel, even lay, into the administra-

[172] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[173] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, II, Part II, 251–59.

tion of his church, nor could he collect any tithe without his bishop's consent.

The authority of the metropolitans underwent the same evolution as that of the bishops. The metropolitans had arrogated to themselves the right of instituting the bishops without recourse to the pope, to pass judgment in case of rivalries, even to create bishoprics. The papacy maintained and energetically confirmed the metropolitans' right of jurisdiction over the bishops of their province;[174] it recognized their right of custody over vacant churches, the right of investigation in elections, the right to consecrate their suffragans; but it took from them the other powers, which would constitute them autonomous prelates to the great harm of the unity of the Church.

In extraordinary circumstances the popes entrusted special powers to legates. These powers were restricted to a particular region, sometimes to a specific matter.[175] The legates were often chosen from the cardinals.

The body of cardinals, organized in 1059,[176] included, in the time of Callistus II, six cardinal-bishops, twenty-eight cardinal-priests, and eighteen cardinal-deacons. It revived, around the Roman pontiff, the ancient *presbyterium* which surrounded the bishops of earlier times.[177] We have seen the preponderant part belonging to it since 1051 in the election of the popes.

As to the power of the papacy, the sad crises it had to pass through did but make it more precise and stronger. At the Lateran Council of 1102, Paschal II aroused no objection from the bishops present, when he asked them to promise under oath "to approve and to condemn whatever the Roman Church would approve or condemn." Henceforth the pope exercised without

[174] *PL*, CLI, 495.

[175] *Ibid.*, CXLVI, 1295; CLXIII, 241, 1186, 1323.

[176] Before 1059 the word *cardinalis* designated the titular priest of a church. Sometimes it was also used with reference to the clergy of the episcopal city as distinguished from the rest of the diocesan clergy.

[177] Dufourcq, *L'avenir du christianisme. Le passé chrétien*, VI, 61.

hindrance his right to depose bishops, to confirm their election, to settle their differences, to create bishoprics, to confer their powers on metropolitans by sending the pallium to them, to establish primates, and to send legates wherever he judged opportune for the welfare of the Church. Neither the resistance of certain bishops and of certain kings, nor the momentary weaknesses of Paschal II prevented this acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Roman pontiff.

Callistus thought the time had come to have sanctioned by a plenary assembly of the episcopate the results acquired during the long struggles which the Church had just passed through. On March 18, 1123, the third Sunday of Lent, he assembled at the Lateran three hundred bishops,[178] who came from all the countries of Christendom. This was the ninth of the ecumenical councils, the first held in the West. At it no new dogma and no new disciplinary law was promulgated; but all the progress realized by the Church during the latter centuries was confirmed, made precise, and approved. The Concordat of Worms was read and corrected, and twenty-two canons were published. Again condemnation was decreed against simony, clerical concubinage, the encroachments of the laity in the realm of ecclesiastical affairs, forbidden marriages, infractions of the Truce of God, debasement of coinage, the violation of the oath to take up arms against the infidels, and attacks committed against pilgrims. The relations between monks and bishops were regulated, as were several special matters.[179]

[178] This is the figure given by Suger, who was present at the council. The figure 997, given by Pandulph, seems to be a copyist's error.

[179] See the Latin text and the English translation in Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils,* pp. 178 ff., 542 ff. (Tr.) Canon 21 reads as follows: "We absolutely forbid priests, deacons, subdeacons, and monks to have concubines or to contract marriage. We decree in accordance with the definitions of the sacred canons, that marriages already contracted by such persons be dissolved, and that the persons be condemned to do penance." Some have at times concluded from this text that, until the First Council of the Lateran, the celibacy of those in major orders, although a matter of precept, was not considered a diriment impediment of marriage (Vacandard, *Etudes de critique et d'histoire,* p. 119). Thus stated, the

Callistus lived but a short time after the great council. He died on December 13, 1124. Emperor Henry V, the last of the race of Franconia, followed him to the grave, on May 22, 1125, at the age of forty-four.

---

assertion seems too absolute. Let us note that the text of the council declares the nullity of the marriage of those in major orders by basing the decree on "the definitions of the sacred canons." From a study of several texts previous to 1123, we see that the Council of the Lateran, in pronouncing the impediment of orders for ecclesiastics in major orders, was merely consecrating an opinion that had become more and more accentuated and that had already been confirmed by provincial councils (Synod of Troyes, under Paschal II). On this question, see Choupin, *Valeur des décisions du Saint Siège,* pp. 393 f.

PART III

The Organization of Christendom

NEITHER the ecumenical Council of the Lateran nor the extinction of the imperial house of Franconia in the person of Henry V put an end to every conflict. Under the domination of the Hohenstaufens, the Church had to sustain many rude combats. But the conditions of the struggle were changed. From the long quarrel of the investitures, the Empire had retired enfeebled; the Church emerged free from its feudal shackles. From this a twofold consequence followed: the Empire, exhausted by the incessant plots of a turbulent feudalism and by its ambitions of conquests in Italy, no longer had the strength to give itself the powerful constitution it needed; the papacy, while resisting the external and internal enemies of the Church, found itself able to organize Christendom. Further, the Holy Germanic Empire was no longer the only great power in Europe. A nation which wise monarchical institutions had made great and on which the Crusades cast a brilliance of knightly valor, France, governed by the holiest and most just of kings, Louis IX, gave the Church her support. Thanks to the providential concurrence of these circumstances, the popes of the thirteenth century, among them Pope Innocent III, endowed the world with great religious, political, social, literary, and artistic institutions, which form the glory of the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER VIII

From Honorius II to Frederick Barbarossa (1124–52)

BETWEEN the death of the last Franconian emperor (Henry V) in 1125 and the coming of the most celebrated of the Hohenstaufens (Frederick Barbarossa) in 1152, five popes followed one another on the throne of St. Peter; a general council was celebrated; a Crusade was undertaken; heretics and schismatics disturbed the Church, while learned men instructed it and while great saints edified it. At first glance we do not easily see any unity in this period of transition. But the unity of the epoch is found at least in the influence of the great monk who dominated it with his genius and penetrated it with his inspiration: Bernard of Clairvaux. Counselor of popes, light of councils, preacher of the Crusade, dread adversary of heresies, and most eminent representative of the sacred sciences, Bernard accomplished a providential work: he assured to the Church the fruits of her victory over the Franconian emperors and prepared her to sustain the struggle against the new dynasty of the Hohenstaufens.

At almost the same time the Church had to elect a pope, and Germany an emperor. These two elections took place in the midst of circumstances that were particularly difficult. One of the regrettable results of the investiture quarrel had been to favor, at Rome as in Germany, an excessive increase of the aristocratic power. To win the nobles to their cause or to hold them, the popes and the emperors had been led to multiply their privileges and to tolerate their encroachments. But this generosity and tolerance had eventually constituted, beside the papal and the imperial power, powerful houses that had to be reckoned with.

Pope Honorius II

At Rome two great rival houses, that of the Frangipani and that of the Pierleoni, each hoped to impose on the Church a pope of its choice. The Frangipani seem to have had a friendly feeling for the German policy, whereas the Pierleoni incarnated rather the popular and national party.[1] The former's candidate was Cardinal Lambert, bishop of Ostia, the negotiator of the Concordat of Worms; the latter favored one of the papal legates at Worms, Cardinal Saxo. To avoid the danger of the election of an antipope, the cardinals put aside the two candidates and unanimously chose Cardinal Theobald, who took the name of Celestine II. The *Te Deum* was intoned. Lambert of Ostia joined his voice with that of the assembly. But the singing of the thanksgiving had barely begun, when Robert Frangipani, accompanied by a band of his followers, suddenly acclaimed Lambert and had the papal mantle placed on his shoulders. The Bishop of Ostia resisted, and refused to lend himself to so irregular an election. The disorder, fomented by the two hostile parties, lasted five days. The prudence of the cardinals put an end to it. Celestine II, to bring about peace, abdicated, and the electors then agreed on Lambert, who, under these new conditions, accepted the tiara. He was canonically proclaimed pope on December 21, 1124, under the name of Honorius II, and was at once acknowledged by all. The new Pope was sprung from parents who were not wealthy and were of obscure condition in the district of Bologna. By the sole force of his talent, he had risen to the most esteemed positions in the Church.[2] Throughout his life he remained faithful to the spirit of prudence and moderation which he manifested at the time of his election.

[1] Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom,* IV, 390.
[2] Cf. Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.,* I, 327.

Not satisfied with thus ending the painful conflicts stirred up at Rome in connection with the papal election, Honorius II did all he could to ward off the strifes which he foresaw would probably break out in connection with the imperial election. The fiercest cupidity was involved. Honorius II had had frequent occasions to become acquainted with this condition during the negotiations which he was commissioned to carry on in Germany regarding the investiture quarrel. Upon learning of the death of Henry V, his first care was to send to Germany a legate, who would follow at close hand the events which he feared would occur.

The fears often manifested by Henry IV and Henry V during their strife against Rome, with regard to the claims of the German aristocracy, were in no way exaggerated. While the emperors were absorbed by their conflicts with the Holy See, feudal Germany was being constituted almost as it continued until modern times. "All fiefs are now hereditary, and when vacant can be granted afresh only by consent of the States; the jurisdiction of the crown is less wide; the idea is beginning to make progress that the most essential part of the Empire is not its supreme head but the totality of princes and barons." [3]

For a century the imperial house of Saxony, and for another century the imperial house of Franconia, had labored to make the Empire hereditary. This they did by the reigning sovereign designating his son, by associating him in the government of the Empire, or by recommending him to the choice of the electors. But henceforth the feudal nobles were resolved to bring about the triumph of the elective principle in all its fulness.[4] In vain Henry V before his death summoned, in the presence of all the princes at his court, his wife Matilda and his nephew Frederick of Hohenstaufen, entrusting to this latter the care

[3] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* chap. 10, p. 165.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 166.

of protecting the princess and of watching over her heritage. This inplicit choice, even though so discreet, rather turned the nobles against Duke Frederick than won them to his cause.

Emperor Lothair

Still young—he was only thirty-five years old—Frederick, duke of Swabia, descendant of the noble family of the Hohenstaufens, was endowed with great qualities. But the lords, both ecclesiastic and lay, in an assembly presided over by Archbishop Adalbert of Mainz, at which the papal legate Gerard took part, preferred a man of more mature age, Lothair of Supplinburg, duke of Saxony and margrave of Meissen and Lusatia. To the ecclesiastical lords, this candidate offered the guaranty of a devotedness to the Holy See, if not more sincere, at least more tried than that of the Duke of Swabia; the lay princes appreciated that he was relying on the most homogeneous part of the Empire. Pope Honorius, requested to approve this choice, ratified it solemnly.[5] Frederick of Hohenstaufen himself took the oath of fidelity to Lothair.[6]

The *Narratio de electione Lotharii* declares explicitly that Lothair, at the moment of his election, renounced two important privileges of the Concordat of Worms, namely, the right to be present personally at the episcopal elections and the right to give investiture before the consecration.[7] The silence of later chroniclers and historians on this point, and the fact that Lothair, without raising any protest from the Holy See, later

[5] Jaffé, no. 7413.

[6] Watterich, II, 160 f. At that time the right of election was not the privilege of a small number of prince-electors and was not yet subject to official regulation. The prince-electors as a distinct body are not mentioned until 1156 (*M. G., Leges*, Vol. II). But in this election of 1125 we see the outline of this organization. Ten of the highest princes of the Empire met to make preparations for the election of a new king. Then they named a commission of forty trusted persons. A certain rule of procedure was adopted in the deliberations. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 653.

[7] *M. G., SS.*, XII, 511.

exercised these rights, have cast doubt upon the testimony of the *Narratio*. Probably we should admit, with some historians, that the King personally made these concessions to the legate, but that they failed to obtain the necessary approval of the princes.[8] In any event, Lothair subsequently always showed himself loyal in following all the clauses of the Concordat of Worms favorable to the Holy See, and was ever ready generously to take in hand the cause of the Church whenever the occasion offered.

Honorius, for his part, firmly sustained the cause of Lothair. Conrad of Hohenstaufen, the brother of Frederick of Swabia, rose up against the newly elected Emperor, with the title of king and had the crown of Italy bestowed on him by the Archbishop of Milan. The Pope thereupon, in the midst of the paschal solemnity of the year 1128, pronounced, with the usual ceremonial, the excommunication of the "false king Conrad, of his brother Frederick, and of their followers." [9] Besides, Honorius sent to Lombardy Cardinal John of Crema, who, in a council held at Pavia, had the Archbishop of Milan excommunicated and deposed for daring to crown Conrad. These measures and the deposition of the patriarchs of Aquileia and of Grado, who had joined the party of Conrad, resulted promptly in isolating the Hohenstaufen and in obliging him to return to Germany without obtaining anything.

The Church in England

Honorius showed the same prudence and the same political firmness in his dealings with England, France, and Sicily. The relations between the Holy See and the King of England were made very strained by a double conflict, going back to the preceding pontificate and not yet settled. In 1119 Pope Callistus

[8] H. Witte, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Wormser Koncordats,* Part I, p. 92.
[9] Jaffé, no. 7308.

II had consecrated at Reims, in spite of the express prohibition of the King, the priest Thurstan, archbishop-elect of York, who had refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the archbishop of Canterbury or to receive episcopal consecration from him. Henry I, deeply offended, then forbade Thurstan residence in Normandy and England.[10] Further, the King of England then claimed, by virtue of a privilege going back to William the Conqueror, the right to prevent at his own pleasure any papal legate from exercising his functions in England. He said: "The question is not one of inflicting harm on the primacy of the pope, but of safeguarding the rights of the legate for Great Britain, who is such by virtue of being archbishop of Canterbury. Honorius II resolved to put an end to both conflicts. Following long negotiations, he succeeded not only in obtaining the admission of Thurstan to England and the acceptance of the legate John of Crema, but also the holding at London in 1125 of a council at which Thurstan of York sat at the side of William of Canterbury. The Council of London confirmed the reform ordinances published by St. Anselm in 1102 and 1108, and referred to Rome the solution of the difference which divided the archbishops of York and Canterbury.[11]

The Church in France

At about this same period, in France the difficulties that set the king and the episcopate in opposition to each other were themselves of a less serious nature. But, through the incidents they aroused, through the passions they started, and through the regrettable misunderstandings they occasioned, they came near letting loose a storm as dreadful for the Church as for France. The zeal of Bernard of Clairvaux and the consummate prudence of Honorius brought about a peaceful solution.

[10] *PL,* CLIX, 505.
[11] Mansi, XXI, 333; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 657–60.

The notable measures of monastic reform, emanating from Cluny, Clairvaux, St. Victor, and Prémontré, brought about some disturbance in the state. "Louis the Fat, notwithstanding his attachment to the Church, showed himself rather disinclined to the introduction of the religious reform in his kingdom. This prince, whose life was one long military epic, naturally considered the bishops and abbots as mere vassals. When a conflict of interests arose between him and his clergy, the temptation to oppose right by might was hard for him to resist. In this matter his council oddly favored his policy. 'The less regular an abbey is,' they used to say at court, 'the more it is dependent on the king and the more useful it is, at least in what concerns the temporal interests.' [12] With such principles, a conflict between the Church and the state was inevitable." [13]

The conflict broke out in connection with the reform which the bishop of Paris, Stephen of Senlis, converted by St. Bernard, wished to introduce in his clergy. Louis the Fat expressly forbade the Bishop "to make any changes in the customs, statutes, and orders of the Church of Paris." [14] The King's interference in the realm of ecclesiastical discipline was manifest. The Bishop ignored the monarch's prohibition. The latter laid hands on the *regalia*. The Bishop replied by imposing an interdict on the diocese of Paris. Thereupon the wrath of the King's court reached its height. Stephen, his life in danger, fled to Sens to his metropolitan, while his foes pounced on his possessions as on some prey.[15]

At this juncture the Abbot of Clairvaux thought the time had come for him to intervene. By a courageous letter and later personally at an audience with the King, he urged the clear prescriptions of the Church laws, threatened the King with an interdict more general than the first, and finally exclaimed:

[12] Abelard, *Hist. calamitatum,* in the *Rec. des hist. des crois.,* XIV, 290.
[13] Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* I, 263.
[14] Luchaire, *Louis le Gros,* no. 424.
[15] St. Bernard, *Epist.,* 45.

"Sire, take care that God does not avenge upon your eldest son the outrage you are inflicting on His bishops." The King, seized with an uncertain terror, promised everything that was asked.[16]

But the cunning monarch had not waited until that hour to maneuver on the side of Rome. Shortly after this interview, a brief from Honorius reached Paris, unconditionally lifting the interdict imposed by the Bishop. Honorius, deceived by the lying reports which Louis the Fat had sent him, decided in favor of the King. The latter at once withdrew all his promises. From that moment on, the affair became embroiled. We have a tearful letter of St. Bernard, begging the Pontiff, "for the honor of the Church," to revoke "the rescript which had been surreptitiously obtained from him by a lie." We know also that Stephen of Senlis, after a short sojourn at Lagny in the states of the Count of Champagne, appeared before Louis the Fat. The details of this meeting have remained a mystery for historians. But we are certain that Honorius revoked his decision and that he sent a legate (Matthew, cardinal-bishop of Albano) to France with instructions to negotiate the peace between the Bishop of Paris and Louis the Fat. These negotiations resulted in an accord, for no trace of the conflict again appears in the writings of contemporaries and, about the end of 1129 or the beginning of 1130, the peace seems well established between the Church and the state.

Sicily

The issue of the disputes that arose between the Pope and Count Roger of Sicily were less happy. Roger, after the death of his cousin William, duke of Apulia (July 26, 1127), invaded his domains, disregarding the claims of Bohemund, who was then in Palestine, and the rights of the Pope as suzerain. Honorius fulminated anathema against the usurper and attempted

[16] *Ibid.*, 46, 47.

to restrict him. But Roger succeeded in having the affair drag out and, profiting by this delay, detached several nobles from the cause of the Pope, who was forced to treat with his adversary. Honorius gave up continuing the dispute about the possession of Apulia. However, he required Roger to take the oath of vassalage and to acknowledge the rights of the Holy See, so often contested, over Benevento.

Papal Elections

While Pope Honorius was laboring to settle these various conflicts, he was not unaware that his enemies were preparing a more terrible conflict. The Pierleoni family, vanquished at the papal election of 1125, were on the watch for the Pontiff's death so as to renew its ambitious claims to the tiara. At the beginning of February, 1130, the Pope, feeling himself grievously attacked by disease, had himself moved from the Lateran to the monastery of St. Gregory. His purpose was to shield the future election, as far as possible, from the encroachments of the Roman nobility. But the latter did not remain inactive; as the Pope's illness grew worse, a constantly increasing excitement was evident in Rome.

The Sacred College saw it would have to take exceptional measures in view of the violent competitions that were being prepared. A commission of eight cardinals was appointed, which, immediately after the Pope's death, should meet in St. Adrian's Church and there, provided with plenary powers by the other members of the Sacred College, should by themselves proceed to the election. Means of defense were set up around this church. At the same time, the leader of the Frangipani party and the leader of the Pierleoni party were sent for and they were required to take an oath to acknowledge the pope regularly elected. Rumors and popular disturbances, stirred up by the Pierleoni, and the struggle that had to be undertaken

to gain possession of St. Adrian's Church, showed that all these precautions were not enough. The Pierleoni were rich; with their fortune they could easily pay and organize a whole army. At any price, something had to be done to prevent them from getting the start and, if once they proclaimed their candidate, to prevent their imposing him by force, thus rendering any other election impossible.

Pope Innocent II

Pope Honorius died during the night of February 13. At daybreak, before news of the Pope's death was spread in the city, the Pope's body was hastily placed in a temporary vault, and the cardinals present (four bishops, five priests, five deacons), in all fourteen members of the Sacred College, proceeded to the election of the new pontiff. The cardinal-deacon Gregory of Sant' Angelo was designated by unanimous vote and, after a moment of natural hesitation, accepted the formidable burden.[17] He took the name of Innocent II.

But, in the afternoon of the same day, twenty cardinals, partisans of the Pierleoni, met together and chose for pope, under the name of Anacletus II, the cardinal-priest Pierleone. The mighty house had already won the people by its gold, and a large part of the nobility by its relationships. On the very day of his election, Innocent II, finding that he was not safe, had to flee to a monastery. Only two Roman families remained faithful to him: the Frangipani and the Corsi. In the month of May, the defection of the Frangipani, who passed over to the party of his foes, forced him to withdraw to a fortress of his family in Trastevere. New threats against the safety of his person and the conviction that no solution could emerge from the agitation of the parties in Rome and Italy, determined him

[17] For the details of this election and a criticism of the documents containing the account of it, see Hefele-Leclercq, V, 676–80 and Vacandard, *op. cit.*, I, 280 f.

to seek refuge in France with Louis the Fat. From there he would more easily address the universal Church. King Lothair, informed in the month of February of the Pope's situation, by a legate and later by two letters addressed, one to him personally, the other to his subjects, had not replied. According as Germany abandoned the protective mission over the Church which it had previously assumed, France more and more became the providential support on which the papacy relied in times of crisis.

Council of Etampes

What Innocent found in France was not merely a nation devoted by tradition to the defense of the Holy See, not merely a powerful king who, despite certain weaknesses, was sincerely attached to the faith, but also the great reformer whose prestige was more and more recognized in all Christendom. As soon as the Pope and the King of France expressed the wish to convoke a council in France to settle the question of the lawful pope, all eyes turned to Bernard of Clairvaux. Louis the Fat and several bishops urgently begged him to come to the council. The holy abbot prepared by prayer and fasting for the task which awaited him. The council met at Etampes.[18] One of its first acts was a unanimous decision that Bernard would be judge of the great question.

Never in the course of the ages had such a mission been confided to one man. The question was most grave and delicate. From the standpoint of strict legality, neither of the elections was altogether safe from criticism. Although the vote of the twenty cardinals who acclaimed Anacletus II might be called tumultuous, still the vote of the fourteen cardinals who elected

[18] On the date of this council, which probably took place in the spring of 1131, see Vacandard, "St. Bernard et le schisme d'Anaclet II en France" in the *Rev. des quest. hist.*, January, 1888, p. 12. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 681 note 1.

Innocent II could be called surreptitious. But the Abbot of Clairvaux, as a real statesman, took the more positive point of view. An inquiry into the canonical regularity of the electoral procedure was impractical. However, the two competitors, the two parties, the two elections could be compared with each other. Which of the two competitors offered in his person the greater guaranties of integrity and worthiness? Which represented the sounder part of the electoral body? Which had been elected in the more regular fashion? [19]

The replies to all these three questions evidently militated in favor of Innocent II. In the person of Anacletus, as in that of his electors and in the manner of his election, everything suggested the ideas of unworthiness, simony, and disorder. Bernard decided in favor of Innocent. If something was lacking for the lawfulness of his election, it was for the universal Church to supply that by ratifying the vote of his electors. This supplement of guaranty, in so far as it might be necessary, was quickly given. The decision of St. Bernard and of the Council of Etampes was like a flash of light, which promptly turned away from the antipope Anacletus at first the Church of France, then the Churches of Germany, England, Castile, and Aragon. Soon the cause of Anacletus was backed by nobody except the Duke of Aquitaine and the Count of Sicily. The former was urged by Gerard, bishop of Angoulême, whom Innocent II was unwilling to confirm in his office of legate; the antipope had won the latter by conferring the royal dignity on him and by giving him his sister's hand in marriage.

The Antipope Anacletus II

True, the duchy of Aquitaine and the countship of Sicily formed only a very small part of Christendom. But the prestige

[19] *Quis dignior? Quae electio sanior? Quae actio ordinabilior?* St. Bernard, in one of his letters (124) sets forth the reasons that made him decide in favor of Innocent II.

enjoyed by Gerard of Angoulême, the soul of the schism in southeastern France, was immense, and the Normans of Sicily represented a military power that had to be reckoned with. Innocent II, or rather his most trusted adviser, Bernard of Clairvaux, thought that the especially important thing was to make sure of the agreement of King Lothair. The agreement was reached easily. The head of the Church had need of the armed support of the monarch; the latter, like his predecessors, desired to receive the imperial crown from the hands of the Roman pontiff. In November, 1132, the Pope and the King of Germany met near Piacenza in the plain of Roncaglia. Of this interview we have no details except that they fixed the next spring as the time for their common march toward Rome.

The antipope Anacletus trembled for his cause, the more as his authority was declining at Rome and as in Italy his chief support, Roger of Sicily, had just been overcome by an insurrection of the nobles of Apulia. He hastened to negotiate with Lothair. His proposals were flattering for the monarch's ambition: the two competitors were to withdraw from the contest, and the King of Germany was to preside at a new papal election. Lothair and his court were on the point of being caught in the snare; but the Abbot of Clairvaux, who had accompanied the Pope in his journey, disclosed the trickery. He showed that the antipope's project was contrary to the canons. "The universal Church," said Bernard, "has spoken; it has pronounced against Anacletus and his accomplices; the case is adjudged; a decision rendered by all Christendom cannot be referred to a particular tribunal." [20] The King yielded to this argument. He perceived that his entry into Rome at the head of a powerful army was the only means of extinguishing the schism.

The expedition was carried out without encountering any resistance. On April 30, 1133, the imperial troops made their entry into the Eternal City. The next day, Innocent II occupied

[20] St. Bernard, *Epist.*, 26, no. 11.

the Lateran Palace. The last followers of Anacletus had withdrawn to the fortresses of the Pierleoni and were still holding the basilica of St. Peter. Lothair failed to dislodge them from these last places of retreat by a regular siege, which would have required too much time. The stay in Rome had become dangerous for the German army on account of the fevers. As St. Peter's was not available, Lothair asked that he receive the imperial crown in the Church of the Lateran. On June 4, 1133, in the hands of Innocent II, he swore "to protect the papal dignity and to defend the fiefs of the Holy See." Then the Pontiff crowned him emperor.[21]

Although weakened, the schism persisted at Rome. It was especially alive in Aquitaine and in Sicily. There Bernard of Clairvaux undertook the task of pursuing it.

[21] On this occasion the Pope and the Emperor renewed the promise to observe religiously the reciprocal agreements made at Worms. They also concluded an accord on the subject of the property which was left by Countess Matilda to the Holy See and over which the German emperors claimed to have rights of suzerainty and even of ownership. They decided that, by the annual payment of 100 livres of silver the Emperor and his son-in-law Henry of Bavaria should receive as fiefs the alodial lands which Matilda had given to the Roman Church. Duke Henry of Bavaria would take an oath of vassalage and fidelity to the pope and, after the death of the Duke and his wife Gertrude, the property of Matilda would return in full to the Roman Church (Jaffé, no. 7633). Cf. Theiner, *Cod. dimplom. dom. temp.*, I, 12. "What was the extent of Countess Matilda's donation? This point has been much discussed. Opinion is divided. Without entering into this discussion, we will, so far as possible, set forth the results. In the deed of donation, Matilda said merely: *Dedi omnia bona mea jure proprietario;* that is, her alodial lands, her lands that were free from subjection, not dependent on any lord. Which were these alodial lands? They were not the Tuscan March, given in fief by the emperor to the countess' father, and before that to her grandfather. They were not the countship of Ferrara, ceded by the pope, a possession which, after the death of the vassal, would have to return to the suzerain. The assignment of alodial lands in the midst of fiefs is something bizarre and extremely difficult to explain. They were scattered over the whole extent of the territory. By combining the text that refers to Countess Matilda's donation, we see that this donation included parcels of land that were generally far separated from one another and that formed a notable extent only at the extremity of Romagna near the frontiers of the district that became the duchy of Modena" (Henri de l'Epinois, *Le gouvernement des papes,* pp. 43 f.).

Gerard of Angoulême

Gerard of Angoulême is a significant figure. Former legate of Popes Paschal II, Gelasius II, Callistus II, and Honorius II, with marvelous diplomatic talent he had conducted the most delicate affairs. As professor in the schools of Poitiers, he had acquired the reputation of an acute theologian, a well-informed canonist, a prudent and safe moralist. His views carried weight in the councils.[22] The charm of his conversation and the loftiness of his eloquence, no less than his dexterity in momentous affairs, won for him enthusiastic admirers and friends in the many countries where he had traveled. Many of these friends, even after his worst defections, remained loyal to him, palliated his faults, and covered him with so much praise for his learning and his character, that they disconcerted the judgment of many historians.[23]

Gerard's danger lay precisely in this immense success. Apparently the Bishop of Angoulême was never blameworthy in his moral conduct, and we are told that all his life he showed himself charitable toward the poor. But he was unable to resist the intoxication of power. Under four successive pontificates he had had in hand the conducting of the weightiest affairs of the Church. When he saw, in 1125, two candidates contesting their right to the tiara, he was fearful of seeing his lofty position slip from him. From each of the two competitors he solicited the retention of his office. This was his first weakness. Anacletus gladly granted his request. But Innocent II, probably advised by the Abbot of Clairvaux, discovered the pride of this man, and refused services that were suspected of being inspired by a selfish ambition.

Removed from his office of papal legate, Gerard, who had

[22] Notably at the Council of the Lateran (1112), where he found means of extricating Pachal II from his disastrous promises given to Henry V (*Historiens des Gaules,* XII, 394).

[23] Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* I, 317.

seen above him only the authority of the pope and who, unable to aspire to that office, was unwilling to accept the loss of his high rank, assumed the task of making a pope. To advance Anacletus to the power by driving out Innocent II, he stirred up the dioceses of Angoulême, Limoges, Poitiers, and Bordeaux; in favor of the antipope he drew up memorials full of legal science and cleverly studied sophisms; [24] and especially he won to his cause William X, count of Poitiers. This prince, "of weak and violent character, of light morals, and of misconceived piety," placed an imposing material force at the service of the antipope and in the hands of Gerard.

Several steps taken by Peter the Venerable and St. Bernard had been unavailing against the obstinacy of the prelate and of the Count, when, about the end of 1134, the Abbot of Clairvaux judged the time was ripe to renew his attempts. The strengthening of Pope Innocent's authority had necessarily lessened the power of the schism. Further, the irregular occupation of the episcopal see of Bordeaux by the Bishop of Angoulême had turned his suffragans and the Bordeaux people against him. Bernard went to Aquitaine and proposed to the two leaders of the schismatic party a public debate. William agreed merely to argue the question with the Abbot of Clairvaux in his castle at Parthenay. Shaken by the powerful argumentation of the monk, but not daring to break with his friends, the Count hesitated, evaded, prolonged the controversy for several days. To end the affair, Bernard proposed to the Count that they turn to God. He would celebrate mass in the venerated shrine of Notre Dame de La Couldre and, in the presence of the people, would implore the light of heaven. The sacrifice began and continued up to the moment of communion amid religious silence. After giving the pax to the people, Bernard, as though under an impulse of sudden inspiration, took the

[24] *Historiens des Gaules,* XII, 366–68.

consecrated host on the paten and turned straight toward the Count of Poitiers: "Here is the Son of the Virgin who comes to you," he said. "Here is your judge. Are you going to reject Him? Are you going to despise Him, as you have despised His servants?" The Count, as though astounded by these words and this sight, fell on his knees and promised to abandon the schism.[25] He died piously three years later, on Good Friday, 1137, while on a pilgrimage to St. James of Compostela. Gerard preceded him to the grave by a year.[26]

Historians are not agreed in their accounts of the last moments of the Bishop of Angoulême. St. Bernard says that he died suddenly. We may hope that the almsgiving which the prelate practiced up to his last hour and which, according to the Scripture, has the power to blot out sins,[27] obtained the grace of final repentance for him who, before being the victim of his own renown, had been one of the glories of the French episcopate in the twelfth century.

Pope Innocent II at Pisa

While these events were taking place in Aquitaine, Innocent II was living at Pisa, where he had withdrawn to avoid a conflict with Anacletus. There he awaited a favorable occasion to resume the struggle against the party of the antipope. At the beginning of 1135 a letter from the Abbot of Clairvaux informed him that the moment had come. Bernard wrote: "Pisa has been chosen to replace Rome. This is not the result of chance, but a favor of Providence. . . . O Pisans, Pisans, the Lord intends to do great things in you." [28]

But, before the campaign should be started, material sup-

[25] *Vita Bernardi,* Bk. II, chap. 6, nos. 37 f.
[26] *Historiens des Gaules,* XII, 395, 397.
[27] Tobias 12:9.
[28] St. Bernard, *Epist.,* 130. Cf. 140.

port must be assured. In a council held at Reims (October, 1131), the Pope had received the adherence of three kings (Henry I of England, Alfonso VII of Castle, and Alfonso I of Aragon). In that same council, he had consecrated the son of King Louis the Fat of France. However, none of these princes could take the part which Lothair reserved to himself as the proper mission of his imperial dignity. Innocent II sent Bernard to Germany to hasten the pacification of the Empire, still upset by the rivalries of the Hohenstaufens. During the summer of 1134, the son-in-law of Lothair, Henry of Bavaria, had, in a brilliant two-months' campaign, succeeded in isolating the army of the enemy and had compelled Philip of Swabia to sue for grace and pardon. The Emperor's first impulse was to refuse any condition and to ruin completely the power of his foe; but the Abbot of Clairvaux, in a diet at Bamberg (March 17, 1135), at which he was present in the name of the Pope, prevailed upon both parties to accept a peace treaty by which Frederick recovered his duchy of Swabia, and in return promised his fidelity to the Emperor and his assistance in an expedition against Rome. For a while Conrad persisted in his opposition, but he finally had to yield and to accept similar conditions, about the end of September, 1135.

Council of Pisa

Immediately after the close of the diet of Bamberg, Innocent II assembled a council at Pisa (May, 1135).[29] The antipope Anacletus and his principal defender, Roger of Sicily, were anathematized. Interdict was pronounced on Sicily and Apulia; to all who had taken arms against Roger and against the antipope, was accorded an absolution like that which Urban II had accorded at Clermont for the First Crusade. The Council of Pisa also promulgated several canons regarding simony,

[29] On the date of the Council of Pisa, see Hefele-Leclercq, V, 706.

the right of sanctuary, and the heresy of the Henricians.[30]

Bernard, whose intervention had been preponderant in all these events, wished to crown the work of the council by a great popular assembly, which was held in the basilica of St. Ambrose. Before the altar the consuls of the city, in the name of all the people, took the oath of obedience to Pope Innocent II and to Emperor Lothair. Thereafter the cause of Lothair was not subjected to any attack. But the foes of Innocent II had still two centers of action: in Sicily and at Rome. There they had to be overcome.

Two expeditions, St. Bernard's peaceful expedition and Lothair's military one, put an end to the schism of Lower Italy. The words and miracles of the holy Abbot of Clairvaux exercised an immense influence over the people.[31] But Roger, whose ambition was still to become master of all southern Italy and who remained faithful to Anacletus, continued to extend his conquests. At the Pope's urgent request, Lothair (September, 1136) with a large army arrived in Lombardy by way of the Trent valley. Thanks to the accord he met with in the cities and castles of the peninsula, the conquest was rapid. At the Emperor's approach, Roger left Italy and withdrew to Sicily. In June, seeing his principal fortresses in the hands of the enemy, he sued for peace. But, in spite of the efforts of St. Bernard, he obstinately refused to disavow the antipope. Neither Innocent II's entry into Rome (October, 1137) after the imperial army nor the death of Anacletus shortly afterward (January 25, 1138) ended the schism. Roger of Sicily at once had another antipope proclaimed, Cardinal Gregory, under the name of Victor IV. But the latter soon made peace with Innocent at Bernard's urging, and even the Pierleoni came over to the true pope.

Emperor Lothair did not witness this reconciliation. He died,

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 711–13.

[31] Chalandon, *Hist. de la domin. normande en Italie et en Sicile*, II, 52–97.

upon returning from his expedition, in a Tyrolese cabin, December 4, 1137.[32]

Guelphs and Ghibellines

In the election of Lothair's successor, the independence of the great German nobles again declared itself. Lothair, by giving to his son-in-law Henry of Bavaria the crown jewels and the marquisate of Tuscany and in addition granting him as a fief the duchy of Saxony, clearly designated him to the electors. Henry's power was precisely what alarmed many of the princes.[33] The choice of the electors was not in his favor, but seemed even to be against him. The father of this Henry of Swabia, belonging to the noble family of the Welfs or Guelphs, had been one of the bitterest foes of Frederick of Swabia, the head of the house of the Weiblingen or Ghibellines. Instead of the competitor of Frederick of Swabia, the electors preferred the latter's brother, Conrad of Hohenstaufen. The Ghibelline was in opposition to the Guelph. Thus continued that strife between Guelphs and Ghibellines which, while frequently changing in character and significance, would profoundly divide the states and cities of Germany and Italy.[34] In this election the ecclesiastical lords were in agreement with the lay lords, and the Pope was favorable to the choice of Conrad, who, since his reconciliation with Lothair, had shown himself as respectful to the Church as he was faithful to his sovereign.

[32] After the conquest of Apulia, when the question arose about the right to the duchy, the contest came near embroiling the pope and the emperor. Innocent II, basing his claims on titles that went back to Louis the Debonair and that had been recognized by the emperors Otto the Great, Henry II, and even Count Roger himself, laid claim to the suzerainty of the duchy. To these claims Lothair opposed the example of several of his predecessors, who had exercised an absolute authority over southern Italy. For the sake of peace, the two sovereigns postponed the conclusion of the disagreement and together gave the investiture to the new duke.

[33] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 717.

[34] Romolo Caggese, *Su l'origine della parte Guelfa e le sue relazioni col comune.*

Lateran Council (1139)

The time of comparative calm following these events seemed to the supreme pontiff favorable for the calling of a general council. It took place on April 4, 1139,[35] in the Lateran. Almost a thousand prelates,[36] patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries of the Church attended, under the presidency of the Pope. Of this council we possess thirty canons, which contain nothing new. They merely recall and confirm the laws relative to simony, clerical incontinence and luxury, the breaking of the Truce of God, and duels, and thus show that these laws were not sufficiently observed. But the chief aim of the Pope, in gathering about him in this council the representatives of all Christendom, seems to have been to stigmatize, with all possible vigor, the schism and its abettors. The Chronicle of Morigny contains part of the Pope's opening address. He said: "You know that Rome is the head of the world. But you know also that its whole ambition is to reconcile those who are divided, to restore order where it does not exist. However, and this we say in tears, we have lived long enough to see right trodden under foot and replaced by might. Against the Holy Ghost and against His saints, men have raised their pride, like a new tower of Babel. Therefore we must now without further delay use like a sword the laws of God, which, during the peace, are like plowshares." [37] After saying this, the Pope by name stripped of their dignities not only the bishops and abbots who were persisting in the schism, but also several of those who had taken part in it only momentarily and had already repented, such as Bishop Peter of Pisa, whose deposition was so deeply

[35] Not April 8, as some historians have said. See Hefele-Leclercq, V, 721.

[36] The reported number varies between 500 and 1,000.

[37] *Chronicon Mauriniacense,* in Duchesne, *Historiae Francorum scriptores coaetanei,* III, 383.

felt by St. Bernard that he immediately wrote to the Pope, though without result, a spirited letter of complaint.[38]

Sicily

The Pope's severity is understandable especially since, at the very time he was speaking, other symptoms of revolt appeared in the Church. In Sicily, Count Roger remained unyielding and threatening. In Upper Italy, a young cleric, Arnold of Brescia, with fiery eloquence was reviving and urging, in favor of the liberty of the Italian cities, some of the violent ideas which had recently been expressed in the investiture quarrel in favor of the German rulers.

Beaten by the Emperor, excommunicated by the Pope, the nephew of Robert Guiscard [39] had given up none of his ambitions, among others that of forming a great kingdom for himself by the conquest of Apulia and the duchy of Capua, of having the Pope recognize that title of king which the antipope had conferred on him, and thus of being on a par with the great sovereigns of Europe. The circumstances favored him. Rainulf, duke of Apulia, died suddenly on April 3, 1139, and Roger with an army immediately fell upon the coveted duchy, pushed

[38] St. Bernard's letter is indeed very spirited, but it is entirely proper and correct from the disciplinary point of view. From the Holy Father's decision, Bernard appeals, not to a council or to Christ, but to the Holy Father himself. He says: "I appeal from you to yourself. Are you not the one who delegated me in the affair of the reconciliation of Peter of Pisa? If you deny it, I will prove it by witnesses" (St. Bernard, *Epist.*, 213). This letter was written shortly after the Council of the Lateran. Peter of Pisa remained apart throughout the pontificate of Innocent II. At least we do not find him in possession of his office until the pontificate of Celestine II (Jaffé, no. 8433). In the eyes of Innocent II and, we may say, of most Christians of that time, schism was considered the most disastrous of all evils, and the disturbers of Christian unity were committing so enormous a crime that, even after their repentance, their punishment had to remain as a reparation and an example.

[39] Roger II of Sicily was born in 1093 and died in 1154. He was the son of Roger I (d. 1101) and brother of Robert Guiscard. Sometimes Roger II, the second count of Sicily, is called Roger I because he was the first king of Sicily.

his conquests in southern Italy as far as Garigliano, and even seized the person of the Pope, who had unwisely advanced into the zone of military operations. As Leo IX had done formerly, Innocent now a prisoner had to subscribe to the conditions which the victor dictated: recognition of his title of king, ratification of his new conquests, and the lifting of the excommunication imposed on him. In return, Roger took the oath of vassalage to the pope and promised him the payment of an annual tribute. Such were the chief clauses of the treaty concluded at Miniano (July 25, 1139). The aspirations of the ambitious Norman were realized. From that hour on, he was most deferential toward the Church, made numerous gifts to monasteries, and received the hearty felicitations of St. Bernard.[40]

While southern Italy was thus formed into a strongly centralized monarchy, political passions were stirring the rest of the peninsula, where many cities were organizing themselves into republics.

Italian Cities

The persistence in Italy of the old municipal institutions of the Roman world, in the case of several cities the resulting autonomy of the episcopal power,[41] the comparative liberty left them by the struggles of the kings against the Church and of the antipopes against the lawful pope, had contributed to form, in central and northern Italy, especially in Lombardy and Tuscany, petty states having their own government and their jealous independence. Their claims were stimulated by

[40] St. Bernard, *Epist.*, 209.

[41] Says the learned C. Hegel: "Municipal liberty in Italy arose in the eleventh century from the episcopal supremacy." "The Lombard municipalities were formed under the shadow of the episcopal power" (Bayet, *Hist. gén.*, III, 129; cf. Provana, *Studi critici*, chap. 1, p. 148; Bonaini, *Archivio istorico*, XVI, 28; H. de l'Epinois, *op. cit.*, p. 46).

the wealth which came to certain cities from the industrial progress and the impulse given to commerce by the Crusades. A higher administration, in which we see commoners sitting beside the lords as consuls; a council made up of notables, without whose advice the consuls could undertake nothing of importance; a general assembly in which the whole people took part and before which, in some places, the consuls rendered an account of their administration: in its broad lines such was the organization of the big Lombard and Tuscan cities. Each city had its customs, in which Roman law and national law were mingled. In the case of most of the cities, these institutions seemed to assure the liberty of the city rather than that of the individuals. Factions kept up a perpetual agitation, sometimes engaging in furious battles. In such a city, the rivalry between the wealthy middle class and the common people, "the fat people" and "the thin people," as they were called, was a source of ceaseless disturbances.

Among the large Italian cities, some, because of their maritime location, had been particularly enriched by the commerce with the East. Such were Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Amalfi. Their leaders, called doges, had become very powerful personages. Venice, Genoa, and Pisa had quarters of their own in Constantinople. The aspect of these cities, at the beginning of the twelfth century was as Oriental as it was Italian. The Greek Empire sided with them; and their fleets would have been victorious in the contest with the Arabs for the dominance of the Mediterranean if fatal divisions had not weakened them. Until 1173, at Venice and at Genoa, the doges were at strife with the aristocracy; in 1136, Pisa seized Amalfi and destroyed it; later Genoa overthrew Pisa; between Genoa and Venice the strife lasted to the end of the Middle Ages.

Of course the effects of such a movement were felt in the papal states and in Rome itself. In 1140 the little city of Tivoli, after conquering several neighboring castles and building for-

tresses of its own, rose up against the pope and the Romans. A military expedition in 1142 re-established the papal authority there. But the Pope refused to yield to the desire of the Romans, who wished to lay the city in ruins. "Then," says a chronicler, "the Romans revolted. They gathered at the Capitol. In their desire to give the city its ancient dignity, they re-established the senatorial order, which had long since disappeared." [42] Following the example of the Lombard cities, the people of Rome resolved to constitute themselves under the republican form. The national spirit, the memory of old Rome, to which we have often seen the Romans appeal in the course of the strifes and quarrels stirred up by the imperial claims, of a sudden awoke more ardent than ever, but with a new orientation. "So long as the emperors, pursuing the idea of being sovereigns of Rome, showed themselves the adversaries of the popes, the party which at Rome wished also to restore the splendor of pagan times, had followed the emperors. But now, since the emperors, instead of following the ambitious plan of Henry IV, took up again the generous idea of Henry II, the Roman party separated from them and determined to act alone." [43]

Arnold of Brescia

This movement was embodied in one man, Arnold of Brescia. He was born at Brescia, a Lombard city, toward the end of the eleventh century. The events which he witnessed seem to have exercised a great influence on his lively imagination and thereby on the whole direction of his life. At Brescia he witnessed the fruitless efforts of Bishop Manfred to bring back to a regular life the simoniacal and dissolute clergy of the city. On the other hand, he saw there a young municipality, equally independent of

[42] Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, Bk. VIII, chap. 27.
[43] H. de l'Epinois, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

the Church and of the Empire, making the first endeavor for its liberty. Two consuls, elected annually by the people, exercised the judicial and military powers. The Bishop, of blameless private life, had scarcely any other power than that which he derived from his great fortune, and was equally powerless in the presence of an insubordinate clergy and independent officials.

Unwisely generalizing what he saw with his own eyes, Arnold regarded the wealth of the clergy as the source of all the evils which afflicted the Church and society; he regarded the government of cities by lay representatives of the people as the secret of all regeneration and of all true greatness. The reading of Roman history eventually inflamed his mind. Having joined the Order of Canons Regular, he assumed as his mission the preaching of the principles which he thought he had discovered. This he did with an ardor and eloquence that recalled the invectives of Peter Damian. The austerity of his life, the fire of his words, the rare charm of his manners, drew disciples to him. The Lateran Council of 1139 seems to have been disturbed by his preaching. Since he did not yet sustain any formal heresy, the fathers merely forbade him to preach.[44] After this condemnation, he was removed from his office and banished from Italy.

He went to France and there he became enthusiastic for Abelard's ideas.[45] Gradually his own ideas formed themselves into a system, and this system appeared manifestly heretical. No satisfactory proof has been adduced that he professed blameworthy opinions about the baptism of infants and about the Eucharist.[46] But he maintained: 1. that a cleric or a monk possessing lands cannot be saved; 2. that all lands rightly belong to the civil authority; 3. that the Church, corrupted in the person of its landowning monks and clergy, is no longer the true Church; that its pope is no longer the true pope; that its faith-

[44] Otto of Freising, in *M. G., SS.*, XX, 403.

[45] That Arnold was a pupil of Abelard is not proved. Cf. Comba, *I nostri protestanti,* I, 173.

[46] Verney, art. "Arnaud de Brescia" in the *Dict. de théol,* I, 1974.

ful should no longer receive the sacraments from the priests of the Catholic Church, but should confess their sins to one another or to Christ.[47]

Probably Arnold of Brescia was in Rome at the time when the Romans, haunted by the memories of the past, were attempting to revive the Roman republic.[48] In any event, his spirit presided there. At the foot of that Capitol where old Rome had crowned its victorious generals, around those palaces and statues that recalled the ancient glories, the municipal life must have appeared with a far greater prestige than in a simple city of Tuscany or Lombardy. The insurrection which, in 1143, resulted in setting up the power of the Senate in opposition to that of the pope, was the starting point of a struggle that lasted forty years. Innocent witnessed only its beginning. It was one of the last griefs of his life. He died September 24, 1143, after a pontificate of thirteen years.

Pope Celestine II

Three days after the death of Innocent II, Cardinal Guido of Castello was elected pope and took the name of Celestine II. This former pupil of Abelard was renowned for his learning and for his peaceful and conciliatory character.[49] His election seems to have been determined by the consideration of these two qualities, so opportune at the moment when so many ideas were being agitated in Abelard's lecture hall and when an eager interest in municipal life was stirring up the Italian cities. But Pope Celestine's pontificate lasted only five months. Thus it was unable to meet the hopes of the Church. The two chief events of his reign were the removal of the interdict against the King of France and an attempt to make Roger of Sicily agree to the

[47] *Ibid.*, 1973 f.

[48] Rocquain, *La Cour de Rome et l'ésprit de réforme avant Luther*, I, 199 note 2.

[49] St. Bernard, in a letter, finds fault with him because he showed too much favor to Arnold of Brescia.

abrogation of the treaty forced on Pope Innocent II. Louis the Fat's son and successor, Louis VII, showed himself even less favorable than his father toward ecclesiastical reform. From the very first years of his reign, he was in conflict with the Abbot of Clairvaux over this question.

In 1141, intending one of his chaplains for the archbishopric of Bourges, he refused to recognize the titular of that see, Pierre de la Châtre, regularly elected by the chapter and consecrated by the Pope himself. In the presence of this opposition, Innocent II imposed an interdict on the King's land. It was not excommunication; it was a prohibition forbidding the celebration of the religious offices wherever the King of France should pass. The monarch, instead of submitting, declared war upon Thibaut of Champagne, whom he blamed for taking sides with Pierre de la Châtre, the archbishop of Bourges consecrated by the Pope. But the combined efforts of St. Bernard and of Suger, the King's counselor, led to a relaxation of hostility. The peaceful spirit of Pope Celestine II completed the work of the two monks. In return for the withdrawal of the papal interdict, Louis gave the investiture of the regalian rights to Pierre de la Châtre. We are told also that he made a promise to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[50]

Pope Lucius II

Celestine II died March 8, 1144. The election of his successor followed immediately. It was the cardinal-priest Gerard, who took the name of Lucius II. The new Pope had distinguished himself, as legate in Germany, by his knowledge of affairs and by his activity. He resumed the program of his predecessor. After the conflict with the King of France was settled, his attention turned to the affairs of Sicily and of Rome. He had a meeting with Roger, who at first showed an intention of revok-

[50] Vacandard, *op. cit.*, II, 182–202; Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. III, Part I, pp. 4–9.

ing the conditions imposed on Innocent II at the treaty of Miniano. But, offended by the cardinals' refusal to consent to certain of his proposals, Roger suddenly changed his attitude and even had the papal domain invaded by an army. The Pope, unable to resist, was reduced to the necessity of concluding a truce.[51]

The Pope's negotiations with the Roman municipality met with almost the same failure. The senators, yielding to the Pope's fatherly solicitations, consented at first to withdraw from the management of municipal affairs; but the failure of the negotiations undertaken by the Holy See with the King of Sicily prompted them suddenly to change. Not only did they resume their situation at the Capitol, but they re-established, on their own authority, the office of patrician, abolished by Henry III, and conferred it on a brother of the antipope Anacletus, named Giordano.[52] At the same time, trying to apply the theories of Arnold of Brescia, they endeavored to convince the Pope that the Church would profit by a return to the golden age of the poverty of the first centuries: to the patrician would be entrusted the management of the temporal goods, and the clergy would receive merely the offerings and tithes. The trap was crude. The plan of the chiefs of the revolutionary municipality tended to nothing less than the subordination of the pope's authority to that of the municipality.

In the presence of these haughty pretentions, Lucius saw no safety except in an open strife. He reminded King Conrad III that the kings of Germany gloried in their office of protector of the Church, and reminded him also of his personal promises. Bernard of Clairvaux wrote to the monarch to the same effect. But Conrad could not or would not engage in an armed expedition. Lucius, then perceiving that he must rely only on his own forces, levied troops and, with a handful of resolute sol-

[51] Jaffé, no. 8653.

[52] This revolt took place in the autumn of 1144. It was the starting point of a new era which the Romans then adopted. See Jaffé, no. 8684.

diers, courageously attempted the assault of the Capitol. The attempt failed. The Pope, who had come to encourage the attackers by his presence, was wounded by a projectile and died as a result of his wounds, February 15, 1145.

Pope Eugene III

The very day of Pope Lucius' death, the cardinals had to proceed in haste and in secret to the election of his successor. More than ever a coup was to be feared. The revolutionary party had in their hands the administration of the city police. In these circumstances the election of an antipope would have disastrous results. This peril was warded off by the spirit of agreement and union among the members of the Sacred College. Meeting in the monastery of St. Caesarius,[53] a little removed from the city proper, they unanimously [54] raised to the papal throne a Cistercian monk, Bernard of Pisa, abbot of St. Anastasius at Tre Fontane, one of the cherished disciples of Bernard of Clairvaux. The esteem in which this monk was held by his former teacher, the high qualities which he showed in the administration of the monastery of St. Anastasius since 1140, were pledges of the wisdom and firmness of his government in the Apostolic See. He took the name of Eugene III.

In the papal chronicle we read:

According to the custom of the Church, he should have been consecrated at St. Peter's the next Sunday. But he received word that the Senate intended by the use of force to annul his election, unless he gave papal confirmation to their usurpations. Under cover of night, he left Rome with a small number of trusted followers and sought refuge in the citadel of Monticelli. The following day, after gathering about him all the brethren who had been scattered by fear of the people's fury, with his entourage he reached the monastery of

[53] On the monastery of St. Caesarius, see Duchesne, *Lib. pontif.*, II, 136 note 23.
[54] *Ibid.*, II, 386.

Farfa in Sabina. The next Sunday he received the grace of consecration for the fulness of his apostolate. News of the event immediately spread, like a song of joy, among all the nations, and the universal Church thrilled with glee.[55]

The Pope soon left Farfa for Viterbo, but he did not return to Rome until December 23, 1145. During those nine months of exile he was not inactive. By his conference with Arnold of Brescia at Viterbo, by the deputations sent to him from the Eastern countries, and by his correspondence with Bernard of Clairvaux, he was able to form a correct idea of the needs of the Church. In these first months of solitude and apparent inactivity, he seems to have worked out the whole program of his pontificate: to oppose the revolutionary element in the movement of municipal independence inspired by the ideas of Arnold of Brescia, to resume the work of the Crusades, to continue the labor of religious reform, to defend the purity of dogma against the new heresies, and to promote the advance of ecclesiastical sciences.

Revolutionary Disturbances

The struggle against the revolutionary agitations that were desolating the city of Rome was the most urgent of the undertakings. From the time of the Pope's departure, anarchy prevailed in Rome. After the Senate declared the abolition of the office of prefect and placed the population under the sole authority of the patrician, an excited populace thought everything was allowed them. The houses of the clergy and nobles faithful to the Pope were pillaged; St. Peter's Church was sacked.[56] During that time Arnold of Brescia went through France and Germany, preaching against the wealth and ambition of the clergy, drawing the masses to him by the outward

[55] *Ibid.*

[56] Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, VII, 31.

appearance of an affected austerity, increasing his attacks upon the Abbot of Clairvaux with obstinate hatred.

But Bernard did not lose sight of the agitator. Enlightened by Bernard, the King of France at first drove Arnold from his states; the Bishop of Zurich then expelled him from his diocese; the people themselves, after a first burst of enthusiasm, finally saw clearly and withdrew from him. Guido, the cardinal-legate in Germany, profiting by these disappointments of the innovator, persuaded him to go to the exiled Pope and make his submission to him. The news coming to him from Rome urged Arnold to follow this advice. "Eugene III, able diplomat and accomplished tactician, succeeded in winning to his cause the counts of Campania, the inhabitants of Tivoli and of the neighboring cities or villages. Gathering together all these forces, further increased by the information which he obtained on the spot, in a few months he reduced his enemies to the last extremity. The vanquished Senate asked for a conference. The Pontiff was the one who dictated the terms of the peace. The office of patrician was abolished, and the office of prefect was re-established. The Roman Senate was retained, but on condition that it should preserve a purely municipal character." [57] Arnold of Brescia, about the end of 1145, went to Viterbo, abjured his doctrines, and was received by Eugene III into the communion of the Church, on condition that he should, in penance for his sins, perform in Rome fastings, vigils, and prayers designated by the Pope.[58] Shortly afterward (December 20, 1145), the Pope made his entry into the Eternal City amid the joyous shouts of the population.[59]

This peace was unfortunately of short duration. Arnold's submission had no doubt been determined by the failure of his cause more than by a true repentance. A few months later,

[57] Vacandard, *op. cit.*, II, 266 f.
[58] *M. G., SS.*, XX, 537.
[59] Jaffé, nos. 8807 f.; *Lib. pontif.*, II, 387.

demagogy was again rampant in Rome, and Arnold was its leader. From the height of the Capitol, he now not only thundered against the clergy in general. He directly attacked the papacy, which he declared devoid of any right to the respect of the nations; he attacked the temporal power, which he pronounced unlawful; he attacked Eugene III himself, calling him anathema.[60] Arnold of Brescia remained master of Rome for ten years, until, when demagogy had destroyed itself by its own excesses, he was obliged with shame to leave the city in 1155, under Adrian IV. The troops of Frederick Barbarossa seized him; and the prefect of Rome, who represented both the papacy and the Empire, condemned him to be hanged. His body was burned, and his ashes were cast into the Tiber.[61]

The Crusades

The misfortunes of Rome did not for a moment make the Supreme Pontiff forget the misfortunes of another holy city, Jerusalem, and of the Christian states of Palestine.

During his exile at Viterbo in 1145 [62] Pope Eugene received two ambassadors from the East. Armenian deputies came and set forth to him certain differences which they had with the Greeks; and Hugh, bishop of Gibelet,[63] announced to the Pope that the city of Edessa had fallen (December 23, 1144) into the hands of Zenki, prince of Mossul.[64] The Greeks and the Mussulmans were threatening the work of the First Crusade.

"For a while the popes had thought they could find in the emperors of Constantinople auxiliaries who would direct the

[60] *M. G., SS.*, XXIX, 133.

[61] On Arnold of Brescia, see Vacandard in the *Rev. des quest. hist.*, XXXV (1884), 52–114.

[62] According to the Annals of Monte Cassino, Eugene III stayed at Viterbo from April 15, 1145, to the end of November of the same year (Hefele-Leclercq, V, 797 note 5).

[63] The ancient Byblos of Syria.

[64] Otto of Freising, Bk. VII, chap. 28.

struggle of Christendom against the Mussulmans. Urban II had exhorted the Crusaders 'to deliver the Eastern Churches.' Paschal II had negotiated with Alexius Comnenus a closer relationship between the Church of Rome and that of Constantinople. The unyielding stubbornness of the Greek clergy made all these attempts vain. The emperors claimed the right to profit by the French conquests to re-establish their domination over the whole East." [65] They based their claim on the oath taken by the leaders of the First Crusade in the hands of Alexius Comnenus. Innocent II, in a bull dated August 22, 1138, objected to this claim, and forbade the faithful to help the Emperor to occupy the cities held by the Crusaders.[66] In 1144, Manuel Comnenus went further in his demands than did his predecessor. He required and obtained from Prince Raymond of Antioch the promise to accept at Antioch a patriarch chosen from the clergy of Constantinople.[67] From that moment the Greek Empire evidently had to be considered, no longer an auxiliary, but a formidable adversary, in the enterprise of the Crusades.

The Mussulman states, which encompassed the Christian states, presented a more immediate peril for them. Their principal leaders were Ommiad caliphs of Bagdad,[68] the Fatimites [69] of Cairo, the sultan [70] of Damascus, and the emir of Mossul. The Ommiad caliphs were in a state of dependence on the Seljuks, who dominated under their name. The Fatimites of Egypt had suffered much from their many losses in Palestine. The Turks were more to be dreaded. Their forces were intact and, as they had a practical knowledge of the country, they came, not with regular armies, but in bands, and harassed their

[65] Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age,* p. 103.

[66] William of Tyre, XV, 3.

[67] Nicetas, *Histor.,* I, 11.

[68] A title which, after Mohammed's death, was taken by the members of his family who ruled over the Mussulmans.

[69] Descendants of Fatima, who ruled over northern Africa at the beginning of the tenth century.

[70] A name given to the sultans of Syria and Egypt.

enemy on the march, ambushed them, and attacked them in their flight. Because of the discords of their chiefs, they had no orderly system of war; but their attacks were incessant; fresh hordes kept arriving at every moment from Khorassan, from the Tigris, from the Caucasus, to replace those whom the war had wiped out. The sultans of Mossul on the Tigris governed through ministers or atabeks.[71] One of these latter, Imad-ed-Din Zenki, having made himself independent, obtained Mesopotamia and Syria from the sultan of Bagdad, whom he persuaded that the small states located between the Tigris and the Mediterranean should be united under a single hand. Zenki, as daring as he was capable, resolved to destroy all the Christian states. In 1144 he appeared unexpectedly before the city of Edessa, undermined the walls, and, immediately after their fall, invaded the city with an army and massacred the inhabitants before the other Christian states had time to send help.

Edessa was considered the bulwark of Jerusalem. Europe was in consternation at news of its fall. The idea of a new Crusade must have entered simultaneously into the mind of the Pope and that of the Christian rulers. The King of France, Louis the Younger, was more particularly prepared to make it his. He had already made a vow, in expiation of his faults, to go to Jerusalem. On Christmas Day, 1145, he announced to his barons that he intended to take the cross. As some of them made objections, he sent for the Abbot of Clairvaux,[72] who advised that he refer the matter to the Pope.[73] Eugene III answered the King's request by a bull which invited all the faithful of the Kingdom of France to arm for the defense of the tomb of Christ.[74] The preaching of the Crusade was entrusted to Bernard of Clairvaux.

[71] From *Ata* ("father") and *Bey* ("lord").
[72] Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frid.*, I, 34.
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] *PL*, CLXXX, 1064.

St. Bernard

Bernard, then entering upon his fifty-sixth year, was at the apex of his glory. "Germany and France venerated him as an apostle and a prophet," says Otto of Freising.[75] His repute as a miracle worker preceded him everywhere.[76] An assembly was convoked to meet on Easter, 1146, at Vézelay in Burgundy. There, on a platform erected in the open air, Bernard appeared beside the King. He read the Pope's bull and then delivered an address, exhorting the faithful to take part in the Crusade.[77] As at Clermont, the crowd replied to the orator by acclamations. The shout, "Crosses, crosses!" arose on every side. The people rushed to the holy speaker to receive the sacred emblem from him. Queen Eleonora of Guyenne and several ladies of the court also wished to take the cross.

After preaching the Crusade in the various provinces of France, Bernard went to Germany. Everywhere he was received as the messenger of God. Emperor Conrad hesitated to enrol. Bernard, in a harangue at Spires before the King, summoned him in the name of Christ, saying: "O man, what have I not done for you? I have given you glory, riches, good counsel, health of body and strength of soul. O man, O king, what will you do for your God?" The King, unable to resist this appeal, enrolled at once, followed by a large number of nobles. In England, Italy, Bohemia, in all Europe, Bernard's discourses or letters stirred enthusiasm, winning adherents. Two armies were formed, each composed of 70,000 knights and accompanied by an enormous throng of footmen. The King of France took command of one; the King of Germany put himself at

[75] Otto of Freising, *loc. cit.*

[76] Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* II, 278.

[77] This discourse has not been preserved. Says Vacandard: "Judged by the effect it produced, it must have been the greatest oratorical success of Bernard's life" (*loc. cit.*).

the head of the other. Under their orders, all Europe, represented by the best of its knights, marched against the infidel.

Difficulties of the Crusade

This great enthusiasm, this rising up of all Christendom at the voice of a monk, for a cause surpassing all earthly causes, was the real and only success of this second expedition. The undertaking was rendered extremely difficult on account of the hostile attitude of the Greek Emperor and the entrance into the picture, with the Turks of Zenki, of a young, strong, warlike race, to which Islam communicated its proselytism and its ardor. The disunion of the Christian princes and the lack of sufficient organization threatened to become additional causes of failure. Eugene III and Bernard took account of these difficulties. An attempt was made to forestall the obstacles that had paralyzed the action of the first crusaders. A prohibition was published against the formation of any group outside the two regular armies; the groups of noncombatant pilgrims must join these and be dependent on them in a military way. The Pope forbade the barons to take dogs and falcons with them, and even prescribed for them a particular form of arms and dress. The itinerary of the Crusade was marked out in advance. To avoid the risk of straying into unknown routes, they were to follow the route which had been taken by Godfrey of Bouillon and the majority of the pilgrims of the First Crusade. Union, concord, purity, and austerity of life were warmly recommended to the crusaders in the name of the holy cause for which they were going to fight. Eugene III and Bernard had performed their duty as apostles. The cause of the Christian peoples could have triumphed, despite every difficulty, if Louis VII and Conrad III had exercised the same zeal in performing their duties as military leaders.

These latter did not carry out their duties perfectly. The throng of noncombatants, who might have been kept within bounds by a strict discipline, became a source of disorder and hindrance for the movements of the troops. The presence of Queen Eleonora, of several ladies of her court, and of a number of other women who followed their imprudent example, gave rise to scandals, from which the King of France himself suffered personally. At last the leaders of the two armies committed two major tactical blunders in the general direction of the expedition. Instead of following, one after the other, on the same route and at a short interval, so as to be ready to lend assistance to each other, as the Abbot of Clairvaux wished,[78] they separated; and, in spite of the evident unfriendliness of the Greek Emperor, they persisted in not regarding him as an enemy.

Defeat of the Crusaders

The German army went first. To rush ahead, pillaging as much as possible along their route, seems to have been its watchword; at least this was the great temptation which its leader could not resist. His pillaging, as he crossed Thrace, was such that Emperor Manuel Comnenus sent a military force to oppose them, and defeated them near Adrianople.[79] After that the Christian army was merely an undisciplined horde which was ceaselessly harassed by the Turkish cavalry who hovered around it on their light horses. Day by day it became more and more exhausted and no longer offered any resistance to the charge of the Turkish army, which crushed it at Dorylaeum.

From that time on, the outcome of the expedition was decided. To avoid the route where the German army had perished, the French followed the coast line of Asia Minor, by way of

[78] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. III, Part I, p. 14.
[79] Odo of Deuil, *M. G.,* XXVI, 64.

Smyrna, Ephesus, and Laodicea. But, along the unknown and difficult mountain paths which they had to follow, the crusaders disbanded. At one time the King of France, separated from his forces and isolated on a bare rock, was attacked by several enemies who took him to be a simple soldier, and he had to defend himself by backing against a tree. He saved his renown for valor, but a large part of his army, surprised in a defile by the Turks, was massacred. The two kings met at Jerusalem, accompanied by a few bodies of knights, the remnants of their armies. The march against Edessa was now impossible. The king of Jerusalem, Baldwin III, persuaded them to besiege Damascus. But, after several futile assaults, the two sovereigns, discouraged, raised the siege and left for Europe.

Bernard drew the lesson from this setback. He declared:

> We announced the peace, and the peace has not come. We promised success, and we have had desolation. We marched with confidence under the orders of the supreme pontiff, that is, under the very orders of God, and God has permitted that the Crusade should fail lamentably. Whom shall we make responsible for this disaster? It is a fact which none of us is unaware of and yet which all at this hour seem to have forgotten. Moses promised the Hebrews to lead them into the land of Chanaan, and during his lifetime none of them entered the Promised Land. The Hebrews, you may tell me, were unbelieving and rebellious. But what, then, have the crusaders been? Ask them. Why repeat what they themselves avow? In both cases, God's promises did not hold against the rights of His justice.[80]

Religious Reform

Once again the success of the Christian arms in the East seemed connected with the moral and religious reform of the West. The mission undertaken by Pope Eugene III with the advice of his teacher Bernard, was the following: to repress the schisms and heresies, to spread the spirit of the Gospel by

[80] St. Bernard, *De consideratione,* Bk. II, chap. I.

the most effective means, in particular by increasing the number of those centers of Christian life, the monasteries, and from them to make it radiate over the progress of science and the development of institutions.

Schism and heresy in the Middle Ages never appeared as a simple attack on the faith: they were attacks against the public order, social crimes. Whoever weakened the authority of the Church and its dogmas, was regarded as thereby weakening faith in Christ, the foundation and guaranty of all order and all peace. St. Bernard did indeed teach that "heretics should be overcome by arguments, not by arms";[81] but he added that from heretics must be taken every means of destroying others.[82] Hence his ardor in combating, under the direction of Pope Eugene, all the heresies of his time, in particular those of Abelard, Henry of Lausanne, and Gilbert de la Porrée.

Abelard

In the course of the year 1140, the Abbot of Clairvaux received from the former Abbot William of St. Thierry who was then a Cistercian monk at Signy, a letter in which the devout and learned monk pointed out with alarm thirteen notable errors which he had just discovered while reading, pen in hand, two recent works of Abelard: the *Introductio ad theologiam* and the *Theologia christiana.* William says: "The question is nothing less than belief in the Holy Trinity, the person of the Mediator, the Holy Ghost, the grace of God, and the sacred mystery of our redemption." He called particular attention to the following errors, saying:

Abelard maintains that the names of Father, Son, and Spirit are improperly used with regard to God and are merely a description of the fulness of the Supreme Being. He maintains that the Holy

[81] St. Bernard, *In cantic.,* sermon 64, no. 9.
[82] St. Bernard, *De consideratione,* Bk. III, chap. 1.

Ghost is the soul of the world. According to him, man can will and do good without divine grace. He says that Christ became man and suffered not to deliver us from the yoke of the devil. Man's temptations are nothing more than the results of purely physical causes. In the Eucharist, the form of the substance of the bread and wine remains in the air. What we call faith is only the judgment we form about invisible things.[83]

Bernard's reply was moderate and prudent. "Your zeal is well founded," he writes, "and the little book you sent me shows that this zeal is not that of an idler. . . . I think the best thing for us to do is to confer together and look into the affair." [84]

The result of this conference, which took place soon afterward, was Bernard's resolve to confer on these grave questions with Abelard himself. He had two meetings with the celebrated professor: one alone with him, the other in the presence of two witnesses. Abelard seemed to be moved by the criticisms offered him, and promised to make some corrections in his works.[85]

Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard were at that time the two most talked-of men in France, perhaps in Christendom. The news of the conferences between the two doctors soon spread to the schools and the monasteries; there it created a great stir. As usually happens, the unrestrained zeal of the disciples embittered the controversy of the masters. A canon of Tours, Hugh Metel, a fine mind of that time, poured out the most offensive epithets on the professor of Mont-Sainte-Genevieve: "that hydra of recent times," "that Phaeton," "that Ezechiel," "Ezechiel's vessel, set to boiling on the hearth fanned to flame by Aquilo." [86] On the other hand, Abelard, in his professorial chair, was greeted with the applause of his hearers. On both sides a wind storm seemed to be blowing.

[83] *PL,* CLXXX, 249 f.

[84] St. Bernard, *Epist., 327.*

[85] *Vita Bernardi,* Bk. III, chap. 5; St. Bernard, *Epist., 337.*

[86] Hugo Metellensis, in Hugo, *Sacrae antiquitatis monumenta historica, dogmatica, diplomatica,* II, 330.

Meanwhile a solemn exposition of relics was prepared in the cathedral of Sens, then the metropolitan see of the Church of Paris. Several prelates, the King of France himself, promised to come to enhance the brilliance of this feast by their presence. Abelard requested of the Archbishop of Sens and obtained from him authorization to explain himself before the assembly of prelates, transformed into a council. The Abbot of Clairvaux augured no good from a public debate. He yielded to the invitation of the Archbishop, but, at a preliminary meeting of the bishops present, he soon convinced them that there should be no question of giving the innovator an occasion for a brilliant tilt. As one accused, not as a disputant, Abelard should appear. Bernard produced the incriminated works, took the most daring propositions from them, proved the heterodoxy of these propositions. When Abelard appeared before the assembly, he was given the choice of abjuring his doctrines or of justifying them by theological reasons. Disconcerted by the tactics of the assembly and foreseeing a condemnation, Abelard refused to justify himself and proudly declared that he appealed to the pope. The council gave him a certificate of his appeal; it also censured, in his works, fourteen articles, which it declared opposed to the faith and manifestly heretical.[87]

Abelard seems to have been one of those natures that popularity intoxicates, that excitement exalts, but that silence and solitude bring back to wisdom. Shortly after the Council of Sens, he wrote: "Logic has made me hateful to the world. . . . I no longer wish to be a philosopher if I have to revolt against Paul. I do not wish to be Aristotle if I am separated from Christ; because under heaven no other name but His exists in which I must find my salvation." [88] However, Innocent II, appealed to by Abelard and by Bernard, had investigated the af-

[87] St. Bernard, *Epist.*, 337.

[88] Cousin, *Œuvres inédites d'Abailard*, I, 680.

fair. On July 16, 1140, he wrote to the Archbishop of Sens, confirming the decision of the council;[89] then, in an edict, he ordered that Abelard be confined in a monastery and that his books be burned.[90]

Abelard bowed before the supreme decision. He merely begged of the Pope the favor of ending his days under the guidance of Peter the Venerable in Cluny Abbey. Innocent granted his request. After edifying the great abbey by the regularity of his life, the penitent monk was obliged to retire, because of numerous infirmities that attacked him, to the priory of St. Marcellus near Chalon on the bank of the Saone. There he died April 21, 1142, after receiving the last sacraments in dispositions of edifying compunction.[91] He was sixty-three years old. Perhaps no man since Origen had gathered around a professorial chair a more numerous and more enthusiastic throng. Abelard was one of the most illustrious and most unfortunate victims of success. Taken as a whole, his influence was harmful. However, just as everything in his life is not blameworthy, so in his work everything is not to be rejected. "By showing, in his *Sic et Non,* the need of an exigent criticism in the use of patristic texts or even of biblical texts, he was a forerunner in a reform of studies";[92] and a school which appealed to his name[93] introduced "three essential improvements in theological teaching: the idea of condensing in a *Summa* the synthesis of all theology, the introduction of the strictest methods of dialectics, and the fusion of patristic erudition with rational speculation."[94]

[89] *PL,* CLXXIX, 515; Jaffé, I, 8188.

[90] *Ibid.,* col. 517.

[91] Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* II, 177.

[92] *Ibid.,* p. 181.

[93] The scholarly researches of Denifle and Gietl have brought to light the existence of a theological school dependent on Abelard.

[94] Portalié, art. "Abélar, Ecole théologique d'" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* I, 49–55.

Heresies

A short time after Abelard's death, about 1143, Everwin or Ebroin, provost of Steinfeld, drew Bernard's attention to the existence of a new sect of heretics in the neighborhood of Cologne. They enveloped themselves in mystery. Their motto was: "Swear and swear falsely, but never betray the secret." But we know that they admitted, as the rule of faith, only the Bible; that in matters of dogma, they rejected the baptism of infants and the communion of saints, and that in morals their conduct did not agree with the austerity of their maxims. Bernard easily recognized in these traits an offshoot of the Manichaean heresy. He refuted the Cologne heretics in two of his sermons.[95]

Two years later, the south of France was the place where he had to fight another branch of the same sect. Henry of Lausanne, the fierce disciple of Peter of Bruys, had infested with his heresy the dioceses of Angoulême, Limoges, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Perigueux, Albi, Agen, and Cahors. Whole villages accepted the new doctrine; noblemen gave it their support. Bernard journeyed through all these districts, preaching in the churches and in the open air, and spent himself without regard for his frail health. Several times God confirmed his preaching by miracles.[96] But in some places the missioner found himself in the presence of irreconcilable fanatics. He said: "They are not to be convinced by reasons; they do not understand these; they are not changed by persuasion, but are merely hardened." [97] And these fanatics were not satisfied with spreading their false doctrines; they pillaged the churches and smashed the crosses. Bernard thought that, besides the duty of the Church, which is to preach, the duty of the civil authority was

[95] St. Bernard., *In cantic.*, sermons 65 and 66. Cf. *PL*, CLXXXII, 676.
[96] Vacandard, *op. cit.*, II, 237.
[97] St. Bernard, sermon 66.

forcibly to repress so much audacity.[98] The arrest of the leader of the heresy, the apostate monk Henry of Lausanne, and his perpetual imprisonment were the most telling blows given to the seditious movement, which was threatening to invade all southern France.[99]

Scarcely had Bernard ended his mission in Languedoc, when his zeal was again called upon to unmask and refute a new error. This false teaching was attributed to an important personage of the Church of France, Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers.

Gilbert de la Porrée has often been compared with his contemporary Abelard. He had a less brilliant mind, but one more profound; and from several viewpoints he formed a striking contrast to the famous professor of Mont-Sainte-Genevieve. The one prided himself on his ingenuity, the other on his faithfulness to tradition. The one captivated his pupils by clothing his theories with the most brilliant figures; the other attracted his hearers' minds in the net of a scholarly dialectic. Abelard rejected both realism and nominalism; Gilbert taught the strictest realism. Born at Poitiers about 1076, Gilbert, after studying under the best masters, taught successively at Poitiers, Chartres, and Paris. In 1142 he was promoted to the bishopric of his native city.

We are told that at the Council of Sens, Abelard, while his

[98] St. Bernard, *Epist.*, 363; cf. *PL*, CLXXXII, 293–95, 361–65, 434–36.

[99] At the time when these various Manichaean sects were appearing in the West, a similar heresy appeared in the East. The question has been raised whether any connection existed between these two. Probably we should look for the origin of all the branches of this heresy in Bulgaria. The Eastern branch gave its followers the name of Bogomils, from the name of its first leader, a certain priest by name Bogomil. At the beginning of the twelfth century it was directed by a physician named Basil. Emperor Alexis Comnenus discovered the existence of the sect in 1118. He condemned Basil to death. Most of the heretics abjured through fear of punishment. Missions were organized to convert those who persisted in their heresy. In 1143 two Eastern bishops were deposed for adherence to the heresy. In 1147 the patriarch of Constantinople, Cosmas, was also deposed for favoring the Bogomil monk Niphon.

teaching was being attacked, perceived near him in the assembly his rival Gilbert de la Porrée and, with that presence of mind which was one of the charms of his speech, he ironically murmured this line of verse to him: *Nam tua res agitur, paries quum proximus ardet* ("Have an eye to your house when the neighboring wall is burning").

He was alluding to Gilbert's doctrine of the Trinity. Applying his realist doctrine to the mystery of God in three Persons, Gilbert made a distinction between the Divinity and God. He said that, just as humanity is distinct from man, so the Divinity is logically and really distinct from God. Did he mean, as St. Bernard thought, that the Divinity and God are distinct from each other as the source of two different things, two real entities, *aliud et aliud?* [100] We are not certain. The thought and the expressions of the Bishop of Poitiers are frequently obscure. But the interpretation given by the Abbot of Clairvaux was at least possible in the mind of Gilbert's hearers and readers. So he was condemned in 1148 in a council of Reims, which was presided over by Pope Eugene III. He submitted humbly. As each of his incriminated propositions was stated, he expressed his disavowal, saying to the Pope: "If you believe otherwise, I believe as you do." [101]

Gilbert de la Porrée left behind him a school which recent investigations have made known.[102] Says one historian of theology:

> Gilbert remains a great name in Scholastic theology. Albert the Great took so great account of this philosophy that he composed a commentary on his tract *De sex principiis*. St. Thomas, when he mentions his name in connection with an error imputed to him, seems to excuse him by supposing he was guilty merely of inadvertence.[103] This lesson of esteem merits our regard. A submissive and faithful

[100] St. Bernard, *In cantic.*, sermon 80.
[101] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 832–38.
[102] Vernet, art. "Gilbert de la Porrée" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, VI, 1354.
[103] St. Thomas, *Summa*, Ia, q. 38, a. 2.

author is not discredited because the Church, his mother and his teacher, points out to him some of his departures from orthodoxy. Sacred science always profits by correction to avoid a human error, and often profits from the corrected work to draw from it with greater security.[104]

Hugh of St. Victor

The theories of Abelard and of Gilbert de la Porrée on the Christian mysteries not only inflicted a wound on orthodoxy, they also had the serious defect of giving separate and too much place to rational speculation in the consideration of those mysteries. A writer of that time nicely expressed the uneasiness which such methods inspired in Christian hearts. He says: "It is expedient to abstain from the distinctions proper to logic when we are treating of the articles of faith. Or, at least, if we admit dialectics in these questions, that it may not be completely absent therefrom, let us do so briefly; and, if the syllogism makes too much fuss, let it be put out. . . . The waters of Siloe flow silently, and in the building of the Temple of God no sound of hammer or axe was heard." [105]

From this reaction was born the mystical school of St. Victor. The honor of making the celebrated Parisian abbey an intellectual center rivaling the Notre Dame cloister belongs to William of Champeaux. But the honor of giving a well-defined doctrinal direction to the teaching of St. Victor goes back to the third successor of William in his chair, Hugh of Blankenburg, better known to posterity as Hugh of St. Victor. He was born, about 1096, of Conrad, count of Blankenburg, in the family manor of Hartingam in Saxony.[106] His family intended him for some great post in the Empire. He preferred to put on the humble habit of the canons regular in the Abbey of St.

[104] De Régnon, *Etudes de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité,* II, 112.
[105] John of Cornwall, *Eulogium; PL,* CXCIX, 1065.
[106] Fourier Bonnard, *Hist. de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor,* I, 86.

Victor, founded by Cassian at Marseilles; there he remained a short time. Then, probably attracted by the fame of the teaching of William of Champeaux, he went to the abbey of the same name at Paris. In 1133,[107] the second successor of William, Thomas by name, fell under the sword of some assassins, and Hugh was asked to occupy his professorial chair. He was not yet forty years old.

For eight or nine years, he strove in his daily teaching to acquaint the young monks of the abbey [108] with all the sciences and all the arts known in his time. His knowledge was encyclopedic. The numerous works which he published bear testimony to this fact. Belles-lettres, history, experimental sciences, philosophy, exegesis, positive and rational theology, asceticism and mysticism—Hugh treated all these. But, whatever the subject of his study, his method was unique, and his purpose never varied. This method has often been distorted. Many persons are too much inclined to consider Hugh of St. Victor as sacrificing reason to faith, intelligence to love. But scholarly works have vindicated the celebrated philosopher and theologian from the imputation of this erroneous interpretation. We now know that Hugh of St. Victor kept the true measure; that the distinction of the two orders was established in his mind as clearly as it was later in the works of St. Thomas Aquinas.[109] "Reason," he said, "aids faith, and faith perfects reason." [110]

But his method was characterized by the large part he assigned to what he called "meditation." And he carefully distinguished natural or scientific meditation from supernatural or religious meditation. According to him, no remark or reading is fruitful unless we supplement it by meditation.[111] He de-

[107] *Gallia christiana,* VII, 664.

[108] Evidently the lectures of William of Champeaux' successors were not attended by such throngs of students as attended those of the master.

[109] Mignon, *Les origines de la scolastique et Hugues de Saint-Victor,* I, 66.

[110] Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis,* Vol. I, Part III, chap. 30.

[111] Cf. Hugh of St. Victor, *Eruditionis didascalicae libri septem,* Bk. III, chap. 11; *PL,* CLXXVI, 772.

fines meditation as "an assiduous and prudent application of the mind to the investigation of the cause, the origin, the mode, and the usefulness of each thing." [112] This meditation should embrace all: the observation of the soul as well as of the world, or, to use his own words, "what is without as well as what is within." No one has more justly purposed giving a scientific demonstration of the existence of God; this is the way he sums up his thesis: "What is outside us corresponds to what is within us, to demonstrate the same truth; and all nature, by bearing witness to its own dependence, proclaims the existence of its Author." [113] Regarding Hugh's mystical theology, De Wulf says:

> According to the *Didascalion,* philosophy is the vestibule which leads to a higher science . . . Hugh's writings on mystical theology deal with the faith in its objective data and especially in the affective sentiment to which it gives rise. Following St. Augustine, Hugh describes the stages in the ascent toward God. . . . Just as the triple eye of the soul is related to a threefold knowable object, so also a triple mode of vision denotes the more or less penetrating way in which we grasp one and the same object: the *cogitatio* is a superficial and extensive regard, the *meditatio* a sustained and deliberate reflection on a given point, *contemplatio* a profound intuition leisurely and comprehensive.[114]

But what are the practical means for following this path, or rather for disposing ourselves to receive the grace which alone leads us in this mystical way? Hugh sums them up in one formula: to make a void in our heart, so as to make room for God there. Hence his insistence on preaching the vanity of transient things. In his dialogue *De vanitate mundi* he presents one of the speakers, Indaletius, as letting himself be captivated by the charms of the works of man. "Very well, they are admir-

[112] *Ibid.*

[113] *De sacramentis,* Bk. I, Part III, chap. 1; *PL,* CLXXVI, 219.

[114] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* I, 214.

able," Dindymus concedes, "but await the end." And he leads him along the heights where one glance of the eye embraces the spectacle of the world. "What do you see?" "A ship moving under full sail beneath a blue sky. The members of the crew are amusing themselves and are singing joyous songs." And after a moment: "What do you still see?" "Alas, I tremble to say it: rising clouds, a roaring tempest, the sea opening its abysses a little, the shipwreck, a terrible struggle with death. And all is finished." "Well, what do you say now about the might and happiness of men?" "Vanity of vanities; all is but vanity." [115] And thus, described by a man who, leaving the world early in life, was able to observe it, we see pass by a rich caravan, wealthy palace, a wedding procession, a flourishing school. "Indaletius, what do you see?" "I see a well-attended school, where young men and old are studying side by side. There men learn to cover parchment with elegant miniatures, to discover the course of the stars, and to deceive men by learned sophisms." "And afterward? Have men found the truth, and with truth, happiness? Not at all. Without God, we have no truth. Without God, no happiness." [116]

This doctor, who spoke in so convinced a tone about the vanity of the world, died like a saint. We have the account of his last moments, written by an eyewitness. "The day before his death," he says, "I came to see him early in the morning. He said to me: 'Are we alone?' When I told him we were, he said: 'Have you celebrated mass today?' 'Certainly.' 'Come near, then, and breathe upon my face in the form of a cross, that I may receive the Holy Ghost.' Already in his last agony, he murmured in a barely intelligible voice: 'I have obtained it. . . . He will receive my soul.' Then, striking his breast, he said: 'Holy Mary, pray for me. St. Peter, pray for me. St. Vic-

[115] *De vanitate mundi,* Bk. I; *PL,* CLXXVI, 705. Modern scholarship is inclined to attribute this treatise, not to Hugh of St. Victor, but to Hugh of Fouilloi, an Augustinian.

[116] *Ibid.,* col. 709.

tor, pray for me.' These were his last words. The lips of this just man, the organ of wisdom, became forever silent." [117] Hugh of St. Victor had accomplished his mission in this world, but his work, the mystical school of St. Victor, would survive him. Richard would be its great theologian, and Adam would be its inspired poet.

Peter Lombard

Among the many works produced by the intellectual activity of Hugh of St. Victor, are two remarkable attempts at dogmatic synthesis: the treatise *De sacramentis* and the *Summa sententiarum.* Along this road he had been preceded by Abelard, whose *Sic et Non* was a collection of patristic texts relating to the principal philosophical and theological problems. He was followed by several other writers of his period: Robert Pulleyn, Robert of Melun, Hugh of Rouen, and especially by him who would receive the title of "Master of the Sentences," Peter Lombard.

In the movement which carried men's minds to philosophical and theological studies and in the presence of the vast amount of material to be investigated and utilized for these works, an urgent need was felt for classification and organization. Hence various works entitled "Summa of Sentences" or "Book of Sentences" had an immense success. Finally one of these collections supplanted the others and was accepted in the schools of the Middle Ages as the classical text offered to the commentaries of the professors. This was Peter Lombard's *Liber sententiarum.*

About 1136 [118] the Abbot of Clairvaux received from the Bishop of Lucca a letter in which the prelate recommended to his charity a young cleric of Novara, who intended to go to

[117] *Epistola Osberti de morbo et obitu Hugonis; PL,* CLXXV, 162.
[118] Vacandard, *op. cit.,* II, 115 note 4.

France to improve his knowledge of the sacred sciences. Encouraged by a favorable answer, the young student set out first for Reims, where Bernard supplied his needs, then to Paris, where Abbot Gilduin of St. Victor's, on Bernard's recommendation,[119] rendered him the same service. The Bishop of Lucca's studious protégé, Peter, was a Lombard by birth; his schoolmates were accustomed to call him the Lombard, or Peter Lombard. He had no intention of making a long stay in Paris; but the intellectual activity that he encountered and the priceless resources he found in that city for his studies kept him there. His passion for work was indefatigable. The writings of the fathers became familiar to him. From student, he became teacher. Some have surmised that he taught at St. Genevieve and at St. Victor.[120] His classes were unlike those of Abelard and Hugh. He had neither the reckless audacity of the former nor the mystical transports of the latter. But his erudition was so vast and so sure, and he had such ease in directing his hearers through the labyrinth of patrology, that his success was not less. Peter Lombard's laborious career was crowned by his appointment to the high office of bishop of Paris. He occupied the see for only a few months, until August, 1160.[121]

The most famous of his works is the *Book of the Sentences.* In it he classifies a large number of texts from Scripture and from the fathers in systematic order which itself reveals the state of mind of that period. Distinguishing in the world realities from symbols, he considers both of them from the standpoint of the eternal beatitude.

The realities include the following: 1. God, the supreme object of beatitude; 2. creatures, providential means of beatitude; 3. the angels and men, subjects of beatitude. These three reali-

[119] St. Bernard, *Epist.,* 410.
[120] Féret, *op. cit.,* p. 15.
[121] *Gallia christiana,* VII, 67 f.

ties are the subject of the first three books of the work. The fourth book is devoted to the symbols. By this expression Peter Lombard means the sacraments and all the religious rites that symbolize the supernatural realities which they confer.

Such is the work which Albert the Great, St. Thomas, and St. Bonaventure commented on in the great universities of the Middle Ages. Nothing less than St. Thomas' *Summa* dethroned it, after long hesitation, from the exceptional place it occupied in the Schools. Some scholars have found in it errors of detail, instances of vagueness, and certain lacunae. It has been criticized for often giving contradictory explanations, without settling the difficulties by clear solutions. But in the twelfth century it formed the most complete body of theology then known, since St. John Damascene's *Exposition of the Faith.*[122] In spite of the imperfections of his work, the Master of the Sentences, the scholar who was able to remain industrious and humble in the chair of Abelard and in the see of St. Dionysius,[123] has a right to a place of honor in the history of Catholic education.[124]

St. Bernard

Should we connect St. Bernard with the mystical school of Hugh of St. Victor or with the positive school of Peter Lombard? By the transports of his piety, the Abbot of Clairvaux belongs rather to the former of these schools; but, intentionally and by the very complexity of his work, he escapes any classification. "What significance has philosophy for me?" he declared. "My teachers are the Apostles. They have not taught me to read Plato or to unravel the subtleties of Aristotle. But they

[122] A critical study of the *Book of the Sentences* shows its dependence on St. John Damascene as also on the work of Hugh of St. Victor.

[123] On Peter Lombard's humility, see the anecdote related in *Histoire littéraire,* XII, 586.

[124] Cf. Protois, *Pierre Lombard, son époque, sa vie, ses écrits.*

have taught me to live. And, believe me, this is no small science." [125] A recent biographer says: "Despite Bernard's professed disdain for lofty theological speculations, he is a very well-informed and profound theologian. Although the vain disputes of the School escape his notice, true metaphysics has no secrets hidden from him. He illumines the questions." [126] His knowledge of Scripture and of the fathers was remarkable. The Bible is familiar to him; St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory the Great are his bedside authors. Although a philosopher like Hugh of St. Victor and a scholar like Peter Lombard, he took no pains to organize his ideas or the contents of his knowledge into a system. But the duty of his office and the care of the direction of a large monastery led him to set forth in didactic manner his principles of the spiritual life. He was a forerunner of ascetical and of mystical theology.

Asceticism had already had its doctors. In the beginning of the fifth century Cassian, by gathering the maxims and examples of the Eastern monks, had formulated definite rules from them. Bernard sets forth their complete doctrine in his two treatises: *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae* [127] and *De diligendo Deo.*[128] In the former he defines humility, the basis of all perfection: "the virtue that makes man vile in his own eyes through the very true knowledge he has of his state"; then he gives an explanation of twelve degrees of pride, in a series of pictures "some of which bear comparison with la Bruyère's *Caractères.*" [129] In the treatise *De diligendo Deo,* Bernard analyzes the degrees of love, which are: love of self, love of God for self, love of God for Himself, and pure love: in other words: self-love, mercenary love, filial love, and beatific love. As to the rule which should guide us in the practice of love, he formulates

[125] St. Bernard, *In festo sancti Petri,* no. 1. Cf. sermon 3, *in Pentecosten,* no. 5.
[126] Vacandard, art. "Bernard" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* II, 582.
[127] *PL,* CLXXXII, 941.
[128] *Ibid.,* col. 973.
[129] Vacandard, *op. cit.,* col. 752.

it in a maxim which St. Francis de Sales adopted: "The measure of loving, is to love without measure," *modus, sine modo diligere*. For the questions of detail and the practical applications connected with his spiritual doctrine, they are treated in his sermons and in his letters, where we find abundance of happy formulas and striking features. He says: "Suppress free will, and there will be no hell." [130] To his disciple whom he wishes to lead to the practice of meditation, he writes: "Take it from my experience, you will find something more in the forests than in books" (*amplius in sylvis quam in libris*).[131] "On the path of holiness," he says, "whoever does not advance, goes backward"; [132] "whatever is added to our vanities is a theft from our needs." [133] To Pope Eugene III he wrote: "On the pretext that nobody may appeal from you to anyone else, do not think you have no other law but your own will, and do not exercise your power without regard for reason." [134] "Do not expend yourself entirely in action; always reserve something of your soul for meditation." [135] "We give only from our surplus," he writes; "if you would be wise, make yourself a reservoir before becoming a channel." [136] "You may say that the habit does not make the monk. True, but the vain heart places on the body the mark of its vanity." [137] "A fool on a throne is like a monkey on a roof." [138]

At bottom, this keen observer of men and things is a contemplative; this monk, who sees so well the defects and the oddities of mankind, when his ministry commands him to observe them so as to combat them, aspires only to silence and to solitary

[130] Sermon 3, no. 3.
[131] *Epist.*, 106.
[132] *Epist.*, 91.
[133] *De officio episcoporum*, chap. 2, no. 6.
[134] *De consideratione*, Bk. III, chap. 4.
[135] *Ibid.*, Bk. I, chap. 7.
[136] *In cantic.*, 18.
[137] *Apologia*, 10.
[138] *De consideratione*, Bk. II, chap. 7.

communion with God; and the most original part of St. Bernard's work is his mystical theology. We find the exposition of it in the eighty-six sermons which he preached on the *Canticle of Canticles.*

Until the twelfth century the Church possessed no treatises on mysticism except the writings of pseudo-Dionysius and their commentaries. But those profound works have in mind only the contemplation of the most mysterious attributes of the Divinity. St. Bernard is the first to describe the stages of the soul rising to the divine union. Although he does not attain the wonderful precision of St. Teresa in the description of the various states of the soul drawn toward the highest summits of love, at least he marks out the essential traits. In the pictures which he sketches, we can recognize what the moderns call the prayer of quiet, the night of the soul, the mystical union, the perfect union, rapture, and ecstasy. He speaks of that tranquil state in which everything is at rest, in which "the tranquillity of God tranquilizes everything" (*tranquillus Deus tranquillat omnia*).[139] He was acquainted with the "great and sweet wound of love" (*grande et suave vulnus amoris*).[140] In terms never surpassed in daring and in delicate purity, he celebrates that intimate union between the soul and God, where everything becomes common, as between husband and wife, *una domus, una mensa.*[141] He speaks of those moments when, as in a lightning flash, we glimpse the Divinity: *Divinitus aliquid raptim et veluti in velocitate corusci luminis interlucet.*[142] And he is really describing ecstasy when he recalls that state where, after all sensible images have vanished and every natural feeling has disappeared, the soul is no longer subject to temptation and sin. There everything is pure, in its life as in its love. In reference

[139] *In cantic.*, sermon 23.
[140] *Ibid.*, sermon 20.
[141] *Ibid.*, sermon 7.
[142] *Ibid.*, sermon 41.

to this, he says: "It is vain to cast a net before the feet of those who have wings." [143]

St. Hildegard

In the description of these different states, Bernard did not conceal that, for the most part, he was speaking from his personal experience. But the teachings of that experience were supplemented by the communications of a soul with which he was in relation, St. Hildegard. Born in 1098 of a noble Christian family in the vicinity of Mainz, Hildegard at the age of five was favored with visions the meaning of which at first she did not grasp, but which gradually became clear afterward. At first a simple nun, then superior of the Benedictine nuns of Disibodenberg, she experienced, beginning in 1141, an irresistible need of writing her revelations. The subject of these revelations is God, His nature, the Trinity, creation, the redemption, the angels, and man. In 1147 Pope Eugene III instituted, for the judging of her visions, a tribunal of which Bernard was a member. The Abbot of Clairvaux, after mature investigation, declared "that such a light ought not be allowed to remain under a bushel." [144] The entire tribunal and the Supreme Pontiff took this same view and merely admonished the seer "to use the utmost circumspection in revealing the things which the Spirit urged her to reveal." [145] Hildegard's fame spread throughout the Christian world. In correspondence with bishops, popes, and emperors, the pious nun remained humble and circumspect, as the Pope had advised her. She died in the odor of sanctity in 1179 at the age of eighty-one years, leaving to posterity three books of revelations, obscure in many passages, but filled with

[143] *Ibid.*, sermon 52.
[144] *Vita Hildegardis*, Bk. I, chap. 1; *PL*, CXCVII, 95.
[145] *Ibid.*

views of a marvelous splendor: the *Scivias,* the *Liber vitae meritorum,* and the *Liber divinorum operum.*[146]

While dogmatic theology was being organized with Hugh of St. Victor and Peter Lombard, and mystical theology with St. Bernard, an Italian monk, Gratian by name, was patiently composing a collection of legal texts. This collection filled, in the study of canon law, the same place as Peter Lombard's *Sentences* filled in the study of theology.

Gratian

We know little of Gratian's personal history. "He was Italian, and a Camaldolese monk in the monastery of SS. Nabor and Felix at Bologna, where he taught law. What his life had been before that, we do not know. Nor do we know the date of his death, which must have occurred before the Third Lateran Council, held in 1179.[147] His collection appeared about 1140,[148] with the title *Concordantia discordantium canonum.* It is better known under the title of *Decretum.* Immediately it supplanted all other similar works. This success was owing to two chief causes: 1. Gratian introduced into his compilation a more rigorous and logical order, the chief divisions of which he took from the Roman law; 2. he gave his work a character of dogmatic exposition and discussion, purposing, as the title indicates, to reconcile apparently contrary texts. The work is divided into three parts. The first part treats of law in general and of ecclesiastical persons; the second part treats of ecclesiastical causes; the third part, of rites. Gratian's *Decretum* soon became the

[146] In *PL,* Vol. CXCVII. From the pen of St. Hildegard we have some short works, like little tragedies, put to music which was also composed by her. Dom Pothier has published several of her musical compositions in the *Revue du chant grégorien.*

[147] Villien, art. "Gratien" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol,* VI, 1728.

[148] This is the conclusion of a scholarly study by Paul Fournier, "Deux controverses sur les origines du décret de Gratien" in the *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. relig.,* March–June, 1898.

basis of canonical teaching, the text which the professors of ecclesiastical law commented on, as the professors of theology commented on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. But this *Decretum* never possessed official authority as a collection. Even the approval which Pope Gregory XIII gave to the edition corrected by his care, did not confer an official character on it. Its texts never had any authoritative value beyond that of the various documents from which they were taken.[149]

Gratian's *Decretum* exercised a twofold influence in the Church. At first it brought about a division in theological science. "Till then the discipline of the Church was not separated from theology strictly so called; the two were studied together, and the same professor taught them both. But this vast collection gave rise to a feeling that special courses were needed. Naturally they were inaugurated at Bologna, where Roman law was taught. In France, first at Orleans, later at Paris, chairs of canon law were established; in the beginning these were at the same time chairs of civil law. The French capital prided itself, in this new professorship, before the end of the twelfth century, on Gerard la Pucelle, Matthew of Angers, and Anselm of Paris." [150] The second result, a consequence of the first, was to give to the government of the Church a more juridical character, to consolidate, by a firmer and more rational jurisprudence, the progress made in the direction of the centralization of authority about the Holy See, and toward uniformity of legislation and of customs in the Church and uniformity in the organization of the hierarchy.[151]

[149] Such is the doctrine set forth with great exactness by Benedict XIV, *De synodo,* Bk. VIII, chap. 15.

[150] Féret, *La faculté de Paris, le Moyen Age,* I, xv. However, theology and canon law continued to influence each other.

[151] These results seem undeniable. But to say, as Harnack does (*History of Dogma*), that the twelfth century was marked by the perfect amalgamation of dogma and law, and that the dogmatic form was completely obscured by the legal form, is utterly to misunderstand the distinctions which history admits.

Monasticism

St. Bernard, in his *De consideratione,* recognized a providential necessity [152] in the immense power which the papacy had acquired, and he asked it merely to remain perfectly worthy of it. In taking this attitude, "he was the incarnation of the Christian mind of the time." [153] "Men's souls, assured as to the reorganization of the Church and the power of the papacy, revived." [154] The great monastic institutions formed the centers of this life. Cluny and Clairvaux were still its chief seats. No doubt many disorders were still evident there. The Clairvaux monks criticized those of Cluny for the luxury of their churches; and in these reproaches they injected a tone of acrimony, which was blameworthy. St. Bernard had to repress the excesses of the one and the pharisaism of the other.[155] He stimulated the zeal of almost all the Benedictine houses of northern France. His relations with the Grande Chartreuse, with the Abbey of St. Victor of Paris, and with that of Prémontré were an occasion of regeneration for those monasteries. He exercised a decisive influence on the reform of the Templars, among whom several abuses had slipped in.[156]

The Clergy

Abuses were to be found not only in the monasteries. They existed also among the bishops, and the Abbot of Clairvaux denounced these abuses in his *De moribus et officio episcoporum.* They were found also among the lower clergy, to whom Bernard addressed his vehement discourse *De conversione.* If we take literally the *De laude novae militiae,* they were notoriously

[152] *De consideratione,* Bk. III, chap. 2.
[153] Dufourcq, *L'avenir du christianisme,* VI, 108.
[154] *Ibid.*
[155] *Apologia,* chaps. 5 f.
[156] Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* I, 230 f.

prominent in the secular knighthood. We have seen that the royal court was often the scene of all this. Only a powerful papacy, either by itself or through instruments docile in its hands, could exercise an effective influence against such abuses and at such a period. Besides the name of St. Bernard, who was the most ilustrious of these instruments, history cannot forget two other names: St. Malachy, bishop of Down, and Suger, abbot of St. Denis.

St. Malachy

Malachy was born in Armagh in Ireland about 1095. At first he was a hermit, then a priest and collaborator of the primate of Ireland in the reform of the Churches of that country, archbishop of Armagh, and finally bishop of Down. In the mind of St. Bernard, Malachy was the ideal bishop. St. Bernard wrote: "I was privileged to see this man, and I rejoiced at seeing and hearing him. Sinner though I am, I found favor in his eyes." [157] Malachy's work is summed up in two phrases: he restored ecclesiastical discipline in Ireland and he connected, by close bonds, the Churches of his country with the Apostolic See.

St. Patrick, when introducing Christianity in Ireland, had no idea of injuring the ancient laws and customs of that land. But some of those laws and customs were harmful to ecclesiastical discipline. Thus the Churches were organized in imitation of the national clans; the bishop was surrounded with collaborators who, under the name of chorepiscopi, contested his authority. Furthermore, the custom of heredity resulted, not only in assuring to a single family such or such an episcopal see or abbey, but also, when clerics were lacking, placing it in lay hands. Malachy, by long efforts and by surrounding himself with monks, succeeded in extirpating these abuses. Then, by submitting the foundation of the metropolitan see of Cashel

[157] *Vita Malachiae,* chap. 16.

to the approval of the pope and by asking the pope to send the pallium for the first two sees of the kingdom, he rendered permanent and stable the bond which was beginning to unite his country with the papacy. Ireland rightly venerates St. Malachy as its greatest apostle after St. Patrick.[158]

Suger

At this same period, Suger, abbot of St. Denis, was the glory of France. Historians are not agreed as to Suger's native land

[158] Vacandard, "Saint Malachie" in the *Rev. des quest. hist.*, LII (1892), 1–57. St. Malachy seems to have received the gift of prophecy. Probably because of his fame as a prophet, an anonymous writer at the close of the sixteenth century attributed to him a prophecy about the succession of the popes. This so-called prophecy of Malachy, first published in 1595, "was composed in 1590 to support the candidacy of Cardinal Simoncelli, who was aspiring to the tiara. A remarkable fact is that, up to Gregory XIV, the mottos fit rather well the coats of arms, the place of birth, or the kind of life of his predecessors. The device for the successor of Urban VII was, *De antiquitate urbis*. In the spirit of the forger, it fitted perfectly Cardinal Simoncelli, who was a native of Orvieto (*urbs vetus*). But the election of Cardinal Sfondrate, a native of Milan, who took the name of Gregory XIV, made the prophecy an inexplicable riddle" (Vacandard, *Rev. des quest. hist.*, July, 1892, LII, 51). The following are the chief arguments adduced against the authenticity of this so-called prophecy: 1. No writer speaks of it before the end of the sixteenth century; St. Bernard, in his *Vita Malachiae*, written at the time when the prophecy would have had its partial fulfilment in the election of Celestine II, Lucius II, and Eugene III, makes not the least allusion to it; 2. We cannot attribute a supernatural origin to a prophecy which places in the same rank the popes and the antipopes and which, in spite of the words of the Savior, fixes at a few decades later the date of the end of the world; 3. Manifest errors have been pointed out in the so-called prophecy. See Ménétrier, *Réfutation des prophéties faussement attribuées à saint Malachie;* 4. The hypothesis of the composition of the document in 1590 on the occasion of the candidacy of Simoncelli for the tiara, explains all the difficulties: *Peregrinus apostolicus* (Pius VI?), *Aquila rapax* (Pius VII?), *Canis et coluber* (Leo XII?), *Vir religiosus* (Pius VIII?), *De balneis Etruriae* (Gregory XVI?), *Crux de cruce* (Pius IX?), *Lumen in coelo* (Leo XIII?), *Ignis ardens* (Pius X?), *Religio depopulata* (Benedict XV?), *Fides intrepida, Pastor angelicus, Pastor et nauta, Flos florum, De medietate lunae, De labore solis, De gloria olivae.* The prophecy ends with the following words: *In persecutione extrema sacrae romanae Ecclesiae, sedebit Petrus Romanus, qui pascet oves in multis tribulationibus. Quibus transactis, civitas septicollis diruetur, et Judex tremendus judicabit populum.*

or the exact date of his birth, which some place in 1080 and others in 1083. All are in accord that he sprang from the common people and that he was born in poverty.[159] Probably he was of servile condition. In childhood he was offered as an oblate to the Abbey of St. Denis. There he was brought up with the eldest son of King Philip I. The great-grandson of Hugh Capet and the descendant of serfs grew up side by side, studied the same lessons, and, amid the political and religious disturbances that were heard about even in the monastery, they exchanged with each other their anxieties and their ideas. We must suppose that the ideas which came from the poor scholar seemed wise to the young prince, because, when he became King Louis VI, he several times confided certain delicate missions to Suger. Suger was then a monk. About 1122 he was chosen by his brethren in religion to be abbot of the monastery of St. Denis. But St. Denis at that period was, according to a certain historian's just remark, less a monastic establishment than an institution of the monarchy.[160] Suger devoted himself entirely to politics; the discipline of the monastery, already much injured by his predecessor, was the least of his cares. The ancient monastery was more than ever like a princely court, not merely by the sumptuous retinue kept there, but also by the nature of the matters there discussed.[161]

The reading of St. Bernard's *Apologia* opened Suger's eyes. He broke with his frivolous habits, subjected himself to the rigors of monastic discipline, and in a few years re-established in his house the austerity of the Benedictine rule. As St. Bernard wrote: "Now the house of God ceases to open to people of the world, there is no access to sacred precincts for the curious. The holy place is open and accessible only to the children of Christ." [162] However, the Abbot of St. Denis did not abandon

[159] Louis de Carné, *Les fondateurs de l'unité française,* I, 76.
[160] *Ibid.,* p. 107.
[161] Vétault, *Suger,* p. 166.
[162] St. Bernard, *Epist.,* 78.

the care of public affairs. Under Louis VII, as under Louis VI, he was the chief adviser of royalty. During the Second Crusade he had the regency of the kingdom. The basilica of St. Denis, rebuilt by him, remains a monument of his piety: and the collective emancipation of an entire locality, of which his example is one of the oldest, is a testimony to his consideration for the lowly.

He wrote the biographies of the two kings whom he served, and his accounts reveal that he possessed so strict a conscience as an historian, that we can say of these accounts that "the twelfth century produced none more authentic or more interesting." [163] Louis VII gave him the name "Father of Our Country," and St. Bernard wrote to Pope Eugene III about him, saying: "If our Church of France possesses a vessel of honor and if the prince's court possesses a faithful servant like David, in my judgment it is the Abbot of St. Denis." [164] History says that, "by inspiring Louis the Fat in his mission of lofty justice and by founding, under Louis the Younger, the close alliance between the royalty and the Church, Suger saved France, anticipated the thought of St. Louis, and prepared for his great reign." [165]

Death of the Pope Eugene III

When (January 13, 1151) the Abbot of St. Denis was called to God, Bernard was already afflicted by the illness that brought on his death two years later. Eugene III preceded his former teacher to the grave by a month: he died July 8, 1153, at Tivoli. A strengthening of the Holy See's authority, a revived enthusiasm in the Crusades, a return of monastic and clerical life to its true spirit, the vigorous repression of schism and heresy, the encouragement of ecclesiastical studies in their new prog-

[163] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. III, Part I, p. 23.
[164] St. Bernard, *Epist.*, 39.
[165] De Carné, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

ress, all these were the fruits of his glorious pontificate. But a few months before the Pope's death a great political event occurred in Germany. This event threatened the permanence of those happy results. On May 4, 1152, the princes of the Empire elected, to replace Conrad III, his nephew Frederick, duke of Swabia, destined to become celebrated in history as Frederick Barbarossa. The new monarch at his coming into power wrote to Pope Eugene, assuring him of the cooperation of his arm in the defense of the Church.[166] But the insistence with which at the same time he proclaimed his desire to restore the ancient splendor of the imperial power, his claim, manifested in the very first year of his reign, to place his candidate in the vacant see of Magdeburg without regard to the Concordat of Worms and to make a judgment of the civil authority precede any papal excommunication issued for injurious attacks upon the possessions of the Church, his cleverness in having his personal ambitions accepted by his people as national traditions, all these were grounds for fearing, in the person of the new King of Germany, a formidable adversary, a new Henry IV, firmer in character and more sustained by his nation. The future justified those fears. With Frederick Barbarossa the Church enters upon a new period of strife against the imperial power.

[166] Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum,* I, 373, 499 f.; Watterich, II, 315.

CHAPTER IX

From Frederick Barbarossa to Innocent III (1152–98)

THE chronicler Otto of Freising, uncle of the new German King, declares that the desire for Germany's greatness guided the electors in their choice of a successor for Conrad III. He says: "Among all the families, two were then illustrious in the Empire, that of the Weiblingen (Ghibellines) and that of the Welfs (Guelphs): one of them accustomed to supply emperors, the other to supply powerful dukes. Their rivalry had often troubled the state. But, by a design of Providence, under the reign of Henry V, Frederick's father (of the Weiblingen family) had married the daughter of the Guelph Duke of Bavaria. The princes then chose Frederick, not merely because of his activity and worth, but because in himself he could reconcile the two hostile families." [1]

Frederick Barbarossa

The newly elected ruler partially fulfilled these hopes. Frederick I, better known as Frederick Barbarossa, was par excellence the sovereign of Germany in the Middle Ages. Perhaps in no other man did the German people better embody its legitimate ambitions and its chimerical dreams. As king of Germany, Frederick assured the almost absolute triumph of those ambitions; but as emperor, he witnessed the complete failure of those dreams. In his reign his country saw the unity of government strengthened, order re-established in the provinces, commerce flourish in the great cities, the court shine with unprecedented

[1] Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici*, Bk. II, chap. 2, in Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, VI, 699.

brilliance, national poetry blossom in noble and gracious works. But as emperor he aimed too high. Obsessed by the idea of a restoration of the Roman Empire in his person, regarding himself as one who had received from God the heritage of the Caesars, Frederick Barbarossa attempted to subject to his domination whatever had any connection, near or remote, with the ancient world. The scope of this ambition included the ecclesiastical hierarchy and even the pope, whom he wished to make an instrument of his power in Rome, his capital. To attain this end, he neglected nothing. Five different times he came himself down into Italy, raised up three antipopes for his cause, placed at his service the learning of the most famous jurists, and, when he judged necessary, erected the most detestable methods of barbarism into a system of war.

But his efforts encountered two insuperable obstacles. The municipal liberties, developed in Italy to such a degree as in some instances to constitute real republics, turned against him; and the papacy, long distrustful of this movement, in the hour of danger became its natural and powerful protector. Thus the quarrel of Guelphs and Ghibellines, which, it had been thought, ought to be quelled, flared up more ardent and more formidable in its proportions: whatever inclined to the cause of the pope and of the liberty of Italy, was called Guelph; and whatever was connected with the cause of the emperor, was called Ghibelline. At last Frederick Barbarossa's imprudent aggression had as its effect the revival of the feeling of Italian independence and the popularizing of the cause of the papacy. A similar attempt in England by King Henry II eventuated in like results.

Born about 1123, the new King of Germany was, at the time of his election, barely thirty years old. A man of fine presence, thin and tall, with a quick and cultivated mind, of simple manners in his private life, of great dignity in ceremonies of state, of extreme valor in battle, he squandered so many fine qualities by a boundless ambition and by an inflexible obstinacy. On the

day of his coronation at Aachen, one of his trusted followers, who had been condemned by him, knelt at the King's feet imploring pardon, and all present joined in his petition. "My sentence was just," replied the King. He was inexorable and refused to revoke the condemnation.

Pope Anastasius IV

The first of his desires was to go to Rome, there to affirm his authority in person. But, as the situation in Germany was far from assuring, he was obliged to postpone carrying out this project. The death of Eugene III, however, and the election of a new pope a few days later (July 12, 1153) seemed to him a favorable circumstance to hasten the accomplishment of his plan. The design was nothing less than to subject Italy to the imperial supremacy, and to render effective that nominal title of king of the Romans which had been bestowed upon his predecessors ever since Charlemagne. The new head of the Church, Conrad of Suburra, cardinal-bishop of Sabina, elected under the name of Anastasius IV, was an old man, renowned for his mercy and kindness. In the first days of his pontificate, he had, in a spirit of conciliation, granted the pallium to the Bishop of Magdeburg, appointed not long before by the King of Germany contrary to the wishes of Eugene III. Frederick counted on the new Pope's complacency. Furthermore, he overlooked nothing that would aid the success of his expedition in Italy. First he conciliated Henry of Saxony by granting him the duchy of Bavaria; then, the more effectively to curb the Normans of the Two Sicilies, he negotiated an agreement with their inveterate enemy, the Emperor of Constantinople.

Pope Adrian IV

But the expedition was scarcely on the march, when word was received of the death of Anastasius IV (December 3,

1154), and of the unanimous election, which took place the next day, of his successor, Adrian IV. The one that Frederick would now have to face was an active pope of mature years, well known for the keenness of his mind, the extent of his knowledge, and the generosity of his character, a man who, in the various offices he previously filled, had given evidence of initiative and firmness.

He was a native of England and before his elevation was called Nicholas Breakspear. In boyhood, as a consequence of events about which history cannot supply sufficient light, he was obliged to live on alms. At an early age he came to France and there stage by stage he reached the city of Avignon. Near this city the Canons Regular of St. Rufus received him, had him educated, and then admitted him into their community.[2] There he experienced all the vicissitudes that usually are the lot of superior men. His eminent qualities soon brought about his election as prior and, shortly after, as abbot of the monastery. But his zeal for reform made him the target of accusations on the part of some of the monks, who haled him before the papal tribunal. As a result of these events, he was brought into the presence of Eugene III. The Pope, struck by his capacities and virtues, kept him near him, appointed him cardinal-bishop of Albano, and subsequently confided to him an important legation in the Scandinavian countries. Nicholas Breakspear erected the archbishopric of Trondheim (Drontheim) for Norway and endeavored to make Upsala the metropolitan see of Sweden.

Elected supreme pontiff, Adrian IV was under no illusion regarding the heavy burden that fell on his shoulders and the obstacles he would encounter on his path. He said: "I know that my path is strewn with thorns; and this papal mantle, which is placed upon me, although much tattered, is still heavy enough to weigh down even the strongest." [3]

[2] *Liber pontif.*, II, 388.

[3] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Bk. VIII; *M. G., SS.*, XXVII, 50.

No sooner was he consecrated than he received news of the arrival of the imperial army in Italy. To complicate the difficulties, the Roman municipality, stirred up by Arnold of Brescia, declared itself independent and ordered Adrian to abdicate from the government of Rome. In these circumstances, Adrian prudently withdrew to the citadel of St. Peter. He wished to do everything possible to calm the excited passions and especially to avoid at any price the shedding of blood. His efforts were vain. A cardinal, on the way to visit him, was grievously wounded by Arnold's followers. Adrian at once put the city under interdict. The divine offices were suppressed in all the churches of Rome. This measure was effective. The Roman population, impatient to see the religious ceremonies resumed, forced the senators to submit to the Pope and compelled Arnold of Brescia to leave the city.

Barbarossa in Italy

However, Barbarossa had reached Upper Italy. According as he advanced, his intentions appeared more and more manifest, and his tactics were revealed. Some Italian cities resisted him. Milan, Chieri, Asti, Rosate, Trecate, Brescia, and Tortona refused to open their gates to him. Frederick, not feeling that he was strong enough to overcome Milan, passed on without taking it. But the other cities were razed to the ground, pillaged, destroyed in whole or in part. At Sutri he met Adrian IV. What would be the attitude of the King of Germany? Custom required that, in such event, the sovereign should hold the bridle of the pope's horse and present the stirrup to the pope. Frederick thought he could properly omit this ceremony. Thereupon Adrian declined to give him the kiss of peace. However, after reflection, the fear of having a quarrel with the Pope and of not receiving from him the imperial crown, on which he was counting, made the monarch alter his decision: the usual

ceremonies were performed. Almost immediately a deputation of the Roman Senate appeared. The purpose of this move was not hard to surmise. Overcome by the spiritual arms of the Pope, the senators came to seek support from the Emperor. But the spokesman of the Roman commune had not finished setting forth its desires, when Barbarossa abruptly stopped him. "I am the successor of Charlemagne and of Otto the Great," he said, "and, as such, the lawful possessor of Rome. Do you think anyone can possibly snatch the club from the hand of Hercules?" [4]

These words left no illusion as to Frederick's dispositions. In vain he repeated to the Pope his promise to restore the power of the Holy See over the city of Rome. He entered the city at the head of his army, drove out the partisans of the Senate from the positions they were holding there, and, while the Pope placed the imperial crown on his head (June 18, 1156), pronounced the traditional oath of the emperors. Evidently as master, not as a mere defender, Frederick Barbarossa intended to interfere in the affairs of Rome and of Italy. Now appeared the new character of the strife that was about to begin between the priesthood and the Empire. The question of investiture was no longer in the foreground, as in the time of Gregory VII; the question now was the pope's temporal independence, his free government of Rome and of the Papal States, which he would have to defend against the imperial claims. Events that presently occurred showed this to be the character of the strife.

In that same year (1156), another conflict arose between the two powers. While the King, on returning to Germany, was there engaged in restraining the excessive claims of his vassals, the Pope concluded at Benevento, with King William of Sicily, a treaty [5] by which he acknowledged his titles of king of Sicily and duke of Apulia and prince of Capua; in return the Pope

[4] Otto of Freising, *op. cit.*, Bk. II, chap. *22*, in Muratori, *op. cit.*, VI, *722*.

[5] Chalandon, *Hist. de la dom. normande en Italie*, II, *232–34*.

received from William an oath of vassalage. This move was opportune to prevent the Empire from encompassing the Roman state both on the north and on the south, as was reasonably feared. The Emperor's plan was, in fact, to join the Two Sicilies to the domains of his crown. Frederick protested vigorously, saying that the Pope was breaking the promises of the Holy See. The complaint was ill founded, because the promises alluded to by the King could be none other than the promise made at Constance by Eugene III, which had for its purpose simply the maintenance and development of the honor of the Empire.[6]

Chancellor Rainaldi

In these recriminations could be easily seen the influence of an evil counselor, whom Frederick in 1156 had elevated to the high office of chancellor of the Empire, Rainaldi of Dassel.[7] This was merely his first step in the path of intrigue and deceit against the authority of the Holy See. Frederick, unmindful of his duty as emperor, neglected to take in hand the cause of the Archbishop of Lund, who had been plundered and imprisoned by malefactors while he was on the way to Rome. Adrian thereupon (1157) wrote to Frederick as follows:

I cannot find an explanation of your indifference. You know what superabundance of dignity and glory your holy mother the Church has procured (*contulerit*) for you. We ourselves would have been pleased to confer on you still more precious favors (*beneficia*), if that had been necessary. But, since you pay no attention to such a heinous crime, subjecting yourself to the influence of the wicked man who sows tares, I am sending you two of my most beloved sons, Cardinal Bernard and Cardinal Roland.[8]

[6] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 886.

[7] Rainaldi was highly educated, tireless, and ambitious. He was chancellor of the Empire from May 10, 1156, to June 30, 1159. At the time of his death in 1167, he was archbishop of Cologne. See J. Ficker, *Reinald von Dassel.*

[8] Mansi, XXI, 789 f.

Chancellor Rainaldi of Dassel immediately translated the Pope's letter into German. But, taking advantage of the ambiguous significance that might be given to the words *contulerit* and *beneficia,* he falsified their meaning, representing the Pope as saying that the Emperor held the imperial dignity from the Holy See and that he could not aspire to possess Rome and Italy except as fiefs,[9] in the capacity of vassal of the Pope. Rainaldi also profited by the occasion mischievously to remind his sovereign of a picture which had greatly offended the monarch when he was visiting the Lateran Palace at Rome. Emperor Lothair was represented in the picture as receiving the imperial crown from the pope, and a Latin distich over the picture explained its meaning thus:

Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores.
Post, homo fit papae, sumit quo dante coronam.

That is, "The king presents himself at the gate and does homage to the city of Rome. Thus he becomes the pope's man, from the pope receiving his crown."

When the papal legates joined the Emperor, about the middle of October, 1157, in a diet held at Besançon, the Emperor's wrath was violent. It rose to the highest degree of fury when one of the legates, Roland Bandinelli, the future Alexander III, either because he was unaware of the reason for the Emperor's exasperation or because he could not refrain from a sharp retort, replied: "From whom, then, does the Emperor hold his imperial dignity, if not from the Pope?" Count Otto of Bavaria at these words raised his sword in the air to split the legate's head. The Emperor, restraining the Count, turned to the papal envoy and said: "If we were not in church, you would learn how heavy the German swords are." The legates were ordered to quit the territory of the Empire immediately by the most direct route, without visiting any bishop or abbot.[10]

[9] The word *beneficium* might, according to the circumstances, mean either favor or fief.

[10] Mansi, XXI. 709 f.

A short time after this, the Pope, in a dignified letter, wrote to the Emperor as follows: "You have treated our two excellent brethren, Cardinal Bernard and Cardinal Roland, in a manner unworthy of your imperial majesty. Apparently you were displeased because of the word *beneficium*. We used it in its primitive and natural sense; it means 'favor,' not 'fief.' Only those who wish to disturb the peace between the state and the Church could explain it in any other sense. Likewise, by the word *conferre,* we meant merely *imponere.*" [11] This declaration, read and translated by Otto of Freising, calmed Frederick, who declared that he was satisfied. "The reconciliation was regarded as concluded between the Pope and the Emperor; but thereafter the friendly feeling between them was at an end, and we may say that the fire, ever ready to break out, continued to smolder under the ashes." [12]

At bottom a real and important divergence continued between the two sovereigns with regard to the respective rights of the papacy and the Empire. Although the pope did not consider the emperor a vassal or the Empire a fief, he could not grant that the imperial dignity was conferred immediately by God or that the crowning of the emperor at Rome was a duty on his part. Neither the pact between Leo III and Charlemagne nor any of the subsequent agreements supported such an interpretation. The office of protector of the papacy could not be conceived as an absolute right, independent of the consent of the Holy See.

The Legists

Such, however, was Frederick Barbarossa's idea.[13] Soon no doubt was possible on this point. In the course of the year 1158, not satisfied with terrorizing Italy by his incursions and with subjecting Milan and Genoa to his sway, he appealed to the

[11] Jaffé, no. 10,386; Mansi, XXI, 793.
[12] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 901.
[13] *M. G.*, XX, 422.

learning of the most famous legists to sustain his claims. This intervention of the legists in the quarrel of the priesthood and the Empire is an event of so great importance that it calls for more than passing mention.

The Roman law had never ceased to be known, cited, and practiced in the early Middle Ages.[14] It holds a notable place in the correspondence of St. Gregory the Great. St. Isidore of Seville several times cites the Digest.[15] As we have already seen, the principal juridical collections of the Romans were utilized in the collections of canon law. But in the twelfth century the political movement produced in Lombardy by the development of the municipal liberties was there the occasion of an enthusiastic study of the ancient law.[16]

The center of these studies was Bologna, where, from 1088 to 1125, the celebrated Irnerius taught. He was looked upon as the real founder of the Bologna school. The outward circumstances, the accessibility of the place, and the mildness of the climate probably contributed to make Bologna a great university city. But the fame of its school of Roman law came to it especially from the remarkable scientific labors of its professors. In their minds, to revive the laws of ancient Rome was to labor for that resurrection of the old municipal liberties which haunted the minds of that epoch. The legists were so esteemed in the city that they occupied a preponderant place in the political direction of affairs.[17] The great merit of the disciples of Irnerius was the direct interpretation of the Roman laws by the minute study of the texts and their critical comparison; so successful were they that, in the case of some texts, they established their meaning with finality.

But history must point out their many grave defects. At first,

[14] See Savigny, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter.*

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] Brandileone, *Il diritto romano nelle leggi romane e sueve,* p. 7.

[17] In 1123 the jurists composed one of the three higher assemblies of the city. Cf. Ghirardacci, *Della historia di Bologna,* II, 64.

as they were not well enough acquainted with Roman history and Latin literature, the meaning and import of several institutions escaped them. A more serious defect was that, in the explanation of the laws which they set forth to the society of their time, they utterly neglected the consideration of the conditions affected by economic and social progress and by the Christian spirit. Hence the system of legislation which they elaborated appeared not only lacking immediate contact with practical life, but marked with a character of rigidity and absolutism, often in contradiction to the moral ideas brought to the world by Christianity.

And precisely this character of absolutism given to the law by the Bologna school was what won the sympathy of Emperor Frederick. He, too, hoped for the revival of the traditions of the Roman Empire. A system of laws which legists had striven to revive and to comment on in the original form which it had in the time of Emperor Justinian, seemed to him a wonderfully suitable instrument for the realization of his designs. He heaped favors upon the Bologna legists, who in return passionately sustained his political ideas. The Roman law, as taught at Bologna,[18] henceforth became sometimes the garb in which the imperial claims were clothed, sometimes the principle from which the Emperor deduced fresh claims.

The Code of Roncaglia

When a great struggle was evident between the Empire and the papacy, Frederick Barbarossa, who was a cautious statesman, could not neglect to make use of the new power offered to him.[19] He convoked, for November 11, 1158, to a diet that would

[18] In other schools, notably at Paris, they engaged rather in commentary on the Roman law by consideration of the advancement of social life.

[19] Thus an institution that was at first inspired by the claims of communal liberties, became the instrument of imperial despotism, the avowed enemy of those liberties.

be held in the plain of Roncaglia between Piacenza and Cremona, the principal legists of his Empire. As he was unable, he said, to govern the Roman Empire with justice and honor unless he knew precisely what were the imperial prerogatives, he was assembling the diet to examine this grave question. The Bologna professors, all of them devoted to the Emperor and more or less in his pay, were preponderant in the assembly. They found in the *Pandects* a text that called the emperor "the ruler of the entire world." And he met a bishop who even commented on this text by saying: "The power of lawmaking belongs to you alone. Your will makes the law, because what is pleasing to the prince has the force of law (*Tua voluntas jus est; quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem*)." [20]

On the basis of these principles, the Roncaglia legists established a code of laws in which the Emperor's most arbitrary claims were transformed into indisputable rights. His prerogatives were enormously enlarged. The jurisdiction of local authorities was suspended and was replaced by that of imperial officers. Bishops and laymen must restore all the *regalia* which they possessed, that is, the fiefs and possessions of whatever sort which were regarded as coming to them directly or indirectly from the liberality of the emperors or which had been placed, freely or by force, under their special protection. Furthermore, the legists held that the following rights belonged to the emperor: 1. territorial sovereignty, that is, the right to appoint the dukes, margraves, counts, and city consuls; 2. sovereignty over roads and navigable rivers, and the right to receive all the tolls and taxes of any sort on these routes of communication; 3. the exclusive and unlimited right to coin money; 4. the right to collect the products of mines, salt works, legal fines, confiscated goods, etc.; 5. the right to make whatever requisitions he judged proper in men, horses, and forage; 6. the exclusive right to construct and possess

[20] *M. G., SS.*, XX, 449.

fortresses; 7. the half of the treasury. This was equivalent to saying that the whole Empire, with all its resources in goods and men, with its cities, its provinces, and its institutions, was placed at the Emperor's discretion. The popular liberties were sacrificed no less than was the liberty of the Church. "No Italian diet," says Sismondi, "so shamefully abandoned the rights of the people." [21]

Pope Adrian's Protests

Let us confine ourselves to the Emperor's encroachments on the ecclesiastical domain. Frederick Barbarossa, alleging his right as authorized by the Roncaglia constitution, invested Duke Welf of Bavaria with the entire heritage of Countess Matilda. Utterly disregarding the Concordat of Worms, by his own authority he conferred on Rainaldi of Dassel the archbishopric of Cologne, and on another of his favorites, Guido of Brandate, the archbishopric of Ravenna. The Supreme Pontiff vigorously protested. At Easter, 1159, he sent to the Emperor's headquarters, then in the vicinity of Bologna, four legates who presented the following explicit demands to the Emperor: 1. that he no longer send to Rome, without the pope's knowledge, any representative of the Empire, because "all authority in Rome comes from St. Peter"; 2. that he no longer levy any *fodrum* on the domains of the pope. By this word *fodrum,* the German sovereigns meant a rather vague right permitting every soldier in warfare, on the pretext that "the war must nourish the war," to make any requisitions, exactions, pillage, and other vexatious demands which the military commander judged proper; [22] 3. that he no longer require of the bishops of Italy an oath of vassalage, but merely an oath of fidelity; 4. that he restore to the Church the possessions of Countess Matilda, the

[21] Sismondi, *Hist. des républiques italiennes,* II, 97.

[22] See Du Cange, *Glossarium,* under the word *Fodrum.*

islands of Sardinia and Corsica, and the duchy of Spoleto.[23] Barbarossa replied: "Since a divine disposition has conferred on me the title and functions of Roman Emperor, I would be representing a mere shadow of sovereignty, I would bear a useless title devoid of meaning, if I did not hold in my hands the supreme government of the city of Rome." [24]

In reality Frederick, by agents whom he cleverly maintained in Rome through a secret understanding with the Senate, endeavored to dominate and constantly thwart the authority of the pope. He succeeded so well that in May, 1159, Adrian IV was obliged to leave the city and, accompanied by twelve cardinals, go to Anagni, where he conferred with William of Sicily and representatives of several Lombard cities. Many of his advisers, including Roland Bandinelli, the former legate to the diet of Besançon, thought the hour had come to issue the excommunication against the German ruler. Adrian wrote to Frederick: "Reflect, reflect. You have received from us the anointing and the crown. By aiming to seize what is not yours, you may lose what is yours." To this the Emperor replied: "All the regalian rights which the papacy possesses, it holds from the liberality of the princes." [25] The Pope was seriously ill when he received this insolent letter. We are told that he was about to answer the Emperor by a sentence of excommunication, when death overtook him at Anagni, September 1, 1159.

Pope Alexander III

Adrian IV died at a critical juncture of affairs. The election of his successor was a matter of grave importance. The cardinals deliberated for three days.[26] The discussion was earnest

[23] Watterich, II, 378.

[24] Ragewin, *Gesta Friderici,* Bk. IV, chap. 4; *M. G., SS.,* XX, 466.

[25] Watterich, II, 373.

[26] The three days following Adrian's burial, which took place on September 4. The date of the election was September 7, 1159. See Jaffé, no. 10,583.

and searching. Finally they agreed on the name of Roland Bandinelli. On the morrow of a brutal aggression, they chose him who had most ardently advised Pope Adrian to adopt decisive measures against the Emperor. On the eve of a war that would evidently be a campaign of scholarship as well as a military expedition, they elected the man who was most able to answer the sophisms of the legists. Equally well known for his vigorous character and for his profound legal learning, Roland Bandinelli had been one of the most illustrious professors of the Bologna schools. At a time when the various branches of theology had not yet become the subjects of distinct teaching there, he had taught, as "lector of Sacred Scripture," dogma, moral, and ecclesiastical law.

We have few details about his origin. He was born at Siena, but the date of his birth is unknown. We possess two of his works; their value justifies the great renown which he enjoyed with his contemporaries and the high honors conferred on him. His *Sententiae* are a theological *Summa* in which he corrects the errors of Abelard, whose method, however, he adopts; and his *Stroma* is a summary of Gratian's *Decretum,* remarkable for order and clearness. According to the *Liber pontificalis,*[27] Roland Bandinelli was at first honored with a canonry at Pisa. Eugene III appointed him successively canon of the Lateran, cardinal-deacon of the title of SS. Cosmas and Damian, cardinal-priest of St. Mark, and chancellor of the Apostolic See.

He was holding this last office when he was elected supreme pontiff. His personal worth, his political sympathies, which were recognized by the King of Sicily and the Lombard cities, the memory of his attitude at the diet of Besançon, all these gave reason for the hope that he would be a formidable adversary of the imperial power. And so Frederick Barbarossa, after doing everything possible to prevent his election and to elevate one of his own followers (Cardinal Octavian Male-

[27] Ed. Duchesne, II, 397.

detti), neglected no means to bring about his replacement by Octavian. Scarcely was Roland clothed in the red papal mantle, when Octavian, jumping upon him, snatched the garment from him and put it on himself. At the same time an armed force rushed in, led Octavian to the chair of St. Peter, proclaimed him pope under the name of Victor IV, and had him acclaimed by the people. Roland had merely time to take refuge in a fortified house, where he was guarded as a prisoner by the soldiers of the Roman commune. However, the crowd, after recovering from its surprise and learning of what had happened, turned against the intruder. He was hooted when he appeared in public. The children, alluding to his family name Maledetti, shouted at him as he passed: "Away with you, cursed one, son of malediction."

On September 17, the people, under the leadership of a member of the Frangipani family, freed Roland, who, on Sunday, September 20, in the presence of a large number of cardinals, clerics, and laity, was consecrated *ad Nymphas* by the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, under the name of Alexander III. The antipope Victor had himself consecrated at Farfa, October 4. The kings of France and England, soon followed by those of Spain, Hungary, Scotland, and by Ireland, rallied to Pope Alexander, whose valid election was beyond doubt. Germany alone took a stand under the obedience of Victor. A seventeen-year war was about to be the consequence of these tragic events.

In its various episodes no less dramatic than the war which a half-century earlier had brought Emperor Henry IV into conflict with Pope Gregory VII, this war which broke out in 1160 between Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III would embrace two distinct phases. From 1160 to 1166 an almost uninterrupted series of military and diplomatic successes for the Emperor resulted in the exile of the Pope, the crushing of his allies, and the solemn coronation of an antipope in the basilica of St. Peter. But, starting from that point,

a series of striking reverses brought the proud sovereign to the feet of the Pope.

From the political and social points of view, the present struggle has a greater scope and result than the investiture quarrel. On one side is a German ruler, relying on the legists, who claim to revive for his advantage and, if possible, to impose on the whole world, the imperial absolutism of ancient Rome; on the other side is a pope, whose allies are the cities that have risen up to maintain their municipal liberties, the localities that are resolved to defend their autonomy against the Germanic despotism. Before dying, Adrian IV, not satisfied with drawing closer the bonds of his alliance with the king of Sicily, obtained from the cities of Milan, Brescia, Piacenza, and Crema a promise not to treat with Frederick without his authorization. Alexander III protested his desire to make common cause with municipal Italy; the latter, which drove out the podestas sent by the Emperor, relied on the papacy to defend it against the "law professors."

For Emperor Frederick I, for his perfidious counselor Rainaldi of Dassel, for the men intoxicated with learning who suggested his maxims to him, any means were good so long as the aim was to bring about the hegemony of the Empire. To accomplish their purpose, they did not hesitate to employ any means of terrorism, any knavery, any atrocity.

Pseudo-council of Pavia (1160)

About the end of October, 1159, the Emperor convoked the prelates of the Empire to a synod that was to meet at Pavia on January 13, 1160. The letter of convocation contains threats against Alexander, who is called merely Cardinal Roland, if he does not appear at the synod.[28] Neither the Pope nor the

[28] For the imperial letter summoning Pope Alexander, see *M. G., Leges,* sec. IV, Vol. I, pp. 255 f., no. 184; Watterich, II, 459 f.

greater part of the Italian bishops answered Frederick's summons. But present were the antipope Victor and all the German prelates holding their fiefs from the Emperor and anxious not to lose them. They were informed that the recognition of Alexander as pope would be a perpetual source of discord between the priesthood and the Empire and consequently the occasion of countless evils, whereas adherence to Victor would be a guaranty of peace and prosperity. The better to win the votes, Victor's followers resorted to an arrant piece of knavery: they produced alleged letters of Alexander to prove that he had concluded with the Lombards and the King of Sicily an offensive league against the Emperor. This trickery disheartened even those who had the best intentions.[29] With all opposition thus crushed, they pronounced, "under the influence of a violent terrorism," [30] a sentence of anathema against Roland Bandinelli, the so-called Pope Alexander III.[31] Contemporaries add that, to make up the number of votes, they had the acts of the council signed by people who had no title to take part in the council: excommunicated bishops and simple laymen. Included in those approving their decree, they placed the names of prelates who had remained silent and those who had declared their vote for Alexander.[32]

The Italian Cities

All that remained to be done was to overcome the opposition of the Italian cities. These possessed armed militias, ready to resist. To vanquish them, the German Emperor organized a system of barbarism which he applied implacably. In his first expedition into Italy he had ordered pillage, incendiarism, and

[29] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 936.

[30] These are the words used by the German historian Reuter, *Geschichte Papst Alexander's III,* p. 118.

[31] Mansi, XXI, 1111; Suppl., II, 519.

[32] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 941; Reuter, *op. cit.,* pp. 119, 513 f.

the poisoning of water sources.[33] The method was generalized and carried to its last degree of ferocity. Two of the Emperor's panegyrists (the chronicler Radevic of Freising and the poet Gunther), without any outburst of indignation, so greatly did admiration for their sovereign obscure their judgment, relate that Frederick, when besieging Crema, ordered that children who had been kept as hostages be fastened in front of his war machines, so as to expose them to the attack that would be made by their own parents.[34] Thus were reduced Crema, Tortona, and Mantua. Milan still resisted. To make himself master of this city, Frederick gave orders to burn the standing grain, to tear up the vines, and to cut down the trees within a radius of fifteen miles around the city. All who were taken captive had their hands and their noses cut off and their eyes plucked out. Troops, posted in the fortresses, were ordered to intercept all communications between the besieged and their allies of Piacenza and Brescia. Whoever were taken carrying food into the starving city, had their right hand cut off. A chronicler, eyewitness of these happenings, relates that in one day twenty-five hands were thus cut off.[35] Nobody dared any longer convey anything to Milan, which was forced by famine to surrender unconditionally. The inhabitants were obliged to leave the city and, under the eyes of imperial officers, to withdraw to designated places in the open country, where they had to construct their own houses.[36] The terror which such scenes inspired hastened the submission of all central Italy. Pope Alexander III, no longer safe in Anagni, left Italy and sought refuge in France.

[33] Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici,* Bk. II, chaps. 14–17, in Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* VI, 710–20.

[34] *Obsides machinis alligatos Princeps decrevit objiciendos. . . . Sicque aliquot ex pueris, lapidibus icti, miserabiliter interierunt* (*Gesta Friderici,* Bk. II, chap. 27, in Muratori, VI, 821).

[35] Radulphus Mediolanensis, *De rebus gestis Friderici primi in Italia,* in Muratori, VI, 1186.

[36] *Ibid.,* col. 1187.

Antipope Victor IV

We have now reached the spring of 1162. Fear lest the Pope would persuade King Louis VII to take arms in his defense, seems to have momentarily haunted the Emperor's mind. A rumor spread that he even contemplated an invasion of France. But, after reflection, he merely set out for imperial Burgundy.[37] From there, though without success, he intrigued with the kings of France and England to win them over to the cause of the antipope. Emperor Manuel Comnenus vainly tried to sell to Pope Alexander his adherence and the complete submission of the Eastern Church in return for the crown of the West. The Supreme Pontiff declined to enter into this bargaining. An understanding with the King of France appeared to him a more practical and more reliable combination. He established his residence at Tours, then at Bourges, and lastly at Sens, where he remained from October, 1163 to April, 1165. There Louis VII provided for the support of his person and of his court.

The protection of the French King enabled the Pope to assemble and to preside over in person, at Tours (May 19, 1163), a great council at which 17 cardinals, 124 bishops and 414 abbots, coming from all the provinces of France, from England, from Ireland, from Scotland, from Spain, from Sardinia, from Sicily, from Italy, and even from the East, renewed the anathema issued against the antipope Octavian, Rainaldi of Dassel, and their followers.[38] The schismatic spirit of Rainaldi, Barbarossa's evil genius, had been manifested shortly before with such insolence that his attitude sufficed definitely to remove the kings of France and England from the Emperor's cause. As those two sovereigns were talking of a meeting of bishops at which an attempt would be made to clarify the question of the

[37] At this period a part of the eastern region of ancient Gaul, known as Burgundy, called also the Kingdom of Arles, was dependent on the Empire. See Fournier, *Le royaume d'Arles et de Vienne.*

[38] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 963.

legitimacy of Alexander III or of Victor IV, the chancellor exclaimed: "The Emperor does not recognize anyone's right to interfere in the Roman question; it concerns him alone." [39]

The important manifestation of the Council of Tours, where all the Christian nations except Germany were represented, the honors accorded to Pope Alexander III by the kings of France and England, had their echo beyond the Rhine. The solid nucleus of faithful partisans whom the Pontiff counted in Germany increased from day to day. Alexander took advantage of this movement to make several fatherly proposals to Frederick I with a view to a reconciliation. They were repulsed with disdain. Even the death of the antipope Victor IV (April 20, 1164) did not discourage the Emperor; or if at that time, advised by the Archbishop of Mainz, he had a desire to make peace with Alexander,[40] Rainaldi of Dassel at once turned him from it. The very day of Octavian's burial, without waiting for the imperial instructions, Rainaldi had another elected in his place. The electors were two cardinal-priests, two German bishops, and the prefect of Rome. They chose Cardinal Guido of Crema, who took the name of Paschal III. Then Rainaldi put the Emperor face to face with the *fait accompli.* He also persuaded his sovereign of the possibility of winning to his cause the King of England, Henry II, then at odds with Alexander on account of Thomas à Becket, archbishop of Canterbury.

Diet of Würzburg (1165)

The Emperor assembled a diet at Würzburg (Pentecost, 1165). "His purpose," he said, "was to deliberate regarding the religious situation of the Empire," in reality, to group all his subjects around the antipope. After "a humble invocation of the Holy Ghost," he made all the great nobles of the Empire

[39] Watterich, II, 529.
[40] *Ibid.*, II, 548.

and the bishops swear that they would never recognize Alexander III as pope. He extended this obligation of the oath to all the clergy, then to the whole population of Germany. Many bishops took this tyrannical oath only with more or less vague reservations. Others, yielding to the imperial pressure at the moment, revoked it afterward.[41] But, as Rainaldi well understood, such measures created merely an external bond of a purely disciplinary sort in the Church of Germany. To produce a deeper coherence, the chancellor contrived (December 24, 1165), with the approval of the antipope Paschal III, the canonization of Charlemagne. He hoped that devotion to the great Emperor would be the religious bond that, in the schism, would unite the German nation.

League of Verona

These measures were only transiently effective. Even in Germany, more than one bishop, such as Conrad of Salzburg, remained firmly loyal to Alexander's cause [42] and, despite persecutions by the Emperor, were followed by all their clergy. In Upper Italy the opposition was organized. A league of cities, called the League of Verona because Verona was its center, had been formed for the purpose of resisting the Emperor and his antipope. Milan arose from its ruins amid popular enthusiasm. Pope Alexander, upon the advice of the kings of France and England and of his cardinals, thought the moment had come to make his return to Rome. He did, in fact, enter Rome (November 23, 1165) amid acclamations. But Barbarossa and Rainaldi then attempted a supreme effort. About the end of July, 1167, the Emperor arrived before the walls of Rome at the head of an army. After eight days of fighting, he entered the city and set fire to St. Peter's Church, which however was

[41] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1016.
[42] *M. G., SS.*, IX, 611–16.

saved from destruction. Alexander III had barely time to flee, disguised as a pilgrim. On August 1, Frederick was crowned at St. Peter's by the antipope, and the Romans were forced to come and swear fidelity to Paschal III. The triumph of the schism seemed complete.

This triumph was of short duration. Barbarossa and his antipope received outward homages, whatever can be gained by force, terrorism, and the prestige of success. But they did not have the souls. Such triumphs are always precarious, and sometimes they are followed by terrible aftermaths.

On August 2, a terrible pestilence suddenly broke out in the imperial army and, we are told, in a few days carried off 25,000 men. On August 6, Frederick had to leave the city with whatever healthy troops he had left. But, says a historian, "the angel of death pursued him in his withdrawal." On August 14, Rainaldi of Dassel was carried off by the plague. Two years earlier he had been elevated to the archbishopric of Cologne; some writers state that God gave him time to repent and to receive the last sacraments. Frederick had to abandon his last troops, the remnants of a magnificent army, and think merely of saving himself from the danger by flight. This sudden and astounding fall from the highest success to the deepest distress appeared to all as a punishment from God, and raised the courage of Alexander's followers as much as it disheartened their foes.

The Lombard League

The Lombards revolted openly, drove out the Emperor's friends and partisans, and labored to recover their former liberties. The number of those in revolt increased rapidly. On December 1, 1167, the great Lombard League counted thirteen cities. Only with great difficulty did the Emperor, sustained by a few princes and a few cities, remain in the peninsula until the month of March of the following year. He then had to pre-

tend a reconciliation with the Church, resort to disguise, and, with a small escort, succeeded in reaching Germany by way of Piedmont and Burgundy. His departure served to strengthen the League. The Pope had joined it openly to sustain, against the imperial absolutism, the civil liberty as well as the ecclesiastical liberty. On May 1, 1168, he was acknowledged its chief. Then he built the city of Alessandria, the Lombard Rome, the consuls of which had to swear fidelity to the Pope, and which from the start was a homage to Alexander III, a defiance of the Emperor, and the bulwark of Italian liberty.[43]

Frederick had wished to assure to Germany the hegemony of the world. But even there he felt himself abandoned. When, in 1174, he appealed for the help of the great nobles to attempt another expedition into Italy, most of them avoided giving their assent. The most powerful of all, the head of the house of the Guelphs, Henry the Lion, refused his assistance. In 1168, upon the death of the pseudo-Paschal III, at the Emperor's orders another antipope was elected, John of Struma, who took the name of Callistus III. He received but little friendly support. The Emperor's campaign in Italy reckoned nothing but disasters. His attacks on Ancona and Alessandria were failures. Conferences with the Pope also failed. In 1176, the members of the League attacked the imperial army and at Legnano inflicted a terrible defeat on it. Frederick, at the end of expedients, tried in vain to detach the Pope from the League. Alexander nobly refused to betray his allies and their lofty cause. For the Emperor no other course was left but to negotiate the conditions of his submission to the Supreme Pontiff and of the liberty of the Italian states. These conditions were regulated in two separate treaties: one was signed with the Pope at Venice on August 1, 1177; the other was concluded with the Lombards, but not until June, 1183, at Constance.

[43] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1025. On the relations between the pope and the Lombard League, see John of Salisbury, *Epist.*, 288; *PL*, CXCIX, 389; *Liber pontif.*, II, 418.

Treaty of Venice

By the Treaty of Venice, Emperor Frederick I recognized the legitimate authority of Alexander III and promised to place back in their sees all the bishops who had been removed on account of their loyalty to Pope Alexander. In return, the Pope promised the antipope an abbey, and his so-called cardinals their restoration to the offices which they were holding before the schism. As regards property, the Emperor agreed to restore all he had unlawfully seized, but he was authorized to retain for another fifteen years, as a fief, the heritage of Countess Matilda. In the final session the Emperor made the following public declaration: "I confess that the imperial dignity unfortunately has not kept me from error. I was deceived by evil counselors; and, once deceived, I inflicted serious harm upon the Church, which I purposed to defend. I divided it. I now come back to the bosom of that Church. I recognize Pope Alexander as supreme pontiff and as father. I now conclude peace with the Church, with the King of Sicily, and with the Lombards." [44] The treaty made in 1183 with the Lombards was intended to regulate the details of that peace. The agreement was made on the following basis: the emperor had the right to maintain permanent agents in Lombardy; but he promised to respect the municipal liberties of the cities.

The Church in England

While Alexander III was fighting against the claims of the German Emperor, a similar conflict agitated the Church and

[44] Mansi, XXII, 122. Coming up to Alexander at the threshold of St. Mark's Church in Venice, the Emperor kissed the Pope's feet, as the traditional ceremonial prescribed. But altogether fabulous is the story that Alexander then placed his foot on the head of Frederick I, saying: *Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis, et conculcabis leonem et draconem.*

the state in England and ended likewise with the humble submission of the King.

Emperor Frederick, in the course of his campaigns against the papacy, had repeatedly turned his eyes toward Great Britain, hoping to receive help from King Henry II.

When, in 1154, the young Henry Plantagenet, only twenty-two years old, ascended the throne of England, the clergy of that country was not without anxiety concerning the religious liberties won by St. Anselm, which it feared would be threatened by the new ruler. These apprehensions were based on the King's entourage, especially on his mother's influence. She was the former Empress Matilda, daughter and niece respectively of two English kings who had persecuted St. Anselm, and widow of Emperor Henry VI who had imprisoned Paschal II. The personal character of the new King, as soon as he had occasion to show it, justified these fears.

Physically Henry Plantagenet was a contrast to Frederick Barbarossa. He was of medium height, robust, with muscular arms like those of a wrestler, callous hands, and always careless about his appearance. All this was far removed from the elegance and majesty of the German Emperor. But both of them showed the same distrust of the ecclesiastical power, the same jealousy of their own supremacy, the same asperity in defending it. However, in Henry's case, the scope of the claims was less vast; his policy was English, not worldwide. A diplomat as well as a fighter, a negotiator as subtle and crafty as he was brutal, the Plantagenet placed at the service of his ambition some remarkable traits of practical intelligence. Though he possessed undeniable qualities, certain other qualities were evidently lacking. Loftiness of view, sagacity and psychological acuteness in the appreciation and employment of men, a grasp of the supernatural point of view which must be taken by the leaders of the Church in the government of souls, were almost totally lacking in him.

St. Thomas à Becket

One of his first acts was the promotion of the archdeacon of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket, to the high office of chancellor.[45] This appointment was made at the prompting of the primate of Canterbury, Theobald, who exercised a considerable personal influence over the young prince and who had had occasion to appreciate the high worth of his archdeacon in the performance of his duties.[46]

Thomas à Becket was the son of a Norman settled at London. Serious studies, begun in his native city and continued in the schools of Paris, Bologna, and Auxerre, showed that he possessed unusual talent. Administrative functions and delicate missions, performed at Rome in the name of his archbishop, trained him in the handling of affairs and of men. His competency and zeal in performing his high administrative duties made the King at first think that he had met a suitable instrument of his absolutist policy. In fact, the new chancellor devoted himself wholeheartedly to defending the King's interests, leaving to the bishops, as the official representatives of the Church, the care of looking after its cause. A consummate legist and capable financier, ready to employ forcible measures, he repressed banditry, terrorized the usurers, favored agriculture, brought back security and prosperity to the kingdom. Magnificent, even ostentatious in his way of life, the statesman seemed at times to forget the churchman; the layman seemed to efface the cleric.

However, strangely enough, this man, who in his public life surrounded himself with great luxury, in his private life was

[45] In the beginning the chancellor of the Saxon and Danish kings was merely their archchaplain, who subsequently became their private secretary and thus the depositary of the state secrets. However, this office did not yet have well determined functions. Thomas à Becket increased its importance by the initiative and vigor of his administration.

[46] On the office of archdeacon in the twelfth century, see Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise,* Part I, Bk. II, chap. 20.

an ascetic. He practiced inexhaustible kindness toward the poor and irreproachable circumspection in his dealings with others.[47] Called by the King to take a hand in the appointment of bishops, he was never influenced by human considerations and never suggested any names except those of excellent men. But his tireless activity in the defense of the rights and prerogatives of the crown misled Henry II, who saw only one aspect of this character. First of all, Thomas à Becket was and remained to his last day a man of duty, perhaps carrying official loyalty to excess. No doubt at that time he permitted himself to be too much involved in that feverish concern with external affairs, against which St. Bernard warned his disciples.[48]

In short, the see of Canterbury and the office of primate of the kingdom having become vacant by the death of Theobald, the King of England thought that by confiding them to his chancellor he would find in him a servant agreeable to his ambitious views. But Thomas, at the first approaches made to him on this matter, decided not to leave the King ignorant of his dispositions. "Sire," he said to the King, "if you do this, I fear that your friendship for me may change into hatred; for, as I know, you wish to do certain things that I will not be able to approve quietly." [49] The King did not grasp the full import of these words. He persisted, and Thomas à Becket finally yielded, as the monarch's insistence was backed by that of the papal legate, Henry of Pisa. At Henry II's proposal, the monks of the cathedral of Christ Church of Canterbury, who had the right of selecting the primate, elected the chancellor Thomas as archbishop of the great Church of England. Their vote was confirmed (June 3, 1162) by a plenary assembly of bishops and higher barons, held at London under the royal presidency.[50]

[47] On Thomas à Becket's charity, austerity, and chastity while he was chancellor, see Robertson, *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket,* II, 6.

[48] St. Bernard, *De consideratione,* Bk. I, chap. 7.

[49] A. du Boys, *L'Eglise et l'Etat en Angleterre depuis la conquête des Normands,* pp. 210 f.

[50] *Ibid.,* pp. 210–14.

From that moment Thomas à Becket gave free rein to his ascetical inclinations, which until then he kept in the sanctuary of his intimate life. He wore a cowl like that of the monks; later it was known that he then began wearing a haircloth shirt under his other clothes. A more recollected life brought him perhaps deeper reflection upon the grave dangers of that absolutism which Henry II wished to inaugurate. Like that of Frederick Barbarossa, with its sad consequences actually being exhibited before his eyes, the absolutism of the Plantagenet seemed to Thomas to offend against the rights of the Church and the traditional liberties of the English nation. Soon he noted that King Henry, to subject nobles and clergy to a common law, violated the traditions and acted in opposition to the past.[51] Like the Emperor of Germany, he surrounded himself with advisers imbued with the principles of the Roman law,[52] who were thus enemies of the old national customs.

King Henry II of England

The first conflict occurred in connection with a question of taxes. One day when the King was in his city of Woodstock, in the presence of the primate and the chief men of the district, he declared that he intended thereafter to claim for the royal treasury a contribution which the sheriffs received annually from the generosity of the tenants of the nobles and of the churches as a becoming compensation for their laborious duties. The assembly in amazement kept silent. Thomas à Becket voiced their minds when he said: "Sire, Your Highness should not appropriate to yourself this money, which is offered freely, to officials worthy of consideration, by the people's gratitude." "By God's eyes," the King replied angrily, "this tax will be levied by my treasury." To this the Archbishop calmly replied:

[51] Luchaire in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. III, Part I, p. 49.
[52] *Ibid.*

"By the same oath, I swear that none of my people or tenants of my churches will give a single penny to your treasury." The King made no answer. But everybody felt that between the King and the Archbishop war was declared.[53]

Soon this war was waged on a question of jurisdiction. According to a privilege known in canon law as the *privilegium fori,* ecclesiastics could not be prosecuted, even for crimes against the common law, except before the ecclesiastical courts. The application of this privilege had given rise to some abuses. As the ecclesiastical courts never imposed the death penalty and in a general way showed themselves more clement than the secular courts, they gave the impression, unfounded in fact but believed by the people,[54] that they favored criminality among the clergy. A few years later the Church proved that she was disposed to look into the matter seriously and to apply effective remedies. But the King of England resolved to settle the affair in a brutal manner.

Of a sudden, on October 1, 1163, he convoked the parliament at Westminster and had it enact: 1. that in the future a royal officer would sit with the archdeacon whenever a cleric appeared before the latter to be tried; 2. that every convicted cleric would be handed over to the king's tribunal for the imposing of the penalty. At once the primate concerted with the bishops and a few days later, without expressing any view about the first of these enactments, declared to the King, in the name of the episcopate, that the Church of England could not accept the second proposal. But Henry II, in his usual offhand manner, had already changed his tactics and chose a new position. He merely required the bishops to accept the "old

[53] Robertson, *op. cit.,* II, 373. The nine volumes of Robertson's *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket* form a precious collection which dispenses the historian from the need of resorting to any other collection of historical sources for the life of this saint.

[54] Clerics were subject to spiritual penalties and a moral discredit, the very shame of which might well be considered as equivalent to more severe material penalties.

customs" (*consuetudines avitae*) of the kingdom. Under this vague expression he hoped to have accepted all the mischievous dispositions which his legists would claim to dig up from the old national law. Thomas à Becket saw the chicanery and replied with an equally vague phrase. The "old customs" (*consuetudines avitae*) would be accepted; but "with reservation of the rights of the clergy and of the Church" (*salvo ordine nostro et jure Ecclesiae*).

Henry saw that his trick had failed. But he had another resource left: to divide the episcopate. Two prelates devoted to the King, namely, Roger of York and Gilbert of London, exerted themselves actively to this end. Negotiators, sent to Rome, detached several cardinals from the primate's cause, obtained from the Pope a letter requesting Thomas to yield to the King so as not to disturb the peace.[55] The Archbishop agreed to drop the clause *salvo ordine,* but in its place he substituted *bona fide.* In other words, he agreed to conform to the "old customs," but with the understanding that "good faith" be preserved. The King declared that he was satisfied. Then, in a meeting of parliament, which opened January 30, 1164 at the royal castle of Clarendon, he had the "old customs" drawn up in sixteen articles and demanded that they be accepted. These articles declared, among other things, that every legal suit regarding the patronage of churches should be brought before the royal courts; that every accused cleric should appear either before a secular tribunal or before an ecclesiastical court assisted by a lay judge; that, without the king's permission, no bishop could leave the realm and no one of the faithful could appeal from a decision to the court of Rome and that no one holding a royal fief could incur any censure. The vacant benefices of bishoprics should be in the king's hands, and no episcopal election should

[55] Hefele thinks this letter was forged or falsified (*Hist. des conciles,* V, 981). A. du Boys considers it authentic (*op. cit.,* p. 235).

take place without his permission.[56] The Act of Clarendon is the fitting companion to the imperial Code of Roncaglia.

Thomas à Becket, at first considering that his conscience was sufficiently safeguarded by the clause *bona fide,* which the King had accepted, agreed to the observance of the "old customs" drawn up at Clarendon. But presently he blamed himself for this approval as a fault. About March 1, 1164, he pronounced against himself a *suspensio a divinis,* refrained from any ecclesiastical function, imposed fasts on himself, and wrote to the Pope to ask his pardon. In the month of April he received from the Pope a fatherly reply. The Pope absolved him for the past and directed him to resume his ecclesiastical functions.[57]

Death of St. Thomas à Becket

Shortly afterward we find him in France. He fled to King Louis VII, who welcomed him with veneration and offered him hospitality in the royal city of Sens. Henry of England wrote about the matter to the King of France, blaming him for receiving "the former Archbishop of Canterbury." "The former Archbishop?" answered Louis VII; "who, then, has deposed him? Assuredly I am a king as much as is the King of England; but I cannot depose the least cleric of my kingdom." Henry II did more than act against Thomas à Becket with the King of France. He threatened Pope Alexander III to enter into the obedience of the antipope Paschal; he approached the Emperor of Germany.

The Pope's position was difficult. He could not consent to surrender the Church of England to the hands of a Plantagenet, but he wished to make every effort to avoid a schism. In 1166 he conferred on Thomas à Becket the powers of papal legate in England, and Thomas was on the point of using these

[56] Mansi, XXI, 1187; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 983–88; A. du Boys, pp. 239–42.
[57] Mansi, XXI, 1193.

powers to excommunicate the King. The Pope wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury that he should not carry out his plan, and further, on May 19, 1168, the more completely to reassure the King, he suspended the primate's jurisdiction. Then the Plantagenet triumphed insolently. But the coarseness of his insolence was his undoing. He boasted that "he held the Pope in his hand"; he boasted that he had bought some of the cardinals; he even specified the price which such or such a one had cost him. He required that Thomas submit to the "old customs" purely and simply, without any reservation. Said Thomas: "Our fathers died for not suppressing the name of Christ; I will not suppress the honor of God. I will take the oath *salvo honore Dei et Ecclesiae.*"

On Christmas evening, 1170, Henry II, beside himself with rage, exclaimed: "Is there no one to rid me of this priest?" These words, an evident provocation to murder, were interpreted in this sense by four knights, who four days later went to the palace of the archbishop of Canterbury and menacingly demanded that he absolve all those whom he had excommunicated. The prelate refused to do so. But, as he entered his church at the hour of vespers, the four knights of the King approached him. Thomas forbade his people to make use of their arms. "The house of God," he said, "must not be defended like a fortress." He refused to flee, and slowly advanced to the choir. The murderers reached him when he was not far from the altar of St. Benedict. He fell under the sword thrusts, crying out: "Lord, into Thy hands I commend my soul."

At news of this murder, the King was seized with fright. The gravity of the crime, the tragic circumstances of its perpetration in a sacred precinct, made him fear that his kingdom would be placed under interdict. He protested that he had nothing to do with the crime. In expiation for his rash words and in testimony of his horror of the sacrilege, he remained in retirement in his palace for several days. He immediately des-

patched to Rome two chaplains who informed the Pope of the King's attitude and feelings. The Pope merely excommunicated the instigators and actual perpetrators of the crime, and sent new legates to England.

The King's Penance

But neither the Pope nor public opinion could be satisfied with these vague demonstrations. Miracles were accomplished at the saint's tomb. The King's conscience as well as his interest showed him that he could not limit himself to his first manifestations of repentance. He had first to annul the Constitution of Clarendon and re-establish all the privileges of the primacy of Canterbury. In the eyes of the English people, this did not suffice to appease the anger of God. Henry finally perceived this attitude. In 1174, four years after the murder, he went on pilgrimage as a penitent, and knelt at the martyr's tomb. Without wearing any of the insignia of royalty, he had himself publicly whipped in the presence of several abbots, bishops, and monks. The scene recalled that of Canossa. On the tomb of him whom the Church would soon honor with the title of saint, the King made more exact and more extensive promises in favor of the liberties of the Church. His young son added the guaranty of his own words to those of his father. "Everybody understood that not merely Henry II but also the kingship itself was pledging itself to the Church and was giving the Church her first charter of freedom." [58] The papacy proceeded to prove that it was ready to make to the kingship all the concessions that were compatible with its own independence. It conceded that, in certain clearly specified cases where public security was involved, the civil tribunals would have the right to judge and to intervene at the side of the ecclesiastical courts so as to assure the protection of the clergy.[59] In short, when, in 1177,

[58] Du Boys, *op. cit.*, p. 311.
[59] *Ibid.*

Emperor Frederick publicly renounced his tyrannical claims over the Church, the cause of the omnipotence of the state was finally overcome in England. Of all the troubles that had desolated Great Britain, no vestiges remained except the homage rendered on all sides to the memory of an archbishop martyr.

Third Lateran Council

Alexander III took advantage of this peaceful period to assemble a great council, which met at the Lateran from March 5 to 19, 1179. It was the eleventh ecumenical council. Its purpose was to strengthen the peace that had been won by the struggles of the preceding years and to assure its happy results by measures of reform and organization. The assembly, at which the Pope presided in person, counted almost a thousand members, including more than three hundred bishops. The Peace of Venice was ratified. Among the twenty-seven disciplinary canons that were voted, especially noteworthy is the canon regulating the conditions of papal elections. This canon decrees that "he without any exception shall be acknowledged as pontiff of the universal Church who has received two-thirds of the votes." Of course it was understood that these electors were only the cardinals. A certain number of decisions were made with a view to reminding clerics of the virtue of personal unselfishness; such were the canons forbidding them to receive any remuneration in return for installations, burials, marriages, the administration of the sacraments, and even teaching.

Other decisions were prompted by a desire to promote and develop works of charity and education. Churches and priests were specially set apart for the service of lepers. A decree was adopted that at each cathedral a free school should be maintained for the education of the poor. Concern for the social peace and for the protection of poor people inspired decisions about the Truce of God and a prohibition against the lesser

nobles introducing new taxes without the explicit authorization of the sovereigns. Lastly the council took up the question of warning Christendom against the attacks or dangerous infiltrations of the infidels and heretics, who were generally disturbers of the social order. Jews and Mussulmans were forbidden to have Christian slaves. Anathema was pronounced against anyone who should furnish arms, wood, or pilots to the Saracens; and the princes were called upon to repress by force the bands of Cathari who, besides professing harmful doctrines, were troubling society by the disorders of their lives, sometimes by their banditry.

Pope Alexander's reform and organizing activity was not limited to the holding of this great council. He entered into negotiations, though without success, with Emperor Manuel Comnenus for the reunion of the Churches of the East with the Roman Church. With all his power he favored the missions in Asia. He reserved exclusively to the Holy See the right of canonization, and he canonized, outside any general council, St. Thomas à Becket in 1173, and St. Bernard in 1174. As protector of the universities, he granted dispensations from residence to facilitate attendance by clerics.[60] As a distinguished canonist, he enriched the canon law with numerous decretals.[61] He greatly favored the Carthusian Order, whose rule he approved in 1176,[62] and encouraged the beginning of the Carmelite Order. And he showed great zeal for the repression and extinction of heresies.

Heresies

The measures which the Pope adopted in this matter call for some detailed notice. They are connected with the general history of the beginning of the Inquisition. Until the middle of

[60] Jaffé, no. 13,751.
[61] Jaffé lists more than 500.
[62] Jaffé, nos. 12,733, 12,794, 12,882.

the twelfth century the penalties inflicted on heretics were merely popular reprisals or exceptional measures for the public welfare. As one historian says, "convicted heretics did not undergo a penalty imposed by the law; there was neither crime nor penalty; a political measure of public safety was adopted to cut short what was regarded as a public danger." [63] The Inquisition has sometimes been represented as an institution devised by the Church, imposed by her on the Christian princes, and thus handed on in the public customs of the Middle Ages. The truth is that its establishment followed an altogether opposite development. The first executions of heretics had a popular character and often took place contrary to the will of the princes and of the Church.

Manichaeism, which was the great heresy of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, had, by the mysterious nature of its organization, by the boldness of its antisocial doctrines, and by the violence and dubious morals of its members, aroused in the people a distrust that gradually changed into hatred. These Cathari, these Patarines, these Arians, these Poplicani, these Piphles, these Bulgarians—such were the various names given the followers of this heresy in various countries—pillaged the churches, smashed the calvaries erected along the highways by the piety of the faithful, rejected the sacraments of the Church, preached against the family and marriage, had a kind of cult for an evil god, who could have been none other than Satan himself, and a rumor was current that crimes against nature were committed in their secret meetings.[64]

In 1040 at Milan the populace, after seizing a group of heretics, put up a stake in the public square and, in spite of the efforts of the Archbishop of the city, burned to death all those who refused to retract their errors. In 1077 at Cambrai the people seized a Patarine who had just confessed his heresy be-

[63] Julien Havet, *L'hérésie et le bras séculier au Moyen Age,* in his *Œuvres,* II, 134.
[64] On the doctrine of these Manichaean sects, see Vacandard, *The Inquisition.*

fore the Archbishop and, without waiting for the judicial decision, shut him in a hut, which they then set on fire. In 1114 the people of Soissons, taking advantage of the Bishop's absence, went to the episcopal prison, dragged out the heretics, lighted a stake outside the city, and there burned them alive. Guibert de Nogent says that the people were fearful of the clergy's indulgence toward them.

About the middle of the twelfth century, considering the progress which the Manichaean sects were making and the anti-Catholic and antisocial character of their doctrines,[65] the princes resolutely undertook a campaign against them and lighted stakes in France, Germany, Italy, and Flanders.[66] At Vézelay in 1167, the Abbot of the monastery joined this movement, swept into it by the crowd. Some accused persons had been convicted of heresy. A large multitude had followed the various phases of the inquiry. The Abbot addressed the people, saying: "What do you wish to be done with those who persist in their error?" A single cry was shouted by all: "Let them be burned! Let them be burned!" And that is what was done.[67]

Repression of Heresies

In a general way, "far from encouraging the people and the princes in their attitude, the Church through her bishops, teachers, and councils continued to declare that she had a horror of bloodshed." [68] Some canonists (Anselm of Lucca and the author of the *Panormia*) had, it is true, declared that the death penalty might be applied to heretics.[69] But these texts seem not to have exercised any influence beyond academic circles.[70] In

[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 52 ff.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[67] *Historiens des Gaules,* XII, 343.
[68] Vacandard, p. 37.
[69] Tanon, *Hist. des trib. de l'Inquisition en France,* p. 453.
[70] Vacandard, *loc. cit.*

1139 the Lateran Council[71] and in 1148 the Council of Reims[72] acknowledged that the civil power had the right and duty to repress the Manichaean heretics by corporal penalties. But this legislation did not suffice for the ardor of the princes who had provoked it. A curious fact is their accusation of the pope and the Church for weakness toward heresy and their repeated demands for new rigors. Among these kings, so fierce against the heretics, we must place in the first rank Louis VII the Younger.[73]

Alexander III at first answered him that "in churchmen indulgence is more fitting than severity" and reminded him of the scriptural counsel: *Noli nimium esse justus.*[74] Later, however, in the Council of Tours in 1162, upon the fresh insistence of the French King, who pointed out to him the Manichaean heresy "spreading like a sore in the provinces of France," the same Pope not only ordered the princes to punish the heretics with prison and confiscation, but enjoined upon the bishops and priests to drive them from the districts where they discovered them.[75] The King of England, Henry II, at the very time when he was in open conflict with the Pope and was himself excommunicated, showed himself a violent persecutor of heretics. "The importance which Henry attached to the matter is shown by his devoting, soon after, in the Assizes of Clarendon, an article on the subject, forbidding anyone to receive them under penalty of having his house torn down."[76] All the heretics he could seize he branded on their forehead and had them publicly flogged.[77]

[71] Mansi, XXI, 532.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 718.

[73] Guiraud, art. "Inquisition" in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cathol.*, II, 830.

[74] Martène, *Ampliss. coll.*, II, 683.

[75] Mansi, XXI, 1178.

[76] Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, I, 113.

[77] Vacandard, p. 40. Some have attempted to explain this severity of Henry II by supposing it was prompted by his desire to pose as a vigorous defender of the

Yet the growth of the heretical sects and their teachings, subversive of all authority, led Pope Alexander III to enter more resolutely on the road of repression. At the Lateran Council of 1179 the Pope, while mindful that the clergy should abhor bloodshed (*cruentas effugiat ultiones*), made the rulers and people promise to take arms against the Cathari of the countship of Toulouse, of Gascony, and of Albigeois. This was the final act preliminary to the Inquisition, which would be realized five years later by Pope Lucius III, and the prelude to the Crusade against the Albigenses, which would be undertaken by Innocent III.

Richard of St. Victor

Reluctantly, under pressure of the events, Pope Alexander adopted these repressive measures; but he was not unmindful that the best means for bringing back to the truth souls misled by the seductions of a false mysticism and a false doctrine, is the diffusion of true doctrine and true holiness. Both of these were then resplendent in the famous Abbey of St. Victor in Paris, chiefly represented, in the second half of the twelfth century, by a great theologian, Richard, and by a great poet, Adam.

Richard of St. Victor, a native of Scotland, had probably met the Italian Peter Lombard in Paris. The same devotion to the Church and to learning animated these two men; but their methods, corresponding to different needs, were different. Peter Lombard, a positive and discreet mind, by grouping and explaining in the light of common sense, in his book of the *Sentences,* a rich treasury of patristic texts, fortified men's minds against the intellectual troubles that might be aroused by Abelard's *Sic et Non.* Richard of St. Victor, a meditative and mys-

Church at the time when he was combatting Thomas à Becket. But even when he had been reconciled with the Holy See, he gave the same evidence of his hatred against the heretics.

tical soul, kept from wandering in the direction of the conceptions of a dubious spirituality the souls that were fond of contemplation and love.

Of an ardent nature, Richard of St. Victor reveals himself fully in the preface to his principal work, his treatise on the Trinity. "Let us advance," he says, "toward perfection. . . . Shake off your dust, daughter of Sion, O my soul. Erect the ladder of contemplation. Take wings, like the eagle. Raise yourself above the earth, soar even to heaven." [78] But, as has been said, "although Richard thinks especially with the heart, he knows that reason must guide the outbursts of love. He exercises his intellect on the mystery; he meditates, he reasons, he argues, he discusses." [79] "In faith," he says, "is the beginning of all good, but in knowledge is the consummation of all good. We should, then, hasten to pass, by all possible degrees, from faith to knowledge." [80] Yet Richard does not argue in the manner of most of those who went before him. He has little taste for the discussions of the School. He takes no part in the disputes that agitate the mountain at the foot of which his monastery was built. He knows the Greek and Latin fathers, but he never quotes a single author in his works. This procedure is explained by his mystical nature. We might say that, when he meditates, erudition becomes for him a weight that hinders the soaring of his thought.

These traits are to be seen especially in his *De Trinitate,* "so short to read, so long to meditate." [81] His conception of the dogma of the Trinity is original. It is based on the analysis of love. Love is the best that can be conceived in a being. God is essentially love. But to love oneself, is not truly to love. To love another with an exclusive love, without uniting oneself to him to love a third, without allowing a third to love him at the

[78] *De Trinitate,* Prologus; *PL,* CXCVI, 889.
[79] T. de Régnon, *Etudes de théol. posit. sur la Trinité,* II, 236.
[80] *De Trinitate,* Prologus; *PL, loc. cit.*
[81] T. de Régnon, *op. cit.,* p. 241.

same time that we do, is to mingle the love with selfishness. Pure and unselfish love implies a trinity. But this love, while indicating the personality of the three beings, implies between them a fusion of what is most profound in them, a fusion which, pushed to the infinite, must lead to unity of substance.[82]

This brief summary gives an idea of the method of Richard of St. Victor. His proofs are set forth rather to be meditated on than to be argued. We can more easily feel their force than set forth their logical connection. Unlike those of St. Thomas Aquinas, they did not pass into the classical teaching. But souls fond of silent reflection and psychological analysis will always be pleased to nourish their thought and their spiritual life upon them.

Adam of St. Victor

Quite different was the fate of the work of another monk of St. Victor, a contemporary of Richard. It was the poet Adam of St. Victor. A short time after his death, his hymns were inserted in the Paris Missal by Odo de Sully. In 1215 Pope Innocent III officially approved his liturgical work, and throughout the Middle Ages his poems had a place of honor in the Churches of Christendom.[83]

Adam of St. Victor, if he is not the author of the dogmatic and liturgical treatises attributed to him, is at least the most illustrious twelfth century representative of a revival of liturgical poetry. His birthplace is unknown. Having entered the Abbey of St. Victor at Paris, his musical and literary tastes led to his being appointed to the office of precentor, or choir director,

[82] *De Trinitate,* Part III. This explanation of the Trinity by love had been attempted by St. Augustine (*De Trinitate,* Bk. VIII, chap. 10). He later abandoned it and explained the mystery by intellect and will (*ibid.,* Bk. IX, chap. 3). For a thorough study of Richard of St. Victor's Trinitarian theory, see De Régnon, *op. cit.,* pp. 305–55.

[83] Guéranger, *Liturgical Year,* Christmas, Vol. I, p. 269.

which he held before 1130. He died after 1173. This is all we know with certainty about his life.

But what we possess of his work, about fifty hymns of undoubted authenticity, reveals the originality of his talent and the importance of the innovations which sacred poetry owes to him. With him the measured and rhymed prosody, which had been only an exception and an experiment with Notker and Abelard, developed and assumed, in the chants of the Church, as brilliant a place as had the ancient poetry based on the meter and quantity of the syllables. With him each piece is divided into stanzas composed of an equal number of verses, and each stanza is divided into symmetrical semi-stanzas. His verses rhyme according to various combinations. "Adam of St. Victor is a fertile inventor of charming rhymes, a 'smith' of strophes, as clever and harmonious as the greatest poets of the nineteenth century." [84] Moreover, to him belongs the honor of the musical composition of his hymns, or at least of their adaptation to gracious melodies, "which mark the close of the liturgical development of Gregorian art. In fact, if the melody still bears the imprint of the grace of the old cantilena, the rhythm and the tonality are almost entirely those of another art." [85]

Is this tantamount to saying that this mystical movement, so opportunely adopted by the school of St. Victor in opposition to the false mysticism of the Manichaean sects, was itself free from all danger? Not at all. Some members of that school exaggerated its tendencies. Achard of St. Victor wrote: "From the imperfection of reason proceeds the perfection of faith." And Abbot Absalom declared, with even greater exaggeration: "We succeed in knowing the cause of causes, not by philosophizing, but by living well. . . . The Spirit of God cannot reign where the spirit of Aristotle dominates." [86]

[84] Léon Gautier, *Œuvres poétiques d'Adam de Saint-Victor,* I, xx.

[85] Gastoué, *L'art grégorien,* p. 97. See the collection of these melodies in Prévost, *Recueil complet des séquences d'Adam le Breton.*

[86] Cf. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* I, 211 ff.

Alexander III, the vanquisher of Barbarossa and of Henry II, could observe, before his death, that the Church was not free from every peril. Even at Rome, in that democracy which for a while rallied to him so as to oppose the Emperor, he found cowardly treason. Shortly after the Lateran Council he was driven out of Rome and died in exile at Civita Castellana on August 30, 1181. His epitaph rightly calls him "the light of the clergy, the ornament of the Church, the father of the city and of the world."

Pope Lucius III

The five popes who followed one another from 1181 to 1198 (Lucius III, Urban III, Gregory VIII, Clement III, and Celestine III) were venerable pontiffs. But the first and the last were old men, the others had short pontificates. We can in a general way say of them that, having to govern the Church in the midst of difficulties of all sorts, they did not let the heritage of Alexander perish, and enabled Christendom to wait, without serious harm, for the great pontificate of restoration, that of Innocent III. Four events should be particularly noted during this period: the first organization of the Inquisition by Lucius III and Frederick I in 1184; two expeditions to the East under Clement III and Celestine III, and the latter's strife against the unjust claims of Emperor Henry VI.

Ubaldo Allucingoli, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, was elected pope September 1, 1181, under the name of Lucius III. He belonged to an illustrious family of Lucca. His experience in affairs, as he had shown in various important missions in France and Sicily, and at the court of Emperor Frederick I, the conformity of his views with those of his predecessor, quickly united the votes of his colleagues in favor of his election. But his advanced age and his long labors had exhausted his strength. During his brief pontificate, lasting only four years, he was

obliged to face serious difficulties, which came to him from the Roman population, the East, Emperor Barbarossa, and the heretical sects.

The popular tumult which had obliged his predecessor to leave Rome, did not permit him to stay there. He had the grief of seeing several clerics of his suite horribly maltreated by the rioters, who tore out their eyes. He was obliged to fix his residence at Verona and to direct the affairs of the Church from that place. There, shortly afterward, he received an embassy of the Christians of the East, asking for his support against the vexations of the Turks. The Pope turned to King Henry II of England, who, in atonement for the murder of Thomas à Becket, had promised to go on the Crusade; but the move remained fruitless.

The Emperor of Germany, since the Peace of Venice, seemed to abandon any policy of conquest, but his absolutism, limited to the confines of Germany, had scarcely moderated. The Pope was unable to count on him for the protection of the papal authority in Rome and for the defense of the Christians of the East. Furthermore, he had to fight Frederick's unjust claims to certain rights: namely, to appoint the archbishop of Trier, to keep indefinitely the heritage of Countess Matilda, to confirm in their offices the prelates instituted by the antipopes, and, during his own life, to have his son Henry crowned emperor. In a series of conferences between the Pope and the Emperor at Verona in October and November, 1184, the Emperor yielded on the two last points. The solution of the other questions was postponed to a later date.

A document of great significance was drawn up during these negotiations at Verona. Lucius and Frederick, both of them astute statesmen, could not be blind to the great danger with which the Church and society were threatened by the neo-Manichaean sects. A new period seemed to have begun in their

development. Aware of their strength amid the divisions of Christendom, "they now formed a communion to which they audaciously gave the name of Church. Although independent from one another, they had frequent dealings together to spread their beliefs or to strengthen their bond of unity." [87] After mature deliberation with Frederick I, Pope Lucius gathered at Verona a well attended assembly, including the Emperor, patriarchs, archbishops, and a large number of princes who came from all parts of the Empire.

With their approval, and especially with that of Emperor Frederick, Pope Lucius promulgated (November 4, 1184) a constitution against the Cathari, the Patarines, those who falsely called themselves the lowly and the poor of Lyons, the *Passagini,* the *Josephini* and the *Arnaldistae.* This constitution was more precise than the constitutions that had previously been issued by the popes and councils, and it remained in force for a long time, because Gregory IX later included it in the Decretals. It excommunicated, along with the heretics, those who protected them, those who had received the *consolamentum* from them,[88] those who styled themselves believers or perfect. Such of them as were clerics would be degraded, be deprived of their offices and benefices, and be turned over to the secular power for punishment. The laymen would be turned over in the same manner and for the same purpose to the secular arm, especially if they were *lapsi.*

Every archbishop and bishop, either personally or by his archdeacon or trustworthy persons, must carefully once or twice a year examine the suspected parishes, and they must have the inhabitants designate under oath the declared or secret heretics. These latter must under oath clear themselves of the suspicion and thereafter show themselves good Catholics. If

[87] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1124.

[88] This is what the Cathari initiation was called.

they refused to take the oath or if they later again fell into the error, the bishop would punish them. The counts, barons, rectors, city consuls, and consuls of other places must take an oath to aid the Church in this work of repression, under pain of losing their office, of being excommunicated, and of having interdict imposed on their lands. The cities that resist the bishops' orders in these matters should be placed under the ban of all the others; no other place must have dealings with them. Whoever receives heretics into his house should be declared infamous permanently, incapable of suing in court, of testifying, and of exercising any public office. Lastly, the archbishops and bishops should have full jurisdiction in a matter of heresy and should be considered as apostolic legates by those who, enjoying the privilege of exemption, were placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See.

"It has been rightly remarked that this decree was the severest that had yet been fulminated against heresy.[89] In fact, this measure did more than strike the heretics who were caught and those persons who assured them of their freedom; it ordered them to be searched for. Besides, this search was organized and was entrusted to the zeal of the bishops, who were responsible for executing it. Every heretic thus discovered must abjure, under pain of a punishment which the civil authority was to inflict. Obstinacy in heresy, complicity with heresy, were not merely faults of conscience, falling solely under spiritual sanctions; they became crimes repressed by graded temporal penalties. In truth, the Inquisition was established by this constitution of 1184. It was not yet the papal Inquisition which would be carried on, in the name of the Holy See, by inquisitors usually belonging to the religious orders, but the episcopal Inquisition, which each bishop was to conduct in his diocese by virtue of his ordinary prerogatives as defender and guardian of the

[89] Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* Bk. I, chap. 3.

faith.[90] This date (1184) therefore marks an important stage in the history of the repression of heresy." [91]

Pope Urban III

The very day of Pope Lucius' death (November 25, 1185) the unanimous vote of the cardinals chose as his successor Uberto Crivelli, archbishop of Milan, whose family had suffered greatly at the hand of the Emperor. The new Pope took the name of Urban III. The promptness and unanimity of this vote were regarded as a demonstration of hostility toward the German sovereign. Possibly the cardinals wished thus to express their desire for a more combative policy toward the Emperor than the policy of the late Pontiff. In any event, the monarch's displeasure soon showed itself. The new Pope replied with vigorous measures, and the two years of his reign were an almost truceless strife between the two powers.

On January 27, 1186, Frederick had the marriage of his young son Henry with Princess Constance of Sicily celebrated at Milan with great pomp. His political purpose was evident.

[90] We may distinguish five different forms of inquisition: 1. the episcopal inquisition, instituted in 1184 by the edict of Lucius III; 2. the legatine inquisition, organized in 1198 by Innocent III, who entrusted it to the Cistercians; 3. the monastic inquisition, regulated by the decree (April 13, 1233) of Gregory IX, who entrusted it to the Dominicans; 4. the Roman inquisition, established in 1542 by Paul III; 5. the Spanish inquisition, which became an instrument of national unification and royal absolutism.

[91] Guiraud, art. "Inquisition" in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cathol.*, II, 833. "After a general survey of the measures that paved the way for this constitution of 1184, in the course of the twelfth century, we can state the following: 1. that, at first averse to any temporal penalties and employing only spiritual ones, the Church did not subject heresy to material penalties until the end of the twelfth century; 2. that the Church was led to this revival of severity by the pressure exerted upon her, not only by pious kings who were submissive to her direction, such as Louis VII, but also by princes who were in frequent revolt against her, such as Henry II of England and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa; 3. that the inquisition was almost universally practiced by the civil authority before being established by an ecclesiastic decision" (Guiraud, *op. cit.*, II, 834).

Constance was ten years older than Henry and was very ugly, but she was the only offspring of the family of Robert Guiscard. Through her the Empire might annex southern Italy and prepare the way for the domination of the Hohenstaufens in the peninsula. The Pope replied by suspending from office the Patriarch of Aquileia, who assisted at the marriage and conferred the Lombard crown on King Henry. On June 1, the Pope suddenly settled the conflict about the archbishopric of Trier by himself consecrating the rival of the imperial candidate.[92] He protested sharply against the usurpation by Frederick, who was using the possessions of Countess Matilda as his own property. On the other hand, the Emperor closed the Alpine passes to prevent any communication of the Holy See with the German bishops, and his son Henry invaded the States of the Church, which he ravaged mercilessly. But so many disturbances and anxieties had ruined the Pontiff's health. Just when he was intending to issue an excommunication against the Emperor, he died suddenly at Ferrara, October 20, 1187.

Pope Gregory VIII

The election of his successor took place the day after his death. The choice of the cardinals was the chancellor of the Roman Church, the cardinal-priest Alberto di Morra, a native of Benevento, who took the name of Gregory VIII. The excessive tension of the relations between the Church and the Empire prompted the cardinals to choose a peaceful man, qualified for preparing a reconciliation between the two powers. The relations which the new Pope had had with the Emperor rendered him suited for this task, to which he devoted himself wholeheartedly. The taking of Jerusalem by Saladin, the news of which reached Italy the very day before the papal election, prompted the Pope to undertake a second mission: the or-

[92] Watterich, II, 666, 676.

ganization of a new Crusade. But Gregory VIII had scarcely time to put his hand to these two great works. He died December 17, 1187.[93]

Pope Clement III

His successor, Paolo Scolari, a Roman by birth, elected December 19 under the name of Clement III, continued Gregory's policy and reaped its fruits. He succeeded in ending the principal conflicts that divided the Holy See and the Empire, and he was also successful in terminating the exile of the papacy. More fortunate than his two predecessors, he was able to enter Rome and reside there in peace until his death. This work of pacification was imperative at the time when a new Crusade became necessary and required the union of all the ardent forces of Christendom.

The Third Crusade

The taking of Jerusalem by Saladin (October 2, 1187) was merely the last disaster of a campaign in which all the Christian states of the East had succumbed. The first half of the twelfth century had been an epoch of prosperity for those states. About the middle of the century, from 1158 to 1167, marriages between several Christian princes and various members of the imperial family of Constantinople seemed to assure the stability of their kingdoms.[94] But "the lack of coherence between the Christian states, the absence of a supreme and undisputed authority, the weakness of the aid sent from the West, enabled

[93] On Gregory VIII, see G. Kleemann, *Papst Gregor VIII.*

[94] In 1158 the king of Jerusalem, Baldwin III, married a cousin of Manuel Comnenus, the Princess Theodora. On December 25, 1165, Manuel Comnenus himself married—this being his second marriage—a daughter of Raymond of Antioch; in 1167 one of the Emperor's sisters was married to the king of Jerusalem, Amalric, the successor of Baldwin III.

the enemies surrounding the Christian colonies to prepare for their destruction." [95]

Bounded on the north by the Eastern Empire, which had imposed its suzerainty on Antioch, and by the atabeks of Mossul, who held the principality of Edessa, the Christian states had not previously felt themselves seriously threatened from the south and east. The situation changed when the atabek of Mossul, Nour-ed-Din, undertook to extend his domination over Egypt and especially when the domination of Egypt passed into the hands of one of his generals, Shirkuh, and later into the hands of the latter's nephew Salah-ed-Din (Saladin), who, after gradually subduing Syria and Mesopotamia, took the title of sultan. The Christian states now found themselves enclosed by enemies. Then it was that Amalric, king of Jerusalem, made appeals to Louis the Younger, Frederick Barbarossa, to all the sovereigns of Europe. But these appeals received no favorable reply. Unfortunately the internal disagreements between the Christian princes of the East did not abate, rather they increased. After Amalric's death in 1173, two parties, that of the Count of Tripoli and that of Guy of Lusignan, opposed each other in seeking the power. Saladin, an energetic and able general, inspired by a fiery religious fanaticism, took advantage of these divisions. His schemes were gigantic: his hope was to destroy all the Christian centers and settlements of the East and even to attack the West.

In 1187 the realization of this ambition did not seem impossible. Taking occasion of the pillage of a caravan by a Christian nobleman (Renaud de Châtillon), Sultan Saladin proclaimed the holy war in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt, and invaded the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Christian army was defeated in a great battle near Tiberias. In a few weeks all the cities of the kingdom surrendered, except Jerusalem and Tyre. Saladin himself directed the siege of Jerusalem, which capitulated at the

[95] Bréhier, art. "Croisades" in the *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.*, I, 822.

first breach. The Sultan entered the city October 2, 1187. He tore down the crosses, smashed the church towers, "purified" the mosques with incense. The work of more than a century seemed lost.

Pope Clement III assumed the mission of saving it. Already his predecessor, Gregory VIII, had taken the first steps. Fasts and public prayers had been ordered throughout Christendom; letters had been sent to all the Christian rulers; the Truce of God was proclaimed for seven years.[96] The hour had come to drop all quarrels pending between the Catholic states. Clement III gave the example by proposing a reconciliation with the Emperor, by offering to make all sacrifices compatible with the essential rights of the Church. The people and kings of Europe followed his lead. On January 21, 1188, Philip Augustus and Henry II Plantagenet, who were at open strife, gave each other the kiss of peace under the elm of Gisors. The King of Sicily and the Byzantine Emperor declared they would forget their old rivalry. Venice made peace with Hungary. Pisa and Genoa promised Pope Clement III to end their perpetual conflicts. The Archbishop of Cologne and the German princes who had opposed the Emperor swore to renounce their grudges.

Never had the Christian princes shown so unanimous an accord; never had the peoples manifested a closer union with their rulers. All persons who were not going to join the Crusade offered, as a subsidy for the expedition to the Holy Land, a tenth of their income and of their chattels.[97] From the name of the enemy against whom the Crusade was directed, this offering was called the "Saladin tithe." On the side of the Turks, the war also assumed a more general character. In the first two Crusades "the Christians had to fight only fragments of states, separated from one another by political and religious jealousies; now they had before them a leader whom the taking of Jeru-

[96] See the letters of Gregory VIII in Mansi, XXII, 419, 527, 531, 619.
[97] Mansi, XXII, 576.

salem had covered with glory in the Mussulman world and who had at his disposal the forces of Egypt and of Asia. Against the Christians he preached the holy war and organized a counter-crusade."[98] The Turk held the Holy City under his yoke; the infidel had seized the true cross. The war took on the proportions of a duel to the death between Christendom and Islam.

Unfortunately the enmities between the Christian princes, momentarily allayed, broke out again and prevented the complete success of the expedition. The Christian armies marched under the leadership of three sovereigns: Emperor Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, King Richard of England, who had just succeeded his father Henry II, and King Philip Augustus of France. But a tragic death removed the first as soon as he reached Syria; and before long disagreement broke out between Philip Augustus and Richard.

The German army had followed the route of the First Crusade, by way of the Danube and Bulgaria; then, after crossing the Hellespont, it penetrated Asia Minor and, under the command of the Emperor, seized the city of Iconium with the cry of, *Christus regnat! Christus imperat!* But on June 10, 1190, Frederick Barbarossa, who had reached the banks of the Selef, began to cross the stream on horseback. Of a sudden the horse stumbled and the horseman disappeared. When his body was recovered from the water, he was dead. The consequences of this death were disastrous for the German army. Some, in discouragement, embarked for Europe; the others, under the leadership of Frederick of Swabia, painfully advanced toward Antioch, where they were decimated by a frightful epidemic.

The kings of France and England had taken the sea route. Disputes broke out between them as soon as they met at Messina. These disagreements continued throughout the expedition. But the two rulers were brave. Richard more audacious,

[98] Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

Philip more able. The King of England pushed fearlessness to the point of imprudence, energy to the point of brutality. The King of France at times confounded policy, in which he was a master, with craftiness; and diplomacy, in which he was unrivaled, with duplicity. On the way to the East, Richard took by assault the city of Messina and conquered the island of Cyprus. At Messina the bluff intrepidity of his bearing won him the name of Coeur de Lion.

Following the directions of Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, who attached great importance to the possession of a port, the two kings went to join, before the walls of St. John of Acre, crusaders of all countries who had already arrived there, and at once began the work of investing the town. The siege was a memorable one, worthy of being celebrated in epic poetry, a siege which for two years detained the most valiant troops of the West and East before the city walls. In this enterprise Richard and Philip displayed their warlike qualities. "Have you seen King Richard?" the Mussulman knights used to say to their horses when they saw the animals rear up in fright. On July 13, 1191, the city capitulated. But the muffled rivalries that persisted between the kings of France and England became complicated by those which started quarreling between two Christian princes of the East, Guy of Lusignan and Conrad of Montferrat. Philip Augustus took the side of Lusignan; Richard, that of Montferrat.

With the city of Acre conquered, Philip decided suddenly to return to France, after swearing to Richard that he would respect his domains. A short time after this, Richard learned that his brother John Lackland was conspiring with the King of France. On October 9, 1192, he too embarked for Europe. In the East the quarrel between Lusignan and Montferrat became so bitter that Montferrat even allied himself with Saladin. After that, any thought of an attempt against Jerusalem was impossible. Even the death of Saladin in 1193 could not awaken

any hope of success. A new Crusade of Germans in 1197 merely enabled the Christians to retake all the coast cities. Thus at the close of the twelfth century the Christian influence in the East ceased. Of the four Latin states, two had perished: that of Edessa and that of Tripoli; and the Kingdom of Jerusalem had St. John of Acre as its capital. But the Christians had conquered two new states more to the west. These were the island of Cyprus, which Richard gave to Lusignan and which became the Kingdom of Cyprus; and the little Armenian territories of Cilicia, which composed the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia.

Pope Celestine III

Clement III did not live to see the outcome of the Crusade. Eight months after Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, he died at Rome,[99] and was immediately replaced by an eighty-five-year-old man, Hyacinth Orsini, cardinal-deacon of St. Mary in Cosmedin, who occupied the Holy See under the name of Celestine III. One of his first acts was the crowning of Emperor Henry VI, who succeeded his father Frederick. Faithfully adhering to the policy of his predecessor, the new Pope was determined to carry to the utmost limits his condescension toward the Christian princes at a time when the Mussulman danger rendered so necessary the union of all the European powers. This first act was a testimony of that policy. But the Pope showed himself inflexible when a grave law of the Church seemed to be involved. His attitude to Philip Augustus and to Alfonso IX of Leon in questions where the holiness of the marital bond seemed to him to be violated, gave proof of this.

The character of the new Emperor sorely tried the Pope's patience. Henry VI pretended to follow the political ideal of his predecessor, but by giving it even more chimerical propor-

[99] Great uncertainty prevails about the day of Clement III's death. See Jaffé, no. 16,674.

tions and by trying to bring it about through the use of more barbarous methods. Never had the German spirit attempted to realize a more fantastic project by more brutal means. The ambition of Barbarossa's son aimed at nothing less than to subject all the nations of the West and the East to the German Empire, rendered hereditary in the house of the Hohenstaufens. This gigantic plan included first the conquest of Europe by the subjection of Italy and the infeudation of England and France; then the absorption of the East by diplomatic negotiations and cleverly managed matrimonial combinations; lastly, the lowering of the upper German aristocracy by the suppression of its right of election; and, consequently, the transformation of the Empire into a unitary monarchy, hereditary, absolute, ruling the world. To attain his ends, Henry VI counted on terrorism, on deceit, and on the enthusiasm which would be sure to arouse the German people at the sight of such a prospect.

Following his marriage to a descendant of Robert Guiscard, he laid claim in 1189, upon the decease of King William (who died without children), to the Kingdom of Sicily. But the Sicilians had given themselves a national king in the person of a natural son of Duke Roger, the valiant Tancred of Lecce. The Pope's intervention in favor of Tancred and the vigorous resistance of the city of Naples defeated the enterprise of the German sovereign.

The arrest of Richard the Lionhearted by the Duke of Antioch at Henry VI's instigation, and his imprisonment by the Emperor entered into the same scheme. To obtain his freedom, Richard in 1193 at Worms was obliged to declare England a fief of the Empire. The efforts to arouse Richard against France were prompted by the same aim: to crush the Kingdom of France and so make it also a fief of Germany. The marriage of Henry VI's brother Philip of Swabia with Princess Irene, daughter of Isaac Angelus, and the moves made in 1194 to obtain the suzerainty of the kingdoms of Cyprus and Armenia

were evident attempts at seizure of the whole East. A prelate of the Empire, Conrad of Querfurt, wrote: "God has permitted that the domination of the most glorious Henry extend to the confines of the universe." [100] And the poet Walther von der Vogelweide, in words addressed to the Emperor, wrote: "Yours is the right to punish and reward. The other rulers are subject to you. You possess the earth, as God possesses heaven. You are His vicar." [101]

These panegyrists were silent as to the means by which the Emperor was working to establish his universal domination. They did not say that in Sicily he had the eyes of the young Prince William gouged out, that he opened and profaned the tomb of Tancred; that he had conspirators sawed in half; that by his orders others had been buried alive or crowned with a crown of hot iron. They dared not honor him for the savage destruction of Tivoli, given over to the fury of the Romans.[102]

By this act, Henry VI perhaps intended to win the favor of the populace in the Eternal City so as to make them a threatening force for himself against the Holy See. At any rate the Pope felt himself menaced by this invading power, which seemed to be endeavoring to crush him as in a vice. Celestine III protested against Henry's claims on Sicily. And he interceded for the liberation of King Richard. But, instead of heeding the counsel and threats of the head of the Church, the proud Emperor refused to take the oath of homage to the Holy See for his possessions in Sicily, and he forbade his subjects to make any appeal or journey to Rome. Probably he was about to engage in fresh outrages, when suddenly death stopped him, at the age of thirty-two. By a strange irony, he who wished to assure the heredity of the Empire left only one child, very young; the question of succession let loose war and anarchy.

[100] Luchaire, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
[101] *Op. cit.*, p. 10.
[102] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* Bk. II, Part II, chap. 4.

The grief which the aged Pontiff suffered from the brutal aggressions of Henry VI was not his only one. Celestine III also had to suffer from the conduct of Philip Augustus, king of France, and from that of Alfonso IX, king of Leon.

Philip Augustus, who three years before had lost his first wife, upon returning from the Holy Land asked the hand of the Danish Princess Ingeburg, sister of King Canute III, and married her at Amiens on August 14, 1193. This marriage seems to have been prompted by considerations of political interest. Philip, who was at that time contemplating a landing in England, wished to make sure of the assistance of the King of Denmark. All the contemporary testimonies agree in praising the beauty, virtues, and loftiness of character of the new Queen; she was then eighteen years old. The French King received her with manifestations of sincere joy.

But, soon after the marriage, a strange change took place in the King's sentiments. A feeling of violent repulsion seized him. The causes of this sudden aversion are a problem for history. The King desired to hand over the Queen forthwith to the Danish ambassadors who had brought her. She declared that she would not go with them but would remain in France and there maintain her rights and rank. Philip assembled his barons and bishops at Compiègne and from them obtained a judgment of obliging compliance, declaring Ingeburg's marriage null on the alleged ground that she was related to the King's first wife. When Ingeburg was notified of the decision, as she did not know the French tongue, she replied by exclaiming: *Roma, Roma!* The unjustly repudiated wife appealed to the Pope from the verdict extorted by the King. At the same time King Canute had recourse to Rome. The reply of Celestine III came promptly. The Pope declared as null and void the decision of the Compiègne tribunal and enjoined the King of France to take back his lawful wife Ingeburg. But the papal legates, commissioned with the duty of giving notice of the Pope's bull, were arrested

at their entrance into France and were interned at Clairvaux. Philip Augustus disregarded them and, to make his divorce irrevocable, he married the daughter of a great Bavarian noble, Agnes of Meran. By the King's order, Queen Ingeburg was taken to the convent of Fervaques and from there to a convent in Soissons. The affair of Philip Augustus' divorce continued under Innocent and brought about a rupture between the King of France and the papacy.

A similar conflict arose in Spain, where King Alfonso IX of Leon, in defiance of the prohibitions of the Church, had married his cousin-german, Theresa, daughter of King Sancho of Portugal. For five years the monarch resisted the repeated rebukes of the Holy See. Celestine III had to pronounce excommunication against him and to interdict his states. Alfonso IX finally submitted and married, but again without dispensation, a close relative, Berengaria, the daughter of the King of Castile, and the Holy See had to condemn this union also.[103]

These strifes had not distracted the Pope's solicitude from works of edification. With all his might he favored the foundations of the Knights of the Teutonic Order, the Fratres Pontifices, and various communities of Beghards and Beguines.

The rule of the Teutonic Knights had already been approved by Clement III. Pope Celestine, in recognition of the services they were rendering the Church, assured them of all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Templars. The Fratres Pontifices did not form a religious order properly so called; they were a body of charitable men, serving the bridges and their hospices, which they had built. The most famous community of Fratres Pontifices was that of Avignon, founded by St. Benezet.

The communities of Beguines, who did not receive their final organization until the beginning of the thirteenth century, go back to the last years of the twelfth century, at least so far as the Netherlands are concerned. The name "Beguines" was given

[103] Jaffé, nos. 17,241–43; J. Laurentie, *Saint Ferdinand III*, pp. 20, 22.

to widows and young women who, desiring to escape from the dangers of the world and not wishing to enter into a convent, formed communities, where they lived a life of recollection and asceticism, binding themselves, for the time of their sojourn in the association, to the practice of obedience, chastity, and poverty. They had no strict cloister or vows, and engaged in various works of charity and piety.[104] Some communities of Beghards were later formed upon the model of the communities of the Beguines.

Pope Celestine III died January 8, 1198. He was preceded to the grave by Emperor Henry VI, who died at Messina on September 28 of the previous year. From that hour the Empire was in a state of anarchy. Two powerful parties engaged in strife for the power: the first elected a Hohenstaufen, Philip of Swabia, brother of Henry VI; the other chose a Guelph, Otto of Brunswick, son of Henry the Lion. The choosing of a new pope at that critical juncture was a matter of exceptional importance.

[104] On the origin of the Beguines and the etymology of this name, which probably is derived from the name of one of their superiors, Lambert le Bègue, see Wetzer and Welte, *Dict. de théologie,* art. "Béguines."

CHAPTER X

The Pontificate of Innocent III (1198–1216)

THE cardinals did not require long deliberation before choosing the successor of Celestine III. The very day of the late Pope's death [1] (January 8, 1198), on the second ballot a majority of the votes were cast for one of the youngest members of the Sacred College, Cardinal Lotario de Segni, of the Conti family, which had already given to Italy some men of the sword and which subsequently gave several popes to the Church. The new Pope was only thirty-seven years old. He took the name of Innocent III. Educated in the schools of Rome, Paris, and Bologna, he there showed an equal aptitude in the study of literature, of theology, and of civil and canon law. In the various affairs entrusted to him by his uncle Pope Clement III, he had given proof of firm and tactful skill. In the pontificate of Celestine III, he employed his leisure in writing two highly regarded treatises: *De contemptu mundi* and *De sacrificio missae.*

Contemporary accounts picture him as being short, with pleasing features, large eyes, straight nose, small mouth, a sonorous voice of such fine quality that he could be heard even when he spoke in a low voice. The vigorous warlike character of his ancestors was tempered in him by the virtues and habits of his clerical calling. The purity of his faith, the strictness of his morals, the perfect correctness of his life, defied envious criticism. The youthfulness of the new Pope and his eminent qualities justified the highest expectations. From the moment of his election he was well aware of the immense task placed on

[1] Potthast, *Regesta,* III, 1. According to certain evidence, cited by Potthast (*ibid.*), Innocent III was elected on the day after Celestine's death; other evidence says simply, the day of the burial.

him. To free the city of Rome and the Papal States from the yoke of the factions, to complete the withdrawal of Italy from German domination, to carry on the Crusade against the infidels, to purify Europe of heresy, to maintain his predecessors' victories over the obstacles set up by the temporal powers: such were the labors that seemed to Pope Innocent III the most urgent. But evidently, in the mind of the young Pontiff, they were merely the indispensable conditions of a loftier mission whose providential hour seemed to have come: namely, to organize Christendom, in its public institutions as well as in each person's private life, among the laity as well as among the clergy, and to realize this organization by the establishment of a powerful hierarchy and also by the inspirations of a deep piety in souls.

Pope Innocent III was able to carry out his program so far as an ideal of perfection could be realized in the conditions in which the world then was. His pontificate was the culminating point of the papal primacy and of civilization in the Middle Ages. More than once he encountered formidable opposition that he had to overcome. Often, like the Israelites mentioned in the Book of Esdras, "with one of his hands he did the work, and with the other he held a sword." [2] But, to fulfil that double mission, no one was better prepared than this warriors' son so thoroughly a priest, than this brilliant student of the universities so filled with the sense of the living realities, than this young Pontiff whose whole ambition was to continue the work of those who had gone before.

Order and Peace in Rome

All these qualities of Innocent III were manifested in the early acts of his pontificate. The first of his cares was to restore the papal power in the city of Rome and in the Roman state. The

[2] Cf. II Esd. 4: 17.

undertaking was arduous. The Pope's authority encountered three powerful rivals at Rome: the prefect, who was officially dependent on the Emperor and received his orders from Germany; the Senate, which represented the people and sometimes depended on the populace; the great nobles, who labored especially for themselves and who, at the first signs of discontent, barricaded themselves in their houses which were transformed into fortresses.

When these three powers leagued together against the pope, he had no other course but to leave the city; when they fought against one another, the regular conduct of ecclesiastical affairs became extremely difficult. But these three powers were rarely at peace. Through political measures, in which firmness and accommodation were prudently combined, Innocent III succeeded in bringing them into submission. As the people had given him notable marks of friendly feeling on the occasion of his coronation and of the largess which he made on that occasion, the Pope profited by this popular movement to obtain from the senator who was governing the city in the name of the people an oath of vassalage to the Holy See. Representatives of the neighboring cities made homage to the Supreme Pontiff. The prefect of Rome, not wishing to be behind the others, took the oath the more readily since the Empire was vacant and since he did not know to which of the two claimants he should make a report of his administration.[3]

True, a recurrence of disturbances at critical hours could not be altogether prevented; they happened in 1203 and 1204, and were so serious as to oblige Innocent to withdraw momentarily from the city. But he was not discouraged. Even during his exile he came to the relief of the Roman middle classes by advances of money given to the merchants [4] and, upon his re-

[3] Innocent III, *Epist.*, Vol. VIII, no. 228; *PL*, Vol. CCXV.
[4] Potthast, *Regesta*, I, 2149.

turn, he founded a large hospital for the poor, confiding its direction to the Brothers Hospitallers of the Holy Ghost, recently founded at Montpellier by Count Guy. This hospital has since been known as *Santo Spirito*. Collections, taken up by the Pope's order in Italy, Sicily, and Hungary for the assistance of the poor of Rome who were menaced with famine, institutions for the aged and for children, a refuge for fallen women, all these works of charity won the people's affection for Innocent III. The Pope's subsequent journeys in the Patrimony of St. Peter, his generous favors and economic reforms there, completed the strengthening of his popularity and his power.

He showed himself as terrible to the unsubmissive mighty ones as he was charitable and kind to the weak. A former favorite of Henry VI, Markwald by name, seneschal of the Empire, was compelled by excommunication to abandon the property which he unjustly held in central Italy.[5] And Conrad of Urslingen, a Swabian knight, had to give up the Duchy of Spoleto, which the Emperor had bestowed upon him.[6] He who showed himself so formidable a lover of justice with regard to the lay lords, was no less strict with regard to the abuses of his own court. He dismissed the noble pages. He suppressed the secret offices where false bulls were fabricated.[7] All members of the Curia were forbidden to exact or solicit any fee, except the writers or expediters of the bulls; and these were paid at a fixed rate.[8] The Pope himself gave an example of strict simplicity at his table, in his personal household, in his whole life, and, that his orders should not remain a dead letter, three times a week he gave a public audience, that he might hear the complaints of his people or of his officials.[9]

[5] Mayr, *Markwald von Anweiler;* cf. *PL,* CCXV, 541.
[6] Innocent III, *Epist.,* I, 356; *PL,* CCXIV, 331.
[7] Potthast, I, 235; *PL,* CCXIV, 202, 221, 322, 430.
[8] *PL,* CCXIV, 80.
[9] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1192.

German Domination in Italy

The complete withdrawal of Italy from German domination was Innocent's second preoccupation. In this undertaking he was sustained by Empress Constance, the widow of Henry VI. She was a Sicilian by birth and, after her husband's death, she retired to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and associated her son Frederick in her government. To strengthen her situation, she renewed the oath of vassalage which bound that kingdom to the Holy See, renouncing the privileges which King William in June, 1156, had extorted from Adrian IV by the Treaty of Benevento. Then, in accord with the Pope, she labored to remove the detested Germans from the kingdom. But soon both she and the Pope encountered a terrible adversary in that Markwald who, driven from Central Italy, claimed that, by a will of Henry VI, he was authorized to assume the guardianship of Prince Frederick and the regency of the Kingdom of Sicily. The danger was increased by a conspiracy between Walther, the chancellor of the kingdom, and Markwald. A second excommunication, pronounced by Innocent III against the impostor, an urgent appeal to the Italian people, recalling the atrocities committed by the German troops in the time of Henry VI, the raising of an armed force at the expense of the Holy See, the aid brought by a French knight related to the Guiscard family, Gautier de Brienne,[10] and the death of Markwald, all these events gave Sicily peace once more, which was confirmed in 1208 by the Diet of San Germano.[11]

The destruction of the imperial power in northern Italy was the more easily realized, owing to the reconstitution of the

[10] On the enthusiasm aroused in Italy by the arrival of Gautier de Brienne and on the resolve taken by Francis of Assisi to enroll under the orders of the French knighthood, see Jorgensen, *Der heilige Franz von Assisi.*

[11] On these events in Sicily, see *PL,* CCXIV, 43, 46, 62, 67 f., 781–86.

Lombard League and the formation of a league of the Tuscan cities under the protection of the Pope.[12]

The rivalries of the two claimants who were at strife for the power in Germany favored the success of the work of independence undertaken by the Pope in Italy. Those rivalries also contributed to the exaltation of the papacy's power of supreme jurisdiction in political conflicts. This power had already been exercised by the head of the Church and would be exercised again to the great profit of the civilized world because, of all the social powers that were in a position to intervene for the peace of the world, the papacy was the only one that offered the guaranties indispensable for that mission.

The two candidates for the imperial power instinctively understood this fact. Each of them wrote to the Pope, asking for a confirmation of his election.[13] Innocent replied that the German nobles should agree upon a single candidate; that he offered them his cooperation to this end; but that, if they did not come to an agreement, he himself would take the matter in hand.[14] To the same effect he wrote a circular letter to all the princes of the Empire.[15] Innocent based his right of intervention in the imperial election on two grounds, one historical, the other logical: 1. the Apostolic See was the authority that transferred the Empire from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne: rightly therefore it intervenes in the functioning of an institution which owes its origin to that see; 2. to the pope belongs the privilege of crowning the emperor: logically he has the right to examine the person whom he is to consecrate.[16] An assembly of the German nobility, held at Bamberg, tried to answer these arguments, or rather to elude their force, by

[12] Innocent III, *Epist.*, I, 555; *PL*, CCXIV, 507.
[13] *M. G., Leges*, II, 20, 201, 203 f.; *Gesta Innocentii*, no. 22; *PL*, CCXIV, 36.
[14] *M. G., Leges*, Sec. IV, Vol. II, p. 4.
[15] Potthast, p. 66.
[16] *Registr. rom. imper.*; *PL*, CCXVI, 1025–33.

taking their stand on the ground of the pure Roman law and of the national independence. The Pope replied to the Bamberg manifesto by a letter which he sent in March, 1202, to the Duke of Zahringen, and in which he clearly and precisely set forth the limits of the right of intervention which he claimed for the Holy See. He did not lay claim to the right to be judge of the circumstances and the validity of the imperial election; that is a matter of state which concerns only the nation; but he maintained his right to pass judgment on the capacity of the person elected. The emperor is the born defender of the Holy See; the Holy See has the right to reject a defender incapable or unworthy.

Applying this principle, Innocent III, in his famous *Deliberatio,*[17] examined the titles of the claimants and, considering their respective qualities, decided in favor of Otto IV. But the party of Philip of Swabia did not submit, and Otto did not reign without contest until after the death of Philip, who was assassinated (June 21, 1208) by Otto von Wittelsbach. On October 4, 1209, the Pope, after receiving from him the oath to respect the rights and liberty of the Church, crowned him emperor. But Otto did not fulfil the hopes which the Pope had founded on him. By perjury and ingratitude, the like of which is seldom to be found in history, he insolently turned against his benefactor, seized the possessions of Countess Matilda, of the counts of Ancona and Spoleto, utterly disregarded the Concordat of Worms, and attempted to seize Sicily. In November, 1210, the Pope excommunicated him. The nobles, who also had occasion to complain of his tyranny, elected in his place, in 1212, the ward of Innocent III, that is, Frederick II. Otto continued his struggle for the power until his death in 1218. In fact, Innocent's candidate had betrayed the Pope's confidence as he had betrayed the confidence of his subjects; but the principle of papal intervention, within the limits in which Innocent had

[17] *PL,* CCXVI, 10.

just defended it, triumphed in the minds of all impartial judges.

Repression of Heresy

Independent in his domain, freed from the Germanic pressure in Italy, the acknowledged arbiter of Christian princes, Innocent III was now able to exercise a more decisive action against heresy; to attempt a more vigorous offensive against Islam; to speak to sovereigns with greater authority, reminding them of their duties to the Church and to the people; to take up again, on a vaster scale, the traditional work of the papacy for the reform of morals in the Church and the Christian organization of the world; in a word, to carry out, on its positive side, the program which he had outlined, or rather which circumstances had imposed on him, at the beginning of his pontificate.

In the very first year of his reign, on the very soil of the domain of St. Peter, the Pope found himself face to face with the Manichaean heresy. The consuls of Viterbo had favored its establishment in that city. Pope Innocent, in this connection, wrote the forcible letter that issued from his chancery. "You fear neither God nor men," he says. "Wallowing in your sin, like a beast of burden in its filth, you are more treacherous than the Jews, more cruel than the pagans. The Jews crucified the Son of God only once; you crucify Him daily in His members." [18] The biographer of Innocent III explains the Pope's indignation thus:

He was unwilling that anyone should be able to reproach the Roman Church with tolerating heresy in its own domain; that anyone should be able to say to her: "Physician, begin by curing thyself," or "First take the beam out of thy own eye." And so he adopted severe measures. Every heretic who was found was arrested and

[18] Potthast, I, 981 f.; Theiner, *Vet. monum. Slav. merid.*, I, 48.

brought before the secular tribunals, there to be judged. Those who were convicted had their property confiscated. In case of relapse, they were expelled from the city. This rigorous statute, applied to the entire papal Patrimony, effected the disappearance of every trace of heresy.[19] From that hour the States of the Church no longer saw those mysterious Patarines who, condemning marriage, the family, and the most solid bonds of society, had all the appearance of real anarchists.[20]

Scattered in different sections of France and Italy, the neo-Manichaean heresy spread especially in Provence. In that sunny land, where passions are strong and fiery, where the faith is manifested with greater sternness and outward show, and where everything, good as well as bad, easily is deified, this doctrine of the "double God," so daring in its claims and so licentious in its practice, which, eight centuries earlier, had seduced the restless youth of St. Augustine, found easy access. The poetry of the troubadours, which in Provence was then a sort of prelude to the literary awakening of Europe, became its harmonious mouthpiece. The sons of knights who, at the time of the First Crusade, following Raymond IV of Toulouse, would not yield to anyone the honor of being the first to go up to the assault on Jerusalem, followed the new movement.

Raymond VI of Toulouse, a descendant of that austere knight of Christ, declared himself on the side of the heresy. Not that he sought to deny the faith of his fathers. On the contrary, he heaped favors on religious congregations, piously assisted at the offices in church, and, when he met a priest bringing communion to a sick person, he dismounted from his horse to adore God present in the host. But he allowed the preachers of the sect to deliver sermons at night in his palace, showered his money and his favors on them, and had his son brought up in

[19] Potthast, I, 3187.

[20] Lea, in his *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (Bk. I, chap. 3) considers the Manichaean doctrines of the twelfth century a return to barbarism.

the new doctrines. Besides, this great noble led a most dissolute life; his court was filled with the companions of his debauchery and the effects of his vicious conduct. His attitude of mind may perhaps be seen in a reply he once made to Arnold Amalricus, abbot of Grandselve. The Abbot was speaking to him in denunciation of a heretic guilty of defiling an altar and of blaspheming in public. "God forbid," said Raymond, "that, for a deed of this sort, I should ever be severe to a compatriot."

Knight and troubadours, justly proud at having their own language, literature, and special civilization without ceasing to be Frenchmen, would no doubt not be sorry at having their own separate religion without quitting the great Church. Such at least may have been the attitude of a large number of them. Some of the nobles and poets refused to participate in the new errors, or they withdrew with great ado as soon as they perceived the danger. Such was that Arnold Amalricus, a converted troubadour, who subsequently became one of the most earnest foes of the heretics.

At any rate, the songs of the troubadours of Provence, which were destined later to awaken the lyrical genius of St. Francis of Assisi,[21] were powerful instruments of propaganda for the heresy; because the minstrel, who roamed from castle to castle, from village to village, retelling his war songs and his songs of adventure, in the twelfth century enjoyed almost the role which the orator, the journalist, or the pamphleteer fills in our day. Through the minstrel's songs, a hundred times repeated, as well as by the regular preachers of the sect, the people accepted the doctrine of the "double God." [22]

[21] "Francis went so far in his admiration of the Provençal 'gaie science' that he had made for himself a two-colored minstrel's costume, intending to wear it in the circle of his comrades" (Jorgensen, *op. cit.*, Bk. I, chap. 2).

[22] The oath "by the double God" is still used in Provence by peasants who have no notion of its meaning.

The Albigenses

At the outset of the thirteenth century, the heresy of the neo-Manichaeans or Cathari was spread all through southern France, from Marseilles to the Pyrenees. Avignon, Marseilles, Montpellier, Béziers, Albi, Carcassonne were its principal centers. As its followers were particularly numerous at Albi, where they were openly protected by Roger II Trencavel, viscount of Béziers, they received the name of Albigenses. The tolerance prevailing in a special manner in the south of France [23] enabled them to organize there more completely than elsewhere. They set up their hierarchy in opposition to the Catholic hierarchy. These bishops were assisted by deacons who, with an established residence in a central village, radiated through the country round about, preaching the doctrine and presiding at the initiation ceremonies. Lower in rank than the clergy, were two categories of the faithful: the "perfect," who had received the *consolamentum* and to whom the full doctrine had been revealed, and the "believers," who were adherents rather than initiated members.

Besides the heresy of the Cathari or Albigenses, another heresy arose, that of the Waldenses. The latter must not be confused with the other; in fact, at the beginning it posed as the adversary of the Albigensian heresy. The Waldenses, at first known under the name of "the poor men of Lyons," owed their origin to a rich merchant of Lyons, Peter Waldes, who about 1170, moved by a desire to reform the Church, began to preach poverty and the reading of the Gospel. "Little by little the radical tendencies of their doctrine were accentuated. By dint of simplifying Catholicism, they went almost to the point of suppressing it. They finally rejected the veneration of the

[23] On the popular tolerance and that of the local authorities in the Midi, see Luchaire, *Innocent III, la croisade des Albigeois,* pp. 1–8.

saints, purgatory, transubstantiation, the priesthood, and the hierarchy." [24] When Pope Lucius III excommunicated them, they left the region of Lyons and spread in Franche-Comté, Burgundy, Dauphiné, the northern coast, the southern coast, and even into Provence and Narbonne (the Narbonnaise).

The progress of the heresy made it bold. Some Albigenses invaded the churches of Castelnaudary and there sang their hymns, robbed the Bishop of Toulouse of his tithes, threatened the Béziers chapter in its cathedral, and obliged it to fortify itself there. In a sort of council held by the Albigenses at St. Felix of Caraman, a certain Nicetas, heretical bishop from Constantinople, came for the purpose of establishing a permanent bond between the Cathari of southern France and those of the Greek Empire. The peril of such an organization supporting a doctrine so ruinous of Catholicism and even of all social order, could not leave the papacy indifferent. Yet the papacy, before resorting to rigorous measures, resolved to exhaust the means of persuasion.

The decree of Lucius III regarding the search for heretics and for their repression had remained almost a dead letter. The Church, ever prompt in proclaiming the rights of truth, because her love for God impels her to do so, is ever slow in enforcing those rights by rigor, because her love for man restrains her. In the middle of the twelfth century, St. Bernard had attempted to convince the neo-Manichaeans of the Midi by preaching the true doctrine at Bordeaux, Perigueux, Cahors, and Toulouse. His harvest was mostly one of insults.[25] In 1178, Alexander III, at the request of Raymond V, count of Toulouse, and of the kings of France and England, had sent into Languedoc a cardinal legate, provided with full powers to repress the heresy. The submission of a few heretics, on whom

[24] Luchaire, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[25] Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* II, 222.

were imposed public penances, pilgrimages, and fines, was the sole result of that mission, which had scarcely any influence on the general movement of the heresy.

In 1198, Innocent III conferred upon some Cistercians, sent as legates into the countship of Toulouse, the power to apply there all the sanctions thus far decreed by the councils against the heretics;[26] but he at once reminded them that he wished the conversion of the sinners, not their extermination. He wrote to them, saying: "We order you to choose men of proved virtue. Taking Christ's poverty as their model, dressing humbly, but filled with ardor for their cause, they will go to find the heretics and, by the example of their lives as by their teaching, will strive, with God's grace, to snatch them from error."[27]

Shortly afterward, in 1207, two Spaniards (Diego de Acebes, bishop of Osma, and Dominic de Gusman, the subprior of his chapter), coming from Rome, went to Languedoc to carry out this program. After a few months of his ministry in France, Bishop Diego had to return to Spain, and there died almost immediately. Dominic continued the enterprise alone. Born in 1170, the new missioner was in his full vigor. Says a witness of his life: "His stature was medium, but his face was beautiful. His hair and beard were light blond. He was always radiant and pleasant, except when he felt moved with compassion by some affliction of his neighbor."[28] He went barefoot, begging his bread, preaching along the roads and at the street corners of cities and villages, after the manner of the divine Master. At first the heretics made fun of him, threatened him with dire harm, and attempted to carry out these threats. The calm serenity of his soul, his imperturbable fearlessness in the midst of dangers, special divine graces which many times confirmed his words by miracles, kept him from all evil. But in the early days of 1208 a tragic event, the assassination of one of the

[26] Potthast, no. 95.
[27] Luchaire, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
[28] Cf. Lacordaire, *Vie de S. Dominique*, p. 219.

Pope's legates, the Cistercian monk Pierre de Castelnau, led Innocent III to modify his attitude.

Pope Innocent's plan, as we find it clearly formulated in his correspondence with his legates, was not to make a direct attack on the powerful Count of Toulouse, but to win, one after the other, the barons of the south and the local middle classes, so that Raymond, finding himself abandoned, would be converted, or that he would more easily be convinced.[29] But, on the one hand, most of the nobles who were appealed to showed themselves refractory or indolent; on the other hand, the Count of Toulouse answered these tactics by showing himself more obdurate than ever. The Pope then resorted to spiritual sanctions. Through his legate Peter of Castelnau, he pronounced a sentence of excommunication, which he confirmed by a vigorous letter to the Count (May 29, 1207).[30] The Pope wished to frighten him, and seemed at first to have succeeded.[31] Raymond promised to amend and entered into negotiations with the legate; but his promise concealed his plans of revenge. One day when Peter of Castelnau, weary of Raymond's evasions, threatened to break off the conferences, the Count exclaimed angrily aloud in the presence of his people: "Take care; wherever you go, by land or by water, I will have my eye on you." A few days later (February 16, 1208), as Peter of Castelnau, after celebrating mass, was about to cross the Rhone at St. Gilles, one of Raymond's attendants struck him with a lance. The wound was mortal. "May God forgive you as I forgive you," exclaimed the martyr before expiring.

This outrageous attack was exceptionally grave. The murder of an ambassador has always been considered, among all races, as a *casus belli* in the highest degree. In the present circumstance, it was also the consummation of a series of accumulated attacks upon the Catholics for a century past. It took place at

[29] Innocent, *Epist.*, XI, 232.
[30] Potthast, no. 3114.
[31] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1279.

the time when the papacy had been unsuccessfully employing all peaceful means for suppressing the heresy. Raymond of Toulouse, moreover, from the standpoint of responsibility, found himself in a situation similar to that of King Henry II of England after the murder of Thomas à Becket. The normal method of repression would have consisted in a common action of the Pope and the King of France, the suzerain of the Count of Toulouse. But Philip Augustus, who was several times requested to make a military display in the Midi,[32] had refused to do so, alleging his war with John Lackland. Innocent III then decided to write, not merely to the King of France, but to all the barons and bishops of the kingdom, the following letter:

> Although the Count of Toulouse for a long time past has been excommunicated on account of many enormous crimes, yet, as certain indications point to his guilt in the murder of our holy legate Peter of Castelnau, since he publicly threatened him with death and since he has admitted the murderer into his intimacy, we once again declare him excommunicated. And, as the holy canons do not wish that anyone keep faith with him who does not keep faith with God, we, by our apostolic authority, free from their oath all those who have promised him fealty, society, or alliance. Without violating the rights of the chief lord, all Catholics have permission not only to pursue his person, but also to occupy his domains.[33]

This serious document contains in germ all the events that followed.

The Crusade against the Albigenses

Historians have expressed divergent opinions about the character of the Crusade against the Albigenses. These divergences appear less marked if we attentively distinguish three periods

[32] The Pope had written four times on this subject to Philip Augustus: May 31, 1204, January 16 and February 7, 1205, and Novembeer 17, 1207.

[33] Innocent III, *Epist.*, XI, 26–33.

in that undertaking. In the beginning the religious point of view predominated: heresy is what they wished to fight in obedience to the Pope. Then gradually political interest and racial rivalry mingled with the religious motive. Finally this political interest became preponderant; the Crusade was changed into a dynastic war, which especially profited France and endangered the results obtained in favor of the Church. From one end of France to the other, in all the regions of the center and north and, a noteworthy fact, also in several regions of the south, the Pope's appeal was heeded.

Raymond of Toulouse was greatly alarmed and asked for reconciliation with the Church. In penitential garb, bare to the waist, he knelt at the threshold of the Church of St. Gilles, where the remains of Peter of Castelnau had been laid. Touching the holy relics, he swore to obey the Pope and his legates. Ten days later, after receiving from the new Papal legate, Milo, absolution from his excommunication, the Count entered the church and promised, on the holy Gospels, "that when the Crusader princes should arrive in his lands, he would carry out all their injunctions." [34] This scene took place on June 30, 1209. But these promises were too unqualified to be fulfilled. We may well doubt whether they were sincere.

At the end of that same month, the great army of the Crusaders, with flying banners, arrived in Provence and marched on toward the viscounty of Béziers, the head of which, Raymond Roger, had openly declared himself the protector of the heresy. The purpose of the legates, who at the outset were the real leaders of the expedition, was at first to impose on the heretics a salutary fear, by an example in the case of the most insolent of their defenders. The onset of the Crusaders upon the high walls of the city was irresistible. At the first assault (July 21, 1209) the city was taken. But soon the fact became apparent that the leaders were not masters of their troops. Pillage, mas-

[34] Mansi, XXII, 771, 774–84.

sacre, and incendiarism marred this first victory. "In the army," wrote the legates, "are too many people who are united with us in body, but not in spirit." [35] From Béziers the army marched upon Carcassonne, where Viscount Raymond Roger had fled. The city surrendered; but this time the legates succeeded in restraining the impetuosity of the soldiers. Persons and property were respected.[36] The Viscount of Béziers was taken prisoner and died a short time after.

The land was conquered, and it now had to be put into safe hands. For this purpose the legates assembled the Crusader princes. The suzerainty of Languedoc was offered to the Duke of Burgundy, to the Count of Nevers, and to the Count of St. Pol, one after the other. But they declined to be invested with this fief that had been conquered by a massacre. A lesser lord of the Île-de-France, possessing domains in England, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, after making some objections, finally accepted.

Simon de Montfort

He who would thereafter incarnate the Crusade movement in his own person was an earnest and sincere Catholic, an army leader of the first order, a diplomat full of resources. His contemporaries praise his faith, which was genuine although a little imperious, his strict chastity, his daring in combat, his obstinacy in strifes, his prudence in councils. But an excessive harshness, too pronounced attachment to his personal interests, an undisguised contempt for the southern race, which he judged to be inferior and which according to him could be regenerated only by the introduction of northern institutions, led him to

[35] Quoted by Luchaire, p. 141.

[36] The sack of Bézier was a most regrettable act of war. Responsibility for it rests partly on the nobles placed at the head of the northern army, who wished to impress the imagination of the southern people by a terrible example; it rests also partly on the rabble which those lords had too readily enrolled in their forces.

exceed the Pope's instructions and alienated from him the good will of the people that he was charged to pacify. Simon de Montfort's moral nature was revealed in his outward appearance. The chronicler Pierre des Vaux de Cernay pictures him as "tall, with distinguished features, strong shoulders, a body of unbelievable vigor and suppleness." [37]

Such a man sometimes pushed rigor to the point of ferocity. But we must also acknowledge that at the same time his foes went even to the point of savagery.[38] His procedure was not always in accord with that of the papacy. But this true knight possessed wonderful traits of valor and faith.

> At the siege of Carcassonne, a crusader was lying at the bottom of a ditch, with a broken leg, under a hail of stones being thrown from the city. Simon, followed by a single squire and risking his life, went down into the ditch, carried out the unfortunate fellow, and thus saved him from certain death. . . . One Sunday, after hearing mass and receiving communion, he was setting out to fight at Castelnaudary, when a Cistercian monk spoke a few words of encouragement to him. "Do you think I am afraid?" said Simon. "This matter is an affair of Christ. The whole Church is praying for me. I know that we cannot get the worst of it." [39]

From 1209 to 1212 he brought under his power nearly all the fortresses of Languedoc. Raymond held only Toulouse and Montauban.

Meanwhile Innocent III was trying to bring the Count of Toulouse to better dispositions. In 1211 a council at Narbonne made a new attempt at conciliation with him. He was promised the full restoration of his possessions on the single condi-

[37] Pierre des Vaux de Cernai, *Hist. Albig.*, chap. 18; *PL*, CCXIII, 570.

[38] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1283. At the Lateran Council, one of the chiefs of the Albigenses, Count de Foix, boasted of having put to death 6,000 crusaders who had been taken by surprise in an ambush. Another knight of the Midi, Arnold of Villemur, declared that he regretted he had not had enough of his prisoners' noses and ears cut off. Cf. Vaissète, *Hist. de Languedoc*, VI, 420.

[39] Luchaire, pp. 185–87.

tion that he would expel the heretics from his states.[40] But Raymond was deaf to these offers. The proposals made at Narbonne were repeated in an assembly held at Montpellier. The Count of Toulouse appeared to accept what was proposed to him. But the next day, just as the required conditions were about to be detailed, he suddenly left the city. During the summer of 1212, the Pope, wishing to give him a last proof of his spirit of justice, declared that he took under his protection the Count of Toulouse against Simon de Montfort himself. The Pope's reason was that Raymond, although accused of heresy, had not been convicted of the charge: therefore his possessions must simply be sequestrated and not treated as definitely conquered territory. But Montfort took little pains to conform to this decision. Marching forward, he installed himself as master in the cities and in the fortified castles. And he had statutes enacted by assemblies in which the southerners had their place but in which he imposed on the conquered districts the customs of Paris, the usages of the north. "He presented himself as the savior who came to institute order, centralization, and peace in place of the feudal anarchy from which the former counts of Toulouse had been unable to preserve the country." [41] Such measures, however cleverly set forth, exasperated the populations of the Midi. Catholic nobles took the side of Raymond.

In 1212, King Peter II of Aragon, alarmed by the progress of Simon de Montfort and by the danger threatening the provinces of the Midi, intervened on behalf of his brother-in-law Raymond VI. "The two slopes of the Pyrenees were then only a single country. Languedoc, Catalonia, and Aragon had the same tastes for poetry and the same literary language. Across the Pyrenees an active exchange of troubadours and knights, of ideas, songs, and merchandise took place continually.[42] The Pope himself again intervened. He enjoined the

[40] Mansi, XXII, 813.

[41] Luchaire, p. 190.

[42] Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. III, Part I, p. 272.

conqueror of Languedoc to repair the losses he had caused in several counties which, as fiefs, depended on the Kingdom of Aragon.[43] Innocent III did even more. He judged that the Count of Toulouse had been sufficiently punished, and he ordered Simon to end his expedition and to take part in a Crusade against the Saracens of Spain. In this connection he wrote to the Archbishop of Narbonne (January 15, 1212) as follows: "Come to an understanding with the illustrious King of Aragon, so as to draw up terms of peace. Endeavor to pacify all Languedoc. Discontinue stirring the Christian people to the war against heresy." [44]

"This letter is of the highest importance. It shows that, in the mind of Innocent III, the Crusade was ended at the close of 1212. Its continuance for another sixteen years was in spite of the Holy See. In some respects, this expedition was like the Crusade of 1204, which, instead of advancing to Jerusalem, as the Pope wished, ended at Constantinople. Political interests got the best of the religious interests; the covetousness of the princes was considered rather than the defense of Christendom. The Crusade, after 1213, was merely an enterprise undertaken by the nobles of the north to dispossess the nobles of the Midi; by the kings of France to join to the crown the magnificent province of Languedoc." [45]

While disapproving the continuation of the war, Innocent III still watched over it, to defend the oppressed and repeatedly to counsel the conquerors to the use of moderation and justice. In 1215, stripped of their lands by the victory of Simon de Montfort, Raymond VI and his son begged the protection of the Pope, whose justice and charity they knew; their hope was not disappointed. To the petitions of the Count of Toulouse, Innocent III replied: "Do not despair. If God grants me a long enough life so that I may govern according to justice, I will

[43] Innocent III, *Epist.*, XV, 212–15.
[44] *PL*, CCXVI, 744; Potthast, no. 4648.
[45] Guiraud, *Hist. partiale, hist. vraie*, I, 283.

elevate your throne so high that you will no longer have cause to complain either to God or to me." Meanwhile, by a decree that tried to reconcile Simon de Montfort's right of conquest with the hereditary rights of Raymond VI, the Pope divided between them the former possessions of the counts of Toulouse. If we closely examine the wording of this document, we will see that Innocent III did what he could to lessen the advantage of the conquerors and to treat the other party with consideration. Innocent's last act in Languedoc (December 21, 1215, six months before his death) was in favor of the conquered Albigenses against their conquerors. He commissioned the Bishop of Nîmes and the archdeacon of Conflans to take from the leader of the crusaders the Castle of Foix and to make an exact inquiry into the circumstances under which the domain of the Count had been annexed to the conquered territory. Luchaire, who cites this fact,[46] comments on it by placing in relief the Pope's spirit of justice. He says: "Unable to make the Crusade keep its religious character, he wished to prevent it from resulting, in the temporal order, in extreme consequences. Again and again he defended the cause of moderation and justice against violent attacks." [47]

The Fourth Crusade

While, in the south of France, Simon de Montfort and Philip Augustus made the Albigensian Crusade deviate to their personal profit, a similar spectacle was taking place on a larger scale in the East, in the course of the Fourth Crusade against the Turks.

In his first encyclicals, Innocent III had spoken of his plan to group all the forces of Christendom with a view to a great Crusade.[48] This project had a definite place in the vast plan of

[46] Luchaire, p. 258.
[47] Guiraud, *op. cit.*, I, 284.
[48] Innocent III, *Epist.; PL,* CCXIV, 9.

his general policy: the Christian organization of the world. By a universal Crusade, well conducted and retaining its supernatural spirit, the princes and nobles, moved by a desire to deliver the tomb of Christ and to assure the salvation of their souls, would break off their private strifes and would organize themselves into a firmer hierarchy, under a closer inspiration of the Church and of the Pope. Innocent III did not give up hope of seeing the two Empires of East and West brought back, the one to the just limits of its mission, the other to union with the Holy See, colaborer with it in the realization of its great work. Preliminary to this enterprise were the first acts of his pontificate: the expulsion of the German influence from the States of the Church, then from the Two Sicilies, from Tuscany, and from Lombardy, his diplomatic efforts to reconcile Philip Augustus with Richard the Lionhearted and to pacify the Italian peninsula and Hungary.

But from the first overtures which the Pope made to the Christian rulers, the fact became evident that, although the Crusade project was gladly accepted by all, two ideas were going to clash as soon as the campaign should be started. Opposed to the traditional policy of the popes, which Innocent III wished to resume, was the Ghibelline party's plan of Crusade. According to the Pope, all other efforts of Christendom ought to be subordinated to the conquest of the Holy Land, and diplomacy would be expected merely to modify the dispositions of the Emperor of Constantinople toward the West and to lead him to cooperate in this work. The Ghibelline plan, on the contrary, was to destroy the Byzantine Empire and replace it with a Latin empire, which would be the best auxiliary of the Crusade. Henry VI took this plan from the Norman kings of Sicily; his brother Philip of Swabia was its depositary; Boniface of Montferrat was to carry it out.[49] The triumph of the Ghibelline plan was brought about by three successive events, three deviations

[49] Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age*, p. 153.

which the princes imposed on Innocent III's first idea: the expedition against Zara at the request of the Venetians, a first taking of Constantinople at the instigation of Prince Alexius, and a second taking of Constantinople to the profit of the crusaders for the formation of a Latin empire. In the presence of the various defeats of his first plan, the Pope, reconciling fidelity to principles with a very adaptable policy, attempted to draw the best possible advantages from the events.

At the Pope's invitation, a large number of preachers spread through all the districts of Europe, urging the faithful to take the cross. Of these popular preachers the most celebrated was a country pastor from the neighborhood of Paris, Foulques de Neuilly, a priest experienced in the labors of the ministry. He had studied the sacred sciences in the University of Paris, where the bright lights at that time were Peter of Corbeil (the future cardinal), Peter the Chanter (*Petrus Cantor*), renowned for the brilliance of his theological teaching, and Peter the Voracious ("Eater of books," *Petrus Comestor*), so named because of his avidity to read everything and know everything. Foulques possessed the two qualities essential for a Christian preacher: the zeal of an apostle and the learning of a doctor. His missionary talents were supplemented by a powerful voice able to dominate the tumult of the crowds, robust health, energy so unrestrained that sometimes it became even rudeness. Peter the Chanter, whom Pope Innocent III asked to take up the preaching of the Crusade and whose strength no longer permitted him to assume so heavy a burden, asked and obtained authorization to transfer the burden to the most esteemed of his disciples, the curé of Neuilly-sur-Marne. At the end of 1199, Foulques' eloquence had won to his cause Count Thibaut de Champagne, Count Louis de Blois, Count Simon de Montfort, several vassals of the Île-de-France and of Champagne, and the future historian of the Crusade, Geoffroi de Villehardouin. At the beginning of the next year, Count Baldwin of

Flanders, his brother Henry, and a great number of Flemish nobles also took the cross. In 1201 the preaching of the monk Martin, abbot of Pairis near Colmar, obtained the adherence of a large part of the German nobles. The Venetian Senate agreed to transport and feed for one year an army of 4,500 knights, 9,000 squires, and 20,000 foot soldiers, and to add to the expedition 50 galleys fully equipped. The crusaders agreed to pay 85,000 silver marks (i. e., about $1,000,000) and to share, half and half, with the Venetians all the lands they would conquer.

This participation of the Venetians, monarchs of the sea, who were indispensable but who were merchants eager for profit, was a cause of anxiety for Innocent III.[50] Another grief came to him from the almost general abstention of the sovereigns. Neither Philip Augustus, excommunicated after his divorce, nor Otto of Brunswick, in strife with Frederick of Swabia, nor the princes whose Italian claims the Pope had rejected, took part in the Crusade. But the nobles never had been so numerous or appeared so well prepared or so disposed to proceed in harmony under the general direction of the Pope and his legates.[51]

Two events of sad augury were the death of Thibaut de Champagne, the knight poet, whom the barons had at first acclaimed as their chief, and the choice of Marquis Boniface of Montferrat, brother of the former rival of Guy of Lusignan, to take Thibaut's place. A short time later when, in the summer of 1202, the papal legate Peter of Capua went to Venice to embark with the crusaders, he learned with amazement that the fleet, instead of sailing for Egypt or Syria, was preparing to set out for Dalmatia. The old Doge Dandolo, moreover, informed him that he could follow the army in the capacity of a preacher, if that suited him, but that he could not expect to hold the rank of legate, that is, of representative of the Roman

[50] This anxiety appears in a letter of Innocent III; *PL*, CCXIX, 131.

[51] Innocent III had ratified the treaty concluded with the Venetian senate, on condition that a legate would follow the Crusade (*PL*, CCXIV, 131).

authority. This open rebellion of Venice toward the Pope may have been the result of an agreement with Prince Alexius, son of the dethroned Emperor of the East, or the result of a conspiracy with the Sultan of Egypt, who is supposed to have promised the Venetians some commercial advantages if they succeeded in diverting the campaign which threatened him. All these hypotheses have been advanced. None of them is necessary to explain the conduct of the Venetians. We need only remark that the port of Zara on the Dalmatian coast interfered with their commerce in the Adriatic. Feeling confident because of their treaty with the crusaders, to whom their fleet was indispensable, they put at the head of the list of places to be conquered, the port of Zara; and in fact they took it. The Pope, who had forbidden the crusaders, under pain of excommunication, to attack any Christian city, did not wish, at the beginning of the expedition, to appear relentless, and removed the censure.

The Pope's benevolence seems not to have greatly affected the Venetian merchants. In the spring of 1203, besides the Zara affair evidently preparations were being made for another undertaking that was not in the plan marked out by the Pope. This time no doubt was possible. At Zara itself a pact had been concluded, at the instigation of the Venetians and of Philip of Swabia, between Boniface of Montferrat, leader of the Crusade, and the representatives of the young Prince Alexius, son of the dethroned Emperor Isaac Angelus, to recover the imperial power against the usurper Alexius III. The young Alexius agreed to pay the crusaders the sum of 200,000 silver marks, personally to take part in the Crusade, to support perpetually in the Holy Land a body of 500 knights, and to submit to the religious authority of Rome.

The Pope, as soon as he learned the news of the pact of Zara, explicitly forbade the crusaders to attack the Byzantine Em-

pire.[52] But the prohibition was too late: when the papal letter reached its destination, the fleet of the crusaders had already set sail for Constantinople. The first assault upon the Eastern capital occurred on July 7, 1203. The undisciplined mercenaries composing the army of Alexius III could not resist the crusaders' army longer than ten days. In July 17 the old Doge Dandolo, with the banner of St. Mark in his hand, was the first to leap upon one of the gangplanks which the fleet set on the shore. Alexius III fled. Isaac Angelus, released from the prison where his rival had confined him, was proclaimed emperor with his son Alexius IV. And now, with the assistance of the new sovereigns of the East, would the crusaders march toward Syria and at length carry out the plan of the Crusade?

By attacking Constantinople, a schismatic but Christian city, the crusaders had again incurred excommunication. Naturally, before entering Jerusalem as liberators of the tomb of Christ, they wished to be reconciled with the Church. The Pope again desired to exercise his fatherly indulgence to the very utmost. Let Emperor Alexius IV clearly join with Rome, as he had promised; let him and his patriarch recognize the primacy of the Church founded by St. Peter: on this condition, all censure would be removed. But the Emperor was as unable to carry out this clause of the Zara treaty as he was to pay the sums of money promised. Vainly the Venetians succeeded in obtaining, by ruse, a letter of absolution, which the papal legate, exceeding the instructions of the Pope, had sent to them. This spiritual immunity did not realize all the desires of Doge Dandolo and his soldiers. Alexius IV in vain sold the chandeliers and the sacred vessels of the churches; he was at the end of his resources and could not pay his debt. The accord which had lasted a while between the emperors and the cru-

[52] Innocent III, *Epist.*, VI, 101; *PL*, CCXV, 106.

saders, soon broke and was followed by open hostility. Quarrels, real combats between Greeks and Venetians, stained the city with blood. An adventurer, Alexius Ducas, called Murtzuphlos ("joined eye-brows"), profited by these disturbances to stir up the people in his favor. On January 5, 1204, he was proclaimed emperor under the name of Alexius V. His first acts were to imprison Isaac Angelus, who died soon afterward, to have Alexius IV strangled, and to order the crusaders to quit the city. The situation of the crusaders, in the presence of an excited populace, was no longer tenable at Constantinople. They withdrew in their ships, but resolved upon another siege as soon as possible.

The question now was, no longer to conquer the city for the sake of an Eastern candidate, but to found a Latin Empire. A treaty which was signed March, 1204, between the Venetians and the barons, provided that after the taking of the city, a council composed of six Venetians and six crusaders would elect an emperor, to whom would be granted a quarter of the Eastern Empire. Of the three other quarters, Venice would take half; the rest would be distributed to the army of knights, under the form of fiefs.

The siege of Constantinople was rigorous. Murtzuphlos himself, feeling that his whole fortune was engaged in this struggle, directed the defense with great activity. But the crusaders increased their deeds of daring. The scantiness of food and the impossibility of turning back, because the Greeks would have massacred them in their retreat, the enticement of the immense riches contained in the capital of the East, were their most powerful stimulants. Bringing up their ships to the very ramparts, fastening them to the walls with ropes under a shower of arrows, climbing up the towers, breaking down the gates with axes, fighting hand to hand, they at length succeeded in penetrating the city by various points at the same time. The night of April 12 enabled Murtzuphlos to flee with

his army. But the Crusade leaders were powerless to restrain the impetuosity of their troops, who rushed upon the treasures amassed in the course of many centuries at Constantinople. The pillage was general and pitiless. Even the churches were not respected. Villehardouin reckons the value of the booty at a million and a half marks (i. e., about $14,000,000).

The partition of the lands was made as had been agreed. On May 16, 1204, Count Baldwin of Flanders, elected according to the forms determined by the treaty, appeared in St. Sophia, clothed in the imperial mantle, with purple sandals covered with gems, and with the chlamys embroidered with eagles. On October 1, he armed 600 knights and distributed fiefs to them. As in Palestine after the taking of Jerusalem in 1099, a feudal Latin domination was founded at Constantinople.

Innocent III, once more in the presence of accomplished facts, felt a great sadness at news of these events. He did not conceal it. But Baldwin wrote him that henceforth he was going to devote all his efforts to ending the schism of the Greeks; and the Pope did not wish to thwart a plan that had always been very dear to his heart. He comforted himself with the thought that perhaps the occurrences which were contrary to his expectations and his orders were providential; that at any rate a wise policy would be to seek in the irreparable facts some element that could still be utilized for the triumph of the good. The formation of a Latin empire at Constantinople might favor both the union of the Churches and the conquest of the Holy Land.

The events soon undeceived those hopes. In that Latin empire, where the numerical majority of the population had a civilization so different from that of the conquerors, no stable coherence could be established. The crusaders' feudalism and the Byzantine bureaucracy were evidently irreconcilable; Oriental pride would not consent to bow before those whom it

called barbarians. The Patriarch of Constantinople and his clergy abandoned none of their claims to an absolute autonomy with regard to Rome. The national or individual conflicts that had divided the Christian princes in the West were repeated in the East. A violent attack by Johannitius the czar of the Vlachs and Bulgars was enough to bring Baldwin's empire to the verge of destruction. His young brother Henry of Flanders, who succeeded him (August 20, 1206), seemed to save the situation by his energy and his skilful policy. But he was unable to prevent the Greeks from acknowledging as their lawful sovereign the Emperor Lascaris (son-in-law of Alexius IV), who, after the taking of Constantinople by the crusaders, had gone to Asia Minor and there formed a new state including Bithynia, Lydia, and Phrygia, with Nicaea as its capital.

In such conditions, the two aims which Innocent III had thus far followed with tireless energy, the union of the Greek Church and the deliverance of the Holy Land, seemed now to be unattainable. The Pope, however, did not lose courage. In 1213 he ordered the Crusade preaching resumed throughout Europe. He commissioned Cardinal Pelagius to negotiate a union with Lascaris, on condition that Lascaris would acknowledge himself a vassal of the Latin empire. Thus he hoped to limit the extension of that empire and to keep the crusaders from making a further diversion of conquests in the East. On July 25, 1215, Emperor Frederick II, following his coronation, of his own accord and to everyone's surprise swore to take the cross, and when, on November 11 of that same year, in opening the Lateran Council, the Pope renewed his appeal for the Crusade, he had reason to believe that the desire of his whole reign was at last about to be realized. But such was far from the truth. The successive deviation of the papal plan, from which the Pope had suffered so much, arose less from passing whims than from a general tendency of the nations to act of their own accord, to organize separately, to replace the inter-

ests of religion, or at least to mingle in them excessively the interests of their commerce, of their industry, and of their territorial expansion.[53]

State of Christendom

We have viewed the three principal works of the pontificate of Innocent III. But these three great projects—the liberation of Rome and Italy from all foreign influence, the repression of heresy, the restoration of the Christian order by the driving back of Islam, by the extinction of the Eastern schism, and by the religious enthusiasm of the Crusades—had not absorbed all the Pontiff's activity. To each of the states he had continually turned his attention, ready to correct abuses in them, to promote reforms, and to increase respect for Christian laws and for his legitimate authority.

Owing to the constant efforts of the papacy, efforts whose age-old work was completed and consecrated by the genius of Innocent III, the various states of Europe were ranged in a strongly organized hierarchy about the Holy See.

At the top, the pope. Beneath him, first a certain number of states bound to him by special titles of dependence, varied as feudalism was. In the first rank, the Empire, embracing Germany and northern Italy; its elective chief, official defender of the Holy See, must be acceptable to the Holy See. Next, various vassals strictly so called, beginning with the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, another sword of help, which the papacy, by a wise policy, was careful to keep separated from the Empire. Next, several other feudatory states, special protégés of the Holy See: such were England, Aragon, Hungary, and other king-

[53] This is the period, about 1212 and 1213, in which some accounts, of disputed historical worth, place the "children's crusade." A young shepherd of Vendome, Stephen by name, is said to have drawn after him 30,000 children. Having set sail at Marseilles on five ships, some are supposed to have perished by shipwreck, the others to have been sold as slaves in Egypt. Another expedition of 20,000 children is said to have taken place in Germany, under the direction of a boy of Cologne. Most of them are supposed to have died of hunger and exhaustion.

doms of the east and north. Lastly, certain states, as France, which had none of these special titles of temporal dependence upon the Holy See, but which nevertheless remained always subject to its "power of declaration" in whatever might concern conscience by reason of sin or of an oath (*ratione peccati ac juramenti*). These last states likewise accepted, either by virtue of a divine right or by virtue of a human right (the question is a matter of controversy among historians and canonists) a power of arbitration by the Holy See in regulating their conflicts.[54]

This may not have been the "Christian Republic" with its complete elements, but at least it was a powerful outline of it.

Some writers, by distorting certain words taken out of their context or by overlooking the circumstances that provoked those words, have maintained that Pope Innocent III showed that he intended to absorb the power of the secular states into his sovereign authority. But the Pope never had such an intention. In a letter to Count William VIII, lord of Montpellier, he says: "We have no wish to prejudice the rights of another or to usurp a power that does not belong to us; because we are mindful of these words of Jesus Christ in the Gospel: 'Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's.' " [55] But this is not to say that the Pope admitted a complete equality between the two powers. "The power of princes," he wrote, "is exercised on earth; that of the priests, in heaven. The former govern only bodies; the latter, souls. Thus the priesthood is as far above the royal power as the soul is above the body." [56] Innocent III seemed even to think that at the time of the Crusade, by the very fact that the princes and peoples committed themselves to him for the direction of the expedition, exceptional powers of intervention were implicitly conferred

[54] Brugère, *Tableau de l'hist. et de la litt. de l'Eglise,* p. 283.
[55] Baluze, *Innocentii III epistolae,* I, 676.
[56] *Ibid.,* p. 548.

on him. Such are the principles that we see him apply in his relations with the different powers.

The Papacy and the Empire

The events narrated above have sufficiently defined the attitude taken by the Pope toward the Empire and toward Sicily. Several early writers have spoken of the respective situation of the papacy and the Empire, calling the Empire "a fief of the Holy See." But we must clarify the meaning of this vague expression.[57]

Several appear to understand it as meaning a fief properly so called, that is, a domain which the owner or feudatory held by cession or investiture of a suzerain lord. The popes and the emperors did not thus understand the dependence of the Empire upon the Holy See. Their view was that the emperor held strictly from the pope not the domain or territory of the Empire, but only the title of emperor. His domain, like that of the other sovereigns, came to him from the free disposal of the peoples who had chosen him, from the constitution of the state, or from his just conquests. The whole right of the Holy See over the Empire was thus reduced to choosing the emperor, either by itself, or by the prince electors, and to conferring on him his title and judging cases where he should be deposed. To establish this explanation, we need merely note the difference between the "oath of fidelity," taken to the pope by the emperors, and the oath taken by the princes who were feudatories of the Holy See. The oath taken by the latter (for instance, the kings of Sicily) clearly supposed that they held their domains by cession or investiture from the pope, whereas the oath of the emperors supposed merely the obligation to protect and defend the interests of the Holy See against its enemies.[58]

During the last years of his life, Innocent III again had occasion to apply these principles. The Guelph Emperor Otto IV,

[57] Du Cange, *Glossarium,* under the word *Feudus.*

[58] Gosselin, *Pouvoir du pape au Moyen Age,* p. 484.

whose cause the Pope espoused, conducted himself like the fiercest of the Ghibellines and violated his most solemn oaths; the Pope therefore did not hesitate to pronounce against him a sentence of excommunication, thus freeing his subjects from their oath of fidelity, and recognized the young Frederick II, king of Sicily, as emperor.

From the general history of Europe we know how Otto, abandoned by the clergy of the Empire, at war with a large number of his vassals, sought in a league against France to restore his political, military, and religious fortune. He was sustained by his uncle John Lackland who, by his rivalry with Philip Augustus and by his revolt against Rome, was doubly his ally, and he was supported by Ferrand of Portugal, Count of Flanders, who had a grievance against the King of France. Otto raised an army which counted, besides the troops furnished by Germany, England, and Flanders, those brought to him by Brabant, Holland, Lorraine, Limburg, and a number of feudal lords angered against Philip Augustus, notably all the nobility of Aquitaine. The King of France had on his side his two hereditary allies, always present in hours of difficulty: the Church and the communes. The members of the league were so sure of success that they had already in advance drawn up the partition of the Kingdom of France.

The two armies met on Sunday, July 27, in the plain of Bouvines on the Marque, not far from Lille. The forces of the coalition numbered 80,000 men; France could oppose them with only 25,000 soldiers. The French thus had to fight in the proportion of one against three. But they were conscious of the greatness of the struggle about to take place, of the justice of their cause. The bourgeois militia was one with Philip Augustus and his faithful knights. All the historians of that period speak of the knightly inspiration which, in the battle of Bouvines, transported men's souls and increased the forces tenfold. These same historians speak also of the part taken,

at the side of the King of France, the living incarnation of the nation, by Bishop Garin of Senlis, representative of the Church, who was seen throughout the action in various parts of the battlefield, exhorting the soldiers and the leaders, communicating to all the sacred fire which animated him. Otto's defeat was complete. Never was more clearly manifested the superiority of a handful of heroes, guided by love of God and of country, over a mass of warriors having no bond but a community of interests and of grudges. When, toward evening, the Emperor was seen fleeing shamefully, with the remnants of his army, the victory that had been won might well be called the victory of France and that of the Church.

As soon as Otto's defeat was known, the Rhine cities submitted to Philip Augustus. The Kingdom of Arles, that of Denmark, the feudal state of Lorraine, abandoned a lost cause. On the very evening of the battle, the King of France sent to the rival of Otto the remnants of the dragon banner of the Empire, which had been taken and torn in the struggle. Frederick of Hohenstaufen was henceforth undisputed master of Germany. He repeated the promises made to the Pope the year before, promised him the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and of appeals to the Holy See, help against the heretics, in a word, the most complete obedience. These promises, which he was careful to have ratified by the German feudalism, surpassed all those which Otto and Philip had been able to make. But this repudiation of the whole program of the race by a Hohenstaufen was too radical to be lasting. We may doubt whether it was sincere. Frederick II, "the polyglot and literary emperor, the friend of the Saracens, the enigmatical despot," [59] soon showed himself and for thirty years conducted himself as one of the most formidable adversaries of the papacy and of the Church.

[59] Luchaire, *Innocent III, la Papauté et l'Empire*, p. 304.

The Holy See and Spain

After the Holy Empire which by its own constitution, so misunderstood by many of its sovereigns, was the official protector of the rights of the Church; after the Norman Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, whose sword, though often insubmissive, at least was able in times of crisis to give mighty blows for the defense of the papacy, three nations gloried in placing their forces at the service of Christendom. Spain, in perpetual contact with the Mussulman world, was like a knight ever on guard at the frontier; England, so closely attached to the See of Rome by its beginnings and by its most ancient traditions, considered fidelity to Rome a point of honor; and France, always generous, in many circumstances had shown that she was unwilling to let anyone outdo her if the occasion was one of performing the *gesta Dei.*[60]

Thanks to Spain, in 1212 Europe was at last freed from the danger of a Mussulman invasion from the south. In fact, while the crusaders were fighting in the East, the infidels continued to spread in northern Africa and in Spain. After the death of the Cid Campeador, through alternating successes and reverses, they had fortified themselves in Morocco, had taken possession of Andalusia, and were threatening Castile. The brave king of Castile, Alfonso VII, by hazardous raids, by terrible predatory incursions which the Spaniards called "algarades," had difficulty in withstanding them. In January, 1212, Innocent, seeing the peril, requested the French of the north and south, the Italians, and the Germans to join the Spaniards to drive back the Crescent. At the same time he ordered throughout Christendom processions and fasts, to draw down God's blessing on the undertaking. Following the

[60] It is known that Guibert de Nogent, recounting the story of the first Crusade, entitled his account, *Gesta Dei per Francos.*

usages of knighthood, the King of Spain sent to the Emir En-Nasir a challenge for the next Pentecost.

The army of Christ and the army of the prophet met at Muradal, in the plain known as Navas de Tolosa. The disproportion in the sizes of the two armies was enormous. The Mussulmans were five times as numerous as the Christians. In spite of the Pope's appeal, the foreign contingents that came to the aid of the King of Castile were not considerable. Of the five Spanish kings, three were present: Alfonso VII of Castile, Sancho VII of Navarre, and Peter II of Aragon. Alfonso II of Portugal, who was kept at home by a civil war, merely sent some reinforcements; and Alfonso IX of Leon, a friend of the Mussulmans, kept away. Spain was left almost alone and did not have at her disposal even all her forces. En-Nasir felt confident of victory. In an insolent manifesto addressed to the King of Aragon, he declared that, after subjugating Spain, he would go all the way to the Basilica of St. Peter in Rome and would purify it by blood.

At the approach of the day fixed upon by King Alfonso, Innocent III called upon all Christendom to unite in prayer. Two months later, July 16, 1212, the Christian army faced the army of the infidels. The Spaniards, after preparing for battle by confession and communion, confidently hurled themselves against the enemies of Christ. At first there was a moment of confusion; but a vigorous charge by Alfonso VII revived the ardor of the Christian army, which was irresistible. The rout of the infidels was general. En-Nasir escaped death only by speedy flight. On the field of battle he left more than 100,000 soldiers; the action had been so vigorously conducted that the victors lost barely a few hundred men. Europe now seemed safe from any Mussulman invasion.

This great victory had another important result. It helped to bring about unity among the five kingdoms of Spain and to

attach them to the Holy See. Like the other countries of Europe, the Spanish peninsula was disturbed by ideas of national independence. We saw, in our account of the Crusade against the Albigenses, how Peter of Aragon, the devoted friend of Innocent III, "the Pope's man" par excellence, had not hesitated to take up arms when he saw a province of his race threatened. In Castile, Alfonso's claims of autonomy were shown with regard to the Holy See and the clergy. Innocent III was on the point of striking him with ecclesiastical penalties for his encroachments on the possessions of the Church; but the prince's services to Christendom halted the excommunication with which he had been threatened. In Navarre, King Sancho had been excommunicated by the papal legate for breaking a truce, and his complacency toward the Sultan of Morocco brought down upon him severe rebuke. But his brilliant part in the battle of Navas de Tolosa won him the generous pardon of the Pope. The kingdom of Portugal, which from its origin was connected with the Holy See by ties of vassalage, had also given cause for grief to the Supreme Pontiff. Sancho I had been clearly hostile in his attitude to the Church. He infringed on the rights of the bishops and refused the Pope the annual quitrent due him. Innocent III refrained from breaking with a prince who could effectively fight the Saracens, and did nothing more than severely reprimand him. The King was grateful to the Pope for this consideration. On his deathbed he publicly repented of his faults and renewed the oath of vassalage which united his kingdom to the Apostolic See. The dynasty of Leon alone showed itself refractory to all the advances of the papacy. Alfonso IX, following two marriages contracted despite impediments of relationship, had to undergo excommunication and see his kingdom placed under interdict. He was the only Spanish ruler who did not answer Pope Innocent's appeal to fight the Mussulmans.

The Holy See and England

England did not let anyone forget that she had received the Christian faith from monks who came directly from Rome and that the institution of Peter's pence owed its origin to three Anglo-Saxon kings, Ina of Wessex, Offa of Mercia, and Ethelwulf. But William the Conqueror had refused to take an oath which the Pope considered a corollary of the bonds attaching his kingdom to the Holy See, and the policy of Richard the Lionhearted had been full of contradictions. Advised by the powerful and capable archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter, he had enacted detestable laws against the clergy. John Lackland had also two policies, but they were successive.

"John Lackland had the qualities of his race: an understanding of government and of business affairs, and that instinct of personal power, an active and restless instinct, so remarkable with Henry II and Richard the Lionhearted. But certainly his brother's vices were to be found in him, exaggerated to the degree of brutal, ignominious debauche. He differed from them by his pliant hypocrisy and a facility in effacing himself or bowing down in the presence of danger, which explain his frequent relapses and his final change." [61]

The first part of his reign (1199 to 1213) was marked by more and more hateful outrages, which were met by more and more severe sanctions by the pope. In 1200 he suddenly repudiated his first wife, Isabella of Gloucester, and married Isabella of Angoulême, the betrothed of the Count of the Marches. Innocent III sent him a severe admonition. In 1203, the King of England, to rid himself of the competitions of his nephew Arthur of Brittany, did not stop even at assassination; in 1205 he brought about, by order, the election of

[61] Luchaire, *Innocent III, les Royautés vassales*, p. 183.

his candidate John de Gray to the archbishopric of Canterbury; and he violently dispersed the monks who elected another candidate. The Pope turned to the bishops of England; three of them pronounced the interdict of the kingdom. The strife became more and more bitter. John confiscated all the landed property and revenues of the English Church. Innocent then ordered the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester to pronounce the personal excommunication of the King. John subjected the monks and the secular clergy to a reign of terror. The Pope excommunicated him and called upon Philip Augustus, king of France, to prepare a landing in England.

At that moment, John Lackland, seeing his cause lost, had recourse to one of those changes of front, which his hypocrisy made easy. He completely reversed his attitude. On May 15, 1213, he resigned his crown into the hands of the papal legate, placed his state in the domain of St. Peter, and declared himself a vassal and tributary of the Holy See for his kingdoms of England and Ireland, with a quitrent of 1,000 pounds sterling. On July 20 he was solemnly relieved of the excommunication. At the same time the Pope forbade the King of France to make any attack on England. The King answered this measure of clemency by abolishing a large number of unjust decrees and by putting into force, according to the desire of the barons of his realm, the liberal laws of Henry I.

But the barons and the Pope soon perceived that the King was merely playing a hypocritical game. Instead of granting the liberties promised in the charta of King Henry, John returned to his methods of despotism. The nobles protested. An uprising took place. Overcome with fear in the presence of his barons, as he was a short time earlier before the Pope, John again repudiated his past conduct by signing (June 15, 1215) the famous document known in English history as the Magna Charta.

This important document, developed in the fifteenth century

into the Petition of Rights, in 1628 into the law of *habeas corpus,* and in 1688 into the Declaration of Rights, is regarded as the basis of English liberties. It stipulated: with regard to the nobles, that henceforth they would be freed from the restrictions placed on their fiscal rights; with regard to the clergy, that their possessions could no longer be taxed by way of fines or requisitions; with regard to the whole population, that thereafter no person could be imprisoned, deprived of his property, or put to death except by the judgment of his peers, that is, of a jury. But these provisions do not constitute the essence of the Magna Charta. It is to be found rather in the stipulation that no tax can be levied without the consent of the "Common Council of the Realm," and that the king's government will be subject to the control of twenty-five lords. "Scholarship and contemporary criticism have, in examining the Magna Charta more closely, restricted its historical significance. They no longer regard it, in the same measure as formerly, as the source of English liberties. . . . But we should not simply assimilate the revolt of 1215 with a commonplace insurrection of a group of nobles desirous of defending against a mischievous royalty the feudal law and the seignorial privileges. We cannot deny that the presence, in the coalition, of the three elements of the English social body is an indication of a national manifestation directed not only against the abuses of absolutism, but also against the regime of theocratic government which John had accepted in 1213 to escape from Philip Augustus." [62] Innocent III soon perceived that the Magna Charta was not a basis for an understanding; that the barons, under pretext of defending their rights, purposed weakening the power of the Holy See at the same time as that of the sovereign. On August 24, 1215, by a bull dated from Anagni, the Pope declared the Magna Charta null and void. "This Charta," he said, "forcibly extorted from the King,

[62] *Ibid.,* p. 238.

constitutes a lack of respect toward the Apostolic See, as also a grave detriment to the royal power."

But this papal document did not put an end to all conflict. On the one hand, John, after signing the Magna Charta, openly violated it and entered upon undisguised strife with the council of twenty-five. On the other hand, the son of the King of France (the future Louis VIII), in spite of the Pope's prohibition, got ready to land in England to take possession of the crown.

The Holy See and France

In provoking the mobilization of the armies of the French King against the King of England, did Innocent III purpose transferring the crown of John Lackland to Philip Augustus, or did he wish merely to frighten King John into submission? Perhaps we shall never have a precise answer to this question, because, after the reconciliation, the Holy See ordered the complete destruction of the documents concerning this affair.[63] According to the English chronicler Wendover, the Pope, even after requesting Philip Augustus to land in England, continued to negotiate with John; this fact lends weight to the supposition that no final decision had been reached regarding the transfer of the royal dignity.

The total disappearance of the documents relative to the expedition of Philip Augustus prevents us from reaching a positive conclusion about the conflict which arose, between the King of France and Innocent III, after the latter had ordered that the French King's descent upon England be abandoned. When Philip Augustus bitterly complained of the Pope's interference in a quarrel of a temporal order, Innocent replied: "that he nowise intended to assume the right to decide in a matter of fief, since that question was subject solely to the

[63] For Innocent's letter to his legate Nicholas of Tusculum, ordering the destruction of these papers, see *Innocentii III regesta,* Bk. XVI, no. 132; *PL,* CCXVI, 926.

King of France, but that he claimed merely the right to pass judgment on the sin." [64] By these words the Pope no doubt meant that he had competence to judge if, in such grave circumstances, a prince's moral duty was to make a truce in any dispute. But, in 1213, the concern about the Crusade, which he desired to resume with energy, by restoring to it its real character of a religious expedition, seemed to oblige the Pope to order the suspension of all internal wars in Christendom. At least, in this obscure question, such is the hypothesis that best harmonizes the Pope's conduct with the principles he had constantly proclaimed. This is also the interpretation reached by the Protestant historian Hurter, who says: "Innocent III strove first of all to maintain peace between two monarchs whose power could effectively contribute to the deliverance of the Holy Land." [65] The death of John Lackland in 1216 and the subsequent rallying of all the barons around his son Henry ended the conflict. Prince Louis, seeing all chance of success slip from his hands, abandoned the struggle.

The King who so earnestly argued for the defense of his real or alleged rights against the Pope was neither an unbeliever nor a rebel. Philip Augustus in the course of his reign gave many testimonies of sincere faith and of true devotion to the Apostolic See. But the interests of his policy and the vehemence of his passions sometimes turned him aside from the right path. We have seen instances of this in his conduct during the Albigensian war and in the matter of his divorce from Ingeburg.

This latter affair had remained pending at the death of Celestine III. Innocent III, as soon as he was elected, hoped promptly to end the scandal given by the King of France. In a letter to the King, he says: "The Holy See cannot abandon the defense of persecuted women. . . . The royal dignity can-

[64] *Decretal,* Bk. I, *De judiciis,* chap. 13.
[65] Quoted by Gosselin, *op. cit.,* p. 566.

not place you above the duties of a Christian." [66] Neither this letter nor several other letters nor the rebuke which the Pope directed his legates to transmit to Philip Augustus could overcome the King's obstinacy. Innocent then resorted to the supreme sanction: the interdicting of the kingdom of France. This penalty was pronounced on January 14, 1200, by the papal legate Peter of Capua,[67] and occasioned great disturbances in the kingdom. The first bishops who carried out the censure were mistreated by the King. The Bishop of Paris and the Bishop of Senlis had their property confiscated. Even peasants were hunted out for having conformed to the orders of their ecclesiastical superiors. But Philip was soon convinced that he would not succeed, by terrorism, in imposing his wishes. On the contrary, a more and more general murmur reached him from all the districts deprived of religious services. "Saladin was blessed," exclaimed Philip, "in not having any dealings with a pope." For his own tranquillity he decided the safer thing would be to submit, or rather to feign submission. He promised whatever was required of him: the sending away of Agnes de Meran, the taking back of Ingeburg, the judgment of the divorce case by a council. On September 7, 1200, the interdict was lifted.[68]

The council which was called to decide on the main point of the case met at Soissons on March 2, 1201. Present at it were King Philip Augustus, Queen Ingeburg, King Canute of Denmark. For fourteen days the council deliberated on the validity of the King's marriage. No doubt existed as to what their decision would be. This Philip understood quite well and he resorted to a trick. Without waiting for the publication of the decision, he spontaneously declared that he was resolved to take for his wife the daughter of the King of Denmark;

[66] Baluze, *Miscellanea,* I, 422; Potthast, no. 199.
[67] Mansi, XXII, 708; suppl., II, 777.
[68] *Ibid.,* p. 722; Froidevaux, *De regiis conciliis Philippo II regnante habitis,* p. 98.

immediately he mounted horseback and, taking Ingeburg behind him, rode off from Soissons. The council was dissolved. This is all that Philip desired. No judicial decision had been reached; and at the end of a short time, he again imprisoned Ingeburg.

The death of Agnes de Meran (August, 1201) seemed to bring about a real movement of change in his feelings. Again he expressed a desire for reconciliation with Rome. The Pope, with extreme condescension, decided, so as to show his love for peace, to legitimate, at the King's request, the two children that Philip had by Agnes, on the ground that, in accord with the dissolution pronounced by the Archbishop of Reims, the King had entered a second marriage in good faith. But this concession, instead of appeasing Philip, seemed to make him more audacious in his claims. From 1202 to 1213 the condition of Ingeburg, in captivity and removed from the King, was wretched. She was refused all the usual domestic conveniences, suitable clothes and food, and even the consolations of religion. Again and again by his letters and by his legates, Innocent repeated his entreaties with the King.[69] Philip did not respond to these fatherly advances, but in 1210 again attempted a marriage with a daughter of the Landgrave of Thuringia. At length, in 1213, he decided to take back Ingeburg and in fact did take her back. This marrige had in the first instance been prompted by political considerations, and the same kind of considerations seemed to prompt Philip to ratify it. He was contemplating an expedition into England. For this purpose he needed the support of the Pope and the alliance of the King of Denmark. At any rate, the joy was great at Rome and in France. Ingeburg officially kept her position of queen until the death of the King her husband in 1223. She survived him by more than fifteen years, treated as queen by her son Louis VIII and by her grandson Louis IX.

[69] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1305–8.

The Holy See and Hungary

Pope Innocent's condescension toward Philip Augustus has seemed excessive to some historians. It is explained by the general policy of this Pope, who has often been represented as a fierce, uncompromising extremist, and especially by his well-founded reliance on that French nation which Philip Augustus, capable and discerning statesman that he was, had organized on solid foundations. The reign of St. Louis would soon realize those hopes.

In eastern Europe two other powers were the object of Innocent's thoughtful solicitude: Hungary and the group of Slavic peoples.

Coming into existence under the auspices of the papacy, when St. Stephen, the first king of the race of the Arpads, received the crown from the hands of Pope Sylvester II, the Kingdom of Hungary was at this time agitated by the movement of national independence which would result, in 1222, in the famous Golden Bull, the great charta of Hungarian liberties. Pope Innocent had three reasons for maintaining in Hungary and consolidating the influence of the papacy as much as possible. He wished: 1. to have it offset Germany; 2. to make it a highway for the Crusades; 3. to employ it in the conversion of the Slavs. Consequently his policy in Hungary was dominated by these two rules: clearly to affirm the rights of the Holy See, but be tolerant and liberal in their application.

When he became Pope, Innocent III found Hungary in a state of civil war. In this struggle were engaged against each other the two sons of King Bela III: Emmerich the rightful king, and his brother Andrew, an unlawful claimant. In giving the archbishop of Gran the right to crown the king, the pope was careful to add: "Saving the authority of the Holy See, on which the crown of Hungary depends." But although

Emmerich by the fickleness of his character gave the Pope many just causes for complaint, Innocent always showed himself kindly toward him. One day this King, on a futile pretext, ill treated a papal legate, placing him under military guard in his house. Innocent merely wrote to him: "Beloved son, what has become of your royal kindness and your Christian sentiments?" And, in a private and separate note, he added: "We have written you in a very mild tone so that no one, in case our letter should be intercepted, may be able to think that you have lost the Apostolic favor." [70] At the same time he reminded the King that "many things have taken place in his kingdom, which upon close examination ought to be corrected, such as the captivity of his brother, the elections of prelates, and many other things besides." [71] The taking of Zara by the army of the crusaders was, for Emmerich, the occasion of a vehement protest. Innocent succeeded in appeasing him by an excommunication issued against the Venetians and by the eagerness he showed in crowning the King's son Ladislaus, who was still a minor.

The relations between the Pope and King Andrew, who became master of the kingdom after the death of his brother Emmerich and of his nephew Ladislaus in 1205, were more delicate. Weak, irresolute, and intermittently violent, King Andrew was dominated by irreconcilable parties one after the other. The aristocracy of the magnates fought against that of the bishops; the native Magyars could not tolerate the Germans and, although at times a temporary coalition was effected between these different factions, the combination was nearly always against the King. Innocent III's intervention in the affairs of Hungary then became almost uninterrupted. It is not our purpose to enter into the details of these events.

[70] Hurter, *Geschichte Papst Innocenz der dritten und seines Zeitgenossen,* Bk. VIII, p. 553.
[71] *Ibid.*

But we can say, in a general way, that if the maintenance of the unity of Hungary during the thirteenth century can be attributed to one man, the glory belongs to Pope Innocent III.

The Holy See and the Slavs

The group of Slavic peoples, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, was appealed to by two tendencies. One inclined it to the Latin Church, the other toward the Eastern schism. Bosnia, Croatia, and Dalmatia followed the former tendency; Bulgaria, Serbia, Galicia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro yielded to the latter. Innocent III, by a prudent and firm policy, which ably profited by the circumstances, finally attached Bulgaria, Serbia, and Galicia to the Latin Church.

The leader of the Bulgarians, Johannitius, called also Calojan, contemplated a revival of the great empire of the tenth century, embracing almost the whole Balkan peninsula and part of Hungary. But, to attain this end, he needed religious independence from Constantinople. He turned to Rome. Innocent III, without making himself a party to the political schemes of the sovereign, profited by his favorable dispositions to send a legate to Bulgaria. This legate was Johannes de Casamaris, who reorganized the Bulgar Church and officially gave Johannitius the title of king. In return the latter acknowledged the pope's right to appoint and consecrate the upper clergy of Bulgaria and promised that his kingdom would never separate from the Holy See.

The attachment of the Serb tribes to the Church of Rome took place in similar circumstances. The supreme head, who governed them with the title of grand zhupan or grand count, was, at the close of the twelfth century, the celebrated Nemanya, whom the Serbs venerate as a saint. His deep piety made him the protector of the monks and of the clergy, but, drawn into the political orbit of Constantinople, he had not

contracted, as national chief, any diplomatic bond with the Holy See. After his death, the competition that arose between his two sons, Vouk and Stephen, led both of them to ask the support of Innocent III, who took advantage of this appeal to send legates to Serbia, where they effected an ecclesiastical reform and attached the kingdom to the Roman Church by permanent relations.

After the terrible defeat of Zawichost in 1205, in which Romanus the prince of Galicia was killed, his widow called King Andrew of Hungary to her aid to free her country from the Russian and Polish invasion. Andrew answered the appeal, proclaimed Romanus' young son Daniel king, reigned effectively under his name, and later even passed the power on to his son Coloman.

Innocent III, whose relations with King Andrew of Hungary were, as we have seen, very close, profited by this political transformation. To Galicia he sent legates, who persuaded the Galicians to abandon the Greek rites, adopt the rites of the Latin Church, and submit to the directions of Rome.

Innocent III and Christian Civilization

In Pope Innocent's negotiations to attach a new nation to Rome, the idea of the reform of Christian and ecclesiastical morals was always a decisive motive. And it was no less preponderant in the government of the old Churches. Of the great expansion of Christian life that filled the thirteenth century with its brilliance, the great Pope did not see all the fruits, but he sowed nearly all the seeds of it. Under his pontificate, with St. Francis and St. Dominic, the monastic life took an altogether new advance. The hierarchy of the secular clergy was more permanently regulated, the transformation of the schools into universities was effected. In that reign were trained the architects who, following his death, would plan

the great Gothic cathedrals of the thirteenth century, the painters who would adorn the Missal of St. Louis with such amazing miniatures and would conceive the plan of the Campo Santo of Pisa; it was then the prose of Villehardouin prepared the way for that of Joinville, that the verses of the troubadours and of the Minnesingers preluded the poems of Dante, and that was elaborated the science of which St. Thomas Aquinas gave the immortal synthesis. We will set forth this religious, artistic, literary, and scientific movement more properly at the moment of its apogee; but we must here relate, because they belong entirely to the pontificate of Innocent III, the origins of two religious orders with which we can connect nearly all the glories of that epoch, the order of St. Francis of Assisi and the order of St. Dominic.

St. Francis of Assisi

The Church, in one of her liturgical prayers, praises God for giving the world the warm charity of St. Francis at a time when the world was growing cold.[72] In the eleventh canto of his *Paradiso,* Dante shows the saint of Assisi rising like a sun over the Umbrian mountains, to give light and warmth to the earth.[73] These metaphors are no exaggerations. They represent the deep impression made on thirteenth century society, at the time when Provençal troubadours and Venetian merchants seemed to be leading it toward a life of pleasure and opulence, by the radiating appearance in its midst of him whom Bossuet calls "the most enraptured, the most ardent, and, if we may say so, the most reckless lover of poverty the Church ever had." [74]

[72] *Domine Jesu Christe qui, frigescente mundo, in carne beatissimi Francisci passionis tuae sacra stigmata renovasti* (collect of the feast of the Stigmata of St. Francis, September 17).

[73] Dante, *Paradiso,* canto 11, verses 43 f.

[74] Bossuet, *Œuvres oratoires* (Lebarq-Levesque ed.), I, 202.

He was born in 1182, in that fertile, beautiful land of Umbria, which has justly been called the Eden of the Italian peninsula. The son of a rich merchant of Assisi, Pietro Bernardone, he grew up in the midst of that abundance of the good things of this world which is the lot of the wealthy. This youth of attractive presence, of refined and vivacious spirit, held the scepter of elegance amid a society of young people who divided their time between the sport of knightly tournaments and the delicate pleasures of the *gai savoir* [75] of the troubadours. But, one day in February, 1209, while Pope Innocent III was still lamenting the scandalous spectacle of the Fourth Crusade, in which the demon of wealth and ambition had so completely diverted the armed knights from their avowed purpose of delivering the tomb of Christ, the young son of the rich merchant of Assisi heard at mass these words of the Savior: "Do not possess gold nor silver nor money in your purses: nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats nor shoes nor a staff." At once he felt himself inwardly transformed. Going out from the church, he threw away, with a sort of horror, his purse, his cane, his shoes. He put on the dress of the poorest inhabitants of the Apennines, the tunic of heavy gray material, with a rope as a cincture. Radiant with joy, to all comers along the highways and in the village squares, he preached evangelical perfection, penance, and peace.[76]

Other men, in other places, under the name of Cathari, Waldenses, Albigenses, Poor Men of Lyons, had also made profession of penance and poverty, but in a tone of bitterness and vexation, cursing the rich, disobeying the Pope, stirring up the people, at times scandalizing them by surprising contrasts between their doctrine and their life. Francis had only words of peace and joy. He believed that wealth would

[75] Jorgensen, *op. cit.*, Bk. I, chap. 2.
[76] Celano, *Vita prima*, Vol. I, chap. 11.

be sufficiently blamed by the glorification of poverty, by his cherishing it and having it cherished around him as a spouse. He loved all men as his brothers, and nature itself was his friend. He sang about "his brother the sun and his sister the moon," the wind, the air, the clouds, and every creature of God, in harmonious verses which the people repeated with enchanted delight.[77] But, when the name of the Savior Jesus came to his lips, his voice changed, according to St. Bonaventure's expression, as though he were listening to an interior melody the notes of which he wished to recover.

At the end of the year 1209, twelve companions had gathered about Francis of Assisi. At the very outset the little community had no common exercises, no ecclesiastical office, none of those things which, properly speaking, constitute a religious order. Each one freely followed the promptings of his own piety. Very early, however, Francis drew up, for the use of the humble society, a simple and short rule, which, about 1209 or 1210, he had approved by Pope Innocent III. This rule underwent frequent alterations at the chapters which the holy founder assembled every year; in 1221 it was supplanted by a more complete and more precise legislation. The distinctive traits of this rule were the spirit of poverty and the spirit of humility. Poverty must be absolute among Francis' disciples, both for the community and for the individuals composing it, and these could accept no money whether directly or through intermediaries.[78]

We are told that Innocent III, when Francis set forth his ideas on this point, said to him: "The kind of life you propose seems to me very hard." In fact, it was in connection with the practice of poverty that arose the controversies which brought about divisions and occasioned reforms in the order. The spirit

[77] *The Canticle of the Sun* or *The Hymn of the Creatures* was well conceived by St. Francis in his native tongue. On this point see Jorgensen, *op. cit.*, Introd.

[78] Cf. *Expositio Regulae Fratrum Minorum,* 1912; Holzapfel, *Handbuch des Geschichte des Franziskanerordens.*

of humility was also the subject of the saint's most insistent recommendations. "One day," writes Thomas of Celano, "while the rule was being read, upon hearing these words contained in it: *Et sint minores, et subditi omnibus,* Francis said: 'I wish this brotherhood to be henceforth called the Order of Friars Minor.' "[79] In 1212 a noble young woman of the city of Assisi, Clare, soon followed by a few companions, placed herself under Francis' direction, and the Order of Poor Clares was founded. Later, in 1219, a Third Order was established for those who are unable to leave the world.

No one can easily picture the joyous, naive, overflowing enthusiasm with which the son of Pietro Bernadone filled the souls of his disciples, and which they spread among the people wherever they passed, preaching penance and love of God. Says Thomas of Celano: "Men and women hastened to hear him. Even the monks came down from the monasteries in the mountains. The most highly cultured literary men were in admiration. You would have said that a new light was shining from heaven on the earth."[80]

This influence increased when people learned of the welcome which Pope Innocent III gave at Rome to the little band of Friars Minor, who had come to Rome to ask his blessing. "Indeed," exclaimed the Pontiff as he looked at the Poor Man of Assisi,[81] "this is the man who is called to sustain and repair the Church of God." In explanation of these words, the

[79] The life of St. Francis by Thomas of Celano is the earliest and the most authentic of the sources for the history of the origin of the Friars Minor. A first biography, the *Legenda prima,* was written immediately after the saint's canonization. A second composition by the same author, the *Legenda secunda,* appeared a few years later, about 1246. For the writing of this second work, Thomas of Celano had in his hands documents gathered by order of the general and also writings by the companions of the saint. Among other historical sources, should be mentioned the legend of the *Tres Socii,* the *Speculum perfectionis,* and the *Legenda minor* of St. Bonaventure.

[80] *Videbatur quaedam nova lux e coelo missa in terris* (Celano, p. 31).

[81] "The Poor Man": in Italian, *Il Poverello,* a title commonly given to St. Francis.

Pope related that, shortly before, after a day in which the misfortunes of the Church had filled him with anxiety, he had seen during his sleep, a beggar holding up the Lateran Basilica, which was tottering on its foundation and seemed ready to fall.[82]

Of the influence exercised by Francis of Assisi in those first years, we have two authentic monuments. One is a communal charta, signed (November, 1210) unanimously by the citizens of Assisi. A breath of peace and supernatural charity inspires this charta, in which, between the *majores* and the *minores* of the city are contracted reciprocal engagements of Christian fraternity and of cooperation, in which liberty is offered to all the serfs on very mild conditions, in which guaranties are given against despotic action by the magistrates. Although the name of Francis does not occur in the document, all historians attribute its inspiration to the apostle of Assisi.[83] A second monument, contemporary with the first, leaves no doubt about Francis' influence over his native city at that period. On a stone in the apse of St. Mary Major's Church we read these simple words, dated 1216: "In the time of Bishop Guido and Brother Francis. . . ." The Poor Man of Assisi and the Bishop are named together as the official personages of the commune.[84]

But to collaborate in the work of preaching the Gospel and of spreading peace among the people, which the papacy of that time had undertaken; to fight the Manichaean heresy by taking from it all its pretexts; to purify the ideal of the clerical and monastic life by the practice of poverty, humility, and charity: all this was not enough for the zeal of the new

[82] Le Monnier, *Hist. de S. François d'Assise,* I, 155. Probably this was the occasion when the diaconate was conferred on St. Francis, at the same time that his companions received tonsure. (*Op. cit.,* p. 156.)

[83] Cristofani, *Delle storie d'Assisi,* Bk. II, p. 130.

[84] *Ibid.* Cristofani had read the date 1210. Faloci has shown that we should read 1216.

apostle. He wished to take part in the Church's works of conquest in the East, to labor for the conversion of the Saracens and to die there, if it so pleased God, there where Christ died for us. In a certain way God answered his prayer. Although it was not granted to Francis to preach the Gospel in the Holy Land,[85] his sons would take a place of honor there. Although he did not have the joy of undergoing death for his God, yet, for the two last years of his earthly life, which were a veritable martyrdom for him, he was marked in his flesh with the painful stigmata of Christ.

In the admirable triplets where the author of the *Divine Comedy* sums up the life of St. Francis of Assisi, he does not separate the founder of the Friars Minor from the founder of the Friars Preachers.

> . . . one, seraphic all
> In fervency; for wisdom upon earth
> The other, splendor of cherubic light.[86]

The Friars Preachers

In these three verses the poet sets down the special characteristic of their two holy founders, and also of their religious families. We have seen Dominic's part in the strife against the Albigensian heresy. He, too, understood that his work could be carried on in a durable manner only by the formation of a society. But his viewpoint in organizing and developing it was that of preaching and teaching. One of the fundamental articles of his rule recommends unceasing application to study. "Let the brethren show themselves applied to study. Day and night, in their residence as also on journeys, let them be unceasingly occupied with reading or meditat-

[85] Did St. Francis visit Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Jerusalem? On this point, see Jorgensen, *op. cit.*, Bk. III, chap. 2.

[86] Dante, *Paradiso*, canto 11, verses 37 ff.

ing." [87] On November 17, 1206, Innocent III had established, in favor of Dominic and for the first time in the Middle Ages, the regime of apostolic preachers, and thus constituted the Order of Preachers under its primitive form.[88] On December 22, 1216, Honorius III gave the new foundation its solemn confirmation, by adding to the canonical life of the order the apostolic and doctrinal mission.[89] The preachers thus became the first order, in the Middle Ages, that placed study at the basis of its constitution. The Dominican conventual foundation was eventually a school. They were not permitted to establish a house of the order without a doctor to teach the monks and secular clergy, who were to have free access there.[90]

Francis of Assisi set up his work in opposition to the false mysticism; Dominic Guzman set up his in opposition to false learning. This latter danger was as formidable as the other. Since the time of Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée, an intellectual fever was agitating men's minds. The monastic and episcopal schools were numerous, but they lacked stability and organization. They sprang up or disappeared, according as they were in possession of a teacher or were without one. The fact of an uninterrupted succession, as at Chartres, is probably exceptional. Under these conditions, odd, venturesome opinions more easily had free play.

Among these opinions we must mention the doctrine of the celebrated Joachim of Flora, abbot of the monastery of that name in Calabria. This doctrine divided the history of the world into three ages, subject to the separate action of each of the three divine Persons: the age of the Father, beginning with creation; the age of the Son, finally established by the redemption; and the age of the Holy Ghost, beginning in the

[87] *First constit.*, dist. I, chap. 13.

[88] Potthast, no. 2912.

[89] *Ibid.*, nos. 5402 f. Cf. B. M. Reichert, *Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum.*

[90] Mandonnet, art. "Frères précheurs" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, VI, 865.

thirteenth century. Beside separating the action of the divine Persons in history, Joachim, in this point a disciple of Gilbert de la Porrée, also separated them in dogma. He enjoyed notable repute among the great, among popes and princes; the people venerated him as a prophet; and his writings indicate a keen mind and a deep interior life. But an over-enthusiastic imagination and a passion ill adapted for study were the two danger points of his thought. In 1183 he obtained from Pope Lucius III a dispensation from several observances of his rule so as to devote himself more fully to study; Clement III, for the same purpose, allowed him to resign his office of abbot. During his life, but especially after his death, his fancies about the approaching revelation of the Holy Ghost misled many imaginations. They would be exploited by the Spirituals and the Fratricelli of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Starting out from a different principle, a doctor of Chartres and professor at Paris, Amalric of Bena by name, reached almost identical results. He taught a sort of pantheism intermingled with theosophic rationalism. All that is, is One; God is immanent in all things, for the being of all things is based on the divine being. Thus humanity is deified, and every man is an apparition of the Divinity just as Christ was. The Scripture texts that refer to the Divinity may be literally applied to each one of us. . . . His deification theory was put into practice by the heretics, who publicly preached to the crowds that man, being a member of God, cannot sin, and that after a few years (about 1210) every man would be the Holy Ghost.[91]

Joachim's tritheism and Amalric's pantheism had to be condemned by the council of 1215 at the same time as the ditheism of the Albigenses.

[91] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, § 208, p. 220.

The Trinitarians

Mysticism and intellectual culture were not the only movements that were in danger of deviation at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The great inspiration of the Crusades, so pure at the outset, had frequently ended in scenes of disorder and scandal. Two men, John of Matha and Felix of Valois, the one born in a little town of Provence, called Faucon, of a noble family, the other a native of that part of Île-de-France which bears his name, resolved, by a divine inspiration, to found a religious order that would go to the infidel countries, there to give the example of a simple, austere, and devoted life. The more special aim of the order was to practice the works of mercy, in particular to ransom the captives and bring them back to their homeland. The new institute, placed under the title of the Holy Trinity, was solemnly approved by Pope Innocent III.[92] A white woolen tunic, ornamented with a red and blue cross, was the costume adopted by the new religious, who, in the middle of the thirteenth century, counted more than six hundred houses, divided into thirteen provinces. The number of the captives ransomed by them was incalculable. But their zeal did not confine itself to this mission. They devoted themselves to preaching in Christian countries, combatted the heretics, and practiced every kind of good works.[93]

Fourth Lateran Council

Without failing to note the effectiveness of all these separate efforts, Innocent III, for the realization of the plan of his pontificate, counted especially on a great collective effort, by

[92] Potthast, no. 483.

[93] The Trinitarians established themselves at Paris in the property where a chapel of St. Mathurin stood. Hence the name of Mathurins which was given them.

the meeting of an ecumenical council. On April 19, 1213, in a letter to the episcopate of the West and East, he said: "Two things lie particularly near my heart: the regaining of the Holy Land and the reform of the whole Church. Attention to both can hardly be delayed any longer without grave danger. . . . I have decided after the manner of the ancient fathers to convoke a general council, by means of which evils may be uprooted, virtues implanted, mistakes corrected, morals reformed, heresies extirpated, the faith strengthened, disputes adjusted, peace established, liberty protected, Christian princes and people induced to aid the Holy Land, and salutary decrees enacted for the higher and lower clergy." [94] The assembly was not to meet until two years later; the date set for its opening was September 1, 1215. The Pope used the interval in the preparation of its labors.

The council began its sessions November 11, 1215. The gathering was enormous. More than four hundred dioceses of the West and East were represented.[95] In addition, there were present more than eight hundred abbots, procurators of many others, the ambassadors of the emperors of Germany and Constantinople, of the kings of France, England, Spain, and all the Christian states.

This council was the twelfth ecumenical and the fourth of the Lateran. Of its proceedings we possess seventy canons, which for the most part were inserted in the *Corpus juris*. No new dogma was promulgated at it, but the disciplinary decrees enacted form the basis of the modern discipline.

Its first business was to issue a solemn condemnation of the three main errors of the Albigenses, of Joachim of Flora, and of Amalric of Bena. The council declared that heaven and earth are ruled, not by two principles, one a principle of good,

[94] Mansi, XXII, 903; supplem., II, 861. (Cf. Schroeder, *The Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*. Tr.)

[95] For the list of these dioceses, see the *Journal des savants,* October, 1905, pp. 557 f.

the other a principle of evil, as was said by the heretics of Albi, nor by three divine Beings dividing among themselves the ages of the world, as taught by the Abbot of Flora, nor by a God confounded with the world, as was maintained by the doctor of Chartres, but by a superior, incomprehensible Trinity, at one and the same time Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[96] The fathers of the council then repeated explicitly the decrees of the Council of Verona relative to the searching out of heretics and their punishment.[97]

The second care of the council was to define and strongly establish the various degrees of the hierarchical authority. Canon 5 proclaims the universal right of appeal to the pope and establishes the following order among the four patriarchal sees: after Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The patriarchs of these last four sees can give the pallium to their suffragans, but they themselves must receive it from the pope. Canons 6 and 7 define the rights and duties of metropolitans, of provincial councils, of bishops, and of chapters.

The organization and functioning of ecclesiastical justice received special attention on the part of the reform council. The questions of judicial order and of procedure were familiar to Innocent III, who was an accomplished jurist. Canon 8, on trials in ecclesiastical courts, was destined to become the basis of the criminal procedure, even before the secular courts. It defended the accused against the arbitrary acts of the judge. It decided that the proceedings should be written, and that the accused should never be cited before a judge too far away. In short, the arraignment procedure, already battered by several of the decretals, finally disappeared and was replaced by the inquiry procedure, *per inquisitionem.*

[96] "We believe and confess with Peter (Lombard) that there is one supreme entity, incomprehensible and ineffable, which is truly Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, together (*simul*) three persons." (Cf. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 240. Tr.)

[97] Canon 3.

The Pope wished not only greater justice but also greater light to enter the clerical world. The schools of theology, instead of being opened arbitrarily or according to the chance of circumstances, were given a hierarchical order and were really placed under control. Canon 11 decreed that "not only in every cathedral church but also in other churches where means are sufficient, a competent master be appointed . . . who shall instruct *gratis* and to the best of his ability the clerics of those and other churches." Canon 27 declares that, "if in the future bishops presume to ordain ignorant and unformed men, . . . we decree that both those ordaining and those ordained be subject to severe punishment."

Passing to the consideration of the faithful, the council issued various decisions regarding marriage impediments and the bans (canons 50–52), prescribed annual confession of the faithful to their own parish priest and the duty of Easter communion (canon 21),[98] repeated the prohibition of dueling (canon 18), provided that the people should be instructed in their duties by regular and frequent preaching (canons 11 and 27).

The last four canons refer to the Jews and the Saracens. They prescribe: "that if in the future under any pretext Jews extort from Christians oppressive and immoderate interest, the partnership of the Christians shall be denied them till they have made suitable satisfaction for their excesses. The Christians also shall be compelled by ecclesiastical censure to abstain from all commercial intercourse with them; 2. since it sometimes happens that through error Christians mingle with the women of Jews and Saracens, and Jews and Saracens mingle with those of the Christians; therefore that such ruin-

[98] The famous canon is worded as follows: "All the faithful of both sexes shall after they have reached the age of discretion faithfully confess all their sins at least once a year to their own (parish) priest and perform to the best of their ability the penance imposed, receiving reverently at least at Easter the sacrament of the Eucharist" (cf. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 259. Tr.).

ous commingling through error of this kind may not serve as a refuge for further excuse for excesses, we decree that such people of both sexes (that is, Jews and Saracens) in every Christian province and at all times be distinguished in public from other people by a difference of dress; 3. that Jews are not to be given public offices; 4. that baptized Jews, having given themselves of their own free will to the Christian religion, must abandon all their former rites."

The decree about a new Crusade is the last document of the council. It fixed the date for the departure of the expedition for the year 1217 and, for this purpose, prescribed a universal peace throughout Christendom.

Innocent III did not see his great plan carried out. In July, 1216, as he was on his way to Upper Italy to settle a difference there between Pisa and Genoa and to make preparations for the Crusade, he was stricken with fever and died at Perugia, July 16, almost suddenly, in his fifty-sixth year, the nineteenth of his pontificate.

We can form a sound judgment of this great Pope's work only by considering it as a whole and by considering it in its circumstances. Some persons have been shocked at seeing Innocent III subject to himself, as vassals, princes and kings, speak to them at times as an army chief would address his captains. But we should not forget that those princes and kings, if they had not gravitated into the orbit of the papacy, would have been drawn, to the great harm of Christendom, into the orbit of the German Empire or that of the Empire of Constantinople; that vassalage was then the normal means of assuring oneself of a permanent authority over the peoples,[99] and that the hegemony of the Holy See appeared, at that precise moment of history, necessary for the triumph of Christian morality and of true civilization. We may add that often the

[99] But France showed herself devoted to the Holy See without ever contracting any bond of vassalage to it.

bond of vassalage to the Holy See was desired by the princes themselves; that they regarded it less as a sign of a yoke than the guaranty of a protection. They even sought to shelter under this vassalage their usurpations or their unjust conquests: so great was the moral authority of the papacy at that time, reaching out to whatever it took under its protection.[100] As we have already noted, Innocent III knew how to moderate the rigor of his government by an unusual spirit of gentle kindness, and in him the justice of the suzerain nearly always effaced itself before the charity of the shepherd and father.

[100] See Duchesne and Fabre, *Liber censuum de l'Eglise romaine.*

CHAPTER XI

From Innocent III to Alexander IV (1216–1254)

WHEN, at the Lateran Council, Pope Innocent III organized the forces of Christendom to hurl them all together against the infidels, one thought in particular gave him confidence for the future. He who shared with him the government of the Western world, the Emperor, seemed to him fully won to his cause. Never, since St. Henry, had a German prince given such pledges of fidelity to the Church. The ward of Innocent III, raised by him to the royal power of the Two Sicilies, then to the imperial dignity, Frederick II appeared no less devoted to the Pontiff's principles than to his person. But the future was preparing some bitter deceptions for Innocent's successors.

The former protégé of the Holy See became its most terrible foe. In him were united, mutually supporting each other, the most ambitious political hopes of his predecessors and the most daring philosophical speculations of his contemporaries. With him the imperial idea was erected into a complete system of antichristian civilization. Calling everything into question in the realm of ideas, even the dogmas of the Church and the divinity of Christ; undermining everything in the order of institutions, with the exception of his divine right, which he exalted even to the point of regarding himself as an emanation of the Holy Ghost, he waged merciless war on priests and monks, he unceasingly thwarted the policy of the Holy See, he even made an alliance with the Saracens, who he considered were closer to his ideal of civilization; and, to attain his end, he regarded all and any means as good, especially

trickery and perfidy, until he was unmasked by Gregory IX and finally crushed by Innocent IV.

Pope Honorius III

On July 18, 1216, three days after Innocent III's death, the cardinal-priest Cencius Savelli was elected pope under the name of Honorius III. He was an aged man reputed for his knowledge of affairs and for the urbanity of his character. To him we owe the *Liber censuum,* in which are listed and described the patrimonial possessions and the tax incomes of the Roman Church.[1] Pope Innocent III, who esteemed him highly, had made him familiar with his projects, and he was known to have nothing more at heart than to bring about the triumph of the ideas of the great deceased Pontiff. These ideas we find clearly expressed in the decisions of the last great council. They may be summed up in three points: to extirpate heresy, to reform morals, and to resume the Crusade. Such was the program which Honorius intended to carry out when he accepted the office of governing the Church. But he was not long in seeing that this program could not be realized so long as Italy was not completely freed from the imperial domination. The realization of this fourth part of the papal program encountered formidable obstacles.

All those obstacles came from Emperor Frederick. The mildness, loyalty, and peacefulness of the new head of the Church were matched by the baseness, hypocrisy, and quarrelsomeness of the new head of the Empire. Born in Italy, and being partly of German blood and partly of Norman, Frederick II combined in himself a surprising mixture of brilliant qualities and coarse vices. His intellectual culture placed him far above his nation; his valor in war and his skill in council raised him to the level of his grandfather Barbarossa; but no one perhaps

[1] See Duchesne and Fabre, *Liber censuum Ecclesiae romanae.*

ever equaled him in shameless dishonesty and perjury. In the whole line of the emperors he is the only one whom Dante, that passionate admirer of the Empire, felt constrained to consign to the tortures of his *Inferno*.[2] Throughout the life of Innocent III he had protested his attachment to the Church and to the Holy See; but in reality he felt himself humiliated at being a vassal of the papacy for Sicily and, like Henry V and Barbarossa, he was contemplating encircling the papal domain with imperial possessions. Only let the Church permit him little by little to realize this scheme, and he would promise everything, even to become the champion of the canons of the council, to fight heresy, to labor for the reform of the Church, and to march at the head of the Crusade. In these conditions, to ask the abandonment of Sicily from the son of the German Emperor Henry VI and the Sicilian Princess Constance, was to encounter invincible resistance. The kind and gentle Pontiff would meet with failure.

Frederick neglected nothing to deceive the Pope about his real dispositions. He not only renewed his vow to set out for the Crusade, but he succeeded in having the Pope pronounce excommunication against the princes who would put off their departure under various pretexts. The tenants of Countess Matilda's domain were relieved of their obligations to the Empire. He confirmed the pope's rights over the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona, recognized all the liberties of the Church, pursued the heretics, placed under the ban of the Empire all whom the Pope had excommunicated for attacking his rights or possessions, and promulgated a perpetual peace in favor of the country people. True, he did interfere in Lombardy and tried to have acknowledged as German Emperor his son Henry, who had already been crowned king of Sicily; that is, he attempted to constrict the papal domain on the north and on the south. But he pretended that his inter-

[2] Dante, *Inferno,* canto 10, verse 120: "Within is Frederick, second of that name."

vention in Lombardy had no purpose except to nullify certain laws passed by the communes against the liberty of the Church. As to his son Henry's election to the imperial office, it had taken place, said Frederick, unexpectedly, during his absence, and he protested that he would not give his assent to it except with the approbation of the head of Christendom. Could the Pope mistrust so devoted and submissive a collaborator? To quiet the Pope's least scruples of conscience, Frederick II declared that in any event Sicily and Germany would be separately administered. Thus would be avoided even the appearance of any threat of encroachment of the state upon the domain of the Church.

If the thought of any hypocrisy on Frederick's part came to the mind of Honorius III, such a hypothesis doubtless seemed to him in this case too revolting to be true. The peaceful Pontiff (September 22, 1220) conferred the imperial crown on Frederick II, who with great spirit took the cross from the hands of Cardinal Ugolino bishop of Ostia and again swore that he would set out for the Holy Land during the summer of 1221.

The faithless Emperor had obtained all that his ambition desired: the obtaining of his authority over northern Italy and over the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the confirmation of his imperial dignity. After that he took no account of his oaths and promises. Honorius, eager to see the expedition to the Holy Land really get started, in vain implored him to set out, and threatened him with the censures of the Church. Frederick alleged urgent necessities, unforeseen hindrances; he repeated his promises, but never fulfilled them. In 1222 his marriage, it was his second marriage, to Princess Isabella, only daughter of John of Brienne and sole heir of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, seemed to pledge him to participation in the holy war. But, in fact, it did nothing of the sort. Frederick took the title of king of Jerusalem and made use of it to

place further obstacles in the way of the Crusade. "A delay is necessary," he pretended, "so as to make the campaign in a sure manner." Meanwhile he oppressed the Sicilians, molested the Lombards, treated the Pope's subjects as though they were his own, and even founded, at Lucera north of Naples, a colony of Sicilian Mohammedans, who terrorized the Christians of the vicinity.

Honorius, who was then absorbed in weighty cares of administration and reform, hesitated to adopt rigorous measures against the formidable sovereign. About the end of 1226, however, he was on the point of resorting to them. The Lombard communes, weary of the imperial yoke, had formed a new league for the defense of their independence. Frederick saw the blow that menaced him; a papal excommunication at that moment might raise the south of Italy against him, might detach several Christian nations from the Empire, and might encourage rebellions in Germany. He resorted to effrontery and trickery. Suddenly revoking the violent measures which he had taken in Lombardy, recalling the bishops he had driven out, he humbly begged the head of the Church to act as arbitrator in his conflict with the Lombards. The Lombards accepted the plan of arbitration. Honorius, in his decision, tried to make the events contribute to the success of the Crusade which he had so much at heart. After repairing the injustices committed on both sides, the Emperor and the Lombards were to go together to fight the Saracens of the Holy Land. At the same time the Pope by his legates strove to arouse public opinion in Germany and in Hungary. But death overtook him (March 18, 1227) before anything was undertaken in Palestine.[3]

[3] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* Bk. II, Part III, chap. 1. On Honorius III, see Potthast, nos. 5317–7862; *Liber pontif.,* II, 453; Pressuti, *Regesta Honorii papae III;* Watterich, *Pontif. roman. vitae,* I, 71–84; Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici II,* I, 503 ff.; Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1409–66.

Pope Gregory IX

The peaceful kindliness of Honorius III had been powerless to disarm the aggressive ambition of Frederick II. After the Pontiff's death, the cardinals unanimously chose a prelate whose energetic and militant character was known to all, the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, Ugolino. He was almost eighty years old; but his advanced age had not lessened the tireless activity and the manly courage which he had shown under the preceding popes in important missions. He belonged to the noble family of the Segni and was related to Innocent III. He promised to defend and continue the work of that Pontiff with the fearlessness of a Gregory VII. The name of Gregory IX, which he took, seemed to be a program. Like Hildebrand, he had always sought his strongest support among the monks. Successfully he resisted his terrible adversary Frederick II in an almost ceaseless struggle, simultaneously carried on in the East and in the West. Besides this he displayed, in theological, canonical, and disciplinary matters, an organizing activity that made his reign one of the important stages in the intellectual movement of the Middle Ages.

A treaty between Honorius III and Frederick II fixed the month of August, 1227, as the date for the Emperor's departure for the Crusade. "In the first letter which he wrote to the sovereign, the new Pope enjoined upon him that he fulfil his vow without delay.[4] A second letter (June 8, 1227) was still more pressing. On September 8, Frederick embarked. But, after his ship had gone only a few miles, he turned back under the pretext of sickness. Then (September 29) at Anagni the Pope launched the excommunication against him. The quarrel of the priesthood and the Empire began again: Frederick transported it to the East." [5] He set out again the next year

[4] Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.*, III, 6.

[5] Bréhier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age*, p. 200.

(June 28, 1228), but at the head of a fleet of fifty ships which scarcely presented the aspect of a religious expedition. The Saracens of Lucera were in it, mingled with the knights of Germany. "Frederick II's Crusade was a purely political expedition. Heir to the traditions of his father Henry VI, he resolved to claim for the imperial authority the Christian states of the East, which until then had been regarded as a conquest of the Church. Imbued with the new political doctrines that were a consequence of the revival of the studies in Roman law, it was with the Caesars of ancient Rome that, far beyond Otto and Charlemagne, he connected the roots of his power. Therefore he regarded as his absolute right the exercise of sovereignty over the East as well as over the West, over the Church as well as over the state." [6]

Boldness and cunning, abetted by a singular coincidence of circumstances, at first seemed to assure full success to this policy. The recent death of Empress Isabella, by handing down to her young son Conrad his eventual rights to the crown of Jerusalem, created for Frederick II a title, or at least a pretext, to intervene in the East for the purpose of protecting the prince's rights there. And so the Emperor everywhere spoke and acted as master. At Cyprus, where the young King Henry reigned, under the regency of his mother Alix of Champagne, the Emperor assumed the suzerainty of the kingdom and the guardianship of the young sovereign. A few barons resisted. An army landed on the island and seized it in the Emperor's name.

Upon his arrival in Palestine, Frederick's situation appeared at first to be very critical. He was excommunicated. The grand masters of the Temple and of the Hospitallers refused to hold communication with him; the Franciscans and the Dominicans preached against him; many of the crusaders returned to Europe. But the circumstances favored him; or rather his

[6] *Ibid.*

unscrupulous conscience let him utilize, for the benefit of his policy, a conflict that had just broken out between the sultan of Egypt, Melek-el-Khamil, and the Prince of Damascus. By agreeing to fight the latter, by promising to prevent the Western princes from attacking Egypt, and by guaranteeing to the Mussulmans the free exercise of their worship and the ownership of the Mosque of Omar, he obtained from the Sultan the restitution of Jerusalem, of Bethlehem, and of Nazareth, with the highways and villages that connected those cities with St. John of Acre. This was the purpose of the treaty signed at Jaffa on February 4, 1229. On March 17 Frederick II made his solemn entry into the Holy City, wearing the imperial mantle and followed by his knights. The only further thing he needed was reconciliation with the Pope. This he accomplished by swearing to have his troops evacuate the States of the Church, to restore to all clerics and laymen what had been confiscated from them on account of their attachment to the Church, to return to their sees and office all the exiled bishops. The agreements were subscribed to by him (July 23, 1230) at San Germano; and the Pope, after receiving satisfaction on all the points which had prompted the excommunication of the Emperor, reconciled him with the Church on August 28.[7]

But Gregory IX was always distrustful of his precarious and equivocal success. Frederick's attitude in the East was unfriendly to the Latin Empire. He aided neither his father-in-law John of Brienne nor his brother-in-law Baldwin II. A coalition was formed against him and, in 1243, the High Court of Jerusalem, on the alleged ground that Prince Conrad, Frederick's son, had come of age, declared Frederick removed from the regency and entrusted the government of Jerusalem to the Queen of Cyprus, Alix of Champagne, as the closest relative of Isabella of Brienne, then to her son, Henry of Lusignan, king

[7] *M. G., SS.*, XIX, 362; *Leges*, sec. IV, Vol. II, pp. 170–83.

of Cyprus. Furthermore, the latter's powers did not last long, because a fresh disaster soon removed the Holy City from the domination of the Christians.

The Crusade in Spain

To fight the infidel, Providence had prepared other succors for the Church. While the German Emperor was upsetting the world on the pretext of delivering the tomb of Christ, St. Ferdinand and his Spaniards, St. Louis and his French, St. Francis of Assisi and his Friars Minor, were accomplishing, with less gorgeous show, more useful works.

The victory at Navas de Tolosa (July 16, 1212) had arrested the impetus of the Mussulman invasion in Spain, but had not removed every danger. The four military orders of Avis, of St. James, of Alcantara, and of Calatrava, would continue to form in the peninsula a sort of living rampart, holding back the flood of the Almohades Mussulmans.[8] King Ferdinand III's coming to the throne of Castile (August 31, 1217) gave a fresh security to Spain and to the Church. The new sovereign was barely nineteen years old. But his serious, strong character, his open intelligence, and especially his deep faith promised his people an era of justice and prosperity. That promise was kept. He started out from the principle that the first condition of a powerful outward action for a state is an internal organization solidly established on the observance of justice between men and on respect for the rights of God. So he first strove to ameliorate the legislation, undertaking that recasting of the Visigoth code which his son

[8] The Almohades (from the Arab *al monahedya*) were a sect and dynasty of Moorish princes, so named because they claimed to be the only ones who acknowledged the unity of God. After 1120 in Morocco, then in the regency of Algeria and on the southern coast of Spain, they supplanted the Almoravides (from the Arab *al morabeth*), so called because they considered themselves the most religious of their race.

Alfonso X completed and published under the name of *El Setenario*.[9] He also watched over the exact application, without passion or weakness, of the laws which he strove to revive. He himself, wherever he passed, was pleased to hear and settle disputes, gladly taking the side of the poor and the lowly. "I have more dread," he said, "of the curses of a poor woman than of all the armies of the Moors." [10]

In 1229 Pope Gregory IX commissioned his legate John of Abbeville, bishop of Sabina, to arouse in Spain a crusade against the domination of the Mussulmans. Ferdinand III was the first ruler to answer this appeal. While James I of Aragon was taking Majorca and Valencia, the King of Castile, who had become also King of Leon through the death of his father Alfonso IX in 1230, took by assault the fortresses of Cordova, Seville, and Cadiz. At his death in 1252 the Moors were in possession, in the Spanish peninsula, only of the city of Granada, and the great King, who wore a haircloth shirt, who passed in prayer the whole night preceding a clash of arms, and who exclaimed: "Lord, you are my witness that I seek only the development of faith in you and not perishable conquests," [11] left to Spain and the Church the example of a saint.

France and the Crusades

When Gregory IX stirred up Spain against the yoke of the Saracens, King Ferdinand III's aunt, Blanche of Castile, was governing France as the guardian of her son Louis IX. Brought to France in 1200 at the age of twelve, she there gave the example of a pious and austere life. Her regency revealed in her also a virile energy, an absolute devotion to the cause of the Church. To her has been attributed the inspiration of

[9] Laurentie, *Saint Ferdinand III*, p. 47.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

the Crusade which Thibaut IV de Champagne, the knight-poet, led to the Holy Land in 1239 and 1240. The Church should venerate in her especially the admirable mother who trained St. Louis. Of her personal life we know particularly what her son was pleased to relate. She had told him often that she would prefer to see him dead than to have him guilty of a mortal sin. These words deeply impressed the young prince and inspired his whole life.

When he became of age in 1235, Louis IX found himself, thanks to his mother, not merely sovereign of a comparatively tranquil kingdom, but profoundly penetrated with the duties of a Christian king. The saintly King already had, no doubt, in his features and in his bearing, that noble beauty which later prompted Joinville, in his account of the battle of Mansurah, to say: "No one ever beheld so beautiful an armed man." With regard to his moral traits, another historian says: "Never did a man charged with governing men have more upright intentions. . . . He guided his steps by the light of two ideas: that of right, and that of salvation. . . . He did not think that encroachment on the rights of others, spoliation, or robbery, forbidden between individuals by morality, were lawful for reasons of state. . . . To his eyes, the blessing of peace was so great that often he consented to sacrifices to procure it for his country and his neighbors. His principle was to reconcile his foes instead of profiting by their quarrels." [12] "If I acted otherwise," he used to say, "I would deserve the hatred of God, who has said: Blessed are the peacemakers."

Louis IX had another reason for maintaining peace in his kingdom and between nations. In his early youth he entertained the hope of uniting all the forces of Christendom against the infidels. When he was a mere boy, nothing afflicted him so much as the account of the oppression that weighed on the Christians of Palestine. The treachery which Fred-

[12] Langlois in Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. III, Part II, pp. 37 f.

erick II manifested in his expedition to the East, was for Louis IX an occasion of great sadness. William of Nangis tells that in 1237, when the Emperor of Germany expressed a desire to confer at Vaucouleurs [13] with the kings of England and France about the interests of Christendom, the latter manifested the intention of going there with two thousand knights. The Emperor, in the presence of this mark of mistrust, alleged an illness to excuse his absence. Three years later the dangers of the Mongol invasion, the supreme appeal of Pope Gregory IX to Christendom against the new peril of the Church, deeply affected the heart of the holy King. The invaders' sudden diversion toward the Far East halted his plan to take the cross; but this idea did not leave him after that. He realized it at a later time, with a brilliance that made him the accomplished model of the knights of Christ.

Like his cousin St. Ferdinand of Castile, St. Louis could indeed say: "What I desire is not the extension of an earthly kingdom, but the spread of faith in Jesus Christ." This was the thought which then also dominated the soul of another great saint. To die for Christ while preaching his name to the infidels, on the soil sprinkled with His blood: such was the hope cherished by Francis of Assisi. In 1219, in the Church of St. Mary of the Angels, he divided the world among his disciples, reserving for himself Syria and Palestine. In the month of August he joined the army of the crusaders at Damietta. Quickly perceiving that many of these soldiers of Christ had need of the word of God, he preached it to them with results, even prompted several of them to put on the robe of a Friar Minor. But Francis had no rest until he preached the Gospel to the Mussulmans. Melek-el-Kamil the sultan of Egypt had promised a gold bezant to anyone who should bring him the head of a Christian. Francis, no doubt

[13] Vaucouleurs was the usual place for the conferences between France and the Empire.

under the pretext of opening preliminaries of peace in the name of the Christian army, presented himself, accompanied by a Friar Minor, before the Saracen outposts. At first the two Christians had blows heaped on them by the sentries; but by dint of shouting, "Sultan, Sultan," Francis was at length led into the presence of the Commander of the Faithful. Then, to everybody's amazement, he did propose peace to the Sultan, but by inviting him to embrace the Christian faith, setting forth its dogmas in simple form. The Sultan merely answered mildly: "Pray God, that he reveal to me the religion which is most acceptable to Him." [14] Then, says an old chronicle, he sent Francis away, "giving him, as also his companion, a certain sign, so that at sight of it, no one should do them any harm." [15]

Emperor Frederick II

Such deeds of heroism consoled Gregory IX for the treasons and perjuries of Frederick II. And these treacheries were not limited to the East. In the spring of 1228 the Emperor, to avenge his excommunication by the Pope, had stirred up the powerful house of the Frangipani and several other great Roman houses, who were won over by gifts of money or by promises of honors. Gregory IX was obliged to leave Rome, flee to Rieti, then to Perugia.

During the summer of that same year, the Emperor, when setting out for Palestine, had left behind him, to disturb the States of the Church, a strong body of soldiers, a mixture of Germans and Saracens, who soon gave the Pope cause of

[14] Celano, *Vita prima,* I, 19; St. Bonaventure, *Vita S. Francisci,* IX, 8; *Acta sanctorum,* October 11.

[15] *Actus Beati Francisci et sociorum ejus* (ed. Sabatier), chap. 27. This sign is supposed to have been a safe-conduct, a sort of *firman.* The preference always shown by the popes in choosing a Friar Minor to represent them in negotiations with the Mussulmans, is supposed to go back to this episode.

complaint. To protect himself from these vexations, two expeditions were required. One, commanded by John de Brienne, drove the imperial forces from the States of the Church; the other expedition entered Sicily, where the subjects of the kingdom were freed from their oath of fidelity to the Emperor. The Treaty of San Germano (1230) brought six years of comparative peace.

But in 1236 war broke out again. The Emperor, on the pretext of fighting the heretics, required that the Pope serve as an instrument of his policy by excommunicating and fighting the Lombards. Instead of acceding to this demand, Gregory IX judged that the hour had come to condemn once again the crimes of the Emperor, who in addition to his public attacks upon the Holy See, the episcopate, and the religious orders, indulged in the disorders of a private life given over to the grossest debauchery. Frederick replied by letters sent to all the Christian rulers, to win them to his cause. The Pope, to avert the storm, made a final effort to start the Emperor toward the East. But a fresh knavish trick by Frederick precipitated the events. While his envoys were promising the Pope all the satisfactions required, he was invading Sardinia and was taking possession of Massa in the diocese of Lucca. The Pope (June 20, 1239) addressed an encyclical to all the Christian rulers and to all the bishops,[16] answering point by point the Emperor's calumnies and disclosing his scandalous impiety. Has he not been heard to say that "three impostors, Christ, Moses, and Mohammed, had led the world to its ruin"? Has he not been heard to exclaim, at sight of a priest taking the Blessed Sacrament to a sick person: "How much longer will this comedy last?" [17] In two letters written shortly afterward (October 21, 1239), the Pope attempted to convince the

[16] Potthast, no. 10,766. Of this letter, mentioned by Potthast, we possess a copy which is addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans.

[17] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1590 f.

King of France of Frederick's guilt and of the necessity of fighting him.[18]

The position of the holy King was a delicate one. His devotion to the Holy See could not leave him indifferent to this great controversy. His own interests would have led him to take up arms against the Emperor. "Frederick always claimed to be the sovereign of all the countries located to the east of the Meuse, the Saône, and the Rhone.[19] In taking Gregory IX's side, St. Louis could drive from the frontiers of France that shadow of imperial sovereignty." [20] But his father Louis VIII and later his mother Blanche of Castile had concluded treaties of friendly understanding with the Empire. No one carried respect for treaties so far as did King Louis IX. "He allowed bishops, according to the Pope's command, to publish the excommunication of Frederick. He let the Pope levy money on the ecclesiastics; but he himself refused to become involved and, in the name of his brother, declined the imperial dignity which the Pope offered to the latter." [21] The King of Spain, Ferdinand of Castile, for similar reasons, took the same attitude.

Relying on the Ghibelline cities, Frederick had hurled his troops on the country districts of the Guelphs; but the Romans at length decided to take in hand the cause of their aged pontiff. In 1237 Gregory IX, sustained by the Orsini and the Conti, recovered possession of Rome. Very skilfully he accepted the struggle on the terrain where the Emperor had been provoking it for some time: he declared that he appealed to a council. From all points of the Christian world, the bishops were convoked to come to Rome. Then Frederick took fright. It was no longer merely the Pope, it was all Christendom that perhaps was going to rise up against him. Furthermore,

[18] Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.*, V, 457; Potthast, nos. 10,798 f.
[19] Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.*, Introd., pp. ccli f.
[20] Wallon, *Saint Louis et son temps*, I, 124.
[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

Gregory IX, then more than ninety-eight years old, was showing tireless energy. The Emperor, personally holding the passes into Italy, entrusted to his natural son Enzio a fleet that was to halt every ship carrying prelates. A number of bishops and of English and French abbots were thus kept from answering the Pope's summons. Some were arrested by the Emperor. Louis IX then intervened and wrote to Frederick in a tone that allowed of no other discussion except resort to arms. Frederick, unwilling to break with the King of France, liberated the prisoners. The Pope's death, which occurred soon afterward, and the election of Innocent IV complicated the grave conflict still more.

Intellectual Activities

So many cares would have worn out a less robust constitution than that of Gregory IX. But what is truly prodigious is that this Pope, who became head of the Church at the age of eighty, was able, for almost twenty years, to give to the canonical, philosophical, and theological sciences a powerful and fruitful impulse which places him, close to Sylvester II, among the great promoters of the intellectual movement in the Church.

He was a canonist of worth. He had noted, in the various juridical collections of his time, two defects, which he expressed in a concise way. Those collections, he said, were "too alike and too diverse": too alike by the accumulation of several texts of identical meaning, and too diverse by the insertion of contradictory texts. Gregory IX was alluding to the five famous compilations, made in the pontificates of his three predecessors, Celestine III, Innocent III, and Honorius III, which the Bologna doctors had adopted, under the name of *Quinque compilationes,* to serve as texts for their lectures. The partial success of this innovation had not escaped Gregory IX; but

he wished the reform to be more complete and permanent. To replace the five collections by a single book, more easily handled, without apparent contradictions and without repetitions, where the texts would be reduced to the conciseness required for legal documents, where the parts fallen into disuse would be eliminated, where everything would have an official juridical value above all dispute; to make it a text obligatory for teaching in the schools, a single code before the ecclesiastical courts: such was his aim. This was more than a change in scholastic method; it was a complete juridical reform that he contemplated, comparable to that which Emperor Justinian realized by codifying and harmonizing the laws of the Roman Empire.

To accomplish such a project a canonist was needed, one able to grasp the great idea by a mighty spirit of synthesis and to realize it by a spirit of critical analysis and judicious common sense. Raymond of Penafort was that man. Born, about 1175, in Spain, in the Penafort castle, whose ruins may still be seen in the neighborhood of Barcelona, with the soul of a scholar and apostle, Raymond in his youth had two ambitions: to acquire consummate learning, which he would distribute freely about him; to amass the greatest possible resources, to be used in ransoming Christian captives from the Mussulmans. He realized his second plan by founding the Order of Our Lady of Mercy. He thought he was sufficiently carrying out the former plan by giving free lessons in canon law, when Pope Gregory IX summoned him to serve him as chaplain and penitentiary, then entrusted to him the execution of his great project.[22] Begun in 1230, the editing of the *Decretales*—such was the name given to the new collection—was completed in 1234. By his bull *Rex pacificus* (September 5, 1234), the Pope imposed the collection on the faculties

[22] On St. Raymond of Penafort, who was the third master general of the Friars Preachers (1238–40), see Mortier, *Hist. des maîtres généraux des Frères prêcheurs*, I, 255–85.

as the sole official text for teaching, on the ecclesiastical tribunals as the authentic rule of the law. All the texts contained in it, whatever their origin or historical authenticity, thenceforth, by the will of the Pope, had a juridical authenticity, and in the future no one could compose another collection without a special authorization of the Holy See.

The teaching of the philosophical and theological sciences had no less need of being regulated at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The relations established, on the occasion of the Crusades, between the West and East, had brought into Europe numerous works, until then unknown, of Greek and Arabian philosophy. The master most frequently cited by both was Aristotle. No doubt, the study of the great philosopher, by the scientific precision of his method and by the depth of his views, would give a great impulse to the philosophy of the thirteenth century. But his doctrine was interpreted too much in the sense of his rationalist commentators.[23] His philosophy of God and of the soul was thus, on many points, in disagreement with Christian dogma. For instance, how was his theory of matter and of eternal movement to be reconciled with the dogma of the creation? How could his doctrine about pure act, which takes no account of the universe, be reconciled with faith in Providence; or his system of the two intellects, one passive and perishable, the other active and impersonal, be reconciled with the immortality of the human soul?

The danger was great, the greater as notorious heretics of that time, Amalric of Bena and David of Dinant, appealed to the authority of the Philosopher. We shall see presently how Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, and the Scholastics succeeded in warding off the peril. But we can understand that the first movement of anxiety by the heads of the Church was

[23] Several treatises of Aristotle, successively translated from Greek into Syriac, from Syriac into Arabic, from Arabic into Hebrew, from Hebrew into a Spanish dialect, reached the Europe of the Middle Ages only after being subjected to the deformations of five different languages.

in the form of a prohibition against reading the works of Aristotle. A council of Paris, convoked in 1210 by Peter of Corbeil, forbade the public or private teaching of Aristotle's writings on natural philosophy and the commentaries of Averroes.[24] Five years later the legate Robert de Courçon repeated the same prohibitions, extending them to the writings on metaphysics. In these official acts, Aristotle was put in the company of the worst heretics of the period. The prohibition was prompted by good reasons. Certain obscure passages of Aristotle could easily be distorted and certain errors in his works could be used to spread dangerous doctrines under cover of his great authority.[25]

But in 1231, when the first panic had passed, Gregory IX saw that, to avoid one peril, they were on the road to encounter another. To forbid Christians the study of the first philosopher of Greece, was to deprive them of intellectual resources of incalculable value; to leave to the Arabs the privilege of commenting on him and adapting him to their doctrines, was perhaps to abandon to them the direction of the intellectual movement, to allow them to reconquer, by their influence over minds, the ground which the Crusades had made them lose. Moreover the errors of Amalric of Bena and of David of Dinant no longer had any followers. Apparently their heresies had been destroyed along with their books. Gregory entrusted to three theologians the task of correcting the forbidden books and allowed the editions thus amended to be inscribed in the program of the faculty of arts at Paris. From that time on, the ecclesiastical authority merely condemned those who should be proved to have made abusive use of Aristotle to teach error, and the authority of the Stagirite continued to grow in the schools.

The maxim of this great Pope was that the proper way

[24] Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis parisiensis*, I, 70.
[25] De Wulf, *op. cit.*, § 228, p. 252.

to combat the errors of a false science is, not by ignorance, but by the light of true science. Such is the thought which inspired him, in 1231, to issue the celebrated bull *Parens scientiarum,* which is regarded as the charta of foundation of the University of Paris. Gregory was a former student of the Paris schools. There he had won even the highest rank.[26] In 1229 the professors, in protest against a violation of certain privileges of their corporation, had even entered into conflict with the royal government and had discontinued their classes in sign of dissatisfaction. The Pope confirmed the right which they claimed to enact statutes for themselves, and explicitly authorized them to use, as a defensive arm, the "cessation," that is, suspension of teaching. He also regulated the University's relations with the chancellor of the Church of Paris. Thus strongly organized, the University of Paris soon experienced a rapid extension and became the model of all the other universities of the Middle Ages.

The Inquisition

But the more favorable Gregory IX was to the progress of studies, the more severe he was toward those who made use of this broadly dispensed instruction to propagate heresy and, by heresy, disturbance in the Church and in society. Gregory IX, the patron of studies, was one of the most active organizers of the Inquisition. From 1229 to 1240, by a series of methodically combined measures, he pursued the repression of heresies throughout Europe by the establishment of an agreement between the Holy See on one side, and the episcopate and Christian rulers on the other.

Some have said that the Roman Inquisition was created in November, 1229, at the Council of Toulouse, by Cardinal Romanus, legate of Gregory IX. This statement is not quite

[26] Du Boulay, *Historia Universitatis parisiensis,* III, 680.

correct. The Council of Toulouse simply decreed a very complete regulation for the finding and punishment of heretics. This regulation,[27] by codifying and supplementing the usages and prescriptions followed for a half century before in the repression of heresy, subsequently became the basis of the procedure followed by the fixed tribunals of inquiry established during the thirteenth century. For this reason it has great historical importance.

These fixed tribunals were established successively in France, where St. Louis put himself at the disposal of the clerics charged with the pursuit of the heretics; in Castile, where St. Ferdinand took the same attitude;[28] in Aragon, where King James, on the advice of his confessor Raymond of Penafort, himself asked the Pope to send him some inquisitors;[29] in Italy, where the Cathari let loose civil war by joining the Ghibellines against the Guelphs;[30] in Germany, where the Dominican Conrad of Marburg was especially commissioned by the Pope to have the inquisition regulations carried out;[31] at Rome, where Gregory IX had those same regulations inserted in the municipal laws.[32] This organization was established by Gregory IX between 1225 and 1240. From that time on, we find a tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome, exercising powers which emanated directly from the pope. This tribunal had its own prisons. Only the obstinate heretics and the relapsed were

[27] Mansi, XXIII, 191.

[28] Raynaldi, *Annales,* year 1236, no. 61.

[29] Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* II, 168.

[30] *Ibid.,* p. 234.

[31] Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* p. 82.

[32] Boehmer, *Acta imperii selecta,* XIII, 378. From Germany the Inquisition extended into Bohemia, Hungary, and the Scandinavian countries. Flanders and the Netherlands were placed under the jurisdiction of the grand inquisitor of France. Gregory IX, after promoting the institution, watched over its functioning. He intervened notably to moderate the excessive and sometimes cruel zeal of the grand inquisitor of France, Robert le Bougre, so named because, before entering the Dominican Order, he had been a Catharist heretic; the Cathari were popularly called Bulgari or Boulgres or Bougres. Cf. Vacandard, *op. cit.*

turned over to the secular arm, to undergo the penalty decreed by the civil law, namely, burning at the stake.

An important bull of Gregory IX was that which (April 20, 1232) gave commission to the provincial of the Dominicans of Provence to organize a general preaching in the south of France against heresy. This bull did not give the Order of St. Dominic the monopoly of the Inquisition in the Midi, as some writers have alleged; but Bernardes Guidonis rightly considers this letter as "the first title of his order to exercise the Inquisition." [33]

Dominicans and Franciscans

Gregory was a great patron of the religious family of St. Dominic. He had seen its beginning and he knew its zeal for the defense of orthodoxy. In his pontificate were drawn up in a logical manner, by order of Raymond of Penafort, then approved by the chapters of 1239, 1240, and 1241, the rules that have since then remained the basis of the legislation of the Preachers. "The modifications subsequently added are nothing more than an authentic and age-long commentary on them. This is why St. Raymond is called the author of these constitutions." [34]

Gregory likewise showed his solicitude toward the Order of St. Francis. When still only a cardinal, he had helped in bringing about the approval of its rule. But, in 1230, he had to intervene in the discussions that divided the members of the order. Outside its rule, approved by Honorius III, St. Francis had left to his religious family a spiritual testament, in which he laid great stress upon the practice of perfect poverty. Among the Friars Minor, some wished to place this testament on the same level as the rule; others, sustained by the

[33] Douais, *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Inquisition dans le Languedoc*, I, v.

[34] Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux des Frères prêcheurs*, I, 281.

new general of the order, Brother Elias, declared that, while respecting their father's last counsel, they did not regard it as having the force of law. By his bull *Quo elongati* (September 28, 1230), Gregory IX decided in favor of Brother Elias and his followers, declared that the testament of St. Francis of Assisi did not oblige in conscience, and that the poverty could and should be reconciled with the use of money by the intermediary of delegates of the benefactors and with the building of monasteries adapted to the needs of a large community.[35] Says a historian of the order: "Beyond doubt this was a departure from St. Francis' ideal, but it was a lesser evil than to endanger the existence of the order by imposing on the multitude of the religious certain obligations which many were powerless to observe." [36] We add that, among those who earnestly called for the observance of a stricter rule, several appear to have been animated by that spirit of exaggeration which would later produce, in the Franciscan Order and in the Church, the schism of the Spirituals.

The spirit of moderation in all things accompanied the devout Pontiff to his last hour. He gave fresh proofs of this with regard to Frederick II by entering upon negotiations with him in 1241 with a view to peace.[37] The Emperor, ill advised by his pride, refused these advances and decided to resort to arms. He advanced at the head of an army and was ravaging the environs of Rome, when the Pope, almost a hundred years old, died (August 21, 1241).

Pope Innocent IV

The worthy Pontiff's death furnished the Emperor with occasion for an insolent and indelicate triumph. To the rulers

[35] Brother Elias of Cortona has been a subject of considerable discussion among scholars. Cf. *Analecta bollandiana,* XXII (1903), 194-202.

[36] E. d'Alençon in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* VI, 812.

[37] Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1605.

of Christendom he wrote: "He did not pass through the bounds of the month of August, he who dared to attack the Augustus. He is dead, he who threw so many men into the peril of death." [38] Frederick's intrigues and interference prolonged the vacancy of the papal see for about two years.[39] Yet the Emperor feared that an indefinite prolongation of this state of affairs, which was agreeable to him personally, would arouse Christendom against him.[40] In May, 1243, seizing upon the moment when Cardinal Romanus of Porto, his most dreaded foe, had just died, he allowed the cardinals to meet in conclave.[41] He seems even to have expressed the desire that the one elected by the cardinals should be the cardinal-priest of San Lorenzo in Lucina, Sinibaldo de' Fieschi, who, by the imperial fiefs which his family possessed, belonged to the nobility of the Empire and with whom the Emperor had had cordial dealings. The cardinals had no difficulty in satisfying this desire. They knew their colleague as a man of eminently reliable faith. The high offices entrusted to him by the confidence of Pope Honorius and Pope Gregory IX had revealed his firm attachment to the Roman Church. His lectures in canon law at the Bologna University had given evidence of his high learning. He was in the full vigor of manhood.

On June 24, 1243, he was unanimously elected. To show that he meant to continue the traditions of Pope Innocent III,

[38] Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.*, V, 1165–67.

[39] This period of vacancy was indeed interrupted by a brief pontificate. Cardinal Godfrey of Milan, bishop of Sabina, a feeble old man, who was elected in October under the name of Celestine IV, died sixteen days after his election without marking his short occupancy of the Apostolic See by any important act.

[40] In August 1242, Louis IX of France had written to the cardinals, urging them to elect a pope and not to let themselves be frightened "by a certain prince who wished to gather the Empire and the priesthood into his own hands." These words plainly pointed to Frederick. St. Louis added that they could count on the support of his kingdom. Cf. Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.*, VI, 68.

[41] The election of Celestine IV in 1241 seems to be the first example of a conclave, that is, the practice of enclosing the cardinals in a certain place from which they do not come out until they have elected a pope. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1613 note 2.

he at once chose the name of Innocent IV and, when notifying the princes of his election (July 2), he declared that he would maintain all the rights of the papacy. Frederick wrote him a letter of felicitation filled with best wishes.[42] But we are told that, with a presentiment of the future, he exclaimed: "I fear that this election has removed a friend from the ranks of the cardinals by giving me, as my only compensation, a hostile pope." If by "hostile pope" the Emperor merely indicated a vigorous defender of the rights which he unjustly encroached upon, his presentiment would be realized beyond all expectation.

The pontificate of Innocent IV, which lasted eleven years, was marked by perfect unity and continuity of purpose: the liberation of the Church, oppressed in the West by the Emperor, in the East by the infidels. The three chief events of his reign are these: the Council of Lyons, the strife with Frederick II, and the Crusade. But they were merely various stages in the execution of that program.

A few months sufficed to convince the new Pope that he could not safely reside in Rome. The Emperor's attitude was more and more equivocal. While he was negotiating, shifting, making promise after promise and keeping none, he was buying fortresses from the Frangipani, had bishops on their way to or from Rome molested by his son Conrad, and he himself stayed in Italy, ready to play a decisive part there. Certain traditions attribute to the Emperor the project of making off with the Pope. Good reason existed at least for fearing that Innocent's communications with the Christian world might abruptly be cut off.

When the danger appeared clear to him, he hastened to create twelve new cardinals to fill up the number of the Sacred College, which had been reduced to seven members, entrusted to Cardinal Otto of Porto the necessary powers to take his

[42] Huillard-Bréholles, *op. cit.*, VI, 90–105; *M. G. Leges,* II, 341.

place in Rome. Then, on June 10, 1244, disguised as a knight, he left the Eternal City, went to Civitavecchia, where one of his relatives had a fleet prepared to escort him, and, joined by twelve of his cardinals, whom he had designated by name, he went to Lyons, then a free city, located on the confines of France and the Empire, not far from the prince who could, in case of danger, give him the most effective protection. The Abbey of St. Just, situated on Fourvières hill and surrounded by a solid fortification, seemed to him a safe retreat. He lived there more than six years and from there, with full freedom, governed the Christian world.

First General Council of Lyons

His first care was to gather about him the great council which had been planned by his predecessor. The sad news coming from the East made the holding of the council especially urgent. In the month of September, 1244, the army of the sultan of Egypt, supported by 10,000 Chorasmians,[43] seized Jerusalem. A body of Mongols threatened Antioch. The Christians of the East were in the greatest peril and appealed for the aid of their brothers of Europe. On January 4, 1245, Innocent IV convoked to Lyons, for June 28 of the same year, all the bishops and all the princes of the Catholic countries, to discuss the questions about the Holy Land, the relations of the Holy See with the Emperor, and the reform of the Church.

It was not in the Emperor's power to prevent this assembly. But he convoked a diet at Verona and sent, to represent him at Lyons and to defend his cause there, several of his most devoted counselors, among them Peter de la Vigne and Thaddeus of Suessa.

On the appointed day more than two hundred prelates,[44]

[43] Chorasmia (Kwarizm) is a region of Western Turkestan, south of Lake Aral.
[44] On the number of prelates, see Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1636.

coming from various regions of Christendom, met in the cathedral of St. John at Lyons. The Latin Emperor of Constantinople, Baldwin II, was seated beside the Pope. The three patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia, and the ambassadors of several princes occupied places of honor.

Despite a very able defense of the Emperor, presented by Thaddeus of Suessa, the council, considering that Emperor Frederick II had violated the oaths several times taken to the sovereign pontiffs, that he had despised the ecclesiastical censures, seized the lands of the Church, and despotically imprisoned prelates, that for nine years he had not paid the tribute due to the Holy See for the Kingdom of Sicily, and that he had made himself suspected of heresy by his relations with the Saracens, declared him deposed from the imperial dignity.

Then the council adopted several measures for the assistance of Constantinople and the Holy Land, and a Crusade was decided upon to be undertaken in the very near future. Among other reform measures was a severe prohibition of duelling and tournaments.[45]

Emperor Frederick II

Upon being informed of the sentence of deposition decreed against him by the council, Frederick flew into a rage. He placed one of his crowns on his head and exclaimed: "I still have my crown, and neither pope nor council can take it from me without a bloody struggle." Next he sent to the European princes a violent circular against the Pope, telling them that their crowns were menaced, and adding that "to take away from the clergy harmful riches would be a pious work,

[45] On this council and its canons, see Mansi, Vol. XXIII and Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1642–78. (Cf. also Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, pp. 297–323, 585–94. Tr.)

so as to lead them back to the Apostolic life of the early Church." All the princes were invited to lend him their concurrence to this end. He was now in open revolt, not only against the Pope, but against the Church; it was a declaration of war against them.

Until the death of Frederick a strife without truce continued between the priesthood and the Empire. At times the Emperor issued numerous official memorials in which, by cleverly presented sophisms, he strove to show that right was on his side; again some people in his pay spread in profusion pamphlets against the Pope and his friends. By offers of money, he tried to win the allies of the Holy See. By a system of terror methodically applied, he attempted to frighten the populations subject to the Pope. Monks, guilty of obeying the decisions of the Council of Lyons, were fastened together, two and two, and by the Emperor's orders were "burned alive like foxes." Mercenary troops made frequent incursions into the Patrimony of St. Peter, pillaging and burning everything ruthlessly.

Innocent was obliged to withstand all these attacks. In conformity with the decree of deposition pronounced by the Council of Lyons, an important fraction of the German princes elected, in the spring of 1246, a new king of Germany, Henry Raspe of Thuringia; then, after the death of this new chief, the next year, the young Count William of Holland. The Pope, that he might not seem to retreat before his enemy and abandon his faithful defenders, was obliged, in order to sustain them, to make enormous expenditures. Frederick had armies and a large amount of money. The possession of Sicily made him the richest ruler of Europe. To resist him Innocent had to resort to extraordinary fiscal measures: taxes on the revenues of the churches and on those which were in some way connected with the ecclesiastical dignities. The large increase of

the "expectatives," [46] the restriction of the freedom of the elections, with a view to increase the interventions of the Holy See in the appointments to benefices, were also regrettable consequences of the financial needs of the Holy See. All this led to spirited complaints, from which the papacy had to suffer greatly, but for which, it must be granted, Emperor Frederick, by driving the distressed Holy See to those lamentable expedients, was primarily responsible.[47]

These unfortunate consequences of the war let loose by the ambitious sovereign were not its only deplorable results. The resumption, in an acute state, of the struggle between the priesthood and the Empire turned men's minds away from the Crusade. "How think of Jerusalem when we do not know whether the Empire will remain in the hands of Frederick or whether Rome will remain the Pope's? Italy and Germany were too much interested in the question to have leisure for thinking about anything else. England and France remained. But, when St. Louis had taken the cross, Henry III was the less disposed to do so. The truce between France and England was near its end, and the King of England hoped perhaps to find, in the absence of the King of France, some occasion to profit by it." [48] Louis IX was, therefore, alone in bearing the weight of that expedition. He was not disquieted by this fact.

St. Louis and the Crusade

For the policy of the King of France, the Crusade, "under its appearance of being an offensive movement, was really the

[46] An expectative is the anticipatory grant of an ecclesiastical benefice, not vacant at the moment, but which will become so on the death of the present incumbent. The Council of Trent abolished expectatives.

[47] In the course of seven years, Innocent IV had to spend more than 200,000 marks (silver) to carry on his struggle against Frederick II. The financial measures used by him stirred up many protests. On this subject, see Berger, *Saint Louis et Innocent IV;* Adlinger, *La nomination aux évêchés allemands sous Innocent IV;* Fournier, *Les officialités au Moyen Age.*

[48] Wallon, *Saint Louis,* I, 212.

continuation of the great work of Christian and European defense, vigorously and successfully conducted, against the assault of pagan and Mussulman barbarism, by Charles Martel and Charlemagne." [49] For his piety, it was the greatest manifestation of devotion and love which a knight could give to his God. In 1244, during a grievous illness that threatened his life, the devout King had the relics of the passion, which three years before he had bought from the Latin Emperor of Constantinople, brought to him; he was suddenly cured. He at once summoned to his side William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris. "Bishop," he said to him, "I beg you to place on my shoulder the cross of the overseas voyage." From that moment, he considered himself bound by a sacred engagement to undertake the expedition to the Holy Land.

For almost four years he matured and prepared his enterprise. On Friday, June 12, 1248, after receiving at St. Denis the oriflamme from the hands of the legate, the saintly King set out from Paris, walking barefoot, wearing the garb of a pilgrim, and escorted by processions from all the churches. After taking leave of his people, he mounted his horse and departed. On August 18 he set sail from Aigues Mortes. On the night of September 17 he landed on the island of Cyprus, which had been chosen as the concentration point. He was detained there eight months, waiting for reinforcements on which he was counting, but which did not come. Finally, on June 14, 1249, he came in sight of the coast of Damietta. Addressing the leaders of his army, he said: "My faithful friends, everything is ours, whatever happens to us. If we win, the Lord's glory will thereby be celebrated in all Christendom; if we are overcome, we will ascend to heaven as martyrs."

God did not grant victory to the arms of his faithful servant. After the taking of Damietta and a very sanguinary victory won at Mansurah, the pestilence forced him to beat a retreat.

[49] Sepet, *Saint Louis*, p. 140.

His army was decimated by the disease and by the sword of the Saracens. He himself fell into the hands of his enemies; but, upon his return to Europe four years later (in 1254) with the remnants of his troops, he left to the Franks as also to the infidels the example of a valor in trials, of uprightness in all things, which elevated the prestige of the Christian name to the height of the most triumphant victories. In Joinville's account we read the following: "As I was on foot with my knights, the King came with his main body. Never did anyone behold so fine an armed man. He appeared towering over all his people, head and shoulders taller than they, a gilded helmet on his head, a German sword in his hand." And again: "The sire de Courtenay related to me that one day six Turks had seized the King's horse by the bridle and were leading the King away prisoner. And alone by himself he freed himself from them with great blows of his sword. When his people saw the defense which the King was making, they took courage." Says another witness: "His features showed that in his heart he had neither fear nor alarm." Count Charles of Anjou, his brother, seeing him ill, begged him to save his life by embarking on board a ship. "Count of Anjou, Count of Anjou," the King gravely replied, "if I am a burden to you, relieve yourself of me; but I will never relieve myself of my people." As a captive, he astonished the Saracens and aroused their admiration, "deliberating and making decisions under their hand with as mature reflection and as perfect freedom of mind as he could have done in his palace at Paris peacefully surrounded by his knights and his secretaries." [50]

His spirit of faith dominated every other feeling in him. In speaking of a certain emir who seemed desirous of becoming a Christian, he used to say: "Oh, if I could become the godfather of such a godson." But piety never took from him the noble high-mindedness that befits the head of a nation. Gener-

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

ous in money matters, he granted all that his enemies asked of him for the ransom of his soldiers, but, when he was asked at what price he placed his own ransom, he answered, says Joinville, "that he was not of a sort that could be redeemed for money." The Sultan, upon hearing this, said: "By my faith, the Frank is liberal, not to bargain over so great a sum." Although conquerors of the King of France, the Saracens felt small before this Christian prisoner.

When St. Louis returned to his kingdom, Emperor Frederick II and Pope Innocent IV were dead. The last years of the German Emperor were filled with bitterness. His barbarous cruelties, his vindictive disposition, had rendered him detestable. The Guelph party had fortified itself in Italy. On February 28, 1248, Frederick had suffered before Parma a decisive defeat, in which his faithful counselor Thaddeus of Suessa perished. The next year his own son Enzio was overcome and made prisoner by the forces of Bologna. His secretary and intimate confidant Peter de la Vigne turned against him and, so it was said, attempted to poison him. Frederick had Peter's eyes torn out and threw him into a dungeon, where he died; report had it that he was strangled by the Emperor's orders. During the summer of 1250, Frederick fell ill of the dysentery at Fiorentino in Apulia. There he died on December 13, at the age of fifty-six, after attempting by his testament to redeem the injustices of his life. He chose as his successor his son Conrad IV. The Emperor made his confession to the Bishop of Palermo, received absolution, and selected for his burial the cathedral of that city, where his body still rests in a superb porphyry monument.

At news of Frederick's death, Pope Innocent IV commissioned a Dominican to preach a crusade in Germany against King Conrad IV, and confirmed William of Holland's title of king. As for Sicily, he offered it successively to Prince Edmund, son of King Henry III of England, who did not fulfil

the required conditions, and finally bestowed it on a natural son of Frederick II, Manfred, who declared that he submitted fully to the Pope. But Manfred showed himself too much like his father, shortly afterward violating all his promises. At the head of an army of Saracens, he attacked the papal troops. Conrad's death (May 29, 1254) did not improve the situation to any notable extent. A little later, Innocent IV, who meanwhile had left Lyons, died of grief at Naples, on December 7 of the same year.

CHAPTER XII

From Alexander IV to Boniface VIII (1254–94)

DURING the forty years between the death of Innocent IV and the coming of Boniface VIII, the outward history of the Church was marked by few great events. From 1254 to 1294, twelve popes followed one another. The shortness of their reigns and the comparative length of the interregnums did not enable them to pursue any great policy. Furthermore, in the nations no great enterprise appeared. Under the scepter of the last of the Hohenstaufens, the Germanic Empire, exhausted by the great struggles of Frederick II, disintegrated. The old kingdoms of Arles, Burgundy, and Lorraine separated from it. The nobles became independent sovereigns. A similar anarchy prevailed in Italy, where the cities and the leagues, after being victorious over the emperors, fought among themselves. In France, on the contrary, in England, and in most of the other states, the tendency of events was to centralize and strengthen the power.

But all these movements of destruction and building up took place by little fits and starts, without contemporaries perceiving the broad lines. The East presented a similar spectacle: the Latin Empire of Constantinople, which sprang from the combined cupidity of Venice and of the nobles, followed the Kingdom of Jerusalem to the grave. The enthusiasm of the crusaders disappeared. St. Louis king of France cast upon it the brilliance of his heroism and sanctity; but he was alone and succumbed. Yet all did not point to ruin in these multiple and complex events. A new world was being elaborated. Only later generations could discern its birth and progress. The

popes, like the kings and peoples, of the second half of the thirteenth century, most of the time could merely face the difficulties of the moment, leaving to Providence to make everything concur in the accomplishment of His designs.

However, never perhaps was the interior life of the Church more intense. The great pontificates of Sylvester II, St. Gregory VII, and Innocent III bore their fruits. It was the period when theology, queen of the sciences, displayed incomparable brilliancy with St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure; when a Christian philosophy was established on solid foundations; when a Christian art was revealed; when a Christian law was organized, in opposition to the ancient law; when a Christian organization of labor and ownership was elaborated; when the natural sciences made unprecedented advance under the influence of a monk of genius, Roger Bacon. This was the age of the *Summa theologica,* of the spread of the great orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis, of knighthood at its acme, of the Gothic cathedrals, of the *chansons de gestes,* of the great universities and workmen's corporations. Especially in reference to this epoch we can say that the Middle Ages was one of the greatest periods of history, and that "the intellectual life was then intense, eager, and vehement, and far more original than the Latin intellectual life." [1]

Pope Alexander IV

Rinaldo Conti, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, was elected pope on December 12, 1254, under the name of Alexander IV. He was notable for the purity of his morals and the nobility of his character. But he was too much influenced by unworthy counselors and lacked the necessary firmness to resist the cabals of the Italian parties. Most of the time he did not live in Rome, where Senator Brancaleone overmatched his power. In Ger-

[1] Faguet, *A Literary History of France.*

many, after the death of William of Holland, two rivals (Richard of Cornwall, brother of the King of England, and Alfonso of Castile) contested each other's claim to the imperial office. The Pope hesitated to take sides, although evidently inclining to Richard's party. In Sicily he had to fight against Manfred, who refused to dismiss the Saracens in his service and put himself at the head of the Ghibelline party in Italy. So many cares kept the Pope from realizing his projects of a Crusade against the infidels. He made a few tentative approaches to the Emperor of the East, Theodore II Lascaris, with a view to the union of the Greek schismatic Church, and he opposed the heretics of Europe by introducing some simplifications in the procedure of the Inquisition [2] and by the encouragement he gave to the preaching of the mendicant friars. He died May 25, 1261.

Pope Urban IV

He was succeeded by two French popes. The first was Urban IV, Jacques Pantaleon, son of a shoemaker of Troyes, who rose by his merits from the lowest ranks of the clergy to become patriarch of Jerusalem. He was elected pope at Viterbo on August 29, 1261. He, too, had to make his habitual residence outside of Rome. He labored to conciliate the two parties that were at strife for the power in Germany, and he persuaded the two claimants, Richard and Alfonso, to accept his arbitration. But he died before pronouncing his decision.

Understanding the gravity of the situation in the Two Sicilies, he offered its government to the King of France, who declined it; then to Charles of Anjou, who, urged by his wife

[2] He decided that henceforth the proceedings should be conducted in a summary manner, without lawyers and without the usual contentions of court trials (Bull dated December, 1257). Cf. Potthast, no. 17,097. By too much simplification in the procedure, the sacred rights of the accused were infringed upon. This fact was recognized and later on gradually lawyers appear at the side of the accused.

and by his own ambition, accepted the offer in spite of the remonstrances of his brother Louis IX. Charles received the Kingdom of Naples as a fief of the Holy See and promised never to join his new states with the Empire or with Lombardy: the independence of the papacy required that the north and the south of Italy should never be combined under the same hand. But Charles' ambition could not restrain itself. Scarcely was he installed at Naples, when he strove to assure himself of a foothold everywhere. At Milan he obtained the appointment of one of his subjects, the Provençal Barral des Baux, as podesta. At Rome, Charles himself was made senator, and by that title represented the whole Senate.

Urban IV, whose piety was profound, attempted to console himself for this defeat of his policy by favoring the cult of the Eucharist. When he held the office of archdeacon at Liège, he was one of the first to approve the project of a feast of the Blessed Sacrament. He resolved to extend to the whole Church the celebration of this solemnity, which was already observed in some dioceses. He requested the two greatest doctors of the time, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, to compose a special office for the occasion and he published a bull to this effect in 1264. But his death soon after delayed for forty years the celebration of that feast, destined to become one of the most solemn and most popular in the Church.

Pope Clement IV

Urban IV's successor, Clement IV, elected February 5, 1265, after a vacancy of four months in the Holy See, was called Guy le Gros. He was a native of St. Gilles on the Rhone.[3] At first a lawyer and jurist, he was one of King Louis IX's intimate advisers. After his wife's death, he embraced the ecclesiastical career and rapidly passed through the various

[3] Potthast, no. 19,650.

ranks. He was returning from a mission that he had filled in England as papal legate, when he learned that the Sacred College, at the death of Urban IV, had elected him unanimously. Like his predecessors, he was unable to stay in Rome. In the conflict that was rending Germany, he claimed, as did Urban IV, the right to decide the choice of the emperor, but he died without making such decision. In Sicily the situation was extremely critical. The exactions and encroachments of Charles of Anjou were such that Clement IV was not averse to coming to an agreement with his rival Manfred, that natural son of Frederick II, who was also laboring to prepare the road to power for the young son of Conrad IV, Conradin. But the prompt success of Charles of Anjou, who defeated and slew Manfred at the battle of Benevento, February 27, 1266, cut these plans short.

This event, however, did not end the strife. In 1267 the young Conradin, who had just attained his sixteenth year, profited from the discontent aroused by Charles' tyranny, to enter on the scene in person, attacking both Naples and Rome, Charles of Anjou and Clement IV. This bold stroke by the young prince, his bravery, his youth, aroused the chief cities of Italy in his favor. Rome received him in triumph, and the greater part of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies had already taken his side, when he was made prisoner and taken to Naples. There Charles of Anjou, after a summary trial, executed him in the city square, October 29, 1268. Thus ended the last of the Hohenstaufens. Some writers have tried to implicate Pope Clement IV in this affair.[4] But "Clement IV, who so often had urged upon Charles of Anjou the practice of prudence, clemency, and justice,[5] certainly had no part in the tragedy which terminated the destiny of the Hohenstaufens. Probably he had no previous knowledge of the execution and sincerely

[4] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire,* chap. 13, p. 202.
[5] Potthast, nos. 19,602, 20,086, 20,248.

deplored the brutal repression that prevailed throughout the kingdom." [6]

Clement IV marked his pontificate by several prudent reform measures. Yet his spirit of centralization and of finance has been blamed.[7] He legalized and thus extended the usage, already introduced by his predecessors, of reserving to the pope the appointment to all benefices "vacant in the Roman court," that is, the benefices the titulars of which died in the place of residence of the Roman court.[8] But this was a means of rescuing from the influence of the local nobles or of the kings the recruiting of the episcopate. Like Innocent IV, he also levied several taxes for the benefit of the Curia. But the struggles he had to sustain in the East, and especially the projects he entertained, from the time of his elevation to the papacy, with a view to a new Crusade in the East, projects from which all Christendom would profit, justified these financial measures.

For some years past the situation of the Church in the East had become extremely grave. In 1261 Michael Paleologus, Greek emperor of Nicaea, thanks to the support of the Genoese and the connivance of the Greek population of Constantinople, had driven from the city and dethroned, almost without a blow, Emperor Baldwin II. The Latin Empire was dead. Pope Urban IV, who was then governing the Church, had tried to stir up a new Crusade. Louis IX, alone of all the sovereigns, answered the appeal. Besides, Paleologus had succeeded in paralyzing the Pope's ardor by at once entering into negotiations with him for the union of the Churches. But soon it was evident that this move was nothing more than a trick intended to deceive the papacy. Furthermore, at the coming of Clement IV, the situation was singularly complicated by the sudden intervention of Charles of Anjou. The King of the Two Sici-

[6] Hemmer, art. "Clément IV" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, III, 60.

[7] Potthast, no. 20,133.

[8] *Ibid.*, no. 19,326.

lies, in his strife against Manfred and Conradin, contemplated resuming, for his own sake, the ambitious project of Frederick II: to rule over both the West and the East. Like Frederick, he turned his gaze toward Jerusalem as well as Constantinople, and, with the support of all the enemies of the German Empire and of all the nobles who hoped to carve out principalities in the East, he was preparing a new expedition. Clement IV urged St. Louis to take the cross. The King of France and his three sons, Prince Edward of England, Count Thibaut of Champagne, and numerous French barons, were already crusaders and were making their first war preparations, when Clement IV died at Viterbo, November 29, 1268.

This death seemed at first to favor the plans of Charles of Anjou. He counted several partisans in the Sacred College. The cardinals were unable to agree on the choice of the new pope. The vacancy of the see lasted three years, offering a free field for the ambitions of the King of Sicily. But the energetic intervention of Louis IX stopped him. The King of France fixed the date of his departure for the Crusade for the spring of 1270 and required his brother to join him at that date before Tunis. The interests of the traditional policy of the popes in the East were saved, at least for the time being, by the initiative of the holy King.

The armies landed (July 17, 1270) on the Carthage peninsula. The castle of Carthage was seized. But, in the month of August, the plague broke out in the army. After seeing the papal legate and several of his best knights die, St. Louis felt himself stricken with the dread disease. Aware that his end was approaching, he wrote, for the sake of his son, this admirable will, worthy of serving as a model for all rulers: "My dear son, the first thing I point out to you is that you devote your heart to loving God. . . . Keep your heart gentle and merciful to the poor and to all those who suffer in heart or body. . . . Maintain the good customs of your kingdom. Do

not burden your people with taxes. Be strict and loyal in preserving justice and uprightness toward your subjects. . . . Bestow the benefices of holy Church upon persons who are good and worthy. . . . Avoid stirring up wars and strifes. . . . Be devoted to the Church of Rome and to the supreme pontiff, our father." Among the last words of the holy King were these: "We will go to Jerusalem." He was speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem.

Having become head of the Crusade through his brother's death, Charles of Anjou hastened to conclude with the Sultan of Tunis a treaty advantageous for his Kingdom of Sicily. Then he embarked for Europe with the French princes, and postponed to three years later the fulfilment of his Crusade vow. Only Prince Edward of England was resolved to continue the expedition to the Holy Land. He landed at St. John of Acre on May 9, 1271, but his forces were insufficient and, the next year, he too turned back to Europe.

Pope Gregory X

The Church then had a new pope. The choice of the Sacred College, Teobaldo Visconti of Piacenza, archpriest of Liège, was at St. John of Acre with Prince Edward, intending to go to the Holy Land as a pilgrim, when he learned that he had been chosen to govern the Church. He was obliged to retrace his steps to Rome; but, as he turned away from Jerusalem, he exclaimed: "O Jerusalem, if ever I forget thee, may I forget myself." Teobaldo Visconti, consecrated and crowned at Rome on March 13, 1271, took the name of Gregory X. Unquestionably the pontificate of Gregory X was the most fruitful and glorious of the period we are now considering. It has been said of this pope that, "with St. Louis, he best represents the social Christianity of that age." His great ideas were the reestablishment of the Empire of Germany, reform, the reunion

of the Greeks, the deliverance of Jerusalem, and the reconciliation of Guelphs and Ghibellines. The two outstanding events of his pontificate were the restoration of the Empire in the person of Rudolph of Habsburg and the celebration of the fourteenth ecumenical council at Lyons.

Like St. Louis in his kingdom, Gregory X wished to be in the Church the incorruptible interpreter of right and the defender of peace. "If it is part of the duty of those who govern states," he said, "to safeguard the rights and independence of the Church, it is also part of the duty of those who have the ecclesiastical government to do everything possible so that kings and princes may possess the fulness of their authority." Judging that the interregnum of the Empire had lasted too long, that the anarchy reigning in Germany since the death of Frederick II in 1250 was becoming a grave peril for the peace of Europe and of the Church, he approved the prince electors' choice (October 1, 1273) of Count Rudolph of Habsburg as King of Germany, and had a solemn conference with the prince, at which Rudolph promised him his concourse to assure the liberty of the Church and to defend it against the heresies. The approval of the Pope led to that of all Germany in favor of him who became the founder of the house of Austria.

Second General Council of Lyons

The council which Gregory assembled at Lyons (May 7, 1274) had for its chief purpose the establishment of peace and the union between the Latin Church and the Greek Church. Four Friars Minor were commissioned to discuss the conditions of this union with Emperor Michael Paleologus; and the general of the Dominicans, Humbert of Romans, prepared a report on the state of the clergy. Five hundred bishops and many other prelates were present at the opening session. Among those in attendance were the learned Dominican Peter

of Tarentaise and the general of the Franciscans, Bonaventure. The most learned of the theologians, Thomas Aquinas, had been invited, but he died on his way to the council, in the Cistercian abbey of Fossanuova, not far from Aquin, on March 7, 1274. The representatives of the Templars and of the Knights of St. John, the ambassadors of the kings of France, Germany, England, and Sicily, the Latin patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople, were present at the council.

While awaiting the arrival of the Greek embassy, the council held three sessions, at which it voted twelve disciplinary canons [9] regarding ecclesiastical elections, Church property, legal procedure, and excommunication.[10] On June 24 the ambassadors of the Emperor of Constantinople presented themselves. Paleologus had the bishops and Greek clergy under his jurisdiction accept three things: the recognition of the primacy of the pope, the acceptance of the principle of appeal to Rome, and the mention of the pope in the liturgy. A fourth session was held, at which, in the Emperor's name, the grand logothete or chancellor of the Emperor, declared that the Church of Constantinople returned to the obedience of the Holy See. The *Te Deum* was intoned and, after an address by the Pope, the *Credo* was sung, with a threefold repetition of the *Filioque* formula. The date was July 6, 1274. It was the end of a schism that had lasted two hundred twenty years.[11]

[9] For the text of these canons, see Schroeder, *op. cit.*, pp. 324 ff., 595 ff. (Tr.)

[10] Canon 29 decided that the prohibition to communicate with excommunicated persons applies only in case of persons excommunicated by name.

[11] Before final adjournment, the council held two more sessions. Among the dogmatic decrees then adopted, one of the most important is that which contains the following declaration: "We confess that the Holy Ghost proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles, but as from one principle, not by two spirations but by a single spiration" (canon 1).

Among the disciplinary decrees, we should note one which was adopted with a view to avoiding in the future any long vacancies of the Holy See. This decree (canon 2) contains the following provisions: "When the pope dies in the city in which he resided with his curia, the cardinals who are present at that city must wait only ten days for their absent colleagues. On the expiration of that time, whether those absent have arrived or not, they shall assemble in the palace in which

"The Council of Lyons was a triumph for the papacy and for the advocates of the Crusades. Apparently no obstacle remained to prevent the deliverance of the Holy Land. From the bishops assembled at the council the Pope obtained the levy of the Crusade tithes for six years. King Philip III, the Queen, many prelates and barons, enrolled as Crusaders. On May 1, 1275, Gregory X accomplished his work of pacification by leading Charles of Anjou and Michael Paleologus to conclude a truce. A few days before his death, the Pope received an embassy from the Byzantine Emperor, who repeated the expression of his zeal for the Holy Land. At that moment, the King of France, the King of Sicily, the King of England, and the King of Aragon had taken the cross. The political and spiritual union of Christendom seemed accomplished. The hopes of Urban II and Innocent III appeared near being realized. Unfortunately this diplomatic accord concealed causes of division so deep that it could not last: immediately after the death of Gregory X, these divisions broke out." [12]

Popes Innocent V, Adrian V, and John XXI

The Greeks, in uniting again with the Church of Rome, had not abandoned all their prejudices against the authority of the pope and their old grudges against the Latins: and Charles of Anjou, in submitting to the Holy See, did not renounce his ambitious projects. The rapid succession of three pontiffs, within a year and a half, in the Apostolic See, favored the

---

the pope lived. . . . To no one shall admittance to the cardinals be granted, nor shall anyone be given opportunity to speak with them secretly. . . . But if, which God forbid, within three days from the time they enter the aforesaid room, the cardinals have not provided the Church with a pastor, they must for the period of five days immediately following, on each day, be content at their noon and evening meals with only one dish. If at the end of that time they have not provided a pastor, then they shall be served only bread, wine, and water till they have done so." Cf. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, pp. 330 ff.; also Mansi, XXIV, 109–32. (Tr.)

[12] Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

development of all these seeds of discord. Innocent V (Peter of Tarentaise), wishing to continue Gregory X's work of pacification, negotiated peace between Charles of Anjou and Rudolph of Habsburg. Unfortunately he died after a pontificate of five months, without being able to bring his work to a successful conclusion. His successor, Adrian V (Ottobuono Fieschi of Genoa, nephew of Innocent IV), elected while he was only a deacon, did not live long enough to be ordained and crowned. Peter Juliani, a native of Portugal, who succeeded him under the name of John XXI,[13] resumed the negotiations undertaken by his predecessors for the purpose of assuring a stable reconciliation between the King of Germany and the King of Sicily. But, seriously wounded at Viterbo by an accidental collapse that happened in his palace, he died a few days later (May 16, 1277), eight months after his election.[14]

Popes Nicholas III and Martin IV

Eight cardinals, divided into two parties (one French, the other Italian), were at Viterbo at the time of John XXI's death. The Italian party prevailed. John Gaetano Orsini, proclaimed pope under the name of Nicholas III, endeavored to limit the power of the house of Anjou by obtaining from the King of Sicily the renunciation of the office of senator of Rome and the abandonment of the office of regent of the Empire in Tuscany. But he was unable to prevent the progress of that house in the East. Nicholas III contemplated undertaking that difficult work, when he died of apoplexy (August 22, 1280) at Soriano near Viterbo, before ending the third year of his pontificate.

The division that had taken place in the College of Cardinals

[13] Why John XXI, rather than John XX? See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, III, 522 ff.

[14] In the matter of the conclaves, John XXI entirely abolished Gregory X's decree, which had already been suspended by Adrian V.

after the death of John XXI broke out again more bitterly after the death of Nicholas III. Six months passed without an agreement being reached. At length the French party triumphed. This intervention of politics in the election of the head of the universal Church was unfortunate. The new Pope, Simon de Brie, who took the name of Martin IV,[15] favored the projects of Charles of Anjou, whose situation became preponderant in Christendom. All-powerful in Italy through the possession of the Two Sicilies, the title of senator of Rome and vicariate of Tuscany, very influential in France through his hereditary states of Anjou and Provence, master of the Kingdom of Arles and of the remnants of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, he assured himself, by a treaty, of the alliance of Venice, and declared war on the Emperor of Constantinople. The Pope, who had not regarded the conversion of Paleologus as serious, approved the expedition. But the catastrophe of the Sicilian Vespers in 1282 cast a permanent cloud over Charles' dream of universal domination. On March 30 the Sicilians, exasperated by the despotic government of Charles of Anjou, had, at the hour of vespers, assassinated all the Frenchmen who were in Palermo. At this signal, a coalition, extending over the whole island, directed by John of Procida and backed by King Peter III of Aragon, son-in-law of Manfred, drove out King Charles and gave the kingdom to Peter of Aragon. In vain the Pope pronounced excommunication against the new sovereign. The papal censures, which were looked upon as prompted by political considerations, were insufficient to restrain the movement of insurrection.

On the other hand, the Emperor of the East openly violated the pact of union which was signed at the Council of Lyons. Emperor Andronicus II declared that he disavowed the conduct of his father Michael VIII, recalled the former patriarch,

[15] Why this name of Martin IV, since only one pope had borne the name of Martin? See Mourret, *op. cit.*, III, 522 ff.

and re-established in their sees all the members of the Greek Church who had shown themselves hostile to the union.

Popes Honorius IV and Nicholas IV

Whatever may have been the fault of Charles of Anjou, the sanguinary conduct of the Sicilian revolutionists could not be approved. The successor of Martin IV, Giacomo Savelli, governed the Church from 1285 to 1287 under the name of Honorius IV and maintained the censures pronounced against the usurpers. He was a native of Rome, renowned for his virtues of justice, prudence, and moderation. He rose above every consideration of party or nationality. In the University of Paris, where he had studied in his youth, he established chairs of Arabic and other foreign languages, with a view to facilitating the conversion of the Mohammedans and the reunion of the schismatics of the East.

After a vacancy of thirteen months, Cardinal Girolamo Maschi, former general of the Franciscans, was called, despite his resistance, to assume the tiara. He took the name of Nicholas IV. In the question of the succession to the Sicilian throne, he imitated the example of his two predecessors, who, contrary to Nicholas III, had decided for the house of Anjou. His great grief was to see the total and final loss of the Holy Land. On May 18, 1291, the Christians' last fortress, Ptolemais or St. John of Acre, fell into the power of the Sultan of Egypt. The city was razed to the ground and its inhabitants slaughtered. Along the whole coast the European population was wiped out or obliged to flee. In vain Pope Nicholas IV tried to stir up a new Crusade. Except the King of England, none of the great sovereigns of Europe agreed to take the cross. France was at war with Aragon. Among the other princes, some abstained through cowardice, others through avarice. Such was the case of the successor of Rudolph of Habs-

burg, Adolphus of Nassau. The disaster was completed by the premature death of Nicholas IV on April 3, 1292. He was a humble and austere monk, a scholar and a patron of learning. He founded several universities, including those of Montpellier, Lisbon, and Gratz in Styria.

Pope Celestine V

After the death of Nicholas IV the Holy See remained vacant for two years and three months. The conclave, meeting in Perugia, gave promise of continuing indefinitely, when King Charles II of Naples, called le Boiteux, proposed and had accepted by the cardinals the candidature of a humble and holy monk, Peter Morone (or Murrone), who seemed in no way to be prepared for the government of the Church. Son of a peasant of the Abruzzi, he had until then followed the eremetical life, at first on Mount Majella, then on Mount Murrone, whence his surname. He took the name of Celestine V. His inexperience put him in the hands of politicians and schemers. At first the King of Naples, who wished to exploit the Pope's moral authority for the conquest of Sicily, made him decide to establish his residence in the city of Naples near him. Then utopians and adventurers endeavored to involve him in their fanciful schemes and intrigues. Soon Celestine V felt himself sinking under the heavy weight of his office. The solitude, which he had left reluctantly, beckoned him. He tried at first to transfer the government of affairs to a commission of three cardinals. Then, upon the advice of true friends, he announced his abdication of the Apostolic office, ordered the election of a new pope, and resumed his solitary life, in which he accomplished his own sanctification. The Church has placed him in the number of the saints; but Pope Clement V, in the very bull proclaiming his canonization, calls him "a pontiff inexperienced in the government of the universal Church" (*ad regimen*

universalis Ecclesiae inexpertus). One of his merits was that he grasped his own incapacity, spontaneously stepped down from the Apostolic See, and left this great lesson of humility to those who would be elevated to offices whose weight they are unable to bear.

Religious Orders

Whatever were the failures, whatever were the variations of policy of the popes during the second half of the thirteenth century, on one point they continued and developed without failure the work of the great pontiffs who preceded them: the patronage of two institutions which became the centers of Christian civilization, namely, the religious orders and the schools. Honorius failed in his Sicilian projects, but he encouraged the progress of studies in the University of Paris; Nicholas IV witnessed the destruction of the Christian centers in the East, but he spread the institutions of learning; all that remains of Celestine's pontificate is the example of a religious life that reached the height of sanctity.

The religious orders, a veritable bulwark of society in the thirteenth century, formed an immense spiritual army, spread everywhere, active everywhere, here by the intercession of prayer and by the example of asceticism, there by the influence of the spoken word and of good works. In the valleys you would meet the white robe of the son of St. Bernard; on the heights the brown robe of the son of St. Benedict; in villages and cities, the coarse gray habit of the Franciscan and the black mantle of the Dominican.[16] We have already noted the work of the monks of Cluny, of Citeaux, and of Clairvaux, the Carthusians, the Canons Regular of St. Victor and of Pré-

[16] The two verses are rather well known:

Bernardus valles, montes Benedictus amabat,
Oppida Franciscus, celebres Ignatius urbes.

montré, the religious of Fontevrault, the Teutonic Brethren, those of the Temple and of the Holy Ghost, the Trinitarians, the Beghards, and the Beguines, the Friars Minor and the Friars Preachers. Besides them, prayed and labored the Carmelites, the Servites, the Hermits of St. Augustine, the Hospitalers of St. Anthony and of St. Lazarus, the Nolascans and the Humiliati, the Knights of St. Michael, and the Knights of the Sword.

Among these countless legions of apostles, two new types of monks appeared in the thirteenth century: the knight-monk and the mendicant monk. Before the thirteenth century, the Middle Ages had seen the missionary monk, like St. Boniface and St. Augustine, converting the barbarians; the monk who cleared the forests, with his mattock remaking the soil of Europe; the contemplative monk, elevating the ideal of a race of hunters and fighters; the usufructuary monk of a great abbey, by royal or papal investiture, cultivating the sciences, letters, the liturgical arts, and spreading around him instruction among the people. The knight-monks and the mendicant monks, created by new needs, possessed an alert and militant quality. We have seen the knight-monks withstand the onset of Islam in Spain and in Palestine, and the mendicant monks fight against heresy in the south of France. Both of them also exercised a mighty influence in the inner life of Christendom. The former, always armed, reminded Christians that the life of this world must be a perpetual battle; the latter, stripped of everything, taught them to detach themselves from the goods of this world. The congregations of St. Dominic and of St. Francis,[17] by their Third Orders, made their spirit enter into families, corporations, private life, and public life.

The institution of the mendicant orders exercised very particularly a most timely influence on the secular clergy. Two

[17] The two other mendicant orders were the Carmelites and the Hermits of St. Augustine.

considerable events took place in the society of the Middle Ages, events that profoundly modified the conditions of the life of the clergy. These were, in the early Middle Ages, the coming of feudalism and, in the thirteenth century, the substitution of the beneficiary regime for the regime of common ownership. The feudal regime made public authority rest on ownership of land; hence the different members of the Catholic hierarchy were led to acquire direct and profitable ownership of domains hierarchically arranged according to the various degrees of their powers. The rise toward the heights of the hierarchy thus became a rise toward riches. The peril was unavoidable. Through moral strength and holiness, a very large number of the clergy triumphed over this danger, and in the case of many the triumph was glorious. But a revolution, gradually prepared and almost consummated in the thirteenth century, aggravated the evil. This was the introduction and generalization of the beneficiary regime, that is, the regime which assigned to an individual cleric the revenues which previously had been assigned to the common funds of the church to which the cleric was attached. True, the theologians kept teaching that fundamentally nothing had been changed; that the beneficiary was merely an administrator, in the name of the Church, of a portion of its property; that over that part he could claim nothing more than his decent sustenance. But, in the eyes of the people, in the eyes of the lay patrons who distributed the benefices, and, by way of influence, in the eyes of such and such clerics, the moral obligation seemed changed. The lure of the benefices and prebends would tempt the ambition of families. In place of first accepting the office and thereby acquiring the right to the benefice, the benefice was first acquired, on condition that the recipient would subsequently render himself eligible for the office. The war carried on by the popes against the lay investitures had to some extent warded off the danger. The institution of the mendicant orders,

exempted by general dispensation from the intitulation prescribed by canon 6 of the Council of Chalcedon, and thereby detached from the ordinary hierarchy, preserved from its difficulties in the order of ecclesiastical ownership, and professing poverty even to its extreme consequences, was like a new appearance of the ancient apostolate.

This advantage was especially proper to the order of St. Francis. The order of St. Dominic seemed to have more particularly had in mind another: the advancement of the ecclesiastical sciences and of preaching.[18]

The Universities

In the thirteenth century, teaching was imparted by the Church in three kinds of institutions: the universities, the episcopal or monastic schools, established near cathedrals and large monasteries, and the "little schools," founded in the villages. These three sorts of institutions corresponded to what we call today higher education, secondary education, and primary education.

The universities were not created by a decision of authority, but had organically constituted themselves, either by the grouping of several schools, or by the large attendance at a school because of the teaching of a renowned professor. The school (*schola*) then took the name of *studium,* and, if a corporation (either of teachers or of pupils), it changed this name of *studium* for that of university, the word *universitas* being at that time a synonym of *corporatio.*[19]

The most famous universities were those of Paris, Bologna, and Oxford. The Paris University was especially a center of philosophical studies, the most illustrious representative of which was the Dominican St. Thomas Aquinas; the Bologna

[18] Nevertheless the Friars Minors' contribution to the progress of the sciences and to the work of preaching has been considerable.

[19] Savigny, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter.*

University was a center of law studies, always inspired by the work of the Benedictine Gratian; the Oxford University gave to the world the greatest scientific genius of the Middle Ages, one of the greatest of all ages, the Franciscan Roger Bacon.[20]

The University of Paris sprang from the episcopal school of Notre Dame. In the shadow of the cathedral, lived a very large number of professors and students, drawn from near and far by the reputation of the Paris schools. One day they resolved to unite by a corporative bond. Their association formed "the University of the Masters and Scholars of Paris." This designation is met with for the first time in a document of 1221; but the formation of the University certainly goes back to an earlier date.[21] The new corporation developed and became organized rapidly. The teachers were grouped into four faculties: that of theology, that of law, that of medicine, and that of arts. The students of the faculty of arts, the most numerous of all, early adopted the practice of meeting in regional groups, according to their country of birth. These groups, at first very numerous, were reduced to four in the time of St. Louis; that of the French, that of the Picards, that of the Normans, and that of the English. They were known as "the four nations." Each "nation" had its own magistrates. About 1240 all the "nations" agreed to elect a common head, the rector. Between the rector (the head of the nations) and the chancellor a strife ensued, which ended in the triumph of the rector, who then became the head of the whole University. To the University were attached various colleges, establishments which at first merely offered to certain categories of students food and lodging, and which subsequently, drawing teachers to themselves, gave the instruction within their own houses. The most

[20] Among the other medieval universities, we should mention the following: in France, Montpellier, Orleans, Angers, Toulouse; in England, Cambridge; in Italy, Salerno, Padua, Naples, Pavia; in Spain, Salamanca; in Germany, Heidelberg, Cologne, Erfurt, Prague, and Vienna.

[21] E. Jordan, "Les Universités" in *La France chrétienne dans l'histoire*, p. 271.

celebrated of these colleges was the one founded by St. Louis' confessor, Robert de Sorbon. This was the origin of the Sorbonne.

The Mendicant Orders

As the University of Paris was, like all the other universities, an institution international in its composition, little by little it came to form a veritable "school state," having its magistrates, its customs, and its privileges; a state often agitated by turbulent rivalries, by real uprisings. The most famous of these quarrels was that which arose between the seculars and the mendicant orders, and in which a tart and fiery writer, Master William of St. Amour, attacked the Dominicans and the Franciscans with extreme violence. The conflict ended by an intervention of Pope Alexander IV, who confirmed the right of the mendicant religious to teach in the University and expelled William of St. Amour, as also the chief ringleaders.

These violent attacks of the seculars upon the religious were evidently connected with doctrinal divergencies and secret jealousies. In the first half of the thirteenth century, in 1231, the Franciscan Alexander of Hales became the first holder of the first chair of theology confided to the order of St. Francis, and the Dominican Albert Bollstadt, called Albert the Great, gave incomparable renown to the chair of philosophy which he held from 1245 to 1248. Alexander of Hales has left us, in the form of a commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, a vast work, logical and methodical, which is considered the first of the theological summas. St. Thomas Aquinas often derived inspiration from its teaching. Says Gerson: "The doctrine of Alexander had a breadth that cannot be praised too highly. We are told that St. Thomas, when asked about the best way to learn theology, answered that it should be studied in a single doctor chosen for teacher. And, when he was asked further

which author to choose, he said: 'Alexander of Hales.'" [22] Albert the Great, whose erudition was prodigious and whose works form a whole library, is the author of an immense encyclopedia, in which he appears as philosopher, theologian, polemic, exegete, scholar versed in all the mathematical and natural sciences of his time, a mystic familiar with the loftiest spiritual ways. His influence was no less in the profane sciences than in the sacred sciences. In his school, St. Thomas Aquinas was trained.

St. Thomas Aquinas

At Paris, about the end of 1245, the young Thomas, then only twenty years old, met Albert the Great for the first time. The latter had just entered his fortieth year. The young religious, who for seven consecutive years would train his mind under the direction of this great man, was, through his father, the grandnephew of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, distant cousin of Emperor Frederick II, then reigning; on his mother's side, he was descended from the Norman princes who had driven the Arabs and Greeks from Italy and had acquired Sicily. It was told of him that his parents had taken him and confined him in a castle to turn him from his vocation to the order of St. Dominic, but that they had been unsuccessful; that when a woman was introduced into his room, he drove her out with a flaming fire-brand in his hand; that he won his two sisters to the religious life in conversations in which they sought to dissuade him from such a life; that Pope Innocent IV, who was entreated to break the bonds that were already drawing Dominic to the order of Friars Preachers, listened to him with admiration and offered him the abbey of Monte Cassino. Having arrived after so much ado, the young

[22] Eckhart, *Corpus historicum medii aevi*, I, 117.

Count of Aquin, who was now merely Brother Thomas, was the center of all eyes in the monastery. But the monks found nothing in him to correspond to their expectations. They beheld a simple young man, who spoke scarcely at all, whose very eyes seemed dull. Finally it was thought that he had nothing lofty about him except his birth, and his comrades smilingly called him "the big silent ox of Sicily." His teacher Albert, not knowing what to think, took occasion of a large assembly to interrogate him with a series of perplexing questions. The student answered with so surprising a wisdom, that Albert was filled with that rare and divine joy which superior men experience when they meet another man who is destined to equal them or surpass them. Deeply moved, he turned to the young men present and said to them: "We call Thomas a silent ox, but some day the bellowing of his doctrine will be heard all over the world." This prophecy was soon fulfilled. Thomas Aquinas became in a short time the most celebrated doctor of the Catholic Church, and even his high birth was eclipsed by the magnificence of his personal fame.[23]

Even a summary exposition of the philosophical, theological, apologetic, oratorical, and poetic work of St. Thomas would here be out of place. That account belongs to special works.[24] Wherever the Angelic Doctor carried the torch of his genius (and the field which he covered before dying at the age of fifty, was immense), he brought order and clearness on the results acquired in his time, and he carried the investigations of his mind further than his predecessors had done. At a period when the domain of the mind was strewn with the debris of ancient, Arabian, and medieval learning, and while several of his contemporaries, putting their hand to the work, did but increase

[23] Lacordaire, *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France de l'Ordre des Frères prêcheurs,* chap. 4; *Œuvres* (Poussielgue ed., IX, 134 f.).

[24] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* II, 3 ff.; Pierre Rousselot, *The Intellectualism of St. Thomas;* Jourdain, *La philosophie de S. Thomas d'Aquin.*

the disorder,[25] he was able, out of all these materials, to construct a monument having a solidity which the centuries have not shaken. Does this mean that St. Thomas has left no lacuna in his work and that on every subject he has said the last word of science? Such a claim would be disloyal to the thought of the master and of his truest disciples. One of the earliest biographers of the saint relates that, shortly before St. Thomas died, he said of his work: "All that I have written seems to me a wretched bit of straw." Says Lacordaire: "St. Thomas is a lighthouse, not a goal."

But the light of this beacon is so sure, that the Church, which must provide with security for the education of her clerics and for the public instruction of the faithful, has made St. Thomas Aquinas her official doctor.[26] It has placed the *Summa theologica* "between the Gospel and the catechism, as the masterpiece of science between the code of revelation and the manual of faith." [27]

St. Bonaventure

In his encyclical *Aeterni patris,* having as its purpose the restoration of Christian philosophy in Catholic schools, Pope Leo XIII, speaking of "the angelic St. Thomas and the seraphic St. Bonaventure," says: "The illustrious teachers, with surpassing genius, by unwearied diligence, and at the cost of long labors and vigils, set in order and beautified Scholastic

[25] On the intellectual movement of this period and its various currents, see the important work at Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e siècle.*

[26] See Leo XIII's encyclical *Aeterni patris* (August 4, 1879) on the restoration of Christian philosophy, and his proclamation (August 4, 1880) of St. Thomas as patron of Catholic schools. (An English translation of the encyclical will be found in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII,* pp. 34 ff. Tr.)

[27] Freppel, *Œuvres,* III, 352. On the work of St. Thomas, see the critical study by Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques de saint Thomas d'Aquin.*

theology, and, when skilfully arranged and clearly explained in a variety of ways, handed it down to posterity." [28]

Usually St. Bonaventure is called a mystic. If we thus mean to contrast him with St. Thomas or to place him outside Scholastic theology, we are wrong. True, he gladly claimed his connection with St. Augustine, pseudo-Dionysius, St. Bernard, and the school of St. Victor; but, like St. Thomas, he declared that he had no other intention than to "follow the old, most common, and most authorized doctrines"; [29] like St. Thomas, he takes as the basis of his teaching the philosophy of Aristotle. Besides his theological work, he did indeed write books of spiritual doctrine, in which, as all agree, he excelled. "After reaching the summit of speculation," said Leo XIII, "St Bonaventure wrote on mystical theology with such perfection that the most capable judges have considered him the prince of mystics." [30] His *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum,* written at a stroke in 1259 at the top of Alvernus, is, according to good critics, the work in which his mind and heart are best revealed. In this treatise is found that magnificent definition of God, distorted by Pascal: "God is an infinite sphere, the center of which is everywhere and the circumference nowhere." [31] In that same work he addresses the following words to the disciples of Averroes: "It is truly surprising that you cannot find the first principle of all things, when He is so near you, and His name is written in letters of fire on the vault of the firmament, in letters of gold in the depth of your consciences." [32]

[28] The encyclical *Aeterni patris.*

[29] St. Bonaventure, *Comment. in Sent.,* II, praeloc.

[30] Allocution of November 20, 1890, in the *Acta ordinis fratrum minorum,* 1890, p. 177.

[31] Pascal said: "Nature is an infinite sphere, with its center everywhere and the circumference nowhere."

[32] Perhaps Kant had this thought in mind when he wrote: "Two things fill my soul with admiration: the starry heavens above my head, and the moral law in my heart."

The Study of Law

The chief center of the study of law was at Bologna. An international university like that of Paris, the Bologna school included several corporations, distinguished into "ultramontane" corporations and "citramontane" corporations. During the second half of the thirteenth century, the University of Bologna does not offer us any great doctor comparable to St. Thomas Aquinas or St. Bonaventure. But the impulse given to law studies by its professors spread over all Christendom. We have already noted that most of the popes of this period were learned canonists; and presently we shall see that the struggle which arose between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair was not so much a strife between two persons or two interests, but rather the contest of the canonist against the legist, of Christian law against pagan law.

The introduction of the study of Roman law into the schools of ecclesiastical law had, like the study of Aristotelian philosophy into the schools of theology, its advantages and its dangers. Just as Pope Gregory IX in 1231 had been obliged to set conditions to the study of Aristotle, so in 1219 Pope Honorius III judged it opportune to forbid to ecclesiastics the study of the *Pandects,*[33] and Gratian had composed, with regard to the Roman law, a work like that of the Scholastics in relation to Aristotle's system of philosophy: he made use of its methods and elements that could be assimilated, while he rejected its spirit. The Church was then able to constitute a Christian law, as also a Christian philosophy.

Between this Christian law and the pagan law of ancient Rome, the divergencies were notable, and at times the oppositions were formidable. They appeared first in public international law, that is, in the reciprocal relations of the different

[33] Both prohibitions were temporary. At the beginning of the fourteenth century the study of Roman law was fully authorized at Bologna.

states to one another. Whereas for the jurist of antiquity each state was constituted in an absolute autonomy, Christian law, as the popes of the Middle Ages taught it and practiced it, rejected that claim. For them, in the relations of the states to one another, there existed rules of justice, with the vicar of Christ as the accepted arbiter, the one whose character and interests were the best guaranty against unfair decisions.

Much has been said about the evil of the "vassalage right" of the popes in the Middle Ages, that is, of those relations of vassalage, guaranteed by an annual tribute, which were established between the Holy See and a large number of states. This practice has been interpreted by some as a desire of universal domination on the part of the papacy. An attentive history of the establishment of the "tribute right" presents the question in a different light. At first the monasteries, to escape the avidity of laymen, appealed to the protection of the Apostle St. Peter and paid an annual tax, the sign of that voluntary dependence. When wronged, they had recourse to Rome, which took their cause in hand by threatening the culpable nobles and sovereigns; and this protection was called "the Roman liberty" (*libertas romana*).[34] "The nobles' domains, even kingdoms, followed the example of the monasteries. Alfonso count of Portugal and Ramiro king of Aragon thus became vassals of the Apostle. This powerful protector, whose only arm was excommunication, had still in his clientele the kings of England and Poland, of Denmark and Kief, the dukes of Bohemia and of Croatia, the counts of Provence. Inscription in the book of the tributes guaranteed to the titulars a sort of security; it appeared to authenticate their rights and to preserve their liberties. The sovereigns also asked the pope to cement, by a religious ratification, the agreements which they signed. A peace was consecrated by oaths. Parties to a con-

[34] On the development of the tribute right, see Paul Fabre, *Etude sur le Liber censuum de l'Eglise romaine,* and the *Liber censuum de l'Eglise romaine,* published with a preface and a commentary by Duchesne and Paul Fabre in 1895.

tract, each mistrusting the honesty of the other, and perhaps even their own, kept a blank space on the treaty for the signature of God, who would unite their work." [35] As the jurist Martin de Lodi wrote, "the pope can oblige the princes to keep a peace agreed to. The crime of breaking the peace between princes is subject to the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical justice." [36]

In public national law, to regulate the relations of a sovereign with the nation, the Christian law of the Middle Ages was in opposition to the Roman law. The imperial law of ancient Rome, considering the prince as incarnating the nation in his person, did not recognize any limits to his power. His will made the law, *quidquid principi placuit, legis habet vigorem.* It was not so in the Christian concept. St. Thomas taught that "the people is not made for the prince, but the prince for the people." Between the two, juridical relations were admitted. And here again, in case of conflict, no one conceived of an arbiter more impartial or of an authority more efficacious than the vicar of Christ. In fact, the pope sometimes recalled a people to obedience toward their prince, sometimes he recalled a prince to a respect for justice toward his people. One of the first rights of a Christian nation was to obey only a Christian prince, and the observance of the laws of God were the best guaranty of the observance of justice toward men; therefore the popes freed peoples from their oaths of fidelity toward princes unfaithful to their own oaths of fidelity toward God.

To say that the popes did not let the caprice of their own wish or the calculation of their personal interests intervene in this high government of Christendom, would be to misunderstand the conditions of human nature and the facts of history. But we must also recognize that often the sense of the

[35] Cf. Otto von Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Age.*
[36] Quoted by Goyau, *La papauté et la civilisation,* pp. 61 f.

frightful responsibility resting on the supreme head of the Church was a safeguard for him and that, in compensation for a few abusive interferences, the papacy of the Middle Ages spared Christendom more than one war and more than one revolution.

On the terrain of private law, the commentators of the *Decretals* were likewise in opposition to the commentators of the *Pandects*. The Roman law, revived by the legists, lowered the woman and the child under the despotic authority of the head of the family and of the state, considered ownership as an absolute right, admitted, in contracts of sale and in the hiring of human labor, a struggle without mercy. The law elaborated by the popes under the influence of the Christian idea and codified by Gratian elevated, on the contrary, the dignity of women and children, considered ownership as a social function, did not admit that the wills of parties to a contract could be freely exercised apart from any consideration for human dignity and the general good.

The dignity of woman was elevated by several juridical institutions, such as the dower, assured by the husband to his wife when marrying her, guaranteeing to her, at the end of his life, an honorable existence. She was also favored by the encouragements given to the regime of joint possession which closely associated the husband and wife for loss and for gain. The suppression of the diriment impediment resulting from the lack of consent by the parents in the case of marriage (an impediment admitted by Germanic law and by Roman law) was prompted by respect for the freedom of the children of a family. The theory, then expressed by numerous canonists and theologians, which placed the essence of marriage in the consent of the persons entering matrimony, came from the same inspiration. As to the multiplication of marriage impediments between relatives, a multiplication that now seems to us excessive at first glance, it had a twofold aim, suggested

by lofty moral and social considerations: to favor mutual reserve by the young people in a single family group, and to appease the hatreds in the hostile family groups. The Christian legislation defended especially the indissoluble and sacred character of the marital bond, rejecting out of the family all natural children, and opposing divorce without compromise.[37]

The regime of ownership also profited greatly by the intervention of the canon law. The feudal conception, which did not comprehend possession of land without duties of homage to a suzerain, of protection for a vassal, of justice and charity toward the inhabitants of the domain, happily seconded the Christian idea of fraternal solidarity between men, of deference toward benefactors, and of compassion toward the weak, which inspired the ecclesiastical law. Canonists and theologians founded, with St. Thomas, the right of individual ownership on social usefulness and taught that almsgiving, for the rich, is a strict obligation. Several juridical institutions likewise contributed to moderate the property regime: such as the admission of prescriptions over a long period, the legal character recognized in those fictitious persons whom the canonists began to call "moral persons," the principle of the right to make a will which the Germanic law did not recognize.

A like influence was exercised on the regime of contracts, which were no longer conceived as a contest between two selfish interests, but as agreements subordinated to the moral law and to the social interest. In sales contracts, the Church wished account taken of the "just price" and, in labor contracts, of the "just wage." The frequent intervention of the oath, that is, the attestation of God to guarantee the man's promise, accustomed the contracting parties to respect for a man's pledged word.

The influence of canon law was felt in the civil and criminal

[37] See Brissaud, *Manuel d'histoire du droit privé,* p. 8; Esmein, *Le mariage en droit canonique;* Bonucci, *La derogabilità del diritto naturale nella scolastica.*

procedure. Although the Inquisition in the thirteenth century, in the presence of the great peril which threatened the Church and society from the heresies of the time and from the need to remedy it effectively and speedily, borrowed the use of torture from the civil legislation of the period, which derived it from the Roman law,[38] we must recognize that it used it with the greatest precautions, reserving it for very grave cases, when presumption of guilt was already very serious and when all the other means of investigation were exhausted.[39] "We should also grant the canonists this merit, that they strove against legal combats, granted the accused a defender, and adopted secret and written legal inquiry. Lastly, thanks to them, the repression was not conceived as a family vengeance, but as an attribute of the public power having the right and duty to maintain the order willed by God. The judge was to consider less the material element of the offense than the intention of the guilty person. The penal law was transformed." [40]

We would have to take up one by one all the legal topics if we wished to make a full study of the immense influence of canon law on the institutions of the Middle Ages and thereby on modern society. In fact, canon law was not merely the sole law

[38] Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages.*

[39] T. de Cauzons, *Histoire de l'Inquisition en France,* II, 237. "In the Midi of France, where the Inquisition was so active in the thirteenth century and at the beginning of the fourteenth, torture was employed so rarely that the enemies of the Church have, without offering any proof, supposed that the use of torture was mentioned in special registers which are now lost" (Guiraud, art. "Inquisition" in the *Dict. apol. de la foi,* II, 874).

[40] Dufourcq, *L'avenir du christianisme,* VI, 396. The Church had to take a hand also in the great transformation that in the thirteenth century affected social economy which, under the influence of the rapid development taken by commerce and industry from the middle of the twelfth century, spread quickly. From agricultural and local economy, it became a financial, industrial, and commercial economy. The monasteries, which already were agricultural centers, often became lending banks. See Génestal, *Rôle des monastères comme établissements de crédit.* On the part taken by the Church in the social economy of the Middle Ages, see Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages,* Bk. III. On the ecclesiastical tithe in the Middle Ages, see Viard, *Histoire de la dîme ecclés. dans de roy. de France aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles.*

applicable before the ecclesiastical courts; it was also applied before the secular tribunals in consequence of three distinct causes: 1. at an early date it was admitted that the canon law would be exercised over all the institutions which the Church had taken under her special protection and over all cases that involved the salvation of souls; 2. when the old feudal procedure was altered and then disappeared, the canon law was what furnished the secular courts with the principal rules replacing it; 3. the authority of the Church, the eminent place taken in the universities by the teaching of canon law, and the habit which secular magistrates adopted of taking their degrees *in utroque jure,* likewise contributed to the transition from theoretical study to practical application.

We should also note that the care with which the canonists had to temper the written law by custom, and justice by equity, gave their doctrines an ease of adaptation permitting them, more than the other jurists, to meet unforeseen cases, political, economic, and social modifications which the movement of the world then brought about. Thus the faculties of canon law, in particular the brilliant faculty of the University of Bologna, may be considered as having been civilizing agents of the first rank in the society of the Middle Ages.

The University of Oxford

If the great Italian university rightly glories in having been the scene of the revival of legal studies in the thirteenth century; if the Paris University prides itself on having given a chair to the greatest of theologians, St. Thomas Aquinas, Oxford claims the honor of having trained the greatest scientific genius of the Middle Ages, Roger Bacon.[41]

[41] In 1914 the University of Oxford, with solemn festivities and the erection of a statue, celebrated the seventh centenary of the birth of Roger Bacon.

The University of Oxford, which in its origin was connected with the ecclesiastical schools founded by Alcuin and Alfred the Great, did not develop its final organization and its great prosperity until the middle of the thirteenth century. Many teachers and students of the University of Paris, following disturbances that agitated the Paris schools at that period, had gone to England and brought there methods of teaching and of studies which the Oxford professors hastened to profit by.[42] Claim has been made that at that time the number of those who attended the great school of Great Britain, if we include the servants of the teachers and students, rose to 30,000.

About 1235, among the most assiduous listeners who gathered about the numerous professorial chairs of the University of Oxford, was a young man whose keen mind, personal qualities, universal curiosity in study, persistence in work, distinguished manners, and honest, sincere piety soon attracted the attention of his teachers and fellow students. His name was Roger Bacon. He was born about 1214 of a noble and powerful family which subsequently took the side of the English King against the rebellious barons. The young lord, as Abelard had done a century earlier, renounced the glory of arms and devoted himself to study. A few years later he renounced his personal fortune and his inheritance so as to embrace the poor life of the sons of St. Francis. But he never abdicated anything of his powerful and original personality. Under the coarse robe of a Friar Minor, Brother Roger Bacon remained one of the most characteristic personifications of the genius of England, "of its religious and practical spirit, which seeks to maintain the past while building up the future."

Encyclopedic minds, equally inquisitive in theology, grammar, history, and linguistics, in pure mathematics and natural sciences, had not been lacking in the Church. Sylvester II and

[42] Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis parisiensis,* I, 169, 189.

Albert the Great had been the most celebrated representatives of this spirit. At Oxford, Roger Bacon met several teachers who were able to lead him far ahead in all sorts of studies. He himself mentions Master Hugh, perhaps Hugh of St. Cher, who explained to him the Aristotelian theory of demonstration; John of London, one of the two greatest mathematicians of that period; Adam of Marino, who, by his knowledge of foreign languages, could be compared, said Bacon, with Aristotle and Solomon; and Robert of Lincoln called Robert Grosseteste, of whom we still possess a curious treatise on the transmission of power, on the laws of reflection and refraction. Roger Bacon speaks also of a group of English naturalists opposed to the Paris naturalists on a question of capital importance, the generation of the humors by the elements, and that of inanimate beings, of vegetables, of animals, and of men by the humors. At Paris, where the studious pupil went to perfect his studies, he heard Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great. There he knew also St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure.

At an early date Roger Bacon published the result of his observations and reflections. His first works have not come down to us, but what remains constitutes an immense work. In philosophy, without departing from the Scholastic method, he shows himself independent. The master whom he preferred seems to be St. Augustine. He knew and wished to have studied the foreign languages: Greek, Hebrew, Chaldean, and Arabic. He is regarded as one of the founders of the science of language, of comparative philology. But the natural sciences are the field where he excels. He laid down the laws of the experimental method. Having a positive and scientific mind, he recognized two foundations for science: 1. an attentive and repeated observation; 2. reasoning, but the exact and rigorous reasoning of mathematics, not that of sophistry, not that which pretends to deduce science from an alleged philosophical principle. Such are the rules he gives in his *Opus majus* and in his *Opus ter-*

tium.[43] The results which he personally reaped from this method are marvelous. "The illustrious doctor seems to have anticipated by six centuries the astounding flowering of modern science. His short work *De secretis operibus artis et naturae* is full of these glimpses of the future. The steamboat, railroads, balloons, the pulley, diving-suits, the telescope, the microscope, the terrible effects of gunpowder, all these are indicated almost in so many words." But the study of the material world did not withdraw Bacon from the contemplation of the mysteries of religion. He defended the truth of the dogmas of the Christian religion with tender piety and with a feeling and eloquence that came from the heart. This scholar's style everywhere possesses remarkable clearness and vivacity. He himself uses a fine comparison to express the relation of the art of good speaking with the art of reaching the truth: "Science without eloquence is like a sword in the hands of a paralytic; eloquence without science is like a sword in the hands of a madman." [44]

Secondary and Primary Education

This great man cherished the thought of popularizing all knowledge, of teaching in a single year to a docile child what he had taken twenty years to learn, of transmitting orally to an attentive man, in a quarter of a year, as he said, what he had discovered as certain in the science of optics. Bacon's worth as a teacher we do not know. Several summaries, drawn up in the form of summas or manuals, which he composed to spread the results of his studies, have not come down to us. But what we can state is that the concern of the great Franciscan was that of the whole Church of his time.

We cannot here describe in detail the functioning of second-

[43] *Opus majus,* Part I, chap. 10; Part IV, dist. I, chap. 3; *Opus tertium,* chaps. 13, 29–37.

[44] *Opus tertium,* chap. 1.

ary education in the Middle Ages. This work has been done in the scholarly studies of the *Histoire littéraire* and in numerous monographs. The canons directing every bishop to open a school beside his episcopal palace, and every abbot in his monastery, remained in force. The case of St. William, regulating the forty schools in the forty abbeys that were reformed by him, is a proof that these prescriptions were observed. And we are certain that these episcopal and monastic schools gave instruction corresponding to what we call secondary education. Little children could not be taught the seven arts of the *Quadrivium,* arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy, and, besides, law, architecture, and other subjects, which figured in the program of many of these schools.

The primary schools were likewise widespread. We readily understand that the history of these village schools and the schools in different sections of the cities has not been recorded with the same exactness as that of the universities. But the synodal statutes, the official records of episcopal visitations, testify to their presence. At Paris in 1292 there were twelve schools for a population of 40,000. In many cities (for example, Brest, Autun, Chalon-sur-Saone, Dijon) the primary teachers were organized as corporations, an evidence not only that they existed, but that they were numerous. "It is not only in the nineteenth century," says Leopold Delisle, "that schools were established in country districts. The idea of this institution goes back to the Middle Ages. At least for our province, we have indisputable proofs of this fact." [45]

Preaching

These schools were placed under the control of the clergy; therefore the religious teaching in them must have had a notable

[45] Delisle, *Etudes sur la condition de la classe agricole en Normandie au Moyen Age,* p. 175.

place. But religious instruction was given to the people especially by the priests themselves, by means of preaching.

In the time of St. Louis a sermon must have been a picturesque thing. At first the preaching was done somewhat everywhere, in the chapels, in the schools, at crossroads, even along the highways. The ordinary place for preaching was the church. The bishop of the place or a priest, a Friar Minor or a Friar Preacher, a canon of St. Victor or of Prémontré, or in addition a deacon, ascended, at the entrance into the choir of the church, a stairway constructed within the wall itself, and he then came into view in a sort of niche having a corbeled balcony.[46] The audience was usually very numerous, separated into two groups: the men on one side, the women on the other. The noble ladies sat on folding-chairs or cushions brought by their servants. The clergy had reserved places in the choir stalls. The rest of the people sat on stone benches, running along the side of aisles or chapels, or on benches and chairs in the main part of the church.

The subject of the sermons was sometimes a doctrinal exposition, sometimes an exhortation on the day's feast, sometimes a commentary on some pious reading. There were also occasional sermons connected with a local or national event, a disaster, a victory. In such event, or even when a famous preacher who chanced to be in the city was invited to preach, the church would prove to be too small, or perhaps they would not even think of going there for the purpose. St. Anthony of Padua, Philip Berruyer, Hugh of Digne drew vast multitudes after them to the public squares, in the ancient arenas, and on the highways. Some preachers even preached in the midst of the markets and fairs.

The thirteenth-century orator always spoke in the vulgar tongue. He used Latin only when addressing an audience made up exclusively of the clergy. The preacher's words and the atti-

[46] Wooden pulpits date only from the fifteenth century.

tude of the audience did not have that solemn and somewhat conventional character which we see in the modern period. Everything was more vivacious, more simple, more spontaneous. The sacred orator denounced vices, faults, irregularities, described them, flayed them. When he was explaining a truth, he endeavored to make it understood by comparisons and by examples taken from daily life. One of the listeners, not grasping the meaning, would interrupt him and thus provoke a fresh explanation. At other times, by a low murmur of approval or disapproval, the people showed their feeling. Then the priest would exclaim: "Very well. I see that you condemn what I am condemning." or: "What now? What is the meaning of these grumblings?" We can understand that, under such conditions, a real orator could establish, between his audience and himself, that communication of mind to mind, which enables a speaker to imbue his audience with his thought, to thrill them, to accomplish that supreme triumph of eloquence, when speaker and audience, carried away by one and the same breath, mutually aroused by the reciprocal reverberation of their feelings and passions and enthusiasm, seem to have but a single thought, a single soul. Often St. Bernard and Foulques of Neuilly had given this spectacle; St. Dominic and St. Francis, St. Anthony of Padua and Hugh of Digne repeated it in the thirteenth century. In large part, it was by the power of the spoken word that the Church aroused Christendom for the Crusades; it was also largely by the spoken word that she freed Christendom from the Manichaean heresy.

The Liturgy

The spoken word of the priest was not the only preaching. The Church, that great educator, knows that teaching and exhortation reach the soul by what it beholds as well as by what it hears. In the Middle Ages, in that thirteenth century when

the nations' confidence gave her a social power never known before, she endeavored to make a preaching of her liturgy and of her temples, where all the arts vied with one another in praising and preaching the religion of Christ.

St. Bonaventure, in a little treatise on the mass, sets forth the symbolism of the priest's vestments at the altar and of all the ceremonies of the holy sacrifice.[47] The ceremonies very closely resembled those of today. We will note merely the modifications which the thirteenth century introduced. The priest no longer celebrated mass, as in the time of Charlemagne, facing the congregation. Clergy and people are respectfully ranged behind him, and the looks of all converge upon the altar. The offering of bread and wine by the faithful, simply optional at the beginning in the eleventh century, is on the road to disappear in the thirteenth. The elevation of the body and of the blood of Christ by the hands of the celebrant after the consecration, becomes a general practice in the time of Innocent III and St. Louis.[48] William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris, introduced at Paris about 1240 the pious practice, already general in the diocese of Reims, of notifying the people by the sound of the bell, at the moment of the elevation, "so that they might then prostrate themselves and ask God's pardon for their sins." [49] And in the thirteenth century we see the appearance of the practice for the faithful to receive communion kneeling down, as they do today, with their hands joined, while the priest places the sacred host on their tongue. Until that time holy communion had been received standing. The people no longer receive communion under the species of wine. St. Thomas consoles them by

[47] St. Bonaventure, *Expositio missae*. St. Thomas gives a fine commentary on the ceremonies of the mass in his *Summa* (IIIa, q.83, a.4).

[48] The elevation of the host after the consecration was not introduced by way of protest against the heresy of Berengarius, but as a protest against the opinion of two theologians, Peter Comestor and Peter the Chanter, who taught that the transubstantiation of the bread into the body of our Lord does not take place until after the consecration of the chalice.

[49] Corblet, *Hist. de l'Eucharistie,* II, 159, 360.

recalling that Christ is whole and entire under each of the two species:

Caro cibus, sanguis potus;
Manet tamen Christus totus
Sub utraque specie.

After distributing holy communion, the priest, according to a practice that goes far back and which became general in the thirteenth century, placed the reserved species in a suitable receptacle hanging over the altar, or in a wrought crosier secured in the masonry, in such a way as to draw the attention of the faithful and arouse their adoration. The celebrant, before leaving the altar, blessed the congregation. This was a rather recent ceremony in the thirteenth century. Until the ninth century, only the bishop blessed. But, for two centuries preceding the time we are speaking of, this blessing had so entered into the ceremonial of the holy sacrifice that the priests could no longer omit it without grave scandal. Says St. Bonaventure: "This blessing is the image of that blessing which Jesus Christ will give his faithful at the last judgment, when He invites them to enter into the abode prepared for them." [50]

Religious Architecture

The Church wished to make the cathedral itself a sermon. Victor Hugo, in one of the chapters of *Notre Dame de Paris*, writes: "In the Middle Ages mankind had no important thought which he did not write in stone." The assertion is quite correct. But the poet is wrong when he adds: "The architectural book no longer belonged to the priesthood, to religion, to Rome; it belongs to the imagination, to poetry, to the people." This is utterly false: the teaching that comes from the architecture and sculp-

[50] St. Bonaventure, *Expositio missae*, chap. 4.

ture of the cathedrals is religious and Catholic. Lamennais eloquently expresses the deep religious significance of "those lofty vaults, which are rounded like those of heaven, expressing, by their deep shadows and the sadness of the dim light, the weakness of the universe darkened since its fall"; of "that ascending movement of each part of the temple, symbolizing the eternal aspiration of the creature toward God, its principle and its end"; and of "the cruciform plan, presenting the image of the instrument of eternal salvation." [51]

After the enlightening proofs of Emile Mâle,[52] no one can doubt that the poetic symbolism of the cathedrals was regulated by the ecclesiastical authority. In 787 the fathers of the Second Council of Nicaea expressed themselves in these terms: "The making of the religious images is not left to the initiative of the artists: it must accord with the principles laid down by the Catholic Church and by religious tradition." And further on: "The art alone belongs to the painter; the ordering and disposition belongs to the fathers." [53] No century more faithfully observed these prescriptions than did the thirteenth. While St. Thomas Aquinas was coordinating all the theological science of his time, and Roger Bacon all the positive sciences,[54] a man of less profound genius, but of vaster erudition, the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais, was giving an exposition of universal science. His work was divided into four parts: the mirror of nature, the mirror of science, the mirror of morality, and the mirror of history. These were the four mirrors that served as a rule for all the symbolism of the cathedrals. The builders of those great religious edifices had to conform to them exactly. The Church left to their fancy only the parts that were purely

[51] Lamennais, *De l'art et du beau,* chap. 2.

[52] Emile Mâle, *L'art religieux du XIII^e siècle en France.*

[53] Labbe, *Concil.,* VIII, 831.

[54] During this same period William Durandus of Mende made a summary of liturgical science, and Jacopo de Voragine collected the finest legends of the saints.

decorative. The rest was merely the reproduction, by architecture and painting and stained-glass, of the encyclopedic work of Vincent of Beauvais.

Thus the cathedral was for the people a Bible in stone, where they admired the wonders of nature and science, studied their duties, surveyed the history of mankind since the creation, having as its center the incarnation of the Son of God and His death on the cross for men's salvation. In such a cathedral, however, without abandoning the aim of giving an encyclopedic teaching, the artist developed more particularly a chapter of Vincent of Beauvais' mirrors. In the cathedral of Amiens, the teaching is more especially messianic and prophetic. In Notre Dame in Paris, Mariology triumphs. At Lyons, it is science and erudition. Beneath the vaults of the cathedral of Sens and on the portal of that of Lyons, we admire the marvels of creation. Bourges celebrates the virtues of the saints of the universal Church, and Reims, a national basilica, reproduces, in its stained-glass windows, the portraits of all the kings of France. In Spain, in Italy, in England, and in Germany the cathedrals of Burgos, of Toledo, of Siena, of Orvieto, of Westminster, of Salisbury, of Bamberg, and of Freiburg give similar teachings. In the smallest village, a church arose, with its slender spire, which seems a raised finger pointing to heaven.

The Romanesque art gave way to Gothic art. This is not the place for a technical account of the two arts. The Gothic style has three chief elements: the pointed arch, the flying-buttress, and a special ornamentation. The archeologists have definitely eliminated from the characteristics of the Gothic the broken arch, which was already in use in the Romanesque art of Burgundy, Provence, and Perigord. The Gothic style, which in a way sprang from the Romanesque style, since it brought the solution of the inquiries that engaged the masters of Romanesque works, "has made possible the erection of structures that are light, well illumined, spacious, and firm, although

vaulted; it carried to the highest point the principle of equilibrium by the opposition of forces, the predominance of empty spaces instead of solid parts"; [55] and by this means the Gothic church exercised over the people, and still exercises over the visitor, even more over those who come there to pray, an influence of elevation and purification. A certain writer has truly said: "You cannot enter the great nave of Amiens without feeling purified. The church, merely by its beauty, acts in some way like a sacrament." [56]

To render more penetrating and effective the voice of "the Bible in stone," all the arts were requisitioned. By the rich sculptures of the portals, by the splendid windows of the churches of the North, by the enchanting frescoes of the Italian basilicas,[57] by the voice, now joyous, now sad, of the bells, by the sweet, majestic harmonies of the organ, by the accents of a whole people singing in unison the traditional hymns, by a poetic inspiration which gave the world these pure masterpieces: the *Salve Regina,* St. Thomas' office of the Blessed Sacrament, the *Stabat Mater* of Jacopone da Todi, and the *Dies irae* of Thomas of Celano, sculpture, painting, music, poetry, all lent their concurrence to architecture and made of the Christian church the sanctuary of religion and the temple of art.

All classes of society labored in building the church. "The artist gave his genius; the baron, his land; the merchant, his money; the man of the people offered what he had, his robust arms; he harnessed himself to the carts; he carried the stones on his shoulders. For more than two centuries, all the living forces collaborated. Hence the mighty life that radiates from those eternal works. The very dead were associated with the living. The cathedral was paved with tombstones. The old gener-

[55] Enlart, *Manuel d'archéologie française, archit. religieuse,* I, 434 f.

[56] Mâle, *op. cit.,* p. 461.

[57] Mural painting has no place in Gothic churches. But in Italy, where the basilica form continues, it produces wonders, such as, for example, the mural paintings in the double church at Assisi, begun in 1228 and finished in 1252.

ations, with joined hands on their burial slabs, continue to pray in the old church. In it the past and the present are united in a single sentiment of love. It is the spirit of the community." [58]

Literature

The people of the thirteenth century loved their church above all else. "It is the blessed house where they could give expansion to their soul, oppressed by the hardness of life. The pomps, the ceremonies of the church, are their joy. They never find the service of God detaining them too long." [59] The mass did not suffice for them. By its form, by its alternate chants, by the dialogue of the officiant and the clergy or faithful, the mass is a drama. The people wish to prolong it and develop it. From that desire sprang the theater of the Middle Ages. The *Mysteries* were at first merely the variation of the office of the day. At Christmas, they sang: *Quem quaeritis, pastores? Salvatorem Christum.* At Easter:

Dic nobis, Maria,
Quid vidisti in via?
Sepulchrum Christi viventis,
Et gloriam vidi resurgentis.

Little by little this dialogue was enlarged and dramatized. Thus were formed: the drama of *The Prophets of Christ,* which was played on Christmas in the churches; the drama of *The Foolish Virgins,* that of *The Three Marys,* that of *The Representation of Adam,* the most remarkable in literary worth.

The French *chansons de gestes,* the poems of the German Minnesingers, emanated less directly from the Church. The war songs often breathed too much ferocity, and the joyous songs too much sensual softness. But even in these the Christian

[58] Mâle, *op. cit.,* p. 462.
[59] G. Lanson, *Hist. de la litt. française,* p. 186.

spirit prevailed. They were dominated by a maxim, that no one can be a perfect hero unless he protects the weak, unless he is the defender of the Church. "Make poor people your cousins," says the *Roman de Carité;* and the greatest of the German Minnesingers, Walther von der Vogelweide, whose patriotism is so fiercely jealous, sings of the dolors and the mercies of the Blessed Virgin with unequaled tenderness.

Chivalry

Thus, under various forms, Christian doctrine and the Christian spirit entered men's souls. But sad experiences had shown the Church that nothing lasts that is not organized into a permanent institution. As the Church had endeavored to organize the political life by the institution of Christendom, it labored to organize private life. To continue at the height of the Christian ideal, the nobility had chivalry, the world of workingmen had the guild, the mass of the nation had the confraternities and the third orders.

Chivalry has been defined as "the Christian form of the military profession," [60] or, "the armed force in the service of the unarmed truth." In its origin, chivalry goes back to an old custom of the Germanic countries, the "giving of arms," that is, the investiture given to the noble's son when he reached the age to fight. Chivalry, however, must not be confounded with the nobility. Every noble was not a knight, and every knight was not a nobleman.[61] The order, which was recruited by adoption, had the right of admitting to its ranks a peasant who had given proofs of courage, and at times it made use of this right. In short, chivalry in its early days formed an elite of fighting men; their whole moral tone is contained in these two traditional

[60] Léon Gautier, *Chivalry,* p. 2.

[61] Nobility is hereditary; knighthood never was so. Reception into a military order does not confer knighthood.

words: "Be valiant." The valiant man is not only a brave soldier, he is a loyal and honorable soldier; he keeps his pledged word to his suzerain as to the one who has armed him, and he never strikes an unarmed enemy.

But the Church perceived that this moral principle was insufficient, that the knight was too often brutal, ferocious in battle, lacking respect for women and children after the combat. In the eleventh century the Church intervened to give knighthood a religious character and to make the knight the type of the Christian soldier.

For the training of a knight, the Church had as its model the training she gave to her clerics and her monks. "The first quality which was desirable and was exacted from a candidate for chivalry, was 'to have the vocation,' " [62] that is, the aptitude and the attraction for that career of noble soldier, of Christian soldier. If this vocation manifests itself from childhood, the boy is taken at the age of fourteen, even as young as seven years. As a page, he accompanies in the chase the lord charged with his education, he lets loose and calls back the falcon, he handles the spear and the sword, he performs the duties of squire,[63] he hardens himself to fatigue, he nourishes his mind on accounts of the great battles or the songs of the troubadours celebrating the exploits of Charlemagne and Arthur. If the page shows himself ever brave and loyal, and a good Christian, he can be made a knight when he comes of age. In the thirteenth century this was fixed at twenty-one years.

The rite of knighting a page was most solemn. In the thirteenth century it had an altogether religious character and constituted a sort of eighth sacrament. The candidate prepared for his initiation by symbolic ceremonies. He took a bath, which signified the purity of body and heart that he should keep when under arms. He passed a night in prayer in the church; this was

[62] Gautier, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

[63] On the duties of a squire, see Gautier, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

the "vigil of arms." He went to confession, heard mass, and received communion. Then he was dressed in a garment of white linen, another symbol of moral purity. Valiant knights, his sponsors, soon dub him, that is, invest him with the various pieces of his armor: the gilded spurs, the coat of mail, and the helmet. In the thirteenth century the Church reserved to the priest the essential part of the dubbing that made the young page a knight. This ceremony took place before the altar. The priest blessed a sword, as he recited the following prayer: "Lord, we beseech Thee, hear our prayers and deign to bless this sword, with which Thy servant desires to be armed, that he may be able to defend and protect the churches, widows, orphans, and all the servants of God." Then he girded the kneeling candidate with the sword, saying to him: "Receive this sword, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The candidate rose up a knight.

Thenceforth he was subject to military and religious prescriptions that he could not violate without making himself guilty of felony, without exposing himself to the penalty of degradation. We may reduce the obligations of a knight to these ten: 1. Thou shalt believe all that the Church teaches and shalt keep her commandments; 2. thou shalt protect the Church; 3. thou shalt respect and defend all the weak; 4. thou shalt love the place of thy birth; 5. thou shalt not retreat before the enemy; 6. thou shalt make ceaseless war on the infidels; 7. thou shalt perform with exactness thy feudal duties; 8. thou shalt not lie and shalt be faithful to thy word; 9. thou shalt be liberal to all; 10. thou shalt endeavor to do all that is good and to combat all that is evil.

It has been said that this code outlines an ideal that was never realized except in the *chansons de gestes*. But Leon Gautier notes that often the history of chivalry has been more beautiful than legend. St. Louis, in his prison, was more admirable than was William of Orange on the battle field of Aliscans. Du-

guesclin, for whose ransom "all the women of France worked at their spinning-wheels," is greater than Renaud, the eldest of the sons of Aymon. What epic hero equals Bayard? And does not the Joan of Arc of history surpass all the heroines of romance?

It has also been said that chivalry was a passing institution. At least, when it disappeared, it left posterity a heritage of sentiments that were almost unknown before it and that the modern nations have not yet seen disappear everywhere from their midst: the cult of honor and all those ways of feeling and acting, so noble, lofty, and delicate, which we can call by no other name but this consecrated expression, the knightly spirit.

The Guilds

While concerned with ennobling the soldier, who defended the country with his sword, the Church did not forget the workingman, who made it prosperous by his labor. Concern for the workingman was an old tradition in the Church; but the thirteenth century was perhaps the epoch when her solicitude was the most active and effective. This solicitude was especially manifested by the organization of the guild.

A discussion that has gone on for a long time has sought to assign a single origin for the guild. The trade unions of ancient Rome (*collegia opificum*), the Germanic gildes, and the Christian religious confraternities were, in various respects, rough outlines of the craftsmen's guilds. The foundation of these "new cities" in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which grouped in a single city the craftsmen scattered in the *villae* or on the estates; the "peace associations" that showed the advantages of solidarity for the undertaking of a common work; the municipal movement, which was its consequence; the vast works undertaken for the construction of the cathedrals, which grouped more closely together the artisans of a single specialty,

were all successive or concurrent causes which had an influence that we cannot accurately measure in each case. But, "if the origin of the guild corporation is previous to the thirteenth century, not until that period did the institution appear finally organized." [64] The organization of the guilds was accomplished, at that time, by a man whose name remains attached to the history of French industry, the author of the *Livre des métiers,*[65] Stephen Boileau.

We know little about his life. He was born about 1200, accompanied the King to the Crusade, was taken prisoner in 1250 and was held for ransom. In 1258 he was called by St. Louis' confidence to the provostship of Paris, and thus became the chief magistrate of the city, the immediate representative of the royal authority. According to contemporaries, he was an upright, austere man, of incorruptible honesty. Under the inspiration of the holy King, he undertook to gather together, in a single codification, all the usages and regulations in force in the crafts of Paris. His *Livre des métiers* enables us to reconstruct the life of a workingman in the thirteenth century. It contained three chief elements: the organization of labor, the life of the family, and the intervention of religion in the laboring and family life.

The historian of the guilds says:

> The guild, taken as a whole, had at its base the division of all craftsmen into three classes: apprentices, journeymen, and masters; those who were being trained, those who served, those who commanded. To each of these three degrees corresponded rights and duties of a particular nature, the list of which was found in the statutes of the craft. Thus the apprentice was not left without protection to the whim of the master. The latter must exercise toward him a moral and professional protection. He has charge of souls. If he failed to

[64] E. Martin-Saint-Léon, *Histoire des corporations,* p. 79. Cf. Levasseur, *Hist. des classes ouvrières.*

[65] The term "corporation" is of modern origin.

keep his solemn engagement, which he contracted toward his pupil, the guild intervened to remind him of this obligation.

After the apprentice had grown up and become a man, after he had finished his apprenticeship, sometimes he became a master at once. Not until the fourteenth century do we find a new term of probation, the journeyman stage, imposed on a candidate for the status of master. But, even in the thirteenth century, more often than not the apprentice attained the status of master only after being a servant. Thereafter he definitely belonged to the guild. The servant was no longer, like the apprentice, bound to the service of a single master. His personality was no longer thus confined. He was free to choose the master for whom he would work; he had the right to discuss the clauses of his agreement. Besides, he had an influential part in the administration of the community; often he had something to say in the choice of his magistrates; he was a participating member of the confraternity and, as such, had a right, in case of need, to the assistance of the society. In short, although, for the performance of his work, he was dependent on the master who engaged him, yet he remained a free man, with a dignity that was always respected.

At the top of the hierarchy was the master. A former apprentice, often a former servant, at last he labored for his own profit, whether he succeeded his father or whether he amassed the necessary resources to have a shop of his own. For this he had to pay certain dues to the craft confraternity, sometimes to the king, and to the master of the craft, if his guild had one. Then generally he engaged one or two servants, took an apprentice, and exercised the rights connected with the rank of master. He attended the meetings, at which he had a vote; he took part in the election of the magistrates, jurymen, or skilled craftsmen, who managed the guild, and he himself might be called upon to hold these offices.

Every collective organization supposes a superior authority whose office is to settle disputes and to enforce respect for the regulations. That authority was confided, in the guild, to sworn councillors, chosen from the masters, generally by election, on condition that the choice be ratified by the provost of Paris. These officers had many duties; some of a financial sort, some connected with the maintenance of

public order. . . . By their office they were the protectors of the apprentices. And they exercised a sort of semi-official authority in all cases involving the security of their subordinates or the general welfare of the craft. Their tenure of office was for a limited time and they had to make their reports to the assembly of the masters.[66]

The principle of the family life was the basis of every workshop; it also became the source of many advantages for the apprentices or servants. "They took their meals with the master. On these occasions minds and hearts easily opened to one another and derived strength from that reciprocal affection. No antagonism. No lodging in the city. No occasion to frequent evil places. The patron's home was the sanctuary guarding the members of the workshop from dangers, from the almost inevitable falls to which the workmen of today are fatally exposed." [67] The apprentice and the servant had in the master's house not only food and lodging, but also fire, light, and laundering. The master was obliged to perform toward them the duties of a father. Under penalty of a fine, he must watch over their morals as well as their work; he must not, for example, allow them to remain out at night later than a fixed hour.

Sharing this family life in the master's home, the workman easily found his life-companion. Often he married the master's daughter. Then he enjoyed the same privileges as the sons of the master. Then the day of his admission to the status of master was not only a grave solemnity, which the guild considered with almost as much respect as the accolade of a knight, as the conferring of the doctorate upon a scholar, or even as the ordination of a cleric; it became a joyous family feast, the starting-point of a new organization of family workshop, where the new master would hand down the principles of morality that he received during his probation as a workman.

[66] Martin-Saint-Léon, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–85.

[67] Hippolyte Blanc, *Corporations de métiers*, p. 198.

As the Church inspired all these practices, of course it gave religion the first place in the family workshop. The master's chief duty was to imbue his apprentice with the fear of God. "Morning and evening," says an old document quoted by Janssen, "and also during his work, the apprentice should ask for God's protection and aid, for without God he can do nothing. The apprentice should attend mass and hear the sermon on Sundays and feast days, and learn to love the reading of good books. During his work he should be industrious and should seek his reputation only in the glory of God. If he sins against the fear of God and obedience, his master should punish him severely: this will do good for his soul; often the body must suffer so that the soul will behave the better." [68]

The performance of religious duties found great help in the confraternity. Frequently, especially at the beginning, the administrative members of the confraternity were the same persons as the officers of the guild. There masters and servants and apprentices mingled in striking equality. The confraternity was the religious and charitable form of the craft. It had two aims: to sustain the members in the practice of their religious duties and to procure assistance for them in their needs. Each confraternity was placed under the patronage of a saint, the patron of the guild, whose image was painted on the banner that was carried on solemn feast days. The metal-workers marched under the banner of St. Eligius (Eloi); wood-workers, under that of St. Joseph; the shoemakers had the image of St. Crepin and St. Crepinian painted on their banner; the bakers, that of St. Honore. A considerable number of confraternities had their own chapel. At Paris, the great butchers' corporation had a magnificent chapel. That of the goldsmiths was very rich. The shoemakers every Monday had a service celebrated at Notre Dame before the images of St. Crepin and St. Crepinian, for

[68] *Exhortation chrétienne,* quoted by Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages.*

the intentions of their members. The flower-girls went to St. Leufroi; the pork-butchers, to the Augustinians.

The confraternity was also a mutual assistance society. The funds were supplied by regular assessments upon its members, varying according to the prosperity of the craft, and by fines incurred, sometimes by the revenues from property owned by the confraternity. The funds were used chiefly for the relief of sick, infirm, and aged workmen, or those who were under the blow of any misfortune. At Paris the confraternity of goldsmiths owned a hospice for the aged and members who were no longer able to work. There they received whatever was required for a decent existence. In return only two things were asked of them: their prayers and their good advice to the young men in the craft.

From St. Louis to Louis XVI, the confraternities lived in dignified pride, without borrowing from anyone. They even made generous offerings outside. Every year the goldsmiths gave a meal to the poor in the Hotel-Dieu. The drapers also made them an annual offering. They gave, besides, a "quarter" of wine and piece of meat to the prisoners of the Châtelet. And the craftsmen were not niggardly in the offerings to the sanctuaries. Most of the stained-glass windows of the Bourges cathedral were offered by confraternities of craftsmen.

The confraternity was always distinct from the guild, and often quite separate from it. In some instances its membership was more limited: some confraternities were composed exclusively of patrons and some of workmen. In other cases it included members of various trades, or even persons belonging to no manual trade. In the great confraternity of Notre Dame, at Paris, were to be found the king, the queen, the princes of blood royal, as well as the smallest tradesmen. Louis XI, a member of this confraternity, was not loath to dine in the home of a member who was a small merchant of the faubourg St. Antoine.

Under the title of confraternities or fraternities, religious

and charitable groups were organized for various special purposes in all parts of Christendom. In the Netherlands, Lambert le Bègue founded "beguinages," whose members, for their own sanctification, bound themselves to certain penances and prayers. "At Paris, Doctor William, with his students and some friends, founded a common house, that they might better realize the Gospel ideal: it was called the Val des Ecoliers. At Le Puy-en-Velay, the Blessed Virgin appeared to a carpenter named Durand Dujardin, and ordered him to go to the bishop for the foundation of a confraternity that would have as its duty the promotion of peace. The 'hooded' swore to go to confession, not to gamble, not to blaspheme, not to frequent the taverns. Similar confraternities were formed in Auvergne, in Berri, in Aquitaine, in Gascony, and in Provence; their members were called 'the peaceful,' or simply 'the sworn.' In Italy phenomena of the same sort were to be seen. Bonfilius dei Monaldi and his friends of Florence distributed their goods to the poor and devoted themselves to penance. The 'humiliati' of Lombardy agreed to associate together for work, prayer, and preaching. Rejected by Alexander III, they persisted and finally were recognized by Innocent; they were authorized to preach morality and piety, but were forbidden to treat of faith and the sacraments." [69]

Piety

Just as the confraternities extended beyond the crafts, so the works of charity extended beyond the confraternities. Besides the charitable works of the monasteries, which continued to give hospitality to pilgrims and travelers and made regular distributions of assistance to the poor, works were founded to aid the poor in general, the lepers, women and children, and the aged. The hospice of Biloque at Gand dates from 1227; the

[69] Dufourcq, *op. cit.*, VI, 267.

Maison-Dieu of St. Malo, from 1252; the Holy Ghost at Hanover dates from 1252; the Quinze Vingts at Paris belongs to the same period. In the West, at the close of the thirteenth century, there were between 15,000 and 20,000 leper-houses. The asylum of the Filles-Dieu at Paris, that of the Six-Vingts at Chartres, that of the foundlings at Lille, the old people's homes founded at Valence, Tournai, the Norman "charities" of Evreux, the houses for women in confinement, and the societies founded for the burial of the dead grew in number in France, Italy, and Germany.

Among all these associations, these groups of charity and piety, one form little by little tended to prevail. These were the third orders. We have already noted their origin.[70] In the thirteenth century, thanks to the third orders, "the world was peopled with young women, married people, men of every rank and station, who publicly wore the insignia of a religious order and bound themselves to its practices in the privacy of their homes. Just as a person belonged to a family by blood or to a society by the service in which he was engaged, so, out of voluntary devotion, they wished to belong to one of the glorious militias that were serving Christ by word and by penance. People wore the liveries of St. Dominic or of St. Francis, frequented their churches, took part in their prayers, followed as nearly as possible the footsteps of their virtues. The history of this institution is one of the most beautiful things we can read. It produced saints in every rank of human life, from the throne to the footstool, with such an abundance that the desert and the cloister were able to be jealous of them. Who has not heard of St. Catherine of Siena and St. Rose of Lima, those two Dominican stars who enlightened the two worlds? Who has not read the life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, the Franciscan? Thus the spirit of God proportioned His miracles to a multitude of dis-

[70] See *supra*, p. 247.

tressful needs. After flourishing in the solitudes, it spread out over the highways." [71]

The Christian Century

In his encyclical *Immortale Dei,* Pope Leo XIII recalls to our minds the time when the influence of the Christian religion and its divine power penetrated the laws and institutions and customs of the nations. The Pope is referring to the period we have been considering. His assertion may appear strange to those who have in mind the schisms and heresies, the oppositions of princes and the weaknesses of clerics, which we have so frequently related in the course of the three centuries we have been studying. But to take scandal from this would be to fail to recognize that the conduct of the most virtuous men never attains the ideal by which they are inspired; this is even truer when we are considering the conduct of a whole society. What is undeniable is that an ideal of life and of Christian perfection reigned over the Middle Ages; that from the eleventh to the thirteenth century it continued to grow; that it entered more and more into the law, the institutions, and the morals, and that it produced marvels. The century of St. Francis of Assisi and of St. Louis, the century of the Gothic cathedrals and the Christian guilds, of chivalry and of the mendicant orders, was truly a century of faith and of charity. Montalembert, in the Introduction to his *Histoire de sainte Elisabeth,* writes: "We know only too well all the sufferings and griefs and crimes there were in the centuries we have been studying. But we believe that, among the evils of these centuries and those of our own century, there were two incalculable differences. At first the energy of the evil everywhere encountered an energy for good, which it seemed to make stronger by provoking it to the combat. Then these evils, from which the world was suffering, were material

[71] Lacordaire, *Vie de saint Dominique,* chap. 16.

rather than moral. An immense moral health neutralized all the ills of the social body. The faith, which had penetrated the world, which laid claim to all men without exception, filtered into all the pores of society like a health-giving sap." [72]

[72] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* VII, 146–48.

Bibliography

The following is a partial list of works referred to in this volume, together with a few titles added by the translator. The dates given are usually those of the latest edition. The abbreviation *PL* stands for Migne's *Patrologia latina.*

ABELARD, Peter: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 178).
Historia calamitatum (*PL,* vol. 178).
Acta ordinis fratrum minorum, 1890.
Acta sanctorum, by the Bollandists, 1643–1931, 67 vols.
ADAMS, H.: *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres,* 1913.
ADÉMAR of Chabannes: *Historiae* (*PL,* vol. 141).
ADLINGER: *La nomination aux évêchés allemands sous Innocent IV,* 1880.
ALBERT of Aachen: *Historia Hierosolymitanae expeditionis* (*PL,* vol. 166).
ALEXANDER NATALIS: *Historia ecclesiastica,* 1785–91, 20 vols.
ANSELM, St.: *Opera* (*PL,* vols. 158, 159).
ARGENTRÉ, Bertrand d': *Histoire de Bretagne.*
ARNOLFO: *Gesta archiepiscoporum mediolanensium* (*PL,* vol. 147).
Assises de Jérusalem, 2 vols., 1841–43.
AUGUSTINE, St.: *De Trinitate.*

BACON, Roger: *Opus majus* (English trans. by Burke, 1928).
Opus tertium.
BALUZE, Etienne (ed.): *Innocentii III epistolae,* 1682.
Miscellanea, 1761–64, 4 vols.
BARONIUS: *Annales ecclesiastici,* 1738–59, 38 vols.
BÉDIER, Joseph: *Les légendes épiques. Recherches sur la formation des chansons de gestes,* 1908–13, 4 vols.
BENEDICT XIV: *De synodo* (vol. 11 of *Opera*).
BERENGARIUS: *De sancta Caena.*

BERGER: *St. Louis et Innocent IV,* 1893.
BERNARD, St.: *Opera* (*PL,* vols. 182–185).
BERNOLD of Constance: *Chronicon.*
BERNRIED, Paul: *Vita Gregorii VII* (*PL,* vol. 148).
BIHLMEYER, K.: *Kirchengeschichte auf Grund des Lehrbuches von F. X. Funk;* vol. II, *Das Mittelalter* (9th ed., 1932).
BLANC, Hippolyte: *Corporations des métiers, leur histoire, leur esprit, leur avenir,* 1898.
BLOIS, Peter de: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 207).
BOEHMER, Johann Friedrich: *Acta imperii selecta,* 1870.
BONAVENTURE, St.: *Expositio missae.*
Vita S. Francisci.
BONGARS, Jacques: *Gesta Dei per Francos,* 1611–12, 2 vols.
BONIZO of Sutri: *Ad amicum* (*PL,* vol. 150).
Historiae pontificiae fragmentum (*PL,* vol. 150).
BONNARD, Fourier: *Histoire des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Victor.*
BONUCCI, A.: *La derogabilità del diritto naturale nella scolastica,* 1906.
BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne: *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* 2 vols.
Œuvres oratoires.
BOUCHE: *Histoire de la Provence.*
BOURGAIN, Louis: *La chaire française au XII^e siècle,* 1879.
BOURGEOIS, René: *Du mouvement communal en Champagne aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles,* 1904.
BOUSQUET, J.: *L'unité de l'Eglise et le schisme grec,* 1913.
BOWER, Archibald: *History of the Popes from the Foundation of the See of Rome to the Present Time,* 1845, 3 vols.
BRÉHIER, Louis: *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age,* 1907.
Le schisme oriental du XI^e siècle, 1899.
BRISSAUD, Jean Baptiste: *Manuel d'histoire du droit privé,* 1908.
BRUCKER: *L'Alsace et l'Eglise au temps de S. Léon* IX, 1889.
BRUGÈRE, F.: *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise.*
BRUNO of Magdeburg: *De bello saxonico* (*PL,* vol. 147).
BRUTAILS, Jean Auguste: *L'archéologie du Moyen Age et ses methodes,* 1900.
BRYCE, James: *The Holy Roman Empire,* 1932.

CAGGESE, Romolo: *Su l'origine della parte Guelfa e le sue relazioni col comune,* 1903.

CALLISTUS II: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 163).

Bullarium.

CALVIN, John: *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* trans. by Henry Beveridge, 1869, 2 vols.

CARLYLE, R. W. and A. J.: *A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West,* Vols. II and III, 1928.

CARNÉ, comte de: *Les fondateurs de l'unité française,* 1856, 2 vols.

CAUZONS, T. de: *Histoire de l'Inquisition en France,* 1908, 3 vols.

CEILLIER, Remy: *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques,* 1859–65, 14 vols.

CELANO, Thomas of: *Vita prima,* 1906 (English trans., *Lives of St. Francis of Assisi by Brother Thomas of Celano,* tr. by A. G. Ferrers Howell, 1908).

CERTAIN, Eugéne de: *Miracula S. Benedicti.*

CHALANDON, Ferdinand: *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I^er^ Comnène,* 1900.

Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile, 1907, 2 vols.

CHAUMONT, Léopold: *Histoire de Cluny,* 1910.

CHAUPIN: *Valeur des décisions du Saint Siège,* 1913.

CHÉRANCÉ, Léopold de: *S. Bonaventure,* 1899.

CHEVALIER, Cyr Ulysse: *La France chrétienne dans l'histoire.*

Chronicon Montis Cassini.

CLAYTON, J.: *St. Anselm,* 1933.

CLERVAL, J. A.: *Les écoles de Chartres au Moyen Age,* 1895.

COCHIN: *Saint Anselme.*

COMBA: *I nostri protestanti,* 1895.

COMNENA, Anna: *The Alexiad of the Princess Anna Comnena,* trans. by Elizabeth A. S. Dawes, 1928.

CONTRACTUS, Hermannus: *Chronicon* (*PL,* vol. 143).

CORBLET, Jules: *Histoire de l'Eucharistie,* 1885–86, 2 vols.

Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae.

COULTON, G. G.: *Life in the Middle Ages,* 1935.

COUSIN, Victor: *Fragments philosophiques.*

Œuvres inédites d'Abailard, 1836.

CRÉGUT, G.: *Le Concile de Clermont en 1095 et la première croisade,* 1895.
CRISTOFANI: *Delle storie d'Assise.*
CUTHBERT, Father: *Life of St. Francis of Assisi,* 1913.

DARRAS, Joseph: *Histoire générale de l'Eglise,* 1869.
DELARC, Odon Jean Marie: *Saint Grégoire VII,* 1889, 3 vols.
DELAVILLE, Leroulx Joseph: *Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre,* 1904.
DELISLE, Léopold Victor: *Études sur la condition de la classe agricole en Normandie au Moyen Age,* 1851.
DEMIMUID, Maurice: *Pierre le Vénérable,* 1876.
DEMOLINS, E.: *Le mouvement communal et municipal au Moyen Age,* 1874.
DENIFLE and CHATELAIN: *Chartularium Universitatis parisiensis,* 1897, 4 vols.
DESCARTES, René: *A Discourse on Method,* trans. by John Veitch, 1924.
DESLANDRES, Paul: *Innocent IV,* 1907.
L'Ordre des Trinitaires pour le rachat des captifs, 1903, 2 vols.
DIEHL, Charles: *Figures byzantines,* 1912.
DITHMAR: *Chronicon* (*PL,* vol. 139).
DÖLLINGER: *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte.*
DOMNIZO: *Vita Mathildis* (*PL,* vol. 166).
DOUAIS, Célestin: *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Inquisition dans le Languedoc,* 1900, 2 vols.
Essai sur l'organisation des études dans l'ordre des Frères précheurs au XIII^e^ et au XIV^e^ siècle, 1884.
Les Albigeois, 1879.
DU BOULAY, César: *Historia Universitatis parisiensis,* 1665–73, 6 vols.
DU BOYS, Albert: *L'Eglise et l'Etat en Angleterre depuis la conquête des Normands,* 1887.
DU CANGE, Charles: *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis,* 1840–50, 7 vols.
DUCHESNE, André: *Historiae Francorum scriptores coaetanei,* 1636–49, 5 vols.

DUCHESNE, Louis: *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution,* trans. by M. L. McClure, 1916.
Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical, 1904.
(ed.) *Liber pontificalis,* 1886–92, 3 vols.
and Paul Fabre: *Liber censuum de l'Eglise romaine,* 1905–10, 2 vols.
DUFOURCQ, Albert: *L'avenir du Christianisme,* 1908, 4 vols.
DUVAL, Frédéric: *Les terreurs de l'an mille,* 1908.

EADMER: *Historiae novorum* (*PL,* vol. 149).
Vita S. Anselmi (*PL,* vol. 158).
ECKHART, Johann Georg von: *Corpus historicum medii aevi,* 1723, 2 vols.
EKKEHARDUS: *Chronicon universale* (*PL,* vol. 154).
ENLART, Camille: *Manuel d'archéologie française,* 1924, 4 vols.
ESMEIN, Jean Paul Adhémar: *Le mariage en droit canonique,* 1891.
EYRE (ed.): *European Civilization, Its Origin and Development,* 1935 (Vol. III, *The Middle Ages*).

FAGUET, Emile: *Histoire de la littérature française,* 1901, 2 vols.
Politicians and moralists of the 19th century, trans. by Dorothy Galton, 1928.
FÉRET, Pierre: *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres, le Moyen Age,* 1896, 3 vols.
FICKER, J.: *Reinald von Dassel,* 1850.
FLACH, Jacques: *Les origines de l'ancienne France,* 1886–1917, 4 vols.
FLICHE, Augustin: *Etudes sur la polémique religieuse à l'époque de Grégoire VII,* 1916.
FLOSS: *Die Papswahl unter den Ottonen.*
FOUCHER of Chartres: *Histoire des croisades,* 1825.
Historia Hierosolymitana (*PL,* vol. 155).
FOURNIER: *Le royaume d'Arles et de Vienne,* 1891.
Les officialités au Moyen Age, 1880.
FRANKLIN, A.: *Recherches sur la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris.*

FROIDEVAUX, Henri: *De regiis conciliis Philippo II regnante habitis,* 1891.

Gallia christiana in privincias ecclesiasticas distributa, 1877, 16 vols.
GASTOUÉ, A.: *L'art grégorien,* 1911.
GAUTIER, Léon: *Chivalry,* trans. by Henry Frith, 1891.
Etudes et tableaux historiques.
Histoire de la poésie liturgique, 1886.
Les epopées françaises, 1892, 4 vols.
Œuvres poétiques d'Adam de Saint-Victor, 1858, 2 vols.
GAY, Jules: *L'Italie méridionale et l'Empire byzantin,* 1904.
GHIRARDACCI, Cherubino: *Della historia di Bologna,* 1932.
GIERKE, Otto Friedrich von: *Political Theories of the Middle Age,* trans. by F. W. Maitland, 1900.
GIESEBRECHT, Wilhelm von: *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit,* 1895, 8 vols.
GOSSELIN, Jean Edme Auguste: *Pouvoir du pape au Moyen Age,* 1845.
GRABMANN, M.: *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* 1910.
GRATIAN: *Decretal* (*PL,* vol. 187).
GREGOROVIUS: *Geschichtschreiber der Stadt Rom,* 1921.
GREGORY VII, St.: *Registrum* (*PL,* vol. 148).
GRUPP, G.: *Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters,* 1925.
GUENTER, H.: *Das deutsche Mittelalter,* 1936.
Deutsche Kultur in ihrer Entwicklung, 1932.
GUÉRANGER, Prosper: *The Liturgical Year,* tr. by Laurence Shepherd.
GUIGNARD: *Les monuments primitifs de la Règle cistercienne,* 1878.

HAGENMEYER: *Peter der Eremit,* 1879.
HAMPE, K.: *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer,* 1916.
HASKINS, C. H.: *Norman Institutions,* 1925.
The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, 1927.
HAURÉAU, Jean Barthélemy: *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique,* 1880, 3 vols.
HAVET, Julien Pierre (ed.): *Lettres de Gerbert,* 1889.
L'hérésie et le bras séculier au Moyen Age, 1896, 2 vols.

HEFELE-LECLERCQ: *Histoire des conciles.*
HELGAUD: *Vita Roberti* (*PL,* vol. 141).
HÉLYOT, Pierre, and Bullot: *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux,* 1719, 8 vols.
HERGENRÖTHER: *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte,* 1925, 4 vols.
HEURTEVENT, R.: *Durand de Troara et les origènes de l'hérésie bérengarienne,* 1912.
HILPISCH, S.: *Geschichte des benediktinischen Moenchtums,* 1929.
Historiens des Gaules, 1738–1904, 25 vols.
HOLTZMANN, R.: *Gebhardts Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte,* 1930.
HOLZAPFEL, Heribert: *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens,* 1909.
HONORIUS II: *Epistolae.*
HUGH of Flavigny: *Chronicon* (*PL,* vol. 154).
HUGH of St. Victor: *Eruditionis didascalicae libri septem* (*PL,* vol. 176).
De vanitate mundi (*PL,* vol. 176).
De sacramentis (*PL,* vol. 176).
HUGO, Charles: *Sacrae antiquitatis monumenta historica, dogmatica, diplomatica,* 1725–31, 2 vols.
HUGO, Louis Charles: *La vie de S. Norbert,* 1704.
HUILLARD-BRÉHOLLES: *Historia diplomatica Friderici II,* 1852–61, 12 vols.
HUME, David: *History of England,* 1866, 6 vols.
HURTER, Friedrich von: *Geschichte Papst Innocenz des dritten und seiner Zeitgenossen,* 1835.
Würdigung des Mittelalters und der Kirche.

IMBART de la Tour: *Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse, époque féodale,* 1907.
INGOLD, Auguste: *Miscellanea Alsatica.*
INNOCENT III: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 215).
Regesta (*PL,* vol. 216).
ISIDORE of Pelusium, St.: *Collationes.*
IVO of Chartres: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 162).

JAFFÉ, Philip: *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum,* 1873, 6 vols.
Monumenta gregoriana, 1865.
Regesta pontificum Romanorum, 1888, 2 vols.
JARRETT, B.: *Life of St. Dominic,* 1924.
JOBIN: *S. Bernard et sa famille,* 1891.
JOHN of Cornwall: *Eulogium ad Alexandrum III Papam* (*PL,* vol. 199).
JOHN of Salisbury: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 199).
JORGENSEN, Johannes: *Der heilige Franz von Assisi,* 1911.

KANTOROWICZ, E.: *Frederick the Second,* trans. by E. O. Lorimer, 1931.
KLEEMANN, Gustav: *Papst Gregor VIII,* 1912.
KRAMMER, Mario: *Der Reichsgedanke des staufischen Kaiserhauses,* 1908.

LABBE, Philip: *Sacrosancta concilia,* 1728–33, 21 vols.
LA BRIÈRE, L. de: *L'Ordre de Malte,* 1897.
LACORDAIRE: *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France de l'Ordre des Frères précheurs,* 1839.
LACORDAIRE, J. B.: *Vie de S. Dominique,* 1888.
LAMBERT von Hersfeld: *Annales* (*PL,* vol. 146).
LAMENNAIS: *De l'art et du beau.*
LANFRANC: *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini.*
L'Anjou historique, 1901.
LANSON, Gustave: *Histoire de la littérature française,* 1926.
LANSPERGE, Jean: *Enchiridion,* 1867.
LASTEYRIE du Saillant: *L'architecture religieuse en France à l'époque romane,* 1929.
LAURENT, François: *Etudes sur l'histoire de l'humanité,* 1860.
LAURENTIE, Joseph: *Saint Ferdinand,* 1910.
LAVISSE, Ernest: *Histoire de France . . . jusqu'à la Révolution,* 1900–11, 18 vols.
LAVISSE and RAMBAUD: *Histoire générale du IV^e siècle à nos jours,* 1893–1904, 12 vols.
LEA, Henry Charles: *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* 1922, 3 vols.

LEIBNIZ, Gottfried Wilhelm von: *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding,* trans. by Alfred Langley, 1916.
LEO of Ostia: *Chronica monasterii Cassinensis.*
LEO IX: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 143).
L'EPINOIS, Henri de: *Le gouvernement des papes dans les Etats de l'Eglise,* 1866.
LESÊTRE, Henri: *Saint Henri,* 1899.
LINGARD, John: *The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church,* 1810.
History of England.
LORAIN, P.: *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Cluny,* 1839.
LOT, Ferdinand: *Les derniers Carolingiens,* 1891.
LUCHAIRE, Achille: *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France,* 1891, 2 vols.
Innocent III, la croisade des Albigeois, 1905.
Innocent III, la Papauté et l'Empire, 1906.
Innocent III, Rome et l'Italie, 1904.
Les communes françaises sous les Capétiens directs, 1911.
Louis VI le Gros, annales de sa vie et de son règne, 1890.
Manuel des institutions françaises; période des Capétiens directs, 1892.

MABILLON, Jean: *Annales ordinis S. Benedicti,* 1703–39, 6 vols.
MAGNIN, Charles: *Théâtre de Hrotsvitha,* 1845.
MALATERRA, Gaufredo: *Historia Sicula* (*PL,* vol. 149).
De rebus gestis Rogerii . . . et Roberti Guiscardi, 1927.
MÂLE, Emile: *L'art religieux du XIII^e^ siècle en France,* 1910.
MANDONNET, Pierre: *Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin,* 1910.
Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e^ siècle, 1908, 2 vols.
MANITIUS, M.: *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,* 1931.
MANN, H. K.: *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages,* Vols. V–XII, 1902 seq.
MANSI, Giovanni: *Sanctorum conciliorum collectio,* 1748–1817, 6 vols.
MARTIN, E.: *Saint Léon IX,* 1904.
MARTIN, T. H.: *Histoire des mathématiques.*

MARTIN-SAINT-LÉON, E.: *Histoire des corporations,* 1909.
MAS-LATRIE: *Traités de paix concernant les chrétiens et les Arabes au Moyen Age,* 1868.
MAYR, J.: *Markwald von Anweiler,* 1876.
MÉTAIS: *Urbain II et Geoffroy I,* 1882.
MICHAUD: *Guillaume de Champeaux et les écoles de Paris au XII^e siècle,* 1867.
MIGNE, J. P.: *Patrologia latina,* 221 vols.
MIGNON: *Les origines de la scolastique et Hugues de Saint-Victor,* 1895, 2 vols.
MONTFAUCON: *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum mss.*
Monumenta Gregoriana.
MORONI: *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica,* 1840.
MORTIER, D. A.: *Histoire des maîtres généraux des Frères prêcheurs,* 1903–13, 6 vols.
MUNRO, D. C.: *The Kingdom of the Crusaders,* 1935.
MURATORI, Lodovico: *Annali d'Italia,* 1821, 18 vols.
Antiquitates italicae medii aevi, 1742, 6 vols.
Rerum italicarum scriptores, 1723–51, 28 vols.

NEUKIRCH: *Das Leben des Petrus Damiani,* 1875.
NOGENT, Guibert de: *De vita sua.*

OLLERIS: *Vie de Gerbert, premier pape français,* 1867.
OTTO of Freising: *Chronicon.*
Gesta Friderici.

PAETOW, L. J.: *A Guide to the Study of Medieval History,* 1931.
PASCHAL II: *Epistolae* (*PL,* vol. 163).
PAULOT, L.: *Urbain II,* 1903.
PELLERINI, C.: *I santi Arialdo e Erlembaldo, storia di Milano nella metà del secolo XI,* 1897.
PETER DAMIAN: *Opera* (*PL,* vol. 144).
PETER of Pisa: *Vita Paschalis* (*PL,* vol. 163).
PETER of Poitiers: *Panegyricus* (*PL,* vol. 189).
PETER the Deacon: *Chronicon Casinense* (*PL,* vol. 173).
PETER the Venerable: *Contra Petrobrusianos* (*PL,* vol. 189).
Epistolae (*PL,* vol. 189).

PFISTER, C.: *Etudes sur le règne de Robert le Pieux,* 1885.
Histoire de France, 1835.
PICAVET, F.: *Gerbert, un pape philosophe,* 1897.
Roscelin théologien et philosophe, 1896.
PIGNOT, H.: *Histoire de l'ordre de Cluny,* 1868, 3 vols.
PIRRO, Rocco: *Sicula sacra,* 1733, 2 vols.
PITRA: *Analecta novissima.*
POTTHAST: *Regesta pontificum romanorum.*
POUPARDIN, René: *Le Royaume de Bourgogne (888–1038).*

QUINET, E.: *Œuvres,* 1857.

RAGEY: *Histoire de saint Anselme,* 1890.
RASHDALL, H.: *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,* 1936.
RAYNALDI, Orderico: *Annales,* 1643.
RÉBELLIAU, Alfred: *Bossuet historien du protestantisme,* 1891.
Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny, 1876.
Recueil des historiens des croisades.
Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France.
RÉGNON, T. de: *Etudes de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité.*
REICKERT, B. M.: *Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum,* 1898–1900, 3 vols.
REY, Emmanuel: *Les colonies franques de Syrie aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles,* 1883.
RÉMUSAT, Charles François: *Abélard,* 1855, 2 vols.
REUTER: *Geschichte Papst Alexanders III,* 1845.
RIANT: *Alexis Comneni ad Robertum I epistola spuria,* 1879.
Inventaire critique des lettres historiques des croisades, 1880.
RICHARD of St. Victor: *De Trinitate* (*PL,* vol. 196).
RICHER: *Histoire de France,* 1930 (*PL,* vol. 138).
ROBERTSON, James Craigie: *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket,* 1875–85, 9 vols.
ROCQUAIN, F.: *Quelques mots sur les Dictatus papae.*
La Court de Rome et l'esprit de réforme avant Luther, 1893–95, 2 vols.
RODULPHUS: *Vita Petri Venerabilis* (*PL,* vol. 189).
RODULPHUS GLABER: *Historiae sui temporis* (*PL,* vol. 142).

ROUSSELOT: *Etudes sur la philosophie du Moyen Age,* 1840.
The Intellectualism of St. Thomas, tr. by James E. O'Mahony.
RUINART: *Vita Urbani II* (*PL,* vol. 151).

SARTORI: *Storia, legislazione e stato attuale dei feudi,* 1857.
SAVIGNY, Friedrich Karl von: *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter,* 1834–51, 7 vols.
SCHLEGEL, Friedrich: *Philosophy of History,* tr. by James B. Robertson, 1883.
SCHLUMBERGER, G.: *L'epopée byzantine à la fin du X^e siècle,* 1900.
SCHNUERER, G.: *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter.*
SCHREIBER, G.: *Kurie und Kloster im 12 Jahrhundert.*
SCOTUS, John: *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (*PL,* vol. 121).
SEGNI, Bruno de: *Vita S. Leonis IX* (*PL,* vol. 165).
SÉMICHON: *La paix et le tréve de Dieu.*
SÉPET: *Adalbéron, l'Eglise de Reims et l'avènement de la monarchie capétienne,* 1896.
SICKEL: *Das Privilegium Ottos I für die römische Kirche.*
SISMONDI, I. de: *Histoire des républiques italiennes.*
SOLOVIEV, Vladimir: *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle.*
STEINDORFF: *Jahrbuch des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich III,* 1874.
STENGEL, E.: *Der Kaiser macht das Heer Studien zur Geschichte eines politischen Gedaekens,* 1900.
SUGER: *Vita Ludovici Grossi* (*PL,* vol. 186).
SYBEL: *Geschichte des ersten Kreussugs.*

TACITUS: *Germania.*
TANON: *Histoire des tribunaux de l'Inquisition en France,* 1893.
TAYLOR, O.: *The Medieval Mind,* 1925, 2 vols.
THANGMAR: *Vita S. Bernwardi* (*PL,* vol. 140).
THOMAS AQUINAS, St.: *Summa theologica.*
THOMAS, Paul: *Le droit de propriété des laiques sur les églises et le patronage laique au Moyen Age,* 1906.
THOMASSIN, Louis: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise,* 1779, 3 vols.
THORNDIKE, L.: *A History of Magic and Experimental Science,* 1923.

UBACHS: *Du problème ontologique des universaux,* 1845.
UDRALRICI CLUNIACENSIS: *Consuetudines cluniacenses* (*PL,* vol. 149).
UGHELLI: *Italia sacra.*

VACANDARD, E.: *Etudes de critique et d'histoire.*
The Inquisition.
Vie de S. Bernard, 1897.
VEIT, L. A.: *Volksfrommes Brauchtum und Kirche im deutschen Mittelalter,* 1936.
VERTOT: *Histoire des Chevaliers de Malte.*
VIARD, Paul: *Histoire de la dîme ecclésiastique dans le royaume de France aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles,* 1912.
VILLENEUVE-BARGEMON: *Monuments des Grands-Maîtres de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem.*
VIOLLET, Paul: *Histoire des institutions politiques et administratives de la France,* 1890–1903, 3 vols.
VIOLLET-LE-DUC: *Dictionnaire d'architecture.*
VITALIS, Orderic: *Historia ecclesiastica* (*PL,* vols. 187, 188).
VOGÜÉ, de: *Regards historiques et littéraires,* 1892.
VOIGT: *Histoire du pape Grégoire VII et de son siècle,* 1842.
VORGES, Domet de: *Saint Anselme.*

WATTERICH: *Pontificum romanorum vitae,* 1861.
WETZER and WELTE: *Encyklopädie der katholischen Theologie,* 1882–1901, 12 vols.
WIBERT: *Vita S. Leonis IX* (*PL,* vol. 143).
WILLIAM of Malmesbury: *De gestis pontificum Anglorum* (*PL,* vol. 179).
WILLIAM of Tyre: *Historia* (in *Recueil des historiens des croisades*).
WILLIAM of St. Theoderic: *Vita Bernardi* (*PL,* vol. 185).
WILLIAMS, W.: *St. Bernard of Clairvaux,* 1935.
WIPPO: *Gesta Conradi II imperatoris* (*PL,* vol. 142).
WITTE, H.: *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Wormser Koncordats,* 1877.
WULF, M. C. de: *History of Medieval Philosophy,* tr. by P. Coffey, 1925–26, 2 vols.

ZIMMERMANN, A. M.: *Kalendarium Benedictinum,* 1933–34.

Index

Aachen: Conrad crowned at, 251; Barbarossa crowned at, 457 f.
Abbeville, John of (bishop of Sabina), 587
Abbo (abbot of Fleury), 79
Abd-er-Rahman (caliph), Otto I and, 22
Abelard, Peter, 369 f., 570
  Celestine II pupil of, 417
  At Cluny Abbey, 433
  Conference with St. Bernard, 431 f.
  Council of Sens condemns, 432
  Death of, 433
  Errors of, 430-33: condemned, 371
  Historia calamitatum by, 349
  Hymns, 498
  Innocent II condemns, 432
  Introductio ad theologiam by, 430
  Sabellianism of, 370 f.
  Sic et Non by, 433, 441, 495
  Theologia christiana by, 430
  Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina by, 371
  And William of Champeaux, 349
Absolution, Form of, 380
Absolutism, Royal, 638
Achard of St. Victor, 498
Achrida (Bulgaria), Crusaders at, 296
Acquapendente, Hildebrand at, 128
Acre (Palestine). *See* St. John of Acre
Ad Nymphas, Alexander III consecrated, 471
Adalbero (archbishop of Reims): Gerbert and, 38, 53, 56; Holy Roman Empire, 38; Hugh Capet, 47
Adalbero (bishop of Laon)
  Attack on Charles of Lorraine, 61
  Character of, 60
  Charles of Lorraine plotted against by, 61
  Death of, 62
  Gerbert teacher of, 60 f.
  Louis of Lorraine and, 61
  Monasticism disparaged by, 60
  Odilo disparaged by, 60
  Poem of, 60
  Robert the Pious and, 60
  Sylvester II and, 62
Adalbero (bishop of Würzburg), 245
Adalbert (archbishop of Bremen), Henry IV and, 210
Adalbert (archbishop of Hamburg), Jurisdiction of, 123
Adalbert (archbishop of Mainz): becomes archbishop, 328; election of Emperor Lothair, 394; tool of Henry V, 328
Adalbert, St. (apostle of Prussia), 44: relics at Gnesen, 66
Adalbert (son of Berengarius II), 23: Death of, 29
Adalbold (bishop of Utrecht), 106 note 39
Adam of St. Victor (poet), 497 f.: Innocent III and, 497
Adela of Blois (countess), 338
Adelaide (German empress). *See* Praxedes
Adelaide, St. (empress)
  Berengarius II and, 220
  Coronation of, 13
  In Italy, 34
  Kindness to daughters of Berengarius, 33
  Otto I husband of, 12, 33
  Otto II son of, 33 f., 37
  At Pavia, 41
  Theophano and, 34, 48
Adelheid. *See* Adelaide
Ademar of Chabannes (annalist), 44
Ademar of Monteil: at Constantinople, 297; crusade legate, 296 f., 284; Death of, 300; First Crusade, 283 f.; *Salve Regina,* 296 note 152
Adolphus of Nassau, 625
Adrian IV (pope), 458-60
  At Anagni, 469
  Arnold of Brescia, 460
  At Benevento, 461
  Bishop of Albano, 459
  Conflict with Barbarossa, 468 f.

Adrian IV (*continued*)
Death of, 469
Election of, 458
Eugene III, 459
Letter to Barbarossa, 462
Meeting with Barbarossa, 460
Roland Bandinelli and, 469
Treaty with William of Sicily, 461
Adrian V (pope), 622
Adrianople: Crusaders in, 289; Crusaders defeated at, 428
Adversus simoniacos by Cardinal Humbert, 170
Aeterni patris, encyclical of Leo XIII, 634
Africa, Caliphate of Cairo and Northern, 277
Agnes (empress): Clement II crowns, 133; at Council of Rome (1076), 215; Henry IV son of, 167, 210
Agnes de Meran: Death of, 559; Philip Augustus dismisses, 558; Philip Augustus marries, 514
Agrigente. *See* Girgenti
Aigues Mortes, St. Louis sails from, 607
Aimoin (archbishop of Bourges), formation of commune, 378
Aix (see), 167
Alaric, *Breviarium of,* 310
Alba, Benzo bishop of, 127
Albano, Nicholas Breakspear bishop of, 459
Alberic II (duke of Spoleto): John XII son of, 10; *Princeps,* 10; *Senator omnium Romanorum,* 10
Albert II (count of Parma), and the Crusade, 313
Albert (antipope), 319 f.
Albert (copyist), 355
Albert the Great, St.: St. Thomas on, 632; teacher of St. Thomas, 633
Alberto di Morra (Gregory VIII), 504
Albi: Albigenses at, 526; Manichaeans at, 526
Albigenses
At Albi, 526
Boldness of, 527
At Carcassonne, 526
Diego de Acebes and, 528
Doctrine condemned, 573
Innocent III, 529
Lateran Council condemns, 573
Origin of name, 526
Philip Augustus, 530
Raymond Roger, 531
Raymond VI of Toulouse and, 529
St. Dominic, 528
At Toulouse, 526
Albigensian crusade, 530 ff.: Carcassonne taken, 532; Innocent III, 535; Simon de Montfort, 532-36
Alcantara, Order of, 586
Alcuin, 72, 78
Aleppo, Turks at, 342
Alessandria: Alexander III builds, 479; Barbarossa attacks, 479
Aleth of Montbard, mother of St. Bernard, 362
Alexander II (pope), 181-85
Beatrice friend of, 182
Camaldolese Order approved by, 117
Character of, 181
Clerical life, 347
Death of, 185
Election of, 181
Godfrey of Tuscany friend of, 182
Harold (king of Norway), 184
Henry IV (emperor), 184
Hildebrand counselor of, 182
Lanfranc teacher of, 181
Lay investiture, 183
Peter Damian counselor of, 182
Philip I of France, 184
Reform measures, 183
Reggio birthplace of, 181
Roger of Sicily encouraged by, 184
Sweyn (king of Denmark), 184
William of Normandy, 184
Alexander III (pope), 469 ff.
Alessandria built by, 479
Antipope Paschal submits to, 480
Barbarossa in conflict with, 471 f.
Barbarossa makes peace with, 479 f.
Born at Siena, 470
At Bourges, 475
Canonizations by, 491
Carthusians favored by, 491
Character of, 470
Conflict with Barbarossa, 476 f.
Conrad (bishop of Salzburg) loyal to, 477
At Council of Tours, 475
Death of, 499
Election of, 470 f.
Entry into Rome, 477
Flight from Rome, 478

Alexander III (*continued*)
In France, 474
Henry II of England, 487 f.
Lateran Council, 490 ff.
Louis VII of France extends hospitality to, 475
Manuel Comnenus' attempt to bargain with, 475
Missions in Asia, 491
Murder of St. Thomas à Becket, 489
Negotiations with Manuel Comnenus, 491
Policy toward heretics, 494
Raymond V of Toulouse, 527
Reform measures, 491
Repression of heresy, 495
St. Thomas à Becket and, 487
At Sens, 475
At Tours, 475
Treaty of Venice, 480
Universities, 491
Alexander IV (pope), 612: Paris University, 631
Alexander of Hales (theologian), 631 f.
Alexius I Comnenus (emperor)
Attitude to the Crusade, 297
Church union, 233
Crusade project, 274
First Crusade rescued by, 291
Kumans at war with, 278
At Nicaea, 298
Normans at war with, 278
Petchenegs at war with, 278
Turks at war with, 278
Alexius III (emperor), Fourth Crusade, 540 f.
Alexius IV (emperor): Boniface of Montferrat, 540; Fourth Crusade, 541; Innocent III, 541; Murder of, 542
Alexius V (emperor), Fourth Crusade, 542
Alexius Ducas. *See* Alexius V.
Alfonso I (king of Aragon), Innocent II and, 408
Alfonso VI (king of Castile): Gregory VII, 230; Moors at war with, 230, 266, 268
Alfonso VII (king of Castile): Innocent III, 408; Moors, 550; Navas de Tolosa (battle), 551
Alfonso X (king of Castile), 587
Alfonso IX (king of Leon): Death of, 587; excommunicated, 514, 552; Marriage of, 514; marries Berengaria, 514; Moors and, 551
Alfonso II (king of Portugal), 551
Al-Hakim (caliph), 92: Jews and, 94 note 15
Alix of Champagne (queen of Cyprus), 584 f.
Alleluia (in mass chant), 82
Allucingoli, Ubaldo (Lucius III), 499
Almohades (dynasty), 586 and note
Almoravides (dynasty), 586 and note: in Spain, 267 f.
Alps, St. Bernard monastery, 45
Altmann (bishop of Passau), 245: at Assembly of Tribur, 218; reform measures, 193
Amalfi: Destruction of, 414; Normans' possession of, 226; Power of, 414
Amalric (king of Jerusalem), 506
Amalric of Bena: Aristotle, 595; Doctrine condemned, 573; Errors of, 571
Amatus (bishop of Oloron), papal legate, 208
Amaury. *See* Amalric
Ambresbury, Council of (979), 38
Amiens: birthplace of Peter the Hermit, 285; Cathedral of, 652; Philip Augustus married at, 513
Anacletus II (antipope), 400, 402 ff.
Anagni: Adrian IV at, 469; Gregory IX at, 583
Anastasius IV (pope), 458
Anastasius (monk), legate of Gregory VII, 199
Anathema. *See* Excommunication
Anazier (king of Mauretania), Gregory VII and, 231
Ancona, March of, 65: Barbarossa attacks, 479; Papacy and, 580; Papal States, 68; taken from Turks, 342
Andalusia, Moors in, 550
Andrew (king of Hungary), 200, 561, 563: Leo IX and, 160
Andronicus II (emperor), Eastern Schism resumed by, 623
Angers: Council of (1096), 285; Eusebius Bruno bishop of, 148; Robert of Arbrissel professor at, 314; University of, 630 note 20
Anna Comnena: on the crusaders, 295; on number of the crusaders, 293

Anno (archbishop of Cologne): Henry IV and, 210; tutor of Henry IV, 183
Anselm, St. (archbishop of Canterbury), 261-66
Abbot of Bec, 262
At Bec Abbey, 303 f., 308
Born at Aosta, 262
Chester Abbey founded by, 262
Consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, 263
At Council of Bari, 265
Cur Deus homo by, 306
At deathbed of William Rufus, 262
In exile, 338
Henry I of England, 339
Henry I recalls, 336
Lanfranc teacher of, 262
Meditations by, 306
Method of, 304 f.
Monologium by, 305 f.
Prologium by, 306
Protestantism and, 307 note 175
At Rockingham Assembly, 264
At Rome, 265
Scholastic method, 305
Scholasticism, 302
Study of theology, 306
William Rufus in conflict with, 263
Anselm (archbishop of Milan), Conrad crowned by, 251
Anselm (bishop of Lucca), 181, 237 note 1
Canon law collection, 309 f.
Collectio canonum, 147
Gregory VII and, 238
Patari encouraged by, 223
On punishment of heretics, 493
Anselm of Baggio (priest), reform movement, 172
Anselm of Laon and Abelard, 370
Anselm of Paris (canonist), 449
Ansfried of Louvain, Otto I and, 15
Anthony of Padua (St.), Preaching of, 647
Antioch: Crusaders besiege, 299; Crusaders decimated at, 508; Latin state of, 340; Patriarch of, 424; Peter III patriarch, 154
Antipopes, List of
Albert, 319 f.
Anacletus II, 400
Benedict X, 174, 176
Boniface VII, 35
Burdinho (Gregory VIII), 330, 333
Cadalous (Honorius II), 182 f., 191, 214
Callistus III, 479
Clement III, 191, 228, 318
Gregory VIII, 318, 331
Guibert, 209, 226, 318
Guido of Crema, 476
Honorius II, 182 f.
John XVI, 52
Leo VIII, 23
Maginulf, 322, 328
Mauricio Burdinho, 331
Octavian Maledetti, 471
Paschal III, 476
Sylvester III, 124
Sylvester IV, 322, 328
Theodoric, 319
Victor IV, 409, 471
Aosta: St. Anselm born at, 262; St. Bernard pass, 45
Apameia, John Zemisses takes, 39
Apologia by St. Bernard, 453
Apprentices, 659-61
Apulia (duchy), 135, 410 note 32
First Crusade in, 295
Honorius II and, 398
Interdicted by Council of Pisa, 408
Norman sovereignty, 176
Roger of Sicily in, 412
William duke of, 461
Aquileia, Sieghart bishop, 218
Aquinas, St. Thomas. *See* Thomas
Arabic language, Paris University, 624
Arabs: Otto I and, 22; John Zemisses at war with, 39
Aragon: Languedoc and, 534; war on Moors, 266
Architecture: Gothic, 652 f.; Lamennais on religious, 651; Religious, 650-54; Romanesque, 79 ff., 652; Victor Hugo on medieval, 650
Arci, Theophylactus family, 69
Arduin (king of Italy), 94
Abdication of, 99
At Fruttuaria Abbey, 100
Death of, 100
Henry II and, 98
Henry II at war with, 98
Ivrea castle, 99
Aremberge, St. Hugh son of, 200

Arialdo: excommunicated, 173; origin of the Patari, 172; Stephen IX, 173
Aristotle: Authority of, 595; St. Bonaventure, 635; St. Thomas Aquinas, 635; Study of, 595 f.; universal ideas, 366 note 126
Arles (kingdom of) separates from the Empire, 611. *See also* Burgundy
Armagh, St. Malachy archbishop, 451
Armenia: Gregory VII and, 230; Kingdom of Lesser, 510
Army, Pestilence in, 478
Arnaldistae condemned, 501
Arnold Amalricus (abbot of Grandselve), 525
Arnold of Brescia, 412, 415-17
  Abjuration of, 422
  Adrian IV and, 460
  Anticlericalism of, 421
  Doctrines of, 419
  Eugene III confers with, 421
  Execution of, 423
  Lateran Council (1139), 416
  Papacy and, 422 f.
  At Rome, 423
  St. Bernard and, 421
Arnulf (archbishop of Reims)
  Adalbero's plot against, 61
  Charles of Lorraine and, 53
  Deposed, 53
  Gregory V and, 62 f.
  Hugh Capet defends, 54
  Imprisoned, 61
  Lothair father of, 53
  Restored to see of Reims, 54
  Robert the Pious and, 54
  Sylvester II and, 62 f.
  Sylvester II reinstates, 63
Arpads (Hungarians), 560
Arras (Council of), Manichaeans condemned, 115
Art, Council of Nicaea (787) on religious, 651
Arthur of Brittany, Assassination of, 553
Ascelin (bishop of Laon). *See* Adalbero
Asceticism, St. Bernard, 443 ff.
Asia, Missions in, 491
Asia Minor, Crusaders in, 428 f., 508
Assizes of Clarendon, punishment of heretics, 494
Astericus (bishop of Kalocsa), Sylvester II and, 66
Astronomy, Sylvester II, 74
Atabeks (Turkish rulers), 425, 506
Augustine, St. (of Hippo), Roger Bacon's preference for, 644
Aurillac, Gerbert of (Sylvester II), 56
Ausona. *See* Vich
Austrians join the Crusade, 290
Autun: Urban II at, 276; Elementary schools at, 646
Autun, Council of (1055), St. Hugh at, 200
Autun, Council of (1077), lay investiture, 208
Autun, Council of (1094), Philip I's divorce, 258
Auvergne, Peter the Venerable born in, 357
Avellana (monastery), Guido abbot, 120
Aventine Hill, Otto III besieges, 69
Averroes, Commentaries of, 596
Aversa, Normans at, 135
Avis, Order of, 586
Azzo (count of Canossa), 135

Baalbek, John Zemisses takes, 39
Bacon, Roger: at Oxford University, 630, 643; *De secretis operibus artis et naturae,* 645; *Opus majus,* 644 f.; *Opus tertium,* 644 f.
Bagdad, Caliphs of, 424
Bagdad, Caliphate of: Cairo and, 277; Syria dominated by, 277
Baldwin II (emperor): deposed, 616; Frederick II and, 585
Baldwin I (king of Jerusalem), 341
  Count of Edessa, 341
  Crusader, 292, 299
  Description of, 294
  Marriage of, 299
  And Templars, 345
Baldwin III (king of Jerusalem), Second Crusade, 429
Baldwin (count of Flanders): Fourth Crusade, 538 f.; proclaimed Eastern emperor, 543
Baldwin de Mons (count of Hainault), crusader, 292, 299
Bamberg: Assembly at, 521; Cathedral of, 652
Bamberg (Diet of), St. Bernard at, 408
Bamberg (see of): Papal jurisdiction, 161; founded, 90, 98
Bandinelli, Roland (Alexander III), 463: Adrian IV and, 469; becomes

Bandinelli, Roland (*continued*)
papal chancellor, 470; elected pope, 469 f.; esteemed by Eugene III, 470; *Sententiae* by, 470; *Stroma* by, 470
Bantino, Urban II at, 249
Barcelona (Council of, 1068), reform measures, 196
Bari, Knights of St. John at, 344
Bari (Council of, 1098): St. Anselm at, 265; Urban II at, 265
Baronius, Liutprand and, 32
Barral des Baux, podesta of Milan, 614
Bartholomew (bishop of Laon), St. Norbert and, 352
Bartholomew Peter, finding of holy lance, 299
Basil II (emperor), 110
Brindisi taken by, 39
Bulgarians slaughtered by, 110
Bulgaroktonos, sobriquet of, 110
Russians defeated by, 110
Saracens at war with, 39
Saracens defeated by, 110
Taranto taken by, 39
Baume Abbey, Cluny Abbey and, 198
Bavaria, Monasteries in, 97
Bavarians join the Crusade, 290
Beatrice (duchess of Tuscany)
Alexander II friend of, 182
Godfrey marries, 166
Henry III cousin of, 166
Henry IV nephew of, 211
Matilda daughter of, 161
Victor II and, 166
Beauvais, St. Ivo born in, 308
Beauvais (Vincent of), Studies of, 651
Bec (abbey): Lanfranc at, 303 f.; Lanfranc prior, 180; St. Anselm at, 303 f.; St. Anselm abbot, 262; St. Ivo abbot, 308
Becket. *See* Thomas à Becket
Beghards, Celestine III and, 514 f.
Bego (bishop of Clermont), Truce of God, 45
Bègue, Lambert le (founder), 664
Beguines, Celestine III and, 514 f.
Bela III (king of Hungary), 560
Belgium in the German Empire, 107 note 40
Belgrade, Crusaders at, 290
Benedict, St. (of Nursia), Leo IX, 143
Benedict V (pope), 26 ff.
Boniface Franco, 34
Death of, 27
Deposed, 26 f.
Election of, 26
The Grammarian, 26
Otto I, 26
Benedict VI (pope), 31-33
Death of, 35
Eldrad (abbot), 35
Frederick (bishop of Salzburg), 35
Imprisoned, 35
Reform of the Church, 35
Benedict VII (pope), 36-40
Bishop of Sutri, 36
Boniface VIII (antipope), 36
Cluny Abbey, 40
Council of Ravenna (974), 36
Councils of Rome (974-81), 36 f.
Death of, 40
Monasticism, 40
Southern Italy, 39
Tomb of, 40
Benedict VIII (pope), 99 ff.
Council of Pavia (1018), 104
Cunigundis crowned by, 99
Death of, 109
Henry II, 99
Henry II crowned by, 99
Project of world peace, 101
Robert the Pious, 101
Romanus (consul), 101
Rudolf III of Burgundy, 101
Benedict IX (pope), 121 ff.
Abdication of, 124
Age of, 121
Bonizo on, 125 note 83
Death of, 125
Deposed, 133
Driven from Rome, 124, 134
Election of, 121
Grottaferrata Abbey, 125
St. Simeon of Trier canonized by, 123
Scandals, 121
Simony, 121, 124
Benedict X (antipope), 174
Abdication of, 176
At Galeria, 176
Hildebrand opposes, 174
Peter Damian opposes, 174
Benedict the Grammarian. *See* Benedict V
Benefices, 628

Benevento, 135
Adrian IV at, 461
Battle of, 615
Council of (1087), 240
Gregory VIII born at, 504
Papal States, 162
Paschal II at, 330
Benezet, St. (founder), 514
Benzo (bishop of Alba), 127
Berengaria (princess of Castile), Alfonso IX marries, 514
Berengarius (heretic)
Abjuration, 152
Archdeacon of Angers, 148
Character of, 149
Council of Paris (1051) condemns, 151
At Council of Tours, 152
Council of Vercelli condemns doctrine of, 151
Doctrine of, 149 f.
Excommunicated, 150
Fulbert of Chartres, 148
Godfrey Martel and, 148
Henry I of France, 150 f., 151 note 32
Heresy of, 275
Imprisoned, 150 f.
St. Bruno, 203
Submission of, 152
Tours birthplace of, 148
Berengarius II (king of Italy)
Adalbert son of, 23
Death of, 29
Otto I, 12
Otto I besieges, 23
St. Adelaide, 220
Bernard of Clairvaux, St., 361-66, 443-46
Abelard's errors, 430-33
Apologia by, 453
Arnold of Brescia, 421
Born at Fontaines, 361
Canonization of, 491
Celestine II, 418
At Châtillon-sur-Seine, 362
At Clairvaux, 346
Clairvaux monastery founded by, 365
Conference with Abelard, 431 f.
Conrad III, 419
At Council of Pisa, 409
Crusade preached by, 425
De consideratione by, 450
De conversione by, 450
De diligendo Deo by, 444
De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae by, 444
De laude novae militiae by, 450
De moribus et officio episcoporum by, 450
Delegated by Council of Etampes, 401
At Diet of Bamberg, 408
Doctrine of asceticism, 443 ff.
Enters Citeaux, 363
Eugene III's correspondence with, 421
In Germany, 408
Heretics of Cologne, 434
Influence of, 391
Innocent II, 403
And Innocent's election, 401 f.
Jesu dulcis memoria by, 361 note 108
Letter to Innocent II, 407, 412 note 38
And Louis the Fat, 397
Louis VII of France, 418
Maxims of, 445
The *Memorare* by, 361 note 108
On monastic decline, 355 f.
Mysticism, 445
And Peter (bishop of Pisa), 411
Peter Lombard aided by, 441 f.
Peter the Venerable, 366
Preaches against heresy, 527
Preaches at Spires, 426
Preaches Crusade in Germany, 426
Roger of Sicily, 413
Rule of Knights Templars, 345
St. Hildegard, 447
On St. Malachy, 451
Second Crusade, 427
And Stephen of Senlis, 397 f.
At Vézelay, 426
William of Champeaux, 365
Bernard of Menthon, St. (abbot): Death of, 45; St. Bernard monasteries founded by, 45
Bernard of Pisa (Eugene III), 420
Bernardone (Pietro), father of St. Francis, 565
Bernordes Guidonis, 599
Berruyer (Philip), Preaching of, 647
Bertha of Blois, marriage to Robert the Pious, 54
Bertha of Holland, wife of Philip I, 256
Bertha of Savoy, marriage to Henry IV, 184
Berthold of Carinthia, Gregory VII and, 193

Berthold of Zähringen, partisan of Henry IV, 320
Bertrade de Montfort (countess of Anjou), Philip I marries, 256
Bertrand (archdeacon of Mende), deposed by Leo IX, 161
Bertrand of Toulouse in Palestine, 341
Besançon, Diet of (1157), 463
Bessan (see), 340
Bézier pillaged, 531, 532 note 36
Bill of Rights, 555
Bishops: Lay investiture of, 17; Temporal power of, 104; in twelfth century, 382
Bishops, election of, 336, 348, 483: Cathedral chapters in, 382; in England, 338; Henry II (emperor), 104; Henry II of England, 486 f.
Bivar (Spain), the Cid, 268
Blanche of Castile (queen of France), 587: treaty with Emperor, 592
Blessed Virgin (Office of) and Urban II, 284
Blessing at mass, 650
Blois, Peter de. *See* Peter
Bobbio (abbey), Gerbert abbot of, 42
Boethius, 72: Sylvester II and writings of, 56
Bohemia: Crusaders from, 287; Gregory VII and, 230; Henry IV founds kingdom of, 237
Bohemund: at Antioch, 299; at Constantinople, 297; crusader, 292, 295; rivalry between Raymond of Toulouse and, 300
Boileau (Etienne), *Livre des métiers* by, 659
Boleslaus II (king of Poland): Gregory VII excommunicates, 230; St. Stanislaus slain by, 230
Boleslaus Chrobry (king of Poland): Henry II and, 97; Henry II at war with, 98
Boleslaus (duke of Poland), relics of St. Adelbert, 66
Bollstädt, Albert. *See* Albert the Great
Bologna, John XIII and, 30
Bologna University, 629 f.
  Gratian teacher at, 448
  Influence of, 642
  Innocent IV teacher at, 601
  Study of law at, 465, 636
Bonaventure, St., 634 f.: Aristotle, 635; at Council of Lyons, 620; explanation of the mass, 649; *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*, 635
Bonfilius dei Monaldi, 664
Boniface VII (antipope), 35
  At Constantinople, 37
  Death of, 43
  Deposed, 36
  Enters Rome, 42
  Flees to Constantinople, 36
  John XIV and, 42
  States of the Church, 43
Boniface (marquis of Tuscany), Henry III and, 135
Boniface of Montferrat: Fourth Crusade, 537, 539 f.; Prince Alexius and, 540
Boniface Franco (antipope Boniface VIII), 35: Benedict V and, 34; Council of Rome condemns, 36
Bonizo (bishop of Piacenza): on Benedict IX, 125 note 83; Bishop of Sutri, 244; Death of, 244
Bononius, St. (monk), Peter of Vercelli and, 92
Bordeaux, St. Bernard at, 527
Bordeaux (Council of, 1080), Berengarius' abjuration, 152
Bosporus, First Crusade at the, 291
Bossuet on St. Francis of Assisi, 564
Botaniates, Nicephorus. *See* Nicephorus
Bougre, Robert le (inquisitor), 598 note 32
Bourges: Alexander III at, 475; Cathedral of, 652; Truce of God at, 378; windows of cathedral, 663
Bourgueil, church built, 80
Bouvines, Battle of, 548
Braga, Burdinho archbishop of, 330
Brancaleone (senator), Alexander IV and, 512
Brandenburg (diocese), Slavs pillage, 37
Brandford, Council of (964), 30
Breakspear (Nicholas), elected pope, 458. *See also* Adrian IV
Brescia, 135
Breslau, suffragan of Gnesen, 66
Brest, Schools at, 646
Breviarium of Alaric, 310
Brienne, Gauthier de (knight), 520
Brienne, Isabella of (empress), marries Frederick II, 581

Brienne, John of, 591: father of Isabella, 581
Brindisi, Basil II takes, 39
Brixen (pseudo-council, 1080): Gregory's deposition declared, 225 f.; Guibert elected antipope, 226
Bruno, St. (archbishop of Cologne), 32 f.: *Commentary on the Gospels* by, 32; *Lives of the Saints* by, 32; Otto I brother of, 12, 32 f.; St. Matilda mother of, 33
Bruno (brother of Emperor Henry II), Ordination of, 98
Bruno of Carinthia (Gregory V), 51
Bruno of Toul (Leo IX), 140 ff.: chaplain of Conrad II, 141
Bruno Hartenfaust, St. (abbot), 203 f.
  Becomes Benedictine, 204
  Berengarius of Tours, 203
  Carthusian Order founded by, 203
  At the Chartreuse, 204
  Cologne birthplace of, 203
  At Molesme, 204
  St. Robert, 204
  Urban II pupil of, 242
Bruno, Eusebius. *See* Eusebius
Brothers Hospitalers of the Holy Ghost, 519
Buccaporci (Sergius IV), 91
Bulgari (heretics), 492
Bulgaria: Byzantine Empire, 278; Crusaders in, 294, 508; Innocent III, 562
Bulgarians: attack crusaders, 290; Basil II massacres, 110; Revolt of, 40
Bulgaroktonos, Basil II called, 110
Bulls, Papal
  Parens scientiarum, 597
  Quo elongati, 600
  Rex pacificus, 594
Burchard (bishop of Halberstadt), Death of, 244 f.
Burchard (bishop of Worms): *Decretum* by, 309; Edict of peace, 102
Burdinho, Mauricio (antipope), 331: Henry V crowned by, 330; imprisoned, 333
Burgos, Cathedral of, 652
Burgundy (kingdom of): separates from the Empire, 611; Waldenses in, 527
Burial, Refusal of Christian, 323 note 20
Byzantine Empire
  Attitude to the papacy, 279
  Bulgaria, 278
  Croatians, 278
  Dalmatians, 278
  Normans' attitude to, 279
  Rule of succession, 278
  Rumanians, 278 f.
  Serbs, 278
  Simeon (czar of Bulgaria), 278
  Venice, 279

Cadalous (antipope Honorius II), 182 f.
  Emperor Henry IV, 182 f.
  Enters Rome, 182
  Excommunicated, 183
  Guibert of Ravenna, 191
  Hugh Candidus favors, 214
  Rome attacked by, 182
Cadiz, Ferdinand takes, 587
Caen: St. Stephen's Church, 180; Trinity Church, 180
  Caerularius, Michael. *See* Michael
  Caesarea (in Cappadocia), Turks capture, 232
  Caesarea (in Palestine), See of, 340
  Caesaropapism, Eastern, 153
Cahors, St. Bernard at, 527
Cairo: Fatimites of, 424; Turks at, 342
Cairo, Caliphate of, 277
Calabria: Norman sovereignty, 176; Saracen invasion, 70
Calatrava, Knights of, 346, 586
Caliphs of Bagdad, 424
Callistus II (pope), 318, 331 f.
  Cistercians, 365
  Concordat of London, 338 f.
  Concordat of Worms, 334
  Council of Reims (1119), 332
  Death of, 385
  Emperor Henry V, 318, 333
  And Henry V at Mouzon, 332
  Indulgences, 380
  Lateran Council (1123) convoked by, 384
  Lay investiture, 332
  Letter to Cluny Abbey, 358
  At Mouzon, 332
  Thurstan consecrated by, 396
Callistus III (antipope), 479
Calne, Council of (978), 38 f.
Calojan. *See* Johannitius
Camaldolese, Order of: approved by Alexander II, 117; Foundation of, 115 f.

Camaldoli, St. Romuald at, 116
Cambrai, execution of a Patarine, 492
Cambridge University, 630 note 20
Camerino, Papal States, 166
Campo Santo (Pisa), 564
Canaporius, Johannes, 44 note 100
Candidus, Hugh. *See* Hugh
Canonicus, Original meaning of, 348 note 70
Canonization: First papal, 44; Popes and, 491
"Canonization," Use of the word, 44 note 101
Canon law. *See* Law
Canons, Capitular, 381 f.
Canons, Cathedral, 348, 382
Canons of Marbach, Foundation of, 254
Canons regular, Gregory VII, 197
Canons Regular of St. Rufus, 459
Canons Regular of St. Victor: Foundation of, 346, 349; Rule of, 350
Canossa: Gregory VII at, 219 f.; Henry IV at, 220 f.; Matilda at, 220; St. Adelaide at, 220
Canterbury (see)
  Dunstan archbishop, 30
  Hubert Walter archbishop, 553
  John de Gray archbishop, 554
  St. Anselm archbishop, 263
  St. Dunstan archbishop, 38
  St. Thomas à Becket archbishop, 483
  Theobald archbishop, 482 f.
  Vacancy of, 261
Cantilena (music), 85
Canute III (king of Denmark), 513
Canute VI (king of Denmark) at Council of Soissons, 558
Canute the Great (king of England), Conrad II and, 113
Capellanus, Office of, 129 note 96
Capet, Hugh. *See* Hugh Capet
Capetian dynasty, Origin of, 47 f.
Capella (Martianus), Sylvester II and writings of, 56
Capua, 135: interdicted, 173; St. Vincent's Church, 173; William, prince of, 461
Carcassonne: Albigenses at, 526; Albigensian crusade, 532
Cardinal-bishops, Sees of, 177 note 102
Cardinals in twelfth century, 383
Carmelites, Alexander III and beginning of, 491
Carroux, Council of (989), 44
Carthage, St. Louis at, 617
Carthusians
  Alexander III favors the, 491
  Approval of Rule of, 491
  Lansperge on, 203
  Rule of, 204
  St. Bruno founder of, 203
  Spirit of, 203
Cashel (Ireland), See of, 451
Casimir I (king of Poland): Mieczyslaw II father of, 123; St. Odilo, 123
Cassian (John), St. Victor Abbey founded by, 437 f.
Castelnau, Pierre de (papal legate), Assassination of, 528 f.
Castelnaudary, Albigenses at, 527
Castiglioni, Godfredo (Celestine IV), 601 note 39
Castile: Moors threaten, 550; Origin of name, 266; war on Moors, 266
Catalonia, Languedoc and, 534
Catania (Sicily): Saracens defeated at, 269; See of, 269
Cathari (heretics), 492: condemned by Lucius III, 501; Doctrines of, 492; in Italy, 598; Lateran Council (1179) condemns, 491, 495
Cathedral chapters, 381 f.: in election of bishops, 382
Cathedrals, Art in, 451 f.
Cayaca, Council of (1050), 146
Celano (Thomas of), *Dies irae* by, 653
Celestine II (pope), 392, 417: Abdication of, 392; Abelard teacher of, 417; Roger of Sicily, 417 f.; St. Bernard, 418
Celestine III (pope), 510-15
  Alfonso of Portugal excommunicated by, 514
  Beghards, 514 f.
  Beguines, 514 f.
  Conflict with Henry VI, 512
  Henry VI crowned by, 510
  Intercedes for Richard I of England, 512
  Philip Augustus' divorce denounced by, 513
  Portugal interdicted by, 514
  Teutonic Knights favored by, 514
Celestine IV (pope), 601 note 39
Celestine V, St. (pope), 625

Celibacy, Clerical
Council of Pavia (1018), 104
Council of Winchester (1076), 196
Denmark, 196
Gregory VII, 196
Hungary, 196
Lanfranc, 196
Norway, 196
Rural priests in England, 196
Sweden, 196
Cencius (tower of), Gregory VII imprisoned in, 212
Cencius Savelli (Honorius III), 579
Cerami, Battle of, 269
Cesena: Papal States, 68; Revolt of, 68
Chabannes, Ademar of (annalist), 44
Chaise-Dieu, Urban II at, 276
Charlemagne: Canonization of, 477; journey to Palestine, 11 note 10; tomb opened, 50
Châlons-sur-Marne, Paschal II at, 324
Chalon-sur-Saône, Elementary schools at, 646
Chalon-sur-Saône (Council of), reform measures, 167
Champeaux, William of, 348 f.
Chant: Guido of Arezzo, 116; Notker the Stammerer, 82
Chanter, Office of, 382
Chapters, Cathedral, 381 f.: in election of bishops, 382
Chapters, Collegiate, 382
Chapters, Ecclesiastical, 381 f.
Charity, Works of, 664 f.
Charles (count of Anjou)
Brother of St. Louis, 608
Conflict with Manfred, 617
Crusader, 618
King of Sicily, 613
Martin IV, 623
Peace with Rudolph of Habsburg, 622
Sicilian Vespers, 623
In Sicily, 615
Truce with Michael Paleologus, 621
Charles II (king of Naples), election of Celestine V, 625
Charles of Lorraine: Adalbero and plot against, 61; Death of, 61; imprisoned, 61; Reims delivered to, 53
Charroux Abbey, Destruction of, 80
Charta caritatis, 365
Chartres, Schools at, 570
Chartreuse, St. Bruno at, 204
Chateauneuf, Commune of, 377
Châtelet (prison), 663
Châtillon, Renaud de, 506
Châtillon-sur-Marne, Urban II born at, 242
Châtillon-sur-Seine, St. Bernard at, 362
Chester Abbey, St. Anselm founds, 262
Children's Crusade, 545 note 53
Chivalry, 655 ff.
Code of, 657 f.
Feudalism, 118 note 64
Heroes of, 657 f.
Initiation ceremony, 656
Organization of, 655
Origin of, 117, 655
Religious character of, 655
Social influence of, 658
Chorasmians seize Jerusalem, 603
Chorepiscopi in Ireland, 451
Christ Church (cathedral, Canterbury), 483
Christian burial, Refusal of, 323 note 20
Christianity, Influence of, 3: Schlegel on, 3
Chrobry, Boleslaus. *See* Boleslaus
Chrodegang (St.), Clerical life, 347
Church, Eastern, union with Rome, 491
Church, Greek. *See* Greek
Church, Reform of
Adalbero, 60
Alexander II, 183
Alexander III, 491
Altmann (bishop of Passau), 193
Anselm of Baggio, 172
Arialdo, 172
Benedict VI, 35
Cluny Abbey, 60, 197 ff.
Councils: Chalon-sur-Saône (*ca.* 1056), 167; Compostela (*ca.* 1056), 167; Embrun (1057), 168; Erfurt (1075), 193; Lateran (1057), 167; Lateran (1215), 574; Llandaff (*ca.* 1056), 167; Mainz (1049), 145; Paris (1074) opposes, 194 f.; Pavia (1018), 104; Pavia (1049), 145; Piacenza (1095), 275; Reims (1049), 145; Rome (1049), 144; Toulouse (1056), 167
Eugene III, 429 f.
Gregory VII, 192-96
Henry IV of Germany, 192
Hildebrand, 167

Church, Reform of (*continued*)
John XIII, 29 f.
John (archbishop of Rouen), 196
Landulf, 172
Leo IX, 142 f., 146 f.
Liemar of Bremen opposes, 193
Monasticism, 19, 201
Otto I, 29 f.
Peter Damian, 167
Philip I (of France) opposes, 255
Ponce of Aix, 167
Raimbaud of Arles, 167
Robert the Pious, 107
Stephen IX, 169
Sylvester II, 76 f.
Urban II, 255
Victor II, 167
William the Conqueror, 209
Church, Roman. *See* Roman
Church and state: in England, 480 f.; Frederick II, 584, 604 f.; Gregory IX, 584; Henry II of England, 485, 489; Innocent III, 545 f.
Cid Campeador: Meaning of, 268 note 84; in Spanish legend, 268
Cilicia, Crusaders in, 299
Cistercians
Beginning of, 360
Callistus II, 365
Charta caritatis, 365
Founding of, 314
Innocent III, 528
Life of, 363 f.
Strict observance, 359
Cistertium. See Cistercians
Citeaux, Order of. *See* Cistercians
City states in northern Italy, 413 f.
Civil law. *See* Law
Civilization, Monasticism and, 97
Civita Castellana, Alexander III dies at, 499
Civitavecchia, Innocent IV at, 603
Civitella, Battle of, 156: Papal army defeated, 163
Clairvaux Abbey: Founding of, 365; Influence of, 450; St. Bernard at, 346
Clare, St., 567
Clarendon (Assizes of), punishment of heretics, 494
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 486 f.: annulled, 489
Claudius of Turin, 78
Clement II (pope), 133: Council of Rome (1047), 134; Election of, 133; Henry III crowned by, 133
Clement III (pope), 505
Born at Rome, 505
Crusade appeal, 507
Death of, 510
Enters Rome, 505
Gilbert de la Porée, 571
Truce of God proclaimed by, 507
Uncle of Innocent III, 516
Clement IV (pope), 614-18
Clement III (antipope Guibert), 191, 228, 318
Clergy (Education of), Lateran Council (1215), 575
Clergy (Secular): Community life of, 347; Life of, 347; and monks, 347; Reform of, 450; rights and duties, 381
Clerical continence, Gregory VII, 191
Clerical immunity. *See* Immunity
Clermont, Council of (1076), 208
Clermont, Council of (1095), 280-85
Attendance at, 280
Crusade project, 275 f.
Holy Communion, 281
Lay investiture, 281
Peter the Hermit at, 285
Philip I's divorce, 260
Reform measures, 281
Truce of God, 281
Cluny Abbey, 78
Abbey church, 354
Abbeys dependent on, 198
Abbots of, 86
Abelard at, 433
Art at, 199
Benedict VII, 40
Decline of, 354 f.
Devoted to the papacy, 19
Exemption, 18
Gelasius II dies at, 317, 331
Gregory V and, 86
Gregory VII, 197-200
Hugh II abbot, 356
Influence of, 18, 115, 198 f., 450
Innocent II and statutes of, 360
Leo VII, 19
Letter from Callistus, 358
Monastic habit at, 199 note 50
Number of monks, 354
Pons sacks, 358
Peter the Venerable abbot, 346, 356 f.

Cluny Abbey (*continued*)
Property of, 86
Reform measures, 197 ff.
St. Hugh abbot, 193, 197 f., 200 f.
St. Majolus abbot, 86
St. Odilo abbot, 79, 86
St. Odo abbot, 19, 86
St. Peter Damian on, 199
Simony, 19
Stephen VIII, 19
Studies at, 199
Urban II at, 242, 276
Viollet-le-Duc on, 199
William duke of Aquitaine, 18
Code of Justinian, 310
Cœur de Lion. *See* Richard I of England
Collectio canonum, Anselm of Lucca, 147
Collectio 74 canonum, 147
Collegiate chapters, 382
Cologne: Heretics of, 434; University of, 630
Coloman (king of Hungary), 563
Commentary on the Gospels by St. Bruno, 32
Communal movement, 375 f.: and Truce of God, 379
Communes, Origin of, 379 note 165
Communion: Ceremonies of, 649 f.; Council of Clermont (1095), 281; Lateran Council prescribes Easter, 575; in twelfth century, 380
Comnenus, Alexius. *See* Alexius
Compiègne: Assembly at, 513; Hugh Capet elected king at, 48
Compostela. *See* Santiago
Comte (Auguste), on Middle Ages, 4
Conceptualism of Abelard, 370
Conclave: Origin of, 601 note 41; Council of Lyons (1274), 620, 622
Concordantia discordantium canonum by Gratian, 448
Concordats: of London (1107), 338 f.; of Sutri, 326; of Worms, 313
Confession, Lateran Council prescribes annual, 575
Confraternities, 377-79: Craft, 662 f.; mutual benefit insurance, 663
Confraternity: of the Assumption, 377; of St. Eloi, 377; of St. Hilary, 377
Conrad II (emperor), 112 f.
Bruno chaplain of, 141
Coronation of, 113
Papacy, 113
At Pavia, 113
Projects of, 112 f.
Simony, 113 f.
Conrad III (king of Germany), 408, 410
Excommunicated, 395
Honorius II, 395
Lucius II, 419
St. Bernard, 419
Conrad IV (emperor), Death of, 610
Conrad (bishop of Salzburg), loyal to Alexander III, 477
Conrad (count of Blankenburg), 437
Conrad of Franconia
Crowned king of Italy, 251
Crusader, 426
Deposed, 318
King of the Romans, 251
Seeks refuge with Matilda, 251
Son of Henry IV, 251
Conrad of Marburg, repression of heresy, 598
Conrad of Montferrat: alliance with Saladin, 509; quarrel with Guy of Lusignan, 509
Conrad the Red, father of Conrad II, 112
Conrad of Suburra (bishop of Sabina), becomes Pope Anastasius IV, 458
Conrad of Urslingen, 519
Conradin (son of Conrad IV), 615
Consanguinity, Impediment of, 639
Consolamentum, 501, 526
Constance (empress): Innocent III and, 520; marries Henry VI, 503
Constance, Council of (1094), Praxedes at, 252
Constance, Treaty of, 479
Constantine IX Monomachus (emperor), Michael Caerularius and, 154
Constantinople
Crusaders attack, 542
Crusaders reach, 291, 294 f., 297
Eustathius patriarch, 110
First Crusade, 285
Latin monasteries, 154
Michael Caerularius patriarch, 154 ff.
Pillage of, 543
Venetians in, 279, 541 f.
Constantinople (Council of, 869), Eastern Schism, 153
Constantinople (Latin Empire of), decline of, 611
Constitutions of Clarendon, 486 f.: annulled, 489

Conti (family), Gregory IX aided by, 592
Conti, Lotario de' (Innocent III), 516
Conti, Rinaldo (Alexander IV), 612
Continence (Clerical), Gregory VII, 189
Contracts, 640
Copyists among Canons of St. Victor, 350
Corbie Abbey, Benedict VII, 40
Corbeil, Abelard's school at, 370
Cordova: Abd-er-Rahman II caliph of, 22; Arab library at, 56 note 3; Ferdinand takes, 587
Corporations, Workingmen's, 658
Corpus Christi: Feast of, 614; Office by St. Thomas Aquinas, 653
Corsi (family), faithful to the pope, 400
Corsica, Barbarossa and right to, 468 f.
Corvey Abbey: Cluny and, 105; Widukind monk of, 32
Coucy (forest), Prémontré in, 352
Councils, List of
Ambresbury (979), 38
Angers (1096), 285
Arras (1025), 115
Autun: (1055), 200; (1077), 208; (1094), 258
Barcelona (1068), 196
Bari (1098), 265
Benevento (1087), 240
Bordeaux (1080), 152
Brandford (964), 30
Calne (978), 38 f.
Carroux (989), 44
Chalon-sur-Saône (*ca.* 1056), 167
Clermont: (1076), 208; (1095), 260, 274 f., 280-85
Compostela (1056), 196
Constance (1094), 252
Constantinople (869), 153
Coyaca (1050), 146
Dijon (1077), 208
Elne (1027), 118
Embrun (1057), 168
Erfurt (1075), 193
Etampes (1131), 401
Gerona (1068), 196
Guastalla (1106), 324
Kirlington (977), 38
Lateran: (1057), 167; (1102), 319 f., 383; (1112), 329; (1123), 384; (1139), 411, 494; (1179), 490 ff., 495; (1215), 544, 572-77
Leyra (1068), 196
Limoges (1096), 285
Llandaff (*ca.* 1056), 167
London (1125), 396
Lyons: (1245), 603; (1274), 619 ff.
Mainz: (1049), 145; (1050), 146
Mantua: (1053), 161; (1064), 183
Melfi (1059), 176
Narbonne: (990), 44; (1211), 533
Nicaea (787), 651
Nîmes (1096), 285
Nordhausen (1105), 321
Paris: (1051), 151; (1074), 194 f.; (1210), 595
Pavia: (997), 51; (1018), 104; (1046), 131; (1049), 145; (1096), 285; (1128), 395
Piacenza (1095), 274-76
Pisa (1135), 408 f.
Poitiers: (1000), 101; (1078), 208
Reims: (924), 253 note 41; (974), 38; (1049), 145; (1119), 332 f.; (1131), 408; (1148), 374, 436, 494
Rome: (964), 25 f.; (974-981), 36 f.; (996), 54; (998), 55, 59, 87 note 86; (1046), 133; (1047), 134; (1049), 143 f.; (1050), 150, 346; (1057), 167, 173; (1059), 177; (1074), 190; (1075), 207; (1076), 215; (1077), 199; (1078), 224 f.; (1079), 225; (1096), 285; (1099), 318; (1102), 377
Ravenna (974), 36
Rouen (1074), 196
Santiago de Compostela (*ca.* 1056), 167
Sens (1140), 432
Soissons: (1092), 368; (1121), 371; (1201), 558
Sutri (1046), 131
Todi (1001), 70
Toulouse: (1056), 167; (1229), 597
Tours: (1054), 152; (1096), 260, 285; (1162), 494; (1163), 475
Trosly (911), 87 note 86
Troyes (1128), 345
Vercelli (1050), 150
Verdun (1016), 103
Winchester: (975), 38; (1076), 196
Courte Heuse. *See* Curthose
Cracow (see of): St. Stanislaus bishop, 230; Church of Poland, 123; suffragan of Gnesen, 66

Crafts, Organization of, 658
Craon (forest), Blessed Robert a hermit in, 314
Criminal procedure, 641
Crivelli, Uberto (Urban III), 503
Crema, Siege of, 474
Cremona, league against Henry IV, 252
Crescentius (family): Henry II, 98 f.; Italian faction of, 89; papal elections, 90
Crescentius (John): Otto II, 34; title of Patrician, 89; ruler of Rome, 35
Crescentius the Younger: Castle of Sant' Angelo, 53; executed, 53; Gregory V driven from Rome by, 52; opposes Gregory V, 51; Patrician of the Romans, 49
Croatians, Byzantine Empire and, 278
Crosier: episcopal investiture, 104; lay investiture, 17; significance, 17 note 21
Crusade: Indulgence of, 284 note 121; Lateran Council (1215), 576
Crusade, Albigensian, 530 f.: Carcassonne taken, 532; Innocent III, 535; Simon de Montfort, 532-36
Crusade, First
At Achrida, 296
Ademar of Monteil: joins, 283 f.; papal legate, 296
Alexius Comnenus rescues, 291
Alexius Comnenus' attitude, 297
Attacks upon, 290
Austrians join the, 290
Baldwin de Mons leader, 292, 299
Bavarians join the, 290
At Belgrade, 290
Bohemund leader, 292, 295
At the Bosporus, 291
In Bulgaria, 294
Bulgarians attack, 290
In Cilicia, 299
Constantinople, 285
Contingent from Bohemia, 287
Contingent from Saxony, 287
Daimbert, papal legate, 301
In Dalmatia, 295 f.
Disorders, 287
Dorylaeum (battle), 298
At Edessa, 299
Eustace of Boulogne, 301
Folkmar goes on, 287
Folkmar's soldiers massacred, 288
France in, 292
Franconians join the, 290
Gauthier de Poix joins, 289
Germans in, 292
In Germany, 294
Godfrey of Bouillon leader, 292 ff., 301
Gottschalk goes on, 287
Henry IV and, 320
Hugh (count of St. Paul), leader, 292
Hugh of Vermandois leader, 294
Hungarians attack the, 290
In Hungary, 289, 294
Innocent II, 424
Jerusalem besieged, 300 f.
Jews massacred, 288
Jews pillaged, 287
Lombards join the, 290
In Lombardy, 295
Lorraine contingent, 292
Massacre at Jerusalem, 301 f.
At Merseburg, 288
Motives, 286 f.
Nicaea taken, 298
Normans in, 292, 295
Pannonia traversed by, 288
Petchenegs attack, 290
Peter the Hermit, 292 note 141: at Jerusalem, 301; preacher of, 285 f.
Popular enthusiasm, 286
Procession to Mount of Olives, 301
Raymond of Toulouse leader, 292, 295 f., 301
Reaches Constantinople, 291, 294 f., 297
Robert of Arbrissel preacher of, 286
Robert Curthose leader of, 294, 301
Scene at the Nichava river, 290
Semicho goes on, 287
Semicho's soldiers massacred, 288
Siege of Antioch, 299
In Slavonia, 296
Stephen of Blois leader of, 294
Swabians join the, 290
Tancred leader of, 292, 295, 299, 301
Urban II, 243
William the Chamberlain goes on, 287
William of Tyre's account, 292
Crusade, Second
Adrianople (battle), 428
In Asia Minor, 428 f.
Assembly at Vézelay, 426
Baldwin III king of Jerusalem, 429
Conrad (emperor), 426

Crusade, Second (*continued*)
Damascus attacked, 429
Defeated at Dorylaeum, 428
Difficulties of, 427
Eleonora (queen of France), 428
Eugene III proclaims, 425
Eugene's regulations, 427
French army, 428 f.
German army, 428
Louis VII of France, 425
Manuel Comnenus defeats, 428
Number of crusaders, 426
St. Bernard preacher of, 425
In Thrace, 428
Zenki, 427
Crusade, Third, 505-10
At Antioch, 508
Conrad of Montferrat, 509
Epidemic at Antioch, 508
Frederick Barbarossa, 508
Frederick of Swabia, 508
German army, 508
Germans, 510
Guy of Lusignan, 509
Philip Augustus, 508: returns to France, 509
Richard I of England, 508 f.
Routes, 508
St. John of Acre besieged, 509
"Saladin tithe," 507
Tithes, 507
Crusade, Fourth, 536-45
Alexius III of Constantinople, 540 f.
Baldwin of Flanders, 538 f., 543
Boniface of Montferrat, 539 f.
Constantinople: attacked, 541-43; taken, 541
Dandolo (doge), 539, 541
Foulques de Neuilly preacher of, 538
Geoffroi de Villehardouin, 538
Ghibellines' plan, 537
Innocent III, 536-45
Isaac Angelus, 541
Louis de Blois, 538
Martin abbot of Pairis, 539
Peter of Capua (legate), 539
Peter the Chanter preacher of, 538
Peter Comestor preacher of, 538
Preaching of, 538
Simon de Montfort, 538
Thibaut de Champagne, 538 f.
Venetians, 539 f.
Crusaders, Number of, 293, 295, 298
Crusades
Acre, 618
Alexius Comnenus and project of, 274
Benefit of, 243 f.
Charles of Anjou, 618
Children's, 545 note 53
Edward I of England, 617 f.
Frederick II, 583 f.
"God wills it," 282 f.
Gregory VII, 272
Gregory VII and project of, 232
Meaning of, 273
Motives of, 272 f.
Peter the Hermit and origin of, 274
St. Francis of Assisi, 589 f.
St. Louis, 588 f., 606-10, 617
Sylvester II, 67, 272
Thibaut IV of Champagne, 588
Urban II and origin of, 274
Urban II's project of, 271 f.
Victor III and, 272
Cunigundis, St., 106 note 39: Coronation of, 99; St. Henry II husband of, 96; Sigfrid father of, 96
Cur Deus homo by St. Anselm, 306
Curthose (Robert): crusader, 294; at Jerusalem, 301
Cyprus
Alix of Champagne queen of, 584
Frederick II seizes, 584
Kingdom of, 510
St. Louis at, 607
Taken by Richard I of England, 509
Third Crusade, 509

Dagsburg, Count of, 140
Daimbert: papal legate with Crusade, 301; patriarch of Jerusalem, 340
Dalmatia: Crusaders in, 295 f.; Gregory VII and, 230
Dalmatians, Byzantine Empire and, 278
Dalmatius, St. Hugh son of, 200
Damascus: Crusaders attack, 429; Frederick II, 585; Sultan of, 424; Turks at, 342; Zemisses and emir of, 39
Damasus II (pope), Death of, 134
Damian, Peter. *See* Peter
Damietta: St. Francis at, 589; St. Louis at, 607
Dandolo (doge), Fourth Crusade, 539, 541
Danes: Otto I at war with, 12; Otto II at war with, 34

Daniel (king of Galicia), 563
Dante on St. Francis of Assisi, 564
Danube, Third Crusade via the, 508
Dauphiné, Waldenses in, 527
David of Dinant, 595
De consideratione by St. Bernard, 450
De contemptu mundi by Innocent III, 516
De conversione by St. Bernard, 450
De corpore et sanguine Domini by Gerbert, 73
De corpore et sanguine Domini by John Scotus, 151
De diligendo Deo by St. Bernard, 444
De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae by St. Bernard, 444
De ignoto cantu by Guido of Arezzo, 120 note 67
De laude novae militiae by St. Bernard, 450
De modorum formulis by Guido of Arezzo, 120 note 67
De moribus et officio episcoporum by St. Bernard
De numerorum divisione by Sylvester II, 74
De rationali et rationi uti by Sylvester II, 73
De sacrificio missae by Innocent III, 516
De sacramentis by Hugh of St. Victor, 441
De secretis operibus artis et naturae by Roger Bacon, 645
De sex principiis by Gilbert de la Porrée, 436
De Trinitate by Richard of St. Victor
De vanitate mundi by Hugh of St. Victor, 439
Dean of a chapter, 382
Decretals, collection of Gregory IX, 594
Decretum: by Burchard, 309; by Gratian, 147, 448; by Ivo of Chartres, 310
Denmark, Clerical celibacy, 196
Deodatus (bishop of Rodez), Truce of God, 45
Desiderius (abbot of Monte Cassino), 237 f.
  Becomes Pope Victor III, 238
  Cardinal, 239
  Gregory VII, 226
  Hildebrand friend of, 167
  Nicholas II, 176
Dialectics, Development of, 304
Diaz, Rodrigo. *See* Rodrigo
Die, Hugh bishop of, 194 f., 208
Diego de Acebes (bishop of Osma), Albigenses and, 528
Dies irae by Thomas of Celano, 653
Diets: Bamberg, 408; Besançon, 463; Roncaglia, 466 f.; San Germano, 520; Würzburg, 476
Digne (Hugh of), Preaching of, 647
Dijon: Council of (1077), 208; Elementary schools at, 646; Bénigue Abbey, 111
Dinant, David of, 595
Disibodenberg (convent), 447
Dispensations, Ivo of Chartres on, 311 f.
Dithmar (bishop of Merseburg), historian, 105: Death of, 106 note 39; on death of Otto II, 41 f.
Divorce of Philip Augustus, 513
Dmitri Isaiaslaf, Gregory VII and, 230
Doge, Office of, 414
Dominic, St., 569
  Albigenses, 528
  Appearance of, 528
  Character of, 528
  Innocent III and, 570
  In Languedoc, 528
Dominicans: Founding of, 569; Gregory IX and, 599; Honorius III approves, 570; Innocent III and, 570
Domnus, supposed pope, 36 note 75
Donus, supposed pope, 36 note 75
Dorylaeum, Battle at, 298, 428
Dower in Christian law, 639
Down, St. Malachy bishop of, 451
Drama, Medieval, 654
Drontheim. *See* Trondheim
Ducas, Alexius. *See* Alexius V
Dueling, forbidden, 575, 604
Duns Scotus, 635 note 32
Dunstan, St. (archbishop of Canterbury), 38
Duranne (copyist), 355
Durham, Rannulf Flambard bishop, 261
Dyrrachium, Hugh of Vermandois at, 295

Easter communion, Lateran Council prescribes, 575
Eastern Church. *See* Church, Eastern
Eastern Schism. *See* Schism
Eberhard: bishop of Merseburg, 105; bishop of Trier, 142 f.
Eberhard (count of Nellemburg), Patari denounced by, 212

Eckhard (margrave of Meissen), 95: Assassination of, 96
"Ecumenical," Title of, 110
Edessa: Crusaders at, 299; Fall of, 423, 425; Latin state of, 340, 510; Mossul and, 506
Edgar I (king of England), John XIII and, 30
Education: Gerbert's methods, 57; study of classical authors, 57; in thirteenth century, 629. *See also* Schools, Universities
Edward I (king of England), crusader, 617 f.
Edward the Confessor: banished from England, 159; Leo IX and, 156, 158; Vow of, 158; Westminster Abbey built by, 159
Edwin (king of England), antireligious laws, 30
Edwy. *See* Edwin
Egypt, Caliphate of Cairo dominates, 277
Eichstätt, Gebhard bishop, 165
Einsiedeln Abbey, restoration of Hirschau Abbey, 202
Ekkehard on Concordat of Sutri, 326
El Setenario (code of laws), 587
Eldrad (abbot of Vézelay), Benedict VI and, 35
Election of German emperor, 394 note 6
Elections, Papal. *See* Popes, Election of
Eleonora (queen of France) in the Crusade, 426, 428
Elevation at mass, 380, 649 and note
Elementary schools, 646
Elias (Brother), 600 note 35: on poverty, 599 f.
Eligius, St. (patron of metal workers), 662
El-Khamil (sultan of Egypt), 585: St. Francis and, 589 f.
Elne (Council of), Truce of God, 118
Eloi. *See* Eligius
Elster (river), 224
End of the world in the year 1000, 87 note 86
England: Church and state, 480 f.; Innocent III interdicts, 554; lay investiture, 336-38; Robert of Normandy invades, 337
En-Nasir (caliph), 551
Enzio (son of Frederick II), 593: captured, 609
Embrun (Council of), simony denounced, 168
Embrun, See of, 168
Emesa, John Zemisses takes, 39
Emmerich (king of Hungary), 560
Empire, Holy Roman. *See* Holy
Empire (German), Papacy and, 547-49
Emperor (German), Rights of, 467
Emperor (German), Election of, 394 note 6, 521: Papacy and, 522
Epic poetry, 85
Episcopacy. *See* Bishops
Episcopal schools, 570, 645 f.: Paris, 630; Reims, 56 f.
Erchembald (archbishop of Tours), suspended, 55
Erfurt (Council of), reform measures, 193
Erfurt University, 630 note 20
Eric. *See* Heiric
Erigena, Doctrine of, 151 note 33
Estridson, Sweyn. *See* Sweyn
Etampes (Council of), delegates Bernard, 401
Ethelred (king of England): John XV and, 44; peace treaty, 44
Ethelwulf (Anglo-Saxon king), 552
Etienne of Vendome, Children's Crusade, 545 note 53
Eucharist
  Berengarius' doctrine, 149 f.
  Council of Rome (1059), 179
  Reservation of, 650
  In twelfth century, 380
  Urban IV and devotion to, 614
Eudes. *See* Odo
Eugene III (pope), 420
  Arnold of Brescia confers with, 421
  Bandinelli esteemed by, 470
  At Council of Reims (1148), 436
  Crusade proclaimed by, 425
  Crusade regulations, 427
  Death of, 454
  Enters Rome, 422
  At Farfa Abbey, 420 f.
  Flees to Monticelli, 420
  Nicholas Breakspear made cardinal, 459
  Reform measures, 429 f.
  St. Bernard's correspondence with, 421
  St. Hildegard's visions, 447
  At Viterbo, 421
Eupraxia. *See* Adelaide (empress)

Eusebius Bruno (bishop of Angers), Berengarius friend of, 148
Eustace (count of Boulogne), 293: at siege of Jerusalem, 301
Eustathius (patriarch of Constantinople), 110 note 48: "Ecumenical," 110
Everwin (provost of Steinfeld), 434
Excommunication, 502
  And Christian burial, 323 note 20
  Meaning of, 258 f.
  Moderated by Gregory VII, 259 note 61
  Regulations of, 245 f.
  Urban II and rules of, 245 f.
Exemption, Cluny Abbey, 18
Expectatives, 605

Faranol, 78
Farfa (abbey), Eugene III at, 420 f.
"Father of Scholasticism," 305
Fatimites: of Cairo, 424; caliphs of Egypt, 92; Persecution by, 92
Fecamp, church built, 80
Felix of Valois, St. (founder), 572
Ferdinand III, St. (king of Castile), 586
  Becomes king of Leon, 587
  Declines imperial dignity, 592
  Leo IX and, 146
  Moors and, 587
  Repression of heresy, 598
Fermo (march of), Normans' possession of, 226
Ferrand (count of Flanders), Otto IV and, 548
Ferrara, 135
Fervaques (convent), 514
Feudal contract, 77
Feudalism, 628: Chivalry and, 118 note 64; in Germany, 12, 34; Sylvester II, 77
Fieschi, Ottobuono de' (Adrian V), 622
Fieschi, Sinibaldo de' (Innocent IV), 601
Figeac (abbey), Cluny Abbey and, 198
Fingard, 78
Fiorentino, Frederick II's death at, 609
Fire, Destruction of churches by, 79
Flambard, Rannulf. *See* Rannulf
Flanders, Manichaeans executed in, 493
Florent (count of Holland), Bertha daughter of, 256
Fleury (abbey), Abbo abbot, 79
Fodrum (military requisitions), 468
Foix (castle), 536
Folkmar: crusader, 287; Massacre of soldiers of, 288
Fontaines, St. Bernard born at, 361
Fontanetto (Council of), Arialdo and Landulf excommunicated, 173
Fonte-Avellana, St. Peter Damian at, 125
Fontenay (monastery), Founding of, 365
Fontevrault (abbey): founding of, 314; visits to church, 380
Forchheim, Assembly of: Henry IV and, 223; Rudolf of Swabia elected king, 223
Foreign missions, Gregory VII and, 231
Farfa, Antipope Victor IV consecrated at, 471
Fossanuova (abbey), St. Thomas dies at, 620
Foucher de Chartres (chronicler), 343
Foulques of Anjou, and Templars, 345
Foulques de Neuilly, Crusade preacher, 538
Fulbert of Chartres, Berengarius disciple of, 148
Fulbert de Nogent (abbot), 376
Fulcran (bishop of Lodève), Truce of God, 45
Fulda (abbey): Antipope John XVI at, 53; Cluny and, 105; papal jurisdiction, 161
France: in First Crusade, 292; Gelasius II in, 331; interdicted, 558; Manichaeans executed in, 493
France (Church of), lay investiture, 335
Franche-Comté, Waldenses in, 527
Franci latini, 21 note 28
Franci teutonici, 21 note 28
Francis of Assisi, St., 564 ff.
  Bossuet on, 564
  Character of, 565
  Conversion of Saracens, 569
  Crusade, 589 f.
  At Damietta, 589
  Dante on, 564
  Influence of, 567 f.
  Innocent III, 567
  Legenda prima, 567 note 79
  Pietro Bernardone father of, 565
  Poor Clares, 567
  Poverty, 599 f.
  Rule of, 566 f.

Francis of Assisi, St. (*continued*)
Spiritual testament, 599 f.
Sultan El-Khamil, 589 f.
Franciscan Rule, 566 f.
Franciscans: Gregory IX and, 599 f.; Origin of, 566; Poverty, 599 f.; Spirituals, 600; Third Order, 567
Franco, Boniface. *See* Boniface
Franconians join the Crusade, 290
Frangipani (family)
Defection of, 400
Frederick II, 590
Frederick II buys fortresses of, 602
Loyalty of, 471
Pro-German policy of, 392
Urban II in castle of, 253
Frangipani (Robert), papal election, 392
Fratres Pontifices at Avignon, 514
Fredelo (bishop of Perpignan), Truce of God, 45
Frederick Barbarossa
Adrian IV's demands, 468
Alessandria attacked by, 479
Alexander III in conflict with, 471 f., 476 f.
Amalric of Jerusalem, 506
Ancona attacked by, 479
Burning of St. Peter's (Rome), 477
Campaign in Italy, 473 f.
Character of, 457
Conflict with Lucius III, 500
Coronation of, 457 f., 461, 478
Cruelty of, 474
Death of, 508
Defeated at Legnano, 479
Diet of Besançon, 463
Diet of Roncaglia, 467
Diet of Würzburg, 476
Election of, 456
Flight from Italy, 478 f.
Gregory VIII, 504
Henry the Lion, 479
Henry of Saxony, 458
Italy invaded by, 460
Lands of Countess Matilda, 468 f.
Legists honored by, 465
Letter from Adrian IV, 462
Lombard revolt, 478
Makes peace with Alexander III, 479 f.
Manichaeans, 500 f.
Meeting with Adrian IV, 460
Rainaldi of Dassel chancellor of, 462
At Rome, 461, 477
St. Thomas related to, 632
Submission of, 480
Treaty of Constance, 479
On Third Crusade, 508
Treaty of Venice, 480
Frederick II (emperor)
Alliance with Saracens, 578
Attitude to the papacy, 578 f.
Buys fortresses of Frangipani family, 602
Character of, 579 f.
Church and state, 604 f.
Conflict with Gregory IX, 591, 600
Crusade, 544, 583 f.
Cyprus seized by, 584
Death of, 609
Defeated at Parma, 609
Deposed by Council of Lyons, 604
Dies at Fiorentino, 609
Eastern expedition, 584
Election of, 522
Excommunicated by Gregory IX, 583
Honorius III crowns, 581
Hypocrisy of, 579 f.
Innocent III, 548, 578
In Italy, 602
At Jerusalem, 585
King of Jerusalem, 581
Last years of, 609
Lombardy, 580, 582
Louis IX, 593
Marries Isabella of Brienne, 581
In Palestine, 584
Peter de la Vigne imprisoned by, 609
St. Louis, 589
St. Thomas Aquinas related to, 632
Sardinia invaded by, 591
Sicily, 581
Treaty with Honorius III, 583
Treaty of Jaffa, 585
Treaty of San Germano, 585
Frederick (Stephen IX), 157, 168: abbot of Monte Cassino, 169
Frederick (bishop of Salzburg), Benedict VI and, 35
Frederick (duke of Swabia), 393 f., 408, 410: Epidemic in army of, 508
Freiburg (Germany), Cathedral of, 652
Frescoes, Mural, 653 note 57
Friars Minor. *See* Franciscans
Friars Preachers. *See* Dominicans
Fruttuaria Abbey, Arduin at, 100

Galera, Theophylactus family, 69
Galeria, Antipope Benedict X at, 176
Galicia, Church of, 563: Innocent III and, 563
Gandersheim Abbey, 70
Gandersheim (convent), Hroswitha abbess, 32
Garin (bishop of Senlis) in battle of Bouvines, 549
Gascony, Cathari in, 495
Gauthier de Brienne (knight), 520
Gauthier de Poix, crusader, 289
Gautier (abbot of Pontoise), Gregory VII and, 195
Gautier (Leon), on Middle Ages, 5
Gebhard (bishop of Constance), 245: at Hirschau Abbey, 247; papal legate, 245, 252; Urban II, 247
Gebhard (bishop of Eichstätt): becomes Victor III, 165; Henry III's counselor, 165
Gebhard (bishop of Salzburg), 244
Gelasius II (pope), 317, 331: dies at Cluny, 331; in France, 317, 331; St. Norbert, 352
Genoa: Peace with Pisa, 507; Power of, 414
Geoffroi de Villehardouin (chronicler), Fourth Crusade, 538
Gerald (bishop of Ostia), Gregory VII and, 199
Gerard (Lucius II): becomes pope, 418; election of Emperor Lothair, 394; Hildebrand, 152
Gerard (bishop of Angoulême), 405 f.: and antipope Anacletus II, 402 f.; Death of, 407; at Lateran Synod (1112), 329
Gerard (bishop of Florence) becomes Nicholas II, 175
Gerard, Venerable (founder), Relics of, 345 note 63
Gerard de Tenque, 344
Gerard la Pucelle (canonist), 449
Gerbert of Aurillac (Sylvester II)
  Abbot of Bobbio, 42
  Adalbero and, 38, 53, 56
  Adalbero taught by, 60 f.
  Becomes archbishop of Ravenna, 54
  Becomes archbishop of Reims, 53
  Constitution of the Church, 73
  De corpore et sanguine Domini by, 73
  Educational methods, 57
  Elected pope, 56
  Gregory V, 54
  Holy Roman Empire, 57
  Hugh Capet, 47, 57 f.
  John XIV, 42
  Otto II engages, 57
  Peace movement, 44
  Preceptor of Otto III, 49
  At St. Gerald of Aurillac Abbey, 72
  School at Reims, 38
  Study of classical authors, 57
  Study of Victorinus, 57
  Teacher of Otto III, 57
  Theological studies, 72 f.
  Writings of, 303
Gerhard (bishop of Cambrai), Manichaeans condemned by, 115
Gerhard of Saxony, 125 note 83
Germans: in First Crusade, 292; Third Crusade, 508
Germany
  Crusaders in, 294
  At death of Otto III, 94 f.
  Feudalism in, 12, 34
  Lorraine and, 21 note 29
  Manichaeans executed in, 493
  Power of nobles, 393
  Reign of Frederick Barbarossa, 456 f.
  St. Bernard preaches in, 426
  Saracens invade, 70
  Slavs invade, 70
Gerona (Council of, 1068), reform measures, 196
Ghibellines, 456: Fourth Crusade, 537
Ghibellines (family), 410
Gibelet (in Syria), Hugh bishop, 423
Gilbert (bishop of London), 486
Gilbert de la Porrée (bishop of Poitiers), 570 f.: condemned by Council of Reims, 436; Errors of, 435 f.; *De sex principiis* by, 436
Gilduin (abbot of St. Victor), befriends Peter Lombard, 442
Giordano, brother of antipope Anacletus, 419
Girgenti, See of, 269
Girolamo Masci (Nicholas IV), 624
Gisela (empress): St. Henry son of, 96; Rudolf III father of, 112
Gisors, Elm of, 507
Glandèves, Guido bishop of, 45
Globe, symbol of imperial power, 99

Gnesen: becomes archbishopric, 66; Relics of St. Adalbert at, 66; Suffragan sees of, 66
"God wills it," 282 f.
Godfrey (archbishop of Milan), Tebaldo and, 212
Godfrey (duke of Tuscany): Alexander II friend of, 182; Cadalous defeated by, 182; Matilda wife of, 249
Godfrey the Bearded (duke of Lorraine), 292: Beatrice marries, 166; Stephen IX brother of, 169; Victor II, 166
Godfrey of Bouillon (duke of Lorraine), 293 f.
At Constantinople, 297
Crusade vow of, 293
Crusader, 292 ff.
Death of, 341
Description of, 294
Fights for Emperor Henry IV, 293
Ruler of Jerusalem, 340
At siege of Jerusalem, 301
At siege of Rome, 293
Godfrey of Milan (Celestine IV), 601 note 39
Godfrey of St. Omer, Knight Templar, 345
Godfrey Martel (count of Anjou), Berengarius and, 148
Godfrey of Vendome: on investiture, 335; Urban II aided by, 254
Golden Bull, 560
Goslar: Burchard at, 244; Hildebrand at, 173; Victor II at, 166
Gorze Abbey, 22 note 32
Gothic architecture, 652 f.
Gottschalk, crusader, 287
Gran becomes metropolitan see, 66
Granada, Moors in possession of, 587
Grande Chartreuse Abbey, 450
Gratian, John (Gregory VI), 124
Gratian, John (canonist), 448 f., 630
Codification by, 639
Concordantia discordantium canonum, 448
Decretum by, 245, 448
Gregory XIII approves *Decretum* of, 449
Writings of, 636
Gratz University, Founding of, 625
Gray, John de (archbishop of Canterbury), 554
Greek Church, union with Rome, 91
Greek rite in southern Italy, 270
Gregory V (pope), 51-55
Arnulf archbishop of Reims, 62 f.
Cluny Abbey, 86
Councils: Pavia (997), 51; Rome (996), 54; Rome (998), 55, 59
Crescentius opposes, 51
Death of, 55
Driven from Rome, 52
Flees to Pavia, 51
Gerbert and, 54
Marriage of Robert the Pious, 54 f.
Stephen (bishop of Le Puy) condemned by, 59
Theodard and, 60
Gregory VI (pope)
Abdication of, 132 and note
Charges against, 132
Henry III and, 131
Hildebrand aids, 126
Hildebrand secretary of, 129
Imprisoned, 133
Letter from St. Peter Damian, 125
Restoration of St. Peter's Basilica, 129
Gregory VII (pope)
Alfonso of Castile, 230
Anastasius legate of, 199
Anazir of Mauretania, 231
Anselm of Lucca, 238
Appreciations of, 235 f.
Armenia, 230
Attack upon, 212
Berthold of Carinthia, 193
Bohemia, 230
At Canossa, 219 f.
Character of, 187 f.
Charges against, at Council of Worms (1076), 214
Clerical celibacy, 189, 191, 196
Clerical life, 347
On Cluny Abbey, 197-200
Consecrated bishop, 189
Council of Worms (1076) declares deposition of, 212
Councils of Rome: (1074), 190; (1075), 207; (1076), 215; (1077), 199; (1078), 224 f.; (1079), 225
Crusade project, 232
Crusades, 272
Dalmatia, 230
Deacon, 188
Death of, 235

Gregory VII (*continued*)
Desiderius of Monte Cassino, 226
Dmitri Isaiaslaf, 230
Election of, 186
Encyclical to French bishops, 194
Excommunication moderated by, 259 note 61
At Florence, 219
Foreign missions, 231
Gautier (abbot of Pontoise), 195
Gerald (bishop of Ostia), 199
Guibert of Ravenna, 191, 212, 225
Harold of Denmark, 229
Henry IV, 193, 211: deposed by, 225; excommunicated by, 215; summoned to Rome, 213
Holiness of, 231
Hugh (bishop of Die): advised by, 208; legate of, 194 f.
Hugh of Lyons, 238
Hugh Candidus, 225: makes charges against, 214
Hungary, 230
Imprisoned in Cencius tower, 212
Lay investiture, 207, 325 f.
Leaves Rome, 234
Letter from Henry IV, 215
On the life of canons, 197
At Mantua, 219
Matilda, 219 f., 226, 231
Michael III (emperor), 232
Monasticism, 197 ff.
Normans, 226
Odo (bishop of Ostia), 199 f., 238: counselor of, 242
Olaf III of Norway, 230
Peter (bishop of Florence) deposed by, 202
Poland, 230
Priest, 189
Pseudo-council of Brixen, 225 f.
Pseudo-council of Rome (1084) deposes, 228
Reform measures, 192-96
Robert Guiscard's treaty with, 226
Rudolf of Swabia, 193
Russia, 230
St. Hugh (abbot of Cluny), 200: friend of, 193, 201
St. Ladislaus of Hungary, 230
St. Peter in Chains (church), 187
Simony, 189-92
Spain, 230
Sweyn Estridson, 229
William (count of Burgundy), 232
William VI of Poitiers, 233
William the Conqueror, 196, 209
Wratislaw of Bohemia, 230
Zeal of, 230
Gregory VIII (pope), 504: Barbarossa and, 504; born at Benevento, 504
Gregory IX (pope), 583 ff.
Age of, 593
Bulls: *Parens scientiarum,* 597; *Quo elongati,* 600; *Rex pacificus,* 594
Canon law, 593
Conflict with Frederick II, 591, 600
Death of, 600
Decretals, 594
Dominicans, 599
Flees from Rome, 590
Franciscans, 599 f.
Frederick II excommunicated, 583
The Inquisition, 597 ff.
Patron of studies, 593
At Perugia, 590
Repression of heresy, 598
At Rieti, 590
St. Ferdinand III, 592
St. Louis, 592
Gregory X (pope), 618 ff.: Crusade project, 621; Projects of, 618 f.
Gregory XIII (pope), approval of Gratian's *Decretum,* 449
Gregory VIII (antipope), 318, 331
Gregory (bishop of Tivoli), 69
Gregory (count of Tusculum): Alberic son of, 121; John XIX son of, 109; *Praefectus navalis,* 89
Gregory Papareschi (Innocent II): becomes pope, 400; First Crusade, 284
Grenoble, St. Hugh bishop of, 204
Grosseteste (Robert) at Oxford, 644
Grottaferrata Abbey: Benedict IX, 125; Founding of, 79 note 60
Gualbert, John. *See* John Gualbert
Gualo (bishop of St. Paul de Leon), Paschal II and, 329
Guastalla, Council of (1106), 324
Guelf (family), 410
Guelf V: Matilda deserted by, 250; Matilda's marriage to, 249; Urban II, 249
Guelphs, 456
Guibert (antipope Clement III), 191
Cadalous, 191

Guibert (*continued*)
Character of, 191
Consecrated, 228
Council of Brixen elects, 226
Council of Piacenza condemns, 275
Death of, 318
Driven from Rome, 238 f.
Effect of the Crusade on, 313
Election of antipope Cadalous, 184
Enthroned in St. Peter's, 228
Flees to Ravenna, 238
Flees to Tivoli, 234
Gregory VII, 191, 212, 225
Henry IV, 221, 225, 227, 237: crowned emperor by, 228; protected by, 253
Hildebrand, 191: deceived by, 184
Hugh Candidus, 214
Hypocrisy of, 191 f.
Made archbishop of Ravenna, 184
At Ravenna, 226
At Rome, 237, 239, 244, 251
Takes name of Clement III, 228
Urban opposed by, 244
William the Conqueror against, 209
William Rufus, 261
Guido (bishop of Glandèves), Truce of God, 45
Guido (bishop of Le Puy), 59: Truce of God, 45
Guido (bishop of Valence), Truce of God, 45
Guido of Arezzo, 119
At Avellana monastery, 120
Chant, 116
Death of, 120
Micrologus by, 120
Musical notation, 120
Musical studies, 304
At Pomposa, 120
Theodulus, 120
Works by, 120 note 67
Guido of Brandate (archbishop of Ravenna), 468
Guido of Burgundy (Callistus II), 318
Guido of Castello (Celestine II), 417
Guido of Crema (antipope), 476: Treaty of Venice, 480
Guido of Vienne (Callistus II), 331: letter from Paschal II, 329
Guigues (Carthusian), Carthusian Rule, 204
Guilds, 658 ff.
Guiscard, Robert
Council of Melfi (1059), 176
Death of, 234
Gregory VII's treaty with, 226
Hugh Candidus, 214
Oath of allegiance, 176
Project against Constantinople, 234
Siege of Rome relieved by, 229
Gunzan, 78
Guy. *See also* Guido
Guy le Gros (Clement IV), 614
Guy of Lusignan (king of Jerusalem), 506: quarrel with Conrad of Montferrat, 509; Third Crusade, 509
Guy of Montpellier (founder), 519
Guzman, Dominic de. *See* Dominic

Habeas corpus, Law of, 555
Habit (Monastic), at Cluny, 199 note 50
Hakim (caliph). *See* Al-Hakim
Halinard (archbishop of Lyons) at Council of Rome (1049), 144
Halise, wife of John of England, 553
Hamburg, Slavs pillage, 37
Hardicanute, Death of, 159
Harold III (king of Norway), Alexander II and, 184
Harold (prince of Denmark), Gregory VII and, 229
Hartenfaust, St. Bruno, 203
Havelburg (diocese), Slavs pillage, 37
Heidelberg University, 630 note 20
Heiling, Leo IX son of, 140
Heiric, 72
Helena, daughter of Constantine VIII, 52
Hellespont, Third Crusade at the, 508
Henricians (heretics), 374
Henry II, St. (emperor), 95-99
Arduin, 98: at war with, 98
Bamberg, See of, 90
Benedict VIII, 99: crowns, 99
Boleslaus Chrobry, 97: at war with, 98
Character of, 96 f.
Charter of, 99 f.
Conference of Ivois, 108
Conference of Mouzon, 103
Coronation of, 99
Crowned at Mainz, 96
Cunigundis wife of, 96
Death of, 107
Education of, 96
Elected emperor, 96
Election of bishops, 104

Henry II, St. (*continued*)
Gisela mother of, 96
Henry the Quarrelsome father of, 95
Lay investiture, 104 f.
Leagues of peace, 102
Marriage of, 96, 106
Monasticism, 97, 105
Robert the Pious, 108
At Rome, 99
St. Odilo friend of, 105
St. Wolfgang, 96
Virtues of, 106
Vow of chastity, 106 and note
Henry III the Black (emperor), 130-37
Beatrice cousin of, 166
Benedict IX expelled from Rome by, 124
Clement II crowns, 133
At Council of Mainz (1050), 146
Death of, 166
Discourse against simony, 131
Gebhard counselor of, 165
Gregory VI, 131
In Italy, 166
Leo IX, 146, 160
Nicholas II opposed by, 180
Papal elections, 133, 164
St. Hugh, 200
Victor II, 166: at death of Henry III, 167
Worms (Assembly of), 140
Henry IV (emperor), 210
Adalbert of Bremen, 210
Agnes mother of, 167, 210
Alexander II, 184
Anno of Cologne, 210: tutor of Henry, 183
Assembly of Forchheim, 223
Attitude to the papacy, 320
Beatrice aunt of, 211
Cadalous, 182 f.
At Canossa, 220 f.
Cencius, 222
Character of, 210
Conrad son of, 251
Crowned emperor by Guibert, 228
Crowned king of Lombardy, 227
Crusade project, 320
Death of, 323
Deposed by Gregory VII, 225
At Diet of Mainz, 320
Diet of Mainz deposes, 322
Dismisses his wife, 210
Eberhard of Nellemburg counselor of, 212
Excommunicated, 215
Godfrey of Bouillon fights for, 293
Gregory VII, 193, 211
Guibert, 221, 227, 237: flees to, 253
Henry V revolts against, 321-23
Henry of Liége invested by, 212
Huzmann of Spires invested by, 212
Hypocrisy of, 211 f., 222
Imprisoned, 322
Italy invaded by, 227, 250
Kingdom of Bohemia founded by, 237
Lateran Council condemns, 319
Lay investiture, 211
League against, 252
Letter to Gregory VII, 215
Mantua besieged by, 250 f.
Marches on Rome, 227 f.
Marriage to Bertha, 184
Matilda, 227, 249, 251: cousin of, 211; leads army against, 252
At Milan, 227
Morals of, 210
At Mount Cenis pass, 219
Papacy, 210 f., 318 f.
Praxedes wife of, 251 f.
Pseudo-council of Worms convoked by, 213
Reform measures, 192
Religious policy of, 210 f.
At Rome, 228
Rudolf of Swabia, 222: at war with, 224
St. Hugh of Cluny, 200: godfather of, 320
Saxony revolts against, 217
Stephen IX, 173
Summoned to Rome by Gregory VII, 213
Tebaldo of Milan invested by, 212
William of Utrecht favors, 216
Henry V (emperor)
Adalbert the tool of, 328
Attitude to lay investiture, 324
Callistus II, 318, 333: meeting at Mouzon, 332
Character of, 323
Concordat of Worms, 334
Coronation of, 328
Crowned by Burdinho, 330
Crowned king, 322
Death of, 385

Henry V (*continued*)
Excommunicated, 331 f.
Henry IV imprisoned by, 322
Lay investiture, 325, 328, 332
Matilda visited by, 329
Paschal II, 317: imprisoned by, 327; peace with, 328
At Ratisbon, 321
Regalia, 324
On regalian rights, 326
Revolt of, 321-23
At Rome, 325, 330
Wars of, 325
Henry VI (emperor), 510 f.
Conflict with Celestine III, 512
Crowned by Celestine III, 510
Crowned king, 504
Cruelties of, 512
Death of, 512
Destruction of Tivoli, 512
Marriage of, 511
Marries Constance of Sicily, 503
Papal States invaded by, 504
Profanes tomb of Tancred, 512
Richard II of England imprisoned by, 511
Henry I Beauclerc (king of England), 336: Innocent II and, 408; and St. Anselm, 339; St. Anselm recalled by, 336; and Thurstan (archbishop of York), 396
Henry II (king of England)
Absolutism of, 484
Appearance of, 481
Character of, 481
Church and state, 485, 489
Clerical immunity, 485, 489
Conflict with St. Thomas à Becket, 484 f.
Constitutions of Clarendon annulled, 489
Election of bishops, 486 f.
Louis VII of France replies to, 487
Lucius III, 500
Matilda mother of, 481
Murder of St. Thomas à Becket, 488
The papacy, 457
Peace with Philip Augustus, 507
Penance of, 489
Punishment of heretics, 494
Religious policy of, 481
St. Thomas à Becket, 482 ff.
Taxation, 484 f.
Theobald (archbishop of Canterbury), 482
At tomb of St. Thomas à Becket, 489
Henry III (king of England), 557: truce with St. Louis, 606
Henry I (king of France): Berengarius, 151 note 32; Berengarius imprisoned by, 150 f.; Bertrand (archdeacon), 161; Council of Rome (1059) promulgated by, 178; Leo IX, 146
Henry (king of Cyprus), 584
Henry (bishop of Liége), Emperor Henry IV invests, 212
Henry (duke of Bavaria), 95: imprisoned, 42; Otto II, 32; Otto III seized by, 42; at Rome, 69; St. Henry son of, 95
Henry of Flanders (Latin emperor of Constantinople), 544
Henry of Lausanne (heretic), 374: Heresy of, 434; imprisoned, 435
Henry of Lusignan (king of Cyprus), 585
Henry of Pisa (papal legate), 483
Henry of Saxony, Barbarossa and, 458
Henry the Lion (duke of Saxony), Barbarossa and, 479
Henry Plantagenet. *See* Henry II king of England
Henry the Quarrelsome (duke of Bavaria), 49
Henry Raspe of Thuringia (emperor), 605
Heretics
Alexander III's policy toward, 494
Anselm of Lucca on punishment of, 493
Assizes of Clarendon, 494
Council of Tours (1162) on, 494
Execution of, 492: at Milan, 492; at Soissons, 493; at Vézelay, 493
Henry of England, 494
Louis VII foe of, 494
Popes' moderation toward, 494
Heresy: Innocent III and repression of, 523-25; Penalties for, 491 f.; Repression of, 495, 501 f., 598
Hermann (bishop of Metz), 245
Hermann (duke of Swabia), 95
Hermann of Luxemburg, elected king of Germany, 228
Herold (archbishop of Salzburg): John XIII excommunicates, 30; Magyars and, 30
Hersfeld Abbey, Cluny and, 105

Hierarchy, Lateran Council (1215), 574
Hildebrand
At Acquapendente, 128
Alexander II's counselor, 182
Archdeacon of the Roman Church, 181
At Arezzo, 168
At Assembly of Worms, 140
Benedict X (antipope) opposed by, 174
Cardinal, 142
Council of Embrun (1057), 168
Council of Tours (1054), 152
At death of Victor II, 168
Desiderius (abbot) friend of, 167
Education of, 127
Enters monastery in Rome, 128
In France, 128
In Germany, 128
At Goslar, 173
Gregory VI aided by, 126
Guibert deceives, 184
Guibert opposed to, 191
John Gratian, 128
Lawrence (archbishop of Amalfi), 127
Legate of Stephen IX, 173
Leo IX's adviser, 142
Papal elections, 164, 175
Papal envoy, 152
Peter Damian compared with, 169 f.
Reform measures, 167
At St. Paul Abbey (Rome), 151
Secretary of Gregory VI, 129
Sovana birthplace of, 127
Victor II, 166
Hildegard, St., 447 f.: *Liber divinorum operum* by, 448; *Liber vitae meritorum* by, 448; *Scivias* by, 448
Hildesheim (monastery), St. Henry at, 96
Hirschau (abbey), 202: Einsiedeln Abbey and, 202; Gebhard at, 247; Restoration of, 202; St. William abbot, 202
Hirschberg, Counts of, 165
Historia calamitatum by Abelard, 349
Historia ecclesiastica by Orderic Vitalis, 255 f.
Historiae by Richer, 79
Hochstadt, Battle of, 228
Holy Ghost, Brothers Hospitalers of the, 519
Holy Ghost, Doctrine of: Amalric of Bena, 571; Joachim of Flora, 570
Holy Land. *See* Palestine
Holy Roman Empire: Adalbero, 38; Gerbert, 57; Idea of, 64; Otto III and idea of, 58, 64; Sylvester II, 64
Holy See. *See* Papacy, Popes
Holy See, Vassals of, 637
Holy Sepulcher: Crusades and, 273; Destruction of, 91; rebuilt, 93
Honesti (family), St. Romuald, 116
Honorius II (pope)
Abbot Pons excommunicated, 359
Apulia, 398
Conrad of Hohenstaufen, 395
Death of, 399
Election of, 392
Emperor Lothair, 394
Frederick II crowned by, 581
Roger of Sicily, 398
Honorius III (pope), 579-82
Death of, 582
Dominicans approved by, 570
Innocent III, 579
Liber censuum, 579
Projects of, 579
Study of the *Pandects*, 636
Treaty with Frederick II, 583
Honorius IV (pope), 624
Honorius II (antipope). *See* Cadalous
Horace, Study of, 57
Hospitalers, Origin of, 343 f.
Hospitals: Innocent III, 519; at Jerusalem, 344; Knights of St. John, 344; for lepers, 664
Hroswitha (abbess of Gandersheim), Writings of, 32
Hubert Walter (archbishop of Canterbury), 553
Hugh, St. (abbot of Cluny), 197 f., 200 f., 356
Aremberge mother of, 200
At Canossa, 220
At Council of Autun, 200
Dalmatius father of, 200
Emperor Henry III and, 200
Emperor Henry IV, 200
Godfather of Henry IV, 320
Gregory VII friend of, 193, 200 f.
Legate of Leo IX, 201
Philip I of France, 201
Robert II of Burgundy, 200
Semur birthplace of, 200
Simony attacked by, 200 f.
William the Conqueror, 201

Hugh (bishop of Die): Bishops deposed by, 195; Gregory VII advises, 208; Manasses I of Reims suspended by, 208; papal legate, 194 f., 208
Hugh (bishop of Gibelet), 423
Hugh, St. (bishop of Grenoble), 204
Hugh (count of Egenthein), assassinated, 248
Hugh (count of Egisheim), Leo IX son of, 140
Hugh (count of St. Paul), crusader, 292
Hugh (count of Vermandois), crusader, 294
Hugh of Blankenburg. *See* Hugh of St. Victor
Hugh Candidus (cardinal)
  Born at Remiremont, 213
  Cadalous favored by, 214
  Charges against Gregory VII, 214
  At Council of Worms (1076), 213
  Deposed, 214
  Gregory VII, 225
  Guibert of Ravenna, 214
  Henry IV, 225
  Made cardinal by Leo IX, 213
  Pseudo-council of Brixen, 225 f.
  Robert Guiscard, 214
  Tebaldo of Milan, 214
Hugh Capet
  Adalbero, 47
  Arnulf defended by, 54
  French monarchy founded by, 46
  Gerbert, 47, 57 f.
  Modern France, 21
  Robert the Pious son of, 54
Hugh des Payens, Templar, 345
Hugh of Digne, Preaching of, 647
Hugh of Flavigny on Philip I, 256
Hugh of Lyons, 241: Council of Autun, 258; Gregory VII, 238
Hugh of Provence, Templar, 345
Hugh of Rouen (theologian), 441
Hugh of St. Cher at Oxford, 644
Hugh of St. Victor, 437-41
  De sacramentis by, 441
  De vanitate mundi by, 439
  Death of, 440 f.
  On meditation, 438 f.
  Method of, 438
  On mystical theology, 438 f.
  Summa sententiarum by, 441
Hugh Metel of Tours attacks Abelard, 431
Hugo (archbishop of Embrun), Council of Embrun (1057), 168
Hugo (Victor) on medieval architecture, 650
Humbert (cardinal): *Adversus simoniacos* by, 170; Lay investiture attacked by, 171, 207; Simony attacked by, 170
Humbert of Romans (Dominican), Council of Lyons (1274), 619
Hume (David) on William Rufus, 261
Hungarians: attack crusaders, 290; defeated at Merseburg, 12; Otto I at war with, 12
Hungary
  Church in, 66
  Clerical celibacy, 196
  Crown of, 66
  Crusaders in, 289, 294
  Golden Bull, 560
  Gregory VII, 230
  Innocent III, 560, 562
  St. Stephen king, 66 f.
  Venice makes peace with, 507
Huzmann (bishop of Spires), Henry invests, 212
Hyacinth Orsini (Celestine III), 510
Hymns, Development of, 498

Iconium, Crusaders besiege, 508
Ida (countess of Boulogne), 293
Ideas, Universal, 366 note 126
Ile-Barbe, church built, 80
Ilsemburg Abbey, Burchard's death at, 245
Immunity, Clerical, 485, 489
Impediment (marriage) of lack of parental consent, 639
Impediment of orders, Lateran Council (1123), 384 note 179
Imperator Augustus, Otto I, 20
Ina (king of Wessex), 553
Incontinence, Clerical, 18
Indulgence: Crusade, 284 note 21; First general, 380
Indulgences: Callistus II, 380; Paschal II, 380; in twelfth century, 380; Urban II, 380
Ingeburg: imprisoned by Philip Augustus, 514; Philip Augustus marries, 514; Philip Augustus' divorce from, 513, 557 f.; wife of Philip Augustus, 558 f.

Innocent II (pope), 400 ff.
Abelard condemned by, 432
Alfonso I of Aragon, 408
Alfonso VII of Castile, 408
Cluny statutes, 360
Council of Pisa (1135), 408 f.
Death of, 417
First Crusade, 424
In France, 400 f.
Henry I of England, 408
Lateran Council (1139), 411
Letter from St. Bernard, 407, 412 note 38
Lothair, 401, 403
Lothair crowned by, 404
Louis VII of France, 418
Louis the Fat, 401
At Pisa, 407 f.
Roger of Sicily seizes, 413
St. Bernard, 403
St. Bernard and election of, 401 f.
Treaty of Miniano, 413
Innocent III (pope), 516-77
Adam of St. Victor, 497
Albigenses, 529
Albigensian Crusade, 535
Alexius IV of Constantinople, 541
Appearance of, 516
Bulgaria, 562
Character of, 516
Christian civilization, 563 f.
Church and state, 545 f.
Conflict with John of England, 553 f.
Crowns Ladislaus king of Hungary, 561
De contemptu mundi by, 516
De sacrificio missae by, 516
Death of, 576
Dominicans, 570
Education of, 516
Emmerich king of Hungary, 560
Empress Constance, 520
England interdicted by, 554
Forged bulls, 519
Fourth Crusade, 536-45
France interdicted, 558
Franciscan Rule approved, 566
Frederick II's attitude to, 578-80
Galicia, 563
Heretics, 528
Honorius III, 579
Hospital founded by, 519
Hungary, 560
King John of England excommunicated, 554
Lateran Council (1215), 544, 572-77
Letter to Duke von Zahringen, 522
Lombard League, 520 f.
Magna Charta, 555
Markwald excommunicated, 519
Moors, 550
Otto IV: crowned, 522; excommunicated, 522, 548; favored by, 522
Peter II of Aragon, 552
Philip Augustus, 556 f.: divorce of, 556 f.; reconciled, 559
Policy of, 537
Possessions of Raymond VI of Toulouse, 536
Projects of, 517, 537
Public audiences, 519
Raymond of Toulouse, 529, 533 f.: excommunicated, 530; seeks protection of, 535
Repression of heresy, 523-25
St. Dominic, 570
St. Francis of Assisi, 567
Serbia, 563
Sicily, 520
Simon de Montfort, 535
Simony, 519
Spain, 550
Trinitarians approved, 572
Unity of Hungary, 562
Works of charity, 519
Innocent IV (pope), 600 ff.
At Civitavecchia, 603
At Council of Lyons (1245), 603 f.
Death of, 610
Fiscal measures of, 606 note 47
Leaves Rome, 603
At Lyons, 603
Meets St. Thomas Aquinas, 632
Innocent V (pope), 621
Inquisition
Council of Toulouse, 597
Five sorts of, 503 note 90
Gregory IX, 597 ff.
Lucius III organizes, 501 f.
Origin of the, 491 f.
Procedure of, 613 note 2
Use of torture, 641
Institutes by Justinian, 310
Interdicts, 502: Apulia, 408; Capua, 173; England, 554; France, 558; Louis VII of France, 418; Nor-

Interdicts (*continued*)
mandy, 180; Paris, 397; Portugal, 514; Rome, 460; Sicily, 408
International law. *See* Law
Introductio ad theologiam by Abelard, 430
Investiture, Meaning of, 205
Investiture, Lay, 16-18, 205-14
Alexander II, 183
Of bishops, 17
Callistus II, 332
Concordat of Worms, 334
Conrad II, 113
Consequences of, 205 f.
Councils: Autun (1077), 208; Clermont (1085), 281; Poitiers (1078), 208; Rome (1075), 207
Crosier, 17
Emperor Henry II, 104 f.
Emperor Henry V, 324 f., 327, 332
In England, 209, 336-38
In France, 208, 335
In Germany, 209 f.
Gregory VII, 207, 325 f.
Humber on, 171, 207
Ivo of Chartres on, 312, 325 f.
Origin of, 16, 205
Parishes, 381
Paschal II on, 324-26, 328
Philip I of France, 194, 208
Ring, 17
Simony, 206
Stephen IX, 169 note 77
Ireland, Church of: Chorepiscopi in, 451; Holy See and, 451; St. Malachy, 451
Irene (princess), Philip of Swabia marries, 511
Irnerius teacher at Bologna, 465
Isaac Angelus (emperor), 511, 540: Fourth Crusade, 541; imprisoned, 542
Isabella of Angoulême, John of England marries, 553
Isabella of Brienne (empress): Frederick II marries, 581; Death of, 584
Isabella of Hainault, wife of Philip Augustus, 513
Isaiaslaf, Dmitri. *See* Dmitri
Isidore of Seville, 72: Writings of, 303
Italy
Brigandage in, 126
City states in northern, 413 f.
Discord in, 611
Emperor Henry IV invades, 227, 250
Factions in, 89, 94
Frederick Barbarossa in, 460, 473, 478
Frederick II in, 602
Greek monasteries, 154
Greek rite in southern, 270
Latin rite in southern, 270
Manichaeans executed in, 493
Maritime cities of, 414
Normans in southern, 156, 162
Saracens attack, 100
Itinerarium mentis ad Deum by St. Bonaventure, 635
Ivo of Chartres, St.
Arrest of, 257
Clerical life, 347
On communal pacts, 376
Decretum by, 245, 310
On dispensations, 311 f.
Doctrine of matrimony, 313 note 188
Lay investiture, 312, 325 f.
Letter from Paschal II, 329
Panormia by, 310
Philip I's divorce, 256
Studies in canon law, 308 f.
Tripartita, 310
Urban II accompanied by, 253
Writings of, 308 f.
Ivois, Conference of, 108
Ivrea, Arduin marquis of, 94, 99
Izagoge by Porphyry, 366

Jacopone da Todi, *Stabat Mater* by, 653
Jacques Pantaleon (Urban IV), 613
Jaffa, Treaty of, 585
Jaime. *See* James
James I (king of Aragon), 587: repression of heresy, 598
Jerusalem
Christian colony at, 339
Crusaders' siege of, 300 f.
Frederick II at, 585
Hospice at, 344
Letter from Church of, 67
Moslems seize, 603
Patriarchate of, 340
Taken by Saladin, 504, 506 f.
Turks capture, 232
Jesu dulcis memoria, Authorship of, 361 note 108

Jews
Bankers, 94
Caliph Hakim and, 94 note 15
Charges against, 93
Lateran Council (1215), 575
Massacred by crusaders, 288
Moslem persecution of Christians, 92 f.
Not to have Christian slaves, 491
Persecution of, 93
Pillaged by crusaders, 287
Joachim of Flora (abbot), Errors of, 570, 573
Johannes Canaporius, 44 note 100
Johannes de Casamaris (legate), 562
Johannitius (king of Bulgaria), 544, 562
John (pope), Numerical designation of, 90 note 2
John XII (pope)
Adalbert, 23
Alberic father of, 10
Charges against, 24
Council of Rome (964), 26
Death of, 26
Deposed, 24
Leo VIII (antipope), 23-25
Monasticism, 19
Otto I, 12, 19, 23 f.: crowned by, 13
Patrimony of St. Peter, 14
Policy of, 22-26
Prestige of papacy, 10
Privilegium Ottonis, 14, 16
St. Adelaide crowned by, 13
Subiaco, 19 note 25
Temporal ruler, 10
John XIII (pope), 28-31
Bologna, 30
Death of, 31
Edgar I of England, 30
Exiled, 28
Herold (archbishop of Salzburg) excommunicated by, 30
Imprisoned, 28
Marozia aunt of, 28
Otto I, 28 f.
Otto II crowned by, 29
Reform of the Church, 29 f.
Theodora the Younger, mother of, 28
Theophano crowned by, 22
Tomb of, 31
John XIV (pope), 40-43
Boniface VII (antipope) and, 42
Death of, 42
Gerbert and, 42
Imprisoned, 42
Otto II, 41
John XV (pope), 43 f.
Death of, 49
Election of, 43
First papal canonization, 44
Ethelred of England, 44
Richard duke of Normandy, 44
John XVII (pope), 90: Petronius (consul), 90
John XVIII (pope), 90: Death of, 91; Greek Church, 91; St. Paul Abbey (Rome), 91
John XIX (pope)
Character of, 110
Conrad II crowned by, 113
"Ecumenical," Title of, 110
Election of, 109
Gregory of Tusculum father of, 109
William abbot of St. Bénigne, 111
John XXI (pope), 622
John XVI (antipope), 52
At Fulda, 53
Calabria birthplace of, 52
Death of, 53
Mutilated, 53
St. Nilus, 52
John (king of England)
Character of, 553
Conflict with Innocent III, 553 f.
Conspires with Philip Augustus, 509
Despotism of, 554
Divorce, 553
Excommunicated, 554
Halise wife of, 553
Isabella of Angoulême marries, 553
Magna Charta, 554 f.
Otto IV, 548
Vassal of the Holy See, 554
John (abbot of Struma), antipope, 479
John (archbishop of Lyons), Paschal and, 329
John (archbishop of Rouen), reform measures, 196
John (bishop of Narni), 28
John (bishop of Sabina, antipope Sylvester III), 124
John of Abbeville (bishop of Sabina), 587
John of Brienne, 591: father of Isabella, 581; Frederick II and, 585

John of Crema (cardinal): at Council of Pavia, 395; papal legate, 396
John of Gaeta (Gelasius II), 317
John de Gray (archbishop of Canterbury), 554
John of Matha, St. (founder), 572
John of Salisbury (bishop of Chartres), Motto of, 4
John de Vendière (abbot), 22 note 32
John Crescentius: Rodfred murdered by, 29; Theodora the Younger mother of, 29
John Gratian (Gregory VI), 124, 128
John Gualbert: Death of, 202; Peter bishop of Florence and, 202; Simony attacked by, 202; Vallumbrosan Order founded by, 201
John Lackland. *See* John king of England
John Mincius (antipope Benedict X), 174
John Scotus Erigena: *De corpore et sanguine Domini* by, 151; Doctrine of, 151 note 33
John Zemisses (emperor)
  Apameia taken by, 39
  Arabs at war with, 39
  Baalbek taken by, 39
  Emesa taken by, 39
  Emir of Damascus and, 39
  Nicephorus II murdered by, 22
  Phenicia conquered by, 39
  Poisoned, 39
  In Syria, 39
Joigny (monastery), Founding of, 365
Joinville on St. Louis, 608
Joseph, St. (patron of carpenters), 662
Josephini condemned, 501
Jourdain of Capua: election of Victor III, 239; papal elections, 238
Jubilus (in mass chant), 82
Judgment of God. *See* Ordeals
Judicial procedure, Lateran Council (1215), 574
Judith (wife of Roger), in Sicily, 268
Juliani, Peter (John XXI), 622
Jumièges Abbey, mass chant, 83
Justinian: *Code,* 310; *Institutes,* 310; *Novellae,* 310

Kalocsa, See of, 66
King of the Romans, Conrad crowned, 251
King's touch, Robert the Pious and, 108
Kirlington, Council of (977), 38
Kolberg, suffragan of Gnesen, 66
Knights of Calatrava, 346
Knights of Malta, 345
Knights of Rhodes, 345
Knights of St. James of the Sword, 346
Knights of St. John. *See* St. John
Knights Templars. *See* Templars
Knights, Teutonic. *See* Teutonic
Kumans: Alexius I at war with, 278; in Thrace, 278

Labeo Notker, 78
La Cava (abbey): antipope Theodoric at, 319; Urban II monk at, 242
Ladislaus, St. (king of Hungary), 161: Gregory VII, 230; Innocent III crowns, 561
Landulf: excommunicated, 173; origin of the Patari, 172
La Ferté (monastery), Foundation of, 365
Lagny, church built, 80
Lambert (Honorius II), 392
Lambert of Hersfeld, 222
Lambert le Bègue (founder), 664
Lamennais on religious architecture, 651
Lance, Finding of the holy, 299
Landfrieden, Henry II and, 102
Lanfranc (abbot of Bec)
  Adviser of William the Conqueror, 261
  Alexander II pupil of, 181
  At Bec Abbey, 303 f., 308
  Council of Winchester, 196
  Death of, 261
  Marriage of William of Normandy, 180
  St. Anselm taught by, 262
  Writings of, 303
Languedoc: Albigenses in, 527; Aragon, 534; Catalonia, 534; St. Dominic, 528; Simon de Montfort in, 533
Languages, Roger Bacon's knowledge of Oriental, 644
Languages, Romance, 81
Lansperge on Carthusian Order, 203
Laon: Abelard's school at, 370; Adalbero bishop, 60; Bartholomew bishop, 352; Premonstratensian Canons near, 344
Lascaris (emperor), 544

Lateran (basilica): Guibert (antipope) consecrated in, 228; Roman cardinals, 170 note 80
Lateran Councils
(1057), reform measures, 167
(1102), 319 f., 383
(1112), rejects the *Privilegium*, 329
(1123), ecumenical, 384
(1139): and Arnold of Brescia, 416; ecumenical, 411; Manichaeans, 494
(1179), 490 ff.: repression of the Cathari, 495
(1215), 572-77: Abbots at, 573; Albigenses condemned, 573; Attendance at, 573; Canons of, 573; Crusade appeal, 544; Crusade project, 576; Errors of Amalric of Bena condemned, 573; Errors of Joachim of Flora condemned, 573; Hierarchy, 574; Innocent III, 572-77; Jews, 575; judicial procedure regulated, 574; Purposes of, 572 f.; reform measures, 574; Saracens, 575; schools ordered, 575; usury, 575
Lateran Palace, Urban II at, 254
Latin in preaching, 647
Latin Empire of Constantinople, End of, 616
Latin rite in southern Italy, 270
La Vigne (Peter de), at Council of Lyons, 603
Law, Canon
Anselm of Lucca's collection, 309 f.
Collections of, 309
Gregory IX, 593
Influence on civil law, 641 f.
Roman law, 636 f.
St. Ivo of Chartres and study of, 308 f.
Teaching of, 484 f.
Law, Civil, influenced by canon law, 641 f.
Law, International, 636 f.
Law, Roman: Canon law and, 636 f.; Study of, 309 f., 465; Women in, 639
Law, Study of, at Bologna University, 636
Lawrence (archbishop of Amalfi), Hildebrand and, 127
Lay investiture. *See* Investiture
League, Lombard, 478 f., 520 f.
League of Verona, 477 f.
Leagues of peace, Henry II and, 102
Legal procedure, 640 f.
Legates (papal) in twelfth century, 383
Legatio Constantinopolitana by Liutprand, 32
Legenda prima by Thomas of Celano, 567 note 79
Legenda secunda by Thomas of Celano, 567 note 79
Legists, 464 ff.: Barbarossa honors the, 466; at Bologna, 465
Legnano, Battle of, 479
Leo (archbishop of Achrida), Manifesto of, 155
Leo VII (pope): Cluny, 19; St. Odo, 19
Leo IX, St. (pope), 140 ff.
Andrew (king of Hungary) appeals to, 160
Beatrice consults, 161
Berengarius excommunicated by, 150
Bertrand (archdeacon) deposed by, 161
Civitella (battle), 163
Composer, 147 f.
Councils: Mainz (1049), 145; Pavia (1049), 145; Reims (1049), 145; Rome (1049), 143 f.; Rome (1050), 150
Death of, 163
Eberhard, 142
Edward the Confessor, 146, 158
Edward the Confessor's embassy to, 159
Election of, 142
Ferdinand of Castile, 146
Heilwig mother of, 140
Henry I of France, 146
Henry III (emperor), 146
Hildebrand adviser of, 142
Hugh Candidus made cardinal, 213
Hugh of Egisheim father of, 140
Journeys of, 145
Legates to Constantinople, 157
Monasticism, 146 f.
At Monte Cassino, 143
At Monte Gargano, 143
Peter III patriarch of Antioch, 154
Reform of the Church, 142 f., 146 f.
St. Benedict, 143
St. Hugh legate of, 201
St. Michael, 143
Simony attacked by, 144
Treaty of Worms, 161
Leo XIII (pope), encyclical *Aeterni patris*, 634

Leo VIII (antipope)
Bull of, 27
Council of Rome (964), 26
Death of, 27
Election of, 24 f.
John XII, 23-25
Otto I, 24 f.
Restored, 27
Leo VI (emperor), Eastern Schism, 153
Leo (bishop of Ostia), Chronicle of Monte Cassino by, 106 note 39
Leo (protoscriniarius): elected antipope, 24 f.; John XII, 23
Leon (kingdom): interdicted, 552; Ferdinand III becomes king of, 587; war on Moors, 266
Lepers: Hospitals for, 664; Lateran Council (1179), 490; Robert the Pious, 108
Le Puis (castle), besieged, 378
Le Puy, Urban II at, 276
Lesser Armenia, Kingdom of, 510
Lethbold (pilgrim), 93
Leyra (Council of), reform measures, 196
Libellus de numerorum divisione by Sylvester II, 74
Libellus de rationali et ratione uti by Sylvester II, 73
Liber abaci by Sylvester II, 74
Liber censuum by Honorius III, 579
Liber divinorum operum by St. Hildegard, 448
Liber Gomorrhianus by St. Peter Damian, 142 and note
Liber ordinis, 350
Liber sententiarum by Peter Lombard, 442
Liber vitae meritorum by St. Hildegard, 448
Libera (chant), 83
Libertas romana, 637
Library of Arab books at Cordova, 56 note 3
Liége, Henry bishop, 212
Liemar (archbishop of Bremen) opposes reform measures, 193
Life of St. Romuald by St. Peter Damian, 116
Limoges: St. Martial Abbey, 80; Urban II at Council of, 285
Lincoln (Robert of) at Oxford, 644
Lipari (islands), 269
Lisbon University, Founding of, 625
Literature, Origin of Romance, 84 f.
Liturgy, 648-50: Adam of St. Victor, 497 f.; elevation at mass, 649 note 48; music, 497 f.; poetry, 498
Liutprand (bishop of Cremona)
Antapodosis by, 32
Baronius and, 32
Legatio Constantinopolitana, 32
Otto I, 21, 32
Pseudo-council of Rome (963), 24
Vita Ottonis by, 32
Liutprand (priest), Mutilation of, 248
Lives of the Saints by St. Bruno, 32
Livre des métiers by Boileau, 659
Llandaff (Council of, *ca.* 1056), reform measures, 167
Lodève, See of, 45
Lodi, league against Henry IV, 252
Lombard League, 478 f., 520 f.: battle of Legnano, 479
Lombards: join the Crusade, 290; revolt against Barbarossa, 478
Lombardy: City states in, 413 f.; Crusaders in, 295; Frederick II, 580, 582
London, Concordat of (1107), 338 f.
Lorraine (kingdom): in First Crusade, 292; Germany and, 21 note 29; Otto occupies, 21; separates from the Empire, 611
Lotario de' Conti (Innocent III), 516
Lothair (king), 47
Arnulf son of, 53
Crowned emperor, 404
Death of, 409
Elected emperor, 394
Enters Rome, 403
Honorius II, 394
Innocent II, 401, 403
Lotharingia. *See* Lorraine
Louis VI the Fat (king of France)
Canons of St. Victor, 350
Coronation of, 408
Gelasius II welcomed by, 317
Innocent II, 401
Paschal II confers with, 324
Religious policy of, 397
St. Bernard, 397
Stephen of Senlis, 397 f.
Suger at court of, 453
Louis VII le Jeune (king of France)
Amalric of Jerusalem, 506

Louis VII (*continued*)
Crusade project, 425
Foe of heretics, 494
Hospitality to Alexander III, 475
Innocent II, 418
Interdiction of lands of, 418
Pierre de la Châtre, 418
Replies to Henry II of England, 487
St. Bernard, 418
St. Thomas à Becket, 487
Suger esteemed by, 453
Thibaut de Champagne at war with, 418
Louis VIII (king of France), treaty with Emperor, 592
Louis IX, St. (king of France), 588 f.
Blanche of Castile mother of, 587
Captured by Saracens, 608
At Carthage, 617
Character of, 588
Clement IV, 614
Crusade vow, 607
Crusader, 588 f., 606-10, 616 f.
At Cyprus, 607
At Damietta, 607
Death of, 617
Etienne Boileau, 659
Frederick II, 589, 593
Gregory IX, 592
Humility of, 663
Joinville on, 608
Last testament of, 617 f.
At Mansurah, 607
Ransom of, 609
Truce with Henry III of England, 606
Valor of, 608
Louis de Blois, Fourth Crusade, 538
Louis of Lorraine, Adalbero and, 61
Lower Italy, Normans in, 156
Lucan, Study of, 57
Lucca, See of, 181
Lucera, Moslem colony at, 582
Lucius II (pope), 418 f.: Conrad III, 419; Death of, 420; Roger of Sicily meets, 418
Lucius III (pope), 499-502
Conflict with Barbarossa, 500
Episcopal Inquisition organized by, 501 f.
Gilbert de la Porrée, 571
Manichaeans, 501
At Verona, 500
Waldenses excommunicated by, 527
Maginulf (antipope), 322: submission of, 328
Magna Charta, 554 f.
Magyars, Herold of Salzburg and, 30
Mainz: Adalbert archbishop, 328, 394; Crusaders massacre Jews in, 288; Henry II crowned at, 96; Sigfrid archbishop, 193
Mainz, Councils of: (1049), 145; (1050), 146
Mainz, Diets of: (1103), Emperor Henry IV at, 320; (1105), Henry IV deposed by, 322
Mainz, Pseudo-council of (1076), 217
Majolus, St., 86
Majorca taken from the Moors, 587
Malachy, St. (bishop of Down), 451 f.: Prophecies of, 452 note 158
Maledetti, Octavian (antipope), 471: favored by Barbarossa, 470
"Malifacius" (antipope Boniface VIII), 35
Malmedy Abbey, Henry II and, 105
Malta, Knights of, 345
Manasses I (archbishop of Reims): Hugh of Die suspends, 208; Philip I of France and, 209; Simony of, 204, 208
Manegold of Lautenbach, Canons of Marbach founded by, 254
Manfred (bishop of Brescia), Church reform, 415
Manfred (son of Frederick II), 610: conflict with Charles of Anjou, 617; Death of, 615; in Sicily, 613
Manichaeans
Barbarossa and the, 500 f.
Council of Arras condemns, 115
Council of Orleans (1022) condemns, 108
Council of Reims (1148), 494
Execution of: in Flanders, 493; in France, 493; in Germany, 493; in Italy, 493
In France, 114 f.
Lateran Council (1139), 494
Lucius III, 501
In Middle Ages, 493
Richard V of Normandy, 107 f.
Manichaeism, 371 f.
At Albi, 526
In the Middle Ages, 492
In Papal States, 523

Manichaeism (*continued*)
Popular attitude to, 492
In Provence, 524
Raymond VI of Toulouse favors, 524 f.
Manosque, Relics of Venerable Gerard at, 345 note 63
Mansurah, St. Louis at, 607
Mantua, 135: Barbarossa takes, 474; Henry IV besieges, 251
Mantua, Council of (1053), Beatrice and, 161
Mantua, Council of (1064), Cadalous excommunicated by, 183
Mantes, Confraternity at, 377
Manuel Comnenus (emperor), 424: attempt to bargain with the pope, 475; defeats crusaders, 428; negotiations with Alexander III, 491
Marbach, Foundation of Canons of, 254
Marcus Aurelius, Statue of, 29, 43
Marino (hermit), St. Romuald and, 116
Mark (measure of weight), 254 note 46
Mark Allan, 78
Markwald (seneschal), excommunicated, 519 f.
Marozia, John XIII nephew of, 28
Marriage: Essence of, 639; impediment of consanguinity, 639; impediment of lack of parental consent, 639
Martel, Godfrey. *See* Godfrey
Martianus Cappella, Sylvester II and writings of, 56
Martin IV (pope), 623
Martin (abbot of Pairis), Fourth Crusade, 539
Mary (Blessed Virgin): Office of, 284 note 123; Preface of, 276 note 104
Mary (mother of Al-Hakim), 93
Masci, Girolamo (Nicholas IV), 624
Mass: Ceremonies of, 649 f.; Elevation at, 649 note 48
Massa (Sardinia), 591
Master craftsmen, 660
Matha, St. John of (founder), 572
Mathematics, Sylvester II, 74
Matilda, St. (queen of Germany), Charity of, 33
Matilda (empress), Mother of Henry II of England, 481
Matilda, St. (queen of Germany): charity of, 33; Otto I son of, 12; at Quedlinburg Abbey, 42; St. Bruno son of, 33
Matilda (countess of Tuscany)
Barbarossa and lands of, 468 f.
Beatrice mother of, 161, 166
At Canossa, 220
Conrad seeks refuge with, 251
Deserted by Guelph V, 250
Donation of, 404 note 21
Godfrey husband of, 249
Gregory VII, 219 f., 226, 231
Guibert driven from Rome by, 239
Emperor Henry IV, 227, 249, 251: cousin of, 211
Emperor Henry V visits, 330
Leads army against Henry IV, 252
Marriage to Guelph V, 249
Paschal II, 327
Praxedes seeks refuge with, 252
Matilda of Scotland, Henry I of England and, 337
Matilda (daughter of Baldwin V), Marriage of, 180
Matrimony, St. Ivo of Chartres and doctrine of, 313 note 188
Matthew (bishop of Albano), papal legate, 398
Matthew (prior of St. Martin-des-Champs), 358
Matthew of Angers (canonist), 449
Mauretania, 231
Mauricio Burdinho (antipope), 331: Henry V crowned by, 330
Mazzara, See of, 269
Medicine, Sylvester and science of, 75
Meditation, Hugh of St. Victor on, 438 f.
Meditations by St. Anselm, 306
Meginaud (bishop of Trier), 105
Meinwerk (bishop of Paderborn), 78, 105
Meissen, See of, 90
Melek-el-Khamil (sultan of Egypt), 585: St. Francis and, 589 f.
Melfi, Normans at, 135
Melfi, Council of (1059), Robert Guiscard duke, 176
Melrichstädt, Battle of, 224
Melun, Abelard's school at, 370
Memorare, Authorship of the, 361 note 108
Mendicant orders, 627: Paris University, 631
Menthon, St. Bernard of. *See* Bernard
Merowig, Merovingian dynasty, 46

Merseburg
Assembly of, 102
Battle of, 12
Crusaders at, 288
Dithmar of, 105
Eberhard bishop, 105
See of, 90
Mesopotamia: subjected by Saladin, 506; Turks in, 425
Messina: Henry VI of Germany dies at, 515; Knights of St. John at, 344; See of, 269; Third Crusade sails from, 508
Metropolitans in twelfth century, 383
Metz, Hermann bishop, 245
Michael (St.), Leo IX and, 143
Michael VII (emperor), Gregory VII and, 232
Michael VIII Paleologus (emperor), 616: Council of Lyons (1274), 619; truce with Charles of Anjou, 621
Michael Caerularius (patriarch of Constantinople), 154 ff.
Becomes patriarch, 155
Deposed, 157
Excommunicated, 157
Exiled, 154
Latin Catholics persecuted by, 156
Monk, 154
Plot against Michael IV, 154
Pope anathematized by, 157
Schism of, 46
Michael IV (patriarch of Constantinople), Caerularius plots against, 154
Micrologus de disciplina artis musicae by Guido of Arezzo, 120 and note
Middle Ages
Christianity in, 5
Comte on, 4
Education in, 629. *See also* Schools, Universities
Leon Gautier on, 5
Religious orders, 626-29
Secondary schools, 645 f.
Study of philosophy in, 302 note 158
Study of Roman law in, 465
Uhlhorn on, 5
Mieczyslaw II, Casimir son of, 123
Milan
Anselm archbishop of, 251
Barbarossa takes, 474
Execution of heretics, 492
Godfrey archbishop of, 212
Guido archbishop of, 179
League against Henry IV, 252
Rebuilt, 477
St. Peter Damian at, 179
Tebaldo archbishop, 212
Uberto Crivelli archbishop of, 503
Military orders, 343 f., 346
Alcantara, 586
Aviz, 586
Calatrava, 586
Origin of, 343
St. James of Compostela, 586
Milo (papal legate), 531
Mincius, John. *See* John Mincius
Miniano, Treaty of, 413
Minnesingers, 564, 654 f.
Minstrels in Provence, 525
Missi (imperial), papal elections, 14
Missions in Asia, 491
Modena, 135
Mohammedanism, Turks strengthen, 277. *See also* Moors, Saracens
Moissac Abbey, Cluny Abbey and, 198
Molesmes, St. Bruno at, 204
Monaldi, Bonfilius dei, 664
Monasteries, List of
Avellana, 27
Baume, 198
Bec, 180, 262, 303 f., 308
Bobbio, 42
Charroux, 80
Chester, 262
Clairvaux, 365, 450
Citeaux, 314, 360, 365
Cluny. *See* Cluny
Corbie, 40
Corvey, 105
Einsiedeln, 202
Farfa, 420 f.
Figeac, 198
Fleury, 79
Fontenay, 365
Fontevrault, 314
Fossanuova, 620
Fulda, 53, 105, 161
Gandersheim, 70
Grand Chartreuse, 450
Grottaferrata, 79 note 60, 125
Hersfeld, 105
Hildesheim, 96
Hirschau, 202
Joigny, 365
La Cava, 242, 319

Monasteries (*continued*)
La Ferté, 365
Limoges, 80
Malmedy, 105
Moissac, 198
Molesmes, 204
Monte Cassino, 40, 105, 116, 143, 169, 172, 176, 239
Monte Gargano, 69 f.
Monte Soracte, 26, 143
Montmajeur, 276
Mount St. Michael, 80
Mouzon, 103, 332
Poitou, 80
Pontigny, 365
Pontoise, 195
Richenau, 105
St. Anastasius (Rome), 420
St. Bartholomew (Sicily), 269
St. Basil, 53
St. Bénigne, 111
St. Bernard, 43
St. Bertin, 198
St. Caesarius (Rome), 420
St. Denis, 452-54
St. Gall, 78
St. Gerald of Aurillac, 72
St. Germain of Auxerre, 198
St. Gregory (Rome), 399
St. Jean d'Angely, 198
St. Just (Lyons), 603
St. Lawrence of Aversa, 320
St. Marcellus, 433
St. Martial, 80, 198
St. Martin-des-Champs, 358
St. Mary on the Aventine, 127
St. Maur des Fossés, 119
St. Pantaleon (Cologne), 40
St. Paul (Rome), 151
St. Peter (Perugia), 40
St. Quentin, 308
St. Sigebert, 352
St. Sophia, 239
St. Vaast, 105
St. Valery, 40
St. Victor (Marseilles), 437
St. Victor (Paris), 437, 450, 495, 497 f.
Sts. Nabor and Felix, 448
Santa Maria del Priorato, 127
Sauxillages, 357
Subiaco, 40
Trois Fontaines, 365
Vézelay, 35, 40, 356
Westminster, 159
Monasteries, Reform of: Henry II, 105; St. Odilo, 105
Monastic habit at Cluny, 199 note 50
Monastic reform, 397: Henry II, 105; Nicholas Breakspear, 459; St. Odilo, 105; Suger, 453
Monastic schools, 303 f., 570, 645 f.
Monasticism, 626 f.
Adalbero disparages, 60
Benedict VII, 40
Civilization and, 97
Cluny Abbey, 86, 197 ff.
Emperor Henry II, 97, 105
Gregory VII, 197 ff.
Influence of, 247, 450
John XII, 19
Leo IX, 146 f.
Moral power of, 18
Music, 85 f.
Otto III, 70
Palestine, 154
Reform of the Church, 19
Reform measures, 201
St. Bernard on decline of, 355 f.
Schools, 303 f.
In Sicily, 269 f.
In twelfth century, 346
Urban II encourages, 303
Monologium by St. Anselm, 305 f.
Mont Cenis pass, Henry IV at, 219
Montauban, 533
Monte Cassino (abbey)
Benedict VII, 40
Desiderius abbot, 176, 239
Frederick of Lorraine abbot, 169
Henry II and, 105
Leo IX at, 143
St. Romuald at, 116
Stephen IX, 172
Victor III abbot, 239
Monte Gargano: Leo IX at, 143; Otto III at, 69 f.; St. Nilus at, 70
Monte Mario, Otto I, 16
Monte Soracte (monastery), Benedict V monk of, 26; Death of Otto III, 71
Montefeltro, Otto I at, 23
Montferrat, Boniface of (marquis): Fourth Crusade, 537, 539 f.; Prince Alexius and, 540
Montferrat, Conrad of. *See* Conrad

Montfort, Simon IV de (earl of Leicester), Albigensian crusade, 532-36
Monticelli, Eugene III flees to, 420
Montierneuf (abbey), Cluny Abbey and, 198
Montmajeur (monastery), Urban at, 276
Montpellier, Guy of (founder), 519
Montpellier, University of, 625, 630 note 20
Monza, Conrad crowned at, 251
Moors
  Alfonso VI of Castile at war with, 268
  Alfonso VII of Castile, 550
  Alfonso IX of Leon, 551
  In Andalusia, 550
  Castile threatened by, 550
  Defeated at Toledo, 266
  Ferdinand III, 587
  Innocent III, 550
  In Morocco, 550
  In Spain, 266-69
Morocco: Almoravides in, 267 f.; Moors in, 550
Morone, Peter (Celestine V), 625
Morra, Alberti di (Gregory VIII), 504
Moslems: Jerusalem seized by, 603; at Lucera, 582; not to have Christian slaves, 491
Mosque of Omar, 585
Mossul: and Eastern Christian states, 506; Emir of, 424; Sultan of, 425; Turks at, 342; Zenki emir of, 423
Mount of Olives, Crusaders' procession, 301
Mount St. Michael (abbey), Destruction of, 80
Mouzon (abbey): Callistus II at, 332; Peace of God, 103
Mouzon, Conference of, 103
Mozarabic liturgy, 197 note 44
Mülhausen, Battle of, 224
Muradal, Battle of, 551
Murrone. *See* Morone
Murtzuphlos. *See* Alexius V
Muset: Sardinia taken by, 158; taken prisoner, 158
Music
  Development of, 84
  Guido of Arezzo, 304
  Leo IX, 147 f.
  Liturgical, 82-85, 119, 497 ff.
  Monasticism, 85 f.
  Sylvester II and study of, 75 f.
Musical Notation, Guido of Arezzo and, 120
Musical studies, 84
Mysticism: Abbey of St. Victor, 498; Hugh of St. Victor, 438 ff.; St. Bernard, 445

Naples: Celestine V at, 625; Death of Innocent IV at, 610; University of, 630 note 20
Narbonne, Councils of: (990), 44; (1211), 533
Narratio de electione Lotharii, 394
Navarre, war on Moors, 266
Navas de Tolosa, Battle of, 551
Nemanya (Serbian ruler), 562
Neo-Manichaeism. *See* Manichaeism
Nesles, St. Ivo at, 308
Netherlands in the German Empire, 107 note 40
New Corbie (monastery). *See* Corvey
Nicaea: Alexius Comnenus at, 298; capital of Eastern Empire, 544; Crusaders take, 298; Greek emperors at, 616
Nicaea, Council of (787): on religious art, 651
Nicephorus II Phocas (emperor): Death of, 22; John Zemisses murders, 22; Otto I, 21
Nicephorus III Botaniates (emperor), 233
Nicephorus (chancellor), desecration of Eucharist, 156
Nicetas (heretic), Albigenses and, 527
Nicetas Pectoratus (monk), Pamphlet of, 155
Nicetas Stethatos. *See* Nicetas Pectoratus
Nichava (river), Crusaders at the, 290
Nicholas II (pope), 175-81
  Community life of clergy, 346 f.
  Council of Rome (1059), 177
  Death of, 180 f.
  Desiderius of Monte Cassino, 176, 239
  Election of, 175
  Henry III (emperor) opposes, 180
  Normans, Alliance with, 175
  Papal elections, 177, 210
Nicholas III (pope), 622
Nicholas IV (pope), 624
Nicholas Breakspear. *See* **Adrian IV**

Nilus, St. (hermit): driven from Calabria, 70; Grottaferrata Abbey founded by, 79 note 60; at Monte Gargano, 70; Philagathus and, 52
Nimes, Council of (1096), Urban II at, 285
Nivard, brother of St. Bernard, 363
Nominalism of Roscelin, 368
Norbert, St. (abbot), 351 f.
Bartholomew bishop of Laon, 352
Conversion of, 351
Gelasius II, 352
Premonstratensian Canons founded by, 346
At St. Sigebert Abbey, 352
Tanchelm's heresy, 373
Nordhausen, Council of (1105), Henry V at, 321
Noricum, 225
Normandy interdicted, 180
Normans
Alexius Comnenus at war with, 278
Apulia, 176
Amalfi in possession of, 226
Attitude to Byzantine Empire, 279
At Aversa, 135
Calabria, 176
Christian recovery of Sicily, 268
Conquest of Sicily, 268 f.
Fermo (march of) in possession of, 226
In First Crusade, 292, 295
Gregory VII asks help of, 226
Lower Italy invaded by, 162
At Melfi, 135
Nicholas II makes alliance with, 175
Oath of allegiance to Leo IX, 163
Rome sacked by, 229
Salerno in possession of, 226
In southern Italy, 135, 156
Tivoli assaulted by, 234
Urban II, 248
Victor II, 166
Norway, clerical celibacy, 196
Notker, Labeo, 78
Notker the Stammerer, 78: chant, 82
Noto, Saracens defeated at, 269
Notre Dame (church, Paris), 652: Episcopal school of, 630
Notre Dame of d'Etampes, church built, 80
Notre Dame de la Couldre (church), St. Bernard's mass in, 406
Notre Dame de Melun, church built, 80
Nour-ed-Din (sultan), 506
Novellae of Justinian, 310
Noyon, Coronation of Hugh Capet, 48
Nyssa, Crusaders slaughtered by people of, 290

Oath on relics of the saints, 102
Ochrida. *See* Achrida
Ocri (monastery), St. Peter Damian prior, 142
Octavian Maledetti (antipope), 471: excommunicated by Council of Tours, 475
Odilo, St. (abbot of Cluny), 79, 86: Adalbero disparages, 60; Casimir I, 123; Henry II friend of, 105; monastic reforms, 105
Odo, St. (abbot of Cluny), 72, 86: abbot of St. Gerald of Aurillac, 72; adviser of Leo VII, 19
Odo of Ostia (Urban II), 241 f.: Gregory VII and, 199 f., 238
Odo de Sully (bishop of Paris), 497
Odo the Younger, 119
Offa (king of Mercia), 553
Offertory of the mass, 649
Office of Blessed Virgin, 284 note 123: Urban II and, 284
Olaf III (king of Norway), Gregory VII and, 230
Oloron, Amatus bishop of, 208
Omar, Mosque of, 585
Ommiads (dynasty), 266, 424
Oppizo (copyist), 355
Opus majus by Roger Bacon, 644 f.
Opus tertium by Roger Bacon, 644 f.
Oratory, Sacred, 646-48
Ordeals, Paschal II condemns, 381
Order of Preachers. *See* Dominicans
Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* by, 255 f.
Orders, matrimonial impediment, 384 note 179
Orders, Military, 343-46: Origin of, 343
Oriental languages, Roger Bacon's knowledge of, 644
Orleans, Council of (1022): Manichaeans condemned, 108; University of, 630 note 20
Orsini (family), Gregory IX aided by, 592

Orsini, Hyacinth (Celestine III), 510
Orsini, John Gaetano (Nicholas III), 622
Orvieto: Cathedral of, 652; Papal States, 68
Osma, Diego de Acebes bishop of, 528
Otranto, Knights of St. John at, 344
Otto, Dynasty of, 78
Otto I the Great (emperor)
  Abd-er-Rahman II (caliph), 22
  Arabs, 22
  Benedict V, 26 f.
  Berengarius II and, 12, 23
  Character of, 11
  Coronation of, 13
  Danes at war with, 12
  Death of, 31
  Feudalism, 12
  Greatness of, 31
  Hungarians at war with, 12
  Imperator Augustus, 12, 20
  Intellectual movement, 31 f.
  John XII, 23 f.: crowns, 13; deposed, 24
  John XIII, 19, 29: Election of, 28
  King of Germany, 11
  King of Italy, 12
  Liutprand, 21, 32
  Lorraine occupied by, 21
  At Merseburg, 12
  Monasticism, 19, 32
  Monte Mario, 16
  At Montefeltro, 23
  Nicephorus II, 21
  Otto II the Red, son of, 33
  Papacy, 23, 25
  Papal elections, 23, 25, 28
  Patrimony of St. Peter, 14
  Policy of, 20
  Privilegium Ottonis, 14
  Pseudo-council of Rome (963), 23 f.
  Reform of the Church, 29 f.
  Rex Francorum, 20
  Roman rebellion suppressed, 29
  St. Adelaide wife of, 12, 33
  St. Bruno brother of, 12, 32 f.
  St. Matilda mother of, 12
  Slavs at war with, 12
  States of the Church, 14, 22
  Sylvester II, 32
  Theophano, 21
  Vita Ottonis, 32
Otto II the Red (emperor), 33-36
  Character of, 33 f.
  Danes rebel against, 34
  Death of, 41 f.
  Defeated at Taranto, 41
  Gerbert engaged by, 57
  Henry the Quarrelsome, 34
  John XIII crowns, 29
  John XIV, 41
  John Crescentius, 34
  At Pavia, 37
  Reconciliation with St. Adelaide, 37
  At Rome, 37, 41
  St. Adelaide mother of, 33 f.
  Saracens oppose, 37
  Scandalous life of, 37
  Slavs rebel against, 34
  Theophano, 21
  Treasury of, 41
  At Verona, 41
Otto III (emperor), 49-51
  At Aachen, 50
  Ambition of, 49 f., 58
  Attitude to the papacy, 65
  Besieged in Rome, 69
  Council of Rome (996), 54
  Death of, 71
  Gerbert teacher of, 49, 57
  At Gnesen, 66
  Henry of Bavaria seizes, 42
  Holy Roman Empire, 64: Ideas of Otto III, 58
  Leaves Rome, 69
  Monasticism, 70
  At Monte Gargano, 69 f.
  At Ravenna, 50
  Rome revolts against, 69
  St. Adalbert, 66
  St. Nilus, 70
  St. Romuald, 70
  Slavs at war with, 51
  States of the Church, 65
  Sylvester II, 58, 64, 69
  Theophano, 49
  Tivoli revolts against, 69
Otto IV (emperor): battle of Bouvines, 549; crowned by Innocent III, 522; excommunicated, 548; Innocent III favors, 522; John of England, 548
Otto of Bavaria (count), 463
Otto of Freising: on Frederick Barbarossa, 456; on St. Bernard, 426
Otto of Porto (cardinal), 603

Otto von Wittelsbach, Philip of Swabia assassinated by, 522
Ottobuono Fieschi (Adrian V), 622
Our Lady of Mercy, Order of, 594
Oxford University, 630, 642-45: Attendance at, 643; Origin of, 643
Ownership, Private, 640

Pactum pacis, 101
Paderborn, Meinwerk bishop of, 105
Padua University, 630 note 20
Paleologus, Michael (emperor), 615
Palermo: Saracens defeated at, 269; Sicilian Vespers, 623
Palestine
  Charlemagne in, 11 note 10
  Christian states in, 339-43
  Frederick II in, 584
  Holy Sepulcher destroyed, 91
  Latin monasteries, 154
  Moslems' final triumph, 624
  Pilgrimages, 93, 154
  Pilgrims in, 345
  Protectorate of, 279 f.
  Under sway of caliphate of Cairo, 277
Pallium, 384, 452
Pandects: Frederick Barbarossa, 467; Study of the, 636
Pannonia, First Crusade crosses, 288
Panormia: by Ivo of Chartres, 310; on punishment of heretics, 493
Pantaleon, Jacques (Urban IV), 613
Pantheism, Amalric of Bena, 571
Paolo Scolari (Clement III), 505
Papacy
  Ancona, 580
  Attitude of Byzantine Empire, 279
  Cluny devoted to, 19
  Conrad II, 113
  The Empire, 547-49
  Frederick II, 578
  Henry IV of Germany, 210 f.
  Imperial elections, 522
  International peace, 637 f.
  Otto I, 23, 25
  Otto III's attitude to, 65
  Power of, in twelfth century, 383 f.
  Spoleto, 580
  Vacancy in, 617, 625
Papal elections. *See* Popes, Election of
Papal legates in twelfth century, 383
Papal States
  Benevento, 162
  Camerino, 166
  Cesena, 68
  Donation of Matilda, 404 note 21
  Duchy of Spoleto, 166
  Emperor Henry III, 166
  Emperor Henry VI invades, 504
  Extent of, 68
  Innocent III tours the, 519
  John XII, 14
  Manichaeism in, 523
  March of Ancona, 68
  Orvieto, 68
  Otto I, 14
  Romania, 68
  Sylvester II, 68
  Terracina, 68
  Treaty of Worms, 161
  Victor II, 166
Parens scientiarum, bull of Gregory IX, 597
Parental consent, Impediment of lack of, 639
Paris: Elementary schools at, 646; interdicted, 397; Notre Dame Cathedral, 652
Paris, Councils of: (1051), Berengarius condemned by, 151; (1074), Reform measures opposed by, 194 f.; (1210), teaching of Aristotle, 595
Paris, University of, 629 f.
  Alexander IV intervenes, 631
  Four faculties, 630
  Four "nations," 630
  Gregory IX, 596
  Influence of, 597
  Language studies, 624
  Mendicant orders, 631
  Origin of, 630
  Rector of, 630
Parishes: Government of, 381; lay investiture, 381; Property of, 381
Parma, Frederick II defeated at, 609
Parthenay (castle), St. Bernard at, 406
Paschal II (pope), 316 f.
  At Benevento, 330
  At Châlons-sur-Marne, 324
  Character of, 323 f.
  Council of Guastalla, 324
  Death of, 330
  First general indulgence, 380
  Fontevrault monastery approved, 314

Paschal II (pope) (*continued*)
Henry V crowned by, 328
Imprisoned by Henry V, 327
Lateran Council (1102), 319
Lay investiture, 324-26, 328
Louis the Fat confers with, 324
Ordeals condemned, 381
Order of St. John approved, 344
Peace with Henry V, 328
Philip I's divorce, 260
Privilegium, 328 f.
Regalian rights, 326
At St. Denis, 324
Paschal III (antipope), 476, 487: Charlemagne canonized, 477; Frederick Barbarossa crowned by, 478; submits to Alexander III, 480; Treaty of Venice, 480
Passagini condemned, 501
Passau, See of, 193, 218, 245
Patari (heretics), 492
Condemned, 501
Eberhard of Nellemburg denounces, 212
In Milan, 223
In the Papal States, 524
Origin of, 172
Paterno, Otto III dies at, 71
Patrician, Office of, 419, 421
Patrimony of St. Peter. *See* Papal States
Patronage, Right of, 205 f.: in France, 335 f.
Pavia, Theophano at, 48
Pavia, Councils of: (997), Gregory V, 51; (1018), Reform of the Church, 104; (1046), Henry III (emperor) at, 131; (1049), Leo IX, 145; (1096), Urban II at, 285; (1128), 395
Pavia, Pseudo-council of (1160), 472 f.
Pavia University, 630 note 20
Peace, Benedict VIII and world, 101
Peace assemblies, Robert the Pious, 102, 107
Peace (International), Papacy and, 637 f.
Peace Leagues, 101
Peace movement: conference of Ivois, 109; Council of Verdun (1016), 102; Warin (bishop of Beauvais), 103
Peace of God: Popular approval of, 103; Truce of God and, 101 note 26
Peace of Venice ratified at Lateran Council, 490
Pectoratus, Nicetas. *See* Nicetas
Pelagius (cardinal), Innocent III and, 544
Penance, Public, 528, 531
Penine Alps, St. Bernard monastery, 45
Perigueux, St. Bernard at, 527
Perpignan, Fredelo bishop, 45
Perugia: Gregory IX at, 590; Innocent III dies at, 576; Papal election at, 625
Pestilence: of 1094, 254; in army of St. Louis, 617; in imperial army, 478
Petchenegs: Alexius Comnenus at war with, 278; Crusaders attacked by, 290, 297; in Thrace, 278
Peter (bishop of Florence): Gregory VII deposes, 202; John Gualbert and, 202
Peter (bishop of Le Puy), Leo IX sustains, 161
Peter (bishop of Pavia) becomes John XIV, 40
Peter (bishop of Pisa): deposed by Innocent II, 411; St. Bernard and deposition of, 412 note 38
Peter (bishop of Vercelli), imprisoned, 92
Peter (bishop of Viviers), Truce of God, 45
Peter II (king of Aragon): Innocent III, 552; Navas de Tolosa (battle), 551; Raymond VI of Toulouse, 534
Peter III (king of Aragon), excommunicated by Martin IV, 623
Peter III (patriarch of Antioch), Leo IX and, 154
Peter (prefect of Rome), Exile of, 29
Peter Abelard. *See* Abelard
Peter Bartholomew, Finding of holy lance by, 299
Peter de Blois (archdeacon), on freedom of the Church, 4
Peter of Bruys: Death of, 374; Errors of, 373 note 151; Henry of Lausanne disciple of, 434; Heresy of, 373; Peter the Venerable and, 374 f.
Peter of Capua (papal legate), 539, 558
Peter the Chanter (theologian), Fourth Crusade, 538
Peter Comestor, Fourth Crusade, 538
Peter of Corbeil (theologian), 538: bishop of Sens, 596

Peter Damian, St., 125 f.
Alexander II's counselor, 182
Benedict X (antipope) opposed by, 174
Bishop of Ostia, 169
Cardinal, 169
On Cluny Abbey, 199
Enters Camaldolese Order, 126
Hildebrand compared with, 169 f.
Letter to the cardinals, 170
Letter to Gregory VI, 125
Liber Gomorrhianus by, 142 and note
Life of St. Romuald by, 116
At Milan as legate, 179
Papal legate, 210
Patari encouraged by, 223
Prior of Ocri monastery, 142
Ravenna birthplace of, 125
Reform measures, 167
Peter the Deacon on Council of Benevento (1087), 240
Peter the Hermit, 285 f.
Birthplace of, 285
At Constantinople, 291
At Council of Clermont, 285
Failure of Crusade, 292 note 141
First Crusade preached by, 285 f.
Influence of, 288 f.
At Jerusalem, 301
Origin of the Crusades, 274
In Palestine, 285
Peter Juliani (John XXI), 622
Peter de la Vigne: at Council of Lyons, 603; Death of, 609
Peter Lombard, 441-43
Bishop of Paris, 442
Liber sententiarum by, 442
Richard of St. Vistor, 495
St. Bernard aids, 441 f.
Sentences by, 495, 631
Peter Maurice of Montboissier. *See* Peter the Venerable
Peter, Patrimony of St. *See* Papal States
Peter of Poitiers on Peter the Venerable, 357
Peter of Tarentaise (Innocent V), 621: at Council of Lyons (1274), 619 f.
Peter the Venerable
At Cluny, 346
Elected abbot of Cluny, 356 f.
Innocent II, 406
Peter of Bruys, 374 f.
Peter of Poitiers on, 357
St. Bernard, 366
Peter Waldes, Waldenses and, 526
Peter's Pence, Origin of, 553
Petra, See of, 340
Petrobrusians (heretics), 374
Petronius (consul), schooling of John XVII, 90
Petrus Cantor. *See* Peter the Chanter
Phasianus (John XVIII), 90
Phenicia, Zemisses conquers, 39
Philagathus (antipope John XVI), 52
Philip I (king of France)
Alexander II, 184
Bertha wife of, 256
Coronation of, 178
Excommunicated, 258
Hugh of Flavigny on, 256
Ivo of Chartres arrested, 257
Lay investiture, 194, 208
Manasses I of Reims, 209
Marries Bertrade de Montfort, 256
Oath of, 179
Reform measures opposed by, 255
St. Hugh, 201
Simony, 194
Simony favored by, 255
Philip I (king of France), Divorce of
Councils: Autun (1094), 258; Clermont, 260; Tours, 260
Ivo of Chartres denounces, 256
Paschal II, 260
Pseudo-council of Reims, 258
Raynald of Reims, 257
Urban II, 257
Philip II Augustus (king of France)
Albigenses, 530
At Council of Soissons, 558
Character of, 509
Conspires with John of England, 509
Dismisses Agnes de Meran, 558
Divorce of, 513, 557 f.: Celestine denounces the, 513; Innocent III and, 556 f.
Ingeburg wife of, 513
Innocent III, 556 f.
Isabella of Hainault wife of, 513
Marries Agnes de Meran, 514
Peace with Henry II of England, 507
Peace with Innocent III, 559
On Third Crusade, 508 f.
Philip of Swabia, 408: Assassination of,

Philip of Swabia (*continued*) 522; Fourth Crusade, 537; marries Irene, 511
Philip Berruyer, Preaching of, 647
Philippopolis, Crusaders in, 289
Philosophy: Aristotle, 595; in Middle Ages, 302 note 158; Roscelin's, 367 f.; William of Champeaux, 368 f.
Phocas (emperor). *See* Nicephorus II
Photius (patriarch of Constantinople), *Filioque,* 153
Piacenza: Innocent II at, 403; Henry III and Gregory VI at, 131; League against Henry IV, 252
Piacenza, Council of (1095): Attendance at, 275; Crusade project, 274 f.; Guibert (antipope) condemned, 275; Heresy of Berengarius condemned, 275; reform measures, 275
Pierleoni (cardinal, antipope Anacletus II), 400
Pierleoni (family): papal elections, 399; Policy of, 392
Pierre de Castelnau (legate), Assassination of, 528 f.
Pierre de la Châtre (archbishop of Bourges), Louis VII of France and, 418
Pietro Bernardone, father of St. Francis, 565
Pilgrimages to the Holy Land, 93
Pilgrims in Palestine, 345
Piphles (heretics), 492
Pisa: Cemetery at, 564; Innocent II at, 407 f.; Knights of St. John at, 344; peace with Genoa, 507; Power of, 414
Pisa, Council of (1135), 408 f.
Pistoia, John Gualbert of, 201
Plague (1094), 254
Plantagenet, Henry. *See* Henry II (king of England)
Plato, universal ideas, 366 note 126
Poetry, Epic, 85
Poetry, Liturgical, 498
Poissy, church built, 80
Poitiers, Confraternity at, 377
Poitiers, Councils of: (1000), Private war condemned by, 101; (1078), lay investiture, 208
Poitou, Charroux Abbey, 80
Poland, Church in, 65 f., 123: Gregory VII and, 230
Pomposa, Guido of Arezzo dies at, 120
Ponce (archbishop of Aix), reform measures, 167
Pons de Melgueil (abbot), 355: Death of, 359; excommunicated, 359; returns to Cluny, 358
Pontigny (monastery), Founding of 365
Pontoise Abbey, 195
Poor Clares, Founding of, 567
Poor Men of Lyons. *See* Waldenses
Popes: change of name, 40 note 86, 238 note 5; policy toward heretics, 494; St. Malachy's prophecies, 452 note 158
Popes, Election of, 23, 25
  Charles II of Naples, 625
  Conclave, 601 note 41, 620 note 11, 622 note 14
  Council of Lyons (1274), 620 note 11, 622 note 14
  Council of Rome (1059) 177
  Crescentius family, 90
  Frederick II, 601
  Henry III (emperor), 133, 164
  Hildebrand, 164, 175
  Lateran Council (1179), 490
  Nicholas II, 177, 210
  Origin of the conclave, 601 note 41
  Otto I, 14, 28
  Privilegium Ottonis, 14 and note
  Victor III, 241
Popes, List of
  Leo VII (936-39), 19
  Stephen VIII (939-42), 19
  John XII (956-64), 10-26
  Benedict V (964), 26
  John XIII (965-72), 28-31
  Benedict VI (972-73), 31-33
  Benedict VII (974-83), 36-40
  John XIV (983-85), 40-43
  John XV (985-96), 43 f.
  Gregory V (996-99), 51-55
  Sylvester II (999-1003), 32, 56-88
  John XVII (1003), 90
  John XVIII (1003-9), 90
  Sergius (1009-12), 91
  Benedict VIII (1012-24), 99
  John XIX (1024-33), 109-12
  Benedict IX (1033-45), 121

Popes, List of (*continued*)
Gregory VI (1045-46), 124-27
Clement II (1046-47), 133
Damasus (1048), 134
Leo IX (1049-53), 140 ff.
Victor II (1055-57), 164-68
Stephen IX (1057-58), 168-73
Nicholas II (1058-61), 175-81
Alexander II (1061-73), 181-85
Gregory VII (1073-85), 186-236
Victor III (1086-87), 237-42
Urban II (1088-99), 243-315
Paschal II (1099-1118), 316-30
Gelasius II (1118-19), 331
Callistus II (1119-24), 331-85
Honorius II (1124-30), 392-400
Innocent II (1130-43), 400-17
Celestine II (1143-44), 417 f.
Lucius II (1144-45), 418-20
Eugene III (1145-53), 420-55
Anastasius IV (1153-54), 458
Adrian IV (1154-59), 459-60
Alexander III (1159-81), 469-99
Lucius III (1181-85), 499-502
Urban III (1185-87), 503 f.
Gregory VIII (1187), 504
Clement III (1187-91), 505-10
Celestine III (1191-98), 510-15
Innocent III (1198-1216), 516-77
Honorius III (1216-27), 579-82
Gregory IX (1227-41) 583-600
Celestine IV (1241), 601 note 39
Innocent IV (1243-54), 600-10
Alexander IV (1254-61), 612
Urban IV (1261-64), 613
Clement IV (1265-68), 614-18
Gregory X (1271-76), 618-21
Innocent V (1276), 621
Adrian V (1276), 622
John XXI (1276-77), 622
Nicholas III (1277-80), 622
Martin IV (1281-85), 623
Honorius IV (1285-87), 624
Nicholas IV (1288-92), 624
Celestine V (1294), 625
Poplicani (heretics), 492
Poppo (abbot), Henry II and, 105
Poppo (bishop of Brixen) becomes Damasus II, 134
Porphyry: *Izagoge* by, 366; Sylvester II and philosophy of, 73
Portugal, Celestine III interdicts, 514
Poverty, Franciscans, 599 f.
Praefectus navalis, Gregory of Tusculum, 89
Praeneste, Theophylactus family, 69
Prague: Crusaders massacre Jews in, 288; Dithmar archbishop of, 42; University of, 630 note 20
Praxedes (German empress): at Council of Constance, 252; at Council of Piacenza, 275; imprisoned, 251 f.; seeks refuge with Matilda, 252; wife of Emperor Henry IV, 251 f.
Preachers, Order of. *See* Dominicans
Preaching, 646-48: in the vernacular, 375
Preface of the Blessed Virgin, 276 note 104
Prefect of Rome, Office of, 422, 518
Premonstratensians, 346, 450: Founding of, 352 f.; Rule of, 353
Preneste. *See* Praeneste
Presburg, Andrew of Hungary besieged in, 160
Prevost, Office of, 382
Priests, Rural (England), clerical celibacy, 196
Primary schools, 646
Private property, Rights of, 640
Privilegium, Paschal and the, 328 f.
Privilegium fori, 485. *See also* Immunity
Privilegium Ottonis, 14 and note
Procedure, Legal, 640 f.
Procida (John of), Sicilian Vespers, 623
Prologium by St. Anselm, 306
Property, Private, 640
Proses (in mass chant), 83
Protestantism, St. Anselm and, 307 note 175
Protoscriniarius, Leo, 23
Provence: Manichaeism in, 524; Troubadours in, 524; Waldenses in, 527
Prussia, St. Adalbert apostle of, 44
Psellus, Michael Caerularius and, 154
Pseudo-councils, List of
Brixen (1080), 225
Mainz (1076), 217
Pavia (1160), 472 f.
Reims (1094), 258
Rome (963), 23 f.; (1084), 228; (1089), 244
St. Basil (991), 53 f., 58
Worms (1076), 213
Ptolemais. *See* Acre
Pulpit in churches, 464
Puy-en-Velay. *See* Le Puy

Quadrivium, 304, 646
Quedlinburg (abbey), St. Matilda at, 42
Quinque compilationes, 593
Quo elongati, bull of Gregory IX, 600
Quomodo de arithmetica procedit musica by Guido of Arezzo, 120 note 67

Rabanus Maurus, 72: Writings of, 303
Raimbaud (archbishop of Arles), reform measures, 167
Rainaldi of Dassel (archbishop of Cologne), 462-64, 478: becomes archbishop of Cologne, 468; canonization of Charlemagne, 477; Death of, 478; excommunicated by Council of Tours, 475
Rainier (Paschal II), 316
Rainulf (duke of Apulia), 412
Ramiro (king of Aragon), vassal of Holy See, 637
Ramleh, Battle of, 342
Rannulf Flambard (bishop of Durham): adviser of William Rufus, 261; imprisoned, 336
Raoul. *See* Rannulf
Raspe, Henry (emperor), 605
Ratier (bishop of Verona), Writings of, 32
Ratisbon: Diet of (1055), 165; Henry V at, 321; The plague at, 254; St. Wolfgang bishop of, 96
Ratramnus, Writings of, 303
Ravenna: Council (974) condemns simony, 36; John XIII and, 29; St. Peter Damian born in, 125; St. Romuald born in, 116
Raymond (bishop of Toulouse), Truce of God, 45
Raymond (prince of Antioch) and Manuel Comnenus, 424
Raymond of Penafort, St., 594: confessor of James of Aragon, 598; Dominican Rule, 599
Raymond of St. Gilles. *See* Raymond IV of Toulouse
Raymond IV of Toulouse: at Constantinople, 297; crusader, 292, 295 f.; Rivalry between Bohemund and, 300; at siege of Jerusalem, 301
Raymond V of Toulouse, Alexander III and, 527
Raymond VI of Toulouse
  Excommunicated, 529 f.
  Innocent III and, 529, 533 f.; and possessions of, 536
  Manichaeism favored by, 524 f.
  Peter II of Aragon, 534
  Public penance of, 531
  Seeks protection of Innocent III, 535
  Simon de Montfort, 533 f.
Raymond Roger: Albigenses, 531; imprisoned, 532
Raynald (archbishop of Reims), Philip I's divorce, 257
Real presence: Berengarius' doctrine, 150; Council of Rome (1059), 179
Reform of the Church. *See* Church, Reform of the
Regalian rights, 325: in France, 335; Frederick Barbarossa, 467; Henry V, 324, 326; Paschal II on, 326
Reggio, 135, 219
Regula de abaco computi by Sylvester II, 74
Regulae rythmicae by Guido of Arezzo, 120 note 67
Reichenau Abbey, Cluny and, 105
Reims
  Adalbero archbishop, 38
  Arnulf archbishop, 53 f.
  Cathedral of, 652
  Episcopal school at, 56 f.
  Gerbert archbishop, 53
  Manasses de Gournay archbishop, 204, 208
  Philip I crowned at, 178
  Raynald archbishop, 257
Reims, Councils of
  (924), 253 note 41
  (974), Theobald (bishop of Amiens) deposed, 38
  (1049), 145
  (1119), 332 f.
  (1131), 408
  (1148): Gilbert de la Porrée condemned, 436; heresies condemned, 374; Manichaeans, 494
Reims (Pseudo-council, 1094), Philip's divorce, 258
Religious orders in thirteenth century, 626-29
Remigius of Auxerre, 72
Remiremont, Hugh Candidus born at, 213
Renaud de Châtillon, 506
Res gestae saxonicae by Widukind, 32

Restauratio imperii romani, 64
Rex Francorum, Otto I, 20
Rex pacificus, bull of Gregory IX, 594
Rhodes, Knights of, 345
Richard I (king of England)
  Celestine III intercedes for, 512
  Character of, 508 f.
  Cyprus taken by, 509
  Imprisoned, 511
  The Lionhearted, 509
  Papacy and, 553
  Returns to England, 509
  Third Crusade, 508 f.
  At Worms, 511
Richard (duke of Normandy): John XV and, 44; Manichaean heresy, 107 f.; peace treaty, 44
Richard of Cornwall, German Empire, 613
Richard the Lionhearted. *See* Richard I (king of England)
Richard of St. Victor (theologian), 495-97: *De Trinitate* by, 496
Richer (monk), *Historiae* by, 79
Rieti, Gregory flees to, 590
Rimini, 23
Rinaldo Conti (Alexander IV), 612
Ring in episcopal investiture, 17 note 21, 104
Robert II the Pious (king of France)
  Adalbero, 60
  Arnulf, 54
  Benedict VIII, 101
  Building of churches, 80
  Charity of, 108
  Composer of music, 83
  Conference of Ivois, 108
  Conference of Mouzon, 103
  Gift of miracles, 108
  Henry II (emperor), 108
  Hugh Capet father of, 54
  Lepers, 108
  Marriage to Bertha, 54
  Peace assemblies, 102, 107
  Peace movement, 103
  Reform of the Church, 107
  Sylvester II, 83
Robert (duke of Normandy): invades England, 337; St. Hugh, 200
Robert (bishop of Troina), papal legate, 270
Robert le Bougre (inquisitor), 598 note 32
Robert de Courçon (legate), 596
Robert of Arbrissel (Blessed): founder, 314; ordered to preach by Urban II, 314; preacher of First Crusade, 286; professor at Angers, 314
Robert of Lincoln at Oxford, 644
Robert of Melun (theologian), 441
Robert of Molesmes, St.: Citeaux Abbey founded by, 314; St. Bruno and, 204
Robert the Strong, 47, 58
Robert Curthose: crusader, 294; at siege of Jerusalem, 301
Robert Grosseteste at Oxford, 644
Robert Guiscard. *See* Guiscard
Robert Pulleyn (theologian), 441
Rockingham (Assembly of), St. Anselm at, 264
Rodfred (count), John Crescentius murders, 29
Rodrigo Diaz, Heroism of, 268
Roger I count of Sicily (brother of Robert Guiscard), 412 note 39
  Alexander II encourages, 184
  Cerami (battle), 269
  Churches of Sicily, 269
  Conquest of Sicily, 268
  Privileges granted to, 270
  Saracens at war with, 184
  Urban II, 248, 269 f.
Roger II count of Sicily (son of Roger I), 412 and note
  Antipope Anacletus, 409
  In Apulia, 412
  Becomes king, 413
  Celestine II, 417 f.
  Defeat of, 403
  Excommunicated, 398, 408
  Honorius II, 398
  Innocent II seized by, 413
  Lucius II meets, 418
  Papal States invaded by, 419
  St. Bernard, 413
Roger (son of Guiscard): election of Victor III, 239; Urban II, 248
Roger (bishop of York), 486
Roger II Trencavel (viscount of Béziers), 526
Roger (Raymond), Albigenses and, 531
Roger Bacon at Oxford, 643
Roland Bandinelli, 463: Adrian IV and, 469
Roland of Parma at Council of Rome (1076), 215

Roman Church, union with Greek Church, 91
Roman law. *See* Law
Romance languages, 81
Romance literature, Origin of, 84 f.
Romanesque architecture, Origin of, 79 ff., 652
Romania, Papal States, 68
Romans (France), Urban II at, 276
Romanus (John XIX), 109
Romanus (brother of Benedict VIII), Consul of the Romans, 101
Romanus (cardinal) at Council of Toulouse, 597
Romanus (Galician prince), 563
Romanus (Senator of the Romans), 109
Romanus II Lecapenus (emperor): Papacy and, 11; Theophano daughter of, 21
Romanus of Porto (cardinal), Death of, 601
Romanus Diogenes (emperor), Turks at war with, 232
Rome
  Alexander III's entry into, 477
  Arnold of Brescia at, 423
  Clement III born at, 505
  Factions in, 10, 124
  Frederick Barbarossa at, 461, 477
  Godfrey of Bouillon at siege of, 293
  Honorius IV born at, 624
  Interdicted by Adrian IV, 460
  Normans sack, 229
  Prefect of, 518
  Republican movement in, 415, 417, 419
  Revolts against Otto III, 69
  Revolutionary activities in, 421
  St. Anastasius monastery, 420
  Senate, 461
Rome, Councils of
  (964), 25 f.: John XII, 26; Leo VIII (antipope), 26
  (*ca.* 974), Boniface Franco condemned, 36
  (981), Simony condemned, 36
  (996), restores Arnulf archbishop of Reims, 54
  (998), 87 note 86: Erchembald suspended, 55; marriage of Robert the Pious, 55; Stephen (bishop of Le Puy) condemned, 59
  (1046), Benedict IX deposed, 133
  (1047), 134
  (1049), 143 f.: Eberhard at, 143; Halinard at, 144; reform of the Church, 144; simony condemned, 144
  (1050), 346: Berengarius excommunicated, 150
  (1057): Capua interdicted, 173; reform measures, 167
  (1059), papal elections, 177
  (1074), simony denounced, 190
  (1075), lay investiture prohibited, 207
  (1076): Agnes (empress) at, 215; Henry IV of Germany excommunicated, 215
  (1077), Cluny, 199
  (1078), Henry IV of Germany and, 224 f.
  (1079), Henry IV of Germany, 225
  (1096), Urban II at, 285
  (1099), Antipope Clement III, 318
  (1102), 377
Rome, Pseudo-councils of: (963), 23 f.; (1084), Gregory VII deposed by, 228; (1089), Urban II excommunicated, 244
Romuald, St.
  At Camaldoli, 116
  Death of, 116
  Marino (hermit) and, 116
  At Monte Cassino, 116
  At Ravenna, 70
  Camaldolese Order founded by, 116
  Ravenna birthplace of, 116
Roncaglia, Diet of, 466 f.
Roncaglia (plain), Innocent II and Lothair meet, 403
Roscelin (philosopher), 348: condemned, 368; Philosophy of, 367
Rouen (Council of, 1074), simony denounced, 196
Rudolf III (king of Burgundy): Benedict VIII and, 101; Conrad II and, 113; Gisela daughter of, 112
Rudolf (duke of Swabia)
  Assembly of Tribur, 218
  Battle of Mülhausen, 224
  Death of, 224
  Elected king of Germany, 223
  Gregory VII, 193
  Henry IV of Germany, 222: at war with, 224
Rudolf of Habsburg (emperor), 619: peace with Charles of Anjou, 622
Rule, Franciscan. *See* Franciscan Rule

Rumanians, Byzantine Empire and, 278 f.
Russia, Gregory VII and, 230
Russians, Basil II (emperor) defeats, 110

Sabellianism of Abelard, 370 f.
Sabina: Conrad of Suburra bishop, 458; Farfa Abbey in, 421; Godfrey of Milan bishop, 601 note 39; John of Abbeville bishop, 124, 587
St. Adrian (church, Rome), election of Innocent II, 399 f.
St. Agatha (hermitage), Victor III monk at, 239
St. Aignan of Orleans, church built, 80
St. Ambrose (church, Pisa), 409
St. Amour, William of, 631
St. Anastasius (abbey, Rome), 420
St. Bartholomew (abbey, Sicily), 269
St. Basil (monastery), 53
St. Basil, Pseudo-council (991), 54: deposes Arnulf, 53; Sylvester II and, 58, 62 f.
St. Benedict-on-Loire, church built, 80
St. Bernard (monasteries in the Alps), 45
St. Bertin (abbey), Cluny Abbey and, 198
St. Caesarius (monastery, Rome), election of Eugene III, 420
St. Cher (Hugh of), at Oxford, 644
St. Denis (abbey), 453: Suger abbot, 452-54
St. Denis (France), Paschal II at, 324
St. Felix de Caraman, Albigenses at, 527
St. Gall (abbey), 78
St. Gerald of Aurillac (abbey), Odo of Cluny abbot, 72
St. Germain of Auxerre (abbey), Cluny and, 198
St. Germain-des-Prés (Paris), church built, 80
St. Gilles: St. Clement IV born at, 614; Knights of St. John at, 344; Pierre de Castelnau assassinated at, 529; Raymond VI of Toulouse at, 531; Urban II at, 276
St. Gregory (monastery, Rome), Honorius II at, 399
St. James of Compostela, Order of, 586
St. James of the Sword, Knights of, 346
St. Jean d'Angely (abbey), Cluny and, 198
St. John of Acre (Palestine), 585: Edward I of England at, 618; Moslems take, 624; Siege of, 509
St. John of Jerusalem, Knights of: at Council of Lyons, 620; Origin of, 343 f.; Paschal II approves, 344
St. Just (abbey, Lyons), Innocent IV at, 603
St. Lawrence of Aversa (abbey), 320
St. Leufroi (church, Paris), 663
St. Lucy (church, Rome), election of Victor III, 238
St. Marcellus (monastery), Abelard dies at, 433
St. Martial (abbey): Cluny and, 198; Destruction of, 80
St. Martin of Tours (church), Destruction of, 80
St. Martin-des-Champs (monastery), 358
St. Mary on the Aventine (abbey), Hildebrand at, 127
St. Mary in Cosmedin (church, Rome), 510
St. Mary the Latin (church, Jerusalem), 92
St. Mary Major (church, Rome), Gregory VII attacked in, 212
St. Maur des Fossés (abbey), Guido of Arezzo at, 119
St. Nicholas (church, Angers), visits to, 380
St. Ouen (Rouen), church built, 80
St. Pantaleon of Cologne (abbey), Benedict VII, 40
St. Paul (abbey, Rome): Hildebrand at, 151; John XVIII, 91
St. Paul (basilica), John XIII's tomb, 31
St. Peter (basilica), 421: Burning of, 477; Henry II crowned in, 99; Henry IV seizes, 228; Restoration of, 129
St. Peter (abbey, Perugia), Benedict VII, 40
St. Peter in Chains (church), Gregory VII at, 187
St. Pierre de Melun, church built, 80
St. Pol de Leon, Gualo bishop, 329
St. Quentin (abbey), St. Ivo abbot of, 308

St. Remy (church, Reims), Leo IX and, 145
St. Riquier, church built, 80
St. Rufus, Canons Regular of, 459
St. Sigebert (abbey), 352
St. Sophia (abbey), Victor III monk at, 239
St. Sophia (church), 157
St. Stephen (church, Caen), William of Normandy, 180
St. Vaast (abbey), Poppo monk at, 105
St. Valéry (abbey), Benedict VII, 40
St. Victor (abbey, Marseilles), 437
St. Victor (abbey, Paris), 437, 450, 495, 497 f.
St. Victor (Canons Regular of), Founding of, 346, 349
St. Vincent (church, Capua), 173
Saints, List of
  Adelaide (empress, d. 999), 12
  Albert the Great (theologian, d. 1280), 632
  Anselm (archbishop of Canterbury, d. 1109), 261-66
  Benezet (founder), 514
  Bernard (abbot of Clairvaux, d. 1153), 361-66
  Bonaventure (Franciscan, d. 1274), 634 f.
  Bononius (abbot, d. 1026), 92
  Bruno (abbot, d. 1101), 203 f.
  Bruno (archbishop of Cologne, d. 965), 12, 32 f.
  Celestine V (pope, d. 1296), 625
  Clare of Assisi (founder, d. 1253), 567
  Cunigundis (empress, d. 1039), 96
  Dominic (founder, d. 1221), 528, 569
  Felix of Valois (founder, d. 1212), 572
  Ferdinand III (king of Castile, d. 1252), 586
  Francis of Assisi (founder, d. 1226), 564 ff.
  Henry II (emperor, d. 1024), 95-99
  Hildegard (virgin, d. 1179), 447 f.
  Ivo (bishop of Chartres, d. 1115), 308 f.
  John of Matha (founder, d. 1213), 572
  Ladislaus (king of Hungary, d. 1095), 230
  Leo IX (pope, d. 1054), 140 ff.
  Louis IX (king of France, d. 1270), 588 f.
  Malachy (bishop of Down, d. 1148), 451 f.
  Matilda (queen, d. 968), 12
  Odilo (abbot of Cluny, d. 1048), 86
  Odo (abbot of Cluny, d. 942), 19
  Peter Damian (cardinal, d. 1072), 125 f.
  Raymond of Penafort (canonist, d. 1275), 594
  Simeon of Trier (recluse, d. 1035), 123
  Stanislaus (bishop of Cracow, d. 1083), 230
  Thomas à Becket (archbishop of Canterbury, d. 1170), 482 ff.
  Thomas Aquinas (philosopher, d. 1274), 632-34
  Ulric (bishop of Augsburg, d. 973), 44
  William (abbot of St. Bénigne, d. 1142), 646
  William (abbot of Hirschau, d. 1091), 202
  Wolfgang (bishop of Ratisbon, d. 994), 96
Sts. Nabor and Felix (monastery), 448
Saladin (sultan), 506
  Alliance with Conrad of Montferrat, 509
  Death of, 509
  Designs of, 506
  Holy war proclaimed by, 506
  Jerusalem taken by, 504, 506 f.
  Mesopotamia and Syria subjected by, 506
  Third Crusade, 507
  Victory at Tiberias, 506
Salah-ed-Din. *See* Saladin
Salamanca University, 630 note 20
Salerno: Gregory VII dies at, 235; Normans' possession of, 226; Tribunal of, 271; University of, 630 note 20
Salisbury, Cathedral of, 652
Salisbury, John of. *See* John
Salve Regina, 653: Authorship of, 296 note 152
San Germano: Diet of, 520; Treaty of, 585, 591
San Lorenzo in Lucina (church, Rome), 601
Sancho (king of Portugal), 514: Papacy and, 552
Sancho VII (king of Navarre): excommunicated, 552; Novas de Tolosa (battle), 551

Sant' Angelo, Bridge of, 25
Sant' Angelo, Castle of
  Benedict VI imprisoned in, 35
  Besieged by Sicco, 35 f.
  Crescentius adds tower, 53
  Gregory VII holds, 228
  John XIII imprisoned in, 28
  John XIV imprisoned in, 42
  Seized by Crescentius, 52
Santa Croce in Gerusalemme (church, Rome), tomb of Benedict VII, 40
Santa Maria del Priorato (abbey, Rome), 127 note 88
Santen, St. Norbert born at, 351
Santiago de Compostela: Pilgrimage to church of, 407; Reform measures at council of, 167, 196
Santo Spirito Hospital (Rome), 519
Saracens. *See also* Moors, Moslems
  Alfonso of Castile at war with, 230
  Attack Italy, 100
  Emperor Basil II at war with, 39, 110
  Frederick II makes alliance with, 478
  Germany invaded by, 70
  Lateran Council (1215), 575
  Otto II opposed by, 37
  Roger of Sicily at war with, 184
  St. Francis and conversion of, 569
  St. Louis captured by, 608
  In Sicily, 268
  Victor III at war with, 241
  Zallaca (battle), 268
Sardinia: Barbarossa and right to, 468 f.; Frederick II invades, 591; Muset takes, 158
Sauxillages (abbey), 357
Savelli, Cencius (Honorius III), 579
Savelli, Giacomo (Honorius IV), 624
Saxo (cardinal), papal legate, 392
Saxony: Crusaders from, 287; revolts against Henry IV, 217; Victor II in, 166
Schism, Eastern, 152-58: Consummation of, 157; End of, 620; resumed, 623; Soloviev on, 153 note 36
Scholastic theology, Urban II, 302 f.
Scholasticism: defined, 302 f.; Forerunners of, 303; St. Anselm, 302; St. Anselm's method, 305
Schools, Elementary, 646: Monastic, 303 f., 570, 645 f.
Schools, Episcopal, 570, 630, 645 f.
Schools for the poor, 490
Schools, Secondary, 645 f.
Scivias by St. Hildegard, 448
Scolari, Paolo (Clement III), 505
Scotus, Duns, 635 note 32
Scotus Erigena, 72: Writings of, 303
Scrofula, King's touch and, 108
Secondary schools, 645 f.
Segni (family), 583
Selef (river), death of Barbarossa, 508
Seljuk (Turkish chieftain), 277
Seljuks, Bagdad, 424
Semicho (count): crusader, 287; Death of, 288; Massacre of soldiers of, 288
Semur (Burgundy), St. Hugh born at, 200
Senate, Roman, 419, 421 f., 461, 518: Barbarossa and, 469
Sentences: by Bandinelli, 470; by Peter Lombard, 495, 631
Sens: Alexander III at, 475; Cathedral of, 652; Thomas à Becket at, 487
Sens, Council of (1140), Abelard at, 432
Sepulcher, Holy. *See* Holy
Sequence (in mass chant), 83
Serbia, Church of, 562 f.: Innocent III and, 563
Serbs, Byzantine Empire and, 278
Sergius IV (pope), 90 f.: Epitaph of, 91
Servandus (bishop of Buzea), Gregory VII and, 231
Servatus Lupus, 72
Seville, Ferdinand takes, 587
Shirkuh (general), 506
Sic et Non by Abelard, 433, 441, 495
Sicco (John XVII), 90
Sicco (imperial envoy), Antipope Boniface VIII and, 35 f.
Sicilian Vespers, 623
Sicily
  Christian recovery of, 268
  Innocent III, 520
  Interdicted by Council of Pisa, 408
  Frederick II, 581
  Monasticism in, 269 f.
  Norman conquest of, 268 f.
  Normans in, 268
  Roger and Churches of, 269
  Roger and conquest of, 268 f.
  Saracens in, 268
Sieghart of Aquileia at Assembly of Tribur, 218

Siena: Alexander III born at, 470; Cathedral of, 652
Sigfrid (archbishop of Mainz), reform measures, 193
Sigfrid (count of Luxemburg), St. Cunigundis daughter of, 96
Silva Candida, Humbert bishop of, 170
Simeon (czar of Bulgaria), Byzantine Empire and, 278
Simeon of Trier, St. (recluse), Benedict IX canonizes, 123
Simon de Brie (Martin IV), 623
Simon IV de Montfort
  Albigensian crusade, 532-36
  Character of, 532
  Fourth Crusade, 538
  Innocent III, 535
  In Languedoc, 533
  Raymond VI of Toulouse, 533 f.
Simony, 17
  Adversus simoniacos, 170
  Benedict IX, 124
  Cluny, 19
  Conrad II, 113 f.
  Councils: Ravenna (974), 36; Reims (1049), 145 f.; Rome (981), 36; Rome (1049), 144; Rome (1059), 179; Rome (1074), 190; Rouen (1075), 196
  Election of Benedict IX, 121
  Extent of, 189 f.
  Gregory VII, 189-92
  Guido (archbishop of Milan), 179
  Henry III's discourse against, 131
  Hugh of Die attacks, 195
  Innocent III, 519
  John Gualbert attacks, 202
  Lay investiture and, 206
  Leo IX attacks, 144
  Manasses I of Reims convicted of, 208
  Philip I of France, 194: favors, 255
  St. Hugh attacks, 200 f.
  Victor II denounces, 168
  William Rufus favors, 261
Sinibaldo de' Fieschi (Innocent IV), 601
Slaves, Jews and Moslems not to have Christian, 491
Slavonia, Crusaders in, 296
Slavs
  Brandenburg pillaged by, 37
  Germany invaded by, 70
  Hamburg pillaged by, 37
  Havelburg pillaged by, 37
  Otto I at war with, 12
  Otto II at war with, 34
  Otto III at war with, 51
  Papacy and, 562 f.
Soissons: Execution of heretics at, 493; Ingelburg imprisoned at, 514
Soissons, Councils of: (1092), Roscelin condemned, 368; (1121), Abelard's book condemned, 371; (1201), Philip Augustus' divorce, 558
Soloviev (Vladimir), on Eastern Schism, 153 note 36
Sorbon (Robert de), Paris University, 631
Sorbonne, Origin of the, 631
Soriano, Death of Nicholas III at, 622
Sovana, Hildebrand born at, 127
Spain: Almoravides in, 267 f.; Gregory VII, 230; Innocent III, 550; legal reforms, 586 f.; Moors in, 266-69
Speyer. *See* Spires
Spires: Crusaders massacre Jews of, 288; Henry IV buried at, 323; St. Bernard preaches at, 426
"Spirituals," Franciscan, 600
Spoleto (duchy), 519: Barbarossa and right to, 468 f.; Papacy and, 580; Papal States, 166
Stabat Mater by Jacopone da Todi, 653
Stanislaus, St. (bishop of Cracow), Boleslaus II murders, 230
States of the Church: Otto I, 22; March of Ancona, 65; Roger of Sicily invades, 419
Statius, Study of, 57
Stavelot (abbey), Henry II and, 105
Steinfeld (abbey), 434
Stephen VII (pope), 19: St. Odo, 19
Stephen IX (pope), 168-73
  Arialdo, 173
  Death of, 173
  Election of, 168 f.
  Godfrey of Lorraine, brother of, 169
  Henry IV of Germany, 173
  Hildebrand legate of, 173
  Landulf, 173
  Lay investiture, 169 note 77
  Monte Cassino, 171
  Reform measures, 169
  St. Peter Damian, 169
Stephen IX (pope) or Stephen X, 168 note 75

Stephen, St. (king of Hungary), Sylvester II and, 66 f.
Stephen (bishop of Le Puy): Election of, 59; Gregory V condemns, 59
Stephen (papal legate), Council of Reims (974), 38
Stephen of Blois, crusader, 294
Stephen of Senlis: and Louis the Fat, 398; reform measures, 397
Stephen of Vendome, Children's Crusade, 545 note 53
Stephen Harding, St., at Citeaux, 360
Strasburg, 248
Stroma by Bandinelli, 470
Style, Gothic, 652 f.
Subiaco (abbey): Benedict VII, 40; John XII, 19 note 25
Suessa (Thaddeus of), at Council of Lyons, 603 f.
Suger (abbot of St. Denis), 452-54: counselor of Louis VII, 418; at court of Louis VI, 453; esteemed by Louis VII, 453
Suicide in Middle Ages, 252 note 40
Suidger (bishop of Bamberg), becomes Clement II, 133
Sultan of Damascus, 424
Summa sententiarum by Hugh of St. Victor, 441
Summa theologica by St. Thomas, 633 f.
Sutri: Concordat of, 326; Council of, 131; meeting of Adrian IV and Barbarossa, 460; Treaty of, 326
Swabians join the Crusade, 290
Sweden, clerical celibacy, 196
Sweyn (king of Denmark): Alexander II demands tribute from, 184; Gregory VII, 229
Sword, Knights of the, 346
Sylvester II (pope), 56-88
  Adalbero, 62
  Arnulf, 62 f.: reinstated by, 63
  Asterius, 66
  Astronomer, 74
  Aurillac birthplace of, 56
  Boethius, Writings of, 56
  Character of, 58 f., 76 f.
  Church in Hungary, 66
  Church in Poland, 65 f.
  Classical studies, 75
  Council of St. Basil, 62 f.
  Crown of Hungary, 66
  Crusades, 67, 272
  De numerorum divisione by, 74
  Death of, 71
  Epitaph of, 91
  Feudalism, 77
  Gnesen made archbishopric, 66
  Gran (archdiocese), 66
  Holy Roman Empire, 64
  Italian nobility, 68
  Leaves Rome, 69
  Libellus de rationali et ratione uti by, 73
  Liber abaci, by, 74
  Literary style, 76
  Martianus Cappella, Writings of, 56
  Mathematician, 74
  Medical science, 75
  Musical studies, 75 f.
  Otto I, 32
  Otto III, 58, 64, 69
  Papal States, 68
  Philosophical writings of, 73
  Porphyry's philosophy, 73
  Portrait of, 58
  Projects of, 59
  Pseudo-council of St. Basil, 58
  Reform of the Church, 76 f.
  Regula de abaco computi by, 74
  Revolt of Cesena, 68
  Robert the Pious, 83
  St. Stephen of Hungary, 66 f.
  Scholarship of, 72
  Scientific studies, 303
  Studies at Vich, 56
  Tomb of, 71
  Victorinus, Writings of, 56
Sylvester III (antipope), 124: election declared null, 132
Sylvester IV (antipope), 322: submission of, 328
Symbolism, Religious, 651 f.
Syracuse (Sicily), See of, 269
Syria: Caliphate of Bagdad dominates, 277; subjected by Saladin, 506

Tagino (bishop of Magdeburg), 105
Tanchelm, Heresy of, 372
Tancred, crusader, 292, 295 f., 299: Henry VI profanes tomb of, 512; in Palestine, 341; at siege of Jerusalem, 301
Taranto: Basil II takes, 39; Otto II defeated at, 41
Tarascon, Urban II at, 276

Tarento, Knights of St. John at, 344
Taxation, Lateran Council (1179), 490 f.
Tebaldo (archbishop of Milan): Henry IV invests, 212; Hugh Candidus, 214
Templars, Knights: at Council of Lyons (1274), 620; Origin of, 343-45; Origin of name, 345; Reform of, 450
Teobaldo Visconti (Gregory X), 618
Teophano. *See* Theophano
Terence, Study of, 57
Teresa (Portuguese princess), Alfonso IX marries, 514
Terracina: Papal States, 68; Urban II elected at, 243
Teutonic Knights: Celestine III favors the, 514; Origin of, 346
Thaddeus of Suessa: at Council of Lyons (1245), 603; Death of, 609
Theobald (archbishop of Canterbury), 482 f.
Theobald (bishop of Amiens), deposed, 38
Theobald (cardinal), becomes Pope Honorius II, 392
Theodard (bishop of Le Puy): election of, 59; Gregory V's letter to, 60
Theodora the Younger: John XIII son of, 28; John Crescentius son of, 29
Theodore II Lascaris (emperor), 613
Theodoric (antipope), 319
Theodulf, 78
Theodulus (bishop of Arezzo), Guido and, 120
Theologia christiana by Abelard, 430
Theology: Abelard's errors, 370 f.; Gerbert, 72 f.; in twelfth century, 371 f.; Urban II, 302 f.
Theology, Mystical: Hugh of St. Victor on, 438 f.; St. Bernard, 444 ff.
Theology, Study of: St. Anselm, 306; Paris University, 629 f.
Theophano (empress): crowned, 22; Otto I and, 21; Otto II and, 21; Otto III and, 49; Romanus II father of, 21; St. Adelaide and, 34, 48
Theophano, wife of Leo VI the Wise, 22 note 31
Theophylactus (family), 69
Theophylactus (Benedict VIII), 99
Theophylactus (Benedict IX), 121 f.: son of Gregory of Tusculum, 89
Thibaut de Champagne: crusader, 538, 588, 617; Death of, 539; Louis VII at war with, 418
Thierry of Chartres, teacher of Abelard, 369
Thietmar. *See* Dithmar
Third orders, 665: Origin of, 247
Third Order Franciscans, 567
Thirteenth century: education, 629; religious orders, 626-29
Thomas (abbot of St. Victor, Paris), 438
Thomas à Becket, 482-84
  Alexander III, 487 f.
  Archbishop of Canterbury, 483
  Archdeacon of Canterbury, 482
  Austerities of, 484
  Canonization of, 491
  Chancellor, 482
  Character of, 482 f.
  Clerical immunity, 485
  Conflict with Henry II of England, 484 f.
  Constitutions of Clarendon, 486 f.
  Courage of, 488
  In France, 487
  Henry II of England, 482 ff.
  Henry II at tomb of, 489
  Louis VII of France, 487
  Miracles at tomb of, 489
  Murder of, 488
  Papal legate, 487 f.
  Taxation, 484 f.
Thomas of Celano: *Dies irae* by, 653; *Legenda prima* by, 567 note 79; *Legenda secunda* by, 567 note 79
Thomas Aquinas, St., 632-34
  Aristotle, 635
  Invited to Council of Lyons, 620
  Meeting with Innocent IV, 632
  Office of Corpus Christi, 653
  At Paris University, 629
  Related to Frederick Barbarossa, 632
  St. Albert the Great teacher of, 632 f.
  Summa theologica by, 633 f.
Thrace: Crusaders in, 289, 428; Kumans in, 278; Petchenegs in, 278
Thurstan (archbishop of York), 396
Tiberias, Saladin's victory at, 506
Tibur. *See* Tivoli
Tivoli, 421: Henry VI destroys, 512; Normans assault, 234; Rebellion of, 414 f.; revolts against Otto III, 69
Todi (Council of, 1001), Otto III, 70

Todi (Jacopone da), *Stabat Mater* by, 653
Toledo (Spain): Cathedral of, 652; Cathedral becomes mosque, 267; Moors defeated at, 266; Primacy of see of, 267
Tollenstein, Counts of, 165
Tortona, Barbarossa takes, 474
Torture, Use of, 641
Toul, Bruno bishop of, 140 ff.
Toulouse: Albigenses at, 526; Cathari in, 495; Raymond bishop, 45; Raymond viscount of, 533; St. Bernard at, 527
Toulouse, Councils of: (1056), reform measures, 167; (1229), 597
Toulouse University, 630 note 20
Tournaments forbidden, 604
Tours: Alexander III at, 475; Berengarius (heretic) born at, 148
Tours: Councils of: (1054), Berengarius before, 152; (1096), Philip I's divorce, 260; (1096), Urban II at, 285; (1162), on heretics, 494; (1163), Rainaldi condemned, 475
Trabico (fortress), Paschal II in, 327
Tractatus correctorius by Guido of Arezzo, 120 note 67
Tractatus de unitate et trinitate divina by Abelard, 371
Trades, Organization of, 658 f.
Trapani, Saracens defeated at, 269
Trastevere, Gregory VII in, 228
Tre Fontane (Rome), 420
Treaties: Constance, 479; Jaffa, 585; San Germano, 585, 591; Venice, 480
Treuga Dei. See Truce of God
Tribur, Assembly of, 218
Trinitarians, Order of, 572
Trinity (church, Caen), William of Normandy, 180
Trinity (Doctrine of), Roscelin, 368
Tripartita by Ivo of Chartres, 310
Tripoli, Latin state of, 340, 510
Trivium, Meaning of, 304
Troina (Sicily), Urban II at, 249
Trois Fontaines (monastery), Founding of, 365
Troja, Siege of, 110
Trondheim, 459
Trosly, Council of (911), 87 note 86
Troubadours, 85, 524
Troyes, Council of (1128), 345
Truce of God, 44-46
  At Bourges, 378
  Clement III proclaims, 507
  Communal movement and, 379
  Council of Clermont, 281
  Council of Elne, 118
  Council of Poitiers, 101
  First use of the expression, 45 note 107
  Lateran Council (1179), 490
  Origin of, 44 f., 118
  Peace of God and, 101 note 26
  Popular support of, 377
Turkestan, home of the Turks, 277
Turks
  At Aleppo, 342
  Alexius Comnenus at war with, 278
  Byzantine Empire threatened by, 232
  Caesarea (in Cappadocia) captured by, 232
  At Cairo, 342
  Crusaders massacre, 301 f.
  At Damascus, 342
  Invasion of, 277
  Jerusalem captured by, 232
  Manner of fighting, 424 f.
  Mohammedanism strengthened by, 277
  At Mossul, 342
  Romanus Diogenes at war with, 232
  In Syria, 424 f.
Tuscany: City states in, 413 f.; Papal States, 68
Tusculans, Victor II, 166
Tusculum (house of): family of Theophylactus, 69; Henry II and, 98 f.; Italian faction of, 89
Tyre: resists Saladin, 506; See of, 340

Ubaldo Allucingoli (Lucius III), 499
Uberto Crivelli (Urban III), 503
Udalric (monk), *Coutumes clunisiennes* by, 198
Ugolino (Gregory IX), 581, 583
Uhlhorn (Johann) on Middle Ages, 5
Upsala, See of, 459
Ulric, St. (bishop of Augsburg), Canonization of, 44
Universal ideas, 366
  Abelard's explanation of, 370
  Aristotle on, 366 note 126
  Plato on, 366 note 126
  Roscelin on, 367
  William of Champeaux, 368 f.

Universitas, 629
Universities: Alexander III, 491; Origin of, 629
Universities, List of: Angers, 630; Bologna, 629 f., 636, 642; Cambridge, 630; Cologne, 630; Erfurt, 630; Gratz, 625; Heidelberg, 630; Lisbon, 625; Montpellier, 625, 630; Naples, 610, 625, 630; Orleans, 630; Oxford, 630, 642-45; Padua, 630; Paris, 596 f., 624, 629 ff.; Pavia, 630; Prague, 630; Salamanca, 640; Salerno, 630; Toulouse, 630; Vienna, 630
Urban II (pope), 243 ff.
Ademar of Monteil legate, 284
Archdeacon of Reims, 242
At Autun, 276
At Bantino, 249
Bishop of Ostia, 242
Born at Châtillon-sur-Marne, 242
Canon of Reims, 242
In castle of Frangipani family, 253
At Chaise-Dieu, 276
Character of, 242
Clerical life, 347
At Cluny, 276
Councils: Angers (1096), 285; Bari (1098), 265; Clermont (1095), 281; Limoges (1096), 285; Nîmes (1096), 285; Pavia (1096), 285; Piacenza (1095), 274-76; Rome (1096), 285; Tours (1096), 285
Crusade projects, 271 f.
Crusade urged by, 282 f.
Death of, 315
Election of, 243
England and, 260
Excommunication rules, 245 f.
First Crusade, 243, 302
Flees from Rome, 251
In France, 276, 310
Gebhard, 247: legate of, 245
Godfrey of Vendôme aids, 254
Gregory VII, 242
Gregory VII's counselor, 242
Guelph V, 249
Guibert (antipope) opposes, 244
Indulgences, 380
Ivo of Chartres accompanies, 253
Last illness of, 313
At Lateran Palace, 254
Letter to monasteries, 247
Letter to William, bishop of Rouen, 246
At Le Puy, 276
At Lyons, 276
At Mâcon, 276
Monasticism: favored by, 303 f.; in Sicily, 269 f.
Monk at Cluny, 242
Monk at La Cava, 242
At Montmajeur Abbey, 276
Normans, 248
Office of Blessed Virgin, 284
Origin of the Crusades, 274
Papal bull to Roger, 270 f.
Philip I's divorce, 257
Primacy of see of Toledo, 267
Pseudo-council of Rome excommunicates, 244
Reform measures, 255
Returns to Rome, 253
Robert of Arbrissel ordered to preach, 314
Roger (brother of Guiscard), 248, 269
Roger (son of Guiscard), 248
At Romans, 276
Rules about excommunication, 245 f.
St. Bruno teacher of, 242
At St. Gilles, 276
Scholastic theology, 302 f.
Studies at Reims, 242
At Tarascon, 276
At Troina, 249
Welf and, 249
William Rufus and, 261, 264
Urban III (pope), 503 f.: Death of, 504
Urban IV (pope), 613
Usury, Lateran Council (1215), 575
Uzerche (abbey), Cluny Abbey and, 198

Val des Ecoliers (Paris), 664
Valais (canton), St. Bernard pass, 45
Valencia taken from the Moors, 587
Vallumbrosa (abbey), John Gualbert founder of, 201
Valois, St. Felix of (founder), 572
Vassalage, 637
Vassals, Bishops as, 206
Vaucouleurs, Conferences at, 589
Velletri, John Mincius bishop, 174
Venetians: Fourth Crusade, 539 f.; in Constantinople, 541 f.

Venice: Byzantine Empire and, 279; colony in Constantinople, 279; peace with Hungary, 507; Power of, 414
Venice (Peace of), ratified at Lateran Council, 490
Venice, Treaty of, 480
Vercelli (Council of, 1050), 150: Berengarius' doctrine condemned, 151
Verdun (Council of), Peace movement, 103
Verona: Diet of, 41; League of, 477 f.; Lucius III at, 500
Vézelay: Crusade preached at, 426; Heretics executed at, 493
Vézelay (abbey), 356: Benedict VII, 40; Eldrad abbot of, 35
Vich, Sylvester in school at, 56
Victimae paschali laudes, 83
Victor II (pope), 164-68
  Beatrice of Tuscany and, 166
  Councils: Chalon-sur-Saône, 167; Llandaff, 167; Rome (1057), 167; Santiago de Compostela, 167; Toulouse, 167
  Death of, 168
  At death of Henry III, 167
  Godfrey of Lorraine, 166
  At Goslar, 166
  Henry III, 166
  Hildebrand, 166: at death of, 168
  Normans, 166
  Reform measures, 167
  In Saxony, 166
  Simony denounced by, 168
  Tusculans, 166
Victor III, Blessed (pope), 237-42
  Abbot of Monte Cassino, 239
  Consecration of, 239
  Council of Benevento, 240
  Crusades, 272
  Death of, 240 f.
  Election of, 238 f.
  Health of, 240
  Jourdain of Capua and election of, 239
  Monk at St. Agatha's Hermitage, 239
  Monk at St. Sophia Abbey, 239
  Roger (son of Guiscard), 239
  Saracens at war with, 241
Victor IV (antipope), 409, 417: Death of, 476; excommunicated by Council of Tours, 475
Victorinus: Sylvester and writings of, 56; Study of, 57
Vienna University, 630
Villehardouin (chronicler), Fourth Crusade, 538
Vincent of Beauvais, Studies of, 651
Viollet-le-Duc on Cluny, 199
Virgil, Study of, 57
Visconti, Teobaldo (Gregory X), 618
Vita Ottonis by Liutprand, 32
Vitalis, Orderic. *See* Orderic
Viterbo: Clement IV at, 617; Death of John XXI at, 622; Eugene III at, 421; Manichaeism at, 523; Urban IV at, 613
Viviers, See of, 45
Vlachs, Johannitius czar of the, 544
Vladimir I, St. (czar of Russia), Conversion of, 46
Vogelweide, Walther von der (poet), 512, 655

Waldenses (heretics), 526 f.: Lucius III excommunicates, 527
Waldes (Peter), origin of Waldenses, 526
Wales, William Rufus' war against, 265
Warin (bishop of Beauvais), peace oath, 103
Warnefrid, 78
Walter, Hubert (archbishop of Canterbury), 553
Walther (chancellor) conspires with Markwald, 520
Walther von der Vogelweider (poet), 512, 655
Weiblingen (family), 410, 456
Welf (family), 410, 456
Welf (duke of Bavaria): Assembly of Tribur, 218; Urban II and, 249
Werla (Diet of), election of Henry II, 96
Werner of Ancona, 322
Westminster (London), 652: Parliament at, 485
Westminster Abbey, 159 note 50: Edward the Confessor builds, 159
Wido. *See* Guido
Widukind, Merowig and, 47
Widukind, *Res gestae saxonicae* by, 32
Wigold (bishop of Augsburg), 245

William I the Conqueror (king of England)
Alexander II, 184
Berengarius, 150
Dying prayer of, 260
Excommunicated, 180
Gregory VII, 196, 209
Guibert (antipope) rejected by, 209
Lanfranc adviser of, 261
Marriage of, 180
Papacy, 553
Reform measures favored by, 209
St. Hugh, 201
St. Stephen's Church (Caen), 180
Trinity Church (Caen), 180
William II Rufus (king of England), 336
Guibert (antipope), 261
Hume on, 261
Rannulf Flambard adviser of, 261
Rockingham Assembly convoked by, 264 f.
St. Anselm at deathbed of, 262
St. Anselm's conflict with, 263
Simony favored by, 261
Urban II, 261, 264
War against Wales, 265
William (archbishop of Auch) on violation of the peace, 377
William (archbishop of Canterbury), 396
William (archbishop of Rouen), letter from Urban II, 246
William (bishop of Utrecht): at Council of Worms, 214; Death of, 217; Henry IV favored by, 216
William, St. (abbot of Hirschau), 202
William, St. (abbot of St. Bénigne): Fruttuaria Abbey founded by, 100; letter to John XIX, 111; monastic schools, 646
William (abbot of St. Thierry), letter to St. Bernard, 430
William (count of Burgundy), Gregory VII and, 232
William VIII (count of Montpellier), letter from Innocent III, 545
William VI (count of Poitiers), Gregory VII and, 233
William X (count of Poitiers), 405 f.
William (duke of Apulia), 398
William (duke of Aquitaine): Cluny Abbey, 18; Gregory VI and, 130
William (duke of Normandy). *See* William the Conqueror
William of Auvergne (bishop of Paris), 607, 649
William the Chamberlain, crusader, 287
William of Champeaux, 346, 348 f., 437: Abelard and, 349; bishop of Châlons, 350; Philosophy of, 368 f.; St. Bernard and, 365
William of Holland (emperor), 605, 609
William of Malmesbury, Philip I's excommunication, 259
William of Nangis, 589
William of St. Amour, 631
William of Sicily: Adrian IV confers with, 469; treaty with Adrian IV, 461
William of Toulouse in Palestine, 341
William of Tyre, account of the Crusades, 292
Winchester, Council of (975), 38
Winchester, Council of (1076), Lanfranc presides at, 196
Winimann (archbishop of Embrun), 168
Wittekind. *See* Widukind
Wittelsbach (Otto von), Philip of Swabia assassinated by, 522
Wolfgang, St. (bishop of Ratisbon), St. Henry II and, 96
Women: in Christian law, 639; in Roman law, 639
Woodstock (England), Henry II at, 484
Workingmen, Corporations of, 658
Worms: Assembly of, 140; Concordat of, 333 f.; Crusaders massacre Jews in, 288; Richard I of England at, 511; Treaty of, 161
Worms, Pseudo-council of (1076)
Charges against Gregory VII, 214
Deposition of Gregory declared, 212
Henry IV of Germany convokes, 213
Hugh Candidus at, 213
William of Utrecht at, 214
Wratislaw (duke of Bohemia): becomes king, 237; Gregory VII and, 230
Würzburg: Adalbero bishop, 245; Diet of, 333, 476

York, Roger bishop, 486
Yaruk (governor of Syria), 92
Year 1000, 87 note 86
Yusuf, Holy Sepulcher destroyed by, 92

Zahringen (Duke von), letter from Innocent III, 522
Zallaca, Mohammedan victory at, 268
Zara (Dalmatia), Venetians and, 540
Zawichost, Battle of, 563
Zemisses (emperor). *See* John Zemisses
Zenki (Turkish ruler), 425: Second Crusade, 427; takes Edessa, 423
Zurich, Assembly of, 102

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME FIVE

1294-1599

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME FIVE

PERIOD OF THE RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

MONASTERY OF SAINT DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH [illegible] STREET
NEWARK [illegible]

B. HERDER BOOK CO.,
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.

MONASTERY OF SAINT DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH [illegible] STREET
[illegible]

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-507

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 4. Aug., 1930,

Joannes Rothensteiner,

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 5. Aug., 1930,

✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*

Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1930

BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Fifth Printing, 1955

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

To the Preface of the author, as rendered below, the translator wishes to add that in this English edition of Mourret the fifth volume appears first, because it is the best one by which to introduce the work to the English-speaking public; the other nine will follow in due course. Those who are competent to judge agree that Mourret's *Histoire de l'Eglise* is unsurpassed as a comprehensive, detailed, and reliable setting forth of the history of the Church. The whole work, when supplied with an adequate index, will be the equivalent of an exhaustive thesaurus of Church History, such as is needed particularly at the present time, when we are entering upon a new era of apologetics, with radio lectures, question boxes, apologetic sermons and lectures, etc.

The bibliography of works which are referred to in the course of the volume, appears as an appendix. It is not in the French original, but we believe it will be welcomed by the student.

THE TRANSLATOR

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The religious and social revolt that broke out in the sixteenth century can be fully explained only by a study of the religious, social, and political disturbances of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Western Schism shook the authority of the popes; the worldly life of certain pontiffs and prelates of their court increased their discredit; the ill-will and sometimes the violent opposition of rulers, inspired by the legists, thwarted the action of the Church; the intoxication of learning and a passion for art and letters developed a spirit of risky independence in the minds of men; the decadence of Scholasticism favored the growth of a dubious mysticism; the sudden development of industry and commerce, the rapid formation of absolute monarchies, and the abrupt appearance of the new power of capitalism, by wiping out the liberties and rights of the old medieval organization, complicated the religious crisis by a social and political crisis, while threatening to extend the slightest shock into a catastrophe of unforeseen proportions. A general uneasiness was in the air. On all sides there was talk of the need of reform. Ever since a certain eminent bishop at the Council of Vienna, in 1311, had called for a reform *in capite et membris,* in the head of the Church and in its members, the formula became popular and was frequently repeated by church councils. While prudent men considered the ways and means of accomplishing the reform through prayer and good works in the Church and by the Church, impassioned and turbulent minds undertook to bring it about by violence and revolt, outside the Church and against it. Luther in Germany, Henry VIII in England, Calvin in

France, and Zwingli in Switzerland assumed the leadership in this movement.

The watchwords of these four so-called reformers were: to purify the Church of scandals, to liberate rulers and Christian peoples from the "tyranny" of Rome, to free consciences from the oppression of doctrinal formulas and the dominance of the Catholic hierarchy, and to lead Christianity back to its pristine purity.

How these men did but aggravate the evils for which they claimed to bring relief; how from Luther's work there issued disorder and corruption of morals in Germany, from Henry VIII's work the enslavement of the Church in England, from Calvin's work the most despairing of doctrines and the most inquisitorial of governments, from Zwingli's work the most dissolvent of systems; how all these noisy appeals for reform succeeded in covering Europe with blood, upsetting consciences, and preparing the way for the worst social and religious catastrophes: to point this out through a recital of the facts of history is the aim of this volume.

Herein we shall also see in what manner the Catholic Church, under the guidance of her legitimate hierarchy, brought about the needed reform and regenerated herself by her own means. Of these the chief was the meeting of the Ecumenical Council of Trent. But the founding of various religious Orders, especially the celebrated Society of Jesus, and the growth of their activities in the realms of science and the apostolate, the reform of the clergy under the energetic influence of St. Charles Borromeo, the firm and lofty policy of St. Pius V, the new impulse given to piety under the influence of St. Teresa, and an unprecedented development of distant missionary enterprises—all these factors helped to prepare for the great Council and continued its work.

An impartial study of the facts will also reveal the fundamental impotence of the so-called reformers and the exhaust-

less vitality of the Catholic Church. It will likewise show us how vain were the pretexts appealed to in justification of the revolt. To attribute the religious crisis of the sixteenth century to abuses of "papal tyranny" and the "corruption of the clergy" is unjust. As we shall see, papal authority never weighed more lightly on States and individuals. Moreover, the very countries where the influence of Rome was the most active—Italy, Spain, and France—were the ones that remained loyal to the Church, whereas it was England, Northern Germany, and Scandinavia that broke away.

As for the corruption of the clergy, five centuries earlier Pope St. Gregory VII cured abuses no less flagrant and accomplished reforms no less difficult. The real causes of the Protestant revolt are to be found elsewhere. Social disturbances, which were brought on by the advent of great States and the break-up of medieval Christendom, deep-rooted hostility to Rome that can be traced back to the strifes between the priesthood and the Empire, a sectarian spirit attaching to the Hussites and the Vaudois, the pride and passions of men who put themselves at the head of the "reform movement"—such were the determining causes of the religious revolt which the sixteenth century witnessed and which had its chief fields of action in Germany, England, and France.

Might we not, at least, justly blame the incapacity or indolence of the papacy for the proportions which the revolt assumed and for the calamities that ensued? It must be admitted that Alexander VI's family interests, the political designs of Julius II, and the too exclusive cultivation of arts and letters that filled the pontificate of Leo X diverted the popes from the great effort required by the religious welfare of the Christian world and at least prevented their perceiving the magnitude of the danger that threatened the Church. But weightier responsibility fell upon those rulers who were false to their duty as defenders of the Church, upon those episcopal bodies that

were infected with the Gallican spirit, and upon those parliaments which, in ceaseless conflict with the Roman court, placed obstacles in the way of a full effectiveness of papal effort, and even affected the common people, who throughout the Middle Ages, by a more active participation in public life and by a freer and more spontaneous piety, had been a support to the reform labors of the popes. But this Christian people came to lose nearly all social action, was caught in the net of a more and more centralized administration, and was unconsciously infected with the poison of skepticism and sensuality by the works of art of the Renaissance; it no longer constituted, about the head of the Church, that atmosphere of respectful and sympathetic confidence to facilitate and powerfully second his endeavors. In all catastrophes, as in all regenerative undertakings, responsibility reaches farther and mounts higher than appears at first glance.

In concluding the preface to his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches,* Bossuet expresses the hope that "this work, which at first might seem contentious, will tend to promote peace more than strife," that his Protestant readers will better understand how the variations and lessening of doctrine have their root in the initial movement giving birth to heresy, and that his Catholic readers "will be filled with a humble and holy awe by considering the delicate and perilous temptations which God at times permits His Church to encounter and the punishment He sometimes inflicts on her. Hence we should constantly pray that she may have exemplary and enlightened pastors, since it was the lack of enough such that led to the ravaging of the flock which was redeemed at so great a price."

This is the good that we dare to hope for, with God's help, as the fruit of the present work.

THE AUTHOR

* * * * * * * *

CONTENTS

PART I

THE RENAISSANCE

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE DECLINE OF MEDIEVAL INSTITUTIONS	3
II.	THE LEGISTS	9
	Philip the Fair's National Policy	13
	Boniface VIII	19
	The Bull *"Clericis laicos"*	25
	The Question of Papal Supremacy	30
	The Anagni Outrage	39
	Benedict XI	42
III.	1305–1315	48
	Clement V	49
	Attempted Condemnation of Boniface VIII	51
	The Knights Templars	56
	The Council of Vienne	64
	The Empire in Italy	68
	Heresies	71
IV.	1316–1378	78
	John XXII	78
	The "Spiritual Brethren"	80
	Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno	82
	The Annates	89
	Benedict XII	92
	Clement VI	95
	Innocent VI	99
	Urban V	103
	Gregory XI	106
V.	1378–1417	114
	Urban VI	114
	Beginning of the Schism	119
	Benedict XIII of Avignon	124
	The Saints and the Schism	131
	The Council of Pisa	136

CHAPTER PAGE

Alexander V 138
John XXIII 139
The Council of Constance 141
John Hus 147
The End of the Schism 149

VI. 1417–1447 152
Martin V 153
Eugene IV 159
The Union of the Churches 166
The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges 172
Joan of Arc 175

VII. 1447–1492 179
Nicholas V 180
Callistus III 185
Pius II 189
Paul II 195
Sixtus IV 197
Monks and Friars 202
Innocent VIII 208
Savonarola 211

VIII. Alexander VI 214
His Nepotism 216
King Charles VIII of France 218
Murder of the Duke of Gandia 221
Savonarola 225
Caesar Borgia 233
Alexander VI and the New World 235
Death of Alexander VI 237

IX. 1503–1517 239
Pius III 239
Julius II 241
Real Power of the Papacy 245
The Lateran Council 248
Leo X 252
The Concordat with France 255

X. The Intellectual Evolution of the Renaissance . 261
Petrarch 261
After the Western Schism 264

CHAPTER PAGE

Greek Literary Culture at Florence 269
Architecture and Painting 274
Influence of Savonarola 277
Philosophy and Theology 281
Mysticism 287

PART II

THE PROTESTANT REVOLT

I. The Prelude in Germany 299
Characteristics of the German Renaissance 299
Luther the Student 305
Luther as a Monk 313

II. Luther's Revolt 325
The Decree of Indulgences 325
Luther's Theses 328
The Humanists 330
Papal Intervention 335
Luther and Miltitz 342
The Theologians 345

III. The Spread of Lutheranism in Germany 350
Alliance of Revolutionary Parties in Germany . . . 350
Luther Excommunicated 352
Emperor Charles V 356
The Diet of Worms 357
Luther at Wartburg 362
The Height of Luther's Success 367
Lack of Union Among Luther's Followers 371
The Sacramentary Dispute 373
Luther's Marriage 376
The Diet of Augsburg 377
The Smalkaldic League 380
The Anabaptists 381
No Reunion with Rome 382
Dogmatic Syncretism and Individualistic Pietism . . 386

IV. Protestantism in England 390
Precursors 390
Henry VIII, Defender of the Faith 392

CHAPTER PAGE

Divorce of Henry VIII 394
The King Proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church . . 400
The Schism Accomplished 402
Fisher and More 407
Executions and Confiscations 411

V. Protestantism in England 416
Edward VI 416
Doctrinal and Disciplinary Measures 416

VI. Protestantism in England 423
Queen Mary's Policy of Conciliation 423
Bloody Repressions 424
Queen Elizabeth 429
Elizabeth's Persecution of the Church 432
The Puritans 435

VII. Protestantism in France 438
The Precursors 438
The Classes in French Society 439
Lefèvre d'Etaples 444
The "Cenacle of Meaux" 445
Attitude of Francis I 450
Massacre of the Vaudois 455

VIII. The Beginnings of Calvinism 459
John Calvin 459
Calvin's Teaching 463
Calvinism at Geneva 467

IX. Protestantism in France 472
Henry II Against the Huguenots 472
France Under the Rule of Factions 477
St. Bartholomew's Day 484
The League 490
Henry of Navarre 493
The Edict of Nantes 498

X. Protestantism in the Countries of the North . . . 501
The Netherlands 501
The Scandinavian Countries 507
Other Countries 511

PART III

THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE POPES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY	517
	Adrian VI	518
	Clement VII	520
	Paul III	522
	Julius III	524
	Marcellus II	525
	Paul IV	525
	Pius IV	528
	St. Pius V	530
	Gregory XIII	534
	Sixtus V	537
	Urban VII, Gregory XIV, Innocent IX, Clement VIII	540
II.	THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE COUNCIL OF TRENT	542
	Difficulties in the Way of Convocation	542
	Opening of the Council	545
	The Bible and the Rule of Faith	548
	Original Sin	550
	Justification	552
	The Sessions Interrupted	556
	The Eucharist, Penance, and Extreme Unction	557
	A Ten Years' Interruption	560
	The Mass, Holy Orders, Matrimony	563
	Disciplinary Questions	564
III.	THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND CATHOLIC RULERS	573
	Situation of the Church	573
	Favorable Attitude of Catholic Rulers	576
	The Inquisition	577
	The Index of Forbidden Books	581
IV.	THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE SECULAR CLERGY	583
	St. Charles Borromeo	583
	St. Charles and the Institution of Seminaries	586
	Pope St. Pius V	591
V.	THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION AND THE REGULAR CLERGY	594
	The Carmelites	597

CHAPTER PAGE

St. Teresa 599
New Religious Orders 603
Religious Orders in Italy 607

VI. The Jesuits 612
St. Ignatius of Loyola 613
The Jesuit Form of Government 616
Expansion of Jesuit Activities 620

VII. The Catholic Reformation in the Intellectual World 626

VIII. The Catholic Reformation and the Spiritual Life . 639
The "Spiritual Exercises" 639
The Mysticism of St. Teresa 642

Bibliography 649

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume V

I. The Renaissance

II. The Protestant Revolt

III. The Catholic Reformation

PART I

THE RENAISSANCE

CHAPTER I

The Decline of Medieval Institutions

THE thirteenth century marked the apogee of Christian life and influence. A vast federation of Christian nations, grouped together under the supreme authority of the pope, the spiritual head of all the faithful and acknowledged arbiter of kings and peoples; a closely knit hierarchy of rights and duties, based on land tenure and crowned by the supremacy of the emperor, who was the born defender of the Church: such was the ideal which the popes of the Middle Ages, from St. Nicholas I to Innocent III, had conceived, striven for, and attained so far as possible, and which Boniface VIII set out to defend with the utmost energy. At the summit of this mighty political organization was the pope. To him, as spiritual head, it belonged to denounce heresies, to arm the civil power for their repression, to judge the political acts of temporal rulers *ratione peccati,* to summon and set in motion all the armies of Christendom and hurl them against the infidel. As the head of human society, invested with an unquestioned moral authority, he passed sovereign judgment in the conflicts that arose between States and, within each Christian nation, between the different classes of society, notably between rulers and their subjects.

It would be unjust to blame the attacks by certain men, however powerful, as solely responsible for the events which

shook the mighty social edifice of Christendom. Its decadence goes back to deeper and more general causes. The formation of the great European States, the development of royal absolutism, and the advent of a great moneyed bourgeoisie had silently undermined the structure and disturbed its regular functioning. The Western Schism, by making it almost impossible to discover who was pope, led the people to turn to their immediate rulers—bishops, priests, and temporal princes. "My master's power is real," said Pierre Flote, one of Philip the Fair's legists, addressing Pope Boniface VIII at the beginning of the fourteenth century, "yours is only verbal." [1] Legist theories, attacks of heterodox teachers, and plots of popular agitators would have been less effective and perhaps would not have occurred at all had they not been provoked by the appearance of those new political and social forces around which special interests and ambitions grouped themselves.

In Germany wars and conflicts, stirred up by the emperors against the Church, had weakened the moral bond that made the unity of the empire. The waste of landed revenues under Frederick II and the partition of the royal prerogatives among the States favored the powers of the princes, who "aimed only at acquiring domains over which they would be sole masters." [2] The efforts of Rudolph of Hapsburg and his son Albert to reëstablish the empire's unity by relying on the strength of the bourgeoisie only increased the latter's power. From this epoch we may date the privileges and great development of free cities, a new social element which, stimulated by an extraordinary growth of industry and commerce, increased outside the feudal system and in opposition to it.[3] The prosperity of the big cities and their subsequent political inde-

[1] Dupuy, *Histoire du différend entre Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel.*
[2] Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* I, p. 417.
[3] *Ibid.,* I, p. 425.

pendence led Machiavelli to call them "the real nerve of the empire." [4]

In Italy the conflicts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries brought about the formation of powerful leagues between the chief cities. Florence, the city of noise and movement, and Venice, the city of silent immobility and mysterious politics, were destined for a long time to keep their power and social preëminence. But all around them petty local tyrannies, which the weakness of the empire had allowed to become established, stifled civil liberties and outraged Christian faith. Ferrante of Naples, whose delight it was to imprison his foes in strongly built cages and, after their death, to make a collection of their mummies; [5] Giovanni Maria Visconti of Milan, who trained his dogs to hunt men; [6] Agnello of Pisa, who required those serving him to kneel: [7] these and other such men of the time were inspired more by recollections of the pagan Roman Empire than by Christian traditions of the Middle Ages.[8]

In England, while large cities, such as London, York, Norwich, Bristol, and Coventry, grew wealthy and rose in importance through industry and commerce,[9] the kings engaged in more conflicts with the Church of Rome than was the case anywhere else.[10] The War of the Roses, by ruining the upper nobility, and the appearance of various sects, like the Lollards, by breaking the unity of the faith, put an end to the Middle Ages in England.

Monarchical absolutism in France, before formulating its maxims and finding a theory for its justification in the Roman

[4] *The Writings of Niccolo Machiavelli,* IV, p. 387.

[5] Jovius, *Historiarum sui temporis libri XLV,* I, p. 14.

[6] Corio, *Storia di Milano,* p. 301.

[7] Filippo Villani, *Storie,* XI, p. 101.

[8] Cf. Burkhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy,* I, chaps. 1–6, pp. 4–75.

[9] Bémont, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, p. 109.

[10] Trésal, *Les origines du schisme anglican,* p. 4.

law, was already a matter of history. The need of order and unity and the necessity of defense against foreign invasions had little by little rallied the social forces about the king, as religious perplexities during the Western Schism gathered the faithful about their bishops. The agricultural, industrial, and commercial renaissance, favored by political unity, drew a considerable immigration to France [11] and produced an era of unexampled ease and prosperity.[12] The feudal nobility lost its prestige. It was the period when the ponderous, massive old castle, formidably equipped for defense, was abandoned or altered into a new abode with open balconies, large windows with carved tracery and well-lighted galleries. Often the new mansion became the dwelling of a wealthy merchant or a magistrate titled for his devotion to the royal power. This new nobility, instead of bridging the gaps that divided the classes, only made them wider.[13] The parvenus did not fuse well with the old aristocracy and separated themselves with the more disdain from the common people.

Among the latter a revolutionary spirit was being fermented by two causes: a rapid trend toward civil and political liberty and the simultaneous increase of poverty and wretchedness.

The trend towards liberty was hastened in the second half of the fifteenth century by various influences, some of a religious or humanitarian, others of an economic or a political order. The kings and nobles had a political and economic interest in liberating the serfs, who, once they were free, began to repopulate the deserted villages and to renew the tillage of the soil by laboring more assiduously and effectively because it was more to their advantage. In the early years of the four-

[11] Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme,* I, pp. 287–295.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 302.
[13] *Ibid.,* p. 460.

teenth century, serfdom, according to Imbart de la Tour, "appears to be more and more an exception." [14]

The freed serfs at once began to organize politically. Rural communities elected their own councillors, procurators, and syndics. In the States General of 1484 [15] we find the villages represented for the first time.

Unfortunately this rapid progress towards liberty was favored only in the rural classes. It was hindered among city workers and coincided with the spread of poverty. Despite the development of agriculture and commerce which marked this period, prime necessaries of life, such as wheat, wine, cloth, and wood, became dearer. The rise of prices was due to a badly organized fiscal system and especially to incessant wars.

But wages remained stationary. "In 1500 a workman's wage was certainly too low to support him and his family; after 1515 it drove him to beg or borrow." [16]

The Church by means of confraternities and the State by means of subventions and various other devices tried to ward off the evil. But these means were insufficient. Medieval institutions were in ruin and those of the modern world still in course of formation.

But from these two facts, pauperism and the trend toward political liberty, there fatally resulted a revolutionary spirit. "In each town there is propagated a center of agitation and disorder. Imagine a little spark in that explosive mass: an election, a new tax, a threat of dearth; the town is inflamed. It is easy to foresee what the religious conflicts will be under such circumstances. . . . Beneath the splendor of the Renais-

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 468.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 491. To the States General of 1302, Philip the Fair had invited representatives of the "common people"; but the rural communities did not form a legal unit in public institutions until 1484.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 512.

sance, the glitter of victories and celebrations, the flashing display of wealth . . . if you but lend an ear you may hear the wretches' murmur which will change into a wild clamor on the day when the clash of beliefs arms all these appetites and absorbs all these attempts." [17]

It has been said that the Protestant Reformation was made in England by kings, in Germany by nobles, and in France by the people. This statement is too systematic to be exact.[18] Yet it is true that the people of France were only too well prepared to give ready ear to every whisper of revolt or revolution.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Cf. Hauser, *La Réforme et les classes populaires en France au XVI^e siècle,* in the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine,* 1899–1900, and Hanotaux, *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu,* I, pp. 473–475.

CHAPTER II

1294–1304

The Legists

So long as a social movement has not found a formula for its expression and a guide for its orientation, it is little to be feared. The movement that attacked the political and social institutions of the Middle Ages found its first expression and orientation in the work of the legists.

Legists, or *chevaliers ès-lois,* was the name given to those men who, from the thirteenth century on, professionally devoted themselves to the study of Roman law and became the kings' councillors.[1] St. Louis, in his desire to reform legislation and improve it, summoned them to his aid, but he did not suffer himself to be dominated by them. Their influence became preponderant under the last descendants of the direct line of the Capetians.

The traditional account according to which the study of Roman law goes back to the discovery of the "Pandects" by the Pisans during the pillage of Amalfi in 1133 is a pure legend.[2] But the legists' opposition, violent at times, to the feudal law and to the Church, which was the soul of that

[1] Caillemer, *L'enseignement du droit civil en France vers la fin du XIII^e siècle,* in the *Nouvelle Revue Historique du Droit Français et Étranger,* 1879, pp. 606 sqq.; Thierry, *The Formation and Progress of the Tiers Etat, or Third Estate, in France,* I, pp. 50 sqq.

[2] Savigny and Schrader long ago proved the unlikelihood of this legend, which first made its appearance two centuries after the supposed event, in an obscure poem by the Dominican Raynier de Gronchi (Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* XII, pp. 287, 314). Rivier, professor of Pandects at the Brussels University, has indisputably established the unbroken continuity of the study of Roman law in Italy throughout the early Middle Ages. *Revue Historique du Droit Français,* 1877, pp. 1 sqq.

law, derived its formulas and principles from the Roman law, which celebrated professors were teaching with great brilliancy at Bologna, Montpellier, Toulouse, Lyons, and many other cities. Enthusiastic youth flocked to the classes of the law professors as had been the case with the grammarians of Charlemagne's time and the philosophers in the days of Abélard and as, two centuries later, they gathered about the humanist teachers.

The four principal foundations on which medieval society was built were custom, land tenure, feudal contract, and Christian royalty. All these had undergone crises calling for reform and readjustment. With an abstract logic which might fittingly be compared to that of the theorists of the French Revolution, and often with a violence not unlike the Jacobin fury of the men of 1793, the legists set to work to destroy what had need rather of being restored and to transform the incipient evolution into a veritable revolution.

The many different elements forming society in the thirteenth century—fiefs, manors, baronies, shires, towns with charters of freedom, cities with elective governments, workmen's and merchants' corporations, communities of peasants, parishes, universities—all these had come into being by the force of things and were directed by the circumstances of the time under the impulse and sometimes the restraint of the Christian spirit, like the vegetation of an immense virgin forest. Each institution had its own special character, its rules, its spirit, its interests, at times its own distinctive dress. The value of such organization was in its very diversity, flexibility, adaptation to each locality and period, and its unlimited capacity of transformation by custom which, having created it, could alter it indefinitely. The trouble with the system sprang from this same diversity, which had become well-nigh inextricable, and from its elusive and ever shifting legal procedure. This common law was odious to the legists,

who admired the exactness, logic, and clearness of the written law of ancient Rome. One of these fourteenth century legists said: "That is a hateful law which, because of the custom of the country, is contrary to the written law." [3]

In the hierarchy of social institutions, the Middle Ages had never divorced the idea of sovereignty from that of landed property. Jurisdiction was acquired with the land, and prerogatives were lost with the alienation of property. Land was suzerain and vassal. The diverse rights attached to the land always corresponded to obligations and duties. But the jurist, in opposition to this notion which he considered barbarous, set forth the idea of the old Roman law, which looked upon the right of property as an absolute right to use, enjoy, and dispose of (*jus utendi, fruendi, et abutendi*), without any obligation to a superior or any duty towards an inferior.

The medieval social groups formed a hierarchical organization, in which the relations and activities were regulated by contracts whereof the details that remained undetermined by custom were specified by precise, positive agreements. "In every part of the country," says Imbart de la Tour, "solemn agreements fixed the amount of rents and taxes, the length of ordinary armed service and knightly service, . . . the gradation of private and public rights. Throughout the whole kingdom there was established the right to discuss, through representatives, any change in these pacts, any increase in taxation, or any modification of the law, and to determine obligations or services." [4] Against such a state of things the legist protested; in his eyes the law should be uniform, every local exemption being objectionable and every concession of liberties being subject to revocation by the king, who was the dispenser of all civil and political rights.[5]

[3] Boutillier, *Somme rurale,* bk. I, tit. 1.
[4] Imbart de la Tour, I, p. 22.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 37.

In the Middle Ages "the most Christian king" was by his coronation oath charged with "safeguarding all rights . . . and repressing all injustices";[6] and for the proper exercise of this duty he was responsible before God, from whom he held his power. The legists also proclaimed that the king "holds his power only from God."[7] By this statement, however, they nowise meant to limit his rights, but rather to render them absolute and unlimited, like those of God Himself. They recalled the Roman maxim: *"Quidquid placuit principi, legis habet vigorem."*[8] For them the ideal of royalty was no longer to be found in a St. Louis, but in the Caesars of pagan Rome.[9]

Yet it would not be quite exact to say that the legists proclaimed and helped to establish the absolute and personal authority of the king. They set up a limit to royalty, namely, that of their own power. This power they exercised in the king's council, to which they were admitted, and in Parliament, which arrogated to itself the right, not only of administering justice, but of safeguarding the fundamental laws of the land, of registering ordinances and edicts, and of addressing remonstrances to the king. In one parliamentary declaration it is asserted that "the said court is the true seat and throne of the king . . . *ad instar* of the Roman senate."[10]

Such were the legists' doctrines, such was their power. Let us observe them at work in France, England, and Germany, at the courts of Philip the Fair, Edward III, and Louis of Bavaria.

[6] Coronation oath, *Archives nationales,* K 1714, f 9. Quoted by Imbart de la Tour, *loc. cit.*

[7] Declaration of Parliament in 1489.

[8] "Whatsoever the prince wills has the force of law."

[9] "Whatsoever the king is pleased to do must be held as law," said the legist-bailiff Beaumanoir, *Coutumes du Beauvoisis,* II, p. 57. A number of legists, like Beaumanoir, no longer invoked the "divine right," but substituted for it "the common good," general welfare, and public utility. See the preambles of decrees quoted by Langlois, *Philippe III,* p. 288.

[10] *Archives nationales,* X, 9323, no. 85, quoted by Imbart de la Tour, p. 43.

Philip the Fair's National Policy

To Philip's initiative and that of his sons has been attributed much of the responsibility for a policy which was due entirely to the legists who surrounded him.[11] More careful historical investigation no longer allows us to regard him as a daring and capable monarch, but rather leads us to consider him a man of weak character, who played only an obscure part.[12] In fact, he is so represented by nearly all of his contemporaries. William Scot, a monk of Saint-Denis, insinuates that Philip was "only a weak man, dominated by his entourage and allowing himself to be swayed by others, rather than a man who directed the policy of his reign." [13] The picture of Philip traced by the pen of his enemy, Bernard de Saisset, is not a mere caricature. "Our king," he says, "is like a horn-owl, the most beautiful of birds, but worthless; he is the handsomest man in the world, but the best he can do is to stare at people without speaking." [14]

It is a far different judgment we must pass on the lawyers who inspired the policy of this French king. Three of them deserve particular mention: Pierre Dubois, Pierre Flote, and William of Nogaret.

Pierre Dubois was born in lower Normandy near Coutances about 1250. After studying law at the University of Paris, where he heard St. Thomas Aquinas preach and Siger of Brabant teaching his commentary on Aristotle's *Politica,*

[11] "The successor of the insignificant Philip the Bold possessed as complete and logical a character as that of St. Louis himself." Henri Martin, *Histoire de France,* IV, p. 391.

[12] "He had a very weak character, and his sons were even more insignificant in the part they took in political life." Langlois, in Lavisse. *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, pp. 120, 122.

[13] *Historiens de la France,* XXI, pref., p. xiv and p. 205.

[14] Quoted by Lavisse, III, part 2, p. 121. Karl Wench, a German writer, has lately tried to defend the earlier opinions as to Philip the Fair. But his arguments do not seem conclusive. See *Bulletin de l'Ecole des Chartes,* May, 1906, p. 272, and *Revue des Questions Historiques,* 1907, p. 556.

he became one of the most active agents in the destructive work undertaken by the legists. Being a court-lawyer, he strove throughout his life, with passionate energy and "without being over-scrupulous in the choice of means," [15] to extend the rights of the civil government and to destroy ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He dreamed of Philip the Fair dominating Europe and incorporating the papal domain into his own States. Pierre Dubois, says Renan, maintained his ideas "with a boldness that has been exceeded only by the sixteenth century reformers." [16] After breathing into the King of France a hatred for the Church, he entered the service of King Edward the First of England, to play a like part at his court.

Pierre Flote of Auvergne, Philip's chancellor, did not entertain Dubois' vast and revolutionary ideas; but this "little one-eyed lawyer," [17] as Boniface VIII called him, introduced a shameless insolence and brutality into his conduct.

In malice both of these men were surpassed by the Gascon lawyer, William of Nogaret, Philip the Fair's "evil genius," [18] the sacrilegious aggressor against Boniface at Anagni. It has been said that in one sense he deserves to be called a great minister, but that in his company you felt yourself in the land of revolutionary theorists.[19] This descendant of the Vaudois, whose grandfather had been burned at the stake as

[15] E. Renan, *Pierre du Bois légiste,* in *Histoire littéraire,* XXVI, p. 476

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 484. Until the middle of the last century, scarcely anything was known of Pierre Dubois except his name. But his life and works have been brought to light through the researches of de Wailly and Boutaric. *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions,* XVIII, part 2, pp. 435 sqq. *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* second series, III, pp. 273 sqq. *Histoire littéraire,* XXVI, pp. 471 sqq.

[17] *"Belial ille Petrus Flote, semividens corpore, mentique totaliter excaecatus."* Dupuy, *op. cit., preuves,* p. 65.

[18] "William of Nogaret was, for several years, the king's tool," Langlois, in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 126.

[19] *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, p. 370.

a Patarin,[20] was himself a true precursor of the Jacobins of 1793.

No one perceived this perfidious influence of the legists more clearly than Boniface VIII. "They are evil councillors," he wrote to the King, "who have inspired you with such false and senseless things. They are the ones who devour the subjects of your realm; they are like those concealed doors which enabled the servants of Baal to remove the offerings secretly. They abuse your protection to steal your goods and the goods of others." [21]

The characteristic note of Philip's policy was not, as has often been alleged, "to make the French nation aware of itself." [22] That such a work was needed at this epoch, and that an ampler autonomy of the different nations would bring about some modifications in the exercise of papal sovereignty, no reasonable mind in the Church denied. This had been undertaken already by St. Louis.

Between the policy of that great king, inspired by a Christian spirit, and that of his grandson, led on by the legists, there was a profound difference. This is plainly pointed out by the German historian, Leopold von Ranke. "We find," he says, "some kings who subordinate their holding the sceptre and even the existence of their kingdom to loftier aims: the maintenance of the order established by God, the progress of civilization, due regard for justice, the accomplishment of the aims of the Church, and the spread of the faith. Others there are who consider themselves as primarily representing their country's interests; the aggrandizement of its power seems to them a purpose glorious in itself. Without hesita-

[20] Vaissète, *Histoire générale du Languedoc,* IV, p. 551. Raynaldi, *Annales,* 1303, no. 41.

[21] Bull *"Ausculta fili"* (December 5th, 1301); Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* IX, p. 221.

[22] Laurent, *Études sur l'histoire de l'humanité.* VI, p. 379.

tion they invade other countries whenever they judge it useful to do so; their destiny and their glory are, in their eyes, to be achieved by the development of their country's internal strength and its external grandeur. Kings of the former type are men of a lofty, humane, religious spirit, who see their power restricted by laws, not with regret, but rather with satisfaction; the others are energetic characters,[23] at times passionate and hard-hearted, men who suffer only the most necessary limitations to their power. The former belong rather to the Middle Ages, the latter to modern times; but both classes are to be met with in all periods of history. After the Capetian race had given the world a St. Louis, the type and model of religious monarchs, it produced a king of the opposite character: this was Philip the Fair." [24] St. Louis, says Guizot, "made his conscience the first rule of his conduct." [25] The French policy under Philip the Fair had as its underlying principle only the pursuit of national interest by every means, or rather, as has been said, "national egotism." [26]

This policy was first manifested in the administration of finances. The efforts of Philip's predecessors resulted in concentrating in the king's hands, for the national defense and good order, the control of immense landed properties, the command of a national army, the direction of more and more numerous and complex administrative functions.

To meet the expenses consequent on this new organization, Philip IV, remarks an impartial historian, had recourse "to financial measures which bore a novel impress of arbitrariness and violence." [27] The fraudulent alteration of the currency, arbitrary taxation, and the calling to France of Jewish

[23] We have seen that the legists are to be credited with energy.

[24] Ranke, *Histoire de France,* I, p. 41.

[25] Guizot, *The History of Civilization,* III, p. 243.

[26] It is in reference to this policy, consecrated by the Treaty of Westphalia, that Lavisse writes: "France was the first to put in practice with great splendor the policy of national egoism." (*Histoire de France,* VII, part 1, p. 23.)

[27] Luchaire, *Manuel des institutions françaises au Moyen Age,* p. 594.

and Lombard financiers, who were forced to disgorge after being allowed to grow rich by the most questionable methods [28] —such were some of the measures which gradually aroused the protests of public opinion against the king.[29] Other measures were aimed directly at the property of the Church and the rights of the clergy.

It was a principle of canon and civil law, universally admitted in the Middle Ages, that the clergy, while subject to the common law of contributions based on their personal possessions, owed nothing to the State on account of church property, which, as is well known, bore the expense of popular education, public charities, and religious worship. In times of public need the clergy never refused to share the burden by the offering of extraordinary gratuitous donations. For example, under Philip the Bold the French clergy voted important financial aid for the war against Aragon.[30]

[28] This was called "squeezing the Jews' sponge."

[29] "We have not found a single historian of the thirteenth or fourteenth century who does not strongly protest against the exactions of the French king. The continuer of Girard de Franchet relates the beginnings of 'that exaction, formerly unheard-of in France, which was called maltote, *malam toltam*. First a hundredth part was required, then a fiftieth of all one's goods. In the beginning the tax was imposed on merchants, but soon it was extended to all laymen, and all the clergy, and throughout the realm.' We find this set forth in similar terms by the other chroniclers of the time; Sismondi sums them up when he says: 'The king's officers at first collected a tax of a hundredth part, then it became a fiftieth; but the arbitrary methods employed and the violence with which seizures were carried out made the maltote more burdensome and objectionable than the amount of the tax would seem to explain.' These last details are taken from Nangis. They show the sore spot. The exactions of the financial administration were often unjust, But even those who uncomplainingly allowed themselves to be stripped were made rebellious by the incomparable insolence of the treasury officers. The subordinates of those days were like those of all countries and all times; they were over-zealous." Gautier, *Etudes et tableaux historiques, Boniface VIII,* p. 244. Cf. *Historiens de la France, Continuatio Girardi de Francheto,* XXI, p. 14; Sismondi, *Histoire de France,* VIII, p. 516. See also Raynaldi, IV, p. 209.

[30] Boutaric, in his conscientious work, *La France sous Philippe le Bel,* makes this judicious remark: "It is oftentimes supposed that in the Middle Ages the clergy did not contribute to the expenses of the State, and that their possessions were exempt from taxation; nothing is farther from the truth. We must distinguish the goods of the Church from those which formed the patrimony of the

The first mistake on the part of Philip the Fair's government was in trying to make these voluntary contributions obligatory and dependent on the arbitrary will of the king.

As early as 1294 Philip obliged all the clergy to vote "a double tithe for two years, beginning at All Saints." Some objections were raised. Several ecclesiastics in the province of Rheims appealed to Pope Boniface;[31] but Philip was not greatly disturbed by these protests. "The clergy were not free to refuse; those ecclesiastics who refused to contribute were exposed to the king's vengeance, who had their temporalities placed under his own hands. The abbots of the Order of Citeaux, in the diocese of Carcassonne, appealed to the immunities which they enjoyed; the seneschal seized their goods and returned them only after the contributions were paid."[32] In 1296 there was another demand for tithes. The bishops met in Paris on May 27th. "They granted, *subject to the pope's approval,* two more tithes, one payable on the next Pentecost, the other on the 29th of the following September, *on condition that they would be collected by the clergy without any interference from the lay authority.*"[33] The government treasury officials were not trusted. "If the Church should experience any vexations on the king's part, the collection of the subsidy was to cease."[34] Such were the somewhat too extensive concessions of the French bishops, sub-

clergy. The same rule did not apply to both. The clergy were exempt from personal taxation, but they shared the burden of taxation by reason of their personal fortune just as the laity, for the needs of the State and of the local communities to which they belonged." Boutaric, *op. cit.*, p. 177 sqq. The chapters of this work which deal with finance are quite remarkable.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 281 sq. See also, in *Historiens de la France,* XXXI, p. 525, the *Inventaire* of Robert Mignon.

[32] Boutaric, *loc. cit.* Boutaric cites an order issued to the seneschal of Beaucoire, directing him to put the Order of Citeaux again in possession of their goods which had been sequestrated, inasmuch as the abbeys of that order had at length promised a subsidy (June, 1295).

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 283 sq.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

missive to the dominance of the King, who was as powerful as he was deceitful. But the Order of Citeaux, which had already energetically opposed the imposition of tithes in 1294 and 1295, arose in unanimous protest against the new exactions of the French King.[35] It was their complaint that led Pope Boniface VIII to issue the Bull *"Clericis laicos."*

Even before Boniface VIII's pontificate, the king of France had in another way encroached on the rights of the clergy. By abusing the privilege of the *"regale,"* that is, the pretended right to receive the revenues of a vacant bishopric, a claim which was itself an abuse,[36] he was not satisfied with the ordinary income, but also took some of the landed property, cutting down the forests and exhausting the fish ponds. To the *"regale,"* thus interpreted, he added what he called "the royal safeguard," which extended in a general way to all abbacies and bishoprics that became vacant, under the pretext of protecting their property from attack. Thanks to this so-called safeguard, he was able to lay his hand on the temporalities of all vacant prelatures.[37]

Boniface VIII

At the very time when these odious exactions were being carried out, the Holy See was occupied by the pious but inexperienced Celestine V,[38] whom popular enthusiasm had snatched from his hermitage and conducted to the Chair of Peter. With justice did a certain prudent historian write: "You might call him an angel, but it was a man that was

[35] Kervyn, *Recherches,* pp. 16 sq.; Boutaric, p. 284.

[36] At this period the ecclesiastical canons granted to the king only the right to watch over the vacant benefices, to reserve their profits for the future titulary, and to appoint to a benefice when its title was of royal patronage. See Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 3, bk. 2, 54.

[37] Boutaric, pp. 69 sqq.; Hefele, IX, pp. 213 sq.

[38] *"Homo Dei in rebus secularibus minus expertus."* Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis,* II, p. 463

needed." [39] This pontiff, who fled from the society of men, who had a little wooden cell built in the papal palace, where he might shut himself in and pray,[40] soon perceived that it was his duty to lay down the burden of the pontificate. At times he was heard groaning and murmuring: "My God, while I reign over souls, I am losing my own!" There was a greatness in the courage with which he abdicated the tiara, resumed his anchorite life, and therein devoted himself to humility, prayer, and mortification, which placed him in the number of the saints.[41]

Eleven days later (December 24th, 1294), the College of Cardinals elevated to the supreme pontificate a man of energy and perspicacity, one familiar with public affairs, such as the Church had need of, Cardinal Benedetto Gaetani, who took the name of Boniface VIII.

He was born of a noble family of Spanish origin in the old city of Anagni at the foot of the Apennines, some time between 1210 and 1230.[42] His ardent and generous soul was early pained at the evils which the papacy had to suffer from the harsh violence of Frederick II and the excessive ambition of Charles of Anjou. Like most sons of noble families of that period, he studied law. Historians have considered him one of the most illustrious doctors of the University of Paris.[43] There he studied civil law and especially ecclesiastical law with so great success that his fame was widespread. In

[39] Christophe, *Histoire de la papauté pendant le XIV^e siècle,* I, p. 73.

[40] *"Fabricata intra palatium lignea camerula se concludebat."* Manhaeus Vagius, in *Vita Celestini,* quoted by Christophe, *l.c.*

[41] Petrarch raised to heaven the sublime act of St. Celestine's abdication (*De vita solitaria,* bk. 2, sect. 3, ch. 18), whereas Dante placed among those "who lived without infamy or praise" him "who made through cowardice the great refusal." Longfellow's translation of the *Inferno,* canto III, vv. 36, 60. Cf. *Acta Sanctorum,* May, IV; *Liber pontificalis,* II, pp. 467 sqq.

[42] Tosti, *History of Pope Boniface VIII and his Times,* p. 37.

[43] Duboulay, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis.* Catalog. III acad., vol. III, p. 676.

the various embassies on which he was sent to Rudolph, king of the Romans, Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, and Philip the Fair, king of France, Benedetto Gaetani had an opportunity to train himself in the business of ecclesiastical and secular affairs. But throughout his life he remained first of all a lawyer, and it is said that he was the greatest canonist of his day. His diplomatic mission to France brought him into relation with Philip the Fair; his sojourn at the University of Paris put him in touch with those legists who were to become the most formidable adversaries of his policy.

The Roman law, to the study of which the clergy devoted themselves during the Middle Ages,[44] had become an object of suspicion to the Church, not only because it turned their minds away from theological studies,[45] but especially because it was conceived in a spirit of hostility to the Church and because emperors and kings had already taken undue advantage of it.[46] Pope Honorius had issued a Bull (November 1219) forbidding all religious and clerics to study Roman law under pain of ecclesiastical censure.[47] Benedetto Gaetani passionately devoted himself to the study of canon law, which became more and more the arsenal for supplying the Church with arms for the struggle in which she was engaged. This venerable discipline, which proudly gloried in holding the loftiest rank in the hierarchy of sciences,[48] which called itself *theologia rectrix* and *theologia practica,* may have borrowed its absolute principles and dialectical methods too much from dogmatic theology [49] and may have been too prone to judge the force of ecclesiastical laws according to abstract and

[44] Savigny, *The History of the Roman Law during the Middle Ages.* Cf. *Corpus juris canonici,* Decret., pars 1, dist. 10, cap. 13.

[45] Cap. X, *Super specula,* tit. 50, lib. 3, Decretal.

[46] Périès, *La faculté de droit dans l'ancienne Université de Paris,* pp. 95 sqq.

[47] Cap. X, *loc. cit.*

[48] See the article on "Kirchenrecht" in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon.*

[49] Viollet, *Histoire du droit français,* pp. 31 sqq.

speculative maxims. It did not take sufficient account of historical circumstances.[50] The Roman law, on the other hand, with its ambition to govern the world, tended overmuch to subordinate the principles and conclusions of the old lawyers to this ambition. A great conflict was about to break out between Boniface VIII and the government of Philip the Fair. May it not be that its prelude is to be found in the class-room argumentations in which the student of the Decretals and future author of the *Liber Sextus* tried his strength against the commentators of the Pandects? At all events, the struggle in which he will one day engage for the defense of the Church will be not merely the tragic duel of two powers, one of which will have all the impetuous force of an assailant and the other all the desperate energy of one besieged; it will be, in fact, a conflict of the two personifications of law at that period—the Gallican legist and the Roman canonist.

As a canonist, such as those times understood the term, Boniface will sometimes employ a somewhat too abstract and rigid argumentation; as a combatant defending a threatened fortress, he will use a too ready vivacity. But we shall see his great soul inspiring him with a generous love of truth; we shall see him promptly explain, comment, and adjust to existing circumstances, some maxim, stated in an absolute form, which a first impulse had dictated to him. To be just toward Boniface, we must consider together his letters proclaiming principles and those subsequently regulating the application of those principles; we must interpret the words of the canonical expert by the practical and moderate explanations of the common father of the faithful.

When, upon his elevation to the pontificate (Christmas, 1294), the new Pope surveyed the Christendom which he knew so well, we can understand why, dreading the heavy

[50] *Kirchenlexikon, loc. cit.*

burden he was assuming, he took for his motto, *"Deus in adjutorium meum intende."* [51]

Europe was aflame. The strife of Albert of Austria against Adolph of Nassau was rending the Holy Empire. France and England had come to blows. Internal convulsions were disturbing Italy. Guelfs and Ghibellines were wrestling for power in Florence and Rome. To the north, the king of Denmark was persecuting the Church. The Holy Land was in the hands of the infidels and, when recent popes had tried to awaken the old crusading ardor, princes and peoples, engaged in fighting one another or in safeguarding their material interests, remained almost deaf to these appeals. The old faith of the Middle Ages was grown cold in the hearts of men. Christian art had lost its traditional symbolism and was entering upon a path of realism which was to become a new expression of religious feeling, but at first was disconcerting.

Boniface, relying on the divine help which he had just implored, planned from the very first days of his pontificate to restore the ancient splendor of medieval Christendom. To pacify peoples and kings, to unite them in a new crusade for the conquest of the tomb of Christ, to revive piety in men's souls, and to renew Christian art—such were the aims he pursued until his death. The painful struggles he had to sustain against the king of France sometimes diverted him from his path, but he returned to it with tireless perseverance, which we can follow almost day by day in the Register of his correspondence.[52]

Boniface was consecrated January 23rd, 1295.[53] The very next day he wrote to King Edward of England and King Philip of France, exhorting them to love and respect jus-

[51] "Come unto my help, O God."

[52] See *Les registres de Boniface VIII,* by Digard, Faucon, and Thomas; also Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* vol. IV.

[53] Potthast, IV, p. 1924, no. 24019.

tice;[54] three weeks later it was to the city of Venice, then at war with Genoa, that he addressed similar exhortations, recalling the memory of the peace of Christendom and the conquest of the Holy Land;[55] six days later he wrote to Edward and Philip, offering his mediation and for this purpose sending them two cardinals as legates.[56] The hostilities between France and England threatened to involve all Europe in fire and blood. King Eric of Norway, Rudolph, former king of the Romans and rival of Adolph of Nassau, Count Florent of Holland, Count Otto IV of Flanders, King Baliol of Scotland, many nobles greedy for conquest, cities and communes of Castile eager for gain, took the side of Philip, while Adolph of Nassau and John of Richemont, duke of Brittany, gave their support to King Edward. Neither the legates' entreaties, fortified and encouraged by pressing letters from the Pope, nor the steps taken by Boniface VIII with Adolph of Nassau, succeeded in appeasing the belligerents. Not satisfied with continuing the war, Philip, hard pressed for funds, violated the rights of his people by coining false money.[57] His ally, Eric of Denmark, contrary to the immunities of the clergy and without respect for the goods of the Church, pillaged the bishops and put one of them, the Archbishop of Lunden, in chains. Boniface addressed King Eric in a noble and paternal protest, asking that ambassadors be sent to Rome to enable him to work for the reëstablishment of peace in the kingdom of Denmark.[58]

If you were to go through all the letters written by the new Pope at this period, you would see that, in fulfilling the rôle of mediator which the public law of the Middle Ages assigned to him and which, moreover, he alone was able to perform amidst

[54] *Ibid.*, no. 24020.
[55] *Ibid.*, no. 24022.
[56] *Ibid.*, no. 24027.
[57] Tosti, *op. cit.*, p. 137.
[58] Reg. Vat., an. II, ep. 59.

the divisions and almost universal hatreds of the times, not a word fell from his pen but breathed a spirit of peace and condescension.

The Bull *"Clericis laicos"*

A time came, however, when the Pontiff's respect for justice and his duty to protect the goods of the Church obliged him to employ the spiritual arms belonging to his office. Unscrupulous usurers infested the diocese of Autun; Boniface VIII ordered the bishop to expel them for good.[59] He directed the bishop of Metz to disinter the remains of a famous usurer and cast them outside consecrated ground.[60] The bishop of Arles, the bishop of Marseilles, the judges of Lucania and those of Pisa and Orvieto made no protest against the laity usurping church property. Boniface summoned them to be judged, and punished them with canonical censures.[61] The Church was also threatened by a less apparent but more dangerous abuse. The desire to win the favor of princes often led the clergy to dispose of property, offered to God for the needs of divine worship and of the poor, to the profit of these princes, under the guise of gifts, aids, or tokens of gratitude. The watchful Pontiff believed that the moment had come to decree a general measure to cure these abuses. Such was the object of the famous constitution *"Clericis laicos"* (February 25th, 1296), which was destined to stir up so much hatred against him.

"The history of olden times teaches, and daily experience proves," said the Pope, "that the laity have always felt hostile to the clergy and have constantly striven to overstep their bounds by wickedness and disobedience. They do not reflect

[59] *Ibid.*, an. I, ep. 59.
[60] *Ibid.*, an. I, ep. 508; cf. Tosti, p 165.
[61] Reg. Vat., an. I, ep. 146, 150, 151, 223, 315.

that all power over the clergy, over persons and property of the Church is denied them. They lay heavy burdens on prelates, churches, and both regular and secular clergy, crush them with taxes, taking sometimes half, at other times a tenth, a twentieth, or some other portion of their revenues, trying to reduce them to slavery in a thousand ways. In the bitterness of our soul we must add that certain prelates and other ecclesiastical persons, fearful when there is nothing for them to fear, seek a fugitive peace and dread a temporal majesty more than the eternal majesty by lending themselves to these abuses, less through temerity than imprudence, but without obtaining due faculty and authorization from the Holy See."

Then follow the weighty censures of the Church. "To cut short these abuses, we, in accord with the cardinals and by virtue of our apostolic authority, ordain the following: All prelates and, in general all persons belonging to the Church, monks or secular clergy, who, without the consent of the Apostolic See, pay or promise to pay to laymen any imposts, taxes, tithe or half-tithe, or even a hundredth part or any portion whatsoever of their revenues or of the goods of their churches by way of subvention, loan, gift, subsidy, etc., as also emperors, kings, princes, barons, rectors, etc., who levy the same, who exact them or receive them, or who even put their hand on valuables placed in the churches or who cooperate in this sort of act, all these persons *ipso facto* incur excommunication. We interdict communities that preach in defense of these condemned acts. Under penalty of deposition, we order prelates and all churchmen not to permit these taxes to be collected without the express consent of the Apostolic See, not to pay them, not even though they allege the pretext that a promise of this sort has been made before the publication of the present decree. Even in this case, if these persons pay and if the laymen receive such payments, both incur *ipso*

facto excommunication. Moreover, no one may absolve from this excommunication or interdict unless he receives from the Apostolic See full power so to do; the one only exception being the case of a person at the hour of death. For we have decided to tolerate no longer this astounding abuse of the civil power; and no privilege granted to any king—for example, that of never being excommunicated—may constitute an obstacle to the execution of this present decree." [62]

Whenever Boniface, no longer addressing an individual, rises to the realm of principles, he proclaims them with an inflexibility which he doubtless received from the scholastic methods of his time and which was of a sort to wound those who were ill-disposed towards him. Besides, in this Bull one senses the unrestrained irritation of an ardent spirit.[63]

At bottom, the papal document introduced nothing new and only recalled to mind the existing law.[64] Yet it was, in the words of Bossuet, "the spark that lighted a conflagration." [65]

Each ruler received the Bull according to his own dispositions. In Germany, Adolph of Nassau, sufficiently occupied with his financial difficulties and with the silent opposition that was already developing against him, accepted it with respect. A diocesan synod held in Cambrai, then German territory, decreed that the Bull be translated into the vulgar tongue and read to the people four times a year.[66]

The brutal Edward of England flew into a passion. Being hard pressed for money by his war with John of Scotland

[62] *Sext. Decret.*, lib. 3, tit. 23, *De immun. eccles.*, cap. 3. Potthast, IV, no. 24291.

[63] It is in this sense that Hefele writes: "The effect of the publication of this Bull was most unfortunate." (*Histoire des conciles,* IX, p. 182.)

[64] In Thomassin it can be seen that the Bull purely and simply renews a doctrine which was traditional in the Church and which had been accepted in principle by all the States up to that time. (Thomassin, *op. cit.,* part 3, bk. 1, ch. 43, no. 9.)

[65] Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis conventus cleri Gallicani, anno 1682,* part 2, bk. 7, ch. 23.

[66] Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae,* IV, pp. 89 sqq.

and his preparations for a campaign against the king of France, that prince crushed the churches with all sorts of taxes. By way of reply to the Bull, he redoubled his violent acts. But he encountered the heroic resistance of the clergy. At a council which met, by royal mandate, at St. Paul's in London, the bishops courageously proclaimed their unanimous adherence to the papal constitution. Neither imprisonment nor exile nor any sort of violence was able to overcome the admirable church of England, gathered about the valiant Archbishop Robert of Canterbury. Edward later on had to disavow his conduct and regret his mistake.

In the attitude of the French king it is not difficult to recognize the influence of the crafty legists who surrounded him. Without making any allusion to the act of the Holy See, Philip forbade his subjects, both clergy and laity, "to transport or send any silver, whether coined or not, beyond the realm, even out of devotion to the Holy See." This measure was intended to cut off one of the most abundant sources of papal revenue and was an open violation of the canons of the Church, which forbade secular powers to interfere in the administration or distribution of these revenues.

The Pope was not deceived as to the meaning and origin of this measure. He wrote to Philip: "See where your wretched advisers have led you. . . . Such was not the conduct of your ancestors." Then, after reminding the King of what the Holy See had done for France and the solicitude which he himself had for that great nation, he reduced to their real significance the prohibitions decreed by his letter. "We have not decreed," he said, "that ecclesiastics should not contribute to the defense and wants of the kingdom, but that our leave is necessary for such subsidies in order to put a stop to the unbearable exactions of your agents over the clergy. In cases of need we would rather sell the sacred vessels and crosses of the churches than expose to the least danger a king-

dom like France, always so dear and devoted to the Holy See." [67] In a second letter Boniface was still more explicit. "As it is an author's right to explain the meaning of his words," he wrote to the King, "so we make the following declaration, both for your tranquillity and that of your successors. If a prelate or any other cleric of your realm wishes voluntarily and without pressure to make you a gift or even a loan, our Bull contains nothing opposed thereto, not even should a friendly and courteous invitation to make such a gift be extended either on your part or that of your officials. It is needless to add that the Bull has not in mind the dues to which prelates may be bound by virtue of the fiefs which they hold. Exemption is also made for those cases of necessity in which the Holy See cannot be consulted, because of the *periculum in mora.*" [68]

This last point was developed in a final letter. The Pope ruled that it would pertain to the reigning king, his successors, or, in case of the king's minority, to the States, to declare "danger of delay" which would permit the raising of subsidies from the goods of the clergy without the supreme pontiff's permission.[69]

These explanations removed every pretext for opposition on the King's part. Philip withdrew his prohibition and even allowed to be published in France the Pope's order directing the renewal of the truce between France and England under pain of excommunication.

[67] Bull *"Ineffabilis"* (September 25th, 1296), quoted in Tosti, p. 170. See Raynaldi, IV, pp. 210, sqq., and Potthast, IV, no. 24398.

[68] Letter *"Romana mater Ecclesia"* (February 7th, 1297); Potthast, IV, no. 24468; Raynaldi, 1297, sec. 49.

[69] Letter *"Etsi de statu"* (July 31st, 1297). Potthast, no. 24553; Raynaldi, 1297, sec. 50. Cf. Potthast, no. 24549. In the accounts published by Guigniau and Natalis de Wailly in volume XXI of *Historiens de la France,* pp. 529 sqq., can be found indicated all the tithes which Pope Boniface VIII authorized to be raised in France from 1297. These "collections" end in 1307, three years after the outrage of Anagni.

The work of pacification in justice seemed to triumph. Boniface took advantage of the calm to hasten King Louis IX's process of canonization. In August, 1297, a solemn Bull addressed to all the bishops and archbishops of France placed the illustrious ancestor of Philip IV on the altars and fixed the celebration of the saint's feast on the day after St. Bartholomew's.[70] "It was a cause of great joy," says Joinville, "and rightly so for the whole realm of France. And it should be a great honor for all his lineage who strive to imitate him in doing good, and a great dishonor to all those of his lineage who wish to do evil; for they will be pointed out and it will be said that their descent from that holy king makes their wickedness the more odious." [71]

The Question of Papal Supremacy

While Joinville was writing these lines, St. Louis' grandson was justifying their eloquent severity by his conduct. Under the inspiration of the legists, his adherence was doubtful, his obedience mingled with reservations, his deference incomplete. If he did, in fact, accept the publication of the truce ordered by the Pope, it was with a protest that, as a matter of right, he was responsible to no one for his temporal government; [72] if the next year (1298) he bowed to the arbitration decision which Boniface pronounced as Pope between him and his rival, it was with a complaint that the Pope had favored England.[73] He professed devotion to the Holy See, but he welcomed about him the Supreme Pontiff's worst enemies.

The most redoubtable of these were Cardinals Giacomo and Pietro Colonna, belonging to the powerful Colonna family

[70] Potthast, no. 24561.
[71] *Historiens de la France,* XX, p. 303.
[72] Dupuy, p. 28.
[73] Hefele, IX, p. 203.

of Rome. Since Boniface's election they had constantly intrigued against him and become the center of a formidable opposition. Gathered about these two rebellious cardinals might be seen the partisans of the house of Aragon and the "Fratricelli," those descendants of the "spiritual Franciscans" who claimed to maintain the pure teaching of St. Francis against later deformations and who had received some encouragement from Pope Celestine V. These opponents charged that Boniface, the crafty supplanter of Celestine, had obtained the latter's resignation by force and was not the legitimate pope.[74] Inflammatory poems and vehement pamphlets by Jacopone da Todi gave form and breath and, as it were, wings to the insurrection. Giacomo and Pietro Colonna, uncle and nephew, were deprived of their dignities by a papal decree of May 10th, 1297;[75] they had started an open revolt. A real war, a "crusade," was organized by Boniface against the rebels and was led by nobles who exercised that pitiless severity which so often marks the suppression of uprisings. The trouble came to an end with the destruction of the chateaux and fortresses occupied by the insurgents and with the imprisonment of the two leaders. But they escaped and accused Boniface of having broken his word to reinstate them in their honors. They took refuge at the court of the French king.

Albert of Austria, another enemy of Boniface, sought Philip's support. He was "a harsh man, of pitiless character, with a somber and calculating mind, mean and unscrupulous."[76] He had himself elected to replace Adolph of Nassau, whom, it is said, he had killed with his own hand in a battle

[74] It is quite possible that Boniface VIII advised St. Celestine V to abdicate. It is beyond doubt that to prevent Celestine becoming, in intriguers' hands, a cause of disturbance, Boniface secured the person of the good and holy monk. But these acts, for which Boniface was bitterly blamed by his foes, should be considered acts of prudence and wisdom.

[75] Potthast, no. 24513.

[76] Georges Blondel, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, III, p. 611.

that took place July 2nd, 1298. But Boniface accused him of having attacked Adolph treasonably, declared him unworthy of the empire, and, reserving to himself the right to dispose of the German crown, summoned Albert to appear before him. Albert turned to Philip, swearing vengeance on the Pope. Later on he was obliged to break off this French alliance, which had no bond save that of a common resentment, and as a matter of policy, to be reconciled to Pope Boniface.

It was at this moment that the legists of the French king, intoxicated with ambition, formed the design of a universal monarchy, established for Philip the Fair's benefit, including the annexation to the French realm of all other States, not even excepting the Empire of Constantinople or the States of the Church, which latter were to be confiscated and secularized.[77] Pierre Dubois proposed to King Philip to have the Pope accept a pension equal to the income from the Patrimony of St. Peter. "The Supreme Pontiff," he wrote, "is so burdened with spiritual cares that he should be considered unable to give proper attention to the government of his temporalities without prejudice to spiritual interests. Deducting expenses and other necessary liabilities, and reckoning what remains for the Pope from the profits and revenues of his domain, it would be better to give them in perpetual emphysteutic lease to some great prince or king on condition of an annual pension." In another memorandum he returns to this idea, which had made Frederick II smile when Dubois proposed to Innocent IV to take the lands of the Church for the payment of a quit-rent. He wrote: "By the mediation of the king of Sicily it will be possible to have the Roman Church declare that the title of Senator of Rome belongs to the king of France, who would exercise its functions by a delegate, and who would also be able to obtain the Patrimony of the Church with the duty of estimating how much is derived from the

[77] Hefele, IX, p. 209.

city of Rome, Tuscany, the seacoast, the mountains, etc., in order to pay to the pope the amounts that he ordinarily derives therefrom, and to receive in exchange the homage of kings and the obedience of cities . . . with all the revenues that the pope is accustomed to receive. The supreme pontiff should claim merely the glory of pardoning, and devote his time to reading, preaching, and prayer." [78]

But what contrasts in human affairs! At the very time when these advisers of the French king were cherishing such strange projects, the Pope, moved by the great success of the jubilee celebrations of 1300, which had brought more than 200,000 persons to the tomb of the Apostles, thought that he could revive the old ideal of Christendom in all its power and glory.

In the course of a jubilee sermon in the Pope's presence, Cardinal Aquasparta, Boniface's confidant, maintained that "the pope alone enjoys spiritual and temporal sovereignty over all men, in place of God." The following year, on the occasion of the election of the king of Hungary, Boniface himself wrote: "The Roman pontiff, established by God above kings and kingdoms in the Church militant, is the supreme head of the hierarchy." [79] As the most living expression of Christendom seemed to the Pope to be an alliance of all Christian peoples armed for the crusade, and as his uppermost thought had always been the deliverance of the Holy Land, he deemed the hour had come to summon princes and people to take up the cross. The encounter of these two imposing ideas was to be tragic.

The Pope appointed Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, to notify Philip of the Crusade. This unfortunate choice pro-

[78] Quoted by de Wailly in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions,* XVIII, p. 443. De Wailly shows that Pierre Dubois' memoir should be dated 1300, for its author speaks of the marriage of Blanche of France with Rudolph of Austria, which took place at the beginning of 1300.

[79] Potthast, no. 25080.

voked hostilities. Bernard de Saisset was known as a man who did not like the French and took little pains to conceal the fact. He had hopes of a greater autonomy for his native country of Languedoc. Whereas he was a personal friend of Boniface VIII, who had entrusted him with several confidential missions, he detested Philip IV, and particularly Pierre Flote, whose affliction prompted him to say maliciously that in the kingdom of the blind the one-eyed is king. On the night of July 12th, 1301, the episcopal palace of Pamiers was surrounded, the Bishop's temporalities placed under the King's hand, and his papers seized. The Bishop was brought before the King at Senlis and subjected to a scorching examination by Pierre Flote, who accused him of the most abominable crimes, besides the complaints attested by witnesses.

The trial continued and would doubtless have led to a severe punishment for the Bishop, when the Pope, informed of the progress of the affair, intervened (December 4th, 1301) by publishing the Bull *"Salvator mundi."* As in the Bull *"Clericis laicos,"* Boniface took occasion of the case in dispute to proclaim one of those general theories, the unqualified enunciation of which so deeply wounded the French legists. "The Vicar of Christ," he said, "can suspend, revoke, or modify the statutes, privileges, and concessions emanating from the Holy See, without the fulness of his authority being restricted by any disposition whatsoever." [80] Consequently, he revoked the permissions previously granted in the matter of raising subsidies for the defense of the State. The next day, in a new Bull, beginning *"Ausculta fili,"* he declared that, as God had established him, the Supreme Pontiff, above kings and kingdoms, "to build up, to plant, to pluck up, and to destroy, the King of France must not let himself suppose he has no superior," for "that would be the thought of a fool, an infidel." Then he summoned the bishops of France to meet in Rome

[80] *Ibid.*, no. 25096.

on November 1st, 1302 for the purpose of leading the King of Fance back into the right path. "Assuredly," he wrote, addressing the King, "we would have the right to employ arms against you, the bow and quiver; but we prefer to deliberate with the ecclesiastical persons of your realm." [81]

Philip had the Bull *"Ausculta fili"* solemnly burned; or did its destruction take place by accident? History has not yet made the matter quite clear.[82] It is certain, however, that a false and misleading summary of the Bull was drawn up by a legist, probably Pierre Flote, which makes the Pope say to Philip: "We wish you to know that you are subject to us in both temporal and spiritual things." [83] This was to insinuate that Boniface intended treating Philip as a suzerain his vassal. At the same time a letter from the King of France, which was never sent to Rome, was circulated by the legists to arouse public opinion. It began in this wise: "Philip, by the grace of God, King of the French, to Boniface, who giveth himself out for Sovereign Pontiff, little or no greeting. Let thy Extreme Fatuity know that we are subject to no one in things temporal, etc." [84] Finally, by way of reply to the Pope, who had convoked a council for November 1st, 1302, Philip summoned for April of the same year the representatives of the three orders of the realm, nobles, clergy, and common people (*gens du commun*), "to deliberate about matters of the highest concern to the King and the kingdom."

This assembly, convened April 10th, 1302, in the Church of Notre Dame de Paris, was the first meeting of the States General. "This assembling of the States General by Philippe-le-Bel," says Michelet somewhat pompously, "constitutes the national era of France, its baptismal register." [85] In reality,

[81] *Ibid.*, no. 25097.
[82] Rocquain in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1883, pp. 383 sqq.
[83] Quoted in Tosti, *op. cit.*, p. 332.
[84] *Ibid.*, p. 337.
[85] Michelet, *History of France,* I, p. 354.

the institution of the States General, in so far as it was liberal and democratic, was only the application of one of the traditional principles of the Middle Ages—"the right to consent to public burdens, to be summoned to exercise control over the established government, and to govern itself." [86] The growing importance of the bourgeoisie and of rural communities at the beginning of the fourteenth century did not permit them to be neglected in the public consultations of the nation. Moreover, it is now asserted that there was nothing democratic in Philip's intentions when, in summoning the States General of 1302, he instructed his bailiffs and seneschals "to select as representatives men who are ready to hear and accept the royal decisions, with express command to proceed against those who would not obey the King's orders." [87] As to the real aim of the convention, it appeared from the first words of the speech of Pierre Flote, who opened the deliberations: it was to set the French nation in opposition to the Pope. "A certain letter from the Pope," he said, "has been brought to us by the Archbishop of Narbonne, declaring that we are subject to the Pope in the temporal administration of this kingdom; and that to him and not to God alone, as has always been believed, do we owe our crown." [88] Here again we have an exaggeration of the Pope's words, transforming his doctrine of "supremacy" into a claim of "suzerainty."

The minds of the members of the assembly had already been prepared by the publication of the pretended papal Bull and of the letter drawn up in the King's name. The nobles declared themselves ready to pour out their blood for the crown.

[86] Imbart de la Tour, *Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse, Époque féodale,* p. 180.

[87] See a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Ms. lat. 17534, p. 511), reproduced in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1906, pp. 470 sqq. Cf. in the *Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France,* the volume which Georges Picot devotes to *Documents relatifs aux États généraux et assemblées réunies sous Philippe le Bel.*

[88] Tosti, p. 335.

The representatives of the communes adhered to the King's declarations. As for the embarrassed clergy, they sent a message to the Supreme Pontiff, begging him to withdraw his prohibitions "so as not to destroy the ancient union that exists between the Church, the king, and the realm."

As he had done in the matter of the interpretation of the Bull *"Clericis laicos,"* the Pope protested against the falsification to which the legists had subjected his letters. "The letters which, after mature deliberation and in accord with the advice of our brethren, we sent to the King, have been falsified by Pierre Flote, that heretic, that Achitopel . . . Pierre Flote will be punished both in spirituals and temporals. He makes it appear that we ordered the King to acknowledge that he holds his kingdom from us. For forty years we have studied law and have learned that on earth two powers, the temporal and the spiritual, have been ordained by God. . . . We have no wish to encroach on the King's jurisdiction; but the King cannot deny that he is subject to us from the point of view of any violation of the divine law, *ratione peccati.*" [89]

When thus clarified, the doctrine of the pope's supreme jurisdiction could not give rise to the least objection on the part of a Christian ruler. Philip the Fair was more humiliated by the defeat which he suffered at Courtrai (July 11th, 1302) from the Flemish militia than by the papal letter. The new power of modern times, the bourgeoisie, now turned against the foe of the papacy. Pierre Flote perished in the battle, and the people, recalling the Pope's words, "that Pierre Flote will be punished both in spirituals and in temporals," viewed his death as a divine punishment.

When, in spite of the King's prohibition, four archbishops and thirty-five bishops betook themselves to Rome for the synod of November 1st, Philip did not dare to protest.

The chief event of the Roman synod was the publication by

[89] Raynaldi, 1302, no. 12; Potthast, no. 25184.

the Pope of his celebrated Bull *"Unam sanctam,"* which has been called "the most absolute proclamation of Catholic doctrine in the Middle Ages." [90]

The Supreme Pontiff, once more rising to the realm of principles, and without seeming to make the least reference to the men and events of his time, set forth that "in the power of the Church there are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal—the latter to be used for the Church, the former by the Church; the former by the hand of the priest, the latter by the hand of kings and soldiers, but with the consent and at the pleasure of the priest, *ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis.*" The Pope goes on to say that "if the temporal power goes astray, it will be judged by the spiritual power, and since this is the supreme power, it can be judged only by God." "Consequently," he concludes, "we say, declare, and define that to be subject to the Roman pontiff is necessary for salvation, for every human creature." [91] Certainly this last phrase, which alone has the force of a dogmatic definition, contains nothing that cannot be accepted by those who are most jealous of the temporal independence of civil governments. It is evidently *ratione peccati,* simply from the viewpoint of sin, that every human creature is placed under the supreme jurisdiction of the head of the Church. If those who favored the Bull should go farther in their claims, they would merely be reproducing a public right universally accepted in the Middle Ages and still more forcibly expressed in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries by Geoffrey of Vendome, St. Bernard,[92] Hugh of St. Victor,[93] and Alexander of Hales.[94] After the

[90] Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 153.

[91] *"Porro subesse romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."* (Raynaldi, 1302, no. 13; Potthast, no. 25189.)

[92] St. Bernard, *On Consideration,* bk. 4, ch. 3. (*P.L.,* vol. 182, col. 776.)

[93] Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis,* bk. 2, chaps. 2, 4 (*P.L.,* vol. 176, col. 418.)

[94] Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologica,* IV, q. 10, m. 5, a. 2. For example, the Pope, not satisfied with declaring that "if the temporal power goes astray, it will

lengthy discussions of the intervening centuries, impartial minds now acknowledge that at bottom Boniface, in this Bull as in the *"Clericis laicos,"* uttered no great novelty.[95] Undoubtedly, if circumstances had left him time, the Pontiff would have taken occasion to show his adversaries the true import of his doctrine; but the sudden turn of fortune in the violent struggle which soon sprang up did not allow him to do so.

The Anagni Outrage

The King, crushed by the disaster at Courtrai and, as it were, overwhelmed by the loss of Pierre Flote, at first gave a favorable reception to a questionnaire presented to him by the Pope following the publication of the Bull and respectfully agreed to discuss the Pope's grievances. It may also be that he wanted to gain time. But as soon as William of Nogaret took the place left vacant by Pierre Flote, events began to be precipitated.

The end of 1302 was approaching. In December the prelates and barons of the realm were convoked "to consult in the matter of safeguarding the honor and independence of the kingdom." The King cleverly chose his ground by once again presenting the papal declarations as an attempt to claim the kingdom of France as a fief of the Holy See. Then, while an effort was made to prolong the conference with the Pope, Nogaret conceived a most audacious plan—nothing less than seizing the Pope in Italy, bringing him to France, and having

be judged by the spiritual power," gives the following reason for the papal supremacy: "It belongs to the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and to judge it if it is not good (*nam veritate testante, spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet et judicare si bona non fuerit*"). It has been maintained that in this passage the word *"instituere"* does not mean to "establish," but "to direct morally." Hugh of St. Victor's text, however, from which Boniface VIII borrows his expression, is very clear, for it reads: *"instituere ut sit."*

[95] Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 154.

him judged by a national council. The Colonnas, who had sought refuge at Philip's court, promised their coöperation.

On March 7th, 1303, William of Nogaret with some trusted French and Italian companions received from the royal chancery a mysterious commission to deal in the King's name "with every person, noble, ecclesiastical, or other whatsoever, for any league or agreement of mutual aid in men or money." On June 13th and 14th, Guillaume de Plaisians, a *chevalier ès-lois,* Nogaret's right-hand man, stirred up popular manifestations before the Louvre under the King's eyes and had the future council acclaimed. Emissaries were commissioned to travel throughout France for the purpose of arousing an opinion favorable to the King and of spreading the worst calumnies against the Pope. The latter, informed of this procedure, drew up, but did not yet promulgate, the Bull *"Super Petri solio"* (September 8th), in which, after recalling the whole history of the quarrel and summing up his grievances, he pronounced excommunication against the King of France, whose subjects he absolved from their oath of allegiance. Nogaret, informed of the imminent promulgation of the Bull, decided there was no time to lose. He interviewed the Pope's enemies and, among the exiles, malcontents, and bandits of the locality, recruited a force of men to which were soon added the ferocious Sciarra Colonna and his family followers. Nogaret then turned his steps towards Anagni, where Boniface was residing at the time.

At daybreak on September 7th, the troop of mercenaries, with the fleur-de-lis banner of France and the gonfalon of St. Peter at its head, rushed into the public square of Anagni with cries of "Long live the King of France and Colonna!" Then they poured into the church, from which they hoped to enter the adjoining papal palace. It was not till nightfall, after a day of pillage, that the aggressors succeeded in forcing an entrance to the papal residence. The aged Pontiff was await-

ing them, seated on a throne, wearing the tiara and cope, and holding in his hands the keys and the cross. "Since, like the Savior, I am betrayed and my end is nigh," he said, "I shall at least die as becomes a pope." Cardinal Boccasini, who later became Benedict XI, and Cardinal Pierre d'Espagne were standing beside him. As a modern writer says, "history has nothing but admiration for those Roman elders who seated themselves on their curule chairs to wait for the arrival of the Gauls; the action of Boniface was even nobler and more dignified." [96]

There is no contemporary witness that confirms the tradition according to which Nogaret or Sciarra Colonna struck the Pope. But no abuse, no threat was spared him. With unruffled dignity, he replied to Sciarra's furious gestures, merely by saying: *"Eccovi il capo, eccovi il collo"* (Here is my head, here is my neck). Nogaret's design was to terrify the Pontiff, to drag from him an approval for the convening of the national council of France, at which he would be forced to appear. For three days the same acts of violence were repeated. This delay gave time to the Pope's friends, especially Cardinal Boccasini, to visit the city and the neighboring villages, spreading an account of the odious outrage. On Monday, September 9th, a sudden change took place among the populace. A crowd of people from Anagni and nearby rose up *en masse,* shouting: "Long live the Pope! Death to the traitors!" A mob ten thousand strong rushed toward the papal palace to demand the liberation of the Pontiff. There was a fight with the Colonna band, many of whom were slain. William of Nogaret was wounded and barely escaped. Boniface, thus freed, proceeded to Rome under the escort of Roman knights who had hastened to his assistance.

The contemporary narrative from which we have taken the above details ends with these words: "The Pope survived but

[96] Boutaric, p. 117.

a short time; he composed the sixth book of the Decretals and governed the Apostolic See in accordance with extreme rigor of the law for nine years and as many months. His life came to a close in 1303." [97] In a holy manner he breathed his last on October 11th, at the age of 86 years. His enemies, following him with their abuse even to the tomb, spread the rumor that he had died in a fit of madness, dashing his head against the wall, foaming at the mouth, and gnawing his hands. But the disinterment of his body in 1605 showed it to be perfectly intact; the calumnious rumors were thus nullified.[98] In defending the great work of Gregory VII and Innocent III by expressions that were sometimes too absolute and with a vivacity that was at times excessive, against the perfidious tactics of the legists, Boniface doubtless did not always exercise in the strife a sufficiently calm spirit nor take due account of the changes and temperaments required by the circumstances; but no fair mind can refuse to admire the loftiness of his ideal, the sincerity of his intentions, and, in short, the greatness of his pontificate.

Benedict XI

That milder interpretation of the Bull *"Unam Sanctam,"* that adaptation of principles to the new conditions of modern society, which the disturbances of his latter days, as also a partial misunderstanding of events and a comprehensible attachment to the glorious past of the Middle Ages, did not permit Boniface to give, his successor, Benedict XI,[99] made to

[97] A contemporary account of the Anagni outrage was discovered by Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove in Reg. XIV, c. 1, of the British Museum, and published for the first time in the *Revue des Questions Historiques,* XI, p. 511 sqq.

[98] Christophe, p. 150.

[99] We do not know on what Michelet bases his statement that Benedict XI owed his elevation to intrigues of the Orsini. The new Pope received the papal insignia from the hands of the archdeacon, Cardinal Matteo Orsini. But a letter written by the new Pope states that he was elected by the unanimous vote of the Sacred College. (Raynaldi, IV, p. 360.)

the King of France at the very outset of his pontificate. Philip IV sent a solemn embassy, made up of three members of his council and William of Nogaret, to "renew the former friendship" between the kingdom and the Holy See. Benedict refused to receive Nogaret, but issued a general pardon of all the excommunications incurred by other personages of France on occasion of the late conflicts.

The popes complement one another by their succession. To say with several historians that "Benedict, with general approval, disavowed all that Boniface had done," [100] is not sanctioned by better informed historians today.[101] That devoted friend of Boniface VIII, Nicholas Boccasini, whose noble soul was unshaken by the Anagni assassins, never disavowed the work of his predecessor. It may be that, in the light of events, he understood more clearly the uselessness of uncompromising resistance. In the words of a Catholic historian, "Boniface sought, in the interest of souls, to thwart and stifle a great error which was beginning; Benedict, likewise for the salvation of souls, sought to cure a great error which was triumphing." [102] In other words, Boniface VIII, the last pope of the Middle Ages, wished to defend to the utmost a social structure that was falling; Benedict XI, the first pope of modern times, did not wish abruptly to separate from the Church a new social structure that was rising. To fall in some other Anagni by the daggers of assassins hired by Nogaret and Colonna may indeed have seemed to him glorious, but useless. The Colonna had become masters of Rome; Florence was in flames; the quarrel between Guelfs and Ghibellines, formerly so bitter, had degenerated into contemptible encoun-

[100] Boutaric, p. 122. In the same sense, Renan in *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, p. 262, and Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 166.

[101] Funke, *Papst Benedikt XI,* proves that the two supposed letters to Philip the Fair (March 25th and April 2nd, 1304) were invented by the King himself.

[102] Gautier, *Benoit XI, étude sur la papauté au commencement du XIV^e siècle,* p. 77.

ters of petty passions and petty coteries. The Roman Court could not longer rely on the support of the empire. "If I abandon you," Philip had haughtily said to Boniface, "who will support you?" This insolent threat was more and more confirmed by subsequent events. Benedict resolved to do everything he could to bring about a much needed peace without sacrificing justice or truth.

On April 5th, 1304, he wrote to the King of France: "We are the disciple of Him who left us the parable of a man who made a great supper and said to his servants: 'Go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in that my house may be filled.' [103] And we have also regulated our conduct according to the parable of the Good Shepherd, who, after losing one of his hundred sheep, leaves the ninety-nine others and goes in search of the poor lost one, until he finds it, and then carries it back with joy on his shoulders. Will we not, then, bring you back to the house of God? Will we abandon a sheep such as you? Will we give ourselves any rest until we have carried you back on our shoulders to the fold of the Church? God forbid that any one should ever be able to reproach us with such neglect!"

The letter concludes thus: "With devotion and filial submission, accept this grace which we offer you, or rather which God offers, whose place we hold here below. Return to submission to Mother Church, a submission as honorable as it is salutary, and know that we have here below no keener desire than that of your salvation and the glory of your realm. Lastly consider, my son, that Joas, king of Juda, lived uprightly and gloriously only so long as he followed the counsels of the high priest Joad." [104]

On May 13th, 1304, the King of France was officially freed from the ban of excommunication. It is worth while showing

[103] Luke 14:23.

[104] Martène, *Veterum scriptorum amplissima collectio,* I, p. 1411.

in what lofty words the Pontiff notified the King of this decision. After formally stating that all who had coöperated in the outrage against Boniface VIII were guilty,[105] he added: "In the hope that the King of France and the French people will henceforth redouble their devotion to God and the Holy Roman Church, we free from ecclesiastical penalties all those on whom they were imposed by Boniface and our other predecessors, always excepting William of Nogaret, whose absolution we particularly reserve to the Holy See; and we receive them back today into the communion of the faithful and to the sacraments of the Church." [106]

To make this reconciliation more complete, Benedict XI renewed all the privileges which the popes had accorded to the crown of France. Twenty papal letters are devoted to these restitutions.[107] The clergy of the royal chapel he exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Paris and the archbishop of Sens. He softened the decisions contained in the Bull *"Clericis laicos"* referring to contributions by the clergy and restricted the anathema to those who should exact the tax or lend direct aid to that exaction.[108] The French clergy, moreover, had taken part in public expenses without waiting for the papal decision. Says Boutaric: "The history of Philip's reign furnishes the most unquestionable proof of this; for it shows the French Church ruined by the part it had to take in contributing to the national revenues. Philip levied twenty-one ecclesiastical tithes, amounting to more than 400,000,000 francs." [109]

On June 7th, Benedict published a Bull of excommunication against Sciarra Colonna and Nogaret. Three weeks later, in words that recall the finest appeals of Peter the Hermit, God-

[105] *"Se culpabiles reddiderunt in captione Bonifacii."*
[106] Raynaldi, IV, p. 377.
[107] Ptolémée de Lucques, *Hist. eccl.*, XXIV, cap. 38 sq., *apud* Muratori, vol. II.
[108] Raynaldi, IV, pp. 378 sqq.
[109] Boutaric, pp. 277, 278, 279; Gautier, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

frey of Bouillon, and St. Bernard, he exhorted the Christian world to join the Crusade. This was one of the last acts of his pontificate.

Benedict XI died at Perugia, July 7th, 1304. The circumstances are thus reported by Villani: "While the Pontiff was at table, a young woman who said she was a servant of the Sisters of St. Petronilla, offered him in a silver dish a number of early figs of the finest appearance. Benedict, who was fond of this fruit, gladly accepted the gift and was unwilling to have a trial made of what was offered him by a woman. He ate them with relish and without suspicion, but at once was seized with violent pains." [110] The figs were poisoned,[111] and it was discovered that the pretended servant was a young man in woman's dress. Public veneration surrounded Benedict's tomb. Pope Urban VIII, after an examination into the immemorial cult rendered to this pontiff, proclaimed him Blessed (November 9th, 1638). Amidst one of the most disturbed periods, that in which Dante portrayed the terrible scenes of his Divina Commedia and the Pisans executed the lugubrious frescoes of their Campo Santo, he had tried to pacify Perugia, Venice, Padua, Lucca, Pistoia, and especially Florence, "that unfortunate city where one saw only mutual hatreds, threats, exile, imprisonment, and swords cruelly drawn in domestic strife." [112]

Rome itself did not offer the pope any greater safety. The Colonna and Orsini by their continual quarrels drenched the city in blood. According to the testimony of the chronicler

[110] Villani, *Storie fiorentine,* bk. 8, ch. 80; Potthast, no. 25448.

[111] A certain Ferreti of Vicenza, a contemporary, accused Philip the Fair of this crime. (Muratori, IX, p. 1013.) A monk of Westminster, writing fifty years later, makes Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna responsible for it (*Monach. Westmin., Flores histor.,* ann. 1364). Still later a certain Bernard Deliciosus was accused (Baluze, *Vitae paparum avenionensium,* II, no. 53). A recent biographer of Benedict XI rejects the hypothesis that the Pope was poisoned (Funke, *Papst Benedikt XI*). See also Hauréau, *Bernard Délicieux et l'inquisition albigeoise.*

[112] Benedict XI, *Epist.* 170.

Ferreti of Vicenza, an hour came when the exercise of papal authority became seriously endangered by the triumph of the Colonna.[113] On April 13th, 1304, Benedict, followed by the cardinals and an immense throng, determined to quit the Eternal City. He went to Perugia to await calmer days.[114] No pope was destined to appear again in Rome until October 13th, 1367, the day when Urban V made his solemn entry. Thus it was that the period began which the Romans called the second Babylonian Captivity.

During this new phase, we shall have occasion to note how the legists of Henry III in England and those of Louis of Bavaria in Germany continued the fatal work of the French legists. But beginning with the pontificate of Benedict's successor, we shall see a second class of workers appear, the heterodox doctors, destroyers of Christianity.

[113] "*Hic tutum se putans a gladiis impiorum, qui, Urbis tyrannidem exercentes, pastoralia decreta negligebant.*" (Ferreti, *apud* Muratori, IX, pp. 1012, 1015.)

[114] This was not the first time that a pope left Rome because of disturbances in the city. From the time of Innocent IV, the popes resided there only intermittently

CHAPTER III

1305–1315

DURING the period which we are about to treat, opposition to medieval institutions and to the supreme authority of the papacy is no longer carried on only by legists, such as Pierre Dubois and William of Nogaret, but is found among churchmen, such as William Occam, Marsilius of Padua, and John Wyclif. It bases its claims, not merely on Roman law, but on Gospel maxims and Christian tradition. When the England of Edward III, the Germany of Louis of Bavaria, and the Rome of Rienzi, after the France of Philip the Fair, endeavor to shake the temporal power of the Holy See, rebellious monks constitute themselves advisers and defenders of refractory princes and attempt to undermine the very foundations of the pope's spiritual authority. In the midst of such dangers, supreme pontiffs occupying the Holy See but residing in Avignon—Clement V, John XXII, Benedict XII, Clement VI, Innocent VI, Urban V, and Gregory XI—fettered by their financial embarrassments, softened by the luxury of a frivolous court, often the prisoners of cliques and factions, do not always rise to the height of their difficult task. However, the eminent holiness of Blessed Angela of Foligno, St. Gertrude, St. Elizabeth of Portugal, St. Juliana Falconieri, St. Andrew Corsini, Blessed John Colombini, and in Provence itself, near the popes, St. Elzear, Count of Sabran, and Blessed Delphine, his wife, St. Roseline and St. Roch bear witness to the inexhaustible vitality of Christian virtues in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Clement V

The death of Benedict XI was followed by a long vacancy. For eleven months the powerful Colonna party, devoted to the interests of the French court, was at strife with the Italian party of the Orsini and Gaetani. On June 5th, 1305, the choice of the conclave fell upon one of French birth, although actually an English subject, an old and faithful friend of Boniface VIII, Bertrand de Got (or d'Agout), archbishop of Bordeaux, a man barely forty years of age. He was born in the village of Villandraut in Gascony and was related to the illustrious Périgord and Armagnac families. After a brilliant course in belles-lettres at Toulouse and in law at Orleans and Bologna,[1] he became successively canon of the church of Bordeaux, vicar-general of his brother Beraud, the archbishop of Lyons, then papal chaplain, bishop of Comminges, and archbishop of Bordeaux. Bertrand de Got was one of those bishops who, in 1302, in defiance of the King's prohibition, went to the council convened by the Pope. Soon after, when Philip the Fair called upon the French clergy to support him in his conflict with the head of the Church, the Archbishop of Bordeaux was again in the number of those who refused to subscribe. On that occasion he even had to exile himself from France and live for a while at the court of Pope Boniface VIII. Benedict XI's policy of pacification gave him a chance to return to favor with Philip the Fair, with whom he renewed the friendly relations he had had in his early youth.[2] Philip, who was his suzerain by virtue of the see of Bordeaux which he occupied,[3] very likely thought that Bertrand de Got was the only French prelate acceptable to the conclave, and accordingly supported his candi-

[1] Baluze, I, pp. 615 sqq.

[2] *"Licet in anglia regione praesul esset, tamen Philippo gratissimus, eo quod a juventute familiaris extitisset."* (Ferreti de Vicenza, bk. 9, p. 1014, *apud* Muratori, IX.)

[3] Bordeaux then belonged to England, but was a fief of the king of France.

dacy.[4] But the alleged interview between the King of France and the Archbishop of Bordeaux in the forest of Saint-Jean d'Angely, along with the mysterious and simoniacal agreement supposed to have been made there,[5] is purely legendary —suggested to the imagination of the Italians by their national resentment during the Avignon exile.[6]

Bertrand de Got received the news of his election while on a visitation of his province. He did not think that he, a Frenchman, could take up his residence at Rome, since Benedict XI, an Italian, had been obliged to keep away from the Eternal City.

It was in the city of Lyons, whither he had summoned the Roman Court, that he received the papal crown from the hands of Matteo Rosso dei Orsini, dean of the Sacred College, November 14th, 1305.[7] There were present also the King of France, the King of England, and all the great nobles of Italy. The metropolis of the Gauls witnessed the most solemn pomp of liturgical ceremonies. But the ever suspicious Italians regarded as an evil omen two regrettable incidents that happened in the midst of these magnificent festivities. On the coronation day, while the Pope, wearing the tiara, was returning

[4] "There is no doubt that Philip viewed Clement V's election with pleasure," says Boutaric, "and that the majority of the Sacred College, in choosing him for pope, wished to please the King of France, is no less certain." (*Revue des questions historiques,* X, p. 309.) Boutaric's assertion rests on very significant avowals. Cf. a letter of Cardinal Napoleon des Ursins, Bibliothèque Nationale, no. 4991 (Baluze, II, pp. 289 sqq.).

[5] Villani, VIII, chap. 80. A French translation of Villani's account may be found in *Revue des questions historiques,* X, p. 304.

[6] The publication of Philip the Fair's *Mansiones et itinera* (*Historiens de la France,* XXI, pp. 443 sqq.) and that of the journal of the Archbishop of Bordeaux' visitations (Rabanis, *Clement V et Philippe le Bel*) prove, by authentic documents, the alibi of those two personages. Villani's dramatic account is, moreover, refuted by reports more reliable than his, as, for example, the account by Ferreti of Vicenza (Muratori, IX, p. 1012). That there was, nevertheless, some sort of understanding between Clement V and Philip IV, it would seem impossible to deny. On this point, see *Revue des questions historiques,* X, pp. 310 sq. Cf. Baluze, II, p. 62; Rabanis, *op. cit.,* p. 76.

[7] Villani, VIII, p. 81; Baluze, II, pp. 63, 624 sq.

on horseback to his residence and while the King of France, according to traditional usage, was leading the papal mount on foot, an old wall, overloaded with spectators, fell down just as the procession was passing; the Pope was upset, his crown fell off, and a stone of great price was loosened. Charles of Valois, a brother of the French King, was severely injured. Nine days later, at a dinner given the Pope on the occasion of his first papal mass, a quarrel broke out between his followers and those of the Italian cardinals and one of the Pope's brothers was killed. The Italians were downcast. The aged Cardinal Matteo Rosso dei Orsini, sadly shaking his head, said: "The French party has attained its aim. It has accomplished what it wanted. For a long time to come the Church will not return to Italy." [8]

Clement V at first led a wandering life, journeying from Lyons to Cluny, from Cluny to Nevers and Bourges, then, after being detained for a year at Bordeaux by sickness, successively to Toulouse, Narbonne, Montpellier, Nimes, and finally stopped at Avignon.

It was the spring of 1309. On the bank of the Rhone, the sunny attractiveness of which was apt to seduce the prelates from beyond the Alps by its seeming another Italy, equally charming and no less devoted to the cultivation of the fine arts, Clement at that time sought only a temporary asylum. He requested the modest hospitality of a Dominican monastery. It took more than half a century of calamities and the inspired appeals of a saint to rescue the papacy from the enchanting sojourn at Avignon.

Attempted Condemnation of Boniface VIII

Hemmed in by the Comtat Venaissin, which was part of the papal domain, Avignon, a city of the Provence countship, was

[8] Villani, *loc. cit.*

a dangerous place of abode for the Holy See because of its nearness to the kingdom of France. The tower that Philip the Fair built soon afterwards on the opposite bank of the Rhone, facing the papal residence and, as it were, spying on it, still remains as a symbolic expression of the French kings' haughty watchfulness over the popes at Avignon.

Already the year before,[9] Philip the Fair, or rather the inner circle of his councillors, with Pierre Dubois as its soul and William of Nogaret the executor of its designs, had drawn the Pope to the city of Poitiers for a conference by which it was hoped to win him for the vast plans contemplated by the ambitious legists. In 1306, under the title, *De recuperatione terrae sanctae,* Pierre Dubois published the most important of his works,[10] which gives us the key to all the others and perhaps to the whole policy of Philip IV. To make the King of France the head of Christendom; to amass a great sum of money under pretext of a Crusade; to place in the King's hands the wealth of the religious Orders and of the secular clergy—this was the legist's dominant purpose. Having in view an expedition to the Holy Land, which seems to have been only a pretence, Dubois set forth a whole scheme of reforms calculated to strip the papacy and the clergy completely of their goods, which would be replaced by pensions paid by the French State.

It was well understood that this exaltation of the political power of the French king could not be realized without a corresponding lowering of the authority of the Holy See. That

[9] Most historians place the Poitiers conferences in 1307. But the *Mansiones et itinera* of Philip the Fair, as set forth by de Wailly in volume XXI of *Historiens de la France,* show that the King did not sojourn at Poitiers in 1307, whereas he was there two months and a half in 1308, from about May 15th to almost August 1st. (*Historiens de la France,* XXI, pp. 448, 450; cf. *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, p. 308.)

[10] Bongars first republished this work anonymously in his collection entitled *Gesta Dei per Francos.* Boutaric has proved that it is certainly the work of Pierre Dubois.

is why one of Philip's first cares was to bind the Pope by promises, to encompass him with French cardinals, and especially to destroy, if possible, the great doctrinal work and moral prestige of the pontificate of Boniface VIII.

This now becomes the goal of the King's every effort and that of his advisers at the conferences at Poitiers. They ask that all the acts of Boniface, from All Saints 1300, be annulled, that he be declared a heretic, that his bones be disinterred and publicly burned. When submitting to the Pope forty-three heretical propositions attributed to Boniface VIII, the king's council added, indeed, that its earnest desire was to see the late Pope's innocence established and proclaimed.[11] The legist Guillaume de Plaisians, whom we have already met at the side of Nogaret, begged besides for the canonization of Pope Celestine, Boniface's predecessor. Clement V easily saw through the hypocrisy of these petitions; but he was not of a stature to withstand the assault of so many conspiring passions and hatreds. It would have required a Gregory VII or an Innocent III.

The Pope sought to gain time, consulted his cardinals,[12] and finally (June 1st, 1308) [13] published the Bull *"Laetamur in te,"* in which he tried to evade the King's request in the matter of Boniface and exhorted Philip, in the name of peace and union, to desist from his accusations and leave the examination of the question to the Church. On the other hand, to show his good will towards the King, he revoked and annulled all the sentences of excommunication or interdict or any other penalties pronounced against the King of France, his kingdom, and all his associates, abettors, or adherents. As for

[11] Raynaldi, 1307, no. 10. Dupuy, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 sq.; *Preuves*, pp. 286, 298, 376, 379; Baluze, I, col. 30; Tosti, pp. 424 sqq.; Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, bk. 91, no. 13; *Histoire littéraire*, XXVII, p. 306.

[12] Villani, VIII, chap. 91; Fleury, *loc. cit.*

[13] We have seen above that this Bull is probably dated incorrectly. It bears the date 1307, but it seems that it should be placed in 1308.

Nogaret, whose case, ever since the Anagni outrage, had always been considered as one apart, he was enjoined, by way of expiation for his crime, to place himself at the head of a crusade after the lapse of three years.[14]

Philip's councillors, dissatisfied with the conference at Poitiers, treated this Bull as a dead letter.[15] By means of chicanery and artifices, Nogaret succeeded in having it admitted that the Bull decided nothing fundamentally and that the matter of Boniface's trial remained intact. This question of Boniface's trial has been justly compared to a sword of Damocles which Philip's legists kept suspended over Clement's head in the hope of forcing him to yield to their scheme. So long as the work and person of the author of the Bull *"Unam sanctam"* were not discredited in public opinion and in the Church itself, it seemed to them that nothing was accomplished.

In the face of renewed insistance, Clement finally promised to open the case against Boniface and declared that, despite his faith in his predecessor's innocence, he would agree to hear the Pontiff's accusers in compliance with the desire of the King of France.

The trial began March 16th, 1310, at Avignon, where the Pope had just established his residence. It was prolonged until February, 1311, amidst painful incidents and violent agitation. The Colonna and Nogaret followers, with unprecedented audacity, brought forward the most infamous charges against the late Pope: heresy, treason, debauchery, all the lying rumors that hatred had maliciously spread abroad for ten years past.[16] Devoted partisans of the Pontiff, among others two of his nephews, replied forcibly and were not always able to re-

[14] Baluze, I, col. 30; Raynaldi, 1307, no. 10; Baillet, *Preuves,* pp. 46–51.

[15] This explains why Dupuy did not find it in the Archives of the Crown. But the document is in the Vatican.

[16] Hefele, IX, pp. 326–338.

strain their anger.[17] The strategy of Pope Clement, who was greatly embarrassed by the affair, the introduction of which had been wrung from his weakness, was to have the trial drag along. Preliminary questions and dilatory incidents succeeded one another. At length, in the month of February, 1311, a letter from Philip IV suddenly halted the proceedings. Considering the gravity of the issues and the fact that Pope Clement V was so occupied with the cares imposed on him by the question of the Holy Land, the reëstablishment of peace between France and England, and the trial of the Templars, the King announced that he withdrew from the trial against Boniface VIII, which he knew was painful to the reigning Pontiff, and that he would turn the affair over to a council soon to be held for a happy termination, for the glory of God and the Church. He also intended that the Templars' case should be referred to this same council.[18]

Clement, suddenly freed from the harassing alarms in the midst of which he had been living for a year past, was not moderate enough in testifying to his joy and gratefulness. Not satisfied with congratulating the French King on his happy decision to withdraw from the prosecution of the dead Pope, he declared that Philip and his friends had been actuated by a praiseworthy zeal and had done everything in this affair in good faith.[19] In the Bull *"Rex gloriae"* (April 17th, 1311) he repeated that throughout the campaign which the King and his councillors had conducted against Boniface VIII, their intentions had been good and pure. He excepted only the Anagni outrage, which was credited to Nogaret and a few others. Consequently all the documents bearing sentence of condemnation against the King and his friends must be

[17] Accusers of Boniface VIII pretended that, not far from Avignon, their adversaries had prepared an ambush for them. (See Dupuy, pp. 288 sqq.)

[18] Dupuy, pp. 296 sqq.; Hefele, IX, pp. 339 sq.

[19] Letter of Philip, in Dupuy, pp. 296, 592 sq.

destroyed in the books of the Roman Church and by any possessors thereof within four months, under pain of excommunication.[20]

This was to fall completely into the trap laid by the legists. Philip's real motive in interrupting the procedure against Boniface was the better to consecrate all his powers to the pursuit of the Order of Templars, whose wealth he coveted, and to drag the Pope into this lengthy trial which had such heavy responsibilities in store for Clement.

The Knights Templars

In the terrible tragedy that was ended by the execution of the Grand Master of the Temple in the Place du Parvis de Notre Dame in Paris, the most recent and impartial studies are more and more favorable to the victims and more and more condemnatory of the King of France.

The illustrious Order which, at first in concert with, then as a rival of, the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, had been the last bulwark of Christendom against the infidels of the East, was at this time at the zenith of its greatness. It possessed immense riches. Artisans, wealthy merchants, and rich land-owners deposited their savings in its impregnable castles. Thus the Templars had become the chief bankers of Europe. Popes and kings, including Philip the Fair himself, had recourse to them in pressing needs.[21] Peasants, workmen, and tradesmen, in order to escape the pursuit and exactions of

[20] Raynaldi, 1311, cap. 26, 32; Dupuy, pp. 592–601; Hefele, IX, pp. 345–348. We cannot understand why Hefele writes that the Bull *"Rex gloriae"* "begins with principles quite opposed to those of Boniface VIII." Clement merely says, with untimely emphasis, that earthly kingdoms were created by God and that, in the new covenant, France enjoys nearly the same place as was formerly occupied by the people of Israel.

[21] Toward the middle of 1306, during an uprising at Paris, caused by an alteration of the currency, King Philip found no safer refuge than the Temple, and thither he betook himself. (Dupuy, *Preuves*, p. 288.)

the nobles and even of royal agents, became "Templars' men," signed agreements in which they engaged, "for profit and usefulness and in order to avoid future perils," [22] to pay the Temple a few farthings' rent in token of dependence. The Templars, bound by vows of religion, practically depended only on their own chief and, almost exempted from papal jurisdiction, constituted a well-nigh autonomous social power in Europe, which might become a great danger. The power of money, the prestige of the sword, and respect for the cross united to give them a unique dominance. "The pride of a Templar" became a by-word.

In the early part of the fourteenth century, previous to Clement V's election, it is related that a Templar, confined in a royal prison for his crimes, made some strange revelations to his fellow-prisoners as to serious disorders existing in the Temple and that had, until then, been surrounded by the greatest secrecy. Later events showed that the accounts were not without some foundation. When these rumors reached the King, he consulted the new Pope about them.[23] It may be that the mysterious engagements mentioned above, between Clement V and Philip the Fair,[24] were concerned precisely with measures to be taken against the powerful Order of Templars.

To thwart the insolence of so menacing a power may have been a political necessity for the French King; to suppress grave abuses among the religious of the Temple by disciplinary measures and, if need be, even by suppressing the Order, was perhaps required for the good of the Church. An understanding to this effect between the Pope and the King contained nothing that was not quite legitimate. But Philip's cu-

[22] *"Pro commodo et utilitate, et ad vitanda futura pericula."* Boutaric, p. 127.

[23] According to a contemporary chronicler, the continuer of William of Nangis, the question of the Templars was discussed at the Poitiers meetings. *"Deliberatum fuit super pluribus . . . ac praesertim de Templariorum captione." Chronique de Guillaume de Gangis,* Edition of the Société de l'histoire de France, I, p. 359.

[24] See page 50, note 6.

pidity was bound to give both the prosecution of the Templars and their suppression an odious character of cruelty and revenge.

This grave question had already attracted the attention of King St. Louis, Gregory IX, Nicholas IV, and Boniface VIII, and an attempt had been made to solve it by fusing the Order of the Temple with that of the Knights or Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem. The aim of the two institutions was the same, and it was hoped "to temper the pride of the Temple by the well-known gentleness of the Hospitallers of St. John." [25] But the Templars' invariable opposition was an insurmountable obstacle. In 1307 Jacques de Molay, Grand Master of the Temple, fearing lest the Pope would take up St. Louis' idea, addressed a memorial to him, setting forth the dangers of a merger of the two Orders. "That," he said, "would be to face grave perils: the Templars and the Hospitallers have arms." [26] These words were evidently a thinly veiled threat.

Clement V, after conferring with Philip, was ready to begin a regular inquiry, when he learned that all the Templars of France had by the King's order been arrested at the same hour on the morning of October 13th, 1307. Even though we lacked documentary evidence on the subject, we might easily have suspected Nogaret's hand in this stroke of force. There is a paper preserved in the crown treasury that confirms this surmise. At a council meeting, held September 23rd, at the royal abbey of Maubuisson, Nogaret was entrusted with this business.[27]

[25] Boutaric in *Revue des questions historiques,* XI, p. 17.

[26] *"Possent multæ pericula provenire quia Templarii et Hospitaliarii habent arma."*—Baluze is mistaken in dating this memoir, 1311. Boutaric is more probably right in placing it in 1307. (*Revue des questions historiques, loc. cit.*)

[27] *"Anno Domini CCCVII, die veneris, post festum B. Mathie apostoli, Rege existente in monasterio regali B. Mariae juxta Pontisaram, traditum fuit sigillum domino G. de Nogareto, militi, ubi tunc tractatum fuit de captione Templariorum."* (Reg. XLIV of the *Trésor des Chartes,* fol. 3. Archives Nationales, J. J. 44.)

The circular which accompanied the order of arrest and which was read to the people, made it appear that the Pope was a party to the royal measure. It contained this ambiguous phrase: "After consulting [28] our most holy father in God, Clement, and after deliberating with our prelates and barons, . . . we empower and direct you, by strict order, to proceed to . . . and there place under arrest all the brethren without exception, to hold them prisoners for presentation to the judgment of the Church, and to seize their goods, both movable and immovable." [29]

Pope Clement indignantly protested. "In contempt of every rule," he wrote to Philip, "while we were far from you, you have stretched forth your hand to the persons and goods of the Templars and have even gone so far as to put them in prison. . . . We cannot doubt that, today rather than tomorrow, as soon as our envoys reach you, ready to receive the persons and goods of the Order of the Temple, you will hasten to turn them over as safely, promptly, and honorably as it can be done." [30]

The accomplished jurists who were Philip's advisers had thought to find a means of assuring the legality of these arbitrary arrests and confiscations. The Church alone, as was well known, had the right to bring a religious Order to trial. But the procedure of the Inquisition seemed to the enemies of the Temple to offer a legal means of attaining their purpose. Philip's confessor, William of Paris,[31] by his position as Inquisitor General of the kingdom, had the right to require from

[28] This word insinuated that the Pope's approbation had been obtained. But nothing could be falser.

[29] Published by Boutaric, after the original which is preserved in the *Trésor des Chartes,* J. 413, no. 22.

[30] This letter, dated October 27th, 1307, was omitted by Blauze. Boutaric published it for the first time, after the original text, which is preserved in the *Trésor des Chartes,* J. 416, no. 2.

[31] On William of Paris, see Lajard's study in *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, pp. 140–152.

the King the intervention of the secular arm for the purpose of prosecuting, not a whole Order, but any individual member. This is what they obtained from him, thinking thus to shelter themselves behind the form of strict legality.

But the Pope judged otherwise. He pronounced as unworthy those inquisitors who lent themselves to this odious measure, suspended the powers of the Inquisition in France, and summoned the case before his own tribunal.

Philip, seeing his plan foiled, feigned to submit, promised to surrender the persons of the Templars to the Pope's representatives, and to have their goods sequestrated. But while the Pope was felicitating him on his good will,[32] the royal legists did not remain idle. Pierre Dubois, whose pen outlined the revolutionary schemes that were carried out by Nogaret's sword, wrote a lengthy memoir to all the princes of Europe, in which, under cover of a great crusading project, he suggested a plan for completely destroying the Order of the Temple and secularizing its goods by means of Inquisition proceedings, to which all powers would be entrusted.[33]

A *Petition of the People of France,* very much like the *Entreaty of the People of France against Boniface VIII,* likewise came from the pen of Pierre Dubois, who issued numerous pamphlets, attacked the Pope, accused him of avarice, nepotism, extortion, and all sort of crimes, and went so far as to declare him devoid of any rights. "Whoever does what he ought is the son of God," he said. "Whoever does otherwise through fear, love, or hatred, is the son of the devil and denies God by that very fact." This was nothing less than Wyclif's theory. Dubois said further: "The path for us to follow was taught us by Moses on the occasion of Israel's apostasy before the golden calf: *'Let every one take his sword and*

[32] Baluze, II, p. 113.

[33] Boutaric in *Revue des questions historiques,* X, pp. 337 sq.

slay his nearest neighbor' . . . Why should not the King, the most Christian prince, proceed in the same way, even against all the clergy if the clergy (which God forbid!) should err or maintain errors?" This was nothing less than the doctrine of Henry VIII, Elizabeth, and Cromwell.[34] In the presence of these violent attacks, the Pope remained silent. The inquisitors, however, gathered a large number of confessions from the lips of the arrested Templars. The indictments by the courts of Paris, Champagne, Normandy, Querci, Bigorre, and Languedoc have been preserved. At Paris the accused appeared in a hall of their fortress before some of the King's councillors and some monks delegated by William of Paris. The records make no mention of torture; but the later statements of the accused lead us to believe that it was not omitted and, moreover, that it was atrocious.[35] Jacques de Saci declared that he saw twenty-five of the brethren die, following their interrogation. Out of 138, about 130 confessed to having taken part in abominable crimes. Jacques de Molay, the Grand Master, acknowledged that he had denied Christ and had spit upon the cross, while others declared they had taken part in obscene debaucheries. Most of them later retracted these confessions.

But it was necessary to convince the Pope of the Templars' guilt. From the chief culprits Philip selected seventy-two knights. Were they ashamed or afraid to retract after so short an interval the confessions wrung from them by torture? Were they really guilty? The fact is that at Chinon, in the presence of three cardinals, with perfect freedom, if we are to believe the official report, without threat or compulsion,

[34] *Histoire littéraire,* XXVII, pp. 524–527; Boutaric, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits,* published by the Institute, XX, part 2, pp. 175 sq., 182 sq.; *Revue des questions historiques,* X, p. 340.

[35] See the documents cited by Lea, *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* bk. 3, chap. 5, especially pp. 317 sqq. and Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* p. 189.

after swearing to tell the truth, they declared themselves guilty of the crimes imputed to them.[36] When the Pope became acquainted with the official report of these confessions, and when at Avignon itself, in full consistory, he heard a man of great influence and kindliness [37] confirm them by his word, he became convinced. With a haste which may be considered excessive, but which is sufficiently explained by the pathetic surprises of this dark affair, he withdrew the suspension of the French bishops and gave orders that they should proceed without delay to investigate the charges against the Templars.

Then began, not only in France, but also outside that kingdom, those investigations which, as has been said, turned Europe into a vast court of inquiry.[38] Clement at last formally authorized the use of torture.[39] Vacandard says: "the tribu-

[36] *Praestito juramento . . . libere ac sponte, absque coactione qualibet et terrore coram ipsis tribus cardinalibus . . . deposuerunt.*" Bull, *"Ad omnium fere notitiam,"* in Dupuy, p. 278. In an address to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, on May 28th and June 4th, 1909, Paul Viollet maintained that the attestations in the official report of the interrogatory at Chinon cannot be accepted as witnessing to the truth of the matter. Cardinal Bérenger de Fiédol, with the good intention of saving the innocent Templars, is supposed to have introduced into the report the avowals of the accused religious, among others that of Jacques de Molay. The King had indeed said that the knights who would not confess should be executed. Cf. Noël Valois, *Deux nouveaux témoignages sur le procès des Templiers,* Reports of the Académie des Inscriptions, 1910, pp. 229–241; Lizerand, *Clément V et Philippe le Bel;* Carrière, *Faits nouveaux en faveur des Templiers,* in the *Revue de l'histoire de l'Eglise de France,* Jan.–Feb. 1912, pp. 55–71. In his study on the *Dépositions de Jacques Molay,* published in the *Moyen Age,* March–April, 1913, Lizerand rejects the hypothesis advanced by Viollet and concludes that de Molay was far from being a hero.

[37] *"Magnae auctoritatis ac generositatis virum."*

[38] Christophe, I, p. 255.

[39] Raynaldi, 1311, no. 53. The introduction of torture into the inquisitorial proceedings was due to Innocent IV in the middle of the thirteenth century. It is known that Pope St. Nicholas I blamed the use of violent measures towards the accused (*Responsa ad Bulgaros,* cap. 86) and that the *Decretum* of Gratian forbade the extortion of confession by torture (Causa XV, quest. XV, cap. 1). But the legists, everywhere reviving the traditions of antiquity, began to have recourse to torture as a speedy method of obtaining information. "The earliest instances with which I have met," says Lea, "occur in the Veronese Code of 1228 and the Sicilian Constitutions of Frederick II in 1231." Lea, *op. cit.,* I, p. 421; cf. Vacandard, pp. 147 sq.

nals of the Inquisition were perhaps never more cruel than in the case of the Templars." [40]

At Paris a provincial synod, held by Philip de Marigny, archbishop of Sens, under the King's favor, condemned as relapsed forty-five Templars, who were given over to the secular arm and burned alive (May 12th, 1310).[41] Terror took possession of the prisoners. "Yesterday," says Knight Aymeri de Villiers-le-Duc, "I saw my brethren in carts going to the execution pile. I feel that I would have avowed anything. I would have confessed that I had killed God, if they wanted me to make such an avowal." The same scenes were witnessed at Senlis. In Provence, where the Templars had been confined in the castles of Meyrargues and Pertuis, the court that was to try them was composed only of their avowed enemies.[42] An upright man, Guillaume Agardi (or d'Agard), provost of Saint-Sauveur, declined the duties of commissioner in so prejudiced a trial. It is related that Charles of Valois, Philip the Fair's brother, had some Templars of Provence burned; local traditions, on the contrary, affirm that Robert the Good, who was governing Provence, let them live.[43]

The King of France invited all the rulers of the West to imitate his conduct toward the Templars. Edward II of England, after answering in the negative, decided (January 7th, 1308) to imprison all those found in England, Ireland, and Wales. Very few confessed themselves guilty, and we may suppose that torture, fear, or promises wrung these confessions from them.[44] At the request of Ferdinand IV, king of Castile and Leon, the Pope (July 31st, 1308) established in Spain a papal commission that was instructed to begin the

[40] Vacandard, p. 188.

[41] Hefele, IX, p. 356, following Havemann, *Geschichte des Ausgangs des Tempelherrenordens.*

[42] Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* I, p. 348.

[43] *Ibid.,* p. 349.

[44] Hefele, IX, pp. 356 sqq.

interrogation of the accused. But they could not be convicted of any crime.[45] In Aragon the Templars, whom James II summoned to appear, withdrew to their citadels and held out against long sieges by the royal troops. They finally declared their willingness to surrender to the Pope, but not to the King, since their castles, they said, were the property of the Church and not of the King. Notwithstanding severe imprisonment and cruel tortures, they never confessed any crime. In the Island of Cyprus, the Knights of the Temple also tried to defend themselves in their fortified monasteries.[46] In Portugal they took to flight. In Italy and Germany the proceedings against them and the treatment they received were of various sorts. But everywhere they were tracked, imprisoned, and tortured.

The Council of Vienne

The Pope, however, reserved to himself the judgment of the Order as a whole and also the proceedings against its higher dignitaries. By the Bull *"Alma Mater"* [47] (April 4th, 1310), he appointed October 1st, 1311, for the meeting of a general council at Vienne for the purpose of reaching a decision on the three following matters: the question of the Templars, the help to be secured for the Holy Land, and the reform of the clergy. A large number of bishops assembled there from France, Italy, Spain, Germany, England, Scotland, and Ireland.[48]

From the beginning, the great question that seemed to dom-

[45] Benavides, *Memorias de D. Fernando IV de Castilla,* I, pp. 629–634, cited by Hefele, IX, p. 358.

[46] Hefele, IX, pp. 359 sq.

[47] Hardouin, VII, p. 1334.

[48] Baluze, I, p. 43. It is not certain how many prelates were present. Villani speaks of 300 bishops (bk. 9, p. *22*, *apud* Muratori, XIII, p. 454), but William of Nangis speaks of only 114 (d'Achery, *Spicilegium,* III, p. 65).

inate and almost absorb all the others was that of abolishing the Order of Templars. Clement's predicament was critical. On the one hand, Philip the Fair, who had come to Lyons to watch the council at close range, was imperiously demanding the immediate suppression of the Order. On the other hand, the great majority of the fathers of the council declared it impossible to suppress the Temple judicially without hearing the Knights in their own defense. Meanwhile, the awkward situation was made still more embarrassing by the unexpected arrival of nine Knights of the Temple, who declared their readiness to defend the Order against every accusation. At the same time there was talk of 1500 or 2000 Templars roaming in the Lyonnais mountains and prepared, in their turn, to come to Vienne to defend themselves. The Pope was disturbed and alarmed. He wrote to Philip, forewarning him of the danger.[49] Some time later the French King arrived at Vienne with so imposing an escort that it was more like an army. The decree abolishing the Order of Templars was already prepared. In conformity with the almost unanimous opinion of the fathers, the Pope declined to pronounce a judicial condemnation, as the Templars had not been heard in their own defense; but, by way of administrative decree,[50] he declared the Order abolished. This was, in fact, the purport of a decision made by the Pope (March 22nd, 1312) in secret consistory. On April 3rd, in a public consistory at which Philip the Fair was present, the Pontiff promulgated, in the presence of an immense throng, the Bull *"Ad providam,"* which decreed the dissolution of the Order of Templars and disposed of their possessions in favor of the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, in order that these possessions, having originally been

[49] Clement's letter to Philip is published by Christophe, I, pp. 430 sq.

[50] *"Per modum provisionis seu ordinationis apostolicae, non autem de jure nec per modum definitivae sententiae."*

given for the interests of the Holy Land, might not be alienated from their purpose.[51]

Through the ill-will of the legists, this purpose of the Pope could not be attained. The King not only failed to give up the considerable monies which he had seized in the banks of the Temple, but, alleging old accounts which had not been settled, declared himself a creditor of the Order for considerable sums of which, however, he was unable to specify the amount. The Hospitallers had to consent to a transaction by virtue of which they paid the King 200,000 French livres on March 21st, 1313. Even this sacrifice did not free them from all claims. They had also to indemnify the crown for whatever sum it considered that it had spent for the support of the imprisoned Templars, as also for the expenses of jail and torture. "In short," writes Langlois, "it seems proved that the Hospitallers were impoverished rather than enriched by the gift to their Order." [52]

There still remained the finishing of the trial of Jacques de Molay, the Grand Master, and some chief dignitaries of the Order, whose case the Pope had reserved to himself. This was the last act of the tragedy. The Council of Vienne had decided that mildness was to be shown to the accused and that severity should be exercised only against the obstinate and the relapsed. Once again Philip's perfidy and the regrettable inaction of the weak and infirm Pope rendered these prescriptions vain.

The papal commission appointed to conduct the trial was found to be made up of cardinals and bishops devoted to the King and determined to act with the utmost rigor. Following an abusive practice already employed, it was decided that, whoever should disavow his confession, was to be regarded as

[51] Mansi, XXV, pp. 389 sq. Hefele (IX, pp. 411–417) gives detailed information on the various Bulls issued by Clement V regarding the abolition of the Order of the Temple.

[52] Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, III, part 2, p. 198.

relapsed and sentenced to be burned alive. As the chief dignitaries accused had already acknowledged their guilt, all chance of saving themselves seemed lost. Should they maintain their first declaration, their penalty would be life imprisonment; if they retracted, it meant death at the stake. They had been kept in prison for seven years. In despair they determined not to return there again. Let us hear the most trustworthy chronicler of this period, the continuator of Guillaume de Nangis: "As the Grand Master of the Temple and his three companions, the 'visitors' of France, Aquitania, and Normandy, had publicly acknowledged the crimes imputed to them and had persisted in their avowals,[53] finally after mature deliberation, the cardinals, seeing that their perseverance did not falter, had them led to the Place du Parvis de Notre Dame in Paris, there to announce to them their condemnation 'au mur' and life imprisonment. It was the Monday following the feast of St. Gregory (March 12th, 1314).[54] But just when the cardinals thought all was finished, of a sudden and contrary to all expectation,[55] the Grand Master of the Temple and the Master of Normandy, turning firmly and not without a certain irreverence toward the cardinal who had just concluded the reading, and toward the Archbishop of Soissons, declared that they retracted their confessions and all avowals previously made. There was general astonishment. The cardinals remanded the acused to the custody of the provost of Paris, who was present, to hold them until a further consideration of the matter, which was expected to be held the following day. But the report was not slow in

[53] *"Cum praedicti quatuor nullo excepto crimina sibi imposita palam et publice confessi fuissent et in hujus confessione persisterent."* (*Historiens de la France,* XX, p. 609.)

[54] The chronicler says 1313. But we know that at that time in France the year began with Easter, while at Rome it began at Christmas.

[55] *"Dum cardinales finem negotio imposuisse credidissent, confestim et ex insperato . . . non absque multorum admiratione. . . ."* (*Historiens de la France* XX, p. 609.)

reaching the King in his palace. Philip consulted his advisers, without, however, calling in his clergy, and after mature reflection, late that afternoon, had the two relapsing Templars consigned to the flames on a little island in the Seine, between the royal gardens and the Augustinian church.[56] The condemned men faced the flames with such firmness and met death with such fortitude and contempt for life that the crowd looking on was struck with amazement and admiration. The two accused who had not retracted underwent confinement in the prison assigned to them.[57]

Was that fearlessness in the face of death the sign of a clear conscience? Or was it only a desperate move of two souls weary of all the suffering and injustice which a hateful procedure had made them undergo, and ready to escape therefrom by precipitating themselves into certain death? History will perhaps never solve this problem.[58]

The Empire in Italy

When the news of the terrible execution reached the Pope, who had retired to the papal residence at Monteaux near Carpentras, he was already afflicted with the ailment which soon after led to his death. He was overwhelmed by cares of all sorts to his very last days.

In Italy and Germany the Guelfs and Ghibellines continued their strife without relaxation and with an ever increasing intensity. On March 14th, 1314, three days after Jacques de Molay's execution, the course of events induced Clement V to exercise upon Germany an act of authority of which only one

[56] Opposite the present *quai des Augustins.*

[57] Chronicle of William of Nangis, *Historiens de la France, loc. cit.*

[58] *Ibid.,* XX, p. 691. "This year," says the *Chroniques de Saint-Denis,* "in the month of March, during Lent, the Master General of the Temple and another grand master who was after him in the Order, the so-called visitor, on the island at Paris in front of the Augustinian church, were burned and the bones of both were reduced to ashes; after that no one bothered to refer to them."

example was known up to that time:[59] it was to appoint, by his own authority, an imperial vicar for Italy, empowered with the provisional administration of the Italian provinces of the Empire in the name of the Pope. The new ruler was the head of the Guelph party, Robert of Anjou. To appreciate the import of this measure, we must go back a few years. When Emperor Albert of Austria was assassinated (May 1st, 1308) by his nephew John of Swabia, the legists of Philip the Fair boldly turned their ambitious gaze on the vacant Empire. Pierre Dubois wrote: "Philip will establish in France the meaning of European polity. He will pacify Germany and Italy and will then be able to lead the united West to the conquest of the Saviour's sepulchre." The King of France tried to have his own brother, Charles of Valois, elected emperor, and for this purpose even solicited the support of Clement V, who made vague promises.[60] The Pontiff, on the contrary, looked with favor upon the election of Henry of Luxemburg, a lesser lord of a county of the Ardennes forest, who took the name of Henry VII and at first seemed to second the Pope's views with zeal. Clement had him crowned emperor at Rome by papal legates (June 22nd, 1313).[61] But visions of universal dominion, evoked by long sojourns in France and Rome, haunted the mind of the new Emperor. From the day when, urged by his ambition, Henry placed Robert of Anjou, the Guelf leader, under the ban of the Empire on the ground of the vassalage of his countship of Provence and because of the sovereign rights of the imperial majesty, from the day especially when he was seen at Rome supporting the Ghibelline party, which had always represented the terrible Colonna family, the Pope could not help but protest. Henry VII died (August 24th, 1313) as he was preparing an expedition into

[59] In 1268 the Holy See had named King Charles I vicar of the Empire.
[60] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, pp. 225, 614.
[61] Raynaldi, 1311, nos. 6 sq.

Apulia in the face of the papal excommunication just published against anyone who should attack the kingdom of Naples, a fief of the Roman Church.

Philip the Fair, ever zealous in supporting the rights of the Pope when he judged them useful to his own plans, encouraged Clement to maintain the prerogatives of the papacy against imperial claims. It was in this spirit that the Pontiff published two decretals, subsequently inserted into the Clementines, wherein he condemned Henry's claims and refuted the arguments of his lawyers.[62] In the midst of the ceaseless struggles waged by the multitude of quarreling petty rulers in Italy, the Pope, with the intent of maintaining papal prerogatives, appointed a pontifical vicar to administer the territories of the Empire in Italy.[63] But if, in one sense, the Empire was dead under the form of its ancient organization, the Ghibelline spirit of national autonomy and opposition to the papacy was more alive than ever. Dante became its eloquent spokesman, not only in his *Divina Commedia,*[64] but also and especially in his famous treatise *De Monarchia.*[65] And the

[62] Constit. II, *"Pastoralis,"* II, XI, *de Sent. et R. judic.;* Constit. un. *"Romani principes,"* II, IX.

[63] Raynaldi, 1314, no. 2; Baluze, I, p. 53.

[64] *Purgatorio,* VI, 88 sqq., VIII, 124 sqq.; *Paradiso,* XVIII, 115 sqq., XXVII, 139 sqq.

[65] Dante therein maintained: 1. that a universal monarchy is necessary for the earthly well-being of humanity; 2. that God confided its government directly to the Roman emperor; 3. that the pope, in so far as he is a prince, is subordinate to the emperor. Dante, however, was attacking, not so much the temporal sovereignty of the popes as its very great extension and the obstacles raised by the Guelph party against the monarchy. His arguments in support of his thesis are curious indeed. In every multitude that has a common end, he says, there must be a single chief. The best state for the world is that which most closely resembles God: but He is one. The ruler of the entire world has nothing to desire, hence he no longer has any passions and with him good will encounters no obstacles. The monarch is not for himself, but for others. Hence it follows that under a monarchy the people are very free. Moreover, whatever can be done by a single individual is always better done by one than by many. Lastly, has not God, by His authority, sanctioned the excellence of universal monarchy? It was while Augustus was making unity and peace reign in the world that the Word willed to become incarnate, and that was the moment which St. Paul called the fullness of time.

acts of defiance for papal authority which were provoked everywhere, but principally in Italian speaking countries, by the learned theories and fiery verses of the great Florentine poet, were not the least of the causes of the sadness that overshadowed the Pontiff's last months in his solitary castle at Monteaux.

His relations with England were also beset with difficulties. At a national synod, held about the feast of the Ascension 1312, King Edward II protested against the Pope's claim that he had a right to tax the clergy for some pious undertaking. Undoubtedly there was question of a crusade. The abbot of St. Edmund even appealed to the Pope to this effect.[66] At this same period, on occasion of a revolt of the nobility, we see Clement V send two legates to England to bring about peace. But in Edward's protest against a money contribution we can perceive a murmur that forbodes the solemn refusal which Edward III soon afterwards made to a like demand of the papacy.

Heresies

Pope Clement V derived great consolation in 1312 from the promulgation of the Acts of the Council of Vienne and from the orderly collection of his constitutions which he presented to the Sacred College at a consistory held March 21st, 1314, four weeks before his death. The Decrees of the Council of Vienne and the *Clementinæ* are the two imperishable monuments of his pontificate.[67]

The examination of the Templars' case was not, as we have

[66] Mansi, XXV, pp. 517–520.

[67] On the date of the Decrees of the Council of Vienne, see Hefele, IX, p. 419. The *Clementines*, a methodical collection of the constitutions of Clement V, were published by his successor, John XXII, in 1317. See John XXII's *Proœmium* at the beginning of the *Clementines* in the *Corpus juris canonici* (Richter ed., II, p. 1056; Boehmer ed., II, p. 1041). On Damberger's objections to the ecumenicity of the Council of Vienne, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, I, p. 88.

seen above, the sole object of the Council of Vienne; it was also to treat the question of reforming the Church.

The investigation incident to the trial of the Templars revealed three chief sources of abuses in the Church, namely, the too absolute exemption of certain religious Orders from episcopal control, the worldly life of the clergy, and, as a consequence of these two causes, an infiltration of suspected doctrines into the Church.

"It is evident," said the Archbishop of Bourges, "that the religious of the Temple would not have given themselves up to the impiety and corruption of which they are accused, if they had been under a stricter control of the episcopate." [68] The fathers of the council seemed for a while inclined to abolish all exemptions. But after reflection, they confined themselves to the suppression of certain abuses, whether of exempt religious or of prelates.[69]

William Durandus, bishop of Mende,[70] in a remarkable memoir in which he called for the reform of the Church *in capite et in membris,* had pointed out the grave abuses brought about by the worldly life of the clergy. We do not know exactly to what extent the council took account of these wishes, as the proceedings have not come down to us in full.[71] Some decrees remain, forbidding the clergy to engage in unsuitable occupations and to wear unbecoming dress.[72]

The various heresies whose existence became better known through the inquiries connected with the trial of the Templars

[68] Raynaldi, 1312, no. 24.

[69] *Clementinae,* lib. 5, tit. 6, *De excessibus praelatorum,* and tit. 7, *De excessibus privilegiatorum.*

[70] This remarkable prelate was the nephew of the celebrated William Durandus, born at Puymoisson in Provence, author of the *Speculum juris,* legate of Pope Gregory X to the Council of Lyons.

[71] Hefele, IX, p. 454. Havemann (*op. cit.,* p. 288) suspects Philip the Fair and his followers of having something to do with this loss. What remains of these documents is to be found in Raynaldi, Mansi, Hardouin, and in the *Clementines* of the *Corpus juris canonici.*

[72] *Clementinæ,* lib. 3.

were a matter of particular attention on the part of the council. It was difficult to discover them among the Templars themselves because the testimony of the accused and their confessions were vague, incoherent, and contradictory. But the impression left by a study of this celebrated case is that great disorders, as a natural consequence of wealth, idleness, and unclerical habits of life among the knights, had found their way into several "Temples" of France. Oriental superstitions, going back perhaps, through the sects from which the Templars had taken them, to the Gnostics, Cainites, and Ophites, seem to have left traces in certain mysterious objects concerning which archaeological science has so far been unable to decide with certainty.[73]

Erroneous teachings were more tangible among the Beghards, Beguines, and "Spiritual Brethren." We shall have occasion later on to speak of the doctrines spread by these sects.

An independent movement, analogous to that which led various States to free themselves from the authority of the Church, impelled certain impatient and restless souls to cast off all positive rule; and, as in the former case, they sometimes went to monstrous excesses. The sixth canon of the Council of Vienne enumerates the chief errors of the Beghards and Beguines of Germany;[74] they may be summed up in a single

[73] "Some bas-reliefs, covered with obscene figures and Arabic inscriptions, have been discovered in our day, some of them in the neighborhood of old commanderies of the Temple. E. Pfeiffer supposes that these monuments, after belonging to some Arab sects that kept the Gnostic traditions, were imported from the Orient into France by crusaders, perhaps Templars. But the so-called Arabic inscriptions of the casket of Essarois, the best known of these monuments, were certainly fabricated by persons whose knowledge of Arabic was very poor. According to S. Reinach, they are spurious. At what period were these imitations made? In the thirteenth century or in our own time? Why were they made? Was it to give credence to the existence of a secret cult with Asiatic tendencies, or was it to give an Oriental appearance to objects really intended for the followers of such a cult? We do not know." Langlois in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* III, part 2, p. 195.

[74] Mansi, XXV, col. 410.

proposition: The perfect man is free from all moral rule. Hence were deduced revolting conclusions of immorality, which sometimes passed into practical life.[75] The fifth canon of the council abolished the Beguines' mode of life under pain of excommunication.[76]

The Beguine heresy and corruption came from the "Spiritual Brethren," Fratricelli, Brethren of the Free Spirit, and other pseudo-mystical sects of the thirteenth century, against whom popes and councils had to act with great severity. Their origin was as follows. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, Pope Nicholas III, wishing to meet the unjust attacks made on various sides against the rule of St. Francis, declared, in the celebrated Bull *"Exiit qui seminat,"* [77] that the life of the Friars Minor was in conformity with the precepts of the Gospel and that their poverty was in imitation of that of Christ and the Apostles. Some zealous Franciscans celebrated their victory blusterously. From the papal Bull they concluded that, as the Franciscan rule summed up the precepts of Christ, every Christian was obliged to observe it, and that poverty, being a realization of Christian perfection, ought to be absolute, extending to the simple use (*usus pauper*) of the indispensable things of life. At the head of these zealots was Peter John Olivi, a young Friar Minor, born at Sevignan in Languedoc. Six centuries of study and discussion have thus far been unable to bring about an agreement among historians on this singular man, whom the sons of St. Francis continue to venerate and to defend against charges of grave doctrinal error,[78] whereas many reliable historians hold him to have been guilty of heresy.[79]

[75] On the Beghards and Beguines, see an article by Hefele in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon;* Mosheim, *De beghardis et beguinabus.*

[76] Hefele, IX, p. 431.

[77] *Decret.,* Lib. sext., c. 3, lib. 5, tit. 12.

[78] Wadding, *Annales ordinis minorum,* V, pp. 385 sq., VI, p. 197.

[79] Noël Alexander, Fleury, and others. Hefele merely reports the different opinions (IX, pp. 421 sqq.).

Olivi, a brilliant, cultivated, enthusiastic man, was convinced that the foundation of the Franciscan Order inaugurated a new era in the history of the Church. The Spirit, he believed, was about to triumph over the worship of matter. His personal life was remarkable for its austerity. He passionately loved the Church; but he would have it pure and spotless. He thundered against those who possessed earthly goods, who received an income from their property, who exacted money for funerals and enriched themselves through bequests for masses, who rode instead of walking, who were always well dressed. "Evangelical poverty," he says, "requires not only that we possess nothing, but that we use in the manner of poverty those things that we do not possess." [80] To this question he devotes a special work. Condemned by his superior general, Jerome d'Ascoli, subsequently pope under the name of Nicholas IV, for having almost deified the Blessed Virgin, Olivi submitted and burned his book with his own hand. But when summoned to Avignon to a general chapter by his new superior, Bonagratia, and then, in 1285, to Paris by Arlotto da Prato, Bonagratia's successor, he defended himself with so much ability and modesty that no decisive step was taken against him. In 1290, Pope Nicholas IV ordered an investigation of Olivi's followers and declared them imbued with erroneous opinions and guilty of rebellion. But the ardent reformer of Franciscan rule escaped from all his enemies' denunciations and all the rigorous measures of authority. He died March 6th, 1298, after receiving the Sacraments of the Church, tenacious of his ideas up to his very last breath.

His teachings, however, did not die with him. During the years preceding the Council of Vienne, the doctrine of *"usus*

[80] Noël Valois in *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 481. Cf. Ehrle, *Petrus Johannis Olivi, sein Leben und seine Schriften,* in *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte,* III, pp. 465, 498, 507, 547; Daunou, *Histoire littéraire,* XXI, pp. 46 sq.

pauper" aroused sharp controversy, and even had its martyrs.[81]

Among Olivi's disciples there was a greater evil than this fanatical defense of poverty; errors against the faith had slipped into their teaching. They taught that Baptism does indeed wipe out the "guilt" of original sin, but without conferring grace and infused virtues; they affirmed that Christ was still alive when pierced with the lance; they denied or called in question that the substance of the rational soul was by itself and by reason of its nature the "form" of the body.[82] The first of these propositions recalled the errors of the Vaudois. The second was contrary to the explicit testimony of St. John. Underlying the statement of the third proposition there was perhaps a suspicion of some error derived from the Averroist doctrine, as St. Thomas understood it, according to which each man was constituted by a vegetative or sensitive "form," while one and the same intellect or rational soul "informed" the human race. It is certain that this semi-pantheistic theory later inspired the most advanced sects of the Brethren of the Free Spirit.[83] All three propositions were condemned by the Council of Vienne.[84]

[81] Raimond Auriol and Jean del Primo, two friars of the monastery of Villefranche in Provence, were on this score imprisoned, chained, and treated with the utmost severity. The former succumbed, the latter survived with great difficulty. See Valois in *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 482. Cf. Ehrle, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Concils von Vienne,* in *Archiv für Literatur,* III, pp. 42 sq., 63, 143, 155.

[82] By "form" in this connection is meant the principle of activity which differentiates beings and which, by penetrating them with its power, gives them the properties that distinguish them. In the present case, it is the rational soul that penetrates the body with its force and power, thereby giving it its "human" properties, which distinguish it from plants and animals.

[83] The condemnation by the Council of Vienne seems, however, to go farther and to include any doctrine which, while recognizing in each man an individual rational soul, would place outside of it the "form," *i. e.,* the principle of human life. (See the Brief of Pius IX, June 15th, 1867.)

[84] *Corpus juris canonici* (ed. Richter), II, pp. 1057 sq. Cf. Hefele, lX, pp. 423 sq. The doctrine opposed to the first proposition is declared more probable and more conformable to the teaching of the saints and theologians; the second proposition is said to be contrary to S. Scripture; the third is condemned as

The labors of this council wore out Pope Clement's health. In the spring of 1314 he set out for Bordeaux. Having arrived at Roquemaure on the banks of the Rhone, he found that his weakness prevented his going farther; he breathed his last April 20th,[85] after a pontificate of eight years and ten months. The Italian historians who blame him for removing the Holy See far from Rome, have often treated his memory with severity. The great difficulties of the period of transition in which Providence placed him and the ever precarious state of his health should be taken into account if we would appreciate the personal responsibility of this Pope, who was after all a remarkable man, even if he does not deserve to be called great.

heretical. Cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* no. 481. Yet it is remarkable that Pope Pius IX, in his letter (April 30th, 1860) to the bishop of Breslau, in which he speaks against the errors of Canon Baltzer, who had repeated the thesis condemned at Vienne, stigmatizes it only as "erroneous" and in opposition to an interpretation of dogma. The same Pope, in a previous letter (June 15th, 1857) addressed to the archbishop of Cologne, on the subject of Günther's errors, had written that the theory denying that the rational soul is the "form" of the body, only "offends the Catholic doctrine and teaching on man." Denzinger, no. 1655. What are we to conclude from these texts except that the word "heretical" was used by the Council of Vienne in this case in the broad sense which the Inquisition gave it at that period? On this subject, see Garzend, *L'Inquisition et l'hérésie,* pp. 130–135.

[85] The death of Philip the Fair, which occurred six months later, gave rise to the legend that Jacques de Molay at the stake made an appointment to meet the Pope and the King before the judgment seat of God within the year. But no contemporary chronicler mentions this supposed prophecy.

CHAPTER IV

1316–1378

John XXII

AMONG Clement V's staunchest helpers and most intimate confidants was a man celebrated for the singularity of his fortune. From being the son of an humble shoemaker of Cahors, he rose to the highest dignity in the Church by the assiduity of his labors and the rectitude of his life. His name was Jacques d'Euse or d'Ossa.[1] When Clement V in 1310 appointed him bishop of Avignon, he was well advanced in years. His eminent services at the Council of Vienne (of which he was the secretary) by virtue of his deep knowledge of law and his business ability brought him the cardinal's hat and the title of bishop of Porto. Short, slender, homely, almost repulsively ugly, he had beneath this humble exterior a lofty genius and a great soul. On August 7th, 1316, after the Holy See had been vacant two years (during which the three parties, French, Italian, and Gascon, had striven without result), the Sacred College chose for a successor to the august member of the houses of Perigord and Armagnac, the son of the humble cobbler of Cahors, who took the name of John XXII.[2]

[1] Contemporaries wrote it Euse, d'Euse, Huèze, Duèze, and also Ossa, Osa, or Oza. Baluze (I, p. 689) and Verlaque, the latest historian of John XXII, endeavor to prove that Clement V's successor belonged to a noble family. However that may be, his father's humble profession is incontestable. *"Patre plebeio ortum trahens,"* says St. Vincent Ferrer; *"filius sutoris,"* says St. Antoninus.

[2] Villani's account (lib. 9, cap. 79), according to which Cardinal d'Ossa, selected by his colleagues as arbiter to designate the new pope, chose himself, saying: *"Ego sum papa,"* deserves no credence. In fact, it is contradicted by the accounts of several contemporary authors, generally well informed, such as Alvarez Pelayo (*De*

He was the most remarkable of all the Avignon popes.

After the example of Boniface VIII and Clement V, John XXII never lost sight of the grand project of a crusade. In fact, we may say it was the great objective of his efforts. But he encountered growing indifference on the part of princes and peoples. Opposition to the papacy was increasing everywhere. The movement aroused by the legists and the so-called "Spirituals" led to the agitation of the heterodox doctors. After Pierre Dubois and Pierre Olivi, there appeared William Occam, Marsilius of Padua, and John of Janduno, gathered about Emperor Louis of Bavaria. The center of hostilities was transferred from France to Germany.

The Empire was still vacant. John of Bohemia, a son of Henry VII, was too young to be a serious candidate for succession to his father. Germany was divided into two camps. A double election raised to the imperial throne Frederick of Austria and Louis of Bavaria. But neither of them could invoke the only title which, according to the public law of the time, constituted the official consecration of imperial right, namely, papal approbation. John XXII took a bold resolve, which showed that he belonged to the race of Gregory VII and Innocent III. On September 5th, 1316, he informed the two rivals that he was ready to act as their arbitrator, according to the right of the Holy See, and, as meanwhile the Empire remained legally vacant, he confirmed King Robert of Naples in the title of imperial vicar of Italy.

Ardent, impetuous, too proud to bow before papal arbitration, backed by almost equal forces, the two competitors preferred to entrust their fate to the arbitrament of war. Fortune

planctu ecclesiae, cap. 3), Ptolémée de Lucques, Pierre de Hérental (*apud* Baluze, vol. I). Moreover, the chapter in which Villani relates the anecdote is full of errors. Then, too, in an encyclical, John XXII affirms that he was elected by the unanimous vote of the cardinals. On this question, see Christophe, I, pp. 437 sq.; Verlaque, *Jean XXII, sa vie et ses œuvres,* chap. 1; G. Mollat, *L'election du pape Jean XXII,* in the *Revue de l'histoire de l'Eglise de France,* January–March, 1910.

decided in favor of Louis of Bavaria. The Austrian troops were defeated at Mühldorf (September 28th, 1322) and Frederick fell into the hands of his rival. Some months later the Diet of Nuremberg placed the imperial crown on the head of Louis of Bavaria. But the papal sanction was still lacking. The intrepid old man seated at Avignon was the less inclined to accord the title to Louis, since the new Emperor displeased the Holy See by fighting King Robert of Naples, imperial vicar, and by supporting with all his might Galeazzo Visconti, the terrible head of the Ghibellines.

Between John XXII and Louis of Bavaria there then began a renewal of the great struggle between the priesthood and the empire. The Pope had ordered Louis under pain of excommunication to give up the administration of the Empire within three months. At the Diet of Nuremberg Louis protested and asked that a general council be assembled to try the Pope.[3] The latter excommunicated Louis (March, 1324). On May 22nd, Louis published a declaration, dated from Sachsenhausen, accusing Pope John of heresy and of usurping the rights of the prince electors.[4]

Reduced to these simple proportions, the struggle forboded a graver conflict than that between Clement V and Philip the Fair. The new elements that were introduced increased its gravity still more.

The "Spiritual Brethren"

Louis of Bavaria was a passionate character, but feeble and changeable, and not of the stature of those Swabian emperors who had in former times maintained so great strife against the Roman Church. But there gathered about him all the malcontents and, in particular, that refractory branch of

[3] Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae,* IV, pp. 298 sq.; Raynaldi, 1323, nos. 34 sq.
[4] Baluze, II, pp. 378 sq.

the Franciscans, whose "Spiritual Brethren" who, since the time of Boniface and especially since the Council of Vienne, had been under censure with their leaders and doctrines. They were seeking everywhere for strength and backing. French and English churchmen and scholars, seduced by the legists' theories, placed their pens at the service of the rebellious and obstinate Emperor. *"Defende me gladio,"* wrote the English Franciscan, William of Occam, *"et defendam te verbo"* (Defend me with your sword, and I will defend you by my pen).

At first glance the question that placed the group of Franciscan "Spirituals" in revolt against their legitimate superiors and against the Pope may seem to us subtle and trifling. The question was whether a Franciscan could possess anything of his own and whether Christ and the Apostles possessed anything, individually or in common. Neither the weighty decisions of popes in these matters [5] nor the violent disputes and bloody scenes marking those lengthy discussions,[6] appear to give them an important place in history. But at bottom, underlying these discussions of a theological and exegetical nature, the only form then taken by questions debated in the cloisters, the weightiest problems were involved. In maintaining that the mendicant friar, by his renunciation of all ownership, even over things of simple usage (*usus consumptibilium*), was alone raised to the imitation of Christ and to evangelical perfection, the "Spiritual" brother placed himself above the whole secular clergy, and even over its supreme head, who

[5] In 1322, John XXII drew up a Bull to declare that *"in rebus consumptibilibus,"* the *"dominium"* and the *"usus"* cannot be separated (*Extravagantes,* tit. 14, cap. 3); in 1323 he declared heretical whosoever should maintain that Christ and the Apostles possessed nothing, either individually or in common (*Extravagantes,* tit. 14, cap. 4); in 1325, to denounce these errors in their source, he condemned Pierre Olivi's commentary on the Apocalypse.

[6] The pillage of the conventual Franciscans at Carcassonne, Narbonne, and Béziers; the apostasy of several "Spirituals" who took refuge among the infidels; the execution of four "Spirituals" at Marseilles. See Hefele, IX, p. 479; Christophe, I, pp. 299–426; Pastor, *History of the Popes,* I, p. 74; Callary, *L'idéalisme franciscain spirituel au XIV^e siècle.*

were not constrained to such rules of life. On the other hand, if Christ had no temporal possessions, then the vicar of Christ, exercising rights of property and dominion, could, it seemed, not do so as vicar of Christ, but only by virtue of some temporal right. Lastly, if the Saviour had thus radically condemned ownership, was it not in order to teach that ownership is an inevitable evil, tolerated by weakness, but essentially opposed to perfection? Although there was no "Spiritual" brother who then maintained such conclusions, who can deny that they were in germ in the heads of these rebellious friars? John Wyclif and John Hus later formulated the inferences.

As for the theologians, like William of Occam and Marsilius of Padua, who united their efforts to those of the Franciscan pseudo-mystics, their doctrines were no less revolutionary. The starting-point of William of Occam's political theories seems to have been Dante's *De Monarchia.* But he added thereto certain more radical and subversive ideas. With Occam the monarchical theory of the empire was combined with a democratic theory of the Church. One of the propositions which the audacious Franciscan most often repeated is that the Christian law is a law of liberty.[7] General councils can err, as can also the pope. The only infallible rules are Holy Scripture and the dogmas accepted by the universality of the faithful. The Church, moreover, should change according to the needs of the times.[8]

Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno

It was in 1328 that William of Occam, in company with two rebellious Franciscans, Bonagratia de Bergamo and Michael of Cesena,[9] went to Pisa to Louis of Bavaria, and

[7] Occam, *Dialogues,* part 3, tract 1, chs. 5–8.

[8] Pastor, I, p. 76.

[9] Michael of Cesena was superior general of the Order; John XXII deposed him and appointed Cardinal Bertrand de la Tour provisional administrator in his place.

placed themselves at his service. The three monks found there two learned doctors of the University of Paris who had also decided to put their minds and influence in the pay of the Emperor; they were Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno.[10]

Marsiglio Mainardino, known as Marsilius of Padua, was in turn physician, soldier, rector of the University of Paris (in 1313), and canon of the Church of Padua (in 1316) by the favor of Pope John XXII. He was one of those learned scholars who became encyclopedic by their studies and cosmopolitan by their personal relations, whose number the Renaissance soon multiplied in Europe. His sojourn at the University of Paris brought him into contact with John of Janduno, a teacher of theology and, like himself, a canon. They were at agreement in their ardent devotion to the rash ideas which a young school, sheltering itself under the authority of Duns Scotus, was spreading in the French capital. From the collaboration of these two men there was produced, in 1324, a strange and obscure work, its ideas in rambling disorder, its parts of unequal merit, a work so venturesome in religious as well as political questions that we can recognize in it "a rough draft of the doctrines developed at the periods of the Reformation and the French Revolution." [11] The title was *Defensor pacis*. The authors propounded the query, what might be the social conditions of that peace which Christ came to bring on earth and which is necessary for the prosperity of human society. They did not seek these conditions chiefly in the complete abolition of ownership, such as the "Spiritual Brethren" had dreamed of, or in the divine power of a universal monarchy, such as the legists affirmed. They thought to find them

[10] The arrival of Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno at the court of Nuremberg very likely dates from the summer of 1326. Pastor, I, p. 76. Cf. Noël Valois in *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 589.

[11] Valois (*Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 587) shows the existence, formerly denied, of collaboration between John of Janduno and Marsilius of Padua. (Cf. pp. 571 sq.)

rather in the theory of popular sovereignty. "The only sovereign," they said, "is the people, taken as a whole, or at least the most notable portion of the citizens." [12] To the people belongs the exercise of legislative power; it would be imprudent to entrust it to a small number of even wise men, as the multitude possesses better than they what is necessary for distinguishing good from evil.[13] The agents of the executive power should be elected by the people and be dependent on them.[14] The head of the State himself, if he should overstep the limits of his powers, would be subject to removal from office by the people.[15]

It has been remarked that similar doctrines were taught by medieval authors and that expressions approaching these can be found in St. Thomas Aquinas; [16] but they never have this absolute rigor. With medieval democrats, the rights of natural justice, of the common welfare, of services performed, of custom, of individual conscience, and especially of the spiritual authority of the Church, counterbalance and moderate the rights of the community. Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno take no account of these saving restrictions. For them the rights of the State are unlimited; it is the State, as absolutely representing sovereignty, that should regulate the citizens' activities and decide their professions. Thereby the democracy of our two sociologists meets the most radical Caesarism of the imperial legists.

These same writers were at great pains to devise an application of this democratic theory to the Church. According to them, the supreme authority in the Church is the council, which theoretically is made up of all the faithful, but, in prac-

[12] *"Legislatorem humanum, solam civium universitatem esse, aut valentiorem illius partem." Defensor pacis,* I, 12; III, 2; concl. 6.

[13] *Ibid.,* I, 13.

[14] *Ibid.,* I, 12 and concl. 10.

[15] *Ibid.,* I, 15.

[16] *Summa theologica,* Ia IIae, q. 105, art. 1, ad 1; q. 90, art. 4; q. 95, art. 1; IIa IIae, q. 42, art. 2, ad 3; *De regimine principum,* lib. 1, cap. 6, 10; lib. 3, cap. 11.

tice, is composed of their delegates, clerical or lay.[17] Moreover, in the conflicts that might arise between Church and State, the two authors are sure to turn the scales in favor of the State. Neither bishops nor pope should have any coercive power over clergy or laity, unless it be granted them by the people, who are the authors of all law;[18] and even when this jurisdiction is granted to bishops or priests, there should always be an appeal from them to the civil power.[19] To the assembly of the faithful or its delegate, the head of the State, belongs the right to choose subjects destined for holy orders,[20] to confer benefices on them, to fix the number of churches,[21] to authorize religious institutions,[22] and to license teachers.[23]

The two reformers showed the extreme consequences of their doctrines. For them the pope is "the dragon, the old serpent, which is the devil and Satan."[24] One of the most violent tirades in the book concludes with these words: "As a herald of truth I tell you and I cry aloud: Kings, princes, peoples, tribes of every tongue . . . these bishops of Rome are trying to bring you into subjection!"[25]

The *Defensor pacis,* written at Paris in 1324,[26] was not divulged until two years later. It was dedicated to the King of the Romans and doubtless the authors were awaiting a favorable moment for presenting it to him.

The continuator of William of Nangis experienced, as it

[17] *Defensor pacis,* II, 20.
[18] *Ibid.,* II, p; III, 2; concl. 7.
[19] *Ibid.,* III, 2; concl. 37.
[20] *Ibid.,* II, 17; III, 2; concl. 21.
[21] *Ibid.,* concl. 22.
[22] *Ibid.,* concl. 29.
[23] *Ibid.,* II, 17, 21; III, 2; concl. 23, 24, 25.
[24] *Ibid.,* II, 26.
[25] *Ibid.,* II, 24. Döllinger (*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* II, part 1, p. 259) and Pastor (I, p. 78) both remark that the system of Calvin is an offspring of the *Defensor pacis.* According to Pastor, it is not unlikely that the *Defensor pacis* exercised a direct influence upon the Geneva reformer.
[26] Géraud ed., II, p. 74. *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 589.

were, a fit of horror in announcing the arrival of Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno at the court of Louis of Bavaria, in 1326. "About this time," he writes, "these two sons of the devil came to Nuremberg." According to the same chronicler, the Emperor at first manifested some repulsion for the boldness of the work presented to him,[27] but he soon allowed himself to be won over by the clever doctor of Padua, kept the two authors among his intimate followers, and made Marsilius his regular physician. From that moment Marsilius became the King's confidant and it was probably his advice that inspired Louis of Bavaria's campaign against the Pope.[28] "The collation of the imperial crown by the Roman people," says Pastor, "their deposition of the Pope and election of an antipope in the person of the Minorite, Pietro da Corvaro, were the practical results of the teaching of the *Defensor pacis.*" [29]

In fact, when John XXII condemned the work of these two doctors of the Paris University,[30] the "priest John," as they called the Pope, was declared a heretic and unworthy of the papacy. It was resolved to march upon Rome.

On January 7th, 1328, the King of the Romans made his entry into Rome. He had himself solemnly crowned (April 18th) by Sciarra Colonna, surrounded by three Roman citizens, syndics of the people, and "the priest John of Cahors" was declared to be deprived of his dignity of sovereign pontiff. On May 12th, the Feast of the Ascension, in a popular gathering held at the Piazza San Pietro, Louis had Pietro Rainalducci of Corbario [31] acclaimed as pope. He was one of those

[27] Nangis, II, p. 75.

[28] *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 591.

[29] Pastor, I, p. 81.

[30] Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis,* II, p. 301; *Histoire littéraire,* XXXIII, p. 590.

[31] *"Petrum de Corbario, quem in Urbe cognovi verum hypocritam . . . inter mulierculas romanas quasi continue residentem."* Alvarez Pelayo, *op. cit.,* lib. I, cap. 37.

degenerate Franciscans who, under a hypocritical semblance of austerity, gave scandal by every kind of disorder. The people, though for a moment impressed by the sight of this mendicant brother in the drugget robe, taking his place beside the Emperor, were soon disabused. In the month of August the populace stoned him out of the city with cries of "Death to the antipope! Long live the Holy See!" [32] At the Pope's word, the Guelf party had taken up arms, and Louis of Bavaria, shamed by his defeat, withdrew to Germany.

This was the signal for a reaction that was marked by unfortunate excesses. While the Romans, in the intoxication of triumph, unanimously offered John XXII the sovereignty of the city, certain extreme defenders of the papacy compromised his case in their writings. "Agostino Trionfo, an Italian, and Alvaro Pelayo, a Spaniard, have, in this matter, gained a melancholy renown," says Pastor. "As one extreme leads to another, in their opposition to the Caesaro-papacy of Marsiglio, they exalted the pope into a kind of demi-god, with absolute authority over the whole world." [33]

Pope John's activity was not limited to his struggle against the German Emperor. The progress of arts and sciences, distant missions among infidel nations, the union of the schismatic Greeks with the Catholic Church, and the undertaking of a great crusade against the Mussulmans were objects of his continual preoccupation.

While the Council of Vienne was in session, Raymond Lully, that astounding representative of science and the apostolate at the beginning of the fourteenth century, who became a martyr for the faith on African soil after dazzling the world as scholar, poet, and mystic,[34] addressed to the as-

[32] Villani, lib. 10, cap. 96.

[33] Pastor, I, p. 80. On the theories of Augustinus Triumphus, see Baudrillart in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* 1898, pp. 334 sq.

[34] The principal works of Blessed Raymond Lully are *L'art général, Le livre des merveilles du monde, L'arbre de la philosophie de l'amour.* See Marius André, *Bienheureux Raymond Lulle;* Keicher, *Raymundus Lullus.*

sembled fathers a petition in which he asked "that three colleges be founded, one at Rome, one at Paris, and another at Toledo, where devout men well versed in theology might learn the tongues of infidel lands, so as to be able to go and preach the Gospel throughout the world and die for the exaltation of the faith." The council did justice to the request and decreed that Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldean should in the future be taught publicly wherever the Roman court should be, and also in the Universities of Paris, Oxford, Salamanca, and Bologna.[35] To John XXII is due the carrying out of this important decree.

Raymond Lully's death (1315) did not dishearten the missioners in Africa. The black continent was opened more and more to Christian civilization. New apostles also went to China, where, in 1306, Clement V had erected the bishopric of Peking. We still possess the reports which Andrew of Perugia and Odoric de Pordenone wrote from that country to John XXII.[36] Relations with the Greeks also became more frequent. "With the popes of Avignon," says Jean Guiraud, "there was an increase in the number of Latins who knew how to speak Greek and of Greeks who knew how to speak Latin." [37] In 1321, Marino Sanudo made a report to the Pope of his voyages to Armenia, Cyprus, and Rhodes. After the submission of Pietro of Corbario, the Pope was able to give more active attention to his crusade project. He stirred the slumbering zeal of princes, aroused the enthusiasm of the masses, and succeeded in arming four galleys which, in conjunction with the little fleet of the King of France, sailed toward Negropont, where they won a glorious victory over the combined Turkish forces." [38]

These apostolic and educational enterprises and political

[35] *Clementines,* lib. 5, tit. 1.

[36] Wadding, *op. cit., ad annos* 1305, 1312, 1326.

[37] Guiraud, *L'Eglise et les origines de la Renaissance,* p. 55.

[38] G. Mollat in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* V, p. 534.

undertakings had called for heavy expenditures on the part of Pope John.[39] Even vaster sums seemed to him necessary for the great crusade which he planned. The financial needs were the more pressing as the revenues formerly derived from Italy no longer came to the popes at Avignon, and the tributary powers, fearing lest part of the amount paid would be handed over to France, showed themselves very irregular in meeting their engagements. Hence the need for the papacy to strengthen and develop its financial organization. To this work the Pope devoted himself with tireless energy.

The Annates

"A man of simple habits, moderate in eating and drinking, spending little on himself, he first of all reorganized his court and took care to banish luxury from it." [40] But a wise economy in business management did not suffice to repair the deficits of the papal budgets. John XXII had recourse to a proceeding the unpopularity of which was promptly exploited by the enemies of the Holy See: it was the institution of the annates.

Pope John did not create the annates. Thomassin, in a scholarly chapter of his *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* shows that they were very old.[41] The taking over of one year's revenue of a small vacant benefice, such as a priory or a parish, to the profit of the greater benefice (abbey, bishopric,

[39] To these expenses, necessitated by works of science and of the apostolate and by the crusade projects, must be added the high living expenses which the Avignon popes seem to have multiplied for a double political purpose: to reassure the nations by a magnificence that would signify their independence of the French king, and to make the restless and turbulent Romans feel that the Holy See was established at Avignon *cum animo manendi.*

[40] G. Mollat in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* V, p. 531; Muntz, *L'argent et le luxe à la cour pontificale d'Avignon,* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVI, (1899), p. 5.

[41] Thomassin, *op. cit.,* part 3, bk. 2, chap. 58: Annates, their origin and progress up to the Council of Constance.

or archdeanery) on which it depended, was a practice that dated back to very early times. "These small benefices," says Thomassin, "seemed then as if joined again for a time to the body from which they had been severed, and the mother church was like an abundant spring receiving back into its bosom the streamlets that had formerly flowed out from it." [42]

The popes could not invoke such a motive, as the benefices, great or small, had never been part of the papal domain. But with the growing centralization of their power and the consequent increase of their expenses, the popes had to devise means of support for the Church; it was natural, then, for them to resort to that form already existing. In his famous memoir to the Council of Vienne, Durand de Mend speaks vaguely of levies made for the profit of the cardinals and the pope *"quoad portionem a praelatis qui promoventur."* In 1319, John XXII decided to take, by way of extraordinary tax, for three years only, the first year's revenues of minor benefices that would fall vacant during that time. This contribution was renewed and became as of common right. The major benefices in their turn became subject to the same process; and the Bull *"Execrabilis"* having increased the number of benefices at the disposal of the pope, the practice of the annates became general. Chroniclers and poets echoed the murmurs provoked by these financial measures. "Wolves are masters in the Church," said the Spaniard Alvaro Pelayo. We find the same sentiment voiced by Dante:

> "In garb of shepherds the rapacious wolves
> Are seen from here above o'er all the pastures!
> O wrath of God, why dost thou slumber still?" [43]

An impartial observer might, indeed, consider the noble use made of these revenues by him who has been called "an

[42] *Ibid.*, ed. André, VII, p. 192.

[43] Dante (Longfellow's translation), *Paradiso*, canto XXVII, v. 55.

incomparable administrator,"[44] and might appreciate the generosity of his inexhaustible charity.[45] But the papacy was to suffer greatly from the discredit cast upon it by these financial measures.

To this discredit was added the irritation of the Italians and Germans, offended at seeing the transfer of the papacy to Avignon confirmed by new building operations[46] and by the appointment of seven French cardinals.

A strange opinion uttered by the Pope on a doctrinal subject contributed not a little to lessening his authority in the minds of the faithful. John XXII preached very often in the Avignon churches. In the course of a sermon delivered on All Saints Day, 1331, he said that the souls of the blessed departed would not enjoy the full sight of God until after the general judgment. Although this opinion had been maintained by some of the Church Fathers, yet the general teaching of theologians was against it. The pope's enemies—Occam, Michael of Cesena, and the whole group of the "Spirituals" —shouted "heresy!" The University of Paris was disturbed. Philip of Valois, king of France, and Louis of Bavaria, emperor of Germany, thought it proper to interfere and, according to one chronicler, even to threaten.[47] Pope John at first could not restrain his anger and went so far as to imprison a Dominican friar for contradicting his view.[48] But, after

[44] This is Muntz' expression, *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVI, p. 14.

[45] On this subject see the scholarly article by G. Mollat, *Jean XXII, fut-il un avare?* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* V, pp. 522 sq., VI, pp. 33 sq. One of Pope John's most interesting foundations was the *Pignotte* (from the Italian *pagnotta,* "small loaf of bread," according to Du Cange), the papal almshouse, which developed into vast proportions, with refectories for the poor, granaries, bakeshops, clothes magazines, etc. The memory of this institution is retained in the *Place Pignotte* at Avignon.

[46] From 1316 to 1322 John XXII bought several houses at Avignon. He also enlarged and put in order the papal residence there. Cf. Guiraud, *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[47] According to Villani, Philip VI threatened to inflict on the Pope the punishment reserved for heretics.

[48] Hefele, IX, p. 494.

gathering an assembly of cardinals and learned theologians, he gave up his opinion. Shortly afterwards (December 4th, 1334), on his death-bed, he publicly retracted the doctrine he had uttered, not as head of the Church, but simply as a private theologian. John XXII reached his ninetieth year. This great Pope lived after the manner of a simple monk, governing Christendom from a modest cell.[49] He left the papal chancery completely reorganized.[50] But opposition to the papacy was far from extinguished. The home of that opposition, which until then had been in France and Germany, was soon transferred to Rome itself.

Benedict XII

Neither the wise government of Benedict XII, nor the brilliant reign of the pompous Clement VI, nor the prudent administration of the austere Eugene IV had the importance of the great pontificate of Innocent VI. Under these three popes, while the young papal court of Avignon, giving itself up to the pleasures of art and letters and an easy life under the beautiful Provençal sky, was preparing the Renaissance, Rome, deprived of its pontiff, was agitated by the chimerical vision of resurrecting its ancient past. Soon it was evident that the only solution of the crisis was to be found in a prompt return of the popes to the traditional capital of Christendom. The saints were the first to perceive this and to say so to the Avignon popes. Urban V and Gregory XI understood it. Throughout the time of their pontificate their eyes were turned toward the Eternal City; but when their project could be realized, it was too late: from "the Babylonian Captivity," the papacy presently fell into the Western Schism.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 493.

[50] On the pontificate of this Pope see Mollat, *Lettres communes de Jean XXII.*

After the popes became established at Avignon, the agitation in Rome and Italy grew worse. The absence of the papacy left the power in the hands of the nobility. The latter were divided and took their stand about the Colonna and the Orsini, who were ever at strife. The people, suffering from these internal dissensions, turned restlessly to the imperial power and greeted it as a liberator or surrendered to princes and foreign adventurers who founded in Italy the régime of petty tyrants. Artists and literary men were spreading about them the study of the literature and monuments of ancient Rome, awakening the pride of the Roman name. The verses of Dante weeping over enslaved Italy were frequently repeated. Under John XXII a league had been formed "to defend the liberty of the fatherland" (*pro tuenda libertate patriae* [51]).

The austere monk, Jacques Fournier, whom the unanimous vote of the Sacred College raised to the supreme dignity in the Church (December 20th, 1334), took the name of Benedict XII. From the very first days of his pontificate he turned his attention to this difficult situation. Unfortunately, his knowledge of affairs did not match his virtue. In his acts it is impossible to discover the application of any continuous systematic policy. Although deeply attached to his duties, he merely sought to ward off present abuses as soon as he discovered them. One of his first acts was to testify his solicitude for the people of Rome by devoting a large sum of money to the repair of its churches.[52] In 1335, in answer to complaints reaching him from Italy, he appointed Bertrand de Deaux, archbishop of Embrun, reformer of the territories of the Church and commissioned him to receive all the grievances of the people.[53] Bertrand obtained from the Colonna

[51] Papencordt, *Cola di Rienzo*, p. 53.

[52] MS. 820, Italian, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, fo. 16, cited by L'Epinois, *Le gouvernement des papes*, after documents in the secret archives of the Vatican, p. 243.

[53] Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus Dominii temporalis Sanctae Sedis*, II, p. 12.

and Orsini a truce (January 19th, 1336), solemnly sworn to by both parties.[54] To strengthen his legate's authority, Benedict chose from the military Order of Knights of St. John of Jerusalem certain captains whom he charged with resisting, if need be by force, the oppressors and disturbers of the Church. But the Romans, some out of a care for the welfare of the Church, others out of haughtiness or national pride, asked for a more effective measure: the Pope's return to Rome. After some hesitation, Benedict decided not to yield to their petitions.[55] The mild and peaceful Pontiff was not forceful enough to withstand the Italian factions and would perhaps have succeeded merely in compromising his supreme authority. Besides, the King of France and the house of Anjou would have barred his way, had he taken the road to Rome.[56]

Before long the Pope himself became so attached to the bank of the Rhone that, in 1339, he laid the foundation of the splendid papal residence, which, enlarged and beautified by his successors, remained the glory of Avignon. This colossal structure, with its massive towers and imposing architecture was a stronghold rather than a palace, where, as has been said, the Western Schism prepared its fortress before breaking out.

Benedict XII gave proof of a determined resolve to correct abuses. The disciplinary measures that he enforced among the clergy of his entourage aroused such enthusiasm that a contemporary chronicler says: "The Church had fallen to the rank of Agar; Benedict gave her the dignity of Sarah.

[54] *Ibid.*, II, p. 11.

[55] L'Epinois, *loc. cit.*

[56] This is what Pastor says, I, p. 84. Benedict XII has been blamed for his dependence on the King of France. But it should be recognized that whenever the solicitations of the secular power appeared to him contrary to justice, he showed himself inflexible. *"Iste non timebat quemquam,"* says the *Liber pontificalis, "quando jus et justitia non servatur."* (*Lib. pont.*, II, p. 486.)

She was enslaved; he set her free." [57] The Pope was less happy in his attempts to end the conflict with Louis of Bavaria, in his efforts to unite the Greek Church with the Roman, in his plan for resuming the work of the crusades, in his measures to assure the reform of the religious Orders and the secular clergy, and in his attempt to suppress the taxes that were too heavy or unjust. When he died (April 25th, 1342), he left the political situation of the Church still threatening.

Clement VI

Pope Clement VI, who ascended the papal throne on May 7th, 1342, presented a striking contrast with his predecessor. Pierre Roger, born in the castle of Maumont near Limoges, rose in a few years, as though by magic, from one ecclesiastical dignity to another, to the highest ranks of the hierarchy. Admired by the great for his distinguishing loftiness of mind, applauded by the people for his winning eloquence, Clement VI, by his imprudent largesses, in a short time scattered the savings of the papal treasury, slowly and painfully amassed by Benedict XII. But his political understanding was keen. Pastor does not hesitate to call him "in many respects a distinguished man." [58]

Where his predecessor's sincere but clumsy good will had failed, Clement VI, favored by circumstances, succeeded. As a discreet diplomat, he strove to establish peace between France and England, persuaded the kings of those two countries to agree to the truce of Malestrout (January 19th, 1343), and, three years later, after the defeat of Crecy, suc-

[57] Baluze, I, p. 232. On Benedict XII's Constitution *"Benedictus Deus"* (January 29th, 1336) condemning John XXII's error in the matter of the beatific vision, and on his *Libellus de erroribus ad Armenos,* see the two learned articles by Le Bachelet in the *Dictionnaire de théologic catholique,* II, pp. 657–704.

[58] Pastor, I, p. 88.

cessfully intervened to moderate the victor. As an able administrator, he negotiated the purchase of Avignon from the queen of Naples.[59] As a capable theologian, he obtained William of Occam's submission and put an end to the agitation of those "Spiritual Brethren" whose fanaticism had so long disturbed the Order of St. Francis and the entire Church. He maintained John XXII's firm policy toward Louis of Bavaria, cleverly obtained an advantage over the Emperor from the opposition of the house of Lützelburg and Wittelsbach, and found a rival to him in the person of Charles of Luxemburg, the grandson of Henry VII. The unexpected death of Louis of Bavaria (October 11th, 1347) hastened the success of Charles, who was crowned emperor and promised to satisfy all the requirements of the Roman curia, so much so that he received the name of "the priests' emperor." [60]

But we should not let ourselves be deceived as to these political triumphs. The truces between France and England soon gave way to violent conflicts; the submission of Occam and the "Spirituals" did not prevent their revolutionary ideas from silently spreading, and the docility of Emperor Charles IV changed to absolute independence toward the papacy by the publication of the Golden Bull, in 1356.

But it is from Italy, even Rome, that the most formidable danger arose. A man of the people, impassioned by his classical studies for the glories of ancient Rome and endowed with a natural eloquence and imposing stature which gave him a dominating influence over the masses, became interpreter of the aspirations of the multitude, of its grievances and dreams,

[59] It is not true that Joanna of Naples, accused of complicity in the assassination of her husband, sold Avignon to Clement VI in exchange for absolution. But it is true that the 80,000 florins stipulated in the sale enabled Joanna to repel the avenging troops of her brother-in-law. Bouche, *op. cit.*, II, p. 370. Christophe, II, pp. 141 sq., 465–471. According to Muntz, the florin was worth about fifteen dollars. *Revue des questions historiques,* LXVI, p. 5.

[60] Pastor, I, p. 86. Hemmer, under the word *Clément VI,* in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* III, col. 70.

which he himself cleverly fomented. He was called Nicholas or Cola di Rienzi. After Clement's election, Rienzi was a member of the Roman delegation commissioned to request the new Pope to return to Rome. The noble and generous Pontiff, himself seduced by the young man's brilliant qualities, appointed him notary of the Apostolic Chamber. Soon the people were led to believe that the Pope, through Rienzi, was going to accomplish the work of liberation and restoration which they had vainly asked of their barons, the emperor, and the popes in exile at Avignon. By inflammatory addresses, by allegorical figures calculated to strike the popular imagination, Rienzi won the confidence of the masses. In 1347, he had himself proclaimed tribune, revived the ancient magistracies, established a militia, and reorganized the police and the finances. Everything seemed to favor him. Men of letters at the court of Avignon, dazzled by whatever awoke in them the memories of Roman antiquity, encouraged the new tribune of the people. Petrarch lauded him in a triumphal ode. Clement VI addressed a brief of felicitation to him. The feudal barons, abandoned by the people and vaguely foreseeing reprisals, quit Rome and withdrew to their castles: Rienzi reigned alone over the Eternal City. His success intoxicated the dictator. He conceived the notion of extending his authority over the whole world. To his judgment seat he summoned the two rivals for the empire, attacked the temporal power of the pope, surrounded himself with senseless pomp, and fell into every excess and infamy with which he had reproached the barons. Soon everyone abandoned him. The mob turned against him. Excommunicated by the Pope and seeing that his reign was ended, Cola left Rome and retired to the monastery of Monte Majella. There, under pretext of pursuing a life of quiet meditation, he was filled with all the dreams of the Fratricelli. After two years of solitary life, he emerged, calling himself the chosen instrument of the

Holy Ghost for the regeneration of the world. He betook himself to Emperor Charles IV, proposing to lead him to the conquest of Italy. But Charles put him under arrest as suspected of heresy and sent him to Clement VI. The Pope, after keeping him for some time in the upper part of the Trouillas tower, gave him freedom within the city of Avignon, under the surveillance of the police.

This was another political triumph for Clement VI. But the moral consequences of such agitations were serious. It could not be indifferent to the good order of Christendom that, in the heart of the Eternal City, the legists' spirit of revolt should be found, in the person of one man, combined with the wildest dreams of the "Spiritual Brethren" and the sensual pomp of the pagan Renaissance.

Some time before his death, the Sovereign Pontiff, through the mediation of Bishop Hemming, one of the upper Scandinavian clergy, received the following letter "written in the name of Christ and at His dictation: 'I, Jesus Christ, exalted you. I had you advance from honor to honor. Arise. . . . Go to Italy and there contemplate the places sprinkled with the blood of My saints. . . . I have been patient; but now My time is near at hand; yours is drawing to a close. I will require of you an account of your neglect. . . . You can reform and improve many things; but you have been unwilling to do so.' . . . If you ask what spirit inspires such words, know that you are acquainted with her who writes. . . . Examine the book of your conscience and you will perceive that I speak the truth." She who wrote thus was, in fact, already known to the head of the Church. It was Brigid of Sweden, seneschale of Nericia, first lady of the palace at the Stockholm court. Great in the world, she was still greater by the supernatural revelations with which God favored her, by the foundation of the Order of the Saviour, which she established at Vadstena, and by the remarkable austerity of her

virtues. In the presence of the inactivity of His pontiff, God raised up a woman from the ranks of the simple faithful to remind him of his duties. On December 2nd, 1352, Brigid had another vision. "The hour of wrath has come," Christ said to her; "I will judge this Pope, who has scattered the flock of Peter. However, if he turns to Me, I will hasten to meet him like a tender father." In an ecstasy Brigid saw the Pontiff's soul ready to appear before its judge, seized with fright at the aspect of the demon and at the same time consumed with a desire to possess the God of love.[61] She thought that Pope Clement's charity [62] and his fidelity to his duties as a Benedictine monk would save him from the sufferings of Purgatory.

Innocent VI

Clement VI died December 6th, 1352. Twelve days later the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, Etienne Aubert, also a native of Limoges, was chosen to succeed him. He took the name of Innocent VI. At the very time that he was being enthroned, Christ again spoke to His servant Brigid, saying to her: "Pope Innocent is a man of better tempered metal than his predecessor. If he knew the revelations I have made to you, he would become still better. . . . His good will shall take the place of deeds and shall be rewarded."

After the death of Clement VI, the cardinals were afraid of the possible scandals of a papacy too worldly and too absolute. By an instinctive action, excessive but easy to explain, they wished to limit the pope's powers by those of the Sacred College and at the same time to raise to the Holy See, not a statesman, but a man of prayer, John Birel, the general of the

[61] *Révélations de Sainte Brigitte,* bk. 9, chap. 144; bk. 6, chap. 96.

[62] Generous and chivalrous, Clement VI showed great courage during the terrible "black plague" of 1348 and 1349. When the people held the Jews responsible for it, he threatened with excommunication anyone who should molest them.

Carthusians. But they thought better of it. Fearful of a reform that would have made of the pope a sort of constitutional sovereign, the wisest of them added the clause: "If the act is in conformity with right." John Birel declined the offer of the papacy. The conclave of 1352 did not repeat the sorry imprudence of the conclave of 1294, which snatched Pietro di Murrone from his solitary retreat in the desert to entrust him with a responsibility beyond his talents. A more enlightened inspiration prompted it to elect the virtuous and learned Etienne Aubert, who had been professor of civil law and chief justice of the city of Toulouse. He gave promise of being a wise and prudent ruler.

One of the first acts of the new Pope was to annul, as "not conforming to right," the constitution drawn up by the Sacred College in a time of anxiety and perhaps under pressure from the French court.[63] On the other hand, he considered it his duty to be guided, so far as possible, by the counsels of John Birel and, as we are told by a chronicler, "if the new Pope did not run into the abuses of mysticism, if he showed himself more restrained in the distribution of favors, if in his reign benefices were generally bestowed on worthy subjects, it is due to the letters of the man of God."[64] Thus the Pope who became the defender of the hierarchy did not hesitate to recognize the need which that hierarchy often has of seeking the respectful and submissive aid of holiness.

Innocent VI banished luxury from the papal court, reduced the number of those in his service, abolished many reservations and commends, sent back to their churches the numerous prelates who were living at Avignon without having been

[63] Hefele, IX, p. 589.

[64] Dorlandi, *Chron. carthus.*, bk. 4, chap. 22. When Birel died a few years later, Innocent VI exclaimed: "God grant that my soul may appear before Him as pure as that of Father Jean Birel. The Church has lost the holiest of her priests."

called thither, and threatened with excommunication all who should fail in the duty of residence.[65]

Since the departure of Cola di Rienzi, the city of Rome had fallen back into anarchy, and from anarchy, as by a natural inclination, into a dictatorship. The new tribune, Baroncelli, a man of the people, more vain and brutal than his predecessor, terrorized the city by cruelties and stained it by his excesses. Innocent VI, who was deceived by Rienzi's behavior, supposed he had been improved by his trials and decided to set up the former tribune against the new one. This was an act of imprudence. Rienzi, received at Rome as a liberator, lost no time in reviving the most hateful despotism. But his dictatorship was of short duration. Just when he had taken the terrified silence reigning in the city as a sign of complete submission, an insurrection suddenly broke out (October 8th, 1354). Cries of "Death to the traitor Rienzi!" resounded on all sides. As he tried to escape, he was attacked by the populace, who massacred him after making him undergo the most shameful treatment.

For reëstablishing order in Italy, Innocent VI found a man of genius, Cardinal Albornoz. Aegidius Alvarez d'Albornoz, a Spaniard of royal blood, had been a captain, councillor of the king, and archbishop of Toledo. Under Peter the Cruel, whose crimes he courageously reproved, he thought it prudent to withdraw from his country. The Pope, appreciating his high qualities, conferred on him the most extensive powers, civil and military as well as religious, over all Italy. In four months, by his able and diplomatic negotiations, his military expeditions, the dominance of his knowledge and virtues, and his untiring activity, he succeeded in restoring independence to the domain of St. Peter, in forcing the petty Italian tyrants to make their submission, in assuring respect

[65] Raynaldi, 1352, nos. 25–30; 1353, nos. 29–31.

for canonical regulations among the religious and secular priests, and in establishing some order in civil society by a code of laws admirably suited to the circumstances. On Easter, 1355, in a peaceful Italy, he was able to have Charles IV crowned emperor in the name of the Pope. Albornoz possessed the wonderful secret, not only of overcoming opposition and captivating men's minds, but also of winning their hearts. A resolute pope who would have set out for Rome at that time would have aroused unanimous acclamations along his entire progress in Italy.[66] Unfortunately old age and illness prevented Innocent VI from carrying out such a project.

This delay caused the situation to grow worse. The frequent demands which the Avignon popes were obliged to make for money caused more and more discontent among the States. To shield herself from these levies, England had recourse to severe legislative measures.[67] The dissatisfaction of Germany was shown in another way, due to a lack of united action; but those concerned, oppressed by national wars, individually expressed their irritation by murmuring. The alienation of the papacy was the result. The famous Golden Bull of January 13th, 1356 (so named from the golden capsule on which the seal of the empire was imprinted) may be considered as the most serious result of this silent opposition. "In agreement with the prince electors, counts, and other nobles," as we are told in the preamble of the famous document, Emperor Charles IV definitively and exclusively transferred the right of choosing the sovereign to seven privileged electors; the confirmation of the newly elected by the pope was passed over in silence; no account was taken of the right, which the pope claimed, of appointing imperial vicars in case of vacancy.

[66] See his letter to Charles IV (April 28th, 1361) in Martène, *Thesaurus*, II, pp. 946 sqq.

[67] Lingard, *History of England*, II, chap. 7, pp. 366 sqq.

Innocent VI protested. The personal relations of friendship between the Pope and the Emperor moderated the controversy; but the breach made in the traditional privileges of the papacy was extremely important. In short, when Innocent VI breathed his last (September 22nd, 1362), in the tenth year of his pontificate, the bright prospect which, for a moment, was offered the papacy by the genius of Albornoz, was already imperilled.

Urban V

The choice of the Sacred College, after hesitating over the name of the celebrated Spanish cardinal, fixed upon the Benedictine abbot of St. Victor of Marseilles, William Grimoard, who was nuncio at Vienna. He took the name of Urban V. Petrarch, echoing the public opinion, greeted this election as the result of a divine inspiration. In fact, the Church was later to raise this Pope to her altars. Two great events were to make his pontificate one of the most important in history: the return of the papacy to Rome and the reëstablishment of the Holy Roman Empire.

The Pope's return to Rome, which had not seen its bishop for sixty years, was a veritable triumph. When (October 16th, 1367) Urban V arrived before the gates of the city, whose half-ruined buildings presented a sight of lamentable decay, as if the very stones bemoaned the absence of the popes, his return was greeted with popular enthusiasm. John Colombini, the founder of the Jesuates, placing himself at the head of his companions, had gone with them as far as Corneto, singing psalms. Petrarch, to commemorate the Pope's return, borrowed words from the Psalmist: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a barbarous people"; on all sides there were signs of joy and gladness.

After spending three years in the Eternal City to reëstab-

lish order and, according to his familiar expression, "peace in justice," [68] Urban V, thinking his presence was needed in France to halt the threatening hostilities between that country and England, sailed from Corneto on September 5th, 1370. He was destined not to see Italian soil again; sickness sapped his strength and soon brought him to the grave.

His stay in Rome had been marked by an event which seemed to fulfil the most magnificent dreams of a Gregory VII and an Innocent III. Emperor Charles IV came thither to solemnly confirm the accord between the Empire of the West and the Church,[69] and John Palaeologus, emperor of the East, there abjured the Greek schism.[70] The ruler of Byzantium came to ask help against the Mussulmans. But the time of the great crusades was past. A few years before, in 1365, Pierre du Lusignan could have been seen scouring Europe and again stirring the popular imagination and the enthusiasm of a handful of knights with the idea of conquering the Holy Land; and you might have seen Blessed Peter Thomas, papal legate, and the king of Cyprus set out for the East with the illusion that all Europe was going to follow in their footsteps. But the princes and nobles who promised their assistance devoted themselves instead to the care of their political interests. The great maritime powers, contented with their treaties with the Mussulmans, were opposed to the whole undertaking.[71] England, which formerly had taken so brilliant a part in these Christian expeditions, showed herself especially cold. And it was from England that came the most formidable opposition and the most painful revolt that the papacy had had to suffer for a long time.

[68] The utility of this short sojourn of Urban V at Rome has sometimes been doubted. In L'Epinois (*op. cit.*, pp. 327–337), see the enumeration, with supporting evidence, of the important reforms carried out at Rome by Urban V.

[69] Pastor, I, p. 95.

[70] Baluze, I, p. 388.

[71] Brehier, *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age*, p. 300.

We saw above that, for some time past, the taxes levied by the Avignon popes had aroused recriminations among the English people. "The laity at this time," says Hume, "seem to have been extremely prejudiced against the papal power, and even somewhat against their own clergy, because of their connections with the Roman pontiff. The Parliament pretended that the usurpations of the pope were the cause of all the plagues, injuries, famines, and poverty of the realm. . . . At another time, they petition the king to employ no churchman in any office of state; and they even speak in plain terms of expelling by force the papal authority. . . . Men who talked in this strain, were not far from the Reformation." [72]

One of the most unpopular tributes was that of £1000 annually which England owed to the Holy See since the time of John Lackland, who promised it when the interdict against him was lifted. The people considered this as a sign of vassalage against which the feeling of national autonomy protested, and for several years the tribute had no longer been paid. But the question of right remained unsettled. In 1367, when Urban V renewed his demand, King Edward III referred the solution of the question to Parliament, which decided that King John did not have the right, without the nation's consent, to subject his realm to a foreign power. This was enlarging the question. But what still more aggravated the matter was the intervention of a theologian, John Wyclif, who was invited to appear before Parliament to give his advice. He declared that, from the point of view of divine and ecclesiastical law as well as that of national law, King John's promise was radically null and void.

John Wyclif, whom this incident introduced into the political world, soon after condensed into his teaching all the temerarious and heretical opinions, destructive of discipline and Christian dogma, which had been uttered by the enemies

[72] Hume, *History of England,* ch. 16, II, p. 273.

of the papacy for two centuries past—Albigenses and Vaudois, Apocalyptics and "Spirituals," followers of Occam and of Marsilius of Padua. His doctrine served as a connecting link to join all these sects to the Protestant Revolt.

Born in 1324 in the village of Wyclif, which has given him his name, John studied philosophy, theology, civil and canon law at the celebrated University of Oxford, where William of Occam's spirit of revolt had unfortunately left some traces. The restless, ambitious, passionate soul of the new doctor exaggerated these dangerous tendencies. In 1356 was published his treatise *De ultima aetate Ecclesiae,* full of bitter denunciations against the state of the Church and abounding in apocalyptical dreams about the approaching end of the world. In the conflicts between the University and the Mendicant Orders, he accused the latter, in the style of a coarse pamphleteer, of "infecting the atmosphere" [73] and of putrefying humanity. With immoderate ardor he undertook the defense of Parliament against the Pope in a new pamphlet, *Determinatio quaedam Magistri Joannis W. de dominio contra unum monachum.* All this was merely the prelude of fresh audacities, the scandal of which was spared the holy Pontiff then ruling the Church, for on December 19th, 1370, Urban V, lying on an humble cot and clothed in the Benedictine habit, which he had never abandoned, gave up his soul to God.[74]

Gregory XI

On the 29th of the same month, in a conclave that lasted only one day, the College of Cardinals, counting fifteen Frenchmen, three Italians, and one Englishman, raised to the

[73] *"Inficientes aerem cum ingurgitato stomacho et sudoribus evaporatis."* (*Trialogus,* cap. 35.)

[74] Urban V was beatified by Pius IX, who fixed his feast on December 19th.

pontifical throne a young cardinal, thirty-six years old, Pierre Roger of Beaufort Turenne, who took the name of Gregory XI. He was a nephew of Pope Clement VI. His pale and gentle features and the modest gravity of his bearing, even more than his noble birth, made him pleasing to all. He bowed before a call which he considered the will of God. It is said that, upon assuming the tiara, he made a vow to carry it back to Rome. Undoubtedly the young Pontiff had no illusions as to the difficulties of such an undertaking. But the need of departing from Avignon left him no choice.

Since the death of Cardinal Albornoz, Italy had fallen back into anarchy. Over and above individual animosities dividing the petty States and setting faction against faction, a common national feeling aroused the whole population of the peninsula more and more against the papal régime. The hasty departure of Urban V for Avignon and the composition of the Sacred College, in which French influence had become preponderant, made the Italians fear seeing the papacy definitively abandon Rome and become a political instrument in the hands of the French kings. Hatred for foreigners and resistance to the "evil pastors of the Church" were the watchwords of an insurrection headed by the Florentine Republic. This latter attributed to the legates of the Holy See calamities whose deepest cause was to be found in its own political constitution and pagan morals.[75] The Florentines, unfurling a red flag on which was inscribed the word "Libertas," revolted with cries of "Death to the legates!" Following Florence, the cities of Milan, Perugia, and Città di Castello also raised the standard of rebellion.

In vain did the peaceful and timid Pontiff try to use methods of gentleness.[76] The tumultuous populace and the nobles,

[75] Pastor, I, p. 100.

[76] Raynaldi (1375, no. 17) prints a paternal letter from the Pope to the Florentines.

stirred by the old Ghibelline animosities, seemed not to hear. The prior of the Carthusians at Florence, clothed with the power of nuncio, was seized by the crowd, flayed alive, and paraded through the streets in a cart. "Diabolical men," as St. Antoninus calls them, usurped the power and spread terror everywhere.[77] Gregory, deciding that the time had come for resort to spiritual weapons, issued a formidable decree against the rebellious city. The Florentines and their followers were excommunicated; the city was placed under the interdict and declared outlawed; all past treaties with the city were proclaimed null and void; it was explicitly forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to supply its inhabitants with wood, bread, or wine.[78] On his side, Emperor Charles IV hurled anathema against the Florentines. But the irritation was too great to halt before these spiritual penalties; faith was too weak for an interdict, however severe, to be able, as formerly, to make a whole people recoil. The papal Bull only exasperated the raging rebels.

In the Sacred College, a man whose talents were as readily displayed on the battlefield as in the council chamber, Cardinal Robert, count of Geneva, proposed to raise an army of ten thousand men "of every tongue and tribe" and to march at its head against the revolting provinces. Gregory, seeing no other way of meeting the danger, consented and bestowed full power on the terrible Cardinal, whom St. Antoninus in his History compares to Herod and Nero. It meant open war between the last Avignon pope and Italy. A body of 400 Gascon lances, making 1200 men, and a Breton company of a thousand horse poured into Italy under the command of Jean de Malestrout, Silvester de Budes, and Raymond de Turenne, answering pillage by pillage, blood by blood.[79]

[77] St. Antoninus, *Hist.*, part 3, tit. 23, ch. 14, no. 16.

[78] Raynaldi, 1376, nos. 1–6; Capecelatro, *Histoire de sainte Catherine de Sienne*, p. 108.

[79] Muratori, *op. cit.*, XVI, p. 526.

Suddenly, amid these scenes of slaughter, a maiden's voice was raised. St. Catherine was born at Siena, in 1347, of a humble bourgeois family. Her father, Jacob Benincasa, a simple and upright man, was a dyer. Up to the time she entered the Third Order of St. Dominic in 1365, she had led a hidden life, practicing the humblest virtues of the Christian religion. But the evils from which the Church was suffering afflicted her heart. In 1376 her confessor, Raymond of Capua, arriving from Florence, related to her the horrors of the war that was going on. Catherine knelt before her crucifix and remained there about an hour in deep meditation. When the humble "mantellata" of St. Dominic arose, one would have said she was a wholly new person. Henceforth her voice was to be heard throughout her life by peoples and rulers, dominating the tumult of quarrels and wars. Brigid, the noble maiden of Sweden, was no longer alone in making known the prophetic words which God inspires amid great crises. A century earlier, Rose of Viterbo had been the soul of the Guelf party in Italy; a half century later another maid, Joan of Arc, received a mission to rescue the most Christian kingdom. The vocation of Brigid of Sweden and Catherine of Siena was greater still: it was to the papacy they were directed to address themselves. Very different were their characters and origin. The one embodied the ancient feudal nobility, the other the young bourgeoisie of modern times; through Brigid the northern races, through Catherine the southern seemed to have found their interpreters; the former always spoke in the name of Christ, the latter in the name of the Christian peoples, but both had the same mission; namely, to beg the pope to bestow peace on the nations, to reform the morals of the clergy, and to return to Rome.

At the beginning of 1371 St. Brigid wrote to Pope Gregory XI: "Holy Father, hear the words addressed to you by Jesus Christ: 'Your worldly court is ruining My heavenly court.

. . . Almost every soul that goes to your court you send into the hell of fire. . . . Go to Rome, to your See, as soon as you possibly can.'" [80] Surely, if cruel and sensual paganism reigned in the Italian courts, the court of Avignon, where so many fashionable women (from Miramonde de Mauleon, niece of Clement V, to Almodie de Besse, niece of Clement VI, and Enemonde de Boulbon, niece of Innocent VI) "had so gaily written light poetry in every kind of Provençal rhythm," [81] did not breathe that fragrance of piety which the Church had a right to expect.

The very day when Blessed Raymond of Capua, her confessor, told her of the desolation of Florence, Catherine wrote to the Pope: "Most Holy Father, your unworthy daughter Catherine, servant and slave of the servants of Jesus Christ, writes to your Holiness with a desire of seeing you unite your children in peace. . . . You are spending the patrimony of God's poor for soldiers who destroy human lives, and thus is hindered your holy desire to reform the Church, your spouse." [82] In another letter she says to the Pope: "Fill the heart of the Church with the ardent love that she has lost; for she has been so drained of blood by the iniquitous men who have devoured her that she is wholly wan." [83] "The letters addressed by St. Catherine to Pope Gregory XI," says Pastor, "are unique in their kind. She looks at everything from the highest point of view, and does not scruple to tell the Pope the most unwelcome truths, without, however, for a moment forgetting the reverence due to the Vicar of Christ." [84]

[80] *Révélations de sainte Brigitte,* bk. 4, ch. 142. Cf. *Acta sanctorum,* October, IV, p. 427.

[81] Jean de Nostredame, *Les vies des plus célèbres et anciens poètes provençaux.*

[82] Tommaseo, *Le lettere di santa Caterina di Siena,* III, p. 172.

[83] *St. Catherine of Siena as Seen in her Letters,* p. 133.

[84] Pastor, I, p. 104.

Catherine's embassy to the court of Avignon on behalf of the Florentine government, in June 1376, failed to attain the desired result, as the Florentine authorities persisted in forcing unacceptable conditions on the Pope. But she profited by her stay at Pope Gregory's court to encourage the Pontiff in the three undertakings which God had charged her to exhort the Pope to carry out, namely, the establishment of peace between the nations, the reform of the clergy, and the return of the papacy to Rome.

The pontificate of Gregory XI improved conditions as much as the misfortune of the times permitted. At the beginning of his reign, he succeeded in bringing about peace between France and England. He put an end to the wars that were laying waste Castile, Aragon, and Navarre. His negotiations with Germany were also of a peace-making nature. "War and the want of virtue," St. Catherine told him, "are the two causes of the Church's ruin." [85]

The Pope yielded to the Saint's insistence. Several of his letters are concerned with the holding of provincial councils, the organization of the crusade, the reform of the monasteries and of the clergy.

Italy alone seemed farther from peace and reform than ever. Catherine repeated to the Pontiff that the only remedy was his speedy departure for Rome. "Go," she said, "restore the greatness of Rome, that garden which was and is even now sprinkled with the blood of martyrs. Rome still has need of martyrs." [86] Gregory indeed would be a martyr if, in the broad sense of the word, it is martyrdom to break the dearest ties of family and friendship in the performance of duty, to risk the enmity of a powerful sovereign, and to go off into a country whose language he did not know, to the midst of a

[85] Tommaseo, III, p. 176.

[86] Capecelatro, *op. cit.*, pp. 129 sqq., 155, 214 sq.

people prejudiced against him, to die under the burden of his sufferings and of an unhealthy climate.[87] This was his lot. Despite so many obstacles, he courageously took the road to Rome, reaching there on January 17th, 1377. A little more than a year later he drew his last breath, beset by the gloomiest forbodings.[88]

Thus ended the period commonly called "the Babylonian Captivity" of the papacy. This expression, however, is an exaggeration if we mean that for almost seventy years the popes were slaves to the policy of French kings or to the "soft delights of the Provençal country." A John XXII and a Gregory XI, to speak only of these two, were able to follow a personal policy; and around the supposed Babylon, what saints there were to adorn the fourteenth century with the gentlest and the sternest virtues! For example, there was that noble Provençal lord, St. Elzear of Sabran, who ruled his house like a monastery, where they conversed only of the things of God and where they busied themselves only with works of charity. Engaged in worldly affairs to the extent that he thought useful to the Church and his country, he died at Paris in 1323, during an embassy to King Charles the Fair. His holy widow, St. Delphine, had the happiness of witnessing his canonization by Urban V in 1369 and rejoined him in Heaven a few months later. In the Chartreuse of Cella-Robandi, near the little town of Arcs in Provence, the lovable St. Roseline of Villeneuve, the glory of the Carthusian Order, gave up her soul to God, June 11, 1329, after a life of prayer and wonderful purity. Two years earlier, St. Roch, the pious pilgrim, born at Montpellier toward the beginning of Philip

[87] Pastor, I, p. 110.

[88] Gerson (*Tract. de examin. doctrina,* pars II, consid. 3) says that Gregory XI on his death-bed advised his cardinals "to distrust men and women who, under cover of religion, relate visions of their brains." But this is not likely, at least if we are to take the Pope's supposed words as referring to St. Brigid and St. Catherine of Siena. Gerson, who was not an eye-witness of the scene, may have given a false interpretation to the accounts of Gregory's last moments.

the Fair's reign, after edifying Languedoc and Italy, left this world August 16th, 1327. His name, renowned by the miracles wrought at his tomb, thenceforth was invoked by the people against various epidemics. More distant from the center of Christianity, Spain gave to Heaven, about the same period, St. Peter Pascal (1300) and St. Peter Armengol (1304); Portugal, its queen, St. Elizabeth (1336); Italy, Blessed Angela of Foligno (1309), Blessed Colombini (1367), and St. Juliana of Falconieri (1314); Germany, Blessed Herman (1327), Blessed Otto (1344), and the two prophets St. Mechtilde (1305) and St. Gertrude (1334), noble relatives of Emperor Frederick II. In warlike Hungary, disturbed by terrible dramas during this fourteenth century, the virtues of St. Elizabeth were handed down in two of her grandnieces, Helen and Margaret, whom the Church honors on March 6th. Surrounding Blessed Urban V, such souls formed an admirable crown of holiness for the Church of the fourteenth century.[89]

[89] Cf. Mollat, *Les papes d'Avignon* (1305–1318).

CHAPTER V

1378–1417

On March 19th, 1378, Gregory XI, with a premonition of approaching death, foreseeing the difficulties that might attend the choice of his successor, decreed that every future papal election, even under abnormal conditions, should be considered valid as soon as a candidate received a majority vote of the Sacred College. At the same time he forbade the commandant of Castel Sant' Angelo to turn over the keys of the fortress to anyone without an order from the cardinals at Avignon.[1] But the passions let loose after his death made these wise precautions inadequate.

Urban VI

When, on Wednesday, April 7th, 1378, the cardinals assembled in conclave, an immense and partly armed crowd, estimated by an eye-witness at 20,000 persons, occupied the Piazza San Pietro, as also the portico and steps of the basilica, surrounded the Vatican, and filled the windows and roofs of nearby houses. As each cardinal passed through the crowd on his way to the conclave, he was greeted by the cry, as unanimous as it was threatening: *"Romano lo volemo, o almanco italiano!"* (We want a Roman, or at least an Italian.) The last one to pass through the crowd was the aged Cardinal Francesco Tebaldeschi, surnamed the Cardinal of Saint Peter's. The night was much disturbed. When morning came, it seemed that the votes were already inclining to Bartolomeo Prignano,

[1] Baluze, II, col. 813.

archbishop of Bari, well known for his eloquence, his austere life, and his ability in handling public affairs. It is a curious fact that two of the cardinals, who later on were to be most responsible for the schism, seem to have become the warmest backers of this candidate. "By these holy Gospels," cried the terrible Cardinal Robert of Geneva, "the pope we shall have is the Archbishop of Bari or another whom I do not yet wish to name." That other was himself, the future Clement VII.[2] The future Benedict XIII, the Spaniard Pedro de Luna, the most fearless of all, when he heard the crowd's threatening cries, proclaimed with a smile that he would meet death rather than yield to terror. On Thursday morning he declared to the Bishop of Jaen that he was quite resolved on the election of the Archbishop of Bari.[3]

With the coming of dawn, the tumult of the crowd became more disquieting. The tocsin was rung. The bells of St. Peter's in turn began to swing. "They are ringing for catechumens or some exorcism," said the good old Cardinal Tebaldeschi. "That exorcism will hardly be to my taste," replied Cardinal de Bretagne, trembling.[4]

Some of the cardinals tried to parley through a wicket with the more and more turbulent throng, which had forced the doors and was filling the Vatican palace with its shouts. But this attempt of the cardinals was labor lost. Then, on the motion of Pedro de Luna, by the unanimous vote of all the cardinals save one, Archbishop Bartolomeo Prignano of Bari was elected pope. Because of the menacing tumult outside, some of the cardinals felt constrained to say: "I vote freely for Prignano." They waited for the crowd to grow somewhat calmer before notifying them of the election. The throng did become quieter a few hours later, after the cardinals had said

[2] Baluze, I, col. 1101; Noël Valois, *La France et le grand schisme d'occident*, I, p. 27.

[3] Valois, I, p. 27.

[4] Depositions reported by Valois, I, p. 40.

some prayers in the chapel and had breakfasted. "Now that everything is calm," said one of the electors, "are we all of the same mind? Do we still adhere to the Archbishop of Bari's election?" "Yes, yes," answered thirteen out of the sixteen cardinals. The other three were absent.

But the monentary calm of the mob was only the prelude of a still greater tumult. Presently the shouting redoubled and became more impatient and threatening. The shouts: *"Italiano!"* were stifled by cries of *"Romano! Romano!"* What the people wanted was a Roman pope. *"Romano lo volemo,"* they shouted; *"se non e romano, tutti li occideremo"* (If the pope is not a Roman, we will kill him along with all the cardinals). The young Cardinal Orsini came out of the chapel and entered into communication with the crowd. "You have a pope," he cried. "Who is it?" "Go into St. Peter's." Someone understood or pretended to understand: "It is the cardinal of St. Peter's," that is, Tebaldeschi. He was a Roman. The crowd acclaimed his name. Then it was that some cardinals in fright had the weakness to advise the old Cardinal of St. Peter's to put on the pontifical vestments. This, they thought, was the only means to quiet the people for the moment. They would tell them the truth when the excitement subsided. The old Cardinal, carried along by the multitude, used what little strength he had to protest against the deception that was being imposed upon him. "I am not the pope. It is the Archbishop of Bari." Thus it was that the name of the real pope reached the crowd, but amidst such confusion and such incertitude that the cardinals had time to escape the rage that would doubtless have fallen on them if the name of Cardinal Prignano had been hastily announced to the irritated throng. But Pedro, unaccompanied, fearlessly passed through the crowd on his way home, imposing respect for his person by his very bearing.[5] On April 8th, if we are to believe Raymond of Capua, he said:

[5] See the evidence in Valois. I. p. 54.

"We have elected a real pope; the Romans will have to tear me limb from limb before I go back on today's election." [6]

If the other cardinals did not speak their minds with like energy, they seemed no less free from doubt in the matter. On the day after the election, they enthroned the new Pope, who took the name of Urban VI. The solemn coronation ceremony took place on Easter, April 18th. Four days before, Robert of Geneva, the future Clement VII, had sent word of the event to King Charles V of France. Several months passed without anyone thinking of revoking or reconsidering what had been done. The cardinals accepted the validity of all the new Pontiff's acts, sought favors of him without scruple, and in their official acts as well as in private conversation regarded him as the legitimate head of the Church.

Even had the cardinals' first choice been influenced by fear, it would seem that their subsequent acts ratified that first decision. Urban VI was a legitimate pope, or at least legitimated.[7]

Who was to blame for the complete change that soon afterward occurred in the Sacred College? Was Urban VI blinded by power? Was his reason disturbed by the tragic vicissitudes accompanying his election? Will a simple indiscretion of zeal or excessive harshness of character account for the regret-

[6] Deposition of Raymond of Capua. Baluze, I, col. 1462; Valois, I, p. 73.

[7] We have treated the election of Urban VI at some length because it is of capital importance in the question of the Western Schism. On Urban's legitimacy depends the legitimacy of Boniface IX, Innocent VII, and Gregory XII at Rome and the illegitimacy of Clement VII and Benedict XIII at Avignon. Valois, after minutely relating all the incidents of the election, concludes that "the solution of the great problem presented to the fourteenth century still eludes the judgment of history." (*Op. cit.*, I, p. 82.) Baudrillart, on the basis of the very facts established by Valois, confidently decides in favor of Urban's legitimacy. (*Bulletin Critique*, 1896, pp. 148 sq.) Such is also the conclusion of Salembier, *The Great Schism of the West*, pp. 43–48; Chénon in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, III, p. 319; Pastor, I, p. 120; Kirsch, in his edition of Hergenröther's *Kirchengeschichte*. The reasons that militate in favor of Urban's illegitimacy have been developed by Hemmer in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse*, 1896, p. 544; 1906, pp. 476 sq.; and in the *Revue du Clergé Français*, 1904, pp. 604–611.

table incidents that marked the beginning of the new Pope's reign? In times of disturbance, when men's minds are excited, the least misstep of those who hold the responsibility of power may precipitate a crisis. Urban VI, who possessed a lofty character and unquestionable austerity, rightly thought that there was no more important work for him to undertake than the reform of the Church. Public opinion called for it, *in capite et in membris.* He resolved to begin by reforming the head. He observed the customary fasts and penances with the utmost rigor and performed his ecclesiastical duties with model punctuality. It was reported that he constantly wore a haircloth shirt.[8] He declared war on simony and on the misconduct and worldly manners of clergymen. His severity was unparalleled and as a natural result awakened animosities. His contempt for the amenities went so far as to offer gross offense to the cardinals, one of whom he called an imbecile, another a libertine; a third one he silenced in open consistory by calling on him to stop his "stupid babbling."[9] Men of the stamp of Pedro de Luna and Robert of Geneva were not inclined to support such proceedings on the part of him whom they had just elected. Indignation soon became general. One day, when the Pope in plenary consistory complained of having too many Frenchmen in the Sacred College and expressed his intention of forming an Italian majority by new promotions, a French cardinal was seen to grow suddenly pale and abruptly leave the hall.[10] It was Cardinal Robert of Geneva. The revolt had begun.

With the coming of the hot season in May, the cardinals, one after the other, requested leave of absence "for reasons of health." Not long after, they all met by previous agreement at Anagni, where they were encouraged in their resistance by the arrival of 200 Gascon and Navarian lances under the com-

[8] Pastor, I, p. 121; Lindner, *Urban VI,* pp. 411 sq.

[9] For other acts of this sort, see Hefele, X, pp. 39–41.

[10] Muratori, III, part 2, p. 725.

mand of the famous Bernardon de la Salle, an old companion of Duguesclin.

These cardinals had no right to depose the Pope. But might they not pass judgment on the validity of his election? They remembered that it had taken place under the pressure of a tumult. Several even recalled, or pretended to recall, that Prignano's election had not been seriously intended by them. They said that they had simply wished to disarm the fury of the mob by pretending to elect an Italian. On August 9th, 1378, a manifesto issued by these cardinals announced to the world that the election of Urban VI was tainted and that the Holy See was actually vacant. A message from the King of France, which they received on September 18th, induced them to go a step farther.[11] Two days later a second collective letter of the Sacred College informed Christendom that the conclave had chosen Cardinal Robert of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. The Great Schism had begun.

Beginning of the Schism

Italian chroniclers are very severe in their judgment of Cardinal Robert of Geneva, for they do not forgive him the expedition which, under Gregory XI, he led against the rebellious Florentines and the horrible massacre of Cesena which took place by his orders in February, 1377. Yet he was not without those qualities which make a great political leader; as for his private conduct, only his enemies find it blameworthy.

[11] This letter, which was written by the King's hand, but the text of which has not come down to us, seems to have exercised a decisive influence on the minds of the cardinals. (Valois, I, p. 101; Baudrillart, *Bulletin Critique,* 1896, p. 151.) It is possible greatly to attenuate the moral responsibility of Charles V, who was ill-informed and whose conscience felt secure, resting on the authority of the Sacred College. But history must pass a less favorable judgment on the conscience of Jean de la Grange, the cardinal of Amiens and the King's confidant, and especially that of Urban VI's envoy to the King of France, Pierre de Murles, whose treachery has been discovered and analysed by Valois (I, pp. 90–93).

He was somewhat lame and squint-eyed, but young, enthusiastic, of noble stature and with features that marked him as a man of illustrious race. He was related to most of the sovereigns of Europe. Up to this time, it is true, war and art had engaged his attention more than Church questions, but after the election of Urban VI he became the very soul of the dissident movement and was marked out, by his qualities as well as by his defects, to become the leader of the schismatic party.[12]

From that time Europe was divided into two *"obediences,"* determined in general by the diplomatic relations of the different nations. Spain, Scotland, and lower Italy followed France in supporting Clement VII; England, the greater part of Germany, Hungary, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, central and northern Italy remained faithful to Urban VI. While the most learned theologians of the time, such as Pierre d'Ailly, Gerson, Henry of Langenstein, Conrad of Gelnhausen, Philippe de Maizières, and Dietrich von Nieheim were divided on the question, the two claimants to headship of the Universal Church excommunicated each other and their respective followers. Saints flourished in both obediences: St. Catherine of Siena, St. Catherine of Sweden, and Blessed Peter of Aragon on the side of the popes of Rome; St. Vincent Ferrer, Blessed Peter of Luxemburg, and St. Collette in the Avignon party. Urban VI's position seemed to be established. But the most incredible failings compromised it. "For some years before his death," says one historian, "Urban had no more cruel enemy of

[12] By these words we nowise intend to qualify with a theological note the mass of the faithful who in good faith rallied to the obedience of Clement VII and his successor. From this point of view one might rightly say that the Western Schism was not a real schism. In the division which then took place among the faithful, there was not so much a disobedience to, as an error concerning the person of, the veritable Pastor. (On this point see Bouix, *De papa,* I, p. 461; Salembier, *op. cit.,* pp. 49, 50, 180 sqq.; Didiot, *Logique surnaturelle objective,* no. 823). Hence it follows that during the schism the Church was not deprived of the sacraments, as the two popes enjoyed what canon law calls a *titulus coloratus.*

his cause than himself." [13] Unblushing nepotism,[14] unprecedented arbitrariness, deeds of violence that we can hardly believe in spite of the detailed circumstances recorded by the chroniclers, darkened the latter part of his pontificate. Nothing equals the sad excesses of his expedition against Joanna of Naples. That queen, on whom there rested the weightiest suspicions for the murder of her husband, Andrew of Hungary, had declared for the pope of Avignon. Urban excommunicated her, declared her deprived of her throne, and had a crusade preached against her. Its direction he entrusted to the unworthy Charles of Durazzo, who seized the aged queen and had her mysteriously put to death.[15] Then, as Clement VII sent against Charles of Durazzo a pretender of his own choice, Louis of Anjou, Urban himself marched upon Naples behind a band of mercenary soldiers and pillagers. One would have supposed he had gone mad.[16] Soon he was mortally embroiled with Charles, who laid siege to him in Nocera and put a price on his head. According to the chroniclers of the time, Urban took revenge by atrociously executing six cardinals guilty of conspiring against him.[17]

Was it possible that such a sovereign was the legitimate father of the faithful? On all sides men asked themselves this

[13] Salembier, p. 106.

[14] Pastor, I, p. 136.

[15] Valois, II, p. 51.

[16] "Certain acts of Urban VI can, we think, be explained only by supposing a condition bordering on mental alienation." Baudrillart, *Bulletin Critique*, 1896, p. 147.

[17] Dietrich von Nieheim relates that these six cardinals were placed in chains. Vinegar and lime were put into the nose or mouth of some of them, pieces of pointed rushes were driven under their finger nails, cords were tightened around their temples. When Urban VI escaped from Nocera, under the protection of some freebooters, he took his prisoners with him, tied to the backs of horses and exposed bareheaded to the midsummer sun. (Von Nieheim, *De scismate*, pp. 67–69, 76–84, 92–95; Valois, II, pp. 113 sq.; Salembier, p. 106.) Valois has shown that the accounts of the five chroniclers who narrate the expedition of Louis of Anjou to Naples are full of errors. But it is difficult to call in question the fact of the cruelties which Urban VI practiced upon his cardinals.

question. Two of Urban's cardinals left him and passed over to Avignon. No longer is it merely the pope's personal authority that suffers from these deplorable excesses, it is the very authority of the supreme pontificate, the notion of which now becomes unsettled in the minds of the faithful. Did Christ build His Church on Peter alone? Was not the foundation broader than that? The most serious and devout men, as Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson, were in doubt, and they concluded that the subordination of the Church to the pope had been until then an accidental and contingent fact, necessitated by historic circumstances, but that the essential constitution of the Church rested on a broader and firmer basis, namely, the infallible authority of the whole body of the faithful represented in council. Thus was elaborated the conciliar theory which the Council of Constance later attempted to make prevail.

Another grave consequence resulted from the situation. The reform of the Church, the first aim of Urban VI, became impossible. Abuses spread and the bounty with which both popes gratified their followers multiplied these abuses infinitely.[18] The financial exactions to which the two competitors had recourse to meet the expenses of their strife, exasperated public opinion.[19] To escape an odious tyranny, adventurous spirits began to think of an unlimited freedom of soul, exceeding the transcendental idealism of Joachim of Flora and John of Parma. The new inspiration was to a freedom from all external discipline and all dogma. "The acts of martyrdom of the Fratricelli, recently published by Denifle, sufficiently satisfy us," writes a recent historian, "as to the hopes of these independent Christians who were scattered throughout Italy. They are tired

[18] Pastor, I, p. 141.

[19] See de Lesquen and Mollat, *Mesures fiscales exercées en Bretagne par les papes d'Avignon, pendant le grand schisme d'occident.*

of the haughty government of Rome. . . . What they ask is to be able to pray as they like, on the plains of Latium, in the highlands of Calabria, without church, without priest, and without liturgy. . . . They dream of an utterly simple Christianity, an eternal *Pater noster* uttered far from cities, in the peaceful quiet of the hills, in the trembling light of the stars." [20] The danger was so much the greater since, according to the same author, "the leaven of heresy, which was then spreading north of the Alps, the preaching of Wyclif, the semi-Islamism of the Beghards of Hungary, the theism of the Dalmatian Patarins, the indecent mysticism of the Adamites of Paris, was a most seductive example for a country that had not forgotten the revolts of Segarelli of Parma and Dolcino de Novare or the recent theory in accordance with which Marsilius of Padua stripped the Church of her earthly kingdom." [21]

Urban VI died October 15th, 1389, and was mourned by no one. Clement VII followed him to the grave five years later. The schism would have ended if the cardinals of either pope had been willing, at his death, to elect his rival. But they did nothing of the sort. In the see of Rome, Urban VI was succeeded by Boniface IX (1389–1404), Innocent VII (1404–1406), and Gregory XII (1406–1417); at Avignon, Clement VII was followed by Benedict XIII, who, to his very death, resisted every solicitation of men and events with immovable obstinacy (1394–1422).

We will not follow the series of conflicts between the two obediences, negotiations twenty times resumed and as frequently broken off. They can be found in special works.[22] Boniface IX [23] was much engaged in reconstructing the papal

[20] Gebhart in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* XCV (1889), p. 142.

[21] *Ibid.,* p. 143.

[22] Valois, *op. cit.;* Salembier, *op. cit.*

[23] Boniface IX, Pierre Tomacelli, belonged to a noble but impoverished family of Naples. He was tall, affable, and pure.

finances; but he irritated the people by his exactions. Innocent VII,[24] who was devoted to the pursuit of science and literature, announced by a solemn Bull the restoration of the Roman University founded by Boniface VIII; but he died shortly afterwards, and one of the saddest results of his short pontificate was the introduction of pagan humanism at the papal court in the person of Poggio. Gregory XII,[25] elected because of his peaceful disposition, did nothing for the union, which he appeared to avoid as much as did his competitor. By this attitude he provoked the most abusive pamphlets against him and—a thing unheard-of until then—he alienated from his person at one time seven cardinals, who placed themselves under the Avignon obedience. Thus each of these popes, although their intentions cannot be blamed, seemed in fact to work against the much desired reunion.

Benedict XIII of Avignon

Benedict XIII, whom the cardinals of the Avignon obedience elected (Sept. 28th, 1394) to succeed Clement VII, was that Pedro de Luna whom we saw exercising a predominant influence, along with Robert of Geneva, at the time of Urban's election. Like his adversaries, the popes of Rome, he offered history not the least pretext to question the purity of his morals or the loftiness of his mind.

"Short, thin, about sixty-six years old, the man who by his merit or cleverness was raised to the doubtful post left vacant by the death of Clement VII, was not," says Noël Valois, "the common hypocrite that his adversaries have asserted. His noble birth (he belonged to one of the most aristocratic families of

[24] From his family name, he was called Cosmato Nigliorati of Sulmone. His learning and virtues have been much praised.

[25] Angelo Corrario of Venice, a venerable old man, known for his great integrity.

Aragon), his legal knowledge, acquired by a long professorship of canon law at Montpellier, and his irreproachable purity of character had early marked him for the choice of Gregory XI. The pains he took to inform himself and his slowness in taking sides at the beginning of the schism indicated a delicate conscience. During the pontificate of Clement VII he showed himself a vigorous polemic, an inventive politician, and a successful diplomat. His embassies to Castile, Aragon, and Navarre were a triumph for him no less than for the Avignon pope. This thoroughly ecclesiastical spirit sinned only by the excess of his qualities: his ability at times degenerated into craftiness; his unbending energy became obstinacy; his personal dignity and taste for independence led to intractable pride." [26]

Like all the popes of Rome, Benedict XIII at the time of his election promised to do his utmost to bring about the union. During the conclave, when his colleagues spoke of the possible necessity of abdicating in the interest of peace, Pedro de Luna said: "What of it? For my part I would as readily abdicate the power as take off my cope." [27] It was not foreseen that, as Benedict XIII, he would lay down conditions for his abdication which would never be accepted. For thirty years he lived in strife with the Roman pope, then with the Council of Constance, and finally with his own followers, and tried to prolong the schism after his death by exacting from the three cardinals who remained faithful to his cause a promise to elect a successor to himself.

The University of Paris, which, because of the excellence of its teaching and the great men then at its head—Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Gerson, and Nicholas de Clemanges—enjoyed

[26] Valois, III, pp. 16 sq.

[27] Du Chastenet, *Nouvelle histoire du concile de Constance,* Preuves, p. 107; Le Couteulx, *Annales ordinis carthusiensis,* VI, p. 65.

a considerable influence throughout Europe, now initiated an extensive campaign for peace. Notwithstanding the repeated injunctions of King Charles V, it had been slow in submitting to the obedience of Clement VII.[28] In 1390, by a solemn remonstrance addressed to King Charles VI, it attempted to intervene with a view to healing the schism. But this effort remained barren.[29] The result was happier in 1394. It instituted a vast inquiry as to the proper means for putting an end to the schism; no less than ten thousand ballots [30] were turned in, suggesting three different methods: the simultaneous resignation of the two popes, arbitration by mutual consent, and a decision of the Church assembled in general council. In 1395 a national council, meeting at Paris under the auspices of the University, decided upon the first method, called the "way of cession." An embassy was commissioned to notify Benedict XIII of the result, both in the name of the assembly and that of the King of France and to beg him to yield for the sake of peace.

Was the jealous susceptibility of the autocratic Benedict XIII offended by the authoritative, impatient, and almost threatening tone of the letters from the University of Paris? After a few dilatory replies, he answered that the way of cession was not admissible in law, that the tradition of the Church did not favor it, and that the only possible method was by a conference with his rival in some safe place. In vain did the King of France implore him by means of special envoys; in vain did the cardinals add their urgent petitions to those of the royal embassy; in vain did Pierre d'Ailly, after patient and astute negotiations, win over Wenceslaus, king of the Romans, to the method of cession. To all these entreaties the Avignon Pope replied that he believed he would be guilty of

[28] Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris,* III, pp. 97–103.
[29] *Ibid.,* p. 104.
[30] *Ibid.,* p. 105.

mortal sin if he employed this method. It is true that the Pope of Rome was, on his side, no more disposed to accept the proposals of the kings of France and Germany.[31]

The University of Paris was cruelly disappointed. For some time another plan had been coming to light: no longer to recognize the pope who was false to the promise he made at his consecration, and to withdraw from his obedience. After long deliberation, a national council, held at Paris, voted, at a session held in July, 1398, the withdrawal of obedience. The council's decision, promulgated by the King, was brought to Benedict XIII by Pierre d'Ailly and forcibly supported by the condottiere Geoffrey de Boucicaut, who besieged Avignon for four years and kept the Pope a prisoner in his palace.

From that time St. Vincent Ferrer and seventeen cardinals abandoned the cause of Benedict XIII. On the other hand, the University of Paris, considering that a resignation obtained by force would be valueless and, moreover, despairing of overcoming the obstinacy of Pedro de Luna, resorted to another method of pacification: the calling of an ecumenical council. On September 1st, 1403, the University notified the Pope of the restitution of obedience, which was voted the preceding May on the proposal of the French king. But as a condition of this restitution, it required the summoning of a council by the Pope within a year. Benedict XIII's character, however, was not calculated to give them much hope that he would take this step. Consequently there arose the idea of summoning a council regardless of the wishes of the two popes. For some time past this plan had been preached in Germany. Conrad of Gelnhausen, formerly a student of theology at Paris and at this time chancellor of the new University of Heidelberg, became its chief promoter. Henry of Langenstein, also educated

[31] "Certainly," he said, "neither because of treaties nor because of words of the kings of France and Germany, will I submit to their will." (Froissart, XVI, pp. 86, 117.)

at the Paris University, made himself its earnest defender and profound theorist. In a treatise entitled *Consilium pacis de unione ac reformatione Ecclesiae in Concilio universali quaerendae* (1381), Langenstein declared that in his eyes the schism was an evil that had happened with the permission of Providence to bring about the reform of the Church. His reform programme consisted in assigning preëminence to general councils, to the loss of papal authority.

Langenstein was a lawyer, a mathematician, an eminent economist,[32] as well as a renowned theologian. In defending his project, he employed all the resources of an acute mind and a vast knowledge. Starting out from the pretended principle that the constitution of the Church ought to be judged by the same rules as the constitution of any society, and also noting that every law should be interpreted in relation to the purpose it is intended to attain, and that the purpose of ecclesiastical society is the good order and peace of the Christian world, this jurist-theologian concluded that the institution of the papacy by Christ should not be exaggerated. Providential events showed that the only way of assuring order in the Church was to recognize the supremacy of a council summoned by the emperor. The Church, to which alone Christ said that the powers of hell should not prevail against her, would find therein her essential constitution.

January 1st, 1404, four months after the restitution of obedience on the part of France to Benedict XIII,[33] Jean Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, while preaching before the Avignon Pope at Tarascon, developed ideas that were almost equally radical. The schism must cease, he said in substance. The purpose of the Church is order and peace. The pope does not suffice to obtain this end. Every other neces-

[32] See Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, II, 95.

[33] Valois, III, p. 417.

sary means must be considered legitimate. But there remains only one means: the meeting of a universal council.[34]

The man who spoke thus was reputed among the most eminent members of the French clergy. Jean Charlier, better known as Gerson, who was to play a predominant part in the councils of Pisa and Constance, was born in the village of Gerson, diocese of Rheims, November 14th, 1363,[35] in a family of very humble station. By hard studying at the College of Rheims, then at the College of Navarre, he soon reached the highest dignities. As chancellor of the University of Paris, in 1395, he so distinguished himself that, according to the expression of Launoy, "he made of this word 'chancellor' a sort of proper noun." He was an administrator, diplomat, scholar, polemic, mystic. In 1403 he published his *Lettre aux étudiants sur la réforme de la théologie* and perhaps the *Mendicité spirituelle* or *Parlement sécret de l'homme avec son âme,* "the reputation of which would have rivaled that of the *Imitation,*" says Paulin Paris, "if it had been as widely read." [36]

Such was the man who, following the most renowned theologian of Germany, found as a remedy for the powerlessness of the popes only a theory that was subversive of the constitution of the Church; so greatly had the sad events of this period disturbed the finest minds.

As for the people, who could not rise to such lofty speculations, they wondered if they were not soon to witness the end of the world. Had not premonitory signs already appeared? Naturally the followers of Benedict XIII saw the Antichrist in the pope of Rome, as those of Innocent VIII saw him in the Avignon pope. The strangest prophecies were credited.[37] In England, Wyclif's disciples, under the name of "poor priests,"

[34] Gersonius, *Opera,* II, pp. 54–73.

[35] Féret, *op. cit.,* IV, p. 224.

[36] Paris, *Les manuscrits français,* II, pp. 115–117. It is well known that some authors have attributed the *Imitation of Christ* to Gerson.

[37] Cf. Pastor, I, pp. 151 sq.

spread the heresiarch's doctrines. It was recalled that, at the beginning of the schism, the fiery professor in a booklet entitled *De Papa romano* had said: "Now is the propitious time: let the Emperor and the kings claim the inheritance of the Church!" In 1380 and 1381, while Conrad of Gelnhausen and Henry of Langenstein in Germany attacked the Church in its hierarchy, Wyclif tried to ruin it in its most essential dogmas. "Let each one of the faithful," he wrote in his *Prospeculum,* "draw his doctrine from the reading of the Bible: there you will find a purer and more complete faith than in all the commentaries and teachings of prelates." But it was especially in his *Trialogus,* written the year before his death (1383), that Wyclif published his most revolutionary doctrines, namely, "that the effects of the Sacraments are due only to the merits of the persons receiving them; that every superior, whether civil or religious, is deprived of his authority by the fact of being in the state of mortal sin; that everything happens by necessity; that the notion we entertain of our freedom of action is a perpetual illusion; that the Church certainly exists somewhere, but may be reduced to a few poor laymen scattered in different countries." [38]

After Wyclif's death, his disciples, the "poor priests," became mingled with the heretical sect of the Lollards, whose origin is not well known and who denied the right of individual ownership. Then the government took alarm. In 1395, after the Lollards had affixed placards to the doors of Westminster and St. Paul's defaming the clergy, a national council assembled in London and condemned eighteen propositions taken from the *Trialogus*. On May 10th, 1401, William Samtre, a London priest, having been convicted of teaching Wyclif's doctrines, was burned at the stake in the presence of an immense throng. For a time in England the energy of the repres-

[38] On Wyclif's doctrines, see Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 11, nos. 153–160; Pastor, I, pp. 159 sq.; Denzinger, nos. 581–625; Trésal, *op. cit.,* pp. 6–14.

sion shattered the combined doctrines of the Wyclifites and Lollards. But they soon came to life again on the continent with John Hus.

The Saints and the Schism

In the midst of this culpable alteration of dogmas, this obscuring of the principles of the hierarchical government of the Church, this confusion of consciences, the historian is tempted to ask himself, where was the truly Catholic spirit?

First of all it was in the saints. As we have seen, God failed not to raise them up in both obediences. St. Catherine of Siena illumined the beginnings of this dark period by the wisdom of her advice no less than by the loftiness of her ecstasies. Until her death, in 1380, she continued to address popes, kings, lords, and peoples with a message of justice and peace. She witnessed Urban VI's election and never doubted its validity. On the morrow of the election of Robert of Geneva, she wrote to the Pope of Rome: "They have chosen, not a vicar of Jesus Christ, but an Antichrist; never will I cease to behold in you, beloved father, the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. Take courage, then, Holy Father, enter the strife without fear." But when she sees the Pope undertaking the work of reform with means so far from evangelical, she utters a courageous protest: "Carry out your task with moderation, not without measure. . . . For the love of Christ crucified, temper those sudden outbursts prompted by your natural disposition." [39] "Justice without mercy is no longer justice, but rather injustice."

When the division of the two obediences was consummated, Catherine's soul was filled with grief and she expressed her feelings to a certain nun in these words: "Each epoch has its anguish, but neither you nor anyone else ever saw a time so troubled as this. Look and your soul will be overwhelmed with

[39] Tommaseo, IV, pp. 64, 442 sq.; Hase, p. 253.

pain and bitterness, you will see the dark shadows that have spread over the Church . . . It is the time to watch and not to sleep; it is the time to overcome the enemy by prayer, tears, labor, loving desires, and unceasing supplication." [40] Yet Catherine never feared for the Church. At the most grievous period of the strife she said: "I see that this Spouse of Christ is the dispenser of life because she has within herself such vitality that no one can kill her . . . I see that her fecundity never diminishes, but ever increases." [41] Catherine died without the happiness of seeing peace restored to the Church, but, at the very last, she thus addressed those gathered about her death-bed: "Remain faithful to Urban VI, for he is the true Pope."

Blessed Peter of Aragon, a prince of royal blood, entered the Order of St. Francis in his youth; he was supposed to be favored with heavenly visions, ecstasies, and prophecies. His relationship to several princely families enabled him to remind the great ones of their duty to rally about the Roman pope.

But God lavished His precious graces also in the Avignon obedience, which embraced many of the faithful, who defended the cause of Clement VII and Benedict XIII so obstinately only because they thought it their duty thus to uphold the unity of the Church and its hierarchy. Models of holiness abounded among them. There was the young Cardinal Peter of Luxemburg, "the St. Aloysius Gonzaga of the fourteenth century," who died at the age of eighteen, after a life of angelic purity and sweetness; [42] there was the earnest missioner and thaumaturge, St. Vincent Ferrer, whose words and virtues performed miracles of conversion; [43] there was the humble St. Colette,

[40] Tommaseo, IV, p. 143.
[41] Capecelatro, pp. 242 sq.
[42] *Acta sanctorum,* July, I, pp. 428, 483.
[43] Fages, *Histoire de saint Vincent Ferrier.*

who, like St. Teresa, reformed a great religious Order.[44] St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Colette at length withdrew from the obstinate Benedict XIII; but Blessed Peter of Luxemburg died without expressing the slightest doubt as to the legitimacy of the Avignon pope.

This mysterious economy of divine grace can in no way disturb a Christian's faith. Amidst the agitations of the schism, St. Vincent Ferrer very justly wrote: "We should not decide the legitimacy of the popes by means of prophecies or miracles or visions. The Christian people are governed by laws against which extraordinary events count nothing." [45] In other words, miracles and other spiritual favors could be granted to reward individual faith and to edify the Christian people, without serving as proofs of any pope's legitimacy. No conclusion can rightly be drawn from them in favor of either claimant to the papacy.

At this epoch we meet with the Christian spirit not merely in individual souls; it was also manifested in a great ecclesiastical institution which was destined, after doing much for the renewal of Christian life, to give the world in that sad fourteenth century, so dark and disturbed, the sweetest and "most beautiful book that ever came from the hand of man, since the Gospel comes from God"—the *Imitation of Christ.* We are referring to the "Brethren of the Common Life," founded by the Venerable Gerard Groote (1340–1384). Salembier says: "A fervidly eloquent preacher, he [Gerard] was the Vincent Ferrer of Holland and the North of Germany; as a reformer of the clergy, he is a forerunner of the mission of St. Vincent de Paul; as an educator of the young, he gives up his whole life to them like Joseph Calasanctius; as the founder of an Order, he is the father of the Brothers of the Common

[44] Douillet, *Sainte Colette;* Comte de Chamberet, *Vie de sainte Colette.*

[45] *De moderno ecclesiae schismate,* Bibl. nat., no. 1470; cited by Valois, I, p. 222.

Life, a congregation which was very popular in our part of the world; he was the St. John de la Salle of the fourteenth century." [46]

The Brethren of the Common Life, who later (1395) adopted the rule of St. Augustine and established the center of their activities at Windesheim, at first held an intermediate position between the existing congregations and the secular clergy. They took no vows and asked nothing from the charity of the faithful. Each house had to be self-supporting by the labor of the brethren, who educated children and copied manuscripts. Thomas à Kempis has left us a charming portrait of the life led in these pious asylums. "Lowliness," he says, "which therein was the chief of all virtues, was sought after by all from the lowest to the highest, and did make a paradise of this earthly house, transforming mortal men into heavenly pearls to be as living stones meet for glory in the temple of God. Here obedience, the mother of virtue, . . . flourished . . . Here the inward manifestations of love, that is for God, and its outward manifestation, that is charity to one's neighbor, burned with so hot a flame that the hard hearts of sinners who heard the holy discourses of the Brothers were melted to tears, and they that had come thither cold at heart, being there kindled by the fire of the Word, went away rejoicing, heedful to sin no more . . . Here the memory of the ancient Fathers was restored to life, and the manner of life of the clergy rose to that standard of the highest perfection which was set by the practice of the Primitive Church." [47]

It has been said that Gerard Groote's work can be summed up in a single phrase: the imitation of Christ.[48] This, in fact, was the title given a collection of maxims by which the brethren lived. The most probable hypothesis is that its origin must be

[46] Salembier, p. 77.
[47] Thomas à Kempis, *The Founders of the New Devotion* (*Works*, II, ch. 21.)
[48] Pastor, I, pp. 147 sq.

referred to those collections or *rapiaria* of maxims, prayers, aspirations, and colloquies which were gathered by the different houses then dependent on Windesheim. The four books of the *Imitation* would accordingly be merely the *rapiarium* of a man of genius, possibly that Thomas à Kempis who, as we remarked above, so exalted the life and virtues of Gerard Groote's spiritual sons.[49]

This choice company of saints and pious persons kept up the pure Catholic spirit in the Church. Attachment to the unity of the Church and to the pope was also deeply rooted in the masses. "As there is only one God in Heaven," said Froissart, "so there can and should be only one pope on earth."

The theologians gave voice to courageous protests. "In the Assembly held in Paris in 1406, where Guillaume Filastre, the future cardinal, absolutely denied the right of a general council to judge or condemn the pope, Pierre d'Ailly lamented the manner in which certain members of the University of Paris spoke of the Pope." [50]

But the idea of a council was launched and gained favor. The cardinals of both obediences adopted a plan to take the direction of the Church into their own hands and to call a council. The project was approved by the universities of Paris, Oxford, and Bologna. These universities took their stand on the natural and divine right which the Church must have of finding within herself the means of reëstablishing her unity.[51] Reduced, in its application, to the case of absolute necessity,

[49] This is the hypothesis accepted by Vacandard in the *Revue du Clergé Français,* December 15th, 1908, pp. 663 sq.; Spitzen, *Nouvelle défense de Thomas à Kempis; Les hollandismes de l'Imitation;* Brucker, *Thomas à Kempis et l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ, nouveaux documents,* in *Études,* May 5th, 1914, pp. 366–369. Cf. Puyol, *L'auteur du livre de Imitatione Christi;* Funck, *Gerson und Gersen;* Malou, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le veritable auteur de l'Imitation;* Duchesne in the *Bulletin Critique,* 1889, p. 228; Denifle, *Kritische Bemerkungen zur Gerson-Kempis-Frage;* Loth, *L'auteur de l'Imitation,* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* 1873.

[50] Pastor, I, p. 185.

[51] Martène and Durand, VII, cols. 894, 898.

this right of the Church was, indeed, undeniable. But it was requisite that the cardinals' titles should be incontestable and that the council summoned by them should be regularly constituted. The very incomplete realization of these two conditions would not only deprive the future council of its ecumenical character, but would also cast grave doubts on the validity of its disciplinary decisions. "If the cardinals doubt the legitimacy of their pope," said Carlo Malatesta, prince of Rimini, "why do they not question the legitimacy of the powers which they hold from him?" [52] He was fearful that the council "assembled to establish unity, would end in a trinity." The event showed he was right.

The Council of Pisa

The pseudo-council summoned to Pisa by the cardinals,[53] against the express opposition not only of Benedict XIII, but also of Gregory XII, the Pope of Rome, could not expect to be considered the organ of the universal Church, since several nations were not represented at it. It met on March 25th, 1409, and, at its best attended sessions, counted 24 cardinals, 80 bishops, 102 procurators of absent bishops, and a large number of ecclesiastics, among whom were 300 theologians.[54] The solemn procession by which the assembly celebrated its opening and the title of "ecumenical" which it assumed could not give it the authority needed to have its decisions obeyed by the Christian nations, and especially by the two popes. The violent, excessive, and precipitate manner in which it proceeded compromised what little prestige it had.

[52] *"Si de papa dubitant, cur non de cardinalatu?"* On Malatesta, who was one of the finest characters of that time, and on his political rôle, see Hefele, X, pp. 179 sq., 307 sq., and *passim.*

[53] Fourteen cardinals of the Roman and ten of the Avignon obedience.

[54] A list of the members of the Council in d'Achery, *Spicilegium,* I, p. 853.

The Council of Pisa was under the leadership of a clever intriguer, as familiar with worldly affairs as he seemed a stranger to the affairs of God,[55] namely, Cardinal Balthasar Cossa, who was accused, though probably unjustly, of having sailed the Sicilian seas on a pirate ship in his youth.[56] By a decree that was without precedent in conciliar tradition, the assembly decided that the votes should be counted by nations and not individually; then, by a condemnation equally novel in the history of the Church, it declared Benedict XIII and Gregory XII deprived of the supreme pontificate as being heretics: they had, said the council, violated the article of the Creed, *"Credo in Ecclesiam . . . unam."* This decision was as unjust as it was illegal.

After promising to take steps for the reform of the Church "in its head and members," the Council of Pisa crowned its work in a decision that, "by commission of the council," the cardinals should elect a new pope. Less precipitation might have saved everything. At that very moment, the ambassadors of the king of Aragon were bringing to the patriarch of Alexandria a document authorizing them to announce the unconditional abdication of Benedict XIII. At the same time, the King of France wrote to his cardinals, begging them not to hasten the election too much.

When the letter of the French King arrived (June 26th, 1409) and when an embassy from the king of Castile presented itself for an audience, it was too late. The influence of Balthasar Cossa had just brought about the election of a peaceful, feeble old man of seventy years, Pierre Philargis, who

[55] St. Antoninus says: *"Vir in temporalibus magnus, in spiritualibus nullus omnino atque ineptus."* (*Summa historialis,* part 3, tit. 22, ch. 6.)

[56] This accusation is made by Dietrich von Nieheim. It seems to be a calumny. Cf. Platina, *De vitis pontificum,* p. 248, and the *Chronique de Saint-Denis* (reign of Charles VI), bk. 33, ch. 28.

took the name of Alexander V.[57] In place of two popes, Christendom now counted three.

Alexander V

Alexander V was born on the Greek island of Candia, of very poor parents, who abandoned him in his childhood. The young boy was begging his bread along the highways when he met an Italian Friar Minor, who was struck by his natural gifts of intelligence and docility and had him received into his monastery. A brilliant course of studies at Oxford and Paris won him a chair of philosophy in the latter city, where he acquired great prestige as a scholar and an orator. But his firmness of character did not reach the level of his gifts of mind; and Balthasar Cossa, precisely because he found this defect in Philargis, thrust him into the papacy, hoping thus to govern the Church in his name.[58]

His expectation came true. Alexander, through timidity, gratitude, or weakness, remained under the sway of his legate, Balthasar Cossa. He entered Rome in triumph with the troops of Louis II of Anjou as a result of Cossa's diplomacy and "belligerent coöperation";[59] he subsequently retired to Bo-

[57] "It was especially Balthasar Cossa who brought about that election," says Hefele (X, p. 292), who founds his view on various contemporary testimonies. Cf. Martène, *Vet. script.*, VI, p. 1115; Von Nieheim, *De scismate,* bk. 3, p. 51; Platina, *op. cit.,* in *Vita Alexandri V* (*The Lives of the Popes,* p. 341). What are we to think of the legitimacy of this election? Pastor (I, p. 191) and Hergenröther (IV, p. 534) consider it altogether null, as the Council of Pisa had been convoked neither by the entire Church nor by the legitimate pope. There are many, however, who consider Alexander V a true pope. In fact, the majority of the Church rallied to him. As to the right which a regular council would have in the case of a heretical pope or a doubtful pope, see Mazzella, *De vera religione et de Ecclesia Christi,* pp. 477, 818. On the character of the Council of Pisa, see Bellarmine, *De conciliis et Ecclesia,* II, chap. 8.

[58] Hefele (X, p. 293) notes another defect of Philargis, which might have made Cossa hope to use him as a tool: "He did not despise the comforts of life, and he liked heady wines."

[59] *Ibid.,* p. 295.

logna because Cossa thus decided;[60] he distributed benefices and privileges with excessive lavishness, particularly in favor of his friends and those of Cossa. His pontificate, however, lasted but a short time. After presiding over the destinies of the Church for ten months and a few days, Alexander V drew his last breath on May 3rd, 1410, recommending peace and concord to his cardinals. Fourteen days later, these cardinals gave him a successor in the person of Balthasar Cossa himself. He was ordained priest May 24th, and consecrated and crowned the day following. He took the name of John XXIII.

John XXIII

The new Pope was not the monster that certain historians would have us believe. It is quite enough that, during his lifetime and without any vigorous denials on the part of his followers, he could be accused of canvassing for the tiara, of using pressure to obtain the votes of his colleagues,[61] and even of shortening the days of his predecessor.[62] It has been said that John XXIII repeated the brutalities of Robert of Geneva and that he was a worthy precursor to the Borgias;[63] but this is not true. It is also recounted that at the conclave, sending for St. Peter's cloak and putting it on, he said: "It is I who am pope"; but this also is pure legend.[64] Yet it must be confessed that with him the spirit of intrigue and worldliness was enthroned on the chair of Peter. His election was a humiliation for the Church. As if Providence, before giving peace and unity to Christendom, willed that all the evils from which

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 306.
[61] *Ibid.*, p. 309.
[62] *Ibid.*, p. 307.
[63] See in Hefele (pp. 310–314) the exposition and refutation of these different accusations.
[64] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

the Church had suffered should be pushed to the extreme, we see in the pontificate of John XXIII the boldest theories of Marsilius of Padua and William of Occam, who had so greatly scandalized the Church, come forth openly in the midst of the Council of Constance, and the most cynical doctrines of Wyclif uttered in the world's most august assembly by the insolent lips of John Hus.

It is said that Balthasar Cossa's character seemed to change after his election, that he no longer seemed the same man as before, that no one recognized in him the accomplished statesman whose brilliant qualities had been noted by the chronicler of Charles VI.[65] In fact, this clever diplomat failed in everything. Perhaps it is ordained that, in a supernatural work like that of the Church, human talents should fail and turn against him who relies upon them.

The assembly of Pisa decreed that a new council should meet three years later. In 1412, John XXIII decided to convoke it in Rome. But the members involved themselves in well-nigh fruitless preliminaries. Nicholas of Clemangis relates that at the first two sessions, just when they were about to invoke the Holy Ghost, an owl suddenly flew in front of the Pope and that it was with difficulty driven away with a club.[66] In short, on March 3rd, 1413, John proclaimed the dissolution of the assembly and the convoking of another council for the month of December; its meeting-place was to be determined later. This gave Ladislas, king of Naples, who had just made an alliance with the Pope, an occasion to break off the alliance abruptly and to pillage Rome, while John promptly took to flight.[67]

[65] *Chronique de Saint-Denis* (reign of Charles VI), bk. 31, chap. 1.

[66] Von Nieheim also speaks of this owl. (Hefele, X, p. 320.) Whether the event was real or legendary, it gives us the impression produced by John XXIII in this council.

[67] Raynaldi, 1413, no. 1. Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages,* VI, pp. 625 sqq.

The unfortunate Pontiff invoked the all-powerful support of Emperor Sigismond. Besides being the born defender of the Church by virtue of his imperial title, Sigismond was by his personal qualities the worthy and energetic leader towards whom Christians instinctively turned with confidence when the papacy became discredited. He answered the appeal and, in the active zeal which he displayed in defending the unity of the Church, if he sometimes exceeded the limits of his rights, he ever displayed the noblest and most upright intentions.

On October 30th, 1413, the Emperor announced that a general council would open at Constance on November 1st of the following year. He invited Gregory XII, Benedict XIII, and all Christian princes to be present. On December 9th, John XXIII issued the official Bull of convocation and, while a republic was proclaimed at Rome, which he had abandoned, he was actively engaged with the preliminaries of the future assembly. No doubt he hoped, thanks to this initiative, to be recognized without dispute by the assembly over which he would preside, to the exclusion of his two competitors. But, as the time for the council drew near, his confidence weakened. Stories are told, showing him on his way to Constance, swearing in the devil's name and, upon reaching the shores of the lake, crying out contemptuously: "It is here the foxes are going to be caught." [68] These narratives lack authenticity, but they well express the feelings this Pope must have experienced as the council drew near.

The Council of Constance

The opening ceremonies of the Council of Constance were splendid. The Pope's solemn entry into the cathedral was triumphal. "A general council in Germany," says Hefele, the

[68] Hefele, X, pp. 325 sq.

great historian of the councils, "the first council ever to assemble there, was a sight so prodigious and extraordinary that thousands of men gathered there from all the States and, following the pompous custom of the times, each one with the largest following he could collect, some to gratify their curiosity, others to shine, to meet their friends, or to transact their business. Besides, desire of gain had drawn to Constance a large number of merchants, artisans, workmen, as well as actors, adventurers, musicians, and even harlots." [69] Gathered about Emperor Sigismond, and in company with the greatest noblemen of Germany, such as the dukes of Bavaria, Austria, Saxony, Mecklenburg, and Lorraine, could be seen the ambassadors of the kings of France, England, Scotland, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Naples, and Sicily. Later came those of the King of Spain and of the Emperor of Constantinople. The number of the members of the council, of foreign princes and nobles,[70] increased notably. At its largest meetings, the council counted 3 patriarchs, 29 cardinals, 33 archbishops, about 150 bishops, more than 100 abbots, and about 300 theologians. Such a gathering, in the midst of such a people, representing the whole of Christendom, if organized hierarchically and canonically, could have become the liberating and pacifying force of the Christian world. By the fault of one and another and by the misfortunes of circumstances, it represented at first only the confusion of ideas and passions that reigned in the world.

From the very first session it was evident that three men

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 392.

[70] Ulrich von Richental, charged with the duty of making a list of the visitors' names, has left it to us. This authentic witness assures us that "there were at Constance at least seven hundred women in the public houses or in their own, without counting those who did not declare themselves." (*Chronik des Constanzer Concils*, f. CCXI.) Hence we may safely conclude that, among so many worldly nobles and men of arms, a certain number were guilty of unworthy conduct. But to use this passage of Richental to attack the morality of the ecclesiastics at the Council of Constance, is manifestly unjust.

would dominate the assembly by the superiority of their learning and their personal influence: they were Pierre d'Ailly, bishop of Cambrai, Cardinal Zarabella, legate of Pope John XXIII, and Jean Gerson, ambassador of the French King and delegate of the University of Paris.[71] These three illustrious personages, whose austere life equally recommended them to the respect of the council and of the entire Church, were unfortunately imbued with false ideas as to the respective powers of the pope and of the Church. For Pierre d'Ailly, "who often," says Bossuet, "voices the mind of the whole Faculty of Paris," [72] "the subordination of the Church to the pope is only accidental," [73] "the pope can err and even become a heretic," [74] "he can be rebuked, as St. Peter was by St. Paul"; [75] he can be reproved and corrected especially by a universal council, which is superior to him. Does it follow that the council is infallible? Not at all; it is a pious belief, contradicted by the facts, for several general councils have made mistakes.[76] Such were the ideas that Pierre d'Ailly began to set forth from the time he left the schools of the Rue du Fouarre, in 1380.[77] Moreover, by character and temperament, the bishop of Cambrai was always a man of conciliation and compromise.

In 1408 [78] the learned canonist Zarabella, from scattered ideas in the works and minor writings of Pierre d'Ailly, formed a powerful synthesis which he set forth in his treatise *De jurisdictione imperiali.* For him the pope is merely the first

[71] According to unpublished documents, analyzed by Noël Valois, Jean Gerson was not the official delegate of the University of Paris, but only an informal representative. (Valois, *op. cit.,* IV, p. 273.)

[72] Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani,* part 2, bk. 6, chap. 20.

[73] *De ecclesiae conc. gen. et sum. pontificis auctoritate,* in the *Opera Gersonii* (Dupin ed.), II, col. 958.

[74] Gerson, *Opera,* I, col. 689.

[75] *Ibid.,* II, col. 949, 959.

[76] *Ibid.,* II, col. 958.

[77] Salembier, *The Great Schism of the West.* On Pierre d'Ailly, see Salembier, *Petrus de Alliaco.*

[78] This is the date assigned by Pastor, I, p. 187.

servitor of the Church. If it is right to recognize in him the supreme power in ordinary times, this is because the universal Church cannot always make a decision through itself, nor through a general council, nor through the college of cardinals. Zarabella differs from d'Ailly in that he admits the infallibility of ecumenical councils. If the pope and the cardinals fail to do so, the councils will be convoked by the emperor.[79] This strange legate of a strange pontiff could not give any but a wrong orientation to the future council.

In this assembly, with Zarabella as its official head and Pierre d'Ailly as it brightest light,[80] Jean Gerson, a mystical and vibrant spirit, exercised a still more persuasive influence and, it seemed, a more preponderant one on the Council of Constance. He was a disciple of Pierre d'Ailly, but went farther than his master. Like Zarabella, he recognized supreme power in the council; but he wished to admit simple parish priests at the side of the bishops.[81] In the Church universal he wished to make a place for the autonomy of national churches, gathered about the head of the State. Does not the Christian ruler render services to the Church by executing her laws? In case of failure of the papal authority, is it not the Christian ruler who maintains the cohesion of the national churches and thus preserves the force of their apostolate? [82]

The lofty integrity and sincere piety of the men who professed such doctrines, the combination of sad circumstances and events which seemed to justify them, explain the welcome accorded them in the Council. Nevertheless they were revolutionary as regards the headship of the Church, subversive of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and expressly opposed to all Cath-

[79] Zarabella, *De jurisdictione imperiali.*

[80] It is Bossuet's expression, *"Sancti Conventus lumen et in dogmatibus explicandis facile princeps."* (*Defensio declar.*, ch. 30.)

[81] Gerson, *Opera,* II, col. 249, 436.

[82] *Ibid.*, col. 114, 135, and *passim.*

olic tradition. Gerson himself admits that his doctrine is a novelty.[83]

One of the first cares of the assembled bishops was to decide, as proposed by Pierre d'Ailly, that "prelates and abbots having jurisdiction should not alone have a 'definitive' voice, but that doctors of theology, of canon or civil law, would have the same rights." [84] This was to give human science a place which, in the supernatural economy of the Church, can belong only to the divinely constituted hierarchy. This first resolution would have been enough to vitiate the council's authority.

But it went farther: it decreed that, as at Pisa, the voting should be by nations. The representatives of France, England, Germany, and Italy (later also those of Spain) used to meet and take a vote *nationaliter* before presenting a question to the general assembly of the four nations *conciliariter*.[85] Thus to transform questions of universal interest into national questions, was to introduce a new element of trouble into the pretended council.

A strange tactical move on the part of John XXIII soon completed the disorder. The second session had just closed. During the evening of March 20th, 1415, while the princes and nobles were occupying their leisure with a great tournament, no one noticed that a man, disguised as a groom, dressed in poor gray clothes, upon a wretched horse with a cross-bow at the saddle, and concealing his face as well as he could so as not to be recognized, passed through the city and out by one of the gates. It was Pope John XXIII.[86] He went to Schaffhausen and the next day wrote the following note from there to Emperor Sigismond: "I am free and enjoying very good

[83] *Ibid.*, col. 247.

[84] Mansi, XXVII, p. 560; Hardouin, VIII, p. 223. Cf. Salembier, *Petrus de Alliaco*, p. 274. Pierre d'Ailly had asked that even the princes be given the right of a "definitive" vote. (Gerson, *Opera*, II, col. 941.)

[85] Gerson, *op. cit.*, II, col. 230; V, col. 53.

[86] Hefele, X, p. 393.

air at Schaffhausen. I take back nothing of the promise that I made to give peace to the Church by resigning my powers." [87] This was a new and contemptible bit of ingenuity on the part of the unworthy Pontiff. Crushed by the council's failure to admit his legitimacy without dispute and by their requiring the resignation of all three popes, himself included, John XXIII hoped to bring about the dissolution of the council by stealing away.

But again his plan failed. The Pope's flight merely left the field free for the independence to which the pseudo-council aspired. On March 26th, 1415, the third general session opened under the presidency of Pierre d'Ailly. The delegates declared that they remained faithful to the obedience of Pope John in spite of his flight, with the explicit reservation that he continue in his purpose of giving peace to the Church. If he should depart from this purpose, they would feel obliged to recognize no other authority but that of the council.[88] Three days later, on Good Friday, the delegations from France, Germany, and England [89] met at the Franciscan monastery and drew up the four articles that became so famous. The following is the essential passage: "The Council of Constance, legitimately assembled in the Holy Ghost, forming an ecumenical council and representing the Church militant, holds its power immediately from God; and everybody, including the pope, is bound to obey it in what concerns the faith, the extinction of the schism, and the reform of the Church in its head and members." [90]

It has been maintained with much probability that the decree, taken in itself, proclaims the superiority of the council only under given circumstances, that is, in case of doubt as to the

[87] Mansi, XXVII, p. 577; Hardouin, VIII, p. 244.

[88] Mansi, pp. 577–582; Hardouin, VIII, pp. 246–249; Hefele, X, p. 399.

[89] Mansi, pp. 582–584; Hardouin, VIII, pp. 240–251; Hefele (X, p. 401) corrects the errors as to date, by Mansi and Hardouin. Only three nations gathered. This was an additional irregularity.

[90] Mansi, pp. 584–586.

legitimacy of the popes;[91] in this sense the proposition would not be heterodox.[92] On any hypothesis, coming from an assembly that lacked the character of an ecumenical council and receiving a majority vote of men who, for the most part, had no deliberative authority, it could not have any dogmatic force.[93]

But the same could not be said of the decrees which the assembly of Constance passed against the teachings of John Hus. The Bull of Martin V against the Hussites, directing the faithful to believe what the Synod of Constance decided "in favor of the faith and for the salvation of souls" (*in favorem fidei et salutem animarum*),[94] plainly confirms those condemnations.

The doctrines of this formidable heretic, who for some years had been stirring up the masses by his impassioned preaching against the most fundamental dogmas of the Christian faith and the most essential principles of society, were a matter of grave concern to the bishops and doctors assembled at Constance from the very outset of the council. Hus had no more intense opponent than Jean Gerson.

John Hus

John Hus was born in 1369 in a village of Bohemia. Although a brilliant professor at the University of Prague, he

[91] See Mazzella, *op. cit.*, pp. 775 sq. and Baudrillart in the *Bulletin Critique,* July 15th, 1902, p. 393.

[92] Mazzella, no. 993, pp. 775 sq.; cf. p. 747.

[93] Pastor, I, p. 198. It is true that the article in question was passed by the general assembly of the fifth session. But the voting took place amidst such disturbance, such protests and restrictions (see Hefele, X, pp. 404 sq.) that we must recognize the absence of those conditions which Gerson himself required for a decision to be taken *conciliariter* (Gerson, *Opera,* II, col. 940). Moreover, the Council of Constance should not be regarded as ecumenical except from the 42nd session to the 45th, when Pope Martin V presided over it. The approbation which Pope Martin V gave to all that the council had done *"conciliariter, et non aliter, nec alio ullo modo,"* regards principally the condemnation of Falkenberg, which was done by only two nations, Germany and France.

[94] Denzinger, no. 658 sq.

was an orator rather than a teacher. He was a man of lofty stature and austere countenance, with a flowing eloquence, at times sharp and biting, and again vibrant and fiery. It seems that he was greatly influenced by those fanatical mystics who, under the name of *"Apostolic Brethren"* and *"Apocalyptics,"* were then spreading through Bohemia, planning a renovation of all things. The violence with which he took sides with the Czech nationality against the claims of the Saxons, Bavarians, and Poles, made Hus appear a champion of national independence. But it was especially in Wyclif's writings that he found his ideas formulated. The twenty-one propositions of that heretic which were condemned at Rome, reached Hus in 1403. The impetuous Bohemian fed upon the works of the Anglo-Saxon. He read them again and again, copied and annotated them. In the margin of some manuscripts, copied by Hus' hand and preserved at the Stockholm library, we read such expressions as this "Wyclif! Wyclif! you disturb the head of more than one!" John Hus had found his doctrine.[95]

According to him, there is no intermediary between Christ and the individual man; consequently, there is no hierarchy and no Church. Along with the Church, every social institution would disappear. In his theory, no one has the right to command unless he is without sin; no one has the right to own unless he is *"faithful,"* that is, unless he is a follower of John Hus. Louis Blanc says: "Hus is the budding genius of modern revolutions." [96] By "modern revolutions" we must understand those which lead to the most radical forms of collectivism and anarchy.

"Czech radicalism," says Pastor, "constituted an interna-

[95] "Recent investigations have furnished incontestable evidence that, in the matter of doctrine, Hus owed everything to Wyclif." (Pastor, I, p. 161.)

[96] Louis Blanc, *History of the French Revolution of 1789,* I, p. 28. Krummel, a Protestant minister, says Pastor, has tried to save the honor of the Hussite movement; but Schwab has shown that this defense does not accomplish its purpose. (Pastor, I, p. 162.)

tional peril" as well as a religious danger. Emperor Sigismond wished to join his efforts to those of the council for the purpose of repressing it with energy. The combined action of the two powers has made it difficult at times to determine their respective responsibilities. On July 6th, 1415, Hus was condemned as a heretic, degraded, turned over to the secular arm and led to the stake. He met death courageously.[97] But the passions aroused by the heresiarch were not quieted by his death. His execution was the beginning of a prolonged civil and religious war in which the fanatical forces of the Hussites withstood the imperial armies. We shall see below how the various sects sprung from John Hus united under the name of *Moravian Brethren* and were finally absorbed in the Protestant movement. "After John Hus," says Bossuet, "a world full of bitterness gave birth to Luther."

The End of the Schism

During the proceedings against John Hus, the still pending question of the abdication of the three popes began to be solved.

The undignified flight of John XXIII resulted in alienating men from him. The council's attitude towards him irritated him personally very much. On May 16th a crushing indictment against him, containing seventy-two points of accusation, was presented to the assembly.[98] Two weeks later, after a long in-

[97] The Church has been reproached for condemning Hus and handing him over to the secular arm in spite of the safe-conduct that had been granted him. It is true that a safe-conduct had been given John Hus, not by the council, but by Emperor Sigismond. But this safe-conduct simply guaranteed him against any arbitrary violence; it could not have the effect of freeing him from condemnation. On this subject see a very complete and well documented discussion in Hefele, X, pp. 521–531. The alleged decision of the council, *nullam fidem hæretico esse servandam,"* is found only in a proposal drawn up by one of the members and rejected by the assembly.

[98] Hefele, X, pp. 427 sq.

vestigation, the council, in its twelfth general session, decreed the deposition of the unworthy pope, Balthasar Cossa, and ordered that he should thereafter "be placed in a secure and suitable place under the custody of Emperor Sigismond." [99]

On June 3rd, the deposed Pontiff was removed to Gottlieben, to a castle of the Bishop of Constance which John Hus had just left. Louis of Bavaria, charged with the custody of the prisoner, carried out his task with the utmost rigor. John XXIII was sent into the Palatinate and lived there several years under the watchful eye of two German guards, with whom he could speak only by signs. He passed his time writing verses on the instability of human affairs. Adversity proved salutary for him. In 1418 he was restored to liberty and lived long enough to acknowledge Martin V as the true pope. He died bearing the title of Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. His body rests in the celebrated baptistery of Florence, and on his tomb you may read this simple epitaph: "Here lies the body of Balthasar Cossa, John XXIII, who was pope."

By John's deposition the situation was restored to the point at which the Council of Pisa had found it, as inextricable now as it was then. The generosity of Gregory XII offered a solution. He announced his intention of resigning, but first sent to the members of the council a convocation in due form, which they accepted. To this true council, made legitimate by his supreme authority, Gregory XII presented his resignation. He died in 1417 with the title of Bishop of Porto and perpetual legate of Ancona. His last words were: "I have not known the world, and the world has not known me."

There remained Benedict XIII. Abandoned by all the prelates of his obedience, he withdrew into Spain, to the impregnable fortress of Pensicola, with three cardinals who had remained faithful to him. On July 22nd the council declared Piedro de Luna, so-called pope, deprived of all rights, as a

[99] Mansi, XXVII, pp. 715 sq.; Hardouin, VIII, p. 376; Hefele, X, p. 442.

notorious heretic and incorrigible schismatic. Piedro de Luna survived his deposition five years. Obstinately immovable, he was fond of saying that the whole Church was with him on the rock of Pensicola, as all humanity had been with Noë in the ark. Every morning, so they say, he hurled excommunications to the four cardinal points of the earth, which had, he said, so basely abandoned him. He died November 29th, 1422, after making his three cardinals swear to give him a successor. Thus his vain resistance continued for a few years after his death. But the newly elected antipope, an obscure Spanish canon, who called himself Clement VIII, saw his rights contested by a certain Bernard Garnier, a sacristan of Rodez, who took the name of Benedict XIV; and so the schism ended in shame and ridicule.

With the removal of Benedict XIII, the Council of Constance remained the sole authority in the Church, in fact as well as in right. Some of the fathers thought that at last the hour had arrived to realize that important reform for which the world had so long waited. Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson succeeded in having a wiser solution adopted. After passing certain disciplinary decrees, the council proceeded to the election of a new pope. On November 11th, 1417, the virtuous Cardinal Otto Colonna was chosen and assumed the name of Martin V.

This selection was welcomed with universal acclaim. In the words of a contemporary chronicle, "men could scarcely speak for joy.[100] Gregorovius, an uncompromising opponent of the papacy, acknowledges that "any temporal kingdom would have perished. But so marvelous was the constitution of this spiritual realm, and so indestructible the idea of the papacy itself, that the deepest of those schisms only shows its indivisibility." [101]

[100] Pastor, I, p. 208.
[101] Gregorovius, VI, p. 649.

CHAPTER VI

1417–1447

THE peace and calm which the Church enjoyed did not shield her from all dangers. After passing safely through the stormiest perils, she was now to meet the most perfidious. The commercial prosperity of the large Italian cities and the resulting habits of luxury, the coming of Greek scholars into Italy and the consequent literary and artistic movement, the consolidation of the temporal power of the Holy See and the diplomatic negotiations which that process entailed, produced an air of pagan worldliness at Rome which the papal court and even the popes themselves did not escape. In the softness of a luxurious existence, in the refined pleasures of mind or in political cares, several of them lost sight of that austerity of life exemplified by the lives of the Roman pontiffs of the Western Schism. The conscience of Christendom was finally aroused. At that time the monks and friars, the truest interpreters of public opinion, echoed its scandalized astonishment. The boldest of these popular preachers, Girolamo Savonarola, shouted his indignation in the very face of the most compromised of these pontiffs, Alexander VI. The unfortunate friar perished at the stake, but at his death the temporal prestige of the papacy had received its rudest blows. The work of reforming the Church "in head and members" became more urgently necessary than ever.

Yet the history of the Renaissance popes is not merely a chronicle of abuses. The time came when it had to be recognized that the epoch of a Christendom governed by pope and emperor had passed, that the autonomy of European States

was a fact, that the Church must treat with them as one power with another. The era of concordats began. The popes of this period, who were for the most part far-sighted statesmen, understood this need and labored intelligently to provide for it. From Martin V to Leo X a positive step was taken to bring about an understanding between the Holy See and the European States. All is not dark in these last years of the fifteenth century. Though it is in vain we look for a St. Gregory VII or a St. Pius V in the Chair of Peter, we do, nevertheless, see truly great men in the interim between great saints.

Martin V

The name "Popes of the Renaissance" does not altogether fit Martin V and Eugene IV, who were rather popes of transition. Their special mission was to settle the painful problems bequeathed by the Great Schism, to rebuild the material and moral ruins left by that schism, to strengthen the unity of the Church under the supremacy of Rome, and to calm men's minds, still shaken by the impressions of the recent conflicts.

The reform of the Church in its head and members was still to be carried out. Every one was expecting a council. This word "council" exercised a sort of magical fascination over the men of that time. The conciliary theories of Gerson, d'Ailly, and Langenstein were confirmed, so it seemed, by this single fact that it was a council that had brought peace to the Church. The very event that had restored tranquillity to the Christian world would thus become a new source of discord. The history of the assemblies of Basle, Ferrara, and Florence fill the two pontificates of Martin V and Eugene IV; all other events are grouped about the history of these councils. To not a few men of this period, the council seemed a panacea for all political and social ills. It is to the councils that the Emperor of Constantinople comes to ask aid against the Turks, and it is from the

councils that the union of the Latin and Greek Churches is expected. All the wars of this period are reëchoed in the councils. The fathers of Constance, when decreeing that the next conciliary assembly should take place five years later and that subsequent councils should meet periodically every seven years, encouraged similar illusions. But the events were to undeceive them. We can understand how able statesmen like Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, profound thinkers like Nicholas of Cusa, even holy men like Cardinal Allemand, archbishop of Arles, who was beatified by Clement VII, for a long time fought in perfect good faith for the supremacy of the councils.

Martin V shared none of these vain hopes. Because of a loftier and broader view, which came perhaps from his eminent station or from that instinct of what is possible, which is communicated to a man by the responsibility of power, and doubtless also because of the graces of state which God has never refused to the head of His Church, Martin V always distrusted this system of periodical councils which was decreed at Constance. "The very mention of 'council' terrified him," says a contemporary writer.[1] To solve or forestall possible conflicts between the papacy and civil powers, he placed more trust in another procedure, which was, in fact, introduced by that same Council of Florence at its forty-third session, held under his presidency. Considering the differences of views and conflicts of interests that divided the nations, the fathers of Constance decided to regulate the relations of the Church with each nation by individual concordats. These were, so to speak, only attempts. The five concordats which Martin V concluded with France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and England seemed to be armistices rather than definitive treaties. The concordat with England was entered into *ad perpetuam rei memoriam,*

[1] *"In immensum nomen concilii abhorrebat."* Raguese, *Monumenta conciliorum,* I, p. 66; Pastor, I, p. 238; Valois, *La crise religieuse du XV^e siècle: Le pape et le concile,* p. 3.

whereas the others were for five years only. But therein lay the future.[2] The era of councils was followed by the era of concordats.

Martin V, of Roman blood, had nothing closer at heart than to restore to the Eternal City, the center of the Christian world, that splendor which had been tarnished by recent strifes. It was an urgent undertaking after that crisis in which the unity of the Church became so seriously threatened and the authority of the Roman pontiff so hotly disputed. The disturbances still desolating the States of the Church kept the Pope two years at Florence and prevented his entry into Rome until September 20th, 1420. But he devoted himself at once to the work of restoration, on which he had determined, with a prudence and perseverance that won for him from the Romans the well-deserved title of father of the country.[3] Even the nepotism with which he is justly reproached had some excuse in the need he felt—confronted, as he was, by unanimously hostile powers—to depend upon men who would be unquestionably devoted to him.

The expiration of the time fixed by the Council of Constance

[2] Cf. Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de concordat,* pp. 17, 44 sq. The word "concordat" is found for the first time in the Treaty of Worms, which, in 1122, put an end to the quarrel of investitures.

[3] On this subject, see L'Epinois, *op. cit.,* p. 402. We mention some of the measures undertaken by Martin V: he organized the provisioning of Rome (Theiner, *Codex diplomaticus,* f. 1861, 1862, III, 223); he took thought for the healthfulness of the city by restoring to activity the office of superintendent of streets and canals (*ibid.,* p. 231) and by appointing a protector of the course of the *Aqua Morana* (*ibid.,* p. 234); he established a commissioner for the repair of the churches and took steps to prevent their pillage (*ibid.,* p. 220); he forbade the abuses that had been introduced in the collection of tolls on the Tiber to the profit of private persons (*ibid.,* p. 229); he enforced uniformity of weights and measures (Garampi, *Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie,* p. 84); he prosecuted the makers of false money (*ibid.,* p. 85); he gave scrupulous attention to the selection of magistrates and syndics (Theiner, *op. cit.,* pp. 201, 218, 242, 243); for matters of greater importance or delicacy, he appointed special commissioners (Theiner, p. 239). The mere enumeration of these reforms indicates the sad state into which the temporal organization of the Papal States had fallen during the Western Schism.

for calling a new council had arrived. To oppose the movement of those who were impatiently awaiting the meeting of the conciliary assembly, was impossible. In 1423 Pope Martin in self-defense summoned the new assembly to meet at Pavia, but an outbreak of the pest necessitated its transfer to Siena. The war which at this very time was bringing France and England to blows, the terrible struggle which Spain had to sustain against the Moors, and the troubles stirred up in Germany by bands of Hussites, prevented most of the bishops from answering the summons of the Sovereign Pontiff, who promptly invoked this pretext to dissolve the council (March 7th, 1424). But the members present, even though few in number, had time to fix upon Basle as the place for the next council, which was to meet seven years later.[4]

Martin V is often blamed for not having labored for the reform of the Church with sufficient vigor during this interval. The fruitless crusades which he had to undertake against the Hussites and the assiduous attention required by the material restoration of the churches and monuments of Rome, were his excuse. This reform, however, did begin to take place through the pure and worthy life of this Pope, whose solid

[4] According to the *Instrumentum electionis civitatis basilensis,* an official document, there were present: for the Italian nation, Bishop Pietro di Castro, Doctor Dominico di San Geminiano, and Abbot Nicolas de Saint Donat representing especially the district of Siena; for the French nation, Guillaume, bishop of Cavaillon, and two abbots; for the German nation, Doctor Hartung de Kappel and the Premonstratensian Theoderich d'Andel; for the English nation, Bishop Frantz, of Aeqs in Gascony, then under the rule of England, and a canon; for the Spanish nation, Abbot Pierre de Saint Vincent, canon of Toledo. Nicolas de Saint Donat, representing Siena, and Pierre de Saint Vincent, representing Spain, declared that they had received no mandate regarding the choice of a meeting-place for the council; but the others used the full powers which they had received and the little assembly unanimously designated the city of Basle as the seat of the council. The papal legates confirmed this decision in the name of the Pope, by virtue of the powers delegated to them (Mansi, XXIX, pp. 6–10; Hefele, XI, pp. 143 sq.). Valois (*op. cit.* I, pp. 76–80) shows that the responsibility for the failure of the council assembled at Siena "falls heavily on those—princes, prelates, doctors —who, though summoned to Siena, failed to come."

virtues were never denied by his contemporaries. In that movement which was carrying men's minds at random towards letters and art, he was able to discern and to encourage those tendencies which were Christian. We know that the meetings at Constance, where so many scholars and literary men of different nations were assembled, either as members of the council or assistants or simply out of curiosity, greatly favored the study of ancient literature. It was there that Poggio relaxed from theological discussions by rummaging the libraries and looking for precious manuscripts. It was there the Greek Chrysoloras introduced the Latins to the study of Homer and Plato. Martin V knew how to distinguish among the humanists those who kept the Christian spirit; he prudently reserved for them the dignities and responsibilities at his disposal. He bestowed the Roman purple upon the illustrious Capranica, the pious Nicholas d'Abergati of the Carthusian Order, the austere Antonio Correr, nephew of Pope Gregory XII, who distributed his great wealth in good works and died at the age of eighty after a life filled with the highest virtues, and the great Cesarini, who became papal legate at the Council of Basle and who, as Cardinal Branda said, if the Church should become corrupt, would be able to reform it single-handed.

Martin V also encouraged and protected the saints whom God raised up to regenerate the Church. In 1425 St. Frances of Rome, a noblewoman, wife of Lorenzo de' Ponziani, under papal auspices founded the Benedictine Oblate Congregation of Tor di Specchi at Rome. This society was made up of devout women of the world who, without any outward distinguishing mark, practiced the purest religious virtues and devoted themselves to every kind of charitable work.[5] Two years later, St. Bernardine of Siena, one of the greatest saints of this period, was falsely denounced at the judgment seat of Martin V. For

[5] Rabory, *Vie de sainte Françoise Romaine.*

almost thirty years this servant of God had been powerfully preaching renunciation and penance. Pope Martin, not only absolved him from the groundless accusations, but desired him to make Rome the particular field of his apostolate for almost three months, and even became one of his humble listeners.[6]

But in the eyes of a prejudiced and jealous nobility these works of internal reform did not compensate for the more or less real scandals of papal nepotism. The partisans of the council bestirred themselves; they wanted to advance the date of it. Their evident intention was to use it as a weapon against the papacy. On November 8th, 1430, posters were put up in Rome during the night, threatening the Pope with a withdrawal of obedience if he delayed any longer in summoning the council. Martin V yielded to these desires. By a decree (February, 1431) he entrusted to Cardinal Cesarini the task of opening the coming council, to be held at Basle, and of presiding over it. At the same time, by another decree, he authorized his legate, in case of need, to dissolve the council or transfer it to another city. Shortly after, grief-stricken by unjust attacks against him, the Pope died, carried off by apoplexy (February 20th, 1431).[7]

The hatred that made Martin V its target was directed less against his person than against his pontifical office: this was clear from events that took place at the conclave which met to choose his successor. The Sacred College proposed for acceptance by the candidates for the tiara a "capitulation" which singularly limited the pope's powers and resources and placed him, in the government of the Church, at the mercy of the cardinals. No declaration of war, no alliance, no collection of imposts or tithes could be decided without a majority vote of

[6] Thureau-Dangin, *Saint Bernardine of Siena.*

[7] Raynaldi, 1431, no. 5–7, and Burchard, *Diarium,* Thuasne ed., I, p. 33.

the Sacred College; no appointment of cardinal, bishop, or abbot was to be made outside of consistory.[8]

This was a new danger which, joined to the conciliary disturbances and the rivalries of princes, reappeared at every papal election throughout the whole fifteenth century. The popes indeed tried to escape from these "capitulations" by not observing them, then by recruiting the body of cardinals from among their friends and relatives. But this simply was curing one abuse by another. A college of cardinals thus made up could be nothing more than a registry office for the pope who appointed it, and often became a center of formidable opposition for his successor. No external organization could produce a true reform of the Church unless a spirit of holiness was its soul and inspiration.

Eugene IV

Gabriello Condulmaro, the newly elected Pope, took the name of Eugene IV. He had the weakness to accept the "capitulation" proposed by the Sacred College, but was not slow in freeing himself from it. Was not such a derogation of the inalienable rights of the papacy vitiated with radical nullity? The opposition, moreover, began to be discredited by its own excesses. A prejudice against the papacy, a reckless infatuation for the supremacy of councils had won many of the best men. This can be seen in the very first sessions of the Council of Basle.

The assembly was to open in March, 1431, but was able to begin its sessions only on July 23rd.[9] Fourteen bishops or

[8] Valois thinks (rightly, it would seem) that the capitulation, concentrating such extensive powers in the Sacred College, was directed, not only against the pope, but also against the councils, whose dominance in the affairs of the Church was much dreaded. (Valois, *op. cit.*, I, p. 100.)

[9] The documents relating to the Council of Basle are found in the *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi decimi quinti*, a vast collection begun in 1857.

abbots assembled in a hall that was almost empty, under the presidency of John of Polomar, who represented Cardinal Cesarini. The assembly proclaimed itself an ecumenical council, recalled the decree *"Frequens"* of the Council of Constance on the supremacy of councils, and drew up a programme containing three aims for its deliberations: the reform of the Church, the settlement of the Hussite question, and the reunion of the Western and Eastern Churches.

On September 9th, Cardinal Cesarini reached Basle to preside over the assembly as papal legate. His attitude was not free from suspicion. On the one hand, he approved all that had been done *"in statuendo et firmando concilium,"* while on the other, he seemed to be aware of the fundamental irregularity of this miniature assembly. Did these fourteen prelates have the right to declare themselves the representatives of the universal Church?[10] In great haste (September 19th) Cesarini sent a strongly worded letter to the bishops, urging them to come to the assembly at Basle; at the same time he dispatched an ambassador to the Pope to acquaint him with the situation. This ambassador, John Beaupère, a canon of Besançon,[11] presented Eugene IV with such a disheartening account of what was taking place at Basle, that the Pontiff by a Bull, *"Quoniam alto"* (December 18th, 1431),[12] by his sovereign authority decreed the dissolution of the council. Unfortunately, by the time the Bull arrived, Cesarini, who had counted on the success of his request to regularize the situation, had already (December 14th), in the cathedral of Basle, solemnly celebrated the opening of the council. The extreme exasperation of the fathers was reflected in a letter from the legate (January 13th, 1432), begging the Pope to withdraw the Bull of disso-

[10] *Monumenta conciliorum,* I, p. 105.

[11] Celebrated for the part he took in the trial of Joan of Arc. See Denifle and Chatelain, *"Le procès de Jeanne d'Arc et l'Université de Paris,"* in *Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Paris,* p. 18.

[12] Mansi, XXIX, p. 564.

lution. It is in this letter that many historians have thought to see the prophetic announcement of the Lutheran revolt. "The axe is laid to the root of the tree," said Cesarini, "the tree inclines and is about to fall; but it still stands; and it is we who are going to hasten its fall!" [13] The council pretended to ignore the papal Bull and on January 21st, 1432, issued an encyclical letter announcing to the world its firm resolve to continue its deliberations.

This was the beginning of the lamentable conflict that rent the Church in the most venerable organs of its hierarchy. On one side, an assembly of bishops, insignificant in number, yet backed by the great universities, which sent them enthusiastic letters, encouraged by the kings of France and Spain, the Emperor, and nearly all the rulers; on the other side, the Pope, weak, disarmed, abandoned by his own entourage, in disagreement with his legate, engaged in Rome itself with permanent uprisings that left him almost no security.

The council was emboldened and, in its second session (February 15th, 1432), renewed the famous decrees of the third, fourth, and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance and accentuated its opposition to the Sovereign Pontiff, declaring that it could not be dissolved, transferred, or postponed by any one whomsoever, not even by the Pope.[14] Under the circumstances of the case, these decrees assumed an exceptional gravity. They were not any longer, as at Constance, dealing with the problem of a dubious pope, for no one questioned the regularity of Eugene's election. Under these conditions, to declare the supremacy of the council was to alter the traditional constitution of the Church.

Yet, when the Hussite army defeated the troops of the cru-

[13] *"Jam, ut video, securis ad radicem posita est. Inclinata est arbor ut cadat, nec potest diutius persistere. Et certe, cum per se stare possit, nos ipsam ad terram praecipitamus."* Joannis de Segovia, *Historia concilii Basilensis,* in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi XV,* Palacki and Birk ed., II, p. 97.

[14] *Monumenta Conciliorum,* II, pp. 124 sq.

sade, the Pope's credit suffered a decline; an opposition party was formed against him among the cardinals, who reproached him for the hasty dissolution of the council. Cardinals Capranica, Brando, Allemand, Cervantes, and de la Rochetaille one after the other withdrew from his side and adhered to the assembly of Basle. We see Blessed Louis Allemand, archbishop of Arles, misled by an aberration that recalls the unreflecting enthusiasm of venerable fathers of the early centuries for Origenism, an aberration that makes us think of weighty personages of modern times seduced by budding Jansenism or by Liberalism in its first days. Thus did this saintly Cardinal pursue the chimera of a constitutional church concentrating its legislative, executive, and judicial powers in the hands of a council.

Allemand soon became the very soul of the Basle assembly, strongly seconded by Nicholas of Cusa, Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, and even the legate Cesarini himself. In the council's programme, papal authority necessarily had to be lowered *pari passu* with the exaltation of the council's powers. Nicholas of Cusa, with the weighty influence that came from his eminent services, his admirable works of reform, and the austerity of his life, did not hesitate to maintain, in his treatise *De concordia catholica,* that the privilege of infallibility, having been granted by Christ to the whole Church, can belong only to an ecumenical council, representing the entire Church, and not to the pope, who is only a member.

At this painful juncture, the Pope adopted a policy from which he did not depart even to his last breath: firmly to maintain the principle of his supremacy and to yield practically all the rest. In the lengthy negotiations between Eugene IV and the fathers of Basle, too long to be detailed here, the extent of the Pope's condescension is astonishing. In vain did the council undertake to bring him to trial, summon him to appear, cite him to its judgment seat. Pope Eugene took care not to break off

negotiations with the rebel assembly, even treating with it as one power with another. He was satisfied to declare, through one of his plenipotentiaries, the Archbishop of Tarentaise, the absolute primacy of his rights: "Even should the entire world turn against the pope," announced the legate, "it is the pope who must be obeyed." [15] When urged to do so by the Emperor, Eugene at length decided to withdraw his decree of dissolution and to recognize the regularity of the Council of Basle by his Bull *"Dudum sacrum"* (first form) on August 1st, 1433, then by the same Bull in its second form on December 15th, but adding in the former, "with the reservation of his own rights and those of the Apostolic See." [16] The council had reached its sixteenth session.

Meanwhile, profiting by the Pope's difficulties and by the turmoil in men's minds, Philip Maria Visconti, duke of Milan, one of those many tyrants who were desolating Italy at that time,[17] invaded the States of the Church: the Pope had no other choice but to appoint the freebooter Francesco Sforza standard-bearer of the Church and defender of its States. Thus was a new humiliation inflicted on the papal power. Nearly all the great Roman families had little by little withdrawn from Eugene, leaving him no option but flight from Rome. The unfortunate Pontiff, whose intentions were beyond blame, retired to Florence, where the renaissance was more flourishing than anywhere else and there became the enlightened protector of letters and art. After the manner of Martin V, he showed favor to Christian humanism, condemned Bec-

[15] *"Si totus mundus sententiaret in aliquo negotio contra papam, . . . papae sententiae standum esset."* (Mansi, XXIX, pp. 482–492.)

[16] *"Ita tamen quod . . . omnia singula contra personam, auctoritatem ac libertatem nostram et Sedis Apostolicae . . . in dicto concilio facta ac gesta . . . per dictum concilium prius omnio tollantur."* Bull of August 1st, 1435. (Mansi, XXIX, p. 574.) The Bull of December 15th did not repeat this restriction (Mansi, XXIX, pp. 78 sq.) nor did it retract it. Eugene IV takes it up again in 1446 with great force.

[17] Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy*, I, p. 19.

cadelli, kept Valla in retirement, reserving his favors for the upright Cardinal Bessarion and the virtuous Flavio Biondo.

The Council of Basle at its twenty-first session (June 9th, 1435) voted to abolish annates, pallium rights, taxes and imposts of every sort collected for the benefit of the Holy See. From Florence, where he was living on alms, the Pope protested by an appeal addressed to the courts of Europe. Soon Allemand, Nicholas of Cusa, and Cesarini became recklessly unrestrained. Beginning with the twenty-fifth session, scenes of tumult grew more frequent. Cardinal Allemand had the imprudence to bring into the council a certain number of ecclesiastics of the neighborhod. Thanks to their presence, the assembly came to have a clearly revolutionary majority. Cardinal Cesarini, following the Pope's wishes, had a decree passed (May 7th, 1437) that the deliberations be continued at Florence or Modena; but the opponents made such an effort to obstruct the measure that it seems the two parties came to blows in the cathedral.[18] The Archbishop of Tarentaise was obliged to take to flight.

The representatives of the Greek Church, who had been at Basle since the end of July, 1434, but had never accepted Basle as the meeting-place of the council, left the city and went to Bologna, where the Pope had been staying since April, 1436. Cesarini refused to preside over the twenty-sixth session. After patient but fruitless efforts to bring the fathers of Basle to submit, Eugene IV issued a Bull (December 30th, 1437) [19] definitively ordering the transfer of the council to Ferrara. But the prelates and various other ecclesiastics who made up the pretended majority of the council did not accept the Bull and continued to sit at Basle under the presidency of Cardinal Allemand. Thenceforth there were two assemblies. Despite the Council of Ferrara, presided over by the Pope, recognized by

[18] See the dramatic account of these events in Valois, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 331–349.
[19] *Monumenta conciliorum*, II, p. 1143.

the Emperor, and accepted by the Greeks, the Council of Basle continued its work of violence and anarchy.

From the hour of this break, there can be no doubt as to the illegitimate character of the Council of Basle. But theologians have questioned whether the previous sessions of the council do not enjoy a doctrinal authority, at least partial. Bossuet,[20] relying on various papal Bulls and particularly on that which transferred the council from Basle to Ferrara, held the view that the council was ecumenical until January 1st, 1438, and that all its decrees had dogmatic authority. But this opinion is no longer tenable. Others have thought that the ecumenical character of the council did not carry with it the authority of its decisions relative to the power of the pope. The authority of a council, they say, is limited by the approbation which it receives from the sovereign pontiff: but Eugene IV by his first Bull *"Dudum sacrum,"* and especially by his declaration of 1446, expressly reserved all the decrees that would atack the supremacy of the Holy See.[21] Still others maintain—it seems with better reason—that, "although summoned as an ecumenical council, the Council of Basle was never so in fact; that the words of Eugene IV have not the import imputed to them; that they were written at a time when the Pope was obliged to use the utmost prudence and to avoid every expression that might arouse opposition; that the Council of Basle-Ferrara-Florence, if we may so call it, became ecumenical only from the time that it fulfilled all the conditions needed to give it an ecumenical character; that the Council of Basle, though legitimate at its beginning, according to Bellarmine's expression,[22] cannot be considered as represent-

[20] *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani.*

[21] *"Absque tamen praejudicio juris, dignitatis et præeminentiae Sanctae Sedis apostolicae ac potestatis sibi et in eodem canonice sedenti in persona Beati Petri a Christo concessae."* (Raynaldi, 1446, no. 3.)

[22] Bellarmine, *De conciliorum utilitate,* bk. 2, ch. 19; *De Ecclesia militante,* bk. 3, ch. 16.

ing the universal Church on account of the ridiculously small number of bishops taking part in it; that all its decisions were vitiated by the votes of ecclesiastics who had no right there and who made up the majority; lastly, that in the gravest circumstances, the legates did not enjoy the necessary freedom." [23]

The Union of the Churches

Of the three questions which the Council of Basle set itself to solve, the most urgent was the union of the Churches. The others could wait. Several of the disciplinary reforms passed by the rebel assembly were excellent, but it seemed that the moment had not yet come to carry them out; the Hussite question received at least a provisional settlement [24] by the approbation given to the famous *Compactata* of Prague; [25] but the Greek question urgently demanded consideration. The constant advances of the Turks about Constantinople drove the Greek emperors to lean for support upon the West and to reconsider the union so happily concluded in 1274 by the second Council of Lyons and so unfortunately broken by Michael

[23] Baudrillart, under the word "Bâle," in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Vacant-Mangenot). Cf. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles,* I, pp. 83–88.

[24] The Hussites, organized in military fashion, had built in the neighborhood of Prague a fortress which they called Thabor. Their demands were formulated in four articles: freedom of preaching, the use of the chalice, suppression of ecclesiastical property, and punishment of all mortal sins by the civil power. The fathers of the Council of Basle, after conferences with the moderate Hussites, called Calixtines, had it accepted by them: (1) that the use of the chalice would be granted only to those who would acknowledge the real presence under both species; (2) that mortal sins might be punished only if they were public and only by competent authority; (3) that freedom of preaching would be exercised only under the safeguard of episcopal authority; (4) that the Church could administer both movable and immovable property, as also possess the same. These were the *Compactata of Prague* (November 30th, 1433). The victory won in 1434 by the moderate Hussites over the Thaborites at Lepan, assured the success of the *Compactata.* The Calixtines returned little by little to the Roman Church; but the Thaborites retained their spirit and their doctrines in a latent condition. Later they reappeared under the name of Bohemian Brethren. (Cf. Hefele, XI, pp. 279—290.)

[25] Cf. Hefele, XI pp. 279–290.

Palaeologus. On the other hand, the prestige of their superior culture made the Greeks more than ever attractive to the literary men of Europe. In 1436, when it became known that the Emperor had invited all the Greek princes, patriarchs, and bishops living outside the Byzantine Empire, notably the princes of Russia and Wallachia, to take part in the "council of union," all Christendom rejoiced. Upon landing at Venice (February 28th, 1438), John VII Palaeologus was welcomed in the name of the Pope by Cardinal Traversari with the greatest magnificence. The scandals of the Council of Basle did not discourage the Greeks; they went to Ferrara full of confidence. The other churches of the East—Armenians, Jacobites, Copts, Chaldeans, and Maronites—followed their example. But, in the eyes of well-informed diplomats, there was one cloud that darkened the horizon. The lower the power of the Greeks had fallen, the more did their eager passion for honors seem to increase: "If the Pope is older than I," the Patriarch of Constantinople said at Venice, "I will honor him as a father; if we are of the same age, I will treat him as a brother; if he is younger, as a son." Scarcely arrived at Ferrara, he protested against the ceremony of kissing the feet. Eugene having decided to make every possible concession, dispensed all the Greeks from this ceremony. He permitted them to celebrate divine service in their own rite and granted to the Patriarch, in the cathedral where the Council was held, a seat like the Pope's, but a little lower. It took nothing less than these honors to calm the susceptibilities of the Orientals.

The Latins and the Greeks were divided on four questions: the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost (*"Filioque"*); the question of the azymes, or the kind of bread to be used in the Mass; the question of purgatory; and the question of the primacy of the pope. A commission made up of five Latin and five Greek fathers began the discussion of these questions with great candor at the third preliminary confer-

ence. But it was not long before a thousand difficulties arose. Neither the princes of the East nor those of the West, so impatiently awaited, seemed in any hurry to come to the council. The fathers of Basle, far from uniting, multiplied their curses and condemnations against the proceedings of the assembly at Ferrara. A strange demand on the part of the Emperor, namely, to enter the cathedral on horseback to take possession of his throne, came near upsetting everything. But the Pope's prudence avoided a conflict. He quieted the Emperor by showering other marks of honor on him, by granting to the Greeks the privilege of opening the first session with an inaugural address, and by yielding to them, in the discussion, the part of attack, while the Latins took that of defense. When someone offered an objection because of the absence of the prelates assembled at Basle, the Pope replied: "Where I am, with the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople, there is all Christendom."

From the outset the question of the *"Filioque"* seemed to absorb all the others. The Greeks forcibly reproached the Latins with keeping the added word *"Filioque"* in their symbol despite the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus, and with teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, whereas the early fathers had taught that He proceeds "from the Father *by* the Son." Their two principal orators, of very unequal worth and ability, were the illustrious Bessarion, archbishop of Nicaea, and the astute metropolitan of Ephesus, Marcus Eugenicus, better known as Mark of Ephesus. To the first point of accusation the Latins replied that the prohibition by the Council of Ephesus against "adding a new article of faith to the symbol," had in mind only the addition of a new element, beyond the text, and not a more precise explanation of a text already contained in the symbol. They went on to say that the addition in question was such a case, for it is the constant teaching of the Greek and Latin Fathers that, to use

the words of St. Basil, "everything is in common between the Father and the Son, except that the Son is not the Father." [26] To oppose any explanatory addition was to swear by the letter and to value it more than the spirit. The Archbishop of Rhodes declared: "What is the symbol of Nicaea but an explanatory amplification of the symbol of the Apostles, and the symbol of Constantinople but an explanation of that of Nicaea, and the symbol of Ephesus but an explanation of the mixed symbol formed by those of Nicaea and Constantinople? New heresies will always make new explanations necessary: to forbid them would be to doubt the word of the Master, who promised His assistance to the Church for all ages." [27]

The discussion had reached the point when the outbreak of the pestilence at Ferrara and also various administrative and financial considerations prompted the Pope to transfer the council to Florence.[28] There the dogmatic question of the procession of the Holy Ghost was taken up. John of Schwarzenberg, provincial of the Dominicans, successfully demonstrated, against Mark of Ephesus, that the Greek Fathers, in teaching that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son, do not set forth a doctrine different from the Latin Fathers, who teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son; that, besides, the Latins admit only one *"principium,"* one single cause of procession, common to the Father and the Son. On Low Sunday, Bessarion delivered a magnificent discourse, declaring loyally that he was convinced by these rea-

[26] Hefele, XI, p. 405.

[27] Mansi, XXXI, pp. 551–556.

[28] The Florentines, hoping to draw great financial profit from having the council held in their city, offered a considerable sum to the Pope. Eugene IV's finances were gravely embarrassed, he could scarcely meet the most essential expenses occasioned by the council, and, moreover, he remembered the generous hospitality he had recently received in the city of Florence; so he decided in favor of the transfer. The Greeks consented to it on condition that they be paid what was due them for the expenses of their stay and that they be granted new financial advantages. (Hefele, XI, p. 414.)

sons.[29] At the Emperor's invitation, the Greeks met together to deliberate as to the union. The majority declared that, as the Latin Church taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son "as from a single principle and by a single act," there was no longer, on this score, any obstacle to the union.[30] On June 8th, 1439, the Orientals and the Westerners gave each other the kiss of peace as a sign of union.[31]

The points that remained for discussion had but a secondary importance. In the matter of the Eucharist, it was defined that transubstantiation takes place as well with leavened as with unleavened bread.[32] As for Pugatory, while they did not pretend to come to any special conclusion as to its nature or location, they declared that it is a place where souls are purified which have not completely "satisfied for their sins by sufficient fruits of penance." They added "that the souls of persons dying in the state of actual or original sin descend into hell, there to undergo diverse pains." [33] In the matter of the primacy of the pope, it was declared by the Council of Florence with a clearness and precision never before attained in an official document of the Church. Greeks and Latins proclaimed and defined that "the Holy See and the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, true Vicar of Christ, Father and Doctor of all Christians." [34] Yet, after thus putting them-

[29] Mansi, XXXI, p. 878.

[30] Denzinger, no. 691.

[31] Mansi, XXXI, p. 894.

[32] Denzinger, no. 692.

[33] *"Illorum autem animas, qui in actuali peccato vel solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, poenis tamen disparibus puniendas."* (Denzinger, no. 693.) By the word "hell," the council evidently, according to the language of the time, meant simply exclusion from Heaven.

[34] *"Item definimus, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem, in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem romanum successorem esse Beati Petri principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium christianorum patrem et doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse."* (Denzinger, no. 594; *Monumenta conciliorum,* III, p. 336.)

selves solemnly on record, the Greeks withdrew and, under the influence of political rivalries and racial antipathies, again separated from the Roman Church. But they had signed the condemnation of their own schism.[35]

The act of union was promulgated July 6th, 1439. "Rejoice, ye heavens," said the fathers, "let the earth leap for joy! Fallen is the wall that separated the Eastern and Western Churches!"

Nevertheless Mark of Ephesus could not tolerate the humiliation of what he called his defeat, but what he should have called the victory of truth and peace. The cunning Patriarch, who had found a pretext for not assisting at the final deliberations, refused to sign the act of union. Presently he began seizing every occasion to stir up trouble and to incite clergy and monks against the council. Cleverly exploiting prejudice, passion, and national animosity, he soon acquired an almost universal popularity. Thenceforth Mark of Ephesus was the hero of the Greeks; Oriental prelates were called the slaves of the Latins, apostates, traitors. A few bishops were won over to the movement. The Emperor took alarm and supported the cause of the council only half-heartedly. Once again the Greek Church returned to open schism.[36]

The council continued its sessions for three years, publishing in succession decrees of union with the Armenians, Jacobites, Ethiopians, Syrians, and Chaldeans. In the act of union with the Armenians is to be found the celebrated *Decretum ad Armenos*, containing a remarkably complete statement of the doctrine of the Sacraments.[37]

Not all the Greeks joined the defection. The most illustrious of them, the great Bessarion, who had been the most

[35] The next day Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, died, leaving a profession of faith susceptible of a Catholic interpretation. (See Hefele, XI, pp. 444–449.)

[36] Mark of Ephesus died impenitent at Constantinople, June 23rd, 1449, after a very painful illness. Cf. Pétridès, *"La mort de Marc d'Ephèse,"* in the *Echos d'Orient*, January, 1910, VI, p. 19.

[37] Denzinger, nos. 695–702.

active and sincere of the peace negotiators, remained faithful to the Roman Church, as did also several of the most renowned of his compatriots. He was made a cardinal (December 8th, 1439) and labored all the rest of his life to reëstablish the union so unhappily broken. His name and labors are still an inspiration to those who in our day are devoting themselves to the work of the union of the two Churches.

At the Council of Basle there was a party that resolutely entered upon the path of schism. Although abandoned by Cesarini, Nicholas of Cusa, and several of the most notable fathers, even after the decree of dissolution, 25 bishops and 17 abbots continued to legislate against the Pope. They declared Eugene IV deposed (January 24th, 1438); about nine months later they elected an antipope, the ambitious Duke Amadeus of Savoy, who took the name of Felix V. But, when abandoned by Aragon and Scotland and no longer supported by Germany and France, the schismatical assembly received its fatal blow. The celebrated Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who became Pius II, was, like Cesarini and Nicholas of Cusa, disillusioned; he used his astute talents to destroy the authority of the pseudo-council.

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges

Unfortunately France and Germany did not at once grasp that the solution of the crisis was to be found in concluding concordats with the Holy See, now restored to all its rights. At the Council of Basle no "nation" showed itself more determined than the "French nation" to force reform decrees on the Pope; no one more violently attacked the Roman court than the head of the French embassy, Amédée de Talaru, archbishop of Lyons.[38] The cause of this opposition was not so much a schismatical spirit on the part of King Charles VII, as

[38] Valois, *Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges,* pp. lxxvi sq.

it was a grievance about questions of imposts and benefices. The French found fault with the Pope for disposing of French benefices to the profit of foreigners;[39] they complained of financial measures which for a century had been drawing into Italy French gold, "that true, pure blood of the realm," as one Gallican called it.

When the Council of Basle promulgated its reform decrees, Charles VII found himself much embarrassed. What should he do about it? Should he accept the decrees of the council *in toto?* That would be schism, with its dread consequences. Should he reject them *in toto?* But the King of France feared lest this would be granting too much to the Pope, would be to make his own policy self-contradictory. The conciliary decrees of July 13th, 1433, and March 22nd, 1436, required that the right of canonical electors be not suspended except "for grave, evident, and reasonable cause"; the decrees of March 22nd, 1436, abolished all reservations, save those admitted in the *Corpus juris;* that of January 24th, 1438, suppressed the right of appeal to the Roman Court except in the weighty cases enumerated in the canon law: these were too conformable to the wishes of the French chancery for the King not to try to keep them. "In such junctures it was the practice of the French kings to shield themselves, at least formally, with a decision of the clergy of the realm."[40] Charles VII summoned a meeting of the clergy at Bourges on May 1st, 1438, at which papal nuncios and envoys of the Council of Basle were also present. After several days of debate, during which the claims of the pope and the council were set forth and discussed at length, the assembly decided that each decree of Basle should be submitted separately, so that it might be freely accepted, altered, or rejected. In fact, a great number of decrees, whose only fault was that they had been enacted by an illegitimate assembly,

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. lvi sqq.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. lxxviii.

were accepted: such were those concerning the recitation of the canonical hours and the proper care of churches,[41] the abuse of the interdict,[42] trivial appeals.[43] The tone of some decisions was softened.[44] But the decree that renewed the doctrine of Constance on the supremacy of councils was entirely adopted, and the assembly of Bourges did not hesitate to suppress the measures that referred to papal intervention in the conferring of benefices. Of its own accord, the assembly decreed severe penalties against those who should accept or obtain "expectatives." [45]

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, promulgated July 7th, 1438, was prefaced by a violent preamble, in which there was mention of "unbridled cupidity," "benefices given to foreigners," "gold transported outside the kingdom." The next day Charles VII informed the Council of Basle that he accepted its reforms in principle.

This act, of course, violated the neutrality which the assembly of Bourges pretended to maintain between the pope and the council. Two years later, after the scandalous election of the antipope Felix V, a new assembly at Bourges clearly divorced the cause of the French clergy from that of the schismatical assembly and declared its intention to continue in obedience to Eugene IV. But the Sovereign Pontiff never accepted Charles VII's Pragmatic Sanction. The conflict was ended only by the concordat of 1516, between Leo X and Francis I.

Thanks to the active steps taken by Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Germany was earlier in reaching the normal solution of a concordat. A diet at Mayence (1439) had declared for the prin-

[41] Sess. XXI, c. 3–11.
[42] Sess. XX, c. 1–3.
[43] Sess. XX, c. 4.
[44] For example, those excluding the Pope's nephews from the Sacred College and suppressing the annates.
[45] Valois, pp. lxxxiv–xc.

ciples of the pseudo-council of Basle almost in the sense of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; but the clever Æneas Sylvius prevented the declaration of Mayence from having the force of law, by winning Emperor Frederick III to the Pope's cause. The "Princes' Concordat" (February, 1447) was a forerunner of the "Concordat of Vienna" (February 17th, 1448), which, a year after Eugene's death, in its chief provisions renewed the concordat signed at Constance under Martin V.

Felix V, abandoned by nearly every one, abdicated the next year. He was the last of the antipopes.

Joan of Arc

The disastrous setback which the Christian armies suffered in the battle with the Turks at Varna, in 1444, darkened Eugene IV's last years. The preaching of the crusade had, as usual, aroused popular enthusiasm; but the greater number of European rulers showed themselves cold towards the undertaking. Three heroes, Scanderbeg, Janos Hunyady, and King Ladislas of Hungary, led to the combat the masses of the common people who had flocked to join the Hungarian, Polish, and Albanian troops. But they had to yield in the presence of superior forces.

Some years before, the Pope might have wondered whether the "Eldest Daughter of the Church" was not about to disappear as an independent nation. Since the battle of Agincourt (1415), which subjected France to English supremacy, France had continued to decline. A celebrated writer of the time represented her as a noble but sad queen, whose crown was almost falling off, while her three children—the clergy, the nobility, and the third estate—were unable to come to her assistance.[46] In the spring of 1429, under the inspiration

[46] Chartier, *Le quadrilogue invectif.*

of God, there arose a humble maiden, who embodied the patriotism of the conquered people. After a glorious campaign on the banks of the Loire, Joan of Arc succeeded in having Charles VII crowned at Rheims. But, with the connivance of the Burgundians and the complicity of Jean le Maistre, vice-inquisitor of France, the English wrought the maid's condemnation by an irregular court [47] and burned her at the stake in the public square of Rouen (1431). Joan's execution was the turning point for the French arms. Six years later, in accord with the maid's prediction, the white fleur-de-lis banner floated over Paris. After seven years more, the English were, to use the words of the Maid of Orleans, "kicked out of France." The War of the Roses was England's expiation for the crime of Rouen.[48]

The liberation of France was not the only result of Joan's mission. At a time when the modern idea of nationality was arising in opposition to the medieval concept of Christendom, Joan, in the simplicity of her patriotism and faith, "incarnated both the young idea of national integrity and the old

[47] The irregularities in Joan of Arc's trial were numerous. The most serious was the substitution, in the documents, of a form of abjuration different from that which the accused had read near the Church of Saint Ouen. Pierre Cauchon, "an old hand, long practiced in the trickeries of chicanery, knew how to conduct the discussions so as to give the illusion that he respected the rules of law. In reality, he sought only to stifle the truth. . . . The judges suspected of sympathy for the Pucelle were excluded or intimidated. . . . The preliminary inquiries made at Domrémy, being favorable to Joan of Arc, were passed over in silence and omitted in the report. . . . Cauchon offered a counsellor to the accused only at the close of the trial. More than that, he charged Loyseleur, a canon of Rouen, to give her, under the seal of confession, advice that was calculated to destroy her." (Petit-Dutaillis in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* IV, part 2, p. 64. See *"Le procès de Jeanne d'Arc"* in Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VI, pp. 9, 295.)

[48] On Joan of Arc, see Wallon, *Jeanne d'Arc;* Petit de Julleville, *Joan of Arc;* Dunand, *Histoire complète de Jeanne d'Arc;* Ayroles, *La vraie Jeanne d'Arc;* Quicherat, *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc;* Chevalier, *L'abjuration de Jeanne d'Arc au cimetière de Rouen;* Dunand, *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Jeanne d'Arc.* Anatole France published a *Life of Joan of Arc,* which is reviewed by Andrew Lang in his *M. Anatole France on Jeanne d'Arc.* Cf. *Revue des Deux Mondes,* April 15th, 1909, pp. 910–983. See also d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum.*

idea of Christian unity by correcting and completing them, the one by the other." [49] It was chiefly because she regarded France as the champion of Christendom that she wished France to be victorious. "Those who make war on the said holy realm," she wrote to the duke of Burgundy, "are making war on King Jesus." [50]

After the expulsion of the English she contemplated another campaign, in which she would advance side by side with the English under the standard of Charles VII to fight for the general interests of Christendom. To lead the pacified Christian world to a new crusade was her supreme aim.[51] Amidst an age of corruption and scandal this daughter of the people cast on the world such a glow of valor and purity, of delicate piety and sturdy common sense, that the earth was, so to speak, rejuvenated. "To destroy English dominance," wrote Christina of Pisa, "is the least of the deeds reserved for her. She has a higher exploit to perform: it is to keep the faith from perishing." [52] The people's instinct perceived the breadth of that mission, for in one of the prayers which they recited at mass for the captive Joan, they said to God: "Grant us to see her, unharmed and freed from the power of the English, accomplish to the letter all that Thou hast ordered her to do by one and the same mission." [53]

Eugene IV died February 23rd, 1447. His physical and moral qualities gave no premonition of the almost continual humiliations of his pontificate. He was of noble birth, of tall stature, with a face so imposing that it is said persons admitted to his presence dared not raise their eyes to him. He was good and generous and always led the life of a holy priest. No one

[49] Goyau, *Vielle France, Jeune Allemagne,* p. 20.

[50] Ayroles, *op. cit.,* VI, p. 58.

[51] On this project of Joan of Arc, see Goyau, ch. 2: (*"Jeanne d'Arc, nationalité et Chrétienté"*).

[52] Cited by Ayroles, III, p. 265.

[53] *Ibid.,* I, pp. 78–80, 687.

presumed to suspect him of distributing favors to his relatives and friends. He was one of those men who have to bear the weight of misfortunes accumulated by the fatality of events and the wickedness of men, and who receive the reward of their earthly trials only in the next life.

CHAPTER VII

1447–1492

THE last excesses of the assembly at Basle, even more than the condemnations by Eugene IV, destroyed esteem for that famous "conciliary theory" which had momentarily dazzled the world. About 1450, when the scholarly Spanish theologian Juan de Torquemada, published his celebrated *Summa against the Enemies of the Church and of the Primacy of the Pope,* men's minds were prepared to grasp it. The sovereign pontiffs from Nicholas V to Leo X encountered no opposition like that which had embarrassed the action of their immediate predecessors. But the danger which Martin V and Eugene IV foresaw in humanism continued to grow. Whoever fails to penetrate beneath the surface of the external events filling the reigns of Nicholas V, Callistus III, Pius II, Paul II, Sixtus V, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, and Leo X, will find this whole period a complicated tangle of negotiations and intrigues, learned theological disputes and bloody wars, noble works of holiness and abominable crimes, unsurpassed masterpieces of the purest art, and the most deplorable scandals. Whoever looks for the inspiring idea of this epoch, will find one fact dominating all. The rising flood of a paganism devoid of morality, finding expression in Machiavelli's *Principe* and Poggio's *Facetiae,* reached the nobility and the world of literary men under Nicholas V and Callistus III; under Pius II it entered the papal court; through the weakness of Sixtus IV it was introduced into the college of cardinals, and finally ascended the papal throne with Innocent VIII and Alexander VI. The lofty qualities of Julius II and Leo X were powerless to restore to the Holy See the glorious luster of past times.

By good fortune, the faith was still very much alive in the common people, the bourgeoisie, and a small section of the political or intellectual aristocracy. Undeniable evidence of it can be found in the admirable records of the period,[1] in the popularity enjoyed by such writings as the *Regola del governo di cura familiare* by Giovanni Dominici,[2] and the *Regola di vita cristiana* attributed to St. Antoninus,[3] in the numerous works of charity, societies, confraternities, pious associations, and third orders, which spread over Rome and all Italy,[4] in the incomparable artistic masterpieces in which the most worldly painters, sometimes also the most immoral, expressed the purest and sincerest religious spirit. So true is it that a work of art depends more upon the period in which it is conceived than upon the artist who executes it. The general tendency of the age, the appreciation of the public before whose eyes he exhibits his work, the models that he has before him, the whole atmosphere so impossible to define, make an impression on the artist even without his realizing it. But the atmosphere of the fifteenth century was still very religious. It was that religious atmosphere which made possible the vigorous protests of so many preaching monks and friars who, from St. Bernardine of Siena to Savonarola, ceased not to rise up against the scandals of this world and prepared the way for the reforms of the Council of Trent.

Nicholas V

In the conclave held after the death of Eugene IV, the two parties of Orsini and Colonna, which we have seen in conflict over the government of Rome ever since Boniface VIII, strove against each other for a while, then came to an agreement to

[1] Pastor, V., pp. 11 sqq.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 35–66.

elect a man known for his aloofness from all parties, Tommaso Parentucelli, who took the name of Nicholas V. He was the son of an humble physician in the village of Sarzano in Liguria. After filling the post of tutor in several noble families of Florence, he entered the service of the devout and scholarly Nicolo Albergati. This brought him into relation with a number of learned and literary men and developed his keen love of arts and letters without harming the exemplary regularity of his life or the purity of his morals. He was short and thin, with a weak constitution, but his black, piercing eyes revealed the intellectual inquisitiveness of his soul and also, as it seemed, his lively and impetuous character.[5]

Posterity called him the father of humanism. But Nicholas V has other claims on the gratitude of the Church. Being an accomplished statesman, he was able, at the outset of his pontificate, to make peace with King Alfonso of Naples, whose hostility might have been very injurious to the interests of the Holy See. In the early days of his pontificate, he agreed to observe the terms of the conventions entered into between Eugene IV and Frederick III, which served as a prelude to the important concordat of Vienna, decreed in principle on February 17th, 1448, and solemnly confirmed a month later. By this act, which was soon accepted by all the States of the Empire, the King of the Romans recognized the Pope's right to the annates and reservations established by canon law; the appointment of bishops was regulated: this was to be done by free choice and was to be considered final only with the pope's confirmation, who for grave and evident reasons had the right, after consulting the cardinals, to set aside the designated candidate and appoint in his stead another more worthy and competent.[6] "This concordat," says Pastor, "practically put an end

[5] See the documents cited by Pastor, II, pp. 19 sqq. and Valois, *Le pape et le concile,* II, p. 324.

[6] In Hefele (XI, pp. 565–573) there is a detailed analysis of this concordat.

to the Council of Basle," which, however, still dragged on a painful existence until 1449. To cover its retreat, it hastened to elect with due solemnity as pope "Tommaso Sarzano," that is, Nicholas V, and after this childish measure, which fooled nobody, voted its own dissolution (April 25th, 1449).[7]

The administrative talent and apostolic zeal of Nicholas V were shown in the important missions entrusted in 1450 and 1451 to Cardinal d'Estouteville in France and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in Germany. The special object of the former's mission was the reform of the collegiate churches, schools, and universities.[8] Bessarion, as legate to Bologna, later on restored its ancient university and reëstablished its prosperity, so that the inhabitants, according to an inscription on their walls, proclaimed him the benefactor of the city. Nicholas of Cusa undertook a vaster work. This great man had chosen for his motto: "To purify without destroying, to restore without crushing." By wise regulations, by the mild persuasion of his gentle words, and still more by his example, he reformed abuses that had entered the lives of the clergy, brought the monasteries back to a strict observance of their rules, fought against superstitions, and removed the last traces of the schism.

Meanwhile St. John Capistran, a worthy son of St. Francis of Assisi, was visiting all parts of Germany, Italy, and Poland. He preached on improvised platforms in the public squares so effectively that his hearers were often moved to tears of repentance and cast at his feet such objects of luxury as playing cards and indecent pictures. The saint would then make a bonfire of them. Nicholas V, to aid the saintly missioner's apostolate, gave him most extensive powers and granted indulgences to those who would hear his sermons.

[7] Raynaldi, 1449, no. 6.

[8] Cardinal d'Estouteville also honored himself by introducing the process of Joan of Arc's rehabilitation.

The jubilee of 1450, with its throngs of pilgrims of all nations coming to Rome and its splendid festivities, helped not a little to reanimate the piety of the faithful and to renew their veneration for the center of Catholic unity. The crowning of Emperor Frederick III, which took place at Rome two years after, was not without influence on the moral authority of the papacy. It was the last imperial coronation in the Eternal City.

The protection which Nicholas V gave to humanism is his great glory in the eyes of profane history. But this trait of his pontificate the Christian historian cannot admire without qualification. By entrusting important offices at the pontifical court to learned and literary men, Nicholas' only aim was to encourage the progress of letters and science. But it came to pass, as Platina says, that "these papal secretaries labored much more for the library than for the Church." [9] And even worse happened. Poggio's *Facetiae* presently revealed the depth of the evil.

The renaissance of ancient arts and letters, if its only effect had been to clothe religious thought with a more perfect form, would have deserved the encouragement of the Roman pontiffs. But this cult of pagan art and literature, entering Italy at the very time when incredible material prosperity was hardening men's hearts,[10] when the collapse of medieval institutions had delivered the peninsula to the mercies of numerous petty tyrants and pitiless freebooters, when the pride of literary and scientific discoveries intoxicated men's minds, became a worship of physical beauty and brutal force and often resulted in the spread of pagan thought, the nourishing of selfish individualism, and the strengthening of a passion for human glory, which insensibly took the place of all other sentiments of heart and mind. The humanists, by their praise of Brutus and Cas-

[9] Platina, *De vitis pontificum,* Nicholas V.

[10] "The fertile soil of Italy," says Guicciardini, "was overflowing with men, merchandise, and riches of all sorts." (*Storia d'Italia,* I, p. 1. Cf. Pastor, V, p. 104.)

sius, everywhere produced to some extent incarnations of their heroes.[11]

Stefano Porcaro, whom contemporaries compared to Catiline, was one of these incarnations. He came of a noble Tuscan family and in his youth was called to fill the honorable functions of captain of the people at Florence. His mind he fed with memories of the Roman Republic. Soon he had only one desire, namely, to restore his country to its ancient liberty. Seditious speeches, delivered openly in Rome, and a popular uprising provoked by him, prompted the Pope to remove him to Bologna under the watchful eye of Bessarion. But one day, after eluding the Cardinal's vigilance, he returned to Rome, gathered his conspirators together, collected a supply of arms, and enlisted a certain number of *bravi* ready for any undertaking. He said to them: "I have decided to rescue you from servitude and bestow wealth upon you." Their plan was to set fire to the Vatican during some great papal ceremony; in the ensuing confusion and disorder they would seize the Pope and, if need be, massacre him.

But the plot leaked out. The conspirators, surrounded in the house where they were gathered, defended themselves desperately; Porcaro was seized in a hiding-place where he had taken refuge. While he was being led in chains to the Vatican, he cried out: "People, will you let your liberator die?" But no one made a move to rescue him. On January 9th he met the death which he so well deserved: he was hanged on the platform of the Castel Sant' Angelo. His last words were: "O my people, this day your liberator dies!"

This event made a deep impression on Nicholas V. Henceforth he never found any quiet of mind. He was like one obsessed with the thought of the ancient republic threatening his life, Rome, and all Christendom. Porcaro's conspiracy took place at the begining of 1453; on July 8th, Rome received word

[11] Pastor, V, p. 134.

of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. This was the catastrophe most dreaded. It meant that Europe was open to the inroads of the infidels. Those Christian peoples who had been given peace with so great difficulty, those monasteries recently reformed, those universities just rising from their ruins, Rome itself again enjoying the splendor of the great Christian feasts, arts and letters flourishing everywhere, that Vatican Library now enriched with so many precious manuscripts—all was perhaps about to perish under the blows of the inexorable enemy of the Christian name.

The emotion of such thoughts crushed the remaining strength of the unfortunate Pontiff. He began to drag himself wearily to the grave. At the hour of his death, during the night of March 24th, 1455, he recovered a surprising dignity and calm. He adjured those about him to labor for the good of the Church; "then Nicholas raised his hands to heaven and said: 'Almighty God, give thy Holy Church a pastor who will uphold her and make her to increase' . . . Then with dignity he raised his right hand and said in a clear, distinct voice, *'Benedicat vos omnipotens Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus'* . . . 'It was long,' says Vespasiano da Bisticci, since any pope had passed in such manner into eternity.' " [12]

Callistus III

The struggle against the threatening power of Islam was the chief objective of the policy of the Holy See during the pontificates of Callistus III, Pius II, Paul II, and Sixtus IV. Upon Mahomet II, the conqueror of Constantinople, depended freedom of navigation on the Mediterranean, the prosperity of commerce with the Levant, the safety of Greece and Hungary, and thereby of all Europe. While secular princes, absorbed in their individual quarrels and immediate interests,

[12] *Ibid.*, II, p. 312.

remained indifferent, the papacy had the honor of taking in hand the general interests of Europe as well as those of the Church. When assuming the tiara (April 8th, 1455), Callistus III, successor of Nicholas V, took a solemn oath "in the presence of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and in the presence of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul," to do his utmost, even should it require the shedding of his blood, to recover Constantinople from the power of Islam.[13]

The feeble old man who made that promise—he was seventy-seven years old—belonged to the time-honored Spanish family of the Borja or, as the Italians spell it, Borgia. Keen intellect, strong will, and physical beauty characterized the men of that race, who, in holiness as in vice, exhibited the extremes of their qualities and gave the world a St. Francis Borgia after an Alexander VI. Callistus III kept his oath to the very day of his death. In the first year of his pontificate he issued a Bull summoning all rulers to the defense of Europe, then menaced by the Turks. But he did more. We see him undertaking at Rome itself the construction and arming of a fleet, turning the banks of the Tiber into shipbuilding yards, and, in spite of ridicule from those who treated his project as chimerical, succeeding in launching (April, 1456) twenty-five vessels carrying a thousand sailors, five hundred soldiers, and three hundred cannon.[14]

[13] D'Achery, *Spicilegium,* III, p. 797.

[14] It has been repeatedly alleged that, in 1456, Callistus III instituted the prayer called the *Angelus* on the occasion of the appearance of the comet whose periodicity has been shown by Halley. "They considered it a certain sign of divine wrath," says Flammarion; "the Mahomedans saw in it a cross, the Christians a yataghan. In so great a danger Pope Callistus III ordered that the bells in all the churches should be rung every day at noon, and he invited the faithful to say a prayer in order to exorcise the comet and the Turks. This custom is still kept up among all Catholic nations. From that time dates the *Angelus.*" (*Popular Astronomy,* p. 479.) The same explanation is given by Guillemin (*The World of Comets,* p. 26) and Arago (*Popular Astronomy,* I, p. 655). In matter of fact, Pope Callistus' action in regard to the comet of 1456 was of an entirely different sort and the

But Germany, more divided than ever, as also France and England, ever on the watch against each other, made no haste to answer the Pope's appeal; three Spanish captains, under orders to engage the Turks in the Aegean Sea, stopped on their way to ravage the Genoese coast;[15] the powerful Duke of Burgundy was satisfied with making fair promises; King Christian of Norway and Denmark and King Alfonso of Portugal looted the funds destined for the crusade; the wealthy republic of Venice, thinking only of its commercial interests, entered into friendly relations with the Sultan and obstructed the Pope's action. Hungary alone, which was hard pressed by the Turks, made a heroic effort. The great Janos Hunyady, ably seconded by the papal legate, Juan Carvajal, and the ardent Friar Minor, St. John Capistran, won some brilliant victories under the walls of Belgrade in 1456. On receipt of this news, several bands of crusaders from Germany, France, England, and other countries set out for the Orient. "The German crusaders were joined," the chronicle of Spires informs us, "by

practice of the *Angelus* had an altogether different origin. Platina (*Lives of the Popes,* p. 385) relates that "there appeared a comet for some days hairy and red; of which when the astrologers said that it portended a great plague, dearth, or some mighty slaughter, Callistus appointed a fast for several days to pray to God that if any judgment hung over them, He would be pleased to avert it and turn it upon the Turks, the enemies of Christianity. He likwise gave orders that God should be supplicated every day, and that a bell should be rung about noon to give people notice when they should join in prayer for the Christians against the Turks." This document is the only source of the legend. There is question neither of a Bull nor of an exorcism of the comet, but simply of dangers that were announced by learned men. We know that scholars of our own day have supposed that the atmosphere of comets contains gases that would be dangerous in the by no means chimerical case that the orbit of the comet's nucleus should meet the earth's orbit. The practice of the *Angelus* was a gradual development in the Church. The ringing of a bell in the evening seems to go back to the thirteenth century and is connected with the custom of curfew. The morning bell is first mentioned in the fifteenth century. The bell at noon was rung, before the time of Callistus III, on Fridays in memory of our Savior's passion. Callistus introduced the practice of ringing it every day. (See Vacant's *Dict. de théologie,* art. *"Angelus"* by Dom Berlière, and *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique,* December 1st, 1909, art. *"Une comète excommuniée."* by Lesêtre.

[15] Pastor, II, p. 365.

crusaders from England, France, and other countries, among whom were 'priests and monks, and they were mostly poor working people.' " [16] In August, 1457, Callistus' courage was revived by a victory of the papal fleet, which captured no less than twenty-five ships at Mitylene.

The heroic Scanderbeg, duke of Albania, continued the exploits of Janos Hunyady, who died August 11th, 1456, in a terrible epidemic and was shortly followed to the tomb by St. John Capistran. Soon after, Scanderbeg was betrayed by his own nephew, Hamsa, who had been seduced by Mahomet and turned against the Christians. In Hungary the discord which broke out between the nobles and the court paralyzed the forces of the country. When Callistus III, after a long illness, which was powerless to abate his courage or diminish his activity, drew his last breath (August 6th, 1458), Islam was victorious.

History owes a tribute of admiration to this Pope for his vigorous activity against the Mussulmans. France is indebted to him for Joan of Arc's rehabilitation, which was solemnly promulgated July 7th, 1456. But his memory cannot be freed from the well-grounded accusation of nepotism. Gregorovius compares the Borgias to the Claudii of ancient Rome. Those sturdy, passionate, pompous, insolent men, with a bull depicted on their coat-of-arms, filled the chanceries. Callistus introduced them into the Sacred College. Cardinal Hergenröther, referring to Callistus' raising two of his nephews to the cardinalate, says: "The new cardinals had not as yet done anything to merit the dignity conferred on them; they were both very young—Rodrigo only five and twenty—their elevation was in itself an unjustifiable action, and the evil was aggravated by the fact that Rodrigo was an immoral and vicious man." [17] This Rodrigo Borgia, who was reproached by Pope Pius II

[16] Quoted by Pastor, II, p. 412.
[17] Quoted by Pastor, II, p. 451.

four years later for his scandalous immorality,[18] became Alexander VI.

Pius II

Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, whom the Sacred College raised to the sovereign pontificate August 19th, 1458, took the name of Pius II. He did not come, like Callistus III, of fighting stock. He was a humanist and a diplomat, and under both aspects renowned throughout Europe. No one was unaware, and he himself honestly acknowledged, that he had need of forgiveness for part of his life, passed in libertinism and schism.[19] He was born in the neighborhood of Siena in 1405 of an impoverished noble family and from childhood was intensely devoted to classical studies.

The young Piccolomini, arriving at Basle as a cardinal's secretary at the age of twenty-six, at once fell under the pernicious influence of pagan humanism and the schismatic spirit. He suffered himself to be drawn into the movement with all the impetuosity of his temperament and all the keenness of his flexible and acute mind. The experience did, in the end, improve his sincere and upright nature. In 1442 he withdrew from his allegiance to the antipope, Felix V, and accepted an appointment in the imperial chancery. His moral conversion followed his political two years later. On March 8th, 1446, he wrote in the following terms to a friend: "He must be a miserable and graceless man who does not at last return to his better self, enter into his own heart, and amend his life: who does not consider what will come in the other world after this. Ah! John, I have done enough and too much evil! I have come to myself; oh, may it not be too late!" [20] It was at this time he was or-

[18] See the letter of Pius II in Pastor, II, p. 452.

[19] Æneas Sylvius, before he became a priest, had two natural children. Pastor, I, p. 342. His *Tractatus de duobus amantibus* is an erotic work.

[20] Pastor, I, p. 344.

dained to the priesthood at Vienna. We know the valuable services he then rendered to the cause of the unity of the Church. When, twelve years later, the choice of the conclave fell upon him, he was overwhelmed. His biographer tells us that the prospect of coming perils weighed heavily on his mind and he took full account of the loftiness of his office.[21] No one knew better than he the evils from which the Church was suffering: in his career as a diplomat and a humanist, he had seen them all too closely.

In the East, the old Greek Empire, whose decrepitude had been a guarantee of security for Europe, gave way to a young, conquering power, animated by a spirit of savage energy.[22] In Italy, the rivalry between the houses of Anjou and Aragon for the kingdom of Naples assumed the proportions of a European conflict because of the family connections of the competitors. At Rome, the freebooter Piccinino with more than twenty bandits like himself was ready to repeat Porcaro's criminal attempt. In France the quasi-schism of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges increased the difficulties in the way of the exercise of papal sovereignty. Bohemia was still being stirred up by the Hussites. Wherever literary culture penetrated, it assumed more and more the character of pagan sensuality and sometimes of open impiety.

Pius II was far from exemplifying the ideal of a saint, in the sense of heroic perfection which we attach to the word. Too much complacency in his own worth appears in his writings, too many genuine weaknesses appeared in his administration, which was often notably influenced by nepotism. But he understood well enough that a pope's programme of reform ought to be founded on a reform of his own life. It is impossible to doubt the sincerity of his faith, his tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the penitential spirit in which he endured his

[21] Campanus, *Vita Pii II*, in Muratori, III, part 2, p. 974.
[22] Heinemann, *Aeneas Sylvius*, p. 2.

many infirmities to the end of his life. When only fifty-three years old, he had the face of a feeble old man. He had contracted gout in consequence of a pilgrimage to a shrine of the Blessed Virgin, which he made barefoot through the snow. This caused him terrible pain, but his dull, pallid features never betrayed it, save by an involuntary twitching of the lips. A celebrated medal by Andrea Guazzalotti of Prato expresses in striking relief the worn, sickly features and dull eyes of his stern face.[23]

The organization of a Crusade against the Turks was one of his first cares. By the Bull *"Vocavit nos Pius"* (October 13th, 1458), he summoned all Christian rulers to meet at Mantua and there agree upon plans for the defense of Christian civilization; this Bull is a masterpiece of noble and moving eloquence. But the rulers of Europe no longer understood such language. A war undertaken for any other purpose than some immediate national advantage seemed meaningless to them. Pius II entered Mantua on May 27th, 1459. Eleven weeks passed without a single one of the great powers sending representatives to the congress; the ambassadors of France and England did not arrive until November; and when they were finally assembled, the Pope had great difficulty in raising the discussions to a loftiness befitting the cause for which he had summoned them.

France demanded that the Holy See should support the claim of its candidate, René of Anjou, to the throne of Naples; Bohemia set forth its complaints against Frederick III; the Germans complained of the increased taxes for the Crusade; Venice specified certain conditions for her participation in the enterprise and treated the affair as a business question. "You have fought well for your allies and subjects against the Pisans and Genoese, against emperor and king," said the Pope, addressing the Venetians; "but now, when you ought to fight for

[23] On the austerity of Pius II's private life, see Pastor, III, p. 31.

Christ against the infidels, you want to be paid." [24] But his words were unavailing; the Venetians persisted in their inadmissible demands. Finally consent was given in principle to a crusade for three years, and the Pope notified the Christian world of the fact by a Bull (January 14th, 1450). But he entertained no illusions. His last words to the congress were a prayer to God: "Almighty, eternal God, who hast deigned to redeem the human race by the precious blood of Thy beloved Son, . . . grant, we beseech Thee, that the Christian princes and nations may so valiantly take up arms against the Turks and other enemies of the Cross that they may be victorious." [25]

Another lofty aim of the Pope encountered no less formidable obstacles. From the outset of his pontificate, plans of reform were drawn up by the illustrious Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa and by the pious and learned Bishop of Torcello, Domenico de Domenichi. The vast project proposed by Nicholas of Cusa looked to a general reformation, from the humblest parish institutions to the papal curia, and even the supreme head of the Church.[26] Nothing escaped the searching eye of the experienced reformer of the Church in Germany, neither the management of church corporations, nor the conduct of hospitals, nor the sale of indulgences, nor the manufacture of relics, nor the system of prebends and benefices, nor the canonical regulations and ecclesiastical customs regarding the dress of the clergy and the recitation of the canonical hours, nor the abuses of the Roman curia, nor the personal duties of the sovereign pontiff. All the measures which were recommended called for a stricter observance of canonical regulations and the Christian spirit.

What especially distinguished the plan of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa was the establishment of a corps of inspectors gen-

[24] Pastor, III, p. 85, who quotes *Pii II comment.*, p. 85.

[25] Pastor, III, p. 99.

[26] The manuscript of this remarkable document is preserved in the State Library at Munich.

eral, "chosen from the ranks of serious men, imitators of Christ, placing justice and truth above all else," who would be so placed as to have nothing to hope or fear from any one.[27] St. Antoninus of Florence, who had just published his celebrated *Summa* of Moral Theology, was called upon by the Pope for his advice on this plan of reform. A Bull was even prepared for the promulgation of the reform. But when on the point of taking the step, Pius II, foreseeing the formidable opposition he would encounter, recoiled and postponed the execution of his project.[28]

Meanwhile he confined himself to the correction of the two abuses which had been the stumbling-blocks of his youth: pagan humanism and opposition to the rights of the Holy See. A large number of scholars, counting on his well-known taste for literary culture, looked forward to an era of favors and privileges at his coming. They were bitterly disappointed. Pius II did not fail to encourage art and letters; but, knowing from experience the fatal tendencies which then prevailed among the humanists, he showed himself very reserved in the matter of the patronage that was asked of him. Later on, some dissatisfied litterateurs made bold to remind him of his earlier sentiments on this matter; but he did not hesitate by a solemn Bull (April 26th, 1463) to retract his former errors in the presence of the Church: "Hear the word of Pius II," he said, "but reject that of Æneas Sylvius" (*Aeneam rejicite, Pium recipite*).

The Dauphin of France, the future Louis XI, before ascending the throne, promised Pius II to abolish the Pragmatic

[27] A summary of this project may be found in Pastor, III, pp. 271 sqq.

[28] In 1894, Emile Chénon wrote: "Callistus III and Pius II, in their preoccupations for the Eastern Church, forgot the reform of the Western Church." (Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* III, p. 342.) Recent scientific investigations in the Vatican Archives no longer permit this assertion to stand. See Celier, *"Alexandre VI et la réforme de l'Eglise"* in the *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome,* XXVII, pp. 65–124, and *Revue des Questions Historiques,* October 1st, 1909: *"L'idée de réforme à la cour pontificale du concile de Bâle au concile de Lateran,"* pp. 418–435.

Sanction of Bourges.[29] In the correspondence between the Pope and the King from the latter's coronation in 1461 to the Pope's death three years later, it is curious to follow the negotiations in which these two great statesmen measured their strength against each other, the monarch promising everything, but with such reservations and implications that he could use them as pretexts for neglecting his promise or for inserting new conditions, the Pope foiling these tricks with tireless skill and patience; Louis giving with one hand what he would take back with the other, Pius II slipping out of his grasp by an ever watchful policy.[30] In 1464, when there was question of two vacant benefices, Louis "requested the Pope to confer them upon Jean Balue, adding that this favorite had already taken possession of them, and that he would himself defend him against all opponents. Pius II refused, and asked the King if he would suffer any one to say to him, 'Give me this castle freely, or I will take it by force.' "

As the Pope grew older, his fearlessness seemed to increase. At times, when he suffered agonizing pains from gout and gall-stones, he could be seen nervously biting his lips, but with never a murmur. He wished, before dying, to give this fifteenth-century world, too much softened by humanism and too absorbed in its material prosperity, an example that would shake it out of its torpor and lead it towards heroism.

Venice, whose interests were endangered by the Turks, had concluded an offensive alliance (September, 1463) with Hungary against the infidels. The Duke of Burgundy promised his support. Upon learning this news, the Albanian hero Scanderbeg, whose very name made the Mussulmans tremble, began a campaign without waiting for the declaration of war. The Pope informed the Christian world that he himself would di-

[29] See his letter in *Opera Aeneae Sylvii*, Basle ed., p. 863.

[30] It is asserted that, in abandoning the Pragmatic Sanction, Louis XI flattered himself that he would win the Pope to the cause of the house of Anjou and would obtain the conferring of the chief benefices in the realm. (Pastor, III, p. 156.)

rect the crusade and would in person march against the Turks. On September 23rd, 1463, he said in the course of an address: "In vain have we cried: Go! Perhaps the cry: Come! will be more effective. Perhaps on seeing a frail, sickly old man, the Vicar of Christ, set out from Rome, Christian princes will be ashamed to remain at home."

A month later he published a Bull in which he appealed to princes and people, not only as head of the Christian religion, but also as representing humanity, civilization, and liberty. From France, Germany, the Netherlands, Scotland, and Spain thousands of the common people set out for Rome to march with the Pope. But the princes and other notables did not share this enthusiasm. Pius II left the Eternal City (June 18th, 1464) and, after a pilgrimage to Assisi, reached Ancona July 19th, in a weak condition. His keenest suffering was the shame of seeing Christendom remain indifferent. Three weeks elapsed without any news of the Venetians. At length, on August 12th, word was brought to the Pope that the Venetian fleet was sighted. Despite the suffering which the least movement caused him, Pius had himself carried to a window overlooking the sea. At sight of the fleet, he said sadly: "Heretofore I lacked a fleet to set out. Now it is I who will be lacking to the fleet." He had only three days more to live. On the feast of the Assumption this great Pope who, even in his early straying, had always loved the Blessed Virgin, quietly breathed forth his soul to God. Although history cannot be unmindful of the grave failings of his youth, it should recognize the greatness of his pontificate.[31]

Paul II

Who would take up the heritage of Pius II? To continue the crusade, restrain pagan humanism, regulate with Louis XI

[31] Rudolf Wolkan has published a critical edition of the letters of Pius II in the *Fontes rerum austriacarum.*

the conditions for abrogating the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, and, if possible, carry out the plans of Nicholas of Cusa and Domenico de Domenichi for the reform of the Church, this was indeed a heavy task, considering the indifference and ill-will which the Holy See everywhere encountered. It was assigned to Cardinal Barbo, who took the name of Paul II (August 30th, 1464).

The new Pope was sprung from a noble Venetian family, a nephew of Pope Eugene IV on his mother's side. He possessed an imposing appearance and distinguished manners and was a "grand seigneur" after the manner of the Venetian merchants, his ancestors, fond of magnificence and display without, however, suffering this defect to injure the purity of his morals, the sincerity of his faith, or the integrity of his government.

Although he did not bring to the war against the Ottomans his predecessor's chivalrous ardor, yet we find him making appeals and adopting numerous measures to gather the money and men needed for a new expedition. But his efforts were almost futile. Not a single European ruler was willing to go to the aid of the heroic Scanderbeg, who for two years had almost single-handed repulsed the repeated attacks of the Turkish forces. After the death of the Albanian hero, in 1468, Mahomet II, filled with confidence, thrust an army of 100,000 men into Greece, while Mahmoud Pasha took to sea with a fleet of almost 400 sails. Paul II repeated his appeal. He made it more pressing when, in July, 1470, the fall of Negropont threw all Italy into terror. It was now the turn of haughty Venice to tremble. But its tense relations with Germany and Hungary were unfavorable to a defensive entente for its advantage. Paul II formed another plan, that of an alliance with the chief of the Turcomans, Uzun Hassan, the avowed enemy of the Turks. The Pope's death, however, prevented his carrying out the plan.

In France, the tactics which Louis XI had employed in his negotiations with the former Pope were renewed with Paul II. He declared the Pragmatic Sanction abolished, but prevented the publication of the papal Bulls in France and threatened to call a council to depose the Pope. When he was reminded of the promises he had made to Pius II, he replied that they did not bind him to Paul II. The University of Paris, moreover, protested against the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction.

The most distinguishing act of Paul II's pontificate was his energetic repression of the pagan and dissolute tendencies of humanism. He reformed the College of Abbreviators, which had been filled with arrogant humanists who asserted that "they gave the papal court a glory as great as that which they received from it." The "Roman Academy," founded by the humanist Pomponius Laetus, "with the aim of spreading a taste for pure Latinity," had become a meeting-place for suspected doctrines and improper ceremonies. The clues of a conspiracy were uncovered there, a plot to put the Pope to death and proclaim the Roman Republic. Paul II had the courage to attack the all-powerful humanists, dissolved the Academy, and arrested one of its leaders, Platina, the author of an odious pamphlet. The humanists took vengeance on the Pope by trying to blacken his memory. But it remains that of an upright and courageous pontiff.

Sixtus IV

Paul was found in his bedroom dying from a stroke of apoplexy, only a moment before he expired (July 26th, 1471). He was succeeded by Cardinal Francesco della Rovere, who took the name of Sixtus IV. A portrait by Melozzo da Forli represents him as a man with broad shoulders and a powerful head, his nose and forehead in a straight line, regular features, deeply wrinkled: his whole attitude indicates uncommon vigor,

whereas the expression of his eyes reveals a generous, almost naïve kindliness. While still young he had entered the Franciscan Order, in which he passed the greater part of his life. The new Pope took no account of his personal needs, but gave with an open hand as long as he had anything to give. It was not long before all his relatives flocked about him to live on him and the Church. Once surrounded by this swarm of parasites, Sixtus IV seemed unable to shake them off or free himself from their exactions; he frequently entrusted responsible offices to them. This was his chief weakness.

His second mistake was his failure to discern clearly enough and to condemn without mercy, as most of his predecessors had done, the pagan elements of the Renaissance. By way of loving and praising the beautiful in art and literature, the Italian of the fifteenth century had come to consider beauty as an end in itself, justified for its own sake. So, too, by devoting himself passionately to military or political activity, he had come to consider the display of personal activity as an end in itself. There is no more morality in Machiavelli's *Principe* than in the *De voluptate* of the humanist Valla.[32] For the pagan humanist of this period, the keeping of an oath is stupid childishness in politics, as respect for modesty is stupid and childish in art.

It was into such surroundings that Francesco della Rovere entered upon quitting the cloister. These politicians and humanists he found among the men most in public favor, among the princes with whom he had to deal; he met them particularly in his own family. The most beloved of his nephews, Pietro Riario, "soon drew upon him the eyes of all Italy, partly by the fabulous luxury of his life, partly through the reports which were current of his irreligion and of his political

[32] *The Prince,* by Machiavelli, was one of the first books placed on the Index by the Council of Trent.

plans." [33] This Pietro Riario regarded himself as free from all moral precept. When cardinalitial posts became vacant by the death of such men as the great Bessarion (d. 1472) and the ascetical Capranica (d. 1478), Sixtus IV replaced them by politicians and humanists. In the very first of his promotions were two of his nephews, Giuliano della Rovere and Pietro Riario, both of them very young, the second one notoriously unworthy.

Notwithstanding these defects, Sixtus IV's political achievements were not without glory. It was during his pontificate that the death of Mahomet II (1481) opened the way to a promising offensive by the Christian army; we see the Pope selling his personal plate to help defray the expenses of the crusade.[34] In 1482, the battle of Campo Morto, coming unexpectedly after deplorable divisions for which the famous Riario, one of the Pope's nephews, was largely responsible, strengthened the power of the States of the Church. In 1483, the peaceful intervention of St. Francis of Paula led King Louis XI to decide against the meeting of a schismatic council.[35]

In the matter of the Spanish Inquisition, the part of Sixtus IV was not so blameworthy as it is often represented. He instituted this tribunal (in 1478) only after the failure of gentler means, to put an end to the incessant disorders provoked by the exactions of falsely converted Jews and by popular reprisals against them. The object of the Inquisition was to end these disturbances by a more regular procedure. If he did not cure all the abuses of this mixed court,[36] in a country

[33] Burckhardt, I, p. 147.

[34] Cf. Pastor, IV, pp. 341, 346, where he refutes Gregorovius, who says that Sixtus IV obstinately confined himself to his territorial policy.

[35] Pastor, IV, p. 377.

[36] On the Spanish Inquisition, see Pastor, IV, pp. 397–404; Hefele, *The Life of Cardinal Ximenez,* pp. 272–400; Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* p. 197. Those Catholic apologists are mistaken who claim that the Spanish Inquisition was a purely political institution. See the refutation of this error in Pastor, *loc. cit.*

where passions were aroused to a high pitch, yet on many occasions he recommended equity and mildness. His appointment of the Dominican friar Thomas de Torquemada in 1483 as Grand Inquisitor was for the purpose of withdrawing the accused so far as possible from the violence of political parties.[37] As for the Pope's fostering protection of arts and letters, "in the history of intellectual culture the name of Sixtus IV must ever find an honorable place together with those of Nicholas V, Julius II, and Leo X. It may safely be said that, in regard to the development of the Renaissance in Rome, Sixtus IV occupies a position similar to that of Lorenzo de' Medici in Florence." [38]

The misfortunes of his pontificate, which were especially those of his times and his relatives, were manifested in the famous conspiracy of the Pazzi. The arrogance of the Medici had long since aroused deep hatred, which was sure to break out sooner or later. The odious conduct of Lorenzo de' Medici, sacking the town of Volterra, appropriating the public revenues to his own use, seizing the chest containing money for the marriage portion of maidens,[39] carried the irritation beyond tolerable bounds. For men who had been feeding their minds with recollections of antiquity and for whom Brutus and Cassius were models, the suggestion was easy. It was well known how Giovanni Maria Visconti, the tyrant of Milan, had been assassinated in 1412, how the Chiavelli, tyrants of Fabriano, had perished in 1435, assaulted during high mass, and how even more recently, in 1476, Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza had been slain in the Church of San Stefano. There

[37] Torquemada has been freely calumniated. But his name does remain attached to the most rigorous period of the Spanish Inquisition. See Hefele, *op. cit.*, ch. 17 and 18. Under his direction, that is during twelve years, about two thousand persons were given to the flames. During that same period, fifteen thousand heretics were reconciled to the Church. Hefele, *op. cit.*, pp. 318 sqq.

[38] Pastor, IV, p. 432.

[39] *Ibid.*, V, p. 116.

were two factions of malcontents in Florence, the one gathered about the Pazzi, who represented the opposition of the old Florentine nobility against the capitalist aristocracy of the Medici, the other about Girolamo Riario, the Pope's nephew, who claimed to represent the interests of the Church. As a matter of fact, Lorenzo might well be considered the soul of all the intrigues against the Pope in Italy. "For any one in my position," he said, "the division of power is advantageous, and, if it were possible without scandal, three or four popes would be better than a single one." [40] He had no dread of schism.

It is related that when the Milanese conspirators decided to do away with Sforza, in 1476, they invoked the protection of St. Stephen.[41] The Florentine conspirators wished at least to be assured of the approbation of the head of the Church. We have an authentic account of the interview that took place on this occasion. "The Pope from the first declared that he wished for a change of government in Florence, but without the death of any man . . . 'On no condition will I have the death of any man' . . . Girolamo then said, 'What is possible shall be done to avoid such a casualty, but if it should occur, will your Holiness forgive its authors?' 'You are a brute,' rejoined Sixtus, 'I tell you I do not desire the death of any man.' " [42] Girolamo insisted no further and withdrew.

It was agreed that, as at Milan and Fabriano, the tyrant should be slain in church during high mass. About the middle of the ceremony, Bernardo di Bandini Baroncelli, one of the conspirators, leaped upon Giuliano de' Medici, crying: "Traitor!" and struck him with a dagger. Giuliano, riddled with the stabs of several knives, was left dead on the spot; but Lorenzo, thanks to his servants who parried the blows with

[40] Archives of Florence, quoted by Pastor, IV, p. 300.
[41] Burckhardt, I, p. 81.
[42] Pastor, IV, p. 304.

their cloaks, was only slightly wounded and found refuge in the old sacristy of the cathedral.

The cruel Medici took his revenge on the innocent; the Pope then issued an excommunication against him; there followed a war with Tuscany. Undoubtedly the Pope was free from all suspicion of complicity in the crime; but for the honor of the papacy it is infinitely to be regretted that the name of Sixtus IV had been mixed up in the plot and that his nephew had been the instigator of such an outrage.

While his relatives so gravely compromised his authority, Sixtus IV, who had been a remarkable General of the Franciscans, was leading the private life of a true religious, laboring to restore the splendor of public worship, showing his zeal for liturgical music by founding the Sistine choir, encouraging devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the use of the rosary, and especially increasing his favors to the religious Orders. In 1484 he approved the severe rule of the Order of Minims, founded by St. Francis of Paula, favored the development of the Brethren of the Common Life, confirmed the Order of Discalced Augustinians, and granted a considerable extension of privileges to the Franciscans by the Bull *"Mare magnum"* and the *Golden Bull.*

Monks and Friars

We must needs take a view of the general state of monasticism at this period in order to understand the meaning and opportuneness of this Bull. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, the monasteries following the Benedictine rule had fallen from their ancient glory and primitive fervor. The more and more numerous exemptions of the great abbeys, their priories, provostships, and correctories, the chapters and parishes dependent on them and the monasteries affiliated to them, had withdrawn a considerable number of ecclesiastical insti-

tutions from the jurisdiction of the bishops and in more than one place had led to violent conflicts.[43] A reaction was urgently needed. Unfortunately it was sought to remedy one abuse by another still worse. *Exemption* was met by *commendation.*[44] The bishops, deprived of all jurisdiction over the abbeys and monasteries, had themselves invested, even though they were seculars, with the abbatial title, free to appoint a vicar for the government of the monks. The kings favored this practice which, under Louis XI, spread over France with amazing rapidity. The abbeys of Saint-Denis, Fecamp, Chaise-Dieu, most houses of the Order of Citeaux, in the middle of the fifteenth century were held *in commendam.*[45] Another evil completed the monastic decadence. The Bull of Benedict XII, which in 1336 so happily grouped the Benedictine houses into several provinces and thus gave effective cohesion to their efforts, had become a dead letter. There was no more common action, almost no general chapters.[46] Each major monastery, having recovered its autonomy, acted only for itself. Particularism had penetrated even into the organization of each community. Besides the collective income, particular incomes were established for the benefit of the priors, cellarers, or sacristans, assuring them of separate revenues. Each office became a benefice. Why should not a secular intrigue for it? The *commenda* offered him the means. In 1481, and again in 1486, the monks of Cluny complained of the increasing intru-

[43] Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la réforme,* II, pp. 189–194.

[44] From the fourth century of the Church, we find the word *commenda* (from *commendare,* "to entrust") used to designate the act of entrusting a vacant benefice to the care of an administrator. This latter, if a layman, was to govern or manage only in temporal matters. This institution, very useful at the time of the barbarian invasions, gave place later on to serious abuses. (See Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 2, bk. 3, ch. 11, 21.)

[45] Imbart de la Tour, p. 198. On the growth of the *commenda* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Thomassin, ch. 20, 21.

[46] On the Bull *"Summi Magistri"* of Benedict XII and its destinies, see Belière, *"Les chapitres généraux de l'ordre de saint Benoit,"* in the *Revue Bénédictine,* 1901–1902.

sion of seculars.[47] At the end of the fifteenth century the Apostolic spirit and zeal seemed to have taken refuge in the mendicant Orders—Friars Minor, Dominicans, Augustinians, Carmelites, and Minims.

There it showed itself with intensity, at times with exuberance. By the enthusiasm which is privileged to the youth of institutions as to the youth of men, by the firmness of a hierarchy whose resources were by no means exhausted, by their very rules which, obliging them to live on alms, made them mingle daily with the people, the mendicants had become a great power, the great regenerating force of human society. The people called them to all its feasts and often commissioned them as interpreters of its demands. When they preached a mission, the town paid their expenses and turned all the police powers over to them.

The Bull *"Mare magnum"* of Sixtus IV, conferring on them the ordinary powers of preaching, hearing confessions, burying the dead, without recourse to the bishops, confirmed all these practices. It became the charter of the mendicant friars. But their apostolate was compromised by the exaggerations of some of their members, who considered themselves the special priests of the faithful, turned their chapels into parishes, and went so far as to claim they were superior to all other pastors of souls;[48] and they also suffered in public esteem by the rivalries that arose between the different mendicant Orders. Their influence was, nevertheless, very great. It was precisely by this Bull *"Mare magnum,"* which some historians so unfairly blame as excessive, that Sixtus IV most effectively labored for the reform of the Church. From the ranks of all these religious Orders, thus favored and encour-

[47] Statutes cited by Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 204.

[48] Brulefer (*In lib. IV sententiarum S. Bonaventurae,* lib. 4, dist. 17, fo. 484) says: *"Mendicantes . . . sunt proprii sacerdotes."* In 1482 a cordelier, Brother Langeli, declared that "the Mendicants are, far more than the parish priests, the pastors of souls." (Cf. Imbart de la Tour, II, 209.)

aged, there arose, with an independence and assurance coming from this mark of confidence, the most zealous and effective preachers of the true reformation.[49]

The picture of popular preaching in the fifteenth century forms one of the most characteristic and interesting episodes of the Renaissance. Leaving to ordinary preachers the care of setting forth the doctrines of religion, the missionary friars engaged solely in preaching a reform of morals. Sometimes in churches, but more usually in the open air, in the public square, before crowded and overflowing throngs and for hours at a time, the Franciscan, Dominican, Augustinian, or Servite friar would attack the evils of the time, accusing the great as well as the lowly, the rich no less than the poor, and would inveigh mightily against pagan immorality.

"The sermons," says Burckhardt, "were moral exhortations, free from abstract notions and full of practical applications, rendered more impressive by the saintly and ascetic character of the preacher. The most powerful argument used was not the threat of hell and Purgatory, but rather the living results of the *'maledizione,'* the temporal ruin wrought on the individual by the curse which clings to wrong-doing. The grieving of Christ and the saints has its consequences in this life. And only thus could men, sunk in passion and guilt, be brought to repentance and amendment—which was the chief object of these sermons . . . The most immediate consequences which follow from the preacher's denunciation of usury, luxury, and scandalous fashions, are the opening of the gaols—which meant no more than a discharge of the poorer debtors—and the burning of various instruments of luxury and amusement, whether innocent or not. Among these are dice, cards, games of all kinds, written incantations, masks,

[49] A Bull to reform the curia, prepared by Sixtus IV and entering into the most precise details, was never published. The text of this Bull is to be found in the national library at Munich.

musical instruments, song-books, false hair, and so forth. All these would be gracefully arranged on a scaffold (*'talamo'*), a figure of the devil fastened to the top, and then the whole set on fire. Then came the turn of the more hardened consciences. Men who had long never been near the confessional, now acknowledged their sins. Ill-gotten gains were restored, and insults which might have borne fruit in blood retracted. Nor did the monks themselves scruple to attack princes, governments, the clergy, or even their own Order . . . In the Piazza del Castello at Milan, a blind preacher from the Incoronata—consequently an Augustinian—ventured in 1494 to exhort Ludovico Moro from the pulpit. There is no want of courageous reproofs addressed even to the Pope in his chapel." [50] Jacopo de Volterra cites a certain Father Paolo Toscanella, who, before the court of Sixtus IV, but in the accidental absence of the Pope, thundered against the Holy Father, his family, and his cardinals. When Sixtus learned of this, says Volaterrani, he merely smiled.[51]

The most celebrated of these orators were, among the Augustinians, Brandolini Lippi and Aegidius of Viterbo; among the Dominicans, Blessed Giovanni Dominici, John of Naples, and that astounding though sometimes vulgar Gabriel Barletta, a preacher possessing such great influence over the masses that a proverb arose: *"Qui nescit barlettare, nescit praedicare."* To put more life into his sermons, he even introduced dialogues: "You, bourgeois, are you a Christian?—Yes, Father; I was baptized in such and such a church.—What is your trade?—I practice usury.—Well, then, if we should put your wife's fine clothes into a press, we would squeeze out the blood of the poor!" [52] In France the Cordeliers

[50] Burkhardt, II, p. 271 and *passim.*
[51] Volaterrani, *Diarium Romanum,* in Muratori, XXIII, col. 173.
[52] Barletta, *Sermones,* fo. 48.

Maillard and Menot preached the most severe truths in a manner no less popular, sometimes even burlesque.

About 1460 the Dominicans devoted themselves more especially to theological study and thus left more room for the Franciscans. We have already mentioned St. Bernardine of Siena and St. John Capistran. Jacques de la Marche († 1476), Roberto of Lecce († 1483), Antoine de Verceil († 1483), Michele Carcano († c. 1485), Blessed Barbardino of Feltre († 1494), and Bernardine de Bustis († 1500) continued their work. In 1494 the Dominican Girolamo Savonarola took up the work of reform with incomparable success.

The labors of the sovereign pontificate ruined the robust health of Sixtus IV. He had an attack of fever in the middle of June, 1484. In the month of August, the defection of Ludovico the Moor, on whose support he counted, was a fatal blow for the Pope. He was heard to murmur: "Ludovico a traitor!" During the night his condition grew worse, and the next day, after receiving holy communion from the hands of his confessor, Blessed Amadeus of Portugal, he quietly breathed his last.

He who has been called "the terrible Sixtus IV," whose name, connected with memories of Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition, has come down to us bearing the curse of more than one historian, does not deserve such a reputation. It is undeniable that in his public life Sixtus often gave the impression of a temporal monarch rather than of a pope, of a Maecenas lavishly bountiful towards literary folk rather than of a reformer of the children of the Church. There were undoubtedly about him plenty of suspicious plots, plenty of blood-spilling and civil war, and if such scandals were those of his time and his relatives rather than of his own person, nevertheless he made the great mistake of not stemming the tide of paganism, but rather opening wide the doors of the

Sacred College to its onrush, and of preparing in a certain measure for the reign of Alexander VI. But by the worthiness of his private life no less than by the intelligent impulse which he was able to give to the true classical renaissance, Sixtus IV deserves our homage. If he personally did little to reform the evils in the Church, yet by his lofty protection of the most active and austere religious Orders, he favored the recruiting of Apostolic workers who would labor for the true reformation.

Innocent VIII

Sixtus IV's death was followed by indescribable tumult. The wrath of the people, who had so long borne the yoke of the Pope's nephews, knew no bounds. The enraged populace rushed to the palace of Girolamo Riario, broke down the doors, sacked the whole place, and left only the walls standing. When this rage quieted down a bit, the conclave assembled. Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, another of the dead Pope's nephews, aspired to the tiara. When he saw that he had no chance to obtain it, he resolutely entered upon intrigues to have a candidate of his own choice elected. The most dubious tactics were possible with men like Raffaele Riario, Ascanio Sforza, Rodrigo Borgia, and Orsini. Giuliano did not recoil before any form of corruption. The negotiations lasted throughout the night (August 28th, 1484) and ended with the written promise of Cardinal Giovanni Battista Cibo to meet all the wishes of his future electors. A few moments afterwards, Cardinal Cibo, the creature of Giuliano della Rovere, was elected pope. It was a triumph of the most shameless simony.[53]

The new Pope, who took the name of Innocent VIII, was descended from a noble Genoese family related to the Dorias.

[53] "The statements of the envoys referring to this matter can nearly all be proved correct." (Pastor, V, p. 238.)

In his youth he had lived licentiously at the court of the kings of Aragon. One son, Franceschetto, and one daughter, Theodorina, were the fruit of an illicit union. But it appears that after his ordination to the priesthood his private conduct was regular; and we get the same impression of his private life throughout his pontificate. But the fact that he stained himself with simoniacal intrigues to obtain the tiara characterized his morality.

Between the pontificate of Sixtus IV, which had a bright side, and that of Alexander VI, in which the very crimes were grandiose and dramatic in their atrocity, the pontificate of Innocent VIII contains little that is striking. He had at heart the material prosperity and good order of Rome and, though without result, assembled a congress for the purpose of organizing a crusade against the infidels. It was in his reign that baptized Jews of Spain, Maraños as they were called, assassinated the inquisitor St. Peter Arbues. King Ferdinand the Catholic summoned all the Israelites to be baptized or leave Spain within four months. A certain number of these exiled Jews betook themselves to Rome, where many of their coreligionists were living in peace. Some of the latter were found even in the papal chanceries. Innocent VIII, when he became aware of this scandal, corrected it.[54]

But under such a leader there could be no question of earnest and thorough reform. A Bull (December 5th, 1484) against practices of sorcery [55] and the condemnation of Pico della Mirandola's errors [56] are the principal documents that can be cited as evidence of this Pope's activity in the matter of reform.

More apparent is the supineness of his government. One of

[54] Pastor, V, p. 347.

[55] It is quite wrong to accuse Innocent VIII of having spread in the Christian world, by this Bull, a belief in sorcery. Many a trial for sorcery took place before that period. The Bull, moreover, possesses no dogmatic character.

[56] See Denzinger, nos. 736–737.

the great scandals of Innocent's pontificate was the solemn marriage of his natural son, Franceschetto, to the daughter of Lorenzo de' Medici in the papal palace. No doubt most of the nobles and dignitaries who were present had not much reason to be scandalized, so accustomed were they, since the days of Sixtus IV, to consider the pope as a temporal ruler. We know from Eneas Sylvius, moreover, that the greater number of reigning princes in his time had been born out of wedlock and that, when Pius II entered Ferrara in 1459, he was received by seven princes, of whom not a single one was the offspring of a licit union.[57] But it was the duty of the head of the Church, of the loftiest representative of Christ on earth, to protest by his example against such immorality.

A still graver scandal—graver, that is, in the consequences that followed from it—appeared in the composition of the Sacred College. When Innocent VIII came into power, the College of Cardinals counted among its members Ascanio Sforza, who dazzled the world by the sumptuous retinue of his house where he entertained with nocturnal festivities, Ballue, a wealthy man of vast ambition, who at his death left a fortune of 100,000 ducats, and Rodrigo Borgia who, to everyone's knowledge, had illicit relations with a Roman woman, Vanozza Catanei. Under the new Pope the College of Cardinals acquired several other prelates no less suspect of worldliness and immorality.

On one occasion Innocent VIII promoted to the purple a natural son of his brother Lorenzo and a young son of Lorenzo de' Medici, Giovanni, barely seventeen years old. Lorenzo de' Medici, who had solicited this appointment with much insistence, when the time came for his young son to enter such an assembly, felt the old childhood sentiment of faith arise from the depth of his heart, along with the apprehensions of his paternal solicitude; he could not refrain from addressing a

[57] Cited by Pastor, V, p. 114.

letter full of prudent advice to the young cardinal. "My son," he wrote, "you will not lack about you councillors, tempters, and envious persons, who will strive to drag you into the abyss into which they themselves have fallen. You should the more heartily undertake to confound these people, as the Sacred College is at present the more devoid of good qualities. I can remember seeing that college composed of men eminent in learning and virtue; you would do well to follow their example."

The preaching friars, however, continued to raise their voices against the evils of the times. In addition to Blessed Bernardine of Feltre and Bernardine de Bustis, there was heard another voice, more sonorous in its accents and more terrible in its threats: that of the Dominican Savonarola.

Savonarola

Girolamo Savonarola was born in 1452 of a noble family of Ferrara. In childhood he manifested an ardent and pensive nature. A Franciscan's sermon, which he heard at the age of twenty-three, prompted him to quit the world and dedicate himself to God. He entered the Order of St. Dominic. When departing from home, he left on his table a treatise, *On Contempt for the World,* full of invectives against a society which he had merely glimpsed at, and in which he had discovered only shame and crime. Before the end of the first year of his religious life, another work came from his pen, a poem *On the Decline of the Church,* in fiery verses that lashed the pride and cupidity which had penetrated into the very sanctuary. "What is to be done to avenge such iniquities?" asked the poet friar. A heavenly virgin answered him: "Keep silent and weep."

But he soon broke this silence. In 1482 Brother Savonarola was sent by his superiors to Florence to preach. Under the

rule of Lorenzo de' Medici, Florence was the most worldly city of Italy. Pagan art and music had invaded even Christian temples. Vasari speaks of a picture of St. Sebastian, painted by Baccio, which was a real scandal in the church where it was exposed.[58] The humble friar, in going through the city, might have met on feast days, amidst a gallant cavalcade, a brilliant knight, having a precious sword hanging at his side, surrounded by masqueraders, singers, and mercenaries taken from the dregs of the *bravi;* this worldly knight was a cardinal of the Holy Roman Church.

It needed less than this to inflame the fiery Dominican's indignation. With abrupt eloquence, disdainful of literary ornamentation, with awkward and jerky gestures, and a strong harsh voice marked by the rough accent of Lombardy, Brother Girolamo thundered against the vices of the world. The Florentines, who were at that time tasting the harmonious and flowery speech of Fra Mariano, the eloquent Franciscan friend of the humanists, failed at first to appreciate the new missionary. But he did not for that reason leave off. Preaching a commentary on the Prophets and the Apocalypse, he readily departed from the habitual form of sermons. His discourses were largely made up of descriptions of the lax morals of the day, followed by biting invectives and terrible threats. It was especially during two missions which he preached near Siena, in 1485 and 1486, that the peculiar genius of his harangues and the inspired prophetic tone of his words were developed.

When Savonarola returned to Florence, in 1490, to give a series of sermons on the Apocalypse from the pulpit of San Marco, the power of his eloquence, now riper and more confident, conquered his hearers. A sudden change took place. The churches could no longer hold the crowds thronging about his pulpit. That sallow complexion, that bony frame, that eagle

[58] Vasari, *Lives of Seventy of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects,* III. p. 74.

nose, those gleaming eyes, those rapid and cutting gestures of a skinny hand, which had made his first hearers smile, now captivated the people; when his emotional voice announced the great punishment of the Church, the gathering burst into tears. The most pagan of the humanists came to hear him and often went away striking their breasts, like that painter Baccio, the sensual author of the St. Sebastian of Florence, who was converted by Brother Girolamo and became the great Christian artist, Fra Bartolommeo. Lorenzo de' Medici himself, whose soul had a depth of generosity, testified his esteem for the ardent Dominican and, had it not been for the uncompromising impetuosity of the monk, might have been converted by him.[59]

Fra Savonarola often presented his threats under the form of visions and prophecies; and he seems to have believed in the authenticity of his office of seer and prophet. During Advent, 1492, he declared that he had heard a voice of thunder coming from heaven and saying: "The sword of the Lord is threatening the earth." Then there fell, he said, a shower of swords in the midst of flaming air, and the most terrible evils spread upon the earth. Six months afterward, Pope Innocent VIII, after asking his cardinals' pardon for not having attained the height of his too heavy task and after receiving the holy viaticum with tears in his eyes, breathed his last (July 25th, 1492). To replace him, the eyes of the Sacred College turned to Rodrigo Borgia.

[59] It is certain that, in 1492, Lorenzo de' Medici, on his deathbed, sent for Savonarola. As to the fact that Savonarola imposed on him as a penance that he give Florence her liberty and as to Lorenzo's refusal, see Villari, *Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola,* I, pp. 148, 168 sq.; Perrens, *Jérome Savonarole,* pp. 64–67. In the present state of critical study it seems impossible to affirm anything about the matter with certainty.

CHAPTER VIII

1492–1503

Alexander VI

At the close of a seven-day conclave, during which intrigue and bargaining entered into agreements and combinations of all sorts, Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, whose irregular life was known to all, became the choice of the Sacred College.[1] Paganism, after having invaded the Roman Curia, at length ascended the very throne of St. Peter.[2]

It is surprising that in the official reports of ambassadors and in the chronicles of the time this election is mentioned without the least allusion to the morals of the newly elected Pope. This very absence of scandal is perhaps the greatest scandal of all. The sacred character of the loftiest ecclesiastical offices seemed to be veiled from the eyes of contemporary historians and statesmen; they judge a cardinal's or a pope's life as they would that of a temporal prince, and the indulgent tolerance of worldly opinion, which is almost unbounded for whatever concerns the private life of the great, quite naturally was extended to the pope himself.

Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia was not without the natural quali-

[1] He was of Spanish origin, born in 1430 or 1431 at Jativa, about thirty-four miles from Valencia. Through his father he belonged to the Lenzuoli family, and through his mother to the Borja, or Borgia. He took this latter name when his maternal uncle, Callistus III, was elected pope.

[2] The acts of simony attaching to the election of Alexander VI, have at times been doubted or denied. Leonetti, *Papa Alessandro VI,* I, p. 60; Cerri, *Borgia ossia Alessandro VI,* p. 94; Nemec, *Papst Alexander VI,* p. 81; *Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques,* XIV, p. 141; *Rassegna Nazionale,* X, p. 133. But the documents which Pastor, (V, p. 382) has brought to light on this subject admit of no reply.

ties that befit a statesman. Hartmann Schedel speaks of the new Pope as "a large-minded man, gifted with great prudence, foresight, and knowledge of the world." Thanks to his widespread acquaintance with men, he appeared conspicuously suited to be a ruler. It could be said in his praise that there was something lofty and superb in his very appearance.[3]

The people acclaimed him with splendid ovations. Hieronymus Portius wrote: "He is tall, in complexion neither fair nor dark; his eyes are black, his mouth somewhat full. His health is splendid, and he has a marvelous power of enduring all sorts of fatigue. He is singularly eloquent in speech." [4] Another contemporary says that "he was exceptionally affable in conversation and admirably skilled in financial matters." [5]

The beginning of Alexander's pontificate did not disappoint the hopes generally placed in him. Preliminary to any internal reform of the Church, there was a political task to be undertaken: to assure the papacy's independence of the Roman factions and Italian tyrants. To this task the new Pope devoted himself with all the energy of which he was capable. In the short interval between the last relapse of Innocent VIII and the coronation of his successor, more than 220 murders had been committed. Alexander ordered a thorough investigation, appointed commissioners to receive complaints from the inhabitants, gave audiences himself to all who had any claims to present to him.[6] At the same time he reorganized the finances, reduced the expenses of the papal court, and kept such a frugal table that the cardinals eschewed his invitations to dinner.[7]

[3] Schedel, *Chronic. chronicar.*, quoted by Pastor, V, p. 395.

[4] *Ibid.*, V, p. 388.

[5] Sigismondo dei Conti da Foligno, *Le storie de suoi tempi*, II, pp. 53, 268, 270.

[6] Infessura, *Diario della città di Roma*, p. 282, in Tommasini, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, and Muratori, *op. cit.*, III, part 2.

[7] The Ferrarese ambassador wrote to his master in 1495 as follows "He [the Pope] partakes of but a single dish, though this must be a rich one. It is, consequently, a bore to dine with him. Ascanio and others, especially Cardinal Mon-

Amid the petty, jealous, turbulent, independent, constantly warring states of which Italy was composed, Rome and the papal domain had much to fear. The Pope used his first available funds to strengthen his strongholds. He fortified Civitavecchia. In May, 1493, the expenses for military purposes reached 26,383 ducats.[8] Whenever the Italian States were at strife, the weaker ones were accustomed to summon foreign aid. The foreigner was the emperor of Germany or the king of Spain or the king of France. In 1492 one of the most dreaded soldiers of fortune in Italy, Ludovico Sforza, whose sun-burnt complexion had won him the name of Ludovico the Moor, proposed to King Charles VIII of France "a secret and private league." [9] But Alexander was on the watch. In April, 1493, he was at the head of a league which rallied Venice, Milan, Ferrara, and Mantua about the Holy See.[10]

Even in carrying out this purely political undertaking, the Pope's moral defects were an obstacle and we soon behold so great talents and efforts lead, not to independence, but to absolutism under the brutal hand of Caesar Borgia, his third son.[11]

His Nepotism

Not satisfied with continuing his dissolute habits after his election to the sovereign pontificate,[12] Alexander VI had an

reale, who formerly were his Holiness' table companions, and Valenza too, broke off this companionship because his parsimony displeased them, and avoided it whenever and however they could." (Gregorovius, *Lucretia Borgia,* p. 94.)

[8] Pastor, V, p. 407.

[9] Lemonnier in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* V, part I, p. 25.

[10] Burchard, *Diarium,* II, p. 67; Infessura, p. 284; Pastor, V, p. 408.

[11] Caesar is often given as Alexander's second son. He was, in fact, the third. See Pastor, V, p. 364.

[12] Before his elevation to the pontificate, Rodrigo Borgia had, of Vanozza de Cataneis, four children: Juan, Caesar, Jafre, and Lucretia; and of another woman he had Pedro, Luis, and Girolama. He later had two more sons, Juan about 1497 and Rodrigo in 1503. The eldest of Alexander's sons was Pedro, who died about 1490. For further information as to the children of Alexander, see Pastor, V, p.

unbounded affection for his illegitimate offspring, who were placed in high office by him and who even formed his pontifical family. We see him sacrifice everything to assure the most advantageous and lucrative offices to his children, his relatives, and those connected with them by marriage; in fact to all who were attached to the Borgia family. The Pope was surrounded by this swarm of parasites whose cupidity formed a common bond. The nepotism of Callistus III was now surpassed. "Ten papacies," wrote Gianandrea Boccario three months after Alexander's accession, "would not have sufficed to provide for all these cousins." [13] The Sacred College was presently filled with favorites whose lives were like unto his own. Cardinal Peraudi said to the Florentine envoy: 'When I think of the lives of the Pope and some of the cardinals, I shudder at the idea of residing at the Court." [14]

There were no bounds to the Pope's passionate attachment to his daughter Lucretia, whom, during an absence from Rome, he even entrusted with the government of the Apostolic Palace,[15] and to his son Caesar, who was the pride of his life. Never could he refuse anything to Lucretia's smiling gaiety, and he was always subdued by the imperious dominance of his son Caesar. This son was his father's evil genius. He was taciturn, impenetrable, always wore a mask to hide, so it was said, the purulent spots of a shameful disease,[16] and was endowed with such herculean strength that he was known to have cut off the head of a powerful bull at a single stroke of the

363. Leonetti (*Papa Alessandro VI*) and Ollivier (*Le Pape Alexandre VI et les Borgia*) have tried to exculpate Alexander from the charge of immorality. But they have been refuted by H. de l'Epinois (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1881, vols. XXIX and XXX) and Pastor. Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 8th ser., vol. IX, March 15, 1873, and Paquier, *Dict. de théol.*, under the word *"Alexandre VI."*

[13] Pastor, V, p. 398, according to a document of the consistorial archives.

[14] Quoted by Pastor, V, p. 492.

[15] This excessive attachment led to odious calumnies, from which the Protestant historian Gregorovius has vindicated the memory of Alexander VI and Lucretia Borgia. (See Gregorovius, *op. cit.*)

[16] Pastor, *Histoire des papes*, (French trans.) V, p. 388.

sword. He was usually accompanied by his confidential assassin, Don Michelotto.[17]

Manifestly such a pope was unfit to labor for the reform of the Church. He had need to begin by reforming himself. Alexander had another defect: his election had been simoniacal. The very men against whom he should have turned with severity were ready to reproach him to his face with that crime. Savonarola did not fail to do so.

This impotence of the papacy led the people to turn their eyes, in the hope of reform, toward some powerful king or mysterious prophet. Hence, the welcome given in Italy to King Charles VIII and especially to the friar Savonarola.

King Charles VIII of France

At the death of King Ferrante of Naples, in 1494, Charles VIII usurped the throne and threatened the Pope to call a council if the Holy See should uphold the claims of his rival, Alfonso. To help realize his scheme, the King of France made sure of the alliance of the Colonna family and of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. The latter was Alexander's most powerful foe, succeeding him under the name of Julius II. Through the good offices of Giuliano, other cardinals were won, with whose assistance it might be possible to call a council and depose the Pope as guilty of simony. Public sympathy would be gained by finally accomplishing the reform of the Church. But so deep and vast a reform, carried out by this poor king, whose mind was as misshapen as his body, whom the Florentine Della Casa declared to be "an incapable monarch, influenced by the first comer," and by that worldly, ambitious, irascible cardinal who bore on his body the marks of the same shameful disease as Caesar Borgia,[18] was a thoroughly chimerical scheme. But

[17] On Caesar Borgia, see Burckhardt, vol. I.

[18] Pastor, *Histoire des papes,* (French trans.) V, p. 388.

Alexander VI was frightened. In June, 1494, Cardinal Sforza wrote to his brother: "The Pope is in the greatest alarm at the efforts of Cardinal Giuliano to support the calling of a council." [19]

Alexander received the French King's ambassadors with every possible courtesy and consideration, hoping in this way to pacify their master. Charles VIII, however, was too deeply plunged into his ambitious enterprises to withdraw. It was said that he aimed at the conquest of the kingdom of Naples "so as to squeeze Italy as in a vice between old France and his new possession, reduce the papacy to the position of a French dependency, and rise to be the master of Europe." It was also said that the Italian war was "the fatal consequence of an attraction which held sway over the minds of French kings for two centuries and kept their eyes turned towards the peninsula." [20] Statesmen who were responsible for the French policy took account of the situation: many Italians, tired of the state of anarchy and political collapse in which they were living and impatient to see a reform in the Church, were ready to welcome anyone who would present himself as a liberator and reformer.

The French army met so little resistance on its way that Philippe de Commines on several occasions expressed his astonishment: "God himself," he wrote, "is protecting our expedition!" Scarcely had the French set foot in Tuscany, when Savonarola, from the pulpit of the Florence cathedral, cried out: "The sword has come! The prophecies are being fulfilled; it is the Lord who leads these armies!" On November 9th, the Florentines arose with the cry of "The people and liberty!" Piero de' Medici took to flight. To save the city, Savonarola hastened to the French camp and, standing before the King, addressed these words to him in resonant voice and prophetic

[19] A letter in cypher, published by Pastor, *History of the Popes,* V, p. 426.
[20] Delaborde, *Expédition de Charles VIII en Italie.*

tone: "Most Christian King, God sends you to reform the Church, which lies prostrate. But if you are not just, if you respect not the city of Florence, the Lord will lay a heavy hand upon you." Charles VIII had a great veneration for the friar who had announced his coming and foretold his success. He promised to respect Florence, its women, its citizens, its liberty;[21] the city was adorned with flags and welcomed the King of France with cries of "Viva Francia!" when he made his entry on November 17th.[22]

Two days later Rome itself was surrounded and cut off. From his windows Alexander could see the horses of the French army galloping to and fro outside the city walls. He retired to the Vatican with his faithful Spanish guard. The fear of a coming council, convoked by the King of France and deposing him as simoniacal, must have disturbed him more than ever. In reality, Charles VIII had not the ambition credited to him, because he did not feel the power to attain it. "He was a young man," says Commines, "and incapable of performing so important a work as the reformation of the Church."[23] But he profited by the panic and increased his threats. The Pope agreed (January 15th, 1495) to sign a treaty of peace containing hard conditions, for they obliged him to respect the possessions and benefices of his foes, notably of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. But the gravest of all his fears had been allayed: he was officially recognized by the King of France.

The impatient partisans of reform who had placed their hope in Charles VIII were dissatisfied. At Siena, Savonarola inveighed against the King: "Most Christian Prince," said he, "thou hast provoked the Lord to anger by breaking faith with the Florentines, by forsaking the task of reforming the Church . . . Shouldst thou fail to resume thy abandoned task . .

[21] Villari, *Savonarola,* I, p. 226.
[22] *Ibid.,* I, p. 232; Delaborde, p. 447.
[23] Commines, *Memoirs,* II, p. 158.

still heavier woes shall be poured on thee by His wrath." [24]

The French, however, gratified with their easy victory in Italy, amused themselves, organized jousts and festivities, when of a sudden the States of the peninsula arose. In the doge's palace at Venice, a league was signed (April 1st, 1495), including the Pope, the Emperor, the King of Spain, Ludovico the Moor who resumed the title of King of Naples, and the Republic of Venice. The French King might well cry out: "It is a great shame!" After the battle of Fornovo, he lost no time in regaining France. He brought back from this expedition, says Commines, "only glory and smoke." As for the faithful, who, like Savonarola, were hoping for a reform of the Church through a change in the government of Italy, they were completely disappointed.

Alexander again took up his struggle against the Italian nobility. Unhappily this was a new occasion for the Pontiff to heap riches and honors on his relatives. To fight the powerful Orsini family, he summoned his son Juan, duke of Gandia. But the latter was quite incompetent. Having been appointed captain general of the papal forces, he allowed his army to be cut to pieces. The Pope then invested him with the duchy of Benevento, thus alienating a domain of the Church in Juan's favor. Prudent and pious men groaned. "If God does not reform His Church," wrote Cardinal Peraudi, "I despair of the future." [25]

Murder of the Duke of Gandia

There was indeed need for reform. At the very time Peraudi wrote his sad reflection (June 8th, 1497), the Pope appointed Caesar Borgia as ecclesiastical legate to Naples and commissioned him to represent the Holy See at the coronation of

[24] Villari, II, p. 11; Commines, bk. 8, ch. 3.
[25] Thuasne, *Burchardi diarium*, II, p. 668.

the new king. The Borgia family dominated Italy and blusteringly gloried in its power.

Six days later was enacted a mysterious drama, which caused Caesar Borgia to be suspected—though it would seem mistakenly—of not stopping even at fratricide to make sure his right of primogeniture and thereby, murmured some of his enemies, of the succession to the papal throne.

On June 14th, Caesar Borgia had supper with his brother, the Duke of Gandia, his cousin Cardinal Juan Borgia, and several friends at the house of his mother, Vanozza, in the vicinity of San Pietro in Vincoli. About midnight the two brothers mounted their mules and set out for the papal palace. Near the Cesarini palace, the Duke of Gandia took leave of his companions. He was seen going away, followed by a squire and a masked man whom he had brought to the banquet; then he disappeared into the night. The following morning, in the same locality, the squire was found covered with wounds and unable to speak. As for the Duke, he had disappeared. They found only his mule and his stirrups bent out of shape. In the evening a wood-merchant related that about two o'clock in the morning he had seen a horseman, escorted by four men, advance to the bank of the Tiber and throw a body into the stream. On the 16th, some boatman drew out of the water the mutilated corpse of the Duke of Gandia, pierced with nine deep wounds. While common rumor accused the Orsini, some suspected Cardinal Sforza, and others attributed the outrage to the vengeance of some jealous Roman whose home had been dishonored by the Pope's son. The Venetian Dono Capello wrote with rash recklessness: "It is Caesar who threw his brother into the Tiber after cutting his throat." A German historian, Gregorovius, accepted this last supposition. But to-day it is universally abandoned. The more probable opinion is that the Duke of Gandia, whose misconduct was notorious,

was the victim of an ambush in one of his escapades.[26]

The Pope was deeply affected. For three days he did not leave his room, weeping and refusing all food. "We would give seven tiaras," he said, "to be able to recall him to life." In a letter to the King of Spain, he spoke of abdication.[27] But Ferdinand dissuaded him from this desperate plan. He then took a more manly and Christian resolve. To the cardinals and ambassadors he announced: "We, on our part, are resolved to amend our own life and to reform the Church." [28]

On June 19th, Alexander appointed a commission of cardinals charged with the duty of preparing a scheme of reform. At the beginning of August, the Pope was the first to give the example: he declared that he would no longer tolerate about him either his children or nephews, and he sent even his daughter Lucretia to Valencia. Then the drafting of a mighty Bull of reform quite absorbed him.[29]

"By the providence of God," he says, "we have been raised on the watch-tower of the Apostolic See in order that in one measure we should exercise our pastoral office by removing what is bad and promoting what is good. Therefore, with our whole soul we desire an amendment in morals. . . . We mean

[26] Caesar's guilt, admitted by Gregorovius (*Lucretia Borgia,* p. 106), is denied by Leonetti (*Papa Alessandro VI*), Maury (*Revue Historique,* XIII, p. 87), H. de l'Epinois (*ibid.,* p. 403), Balan (*Storia d'Italia,* p. 372), Reumont (*Geschichte der Stadt Rom,* III, p. 225), Hoefler (*Rodrigo de Borgia,* p. 79), Brosch (*Alexandre VI,* pp. 370, 372), and Pastor (V, pp. 497, 512). Except Gebhart (*Revue des Deux Mondes,* LXXXIV, p. 918) and *Histoire générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud (IV, p. 15), no modern historian sustains the opinion of Gregorovius. Caesar, who was on the road to the highest honors, had nothing to gain by slaying his brother. On the contrary, he had every reason to fear the consequences of such a crime. The supposition that he thus was clearing the way to the papacy is most unlikely, as he was, at that very time, entertaining the idea of quitting the clerical state, a project that he carried out soon after.

[27] A letter of Lod Carissimi (August 8th, 1492) which was first published by Pastor, V, p. 500.

[28] Report of the Venetian ambassador, quoted by Pastor, V, p. 500. Cf. Sanudo, *I diarii,* I, p. 653.

[29] Some extracts from this Bull were found in the secret papal archives and published by Pastor (*History of the Popes,* V, pp. 514 sqq. and appendix 41).

to begin with the reform of our own court, which is composed of members of all Christian nations and should be an example of virtue to all. For the inauguration of this most necessary and long desired work, we have selected six of the best and most God-fearing of the cardinals. With their assistance we publish the following ordinances."

After this preamble, the Pope takes up the regulation of divine service in the papal chapel, decrees severe measures against simony, provides at length for the reform of the College of Cardinals and officials of the court. "We see in all these prescriptions the result of Alexander's experience in the vice-chancellorship. He knew what bitter feelings had been aroused in all parts of the world by the corrupt practices of the secretaries of the court." [30]

This Bull never advanced beyond the status of a project. With the lapse of time, the grief and remorse in Alexander's soul gradually faded away. The unfortunate Pontiff did not possess the strength of will to break completely with so scandalous a past as his, with so many and so captivating attachments. Once the first emotion had passed, he yielded: the demons of voluptuousness and ambition again took up their sway over his soul and "his last state became worse than the first."

Caesar again took his place at court, the more exacting as his situation had for a moment been the more endangered. It soon became known that he was going to quit the purple and wed a princess. In December, 1487, Lucretia obtained a declaration of nullity of her marriage to Giovanni Sforza. There was nothing which the Pope was not ready to grant his sons: he had become their slave. Nasty rumors were in circulation concerning the Borgia house, even to the point of an accusation of "an unmentionable crime," [31] false though it was.

[30] Pastor, V, p. 518.

[31] Gregorovius, p. 109. We saw above that Gregorovius regarded as pure calumny the charge of incest against the Pope.

Popular report spoke of strange manifestations of the powers of darkness. Some there were who declared that on June 14th, 1497, they had seen torches flitting hither and thither in the interior of St. Peter's basilica, carried by invisible hands. Unusual noises, it was said, were heard in the churches. Was it not a significant manifestation of the powers of darkness that, on October 29th, lightning struck the powder magazine of Castel Sant' Angelo and shattered the statue of St. Michael? [32] Such a state of mind favored the success of the new prophet in Florence, from whom alone the great reformation was now expected.

Savonarola

Since the ocupation of Florence by the French and the abandonment of the city by the Medici, its condition had become lamentable. The Florentines, suddenly finding themselves free and masters of themselves, fell into a sort of confusion and disorder: a disorder which seemed the more hopeless as a young school of politics, later represented by the celebrated names of Machiavelli and Guicciardini, was elaborating, in all the effervescence of its formation, the most diverse and rash conceptions.

By the very force of things, the popular preacher of the San Marco monastery was led to speak of what was occupying everyone's mind. Savonarola at first hesitated, undecided. "O my people," he said, "thou knowest that I have always refrained from touching on the affairs of the state; thinkest thou that I would enter on them at this moment, did I not deem it necessary for the salvation of souls?" [33] On December 12th, 1494, he entered the domain of politics and set forth the following principles: "An absolute monarchy is the best

[32] Thuasne, *Burchardi diarium*, II, p. 411.
[33] Sermon XIII, in Villari, I, p. 262.

of all governments under a good prince, but the worst under a bad one. . . . These principles should be modified according to the nature of the people to whom they are applied. Among northern nations, where there is great strength and little intellect, and among southern nations, where, on the other hand, there is great intellect and little strength, the rule of a single despot may sometimes be the best of governments. But in Italy, and above all in Florence, where both strength and intellect abound, where men have keen wits and restless spirits, the government of one can only result in tyranny. . . . Your reform must begin with spiritual things." [34] In connection with this last principle, the "prophet," as he was commonly called, indignantly inveighed against the famous saying of Cosimo the Elder, that "States are not governed by Pater Nosters."

In his sermons on the Psalms, which he began preaching on January 6th, 1495, political advice is mingled with religious counsel. It was in accordance with Savonarola's recommendations that the arbitrary imposts of 1427 were replaced by a new tax of ten per cent. on real estate and that the court of the Mercananzia (Commerce) was reorganized. The drafting of a new code of commerce was due to his initiative. In December, 1495, he had a monte di pietà (pawnshop) established.

We find him employing words of extreme violence against tyranny and anarchy, which he considered closely related. "Tyrant," he said, "is the name of a man who leads a detestable life. A tyrant is ruled by pride, lust, and greed. A tyrant contains within him all the vices that man is capable of; all his senses are corrupted: his ears by flattery, his taste by gluttony, his eyes by indecency. Public offices he buys, orphans he robs, and the people he oppresses. And you, fellow citizen, who are in subjection to him, are no less wretched than he is: your tongue is enslaved when speaking to him; your eyes are en-

[34] Villari, I, p. 261.

slaved when looking at him; your property is his; and, if he strikes you, you must forsooth, say: 'Thanks!' " [35]

Savonarola hated no less the Florentine practice according to which at certain times the people, summoned by the bell, met together unarmed in the public square to pass laws. Such a meeting was called the *parlamento*. In reality, under this appearance of liberty, the people became a docile tool in the hands of a few powerful and ambitious citizens. Nothing could equal the friar's vehemence when speaking of the *parlamento*. "Come forward, my people! Art thou not sole master now?—Yes!— . . . Keep ye this in mind and teach it to your children. And thou people, at the stroke of the bell calling thee to Parliament, rise and draw thy sword. . . . If he that would summon a Parliament be of the Signory, let his head be cut off; if he be not of it, let him be proclaimed a rebel and all his goods confiscated. . . . Should the Signory seek to call a Parliament, the instant they set foot on the ringhiera, they shall no longer be considered the Signory, and all may cut them to pieces without sin." [36]

What, then, was the authority which the ardent preacher wanted to establish at Florence? On Palm Sunday, 1496, he set it forth clearly. After an eloquent discourse, the friar held up a crucifix before the people, saying: "Florence, behold the King of the world! He wishes to be your King. Do you want Him?" An immense acclaim was his reply. When the preacher left the pulpit, many burst into tears. From that moment Christ was the King of Florence. The Florentine government had this memorable inscription carved above the door of the palace where it resided: *"Jesus Christus, Rex florentini populi senatusque decreto electus"* (Jesus Christ, King by the will of the people and senate of Florence.)

[35] Sermon preached February 25th, 1496.
[36] Villari, I, p. 292.

From this moment onward, the influence of Savonarola, speaking in the name of Christ the King, was unbounded. If he preached against the luxury of the age or the paganism of art, the people came in throngs to cast at his feet musical instruments, pictures, poems, perfumes, cloth of rare texture, and rich lace. The ardent Dominican, repeating a spectacle that many missioners had enacted before him, made a bonfire of all these objects of vanity: it was what they called the *brucciamento delle vanità,* the "bonfire of vanities." During the carnival of 1497, he constructed in the Piazza della Signoria a huge octagonal pyramid, 150 feet high and 600 feet wide. On fifteen steps were placed the objects brought by the inhabitants of Florence: harps, lutes, viols, guitars, perfumes, pomades, and cosmetics, works of pagan poets and frivolous humanists, indecent pictures of the young Florentine school. At the foot of the pyramid were heaped twigs, tow, and gunpowder. A band of children dressed in white went in procession around the monument, singing canticles. Then, at a given signal, the four corners of the "bonfire of vanities" were lighted. When the first flame and smoke shot heavenward, the bells began to ring, the trumpets of the Signory resounded, and a tremendous shout of triumph came from all throats, as if the empire of Satan had been annihilated.

Savonarola's influence had not failed to stir up violent rivalry about him and his ardent disciples. Not counting the followers of the Medici and those devoted to the Franciscans, who rallied about Fra Mariano, a new party was formed, that of the *Arrabiati,* "the enraged," ready to dare anything against the ardent Dominican. Songs, sonnets, pamphlets, in prose and verse, all were used to attack the preacher.

The Friar of San Marco, urged by his disciples, the *Frateschi,* who formed a perpetual guard about him and had a sort of worship for him, being carried away by his impetuous temperament, did not always preserve due moderation in his

words and deeds. His moral preaching became more and more exacting, going so far as to require people of the world to observe the strictest rules of monastic life; we see him forcing women into the convents in spite of their husbands' unwillingness. Some of the youth devoted to him went from street to street, entered private houses, overturned gaming tables, smashed harps and other musical instruments, and reported to Savonarola the names of offenders, who were always punished with severity.[37] A vast inquisition enveloped the city of Florence. Savonarola's great mistake in his reformatory efforts was to attack at one and the same time all the existing abuses and to try to abolish them without any transition or period of preparation.

His invectives became more and more frequent and vehement. So long as they were addressed only to the tyrants and demagogues whose crimes were so great in that Italy of freebooters and *bravi,* the friar could be blamed only for a certain excess of language. But, as we know, the abuses had another center, loftier than that. The impassioned apostrophes of the daring orator soon mounted the papal throne. "If he who sits on the chair of Peter," he said, "is found to be in manifest opposition to the law of the Gospel, I will say to him: 'You are not the Roman Church; you are but a man and a sinner.'" He maintained that, as Alexander's election was null because tainted with simony, the orders of Rodrigo Borgia had no authority to bind him, and he appealed to a general council. The Pope forbade him to preach; Savonarola at first submitted, then disobeyed the command. He wrote to the Pope (March 18th, 1498): "Being no longer able to hope for anything from your Holiness (for the reform of the Church), I must needs now address myself to Him who makes use of what is weakest on earth to confound the power of perverse men. Let your Holiness think of your salvation without further de-

[37] Pastor, V, p. 205.

lay." Shorty after, he asked the kings of France, Spain, and England, and the Emperor of Germany to call a general council. But his letter to Charles VIII was intercepted and at once dispatched to the Sovereign Pontiff. Alexander VI had now in his hands an authentic document showing how far the audacity of the rebel friar might go.[38]

The group of Savonarola's enemies was increased by the addition of all those whom his word or attitude had offended: lords, humanists, condottieri, wealthy burghers, whose paganism or luxury he had criticized. Popular songs made fun of him.[39]

An unfortunate incident soon completely ruined the friar's popularity. Savonarola's enemies, who bore it ill that Alexander VI was so forbearing,[40] resolved to precipitate the issue.

In various sermons, notably in one preached March 8th, 1496, the Dominican recalled that more than once the will of God had been made known by the judgment of fire.[41] About the beginning of 1498 he proposed that he and his adversaries should go to some elevated place and there ask God to send fire from heaven upon those who taught false doctrines. Not long after this, some of the *Arrabiati* urged a Franciscan friar,

[38] Several letters, written to the Emperor and the King of France, urging them to convoke a council against the Pope, have been published by Baluze (*Miscellanea,* I, p. 583). The letter from Savonarola to Charles VIII, which is preserved in the San Marco library at Venice, has been published by Perrens (*Savonarole,* I, 487). The letters to the King of England and the King of Hungary are lost.

[39] One of them ran thus:

O popolo ingrato,
Tu ne vai preso alla grida,
E dietro a un guida
Pienno d'ipocrisia.

[40] Pastor, VI, p. 5, states that the Pope showed great moderation throughout this affair. Ranke (*Historisch-biographische Studien,* p. 246) pays the same tribute. Alexander VI was especially adroit. Foreseeing that the friar would be ruined by his own excesses, the Pope made no haste to employ severe measures, but patiently waited until the people became detached from Savonarola.

[41] Perrens, *Savonarole,* I, p. 325.

Francesco Puglia, to accept this challenge, which they regarded as a defiance. An ardent disciple of Savonarola, the Dominican Fra Domenico Buonvicini, at once declared that he was ready to undergo the trial. But it was Girolamo Savonarola they wanted to see submit himself to the judgment of God. His foes looked for his confusion, his devoted followers expected a miracle.

It would seem that Fra Girolamo hesitated a long time and at length yielded reluctantly.[42] These ordeals of fire, in use during the later Middle Ages, had been explicitly forbidden by the popes of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries;[43] but Savonarola's friends maintained that the gravity of the circumstances which, to their minds, involved the peace of the universal Church, justified an infraction of the ecclesiastical canons. Brother Girolamo accepted the ordeal. On April 7th, 1498,[44] in the Piazza della Signoria, a huge pile was constructed, through the middle of which a narrow passage was arranged. It was by this pasage that the two adversaries were to pass, after the pile was set aflame. A vast throng crowded to the spectacle. Did the two champions recoil before the danger? Did they entertain a secret hope that the Pope, notified of the intended violation of the laws of the Church, would intervene to prevent it? The delays, subterfuges, the endless disputes of the adversaries as to the conditions of this judgment of God, seemed to indicate a secret wish to evade the strange ordeal. All these incidents annoyed the crowd. A sudden shower momentarily interrupted the negotiations. A nervous agitation began to run through the multitude. Quarrels arose. Soon there was an indescribable tumult. Fra Francesco took refuge in the palace of the Signoria, Fra Girolamo in a church: finally, the ordeal was abandoned.

[42] During the trial Savonarola declared that he had in every way sought to foil Fra Domenico's project.

[43] Vacandard, *Études de critique d'histoire religieuse,* I, p. 213.

[44] Pico della Mirandola, *Vie de frère Jérôme Savonarole,* ch. 15, 65.

From this time onward, Savonarola's prestige seemed lost beyond recovery. Palm Sunday evening, when he and his most devoted friends were in the monastery of San Marco, the people attacked it and took it by assault. Savonarola, along with two of his companions, was arrested, turned over to the magistrates, and put to the torture. The Pope claimed the right to judge the accused. But the government of Florence went ahead with the case; they yielded only to the extent of admitting two papal judges to the court which would pronounce the sentence. When the two papal judges reached Florence, the trial was far advanced and the Florentine judges had made up their minds.[45] Savonarola, accused of having deceived the people by false prophecies, of having conspired against the government of Florence, and of having negotiated with the powers for the calling of a council against the Pope, was sentenced, as were also his two companions, "that each of the three be hung from the gibbet, and then burnt; so that their soul be entirely parted from their bodies." [46]

On the morning of their execution, they received communion in the chapel of the palace. Savonarola, taking the consecrated Host into his hands, asked pardon of God and of men for all the faults he had committed and for all the scandal he had given. They were then led to the Piazza. The instrument of execution erected there was a scaffold about six feet high, covered with combustible materials, from the midst of which there rose a gallows in the form of a cross. The Piazza was thronged with eager spectators, animated by very different feelings, some grief-stricken and downcast, others full of insolent joy.

The condemned men advanced to their execution courageously. Just when the flames were enclosing the body of Fra Girolamo, the words "Jesus! Jesus!" were heard. When a gust

[45] Pastor, VI, p. 48.
[46] Villari, II, p. 404

of wind divided the flames and thus enabled the friar's body to be seen, the people shouted: "A miracle, a miracle!" But it was only for a moment. The fire accomplished its work. This was May 23rd, 1498. Girolamo Savonarola had reached the age of 45 years and 8 months.[47]

With great courage, lofty talent, undoubted good will, but with manifest exaggerations and an independence that went to the point of disobedience and revolt, Savonarola for a time personified the popular indignation against the abuses of the civil and religious governments of the Renaissance. There have been saints, like St. Philip Neri and St. Catherine de Ricci, who praised his virtues. Later on we shall discuss the import of his philosophical and mystical work. Cardinal Newman, without misconstruing the purity of the eloquent Dominican's intentions or the integrity of his morals, seems to have expressed the judgment of history when he wrote: "He thought too much of himself and rose against a power which no one can attack without injuring himself. No good can come of disobedience; that was not the way to become the apostle of either Florence or Rome." [48]

Caesar Borgia

Savonarola's disappearance marked the beginning of a new period of triumph for Caesar Borgia. He quit the purple (August 17th, 1498) and shortly afterwards, as Duke of Valentinois, married a French princess, Charlotte d'Albert, daughter of the King of Navarre. With the support of French and papal troops, he then gave free rein to his insatiable ambition. In the spring of 1499 he began a campaign against the chief Italian families. To take Urbino from the Montefeltri,

[47] On the trial and execution of Savonarola, see Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VI, pp. 323–368.

[48] Quoted by Pastor, VI, p. 53. Savonarola may have been in good faith in attacking the legitimacy of Alexander's authority. See Pastor, VI, p. 218.

Perugia from the Boglioni, Siena from the Petrucci, stir up Arezzo, Cortona, and Pisa against Florence, return in triumph to Rome, and there receive the golden rose blessed by the Sovereign Pontiff and obtain the title of Gonfalonier of the Holy See, was a matter of scarcely three years.

The conqueror no longer hesitated at any crime. In 1498 his sister Lucretia had married Duke Alfonso of Biseglia. On August 18th, 1500, Caesar, provoked by Alfonso, entered his brother-in-law's bedroom and had him strangled before his very eyes by Don Michelotto. "Evidently Alexander VI thought it prudent to hush up the whole affair as much as possible; no doubt he too was afraid of Caesar." [49] By various Bulls the Pope conferred several duchies on members of his family, notably on a son of Lucretia and Alfonso, and on one of his own sons, Juan Borgia, whom he had just legitimated.[50] "Almost the entire State of the Church was by this time a possession of the Borgia." [51] The cardinals complained at the sight of the Pope's family delving into the most intimate secrets of the administration of the Church. As a matter of fact, Alexander VI, in July, 1501, when leaving Rome for a sojurn in the country, "had the effrontery to hand over the regency of the palace to Lucretia Borgia during his absence, with power to open his correspondence." [52] A certain ambassador wrote: "The Pope has only one desire: it is to make his children powerful." [53]

"It is noteworthy that in matters purely concerning the Church, Alexander never did anything that justly deserves

[49] Pastor, VI, p. 78.

[50] "These undoubtedly genuine documents nullify all attempts to rebut the accusations against the moral conduct of the Pope." Pastor, VI, p. 105.

[51] Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages,* VII, p. 481.

[52] "Of course," says Pastor, "Lucretia was only regent in regard to secular affairs, but such a thing had never been done before and was a startling breach of decorum." (VI, p. 104.)

[53] Quoted in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 18.

blame." [54] In fact, "not only is the bullarium of this monster faultless," as Joseph de Maistre remarks, but we see this unworthy Pope making himself a defender of the purity of the faith. In 1492 he made serious efforts to recall the utraquists of Bohemia to the unity of the Church. In 1500 he tried to protect the faithful against the Vaudois, who had spread over Moravia.[55] Even the missions of Greenland were an object of his solicitude.

Alexander VI and the New World

The work of the propagation of the faith owes to Alexander's intervention another favor of still greater consequence. In 1492, as Alexander VI was mounting the steps of the papal throne, Christopher Columbus discovered a new world. The consequences of this event were destined to be of incalculable importance for the future of the Church and of general civilization. "Columbus needed not only genius," says a philosophical historian, "he needed also a principle of faith to dominate him, as it did the greater part of the men of his time. Long-distance voyagers and great adventurers, before and after Columbus, were not stirred solely by a thirst for gold or fame; and the governments which helped or encouraged them were not merely impelled by ambitious projects: they all were more or less animated by a zeal for religious propaganda." [56]

In March, 1493, when the discoverer returned to Spain, great was the joy at the court of Ferdinand and Isabella, who had been the patrons of the expedition. At Rome the joy was still greater at the thought that new fields were going to be

[54] Pastor, VI, p. 140.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[56] Cournoy, *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes*, II, p. 129.

opened for the missioners of the Gospel. But what nations were to exercise temporal jurisdiction over the newly discovered lands or those yet to be discovered? At the request of Columbus and on the basis of his reports, Alexander VI, after several days of negotiation conducted by the Spanish Cardinal Bernardino Carvajal, promulgated three Constitutions of great importance (May 3rd and 4th, 1493). "By virtue of his office as Vicar of Christ, in order the more easily to lead the peoples of those countries and islands to the Catholic faith, the Pope gave and assigned to Spain all the islands and mainland, discovered or to be discovered, west of a line running from the North to the South Pole and passing one hundred leagues west of the Azores Islands." [57]

Few acts have given occasion to more unjust criticism of the exercise of papal power. It has even been asserted that Alexander VI authorized the Europeans to reduce the inhabitants of the newly discovered lands to slavery.[58] An impartial interpretation of the document shows that "in all these deeds the grant refers to the other European princes and not to the populations of the New World," [59] that the latter may be converted to the Catholic faith by voluntary adherence,[60] and that the fact of their conversion was in no wise to the prejudice of the rights of the infidel rulers.[61] "As regards the other Christian States, Alexander VI conferred, so to speak, on the Spanish sovereigns a right similar to our patents and copyrights. Moreover, at the time of Alexander VI, Christian peoples still acknowledged, at least in theory, that the pope had this right

[57] A decision of Pope Callistus III, in 1479, gave Portugal the right to found colonies and carry on commerce in the regions of the East. (*Bullarium romanum*, V, pp. 361–364.)

[58] Henri Martin, *Histoire populaire de la France*, I, p. 252.

[59] Pastor, VI, p. 162.

[60] This restriction was already a matter of law and had no need of being formulated. (Cf. Raynaldi, 1497, no. 33.)

[61] This was the doctrine then taught by all theologians, following St. Thomas (*Summa theol.*, 1a 2ae, q. 10, art. 10).

of arbitration so often exercised in the Middle Ages." [62] In other words, the sending of missioners and the armed intervention which this sort of protectorate might require, was reserved to the Spaniards and Portuguese.[63] "The peaceful settlement of a number of thorny boundary questions between Spain and Portugal was entirely due to papal decisions and should therefore justly be regarded as one of the glories of the papacy. Nothing but complete misunderstanding and blind party spirit could turn it into a ground of accusation against Rome." [64]

Death of Alexander VI

On August 12th, 1503, the Pope was taken with an attack of fever and vomiting. Six days later, as the fever grew worse, the Pontiff made his confession and received communion. At six o'clock that evening, after an attack of suffocation, he drew his last breath.[65] "This Pope," says Gebhart, "had impulses of greatness of soul, but he never had the time or freedom to carry out a generous action." [66]

"From the Catholic point of view," says Pastor, "we cannot condemn Alexander VI too severely." At the sight of certain scandals, to use Bossuet's words, we cannot help being "filled with a salutary and holy awe, when we contemplate the dangerous and slippery temptations with which God tries His Church, and the judgments which He exercises on her." [67] And it must be acknowledged that in the pontificate of Alex-

[62] De la Servière in *Dict. apol. de la foi catholique,* I, col. 85.

[63] It is thus that Bellarmine explained Alexander VI's act. (*De Romano pontifice,* V, p. 2.)

[64] Pastor, VI, p. 161.

[65] The idea of poisoning, advanced by some historians, must be discarded. Nothing abnormal occurred between the attacks of periodic fever, which had the marks of swamp fever or malaria.

[66] Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 16.

[67] Bossuet, *Variations,* pref., sec. 29. I, p. 17.

ander VI the doctrines of the Church "were maintained in all their purity. It seemed as though his reign were meant by Providence to demonstrate the truth that though men may hurt the Church they cannot harm her." [68]

[68] Pastor, VI, p. 140.

CHAPTER IX

1503–1517

THE death of Alexander VI decided the collapse of Caesar Borgia's power. This unscrupulous politician had, however, taken his own precautions in view of the fatal event. Men used to say: "It is Caesar who will be the next pope." Intrigues in the Sacred College, intrigues with the rulers of Europe—he had neglected nothing. But at the very hour of Alexander's death, he himself was prostrated by sickness. Says Machiavelli: "He told me that he had thought of everything that might occur at the death of his father, and had provided a remedy for all, except that he had never anticipated that, when the death did happen, he himself would be about to die." [1] Sick and far from Rome, Caesar nevertheless maintained a real influence which he sought to consolidate by an alliance with King Louis XII of France (September 1st, 1498).

Pius III

This influence, however, was counterbalanced by that of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. The strength of the two parties, now of equal power, allowed the moderate members of the Sacred College to assure a victory to the candidacy of the upright and pious Cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, nephew of Pope Pius II, who, in memory of his uncle, took the name of Pius III (September 23rd, 1503).

For all men of good will, this was a joy without reserve. "A new light has risen above us," wrote Pietro Delfino, general

[1] Machiavelli, *The Prince*, p. 61.

of the Camaldolese, "our hearts rejoice, our eyes weep, because God has at last taken pity on His Christian people and has given us a supreme pastor, holy, innocent, spotless. To mourning has succeeded rejoicing; after the night and the storm, have come dawn and calm." [2] It would be hard to imagine a more striking contrast than that between the Pope who had passed away and the one whom Providence had just given the Church. To quote a contemporary, "he left no moment unoccupied; his time for study was before daybreak; he spent his mornings in prayer and his midday hours in giving audiences, to which the humblest had easy access. He was so temperate in the use of food and drink that he only allowed himself an evening meal every other day." [3] In the various duties that had been entrusted to him by his uncle, especially a diplomatic mission to Germany and the government of the march of Picenum, he was noted for the lofty integrity of his life. The new Pope declared: "I do not wish to be a pope of war, but a pope of peace." [4] And this was the motto of his short pontificate. Pius III was gentle towards everyone, even toward Caesar Borgia, who requested that he be allowed to return to Rome and was permitted to do so. "I wish the Duke no ill," said the Pontiff, "for the pope, more than others, has the duty of being merciful towards all; yet I confess that Caesar will end badly at God's judgment." [5]

Pius III was just sixty-four years old at his accession; but painful attacks of gout had greatly aged him. As he was only a deacon, it was necessary for him to be ordained to the priesthood and to receive episcopal consecration before the solemnity of his coronation. These long ceremonies used up his

[2] Raynaldi, 1503; *P. Delphini oratiunculae,* p. xi.

[3] Sigismondo dei Conti da Foligno, *op. cit.,* II, p. 291. Gregorovius is the only historian who has ventured to suspect the morals of Pius III. He is refuted by Pastor, VI, p. 199.

[4] Dispacci di A. Giustiniani, II, p. 208.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 207.

strength. He had to sit down while celebrating his first mass, and was obliged to postpone the ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran. The audiences which he gave, the long consistory that he held on September 11th, his struggles with the two families of Orsini and Colonna, now leagued against Caesar Borgia, ended by undermining his health. In September, 1503, he called his cardinals together and explained his programme to them. It may be summed up in two points: (1) a complete reform of the Church, including pope, cardinals, and curia, and (2) the restoration of peace in Christendom. Only a few days passed when his physicians declared that his extreme weakness left no hope. On October 18th, Pius III quietly fell asleep, after receiving the last Sacraments with such devotion as to greatly move the bystanders. Despite incessant rain, all Rome filed before his mortal remains, piously kissing his feet as those of a saint. "The death of Pius III," wrote Sigismondo Tizio, "was a great loss to the Church, to the city of Rome, and to us all, but perhaps we deserved no less for our sins." [6]

Julius II

Immediately after the death of Pius III, the old rivalries reappeared. Giuliano della Rovere and Caesar Borgia, after holding each other in check, judged it more advantageous to work in concert. In one of the shortest conclaves in the history of the papacy, Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere was elected pope by an almost unanimous vote (November 1st, 1503); he took the name of Julius II.[7] Everywhere his fine qualities were extolled. Physically and morally he possessed the nature of a giant. He had a large head and sharp features of sculptural

[6] Nuti, *Littera di Sigismondo Tizio,* quoted by Pastor, VI, p. 207.

[7] The simoniacal character of Julius II's election seems certain to Pastor, who adduces numerous and striking testimonies in support of his opinion. (VI, p. 209.)

beauty. His eyes sparkled and flamed beneath prominent brows; his nose was large, his lips were closely drawn. There was something powerfully majestic and dominating in his appearance, prompting his contemporaries to give him the epithet "Pontefice Terribile," which he himself applied to Michelangelo. His moral temperament corresponded to his physical traits. "He had no moderation either in will or conception; whatever was in his mind must be carried through, even if he himself were to perish in the attempt." [8] With a mind always active and a body always in motion, he never had the patience to listen quietly to those who were talking to him, nor to hold back a reproach, a cry of indignation, or a word of abuse: "It will kill me," he used to say, "if I don't let it out." At least he was never accused of dissimulation, for he was incapable of it; but his frankness went so far as to become violence and brutality.

With his impetuosity of character, Julius II took up the scheme of government which the mild-natured Pius III had conceived to assure the peace of Christian peoples and to reform the Church.

The peace of Christian peoples did not seem to him possible save by the consolidation and extension of the temporal power of the Church. Being under obligations to Caesar Borgia for his election, Julius II was aware of the special difficulty of his situation in the face of him who had possession of the principal domains of the Church. But he soon had occasion to intervene in the affairs of the Duke of Valentinois. He seized it with his usual ardor.

The Venetians had profited by the ephemeral pontificate of Pius III, by the brief vacancy of the Holy See, and by Caesar's illness, to introduce themselves, by leave or by force, into the principal cities of the papal States. The power of Venice was becoming dangerous. Julius II, fearful of seeing all the strong-

[8] Quoted by Pastor, VI, pp. 214.

holds of the Romagna, held by Caesar, fall into the hands of Venice, called upon him to turn over to the Holy See those which still remained in his power. Caesar refused; the Pope had him arrested and (January 29th, 1504) obtained from him as the price of his freedom, the surrender of the places in question.[9] Caesar was again arrested in Spain at the instigation of the Pope on May 27th; there was a second cession of the strongholds,[10] which curbed the ambition of the audacious Borgia for a couple of years. Caesar escaped from prison (October 25th, 1506) and gave the Pope a momentary scare; but he fell mortally wounded (May 12th, 1507) before the walls of Viana in Navarre, and the Pope, by receiving his inheritance, profited by his conquests. "Although his intention was not to aggrandize the Church but the Duke, nevertheless what he did contributed to the greatness of the Church, which after his death and the ruin of the Duke, became heir to all his labors." [11]

A patiently reorganized financial administration, strict economy,[12] complete freedom from nepotism in appointments to public office,[13] nine years of negotiation, effort, and strife to repress the factions at Rome and in the provinces, finally ended in restoring papal authority in Italy. Certain favorable circumstances, events that seemed providential, certain movements that Julius was able to turn to profit, gave him a chance to make his authority prevail among the nations of Europe. But the intervention of France in the affairs of Italy disturbed him. He swore to chase the French from Italian soil and, in 1510, considered that he was strong enough to begin the inevitable struggle with Louis XII. "These Frenchmen," he said

[9] Burchard, *Diarium,* III, p. 331.

[10] Pastor, VI, p. 243.

[11] Machiavelli, p. 93.

[12] Pastor, VI, p. 223.

[13] "Other popes had labored to procure principalities for their sons or their nephews: it was the ambition of Julius to extend the dominions of the Church." (Ranke, *History of the Popes,* I, p. 40.)

to the Venetian ambassador (June 19th, 1510), "want to make me their king's chaplain; I intend to be pope in spite of them, and I will show them by my acts." On January 20th, 1511, despite his seventy years, Pope Julius II joined his army before the walls of Mirandola, and when the stronghold capitulated, in his haste to enter the conquered city, did so through the breach by means of a ladder.

The Protestant historian Ranke says: "If we inquire what enabled him to assume so commanding an attitude, we find it principally attributable to the fact that the state of public opinion in his day permitted the frank avowal of his natural tendencies; he was free to profess them openly; nay, to make them his boast. The reëstablishment of the States of the Church was in that day considered not only a glorious, but even a religious enterprise; every effort of the Pope was directed towards this end; by this one idea were all his thoughts animated." [14] A more recent historian says: "There is no doubt but this Pope, by his political programme, his alliances, and his wars, extended both the power and the prestige of the papacy. With him the modern Church begins. . . . Through him the Eternal City became the center of the political world." [15]

He made it equally the center of the artistic movement. "It is to the patron of Bramante, Michelangelo, and Raphael, to the Pope who, even as a cardinal, was such a generous friend of artists, that Rome owes the proud position that she now holds of being the ideal center of esthetic beauty for all its devotees throughout the whole world . . . Bramante's St. Peter's, Michelangelo's ceiling in the Sistine Chapel, Raphael's

[14] *Ibid.*, I, p. 41.

[15] Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 56. "The temporal power of the Church, which before the time of Alexander was looked on with contempt by all the Protestants of Italy, and not only by those so styling themselves, but by every baron and lordling however insignificant, has now reached such a pitch of greatness that the king of France trembles before it." (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. 1897, p. 79.)

frescoes in the Stanze . . . are the undying memorials of the aim and purport of the reign of Julius II." [16]

There remained for the great Pope only to make Rome the center of the religious movement, properly so called. By summoning a general council to meet at Rome, Julius II realized this third project, the while he was preparing the reform of the Church. There was no reason for delusive hopes. Neither political hegemony in Europe nor the supreme prestige exercised over men's minds by the splendor of arts could be lasting without the union of souls in a common faith and in a filial obedience to the Vicar of Christ.

Real Power of the Papacy

Let us examine what was the real power of the papacy under the brilliant appearances of this period. Julius II was, in a sense, more powerful than Gregory VII or Innocent III, and he was aware of the fact. He proclaimed himself arbiter of the destinies of nations and wanted "to be lord and master of the game of the world." [17] In his reign they spoke of the "two swords, one of which was used by the Church, the other for the Church." [18] Kings took oaths of obedience to him.[19] He presented crowns and also purposed taking them away.[20] However, in all this we must recognize only a deceptive appearance and the rule of Christendom seemed indeed at an end. The failure of every attempt at a crusade, from Pius II to Leo X, at the very time when the Turkish danger was more threatening than ever, is a clear proof of it. Gallicanism also made its

[16] Pastor, VI, p. 455f.

[17] *"Il papa vol esser il dominus et maistro del jocho del mundo."* (*Sommario de la relation di Domenigo Trivixan,* MS. quoted by Ranke, I, p. 40.

[18] Sigismondo dei Conti, II, app. no. 18.

[19] Instructions of King Louis XII, Bibl. Nat. Fr., 2930. Quoted by Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 59.

[20] In 1510 the Pope offered the French crown to the King of England and prepared the Bull of Louis XII's deposition. (Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 134.)

appearance; already it showed itself under two aspects: the limitation of papal prerogatives and the exaltation of royal power. On the other hand, the pope is seen to be in less immediate contact with the people than during the Middle Ages. Between him and the faithful, between him and his clergy, are found the kings with their national councils, most often under control of their commissioners. It is with the civil rulers that the Church has henceforth to treat. Concordats become the connecting link between the papacy and the national churches, which will at the same time derive therefrom a freedom which they did not possess before.

The papal power, too, however universal it may appear, was no longer international in the same sense as formerly. The papacy under Julius II is, in a way, an Italian papacy. This "Italianization" of the papacy was a necessity. "To escape the tutelage and hostility of the great powers, it was necessary that the pope should be a stranger to all. A French, German, English, or Spanish pope would always be under suspicion of serving the interests of his country. An Italian pope, thanks to the divisions and political effacement of the peninsula, could no longer give rise to umbrage. Rome became nationalized so as to maintain, between the cupidities of European states, the internationalism of religion." [21]

But this new organization was not without its serious disadvantages for the internal life of the Church. Such a political centralization allowed a development of the Roman Curia, which became a court and soon had all the disadvantages of one. The "Sacred Palace" was peopled by 600 or 800 "curiales," or officials of all sorts, from masters of ceremonies and chamberlains to policemen, janissaries, and other kinds of armed men. Under Julius II and Leo X comedies and ballets had to be given to entertain this crowd.

The concentration of masterpieces of painting and sculp-

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

ture at Rome was not without danger. It was no longer a question of those innocent works in which the artist, while combining the finest effects of line and light, was aware that he was performing a religious act and sought to arouse the spirit of prayer; in the purest masterpieces of Raphael and Michelangelo we can perceive the tendency which was to lead their disciples to sacrifice everything to the magic of color and the grace of form: it meant the end of Christian art.

The calling of a general council was becoming more and more urgent. The Emperor of Germany and the King of France, disturbed at the growing power of Julius II, openly sought to limit the spiritual authority of the papacy and spoke of convoking conciliar assemblies on their own initiative. In the autumn of 1510, Emperor Maximilian, on the pretext of caring for the interests of the Church, but in reality to exert political pressure on the Pope and force him to enter the league of Cambrai, threatened the Holy See with the promulgation of a Pragmatic Sanction and the suppression of the annates in Germany. He also demanded that a legate be permanently established in Germany, whose duty it would be to pass judgment on all religious questions that might arise there. "This plan, in combination with the introduction of a Pragmatic Sanction, was the first step towards a severance of the German Church from Rome, in other words, towards a schism." [22] At the same time Louis XII gathered an assembly at Tours, composed of 5 archbishops, 55 bishops, 50 doctors of theology, and representatives of the universities and parliaments, and obtained from them a declaration that the king of France could, with a safe conscience and without departing from the unity of the Church, call for the assembling of a general council, as authorized by the Council of Basle, and if needs be, declare war on the Holy See.[23]

[22] Pastor, VI, p. 356.

[23] On the Council of Tours, see Imbart de la Tour, II, pp. 131–137.

On May 16th, 1511, the ambassadors of Maximilian and Louis XII had it decided by three cardinals that a council would be assembled at Pisa in spite of the Pope. The irritated King of France spoke of deposing Julius II, whereas the Emperor contented himself with carrying on negotiations with him through his legate, Matthew Lang, bishop of Gurk.[24]

Caricatures as well as pamphlets ridiculing the Church and the Pope in prose and verse, were circulated with the approbation of the sovereigns. King Louis XII, "who used the theatre as modern politicians use the press," [25] gave full license to jibe at the papacy.

The Pope's illness made him suffer tortures, while his military expeditions rendered more frequent the attacks of gout from which he suffered habitually. But the valiant Pontiff was never so great as in the midst of affliction, his strength of will making everything yield, even the most atrocious pains. He condemned the rebellious cardinals who had lent their support to the schismatic undertakings of the Emperor and the King of France. While these latter, disconcerted by the Pope's straight blow, were hesitating what to do, the Pope, steadily pursuing his aim, convoked a council at Rome, made an alliance with King Ferdinand the Catholic of Spain, and formed a league against France. Spain and Venice were at first the only members of the league, but the adherence of England and Germany was in reserve (October 5th, 1511).[26]

The Lateran Council

The Bull convoking this Council, dated July 25th, 1511, began by recalling that the Pope alone has the right to summon

[24] Hergenröther, IV, p. 672.

[25] Lanson, *Hist. de la lit. franc.*, 7th ed., p. 211. On the pamphlets and caricatures of this period, see Maulde de la Clavière, *Les origines de la révolution française au commencement du XVI^e siècle*, p. 272; Fleury, *Histoire de la caricature sous la réforme et la ligue*, p. 3.

[26] Raynaldi, 1511; Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 157.

such an assembly and that a council meeting without his participation would be radically null. Then, in exact terms, the Pontiff assigned a fourfold object for the deliberations of the Council: to stifle the nascent schisms in their germ, to repress the heresies still alive, to reform the morals of clergy and laity, to gather Christian peoples into a single group that they might be able to undertake a holy war against the Turks. The new assembly would be held in Rome itself, at the Lateran palace, after the Easter festivities of the next year, April 19th, 1512.

A grievous illness seemed, for a moment, to destroy all the Pope's projects by reawakening the hopes of his foes. In a letter dated September 18th, 1511, Maximilian I even went so far as to express the chimerical dream of placing on his own head both the imperial crown and the papal tiara.[27] But the face of affairs was changed by the unexpected recovery of the intrepid Pontiff. Maximilian, that "affable Caesar, smitten with greatness, but without will-power, money or soldiers, spending his life in undertakings that never succeeded," [28] was not of a stature to make Julius II tremble. After certain differences of opinion with Louis XII as to the city where the Council should be held, and some disputes between imperial and French troops, the Emperor withdrew from any agreement with the King of France, and the latter was left alone to bear the responsibility for the schismatical council.

It opened at Pisa (September 30th, 1511), under the presidency of Cardinal Carvajal. Even the arrival of five dissentient cardinals (Briconnet, de Prie, Albret, Borgia, and Sanseverino) proved powerless to save its prestige. It was necessary to come to some determination. The conciliar theory had had its day. The former assemblies of Pisa and Basle had so

[27] The text of this letter, preserved in the archives of Lille, was published by Le Glay, *Correspondance de Maximilien I^er^ et de Marguerite d'Autriche*, II, p. 37.

[28] Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 142.

lowered it in public esteem that churches and inns closed their doors to the fathers of the pretended council and their retinues. They were obliged painfully to shift from Pisa to Milan, from Milan to Asti, from Asti to Lyons. Everywhere the reception was about the same. A raising of taxes on ecclesiastics, decreed by the Council for the benefit of the French king, stirred up opposition in all directions. The abbot of Cluny declared that to the Pope alone and his legate belonged the right to tax him. The clergy of Aix, Digne, and Riez followed the example of Cluny and were imitated by a great number of churches.

The entrance of a great theologian into the lists gave the opposition a nobler impulse. The Dominican Tommaso de Vio Gaetani, better known as Cajetan, who later on took a most important part in the defense of the Church against the errors of Luther, was renowned for his brilliant dispute with Pico della Mirandola in 1494. This small dark-complexioned man, whom Duke Sforza of Milan took delight in ridiculing because of his awkward appearance, had already given proofs of immense learning in philosophy, theology, and exegesis, in the courses taught at the University of Pavia and at the Sapienza in Rome. He became general of his Order in 1508. He took part in the theological discussions over the question of the Council of Pisa by the publication of his treatise *De auctoritate papae et concilii,* wherein he maintained that a council does not receive its authority directly from Christ; that, if the pope is not a party to it, it does not represent the universal Church; that there is a very great difference between the authority of a council in case of a doubtful pope and that authority in case of an incontestable pope, such as Julius II.

Some parliamentarians and court prelates, such as a judge, Nicole Bertrand, a lawyer, Vincent Sigault, and Abbé Zaccaria Ferreri, attempted a defense of the false council. James Almain, a young doctor of the Sorbonne, tried to refute

Cajetan's thesis. But the people were not on the side of these false doctors. Pierre Gringoire himself, who had been encouraged by the King to make a laughing-stock of the Pope for the multitude, now ended his plays by an appeal for peace.[29] Public opinion also found expression in two poems that appeared in 1512, the *Conseil de paix,* in which the author called upon princes to make peace with the Pope and France and to prepare for the reformation "by a good council," and *La déploration de l'Eglise militante,* in which the poet Jean Bouchet expressed the same wish for "reform through peace."

The Council of Pisa finished its agony at Lyons, leaving the Pope's power stronger than before.

The Lateran Council, which was the eighteenth ecumenical council, opened on May 3rd, 1512, with the adherence of Spain and England. That of Germany came on November 4th. The council was called "to put an end to schism, to restore general peace, and to assure reform." All pure and upright souls in the Church were thrilled with joy. The illustrious and devout Giles of Viterbo, general of the Augustinians, voiced this universal rejoicing in the opening address: "Our eyes have seen the holy and salutary beginning of a long awaited restoration. The spouse was prostrate on the earth, like dead foliage in winter; but now behold her rise and blossom again with the vivifying breath of the councils . . . And what I say of faith, I can say of temperance, wisdom, justice, and all the virtues. Holy Father, after so many victories which you have gained, there remained but two things that you lacked: to call a council and to give peace to the Christian people. Know, Holy Father, that you have raised the hearts of all toward a great hope." [30]

It was at the very dawn of this hope that the intrepid Pon-

[29] *Le jeu du prince des sots et de la Mère Sotte,* a farce played at the Halles in Paris, February 28th, 1512, closes with an appeal for peace.

[30] Mansi, XXXII, p. 669.

tiff died. From Pentecost, 1512, his health had rapidly declined. "They flatter me," he said, "but I feel that my strength grows less hour by hour and I know that I have not much longer to live." The strongest stimulants and other remedies were used in vain by the physicians to give him sleep and appetite. Up to his very last days he continued, despite the advice of those about him, to work without relaxation and to receive cardinals and ambassadors even when confined to bed. On the night of February 21st, 1513, after piously receiving the last sacraments, he yielded his great soul to God. An immense throng was present at his funeral. "Rome," says the Protestant historian Gregorovius, "felt that a royal soul had quitted this world." [31]

Leo X

On March 11th the Sacred College unanimously chose as successor to the robust old man who had so vigorously governed the Church for almost ten years a young cardinal who had not yet attained his thirty-eighth year. He was the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, Giovanni de' Medici, and took the name of Leo X.

We know the brilliant circle of humanists in which the young Florentine patrician grew up and the prudent advice which he received from his father when, scarcely fourteen years old, he had been raised to the dignity of a member of the Sacred College.[32] "He had a broad forehead, firm chin, lofty and serene features, but his eyes twinkled and his white hand reclined listlessly." [33] He gave no promise of being a man of commanding deeds and strong passions like his predecessor.

[31] Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, VIII, p. 108.

[32] Innocent VIII raised him to the cardinalate in 1488. However, before receiving the insignia of his new rank, he was obliged to study theology for three years. On March 9th, 1492, he was received into the College of Cardinals.

[33] Imbart de la Tour, II, 452.

Polished, literary, easy and gracious in his manner, he showed himself inclined to gorgeous display among the great, mild and generous toward the poor, pliant and conciliatory towards all; nowhere in Europe was free-thought more unrestrained than at his court. If Rome and the world acclaimed his advent with almost unanimous enthusiasm, it was perhaps because there was no one in the world who was more "a man of the times" than he was. Therein lay both his strength and his weakness.

To continue and conclude the Lateran Council and negotiate a concordat with France were the first great works of his pontificate.

Leo X had been pope only a month when he took up on his own account the programme which Julius II had outlined for the council.[34] He appointed three commissions in the council: the first was charged with the study of the various questions relating to peace between nations; the second was to devise means for abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction; the third had for its mission to prepare a scheme of general reform. In the month of December, after diplomatic preliminaries, Louis XII's complete adherence to the Lateran Council was obtained.[35]

The task of the first commission was too complex to lead to any immediate results: Leo X's mild spirit and acute diplomacy accomplished more for peace than all the conciliar measures. The abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, the aim of the second commission, became effective only by the conclusion of a concordat. As for the general reform of morals, it constituted the object of a plan presented to the Council at its ninth session (May 5th, 1514).[36] The first section of the plan had the pope directly in mind: it treated of the manner of appointing and transferring bishops and the various abuses

[34] Mansi, XXXII, pp. 782–784.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 832.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 874.

created by the introduction of commendatory benefices, cumulation of benefices and trafficking in them. Then followed a requirement that the cardinals conduct themselves as becomes priests, visit their churches, live in the place of their legation or reside in curia. The regulations proposed for the religious education of children, the suppression of the wide-spread practices of sorcery, and the protection of ecclesiastical property against the encroachments of civil rulers, all breathed the same sincere desire to undertake a serious reform of morals. But these last provisions, as also those concerning the curia and the Sacred College, were left too vague. In vain will you look there for a practical, concrete, and energetic reform of the abuses which so gravely compromised the episcopacy, the secular clergy, and the mass of the faithful.

The axe was not applied with a bold hand except to the regulars, especially the mendicants. These had at times abused the system of exemptions and the celebrated Bull *"Mare magnum"* of Sixtus IV which gave them very extensive powers. At the second session the Pope complained of "the unbounded audacity of the *exempt*." [37] At the eleventh session some of the prelates called for the suppression of that famous Bull. Finally a decree was passed reëstablishing the bishops' authority over mendicant religious.[38] Provisions relating to preaching, clerical studies, and the heretical tendencies of the philosophers of the day completed the reform work of the Council.

This work, however, left but few traces. As it was decreed by bishops who were too sparing of themselves, it failed almost completely. Nearly everywhere the monks opposed it by the force of inertia, sometimes by open resistance.[39] The legists of the royal courts, hostile to the dominance of Rome, placed their

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 908.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 970.
[39] Imbart de la Tour, II, pp. 531–535.

inexhaustible resources of tactics at the service of the refractory monks,[40] and popular sentiment took the side of the religious.

Pierre Gringoire used the stage to abuse the pretended reformers, "papelards, bigots, hypocrites," who declaimed against all vices, but ran after money, who expelled the poor friars, but spared the powerful abbeys.[41] The poet's biting raillery was not without some foundation. Most of the bishops had not abandoned their habits of frivolity and luxury; such a manner of life persisted in the Roman Curia more than anywhere else. The restoration of Christian and religious life was carried out only by a few sincerely virtuous bishops and abbots.[42] The venerable Giles of Viterbo, in his inaugural address, had proclaimed, with the magisterial weight of his virtue and learning: "It is possible to restore human institutions by holiness, but not to restore holiness by human institutions." [43]

The Concordat with France

The concordat of 1516, which regulated the external relations of the Church with France, was effective only inasmuch as it consecrated established conditions and offered orientations that were made possible by the development of customs.

If the medieval theory of the pope's direct dominance in the national churches was abandoned, the new theories of a par-

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 535.

[41] Gringoire, *Les folles entreprises*, I, p. 101.

[42] For example, in the Order of Cluny, a chapter, held in 1504, stated that several monasteries had been brought back to a better manner of life. (Lorain, *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Cluny*, ch. 21.) Other examples could be found among the Carthusians, to whom even Erasmus renders high praise (*Colloquies: The Soldier and Carthusian*), at Fontevrault and Citeaux and among their dependencies. (Imbart de la Tour, II, pp. 523–526.)

[43] "*Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines.*" (Mansi, XXXII, p. 669.)

liamentary church governed by councils or of a group of autonomous churches under the direction of temporal princes, were equally discredited. The idea of a compromise between these diverse doctrines came from the conciliatory spirit of Leo X and Francis I, and especially from the political genius of a great lawyer, Duprat.

The successor of Julius II and the successor of Louis XII seemed made to understand each other. Francis I united in his person the best qualities and the worst defects of the Frenchman of the sixteenth century; Leo X was the perfect type of an Italian humanist. But at that period the two nations were united in their devotion to art, literature, and distinction of manners. When the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent made his first appearance at the court of France, the courtiers, without any ill intent, called him "the polished lieutenant of the King of Heaven"; and it is related that when King Louis XII looked upon his young cousin so full of life and animation, so generous and chivalrous, he could not help saying: "Oh, what a fine gentleman!" It is true that at the same time he shook his head and added: "We are laboring in vain; this boy will waste it all."

At the outset Francis I seemed, on the contrary, to save everything. His brilliant campaign in Italy, undertaken to conquer the Milan country, and his victory at Marignano (September 15th, 1515) semed to inaugurate a glorious reign. The Pope, who had clung to the league entered into between the Emperor and the King of Spain to defend the Duke of Milan, was overwhelmed. "What is going to become of us?" he cried, upon learning from the Venetian ambassador of the defeat of the allies. "Holy Father," replied the ambassador, "your Holiness will suffer no harm. Is not the most Christian King the eldest son of the Church?" It was then that Leo X wondered whether it might be possible to recover by diplomacy the advantages which he had lost through the victory of the

French King. An understanding with France seemed to him, too, quite opportune in view of the unbounded ambitions which were coming to light on the side of Spain. Leo X then proposed a conference to Francis I.

The Pragmatic Sanction had been the occasion of endless conflicts for Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII; the method of appointment to benefices, as provided by the royal act, was no less harmful to the sovereign authority of the King than to that of the Pope. The activities of the Holy See against the partisans of the Pragmatic Sanction had made trouble in the kingdom. Would it not be better to replace this unilateral act, perennially in dispute, by a concordat freely agreed to by the King of France and the head of the Church? On the side of Francis I there was a man who, at need, would keep him in mind of the crown's interests. He was "that ill-mannered Auvergnian, determined, trained, well-informed, imperious, whom history celebrates and often curses under the name of Chancellor Duprat";[44] "one of the most important men of old France," according to the judgment of a good critic, "and perhaps, if we except Richelieu, the minister who has exercised the greatest influence on the destinies of France."[45] It was to him that Francis I entrusted the negotiations.

The interview between the Pope and the King took place at Bologna and was magnificent. The young King was escorted by 1200 men of arms and 6000 lansquenets; the Pope was surrounded by thirty cardinals.[46]

Three questions were to be solved, concerning benefices, jurisdiction, and finances.

We are already acquainted with the system of benefices: some were elective, that is, conferred by the free choice of the chapters; the others were collative, that is, conferred by the

[44] Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de Concordat*, p. 68.
[45] Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions*, I, p. lvi.
[46] Madelin, *De conventu bononiensi*, pp. 52–58, 66.

bishop or the patron. As for the former, a solution was already prepared by successive compromises which would result in a system of appointment by the king and canonical institution by Rome. This solution constituted the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of the concordat.[47] The king, however, could appoint only candidates meeting the canonical requirements, and the pope would refuse institution only in the case of men notoriously unfit or unworthy.

The régime of collative benefices had for a long time been troubled by the introduction of "expectative graces" and "expectative mandates," by which a collator or patron, even the pope himself, promised a person to confer a benefice on him in case of vacancy. The eighth article suppressed expectative graces and reservations of every sort.[48] The concordat also accorded an important place to university graduates and reserved a third of the benefices to them (eleventh article).[49]

The solution of the question of jurisdiction was, like that of the benefices, prepared by precedents of procedure. The concordat provided that "outside of major cases, expressly specified as such in the canons, all cases would be brought before the judges of the parties, who by right, custom, or privilege have jurisdiction over them." [50] The Holy See remained the supreme court of appeal, but only after all intermediate jurisdictions had been exhausted.

The financial question, treated evasively, and probably by mutual agreement, in the concordat of Bologna,[51] was regulated by a Bull of October 1st, 1516.[52] The Pope fixed the manner of paying the annates. This was the most delicate question to be settled. The King of France, or rather Chancellor Du-

[47] Mansi, XXXII, pp. 1020–1022.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 1022.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 1023.
[50] Tit. XXIII; *ibid.*, p. 1028.
[51] Mansi, p. 1039.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 1042.

prat, allowed the Pope to triumph in the matter of right, but in fact, as evidenced by the recent study of the reports of the chamber, this tax, which had become so unpopular, was henceforth paid only by a small number of benefices and for a trifling portion of their annual revenue.[53]

The concordat touched on the question of reform in a few articles: a prohibition against seculars holding benefices of regulars, and vice versa; strong measures against clerics living in concubinage;[54] the establishment of a pulpit in each church, where the Sacred Scriptures should be taught at least once a week.[55]

Public opinion for the most part received the concordat of 1516 with favor; but Parliament found fault with it for surrendering the royal jurisdiction over ecclesiastical cases by the right of appeal to the Holy See and by the trial of "major cases" at Rome; the University could not forgive the two contracting sovereigns for the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction and thereby abandoning the theory of conciliary supremacy; some of the clergy regretted the loss of the right of election. From these the concordat met with a violent opposition which prevented its registration for more than a year.[56] This memorable agreement, which was destined to regulate the situation of the Church in France for almost three centuries, until 1790, was, taken all in all, a benefit to the Church. By modifying the régime of elective benefices, it prevented the formation of a wealthy and powerful ecclesiastical aristocracy which might have been able, at the appearance of Luther and Calvin, to play in France the same part as the ecclesiastical aristocracy in Germany, to arouse the same cupidity of princes and lay nobility, and thus furnish the Protestant movement

[53] Richard in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique,* VIII (1907), p. 144.

[54] Mansi, p. 1030.

[55] *Ibid.,* p. 1023.

[56] For an account of this opposition, see Baudrillart, *Quatre cents ans de Concordat,* p. 90; Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 469.

additional strength. By officially obliging the king of France to accept the regular intervention of the pope in the religious organism of the nation, it restored the spiritual authority of the papacy. To pretend that the Holy See was "paid in smoke" for its big concessions, is an exaggeration; the destruction of the first two articles of the Pragmatic Sanction, proclaiming the superiority of councils over the pope, was surely a result of the highest importance. To maintain, as some have done, that Leo X, by granting to the king a right of appointment to benefices, "gave away what did not belong to him," is no less clearly unjust; for the pope did not confer on the king any right of ownership to the benefices, and the right of partial jurisdiction which he did concede belonged to the papacy by virtue of the most authentic traditions.[57]

The agreement concluded between Leo X and the King of France did not, it is true, lay all dangers at rest. After the concordat the legists did not abandon their subversive doctrines, nor the nobles their ambitious cupidity and dissolute life, nor the exalted souls of this period their plans of spiritual renovation. A breath of revolution was blowing over Europe. A Saxon monk was soon to seize upon all these scattered forces and let loose upon the Church the most violent tempest that she had ever encountered.

[57] Cf. Jules Thomas, *Le concordat de 1516.*

CHAPTER X

The Intellectual Evolution of the Renaissance

THE political and social movements which aroused legists, churchmen, popular preachers, and chimerical dreamers against the institutions of the Middle Ages, had as an accomplice a more hidden, but not less powerful movement of artistic, philosophical, and religious thought. The leaders of this intellectual evolution represented it as a return to antiquity and to nature. It took the name of Renaissance and developed especially in Italy, Germany, France, and England.

Petrarch

The Italian Renaissance was born on the banks of the Rhone, at Avignon, during the sojourn of the popes in that city.[1] But there art, properly so called, still held to the Middle Ages. The massive feudal construction of the papal castle and the original gigantic shrine which formed the tomb of John XXII are monuments of Gothic architecture; but the sumptuous villas erected on the banks of the Rhone by the cardinals of the papal court already indicate a change from the feudal manors, and the painter Simone Memmi, who came to Avignon in 1339 to decorate the papal palace and the church of Notre Dame des Doms with his frescoes, is, in carefulness of line and color, a real precursor of the new times.[2]

[1] Guiraud, *L'Eglise romaine et les origines de la Renaissance*, p. 59.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 41. Cf. Faucon, *Les artistes à la cour d'Avignon.* It is supposed that Raphael and Michelangelo drew inspiration from Memmi, the former in his "Transfiguration," the latter in his "Last Judgment."

Avignon was the cradle particularly of the literary Renaissance. Clement V moved the papal library there and John XXII enriched it with the works of Seneca, Pliny, and Ptolemy,[3] and enabled literature and science to profit by the relations between the Holy See and the East.[4] Urban V surrounded himself with the most celebrated humanists, such as Salutati and Francesco Bruni, and admitted them to the "College of Apostolic Secretaries." Thus did the popes of Avignon prepare or second the great intellectual movement of the fourteenth century. But its chief glory belongs to an Italian.

Francesco Petrarch, the "first of the moderns," as he has been called, was born at Arezzo on the border line of Tuscany and Umbria, July 20th, 1304. While still young, he left Italy soon after his father, who was exiled as a Ghibelline at the same time as Dante. Thereafter most of his life was passed at Avignon and its environs. In spite of his father's wish that he take up an administrative or judicial career, young Petrarch passionately devoted himself to poetry, the cultivation of ancient letters, and the researches of erudition. After a sojourn in the secluded valley of Vaucluse, which he immortalized by his verses, and some diplomatic missions, which brought him into contact with the principal scholars and artists of his time, he died at his country home at Arqua, in Italy, July 18th, 1374, at the age of seventy.

It is a mistake to think of Francesco Petrarch only as the delightful author of the *Canzoniere,* the subtle and melancholy verses which "are the source of modern lyric poetry." [5] Petrarch was also "an enlightened bibliophile, who did everything possible to promote research and to make the correction of texts a fashionable study." [6] From him as initiator are

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 52.
[4] *Ibid.,* pp. 55, 58.
[5] Brunetière, *Histoire de la littérature française,* I, p. 11.
[6] Langlois, *Manuel de bibliographie historique,* p. 247.

descended "the Italian humanists of the fifteenth century, those incomparable collectors whose genius for conjectural emendation has never been surpassed." [7]

This favorite of popes is the type of nascent humanism in the period when it was still Christian. He had the two dominant passions of the Renaissance man, as humanism later formed him: a devotion to physical beauty and a passion for glory. The mere sight of a perfect figure in the porch of St. Clare's church at Avignon, was enough to trouble the poet's life. As to his thirst for glory, it was scarcely gratified by the superb triumph in the spring of 1341, when he mounted the steps of the Capitol amid the acclamations of an immense throng, to receive the crown of poetry.

Petrarch, despite some lamentable weaknesses of his private life, ever remained a Christian in heart and mind. In his celebrated dialogue *De contemptu mundi,* which he called his *Secretum,* he examines his conscience and bitterly accuses himself of denying the faith by his persistent temptations to sensualism and the pagan spirit. When reading Cicero, he cannot refrain from marginal notes whenever the great orator offends his beliefs: *"Cave!"* he writes, *"male dicis."* [8] "Practices of an almost scrupulous piety are habitual with him . . . Every night he rises to pray to God . . . Every Friday the chanter of Laura de Sade imposes a rigorous fast on himself; and he has a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin." [9] Henry Cochin says: "We might write a book entitled *Petrarch and Mysticism,* which would be the companion volume of Nolhac's *Petrarch and Humanism.*" [10]

After his great triumph at Rome, he recalls his austere

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Guiraud, pp. 68–71.—Cf. Pierre de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme.*

[9] Mézières, *Pétrarque. Étude d'après de nouveaux documents.*

[10] Henri Cochin, *Le frère de Pétrarque,* in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Litt. Rel.,* 1901, p. 43.

abode at Avignon, and celebrates "the triumph of chastity" as greater than the triumph of science and art.[11]

The popes showered the tokens of their benevolence on this great man and encouraged him in every way. Petrarch was a cleric; he never became a priest and perhaps did not even receive minor orders; but his clerical status enabled him to hold benefices. In 1335 Benedict XII made him canon of Lombez; eight years later Clement VI appointed him ambassador to Naples, soon after made him protonotary apostolic, and finally, in 1348, archdeacon of Parma. By bestowing so many favors on him, especially by giving him access to the treasures of their library and accrediting him as legate in foreign countries, the popes of Avignon aided the spread of the new culture and should, therefore, be considered the first patrons of the literary Renaissance inspired by the Christian spirit.[12]

After the Western Schism

During the sad period of the Western Schism (1377 to 1417) the artistic and literary movement was retarded, nay, almost halted; but the pontificates of Martin V, Eugene IV, and Nicholas V gave it a new impulse. Questions of general policy did not completely absorb Martin V's activity. At his summons, the painters Victor Pisanello and Gentile da Fabriano came to Rome to continue the work of artistic renovation begun by the school of Giotto. To the purest Christian inspiration they added a feeling of nature and a care for exactness of detail that were unknown before their time. Eugene IV deserves credit for divining the genius of Masaccio, that young painter whose masterful frescoes, by reacting against the pranks of certain disciples of Giotto, became a source of in-

[11] Petrarch, *Le rime,* I, p. 192.

[12] On Petrarch, see Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme;* Mézières, *Pétrarque d'après les documents inédits;* Fuzet, *Pétrarque, ses erreurs, ses voyages, sa vie chrétienne.*

spiration for the whole Florentine art of the fifteenth century. The Pope wanted Masaccio to execute the frescoes with which he intended to decorate the basilicas of St. Clement and St. John Lateran.

Pisanello and Gentile were merely the precursors of a painter greater than themselves, one whose mystical inspiration was never surpassed by anyone, Fra Angelico da Fiesole, of the Order of St. Dominic. About 1445, at the age of sixteen, he was sent to Rome by Eugene IV. Under this Pope and his successor, Nicholas V, Fra Angelico filled Rome, Florence, Pisa, and Umbria with incomparable marvels.[13] The pure Christian tradition of which Fra Angelico [14] was the most illustrious representative was perpetuated in the Umbrian school, until Benozzo Gozzoli, the admirable painter of the "Triumph of Saint Thomas Aquinas," abandoned the gentle mystical visions of his master and devoted himself to the painting of purely human beauty, and until Perugino, discouraged in his art and perhaps in his faith by the death of Savonarola, allowed the passionate naturalism of Signorelli to triumph.

Even at Rome pagan sensualism began to take root in the time of the illustrious Dominican. Beside the pious and entrancing mural frescoes which Fra Angelico painted for Nicholas V's study,[15] that Pope called upon Andrea del Castagno and Pietro della Francesca to execute some paintings whose realistic style already presaged the over-sensual art of Filippo Lippi.

The sculpture of the period is guilty of the same tendency. The Florentine Donatello, whom Cosimo de' Medici commissioned to restore the ancient statues of his native city, took too

[13] On Fra Angelico, see Rio, *De l'art chrétien,* II, pp. 283–344; Cochin, *Fra Angelico;* Sortais, *Fra Angelico;* Guiraud, *op. cit.,* pp. 123, 201.

[14] The word *Angelico* is a surname given to Santi Torini to express the angelic character that he gave to the personages in his paintings.

[15] The studio of Nicholas V became the chapel of St. Lawrence. Fra Angelico's paintings may still be seen there, portraying the chief scenes in St. Stephen's life.

much of his inspiration in religious art from these pagan works. His *Christ of Santa Croce* in Florence, his *Magdalen* in the baptistery of the same city, and his *St. John the Baptist* in the Lateran do not elevate the thought above purely natural beauty; and the bronze [16] doors of St. Peter's, carved in the time of Eugene IV, under Donatello's direction, at the very entrance to the most venerable temple of Christendom, contain immoral scenes of pagan mythology.[17]

Artistic technique made remarkable progress at this time. Donatello's models are expressive from head to foot; linear perspective, created by Brunellesco, was carried to perfection in the bas-reliefs of the admirable Florentine artist; the sketches of Pietro della Francesca and Andrea Orcagna reveal a consummate knowledge of foreshortening; artistic anatomy began to be studied scientifically; by the incomparable purity of its lines, by the ravishing harmony of its colors, and by the scientific correctness of its design, this revived art of the Renaissance might in its own way praise God if it could preserve the religious purity of its primitive inspiration. But more than one artist, painter, sculptor, or architect, was forgetful of it, and we need not wonder, therefore, that naturalism soon invaded the Christian temple itself.

When Nicholas V desired to rebuild St. Peter's basilica on a new plan, he entrusted the work to the Florentine, Leone Battista Alberti, a canon by nepotism, an artist by vocation, but by nature and inclination a dilettante and a skeptic. Alberti had just become famous by his construction of the Pitti palace at Florence, with its noble and severe style of architecture, and

[16] At that time called the *silver* doors, because they were covered with silver.

[17] On the doors of St. Peter's basilica were represented subjects taken from the immoral fables of pagan mythology: Jupiter and Ganymede, Hero and Leander, the Nymph and the Centaur, Leda and the Swan. It is, however, worthy of remark, as Broussolle states (*L'art, la religion, et la renaissance,* p. 40), that these pagan subjects are to be found only in the foliage of the stiles and consequently are rather hidden from view.

by the publication of his great work *De re aedificatoria,* from which all idea of religious symbolism was systematically excluded. Bramante's influence, and later that of Carlo Maderna and Bernini, accentuated this movement towards a new style of architecture, in which, by the help of an art carried to perfection, decoration stifled the idea. Undoubtedly a harmonious grouping of garlands and balustrades, of tassels and foliage, of rostra and trophies, delightfully rest the eyes; but Christendom no longer witnessed the rise of those marvelous Gothic cathedrals whose softened light, sifting through stained glass, is so congenial to recollection, whose slender columns, rising high and losing themselves in the shadows, are so elevating to flights of prayer, whose inexhaustible symbolism opens such entrancing perspectives to the spirit of meditation.

Thus also did the speculations of thinkers and lofty minds of the time less and less favor the elevation of the soul. In the course of 1431 there appeared, in the form of dialogues between apostolic secretaries, a book entitled *De voluptate.* Its author, Lorenzo Valla, was himself one of that crowd. He maintained that sensual pleasure is man's only real good. As this work gave offence, Valla published a second treatise, *De vero bono,* in which the same doctrines were set forth with certain attenuations of expression. The form being now less brutal, made the odious substance all the more dangerous.

Since the publication of the numerous intimate letters of that period, it may now be affirmed that lewd conversations did take place in this college of apostolic secretaries, founded by the popes of Avignon to encourage scholars and literary men. There you might meet Filelfa, a man devoid of morals, who had gone to Constantinople to study Greek under the famous Chrysoloras and then pilfered his fortune and corrupted his daughter; [18] Loschi, who was no less eager to gather rich prebends than to collect old manuscripts; and Leonardo Bruni

[18] Guiraud, p. 237.

(Aretino), who composed a pretended discourse of Heliogabalus, full of disgusting cynicism.[19]

In this same company was Poggio, "one of the most repulsive figures of the period," [20] in whom were combined, though with less talent, something of Voltaire's malicious irony and Renan's wavering dilettantism. Poggio, who entered Rome with five coppers in his pocket, became, by virtue of his flattery, one of the churchmen with the highest income. For fifty years, under seven successive pontificates, he succeeded in keeping his position of apostolic secretary. In 1449, when he had reached the age of seventy, he published his *Liber facetiarum,* a collection of most obscene jokes, which revealed the vileness of his soul.[21] This happened under Nicholas V.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 308.

[20] Pastor, I, p. 29.

[21] Guiraud, pp. 98, 152, 295–307. We may naturally wonder how such persons could be tolerated by popes like Martin V, whose life was strict and irreproachable, Eugene IV, who gave an example of monastic virtues, and Nicholas V, who, notwithstanding an excessive fondness for humanism, was sincerely pious. It is but just to remark that the immorality of Poggio and his friends was not well-known until the posthumous publication of their correspondence. While these men were still alive, it was quite possible for the popes to be deceived as to their true sentiments, quite possible to regard certain expressions in their writings as literary fancies. This is, in fact, the impression which they give. Guiraud says: "The popes seemed not to perceive that revival of paganism or, if they did observe it, they did not take it seriously." (*Op. cit.,* p. 308.) Moreover, the scholarship of these men was considerable. To Poggio we owe priceless finds: he discovered Quintilian, Silius Italicus, Lucretius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and a portion of Cicero. Lorenzo Valla was the first to contest, in a scientific way, the authenticity of Christ's alleged *Letter to Abgar,* of Constantine's act of donation, of the redaction of the Apostles' Creed by the twelve apostles, etc. In the papal circle were personages of the highest integrity, such as Cardinal Albergati, Blessed Aleman (cardinal), Blessed Traversari, Cardinal Bessarion, and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, who were in relation with Poggio, Valla, and Filelfa. The learning of these humanists and the usefulness of their services cloaked their faults from the eyes of the Roman court, which needed their help to give the chancery acts that literary polish so highly valued at that time. Their unfamiliarity with worldly matters has been generally blamed and brought about no small difficulties for those who had to take the initiative in such affairs. Finally, the troubles of the period occupied the close attention of the popes. A Gregory VII or a Pius V, in short, a saint, would doubtless have courageously faced all these obstacles. But it must be acknowledged that the popes of this epoch had neither the vision to foresee the harmful influence

The appearance of Poggio's *Facetiae* opened the eyes even of the blindest. "It was only then," says Guiraud, "that it became possible to measure the depth of indecency in him who had written them and in that gathering of literary men who took delight in them." [22] Callistus III, Pius II, and Paul II fulfilled their duty as defenders of morality. We have seen how Paul II, by a single stroke, suppressed that section of the "college of secretaries" known as the "college of abbreviators," in which most of these lascivious humanists were to be found. It is true that before long the college of abbreviators [23] was reëstablished by Sixtus IV; but thereafter pagan humanism felt that it was under suspicion at Rome and gathered about the Medici at Florence.

Greek Literary Culture at Florence

In his *Divina Commedia* Dante bewailed that his native city had abandoned the virtuous austerity of former times and in a melancholy strain celebrated the days when

> Florence, within the ancient boundary
> From which she taketh still her tierce and nones
> Abode in quiet, temperate and chaste.
> No golden chain she had, nor coronal,
> Nor ladies shod with sandal shoon, nor girdle
> That caught the eye more than the person did.

which these literary and licentious men could exercise, nor did they have the courage, when they did suspect the danger, to unmask them and the strength to remove them before they gave grave scandal. It is characteristic of weak authority to close its eyes to abuses, the revelation of which would embarrass it by obliging it to use severe measures.

[22] Guiraud, preface, p. xiii.

[23] The abbreviators were divided into abbreviators of the major park and abbreviators of the minor park, because of the railed-off enclosures in which they worked. It was their function to prepare summaries of briefs and other papal acts. As a matter of fact, the office was almost a sinecure, intended to supply honorable pensions for literary men. The College of Abbreviators was reorganized by Leo X and finally suppressed by Pius X's Bull *"Sapienti consilio"* (June 29th, 1908).

No houses had she void of families,
Not yet had thither come Sardanapalus
To show what in a chamber can be done.[24]

Since the day when the poet wrote these lines, luxury and immorality had grown worse in the brilliant Tuscan city. The opulent Medici family, enriched by its great commerce, had acquired a preponderant influence, but in these titled merchants nothing recalled the chivalric spirit of the feudal nobles. Cosimo I (de' Medici), known as Cosimo the Elder, in speaking of the crusade undertaken by Pius II, had been heard to say that the Pope "was an old man and had undertaken the enterprise of a young one"; and Machiavelli relates that one of this great lord's favorite maxims was that "a State cannot be held by the man who is always telling his beads." [25] His grandson Lorenzo, whose sumptuous lavishness won him the name of "the Magnificent," dreamed of uniting in Florence everything the most dazzling that art and letters could offer.

At this time a number of Greek scholars, forced out of Constantinople by the Turkish conquest, sought an asylum in Europe. Lorenzo de' Medici did his best to attract and retain the most eminent of them. Thus he welcomed the learned Demetrius Chalcocondylas, who was said to be as remarkable for the polish of his manners as for the extent of his learning. Chalcocondylas for twenty years taught the Florentines Greek, introducing them to the beauties of Homer. Along with him was to be found Gemistus Plethon; it was this Byzantine Platonist who, at the time of the Council of Florence, appeared in the Grand Duke's palace with a mysterious manuscript and read the Dialogues of the "Divine Plato" to a little group of hearers.

About these Greeks, who opened the eyes of the Florentines to the classical beauties of Greek antiquity, there gathered

[24] *Paradiso;* Longfellow's translation, canto 15, verses 97 sqq.
[25] Machiavelli, *History of Florence,* p. 317.

Italian humanists, the most celebrated of whom were Pico della Mirandola, Pomponius Laetus, Angiolo Politian, and Marsilio Ficino.

Giovanni Pico, of the princes of Mirandola and Concordia, was a precocious scholar who, at the early age of ten years, won renown as an orator and a poet, was admitted to the University of Bologna at the age of fourteen, and at the age of twenty-three challenged all the scholars of the world to a public discussion of 900 theses *de omni re scibili.*[26] Pico was an adventurous scholar, dreaming of a revival of religion by a more critical study of the sacred texts and a more attentive comparison with ancient religions; he was also a daring thinker, affirming that sin, limited in time, can never merit eternal punishment, that Christ did not descend into hell save in a virtual manner, and that no science can better prove the divinity of Christ than magic.[27] By a brief dated August 4th, 1486, Innocent VIII condemned the 900 theses of Pico della Mirandola. The young scholar humbly submitted. A few years later he died, at the age of thirty-one, in one of his villas near Florence, at the very moment when, by the influence of Savonarola, he was disabused of the world's vanities and of human knowledge and was thinking of entering the Order of St. Dominic.[28]

Pomponius Laetus (1425–1497), whose real name was

[26] It seems that the words *de omni re scibili,* which could refer only to questions included in the programme of university studies, were not in the title of the thesis. At any rate, the words *et de quibusdam aliis* are Voltaire's invention.

[27] Tiraboschi, *Storia della lett. ital.,* VI, p. 32; Pastor, V, p. 343.

[28] Pico della Mirandola, shortly before his death, addressed Alexander VI in a memoir containing an exposition of his personal views as to the condemned propositions. The Pope, in a special brief, assured him that he had never been judged guilty of personal or formal heresy. It has sometimes been maintained that Alexander VI thus contradicted his predecessor and approved the famous theses. (See *Il Rosmini* for 1889.) But this is a mistake. Alexander's brief exculpated Pico only from *formal* heresy, that is, personal and imputable, and approved only the ideas set forth in the memoir. Cf. Tripepi in *Il papato,* XXI, pp. 37 sqq., and Pastor, V, 344.

Giulio, lord of Sanseverino, belonged, like Pico della Mirandola, to the upper Italian nobility. He took his surname from Roman antiquity, quite convinced of the influence which an habitual appellation might have on the character and moral worth of a man.[29] Giulio Sanseverino thought to make himself an ancient and succeeded only too well in this. His two young daughters, who were trained in his school and like him were thoroughly devoted to the study of pagan antiquity, collaborated with him in his works, the subjects of which were the political, administrative, and sacerdotal institutions of ancient Rome. After Paul II's dissolution of the famous Roman Academy, of which he was the president, he settled at Florence in 1468. Pomponius Laetus lived and died in a pagan atmosphere, which seems to have extinguished in him the Christian spirit which Pico della Mirandola kept so much alive in his soul.[30]

Angiolo Politian (1454–1494), who belonged to the Cinci family, accomplished still more for the propagation of pagan culture. Trained in the school of the best masters, endowed with a capacity for work that enabled him to pass whole nights poring over ancient manuscripts, gifted with a brilliant imagination by means of which he was able to resurrect a forgotten world in his interpretation of some old text, Angiolo Politian, at the age of twenty-nine, was the most brilliant professor of Florence. Men came from England and Germany to hear his lectures. With misshapen features, an enormous nose, and a neck clumsily joined to his irregular trunk, the first sight of him provoked amazement.[31] But so soon as he opened his mouth, his hearers felt themselves seized and led along by a master mind. The compelling sweetness and sonorousness of

[29] Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique* (art. *"Platina"*), XII, p. 164.

[30] Professor Zabughin, in a scholarly study (*Giulio Pomponio Leto*), asserts that, contrary to the generally accepted opinion, there is not in the works of Leto the least trace of immorality.

[31] *"Erat facie nequaquam ingenua et liberali, ab enormi nasu subluscoque collo."* (Jovius, *Elogia doctorum,* ch. 38.)

his speech, the expression of his face and gestures soon communicated to his listeners the emotion that vibrated in his frame. While he explained the masterpieces of classical antiquity, often a point of delicate sarcasm (*salsa comitas*) would opportunely relieve the tension of his hearers hanging on his words.[32] At times, on the conclusion of his brilliant lectures, Lorenzo the Magnificent would condescend to take the arm of the beloved and popular professor and walk with him through the streets of Florence; and as the prince and the scholar thus passed through the city, they would be greeted everywhere by the flattering murmur of a continual ovation. Under the canon's hood, which the Medici influence obtained for him, Angiolo Politian remained one of the most thoroughgoing pagans of his age.[33] Nevertheless Lorenzo de' Medici thought it right to entrust to the brilliant humanist the education of his young son Giovanni, who, himself a canon at the age of fourteen, was one day to become Pope Leo X.

Above all these fine scholars there rose, by the vigor of his mind, one who should be regarded as the very leader and head of the Florentine Renaissance, the founder of the Academy of Florence, Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499). We shall soon have occasion to speak of his philosophical work. But the Platonist doctrine of which Ficino was the protagonist, penetrated the minds of the fifteenth century so deeply only because of the

[32] One of his hearers has expressed in Latin verse that, in listening to Politian explaining Virgil, you could almost hear the gentle, murmuring voice of the sonorous pine and the babbling brook flowing over the shining, pebbly bottom, and the echo playfully repeating the poet's verses.

Hic resonat blando tibi pinus ancata susurro,
Pura coloratos intestrepit unda lapillos,
Hic ludit nostri captatrix carminis Echo.

[33] Pico della Mirandola, after his conversion, endeavored to lead Politian back to the Christian spirit. One day, while the illustrious canon was reading to his friend a poem written in honor of letters, Pico rested his charming head on Politian's deformed shoulder and whispered: "Foolish Politian, wearying yourself searching in man's art for what is to be found only in the love of God!" The canon smiled and continued to read.

delicate art with which he knew how to present his ideas.

Without being so deformed as Politian, the founder of the neo-Platonic school was ill-favored by nature. It is related that at his baptism the priest could not help smiling "at the sight of that tiny morsel of humanity that could have found room in the little silk slipper of a Florentine lady."

Marsilio Ficino was sickly all his life; being susceptible to changes of temperature, he would find his genius dry up when the sky became cloudy and would recover his inspiration only under the brightness of a clear blue sky. The object of all his labors were the works of Plato. In order the better to penetrate the meaning of his favorite philosopher, he studied Greek with the greatest masters, pitilessly burned up his first attempts at translation, and revised his work with tireless perseverance. Of his translation of Plato, Villari says: "To this day, notwithstanding the progress achieved in Hellenic philology, Ficino's version still holds its place in the public esteeem." [34]

Architecture and Painting

Such influences on the part of the masters of thought were sure to accelerate the movement which was gradually paganizing architecture and sculpture. After Poggio's discovery of Vitruvius' treatise and its publication, Gothic was abandoned and there was a return to the semicircular form, to Doric,

[34] Villari, I, p. 58. An anecdote, recorded by Tiraboschi in his *Storia della letteratura italiana,* relates that, after spending two years in the study of Plato's works, Marsilio Ficino presented one of his manuscripts to the great Duke Cosmo. The latter, who was an accomplished Hellenist, turned over a few pages, smiled, and shook his head. Marsilio understood and thereupon began a deeper study of Greek under the celebrated Platina. He revised his work and submitted it to the criticism of the famous Hellenist, Marcus Musurus. While Ficino was reading his manuscript to Musurus, the latter coolly took his inkstand, as he might have taken a box of gold dust, and poured the ink on Ficino's manuscript. Marsilio, who had learned from Plato that a wise man never gives way to impatience, set to work again and, after a few years, brought Lorenzo the Magnificent his masterpiece, which won the prince's admiration and that of posterity.

Ionic, and Corinthian, or rather composite columns, for Greek architecture was scarcely known, except through the transformations which it underwent at the hands of the Romans. Church façades were ornamented with motives derived from Roman triumphal arches. The wonderful architect Brunellesco, who raised the cupola of the Florence cathedral to a height of more than 300 feet, borrowed from antiquity a great abundance of decorations in his construction of the Strozzi chapel.

The sculptural art was more timid; Ghiberti (1378–1456), the celebrated sculptor of the bronze doors of the Florence baptistery, and Luca della Robbia (1400–1482), the great terra cotta artist, tried to reconcile Christian idealism with a closer observation of anatomical forms and beauty of lines, and thus brought about a transition between the Gothic art of the Middle Ages and the new art of the Renaissance. Donatello (1383–1466) with equal genius expressed the asceticism of St. John the Baptist and the ironical smile of Poggio, the noble attitude of St. George, so much admired by Raphael, and the licentious cynicism of the famous "Zuccone" which ornaments the campanile of Florence.

Painting, more closely attached to the representation of religious scenes, more subject to the control of a people still Christian, resisted pagan influences for a longer time. A marvelous poetry still illumined the melancholy figures of Filippo Lippi (1406–1469). Yet the moral weaknesses of the poor artist already showed themselves in his works. "It is with him that painting, while still remaining at the service of the Church, departed from its purely religious spirit." [35] The study of the nude and of motion became the artist's chief objective.

Filippino Lippi, Botticelli, and Ghirlandajo accentuated the master's style. Filippo's son, Filippino Lippi, lacked inventiveness, but was a ready artist, productive, ingenious, and ele-

[35] Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 588. Cf. Charles Blanc, *Histoire des peintres, École florentine,* pp. 3, 8.

gant; his pictures rarely show the mystical vision which inspired his father's brush. Botticelli, for seven years a pupil of Lippi, strayed still farther from the Christian ideal and, at the request of Lorenzo the Magnificent, multiplied pagan subjects in his paintings; his "Birth of Venus," in which all is fair, shining, and springlike, smiling and singing joyful strains of youth and dawn,[36] was the most perfect expression of the sensual paganism that was everywhere insinuating itself in Italy. Domenico Ghirlandajo (1449–1494) more nearly approached the great geniuses by the severe simplicity of his composition, the beauty of his types, and the purity of his taste; but in his incomparable frescoes the human ideal more and more takes the place of heavenly vision.

However, the technique of the art helped to develop its progress. Antonello da Messina brought from Flanders to Italy painting in oil, which greatly increased the resources of esthetic expression; Andrea Mantegna, whom Innocent VIII called to Rome, revealed a knowledge of coloring and perspective no less precise than that of Signorelli and more deeply penetrated with Christian symbolism; Verrochio (1435–1488), the master of Leonardo da Vinci, Lorenzo di Credi, and many others, by the skill of their methods, the pleasing firmness of their design, and the finish of their paintings and sculptures, heralded the appearance of the three great geniuses who carried the art of the Renaissance to its apogee: Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo da Vinci.

In literary circles the decadence of the Christian spirit was still more marked. Men were no longer satisfied to turn their back on the ideal of the Middle Ages; they made fun of it. The buffoon-poet Pulci, in his "Morgante Maggiore," composed at the request of Lorenzo de' Medici, turned the heroes of chivalry into ridicule. Even cardinals scarcely dared call the Holy Ghost, the Blessed Virgin, and Heaven by their tradi-

[36] Blanc, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

tional names. Cardinal Bembo spoke of the "celestial Zephyr" and the "lauretain goddess"; the truly virtuous Bessarion, in lamenting the death of Gemistus Plethon, expressed the hope that this great man might "join the celestial spirits in the mystic dance of Bacchus." [37]

What was only a Platonic fancy in the words of these serious persons, unfortunately became a reality with more than one churchman of the time. If we are to credit Sanudo's journal and Molmenti's accounts, many princes of the Church did not scruple to take part in dances. Lorenzo the Magnificent made a collection of dance songs.[38] Marsilio Ficino, who wrote a Christian apologetic that was not without value, kept a lamp burning before the statue of Plato; [39] and Lorenzo the Magnificent, surrounded by his literary court, when he would ascend the hill of Fiesole towards evening, was wont to repeat a sonnet composed to the glory of "that over-soul" which spreads out from the center of the universe into all the members composing it.[40]

Influence of Savonarola

We have already had occasion to remark that the Christian conscience was shocked at such sights. From the very monastery of Fiesole from which Fra Angelico came, a group of Friars Preachers had come to Florence and there founded the monastery of San Marco, where Savonarola preached. But some time before him, St. Bernardine of Siena, St. John Capistran, Albert Berdini of Sarteano, Giles of Viterbo, and many

[37] Villari, *Savonarole et son temps.* Translator's preface, p. xxviii.

[38] Sanudo, *I diarii,* XXVII, 30; Molmenti, *La storia di Venezia,* p. 279; Castil-Blaze, *La danse et les ballets,* p. 15; Rodocanachi, *La danse en Italie du XV^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle,* in the *Revue des Études Historiques,* Nov.–Dec., 1905.

[39] Villari, *loc. cit.*

[40] *"Per la tua providenza, fai, s'infonda*
L'anima in mezzo del gran corpo, donde
Conviene in tutti membri si diffonda."

others had forcibly denounced the shameless paganism which was being displayed in arts, letters, and morals.

It is worthy of remark that the great preacher of Florence did not content himself with thundering against pagan morals. It would be an exaggeration to speak of a school of art founded by Savonarola, yet the Christian influence which the celebrated friar exercised over the artists of his time is indubitable. Savonarola induced Lorenzo di Credi to turn over to him several pagan studies which he burned in the public square, and he obtained from the painter a promise to show more respect to the dignity of his art in future. The three Robbias had a deep veneration for the Prior of San Marco. Although Botticelli long remained refractory to his influence, yet after the death of the friar who had reproved him, the painter desired to end his days in austere penance. It is said that we owe many of Donatello's Christian masterpieces to Savonarola's solicitations and, if we are to accept the word of Vasari, the architect Simone Cronaca paid a sort of cult to the bold reformer.

The paganism of the literati, being deeper, was harder to combat than that of the artists. Yet we know the decisive influence Fra Girolamo exercised over Pico della Mirandola. Marsilio Ficino followed his sermons for a while and was deeply moved by them; Guicciardini could not help paying homage in his writings to the merits of Savonarola,[41] and Lorenzo the Magnificent himself must also have felt his influence, since, on his death-bed, he sent for the friar to hear his confession.

Savonarola's influence over the artists continued after his death; it was extended to the three great geniuses whose names illumine the sixteenth century. Raphael, who in his "Disputa" placed Savonarola in the midst of the greatest

[41] Guicciardini, *Opere inedite*, III, ch. 13.

doctors of the Church, was only fifteen years old at the time of the "prophet's" death; but he felt Savonarola's inspiration through his connection with Fra Bartolommeo, one of the friar's faithful disciples. Michelangelo, who had heard Savonarola preach, always entertained a great veneration for his writings.[42] Leonardo da Vinci, the friend of Fra Bartolommeo, Botticelli, Filippi,[43] and almost all the close friends of Savonarola, experienced at least the indirect influence of the friar.

The naturalistic and pagan aspects of the works of these three great masters have often been pointed out. Undoubtedly more than once did their devotion to plastic form seem to hide from them the religious ideal so preponderant in medieval works of art; but it is just to recognize that under their influence, according as "the legendary world saw the boundaries of its empire gradually restricted, those of the historical world became more exact and strengthened in view of the coming requirements of the modern spirit."[44] In the works of Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo, the iconography of the Saviour and His Apostles was more strongly inspired by the Gospel facts. When Protestantism attacked the dogmas of St. Peter's primacy and the Eucharist, the people received the reply of history and art at the same time, by contemplating the pictures of these great masters. By means of attentive study, it has been possible to show how the Stanze of the Vatican, by the *ensemble* of their decoration, constitute a new and wonderfully opportune argument for the divinity of the Church. How could one set into better light the social import of the Eucharist than in the "Disputa"? Did not Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper," so widely reproduced, revive the memory of Judas' treason by dramatically picturing it before

[42] *"Ebbe in gran venerazione le opere scritte di Savonarola."* (Vasari.)

[43] In 1898 Villari edited an unpublished life of Savonarola, written by Fillipepi, a brother of the painter Botticelli.

[44] Broussolle, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

the eyes of the people? Was it possible more strikingly to represent all humanity, sublimely idealized, taking part in the sacrifice of salvation, than by the wonderful ceiling of the Sistine Chapel? [45] Was not the whole artistic career of Michelangelo like a religious drama? [46]

The artistic ideal of the great Florentine preacher kept itself purer and more untainted in the school of his faithful disciple Fra Bartolommeo. It was also perpetuated at Florence in the convent of Santa Sabina, where Sister Plautilla Nelli brilliantly displayed her artistic talent. The memory of the Dominican friar was preserved there with pious care: it was by his advice and under his auspices that the study of painting was combined with exercises of piety.[47]

At the beginning of the sixteenth century it might have been expected that, thanks to Savonarola and his disciples, the inspiration of the Gospel would counterbalance the pagan spirit of the Renaissance. We shall presently see, in studying the ramifications of the humanist movement in Germany, France, and England, that, under quite different aspects, the same hope there seemed to be reasonable. But just when Fra Bartolommeo was leaving this world (1517), Luther was shouting his cry of revolt. Unforeseen events and entirely new influences came to modify all predictions and expectations.[48]

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 340, 388, 395.

[46] Michelangelo's work is especially significant from the point of view of the development of religious art. Often we are surprised at the striking contrast between the man's mysticism and the brutal crudity of his masterpieces. Perhaps we do not reflect that the powerful figures of the Sistine Chapel and the formidable Moses at St. Peter in Chains were preceded by masterpieces of serene beauty, like the Pietà at St. Peter's, and likewise followed by scenes of the purest religious inspiration, such as the Deposition in the Duomo at Florence. It would seem that the great artist, having started out with the gentlest emotions of faith, met on his road that pagan beauty which had become an idol to his contemporaries and which triumphed over him by a genial effort that left its trace in his work.

[47] Rio, *De l'art chrétien*, II, p. 458.

[48] Lafenestre, *Saint François d'Assise et Savonarole, inspirateurs de l'art italien.*

Philosophy and Theology

Similar deceptions were produced at the same time in the sphere of philosophical and religious thought. Scholastic philosophy in the twelfth century had called forth mighty activities of mind among the disciples of Peter Lombard and the monks of St. Victor, and in the thirteenth century was set forth with masterful genius in the syntheses of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure. But in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, whether we should attribute this decline to the excessive multiplication of universities which led to a scattering of the workers, or to the rivalries of certain religious Orders all too ready to substitute irritating and superficial polemics for quiet and fruitful study, or to that relaxation which always seems to follow periods of great labor in the realm of speculation as in that of action, or to the discredit which suddenly fell upon the heavy and barbarous phraseology of the Scholastic doctors in the minds of masters trained in the prose of Cicero—it is a fact that men abandoned the noble theses to lose themselves in verbal disputes, that they wore themselves out searching for subtle distinctions: they argued more than they reasoned; they reckoned authorities more than they weighed arguments; they were Thomist, Scotist, or Augustinian according as they belonged to the Order of St. Dominic, or that of St. Francis, or that of St. Augustine, to the university of Paris or to that of Oxford.[49] Capreolus of Rodez (1380–1444), the "Prince of Thomists," as he was called, vainly strove to have the *Summa* of St. Thomas accepted as the classical manual in teaching. In his monumental *Liber defensionum theologiae divi doctoris Thomae,* he provided a sort of encyclopedia of Thomistic doctrines; but "certain defects of method derived from the decaying Scholasticism" [50] prevented

[49] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* p. 486.
[50] *Ibid.,* p. 436.

his work from obtaining the favor that its intrinsic worth deserved.

Gabriel Biel of Tübingen (1430–1495), surnamed "the Last of the Schoolmen," [51] exercised a more telling influence on the movement of ideas because of the nature of the questions that he treated. His great work, *Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros,* learnedly and systematically arranged, contained original views on individual and social morality. His ideas on the rights of property, the theory of money, loaning at interest, a just wage, the rights of war, the conditions of commerce, the origin of power, etc., attracted attention; unfortunately his dogmatic hardihood disturbed men's minds.[52] He was frankly a nominalist of Occam's school.[53] He taught that the Sacrament of Penance was simply a pledge that the sins have been pardoned by an internal act of the virtue of penance; [54] that the causality of the Sacraments is purely moral, in this sense, that at the moment the rite is performed, God produces the grace; [55] that the independence of the divine will is absolute, able to create morality, to make just what would be otherwise unjust; [56] that the pope, having no power contrary to Scripture, to natural or divine right, has a claim to obedience only insofar as he keeps within the limits of his competency.[57] Luther in his monastery studied Biel and did not fail to exploit these ideas of the Tübingen theologian in favor of his own doctrines.

Towards the end of the 15th century, a young doctor of the

[51] So called because he was the last commentator of Peter Lombard.

[52] Cf. Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* I, pp. 109, 476.

[53] The Nominalism of the fourteenth century was a reaction against the formalism of Duns Scotus, which excessively increased the number of metaphysical forms of entities. The Nominalists fell into another excess: they denied metaphysical realities, or at least saw in words only symbols of unknowable realities. (See De Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 418.)

[54] *Collectorium,* bk. 4, dists. 14, 16, 17, 18.

[55] *Ibid.,* dist. 6, q. 2.

[56] *Ibid.,* bk. 1, dist. 2, q. 11; dist. 5, q. 1; dist. 10, q. 1; dist. 11, q. 1; dist. 34.

[57] *Ibid.,* bk. 3, dist. 34; bk. 4, dist. 15, q. 8.

Order of St. Dominic, Tommaso de Vio, better known as Cajetan, professor at Padua, then at Pavia, gave Thomism the powerful renewal that it needed. But the period of decadence of Scholasticism had lasted too long. Divergent schools sprang up. At the side of traditional Thomism, often in conflict with it, there developed the heterodox Aristotelianism of Pomponazzi, the semi-pagan Neoplatonism of Marsilio Ficino, an independent philosophy that made use of the name of Nicholas of Cusa, and a dubious mysticism that was connected with Master Eckhart.

The deeper knowledge of Greek which they possessed led scholars to read Aristotle's works in the original. There they discovered, or at least pretended to discover, profound differences between the traditional interpretation which the Middle Ages had given to the Stagirite and the literal sense of his writings. What could there be in common between the Christian dogma of a personal God, the Creator of the world, and the Aristotelian theory of *"actus purus,"* thought of thought, eternally coexisting with matter that was independent of him, and not concerning himself with the contingent beings that gravitated about his absolute being? How reconcile the dogma of the immortality of the soul with the doctrine of the double intellect, passive and active, the former disappearing with man's body, the latter surviving it only in an everlasting impersonality?

John of Janduno, a doctor of the University of Paris, whose political influence we considered above, declared himself in favor of these later doctrines, which he stubbornly maintained against those of St. Thomas. He taught the eternity of the world, the impersonality of the active intellect (*intellectus agens),* the impossibility of God creating beings or knowing anything except Himself. Moreover, he seems to have admitted the coexistence of two truths, independent of, and sometimes opposed to each other, the one rational, the other

revealed. John of Janduno had disciples; in his works he speaks of his *socii*. It has been surmised that he was at the head of a regular school.[58]

We have more precise and abundant information as to the person of Pietro Pomponazzi, a lay professor of the University of Padua, who carried the temerity of philosophical speculation even farther than John of Janduno. This ugly, almost dwarfish little man, learned, spiritual, clownish at times, whose sallies disarmed and amused the cardinals, taught that a philosophical truth may be a theological error, and vice versa.[59] This principle made it convenient for him, under cover of Aristotle, to maintain the most erroneous doctrines, such as the doctrine of the mortality of the soul. His book, *De immortalitate animae,* embodying this thesis, escaped condemnation at the hands of the Holy Office only because of Cardinal Bembo's protection; it was later placed in the number of forbidden books by the Council of Trent.

The temerity of this Neoaristotelianism produced a reaction favorable to the development of that Neoplatonism which, since the foundation of the Academy of Florence by Lorenzo the Magnificent, was winning more and more the best minds. The theories of William Occam, his agnostic theodicy and conceptualist psychology, the determinism of Jean Buridan, the mysticism of Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson had prepared the way for Platonic idealism, if only by their attacks on Scholasticism.[60]

The literary renaissance disposed men's minds towards ac-

[58] On John of Janduno, see Noël Valois in *Histoire litteraire,* XXXIII, pp. 528–633; De Wulf, pp. 440 sqq.; Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris au Moyen Age,* III, pp. 272–275.

[59] Höffding, *History of Modern Philosophy,* I, 15.

[60] Among the foes of Scholasticism in the fourteenth century, mention should be made of a solitary genius, restless and remarkably daring, Nicholas d'Autrecourt, whose radical subjectivism is not surpassed by Kant's. See De Wulf, pp. 445–450, and Hauréau, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscripts latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale,* XXXIV, part 2.

cepting the poetic dialogues of the head of the Academy. Besides, Ficino's doctrine, so brilliantly set forth in his *Theologia platonica,* was nothing else but Plato's doctrine as interpreted by Plotinus; this poetic mysticism conceived the ensemble of beings, from the eternal God to pure matter, as an imperceptible gradation of being, whereby everything finds a place in a harmonious hierarchical arrangement, bound together without discontinuity. Whereas, in studying Aristotle, they were fond of noting the points which separated him from Christian doctrine, they were, on the contrary, pleased to point out in what the "Divine Plato" approached the Gospel. Would it be possible to consider the teachings of Christ and of the Church as a vast syncretism wherein all the religions of antiquity would providentially meet? [61] Marsilio Ficino seems to maintain this in his treatise *De religione christiana,* wherein, without abandoning the dogma and the traditional proofs of the Church, he seems too much inclined to dissolve Christianity into a sort of enlarged paganism.[62]

At the side of Marsilio Ficino, the celebrated Cardinal Bessarion (died 1472) became the defender of Platonic doctrines; under the title, *Contra calumniatores Platonis,* he published a declaration full of moderate ideas. While admiring Plato as his master, he rejected all the pagan ideas in his Dialogues and gave high praise to Aristotle.

Nicholas Cryfts (1401–1464), better known as Nicholas of Cusa, claimed that he depended neither on Plato nor on Aristotle. It is said that it was in the course of a long voyage, about 1438, when returning from his embassy at Constanti-

[61] Charles Huit has shown the lively faith that was in Ficino's soul. But, for Ficino, the study of Plato was a Christian work. Hence came his maxim, *"Qui te ad Platonem, ad Ecclesiam vocat."* (*Annales de philosophie chrétienne,* pp. 370–372.)

[62] The treatise *De religione christiana,* except for this vague tendency, is a most original and remarkable essay in apologetics. The extrinsic proofs of religion are supplemented and completed by intrinsic proofs. Cf. Brugère, *De vera religione,* preface, p. xiv.

nople, the genius of Nicholas of Cusa conceived the vast philosophical system which he developed in his works *De conjecturis temporum, De docta ignorantia, De visione Dei,* etc. Although, in comparing Aristotle with Plato, he seems to lean towards the latter, this was because of his studies in natural science, his administrative and diplomatic career, and his mystical meditations. He always distrusted abstract essences with well-marked outlines: he regarded them as artificially classified and joined together by pure dialectics; and he repeated a supposed saying of St. Ambrose: *"A dialecticis libera me, Domine."* [63]

His conception of God and the world has induced many historians of philosophy to regard him as one of the originators of modern philosophical thought.[64] He protested against every form of pantheism; but several of his views seem to favor a compenetration of God and the world that is hardly reconcilable with orthodoxy. Against the geocentric and dualistic theory of the universe, he fought intensely. This theory, by placing the earth in the center of all creation, established a radical opposition between the terrestrial world, which is contingent and corruptible, and the celestial world, which is immutable and incorruptible. In a sense, however, according to him, man is the center of the universe, because he sums up all beings in himself by being the representation of them, as God sums them up by possessing the reality of them. In the teaching of Nicholas of Cusa, God is not, in fact, a Being separated from creatures, as He is represented in the Aristotelian conception; He is the infinite Being in whom all beings meet, unite, and are reconciled, even contradictories (*"omnium rerum complicatio . . . etiam contradictoriarum"*). Man, he says, can know

[63] On the origin of this expression, see *Bulletin de Litt. Ecclés. de l'Inst. Cath. de Toulouse,* January, 1906. (Cf. *P.L.,* XVI, col. 536.)

[64] Fiorentino, *Il risorgimento filosofico del Quattrocento;* Hoffding, *op. cit.,* I, pp. 83–91. Cf. Duhem, *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux,* April–June, 1907.

finite beings only by their differentiations *(alteritates)*, and the infinite Being only by a supernatural intuition. The principle of knowledge, according to our philosopher, is a tendency to unite diverse beings. This tendency first of all unifies sense knowledge, and is the part played by the *sensus;* then it unifies man's total perceptions and is thus the function of the *ratio,* which distinguishes the knowing ego from the known world. But if I wish to conceive, beyond me and the world, being and the possible, a supreme unity embracing all, I must go to God; this I can do only with a direct view of the *intellectus*, aided by grace.[65]

Mysticism

When Savonarola approached the religious problem, he did not have the German thinker's vast conceptions; but his *Triumphus crucis,* "the first apologetic in date," says Lacordaire, "and not the last in genius," [66] proceeded from a very personal idea. The *Triumph of the Cross* is divided into four books and aims at demonstrating the truth of Christianity, not by quoting authority,[67] nor by purely rational proof,[68] but by a just inference of the soul, rising from facts it observes or experiences [69] in the external world and in the soul, to faith in God, Christ, and His Church.

Savonarola establishes his apologia of the Christian religion not only on the argument from miracles and prophecies, but

[65] *De conjecturis temporum.* Cf. Hoffding, I, p. 83; De Wulf, p. 457. Nicholas of Cusa is rightly considered a precursor of Galileo. Yet it must be noted that he did not oppose the geocentric theory in the name of science, but only in the name of philosophy. Moreover he attacked heliocentrism as well as geocentrism, that is, any topocentric theory.

[66] The date of the *Triumphus crucis* is 1472. The apologetic composed by Marsilius Ficino in 1474, under the title of *De religione christianæ,* was not published until after his death, which occurred in 1499.

[67] *"Nullius auctoritate innitemur."* (Procemium.)

[68] *"Fides principiis et causis naturalibus demonstrari non potest."* (*Ibid.*)

[69] *"Innitemur soli rationi ex iis quae videmus et experimur."* (*Ibid.*)

on the Christian fact, studied in general history and in each soul, on the needs of the human heart, on the effects of Christianity in its worship, in the works of Christ, in the external and internal life of Christians,[70] and on the comparative study of all non-Christian religions known at that time.[71] A picture, revealing the masterful oratory of the celebrated Dominican, sums up his whole argumentation: it is the *triumph of the cross,* wherein we see Christ, crowned with thorns, standing in a triumphal chariot, drawn by the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles; on both sides are the lines of martyrs, virgins, and confessors; this retinue is followed by a crowd of infidels, the impious, the reprobate, and the persecutors, obliged to acclaim the divine Victor.

In this work of the friar of San Marco, philosophical thought is mingled with that mystical inspiration which had been showing itself for a century with a vivacity that was sometimes disturbing. "What availeth us the knowledge of genera and species?" said the author of the *Imitation.* "Let all doctors be still in Thy presence, and do Thou only, Lord, speak to my soul." By St. Catherine of Siena in Italy, by St. Brigid in Sweden, by Jean Gerson in France, by the disciples of Gerard de Groote and Thomas à Kempis in Germany and Holland, mysticism—that is, according to the definition of its greatest teacher, "the study and experience of things divine" [72] —had spread along safe paths, clear of the bizarre notions of the "Spirituals." While the body of the Church, in the person of the most eminent representatives of its hierarchy, seemed to be too satisfied in the domain of semi-pagan naturalism and human policy, it has been said that the soul of the Church advanced, as with a mighty leap, towards the loftiest realms of mysticism.

[70] *Triumphus crucis,* part 2, chaps. 10–16.
[71] *Ibid.,* part 4.
[72] Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the Divine Names,* 76 (*P.G.,* III, col. 648.)

But the spread of the deep and obscure doctrines of the new mystics, especially of Master Eckhart, was sure to give rise to more than one suspect movement.

The life of Frater Eckhart of Hochheim (d. 1327), of the Order of St. Dominic, better known as "Master Eckhart," is almost unknown. After courses at the universities of Cologne and Paris, he followed the study of St. Thomas Aquinas by that of Dionysius the Areopagite, or the author who wrote under that name. Having been called to give some spiritual conferences to his brethren in religion, to some Dominican sisters, and to some Beguine communities, he inaugurated the practice of preaching in the vulgar tongue and broke away from the method, if not the doctrine, of the Scholastics.[73]

Master Eckhart sought above all to touch the hearts of his hearers by revealing to them the depth of their sins, their truest and innermost aspirations, their profoundest religious needs. Then, in words burning with love, he spoke to them of the meeting of the soul with God, the divine betrothal, the total transformation of created beings into the Uncreated.[74] To express his thoughts, he made use of pithy sayings and sublime metaphors. The movement of the soul towards God he compares to the flight of an eagle rising beyond human ken into limitless space. Thus the soul, successively illumined and raised up by prophetic revelation, by the practice of the Christian life, and by ecstasy,[75] loses itself in "the unfathomable depth," in that infinite God whom he calls in turn "the sublime Nothing," alluding to our powerlessness to speak of Him as we ought,

[73] As to how far Master Eckhart followed the method and teaching of St. Thomas, see the discussion between Denifle and Delacroix. Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II, p. 421; Delacroix, *Essai sur le mysticisme spéculatif en Allemagne*, pp. 156, 262.

[74] "*Nos transformamur totaliter in Deum et convertimur in eum.*" (Denzinger, no. 510.)

[75] Denifle, *op. cit.*, V, p. 361.

and "the inexhaustible All," referring to the essential destitution of all that is not God.[76]

Master Eckhart had published no writing; but his enthusiastic disciples spread his maxims and often exaggerated them. In 1326, the year preceding the doctor's death, the bishop of Cologne was alarmed and opened an inquiry as to his teaching. Three years later, Pope John XXII condemned 28 propositions attributed to Master Eckhart by his disciples, notably those which in too unqualified terms proclaimed the inefficacy of external works for our sanctification and the powerlessness of our concepts and formulas to express the attributes of the Divinity.[77]

In spite of everything, Eckhart's influence was immense. Blessed John Ruysbroeck, Tauler, and Blessed Henry Suso, who were his orthodox posterity, called him "the Master" and rendered a sort of cult to him.

Ruysbroeck (1294–1381), the ardent contemplative, combined vigorous transports of piety with their brilliant figures and an extreme prudence which guarded him from the illuminism of the Beghards. For him the movement of the soul towards God is like a hunt, directed by the Holy Ghost, who acts in the soul by interior excitations and gives it the feeling and, so to speak, the scent of the divine. Lessius praised him without reserve, and Bossuet has stated, after Bellarmine, that "his teaching has remained uncondemned," because "it is impossible to draw any precise conclusions from his exaggerations" [78]

John Tauler (d. 1361), the profound master of the interior

[76] Denifle, *La vie spirituelle d'après les mystiques allemands du XIV^e siècle,* ch. 20 and *passim.*

[77] Denzinger, nos. 516–519, 528. The works of Master Eckhart have become well known only since the middle of the last century. In 1857 Franz Pfeiffer reconstructed Eckhart's German sermons and in 1880 Denifle began the publication of Eckhart's Latin works. (Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts.*)

[78] Bossuet, *Instruction sur les états d'oraison,* bk. 1.

life, set forth his spiritual teaching in his *Institutiones divinae* and *Sermons*. Starting out from the principle that perfection consists in detaching oneself from the world in order to become attached to God, he taught that this is accomplished in us interiorly by destroying the evil recesses of our soul so as to give perfect freedom to God's inspirations. We attain this by renouncing all that is ephemeral and accidental, by mortifying our self-will, by stripping ourselves of all deceptive images and abandoning ourselves to the Holy Ghost.[79]

In certain passages, of which Luther later made abusive use, Tauler seems to regard external works as of small value; but he employs correctives that leave no doubt as to the orthodoxy of his doctrine.[80] St. Francis de Sales strongly recommended the reading of Tauler to St. Jane de Chantal.[81]

Blessed Henry Suso (1295–1366), the inspired chanter of suffering and love, relates in the first part of his *Exemplar* the distressing interior and exterior trials through which God made him pass. But by these very sufferings he reached a joyous love, overflowing with warmth and generosity. He expresses this love in the second part of his *Exemplar,* which he entitles *The Little Book of Eternal Wisdom.* Thiriot says this work was the most widely read book in Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[82]

It was in vain that Luther invoked the great mystical theo-

[79] Tauler, *Institutions,* ch. 3; *Sermons,* I, p. 111.

[80] For example, the sermons for the fourth Sunday of Lent and for the eighth and twelfth Sundays after Trinity.

[81] Very little is known of Tauler's life. The story that his conversion was brought about by a layman, who then became his spiritual director, is shown by Denifle to be pure legend.

[82] Thiriot, *Œuvres mystiques du Bienheureux Henri Suso.* Janssen credits Suso and Tauler with a great influence in the formation of German prose. "These mystical writers were the first to reveal the aptitude which the German language possesses for the happy expression of philosophical ideas. They discovered the art of clothing the most subtle and abstract thoughts in clear and precise terms." (Janssen, I, p. 258.)

logians of that period in support of his theses;[83] the only ones that could be considered his real precursors are some venturesome spirits, of whom it remains for us to speak in order to complete this sketch of the intellectual movement at the time of the Renaissance.

We have already seen a popular form of false mysticism spreading under the name of "Brethren of the Free Spirit." This sect, which arose in Germany near the end of the thirteenth century, was made up of various communities, some of them directed by priests, others by laymen. They taught the coexistence of two religions: one for the ignorant—the religion of obedience and literal observance; the other for the enlightened—the religion of freedom and of the Spirit.[84]

The Brethren of the Free Spirit managed to have their dangerous doctrines penetrate the communities of Beghards and Beguines, strange associations, half-religious, half-lay, founded at the close of the twelfth century by Lambert le Begue. In the fourteenth century they were widespread in Flanders, Germany, and France. The Council of Vienne (1311) gave notice to the associations of Beghards and Beguines that they were to disperse. But Pope John XXII, when publishing this decision five years later, did not press for its execution; and the Beguinages, centers for the spread of the doctrine of the Free Spirit, often became places of most shameless excesses. The bishops of Strasburg and Cologne, as also Pope Urban V himself, in 1367, were obliged to have recourse to the tribunals of the Inquisition to suppress these scandals.

But the false mysticism found its learned expression in the teaching of three men of great culture, Berthold de Rohrbach, John Wessel of Gröningen, and John Wesel of Erfurt.

[83] "Just as the Catholicism of the Middle Ages had associated Aristotle and the theology of the Fathers, so Luther combined Erasmus and the mystic sense." (Boutroux, *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy*, p. 13.) The inexactness of this assertion appears from a simple exposition of the facts.

[84] For further details, see Delacroix, *op. cit.*, pp. 61–66.

To form an idea of the influence exercised by the German doctors of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we must consider them in all the prestige which the custom of the times attached to their high functions. These pontiffs of learning uttered their maxims in the manner of oracles, from a sort of elevated throne surmounted by a kind of canopy. When one of them passed along the street, dressed in his long and ample garb and wearing the traditional cap,[85] students respectfully gathered about him as the "master." Several were publicly crowned with laurels in the midst of triumphal ovations.

Berthold de Rohrbach, who was burned at Spires as a heretic at the end of the fourteenth century, had taught from his professorial chair that the man who has reached perfection no longer needs anything but fasting and prayer. This was tantamount to denying the efficacity of good works, at least for the perfect. He also said that for a pious man all food taken in the spirit of faith produced the same effect as the Eucharist, and that a layman urged by the Spirit of God is more useful than a priest. This was an implicit negation of the special efficacy *(opus operatum)* of the Sacraments and of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.[86]

The erudition and dialectic skill of John Wessel (1419–1489) won for him the surnames of *Lux mundi* and *Doctor contradictionum.* Thomas à Kempis had been his teacher; Bessarion, Reuchlin, Agricola, and Francesco della Rovere, the future Sixtus IV, were his friends. Wessel never intended to withdraw from the Roman Church, but his great vivacity led him to employ violent invectives against the abuses of his time, and an excessive independence of mind at times suggested to him new formulas that had a most dubious appearance. He was fond of saying that "to be freed from sin was

[85] Janssen, I, p. 197.
[86] Hergenröther, V, p. 170.

nothing else but to possess justifying love," that "love is more than all obedience," that "to cleanse us of sin, Christ communicates justice to us." [87]

There is none of these expressions but is susceptible of an orthodox interpretation. But ill-disposed and rebellious minds affected to understand them in a heretical sense. They did not even hesitate to falsify Wessel's writings.[88] "I regard Wessel as a theodidact," said Luther; "because I have read him, my opponents imagine that Luther has taken everything from Wessel, so much do our ideas agree." [89] It appears, however, that Luther never read the works of Wessel, but relied on the reports of others as to their contents.[90]

Though Luther was not acquainted with the writings of the Gröningen professor, he knew the teachings of John Wesel, professor at Erfurt. That bold and turbulent spirit, whether as preacher or as vice-rector of the University of Erfurt, grievously scandalized the Church by the temerity of his opinions. He was censured by the tribunal of the Inquisition in 1479 for having maintained the following propositions: that Scripture is the only authority in matters of faith; that Christ conferred the right of jurisdiction over the faithful neither on the Apostles nor on their successors; that those only are saved who are predestined to grace; that Christ wishes no other prayer but the "Our Father" and requires neither festal solemnities, nor fasts, nor pilgrimages, etc. When condemned to be burned at the stake, unless he retracted these doctrines, Wesel did public penance and was confined in the Augustinian monastery at Mayence, where he died in 1481, two years before the birth of Luther.[91]

Similar doctrines were taught at Erfurt and there created

[87] Döllinger, *La réforme et son développement intérieur,* III, p. 4.
[88] Hergenröther, V, p. 178.
[89] Luther, *Schriften* (Walch ed.), XIV, p. 220.
[90] Döllinger, III, p. 4.
[91] Hergenröther, V, p. 177; *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses,* art. "Wesel."

a great stir, which had not yet quieted down when Luther came to that city to study.

At that same period in England, the disciples of Thomas Bradwardine (1290–1349), under the pretext of combating a pretended Pelagianism, maintained very nearly the doctrine of absolute predestination,[92] and in Switzerland Thomas Wyttenbach (1556) taught at Basle that indulgences were nothing but illusions and impostures.[93] It was not only German Lutheranism, it was also French Calvinism, English Puritanism, and Swiss Zwinglianism that was thus being worked out in some heads of that period.

Nearly all these ideas were to be found vaguely indicated or cleverly insinuated in an anonymous treatise on spirituality, probably written towards the end of the fourteenth century. This work Luther published in part in 1516, two years later in its entirety, under the title *Deutsch Theologia*. He prefixed an introduction which contained the following lines: "This excellent little book, which is so sparingly ornamented with fine words of worldly wisdom, is so much richer in the wisdom of God that I fear not to place it beside the Bible and the works of St. Augustine, for more than any other it has taught me what are God, Christ, man, and all things." In fact, the most risky speculations of the thinkers of the time were to be found therein, mingled with the most equivocal tendencies of the mystics.

Nothing could be more orthodox than the leading idea of this book, which derived not a little of its inspiration from Master Eckhart's spirituality. The author, after stating the principle that God is, if not immanent, at least present in all things, and that all activity comes from Him and should return to Him, deduces the practical conclusion that we ought to leave all things, even ourselves, in order to unite ourselves to God alone, who is to be found in the very depth of our soul.

[92] Wetzer and Welte *Kirchen-Lexikon,* art. "Bradwardine."

[93] *Ibid.,* arts. "Wyttenbach" and "Zwingli."

But the *Deutsch Theologia* sets forth these ideas with so much force that at times it seems to exaggerate them; it exalts the exclusive power of God so that it appears to ignore all initiative and merit on the part of man; it lays such emphasis on the value of the interior life that it appears to deny all value to external works and thereby seems to be a rough sketch of the Protestant theories of predestination and the inutility of good works.

It was in this book that Luther thought he found support for his doctrine when he published it in 1516, one year before the famous quarrel over indulgences, and provided it with an introduction which was in reality a manifesto.[94]

The artistic, literary, philosophical, and mystical movement of the Renaissance was, in fact, as capable of becoming the starting-point of the Protestant revolt, as the prelude of a Catholic reform: All depended on the spirit that prevailed in this movement and the men who directed it.[95]

[94] The only extant manuscript of the *Deutsch Theologia* is of the year 1494. The doctrine set forth therein is so equivocal that even to-day it is a matter of dispute between Catholics and Protestants. While Kraus vigorously defends its orthodoxy (*Histoire de l'Eglise,* II, p. 487), Kuhn (*Luther, sa vie et son œuvre*) maintains that its teaching is Protestant.

[95] The Renaissance movement was so varied, shifting, and complex, according to differences of place and time, that we can understand how historians hold such varied opinions about it. The general attitude of the Church towards it has also given rise to diverse appreciations. Baudrillart considers that "the popes joined in that movement which was then attracting and winning men's minds because the movement was inevitable and irresistible, that opposing it would not stop it, and that the very fact of papal participation proves that it was not in itself fundamentally contrary to the Christian spirit." (*Bulletin critique,* March 25th, 1902, p. 161.) Jean Guiraud, however, is "unable to share a like optimism, because it remains to be proved that this naturalism and freedom from any religious idea—qualities that finally became the distinctive traits of humanism—are not found by a sort of direct and legitimate descent, in the irreligious spirit of the eighteenth century and in the Revolution, and even in the antichristian negations of our contemporaries." (*L'Eglise romaine et les origines de la renaissance,* preface, p. xv.) Nor does it appear that the papacy had a clear and uniform attitude toward humanism. It was a humanism with Christian tendencies that the Avignon popes favored. Although an epicurean and materialist humanism triumphed at the court of Alexander VI and Leo X, yet Adrian V, Paul IV, and Pius V unmistakably withdrew from it.

PART II

The Protestant Revolt

CHAPTER I

The Prelude in Germany

WITH some reason has it been said: "It was not Luther who made the new times, but rather the new times that made Luther." [1] At the beginning of the sixteenth century, not only were all Protestant ideas already fermenting in some minds, but all the social forces seemed ready to break loose in a mad frenzy. Hatred of princes for the papacy, prejudices of the legists against medieval institutions, irritation of the populace at sight of the scandals among the great, the recrudescence of paganism in art, literature, and public morals, a silent hostility against sovereign authority: these were some of the evils from which all Europe was suffering.

Characteristics of the German Renaissance

A dislocation of the German aristocracy and deep uneasiness among the lower classes rendered these dangers especially formidable in Germany. Since the death of Frederick II, the princely oligarchy, seconded by the legists, had extended its power to the injury of the authority of the emperor and of the lesser nobility. The Hohenzollerns in Brandenburg, the Wittelsbachers in the Palatinate and Bavaria, the Wettins in Saxony, and the Zähringens in Swabia clashed in rivalries that were a ceaseless cause of disturbance. "Poor Germany!" said Emperor Maximilian I (1493–1519), called "the Last of the

[1] Denifle and Weiss, *Luther und Luthertum*, II, p. 107.

Knights," [2] who founded the greatness of the Austrian house but who, by a misplaced generosity, failed to defend the imperial prerogatives firmly enough against the upper nobility.[3] "We foresee a general conflagration of Germany," wrote the elector of Mayence shortly afterwards. German knighthood, dominated by the princes and ruined by the economic evolution which depreciated the value of landed property, was stirred up by a ferment of revolt. The large cities, on the contrary, were favored by commercial and industrial prosperity and sought to take the direction of political affairs into their own hands.

Peasants and workmen still received high wages; [4] but, ruined by the usury of the Jews,[5] by habits of luxury and excess in eating and drinking,[6] they were stirred by an ever growing irritation. The chronicler of Magdeburg wrote in 1402: "Between the rich and the poor there reigns an old hatred; the poor hate those who have property." During the whole century this disorder kept increasing.[7]

[2] The following words were found written on the wall of his bedroom at the royal castle of Innsbruck:

"I, who am king by the grace of God, wear the royal crown
In order to protect the poor,
In order to be just towards them
As well as towards the rich,
In order that we all may live together for ever
In the joy of paradise."

(Janssen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 492.)

[3] *Ibid.*, I, p. 495.

[4] "In Saxony, between 1485 and 1509, a mason or carpenter received about two big four-pfennig pieces, *i. e.*, more than a third of the value of a bushel of wheat. At Meissen, in addition to this pay, he had a right daily to two pitcherfuls of *canet* (a sort of fermented drink). In six days, reckoning only his wage, he could earn enough to buy three sheep and a pair of shoes." (Janssen, I, p. 335.)

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 371.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[7] We cannot overemphasize the influence of economic causes on the development of Protestantism. The sudden fluctuations of wages, on account of which the workman's condition shifted from excessive luxury to extreme wretchedness, the opening of the markets of the New World, abruptly transferring the movement of commerce from the shores of the Mediterranean to those of the Atlantic, the breaking off of ties of vassalage and their replacement by unstable and precarious con-

A well regulated clergy might have been able, if not to remove evils which largely resulted from faults of the constitutions, at least to soften them by their example and labor and works. It is unfortunately true that the clergy of Germany [8] was at that time invaded by the morals and manners of secular life.[9]

Humanism was introduced into Germany by a man of genius, Nicholas of Cusa, and developed there with prodigious activity. "As in Italy," writes Baudrillart, "its disseminators were illustrious teachers, such as Alexander Hegius, whose name is associated in our memories with that of the Italian, Vittorino da Feltre. He was director, successively, of the schools of Wesel, Emmerich, and Deventer, where he had, it is said, as many as 2,200 pupils; he made the Greek and Latin classics the basis of the instruction of youth; he modified the methods of teaching, and inspired not only love of study, but even a passion for teaching in a great number of his pupils. . . . The part played by universities was much greater than that of isolated masters, and they were much more active than in Italy. . . . They were still young, but eminent men gathered around them.

"Did the Renaissance produce more astonishing results in the land of Pico della Mirandola than in the Germany of Adam Potken, who read the Aeneid and the speeches of Cicero to pupils eleven or twelve years old, or of Johann Eck, who completed the whole course of the Latin classics between his ninth

tractual relations, and the settling of large numbers of workmen in the big industrial cities, were conditions well calculated to give every revolt a widespread echo and to make of every new idea a ferment of anarchy. The violent deeds of the Protestants in propagating their teaching and of the Catholics in their repressive measures are ordinarily less imputable to men's personal malice than to social conditions, the responsibility for which cannot be laid at the door of any particular individual or group.

[8] If we would have an exact and genuine picture of the ecclesiastical abuses of this period, we should consult the *Hundred and One Grievances* of the German nation, presented to the Diet of Worms in 1521. (Walch, XV, p. 1636.)

[9] On the sad state of the clergy at this epoch, see Pastor, VII, ch. 7.

and twelfth years, or of Cuspinian, who delivered lectures at Vienna when he was eighteen years old, and was rector of the University at twenty-seven?" [10]

But this Germanic Renaissance soon became differentiated from the Italian Renaissance. Although like the latter it was universal in its culture, it was much more national in its aspirations. "German history, German thinking, German conscience, that is what these scholars aimed at; and if they gathered around Maximilian, it was because the Emperor was not merely a leader, but a symbol." [11] A second trait of this Renaissance was not long in taking shape: it was more scientific than literary. "Germany will have the creators of astronomy and modern geography, Johann Müller and Peutinger; she will have the princes of philology, Reuchlin and Erasmus." [12] It is especially by the latter that a third characteristic of this intellectual movement will manifest itself: it will be more concerned with religion.

The restoration of profane antiquity brought with it the restoration of sacred antiquity. Agricola studied Hebrew and translated the Psalms, Trithemius with his own hand copied a Greek version of the New Testament, Reuchlin in 1506 published his *De rudimentis hebraicis* and in 1518 his three books *De accentibus et orthographis linguae hebraicae.* Erasmus, in 1505, gave the public a commentary on the New Testa-

[10] Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism,* p. 33. "At Cologne there were Bartholomaeus of Cologne and Ortwin Gratius; at Heidelberg, Rodolphus Agricola, the chancellor Johann von Dalberg, Reuchlin, the illustrious abbot of Sponheim, Johann Trithemus, the greatest German historian of the century; at Erfurt, the famous group of humanists founded by Maternus Pistorius, with Crotus Rubeanus, Eobanus Hessus, Hermann Busch, Mutian—the poets who soon opposed the Scholastics; at Basle, Heynlin von Stein, who still adhered to the Scholastic school and represented it with honor; finally at Strasbourg, Wimpheling, in whom ardent patriotism was joined with extensive learning, dictated the first history of Germany written by a humanist."

[11] Imbart de la Tour, II, p. 341.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 542.

ment according to Valla's edition, and in 1516 the Graeco-Latin edition of the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles. His motto, "To preach Christ according to the sources" *(Christum ex fontibus praedicare)*, became that of most of the literary men and even gained favor among the people. From 1477 to 1518, according to Janssen, there were not less than 19 editions of the Scriptures, 25 of the Gospels or Epistles, 11 of the Psalms. Upon entering the northern countries, humanism assumed a graver and more disturbing aspect. This "new culture," which for the light-minded Italian was only voluptuousness, for the sneering Frenchman only a pretext for spiritual jesting, in the head of a dreamy, mystical German, prejudiced against Rome, took the form of an obsesssion and became real fanaticism.

In studying the religion of Christ at its sources, profound differences (if not dogmatic, at least moral) were thought to be discovered between the religion of the Apostles and the Fathers of the Church on one hand, and the religion professed by the entourage of Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, and Leo X on the other. Still more was the difference noted between pagan antiquity and Christian dogmas: in the former all the natural tendencies of man are exalted; in the latter nothing is more strongly marked than the fall. Is this nature, to which the Renaissance sought to lead us back, fundamentally good or bad? And must not this anxious query extend to the Author of the world Himself? When the question of indulgences comes to the fore, a German will be unable to keep from crying out: "What a trifling question this is which discusses how far the power of the Church extends in the matter of indulgences, beside that other question, so much more serious, to know how far extend the power and goodness of Him who has given the Church its authority." Thus the most fundamental religious tenets came to be questioned.

These problems tormented the German humanists so much the more as Erasmus,[13] the protagonist of the intellectual movement, while no doubt sincerely [14] keeping from making war on the Church, was, none the less, a religious who left his monastery and discarded all the rules of his Order, a priest never saying mass and rarely hearing it, a Christian preaching the primitive austerity of Christianity and seeming to live like a pagan. In fact, did he not proclaim that "there were more saints than we have in our catalogue," [15] and that the force of moral instinct was able to raise the pagans to a loftiness of

[13] Didier of Rotterdam, who, following a common practice among the humanists, translated his name into Greek (Desiderius, Ἐράσμιος, *i. e.*, the amiable), was born October 28, 1467, under most untoward circumstances, *"ex illicito et, ut timet, incestuoso concubitu,"* says a memoir of Leo X (January 25th, 1517), quoted by Janssen (II, p. 6). The great historian of the German Reformation says: "Erasmus was an orphan from early childhood and was robbed of his inheritance by avaricious tutors. He embraced the monastic life without having any real vocation among the Augustinians of Stein, not far from Gonda. Thenceforth he never ceased nourishing a deep hatred for the religious vows as approved by the Church. In 1491 he left his monastery and for ten years he led a disturbed and wandering life in continual journeyings through Europe, thinking of settling down in England or in France or even in Italy, or at other times in the Netherlands or Burgundy and even speaking of ending his days in Spain or Poland. Although he was a priest, he soon incurred the reproach of almost never saying mass and rarely hearing it. The 'most learned Erasmus' considered ridiculous the Breviary prayers and the Church laws of fasting and abstinence. In the matter of his moral conduct, he used to utter the most kindly judgments. Love of money was unknown to him; drunkenness and debauchery were repugnant to his nature. (*Opera,* III, 1527–1530, *App. epist.,* July 8th and 9th, 1514.) His frail constitution forbade all excess. Yet it has been thought that his taste for heavy wines was a cause of certain pains that often distressed him. He exercised an immense influence on his age. We are amazed at the enumeration of his varied and incessant labors. His wealth of style has been rarely equalled. His penetrating glance embraced everything." (Janssen, II, pp. 6–10.) When Luther was placed under the ban of the empire, Erasmus regretted what he had written in praise of the apostate friar, and he would not yield to the solicitations of Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Hutten, who tried to draw him to their side. At the same time he refused Leo X, Adrian VI, and Clement VII to undertake a campaign against the heresiarch. Pope Paul III wished to make him a cardinal, but he declined. He died (July 12th, 1536) with these words on his lips: *"Domine, miserere mei."*

[14] Plancke, *Le catholicisme d'Erasme,* in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique,* December 5th, 1908, p. 419.

[15] Erasmus, *Colloquia,* I, p. 182 (*Convivium religiosum*).

spiritual nobility never surpassed by Christian holiness?[16] Such being his dispositions, we are not surprised that Erasmus took little account of dogmatic formulas, that he uttered many diatribes against Scholasticism and the Middle Ages, and that he spoke with the greatest contempt of the literal sense of Scripture.

This is the man the German Renaissance acclaimed as a demigod. When, during his peregrinations, Erasmus deigned to stop at Erfurt, Konrad Mutianus greeted him in these terms: "In Erasmus the limit of human talents is surpassed; Erasmus is a divine being. Let us adore him with religious piety."[17]

It is true that the author of *The Praise of Folly* had sincere returns to orthodoxy. He feared that the Renaissance would bring about a return to paganism. That apprehension haunted and disturbed him.[18] He wished to maintain amicable relations with Rome, dedicated his New Testament to the Pope, and gloried in the Brief of felicitation which the Pontiff sent him.[19] From no one did Protestantism receive more bitter criticisms than those directed against it by this scholar in whom the spirit of his age was incarnated.

The drama of anguish and rebellion which was about to agitate Europe was first enacted in the troubled and passionate soul of a friar, Martin Luther.

Luther the Student

"I am the son of peasants," wrote Luther; "my father, my grandfather, my ancestors were real peasants[20] . . . My par-

[16] *"Quotusquisque Christianorum sic moderatur viam suam? Quid ab homine christiano divi potuit melius?"* (*Ibid.*) On this subject, see Dedieu, *Les origines de la morale indépendante* in *La Revue Pratique d'Apologétique,* June 15th, 1909.

[17] Janssen, II, p. 22.

[18] *Opera,* III, p. 189.

[19] Letter of Leo X to Erasmus, September 10th, 1515. Erasmus, *Opera,* III, p. 156; Brief of September 16th, 1518.

[20] *"Ego sum rustici filius, proavus, avus meus, pater sein rechte pauren gewest."* (Bindseil, *Martini Lutheri colloquia,* II, p. 153.)

ents were very poor, and my mother, to bring us up, often carried wood on her back." [21]

Martin Luther was born November 10th, 1483, at Eisleben in Saxony, of the peasant Hans Luder [22] and Margaret Ziegler, his wife. The Saxon peasant, better paid at that time than he is today,[23] was, nevertheless, in consequence of habits of luxury or of excess in eating and drinking, often in a precarious situation.[24] It has been conjectured that Martin Luther's almost irresistible fondness for wine and good cheer, which he often avowed, came to him by heredity. Hans Luder was stern and irascible, as also was his wife. Luther himself says: "One day my father beat me so mercilessly that I was frightened and ran away from home. I was so embittered against him that he had to win me to himself again. And once my mother, on account of an insignificant nut, beat me till the blood flowed." [25]

Hans Luder settled at Eisleben because he had to flee from Mohra, his native place in Thuringia, where, it was said, he had, in a fit of anger, killed a herdsman who was working for him.[26] At least it is affirmed that the Luder family was not liked by the people of Eisleben. "God has placed me in such a position," said Luther, "that at times I have to hum a little refrain which my mother used to sing:

No one loves us, nor thee nor me.
If not our own, whose fault can it be?" [27]

[21] *"Pater ist ein armer heuer gewest, die mutter hat alle ihr holtz auff dem ruhken eingetragen, damit sie uns ertzogen hat."* (*Coll.*, II, p. 160.)

[22] Luther signed himself "Luder," which was his father's name, until 1517, at which time he dropped "Luder," which means "carrion," for "Luther," which, he said, came from Lothair or Lauter.

[23] This is the conclusion reached by Janssen in a close study which he made of the German peasant of the fifteenth century. Janssen, I, p. 335.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[25] Luther, *Tischreden.*

[26] Janssen, II, p. 67.

[27] *"Mir und Dir Niemand hold.*
Das ist beider Schuld."
(*Ibid.*, II, p. 67; Kuhn, I, p. 22; *Sämmtliche Werke*, LXIII, p. 352.)

Margaret Ziegler was genuinely pious, but her piety was timorous and troubled; she had a great fear of the devil.[28] In the Luder household, not only did they have a terror of the devil, they also trembled before Christ. As Luther himself says: "We grew pale at the mere name of Christ, for He was represented to us as a terrible and angry judge." [29]

When the boy reached the age of fourteen, his father entrusted him to the Brethren of the Common Life at Magdeburg, where they had a Latin school. The historians of the Founder of the Protestant Revolt relate of him (some to increase his glory, others to lessen his fame) that as a student young Martin Luder went begging for alms.[30]

We do not know what circumstances led young Martin dur-

[28] Luther relates that his mother was for a long time tormented by the diabolical enchantments of a neighbor, a sort of sorceress, who had to be placated by presents. (*Colloquia,* III, p. 9.)

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] "Do not despise," he said at a later time, "poor students who go about singing and begging a little bread for the love of God. I was one of them. I begged from door to door." But this incident should be reduced to its true proportions. Singing in the streets and receiving a coin from some passerby was not unusual for a German student of that period. "When two or three persons are together," says a book published in 1509 (quoted by Janssen, I, p. 219), "they have to sing." Drinking songs and religious canticles, songs of romantic sentiment and satirical compositions echoed through the streets and at cross-roads. Young Luder, whose pleasing voice had an agreeable and sonorous *timbre,* must have taken a considerable part in these artistic distractions. And, besides, he always kept a tender memory of the religious songs which he either sang or heard in his youth. In one of his sermons he said: "The papists composed some very fine hymns, as, for instance, 'O thou who rent the gates of hell' and 'Christ is risen.'" These hymns seem verily to spring from the heart. At Christmas was sung, "A little Child to us is born"; at Pentecost, "Let us pray the Holy Ghost"; and during mass you might hear the beautiful hymn, "Blessed be Thou, most holy God, who nourishest us with Thy own substance." Janssen (*An meine Kritiker,* p. 61) proves that half of the hymns for which Luther has been credited, go back to an earlier time and were simply altered by him to make them agree with his new doctrine. But religious songs were not the only ones heard on the streets of Magdeburg. The young student must have heard, and very likely joined in, drinking songs such as these: "Long life to wine, to the wine of the Rhine. The timid it makes bold, and the miser it makes liberal."—"What I love is bound, bound by hoops of iron; what I love wears a dress, a dress of wood; what I love is wine, Rhine wine, in its cask." (Cf. Janssen, I, pp. 215, 222.)

ing his sixteenth year from the Magdeburg school to that of Eisenach. In the latter he doubtless found the same régime of studies and distractions. At this time, when his eager youth sought only to spend itself, he became acquainted with the two passions which humanism was everywhere stirring up in men's souls: the passion of esthetic pleasure and that of glory.

Ursula Cotta, a noble lady of Italian birth, having heard the young student sing in church, was unable to conceal her emotion; she sent for him, introduced him into her home, admitted him to her table, showered him with presents, and altered his needy existence into an almost luxurious life. Later on the poor apostate friar sadly recalled that Ursula Cotta had taught him to sing this refrain, which may have troubled him in his monastic cell:

"There's naught on earth sweeter than a woman's love, if one is privileged to obtain it." [31]

It was likewise at Eisenach, according to Luther's declaration, that he heard one of his teachers predict a great destiny for him.[32] This prophet may have been John Trebonius, who was accustomed to take off his hat when entering his class and respectfully advance to his desk with uncovered head. "Among these young men," he said, "there are some whom God one day will make judges, burgomasters, and doctors; it is but right to show them, even now, the respect due to their noble destiny."

In the autumn of 1501, at the age of eighteen, Luther

[31] "*Nichts lieberes ist auf Erden,*
Denn Frauen Lieb, wem sie mag zu Theil werden."
Such is the original text which Protestant historians have sometimes tried to soften. (Cf. Janssen, II, p. 68.) Luther quotes it in his commentary on the Book of Proverbs (xxxi, 11). No one has ever claimed that Ursula Cotta was a loose character or that Luther was lacking in delicacy. Yet the title of "worthy matron," which some historians give her on that occasion, seems exaggerated. Janssen remarks that more than forty years later one of her sons was a student at Wittenberg. She could not have been very old in 1500.

[32] Köstlin, quoted by Janssen, *l.c.*

passed to the University of Erfurt, where he took up the study of law and philosophy.

We know that these studies in certain schools at the beginning of the sixteenth century had become a set of dry metaphysical formulas, mixed with daring propositions. The eager young man, however, passionately devoted himself to them. Subtle, tenacious in discussion, powerful in his attacks, he vexed with his arguments his fellow-students and even his professor, the honest Jodocus Truttvetter, whose death Luther later on accused himself of having perhaps hastened.[33]

But such exercises did not absorb his tireless activity. We know that he successfully followed Jerome Emser's course of humanities and, according to Melanchthon, "the whole school admired his remarkable gifts of mind." [34] His favorite authors were Cicero, Livy, Virgil, and Plautus. He ardently devoted himself to music and often took part in the recreations of his companions. "He was," says Mathesius, "a young man of good and cheerful nature, given to liberal studies and to music, which he liked throughout his life." [35] Nowhere in Germany perhaps was humanism more brilliantly developed than at Erfurt. By the side of Konrad Mutianus, canon of Gotha, whom his enthusiastic pupils called "the Master of Virtue," and "the Father of Blessed Peace," was John Lange, the learned Hellenist, who remained a close friend of the reformer, George Spalatin, who was destined to play a still greater part in Luther's life, and Ulrich von Hutten, whom we shall presently see stirring up the celebrated "quarrel of the monks" and the no less celebrated "war of the knights."

[33] In a letter to Spalatin, he says: *"Timeo amsam acceleratae suae mortis fuisse."* Denifle, one of the latest historians of Luther, in his *Luther und Luthertum* (Italian translation, p. 200), remarks that Luther was a scholastic disputant of the first class and that he used all the classical procedures, with this sole difference, that he employed them, not to reach clearer and more precise conclusions, but to create confusion.

[34] Melanchthon, *Vita Lutheri,* in the *Corpus reformatorum,* VI, p. 157.

[35] Janssen, II, p. 69.

If the city of Erfurt had its Politian in Mutianus, it also possessed a Poggio in Bebel, whose *Facetiae,* published in 1506, were no less obscene or less indicative of profound corruption than those of the famous Italian humanist.[36]

These invitations to a sensual and luxurious life found a strange contrast in painting, sculpture, and engraving. The close of the fifteenth century was marked by the appearance in art of a new theme, which the brush and the chisel would execute under every form: the *danse macabre.* Grinning corpses, living beings surprised and pitilessly dragged along by mocking death, infernal dances in which the grotesque was mixed with the terrible, such were the subjects which Holbein, Dürer, and many others loved.[37] Luther saw them and was annoyed by them. The frightful impressions of early childhood suddenly returned to his mind and terrified him. Often at the close of a merry party, or in the midst of a noisy festival, his face became serious: the thought of divine justice and the fear of the devil had seized him. In such a state of mind, the smallest events could have most serious consequences. One day, at the Erfurt library, where Luther loved to spend long hours, he saw for the first time one of those Latin Bibles which were being multiplied by the invention of printing. The city of Erfurt had procured it at a great price. He opened it, turned over its pages, and admired it.[38] "My God," he exclaimed, "how I would long to have such a book as this above all things

[36] *Ibid.,* pp. 28, 31.

[37] We may well wonder what was the reason for the appearance of the *"danse macabre"* in the art of the fifteenth century. It would seem that this systematic representation of death was due to the influence of the preaching friars, who sought to stir up a reaction against worldly vanity by frequent appeals to man's last end. Moreover, these representations, coming from the Renaissance artists, did not convey that mild and serene impression which medieval artists gave to their death scenes. The new art accustomed painters to represent bodies, not souls. Hence, under their brushes we have more voluptuousness in living beings and more horror in dead. Cf. Male, *"La danse macabre"* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* April 1st, 1906.

[38] *Colloquia,* III, p. 271.

else!" He began to peruse the Old and the New Testament in this magnificent edition. A great change took place within him. "Lord," he cried, "how small my illustrious master Jodocus Truttvetter appears to me when I compare him with Moses and St. Paul."

When Luther was twenty years old, excessive application to study had exhausted him and he fell ill. His weakness served to increase his nervous excitability. It does not appear that any priest exercised a spiritual influence upon him at this time. During his sickness he seems to have been visited only by an aged monk, whose name has not come down to us.[39]

Three incidents, of small importance in themselves, produced a decisive reaction on this sickly nature. One day, while on a visit to his parents, he happened to become entangled with his sword.[40] He became frightened and, thinking he was going to die, cried out: "Mary, help me!" Later he declared that the Blessed Virgin had saved him. This incident, which took place in 1503, increased his impressionableness. Though he led a pure life, he was sometimes seized with mortal dread and trembled at the thought of God's judgments. "Often," says Melanchthon, "when he reflected on the anger and judgment of God, a violent terror seized him which almost brought on his death. I myself have seen him, when speaking about some doctrinal matter, rush to an adjoining room, cast himself on the bed, and repeatedly cry out: 'He [God] has subjected all to damnation in order to have pity on all.' " [41]

In 1505 two additional events took place which exercised a more decisive influence on the orientation of his life. One of his friends met a sudden death in a duel. This catastrophe shook Luther's soul to its very depth. A short time afterwards, while still under the impression of this shock, he was overtaken

[39] *Studien und Kritiken,* 1871, p. 41.

[40] Students habitually wore a sword with hangings at that time.

[41] Melanchthon, *Vita Lutheri,* in *Corpus reformatorum,* VI, p. 7.

by a storm at the gates of Erfurt: a bolt of lightning struck close beside him. The terrified young man cried out: "Saint Ann, save me and I will become a monk!" That was on July 2nd, 1505. Luther often recalled this critical date.[42]

For fourteen years he remained undecided, then at last resolved to seek admission to the Order of the Augustinians.

On July 16th he invited his comrades to a banquet. There was music, and the party lasted far into the night; it was only at early dawn that Luther confided his project to his friends. Let us report the event in Luther's own words. "God had translated my vow into Hebrew, for 'Ann' means 'grace,' not 'law.' I persevered, then, and, on the vigil of St. Alexis, invited some of my best friends for the purpose of bidding them farewell and to escort me to the monastery in the morning. As they kept begging me to give up my purpose, I said to them: 'Today you still see me, but you will never see me again.' Then, with tears in their eyes, they accompanied me. My father was greatly irritated over my vow, but I persevered in my plan. I intended never to come forth from the monastery, regarding myself as dead to the world." [43] That morning, July 17th, the feast of St. Alexis, Martin Luther presented himself at the monastery of the Augustinians. He brought with him his ring, denoting his rank of magister, his Plautus, and his Virgil, all carefully wrapped up. The next day he sent the ring back to the university, but kept the Virgil and Plautus.

Would monastic discipline subdue this ardent soul, which so many causes, both internal and external, had contributed to exasperate? Would he find peace by taking the religious habit,

[42] It has been thought that Luther sought spiritual counsel at this critical period of his life. A manuscript quoted by Kuhn (*Luther, sa vie et son œuvre,* I, p. 44) reports that he consulted his preceptor and some matrons on his vocation. But it has been proved that the reported fact does not belong to his life at all, but is borrowed verbatim from the life of his disciple Myconius.

[43] *Colloquia,* III, p. 187.

by receiving holy orders, by being subjected to a firm and prudent spiritual direction? As a primary condition for that, it was needful that the monastic rule should appeal to him with an authority capable of subduing him; [44] it was also necessary that the rule should find in him who accepted it a humble soul open to its salutary action.

Luther as a Monk

Martin Luther entered the monastery in a fit of despair, "not so much attracted as driven" (*non tam tractus quam raptus*), as he himself says. And the bitter and incessant reproaches of his father and mother were not calculated to calm his disturbed soul. "My son," his father wrote to him, "you have offended against the fourth commandment in refusing us all comfort and help after all the sacrifices we have made for you." [45] The reception of the habit brought him only a momentary joy, which was soon followed by mortal anguish; the silence of his cell served but to develop in him a sad bitterness. He himself tells us the cause: "At that time I was the most presumptuous of the just: [46] relying on my works, I trusted not in God, but in my own justice. I presumed to scale heaven." [47] God does not condescend to so haughty a soul.

The unhappy man continued to seek peace in external works of mortification. "I became," he says, "the persecutor and

[44] It is difficult to pass a general judgment on the state of monastic morals in Germany at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Beside praiseworthy examples of monastic life, we meet lamentable scandals. It is certain that the monasteries of the Augustinian Order, which went over to Protestantism *en masse*, had fallen very low indeed. See Denifle, *Luther and Lutherdom*, p. 360; Pastor, VII, p. 303.

[45] Janssen, II, p. 70.

[46] Or rather "of those seeking justification" (*praesumptuosissimus justitiarius*). *Ibid.*

[47] Kuhn, I, p. 55.

horrible executioner of my own life: I fasted, I endured vigils, I wore myself out in prayer, to do which is nothing but suicide." [48]

At times, in fits of despair, he took to hating God and cursing Christ. "I was so estranged from Christ," he declares, "that when I saw any of His images, such as the crucifix, I was at once seized with fright; I would more willingly have looked upon the devil." [49]

His approaching ordination to the priesthood in 1507 brought him a gleam of hope. In a letter to his friend John Braun, assistant pastor of Eisenach, inviting him to come to his first mass, he says: "God, glorious and holy in all His works, has deigned to exalt me, wretched and unworthy sinner that I am, and to call me to His sublime ministry, only for His mercy's sake. I ought to be thankful for the glory of such divine goodness (as much as dust may be) and to fulfill the duty laid upon me . . . Help me with your gracious presence and prayers, that my sacrifice may be acceptable in God's sight." [50] The ordination ceremony awakened terrible anxieties in the soul of the new priest. At the offertory, while saying, *"Suscipe, sancte Pater, omnipotens, aeterne Deus, hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus,"* he tried to leave the altar. His prior restrained him.[51] "Alas," he said, "how can I dare to address God, when men tremble before a king?" At the words of the ordaining bishop, *"Accipe potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis,"* he was seized by

[48] Janssen, II, p. 71. Later on, Luther complained that he had been a victim of the fasts and vigils of the monastic life. Denifle (p. 347) shows, by a minute examination of the monastery rule and by avowals of Luther himself, that the rule was very mild. Christiani (*Luther et le Luthéranisme,* pp. 54–58) sums up Denifle's argument.

[49] Janssen, I, p. 72.

[50] De Wette, I, p. 3; Smith, *Luther's Correspondence,* I, p. 21.

[51] *"Incipiens verba canonis, ita horrui ut fugissem de altari nisi fuissem admonitus per priorem."* (*Colloquia,* III, p. 169.)

a sudden trembling; "if at that moment the earth did not swallow me," he said later, "it was at fault."

He seems to have grown calmer after his first mass. At a meal at which the young priest's relatives and friends were gathered, Hans Luder arose and gravely said: "My son, know you not that you must honor your father?" [52] Then, after a short pause: "Son, you have forsaken your mother and me." The young priest was greatly moved and muttered his excuses, alleging miraculous occurrences, his friend's death, the flash of lightning, etc. But the old peasant replied: "God grant that it may not have been a delusion or a diabolical deception!" Luther, when recounting this incident, added: "It was impossible for me to turn back; my heart was established in piety. Yet I could not despise my father's words." [53]

Thus the monastic rule and the priesthood, far from quieting Luther, only aggravated his distress.[54]

In 1507 the Augustinians elected as their superior general a man whose lofty culture, breadth of view, and personal eminence were calculated to attract the sympathies of the young friar and hold him by ties of remarkable affection. This man was Johann von Staupitz. He was an imposing personage, descended from a noble Saxon family. "He shone not only in the class-room and in church," said Luther, "but held his place in the world among the great ones of the court." [55] Staupitz

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 156. *"Die primitiarum mearum, objiciebat mihi: Fili, nescis, quod patrem honorare debuisti?"*

[53] Kuhn, I, p. 56.

[54] What was the nature of Luther's torments? Some historians have thought he was epileptic or hypochondriac; others maintain that he was possessed by the devil. In support of these opinions, there is cited a fact which Cochlaeus reports: "One day at mass, while the priest was reading the gospel of the demoniac, Luther fell prostrate, as though thrown down by some invisible force; he cried out: *'Non sum! non sum!'"* (Kuhn, I, p. 55). It seems that his moral trouble was accompanied by some nervous malady.

[55] Kuhn, I, p. 62.

henceforth became the regular director of the young Augustinian's conscience and studies.[56]

Johann von Staupitz, the type of a distinguished gentleman and perfect humanist, was a pious and scholarly priest, with a mind open to all new ideas. But in character he was weak, hesitating, lacking foresight as well as firmness, a man but little suited to guide the sickly and tormented soul of Brother Martin.[57] We shall later see him uphold Luther and abandon him in turn, bow before Tetzel and banter him in secret, carry on a friendly correspondence with Cajetan and combat him. This trait led the reformer to say. "He is unable to decide between the pope and Christ!" [58]

It was under this master's guidance, from 1507 to 1517, that the restless Luther, brooding over his personal anguish, feeding his mind daily with books in which decadent Scholasticism mingled a rash and novel idea with the dryness of its dialectics, devouring the writings into which Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Gerson, and the disciples of Master Eckhart injected more than one equivocal formula,[59] breathing at Erfurt an atmosphere in which the Brethren of the Free Spirit and certain scholars—Berthold, Wessel, and Wesel—had spread many venturesome ideas, gradually elaborated the three fundamental dogmas that were to constitute his own particular doctrine, later known as Lutheranism.[60] These dogmas were: (1)

[56] It does not appear that, up to this period of his life, Luther had a confidant to guide or advise him. The preceptor, who restrained him when he was on the point of leaving the altar during his ordination, was merely one of those tutors who helped the students in preparing their lessons. When, in 1505, Luther alludes to his confessions, he never speaks of a particular confessor. He simply says: "our confessors." "We wearied our confessors, and they scared us with their conditional absolutions." (*Colloquia,* I, p. 69.)

[57] On entering religion, Luther took the name Augustine. Later on he dropped it, saying that it was offensive to him to seem to deny his baptism by repudiating the name received therein.

[58] "*Inter papam et Christum medius haeret.*" (Luther, *Epist.,* I, p. 211.)

[59] It is claimed that Luther knew by heart Biel's scholastic manual and the chief works of Pierre d'Ailly.

[60] In the opinion of Harnack and other liberal Protestants, which is shared by

the psychological doctrine of the absolute corruption of human nature and the denial of free will; (2) the soteriological doctrine of man's redemption by Christ alone to the exclusion of all coöperation by our good works; and (3) the ecclesiological doctrine of the rejection of papal authority and the substitution for it of the exclusive authority of Scripture, individually interpreted. Luther drew these pretended dogmas from his personal experience and borrowed the formulas into which he cast them from the authors he had before his eyes.

The violent and exaggerated state of soul which inspired the thoughts and feelings of the Augustinian friar and which, by the phenomenon known as "substitution of feelings," so much studied by modern psychologists, soon carried him to opposite extremes, may be characterized in three words: Pelagianism, Pharisaism, and Papism. A Pelagian he certainly was, since, as we have seen above, he wanted "to scale heaven" by his own powers. By his absolute confidence in the efficacy of good works, he deserves to be called a Pharisee. He himself later on said with much irreverence, but not without a certain appositeness: "If ever a monk entered heaven by his monkery, surely I would have done so." When he became a priest, "he would have liked all his relatives to be dead so that he might free them from Purgatory by his masses." This Pelagianism and Pharisaism were strengthened by an immoderate devotion to the authority of the pope and of tradition. "At that period," he said later on, "I would have slain, if I could, all who refused to obey the pope, were it only in the matter of a syllable." [61]

Denifle, Luther did not seek to establish a Protestant church until the Diet of Worms (1521), at which time he found himself at the head of a vast movement and, alarmed at his own work, tried to restrain it. It was then that Melanchthon's support proved useful to him and led him to give the sanction of his authority to the Protestant doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. From that time Protestanism took the place of Lutheranism.

[61] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XL, p. 184.

"No one reverenced the traditions of the Fathers more than I did; I regarded them as holiness itself." [62]

But it happened that, despite the friar's ardent will to save himself through himself, despite the impetuosity of his zeal for the Church and the pope, the expected conversion did not take place: his rebellious human nature kept torturing him, his scruples did not cease, the flesh cried out unceasingly, the disquiet increased. His proud obstinacy blinded him: how indestructible must be his defects, he thought, since the most tenacious will was unable to correct them. How thoroughly human nature must be vitiated in the very depth of its substance and in its free will. And how inefficacious must be man's effort to attain salvation, since the most perfect works, those of the monastic life, were unable to do it. If there is any redemption and justification for man, it can come only from the work of Christ. And doubtless the most complete adherence to the hierarchy was no safeguard, since a zeal like Luther's for the pope and the Fathers did not save him. From this soul, so full of distress, there thus arose the three dogmas of original corruption of human nature, the inefficacy of good works, and ecclesiastical anarchy, not formulated in precise terms nor fully conscious, but silently inspiring in him, first discouragement and then revolt.

[62] These words remind us of those which Lamennais wrote in the *Avenir,* addressed to the then pope: "Father, read the hearts of your children. If a single one of their thoughts be estranged from yours, they disavow and abjure it." In the description of the state of Luther's soul, following Döllinger, Janssen, and Pastor, we have frequently supported our view by the very declarations of Luther himself. The view recently expressed by Denifle, that the history of Luther before the quarrel over indulgences is impossible to write because it rests solely on his own testimony, seems excessive. The errors and misstatements so patiently brought to light by Denifle in Luther's writings, however incontestable they may be, are not sufficient to call his testimony in question when it agrees with facts otherwise known, when it fits the person's character, when it explains his later life and his teaching, and when it manifestly breathes an accent of sincerity. It is solely under these conditions that we have considered we could safely appeal to Luther's own words in our narrative.

The good and faint-hearted Staupitz, witnessing this sad crisis, felt pity for the poor harassed friar. Unfortunately this man, more humanist than theologian,[63] more orator than psychologist, did not always measure the import of his words of consolation and did not calculate the effect which the strong maxims of his master, St. Augustine, might have in the vibrating soul of the young priest. One day Luther, in a fit of despair, said to him: "Father, how terrible God seems to me! Why has He so deeply wounded the heart of man?" Staupitz replied: "He has wounded man in order to heal him; He has let him be lost in order to save him." Luther concluded that man's free will was destroyed by the all-powerful will of God. "Another day," Luther relates, "I wrote to Doctor Staupitz: 'Oh, my sins, my sins!' He answered: 'Christ is the true pardon of true sinners.'" [64] And belief in salvation by Christ alone took root in his soul.

His faith in tradition and in the pope persisted for a long time. Janssen has shown that it is not exact to say that Luther's journey to Rome in 1511 destroyed this faith. Even amidst the luxury of the Roman court, the Augustinian friar deeply venerated the pope and the Church; his correspondence bears witness to this fact.[65] It was the imprudence of Staupitz that finally ruined that belief.

One day Luther found the works of John Hus in the library of the Erfurt monastery. As he read them, he could not restrain a deep sympathy for that bold reformer, whom Rome had condemned. This thought preoccupied him. But one day Staupitz, while showing him, in the portrait gallery of the superiors of the Augustinian Order, the picture of one of his predecessors, Zachary by name, said to him: "You see this

[63] A. Jundt, *Le développement de la pensée religieuse de Luther jusqu'en 1517*, p. 54.

[64] Luther, *Schriften* (Walch ed.), XXII, p. 553.

[65] Janssen, II, p. 73.

friar: he must be in hell unless he repented; for he was one of those who, at the Council of Constance, condemned John Hus by a false interpretation of the Bible." Such words helped to lessen in Luther's eyes the prestige with which, until then, he had always surrounded the authority of a council condemning a heretic.

The evil was completed by the reading and study which the imprudent superior allowed to the puffed-up friar. The books which Luther studied at the Erfurt monastery, and those which he consulted later for his teaching at Wittenberg, did not suggest to him his new dogmas, as has often been said,[66] but they furnished the innovator with certain expressions which he was glad to make use of. Therein he encountered the triple influence of Augustinianism, mysticism, and Nominalism.

In the works of St. Augustine, so much esteemed in the monasteries placed under the patronage of that holy Doctor, Luther eagerly annotated the passages where the master, in refuting Pelagianism, belittled human reason and combated the arrogance of the human will. *"Pulchre pulchra,"* he wrote in the margin, *"Egregie solvis, sancte Pater Augustine."* At the end of the treatise *De vera religione* he added these words: *"Totam philosophiam stultitiam esse. Intellige, quod legis."* He thought he discovered in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine the doctrine that the soul attains to God by piety alone, as opposed to theology.[67]

In the writings of the mystics, which he read greedily,[68] in the *Deutsch Theologia,* and in the works of Master Eckhart's disciples, he observed—so he thought—a contempt for external works, and faith in Christ as the sole Redeemer. From

[66] Jundt (*op. cit.*), it seems to us, insists too much on these intellectual influences.

[67] In 1893 Buchwald published Luther's marginal notes, written in St. Augustine's works. Cf. Jundt, pp. 76, 78. The annotations on Peter Lombard, which Luther made about 1511, when he was delivering his commentary on the *Sentences,* express the same sentiments. (Jundt, p. 101.)

[68] Denifle demonstrates that Luther did not make a deep study of the mystics. But he did consult them and often turned the pages of their books.

these mystics he took only the theories which seemed to him to agree with his personal aspirations and his own experience.[69]

In the works of the Nominalists of Occam's school he read that words are only "vain sounds devoid of meaning" (*flatus vocis*), that life is to be found only in Christ and sacred Scripture, that the authority of the sovereign pontiff must yield to that of secular rulers. These words supplied Luther with most

[69] That Luther took from the authors that he read only such ideas as were conformable to his personal experience is admitted by the principal Protestant historians. One of the most remarkable examples of this fact is found in the Lutheran theory of redemption. We know the primitive redemption theory set forth by St. Irenaeus, drawn from the customs of ancient slavery. It explained that Christ paid the devil the ransom of man, Satan's slave. In the twelfth century this was replaced by two other theories. These were St. Anselm's juridical theory, known as the theory of vicarious substitution, connected with the Augustinian tradition, and Abélard's moral and psychological theory, which was rather akin to Pelagianism. According to St. Anselm, redemption consists in the fact that Christ substituted himself for the sinner in order to make reparation for the offense committed against God; thus the Redeemer wiped out in man both the sin and its stain. According to Abélard, redemption takes place essentially in man's heart by a conversion, for which Christ's life and death are both the means and the moving influence. In the thirteenth century St. Thomas moderated and completed the Anselmian theory of vicarious substitution by the idea of a mystical solidarity between Christ and man. In the next century, the mystical French school of Pierre d'Ailly and John Gerson subjected Abélard's theory to a certain correction. Like Abélard, they started out from the psychological point of view, but they did not extend the perspective all the way to God. While the need of conversion by reparation exists in man's heart, says d'Ailly, it is also required in the bosom of God by infinite justice and mercy; in a sort of dramatic prosopeia, he shows absolute justice accusing man, while infinite mercy intercedes for him. The great discussion resulted in the decree of the Incarnation and death of Christ the Redeemer. Luther was familiar with the works of Pierre d'Ailly. Why did he reject this theory, from which Zwingli drew his inspiration, and prefer that of external and juridical redemption with its extrinsic quality? Once more we find Luther adopting—at least until the Augsburg Confession—a religious theory merely to explain his own personal psychology. For this monk, who found himself powerless to repress concupiscence, man is incapable of conversion, unable to obtain pardon. Christ the Redeemer merely casts the mantle of His justice over the sinner's leprosy; but no internal change takes place in the soul. In St. Augustine he found, in regard to the effect of Baptism on concupiscence, certain rather dangerous expressions when literally interpreted, *e. g.*, "Concupiscence is remitted, indeed, in baptism, not that it may be put out of existence, but that it may not be imputed for sin." (St. Augustine, *Works,* XII, p. 126, *i. e., On Marriage and Concupiscence,* bk. 1, chap. 28; *P.L.,* XLIV, col. 429. Cf. *P.L.* XLIX, col. 173, 178.) According to St. Augustine, original sin consists in concupiscence.

precious formulas, which he employed against the pope and against tradition.[70]

The friar reformer preached his new doctrine openly under the kindly eyes of his master, Staupitz. In a sermon delivered on Christmas, 1515, he said: "Our justice is nothing but sin: let each one confine himself to accepting the grace which is offered him by Christ." [71] On April 7th, 1516, he wrote to his friend, the friar Spenlein: "Let us learn to say, 'Thou, Lord, art my righteousness, and I am Thy sin.'" And he adds: "He who does not believe this, is damned." [72] In August, 1517, he taught that "the human will is not free, but captive." [73]

In a sermon delivered about this time, commenting on St. Augustine's words, *"O felix culpa, quae tantum meruit Redemptorem,"* he explained them as meaning that God "has willed sin in order to be its Redeemer." [74] In his lectures at the University of Wittenberg he taught these doctrines on the authority of St. Augustine, and under the cover of that great name the university accepted them.[75]

Nevertheless the hearers of the audacious friar entertained apprehensions. In 1512, Martin Pollich, the first rector of the University of Wittenberg, after hearing Brother Martin, remarked: "This brother has very deep eyes: he is going to have strange imaginings." In June, 1517, three months before the quarrel over indulgences broke out, Duke George of Saxony,

[70] Denifle has shown that Luther, claiming to depend on these various authors, whether of the Augustinian or the mystical or the Nominalist school, is not satisfied with making a selection agreeable to his ideas, but often directly falsifies them. (See especially *Luther und Luthertum,* bk. 1, sec. 1, nos. 2, 3, 6, 8.)

[71] *Lutheri opera latina,* I, p. 57.

[72] De Wette, I, p. 16; Luther, *Letters,* translated by Currie, p. 5.

[73] *Opera latina,* I, p. 315.

[74] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXI, p. 192 sq.

[75] Janssen, II, p. 77. In his commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (written in 1515–1516), Luther teaches his system of justification. This commentary is to be found in manuscript 1826 of the Palatine Library in the Vatican.

after hearing Luther preach on justification, several times repeated: "I would give much not to have heard that man; such teaching will serve only to give the people a false security and to make them incredulous." [76]

Strange anomalies are to be met with in Luther's character. When the plague broke out at Nuremberg and he was asked to flee, he answered: "Flee? Never! If I die, the world will not perish for having one monk less." And he stayed to care for the afflicted. He was afraid of glory. "Do not," he said, "praise him who is only ignominy, the poor Luder." He signed one letter: "Martin Luther, the son of Adam the banished." [77] But at other times an immoderate gaiety broke out in his letters and conversation. Thus he wrote to Spalatin: "See that you procure good wine for us," and to Scheurl: "I would rather talk nonsense than be silent." He worked with such energy that, in 1516, he no longer found time to say his Office or to celebrate mass.[78]

His words, his looks, his whole person possessed a magical power of seduction. Irascible and rude to the point of coarseness, in his circle of intimate friends he gave way to outbursts of joy and sadness. More than one man of eminence was won over by the attractive charm of that soul so full of life. There was the naïve Johann von Staupitz, who entrusted him with the most delicate missions, *e. g.,* sent him to Rome in 1511 to defend the interests of the monastery and, in 1517, appointed him to uphold the supposed rights of the Augustinians against the claims of the Dominicans; there was Albrecht Dürer, the great artist, and Hans Sachs, the popular poet, and Reuchlin,

[76] Janssen, II, p. 77.

[77] Cf. De Wette, I, pp. 24, 45, 49, 53, 58, 64; Walch, XXII, p. 2276.

[78] *"Raro mihi integrum tempus est horas persolvendi et celebrandi,"* he says in a letter to his friend Lang. (*Werke,* Enders ed., I, p. 66.) Denifle has good reason to be surprised that Luther's Protestant publishers or biographers, such as Köstlin and Kawerau, have not understood the meaning of this word *"celebrandi,"* which signifies "to say mass." (Denifle, *Luther and Lutherdom,* p. 35.)

the erudite Hebraist; there were the strange Carlstadt and the gentle Melanchthon.

Despite his robust nature, Luther at this period often had fainting spells and complained of severe pains.

CHAPTER II

Luther's Revolt

The Decree of Indulgences

To build St. Peter's basilica, Pope Julius II appealed to the generosity of the faithful and promised abundant indulgences to donors. In 1514 Pope Leo X, in need of new subsidies, promulgated another concession of spiritual favors. The publication of the papal Bull in northern Germany was entrusted to the Archbishop of Mayence, and the preacher chosen to insure its effective spread was a Dominican, Johann Tetzel.

Tetzel has been undeservedly maligned.[1] It is not true that he preached "the forgiveness of all crimes for money without any question of repentance." [2] But it must be acknowledged that many preachers, including Tetzel, by their manner of offering the indulgences, extolling them and putting a price upon them, did provoke real scandals.[3]

The publication of these indulgences in northern Germany was the occasion for a traffic far from honorable. Albrecht of Brandenburg, archbishop of Mayence, loaded with enormous debts to the Fuggers, bankers of Augsburg, had obtained from Pope Leo X the privilege of using one-half of the money re-

[1] According to Michelet, Tetzel was a man devoid of morality. This writer says that "Tetzel was well suited to the undertaking. He might truthfully have declared: 'Behold in me one who has been whitewashed by indulgences; after this accomplishment, what may it not do?'" Such an accusation rests only on the words of his enemies; it is a calumny.

[2] Kuhn, I, p. 188, makes this assertion without producing any evidence for it. Hefele, Hergenröther, and Janssen have demonstrated the orthodoxy of Tetzel's preaching. (Cf. Hergenröther, V, p. 194; Janssen, II, p. 79.)

[3] Cardinal Sadoleto protested against these scandals. (Sadoleto, *Opera*, p. 753.)

ceived from the indulgences to pay his creditors.[4] This agreement, soon known to the people, and the excessive increase of concessions of indulgences made during the preceding years, had lessened the people's regard for true repentance, and, as a consequence, some bishops, like those of Constance and Meissen (Saxony), forbade the preaching of indulgences in their dioceses.

It was in 1516 that Luther first heard of Tetzel's preaching. While travelling with his superior, Staupitz, he was told that the church bells were rung at Tetzel's appearance in a city, that he came in an open carriage with two chests beside him, one for the indulgence tickets, the other for the money, and that he was wont to say:

> "As soon as the gold in the casket rings
> The rescued soul to heaven springs." [5]

Staupitz smiled; but Luther flew into a rage. "This Tetzel!" he cried; "I would like to punch a hole in his drum." With his superior's authorization, he began a campaign of inflammatory sermons against the preaching of indulgences.

What we know of the friar's character enables us to understand his eloquence. Impulsive, alternately violent and pensive, overflowing now with joy and then with melancholy, Brother Martin belonged to that class of men who see and

[4] For the details of this "shameful pact," as Janssen (II, p. 66) calls it, see Hennes, *Erzbischof Albrecht von Mainz*, pp. 4–10, 21–23. We have seen above that, to supply the needs of the Holy See, Rome exacted heavy contributions from the churches on occasion of episcopal elections. At Mayence the pallium cost 20 Rhenish florins, apportioned among the various districts of the diocese. The young Albrecht of Brandenburg, who agreed to be responsible for the payment of this sum, was chosen by the chapter because of that declaration. But, in 1517, he was no longer able to meet his obligations to the Augsburg bankers who had advanced the money. Certain business men suggested that it be proposed to the pope that the Fuggers be paid off out of the indulgence offerings. Leo X made the mistake of listening to the proposal.

[5] *"Sobald das Geld im Kasten klingt*
Die Seele aus dem Fegfeuer springt."

make others see whatever they speak about; but he was also one of those who see everything unduly magnified. Luther discovered in indulgences, such as they were preached, the great scandal of the Church, the most terrible of evils, the work of Satan, a hideous leprosy which threatened to spread over all Christendom. "How great are the dangers of this age!" he said, in a sermon preached February 24th, 1517. "Oh, sleeping priests! Oh, darkness deeper than that of Egypt! What an incredible security amidst such great evils! Would that I might lie so as to be able to say that indulgences are so called only because *indulgere* is synonymous with *permittere!*" [6]

Already before this time, in a Christmas sermon delivered in 1515, he represented those who preached the efficaciousness of good works in place of faith in Christ alone, as birds of prey, swooping down on little chicks and snatching them from their mother.[7] In a sermon on the feast of St. Thomas (1516), he asked whether, instead of preaching the Evangel (*i. e.*, good tidings), it would not be better to preach the Kacangel (*i. e.*, evil tidings).[8] In one of his Lenten sermons in 1517, he set up what he called the Bull of Christ against the Bull of the Pope. "Hear me, O Christian. You have no need of running to Rome or Jerusalem or St. James of Compostela to obtain forgiveness of your sins. Here is the Bull of Christ, conceived thus: 'If you forgive your brother, My Father will forgive you; if you forgive not, you will not be forgiven.' " [9]

There was no doubt but that a powerful orator had made his appearance. "Luther," says Janssen, "handled words with veritable power. He is a true master of German. His style is concise and forceful; his comparisons are striking. He drew extensively from the rich sources of the popular tongue. In the matter of homely eloquence, few men can be compared with

[6] Weimar, I, p. 141.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 111.
[9] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXI, p. 212; Janssen, II, p. 78.

him; and when he is inspired by his Catholic past, his words reveal a depth of religious feeling that recalls the finest days of mysticism." [10] The Protestant historian Menzel says: "Luther is now an eagle in powerful flight, now a gentle dove." According to Bossuet, "he had the strength of genius, a vehemence in his discourses, a lively and impetuous eloquence, which captivated the people and carried all before him, an extraordinary boldness when supported and applauded, with an air of authority which made his disciples tremble." [11]

Luther's Theses

Luther's words captivated some and alarmed others. Some declared that while hearing him they were listening to a voice from heaven; others thought that they saw in him some diabolical influence.[12]

In October, 1517, the daring reformer thought the moment had come to make a great demonstration. In All Saints, the parish church of Wittenberg, November 1st was a great feast-day; abundant indulgences were granted to all who, after going to confession and communion, would visit certain chapels. October 20th, Luther preached there on the subject of

[10] Janssen, II, p. 208. The friar preacher had recourse, not merely to the language of the common people, but to the most uncouth and inelegant onomatopoeias. The following passage is often quoted from a sermon intended to prove that repentance should not be postponed. "When Sodom and Gomorrha were swallowed up in the twinkling of an eye, all the inhabitants of these two cities—men, women, and children—fell dead and tumbled into the depths of hell. There was no time for anyone to count his money or to gad about. In a single instant every living thing fell dead. Then was heard the drum and trumpet of the good God. They sounded like this: *Pumerle pump! pumerle pump! pliz! schmir! schmir!* This was the sound of the Lord's drum, or, as St. Paul says, the trumpet of God. When God thunders, there is a noise as of a drum: *Pumerle pump!* This will be the war-cry and *taratantara* of God. Then will the heavens resound with this noise: *Kir, kir! pumerle pump!*"

[11] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 1, sec. 6.

[12] "*In ejus oculis,*" wrote a contemporary, "*nescio quid daemoniacum elucere solitum.*" Proteolus, *De vitiis, sectis, omnium haereticorum.*

indulgences. "An indulgence," he said, "is in itself something venerable; it rests on the merits of Christ. But it has become an instrument of greed and placed at the service of Mammon." The next day he fastened his famous 95 theses on the doors of Wittenberg Castle.

It must be recognized that neither in the sermon nor in the theses did he directly and fundamentally deny the value of indulgences, as taught by the Church. The 71st thesis was worded thus: "Whoever speaketh against the truth of apostolic indulgences, let him be anathema." [13] But along with just criticism Luther mingled temerarious ideas. He claimed, for example, that "the pope has not the right to remit any other punishments but those which he himself has imposed" (5th thesis), and that "every truly contrite Christian obtains entire remission both of the guilt and of the punishment of sin" (36th thesis). Moreover, he let it be understood in his sermons that the campaign begun by him had a more general import: he spoke of St. Peter's basilica, "so dear to the devil," of the decline of the clergy, which the pope was incapable of remedying, of the equal powers of pope, bishop, and priest in the matter of Purgatory. These ideas he presented as an exposition of "his doctrine." [14] At this period he began to sign himself "Martinus Eleutherius" (Martin the Free).

Tetzel refuted Luther's 95 theses by 110 antitheses, of which Hefele says: "Whoever reads the antitheses of Tetzel will be forced to acknowledge that he had a perfect understanding of the difficult doctrine of indulgences." [15] But Luther, intoxicated with success and popularity, was no longer open to conviction. His boldness increased. On January 14th, 1518, he declared "that he despised excommunication, that he was going to begin an open war, that he was afraid of no one; for, that

[13] *"Contra veniarum apostolicarum veritatem qui loquitur, sit ille anathema et maledictus."*

[14] Janssen, II, p. 79.

[15] Hefele, *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift,* 1854, p. 631.

which he knows, that which his adversaries are attacking, he has received from God Himself." [16] This was adding to his temerarious ideas on indulgences the evidently erroneous theses of the inefficacy of excommunication and the heresy of individual inspiration.

No doubt these doctrines had not yet reached a positive and definite form in Luther's mind. In that essentially impulsive nature of his, passion preceded the idea. It may be, too, that he recoiled before the consequences of his theories. In February, 1519, he still wrote: "Under no pretext is it permitted to separate oneself from the Church." But external circumstances soon dissipated his hesitation.

The Humanists

The theses affixed to the door of Wittenberg castle spread rapidly in Germany. It seemed to Myconius, who soon after joined the Protestant cause, that "the angels themselves filled the office of messengers." [17] Luther received expressions of admiration from several of his friends, notably Spalatin, Justus Jonas, and Johann Lange. Rudolph von Langen, an aged humanist of Münster, wrote to him: "The time is now at hand when the darkness will be dispersed and we shall have pure doctrine in the churches as well as pure Latin in the schools." Nowhere did Luther's theses receive greater support than among the humanists, or, as they were called in opposition to the theologians, the poets.

German humanism was just then divided into two camps by the famous "controversy over the Jewish books."

The Jewish question was very much alive in Germany in the fifteenth century. The usury practiced by Jewish bankers had stirred up popular hatred against them. Theologians like

[16] De Wette, I, p. 132.

[17] Luther's *Sämmtliche Werke* (Erlangen ed.), XXVI, p. 52.

Gabriel Biel proposed to exclude the Jews from intercourse with other men; as a protection for Christian people against Jewish extortion, monks had increased the number of popular banks. But the power of the Jewish financiers kept on growing. At the end of the fifteenth century it constituted a veritable danger for society. "Hatred of the Jews is so general in Germany," wrote Pierre de Froissart in 1497, "that the calmest people are beside themselves as soon as the conversation turns to the topic of Jewish usury." [18] At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Johann Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew, became the interpreter and earnest advocate of a measure which seemed to him the best means of putting an end to the danger to which his former coreligionists were exposing the nation. It consisted in destroying Jewish books everywhere. Many confiscations and auto-da-fes resulted, but the Emperor's intervention was impatiently awaited.

Maximilian wished to take counsel before making any move in the matter. For this purpose he addressed himself to the prelate whom he regarded as the best representative of the interests of the Church, Archbishop Uriel of Mayence, and to the scholar whom he thought best qualified to speak in the name of science, Johann Reuchlin.

Reuchlin was introduced to humanism by the illustrious masters of Florence and had creditably filled the offices of magistrate and ambassador in the service of the Emperor of Germany. Having fallen out of the Emperor's favor, he found consolation in his misfortune by again assuming the professor's robe. He taught Oriental languages and took for his motto: *"Semper discendo docere."* When consulted by the Emperor on the question of burning the Jewish books, Reuchlin courageously answered in the negative. "To refute the Talmud," he said, "is better than to destroy it; the more so as, by consigning the Jewish books to the flames, we would be

[18] On the Jewish peril in Germany in the fifteenth century, see Janssen, I, p. 371.

depriving ourselves of invaluable documents." After seeking the advice of the ecclesiastical authorities, the Emperor's council decided upon a prudent course, namely, to gather up all the suspected books, restore the inoffensive ones to circulation, and preserve those judged useful to science in the public libraries. A violent controversy ensued between Pfefferkorn and Reuchlin embittered the conflict and divided Germany into two camps, which continued the strife for fifteen years.

Pfefferkorn, irritated by the advice which Reuchlin had given, published a vehement pamphlet entitled, *Handspiegel* (Hand Mirror), to which Reuchlin at once replied by an *Augenspiegel* (A Mirror for the Eyes). All thinkers in Germany took sides either with the *Handspiegel* or with the *Augenspiegel,* and thus the personal dispute between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn assumed the proportions of a general conflict. It revealed a profound division in Germany between those called "theologians" and those called "poets." The condemnation of the *Augenspiegel* (1513) by the Inquisition and the appearance (1515) of an utterly venomous work, *Epistolae obscurorum virorum,* by Johann Crotus Rubianus [19] and Ulrich von Hutten, filled up the measure of disturbance.

Under the name of "poets," all the humanists, all those animated by devotion to ancient classic literature and contempt for the Middle Ages, rallied about Reuchlin. The most ardent of them was Ulrich von Hutten. He was born of a poor but noble family of Franconia and led the wandering life of a scholar who possessed neither conscience nor morality. In the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* he displays, along with marvelous erudition and inexhaustible enthusiasm, all the bitterness that was fermenting in his irritable soul. The enigmatic Erasmus, that other nomad with a still greater mind, but with

[19] On Crotus Rubianus and his return to the Catholic Church, see Döllinger, I, pp. 137–141.

a reserve of judgment which enabled him to survey all the sects without definitely becoming a vassal to any one of them, took no part in the dispute over the Jewish books. Yet we know that the author of the *Praise of Folly* was the friend of Hutten, who loaded him with eulogies, and it was not without good reason that his contemporaries regarded Erasmus as the intellectual father of the pamphlets directed against the "theologians."

The soul of the humanist movement at Erfurt was, as we have seen, Conrad Mutianus. His humanism was unfortunately more pagan than Christian. This canon of Gotha, who abstained from saying mass or receiving communion, was a more open pantheist than Ficino, and almost as brutally immoral as Poggio. "There is only one God and one goddess," he wrote, "but there are many divine beings and many names of divinity.[20] The true Christ is spirit [21] . . . Justice, peace, joy, this is the real Christ descended from heaven." [22] Writing to his friend Herebord von den Marten, he said: "Hurry and get a copy of Bebel's *Facetiae;* they are well told and you will remember them a long time." In the same letter he expresses a desire to make a collection of "facetiae of his own." This was the only exception he was willing to make to his resolve never to write any books.[23] Mutianus did not carry out his plan; but his pupil Tribonius imitated Bebel's *Triumphus Veneris.*

[20] Quoted by Janssen, II, p. 29.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.* Kampschulte (*Die Universität Erfurt in ihrem Verhältniss zu dem Humanismus und der Reformation,* I, p. 86) attributes Mutian's anti-Christian expressions to his animosity toward his colleagues, the canons. But this explanation cannot be accepted. Mutian's ideas may be found set forth in his intimate letters, in which they seem to be a sincere expression of his personal thought.

[23] Mutian had resolved not to write any books, but to impart his ideas by conversation. "This is the only effective means of spreading ideas," he said; "it is the way that Socrates and Christ used." Doubtless there was also a motive of prudence, for, in a letter to a friend, he writes: "Be careful about spreading these things; we must shroud them in silence, as was the practice in the Eleusinian mysteries. In religious matters one ought always to employ allegory and enigmas." (Janssen, II, p. 29.)

It was from the ranks of such men [24] that the pretended reformer of faith and morals sought his first backers. "The humanists," says Janssen, "were Luther's first allies." In his writings we find him offering homage successively to Mutianus, Reuchlin, and Erasmus; if he did not at once address himself to Hutten, it was because the latter, in a spirit of haughty skepticism, had at first declared that he "despised a wretched quarrel between monks." [25] Luther wrote to Mutianus (May 29th, 1516): "The barbarian Martin, accustomed only to cry out among geese, salutes you, a man of the deepest and most exquisite learning." [26] Mutianus, the pagan, greeted Luther as the restorer of Christian austerity; he called him "a new Hercules" and "a second St. Paul." [27] Luther wrote to Reuchlin (December 14th, 1518): "As God reduced Christ to dust through death, and as from this dust the Christian world has come forth, so you have been ground, if I may so speak, and now we see the brave defenders of Holy Scripture arise from your dust." [28] With Erasmus he stooped to downright flattery: "I am not learned enough," he wrote him, "to approach, even by letter, so great a savant as Erasmus. I was raised among the sophists. But I will venture to approach and ask the favor of the great Erasmus, whom the whole world applauds." [29]

In reality, Luther was no more a disciple of Erasmus and Reuchlin in scholarly criticism than he was of Mutianus in morality. But he found powerful auxiliaries in them. They were united in a common aversion to tradition. In the strength of such support, the monk-reformer soon ventured to withstand papal delegates, set the theologians at naught, and defied

[24] Personally Reuchlin was quite worthy of esteem. But the party of the "poets," gathered about him, was rightly subject to suspicion. (Cf. Pastor, VII, p. 251.)

[25] Janssen, II, p. 88.

[26] De Wette, I, p. 21.

[27] Kampschulte, II, p. 30.

[28] De Wette, I, p. 196.

[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 247–249.

the two supreme powers of Christendom, the pope and the emperor.

Papal Intervention

In April, 1518, at a formal meeting of the Augustinians held at Heidelberg, Luther publicly defended, in the name of St. Augustine, as he said, and against the Pelagian sectarians, the new doctrines of the abolition of free will by original sin, the radical corruption of the human will, and man's absolute passivity under the action of God. Emboldened by his success, the monk expanded the discussion. Henceforth it was not merely the question of indulgences that he treated, but the most fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion. His eloquence, his tone of assurance, the prestige of St. Augustine's authority, under shelter of which he sought to propagate his ideas, as also the spirit of revolt which inspired his discourses, drew new followers to him from both the secular and the regular clergy.

Among them was the Jacobin Bucer, "a man of learning, of a pliable mind, more fruitful in distinctions than the most refined Scholastics, an agreeable preacher, with a somewhat heavy style, but imposing in figure and tone of voice." [30] Then there was Andreas Bodenstein, surnamed Carlstadt from his birthplace, "the most restless and impertinent of men," [31] and Eobanus Hessus, equally renowned as a drinker and a poet, who unblushingly ascribed his own faults to the monks whom he detested.[32]

[30] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 3, sec. 3. Later on Bucer "married, like the others, even more than the others; for, after his wife's death, he married again, and later a third time." (*Ibid.*)

[31] *Ibid.,* bk. 2, sec. 7.

[32] He is the author of the following verses:

"O monachi, vestri stomachi sunt amphora Bacchi:
Vos estis, Deus est testis, teterrima pestis."

In company with his friend Ulrich von Hutten, he might be seen going through the town crying: *"Pereat Tetzel! Vivat Luther!"*

Luther at this period seems not yet to have dreamed of separating from the Church, but rather of making his own doctrines triumph within the Church.

It was at the beginning of 1518 that the first sounds of the religious agitation in Germany reached the ears of Leo X through the intermediary of the Archbishop of Mayence. This Pope has been accused in turn of having been too disdainful of "a wretched quarrel of monks" and of having taken it too tragically.[33] The truth seems to be more justly expressed by the eminent Protestant historian, Leopold von Ranke, who says that Leo X "showed himself equal to the difficult position in which he found himself." [34] "Lorenzo de' Medici said of his three sons, Julian, Peter, and John, that the first was good, the second a fool, and the third, John, the incarnation of prudence." This third son was Pope Leo X,[35] whose conduct justified his father's judgment. In February, 1518, the Pontiff asked the Vicar General of the Augustinians, Gabriel della Volta, to intervene with the rebellious monk and to employ monastic discipline to make him stop his dangerous campaign.[36] But the attempt met with an obstinate refusal. In a memorial (May 30th), couched in terms of humble obedience, Luther declined to make a retraction.[37] Emperor Maximilian pointed out to the Pope the grave danger of the situation from the social and political point of view and promised to place his authority at the service of the Church if the Pope judged it proper to put an end to the painful agitation.[38]

The writings and theses which Luther continued to publish became more and more temerarious. The Pontiff finally, by a

[33] "Leo X, in place of trying to pacify this restless and troubled soul, placed his thunder at the service of Luther's enemies." (Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 402.)

[34] Ranke, I, p. 62.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] Bembi, *Epist. Leonis X,* XVI, p. 18.

[37] Weimar ed., I, p. 527.

[38] Raynaldi, 1518, no. 90.

Brief (August 23rd, 1518) to Cardinal Cajetan, then legate at the diet of Augsburg for the settlement of the Turkish question, declared that if Luther should appear before the papal legate and retract his errors of his own accord, he would receive pardon; otherwise Cardinal Cajetan might inflict the penalties of heresy and excommunication upon him and his followers and requisition the help of the secular arm for the execution of his judgment.[39]

In selecting Cardinal Cajetan to conduct this difficult affair, Leo X gave a new proof of his pacific spirit. The illustrious Master General of the Friars Preachers, a theologian, exegete, and diplomat, was one of the most prudent men of his time.[40] At the outset he refrained from making use of the extensive powers granted him by the Holy See and declared that Luther would receive a paternal reception from him.

Luther's disposition was less amiable. At the first rumor apprising him that a canonical trial might be instituted against him, he wrote the Pope (May 30th, 1518): "Most holy father, I prostrate myself at your feet, placing myself and all I am and have at your disposal, to be dealt with as you see fit. My cause hangs on the will of your Holiness, by whose verdict I shall either save or lose my life. Come what may, I shall recognize the voice of your Holiness to be that of Christ, speaking through you. If I merit death, I do not refuse to die." [41] But on July 10th of the same year, in a letter to his friend Wenzel Link, he expressed quite different sentiments towards the representatives of the Holy See, whom he denounced as

[39] On this important Brief, the authenticity of which Ranke questioned, see Kalkoff, *Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess.* This scholarly monograph is the most important study that has been published on Luther's trial from the Brief of August 23rd, 1518, to the Bull *"Exsurge"* (June 15th, 1520).

[40] On this celebrated theologian, see Vacant, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* art. *"Cajétan."*

[41] *"Vivifica, occide, voca, revoca, approba, reproba, ut placuerit; vocem tuam vocem Christi in te praesidentis et loquentis, agnoscam; si mortem merui, mortem non recusabo."* (De Wette, I, p. 112; Currie, p. 30.)

tyrants, ignoramuses, and sordid money-grabbers.[42] He purposely exaggerated the condemnation that awaited him. In the same letter he writes: "What can they do with me, a poor sick man, all worn out and wasted? Christ our spouse is a spouse of blood. Pray for your poor servant." [43] On October 8th, after a painful journey, mostly on foot, from Wittenberg to Augsburg, he arrived, worn out with fatigue, at the place which the Pope had designated. But at sight of the ovations that he received, his pride revived. He wrote to his friend Melanchthon (October 11th): "The whole city is full of my name, and everybody wants to see the Herostratus who has lighted so great a conflagration . . . I will rather die than recant what I have well said." [44]

The conference between Cardinal Cajetan and Luther took place on October 13th and the two following days. The importance of this discussion and the false interpretations often given it by even weighty authors require that we examine it with some attention. Knaake's recent critical edition of Luther's works and Kalkoff's scholarly monograph now make this task easier.

"Cajetan maintained his self-respect while upholding the authority of the curia. He declined to enter into any discussion. 'I demand of you,' he said to Luther, 'only a single word of six letters—*Revoco.*' Luther left the city and appealed to the better informed Pope." [45] Thus does Ernest Denis speak of the affair. How incomplete and thereby inexact this appreciation is, we shall see from an examination of the original documents and Luther's own avowals. The latter, first of all, declared that he was received very kindly by the legate, who

[42] *"Habui nuper sermonem ad vulgum de virtute excommunicationis, ubi taxavi obiter tyrannidem et inscientiam sordidissimi istius vulgi officialium, commissariorum, vicariorum."* (De Wette, I, p. 130.)

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] *"Mei nominis rumore plena est civitas, et omnes cupiunt videre hominem tanti incendii Herostratem . . . Mœlo perire quam ut revocem bene dicta."* (*Ibid.*, p. 145.)

[45] Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 402.

told him that he was not there as a judge and that the Pope had not commissioned him to enter into a doctrinal discussion, but simply to require three things, namely, a revocation of his errors condemned by the Holy See, a promise not to teach them any more in the future, and abstention from whatever might disturb the peace of the Church. Such a request, addressed to a monk who called himself a submissive son of the Church and who had written the letter quoted above (May 30th, 1518), was a perfectly natural one. The Cardinal did not proceed in a strict and rigid way, but condescended to an explanatory conversation with Luther. The latter began by declaring that "he was not conscious of any error," whereupon Cajetan at once pointed out two erroneous doctrines in his teaching, namely, the denial that the Church possessed a treasury of indulgences and the theory of justification by faith alone without good works. These two assertions had been condemned by the *Extravagantes*[46] of the popes, notably those of Clement VI and Sixtus III. Cajetan added "that the doctrine which denied the supreme authority of the pope was rejected by the condemnation issued against the Council of Basle and the Gersonians."[47]

The next day, at his second interview with Cajetan, Luther, accompanied by Staupitz who had just reached Augsburg, protested his submission to the judgment of the Church, but demanded that his propositions be submitted to the universities of Basle, Freiburg, Louvain, and Paris.[48] Cajetan perceived the trap in this reservation. The innovator was trying to transform the dogmatic question into one of pure Scholasticism

[46] *Extravagantes* is the name applied in canon law to papal decretals and decrees of councils not included in the *Decretum Gratiani.*

[47] "*Abrogationem concilii basiliensis recitavit et Gersonistas damnandos censuit.*" (Weimar ed., II, p. 2.) This second volume contains, under the title of *Acta Augustana,* Luther's report of his conferences with Cardinal Cajetan, followed by a documentary supplement.

[48] Weimar ed., II, p. 8.

and to gain time. It was then that Cajetan uttered the famous words: "I do not ask so many phrases of you; I require of you only a single word of six letters—*Revoco.*"

However, by way of condescension, the legate did not refuse to discuss the question of the authority attached to a text of the *Extravagantes.*[49] The entire day was devoted to this debate. Luther argued with such vivacity that at one time the young Roman diplomats who acted as assessors for Cajetan, and Cajetan himself, could not help laughing. Luther never forgave the Cardinal for this irony.[50] This second day ended with a second declaration of submission; but that evening Luther wrote to Spalatin: "I am preparing an appeal, resolved not to recant a syllable. If he proceeds as he has begun, by force, I shall publish my answer to him, that he may be confounded throughout the whole world." [51] The next day the legate, wishing to exhaust all means of conciliation, implored Staupitz to intervene with his spiritual son in the hope of obtaining a sincere retraction.[52] The result of this intervention was a letter which Staupitz thought satisfactory, but which did not deceive the Cardinal. Luther, after thanking Cajetan for his kindness, expressed his regret for having spoken of the Sovereign Pontiff too violently, asked pardon, called the Cardinal "his very gentle father," promised to hear and obey the Church, but retracted nothing except in a conditional and equivocal way.[53]

[49] *Extravag. comm.*, bk. 5, *De poenitentia*, IX, ch. 2.

[50] "*Hoc faciebat fiducia sua,*" says Luther's account, "*arridentibus et pro more suo cachinnantibus caeteris Italis familiaribus suis, ut victo similis viderer.*" (Weimar ed., II, p. 7.) In a letter to Spalatin, he represents Cajetan as grinning like a fool.

[51] "*Appellationem paro, ne syllabam quidem revocaturus ut per orbem confundatur.*" (Letter to Spalatin, October 14th, 1518, in Smith, *Life and Letters of Luther*, I, p. 49.)

[52] "*Vocato reverendo et optimo patre meo Stupicio,*" says Luther, "*ut ad revocationem inducerer spontaneam.*" (Weimar ed., II, p. 17.)

[53] "*Reverendissima Paternitas tua dignetur ad sanctissimum Dominum nostrum, Leonem X, istam causam referre, ut . . . ad justam vel revocationem vel credulita-*

The letter was dated the vigil of the feast of St. Luke; it was therefore October 17th. The next day was a Sunday. Cajetan observed silence. In the evening Luther wrote a second letter, informing the legate that he thought he had given sufficient proofs of his obedience and that, not wishing to be any longer a burden to the Carmelites, with whom he was stopping, he was about to leave Augsburg. He said that he deserved no censure and that he did not fear ecclesiastical penalties; for he was aware that he had the grace of God in him. Monday and Tuesday passed without any reply from the Cardinal. Was Luther afraid that the legate had decided to make use of the power granted him by the Pope to have him seized by the secular arm? Tuesday night he secretly left the city, aided by Staupitz, who freed him from obedience to the rule and engaged a peasant to conduct him safely beyond the city.[54]

Before his departure, Luther, with the help of his friends, took measures for having posted on the walls of Augsburg a declaration in which he "appealed from the Pope badly informed to the Pope to be better informed." [55] The monk and his friends had, in fact, while Cajetan was silent, guessed that the Pope was preparing a Bull of condemnation. Luther's letter of October 31st to Spalatin abounds in coarse abuse of the Pontiff, that "rascal who, under the name of Leo X, pro-

tem possit compelli . . . Nihil enim cupio, quam Ecclesiam audire et sequi." (De Wette, I, p. 161.)

[54] It has been claimed that Cajetan gave orders to have Luther imprisoned. But this version is refuted by the account of Luther himself, who declares merely that Cajetan boasted of having the necessary powers for Luther's imprisonment; but we know under what conditions. "*Quarto die mansi et nihil fiebat. Item silentium quinta die passus. Tandem consulentibus amicis, praesertim cum antea jactasset se habere mandatum ut me et Vicarium* [*Staupitz*] *incarceraret, disposita appellatione affingenda, recessi.*" (Weimar ed., II, p. 17.) Luther's hasty flight seems due solely to a feeling of panic which came on during the night, a feeling easily explained by his psychology. On October 10th he wrote to Spalatin that he did not have time to take along his breeches.

[55] Smith, *Luther's Correspondence,* I, p. 128; Weimer ed., II, p. 28.

poses to terrify me with this decretal." [56] In order to contrive a new subterfuge, he published (November 28th) another manifesto, appealing "from the Pope ever subject to error" to an ecumenical council.[57]

Luther's conjectures or information had not deceived him. On November 9th, Leo X despatched from Rome to Cardinal Cajetan a dogmatic constitution on indulgences, in which, without any allusion to Luther, the Catholic doctrine was correctly set forth. The Cardinal published it (November 13th) and had copies of it printed and circulated.

But Luther's invectives preceded it everywhere. The constitution failed to produce the expected effect on public opinion. In the intoxication of popularity, the innovator wrote: "We are merely at the beginning of the strife: let the potentates of Rome beware! I really do not know whence all my ideas come. My pen is inviting me to greater things than ever." [58]

Luther and Miltitz

Luther's confidence in the future was all the stronger for having found an avowed protector in the prince elector Frederick of Saxony. When Cajetan requested Frederick to have Luther brought to Rome, or at least to banish him from his states,[59] Frederick took counsel with Staupitz and Spalatin and, on their advice, refused to comply with the legate's request. Luther, who was kept informed by Staupitz, had written to his lord a letter in which he heaped praise upon him and appealed to him as arbitrator. Was not the cause of the

[56] Smith, *loc. cit.*: *"Ille nebulo qui, sub nomine Leonis decimi, me terrere proponit decreto."*

[57] Weimar ed., II, p. 36.

[58] *"Get schon mit viel grösserem um."* (De Wette, I, p. 192.) On Luther's history up to 1530, see Grisar, *Luther,* vols. I and II.

[59] Kalkoff, *op. cit.,* p. 19.

Wittenberg professor the cause of his university? The prince allowed himself to be persuaded. For Luther the support of Frederick of Saxony was precious. There were strained relations between the prince elector and Rome, which had refused a benefice to his natural son; hence he might become the most solid support for the new movement.

Leo X, who was a capable statesman, did not hide from himself the grave difficulties of the situation. Luther had not ceased challenging Cajetan as a Dominican and a Thomist, saying that all the charges against him turned on a rivalry of religious Orders and a Scholastic controversy. The Pope attempted to cut short these recriminations by selecting as negotiator a diplomat of Saxon birth, who was commissioned first to bring the Golden Rose to Frederick of Saxony, then to have an interview with Luther and obtain the desired retraction from him. The Pope's idea was good; but his choice of an intermediary was not a happy one: it fell upon Karl von Miltitz,[60] one of those worldly humanists who had derived from the new culture nothing but frivolity of manners and skepticism of mind.

Miltitz presented the question in the light of a trifling conflict which, he said, Thomas de Vio, that dull theologian, had mistakenly taken too seriously. Besides, was not the fanatical Tetzel responsible for the whole misunderstanding? He concluded that Luther had only to sign a statement tinged with submission and obsequiousness towards the Pope, while reserving his rights of conscience. Miltitz undertook to obtain a word of peace from Leo X. His interviews with Luther, which took place at Altenburg in January, 1519, ended by Luther promising to observe silence on the question of in-

[60] Pallavicini, in his *Histoire du concile de Trente* (bk. 1, ch. 13, no. 8), says that Miltitz used to talk in a light vein, was fond of drinking, and congratulated himself on not being a priest because, as he said, he would not have been able to fulfil the duties of the priesthood.

dulgences and accepting the arbitration of a German bishop on the fundamental questions of the case.[61]

It does not seem to us that it can justly be said, with Kuhn, that Miltitz by his pliant diplomacy triumphed over the impressionable and thoughtless soul of Luther, nor with Audin [62] and Hofer,[63] that the legate was worsted by the hypocrisy or cleverness of the monk. The truth is that each of them, thinking perhaps to deceive the other, agreed to deceive the Sovereign Pontiff and to offer him as an act of submission what was merely an equivocal promise.[64]

Luther exulted. On February 2nd he wrote to Staupitz that he was conscious of a divine mission, that God Himself was leading him, urging him, forcing him along.[65] The same day he wrote to Sylvius Egranus: "We separated amicably, with a

[61] At least such is the conclusion reached by Kalkoff (*op. cit.*, p. 279) and Pastor (VII, p. 382), as opposed to several authors who admit a more precise agreement on four determined points. There is sometimes cited, as a conclusion of these interviews, a letter (dated March 3rd, 1519), in which Luther calls himself "the filth of the earth" (*faex hominum et pulvis terrae*). De Wette, I, p. 233. Recent investigation has shown that this letter was written January 5th or 6th of that year, but was never sent. (Cf. Pastor, XII, p. 382, and Kalkoff, p. 401.)

[62] *History of the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of Luther,* I, ch. 16, pp. 160–169, and *Histoire de Léon X,* II, p. 479.

[63] *Nouvelle biographie générale,* art. "Luther."

[64] It may be that Luther exaggerates Militiz's traits in his account of their first meeting. But when we consider Cardinal Pallavicini's judgment of Miltitz, we are led to believe that Luther's description is not a mere travesty. We are told that the noble diplomat greeted the monk in this wise: "Ah, is this you, Martin? I was expecting to see an old theologian doting in a corner by the fire, and I find before me a sharp, hale, merry fellow." Then, to relieve Luther of any fear of bodily constraint, he added: "Had I with me twenty-five thousand armed men, it would be impossible to bring you to Rome. On my way here I became convinced of this. The whole way I kept asking people: Are you for the Pope or for Luther? I scarcely found one out of four for the Pope; the other three were for Luther." To these flatteries he added cheap joking: "At times I asked respectable women and innkeepers' daughters: 'What do you think of the Roman See?' To this they would reply: 'Roman seats? We really do not know on what you sit at Rome. Are your seats stone or wooden?'" We can imagine the interview between the "merry" monk and the sceptic diplomat, sitting at a table in a wine-shop, with their elbows on the table and a bottle of Rhine wine before them.

[65] *"Deus rapit et pellit."*

kiss (a Judas' kiss) and tears. I pretended that I did not know they were crocodile's tears." [66] On March 13th he said to Spalatin: "I whisper it in your ear—I know not whether the Pope is Antichrist himself or his apostle." [67]

The Theologians

In the eyes of well-informed theologians, all the formulas of submission signed by Luther practically remained a dead letter so long as nothing was done about the grave questions which he raised before the public. These questions concerned free will, the corruption of human nature, justification by faith, and the authority of the pope. This anxiety was voiced by a learned professor of the University of Ingolstadt, Johann Eck.[68]

About 1518, at the request of the bishop of Eichstädt, Eck collected, under the title of *Obelisci,* a series of remarks on the different propositions advanced by Luther. A copy of the manuscript reached Carlstadt,[69] one of Luther's most fiery

[66] Smith, *Luther's Correspondence,* I, p. 160; De Wette, I, p. 216: *"Dissimulabam hujus crocodili lacrymas a me intelligi."*

[67] Smith, I, p. 170; De Wette, I, p. 239.

[68] Johann Eck (born 1486) was one of the most learned men of his age. His teacher was the famous pedagogue Adam Potken, who put children of from ten to fourteen years through the complete course of Latin classics as also of Christian authors and modern writers. Eck was equally well versed in the works of Homer, St. Augustine, Gerson, and Aretin. When only twenty years of age, he was in touch with the most eminent scholars of his time, such as Reuchlin and Peutinger. As Janssen says, "Eck was an old-fashioned man of conservative temper. But he was also a zealous champion of all true reform, one of those sages who, while loving the past, knew how to discard what was outworn." (Janssen, I, p. 111.)

[69] Andreas Rudolph Bodenstein, called Carlstadt from his birthplace, Carlstadt in Franconia, was born in 1480. Besides being archdeacon of All Saints Church at Wittenberg, he was also professor of theology at the university. He it was who, in 1512, presided at the session at which Luther won his doctor's cap. "This poor devil of a Carlstadt," Luther wrote later, "for two florins gave us the degree of doctor of theology. He has remained for me the type of shallow dialectician and ignorant rhetorician." (*Tischreden,* p. 575.) Carlstadt was, in fact, a type of those restless and unsettled natures whose inordinate inclinations are re-

disciples, who, after distorting many of Eck's statements, published part of the *Obelisci* with coarse abuse of the Ingolstadt theologian. Eck complained of the impropriety of this proceeding.[70] Luther answered him by a pamphlet entitled *Asterisci* and challenged him to a public debate.[71]

The city chosen for the debate was Leipsic. The keenness of the polemics which preceded this important debate and the eager desire to see the famous Brother Martin Luther engage in a public dispute with one of his most learned adversaries, drew to Leipsic a great number of curious hearers, several of whom came from foreign parts.

About the middle of June, 1519, Luther made his entry into the city, escorted by two hundred students bearing arms. The debates, lasting three weeks (June 27 to July 13th), were held at the residence of Duke George of Saxony.

During the first week Luther let his disciple Carlstadt sustain his side of the debate. The subject was free will and the part it has in good works. All agreed that Eck was completely victorious. The fiery Carlstadt made statements which put all the logic on his adversary's side. Luther raged. "What sort of an ass is this playing a lyre?" he cried. "Sweep out this filth, this Johann *Treck*." [72] At the beginning of the second week Luther himself appeared on the rostrum. An eye-witness has left us a picture of him at this period. "Brother Martin," says Pfug,[73] "is of medium height. He is alert and smiling,

vealed by critical periods which drive them to extremes. He was a Catholic in 1512, a Lutheran in 1520, a Sacramentarian in 1530, an anarchist in 1534, an Anabaptist in 1545, and shocked the world by the extravagance of his successive views. But in 1519 Luther could not find words adequately to express his praise of the Wittenberg professor, of whom he said: "If our university had several Carlstadts, it would reach the eminence of that of Paris."

[70] De Wette, I, p. 125.

[71] The fact that the public debate was provoked by Luther is evident from several of his letters. (*Ibid.*, I, pp. 171, 185, 216, 276.)

[72] This is a play on the word Eck, which Luther transformed into *Treck* (*i. e.*, filth).

[73] Quoted by Zimmermann, *Luthers Schriften*, I, p. 350.

but so thin that you can count his bones through his skin. His voice is sonorous. He is caustic and biting, readily falls into the use of invectives, and quotes the Bible on every occasion." The discussion turned to the primacy of the pope. Luther, driven by the dialectics of his relentless adversary, was led to reject successively the authority of the Church Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture, then that of the Council of Constance, and lastly that of all the general councils. "Are you, then, a Bohemian, a Hussite?" cried Eck. At this question, Luther was beside himself, cried out in Latin and German, tried to shift the question and evade the issue, plunged into personalities and became so abusive that Duke George, who was present, shook his head and, placing his hands on his hips, said: "Surely, this man is crazy!"

The third week was devoted to the Sacrament of Penance and justification by faith. Carlstadt's intervention brought no victory to Luther's cause, and the latter, foreseeing an unfavorable outcome, left before the end of the debate. His anger was poured forth in coarse abuse of all those who had dared to criticise him on that occasion. When Jerome Emser, private secretary of Duke George, published a work on the questions debated at Leipsic, Luther wrote: "The goat threatens me with his horns. Jerome, beware; both you and your writings show that you are nothing but a goat." The Franciscan August von Alfeld having attacked his ideas on the papacy, Luther wrote to Spalatin (May 5th, 1520): "Brother Augustine has come with his stuff . . . I will give it as an exercise to my servant to make verses and orations against this stolid ox." [74]

It was at this time that Luther won over to his cause one who was to represent, in the Protestant movement, the moderation and urbanity of gentle manners—the mild and peace-

[74] On the Leipsic debates, see Luther's letters in De Wette, I, pp. 284–306.

ful Melanchthon.[75] Bossuet explains this young scholar's adherence to Protestantism, as also that of several other humanists of like character, as follows:

"To reform corrupt morals was an object desired by the universe; and sound doctrine was not explained equally well by all preachers. Many preached nothing but indulgences, pilgrimages, almsgiving to the religious, and made those practices, which are only accessories of piety, the foundation of religion. They spoke little of the grace of Jesus Christ; and Luther, who by the dogma of imputed justice, took a new view of it, appeared to Melanchthon, as yet but young, and more acquainted with polite literature than theology, to be the only preacher of the Gospel . . . The novelty of Luther's teaching and opinions captivated men of wit. Melanchthon was the chief of them in Germany. To erudition, to politeness, and to elegance of style, he united a singular moderation . . . But the tide of novelty bore him down with the crowd. We see him charmed by a sermon of Luther on the subject of the Sabbath, wherein he taught a repose in which God did all and man nothing . . . Melanchthon was sincere and credulous as men of talent often are, and consequently was taken in . . . Luther's confidence impressed him more and more; and with his master he succumbed to the temptation of trying to reform

[75] Philip Schwarzerd, who called himself Melanchthon (μέλαινα χθών = black earth), was a young professor of Greek at the University of Wittenberg. He was a nephew, or at least a near relative, of the celebrated Reuchlin and a disciple of Erasmus. Döllinger says that Melanchthon "was in many ways the equal of Erasmus and in some respects excelled him." (Döllinger, I, p. 340.) During the Leipsic debate he was seduced by what impressed him as a lofty grandeur and heroic daring on the part of the rebellious friar. Later on, shocked by Luther's despotism and brutal polemics, he tempered his enthusiasm. When the rupture occurred between Luther and Erasmus, Melanchthon took his stand with the latter. But from 1529 to 1534 he was devoted to Luther with whole-souled ardor, and Luther professed unreserved admiration for him. "I take as much account of Philip as of myself," Luther wrote in 1523, "save in knowledge and worthiness, wherein he not only surpasses me, but makes me blush." (De Wette, II, p. 407.)

bishops, popes, princes, kings, and emperors, at the expense of unity and peace." [76]

Encouraged by the enthusiasm of this bubbling youth, Luther wrote: "As Christ, when rejected by the Jews, turned to the Gentiles, so now true theology, abandoned by our conceited old men, may turn to the young." [77]

In that demonstrative and untamed nature, brutal violence at times was replaced by feelings of tenderness and compassion. In 1519 his first adversary, the Dominican Tetzel, now an old man, was dying, weighed down by physical infirmity and mental worry. Abuse and calumny had been heaped upon him by personal enemies, the chief of whom was that unworthy Miltitz who had tried to cast on Tetzel the whole responsibility for the religious crisis at Altenburg. Luther felt pity for this unfortunate man. He wrote to Georg Spalatin (February 12th, 1519): "I am sorry for poor Tetzel. I have nothing to gain from his shame, as I had nothing to lose from his glory." [78] Later he wrote to Tetzel himself: "Do not worry. You are not responsible for what has happened. The child has quite another father."

But these moments of pity and tenderness were accidental and transient in Luther's life. On the contrary, what seemed to grow more and more dominant in him was a spirit of bitterness, hatred, and sarcasm, the fruit of unconquerable pride.

[76] Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 5, secs. 1 and 2.

[77] *"Sicut Christus ad gentes migravit rejectus a Judaeis, ita et nunc vera ejus theologia, quam rejiciunt opiniosi illi senes, ad juventutem se transferat."*

[78] *"Doleo Tetzelium . . . Sua ignominia nihil mihi accrescit, sicut nihil decrevit mihi sua gloria."* (De Wette, I, p. 223.)

CHAPTER III

The Spread of Lutheranism in Germany

THE agitation created by the Augustinian monk appeared more and more clearly as a manifestation of the various intellectual, political, religious, and social tendencies which stirred Germany at that time. In history no less than in geology, visible streams nearly always have their source in underground currents.

Erasmus, the oracle of the humanists, greeted Luther as the man predestined to abolish "Scholasticism, the food of asses, and to replace it by poetry, the royal gift of the gods." Erasmus explained the new doctor's literary vagaries and brutal manner by saying that "the obstinate and obdurate world needed a rude master of that sort." [1]

Alliance of Revolutionary Parties in Germany

The political tendencies of Germany, especially after 1514, exhibited a ferocious hatred of Rome. Ulrich von Hutten praised the ancient glory of Germany and declared that Rome wished to arrest its progress. "The pope is a bandit," he said, "and this bandit's army is the Church." Luther appeared to be the living incarnation of the national party, perhaps its future leader—Luther who attacked the pope so aggressively and whose nature was so thoroughly German (*kerndeutsch*).

New religious tendencies, originating among the mystics of the fourteenth and monastic agitators of the fifteenth century, were disturbing men's minds. The secret followers of

[1] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 18, no. 18; bk. 19, no. 3.

Hus in Germany entered into epistolary correspondence with Luther.[2]

A silent social fermentation manifested itself periodically in bloody conflicts between peasants and knights, between knights and the great vassals of the crown. Perhaps the worst revolutionists were those freebooting knights who, like Franz von Sickingen and Götz von Berlichingen, burned down villages and plundered merchants on the highways.[3] These anarchistic tendencies later on caused not a little German blood to flow in the War of the Knights; these tendencies were not the last to recognize their image in the rebel monk's inspiration against all traditions. Ulrich von Hutten, the friend of Franz von Sickingen, undertook the first overtures looking to a mutual understanding. He wrote (February 20th, 1520) to Luther's friend Melanchthon: "Sickingen has commissioned me to let Luther know that, should he fear any danger because of his opinions, he may address himself to him with all confidence. He is well liked by Sickingen."[4] Luther enthusiastically accepted these offers and wrote to Spalatin: "*Alea jacta est:* Franz von Sickingen and Sylvester von Schamburg have freed me from every fear. I no longer desire any reconciliation with the Romans (Catholics) for all eternity."[5]

Luther's alliance with all the revolutionary parties of Germany was henceforth a fact beyond dispute. The famous manifesto "To the German Nobility"[6] (August, 1520) was a signal for the beginning of the war against the papacy. "A

[2] Hergenröther, V, p. 215.

[3] "As we were setting out," says Götz von Berlichingen, "five wolves pounced on a herd of sheep. I enjoyed watching them and wished them good luck as likewise for ourselves. I said to them: 'Good luck, comrades, good luck to you all!' I regarded it as a good omen thus to be entering the campaign at the same time as our comrades, the wolves."

[4] Böcking, *Ulrici Hutteni Opera,* I, p. 320.

[5] De Wette, I, pp. 446, 449, 475.

[6] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXI, pp. 274–360.

Christian barely emerges from the waters of baptism," he wrote, "when he is a priest. He can then pride himself on being a cleric, bishop, and pope." As for the pope of Rome, "he lives at our expense and by his pomp defies emperors and kings." These latter, established by God to punish the wicked, "should not be respecters of persons and should strike pope, bishops, monks, and nuns without distinction," for "Antichrist himself could not reign in a more offensive manner than the pope of Rome."

"The pope of Rome" at that time was Leo X, a man heartily devoted to art and literature, the protector of Raphael and the friend of Machiavelli. This son of Lorenzo the Magnificent welcomed Erasmus with particular marks of courtesy; but Luther's doctrinal temerity exceeded all bounds.

Luther Excommunicated

After long and mature deliberation, Leo X decided to issue (June 15th, 1520) the Bull of Excommunication, *"Exsurge Domine,"* condemning forty-one propositions drawn from Luther's writings, ordering the destruction of the books that contained them, and threatening Luther with the full rigor of ecclesiastical punishment if he would not abjure his errors within sixty days.

The tone of the Bull was thoroughly Apostolic: "In imitation of the divine mercy, which wills not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live, we have resolved," says Leo X, "unmindful of all the attacks directed against us, to employ the greatest indulgence and to do our utmost to bring Brother Martin by the path of gentleness to reflect and to renounce his errors." The condemned propositions were chiefly these: (1) errors concerning the radical corruption of human nature;[7] (2) errors concerning justification by faith

[7] Prop. 31, 32, 36.

alone,[8] indulgences,[9] and Purgatory;[10] (3) errors concerning the pope and the hierarchy.[11]

It was a mistake to select Doctor Johann Eck, Luther's old foe, to publish the Bull in a large number of German dioceses.[12] The students at Leipsic tore up the papal document and came near putting Doctor Eck to death; at Erfurt there were bloody riots. All the university towns witnessed scenes of disorder. Ulrich von Hutten organized the protestations with tireless activity. Luther's insolence knew no bounds.[13] On August 18, 1520, he wrote to Spalatin: "I am convinced that we have a right to do anything in order to annihilate the papacy."[14] Three months later he says, in another letter to Spalatin: "Never did Satan dare to offer worse blasphemies than are contained in the Bull."[15] On December 10th he lighted a fire before one of the Wittenberg gates and cast the papal Bull into the flames, saying: "Since you have afflicted the holy one of the Lord, may eternal fire devour you." On the next day he defended his act from his professorial rostrum at the university, explaining to his hearers that the burning of the papal Bull was only a symbolic ceremony; what it was important to burn, was the pope himself, that is, the Apostolic See."[16]

This deed of December 10, 1520, marks an important epoch in the history of Protestantism. It inaugurated open revolt against the head of the Church. There is no exaggeration in the metaphor employed by a contemporary who said that

[8] Prop. 10, 11, 12.

[9] Prop. 17, 19.

[10] Prop. 37–40.

[11] Prop. 13, 16. See Raynaldi, 1520, no. 51; Denzinger, nos. 741–781. The complete text of the Bull is found in Mansi, XXXII, p. 367, and in Hardouin, IX, p. 1228.

[12] Paquier, *Jérôme Aleandre,* p. 143.

[13] Pastor, VII, p. 408.

[14] De Witte, I, p. 478.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 522.

[16] Luther, *Opera latina,* V, p. 252.

Luther, in burning the papal Bull before the gate of Wittenberg, kindled the most formidable conflagration that Christendom had ever witnessed.[17]

From this moment Luther became in the eyes of his followers what he himself said he was, the "holy one of the Lord." One of Lucas Kranach's engravings, representing him with his forehead encircled by a halo, was widely circulated among the people. It was rumored that at the moment when he burned the papal Bull, angels were seen above him, encouraging his revolt.

All his allies forthwith bestirred themselves. Sickingen's knights and the Hussites of Bohemia announced that they were ready to march to his defense. According to Luther's affirmation, the Bohemians offered him 35,000 men, and seven provinces were prepared to rise up to espouse his cause.[18] Hutten circulated among the people the most inflammatory of his war songs. [19] In the words of Ernest Denis, "Hutten led to Luther all those who desired a radical revolution. Thanks to him, in 1520, the religious and political movements that were stirring the nation united in resistance against Rome. This alliance marks a decisive date in the history of Germany. What

[17] Anshelm, *Chronique de Berne,* V, p. 478.

[18] Janssen, II, p. 120.

[19] Here is one of them:

"To nobles' pride I make appeal
Rise up, good towns, arise,
Lift up your hand, ye Germans proud,
The time has come to strike
For liberty. God wills it."

In this new sort of crusade, they even appealed to foreign aid:

"On my immortal soul I swear,
If God who guardeth innocence
Give me the needed grace,
My wrongs I'll right with my own hand,
E'en foreign aid I'll gladly use."

What was purposed was an invasion of Italy and the sack of Rome after the manner of the Goths and Vandals. (Cf. Janssen, II, p. 120.)

is thenceforth at stake is the very destiny of the Empire and of Europe." [20]

A writer full of enthusiasm arose in the camp of those who remained faithful to the Pope; it was the Franciscan Thomas Murner, a great satirist, who, up to his death (1536), coped with Luther, Hutten, Melanchthon, and their disciples by his writings in prose and verse, his sermons, songs, and epigrams. In 1506 he was crowned with the poet's laurel by Emperor Maximilian at Worms and in 1519 he became a professor at Strasburg. Until then he had published only stinging satires against the morals of the time.[21] But the war started by Luther in 1520 seemed to him the supreme religious, social, and political danger against which he thenceforth directed all his power of speech and pen. "The Empire," he said, "has no more dangerous foe than Luther." [22]

Murner, like most of his countrymen, turned his eyes towards the newly elected young Emperor, Charles V, who in the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle, with his hands between those of the Archbishop of Cologne, had just taken (October 23rd, 1520) the famous oath which formed, as it were, the basis of the imperial constitution. "Do you promise," asked the Archbishop, "to maintain and protect the Catholic faith, to observe the obedience which you owe to the pope and holy Church, and to sustain them by your acts?" To this the young Emperor, resting two fingers of his right hand on the altar, replied: "Relying on the divine assistance, and supported by the prayers of all Christians, I promise loyally to fulfil all

[20] Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 404.

[21] "He who would acquaint himself with the manners of that period or who cares to study the German language in its whole extent, should attentively read these stories of Murner. Nowhere else will he find so well assembled all the qualities of the German tongue: force, harshness, realism, and all that goes to make it suited to raillery and invective." (Janssen).

[22] Waldau, *Thomas Murner*, pp. 84–95; Janssen, II, pp. 128–134.

these duties, so help me God and His holy Gospel." [23] A contemporary author remarks: "All the people placed their hope in the newly elected Emperor and looked to him for their deliverance." [24] Nor did Luther and Hutten lose sight of him. For a while they hoped to win him to their cause; but they soon perceived that this hope was vain and made ready to resist him with all their strength.

Emperor Charles V

Charles I, king of Spain, had been elected (June 28th, 1519) Emperor of Germany, under the name of Charles V, despite the formidable competition of Francis I of France and the silent opposition, it was said, of Pope Leo X.[25] He encountered serious difficulties, arising from both the political and the religious situation of the country.

During the deliberations of the electors, the bandit knight, Franz von Sickingen, who was in turn bought by the king of France and by the king of Spain, played an almost preponderant part; and Ulrich von Hutten, a man devoid of morals, might be seen carrying on wary negotiations with the archbishop of Mayence and the margrave of Brandenburg. On the other hand, the Spaniards, displeased at the election and fearful lest the new Emperor would lead them into bloody wars for the benefit of Germany, refused to pay their taxes and threatened to revolt. The treasury of Charles V, who had spent a million florins for his election, was empty. The religious situation was equally disquieting. Jerome Aleander, the

[23] Janssen, I, pp. 407–409; II, p. 139.

[24] Bodmann, *Posthumous Writings,* quoted by Janssen, II, p. 132.

[25] The vacillating policy of Leo X in this affair is analysed and estimated at length by Pastor, VII, pp. 272 sqq. To claim, as Baumgarten does (*Die Politik Leos X,* p. 555) that this policy was dominated by considerations of nepotism, is an error. Family interests had their part, no doubt, but never outweighed those higher considerations whose object was the independence of the Italian States and consequently of the Holy See.

papal legate in Germany, with some exaggeration but under the impulsion of a panic fear that was not altogether groundless, wrote: "Nine-tenths of the country is crying: Luther! and the other tenth: May the Roman court perish!" [26] Luther, at the height of his exaltation, proclaimed: "Let Rome excommunicate me and burn my writings! Let her send me to the stake! She will not be able to stop the advance; there is something resembling a prodigy at our very doors."

Hutten had tried by flattery to win over the Emperor to the new ideas and hailed him as the Ziska of a new Hus. But the personal sentiments of the new sovereign, as well as his political interests, would not permit him to support the Reformation. Charles, who was sincerely pious, was shocked by the clamor and blasphemies of the sect attaching itself to Luther. As he was charged with continuing the work of Charlemagne and with maintaining the unity of the Holy Roman Empire, he naturally opposed a revolt whose watchword was separation from Rome.[27]

The Diet of Worms

With these dispositions he assembled the diet of Worms (January 27th, 1521). Its first sessions were devoted to the settlement of certain political questions, domestic and foreign. But Luther's name was on everyone's lips. All were waiting to see the diet take up the religious issue and expecting to see the reformer appear there in person.

On February 13th, Aleander, the papal legate, speaking in the name of the Pope, delivered a three-hour discourse which made a deep impression upon his hearers. He set forth how the doctrines of the Augustinian monk and the intrigues of his

[26] Paquier, *Jérôme Aléandre,* p. 184. On Aleander, see Pastor, VII, pp. 404 and 419–441.

[27] Paquier, p. 172.

followers threatened not only the Church, but also the Empire, nay, the whole social order. In conformity with these conclusions, the Emperor submitted to the estates an edict banishing Luther as a disturber of the faith and of the public peace, and declaring as guilty of lese-majesty anyone who in future would declare himself a protector or partisan of the rebel monk.[28]

The discussion of this edict lasted seven days and was extremely violent. At one of the sessions, Duke Frederick, elector of Saxony, and Margrave Joachim, elector of Brandenburg, almost came to blows.[29] All around the city Sickingen's freebooting knights exercised a veritable reign of terror. There was a fear lest at any moment that terrible band might invade the meeting-place of the diet. Aleander wrote: "Sickingen is the real master of Germany: he has armed men when and as he wishes, whereas the Emperor has none." [30]

The estates refused to approve the imperial edict, alleging that to banish Luther would be to stir up a formidable revolution. But they required that the Augustinian monk should be summoned to Worms and permitted to offer an explanation before the diet. In accordance with this decision, the Emperor wrote to Luther (March 6th, 1521): "You have no need to fear either ambushes or ill-treatment; our escort and safe-conduct will protect you. We count on your obedience. If you refuse to obey, you will at once incur the rigor of our judgment."

Luther's pride seemed at first to be exalted at the thought that he, a simple monk, was to appear before the diet of the Holy Empire, in the presence of the Emperor and the heads

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 198–203.

[29] *"Le duc saxone e el marchese Brandeburgh vennero quasi ad manus, et sarebbe fatto, se non fusse messo de meggio Saltzburgh et altri que vi erano."* (From a dispatch of Aleander, published by Balan, *Monumenta reformationis lutheranae ex tabulariis Sanctae Sedis secretis,* p. 62.)

[30] Balan, p. 160.

of the estates. Exaggerating the perils and forgetting his safe-conduct, he said: "Were they to build a fire reaching to the sky, I would pass through it in the name of God: I will enter the very jaws of this behemoth, break its teeth, and confess the Lord."

Luther left Wittenberg on April 2nd; his journey was a triumphal march organized by his friends. Crotus Rubianus, rector of the University of Erfurt, accompanied by forty professors and followed by a great throng of people, went forth three miles to meet him who was hailed as "the Hero of the Gospel," "the Expected One," "the new St. Paul."

Luther preached in the Augustinian church at Erfurt on April 7th, attacking the Holy Father and the doctrine of sanctification by good works.[31] A week later he wrote to Spalatin: "I have decided to force Satan to recoil, and I despise his snares." On the 16th, accompanied by his friends, he reached Worms. The next day he appeared before the diet.

The Emperor presided, dressed in his gorgeous Spanish mantle. Below him sat the two nuncios, the ecclesiastical and lay electors, and the princes, knights, and burgomasters of the imperial cities. More than 5,000 persons filled the hall and its approaches.

In the presence of this assembly, the rebel monk lost his arrogance. The *officialis* of the Archbishop of Treves, pointing to some books on a table and reading their titles, asked Luther whether he was their author and whether he was ready to retract their errors which had been condemned by the Church. Luther answered the first question affirmatively, but asked for a delay before replying to the second. He spoke with such a

[31] It was there, according to his partisans, that Luther performed his first miracle. While he was preaching, an unusual noise was heard. The crowd, panic-stricken, rushed pell mell to the doors. Thereupon Luther cried out: "My beloved friends, it is the devil to whom we owe this alarm. But take courage!" "After Luther had threatened the demon, silence was at once restored. This was Luther's first miracle and his disciples gathered about him and attended him." (Kampschulte, *op. cit.*, II, p. 98.)

feeble voice that even those who were very close could scarcely hear him. "He spoke almost in a whisper," reports Philip von Fürstenberg, "and seemed to experience fright and anxiety." [32] Great was the disillusion. "That is not the man," said Charles V, "to make a heretic of me."

On the morrow, however, Luther's attitude was changed. In a firm and confident tone, he declared that he was not willing to retract anything, but said he was ready to discuss his doctrines according to the Scriptures. He was then told that there was to be no discussion about the Scriptures, but simply to establish the fact that his doctrines were contrary to those of the popes and the councils. He answered: "I cannot submit my faith either to the pope or to councils, because it is as clear as day that they have fallen into error." During the following days several schemes of conciliation were considered. The *officialis* proposed to Luther that his cause be submitted either to the Emperor, or to a commission of German prelates appointed by the Pope, or to a council soon to be held. Luther rejected the first two proposals and declared he would accept the future council only in so far as the council would conform to Scripture and truth. A public debate was proposed to him, but he refused. When driven to the wall, he finally cried out: "My doctrine was revealed to me." [33]

This complete change of front can be easily explained. Since the evening of Luther's first appearance before the diet, the revolutionary knights had surrounded the diet; the people, aroused in his favor, ran through the streets of the city, shouting the reformer's name. Two days later there was posted on the walls of the city hall a placard with this inscription: "We are four hundred nobles bound together by an oath not to

[32] Quoted by Janssen, II, p. 169. Cf. Balan, p. 175. The Strasburg ambassadors said they were unable to hear Luther because he spoke so low, *"mit niderer stim."* (Paquier, p. 237.)

[33] Janssen, II, p. 172.

abandon Luther the Just." The placard concluded with the terrible rallying cry of the rebellious peasants: *"Bundschuh! Bundschuh!"* The bundschuh, or laced shoe, its sole studded with large hobnails, was the German peasants' rallying sign, which they used in opposition to the military boot. Hutten wrote (May 1st, 1521): "Franz von Sickingen is with us. At table he has Luther's writings read aloud. I heard him affirm under oath that, in spite of every danger, he could not abandon the cause of truth." [34]

After the failure of these attempts, Charles V ordered Luther to depart without delay, giving him the protection of a safe-conduct for thirty-one days. Luther left Worms April 26, 1521. One month later, when the safe-conduct had expired, the diet passed an edict banishing the reformer and his partisans from the Empire: the princes were ordered to seize his person in case he should contravene the edict of banishment.[35]

Luther had been arrested a few days after leaving Worms, but with an intention quite other than that provided by the edict. Just as he reached the entrance to a forest, close by the city of Altenstein, he was seized by masked horsemen, who put his companions to flight and mysteriously carried him to a solitary fortress, perched like an eagle's nest on a mountain top. These masked horsemen were in the service of the elector of Saxony, Luther's friend and the organizer of the comedy

[34] Böcking, *Ulrici Hutteni Opera,* II, p. 50. Events will show how he should have reckoned with such an oath. At the very time that Luther was condemned by the diet, we see Sickingen forsake the revolutionary party and offer his sword to the Emperor. Robert de la Mark, with Francis I's encouragement, had invaded the hereditary country of Charles V. The latter, on very advantageous pecuniary conditions, had just enrolled the terrible leader of the bandit knights in his forces. As for Hutten, to reduce him to inaction, it sufficed to promise him, in the Emperor's name, an annual pension of four hundred florins. (Janssen, II, p. 178.)

[35] Balan, p. 223. See Paquier (*op. cit.,* p. 268) on the accusation against Aleander that he had antedated the edict of Worms and on the objections made to the legality of that edict.

that was about to be played.[36] The solitary stronghold where the banished monk was going to live under the name of "Junker Georg" (Squire George) was the famous castle of Wartburg.

Luther at Wartburg

The castle of Wartburg, which belonged to Duke Frederick of Saxony, was an old-time citadel, situated near Eisenach, made famous by the Minnesingers and sanctified by the presence and virtues of St. Elizabeth. To mislead the search that would be made for Luther, the prince circulated a report that, in spite of the Emperor's safe-conduct, the monk, his protegé, had been seized by brigands who took him prisoner and inflicted the most cruel torments on him. The rumor went so far as to affirm that his body had been discovered in a mine shaft.[37]

The author of this kidnapping exploit and his accomplices were doubtless not blind to the likelihood that in the end the mysterious retreat would become known; but they hoped that, with Luther no longer preaching, the Emperor would not attempt a siege of the stronghold. Besides, even in such an event, the followers of Luther might perhaps be able to sustain a siege in such a strong citadel.

It shortly became evident that they would not have to concern themselves with this eventuality. Soon after the closing of the diet, Charles V was called to the Netherlands, then to Spain, where disturbances had broken out, and before long his war with France so absorbed him that Germany, left to itself,

[36] "I allowed myself to be confined and hidden. For the present it is necessary to keep silent and suffer," Luther wrote to the painter Lucas Cranach (April 24th, 1521). (De Wette, I, p. 588.)

[37] From the diary kept by the celebrated painter Albrecht Dürer at this period, we see how great a feeling was aroused by these reports. (Thausing, *Dürers Briefe*, pp. 119–123.)

felt the influence of the princes favorable to Lutheranism. The edict of Worms was executed only in a few States.

Leo X's death [38] (December 1st, 1521) did not improve the situation. His successor, Adrian VI, was a superior man, whose imperishable glory, as we shall see later, it was to be the first to place his finger on the sore spot of the Church and to point out the course to be followed. He made sincere attempts to reform ecclesiastical abuses; but the fruitlessness of these attempts clouded and perhaps shortened his life. Chieregato's failure at the diet of Nuremberg was a painful blow to him. The nuncio was commissioned to demand, in the Pope's name, the execution of the edict of Worms; but the diet insisted on impossible conditions, called for a council to be held in Germany, and made some vague promises that were never kept.

Luther's cause profited by all these events. On his solitary rock, which he called his retreat of Patmos, the leader of the Reformation, whose exuberant activity had need of an outlet, undertook a translation of the Bible into popular German. That the sacred volume might be placed in everyone's hands [39] was the desire of him who regarded the Epistle of St. James as an "epistle of straw" and rejected it along with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse solely because these three books—so he asserted—did not contain the doctrine of Christ. Thus did Luther set up individual judgment in matters of Scripture.[40] Having a lively, brilliant, and incisive style, now

[38] Two contemporary historians, Jovius (*Vita Leonis X*, I, p. 4) and Guicciardini (*Storia d'Italia*, XIV, p. 4) speak of poisoning in connection with this death. But Pastor, after a critical examination of the evidence, concludes that "everything points rather to the idea that Leo X, like Alexander VI, was the victim of a virulent attack of malaria." (*Op. cit.*, VIII, p. 68.)

[39] Luther's German translation is sometimes mentioned as the first one ever published in the vulgar tongue. But this is not so. Janssen proves that German translations of the Bible were wide-spread in the fifteenth century. He counts, before the Lutheran version, fourteen translations in High German and five in Low German, besides a large number of editions of the Gospels and Psalms. (Janssen, I, p. 45.)

[40] Luther, *Sämmtliche Werke*, XLIII, pp. 115, 156, 158.

naïve and simple, now striking and lofty, his translation possesses genuine literary value. But what merit of style can excuse the misleading interpretations and clever and dishonest insertions which make his work a profanation of the sacred Book? [41]

Various polemical writings also issued from the castle of Wartburg. Among them is a pamphlet against King Henry VIII, who had criticized one of Luther's works, *The Babylonian Captivity,* and on that occasion had received from Pope Leo X the title of "Defender of the Faith." The translator of the Bible interrupted his labor to call his royal adversary "a crowned ass," "an arrant puppy," "an idiot," "the refuse of pigs and asses," "besmirching the crown of Christ with his filth." [42]

Even these labors did not absorb his restless spirit. A vast correspondence reveals the thoughts that were stirring in that powerful and unbalanced nature. More than once, in the silence of his retreat, Luther was assailed by doubts, by anguish, and by remorse. When he contemplated all that had taken place during the preceding four years—how he, a simple monk, had defied the Pope, the Church, and tradition, he trembled. When he is no longer sustained by the intoxication of popular applause or the fever of battle, his boldness fails him. "I have destroyed," he wrote, "the ancient equilibrium of

[41] Eminent scholars, such as Döllinger (III, pp. 135–169), Janssen (II, p. 210), and Hergenröther (V, p. 237), have shown that Luther, in his translation, sought first of all to popularize his doctrine and did not hesitate to falsify the text in order to attain this end. Let us cite one instance. Luther was blamed for translating δικαιοῦσθδι πίστει ("to be justified by faith," Rom. 3:28) by *"allein durch den Glauben"* ("by faith alone"). He wrote to his friend Lynk: "Your papist is tormented by this word 'alone' which I have added. Tell him: 'Doctor Martin Luther wants it so. Papist and ass are one and the same thing. I am not the papists' pupil, but their judge and I am pleased to strut before their ass-heads. I am sorry I did not translate χωρίς ἔργων νόμου ('without the work of the law') by these words: 'without any work of any law.'" (Döllinger, III, pp. 135–169.) At Wartburg Luther translated only the New Testament (published in 1522). The Old Testament was published in 1534 at Wittenberg.

[42] Luther, *Opera* (Jena ed.), II, p. 518; De Wette, III, p. 23.

the Church, so calm and tranquil under papism." [43] And all that for a new doctrine of which he is not sure! [44] After all, he says, was even the great Apostle Paul sure of the truth of his teaching? [45] To free himself from this anguish, the lonely reformer tried to persuade himself that the cause of all these scruples is the devil. And he found the means to silence the demon: "It is to drink, play, and joke, albeit immoderately, and even to commit some sin by way of defiance and contempt for Satan; to try banishing diabolical thoughts by the aid of other ideas, as, for example, by thinking of a pretty girl, of avarice or drunkenness, or even by stirring up a violent fit of anger." [46]

In reality he strives to stifle the remorse of his conscience by deafening it with the noise of his fits of anger and his diatribes. "I can no longer do anything," he writes, "but at least I can curse. In place of saying 'Lord, Thy will be done,' I say: 'Damned and cursed be the name of papists.'" [47] "Let us abuse the pope! Let us keep on abusing him, but especially

[43] Luther, *Sämmtliche Werke,* XLVI, pp. 226, 229; LX, p. 82. Cf. LIX, p. 297; XLVIII, p. 358.

[44] "What amazes me is that I myself cannot have full confidence in my doctrine." (*Ibid.,* LXII, p. 122.)

[45] "By way of consolation in his doubts, he tried to persuade himself that St. Paul never reached the point of firm belief in his own doctrine and that doubt was the sting of the flesh of which he speaks in his epistles." (Janssen, II, p. 185.)

[46] *"Est nonnunquam largius bibendum, ludendum, nugandum atque adeo peccatum aliquod faciendum in odium et contemptum diaboli . . . Quisquis satanicas illas cogitationes aliis cogitationibus, ut de puella pulchra, avaritia, ebrietate, etc. pellere potest, aut vehementi aliquo irae affectu, huic suadeo."* (De Wette, IV, p. 188.) Elsewhere Luther says that he is convinced that "the Gospel does not require any works of us, that instead of saying, 'Do this, do that,' it simply commands us to hold out our apron or cloak and receive, as though it said, 'Accept this gift, believe therein and you will be saved.'" (*Sämmtliche Werke,* I, p. 139; cf. Döllinger, III, p. 35.) So could he write to Melanchthon (August 1st, 1521): "Sin, sin strongly, but believe more strongly." (*"Esto peccator, et pecca fortiter, sed fortius crede"*; De Wette, II, p. 37.) The year before, Luther went so far as to declare in the pulpit: "If temptation comes, and your flesh is inflamed, you become blinded, no matter how ugly the creature may be. Whoever has no water at hand, let him take even dung to extinguish the fire." (Weimar ed., IX, pp. 213, 215.)

[47] *Sämmtliche Werke.* XXV. p. 108.

when the demon comes to attack us." [48] From Luther's own avowals we may conclude that at Wartburg he tried to drown his suffering in wine. On May 24th, 1521, he wrote to Spalatin: "I sit here the whole day, idle and drunk." [49]

Did Luther intend to symbolize his internal struggles by an imaginary scene? Did he believe that he saw or did he really see the devil? In a writing on *Private Mass* (1533) he narrates a dialogue with the devil, which he seems to place at the Wartburg.[50]

"It is surprising to see how seriously and animatedly he describes his awakening, as in a surprise, in the dead of the night; the manifest apparition of the devil to dispute against him. The terror with which he was seized, his sweat, his trembling, and the horrible palpitation of his heart in this dispute; the strong arguments of the demon, who leaves no repose to the mind; the sound of his thundering voice; his oppressive ways of arguing, when he makes both question and answer perceptible at once . . . When Luther appears convinced and

[48] Walch ed., III, p. 136.

[49] *"Ego otiosus et crapulosus sedeo tota die."* (Enders, III, p. 154.) It has been contended that this expression is an exaggeration and a joke. But this "joke" is several times repeated under Luther's pen. In 1522 a certain Count Roger von Mansfeld wrote to a friend that at first he had been very much drawn to Luther, but that he became convinced that Luther was nothing more than a blackguard; that he used to get drunk and led an easygoing life. (Cf. Grisar, *"Der 'gute Trunk' in den Lutheranklagen"* in the *Historisches Jahrbuch,* XXVI, p. 479.) Melanchthon wrote about an evening spent with Luther (October 19th, 1522): "There was drinking and shouting as usual." (*Corpus reformatorum,* I, p. 579.) In 1522, shortly after leaving the Wartburg, Luther formed his theory of intoxication as follows: *"Ebrietudo* (drunkenness) is to be borne with (*ferenda*), not inebriation (*ebriositas*)." (Denifle, *Luther and Lutherdom,* p. 111.) In 1530 he wrote: "What other do you think might be the reason I drink the more heavily, prate the more loosely, and carouse the more frequently, than to mock and to vex the devil, who set himself to mock and to vex me." (Quoted by Denifle, *l.c.*) In 1535 he signed a letter *"Martinus Lutherus, doctor plenus."* (Quoted by Denifle, *l.c.*) On Luther's inclination to drink, see Benrath, *Luther im Kloster,* pp. 71 sqq., and Kalkoff, *Aleander gegen Luther,* pp. 141 sqq. These last two authors take Luther's side.

[50] The devil said to him: "You who have been saying mass for fifteen years." As Luther was ordained a priest in 1507, the dialogue must have taken place in 1522.

unable to answer anything more, the devil presses no farther, and Luther rests satisfied he had learned a truth of which he was ignorant before. If this be true, how horrible to be tutored by such a master! If Luther fancied it, what illusions, what dismal thoughts occupied his mind! If he invented it, how sad a story had he to boast of." [51]

The solitude of the Wartburg weighed on Luther; his disciples were calling for him to come to them. He himself longed to go to Wittenberg, where the fiery Carlstadt, profiting by the master's absence, was pushing his doctrine to its logical consequences, preaching the closing of monasteries and leading the mob to the pillage of churches. At Zwickau some Hussites, making use of Luther's name, were teaching millenarianism, condemning the universities, cursing science, suppressing infant baptism, and denying everything outside their own views.

Luther, therefore, quit the Wartburg on March 3rd, 1522, and betook himself to Wittenberg, there to rejoin his faithful disciples and repress the "errors" of his compromising followers.

The Height of Luther's Success

The year 1522 marks the apogee of Luther's popularity. All the new currents of opinion agitating Germany in the intellectual, religious, political, and social order rallied about him as their leader. The part he took in the famous debate at Leipsic, at Wittenberg where he burned the papal Bull, at Worms where he asserted himself in the presence of the Emperor and the estates, drew the eyes of all towards him. His life of retirement at the castle of Wartburg gave his features a sort of fascination, which mystery and misfortune always lend to the renown of great men. He was in the full power of

[51] Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 4, sec 17.

his prodigious talent. "He had," says Bossuet, "a great strength of genius; he lacked nothing but the rule, which can be had nowhere but in the Church and under the yoke of a legitimate authority." [52]

In 1522 Franz von Sickingen, suddenly abandoning the service of the imperial armies, placed himself at the head of a league of knights formed at Lindau for the regeneration and independence of Germany. His castle of Ebernburg, near Kreuznach, the headquarters of the league, became a rendezvous for the leaders of the Lutheran party. It was the time when the popular poet Hans Sachs sang the praises of "the Nightingale of Wittenberg," [53] when the painter Albrecht Dürer drew inspiration for his pictures from Lutheran doctrines, and when numerous monks, misled by so many writings, songs, discourses, murmurings, and rumors, left their monasteries and placed their popular eloquence or the prestige of their learning at the service of the reformer. Frederick Myconius preached Lutheranism at Weimar; Conrad Pellicanus taught it at Basle; Osiander propagated it at Nuremberg; Oecolampadius was about to spread it throughout Switzerland.

Calvin, whom Osiander calls "a brutal man, a wild beast incapable of being tamed," and whose "extreme arrogance" [54] is blamed by Melanchthon, later on disturbed the Protestant world by his strange doctrines on the real presence and on justification.[55] He was a man of genuine learning, forcible

[52] *Ibid.*, bk. 2, sec. 30.

[53] This is the title of a poem published in 1523 by Hans Sachs in praise of Luther.

[54] Quoted by Bossuet, bk. 8, secs. 12, 13.

[55] He maintained that justification is effected in us, not by the imputation of Christ's justice, as the other Protestants would have it, but by an intimate union of God's substantial justice with our souls. The doctrine of the real presence he exaggerated, going so far as to declare that we ought to say of the Eucharistic bread, "this bread is God." This doctrine is called impanation. (Bossuet, bk. 8, sec. 11.)

eloquence, and cheerful enthusiasm, who did not hesitate at a coarse or blasphemous allusion.

While Osiander resembled Luther in temperament, Oecolampadius rather recalled Melanchthon. "From the feet of the crucifix, before which he had been accustomed to pray, he wrote such tender things to Erasmus on the ineffable sweetness of Jesus Christ, whom this pious image represented to his imagination, that one cannot read them without being affected . . . He became a religious with much courage and deliberation . . . However—such is human weakness and so great the contagion of novelty—he left his monastery, preached the new reformation at Basle, where he was pastor, and, tired of celibacy, like the rest of the reformers, married a young girl with whose beauty he was enamored. 'This,' said Erasmus, 'is the way they mortify themselves.' " [56]

In 1522 the Reformation was openly preached at Magdeburg, Ulm, Hamburg, and Breslau. Beginning with 1521, the city administration of Nuremberg was in the hands of the so-called Martinians, *i. e.,* adherents of Martin Luther. It is true that many Catholics who rallied about Luther intended to remain faithful to their religion. They thought it was only a question of reacting against abuses which shocked them in the Roman Church. But pride, sensuality, the fascination always exercised by the words "liberty of belief and of conscience" have a powerful influence upon the masses. A doctrine that permits every man to make himself the judge of his own belief without the guidance or restraint of any authority, which rejects celibacy, vows, and good works, and indulges the passions,[57] assuring all of the kingdom of Heaven if they will but believe, easily attracts the ignorant. The princes, who had long coveted the property of the Church, were eager to accept

[56] *Ibid.,* bk. 2, sec. 24. Oecolampadius' real name was Johann Hausschein. He translated it into Greek, calling himself Oecolampadius, "light of the house."

[57] Cf. Denifle, p. 99, and Bossuet, bk. 6, sec. 11, for Luther's theories on chastity. Cf. Cristiani, *Luther et le luthéranisme,* pp. 207–258.

a doctrine which promised them a great part of the booty, and at an assembly of the imperial cities held at Spires decided that it was the duty of the civil authority to have the "pure Gospel" preached and explained; as a rule it was Luther's interpretation of the Gospel that was imposed by the cities.[58]

The Duke of Pomerania, who declared that he wished to be converted to the "pure Gospel" and to seize the goods of the Church "so as to make a Christian use of them," [59] spread Lutheranism in his domain. The new doctrine made rapid progress in the electorate of Saxony.

The most notable apostasy was that of the grand master of the Teutonic Order, Albrecht of Brandenburg. He was put in touch with Luther by Osiander, who had met him at the diet of Nuremberg, in 1523. When he visited Luther at Wittenberg the following year, the latter advised him to abandon "the false and silly rule" of his Order, to marry and to convert the possessions of the Teutonic Order into a hereditary estate. The duke followed this advice, disposed of the domains of which he was custodian, gave land and appointments to those of his religious who were ready to follow him, exiled the recalcitrant, reserved to himself the appointment of preachers and pastors, and forbade the preaching of any other doctrine but the "pure Gospel." In 1526 he decided, in spite of his vow of chastity, to marry Princess Dorothea, daughter of the king of Denmark. In a letter inviting Luther to the marriage, he wrote: "We have given up the sign of the cross to embrace the lay state; and as we desire, after your example and that of several others, to labor for its increase, we have married in God the Princess Dorothea. We will celebrate our princely wedding on St. John's day at Königsberg in Prus-

[58] The text of this important declaration may be found in Janssen, II, p. 367. It is the principle that gave rise to the famous formula: *"Cujus est regio, illius sit et religio."*

[59] Janssen, II, p. 366.

sia." This was the origin of the hereditary duchy of Prussia.[60]

Meanwhile the Lutheran doctrines had let loose a veritable social and religious revolution in Germany.

Lack of Union among Luther's Followers

In 1522, in the castle of Ebernburg, which had become the boisterous headquarters of German knighthood and the religious reformation, Luther felt himself engulfed by the revolutionary forces which he had mistakenly unchained in the nobility. These anarchical forces split up the humanists, stirred up the masses, won over many of his own followers, passed beyond his own control, compromised him, led him into adventurous undertakings, and finally, when he tried to oppose them, turned violently against him. At sight of the ruins heaped up about his person, the reformer fell into a gloomy discouragement that clung to him up to his very death.

Under the command of Franz von Sickingen, the knights' campaign, begun in 1522, became a truly revolutionary undertaking. "The knights," says Ernest Denis, "needy and turbulent, haughty and brutal, by one of those illusions not unusual in factions, had welcomed the reformation as a sort of resurrection of the Middle Ages for their profit. That faction or party whose ambition was anarchy, had found a worthy leader in Franz von Sickingen, whom popular fancy regarded as a hero, but who in reality was nothing more than a common

[60] It is well known that Albrecht of Brandenburg was not happy either in his family or in the government of his duchy. His duchy was the theatre of ceaseless revolutions. It was with sadness that he later on asserted that he would have done better "to herd sheep than to attempt to govern men." From his marriage with the daughter of the king of Denmark he had seven children, six of whom died at an early age. From a second marriage, contracted with a princess of Brunswick, he had a blind daughter and his only son, Albert Frederick, who throughout life was subject to fits of hypochondria and violent madness, which sometimes led him to hurl dishes at his guests' heads. On the origin of Prussia, see Janssen, II, pp. 79–86.

freebooter." [61] This revolutionary trick miscarried. The energetic resistance of the archbishop of Treves, seconded by the landgrave of Hesse and the count palatine of the Rhine, forced Sickingen to retreat. He surrendered (May 6th, 1523) and soon after died of his wounds. His friend Ulrich von Hutten, exiled to Zurich, succumbed a little later. Luther knew the distress of the revolutionary leaders at seeing their work slip out of their hands; he feared to alienate the prince electors, whose help he needed, and therefore disavowed the knights. They never forgave him for this desertion.

The next year (1524) it was the humanists who, following the example of Erasmus, clamorously separated from the head of the reformation. Erasmus, shocked at Luther's attacks on human liberty, wrote his work *De libero arbitrio,* which started a lively polemic. Reuchlin, Melanchthon, Staupitz, Luther's best friends, abandoned him. Staupitz abjured him "so as not to mix with the horde of ill-famed people who followed him." [62]

In 1525, the masses of the people turned against Luther and fought him. The terrible comrades of the Bundschuh, who four years previously, during the diet of Worms, had threatened to rise up in the reformer's defense, in 1524 rose up on their own account. The peasants had embodied their demands in twelve articles, which called for the reduction of forced labor, the suppression of tithes, freedom of waters and forests, and especially the observance of the Decalogue and the maxims of the Gospel.[63] Unfortunately, their methods were anything but evangelical. In a few weeks they burned

[61] E. Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 416.

[62] Luther himself reports Reuchlin's words in all their crudeness. *"Tu scribis,"* he wrote, *"mea jactari ab iis qui lupanaria colunt. Et neque miror neque metuo."* (Letter of June 27th, 1522.)

[63] It is because of this last demand that the Socialist Lassalle treated the peasants of the Bundschuh as reactionaries, because they pursued the ideal of the Middle Ages, that is, of a society governed by religious principles, while, according to him, the nobles worked for the laicization of the State.

down hundreds of castles, monasteries, and libraries. But they, too, in turn were soon crushed. The vengeance of the nobles was atrocious. It is related that within the territory of the Swabian League alone, before the end of 1526, more than ten thousand executions took place. Luther thought it his duty to turn against those whom his doctrines had aroused. During the war he wrote his book "Against the Murderous and Robbing Rabble of Peasants," in which he thus exhorts the princes: "Seize, strike, slaughter, from front or rear: if you fall, it will be a martyrdom." Meanwhile the terrible and malicious Erasmus wrote to Luther: "We are now gathering the fruits of the new spirit. You do not wish to recognize the rebels; but they recognize you quite well. We know without question who instigated this rebellion." [64]

These princes, to whom Luther gave such strange encouragement, were not irreproachable themselves. With less shouting and tumult than the incendiary and murderous peasants, but with no less culpable avidity, they had rapaciously pounced upon the possessions of the clergy. When Melanchthon, at the diet of Augsburg, seeing so many princes adorned with gold stolen from the monasteries, ventured a timid suggestion of restitution, they would not listen to it.

Thus the preachers of the new doctrine had lost their authority over men's minds and an internal process was at work ruining the doctrines and morals of the pretended reformation.

The Sacramentary Dispute

The great discussion known as the "sacramentary dispute" had created havoc among the doctors. Contrary to Osiander, who in a way exaggerated the real presence and divinized the altar bread by his theory of impanation, Carlstadt, with his usual boldness, denied the presence of Christ in the Host. "I

[64] Cf. Janssen, II, pp. 484–488.

interpret," he said, "these words of the Gospel, 'This is my body,' in the same way that Martin Luther interprets those other words reported in St. Matthew's Gospel, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.' " [65] But in 1526 a dialectician of greater power had lent his assistance to the dissident reformer and maintained his thesis with more weighty arguments. It was Zwingli, pastor of Zurich in Switzerland (1484–1531). "He was a daring man, whose fire surpassed his learning; in language, clear and intelligible, not excelled by any of the pretended reformers in a precise, uniform, and coherent way of expressing his thoughts." [66] Maintaining that "whatever exists is God," that "original sin damns no one," that Baptism is purely a symbol, and that the Sacraments are vain ceremonies,[67] he could not accept the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as the Church understands it. He claimed to base his denial on the scientific interpretation of Scripture. In the expression, "This is my body," he said, the verb *to be* evidently has the meaning *to signify,* as in such other Biblical expressions as, *I am the true vine,*[68] *I am the door,*[69] *the rock was Christ,*[70] *it* (the lamb) *is the Phase of the Lord.*[71] "Zwingli and Oecolampadius wrote in defense of this new dogma: the former with much wit and vehemence; the latter with much learning and an eloquence that, 'were it possible,' says Erasmus, 'and if God permitted it, were capable of seducing even the elect.' " [72]

Luther, notwithstanding his errors on the Eucharist, was

[65] Luther had maintained that Christ pointed to Himself when saying, "Upon this rock I will build My church." Carlstadt held that He also pointed to himself when he said, "This is My body."

[66] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 2, sec. 19.

[67] See Möhler, *Symbolism,* pp. 194 sqq.; Janssen, IV, pp. 92 sqq.

[68] John, 15:1.

[69] John, 10:7.

[70] I Cor., 10:4.

[71] Ex. 12:11.

[72] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 18, ep. 9; Bossuet, *op. cit.,* bk. 2, sec. 25.

never able to doubt the real presence,[73] invincibly struck, as he was, with the force and simplicity of Christ's words, "This is my body." He eagerly took up the defense of the realistic interpretation of this passage. Unfortunately, he denied transubstantiation and in its place admitted a sort of consubstantiation or "companation," as it is technically called, saying that Christ was "with the bread" and that the words "This is my body" mean, "This contains my body." But the Zwinglians, with whom he found fault for translating it by, "This signifies my body," forcibly replied: "If it is lawful for you to admit in the words of institution that rhetorical figure which puts the part for the whole, why do you try to prevent us from admitting in them that figure which substitutes the thing for the sign? Figure for figure, the metonomy which we acknowledge is worth fully as much as the synecdoche which you admit. These gentlemen were humanists and grammarians. All their books were filled with the synecdoche of Luther and the metonomy of Zwingli; it was necessary for Protestants to engage on one side or the other of these two figures of rhetoric; and it appeared manifest that none but the Catholics, equally distant from one and the other, and admitting in the Eucharist neither bread nor a bare sign, justly established the literal sense." [74] "Yet the excesses to which they went on both sides, discredited the new reform with people of good sense. This dispute upset the common foundation of the two parties. They thought they could put an end to all disputes by Scripture alone and they wanted no other arbiter but that. Yet everyone saw that they were endlessly at odds over the meaning of Scripture, and particularly over one passage that should be most clear, inasmuch as it is Christ's

[73] "I would have been greatly pleased," he wrote, "to have anyone show me a good way to deny it, because nothing would have served me better in my plan to injure the papacy." (*Epist. ad Argentin.*)

[74] Bossuet, bk. 2, sec. 35.

last will and testament. . . . Erasmus, whom they tried to win over, said to them, as did all the Catholics: 'You summon all to the pure word of God, and you consider yourselves its true interpreters. Agree among yourselves before laying down the law for the whole world.' " [75]

Luther suffered from this obstacle to the progress of his work. "He causes me unwonted distress," wrote Melanchthon, "by his long tales of woe." [76] "Strange agitation," says Bossuet, "of a man who hoped to see the Church repaired, and now sees her ready to fall by the very means taken for her re-establishment!" [77]

Luther's Marriage

Other trials of a more personal nature harassed the soul of the apostate monk. He who had showered so many sophisms, coarse epigrams, and wrathful apostrophes upon celibacy, was in no hurry to get married. Did he dread the terrible raillery of Erasmus, who contemptuously poked fun at Carlstadt's marriage? Was he afraid of incurring the displeasure of Frederick of Saxony, who called the marriage of priests a disguised concubinage? But, as has been truly said, it was impossible that so froward a panegyrist of marriage should keep his vow of chastity and die in celibacy: he was bound to yield to the physical necessities which he so luridly depicted.

After the death of the elector Frederick, while the cannon thundered and the peasants' blood was being poured out, he married Catherine von Bora, a twenty-six year old nun of the convent of Nimptschen, from which she had been removed by Leonard Köppe, councillor of Torgau; she was then secretly hidden in the convent of Wittenberg. The monks, whom

[75] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 18, ep. 3; bk. 19, ep. 3, 113; bk. 31, ep. 59, etc.
[76] Melanchthon, *Epistolae,* IV, p. 76.
[77] Bossuet, bk. 2, sec. 41.

Luther had so scoffed at, at once took their revenge. Epithalamiums, odes, sacred and profane canticles, couplets, poems both heroic and comic—their muse freely employed every tone and idiom. Long after Luther's marriage the sound of the mocking hymns was still heard.[78] "By this marriage," said Luther, "I have rendered myself so vile and despicable that all the angels will laugh and all the devils will weep." [79]

Married life seems not to have brought Luther all the consolation he expected. We see this fiery reformer, who had defied pope and emperor, bow to Catherine's dominance and to complain of it to his friends with an irony that seemed intended to anticipate their mockery. He ends more than one of his letters in this way: "Catherine, my mistress, my empress, greets you" (*Dominus meus, imperatrix mea, Ketha, te salutat*). To escape her garrulousness and foolish questions, he would often take some bread, cheese, and beer, retreat to his study, and lock the door. "Patience with the pope," he once said, "patience with my disciples, patience with my Catherine: my whole life is nothing but a trial of patience." [80] We scarcely need to add that many a time he lacked patience with his Catherine, just as he did with the pope and with his disciples. His character became soured.

The Diet of Augsburg

The opposition of his followers became intolerable to the leader of the Reformation, who forgot that he had enunciated the maxim that religion should not seek the support of force. Under the direction of the landgrave Philip of Hesse, who

[78] Laffay, *Origines du protestantisme,* p. 54.

[79] Quoted by Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* III, p. 45.

[80] Catherine often had cause to complain of the contempt shown her by the women of Wittenberg. Luther, in his *Tischreden,* acquaints us with the anxieties that at times disturbed the unfortunate woman. One day she said to him: "Master, how is it that, when we were papists, we prayed with so much faith and zeal, whereas now our prayers are so lukewarm and spiritless?" (*Tischreden,* p. 218.)

embraced the new doctrine in 1527, the Lutherans raised an army, and this made them so confident that they thought they were in a condition to protest against the decree of Spires, issued against them the next year. This was the occasion of their assuming the name "Protestants." In the same year (1529) the landgrave, understanding that diversity of opinions would be a permanent obstacle to common action, brought about the celebrated conference of Marburg,[81] at which Luther and Zwingli argued the question of the real presence. There was an attempt to agree on some equivocal formulas, but the two leaders parted more divided than ever.

A supreme means was then tried by the Emperor and, for a moment, it seemed that a union would be realized not only between the Protestants, but between all Christians. Emperor Charles V (January 21st, 1530) invited the estates to a diet, to be held at Augsburg on April 8th. The principal object of the assembly was to consider a national peril. The Turks, under the leadership of Soliman, had just laid siege to Vienna with an army of 350,000 men and were holding sway over Hungary.

It soon became apparent that no concerted action against the infidel invader was possible unless an accord could be established between the Christians. The learned and astute Melanchthon undertook to demonstrate that such an accord could easily be reached, first of all because the Protestants had never separated from the Church and had only sought to go back to the true notion of the Church as held by the Apostles and the early Fathers, and because it was possible to draw up a confession of faith acceptable to all Christians.

Such a confession was in fact drawn up and presented by him in two parts: the first contained the Protestant doctrine in twenty-one articles; the other, in seven chapters, enumerated the so-called abuses of the Church, which it was de-

[81] Janssen. III, pp. 166–169.

sired to correct. We must acknowledge in the first part a genuine effort to render the Protestant formulas acceptable to the Catholics. But, aside from the fact that several articles merely concealed fundamentally grave differences by means of equivocal expressions, there was an essential point separating the Protestants from those Christians who remained faithful to the pope. A learned historian says with great clarity: "In this vast religious quarrel it was not a question of such or such a dogma, of maintaining or reforming such or such a disciplinary law; strictly speaking, the discussion had only one object: the admission or rejection of the infallible teaching office of the Church. The Protestants denied that office. At the same time they rejected the perpetual sacrifice, because it supposes in the bosom of the Church the existence of those supernatural operations which have Christ for their author. Thus did every effort at reconciliation remain ineffective." [82] The second part created a new obstacle to the union; for on several points of doctrine, such as devotion to the saints, the veneration of images, the value of the Sacraments, and supernatural merit, the Augsburg Confession attributed to the Roman Church opinions which she never professed.[83]

Nor did an understanding between the Protestants appear any easier. Zwingli had communicated to the diet a confession of faith quite different from that of Melanchthon. The four cities of Strasburg, Lindau, Constance, and Memmingen had sent a third draft. Melanchthon, moreover, because of his concessions and compromises, was regarded as a traitor by members of his own party. But no one opposed an agree-

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[83] Bossuet (bk. 3, sec. 63) sets forth at considerable length and refutes these assertions of the Protestants, which he rightly calls calumnies. "We see," he concludes, "the Lutherans would relinquish many things, and almost all, I dare say, if they would only take the trouble to lay aside the calumnies with which they charge us."

ment more violently than Luther. Having been proscribed by the edict of Worms, and not daring to show himself at Augsburg, he wrote to his friends from Coburg: "No union is possible so long as the pope will not renounce the papacy"; [84] and again: "If the canon and private mass be admitted, one must needs reject the whole Protestant doctrine." "In truth, I am bursting with anger and vexation," he said; "in the name of God, cut short the question, cease your quibbling, and come back home." [85]

Thus the Augsburg attempt at effecting a reconciliation failed. Yet it was an event of capital importance in the history of Protestantism that an attempt had been made to formulate its dogmas into a profession of faith and to have them protected by the secular authority. By that single fact *Protestantism* broke with *Lutheranism.* Later on, "orthodox" Protestants appealed to the Confession of Augsburg as their symbol of faith, while "liberal" Protestants proclaimed their attachment to that primitive Lutheranism, that utmost individualism, that Christianity without a Church, that Gospel without a hierarchy and without dogma, or almost so, which formed the religion of Luther's first disciples.

The Smalkaldic League

The diet of Augsburg had only placed in evidence the irreducible opposition between the majority of Protestants, especially Luther, on the one hand, and the Roman Church on the other. In his *Notice to my Beloved Germans on the Conclusions of Augsburg,* Luther said: "The papists have on their side neither divine right nor human right." A league, called the Smalkaldic League, was formed (February 27th, 1532) between electoral Saxony, Hesse, three other states,

[84] De Wette, IV, p. 147.
[85] *Ibid.,* p. 170.

and eleven cities, with a view to defend "the word of God against every attack." The political complications of Europe aided the rebels. On April 21st, Francis I, taking this occasion to weaken the imperial power and to encourage anarchy in Germany, promised his aid to the League; on May 3rd, Henry VIII, who was on the point of repudiating Catherine of Aragon, the Emperor's aunt, in order to marry Anne Boleyn, added his promise to that of the French king. Denmark also gave its adherence. The dukes of Bavaria, jealous of Ferdinand, in turn joined the League. The League was not without some hope of obtaining the Sultan's support, who was threatening to invade Germany. The gravity of the danger led the Emperor (June 12th, 1532) to grant the so-called peace of Nuremberg, providing that, until the next council, all trials "for matters concerning the faith" should be suspended. This is what was called the Interim.

The Anabaptists

But the war was rekindled by various incidents, of which the chief one was the founding of the "Kingdom of the Anabaptists" at Münster under the protection of the landgrave Philip of Hesse.

In the city of Strasburg, where the Zwinglian doctrines had been disseminated since 1524, some men had been exalted by Luther's words, "Every Christian is the judge of those who teach him, because God Himself instructs him from within," and by these words of Zwingli, "Baptism is a mere symbol." They rejected all external authority, including that of the Bible, no longer gave heed to aught but the light from within, made no account of their sacramental Baptism, and, as a sign of alliance, gave one another a second baptism. They were called Anabaptists. Due to the zeal of a Swabian tawer, who was an itinerant preacher. Anabaptist doctrines spread

in Holland and lower Saxony. Under that gloomy, cloudy sky, favorable to the growth of mystical reverie and social utopias, Anabaptism was not long in assuming a revolutionary form.

John Matthys, or Matthiessen, a baker of Haarlem, became the head of the movement. He organized an effective propaganda and went to Westphalia, where he established polygamy and communism among his followers. This was the kingdom of the "New Sion," which was expected to conquer the world and dispossess all princes except the landgrave of Hesse. When Matthys perished in a sortie against the army of the bishop of Münster, his authority passed into the hands of a Dutch tailor, the young and handsome John Bockold, more generally known as John of Leyden, who made Münster a center of religious and social anarchy. It took no less than a year's siege to regain possession of the city. Finally, on the night of June 24th, 1535, the bishop's troops entered, and executed John of Leyden and his principal officers amidst frightful tortures. Luther, who had fought this compromising sect from the beginning, had reason to rejoice over its ruin. But the spirit of individualism that inspired it did not die with it and was destined in aftertime greatly to trouble the Protestant churches.

No Reunion with Rome

Under the auspices of Pope Paul III, Charles V continued to pursue the work of reunion that he had undertaken. The Pope and the Emperor, in an interview at Bologna (February 24th, 1533), promised each other to do everything to hasten the assembly of a council to restore peace. The Sovereign Pontiff in a kindly letter dated June 2nd to the elector of Saxony, who was Luther's principal supporter, informed him that "the council would be free and universal, in all respects

like the ancient assemblies of the Christian Church." [86] A papal lettter (June 2nd, 1536) officially invited all Christian nations to be represented.

Some moderate Protestants, with Melanchthon at their head, tried to persuade their coreligionists to accept the Pope's proposal.[87] But the opinion of the princes, and especially that of Luther, prevailed in the end. Far from accepting the invitation of Paul III, the Protestant princes announced, through Melanchthon, that they rejected the papal offer.[88] The elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse, who were always at the head of the opposition, even proposed an anti-council to be held under the name of "national evangelical council." [89] The next year Luther published, under the title of *Articles of Smalkalden,* a statement in which on several points he clearly departed from the Augsburg Confession. With unheard-of violence he attacked the Mass, "that execrable abomination, that comet drawing in its train the vermin of idolatry," and denounced the Pope as "that Antichrist, that real Satan." [90]

Charles V, however, did not give up hope. At Hagenau, then at Worms, and finally at the diet of Ratisbon (1541), he arranged religious conferences between Catholics and Protestants, with a view to settle the grave dogmatic and disciplinary questions that divided men's minds, as one settles a political question. This was an illusion. No lasting result could come from such conferences. The Ratisbon Interim, which accorded Protestant princes privileges that were canonically inadmissible (such as the power to reform and suppress monasteries within their territory), was rejected even by Luther and remained a dead letter.

The Smalkaldic League was strengthened by new recruits

[86] Raynaldi, 1533, nos. 7, 8; Pallavicini, bk. 3, ch. 13.
[87] *Corpus reformatorum,* III, pp. 293, 298, 327.
[88] Pastor, *Reunionsbestrebungen,* p. 93.
[89] Janssen, III, p. 386.
[90] Luther, *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXV, pp. 109–146.

and became more threatening for the Empire. Protestant propaganda conquered new provinces and took on an ever increasing revolutionary aspect. Churches were pillaged, dead bodies exhumed, the sacred Hosts scattered. "Roman idolatries" were everywhere abolished, while the cabarets were filled to overflowing; there was no longer any limit to intemperance and debauchery. "Who of us," said Luther, "would have had the courage to preach the Gospel if he had been able to foresee the calamities, seditions, scandals, blasphemies, ingratitude, and perversity that were to follow our preaching?" [91] And Erasmus wrote: "It seems that the Reformation amounts to defrocking some monks and marrying some priests, and this mighty tragedy has a comic outcome, for everyone is married at last, as in the comedies." [92] In 1540, Philip of Hesse, one of the chief protectors of the Protestant movement, after repudiating his wife, married another with the explicit authorization of Luther and Melanchthon. "What the Mosaic law permitted," said the reformers, "cannot be forbidden by the Gospel." [93]

At the request of the elector of Saxony, Luther published (1545) a violent pamphlet entitled, *Against the Papacy Founded at Rome by the Devil.* The coarseness of his abuse surpassed anything that can be imagined. Bossuet says of it: "Let one of his most partial disciples take the trouble to read this discourse which he composed against the papacy, in the

[91] Janssen, III, p. 592. Cf. De Wette, II, p. 107, and the texts quoted by Döllinger, *La Réforme,* III, p. 195.

[92] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 19, ep. 3.

[93] On the bigamy of the landgrave of Hesse and its approval by Luther, see Janssen (III, pp. 449–458), Denifle (*Luther and Lutherdom,* pp. 127 sqq.), and the Protestant Bezold, who considers this incident "the blackest spot of the Reformation" (*Geschichte der deutschen Reformation,* p. 795.) In authorizing this case of bigamy, the leader of the Reformation was quite in keeping with the principles which he proclaimed in a sermon in 1522: "If they are stubborn [he is speaking of wives], it is fitting their husbands should tell them, if you will not, another will: if the mistress refuse to come, let the maid be called." (Quoted by Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 6, sec. 11.)

time of Paul III, I am certain he would blush for Luther. He will there find throughout the whole, I do not say so much fury and transport, but such wretched puns, such low jests, and such filthiness of the basest kind, as is not heard but from the mouths of the most despicable of mankind. 'The pope,' says he, 'is so full of devils, that he spits them and blows them from his nose.' Let us not finish what Luther was not ashamed to repeat thirty times." [94] Upon reading this little book, many of Luther's contemporaries thought that he had become either insane or was possessed by the devil.[95]

Toward the end of July, 1545, Luther expressed a desire to quit Wittenberg, to flee from the society of his friends, and to wander about begging his bread.[96] Seven months later, having gone to Mansfeld to arbitrate a dispute between the counts of Mansfeld relative to some copper mines, he felt himself growing weak. In fact, he was physically and morally exhausted. He breathed his last during the night of February 18th, 1546.[97]

This pretended reformer and veritable revolutionist left trouble and disunion everywhere, in the institutions of the time as well as in the souls of men. Such a result was not due solely to the violence of Luther's character and the faults of his followers. It also proceeded from a vice deeply rooted in his teaching. Luther had at first wished to free himself from all authority, to acknowledge no criterion of truth but private interpretation of Scripture; but soon after, alarmed by the anarchy of his work, he sought to impose fundamental dogmas on it. Protestant historians, such as Adolph von

[94] *Sämmtliche Werke,* XXVI, pp. 108–228; Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 1, sec. 33.

[95] Janssen, II, p. 590.

[96] Burkardt, *Luthers Briefwechsel,* p. 475.

[97] Majunke maintains that Luther ended his own life by hanging. But his arguments are not convincing. See Paulus, *Luthers Lebensende und der Eislebener Apotheker Johann Landau; Luthers Lebensende;* Janssen-Pastor, *History of the German People after the Close of the Middle Ages,* VI, p. 281.

Harnack, have recognized the existence of this dissolving dualism in Luther's doctrine.[98]

Dogmatic Syncretism and Individualistic Pietism

After the death of its founder, the Protestant Revolt split into two dissident parts: some of its members labored to hold it together by coming to an agreement on a common fund of beliefs; the others, leaving to each one's individual conscience the care of formulating a symbol, sought merely to cultivate sentimental piety: these are the two movements which have been called dogmatic syncretism and individualistic pietism.

Dogmatic syncretism, which first took shape in the Augsburg Confession (1530), attempted to organize itself, during the latter half of the sixteenth century, under the direction of the German rulers. The Augsburg Interim, which in 1548 tried to come as near as possible to Luther's doctrine, the Religious Peace of Augsburg, which in 1555 granted to each ruler the *jus reformandi, i. e.,* the right to determine what religion was to be practised by his subjects, the Heidelberg Catechism, which in 1563 undertook to establish the religious union of all Protestant countries of Germany upon a Calvinist symbol,[99] and the Formula of Concord (1580), which was

[98] Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* bk. 3, chap. 4. Auguste Sabatier, dean of the Protestant theological faculty of Paris, writing in the *Journal de Genève,* May 5th, 1896, says: "Protestantism suffers from an internal antinomy that is derived from its very principle . . . If you have no confession of faith, who are you? What society do you form? Why do you exist? And if you promulgate a profession of faith, and wish to impose it on me with authority and in spite of the resistance of my conscience, how are you still a Protestant? What are you doing other than what is done by Catholicism, against which you say that Luther and Calvin did well to revolt?" Henri Hauser (*Études sur la Réforme française,* p. 63) says: "Calvin did not see, or was unwilling to see, the startling antinomy in the very foundation of his work: to reëstablish an authority, a dogma, a church, with private judgment as a starting-point." See this objection eloquently set forth in Rousseau's *Deuxième lettre de la montagne* and in Lessing's *Anti-Göze.*

[99] Janssen, IV, p. 205.

an effort "to place a definite seal on Luther's work,[100] mark the principal stages in the history of dogmatic syncretism in the sixteenth century.

Individualistic pietism, which found its first expression in the Anabaptist movement, had to wait for its full development until the seventeenth century, under the impulse of Philip Jacob Spener; but Caspar Schwenkfeld (d. 1561), Valentin Weigel (d. 1588), and Jacob Böhme (d. 1624) were its precursors.

Caspar Schwenkfeld, born at Ossig in Silesia, was at first an enthusiastic disciple of Luther; but the desperate dryness of the Lutheran doctrine, no less than the tyrannical measures of the reformer, soon repelled his pious soul. He turned against his teacher, accused him of being the slave of a dead letter and wishing to destroy the wheat along with the cockle. For Schwenkfeld, internal piety was everything; he regarded external organization and dogmatic formulas as in themselves indifferent and of worth only as indirect means of stirring up faith and love. Word and sign speak to the carnal man; the Spirit of God alone acts on the spiritual man, producing grace in him and rendering his soul capable of hearing the word from without. The most expressive symbol of this vivifying action of God in souls is the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is purely a ceremony and, as a figure, singularly striking and effective. Schwenkfeld's Christology was a sort of Eutychianism: Christ's flesh, according to him, was indeed human flesh, but so penetrated by grace from the very beginning, and transfigured in such wise by the Resurrection, that it was completely divinized, it was God Himself. Whosoever believed these things and lived by them, to whatever sect he belonged, was predestined for Heaven, and the society of the predestined formed the true and only Church.[101]

[100] Preface of the *Formula Concordiae.*

[101] Cf. Döllinger, *La Réforme,* I, pp. 229–268.

Schwenkfeld preached his doctrine at Wittenberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Tübingen, and Strasburg. As he was opposed by both the Lutherans and the Catholics, he was unable to establish a numerous church, but communicated his faith to some devoted and enthusiastic followers, who conserved his doctrine and spread it after his death.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, a Protestant pastor of Saxony, Valentin Weigel, gathered about him a large number of men who, dissatisfied with the withering dogmas of official Protestantism and with its tyrannical organization, aspired to an interior life free from all hindrances. Nourished on the works of Master Eckhart, Tauler, Carlstadt, and Schwenkfeld, fusing the views of the pseudo-Areopagite with the "Deutsch Theologia," Valentin Weigel taught that the internal light suffices for all the religious needs of the soul; what comes from without can only disturb it. From the celebrated physician Paracelsus [102] he borrowed the idea that the operation of grace in the soul is quite similar to that of God in nature. And hence chemistry can furnish a solution of the problems of the soul. Weigel was something of a Gnostic and an alchemist.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century we meet a sort of synthesis of Schwenkfeld's and Weigel's pietism in the writings of the shoemaker-philosopher Jacob Böhme, who professed to obtain all his internal revelations from personal intuition and who attempted to explain his mysticism by colors, sounds, physical and chemical phenomena. He insisted, more than did his predecessors, on dying to oneself in order to live in God, and he tried to establish his religious system on ontological principles. Böhme's works, translated into French by Claude de Saint-Martin (*"le philosophe inconnu"*),

[102] Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (1493–1541), a Swiss physician, in his writings took the name Aureolus Theophrastus Paracelsus. After maintaining most extravagant doctrines, he died a Catholic.

founder of the sect of Martinists, exercised a real influence, not only in Germany and France, but also in England.[103]

Such were the fruits of Protestantism in Germany at the end of the sixteenth century.

A strange doctrine of justification, invented by a monk who had no religious vocation, to soothe his anguished conscience, was preached with passionate eloquence and agitated men's minds, already so gravely disturbed by humanism; then, thanks to the general discontent resulting from the economic perturbations of the time, the anarchy of rulers and abuses among the clergy, civil war broke out. However, the Lutheran dogma, by its innate inconsistency, dissolved of its own accord and gave birth to a thousand sects that devoured one another, and the social condition of Germany grew daily worse. Once more history shows that heresy, so powerful in destroying, is incapable of building up.

[103] On Jacob Böhme, see Boutroux, *Historical Studies in Philosophy*, one chapter of which (pp. 169–233) is entitled "Jacob Boehme, the German Philosopher." This study is quite sympathetic to the shoemaker who was a philosopher and mystic.

CHAPTER IV

Protestantism in England

WHEN, in 1521, King Henry VIII fought Luther's errors so vigorously that he received from the Pope the glorious title of "Defender of the Faith," a superficial observer could not have foreseen that this same king would provoke a more radical and complete separation between the Roman Church and England, than that which reigned in Germany; that, under favor of this separation, his son Edward VI would allow Lutheranism to penetrate into Great Britain; and that his daughter Elizabeth would organize a most effective and cruel persecution against Catholics. Starting out with the denial of an essential dogma, Luther finally engaged in a violent war against Rome; beginning by a rupture with the Holy See, the English monarchy finally established the Anglican heresy: so true is it that all heresy leads to schism and that all schism paves the way for a heresy, the purity of the faith and obedience to the hierarchy being indissolubly bound together in the Church of Christ.

Precursors

The germs of schism and heresy that were troubling the continent since the fourteenth century existed also in Great Britain. At the origin of the two movements which most deeply shook the institutions of the Middle Ages, that of the legists and that of the heterodox teachers, we met two Englishmen, William of Occam and John Wyclif. The false mystics who were agitating Germany and France would have re-

garded as brothers the Lollards who, at the close of the fourteenth century, were posting on church doors placards defamatory of the clergy and preaching doctrines closely resembling those of the most advanced collectivists of our day.[1] In the fifteenth century the combined efforts of the pope and king dispersed them and seemingly suppressed their teaching; but their spirit survived and became one of the most effective elements of the Anglican schism.

Nowhere was the spirit of national egoism, which had ruptured the unity of Christendom, more alive than in England at this time. The new British aristocracy, born in commerce and finance, penetrated with a utilitarian spirit, incapable of rising to the generous heroism of the crusaders of former times, and ruined by the War of the Roses, looked with envious eyes upon the rich possessions of the upper clergy. King Henry VII, after the union of the two Roses in his own person had been sanctioned by the pope, created an absolute monarchy and kept the episcopate under his hand. The appointment of bishops belonged of right to the chapters, but in fact depended on the king, who used pressure on the chapters and rewarded the most competent prelates by appointment as legal councillors, ambassadors, and ministers of state. Simple priests and other clerics were deprived of the "privilege of clergy" and subject to trial by the royal courts. The rank and file of the nation distrusted the pope. It was feared that the Holy See had become dependent on the emperor of Germany, as it was dependent on the king of France during the Western Schism. Already in 1426, Pope Martin V complained that the king of England had "usurped spiritual jurisdiction as absolutely as if our Lord had appointed him His vicar." Since then the evil had grown much worse.

[1] On Wyclif and the Lollards, see Lechler, *John Wiclif and his English Precursors;* Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe.* The name Wyclif is variously spelled by historians. On the relation of the Lollards to the Reformation, see Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England.*

John Colet, a priest of great erudition, born at London in 1467, but trained in the culture of humanism by Florentine teachers, brought back to his country the spirit of the Renaissance, explained the Bible without having recourse to the Scholastic doctors, and developed reformatory ideas borrowed from Savonarola. Colet, Erasmus, and More soon formed what was later called the Oxford reform school. It was at the house of Thomas More in London that Erasmus wrote (1511) his *Praise of Folly,* wherein, while not attacking any dogmas of the Church, he ridiculed monks, Scholastic theologians, the popes, the veneration of images, the use of relics, and the practice of indulgences. Thomas More himself, sturdy Christian though he was, in his *Utopia* (1516) played with the strangest paradoxes and went so far as to require that "priests in the Utopian kingdom" be elected by secret ballot and that all religions should take part in the same public worship held in the same temple. All this was, of course, a matter of witty trifling; but with the reading of these literary fancies, new ideas fermented, men's heads became overheated, and Thomas More himself became the victim of a revolution which his Utopia may have helped to foment.

Henry VIII, Defender of the Faith

The accession of the brilliant and popular Henry VIII to the British throne in 1509 could not but accentuate the movement of national autonomy and literary culture which we have already noted. The young King had reached his eighteenth year. His youth, beauty, and gracefulness won all hearts. The Venetian ambassador, about 1510, said: "His Majesty is the most charming prince our eyes have ever beheld." At the Field of the Cloth of Gold, in 1520, the French found him "tall and straight, the handsomest prince who ever governed England." In 1517 Chieregati wrote to Isabella

d'Este: "To my mind Henry surpasses all those who have ever worn a crown. The country may well be called happy and blessed that possesses so worthy a lord and so perfect a sovereign." He was a good musician, an excellent horseman, remarkably skilful in manly sports, and could fluently converse in Latin, French, and Spanish. Every day he heard three masses, sometimes five. In addition to this, he was present at the divine office, *i. e.,* vespers and compline;[2] but the evenings he passed in masquerades, comedies, games, and various diversions. From a prince so assiduous at the services of the Church and at the same time so given to worldly amusements, one might expect a strange policy. Henry applied himself to combine the satisfaction of his sensual passions and his mania for dominance in religious matters with that exclusively national and utilitarian policy which was a tradition left him by his father and to which the general tendency of his people urged him.

Upon his coming to the throne, Henry VIII found the English policy orientated from the Spanish point of view and consequently allied to the pope's cause and directed against France. His marriage to Catherine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand, which was negotiated in 1503 by his father, Henry VII, was calculated to set the seal on that national policy; but it was only after some opposition that the young prince finally accepted a union that had been decided upon without consulting him.

His taste for religious controversy found its gratification in the alliance with the Holy See. In 1514, Leo X, just elected, made him a present of cap and sword. In 1518, at the first reports of Luther's revolt, the royal theologian wrote a dogmatic treatise, now lost, on the subject of vocal prayer.[3] In 1521, after the condemnation of Lutheranism by the Bull

[2] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian,* II, no. 1287, p. 559.
[3] Erasmus, *Epistolae,* bk. 6, ep. 12; bk. 19, ep. 107.

"Exsurge," he published a more lengthy and pretentious work on the theology of the Sacraments.[4] A papal Bull conferred on the King the title of "Defender of the Faith." His pride in this title and the flattering praise that went so far as to call him "Luther's most formidable adversary," gave the King a haughty confidence in his theological knowledge, an immoderate desire to govern his kingdom in spirituals as well as in temporals, and a disdainful attitude towards churchmen.

The repression of heresy was his first care. The sect of the Lollards was dissolved. Although many a bold opinion was uttered, yet formal heresies were rare. Nevertheless, from 1509 to 1522, two heretics were sent to the stake in the diocese of London. A carpenter, James Brewster, arrested in 1505 for having spoken ill of pilgrimages, images, and the Sacrament of the Altar, was condemned to be burned. William Sweeting, a shepherd, arrested for like reasons, and especially for having denied transubstantiation, mounted the same scaffold as Brewster (October 18th, 1511). Among thirty-seven accused men who were set at liberty after retracting their errors, one had maintained that there were six gods, another that St. Paul's church was a den of robbers, a third that the clergy were too rich, a fourth that there were too many holydays.[5]

Divorce of Henry VIII

An incident that was purely personal with the English King was destined to produce a national schism. Catherine of Aragon, whom Henry VIII had married immediately after

[4] The title is *Assertio septem sacramentorum.* Its doctrine is faultless. Cardinal Fisher is reputed to have collaborated in this work.

[5] Trésal, *Les origines du schisme anglican,* p. 37.

ascending the throne in 1509, had been married eight years before to the King's elder brother, Arthur. This prince, not yet fourteen years old and in feeble health, died a year later. The marriage had never been consummated. Nevertheless it was necessary to obtain from Pope Julius II a dispensation from the first degree of affinity in order to celebrate Catherine's second marriage. But, a few years after this, the frivolous monarch fell in love with a young Irish maiden, formerly lady-in-waiting to Princess Margaret of Navarre, but at that time in the suite of Queen Catherine. Political motives were added to Henry's passionate desire. He had no hope of a male heir to the crown.[6] Emperor Charles V, by refusing the hand of the young Princess Mary, which Henry VIII offered him, and by releasing Francis I after Pavia, had annihilated the ambitious projects of the English monarch, who was hopeful, with the Emperor's help, of winning the French crown for himself. His vengeance would be to divorce Catherine, the Emperor's aunt; the matrimonial rupture would accentuate the diplomatic rupture. But a reason had to be found; the royal theologian and his councillors

[6] The recent study of new archival documents has led some to think that this political consideration was the prime motive of the divorce. In 1525, two years before the divorce, Henry was contemplating a plan to bestow the royal succession on a natural son by Elizabeth Blount. As early as 1514, we find a Venetian writing from Rome: "It is said that the King of England is thinking of repudiating his wife because he can have no children of her." In 1525 the English ambassadors were commissioned to negotiate a marriage of the King with a niece of the Emperor. (See Constant, *Le divorce d'Henri VIII et le schisme anglican,* in the *Revue Hebdomadaire,* September 4th, 1909). It is none the less true that Henry's passion for Anne Boleyn became the determining motive for his rupture with the Pope, whose authority was in the way of Henry's designs and was the unyielding defender not only of Christian morals, but also of the monks, whose property the King coveted in order to bestow it on personages of his realm in exchange for their lost liberties. We must, moreover, recognize that, if England so promptly complied with the new order of things, it was because of the slow but deep transformation which the English people had undergone under the influence of Lollard preaching, the introduction of printing, great discoveries, and the notable commercial changes that ensued.

alleged no less than three: it was doubtful, they said, whether the pope could permit one to marry one's brother's widow;[7] they added that the Bull of Julius II was null and void because it had been obtained by false pretences; and after all, the eminent services of the King of England to the Church deserved a special privilege, if he had need of such. They asked that at least the case should be tried in England and that it should be entrusted to the chancellor of the realm, Thomas Wolsey, cardinal and archbishop of York. In 1519, Giustiniani, the Venetian ambassador, spoke of this prelate as "very handsome, learned, remarkably eloquent, prodigiously capable, and indefatigable." On Giustiniani's first arrival in England, Wolsey used to say to him, "His Majesty will do so and so." Subsequently, by degrees, he forgot himself and said, "We shall do so and so." Finally, he reached such a pitch that he used to say, "I shall do so and so."[8] Thomas Wolsey was the type of those worldly prelates that we meet with so often in the decadence of the Middle Ages; in him the statesman supplanted the priest; reasons of state were almost everything to him, and justice was a matter of little account. He was gifted with keen perspicacity in political matters and even foretold the maritime future of England; but as he was no less attached to his own personal interests than to those of his country, he did not fear to play a double game between Francis I and Charles V in order to reach the papacy. In the matter of the King's marriage, Wolsey was the first to suggest a divorce. He hoped to have the solution of the question confided to him and expected to solve it in favor of his scheming policy.

Catherine of Aragon, whose calm dignity won her the sympathy of unprejudiced minds, appealed to the Pope. The

[7] Some medieval theologians had asked this same question. See, for instance, Pierre de la Palud, *Com. in sent.*, IV dist. XL, a. 3, 3a concl. But there can be no doubt about its solution in the affirmative. (See Bossuet, *Variations*, bk. 7, sec. 50–62.)

[8] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, II, no. 1287, p. 560.

Holy See was then occupied by Clement VII, who was embroiled with the Spaniards and exposed to the attacks of Italian factions, and had retired to Orvieto, where he lived in poverty, abandoned by all. Clement's profound circumspection in delicate matters and his great ability in solving difficult problems were everywhere admired; but, as Ranke remarks, "there is a practical and inventive faculty by which some men intuitively perceive the simple and practicable in affairs, and, guided by this, they rapidly seize on the best expedient. This he did not possess." [9]

It has been said that a Gregory VII would have cut the knotty problem by a single stroke. But we would not venture to pass so absolute a judgment on Clement's conduct. He purposed first to treat gently this prince who had shown himself so formidable an adversary of Luther. The Pope's tactics aimed at gaining time. He hoped that the King's passion for Anne Boleyn would sooner or later grow cool. Passion, however, was not Henry's only motive; there was also a policy of national interest, in the narrow sense of the term; there was, finally, a tenacious pride. Besides, the Pope could not foresee that soon two perfidious councillors would make themselves the tools of the King's passion, policy, and pride. In a Bull (June, 1528), which was intended to be kept secret and which has not come down to us, Clement VII solved in principle, it seems, the question of Henry VIII's marriage in favor of the King and instructed his legate Campeggio, along with Wolsey, to pass a definitive judgment on the case.

Queen Catherine was a superior woman with a broad and deep intellectual culture; she had received lessons from Erasmus. But the people had been drawn to her especially by her goodness. She was acclaimed whenever she appeared in the streets. Campeggio, on the contrary, was hissed because it was supposed he had been commissioned to decide the case

[9] Ranke, I, p. 80.

against her. In reality, the legate had received secret instructions to drag out the case. "Time solves all difficulties," say the Italians. It was hoped that Henry might adopt the suggestion to introduce a new petition. The King had, indeed, entertained the idea of obtaining a dispensation from bigamy in order to marry Anne. The expedient would have failed; but to let the matter be introduced on this new basis would have been to gain time.

This delay unfortunately permitted two unscrupulous Englishmen to play a fatal part in the drama—Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell. The King, during a journey made in August, 1529, stopped at the abbey of Watham and there met a young priest, a tutor at Cambridge University, whose ideas pleased him greatly. This priest maintained that, if a declaration in favor of the royal divorce were obtained from a certain number of universities, the King could, with a safe conscience, consider his marriage as null and void. He also gave the King to understand that he would gladly undertake to procure the desired declarations. His name was Thomas Cranmer. His life and character designated him as fit to become the principal agent of a schism. He had violated the most solemn engagement of his priesthood by marrying and thereby lost his post as a fellow, which was subsequently restored to him on the death of her whom he had made the companion of his sacrilege. Later on he secretly married the daughter of the celebrated Lutheran pastor Osiander, and it seems that at the time the King met him he was already attached to Luther's doctrine. The King asked him for a memorandum on the question of the divorce and on the means of carrying out the project which he contemplated. This was the beginning of the prodigious fortune of the poor tutor, who was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 1533.

The favor accorded to Cranmer coincided with the disgrace

of Wolsey. The King and Anne Boleyn attributed the failure of the divorce case to the Cardinal's negligence or incapacity. On October 29th, 1629, Wolsey was the object of a bill of *Praemunire,*[10] for having exercised the functions of papal legate in England. In November an accusation of high treason was preferred against him. About a year later (November 29th, 1530) he died of grief in a monastery at Leicester. His last words were these: "If I had served God as diligently as I have done the King, he would not have given me over in my gray hairs." [11]

Shortly after Wolsey's death, Thomas Cromwell, an attorney in the Cardinal's service, having a complaint to offer because of an insult received from some nobleman, obtained an audience with the King. As related in a report by Charles V's ambassador to the English court, "the lawyer Cromwell addressed the King in such flattering terms and with such eloquence, promising to make him the richest sovereign in the world, that the King at once took him into his service and made him a councillor, although his appointment was kept secret for four months." [12] According to the same authority, Cromwell, the son of a poor blacksmith, had led a rather irregular and dissipated life in his youth. After some time spent in prison, he travelled in Flanders and Italy, married a fuller's daughter, and for a while directed the workmen in his father-in-law's shop; then he entered the service of Cardinal

[10] According to Trésal, "*Praemunire,* a corruption of the Latin *praemonere,* the opening word of an order by which a magistrate summoned a citizen to answer a charge of violating the statutes or laws which, beginning in the fourteenth century, aimed at preventing encroachments of ecclesiastical jurisdiction upon civil jurisdiction. The laws of *praemunire* forbade papal legates to enter England or to exercise their office therein without royal sanction; they forbade appointments to English benefices by the Holy See, etc. As their phrasing was vague and obscure, they constituted a terrible weapon in the hands of a tyrant." (Trésal, p. 58.)

[11] Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey,* p. 271.

[12] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII,* IV, no. 6391, p. 2869.

Wolsey, who had divined the resources of that active and enterprising spirit.[13]

Cranmer and Cromwell, in the high station to which Henry VIII elevated them, became the most powerful agents of the schism. Cranmer, by collecting the testimony of the universities in favor of the royal divorce, and Cromwell, by laboring to subject the clergy to the spiritual authority of the King, both of them by secretly favoring the Lutheran heresy, prepared the ground for the rupture between England and the Holy See. Cranmer consummated the work under Edward VI.

Promises, threats, bribes, violence, nothing was spared to obtain an opinion from Cambridge University in favor of the King's divorce. Finally the two most energetic opponents were ejected from the hall where the deliberations were being held; the others voted in conformity with the will of the King.[14] From the Sorbonne a favorable though irregular decision was obtained by means of pressure on the French government. Agents, well provided with gold, approached the doctors of Padua and were able to bring back an opinion in accord with Henry's desires. It is said that Cranmer's secret marriage took place while he was in Germany recruiting votes.[15]

The King Proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church

To suppress the monasteries, intimidate the clergy, and force them under the jurisdiction of the King, who was proclaimed "supreme head of the Church," was the work of Thomas Cromwell. If Wolsey could be declared guilty of having violated the statute of *Praemunire* by accepting the office

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Trésal, p. 64.

[15] Bossuet (*Variations,* bk. 7, sec. 9) speaks of the sister of Osiander.

of papal legate, did not the bishops and abbots who took an oath of allegiance to the bishop of Rome fall logically under the same prohibition and incur the same penalties? Besides, did not that obedience of the clergy to the sovereign pontiff create a troublesome dualism in the realm, did it not make of England a two-headed monster? Such arguments, ably presented by Cromwell, touched the King. They also moved Parliament, where the King's royal projects had encountered no serious opposition.

The clergy, terrified by Cromwell's procedure and threats, voted 100,000 pounds sterling as a fine for a crime which they had not committed; on February 11th, 1531, the two ecclesiastical chambers passed five articles, the first two of which read as follows: (1) "We recognize that His Majesty is the special protector, the sole and supreme lord, and, so far as the law of Christ allows, the supreme head of the Church and clergy of England." [16] (2) "The care of souls will be entrusted to His Majesty."

The Spanish ambassador at London wrote on February 14th: "The English clergy have been induced and compelled to declare, constitute, and accept the king as the chief and principal head of the whole Anglican Church, which amounts almost to making him pope in England." [17] A week later he wrote: "Anne Boleyn and her father, too, have been the principal promoters of this measure (the King assuming the sovereignty of the Church in England). No one except perhaps a few who have taken part in this affair approve of such a step as this. . . . The chancellor himself is so horrified at it that he wishes to quit office as soon as possible. The Bishop of Rochester [Fisher] is quite ill in consequence." [18]

[16] The words, "so far as the law of Christ allows," were added at Fisher's request. They attenuated, but did not remove, the odious character of the declaration. (See Kerker, *Vie de Fisher*, p. 202.)

[17] *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, IV, part 2, pp. 63, 71.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 641.

The future showed how well-founded were these apprehensions. The amendment which was voted at Fisher's request—"so far as the law of Christ allows"—was practically taken no account of. Who of those prelates, appointed by the Crown and more subject to the King than to the Pope, would have dared to oppose the sovereign as to the meaning of this reservation?

In March, 1532, the King had the House of Lords and the House of Commons pass a bill abolishing the annates: on May 10th he forced the clergy to "offer and promise" that they would "never from henceforth enact, put in, promulgate, or execute any new canons or constitutions or any other new ordinance" without royal authorization.[19] It was a question of ecclesiastical laws and constitutions. The very day this declaration was passed, Sir Thomas More resigned from the office of chancellor. Bishop Fisher, who had been the victim of a mysterious attempt to poison him, left London. On May 13th Ambassador Chappuys wrote to his sovereign: "Churchmen will be of less account than shoemakers, who have the power of assembling and making their own statutes." [20]

The Schism Accomplished

When the Pope's decision, declaring the validity of Henry's first marriage, was solemnly promulgated (March 23rd, 1533), the schism was accomplished both in fact and in law. Three great laws, passed at the beginning of 1534, consummated the separation. The first of these, regarding the pope as a foreign bishop, whose decisions, even in matters of dogma or morals, counted for nothing in England, regulated the appointment of bishops: the king was to nominate a

[19] In Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, p. 177.

[20] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, V, no. 1013, p. 467.

candidate of his own choice; "permission to elect" was granted to the chapter for twelve days; at the end of that period, the appointment would be made directly by the king. The new bishop would take an oath of obedience to the king alone. The second great law abolished Peter's pence and all other contributions that had been established in favor of Rome. The third suppressed the right of appeal to Rome and subjected all episcopal ordinances to the king.

Meanwhile Cranmer's authority had been increasing. At the beginning of 1533 he was appointed archbishop of Canterbury and took the oath required by the Pope, but only after declaring in writing that this oath was simply a formality and could nowise restrict his freedom of action. By virtue of a power granted him by the King, he proclaimed (May 23rd) the nullity of the marital union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Five days later he declared as valid the secret marriage which the King affirmed he had contracted with Anne Boleyn on January 25th preceding. On June 1st, he solemnly crowned the new queen, who on September 7th gave birth to a child who was to become Queen Elizabeth. Charles V's ambassador wrote: "It all seems a dream, and even those who take part in these feasts know not whether they should laugh or cry."

The King's new marriage was criticized by some priests; Cranmer forbade them to preach for a year. A Franciscan preacher defended the validity of the King's first union; they threatened to throw him into the Thames. But the son of St. Francis replied: "Do so; I am quite sure that one can go to heaven by water as well as by land." However rare these symptoms of resistance were, they had to be crushed. Cranmer made a visitation of his province and forced on his clergy a declaration that "the bishop of Rome has not received from God any greater authority over the English realm than any other foreign bishop." From two assemblies of the clergy the

following perfidious declaration was obtained: "*According to Scripture* the pope has no more authority in England than any other bishop and there is nothing *in Scripture* regulating the relations between Rome and England." As it is quite clear that Scripture never formally and directly spoke of England, many thought they could accept this text with a safe conscience; others no doubt were glad to shield themselves by an equivocation. Two monks there were who did not blush to distribute in the monasteries another form of oath, more explicitly in favor of the King. This was a perfidious trick: they counted on a refusal *en masse,* which would permit a general dissolution of the religious Orders. The Franciscans of the strict observance, the monks of the Augustinian abbey of Sion, and those of Charterhouse at London were the only ones to offer a unanimous and energetic resistance. Several, however, in the end, took the oath with the restriction: "So far as the law of God permits."

Thomas Cromwell, who had been only a layman, was appointed (January, 1535) vicar general of the King for all ecclesiastical affairs, with authority to make a visitation of the churches, monasteries, and hospitals, to issue ordinances, to try the clergy and religious, and to give investiture to bishops. "Till then," says Bossuet, "that title had not been met with on the list of the Crown officers of England, nor among the employments recorded in the review of the empire, nor in any Christian kingdom whatsoever; and it was Henry VIII that first showed England and the Christian world, a lord vicegerent and a king's vicar general in spirituals." [21]

The papal act of March 23rd, 1533, deciding the divorce case against the King, excommunicated Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, and Cranmer. But the thunders of Rome could no longer frighten the King and his councillors, who took their

[21] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 7, sec. 4.

stand on purely national ground. What secular power would dare to execute the Pope's sentence? The Emperor, although Henry VIII's attitude shocked his Catholic faith and the divorce touched his aunt's honor, did not even wish to recall his ambassador from London, lest Francis I would come to an understanding with Henry to take Flanders from him. The attitude of Francis was full of hesitation: the eight French cardinals left the Eternal City just when the consistory was about to make its decision in the case of Henry's divorce. In the conflict between their conscientious duty and the interests of their sovereign, who did not want to do anything in opposition to the desire of King Henry VIII, they simply preferred to abstain from any participation. The days of the crusades were decidedly past: the care of political and commercial interests had taken the place of chivalry.

Almost the only protest left was that of the popular conscience. "On Easter Sunday (April 13th, 1534) the prior of the Augustinians, preaching at St. Paul's, invoked heaven's blessing on the new Queen. At once a great tumult arose in the church and the people left as a mark of protest. Like scenes took place in most of the country churches and, in many parishes, for several months no notice was taken of the royal orders prescribing prayers for Anne. Capello, the Venetian envoy, wrote (June 3rd, 1535): "The King is very unpopular; a rebellion could easily break out any day and cause great disorder." [22]

Cromwell and Cranmer, political tricksters that they were, had tried, the year before, to terrify the people by an execution that received wide publicity. Elizabeth Barton, a farm servant, predisposed to religious monomania by some nervous disease, had supposed visions and ecstasies in which she spoke forcibly against the King's divorce and the errors of the

[22] Trésal, p. 122.

times. The "Holy Maid of Kent," as she was called, used often to go to a chapel which, from 1528 to 1534, became a sort of pilgrimage place, the rendezvous of a certain number of people faithful to Catherine of Aragon. Cranmer made an investigation, following which he claimed to have discovered in a vast plot the whole party opposed to his policy, including Chancellor Thomas More, Bishop Fisher, the Marchioness of Exeter, the Countess of Salisbury, and Queen Catherine herself. Elizabeth Barton was executed (April 20th, 1534). This was the first blood shed during the religious discords in England. Nobler victims were soon to fall beneath the executioner's axe.

An "oath of supremacy" had been imposed on all ecclesiastics, obliging them to recognize the King as the source of all spiritual power, and an "oath of succession" forced the faithful to acknowledge the daughter of Anne Boleyn as the only legitimate heir to the throne. The famous "treason laws" completed these prescriptions and added terrible penalties thereto. All persons are adjudged traitors who "maliciously wish, will, or desire by words or writing, or by craft imagine, invent, practice, or attempt, any bodily harm to be done or committed to the King's most royal person, the Queen's, or their heirs apparent, or to deprive them or any of them of the dignity, title, or name of their royal estates, or slanderously and maliciously publish and pronounce, by express writing or words, that the King our Sovereign Lord should be heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, or usurper of the Crown." [23] This was the "English Terror." "In 1535 Charterhouse and Sion," says Denis,[24] "supplied contingents of martyrs, fettered at Newgate, hanged and quartered at Tyburn. The horrors of 1536 exceeded those of the year before. The time had come when every Englishman, under pain of

[23] *Statutes of the Realm, Henry VIII,* A. D. 1534, III, p. 508.
[24] Ernest Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, pp. 571–579.

death, was obliged, like Shakespeare's King John, to spit on the papacy." [25]

On May 4th, 1535, three Carthusian monks (John Houghton, Robert Lawrence, and Augustine Webster), a Brigittine (Richard Reynolds), and an aged pastor of Isleworth (John Hale), accused of having violated the "treason laws," were stretched on wooden hurdles, their feet tied together, and were dragged through the streets. Following this torture, they were hanged on a gibbet; then, as the law obliged their agony to be prolonged, they were let down at the first signs of strangulation; finally their entrails were cut out piece by piece, and their entire heart at one stroke.[26]

Fisher and More

All the bishops yielded except Fisher, all the jurists except More. Fisher and More, the two greatest men in England, did not escape the block. Their death was as noble as their life. To narrate, even without comment, the last hours of these two martyrs of the Catholic faith, is the greatest homage that history can pay their memory, the Church for which they died, and the country which they adorned.[27]

Fisher was accused of having said: "The King, our sovereign lord, is not supreme head on earth of the Church in England." He appeared before a special commission (June 12th, 1535). So weakened was he by sickness that he could scarcely stand. Turning to the advocate general, the Bishop said: "Mr. Rich, I cannot but marvel to hear you come in and bear witness against me of these words. . . . This man came to me from

[25] "Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy and ridiculous
To charge me to an answer, as the pope."
(King John, Act III, scene 1.)

[26] *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, VIII, no. 726, p. 272.

[27] See Leclercq, *Les martyrs*, VII, pp. 38–161.

the King (as he said) on a secret message, with commendations from His Grace. . . . Yet he told me that the King, for better satisfaction of his conscience, had sent him unto me in this secret manner, to know my full opinion in the matter. . . . He told me that the King willed him to assure me on his honor, and on the word of a king, that whatsoever I should say to him by this his secret messenger, I should abide no danger or peril for it." Rich offered no denial of Fisher's assertion. Nevertheless the Bishop was condemned to death. The King merely exempted him from the usual tortures; he was simply decapitated.

When the Bishop reached the foot of the scaffold, he motioned his guards aside as they wished to help him ascend, and climbed up the ladder with a spryness that astonished those who knew his weakened condition. When he reached the platform, he said in a strong voice: "Christian people, I am come here to die for the faith of Christ's holy Catholic Church, and I thank God . . . I beseech Almighty God of His infinite goodness to save the King and this realm." He knelt down, prayed for a moment, and then laid his head on the block. A single stroke of the axe severed it from the trunk. His head remained exposed on London Bridge for several days and was then thrown into the river. Its place on the bridge was soon taken by that of the chancellor, Thomas More.[28]

By his domestic virtues, his sprightly humor, his lofty culture, and his independence of mind, Thomas More was one of the most attractive figures of the Renaissance. His last days revealed the deep religious sentiments of his soul. Among other accusations, advocate general Rich, as in the case of Fisher, charged him with certain words that were uttered in a private conversation into which he had been tricked. Rich also distorted the meaning of the words. With stately and indignant eloquence, the former chancellor showed how odious was the part of spy and traitor played by his accuser. He was, of course,

[28] On Blessed John Fisher, see Bridgett, *Life of Blessed John Fisher.*

condemned to death. More addressed his judges in stirring tones: "Since I am condemned, and God knows how, I wish to speak freely of your statute, for the discharge of my conscience. For the seven years that I have studied the matter, I have not read in any approved doctor of the Church that a temporal lord could or ought to be the head of the spirituality." The chancellor interrupting him, said: "What, More? You wish to be considered wiser and of better conscience than all the bishops and nobles of the realm?" To this More replied: "My lord, for one bishop of your opinion I have a hundred saints of mine; and for one parliament of yours, and God knows of what kind, I have all the general councils for a thousand years."

He was executed on July 6th, at 9 o'clock in the morning. To the very last he preserved a cheerful humor which was ever mingled with his Christian piety and magisterial gravity. The scaffold was shaky. As he stepped on the first round of the ladder, he said to the lieutenant accompanying him: "I pray thee, see me safe up, and for my coming down let me shift for myself." He knelt down, recited the *Miserere,* his favorite prayer, and rested his head on the block.[29] The Church honors Fisher and More with the title of Blessed.[30]

The execution of Fisher, known and esteemed in all the courts of Europe, and of Chancellor More, celebrated in the literary circles of the time, produced great emotion. No one could be more affected by it than the head of the Church. The two martyrs, before their death, had appealed from the king's judgment to God and to the Church. Since 1534 the Holy See had been occupied by Paul III, the eminent pope who redeemed the weaknesses of his past life by the gigantic efforts he made,

[29] See Bridgett, *Life and Writings of Blessed Thomas More,* and Brémond, *Vie de Thomas More.*

[30] Pope Leo XIII (December 9th, 1886) proclaimed as Blessed not only More and Fisher, but also the three Carthusian fathers, the Brigittine monk, and the secular priest who were executed in 1535.

amidst numberless difficulties, to convoke the Council of Trent. The Pontiff heard the final appeal of the holy bishop and the noble chancellor; he wrote to several princes that he intended to interdict the King of England and to release his subjects from their oath of allegiance. But purely political reasons kept the princes from promising the Pope eventual obedience. The "Most Christian King," Francis I, who held to his alliance with England, was unwilling to withdraw his ambassador from London; all he promised was neutrality. The Emperor, born defender of Christendom and of the rights of the Holy See, was afraid that, by declaring himself against Henry VIII, he would strengthen the Anglo-French alliance, which he already feared. Ferdinand, king of the Romans, said that he wished to follow the policy of his brother Charles V.

Shortly afterwards, the Pope made a second attempt. Reginald Pole, who was Henry VIII's cousin, left England in 1532, so as not to be mixed up in the lamentable affair of the royal divorce, and wrote a treatise on the "Unity of the Church," wherein the King's religious policy was solidly refuted.[31] Paul III, who had the talent of employing men of worth, made Pole a cardinal, and, about 1537, entrusted him with a diplomatic mission to Francis I and Charles V, namely, to deliberate with the two sovereigns as to the means of leading England back to the Catholic faith.

But Henry's exasperation was further increased by Pole's embassy, in which he thought to discover conspiracy. The daughter of Francis I had just married the King of Scotland. What plot was being hatched? An invasion of England by Scottish troops? At that time this would have been an extreme peril. There was insurrection in the northern provinces. The

[31] This work was composed at the King's request. But when it appeared in 1536, Henry VIII's ideas had changed. On account of it the King conceived a violent dislike for his cousin.

firmness of the Pope's attitude had revived the courage of the Catholics. The destruction of several monasteries in the counties of Lincoln and York had led to a general uprising of the northern provinces. Thirty thousand men were in revolt, carrying a banner decorated with the five wounds, a chalice, and a host. This is what has been called the Pilgrimage of Grace. The astute Cromwell was at that time disposed to engage with the rebels in those lengthy negotiations which, by abuse of their loyalty, ended in their dispersion.[32] But the King gave free rein to his anger. Pole's mother and two of his relatives were put to death on unproved charges, and a price of 50,000 ducats was placed on the Cardinal's head. This measure was the height of royal abuse. The Sovereign Pontiff, in an allocution delivered in the presence of the cardinals (October 28th, 1538), recalled the series of crimes committed by Henry VIII, and two months later pronounced excommunication and the interdict against him.

Executions and Confiscations

Henry VIII was first of all a statesman: the interests of his royal power, especially when he could reconcile them to his passions and his pride, outweighed every other consideration. It has been justly remarked that, "during the last eleven years of his reign, 'the supreme head' regulated the dogma, discipline, and worship of his church according to the changing vicissitudes of European politics. When the Pope seemed on the point of succeeding in his attempt to combine the Emperor and the King of France against England in the name of religious unity, considered as the basis of peace, then Henry VIII showed himself very Catholic in his formularies of faith and pitilessly hunted out heretics and sent them to the stake so as to deprive the Catholic sovereigns of their best pretext

[32] For a résumé of these negotiations, see Trésal, p. 172.

for armed intervention. When danger from that quarter subsided, Henry entered into relations with the German reform party, received and sent embassies, led them to expect the possibility of a treaty of alliance, which he always avoided concluding. At such times we see him seeking the advice of Melanchthon, the oracle of the Lutheran party." [33]

The execution of fourteen Anabaptists, who were burned at the stake in June, 1535, between the death of Fisher and that of More, may have been a move of that two-faced policy. Before them, in 1533, pastor John Frith, who had attacked the doctrines of Purgatory and transubstantiation, and a poor London tailor who merely said: "I believe what John Frith believes," had perished at the stake. The *Ten Articles* of 1536, soon replaced by the *Six Articles* of 1539, seemed to be a doctrinal compromise between Catholicism and German Protestantism: but nothing was more obligatory than this compromise; yet no act shed more blood than this one of supposed conciliation.

The *Six Articles* ordered the acceptance of: (1) transubstantiation; (2) communion under one species; (3) ecclesiastical celibacy; (4) the binding force of the vow of chastity; (5) mass for the souls in purgatory; (6) auricular confession. Every contravention, even verbal, of these dogmas was punishable by death and confiscation of property; and—an unheard-of thing—abjuration did not save the guilty. Cranmer had to dismiss his wife. Even Cromwell, whose policy and procedure had been displeasing to the King, was accused of heresy as well as treason, and in spite of his cringing and hypocritical moves, was put to death (July 28th, 1540).

However, the atrocious repressive measures of the King and the calculations of his see-saw policy were strangely mingled with the freest fancies of his passions. By means of six wives, who were successively the victims of his caprice

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

or fury, the religious supremacy became an object of contention between bishops who were secretly Lutheran, such as Cranmer, Latimer, Fox, Shaxton, and bishops devoted to the policy of the Six Articles ("Henrician bishops"), such as Gardiner, Lee, and Tunstall. Anne Boleyn, who was favorable to the Protestants, was decapitated for adultery, incest, and high treason in 1536. Then followed Anne Seymour, who died October 24th, 1537, in giving birth to the future Edward VI. Next came the Lutheran Jeanne of Cleves, advanced by Cromwell, but soon repudiated. The fourth was Catherine Howard, who represented the Henrician party and whom Cranmer had decapitated in 1542; lastly came Catherine Parr, who favored German Protestantism and who alone survived the King; it is true that at Henry's death she was about to be burned as a heretic. "Among the personages immolated by Henry," says Cardinal Hergenröther, "there were 2 queens, 12 dukes and counts, 164 noblemen, 2 cardinal archbishops, 18 bishops, 13 abbots, 500 priors and monks, and 38 doctors of theology or canon law." [34]

So many crimes had been committed and rendered well nigh irreparable by the ruin of the English monasteries.[35] When the schism occurred, England counted about 800 monasteries of men or women. Henry first sought to ruin these houses by imposing crushing burdens on them. At the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace, he began tearing down a large number of monasteries in the north on the pretext that their abbots had committed treason. The hypocritical conduct of two men in particular made them especially odious in this work of destruction. These two, Legh and Layton, performed the duties of "visitors" in the name of the King. Denying that they had any wish to confiscate the monastic

[34] Hergenröther, V, p. 421.

[35] On this question, see the scholarly work of Card. Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries.*

property and punishing those who spread such reports to their discredit, they induced the abbots to sign away the property, either by using threats or by offering large sums of money to the superiors as premiums for their unfaithfulness. The abbots of three large Benedictine monasteries, Reading, Glastonbury, and Colchester, declined these offers. The King had them condemned and executed as guilty of high treason.[36] Many others, convicted for a similar refusal, met a like fate. The last monastery was given up to the King on March 23rd, 1540. In less than five years was consummated the destruction of monasticism in England.

The King had promised that the wealth of the monks would be employed for the education of poor children, to provide pensions for aged servants, and to improve the highways. These promises were not kept.[37] "It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of this unparalleled operation," says one historian. "The King kept none of the monastic property; he sold it; he gave it to his courtiers; during the last eight years of his life, he alienated the spoils of 420 abbeys or priories. These goods consequently passed into the hands of the gentry. Thus the whole upper class of the laity found themselves more or less concerned in maintaining the new order of things which procured such rich endowments for them. An analogous event took place in 1789 in the ranks of the French peasants after the division of the national possessions. In England the monastic domains served to endow the new aristocracy, which has been the strongest support of the religion of the Tudors." [38]

On the other hand, the condition of the common people was made worse by this immense transfer of property. The new owners, more exacting than the monks and not residing

[36] Rymer, *Foedera,* VI, parts 3 and 4, pp. 15 sqq.
[37] Gasquet, *op. cit.,* p. 430.
[38] C. V. Langlois in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 576.

on their estates, were more rigorous in the matter of enclosing the communal pastures, which up to then had been left to the use of the poor. "In the year 1540 Parliament was obliged to come to the help of 57 cities fallen to decay in consequence of the destruction of the abbeys. The first collection for the poor, the beginning of the famous poor-tax, took place in 1538. Pauperism, one of the most hideous sores of England today, dates from the destruction of the monasteries." [39]

Such was the condition of Great Britain when King Henry VIII, old, corpulent, and apoplectic, long since threatened with his approaching end, died, on January 28th, 1547. He had sent for Cranmer the day before. When the bishop arrived at the King's side, the latter had lost his speech and almost his consciousness. While the prelate was exhorting him to give some sign of his confidence in Christ, the wretched monarch could only press his hand in a last effort of failing strength.[40]

[39] Trésal, p. 190.

[40] "Some say this unhappy prince, towards the end of his days, felt some remorse for the excesses he had run into; and, in order to calm his conscience, sent for some bishops to him. I vouch it not; those who in scandalous sinners, but particularly in kings, are for discovering such biting stings of conscience as appeared in an Antiochus, are not acquainted with all God's ways, nor reflect sufficiently on that deadly insensibility and false peace He sometimes suffers His greatest enemies to fall into. Be that as it will, should Henry have consulted his bishops, what could be expected from a body which had enslaved the Church? . . . He who could not brook truth from the mouth of Thomas More, his chancellor, nor from the holy Bishop of Rochester, both of whom he put to death for speaking it freely to him, never more deserved to hear it." (Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 7, sec. 74.)

CHAPTER V

Protestantism in England

Edward VI

THE successor of Henry VIII was a pale and sickly child, less than ten years old at the time of his accession, but already serious and gloomy. By the time he reached the age of thirteen he had a passion for theology and took pleasure in the talk of the most extreme reformers. He reigned for six years, keeping an almost daily record of the events of his life in an unchanging, laconic, and precise style. His maternal uncle, Count Seymour, seized the regency with the title of duke of Somerset. Seymour, who had long before accepted the Lutheran ideas, had early inspired the young Edward with a hatred for the Roman Church and its teachings. Cranmer, the archbishop of Canterbury, who had fallen into disfavor under Henry VIII, made haste, in Edward's reign, to recover the place of preponderance whence the influence of the Henrician bishops had driven him. At the same time he cast aside his mask of hypocrisy and loudly proclaimed himself the partisan of a doctrinal reform.

Under such auspices, not only Lutheran, but Calvinist and Zwinglian doctrines as well, invaded England, penetrated the official professions of faith, and were imposed on clergy and people by a tyranny even more absolute than that of Henry VIII.

Doctrinal and Disciplinary Measures

Parliament was a docile tool in the hands of the Protestant Somerset. Its first acts were to abolish all the laws against

heresy, to suppress the vague "permission of election" accorded to the chapters, and to decide that episcopal appointments would henceforth be made by royal letters patent. Then were suppressed all corporations, guilds, fraternal and mutual benefit associations, of a religious nature; their goods were confiscated, as had been done with the abbeys, priories, and convents. Catholics were now deprived of the right of association, of all corporate property, and of all means of acquiring any.

The work of doctrinal and disciplinary destruction could then be pursued without fear of effective resistance. From the bishops was taken the right to authorize preachers; this was reserved to the King and Archbishop Cranmer.[1] For a while all preaching was suspended throughout the realm.[2] By way of silencing even the voice of the old ceremonies and the ancient images, by which the people received the traditional faith, the famous royal decrees of July 31st, 1547, overturned the liturgy and ordered the destruction of all pious representations, including paintings and stained glass windows. This was an irreparable loss to art. Then, as the liveliest discussions were taking place on the question of the Holy Eucharist, a royal order (issued December 27th, 1547,) forbade any teaching on this subject not contained in the Scriptures, until the King should determine the official doctrine.[3]

In March, 1548, an "Instruction on Communion" and a small ritual, taken from a compilation of Lutheran usage at Nuremberg, were published by royal order. Therein the obligation of auricular confession was suppressed, but the Latin Mass was still retained. This last point aroused violent discussion. Cranmer and his party were no longer satisfied

[1] Burnet, *History of the Reformation of the Church of England,* II, p. 156.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Constant, *La transformation du culte anglican sous Edouard VI,* in the *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique,* January 15th, 1911.

with Lutheran doctrines; they went so far as to say, with Zwingli, Carlstadt, Calvin, and all the Sacramentarians, that the Eucharist is only a symbol, a simple commemoration of the Last Supper. These discussions eventually (January 15th, 1549) led to the promulgation by Parliament of the celebrated *Book of Common Prayer,* which, with various subsequent modifications, has remained the official and popular symbol of the beliefs of the Anglican Church. The Real Presence was admitted, but the prayers and ceremonies were stripped of whatever seemed "too much to favor transubstantiation or even the corporeal presence." [4]

The disputes were enlivened by the presence in England of several Lutheran theologians, to whom both teaching and preaching were entrusted, while silence was imposed on Henricians and Catholics. Vermigli, an Italian monk who had married a nun and who is known as Peter Martyr, was appointed professor at Oxford in 1547; a work published by him two years later frankly accepted Zwingli's radical doctrine on the Eucharist.[5] His compatriot, Bernardino Ochino, an unfrocked Capuchin and canon of Canterbury, taught almost identical doctrines. The arrival at Cambridge (April, 1529) of two German theologians, Bucer and Fagius, driven from Strasburg by the Interim, accentuated the Lutheran movement. They were given the two most prominent professorships of the English universities and their influence was felt throughout the realm. The Henrician bishop Gardiner was imprisoned for protesting.

In 1549 an uprising of the people in the West, enraged by the destruction of images and statues, starved by the suppression of the monasteries and religious fraternities, was crushed with the utmost cruelty by bands of Spanish, Italian,

[4] Bossuet, *op. cit.*, bk. 7, sec. 85.
[5] *Ibid.*, bk. 7, sec. 81.

Flemish, and German mercenaries.[6] But Somerset, the Lord Protector, did not long enjoy his triumph; his rival Warwick supplanted him in 1549. Somerset was accused of high treason and decapitated in 1552.

The Count of Warwick, the head of England's landed aristocracy, continued Somerset's religious policy with still greater violence. Warwick, as soon as he came into power, sent a circular letter to the bishops ordering them to direct the deans and canons of their cathedrals, as also the pastors, curates, chaplains, and church-wardens of all their parishes, to bring to them or their delegate all the antiphonaries, missals, graduals, processional books, manuals, saints' lives, mass books, ordinals and other liturgical books, according to the rites of Sarum, Lincoln, York, Bangor, or Herford. The bishops were further ordered, once they had these works in their hands, to destroy them so that they could never be used again and so as to complete the established uniformity.

Notwithstanding the strong opposition of the bishops and nobles, Warwick had Parliament pass a bill (January 25th, 1551) ordering the destruction of every kind of statue or image that still remained in the churches, only excepting the statues of kings, princes, or nobles who never were regarded as saints. The episcopal revenues also tempted the new government. Each new bishop was appointed on condition that he surrender one or two castles of his domain. When Pouet was raised to the see of Winchester, in 1551, he had to turn over to the Crown all the possessions of the bishopric in exchange for a pension of 2,000 marks.

This policy was not a thing to displease the young King. When Charles V threatened England with a war unless his

[6] The insurgents especially demanded the restoration of the old public worship and the reëstablishment of two abbeys in each county, along with the restitution of half their lands. Hume says: "They were acknowledged to have been the best and most indulgent landlords." (*History of England,* III, p. 354.)

niece, Princess Mary, were permitted to hear the Roman Mass, it was the King who refused any concession, in spite of the advice of his council.

The King's sister, in fact, refused to have any changes made in the ceremonies of the Mass which was celebrated in her chapel, or in her other religious practices. In spite of the mutual affection between him and his elder sister, the King imprisoned the princess' chaplain and several of her servants. Mary protested that she was His Majesty's humble subject, but that she would lay her head on the block rather than accept a form of worship other than was in use at her father's death. The King dared not push the matter further. Mary had Mass celebrated secretly in her chapel, and the royal authority closed its eyes.

Unlike his father, who aimed only at making himself independent of Rome and who purposed remaining the "Defender of the Faith" until his death, Edward VI instinctively inclined to heresy and devoted his unconquerable tenacity to its spread. The Calvinist doctrine, more radical and clearly defined than the Lutheran, was more agreeable to his cold, apathetic nature and lucid mind,[7] whose very outbursts of anger seemed calculated. Martin Bucer wrote to Calvin (May 15th, 1550): "There is no study which the King pursues so earnestly as Holy Scripture; every day he reads ten chapters of the Bible with the closest attention." In another letter (May 25th) he writes: "The King is using all his authority to restore the kingdom of God." A French Protestant, Burgogne, wrote (December 4th, 1550) from London to Calvin that the King, in a conversation, had asked him many question about the Geneva doctrine. At the beginning of the following year, Calvin, emboldened by such information, found

[7] The Italian philosopher, Cardone, who saw the King about 1552 when the latter was about fifteen years old, declared that he was amazed at the King's seriousness and strength of mind.

fault with Cranmer for his moderation and delay; the primate replied by urging Calvin to address the King directly.

The head of the French reformation had reason to be gratified. A second edition of the Book of Common Prayer, made obligatory from November 1st, 1552, notably modified the celebration of the Lord's Supper, eliminated every allusion to transubstantiation, prayers and other examples of the saints, abolished the memento for the dead, and suppressed sacerdotal vestments. Knox, whose doctrinal denials and boldness surpassed those of Calvin, in his recollections, written later, declared that Edward VI was "admirably disposed in favor of the truth." We know the meaning of such a declaration from such a pen.

The doctrinal work of Edward VI was crowned by the publication (1550) of the Ordinal, regulating the ceremonies to be observed in conferring Holy Orders, and by the compilation of a Declaration of Forty-two Articles, establishing the symbol of faith. The Ordinal, considered along with the changes it underwent in 1552, suppressed in the ordination of deacons and priests the ceremony called "the tradition of the instruments," or the touching of the chalice and paten, which some theologians regard as essential. Hence arose the question of the validity of Anglican Orders. The Forty-two Articles, edited by Cranmer and Bishop Ridley of London, contained a mixture of Lutheran, Calvinist, and Zwinglian ideas.

These "reforms" were not accomplished without considerable opposition. Five protesting Henrician bishops were deposed. In the contrary direction, there was gathering about John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, later on called "the Father of Non-Conformists"—a group of dissident irreconcilables who carried Calvinistic austerities to their utmost conclusions.

The decadence of the clergy was lamentable. Bucer wrote

to Calvin: "Very few parishes have pastors qualified for their office. Most of them are sold to the nobility." [8] The Bishop of Gloucester stated that, out of three hundred priests visited by him, 160 were unable to recite the Ten Commandments.[9] Ambitious rivalry divided the bishops who were faithful to the King. The people, who were becoming more and more wretched, faintly murmured against the government. The pillage of churches, monasteries, and great monastic and university libraries had not enriched the treasury. The young King was ill. Warwick, Cranmer, Ridley, and all others who had power or influence at their disposal, feared a Catholic reaction upon Edward's death. At all costs, it was necessary to eliminate Princess Mary. The King's Council thereupon declared that the order of succession would be changed and that the heir to the throne would be Lady Jane Grey, a grand-niece of Henry VIII. When Edward died, on July 6th, 1553, Lady Jane was proclaimed Queen of England. The episcopate and a party of the nobility were devoted to her. But the rank and file of the nation, on being delivered from the "Protestant misrule," [10] acclaimed Princess Mary, who overthrew Jane Grey and entered London in triumph (August 3rd, 1553).

[8] Robinson, *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation,* II, p. 546, *i. e.,* letter 253.

[9] Hooper, *Later Writings,* p. 251.

[10] "The reign of Edward VI, lauded by some as the sacred epoch of the English Reformation, and cursed by others, is to-day narrated in historical works by dignitaries of the Anglican Church under the heading, The Protestant Misrule." (C. V. Langlois, in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, 590.)

CHAPTER VI

Protestantism in England

Queen Mary's Policy of Conciliation

THE accession of Queen Mary was an occasion of unmixed joy for all the persecuted, Catholics and Henricians alike. One of the reformers, a contemporary of these events, writes: "The papists, who had been always longing for this most wished for day, dig out as it were from their graves their vestments, chalices, and portasses, and begin Mass with all speed. . . . They, then, even the poorest of them, made voluntary subscriptions." [1] Gardiner, the head of the Henricians, was appointed chancellor of Cambridge University; Cranmer, the instigator of the most violent measures under Edward VI, was simply deposed, with the promise of a pension; Peter Martyr, the most radical and stirring of the Protestant preachers, received a passport drawn up in most honorable terms. The new Queen pardoned the conspirators who had taken up arms against her, except three of their leaders—Northumberland, John Gates, and Thomas Palmer—who were decapitated as traitors. Despite the Spanish ambassador's urging, she firmly refused to send Jane Grey to the block. At a meeting of her council, held August 12th, 1553, we find it recorded that, "albeit her Grace's conscience is stayed in matters of religion, yet she meaneth graciously not to compell or constreyne otherwise then God shall (as she trusteth) putte in their hearts a persuasion of the truthe that she is in." [2] Her uncle, Emperor Charles V, encouraged

[1] Robinson, *Original Letters,* I, p. 369, *i. e.,* letter 182.
[2] *Acts of the Privy Council,* IV, p. 317.

her in this policy. In fact, he wrote, advising "that she should adapt herself with all possible gentleness, conforming to the decrees of Parliament and gradually restoring things as best she could, and that she ought to be, above all else, a good Englishwoman." [3]

At the very outset an incident all but compromised the good harmony of the kingdom. Just when Cranmer's possessions were being inventoried to determine the amount of his pension, he issued a proclamation in which he spoke of the "horrible sacrileges" of the Roman Mass. The council sent him to the Tower. Soon a series of harsh measures, which were not all due to the Queen's will, and certain regrettable events for which it is hard to fix the responsibility, transformed the régime of pacification which it was sincerely intended should be inaugurated, into a régime of bloody repressions.

Bloody Repressions

The Queen's marriage with the Emperor's son, the future Philip II, was the first of these political mistakes and the starting-point of all the evils and misfortunes of her reign. This cold and apathetic Spanish husband, eleven years younger than the Queen, a man who never loved her, could be no support to her. In fact, he became the first obstacle to her policy. The marriage contract had, indeed, stipulated that England and Spain should be separately administered and that public offices in England should be confided only to Englishmen.[4] The people distrusted this foreign sovereign, who was said to be a fierce Catholic and a crafty statesman.

A young nobleman, Courtenay by name, whom it seems the Queen had favored as a wooer, turned bitterly against her,

[3] *Papiers d'état de Granvelle,* IV, p. 55.

[4] *Statutes of the Realm: Mary,* chap. 2, p. 22.

carrying with him a large number of other nobles. It was intimated to him that, failing to obtain Mary's hand, he might obtain that of her sister Elizabeth. Courtenay was the soul of several plots whose aim was to put Mary to death and raise Elizabeth to the throne. This occasioned many arrests, in consequence of which there were sixty executions. One of the chief personages involved was the Duke of Suffolk, Jane Grey's father. The council decided that he should be put to death as well as his daughter. The Queen felt obliged to yield. Jane Grey certainly was innocent; she was forced on the throne in spite of herself before Mary's accession, and she had never taken the least part in her father's rebellion. Truly touching were the last moments of the unfortunate maiden, barely seventeen years old: "My crime," she said, "is that I showed I was fit to be queen." She was decapitated February 12th, 1554. Her execution, which moved even the Queen's most devoted followers to tears, stirred the wrath of her enemies. This was the second great mistake of Mary's reign.

Gardiner, the chancellor and former councillor of Henry, as also some Henrician prelates who tried to have their past weaknesses forgotten, displayed excessive zeal, urging the Queen to the most severe measures. At the end of 1553 there appeared a pamphlet calling the Henrician prelates "cut-throats" and "pickpockets." On the morning of April 8th, 1554, there was to be seen, near St. Paul's, hanging on a gallows, a dead cat dressed in priest's vestments and holding a host between its paws. On June 10th someone shot at a preacher delivering a sermon at St. Paul's.

The solemn reconciliation of the kingdom with Rome, celebrated November 30th, 1554 by the Queen and Cardinal Pole at Westminster, was a new occasion for the enemies of the Queen and of the Catholic Church to spread calumnious reports about Mary and the papacy. The Queen had been

fearful of the consequences of this act, which would become necessary sooner or later, but for which public opinion needed to be prepared. She was aware that, although it was a simple matter to lead the nation back to Catholic ceremonies which had been abolished only four years previously, it would be otherwise with the papal supremacy, forgotten for thirty years past, misrepresented, dreaded by the possessors of former ecclesiastical property, who saw, though mistakenly, a menace in the measure.[5] The Pope, in fact, had declared that these possessors would not be disturbed. But the Queen, through a conscientious scruple, having restored to the former owners those goods which the Crown had not disposed of to individuals, there was produced a panic among the nobles whose fortune was built upon the property of the Church. Most of these noblemen held high places in the kingdom. Early in 1555 it was discovered that a certain Thomas Rose had organized in different parts of London secret religious services according to the Protestant practice, and that this prayer was used: "Lord, turn the heart of Queen Mary from idolatry, or else shorten her days." [6]

The erection of the seigniory of Ireland into a kingdom (1555) by Paul IV at the request of Mary and Philip was another cause of antipathy towards the Queen. Princess Elizabeth, whose attitude at the time of Courtenay's plots had been very enigmatical, took advantage of all these incidents against her sister.[7]

The Queen's councillors had, for some time past, been pro-

[5] *"Plus difficultatis fit circa auctoritatem Sedis Apostolicae, quam circa verae religionis cultum; adeo falsis suggestionibus sunt alienati subditorum animi a Pontifice."* Letter from Queen Mary to Cardinal Pole, October 28th, 1553, quoted in Lingard, *History of England* (1878 ed.), V, p. 199. See Ancel's important study, *La reconciliation de l'Angleterre avec le Saint-siège sous Marie Tudor,* in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Louvain), 1909, X, pp. 521–536, 744–798.

[6] Trésal, p. 315.

[7] On Elizabeth's intrigues, see Lingard, V, chap. 5.

posing that she revive the laws of Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V, providing death at the stake for those who professed heresy and those who prayed for the death of the sovereign. The House of Commons and the House of Lords passed laws to this effect. These statutes were to go into effect on January 20th, 1555. On the 22nd ten preachers were brought before a commission on a charge of heresy. By the beginning of February, eleven heretics had been executed. The former primate, Cranmer, was convicted of heresy, adultery, blasphemy, and high treason, and died at the stake at Oxford. He had made no less than seven successive retractions, each of them more humble than the other. But at the stake he revoked these retractions and added: "If the Pope had saved my life, I would have obeyed his laws." But he died with firmness and courage. As the flames rose, he stretched out his right hand, on the pretense that it had been stained by a criminal signature, so that it might burn first.

These executions accomplished little beyond multiplying hypocritical conversions and encouraging clandestine meetings and secret societies. The government in turn trembled and had recourse to penalties which in the sixteenth century did not have the odium which attaches to them in our day, but were none the less blameworthy. On February 6th, 1557, the bodies of Bucer and Fagius, who brought the first germs of heresy to England, were exhumed and burned in the Cambridge market-place, the body of Peter Martyr's wife, a former nun, was thrown on a dunghill.

Cardinal Pole, consecrated archbishop of Canterbury (March 22nd, 1556), made every effort to calm the Queen's impatient and unhealthy irritation and to counterbalance the influence of her imprudent councillors. But these efforts only helped to bring about his denunciation at Rome as being in connivance with the heretics. Pole fell into disfavor with

Paul IV, who was also ill-disposed towards the Queen of England. Philip II, who, following his father's retirement, had become emperor of all the Spains (January 15th, 1556), had drawn Mary into an alliance with Spain, which ran counter to the diplomacy of Paul IV. The last months of the life of this Queen, who had so intensely pursued the enemies of the Church, were marked by a coldness in her relations with the Holy See. But Cardinal Pole remained her faithful and devoted councillor to her last day. After a reign of five years, she died (November 17th, 1558) at the age of forty-two. The name of "Bloody Mary," which is often given her, has been inspired by partisan hatred rather than by a just estimate of her reign.[8] The recent publication of the secret papers of her reign confirms the previous conclusions of impartial historians as to the sincerity of her faith, the loftiness of her character, and the uprightness of her intentions. She was a victim of the difficulties of a period when, as has been said of another epoch, "it was harder to know one's duty than to do it." Her unhappy reign also shows that in human government acts of imprudence are often more fatal than crimes.

[8] There is endless discussion as to the number of executions that took place under Queen Mary. The Protestant historian Cobbett in his *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland* (letter 8) reckons only 300. But this author, who often adopts the tone of a pamphleteer, sometimes tends to exaggerate the faults of his coreligionists. Certain Protestant writers speak of 3000 victims. This figure is evidently a gross exaggeration. Impartial historians generally agree that the number of executions under Mary is far below the number of those carried out under Edward VI and Elizabeth. Why, then, has Mary's name remained more odious among Englishmen than the names of Edward and Elizabeth? Sectarian hatred alone does not suffice to explain this strange fact. It is noteworthy that the victims of the Protestant monarchs were especially priests and monks, whereas those of the Catholic Queen were fathers of families, whose outcries were more far-reaching, since their deaths affected a greater number of persons. Queen Mary's greater care to observe legal procedure in the trials made them the more widely known. Those who had come into possession of church property were always fearful of being dispossessed. Their consequent panic contributed not a little to stir up the people.

Queen Elizabeth

The same historians who speak of "Bloody Mary," generally call her sister "Good Queen Bess." The latter qualification, as we shall see, is no better justified than the former. The daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn inherited from her mother a passion for jewelry and a fondness for luxury and display. The trials of her youth, the régime of espionage in the midst of which she lived, and her prison life in the Tower had developed in her a spirit of defiance, falsehood, and perfidy. On taking possession of the throne left vacant by her sister Mary's death, she at first seemed favorable to Catholicism. She was crowned according to the Catholic rite, swore to protect the Roman religion, and proposed an alliance with the King of Spain. The Venetian ambassador Priuli wrote (November 27th, 1558): "No change can be seen in the churches; no insult has been offered monks and priests visiting London, and her Majesty still hears Mass as before." [9] But at the same time the new Queen, whose best support had always come from the Protestant party, surrounded herself with ministers favorable to the Reformation. Two of them, William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon, became the evil geniuses of her reign.[10] The Spanish envoy, Feria, was able truthfully to write, at the same time as his Venetian colleague: "Every day the Queen takes a stronger stand against religion." From the very outset Elizabeth put into practice those principles, if we may so speak, which came to dominate her whole policy. They consisted in subordinating everything to her personal interests, identified so far as possible with those of the nation, in making reli-

[9] *Acts of the Privy Council.*

[10] Nicholas Bacon was the father of the famous philosopher. William Cecil contributed greatly to England's commercial prosperity by developing her marine, which Wolsey had created. But the "Plan of the Anglican Reformation," drawn up by these two statesmen, is a masterpiece of perfidy.

gion a national institution, and in governing it without control. Elizabeth, a pagan by taste and temperament in private life, displayed this quality also in her public life.

After notifying Pope Paul IV of her elevation, she suddenly ordered her ambassador to break off all relations with the Holy See. Then she asserted her policy of progressive reform by the discreet revision of the Book of Common Prayer. She promulgated (February 25th, 1559) a decree, "restoring to the Crown its former jurisdiction over the ecclesiastical and spiritual state and abolishing all foreign authority in opposition to the Crown." In this act, the Queen, fearing lest she might alarm the non-conformists, whether Catholics or Calvinists, was at pains to attenuate the expressions current under Henry VIII. She does not call herself the "Supreme Head," but "the only Supreme Governor of this realm as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal."

The organization of a hierarchy like that of the Roman Church, related to the Pope by ordination, but placed under the control of the Queen by jurisdiction, was the natural consequence of these first measures. Matthew Parker, a beneficiary in the time of Edward VI, then deprived of his office under Mary's government, was consecrated (December 17th, 1559) archbishop of Canterbury by the Protestant Bishop Barlow and three other prelates. This ceremony, using Edward VI's Ordinal, which suppressed the rite of the presentation of the chalice and paten, was performed by bishops who notoriously rejected the existence of the episcopate in the Church of Christ. It could not, with a safe conscience, be considered a valid ordination, and, as a consequence, all the Anglican Orders which depend on Parker must be regarded as radically vitiated and null.[11] Parker was deservedly reputed

[11] The question of the validity of Anglican Orders was, for a long time, freely discussed among Catholics. See Dalbus, *Les ordinations anglicanes;* Boudinhon,

to be a moderate man. His personal character evoked nothing but sympathy. By order of the Queen, the ornaments and ceremonies of the Church were rigorously preserved. These facts, considered in connection with what we have already seen of the condition of the English clergy in relation to the king, explains how, out of 2400 beneficiaries, barely 60 refused to take the oath of royal supremacy when it was required of them.

As for the common people, whom we have seen several times, in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, rising up for the defense of the religion of their fathers, their ardor had fallen. Whether long practice had accustomed them to obey the established power in spirituals, or the wide-spread calumnies against Rome had shaken their fidelity, or the excessive severities of Queen Mary had alienated many from the Catholic cause, the people in England never again upheld the cause of the Roman Church against the royalty and nobility. No resistance was offered to the bill (1562) which imposed the oath of supremacy, not only on ecclesiastics, but likewise on the chief civil officers, lawyers, and all teachers, whether public or private.

Elizabeth understood that her people were ripe for a more radical reformation. On the condition of freeing the Anglican religion of every element that was too markedly Calvinistic or Zwinglian, of bestowing on it the characteristics of an essentially national institution, and of representing all its enemies as enemies of the country, it was possible to hope to more and more accentuate its anti-Catholic character. The

Etude théologique sur les ordinations anglicanes; De la validité des ordinations anglicanes; Puller, *Les ordinations anglicanes et le sacrifice de la messe.* The encyclical *"Apostolicae curae"* (September 2nd, 1896) closed the question by affirming the nullity of Anglican Orders. The story of Hog's Head Tavern, according to which Parker was supposed to have been consecrated by Barlow at an inn amidst a ridiculous masquerade, is a legend pure and simple, doubtless founded on the well-known fact that Barlow did not believe in the episcopate. (Cf. Servière, *La controverse sur la validité des ordinations anglicanes d'après des publications récentes,* in *Études,* September 5th, 1912.)

Forty-two Articles, drawn up under Edward VI, were revised and reduced to thirty-nine. These Thirty-nine Articles, published in January 1563, by dubious phrases, modified Edward VI's declaration in its manner of expression rather than in substance. They rejected the primacy of the pope, the sacrifice of the Mass, "that sacrilegious invention," transubstantiation, Purgatory, the invocation of the saints, the veneration of images, and indulgences. Whosoever should do anything contrary to this symbol of faith was to be punished as a heretic. Elizabeth's Thirty-nine Articles have remained the code of the Anglican Church.

The new symbol might expect to encounter two classes of violators: the Catholics, and a group of independent spirits who derived their inspiration from Calvin and Zwingli and who were known as Puritans.

The Catholics, since the suppression of the papal embassy to London and the rupture of diplomatic relations between England and the Holy See, no longer had any official backing at court. Thus abandoned and leaderless, they found it difficult to agree upon a plan of resistance. Many thought they could be present at the offices established by the Book of Common Prayer; others abstained from them. The election of Cardinal Ghislieri, who took the name of Pius V (January 7th, 1556), reanimated their courage. The new Pontiff was a man whose energy was equal to his prudence. He formally condemned the Book of Common Prayer and granted to refugees, Harding and Sanders, authority to reconcile to the Church those of the faithful who had made themselves guilty of schism by their presence at the condemned offices.

Elizabeth's Persecution of the Church

Elizabeth was awaiting an occasion to persecute the Church for a motive of political interest. At the beginning of her

reign the Catholics had not concealed their sympathy for Mary Stuart, queen of Scotland, a niece of Henry VIII, whom many regarded as the legitimate heir to the English throne. But thus far no overt act had cast any suspicion on their loyalty. Elizabeth cast Mary Stuart into prison after having promised her an asylum; this odious conduct so stirred certain Catholic noblemen that, in 1568, they formed a plot to free the captive. Elizabeth made out all Catholics to be coöperators with these nobles. As Mary Stuart had been married to King Francis II of France, Elizabeth accused the Catholics of being hired by the foreigner to betray her. Some hundreds of Catholics were put to death. Gibbets were erected through the length and breadth of the land and heavy fines imposed on anyone who fell under the slightest suspicion.[12] Pope St. Pius V, after long consultation, reflection, and prayer, published the Bull *"Regnans Dei"* (February 25th, 1570), pronouncing Elizabeth's excommunication and deposition.

Three bills of persecution were the Queen's reply. Whosoever should deny or cast doubt upon Elizabeth's right to the English crown was declared guilty of high treason. Formidable fines were the penalty for refusing to attend the Anglican services. A high court of commission was invested with exceptional inquisitorial powers. To find a more pitiless piece of legislation one must go to the French Terror of 1793. The situation became worse in 1581. The exercise of any priestly function, even the giving of asylum to a priest, made one subject to the death penalty. The prisons overflowed with Catholics. Numerous priests were punished with a traitor's death. Father Nelson and a seminarian, Sherwood, came from Douay to preach the faith in England; they were cut

[12] English priests and monks, who were being everywhere hunted out, founded colleges and religious communities in foreign lands. The beginnings of the English colleges of Douai, Rome, Valladolid, Saint Omer, etc., date from this period.

down alive at Tyburn.[13] Two English Jesuits, Fathers Persons and Campion, had been travelling hither and thither in England since 1580, in the midst of every danger, frequently changing their dress and name, celebrating the sacred mysteries in secret, and fortifying the faithful. Campion was arrested and martyred. In 1584, at the death of the bishop of Lincoln, the Catholics were without a bishop. They obtained an archpriest only in 1798. In 1585, on the pretext of new plots, the persecution was renewed with increased fury. In the next year, a courageous Christian woman, Margaret Clitherow, was martyred with barbarous brutality; a door was placed upon her and then weighted down until she was crushed to death.[14]

The execution of Mary Stuart, whose last moments must needs provoke everyone's admiration, aroused the indignation of the Catholic world.[15] But after this execution Philip II was able to proclaim his right to the English throne, as husband of the former Queen Mary; the Catholics, despite the heroic loyalty of most of them,[16] were suspected of betraying England to Spain. It is well known how the devoted patriotism of the English and sudden natural disturbances brought about the destruction of the terrible Spanish Armada (1588).

[13] The students of the college of Douai promised to return to their country to preach the faith there.

[14] On these matters, see Destombes, *Histoire de la persécution en Angleterre sous Elizabeth,* and Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* vol. VIII.

[15] Mary Stuart would not have succumbed if Protestant fanaticism had not been arrayed against her. But, on the other hand, Elizabeth, in spite of her hatred and jealousy, would not have dared to outrage her "sister's" royal majesty if Mary, by too reliant relationship with the enemies of Elizabeth, had not given the latter the pretext for which she had long been seeking. This is the double conclusion of Lady Blennerhassett's *Marie Stuart,* which, though not offering any new documents, is a judicious summing up of the numerous works devoted to Mary Stuart.

[16] David Hume pays tribute to this loyalty of the Catholics. (*History of England,* IV, p. 258.) Others have thought that they would have been wiser to form a coalition like the League of French Catholics. Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise,* p. 731.

The Puritans

By temperament no less than by policy, Elizabeth detested the Puritans. Enamored of the literary and artistic culture of the Renaissance, she could not help being shocked by the speech and bearing of those austere, somber, almost savage men. Then, too, her whole religious hierarchy, so patiently constructed, was being assailed by the wild democracy of these innovators.

The Puritan spirit entered England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. Some English Protestants, persecuted during the previous reign, had taken refuge in Switzerland, where, through contact with Calvinists and Zwinglians, their Protestantism became more radical and severe. With the accession of the new Queen, they came back. From the doctrines of Zwingli and Calvin they took only what was adapted to the English mentality. The dogmas of "predestination" and "inamissible grace" became for them principles of practical life, fashioning them into haughty and independent spirits. Elizabeth, who rightly saw in their attitude an eventual danger to the monarchy, did not, however, organize any persecution against them. She regarded the Puritans in Scotland, where they had expanded prodigiously, as valuable auxiliaries against her enemy, the Catholic Mary Stuart.

The progress of the Puritan heresy in Scotland had been singularly favored by the sad condition of a clergy very lacking in culture and of a restless and impoverished aristocracy. The influence of a man of consuming energy and fervid eloquence, John Knox, gave it an entirely original character. From Geneva, where he was then (1557) living, John Knox published his famous "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women." It was directed against the Catholic government of Mary Stuart. Soon afterwards, at Knox' instigation, some Scottish nobles formed the "Lords

of the Congregation," in opposition to the Catholics, whom they called the "Congregation of Satan." In 1558 an apostate priest, Walter Milne, was condemned to be burned at the stake; the Puritans demanded complete freedom of worship. Knox came from Geneva the next year and let loose a veritable revolution. Churches and convents were given over to pillage, the superb cathedral of Saint Andrew was destroyed. A treaty was then made, granting liberty of worship to the Puritans; but they were no longer satisfied with that; they wanted to reign alone. Whilst their demands were growing more pretentious, their doctrines were becoming more radical. At the side of the Presbyterian Puritans, who wanted the Church governed by simple priests, there arose the independent Puritans, who recognized in every "saint," whether soldier, workman, or bourgeois, the right to ascend the pulpit and preach. The Established Church of England had adopted the slogan "No popery"; the Presbyterians shouted, "No bishop"; the Independents, "No priest," and even "No king."

It was to such men that Elizabeth, in self-defense, had to promise and give her support. France had taken the side of Mary Stuart; Elizabeth, therefore, had to accept the alliance of the Puritans. Once again, political interests overshadowed all other considerations. The Puritans, on their side, let Queen Elizabeth die in peace; but under her successor, James I, they clamored noisily and threatened both Church and monarchy.

As for the Catholics, their lot did not appreciably improve during the last years of the sixteenth century. The valiant Cardinal Allen took refuge in Rome and from there, so far as possible, directed their resistance. His death and the lamentable divisions among the missioners in England itself aggravated the trials of the persecuted Catholics. Just when she was planning to carry out some new means of persecution, Elizabeth died (March 24th, 1603). She left Anglicanism

firmly rooted in English soil. It is due to her policy that the Established Church long remained, and still remains for many Englishmen, closely bound up with the national cause, as paganism was in ancient Rome. It is equally because of that utilitarian policy that England, once an apostolic nation at the side of France, is at the present moment not in the van in the accomplishment of that great mission, waiting for the day when, "tried by adversity or enlightened on the emptiness of her material prosperity, she will at length recognize that she needs the Catholic Church, even more than the Catholic Church needs her." [17]

[17] Brugère, p. 734.

CHAPTER VII

Protestantism in France

The Precursors

WHILE the revolt beyond the Rhine and in England led to the separation of two great nations from the Church, in France it merely brought about a violent upheaval of the social order. After many a rude shock, France in the seventeenth century recovered its religious, intellectual, and political equilibrium, which gave it Bossuet, Corneille, and Colbert. Whether we should attribute this result to the strong organization of its monarchy, to the coherence of its episcopate, to its ethnic temperament, to a particular protection of Providence, or to all these causes combined, is a problem which the simple narrative of events may help to solve.

The seed of French Protestantism was planted during the first years of the sixteenth century in a peaceful, friendly meeting of literary men under the patronage of a bishop, Guillaume Briçonnet, and its doctrine and organization were formulated in the work of a cleric of Noyon, John Calvin. How, in spite of the harsh, repressive measures of Francis I and Henry II, it succeeded in rapidly winning over a part of the people, the magistracy, and the nobility; how, in the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III, it engaged in bloody conflicts with Catholicism for the government of the kingdom and the direction of men's minds; how, in fine, it became established in the French State at the side of triumphant Catholicism under the form of a veritable political and religious power by favor of the Edict of Nantes—

therein lies the history of a hundred years of strife, polemics, wars, intrigues, plots, scenes of heroism and of horror, of glory and of shame.

The Classes in French Society

In French society at the beginning of the sixteenth century we can distinguish five clearly marked classes: the common people, the bourgoisie, the nobility, the clergy, and the court.

The condition of the common people was characterized by two facts: a rapid progress towards civil and political liberty, and, following the confusion that resulted from the progress of industry and commerce, an equally rapid spread of pauperism. Hence there resulted a general unrest, a moral and social lack of balance, and revolutionary instincts ready to break forth at the first appeal.

The great industrial, commercial, and financial movement that marked the end of the fifteenth century brought about a no less important evolution among the bourgeois. In the Middle Ages these did not constitute a distinct class, but formed a connecting link between the nobility and the populace. Yet, through a certain number of its members, it suddenly became the directing class of the State. These "argentiers," as they were called, such as Semblançay who was said to be a "quasi-king," or Briçonnet who negotiated alliances in the name of Francis I, formed real dynasties, no less powerful than the old nobility of the sword, often more pompous and insolent.

The feudal aristocracy was in full decay. Through principle and through fear of lowering itself, it was unwilling to engage in commerce, yet, on the other hand, wishing to preserve its traditions of luxury and vanity, it wore itself out in wretched expedients, burdened its estates with numerous and hateful financial measures, and had recourse to usurers, who

confiscated its possessions unless it abdicated its independence by vassalage to the king. Thus was formed in the very heart of the nobility a contingent of the most disorderly battalions which we shall see taking part in the religious struggles.

The lower clergy, mingling with the people, exercised only a religious influence; the great rivalries of political factions at first left them almost indifferent. Later on, however, perceiving that the religious question was uppermost, they courageously threw themselves into the thick of the strife and, in the popular movement of the League, were found in the front rank.

Although the upper clergy of France, unlike those of Germany, were not at the head of veritable states, they were admitted to the king's councils and were to be found in the sovereign courts, the parliaments, and exchequer offices. In 1494 the president of the Court of Exchequer was Archbishop Briçonnet of Rheims, who received Holy Orders after his widowerhood; his son Guillaume it was who gave the first impulse to the reform movement. The régime of the Pragmatic Sanction led the upper clergy to a policy hostile to the Holy See, and under Louis XII they clearly took sides with the King against Pope Julius II. They were crushed by the concordat of 1516, which stripped them of notable prerogatives to the advantage of the pope and the king; yet they were not without defiance and irritation, the more so as the sometimes excessive cultivation of arts and letters turned many prelates aside from the maxims of the Gospel.[1]

Above all this hierarchy was the king. His power grew with the ruin of feudal institutions. In Louis XII, and es-

[1] Jean du Bellay, bishop of Paris, never separated himself from his Horace, not even at night. Amyot was rewarded for his translation, *Théagene et Chariclée*, by the abbey of Bellozane and, after his translation of Plutarch, was appointed bishop of Auxere.

pecially in his successor, Francis I, the personal prestige of royalty was immense.

Francis I was one of the most representative men of his time. Titian's portrait of him is, it seems, a masterpiece of fancy. We can better recognize King Francis, as he really was, in these few lines written by a Venetian ambassador following the King's entry into Paris, in 1515: "Afterwards came the King, armed and mounted on his barded horse. He did not stay under the canopy at all, but made a great disturbance on his horse, which was all the time prancing in the air. And the place was full of fine horses and riders who performed marvelous feats so as to show off before the ladies." This brilliant nobleman, cavorting in front of the ladies, in the midst of his lords, was Francis I. Such was his policy, his whole reign. He has been wrongly called "the knightly king"; rather is he "the dandy king." His rule of conduct was not honor, as meaning the judgment of a Christian conscience, after the manner of a St. Louis, but "the point of honor," understood as the judgment of men of the world.

Nor can we say that Francis I was the Mæcenas of genius, as might be imagined from the title "Father of Letters" which has been given him. He was a dilettante rather than an artist or a man of letters, favoring art and literature as an additional elegance which he might add to his other elegancies. He preferred brilliant to powerful works; but he was fond of them to the point of professing a sort of worship of them. Says Montaigne: "King Francis welcomed learned men about him as holy personages." He showered favors on Erasmus, Clement Marot, Leonardo da Vinci, Primaticcio, and Titian. He founded the Collège de France, built a great part of the Louvre, and created the Imprimerie Royale.

As a changeable and fluctuating statesman, Francis I deserves to have applied to himself the lines that he scratched on a window at the castle of Chambord:

"A changeable thing is woman
A fool he who ever trusts one."

He was always someone's follower, the follower of some group or coterie, always subject to changing and unstable influences.

The make-up of such a king's entourage must needs be of extreme importance. There we find three women who exercised a decisive influence over him. Until 1531, this position of dominance was held by his mother, Louise of Savoy. She was a strong-minded woman, entirely given to practical questions, consequently more concerned with politics and finance than with literature, art, or religion. She quite missed the import of the movement started by "the school of Meaux"; yet she inclined the King to the side of the first reformers rather than to the side of the Church and traditional doctrines. After her death, it was Margaret d'Angoulême, duchess of Berry, the King's sister, who seemed to occupy the only place in his affections. The interchange of tender feelings between brother and sister, as revealed by their correspondence, is expressed with such vivacity that the learned editor of the *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême* considers that it justifies a suspicion of immorality.[2] Intelligent, spiritual, as scholarly as she was thoroughly French, feeling all the manifestations of art and beauty, Margaret had a passionate admiration for her brother.[3] A literary critic defines her tendencies by saying that "she enslaved herself through her strong feelings and freed herself by her good sense." [4] Margaret aided the reform movement even more than did her mother.

[2] Génin, *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême,* preface.

[3] The Venetian ambassador Dandolo was not sparing in his praise of Margaret d'Angoulême: *"Questa credo la piu savia non dico delle donne di Francia, ma forse anco degli uomini. Cosi ben intelligente e dotta, qu' io credo pochi ne sappino parlar meglio."* (Quoted by Ranke, *Histoire de France pendant les XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles,* I, p. 151.)

[4] Landon, *Histoire de la littérature française* (7th ed.), p. 233.

From the time of Agnes Sorel, there had not been seen in France any acknowledged mistress at the king's side. But Francis I furnished the spectacle. Madame de Chateaubriand, whose epitaph Marot wrote, and especially Anne de Pisseleu, duchess d'Etampes, exercised a most baneful influence on the King. When we recall that the latter succeeded in having her uncle, Antoine Sanguin, appointed archbishop of Toulouse, one of her brothers bishop of Condom, another, abbot of Compiègne, and her own sister abbess of Maubuisson, we may conjecture how great harm she inflicted on the Church and on France. We find written in Tavannes' *Memoires:* "Madame d'Etampes' band is governing."

About these frivolous women there gravitated a court nobility which Margaret d'Angoulême did not blush to picture in her licentious *Heptameron,*[5] that book "of brazen indecency, a mixture of devotion, mirth and morality . . . wherein the age could see itself." [6] Bayard's biographer says: "Never has there been seen a king of France over whom the nobility so much rejoiced." [7] If from such a circle there did at times come forth some measures against the reformers, would that bring comfort to the Church? Would she not rather be compromised by it?

Two institutions, of great weight by their very character and constitution, protested authoritatively against the innovators in the name of national traditions: they were the Sorbonne and Parliament. But if at first the members of the Sorbonne and Parliament do express themselves very clearly against Protestant doctrines, they soon become afraid of unduly favoring the Pope's authority and later support the followers of Calvin and refuse to accept the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent.

[5] Génin, in his preface to the *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême,* shows that most of the characters in the *Heptameron* were real persons.

[6] Lanson, p. 235.

[7] *Le loyal serviteur,* p. 369.

Lefèvre d'Etaples

About 1516, while Luther was at Wittenberg working out his doctrine of justification, the foundation of his whole theological system, just before the great quarrel over indulgences, there was noticed in the scholarly and literary movement that was stirring men's minds at Paris, a venerable savant, a little man,[8] constantly surrounded and consulted by a group of youth, eager to be trained in the study of ancient languages, in the reading of old manuscripts, and in the criticism of sources. That gentle,[9] smiling old man, Lefèvre, was commonly known as Lefèvre d'Etaples (*Faber Stapulensis*), from the name of his birthplace, Etaples, in Picardy. He was born in 1455, came to Paris at an early age, and there enthusiastically studied philology, literature, mathematics, and the philosophy of Aristotle. Then, weary of profane studies, he turned with great fondness to the cultivation and meditation of Sacred Literature.[10] In 1512 he published his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul,* wherein he says: "For a long time I was attached to human studies. But to my eyes there came so brilliant a light that human teaching seemed to me nothing but darkness in comparison with sacred studies, while these latter appeared to exhale a fragrance of such sweetness that nothing on earth equals it." Lefèvre did not pursue these "sacred studies" in the traditional manner of the doctors of the Sorbonne, but employed the methods raised to a position of honor by the learned men of the Renaissance, relying almost exclusively on Scriptural sources. A freshness of method

[8] In 1519 Erasmus calls him an old man, *"senex."* Two of his contemporaries, Paulus Jovius and Scaevola de Sainte Marthe, insist on his small stature. The latter calls him *"homunculus genere staturaque perhumili."* (*Elogia gallorum illustrium.*) *"Statura fuit supra modum humile."* (Jovius, *Elogia doctorum virorum,* p. 363.)

[9] Erasmus speaks of him as being of *"natura mitis et blandus."*

[10] Graf, *Essai sur la vie et les œuvres de Lefèvre d'Etaples.*

might have its usefulness, even its necessity; yet in artificially separating Scripture from living tradition, of which it was but the partial expression and not by any means the only source, this freshness offered great dangers.[11]

The smiling courtesy of the gentle Lefèvre as well as his learning attracted to him a choice group of eager and inquiring minds. Along with aged scholars, such as the Hebraist Vatable, the orientalist Postel, and the erudite Budé, we find not a few young men, many of whom later, for various reasons, won great fame, such as Gerard Roussel, Guillaume Farel, and Josse Clichtove.

A bishop's patronage and the favor of a princess of royal blood soon gave considerable importance to the movement which Lefèvre had started. Among his most faithful disciples we find Abbot Guillaume Briçonnet of St. Germain-des-Prés, near Paris, with his eager, mystical mind and somewhat naïve enthusiasm, ready for any daring initiative. He belonged to that celebrated family of Briçonnet which, as we noted above, held so high a rank in the new financial and parliamentary aristocracy. He was made bishop of Meaux by royal decree in 1516. Guillaume had long since desired to reform the Church. One of his first cares was to thank the Cordeliers for the service they rendered the diocese in the preaching ministry and to replace them by young ecclesiastics, chosen from Lefèvre's circle in Paris. These new missioners read the Gospel in French, made little mention of rites and ceremonies, and called themselves "evangelists."

The "Cenacle of Meaux"

The new group derived its coherence from the presence of Lefèvre, whom the bishop of Meaux was not long in drawing

[11] Lefèvre also published the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, Richard of Saint Victor's book on the Trinity, and Ruysbroeck's *Ornement des noces spirituelles.* Thence came a tendency to mystical piety, which degenerated into quietism. (Cf. Schmidt, *Les libertins spirituels.*)

to himself and whom he appointed administrator of the *Léproserie* in 1521 and vicar-general in 1523. In this circle, commonly known as the "Cenacle of Meaux," prudent ideas of reform were almost imperceptibly mingled with many rash ones and with more than one utopia. From it there issued a French translation of the New Testament and an Exposition of the Sunday Epistles and Gospels by Lefèvre; these were enthusiastically explained by the young preachers: Gerard Roussel, the future confessor of Margaret d'Angoulême, Michel d'Arande, who became bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Chateaux, the fiery Farel, destined to prepare the way for Calvin's coming in Geneva, and Pavannes, who was to die as an impenitent heretic at the stake.

The King's sister, Margaret d'Angoulême, who at this very time, upon reading the works of Nicholas of Cusa, became seized by an ardent desire for a philosophical and religious revival, could not help but follow sympathetically the activities of the school of Meaux. She soon began to enter into relations with Briçonnet. To him and his fellow-workers she addressed herself "just as," she says, "a sheep, wandering in strange pastures, naturally lifts its head to whiff the air coming from the place where the great shepherd, by his good ministers, gives it sweet nourishment." Neither Margaret nor Briçonnet nor Lefèvre then had the least desire, in combating abuses, to favor heresy. The bishop and the scholar gladly joined in the wish of the princess "that the faith be strengthened and the Church reformed, that heresies as well as vain fancies be driven out, and that the Church triumph by the victory of our faith." [12]

[12] Génin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 285. On Margaret's Protestant tendencies and the apparent contradictions in her conduct, see Hauser, *Études sur la Réforme française,* pp. 35–39; Lefranc, *Idées religieuses de Marguerite,* in the *Bulletin de la Société du Protestantisme Français,* January–March, 1798; *Marguerite de Navarre et le platonisme de la Renaissance* in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* 1897–1898; *Le mysticisme quiétiste au début de la Réforme,* in the *Bulletin de la Société du Protestantisme Français,* VI, pp. 449–461.

The events that happened in 1525 under the regency of Louise of Savoy, while Francis I was a captive, separated the elements composing the "Cenacle of Meaux," turning some in the direction of the Protestant revolt and recalling the others to the traditional teaching of the Roman Church.

In 1520 the Pope's solemn condemnation of Luther opened the eyes of the wiser men to the dangers of a reform of the Church by individual efforts in opposition to the divinely instituted hierarchy. Clichtove, one of Lefèvre's first disciples, suddenly turned against Luther and by his treatise on Devotion to the Saints (1523) and his *Antilutherus* (1524) publicly retracted his former opinions.[13] It was in vain that Luther, in 1521, praised "that pillar of learning and integrity," [14] who was none other than Lefèvre d'Etaples, and that the latter counted Luther among those "whom he cherished in Christ." These courteous expressions did not banish the double meaning which lay hidden under the word "reform," employed by the German heresiarch and by the head of the school of Meaux.

The Latin writings of Luther, however, began to enter France. The Sorbonne took alarm. In 1520 it had created a new office, that of syndic, a sort of dean especially charged with prosecuting religious errors. This position was confided to a man whose absolute integrity, perfect disinterestedness, and inflexible independence seemed not to admit the least shadow of a doubt. He was Noël Bedier, or Beda.[15] He had already fought against Erasmus, his old friend, and was destined to fight throughout his life and to attack, one after another, the religious and literary innovators, the King of Eng-

[13] Clerval, *De Jodoci Clichtovei neoportuensis vita et operibus.*

[14] *"Eruditionis et integritatis columen"* (quoted in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* V, part 1, p. 351).

[15] Noël Beda's character has been unfairly blackened by most Protestant historians. See *Revue des questions historiques,* October, 1902; see also Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris, Époque moderne,* II, p. 4.

land, and the King of France. Invincibly attached to tradition, with which he indiscriminately and mistakenly confounded current opinions that were really open to examination and correction, he had in 1519 violently attacked Lefèvre d'Etaples on account of his publication (1512) of a dissertation *De Maria Magdalena,* in which he maintained that under the one name employed by the evangelists we should recognize three different women.[16] Beda answered him by a "Scholastic Declaration of the Opinion and Rites of the Church concerning the one Magdalen." One of the new syndic's first cares was to obtain from the faculty of theology the condemnation of the book *De Maria Magdalena.* From that time suspicion fastened on the leader of the "Cenacle of Meaux" and his disciples.

The troubles accompanying the regency of Louise of Savoy, in 1525, showed these suspicions to be not without some foundation. A Bull of Pope Clement VII (May, 1525) at the regent's request assigned to three members of Parliament and one of the pastors of Paris the duty of investigating heretical sectarians. The "evangelists" of Meaux did not hide their irritation. Events then showed how perilous it is to sow the spirit of insubordination among the people. "If this reign of terror should continue," wrote Gerard Roussel on September 27th, "no one will any longer dare in safety to announce the kingdom of Christ." The words of the Meaux theorists were picked up by men of action. Some of the faithful at Meaux tore up the papal Bull. A certain wool-carder, Jean Leclerc, put up a poster wherein the Pope was called the Antichrist. Leclerc was whipped and branded on the forehead.

[16] In a brochure, dated April 26th, 1675, and first published by Emery in *Opuscules de l'abbé Fleury* (p. 320), Bossuet maintained that "it is more conformable to the letter of the Gospel to distinguish these three saints: the sinful woman who came to the house of Simon the Pharisee; Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus; and Mary Magdalen, out of whom our Lord expelled seven devils." (*Op. cit.,* p. 324.) Cf. Bossuet, *Œuvres complètes,* Lachat ed. XXVI, pp. 114–116; Levesque and Urbain, *Correspondance de Bossuet,* letter 428, note 25.

He then fled to Metz, a city of the empire, where he smashed a statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary and for this deed was condemned to the flames. Jean Leclerc has remained one of the most popular martyrs among Protestants.[17] For acts of a like nature, Pavannes, another member of the "Cenacle of Meaux," was burned at the stake in Paris the next year (August, 1526). He is no less famous than Leclerc in the annals of Protestantism, being the first Protestant who was executed in France.

It was time for the leaders of the reformist movement to emerge from their equivocal position and declare themselves either for or against the Church. Vatable, Michel d'Arande, and Briçonnet did not hesitate. The Bishop of Meaux excommunicated the perpetrators of the insult to the papal Bull and published two vigorous mandates against the Lutheran errors.[18] After explicitly condemning the books of Martin Luther, "who has laid the axe to the very root of the Church," he forbade all the faithful "to buy, read, possess, spread, or approve . . . the books of the said Martin" and ordered his clergy not to allow Lutherans to preach, as also "all others professing their doctrines." Pavannes and Farel abruptly separated from the Church; Roussel took refuge in Strasburg, whence he betook himself to Princess Margaret. As to Lefèvre, he went to Strasburg with Roussel, but we do not learn that he ever did anything that smacked of nonsubmission. Catholics have no right to make a hero of this honest but tactless man; but the Protestants are no less mistaken in claiming him as a precursor of their doctrines.[19]

[17] Crépin, *Acta martyrum,* bk. 4; Théodore de Bèze, *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France,* bk. 1; Felice, *History of the Protestants of France,* p. 22.

[18] Some authors, however, think that Briçonnet's mandates date from 1523. See Berger, *Le procès de G. Briçonnet,* in the *Bulletin de la Société du Protestantisme français,* 1895.

[19] "In 1512 Lefèvre published his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. He

Attitude of Francis I

The court now had to face the necessity of deciding on which side it would stand in the question of heresy. It was dominated by two influences, that of Parliament and the Sorbonne, which had decided to deal severely with the innovators, and that of the humanists, inclined to indulgence. At the head

anticipated and equaled the boldness of Luther and Zwingli, affirming unreservedly the exclusive authority of Scripture, salvation by faith and not by good works; he disapproved of prayers in Latin, the celibacy of priests, and local superstitions. He even went so far as to say that 'ablution in the water of Baptism does not justify, but is only the sign of justification by faith in Christ.' Lastly he declared that 'what takes place daily [in the Mass] by the ministry of the priest is not so much a repeated sacrifice as an act of commemoration.' Michelet said with wilful exaggeration: 'Six years before Luther, the venerable Lefèvre was teaching Lutheranism at Paris.'" (Ferdinand Buisson in Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 479.) We can see how far Michelet's wilful exaggeration went, by referring to Lefèvre's Commentary itself. Lefèvre admits the spiritual authority of the pope and even his temporal authority, as it was understoond in the Middle Ages. "In things sacred," he says, "the secular ruler must obey the sacred ruler." If he deplores abuses on the part of bishops, monks, and priests, he does so no more vigorously than was done by St. Peter Damian and St. Bernard. On the very important question of justification by faith and the merit of good works, here are his very words: *"Neque credas sufficere ut continuo justificatus sis, si fidem habes. Nequaquam ita est. Nam non quisque ex fide justificatur, ut fides ipsa justificatio sit, ut neque opera. Etenim credunt daemones, ut inquit Jacobus apostolus; sed ex fide justificamur quemadmodum ex operibus, ex his remotius, ex illa vicinius. Neque fides neque opera justificant, sed preparant ad justitiam, quemadmodum unus est Deus qui justificat."* Lefèvre also makes the bold assertion that *"maxima pars hominum non orant cum intellectu; orant enim in linga quam non intelligunt."* In the matter of local superstitions, Lefèvre says that many do wrong to abandon Christ for popular superstitions. He says also that the Saviour's stigmata are more to be venerated than those of St. Francis. (Graf, *op. cit.*, pp. 76, 79, 80.) The text of Lefèvre's Commentary, *"Ablutio circa nos materialis aquae in baptismate non justificat, sed signum est justificationis,"* taken by itself and with exact literalness, would be Zwinglian. But it should be supplemented by other passages in which Lefèvre admits the baptism of infants and declares that Christians are justified upon emerging from the sacred water. In the matter of sacerdotal celibacy, he declares, following St. Paul, that *"vita thori bona est et vita abstinens a thoro bona, sed vita abstinentium a thoro propter Christum ut caelibem vitam ducentes, sanctius puriusque vacent orationi . . . operibus misericordiae melior est."* He did say, it is true, that the state of virginity is salutary only for those whom God calls thereto and, after saying that the Church formerly admitted it, he adds: *"Agamiam ac-*

of the former party was Noël Beda, whose policy seemed justified by the events and who called for a vigorous repression. The King's sister, Margaret d'Angoulême, on the other hand, became, with her brother and in the opinion of the public, the interpreter of those feelings of good-will which were cherished by the literary world towards the reformers. During Francis' captivity she wrote him several letters expressing this view. When through her marriage to Henry d'Albret, Margaret became queen of Navarre (1527), she increased her favors to the dispersed members of the "Cenacle of Meaux," received Lefèvre, Roussel, Marot, and Calvin himself at her castle of Nerac, and, mingling mysticism with frivolity, tried to force on her court a new liturgy, derived more from Calvin's ideas than from Catholic tradition.

Between these two influences the King fluctuated undecided. He kept this attitude during the whole time of his reign, in which harsh persecutions alternated with unexpected favors to the reformers.

In 1527 Beda discovered that a nobleman of Artois, Louis de Berquin, had translated several of the German reformers' works and was spreading them among the people; he at once began proceedings against him. But Berquin enjoyed friendly relations with Erasmus and other literary men, and with the court; Margaret d'Angoulême intervened, and the King had him released. The next year, on the day after Pentecost, there was found before the door of St. Anthony's church in the

ceptaverunt aliae ecclesiae, unde plurimi, per deteriorem incontinentiam lapsi, in pedicas inciderunt diaboli." But this is merely a more or less exact statement of historical fact that is nowise to the prejudice of dogma or discipline. As for the sacrifice of the Mass, Lefèvre does, indeed, speak of one only sacrifice; but he seems to do so in the sense which all Catholic commentators have attributed to the Epistle to the Hebrews. He says: "*Non tam sunt iteratae oblationes, quam unius ejusdem, et quae semel tantum oblata, est victimae memoria et recordatio.*" Moreover, he energetically professes his belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

Saint-Germain parish a statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary mutilated by the heretics. Parliament and the King were aroused. Francis promised a liberal reward to whosoever would denounce the guilty and replaced the broken statue by a silver one, which he himself carried amidst an imposing procession. Louis de Berquin was caught in a second offense, rearrested, condemned and promptly executed by order of Parliament during the King's absence at Blois, for fear the guilty man might be saved through court influence.[20]

In fact, the court allowed itself to be more and more won over to the new ideas. It purposed employing that "Christian liberty which shakes off superstitions and excesses." The "sweet and titillating chanting" of Clement Marot's rhymed psalter was most pleasing to the ears of the elegant lords and ladies. While Parliament, as the inexorable custodian of public order and national traditions, was prosecuting heresy without intermission, the court was singing Margaret's canticle:

"Awake, Lord God, and everywhere
Avenge the death of Thy dear ones.
Thy will it is to have the Word
Announced by Thy devoted sons
In every palace, hamlet, town,
With nothing even half-concealed.
Give to Thy servants hearts right strong
To meet their death with glowing love."

Encouraged by such protection in high places, the Protestants became bolder. In 1530 statues of the Blessed Virgin, of the Infant Jesus, of St. Roch, and of St. Fiacre, set up at street corners, were smashed. Parliament made some new arrests; the King ordered more expiatory processions. In the autumn of 1533 certain political events led the King to declare

[20] Felice, p. 27.

himself clearly against the Protestants. In the course of negotiations to arrange the marriage of his son, the Duke of Orleans, to Catherine de' Medici, Clement VII's niece, Francis I at an interview in Marseilles (October, 1533) promised the Pope to proceed vigorously against heresy. But he had scarcely left Marseilles when a complete reversal took place in his dispositions. At Avignon, in November, he conceived the plan of an alliance with the Protestants of Germany. Having reached Lyons, he learned that a book by his sister Margaret, entitled *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse* (Mirror of a Sinful Soul), the very book containing the celebrated lines on tolerance, had just been condemned by the Sorbonne and that the students of the College of Navarre, in a shameless farce, had played the Princess of Angoulême on the stage. The King was unable to restrain his wrath. From Lyons he issued an order exiling the syndic Beda to a distance of thirty leagues from Paris and placed the head professor of the College of Navarre under arrest.

Then did the boldness of the Protestants increase still more. Étienne Lecourt, a parish priest of Condé-sur-Sarthe, said: "If St. Peter's bones were in my church, I would bury them; and if my parishioners should come to venerate them, I would put the bones in a sack and throw them into the river." Such words aroused the indignation of the Catholics. This time Margaret's intervention was powerless to save Lecourt, who was burned alive at Rouen in December, 1533.[21] To the influence of the Duchess of Angoulême was added that of the Duchess d'Etampes, inclined in favor of the innovators, and that of another person more worthy of being listened to, Pierre Duchatel, the King's almoner, a man of undoubted orthodoxy, but a foe to bloody measures.

[21] We do not include in the number of Protestant victims Étienne Dolet, whom many Protestants have repudiated as an impious libertine. (See Duval Arnould, "Étienne Dolet," in *La Quinzaine*, August 1st, 1898.)

But these influences were neutralized by the growing dominance of Cardinal de Tournon, the King's chief minister. This able statesman, looking at things especially from the point of view of public order and national peace, which he considered to be upset by the Protestant sect, impelled the sovereign towards a policy of harsh repression. Piles blazed at the Halles, at the Saint Michel bridge, at the Place Maubert, at the cemetery of St. John. Strange to relate, during this very time, the King was carrying on negotiations with the Landgrave of Hesse, the political leader of the German Protestants, sent Guillaume du Bellay on an embassy to the Lutheran princes and the Swiss Leaguers, and engaged in personal correspondence with Melanchthon.[22] The policy of public order and national defense, which seemed to call for the persecution of Protestants in France, required that they be favored abroad.

At the close of 1535, tranquillity prevailed, following an edict which granted amnesty to "all those under arrest, whether as contumacious or suspected of Lutheranism, provided they would henceforth live as good Catholics and abjure their errors within six months." Was this measure prompted by the need of adopting a gentler attitude towards the Lutherans of Germany or was it inspired by the influence of the court, or by a letter from Pope Paul III, reminding the King "that God the Creator has employed mercy rather than strict justice and that burning a man alive is a very cruel death?" [23] It is difficult to say. The word "Lutheran," inserted in the edict, would seem rather to have in mind the German Protestants, who at that time detested the Calvinists; as for these

[22] See Bossuet, *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani*, chap. 23.

[23] This papal letter is to be found only in the *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris* (Lalanne ed., p. 458). No other collection contains it. It is likely on the Pope's part; that very year, 1535, he wrote to the Swiss Catholics: "*Vos ab armis contra alios Helvetios abstinere, quantum salva ipsa catholica fide fieri possit, hortamur in Domino.*" (Raynaldi, 1535, no. 27.)

latter, including nearly all the French Protestants, the King remained free to take measures against them.[24]

Massacre of the Vaudois

The most tragic episode of that repression was the massacre of the Vaudois in Provence. On both slopes of the Alps there were a few clans of shepherds and laborers, the last fragments of the heretical sect of Peter Waldo, living isolated, fiercely attached to their old traditions, and well nigh forgotten by the public authorities. Oecolampadius and Bucer had in vain tried to win them to their cause. There was one doctrine of Protestantism which invincibly repelled these free mountaineers—the denial of free will. A former member of the "Cenacle of Meaux," Guillaume Farel, was more successful. At the foot of Mount Geneva, in the valley of Angrogne, on the frontier of France and Italy, Farel's eloquence, after prolonged conferences, finally (1532) won the Vaudois communities over to Protestantism.

In the midst of the wars and rivalries that threatened France from outside, the setting up of a sort of Protestant State on the frontiers was certainly not without danger. This consideration justified a careful watch being kept on the Vaudois communities. Combined with motives of a different sort, it led to terrible scenes of carnage.

An inquiry ordered by the parliament of Aix brought to light deeds of pillage and murder, evidences of a plot, and the patent existence of heresy, charged against several towns of Provence, principally the two towns of Mérindol and Cabrières. Chassanée, president of the parliament, resolved to terrify these populations by a formidable decree. He had the parliament order that the towns of Mérindol and Cabrières be set afire, the trees cut down throughout the whole extent of

[24] Du Bellay, *Mémoires,* bk. 6 (Petitot Collection, 1st series, pp. 345 sqq.).

the territory, and the land sold without the inhabitants or their descendants ever being allowed to acquire them again, lease them, or cultivate them under any title whatsoever.

This terrible decision, the execution of which neither parliament nor the King intended to hasten, would undoubtedly have remained a mere threat, if local passions and rivalries had not supervened. Five years passed by. The bishop of Carpentras, on whom Cabrières depended, was the scholarly and pious Sadoleto, who, in 1539, when requested by the vice-legate to adopt severe measures against the heretics,[25] replied: "I will employ these powers if it becomes necessary; but I will endeavor that it be not so. . . . It is not by the terror of torture, but by the power of the truth and by Christian mildness that I want to elicit from their hearts the abjuration of their false doctrines." [26]

In 1545, while Sadoleto was in Rome, Chassanée was succeeded in the presidency by Jean Maynier, baron of Oppède. This harsh and hateful man, humiliated because a lady of Cental, suzerain of the Vaudois, had refused him her hand, desired to avenge this personal affront by ruining the villages that depended on the house of Cental. Seconded in his schemes by the advocate general Guerin, the terrible magistrate found a pretext in a connivance of the Vaudois with the foreigners —a connivance of which he could furnish no decisive proof. He persuaded Cardinal de Tournon to authorize the execution of the decree of 1540. At the same time he kept in his service bands of freebooters, recruited by a soldier of fortune, Baron Paulin de la Garde; placing himself at the head of these troops, he conducted them toward the heretical districts. Cabrières, Mérindol, and twenty-two villages were given up to fire and sword, three thousand persons were slaughtered.[27]

[25] The town of Cabrières, located in the Comtat Venaissin, was dependent on the Holy See, whereas the Vaudois of Mérindol were subjects of the French king.

[26] Raynaldi, 1539, no. 34.

[27] This is the figure admitted by Daniel, *Histoire de France*, X, p. 572.

Public opinion was aroused against such a butchery. It is said that when, two years later, Francis I was dying, assisted by his confessor Pierre Duchatel, he recommended to his son Henry II that he investigate the injustices committed in the Cabrières and Mérindol massacre. At any event, public opinion demanded a reparation. This was partially accorded in 1552. Baron d'Oppède and Baron de la Garde, thanks to the protection of the Guises, escaped execution; but advocate general Guerin had his head cut off.[28]

Such massacres, instead of restraining the ardor of the heretics, only stirred them up the more. "When men allow themselves to be won by the allurement of novelty," says Bossuet, "torture and execution do more to inflame them than to stop them." [29]

A Catholic historian of the time, Florimond de Rémond, has depicted the scenes presented by the new persecutions. You might see, he says, "silly women seek torture to give a proof of their faith and, on their way to death, call upon Christ the Saviour and sing psalms. The men rejoice at the sight of the frightful preparations and instruments of death. . . . These constant, terrible scenes disturb the souls, not only of the lowly, but also of the greatest. . . . Others have compassion on them; at sight of those black corpses in public places, they cannot restrain their tears; the very hearts would weep with the eyes." [30]

Happily Providence supplied other remedies for the evils that were afflicting Christendom. While the Parliament of

[28] See Bouche, *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence,* II, pp. 78–86: *"Histore de l'exécution de Cabrières et de Mérindol";* Gaffarei, *Les massacres de Cabrières et de Mérindol,* in the *Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartes,* May–August, 1911.

[29] Bossuet, *Histoire de France pour le Dauphin,* the reign of Henry II.

[30] Rémond, *De la naissance de l'hérésie,* bk. 7, chap. 6. The Protestant martyrology was published in 1554 by Jean Crespin. It had a considerable success. Several new and enlarged editions came out. In 1560 a quarto edition was published, then one in folio. At the same time editions in 16mo and 8vo were put in circulation, besides a Latin translation.

Paris was inaugurating a policy of harsh repression, a Spanish knight, Ignatius of Loyola, and six friends were on their knees in the church of Montmartre, consecrating their lives to the service of the Church in poverty, chastity, and obedience. During the year 1545, while the ruins of Cabrières and Mérindol were still smoking, the most venerable prelates of the Church were on their way to the Council of Trent, there to deliberate on the reform of the Church.

CHAPTER VIII

The Beginnings of Calvinism

FRENCH Protestantism was the more confident in itself as at length it had a body of doctrines. In 1535 there appeared a book, dedicated to the Most Christian King, Francis I, and claiming to be "the confession of faith and summary of a doctrine which all the States, by a common accord, united in condemning." The work was entitled "Institutes of the Christian Religion"; it came from Switzerland, where its author, John Calvin, a Frenchman by birth, had taken refuge.

John Calvin

The work and the person of John Calvin were destined to play a preponderant and decisive part in the future of French Protestantism. He was born at Noyon in Picardy (July 10th, 1509). As in the case of Luther and Henry VIII, so in that of John Calvin, history is unable to draw a sharp line between what is due to the heresiarch and what is imputable to the influence of heredity and environment, in fixing the responsibility for so many evils let loose by heresy; it can but register the facts, essay conjectures, and leave the final judgment to God. As we learn from a compatriot of Calvin, "there was no city more thoroughly Picard than Noyon. None better exemplified that mixture of censoriousness and stubborn dogmatism which is characteristic of the district." [1]

In the circle of procurators and business men that formed a considerable part of the Noyon bourgeoisie, there was one

[1] Lefranc, *La jeunesse de Calvin*, p. 25.

who was distinguished by his litigious bent of mind and his unceasing quarrels with the clergy. He was fiscal procurator, secretary of the bishopric, and proctor of the chapter,[2] Gerard Cauvin by name. Rarely has the Church had reason to felicitate herself on account of that class of men of the law, at her side, living on her, but without having her spirit. Cauvin was excommunicated in 1531 and buried without religious rites. Charles, his eldest son, undertook to carry on the difficult matters left by his father and died under the same conditions, three years later. Such a family history could not but have an influence on the character of the second son, John, who changed his family name to Calvin.[3] The cunning Picard, before dying in a situation deeply involved in debt, took care to assure the temporal future of his son John by obtaining for him the protection of the noble family of Hangest and several ecclesiastical benefices.[4]

In 1523 this boy, then fourteen years old, quit Noyon [5] and

[2] Henry Lemonnier in Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* I, part 1, p. 369.

[3] The leader of French Protestantism had many pseudonyms. That which was the least removed from his real name was Calvinus. He also signed himself Alcuinus, Lucanius, and Chambardus. This last pseudonym is found in correspondence with his friend Baduel, which is preserved in the library of the Calvet museum at Avignon (no. 1290).

[4] In 1521 the Gesine chapel in the cathedral was assigned to him. Six years later he was assigned the curacy of Marteville, which he exchanged for that of Pont l'Evêque near Noyon in 1529. As Calvin was barely twelve years old when he obtained his first benefice, he was naturally unable to exercise its functions. He divided the revenues of it with the priest who was delegated to perform its duties. In 1534 Calvin resigned from the curacy of Pont l'Evêque for a money consideration.

[5] In 1558 Simon Fontaine wrote in his *Histoire catholique de notre temps* (p. 193): "Infamous reports have been spread regarding the life of Calvin which, if they were true, would furnish irrefutable arguments of the extreme bestiality of that place [Noyon]." Later on Du Préau, Démocharés, la Vacquerie, Surius, Bolsec (in his *Histoire de la vie de Jean Calvin,* p. 28), and Richelieu (in his *Traité pour convertir ceux qui se sont séparés de l'Eglise,* bk. 2, ch. 10, p. 291) made these accusations more specific. According to these reports, Calvin was obliged to leave the city of Noyon because of infamous vices for which he would have been condemned and branded. Desmay (*Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France,* p. 390) wrote: "I heard from some very old canons of Noyon that they had seen a blank

went to Paris to follow more advanced studies, which he continued at Orleans and Bourges. In the words of Florimond de Rémont, a contemporary, Calvin "had an active mind, an unusual memory, great aptitude and quickness in learning, as also an extraordinary facility and beauty of language." This young student, with such rare gifts of mind, did not lack excellent teachers. He studied belles-lettres at the Montaigu College, which was then governed by Beda, studied law under Pierre de l'Estoile and the famous Andrea Alciati, followed the classes of Melchior Wolmar and Peter Danes in Greek, began the study of Hebrew under Vatable, and became interested in the works of Budé.

Most of these men were involved in the religious controversies of the time. Vatable came from the "Meaux Cenacle," Wolmar was supposed to hold Luther's ideas on grace, and Beda was well known for his terrible campaigns against the reformers. It was not long before Calvin became more preoccupied with religious questions than with any other. "I was set at the study of law," he says. "No matter how faithfully I forced myself to apply my mind to the subject, God always,

page in the register, at the top of which was written, *'Condemnatio Calvini.'"* Father Lessius, a Jesuit, relates that, having asked to see the registers of the Noyon chapter, he was told: "These registers have been copied and changed; the account of the infamy is omitted" (*Liber de vera capessenda religione,* p. 81). But might not the charge against Calvin be the result of a regrettable confusion? A certain canon, La Vasseur by name, in a work of which only one copy is known to exist (in the British Museum), says that about the middle of the sixteenth century a canon by the name of Jean Cauvin was whipped for a crime of immorality and that, as he thinks, this Cauvin has been confused with the leader of French Protestantism. The registers of the Noyon chapter are lost; there remains (*Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds français,* no. 12032) only a detailed inventory, drawn up in the eighteenth century. It contains this entry: "May 26th, 1534, M. Jean Cauvin was imprisoned at the Corbant gate for a disturbance in the church on the eve of the Holy Trinity." Kampschulte and Paulus, both Catholic historians, do not credit the story of Calvin's infamy. A thorough discussion of this question may be found in Lefranc, *op. cit.,* and Doumergue, *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps.* "The defamatory accusations against Calvin during the whole time that he belonged to the Catholic Church," says Paul Bernard, "rest solely on vague rumors, the origin of which is self-explanatory." (*Etudes,* July 5th, 1909, p. 13.)

in His hidden providence, made me face about in another direction. . . . Having, at that time, received some taste for and knowledge of true piety, I was at once inflamed with so great a desire to profit thereby that, although not altogether abandoning other studies, I attended to them less attentively."

Contemporary evidence shows that from childhood he was serious and studious, but somber, silent, restless, strict with others as also with himself, so ready to suspect and accuse that his comrades called him the "accusative." [6] The "true piety" which seized upon Calvin could not be that living and popular piety of kindly souls, a piety that speaks to the heart, the imagination, and even the senses, recalling the infant Saviour, the Blessed Virgin, the abiding Eucharistic presence of the Saviour in our midst, the redeeming power of the sacrifice of the Mass, the saints crowned with glory and bending down to us, relics and places of pilgrimage preserving the impress of holiness. For the embittered son of the excommunicated lawyer of Noyon, too exclusively devoted to the literary criticism in vogue at the new Collège de France and much impressed by Luther's cry of revolt, "true piety" was, as has been well said, "a reasonable, logical, and, if you prefer, a rational religion—a religion consisting essentially, almost solely, in the adherence of the intellect to truths almost proved, a religion proved, not by the consolations that it brings to afflicted souls, not by the way it fits the needs of human nature, not by the person of God who revealed it to us, nor finally by anything that touches and moves, that consoles and relieves, but by the literalness of its agreement with a text, which is a ques-

[6] Doumergue (*op. cit.*) admits that this name was given Calvin by his comrades and he conjectures that it came from the fact that, during his schoolboy days, Calvin was unable to recite a declension beyond the accusative case. Doumergue states that one of Calvin's schoolmates was called "the ablative" because of his tendency to remove articles belonging to others.

tion of pure philology and, by the solidity of its logical structure, solely a matter of pure reasoning." [7]

Calvin's Teaching

The first manifestation of Calvin's ideas was capable, prudent, calmly prepared and well calculated. Nothing could have been less like the furore caused at Wittenberg seventeen years before by the posting of Luther's public theses on indulgences.

On November 1st, 1533, the new rector of the Paris University, Nicholas Cop, a son of William Cop, the King's physician, on the occasion of the feast of All Saints, delivered a striking discourse on "Christian philosophy," wherein he insisted chiefly on two ideas that were manifestly inspired by Lutheranism: the notion of justification by faith alone and that of an opposition between the Gospel and what the preacher called the Law, *i. e.,* the Church.[8] It soon became known that the sermon was the work of a young tonsured cleric, twenty-four years old, John Cauvin, of Noyon, known among literary men by a recently published commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia.* It was said that he used often to visit the house of a certain compatriot, a rich wine-merchant on rue

[7] Brunetière, *Discours de combat,* "L'Œuvre de Calvin." In *Études* (July 5th and 20th, 1909) Paul Bernard surmises that "Calvin's conversion" should be attributed to purely human and personal reasons. In a curious brochure published in 1625 at Rome (Amydeus, *De pietate romana,* p. 191) we read: *"Novi ego Joannem Calvinum, imo cum homine idem diversorium et idem cubiculum sortitus sum, ubi tunc ille noctu narrare cuius esset et quid negotii Parisiis. Judicarunt (inquiens) judices mihi canonicatum quem impetraveram non adjudicandum, et quidem injuste; sed sentient magno Galliae malo quantus vir est Caluinus."* Without in any way denying the existence or even the preponderance of this motive in Calvin's mind, it seems to us impossible to prescind from the personal tendencies that inclined him toward a rational and individualistic religion, or from his family antecedents, which predisposed him to a struggle against the Church. Cf. *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France,* January 25th, 1910, p. 115.

[8] Until recently only fragments and summaries of this sermon were known. But in 1872 the complete discourse was discovered in a manuscript in the Strasburg library and published in the *Opera Calvini* (IX, prolegomena, p. lxxiii).

Saint-Martin, Etienne de la Forge by name, where he was wont to meet a group of reformers indoctrinated by Gérard Roussel.

The sermon had been skilfully made up of extracts from various authors; there were to be found attenuated passages from Luther cleverly combined with the most venturesome excerpts from Erasmus.[9] The friendly relations which Nicholas Cop enjoyed at court were no secret. Queen Margaret of Navarre, so it was said, was not a stranger to his appointment. The group of rue Saint-Martin hoped to be sheltered from pursuit, thanks to the influence of Gérard Roussel, the princess' confessor.

But these expectations were not fulfilled. The Cordeliers reported Cop's sermon to Parliament. Cop himself, in his quality of rector, claimed the privilege of being judged in the first instance by the university. Seeing, however, that opinion was divided on this question of procedure, he left France and withdrew to his native Basle in Switzerland. Etienne de la Forge was brought to trial and was burned at the stake on February 16th, 1535. As for Calvin, he was already beyond the frontiers of France. When an order of arrest and summons was issued against him at the Collège de Fortet,[10] where he was staying, it is said he escaped through a window, disguised as a vine-dresser, fled to Saintonge,[11] whence he be-

[9] Land, *Die Bekehrung Johannes Calvins,* shows that in this sermon Calvin copied, sometimes word for word, either Erasmus (*Paraclesis,* being the preface to the third edition of his New Testament) or Luther (Sermon for All Saints, 1522). Cf. Doumergue, *op. cit.,* I, p. 336. Some have tried to see in this first attempt an indirect protest against the penalties decreed by the Sorbonne and Parliament. It would have been a very timid and vague protest.

[10] Near the present site of the Pantheon, on the street now called rue Vallet, in Paris.

[11] Jacques Desmay relates that a certain canon of Noyon met Calvin, recognized him, and begged him "to change his manner of life and choose the path of goodness." Calvin replied: "Since I have committed myself, I will keep on; but if I had to begin over, I would not thus commit myself." "Jacques Desmay, a doctor of the Sorbonne and vicar general of Rouen, preaching a Lenten course at Noyon,

took himself to Nérac, where the remains of the "Cenacle of Meaux" were trying to reorganize about the Queen of Navarre.

The tragical events of 1534 induced Calvin to go to a foreign land. First he went to Strasburg, then, towards the end of the year, to Basle, where he planned to profit by his solitary and hidden life to assemble the ideas of reform that had occupied his mind for so long. The people of Basle must often have wondered who was this pale, somber young man who had come into their midst under the name of Martianus Lucanius and who seemed to be always plunged in deep meditation. It was John Calvin, preparing his "Institutes of the Christian Religion."

The book appeared in Latin in 1536.[12] It was soon translated by the author into French, and was several times revised and enlarged. Luther published numerous pamphlets, letters, and occasional writings, but Calvin condensed his whole doctrine into a single, well thought out work, written in a sober, firm, clear, and precise style, which made it a model of its kind and contributed much to its success. "Calvin," says Bossuet, "wrote as well as any man of his century." The spirit in which the book was conceived corresponded to the aspirations of the men of that time for independence.

An instinctive aversion to any organized Church and traditional dogma, the denial of any intermediary between God and man except the Bible, the reduction of the sacraments to two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the efficacy of which was singularly diminished, the condemnation of pious images, holy water, altars, any authority in the teaching of doctrine or the

in 1614, there collected *Remarques sur la vie de Jean Calvin,* written without excess of malice or passion." (Lefranc, *op. cit.,* p. xiv.)

[12] *Christianae religionis institutio,* with the famous preface addressed to Francis I. The first French edition appeared at Geneva in 1541. The hypothesis of a French edition before 1536 must be abandoned. (Hauser, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* VII, 63.)

administration of the Sacraments: such was the negative part of Calvin's scheme, in this sense more radical than the work of Luther, who professed, in his own fashion, at least a belief in the Real Presence and in the efficacy of Baptism. The positive portion of the *Institutio* also took the work of the German reformer for its starting-point. Luther had spoken of the radical corruption of the heart of man; Calvin likewise proclaimed that "the will is in every part so entirely vitiated and depraved that it can produce nothing but what is evil." But he especially insisted that this corruption and the damnation that may result from it are the result of an absolute predestination on the part of God, and said: "Farewell, all the idle observations of many writers concerning preparation." [13] Luther had taught justification by faith, independently of good works, solely by virtue of the imputation of Christ's merits; Calvin writes: "We simply explain justification to be an acceptance, . . . and we say that it consists in the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ." [14] But this imputation he views in an eternal and immutable decree, which renders it incapable of being lost, in such wise that whoever has had grace at a given moment, has it forever, and whoever is predestined to damnation, can do nothing to save himself.[15] Lastly, Luther preached the gratuitousness of divine gifts, independent of any merit of man; Calvin completes the doctrine of gratuity thus understood by that of the absolute good pleasure of God, independent of justice, for justice itself is the work of God's will. And this frightful doctrine of the absolute predestination of man so dominates Calvin's teaching that we may say that if the Lutheran dogma re-

[13] *Institutio,* I, p. 26.

[14] *Ibid.,* II, p. 204.

[15] Whereas Luther makes faith a condition of predestination, Calvin makes the latter a condition of faith. Moreover, Luther seems rather concerned with finding a *means* of salvation; Calvin with finding a *certitude* of salvation. See Labauche, *Leçons de théologie dogmatique,* pp. 260, 279, 320.

quired man to sacrifice his free will and reason, the Calvinist dogma requires him to sacrifice his conscience.[16]

Calvinism at Geneva

How did it happen that so positive and practical a man as John Calvin fixed upon such a doctrine of despair? We should note that although, on the one hand, the dogma of absolute predestination lowers human nature, on the other hand it remarkably exalts it. To feel themselves forever established in goodness, to know themselves to be the élite of humanity, had a power, among the "predestinated," to greatly increase their energy. If, by the denial of the Real Presence, the temples seemed empty and the ancient liturgical rites purposeless, "this very fact," says Bossuet, "was a new charm for certain lofty minds, who thought themselves, by this means, raised above the senses and distinguished from the vulgar crowd." [17] It is not without good reason that some have reproached Calvin and others have praised him for having "aristocratized" religion.[18]

[16] Says Buisson: "Catholicism required man to sacrifice his reason [?]; Calvin required him to sacrifice his conscience. He exacts the adoration of the divine pleasure as supremely just." (Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 524.)

[17] Bossuet, *Variations,* bk. 9.

[18] Brunetière (*op. cit.*) gives a broader meaning to this word "aristocratize," as he does to "intellectualize" and "individualize," when he applies it to Calvin's religion. From this point of view it was quite just to remark that "in Calvin's religion the illiterate as well as the learned are called, since it is sufficient that they believe in the preaching of the pastors; if, in the *Institutio,* anything is forcibly inculcated, it is the obligation of bowing before the impenetrable mysteries of religion; Calvin, while rejecting the doctrine of the Communion of Saints in the sense held by the Catholic Church, admitted a visible church, the members of which constitute the mystical body of Christ, and which is united by fraternal charity." (Paul Dudon in *Études,* December 5th, 1909, pp. 677 sq.) It remains no less true, as has been said, that in a very real sense Calvin, by setting up his private interpretation in opposition to the Church, not merely for an almost entirely negative work like Luther's, but to define a symbol, to organize a form of public worship, to form a government, anathematize the so-called papal errors, did, more than Luther, show himself intellectual, aristocratic, and individualistic.

The terrible doctrine was, then, able to gather about its master a group of men who were ready for any undertaking, devoted even unto death, unmoved by suffering to the point of insensibility, ardent to the point of fanaticism. With their aid Calvin made the first attempt at a society dominated by his principles in the city of Geneva.

Geneva, an ancient Swiss city, which gloried in tracing its history back to the Romans, and in having fought, throughout the Middle Ages, for the autonomy of its Burgundian traditions against its own bishops and the counts and dukes of Savoy, was passing through a political and religious crisis at the very time when the *Institutio* appeared. The town council, excommunicated by the bishop, at strife with the dukes of Savoy, had just formed itself, with the support of the cantons of Fribourg and Bern, into a Great Council, and had proclaimed Geneva a free city under the nominal protectorate of the German Empire. The leaders of this independence movement, until then called "Libertins," had, in consequence of their union with Fribourg and Bern, taken the name of "Confederates," in German "Eidgenossen," whence is undoubtedly derived the name of "Huguenots." But the people of Bern, already won over to the Lutheran ideas, had taken advantage of their political influence and the rupture of the city with the bishop, to admit the new ideas. On August 27th, 1535, the Great Council abolished the exercise of the Catholic religion at Geneva and opened its gates to all the reformers who were being brought to trial by Christian princes.

The Reformation had, moreover, certain men of intellectual ability at Geneva. William Farel and one of his friends, a Dauphinois named Saunier, had come a few months previously, fortified with letters patent from the Bernese authorities, licensing them "to teach any person whatsoever, of any age or sex, the reading and writing of French." These two reformers had preached their doctrines openly. Farel was pro-

moter of the law of August 27th, 1535; he was the most active worker for the tyrannical measures that followed: the closing of convents, the expulsion of religious, confiscation of church property, and threats against the Catholic laity. There was uneasiness on all sides. Many peaceful citizens left the city, while reformers, driven from France, came in large numbers.

It was under these circumstances that John Calvin came to Geneva. Although he was barely twenty-seven years old, his thin features, white hair, and slightly bent posture, and the somber gravity of his eyes gave him almost the appearance of an old man. The report of his misfortunes, of his relations with eminent persons at court, and of the great work which he had just composed in defense of the new doctrines, increased his prestige. His imperious voice and abrupt gestures indicated a man accustomed to command and determined to be obeyed without question. Geneva, abandoned as it was, had need of a dictator.

Calvin, who, after the manner of the reformers, had just drawn up a whole set of doctrines, was in need of a temporal power to impose them. To seek the aid of a secular prince, as Luther did, was dangerous; to hope for such aid from the king of France, so prepossessed with the powers which the concordat of 1516 gave him over persons and property of the Church, was chimerical. But Geneva, a free city, where politics and religion were now closely united, where the ruler could easily govern State and Church at the same time with dictatorial power, seemed to be a suitable field for experiment, where Protestantism might try its strength. Calvin, a consummate politician, possessed to an equal degree the gift of seeing what possibilities could be realized and the gift of knowing how to wait for them patiently. For five years he let Geneva struggle in anarchy, call upon him as its savior, and reject him only to call on him again. In the autumn of 1541, after long prayer, aware of his strength and Geneva's need

of him, he installed himself, if not as official head of the republic, at least as the chief councillor, without whom nothing might be done.

The first of his cares was to call to Geneva all Frenchmen who were persecuted by the Parliament. Of these partisans the most devoted formed a sort of body-guard, following him everywhere. The Bernese and Genevan pastors, subjected to the irresistible dominance of his personality, no longer thought or legislated save according to his will. Under the name of "Consistory," a body of elders, recalling the *"episcopi"* or "overseers" of the early Church and the "censors" of ancient Rome, organized an inquisitorial vigilance over the citizens and denounced infractions of the moral law as social crimes. As the Protestant historian Leopold von Ranke says, "outward life was subjected to regulations of the strictest discipline. The amount to be spent on clothes and meals was fixed; dancing was forbidden, as was the reading of certain books, for example, *Amadis*. Card players might be seen set in the pillory, with their cards in their hands. Once a year, an inquiry was made in every house as to the knowledge and observance of religious precepts. There was introduced into the Council the practice of reciprocal admonition for the failings that one member might observe in another. No indulgence was extended to offenders. One woman was burned for singing indecent songs; one of the principal burghers, who had made fun of the doctrine of salvation and of the person of the great preacher, had to kneel down in the public square, holding an inverted torch, and to ask pardon before the people. On the proposal of the general assembly, the death penalty was enacted for adultery; a man, convicted under this law, when about to be executed, had to bless God for the stern laws of his country." [19]

[19] Ranke, *Histoire de France pendant les XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles*, I, p. 164. Hauser considers this tyrannical legislation as a reaction against the mode of living of the "libertines" and humanists. (*Études sur la Réformation française*, pp. 55–65.)

The most celebrated case of capital punishment at Geneva by order of Calvin was that of Michel Servet. This man, a Spanish physician, had dared to write the counterpart of the *Christianae Religionis Institutio* under the title of *Restitutio Christiana.* Therein were found heresies on the Trinity, among others a denial of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. Calvin, unable to lay hands on his contradictor, did not hesitate to denounce him to the Catholic Inquisition. Servet was arrested in France by order of Cardinal de Tournon, but escaped. He had the imprudence to pass by way of Geneva. There he was promptly seized, condemned, and on October 27th, 1553, burned at the stake.[20] The next year, by way of justifying himself, Calvin published a *Déclaration pour maintenir la vraye foy, . . . où est montré qu'il est licite de punir les hérétiques.*[21] The principal leaders of Protestantism in Germany and France declared themselves in accord with Calvin's act. Bucer and Melanchthon expressed approval of Servet's execution. When Sebastian Castellion, a former friend of Calvin, attacked the doctrine of the repression of heresy. Theodore de Bèze took up his pen and defended the inquisitorial system in a special work that was published by Robert Estienne under the title, *De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis.*

[20] See Bouvier, *La question Michel Servet.*

[21] "A declaration in support of the true faith . . . in which it is shown that it is permitted to punish heretics." (Calvin, *Opera,* IX, pp. 70, 92.)

CHAPTER IX

Protestantism in France

THE Protestant communities thenceforth founded in France took the Geneva organization for a model: a council of elders, called the Consistory, the election of pastors by the laity, regular meetings at which, after a reading from the Scriptures, there followed an exhortation and the singing of Psalms. They used to write to Geneva for Calvin's advice and even asked him for pastors. In this way were established the Reformed Church of Pré-aux-Clercs at Paris and the Reformed churches at Meaux, Angers, Poitiers, Bourges, Blois, and Tours. The names "Huguenots" and (more usually) "Calvinists" were given to Calvin's disciples. France, which had only one Protestant in 1522, counted 400,000 Protestants in 1559.[1] Calvin had given them their doctrine at Basle and their organization at Geneva.

Henry II against the Huguenots

Organized, militant, gathered about a man of unquestioned leadership and superior ability, Calvinism became a danger to Church and State.

Francis I died on March 31st, 1547, at the age of 53 years. His successor, Henry II, being an artist and a man of letters, was allied to the world of humanists from which the reformers were recruited, but on the day of his coronation, on taking possession of the throne, he took his oath "to wipe out heresy and to do so in such wise that posterity might say: 'If Henry

[1] This is the figure given by Theodore de Bèze and accepted by historians.

II had not reigned, the Church would have perished.' " From the death of Francis I to that of Henry II, the four virtuous pontiffs who occupied the see of Peter were Paul III, Julius III, Marcellus II, and Paul IV. They asked nothing better than to back up the King's action by their authority. Unfortunately conflicts over questions of jurisdiction obstructed the coöperation of the Holy See with the royal authority which a mutual understanding would have rendered effective. Strange though it may seem, no one was keener in urging Henry II to employ severe measures against heretics than Diana of Poitiers, an enigmatic woman much older than the King, who undertook "to train him in honor and manly virtues," yet seems to have played the sad rôle of a favorite.

One of Henry's first acts was to create a commission—the famous Chambre Ardente—in the Parliament of France to judge heresy cases. This commission sat from 1547 to 1550 and issued 66 death sentences.[2] The edict of 1551, known as that of Châteaubriant, codified in 46 articles all the measures taken against the Lutherans and regulated the juridical procedure in these cases. But at times most regrettable scenes occurred. If we are to credit Jean Crépin's *Acta martyrum,* one day in the Louvre, during the trial of a tailor accused of heresy, Diana of Poitiers, who was often present on such occasions, uttered some remark. "Madame," roughly replied the Paris workman, "be satisfied with having infected France without introducing your filth into so holy a thing as religion." On the morrow, Henry II went to see the execution. "But," says the annalist, "the condemned man turned upon the King a look so piercing that the latter was obliged to withdraw and was so deeply moved that it seemed to him he was followed by this man."

Such scandals would have been avoided if the King and the Parliament of Paris had heeded the voice of the Council

[2] Weiss, *La chambre ardente.*

of Trent in its protest against the intrusion of secular tribunals into religious cases and the voice of Pope Paul IV proposing to Henry the introduction of the Inquisition. The result would have been a more orderly procedure, freer from court influences and more competently conducted. Paul IV did, by Bull, appoint three French cardinals as chief inquisitors.[3] But the Parliament, imbued with Gallican ideas and distrustful of Rome, obstinately resisted. Ecclesiastical courts, it was said, would not be severe enough. As they could not inflict the death penalty, their work of repression would be ineffective. The Inquisition edict was officially registered, but never carried out. Parliament preserved its pretended right to exercise a more severe justice.

On the contrary, it was, in fact, becoming more and more tolerant. At the very moment when the civil magistracy was arrogating to itself the sole right to try heresy cases, heresy was entering its bosom.

The famous lawyer, Dumoulin, in 1552 published his *Commentarius ad edictum Henrici II, contra parvas datas et abusus curiae Romanae,*[4] taking to task the pope and the Roman chancery. This gave rise to violent polemics, in the course of which Dumoulin went so far as to maintain that "the pope is the great beast of the Apocalypse, that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, and that communion under both species is necessary for all the faithful."

Such propositions were notoriously heretical and gave public scandal. Dumoulin was one of the most eminent lawyers of

[3] Guise, Bourbon, and Châtillon.

[4] When an ecclesiastic wished to resign a benefice, he directed his request to Rome. It seems that it became an established custom to give two dates to the resignation: the "Great Date," indicating the day when the pope registered the request at Rome, and the "Little Date," indicating the day of its registration by subordinate officials. The existence of these two dates gave rise to abuses, which were, however, soon suppressed by the popes. (See *Mémoirs du clergé de France,* XII, pp. 889–899.)

the day. His treatise *De dividuo et individuo,* the substance of which was appropriated by Pothier in his *Traité des Obligations,* placed him in the first rank among his colleagues. Many of these undertook his defense. This was the starting-point of an evolution of Parliament towards Protestantism and was destined to have fatal consequences.

In 1558 Marot's "Psalms" were sung in the open air at Pré-aux-Clercs, and among the singers were Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, and the Prince de Condé. In May, 1559, representatives of the fifty reformed churches of France met in a house in the Faubourg Saint-Germain and drew up the "Confession of Faith of the French Churches." [5]

A certain number of magistrates decided to employ rigorous measures. But Parliament was divided. The two chambers were at odds. The Grand Chambre, having extraordinary jurisdiction, being successor to the Chambre Ardente, wanted to apply the Compiègne edict with severity; but the Tournelle, or chamber of ordinary jurisdiction, preferred to inflict only light penalties or even to dismiss the pleas. This latter chamber, presided over by Pierre Séguier and de Harlay, counted Christophe de Thou among its members. Among those in favor of severe repression may be named the first president, Gilles Le Maître, and Presidents Minard and de Saint-André.

To put an end to the conflict, it was decided to meet once a week. After six weeks of discussion, it was evident that the partisans of tolerance were in the majority. The Cardinal of Lorraine then counselled the King to launch a bold stroke. On June 15th, 1559, Henry II, with a numerous suite, including the princes of Bourbon and the three Guises, appeared before Parliament. Bertrandi, keeper of the seals, spoke. "The King," he said, "commands you to continue freely in his

[5] The text of this Confession of Faith may be found in Bèze, *Histoire ecclésiastique,* I, pp. 173–190.

presence your deliberations on the penalties to be inflicted on heretics." Minard, Saint-André, and Le Maître spoke in favor of the edicts. Then came the others' turn. Louis du Faur, looking directly at Henry II, said to him: "Do you fear lest it be said to you, as Elias formerly said to Achab: 'You it is that disturbs Israel?' " And Christophe de Thou declared: "In matters of this sort, Parliament is supreme, the king's men have no right to interfere." Arnaud du Ferrier proposed that "the matter should be deferred to a meeting of a general council." At length Anne du Bourg said: "I know there are certain crimes that ought to be punished without mercy, such as adultery, blasphemy, debauchery. But are we to consider it a slight matter to condemn men who invoke the name of Jesus Christ in the midst of flames?" This was an open apology for the Protestants. The King indignantly arose and ordered Montmorency to seize the guilty councillors on the spot. The constable descended the steps, seized the men indicated, and delivered them to Montgomery, captain of the guard, who brought them to the Bastille.

Some days later, President Minard, returning on his mule from the royal palace, when nearing his house on rue Vieille-du-Temple, was killed by an arquebus shot. The people suspected the Calvinists of having done this out of revenge for the arrest of du Bourg and the other councillors. The Protestants took upon themselves to confirm these suspicions, by singing when the Cardinal of Lorraine passed by:

"Garde-toi, cardinal,
Que tu ne sois traité
A la minarde
D'une stuarde." [6]

[6] The name "stuardes" was given to poisoned pills, which it was rumored that James Stuart used.

France under the Rule of Factions

The King, on his return to the Louvre after the famous council of June 15th, 1559, was beside himself. He is reported to have said that he would go to see du Bourg burned with his own eyes. A few days afterwards, Montgomery's lance overthrew him in a tournament. His successor, Francis II, was a young man of fifteen, delicate, sickly, and taciturn. He ruled scarcely seventeen months and left the throne to a child, nine or ten years old, Charles IX. The Guises, uncles of King Francis II by his wife Mary Stuart, seized control. From that time until the coming of Henry IV the monarchical government was, so to speak, in suspense. The direction of affairs was entirely in the hands of parties, which necessarily grouped themselves according to their religious ideas. It has justly been said that "1559 marks the close of an era . . . There is no longer any international policy, strictly so called . . . Italian question, Spanish question, German question, Navarre question—all these are in the background. It is the hour when Charles V disappears, when Henry II and Mary Tudor die. The cause of orthodoxy is represented by Philip II, that of the Reformation by Elizabeth. Between the two, Europe will be divided for forty years." [7] The same division and the same point of view will naturally force itself on the internal policy of France. As against the house of the Guises, which will support the Catholic party, the house of Bourbon will declare itself for the Protestants: between the two a third party will be formed, made up of undecided, fluctuating followers, actuated by policy, as Catherine de' Medici, Henry II's widow, or by family reasons, as Montmorency, or by principle, as Chancellor Michel de l'Hôpital. Francis II's reign will assure the predominance of the Catho-

[7] Henri Lemonnier in Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, V. p. 181.

lic party by the Guises; the beginning of Charles IX's reign will favor the third party, that of de l'Hôpital; but the chancellor's policy will assure the triumph of the Protestant party, of the Bourbons, which, by provoking the Vassy massacre, will let loose, under Charles IX and Henry III, a thirty years' civil war.

The Guises, or Lorraines, as their enemies called them to emphasize their foreign origin, prided themselves on their descent from Claude, duke of Guise, who was made duke and peer for having saved France from the invasion of the Rustauds. The then head of the family, Francis, surnamed the Great Duke of Guise, by his taking of Calais in 1558, had just completed, after a century's interval, the work of Joan of Arc, by driving the English entirely from French soil. Wherever he appeared, he was acclaimed with popular enthusiasm. His friends were fond of recalling that, while he was French by the services of his family and his own, he was likewise so by his chivalrous character. Later on it will be told how, at the siege of Metz, he was seen aiding the poor, and how his example led his companions to do likewise. His brother, the cardinal, raised to the highest ecclesiastical dignities while still very young, a prelate of lofty conduct, employed his great influence for the good of science and of the Church. To him is due the creation of the University of Rheims and the first attempts at seminaries in France. Both of them came of that great stock of which the Maréchale de Retz said: "These Lorraine princes have such fine features that other princes seem like common people beside them."

The house of Bourbon traced its origin back to St. Louis through his sixth son, Robert. It was represented by three brothers: Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, who was soon pushed towards militant Protestantism by his wife, Jeanne d'Albret; Cardinal Charles de Bourbon, at first favorable to the Calvinists, but later turned by circumstances against the Prot-

estant party and proclaimed king of France by the leaguers at the death of Henry III; and the Prince de Condé, a decided Huguenot, already compromised by having publicly sung Marot's Psalms at the Pré-aux-Clercs. Condé was small, ill-favored, slightly hump-backed, but active in all bodily exercises, brave, intelligent; it was he who, at the coming of Francis II, seeing the favor accorded the Lorraine princes, placed himself at the head of the malcontents.

The Prince de Condé, by his marriage to Eléonore de Roye, in 1551, became allied to the house of Châtillon or Coligny, already won over to Protestantism in the person of several of its members. Of these the most celebrated was Admiral Gaspard de Coligny. Born in 1517, he became noted as a brave soldier and especially as a leader of grim calmness, stern severity, at times of dreadful coldness towards his subordinates when discipline was at stake. As the influence of Diana of Poitiers removed him from the command of an army sent to Italy, he kept, throughout Henry II's reign, a resentment against the court. In 1559 he openly declared himself a Huguenot. Soon after he played an important part in the religious wars.[8]

The third party was represented chiefly by the Queen Mother, Catherine de' Medici, and by the Chancellor, Michel de l'Hôpital.

[8] The Admiral had been brought to embrace Protestantism by the influence of his young brother Francis, better known as Dandelot. He was imprisoned in 1551 and during his imprisonment he read Calvin's works, which produced a deep impression on him. This impression he communicated to his two brothers. The elder, Odet, known as Cardinal de Châtillon, did not exert any great political influence. But his strange career is noteworthy, as indicative of the customs of the time. He was born in 1515, became a cardinal when eighteen years old, archbishop of Toulouse the next year, then, a year later, bishop of Beauvais. He led a rather worldly life. When he openly declared himself a Huguenot, after the death of Henry II, Pope Paul IV excommunicated him. He dressed in red for his public marriage with Elizabeth de Hauteville, whom he presented at court, where she was commonly called Madame la Cardinale or the Countess of Beauvais. In the religious wars he fought in his brothers' army, then went to England, where he was well received by Queen Elizabeth.

Catherine de' Medici is often pictured as a restless, insincere, intriguing woman. The recent publication of her extensive correspondence [9] has made it possible to test this traditional estimate. Henry II's widow was a practical and intelligent woman who seems constantly to have aimed at maintaining the king's authority and the peace of the realm.[10] This was no slight task. Catherine sought to gain this end, now by the use of broad tolerance and now by a wavering policy. Overmuch swayed by the counsels of her fellow-countryman, Machiavelli, she too often was indifferent as to whether the means of attaining her purposes were fair or foul. Frequently these means were lying and, at least once, murder.

With this policy of the Queen Mother we cannot absolutely identify that of her most trusted adviser, Michel de l'Hôpital. He was outspoken, cold, and blunt, "another Cato the Censor," says Brantôme; "with his long white beard, pale face, and solemn manners, he had quite the appearance of one." His fondness for rules and regulations went to the point of being a mania. Never did a chancellor publish more edicts upon a greater variety of subjects. His compatriots questioned the sincerity of his Catholicism. "We mistrust," they said, "the Constable's paternoster, the Admiral's toothpick, and the Chancellor's Mass." [11] From an examination of his correspondence and of his deeds it would appear that Michel de l'Hôpital [12] was not a Protestant in disguise, but a legist, or rather a "doctrinaire," a "liberal Catholic"—if by anticipation we may apply to him these terms of another period. For him, religion was purely a personal matter, not a question of the

[9] The publication of Catherine de' Medici's correspondence was begun by de la Ferrière and continued by Baguenault de Puchesse.

[10] *Revue des Questions Historiques,* 1885, pp. 551 sq.

[11] It is related that Montmorency used to say his beads while considering some severe orders and that Coligny was found plying a toothpick whenever he had some serious move in mind.

[12] See his *Letters,* published in 1778.

social order; the Church is no concern of the State, nor the State of the Church. His religious tolerance bore a very close resemblance to indifference. "Give up those fiendish names," he said, "the symbols of parties, factions, and seditions, Lutherans, Huguenots, Papists. Let us not change the name of Christian." [13]

At the side of Catherine de' Medici and Chancellor de l'Hôpital was Constable Montmorency, a Catholic at heart, but allied with the Bourbons. He began by practicing the third party's policy, though later he lined up with the Guises.

It is not our purpose to recount the political strife of these latter with the malcontent faction, the conspiracy of Amboise, rendered abortive by the arrest and execution of La Renaudie, Antoine de Bourbon's negotiations with Queen Elizabeth of England and the Protestant princes of Germany, the arrest and condemnation of Condé and his liberation by Francis II's death in 1560, Catherine's policy, dictated by the Bourbon interests, the appeal to the Council by Antoine de Bourbon, Coligny, and Montmorency, and that measure which led to the edict (February 24th, 1561) by virtue of which the imprisoned reformers were to be released, the banished recalled, and all heresy trials discontinued. All these liberal measures were on condition of a return to Catholicism. But this stipulation was never applied.

This edict of amnesty, instead of appeasing the Calvinists, exalted them. Their aim then became evident: what they wanted in France, as at Geneva, was not freedom but domination. In April, 1561, they held an assembly in the very halls of Parliament. Numerous writings called upon the government to carry out the religious reformation. At Paris, in the faubourg Saint-Marcel and outside the Saint-Antoine gate, they preached furiously against the papacy. In the prov-

[13] From an address (December 13th, 1560) to the Orleans States General. (Cf. Felice, p. 92.)

inces they drove out the priests and seized the churches. Baron des Adrets terrorized the Midi.

Again Chancellor de l'Hôpital had recourse to one of his chimeras: to bring about an agreement between Catholics and Protestants by trying to harmonize the two doctrines. At the invitation of the Queen Regent conferences were held in the refectory of the old monastery of Poissy in September and October, 1561. With the little King Charles IX presiding over the meetings, Theodore de Bèze and Peter Martyr spoke in behalf of the Protestants, while the Cardinal of Lorraine espoused the cause of the Catholics. These conferences have become known to history as the "Colloquy of Poissy." At the end, both Catholics and Protestants departed more exasperated than they were at the beginning.[14]

A like result obtained from an edict, issued at Saint-Germain-en-Laye (January 17th, 1562), which conditionally authorized Protestant public worship and meetings.[15] It dissatisfied both the Catholics, who were irritated at seeing heretical worship thus officially protected, and the Protestants, who were expecting greater favors. At Montpellier, at Castres, in fact more or less everywhere, the Calvinists invaded the churches, seized the bells, and smashed the altars.[16] In January, 1562, Theodore de Bèze wrote to Calvin that one could not imagine to what a degree the Huguenots' fury had risen in the Midi. "The Aquitanians," he said, "will not be satisfied until they exterminate their foes." Ronsard, in his *Discours sur les misères du temps,* reproached the reformers for preaching "a Christ carrying a pistol and all blackened with smoke." [17]

[14] Th. de Bèze, *Hist. Eccl.,* I, pp. 500–665.

[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 674–681.

[16] See an article by Louis Batiffol in *Revue hebdomadaire,* November, 1908.

[17] Ronsard, *Œuvres complètes* (Marty-Laveaux ed.), V, p. 336. The original edition was published in 1562. See Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VII, pp. 175–183. Cf. Verstegan, *Theatrum crudelitatum haereticorum nostri temporis.* On Ronsard's at-

The Catholics, on their part, at times employed similar reprisals. At Paris they invaded a house where a preaching service was going on and destroyed the furniture.

At this stage the Connétable de Montmorency, deeming religion in danger, aligned himself with the party of the Guises. François de Guise, Montmorency, and Saint-André formed a pact, constituting a sort of triumvirate. Cardinal de Tournon joined it. Philip II of Spain, the Duke of Savoy, and the Pope did not hide their gratification at this news. The situation became more tense than ever. It needed only a spark to start a general war. At Vassy on the Champagne frontier, (March 1st, 1562), the Duke of Guise, returning from Saverne to Paris with an escort of two hundred horsemen, met a body of four or five hundred Protestants. After mutual provocations, they came to blows, and blood flowed. The casualties amounted to sixty men killed and two hundred wounded. The affair was magnified and worked up. Everyone talked of "the Vassy massacre." Thereafter the January edict was regarded as a dead letter. Wherever the Protestants were the stronger, they seized churches; where the Catholics had the upper hand, they proscribed the Protestants. François, duke of Guise, on his arrival in Paris, was acclaimed king with shouts of "Vive Guise!" The Protestants gathered in arms about their leaders. The two parties got ready to test each other's strength on the field of battle.

It does not enter into the plan of this narrative to detail the various incidents of the religious wars that crimsoned the soil of France at the end of the sixteenth century. These episodes have their proper place in the history of France.

A strange fact strikes us when we consider the picture of these religious strifes as a whole: the Protestants, nearly

titude toward the Protestants and the causes of it, see Strowski, *Saint François de Sales, Introduction à l'histoire du sentiment religieux en France au XVII^e siècle,* pp. 13 sqq.

always worsted on the field of battle, are always favored in the treaties. "We constantly beat the Huguenots in arms," says Montluc, "but thereupon they beat us by their devilish writings." The key to this fact is found in Catherine de' Medici's policy: to prevent the triumph of parties and to govern by keeping them balanced, she always took up the defense of the weaker party. When she saw the Protestant faction about to win the hegemony, through the dominance of Coligny over the young King, she crushed it by a terrible stroke.

St. Bartholomew's Day

The account of this sad episode and of the formation of the League and an exposition of the Edict of Nantes which put an end to so many wars, must now receive our attention.

The founder of French Protestantism, worn out by diseases and ceaseless activity, slowly expired on May 27th, 1564. With his health undermined by disease of head and stomach, by gout, gall stones, and asthma, John Calvin kept preaching, writing, dogmatizing, expending his extraordinary energy in prodigious activities, living to his very last days—to use his own words—*in tumultu et festinatione*. At his death he left his followers a set of doctrines, an organization, and, what is more, a spirit of haughty independence, unconquerable revolt, and obstinate combativeness, not so much for the defense of individual liberty as for the conquest of power. This spirit lived in Calvin's successors. Theodore de Bèze kept it in his sermons, Coligny carried it into the military camps.

Three successive campaigns, brought to an end, the first by the treaty of Amboise (1563), the second by the peace of Longjumeau (1568), and the third by the peace of Saint-Germain-en-Laye (1570), resulted in giving the Protestants the free public exercise of their religion throughout the

kingdom, except Paris, admitting them to public office, and four places of refuge: La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, and La Charité-sur-Loire. The party of the Guises sank, while Henry of Navarre obtained the hand of Margaret of Valois, sister of King Charles IX (1572), and Coligny was admitted to court, where he became all-powerful. Catherine observed that her unwise policy of compensations, granted to the reformers, had exceeded reasonable bounds. The assassination of the Duke of Guise by the Protestant Poltrot de Méré (1563), then the massacre of Nîmes (September 29th, 1567),[18] in which 120 Catholics were cruelly slaughtered, and almost at the same time Condé's daring attempt to capture the court (September 25th, 1567) showed how far the boldness of the Huguenots might go.

This last affair maddened the young King. "No one is going to give me any more such frights," said Charles IX with more oaths than necessary, according to the account given by Bouchefort in a letter to Renée de Ferrare. "I will enter their houses and penetrate to their very beds to look for those who give me these alarms." The peace of Saint-Germain, by granting the Protestants four fortified strongholds, formed, as it were, a State within the State, capable of contracting foreign alliances.[19] This was well calculated to increase their audacity. The people, taken as a whole, "regarded the Protestants as sacrilegious infidels, savages, enemies of human society," [20] and were ready to applaud any measure of stern repression taken against them.

The saintly Pope Pius V, who took possession of the Holy

[18] Vaisette, *Histoire de Languedoc,* V, p. 289.

[19] "Nearly all the Protestants wanted the German princes to be asked for prompt and ample assistance." (Bèze, II, p. 35.) Condé and Coligny treated with the English, as is evidenced by their correspondence. In 1561 Coligny had some meetings with Trockmorton in the Fontainebleau forest. At these interviews Coligny revealed what had taken place in the royal council and thus informed Queen Elizabeth. (Laferrière, *Le XVI^e^ siècle et les Valois,* p. 52.)

[20] Lavallée, *Histoire des français,* I, p. 560.

See in 1565, repeatedly called the attention of Christian rulers, particularly Charles IX, to the Protestant danger and the need of meeting it.[21] Statesmen, mindful of the traditional policy of the monarchy, remembered that one of its most important traditions had ever been to repress heresies,[22] that King Charles IX, like all his ancestors, had, on his coronation day, sworn to defend the religious unity of the realm. The circumstances called for grave measures.

Coligny, having attained the summit of power and having won the complete confidence of the young King, who called him "my father," planned nothing less than a change in the orientation of French policy. To oppose Spain by an alliance with the Protestant princes of Germany was his aim. The Catholic leaders were alarmed at the prospect of an army of Protestants commanded by Coligny. "Madame," said Tavannes to the queen mother, "if anyone offers you such advice, you ought to have his head cut off." [23] Catherine foiled the admiral's projects. "God grant, Madame," said he, "that you be not overtaken by another war, from which you will be unable to withdraw!"

The presence in Paris of numerous Protestants who came for the marriage of Henry of Navarre to Margaret of Valois (August 18th, 1572) and their insolent conduct irritated the city population. A popular song exhorted the people to "work wonders" by making this a "red marriage." About eleven o'clock on the morning of August 22nd, while the Admiral on his return from the Louvre was passing through a little street between rue des Fossés-Saint-Germain and the quay, an arquebus shot, coming from behind a window curtain, cut off the first finger of his right hand and lodged in his arm.

[21] Falloux, *Vie de saint Pie V*, pp. 203, 208, 217–219.

[22] The French tradition in this matter may be seen in the scholarly work of Thomassin, *Traité dogmatique et historique des édits et autres moyens dont on s'est servi pour établir et maintenir l'unité de l'Eglise.*

[23] Laferrière, *Lettres de Catherine de' Medici*, IV, pp. lxvi sqq.

Much feeling was aroused. The King himself paid a visit to the injured Admiral. "The wound is yours," said the King, "the pain is mine." A chronicler [24] reports that the Admiral profited by the occasion to take the young King aside and warn him to distrust his mother. But Catherine, by dint of much insistence, drew from the King the secret of this meeting: her irritation against the Admiral was at its height.

The excitement of the Protestants increased. In the little courtyard of the house on the rue de Bétisy, where the Admiral lived, a crowd gathered and remarks like this were heard: "That arm will cost thirty thousand other arms." That evening, Bouchavannes, having overheard certain proposals at the same place, reported at the Louvre that the Huguenots had decided to attack the King in his palace "on the morrow at supper time." This threat provoked mad rage at court. Catherine summoned the King's council. All were of opinion that no alternative was open but to strike or perish, that the King, being supreme judge and the source of all jurisdiction, had a right, by virtue of his title, to have all disturbers of the peace seized, condemned, and executed, and that the hour had come to exercise this right.

But Charles himself had first to be brought to this same frame of mind. For more than two hours Catherine begged, implored, threatened, tortured him, fiercely strove to stir up in that sickly, irritable little being a tempest of rage, a nervous crisis, in the midst of which she might extract from him the order which she needed and which the King would doubtless have refused in cooler moments. The councillors added their entreaties to those of the Queen. In a moment of fevered excitation, the young King cried: "Very well then, since you wish it, kill them all, kill them all!"

That was enough. The provost of trade, Le Charron, re-

[24] *Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, Correspondance de Catherine de' Medici.*

ceived orders to seize the keys of all the city gates, to stop all boats on the Seine, and to place the city militia under arms. Marcel, former provost, a man who held the populace in his hand, was summoned to the Louvre. He replied that twenty thousand men, drawn up in twenty quarters of Paris, would hold themselves in readiness all night to receive orders from their chiefs. The houses of Protestants would be marked with chalk. About an hour before dawn, at sound of the tocsin at the Palace of Justice, they would descend upon the designated houses.

Catherine, fearing perhaps that the King might recoil at the last moment, advanced the hour. On her own authority, at about two o'clock in the morning, she ordered the ringing of the tocsin at Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, the church nearest the Louvre. It was August 24th, the feast of St. Bartholomew.

As had been agreed upon, the first victim was Coligny. A certain Besme, a German officer in the service of Guise, forced the outer gate, slew the porter, took his keys, and, accompanied by his men, broke into the Admiral's apartment. The latter had risen from bed at sound of the soldiers' tumult. Clad in a dressing-gown, not doubting the death that awaited him, he began reciting his prayers. "Are you the Admiral?" asks Besme. "Yes." At this reply, Besme plunged his sword into the Admiral's bosom. Soldiers seized him and threw him out of the window while still breathing. Guise and Angoulême were waiting in the street. The latter dismounted from his horse, leaned over the corpse, and said: "It is he." Guise's followers then cried: "Kill the rest of them now! The King commands it!" and they scattered to the various quarters of the city.

The populace, recruited by Marcel, rose up on all sides and, according to Tavannes' expression, "death and blood flowed in the streets." At eleven o'clock in the morning, shooting and sacking were still going on. Charles IX tried to put an end to

the massacre and pillage. Mounted archers patroled the streets. In the afternoon the tumult subsided, but scenes of murder were renewed on the 25th, 26th, and 27th of August. Unauthorized bands profited by the disturbance to steal and plunder. Men laid hold on their personal enemies, their rivals, on those whose wealth they coveted, and made them pass for Protestants. "To have money," declares Mézeray, "or to hold an enviable position, or to have hungry heirs, was to be a Huguenot."

Like scenes were enacted outside of Paris, at Meaux August 25th, at Angers on the 29th, at Lyons on the 30th, at Bourges on September 15th, at Rouen on the 17th, at Toulouse on the 23rd, at Bordeaux on October 3rd, at Poitiers on the 27th. In some of these cases, the movement may have been prompted by instructions more or less secret; but for the most part the uprising was spontaneous.

Efforts have been made to ascertain the number of Protestants done to death in the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre. It seems impossible to determine the number outside of Paris. In Paris itself it could not have exceeded two thousand.[25]

[25] This is the figure accepted by Ranke, Henri Marin, Lavisse and Rambaud (*Histoire générale,* V, p. 145), and Batiffol (*The Century of the Renaissance,* p. 234). Among contemporaries we find the following estimates: de Thou says 2000; the Venetian ambassador Micheli, from 2000 to 4000; d'Aubigné, 3000; Brantôme, 4000; Mézeray, 5000. The Protestant martyrology places the figure at 10,000, but enumerates only 468 by name. Caveirac, in his *Apologie de Louis XIV, suivie d'une dissertation sur la Saint-Barthélemy,* p. lxiii, published a document that can supply a basis for probable evaluation: it is a note of the grave-diggers for the burial of eleven hundred bodies taken from the Seine. Since it is likely that most of the bodies were thrown into the Seine, that the greater number of them were recovered, and that the grave-diggers would not have reduced the number in their report, the estimate of 2000 as the number of victims seems correct. Moreover, we should not forget that, according to a remark by Mézeray, a certain number of Catholics were among those who perished in the massacre. The story that Charles IX shot at the Protestants with an arquebus from a window of the Louvre has no historical foundation. (Loiseleur, *Trois énigmes historiques,* pp. 108–116.) As for the clergy, it is worthy of note that not one of them took part in the council that decided on the St. Bartholomew slaughter, that in several provinces the clergy put an end to scenes of murder, and that several of the most eminent members of the

Catherine de' Medici sent word to Pope Gregory XIII that the King, endangered by a great conspiracy, for the sake of his kingdom's tranquillity had to execute a large number of Huguenots, whereupon the Pope declared: "It seems that God is beginning to turn the eyes of His mercy upon us," and had a Te Deum sung to thank God for an event which he supposed had saved France; he also had a medal struck bearing the device, *"Ugonotorum strages."*

Two years later, King Charles IX, burning with fever and tormented by remorse, cried out on his deathbed: "How much blood! how much blood! . . . My God, pardon me!" [26]

The League

The religious strifes of which we have thus far spoken, appear rather as conflicts of great nobles, cabals of officials, court intrigues. A new element now introduced itself. The people, whose voice had been heard only in low and intermittent rumbling, now entered the conflict and in a vast movement, with many a fault, yet filled with glory, in the end forced their decision on the great and saved France from heresy.

Just as in the eleventh century rural communities united for the liberation of the communes and the salvation of the social order, as in the thirteenth confraternities of third orders were formed to regenerate the Christian spirit, so, in the middle of the sixteenth century, in presence of the ruins accumulated by Protestantism, leagues were formed here and

clergy denounced the St. Bartholomew massacre. At the States General, in 1614, Cardinal Du Perron denounced "those violent spirits who, being carried to one extreme, think the best means of justifying themselves is to pass to the other." Hardouin de Péréfixe execrated "that atrocious act which was never equalled and, please God, never will be." (*Histoire du roi Henri le Grand.*)

[26] On St. Bartholomew's Day, see: Philippson, *Die Römische Kurie und die Bartholomäusnacht;* Vacandard, *Les papes et la Saint-Barthélemy,* in *Etudes de critique et d'histoire religieuse,* pp. 219–292; Boutaric, *La Saint-Barthélemy d'après les archives du Vatican.*

there between "nobles, clergy, and citizens, under the king's good pleasure, to defend God's honor and that of His Roman Catholic Church." [27] Later, under the influence of the Cardinal of Lorraine who, it is said, conceived the idea at the Council of Trent, other leagues, with less regard for the "king's good pleasure," drawing their inspiration more especially from the confraternities and third orders, of which they were often merely an extension, agreed, like the League of Orleans in 1568, "to defend holy religion and to sustain one another to the last drop of their blood." [28] The St. Bartholomew episode which, it seemed, clearly marked the court's intention to be through with heresy, was the occasion for the dissolution of many of these leagues. But the attitude taken by the new King, Henry III, at the very beginning of his reign (1574), the repeated setbacks inflicted by the frivolous monarch upon defenders of the old faith, the extraordinary advantages extended to Protestants by the Edict of Beaulieu in 1576—full liberty of worship, except at Paris, and four new places of refuge [29]—awoke the Catholics.

The peace of May 6th, 1576, called the Peace of Monsieur, decided that the city of Péronne should be given over to the Prince de Condé as a place of refuge. The inhabitants of Péronne were indignant and refused to obey a master who, they said, wanted to make Huguenots of them. An act of union was signed "between prelates, gentlemen, and other good inhabitants of Picardy, resolved to use their goods and their lives, to the last drop of their blood, for the preservation of the city and the whole province in the king's obedience and the observance of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church . . . for the safeguarding of both clergy and the poor from

[27] Petitot, *Collection de mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France,* XXII, p. 157.

[28] Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise,* p. 654; Vergniaud Romagnési, *Histoire d'Orleans,* II, p. 531.

[29] These four new places of refuge were: Saumur, Niort, Saint-Jean d'Angély, and Mézières.

all oppression and violence . . . for carrying out these purposes, to select a chief of the said confederation whom all will be bound to follow even to the point of death, and to enter into relation with similar confederations of the other provinces and even of neighboring nations" . . . as also "at the States General to offer the king certain articles to which he should swear, the while protesting to do nothing to the prejudice of what will be ordained by the said States," the entire aim being to restore to France "the franchises and liberties . . . of the time of King Clovis . . . and still better and more profitable, if such can be obtained." [30]

"This would have been a Catholic revolution anticipating the French Revolution by two centuries. As yet it was only a league of nobles and needed to have the popular element join it." [31] This happened shortly after (1584), when the death of the King's brother, the last of the Valois, left as his sole heir, according to the Salic law,[32] Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot,

[30] Palma Cayet, in Petitot collection, XXXVIII, p. 254; *Panthéon littéraire* (Buchon ed.), I, p. 8.

[31] Brugère, p. 661.

[32] Not according to the Salic law, such as it was drawn up by the Merovingian kings, but according to the Salic law which was transferred from the civil to the political order by the assembly of barons in 1316 and considered independently of any other fundamental law of the kingdom, such as the law of religion, which required that the king of France belong to the traditional religion of the French. Hence it is evident that the League, far from being a revolutionary undertaking, was really the expression of a traditional and constitutional sentiment. It rested on this principle that the French monarchy was limited by fundamental laws, the chief of which was that the king of France, a Catholic nation, could be none but a Catholic. The other fundamental laws, inscribed, not in written documents, but "in the hearts of all Frenchmen," were that the taxes had to be agreed to, that communal and provincial liberties were inviolable, that agreements made between individual citizens and the king had to be respected. Should any one violate one of these laws, even though it be a prince of royal blood or the king himself, the people had the right to rise up in order to have such law respected. Viollet, *Etablissements de saint Louis,* I, p. 180. Pope Sixtus V, in his Bull *"Ab immensa"* (September 9th, 1585)—the last act of official intervention by the popes in the matter of the temporal power of kings—rested on no other principles. *"Pronuntiamus,"* said the pope, *"ac declaramus Henricum quondam [Navarrae] regem et Henricum condensem fuisse et esse haereticos . . . ac proinde . . . eos ipso jure privatos et incapaces ac*

the chief of the Huguenots. "Charles Hotman, a most virtuous citizen," says La Roche Blond, "entered into association with various ecclesiastics and citizens. A council of six members (later sixteen, corresponding to the sixteen quarters of Paris) directed the association, arranged secret meetings that were generally held at the Collège de Fortet, which thence was called 'the cradle of the League.' From various bodies of Parisian workmen came numerous new members. Then 'several good inhabitants of Paris, men of sound judgment,' were sent to different provinces to rally the local leagues 'so that there might be but one body moved by one and the same mind throughout France.' " [33]

Henry of Navarre

This association realized that it needed a chief, at the same time not forgetting that "it was the people who formed the League," as a contemporary says, "and that in them rested its matter and substance, and that the Lorraine princes were but accessories." It turned to a Lorraine prince, Duke Henry of Guise, and asked him to become its director. He was of the same age as Henry III, tall and handsome, with a face made the more masculine by a large scar which won for him the surname of *Balafré* (the Scarred). He soon became the people's idol. "France," says Balzac, "became mad over this man, for to say the people were enamoured of him would fall short . . . and the Huguenots were mad over the League when they looked at the Duke of Guise."

inhabiles ad succedendum in quibuscumque principatibus . . . ac specialiter in regno Franciae." This Bull, omitted from the *Bullarium Romanum* in consequence of Henry IV's conversion, is to be found in the writings of that period, in the *Archives de l'histoire de France,* IX, p. 49, and in Segrétain, *Sixte V et Henry IV.*

[33] Lezeau, *De la religion catholique en France,* p. 41; *Dialogues entre le Maheustre et le Manant,* Paris, 1593, p. 439. Lezeau was a moderate defender of the League. His work has been published in the *Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France,* XIV, pp. 9–91. The author of the *Dialogues entre le Maheustre* (royalist gentleman) *et le Manant* (Leaguer) is probably Roland, one of the Sixteen.

The dramatic episodes of the war of the three Henries [34] are so well known from the secular history of France that we have no need to recount them in detail: the battles of Coutras and of Vimory, the Day of the Barricades, the States General of Blois and its important "cahiers," the assassination of Duke Henry of Guise, Henry of Navarre's march on Paris, the murder of Henry III, the proclamation of Cardinal Charles de Bourbon as king under the name of Charles X, Henry of Navarre's abjuration and his coronation at Chartres under the name of Henry IV, his triumphant entry into Paris amidst popular acclaim, and the evaporation of the League after Pope Clement VIII absolved the King from the censures he had incurred.

Two facts, however, are of such a nature as to call for particular mention by a church historian: the attitude of the papacy during the crisis and the French King's attitude at the time of his conversion.

At first glance the variety of means employed by Sixtus V, Gregory XIV, and Clement VIII, is disconcerting. But a closer examination of them shows a perfect unity of idea, simplicity and wisdom. Cardinal Sega says: "The pope's chief intention is to have the Catholic religion conserved in the kingdom of France and the latter reëstablished in its former splendor and dignity." To praise the zeal and efforts of the Leaguers for the defense of the Catholic religion, but without encouraging their acts of rebellion for fear of harming the unity of France; on the other hand, to urge the royalists to abandon their heretical leader, the while maintaining relations with them "so as not to break," as Clement VIII said, "any thread of importance to the welfare of Christendom"—such was the secret of the policy followed by the last popes of the sixteenth century,

[34] Henry III, king of France, Henry of Navarre, leader of the Huguenots, and Henry of Guise, head of the Leaguers.

a policy, apparently varied and divergent, but in reality logical, prudent, and lofty.[35]

This policy was crowned with success by the conversion of Henry IV. The exaggerated claims of the Spaniards, who wanted to be recompensed for their support of the League by forcing it to acknowledge the Infanta of Spain, granddaughter of Henry II,[36] as queen of France, aroused the indignation of patriotic leaguers. "All Frenchmen will rather perish than permit the Spaniards to realize their claims," wrote Doctor Manclerc.[37] "The persistence of the Spaniards in trying to force the Infanta on us despite our laws," adds Desportes, "will occasion the party's ruin and the establishment of Navarre." [38] "The people," wrote the Duke of Feria, Spanish ambassador, "are impelled by a general desire toward a king of their own nationality." [39] Parliament solemnly "decided and decreed (June 18th, 1593) that repeated remonstrances be made to the Duke of Mayenne . . . to prevent this kingdom, which depends only on God in temporalities, from being seized by foreigners under pretext of religion." There seemed to be only one possible solution of the affair: the conversion of the King of Navarre. Henry had already thought of taking this step. With his ordinary frankness, he said to Sully on February 15th of that year: "Sully, I beg you to tell me freely what you would do if you were in my place." To this the Huguenot statesman replied: "To advise you to go to Mass is something you could not expect from me, since I am not a Catholic; yet I will say to you that you will never reign

[35] Such is the conclusion reached by L'Epinois in his important work, *La ligue et les papes,* based on documents in the national archives and especially the Secret Archives of the Vatican.

[36] L'Epinois, p. 591.

[37] Letter dated April 30th, 1593, quoted by L'Epinois, *l.c.*

[38] Letter dated July 22nd, 1593 (*ibid.*).

[39] Quoted by Forneron, *Philippe II,* III, p. 202.

peacefully so long as you make external profession of a religion which is held in such aversion by both great and small." [40] This was the language of policy. At the same time, the Catholic prelates who had access to the King, chiefly his reader, Cardinal du Perron, made him listen to the language of conscience. "When his affairs were most difficult," wrote the Cardinal, "the King did me the honor to confer privately with me on the question of his conversion." [41]

Henry of Navarre was powerfully impressed by the report of a conference (April, 1593) in which du Perron, "that mind of stupendous knowledge," to quote d'Aubigné, put to rout fourteen Protestant ministers. The King wanted another discussion, to take place in his presence. It was held at Mantes, like the first, about the beginning of June.[42] At this disputation, two ministers, Rotan and Morlas, acknowledged the possibility of salvation in the Catholic Church, whereas du Perron denied it in Protestantism. It is reported that the King thereupon declared that he would take the surer side and would embrace the Catholic faith, "in which, as they all agreed, he could be saved, rather than that in which only one party assured it." [43] If this expression amounted to anything more than a bit of wit, Henry, it seems, was not long in recognizing the insufficiency of such an argument.[44] In fact, he sum-

[40] *Mémoires,* pp. 107–110.

[41] Quoted by Féret, *Henri IV et l'Eglise,* p. 40.

[42] Féret, p. 51.

[43] Dupleix, *Histoire de Henri le Grand,* p. 119.

[44] "At bottom this famous bit of reasoning, so much admired by certain theologians, is a sophism. When Catholics say: 'It is impossible for you to be saved if you are a Protestant,' they mean 'if you are not in good faith'; and when Protestants grant that one can be saved as a Catholic, they mean 'supposing one is in good faith.'" (Brugère, p. 681.) If we are to accept Richelieu's statement, Henry IV confessed to the Queen (Maria de' Medici) that when he first made profession of being a Catholic, he embraced Catholic truth only in appearance in order to secure the crown, but that after the conference at Fontainebleau between Cardinal du Perron and Duplessis-Mornay (1600), he abhorred the Huguenots'

moned a meeting of prelates and doctors to be held July 20th at Saint-Denis "for the purpose of receiving instruction," [45] and, in the course of his conversation with his catechists, he more than once showed deep emotion. "You have not quite satisfied me on this point," he said to them, speaking of the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament; "this day take my soul in your hands; I beg you to take care of it; once you have me within there where you are leading me, I will depart only at death; this I swear and protest to you." [46]

The following Sunday (July 25th, 1593) Henry abjured the Protestant religion in the presence of the Archbishop of Bourges, who granted him absolution from the censures he had incurred. This episcopal absolution was later on declared illegal by Pope Clement VIII and supplemented by a papal absolution.[47] From that time public opinion was with Henry IV, and the double aim of the Roman diplomacy was attained: the Catholic religion was "conserved in the kingdom of France and the latter reëstablished in its former splendor and dignity."

beliefs for reasons of conscience as much as he did their party for reasons of state." (*Mémoires de Richelieu;* Petitot collection, 2nd series, X, p. 157.) As for the famous expression that Henry IV is supposed to have uttered at the time of his conversion—"the crown is worth a Mass, Paris is worth a Mass"—it is altogether unlikely. Henri de Bearn was too clever to speak thus. Edouard Fournier thinks he has found the author in a satirical work of the time, first published in 1622 and reëdited in 1855 under the title of *Caquets de l'accouchée.* See Fournier, *L'esprit dans l'histoire,* p. 240.

[45] *Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France—Lettres missives de Henri IV,* III, pp. 815, 817.

[46] *Registre-Journal de Henri IV* in *Nouvelle collection de mémoires,* by Michaud and Poujoulat, p. 160.

[47] In the definitive absolution granted to Henry IV, Clement VIII declared the episcopal absolution "null, invalid, and of no effect" (*"nullam et invalidam ac nullius roboris et momenti"*). The Pope declared that he reserved to himself the supreme judgment of the conditions of Catholicity imposed on rulers. In this act, quite aside from the need of mollifying Spain, we can see the intention of preserving what could still be kept of the old international law of Europe.

The Edict of Nantes

Shortly afterwards, the King wished, by a decree, to sanction and regulate the religious pacification which his abjuration had determined. This was the object of the Edict of Nantes, promulgated April 15th, 1598.

The Edict of Nantes comprises 93 articles, with 36 supplementary articles, which were withheld from examination and registration by Parliament.[48] The first eighteen articles aimed at granting the broadest liberties to the Protestants. Full amnesty was granted for all past deeds during the religious wars. Not only could the public ministry thenceforth not bring any judicial action relative to these deeds, but they could not be made the occasion of any lawsuits between individuals (arts. 1 and 2). Catholic worship was to be reestablished wherever it had been suppressed; the "reformed" worship was to be freely carried on wherever it had been established and, in addition, in two designated places of each bailiwick (arts. 3, 9, and 11).[49] It was forbidden to attack Protestants from the pulpit (art. 17), to suborn their children (art. 18), to disinherit a relative because of his religion (art. 26). The reformers were to enjoy all civil and political rights and were to be admitted to all employments (art. 27).

These liberal concessions, so much in conformity with our present habits, seemed, in 1598, excessive to most Catholics, who knew that the Huguenots everywhere aspired, not to liberty, but to domination, that wherever they had possessed

[48] Isambert, *Anciennes lois françaises,* vol. XV.

[49] A special difficulty presented itself for certain cities, notably for Paris. Treaties that had been entered into with the League had stipulated that the exercise of Calvinist public worship would be forbidden in Paris and a few other large cities. The decree of pacification professedly respected these treaties, but added that the members of the Reformed Church could freely sojourn in these cities and hold their services in the nearby outskirts. For Paris, Ablons was the designated place, near Villeneuve-Saint-Georges. It was there that Sully went to attend the Calvinist services, after making his offering of blessed bread at the Church of St. Louis. It used to be said that he belonged to two parishes.

the power (*e. g.*, at Geneva and in Bearn) they had banished the Catholics.[50] To give liberty to such foes seemed a risky venture. But three privileges granted the Protestants especially aroused the apprehensions of Catholics. In the first place, the reformers had the right for eight years (and this period was later extended, as might have been foreseen) to hold places, called "refuges," the garrisons of which would be maintained by the King. Under this head, the Protestants kept more than two hundred cities, seventy of which could be defended, some, like La Rochelle, Montpellier, and Saumur, being strongly fortified. In the second place, the Protestants were authorized to hold assemblies periodically, a sort of states general, and to have delegates at the court, like ambassadors. Thirdly, a special commission of the Parliament of Paris, called the Chamber of the Edict, was charged with judging accusations against the reformers (arts. 30, 31, 32, etc.). Similar commissions were established in several provincial parliaments.

The Pope objected to the Edict of Nantes, and the Gallican parliaments, which in former times had so loudly protested against the special jurisdiction of the Catholic Church, now denounced the military, political, and judicial privileges which made of the Calvinist Church a State within the State. They drew attention to the fact that the situation of the Protestants was more favorable than that of the Catholics and that the articles relative to fortified places, general assemblies, and judicial organization seriously altered the fundamental and traditional constitution of France. The King listened to these remonstrances, but confined himself to saying that he regarded the Edict, not as something absolutely good, but as the best possible under the circumstances. Doubtless he hoped that,

[50] At the Saint-Bris conferences, in 1586, Catherine de' Medici said to the Vicomte de Turenne, the representative of Henry of Navarre: "The King wants only one religion in France." To this the Huguenot replied: "We also, Madame, but we intend that it shall be ours."

during the eight years granted the Protestants for the enjoyment of their privileges, they would be converted. The conferences that he brought about between Catholic and Protestant theologians, the recall of the Jesuits despite the opposition of his entourage, the favor which he showed to those of his friends who abjured Calvinism—such as Gontaut-Biron, Palma-Cayet, and Sancy—seem to justify this hypothesis. Ravaillac's crime prevented the realization of these hopes.

Scarcely had Henry IV drawn his last breath, when the assembly of Protestants submitted to the King a project "so drawn up," says Richelieu, "that, had the council been Huguenot, it could not have approved it." What the Protestants proposed was, in fact, a great federation, a sort of Protestant republic, established in France, divided into fifteen provinces and governed by a general council. The project was rejected. But the Huguenots, none the less, continued to profit by their situation in the State until they encountered the energetic policy of Richelieu.

CHAPTER X

Protestantism in the Countries of the North

The Netherlands

THE Low Countries were one of the most active centers of mysticism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. There Protestantism penetrated under its pseudo-mystic form.[1]

We saw above how a Swabian furrier, Melchior Hofmann, and a fanatical baker of Haarlem, John Matthys (or Matthiessen), became ardent propagators of Anabaptism.

The imagination of the Netherlands was inflamed by the theories of these men, who called themselves prophets and who preached a "reign of God" without church or dogma, community of goods, a return to "the primitive state," and obedience to nothing but "the inner light." [2] Charles V, on whom the Netherland provinces depended under the name of the "Circle of Burgundy," tried to stifle the movement by stern repression. But the Spanish Inquisition, which he introduced, bore too much the character of a political institution to bring about peace of conscience. Neither prison nor torture

[1] We limit ourselves to a presentation of the major phases of this period. It seems that the time has not yet come for a final and detailed account of this movement. In 1907 the Peter Canisius Society decided to write a history of the Reformation in the Netherlands and several committees were appointed to gather the materials for it. Since then it has become evident that the ground was not sufficiently prepared by the publication of sources and by monographs on separate subjects. At one of its meetings (April 15th, 1909) the Canisius Society, after an address by Doctor Schoengen (state archivist at Zwolle), resolved to appeal to other scientific societies, especially the Nugensfonds and the Wetenschappelijke Vereeniging onder de Katholicken, in order to bring about the publication of a series of sources and monographs relating to the Reformation in the Netherlands.

[2] On Hofmann and Matthys, see Janssen, III, pp. 329, 334.

subdues deeply stirred souls. External peace was obtained; but the internal ferment continued, and was made use of by the leaders of the Protestant revolt in the Low Countries.

These leaders found other accomplices. In the "Circle of Burgundy," which had no more political than religious unity,[3] an impoverished nobility coveted the goods of the Church, a poorly organized clergy was lacking in priestly training,[4] a newly-rich bourgeoisie was losing the rugged family virtues in a life of luxury,[5] and the whole nation with difficulty tolerated the yoke of the Spaniards. Yet the people remained deeply attached to the Catholic religion: they would not see their faith shaken until the day when nobles and bourgeois should succeed in confusing, in their eyes, the cause of the religious Reformation with that of national independence. Their customs, moreover, retained certain remnants of barbarism. The right of private revenge was still guaranteed by Netherland law at the end of the fifteenth century.[6] A clever and unscrupulous leader, William of Nassau, prince of Orange, surnamed "the Silent," [7] took advantage of all these revolutionary elements to stir up the country. As "stathouder" of the three provinces

[3] In the whole Circle there were only four episcopal sees: Utrecht, Cambrai, Tournai, and Arras. The major part of the Circle was under German jurisdiction; one part, under that of French bishops. Münster, Osnabrück, Minden, and Rheims had domains in the Circle of Burgundy.

[4] A Dutch Catholic historian says: "Erasmus of Rotterdam is, in this matter, a severe but reliable witness. Though he observes neither dignity nor measure in his raillery, yet he is not a calumniator. When the Reformation entered a country which had supplied the author of *The Praise of Folly* with his principal satires, it found there a well-prepared soil." (Meuffels, *Les martyrs de Gorcum,* Paris, 1908, p. 30.)

[5] At the time of Charles V's abdication, Flanders was enjoying unparalleled prosperity. "At Antwerp," says Janssen, "they transacted more business in a month than in two years at Venice at the time of its greatest prosperity. Excessive well-being had corrupted their morals." (Janssen, IV, p. 265.)

[6] Petit-Dutaillis, *Documents nouveaux sur les mœurs populaires et le droit de vengeance dans les Pays-Bas au XV^e^ siècle.*

[7] Namèche, *Guillaume le Taciturne;* Tacheret, *L'évolution religieuse de Guillaume le Taciturne.* William the Silent was successively Lutheran, Catholic, and Calvinist. At bottom he was religiously indifferent.

of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht, he accorded hearty welcome, in the cities under his authority, to all political exiles, all proscribed heretics, and even criminals of every kind. These last, in the expectation of rich plunder, might be made into an armed force, terrible in its devotion to him. Philip II, though a wise and prudent ruler, was a man whose haughty bearing and too marked preference for the Spaniards displeased the Netherlanders; his coming in 1555 was the signal of rebellion. The unpopularity of Cardinal Granvella, the Spanish king's minister, and Philip's awkward evasions, made the situation worse. Agents from England and Huguenots from France stirred up the people. In 1564 Theodore de Bèze declared that the day of revolt had arrived.[8] Philip II ordered (October 17th, 1565) the strict execution of the former decrees of Charles V.[9] "Good," cried William the Silent, "this is the beginning of a fine tragedy." [10]

Some weeks later, a meeting of about twenty nobles at a palace of the Prince of Orange drew up an alliance, the famous *Compromis des Nobles,* which soon received three hundred signatures. It is related that, when Margaret of Parma, regent of the Netherlands, became alarmed at this movement, Count de Barlaymont said to her: "Madame, are you afraid of these beggars?" The nobles proudly assumed this name "Gueux" (beggars) which had been cast at them in disdain. Soon afterwards, a great meeting of nobles decided that representatives of all the provinces should unite with the nobility in a solemn procession to demand religious liberty from Margaret and to agree to defend it by force of arms against the King of Spain. Everywhere the Gueux were acclaimed as saviors of the country. The *Compromis des Marchands* (Merchants' Alli-

[8] Janssen, IV, p. 269.

[9] The bishops of Ypres, Namur, Ghent, and Saint-Ouen, and several theologians met at Brussels and petitioned Philip II to moderate the edicts. The King would hear nothing of it. (See Lettenhove, *Les Huguenots et les Gueux,* I, p. 264.)

[10] This saying is reported by Vigilius, *Vita Vigilii,* p. 45.

ance), the work of the upper bourgeoisie, promised the money needed for the contemplated resistance. In spite of the edicts, Calvinist ministers preached in the open air and at the city gates of Antwerp, Ghent, and Bruges. The lulled fanaticism of the old Anabaptists awoke and the collection of criminals, to whom William the Silent had granted ready hospitality, broke loose. "Popular excitement," says a Protestant historian, "soon burst into deeds of violence. In the course of August, churches and chapels were wrecked and images of the saints—emblems of 'Roman idolatry'—were pulled down and demolished. It was like a tempest passing with lightning speed over the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, seizing unexpectedly on everyone, increasing the exaltation of the Calvinists, terrifying the Catholics and the government, deranging the stubborn but prudent calculations of the Prince of Orange. A countless number of masterpieces of the great painters and sculptors of the Middle Ages were thus destroyed in a few days by the blind fanaticism of the unrestrained multitude. The magnificent cathedral of Antwerp and many other churches, which were veritable art museums, lost all their treasures." [11]

Philip's anger was extreme. Cardinal Granvella and Pope Pius V [12] advised him to go to the Netherlands in person. He preferred to send the terrible Duke of Alva on a punitive expedition against the rebels.

The victor of Mühlberg, who had crushed the Protestant

[11] Paul Frederick, professor at the University of Ghent, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* V, p. 185. Says another Protestant author: "There is no doubt but the destruction of images was premeditated or tacitly permitted by these gentlemen of the League." (Bor, quoted by Janssen, IV, p. 273.) For information as to the popular agitation, knowingly stirred up by foreign emissaries, see Lettenhove, *op. cit.,* I, p. 355.

[12] The prudent advice given to Philip II by Cardinal Granvella may be seen in Gachard, *Correspondance de Philippe II,* I, pp. 201, 489, 518, 534, 560, 594, 599; II, p. 41. In Janssen, *Schiller als Historiker,* p. 56, may be found a justification of Granvella in the matter of the accusations brought against him by certain Protestants. On Pius V, see Gachard, I, p. 488; Lettenhove, I, p. 470.

forces of Germany in 1547 and had ruled Italy with an iron hand, reached Holland, preceded by a reputation for unconquerable and merciless energy. Contemporaries describe him as "an old man, tall and thin, with a long, sparse beard." "He ruled the Netherlands," says Cardinal Hergenröther, "by arrests and torture, firmly resolved to maintain the Catholic religion in the provinces or to destroy them." [13] Sinister rumors circulated, mingled with calumnies. Two apocryphal writings distributed by the Gueux announced that the Spanish Inquisition and King Philip II had decreed the death of all Netherlanders. While this appeared unlikely to many, yet it none the less contributed to arouse the people. The *"Gueux de mer"* (Waterbeggars) lent their support to the *"Gueux de terre"* (Landbeggars) and traversed the sea as pirates. William the Silent treated with Coligny and also received subsidies from the Protestants of Germany. The people as a whole, until then strongly attached to the Catholic religion, began rallying to the Prince of Orange, whom they regarded as a defender of the fatherland against the foreigner. The raising of heavy taxes in the name of the King of Spain [14] served to detach the sincerest believers and most loyal subjects from the Spanish cause. "It was not," wrote Granvella, "an inclination to heresy and revolt that put arms into the hands of the Netherlanders; it was the harsh treatment meted out to them by the Spaniards."

The Calvinists took advantage of the popular uprising. Following the taking of Brielle by the "Waterbeggars," in 1572 nineteen priests and monks were put to death at Gorkum out

[13] Hergenröther, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* V, p. 492. For details, see Janssen, IV, p. 280; Gachard, II, pp. 4–6.

[14] These taxes were known by the name of hundredth, twentieth, and tenth. The Duke of Alva required each inhabitant to pay him, once for all, the hundredth part of the value of his property. Besides this, in all business transactions, he reserved for himself a twentieth levied on immovable property, a tenth on movable goods.

of hatred for the Catholic faith. They met their end with admirable fortitude. Nicholas Pieck, guardian of the monastery of the Friars Minor, defended his faith to the last breath against the objections of the heretics and, to encourage his brethren to die nobly, was the first to ascend the scaffold. Godefried of Mervel, a humble brother sacristan, when he was being hoisted for hanging, cried out: "Lord, pardon them, for they know not what they do." Godefried van Duynsen thus addressed his executioners: "Make haste, for I see the heavens open." [15] Pius IX canonized (June 29th, 1867) the eighteen martyrs of Gorkum.

The pacific measures undertaken by Don Luis of Requesens (1572–1576), successor to the Duke of Alba, accomplished nothing. It was too late. The ambitious William of Orange, who had officially passed over to Calvinism, aspired to rule the Netherlands. On December 8th, 1576, a treaty of reconciliation, on the ground of national defense, united Catholic and Protestant representatives of all the provinces against the Spanish domination. This was known as the "Pacification of Ghent." It stipulated a general amnesty and the recognition of William of Orange as the King's lieutenant in the revolted provinces. Requesens' successor, Don John of Austria, the victor of Lepanto, was obliged to approve the Pacification of Ghent. On the question of national autonomy, the opposition seemed invincible.

A goodly number of devout Catholics with difficulty gave their support to an alliance that seemed to make them approve the Calvinist acts of violence. In 1579 a new governor, Alessandro Farnese, duke of Parma, after a series of negotiations that showed him to be a statesman of the highest order, succeeded in winning the provinces of the south to his cause. They concluded (January 6th, 1579) the "Union of Arras," in op-

[15] Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VII, pp. 212–355, repeats the celebrated report of Willem Estius. See *Les martyrs de Gorkum* (in the series *Les saints*).

position to which the Calvinist provinces of the north formed (January 27th) the "Union of Utrecht." The Pacification of Ghent was broken. By the Union of Arras the future Belgium was preserved in the Catholic faith, whereas the Union of Utrecht laid the foundation of the Dutch Republic. In this latter region Calvinism became firmly established and the University of Leyden, founded in 1574, propagated the teachings of the Reformation. Contrary to his former promises, William (December 20th, 1581) forbade Catholic worship. Scenes of pillage and persecution were renewed, driving the faithful Catholics to desperate resistance.

Maritime commerce, however, more and more flourishing, enriched the Gueux families. A commercial and financial aristocracy was formed, which impressed its own particular stamp upon Holland. The United Provinces were recognized in 1596 by Henry IV and Elizabeth, took rank among European powers, and soon became a powerful support to the Protestant policy in Europe.

The Scandinavian Countries

To the north of the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, united under the hegemony of the king of Denmark, had kept the faith preached there by St. Ansgar. During the troublous period of the fourteenth century, St. Brigid of Sweden and Queen Margaret of Denmark, two women of superior mind, exercised a profound and beneficent influence on those countries. St. Brigid, by her writings, her relations with popes and cardinals, and the founding of a new Order which was destined to combine the apostolate with the contemplative life, had strengthened the bonds that united her country to the center of the Church. Queen Margaret, in the midst of schism and at a time when wars were splitting the West, conceived and carried out the courageous project of

uniting the three kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden under a a single scepter. Her efforts ended in the famous Union of Calmar. Neither in the Scandinavian literature of the time, which was limited to translations of the Bible and of poems of chivalry, nor in the expressive and rudimentary religious art, was there any sign as yet of the influence of the Renaissance.

The three kingdoms were soon to be abruptly separated from Catholic unity by the political designs of two ambitious and covetous rulers.

Christian II assumed the government of the united kingdoms at the age of thirty-three (1513). He had but one aim: to make himself master of the Church as well as of the State. "He promulgated new legislation which reduced bishops to a status, as it were, of humble chaplains . . . He forbade the clergy to acquire landed property either by purchase or inheritance . . . Here and there we find such significant expressions as these: 'Bishops must preach the Gospel; the Gospels contain nothing about monastic vows; priests must not buy land unless they are willing to marry.' Such provisions indicate his Lutheran tendencies. But there is every reason to believe they were exclusively political." [16] Yet, about 1520, Christian invited Martin Reinhard, a follower of Melanchthon, to come so that he might make him a professor at his university. And to his uncle, Frederick of Saxony, he expressed a desire to see Luther.

Luther rejoiced at this news and wrote to Spalatin (March 5th, 1521): "Martin [Reinhard] informs us that the King [Christian] is getting after the papists." [17] Melanchthon confirmed the news, adding that Christian "had some bishops decapitated and some monks drowned." [18] The news

[16] Jules Martin, *Gustave Vasa et la Réforme en Suède*, p. 108.
[17] De Wette, I, p. 570.
[18] *Corpus reformatorum*, I, p. 364.

was only too true. In Sweden and Norway, as in Denmark, Christian confiscated the property of bishops and monks, proceeded with pitiless severity against any who resisted, and openly favored the preaching of Lutheran doctrines.[19] "No good is accomplished by gentleness," he wrote to Erasmus; "the most effective means are those which weaken the body." As he displayed a merciless rigor and unexampled rapacity, not only toward the clergy, but also toward the nobility, the Swedish nobles rebelled. Gustavus Eriksson, son of one of his victims, raised an army, defeated the Danes, and had himself proclaimed king of Sweden (June 15th, 1523) under the name of Gustavus Vasa.[20] The work of Queen Margaret of Denmark was destroyed; that of St. Ansgar and St. Brigid was gravely endangered.

The new King of Sweden, wishing to change an elective monarchy into an hereditary and absolute kingdom, sought especially to crush the power of the nobility and clergy. "The subjection of the Church seemed above all indispensable to him for the accomplishment of his designs. Using now trickery and now violence, he attained his purpose, and nowhere was the Caesarian work of the Reformation established more speedily and in such an open, complete, and lasting manner." [21]

It was during a stay at Lübeck that Gustavus became acquainted with Lutheran doctrine. Olaf and Lars Petri (or Peterson), two brothers of Swedish origin, but trained at Wittenberg, were his able and devoted helpers: the former was appointed court preacher, the latter professor at the University of Upsala. Olaf preached Luther's doctrine on the marriage of priests and became married himself. The archbishop of Upsala and the bishop of Vesteras were put to death

[19] Jules Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[20] The name Vasa comes from the Swedish word for sheaf (*Vase*), which figured on the escutcheon of Gustavus Eriksson.

[21] Jules Martin, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

(February, 1527). As the new teaching found little favor with the Swedish people, Vasa played the hypocrite. "We wish no other religion," he said, "than that which our ancestors followed";[22] and he furnished letters of recommendation to Compostela pilgrims. But at the same time, by ruse or force, he became possessed of the property of the monasteries.[23] In 1529 the Senate published the celebrated act known as the Recess of Vasteras, the second article of which decreed as follows: "Considering that the revenue of the Crown is so small and that that of the Church and of bishops comes from the generosity of the laity and that the ambition of prelates often gives rise to troubles, the said revenues will revert to the Crown and the bishops' suites will be regulated by the king. The same will be true of the property of cathedrals and chapters. There will first be deducted merely what is needed for the support of the persons concerned. As to the monasteries, since they have long been administered by incapable hands, the king will provide a good manager for them."[24]

"By the year 1545," says the latest biographer of Gustavus Vasa, "the religious revolt of Sweden may be regarded as achieved. Save for an attempt of Calvinist propaganda under Eric XIV and an interesting but transient attempt at Catholic restoration under John III and his son Sigismund, the future king of Poland, the Lutheran Church of Sweden has kept, to our day, the essential traits that it received from the strong hand of Gustavus. And it is in the same sense that Charles IX and Gustavus Adolphus succeeded in organizing it."[25]

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 316. On the value of Church property in Sweden at that period, see pp. 199–204.

[24] The text may be found in the Registers of Gustavus Vasa (1861 and the following years). Quoted by Jules Martin, p. 360.

[25] Martin, p. 489.

Other Countries

Protestantism was not destined to conquer any other great kingdom. Elsewhere Protestant heresy succeeded in penetrating only by slow infiltration. The Lutherans entered Poland early and were followed by Calvinists, Zwinglians, and Socinians. In that country, undermined by intestinal divisions, these various sects succeeded (1570) in forming a sort of confederation under the name of "Consensus Sendomiriensis." In Hungary, Lutheranism was propagated by students from Wittenberg, but was soon dominated by Calvinism, which expressed its dogmatic formulas in the *Confessio Hungarica.* Italy did not succeed in forming a Protestant Church or in formulating a confession of heretical faith. But from Italy came "Peter Martyr" Vermigli, who died at Zurich, Bernardino Ochino, who became a professor at Oxford, and Vergerio, who died while a professor at Tübingen. It was by the spread of Erasmus' works and under his patronage that ideas subversive of Catholic dogma entered into Spain. About 1560, Pope Paul IV became seriously alarmed. But the progress of error was arrested by the rigor of the Inquisition and by the activity of illustrious theologians, of whom we shall have to speak later on. For a moment the Lutherans turned hopeful eyes toward the Greek schismatics. In 1559 Melanchthon took the first step in that direction by sending the Augsburg Confession to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Somewhat later the Calvinists of Holland made a like attempt, but with no great success. Despite the common hostility against Rome which animated the two churches, there was too deep-rooted incompatibility between the mobile and shifting Protestant heresy and the fixed and immovable mass of Oriental schism.[26]

[26] Later on, in the seventeenth century, the patriarch Cyril Lucaris made profession of Calvinism. But this defection cost him his life.

With this last attempt ends the history of the Protestant movement among the Christian nations in the sixteenth century. If Luther seemed to personify it in himself by his genius and the celebrity of his conduct and if in the end the religious question did dominate it, yet it would not be exact to say that the Wittenberg friar began it, or that a religious idea was its sole starting-point. In fact, the Protestant revolt broke out, not only in Germany, but nearly everywhere in Europe, well before Luther's rebellion. In 1517, three years before the destruction of the papal Bulls by the friar of Wittenberg, the possessions of the Church had aroused the cupidity of King Christian of Denmark and his nobility. The violent attacks of the Netherland aristocracy on the monasteries began at the same period. At the very outset of the century, the Lollards were preaching anarchy in England. The armed bands which overran France in 1514, demanding the partition of property, knew nothing of Lutheran doctrines. When Luther proclaimed his defiance in 1520, the freebooting knights of Franz von Sickingen were already ravaging Germany. Nowhere, moreover, do we see the revolutionary spirit showing itself as an outburst of oppressed consciences or as a spontaneous movement or protest against the abuses of the Roman Court. The economic crisis that had just upset the world of wealth and toil, the social crisis which gradually dispossessed the old feudal nobility of its influence and property, the political crisis which gave birth to great centralized absolute monarchies—all these crises amply explain that universal uprising of starving peasants, covetous lords, and ambitious princes, pouncing upon the old régime, or rather upon the goods of the Church, which, in their eyes, were its most tangible expression. Luther's cry of revolt furnished a watchword to those unbridled passions.[27] The confederates of the Bund-

[27] "Döllinger, Janssen, and, more recently, Evers, have shown that the Protestant Reformation was the consequence of a political and national rather than of a re-

schuh sacked monasteries in the name of the "pure Gospel" quite as the Jacobins of 1793 sacked them in the name of fraternity. The religious point of view, which we must assume in writing this Church history, should not make us forget the important social side of the beginnings of the Reformation. Neither should it close our eyes to its political consequences. The consolidation of the absolute power of rulers,[28] the diminution of public liberties,[29] the increased bitterness of the class struggle—such is the situation which the sixteenth century at its close bequeathed to the seventeenth. "It is those countries which adopted the Reformation," says a Protestant historian, "whose political evolution is the least advanced." [30] Lord Molesworth, who was thoroughly acquainted with the Protestant North, remarked in 1692 that "in the Roman Catholic religion, with the head of the Church in Rome, is a principle of resistance against unlimited power, . . . but the whole northern population of Protestant countries have lost their freedom since they exchanged their religion for a better." [31] Donoso Cortés wrote: "Wherever the power of the

ligious movement." (Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism,* p. 82.) As the philosopher Balmes says, "if men have wandered so much in the definition and explanation of Protestantism, it is because they have not sufficiently observed that it is not only a fact, common to all ages of the history of the Church, but that its importance and its particular characteristics are owing to the epoch when it arose. . . . In place of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, let us suppose Arius, Nestorius, and Pelagius . . . it will all lead to the same result." (Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in Their Effects on the Civilization of Europe,* p. 29.)

[28] "Rulers ought to know," says Luther, "that there is nothing better for them to do than to subdue and dominate the common people." Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles. The confiscation of Church property, moreover, permitted Protestant rulers to dispense with the aid of their states and thereby bring about the destruction of public liberty. Besides, the disturbances of demagogy called for a monarchistic reaction.

[29] The régime established at Geneva by Calvin and in Scotland by Knox was that of a stern inquisition; and the uprisings of the peasants in Germany led to the restoration of serfdom by the decrees of 1633, 1648, and 1654.

[30] Georges Pariset, in his work, *L'état et les églises en Prusse sous Frédéric II,* quoted by Baudrillart, *op. cit.,* p. 312.

[31] Quoted by Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches,* p. 83.

Church was weakened, the civil power has seen its own might increase: the most certain guarantee of the liberty of the human race is the independence of the Church." [32]

[32] Donoso Cortés, quoted by Martin, *De l'avenir du protestantisme et du catholicisme*, p. 335. Cf. Cortés, *Lettres et discours*, p. 25.

PART III

The Catholic Reformation

CHAPTER I

The Catholic Reformation and the Popes of the Sixteenth Century

(1521–1600)

THE question of reform, which was a subject of much concern to Christians of the fifteenth century, was temporarily relegated to second place by the artistic and literary movement of the Renaissance. But after the death of Leo X (1521) it again began to stir the whole Church. In those scholarly and critical studies which so intensely absorbed the minds of intellectual men, in that sometimes insolent contempt for decadent Scholasticism, in that ill-defined mysticism which troubled many souls, in that spirit of independence which showed itself among the nations, in that exaggerated cultivation of ancient arts and letters, in the too clever political machinations of churchmen, and in the excessive magnificence of the Roman Court, everywhere good and evil were oddly commingled, and the need of a strong restoration of good order was felt. The revolutionary doctrines which an excommunicated monk spread under the name of Reformation did but increase the disorder. The wind of anarchy was blowing on institutions and on the souls of men.

Once again the Church found within herself the power of regeneration. However much the popes were absorbed by perplexing and difficult external affairs, they ceased not to labor at this great work. Bishops, too, assembled in the ecumenical Council of Trent, under the authority of the supreme pontiff, placed upon it the seal of their infallible magisterium. De-

vout persons among the laity, saintly religious, simple clerics, and humble women accomplished the work of regeneration, some by bringing the old monastic Orders back to their pristine austerity, others by founding new Orders under papal direction, all of which strove against heresy, carried the faith to distant lands, and caused sanctity to flourish in Europe. The sad century of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth of England was likewise the glorious century of St. Pius V, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis Xavier, and St. Teresa.

Adrian VI

No one perceived the situation with greater clearness and courage than Adrian VI, the successor of Leo X. In an instruction drawn up for his nuncio Chieretaro, he wrote: "We know that evil has spread from head to foot, from pope to prelates: we all have deviated from the right way; to abuses in things spiritual are added abuses in the exercise of power; all has been vitiated." [1]

The traits of him who spoke thus were in singular contrast with those of his predecessor. A contemporary author relates that at the conclave after Leo X's death, when the Sacred College could not agree on any one of the cardinals present, Cardinal Julius de' Medici, the future Clement VII, proposed the choice of a Netherlander, namely, Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht, professor at Louvain University, a man little known at Rome, but who was reputed to be a saint. Cardinal Cajetan seconded this choice, which at once received a majority of votes.[2] When this humble priest took possession of the sumptuous apartments of Leo X and Julius II, he scarcely altered his rule of life, even retaining his old housekeeper and

[1] Raynaldi, XI, p. 363.
[2] Sanuto, XXXIII.

continuing his practice of rising very early in the morning. Everyone was edified by the regularity of his exercises of piety, the simplicity of his meals, and the strict conscientiousness with which he transacted daily business.[3] In appointments to ecclesiastical preferment, "never," says Ranke, "did a pope show himself more reserved; he proceeded with scrupulous conscientiousness." [4]

But when Adrian VI undertook the most essential reforms, he encountered insurmountable obstacles. When he suppressed the excessive income attached to certain offices of the Roman Court, it was objected that he could not do so without wronging those who had licitly bought those lucrative posts at a just price. When he purposed changing the régime of marriage prohibitions and dispensations, he was told that by such reforms he would weaken the discipline of the Church. When he considered a revision of Church legislation in the matter of indulgences, it was pointed out to him that, whereas he would be doing something quite agreeable to Germany, he would risk the loss of Italy. At every attempt of reform he saw a thousand difficulties rise up. There could be no feeling of sympathy between the Italian people, habituated to the pomp of the Medici, and the austere Pontiff who, at sight of the ancient statues, could not help crying out: *"Proh! Idola barbarorum!"*

The Turkish peril, which became very threatening after the taking of Rhodes, and the French peril, which Italy considered equally menacing after the plots hatched in Sicily, perforce diverted the Pope from his schemes of reform. Moreover the brief duration of his pontificate—scarcely a year and a half—would not have allowed him to bring any major undertaking to a conclusion. On his tomb were engraved

[3] *"In sacrificio quotidianus et matutinus est. Ira non agitur, jocis non ducitur. Neque ob pontificatum visus est exultasse; quin constat graviter illum ad ejus famam nuntii ingemuisse."* (Sanuto, XXXIII, *Litterae directivae ad cardinalem de Flisco.*)

[4] Ranke, I, p. 73.

these words, written by himself shortly before his death: "How unfortunate that there are times when the best-intentioned man is obliged to yield." Even though yielding, Adrian VI at least left the example of a great effort.

Clement VII

Julius de' Medici became pope and took the name of Clement VII. Could he and would he profit by that example? Being an Italian, a humanist of lofty culture, made familiar with world affairs through the important posts he had held under Leo X and Adrian VI, the new Pope, it seemed, would meet none of the obstacles that paralyzed his predecessor's efforts. The instructions given by him to Campeggio, his nuncio at the diets of Nuremberg and Augsburg,[5] show how sincere and earnest were the reforming intentions of this intelligent, pious, and moderate Pope.[6] "Seldom have high expectations been so cruelly disappointed as they were in Clement VII . . . His pontificate was one of the most disastrous known to history. The chief cause of this is to be found in the inconceivable irresolution and pusillanimity of the Pontiff, who lost courage at once and let the helm fall from his grasp. It needed the royal spirit, the bold determination, the mighty strength of a Julius II." [7] The failure of his nuncio, Campeggio, at the Diet of Nuremberg, whither he had been sent in 1524 to urge the execution of the Edict of Worms and to devise means of reforming the clergy, seems to have discouraged the Pope from any attempt in the matter of discipline and morals.

To save at least the temporal authority of the Holy See appears to have been the aim of all his efforts. Although favor-

[5] Janssen, I, p. 347; III, p. 183; Ranke, I, p. 85.
[6] Pastor, VII, p. 8.
[7] *Ibid.*; cf. Fraikin, *Nonciatures de Clement VII*, I, pp. 52, 79.

ably inclined toward the Spaniards, whose fellow-countryman he was through family origin, and being a personal friend of the Emperor, he was unable to stop in time the successive invasions of imperial forces into the peninsula. In the summer of 1326, Italy rose up for its deliverance. The Pope was obliged to place himself at its head against the invaders. But no tactics were more fatal for him. The next year the Connétable de Bourbon with imperial troops and the Lutheran bands of Frundsberg took Rome and sacked it. After the grief of combating his own compatriots, the unfortunate Pontiff had the humiliation of seeing the Holy City sacked by his former friends in a campaign for which he might justly hold himself responsible.[8] Nor was he happier in his negotiations with Francis I, to whom, in 1533, he promised the hand of his niece, Catherine de' Medici, for the future Henry II. The King of France promptly allied himself with the Landgrave of Hesse, that redoubtable protector of Protestantism in Germany.[9]

Meanwhile Charles V, master of all Italy, insistently demanded the calling of a council. But, it was his idea that the council should be convoked in the name of the Emperor and should deliberate under his influence. In an interview between Clement VII and the Emperor at Bologna, in 1534, the Pope, having let Charles V take the initiative in a matter that rightly belonged to the former, saw himself in the sad necessity of opposing the meeting of such an assembly. What would he have gained in seeing heresy condemned if he thereby made himself dependent upon imperial authority?[10]

[8] Guicciardini, XX, p. 2. Charles V, displeased at the alliance between Clement VII and Francis I, had sworn to take vengeance on "this villainous Pope." (Dispatch of the Venetian ambassador Contarini, quoted by Fraikin, I, p. 35.) Details of this campaign will be found in the diplomatic dispatches published by Fraikin, I, pp. 360–394.

[9] Ranke, I, p. 90.

[10] On the Bologna interview, see Pallavicini, *Histoire du concile de Trente,* bk. 3, ch. 12. Clement VII wrote to the Emperor: *"Nessun remedio e piu pericoloso, per*

Not only did all the arms, spiritual and temporal, against heresy seem to break in the hands of the ill-fated Clement VII, but the next year he saw the great kingdom of England separate itself from the Church. A third of Europe was now withdrawn from obedience to the pope. To the east, Hungary, that country which had been Europe's bulwark against Islam, was overcome in 1529 by the Turks in the famous battle of Mohacs, and, torn by internal strife, ceased to exist as a nation.

The very excess of so many evils produced an awakening of national and Christian sentiment. While European rulers were concerting for resistance to a possible Turkish invasion, religious life and apostolic zeal were being renewed in the Church through the foundation of the Theatines, Capuchins, Somaschi, and Barnabites, and when the most unfortunate of the popes [11] went down to his grave, the most militant of religious Orders, the Society of Jesus, had just come into being.

Paul III

A pope, whose worldly youth seemed not to have predestined him for the part of a reformer, took advantage of this movement. Alessandro Farnese had already shone in the school of Pomponio Leto and the society of Lorenzo de' Medici among elegant humanists. From his studies and lofty associations he retained an air of nobility and dignified bearing and distinguished manners, which won everybody to him. In 1534, at the age of sixty-six, he succeeded Clement VII

partorir maggiori mali [*del Concilio*] *quando non concorrono le debite circonstanze.*" (*Delle lettere di principi,* II, p. 197.) "The Pope," says Pallavincini, "was not inclined favorably toward the council, for he judged this remedy but little suited to the nature of the general evil and also injurious to his interests at the time." (*Histoire du concile de Trente,* bk. 2, ch. 10, nos. 1 sqq.)

[11] Pastor, VII, p. 8.

and took the name of Paul III. He took his duties seriously. His first anxiety was to spare Europe and the Church the evils of a Mussulman invasion. With consummate circumspection and address, in an interview at Nice, he sought to reconcile Charles V and Francis I, arranged the marriage of one of his nephews to a natural daughter of the Emperor, and of one of his nieces to the Duke of Vendome, a prince of French blood.

While the imperial troops were crushing the forces levied by the Smalkaldic League, Paul III devoted all his efforts to the work of reform. By the appointment of a commission on studies—including such illustrious cardinals as Sadoleto, Pole, Contarini, and Caraffa [12]—by the approbation of the Society of Jesus (1540), by the reorganization of the tribunal of the Inquisition (1542),[13] by the institution of a strict censorship of books and the publication of an Index (1543),[14] and lastly by the opening of the Council of Trent (1545), Paul III launched the question of the Catholic Reformation on the way to positive realization. He published numerous Bulls to cure various abuses,[15] and, attacking those which he saw nearest and which were not the least difficult to abolish, he exhorted the cardinals "to bring about an exemplary reform in themselves and in the whole Roman Court." [16] He strove to introduce the most deserving men into the Sacred

[12] On this *Consilium delectorum cardinalium ac aliorum praelatorum de emendenda Ecclesia,* see Mansi, Suppl. V, p. 537, and Le Plat, *Monumenta,* II, p. 596.

[13] The Bull *"Licet ab initio"* (July 21st, 1542). *Bullarium* (Coqueline's ed.), IV, p. 211. Cf. Ranke, I, pp. 157–163.

[14] The universities of Paris and Louvain had already published catalogues of condemned books, *Indices librorum prohibitorum.* (D'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus,* I, append. p. 37, and II, pp. 134–136.) Paul IV's Index, published in 1557, is the first to have the present form. New arrangements of the contents and important revisions were added by Benedict XIV in 1757 and Gregory XVI in 1841.

[15] On his reforms in the Curia, see Raynaldi, 1536, no. 37, arts. 54 sqq.; 1539, no. 22; 1540, no. 65.

[16] Pallavicini, bk. 3, ch. 17, no. 3.

College. The granting of unwise favors to members of his family [17] was the great fault of his life, a fault that cost him bitter tears. He died, sadly repeating the Psalmist's words: *"Si mei non fuerint dominati."*

Julius III

Undoubtedly the members of the Sacred College, in placing the tiara on the head of Cardinal del Monte, who had given proofs of wisdom and energy, did so in the hope of imparting a new impulse to the reform movement. But the responsibilities of high office, stimulating and ripening for some, are disconcerting and dejecting to others. This latter was the case of the new Pope, who, in memory of Julius II, whose camerlengo he was, took the name of Julius III.

The ambitious and restless Farnese family, loaded with riches and dignities by Paul III, disturbed Italy, negotiated alliances with the King of France, and provoked reprisals by the Emperor. "We never thought," wrote the Pope, "that God would so afflict us." [18] On the other hand, the attitude taken in the council by certain bishops, especially by the German deputies, disquieted him.[19] By suspending the assembly (1552) he seemed to free himself from a painful care. Thenceforth the down-hearted Pontiff appeared to become more and more unconcerned with public duties. He withdrew to a villa near Porta del Popolo and there seemed to forget the rest of

[17] Among these we must number a son and a daughter, publicly acknowledged by him as such. Were they born of a legitimate union? There is no authentic document revealing that Alessandro Farnese had been married before receiving Holy Orders. The fact that contemporary chroniclers speak of the Pope's children without showing any feeling of horror over the irregularity of their birth, is not a peremptory argument in that unfortunate sixteenth century. Paul III's son, Pier Luigi, after a life of ambition and intrigue, met a wretched end, being assassinated at Piacenza in 1547.

[18] From a letter (April 13th, 1552) to C. Crescentio.

[19] A letter, dated January 16th, 1552.

the world except, alas, his relatives and some of their friends, on whom he showered dignities and privileges beyond measure.

Marcellus II

It was to ward off every appearance of such abuses that the virtuous and austere Marcello Cervini, elected pope April 11th, 1555, under the name of Marcellus II, began by removing the members of his family to a distance and by economically regulating the expenses of his court. "That reform in the Church, of which others only talked, he exemplified in his own person." [20] After a pontificate of only twenty-one days, death took him just as he was preparing a detailed programme for the restoration of the Church. To him the Romans applied the verse written about another Marcellus:

> *"Ostendent terris hunc tantum fata, neque ultra*
> *Esse sinent."*

Paul IV

He was succeeded by a man seventy-nine years old, but one who in his whole exterior—in his poise of body, his quick step, and the bright gleam of his eye—manifested the ardor of youth. It was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, who, along with St. Cajetan, had founded the Order of Theatines and who, in conjunction with Cardinal Alvarez of Toledo, had persuaded Paul III to reorganize the Inquisition. He took the name of Paul IV. This severe and incorruptible old man, who knew that he had not made the slightest move to be elected pope, always affected to consider himself as directly chosen, not by the Sacred College, but by God. In a Bull issued on the oc-

[20] Ranke, I, p. 212.

casion of his accession, he took a solemn oath "to be scrupulously painstaking in carrying out the universal reformation of the Church and the Roman Court." On the very day of his coronation he sent two monks of Monte Cassino to Spain for the purpose of restoring monastic life there. He established a congregation for this universal reform and sent to the different universities the list of subjects on which this commission was to deliberate. The people of Rome, whom he exempted from various taxes, erected a statue to him.

The generous but somewhat excessive ardor of the vigorous reformer proved a snare for him. No one tolerated the yoke of Spanish domination with greater indignation than he, who had known the free Italy of the fifteenth century. Carlo Caraffa, one of his nephews, who had personal grievances against Philip II, imparted his resentful animus to the Pope. The patriotic Pontiff swore to restore independence to his country and declared war on Philip. Deceived by the hypocritical exterior of his nephew Carlo—a soldier abandoned to every vice—he raised him to the cardinalate. Another nephew he made duke of Palliano; a third, marquis of Montebello. Once again nepotism, that plague of the Church ever since Sixtus IV, seemed to spoil the whole reform work of a zealous pontiff.

The defeat of the papal troops and the invasion of the States of the Church by the Duke of Alva (September, 1556) obliged Paul IV to put an end to his warlike undertakings. At last he opened his eyes to the shameful conduct of his nephews. One day, as he was speaking to his cardinals on the subject of reformation, Cardinal Pacheco interrupted him, saying: "Holy Father, you must needs begin this reform with yourself." These words struck his upright and sincere heart. He convoked the Sacred College (January 27th, 1559), called God to witness that he knew nothing of his nephews' infamous behavior while he was showering dignities on them, and at once

deprived them of all their offices and exiled their families. Carlo Caraffa was forcibly expelled by the Swiss guard. The young marchioness of Montebello, finding her palace closed, was obliged to wander without asylum until a poor tavern gave her hospitality.[21]

The Pope then turned his attention to the reform of the Church with the same inexorable rigor.[22] In his honor a medal was struck, showing Christ driving the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. Paul IV boasted that he did not let a single day pass without striking at some abuse; it must be acknowledged that a large number of his reform measures were so well conceived that they passed into the decrees of the Council of Trent. By preference he turned his attention to the Inquisition, which he had labored to reform and strengthen.[23] He never failed to be present at the regular Thursday meeting of the Holy Office, extended the jurisdiction of that body to additional crimes, and bestowed on it the right of using torture to discover accomplices. He saw to it especially that the inquisitors should never be hindered by consideration of person and did not hesitate to cite even barons and cardinals before this high ecclesiastical court.

On August 18th, 1559, although laid low by disease, he had

[21] For more details of this whole affair, see Ancel, *La disgrâce et le procès des Caraffa,* in the *Revue Bénédictine,* April, 1907.

[22] See Ancel, *L'activité réformatrice de Paul IV,* in the *Revue des Questions Historiques,* July 1st, 1909.

[23] To avoid going astray in this complex question of the Inquisition, it is necessary to distinguish between: "1. the episcopal Inquisition and the beginnings of the papal Inquisition in the thirteenth century; 2. in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Inquisition well established, organized with all its regulations, exercising a powerful but inconstant pressure on the whole Christian world, often opposed by political events; 3. in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Roman Inquisition, organized against the precursors of Luther and the Reformation and making itself felt especially by the action of the Holy Office, an action that was moral rather than material; 4. the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisition, reorganized by Catholic monarchs at the close of the fifteenth century, an institution at once ecclesiastical and civil, with a power unknown to the other inquisitions." (Jean Guiraud in the *Revue pratique d' Apologétique,* November 1st, 1909.)

the courage to assemble the Sacred College about his death-bed and breathed his last while recommending to it the cause of the Holy See and of the Inquisition. The people of Rome, mindful of his nephews' vices and attributing to him the invasion of the States of the Church by the Spanish forces, upon learning of his death, demolished his statue and set fire to the palace of the Holy Office.[24]

Pius IV

One of Pius IV's first cares was to resume the work of reform by less violent methods. He was the son of Bernardino Medici, a modest farmer on public land. Being of a mild, peaceful disposition and an engaging manner, he offered a striking contrast to his predecessor. The work of disciplinary restoration, which the strong hand of Paul IV had so energetically started, he would doubtless not have dared to undertake. But he abolished none of his predecessor's ordinances and contented himself with putting a measure of moderation and mildness into their application. He did not like the Inquisition and openly declared his aversion to it, but he added that, since learned theologians approved this supreme means of combating heresy, he had nothing to alter in what had been established.

[24] Gebhart (Lavisse and Rambaud, IV, p. 36) speaks of Paul IV as "this ascetic, a heavy eater and a drinker of mangiaguerra, the terrible black wine of Vesuvius." Ranke (I, p. 217) says: "He would sit for long hours over the black, thick, fiery wine of Naples, his usual drink (it was of a sort called mangiaguerra)." Both these statements depend on a passage of Navagero, a Venetian ambassador, whose meaning is quite different. The ambassador relates merely that the Pope was obliged to prolong his meals because of a disease. As for "the terrible black wine of Vesuvius," mentioned by Gebhart, it was a wine produced from the soil of Naples, and Paul IV used it because he was a Neapolitan. These are Navagero's words: "He used to eat in public like other popes, till his last indisposition, which was mortal. When he lost his appetite, he often spent three hours at table. After taking his repast, he always drank wine of Malvoisie, with which, however, as his intimates say, he merely washed his teeth. At dinner he drank of the wine called mangiaguerra." (Quoted by A. de Saint-Chéron in Ranke, I, p. 217.)

Once only was he seen to resort to stern measures; and it may well be that these measures must be attributed to the pressure of public opinion, rather than to his own initiative. The rigorous attitude adopted by Paul IV against the members of his family had not appeased the hatred which the people nourished against the Caraffas. A sad domestic tragedy drew attention to them. The Duke of Palliano through jealousy killed his wife. His trial brought to light other accusations, falsehoods, evil conduct of all sorts, murder, and brigandage. Presently it became a trial of the whole family of the late Pope. One might say that the resentment accumulating in the popular soul for three-quarters of a century against the "wicked nephews" of various popes—the Riarii, the Rovere, the Borgias, the Medici, and the Farnese—now broke loose against the Caraffas. The documents of the trial which have come down to us show that the charges frequently passed beyond the bounds of justice and truth. St. Pius V later on had the trial reviewed and punished the recorder.[25] The Marquis of Montebello escaped punishment by flight, but the Duke of Palliano, Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, and two of their near relatives were put to death. This terrible example put an end to an abuse, the origin of which is comprehensible,[26] but the results of which had been most harmful to the Church and society.

Pius IV himself, it is true, did not seem free from nepotism. By heaping dignities on the head of his nephew, Charles Borromeo, by summoning him to his side and associating him in his government, he intended to make him one of the great personages of the Roman Court. The grace of God made him a saint. The fine qualities of the nephew covered up whatever may have been faulty or abnormal in his precocious elevation. To St. Charles Borromeo no less than to Paul IV should be

[25] Pallavicini, bk. 14, ch. 4.

[26] See above, p. 155.

credited the formation of the commission of eight doctors who later became the "Consulta," the efforts to enforce canonical residence on the part of the bishops, the skillful foiling of the maneuvers of the Emperor and the French Court, who were trying to obtain authorization for the marriage of priests and communion under both species for the laity.[27] It was also St. Charles who thwarted the efforts of those princes, favorable to the Protestants, who were calling for a new council. By his decisive intervention, the labors of the interrupted council were resumed on Easter, 1561.[28] In short, the promptness, zeal, prudence, and regularity which were remarked in the conduct of affairs, both temporal and spiritual, were due to the energetic Cardinal's initiative.

Among the last acts of this great pontificate were the Bull *"Benedictus Deus"* (January 26th, 1564), approving all the decisions of the Council of Trent, the establishment of a commission to interpret them and to execute its decrees, the promulgation of the rules of the Index, the imposition of a profession of faith on all the clergy and all professors or graduates of any faculty, and lastly the impulse given to the founding of seminaries.[29]

St. Pius V

Holiness entered the councils of the head of the Church with Cardinal Charles Borromeo; with Michele Ghisleri, who took the name of Pius V, it ascended the papal throne. He was born of humble parents at Bosco, near Alessandria, became a Dominican at the age of fourteen, and head of the Inquisition under Paul IV. Everywhere he gave the impression of austere

[27] Raynaldi, 1560, nos. 55, 56.

[28] By way of prudence, the Pope did not expressly say that the new gathering would be a continuation of the previous council, but he refused to summon, in explicit terms, a new council.

[29] Pallavicini, bk. 24, ch. 9.

virtue, boundless charity, and angelic piety. St. Charles Borromeo declared that he had greatly contributed to his election. "Having known the Cardinal of Alessandria for a considerable time," he says, "and conceived a high esteem for him on account of his singular holiness and zeal, I judged that no more fitting pontiff than he could be found to rule the Christian commonwealth wisely and well. I therefore took up his cause with all my might." [30]

The burden of governing the Church, far from turning the new Pope from the practice of virtue, was an additional stimulus to his piety. On seeing the holy Pontiff pass in procession, with his sharply defined features and deep-set eyes revealing the austerity of his virtues, while his clear look and gentle smile betokened the goodness of his heart, the people could not repress a feeling of admiration and liking for their new pope. Pius V took as his motto that no one can rule others save by ruling himself. He began his reform with the highest dignitaries of the clergy. He granted few dispensations, privileges, or favors. An auditor general was appointed by him to make a report on all archbishops and bishops not residing in their dioceses.[31] Pastors were ordered, under the severest penalty, not to leave their parish churches.[32] The relations between monks and the diocesan bishops were strictly regulated.[33] Strict cloister was imposed on nuns. As lay interference had been one of the most frequent causes of the decline of churches and monasteries, the watchful Pontiff forbade all infeudation of church property under whatsoever pretext, and decreed excommunication against any and all who should aid such action, even though only by advice.[34]

[30] A letter (February 26th, 1566) to the Cardinal of Portugal, quoted by Giussano, *Life of St. Charles Borromeo*, I, p. 72.

[31] *Bullarium*, IV, p. 303.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

[34] Bull *"Admonet Nos,"* March 29th, 1567.

What the Pope's holiness accomplished in the government of the universal Church, the holiness of several bishops and religious did in dioceses and monasteries and thence in the lay world. St. Charles Borromeo reinvigorated the clergy by the foundation of seminaries, by holding numerous synods, and especially by his exemplary life, while the young Society of Jesus and the zealous Congregation of the Oratory spread a taste for solid piety in all classes of the lay world.

The saintly Pontiff, mindful of the importance of liturgical prayer and catechetical instruction in the life of the Church, published a new Breviary and Missal, drawn up "after the most ancient and authentic manuscripts that could be found in the Vatican Library and that could be acquired elsewhere." [35] By means of the Roman Catechism he saw to it that the chief dogmatic propositions of the Council of Trent were placed within reach of all.

After this work of internal restoration, which may be considered the principal object of his labors, Pius V turned his attention to the general situation of the Church, threatened from without by the Turks and torn within by heresy. We know how, by countless efforts, he gathered the armed forces of Christian nations under the command of Don John of Austria and had the happiness to see a great victory won over the Ottoman fleet at Lepanto (October 7th, 1571), thus ending the maritime preponderance of the Turks. On this occasion he instituted the feast of Our Lady of Victory which, under Gregory XIII, became the feast of the Rosary.

Three great Catholic nations—France, Italy, and Spain—had thus far resisted heresy. To King Charles IX of France, Pius V sent troops to be used against the Huguenots. For the preservation of Italy and Spain he saw no other salvation but

[35] *"Collatis omnibus cum vetustissimis nostrae vaticanae bibliothecae aliisque undique conquisitis emendatis atque incorruptis codicibus."* (Bull *"Quoniam vobis,"* July 9th, 1568.)

the wise and firm organization of the Inquisition. While he encouraged rulers, notably Philip II, to combat heresy, we must at the same time recognize that he opposed the King of Spain when the latter sought to make of the Holy Office a tool of the government or when he exercised inordinate zeal in the pursuit of heretics and infidels. The Pope rescued Archbishop Carranza of Toledo from the hands of the royal Inquisition,[36] aided in the reconciliation of relapsed Judaizers, assured holy communion to those condemned to death,[37] and reminded King Philip II of the stipulations made by different popes for the protection and peaceful evangelization of the American Indians.[38]

To avoid vexatious meddling by Catholic kings in the affairs of the Church, "he ordered the publication, not only at Rome, but throughout the Church, on Holy Thursday, of the ancient Bull *'In caena Domini,'* [39] which was a summary of the old public law of that Christian commonwealth which was disappearing." [40]

But the two great nations that heresy wrenched from the Church did not cease to be the object of the Pontiff's anxious solicitude. Through the negotiations of Commendone, his able ambassador to the court of Emperor Maximilian II, and especially by the encouragement given to missions and Catholic schools, Pius V prepared the ground for Germany's Catholic reaction in the next century. The moral assistance which he gave to Mary Stuart and his efforts to arouse an effective Catholic resistance to the religious despotism of Elizabeth, were unhappily not seconded.[41] At the time of his death Pius V was contemplating an expedition to England, with

[36] See Balmes, *op. cit.*, ch. 37.

[37] See the Brief, published by Falloux, *Vie de saint Pie V*, ch. 14.

[38] See the Pope's letters in Falloux, ch. 15.

[39] Published by Urban V in 1363.

[40] Brugère, p. 823.

[41] On this intervention see Jules Martin's scholarly article, *"Grégoire XIII et l'Irlande,"* in the *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 1909, no. 2.

himself at its head. One of his last utterances was this: "If needful, God will raise up from the very stones the man we need."

Gregory XIII

St. Pius V died May 1st, 1572. The providential man for whom he had hoped was not found. But the impulse given to the Catholic reformation in the whole Church was such that a mediocre pontiff, coming after that great pope, would feel himself drawn into the movement. Ugo Buoncompagni of Bologna, who took the name Gregory XIII, was by no means mediocre. His youth had been passed in the midst of worldly pleasures and affairs,[42] but after his ordination to the priesthood his moral conduct was irreproachable and his pontificate truly great. By the encouragement which he gave to the development of works of education and instruction, he assured the continuation and extension of the reform movement set on foot by St. Pius V. Newly established religious Orders supplied him with numerous well trained workers, and he made good use of them. At Rome he founded colleges for the English, Germans,[43] Greeks, and Maronites. In various countries he created or reëstablished twenty-three other colleges, including those of Vienna, Prague, Graz, Olmütz, and Vilna; and his concern for education reached even to Japan. He wished to make of the Collegium Romanum, founded by St. Ignatius (1550), a "College of all nations." On the day of its opening there were delivered twenty-five addresses in different languages. In 1584 no less than 2700 students were enrolled in this celebrated college, from the alumni of which have come almost five hundred archbishops or bishops, more

[42] The birth of his son Giacomo is under the same cloud as that of Paul III's children.

[43] To the Collegium Germanicum he joined, in 1580, the Hungarian College, founded by him three years before.

than fifty abbots or generals of religious Orders, and eleven martyrs.

In each of these foundations may be seen the Pope's bigness of mind. At the Greek College were to be received boys between the ages of thirteen and sixteen, not only from countries under Christian domination, but also from those countries which were under a schismatic or infidel government. And they were to have Greek professors. The students wore the kaftan and Venetian cap; they were to be educated in a thoroughly Greek way so as constantly to bear in mind that they were to return to their own country. They were to be left the use of their own rite, as also of their native tongue.[44] Ever concerned with the extension of Catholic influence in the East, Gregory XIII founded a printing establishment for fifty Oriental languages and sent in search of manuscripts to Egypt, Ethiopia, and various countries of the East. In 1582 he published the official edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici,* the revision of which had been ordered by Pius V in 1566.

The best known of Gregory's reforms is that of the calendar—a reform that had long been desired. By the time of Gregory XIII the Julian calendar was ten days behind astronomical time. The Council of Trent, by fixing certain important feasts according to their relation with the seasons, made a revision of the calendar indispensable. Luigi Lilio, a Calabrian astronomer, pointed out a simple, easy method to correct the inaccuracy of the former calendar. The pope submitted the proposal to a commission of learned men and, after sending it to the Catholic courts, solemnly published the reform by Bull (February 13th, 1582).

Shortly before his death, the tireless reformer published a new edition of the Roman Martyrology, carefully corrected by the learned Cardinal Baronius.

The enterprises of this pontificate were not accomplished

[44] *Dispaccio a Antonio Tepolo,* March 16th, 1577.

without enormous expense. Baronius calculated that the help which Gregory gave to poor youth for their education cost two million francs. Lorenzo Priuli estimated the amount expended yearly by the Pope for works of piety at 200,000 scudi. The twenty-two Jesuit colleges founded by him considerably increased his budget. On the other hand, the strict reformer had firmly resolved never, for the relief of his finances, to have recourse to new taxes, nor to spiritual concessions, nor to the sale of church property. What other means was there? Gregory, guided by a too absolute idea of social justice, considered that a large part of the castles and property of nobles depending on the Holy See should devolve to the papal patrimony, either through the extinction of the line that had been invested therewith, or by failure on the part of beneficiaries to carry out the obligations imposed. Nothing seemed more logical in theory, but nothing was harder or more dangerous in practice than to appoint revision commissions and to enforce the restitution of property unrightfully held.

On all sides arose claims and suits. Many nobles thus threatened took a hostile stand to defend their possessions. In the ensuing disorder, old factions revived. In the churches no less than on the streets and public squares there appeared the Guelf, with threatening air and ready dagger, wearing a feather on the right side of his hat, and the Ghibelline, equally threatening, with a feather on the left side. Nobles organized themselves into robber bands under the leadership of great lords, such as the Piccolomini, Malatesta, and Orsini. "Even though I am a lost man," declared one of them in the Pope's presence, "I will at least have the satisfaction of defending myself." Commonplace bandits assumed a knightly attitude. A certain Marianazzo, in refusing a pardon offered him, said: "I prefer to live as a bandit, for thus I find greater consideration and safety."

The Pope, realizing his political error, dropped all the con-

fiscation proceedings. But it was too late. Moreover, Gregory was never happy in his political designs. The league that he attempted to form against the infidels was dissolved: Venice withdrew from it to make peace with the Ottomans; Philip II himself concluded a truce with the Turks. The steps taken by Gregory to oppose Elizabeth's persecution, to sustain the League in France, to intervene in Portugal between rivals for the throne, were crowned with no better success. In his last illness he was often heard to say: *"Tu exsurgens, Domine, misereberis Sion."* [45] But his diplomatic failures should not make us forget the importance of his great reforms.

Sixtus V

The internal dissensions that disturbed the States of the Church at Gregory's death were but superficial. A strong hand sufficed to remove them. The Roman Church, its savor lessened and its brightness dimmed at the close of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, again appeared, thanks to the pontificate of St. Pius V and Gregory XIII, as the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Another great pontiff, Sixtus V, undertook to restore to her, under new forms, the strong internal organization and the political and social hegemony which she had lost since the Middle Ages.

There is nothing to indicate that Sixtus V ever exercised, as has been charged, the occupation of a swineherd. Being the son of an humble gardener in the Marches of Ancona, it is possible that in early childhood he may have tended some swine. What we do know with certainty about his youth is that, when nine years old, he entered the Franciscan monastery at Montalto, that three years later he took the monk's habit, that he made rapid progress there, and already had a reputation as a preacher at the age of nineteen. His sermons

[45] "Thou shalt arise, O Lord, and have mercy on Sion." (Ps. 101:14.)

in the Church of the Holy Apostles at Rome in Lent, 1552, showed uncommon eloquence, a profound grasp of theology, and particularly a knowledge of men and affairs that was surprising in a young monk, scarcely thirty years old. St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Philip Neri, who heard him, took him into their friendship; Cardinal Caraffa (the future Paul IV) and Cardinal Ghisleri, who became St. Pius V, often visited him in his monastic cell; the noble Colonna family boasted of its friendly intercourse with him. Everyone saw in Fra Felice Peretti—such was the young monk's name—a man destined to become some day a pillar of God's Church. He was successively prior, general of his Order, bishop, cardinal, and, at the death of Gregory XIII, was unanimously chosen pope.

His first care was to suppress brigandage. Thanks to salutary punishments, thanks especially to the coöperation which he was able to exact from the needs of the other States of the peninsula, the bands of brigands disappeared.

The sad plight of the papal exchequer was the second plague of the papal domain. Sixtus V remedied this by a financial system that we have no need to set forth here. The chief elements were an increase in the number of salable public offices and the organization of *monti,* or public loans, either redeemable or not. Only an active, watchful control could escape the risks of this system. But the new Pope was capable of exercising such control. The salable offices were granted only to competent and worthy persons; the operation of the *monti* was subjected to a strict supervision. Soon a treasury of three million scudi in gold and one million in silver testified to the success of these undertakings.

The reëstablishment of public order in the States of the Church and the prosperity of the papal finances were, in the Pope's mind, merely preliminary measures.

The central government of the Church no longer corresponded to the new needs of the times. The multiplicity and variety of affairs which the Pope had to treat required that he have about him especially competent men to handle these matters properly. It was this consideration that prompted the formation of two "congregations," that of the Council and that of the Index, by Pius IV and Pius V. Not only did Sixtus V confirm and extend the powers of these two congregations, but he generalized the system and divided the various matters among fifteen congregations, which constituted, as it were, so many ministries. He took thought also of the organization and membership of the Sacred College. The number of cardinals was fixed at seventy and divided into three orders: six cardinal bishops, fifty cardinal priests, and fourteen cardinal deacons, requiring for admission to their ranks that the candidates be tonsured clerics with minor orders. He enlarged the Vatican printing establishment, where he published an official edition of the Vulgate, a difficult and considerable work, which was finished in 1590.

As European States were acquiring greater autonomy, it was important that Rome, the center of Christendom, should impress the world with her supremacy by her sovereign majesty. Sixtus planned to make Rome so great and beautiful that everyone, monarch or subject, visiting it, would recognize it as the capital of the world. The colossal aqueducts that he constructed after the example of the ancient Caesars, the monumental obelisk which he moved to the front of the Vatican Basilica, the majestic cupola of St. Peter's which he was so eager to see rise and in the construction of which he employed six hundred men, working night and day, the placing on the capital of an ancient Minerva, her spear replaced by an enormous cross, and many other works to which the great Pope's name is still attached, had only one aim in view, an aim

recalled by an inscription which Julius II placed in the Strada Julia: "to show the majesty of the newly recovered sovereign dominion."

Sixtus' plans went still farther. He flattered himself with the prospect of putting an end to the Turkish Empire, since he had reached an agreement with Persia in the East and thought that Russia would join the Catholic nations in this enterprise. The conquest of Egypt was also seriously considered by him. He conceived the project of joining the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, thereby reopening the ancient commerce of the world. It was his ambition to organize regular pilgrimages from all countries, even America, to Rome, the universal city and capital of the world. Time and means were lacking to carry out all these plans, some of which were, perhaps, chimerical. But if we reckon merely the undertakings brought to a successful issue, we are seized with admiration when we reflect that a pontificate of only five years sufficed for this great Pope to realize them.

Urban VII, Gregory XIV, Innocent IX, Clement VIII

The pontificates of Urban VII (1590), Gregory XIV (1590–1591), and Innocent IX (1591) were too short to advance the reform work of St. Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Sixtus V. The pious, hard-working Clement VIII (1592–1605) was unfortunately diverted therefrom by numerous and weighty concerns of external policy: the reconciliation of King Henry VI of France with the Holy See, peace negotiations between Spain and France, recovery of the fief of Ferrari, and the execution of the famous Beatrice Cenci and her accomplices.[46] Yet Pope Clement VIII found leisure to publish a new edition of the Breviary, to have a revision made

[46] Cf. Rinieri, *Beatrice Cenci, secondo i constituti del suo processo.*

of the Vulgate, and to establish a special commission for the controversies on grace.

The celebration of the great jubilee of 1600, which brought three million pilgrims to Rome, testified to the veneration which the Holy See enjoyed at the close of the sixteenth century. After the Rome of the Middle Ages, governing princes and peoples by virtue of a commonly accepted international right, was founded the Rome of modern times, influencing the world by the centralization of her spiritual government, the prestige of her moral greatness and supreme influence.

CHAPTER II

The Catholic Reformation and the Council of Trent

IN the Protestant revolt, everything either heralded Luther or followed him; in the Catholic reform movement, everything was either a preparation for the Council of Trent or a consequence of it. The frantic insurrection of one man in the name of individual liberty, and the sage restoration of faith and morals by a hierarchically organized assembly, in the name of tradition: these are the two generative facts of modern times.

Difficulties in the Way of Convocation

The reform of the Church, reform by a council, universal reform from the head to the lowliest members, *in capite et in membris:* these demands, rising on all sides about the middle of the sixteenth century, sometimes so clamorous as even to drown the noise of theological controversy and international strife, the Catholic Church was the first to make heard. Without going back to St. Bernard, St. Peter Damian, or further still—for all the saints were, each in his own way, reformers, and every council was a work of reform—we saw above that at the Council of Vienne (1311) a bishop, commissioned by the Pope to prepare the programme of the council's deliberations, placed at the head of the agenda the celebrated formula: "To reform the Church in head and members."

This formula had been repeated by the legists, the leading scholars of the fifteenth century, and by the Protestants of

the sixteenth, and Emperor Charles V took it up on his own account. The legists and Gallican doctors saw therein an occasion to renew in a council the declarations of Constance and Basle; the Protestants purposed setting up, in opposition to the personal authority of the pope, the authority of a representative assembly of the faithful to consecrate their doctrines; [1] the Emperor hoped to find in the reform measures of a future assembly a common ground of mutual agreement between the two parties, Catholic and Protestant, which were disrupting the moral unity and political solidarity of his empire.

The Holy See reluctantly lent itself to the execution of a project pursued with such intentions. Even in the circle about the Pope, among those whose tranquillity was endangered by reform [2] and whose interests ran the risk of being jeopardized, this enterprise encountered systematic opposition. But more and more urgent grew the need of providing a remedy for the perils that beset the Church. Along with the necessity of reforming the Church, there was the need of safeguarding it from a false reform which would be a hundred times worse than the abuses to be cured. On May 22nd, 1542, Paul III published a Bull convoking a universal council on November 1st of that year.[3] After placing himself under the protection of God, the Pope begged everyone's coöperation to assure the integrity of the Christian religion, the reform of morals,

[1] Although Luther and the Protestants several times called for the summoning of a council, they always insisted that it be national, German, as they declared at Smalkalden in February, 1537. They always required, as a preliminary condition, the rejection of the primacy of the pope, as they did at Ratisbon in 1531, when Paul III, out of consideration for the wishes of Charles V, instructed his legate Contarini to arrange some common ground of mutual understanding with them. In the course of the Council of Trent, they followed the same tactics. (Sarpi, *History of the Council of Trent*, p. 118; Pallavicini, bk. 3, ch. 15.)

[2] At the first serious mention of calling a council, the price of all the salable offices at the Roman court fell considerably. Cf. Ruscelli, *Delle lettere di principi* (French translation by Belleforest, *Epitres des princes*, III, bk. 5).

[3] Raynaldi, 1542, no. 13.

the concord of Christian princes and peoples, and the means of repelling the attacks of the infidels. Such was the magnificent programme of the council. From that moment, for more than twenty years—that is, until the final closing of the assembly in 1563—three successive popes, Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV, in the face of a thousand obstacles, continued the holy undertaking with persevering and prodigious energy.

After some hesitation, the Pope, in agreement with the Emperor, fixed upon the city of Trent as the place for the meetings of the Council. "This city, located on the Adige River in the Italian Tyrol and ruled by a prince-bishop, Madrucci, in conjunction with a delegate of the Court of Tyrol (Ferdinand, brother of Charles V), was situated at the opening of the lowest Alpine pass and consequently easily accessible from Germany—a fact calculated to give confidence to the Protestants. . . . For one going from France to Italy, Trent was not far from the Turin-Milan-Venice highway. As for the Spaniards, any Italian city would have been equally convenient in the matter of distance." [4]

However, on the day fixed for opening the Council, only a few bishops from Italy and the neighboring regions of Germany were present. In vain the three papal legates waited seven months for the arrival of the other members of the episcopacy and the envoys of Catholic rulers. It seemed that the cause of the Council was lost. Hostilities, which reopened between Francis I and Charles V, were the chief obstacle. After the Peace of Crespy, Paul III (November 19th, 1544) again summoned the episcopate to meet on March 14th, 1545. This postponement was not to be the last. Charles V, besieged by the Protestants, now seemed to hesitate; he would liked to have had a simple congress, like that of Ratisbon, where Catholics and heretics might freely seek a mutual understanding by

[4] Deslandres, *Le concile de Trente et la réforme du clergé catholique au XVI^e siècle*, p. 8.

means of reciprocal concessions. The indefatigable Pontiff, despite his age and labors, redoubled his activity and fixed May 3rd for the opening of the assembly. This time it was France that defaulted. Francis I, vexed on account of all the compromises obtained by his adversary, recalled the four French bishops who had answered the summons.

Opening of the Council

After fresh negotiations and convocations, on December 13th, 1545, the solemn opening session was celebrated by four cardinals, four archbishops, five generals of religious Orders, three abbots, and thirty-five theologians. Paul III had enjoined that they should proceed to their labors, whatever might be the number of those present.

The Pope did not preside in person over the Council, and his two successors imitated his prudent reserve. But he chose as legates, to speak in his name and to act in his place, three eminent cardinals; Giovanni Maria del Monte, who succeeded him as Julius III, Michele Cervini, afterwards Pope Marcellus II, and Reginald Pole, the astute and active diplomat who, though exiled from England, his fatherland, because of the independence of his loyalty, was to show the same courageous loyalty in defense of the Roman Church.

After the solemn opening ceremonies of the Council, the assembled prelates at Trent took account of the extreme seriousness of their mission. The regrettable delays attending their gathering had given time for the malcontents to bestir themselves, for passions to be let loose, and for the Protestant revolt to gain ground. All the old heresies of the Middle Ages —those of the Vaudois, Albigenses, Beghards, Brethren of the Free Spirit, Wyclifites, and Hussites—seemed to be concentrated in Protestantism. All the ecclesiastical abuses formerly suppressed by Gregory VII and Innocent III, seemed

to arise again in the Church. It was a question of defending or reconstructing the whole *ensemble* of dogma and discipline.

In the liturgical processions and solemn prayers at the beginning of their labors, the fathers of Trent doubtless saw above them, with the eyes of faith, the Spirit of Wisdom and Knowledge who had assisted the fathers of Nicea, Ephesus, and the Lateran. They likewise remembered that for three centuries the genius of a great saint had given Catholic theology remarkable precision and clearness. In the midst of their assembly hall they placed, as a treasure whence they would draw sound doctrine, the *Summa* of St. Thomas.[5] For some time past Scholastic theology had taken on new life. The need of wrestling with Protestantism had led it to abandon the abstract and futile discussions which overloaded it in the preceding century. It was worthily represented at the Council of Trent. The young and valiant Society of Jesus sent the eloquent Salmeron, one of the first companions of St. Ignatius, the learned Claude le Jay, whom the bishop of Augsburg

[5] There is a frequently repeated Dominican tradition that the *Summa* of St. Thomas was placed "on the altar" by the fathers of the Council of Trent, at the side of the Bible and the papal bullaria. We have been unable to find mention of this fact in any contemporary document. Neither Soto nor Cano, both Dominicans who were present at the Council, nor the Dominican Gravina, who vigorously defended the teaching of St. Thomas at the beginning of the seventeenth century, makes the slightest allusion to any such homage paid to the Angelic Doctor. Father Sabatier, in the *Bulletin Critique* (October, 1902, p. 587), denied the validity of the tradition. Father Déodat Marie, a Franciscan, and several of his brethren in religion, took up the question in the *Bonne Parole* (October and November, 1908; January to June, 1909). From these studies it would seem that the Dominican tradition is a legend of which the first written trace is to be found in Gonet's *Clypeus thomisticus,* which appeared at the close of the seventeenth century. In the tenth edition, Gonet declared that he spoke *"sine teste,"* solely relying on the tradition of the Friars Preachers. He then refers to a certain cleric regular, Thomas Aquinas of Naples, who asserts, in his *De politica christiana* (bk. 2, ch. 6), that he has it from trustworthy witnesses that in the assembly hall of the Council there was "a table laden with a holy weight of books," among which was the *Summa* of St. Thomas; *"mensam extitisse sacro librorum pondere gravem, in qua hi sacri codices conspiciebantur, Sacra Scriptura, et sanctiones ac decreta Pontificum, sancti Thomae Summa."* On this question, see the *Revue du Clergé Français,* August 1st, 1909.

had chosen as his procurator, and the illustrious Lainez, future general of the Order, who was to hold so important a place in the Council. The Order of St. Dominic was represented by its vicar-general, Dominic Soto, the theological light of his time, the celebrated Melchior Cano, professor at the University of Alcala, in whom were joined the elegance and scholarship of the humanist and the science of the theologian, the earnest Ambrose Catharinus, of fervent piety, profound knowledge, and hardy thought even to the point of temerity. Louis Carvajal, philosopher and theologian, André de Vega, professor at Salamanca, Bernardine d'Asti, general of the Capuchins, and the eloquent bishop of Bitonto, Cornelius Musso, represented the sons of St. Francis.

The fathers' first care was to determine the order of business. The Pope, to ward off the Protestant danger as soon as possible, desired that the Council begin with questions of faith. On the other hand, the Emperor, wishing to satisfy his Lutheran subjects, through Cardinal Madrucci of Trent demanded that the reform of the discipline be first taken up. The fathers, in a spirit of conciliation, decided that both doctrinal and disciplinary subjects would be discussed simultaneously.[6] Three large committees were formed, each presided over by one of the three legates.[7] "The reason this measure was adopted by the general assembly," says Pallavicini, "was the desire to treat more subjects in less time and to debate them with less confusion; but the legates, in their inner minds, proposed by this division to break up the factions and leagues into which the bishops might be led through yielding to the influence of some vehement, eloquent, and stirring orator." [8]

From the outset there was reason to fear that the discussions would become too animated, that various currents, hard

[6] Theiner, *Acta genuina concilii tridentini*, I, p. 41.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 43.
[8] Pallavicini (Migne ed.), II, col. 62.

to stem later on, would be formed among the fathers of the Council. Questions of schools of thought divided the sons of St. Francis and those of St. Dominic, or, as someone said, the Cordeliers and the Jacobins. Moreover, the bishops from the four great nations represented in the Council—Germany, France, Spain, and Italy—readily formed four distinct groups. The German prelates, under the Emperor's influence, demanded the reform of the Church first of all; the French, too much dominated by the vacillating policy of Catherine de' Medici, inclined rather toward measures agreeable to the Protestants; the Spaniards held out strongly for the prerogatives of the episcopacy; the Italians were ready for an ardent defense of the privileges of the Roman Court. These last were by far the most numerous. The fathers wisely decided that the greatest liberty of discussion should prevail, but that the Council would determine its own policy and that dogmatic definitions would be by unanimous vote.

The Bible and the Rule of Faith

The first three sessions were devoted to the work of organization and regulation. In the fourth, fifth, and sixth sessions the fathers approached the Protestant question in its most fundamental aspect.

To acknowledge no rule of faith but the Scriptures as interpreted by private judgment, to hold that human nature is essentially corrupted to its very depth, and to hope for salvation only by external application of Christ's merits, independently of good works—such, as we have seen, was the Lutheran doctrine in its essentials.

The chief consequences of this system were the revolt against the authority of the Church and tradition, rejection of free will, and denial of any internal renovation in the soul of the justified sinner.

It was a bold move to attack, at the first stroke, the Protestant thesis in its fundamental principles. The Pope spiritedly urged it. But the Emperor was no less energetically opposed. "He wrote to Cardinal Pacheco and charged Dandini, papal nuncio at his court, to send word to the legates that it was needful to proceed slowly in this matter and that no anathema should be pronounced against the Protestants, lest they become still more furious." [9]

Some of the fathers were alarmed and urged that great circumspection be used in the matter. The majority disregarded the supposed danger and went on with the programme. Then was taken up the question of the authority of Sacred Scripture and tradition, and a deep and lively discussion began. The most extreme opinions were voiced. Some considered that "it was a spiritual tyranny to hinder the faithful from exercising their minds according to the talents God had given them and to oblige them to remain attached to the single meaning of the Fathers." Richard du Mans, on the contrary, held that "the Scholastics had so clearly expounded the doctrines of faith that one should no longer learn them from Scripture." [10] Cornelius Musso declared that between Scripture and tradition there is only an accidental difference, since both are equally the word of God.[11] The Jesuit, Claude le Jay, and the Dominican, Dominic Soto, wisely remarked that it was necessary to distinguish the matter of faith and morals on which recourse must be had to the traditional interpretation, but that, for the rest, there was no harm in leaving each one the liberty of thinking and writing, without wronging piety and charity.[12]

The result of these theological discussions, which were

[9] Pallavicini, bk. 6, ch. 7, no. 17; Sarpi, I, p. 202.

[10] Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, bk. 142, nos. 73, 74.

[11] Pallavicini, bk. 6, ch. 14, no. 3.

[12] Fleury, bk. 142, no. 74.—On Lejay's intervention, see Pallavicini, bk. 6, ch. 11, no. 8.

summed up at a general assembly (April 1st, 1546), as also the observations of canonists and exegetes on the canon of the Sacred Books, was the important decree *"De Canonicis Scripturis"* (April 8th, 1546), wherein the Council, after fixing the canon of the Sacred Books and declaring that the Vulgate translation should be held as the official text and "as authentic in public addresses, disputations, sermons, and expositions, proclaimed, 'for the suppression of petulancy of mind,' that, in matters pertaining to faith or morals, no one should attribute to Scripture a sense other than that which our holy mother the Church has given and does give." [13] The Protestants, as has been well said, "in attempting to strengthen the faith of all Christians in the Sacred Books, succeeded only in imperilling both the Christian religion and the Bible: the Roman Church, proclaiming, at the Council of Trent, the authority of tradition, saved both." [14]

Original Sin

When the question of original sin came up at the fifth session of the Council, the Emperor renewed his requests. He informed the Pope, through the Cardinal of Trent, "that he would be greatly displeased if the article were proposed." [15] But the papal legates upheld the programme fixed upon. The theologians engaged in the freest discussion (May 21st, 1546) on the nature of original sin, the manner of its transmission, its effects, and its remedy. St. Thomas had deeply explored these questions, which the prolonged controversies against the Pelagian heresy had aroused long since. The three schools—Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian—professed different theories to explain the state of the first man, his fall, and the

[13] Denzinger, nos. 783–786.—Cf. Theiner, I, p. 49.

[14] Loisy, *Histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament*, p. 256. See especially book 3, chapter 1, entitled, *"Le concile de Trente et le canon de l'Ancien Testament."*

[15] Sarpi, I, p. 202; Pallavicini, bk. 7, nos. 1–3.

manner in which the consequences of that fall affect posterity. While the disciples of St. Thomas maintained that our first parent was *created* in the state of original justice, the school of St. Bonaventure taught that this supernatural justice could have been communicated to him by God only after an act of the will on Adam's part. Despite the authority of St. Thomas, who made original sin consist mainly in the privation of original justice, the spiritual sons of St. Augustine considered it to be the fact of concupiscence and explained its transmission by a sort of Traducianism. Shortly before the opening of the Council, the Dominican Catharinus did not hesitate to attack at the same time all the theories previously advanced. How, said he, can we be responsible for a fault that is not personal to us? To justify the doctrine of original sin, he argued, our will had been implicated "in a certain manner, in God's eyes," in the will of our first parents.[16] For a time it seemed that Catharinus' eloquence and his cogent dialectic would compel the adherence of the fathers of the Council. But they did not yield to that movement, for the ardent Dominican's theory had no support in Patristic tradition.

On another point tradition was invoked by both sides. Was the transmission of original sin universal? Was the Blessed Virgin preserved therefrom? The latter was energetically sustained by the Franciscans, supported by the Jesuits Lainez and Salmeron; the Dominicans appealed to the authority of St. Thomas to defend the former. Then there was another subject of controversy: an old formula, going back to Venerable Bede, stated that man was, by original sin, wounded in his natural faculties (*vulneratus in naturalibus*). This expression pleased those who wanted to strike the Lutheran heresy as gently as possible.

[16] *"Peccatum nostrum . . . habet rationem culpae, quia aliquo modo in patre eramus coram oculis Dei."* (Ambrosius Catharinus, *De casu hominis et peccato originali*, disp. 5, p. 183.) This doctrine, admitted by Salmeron and criticized by Bellarmine, is entirely abandoned to-day.

The dispute waxed hot. The minutes of the conciliary committees and the reports of ambassadors to their rulers breathe the ardor and fever of battle. But the decree of the Council is calm and moderate. With perfect delicacy, the fathers refrained from deciding any of the questions freely discussed in the Catholic schools. They were assembled, they said, to repress a redoubtable and openly declared heresy, not to restrain liberty of thought among loyal defenders of the Church. Only on belief in the Immaculate Conception, while judging that the question was not yet timely, they expressed their inner sentiment in a clear manner. They declared and defined: (1) that the first man, fallen by his disobedience from the state of holiness and justice in which he had been constituted, in regard both to soul and body, transmitted to his descendants, not only corporal penalties, but that sin itself; (2) that this sin, transmitted to all, not by imitation, but by propagation, can be effaced only by the merits of Jesus Christ, applied to each soul, whether adult or infant, by the Sacrament of Baptism; (3) that Baptism remits and removes from the soul everything that is in the nature of sin, but leaves subsisting there concupiscence, which is not a sin, unless in the sense that it comes from sin and inclines to sin; (4) that, in this decree on original sin, the council does not mean to speak of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God.[17]

Justification

There remained the question of justification. It was the most fundamental point of Lutheran doctrine. The Wittenberg friar found his most pathetic accents of eloquence in attacking the pretended Pelagian doctrine of free will and good works, in glorifying the mercy of God, who justified man by His sole merits and covered the leprosy of inexpiable sin with

[17] Denzinger, nos. 787–792.

the mantle of His infinite goodness. When he spoke of it, it was as if his whole tormented interior life vibrated within him. No other doctrine struck such rude blows at Catholic dogma; for, as Adolph Harnack recognizes, "with this doctrine Luther opposed not only the Scholastics, but also the Church Fathers, yes, Augustine himself." [18]

The fathers trembled for a moment before the greatness of their task. The Scholastics, even St. Thomas, who on the question of original sin had been of such great help to them, offered little light on this point. Twenty years of warm controversy had illumined one by one the various aspects of the question; but no one had yet elaborated a synthesis of it. Cardinal Michele Cervini called attention to this fact and added that it would not suffice to declare: Luther has said such and such a thing, therefore it is false; but the error would have to be searched and examined without prepossession; that it also behoved them not to fall into a contrary excess, as happened to Pighius, who, in combating the Lutheran error on original sin, fell into the Pelagian heresy.

Cardinal Pacheco proposed that the question be studied by the special commissions of theologians. Cardinal Pole asked that the divine assistance be implored with all the more fervor as the question appeared most difficult. At the meeting of June 21st, 1546, a commission of theologians reduced to six points the chief questions connected with the doctrine of justification.[19] In following sessions there came to light the

[18] Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* p. 552. We may add that Luther's system was opposed to St. Paul himself, as several Protestants of our day recognize, for instance, Sabatier, *L'apôtre Paul,* pp. 319–321. Denifle, in the first appendix to his *Luther und Luthertum,* shows by verified texts in the most reliable manuscripts, that, without exception, all authors until Luther understood the *"justitia Dei"* as the Council of Trent defined it, *"non qua ipse [Deus] justus est, sed qua nos justos facit."* From this we may see what is to be thought of assertions like Hoffding's, "Christianity was here really brought back to the original principle from which it had sprung . . . Luther took as his foundation the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith." (Hoffding, *A History of Modern Philosophy,* I, p. 39.)

[19] Theiner, I, p. 159.

two tendencies that divided the council into Thomists and Scotists, the former seeming to attribute more to God's action, while the latter seemed to emphasize the free coöperation of man. At times the debate grew quite animated. Pallavicini relates, according to the acts of the council and the journal of its secretary, Massarelli, how, on July 17th, San Felice, bishop of La Cava, was so far beside himself as to seize the beard of the one disputing with him.[20]

The result of these impassioned but profound labors was the celebrated *Decretum de Justificatione,* embracing sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons, which, in the consensus of all theologians, must be regarded as the masterpiece of the Council of Trent. Its redaction was largely the work of the learned Cardinal Michele Cervini. After forcibly affirming the inexpressible weakness of man (chap. 1) and Christ's infinite mercy (chaps. 2 and 3), the Council describes in precise and striking terms the progress and work of grace in the soul of of a sinner who returns to God (chaps. 4, 5, and 6), the essential elements of justification (chap. 7), and its gratuitous nature (chap. 8); it condemns the false idea of faith held by Protestants (chap. 9), and deduces from the Catholic doctrine certain important consequences concerning the observance of the commandments, the gift of perseverance, the merits of good works, etc. (chaps. 10 to 16). Like Luther, the fathers affirm that the forgiveness of sins and of the penalty due them can come only from the merits of Christ; but they add that these merits are powerful enough to effect in a repentent man an interior renovation, and that such is the only admissible meaning of the expressions of St. John and St. Paul when they describe the effects of grace as a freeing from

[20] *Ibid.,* p. 192. "*Rixa inter episcopos cavensem et chironensem.*" (Pallavicini, bk. 8, ch. 6, nos. 1, 2.) The Bishop of Cava, excommunicated for this act, was subsequently freed from the censures incurred and permitted to resume his place in the Council.

sin,[21] an abiding peace,[22] an invincible power,[23] a renovation,[24] and a resurrection of the soul.[25]

When the year 1546 came to an end, the decree on justification was not yet promulgated. Events of exceptional gravity threatened to bring about the dissolution of the Council. The Protestants had taken up arms, and Charles V, fearing that the condemnation of the fundamental doctrine of the Reformers would exasperate them, brought all his authority to bear on the German bishops to prevent the publication of the decrees of the sixth session. There was talk of suspending or transferring the Council. But the Pope was opposed to the former solution, and when the latter was mentioned to the Emperor, he grew very angry. The crushing defeat of the Lutherans by the imperial forces settled the question. The decree on justification was promulgated January 13th, 1547, amidst universal acclamations at a public general assembly, and the seventh session opened.

The study of the Sacraments in general was now begun. The question how justifying grace is obtained, increased, and recovered through the Sacraments, was the first corollary to the question of justification. As Harnack says, Luther "here opposed Augustine no less than the Scholastics.[26]. . . Luther destroyed the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, not simply the seven. Through the three sentences: (a) the Sacraments contribute unto the forgiveness of sin and nothing else; (b) *sacramenta non implentur dum fiunt, sed dum creduntur;* (c) they are a particular form of the redemptive word of God (of the *promissio Dei*) and therefore have their virtue in the

[21] John, 8:24.
[22] John., 14:27.
[23] John, 16:23.
[24] Tit., 3:5.
[25] Col., 3:1.
[26] Harnack, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* p. 552.

historical Christ—he transformed the sacramental elements into sacramental ordinances." [27] In thirty canons the Council reaffirmed and stated in more precise terms the traditional doctrine of the Sacraments in general, and of Baptism and Confirmation in particular.

The Sessions Interrupted

The Council of Trent was about to continue its labors when a new obstacle arose. An epidemic broke out in the city. Two bishops died suddenly. The legates, by virtue of special powers received from the Pope, declared the Council transferred to Bologna. Thereupon Charles V was sorely vexed and kept the prelates of his dependence at Trent. The fathers who remained at Trent dared not perform any synodal act, and those assembled at Bologna contented themselves, from the eighth to the twelfth session, with preparing material, but published no decrees. The Emperor, dissatisfied with this inaction, then resolved to act by himself. At Augsburg he convoked two Catholic doctors and the Protestant Agricola and had them draw up a profession of faith in thirty-six articles, which he intended to impose on the Christian world while awaiting the definitive decrees of the Council: it is known as the Interim of Augsburg.[28] This merely added to the disorder, and Paul III ordered the Cardinal Legate, del Monte, to dissolve the Council.

Two months later (in December, 1549), Paul III died and the conclave chose for his successor the same Cardinal del Monte, who took the name of Julius III. This change in the papacy permitted a change in tactics. The new Pope's first act was to reconvoke the Council at Trent.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] On the Interim of Augsburg, its origin, publication, opponents, and results, see Janssen, IV, pp. 672, 681.

There it resumed its sessions and on May 1st, 1551, under the presidency of the Cardinal Legate Crescenzio, assisted by two bishops. Thanks to the long and patient labors of the theologians Cano, Lainez, and Salmeron during the five sessions at Bologna, it seemed that the work would be rapid and fruitful. The Emperor favored the resumption of the Council. But a new incident all but spoiled everything.

This time the difficulties arose on the side of France. Henry II, who was at variance with the Pope in consequence of a quarrel over the city of Parma, forbade the French bishops to take part in the Council of Trent and announced a coming meeting of a national council. A letter which Jacques Amyot, abbot of Bellozane, presented to the Council in the King's name, provoked a tempest. At the mere reading of the superscription: "To the holy assembly" (*sacro conventui*), the fathers cried out. They were a true council, not a vague gathering! And it did not pertain to the King of France thus to treat the representatives of the Church universal! In vain did the gentle and docile ambassador try to show that the word *conventus* is, in good Latin, a term of honor. "Whatsoever I might say," relates Amyot, "they obstinately stuck to that word *conventus*. . . . I went on as gently as I could, yet it was enough to have me imprisoned if I had gone a little too far." [29] Finally the incident was closed by the reading of the royal letter and the promise of a reply to the King of France at the next session.[30]

The Eucharist, Penance, and Extreme Unction

On September 2nd, 1551, the dogmatic discussions were resumed. The subject of the Eucharist was next in order. The

[29] Letter of Jacques Amyot (September 1st, 1551). Dupuy, *Mémoires*, p. 26.

[30] On this incident, see Theiner, I, p. 486; Raynaldi, 1551, nos. 29, 32; Le Plat, *Monumenta ad historiam concilii tridentini*, IX, pp. 237–242.

question had not only given rise to a great number of disputes in the Catholic schools, it had, as we know, also divided the Protestants. In formulating the condemnations, both Zwingli's symbolism and Luther's heterodox realism must be included. At the same time, in setting forth the true doctrine, there must be avoided any formula that would offend any one of the Catholic schools, to which it was intended to leave complete liberty. The fathers were in the presence of the central dogma of religion, the memorial of all the mysteries, the source of all Christian life, not merely a Sacrament like the others, imparting holiness by an outward sign, but God Himself, the author of all holiness, showing Himself under a visible sign. To avoid a repetition of the painful scenes of excitement between the followers of different schools, they decided "that the theologians, when expressing their views, should support them solely on the authority of Holy Writ, Apostolic tradition, approved councils, constitutions of the sovereign pontiffs, the Church Fathers, and the consensus of the Catholic Church." [31] In order the more surely to strike the Protestant errors, they ruled "that after each error to be condemned, there should be cited the exact places in the heretical books where such error was to be found."

These resolutions were observed. At the thirteenth session (October 11th, 1551), after a solemn Mass and a sermon in praise of the Blessed Sacrament, Archbishop Sassati read the decree on the Eucharist. In words whose majesty admirably suited the loftiness of the doctrine, "the sacred and holy, ecumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, . . . that it might set forth the true and ancient doctrine touching faith and the Sacraments, . . .

[31] *"Sententiae per theologos dicendae deducantur ex Scriptura, traditionibus apostolicis, sacris et approbatis conciliis, ac constitutionibus et auctoritatibus Summorum Pontificum et sanctorum Patrum ac consensu catholicae Ecclesiae. Utantur brevitate, et abstineant a superfluis et inutilibus quaestionibus ac etiam protervis contemptionibus."* (Theiner, I, p. 489.)

that it might pluck up by the roots those tares of execrable errors and schisms which the enemy hath, in these our calamitous times, sown in the doctrine of the faith, in the use and worship of the sacred and holy Eucharist, which our Saviour, notwithstanding, left in His Church as a symbol of that unity and charity, . . . teaches and openly and simply professes that, in the sacred Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things." [32] Then, "since it is not enough to set forth the truth, if errors are not also uncovered and rejected," the Council uttered anathemas against the various forms of Protestant heresy.

In October the consideration of the Sacrament of Penance was begun. The fathers were here in the presence of a doctrine that had been studied at great length by the Scholastics and forcibly expressed by St. Thomas Aquinas. But there was scarcely anything which Luther assailed so passionately as this. By reducing all conditions of forgiveness to interior contrition, and this to faith, by denying, consequently, the value of any external work performed by priest or penitent, Luther, according to Harnack's words, had sought to "destroy the tree of the Catholic Church." [33] The Council, in a decree of nine chapters and fifteen canons, set forth the traditional doctrine and condemned the Protestant errors.

Another decree had just been passed, establishing the Catholic teaching on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, when, at the close of 1551 and during the first days of 1552, a number of Protestant deputies, yielding to the Emperor's urgent request, appeared at Trent. Charles V hoped to accomplish much for political and religious pacification by the presence of those delegates at the Council. But he was soon

[32] Buckley, *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 70.
[33] Harnack, p. 554.

to discover his mistake. These Protestants brought to Trent exigent demands and haughty pretensions. Among other things, they required that most of the decrees already passed should be reopened to debate, that the Pope should not preside over the Council either in person or by legates, and that everything should be decided solely by rational interpretation of the Bible.

A Ten Years' Interruption

While the preliminaries were dragging on, Maurice of Saxony, the most ardent protector of the Protestants, suddenly threw aside his mask and fell upon Tryol. He very nearly surprised Charles V at Innsbruck and threatened the city of Trent at close range. The Protestant deputation hastily disappeared. Many terrified prelates took to flight. The Pope, promptly informed of the situation, published (April 28th, 1552) a Bull suspending the assembly.

The Council, thus dispersed, did not resume its labors for ten years. The unhappy incidents created by Julius III's nepotism and inconsistent policy, the ill-considered campaign of Paul IV against Spanish domination in Italy, the ensuing coldness between the Pope and Philip II, the political advance of the Protestants, and, in consequence thereof, the strange concessions demanded by the Emperor and the King of France in favor of the Reformers,[34] kept postponing the reopening of the Council of Trent from day to day. Yet time pressed. Rulers were now talking only of national councils, of conferences, colloquies,[35] or even of a universal "free and Christian"

[34] The Emperor and the French court asked: (1) that the new assembly be regarded as a new council and not as the continuation of the preceding; (2) that communion under both species be allowed the laity and that priests be permitted to marry. (Raynaldi, 1560, nos. 55, 56.)

[35] In France preparations were being made for the colloquy of Poissy.

council, understood in the Protestant sense. Pius IV, who succeeded Paul IV in 1560, saw the danger and, braving every difficulty, published (November 29th, 1560) a Bull reconvoking the council. More than a hundred bishops answered the summons, and the seventeenth session was opened at Trent, January 18th, 1562.

The situation had notably changed during the intervening ten years. Emperor Charles V had retired from the world in 1555 and died at the monastery of Saint Just, in 1558. His successor, Ferdinand I, had no authority in Italy. No longer was there any hope for a reunion of the Protestants. In northern Germany and in England their cause was almost identified with that of the political power. On the other hand, differences were accentuated between the Spaniards, Germans, Italians, and French. The French were amused at the claims of the Italian prelates; the Italians spoke of the "French sickness" and the "Spanish leprosy." Often, after discussions, mobs gathered and altercations arose in the streets with shouts of "Spain! Italy! France!" At Rome it was questioned whether the meeting of a council were not too violent a cure for the feeble body of the Church. However, the work already undertaken could not be abandoned. The question of indulgences, which had given rise to the first external disturbances of Protestantism, the question of the sacrifice of the Mass, concerning which Luther had published his most abusive pamphlets, and the questions of the Sacraments of Holy Orders and Matrimony, which required so many delicate points to be settled, had not yet been touched.

The great problem of the reform of the Church, which had been merely sketched out in the first sixteen sessions, could not remain in suspense. The Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IV, said one day, in a moment of discouragement, that the papacy could no longer be maintained except by a strong union with the

rulers. It would seem that he thought to accomplish the reform in his own name with the support of the secular rulers. But he soon recognized that such would be at best an ineffective and perhaps unrealizable half-way measure. The only practical means was to continue the Council, making sure of the adherence of the three great powers, Germany, Spain, and France. Cardinal Morone, who had long enjoyed the sympathy of the house of Austria, entered upon negotiations with Ferdinand. After assurance was given that the theologians would be allowed to meet by nations for the preparation of the decrees and that the work of reform would be actively pushed in the greatest possible accord with the Emperor's desires, Ferdinand promised his coöperation.

The work of the eighteenth session was limited to the publication of a decree on the compilation of a catalogue of forbidden books and a safe-conduct for the Protestants. The next two sessions had to limit themselves to publishing a decree of prorogation. On all sides rulers placed obstacles in the way: France insisted that the assembly be considered a new council; Spain, on the contrary, wanted it to declare itself a continuation of the preceding council. The opposition of these two nations was not, however, irreducible. Philip II, deeply concerned with the difficulties stirred up against the crown by a powerful clergy complaining of the heavy taxes that accumulated on their property, finally gave his unqualified adherence to the Council; he hoped to obtain from it a limitation of the power of his bishops. The Guises, who were then governing France, and whose political interest inclined them to the support of every measure calculated to combat the Protestant party, were easily won in favor of the Council. The Cardinal of Lorraine even went to Rome to propose conditions for an understanding between the Pope, the Emperor, and the Kings of France and Spain. External difficulties were smoothed out. The Council had

only to continue its discussions with energy and determination.[36]

The Mass, Holy Orders, Matrimony

The purely doctrinal questions were treated with relative calm. The theologians who, at the outset, hoped to win the Protestants by conciliatory formulas, were disillusioned and no longer sought any attenuation in the statement of Catholic dogma. The decree relative to Holy Communion, published at the 21st session (July 16th, 1562), declared that the Church, having received from God the power to change, in the sacraments, whatever did not affect their substance, henceforth officially approved communion under one species and made this a law for the faithful.

The 22nd session was devoted to the Mass, which the Council proclaimed to be a true expiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, in no wise derogating from the sacrifice of the Cross, but renewing it under another form. Those were condemned who rejected the use of Latin in the celebration of the Mass or who introduced therein non-religious music. At the 23rd session (July 15th, 1563) was published the decree on the Sacrament of Holy Orders, in four chapters and eight canons. Therein were set forth the sacramental nature of Holy Orders, its indelible character, the preëminence of bishops over priests, and different degrees of the hierarchy, dependent solely on the pope, to the exclusion of any intervention by the people or by secular rulers.

The doctrinal question of Matrimony was the principal subject of the 24th session, which affirmed the power of the Church to establish diriment impediments. The indissolubility

[36] Pius IV's diplomatic negotiations, under these circumstances, have been carefully set forth by Ranke, according to archival documents, especially a report of Morone which Sarpi and Pallavicini did not know. (Ranke, I, pp. 256 sqq.)

of marriage, even in case of adultery, was also defined; but pains were taken in the wording of the canon so as not to anathematize the Greeks, although condemning their error.[37] Banns of matrimony were instituted. Lastly, after long debate, the Council established the impediment of clandestinity under certain conditions which continued until the decree of August 2nd, 1907.

Disciplinary Questions

During this last period of the Council the liveliest discussions took place on questions of discipline and on doctrinal subjects that in some way touch on matters of discipline. Reform questions treated during the first sixteen sessions concerned preaching (5th session), the duties of bishops, the authority of cathedral chapters during a vacancy of the episcopal see (7th session), episcopal jurisdiction (13th and 14th sessions). No serious objections were stirred up, or at least the burning questions of the divine right of episcopal residence and of the supremacy of the pope and his legates over the council were wisely avoided.[38] The discussions were conducted with unexampled violence from the beginning of the 17th session.

The upper Spanish clergy, proud of their important place

[37] The Venetian ambassadors had asked for this way of handling the question, in favor of the Greeks who were under their domination. (Cf. Pallavicini, bk. 22, ch. 4, no. 27.)

[38] Notably at the fourth and sixth sessions (Pallavicini, bk. 7, ch. 4, no. 9; bk. 6; bk. 9, chs. 1, 2) and in the preparations for the thirteenth session (Pallavicini, bk. 12, ch. 3). Cf. also Pallavicini, bk. 15, ch. 16, 17; bk. 16, ch. 4. "The Pope ran considerable risk if certain questions had been inopportunely brought up . . . At least it was needful that the assembly be under the guidance of persons who were wholly devoted to him. All who were selected were men of great worth. The first legate presided over the council, each of the others over special commissions. By the very force of things, their part was bound to be preponderant. In the presence of an assembly made up of diverse nationalities and of often conflicting interests, they knew what they wanted; they were in touch with all the questions to be introduced or avoided; at every moment they asked instructions from Rome." (Deslandres, p. 18.)

in the monarchy, suspected Philip II, who took umbrage at their power, of coming to an agreement with the Pope to restrain their authority within just limits. The habit of striving against the King had given them a high idea of their prerogatives and prepared them to engage in a conflict with the Pope. In the first rank of Spanish prelates, both by the dignity of his position and by the extent of his theological knowledge, was the archbishop of Granada, the fiery Pedro Guerrero. At the 17th session, which marked the reopening of the Council of Trent, Guerrero, using as a pretext a certain expression employed in promulgating one of the conciliar decrees, "on the proposal of the legates" (*proponentibus legatis*), "began," says Pallavicini, "to make a noise and this noise reached the ears of the presiding officers, who directed the secretary, Massarelli, to calm the turbulent bishop." [39] Guerrero flew into a rage, declared that the expression was a novel one, not employed in former councils, and of a nature to make it appear that the Council was not free, an expression calculated to repel Protestants in good faith. A majority of the Council ignored the incident,[40] but in the following sessions the archbishop of Granada took up the subject again under another form.

Already at the 4th session the question of the divine right of residence came up in connection with the matter of bishops' preaching. The legates prudently avoided this occasion

[39] Pallavicini, bk. 15, chap. 16.

[40] The legates had, in fact, *proposed* almost all the questions submitted for debate. Under the circumstances, considering the diversity of nations and interests represented in the Council, so long as there was still any echo of the great controversies over the supremacy of the pope or of the council, this practice was a prudent one. But it was, perhaps, unwise to insert, in so many words, the new formula, *proponentibus legatis*. This served to awaken passions that were scarcely lulled. On the other hand, it would be an exaggeration to say that, during the second period of the Council, the legates were the only ones to introduce questions for discussion. As the sessions continued, the fathers became more experienced. In fact, there were discussions on many topics with the introduction of which the legates had nothing whatever to do.

of sharp controversy. But it became a subject of conversation among the fathers.[41] Was a bishop's residence in his diocese a matter of divine right or simply of ecclesiastical law? Many theologians had clearly decided in favor of the divine right, saying that they could not bring themselves to consider as dependent on a superior's will a duty so essential to the ecclesiastical organization. Moreover, was not a bishop the mystical spouse of his church? Such an opinion, replied those on the other side, is not admissible. To declare that residence is of divine right would be to destroy the authority of the sovereign pontiff, who always had exercised the faculty of employing bishops according to the needs of the Church. The first bishops were without any fixed sees, going from place to place.[42] The Pope directed Cardinal Simonetta to avoid, at any price, a purely speculative controversy, for, as he said, whether residence be of divine or of ecclesiastical right, everybody knows that it is a matter of strict and necessary command and it is more worth while to consider the means of having it observed than to indulge in discussions as to the origin of this obligation. Such, however, was not the opinion of the fathers. Once men are divided on speculative questions, these obsess them with a force and persistence rarely obtained by matters of a purely practical sort; disputes over ideas are frequently more earnest than over matters of personal concern. "During the intervals between the sessions, nothing was talked of but residence, and he would have been regarded as a most stupid man who did not side warmly with one or other of these two opinions." [43]

On April 7th, 1562, in the discussion of an article proposed

[41] Pallavicini, bk. 16, ch. 4, no. 1.

[42] *Ibid.*, bk. 16, ch. 13.

[43] *Ibid.*, bk. 16, ch. 4, no. 2. On this difficult question, see Prat, *Histoire de concile de Trente*, pp. 515–522. Theologians are still divided on the subject. A third opinion was expressed, according to which episcopal residence is of divine right, substantially, but not as to manner.

by the legates in regard to episcopal residence, Guerrero took the floor. "The subject has been proposed," he said; "not to settle it now would be a scandal." "The question," says Pallavicini, "was like an abyss into which everyone precipitated himself in panic without looking at the edge." [44] The legates were divided on the matter. As there seemed no hope of reaching an agreement, the solution was postponed until the question of Holy Orders would come up.

At the 18th session Guerrero again made himself the spokesman of episcopal and conciliar prerogatives and proposed that in the decrees these words be inserted: "The Council, *representing the universal Church.*" [45] But his motion was lost. At the next session, when urged by one of his Spanish colleagues to assure the Pope of his obedience to the Holy See, he replied: "Let the Pope give us what is ours, and we will give him what is his." [46] At the root of all this opposition was the question of the Council's supremacy over the Pope. But the issue was not faced directly. At Cardinal Morone's interviews with Philip II it was agreed that this irritating subject should be laid aside.[47] Thanks to these measures of prudence, the work of reform could advance by the promulgation of several important decrees on the visitation of dioceses,[48] the life of the clergy,[49] the duties of prelates,[50] the holding of synods, the cumulation of benefices, provisions and expectatives, meetings of regulars [51] and their mode of life.[52] The stormiest session was the 23rd; it was perhaps also the most

[44] Pallavicini, bk. 16, ch. 4, no. 5.
[45] *Ibid.*, bk. 15, ch. 21, no. 5.
[46] *Ibid.*, bk. 20, ch. 9, no. 11.
[47] *Summarium eorum quae dicuntur inter Caes. majestatem et ill. card. Moronum;* quoted by Ranke, I, p. 258.
[48] Session 21.
[49] Session 22.
[50] Session 23.
[51] These last four questions were treated in session 24.
[52] Session 25.

fruitful because of the decree on the establishment of seminaries, a decree which closed this session, and which alone, we might say, was worth all the labors of the Council.[53]

For three centuries both Catholics and heretics had been calling for a reform of the Church in its head and members (*in capite et in membris*). The Council did not close without accomplishing its full programme. At the 23rd session the impetuous Archbishop Guerrero of Granada forcefully insisted on the reform of the Sacred College. He was on the point of weakening the justice of his plea by the violence of his words when, it is said, the saintly Bishop of Braga, Bartholomew a Martyribus, was seen to rise. He was a friend of St. Charles Borromeo. The austerity of his life and his mystical gifts crowned him, as it were, with a halo of sanctity. "It is my opinion," he said, "that the most illustrious cardinals have need of a most illustrious reform." [54] In accord with this sentiment, the Council declared that the penalties for non-residence applied to cardinals as well as to others; [55] it abolished reservations and expectatives even for cardinals,[56] applied to them the regulations regarding nepotism and prelates' manner of life,[57] and offered for their meditation these fine words (second decree of the 25th session): "Whereas the administration of the universal Church depends upon their advice to the Roman pontiff, it would seem to be shameful if they did not at the same time shine so preëminently in virtue and in the discipline of their lives as deservedly to turn unto themselves the eyes of all men." [58] The Holy Father was de-

[53] Pallavicini, bk. 21, ch. 8, no. 3.

[54] *"Illustrissimi cardinales indigent, ut mihi quidem videtur, illustrissima reformatione."* This remark, reported in the *Vie de Barthélemy des Martyrs* (bk. 2, ch. 8), is to be found neither in Pallavicini nor in Sarpi. Cf. Baluze, *Miscellanea,* IV, p. 316, and *Revue des Questions Historiques,* July, 1869, p. 60.

[55] Session 23.

[56] Session 24.

[57] Session 25.

[58] Session 25; Buckley, p. 231.

clared to be bound by "that solicitude which, by the duty of his office, he owes to the universal Church," [59] and which he should show in the care of the universities placed under his protection.[60] On the other hand, it was declared "that nothing new or that has not previously been in use in the Church shall be decreed without the Roman pontiff having been first consulted," [61] and that the extirpation of abuses should be left to "the sovereign pontiff, by whose authority and prudence that which may be expedient for the universal Church will be ordained." [62]

Thus did the Church enact its own reform in head and members. But before final adjournment, the Council of Trent could not forget that the greatest abuses came not from the Church herself, but were due rather to the abusive meddling in church affairs by those rulers who so loudly called for a return to the purity of ecclesiastical life. "Protestantism," says Janssen, "proclaimed that the temporal power alone is of divine right. Naturally Catholic rulers could not admit such a doctrine. Yet long before Luther they had endeavored, according to the principles inculcated by the Roman jurists, to subject to the lay power the temporal concerns of bishoprics. At first they arrogated to themselves the right to dispose of the goods of the Church at pleasure, then the right to make all appointments, and lastly to exercise control over all the ordinances of the clergy. The Catholic duke of Saxony, George the Bearded, said with brutal frankness: 'We pilfer episcopal sees for our brethren and friends; we merely undertake to have our own penetrate the fold; whether it be by the gate or by the wall, matters little to us.' The deterioration of monastic practice, the unwonted and culpable frivolity of most rulers, brought about a prevalent custom of admitting huntsmen,

[59] Session 24, ch. 1.
[60] Session 25, ch. 2.
[61] Decree on the invocation of the saints, Session 25; Buckley, p. 215.
[62] Decree on indulgences, Session 25; Buckley, p. 253.

falconers, grooms, and other lackeys to the convents. The clergy were continually complaining of this state of affairs. In 1528 the dukes of Bavaria did indeed forbid licence and buffonery in the cloister; but their orders were no more than 'dust in the wind.' " [63] In France, Spain, and the kingdom of Naples, the Church was no less enslaved.

At its 25th session the Council of Trent laid the axe to the root of the evil. Under pain of excommunication it forebade rulers to mix in ecclesiastical affairs, required them to respect the ancient prerogatives of the clergy, refused them the right to confer benefices, forbade them to lay hands on ecclesiastical privileges or church property, adjured the emperors, kings, republics, and all rulers, of every kind and degree, to be watchful that the rights and liberty of the Church be respected.[64]

The fathers of the Council did not hide from themselves the opposition that such injunctions would arouse. Already the Emperor had threatened serious disorders if the articles about "the reform of rulers" were not withdrawn.[65] The young King Charles IX, hearing these articles mentioned, declared: "The fathers of Trent want to trim the claws of kings while sharpening their own. We will never suffer them to touch our prerogatives." [66] But the Pope was inflexible. "His Holiness thinks," wrote Cardinal Otto (September 17th, 1563), "that the reform of the clergy would bear but little fruit if the rulers failed to accept a complete reform." [67]

[63] Janssen, IV, pp. 165–169; cf. II, pp. 361–365, and Sugenheim, *Baierns Zustände*, p. 265.

[64] Session 25, *De reform.*, ch. 20; cf. session 7.

[65] Janssen, IV, p. 171.

[66] Letter dated April 28th, 1563; see Le Plat, VI, p. 194.

[67] Letter from Cardinal Otto to Father Johann von Reidt at Cologne, quoted by Janssen, IV, p. 165. It is evident how incorrect is Harnack's opinion about the Council of Trent. He says: "Even at Trent was dogma transformed into politics." (*Op. cit.*, p. 511.) On the contrary, impartial history shows that, although the majority of the Council had due respect for the opinions of all the schools of Catholic thought, they were inflexible even toward princes, kings, and emperor, whenever the higher interests of justice or of faith seemed to them to be at stake.

It was necessary to advance the 25th and last session of the Council. Pius IV, who had been ill for some time, was suffering a severe attack. It was desirable that he should survive the Council, lest it be disturbed by the conflicts incident to the election of a new pope. There was a rumor that France projected a national council, in which Protestant pastors were to take their place side by side with Catholic bishops.[68] Happily the doctrinal questions that remained to be treated—Purgatory, indulgences, devotion to the saints—had been carefully prepared by the theologians at Bologna. The decree on indulgences, which, for want of time, had not been previously introduced, was drawn up on the night of December 3rd, 1563. It could not be omitted without seeming to evade the very question that was the starting-point of militant Protestantism.

On December 4th the secretary, Massarelli, after reading the decrees, stepped to the middle of the assembly. Two hundred and fifty-five prelates were present. "Most illustrious lords and most reverend fathers," he said, "is it your pleasure that we do now bring to a close this holy and ecumenical Council, and that, in the name of this same Council, the presidents do request the Holy Father to confirm all that has been here ordained and defined?"

Each of the fathers in turn expressed his assent by the consecrated formula, *"Placet."* Guerrero alone, the eternal opponent, replied: "I agree to the closing of the Council, but I do not request the confirmation." [69] He doubtless thought that a sufficient confirmation resulted from the ensemble of the acts.

"Thus the conclusion was prosperous," says Ranke. "The Council, so eagerly demanded and so long evaded, twice dissolved, and agitated by so many political tempests, which had even in its third assembly been assailed by dangers so im-

[68] Raynaldi, 1563; Prat, p. 230.
[69] Pallavicini, bk. 24, ch. 8, no. 8.

minent, closed amidst the universal accord of the Catholic world." [70] Thenceforth Catholicism stood before the Protestant world with redoubled and rejuvenated force.[71]

[70] Ranke, I, p. 264.

[71] It has sometimes been claimed that, whereas at the Council of Trent the Church freed herself from the influence of rulers, she "unfortunately enslaved herself to Scholasticism and Aristotelianism." To this is due, we are told, a halt or a deviation in the progressive advance of Christian thought. A close study of the dogmatic definitions of the Council would doubtless show how much the fathers of Trent profited by the theological work of the Middle Ages, and particularly by the incomparable synthesis of St. Thomas Aquinas; to what extent also they were able to utilize the wealth of language and thought which Aristotle's philosophy placed at the disposal of theology. But such an inspection would likewise prove that the authoritative mind of the Church, instead of being enslaved to any philosopher's theory, even though he be the genial author of the *Metaphysica* or the *Ethica Nicomachaea,* did, on the contrary, dominate it. Although the decrees of the Council use such words as substance, space, matter, and form, it would be easy to show that these words take on an autonomous sense, deeper and more precise than that which the Aristotelian philosophy had given them, and that perhaps nowhere more than at Trent was philosophy, to use the medieval expression, the humble handmaid of theology (*"ancilla theologiae"*).

CHAPTER III

The Catholic Reformation and Catholic Rulers

"WHEN, as sometimes occurs, a great movement, agitating the whole world, is originated by an individual power, which then constitutes itself the special representative of the principle actuating that movement, the power thus in action takes then so influential a part in the collective operations of the century, it enters into relations so intimate with all the powers of the world that its history, in a certain sense, expands into universal history. Such was the epoch upon which the papacy entered at the close of the Council of Trent. Convulsed to its center, endangered in the very groundwork of its being, it had not only maintained itself, but found means to gain renewed force. In the two southern peninsulas, all influences hostile to its ascendancy had been promptly expelled, all the elements of thought and action had been once more gathered to itself and pervaded by its own spirit. It now conceived the idea of subduing the revolt in all other parts of the world. Rome once more became a conquering power, projects were formed and enterprises engaged in, recalling those proceeding from the Seven Hills in ancient times and during the Middle Ages." [1]

Situation of the Church

From an outside point of view, the situation of the Church, following the Council of Trent, appeared to be extremely crit-

[1] Ranke, I, pp. 394 sqq. This chapter of Ranke is one of the most remarkable summaries ever written of the Catholic reform after the Council of Trent. It has lost none of its value to-day.

ical and the Catholic cause seemed lost. Two-thirds of Europe had entered the ranks of heresy, which infested the two great nations on which the Church most relied in the Middle Ages. "A Venetian ambassador calculated, in the year 1558, that only a tenth part of the German people still adhered to the ancient religion.[2] In 1561 the Venetian ambassador Micheli found no province of France free from Protestantism; three-fourths of the kingdom were filled with it." [3] Italy and Spain, taken as a whole, remained Catholic; but among the people vague rumblings of heresy were heard. Of Catholic rulers, even those who lent their devoted support to the Council now chafed at seeing the Catholic reform extend to themselves and refused to promulgate the decrees of Trent. Philip II published the *Decreta Tridentina,* but with a reservation as to "the prerogatives of the crown." Catherine de' Medici declared that she was ready to execute the Council's decisions in particular, but refused to make a general promulgation of them. Henry IV did, indeed, promise to carry them out, but he did not keep his promise.[4]

A closer examination of the situation, however, was apt to give the Church full confidence. Eminent prelates, assisted by theologians of consummate knowledge and deliberating with the aid of the Holy Ghost, had proclaimed in calm and majestic language the ancient dogmas that were contested by heresy and had enriched them with new precision. As Ranke says: "The Protestant spirit alone had hitherto filled the

[2] Ranke, p. 401.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 403.

[4] The decrees had to be accepted by the Catholic rulers in order to have the force of civil laws. On the obstacles in the way of their acceptation in France, see Baguenault de Puchesse, *Histoire du concile de Trente,* pp. 272–292, where an exact and ample treatment of the question will be found. With perfect truth it has been remarked that, although France deferred publishing the decrees of the Council, yet she accepted and applied their spirit. At a meeting in 1615, the bishops decided to publish the decrees in their respective dioceses. The Catholic States of Germany, as also Portugal, Poland, Venice, and the chief States of Italy, accepted the decrees of the Council without restriction.

theatre of the world with results that held the minds of men enthralled; another spirit . . . now entered the lists, displaying similar power to make the minds of men its own, and to kindle them into activity. . . . In the Council so prosperously concluded, the popes had even gained an accession of that authority which it had been the purpose of the temporal powers to restrict, and had strengthened their influence over the national churches. . . . Thus strengthened internally, thus supported by powerful adherents and by the idea of which they were the representatives, the popes exchanged the defensive position, with which they had hitherto been forced to content themselves, for that of assailants." [5]

They were encouraged to do so by the internal state of Protestantism, which, notwithstanding an almost complete external triumph, was everywhere torn by intestinal dissensions. To the sacramentary quarrel, which had not ceased being a source of disturbance, there was added wrangling and dispute by various groups—the Antitrinitarians, who claimed doctrinal descent from Michel Servet; the Majorists, who took their name from Michel Major and defended the efficacity of good works; the Mennonites, who, following Menno Simons, rejected oaths, war, and absolute predestination; the Crypto-Calvinists, who invoked the authority of Melanchthon; the Mystics of Schwenkfeld; the Synergists of Pfeffinger; the Osiandrists, and the Armenians. Germany in particular was troubled by the Anabaptists, who pursued the utopia of a theocratic kingdom without laws or rulers, in which perfect equality and community of possessions would reign. The Socinians, denying the divinity of Christ, the reality of original sin, and the supernatural value of the sacraments, passed from Germany into Switzerland and Poland. The Protestant Church of the Netherlands was divided on the question of absolute predestination. The Church of England saw the formation of

[5] Ranke, I, pp. 407, 409.

the three sects that were to divide her followers into Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents.

Favorable Attitude of Catholic Rulers

The social disturbances provoked by these disputes, while weakening the Protestants, facilitated the action of the Church by winning to her, in certain directions, the support of rulers who were concerned with repressing the turbulence of the reformed sects. The principle, often proclaimed by Protestantism, that the religion of a State depends upon that of the ruler, turned sharply against it.[6] Duke Albert V of Bavaria closed his frontiers to heresy, obliged the professors of the University of Ingolstadt to sign the profession of faith published by the Council of Trent, and entrusted the education of youth to the Jesuits. Ecclesiastical princes hastened to follow this example. The prince-abbot of Fulda, Balthasar von Dernbach, who was elected in 1570, favored the extirpation of heresy with all his might. In 1572 James von Eltz, prince-elector of Treves, excluded Protestants from his court. These examples were followed by others: in 1574 by the archbishop-elector of Mayence, in 1582 by the bishop of Würzburg, in 1585 by the bishop of Paderborn. The duke of Austria in 1587 adopted similar measures. Archduke Ferdinand extended them to Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola in 1598.

"The imperial power," says Ranke, "was neither sufficiently strong nor sufficiently resolute to come to any effectual decision regarding it [*i. e.* the declaration of the peace of Augsburg], still less to make it respected. Even in the diets of the empire there was not the energy or the unanimity that would have been required to procure the adoption of measures in its favor. The most important changes occurred without a word of remark, almost without observation; they were not even men-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 419.

tioned by the historians of the period, but passed as things inevitable and that could not be otherwise." [7] Southern Germany and all of Austria thus returned to Catholicism. In France, while Edmund Auger's [8] eloquence and the fame of Maldonatus' [9] teaching drew crowds about Catholic professors and preachers and away from the sermons of the Huguenots, public opinion, feeling that national unity was endangered by the Protestants, turned to the Guises and greeted the League as an instrument of freedom. The attempts at Catholic restoration by Queen Mary in England, by King John in Sweden, and by Mary Stuart in Scotland, did not attain any lasting result, but bore witness to the revival of Catholic feeling. In the Netherlands the League of Arras laid the foundation of the Catholic kingdom of Belgium and, under the influence of St. Charles Borromeo, the seven Swiss cantons that had remained faithful to Rome founded the Golden League for the defense of the true faith.

Popes St. Pius V, Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, and Urban VIII presided over this movement, which has been called the Catholic Counter-Reformation.

But the Church, while gratefully accepting the help of secular powers when these do not encroach beyond the limits of their competency, counts especially, in the work of self-regeneration and the salvation of souls, on the canonical means which her divine constitution gives her the right to employ.

The Inquisition

For the defense of her children against heresy, the Church organized two great institutions: the Roman Inquisition and the Index.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 431.

[8] Edmond Auger (1530–1591) was born at Alleman, near Troyes. He joined the Jesuits, taught the humanities in Italy, preached in France, and was Henry III's confessor.

[9] On Maldonatus, see chapter 27.

We have seen how, in 1542, Pope Paul III by the Bull *"Licet ab initio"* centralized the different particular tribunals of episcopal and monastic inquisition that were in operation since the twelfth century and established a supreme tribunal of inquiry for the whole Church: this was the Roman Inquisition. It could reach bishops and cardinals as well as the simple faithful. Under Paul IV, Cardinals Morone and Pole, notwithstanding the renown of their services, were haled before the new tribunal. Pius V raised the number of cardinal inquisitors to eight and conferred very extensive powers on them. Lastly Sixtus V, by his constitution *"Immensa aeterni Dei,"* which reorganized the whole Roman curia, made the Holy Office, or Universal Congregation of the Inquisition (*Sacrum Officium seu Universa Inquisitionis Congregatio*), the first of the fifteen congregations of cardinals among which he distributed all the business of church government. Furnished with the full powers of a tribunal, it had competency in all cases relative to the faith, from heresy to the abuse of the Sacraments, and exercised jurisdiction in all countries where the Catholic religion existed.

The procedure of the Inquisition differed from ordinary inquiries: the facts appealed to in the accusation had to be communicated to the accused, but the names of the deponents were always kept secret; if the charges were not rejected, the accused, instead of taking the ordinary oath, had to make an abjuration of heresy; the inquiry, in a case of heresy, might involve the gravest penalties, notably degradation and transfer to the hands of the civil power; after the decisions of Innocent IV, published in 1552, torture, which was forbidden in ordinary ecclesiastical tribunals, could be used.[10]

[10] These regulations prompt a recent historian of the Inquisition to say: "The Church forgot her early traditions of toleration, and borrowed from the Roman jurisprudence, revived by the legists, laws and practices which remind one of the cruelty of ancient paganism." (Vacandard, *The Inquisition,* p. 158.) "An accused man's confession of crime ought to be free," wrote Pope St. Nicholas I in the ninth

While the Council of Trent was in session, the Inquisition was at work in Italy and Spain. In Italy it nearly everywhere functioned in concert with the civil power. "The governments of Milan and Naples," says Ranke, "could present but slight opposition, because they had themselves intended to establish the Spanish Inquisition in their own territories . . . In Tuscany the Inquisition was rendered accessible to the influence of the civil power . . . The Inquisition for the Venetian States was in some measure subjected to the control of the civil power . . . Many took to flight, and these fugitives were to be found in every town of Germany and Switzerland." [11]

In Spain, where the suppression of heresy was still more severe, it was the civil authority that took the initiative. From the monastery of St. Just, whither he had retired, Charles V wrote (May 25th, 1558) to his daughter: "Were I not certain that you and the members of the council who are by your side would utterly uproot the evil (for it is but a beginning without depth or strength) by rigorously punishing the guilty to prevent it from growing further, I should make up my mind to leave this place to go and remedy matters myself." In the codicil of Charles V's will, which he added a few days before his death, he enjoined his son to seek out and punish without mercy or pity, all the heretics in his dominions.

century. "It is an injustice to put him on the rack, which yields only a forced avowal, and often leads an innocent man to declare himself guilty. There is no law, divine or human, that can justify such a practice (*quam rem nec divina lex nec humana prorsus admittit*). (*P.L.*, CIX, col. 1010.) The harshness of barbarous customs led mediæval legislators to employ severe punishments and methods that were at times nothing less than brutal." As the Protestant historian Lea declares, these "were the ordinary expedients by which the criminal jurists sought to deter crime by frightful examples which would make a profound impression on a not over-sensitive population." (*Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, I, p. 235.) It would not be just to maintain that the popes took the initiative in these severe measures. "The papacy," says Luchaire, "was the last to take up the pursuit of heresy. The popular masses, royal authority, and the local clergy preceded the papacy in this matter. The popes only followed suit and, as it were, under pressure from violent urging." (Luchaire, *Innocent III et la croisade des Albigeois*, p. 37.)

[11] Ranke, I, p. 162.

Philip II ruthlessly excuted his father's orders. In accord with Pope Paul IV, who had issued a brief directing confessors "to refuse absolution to those who would not denounce all who were inculcated in heresy, even their relations," Philip ordained (September 7th, 1558) "that all those who bought, sold, or read forbidden books, such as the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, should be condemned to be burned alive."

"Arrests were made in the most remote provinces of the peninsula," says Baudrillard. "It was in this great harvest of 1557 that the principal leaders of the Protestant movement were taken, especially at Valladolid and at Logrono. After the arrests and the trials came the penalties. Five important *autos da fé* took place—at Valladolid on May 22nd, 1559; at Seville on September 24th, 1559; at Valladolid, October 8th, 1559; at Toledo, February 25th, 1560; and at Seville, December 22nd, 1560. The first of these lugubrious solemnities took place on May 22nd, 1559, in the presence of the Regent Joan, of her nephew Don Carlos, of a considerable number of nobles and ladies, and of an immense crowd of people. The celebrated theologian Melchior Cano had been chosen to preach the sermon. The Regent and the heir to the crown, Don Carlos, took a vow to uphold the Inquisition everywhere and at all times. The reading of the sentences, the degradation of the condemned ecclesiastics, and other formalities to be gone through lasted from six o'clock in the morning until two in the afternoon. Nobody showed the least sign of fatigue, and the Regent did not retire until all was finished. The condemned, escorted by guards and followed by the clergy, confraternities, and schools, then went towards the *quemadero,* which was either a pile or a block. Fourteen were to be burnt. The first called was Agostino Cazalla, who was reconciled to the Church and exhorted his companions to abjure their errors. The Inquisitors rewarded him by ordering that he should be strangled before being thrown into the flames. His brother Francesco,

a priest, refused to retract, and was burnt. A third brother, Pedro, was strangled in exchange for some useful information. The same favor was accorded to several others of the condemned who retracted, especially to several women, amongst them being Beatrix de Vibero. The bachelor Herrezuelo showed an unconquerable obstinacy.

"On September 24th, at the *auto da fé of* Seville, twenty-two persons were burnt. One woman, Maria Bohorques, continued to the very end her protestations of faith in the Lutheran doctrines. The priest Juan Gonzales and his two young sisters marched to the scaffold singing psalms, an incident which made a great impression on the people.

"The *auto da fé* held at Valladolid on October 8th, 1559, was honored by the presence of Philip II, who had been recalled to Spain by the progress of heresy. Princes, ambassadors, and the nobles of Spain accompanied him.

"There were other *autos da fé* in several towns: Protestants were burnt until the end of the century, but after 1570 Protestantism in Spain may be considered as at an end.

"Such scenes," concludes Baudrillard, "make one shudder: yet we cannot but acknowledge with Joseph de Maistre that the religious strifes of the seventeenth century caused less blood to flow in Spain than elsewhere. Compare the number of victims of the Spanish Inquisition with those of the religious wars in France and Germany, or even with the number condemned under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth, and mark the difference." [12]

The Index of Forbidden Books

The Church was always concerned in the condemnation of heretical books. From the earliest Christian times, she had them cast into the flames. At the end of the fifth century, Pope

[12] Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism*, p. 197.

Gelasius I drew up a list of the books which, according to his own expression, "Christians should avoid." [13] In the fifteenth century, after the invention of printing, it was needful, not only to take account of bad writings already published, but to provide that no work of such nature be published in the future: Alexander VI drew up a famous constitution,[14] which Leo X extended to the whole Church.

It appears that the first general Index of forbidden books was printed at Venice in 1543.[15] The Council of Trent in its eighteenth session (February 26, 1562) instituted a commission of eighteen fathers who were to compile a catalogue of forbidden books and in particular—this constituted an important innovation—to prepare general rules regarding them. The work of this commission was sent to Pope Pius IV at the twenty-fifth and last session, and was published by the Sovereign Pontiff in 1564. Seven years later, Pius V instituted a congregation whose duty it should be to watch over the observance of the rules of the Index. These regulations remained in force until the constitution *Officiorum* of Leo XIII, who (January 22nd, 1897) abrogated them and gave them a new form to obviate the difficulties which modern opinion accused them of creating.[16]

[13] *Decret. Grat.*, cap. *"Sancta,"* dist. 15, cap. 3.

[14] Constitution *"Inter multiplices"* (June 1st, 1501), in Raynaldi, 1501, no. 36.

[15] Périès, *L'Index*, p. 24.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 32. "To my mind," wrote Francisque Sarcey, "one of the silliest commonplaces of freethought oratory is to cry out against the Congregation of the Index and its condemnations. Here is a commission of men holding a collection of beliefs and entrusted with their protection. To those who share the same faith they say: 'Take care! the ideas in this book are dangerous; keep away from them.' What could be more in harmony with sound reason and good sense?" (*Le Gaulois*, October 25th, 1869.)

CHAPTER IV

The Catholic Reformation and the Secular Clergy

THE acts of authority exercised by Catholic rulers and the repression undertaken by the Roman Inquisition and the Index were merely the indispensable prelude to a more positive and effective work of reform which would extend to the secular clergy, the religious Orders, and the laity, and would carry Catholic truth to the extremities of the earth.

The best reform, moreover, could only remain a dead letter unless it were incarnated in some men who would spread it by their personal zeal and would make it loved by their holiness. The latter half of the sixteenth century saw several such men appear; the greatest of them, placed by Providence close to the Holy See, was Cardinal Charles Borromeo.

St. Charles Borromeo

A great man always sums up a more or less latent tradition. To keep ever before him the lessons and precious example of a saintly life, St. Charles Borromeo had placed in his humble room the portrait of a holy bishop whom God called to Himself at the very hour when the Council of Trent opened. It was Matteo Giberti, who was born at Palermo in 1495 and died as bishop of Verona in 1543, after passing many years at the court of Leo X and Clement VII. Wherever he appeared, Giberti left a renown for lofty wisdom, eminent knowledge, and consummate holiness. He established in his palace a press for the publication of the works of the Greek Fathers, endowed his diocese with a large number of charitable institu-

tions, and reëstablished ecclesiastical discipline among his clergy. One of his disciples tried to show by example how a true bishop ought to live;[1] the fathers of Trent always had in view the bishop of Verona in their reform projects, and the decrees of the Council adopted most of his institutions for the universal Church.

St. Charles Borromeo always considered himself the continuator of the work of the humble and saintly Bishop Giberti of Verona. But, in the range of his reformatory activity, he surpassed him. It is said of the great Archbishop of Milan that he was, "with the necessary difference of the times, the Hildebrand of the sixteenth century."[2] Without a doubt, there was no one who undertook and accomplished, as did he, the reformation of the clergy and laity, as intended by the Council of Trent.

When, at the beginning of 1560, the newly elected Pope, Pius IV, appointed his nephew, Charles Borromeo, then scarcely twenty-two years old, in quick succession protonotary apostolic, referendary of the papal signature, cardinal-deacon of the title of St. Vitus, and archbishop of Milan, many a one in Rome and elsewhere, as we saw above, loudly denounced this as a prodigious example of nepotism.[3] Was the world to see a repetition of the grave scandals that had occurred from Sixtus IV to Alexander VI? The new Cardinal's attitude promptly dissipated any such fear. As an accomplished man of the world, Charles knew how to conform to the exigencies

[1] Petrus Franciscus Zinus, *Boni pastoris exemplum ac specimen singulare, ex Matthaeo Giberto episcopo expressum atque propositum,* written in 1566 and found in Gibertus, *Opera,* p. 252.

[2] Brugère, p. 803.

[3] "In a spirit of piety some have tried to excuse Pius IV's nepotism by explaining his favors to his nephew on the score of a foresight of the services which the latter would render to the Church. But this explanation can scarcely be admitted, when we see the Pope later on urge his nephew to marry. (Giussano, *Vita de San Carlo,* ch. 5.) Providence deserves all the glory, the merit belongs to St. Charles." (Brugère, p. 803.)

of his situation in the polite and literary society of a city that passed for the most scholarly of the period.[4] But he was austere in his conduct, deaf to adulation, superior to worldly seductions, of which his family and the Pope himself one day became the accomplices,[5] and in the end he dominated all by the ascendency of his wisdom and holiness.

All of Pius IV's great undertakings may be regarded as inspired by the saintly Archbishop of Milan. The reopening of the Council of Trent in 1560 and its happy issue in 1563 were largely the work of St. Charles. Once the Council was terminated, the Archbishop of Milan became a member of the commission established to interpret and to assure the observance of its decrees. The labors of the commission that drew up the Roman Catechism were under his direction.[6] He had a part, though less active, in publishing the Breviary in 1568 and the Missal in 1570.[7] For the solid training of the secular clergy he founded the Congregation of the Oblates. He held six provincial councils and eleven diocesan synods, in which, despite the often violent opposition of the governor of Milan, the chapter of St. Mary's, and the Order of the Humiliati, he methodically and perseveringly proceeded to apply all the decrees of the Council of Trent. We see him personally visiting the whole territory under his episcopal jurisdiction, going to the Swiss portion of his diocese to raise the spirit of the Catholic cantons and to encourage their confederation.

[4] See *Noctes Vaticanae seu sermones habiti in academia,* in St. Charles's *Opera.*

[5] Members of his family, including Pope Pius IV, having urged him, after his elder brother's death in 1562, to return to the world and get married, the young Cardinal cut short their urging by having himself secretly ordained to the priesthood. He wrote to his uncle: "Most Holy Father, do not chide me; I have chosen as a bride one whom I have loved long since, and whom I desired to possess ever since I knew her."

[6] The Roman Catechism was finished in 1564 and published two years later by St. Pius V. On the development of catechetical teaching, of which the Council of Trent was the starting-point, see Hézard, *Histoire des catéchismes,* pp. 182 sqq. and 248 sqq.

[7] Bäumer, *Histoire du bréviaire,* II, pp. 145, 160 sqq., 220, 228 sqq.

At Milan, during the pestilence of 1576, he cared for the pest-stricken, consoled them, helping them in every way even at the risk of his life. After the scourge ceased, he established numerous charitable works to relieve the miseries that followed from it. His writings, all prompted by practical and actual needs, form a veritable pastoral theology based on experience. It is true that the great Archbishop, whose pale features and strong profile betokened the austerity of his character, had none of the gentle grace of St. Francis de Sales; but of all the virtues he required of others, he himself gave the heroic example. The history of the Church does not furnish a more complete type of the man of action.

St. Charles and the Institution of Seminaries

In the supremely important work of the institution of seminaries, the organizing genius of St. Charles is revealed in all its energy and far-sightedness.

"It was at one of its last sessions that the Council passed its celebrated decree on diocesan seminaries. If this word 'seminary' or 'nursery' of the clergy was new, the thing itself was ancient. In adopting this measure, the fathers of Trent were returning to the ancient discipline of episcopal schools which formerly had borne such salutary fruit. No decision could have been more timely, for we today find it hard to imagine what was then the deplorable state of clerical education. Monastic schools, which had supplanted the episcopal schools, had in turn experienced decay. The colleges or boarding-schools founded near the universities of the big cities also degenerated. These clerical houses scarcely differed from the colleges or boarding-houses where the young laymen studied law or medicine. Besides, the best of these institutions, by reason of their location near the universities, suffered the grave defect of being inaccessible to the mass of future parish clergy. In fact,

most of the young men destined for the parish ministry were trained haphazard in parish houses. Ordinarily they passed their youth in country rectories; their bringing-up was generally very crude, their instruction still more defective. Vocations were decided by the whim of parents and benefactors, according to the suggestions of interest and ambition; Holy Orders were received amidst worldly distraction, without serious preparation. All these disorders had engendered a state of ignorance and corruption which the best testimony describes with grief and which we cannot loyally dispute.

"The Council had all these evils before its eyes when it drew up its wise and salutary decree. It well knew that the reform of the clergy would not be affected by aged priests, but only by the younger clergy; it was not unaware that this youth, like the youth of the laity, is easily fascinated by the pleasures of the world, unless from its tender years it is carefully trained in piety and religion, and it was with such paternal and episcopal thoughts that the Council fixed the rules to govern the foundation of seminaries. These rules are very simple. Each cathedral church must found a seminary, where it will keep a sufficient number of clerics for the needs of the diocese. The seminary will accept only students at least twelve years old, born in legitimate wedlock, knowing how to read and write, and possessing character and inclinations that offer serious signs of a sacerdotal vocation. The students are to be recruited especially among the children of the poor. They are at once to receive tonsure and wear the clerical garb. They shall be trained in a practical manner in ecclesiastical virtues and sciences, and for this purpose be divided into a suitable number of classes. Worthy and capable superiors are to be placed over these houses. The bishop shall watch over the discipline, morals, and studies in his seminary and in the discharge of this duty shall be assisted by two canons, whom he is to choose from among the eldest and most serious.

"To help meet the considerable expenses of these establishments, the bishops are authorized to levy a contribution on all the benefices of the diocese, without any religious Order being exempt, except the Mendicants and the Knights of St. John. The bishops may also join benefices to their seminary.

"For the fixation of these contributions and for the annual auditing of the seminary accounts, the bishop shall be assisted by a commission of two canons and two pastors of the episcopal city. The bishop will appoint one of the canons and one of the pastors; the chapter and the pastors of the city will designate the other two.

"Poor dioceses may maintain a seminary in common; dioceses of large extent may have several seminaries.

"If a bishop neglects to found a diocesan seminary, his archbishop is to reprove him; if it be an archbishop who is guilty of this neglect, the provincial council will oblige him to obey.

"Such are the dispositions of this celebrated decree. They are both clear and broad. The Council did not wish to establish a course of clerical pedagogy; it left the solution of a great number of secondary questions to the prudence of the prelates who would have to regulate them in accordance with the infinitely variable circumstances of time, place, and persons; nothing could have been wiser." [8]

If we compare the decree of the Council of Trent with what Giussano [9] relates of the three seminaries established by St. Charles at Milan, "we shall see," says Thomassin, "how well this saint carried out the intentions of the Council, and even surpassed them." [10]

This same biographer says: "St. Charles saw that the assistance he needed was threefold. First, were needed good men

[8] Letourneau, *La mission de Jean Jacques Olier et la fondation des grands séminaires,* pp. 2–4.

[9] Giussano was an oblate of St. Ambrose and secretary and companion of St. Charles.

[10] Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* part 2, bk. 1, ch. 102.

to sustain the burden of the management; secondly, a number of fresh priests to fill the vacant parishes; thirdly, there was need of some means whereby the clergy might supply their lack of learning and be encouraged in the practice of priestly virtues, in order to labor more fruitfully in the vineyard. It was his special aim to supply these pressing needs and he directed his plans accordingly. He took especial care that their spiritual father should be a man experienced in the direction of souls, and in the guidance of youth to the punctual practice of daily mental prayer and examination of conscience, together with the frequentation of the Sacraments and the mortification of self. St. Charles provided also that the students should be trained in the true way of preaching the Word of God. To this end the clerics were accustomed to preach in turn during meals in the refectory. The first care of St. Charles on the admission of a new candidate was that the edifice of his spiritual life should rest on a solid foundation. He directed that the neophyte should be kept apart from the other students for some days of retirement and meditation under the guidance of his confessor; and that the old Adam might be entirely put off, a general confession was made of the past life. These spiritual exercises were renewed every year, at the beginning of each course of studies, and likewise before the candidates were admitted to the priesthood. These wise provisions were attended with great advantage." [11]

It need scarcely be said that, to carry out his plan, the saintly Archbishop had to overcome an army of opponents. "He was obliged," says Letourneau, "to battle against routine, the passions and privileges of numerous canons, pastors, abbots, beneficiaries of every kind. Better than any one else he knew that clerical feudalism, with its claims and exemptions, would cause a mighty opposition. In this matter, as in all undertakings of moral reform, he plunged into the

[11] Giussano, *Life of St. Charles Borromeo,* I, pp. 105, 109.

strife with heroic courage and he succeeded in attracting to these houses a great number of young clerics. He endeavored to have all his clerics enter these holy institutions. But that complete triumph was reserved to his successors." [12]

Like attempts were made in England, France, and Portugal. The disturbed condition of Germany prevented the bishops there from carrying out any measures in favor of clerical education. That is why Gergory XIII, as we saw above, instituted, on broader and more solid foundations, the German College founded at Rome by St. Ignatius for the German clergy. The first attempt to organize seminaries in England, made by Cardinal Pole in 1556, did not bear lasting fruit. In France the results of certain generous efforts seemed at first happier and more secure. The Cardinal of Lorraine, archbishop of Rheims, in 1567 founded a seminary in his episcopal city with regulations that wisely provided for all that concerned piety, study, and discipline. In consequence of resolutions adopted at the States of Blois and the assembly of Melun in 1577 and 1579, several seminaries were founded at Rouen, Bordeaux, Aix, Toulouse, etc. But neither these establishments nor the seminary that the Jesuits opened at Avignon were able to continue very long, either for lack of a competent personnel or because the practice of gathering humanists and theologians under one roof injured the good order of these various houses or because the privileges and exemptions, which in France were enjoyed by too many canons, beneficiaries, doctors, lords, and lay patrons, paralysed the bishops' action. The zeal of Bourdoise and the foundation of the Congregations of the Oratory, of St. Lazare, and of St. Sulpice, in later years permitted the resumption of the work of St. Charles Borromeo, so unfortunately interrupted.

Along with the holy Archbishop of Milan, we should mention two of his intimate friends who labored at the same

[12] Letourneau, p. 16.

work of religious reform by applying the decrees of the Council of Trent: they were the venerable Bartholomew a Martyribus and St. Philip Neri. The former, bishop of Braga, founded the first seminary in Portugal, held an important provincial synod in 1566 and, to increase the zeal of his priests, published his *Stimulus Pastorum.* At Rome St. Philip Neri, so strict with himself and so gentle with others, "who advised rather than commanded, conversed rather than taught," gathered a group of priests who, like himself, were consumed with the love of God and of souls. This was the origin of the Congregation of the Oratory, of which we shall presently have occasion to speak.

Pope St. Pius V

In all ranks of the hierarchy were to be found holy priests who gave an edifying example of Christian and sacerdotal life—the only effective source of genuine reform. But the Catholic reform movement could not acquire conquering strength until all these individual efforts were at length coordinated and directed by the hand of a pontiff who was himself a saint. As we said above, St. Charles Borromeo notably contributed to bring about the election of Pius V, in 1566. The external history of the Church owes a place of honor to this great Pope. We see him revive the courage of the Grand Master Lavalette, powerfully help in the defense of Malta, the bulwark of Christendom, dominate the wavering Emperor Maximilian, urge firmness on Charles IX and righteousness on Catherine de' Medici, affront the powerful Queen Elizabeth, moderate Philip II, facilitate the conversion of the New World, protect the savages from the cruelty of their masters, discover the secret plots of the Moors, by advice, exhortation, and prayer sustain the Christian army which finally triumphed at Lepanto, discover and condemn the germs of a nascent heresy in the errors of Baius, crush the wicked without vio-

lence, and foil the trickery of politicians without recourse to dissimulation.[13]

But the internal history of the Church ought especially to honor this holy Pope. In that same papal palace which Leo X had made the theatre of his worldly pleasures and Alexander VI of his scandals, Pope St. Pius V rose every night to pray to God. He no longer would have the carnival amusements held in the vicinity of St. Peter's, on ground watered with the blood of martyrs. In temporal and spiritual difficulties he had recourse to the Blessed Virgin Mary, whom he venerated with a filial devotion. Desiring to have all Christians invoke her, he confirmed (September 18th, 1569) all the indulgences granted by his predecessors to the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary. He visited the hospitals and gave an example of the care to be shown the sick, entered the prisons and offered divine consolations to the condemned even to the foot of the scaffold. He blessed the continual martyrdom which he suffered from gallstones. His meals were of monastic plainness, and he sanctified them by spiritual reading, often chosen from the letters in which St. Bernard recalls to Pope Eugenius the duties of the sovereign pontificate. Beneath his papal robes he wore a shirt of Dominican serge.

Yet neither his weak health nor the prayers that occupied part of his nights, nor the spiritual and corporal works of mercy which he lavished on the poor, turned him from the duties of his office. To honor and promote the study of theology, he proclaimed St. Thomas a doctor of the Church and in 1570 had published the collected works of the Angel of the Schools, which until then were scattered and often disfigured. He loved to consult saints, such as Charles Borromeo, Philip Neri, and Francis Borgia. So convinced was he that only holiness would regenerate the world, that one of his greatest joys was to see the Carthusian Laurent Surius publish in six vol-

[13] Falloux, II, p. 161 and *passim.*

umes a collection of *Lives of the Saints,* to vindicate them from the accusations which the Protestants brought against them.[14] "Beloved son," the Pope wrote to him, "we praise you for a work that we have always desired and that is most useful to repel the lies which the heretics unceasingly spread about the lives of the saints."

[14] We must add that not every part of the work corresponded with the author's intention. Father Schütz, S.J., in his critical commentary, *De scriptis et scriptoribus, s.v.* "Surius," says: *"Optandum fuerat ut has vitas, quales apud primaevos scriptores repererat, relinqueret."* But a century later the project was more scientifically and successfully undertaken by the Jesuits in Holland and led to the celebrated *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists.

CHAPTER V

The Catholic Reformation and the Regular Clergy

IN THE Middle Ages the great religious Orders were abundant and apparently inexhaustible sources of holiness. It was in the cloister that Pius V developed those virtues of which he gave so shining an example to the world. Not a few of these spiritual founts, however, were dried up; others gave forth only muddy and corrupt water. Entire monasteries of the Augustinian Order had passed over to Protestantism.[1] Attempts had been made at reform as early as the end of the Western Schism, but they encountered the greatest difficulties. Beginning with Martin V, nearly all the popes were concerned with the improvement of the religious Orders. But, says Pastor, "the results of the monastic reform varied greatly. . . . As a rule it was the richest cloisters and abbeys which had fallen furthest from their original spirit and which were most strongly opposed to any attempt at reform.[2] Wealth . . . tempted the nobles, who saw in the Church only a means of provision for their sons, and regarded religious houses as made to be appropriated for their own ends. . . . Rich abbeys served practically as 'hospitals for the nobles,' in which those were placed who were unfit for the world. Even the lame and blind were placed in them without any regard for a religious vocation . . . Thus did these religious houses decline more and more from their fervor . . . In fact, contemporaries complain that cloisters and consecrated places became mere

[1] "The Saxon province of Luther's own Order, the Augustinians, had so degenerated that in 1521 it broke away as a whole and, with the exception of a few members, followed the new religion." (Pastor, VII, p. 304.)

[2] See the numerous examples adduced by Janssen-Pastor, I, pp. 725–732.

pleasure resorts . . . All this was equally the case in the houses of religious women." [3]

Under Leo X great efforts were again made to renew the religious life. At Rome the Oratory of Divine Love was formed; but the sacking of the city by imperial forces in 1527 obliged the new religious to scatter. In 1538 a commission of cardinals, appointed by Paul III, proposed the suppression of all monasteries, or at least a provisional suspension of recruiting, by forbidding them to receive any novices. Once the old personnel should disappear, an attempt would be made to train a new generation in the spirit of the primitive rule. Happily Paul III was not persuaded to follow this desperate advice. The first ravages of Protestant heresy awoke fresh zeal in the hearts of true religious. From 1528, the date of the Franciscan reform of the Capuchins, to 1600, the date of the Benedictine reform of Saint-Vanne, not only did a great number of the old Orders strive to return to their primitive fervor, but new Orders were founded, the better to meet the needs of the times: such were the Theatines, the Somaschi, the Barnabites, the Oratorians, and that Order which was to become the most effective instrument of Catholic restoration—the Society of Jesus.

In 1528 Matthieu Bassi, a Franciscan friar of the Monte Falco monastery, obtained from Pope Clement VII, for himself and for those who wished to follow him, permission to live and preach apart, with certain distinctive marks, such as the long beard and the pointed cowl. The new preachers' ardent zeal and their unstinted devotedness in all public calamities soon brought them universal esteem. The sad defection of their vicar general, Bernardino Ochino, who turned Protestant in 1542, seemed to deal them a mortal blow; but the institute, momentarily under suspicion at Rome, recovered the lost ground by its humility, obedience, and zeal. The Council of Trent authorized it to practice absolute poverty. The Order

[3] Pastor, VII, p. 304.

of Capuchins—such was the name given it—then continued to increase. In the seventeenth century it counted 34,000 members, among whom were several men of note, such as the famous Father Joseph so closely associated with Richelieu.

In 1562 St. Teresa reformed the Carmelite convent of Avila, then, with the coöperation of St. John of the Cross, extended her reform to thirty-two convents, of which seventeen were of women and fifteen of men.

Eleven years later, Venerable Jean de la Barrière, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Feuillant near Toulouse, tried to bring his monks back to a more austere rule of life. Sixtus V approved his reform in 1586. This was the origin of the so-called Feuillants, soon followed by the foundation of the Feuillantines (1590).

The reform of the Trinitarians, begun at Saint-Michel near Pontoise in 1578, was continued in France at the abbey of Cerfroy in 1580 and carried out in Spain (1594) by the foundation of the discalced Trinitarians. In 1596 the Dominican Michaelis, to counteract the laxity of some houses of his Order, founded the Occitaine congregation at Toulouse; and in 1594 St. Peter Fourier reformed the Canons Regular by founding the congregations of Notre Dame and Notre Sauveur. At about the same time, under the impulse of St. Pius V and Gregory XIII, the Premonstratensians and the Camaldolese returned to their ancient observance and Didier de Latour, prior of Saint-Vanne abbey in Lorraine, reëstablished the primitive rule of St. Benedict in his monastery. From this reform was born the celebrated Congregation of Saint-Vanne, which gave to the Church and science Dom Calmet and Dom Cellier. Later on the Congregation of Saint-Maur, an offspring of the same movement, produced Ruinart, Martène, d'Achery, Montfaucon, and Mabillon.[4]

[4] For details of these various reforms, see Hélyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques.* Badiche cast this book into dictionary form, with notes and additions. It constitutes volumes 20–24 of Migne's *Encyclopédie théologique.*

The Carmelites

Among all the reforms is one which, by its extent and influence, by the holiness and genius of her who promoted and effected it, deserves special mention: it is the reform of Carmel by St. Teresa.

Of all the religious Orders, none was more justly proud of its origin and glorious traditions than the Order of Carmel. The tenderest devotion to the Virgin Mary was joined with practices of most austere penance. But the pious solitaries did not escape the laxity brought about almost everywhere by the Western Schism and the ruin of medieval institutions. In 1431 their general, Jean de Fasy, obtained from Pope Eugene IV a Bull of "mitigation," restricting their fasts and abstinences and tempering the rigor of their perpetual solitude. The most fervent members grieved and ceased not to long for the life of deep recollection, quiet contemplation, and ardent prayer which had been that of their pioneers. Of this number was Blessed John Soreth, who, as general of the Order, obtained from Pope Nicholas V (1442), by the Bull *"Cum multa,"* the privilege of admitting religious women to follow the rule of the Carmelites. But after his death the Carmelite nuns, subject to the government of the provincials of the Order, lost the principles of their first institutor and, for the most part, showed themselves no stricter than the fathers and brothers.

Such was the condition of affairs when, in 1560, the voice of God reached Teresa [5] of Alumada, a nun in the convent of the Incarnation at Avila, and manifested to her the divine will to see a reformed monastery of Carmel founded through her care under the patronage of St. Joseph. "If religious Orders

[5] "It has long been recognized that the name *Teresa,* thoroughly Spanish, should be written as the saint herself wrote it and as it is now always written in Spain." (Polit, bishop of Cuenca, in the preface to *Œuvres complètes de sainte Térèse,* p. xiii.) The spelling *Theresa* is owing to a purely imaginary Greek etymology.

have lost their primitive fervor," said the divine Master, "they still render me great services. What would the world become if there were no religious? . . . Go, then, daughter, find your confessor; tell him the command I have just given you, and bear him word from Me not to oppose it." [6] Shortly afterwards He added: "Daughter, you are going to understand what the founders of religious Orders have had to suffer: you will endure persecutions greater than you can imagine; but be not disturbed." [7]

Formidable obstacles did, in fact, arise before the humble virgin as soon as she uttered the first word of reform. The opposition came from the Sisters in the convent, public opinion, and the authorities of her country. "The convent of the Incarnation," says one of St. Teresa's biographers, "not yet a half century old, had never known any but the mitigated rule; the ancient traditions of the Order it knew only as memories, the glory of which it retained without bearing their weight." [8] Moreover, the Spaniard of those days, proud of his eight centuries of combat against the infidel and of the battles fought by his armies against Protestant heresy, and no less proud of the greatness of his monarchy, "on which the sun never set," did not feel this need of reform which was agitating other nations.

Before facing the great trials incident to her mission, the holy nun had to undergo no less painful trials in the work of her personal sanctification.

[6] *Histoire de sainte Thérèse* according to the Bollandists, I, p. 232. This life of Saint Teresa, called, "the Carmelite of Caen," is one of the most esteemed. In 1908 Henri Joly also published a life of St. Teresa. In the same year Father Jaime Pons, S.J., brought out a new edition of Ribera's *Vida de Sancta Teresa de Jesus*, with critical notes, introduction, and appendices. The volume begins with a study by Father Louis Martin, S.J., on *Sainte Térèse de Jésus, docteur mystique.*

[7] *Histoire de sainte Thérèse* according to the Bollandists, I, p. 244.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

St. Teresa

Teresa was born of noble parents at Avila, on March 28th, 1515. From her tenderest years her soul was fretted by the anguish of things eternal. Her early longings were to set off on the road of the Moors, so as to win "the life that has no end" by martyrdom, or to build a little hermitage where she might prepare for eternity. The remorse that she experienced from some thoughts of childish vanity and some worldly imaginations aroused by the reading of chivalrous novels, enkindled in her soul the fire of divine love. Yielding to an irresistible attraction, she entered the Carmelite Order (November 2nd, 1533). God permitted the distress of separation from her family to wound her loving and delicate heart. "When I set out from my father's house," she says, "I experienced so excessive a grief that I believe the hour of my death cannot have in it anything more cruelly painful. I seemed to feel my very bones parting from one another . . . Had God not come to my assistance, all my considerations would not have been enough to make me go on." [9] But frequent visits to the parlor hindered the ascent of her soul to God.[10] Terrible illness, brought on by excessive penances,[11] grievous periods of spiritual dryness during which her courage all but failed, tried and purified her soul, uprooted or paralyzed whatever might retard her flight towards perfection. "Henceforth," said our Lord to her, "I no longer wish that you converse with man." From that moment, even in the midst of men, her soul con-

[9] *Œuvres complètes de sainte Térèse* (edited by Polit), I, p. 66.

[10] *Vie écrite par elle-même,* ch. 7.

[11] Certain rationalists have regarded these illnesses as hysterical attacks, which would explain the saint's revelations. On this question, see De Smedt, *Les révélations de sainte Thérèse,* in the *Revue des questions historiques,* 1884, vol. XXXV, p. 533, and Hahn, *Les phénomènes hystériques et les révélations de sainte Thérèse* in the same *Revue,* 1883, p. 183.

versed only with God, who favored her with a more elevated mystical union, with visions and ecstasies.[12] The report of the ravages caused by Protestant heresy served but to arouse her apostolic spirit. "It grieved me bitterly," she says, "and I cried to God . . . I felt that I would have laid down a thousand lives to save one of the many souls perishing there . . . All I cared for then, as I do now, was that, as the enemies of God are so many and His friends so few, these latter at least might be good ones." [13] The whole inspiration of her life and of her reform movement may be found in these lines: "One perfect soul is of more worth than a multitude of ordinary souls." [14] She also said: "I think we should act as people do when, in time of war the enemy has overrun the country and the king finds himself hard pressed. He retires into a strongly fortified town, from whence he sometimes makes a sortie. The small company with him in the citadel, being picked men, are better than a large army of cowardly soldiers." [15]

At first glance it would appear that nothing could be more austere, we might almost say more rigid, than St. Teresa's

[12] Some philosophers have offered a psychological explanation of St. Teresa's mystical phenomena, not only as being *in* the subject affected by them, but also, as of imaginings, certain internal movements of sentiment: as it happens that in a dream, anxiety, for instance, provokes images that are calculated to account for the feeling. St. Teresa sought union with God through different degrees of prayer —quietude, union, and ecstasy. These degrees progressively abolished personal consciousness and interiorly realized, for a very short time, the personal consciousness of the divine presence." (Delacroix in the *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie,* January 1906.) But "such conclusions are due to the fact of studying mystical phenomena, not only as being *in* the subject affected by them, but also as being *of* the subject alone. In this method we recognize a bias under color of scientific reserve. Moreover, it is not correct to say that St. Teresa *sought* to rise to the state of quietude, etc. If there is one fact certain in the case of all mystics, it is that they are aware of undergoing an influence without being at all able, of themselves, to attain it." (Maurice Blondel, *Vie,* pp. 16–21.) This is just what St. Teresa repeatedly says (ch. 5).

[13] *The Way of Perfection,* p. 5.

[14] See the report for 1561–1562, *Lettres,* III, p. 377; *The Way of Perfection;* and the first part of the *Foundations.*

[15] *The Way of Perfection,* p. 16.

plan when (August 27th, 1562) she founded the first convent of discalced Carmelites at Avila under the patronage of St. Joseph. Poverty was to be absolute. The members of the community were to be limited to thirteen: "Experience has taught me," she said, "what a house is where a large number of women are gathered; God keep us from such!" There should be no lay sisters: thus the nuns would be obliged in turn to look after the household duties. Each house was to be as free from episcopal jurisdiction as possible. "I am persuaded," she wrote to Father Gratian in 1576, "that no cure can be found for our religious so long as there is not some one of the family to direct them."

But in the holy reformer, zeal was accompanied by practical good sense and a never failing spirit of prudence. Although her first reform plan remained the ideal toward which she constantly tended, yet her remarkable perception of actual possibilities and the obedience due her legitimate superiors led her to postpone or modify it according to circumstances. As experience taught her that a community of thirteen persons might become insufficient for the choral exercises in consequence of sickness among them, she raised the maximum figure to twenty-one. She likewise recognized that the absence of all revenue, in principle well suited to impart a lively impulse to the spirit of poverty, was not strictly needful and might involve real embarrassments. Teresa also revised her idea on the subject of lay sisters and established them because she perceived "that too much bodily labor stifles the spirit." Lastly, according to times and places, she regulated the question of the dependence of the convents on the ordinaries, experience having shown her the serious difficulties there were in placing her convents under the jurisdiction of mitigated Carmelites.

Yet it is noteworthy that, in seeking to tighten, so to speak, the bonds of the material life, St. Teresa especially aspired to free the souls of her reformed religious. "She repeats in many

places that the religious are not slaves. Nor would she tolerate that anyone, whether sister, mistress, prior, confessor, or visitor, should impose on them anything outside the rule. Outside the rule, it is a matter of each one's conscience." [16] "She desired," says Ribera, "that her daughters have full liberty, both in the matter of hearing sermons and in that of particular spiritual direction, to treat with those who were most suited to their souls." And she writes: "For the love of our Lord, I beg the superior to maintain this holy liberty, and to get permanent leave from the bishop or provincial for the nuns to have, besides their ordinary confessors, learned priests to whom they may all speak and open their souls." [17]

After reforming the Carmelite nuns, St. Teresa wanted to labor at a reform of the Carmelite monks. As a helper in this undertaking she had St. John of the Cross. He was born in obscurity and poverty near Avila in 1542, and at the age of twenty-one was admitted to the Carmelite Order. Father John longed to join the Carthusians, so as to lead a more recollected life, when, one day, after a short interview with Mother Teresa in the convent parlor at Avila, the latter was enlightened by God and declared: "Have patience and give up your idea of joining the Carthusians, for we will prepare in our own Order a reform that will satisfy you." This was in 1567: St. John was barely twenty-five years old. Thenceforth we witness the extraordinary sight of this monk, already a priest, being trained in the monastic life by a woman and then, along with her, undertaking to reform the monasteries of his Order. Repulses there were. Persecuted by his unreformed fellow-monks, condemned as a rebel and deserter, imprisoned, calumniated, John of the Cross bore it all patiently. For his motto he had taken the words: "To suffer and to be despised for Jesus

[16] Joly, *Sainte Thérèse*, p. 105.
[17] *The Way of Perfection*, p. 35.

Christ." When St. Teresa died (October 4th, 1582),[18] fifteen monasteries of Carmelite monks had already adopted a reform like that of the Carmelite nuns.

New Religious Orders

It was not enough to reform the old Orders. The religious life is, by its inspiration, a direct institution of Christ, by its organization, the work of the vivifying Spirit who animates the Church in the various phases of her earthly existence. New needs create new forms of apostolic life; they sprang up in great numbers toward the middle of the sixteenth century.

In 1524, at the height of the Italian Renaissance and in the midst of the Protestant revolt, at the very time when, in the brilliant Rome of Clement VII, Michelangelo was beginning his great architectural works and when in Germany, upset by Luther, the terrible peasant war was kindling, four Italian priests, under the auspices of the Sovereign Pontiff, founded the first of these new Orders, the Theatines. Therein we may justly recognize the most characteristic attempt of a Christian renaissance and a Catholic reformation.

A young nobleman, Gaetano di Tiene, born in 1480, familiar with the whole literary, juridical, philosophical, and theological culture of the period, went to Rome about 1508, there purchased an appointment as apostolic secretary, received prelatial honors, took part in the humanist movement, and became a friend of Cardinal Sadoleto, the celebrated literary light, just at the time when Sadoleto and certain other humanists, attracted by Christian charity no less than charmed by ancient art, were planning to found an association for the realization

[18] This date is made memorable by the Gregorian reform of the calendar. The ten dates following October 4th were suppressed in the calendar so that the day following St. Teresa's death became the 15th of October. This explains why the Church fixed St. Teresa's feast on that date.

of their common aspirations. In 1516 they put their project into execution and founded the Society of Divine Love (*del Divino Amore*), a little gathering of sixty choice spirits that met in a tiny church in Trastevere. Gaetano soon became its soul, although they decided that no one should hold first place.

The Society of Divine Love was not long in spreading through Italy.[19] In fact, it corresponded to a tendency of the Italian Renaissance which, if we are to believe its learned historian, by mingling the teaching of Plato with the mysticism of the Middle Ages, upheld the doctrine "that the visible world was created by God in love." [20] But that was only the first stage, so to speak, in Gaetano's undertaking. After some years devoted to works of charity and in the sweet intimacy of Christian friendships, the young prelate, in union with two friends —the devout lawyer Bonifacio da Colle and the zealous bishop of Chieti, Giovanni Pietro Caraffa—planned a more profound reform. Their desire was to found a society of priests which, without adopting the rules of the old monastic institutions, would have for its aim the training of a clergy more perfect in purity, knowledge, and abnegation, and which would thus become the best means of a general reform. "This timid, precise traditionalist," says a recent biographer of St. Cajetan, "had a vision of a pure, virile, intellectual clergy, free in a free state." [21] The idea was acceptable to Clement VII and to the best prelates of his entourage.

[19] Father Tacchi Venturi, making use of documents discovered at the University of Genoa, proves that a Brotherhood of Holy Love was founded in that city in 1497. The Brotherhood at Rome would, then, be only an imitation of the one at Genoa. (Venturi, *Storia della Compania di Gesù in Italia,* I, p. 407.) Father Brucker (in *Etudes,* October 5th, 1909, p. 25, and January 5th, 1910, p. 98) thinks it can be traced farther back; the *Dévote compagnie secrète de l'Oratoire de Saint-Jérôme,* founded at Vicenza in 1494, had the same statutes that we find later in the Roman association and the Genoese Brotherhood.

[20] Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy,* II, p. 382. "To love is to know," said Trithemius. Sadoleto declares that "love is the first and chief cause of our salvation."

[21] Maulde la Clavière, *Saint Cajetan,* p. 76.

By a Brief of June 24th, 1524, the Pope authorized the formation of the new institute. This Brief, says the same author, "if only by reason of its exquisite Latinity, may be considered one of the charters of the Christian Renaissance; it admirably blends the ideas of the beauty of life and of material disinterestedness. It is full of Cajetan's thought, ripened, weighed, and concentrated. The applicants, it says in effect, have expressed to the Holy Father their desire to serve God with the most perfect tranquillity of soul (*cum majori animi quiete*); to this end, they desire to make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, to live together without any special costume, under the direct jurisdiction of the Holy See. This the Brief authorizes them to do, as regular clergy, with a very broad and practical constitution. They are to have a superior, a 'provost,' elected annually, and in no case to hold office for more than three years. They are themselves to frame their internal constitution. They may admit to their order, after one year's probation, any priest whatsoever, and appoint any priest to receive his profession. They will enjoy the spiritual privileges of the canons of the Lateran. The Brief entrusts to them in addition a special mission, which well reflects the dominant preoccupations of the time: that of drawing up a scheme for the reform of the Breviary and the liturgy, without any limit to their power beyond the fundamental prescriptions of the apostolic canons. A special Brief gave Caraffa the dispensation necessary to his retention of the title and rank of bishop." [22]

The clerics distributed their patrimony to their relatives and to the poor by duly registered donations and retained only a small fund to help defray the first expenses of installing the new society. The title of bishop of Chieti (in Latin, *Theatinus*), which Caraffa kept, gave the new religious the name of Theatines. They soon spread over Italy and into Spain, Ger-

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 88. Giovanni Pietro Caraffa was elected pope in 1555 and took the name of Paul IV.

many, and Poland. At the beginning of the twentieth century, this Order counted only about a hundred members in ten houses. But in its early days it rendered most eminent service to the Catholic Reformation.

The foundation of the Regular Clerics of St. Paul, commonly called Barnabites, from a church of St. Barnabas that was granted them in Milan, closely followed the institution of the Theatines. The three founders—St. Antony Mary Zaccaria, Bartholomew Ferrari, and Jacob Morigia—assigned it as its special aim "to regenerate and spread the love of divine worship and a truly Christian life by means of frequent preaching and the faithful administration of the sacraments." [23] The new religious bound themselves not to solicit either office or dignity. Their first organization took place in 1530, just when German Protestantism was elaborating the Augsburg Confession. They were canonically erected as an Order of Regular Clerics by Clement VII (1533) on the morrow of England's rupture with the Church, and confirmed by Paul III (1535) at the time when Calvin's *Institutio* appeared. By their missions and catechisms and by their enlightened direction of souls, these new religious powerfully helped the Church repair the breaches made by Protestantism.

The Regular Clerics of St. Mayeul, or the Somaschi,[24] were founded by St. Jerome Emiliani at almost the same time as the Barnabites. At first their sole aim was to care for orphans, the sick, and the poor. But their sphere of activity gradually widened. They opened numerous colleges, among which the chief was the Clementine College, intended for the education of boys belonging to noble families. The establishment of this Order was one of the great joys of Clement VII's pontificate. Paul III granted them (1540) canonical institution, which

[23] *Constitutiones cleri regularis S. Pauli,* ch. 1.

[24] This name came to them from "Somasca," a city situated between Milan and Bergamo, where St. Jerome Emiliani drew up their rule.

was renewed by Pius IV (1563) and St. Pius V (1568).

These first three religious societies began in Italy. Catholic Spain, which under Charles V and Philip II so often claimed the honor of defending the cause of Catholic unity, gave to the Church the fourth and fifth of the congregations founded in that century. In 1534 a Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola, founded at Paris the Society of Jesus, which was soon to spread its works of teaching, science, and apostolate throughout the world. The Order of the Brothers of St. John of God, founded at Granada about 1540, had for its sole purpose the service of the sick. But the absolute devotedness of its members, who soon spread over all Europe, was in the eyes of the people a powerful argument for Catholic truth. St. Pius V raised the congregation to the rank of a religious Order in 1572.

Religious Orders in Italy

Under the protecting influence of the popes, the fertile soil of Italy ceased not to produce works of peaceful reform and apostolic zeal. After St. Cajetan and the Theatines, St. Antony Zaccaria and the Barnabites, St. Jerome Emiliani and the Somaschi, the restoration movement undertaken by the Council of Trent called forth in Italy St. Charles Borromeo and the Oblates, St. Philip Neri and the Oratorians, St. Camillus de Lellis and the Camillians, St. Joseph Calasanctius and the Pious Workers, St. Angela de Merici and the Ursulines.

We have already had occasion to mention St. Charles' foundations and the beneficent influence of St. Philip Neri. The Congregation of the Oratory,[25] springing from a group of priests and clerics whom St. Philip gathered about him for spiritual exercises and mutual edification,[26] was one of the most

[25] So called by St. Philip to indicate that its members, in the work of their personal reform, should rely principally on prayer.

[26] Incidents of sacred history were also set forth, with musical accompaniment. Hence the name "Oratorio," given to these musical compositions.

original creations of the period. "This institute," says the learned Oratorian, Father Augustine Theiner, "was founded on charity and the spirit of the first Christians"; and St. Francis de Sales called the Oratorian manner of living "an angelic life (*vita angelica*)."

Its members live in community, but their food is at their own expense; they have a common table, toward which they contribute a monthly sum. From the society the members receive absolutely nothing but lodging. They are bound by no vows, are free at any time to quit the institute and take with them whatever fortune they have brought in. Notwithstanding this extraordinary liberty, it is rare to see an Oratorian leave the congregation. The society's form of government is republican. The superior, though first in honor, in other matters is on an equality with all his brethren; he has to perform all the functions of his ministry, as preacher, confessor, etc., following the order of seniority; when he reaches eighty years of age, he is not exempt from serving at table, a service performd by the fathers and not, as in other Orders, by lay brothers. The superior is assisted by four advisers, called deputies, who with him direct the inner affairs of the society.

No public act can be decided except by a majority vote of the assembled congregation. In fact, the legislative power resides in the congregation, which may call on the superior for an accounting, may depose him and restore him, if it judge useful, without the approval of any other ecclesiastical authority. The bishop is the immediate superior of the congregation, but may not order its members to do anything outside the province of the institute, of which he is the guardian. The various houses of the Oratory are independent of one another and have no superior general.[27] At St. Philip's death, the Roman Oratory chose as superior the scholarly Baronius, author of the *An-*

[27] Augustin Theiner in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* (art. *"Philipp Neri"*).

nales Ecclesiastici, one of the greatest glories of the Oratory. The congregation, formed in 1564, was canonically approved in 1583 by Gregory XIII and spread rapidly in Germany, England, Austria, and even to Mexico and Ceylon.

The society of the Camillians, founded for the care of the sick, was approved by Sixtus V in 1586 and raised to the rank of a religious Order by Gregory XIV in 1591.

At this same time Caesar de Bus in the Comtat Venaissin (now in France) and St. Joseph Calasanctius at Rome were engaged in undertakings for the training and teaching of youth.

Caesar de Bus's life is a strange one and well reflects the agitation of those troublous times. He was born of an ancient and pious family (February 2nd, 1544) at Cavaillon in the Comtat Venaissin. At a mature age he joined the Confraternity of Black Penitents, served in the royal army against the Huguenots, in the intervals between wars occupied himself with painting and poetry, went to Paris for his health, lost his faith there, and became the most worldly of courtiers. After the death of his father and his brother, in the quiet life which he led in the country and in reading the lives of the saints, he found again the belief of his youth. Thereupon he engaged in works of mercy with the same ardor that he had shown in fighting the Protestants, in cultivating the fine arts, and in frequenting worldly company at the capital. Lastly, the reading of the Catechism of Trent opened his eyes to his true vocation. He would devote himself to the education of youth. Deprived of sight at the age of forty-nine, he supported his infirmity with wonderful patience, continued to instruct the children and the uneducated, and at his death was reputed a saint. The Society of Secular Clerics of Christian Doctrine, or Doctrinaires, founded by him in 1592, was approved by Clement VIII in 1597.[28]

[28] Cf. Beauvais, *Histoire de la vie du P. César de Bus.*

No less dramatic, but in a different way, was the life of St. Joseph Calasanctius. He was born in a city in the kingdom of Aragon, of a wealthy noble family. His vocation showed itself at an early age. While still very young, he used to gather little children about him and teach them their prayers and the mysteries of the faith. In 1592 he went to Rome, for a while joined St. Camillus de Lellis in caring for the pest victims, but his attraction always drew him to the children of the poor. He felt himself called by God to establish, under the Blessed Virgin's protection, a congregation, called the Congregation of Pious Schools, dedicated to the work of teaching poor children reading, writing, arithmetic, and bookkeeping. The new society, founded in 1597, rapidly passed from Italy to Bohemia, Germany, and Hungary. To keep it in its pristine fervor, its holy founder suffered untold tribulations. When more than eighty years old, he was insulted, calumniated, and persecuted by members of his own congregation, deposed from his office of superior general, obliged to submit to the yoke of his chief persecutor, and died in disgrace at the age of ninety-two, after predicting the rise and increase of his Order, at that time almost reduced to nothing.

At the side of these new Orders, devoted to the teaching of poor children, there existed in Italy, from the middle of the century, a congregation of women consecrated to the education of girls: this was the institute of the Ursulines,[29] founded in 1535 by St. Angela de Merici and approved by Pope Paul III in 1544. The rule prescribed neither a habit nor life in common under the same roof. The young ladies continued to live at home or with friends, generally wore a black dress and veil. The daily recitation of the Office of the Blessed Virgin, of the seven penitential psalms, and of a prayer composed by the founder, daily hearing of Mass, communion on feast days, the

[29] So called because the foundress placed them under the patronage of St. Ursula.

practice of the evangelical counsels, and a monthly meeting under the presidency of the father superior: such were the primitive observances of the institute. Before leaving this world, the holy founder, in her will, recommended to future superiors to be guided, in the government of the society, only by the love of God and zeal for the salvation of souls, to cherish a deep esteem for each of their spiritual daughters, to be mild after our Savior's example, and to guide their spiritual family, not by violence and severity, but by love and kindness. The faithful observance of these precepts favored the influence and expansion of the new institute, which, at the death of St. Charles Borromeo, its most devoted protector, counted 18 houses and 600 members.

CHAPTER VI

The Jesuits

THOUGH at bottom the spirit of these new congregations was the same as that which inspired the great Orders of the early Christian centuries and of the Middle Ages, yet it is impossible not to observe notable differences. A monk of St. Basil, St. Augustine, St. Benedict, St. Francis, or St. Dominic differs in many respects from a regular cleric of the sixteenth century. In the new institutes less time is given to choral office, manual labor, and the contemplative life, but a larger place is assigned to works of the apostolate, teaching and helping the poor. There is more poetry in the old Orders, while in the new there is more practical activity. When the bourgeois and the scholar were taking a place beside the old feudal lord in civil society, the Oratorian and the Jesuit appeared at the side of the sons of St. Benedict and St. Francis of Assisi.[1]

The Jesuit seems best to characterize the development of the religious life at the close of the Renaissance. There is some exaggeration in the saying that "the Church was Benedictine in the Middle Ages and became Jesuit after the Renaissance," [2] yet it is true that the son of St. Ignatius is the type of the religious of modern times.

The Society of Jesus received its special character from its founder and the providential circumstances of its foundation.

[1] It is scarcely necessary to say that the Franciscan and the Benedictine also take their place in this scientific and literary movement.

[2] "Since the time of the Council of Trent the work of the Jesuits has been inseparable from the progress of the Church. They have been the most complete, intense, and concentrated expression of the spirit of Catholicism." (Gabriel Monod, *La place de la Société de Jésus dans l'histoire de la Réforme,* in the *Revue politique et littéraire,* October 9th, 1909; cf. Boehmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites,* p. xviii.)

St. Ignatius of Loyola

Ignatius of Loyola, was born in 1491 [3] of a noble family in Guipuscoa. He was a page at the court of King Ferdinand of Aragon, then captain in the army of Charles V. With heroic valor he defended the city of Pampeluna against the French in 1521 and received two grievous wounds. During his convalescence he read, among other books, the *Flores sanctorum* and the Life of Christ by Ludolph the Carthusian. Thereupon he felt within him a desire to accomplish for God's glory other deeds of valor than those which his youth had dreamed of for his own glory. He hung up his sword and dagger in the sanctuary of Montserrat, led a life of penance and charitable devotion to the sick, retired to a cavern near Manresa, and there spent his time in exercises of piety which made a new man of him. At this period he began to make notes of his reflections, prayers, and various spiritual experiences; these notes grew into the famous *Spiritual Exercises.* To lead souls to sanctify themselves in the way he had followed and, with a chosen band, to form a little society of brethren devoted to the evangelization of the infidel Mussulmans, was his whole ambition. He conceives his future society as a military company marching to the conquest of souls under the standard of Christ the King as an army marches under the banner of an earthly monarch.[4] This becomes the spirit of the Society of Jesus: providential circumstances, enlarging Ignatius' views, pointed out its definitive mission.

The new convert, during his studies at the Universities of Alcala,[5] Salamanca,[6] and Paris, won six devoted companions

[3] This is the date proposed by Astrain, after a scholarly discussion, in his *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España,* I, p. 3.

[4] See the meditation on the Two Standards, in the *Spiritual Exercises.*

[5] It was during his stay at Alcala that his ardent zeal and the exaggerations of two women whose consciences he was directing led to his being twice denounced to the Inquisition and being imprisoned. (Cf. Fouqueray, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France,* I, p. 6.)

[6] At Salamanca Ignatius was subjected to new prosecutions and another imprison-

to his project: Peter Faber, Francis Xavier, Alphonse Salmeron, James Lainez, Simon Rodriguez, and Nicholas Bobadilla. At the church of Montmartre in Paris (August 15th, 1534) all of them together took the vow of chastity and poverty and agreed to care for sick Christians at Jerusalem and to labor for the conversion of the Turks, by placing themselves at the disposal of the pope.

The idea of enlarging the field of action of this little band seems to have come to Ignatius at the time he met Pietro Caraffa, one of the founders of the Theatines, the future Paul IV. The oldest chroniclers say explicitly that the Saint was never willing to report what took place between himself and Caraffa, although letting it be understood that there were incidents of some importance.[7] It has been suggested as a reasonable hypothesis that "the Theatines called his attention to the abuses which defiled the Roman Church, as well as to the moral degeneracy of the West, and invited him to a field of action as wide as it was fruitful." [8] Not long after, encountering insurmountable obstacles that prevented him and his companions from going to the Holy Land, Ignatius decided, in accord with the last part of the vow at Montmartre, to place himself and his little group at the disposal of the Holy Father.

His first impression of the city of Rome on reaching there,

ment, in consequence of which he decided to quit that city and Spain. (Fouqueray, I, p. 7.)

[7] Joly, *St. Ignatius of Loyola,* p. 141.

[8] Cf. Joly, *Ibid.* Some historians have wondered whether St. Ignatius did not belong to the Order of Theatines for a while. There is a popular tradition that he did. At times St. Teresa in her correspondence used the word Theatines to designate the Jesuits. (*Lettres de sainte Thérèse,* edited by Grégoire de Saint Joseph, I, pp. 7, 154, 437; III, p. 350.) The latest biographers of St. Ignatius reject this hypothesis, as having no serious foundation. The similarity of dress and the analogous character of their activities may have confused the two societies in the minds of the people. Moreover, at that time, the word Theatine, to which a fanciful etymology had given the meaning of "man of God," was much in vogue. (See Maulde la Clavière, *op. cit.,* p. 88, and Joly, *St. Ignatius,* pp. 141, 157.)

in 1538, was well calculated to keep the holy founder in the West, attracted, as he always was, by the opportunity of accomplishing the greatest good. "Judging by appearances," he wrote, "we are laboring on land barren in good works and fertile in bad." [9] It was the very time when the reform commission, appointed by Paul III and principally composed of Pietro Caraffa, Giovanni Morone, Sadoleto, Aleander, and Contarini, had just proposed to the Pope the desperate expedient of suppressing all monasteries, or at least temporarily forbidding them to accept new members, so as to reorganize the religious life on entirely new foundations.[10] The Sovereign Pontiff declined to adopt this radical measure; but it was under the influence of these circumstances that Ignatius and Paul III considered the plan of a new Order, which would not, as most of the old monastic congregations, have a particular aim of penance or preaching, of corporal works of mercy or liturgical prayer, but would embrace in its mission all forms of the apostolate, literary and theological teaching in all its degrees, good works of all sorts, home and foreign missions, and would view the whole world as its field of action. The precise idea of the Society of Jesus was at last found. As one historian says, "it was a series of events, independent of Ignatius' will, which led him to create that vast organization of teaching, preaching, and spiritual direction, that was to hold Protestantism in check and so powerfully to collaborate with the work of the Council of Trent." [11]

By the constitution *"Regimini militantis"* (September 27th, 1540), Paul III authorized "his beloved sons Ignatius Loyola,

[9] Joly, p. 153. It may be that by these words St. Ignatius was alluding to the odious calumnies that were being spread at Rome against him and his companions. (Cf. Fouqueray, I, p. 69.)

[10] The work of this commission, though drawn up in 1537, was not published until the next year, just when St. Ignatius reached Rome. (Cf. Le Plat, II, p. 601.)

[11] Gabriel Monod in the *Revue politique et littéraire*, October 9th, 1909; Boehmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites*, p. xxvi.

Peter Faber, etc., to form a society, known as the Company of Jesus, and to receive therein whosoever, desirous of carrying arms for God and of serving only Jesus Christ our Lord and the Roman Pontiff, His vicar on earth, would be disposed to take the vow of perpetual chastity and to labor for the advancement of souls in the Christian life by preaching, by spiritual exercises, the hearing of people's confessions, and works of charity." [12]

St. Ignatius died on July 31st, 1556, leaving thirteen provinces, a hundred houses, and over a thousand religious. James Lainez, his successor, held the first general congregation, which approved the constitutions.[13] We cannot find a more exact idea of them than Ribadeneira's summary.[14]

The Jesuit Form of Government

"This is our system and form of government. At the head of the Society is a single general, armed with supreme power. He is chosen by the votes of the provincials, who are accompanied by two professed members that each province appoints and sends with its provincial to the general assembly.

"The general is elected for life. By virtue of his great knowledge of the members and affairs of the Society, he appoints the college rectors and superiors of the various houses,

[12] Bull *"Regimini,"* in the *Instit. Soc. J.* (Florence ed.), I, pp. 1 sqq. *Bullarium Romanum,* IV, pp. 185 sqq.

[13] It has been claimed that at this general assembly Lainez profoundly modified St. Ignatius' work, "reducing the government of the Institute to absolutism and making its fundamental law the will of the superior," almost assimilating it to those old Mussulman communities, long known in Spain, and being inspired by them. (H. Müller, *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus,* pp. 246–258.) There seems to be no doubt that the constitutions that were approved in 1556 contained certain changes of St. Ignatius' primitive text; but these were merely modifications of details, quite in conformity with the views of the founder and inspired by his spirit. (Cf. Joly, pp. 214 sqq.; *Études,* December 5, 1898.)

[14] A more detailed analysis of the Jesuit Constitutions will be found in Fouqueray, I, pp. 100–126.

designates the provincials, visitors, and commissaries. This method is well calculated to preserve peace, modesty, and humility; for it suppresses or attenuates the passions, dissensions, jealousies, and hatreds which nearly always follow the election of superiors when the latter depend on the appreciation and good will of a great number.

"It is likewise the general who, either directly or through his provincials, governs the colleges. It is he who dispenses to his brethren the permissions and privileges granted by the Holy See, restricting some, moderating others, or withdrawing them. He has full power to admit members, to exclude, and to call the general assemblies, at which he presides. In short, all questions in the Society are subject to his judgment and decision.

"He is chosen with extreme care; yet, in order that he may not abuse his power, those who elect him choose, at the same time, four other Fathers from the most recommendable. These four are called his assistants and form his council. The general assembly, which represents the entire Society and which is above even the general, can be convoked by the assistants. It can depose the general and, if the case should require, can pronounce still graver sentence against him.

"This mode of government closely approaches a monarchy; but it still more resembles an aristocracy; for it avoids what is vicious in each of the two systems and takes what is best in each. That the government should be in the hands of one person is a condition of stability, provided he be moderate and prudent. Yet there is reason to fear that, puffed up by this honor, he may follow whim rather than reason, and that he may abuse his power to the loss of many, whereas it is confided to him for their salvation. Even though he might be spared this misfortune, and even though he be never so wise, yet no man can know all; consequently the general welfare requires multiplicity of counsel: each one gives to the others

the advantages of what he is in a better position to know than they are. There is, then, the danger that there will be as many opinions as there are heads and that what ought to contribute to the unity of an assembly or society will be scattered and dispersed. To avoid these two dangers, our Company took from monarchy its unity, from aristocracy the council, thus moderating the two systems, the one by the other, in such wise that the general commands all and at the same time is subject to all (*praesit et subsit*). Such is the constitution, such the method of government of our Company which St. Ignatius elaborated and bequeathed to us." [15]

We can now see what constitutes the originality of the constitution of the Jesuits. Whereas St. Teresa and the other reformers of the old Orders sought to strengthen the cloister walls and to restrict the enclosure limits, St. Ignatius freed his religious from the bonds of monastic observance; on the other hand, unlike most founders of new religious Orders, (such as the founder of the Oratory), who accentuate democratic organization, the founder of the Company of Jesus endowed his congregation with an essentially monarchical and aristocratic character. The very conception of the new foundation, the complexity of the functions assigned to it, its international character, its exemption from many canonical rules, which St. Ignatius and Lainez asked as a condition of freer and more supple activity, doubtless required, as a means of harmony and unity of action, the existence of a firmer internal bond. As a Protestant historian says, "at the time when the Society of Jesus was constituted, the Church might reasonably

[15] "Nothing justifies the belief that the Jesuits had secret constitutions and rules in addition to the official Constitutions of the Order. The *Monita secreta,* which have been attributed to them, are a satire fabricated probably by a certain Zoborowski, a Polish Jesuit expelled from the Order, who published them at Cracow in 1614." (Gabriel Monod, *Mémoire lu à l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques,* October 16th, 1909. Cf. Bernard, *Les instructions secrètes des Jésuites; Monita secreta Societatis Jesu;* Boehmer-Monod, *op. cit.,* pp. lii–lxx; and Brou, *Les Jésuites de la légende,* ch. 9.)

have been alarmed at the disorder which the Protestant Reformation and the Renaissance had introduced into the religious edifice bequeathed by the past. It was to that requirement of rule and order, which then seemed the primordial need of Christian society, that the Society of Jesus responded." [16]

Yet this new organization did not get established without difficulties. Says a Jesuit historian: "From the outset the Society had to struggle: at first over the question of its name, then because of the absence of choir prayer. The attack was sharp, although restrained by the pope. The danger increased when Paul IV introduced the practice of holding choir and reduced the general's term of office to three years. These measures were abolished by his successors. The recitation of the Office in common was reëstablished by Pius V (1572), but afterwards suppressed. Finally Gregory XVI put an end to all these vicissitudes by confirming, in the Bull *"Ecclesiae catholicae"* (June 28th, 1591), the primitive constitutions established by St. Ignatius." [17] Still graver difficulties developed in regard to the essentially international character which St. Ignatius had desired to give his work. "As the unbroken succession of Spaniards as generals of the society was considered dangerous, this continuity was interrupted, after the death of St. Francis Borgia, by the election of Everard Mercurian. The discontent of the Spaniards broke out under General Claudio Aquaviva, who was an Italian. They wanted procurators and a commissary general for their country, with authority inde-

[16] Monod (p. 458). Monod goes on to say that "we may wonder whether, by the exclusive triumph of this idea of the Order, all freedom would not have been destroyed." We should, however, note that, according to the very rules of the Society of Jesus, the duty of obedience does not extend to the case of a superior commanding something that is contrary to the law of God (*"ubi Deo contraria praecipit homo"*). Nor should we forget that the fourth chapter of the Constitutions, "on the authority and watchfulness which the Society should exercise over its general," expressly limits his powers. (On Michelet's calumnies in this matter, see Boehmer-Monod, p. xiii.)

[17] Albers, *Manuel d'histoire ecclésiastique*, II, p. 311.

pendent of the general. Philip II backed up these claims; Sixtus V sustained the general. Lastly under Paul V, by the constitution *"Quantum religio"* (September 4th, 1606), the primitive institution prevailed." [18]

Expansion of Jesuit Activities

This primitive institution was animated by so powerful a vitality that, while encountering such assaults, it had enabled the new religious to accomplish marvels of zeal. No one has described with loftier impartiality the Apostolic labors of the first Jesuits than the Protestant historian Leopold von Ranke: "Not in Rome only, but throughout all Italy, the most extraordinary success attended their efforts; designed in the first instance for the common people, the Society of Jesus was not slow to gain acceptance from the higher classes also. It was highly favored in Parma by the Farnese; princesses submitted themselves to the Spiritual Exercises. In Venice, the Gospel of St. John was expounded by Lainez expressly for the nobility, and, in 1542, he succeeded, with the assistance of one of the Lippomano family, in laying the foundation of a Jesuit college in that city. So extraordinary a degree of influence was gained by Francesco Strada over the citizens of Montepulciano that many were induced to accompany him through the streets, when he went begging—Strada knocking at the different doors, and his companions receiving the donations. They made themselves extremely popular in Faenza, although this city had previously been much under the influence of Bernardino Ochino. They established schools there, succeeded in allaying

[18] *Ibid.* These internal quarrels in the Society of Jesus are related in detail by Astrain (*op. cit.*, vol. III). By the evidence of archival documents, he there shows that the intrigues were the work of a small number of malcontents, the most noted of whom was the celebrated Father Mariano, author of the *General History of Spain.*

enmities of a hundred years' standing, and in forming societies for the relief of the poor. I name these instances as examples only; suffice it to say, that they appeared everywhere, gained numerous adherents, and firmly established their ascendancy.

"But as Ignatius Loyola was altogether a Spaniard, and entirely possessed by the ideas of his nation, as also he had thence received his most zealous disciples, it followed that his society, wholly Spanish in spirit, made greater progress in Spain than even in Italy. A very important conquest was gained at Barcelona in the person of Francesco Borgia, duke of Gandia. Such multitudes flocked to hear Araoz, in Valencia, that no church could contain them, and a pulpit was prepared for him in the open air. Equally successful was Francisco Villanova in Alcala, where he gained numerous adherents of high consideration, notwithstanding his low birth, weakness of health, and total want of learning. From this city and that of Salamanca, where the Jesuits commenced their establishment in a small wretched house in 1548, they afterwards extended themselves over all Spain. Nor were they less cordially received in Portugal. Of the first two Jesuits who were sent to him at his own request, the King retained one, Simon Rodriguez, near his person; the other he dispatched to the East Indies; and this latter was Francis Xavier, who gained for himself the name of an apostle and the glory of a saint. At both the peninsular courts, the Jesuits gained extraordinary popularity; that of Portugal they reformed altogether, and in the Spanish court they were almost instantly selected as confessors by the most distinguished nobles, the president of the council of Castile, and the Cardinal of Toledo." [19]

The Society extended itself over the Netherlands. In Lorraine the most decisive success attended the efforts of Faber. Eighteen young men, already masters of arts or bachelors in

[19] Ranke, I, p. 169.

that university, attached themselves to his steps, offering to abandon home and country, for the purpose of following him into Portugal.[20]

"The instruction of youth had been hitherto left to men who, after long study of profane literature, had turned their attention to theological subjects, which they treated in a manner never very acceptable to the court of Rome, and eventually altogether reprobated by it. The Jesuits took upon themselves to expel these men from their office, and to occupy it in their stead. They began by the closest observance of a carefully considered system, dividing the schools into classes, and pursuing in these a method strictly uniform, from the earliest principles of learning to the highest degree of science. They paid close attention to moral culture, and formed their pupils to good character and correct manners. . . . They were expressly forbidden to ask or accept remuneration or reward; as were their sermons and masses, so was their instruction altogether gratuitous." [21]

Their colleges sprang up throughout Europe. In 1550 Emperor Ferdinand, realizing that the surest way to preserve pure Catholic doctrine in Germany was to provide pious and learned teachers for the young, turned to Ignatius Loyola. The next year, thirteen Jesuits, among them the scholarly Claude Lejay, founded their first college at Vienna. Five years later, we find them established at Cologne and Ingolstadt. From these three cities they spread into all the cities of Germany. In France, under favor of letters patent from Henry II (January, 1515), the Jesuits had to overcome the formidable opposition of Parliament and the University, which feared their in-

[20] *Ibid.*, I, p. 165.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 172. A German Protestant historian writes: "We hear it said that it was the Prussian school-teacher who won the victory at Sadowa and made sure the hegemony of Prussia. There is even more reason for saying that it was the Jesuit school-teacher who assured the supremacy of the old Church in many countries." (Boehmer-Monod, p. 55.)

fluence. After the Conspiracy of Amboise, in 1560, Francis II planned setting them up as a bulwark against heresy. But the foes of the Society did not disarm. Of all the reasons alleged against its legal admission into France, the principal one was the number of privileges it had received from the sovereign pontiffs. In a petition addressed to Parliament the Jesuits protested "that they were asking for nothing more than the mendicant Orders, nothing, consequently, that was contrary to the Church in France and the concordats between the king and the Holy See." [22] On October 9th, 1560, positive orders, signed by the King of France, confirmed "the Bulls granted to the Company of Jesus by Popes Paul and Julius . . . in the hope that the fruit it will bring to Paris and other places of the kingdom will greatly exceed the embarrassments and difficulties cited by the opinions of the bishop of Paris and the faculty of theology. . . . As to these difficulties, moreover, should they arise, it will be easy to make provision through the bishops and prelates, who, as becomes them, have an open eye for whatever concerns the people's instruction." [23] Neither these nor other letters from Charles IX (December 23rd, 1560 and March 14th, 1561) caused a cessation of Parliament's resistance. But, with the backing of royal approval, the Jesuits founded several colleges in succession at Pamiers (1561), Tournon (1562), Mauriac (1563), Toulouse (1564),

[22] Letter from Father Cogordan to Father Lainez (July 16th, 1560), quoted by Fouqueray, I, p. 237. "By this renunciation of privileges," says Crétineau-Joly, "the Jesuits placed themselves in an impregnable position. Objection was made to the favors granted them by Rome. These favors they abandoned as explicitly as possible." (*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus,* I, p. 325.) Fouqueray, a recent historian of the Jesuits, does not admit this interpretation. "Such is not the meaning of Father Cogordan's words," he writes. "The Company could not give up privileges granted by the Holy See, as being necessary for their freedom of action. It could only agree to moderate the exercise thereof in case some of these privileges should be in opposition to the laws of the realm." (Fouqueray, I, p. 327.) The enemies of the Jesuits believed, or pretended to believe, that a veritable renunciation had been made.

[23] Quoted by Fouqueray, I, p. 239.

Avignon (1565), then at Chambery, Lyons, Bordeaux, etc. The opening of the Collège de Clermont at Paris, where Maldonatus taught, led to prolonged law-suits with the University (1565–1567). The foundation of the University of Pont-à-Mousson finally crowned their persevering efforts in the teaching of youth. [24] To the office of teacher, several of them added that of missioner. Such were Father Anger, who evangelized Toulouse, Lyons, Rheims, Metz, Bourges, and Paris, Father Possevin, who gave missions at Marseilles in the royal galleys, and Father Maldonatus, who debated with Protestant ministers at Sedan.

The labors of the French missioners were surpassed by those of the Apostle of Germany, St. Peter Canisius.[25] Educator, preacher, organizer and pillar of his Order, adviser and director of princes, champion of Catholicism in the diets of the empire, papal nuncio and publicist, in all these varied functions he had only one aim, which gave unity to his life, namely, to set up a true and salutary religious restoration as opposed to the false reformation. This it was that led both Catholics and Protestants to give his work the name of "Counter-Reformation." A large number of his brethren followed his example. They were, says Ranke, "at once diligent and visionary, worldly wise, yet full of enthusiasm; well-bred men and attractive companions; disregarding their personal interests, but laboring for the advancement of each other. We cannot wonder that they were successful. . . Such a combination has never been exhibited in the world before or since." [26]

The history of the Jesuits became inseparable from the universal history of the Church. They are henceforth seen in the

[24] Details of these foundations will be found in Fouqueray, I, pp. 363–616.

[25] Peter Canisius was born at Nimégue, May 5th, 1521, and died in the odor of sanctity, December 21st, 1597. He was beatified by Pius IX, June 24th, 1864, and canonized by Pius XI, June 21st, 1925. (See Vacant-Mangenot's *Dict. de théol. cath.*, art. "Canisius," by Le Bachelet).

[26] Ranke, I, p. 417. Cf. Macaulay, *History of England*, II, pp. 712–718, *i. e.* ch. 6.

first ranks, with St. Francis Xavier, in that magnificent movement which, in the sixteenth century, carried so great a number of missioners to the shores of Asia, America, and Africa, where, at the price of their sweat and blood, they tried to compensate for the cruel losses that heresy inflicted on the Church on the soil of Europe.

CHAPTER VII

The Catholic Reformation in the Intellectual World

ERASMUS, RABELAIS, and Montaigne, both in their lives and in their works, admirably show forth that indefinable and equivocal spirit of the Renaissance, with its encyclopedic range and restless aspirations, at once skeptical and impassioned, wherein the Epicureanism and Stoicism of ancient Rome were so strangely mingled with the mysticism of the Gospel.[1] Following the Council of Trent, there appeared, in the nations that remained Catholic, three literary works of a frankly religious inspiration: Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered* in Italy, Camoens' *Lusiades* in Portugal, and the dramatic works of Lope de Vega in Spain. All three poets have recourse to the fables of pagan mythology; all three exalt national sentiment; and thereby they truly belong to their century; but all three take their heroes from Christian history, and their poems are animated by a sincerely Catholic spirit. Tasso died invoking the Blessed Virgin; Camoens, in his misfortunes, remained steadfast to the faith of his childhood; Lope de Vega, educated by the Jesuits and honored with the friendship of the highest dignitaries of the Church, died in sacred Orders. Popularity at once crowned their works, in which they celebrate the heroism of

[1] Erasmus, Montaigne, and Rabelais represent three aspects of humanism—that attempt to return to antiquity and to nature which the Middle Ages are said to have misunderstood. We have spoken above of Erasmus' learned dilettantism and of his successive attitudes to the Reformation. On the Neo-Stoicism of Montaigne, see Strowski, *Pascal et son temps,* vol. I "From Montaigne to Pascal," pp. 28–58. On the Epicureanism of Rabelais and his changing attitudes toward Protestant teaching, see Hauser, *Études sur la Réforme française,* pp. 47–52, 61.

the crusades, the conquest of the New World for Catholic civilization, and the Christian worship of honor.

In the fine arts a like evolution betrayed itself. Art, seeking to adapt itself to the diverse surroundings, becomes divided into national schools;[2] at the same time, under the influence of the decrees of Trent, it little by little abandons its too pagan inspiration. In 1573, Paul Veronese is cited before the Holy Office and rebuked for not following Catholic tradition closely enough in his "Last Supper";[3] but the Bologna school, founded by the Carraches, soon after produced, after Annibal Carrache's pathetic *"Ecce homo"* and his brother Augustine's appealing "Saint Jerome," the wonderful "Communion of St. Jerome" by Domenichino, Guido's charming Madonnas, and the fine religious paintings of Barbieri (Il Guercino).[4]

During the latter half of the sixteenth century it is true that architecture experienced an evolution, the worth of which is much disputed. The church of the Gesù, begun at Rome by Vignola in 1568, remains a typical example. The Jesuits, great builders at that period, adopted this as a model, and the style of those churches, by that fact, received the name of Jesuit style. It consists especially in making the façade of the structure the most richly decorated part, about which all the other members of the construction seem, according to an art critic, "to stir and set in motion in a great crescendo."[5]

Whatever may be the artistic merits of these temples, Pietro Luigi Palestrina's music on days of great solemnity gave them a new soul. The theatrical tone which church music had taken for some time past evoked the Council of Trent's protest.[6] By the investigations of numerous scholars it is shown to-day

[2] André Michel in Lavisse and Rambaud, V, p. 441.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 416.

[4] On the Bolognese school, see Marcel Raymond, *L'école bolonaise,* in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes,* January 1st, 1910.

[5] Michel in Lavisse and Rambaud, V, p. 423.

[6] See Vigourel, *La liturgie et la vie chrétienne,* pp. 476 sqq.

that the Plain Chant which Gregory the Great introduced in the churches was followed until the fifteenth century. In the Middle Ages there was added to the liturgical work of the great Pope a wealth of sequences, hymns, antiphons, and responses whose religious rhythm harmonized well with the architectural style of the venerable cathedrals.

Unhappily the development of polyphonic music (that is, music written for several voices together) little by little destroyed the rhythm of the Gregorian Chant, which became a body without a soul. The long vowel passages, having now lost their rhythm and being sung heavily, no longer inspired anything but weariness and disgust. They were abridged. Other means were sought of stirring the faithful. Profane polyphonic music, thanks to its incomparable resources of harmony and instrumentation, easily took the place of the Gregorian Chant, whose meaning seemed to be lost. Moreover, the simplicity of the Plain Chant and its long vowel passages no longer fitted in with the artistic taste of the period. On this point, as on others, there was felt a need of innovation. *"Abbrevietur cantus"* became the watchword, which found an echo even in the councils. But in abridging the Gregorian Chant, they denatured it. John XXII rose up against the mania of the innovators, who tried to "musicalize" the Plain Chant. Yet the taste for novelty continued and prevailed even at Rome. The new music, excellent to express and arouse the passions, substituted for genuine religious sentiment a vague sentimentality, more fitted to make dilettantes than Christians.

Pope Pius IV, wishing to meet the desires expressed by the Council of Trent, appointed a commission to decide on the following question: Is it useful to tolerate music in the churches? At the same time he rigorously applied the Church law which prescribed that only clerics should constitute the papal choir.

One effect of this measure was to deprive of his post a poor choirmaster, Giovanni Pierluigi, more commonly known as

Palestrina, from the name of his home city. Forgotten and forsaken, he withdrew to a poor hut near Monte Celio. But Palestrina was a lofty, courageous soul. In the silence of his retirement he devoted himself to his art with a perseverance and enthusiasm that inspired the finest and most original musical productions. The humble artist excelled in his ability to grasp and render the deep sense of a Scripture text. No one was more capable of giving church music a truly religious accent. Of this the papal commission finally took account.

Palestrina applied himself to the task. On one of the poor maestro's manuscripts are found these words: "Lord, enlighten me!" After two fruitless attempts, he succeeded in a period of inspiration in composing "The Mass of Pope Marcellus." Its success exceeded all hopes. An imploring "Kyrie," an humble "Agnus Dei," and a triumphant "Gloria" express the meaning of the text with astonishing truth and precision. Pius IV was charmed and declared that he thought he was listening to angelic melodies when he heard this mass. The question was thenceforth settled in favor of church music. At last a field was opened, wherein the most beautiful and varied productions could be displayed to the world's admiration without injury to the edification of the faithful.

The restoration of theological studies sustained the movement of literary and artistic reform. St. Thomas, whose writings were a guide to the Council of Trent, and whom Pius V declared a doctor of the Church in 1567, became the soul of this renaissance. It centered in Spain and Portugal. The University of Salamanca, where the Dominicans taught, was its cradle. St. Thomas' *Summa Theologica* replaced Peter Lombard's *Sentences* in the schools. Francis of Vittoria (1480-1566), to whom belongs the honor of giving us the first systematic doctrine of the right of war, was the promoter of the Thomist renaissance. Melchior Cano (1509–1560), Dominic Soto (1494–1560), and Dominic Bañez (1528–1604) fol-

lowed in his footsteps and gave to scholastic teaching a purer diction and improved literary form.

In the Society of Jesus, which St. Ignatius had ordered to follow the teaching of St. Thomas, Pedro da Fonseca (1548–1597), surnamed the Aristotle of Coimbra, James Lainez (1512–1565), Gabriel Vasquez (1551–1604), Francisco Toledo (1532–1596), and Luis de Molina (1535–1601) commented on the writings of the Angelic Doctor. But in Spain none equalled Francisco Suarez (1548–1617), who was surnamed "Doctor Eximius." "In him alone," says Bossuet, "you will hear most of the moderns." [7] Suarez' influence was due to the perspicacity of his genius, the vast extent of his erudition, the persuasive clearness of his style, and the logical force of his argumentation. Without ever departing from the spirit or essential teaching of St. Thomas, he did not hesitate to enunciate original ideas on particular points. "His *Disputationes Metaphysicae* is undoubtedly one of the ablest, fullest, and clearest repertories of Scholastic metaphysics. It is no commentary, but an original treatise on Being, its categories and causes," [8] wherein, in disagreement with St. Thomas, Suarez rejects the real distinction between essence and existence, and this difference leads him to explain several theological doctrines in a manner different from that of the Thomists.[9]

Being of a naturally moderate spirit, Suarez showed himself eclectic and conciliatory in disputed questions. Between Thomism and Molinism, of which we will speak presently, he devised the system of "Congruism." His theory of faith shows a desire to give a proportionate place to the various psychological ele-

[7] Bossuet, *Préface sur l'instruction pastorale donnée à Cambrai le 15 de septembre 1697*, no. 34. This passage of Bossuet is frequently but wrongly quoted as, "Suarez, in whom we hear the whole School." However great Bossuet's praise, it does not go that far.

[8] De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, p. 494.

[9] Cf. A. Martin, *Suarez métaphysicien commentateur de saint Thomas*, in *La Science Catholique*, 1898, pp. 686 sqq., and De Wulf, p. 442.

ments of the rational and moral order that constitute it. According to him, faith does not rest on the evidence of truth which is its subject, nor on the evidence of the witness who affirms that truth, but upon "the evidence of the obligation to believe it." To him it seems that such a theory safeguards better than any other the element of feeling and the element of freedom which the act of faith necessarily imports.[10]

In the realm of social morality, the great Spanish theologian had at heart the purpose of reconciling the rights of rulers with the rights of the people. "The common opinion," he wrote, "seems to be that God gives the power. Men furnish the matter, so to speak; in some way God gives the form by conferring the power; but it should be understood that the civil power, whenever found in a man, has emanated, by ordinary and legitimate right, from the people, either proximately or in a remote way; for it to be just, it cannot be had otherwise." [11]

It was a like theory that was more fully and enthusiastically held in Italy by Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, whom Ranke justly calls "the most powerful controversialist of the Catholic Church" [12] and of whom Bayle says that "there is no author who has better sustained the cause of the Church in general and of the pope in particular." [13] In the first place, Bellarmine, like Suarez, gave an example of the most eminent virtues.[14] A rich memory, a remarkable faculty of assimilation, a clearness of thought and method, making him fit to grasp any question promptly and to set it forth clearly, permitted the learned Jesuit

[10] Suarez, *De fide,* disput. III, s. 7 and 8. Cf. Brugère, *De vera religione,* appendix 9; *De doctrina theologorum scholasticorum circa finem,* pp. 290 sqq.

[11] Suarez, *De legibus,* bk. 3, ch. 3. On Suarez, see Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius,* I, pp. 138–142.

[12] Ranke, I, p. 383.

[13] Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique,* III, p. 264.

[14] *"A multis vocatum in dubium est, doctiorne Suarez an sanctior."* (Hurter, I, p. 139.) As for Bellarmine, the process of his canonization, which was twice resumed under Benedict XIV, "was halted," says Hefele, "only because the Bourbon court at that time would have regarded the canonization of a Jesuit as an attack against it."

to mingle in all the controversies of his time while neglecting none of the duties of his ministry. Not one of his pastoral, oratorical, ascetical, exegetical, or theological works but does honor to his name. Yet Bellarmine is first of all the apologist of the papal primacy. On the origin of civil power, on the indirect authority of the popes in relation to the temporal power of kings and on the right of popular resistance to tyranny, Bellarmine forcibly proclaims the theories taught by the Scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages.

"It is certain," he writes, "that public authority comes from God, from whom alone emanate good and licit things. The Wisdom of God has so said in the Book of Proverbs: 'By me kings reign.' " [15] But, after setting down this principle, which puts an abyss between his theories and those of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Bellarmine loudly proclaims that "the public power resides *immediately* in the whole multitude, as in its subject, for, the positive right having been bestowed, there is no reason for one man ruling rather than another; and, as human society is a perfect government, it should have the power of self-preservation, hence the power to punish those who disturb the peace." [16] Bellarmine considers, moreover, that a Christian

[15] *"Certum est politicam potestatem a Deo esse, a quo non nisi res bonae ac licitae procedunt. Sapientia Dei clamat (Prov. 8:15): Per me reges regnant."* (Bellarmine, *Disputationes de controversiis fidei,* II, bk. 3, ch. 6.)

[16] *"Nota hanc potestatem esse, tanquam in subjecto, in tota multitudine; sublato jure positivo, non est major ratio cur ex multis aequalibus unus, potius quam alius, dominetur; humana societas debet esse perfecta respublica, ergo habere potestatem seipsam conservandi et proinde puniendi perturbatores pacis."* (Ibid.) King James I attributed to Bellarmine the assertion that every king is chosen by his subjects and for various reasons may be deposed by them. Bellarmine disavowed this doctrine. What the learned Jesuit maintains is merely that the titles of rulers, of whatever sort, are of purely human right, that, at least originally, the right of designating such rulers resides in the people, and that the people have the right to recover their liberty if the government degenerates into tyranny. Thus expressed, Bellarmine's opinion is undoubtedly open to dispute and, in fact, is disputed. But no one can deny that it agrees with the principles enunciated by St. Thomas Aquinas and admitted by most Scholastics. The Protestant theory granted less liberty to the people. Henry VIII set up the divine right of kings in opposition to the divine right of popes. Article 39 of the "Confession of Faith of the Churches of France" de-

people may free itself from the yoke of an infidel king who is drawing it into infidelity, in the same way that a Christian wife may free herself from the authority of an infidel husband, following the precept of the apostle and the decretals of the popes.[17]

Although the question of papal authority was ever the dominant preoccupation of the illustrious controversialist, yet, in his celebrated *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus Temporis Haereticos,* Bellarmine touches on all the points of dogma or morals attacked by the Protestants. Having a thorough knowledge of the works of Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Beza and the Socinians, he clearly sets forth the points in dispute and solves them by the help of his remarkable Patristic erudition. Hence he is regarded as one of the first representatives of positive theology.[18]

The author of the *Controversies* had only to follow the way

clares that "God has established kingdoms, republics, and all other kinds of principalities and whatever pertains to the state of justice, and wishes to be acknowledged as their author. This cause has put the sword in the hands of rulers for the repression of sins." Calvin declares that the ideal of a good government is more easily attained in an aristocratic régime or in the union of aristocracy and republic. "The domination and overlordship of a single man," says Calvin, "is a form of power the least agreeable to men, but in Scripture it is especially recommended as above all others." Kings and magistrates are "the ministers and vicars of God." (Cf. Calvin, *Institutes,* bk. 4, ch. 2; Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale,* II, pp. 150–155.)

[17] *"Cur non potest liberari populus fidelis a jugo regis infidelis et pertrahentis ad infidelitatem, si conjux fidelis liber est ab obligatione manendi cum conjuge infideli, quando ille non vult manere cum conjuge christiana sine injuria fidei, et aperte deduxit ex Paulo, I Cor. 7, Innocentius III, cap. Gaudemus, Extrav. De divortiis."* (Bellarmine, *De Romano pontifice,* bk. 5, ch. 7.) In a smaller writing, not found in his complete works, but of undoubted authenticity (see Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus,* I, p. 1180), entitled, *Responsio . . . pro successione Henrici Navarreni, auctore Francisco Romulo,* Bellarmine applies this principle to the kingdom of France and declares Henry of Navarre deprived of the right of succession to the crown because he was declared a heretic by Sixtus V. On Bellarmine's life and works, see Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius,* I, p. 272; Le Bachelet in Vacant-Mangenot's *Dict. de théol.* (art. "Bellarmin"), and La Servière, *La théologie de Bellarmin.*

[18] Hurter, I, p. 272.

opened by the brilliant author of *De Locis Theologicis,* the Spaniard, Melchior Cano (1509–1560). This important work, which appeared about the middle of the century, marked a notable stage in the history of ecclesiastical studies. "The *De Locis Theologicis,*" says Mandonnet, "is a veritable manifesto of theological data. It is the result of the reform action carried on in Spain by Francis of Vittoria, whose most faithful and brilliant disciple Cano was. A return to Patristic erudition and the use of a literary tongue in theological sciences were the predominant points of view in the direction created by Vittoria and realized by Cano with remarkable masterfulness." [19] The *De Locis Theologicis,* which Melchior Cano's premature death left incomplete, is a treatise on method in theology. A great delicacy of judgment, a well-informed critical sense, and a finished literary form make Cano's work the equal of the finest productions of the Renaissance.[20]

Positive critical methods also prevailed in the exegetical studies of Estius and Maldonatus. William Estius, chancellor of the University of Douai (1542–1613), won the enthusiastic admiration of his contemporaries by the talent he displayed in his commentary on the Apostolic Epistles and his explanation of the texts which the Protestants quoted to sustain their false doctrines. Notwithstanding certain doctrinal errors, resembling those of his teacher, Baius, he received the title of "Doctor Fundatissimus" from Benedict XIV. But his renown was surpassed by that of the Jesuit Maldonatus (1534–1583). Maldonatus was born in Estremadura and taught theology at Rome. When the Society of Jesus obtained the right to open schools in Paris (1562), it called the learned professor thither. Equally well-versed in history and the Oriental languages as

[19] Mandonnet in Vacant-Mangenot, *op. cit.* (art. "Cano").

[20] Cano's opinion on matrimony, which, according to him, becomes a Sacrament only by the intervention of the priest, had enough weight to induce a large number of theologians to follow it. For a while it even became the common opinion. Cf. *De locis theologicis,* bk. 8, ch. 4.

in philosophy and theology, Maldonatus obtained the greatest success in his public lectures on the four Gospels. Like Abélard, he drew to these classes so great a number of followers that the hall where he taught could not hold them and he was obliged to teach in the open air. Calvinist preachers followed his lectures and admired his scholarship. Says Dom Calmet: "Maldonatus possessed all those faculties that go to make a remarkable scholar." Richard has paid tribute to the solidity of his knowledge,[21] and the critics of our own day still derive great profit from studying his commentaries on the Gospels.[22]

In the renaissance of ecclesiastical studies, schools were formed and new topics discussed. One of the chief questions in dispute during the latter half of the sixteenth century was Molinism.

The Protestant heresy, by drawing attention to the difficult problem of the relation of grace to free will, gave a new impulse to the two tendencies which, ever since the predestination dispute of the fifth century, had divided Catholic theologians. Must it be admitted that God determines the human will in advance to each one of its acts by an all-powerful impulse or "premotion," which necessarily entails consent and *seems* to destroy the action of free will? Or ought it be recognized that actual grace is not efficacious by its own nature, does not necessarily obtain the act toward which it urges, that consequently human acts *seem* to be independent of God's action? In other words, to use the technical expression of theologians, granting that God gives men sufficient grace for their salvation, does this sufficient grace become efficacious by its own

[21] Simon, *Histoire critique des principaux commentaires du Nouveau Testament.*

[22] Maldonatus' commentaries on the Gospels have been reprinted again and again. The date of the first edition is 1596. Says Reusch; "It is claimed that the editions since 1617 have been mutilated." Reusch in Goschler, *Dict. de théol.* (art. *"Maldonat"*). *"Prima editio est rara,"* says Hurter, *"et, ut ait Calmet in Bibliot., optima; cur autem haec praeferatur, inquit, (l.c.) faciunt ea quae in parisiensi et lugdunensi editione edita sunt, vel mutata, vel dempta."* (*Nomenclator litterarius,* I, p. 88.) Cf. Prat. *Maldonat et l'université de Paris au XVI^e siècle.*

proper power (*ab intrinseco*), or by the consent of the human will (*ab extrinseco*)?

At the Council of Trent, the attention of the fathers had been roused on this doctrinal point; but, in fidelity to their general rule in disputed matters, they avoided favoring one opinion rather than the other in drawing up their decrees.

In 1588 a Spanish Jesuit, Luis de Molina, professor of theology at the University of Evora, a man of great learning and eminent virtue, brought out at Lisbon a work entitled, *Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace.* Therein he clearly taught that sufficient grace, given by God to all men, becomes efficacious only through the consent of free will and that the work of sanctification is thus the result of the simultaneous coöperation of God and man. Moreover, he said, the fulfilment of God's sovereign will, its infallible predestination, cannot, under this head, suffer any loss; God predestines a man, not by giving him a grace that He *makes* efficacious, but by giving him a grace that He *knows* to be efficacious. Molina explained how God can have certain knowledge of a fact that exists neither in the present nor in the past nor in a determined future, but simply in the conditional future: in this matter he borrowed from his teacher Fonseca the theory of the *scientia media* ("middle knowledge").

The book had a great success. This consoling solution of a redoubtable problem was ardently preached by the sons of St. Ignatius and was favorably received by a great number of the faithful.

But did not such a system contradict the formal texts of St. Augustine and even of St. Thomas Aquinas, as also the universal character of divine causality? The sons of St. Dominic, devoted champions of the Thomist tradition, declared that it did.

Just when Molina's book appeared, a holy and learned Do-

minican, Dominic Bañez [23] (1528–1604), was teaching at Salamanca. He was a powerful mind, a lofty and noble soul, a monk of great piety. For several years he was St. Teresa's confessor. Bañez taught out and out that nothing in man can be withdrawn from the divine causality, that God, to use the expressions by which Bossuet later summed up this doctrine, "governs our freedom and ordains our acts; that if free creatures were not comprised in this order of Providence, that would be to take from God the conduct of what is the most excellent in the universe;" [24] that in creating freedom, God reserved to Himself certain means of leading it where He pleased;" [25] that God consequently made two parts in humanity, one to show His mercy and the other to manifest His justice. Such a doctrine nowise shocked those sixteenth-century Spaniards, accustomed as they were to consider the world as a battlefield between the Cross and the Crescent, between the chosen race and the cursed race. Moreover, the logical coherence of the system, rigorously deduced from the consideration of divine causality and placed under the authority of St. Thomas, seduced many theologians.

The strife soon grew so lively between Jesuits and Dominicans that Pope Clement VIII, in 1594, summoned the matter to Rome, and, in 1597, instituted the famous Congregation *De Auxiliis* [26] to pass judgment on it. In vain did Suarez and Vasquez try to conciliate the adversaries by interposing, between Thomism and Molinism, the system of Congruism, according to which sufficient grace becomes efficacious in consequence of a conformity and adaptation of the character of the agent to the circumstances of the act. The controversy was not appeased. On November 30th, 1602, the Jesuit Gregory of

[23] Or Bañes, as it is sometimes spelled.

[24] Bossuet, *Traité du libre arbitre*, ch. 3; Lebel ed. XXXIV, p. 383.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 388.

[26] *De auxiliis divinae gratiae.*

Valentia, in a debate with the Dominican Lemos, fell exhausted to the floor.[27] At length (August 28th, 1607) Pope Paul V put an end to the discussions and enjoined the rival Orders to abstain from the use of injurious epithets.

These heated debates were not without result for theology. Though the system of efficacious grace and free will remains an obscure and insoluble problem, though, after all is said and done, we must confine ourselves "to holding strongly, as it were, to the two ends of the chain, without always seeing the middle where the chain continues," [28] at least we can see springing from these debates a deeper knowledge of human nature and of the supernatural; it was in these disputes that the theologians were prepared to combat the most subtle and dangerous of the errors of the seventeenth century—Jansenism.

[27] Serry, *Historia congregationum de Auxiliis,* p. 301.

[28] Bossuet, *Libre arbitre,* ch. 4; Lebel ed. XXXIV, p. 410. For a more complete doctrinal exposition and for a discussion of the Thomist and Molinist arguments, see Tanqueret, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae specialis,* III, ch. 1, nos. 104–113, Pohle-Preuss, *Grace, Actual and Habitual,* pp. 222 ff.; Labauche, *Dogmatique spéciale: L'homme,* part 2, art. 4.

CHAPTER VIII

The Catholic Reformation and the Spiritual Life

THE spiritual life, which experienced so powerful a development during the second half of the sixteenth century, had incomparable masters. The century of Luther's pamphlets and Calvin's *Institutions* was likewise that of St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises* and St. Teresa's *Way of Perfection.*

The "Spiritual Exercises"

It has been questioned to what extent the author of the *Exercises* was inspired by ascetical writings before his time, notably those of the Benedictine Dom Garcia Cisneros, printed about 1500.[1] In reality, the founder of the Society of Jesus seemed to have made use of the whole ascetical tradition of the Church; but he did so with his own temperament, with the aid of special lights communicated to him by God, and in view of a new enterprise, marvelously adapted to the needs of modern times: therein lies the novelty of the book of the *Spiritual Exercises.*[2]

Masters of the spiritual life, describing the advance of the

[1] Hermann Müller (pseudonym), in a work entitled *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus,* maintains the hypothesis that St. Ignatius borrowed not only from Cisneros, but from the rules of Mussulman religious orders. The borrowing from Cisneros seems likely. As for the analogies indicated between the *Exercises* and the rules of Mussulman religious orders, they are far from convincing. (See Müller, pp. 36–144.)

[2] In *Études* for 1897, Father Watrigant has a series of articles on the question of what St. Ignatius took from his precursors, especially from Ludolph the Carthusian. Cf. Joly, *Saint Ignace de Loyola,* pp. 37 sqq., where a summary of the discussions on this point will be found.

soul towards God, distinguish two ways: the ascetical way, by which the soul, more active than passive, more conscious of its own efforts than of the divine action within it, rises to perfection by a series of exercises, the rules of which form a veritable practical science; and the mystical way, whereby God calls whom He pleases and wherein the soul, more passive than active, and conscious of God's action within it, has, as its chief duty, surrender to grace.

St. Ignatius was no stranger to the mystical state, but in the book of the *Spiritual Exercises* he meant to lay down rules of pure asceticism. Is there question of a soul passing from unbelief to religion, choosing a state of life, taking an important resolution, undertaking a renewal of Christian life? The *Exercises* utilizes all the traditional means and methods for the development of the Christian life: meditation, vocal and mental prayer, examination of conscience, mortification of the senses and employment of all our faculties—reason, feeling, memory, imagination, and will. Thus it is intended to lead that soul, by a sure and clearly marked way, to the desired goal.

First of all, a solid, enlightening, and fundamental meditation recalls to the soul that it comes from God, its first Principle, and that it should aspire to God, its last End; that henceforth all created things should be chosen in the measure in which they lead to that supreme end, and rejected in the measure in which they remove therefrom. This first conviction is considered as the preliminary and indispensable condition of the success of the *Exercises*. Without it, it would be useless to go any farther. But, once this disposition is assured, St. Ignatius, during an entire week, places the soul face to face with its sins, makes it ashamed of its own corruption, shows it the terrible punishment of sin in the fall of Lucifer and his demons, in the lamentable decadence of the human race as a consequence of Adam's sin, and in the eternal torments of the

reprobate. He seeks to produce these pictures, not by oratorical means, but, according to his habit, through a realistic representation of the object by "the application of the senses."

In these meditations, the retreatant is never alone. One of the original characteristics of St. Ignatius' method is to place him who is making the exercises beside him who "gives" them. A master is there, experienced in spiritual ways, enlightened by the admirable "annotations" that precede the text of the *Exercises,* and especially by the "rules of discernment of spirits." According to the retreatant's needs, the retreat master prolongs or abridges, repeats or omits such or such a particular exercise.

Once this first stage is complete, St. Ignatius conducts his disciple to the stage of the second week, but only after sounding his heart, as he tries to sound his reason at the beginning of the exercises. Has the disciple really a generous disposition of soul (*magnum et liberalem animum*)? If so, St. Ignatius prepares him for "the election," that is, for the resolution that should crown the retreat. Before the retreatant's eyes, he evokes the image of a magnanimous king summoning his knights to conquer the Holy Land from the Mussulman. Then he shows him Christ, King of the ages, to whom belongs absolute dominion over the universe, proposing battles and conquests to men of good will. Like the magnanimous king, Jesus the Saviour does not hide the dangers of the undertaking; they are the ones that He himself met: the cross with its humiliations, poverty and its sufferings; but the stakes of the campaign are the greatest that can be imagined, since they are the salvation of souls and the glory of God.

During the last two weeks the spiritual guide passes in review before the retreatant's eyes, in a well-ordered series of contemplations, all the mysteries of our Saviour's life from

the Incarnation to the Ascension.[3] He helps him to make "the election," that is, to take the resolution which is the chief object of the retreat; and this is followed by a final contemplation, intended to make the greatest love rise up in the soul. Thus, the disciple goes forth from these exercises, which began by a cold intellectual meditation, with a flame of love in his heart.

The Mysticism of St. Teresa

St. Teresa turns to souls that have already passed through the trials of asceticism described by St. Ignatius, or souls that God would raise, from the outset of their spiritual life, to the higher but a thousand times more painful conditions of mystical contemplation.[4] The Saint knew by revelations and ecstasies, the inexpressible beauty of the soul in the state of grace,[5] the indescribable ugliness of the sinful soul,[6] the great prize of eternity, the infinite power of love.[7] The soul, eternity, love—these three words indicate the whole inspiration of St. Teresa's work.

The phases of the mystical life are marked especially by states of prayer. The reformer of the Carmelites excelled in describing these states and making them understood. Nearly all other mystics—Ruysbroeck, Tauler, Blessed Angela de Foligno—suddenly transport us into contemplations and ec-

[3] A Protestant historian draws attention to the sublimity and the broad scope of these meditations. Not only is the retreatant conducted through a review of his own life, with all its faults and wretchedness, but he follows the whole drama of the world's Redemption, from the fall of the angels to the Ascension of Christ. (Böhmer, p. 33.)

[4] *Way of Perfection,* chs. 17 and 18. The Saint is careful to remark that "contemplation is a gift of God, which is not necessary for salvation nor for earning our eternal reward . . . She who is without it, yet who follows the counsels I have given, will attain great perfection." (*Ibid.,* p. 107.)

[5] *Interior Castle,* ch. 1.

[6] *Ibid.,* 1st mansion, ch. 2; 7th mansion, ch. 1; *Vie écrite par elle-même,* ch. 11.

[7] In chapter 29 of the *Vie écrite par elle-même,* St. Teresa relates the famous vision during which an angel pierced her heart with a flaming dart.

stasies. We are disconcerted by the often obscure and strained language. St. Teresa's language is clear, supple, alert, spiritual, and of literary perfection. She leads us step by step on the "path of perfection," pictures for us the different abodes in the "interior castle" of the soul, relates her own "foundations," and sets forth the phases of her interior life with such charm [8] that even persons unacquainted with the mystical states which she describes follow her with delight.

Ordinary prayer or meditation, mystical union or passive contemplation, and extraordinary union or ecstasy: these are the three stages through which St. Teresa follows the soul in its ascent towards God. Ordinary prayer, according to St. Teresa, is not merely the starting-point of this ascent: it is the indispensable exercise to which recourse must be had every time that God does not raise the soul to the mystical state. This ordinary prayer, carefully described by St. Ignatius, is made under the form either of meditation or affective prayer, according as the reason or the heart is chiefly concerned. St. Teresa mentions the former of these two forms and describes the latter, without calling it by this name, in several places in her works.[9] But she particularly studied the soul just as it enters the mystical state, properly so called. At times she calls this "the supernatural state," because, she says, we can never acquire it by ourselves, no matter what care and diligence we employ; all we can do is to dispose ourselves for it by keeping ourselves perfectly subject to God.[10]

Contemplation, which in its first degree St. Teresa also calls the prayer of quietude, and mystical union when it reaches its second degree, is outlined by the Saint in her *Life* and in the *Way of Perfection* and closely analysed in her last work,

[8] The best edition of her complete works is that published by the Carmelites of Paris under the direction of Mgr. Polit.

[9] *Vie par elle-même,* chs. 11, 12, 13; *Way of Perfection,* ch. 19; *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 2.

[10] Letter to Father Alvarez, February 1576; *Way of Perfection,* chs. 19, 25, 31.

the *Interior Castle.* The starting-point of the prayer of quietude is a sweet and calm recollection,[11] soon followed by a deep peace, amidst which the soul "perceives a certain fragrance, as we may call it, as if within its inmost depths were a brazier sprinkled with sweet perfumes." [12] The soul then understands, but in a different way than it could by the medium of external senses, that it is already near God.[13] It cannot doubt God's presence within it.[14] "It is less distressed by the fear of hell, for, though more anxious than ever not to offend God, it has lost servile fear. . . Greater indifference is felt for sufferings. . . As the soul better understands the divine Majesty, it realizes more vividly its own baseness." [15]

From the state of quietude, the soul led by God in the mystical ways, rises to the state of union, where, completely dead to creatures, and living only in God, it feels united to the Divinity "in so close a manner that it is like a person who faints from excess of joy and happiness." [16] Then "the spirit does not recognize itself, being as different from what it was as is the white butterfly from the caterpillar. . . The soul is desirous of praising God, and longs to sacrifice itself and die a thousand deaths for Him. . . After what it has experienced, everything on earth disgusts it . . . Its wings have grown and it can fly . . . It wearies of everything, realizing that no true rest can be found in creatures." [17]

At the same time "it feels an interior torture at seeing that God is so greatly sinned against; and this pain penetrates the very depths of its being, appearing to cut the soul into pieces and grind it to powder . . . Yet the soul feeling it, in its

[11] *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 3; *Way of Perfection,* ch. 28.
[12] *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 2.
[13] *Way of Perfection,* ch. 31.
[14] *Vie écrite par elle-même,* ch. 15.
[15] *Interior Castle,* 4th mansion, ch. 3.
[16] *Sur le Cantique des cantiques,* ch. 4.
[17] *Interior Castle,* 5th mansion, ch. 2.

vehement love for God, counts these sufferings as naught and would willingly undergo greater." [18]

Then we have the moment of ecstasy, the prelude of the transforming and, so to speak, deifying union. It is an indescribable state, in which God resides in the soul, for "as He has a dwelling-place in heaven, so has He in the soul, where none but He may abide, and which may be termed a second heaven." [19] "All the three Persons here communicate themselves to the soul, speak to it, and make it understand the words of our Lord in the Gospel, that He and the Father and the Holy Ghost will come and make their abode with the soul which loves Him, and which keeps His commandments." [20] "That which we hold, as a doctrine of faith, the soul now, so to speak, understands by sight, although it beholds the Blessed Trinity neither by the bodily nor by the spiritual eyes, for this is no imaginary vision." [21] All this does not totally absorb the soul, which "is far more active than ever in all that concerns God's service, and when at leisure, enjoys this blessed companionship." [22]

God now, "by an imaginary vision of His most sacred Humanity, reveals Himself to the soul . . . full of splendor, beauty, and majesty, as He was after His Resurrection." [23] God unites Himself to the soul. "Union may be symbolized by two wax candles, the tips of which touch each other so closely that there is but one light; or again the wick, the wax, and the light become one . . . But spiritual marriage is like rain falling from heaven into a river or stream, becoming one and the same liquid, so that the river and the rain water cannot be divided; or it resembles a streamlet flowing into the ocean,

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 112.
[19] *Ibid.*, 7th mansion, ch. 1, *i. e.* p. 254.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 257.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 258.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

which cannot afterwards be disunited from it." [24] There is only one expression fit to designate a union of this sort—spiritual marriage, which is the tomb where the mystic butterfly died and where Christ becomes the soul's life.[25] The fruits of this new life are a total forgetfulness of self, a greater desire to suffer, and the habit of considering death as a gentle delight. But the desire to suffer is tranquil because of the perfect conformity of the soul with God's pleasure and the impatience for death in order to be with Christ is changed into an ardent desire to live so as to serve Him and procure His greater glory. Thus this ascent of the soul, which appears to remove it from the external apostolate, leads it back thereto with a hundredfold greater force. For, says St. Teresa, "by its becoming one with the Almighty, by this sovereign union of spirit with spirit, the soul must gather strength, as we know the saints did, to suffer and to die . . . This must be the reason of the severe penances performed by many of the saints . . . This caused the zeal felt by our Father Elias for the honor of God, and the desires of St. Dominic and St. Francis to draw souls to praise the Almighty . . . Believe me, both Martha and Mary must entertain our Lord and keep Him as their Guest, nor must they be so inhospitable as to offer Him no food. How can Mary do this while she sits at His feet, if her sister does not help her? His food is, that in every possible way we should draw souls to Him, that they may be saved and may praise Him for ever." [26]

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 288. St. John of the Cross, St. Teresa's colaborer in the reform of Carmel, gives another description of the soul's ascent to God, envisaging the states of the soul from a different point of view and completing the doctrine of St. Teresa. He considers four principal stages in the mystical life: (1) the *night of the senses,* which is characterized by a tendency of the soul to turn towards God alone, in the midst of spiritual dryness and with a feeling of powerlessness to meditate or converse, but with such an impression of God's presence in the soul that we can perceive the beginning of what St. Teresa calls the prayer of quietude; (2) the

This colorless summary, despite our care to use the Saint's own words so far as possible,[27] conveys but a feeble notion of those sublime pages, written by a hand that seems still trembling with the emotions of contemplation and ecstasy. No one ever spoke with such great depth and doctrinal sureness [28] of the marvels of that divine life whose existence in men's souls Protestantism boldly denied. It may not have been sufficiently

first period of the *night of the spirit,* marked by a state of habitual quietude and "a binding of the powers of the soul," a second purgatory, as it were, added to that of the night of the senses; (3) the second period of the *night of the spirit,* characterized by a sort of blinding contemplation of the attributes of Divinity; (4) the transforming union or spiritual marriage which exactly designates the state described by St. Teresa under the same title. St. John of the Cross describes the first three stages in *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* and *La nuit obscure,* the fourth in *La vive flamme d'amour* and *Le cantique spirituel.* He differs from St. Teresa in that he particularly sets forth the toilsome and dolorous character of the soul's ascent, while St. Teresa sets forth its bright and consoling aspect. The most original portion of his doctrine is the description of the *night of the senses,* which theretofore had not been studied with such depth and delicacy. (Cf. Poulain, *La mystique de saint Jean de la Croix* and *The Graces of Divine Prayer,* p. 200.)

[27] Briefly, the following are the different phases of the ascent of a soul which God leads by the mystical path, as they appear to St. Teresa according to her own experience. A lively feeling of God's presence produces a *mystical recollection* in the soul. The peaceful joy of that divine presence gives the soul the state of *quietude,* which contains various degrees. A strong turning of the will towards God alone, while the other powers of the soul—memory and understanding—partly keep their own activity, leads it to the state of *mystical union.* The progressive death of all its powers to things of earth and their ever increasing adherence to the thought and love of God, raise it to the *perfect union.* If this union of the powers no longer comes only from the interior, if the soul feels, as St. Teresa says, that "God is drawing it to Himself in such a way that it seems to quit the organs that it animates," it is then the state of *ravishment* or *ecstasy,* called also transport or flight of the spirit. The soul is then so seized and occupied by God that it ceases to exercise, in relation to the body to which it is united, its ordinary functions: bodily heat grows weak; the body becomes so light that it has scarcely any weight; at times a mysterious force raises it. It is in the state of ravishment that occur the phenomena known as *betrothal* and *spiritual marriage.* The ravishment of all the powers of the soul at the same time is of very brief duration. It soon leaves the soul to the ordinary gloom and wretchedness of the life of this world. But from it the soul keeps a new force, in view of deeper sufferings to be undergone and in view of a more devoted activity to be undertaken.

[28] In the Office of St. Teresa, the Church begs God to nourish the faithful with the sweetness of her heavenly doctrine, *"ut caelestis ejus doctrinae pabulo nutriamur."*

remarked how Luther's negations found their most telling refutation in the positive work of St. Ignatius and St. Teresa. According to the heresiarch's fundamental thesis, man is sanctified neither by his works nor by his personal efforts, but by the sole application of Christ's merits, who covers the stained soul, as by a cloak, without changing it interiorly. The *Spiritual Exercises,* by their marvelous effectiveness in converting souls,[29] showed what could be accomplished by man's effort, wisely disciplined under the influence of divine grace; and the writings of St. Teresa make us feel the nearness and effulgence of that interior, transforming, and divinizing action which all tradition, following St. Paul and our Saviour Himself, had affirmed. Luther maintained his doctrine by setting up a claim of individual inspiration as opposed to the judgment of the Church and the pope; Ignatius and Teresa, favored by the most reliable divine communications, on the contrary prostrate themselves at the feet of the Roman pontiff. Ignatius added, for his Order, to the three usual religious vows, that of placing itself at the absolute disposal of the pope; and Teresa, when dying in the raptures of ecstasy, could but repeat these words: "Lord, I am only a child of the Church." This is why their work was destined to be fruitful.

[29] St. Francis de Sales said of the *Spiritual Exercises* that "it made more conversions than it had letters."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in the footnotes:

ACADEMIE DES INSCRIPTIONS: *Comptes rendus.*

ACTA SANCTORUM, the scholarly work of the Bollandists.

ALBERS: *Manuel d'histoire ecclésiastique.*

ALEXANDER OF HALES: *Summa theologica.*

AMYDENUS, T.: *De pietate romana,* 1625.

ANDRÉ, Marius: *Bienheureux Raymond Lulle,* 1909.

ANSHELM, Thomas: *Chronique de Berne.*

ANTONINUS, St.: *Historiarum opus.*

ARAGO, François: *Popular Astronomy,* tr. by Admiral W. H. Smyth, 2 vols., 1858.

Archives Curieuses de l'histoire de France.

Archives de l'histoire de France.

Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte.

ASTRAIN, Antonio: *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la asistencia de Españas,* 4 vols., 1914.

AUBERY, Jacques: *Histoire de l'exécution de Cabrières et de Mérindol.*

AUDIN, J. M. V.: *Histoire de Léon X,* 1844.

History of the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of Luther, tr. by W. B. Turnbull, 2 vols., 1854.

AUGUSTINE, St.: *Works,* ed. by Marcus Dods, 15 vols., 1885.

AYROLES, Jean Baptiste: *La vraie Jeanne d'Arc,* 5 vols., 1902.

BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, Gustave, Comte: *Histoire du Concile de Trente.*

BALAN: *Monumenta reformationis lutheranae ex tabulariis secretioribus Sanctae Sedis, 1521–1525,* 1884.

Storia d'Italia.

BALMES, James: *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their*

Effects on the Civilization of Europe, tr. by Hanford and Kershaw, 1851.

BALUZE, Étienne: *Miscellanea,* 4 vols., 1764.

Vitae paparum avenionensium, 2 vols., 1921.

BARLETTA, Gabriel: *Sermones,* 1511.

BASCHET, Armand: *Les archives de Venise,* 1870.

BATIFFOL, Louis: *The Century of the Renaissance,* tr. by E. F. Buckley, 1916.

BAUDRILLART, Alfred: *Quatre cents ans de concordat.*

The Catholic Church, the Renaissance, and Protestantism, tr. by Mrs. Philip Gibbs, 1908.

BÄUMER, S.: *Histoire du bréviaire,* 1905.

BAUMGARTEN: *Die Politik Leo X.*

BEAUMANOIR, Philippe de Remi, Sire de: *Coutûmes de Beauvoisis,* 2 vols., 1690.

BEAUVAIS: *Histoire de la vie du P. César de Bus,* 1645.

BELLARMINE, Robert: *De conciliis et ecclesia.*

De conciliorum utilitate.

De romano pontifice.

Disputationes de controversiis fidei.

BEMBO, Pietro: *Epistolae Leonis X.*

BENAVIDES, Antonio: *Memorias de D. Fernando IV de Castilla,* 2 vols., 1860.

BENRATH: *Luther im Kloster,* 1905.

BERNARD, St.: *On Consideration,* tr. by George Lewis, 1908.

BERNARD: *Les instructions sécrètes des Jésuites,* 1903.

BÈZE, Théodore de: *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France,* 3 vols., 1889.

BEZOLD, Friedrich von: *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation,* 1890.

Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes.

BIEL, Gabriel: *Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros.*

BLANC, Charles: *Histoire des peintres.*

BLANC, Louis: *History of the French Revolution of 1789,* 1848.

BLENNERHASSETT, Lady: *Maria Stuart,* 1909.

BODMANN: *Œuvres posthumes.*

BŒHMER-MONOD: *Les Jésuites.*

BÖHM: *Handschriften des K. K. Staats-Archivs,* 1874.
BOLSEC, Jérôme H.: *Histoire de la vie, mœurs, actes, doctrine, constance, et mort de Jean Calvin,* 1875.
BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne: *Defensio declarationis conventus cleri Gallicani anno 1682,* 2 vols., 1745.
Histoire de France pour le Dauphin.
History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches, 2 vols., 1836.
Instruction sur les états d'oraison.
Libre arbitre.
Préface sur l'instruction pastorale donnée à Cambrai le 15e septembre 1697.
BOUCHE: *Essai sur l'histoire de Provence.*
BOUDINHON: *De la validité des ordinations anglicanes,* 1895.
Étude théologique sur les ordinations anglicanes.
BOUIX: *De papa.*
BOUTARIC, Edgar Paul: *La France sous Philippe le Bel,* 1861.
La Saint Barthélemy d'après les archives du Vatican.
Notices et extraits des manuscrits.
BOUTILLIER: *Somme rurale.*
BOUTROUX, Étienne Emile: *Historical Studies in Philosophy,* tr. by Fred Rothwell, 1912.
Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy, tr. by Jonathan Nield, 1909.
BOUVIER: *La question Michel Servet,* 1908.
BRÉHIER, Louis: *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age,* 1907.
BRÉMOND, Henri: *Sir Thomas More,* tr. by Harold Child, 1904.
BRIDGETT, Thomas Edward: *Life and Writings of Blessed Thomas More,* 1913.
Life of Blessed John Fisher, 1902.
BRIGID, St.: *Revelations.*
BROM: *Guide aux archives du Vatican,* 1910.
BROSCH: *Alexandre VI.*
BROU: *Les Jésuites de la légende.*
BROUSSOLLE, J. C.: *L'art, la réligion, et la renaissance,* 1910.
BRUGÈRE, Louis Frédéric: *De vera religione.*
Tableau de l'histoire de la littérature de l'Eglise.

BRULEFER: *In libros IV sententiarum S. Bonaventurae.*

BRUNETIÈRE, Ferdinand: *Discours de combat,* 2 vols., 1903.

Histoire de la littérature française, 8 vols., 1907.

BUCKLEY, T. A.: *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* 1851.

BULLARIUM ROMANUM.

BURCHARD, Johann: *Diarium sive rerum urbanarum commentarii, 1483–1506.*

BURCKHARDT, Jacob Christoph: *Handbuch der deutschen Archive,* 1887.

Luthers Briefwechsel.

The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy, tr. by S. G. C. Middlemore, 2 vols., 1878.

BURNET, Gilbert: *History of the Reformation of the Church of England,* 7 vols., 1865.

CALLARY, F.: *L'idéalisme franciscain spirituel au XIV^e^ siècle,* 1910.

CALVIN, John: *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* tr. by Henry Beveridge, 3 vols., 1846.

Opera, 59 vols., 1900.

CAMPANO, Gian Antonio: *Vita Pii II.*

CAPECELATRO, Alfonso: *Histoire de Sainte Catherine de Sienne,* 1863.

CASTIL-BLAZE, François: *La danse et les ballets,* 1832.

Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques.

CATHERINE of Siena, St.: *Saint Catherine of Siena as Seen in her Letters,* tr. and edited by Vida D. Scudder, 1906.

CATHERINUS, Ambrosius: *De casu hominis et de peccato originali.*

CAVEIRAC, Jean Novi de: *Apologie de Louis XIV, suivie d'une dissertation sur le Saint-Barthélemy.*

CAVENDISH, George: *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey,* 1905.

CAYET, Palma: *Panthéon littéraire.*

CERRI: *Borgia ossia Alessandro VI,* 1858.

CHAMBERET, Comte de: *Vie de sainte Colette,* 1887.

CHARLES BORROMEO, St.: *Opera,* 5 vols., 1747.

CHARTIER, Alain: *Le quadrilogue invectif.*

CHASTENET, Bourgeois de: *Nouvelle histoire du concile de Constance.*

CHEVALIER, Ulysse: *L'abjuration de Jeanne d'Arc au cimetière de Saint-Ouen et l'authenticité de sa formule,* 1902.
CHRISTOPHE: *Histoire de la papauté pendant le XIV^e^ siècle.*
Chroniques de Saint-Denis.
CLERVAL: *De Jodoci Clichtovei neoportuensis vita et operibus,* 1894.
COBBETT, William: *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland,* 1905.
COCHIN, Henry: *Le Bienheureux Fra Giovanni Angelico de Fiesole,* 1906.
COMMINES, Philippe de: *Memoires,* 2 vols., 1856.
CORIO, Bernardino: *Storia di Milano,* 3 vols., 1857.
Corpus Juris Canonici.
Corpus Reformatorum, 94 vols., 1914.
CORTÉS, Donoso: *Lettres et discours,* 1850.
COURNOT, Antoine Augustin: *Considerations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes,* 2 vols., 1872.
CREPIN, Jean: *Acta Martyrum.*
CRÉTINEAU-Joly: *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus.*
CRISTIANI: *Luther et le lutheranisme.*

D'ACHERY, J. L.: *Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis maxime Benedictorum latuerant spicilegium,* 13 vols., 1677.
DALBUS: *Les ordinations anglicanes,* 1894.
DANIEL, Gabriel: *Histoire de France.*
DANTE ALIGHIERI: *De monarchia,* tr. by Aurelia Henry, 1904.
Divina Commedia, tr. by H. W. Longfellow.
D'ARGENTRÉ, Charles du Plessis: *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus.*
DELABORDE, H. François: *Expédition de Charles VIII en Italie,* 1888.
DELACROIX: *Le mysticisme spéculatif en Allemagne.*
DELPHINUS: *Oratiunculae.*
DENIFLE, Heinrich: *Anthologie des mystiques allemands.*
Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters.
Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400, 1885.
Kritische Bemerkungen zur Gerson-Kempis Frage.

La désolation des églises, monastères, et hôpitaux en France pendant la guerre de cent ans, 3 vols., 1899.

La vie spirituelle d'après les mystiques allemands du XIV^e^ siècle, 1904.

Luther und Luthertum, 1905; tr. in part by A. Reinhardt and Raymund Volz, 1917.

DENIFLE and CHATELAIN: *Chartularium Universitatis parisiensis,* 4 vols., 1897.

DENIFLE and WEISS: *Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwickelung,* 1909.

DENZINGER: *Enchiridion.*

DESLANDRES, Paul: *Le concile de Trente et la réforme du clergé catholique au XVI^e^ siècle.*

DESMAY, Jacques: *Remarques sur la vie de Jean Calvin.*

DESTOMBES: *Histoire de la persécution en Angleterre sous Elisabeth.*

Dialogues entre le Maheustre et le Manant, 1593.

Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique.

Dictionnaire de Bibliologie, 5 vols., 1860.

Dictionnaire de Théologie (Goschler).

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique (Vacant-Mangenot).

Dictionnaire Historique.

Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, 1820.

DIDIOT, Jules: *Logique surnaturelle objective.*

DIGARD, FAUCON, and THOMAS: *Les registres de Boniface VIII,* 1884.

DIONYSIUS the Areopagite: *On the Divine Names,* tr. by C. E. Rolt, 1920.

Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France.

DÖLLINGER, Johann Joseph Ignaz von: *La réforme et son développement intérieur,* 3 vols., 1848.

Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.

The Church and the Churches, or the Papacy and the Temporal Power, tr. by W. B. MacCabe, 1862.

DORLANDI: *Chronica Carthusiana.*

DOUILLET: *Sainte Colette,* 1884.

DOUMERGUE, Émile: *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps,* 5 vols., 1917.
DU BELLAY: *Mémoires.*
DUBOIS, Pierre: *Gesta Dei per Francos.*
DUBOULAY: *Historia Universitatis parisiensis.*
DUCHESNE, Louis: *Liber Pontificalis.*
DUNAND: *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Jeanne d'Arc,* 3 vols., 1909.
Histoire complète de Jeanne d'Arc, 3 vols., 1902.
DUPLEIX: *Histoire de Henri le Grand,* 1635.
DUPUY: *Histoire du différend entre Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel,* 1655.
Mémoires, 1654.
DURAND, Guillaume: *De modo celebrandi generalis concilii,* 1545.

EHSES, Stephan: *Acta concilii Tridentini,* 1904.
Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses.
Encyclopédie Théologique (Migne).
ERASMUS, Desiderius: *Commentarius in S. Marcum.*
Epistles, 1918.
Opera, 11 vols., 1706.
Paraclesis.
The Colloquies, tr. by N. Bailey, 3 vols., 1900.
The Praise of Folly, tr. by John Wilson, 1913.

FAGES: *Saint Vincent Ferrier,* 1893.
FALLOUX: *Vie de saint Pie V.*
FAUCON: *Les artistes à la cour d'Avignon.*
FELICE, Guillaume de: *History of the Protestants of France,* tr. by Philip Edward Barnes, 1853.
FELLER (editor): *Biographie Universelle,* 45 vols.
FÉRET, Pierre: *Henri IV et l'Eglise,* 1875.
La faculté de théologie de Paris au Moyen Age, 10 vols., 1909.
FICINO, Marsilius: *De religione christiana.*
FIORENTINO: *Il risorgimento filosofico del Quattrocento,* 1885.

FLAMMARION, Camille: *Popular Astronomy,* tr. by J. E. Gore, 1894.
FLEURY: *Opuscules,* 1818.
FLEURY, Claude: *Histoire ecclésiastique,* 36 vols., 1738.
FLEURY, Jules François: *Histoire de la caricature sous la réforme et la ligue,* 1880.
FONTAINE, Simon: *Histoire catholique de notre temps,* 1558.
FORNERON, Henri: *Histoire de Philippe II,* 4 vols., 1882.
FOUQUERAY, Henri: *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France,* 2 vols., 1913.
FOURNIER, Edouard: *L'esprit dans l'histoire,* 1867.
FRAIKIN, J.: *Nonciatures de Clement VII,* 1906.
FRANCE, Anatole: *The Life of Joan of Arc,* tr. by Winifred Stephens, 1909.
FUNCK: *Gerson und Gersen.*
FUNKE: *Papst Benedikt XI,* 1891.
FUZET: *Pétrarque, ses errures, ses voyages, sa vie chrétienne,* 1883.

GACHARD, Louis Prosper: *Correspondance de Philippe II sur les affaires des Pays-Bas,* 4 vols., 1861.
Notice historique et descriptive des archives royales de Simancas, 1848.
Notice sur le dépôt des archives de Belgique, 1831.
GAIRDNER, James: *Lollardy and the Reformation in England,* 4 vols., 1913.
GARAMPI: *Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie.*
GARZEND, L.: *L'inquisition et l'hérésie,* 1913.
GASQUET, Francis Aidan: *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries,* 2 vols., 1902.
GAUTIER, Léon: *Benoit XI; Étude sur la papauté au commencement du XIVe siècle.*
Études et tableaux historiques.
GEE and HARDY: *Documents Illustrative of English Church History,* 1896.
GÉNIN, François: *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême,* 2 vols., 1841.
GERSON: *Opera.*

GIBERTUS: *Opera.*
GIUSSANO, John Peter: *The Life of St. Charles Borromeo.*
GONET: *Clypeus thomisticus.*
GOYAU, G.: *Vieille France, jeune Allemagne.*
GRAF: *La vie et les œuvres de Lefèvre d'Etaples.*
GRANVELLE, Antoine di Perrenot de: *Papiers d'état.*
GREAT BRITAIN: *Acts of the Privy Council.*
Calendar of State Papers.
Statutes of the Realm.
GREGOROVIUS, Ferdinand: *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages,* tr. by Annie Hamilton, 8 vols., 1902.
GRINGOIRE, Pierre: *Les folles entreprises.*
Œuvres complètes.
GRISAR, Hartmann: *Luther,* tr. by E. M. Lamond, 6 vols., 1917.
GUERARD, Louis: *Petite introduction aux inventaires des archives du Vatican,* 1901.
GUICCIARDINI, Lodovico: *Opere inédite,* 10 vols., 1867.
Storia d'Italia.
GUILLEMIN, Amédée: *The World of Comets,* tr. by James Glaisher, 1877.
GUIRAUD, Jean: *L'Eglise romaine et les origines de la Renaissance,* 1904.
GUIZOT, François: *The History of Civilization,* tr. by William Hazlitt, 3 vols., 1846.

HANOTAUX, Gabriel: *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu,* 2 vols.
Recueil des instructions.
HARNACK, Adolf: *History of Dogma,* tr. by Neil Buchanan, 7 vols., 1910.
Outlines of the History of Dogma, tr. by E. K. Mitchell, 1893.
HARTZHEIM: *Concilia Germaniae.*
HAURÉAU, Jean Barthélemy: *Bernard Delicieux et l'inquisition albigeoise,* 1877.
Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la bibliothèque nationale, 6 vols., 1893.
HAUSER, H.: *Études sur la réforme française.*

La réforme et les classes populaires en France au XVIe siècle. Les sources de l'histoire de France, 1909.

HAVEMANN: *Geschichte des Ausgangs des Tempelherrenordens.*

HEFELE, Carl Joseph von: *Histoire des conciles.*

The Life of Cardinal Ximenez, tr. by Canon Dalton, 1860.

HEINEMANN: *Aeneas Sylvius.*

HELYOT, Pierre: *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires, et des congrégations séculières,* 8 vols., 1792.

HENNES: *Erzbishof Albrecht von Mainz.*

HENRY VIII: *Defense of the Seven Sacraments,* 1908.

Letters and Papers.

HERGENRÖTHER: *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte,* re-edited by J. P. Kirsch, 4 vols.

HEZARD: *Histoire des catechismes,* 1900.

Histoire littéraire de France.

Historiens de la France.

HOEFER: *Nouvelle biographie générale,* 46 vols.

HOEFLER: *Rodrigo de Borgia.*

HOESSEL, D. G. F.: *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum qui in bibliothecis Galliae, Belgiae, Britanniae Magnae, Hispaniae, Lusitaniae asservantur,* 2 vols., 1893.

HÖFFDING, Harald: *A History of Modern Philosophy,* tr. by B. E. Meyer, 2 vols., 1920.

HOOPER, John: *Later Writings.*

HUGH OF ST. VICTOR: *De sacramentis.*

HUME, David: *The History of England,* 1865.

HURTER, Hugo: *Nomenclator Litterarius Theologiae Catholicae* 5 vols., 1899.

HUTTEN, Ulrich von: *Opera.*

IGNATIUS LOYOLA, St.: *Spiritual Exercises.*

IMBART DE LA TOUR, Pierre: *Les origines de la Réforme,* 2 vols., 1914.

Questions d'histoire sociale et religieuse, 1907.

INFESSURA, Stefano: *Diario della città di Roma,* 1890.

ISAMBERT: *De l'étude et des sources des anciennes lois françaises,* 1822.

JANET, Paul: *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale,* 2 vols., 1872.

JANSSEN, Johannes: *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages,* tr. by M. A. Mitchell and A. M. Christie, 16 vols., 1910.

An meine Kritiker.

Schiller als Historiker.

JOHN OF THE CROSS, St.: *The Ascent of Mount Carmel,* tr. by David Lewis, 1906.

JOLY, Henri: *Sainte Thérèse,* 1902.

St. Ignatius of Loyola, tr. by Mildred Partridge, 1899.

Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris.

JOVIUS, Paulus: *Elogia doctorum virorum,* 1571.

Historiarum sui temporis libri XLV.

Vita Leonis X, 1548.

JULLEVILLE, Louis Petit de: *Joan of Arc,* tr. by Hester Davenport, 1901.

JUNDT, A.: *Le développement de la pensée religieuse de Luther jusqu' en 1517.*

KALKOFF, Paul: *Aleander gegen Luther,* 1908.

Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess, 1905.

KAMPSCHULTE, Franz Wilhelm: *Die Universität Erfurt in ihrem Verhältnisse zu dem Humanismus und der Reformation,* 2 vols., 1860.

KEICHER, Otto: *Raymundus Lullus,* 1909.

KERKER: *Vie de Jean Fisher.*

KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE: *Les Huguenots et les Gueux,* 6 vols., 1885.

Recherches sur la part que l'Ordre de Citeaux et le Comte de Flandre prirent à la lutte de Boniface VIII et de Philippe le Bel, 1853.

KRAUS, Franz Xaver: *Kirchengeschichte.*

KUHN, Félix: *Luther, sa vie et son œuvre,* 3 vols., 1884.

LAFENESTRE, Georges Edouard: *S. François d'Assise et Savonarole, inspirateurs de l'art italien,* 1911.

LAFERRIÈRE, Adolphe: *Le XVI^e siècle et les Valois,* 1879.

Lettres de Catherine de Médicis, 10 vols., 1909.

LAFFAY, E.: *Origines du protestantisme,* 1905.
LANG, Andrew: *M. Anatole France on Jeanne d'Arc,* 1909.
LANG, August: *Die Bekehrung Johannes Calvins,* 1897.
LANGLOIS, Charles Victor: *Le règne de Philippe III le Hardi,* 1887.
Manuel de bibliographie historique, 1904.
LANSON, Achille: *Histoire de la littérature française,* 1909.
LAURENT, François: *Études sur l'histoire de l'humanité.*
LAVALLÉE, Théophile Sébastien: *Histoire des Français,* 4 vols., 1854.
LAVISSE, Ernest: *Histoire de France,* 9 vols., 1911.
LAVISSE and RAMBAUD: *Histoire générale,* 12 vols., 1901.
LEA, Henry Charles: *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages,* 3 vols., 1888.
LEBAUCHE, L.: *God and Man: Lectures on Dogmatic Theology,* 2 vols., 1917.
LECHLER, Gotthard: *John Wiclif and his English Precursors,* tr. by Peter Lorimer, 2 vols., 1878.
LECLERCQ, H.: *Les martyrs,* 12 vols., 1913.
LE COUTEULX, Charles: *Annales Ordinis Carthusiensis.*
LEFÈVRE D'ETAPLES: *Commentaire sur les Epitres de S. Paul.*
LEFRANC, Abel: *La jeunesse de Calvin,* 1882.
LE GLAY: *Correspondance de Maximilien I^e^ et de Marguerite d'Autriche.*
LELONG, Jacques: *Bibliothèque historique de la France,* 5 vols., 1778.
LEONETTI: *Papa Alessandro VI,* 1880.
L'EPINOIS, Henri Comte de: *La Ligue et les papes,* 1836.
Le gouvernement des papes au Moyen Age.
LE PLAT, Josse: *Monumentorum ad historiam Concilii Tridentini potissimum illustrandam spectantium amplissima collectio,* 7 vols., 1787.
Les martyrs de Gorcum (in the collection "Les Saints").
LESQUEN and MOLLAT: *Mesures fiscales exercées en Bretagne par les papes d'Avignon pendant le grand schisme d'Occident,* 1903.
LESSIUS: *Liber de vera capessenda religione.*
LETOURNEAU, G.: *La mission de Jean Jacques et la fondation des grands seminaires.*
LEVESQUE and URBAIN: *Correspondance de Bossuet,* 10 vols., 1916.

LEZEAU: *De la religion catholique en France.*
L'HOPITAL, Michel de: *Lettres,* 1825.
LINDNER: *Urban VI.*
LINGARD, John: *The History of England,* 11 vols., 1915.
LIZERAND, G.: *Clement V et Philippe IV,* 1910.
LOISELEUR, Jean: *Trois énigmes historiques,* 1882.
LOISY, Alfred: *Histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament,* 1890.
LORAIN, Prosper: *Essai historique sur l'abbaye de Cluny,* 1839.
LUCHAIRE, Denis Achille: *Innocent III et la croisade des Albigeois,* 1905.
Manuel des institutions françaises au Moyen Age, 1892.
LULL, Raymond: *L'arbre de la philosophie de l'amour.*
L'art général.
Le livre des merveilles du monde.
LUTHER, Martin: *Briefe,* edited by De Wette, 6 vols.
Colloquia (Bindseil ed.), 3 vols., 1866.
Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles.
Correspondence, tr. by Preserved Smith, 2 vols., 1913.
Deutsch Theologia.
Letters, tr. by Margaret A. Currie, 1908.
Opera (Jena ed.).
Sämtliche Werke (Erlangen ed.), 67 vols., 1868.
Schriften (Walch ed.).
Table Talk, tr. by William Hazlitt, 1848.
Werke (Enders ed., being supplementary to the Erlangen ed.), 1870.
Werke, Kritische Gesamt-Ausgabe, ed. by Knaake. (This is referred to as the Weimar edition.)

MACAULAY, Thomas Babington: *History of England,* 8 vols., 1886.
MACHIAVELLI, Nicolò: *History of Florence.*
The Prince, tr. by W. K. Marriott, 1920.
Writings, tr. by C. E. Detmold, 4 vols., 1882.
MADELIN: *De conventu Bononiensi.*
MAI, Angelo: *Spicilegium Romanum,* 10 vols., 1844.
MAJUNKE, Paul: *Luthers Ende,* 1886.

MALOU, Jean: *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le véritable auteur de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ,* 1849.

MANSI: Annotated edition of Baronius-Raynaldi: *Annales,* 38 vols., 1759.

MARGUERITE D'ANGOULÊME: *Heptameron.*

MARIANA, Juan de: *The General History of Spain,* tr. by John Stevens, 1699.

MARTÈNE, Edmond: *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio.*

MARTIN: *De l'avenir du Protestantisme et du Catholicisme.*

MARTIN, Henri: *Histoire populaire de la France.*

MARTIN, Jules: *Gustave Vasa et la Réforme en Suède,* 1906.

MAULDE DE LA CLAVIÈRE: *Les origines de la Révolution française au commencement du XVI^e siècle,* 1899.

Saint Cajetan, tr. by G. H. Ely, 1902.

MAZZELLA, Camillo: *De vera religione et de Ecclesia Christi.*

MELANCHTHON, Philip: *Epistolae.*

Opera, 7 vols., forming part of the *Corpus Reformatorum.*

Vita Lutheri.

Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome.

Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions.

Mémoires du Clergé de France.

MERKLE, Sebastian: *Concilii Tridentini diariorum pars prima,* 1901.

MEUFFELS, Hubert: *Les martyrs de Gorcum,* 1908.

MÉZIÈRES, Alfred: *Pétrarque d'après les documents inédits,* 1868.

MICHAUD and POUJOULAT: *Nouvelle collection de mémoires.*

MICHELET, Jules: *History of France,* tr. by G. H. Smith, 2 vols., 1847.

MIGNE, Jacques Paul: *Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique,* 171 vols., 1866.

MIRANDOLA, Pico della: *Vie de frère Jérôme Savonarole.*

MISTRAL, Frédéric: *Nerto.*

MOEHLER, John Adam: *Symbolism,* tr. by J. B. Robertson, 1906.

MOELLER, Charles: *Introduction critique à l'histoire moderne: materiaux et littérature,* 1891.

MOLLAT, G.: *Les papes d'Avignon,* 1912.
Lettres communes de Jean XXII.
MOLMENTI: *Venice, its Individual Growth.*
MONOD, Gabriel: *Mémoire lu à l'Academie des sciences morales et politiques.*
Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Saeculi Decimi Quinti.
Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu.
MOSHEIM: *De beghardis et beguinabus,* 1790.
MÜLLER, Hermann: *Les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus.*
MURATORI: *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* 25 vols., 1761.

NAMÈCHE: *Guillaume le Taciturne,* 2 vols., 1850.
NEMEC: *Papst Alexander VI,* 1882.
NICHOLAS OF CUSA: *De conjecturis temporum.*
NIEM, Theodoricus de: *De schismate papistico,* 1802.
NOLHAC, Pierre de: *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme,* 1892.
NOSTREDAME, Jean de: *Les vies des plus célèbres et anciens poètes provençaux,* 1575.
Nouvelle Biographie Générale, 46 vols.

OCCAM, William: *Dialogues,* 1494.
OLLIVIER, Joseph Henry: *Le pape Alexandre VI et les Borgias,* 1870.

PALLAVICINI, Pietro Sforza: *Histoire du concile de Trente,* 4 vols., 1833.
PALMIERI: *Ad vaticani archivi romanorum pontificum regesta manductio,* 1884.
Panthéon Littéraire.
Papal Registers, Innocent III to Sixtus V, 2018 vols.
PAPENCORDT: *Cola di Rienzo und seine Zeit.*
PAQUIER, J.: *Jérôme Aléandre,* 1900.
PARIS, Alexis: *Les manuscripts français,* 7 vols., 1848.
PARISET, Georges: *L'État et les Eglises en Prusse sous Frédéric-Guillaume I^er^,* 1896.

PASTOR, Ludwig von: *Reunionsbestrebungen.*
History of the Popes, 1912.
PAULUS, N.: *Luthers Lebensende und der Eislebener Apotheker Johann Landau,* 1896.
PELAYO, Alvarez: *De planctu ecclesiae.*
PÉRÉFIX, Hardouin de: *History of Henry IV,* tr. by Le Moine, 1903.
PÉRENNÈS (editor): *Dictionnaire de Bibliographie Catholique.*
PÉRIÈS, Georges: *La faculté de droit dans l'ancien Université de Paris.*
L'Index, 1898.
PERRENS, François Tommy: *Jérôme Savonarole,* 1856.
PETIT-DOUTAILLIS, Charles: *Documents nouveaux sur les mœurs populaires et le droit de vengeance dans les Pays-Bas au XV^e siècle,* 1908.
PETITOT, Claude Bernard: *Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France,* 52 vols., 1826.
PETRARCH, Francesco: *De vita solitaria.*
Le rime, 3 vols., 1829.
PFEIFFER, Franz: *Deutsche Mystiker des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts,* 2 vols., 1857.
PHILIPPSON: *Die Römische Curie und die Bartholomäusnacht.*
PICCOLOMINI, Aeneas Sylvius: *Opera.*
PIUS II: *Letters,* 1909.
PLATINA, Bartolommeo: *The Lives of the Popes,* 1865.
POHLE-PREUSS: *Grace, Actual and Habitual,* 1914.
POULAIN, Augustin: *La mystique de S. Jean de la Croix.*
The Graces of Interior Prayer, tr. by Leonora L. Yorke Smith, 1912.
POTTHAST, August: *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum,* 2 vols., 1875.
PRAT: *Histoire du Concile de Trent,* 3 vols., 1854.
Maldonat et l'Université de Paris au XVI^e siècle, 1856.
PROTEOLUS: *De vitiis, sectis omnium haereticorum.*
PTOLÉMÉE DE LUQUES: *Histoire ecclésiastique.*
PULLER: *Les ordinations anglicanes et le sacrifice de la messe,* 1896.

PUYOL, Pierre: *L'auteur du livre de Imitatione Christi,* 2 vols., 1900.
Quadro elementas das relaçoes politicas e diplomaticas de Portugal, 18 vols., 1876.
QUICHERAT, Jules: *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc,* 5 vols., 1849.

RABANIS: *Clement V et Philippe le Bel,* 1898.
RABORY: *Vie de sainte Françoise Romaine,* 1884.
RAGUSE, A. F. L. Marmont, duc de: *Monumenta Conciliorum.*
RANKE, Leopold von: *Histoire de France pendant les XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles.*
Historisch-biographische Studien, 1877.
History of the Popes, tr. by E. Foster, 3 vols., 1912.
Rassegna Nazionale.
RAYNALDI, Odorico: *Annales Ecclesiastici, 1198 to 1565,* 10 vols., 1679.
REBELLIAN, Alfred: *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme,* 1892.
Registres des Papes, published by the École Française at Rome.
RÉMOND, Florimond de: *De la naissance de l'hérésie.*
REUMONT, Alfred von: *Geschichte der Stadt Rom,* 4 vols., 1870.
RIBERA, Francisco de: *Vida de S. Teresa,* 1908.
RICHELIEU, Armand Jean du Plessis, duc de: *Mémoires.*
Traité pour convertir ceux qui se sont séparés de l'Eglise, 1651.
RICHENTAL, Ulrich von: *Chronik des Constanzer Concils,* 1882.
RINIERI, H.: *Beatrice Cenci, secondo i costituti del suo processo,* 1909.
RIO, Alexis: *De l'art chrétien,* 4 vols., 1874.
ROBINSON, Hastings (editor): *Original Letters Relating to the English Reformation,* 2 vols., 1846.
ROMAGNÉSI, Vergniaud: *Histoire d'Orléans.*
RONSARD: *Œuvres complètes.*
ROUSSEAU, J. J.: *Deuxième lettre de la montagne.*
RUSCELLI, Girolamo: *Delle lettere di principi,* 3 vols., 1577.
RUYSBROECK, Jean de: *L'ornement des noces spirituelles,* 1911.
RYMER, Thomas: *Foedera,* 20 vols., 1735.

SABATIER, Louis August: *The Apostle Paul,* tr. by A. M. Hellier, 1912.
SADOLETO, Jacopo: *Opera,* 4 vols., 1738.
Saggio d'inventario degli archivi di Venezia, 1861.
SAINTE MARTHE, Scævola de: *Elogia gallorum illustrium.*
SAINT VICTOR, Richard de: *Trinité.*
SALEMBIER, Louis: *Petrus de Alliaco,* 1886.
The Great Schism of the West, tr. by M. D., 1907.
SANUDO, Marino: *I diarii,* 58 vols., 1903.
SARPI, Paolo: *The History of the Council of Trent,* tr. by Nathanael Brent, 1676.
SAVIGNY, Friedrich Carl von: *The History of the Roman Law during the Middle Ages,* tr. by E. Cathcart, 1829.
SAVONAROLA, Girolamo: *The Triumph of the Cross,* 1901.
SCHEDEL: *Chronica Chronicarum.*
SCHMIDT: *Les libertins spirituels,* 1876.
SEGRETAIN, E. A.: *Sixte Quint et Henry IV,* 1861.
SEPET, Marius: *Jeanne d'Arc,* 1896.
SERRY: *Historia Congregationum de Auxiliis,* 1699.
SIMON, Richard: *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament,* 1693.
SIGISMONDI, dei Conti da Foligno: *Le storie de suoi tempi,* 1883.
SISMONDI, Jean Charles: *Histoire de France.*
SMITH, Preserved (editor): *Life and Letters of Martin Luther,* 1911.
SOCIÉTÉ DE L'HISTOIRE DE PARIS: *Mémoires.*
SOMMERVOGEL: *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus.*
SORTAIS: *Fra Angelico.*
SPITZEN: *Les hollandismes de l'Imitation,* 1884.
Nouvelle défense de Thomas à Kempis, 1884.
STEIN: *Manuel de bibliographie générale,* 1897.
STROWSKI, Fortunat: *Pascal et son temps,* 3 vols., 1908.
Saint François de Sales, Introduction à l'histoire du sentiment réligieux en France au XVII^e siècle, 1898.
SUAREZ, Francisco: *De fide.*
De legibus.
SUGENHEIM: *Zustände Baierns.*

SULLY, Maximilien de Béthune, duc de: *Mémoirs,* tr. by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox, 4 vols., 1856.
SUSTA: *Die römische Curie und das Concil von Trient,* 1904.

TACHERET: *L'évolution religieuse de Guillaume le Taciturne,* 1904.
TANQUEREY: *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae specialis.*
TAULER, John: *Institutions,* 1840.
Sermons and Conferences, 1910.
TERESA, St.: *Book of the Foundations.*
Histoire de S. Thérèse, d'après les Bollandistes, 2 vols., 1882.
Letters, tr. by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1919.
Life and Letters, tr. by Henry James Coleridge, 3 vols., 1896.
Œuvres, 4 vols., 1845.
St. Teresa of Jesus, tr. by David Lewis, 1910.
The Interior Castle, or the Mansion, tr. by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1912.
The Way of Perfection, tr. by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, 1911.
THAUSING, Moriz: *Albrecht Dürer, his Life and Works,* 2 vols., 1882.
THEINER, Augustine: *Acta genuina concilii Tridentini,* 1874.
Codex diplomaticus Dominii temporalis Sanctae Sedis, 3 vols., 1862.
THEODORE VON NIEHEIM: *De schismate papistico,* 1802.
THIERRY, Augustin: *The Formation and Progress of the Tiers-État, or Third Estate in France,* tr. by F. B. Wells, 2 vols., 1859.
THIRIOT: *Œuvres mystiques du bienheureux Henri Suso,* 1889.
THOMAS, Jules: *Le concordat de 1516, ses origines, son histoire au XVI^e^ siècle,* 3 vols., 1910.
THOMAS À KEMPIS: *Works,* tr. by J. P. Arthur, 1905.
THOMAS AQUINAS, St.: *De politica christiana,* 1647.
De regimine principum.
Summa Theologica, tr. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, 16 vols., 1922.
THOMASSIN, Louis: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* 3 vols., 1779.
Traité dogmatique et historique des édits et autres moyens dont

on s'est servi pour établir et maintenir l'unité de l'Eglise, 2 vols., 1703.

THUREAU-DANGIN, Paul: *The Life of Saint Bernardine of Siena,* tr. by Baroness G. von Hügel, 1911.

TIRABOSCHI, Girolamo: *Storia della litteratura italiana,* 20 vols., 1813.

TOMMASEO, Niccolò: *Le lettere di S. Caterina da Siena.*

TOMMASINI: *Fonti per la storia d' Italia,* 1890.

TOSTI, Luigi: *History of Pope Boniface VIII and his Times,* tr. by E. J. Donnelly, 1911.

TRÉSAL, J.: *Les origines du schisme anglican,* 1908.

TREVELYAN, George Macaulay: *England in the Age of Wycliffe,* 1920.

VACANDARD, Elphège: *Études de critique et d'historie religieuse,* 2 vols., 1910.

The Inquisition, tr. by Bertrand L. Conway, 1908.

VACANT-MANGENOT (editors): *Dictionnaire de Théologie.*

VAGIUS: *In vita Celestini.*

VAISSETTE, Jean Joseph: *Histoire générale de Languedoc,* 16 vols., 1904.

VALOIS, Noël: *Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges,* 1906.

La crise religieuse du XV^e^ siècle. Le pape et le concile, 2 vols., 1909.

La France et le grand schisme d'Occident, 4 vols., 1902.

VAN DEN GHEYN: *Catalogue des manuscripts de la bibliothèque royale de Belgique,* 1908.

VASARI, Giorgio: *Lives of Seventy of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects,* tr. by Gaston de Vere, 8 vols., 1914.

VAZIO: *Relazione sugli archivi di Stato italiano,* 1883.

VENTURI: *Storia della Compania di Gesù in Italia.*

VERLAQUE, V.: *Jean XXII, sa vie et ses œuvres,* 1883.

VERSTEGAN, Richard: *Theatrum crudelitatis haereticorum nostri temporis,* 1587.

VIGILIUS: *Vita Vigilii.*

VIGOUREL, Adrian: *La liturgie et la vie chrétienne.*

VILLANI, Filippo: *Storie fiorentine,* 8 vols., 1803.
VILLARI: *Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola,* tr. by Linda Villari.
VIOLLET, Paul: *Droit privé et sources. Histoire du droit civil français. Etablissements de saint Louis,* 4 vols., 1886.
Précis de l'histoire du droit français, 2 vols., 1886.

WADDING, Luke: *Annales Ordinis Minorum.*
WALDAU: *Thomas Murner.*
WALKER, Williston: *John Calvin,* 1906.
WALLON, Henri Alexandre: *Jeanne d'Arc,* 1876.
WETZER AND WELTE: *Kirchenlexikon,* 2nd ed. by Card. Hergenröther.
WEISS, Nathanael: *La chambre ardente,* 1889.
WULF, Maurice de: *History of Medieval Philosophy,* tr. by R. Coffey, 1909.
WYCLIF, John: *Trialogus.*

ZABUGHIN, Vladimiro: *Giulio Pomponio Leto,* 2 vols., 1912.
ZARABELLA: *De jurisdictione imperiali,* 1566.
ZIMMERMANN: *Luthers Schriften.*

INDEX

Abbreviators, College of, 197, 269
Absolutism of French monarchy, 5
Academy of Florence, 273, 284
Accentibus et orthographis linguae hebraicae, De (by Reuchlin), 302
Achery, d' (Benedictine), 596
Acta martyrum (by Crépin), 473
Acta sanctorum (by the Bollandists), 593 note
Ad providam, Bull, 65
Adolph of Nassau (emperor), 23, 31
  Boniface VIII, 24
  Bull *Clericis laicos,* 27
  Edward I, 24
  Philip the Fair, 24
Adrets, Baron des, 482
Adrian VI (pope), 518-520
  Edict of Worms, 363
  Reform measures, 519
Adrian of Utrecht (Adrian VI), 518
Aegidius of Viterbo (card.), 206
Against the Papacy (by Luther), 384
Agardi, Guillaume, 63
Agincourt, Battle of, 175
Agnello of Pisa, 5
Agricola, 302
  Interim of Augsburg, 556
Ailly, Pierre d' (theologian), 153, 284
  Council of Constance, 143, 145 f., 151
  Papal authority, 122, 143
  Western Schism, 120, 126 f., 135
Aix, Seminary at, 590
Aix-la-Chapelle, 355
Albergati, Nicolo (card.), 157, 181
Albert, duke of Austria (emperor), 23, 69
  Adolph of Nassau, 31
  Boniface VIII, 31
Albert V, duke of Bavaria, 576
Albert Berdini, Blessed, 277
Albert of Hapsburg, 4
Albert, Charlotte d', 233
Alberti, Leone (artist), 267
  St. Peter's, Rome, 266
Albornoz (card.), 101, 103, 107
Albrecht of Brandenburg (archbishop), 325
  Becomes Lutheran, 370
  Indulgence offerings, 326 note
Albret, Henri d' (king of Navarre), 451
Albret, Jeanne d' (queen of Navarre), 478
Alcala, University, 547, 613, 621
Alciati, Andrea (jurist), 461
Aleander, Jerome (card.), 357, 615
Alexander V (pope), 138 f.
  Election of, 138 note
Alexander VI (pope), 152, 214-237, 582
  American explorations, 236
  Charles VIII, 220
  Children of, 216 note
  League with Venice, 216
  Murder of duke of Gandia, 223
  Nepotism, 217
  Reform project, 223
  Savonarola, 229 f.
  Simony in election of, 214 note
Alexander of Hales (theologian), 38
Alfeld, August von (Franciscan), 347
Alfonso (claimant to Naples), 218
Alfonso, king of Naples, 181
Alfonso, king of Portugal, 187
Alfonso of Biseglia, 234
Allemand (card.), at Council of Basle, 162, 164
  Papal authority, 154
Allen (card.), 436
Alma Mater, Bull, 64
Almain, James (theologian), at Council of Pisa, 250
Almodie de Besse, 110
Altenburg, Miltitz and Luther at, 343
Altenstein (Germany), 361
Alumada, 597
Alva, Duke of, in Italy, 526
  Netherlands, 504 f.
Alvarez (card.), 525
Amadeus of Portugal, Blessed, 207

Amadeus of Savoy (antipope), 172
Amalfi (Italy), 9
Amboise, Conspiracy of, 481, 623
Amédée de Talaru, at Council of Basle, 172
American Indians, Pius V and, 533
Anabaptists, 381, 387, 412, 501, 504, 575
Anagni, 20
  Boniface VIII, 39 ff.
  Cardinals' meeting at, 118
Ancona (Italy), Pius II at, 195
Andrea del Castagno (painter), 265
Andrea Mantegna (painter), 276
Andrea Orcagna (painter), 266
Andrew Corsini, St., 48
Andrew of Perugia (missioner), 88
Angela de Merici, St., 607, 610
Angela of Foligno, Blessed, 48, 113
Angelico da Fiesole (painter), 277
  Eugene IV and, 265
Angelus, 186 note
Anger (Jesuit), 624
Angers (France), Slaughter of Huguenots at, 489
Anglican Church, *Book of Common Prayer,* 430
  Eucharist, 418
  Forty-two Articles, 421
  Real Presence, 418
  Six Articles, 412
  Ten Articles, 412
  Thirty-nine Articles, 432
Anglican Orders, 421, 430
Angoulême, Margaret d', 442, 446, 449, 451
  Calvin and, 465
  Heptameron, 443
  Miroir de l'âme pécheresse, 453
Annales Ecclesiastici (by Baronius), 607
Annates, 89, 181, 258
  Abolished in England, 402
  Council of Basle, 164
Anne Boleyn, 397 ff.
  Excommunicated, 404
  Executed, 413
  Marriage, 403
Anne de Pisseleu, 443
Anne du Bourg, 476
Anne Seymour, 413
Antilutherus (by Clichtove), 447
Antipopes, Benedict XIV, 151; Clement VIII, 151; Felix V (i. e., Amadeus of Savoy), 172; Pietro of Corbario, 86-88
Antitrinitarians, 575
Antoine de Bourbon, 475, 481
Antoine de Verceil, 207
Antonello da Messina, 276
Antoninus, St., *Regola di vita cristiana,* 180
  Summa, 193
Antwerp, 504
  Prosperity of, 502 note
Apocalypse, rejected by Luther, 363
"Apocalyptics," 148
"Apostolic Brethren," 148
Apostolic Secretaries, College of, 262, 267
Appeal to Rome, suppressed in England, 403
Appointment of bishops, Henry VIII and, 402 f.
  In England, 417
Aquaviva, Claudio (Jesuit), 619
Aquinas, *See* Thomas Aquinas
Arabic inscriptions, Templars and, 73 note
Arabic, Teaching of, 88
Aragon, Gregory XI and wars in, 111
Arande, Michel d' (bishop), 446, 449
Araoz (Jesuit), 621
Arbues, Peter, 209
Architecture, Gothic, 267
  Renaissance, 274 f.
Arcs (France), 112
Arezzo (Italy), 262
Aristocracy in France, 439
Aristotelianism, 283
Aristotle, Study of, 283, 285
Arles, Bishop of, and lay usurpation, 25
Armada, Spanish, 434
Armengol, Peter, 113
Armenians, 575
  Council of Basle, 167
Arrabiati, Party of the, 228, 230
Arras, League of, 506, 577
Art, Christian, 247
  Realism in, 23
Arthur, and Henry VIII's marriage, 395
Articles, *See* Anglican Church
Articles of Smalkalden (by Luther), 383
Ascoli, Jerome d', and Olivi, 75
Asterisci (by Luther), 346
Asti (Italy), Council of Pisa, 250

Asti, Bernardino d', at Council of Trent, 547
Aubert, Etienne (Innocent VI), 99
Auctoritate papae et concilii, De (by Cajetan), 250
Augenspiegel (by Reuchlin), 332
Auger, Edmund (Jesuit), 577
Augsburg Confession, 379, 383, 386, 511
Augsburg, Diet of, 373, 377-380, 520
Augsburg Interim, 386, 556
Augsburg, Luther at, 337 ff.
Augsburg, Peace of, 386
Augustinianism, Luther and, 320
Augustinians, Discalced, 202
  Luther, 312
  Popularity of, 204
  Protestantism and, 594
Ausculta fili, Bull, 15 note, 34, 37
Authority, Doctrine of ecclesiastical, 84
  Doctrine of political, 84
  Principle of, 130
  Royal, 12
Auto da fé, 580
Autun, Usurers in diocese of, 25
Auxiliis, Congregatio de, 637
Avignon, Clement V at, 51
  Jesuit college, 624
  Notre Dame des Doms, 261
  Papacy at, 47
  Papal library, 262
  Papal palace, 94, 261
  Purchase of, 96
  Renaissance, 261
  Seminary founded, 590
  Siege by Boucicaut, 127
  Tomb of John XXII, 261
  Worldliness at, 110
Avila (Spain), 597, 599, 601
  Convent of, 596

"Babylonian Captivity" of the papacy, *See* Avignon
Babylonian Captivity (by Luther), 364
Baccio, Picture of St. Sebastian, 212
Bacon, Nicholas, 429
Baius (theologian), 591, 634
Baliol, king of Scotland, 24
Ballue (card.), 210
Bañez, Dominic, 629, 637
Baptism, Heretical doctrine of, 76
Barbardino of Feltre, Blessed, 207
Barbieri (painter), 627
Barbo (i. e., Paul II), 196
Bari, Archbishop of, 115
Barletta, Gabriel, 206
Barlow (bishop), 430
Barnabites, 522, 595, 606
Baroncelli, tribune of Rome, 101
Baroncelli, Bernardo, 201
Baronius (card.), *Annales Ecclesiastici,* 608
  Roman Martyrology, 535
Barricades, Day of the, 494
Barrière, Jean de la, 596
Bartholomew a Martyribus (bishop), 591
  Council of Trent, 568
  Stimulus pastorum, 591
Bartholomew's Day, Saint, 484 ff.
Bartolommeo (painter), 279 f.
  Converted by Savonarola, 213
Barton, Elizabeth, Execution of, 405
Basle, Calvin at, 465
  Oecolampadius at, 369
  Pellicanus at, 368
Basle, Council of, 158 f., 182
  Annates, 164
  Armenians at, 167
  Authority of, 165
  Bull of dissolution, 160
  Opposition to pope, 161
  Orientals at, 167
  Reform decrees, 173
  Transferred to Ferrara, 164
Bassi, Matthieu, 595
Bavaria, 299
  Smalkaldic League, 381
Beatific vision, Doctrine of, 91
Beaulieu, Edict of, 491
Beaupère, John, Council of Basle, 160
Bebel, *Facetiae,* 310
  Triumphus Veneris, 333
Beccadelli, Condemned by Eugene IV, 164
Beda, Noël, 447, 450 f., 453, 461
Bedier, *See* Beda
"Beggars," 503
Beghards, 73, 292
Begue, Lambert de, 292
Beguines, 73, 292
Belgium, 507
Bellarmine, Robert (card.), 631 f.
  Authority of Council of Basle, 165
  Disputationes de controversiis, 633
Bellay, Guillaume du, 454
Bembo (card.), 277, 284

Benedict XI (pope), 42-46
Beatified, 46
Crusade, 46
Death of, by poison, 46
Excommunicates Colonna and Nogaret, 45
Leaves Rome, 47
Letter to Philip the Fair, 44
Benedict XII (pope), 92-95
Bull *Summi Magistri,* 203 note
Petrarch and, 264
Reform measures, 94
Benedict XIII (pope), 115, 124-131
Council of Pisa, 136 f.
Deposed, 150
Benedict XIV (antipope), 151
Estius and, 634
Benedictine monasteries, 202 f.
Benedictus Deus, Bull, 530
Benefices, 257 f.
Benevento, Duchy of, 221
Benincasa (*See* Catherine of Siena)
Beraud de Got (archbishop), 49
Berdini, Blessed Albert, 277
Bergamo, Bonagratia of, 82
Berlichingen, Götz von, 351
Bern (Swiss canton), 468
Bernard, St., and papal supremacy, 38
Bernard de Saisset (bishop), 33 f.
Bernardine de Bustis (Franciscan), 207, 211
Bernardine of Feltre, Blessed, 211
Bernardine of Siena, St., 180, 207, 277
And Martin V, 157
Bernardon de la Salle, 119
Berquin, Louis de (Huguenot), 451 f.
Berthold de Rohrbach, Mysticism of, 292 f.
Bertrand, Nicholas (jurist), 250
Bertrand de Deaux (archbishop), 93
Bertrand de Got (Clement V), 49
Besme, and death of Coligny, 488
Bessarion (card.), 182, 184, 277
Contra calumniatores Platonis, 285
Council of Ferrara, 168
Council of Florence, 169
Eugene IV and, 164
Greek Church union, 171
Beze, Theodore de, 482, 484, 503
De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis, 471
Bible, Council of Trent and canon of, 550
German translations, 363 note
Editions, 303
Council of Trent and interpretation of, 550
Luther at Erfurt, 310
Luther and canon of, 310
Luther's translation, 364 note
Rule of faith, 548 f.
Biel, Gabriel, *Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros,* 282
Bigamy of Philip of Hesse, 384
Biondo, Flavio, and Eugene IV, 164
Birel, John (Carthusian), 99 f.
Bishops, Appointment of, and Henry VIII, 402 f.
Appointment of, in England, 417
Right of residence, 566 f.
Black Penitents, Confraternity of, 609
Blessed Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, and Council of Trent, 552
Blois, States General, 494
"Bloody Mary," 428
Bobadilla, Nicholas (Jesuit), 614
Boccasini, Blessed Nicholas (Benedict XI), 41
Bockold, John (John of Leyden), 382
Bodenstein, Andreas (i. e., Carlstadt), 345 note
Böhme, Jacob, 387
Bohemia, John of, 79
Bohemians, and Luther, 354
Boleyn, Anne, 397 ff.
Executed, 413
Marriage, 413
Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum,* 593 note
Bologna (Italy), 139, 521
Council of Trent, 556
Eugene IV at, 164
Francis I and Leo X at, 257
Bologna University, 88
Restoration of, 182
Study of law at, 10
Western schism, 135
Bonagratia (Franciscan), 82
And Olivi, 75
Bonaventure, St., 281
"Bonfire of vanities," 228
Boniface VIII, 19-42
Abdication of Pope Celestine, 31 note
Adolph of Nassau, 24
Albert of Austria, 31
Anagni outrage, 39 ff.

Arbitrator between France and England, 30
Attempted condemnation of, 52 ff.
Bishop of Metz, 25
Bull *Ausculta fili*, 15 note, 34, 37
Bull *Clericis laicos*, 19 ff.
Bull *Ineffabilis*, 29 note
Bull *Salvator mundi*, 34
Bull *Super Petri solio*, 40
Bull *Unam sanctam*, 38
Calumnies regarding death of, 42
Canonization of St. Louis, 30
Charges against, 31
Council at Rome (1302), 37
Crusade, 23, 33
Eric of Denmark, 24
Feudalism, 3
Flote, 14
Lay usurpation, 25
Legists, 15
Letter from Pierre Flote, 4
Letter to Edward I, 23 f.
Letter to Philip the Fair, 23 f., 28 f.
Papal supremacy, 30-39
Pretended letter from Philip, 35
Taxation of Church property, 18
Templars, 58
Truce between England and France, 29
University of Paris, 20 f.
Venice, 24
Boniface IX (pope), 123
Book of Common Prayer, 418, 421
Condemned, 432
Elizabeth's revision, 430
Bora, Catherine von, 376
Bordeaux, Jesuit college, 624
Seminary founded, 590
Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
Borgia, Alfonso (Callistus III), 186
Borgia, Caesar, 216 f., 221, 224, 239 ff.
Marries Charlotte d'Albert, 233
Murder of Duke of Gandia, 222
Borgia, Francesco, 621
Borgia, Juan, 222
Legitimation of, 234
Borgia, Lorenzo, 210
Borgia, Lucretia, 217, 223
Giovanni Sforza and, 224
Marries Alfonso of Biseglia, 234
Regency of papal palace, 234
Borgia, Rodrigo (Alexander VI), 208, 210, 214
Borgia, St. Francis, 186
Borromeo, St. Charles (*See* Charles Borromeo)
Bossuet, Authority of Council of Basle, 165
Botticelli (painter), 275 f., 279
And Savonarola, 278
Bouchet, Jean (poet), 251
Boucicaut, Geoffrey de, Siege of Avignon, 127
Boulbon, Enemonde de, 110
Bourbon, Antoine de, 478, 481
Bourbon, Charles de (card.), 478, 494
Bourbon, Connétable de, Sack of Rome, 521
Bourbons, 477 ff.
Bourdoise, 590
Bourg, Anne du, 476
Bourges, Father Anger at, 624
Slaughter of Huguenots at, 489
Pragmatic Sanction of, 172-175, 190, 194
Bradwardine, Thomas, on predestination, 295
Bramante (architect), 267
And Julius II, 244
Brandenburg (Germany), 299
Albrecht of, 370
Brando (card.), and Council of Basle, 162
Braun, John, letter from Luther, 314
Breslau, Reformation preached at, 369
Brethren of the Common Life, 133 f., 202
Luther as student, 307
Brethren of the Free Spirit, 74, 76, 292
Breviary, Revision of, 532, 540
Brewster, James, Execution of, 394
Briçonnet, Guillaume (bishop), 438 ff., 445 f., 449
Brielle (Netherlands), 505
Brigid of Sweden, St., 98 f., 109, 507
Letter to Gregory XI, 109
Mysticism of, 288
Brothers of St. John of God, 607
Brucciamento della vanità, 228
Bruges (Belgium), 504
Brunellesco (architect), 266, 275
Bruni, Francesco (humanist), 262
Bruni, Leonardo, 267
Martin (Reformer), 455, 471
Body exhumed, 427
Budé, Guillaume, 445, 461

Bull, Golden (of Emperor Charles IV), 96, 102; (of Sixtus IV), 202
Bulls, Papal:
Ad providam, 65
Alma Mater, 64
Ausculta fili, 15 note, 34, 37
Benedictus Deus, 530
Clericis laicos, 19, 25-30
Cum multa, 597
Dudum sacrum, 163, 165
Ecclesiae catholicae, 619
Execrabilis, 90
Exiit qui seminat, 74
Exsurge Domine, 352, 394
In caena Domini, 533
Ineffabilis, 29 note
Laetamur in te, 53
Licet ab initio, 523 note, 578
Mare magnum, 202, 204, 254
Quoniam alto, 160
Regnans Dei, 433
Rex gloriae, 55, 56 note
Salvator mundi, 34
Sapienti consilio, 269 note
Summi Magistri, 203 note
Super Petri solio, 40
Unam sanctam, 38
Vocavit nos Pius, 191
Bundschuh, 372
At Worms, 361
Buoncompagni, Ugo (Gregory XIII), 534
Burgundy, Circle of, 501 f.
Buridan, Jean, 284
Bus, Caesar de, 608
Bustis, Bernardine de (Franciscan), 207, 211

Cabrières, Massacre of, 455 ff.
Caesar Borgia, 216 f., 221, 224, 239-243
Marriage, 233
Murder of Duke of Gandia, 221 f.
Caesar de Bus, 608
Cajetan, St., and the Theatines, 603, 605
Cajetan, Tommaso, Council of Pisa, 250
De auctoritate papae et concilii, 250
Luther, 337 ff.
Pico della Mirandola, 250
Staupitz, 316
Thomism, 283
Calais, French taking of, 478
Calasanctius, St. Joseph, 607 f., 610
Calendar, Gregorian, 603 note
Gregory XIII and, 535
In France and Rome, 67 note
Luigi Lilio and, 535
Calixtines, 166 note
Callistus III (pope), 185-188, 269
Angelus, 186 note
Nepotism, 188
Portuguese colonies, 236 note
Calmar, Union of, 508
Calmet, Dom, 596
Calvin, John, 368, 438, 459 ff.
At Basle, 465
At Collège de Fortet, 464
At Geneva, 467 ff.
At Nérac, 465
At Saintonge, 464
At Strasburg, 465
Commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia,* 463
Cranmer, 420
Death of, 484
Defensor pacis, 85 note
Doctrine of justification, 368 note
Institutes, 465 f.
Margaret d'Angoulême, 451, 465
Reputed infamy of, 460 note
Calvinism, 459 ff.
At Geneva, 467 ff.
In France, 472 ff.
Calvinists (*See* Huguenots)
Camaldolese, 596
Cambrai, and Bull *Clericis laicos,* 27
League of, 247
Cambridge, University, 423
Bucer and Fagius, 418
Henry VIII's divorce, 400
Camillians, 607, 609
Camillus de Lellis, St., 607, 610
Camoens, *Lusiads,* 626
Campeggio, Lorenzo (card.), 397, 520
Campion, Edmund (martyr), 434
Campo Morto, Battle of, 199
Candia (island), 138
Canisius, St. Peter, 624
Cano, Melchior (theologian), 580, 629
Council of Trent, 547, 557
De Locis theologicis, 634
Canon law, and taxation, 17-19
Study of, 20
Canon of Scripture, Council of Trent, 550
Luther, 363

Canons Regular, 596
Canterbury, Archbishop of, Cranmer appointed, 403
Canzoniere (by Petrarch), 262
Capistran, St. John, 182, 187 f., 207, 277
"Capitulation" at papal elections, 158
Capranica (card.), and Martin V, 157
Council of Basle, 162
Capreolus of Rodez, 281
Defensiones theologiae divi doctoris Thomae, 281
Capuchins, 522, 595
Caraffa, Carlo (card.), 526 f.
Executed, 529
Caraffa, Giovanni Pietro (Paul IV), 523, 525, 538, 604 f., 614 f.
Carcano, Michele (Franciscan), 207
Carcassonne, Diocese of, 18
Cardinals, College of, and Sixtus V, 539
Carinthia, 576
Carlos, Don, 580
Carlstadt (Reformer), 324, 345
At Wittenberg, 367
Debate at Leipsic, 346 f.
Sacramentary dispute, 373
Carmelites, 596 ff.
Popularity of, 204
Carniola, 576
Carrache, Hannibal (painter), 627
Augustine (painter), 627
Carranza (archbishop), 533
Carthusians (London), Martyrs, 406
Papal authority, 404
Carvajal, Bernardino (card.), 236
Council of Pisa, 249
Juan (papal legate), 187
Louis, at Council of Trent, 547
Castagno, Andrea del (painter), 265
Castel Sant' Angelo, 114, 184
Castellion, Sébastien, 471
Castile, Wars in, 111
Catanei, Vanozza, and Rodrigo Borgia, 210
Catechism, Heidelberg, 386
Catechism of Trent, 609
Catechism, Roman, 532, 585
Catharinus, Ambrose, at Council of Trent, 547, 551
Catherine de' Medici, 453, 479 ff., 484 f., 521, 591
Council of Trent, 548, 574
St. Bartholomew's Day, 487 f., 490
Catherine de' Ricci, St., esteem for Savonarola, 233
Catherine Howard, executed, 413
Catherine of Aragon, 393 ff., 406
Divorce declared, 403
Catherine of Siena, St., 109
Clement VII, 131
Embassy to Gregory XI, 111
Gregory XI, 110 f.
Mysticism, 288
Urban VI, 131
Western schism, 120, 131
Catherine of Sweden, St., Western schism, 120
Catherine Parr, 413
Catherine von Bora, 376
Cauvin, Charles, excommunicated, 460
Gerard, excommunicated, 460
John (*See* Calvin)
Cazalla, Agostino, executed, 580
Francesco, executed, 580
Pedro, executed, 581
Cecil, William, 429
Celestine V (pope), 19 f.
Abdication of, 31 note
Canonization of, 53
"Fratricelli," 31
Cella-Robandi, Chartreuse of, 112
Cellier (Benedictine), 596
"Cenacle of Meaux," 445 ff.
Cental (France), 456
Cerfroy, Abbey of, 596
Cervantes (card.), Council of Basle, 162
Cervini, Marcello (Marcellus II), 525
Michele (card.), Council of Trent, 545, 554
Cesarini, Giuliano (card.), Council of Basle, 157 f., 160, 162, 164, 172
Martin V and, 157
Cesena (Italy), Massacre, 119
Chaise-Dieu, Abbey of, 203
Chalcocondylas, Demetrius, 270
Chaldean, Teaching of, 88
Chaldeans, Council of Basle, 167
Chamber of the Edict, 499
Chambéry (France), Jesuit college, 624
Chambre Ardente, 473
Chant, Gregorian, 628
Charité-sur-Loire, La, 485
Charles I (King of Spain), 356
Charles IV (emperor), 98
And city of Florence, 108
At Rome, 104

Coronation, 102
Issues the Golden Bull, 102
Charles V (emperor), 362, 383, 395, 419, 521, 560 f., 579
Anabaptists, 501
At Worms, 360 f.
Clement VII and, 521
Coronation oath, 355
Council of Trent, 555 f., 559
Diet of Augsburg, 378
Francis I and, 523, 544
Letter to Queen Mary, 424
Charles V (king of France), Election of Urban VI, 117
Letter to cardinals at Anagni, 119
Charles VI (king of France), Western schism, 126
Charles VII (king of France), 177
Council of Basle, 172 f.
Crowned at Rheims, 176
Charles VIII (king of France), 218
And Alexander VI, 220
And Italy, 219
And Savonarola, 219 f.
Enters Florence, 220
Charles IX (king of France), 438, 477, 485, 591
Council of Trent, 570
Jesuits, 623
Pius V and, 532
St. Bartholomew's Day, 487 ff.
Charles X (king of France), 494
Charles IX (king of Sweden), 510
Charles Borromeo, St., 529, 532, 577, 583 ff., 591
Consulta, 530
Pius V and, 592
Proposed marriage, 585 note
Seminaries, 586 ff.
Charles de Bourbon, 494
Charles of Anjou, 20 f.
Charles of Durazzo, and Clement VII, 121
And Urban VI, 121
Charles of Luxemburg, 96
Charles of Valois, 69
And Templars, 63
Charlier, Jean (*See* Gerson, Jean)
Charlotte d'Albert, marriage to Caesar Borgia, 233
Charterhouse (London), Martyrs of, 406
Papal authority, 404
Chartreuse of Cella-Robandi, 112
Chassanée (magistrate), 455
Châteaubriand, Madame de, 443
Edict of, 473
Châtillon, Cardinal de, 479 note
Chiavelli, Assassination of the, 200
Chieregato, 363
China, Missions in, 88
Chinon, Trial of Templars at, 61
Christian I (king of Denmark), Crusade funds, 187
Christian II (king of Denmark), 508
Christian art, 247
Christian Doctrine, Secular Clerics of, 609
Chrysoloras, 267
Council of Constance, 157
Church and State, 85
Church of England (*See* Anglican Church)
Church property, Taxation of, 17-19, 45
Cibo, Giovanni (Innocent VIII), 208
Circle of Burgundy, 501 f.
Cistercians, 596
Citeaux, Order of, and taxation, 18 f.
"Commendatory abbots," 203
Cities, Poverty of workers in, 7
Development of free, 4
Città di Castello, Rebellion, 107
Civil law, and taxation of church property, 17-19
Study of, 20
Civitavecchia fortified, 216
Clandestinity, Impediment of, 564
Classes in French society, 439 ff.
Claude, duke of Guise, 478
Clement V (pope), 49-71
Bishopric of Peking, 88
Bull *Ad providam,* 65
Bull *Alma Mater,* 64
Bull *Laetamur in te,* 53
Bull *Rex gloriae,* 55
Charges against, 60
Conference at Poitiers, 52
Death of, 77
Edward II, 71
Letter from Philip, 55
Letter to Philip the Fair, 59
Settles at Avignon, 51
Templars, 58 ff.
Clement VI (pope), 95-99, 107
And Petrarch, 264

Black plague, 99 note
Clement VII (Avignon pope), 123
Catherine of Siena, St., 131
Charles of Durazzo, 121
Clement VII (Roman pope), 520-522, 595, 604
At Orvieto, 397
Barnabites, 606
Charles V, 521
Francis I, 453, 521
French heretics, 448
Henry VIII, 397
Somaschi, 606
Clement VIII (antipope), 151
Clement VIII (pope), 540
And Henry of Navarre, 494, 497
Doctrinaires, 609
Thomism and Molinism, 637
Clementine College, 606
Clementines, The, 71 note
Clerics of St. Mayeul, Regular, 606
Clerics of St. Paul, Regular, 606
Clericis laicos, Bull, 19, 25-30
Clerics of Christian Dŏctrine, Secular, 609
Clergy, and taxation, 17-19
In France, 440
Clermont, Collège de, 624
Cleves, Jeanne of, 413
Clichtove, Josse, 445 ff.
Antilutherus, 447
Clitherow, Margaret, Execution of, 434
Cluny, Abbey of, 203
Abbot of, and right of taxation, 250
Coburg (Germany), Luther at, 380
Cognac (France), 485
Coimbra, The Aristotle of, 630
Colchester, Abbey of, 414
Colet, John, and the English Reformation, 392
Coligny, Gaspard de, 479, 484 f., 486 f., 505
Murder of, 488
Colle, Bonifacio da, 604
Collectorium circa quatuor sententiarum libros (by Gabriel Biel), 282
College, Clementine, 606
Collège de Clermont, 624
Collège de Fortet, 464, 493
Collège de France, 441, 462
College of Abbreviators, 269
Paul II and, 197
College of Apostolic Secretaries, 262, 267
College of Cardinals, Sixtus V and, 539
College of Navarre, 453
College, Roman, 534, 590
Collette, St., and Western schism, 120, 132 f.
Colloquy of Poissy, 482
Cologne, Jesuits at, 622
Colombini, Blessed John, 48, 103, 113
Colonna family, 180
Alliance with Charles VIII, 218
And Orsini, 46, 93
And Pius III, 241
Masters of Rome, 43
Colonna, Giacomo (card.), and Boniface VIII, 30 f.
Colonna, Otto (Martin V), 151
Colonna, Pietro (card.), and Boniface VIII, 30 f.
Colonna, Sciarra, 86
And the Anagni outrage, 40 ff.
Excommunicated, 45
Columbus, Christopher, 235
Comet, Exorcism of, 186 note
"Commenda," 203 note
Commendation, Abuse of, 203
Commendone, Giovanni (card.), 533
Commentary on Epistles of St. Paul (by Lefèvre), 444
Commines, Philippe de, 219
Common law, 10
Common Life, Brethren of the, 133 f., 202
Common Prayer, Book of, 418, 421
Condemned, 432
Elizabeth's revision, 430
Communion, Instruction on (England, 1548), 417
Compactata of Prague, 166
Compromis des Marchands, 503
Compromis des Nobles, 503
Concord, Formula of, 386
Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace (by Molina), 636
Concordats:
France (1516), 174, 255, 258 ff., 440
Princes', 175
Vienna, 175, 181
Concordats, Era of, 154
Council of Constance, 154
Concordia catholica, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 162

Conde, Prince de, 475, 479, 481, 485, 491
Condulmaro, Gabriello (Eugene IV), 159
Conference of Marburg, 378
Confessio Hungarica, 511
Confession, Augsburg, 511
"Confession of Faith of the French Churches," 475
Congregation "De Auxiliis," 637
Congregation of the Oblates, 585
Congruism, 630
Conjecturis temporum, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 286
Conrad of Gelnhausen, 130
  Calling of Council, 127
  Western schism, 120
Conseil de paix (poem), 251
Consensus Sendomiriensis, 511
Consilium pacis, 128
"Consistory," at Geneva, 470
  In France, 472
Conspiracy of Amboise, 481, 623
Constance, Bishop of, and Indulgences, 326
Constance, Council of, 140-147
  Concordats, 154
  Ecumenicity, 147 note
  Gerson, 129
  Hus, 147
  John XXIII, 145
  Periodic councils, 154
  Study of ancient literature, 157
Constantinople, taken by Turks, 185
Constitution *Quantum religio,* 620
Consulta, 530
Contarini (card.), 523, 615
Contempt for the World (by Savonarola), 211
Contemptu mundi, De (by Petrarch), 263
Contra calumniatores Platonis (by Bessarion), 285
Contra parvas datas (by Dumoulin), 474
Controversiis Christianae Fidei, De (by Bellarmine), 633
Cop, Nicholas (Huguenot), 464
  And Calvin, 463
Copts, at Council of Basle, 167
Corbario, Pietro of (antipope), 86-88
Cordeliers, 206, 464
Corneto (Italy), Urban V met at, 103
  Urban V sails from, 104
Coronation oath, Imperial, 355
Corpus Juris Canonici, Gregory XIII and, 535
Corrario, Angelo (Gregory XII), 124 note
Correr, Antonio (card.), and Martin V, 157
Corvaro, Pietro da (antipope), 86-88
Cosimo de' Medici, 265, 270
Cossa, Balthasar (John XXIII), 139
  And Alexander V, 138
  Council of Pisa, 137
Cotta, Ursula, 308
Council, Authority of, 122, 146
  Calling of, 127, 135
  Congregation of, 539
  Ecumenical, Infallibility of, 162
  Theories of, 153
"Council of Union," Greek Church, 167
Councils:
  Basle, 158 f., 164 f., 182
  Constance, 129, 140, 142 ff., 147, 154, 157
  Ferrara, 164, 167, 169
  Florence, 169
  Lateran, 253
  London, 130
  Lyons, 166
  Pisa, 129, 136 ff., 249 ff.
  Rome (1302), 37
  Siena, 156
  Trent, 542 ff.
  Vienne, 64 ff., 72 f., 76, 87, 90, 292, 542
Councils, Authority of, 84
Courtenay, and Queen Mary, 424
Courtrai, Philip the Fair defeated at, 37
Coutances (France), 13
Coutras, Battle of, 494
Cranmer, Thomas (archbishop), 398, 400, 413, 415-417, 422, 424
  Appointed archbishop of Canterbury, 403
  Calvin and, 420
  Deposed, 423
  Excommunicated, 404
  Executed, 427
  Execution of Elizabeth Barton, 405
  Forty-two Articles, 421
  Henry VIII's divorce, 403
Crecy, Battle of, 95
Credi, Lorenzo di (painter), 276, 278
Crépin, Jean, *Acta martyrum,* 473

Crescenzio (card.), Council of Trent, 557
Crespy, Peace of, 544
Cromwell, Thomas, 398-401, 412 f.
  Execution of Elizabeth Barton, 405
  Henry VIII's vicar general, 404
  Pilgrimage of Grace, 411
Cronaca, Simone, and Savonarola, 278
Crusade, Boniface VIII and, 23, 33
  Callistus III, 187
  John XXII, 79
  Paul II, 196
  Pius II, 191, 194
  Preached in 1365, 104
  Sixtus IV, 199
Cryfts, Nicholas (*See* Nicholas of Cusa)
Crypto-Calvinists, 575
Cum multa, Bull, 597
Curia, Roman, Reorganized, 578
Cuspinian, Johannes, 302
Cyprus, and crusade, 104
  Templars in, 64
Cyril Lucaris (patriarch), 511 note

D'Ailly (*See* Ailly, Pierre d')
Danes, Peter (Hellenist), 461
Danse macabre, 310
Dante, 70, 93
  De Monarchia, 82
  Divina Commedia, 90, 269
  Doctrine of government, 70 note
  Exiled, 262
Date, "Great" and "Little," 474 note
Day of the Barricades, 494
Decline of feudalism, 3-8
Decline of the Church (by Savonarola), 211
Decretals, 22
"Defender of the Faith," 364
Defensiones theologiae divi doctoris Thomae, 281
Defensor pacis, 83
  And Calvin, 85 note
Del Monte (Julius III), 556
Delphine, St., 48, 112
Demetrius Chalcocondylas, 270
Denmark, Persecution in, 23
  Smalkaldic League, 381
  Union with Norway and Sweden, 508
  Western schism, 120
Deploration de l'Eglise militante (poem), 251
Deposition of pope, at Council of Pisa, 137
Dernbach, Balthasar von, 576
Deutsch Theologia (by Luther), 295 f., 320
  Orthodoxy of, 296 note
Deventer (school), 301
Devil, Luther's debate with, 366
Diana of Poitiers, 473, 479
Didier of Rotterdam (i. e., Erasmus), 304 note
Diet of Augsburg, 377-380, 520
  Melanchthon at, 373
Diet of Nuremberg, 80, 363, 370, 520
Diet of Ratisbon, 383
Diet of Worms, 357-362
Dietrich von Nieheim, and Western schism, 120
Disputationes de Controversiis Fidei (by Bellarmine), 633
Disputationes metaphysicae (by Suarez), 630
Divina Commedia (by Dante), 269
Divine Love, Society of, 604
Dividuo et individuo, De (by Dumoulin), 475
Docta ignorantia, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 286
Doctrinaires, 609
Dogmatic Syncretism, 386 f.
Dolet, Étienne (Huguenot), 453 note
Domenichi, Domenico de (bishop), Reform project, 192
Domenichino (painter), 627
Dominicans, at Council of Trent, 547
  Popularity of, 204
Dominici, Blessed Giovanni, 206
  Regola del governo di cura familiare, 180
Donatello (sculptor), 265 f., 275
  And Savonarola, 278
Donations by the clergy, 17-19
Dons gratuits, 17-19
Dorothea, Princess, Marriage of, 370
Douai (France), 433
  University of, 634
Dubois, Pierre (legist), 13 f.
  And Innocent IV, 32
  Charges against Clement V, 60
  De recuperatione terrae sanctae, 52
  French domination, 32 f., 52, 69
  Templars, 60
Duchatel, Pierre (humanist), 453

Dudum sacrum, Bull, 163, 165
Duke of Gandia, Murder of, 223 note
Dumoulin, *Contra parvas datas,* 474
De dividuo et individuo, 475
Duns Scotus, 83
Duprat (chancellor), 257 f.
Durandus, William (bishop), 72
And Council of Vienne, 90
Dürer, Albrecht (painter), 368
Duynsen, Godefried van (martyr), 506

Ebernburg, Castle of, 368, 371
Ecclesiae catholicae, Bull, 619
Ecclesiastical authority, Doctrine of, 84
Eck, John, "Master" (theologian), 283, 301, 353
Debate at Leipsic, 346 f.
Manner of preaching, 289
Mysticism, 289 f., 295
Obelisci, 345
Propositions condemned, 290
Ecumenicity of Council of Pisa, 136
Edict of Beaulieu, 491
Edict of Châteaubriant, 473
Edict of Nantes, 438, 498 ff.
Edict of Worms, 520
Editions of the Bible, 303
Education, and Jesuits, 622 ff.
Edward I (king of England), 14
And Bull *Clericis laicos,* 27
Letter from Boniface VIII, 23 f.
Edward II (king of England), and Clement V, 71
And Templars, 63
Edward III (king of England), 71, 105
Edward VI (king of England), 413, 416 ff.
Ordinal, 430
Efficacious grace, 636 ff.
"Eidgenossen," 468
Eisenach (Germany), 314, 362
Luther at, 308
Eisleben (Germany), 306
Elections, Papal, 114
Elizabeth (queen of England), 429 ff., 591
Alliance with Puritans, 436
And Mary Stuart, 433
And Paul IV, 430
And Queen Mary, 426
Birth of, 403
Book of Common Prayer, 430
Death, 436
Dislike of the Puritans, 435
Excommunication of, 433
Oath of Supremacy, 431
Plots in behalf of, 425
Thirty-nine Articles, 432
Elizabeth of Hungary, St., 113
Elizabeth of Portugal, St., 48, 113
Eltz, Jacob von (archbishop), 576
Elzear, St., 48, 112
Embrun, Diocese of, 93
Emiliani, St. Jerome, 606
Emmerich (school), 301
Empire and Papacy, 4
Empire in Italy, 68
Emser, Jerome, 309, 347
Enemonde de Boulbon, 110
England, Church of (*See* Anglican Church)
Concordat of Martin V, 154
Laws against papal levies, 102
Opposition against papal taxes, 104
Peace with France, 111
Protestantism in, 390-437
Reconciliation with Rome, 425
Templars in, 63
Western schism, 120
"English Terror," 406
Eobanus Hessus, 335
Ephesus, Mark of, 168
Council of Ferrara, 168
Council of Florence, 169
Episcopal residence, Council of Trent, 566 f.
Epistle of St. James, Luther and, 363
Epistle to the Hebrews, Luther and, 363
Epistolae obscurorum virorum (by Rubianus), 332
Erasmus, 302, 304, 332 f., 350, 352, 392, 451
And Protestantism, 305
At Erfurt, 305
Beda and, 447
Commentary on the New Testament, 302, 305
De libero arbitrio, 372
Francis I, 441
Luther, 334
Praise of Folly, 392
Erfurt, Erasmus at, 305
Luther at, 312-324
Papal Bull, 353
Erfurt University, 359
Humanism, 333

Luther at, 308, 310
Eric (king of Denmark), 24
Eric XIV (king of Sweden), 510
Eriksson, Gustavus, 509
Espagne, Cardinal d', 41
Estius, William, 634
Estoile, Pierre de l', and Calvin, 461
Estouteville, d' (card.), 182
Etampes, Duchesse d', 443, 453
Etaples (*See* Lefèvre d'Etaples)
Eucharist, Anglican Church and, 418, 421
Council of Trent, 557 f., 563
Lutheran dispute, 373-376
Eugene IV (pope), 153, 159-177, 597
Bull *Dudum sacrum,* 163, 165
Bull *Quoniam alto,* 160
Conflict with Council of Basle, 161
Deposition declared, 172
Fra Angelico, 265
Hussites, 162
Masaccio, 264
Eugenicus, Marcus, and Council of Ferrara, 168
Council of Florence, 169
Euse, Jacques d' (John XXII), 78
Evora, University of, 636
Execrabilis, Bull, 90
Exemplar (by Blessed Henry Suso), 291
Exemptions, Lateran Council and, 254
Exeter, Marchioness of, 406
Exiit qui seminat, Bull, 74
"Expectative graces," Suppression of, 258
Exsurge Domine, Bull, 352, 394
"Extravagantes," 339 note
Extreme Unction, Council of Trent and, 559

Faber, Peter (Jesuit), 614, 621
Fabriano, Gentile da (painter), 264
Facetiae (by Bebel), 310
Facetiae (by Poggio), 179, 183, 268 f.
Faenza (Italy), Jesuits at, 620
Fagius, Paul (Reformer), 418
Body exhumed, 427
Faith, Rule of, Council of Trent, 548 f.
Falconieri, St. Juliana of, 113
Farel, Guillaume (Reformer), 445 f., 449, 455
At Geneva, 468
Farnese, Alessandro (Paul III), 522
In the Netherlands, 506
Farnese family, 524
Fasy, Jean de (Carmelite), 597
"Father of Letters" (Francis I), 441
"Father of Non-Conformists" (Hooper), 421
Fecamp, Abbey of, 203
Felix V (antipope), 172
Abdication of, 175
Feltre, Blessed Bernardine of, 211
Ferdinand I (emperor), 561
Council of Trent, 562
Henry VIII, 410
Jesuits, 622
Ferdinand II (emperor), 576
Ferdinand IV (king of Castile), and Templars, 63
Ferdinand V (king of Spain), 235
Alliance with Julius II, 248
Baptism of Jews, 209
Ferrante (king of Naples), 5, 218
Ferrara (Italy), Council of Basle transferred to, 164
Council transferred to Florence, 169
Greek Church at, 167
League with Alexander VI, 216
Pius II at, 210
Ferrari, Bartholomew (Barnabite), 606
Ferreri, Zaccaria (bishop), Council of Pisa, 250
Feudalism, 10 f.
Boniface VIII, 3
Decline of, 3-8
Lollards, 5
War of the Roses, 5
Western schism, 4
Feuillant, Monastery of, 596
Feuillantines, 596
Feuillants, 596
Ficino, Marsilio, 271, 273 f., 278
De religione christiana, 285
Neoplatonism, 283
Theologia platonica, 285
Work on Plato, 274 note
Fiesole, Monastery of, 277
Filastre, Guillaume (card.), 135
Filelfa, Francesco (humanist), 267, 268 note
"Filioque," at Council of Ferrara, 168
Filippino Lippi (painter), 275
Filippo Lippi (painter), 265, 275
Fire, Ordeal of, and Savonarola, 230 f.

First Blast of the Trumpet (by Knox), 435
Fisher, Blessed John, 401 f., 406 ff.
Flora, Joachim of, Idealism, 122
Florence (Italy), 43, 46
  Academy of, 273, 284
  Arrabiati, 228, 230
  "Bonfire of vanities," 228
  Council of, 169
  Emperor Charles IV, 108
  Eugene IV at, 164
  Factions in, 201
  Guelfs and Ghibellines in, 23
  Insurrection headed by, 107
  Interdicted, 108
  King Charles VIII, 220
  Martin V at, 155
  Medici, 270
  Papal nuncio flayed alive, 108
  Power of, 5
  St. Catherine's embassy, 111
Florent of Holland, and Philip the Fair, 24
Flores sanctorum, 613
Flote, Pierre (legist), 4, 14, 34
  Bull *Ausculta fili,* 37
  False Bull, 35
  States General of 1302, 36
Fonseca, Pedro da (Jesuit), 630
Forge, Étienne de la (Reformer), 464
"Form," Meaning of, 76 note
Formula of Concord, 386
Fornovo, Battle of, 221
Fortet, Collège de, 493
  Calvin at, 464
Forty-two Articles, of the Anglican Church, 421
Fourier, St. Peter, 596
Fournier, Jacques (Benedict XII), 93
Fox (bishop), 413
France, Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Intervention in Italy, 243
  Legists in, 9-12
  Liberated by Joan of Arc, 176
  Monarchical absolutism in, 5
  Nobility in, 6, 439
  Peace with England, 111
  Protestantism in, 438 ff.
  Revolutionary spirit in, 6-8
  Royal power, 440 f.
  Scheme for dominance of, 52
  Western schism, 120
France, Collège de, 462
Frances of Rome, St., 157
Francesca, Pietro della (painter), 265 f.
Francis I (king of France), and Anne de Pisseleu, 443
  Berquin's sacrilege, 451
  Cabrières massacre, 457
  Captivity of, 447, 451
  Character of, 441
  Charles V, 395, 523, 544
  Clement VII, 453, 521
  Collège de France, 441
  Henry VIII, 405, 410
  Imprimerie Royale, 441
  Leo X, 256
  Letter from Paul III, 454
  Louvre, 441
  Madame de Châteaubriand, 443
  Protestantism, 438
  Smalkaldic League, 381
Francis II (king of France), Factions, 477
  Jesuits, 623
  Marriage, 433
  Protestantism, 438
Francis Borgia, St., 186, 619
  Pius V and, 592
Francis de Sales, St., Writings of Tauler, 291
Francis of Paula, St., King Louis XI and, 199
  Order of Minims, 202
Francis of Vittoria, 634
  Doctrine on war, 629
Francis Xavier, St., 614, 621
Franciscans, and Nicholas III, 74
  At Council of Trent, 547
  Popularity of, 204
  Privileges extended, 202
"Fratricelli," 74
  Acts of martyrdom, 122
  And Celestine V, 31
Frederick II (emperor), 20, 113, 299
  And Dubois, 32
Frederick III (emperor), 175, 191
  Coronation at Rome, 183
Frederick, duke of Saxony, 342 f.
  At Diet of Worms, 358
  Kidnapping of Luther, 361
Free cities, Development of, 4
Free Spirit, Brethren of the, 76, 292
French society, Classes in, 439 ff.
Friars Minor (*See* Franciscans)
Frith, John, executed, 412

Frundsberg, Sack of Rome, 521
Fuggers (bankers), 325, 326 note

Gaetani, Benedetto (Boniface VIII), 20
Gaetani, Tommaso (*See* Cajetan)
Gallicanism, 245 f.
Gandi, Murder of Duke of, 221 f.
Garde, Paulin de la, 456 f.
Gardiner, Stephen (bishop), 413, 423, 425
  Imprisoned, 418
Garnier, Bernard (antipope Benedict XIV), 151
Gates, John, executed, 423
Gelasius I (pope), 582
Gelnhausen, Conrad of, 130
  Calling of council, 127
  Western schism, 120
Gemistus Plethon, 270, 277
Geneva, Calvin at, 469 ff.
  Knox at, 435
Genoa, war with Venice, 24
Gentile da Fabriano (painter), 264 f.
Geoffrey de Boucicaut, Siege of Avignon, 127
Geoffrey of Vendôme, and papal supremacy, 38
George, duke of Saxony, 322, 346
George the Bearded, duke of Saxony, 569
George, Junker (i. e., Luther), 362
German nobility, To the (by Luther), 351
German Renaissance, 299-305
Germany, Clergy of, 301
  Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Gregory XI, 111
  Innocent VI, 102
  Lutheranism in, 350-389
  Revolutionary parties, 350 f.
  Templars in, 64
  Western schism, 120
Gerson, Jean, 153, 284
  Council of Constance, 143 f., 151
  La réforme de la théologie, 129
  Mendicité spirituelle, 129
  Mysticism, 288
  Papal authority, 122, 144
  Western schism, 120, 128
Gertrude, St., 48, 113
Gesta Dei per Francos (by Bongars), 52 note
Gesù, Church of the (Rome), 627
Ghent, 504
  Pacification of, 506
Ghibellines, 80, 536
  And Guelfs, 23, 43, 68
Ghiberti (sculptor), 275
Ghirlandajo, Domenico (painter), 275 f.
Ghislieri, Michele (Pius V), 432, 530, 538
Gilberti, Matteo (bishop), 583
Giles of Viterbo (Augustinian), 251, 255, 277
Giotto (painter), 264
Giovanni de' Medici (Leo X), 210, 252, 273
Giuliano de' Medici, Assassination of, 201
Giulio Sanseverino (*See* Pomponius Laetus)
Glastonbury, Abbey of, 414
Godefried of Mervel (martyr), 506
Godefried van Duynsen (martyr), 506
Golden Bull (of Emperor Charles IV), 96, 102
Golden Bull (of Sixtus IV), 202
Golden League, 577
Golden Rose, bestowed on Caesar Borgia, 234
"Good Queen Bess," 429
Gorkum, Martyrs of, 505 f.
Gothic architecture, 267
Gottlieben, John XXIII imprisoned at, 150
Gozzoli, Benozzo (painter), 265
Grace, Efficacious, 636 ff.
Grace, Pilgrimage of, 411, 413
Granada (Spain), 607
Grande Chambre, 475
Granvella (card.), 503 f.
Graz (Austria), Jesuit college, 534
Greek Church, 95
  And Protestantism, 511
  Council of Basle, 164
  Schism renewed, 171
  Union with Rome, 166-170
Greek College at Rome, 535
Greek literary culture at Florence, 269-274
Greek schism, abjured by John Palaeologus, 104
Greenland, Missions of, 235
Gregorian Chant, 628
Gregory IX (pope), and Templars, 58
Gregory XI (pope), 106-112

And private revelations, 112 note
And the return of the papacy to Rome, 92
Embassy of St. Catherine to, 111
Goes to Rome, 112
Letter from St. Brigid, 109
Letter from St. Catherine, 110 f.
Papal elections, 114
Gregory XII (pope), 123 f.
Council of Pisa, 136 f.
Resignation, 150
Gregory XIII (pope), 534-537, 596
Calendar reform, 535
Colleges at Rome, 534
Corpus Juris Canonici, 535
Greek College, 535
Oratorians, 608
Roman College, 590
Roman Martyrology, 535
St. Bartholomew's Day, 490
Gregory XIV, 540
And Henry of Navarre, 494
Camillians, 608
Gregory XVI, Bull *Ecclesiae catholicae*, 619
Jesuits, 619
Gregory of Valencia (Jesuit), 638
Grey, Jane, and Queen Mary, 423
Executed, 425
Proclaimed queen, 422
Grimoard, William (Urban V), 103
Gringoire, Pierre (poet), 251, 255
Groote, Gerard, 133
Mysticism, 288
Guelfs, 87, 109, 536
And Ghibellines, 23, 43, 68
Guercino, Il (painter), 627
Guerin (magistrate), 456 f.
Guerrero, Pedro, Council of Trent, 565 ff., 571
"Gueux," 503
"— de mer," 505
"— de terre," 505
Guicciardini, 278
Political theories, 225
Guido Reni (painter), 627
Guipuscoa (Spain), 613
Guise, House of, 477 f., 485, 577
Council of Trent, 562
Guise, Claude, duke of, 478
Guise, Francis, duke of, 478, 483
Assassinated, 485
Guise, Henry, duke of, assassinated, 494
The League, 493
Gustavus Adolphus (king of Sweden), 510
Gustavus Eriksson (Vasa), 509

Habsburg, Albert of, 4
Rudolph of, 4
Hagenau, Conference at, 383
Hale, John (martyr), 407
Hamburg (Germany), Reformation preached at, 369
Hamsa (nephew of Scanderbeg), 188
Handspiegel (by Pfefferkorn), 332
Harding, Thomas, and English Catholics, 432
Hausschein, Johann (Oecolampadius), 369 note
Hebrew, Teaching of, 88
Hebrews, Epistle to, rejected by Luther, 363
Hegius, Alexander (humanist), 301
Heidelberg, Luther defends his doctrine at, 335
Heidelberg Catechism, 386
Heidelberg University, Conrad of Gelnhausen at, 127
Helen of Hungary, St., 113
Hemming (bishop), 98
Henrician bishops, 413
Henries, War of the Three, 494
Henry VII (emperor), 69
Henry VIII (king of England), and Anne Boleyn, 413
Anne Seymour, 413
Appointment of bishops, 402 f.
Cardinal Pole, 411
Catherine Howard, 413
Catherine Parr, 413
Death of, 415
"Defender of the Faith," 364, 390
Divorce, 395 ff.
Excommunicated, 404
Fisher, 407 f.
Interdict, 410 f.
Jeanne of Cleves, 413
Marriage to Anne Boleyn, 403
Melanchthon and, 412
More, Thomas, 408 f.
Oath of succession, 406
Oath of supremacy, 406
On vocal prayer, 393

Smalkaldic League, 381
Theology of the Sacraments, 394
Wives, 413
Henry II (king of France), 521
And Huguenots, 472 ff.
Council of Trent, 557
Jesuits, 622
Henry III (king of France), 438
And Huguenots, 491
Murder of, 494
Henry IV, king of France (Henry III of Navarre), 485, 492 ff.
Conversion of, 495 ff.
Council of Trent, 574
Edict of Nantes, 498 ff.
Marriage to Margaret of Valois, 486
Henry III, king of Navarre (*See* Henry IV, king of France)
Henry d'Albret, 451
Henry, duke of Guise, Assassination of, 494
The League, 493
Henry of Langenstein (theologian), 130
Calling of council, 127
Western schism, 120
Henry of Luxemburg, 69
Heptameron (by Margaret d'Angoulême), 443
Herezuelo, executed, 581
Hesse, Landgrave of, 377 f., 384, 454, 521
Hessus, Eobanus, 335
Hofmann, Melchior (Anabaptist), 501
Hohenzollerns, 299
Holland, 503, 507
Anabaptists, 382
Holy Ghost, Procession of, 168
Holy Land (*See* Crusade)
"Holy Maid of Kent" (Elizabeth Barton), 406
Holy Office, 578
Paul IV and, 527
Paul Veronese before, 627
Philip II and, 533
Holy Orders, Council of Trent, 563
Honorius (pope), and study of Roman law, 21
Hooper, John (bishop), 421
Hôpital, Michel de l', 479 f., 482
Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, 56 ff., 94
And Templars, 65
Hotman, Charles, and the League, 493
Houghton, John (martyr), 407
Howard, Catherine, executed, 413
Hugh of St. Victor, 39 note
And papal supremacy, 38
Huguenots, 468, 481
Henry II and, 472 ff.
Humanism, Nicholas V and, 183
Sixtus IV, 198
Humanists, and Luther, 330-335
Humiliati, Order of the, 585
Hungary, alliance with Venice, 194
Overcome by Turks, 522
Protestantism in, 511
Western schism, 120
Hunyady, Janos, 175, 187 f.
Hus, John, 140, 147-149
Council of Constance, 147
Influence of Wyclif, 148
Luther, 319
Safe-conduct, 149 note
Hussites, 149, 166, 190
At Zwickau, 367
Demands of, 166 note
Eugene IV, 162
Luther and, 354
Martin V's crusades against, 156
Hutten, Ulrich von (Reformer), 309, 333, 350-354, 356 f., 361, 372
Epistolae obscurorum virorum, 332

Idealism, Platonic, 284
Ignatius Loyola, St., 538, 607, 613 ff.
A Theatine? 614 note
Emperor Ferdinand, 622
Roman College, 534, 590
The *Spiritual Exercises,* 639
Images, Destruction of, 419
Imitation of Christ, 133
Immaculate Conception, Council of Trent and, 552
Immensa aeterni Dei (Constitution), 578
Immortalitate animae, De (by Pomponazzi), 284
Impanation, Calvin's doctrine of, 368 note
Imperial vicars, 102
Imprimerie Royale, 441
In caena Domini, Bull, 533
Index, Congregation of the, 539
Of forbidden books, 523, 581 f.

Indians (American), Pius V and, 533
Individualistic pietism, 387-389
Indulgences, Decree of, 325-328
  Leo X on, 342
  Luther, 327
  Luther's theses, 328
  Tetzel's antitheses, 329
  Thomas Wyttenbach, 295
Ineffabilis, Bull, 29 note
Infallibility, 82
  Of council, 162
Ingolstadt, Jesuits at, 622
Ingolstadt University, 576
Innocent IV, and Dubois, 32
  Inquisition, 578
Innocent VI, 99-103
  And the Golden Bull, 102 f.
  Reform measures, 100
  Rienzi, 101
Innocent VII, 123 f.
Innocent VIII, 208, 213
  Crusade project, 209
  Theses of Pico della Mirandola, 271
Innocent IX, 540
Inquisition, Beghards and Beguines, 292
  Development of the, 527 note
  In Italy, 579
  Jews, 199
  Paul IV, 527
  Philip II, 533
  Pius IV, 528
  Pius V, 533
  Reorganization of, 523
  Templars, 60 ff.
  Torture, 61 f., 578 note
Inquisition, Roman, 577 f.
Inquisition, Spanish, 511, 579 ff.
  In the Netherlands, 501
  Sixtus IV, 199
Institutes of the Christian Religion (by Calvin), 459, 465 f.
Institutiones divinae (by Tauler), 291
Instruction on Communion (England, 1548), 417
Interim of Augsburg, 386, 556
Interim of Ratisbon, 381, 383
Interior Castle (by St. Teresa), 644
Ireland, made a kingdom, 426
  Templars in, 63
Isabella (queen of Castille), 235
Italian cities, League of, 5
Italy, Anarchy in, 107
  And France, 243
  Concordat of Martin V, 154
  Inquisition in, 579
  Order restored by Card. Albornoz, 101
  Protestantism in, 511
  Templars in, 64
  The Empire in, 68
  Western schism, 120

Jacobites, Council of Basle, 167
Jacopone da Todi (poet), 31
Jacques de la Marche (Franciscan), 207
James II (king of Aragon), and Templars, 64
James I (king of England), and Puritans, 436
James, Epistle of St., rejected by Luther, 363
Janduno, John of (*See* John of Janduno)
Jane Grey, and Queen Mary, 423
  Executed, 425
  Proclaimed queen, 422
Jay, Claude le, at Council of Trent, 546
Jean de la Barrière (Cistercian), 596
Jean de Malestrout, 108
Jean le Maistre, condemnation of Joan of Arc, 176
Jeanne of Cleves, 413
Jerusalem Delivered (by Tasso), 626
Jesuates, 103
Jesuit churches, 627
Jesuits, 532, 595, 612 ff.
  Approbation of, 523
  Collège de Clermont, 624
  Colleges, 536
  Constitution *Quantum religio,* 620
  Council of Trent, 546
  Form of government, 616 ff.
  In Bavaria, 576
  In England, 434
  Monita secreta, 618 note
  Obedience, 619 note
  Schools, 622 ff.
  University of Paris, 624
Jesus, Society of (*See* Jesuits)
Jewish question in Germany, 331
Jewish writings, 331
Jews, in Germany, 331
  Inquisition, 199
  Usury, 331
Joachim of Brandenburg, at Diet of Worms, 358

Joachim of Flora, idealism, 122
Joan (regent of Spain), 580
Joan of Arc, 109, 175-178
  Irregularities in trial of, 176 note
  Rehabilitation, 188
Joanna of Naples, Urban VI's expedition against, 121
John III (king of Sweden), 510, 577
John XXII (pope), 78-92, 112
  Annates, 89
  Bull *Execrabilis,* 90
  Beghards and Beguines, 292
  Crusade, 79
  Defensor pacis, 86
  Doctrine of beatific vision, 91
  Louis of Bavaria, 80
  Marsilius of Padua, 83
  Teaching of Master Eckhart, 290
  The Empire, 79
  Tomb, 261
John XXIII (pope), 139-141
  Council of Constance, 145, 149
  Deposed, 149
  Imprisoned, 150
  Letter to Emperor Sigismond, 145
John Capistran, St., 182, 187 f., 207, 277
John Colombini, Blessed, 48
John Lackland (king of England), 105
John of Austria, 532
  In Netherlands, 506
John of Bohemia, 79
John of Janduno, 83 f., 86
  Doctrine, 283
John of Jerusalem, Knights of St. (*See* Hospitallers)
John of Leyden, 382
John of Naples (preacher), 206
John of Parma, idealism, 122
John of Polomar, Council of Basle, 160
John of Richemont (duke of Brittany), and Edward I, 24
John of Schwarzenberg, Council of Florence, 169
John of Swabia, 69
John of the Cross, St., 596, 602
  Mysticism, 646 note
John Palaeologus (emperor), abjures the Greek schism, 104
Jonas, Justus (Reformer), 330
Joseph Calasanctius, St., 607 f., 610
Joseph, Father, 596
Juan Borgia, 221 f.
  Legitimation of, 234
Jubilee of 1450, 183
Judgment of fire, Savonarola, 230 f.
Juliana Falconieri, St., 48, 113
Julius II (pope), 241-252
  Alliance with Ferdinand, 248
  Henry VIII, 395 f.
  Lateran Council, 248 ff.
  Louis XII, 440
  Simony in election of, 241 note
Julius III (pope), 524
  Council of Trent, 556
Julius de' Medici (Clement VII), 518
Junker Georg (i. e., Luther), 362
Jurisdiction, Ecclesiastical, 258
Jurisdictione imperiali, De, 143
Jus reformandi, 386
Justification, Calvin's doctrine, 368 note
Justification, Council of Trent on, 552 ff.

Kent, "Holy Maid" of (Elizabeth Barton), 406
Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (*See* Hospitallers)
Knights Templars (*See* Templars)
Knights, War of the, 351
Knox, John (Reformer), 421, 435
  First Blast of the Trumpet, 435
Königsberg (Germany), 371
Köppe, Leonard, and Catherine von Bora, 376
Kranach, Lucas (artist), 354
Kreuznach (Germany), 368

La Charité-sur-Loire, 485
Ladislas (king of Hungary), 175
Ladislas (king of Naples), 140
Lady of Victory, Feast of Our, 532
Laetamur in te, Bull, 53
Laetus, Pomponius (humanist), 197, 271 f.
Lainez, James (Jesuit), 614, 616, 620, 630
  At Council of Trent, 547, 557
Lambert le Begue, 292
"Landbeggars," 505
Lang, Matthew (bishop), 248
Lange, Johann (Hellenist), 309, 330
Langen, Rudolph von (humanist), 330
Langenstein, Henry of, 130, 153
  Calling of council, 127
  Consilium pacis, 128
  Western schism, 120
La Rochelle (France), 485, 499

Lateran Council, 248-252
Exemptions, 254
Leo X, 253
Mendicant Orders, 254
Project of reform, 253
Latimer (bishop), 413
Latour, Didier de, 596
Lavalette, Master, 591
Law, Canon, Study of, 20
Law, Civil, and taxation of Church property, 17-19
Study of, 20
Law, Common, 10
And taxation, 17
Law, Roman, 11, 22
Study of, 9-11, 21
Lawrence, Robert (Carthusian), martyred, 407
Layton, Richard, and English monasteries, 413
Lazare, Congregation of St., 590
League, Golden, 577
League of Arras, 506, 577
League of Cambrai, 247
League of French Catholics, 490 ff.
League, Smalkaldic, 380, 383 f., 523
Leclerc, Jean, executed, 448 f.
Lecourt, Étienne, executed, 453
Lee (bishop), 413
Lefèvre d'Étaples, 444 f., 446 f., 449, 451
De Maria Magdalena, 448
Doctrines of, 449 note
Legh, 413
Legists in France, 9-12, 32 f.
Leipsic, Debate at, 346
Papal Bull, 353
Lejay, Claude (Jesuit), 622
At Council of Trent, 546
Lemos (Dominican), 638
Leo X (pope), 252-260, 582, 595
Bull *Exsurge Domine*, 352
Cause of his death, 363 note
Decree of indulgences, 325
Excommunication of Luther, 352
Francis I, 256
Henry VIII, 393
Lateran Council, 253
Luther, 336
On indulgences, 342
Leo XIII, Constitution *Officiorum*, 582
Leonardo da Vinci, 276, 279
And Francis I, 441
Lepanto, Battle of, 532
L'Estoile, Pierre de, and Calvin, 461
Leyden, John of (Anabaptist), 382
Leto (*See* Pomponius Laetus)
Liber Sextus, 22, 42
L'Hôpital, Michel de, 479 f., 482
Libero arbitrio, De (by Erasmus), 372
"Libertins," at Geneva, 468
Licet ab initio, Bull, 523 note, 578
Lilio, Luigi (astronomer), 535
Lindau, League of knights, 368
Link, Wenzel, 337
Lippi, Brandolini (preacher), 206
Lippi, Filippino (painter), 275
Lippi, Filippo (painter), 265, 275
Literary culture at Florence, 269-274
Little Book of Eternal Wisdom (by Suso), 291
Liturgical books, to be destroyed, 419
Lives of the Saints (by Surius), 592
Locis theologicis, De (by Melchior Cano), 634
Lollards, 130 f., 391, 394
And feudalism, 5
Lombard, Peter, 281
Sentences, 629
"Lords of the Congregation," 435
Lord's Supper (*See* Eucharist)
Lorenzo de' Medici, 200 f., 210, 212, 270, 273, 276 f., 284
And Savonarola, 213, 278
Excommunicated, 202
Lorenzo di Credi (painter), 276
And Savonarola, 278
Lorenzo the Magnificent (*See* Lorenzo de' Medici)
Lorraine, Faber in, 621
Lorraine, Cardinal of, 475 f., 482, 491, 590
Loschi, 267
Louis IX, St. (king of France), 15 f.
And Templars, 58
Canonization of, 30
Louis XI (king of France), 199
Commendatory abbots, 203
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 194, 197
Louis XII (king of France), 239, 256
And Julius II, 243 f., 440
Calling of council, 248
Council of Pisa, 249
Council of Tours, 247
Lateran Council, 253
Louis of Anjou, 121, 138

Louis of Bavaria, 79, 80, 82, 86 f., 91, 95 f.
And John XXII, 80
Custody of John XXIII, 150
Excommunicated, 80
Louise of Savoy, 442, 447 f.
Louvain University, 518
Louvre, 441
Love, Society of Divine, 604
Low Countries (*See* Netherlands)
Loyola (*See* Ignatius)
Luca della Robbia (painter), 275
Lucaris, Cyril (patriarch), 511 note
Lucretia Borgia, 217, 223
And Giovanni Sforza, 224
Marries Alfonso of Biseglia, 234
Regency of papal palace, 234
Luder, Hans, 306, 315
Luder, Martin (*See* Luther)
Ludolph the Carthusian, *Life of Christ*, 613
Ludovico the Moor (*See* Sforza, Ludovico)
Lübeck, Gustavus Vasa at, 509
Lützelburg, House of, 96
Lully, Raymond (missioner), 88
Writings of, 87 note
Luna, Pedro de (Benedict XIII), 115, 124
Lusiads (by Camoens), 626
Lusignan, Pierre du, preaches crusade, 104
Luther, Martin, 305-386
Against the Papacy, 384
Articles of Smalkalden, 383
Asterisci, 346
At Altenburg, 343
At Augsburg, 337 ff.
At Erfurt, 312
At Heidelberg, 335
At Leipsic, 346
At Mansfeld, 385
At Rome, 319, 323
At Wartburg Castle, 362-367
At Wittenberg, 367
At Wittenberg University, 322
At Worms, 359 ff.
Augustinianism, 320
Augustinian monk, 313-324
Bible at Erfurt, 310
Bigamy of Philip of Hesse, 384
Brethren of the Common Life, 307
Burning of papal Bull, 353
Cajetan, 337 ff.
Canon of the Bible, 363
Conference of Marburg, 378
Death of, 385
Debate with the devil, 366
Deutsch Theologia, 295 f., 320
Diet of Augsburg, 380
Doctrine of, 318, 322, 329, 374 ff.
Edict of banishment, 361, 363
Eisenach, 308
Erasmus, 334
Erfurt University, 309 f.
Eucharist, 374 f.
Excommunicated, 352
First of supposed miracles, 359 note
Good works, Doctrine of, 327
His writings as sources, 318 note
Humanists, 330-335
Hussites, 354
Indulgences, 327
Kidnapped, 361
Lefèvre d'Etaples, 447
Leo X, 336
Magdeburg, 307
Marriage of, 376
Miltitz, 342-344
Mutianus, 334
Mysticism, 320
Nominalism, 321
Papal intervention, 335-345
Parents of, 306
Peasants' War, 373
Plague at Nuremberg, 323
Preacher, 327
Propositions condemned, 352
Real Presence, 374
Reuchlin, 334
Student, 305-313
Teaching of John Wesel, 294
Theses, 328-330
The theologians, 345-349
To the German Nobility, 531
Translation of the Bible, 363, 364 note
Trebonius, 308
Truttvetter, 309
Ursula Cotta, 308
Vow, 312
Works of Wessel, 294
Lutheranism in Germany, 350-389
Lyons, Coronation of Clement V at, 50
Council of, 166
Council of Pisa, 250 f.

Father Anger at, 624
Jesuit college, 624
Study of Roman law at, 10

Mabillon, Jean (Benedictine), 596
Machiavelli, Political theories, 225
Il principe, 179, 198
Maderna, Carlo (architect), 267
Madrucci, at Council of Trent, 547
Mahomet II, 185
Magdeburg, Luther at, 307
Reformation preached at, 369
Magnificent, Lorenzo the (*See* Medici, Lorenzo de')
Maillard, Olivier (Franciscan), 207
Mainardino, Marsiglio (*See* Marsilius of Padua)
Maizières, Philippe de, Western schism, 120
Majella, Monte, and Rienzi, 97
Major, Michel, 575
Majorists, 575
Malatesta, Carlo, 136
Maldonatus, Juan (Jesuit), 577, 624, 634 f.
Malestrout, Suppression of Italian revolt, 108
Truce of, 95
Malta, 591
Manresa (Spain), 613
Mansfeld, Luther at, 385
Mantegna, Andrea (painter), 276
"Mantellata" (*See* Catherine of Siena)
Mantua, League with Alexander VI, 216
Pius II at, 191
Maraños, The, 209
Marburg, Conference of, 378
Marcellus II (pope), 525
Marche, Jacques de la (Franciscan), 207
Marcus Eugenicus, Council of Ferrara, 168
Council of Florence, 169
Mare magnum, Bull, 202, 204, 254
Margaret (queen of Denmark), 507
Margaret, queen of Navarre (Margaret d'Angoulême), 442, 446, 451, 464, 485
And Calvin, 465
Heptameron, 443
Marriage to Henry of Navarre, 486
Miroir de l'âme pécheresse, 453
Margaret of Hungary, St., 113
Margaret of Parma, 503
Margaret of Valois (*See* Margaret d'Angoulême)
Maria Magdalena (by Lefèvre), 448
Mariano (Franciscan), 212, 228
Marignano, French victory at, 256
Marigny, Philip de (archbishop), and Templars, 63
Mark of Ephesus, Council of Ferrara, 168
Council of Florence, 169, 171
Marot, Clement (poet), 451 f.
And Francis I, 441
Maronites, Council of Basle, 167
Marseilles, Francis I and Clement VII at, 453
Possevin at, 624
Marseilles, Bishop of, and lay usurpation, 25
Marsilio Ficino (*See* Ficino)
Marsilius of Padua (theologian), 48, 82 ff., 86 f., 140
Martène, Edmond (Benedictine), 596
Martin V (pope), 153-158, 391
Acknowledged by John XXIII, 150
At Florence, 155
Bernardine of Siena, St., 157
Concordats, 154
Elected by Council of Constance, 151
Nepotism, 155, 158
Periodic councils, 154
Restoration of Rome, 155
Works in Rome, 155 note
Martinists, 389
Martyrology, Protestant, 457 note
Roman, Revision of, 535
Mary (queen of England), 422, 423-428, 577
Accession, 423
Bloody repression, 424 f.
Charles V, 424
Courtenay, 425
Executions for heresy, 427
Ireland, 426
Jane Grey, 423
Mass, 420
Number of executions by, 428 note
Paul IV, 428
Policy of conciliation, 423
Reconciliation of England with Rome, 425

Mary Stuart (queen of Scots), 433, 577
Attack by Knox, 435
Execution, 434
Pius V and, 533
Mary, Immaculate Conception of, at Council of Trent, 552
Masaccio (painter), and Eugene IV, 264
Mass (*See* Eucharist)
Massacre of Nimes, 485
Massacre of the Vaudois, 455-458
Massarelli, at Council of Trent, 571
Matrimony, at Council of Trent, 563
Matthiessen (*See* Matthys)
Matthys, John 382, 501
Maubuisson, Abbey of, 58
Mauleon, Miramonde de, at Avignon, 110
Mauriac, Jesuit college, 623
Maurice of Saxony, 560
Maximilian I (emperor), 299, 302, 336, 355, 591
Calling of council, 248
Council of Pisa, 249
Jewish books, 331
Threat of Pragmatic Sanction, 247
Mayence, Archbishop of, 325
Maynier, Jean (magistrate), 456 f.
"Meaux, Cenacle of," 445 ff.
Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
Mechtilde, St., 113
Medici, family, 270
Conspiracy of the Pazzi, 200
Catherine de', 453, 479 ff., 484 f., 521, 591; Council of Trent, 548, 574; St. Bartholomew's Day, 487 f., 490
Cosimo de', 265, 270
Giovanni de' (Leo X), 210, 252, 273
Giuliano de', Assassination of, 201
Julius de' (Clement VII), 518
Lorenzo de', 200 f., 210, 212, 270, 273, 276 f., 284; and Savonarola, 213, 278; excommunicated, 202
Piero de', 219
Medieval institutions, Decline of, 3-8
Meissen, Bishop of, Indulgences, 326
Melanchthon, 324, 338, 348, 454, 471, 575
Abandons Luther, 372
Bigamy of Philip of Hesse, 384
Diet of Augsburg, 373, 378
Greek Church, 511
Henry VIII, 412
Memmi, Simone (painter), 261
Mende, Durandus, bishop of, and Council of Vienne, 90
Mendicant Orders, Lateran Council, 254
Popularity of, 204
Mendicité spirituelle, 129
Mennonites, 575
Menot, Michel (Franciscan), 207
Mercananzia, Court of the, 226
Mercurian, Everard (Jesuit), 619
Méré, Poltrot de (assassin), 485
Merici, St. Angela de', 607, 610
Mérindol, Massacre of, 455 ff.
Mervel, Godefried of (martyr), 506
Messina, Antonello da (painter), 276
Metz, Father Anger at, 624
Siege of, 478
Bishop of, and Boniface VIII, 25
Michael of Cesena (Franciscan), 82, 91
Michael Palaeologus (emperor), 167
Michaelis (Dominican), 596
Michelangelo (artist), 279
And Julius II, 244
Masterpieces of, 280 note
Michelotto (assassin), 218, 234
Middle Ages, Decline of institutions of, 3-8
Papacy in the, 3
Milan, Council of Pisa, 250
French war against, 256
League with Alexander VI, 216
Pestilence at, 586
Rebellion, 107
Milne, Walter, executed, 436
Miltitz, Karl von, 342-344, 349
And Luther, 342 ff.
Minard (magistrate), 475 f.
Minims, Order of, 202
Popularity of, 204
Miramonde de Mauleon, at Avignon, 110
Mirandola, Julius II at, 244
Mirandola, Pico della (philosopher), 271
And Cajetan, 250
Errors condemned, 209
Heresy of, 271 note
Politian and, 273 note
Savonarola, 278
Theses condemned, 271

Miroir de l'âme pécheresse (by Margaret d'Angoulême), 453
Misères du temps (by Ronsard), 482
Missal, Revision of the, 532
Mitylene, Crusade victory at, 188
Mohacs, Battle of, 522
Möhra (Thuringia), 306
Molay, Jacques de (Templar), 58, 61, 66
  Death of, 67
Molina, Luis de (Jesuit), 630, 636 f.
  Concord of Free Will with the Gifts of Grace, 636
Molinism, 636
Monarchical absolutism in France, 5
Monasteries, Abuses in, 570
  Benedictine, 202 ff.
  Decline of, 594
  Destruction of English, 411, 413 f.
  Exemptions, 202
  Suppression of English, 400 f.
Monsieur, Peace of, 491
Montaigu College, 461
Montauban, Huguenot refuge, 485
Monte, Del (Julius III), 524
  Council of Trent, 545
Monteaux, Clement V at, 68
Montebello, Marquis of, 529
Monte Falco (monastery), 595
Montfaucon (Benedictine), 596
Montepulciano, Strada at, 620
Montmartre, Church of, 614
Montmorency, 481, 483
Montpellier (France), 112, 499
  Pedro de Luna at, 125
  Study of Roman law at, 10
Montserrat (Spain), 613
Moravian Brethren, 149
More, Blessed Thomas, 392, 406, 408 f.
  Resigns as chancellor, 402
  Utopia, 392
Morigia, Jacopo (Theatine), 606
Morone, Giovanni (card.), 578, 615
  Council of Trent, 562, 567
Mount Carmel, Order of, 597 ff.
Mühldorf, Battle of, 80
Müller, Johann (astronomer), 302
Münster, Anabaptists at, 381 f.
Murner, Thomas, 355
Murrone, Pietro di (Celestine V), 100
Music, Church, 627 ff.
Musso, Cornelius, at Council of Trent, 547
Mutianus, Konrad, 305, 309, 333
  And Luther, 334
Myconius, Frederick, 368
  And Spalatin, 330
Mysticism, of Luther, 320
  Renaissance, 287-296
  Saint Teresa, 642 ff.

Nantes, Edict of, 438, 498 ff.
Narbonne, Archbishop of, 36
Nassau, William of, 502 ff.
Navarre, College of, 453
  Gregory XI and, 111
Negropont, Battle of, 88
  Fall of, 196
Nelli, Sister Plautilla (artist), 280
Nelson, Blessed John, 433
Neoplatonism, 283 f.
Neoaristotelianism, 284
Nérac, Calvin at, 465
Neri, St. Philip (*See* Philip)
Netherlands, Jesuits in, 621
  Protestantism in, 501 ff.
  Spanish Inquisition, 501
Newgate, Martyrs at, 406
"New Sion," Kingdom of, 382
New Testament, Commentary on (by Erasmus), 302, 305
Nicholas III (pope), and the Franciscans, 74
  Bull *Exiit qui seminat,* 74
Nicholas IV (pope), Olivi's disciples, 75
  Templars, 58
Nicholas V (pope), 180-185
  Bull *Cum multa,* 597
  Humanism, 183
  St. John Capistran, 182
Nicholas d'Abergati, and Martin V, 157
Nicholas of Cusa (card.), 182, 201, 283
  Council of Basle, 162, 164, 172
  De concordia catholica, 162
  Doctrine, 285 f.
  Papal authority, 154
  Reform project, 192
Nieheim, Dietrich von, 120
Nigliorati, Cosmato (Innocent VII), 124 note
Nimes, Massacre of, 485
Nobility in France, 6, 439
Nocera, Urban VI besieged at, 121
Nogaret, William of (legist), 14
  Anagni outrage, 39 ff.

Benedict XI, 45
Clement V, 54
Excommunicated, 45
Templars, 58
Nominalism, Luther and, 321
Norway, Union with Denmark and Sweden, 508
Western schism, 120
Notre Dame, Congregation of, 596
Notre Dame des Doms (Avignon), 261
Noyon (France), 438, 459
Nuremberg (Germany), 86
Diet of, 80, 370, 383, 520
Martinians in control of, 369
Osiander at, 368
Peace of, 381
Plague at, 323

Oath of succession (in England), 406
Oath of supremacy, Queen Elizabeth, 431
Oath of Supremacy, Henry VIII, 406
Obelisci (by Eck), 345
Oblates, Congregation of the, 585
Obligations, Traité des (by Pothier), 475
Occam, William, 48, 81 f., 91, 96, 140
Doctrine, 284
Occitaine Congregation (Dominicans), 596
Ochino, Bernardino, 418, 511, 595, 620
Odoric de Pordenone (missioner), 88
Oecolampadius, Johann (theologian), 348 f., 455
Sacramentary dispute, 374
Officiorum (Constitution), 582
Olivi, Peter John (Franciscan), 74 ff.
Olmütz, College at, 534
Oppède, Baron d' (Jean Maynier), 456 f.
Orange, William of, 502 ff.
Oratory, Congregation of the, 532, 590, 595, 607 f.
Oratory of Divine Love, 595
Orcagna, Andrea (painter), 266
Ordeal of fire, Savonarola, 230 f.
Order of Discalced Augustinians, 202
Order of Minims, 202
Order of the Humiliati, 585
Orders, Anglican, 421, 430
Orders, Decline of Religious, 594
Ordinal of Edward VI, 421, 430
Original sin, Council of Trent, 550 f.
Orsini, 180
And Alexander VI, 221
And Colonna, 46, 93
And Pius III, 241
Orsini (card.), and Election of Urban VI, 116
Matteo Rosso dei, 50 f.
Orvieto, Clement VII at, 397
Osiander, Andreas, 369
And Albrecht of Brandenburg, 370
At Nuremberg, 368
Sacramentary dispute, 373
Osiandrists, 575
Ossa, Jacques d' (John XXII), 78
Otto, Blessed, 113
Otto IV, count of Flanders, and Philip the Fair, 24
Our Lady of Victory, Feast instituted, 532
Oxford, Executions at, 427
Reform school, 392
University, 88; Peter Martyr at, 418; Western schism, 135

Pacification of Ghent, 506
Padua University, 284
Henry VIII's divorce, 400
Painting, Renaissance, 275 f.
Palaeologus, John (emperor), abjures schism, 104
Michael (emperor), Greek Church, 167
Palatinate, 299
Palestrina, 627, 629
Palliano, Duke of, executed, 529
Palmer, Thomas, executed, 423
Pamiers, Jesuit college at, 623
Pampeluna (Spain), 613
Pandects, 9, 22
Papa romano, De (by Wyclif), 130
Papacy and Empire, 4
Italianization of, 246
Power of, 245-247
Papal authority, 127 ff.
At Council of Basle, 162
Jean Gerson and, 122
In England, 403
Pierre d'Ailly and, 122
Papal elections, 114
Papal intervention, and Luther, 335

Papal supremacy, Boniface VIII and, 30 ff.
Bull *Unam sanctam,* 38
Philip the Fair and, 30 ff.
Paracelsus, 388
Parentucelli, Tommaso (Nicholas V), 181
Paris, Collège de Clermont, 624
Father Anger at, 624
Trial of Templars, 61, 63
Paris University, 13, 83, 88, 91, 463 f., 613
Boniface VIII and, 20 f.
Gerson, 129
Jesuits, 624
Pragmatic Sanction, 197
Western schism, 125 ff., 135
Parker, Matthew (archbishop), 430
Parliament (English), Annates, 402
Heresy laws, 427
Parliament (French), 499
Edict of Nantes, 499
Heretics, 450, 452
Jesuits, 623
Nicholas Cop, 464
Protestantism, 443
Parma, Jesuits in, 620
John of, Idealism, 122
Parr, Catherine, 413
Parsons, Robert (*See* Persons)
Pascal, St. Peter, 113
Paul II (pope), 195-197, 269
Crusade project, 196
Roman Academy, 272
Paul III (pope), 382, 522-524, 615
Barnabites, 606
Bull *Licet ab initio,* 523 note, 578
Children of, 524 note
Constitution *Regimini militantis,* 615
Council of Trent, 543 f.
Interdicts Henry VIII, 411
Letter to Francis I, 454
Monasteries and, 595
More and Fisher, 408 f.
Nepotism, 524
Plans interdict of England, 410
Somaschi, 606
Ursulines, 610
Paul IV (pope), 474, 525-528, 580
Elizabeth, 430
Henry II, 474
Index, 523 note
Inquisition, 527, 578
Ireland, 426
Jesuits, 619
Nepotism, 526
Philip II, 526
Protestantism in Spain, 511
Queen Mary, 428
Reconvokes Council of Trent, 561
Reform measures, 527
Paul V (pope), Constitution *Quantum religio,* 620
Jesuits and Dominicans, 638
Pavannes, Jacques, 446
Executed, 449
Pavia, Council at, 156
List of prelates, 156 note
Pazzi, Conspiracy of the, 200
Peace of Augsburg, 386
Of Crespy, 544
Of Monsieur, 491
Of Nuremberg, 381
Of Saint-Germain, 485
Peasants' War, 373
Pedro de Luna (Benedict XIII), 124
Peking, Bishopric of, 88
Pelayo, Alvaro, 87, 90
Pellicanus, Conrad (theologian), 368
Penance, Sacrament of, at Council of Trent, 559
Penitents, Confraternity of Black, 609
Pensicola (fortress), Benedict XIII at, 151
Peraudi, Raimond (card.), 217
Peretti, Felice (Sixtus V), 538
Péronne (France), 491
Perron, Cardinal du, and Henry of Navarre, 496
Persons, Robert (Jesuit), 434
Perugia, Benedict XI goes to, 47
Rebellion, 107
Perugino (painter), 265
Peter Arbues, St., Assassination of, 209
Peter Armengol, St., 113
Peter Fourier, St., 596
Peter Canisius, St., 624
Beatified, 624 note
Peter Canisius Society, 501 note
Peter Lombard (theologian), 281
Sentences, 629
Peter Martyr (Vermigli), 418, 423, 482, 511
Peter of Aragon (Blessed), Western schism, 120, 132

Peter of Luxemburg (Blessed), Western schism, 120, 132 f.
Peter Pascal, St., 113
Peter the Cruel, and Card. Albornoz, 101
Peter Thomas (Blessed), sets out on crusade, 104
Peter's pence, abolished in England, 403
Peterson (*See* Petri)
Petrarch, Francesco (poet), 261-264
  Benedict XII, 264
  Bibliophile, 262
  Canzoniere, 262
  Clement VI, 264
  De contemptu mundi, 263
  Praise of Urban V, 103
  Rienzi, 97
Petri, Lars, 509
  Olaf, 509
Peutinger, Conrad (humanist), 302
Pfefferkorn, Johann, *Handspiegel,* 332
  Jewish writings, 331
Pfeffinger, 575
Philargis, Pierre (Alexander V), 137
Philip II (king of Spain), 434, 483, 565, 580 f., 591
  Council of Trent, 562, 567, 574
  Inquisition, 533
  Jesuits, 620
  Netherlands, 503 f.
  Paul IV and, 526
  Pius V and, 533
  Queen Mary, 428
Philip III (the Bold), king of France, 17
Philip IV (the Fair), king of France, 13 ff.
  Builds tower opposite Avignon, 52
  Bull *Ausculta fili,* 35
  Bull *Clericis laicos,* 28
  Clement V, 70
  Council of Vienne, 65
  Debasing of coinage, 24
  Defeat at Courtrai, 37
  Legists, 9-12, 32
  Letter from Benedict XI, 44
  Letter from Boniface VIII, 23, 24, 28 f.
  Letter from Clement V, 59
  Letter to Clement V, 55
  Mansiones et itinera, 50 note
  National policy of, 13-19
  Papal supremacy, 30 ff.
  Pretended letter to Boniface VIII, 35
  Ranke's estimate of, 16
  States General of 1302, 36
  Templars, 58 ff.
Philip Neri, St., 538, 591, 607
  Esteem for Savonarola, 233
  Pius V and, 592
Philip, landgrave of Hesse, 377 f.
  Bigamy of, 384
Philip of Valois, 91
Philippe de Commines (historian), 219
Philippe de Maizières, Western schism, 120
Philosophy, Renaissance, 281
  Scholastic, 281
Piccinino, 190
Piccolomini, Eneas (Pius II), 189
  Concordat with Germany, 174
  Council of Basle, 162, 172
  Papal authority, 154
Piccolomini, Francesco (Pius III), 239
Pico della Mirandola (*See* Mirandola)
Pieck, Nicholas (martyr), 506
Pierluigi, Giovanni (Palestrina), 628 f.
Piero de' Medici, 219
Pierre du Lusignan, preaches a crusade, 104
Pietism, Individualistic, 387-389
Pietro della Francesca (painter), 265 f.
Pietro di Murrone (Celestine V), 100
Pietro of Corbario (antipope), 86, 88
Pighius (theologian), 553
Pignotte, The, 91 note
Pilgrimage of Grace, 411, 413
Pious Schools, Congregation of, 610
Pious Workers, 607
Pisa (Italy), 9, 82
  Council of, 136 f., 140, 249-251; Deposition of pope, 137; Ecumenicity, 136; Gerson, 129
Pisanello, Victor (painter), 264 f.
Pisseleu, Anne de, 443
Pitti palace, 266
Pius II (pope), 189-195, 269
  At Ferrara, 210
  Bull *Vocavit nos Pius,* 191
  Crusade, 191, 194
  Humanism, 193
  Reform measures, 192
Pius III (pope), 239-241

Pius IV (pope), 528-530, 571, 584 f.
Bull *Benedictus Deus,* 530
Index, 582
Music, 628
Nepotism, 584 note
Palestrina, 629
Somaschi, 607
Pius V, St. (pope), 432, 504, 530-534, 582, 591 f., 596
American Indians, 533
Brothers of St. John of God, 607
Bull *Regnans Dei,* 433
Charles IX, 486, 532
Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, 433
Iniquisition, 533, 578
Mary Stuart, 533
Jesuits, 619
Philip II, 533
Protestants, 486
St. Thomas Aquinas, 629
Somaschi, 607
Pius X (pope), Bull *Sapienti consilio,* 269 note
Plain chant, 628
Palisians, Guillaume de (legist), 40, 53
Platina, Bartolommeo, 197
Plato and Platonism, 274, 284, 285
Plautilla Nelli, Sister (artist), 280
Plethon, Gemistus (philosopher), 270, 277
Plotinus, 285
Poggio, Giovanni (humanist), 268, 274
At papal court, 124
Council of Constance, 157
Facetiae, 179, 183, 268 f.
Poissy, Colloquy of, 482
Poitiers, Conference of Clement V at, 52
Poland, Protestantism in, 511
Western schism, 120
Pole, Reginald (card.), 523, 578, 590
Council of Trent, 545
Henry VIII, 410
Paul IV, 428
Queen Mary, 427
Reconciliation of England with Rome, 425
Unity of the Church, 410
Politian, Angiolo (humanist), 271 ff.
And Pico della Mirandola, 273 note
Political authority, Doctrine of, 84
Pollich, Martin, and Luther, 322
Polomar, John of, and Council of Basle, 260
Poltrot de Méré (assassin), 485
Pomerania, Lutheranism in, 370
Duke of, 370
Pomponazzi, Pietro, Aristotelianism, 283
De immortalitate animae, 284
Pomponius Laetus (humanist), 197, 271 f.
Pont-à-Mousson, University of, 624
"Pontefice Terribile," 242
"Poor priests," 129 f.
Poor-tax in England, 415
Pope, Primacy of, Council of Florence, 170
Popes:
Celestine V (1294), 19 f.
Boniface VIII (1294-1303), 19-42
Benedict XI (1303-04), 42-46
Clement V (1305-14), 49-71
John XXII (1316-34), 78-92
Benedict XII (1334-42), 92-95
Clement VI (1342-52), 95-99
Innocent VI (1352-62), 99-103
Urban V (1362-70), 103-106
Gregory XI (1370-78), 106-112
Urban VI (1378-89), 114-123
(Clement VII, 1378-94), 123
Boniface IX (1389-1404), 123
(Benedict XIII, 1394-1424), 124-131
Innocent VII (1404-06), 123 f.
Gregory XII (1406-15), 123 f.
Alexander V (1409-10), 138 f.
John XXIII (1410-15), 139-141
Martin V (1417-31), 153-158
(Clement VIII, 1424-29), 151
(Benedict XIV, 1424), 151
Eugene IV (1431-47), 159-177
(Felix V, 1439-49), 172
Nicholas V (1447-55), 180-185
Callistus III (1455-58), 185-188
Pius II (1458-64), 189-195
Paul II (1464-71), 195-197
Sixtus IV (1471-84), 197-207
Innocent VIII (1484-92), 208, 213
Alexander VI (1492-1503), 214-237
Pius III (1503), 239-241
Julius II (1503-13), 241-252
Leo X (1513-21), 252-260
Adrian VI (1522-23), 518-520
Clement VII (1523-34), 520-522
Paul III (1534-49), 522-524

Julius III (1550-55), 524
Marcellus II (1555), 525
Paul IV (1555-59), 525-528
Pius IV (1559-65), 528-530
Pius V (1566-72), 530-534
Gregory XIII (1572-85), 534-537
Sixtus V (1585-90), 537-540
Urban VII (1590), 540
Gregory XIV (1590-91), 540
Innocent IX (1591), 540
Clement VIII (1592-1605), 540
Popes, Worldliness of the, 152
Porcaro, Stefano (card.), 184
Pordenone, Odoric de (missioner), 88
Portugal, Jesuits in, 621
Templars in, 64
Possevin, Antony (Jesuit), 624
Postel, Guillaume (orientalist), 445
Pothier, Robert, *Traité des obligations,* 475
Potken, Adam, 301, 345 note
Pouet (bishop), 419
Poverty, Doctrine of, 81
Of city workers, 7
"Praemunire," 399 note
Bill of, and Cardinal Wolsey, 399
Praise of Folly (by Erasmus), 392
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 172-174, 190, 194, 257, 260, 440,
Abolition of, 253
Prague, College at, 534
Compactata of, 166
Prato, Arlotto da (Franciscan), and Olivi, 75
Preaching (15th century), 205
Predestination, Thomas Bradwardine on, 295
Premonstratensians, 596
Prignano, Bartolommeo (Urban VI), 114 f.
Primacy of the pope, at Council of Florence, 170
Primaticcio, and Francis I, 441
"Princes' Concordat," 175
Principe, Il (by Machiavelli), 179, 198
Procession of Holy Ghost, Council of Ferrara, 168
Council of Florence, 169
Prospeculum (by Wyclif), 130
"Protestant," Origin of, 378
Provence, Trial of Templars in, 63
Prussia, Origin of Duchy of, 371
Puglia, Francesco, and ordeal of fire, 231
Pulci (poet), 276
Puritanism in Scotland, 435 ff.
Elizabeth's alliance with, 436
Purgatory, at Council of Florence, 170

Quantum religio, Constitution, 620
Quoniam alto, Bull, 160

Rainalducci, Pietro (antipope), 86-88
Raphael (painter), and Julius II, 244
And Savonarola, 278
Ratisbon, Diet of, 383
Interim, 383
Ravaillac, 500
Raymond de Turenne, Suppression of Italian revolt, 108
Raymond of Capua, and St. Catherine, 109
Re aedificatoria, De (by Alberti), 267
Reading, Abbey of, 414
Real Presence, Calvin's doctrine on, 368 note
In Anglican Church, 418
Recess of Vasteras, 510
Redemption, Lutheran theory of, 321 note
Reformation, Economic causes, 300 note
Réforme de la théologie, 129
"Regale," Privilege of, 19
Regimini militantis (Constitution), 615
Regnans Dei, Bull, 433
Regola del governo di cura familiare (by Dominici), 180
Regola di vita cristiana, 180
Regular Clerics of St. Mayeul, 606
Regular Clerics of St. Paul, 606
Reinhard, Martin (Reformer), 508
Religione christiana, De (by Ficino), 285
Religious Orders, Decline of, 594
Renaissance, German, 299-305
Intellectual evolution of, 261
Papacy and, 296 note
Renaudie, La, executed, 481
René of Anjou, 191
Reni, Guido (painter), 627
Requesens, Luis of, 506
Residence, Episcopal, at Council of Trent, 566 f.
Restitutio Christiana (by Servet), 471

Reuchlin, Johann (humanist), 302, 323
Abandons Luther, 372
And Luther, 334
Augenspiegel, 332
De accentibus et orthographis linguae hebraicae, 302
De rudimentis hebraicis, 302
Jewish books, 331
Revolutionary spirit in France, 6-8
Rex gloriae, Bull, 55, 56 note
Reynolds, Richard (Brigittine martyr), 407
Rheims, Father Anger at, 624
Seminary founded, 590
University, 478
Rhodes, 519
Riario, Girolamo (card.), 201, 208
Pietro (card.), 198 f.
Raffaele (card.), 208
Ribadeneira, Pedro (Jesuit), 616
Ridley, Nicholas (bishop), 422
Forty-two Articles, 421
Rienzi, Cola di, 97-101
Robbia, Luca della (artist), 275
Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 28
King of Naples, 79 f.
Of Anjou, 69
Of Geneva (Clement VII), 115, 119, 124; his break with Urban VI, 118; election of Urban VI, 117; revolt in Italy, 108
The Good, and the Templars, 63
Roberto of Lecce (Franciscan), 207
Roch, St., 48, 112
Rochelle, La (France), 485, 499
Rochetaille, de la (card.), Council of Basle, 162
Rodriguez, Simon (Jesuit), 614
In Portugal, 621
Roger, Pierre (Clement VI), 95
Pierre de Beaufort (Gregory XI), 107
Rohrbach, Berthold de, Mysticism, 292 f.
Roman Academy, and Paul III, 197
Dissolution of, 272
Roman Catechism, 585
Roman College, 534, 590
Roman Inquisition, 577 f.
Use of torture, 578
Roman law, 11, 22
Study of, 9-11, 21
Roman Martyrology, Revision of, 535
Roman University, Restoration of, 124
Rome, Arrival of Urban V at, 103
Colleges founded by Gregory XIII at, 534
Colonna, 43
Colonna and Orsini, 46
Greek College, 535
Gregory XI goes to, 112
Guelfs and Ghibellines in, 23
Luther at, 319, 323
Pillage by Ladislas, 140
Restoration by Martin V, 155
Rienzi, 101
St. Ignatius at, 615
Ronsard, *Les misères du temps,* 482
Rosary, Confraternity of, 592
Feast of the, 532
Rose, Thomas, 426
Rose of Viterbo, St., 109
Roseline of Villeneuve, St., 48, 112
Rouen, Seminary founded, 590
Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
Roussel, Gerard, 445 f., 449, 451, 464
Rovere, Francesco della (Sixtus IV), 198
Giuliano della (Julius II), 199, 208, 239, 241; Alliance with Charles VIII, 218; and Alexander VI, 220
Royal authority, 12
Royal power in France, 440 f.
"Royal safeguard," 19
Royalty, Ideal of, 12
Rubianus, Crotus, 359
Epistolae obscurorum virorum, 332
Rudolph, king of the Romans, 21
And Philip the Fair, 24
Rudolph of Habsburg, 4
Rudolph von Langen (humanist), 330
Ruinart, Thierry (Benedictine), 596
Rule of faith, Council of Trent, 548 f.
Ruysbroeck, Blessed John, Mysticism, 290

Sachs, Hans (poet), 323, 368
Sachsenhausen, 80
Sacramentary dispute, 373-376
Sacraments, at Council of Trent, 555, 557 ff.
Efficacy of, 293
Sadoleto, Jacopo (card.), 523, 603, 615
"Safeguard, Royal," 19
Saint-André, Jacques, 483

Saint Andrew's cathedral (Scotland), 436
Saint Bartholomew's Day, 484 ff.
Number of the slain, 489 note.
Saint-Denis, Abbey of, 203
Saint-Germain, Peace of, 485
Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 482
Saint John of God, Brothers of, 607
St. John of Jerusalem, Knights of (*See* Hospitallers)
Saint Just, Monastery of, 561, 579
Saint-Martin, Claude de, 388
Saint-Maur, Congregation of, 596
Saint Mayeul, Regular Clerics of, 606
Saint-Michel, Trinitarians at, 596
Saint Paul, Regular Clerics of, 606
St. Peter's basilica, and Alberti, 266
Doors of, 266 note
Nicholas V, 266
Sixtus V, 539
Saint Sauveur, Congregation of, 596
Saint-Vanne, Abbey of, 596
Benedictine reform, 595
Congregation of, 596
Saint Victor of Marseilles (abbey), 103
Saintonge, Calvin at, 464
Saints, Destruction of images of, 419
Saisset, Bernard (bishop), 33 f.
Salamanca, Jesuits at, 621
University, 88, 547, 613, 637
Salic law, 492
Salmeron, Council of Trent, 546, 557
Salutati, Coluccio (humanist), 262
Salvator mundi, Bull, 34
Samtre, William, executed, 130
Sanction of Bourges, Pragmatic, 172-175, 190, 194
Sanders, and English Catholics, 432
Sanseverino, Giulio (*See* Pomponius Laetus)
Sant' Angelo, Castel, 114, 184
Sanudo, Marino, 88
Sapienti consilio, Bull, 269 note
Saumur, Huguenots at, 499
Saunier (Reformer), at Geneva, 468
Sauveur, Congregation of Saint, 596
Savonarola, Girolamo, 152, 180, 207, 211 ff., 225 ff., 229, 233
Alexander VI, 229 f.
Apologetics, 287 f.
At Florence, 211
At Siena, 220
Botticelli, 278
Charles VIII, 219 f.
Contempt for the World, 211
Decline of the Church, 211
Donatello, 278
Execution of, 232
Influence on art, 277 f.
Lorenzo de' Medici, 278
Lorenzo di Credi, 278
Ordeal of fire, 230 f.
Pico della Mirandola, 278
Political theories, 226
Preaching of, 212 f.
Raphael, 278
St. Catherine de Ricci, 233
St. Philip Neri, 233
Simone Cronaca, 278
Trial of, 232
Triumphus crucis, 287 f.
Saxony, 299
Anabaptists, 382
Scanderbeg, 175, 188, 194, 196
Scandinavian countries, Protestantism in, 507 ff.
Schaffhausen, John XXIII at, 145
Schamburg, Sylvester von, and Luther, 351
Scheurl, Christopher (Reformer), 323
Schism, Greek, abjured by John Palaeologus, 104
Schism, Western, Beginning of, 119
Blessed Peter of Aragon, 120, 132
Blessed Peter of Luxemburg, 120, 132 f.
Bologna University, 135
Charles VI, king of France, 126
Conrad of Gelnhausen, 120, 127
Denmark, 120
Dietrich von Nieheim, 120
End of, 149 ff.
England, 120, 402 ff.
Feudalism, 4
France, 120
Geoffrey de Boucicaut, 127
Germany, 120
Henry of Langenstein, 120, 128
Hungary, 120
Italy, 120
Norway, 120
Not a real schism, 120 note
Oxford University, 135
Paris University, 125 ff.
Philippe de Maizières, 120
Pierre d'Ailly, 120, 126 f.

Poland, 120
St. Catherine of Siena, 120, 131
St. Catherine of Sweden, 120
St. Colette, 120, 132
St. Vincent Ferrer, 120, 127, 132 f.
Scotland, 120
Spain, 120
Sweden, 120
Wenceslaus, king of the Romans, 126
Scholasticism, 281
Council of Trent and, 572 note
Decadence of, 283
Schools, Congregation of Pious, 610
Schools, Jesuit, 622 ff.
Schwarzenberg, John of, and Council of Florence, 169
Schwarzerd, Philip (Melanchthon), 347 note
Schwenkfeld, Caspar, 387, 575
Scotland, Puritanism in, 435
Western schism, 120
Scripture as rule of faith, at Council of Trent, 548 f.
Scripture, and canon of, at Council of Trent, 550
Editions of, 303
Sculpture, Renaissance, 275
Sebastian, St., painting by Baccio, 212
Secular Clerics of Christian Doctrine, 609
Sedan, Maldonatus at, 624
Semblançay (archbishop), 439
Seminaries, Council of Trent, 568
St. Charles Borromeo, 586 ff.
Sendomiriensis, Consensus, 511
Sentences (by Peter Lombard), 629
Servet, Michel, 575
Restitutio Christiana, 471
Servites, Popularity of, 205
Seymour, Anne, 413
Seymour, duke of Somerset, 416
Seville, Auto da fè at, 580 f.
Sforza, Ascanio (card.), 208, 210
Francesco, 163
Galeazzo Maria, Assassination of, 200 f.
Giovanni, and Lucrezia Borgia, 224
Ludovico, 207; and Charles VIII, 216; league with Alexander VI, 221
Shaxton (bishop), 413
Sherwood, Thomas (martyr), 433
Sickingen, Franz von, 351, 354, 356, 358, 361, 371 f.
League of knights, 368
Siena, Council of, 156
Savonarola at, 220
Sigault, Vincent, Council of Pisa, 250
Siger of Brabant, 14
Sigismond (emperor) and John XXIII, 141, 145
Signorelli (painter), 265, 276
Silvester de Budes, and suppression of Italian revolt, 108
Simone Cronaca and Savonarola, 278
Simons, Menno, and the Mennonites, 575
Sin, Original, at Council of Trent, 550 f.
Sion, Abbey of, 404
Martyrs, 406
Sistine Choir, 202
Six Articles (Anglican Church), 412
Sixtus IV (pope), 197-207
Assassination of Giuliano de' Medici, 201
Bull *Mare magnum,* 202, 204
College of Abbreviators, 269
Crusade, 199
Golden Bull, 202
Humanism, 198
Nepotism, 198
Spanish Inquisition, 199
Sixtus V (pope), 537-540, 596
Camillians, 608
College of Cardinals, 539
Congregation of the Council, 539
Congregation of the Index, 539
Constitution *Immensa aeterni Dei,* 578
Henry of Navarre, 494
Jesuits, 620
St. Peter's basilica, 539
Vulgate, 539
Smalkalden, Articles of (by Luther), 383
Smalkaldic League, 380, 383 f., 523
Society of Jesus (*See* Jesuits)
Socinians, 575
Soliman, Siege of Vienna, 378
Somaschi, 522, 595, 606
Somerset, Duke of, 416, 419
Sorbonne, and heresies, 447
And heretics, 450

Henry VIII's divorce, 400
Margaret d'Angoulême, 453
Protestantism, 443
Sorcery, Practice of, 209
Soreth, Blessed John, 597
Soto, Dominic, 629
At Council of Trent, 547
Soul, the "form" of the body, 76
Sovereignty, Doctrine of political, 84
Spain, Concordat of Martin V, 154
League with Alexander VI, 221
League with Julius II, 248
Protestantism in, 511
Western schism, 120
Spalatin, George (Reformer), 309, 323, 340 ff.
Spanish Armada, 434
Spanish Inquisition, 511, 579 ff.
In the Netherlands, 501
Sixtus IV, 199
Spener, Philip (poet), 387
Spenlein, and Luther, 322
Spires, Decree of, 378
"Spiritual" Brethren, 74, 81 ff., 96
Spiritual Exercises (by St. Ignatius), 613, 639 ff.
State, Church and, 85
States General (1302), 36; (1484), 7; of Blois, 494
States of the Church, 244
Statues of saints, Destruction of, 419
Staupitz, Johann, 315 f., 319, 322 f., 326, 339, 342, 372
Stimulus pastorum (by Bartholomew a Martyribus), 591
Strada, Francesco (Jesuit), 620
Strasburg, 449
Calvin at, 465
Stuart, Mary, and Pius V, 533
Styria, 576
Suarez, Francisco (Jesuit), 630, 637
Congruism, 630
Disputationes metaphysicae, 630
Succession, Oath of (in England), 406
Suffolk, Duke of, executed, 425
Sulpice, Congregation of St., 590
Summa theologica of St. Antoninus, 193
Of St. Thomas Aquinas, 281, 629; At Council of Trent, 546
Summi Magistri, Bull, 203 note
Super Petri solio, Bull, 40
Supremacy, Oath of (in England), 406
Elizabeth, 431
"Supreme head of the Church," 400
Surius, Laurent, *Lives of the Saints,* 592
Suso, Blessed Henry, *Exemplar,* 291
Little Book of Eternal Wisdom, 291
Swabia, 299
Sweden, 509
Union with Norway and Denmark, 508
Western schism, 120
Sweeting, William, executed, 394
Switzerland, 577
St. Charles Borromeo, 585
Syncretism, Dogmatic, 386 f.
Synergists, 575

Talaru, Amédée de, Council of Basle, 172
Tarascon, Gerson preaches at, 128
Tarentaise, Archbishop of, Council of Basle, 163 f.
Tasso, *Jerusalem Delivered,* 626
Tauler, John, *Institutiones divinae,* 291
Mysticism, 290 f.
Taxation of Church property, 17-19, 45
Tebaldeschi, Francesco (card.), election of Urban VI, 114, 116
Templars, Arabic inscriptions, 73 note
Arrest of, 58 f.
Charges against, 57
Council of Vienne, 65 f.
Trial of, 55
Wealth of, 56
Ten Articles (Anglican Church), 412
Teresa, St., 596 ff., 637
Interior Castle, 644
Mysticism of, 642 ff.
Way of Perfection, 643 f.
"Terror, English," 406
Tetzel, John (Dominican), 316, 326, 349
Antitheses, 329
Indulgences, 325
Teutonic Order, 370
Thaborites, 166 note
Theatines, 522, 595, 603 ff., 614
Theologia platonica (by Ficino), 285
Theologians, and Luther, 345-349
Theology, Renaissance, 281-287
Theology of the Sacraments (by Henry VIII), 394

Theses of Luther, 328
Thirty-nine Articles (Anglican Church), 432
Thomas à Kempis, 135
  Brethren of the Common Life, 134
  Mysticism of, 288
Thomas Aquinas, St., 13, 281, 592, 629
  And political authority, 84
  Summa, 281, 629
Three Henries, War of the, 494
Tiene, Gaetano di (Cajetan), 603
Titian, and Francis I, 441
Todi, Jacopone da (poet), 31
Toledo, Auto da fé at, 580
Toledo, Francisco (Jesuit), 630
Tomacelli, Pierre (Boniface IX), 123 note
Tommaso de Vio (*See* Cajetan, Tommaso)
Torquemada, Juan de (theologian), 179
Torquemada, Thomas de, Spanish Inquisition, 200
Tor di Specchi, Congregation of, 157
Torini, Santi (Fra Angelico), 265 note
Toulouse (France), 596
  Father Anger at, 624
  Jesuit college, 623
  Seminary founded, 590
  Slaughter of Huguenots, 489
  Study of Roman law, 10
Tournelle, The, 475
Tournon (France), Jesuit college, 623
Tournon, Cardinal de, 454, 456, 483
  And Michel Servet, 471
Tours, Council at, 247
"*Traditio instrumentorum*," 421
Tradition, rule of faith (Council of Trent), 548 f.
Transubstantiation, Council of Florence, 170
Treason laws, in England, 406
Trebonius, John, 308
Trent, Council of, 542-572
  Canon of Scripture, 550
  Catechism, 609
  Charles V, 559
  Convocation of, 543
  Decisions approved, 530
  Dissolved, 556
  Dominicans at, 547
  Eucharist, 557 f.
  Extreme Unction, 559
  Franciscans at, 547
  Holy Orders, 563
  Immaculate Conception, 552
  Interruption, 556, 560
  Jesuits at, 546
  Justification, 552 ff.
  Mass, 563
  Matrimony, 563
  Original sin, 550 f.
  Penance, 559
  Philip II, 562
  Protestants at, 559
  Reconvoked by Paul IV, 561
  Rule of faith, 548 f.
  Sacraments, 555, 557 ff.
  St. Thomas's *Summa* at, 546 note.
  Scholasticism, 572 note
  Transferred to Bologna, 556
  Vulgate, 550
Trialogus (by Wyclif), 130
Tribonius, 333
Trinitarians, 596
Trionfo, Agostino (theologian), 87
Trithemius (humanist), 302
Triumphus crucis (by Savonarola), 287 f.
Triumphus Veneris (by Bebel), 333
Truce of Malestrout, 95
Truttvetter, Jodocus, 309, 311
Tunstall (bishop), 413
Turks, 532
  Capture of Constantinople, 185
  Overcome Hungary, 522
  Siege of Vienna, 378
Tyburn, Executions at, 406, 434

Ulm, Reformation preached at, 369
Ultima aetate Ecclesiae, De, 106
Unam sanctam, Bull, 38
Union, Council of, 167
  Of Arras, 506, 577
  Of Calmar, 508
  Of Utrecht, 507
Unity of the Church (by Pole), 410
Universities:
  Alcala, 547, 613
  Bologna, 135, 182
  Cambridge, 400, 418, 423
  Douai, 634
  Evora, 636
  Erfurt 310, 359
  Heidelberg, 127
  Ingolstadt, 576
  Louvain, 518

Oxford, 135, 418
Padua, 284
Paris, 125 ff., 129, 135, 197, 463 f., 613, 624
Pont-à-Mousson, 624
Rheims, 478
Rome, 124
Salamanca, 547, 613, 637
Upsala, 509
Vienna, 302
Wittenberg, 322, 347 note
Urban V (pope), 103-106, 113
Arrival at Rome, 103
Beatified, 106 note
Beghards and Beguines, 292
Bull *In caena Domini,* 533
Canonization of St. Elzear, 112
Departure for Avignon, 107
Goes to France, 104
Return to Rome, 92
Tribute from England, 105
Urban VI (pope), 114-123
Catherine of Siena, St., 131
Charles of Durazzo, 121
Cruelty of, 121
Election of, 114-119
Expedition against Joanna of Naples, 121
Letter from St. Catherine of Siena, 131
Reform measures, 118
Urban VII (pope), 540
Uriel (archbishop), Jewish books, 331
Ursulines, 607, 610
Usurers, in diocese of Autun, 25
Usury, 300, 331
Usus consumptibilium, 81
Usus pauper, 74
Utopia (by More), 392
Utraquists of Bohemia, 235
Utrecht, Province of, 503
Union of, 507

Vadstena, 98
Valencia, Araoz at, 621
Valla, Lorenzo, 268 note
And Eugene IV, 164
De vero bono, 267
De voluptate, 198, 267
Valladolid, Auto da fé at, 580 f.
Van Duynsen, Godefried (martyr), 506
Vanozza, Catanei, 222
Varna, Turkish victory at, 175
Vasa, Gustavus, 509
Vasquez, Gabriel (Jesuit), 630, 637
Vassy massacre, 483
Vasteras, Recess of, 510
Vatable (Hebraist), 445, 449, 461
Vatican, Stanze, 279
Vaucluse, Petrarch at, 262
Vaudois, Massacre of the, 455-458
Vega, André de, at Council of Trent, 547
Lope de (poet), 626
Venaissin, Comtat, 51
Venice, Alliance with Hungary, 194
Boniface VIII, 24
Julius II, 242
Lainez at, 620
League with Alexander VI, 216, 221
League with Julius II, 248
Opposed to Crusade, 187
Power of, 5
Verceil, Antoine de, 207
Vergerio, 511
Vermigli (Peter Martyr), 418, 511
Vero bono, De (by Valla), 267
Veronese, Paul (painter), 627
Verrochio (painter), 276
Vibero, Beatrix de, executed, 581
Vico, Tommaso (*See* Cajetan, Tommaso)
Victory, Feast of Our Lady of, 532
Vienna, College, 534, 622
Besieged by Turks, 378
Concordat of, 181
University of, 302
Vienne, Council of, 64, 72 f., 90, 542
Beghards and Beguines, 292
Heresies condemned, 76
Raymond Lully, 87
Templars, 65
Vignola (architect), 627
Villanova, Francisco (Jesuit), 621
Vilna (Poland), College, 534
Vimory, Battle of, 494
Vincent Ferrer, St., and Western schism, 120, 127, 132 f.
Vinci, Leonardo da, 276, 279
And Francis I, 441
Visconti, Galeazzo, 80
Giovanni Maria, 5; Assassination of, 200
Philip Maria, attacks States of the Church, 163

Visione Dei, De (by Nicholas of Cusa), 286
Vitruvius, 274
Vittorino da Feltre, 301
Vocavit nos Pius, Bull, 191
Voluptate, De (by Valla), 267
Volta, Gabriel della, 336
Volterra, Sack of, 200
Vulgate, at Council of Trent, 550
  Revision of, 541
  Sixtus V and, 539

Waldo, Peter, and Vaudois, 455
Wales, Templars in, 63
War of the Knights, 351
  Of the Roses, and feudalism, 5
  Of the Three Henries, 494
Wartburg (castle), Luther at, 362-367
Warwick, Count of, 419, 422
"Waterbeggars," 505
Watham, Abbey of, 398
Way of Perfection (by St. Teresa), 643 f.
Webster, Augustine (martyr), 407
Weigel, Valentine, 387
Weimar, Myconius at, 368
Wenceslaus (king of the Romans), Western schism, 126
Wesel, John, 294, 301
  Doctrines, 294
  Mysticism, 292 ff.
Wessel, John, 293 f.
  Mysticism, 292 ff.
Western schism (*See* Schism, Western)
Westphalia, Anabaptists in, 382
Westminster, Queen Mary at, 425
Wettins, 299
William Durandus, 72
William of Nassau, 502 ff.
William of Nogaret (legist), 14
  Anagni outrage, 39 ff.
  Benedict XI, 43, 45
William of Paris (bishop), 59, 61
William the Silent, 502 ff.
Winchester, Diocese of, 419
Windesheim, 134 f.
Wittelsbach, House of, 96, 299
Wittenberg, 320, 370, 376, 509, 511
  Carlstadt at, 367
  Luther at, 367
  Luther's theses, 328
  Papal Bull burned, 353
Wittenberg University, 347 note
  Luther at, 322
Wolmar, Melchior, 461
Wolsey, Thomas (card.), 396, 399
Works, Good, 296
  Luther and doctrine of, 327
Worms, Conference at, 383
  Diet of, 357-362, 372
  Edict of, 361, 363, 520
Wyclif, John, 48
  De dominio contra unum monachum, 106
  De ultima aetate Ecclesiae, 106
  Declaration to Parliament, 105
  Doctrine, 130
  Influence on Hus, 148
  Prospeculum, 130
  Teaching of, 105 f.
  Trialogus, 130
Wyclifites, 129 ff.
Wyttenbach, Thomas, on indulgences, 295

Xavier, St. Francis, 614, 621

Zaccaria, St. Anton Maria, 606
Zahringens, 299
Zarabella (card.), Council of Constance, 143 f.
  De jurisdictione imperiali, 143
  Papal authority, 144
Zealand, Province of, 503
Ziegler, Margaret, 306
Zoroborowski (Jesuit), 618 note
Zurich, Hutten exiled to, 372
Zwickau, Hussites at, 367
Zwingli, Ulrich, Conference of Marburg, 378
  Diet of Augsburg, 379
  Sacramentary dispute, 374 f.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME SIX

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME SIX

PERIOD OF THE ANCIENT REGIME

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS 2, MO.

AND

33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.

1947

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in U.S.A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 12. Julii, 1945

Emmett L. Gaffney, C.M.

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 12. Julii, 1945

✠ *Joannes J. Glennon*

Archiepiscopus

Copyright 1946

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Second Impression

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

PART I

THE CATHOLIC RENAISSANCE

CHAPTER

I. THE PAPACY 8
The Jubilee 8
Pope Clement VIII 11
Pope Leo XI 17
Pope Paul V 18
War against Venice 21
England 25
Germany 27
Paul V's Reform Efforts 30
Pope Gregory XV 33
The Pope's Reform Efforts 37
Pope Urban VIII 41
Galileo 48
Activities of Urban VIII 56
Pope Innocent X 59
The Treaty of Westphalia 62
The Bull *Zelus domus meae* 65

II. THE CATHOLIC RENAISSANCE IN SPAIN, ITALY, AND GERMANY 68
The Church in Spain 68
Religious Orders 71
Juan de Ribera 73
Mary of Agreda 75
The Church in Italy 77
The Church in Germany 80

CHAPTER PAGE

III. THE BEGINNING OF THE CATHOLIC REFORM IN FRANCE . 87
The First Causes of the Reform 87
St. Francis de Sales 88
King Henry IV 91
The Institute of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin . . 96
St. Francis de Sales and the Reform of the Clergy . . 98

IV. REFORM OF THE CLERGY IN FRANCE 105
The Regular Clergy 105
Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld 105
The Trappists 108
New Congregations 110
The Secular Clergy 111
The Oratory 116
Charles de Condren 120
Adrian Bourdoise 120
St. John Eudes 122
St. Vincent de Paul 124
The Missions 128
Retreats 129
The Seminaries 133
Father Olier 134
Seminary of St. Sulpice 138

V. WORKS OF CHARITY IN FRANCE 141
Conditions in France 141
Work of St. Vincent de Paul 144
Parish Missions 149
The Company of the Blessed Sacrament 155
The Company's Activities 160
Dueling 162
The Laboring Classes 164
Trade Unions 167
Workmen's Societies 168
Other Activities 169
Orthodoxy of the Company 173
Opposition to the Company 176

VI. THE FOREIGN MISSIONS 181
St. Francis Xavier 182
The Jesuits in India 191

CHAPTER PAGE

The Missions in Japan 195
The Missions in China 199
Matteo Ricci 200
The Chinese Rites 204
The Missions in South America 206
Bartholomew de Las Casas 207
Peru 210
Brazil 211
The Jesuits in Paraguay 216
The Missions in North America 220
The Missions in Africa 226

VII. The Intellectual Movement 230
The Study of Theology 231
Positive Theology 235
Pastoral Theology 238
Ascetical Theology 240
Biblical Exegesis 244
The Study of Church History 247
The Anti-Christian Movement 249

PART II

ORTHODOXY

VIII. The Popes of the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century 255
Pope Alexander VII 255
Pope Clement IX 261
Pope Clement X 263
Pope Innocent XI 265
Pope Alexander VIII 269
Pope Innocent XII 271

IX. Protestantism 273
The Crisis in Germany 273
Pietism 282
Jacob Spener 284
Protestantism in England 287
Charles I 288

CHAPTER PAGE

Oliver Cromwell 289
Cromwell's Government 292
Charles II 296
James II 299
Protestantism in France 304
Louis XIV 308
The Edict of Nantes 310

X. GALLICANISM 317
Richelieu's Religious Policy 319
Religious Policy of Louis XIV 325
Affair of the Corsican Guard 326
The Regalia 330
Nicholas Pavillon 331
François Caulet 332
The Nuns 337
The Convent of Charonne 339
Policy of Louis XIV 340
Assembly of the Clergy 342
Bossuet 343
The Four Articles of 1682 348
Reaction of Innocent XI 353
Organization of the Church of France 355

XI. JANSENISM 358
Origin of Jansenism 358
Michael Baius 359
Cornelius Jansen 363
Arnauld d'Andilly 369
Mother Angélique 370
St. Cyran and Port Royal 377
The *Augustinus* 384
"The Great Arnauld" 390
The Jesuits 394
Jean Jacques Olier 398
The Five Propositions 400
The Formulary 404
Blaise Pascal 407
The Resistance of the Four Bishops 412
Pasquier Quesnel 417

CHAPTER PAGE

XII. QUIETISM 420
Madame Guyon 420
Fénelon 425
The Maxims 430
The Age of Louis XIV 432
Bossuet 433
Fénelon 434
Bourdaloue 434

PART III

THE STRIFE AGAINST UNBELIEF

XIII. THE LAST POPES OF THE ANCIENT REGIME 440
Pope Clement XI 440
Pope Innocent XIII 442
Pope Benedict XIII 445
Pope Clement XII 447
Pope Benedict XIV 451
Pope Clement XIII 457
Pope Clement XIV 464

XIV. DEVELOPMENT OF UNBELIEF IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY 472
Protestantism in Germany 472
Protestantism in England 474
Protestantism in France 476
Jansenism in the Eighteenth Century 482
Port Royal 485
Archbishop de Noailles 487
Gallicanism 491
Febronianism 492
Josephism 496
Christopher de Beaumont 497
Descartes 499
Locke 500
The Encyclopedia 501
Freemasonry 503
Freemasonry in France 507

XV. THE CATHOLIC FORCES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY . 510
Spain 510

CHAPTER PAGE

Italy 512
St. Francesco Girolamo 514
St. Leonard of Port Maurice 514
St. Paul of the Cross 515
St. Alphonsus 515
Clement Mary Hofbauer 518
The Church of France 520
Elementary Education 524
St. John Baptist de La Salle 525
Secondary Education 528
Higher Studies 530
Apologetics 533
Preaching 536
Piety 538
Works of Charity 541

XVI. The Eastern Church during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries 547
The Greek Orthodox Church 547
The Church of Constantinople 555
The Patriarchate of the South 556
The Melchites 561
The Maronites 564
The Syrian Church 566
The Chaldeans 568
The Armenians 569
The Copts 571
The Ethiopians 572
The Serbs 572
The Rumanians 573
The Serbo-Croats 577
The Albanians 577
The Georgians 579
The Ruthenian Church 579
The Russian Church 585

Bibliography 590

Index 601

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume VI

I. The Catholic Renaissance

II. Orthodoxy

III. The Strife Against Unbelief

Introduction

THE term "ancient regime" is generally used to indicate the political and social life of the European nations during the two centuries preceding the French Revolution.[1]

That period is particularly marked by the rise of absolute monarchies, the centralization of government, and the weakening or disappearance of provincial and local special privileges.

At first blush it all appears majestically arranged. In Germany, France, Spain, and England, the king, no longer restrained by feudal rivalries, was absolute master. Uniformity prevailed in the laws. The two tendencies, traditional and progressive, which had clashed during the Renaissance, apparently reached a stable equilibrium.

We would be mistaken if we came to a final judgment about the ancient regime on the basis of this external organization. Many a traditional practice was still much alive: the jurists did not succeed in abolishing them, and the royal authority hesitated to challenge them. Anyone who should form an opinion of the government of that time simply by reading its laws would make some absurd mistakes. The rule was rigid; the practice was flexible. Such was the ancient regime.[2] That dualism produced a deep feeling of discontent. The nobleman, wishing to keep his privileges without any longer fulfilling the social obligations that were his corresponding duty, became unpopu-

[1] The ancient regime did not disappear everywhere at the same time. When it fell in France in 1789, it received its mortal blow in Austria at the hands of Joseph II. In Spain it persisted until 1810, and continued even longer in England.

[2] Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Old Regime and the Revolution*, p. 89.

lar. The peasant, having become a landowner, was proud of his advancement; but he still suffered from the taxation that reached him directly, and he complained at this. The spirit of autonomy and independence, which had found its lawful satisfaction and needful regulation in the medieval institutions, now began to grumble in a low tone. In France, one of the most traditional institutions, the Parliament, at times became a center of revolutionary agitation.

The religious condition of the ancient regime presented a like complexity. A period that gave a Bossuet to the Christian pulpit, a Petau, a Mabillon, and a Thomassin to Catholic scholarship, was in many respects a period of high attainment. Few epochs have presented greater religious problems and have produced greater genius for their solution. The whole question of the relations of Church and state were involved in the question of Gallicanism. The very foundations of dogma and morals were the subject of the Jansenist disputes. In the question of quietism Bossuet and Fénelon open up the most delicate notions of asceticism and mysticism. The whole method of preaching the gospel to the infidels was at stake in the conflict between the Jesuits and Dominicans. The entire rejuvenation of apologetics was Pascal's aim. In the internal crisis that undermined Protestantism, Leibnitz and Spener tried to go back to the very essence of Christianity. The defense of the basis of the supernatural order was the work of the apologists of the eighteenth century, against the deism of Voltaire and Rousseau. Whoever opens the memoirs and correspondence of the time will see that the religious question dominates almost every page.

Yet we must recognize that, in many instances, religion is a matter of formality rather than something spontaneous, more outward than deep, more a matter of prevailing fashion than of instinct. Furthermore, the ancient regime is traversed by schismatic, heretical, and irreligious currents, mostly springing from the Protestant heresy and destined to be appropriated

by the Freemasonry of the eighteenth century. The teaching of Jansen and St. Cyran is a sort of Protestantism when it preaches determinism and declaims so loudly against the corruption of the Church. Semi-Protestant, too, is parliamentary Gallicanism when it proclaims the absolute independence of the civil powers with regard to Rome and their right to intervene in purely ecclesiastical affairs. Semi-Protestant also is the quietism of Molinos and Madame Guyon, to the extent that it teaches man's direct relations with God and the futility of personal effort. Philosophism, affirming the absolute rights of the individual conscience, is nothing more than Protestant individualism without the Bible, pushed to its most extreme consequences.

The ancient regime, so majestic in its political structure and so venerable in the religious sentiments animating it, found itself penetrated little by little with antireligious and antisocial principles that would result in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

PART I

The Catholic Renaissance

CHAPTER I

The Papacy, 1600–55

The Jubilee

THE sixteenth century came to a close with magnificent ceremonies. The jubilee year 1600 brought to Rome more than three million pilgrims. The last years of the century had witnessed many outrages against the Roman Pontiff and a profound disturbance of European countries. The Catholics of the whole world felt the need of rallying more closely about the common father of the faithful and of publicly expressing their loyalty and submission to him.

This glorious spectacle did not prevent Clement VIII from clearly perceiving the reality of the situation. The Protestant heresy appeared to be implanted in the northern countries as a permanent growth. It was supreme in Germany from the Rhine to the Vistula, from the Main to the North Sea and the Baltic. In England, triumphant Protestantism prompted the enactment of Draconian laws in increasing number and severity against Catholics. It was preponderant in Scandinavia and the Netherlands. Of the thirteen cantons of Switzerland it had won at least six to its side. The countries that remained Catholic no longer formed that powerful unity, hierarchically organized about the pope and the emperor, such as the Middle Ages had known. Spain, politically established in northern and southern Italy, was there arousing more and more the susceptibilities of the independent states. The Republic of Venice, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Duchy of Savoy, aspired to acquire autonomy; the smaller states of Italy turned their po-

litical leanings in different directions according to the circumstances of the moment. Hungary, formerly the bulwark of Christian Europe, was weakened by the heretical sects, and disturbed by ceaseless incursions of the Turks.

Only two nations, France and Austria, seemed capable of taking in hand the cause of the Church. France was, indeed, sharply divided, its institutions were disorganized, the whole country was ruined by wars and dissensions, the causes of these disasters apparently to be perpetuated by the Edict of Nantes, which was excessively favorable to the Protestants. But Europe had learned to know the valiant and generous King of France, an able statesman as well as a fearless soldier; people could confidently expect that the privileges accorded by him to his former coreligionists would be only provisional and that the zeal of the new convert would more and more manifest itself in favor of the Catholic Church.

The Emperor of Austria was that Rudolf II whose intellectual preoccupations often distracted him from attention to political problems and whose impulsive character, alternately indolent and aroused, seemed poorly suited for energetic and persevering action. But he belonged to that powerful house of the Habsburgs whose two branches, the Spanish and the Austrian, were striving, by numerous intermarriages, to cement a sort of family pact between them. As Rudolf bore the title of Emperor and held this high imperial office, his most essential concern impelled him to become the champion of the Roman Church. If, of all the countries of Teutonic tongue, Germany was the one where the old religion was best defended, the reason for that condition must be sought only in the constitution of the Holy Roman Empire. The emperor could not keep his suzerainty over Italy, Lorraine, and the Netherlands, his position of primacy among Christian princes, at the same time that he posed as the head of a German Church, schismatic and heretical. By the very nature of the political institutions and in

spite of all the racial tendencies, the Protestant party in Germany at that time could be nothing else but an opposition party.

The hopes of the Church had until then rested on Germany and the house of Habsburg. But at the beginning of the seventeenth century the question might well arise, whether the direction of the papal policy was not about to change. The marked friendliness of Clement VIII for Henry after the latter's conversion, might indeed forecast an alliance with France, the dreaded rival of Austria and Spain. Such an eventuality was feared in the country south of the Pyrenees. Hence arose an opposition of Spaniards, that was a chief cause of anxiety for Catholics. Other causes of anxiety were disturbing the Christian world. The increasing favor which Clement VIII showed to his nephew, Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, stirred the papal court and the Roman nobility; the liveliness of the quarrel between the Thomists of the Order of St. Dominic and the Molinists of the Society of Jesus complicated the difficulties of the political situation with considerations of a more internal sort. With regard to Molina's book, two projects for its censure, drawn up in 1598 and 1600, agitated public opinion. The question arose whether a condemnation of Molinism would not lower the valiant Society of Jesus from the preponderant place it held in the Church.

In the period following the great jubilee festivities of 1600 more than one cloud darkened the horizon of the Church. Yet, by and large, the position was firmly established. The decrees of the Council of Trent and the measures taken by the reforming popes of the latter part of the sixteenth century had borne their fruit. The papacy was no longer that feeble and disputed power, making the head of the Church rely on his neighbors or on factions, with their opposing influences succeeding one another after bitter conflicts between them. Clement VIII had been the choice of all and continued the policy of the deceased Pope. This result was of considerable importance and was prolonged

under the following pontificates. The papacy was not alone in benefiting by this transformation. Individual jealousies and ambitions henceforth had to restrain themselves, and the Pope's entourage necessarily conformed to the new conditions of the government of the Church. Nepotism, that plague of the preceding ages, had undergone a notable change under the influence of Paul IV and Pius V: it had been feudal in nature, now it assumed a character of rank and finance. The new circumstances, unfavorable to that institution, soon led to its complete disappearance.[1]

Clement VIII (1592–1605)

The hard-working, austere, and devout Pontiff who occupied the chair of Peter at the beginning of the century possessed the qualities needed for maintaining the supreme authority in the eyes of princes and peoples. Clement VIII,[2] who was honored by being the friend of Philip Neri and who every day knelt at the feet of Father Baronius to make his confession, had not the might of intellect and will of Sixtus V, whose disciple he proudly boasted that he was. But he honestly purposed to follow the policy of the great Pope. His views were broad and lofty. His pontificate was not without analogy to that of Boniface VIII, who, at the outset of the fourteenth century, when the jurists of Philip the Fair were undermining the social structure of the Middle Ages, took in hand the defense of the institutions of Christendom. In 1600, at the very

[1] Nepotism disappeared completely only under Innocent XII, at the end of the seventeenth century. We meet the two favorite nephews again, one in the sacred college, the other in the civil administration. According to established usage, the cardinal nephew is ineligible for the papacy; but he has a notable influence in the election of the next pope. Cf. Ranke, *History of the Popes*, I, 367 (Bk. IV, chap. 6).

[2] Ippolito Aldobrandini, proclaimed pope on January 20, 1592, under the name of Clement VIII, was born in 1536 in the States of the Church, of an illustrious Florentine family. Sixtus V had made him a cardinal in 1585 and sent him as legate to Poland in 1586.

time when the greatest of the Spanish writers was penning, with friendly irony, the caricature of chivalry,[3] the chivalrous spirit of past times was haunting the court of Clement VIII.

The generous Pontiff made of this spirit the chief inspiration of his policy. The Ottoman Empire, perpetually at war with Hungary, ceaselessly disturbed by revolts in Asia, sapped by the corruption of the seraglio, seemed to be growing weaker and weaker. To rally the Christian nations about the head of the Church for a new crusade, was the project of Clement VIII. The King of France, to whom the conduct of the expedition was destined, declined participation in the undertaking.[4] But he did accept gladly the arbitration of the papacy in concluding the Treaty of Vervins which, in 1598, brought about a truce, if not an end, to the age-old conflict between France and Spain. Three years later, Clement VIII again intervened to reconcile the King of France and the Duke of Savoy by the Treaty of Lyons.[5] By these acts the Pope continued the traditions of the old papal right in international conflicts. The grateful Henry IV, as a Christian prince, sustained the rights of the Holy See and helped it to triumph over Caesar d'Este in the recovery of the Duchy of Ferrara, claimed by Clement VIII as an apostolic fief.

Would these services suffice to orientate the papal policy toward France? To do this would be to abandon Austria and Spain. Under Philip II the Spanish colossus had exercised a heavy pressure on Europe, backed by the power of gold, the supplies of which it held, and by the prestige of the Cross, which it tried to monopolize to its own advantage. At that time this

[3] Cervantes' novel, *Don Quixote,* appeared in 1605. It had considerable influence on the changing ideas of the time.

[4] Forty-two letters of Henry IV, found in the archives of Prince Doria, enable us to follow the policy of the King of France in this affair. After vague promises, he eluded the invitation of Clement VIII. Henry IV thought that an alliance with the sultan would better serve the interests of French commerce and of the Catholic missions in the Orient.

[5] Muratori, *Annali d'Italia,* XI, 1–3.

power seemed to be on the point of crushing all national independence everywhere and, with the fragments of Christendom subject to the pope, to remake a new Christendom dominated by the Habsburgs. The great empire that encompassed Rome and France by its kingdoms, its fiefs, its presidios, its allies, seemed likely to be the last bulwark of the Church against heresy. Chivalrous, but timid, Clement VIII hesitated to take part in the project.

An able diplomat, equally devoted to France and to the Church, Arnaud d'Ossat, led the Pope from his hesitation and prudently showed him the path to follow. In spite of what Sully says in his *Mémoires,* Henry IV did not then form the great design of reorganizing Europe in a vast Christian commonwealth where the three religions—Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist—would form a mighty federation against the barbarous Muscovite and the infidel Turk. The policy of the Bearnese King was too practical to indulge in those adventurous fancies; but it did merit studious attention. Arnaud d'Ossat wrote as follows: "Holy Father, the Pope and the court of Rome can do much good for the King of France. . . . The King of Spain, with all his power and his forces both by land and by sea, cannot harm you so much as this court can by sitting still. . . . The King of France ought to regard as certain that, as his affairs go in France, so will they go at Rome."

He who wrote these lines, who so clearly saw how artificial was the display of material forces by Spain and what fruitful reserve was to be found in the resources of his country, was the lowly son of a horseshoer, born in 1535 at the foot of the Pyrenees, of Gascon or Bearnese stock. The Church had made him a cardinal; and the King of France, an ambassador.[6] His

[6] What we call the diplomatic career did not then exist, at least in France. Something approaching it was to be found in the Republic of Venice and in the service of the king of Spain. A great lord would go to some court for a definite purpose, with a personal and temporary mission. In his suite he had some gentlemen for the sake of pomp, some personal servants, generally clerics to act as secretaries. Besides

wise and moderate counsel prevailed with Clement VIII and, without prompting a rupture of the Holy See with Austria and Spain, drew it as close as possible to France.

For a while the Supreme Pontiff hoped that England would give him the same consolations. When James I ascended the throne in 1603, the Pope sent him sincere greetings; and to the Queen, who he knew was secretly a Catholic, he sent a letter full of hope. But soon the Gunpowder Plot served as a pretext for the most shameful persecution and utterly destroyed the Pope's hopes.[7]

In the administration of his states and in the spiritual government of the Church, Clement VIII's activities had freer scope and could be more effective. Few pontiffs have been surrounded by cardinals as eminent as those of Clement VIII. At the side of D'Ossat, whose virtue was not less than his talent, the Pope introduced into the sacred college the illustrious Duperron, who had been converted from the Calvinist heresy to the Catholic faith by the reading of the Church Fathers and who by his persuasive eloquence had brought many Protestants to the Church; the scholarly Toletus, whose writings aroused the same admiration in Bossuet and in Richard Simon; Bellarmine, the master of controversy; Baronius, the Father of Church History. Aided by the counsel of these great men, Clement VIII accomplished important reforms: he established a new apportionment of taxes in the States of the Church, put the revenues of the communes under a special inspection, and made the barons submit to a strict justice. Attentive to the exact

---

these embassies would be found friendly agents acting as go-betweens. At Rome, where all the affairs of Christendom converged and criss-crossed, the semi-official agents were legion. . . . For France an age-old tradition was to maintain at Rome some Roman prelates who remained good and active Frenchmen. . . . For twenty-five years this tradition had no guardian more adroit than the Abbé d'Ossat" (E. M. de Vogué, "Le cardinal d'Ossat," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* May 1, 1895).

[7] "Fu creduto da molti, et anche da Papa Clemente VIII, che la religione cattolica avesse a montar sul Trono con questo Re. Si trovarono ben ingannati (Muratori, *Annali,* XI, 10).

observance of the canonical and liturgical rules, he published new editions of the Index, the Pontifical, the Ceremonial of Bishops, the breviary, and the Missal. By a bull of November 25, 1592, he instituted the Forty Hours' Adoration. He forbade the recitation, in the liturgical offices, of any other litanies but those of the saints and of Loreto, and decreed severe penalties against duelists. His solicitude extended particularly to the faithful of the Greek rite; in 1595 he graciously welcomed the delegates of the Ruthenian Church, who came to treat of their union with Rome; he required their adherence to the decrees of the Council of Florence and granted to the metropolitan the right to consecrate the bishops for the sees that would become vacant, but every newly elected metropolitan must ask confirmation of his election from Rome; a bull regulated in a general way the liturgical rules observed by the Greeks established in Italy.

For most of his reforms Clement VIII did not judge it advisable to submit the questions to the deliberations of the cardinalitial congregations that Sixtus V had wisely organized about the head of the Church. He was aware of the delays that such a method might encounter, and his entourage was not at all displeased with this practice; but as the Pope advanced in age, everybody noted that one of his nephews, Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, took a more and more preponderant place in the administration of the Church. His exceptional ability explained why the Pope let him assume so important a role. But the Roman nobility chafed at this. The Farnese family, that an old rivalry kept in opposition to the family of the Aldobrandini, became the center of an opposition movement which degenerated into revolt. *Cavalieri* and *nobili* flocked to the Farnese palace. Their common talk was that the Pope and the Church must be delivered from the captivity in which Cardinal Aldobrandini was holding them. Several members of the sacred college were won over to their side.

The Aldobrandini were known as having a leaning toward France; the Farnese openly favored the Spaniards. Some forces of Spanish troops, called by them, even appeared on the Neapolitan frontier, and the question arose whether the grievous factional strifes, that had embroiled the people of Rome in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, might not suddenly be renewed. Such an event would have been the ruin of the peaceful policy introduced by Clement VIII, who had up to then shown his friendliness for France without breaking with the Habsburgs. The sagacity of Cardinal Farnese and the ability of Cardinal Aldobrandini succeeded in preventing an outburst of violence. While Aldobrandini, taking advantage of the hatred for the Spanish which awoke so quickly in Italy at each interference by the foreigner, rallied the states of the peninsula in a formidable league under the protection of France, Cardinal Farnese prudently withdrew to his estates of Castro, where his foe let him find consolation for his defeat by the enthusiastic ovations of his friends.[8]

These incidents saddened the last days of Clement VIII. The death of Cardinal d'Ossat in the meantime (1604) was a particularly sad blow to the Pope. He thereupon fell ill. At the beginning of 1605 the fresh outbreak of the long theological quarrel, momentarily lulled, that divided the Dominicans and the Jesuits, gave him increased concern. He was petitioned to make a decision for or against the Molinists.[9] The Pope was attacked by intermittent fever, which suddenly grew more serious. He died on March 3, 1605, at the age of sixty-nine.[10]

[8] *Ibid.*, XI, 15.

[9] Clement VIII evidently leaned to the Thomist opinion. However, if we are to believe one of his close confidants, Cardinal Monopolio, his idea was never to condemn Molina, but to define certain doctrines of St. Augustine admitted by both parties. But he died without having made any decision. Cf. J. de la Servière, in art. "Clement VIII," Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*

[10] Muratori, *op. cit.*, XI, 16.

Leo XI (1605)

The sixty-two members of the sacred college entered into conclave on March 14, 1605. Among so many illustrious cardinals, to which one would the keys of Peter be entrusted? Their thoughts turned to Baronius and Bellarmine. Baronius had almost completed his monumental *Annales ecclesiastici.* Both his vast learning and the lofty virtues that have won for him the title of Venerable, seemed to designate him to the choice of his colleagues.[11] But Spain found fault with the impartial annalist for having taken a stand against the Spanish claims in Sicily and for having influenced the mind of Clement VIII toward France.[12] In a word, the court of Madrid formally opposed his election. All the controversies of the time had, for Bellarmine, been occasions for manifesting the depth of his learning and the activity of his zeal. But his attitude in the affair of the congregation *de Auxiliis,* and his intervention with Clement VIII to prevent a condemnation of Molinism had alienated from him the approval of several of his colleagues.[13] However, the illustrious Jesuit obtained ten votes in the first ballot. The scholarly Oratorian received twenty; the second ballot gave him thirty-seven. The two great men were quite above any personal ambition. Said Bellarmine: "If I could become Pope by merely lifting a straw from the ground, I would not stoop to pick it up." Baronius, who lacked only three votes for his election, persuaded his friends not to continue voting for him.

[11] Cf. G. Calenzio, *La vita e gli scritti del card. C. Baronio.*

[12] Baronius, Clement's confessor, made use of his influence to facilitate the reconciliation of Henry IV with the Church. This event brought about friendly relations between the Pope and the French King. The Spaniards blamed Baronius for this result.

[13] In Serry, *Hist. cong. de Auxiliis,* Bk. II, chap. 26, see the confidential letter in which Baronius endeavors to dissuade the Pope from making a decision on this complex question of the effects of grace. Cf. Le Bachelet in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* II, 567.

In a unanimous desire to assure peace to the Church, all the votes of the conclave were cast for Cardinal Alessandro de Medici, who took the name of Leo XI. This seventy-year-old man was unselfish, affable, joining to all the great qualities of his race those of a well-known austerity and unqualified uprightness. The Medici family which, in less than a century, had given empresses to Germany, two queens to France, wives to all the greatest princes of Europe, and four popes to the Roman Church, seemed likely to have the good will of all the nations. The news of his election was received in France with great joy. One historian reports that the King of France had bonfires lighted in Paris, the church bells rang, the churches resounded with hymns, and the cannons of the Arsenal were fired, publishing by these mouths of fire the part that this great prince took in the elevation of this great Pope.

But the universal joy was of short duration. When the Pope returned from the ceremony of taking possession of St. John Lateran, he suffered an attack of fever and took to bed. The sickness was aggravated by his advanced age and by the burden of the heavy responsibilities of his office. He died less than a month later (April 29, 1605). On his deathbed, when someone spoke to him about some temporal affairs, he said: "Permit me to be concerned solely with eternal matters." His elevation, consequent on the abnegation of two great men, and his admirable death, left the Christian world precious examples, the only fruit of his brief occupation of the chair of Peter.

Paul V (1605–21)

In the new conclave, which met on May 8, Baronius' influence was preponderant. He profited by it to turn the votes of his colleagues to the name of Bellarmine, who in turn refused to sanction his candidacy. Amid the lively disputes then divid-

ing men's minds, his being a Jesuit would probably have rendered his action difficult.

Then the attention of Cardinal Aldobrandini turned to Cardinal Camillo Borghese, whose works, though not rivalling the brilliance of those of Baronius and Bellarmine, were such as to win him everybody's esteem. He was fifty-five years old, but appeared not more than forty. His tall and majestic figure, his dignified bearing and fine features, all were prepossessing. His previously retired and quiet life had kept him outside any party intrigues. He was praised for "the blameless purity of his life, his love for things of religion, and the loftiness of his mind, which seemed to destine him to conceive and realize great things." [14] The French and the Spaniards welcomed his candidacy, presented by the cardinal nephew of Clement VIII, with as much favor as did the Germans and the Italians. Every indication gave reason to hope that he would continue the policy of Clement VIII. On the evening of May 16, 1605, he was unanimously elected and took the name of Paul V.

From the profession of lawyer, which he had at first practiced, Paul V had preserved the habit of judicial exactness, a deep respect for civil and canonical laws, and a pronounced taste for firm and exact regulations.

From the very first days of his pontificate, the new Pope's attention seemed to turn less to the Protestants, who were attacking the Church from without, than to the bad Christians who were compromising it from within. Camillo Borghese, in several judicial memoirs, had had occasion to manifest his zeal in defending the rights of the papacy and the clergy. The circumstances of his election increased this zeal. Chosen without any scheming and by the unanimous vote of his colleagues, he was accustomed throughout his life to regard his elevation to the pontificate as a direct call of Providence. He used to say

[14] Muratori, XI, 14.

that he was elected by God, not by men. "I have been elevated to this See," he said, "not by men, but by the divine Spirit, with the duty of preserving the immunities of the Church, the privileges of God: in my conscience I am bound to devote all my strength to free the Church from usurpation and violence; I prefer to expose my life rather than be obliged to be accountable some day for neglect of my duties, when I shall be called before the judgment seat of God." [15]

This sense of conscientious duty in the strict application of the laws appeared at the very outset of his pontificate.

As everywhere else at that time, so at Rome the laws punished with death the crime of lese majesty. But, shortly after Paul V's elevation, the papal police discovered that a certain Piccinardi, a native of Cremona, had composed a violent pamphlet attacking Pope Clement VIII. In this pamphlet the deceased Pontiff was compared to Emperor Tiberius. The writing, not yet issued for the public, circulated secretly and stirred the spirit of disorder and rebellion. Paul V was pitiless for this criminal insult to authority and made an example of the culprit: Piccinardi was beheaded on the Sant' Angelo Bridge.

People trembled in the Pope's entourage and elsewhere. Most serious infractions of discipline had become frequent. The wise prescriptions of the Council of Trent about residence were far from being observed by the upper clergy or even by the members of the sacred college. The severe sanctions promulgated in the first chapter of the twenty-third session against non-residents, whatever their dignity or privilege, remained as a threat suspended over the head of the delinquents. The council had declared every non-resident cleric to be guilty of mortal sin and subject to various penalties, which included the application of his revenues to the poor of the locality and even went so far as to prescribe removal from office.[16] Paul V, conscientious

[15] Cf. Ranke, II, 118 (Bk. VI, chap. 11).

[16] Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 165 f. [Tr.]

jurist that he was, could not forget these explicit texts or let them become a dead letter. The application of these provisions came promptly. On May 17, 1606, Cardinal Duperron wrote to Villeroy: "The Pope has just made known that his will is that all his cardinals who have bishoprics should return to them or resign them or send coadjutors to them." The Pope likewise recalled the canonical prescriptions forbidding Church revenues to be employed for personal use. On these two points he was unwilling to hear any excuse. Most of the cardinals who were in fault in the matter, returned to their residence; a few asked for a delay; others, so as not to leave Rome, resigned their benefices.

In that year 1606 the valiant Pontiff was requested to exercise his energy in three great external affairs: the strife against Venice, the persecution of Catholics in England, and the religious strife that would give rise in Germany to the Thirty Years' War.

War against Venice

Rich and proud Venice had often entered into conflict with the popes, and almost always as the champion of the rights of the state against the Church. Although excommunications were fulminated against it in 1483 by Sixtus VI and in 1509 by Julius II, it had never allowed the publication of the famous bull *In caena Domini* and, notwithstanding the protests of Clement VIII, had not feared to recognize Henry IV, still excommunicated, as King of France. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the proud republic seemed desirous of finding consolation for the decline of its commerce [17] and of its artistic glory,[18] by an increasing disdain toward the papacy. On January 10, 1603, the Venetian senate forbade the building

[17] This decline was made almost beyond recovery on account of the fire which destroyed its arsenal in 1569 and on account of the treaty it was obliged to make with the Turks in 1573.

[18] The last of these great painters, Il Tintoretto, died in 1594.

of churches, monasteries, and hospitals without its permission; two years later (March 26, 1605) it forbade the alienation of property possessed by laymen in favor of ecclesiastics. Shortly after this, the senate ordered the arrest of two ecclesiastics, Scipio Sarrasin, bishop of Vicenza, and Brandolino Valdemarino, abbot of Nerveze, and, in the face of explicit prescriptions of the canon law, recognized the jurisdiction of the secular courts to try them.[19] But the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, chap. 25) admonished "the emperor, kings, states, princes, and each and all, of whatever state or dignity they may be . . . that they should punish severely those who obstruct the liberty, immunity, and jurisdiction of the Church." [20] With the advice of Bellarmine and Baronius,[21] Paul V called upon the Republic of Venice, under threat of censure in case of refusal, to revoke the ordinances and to hand over the two accused men to the apostolic nuncio. When the senate replied that it held only from God the power of making laws, the Pope assembled a consistory, in which forty cardinals (out of forty-one), after hearing Baronius' report of the facts, declared that compromise could not be employed in this affair without betraying the rights of the Church.

The Pope's line of conduct was clearly marked. On April 17, 1606, Leonardo, the doge of Venice, and all the members of the senate were declared excommunicated, and the Republic was placed under interdict, unless within twenty-four days the Pope's demands should receive satisfaction. The doge replied by an injunction to all the priests, secular and regular, to continue the exercise of public worship under pain of exile. The secular clergy, more closely dependent on the civil authority, partly submitted; but the Capuchins, the Theatines, and the Jesuits refused en masse to obey the orders of the senate and were expelled.

[19] Muratori, XI, 14.

[20] Trent, Session XXV, chap. 20; Schroeder, *op. cit.*, p. 252. [Tr.]

[21] Muratori, XI, 20.

The affair came near assuming the proportions of a European conflict as well as a religious schism. When the Pope, after the example of Sixtus IV and Julius II, intended to resort to temporal arms and to levy troops, King James I of England and also the Dutch threatened to send a fleet to the help of Venice; the Gallicans of France took the side of the Republic; in their eyes the cause of Venice was the cause of the independence of civil states in the face of papal tyranny.

In Venice itself the cause found a formidable champion in the person of a Servite religious, Fra Paolo Sarpi, who placed the resources of his prodigiously fertile and active mind at the service of the proud Republic and its ideas of independence, of which it was the standard bearer. Bayle, Bossuet, and Voltaire, basing their judgment on dubious accounts reported by Daniel and by Burnet, regarded Sarpi as a Protestant and even as an atheist. This view, however, is not well founded. The fiery Servite was, indeed, a radical predestinationist, almost as fully as Calvin. But his ideas on this point of doctrine, as also his impassioned attacks on the Roman Curia, may be explained by his embittered character, which was taciturn with an inclination to fatalism. Moreover, he had that indomitable pride of Venetian patriotism which the decline of the Republic did but exasperate in most of his fellow Venetians and which in him seemed to reach the paroxysm of irritability.

Sarpi was born at Venice, August 14, 1552. His rare sharpness of mind and his prodigious memory brought him early success. Received with favor by Sixtus V, enjoying relations with Bellarmine, in correspondence with the greatest scholars of the time—Casaubon, Saumaise, Vossius, Bacon, Grotius—a close friend of Galileo, who called him his master and father, Fra Paolo Sarpi, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, seemed to possess an encyclopedic mind and a powerful initiative. If he did not discover the circulation of the blood thirty years before Harvey, as has been claimed, he certainly

corrected and surpassed Franciscus Vieta in algebra, preceded Gilbert in the study of the declination and variations of the magnetic needle, was ahead of Hunter in the study of the effects of air forced into the lungs in case of apparent death, the first to remark the choroid in the eyes of all animals. His knowledge of ancient and Oriental languages was no less marvelous; his theological learning won him the title of theologian from the Duke of Mantua and a chair of theology in that city.

Such was the man whom the Venetian senate, in 1606, appointed canonist and theologian of the Republic. He was a figure that matched any of the greatest agitators whom the Church has encountered in the course of the ages. His first act was the publication, in 1606, of a *Treatise on the Interdict* in which, with incisive clearness and energy, he strove to demonstrate the evil consequences of papal intervention in the affairs of his country. His popularity was at once immense, and his influence in the affairs of the state almost boundless. He negotiated an alliance with the young republic of Holland, issued numerous memoirs on all the current questions of politics, religion, and administration; and these labors did not hinder him from writing his *History of the Council of Trent,* with all the bitterness of his irritated soul, and with a bias of disparagement that is undeniable, but also with a talent that placed him in the first rank of the historians of Italy, directly after Machiavelli. His friend Dominis published it at London in 1619, to the great scandal of the Church. But by that time the Venetian conflict had happily come to an end, thanks to the intervention of King Henry IV of France.

This intervention was one of the most marvelous tactics of Henry IV's delicate and subtle policy. The Duke of Savoy secretly offered his services to the Venetians; the dukes of Urbino and of Modena inclined to their side; the King of Spain, feeling that most of the states would rally to the cause of Venice as to the common cause of the princes against the encroach-

ments of Rome, painfully evaded, promising to send help to the Pope and at the same time urging the Venetian senators to stand by their rights; Henry IV then offered to act as mediator in the affair. The Pope saw himself in the presence of an almost inextricable situation; and the Venetians could not mistrust the King of France, whose coming to the throne they had acclaimed. Both accepted the arbitration proposal. To the great vexation of Spain, which was not consulted, Cardinal de Joyeuse, Henry's plenipotentiary envoy, succeeded in having a settlement accepted. The senate turned over to the ecclesiastical authority the two imprisoned clerics and declared that it withdrew the manifesto which it had published against the censures. But it obstinately refused to extend the benefit of the amnesty to the Jesuits, whom it considered the instigators of the resistance. On April 30, 1607, the Pope raised the excommunication and the interdict pronounced against Venice.[22]

England

The affairs of England called for a firmer attitude on the part of Paul V. The question of the relations between the temporal and the spiritual was of such a sort that every ambiguity had to be removed at all costs.

From the origin of the schism, the English government had required from the Catholics the oath of supremacy, by which they acknowledged that the supreme authority, in things spiritual as well as temporal, belonged to the king alone.[23] After the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, King James I, wishing to condemn especially the opinion of the Catholics, who regarded his temporal authority as subordinate to that of the pope, had the Parliament adopt a newly worded oath.

[22] On Paul V's conflict with the Republic of Venice, see Muratori, XI, 19 ff.

[23] For the complete formula, see Suarez, *Defensio fidei,* Bk. VI, prooemium; Bellarmine, *Responsio ad Apologiam,* praeambul. Cf. Lingard, *History of England,* Vol. V, passim.

All Catholics or persons suspected of being so were to be obliged, on the demand of the local authorities, to declare not only, as many Catholics had professed under Elizabeth, that the king cannot be deposed by the pope, but further that any contrary doctrine is impious and heretical. The oath was worded in part as follows:

> I, A. B., do truly and sincerely acknowledge that our sovereign lord, King James, is lawful and rightful King. . . . And I do further swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated by the pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or by any other whatsoever. And I do believe that the pope has no power to absolve me from this oath. . . . Also I do swear that notwithstanding any sentence of excommunication or deprivation I will bear allegiance and true faith to His Majesty.

At this juncture the Catholics of England, previously united, now were divided with regard to the lawfulness of taking the new oath of allegiance. Some, regarding the oath as simply a reproduction, in equivocal terms, of the oath of supremacy, condemned it; others, regarding it merely as a promise of obedience purely civil and as the condemnation of a dubious doctrine, maintained they could take the oath without scruple. By a brief (September 22, 1606), Paul V condemned the oath of allegiance as containing several things contrary to the faith and to salvation. This condemnation dismayed many of the faithful, because the penalties to be imposed on those who refused to take the oath were terrible: imprisonment for life and confiscation of property. The archpriest George Blackwell, a fearful old man, could not believe that the Pope's brief was authentic; in any event, he thought, it appeared to have been drawn up on the basis of a false report of the facts and certainly contained nothing more than a counsel. For these reasons Blackwell refused to promulgate the papal document. When Paul V received this news, he repeated his condemna-

tion in a second brief (September 22, 1607). Before this second letter reached England, the archpriest had submitted to the royal order. But in general the faithful adhered to the papal brief and many of them suffered persecution for refusing to take the condemned oath.

Germany

At the very time when the King of England was rekindling the persecution against the Catholics, the Pope's attention was drawn to Germany. On April 11, 1606, at Donauwörth, a mixed imperial city, where the Catholics had organized a procession, the Protestants were stirred up, dispersed the procession, and pillaged the church. Apparently the deed was not a matter of great importance; but it revealed to the eyes of prudent statesmen an ominous state of tension which could not be ignored. The crisis was both religious and political. Whereas the idea of the Empire seemed to many minds the sole means of safeguarding German hegemony, the oligarchy of princes was a fact that more and more obtruded itself. The Protestant princes, enriched by the spoils of Church property, clung to their autonomy more than ever; and the Catholic princes, several of whom had by vigorous efforts recovered religious unity in their domains, were unwilling to efface themselves before a master. The jurists now pleaded in their behalf; Sleidanus' book, *De statu religionis et reipublicae,* became their manual of civil law. Conflicts of a religious nature aggravated the situation. The clause of the Ecclesiastical Reservation, which was stipulated at the peace of Augsburg, by virtue of which every holder of a benefice passing over to the Lutheran religion must abandon his possessions, was repeatedly violated by the Protestants.[24] The irritation was especially extreme among the Calvinists. They were already numerous in Germany, and experienced all

[24] Cf. Alzog, *Church History,* III, 447.

the hardships of the treaties without benefiting by any advantage; for all the favorable clauses had been issued in favor of the Lutherans. In them the hatred for the Empire was united to hatred for the Catholic Church. The agitation that continually increased from 1550 to 1605 was principally their work.

Emperor Rudolf was not unaware of the gravity of the danger and decided upon an energetic repression. After putting the city of Donauwörth under the ban of the Empire, he entrusted the execution of the sentence to Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. This prince, with a vigorous and penetrating mind, was an excellent administrator and tireless warrior, full of grandiose political schemes.[25] He was the very person to take in hand the direction of the Catholic forces in Germany. At his side Archduke Ferdinand, whose unconquerable strength of soul was founded on a deep faith, the aged Bishop of Würzburg, who had made the first attempt of counterreformation, and the prince elector of Mainz, whose influence was considerable throughout the Empire, were the chiefs of a group that the political events had spontaneously formed and that seemed ready to take up the defense of the Church against the undertakings of the Protestants.

All Europe, as evidenced by the diplomatic documents of this period, sensed the approaching outbreak of a great conflict. The seizing of Donauwörth by Maximilian was soon followed by the formation at Alhausen (1608) of the Protestant Union, which rallied the Protestant princes under the direction of the elector Palatine Frederick. This serious prince, somewhat melancholy and proud, but filled with lofty thoughts, possessed enough self-control to be on guard against the lax habits of life then common among the German nobles.[26] The Catholic princes replied by the formation (1609) of the League of

[25] Ranke, II, 213.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

Würzburg, with Maximilian of Bavaria at its head. War was imminent. The assassination of Henry IV, on whom the Emperor's enemies counted for support, disconcerted them. But help soon came to them from Bohemia and revived their courage.

Protestantism, having found in Bohemia the support of the Utraquists, made notable progress there. From Maximilian II it obtained freedom of worship and from Rudolf II (1606) a "Letter of Majesty," or Royal Charter, granting to all the nobility, knighthood, and royal cities that had embraced the Reform, the same rights as to the Catholics. An imperial rescript conceded to them authorization to erect Protestant churches on a Catholic soil. These concessions resulted merely in making the Czechs prouder and more presumptuous. The political state of Bohemia likewise favored the spirit of anarchy; a feudal oligarchy, as harsh to its inferiors as it was arrogant toward the head of the Empire, had reduced the peasants to serfdom: irritation was widespread and cohesion nowhere. In 1617 and 1618 the vassals of the Archbishop of Prague, at Hrob (Klostergrab), and the people of the city of Broumov (Braunau), despite the opposition of their lords, having built temples, the Emperor ordered them to be closed, as the imperial privilege applied only to the lords and not to their vassals. The Czech Protestants protested, appealing to the regulations of their old national public law, which, they said, regarded ecclesiastical property as national domains. Rudolf's reply was threatening. Thereupon the death of the two governors of the city of Prague, Martinitz and Slavata, to whom the Emperor's reply was imputed, was decided on. On May 23, 1618, some conspirators, meeting them in the old Hradschin castle, which raises its threatening silhouette on the left bank of the Moldau, hurled them out of the windows from a height of eighty feet. This incident is usually referred to as The Defenestration of Prague. **The Thirty Years' War had begun.**

Emperor Matthias, a weak and incapable ruler, died March 20, 1619, and Ferdinand, Duke of Styria, became emperor, taking the name of Ferdinand II. This change accentuated the religious nature of this war. When nineteen years old, Ferdinand, a devout Catholic, had promised, at the feet of Our Lady of Loreto, that he would ever be the champion of Catholicism against heresy.[27] Already he had banished the heretics from his duchy. The Evangelical Union came out against the new Emperor, and the Catholic forces gradually rallied about Ferdinand. Philip III sent him assistance in men and money; King John Sigismund III of Poland placed at his disposal several thousand cossacks. Pope Paul V was asked to intervene, but he did nothing more than make vague promises.[28]

The rebellious Bohemians were not united and were ill served by an army of serfs that marched without enthusiasm under the leadership of their lords. On November 8, 1620, they were crushed at the battle of the White Hill. Paul V had the time to thank God for these first successes. But during the procession that took place to celebrate the victory of the Catholics, the Pope suffered a stroke of apoplexy. Thus began the illness which in a short time carried him off.

Paul V's Reform Efforts

International political events did not wholly occupy the thought and zeal of this Pontiff. The historian Bzovius, a contemporary and the continuer of Platina, who wrote shortly after the Pope's death, has left us an account of his important reforms.

In spite of the great efforts of Sixtus V, security left much to be desired in the city of Rome and in the Roman Campagna. This condition resulted from the instability of the population,

[27] Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II und seiner Eltern,* II, 229; III, 436.
[28] Gindely, *History of the Thirty Years' War,* I, 193.

that gravitated almost entirely about the great families and followed their fortune. A multitude of hired men, clients, vagabonds, condottieri, and *bravi* were perpetually going and coming and thus constituted a ceaseless danger. Paul V endeavored to relieve the most urgent evil conditions and especially to establish the families on the soil. He built public granaries, granted special privileges to farm laborers as being foster fathers of the land, and made provision for the safety of citizens by the exercise of strict justice in dealing with murderers and highway robbers, who trembled and took to flight at the very mention of the name of Paul, as owls hide from the light of the sun. Paul V, wishing to apply the remedy to the root of the evil, strove particularly to promote the catechetical instruction of the faithful.[29] Thinking that the example of ecclesiastics would be the most effective sermon, he watched over the observance of the regulations issued by the Council of Trent about the life of clerics; he gave precise instructions to the clergy of Rome,[30] and chose bishops among the most exemplary religious.[31] By canonizing St. Charles Borromeo and beatifying Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Philip Neri, and Theresa, he proposed for the worship and imitation of the faithful the most admirable examples of holiness.

Paul V was also a patron of learning and the arts. He enriched the Vatican Library with many volumes, decreed that in all religious orders there should be established chairs of Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, and in each university a chair of Arabic. As we read in a contemporary account, "this great Pope has leveled small hills throughout the city, opened broad views wherever there were winding streets, opened big public squares, which have been made more magnificent by new buildings erected around them. The chapels he built had the air of basili-

[29] Bzovius, *Paulus Quintus,* chap. 24, p. 31.
[30] *Ibid.,* chap. 22, p. 29.
[31] *Ibid.,* chap. 21.

cas, the basilicas were like temples, and the temples resembled mountains of marble." [32]

But none of the works of art executed under his inspiration aroused more enthusiasm among his contemporaries than the completion of St. Peter's basilica. Paul V, who was fond of imposing splendor, was not altogether pleased that the Vatican basilica should not have the form of a Latin cross and should not have the length of the earlier basilica. But such a change would depart from the harmony planned by Bramante and by Michelangelo. The architect Carlo Maderna assumed this formidable task. The proportions of the edifice were excessively increased. An enormous façade, which was like a triumphal arch and also like a palace wall, hid the superbly soaring cupola and destroyed the charming reminders of the Middle Ages which the first artists wished to preserve. But, all in all, the temple gave the impression of colossal greatness, and Paul V was able proudly to write his name, in gigantic letters, on the front of the great temple of Christendom; the work on which the thought and effort of the Renaissance were concentrated, was achieved.[33]

A passion for splendor was the weakness of this great Pope. Unfortunately he did not limit himself to the lavish bestowal of this magnificence to the churches and monuments of the city; he loaded the residences of his nephews with them: precious stones, costly furniture, magnificent coaches, rich plate, were amassed in the villa Borghese and villa Rospigliosi, built by his nephew, the ostentatious Scipio.[34] Thanks to the Pope's favors, the Borghese family became the richest and most powerful family of Rome. Paul V died suddenly on January 28, 1621. He had time to recommend himself to God and, with sentiments of fervent piety, he ended a pontificate which, notwithstanding some

[32] *Vita Pauli V compendiose scripta,* manuscript in the Barberini library; cf. Ranke, II, 380.

[33] Eugène Pératé, *Le Vatican, les papes et la civilisation,* p. 616.

[34] Ranke, II, 338.

blemishes, was truly glorious for the Church and for civilization.

Gregory XV (1621–23)

In the conclave following Paul V's death, the choice of the sacred college, after inclining to Cardinal Bellarmine, who once more declined the papal office, and then to Cardinal Frederick Borromeo, who likewise declined the honor of the tiara, was fixed on Cardinal Alessandro Ludovisi, archbishop of Bologna, former papal nuncio in Savoy, who took the name of Gregory XV (February 9, 1621). He was a sickly old man, of puny appearance, pale face, lackluster eyes. But he excelled in the study of law; his nunciature in Switzerland had revealed his prudence and skill. Introduced to state affairs by the late Pope and enjoying bonds of friendship with the Borghesi, he was prepared to continue the external policy of Paul V, which consisted in favoring the Catholic program of Austria without giving offense to France. Being much attached to the religious orders and in particular to the Society of Jesus, which had educated him, he might be expected to make use of this new power of regeneration in the government of the Church. Moreover, it was known that he would have at his side a twenty-five-year-old young man, his nephew Ludovico Ludovisi, who, even according to the admission of his enemies, had remarkable talent for the management of affairs. He was one of those active and shrewd spirits that can always find an expedient in the most complex difficulties; he also possessed that calm courage which advances over obstacles, as soon as the probability of their being overcome has been foreseen. It was thought that the nephew's activity would supply for the uncle's weakness, and that the old man's wisdom would check the imprudences of the young man.

If such were the calculations of the members of the conclave when they abandoned the candidature of a Bellarmine and of

a Frederick Borromeo, to elect the aged Archbishop of Bologna, the event fully justified them. The first concern of the new Pope was to profit by the situation which had just come to the Church through the victory of the Catholics at White Hill. One of the first instructions issued by him says that he intends to apply all his thoughts to drawing the greatest possible advantage from this fortunate change and from the recent victory. The occasion for realizing this project soon came to him. Ferdinand II had promised to confer the Palatinate on Duke Maximilian of Bavaria in case of the success of the campaign they had undertaken. Now, from the Catholic point of view, the realization of that promise possessed a capital importance. The situation of Germany was such that the Catholic votes and the Protestant votes balanced each other in the council of the prince electors. With the Palatinate falling to the Duke of Bavaria, the majority of votes would be with the Catholics. But certain difficulties had to be overcome: to persuade the King of Spain to keep his promise, to forestall the opposition of the European rulers, to lead the Emperor to guarantee this important transfer by his supreme authority. Long negotiations, in which the Roman court was admirably served by an able Capuchin, Father Hyacinth, finally (February 25, 1623) conferred the electorate of the Palatinate on Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, but by way of a purely personal title, with the rights of the natural heirs of the Palatinate reserved for the future. The old Pope, upon receiving this news, joyously exclaimed: "The daughter of Sion can now shake from her head the ashes of mourning and put on her festal garments." [35]

[35] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 237 (Bk. VII, chap. 4). One of the Emperor's first acts was to order the Protestants, by a decree dated March 26, 1627, to embrace the Catholic faith or to move out of the country within four weeks. "These measures are not in accord with the political principles followed in our time, but they were in conformity with those admitted everywhere in the seventeenth century. If we consider that religious doctrine was, for the vast majority of men, the sole principle of morality and law, and that a single change in doctrine produced a change in the civil and political life, we can hardly deny that the governments of that time had a right to

But, while the title of Defender of the Church was being consolidated on the head of the Emperor, care must be taken not to abandon the relations of good understanding with France. King Louis XIII had sent to the Pope a request to have the see of Paris made a metropolitan see. That diocese of Paris which, it was said, ever since its first bishop, St. Denis, had been governed by 107 bishops, nine of whom received the purple and seven were venerated as saints, that venerable chapter, which had seen six of its members mount the throne of St. Peter,[36] surely deserved the honors attached to the archiepiscopal title. Gregory XV conceded the justice of this request and placed under the metropolitan of Paris the sees of Orléans, Meaux, and Chartres.

On September 5 of that same year he gave a new pledge of benevolence to the court of France by raising to the cardinalate the almoner of Marie de Medici, Armand de Richelieu, a young prelate barely thirty-six years old, who would soon become the master of the affairs of France and almost the arbiter of the affairs of Europe.

More important events served to draw the papacy and the kingdom of France closer together. Sultan Osman II perished tragically on May 20, 1622, assassinated by his janissaries at the Seven Tours Castle, and the reign of Mustafa I began as a time of frightful anarchy. Gregory, who had started negotiations with Osman with a view to obtaining the protection of the Catholic missions in Barbary, feared that he would see the results of all his efforts engulfed in the revolution. But the diplomatic relations between the Porte and France were at that time very satisfactory. Since the time of Francis I, the kings

---

exercise constraint in this matter" (Charvériat, *Histoire de la Guerre de Trente ans*, p. 502).

[36] In a bull of December 18, 1296, Boniface VIII declares that he had received the office of canon in the Church of Paris. The Paris necrology mentions, as having belonged to the Paris chapter, five other popes: Gregory IX, Adrian V, Innocent VI, Gregory XI, and Clement VII.

of France, perhaps to soothe their conscience for that entente with Islam for which they had often been blamed by Rome, employed for the protection of Christendom the alliance that seemed to repudiate it. Since 1535, by conventions which the Ottoman pride was pleased to call the "capitulations" of France, but by which it was Islam that capitulated, the French influence became solidly established in the Orient. The Pope did not hesitate to have recourse to it. Reminding the son of Henry IV that recently, in the regencies of Barbary, notably at Algiers, certain protégés of the King of France owed their safety only to the intervention of religious sent by Paul V, he asked Louis XIII to render to the Holy See favor for favor. The disturbances that embroiled with bloodshed the reign of Sultan Murad IV (1623–40) did not allow the intervention of the King of France to produce all the desirable results, but the closer accord between France and the Holy See was acquired.

To serve the cause of the Church by opposing the hegemony of the house of Austria was the aim of the French policy.[37] To identify the Catholic interests with its own interests seemed to be the ambition of the house of Habsburg. The two rival claims clashed in Italy in the Milanese valley. In 1621 the Catholics of Valtellina, conquered by the Protestant Grisons and persecuted in the exercise of their faith, had risen up with violence against their oppressors, paying them massacre for massacre, blood for blood. But Valtellina, freed from the Grisons, fell back under the Spanish domination. This was the restoration of the terrible strategic line that permitted the Habsburgs to establish communication between their Austrian possessions and the Spanish possessions in Italy. France had good reason to fear. The Treaty of Madrid, signed by Philip III and Bassompierre (April 15, 1621), restoring Valtellina to the Grisons

[37] According to Richelieu, to let the power of the house of Austria develop, would be "to put chains on Christianity, to make the pope a chaplain of the Habsburgs." Cf. Richelieu, *Mémoires,* II, 17, 66, 129, 183.

while requiring of the latter certain guaranties and conditions hard to enforce, did not solve the difficulty. It then appeared that no one but Gregory XV could solve the conflict by arbitration. The Pope, considering that the peace of the world depended on his intervention, accepted the proposal made to him. Everything was ripe for a final arrangement, with the independence of Valtellina as a basis, when Gregory's death broke off the parleys.[38]

The Pope's Reform Efforts

Diplomatic negotiations did not form the most important work of the short and fruitful pontificate of Gregory XV. His constitution (November 15, 1621) on the election of the pope, another (June 22, 1622) on the Congregation of Propaganda and the various measures it takes to revive the piety of Christian souls, make his reign one of the most significant stages in the life of the Church.

We know how the long efforts of the popes to free the Roman Church from imperial domination led, in the middle of the eleventh century, to Nicholas II's regulation, reserving the initiative in the election of the pope to the seven cardinal bishops. The voting, properly so called, was reserved to the cardinal clerics. But the regulation still required the consent of the clergy and of the people and even the approval of the emperor, to whom the Holy See conceded this right. At the end of the twelfth century, the Third Council of the Lateran took a further step by suppressing the intervention of the clergy, of the people, and of the emperor, and by declaring, as requisite and sufficient for a papal election, a two-thirds vote of the cardinals. The unhappy attempts to impose certain compromises on the popes of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, had shown the need of a still stricter electoral legislation and one

[38] Ranke, II, 262 (Bk. VII, chap. 3).

more precise. Gregory XV, who from his juridical habits was familiar with these questions, thought the moment had come to promulgate this legislation.

His bull (November 15, 1621), which is still in force in its general dispositions, clearly distinguishes between three modes of papal election: election by quasi-inspiration, adoration, or acclamation; election by compromise; and election by ballot and *accessus*.

The election by acclamation takes place when the cardinals, as though under the impulse of a supernatural inspiration, name the pope spontaneously. Thus St. Gregory VII was named at the end of the eleventh century. Gregory XV sanctions this mode, but at the same time confines it to rigorous conditions. Thus any previous agreement would render the election null, and the acclamation must be made with absolute unanimity of the votes; a single opposition would invalidate it. The election by compromise takes place when the cardinals, to end insurmountable difficulties, agree to refer it to the decision of one or more of their number. Several popes—Clement IV, Gregory X, Clement V, and John XXII—had been elected by compromise. Gregory XV regulated that, for the method of compromise to be valid, all the cardinals must consent to it: the veto of a single one would render the election null. The nomination by ballot and by *accessus* is the most ordinary. Two-thirds of the votes, plus one, of the members present is required for validity. The elector must write on his ballot his own name and that of the cardinal for whom he is voting; before depositing the ballot in the chalice destined for this purpose, he must swear that he had designated only him who has seemed to him the best. The cardinal who does not observe these laws will be excommunicated. The *accessus* takes place when, if the first ballot fails to give any candidate the two-thirds vote, they will proceed to a second, by which the electors can rally to one of the candidates for whom they did not vote at first, and thus

complete the necessary number of votes. The particular rules of the *accessus* differ but little from those of the first ballot, the ballot strictly so called. A constitution (March 22, 1622) determined more precisely the details of the ceremonial to be observed.

The great development of the foreign missions required an organization and a centralization of their labors. Pope Gregory XIII had already ordered that a congregation of cardinals be charged with the general direction of the missions of the Orient. But this institution was neither firmly established nor provided with funds sufficient for its task. Apostolic souls were distressed. A Capuchin, Girolamo da Narni, voiced their sentiments. His fiery eloquence, his tone of conviction, won for him not only general popularity, but also the favor of Cardinal Ludovisi, the Pope's nephew, and of Cardinal Bellarmine. Gregory XV, enlightened and supported by the advice of these three ecclesiastics, decided to enlarge and consolidate the institution of Gregory XIII. His constitution (June 22, 1622) established a congregation *De propaganda fide,* composed of eighteen cardinals and several prelates, to whom he assigned the duty of directing the Catholic missions in all parts of the world. This congregation should meet at least once a month in the presence of the Pope. Gregory allotted to it the necessary funds; Cardinal Ludovisi came to its aid with his own resources, and Christian charity, stirred by Girolamo's preaching, was generous toward this new institution, which, soon encouraged and developed by Urban VIII, thereafter continued to prosper.

By various acts and measures, the holy Pontiff strove to reanimate piety in men's souls. His own example was an edification. This feeble old man, who suffered extreme pain from a disease of the liver, but did not relinquish the duties of his office and his exercise of piety, offered his entourage an example of Christian patience. His approval and encouragement of sev-

eral religious congregations, such as the Clerks Regular of the Pious Schools, founded by Joseph Calasanctius, that of the Pious Missioners, instituted by Carlo Caraffa, and the Benedictine congregation of St. Maur, extended afar the effects of his zeal. But his deep faith made him seek especially the help of the saints. Having been educated by the fathers of the Society of Jesus, he found a particular joy in raising to the altars St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis Xavier, "those two great saints," as the bull says, "that God raised up at the moment when new worlds, peopled with infidels, had just been discovered, and when heresy was ravaging the Old World, to labor for the conversion of the heretics and pagans." He also canonized St. Isidore the Laborer, St. Philip Neri, and St. Theresa; and the veneration of these saints, who would be reckoned among the greatest of the Church, exercised an effective influence on the renewal of apostolic zeal which marked the beginning of the seventeenth century. The extension to the Universal Church of the feast of St. Bruno, glorious patron of the contemplative life, seemed to crown his efforts by giving the Church new patrons.

But the pious Pontiff did more than that. To him the Christian world owes the remarkable devotions which took place at that epoch to St. Anne, St. Joseph, and the Blessed Virgin. Doubtless he thought that, after the painful troubles that had torn the Church, nothing could be more beneficial for the great Christian family than to turn its eyes to those calm and grave figures that had watched over the cradle of Christianity. St. Anne was venerated in several individual Churches; Gregory wished that henceforth this veneration should extend to the whole world. In Spain, the Netherlands, and Hungary, the piety of the faithful had spread the veneration of St. Joseph, who was invoked under the title of Preserver of Peace;[39] Gregory fixed his feast on March 19 for the universal Church. At this

[39] Bollandists, March, III, 9.

same time a great movement of devotion led the faithful to affirm more than ever the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin. The discussions of the theologians on this point were more and more overwhelmed by the acclamations of popular piety. "Every time a preacher, led on by sentitments contrary to the common opinion, so far forgot himself as to oppose or rail at the doctrine of the immaculate conception, his hearers rose up against him. The indignation was so manifest that the fact, carried to Rome, provoked the intervention and the censure of the Pope." [40] Gregory XV, renewing and amplifying a decree of Paul V, declared in a decree of May 24, 1622, not only a prohibition of public denials and discussions of the common belief, but even forbade that the doctrine should be called into question in private gatherings. "Was this not a recognition, though not explicit, of the mystery, proclaimed 230 years before the definition?" [41]

The winter of 1622–23 had increased the fatigues of the pious Pontiff. From now on his illness was continual. On July 7, 1623, being unable to celebrate the holy Sacrifice, he had two Masses said in his presence, and received extreme unction. The next day, realizing the imminence of the danger, he said to his cardinals: "I am leaving with one consolation: you will have no difficulty in choosing among you someone more worthy and more capable than I am; he will have some errors to correct in the administration of the Christian commonwealth."

Urban VIII (1623–44)

The one whom they elected was Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, who took the name of Urban VIII.

Descended from one of the most ancient and celebrated families of Florence, he had been educated, like Gregory XV, by

[40] Dubosc de Pesquidoux, *L'Immaculée Conception, histoire d'un dogme*, I, 435.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 437.

the Jesuits, was early distinguished as a literateur and poet by the publication of several highly esteemed literary works,[42] and, under Clement VIII, Paul V, and Gregory XV, mounted through all the grades of the Roman Curia. His zeal for the repression of abuses was well known, and no one was surprised to see him, at the outset of his pontificate, put his hand courageously to the work of reform. With much energy he repressed the public veneration which the citizens of Venice paid to the memory of Fra Paolo Sarpi, regulated the conditions of stability of religious in their respective orders, and published a decree regulating the canonical visitations to be made in all the churches, monasteries, and chapels of the city of Rome, for the correction of the abuses which time and human weakness had allowed to creep in. He remarked that, if it is urgent to cure the ills of the Christian commonwealth wherever they are found, he must think first of all of the ills of the city of Rome. He approved the Order of the Visitation, canonized Aloysius Gonzaga, beatified Francis Borgia, Cajetan of Thiene, Felix of Cantalice, and Andrew Avellino.

But soon some striking differences were remarked between him and his predecessors. Whereas ordinarily Clement VIII used to read the books of St. Bernard, and Paul V and Gregory XV were occupied in the study of the canonists and lawyers, on the desk of Urban VIII were seen studies of fortification. This contrast was not the only one. In the conflict that was involving all Europe, Clement VIII, Paul V, and Gregory XV turned readily to the king of Spain and to the emperor; Urban VIII, who under Clement VIII and Paul V, during two nunciatures that he filled at the court of France, had, so it was said, won the favor of Henry IV, seemed to incline rather toward "the Most Christian King." Lastly with Clement VIII,

[42] Urban VIII's Latin poems were printed at Paris in 1642 under the title, *Maffei Barberini poemata*. His Italian poems appeared at Rome in 1640. In both cases, the poems generally have religious subjects.

Paul V, and Gregory XV, concern over the spiritual reform and with the struggle against Protestantism took the first place; Urban VIII, coming to power in the midst of the Thirty Years' War, at a time when the religious questions were closely mingled with political questions of supreme interest, judged that the Holy See ought especially to take a stand in this turmoil of peoples, or at least to fortify itself against the danger of a formidable blow. So, even while he was publishing bulls to approve religious orders and to canonize saints, he strengthened the frontiers of his states with fortresses. He said: "My predecessors erected monuments of marble; I am going to build monuments of iron." An arms factory was established at Tivoli; the grounds adjoining the Vatican Library were set aside for the construction of an arsenal; at Rome, the Castle Sant' Angelo was fortified, provided with munitions of war and with food, as though the enemy were at the city gates; on the frontiers of the district of Bologna a new fort rose up, which was named Fort Urban; extensive works were started at Civitavecchia, the free port of the Papal States.

The Valtellina affair obliged Urban VIII to decide upon a definite political orientation. At first he was hesitant. He was alarmed at the demand of the Spaniards, that Valtellina be made a strategic road of communication with the Austrians; but his faith was grieved at seeing the Catholic people of Valtellina under the rule of the Protestant Grisons. This latter consideration decided him. When the court of France asked him to evacuate the forts which the papal troops were occupying in that district since Gregory XV, he refused; the Marquis of Bagni, commanding officer of the forces of the Holy See, yielded only to force, at the time when the Marquis of Cœuvres invaded Valtellina (January, 1625) in the name of Louis XIII. Gregory XV, however, did not favor the Austrian policy. In that same year 1625 Cardinal Borgia, in the name of the King of Spain, complained of the rigidity of the Pope, from whom,

he said, no concession could be obtained in the Valtellina affair.[43] Following these events, long negotiations which the Pope entered upon with the court of Paris seem to have contributed at last to determine his attitude.

In these parleys, Urban VIII found himself confronted by Cardinal Richelieu.

At that time three great ministers seemed to hold in their hands the destinies of Europe: Buckingham in England, Olivares in Spain, and Richelieu in France. The incapacity of the first and the early disgrace of the second soon left Louis XIII's minister alone dominating the field. Although at that time the expansive force of the religious element was on the downward path and although the world was more and more given over to the domination of purely political considerations,[44] nobody better represented this new tendency than Cardinal Richelieu. No one can deny the importance of the services rendered by this great statesman: partly to his intelligent and energetic patronage France owes the movement of religious renaissance and literary revival which marked the first half of the seventeenth century. Notwithstanding whatever his enemies have said, his private life was irreproachable and his Catholic faith was sincere.

His program of government deserves unreserved approval, as he set it forth to the King upon assuming power: to ruin the Huguenot party, to humble the pride of the great, and to enhance the name of France among the nations. If the desire to oppose the house of Habsburg dominated his foreign policy too exclusively, that was undoubtedly because, along with Father Joseph, his confidant, he judged that, since "France was the only one able to successfully lead the crusade against the infidels and the heretics, the defeat of the house of Austria would promote the cause of Catholicism. But, in fact, the Car-

[43] Ranke, II, 293 (Bk. VII, chap. 4).
[44] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 319.

dinal's plan led him to political procedures which morality does not approve, to political combinations from which the Protestant party issued powerfully strengthened. Richelieu used to say that "the future is more to be considered than the present"; but the truth is that his policy sacrificed the future to concern for present greatness and prosperity. We may rightly think that both the greatness of France and the triumph of Catholicism would have been assured by carrying out the plan which Cardinal de Berulle proposed to him: to maintain the house of Austria within limits by a league of the Catholic states and to mistrust the Protestants whether within France or outside.

The protestations of orthodoxy by Richelieu, who then openly showed his opposition to the doctrines of Richer, may have been intended to remove the last scruples of the Pope. At any rate, from 1625 onward we see Urban VIII progressively involved in the Cardinal's policy. In 1625 he favored the marriage of Henrietta of France, sister of Louis XIII, to the King of England, Charles I, thus bringing about the rupture of a projected marriage of this prince with the infanta of Spain. He rejoiced to see at Mantua, by the marriage of the young princess to the Duke of Nevers, a prince independent of the house of Austria. Dreading the extension of the Austro-Spanish influence in Italy, he urged France to war. He wrote: "Let the King send an armed force into war without waiting for the taking of La Rochelle; the siege of this bulwark of the Huguenots is not more agreeable to God than an intervention in the Mantua affair." [45] Apparently, in the circumstances, he was not able to join more clearly in Richelieu's policy. Such was Urban's attitude throughout the Thirty Years' War. The leaders of the Catholic army complained of it bitterly. A final act of the Pope exasperated them.

In the time of Gregory XV (March 5, 1621) Emperor Ferdinand II published an Edict of Restitution, by virtue of which

[45] Siri, *Mémoire,* VI, 478; cf. Ranke, II, 295.

the Protestants were obliged to restore all Church property taken by them from the Catholics since the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555); Pope Urban refused to take a hand in executing the edict. This measure, which involved a third of the Protestant possessions, seemed to him imprudent and likely to lead to terrible reprisals.[46] The irritation of the allied Catholics was at its height. General Wallenstein spoke of undertaking an expedition against Rome. On their side, the Protestants appealed to the ambitious King of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus. We know how that terrible monarch, landing the next year (1630) in Pomerania with a force of 40,000 men, rallied about him all the Protestant rulers, saw everything yield to his might, and, taking under his particular protection the Protestant ministers and everywhere encouraging the religion of the Confession of Augsburg, had Lutheran preaching follow in the wake of his victorious troops. No basis exists for believing that Urban VIII in any way favored the undertakings of the Protestant King. But the malignity of his enemies supposed such was the case. The Emperor complained loudly. The members of the Roman court and the people of Rome were murmuring. They said: "The King of Sweden has more zeal for his Lutheranism than our Holy Father has for the Catholic Church, which alone can save us." Cardinal Borgia came before the Pope to express a solemn protest. Urban merely replied that the war against the Habsburgs was not a war of religion.

After the death of Gustavus Adolphus the Swedish army, aided by the French, continued the war for sixteen years more. The belligerent nations were equally exhausted. The early death of the King of Sweden had brought his vast projects to nothing; Emperor Ferdinand dropped his Edict of Restitution. People were longing for peace. The Pope sought to separate the cause of the papacy from the temporal interests contested

[46] Cf. Charvériat, *op. cit.*, I, 461.

between the various Powers and to oppose whatever might be concluded against the Edict of Restitution.[47] The Jesuits seconded him in this endeavor;[48] but the papacy had lost much of its influence. The Emperor, galled at not having been supported by Urban VIII, declared himself the champion of the Church in spite of the Pope. On the other hand, the good relations with France had changed. Richelieu having persisted, notwithstanding the Pope, in confiding to Cardinal Lavalette the command of an army directed against Austria, the Pope refused to the minister of Louis XIII the confirmation of his title of abbot of Cîteaux and recalled his nuncio (Mazarin) to Rome. On its side, the Republic of Venice, offended because, in a document, the Holy See had not treated it as the equal of kings, continued its ill will toward Rome.[49] The situation was not less strained in the relations with Portugal, as Urban had refused to recognize the new king, of the house of Braganza, for fear of rousing the indignation of the house of Spain against him.

Lastly, the excessive favors that the Pope bestowed on his nephews had alienated from him the good will of many at Rome. The insolence and greed of some members of his family partly explained this change. People said: "What the barbarians did not do, the Barberini accomplish" (*Quod non fecerunt Barbari, faciunt Barberini*). The bull published by the Pope (March 6, 1644) to renew against Jansen the condemnations already issued by St. Pius V and Gregory XIII against Baius, aroused against him the wrath of a sect already powerful. The Pope's character, naturally selfish and dominating,[50] was embittered at sight of the decline of his authority. In fact,

[47] A bull of Urban VIII reminds princes and bishops of their strict duty to defend the Church.

[48] Letter of Cardinal Barberini to the nuncio Baglione (March 17, 1635); cf. Ranke, II, 313.

[49] The Pope granted the cardinals the title of Eminence and ordered that henceforth they should be thus addressed by all, except by kings. Venice was not excepted.

[50] Cf. Ranke, II, 290–92.

observation, in this book explained the apparent movement of the stars, the precession of the equinoxes, and most of the phenomena that had determined the complicated system of Ptolemy, by the hypothesis of the rotation of the earth on itself and a suitable movement of its axis. Copernicus' theory, which contradicted both the traditional data of science and the current explanations of the Bible, found no more favor with the Protestants than with the Catholics. Luther said: "This fool Copernicus wants to upset all astronomy; but the Scripture says that Josue stopped the sun, and not the earth." Rome, however, had not condemned the new theory.[53] Meanwhile, in 1613, an Italian work appeared, entitled *Istoria e dimostrazioni intorno alle macchie solari,* in which the system of Copernicus was openly and warmly defended. Its author, the Pisan Galileo Galilei, already known by several scientific works, counted friends in the entourage of Pope Paul V, who held him in high esteem; and Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, the future Urban VIII, wrote to him (June 5, 1612), saying: "I shall read your dissertation with great pleasure, to admire the fruits of your rare intelligence as also to confirm my opinion which accords with yours." The opposition sprang especially from the ranks of the Aristotelians, for whom all the utterances of the Stagirite constituted the final and immutable word of science, and from certain exegetes who, in spite of the warning of Baronius,[54] persisted in seeking scientific teaching in the Bible. Did not Aristotle teach that the earth is the immobile center of the world? And did not the same theory rest on the evidence of the Book of Josue?

In 1614 the storm burst in Florence, in the church of Santa Maria Novella, on the fourth Sunday of Advent. Father Thomas Caccini of the Friars Preachers, taking for his text

[53] Cf. J. Czinski, *Copernik et ses travaux.*

[54] Cardinal Baronius said: "The purpose of Holy Scripture is to teach us how to go to heaven, not how heaven goes."

verses 11 and 13 of the tenth chapter of Josue, combined with verse 11 of the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, fulminated against the pride of the astronomers and mathematicians, and did not hesitate to mention Galileo by name. Without regard for the sacred text that he was commenting on, he cried out: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand you looking up to heaven?"

The celebrated astronomer of Pisa is represented by all the contemporary historians as a passionate, vehement man, having no hesitancy in opposing the current opinions. In his letters he even spoke of "the funeral, or rather the last judgment, of philosophy." [55] He wrote (December 21, 1613): "The Holy Scripture can neither deceive nor be deceived; but those who explain it can be deceived in many ways. . . . In the questions of the natural sciences the Holy Scripture ought to occupy the last place. . . . Furthermore, can an opinion be heretical that does not concern the salvation of the soul?" The aged Giovanni Battista Ciampoli, secretary of Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, advised him to be prudent, not to go beyond the limits of physics and mathematics, because the theologians claimed that to them alone belonged the office of clarifying the Scriptures. Galileo, becoming increasingly bold, exclaimed: "That God, who has endowed us with senses, speech, and intelligence, has willed, rejecting the use of these means, to give us by another means the knowledge that we can acquire with their aid, is something that seems to me not necessary to believe."

The imprudent astronomer, cleverly drawn by his adversaries on to the terrain of theology, fell into their trap. After that, the question of the motion of the earth was merely accessory. "The question at issue became whether a layman without commission should be allowed to set limits to biblical exegesis. Precisely by abusing the private interpretation of the Scripture the Protestants had denied the sacraments and transubstantiation. Calvin had been dead less than fifty years, Theodore

[55] Letter of Galileo to Prince Cesi (May 12, 1612).

of Beza had ceased writing only ten years before. The peril seemed imminent. People were walking in the glare of the conflagration that had set fire to Europe. The Pope feared committing the Church to a path whose end he did not perceive." [56] The Pope's duty to intervene seemed the greater since Galileo himself avowed that he was not advancing an irrefutable argument in favor of his system.[57] A dubious theory could not authorize any change. Bellarmine wrote wisely that, in doubt, a person ought not abandon the interpretation of Scripture given by the Fathers.[58] We read in a contemporary letter: "Who does not see the danger for the Church if everybody were permitted to explain the Scripture in his own way, contrary to the view of the Fathers and of St. Thomas and to trample underfoot the philosophy of Aristotle, who is so useful an auxiliary of Scholastic theology?" [59]

On February 19, 1616, the consulting theologians of the Holy Office gave their decision about the two following propositions: 1. The sun is the center of the world and consequently is without local motion; 2. the earth is not the center of the world and is not immobile, but it moves on its whole self by a daily motion. The first proposition was declared, by the consulting theologians, "senseless and absurd in philosophy and formally heretical in so far as it expressly contradicts several passages of Holy Scripture." The second was declared "to merit from the philosophical point of view the same censure and, from the theological point of view, to be at least erroneous in the faith." [60] In consequence of this declaration, on Friday,

[56] Pierre Aubanel, *Galilée et l'Eglise*, p. 70.

[57] Upon going to Rome in response to the summons of the Holy Office, Galileo wrote to his friend Diodati: "Suppose that later on the coherence and ensemble of the facts attest to the movement of the earth." The almost unanimous opinion of scholars declared that the new theory could not be admitted. See Aubanel, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 37.

[58] Letter of April 12, 1615, to Father Foscarini, published by Berti, *Copernico e le vicende del sistema copernicano.*

[59] Von Gebler, *Die Acten*, p. 12.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

February 26, the general commissarius of the Holy Office conveyed to Galileo, in the name of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Congregation of the Holy Office, "the order to abandon his opinion, the prohibition to defend it in any manner, under penalty of being brought to trial before the tribunal of the Inquisition."

The official report adds that Galileo agreed to the order given him and promised to obey.[61] Evidently this order was a purely disciplinary measure. Then, on March 5, the Congregation of the Index, without mentioning Galileo by name, probably on account of his submission, condemned the Copernican theory as "false and altogether contrary to the divine Scripture." Was this merely a "theological note," analogous to that of "erroneous, temerarious, false, etc." which the Church was accustomed to employ when she intended to warn the faithful against a doctrine without calling it heretical? Or should this expression be regarded as the equivalent to a qualification of heresy?[62] Precisely this question is disputed. In any event, the form of the act of condemnation, a simple decree of a Roman Congregation, having none of the conditions of a definition of faith made by the Pope *ex cathedra,* did not involve the infallibility of the Church.[63]

[61] *Ibid.,* p. 49.

[62] Funck (*Zur Galilei Frage,* p. 460) and Vacandard (*Etudes de critique et d'histoire,* p. 340) hold that "by the decree of 1616, the Copernican doctrine, taken as a whole, was stigmatized as heretical." But Grisar (*Galileistudien,* pp. 213–51) thinks that, since the qualification of "heretical" is found only in the decisions of the theological consultors, and not in the decree of the Congregation, the note of heresy was not incurred by the Copernican theory. Furthermore, we note that, from that time onward, the partisans of this theory were never regarded as heretics.

[63] To justify the Church in this affair, some writers have alleged: 1. that the decree of the Congregation was not signed by the Pope; 2. that Galileo's system was not condemned in itself, but only so far as it was based on Scripture; 3. that the Congregation allowed it to be held hypothetically; 4. that at bottom the decision of the Holy Office, condemning the theory of the immobility of the sun, is sound from the scientific viewpoint, as modern science shows that the sun has a movement of its own toward some point in space. All these arguments must be abandoned because: 1. the pope never signs the decrees of the Congregations, but the Congregations always

Things would have rested there and, as Bellarmine advised, people would have calmly "waited for a scientific demonstration of the motion of the earth, before interpreting the Scripture otherwise than had been done up to that time," [64] if Galileo had not presently compromised the peace by his rash words and his imprudent steps.

The elevation of Cardinal Barberini, that wise friend of Galileo, to the Supreme Pontificate, under the name of Urban VIII, in 1623, might have assured the peaceful progress of science by giving security to the scholar; unfortunately this circumstance did but stir Galileo's claims. On October 9, 1623, he wrote to Prince Cesi: "I could not hope for more wonderful conjectures. . . . I am turning over in my mind projects of

---

act by his order; and the papal approbation is not declared in the decrees of 1616 and 1633; the custom of expressly mentioning it was not introduced until the middle of the eighteenth century; 2. a mere reading of the text of the decrees shows that the system of Copernicus is there condemned purely and simply; 3. at the time of Galileo, the word "hypothesis" was given a purely abstract meaning, as in mathematics (cf. Jaugey, *Le procès de Galilée et la théologie,* p. 13); 4. a reading of the documents of the trial shows that the Roman Congregations, in condemning the proposition that the sun is without local motion, intended simply to affirm that the sun is not the center of the world, that the sun moves round the earth, not the earth round the sun. Cf. Aubanel, *op. cit.,* p. 187.

[64] Father Grassi wrote as follows to Guiducci regarding the ideas of Galileo: "When a demonstration of this movement is made, we will need to interpret the Scripture differently from the way it has been done; this is Cardinal Bellarmine's view" (*Le opere,* IX, 65). Cardinals Conti, Borromeo, Francisco del Monte, and Maffeo Barberini were known to be favorable to Galileo's ideas. In September, 1612, a Dominican had sustained the Copernican theory in public lectures. Cf. *Le opere,* VIII, 274. Gregory XV's secretary of briefs, Agucchi, predicted to Galileo that "some day the world will unanimously approve your system" (*Le opere,* VIII, 274). From all this we may judge that Galileo's system was not condemned *in se,* but simply inasmuch as its author had improperly involved the Scripture. "We may say either that the Scripture must be interpreted in a scientific sense, as many think, and then evidently Galileo's theory is opposed to it; or, as Bellarmine thinks, the Scripture ought to be regarded as foreign to science, and in this case Galileo is wrong to mix it with his system." Today the rule of exegesis which at that time divided men's minds, is perfectly clear. The texts that were matter of discussion should be taken in a popular sense, since the inspired author's purpose was not to write a work of science. See Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus* and the various replies of the Biblical Commission.

great importance." [65] Doubtless, in his imagination, he saw the Pope humbling his enemies and crowning his triumphant work. The result of this sort of intoxication was the publication at Florence, in 1632, of a biting satire against his adversaries. He entitled the work, *Dialogo dei due massimi sistemi del mondo* ("Dialogue of the two greatest systems of the world"). Received by some with an almost delirious enthusiasm, it stirred the wrath of all those whom it blamed, at whom it railed, whom it sought to ridicule. This action was an insolent violation of the solemn promise made in 1616 before the Pope. Urban VIII could not let this infraction go unpunished. Galileo, summoned to appear before the tribunal of the Inquisition, was there convicted of having violated the prohibition of the Index of March 5, 1616, and of having taught the Copernican theory as absolutely true. Consequently, by a judgment of June 21, 1633, he was condemned to prison for a period which the Pope would determine at his own discretion. Immediately after the condemnation, the Holy Father assigned to him as prison the palace of the ambassador of Tuscany; [66] then, fifteen days later, allowed him to go to Siena, to the splendid residence of his friend Piccolomini, and finally authorized him to retire to his own villa of Arcetri near Florence. The only condition imposed was that he would not receive any person that was suspect and would not talk of the motion of the earth. The illustrious scholar there devoted himself to several scientific works, composed his *Dialoghi delle nuove scienze*, published at Leiden in 1638, and there he died, January 8, 1642, at peace with the Church, after receiving on his deathbed the blessing of the Pope.

Thus freed from fanciful elements which the ill will toward

[65] *Le opere*, VI, 289.

[66] It was the Villa Medici, built on the Pincio. Since 1801 it has been the seat of the Academy of Fine Arts. The grounds of the Villa Medici were at that time more extensive than they are today, including woods and vineyards of considerable extent.

the Church has often added,[67] such is the story of the condemnation of Galileo. An impartial examination of the facts justifies fully the judgment given, at the end of the eighteenth century, by the judicious historian of Italian literature, Tiraboschi: "If Galileo had not maintained his opinion in so fiery a manner and if various other circumstances had not combined to make him suspect and odious to the Roman tribunals, he would not have been subjected to any annoyance for defending his system." [68] To see in the decree of the Index (1616) and in the judgment of the Holy Office (1633) a deliberate attempt to halt the progress of science, is manifestly unjust. But, however it may be explained, the error committed by the Roman tribunals speaking in the name of the Holy See, is no less most regrettable. From it resulted an unfortunate impression, as the truth of the Copernican system came to appear more evident, and some appearance of truth could be found in the reproach by adversaries of the Church, that Rome had opposed science.[69]

[67] "The account of the misfortunes of Galileo, exaggerated as a pious legend, has affirmed the triumph of the truths for which he suffered. . . . To tell the full truth, we must say that this great lesson did not cost him profound grief. Galileo's long life, viewed as a whole, was one of the mildest and most enviable in the whole story of the history of science" (J. Bertrand, *Les fondateurs de l'astronomie moderne,* p. 179). Galileo was not incarcerated in the prisons of the Inquisition, nor was he subjected to torture, as some have declared. A single document makes a remote and vague reference to torture, and that document is rejected as apocryphal by all historians. Cf. Bertrand, *op. cit.,* pp. 254–56. With regard to the anecdote which shows Galileo proudly holding up his head in the presence of his judges and exclaiming: *E pur si muove* ("Yet it does move"), is the most unplausible of legends. It was related for the first time in 1761 by Abbé Irailh in his book, *Les querrelles littéraires.* The truth is that Galileo abjured his doctrine with perfect docility before his judges. Cf. Vacandard, *Etudes de critique et d'histoire,* p. 335.

[68] Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana,* VIII, 346.

[69] The decisions of the Congregations were never considered by contemporaries as unchangeable, or irrevocable. In fact, the Church did later revoke them. Cf. Vacandard, *op. cit.,* p. 374; Grisar, *Galileistudien,* pp. 123, 344, 354–56.

The national edition of Galileo's works, begun in 1890, terminated with the twentieth volume, published in 1909. It is entitled *Galilei opere.* Galileo's immense correspondence includes more than 4,000 letters.

On Galileo, see Léon Garzend, *L'Inquisition et l'hérésie, à propos de Galilée,* 1943.

Activities of Urban VIII

The condemnation of Galileo was a misfortune; the war of Castro was a blunder.

Among the great families which various regimes had elevated to high positions in the peninsula, was the Farnese family, which rivalries of interest and ambition had put in opposition with the Barberini family.[70] In their Castro domain, erected into a duchy by one of them, Pope Paul III, the Farnesi exercised a sort of feudal tyranny to the detriment of all justice. Urban VIII, yielding to the insistence of his relatives, the Barberini, seized possession of Castro (October 13, 1641); then, a few months later (January, 1642), he issued an excommunication against the Duke. This rigor aroused the Italian princes, long jealous of the aggrandizement of the Papal States. Tuscany, Modena, and Venice came to the aid of Duke Farnese, who sallied into the Roman State with 3,000 horsemen. Urban obtained peace only through the mediation of the King of France and the abandonment of the Duchy of Castro to the Farnese family (May 31, 1644). This wretched war, in which we see a pope yielding to the ambitious solicitations of his relatives, was a blot on the pontificate of Urban VIII.[71]

Yet the moral and spiritual influence of the Holy See continued to be exercised effectively upon the faithful of the whole world. Pope Urban canonized (May 25, 1625) St. Elizabeth of Portugal, the illustrious princess who, after the death of her husband, King Diniz, led the life of a poor Franciscan sister. The Pope also placed on the altars (April 22, 1629) St. Andrew Corsini, the Florentine nobleman who had renounced a most brilliant future to put on the habit of the Carmelites. Thus Urban VIII recalled to the world the ideal of the most sublime

[70] Muratori, XI, 142.
[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 153 f.

Christian virtues. By his many encouragements of the religious orders, by the approbation which he gave (January 12, 1632) to the Congregation of the Mission, and by the foundation at Rome of the College of the Propaganda, the zealous Pontiff facilitated the realization of this ideal among the faithful. In his care everywhere to favor the spread of the Gospel, he welcomed graciously an ambassador of the King of Congo and the envoys of the patriarch of Constantinople, Parthenius, with whom he conversed in the language of Homer without an interpreter. Urban VIII also thought that the encouragement given to zeal would not become truly efficacious unless it was accompanied by the severe repression of abuses. A devout person of Barcelona, Isabel Rosella, had founded, in imitation of St. Ignatius Loyola, the religious congregation of the Jesuitesses, with the four solemn vows. This institute, which was not approved by Pope Paul III, was not regarded favorably by the Jesuits themselves. Pope Urban VIII suppressed it in 1638.[72]

The Pope was less admirably inspired in the realization of another reform, in which his literary taste was a factor no less than his priestly zeal. In spite of five successive revisions which the popes had given to the breviary since the beginning of the sixteenth century, the complaints of scholars, humanists, and liturgists continued. The scholars considered that the text of the homilies of the Church Fathers inserted in the breviary was not always conformable to the best sources; the humanists criticized the hymns for their offenses against the laws of prosody and good meter; the liturgists called for divisions in the psalms better suited to the requirements of psalmody. Urban VIII appointed two commissions for the revision of

[72] On the Jesuitesses, their constitution, their history, and their suppression, see Hélyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques,* VII, 491–93, and Richard Simon, *Bibl. crit.,* I, 298. Richard Simon is mistaken in holding that the Roman bullarium does not contain the act of suppression of the Jesuitesses. The brief of suppression is to be found under its date, 1638, in the *Bullarium,* IV, 115.

the breviary and, by his bull *Divinam psalmodiam,* approved a new edition, in which the patristic texts were given according to their collation with the best manuscripts, the Latin verses of the hymns were revised in accordance with the principles of classical prosody, and the verses of the psalms were divided by an asterisk to indicate the place of the mediant. This is the breviary we have today. Some critics maintain that the corrections of the hymns have deformed them rather than improved the work of Christian antiquity,[73] and that Urban imitated the Barberini, his relatives, who, by supplying missing members to the ancient statues, disfigured them more than did the earlier mutilations.[74] Thus this correction of the breviary was not acceptable, in a general way, to the Christian people. None of the religious orders that have kept their ancient rites adopted it; even at Rome, in the basilica of St. Peter, it was rejected, and "the best canonists, though fulfilling the obligation of conforming to it in the recitation of the Office, let it be seen that the Church, through its head, could some day revise the decision of Urban VIII." [75]

The conclusion of the peace treaty with the Farnesi was the last consolation of Urban VIII. At the very time when he was promising himself to profit by the calming of men's minds in Italy, to carry out more earnestly the work of reform, he felt himself stricken by the disease that would bring about his death. At once he asked the help of religion. A manuscript report of his death relates that he then showed regret at having excessively favored his nephews. Some have said that the murmurs of the people, who cursed the Barberini, and the failures of the chief undertakings of the papal policy hastened Urban's death.[76] He died July 7, 1644, at the age of seventy-seven years.

[73] Ulysse Chevalier, *Université catholique,* VIII, 122.

[74] Battifol, *History of the Roman Breviary,* p. 221.

[75] Chevalier, *loc. cit.* We know that Pope Pius X appointed a commission charged with the revision of the breviary.

[76] Muratori, XI, 199.

Innocent X (1644–55)

Nothing would be more unjust than to blame the popes of this period for the failure of their external policy. Those results sprang from more general causes. For two centuries the civil powers had continually developed in the direction of a more jealous autonomy of their so-called rights. The Treaty of Westphalia was the official consecration of these claims. The wisest and most zealous popes came into conflict with this new state of mind. Such is the spectacle presented to us by the pontificate of Urban's successor, Innocent X.

The old man, seventy-two years old, who was elected Pope on September 15, 1644, had only one idea: to continue the work of Catholic restoration to which his two predecessors had initiated him.[77] In contrast to the somewhat haughty austerity of Urban VIII, at first he showed a ready affability and cheerful humor. In the various offices he had held he always showed himself active and loyal, as well as gentle and engaging. Innocent X kept these qualities in his pontificate. The good people of Rome used to say: "See how our Pope, in spite of the burdens of age and office, has remained as fresh and unreserved as before; he is pleased to talk with everyone and gives everyone a chance to explain." To maintain order and tranquillity in Rome by suitable regulations and by a well-organized police, was his first care. During the famine that afflicted the city in 1649, after the overflowing of the Tiber, he spent himself without stint, ordered a supply of wheat from Sicily and Poland, organized relief, visited the bakers, even opened the Lateran palace to all the needy for the distribution of provisions. The next year the celebration of the jubilee was another occasion for emphasizing his contact with the people. At all the

[77] The new Pope, sprung from the noble Pamfili family, had been auditor of the Rota and nuncio to the court of Naples under Gregory XV. Urban VIII raised him to the dignity of patriarch of Antioch and accredited him as nuncio to Philip IV.

ceremonies he prayed with the crowd. Following his example, the Roman nobles placed their villas and houses at the use of the visitors, and all classes of society seemed to form but one body and one soul, as in the first days of Christianity.

Under the Pope's influence, popular preachers grew in number. He himself encouraged their manner of preaching, which was apostolic, informal, and earnest. He was present at the sermons of preachers, such as the Jesuits Segneri and Abrizzi, who most vigorously flayed the morals of the time. Innocent X, convinced that no more effective instruments of religious regeneration could be found than fervent and well-regulated congregations, confirmed the institute of the Noble Widows of Dole, established to spread the cult of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and that of the Secular Priests of Christian Doctrine, founded by Cesar de Bus. But the Pope dissolved the act of union which the latter had imprudently made with the Somaschi,[78] and abolished two congregations that had departed from their primitive rule: that of St. Basil of the Armenians and that of the Good Jesus of Ravenna. At the same time his attention was drawn to the activities of the Jansenists: by the bull *Cum occasione* (May 31, 1653) he condemned the five famous propositions of Jansen; and he also denounced (April 23, 1654) the apocryphal bull by which, according to the Jansenists, Paul V condemned Molina.

Following the example of his predecessors, Innocent X was much occupied with embellishing the city of Rome. We are told that whenever he passed through the piazza of St. Peter he

[78] In 1616, Father Viger, third superior general of the Clerks Regular of Christian Doctrine, with a view to strengthening his congregation, decided to give it the form of a religious order, introducing solemn vows. For this purpose he united it with the Order of the Somaschi. But, as the union did not produce the desired effects, Father Viger himself finally requested the Holy See to annul the contract made with the Somaschi fathers. The decree of Innocent X returning the Clerks Regular of Christian Doctrine to the secular clergy is dated July 30, 1647. On this question, see Hélyot, *Hist. des ordres monastiques*, IV, 239–44.

could not take his eyes from the fountain of Paul V: he wished to rival that Pope in sumptuousness. Michelangelo and Bramante were no longer there, but Bernini, their ambitious disciple, was at the height of his fame. Among his works of unequal merit, in which immoderate bigness often took the place of real grandeur, in which the absurd was sometimes to be found side by side with imposing greatness, people admired the sumptuous and ponderous baldachino in St. Peter's, the superb Villa Barberini and the two ugly towers of the Pantheon which popular malice called "Bernini's ass's ears." After some hesitation, Innocent entrusted to Bernini the execution of his great projects. Certainly the daring artist became responsible for the wretched interior of St. Peter's. By a lavish use of bronze around the "chair of St. Peter," by his multitude of distressing statues in the niches that he cut in the pilasters, by profusely spreading his veneer of many-colored marbles the length of the immense nave, Bernini made the work of Bramante and Michelangelo lose some of its majestic grandeur. But his exterior work was indeed beautiful. When he moved to the enlarged piazza of St. Peter the great obelisk of the temple of Caracalla and when, in this vast space where you would have felt yourself flooded with so much air and light, the artist planned to put a double colonnade, extending to right and left its two immense stone arms, as though to embrace the world,[79] Innocent might well say that his dream was at last realized: he had embellished the work of Paul V.

This somewhat gorgeous grandeur which Innocent X was fond of in the arts, he carried also into his government. His external policy, where the cause of the Church inspired him most happily, had an imprint of magnanimity; but in his internal policy, where his family interests too often influenced him, unfortunately the desire for splendor was dominant.

[79] This project was realized by Bernini under Alexander VII.

The Treaty of Westphalia

At the very hour when the descendant of the Pamfili mounted to the throne of St. Peter, the long efforts of Urban VIII were resulting in the first negotiations of peace between the powers whose bitter strifes, for almost thirty years, covered all Europe with ruins. In 1644 the first plenipotentiaries of France, Sweden, Austria, all the Christian states of the continent, and all princes of Germany and of the imperial cities, were on their way to the cities of Münster and Osnabrück, selected by common agreement as the place for a discussion of the conditions of peace. Three powers—France, Sweden, and the Empire—acted as intermediaries for all the others.[80] They arrogated to themselves the fullest powers that any congress of nations ever exercised, and did not hesitate to remake the map of Europe or to recast international law or to regulate with authority the most delicate questions touching the relations of religion with the states.

Apart from the clauses dealing with purely political questions in such a way as to assure the preponderance of the France of Louis XIV [81] and to transform from top to bottom the constitution of Germany,[82] the plenipotentiaries of Münster and Osnabrück, in their sincere and laudable desire to establish a durable peace among the various religious denominations and the different nations, unfortunately brought about the triumph of three principles, which none of them formulated in explicit terms but which history must extract and place in relief because they sum up ideas vaguely spread for two centuries and would inspire all modern politics: the principle of European equilibrium, the principle of the equality of forms of worship, and that of the supremacy of the civil power.

[80] Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* VII, Part I, p. 15.

[81] On the rather vague clause which contained the cession of Alsace to France, see Lavisse, *loc. cit.*

[82] Lavisse, pp. 16–21.

The establishment of an international order based on the principle of European equilibrium was the triumph of Richelieu's policy, which Mazarin well grasped and continued.[83] At the time when the modern nations had just been constituted in their autonomy, to prevent the easily oppressive dominance of any one of them was indeed an important aim. Urban VIII himself had been concerned with that danger. But the idea that triumphed in the Treaty of Westphalia had a vaster import and is to be traced further back. In our study of the intellectual movement of the Renaissance, we found close to Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin, the figures of Ximenes, Granvelle, and Wolsey, beside Michelangelo we found Machiavelli. Under the influence of these latter personages, external policy had changed, as art and philosophy had. A sudden extension in the combinations of diplomacy; a regularity previously unknown in the service of cabinets and embassies; the establishment of permanent armies; the term "power" then used to designate, in the sphere of international relations, the nations in which the powers resided and the princes who had the disposal of these forces; the idea of a "political balance of the powers" neutralizing one another by a simple play of opposed forces, substituted for a "political system" based on law: such had been the stages of an evolution whose theorists had been Machiavelli and his disciples. And, though we cannot regard Richelieu as a mere adept of Machiavellianism, we must recognize in the spirit of the great French minister some imprint of the ideas set forth by the Florentine statesman.[84]

The treaties of Münster and Osnabrück gave official sanc-

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[84] On the agreements and divergences between the principles of Machiavelli and those of Richelieu, see Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale* (2nd ed., II, 101 ff.). Some traces of Machiavellianism are evident in what Richelieu says about justice in the political sphere. According to him, this justice ought to follow a different path from that of ordinary justice (*Testament politique*, Part II, chap. 5). But we should note that no political writer has more strongly and brilliantly condemned the principle of disregard for agreements made (*ibid.*, chap. 6).

tion to these ideas. When the diplomats of Europe, after five years of negotiations, finally drew up the clauses that have received the name of Treaty of Westphalia, the Holy Empire, natural defender of international law, no longer existed.[85] Germany was officially open to the foreigner; the King of Sweden entered the diet; the King of France became a member of the League of the Rhine; the sovereignty of the princes and cities of the Empire was recognized; the imperial authority was reduced to nothingness; and the high contracting powers, declared to be the guarantors of the Peace of Westphalia, had the right to maintain that anarchy. Notably France, which filled the role of lion in this dismemberment of the Empire and which, "a Catholic and monarchical state, became the ally of heretics, infidels, rebellious Flemish, Hungarians, and Neapolitans, was the first to practice with brilliance that policy of national egoism." [86] In short, this peace, based not on right, but simply on the equilibrium of the forces, without any idea of justice, could be, according to Frederick von Schlegel's view, nothing more than a superficial peace, an interim, the preface of another general peace, which our age is still waiting for.[87]

The principle of the equality of Christian denominations and consequently the admission of the Protestants to all political rights, were set forth in the first section of Article V of the Treaty of Osnabrück, declaring that an exact and reciprocal equality should exist between all the Electors, Princes, and States of either religion. Other articles specified that, in the assembly of the deputies of the Empire and in the imperial chamber, an equal number of Catholics and of Protestants should have seats. To put an end to the difficulties arising in connection with the possession of ecclesiastical property, as also in connection with the exercise of worship, the Treaty provided

[85] E. Denis in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. gén.*, V, 581.
[86] Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. VII, Part I, p. 23.
[87] Cf. Schlegel, *Philosophy of History*, II, 424.

that all things should revert to the condition they were in on January 1, 1624. The princes agreed among themselves that plenary indulgence should be granted for all their thefts up to 1624, which was declared the normal year, after which they proclaimed they would no longer steal. At least they were expected to refer to the pope and to the bishops, without whose authorization any transfer of ecclesiastical property was null and void. The Treaty of Osnabrück went even further. Articles X–XV granted to certain Protestant princes, under the title of "compensation," "satisfaction," or "recompense," a great number of monastic and ecclesiastical properties. In this treaty and in this connection we meet for the first time the word "secularization."

The essentially Protestant principle of the supremacy of the civil power [88] was clearly proclaimed in Article V, section 12. The treaty said: "Since to the states belongs, together with the right of territory and supremacy, the right to reform religion . . . no immediate state will be disturbed in its right over the affairs of religion." This provision was in formal opposition to the Council of Trent, which reserved to the ecclesiastical authority, notably to councils canonically held, the right to reform morals and to pronounce on dogmatic formulas.[89]

The Bull *Zelus domus meae*

The Pope's protest could not fail to be heard. By his bull *Zelus domus meae* (November 26, 1648), Innocent X declared "null, vain, invalid, iniquitous, reproved, without force or effect . . . all the articles of the treaty prejudicial to the Catholic religion, to divine worship, to the Apostolic Roman See, as well as to inferior Churches." A learned German canonist says:

[88] That the doctrine of the supremacy of the civil power in matters of religion is an essentially Protestant doctrine, is amply demonstrated by Döllinger in his *The Church and the Churches,* pp. 55–62.

[89] Session XXIV, De reform., chap. 2.

In fact, if the Treaty of Westphalia can be regarded as a sincere and meritorious effort so far as its aim was to establish a durable peace among the various religions and between the different nations, from the viewpoint of the civil law of the period and from the viewpoint of canon law it was an evident injustice. The states did not have the right to attribute to temporal rulers foundations that had been established for the benefit of corporations and for purposes of a spiritual order; and they could not dispose of the goods of the Church without the consent of the canonically recognized authorities of the Church, namely, the bishops and the pope. They had even less right to take upon themselves to abolish bishoprics and chapters, whose spiritual jurisdiction depended directly on the Holy See.[90]

Among the statesmen of the time who, according to the expression of Innocent X, sought rather their own interests than the interests of God, none seemed greatly affected by a protest which the Pope had made to free his conscience so as not to be charged with neglect on the day when he would appear before the judgment seat of God. The Pontiff's authority was the less to be dreaded in their eyes since countless difficulties at Rome were hindering the free exercise of his government. Once again the papacy fell under the yoke of nepotism. Innocent's sister-in-law, Olimpia Madalchini of Viterbo, an energetic and intriguing woman, seems to have been responsible for the excessive favors that the Pope bestowed on members of his family. The faction of the Barberini, nephews of the preceding Pope, bestirred themselves. Even among the relatives of Innocent X jealousy sowed division and strife. The Spanish party, which counted several members in Rome, rose up menacingly. Certain noblemen, friends of Mazarin, by way of protest, displayed the arms of France in the windows of their palaces. Measures taken by the Pope and attributed to the influence of Olimpia, increased the irritation of the nobility. Age and cares deeply affected the robust constitution of the Pontiff. Then his

[90] Walter, *Manuel de droit canonique,* 8th ed., p. 221. Cf. Alzog, *History of the Church,* III, 459.

domineering sister-in-law no longer left his side; in a way, she forced her services on him. At the end of December, 1654, the unfortunate Innocent X, feeling feebler than usual, wished to receive the last sacraments and gathered his nephews and nieces about him. He murmured: "You see how the grandeurs of the Supreme Pontificate come to an end."

On January 7, 1655, assisted by Father Gian Paolo Oliva, general of the Society of Jesus, he rendered his soul to God. A chronicler relates that his body remained three days abandoned in a room of the palace, where workmen used to leave their tools. Olimpia, on whom the Curia relied to make the necessary arrangements, did not even take the trouble to order a coffin or to make any other provisions. Pallavicini, recalling the fact, adds: "This is a great lesson for the Pontiffs. It teaches them what they can expect from relatives for whom they have compromised their conscience and their honor.

This date marks more than the death of a pope; it was the end of a regime. In fact, henceforth the voice of the papacy will no longer be heard in the temporal order. It will confine itself to the spiritual order, and will scarcely be uttered except in days of extreme peril, to save that ungrateful Europe, which it had in times of old civilized and organized.

CHAPTER II

The Catholic Renaissance in Spain, Italy, and Germany

WHILE the Christian rulers were succeeding in breaking the political bonds that connected them with the papacy and refused or neglected to publish the decrees of the Council of Trent, the spirit of the great council spread throughout Europe and produced abundant fruit of a wise reform. Spain, which, in the second half of the previous century, had given the Church so many great reformers, continued, in spite of the shocks of a terrible economic and political crisis, to produce saints. Germany, torn by political and religious anarchy, increased the efforts for the restoration of the clergy and the edification of the faithful. Italy was covered with teaching and charitable religious congregations. But in France the movement of the Catholic renaissance, which was retarded by the religious wars until the coming of Henry IV, developed in all its fullness. Under the influence of St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul, of the institute of the Jesuits and of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, the land of France became covered with works of piety, zeal, and charity.

The Church in Spain

During all of the first half of the seventeenth century, the great Spain of Charles V and Philip II continued to decline. In a space of sixty-seven years the Spanish monarchy, so mighty in appearance, so proud of its immense possessions, which were said to be twenty times as great as those of the Roman Empire, tumbled with the heaviest fall that modern history

records. Some writers have tried to lay the blame for this decline upon the weak character of the two successors of Philip II and on the supposed fanaticism of the bishop who advised the expulsion of the Moors. True, neither Philip III nor Philip IV seems to have been of a stature to govern, with the required vigilance, the vast Spanish possessions in Asia, Africa, America, Italy, and the Netherlands. It is likewise true that the expulsion of the Moors deprived Spain of a large number of hard-working farmers and able artisans. But the causes of the Spanish decline are of a more general sort and of more remote origin. The sudden abundance of the precious metals, which the peninsula obtained from its colonies, provoked a considerable emigration of Spaniards to America and discouraged the labor of agriculture and industry in the country. When Philip III, to compensate for the loss which the nation suffered by the expulsion of the Moors, offered titles of nobility and exemption from the military service to all his subjects who would devote themselves to agriculture, his appeal was not heeded.

The Spanish monarchy, moreover, in consequence of various influences that affected all Europe, turned more and more to despotism.[1] With Philip III, ruled by the Duke of Lerma, and with Philip IV, dominated by Count Olivares, the regime of favorites became implanted in the kingdom. While a meticulous and inflexible etiquette regulated everything at court,[2] and a bureaucratic centralization spread the network of its system over all the public services, wiping out the old municipal liberties before the invading authority of the corregidors and

[1] In the preceding volume we saw how the Protestant Revolt, by necessitating energetic repressions, by exalting the power of the kings in the spiritual order, and by destroying the weighty and moral influence of the clergy, everywhere, even in nations that remained Catholic, favored and consolidated the absolute power of the kings.

[2] Philip III died a victim of etiquette, in consequence of an attack of erysipelas, because his chamberlain, the Duke of Uzeda, who alone had the right to enter his apartment, was not there to remove an overheated brazier. Bassompierre, *Ambassades en Espagne*, p. 228.

the alcaldes, outstanding personalities disappeared, even the clergy, sharing the widespread indolence, no longer gave the people the strong spiritual nourishment which it had formerly distributed. The abundant literature of this period, with Cervantes as the most illustrious representative, fixed, with some marks of genius, the representative types of that sad epoch: the impoverished hidalgo, proud beneath his rags, the famished student, sauntering about the public squares, the brutal muleteer, the rapacious innkeeper, the bandit giving battle to the police in the sierras, and all these folks, wretched or disreputable, mantling themselves in the memory of the past grandeur of their country, in their dignity as man and Spaniard, wearing a sword, and calling one another "Your Grace" and "Knight."

Yet the deep religious impulse given to the country by St. Ignatius Loyola and by St. Theresa was still powerful. A race that had produced such heroes could not quickly decay under economic and political influences. The movement of religious reform was not halted nor was the current of holiness dried up: while the Society of Jesus gave to the Church of Spain, Alonzo Rodriguez and Peter Claver; the Carmelite Order, its greatest theologians and its most zealous missioners; the orders of Mercy, of the Trinity, and of the Friars Minor, the most austere of the saints; a great bishop and a humble woman entered even into the council of the kings and there made prevail the rights of justice and of truth.

In 1609 a book appeared at Seville, a quarto volume of more than 600 pages, *The Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection.* Its author was Father Alonzo Rodriguez of the Society of Jesus. This book would remain the classical manual of Christian asceticism. Few works would be more widely spread or would win so great approbation. Port Royal, at the very time it most vehemently attacked the moral teaching of the Jesuits, circulated the work of Rodriguez. While the book of the learned Jesuit spread the practice of Christian virtues through the

world, a lowly lay brother of the same name was giving an admirable example of those virtues by performing the modest duties of porter in the college which the Society of Jesus conducted at Majorca;[3] and one of the students of this college, likewise a son of St. Ignatius, was devoting himself heroically to the apostolate of the black race. This was Peter Claver, who used to sign all his letters: "Peter, the slave of the Negroes forever."

Religious Orders

The daughters of St. Theresa spread out in all the Christian countries and even beyond. In 1604 Marie of the Incarnation introduced them into France, where they would become one of the purest glories of the French Church. Four years earlier a branch of the Carmelites, formed into a special congregation under the name of St. Elias, expanded into the whole world, passed into Belgium, France, Poland, Germany, and Austria, founded stations in the Protestant countries, such as Holland and England, reached out into distant missions, preached the gospel in Persia, India, Armenia, and Turkey, established itself in Peking, and extended even to North America. Father Thomas of Jesus, Father Peter of the Mother of God, and Father Dominic of Jesus Mary, Discalced Carmelites, had a considerable part in the organization of Propaganda,[4] and Father Bernard of St. Joseph founded at Paris a seminary of the foreign missions.[5] Such aspirations of apostolic zeal did not turn the sons of St. Theresa and of St. John of the Cross from the high theological studies which St. Theresa always honored so greatly. From 1621 to 1707 the Discalced Carmelites of Alcalá and Salamanca published two collective works of immense

[3] Pope Leo XIII canonized him January 15, 1882.

[4] On the constitution of Propaganda by Gregory XV, see De Martinis, *Juris pontificii de propaganda fide*, Part I, Vol. I, p. 1.

[5] Cf. Zimmermann in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, II, 1783. On the congregation of St. Elias, see Hélyot, *Hist. des ordres monastiques*, I, 356–58.

theological significance. The *Complutenses* and the *Salmanticenses* hold a place among the most famous theologians of modern times.

The Order of the Trinity, founded for the redemption of captives, provided fine examples of charity in Spain. Blessed Simon de Rojas, who was the confessor of Queen Elizabeth, the wife of Philip II, and who directed the education of her two sons, edified the court by his thoroughly evangelical conduct. However, laxity had entered the order. As early as 1594 a general chapter expressed the desire for a reform. The work was attempted and, amid countless difficulties,[6] was brought to success by a holy religious, born at Almodovar, a village of the diocese of Toledo, of a family so much esteemed that St. Theresa, passing through Almodovar, was unwilling to take lodging anywhere but in the home of the father of our saint. He was called in religion Father Juan Bautista of the Immaculate Conception. His mortifications recalled those of the most austere Fathers of the desert. Associated with some fervent religious of his order, he organized a community in which each one on entrance stripped himself of his clothes in exchange for coarser ones, and abandoned his shoes "to go barefoot, wearing only little sandals of leather or rope, in the Spanish manner." [7] Such was the origin of the Discalced Trinitarians, authorized in 1609 by Paul V to elect a vicar-general and made completely independent in 1636 by a bull of Urban VIII.[8] Soon they spread, not only in Spain, but even in Poland, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Italy, and France.

About this same period, in 1613, a noble young woman, raised at the court of the king of Spain, Blessed Marianna of Jesus, founded the pious institute of the discalced nuns of Our Lady of Mercy, whose aim was to obtain from God, by prayer and

[6] For an account of these trials, see Hélyot, *op. cit.*, II, 323–26.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 323.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 327. Juan Bautista of the Immaculate Conception was beatified by Pius VII in 1819

the practice of penance, the conversion of sinners, the release of the souls in purgatory, and the redemption of Christians who had fallen into the power of the infidels.[9]

Juan de Ribera

The secular clergy also had some saints. Such was the illustrious Juan de Ribera,[10] to whom St. Pius V had confided the government of the diocese of Valencia and whom Philip III appointed viceroy of the province of the same name. He was an upright man, deeply religious, passionately devoted to the interests of the Church and of his country. But the province of Valencia, at the time when he had to direct its civil and religious administration, was a prey to formidable difficulties. These came especially from the presence of nobles and wealthy families of Mussulman origin, officially belonging to the Church by baptism and by the outward practices of religion and at the same time attached to Spain by the oath of allegiance to the King. But they were thought to be quite ready at times to return to Mohammedanism and to rise up against the state. They were called Moriscos or Moors. A decree of Charles V placed them under the authority of the Inquisition. Their situation was not made worse by this act, quite otherwise. Says Hefele: "In general they were treated with much mildness. Pope Clement VII was solicitous that they should be given a solid Christian instruction. Emperor Charles V forbade the confiscation of the apostates' property, which was to be kept for their children; he likewise forbade the condemnation of any apostate to death. Gregory XIII strove to win the Moors by kindness. But these measures were vain. Again and again they rose up and joined hands with the Moors of Africa." [11] The danger was extremely

[9] Marianna of Jesus was beatified by Pius VI in 1783.

[10] Alarcon, *El Beato Juan de Ribera.*

[11] Hefele, art. "Mauren" in *Kirchenlexicon,* VIII, 1050 (1898 ed.).

serious. Juan de Ribera did not hesitate to advise the King to adopt a radical measure: the definitive expulsion of the Moors from the soil of Spain. This was a bold counsel.[12] With the applause of all the enlightened men of Spain, notably of Cervantes, Philip III (September 22, 1609) promulgated a decree ordering the Moors to quit the soil of Spain. In consequence of this decree, 400,000 persons, about one-twentieth of the population, were thus constrained to flee. Most of them sought refuge on the Barbary coast. Undoubtedly the unity of Spain was thereafter protected from the most dread peril; but likewise undeniable is the fact that the departure of such a large part of the population brought about serious economic disturbances in the peninsula. Because of the people's indolence Philip's efforts to repopulate the abandoned lands failed to accomplish the expected results. Finally, when this good and pious but feeble King went down to the grave, the economic decline of Spain had advanced another step.

This movement was accelerated under Philip IV (1621–65), or rather under the government of Duke Olivares, who directed the whole policy of the King and who engaged the Spanish monarchy in that gigantic struggle against a part of Europe, in which Spain would loose its army, its navy, and its last resources. A certain pamphleteer wrote: "Philip, you are great, but after the manner of ditches: the more a person takes away from them, the greater they are."

A humble religious, abbess of the Franciscan convent of Agreda, on the border of Aragon and Old Castile, tried to arrest her country on its fatal decline. To the King of Spain

[12] Of this affair, Richelieu wrote as follows: "It was the most barbarous advice to be found in the history of any ages." This severe condemnation has been repeated and even aggravated by most historians. See Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, V, 652; Cantu, *Histoire universelle*, XV, 186; Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, p. 198; Langlois, *L'Inquisition d'après les travaux récents*, p. 110. The measure has been well justified in the masterly work of Don Boronat y Barrachina, *Los Moriscos españoles y su expulsion*. We cannot now question that the Morisco peril gravely threatened the security of Spain under Philip III.

she wrote (October 13, 1643): "Sire, among those near you, some are of no value in affairs. Others are there also, whose talents and ability might be useful to you. . . . The former government is detested because to it are attributed our calamities of today: people think that they are the same men who govern. You will find it to the purpose to give a wise satisfaction to the world that asks it, for Your Majesty has need of it." [13]

Mary of Agreda

She who dared offer such advice to the King of Spain was the daughter of a simple bourgeois of the city of Agreda, Mary Coronel, in religion Mary of Jesus, better known under the name of Mary of Agreda. Mystical graces, supernatural revelations, which she committed to writing but without publishing the account, from the year 1627 [14] had drawn to herself the attention of her superiors. In 1643, when Catalonia and Portugal separated violently from the crown, King Philip IV, passing through Agreda, decided to ask counsel of the holy abbess. The result of that interview was a correspondence between the King and the nun, which went on for twenty-two years, until the death of Mary of Agreda. The letter that we quoted above is the second that she wrote to him. The King replied: "The evils which took so long a time to be produced cannot be repaired in so short a time; but I am determined to depart from the path followed up to the present by the preceding government. I hope that you will have proof of this, and you will be able to declare to the world that the past is no more. This is the truth, and I have resolved that it shall be." [15]

The editor of the royal correspondence adds at this point: "The history of the reign of Philip IV shows us that unfortu-

[13] Germont de Lavigne, *La sœur Marie d'Agréda et Philippe IV*, pp. 19–21.
[14] Van den Gheyn, art. "Marie d'Agréda" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, I, 628.
[15] Germont de Lavigne, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

nately this resolution, apparently so firm, had no effect in the future; and the venerable mother, undoubtedly understanding that the weak spirit of the King was little disposed to profit by the wise counsels of those who were devoted to him, confined her efforts to working for the reformation of the morals of that realm, trying to inspire in the prince the practice of real holiness." [16] "The letters of the nun consoled him for all the troubles of his reign, for all the discomforts of a continual state of illness. Then, when Mary was dead, having no longer anyone to console him, and no longer receiving from anyone about him those lofty admonitions which filled all his hours without his ever profiting by them, he fell into disgust with life and died four months after the venerable sister." [17]

Five years later, in 1670, appeared the principal work of Mary of Agreda, *La mistica ciudad de Dios, historia divina de la Virgen, Madre de Dios* ("The Mystical City of God"). Taking as its basis certain private revelations, it relates the detailed history of the Blessed Virgin. It is a strange work, containing a mystical contemplation that is truly imposing. Its speculative part shows a depth that is rare in a woman, but the emphasis, the pompous style, sometimes the bad taste, and extraordinary historical assertions disconcert the reader.[18] As soon as this book appeared, it had an immense vogue in Spain and, among clergy and people, continued the work of edification which the pious abbess had attempted to accomplish with the King. But we must recognize that the work of Mary of Agreda

[16] *Ibid.*, p. xxiii.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. vi.

[18] What is the doctrinal value of this work? The holy life of Maria de Agreda creates a prejudice in favor of her good faith. But we know that mystical writers have not, for the account of their revelations, the divine assistance which God accorded to the sacred writers. The limited culture of the pious abbess, her ignorance of theology and of history, may have led her into many an error. In her preface she herself says: "Error on my part is possible; for that I submit to the correction of holy Church" (Introduction to Part I, no. 14). Bossuet passed a severe judgment on this book. See *Œuvres de Bossuet* (Lebel ed.), XXX, 637–40; XL, 172, 204 ff.; XLI, 92.

has but faint luster when compared with the calm work, so lofty in form and substance, so equal and perfect in all its parts, which St. Theresa gave to the world in the preceding century. Mysticism itself was in decadence.

The Church in Italy

The first half of the seventeenth century was a most disturbed period for Spain.[19] But it was a most tranquil period for Italy.[20] No civil wars and no foreign wars upset the peace. Each state, with well-established boundaries, organized peacefully and freely. Yet, in literature and in the arts, this time of peace did not produce any of those great works which the preceding periods had given to Italy amid their ceaseless strifes. But the movement of religious revival, begun by the Council of Trent and vigorously pursued in Italy by St. Charles Borromeo and St. Philip Neri, developed, spread, covered the land of Italy with religious houses and charitable institutions, and gave birth to models of holiness. There we do not meet with the daring political projects of a Juan de Ribera—the situation of Italy did not lend itself to them—nor the mystical and somewhat obscure flights of a Mary of Agreda—the temperament of the nation was not inclined to them—but rather positive and practical institutions, works of education and charity.

At the opening of the seventeenth century, the work of the reform of the clergy by the founding of seminaries underwent a crisis in consequence of the opposition of a clerical feudalism obstinately attached to its privileges, but the 800 schools founded by St. Charles Borromeo in the diocese of Milan were in full prosperity, and the renown of the great Archbishop continued to grow. Numerous miracles took place at his tomb. In

[19] Under Philip IV several conflicts arose between the court of Madrid and the Holy See. Innocent X even recalled his nuncio, Gaetani, from Spain and closed the nunciature.

[20] Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana,* Vol. VIII, Part I, p. 1.

1601 Pope Clement VIII ordered that the requiem Mass, which was said annually for the venerated prelate, should be replaced by a Mass of the Holy Ghost. Three years later he instructed the Congregation of Rites to devote its attention to the procedures preparatory to canonization. The next year Leo XI decided to erect at Rome a church in honor of the venerated prelate; and on November 1, 1610, Paul V, with great solemnity, celebrated Charles Borromeo's enrollment in the catalogue of the saints.

An almost equal veneration surrounded the memory of Philip Neri. Between 1600 and 1622 appeared three different biographies of the holy priest, written by Antonio Gallonio, Girolamo Barnabei, and Giacomo Bacci. These books spread far and wide the fragrance of his virtues. A bull of Paul V, dated February 24, 1612, gave canonical approbation to the Congregation of the Oratory founded by him.

The influence of these two great men dominated all the works and institutions of this period in Italy. A disciple of St. Philip Neri, St. Camillus de Lellis, a former soldier, who became the passionate lover of Jesus Christ in the person of the sick poor, had founded, about the close of the sixteenth century, the Congregation of Clerks Regular Ministering to the Sick. At his death (1613) the holy founder left more than 20 houses, 16 of them in Italy, and about 300 religious. More than 120 of these religious had died, victims of their devotedness, from diseases contracted in the hospitals. They were known by the name of "The Fathers of a Good Death" because at the bedside of the dying they devoted themselves to the work of preparing them for a pious death.

Besides these devoted servants of the poor, who wore as their distinctive sign a light brown cross on their habits,[21] the Brothers Hospitallers of St. John of God, wearing cowl and

[21] Hélyot, Vol. IV, plate 59.

hood,[22] also vowed themselves to the service of the sick. This institute came from Spain.[23] Soon it was recruited abundantly in Italy, where the people called them the Fate Bene Fratelli, from the words they used in asking alms.

The Clerks Regular of the Pious Schools, or Poor Clerks of the Mother of God, wearing a cassock with a leather belt and a short cloak,[24] engaged in giving a Christian education to children, principally to poor children.

The Celestial Annunciades, whose habit was a white robe and a cloak of sky-blue,[25] engaged in spinning material for corporals and purificators for poor churches. They were founded at Geneva in 1605 by Blessed Maria Vittoria, a holy widow, who, after her five children had consecrated themselves to the service of God, felt herself inspired to found a new religious order and carried out her design with the advice of Father Bernardine Zenon of the Society of Jesus, her confessor.[26]

Simple confraternities, such as those founded at Rome by a gentleman of Milan, Marco de Sadis Cusani, and at Florence by a silk worker, Ippolito Galantini, powerfully seconded all these efforts, teaching catechism to children and adults.[27] From these two confraternities, greatly encouraged by the popes, sprang the Congregation of Christian Doctrine, later allied with the Doctrinarians of France, and an archconfraternity which, erected in St. Peter's Basilica, had the right to free two prisoners every year.[28]

Far from harming the prosperity of the earlier congregations, this flowering of new institutes only aroused a holy emulation. In the Society of Jesus, which painful blows had just

[22] *Ibid.*, plate 34.
[23] He had been drawn to Italy by Marie de Medici in 1601.
[24] Hélyot, Vol. IV, plate 61.
[25] *Ibid.*, plates 66 and 67.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 297.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 246.
[28] *Ibid.*, 248.

shaken, an Italian, Claudius Acquaviva, chosen superior general of the order, by his wisdom and firmness consolidated the work of St. Ignatius and, by the publication of the *Ratio studiorum,* the *Directorium in exercitiis spiritualibus* and the *Industriae ad curandos animae morbos,* infused a sort of new life into the Society.

The Ursulines continued to live in Italy without special habit and without absolute cloister, flowing over into France, Germany, and Austria. The Italian Capuchins gave the Church two ardent missioners: St. Joseph of Leonessa, the apostle of the Turks, and St. Lorenzo da Brindisi, apostle of the Jews. In the Franciscan third order St. Hyacintha Mariscotti revived the most austere practices of penance of the Fathers of the desert. Foreign scholars passed over the mountains to consult in Italy the learned Barnabite Gavantus, the glory of his order and of the liturgy; and the pious movement that drew souls to frequent Communion had no more ardent promoters than the Italian disciples of St. Philip Neri.[29]

The Church in Germany

More distant from the center of Christianity and more deeply ravaged by the Protestant heresy, the German countries might be thought to have remained outside the movement of the Catholic renaissance. But such was not the case.

Germany, too, had had its great apostle. Blessed Peter Canisius of the Society of Jesus, who died in 1597 after preaching the gospel in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, had been chiefly a man of action. The earliest office that he held brought him into relation with the two chief universities of Bavaria and

[29] On St. Philip Neri's doctrine regarding frequent Communion, see the Bollandists, May, IV, 553. The advocates of frequent and even daily Communion were to be found also in Spain. Such were the Benedictines Chinchilla and Marzilla, the Carthusian Antonio de Molina, and especially Juan Falconi, a Brother of Mercy. See Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* III, 537 f.

Austria; the resources at his disposal as founder and first provincial of his order in Germany; the influence that he soon acquired with the Catholic princes, both secular and ecclesiastical; the part he took in the diets of the Empire; his presence, however short, at the Council of Trent; the various ministries he exercised in the largest cities: all these converged to the same practical end: to develop among the Catholics a movement of active and militant faith, and thus to oppose an effective resistance to Protestantism.[30]

The political and social state of Germany made this movement difficult. At the beginning of the Thirty Years' War almost all aspects of German life had undergone a complete transformation. The Holy Roman Germanic Empire, even before the outbreak of the war of extermination in the seventeenth century, had lost its eminent political position. The princes established their power on the ruins of the Empire and, to their own advantage, exploited the revolutionary movement of their time and gradually became almost sovereign arbiters of the destinies of the people. Their might had grown steadily in virtue of the Roman law, which was more and more followed. This Caesaropapism was as fatal to religion as it was to popular morals. What could be done to remedy such a state of affairs? An endeavor to re-establish religious unity as far as possible, by working for the conversion of the heretics and by establishing centers of Catholic life in the heart of the Church of Germany.

Two Jesuits, Georg Scherer and Jeremias Drechsel (or Drexelius), in their preaching, continued the apostolic work of Canisius. Said Scherer: "While combating the heretics, we must observe a great moderation. No insults or sarcasm. The archangel St. Michael, according to the apostle St. Jude, did

[30] Le Bachelet, art. "Canisius" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.* Pope Leo XIII called Canisius the second apostle of Germany after St. Boniface. (Encyclical of August 1, 1897.) On the work of Canisius, see Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* VII, 86, 576–78.

not use insults even toward Satan." The writings of Drechsel breathed so great a spirit of peace that the Protestants read them for their edification. This was the time when the preacher Johann Arndt, the mildest and most amiable of preachers, employed in the pulpit a sober and practical piety, well calculated to win devout souls.

However, this work of the apostolate could be effective only on condition that Catholic life be revived in its centers. This need was grasped by bishops who, like Johann von Bicken, archbishop of Mainz, Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn, bishop of Würzburg, were columns of the Church by the example of their lives and by their zeal for the reform of morals. But two notable movements of Catholic renaissance especially merit our attention because they so well sum up, the one the monastic reform and the other the secular reform of the clergy of Germany during the first half of the seventeenth century. We refer to the attempt to form a congregation of all the monasteries of Germany under the Rule of the abbey of Melk and of the undertaking to restore the secular clergy by the congregation of the Bartholomites.

We might say that, since the time of St. Boniface, religious Germany was chiefly the work of the monks. The monastic life, strong and pure, had given life to Germany; when weakened and corrupted, it had brought it to its ruin. But, among the Benedictine abbeys of Germany, one, by the exact observance of the primitive rule, had for several centuries attracted the attention of the men of God. That was the abbey of Melek, or Melk, located in Austria on the Danube, in the diocese of Passau. "Ever since 1460 several German abbots had resolved to join together into a congregation and to embrace the observances of Melk." [31] The project could be realized then only in part and for a short time. The Protestant Revolt ruined it

[31] Hélyot, VI, 220. Berlière, "La Réforme de Melk au XVI[e] siècle" in the *Revue Bénédictine*, XII, 1895.

from top to bottom. From 1520 to 1587, by the weakness of several abbots, the heretical spirit succeeded in penetrating the monastery. Defections occurred. The faithful monks and the Catholics in general then founded great hopes on the pious and energetic Gaspard Hoffmann, who had received the abbatial crosier in 1587. Those hopes were not deceived. The new abbot, born at Ochsenfurt in Franconia, was a friend of Cardinal Klesl. He re-established discipline, revived studies, led his community back to the spirit of real monastic life. His influence was great. Suzerain of numerous vassals, councillor of the Emperors Rudolf II, Matthias, and Ferdinand II, he enjoyed in Germany a prestige that was almost unique. So when, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, everybody felt the need of a reform, the eyes of all who were zealous for the revival of monastic life turned to Gaspard Hoffmann.

In 1618 six abbots of Austrian abbeys met at Melk, resolved to join together, and drew up constitutions intended for the new congregation. But the troubles that the Protestants stirred up at that time in Bohemia and Austria, then Gaspard Hoffmann's death in 1623, halted the progress of the negotiations. They were resumed shortly afterward, and Reiner von Landau, Hoffmann's successor, had the joy of seeing the Observance of Melk accepted by eleven abbots and formally approved, in 1625, by Urban VIII. Stimulated by this example, the abbot of Fulda five years later conceived the design of uniting by a similar bond all the monasteries of Germany. Two general assemblies, meeting at Ratisbon, drew up the basis of that pious confederation, and procurators were sent to Rome and to the imperial court to obtain the confirmation of the Pope and the Emperor. The Swedish invasion of Germany broke all these plans. From the organizing projected in Germany, apparently nothing remained except the congregation of Salzburg, erected in 1641 and embracing all the monasteries of that diocese: the union of the Austrian monasteries under the Melk Rule seems

not to have lasted beyond 1650. But so many efforts were not without fruit. In 1696 a large number of monasteries were proud to call themselves "of the Union of Melk," and at least followed its spirit; the famous abbey became more and more, according to the expression of its historian, "a nursery of superiors, a seminary of scholars, and an academy of history." [32] Unfortunately that golden age was followed by an iron age, when the Josephite despotism tried to enslave the successors of Gaspard Hoffmann to the regime of its narrow bureaucracy.[33]

Wholly devoted to the sanctification of the secular clergy, was Bartholomew Holzhauser. This holy priest, born in 1613 at Langnau in the district of Ulm (died at Binden in 1658), was the son of a poor shoemaker. Some charitable persons, who met him when he was a mere boy singing hymns along the roads, had him admitted in a school, then with the Jesuits of Ingolstadt, who taught him philosophy. He was a mystical, contemplative soul, exceedingly fond of silence and peace, and seemingly favored with special supernatural graces. But the fact was discovered that this mystic had a clear view of the evils that afflicted the clergy of his time and was able to find and put in operation the means best suited to cure these evils. The decadence of the secular clergy, who were intended to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world among the people, seemed to him the great evil of his time. He discovered three causes of this evil: idleness, worldly distractions, and the evil use of the goods of the Church. One of his biographers says:

To prevent and to avoid the evils produced by these three disorders, the holy reformer joined with himself a few priests filled with the same spirit. First they asked their bishop for an appointment, placing themselves under his orders, with so great a detachment that they promised him not to have henceforth any other will but his; so that he might dispose of them according as he judged for the good and profit of the

[32] Keilblinger, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Mélek,* I, 961.
[33] Cf. Hélyot, VI, 217–24.

faithful. Secondly, they lived together under the guidance of their charitable superior, and that in houses where no women of any sort should be, under any pretext whatever. Thirdly, they placed their ecclesiastical revenues in common, to be employed in works of piety for the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls.[34]

The constitutions of the new association, drawn up by Holzhauser, were approved by Cardinal San Felice, papal nuncio at Cologne, who used to call them the marrow of the canons of the Church, *medulla canonum*. Pope Innocent XI solemnly confirmed them in 1680. The new society, known thereafter under the name of the Society of the Bartholomites, spread rapidly to the great good of the Church. It was introduced into Hungary about 1676, into Spain and Poland five years later.

The association when established in a diocese always had there three houses. The first contained the aspirants to the ecclesiastical state. They were sent to the public schools to follow the courses of study there, but their moral and religious training was given them in their own house, by the daily practice of meditation, by instructions intended to develop in them the virtues of their state, by the reading of Scripture, Church history, and the lives of the saints, by exercises suitable for training them in liturgical ceremonies and preaching.[35]

The second house was intended for priests engaged in active service. They placed in a common fund all the income from their offices; but from this fund each one was granted a certain sum for his works of charity and for his parents.

The third house, maintained by annual contributions from the revenues of the second house, received priests who, by reason of age or infirmity, had need of retirement.

The bishop had the right to supervise all the houses of the Institute and to dispose of the priests as he wished. The In-

[34] *Ibid.*, VIII, 119.
[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 123 f.

stitute had a president, who must promise special obedience to the pope and who made a yearly visitation of the establishments under his authority. We scarcely need to remark the immense good that such an association accomplished in Germany.

Reasons similar to those which thwarted the union of the German monasteries, later on hindered the zeal of the Bartholomites. Yet even to the end of the eighteenth century we find them in charge of several seminaries, notably in Swabia and Bavaria.[36]

[36] Cf. Gaduel, *Vie de Barthélemy Holzhauser.*

CHAPTER III

The Beginning of the Catholic Reform in France

The First Causes of the Reform

In 1560 more than half of France was Protestant. Forty years later it was Catholic in its general spirit. Much of this improvement may be traced to the influence of Spain and Italy. The fame of the great saints who had shed luster on those countries during the sixteenth century penetrated into France. The biographies of St. Theresa, St. John of the Cross, and St. Aloysius Gonzaga circulated among the devout faithful. The assemblies of the clergy, concerned with reforming the life of clerics, sought for guidance in the life and writings of St. Charles Borromeo and St. Philip Neri. But these were not the only causes of France's return to Catholicism. In vain Henry IV treated his former coreligionists with utmost consideration. Once the French spirit passed the feverish disturbance that had deranged it in the confusion of the religious strife, it separated from that so-called reformed religion, which had brought it nothing but political anarchy along with the intellectual anarchy.[1] The natural French spirit of order and good sense triumphed over the spirit of plot and intrigue. The moderate reforms of the Council of Trent, which the puritanism of the northern countries considered insufficient and which the Italian epicurism considered too onerous, in France corresponded with the most genuine aspirations of public opinion.

This Catholic movement, however general, lacked that mys-

[1] Strowski, *Saint François de Sales, introduction à l'étude du sentiment religieux en France au XVII^e siècle,* pp. 1–17.

tical enthusiasm and that interior discontent which the Calvinists had exploited to their advantage in the preceding century. In the case of many Frenchmen it was mingled with politics, the fashion of the moment, and self-interest. For these people, to become Catholic or to remain so, was to profess submission to the traditional dogmas and to a powerful hierarchy, to follow simply the example of the King and the court, to stand on the side of order. With some literary men (e.g., Montaigne), Catholicism was tainted with Epicurism; with others (e.g., Charron and Du Vair), it was tainted with Stoicism. In short, if, in the various impulses that brought souls to the Church, certain tendencies led to the Catholicism of Bossuet and Pascal, others, in spite of appearances, went straight to the naturalism of Jean Jacques Rousseau and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre.[2]

What influences and new forces would bring about unity and harmony among the various elements that were at work in a more or less hidden manner in these beginnings in the seventeenth century? Those influences and forces are found combined in the person of St. Francis de Sales.

St. Francis de Sales

Everything apparently prepared this great man for his providential mission. Born at Thorens in Savoy in 1567, of a noble family that was attached to Geneva by many family traditions and that counted relatives among the leaders of Geneva Calvinism, Francis de Sales was brought up by his father and his pious mother in the purest principles of Catholic orthodoxy. From his parents he inherited an acute and judicious mind, together with a generous and firm will. His childhood was passed at the foot of those imposing Alps that show their sublimity to those who contemplate them at close range, but that appear full of charm and moderate coolness to those who are sheltered

[2] Cf. Strowski, *op. cit.*, pp. 37–50.

in their valleys. His education was that of the cosmopolitan student of the sixteenth century, journeying from university to university, seeking in the different schools the lessons of the teacher who was most celebrated in such or such a branch of knowledge, continually broadening his mind by experience of new manners, faces, and languages.[3] From these contacts, St. Francis' religious spirit, without losing any of its fundamental strictness, acquired a quality of humaneness, adaptability, and amiability.

In those days, philosophers and theologians and controversialists regarded God too exclusively as the Author of moral truths or as the Author of the principles of the mind and of the laws of nature. With greater warmth of imagination the mystics had a more living God, but they attributed to Him a curious obscurity and splendor. . . . Francis de Sales did not divest the idea of God of its majesty; he retained God's metaphysical and moral attributes, and His inaccessible perfection, but his image of the Divinity remained amiable and kindly as well as great. His *Treatise on the Love of God* opens with the glorification of beauty. The idea of God, perfect beauty and perfect love, is manifested in the holiness of St. Francis de Sales. This idea dominates his whole life, is the very soul and light of that life.[4]

Before St. Francis' apostolic zeal was exercised at Paris and from there over all France and in many other parts of the world, its first manifestation was in a mission preached to the Protestants of the province of Chablais.

The undertaking was especially arduous. The districts of Thonon and western Chablais which, by the vicissitudes of war, passed into the hands of the Bernese from 1536 to 1564, had been completely won over to the Protestant heresy by their new masters. Rigorous measures which Charles Emmanuel, duke of Savoy, adopted in 1589, had produced only precarious results. St. Francis himself reports that "several people of Thonon

[3] E. Faguet, *Le XVI^e siècle en France*, p. 8.
[4] Strowski, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

and the province of Chablais, frightened by the noise of bombs and guns rather than moved by the sermons that were preached there, returned to the bosom of the Holy Roman Church. But later, when these districts were infested by incursions of the Genevans and French, they went back to their mire." [5] In 1594 Bishop Claude Granier of Geneva and Annecy persuaded the Duke of Savoy to approve the project of a peaceful mission that would not appeal to the laws or to force and that would be carried out merely by two priests. The undertaking was a hard one. In consequence of the recent events, an abyss had opened between Catholics and Protestants. The latter obstinately refused to listen to a Catholic preacher or to read any book in defense of the Roman Church. First a bridge must be built across the chasm. Francis de Sales, then twenty-seven years old, was charged with that important undertaking. His character was a wonderful help to him.

Among the Protestants the principal ones he would have to convert were friends of his father and friends of his friends. He was able to maintain cordial relations with these people, and thus their doors were opened to him. Although he was indignant at the public decree forbidding attendance at his sermons, he remained on terms of amiability with the very authors of the decree. He showered them with his courtesies. He found each one's strong and weak point, observing at what point the people's faith wavered, and what hold anyone might be able to get on them. All he asked for was a first success. This he had at the end of eight months.[6]

The conversion of one of the chiefs of the heresy in the country, the lawyer Poncet, which was soon followed by that of Baron d'Avully, president of the consistory, stirred the city of Thonon. The people of the city came, with the syndics at their head, to hear a sermon by the zealous missioner on the subject of the Eucharist. Thenceforth the final success was assured.

[5] St. Francis de Sales; *Œuvres complètes* (Berche and Tralin ed.), V, 64.
[6] Strowski, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

Francis had to intervene only to restrain the civil authority of the dukes of Savoy from abusing this triumph and to make sure of the perseverance of the new converts. Then he spread those numerous handwritten leaflets that later formed the famous book entitled *The Catholic Controversy.* Studying the principles common to Catholics and Protestants, and then examining the gaps in the doctrine of the Protestants, he strove gently and firmly to lead the latter back to the full Christian doctrine. Thus *The Catholic Controversy* was a forerunner of Bossuet's *The History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches.*

In 1602 our saint went to Paris. Being a prominent personage and having connections with the Guises, the Nemours, the Mercœurs, the Duperrons, even with Henry IV, he soon was able to become acquainted with the religious needs of the society in which he was living. People were Christians, but they left to the monks and hermits the practices of piety. Francis now found the second trait of his apostolate. He would be the apostle of piety, of the devout life, among people of the world. Without in any way inclining to the naturalism of Charron or Montaigne and while jealously defending the supernatural character of the Christian life, he would present it as something so gentle and likeable that people, after his example, would feel, in practicing it, that they were human beings more than anything else.

King Henry IV

The former missioner of the Chablais soon understood, by his dealings with the King, the influence which that ruler was able to exercise in favor of the Church.

Let us glance briefly at the political situation of France at that time. King Henry IV's authority was now undisputed. The Protestants, whom he attached to himself by favors; the sincere Catholics, whom he reassured by the genuineness of

his faith; the patriots, whom he vanquished by his mighty love for France; the courtiers, whom he dazzled by his brilliant mind; the malcontents, whom he disarmed by his wit; the crafty politicians, whom he disconcerted by his direct blows; the court nobility, whom he captivated and at the same time reassured by his frivolity: all were won over to him. The unity of France, which had been endangered in the course of the previous century, was solidified about this alluring Bearnese. Like Archbishop Duperron and the Jesuit Father Coton, Francis de Sales counted on Henry IV to take up the cause of religion in France. In fact, in the reign of this monarch, as prudent in his public life as he was frivolous in his private life, the Catholic renaissance is outlined: the religious orders start to flourish again, the clergy return to the practice of more regular habits of life, the simple faithful are inspired by more truly Christian maxims.

One of the most important acts of the royal policy in favor of religion was the recall of the Jesuits, who, in spite of the banishment issued against them by the Parliament of Paris,[7] had not entirely left the kingdom. This act of the King was not accomplished without difficulty.

In the entourage of Henry IV the Society of Jesus encountered strong prejudices. There people recalled that the League had found its warmest partisans among the Jesuits. Though the trial of Jean Châtel (1594) had not produced proof of their complicity in the attempted assassination of Henry IV, four years later a Spanish Jesuit, Mariana, almost glorified the criminal attack of Jacques Clement on the person of Henry III.[8]

[7] The decree of banishment is dated January 7, 1595. At the same time a Jesuit, Father Guignard, signer of a pamphlet published at the time of the League, had been hanged. As a certain Protestant historian says, "This execution was nothing less than a judicial murder, and the banishment of the Jesuits could not be legally justified. It was not justice, but a blind and furious passion that dictated these two decrees" (Bœhmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites*, p. 93).

[8] J. Mariana, S.J., *De rege et regis institutione*, published in 1599. In this first edition we find the sentence: *Sic Clemens periit, aeternum Galliae decus, ut plerisque*

In the King's mind another cause of suspicion continued against the Society of Jesus. The Huguenots and the politicians had never ceased to picture the Jesuits as entirely devoted to the interests of Spain, whose abasement was then the chief object of the French policy. Father Acquaviva, who was then governing the Society of Jesus with great prudence, decided to undeceive the King of France. On May 29, 1603, two Jesuits, Father Armand and Father Coton, presented themselves in his name at the court of Fontainebleau.

Father Coton, who would soon play an important part at Henry IV's side, was born in 1564, the son of a private secretary of the Queen Mother. He was considered one of the most remarkable preachers of the Society. He had converted to the Catholic religion Madame de Créqui, daughter of Marshal de Lesdiguières. The latter, who would make his abjuration nine years later, had spoken to the King in Father Coton's praise. Everything combined to favor Acquaviva's envoy. "He was at that time forty years old. He had a fine presence, and a face of remarkable beauty: a full forehead, blonde hair and beard, large and somewhat aquiline nose; a friendly smile always on his lips. His affable character and lofty soul presented attractions enhanced by a reflection of serious but kindly holiness." [9] Presently the King was won by this envoy, whose cause was good. The next Sunday, Father Coton, invited to preach in the royal chapel, there obtained a full success. Thus began the favor which this Jesuit enjoyed at court. Before long he became the King's trusted adviser, as also the spiritual director of the King's conscience. Father Coton, not at all embarrassed by so many honors, bore them with good grace. "Polished man-

visum est. In this work Mariana says that in case of tyranny, if it is impossible to assemble the representatives of the nation and if nevertheless it seems that the will of the people is that the tyrant should be done away with, each private person has the right to slay the prince to satisfy the desires of the people, *qui, votis publicis favens, eum perimere tentat, haudquaquam inique eum fecisse existimabo* (Mariana, *De rege,* p. 60).

[9] Roverius, *De vita P. Petri Cotoni,* Bk. III, chap. 9.

ners seemed to be born with him. From the moment he entered the court, he appeared as though he had grown up there. The courtiers were amazed that the man of France who most despised the world was the one who knew it best." [10]

A royal edict, published at Rouen (September, 1603), officially recognized all the houses that the Society of Jesus had kept in Guyenne and Languedoc, removed the prohibition that excluded the Society from the rest of France, allowed it to recover its former schools and to found new ones with the previous authorization of the King. This act was regarded as a manifest proof of the high standing which the representative of the Jesuits enjoyed at court. Henry IV's views undoubtedly were not thus limited. By this edict the intelligent monarch wished, not merely to testify his friendliness for a religious whom he was fond of, and to assure himself of the gratitude of a body whose power he was aware of; we have every reason to believe that, being concerned at the decline of studies and morals, he saw in the recall of the Jesuits the surest means of restoring both.

In 1595 he had charged a commission, composed of the highest personages of the Church and the magistracy, to make an inquiry about the means to raise the level of morals and studies in the University of Paris. Abuses were increasing there. In the colleges, what had lately served as barracks for foreign regiments and as asylums for the peasants of Île de France, in the Latin quarter, filled with musicians, thugs, and actors, corruption and disorder were at their height. "The candidates, without taking any examinations, but by paying the bedels and registrars, had their names entered in the register of graduates and, by force of money, obtained their diplomas." [11] Quite different was the discipline in the Jesuit schools. There the harmony, desired by so many noble souls, between

[10] D'Orléans, *La vie du P. Coton*, p. 225.
[11] Mariéjol in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, VI, II, 98.

the Christian spirit of the Middle Ages and the humanist culture of the Renaissance, seemed to be permanently assured. Perhaps nobody labored so effectively as did the fathers of the celebrated Society, in preparing for the literary splendors of the great century. They abandoned the compilations of the Middle Ages and their barbarous Latin, for the great writers of antiquity. But the ancients were not studied for their own sake, as interpreters of an abolished paganism. From them were asked only some rules in the art of writing, only some models of a literary and grammatical culture. In these schools, enclosed indeed, but with nothing of a prison except the gates, the teacher mingled in the games of the boys, and entered into their confidences. A warm and sincere affection existed between the professors and the pupils. Brilliant youth, recruited from the nobility and the upper bourgeoisie, came forth every year from these schools, trained in good manners, instructed in the practices of the world, their memory adorned with beautiful verses and elegant quotations, at the same time that they were ready to receive and joyfully follow the direction of the Society and the teachings of Rome. The Society was soon more powerful and flourishing than ever. In 1610 it already counted in its four French provinces, 36 colleges, 5 novitiates, 1 professed house, 1 mission, with about 1,400 members. Its schools were attended by larger numbers than before: the largest school, La Flèche, founded by Henry IV, had 1,200 pupils. The Institute, by the middle of the century, counted 84 colleges and 64 other houses with more than 4,000 collaborators.

Father Coton profited by the King's high esteem for him to serve the cause of the Church the best he could. For six years, on each Sunday and feast day he preached at court, which never missed hearing his word, the most austere truths of dogma and morals. Undoubtedly we should credit to Father Coton's influence with the King certain events and happenings: Henry IV's serious effort in 1608 to bring his private conduct

into harmony with his faith, the severe edict published in 1609 against dueling, the steps taken with the Grand Turk for the liberation of Christian prisoners, the King's fruitful solicitude for the development of the foreign missions, lastly his deferential and respectful attitude toward the papacy in the various agitations that troubled Italy.[12] Likewise when the fact became known that Henry IV, in delicate gratitude, decided to bequeath his heart to the Jesuit college of La Flèche, nobody was surprised. Louis XIII, who for two years received lessons in religion from Father Coton, preserved the same esteem for him and kept him as his confessor until 1617, when the zealous Jesuit left the court and journeyed through the provinces as a missioner. He died at Paris on March 19, 1626, after worthily fulfilling the important mission that Providence had entrusted to him for the good of the Church in France.

The Institute of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin

No one rejoiced over the success of the Society of Jesus more than St. Francis de Sales. When he was barely fifteen years old, he begged his mother to send him to the Jesuit college, where, he said, "he would learn the sciences and the way to heaven both together." [13] Later, when he had become Bishop of Geneva, he wrote to his priests: "We would have all been lost if the divine goodness did not raise up the fathers of the Company of Jesus, those mighty souls, those great men, who have tireless courage, intrepid zeal, and profound knowledge; who, in spite of calumnies and insults, have re-established the

[12] We see in Father Coton's correspondence that concern over the conduct of the King never left him. He writes (January 20, 1609) to Father Acquaviva: "Thanks to the blessing of the Sovereign Pontiff, the King has put his conscience in order. Of the two persons who were the objects of his unlawful pleasures, one is thinking seriously of withdrawing to a solitary life, the other has been sent away to a distant castle."

[13] Hamon-Gonthier-Letourneau, *Vie de saint François de Sales,* I, 35.

true faith; and who, by their great labors, still fill the world with learned men, exterminating heresy everywhere." [14]

The Bishop of Geneva did more than applaud the good accomplished by existing congregations. At the time he wrote the lines just quoted, he had endowed the Church with a new institute, that of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin. For a long time he had remarked that a considerable number of souls, called to the perfection of divine love in the religious life, were unable to gratify their desire. Almost all convents imposed bodily austerities that could not be endured by persons with delicate health.[15] Could these austerities not be replaced by a mortification within the reach of all, that of the spirit, of the heart, and of the will? Francis de Sales explained his plan to a holy woman, whom Providence had placed under his spiritual direction, Jane Frances Frémyot, widow of Baron de Chantal. He found in her the same interior aspirations. On June 6, 1610, the feast of the Holy Trinity and of St. Claude, Baroness de Chantal and two ladies of rank, Charlotte de Bréchard and Jacqueline Favre, received from the holy Bishop an abridgment of the constitutions of the new institute. They began their novitiate in a modest house at Annecy, a house known as La Galerie, a name that has been religiously preserved in the memories of the Order of the Visitation.

The saint did not at first intend to found a religious order. To organize an association of charity, like the one founded shortly before by St. Frances of Rome at Tor di Specchi, without solemn vows, without cloister, without recitation of the large Office, with the right to accept pious widows and even married women who would desire to withdraw for a while and devote some time to prayer far from the tumult of the world: such was his first project.[16]

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 500.
[15] *Ibid.*, II, 1.
[16] See D'Avrigny, *Mémoires*, I, 62; Hamon, II, 84.

But Archbishop Marquemont of Lyons, to whom he referred his plan, having been of the opinion that a real religious order should be founded, with absolute cloister and solemn vows, the saint humbly abandoned his own view. He later said to the Bishop of Belley: "I have been called the founder of the Visitation. But nothing is more unreasonable than to give me this title. I did what I had not intended to do; and I failed to do what I intended." But in fact his main idea survived: to give to God souls of prayer, fully devoted to the perfection of divine love, without the burden of too onerous bodily practices. As to the rather unusual form, freer and more adaptable, that could wait for its hour, which would come later.

The new institute spread so rapidly that St. Jane de Chantal had the consolation, before her death, to see 87 Visitation houses founded in France and Savoy. For this flock blessed by God, the saint, during the years that followed, gave the best of his heart and of his doctrine in the conferences that have been piously collected by his spiritual daughters.

St. Francis de Sales and the Reform of the Clergy

However agreeable these consolations might be to the heart of St. Francis, they could not make him forget the important decrees published by the Council of Trent in regard to the reform of the secular clergy. Apart from the influence which the example of his life exercised upon his priests, by his conferences and correspondence he strove to make use of two means indicated by the council: the holding of diocesan synods and the organization of seminaries. We have the collection of the synodal statutes published by the Bishop of Geneva; they are short and substantial. Whatever concerns the observance of residence, the celebration of the Divine Offices, the proper condition of the church edifices, and the private lives of clerics, is indicated clearly and precisely.[17]

[17] Cf. Hamon, I, 493.

The holy Bishop did not content himself with this. . . . He was assiduous in watching over the observance of his ordinances. Once every six months twenty overseers, who were later called archpriests, made a report to him about what had happened in their respective districts. If in this report someone was specifically mentioned as disregarding the regulations, the Bishop then promptly recalled him to the path of duty with gentle firmness. Hence arose the widespread conviction that nothing escaped his vigilance. Thus the Bishop succeeded in establishing good order throughout his diocese.[18]

The holy prelate was never able to have a seminary. Even his persevering efforts met with failure. Sometimes funds were lacking; sometimes a suitable personnel was wanting. When the Holy See was requested to authorize an assessment on the benefices as a means of meeting the expense, no reply was given.[19] Cardinal de Berulle, when urged to furnish subjects, was unable to send them. Francis de Sales then did what he could to supplement the lack of a seminary. He himself studied the dispositions and aptitudes of the young men who presented themselves to him to receive holy orders. He himself acquainted them with the ecclesiastical duties, animated them by his exhortations, and often, notwithstanding his extensive labors, even heard their confessions. The fruits of such zeal were marvelous. At St. Francis' process of canonization, St. Jane de Chantal declared: "I think that few dioceses can be found where the clergy live in a more devout and exemplary manner than in the diocese of Geneva and especially in the city of Annecy." [20]

These good results spread beyond the diocese governed by St. Francis de Sales. France, where the holy Bishop often preached, benefited to a great extent. Henry IV, who was particularly fond of him and who, in the words of the amiable saint, "when he became a sheep of the great Shepherd, planned

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 496.
[19] *Ibid.*
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 506.

to make himself the shepherd of his people," [21] did everything possible to keep Francis de Sales in France. Five times he repeated the attempt. But Francis declined the most insistent offers. Yet he profited by the confidence that the King showed toward him to arouse the monarch's zeal. The Church had, in general, good reason to rejoice at Henry IV's good will in the work of the reform of the clergy. In 1606, replying to an address by the Assembly of the Clergy, he promised to fill the prelacies, abbacies, and other benefices subject to his appointment,[22] with none but "persons of merit, fitness, and requisite talent." He said: "I am proud to see that those I have appointed are quite different from those of the past; the account of them which you have given me increases my courage to do better in the future." In spite of several regrettable appointments,[23] Henry IV almost fully kept his word and prepared for the reform which all good Catholics were demanding.

When the holy Bishop of Geneva was working so zealously for the reform of religious life and priestly life, he was thinking of the Christian people. From the outset of his ministry his far-seeing mind grasped the lacuna then existing in the popular teaching of devotion. His view was expressed in an outspoken way when he wrote: "Almost all that have hitherto treated of devotion have had in view the instruction of persons wholly retired from the world, or have taught a kind of devotion leading to this absolute retirement." [24] He had a high esteem for *The Spiritual Combat* and Father De Grenade's *La guide des pécheurs,* and the great works of St. Theresa. But he thought

[21] Letter 600, *Œuvres complètes* (Mackey ed.), XIV, 309.

[22] By virtue of the concordat of 1516, the king of France nominated to bishopries and major benefices.

[23] Charles de Lévis, in 1604 nominated to the bishopric of Lodève, was only four years old, and Henry IV took the matter so lightly as to joke about it (letter of October 24, 1605, to Maria de Medici). At the death of Charles of Lorraine, bishop of Metz, in 1607, the scandal was even greater. The King asked the chapter to "postulate" for the appointment to the see his bastard son Henri de Verneuil, six years old.

[24] *Introduction to the Devout Life,* Pref.

that the first two works just mentioned were too absolute in their principles, more suitable for the cloister or for a pious confraternity than for secular life in the world of modern times. The great mystical flights of the holy founder of Carmel seemed to St. Francis unsuited for those good people that he had become acquainted with in his missions in the Chablais, indeed even for the good bourgeoisie that he often visited and for the King's court, where he had been admitted. He considered that "it is an error, or rather a heresy, to say that devotion is incompatible with the life of a soldier, a tradesman, a prince, or a married woman." [25] If man is too often a sharp and bitter animal, let devotion be the sugar to sweeten him.[26]

In this spirit and with a view to dissipating that unsound notion of a "sad, contentious, fretful, censorious virtue, on a rock off by itself, amid briers, a phantom to scare people," [27] St. Francis de Sales wrote his *Introduction to the Devout Life*. But his purpose was also to inculcate in people of the world a more solid and more profound devotion, which by effort and sacrifice goes even to the complete renovation of the heart.

In short, the saint asks three things of his readers: examination of conscience, meditation, and the conscientious practice of the duties of their state. Examination of conscience dissipates paralyzing prejudices and opens the eyes to that quantity of sins that live and often rule in our soul without our noting their presence.[28] Meditation brings vividly before us God, the Blessed Virgin, the saints, the views of the future life, the most potent ideas and models of virtue and perfection. It teaches us to reflect upon those ideas and images until we succeed in saturating ourselves with them, penetrating ourselves with them, and nourishing ourselves on them.[29] The practice of the

[25] *Ibid.*, Bk. I, chap. 3.
[26] *Ibid.*, Bk. III, chap. 39.
[27] Montaigne, *Essays*, I, 176.
[28] *Introduction to the Devout Life*, Bk. II, chap. 19.
[29] *Ibid.*, Bk. I, chaps. 9–18.

duties of our state, especially of the lesser duties, makes devotion enter, not only our mind and heart, but our life; it turns a good act into a habit; and gradually from little things the soul rises to great things, to heroism and, if need be, even to martyrdom.

The doctrine of *The Introduction to the Devout Life* is supplemented by that of the *Treatise on the Love of God.* The author declares that, in writing this book, he has "taken into consideration the state of the minds of this age: it much imports to remember in what age we are writing." [30] But his doctrine is an ancient one, which he adapts and rejuvenates.

The work opens with a rather dry description of the faculties of the soul. But, as soon as the author begins to speak about the love of God, of that deep inclination which, from the midst of things of earth, raises us powerfully toward the divine realities, his style takes on loftiness, color and warmth, and we understand his words written to Mother de Chantal (February 5, 1610): "I am about to start writing the book, *The Love of God,* and I will try to write it on my heart as I commit it to paper." [31] He says:

> Among partridges, often some of them steal the eggs of others to hatch them. . . . Note this curious fact: the partridge that is hatched and fed under the wings of a strange partridge, at the first cry that it hears from its real mother leaves the robber partridge and goes to its first mother and follows her by the relationship it has with its first origin. . . . The same is true, Theotimus, with our heart. Although it may be hatched, nourished, and brought up amid bodily, low, and transitory things and, so to speak, under the wings of Nature, yet at its first glance upon God, at the first knowledge it receives, the natural and first inclination to love God, which may have been slumbering and imperceptible, awakes at once.

Love, then, is the starting point for the ascent of the soul toward God; and at the summit is love. To describe this ad-

[30] *A Treatise on the Love of God,* Pref.
[31] Letter 572, *Œuvres complètes,* XIV, 247.

vance toward perfection, the holy doctor has therefore only to describe the advance of love. Books II, III, and IV are devoted to relating the birth, progress, and decline of divine love. The next five books describe the exercises or practice of this love. The last three show the excellence of the love of God and give some counsels for progress in it.

Whatever the most eminent mystics have said about the mysterious sense that makes us perceive the divine, about the highest states of prayer—quietude, union, rapture, and ecstasy —St. Francis sets forth in this book in clear and agreeable language, sometimes marked with deep feeling.

Higher than the senses or reason or faith, St. Francis mentions a "certain eminence or supreme point of the reason and spiritual faculty, which is not guided by the light of argument or reasoning, but by a simple view of the understanding and a simple movement of the will, by which the spirit bends and submits to the truth and the will of God." [32] Let the soul abandon itself to this inclination, and God will attach Himself to it by the sweetest bonds.

> See, I beseech you, Theotimus, this little child cleaving to the breast and neck of his mother; if one offer to take him thence to lay him in his cradle, it being high time, he struggles and disputes as far as he is able, in order not to leave that beloved bosom, and if he is made to let go with one hand, with the other he grapples, and if he is carried quite off, he falls a weeping. . . . So the soul that by the exercise of union has come as far as to be taken and fastened to the divine goodness, can hardly be drawn from it save by force and with much pain.[33]

The divine love can even reach such a degree

> that this holy fire wastes and consumes their life. . . . When the fervor of holy love is great, it gives so many assaults to the heart, so often it wounds it, causes it so many languors, melts it so habitually, and puts it so frequently into ecstasies and raptures, that by this means

[32] *A Treatise on the Love of God,* Bk. I, chap. 12.
[33] *Ibid.,* Bk. VII, chap. 3.

the soul, almost entirely occupied in God, not being able to afford sufficient assistance to nature to effect digestion and nourish itself properly, the animal and vital spirits begin little by little to fail, life is shortened, and death takes place. O God! Theotimus, how happy this death is! [34]

Thus he who, in the delicacy of his psychology and the charm of his style, has been called "the Montaigne and the Amyot of spirituality," [35] seems at times to presage the magnificence of Bossuet and the pathos of Pascal. But he does not keep his reader long in abstract heights. A delightful comparison or a familiar proverb promptly brings the reader back to the realities of daily life. And the end which the holy doctor intended is reached. Thanks to him and his disciples, henceforth workmen and courtiers will have no difficulty in becoming acquainted with the various degrees of the spiritual life. While De Berulle, Rancé, Bourdoise, Vincent de Paul, and Olier labor to regenerate the regular and secular clergy, laymen of all ranks will join with priests and bishops to form one of the most wonderful associations of zeal and piety that have appeared in modern times, the Company of the Blessed Sacrament.

[34] *Ibid.*, chap. 10.
[35] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, I, 215.

CHAPTER IV

Reform of the Clergy in France

The Regular Clergy

In spite of the great efforts made since the Council of Trent, the monastic state at the beginning of the seventeenth century was still far short of its early fervor. The cloisters, formerly the depositaries of the most eminent virtues, were now scarcely inhabited by anyone but indolent, ignorant men, lovers of good cheer. And such were by no means the worst to be found there. Many were given to shameful excesses. Complaints of this state of affairs were often brought to Louis XIII. The King himself one day, when he was hearing Mass at Marmoutiers Abbey near Tours in 1619, was disedified by the conduct of the monks, who had so little of the Christian spirit that the respect due to the royal majesty failed to remind them of the respect they owed to the divine Majesty. Henry de Gondi (Cardinal de Retz, bishop of Paris, and head of the royal council) took the occasion to tell the King that he could do nothing more worthy of his piety and agreeable to God than to re-establish discipline in the monasteries which had lost it and that, if the matter should be placed in the hands of Cardinal de La Rochefoucault, they might hope for good results.[1]

Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld

In the number of persons close to the King, among the members of the higher clergy none was more able to undertake this difficult task than Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld. Born in 1558,

[1] D'Avrigny, *Mémoires*, I, 152. The monastery of the Great Augustinians de Paris had become the fable of Paris and France. In 1638 Father Olier, charged with making a visitation of the monastery of La Régripière, found the door closed and had to spend the night in a shed. Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier*, I, 242. On July 8 of the same year Richelieu asked the King for three regiments to establish order among the Carmelites.

he had the good fortune, during a journey in Italy, to see St. Charles Borromeo; the memory of his conversations with that great man of God remained deeply impressed on his soul. Owing to his instigation, following the States General of 1614, the Assembly of the Clergy adopted a resolution to receive and observe, as far as they could, the canons of the Council of Trent.[2] Courage was needed for such an initiative since the explicit attitude of the King and of Parliament, although they favored the reform of the clergy, was against receiving the decrees of Trent. But the Cardinal's energy was equal to his piety. The consideration of these qualities prompted Pope Gregory XV to charge him, by a brief of April 8, 1622, to labor for the reform of the monasteries of France. King Louis XIII, to give him the more authority, conferred on him the title of minister of state. The Cardinal, foreseeing that his new duties would hinder his habitual residence in his diocese, and wishing to give an example of conformity to the rules of the Church, resigned his bishopric of Senlis and devoted his whole time to the promotion of the reforms. By letters patent (July 11, 1622), the King added to him a commission of bishops and magistrates to help him by their knowledge and to lend him the force of their influence if that should be needed. He himself formed a council composed of a Carthusian, a Benedictine, a Jesuit, a Feuillant, a Dominican, a Minim, and a few other persons of well-known virtue. On March 11, 1623, he drew up the regulations that he judged necessary to propose to the monasteries he would have to reform.

The work encountered various obstacles and difficulties. The Cardinal began the reform with the monastery of St. Etienne du Mont, of which he was abbot. To overcome the opposition of some of the monks, he brought to the monastery a dozen canons of St. Vincent of Senlis, men whose tried virtue was well known. Then he resigned his office of abbot and let the

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 212.

community choose as his successor a monk of edifying life. Thus regular life was gradually re-established there.

The reform was harder at Clairvaux and Citeaux. More than 3,000 monks were living there in utter disregard of any monastic ideal. "Those lands that formerly were so fertile in fruits of holiness, now produced nothing but thorns. All the branches of the great monastic tree felt the corruption of the root." [3] In 1625, the almost simultaneous death of Denis Largentier, abbot of Clairvaux, and of Nicholas Boucherat, abbot of Citeaux, both of them favorable to the reform, precipitated the crisis. Four years earlier Abbot Denis, with good intentions but not without some pressure, had his nephew Claude Largentier elected. The latter, contrary to the expectations of his uncle, began by giving assurances to the foes of the reform. Fifteen young monks, full of zeal for the restoration of monastic life, attacked the election of the new abbot. But a certain number of the older monks, less eager for a reform that would be contrary to their inveterate habits and unfortunately more accredited at Rome and at Versailles, took the Pope and the King by surprise. They calumniated their young confreres who, they said, practiced abstinence during the day and "turned the roasting spit during the night." They succeeded in having revoked a decision that Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld had given for the good of Clairvaux and in having Claude Largentier's election confirmed. The Cardinal's persevering efforts finally introduced a mitigated reform in the monastery.

At Citeaux, by intrigue and pressure, Peter de Nivelle, who favored the abuses, was elected abbot. Twenty-eight monks, with the backing of Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld, appealed to the Pope, asking for the revocation of the election. Rome merely reduced the authority of Peter de Nivelle: the abbot's jurisdiction over the convents of women, particularly over Port Royal, was taken from him. "These houses did not recover the spirit

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

of St. Benedict and St. Bernard, but at least licentiousness was banished from the place. Although the woods consecrated by the penance of those famous patriarchs and their early disciples did not once more become the object of public veneration, at least they ceased to be the retreat of those satyrs whose indecency alarmed the neighborhood." [4]

The Trappists

Among the other reforms of religious orders,[5] that of La Trappe by Abbot Rancé deserves special mention. Jean Armand le Bouthillier de Rancé is one of the most representative men of the period we are speaking of. His youth had all the ardor of the man of the Renaissance; his maturity and old age had almost the austerity of the Jansenist. In no man of that time was the reaction against the naturalism of the sixteenth century more emphatically evident. This son of a president of the Chambre des Comptes, nephew of a superintendent of finance and of two bishops, and godson of Cardinal Richelieu, at first dazzled the world by the brilliance of his mind and the luxury of his worldly life. Hunting, various other pleasures, schemes, studies; Rancé indulged in them all at the same time, and he excelled in them all.

But the death of certain persons very dear to him suddenly opened his eyes to the frivolity of human pleasures and the instability of human greatness. The thought of eternity seized him and never again left him. "All the little reasons that have been offered to lower Rancé's resolution vanish before this idea of eternity; it rises up and results from his whole life and his whole soul." [6] Thereafter the perfection of the Christian

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[5] We should mention the reform of the Order of the Premonstratensians by Servet de la Ruelle, that of the Feuillants by Jean de la Barrière, that of Cluny by Richelieu, that of the Abbey of Sept-Fons by Eustache de Beaufort, and that of the Penitents of the Third Order of St. Francis, which occurred rather in a spontaneous manner.

[6] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, IV, 46.

life appeared to him in the monastic rule, and the monastic rule appeared to him as a continual crucifixion; he thinks of monks who would have "the mortification of the Crucified, the holiness of the apostles, and the purity of the angels." [7]

Following a solitary sojourn on his Véretz estate and a consultation with weighty men, among them Pavillon, bishop of Alet, and Caulet, bishop of Pamiers, he took a courageous resolve, gave all his possessions to the poor, resigned his benefices, kept for himself only the abbey of La Trappe in the province of Perche, and retired there with the desire to establish the most complete reform. At that abbey he made his profession (June 26, 1664), changed his title of commendatory abbot for that of regular abbot. Then he undertook gradually to establish at La Trappe the most austere practices, manual labor, silence, and vigils. He cut off from his monastery whatever did not conform to the most rigorous poverty and was himself the first to bind himself to the life of penance which he imposed on the others.

This great change and the hospitality which the zealous reformer established in his abbey attracted ecclesiastics and people of the world from all directions to this wilderness. People came out of curiosity, out of a desire for edification and for recollection, during a few days of retreat, from the tumult of the world and the burdens of business affairs. Bossuet went there eight times, sometimes by himself, sometimes with some one of his friends, such as Bishop de la Broue of Mirepoix, Abbé Fleury, Abbé de Langle, Abbé de Langeron. There might also be seen Marshal Bellefonds and King James II of England. So great was the impression which it made on them all, that they talked about it at court and in the city.

The most opposed parties endeavored to attract the new reform to themselves. Jansenists, Benedictines, Jesuits, all introduced into their controversies the name of Rancé. But he,

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

by the purity of his faith, rose above all these disputes. Bossuet wrote as follows: "I shall express my view of La Trappe with complete frankness, as a man who has no other view than that God may be glorified in the holiest house that is in the Church, and in the life of the most perfect director of souls in the monastic life that has been known since St. Bernard. If the story of this holy personage is not written by an able hand and by a head that is above things of earth, it will all go bad. Every party will want to draw the holy abbot to itself. Simplicity should be the only ornamentation of his history." "All I can say of him is that he is another St. Bernard in doctrine, in piety, in mortification, in humility, in zeal, and in the practice of penance; posterity will reckon him among the restorers of monastic life."

New Congregations

Alongside the old reformed orders, several new congregations were founded in France. In the early years of the century Jeanne de Lestonnac, a niece of Montaigne, instituted at Bordeaux the Congregation of the Daughters of Notre Dame for the education of girls. It was confirmed by a brief of Paul V (April 7, 1607). About the same period, at Paris, a woman of the highest virtue, Madame Acarie de Villemar, after taking an intimate part in whatever good was being done in the capital, introduced into France, with the help of Father de Berulle, the Order of the Carmelites. Then, aided by one of her friends, Madame de Sainte-Beuve, and by a young lady of Avignon, Françoise de Bermond, she promoted the diffusion in France of the institute of the Ursulines. Another congregation, for the Christian instruction of girls, was established at Mattaincourt, thanks to the zeal of St. Peter Fourier and Alix Leclerc: this was the congregation of Canonesses of Notre Dame, which, before the end of the century, counted more than eighty houses in France, Lorraine, Germany, and Savoy. All these works

were but the continuation and extension of the movement of reform that we studied in the sixteenth century. With St. John Eudes, Adrien Bourdoise, Father de Berulle, St. Vincent de Paul, and Jean Jacques Olier, we find ourselves in the presence of more original creations quite characteristic of this time.

The Secular Clergy

Solidly constituted in the state, from the social and political standpoints, the secular clergy of France in the first years of the seventeenth century were, from the religious point of view, in a situation no less deplorable than the regular clergy of the monasteries.

The clergy of France (i.e., both regular and secular) were the largest landowners of the kingdom. Their wealth cannot be reckoned precisely. But, from the reports of the inquiry commissioners of 1663, we learn that the revenues of the clergy far exceeded those of the nobility in each district. And the clergy managed their great possessions well. A whole financial administration—receiver general, provincial and diocesan receivers and controllers, about 700 officers—was at its service and was responsible only to it. When the clergy borrowed money, they did so on good terms. More honest than the king, their credit was better.[8]

In 1675 the provost of Paris, in a speech, thanked them for the exactitude of their payments. That same year, in the midst of the war with Holland, the King himself, acknowledging the *don gratuit* of 4,500,000 livres which the Assembly of the Clergy had just voted for him,[9] expressed his thanks in the warmest terms "to this first body of the realm."

The clergy, besides being a great social power, also constituted a real political order. They were represented in dealings with the king by the Assembly of the Clergy, which met

[8] Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. VIII, Part I, p. 390.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 389.

every five years to vote a contribution. In the interval between these meetings, two "general agents of the clergy" had entered into the council of the parties to present petitions there, and into the parliament in every case in which the clergy was a civil party.

In consequence of this high social and political position of the clergy, they had a considerable influence. "They had support in the great and middle-class families from which they were recruited. Thousands of peasants cultivated their lands. They were the feudal judge of whatever was dependent on their domains." [10] Multitudes of beggars held out their hands at the doors of the houses of the clergy and lived on their alms.

In this temporal preponderance, the Church had found a cause of spiritual decadence. The nomination of the bishops and of the incumbents of the big benefices was, in fact, in the king's hands. Henry IV was careful not to appoint persons notoriously ignorant and scandalous, but he chose them too exclusively among the great lords; and the nobility, feudal or financial, of the robe or of the sword, was accustomed to consider the goods of the Church as the hope of their younger sons, the natural appanage of the great fortunes, or the helpful providence of the ruined houses. Bishop Cospéan of Lisieux said in 1614: "Bishoprics were sometimes given to young children who were still in their nurse's arms or were schoolboys. They were bestowed on men who had nothing ecclesiastical about them except the garb. Often the king assigned pensions out of the revenues of bishoprics and benefices, as he might have done out of the general funds of the state." [11] And these great lords, these high bourgeois, who had become prelates by the royal will, continued, in their dioceses, when perchance they resided there, to enjoy good cheer, hunting, and living in the midst of worldly pleasures. The evil was so universal, so deep-

[10] Lavisse, *loc. cit.*

[11] *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, Part II, p. 376.

rooted, that it no longer provoked scandal. The political and social aspect of the episcopate so veiled its sacred character from the eyes of the best, that at the time of admitting a child to the ecclesiastical state, the question of vocation was almost never asked. A significant instance of this procedure is the way the pious Gondi family, when St. Vincent de Paul exercised so religious an influence there, decided upon the entrance of one of their sons, the future Cardinal de Retz, into sacred orders. "When his elder brother, who was destined for the Church, was slain by accident in 1622, the family at once changed their plans with regard to the younger son, and decided that he should be a priest, to receive the 'succession'—the word is perhaps a little rude, but we find no other—of his grand-uncle, then of his two uncles, successively bishop and archbishop of Paris." [12] Almost fifty years later Cardinal de Retz wrote in his famous *Mémoires:* "I do not believe there was in the world a better heart than that of my father, and I can say that his character was most virtuous; yet my duels and my gallantries did not at all hinder him from making every effort to attach to the Church a soul that was perhaps the least ecclesiastical in the world."

The situation of the lower clergy was scarcely better. Poor they certainly were, these curés on allowance, these parish priests whom high tithe-owners pressed, sometimes reducing them to beggary to the profit of lay commendatories and of court prelates. But indigence is not more moral than is opulence. We know, from the life of St. Vincent de Paul, that two of his priests sent him two memorials on the state of the clergy at Paris and in Brittany. The question is about benefice-holders who have been obliged to agree "that they have long lived in disorders," "that they have kept for themselves large sums belonging to the Church," "that they have held incompatible benefices," "that they have never given religious instruction

[12] E. de Broglie, *Saint Vincent de Paul,* p. 79.

to their parishioners." In certain dioceses "for anyone to go to confession on feast days was unheard of; only one priest could be obtained to preach the Lenten sermons in five or six parishes widely separated, and in certain entire dioceses scarcely a single country ecclesiastic could be found who dressed in black, most of them being dressed in gray and working after their Masses like laymen." [13]

From where could the reform of such abuses come? From the papacy? In a country whose King obstinately refused, in spite of the urging of the clergy, to receive the decrees of Trent, where the parliaments daily complained of the "encroachments" of the court of Rome, where the provost of the merchants forbade any clerics to introduce any innovation in the ecclesiastical policy without the King's permission, under penalty of having their temporalities seized,[14] the action of the papacy was fettered. From the episcopate? But in 1625, out of 127 heads of dioceses in France, about ten were of such morals or reputation that any idea of reforming others was out of the question.[15] Of the rest, some, having become rich landowners and high lords by their prelacies, had enough to do in their litigations against their vassals and tenants; the others held public offices that were incompatible with residence in their sees or even with their sacred character. The sovereign, who refused to receive the reform canons of the Council of Trent, seemed ill suited to intervene, as he had done by the Ordinances of Blois and of Paris in 1579 and 1624, to effect a reform in the Church. Furthermore, under a power like the absolute monarchy, that was essentially conservative, evidently nobody could hope to destroy the age-old institutions in which the evil had its chief source. The principal obstacles to the reform of the clergy came from the ecclesiastical feudalism. From what

[13] Abelly, *Vie de Saint Vincent de Paul,* Bk. II, chap. 5.

[14] D'Avrigny, *op. cit.*, I, 230.

[15] Alfred Rébelliau, "Un épisode de l'hist. religieuse du XVII^e siècle" in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 1903, p. 542.

source would the desired reform come? Devout men who were trying to find a cure for these ills observed that institutions have an influence through the spirit with which they are applied rather than through their legal form. These men did not try to upset the outward structure of the Church of France; they strove to insinuate into it a new spirit, thanks to which the harmful institutions would perhaps later fall of themselves. Richelieu, with a deep political sense, had grasped this truth. In his political testament he wrote: "A bishop ought especially be humble and charitable; he ought to have knowledge and piety, firm courage and an earnest zeal for the Church and for the salvation of souls."

What Richelieu perceived particularly in political matters, the holy priests of that period—Condren, Ender, Bourdoise, Vincent de Paul, Olier—felt in the depth of their apostolic souls. The means of inspiring the ecclesiastical body with this spirit of humility, charity, knowledge, piety, and zeal, which the great minister considered urgently necessary, these priests thought must consist of various works and institutions, chiefly the establishing of seminaries for the training of priests according to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent.

The reform of the clergy of France in the seventeenth century took place around four principal centers: the Oratory, St. Nicholas du Chardonnet, St. Lazare, and St. Sulpice. In the Oratory the promoters of this great movement were Father de Berulle and Father de Condren by their influence over their disciples and the lofty idea of the priesthood which they were able to impart. But, as a result of various circumstances, their personal work was limited to the founding of seminaries within the Oratory, intended for the training of its own candidates. At St. Nicholas du Chardonnet the austere Bourdoise was convinced that the urgent work was the foundation of diocesan clerical schools; but, in his scrupulous respect for the hierarchy, he founded only a parish seminary. At St. Lazare the zealous

Vincent de Paul, to whose soul every physical and moral suffering appealed, never lost sight of the essential work of the reform of the clergy, and he devoted to it all the time which the more urgent demands of charity left him. In this sphere his chief work was the founding of retreats for those preparing for ordination. Lastly, Jean Jacques Olier, a disciple and friend of these holy priests, directed by Condren, stimulated by Bourdoise, encouraged by Vincent de Paul, impelled especially by interior supernatural inspirations, founded at Vaugirard, then at St. Sulpice, the first major seminary properly so called.

The Oratory

Pierre de Berulle, born February 4, 1575, of an ancient and illustrious family of Champagne, pursued his studies at the college of Bourgogne, then at the Jesuit college of Clermont. His teachers declared they never saw a more vigorous mind, a sounder judgment, and a more tender devotion. The young man, at the close of his studies, when he returned home to his widowed mother, wrote the following resolutions, which thereafter remained the invariable rules of his whole life: "Every night and every morning and often in the course of the day I will renew my desire to tend to the greatest perfection and to overcome all obstacles I may encounter. . . . I will humble myself in everything. . . . I will not greatly regard my elevations of mind, however sublime, if, apart from them, I am not more prompt than before in the work of virtue and self-denial."

In 1599, after an austere forty days' retreat with the Capuchins on rue St. Jacques, he was ordained a priest. Everything in his outward relations and likewise in his aspirations to the perfect life seemed to incline the pious young man to embrace the religious life: the Jesuits had been his teachers; a Carthusian, Dom Beaucousin, was his spiritual director; a Capuchin,

Father Pacifique, was his friend and the confidant of his soul. But, he said, "although I have a high regard for all the established congregations, none of them accords with my spirit of grace or my spirit of nature." Upon the advice of Dom Beaucousin and Father Magius, provincial of the Jesuits, whom he consulted, Pierre de Berulle asked only for the priesthood, reserving his freedom to follow, at the proper time, the designs of Providence.

One day two years later, while he was reciting the Divine Office, the young priest felt deeply moved upon reading this verse of Psalm 9: "Declare His ways among the Gentiles." When he related this impression to a certain Carmelite nun, Mother Madeleine of St. Joseph, who was experienced in the ways of the spiritual life, she said: "I see great things in what you have just told me."

Father de Berulle's project soon became definite in its main lines.

The question was not to establish a religious order like the great monastic institutes of the Middle Ages or even like the congregations founded in the sixteenth century which like the monastic orders were based on the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience. Father de Berulle's idea was simpler and at the same time more complex. The basis of the new society would be exclusively sacerdotal and not at all monastic. The vows of the priesthood, but not those of the religious life, would be the sole bond uniting the members of the association to one another. In other words, this society would be composed of secular priests who would remain subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops and would not enjoy any privilege of exemption.[16]

November 11, 1611, is an important date for the history of the clergy of France. On that day, in a house of the Faubourg

[16] Cardinal Perraud, superior general of the Oratory, in *L'Oratoire de France au XVII^e siècle*, p. 42. In one point Pierre de Berulle departed from the notion of St. Philip Neri, whose idea was to make each of his Oratories a work of local apostolate, having its own independent superior and its own novitiate. The new founder intended to centralize the authority in one superior and to assign a universal apostolate to his congregation.

St. Jacques, six priests meeting together, with Pierre de Berulle at their head, formed themselves into a community and resolved to practice the duties of the priesthood as perfectly as possible. According to the holy founder, the priesthood is the order founded by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. It is the first, the most essential, and the most necessary for the Church of God. Bossuet later expressed the spirit of the new congregation when he said: "Pierre de Berulle's great love inspired him with the design of forming a company to which he wished to give no other spirit than that of the Church herself, no rules except her canons, no bonds but her charity, no solemn vows except those of baptism and the priesthood.[17]

Letters patent, confirmed on January 2, 1612, and registered in the Parliament on September 4, 1613, gave the new institute the sanction of royal approval. A bull of Paul V (May 10, 1613), granting it approbation, sketched its plan of life as follows: "To live together in a society subject to rules; and, in a spirit of continual humility, to conduct themselves as servants of the Almighty, endeavoring especially to realize in all their acts the perfection of the priestly state; to remain subject to the bishops for the labors of the holy ministry; to devote themselves to the training of the clergy and to have these cultivate learning, not for the sake of learning itself, but for the services it can render the neighbor." [18]

The Jesuit, Father Coton, declared that the Oratory seemed necessary for the Church and that he regarded it as a new creation which had been lacking for the perfection of that second and divine universe, the Church. St. Francis de Sales said that, if he could become someone else, he would choose to be Father de Berulle and that he would gladly leave his present state in order to live under the guidance of that great man.

[17] Bossuet, *Oraison funèbre du P. de Bourgoing.*

[18] Bull *Sacrosanctae; Bull, rom* (Luxemburg ed.), III, 371.

Priests came in large numbers and gathered about the holy founder, some becoming members of his congregation, others simply seeking edification from his lessons and imbibing his spirit. In a few years several houses of the Oratory were opened in various cities of France. Soon Father de Berulle's reputation for holiness reached beyond the boundaries of France, new colonies of Oratorians were sent to Louvain, Madrid, Savoy, and Rome, where Pope Paul V, in accord with Louis XIV, entrusted to them the church of St. Louis of the French. In the number of these establishments we should note, in the Faubourg St. Jacques, the College of St. Magloire. Speaking of this, Bossuet said: "Go to that house, where the bones of the great St. Magloire rest. There, in the purest and most serene air of the city, a countless number of clerics breathe a still purer air of clerical discipline. They spread into all the dioceses and carry with them the spirit of the Church." [19]

De Berulle's idea was to have the priests of the Oratory devote themselves solely to the direction of the seminaries. But, by a remarkable permission of Providence, the Holy See did not give its approval to this exclusive plan. The zeal of the Oratory then spread out into all the functions of the priestly ministry. The young institute was not long in covering itself with glory. Soon it gave to scholarship Jean Morin, Richard Simon, Abel Louis de Sainte-Marthe, Houbigant, and Thomassin; to mystical theology, Condren; to philosophy, Malebranche; to the Christian pulpit, Mascaron, Lejeune, and Massillon. Its colleges presently rivaled those of the Jesuits. The work of the theological seminaries was unable to develop as the zealous founder of the Oratory had expected. But he had the joy of seeing founded at Paris in 1620, thanks to the benevolence of Cardinal Henry de Gondi, bishop of Paris, the seminary of St. Magloire. His work would be continued and

[19] Bossuet,, *op. cit.*

his views fully realized by his worthy successor, Charles de Condren, and four priests trained in his school: Adrian Bourdoise, Vincent de Paul, John Eudes, and Jean Jacques Olier.

Charles de Condren (1588–1641)

According to a saying of Father de Berulle, Charles de Condren [20] received the spirit of the Oratory in his cradle. His reputation for holiness was remarkable. St. Chantal said: "God gave our blessed founder to the Church for the instruction of men; but he made Father de Condren capable of instructing the angels." [21] When news of his death reached St. Vincent de Paul, this saint cast himself on his knees and struck his breast, accusing himself of not having honored that holy man as he deserved. From Father de Condren the eighteenth-century reformers of the clerical life received those lofty views about the priesthood which would inspire all their works. One of them, Father Olier, declared that Father de Condren had grasped the sublime idea of the design that God manifested to him. He gradually made known what he himself knew was useful.

Adrian Bourdoise (1584–1665)

A retreat made at the Oratory in 1611, under the direction of Father de Berulle, decided Bourdoise's vocation. He was born July 1, 1584, at Brou, a small town in the diocese of Chartres. His father was a subordinate government official. After his father's premature death, his mother was left destitute and he was obliged to work as watcher of cattle, then as a domestic servant, until the day when a charitable pastor introduced him to the studies necessary for attaining to holy orders. The idea of the greatness of the priesthood haunted him from

[20] Born at Vaubuin in 1588; died at Paris in 1641.
[21] Caraccioli, *Vie du P. de Condren,* p. 123.

the time of his early childhood. In 1639 he wrote: "At the age of four I began singing in the choir; from that time on, I thought of nothing but the means for seeing in the Church priests who would take to the heavenly road while leading the people there." To say that he was original and simple would not have offended him. He himself used to say: "My principle was always to note what was ordinarily done, and then to do the contrary." "I am merely crudeness and brutishness, having passed my youth in activities unworthy of a cleric." [22] The portraits we have of him show him with a receding, wrinkled forehead, piercing eyes beneath curved protruding eyebrows, features stern and common. He was without moustache, as a protest against the general custom of clerics of that time. The biographers of this dauntless priest often call him a new Elias, a second John the Baptist. He was the most outspoken of the precursors. One of his contemporaries tells us that his manner sometimes seemed to shock human prudence; but, although arousing laughter, it had good effects. One day he even called St. Vincent de Paul a milksop. Letourneau says: "The ideal of this great servant of the Church was to restore the parish and the parish spirit. He had an invincible horror of all domestic chapels. He insisted that Christians ought to attend High Mass. He thought that parishes should be served by priests living in community, like monks, in perfect poverty and humility." [23] He even wished ecclesiastics to be more perfect than monks. In one of those anthitheses that he was fond of, he used to say that the monk is for himself, the cleric is for the Church. The monk saves himself by flight, the cleric by fight. Moreover, he did not understand the possibility of the common life and of holiness in the priesthood without the seminary. He said that for the general disorder of the Church only one remedy would be effective, the establishment of seminaries. What

[22] Quoted by Faillon, *op. cit.*, I, 225.
[23] G. Letourneau, *La mission de J.-J. Olier*, p. 61.

makes a good Capuchin or a good Jesuit is a good novitiate. But we have no novitiate for priests. He conceived seminaries as diocesan, founded and directed by the bishop; in conformity with this view he did not found any diocesan seminary properly so called, because, as he said, he did not wish to labor outside the hierarchy. He merely formed a parish seminary at St. Nicholas du Chardonnet, his own parish.

By this work, by the zeal he exercised in the esablishment at Paris of the "exercises for ordinands," and especially by the foundation of his parish community of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet, Bourdoise did much for the restoration of the clergy of France. Shortly before his death (1665), he wrote: "Our eyes are happy at what they see, the beginning of a reform. . . . What we see in the Church is silver compared with the past, which was lead. But, compared with the gold that is to be desired, this silver is merely lead." [24]

St. John Eudes (1601–80)

Adrian Bourdoise was not a long time in the Oratory; John Eudes spent twenty years in it. Besides Berulle's influence, which was exercised on him for six years, that of Father de Condren continued for twelve years; then, for two years, that of Father Bourgoing. John Eudes, born (1601) in the little village of Ri in Normandy, in a lowly family, was the oldest of seven children, one of whom became the historian Mézeray. Like Adrian, he was struck, from the time of his childhood, by the sight of the indifference with which priests and laity treated the holiest things. "No sanctuary," he said, "is any longer to be found, no place reserved to the sacred ministers of the holy of holies. We have merely a den of robbers, a retreat of beasts. . . . Do you wish to see how little veneration most Christians have for the house of God? Go into the houses of the great ones

[24] Schoenher, *Histoire du Séminaire de Saint-Nicolas*, p. 197.

of earth: there you will see nothing that is not neat and in good order. Go into the churches: there you will see many of them surrounded with filth, covered with cobwebs, the floors covered with mud. Great God, where is the faith of Christians?" [25] Upon joining the Oratory, John Eudes hoped to labor at bringing some remedy to these evils by the foundation of seminaries. The missions that were entrusted to him by his superiors and that he preached in different dioceses, especially in Normandy, strengthened his conviction that a reform of the morals of the faithful would be impossible unless a beginning was made by reforming those of the priests. But he encountered Father Bourgoing's refusal when he formed the project of organizing, in concert with a few ecclesiastics, a real priestly work. This refusal seems to have determined his leaving the Oratory.

Immediately upon leaving the Oratory he founded at Caen (March 25, 1643) a new society under the name of the Society of Jesus and Mary. Like the institute established by Berulle, that of John Eudes was formed without any vows but those of baptism and the priesthood. But he limited his activity to two functions: the sanctification of clerics by seminaries and the preaching of the gospel to the faithful. Furthermore, the holy founder intended that the work of the seminaries should be always the chief aim of his congregation. He often repeated the motto: The interests of the seminaries are preferable to anything that can be done outside. The program laid down for the new society was persistently followed, in the face of a thousand obstacles. Cardinal Richelieu (October, 1642), in several conferences that he had with Father Eudes, promised his support for the founding of a seminary at Caen. The establishment, generously endowed by his niece, the Duchess of Aiguillon, was able to open in 1643. From 1650 to 1667, four other seminaries were founded; namely, at Coutances, Lisieux, Rouen, and Evreux. A petition presented by John Eudes to the Assembly

[25] Quoted by H. Joly, *Le Bienheureux Jean Eudes*, pp. 11–13.

of the Clergy (1645) for a general organization of the seminaries of France under a single direction, aroused keen opposition, and the project of the servant of God was finally rejected by the Assembly, which did, however, encourage the priests of the Caen seminary to continue in the way they had begun. Three years later, a higher authority, the Congregation of Propaganda, explicitly declared, in reply to malicious charges, that the seminary established at Caen by John Eudes was erected according to the mind of the Council of Trent and that it had no need of confirmation.

St. Vincent de Paul (1576–1660)

When John Eudes was withdrawing from the Oratory and was instituting a new society, St. Lazare and St. Sulpice were already founded. At St. Lazare the priestly life found its accomplished model in St. Vincent de Paul; at St. Sulpice the seminaries of France recived their definite form from Father Olier.

The world scarcely knows St. Vincent de Paul except as the outstanding apostle of charity. Those who have carefully studied the life of this great man of God see in him especially the priest or, as his first and most penetrating biographer says, "a great lover of the priesthood of Christ." [26] To one of his confreres he wrote: "How blessed you are to be serving our Lord as an instrument in the making of good priests! You cannot find any work more necessary and more desirable than yours." [27] He regarded the priesthood as a center of charity, flowing out over the whole world. He had no love for those souls "that confine their love to God alone, those souls that are elevated in contemplation but that stop with the taste of that infinite source of sweetness without concern for their neigh-

[26] Abelly, *op. cit.*, Bk. III, chap. 11, § 5. (1839 ed., II, 334).
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

bor." "Our vocation," he said, "is to go, not into one parish or into one diocese, but throughout the earth, to embrace the hearts of men. We are not satisfied with loving God if our neighbor does not also love Him." [28] The whole life of St. Vincent may be found in these words. He is engaged in the solacing of all wretchedness of body and soul, but in his priestly soul he seeks the source of his devotedness and gives the best of his soul to the training of holy priests.

Like Adrian Bourdoise and John Eudes, he came of peasant stock.[29] Throughout his life he humbled himself, as for a crime, with having, in early childhood, blushed for his father, poor and ill dressed. He once said to his priests: "To whom do you render obedience? To a man full of sins. I have recently been thinking of this. For I recall that, when I was a little boy, as my father was bringing me with him into the city, I was ashamed to go with him and to acknowledge him as my father because he was ill dressed and a little dirty. Wretch that I was! . . . I ask pardon of God and of the whole Company." Throughout all his life, before the common people as also before those at the royal court, he repeatedly called to mind that he sprang from a poor family. Providence would lead this son of peasants through the most brilliant and diverse society of his time.

Vincent was born (1576) in the village of Pouy near Dax, in the Landes department of Gascony. As a child he watched his father's sheep. His first studies, with the Cordeliers of Dax, showed the alertness and penetration of his mind. The generosity of a certain lawyer, who engaged Vincent as tutor of his children, enabled the young man to answer the call to

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 286.

[29] In the seventeenth century the particle (de) was not a sign of nobility. The younger brother of John Eudes was called Charles d'Honay; in certain districts the custom was for the younger brothers to leave the family name to their oldest brother while they took the name of a paternal locality or some other surname. Cf. Joly, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

the priesthood which he heard in his soul. He then pursued his advanced studies at the Toulouse University and there was ordained priest in 1600. After that, at the University of Saragossa, where the subtle discussions on the divine concursus soon impressed his clear genius and his gentle humor, he acquired a solid knowledge of theology.[30]

Five years later he was captured by Barbary pirates and became the slave of a renegade apothecary. At Tunis he argued with the Mussulman infidels and began an acquaintance with their medical knowledge. Soon after this, Providence brought him to Rome. There we see him at the papal court, attentively noting the customs of that world which was new to him. While he was yet less than thirty-four years old, Pope Paul V, struck by his sagacity, entrusted him with a confidential mission to Henry IV. The astute monarch took good care to keep at his court that sharp and genial mind, which was somewhat like his own. Thus the humble priest became chaplain of the Queen of France. In the sort of Academy that Margaret of Valois had in her palace in the Faubourg St. Germain and at her château at Issy, good Father Vincent rubbed elbows with the finest minds of the age: the humanist Bishop Coëffeteau, the scholarly Dupleix, the historian Palma Gayet, the poet Mathurin Regnier. Soon, in the house of the great nobleman, Emmanuel de Gondi, commander of the galleys and brother of the Bishop of Paris, who (1613) entrusted to him the education of his son, the future Cardinal de Retz, Vincent found the same taste for literature and learned discussions. This circumstance reveals one of the remarkable traits in the life of this man who was the humblest and simplest spirit of his time and perhaps of

[30] The Jansenist party could not forgive Vincent de Paul for having so cleverly discovered and so courageously denounced their errors. They endeavored to accredit the legend of a St. Vincent de Paul ignorant and incapable of lofty dogmatic speculation. But we know the impression which his learning and penetration made on the Prince de Condé and on Cardinal Richelieu. Authentic documents, found after his death, show that the University of Toulouse conferred on him the right to teach Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences.*

all times. One step more, and Vincent became the very soul of that "Council of Conscience" which the Queen, Anne of Austria, and her chief minister, Mazarin, formed to help the royal government in the handling of ecclesiastical matters, especially in the appointments to benefices. Everywhere the influence of the holy priest was felt by all. When, on his way to the royal council, the son of the Landes peasant, with his slow and somewhat heavy step, passed through the ranks of the courtiers, some of the great lords may have smiled at his patched cassock and his worn-out hat; presently his convinced and burning words and the frank expression of his penetrating look would have the gift of touching the most selfish hearts and of overcoming men who were the most hardened in the handling of political affairs.[31]

Indeed the virtue of this priest was remarkable. Long years of silence and prayer, of terrible interior distress,[32] had forged his apostolic soul. An astonishing loftiness of ideal in the conception of his works was united with a marvelous prudence in execution; a slowness of decision, which sometimes exasperated his friends, whenever God's will did not appear clear to him, combined with a warmth of zeal, a determined perseverance, which nothing thwarted once the divine will was manifest. The preaching of the gospel to the poor and the sanctification of the clergy were the two aims of his zeal. But every material, moral, or religious need of his time appealed to his charitable soul. In all its forms, charity filled the life of the holy priest. The story of the Catholic revival should mention in par-

[31] Queen Anne of Austria was unable to resist the charitable solicitations of the saint. One day, after emptying her purse, she turned over to him for his poor a diamond worth 7,000 livres, asking him to keep secret the identity of the benefactor. To this Vincent replied: "Madame, pardon me if I fail to obey you in this. I cannot conceal so beautiful an act of charity."

[32] One time the holy priest, seeing that his arguments failed to vanquish the doubts of a Sorbonne doctor, heroically offered to endure this painful trial of conscience. We know how, during the space of four years, this humble soul underwent the torment of unbelief. He was suddenly delivered from this temptation by his vow to consecrate himself entirely to Christ in the person of the poor.

ticular three of his works: the missions, the retreats for ordinands, and the seminaries.

The Missions

In the first of these undertakings St. Vincent was helped by the devout Marchioness de Gondi. "Margaret de Silly's pure and sweet personality, attractive and charming to an unusual degree, caused the most austere Christian virtues to be admired in the highest society, without losing anything of her grace and exquisite distinctions." [33] This noble woman deserves a place among the personages who brought about the Catholic revival of the seventeenth century. St. Vincent de Paul always attributed to her the inspiration of the work of the missions. Moved by the moral wretchedness of the peasants on her estates, Madame de Gondi begged Father Vincent to preach to them and especially to urge them to make a general confession. As the saint himself says: "God had much regard to the confidence and good faith of this lady. . . . These good folk were so touched by God that they all came to make their general confession." All through his life the saint preserved the memory of a certain day (January 25, 1617) when for the first time he preached to these poor peasants; he celebrated its anniversary devoutly as that of the first and remote origin of his apostolic works. With the help of the pious Madame de Gondi and her worthy sister-in-law, the Marchioness de Maignelay, Vincent founded (1618) the first society of the Ladies of Charity.

Before appearing in the presence of God, Madame de Gondi had the consolation of seeing the charitable undertakings of her holy teacher consolidated by the foundation of a solid institution. On April 17, 1625, at the Gondi palace in Paris, was signed the agreement for the founding of what would later be

[33] E. de Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

called The Mission. The Marquis de Gondi and his wife are mentioned in the first line of this agreement. Vincent de Paul is scarcely named in it, but his inspiration fills this fine document, famous in the religious history of the seventeenth century.

The purpose of the new society was to come to the aid of the poor country people by uniting a few good priests of well-known doctrine, piety, and ability who would go from village to village, at the expense of the common treasury, to instruct and exhort the poor people, without taking any compensation, with a view to distributing gratis the gifts they have received freely from the generous hand of God. Madame de Gondi died two months after the signing of the agreement, assisted at her last hour by the holy priest to whom she had entrusted the direction of her conscience. The new Society, approved by the royal authority two years later, was erected into a regular congregation, under the name of Society of the Priests of the Mission, by a bull of Urban VIII (January 12, 1632).[34] At the close of that year its headquarters were transferred to the priory of St. Lazare, whence the name of Lazarists given to the missioners instituted by St. Vincent de Paul.

Retreats

St. Lazare now became the center of the works founded by St. Vincent. There he gave most of the retreats for ordinands. These retreats were intended to be the immediate preparation of the young men who were about to be ordained priests.

For some time past the saint had been lamenting the deplorable conditions in which the ordinations of clerics were taking place. Worldly clerics of the cities, younger sons, having

[34] See an abridgment of the Constitutions and Common Rules of the Congregation of the Mission, in Mott, *Saint Vincent de Paul et le sacerdoce,* pp. 429–36. On the history of the foundation of the Mission, see the same work, pp. 237–57.

university diplomas with a view to desired benefices, and poor village clerics, uncultured, ignorant, and crude: [35] both groups were on a par so far as religious preparation was concerned. Canon law required that the candidate's qualities should be assured, and his piety often led him to prepare for orders by a retreat. But practically nothing was regulated. You might see young men, without examinations or retreats, without any kind of instructions or counsels, receive from their bishop the order that permanently attached them to the Church by the subdiaconate; on another day you might see them receive the mighty powers of the priesthood. "One is saddened in reading the history of that saintly prelate, Bishop Donnadier, who, penetrated with zeal for the sanctity of the priesthood, required the ordinands of his diocese to prepare on the eve of their ordination by a general confession. For almost three hours he exhorted them, and in the evening sent to their lodgings to discover and reject the unworthy." [36]

One day (in July, 1628) the Bishop of Beauvais (Augustine Potier), taking Father Vincent with him in a carriage, remained some time with his eyes closed, saying nothing, meditating on something in his own mind. Those who were with him, thinking he was asleep, remained silent. Then, opening his eyes, he told them he had not been asleep but was thinking what might be the most direct and certain means for rightly disposing and preparing the candidates for holy orders. He said he thought it might be to have them come to his own house and there stay with him a few days, while they would be given some suitable exercises to inform them of things they ought to know and of the virtues they ought to practice. Then Father Vincent, who had already in a general way spoken to him about the need of this preparation, now expressed his approval of the suggested program, saying: "This thought of yours comes from God; your proposal is an

[35] Bourdoise relates: "A good man, my godfather, told me at that time: 'Adrian, you must learn to read so as to sing well in the church, for it is a fine thing when a priest knows how to read and write.' See what was the state of the clergy of my day" (Bourdoise, *Sentences chrétiennes,* chap. 8, no. 22).

[36] Bougaud, *St. Vincent de Paul,* I, 138.

excellent way gradually to put all the clergy of your diocese in good order." [37]

At the time of the next ordination, which occurred on the September Ember days, Father Vincent went to Beauvais and put himself at the disposal of the Bishop for the organization and preaching of his first retreat for ordinands, "being more assured that God was asking this service of him, since he received it from the lips of a bishop, than if it had been revealed to him by an angel." [38] Fortunately the example given by the Bishop of Beauvais became contagious. At the beginning of 1631, the archbishop of Paris, Jean François de Gondi, published a decree requiring that all the subjects of his diocese who should aspire to holy orders must, ten days before receiving them, go into retreat with the Fathers of the Mission, there to dispose themselves, by the exercises of a special retreat, to receive them worthily and fruitfully. These exercises, organized at the Collège des Bons-Enfants and later at St. Lazare by St. Vincent's practical genius, had a prodigious success in France and beyond. Several bishops adopted them. In many places they were conducted by the Oratorians. In 1659 they received the approval of the supreme authority. In November of that year, by command of Pope Alexander VII, an order of the Cardinal Vicar obliged all aspiring to sacred orders to prepare for them by a ten-day retreat made with the Priests of the Mission.

These ten days of retreat, spent in meditation upon the greatness and responsibilities of the priesthood, prepared the young ordinands to receive more abundantly the graces of their holy state and to approach the exercise of those orders with greater generosity. But would not these impressions soon be-

[37] Abelly, *op. cit.*, I, 119.

[38] Says Letourneau: "It would be a mistake for us to regard the thought of the Bishop of Beauvais as a sort of heavenly revelation, manifesting a wholly new project. The idea of retreats for ordinands had already been prepared by several persons" (Letourneau, *op. cit.*, p. 55).

come weakened? Father Vincent reflected upon the matter, praying God to help him to thwart such a misfortune. He considered means for remedying the situation. Ever distrustful of his own lights, as usual he awaited some sign from Providence before applying them.

"While he was occupied with these thoughts, a virtuous ecclesiastic, who had attended the ordinand's exercises at Paris, called on Father Vincent. He proposed to him that some kind of union should be established among the ecclesiastics who might wish to live in conformity with the holiness of their vocation. He expressed the hope that Father Vincent would consent to have them meet at times at St. Lazare where they would confer together about the virtues and duties proper to their ministry. Father Vincent received this suggestion as coming from God." [39]

On July 25, 1633, at St. Lazare began the clerical conferences that would become famous as the Tuesday Conferences. Among the approximately three hundred priests who were admitted to these conferences during St. Vincent's lifetime, we find that the Church of France then had men eminent by birth, talent, learning, and virtue: Abelly, the future bishop of Rodez and biographer of St. Vincent; Pavillon, Godeau, Fouquet, Vialart, and Perrochel, future bishops respectively of Alet, Vence, Bayonne, Chalons, and Boulogne; the Abbot of Coulanges, uncle of Madame de Sévigné, Father Olier, founder of St. Sulpice, and, most illustrious of all, Bossuet, who throughout all his life retained the memory of these conferences. Fifty years later (1702), in his deposition with reference to the servant of God, he wrote: "We had the consolation of seeing with our own eyes the person and the actions of that apostolic man and of hearing with our own ears the words of life that came from his lips. During the last six years of his life we were privileged to be admitted to the company of those clerics that

[39] Abelly, *Collection des Lazaristes,* II, 316, quoted by Mott, *op. cit.,* p. 293.

met together for the Tuesday Conferences, at which a large number of prelates and doctors were present. We were extremely edified by his conduct and considered him a saint, who practiced all the Christian and ecclesiastical virtues in a heroic degree."

Other similar associations were founded, on the model of that of St. Lazare, in many dioceses. The results soon made themselves felt. Often we are tempted to ask how, in the frivolous society of the seventeenth century, so many priests and prelates, mingling in the world and at court, were able to maintain a worthiness of life in such contrast with that of their environment. The secret of their priestly virtues, their zeal for the salvation of souls, and their service of the poor, is to be found largely in the work of the ordinands' retreats, and particularly in the personal influence of the holy founder of the Mission, in the influence of his example and conversations. More than any other cause, the sincere and moving words of the humble priest may have contributed to the emancipation of Bossuet's genius from the pompous rhetoric of the period.

The Seminaries

By the work of the ordinands' retreats, divine Providence prepared the important work of the seminaries, an undertaking called for by the Council of Trent. The bishops had now under their hand a prepared house and personnel. Nothing further was required than the enlargement and affirmation of the first work. But the saint was not in a hurry to start the work. His humility kept him from taking part in this enterprise. To prompt him to do so required the intervention of Cardinal Richelieu. One day, when Louis XIII's minister sent for him to consult him about the affairs of the French clergy, Father Vincent took advantage of the circumstances to say to him that, after the ordinands' retreats and the spiritual con-

ferences of the clergy, which were now taking place in several localities, nothing remained to wish for but the establishment of seminaries in the dioceses.[40] The Cardinal, after listening with gratification, urged that Father Vincent himself should undertake the foundation of a seminary. As means for the beginning of the work, he sent him a thousand crowns, which were used for the maintenance of the first clerics that Father Vincent received at the Collège des Bons-Enfants in February, 1642. After that, several bishops established seminaries and put them in charge of the priests of the Congregation of the Mission, as at Cahors, Saintes, St. Malo, Tréguier, Agen, Montauban, Agde, Troyes, Amiens, Noyon, and also in Italy and other countries.

But at that time (December, 1641), a major seminary, exclusively for young men who had completed their course of the humanities, was founded by one of the most faithful disciples of St. Vincent and of Father de Condren, by one of the best friends of John Eudes and Adrian Bourdoise. This priest was Jean Jacques Olier.

Father Olier (1608–57)

Jean Jacques Olier was a conquest of grace. He was the son of Jacques Olier de Verneuil, councilor in Parliament and secretary of Henry IV. He was related to the first families of the

[40] The saint took no account of the attempt he had made in 1635, when receiving at the Collège des Bons-Enfants young children destined to be brought up according to the mind of the Council of Trent. The success did not correspond to his good desires. On May 13, 1644, he spoke thus of the young clerics of this first seminary: "We have twenty-two of them in our seminary of the Ecoliers des Bons-Enfants, among whom not more than three or four are passable, giving promise of perseverance. . . . The decree of the Council is to be respected as coming from the Holy Ghost; nevertheless, experience shows that in the way it has been carried out with regard to the age of the seminarians the thing has not succeeded either in Italy or in France." St. Vincent's project was fully realized only when he transferred the young students from the Collège des Bons-Enfants to the St. Charles Seminary, a real preparatory seminary that gave excellent results. (Abelly, *op. cit.*, I, 557.

Paris magistracy. At the age of eighteen he was provided with the abbacy of Pébroc, was prior of Bazainville and of Clisson, honorary canon of the illustrious chapter of St. Julian of Brioude. At first he led the worldly life of most ecclesiastics of his condition. He had a large retinue, two carriages, and numerous servants. His vivacity, his noble and affable manners, made him sought after in society.[41] He had delicate features, a broad forehead, aquiline nose, bright red lips, a silvery voice, natural gestures, an easy bearing. In the world of young ecclesiastics of quality who were then scandalizing pious souls in Paris by using the revenues of their benefices in having carriages and valets, in making good cheer, in gaming, and in various kinds of foolish expenses, the young Abbot of Pébrac held first place. One day, when a group of these young clerics were on their way back from the St. Germain fair, a humble woman came up to them and said: "Alas, gentlemen, how sorry I am for you! For a long time I have been praying for your conversion. Some day, I hope, God will hear me."

Olier, who was in the group, never forgot that meeting and the woman who thus spoke to them. Her name was Marie de Gournay, the widow of David Rousseau, one of the twenty-five "Paris wine-merchants before the court." [42] At an early age she had felt impelled to labor for the good of the Church and by her prayers had already obtained the reform of the abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés. Father Olier later declared that he owed his first conversion to this holy soul. He began to live unto God in desire and by an affection that was not deep. But, in spite of the solicitations of God, he always fell back, until the time of his visit to Notre Dame of Loreto. There he was en-

[41] Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier*, I, 23.

[42] It does not follow that we can say, with Faillon, that "God chose Marie de Gournay from the most obscure class and one of the occupations most degrading in the eyes of the world" (Faillon, *op. cit.*, I, 24). Offices such as that of wine merchant to the court were bestowed on persons whom the government wished to gratify, persons who often had the business managed by others.

tirely conquered by grace. From that time on, he was completely changed. St. Vincent de Paul, whom he took for his confessor, introduced him to the most excellent works of charity and apostolic zeal. He attended the ordinands' retreat at the time of his promotion to sacred orders in 1633 and was one of the first priests who attended the famous conferences at St. Lazare.

The missions, which St. Vincent's disciples were organizing in the various districts of France, counted Father Olier among their most devoted workers. These apostolic labors occupied him for about ten years and left an indelible impression on his soul. We can truly say that, to the very end of his life, he remained a missioner, even when he was preaching to his seminarians the loftiest maxims of the interior life and when he was striving to bury himself in the confines of his community: even then he was still thinking of missions in France, Canada, Cochinchina, and Mesopotamia. The long experiences he had acquired in the missions gave him great authority in directing the clerics and priests who sought his advice.

A remarkable event, which inquiry by the Congregation of Rites allowed to be regarded as miraculous, turned him finally to the work of seminaries. In 1634, while the servant of God was at prayer during his retreat at St. Lazare, a nun, apparently of the Order of St. Dominic, suddenly appeared to him, holding a crucifix in one hand, in the other a rosary. With her eyes filled with tears, she made known to him that she was weeping for his perfect conversion.

A few weeks later Father Olier, during a mission he was preaching in Auvergne, recognized the nun who had appeared to him. It was Mother Agnes, prioress of the convent of St. Catherine of Langeac. This holy woman, whom the Church has since proclaimed Venerable, then declared to him that God destined him to lay the foundations of the seminaries in the King-

dom of France. On October 12, the holy nun, convinced that she was obeying a supernatural inspiration, wrote to Father de Condren, begging him to assume the spiritual direction of Father Olier. A week later Mother Agnes rendered her soul to God, leaving here below the fragrance of the most heroic virtues.[43]

The second superior of the Oratory then seemed to have given up any hope of directing the zeal of his congregation toward the training of the clergy. He gathered about him a few ecclesiastics and explained to them those profound views of spirituality that had delighted St. Chantal and would exercise a great influence over the seventeenth century. This holy man's ideas were most sublime on the Incarnation, the death and Resurrection of Christ, the priesthood, the Mass, the life of the Savior in us in the fullness of His spirit, in the truth of His virtues, and in the communion of His divine mysteries. For five years he never spoke to these young priests, in clear and precise words, about their vocation. He turned their activities to the preaching of the missions and merely said to them that God was reserving for them an excellent work, more useful for the Church than even the functions of the episcopate. However, shortly before his death, he sent for one of his disciples, Father du Ferrier, and revealed to him that the work he was thinking of was the training of young men in the clerical spirit, a work that could be accomplished only in seminaries, as the Council of Trent had wisely declared. "Lose no time," he added "the evil spirit will stir up dissensions; avoid wordy strife and contention and take no sides but the side of the pope." The next day Father de Condren took to bed for the last time. Through Father Olier and his companions, he laid the foundation of the work of seminaries and thereby of a solid regeneration of the

[43] A decree of Pius VII (March 17, 1808) declares that Mother Agnes practiced the virtues in a heroic degree.

French clergy. Thus he consummated the mission for which God had sent him into this world.

Seminary of St. Sulpice

After earnest prayers, long conferences, and hard trials, three of his disciples—François Caulet (abbot of St. Volusien de Foix), Jean du Ferrier, and Jean Jacques Olier (abbot of Pébrac)—decided to follow the way indicated by their venerated spiritual guide.

The beginnings were as humble as possible. A pious woman, Marie Luillier (Madame de Villeneuve), placed at their disposal in the village of Vaugirard, in the Paris environs, a small one-story house. In fact, an old pigeon-house had to be made into rooms for the seminarians. On December 29, 1641, the three priests were able to install themselves very modestly. Madame de Villeneuve sent them, in a little kettle, their dinner of soup and boiled meat every day. Father Bourdoise, the rough superior of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet, wrote to them, saying: "What a fine thing, if three priests could be found, sufficiently filled with love for the Church, so that they would declare themselves against the world and its ways! To obtain the reform of the clergy I would gladly go a hundred leagues to see them." The three priests replied, "To see the three men whom you seek, you have no need of going a hundred leagues. Simply come to Vaugirard."

Soon eight seminarians joined the little community, whose rule was formed gradually and, as it were, of itself. The three priests remained alone in their little house for several weeks, easily agreeing to divide the day into a series of exercises composed of prayer, study, and the apostolate. Young clerics who came to them were simply invited to take their place beside their elders and join fully in their life. Hence arose the most original trait of the life of St. Sulpice, namely, that the Sul-

pician seminaries should not have two rules, one for the teachers and another for the students.[44] Father Olier's successors have always considered this feature a guaranty of God's blessings.

Father Olier, who from the outset was charged with the direction of the little community, was concerned with realizing the wish formerly expressed by Father de Condren, to have at his side doctors animated by the scientific spirit and by the Christian spirit. He himself took charge of the course in Scripture. Three providential recruits—Father de Bassancourt, former companion of Father Olier in the missions by St. Lazare, an Orléans priest, Father Houmain, and the provost of the chapter of Brioude, Father de la Chassaigne. These men gave the courses in liturgy and theology. The courses were not strictly confined to those living in the community; the same may be said of the spiritual conferences by which the words of the zealous superior every evening inflamed the souls of his disciples. Soon a coming and going developed between the Faubourg St. Germain, where a number of young clerics had their time at their own disposal, and the plain house of Vaugirard. Little by little this seminary took on a considerable importance. In February, Father Bourdoise spent three weeks there, where he saw a school of holiness in which the clerics were striving to die wholly to themselves that they might live the life of Christ. Cardinal Richelieu, surmising that there was found the source of the true reform of the clergy, offered his château de Rueil to the priests of Vaugirard. But on August 10 of that year, when Father Olier became the pastor of St. Sulpice, the seminary followed him there and took its definite name of Seminary of St. Sulpice.

Two marks distinguished it from all the seminaries previ-

[44] Not until a comparatively late period, twenty or thirty years after the death of Father Olier, did the growth of the community oblige his successors to consign to paper, as a seminary rule, the customs that had been established there.

ously founded: it was intended exclusively for clerics who had finished their humanities. Thus it constituted a "major seminary," strictly so called; it had its own life, separate from the parish regime. The house was not even a diocesan seminary; it did not depend on the archbishop of Paris, but on the abbot of St. Germain-des-Prés, who was dependent immediately on the pope.

The holy founder rejoiced at this fact, which he considered providential. He used to say that the real superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice was the pope, and that the seminary was a place prepared to give the spirit of respect, love, and service to the whole clergy of the Church, whose sovereignty resides in the person of the successor of St. Peter. This idea was the echo of Father de Condren's words, that he left to his followers as a last testament: "Do not take sides, except the side of the pope."

Such was the origin of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, which Father Hilarion de Nolay in 1694 called "a school of holiness," and the Duke de St. Simon in 1709 called "a nursery of bishops." Father Olier's first purpose had been to found only this house, held by a dozen members associated together and to train there subjects that might be given to the bishops for the direction of similar houses. Circumstances later led him to take the management of the houses thus established. In this way, what had been only a seminary became, according to St. Simon's expression, "a sort of congregation," the Company of St. Sulpice, whose essential aim has always been the training and sanctification of the clergy.

CHAPTER V

Works of Charity in France

Conditions in France

WE cannot easily form an idea of the material and moral wretchedness from which France suffered during the first half of the seventeenth century. The religious wars were the first cause of this distress. In the strifes between castle and castle, city and city, party and party, in which nobles and bourgeois, workmen and peasants, opposed each other, the sieges, the passing of the armies, the pillaging, had increased the devastation. Labor had ceased almost everywhere. An impoverished and demoralized nobility was pressing upon the peasants, who revolted. Industry and commerce felt the effects of so many disasters. France had become tributary to foreign industry.[1] Workmen without work and peasants driven from the country districts by indigence filled the cities with hungry multitudes. Henry IV, on May 1, 1598, wrote: "France and I need to catch our breath."

But scarcely was King Henry dead, when the Thirty Years' War broke out. During the French period of that war the eastern provinces were overrun, ravaged, and reduced to the most extreme poverty by the passing of the armies of all the European countries. Callot's engravings have preserved the memory of those calamities. Public documents and especially the private reports that have come down to us make us shudder with horror. Omer Talon wrote in a remonstrance to the

[1] France had to buy from the English various kinds of cloth, and to have the wool of Languedoc and Provence manufactured in Italy. See Mariéjol, in Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, Vol. VI, Part II, p. 67.

Queen: "Ten years ago the country districts were ruined; the peasants are reduced to the necessity of sleeping on straw, their furniture has been sold to pay the taxes which they can no longer meet. Millions of innocent souls are obliged to live on bread made of bran and oats. The whole kingdom is languishing, weakened by the frequency of the extraordinary raising of taxes that are the blood of the people. . . . In the evening, Madame, in the solitude of your oratory, consider the calamity of the provinces. . . . The honor of battles won, the glory of districts conquered, cannot feed those who have no bread." [2]

The sister of Chancellor Séguier, a Carmelite nun in a convent at Pontoise, wrote to her brother as follows: "Monsignor and dear brother: This note is to ask from you that a certain good old man be freed from prison. A certain M. Lempereur is playing the tyrant. Our prison at Pontoise is filled with poor people for non-payment of taxes, and I do not know whether the King is being better served thereby. Gladly I become their advocate. Render them justice, and God will render you justice." In Lorraine bread was sold at one franc a pound; acorns and roots became the ordinary food of the people. In many places the cloistered nuns almost died from lack of nourishment, and the convent bell, intended to warn the people of peril to the community, rang continually for whole months. After the religious wars and the Thirty Years' War, the Fronde, with its brilliant appearances, was the last stroke inflicted on the fortune of France. Mother Angélique Arnaud (January 7, 1649) wrote from Port Royal des Champs to one of her nuns: "What a horrible thing this poor countryside is! People no longer work, we have no horses any more; everything has been stolen. . . . The peasants are reduced to sleeping in the woods, happy to have there a retreat to escape being butchered."

The moral condition suffered no less than the material state from so many bloody strifes and from so many frivolous rival-

[2] Omer Talon, *Mémoires*, p. 212.

ries. From camp life the common man brought back the horrible practice of blasphemy, and the gentleman brought the barbarous custom of dueling. In the rural districts, where the wars had often interrupted the ceremonies of divine worship, ignorance was widespread. "If a pagan," said Bourdoise, "came here from the remote country of Japan, and saw a country church, poor, unkept, half-ruined, that place would probably seem to him more suited for housing animals than for offering sacrifice to the living God." [3] In the cities, among the bourgeois and the nobles, beside the Huguenot reading the Bible and singing the psalms of Marot, appeared the "libertine" haranguing and showing off. What was this licentiousness? Was it a disorder of morals? Pascal seems to say so. He wrote: "There are some men who do not believe, but by licentiousness." Was it a disorder of mind? Thus Bossuet seems to understand it, when he speaks of "those false religions that are merely licentiousness of mind. To think whatever they please, is the charm by which these minds are thrown into licentious opinions." In any event, the libertines had at Paris their headquarters in the Faubourg St. Germain. The people confusing them with the Huguenots, called that faubourg "the little Geneva." Philosophers and theologians, such as Garasse and Mersenne, called them atheists. Among themselves, however, they called one another "men of politics." "The Faubourg St. Germain was at that time the cesspool, not only of Paris, but almost of all France; it served as a sort of retreat for all the libertines, atheists, and other persons who lived in disorder and impiety." [4]

To organize the charity, to oppose the licentiousness, and to gather the devout faithful into charitable associations, were the tasks undertaken by zealous souls of that time. The realization of these projects we shall see in three kinds of works: in the charitable institutions of St. Vincent de Paul; in the mis-

[3] Bourdoise, *Sentences chrétiennes,* chap. 9; *"Des temples sacrés"* p. 42.
[4] Abelly, *Vie de saint Vincent de Paul* (1839 ed.), I, 524.

sions preached in the country districts and in Paris, chiefly in the Faubourg St. Germain by Father Olier; in the founding of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament by the Duke de Ventadour.

Work of St. Vincent de Paul

St. Vincent de Paul did for charity in the seventeenth century what St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century did for the science of the faith. This simple and great man was endowed by God with a genius for organization. In 1617, while he was pastor of Châtillon-les-Dombes, the devotedness of two converted worldly-minded women (Madame de la Chassaigne and Madame de Brie) suggested to the saint the first idea of the conferences of charity, from which would emerge the institution of the Daughters of Charity. Father Vincent's first plan was simply to establish these conferences in the villages. But some society ladies, who had lands in the places where the conferences were established, considering that the same needs were to be met with in Paris, spoke about it to the various pastors, and these spoke of it to Father Vincent, who was thus obliged to take a hand in making this establishment in the parishes where it was asked for.[5] This was in 1618. The new association soon had its rule. "The conferences of charity were established to assist the poor sick bodily and spiritually. They were composed of a certain number of women and girls, the latter with the consent of their fathers, the former with the consent of their husbands. . . . They will, each on her day, serve the sick poor: to the homes of the sick they will take their food already prepared, and will cherish the sick as persons whom our Lord has united by His love." [6] The saint had a charming tone in the instructions he gave to his first conference of "servants of the poor." "The servant of the poor," he said,

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 28.

[6] For the complete rule, see *ibid.*, pp. 29–32.

"must at first greet the sick gravely and charitably, then carry their dinner to them, fix the table on the bed, upon the table place a napkin, a glass, a spoon, and some bread, and wash the sick person's hands; she must do all this as if she were doing it for her son." In these instructions we see St. Vincent's whole soul, with its simplicity, practical sense, touching charity, and joyous enthusiasm.

The example of the first associates soon brought about a holy emulation among the ladies of the highest society. At the side of Madame de Gondi, always devoted to the works of her holy spiritual director, we see the Duchess of Aiguillon, niece of Cardinal Richelieu, Madame Fouquet, mother of the inspector, Madame de Miramion, so well known for her beauty and her virtues, Madame Séguier, Mlle de Vigeau, Princess Gonzaga, and the Queen, Anne of Austria, all declaring they would devote to the good works the entire superfluity of their fortune and all the time which their position left to them. The visits to the sick in the hospitals and to the prisoners in their prisons and especially the adoption of the foundlings exercised the zeal of these women of the world. We know that one day the Ladies of Charity, overwhelmed by the financial burden of the work of the foundlings, feeling their courage give way, were on the point of abandoning a work too heavy for their strength; but Vincent stepped in. "Take heart, now," he said, "give up being the mothers of these infants and become their judges. Their life and their death are in your hands. I shall now collect your decisions, your votes." The tears of the assembled Ladies was the first reply, and the Ladies of Charity resolved to keep up the work at whatever price.

The scenes of wretchedness in Paris did not turn Vincent's attention from that of the provinces, particularly that of the east, ravaged by the Thirty Years' War. For more than twenty years he and his disciples were the great almsgiver, the public purveyor for those unfortunate regions. He published a peri-

odical gazette, the *Magasin charitable,* to keep the public acquainted with the sufferings of the peasants and with the distribution of relief carried out by his missioners. He instituted the *potages économiques.* He himself wrote out an instruction about the way to make these soups; he founded companies of "aeraters" for the purification of the soil and the atmosphere; he had seed sent to the peasants to enable them to plant the devastated lands; he created a special work to assist the Lorraine nobility who were refugees in Paris; he made the most urgent appeals to the rich, and, when his treasury was empty, he held out his hand to the court. The Queen, unable to refuse him anything, sent him, in place of money, some jewels, which he sold for his poor.

Amid these calamities the saint instituted relief undertakings that are often regarded as the glory of later times. To sustain his works he bought, in the country, some sheep, cows, and calves; in the cities he formed some workshops, where he provided work for children, convalescents, and even healthy men. This procedure was helping them by their own work. A hospice was opened for transients who there received supper and a bed; the next morning they were given "two sous" to continue their journey. While he was in the service of Marquis Emmanuel de Gondi, commander of the royal galleys, Vincent had been moved at sight of those unfortunate convicts, who were flogged on their bare shoulders. To M. de Gondi he said: "These poor people belong to you, and you will answer to God for them. While they are waiting to be brought to their place of punishment, you have a duty of charity not to let them remain without assistance and consolation." Thus was born the work for the galley-convicts, then the more general work of the prisons, by which material relief and spiritual consolations were extended to the prisoners. These works were recommended in 1618 by the bishop of Paris, Henry de Gondi, brother of the commander of the galleys. In 1622, the work for the galley-

convicts was extended to Marseilles and Bordeaux, and there bore wonderful fruit.

During the Fronde, Vincent de Paul was an infirm old man. But in Paris and the environs, in Champagne and Picardy, he multiplied himself to bring help to the unfortunate. He did even more than this. Convinced that Mazarin's presence at the court was the principal cause of all these troubles, he went courageously to the Queen Mother and said to her: "Madame, is it just to make a million innocent people die in order to punish twenty or thirty guilty ones? If the presence of the Cardinal is the source of the troubles in the state, are you not obliged to sacrifice him at least for a while?" Then he went directly to Mazarin and spoke to him at some length about the misfortunes of the civil war, concluding with these words: "Monsignor, yield to the times and cast yourself into the sea to calm the storm." "You have read me a very severe lecture," replied Mazarin; "no one has ever before ventured to address me in such terms. Nevertheless, I will go and see whether M. Le Tellier shares your view." This was a way of informing Father Vincent that his attempt had failed. Mazarin never forgave that courageous move by Vincent. The people, misinformed about the affair, accused Father Vincent of being bought over by Mazarin, ridiculed him by songs and insults. Good Father Vincent then tasted the bitterness of unpopularity. The house of St. Lazare was broken into and plundered by the rabble, who consumed the provisions intended for distribution to the poor.

The Ladies of Charity were, since 1633, seconded by a new work, that of the Daughters of Charity. This was the most popular of St. Vincent's foundations. Whenever people hear his name, they see before them the white cornet of the Sisters of Charity.

Among the ladies devoted to the visiting of the sick under the saint's direction, was a noble woman, Louise de Marillac. She was the niece of Maréchal de Marillac and of the keeper

of the seals, Michael de Marillac, both of whom had recently died, one on the scaffold, the other in prison. Both were victims of their loyalty to Marie de Medici. A widow at the age of thirty-four (1625), Louise vowed herself wholly to prayer and good works. But all the great ladies of Paris whom Vincent had succeeded in gathering about him did not possess the same zeal. Without difficulty from their ranks could be obtained women to take part in the conferences of charity, to give alms for the poor and visit them; but when they were asked to care for the poor personally, some were hindered by duties of their position, others did not have the time or at any rate did not take the time. They sent their servants to do the work in their place. Thus a gap was left to be filled.[7] Vincent, with the help of Mlle Legras (that is, Louise de Marillac), gathered a few good country girls, courageous and accustomed to hard work. On November 29, 1633, four or five of these humble servants of the poor inaugurated the Institute of the Daughters of Charity in a little house, entered by a low door and a dim hallway; but it was the refuge of the purest and most unselfish devotion.

The humble girls labored twelve years without written rules or constitutions of any kind. At first they were simple auxiliaries of the conferences of charity. Soon they had their place in all the good works: the service of the hospitals, little schools, visiting the sick, and so on. Their holy founder gave them a beginning of organization; he let them (March 25, 1642) make annual vows; but he persistently required that they remain "seculars," not "religious"; he meant that his purpose was to make them a religious community without cloister.

However, the infirmities of the old man grew worse from day to day. He used his last strength in the founding of the hospice for the aged and especially in the founding of the General Hospital.

Vincent de Paul, before his death, had the joy of seeing the

[7] E. de Broglie, *Saint Vincent de Paul*, p. 125.

statutes of the Congregation of the Mission solemnly approved by Pope Alexander VII in a brief of September 22, 1655, and two years later the King's recognition of the Congregation of the Daughters of Charity, which received the approval of Rome in 1668. On September 27, 1660, after giving his last counsels to his successor in the government of the Priests of the Mission, the great servant of God and of the poor rendered his soul to God, as he uttered the word *Confido* ("I have confidence"). He was eighty-five years old. A bull of Clement XII (June 16, 1737) placed him in the number of the saints.

Parish Missions

In the organization of charity, St. Vincent's genius is incomparable; in the work of preaching the gospel to the people, divine Providence raised up admirable emulators. During the first part of the seventeenth century, Brittany was evangelized by Michel Le Nobletz, Normandy by John Eudes, Vivarais and Velay by Francis Regis, Lorraine by Peter Fourier, Provence by Anthony Yvan, Burgundy and Champagne by John Le Jeune. The Faubourg St. Germain in Paris was the field where Olier exercised his zeal.

Brittany, traditional and pious, jealously faithful to its language and its old customs, and gladly appealing, in its provincial assemblies, to the time of Queen Anne, had excelled all the provinces in preserving the faith of former times. But many superstitions were mingled with their old loyalties in consequence of the people's ignorance and sometimes that of the clergy. For almost forty years (1614–52) a holy Breton priest, a tireless apostle, Michel Le Nobletz, traversed the dioceses of Leon, Tréguier, and Quimper, visiting the cities and the country districts, adding repeated instructions to the example of a penitential life, and declaring war upon ignorance, vice, and superstitious practices.

Normandy, no less attached to its traditions, especially in legal matters, formed a striking contrast to Brittany. Rich, engaging extensively in commerce and industry, the opulent province had permitted the introduction of many abuses and vices. The most celebrated missioner who evangelized that district was John Eudes. In 1632 he began going through the dioceses of Coutances, Bayeux, Lisieux, St. Malo, and Séez. His missions lasted several weeks. With the help of a few auxiliaries, he neglected nothing to impress the minds of these people by the majesty and brilliance of ceremonies. At the close of a mission, public worship was displayed in all its pomp. To the liturgical offices were added outdoor meetings: obscene writings and pictures were there publicly burned. Leagues were formed against swearing, blasphemy, and dueling. But nothing moved the people's souls so much as the fiery eloquence of the holy preacher. "John Eudes' eloquence had none of the defects so often to be noted in the preaching before the time of Bossuet. Never did he indulge in the triviality of the preachers of the League or in the affected elegance of fine minds cherished in the salon of Madame Rambouillet. But from his contemporaries he took strong and colorful expressions; the daring of his direct appeal never went beyond the holy liberty of God's representative on earth." [8] His labors were crowned by the founding of the Congregation of the Good Shepherd for the reform of fallen women and by the spread of devotion to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary.[9]

Vivarais and Velay, inhabited by people who were energetic and sometimes harsh and stubborn like their sharp mountains, were still shaken by the religious wars that had drenched them in blood. Privas and Aubenas were strongholds of Protestantism. The Jesuit, John Francis Regis, born in the village of Fontcouverte in the diocese of Narbonne, preached in those

[8] Henri Joly, *Le vénérable Jean Eudes*, p. 68.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 140–61, 177–87.

districts. Called by the Bishop of Viviers (1632) to defend the cause of religion against the heretics, he converted many of them, including two gentlemen, Count de la Mothe-Brion and M. de la Suchère, who seconded him in his undertakings. Beginning in 1636, he labored without interruption in Velay, preaching in Le Puy during the summer, visiting the neighborhood during the winter. Some striking conversions and the formation of associations of charity for the benefit of the poor, the sick, and prisoners, were the result of his visit. The rigor of the winters, the difficulties of the roads, nothing was able to stop his journeys. After establishing a house of refuge at Le Puy, he died at La Louvesc (December 31, 1640) in the midst of his labors. His tomb is today the object of veneration of these districts.[10]

In unfortunate Lorraine, ravaged by the wars, we find another apostle, whose name we have already met, St. Peter Fourier (1565–1640). We saw him, along with the pious Alix Le Clerc, founding the Congregation of Notre Dame and laboring at the reform of the canons regular in the abbey of St. Remi of Lunéville. He was a model pastor of Mattaincourt, instructing, exhorting, correcting, waging war on abuses, showing a special solicitude for the poor, seeming to live only for the good of souls. He was a holy priest.

Provence was the noblest part of old France. Its capital, Aix, took pride in its Latin name, its parliament, its Court of Commerce, and its university.[11] But, beneath its clear sky, in the mildness of its winters and the splendor of its summers, a sensual paganism, awakened by the Renaissance, enervated and ensnared men's souls. One of its sons, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, recalled the stern virtues that compensate for the light-hearted gaiety of life. His name was Anthony

[10] John Francis Regis was canonized June 16, 1737, by Clement XII at the same time as Vincent de Paul. Cf. J. M. Cros, *Saint François Régis.*

[11] Hanotaux, *Hist. du Card. de Richelieu,* I, 184–86.

Yvan. Born at Rians (1576) of poor parents, he grew up amid privations imposed by poverty, amid daily labor that strengthened him. "Yet his religion, strict and almost rude, was also living, human, popular; this strict spiritual director was the mildest of men, always maintaining the reserve and high spirit, the sprightly good humor of the peasants of Provence. . . . Once he received the light of God, he lived for nothing else. 'I should like to be a thousand Yvans,' he said, 'that I might traverse the world and found houses of religious.' " [12] He was successively pastor of Catignac, a hermit near Rians, missioner at Aix, founder, along with a holy young woman, Madeleine Martin, of the Sisters of Mercy, whose convents grew in number at Marseilles, Avignon, and Paris. Few men have carried further the love of crosses and the courage to bear them.[13] He died a saint on October 8, 1653.

For sixty years (1611–71) almost all France was the field that witnessed the apostolic zeal of Father John Lejeune, a priest of the Oratory.[14] Normandy, Picardy, Champagne, Burgundy, Touraine, Berry, Auvergne, Provence, and Limousin heard his forcible word, sometimes original to the point of trivial familiarity, but ever Christian, derived, not from the schools, but at the foot of the crucifix. "Lejeune was an outspoken, direct orator, not speculative in spite of brilliant flights, speaking close to the various classes of society." [15] He was known among the people under the name of "the blind priest." In fact, he had lost his sight while preaching a course of Lenten sermons in the cathedral of Rouen. The story is told that, during one of his sermons, he suddenly felt the cloud of blindness hide the sight of his hearers from him. After a short pause, he passed his hand over his eyes and continued speaking as if nothing had happened. But at the end of his sermon he

[12] Henri Brémond, *La Provence mystique au XVII^e siècle,* p. 8.
[13] Picot, *Essai historique,* I, 434.
[14] He was born at Poligny in 1592.
[15] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal,* I, 468.

held out his hands to guide himself and required someone's help as he came down from the pulpit. That was in 1631. The "blind father" continued his preaching for forty years more, and his abiding patience in his affliction added greatly to the effectiveness of his preaching.

But all this apostolic labor in the provinces could not produce lasting fruit for the Christian regeneration of France so long as Paris, its capital, contained the heart of licentiousness, heresy, and atheism. As we have already observed, that center was to be found in one of the faubourgs, that of St. Germain des Prés, the meeting place of all those who wished to live in a disorder of morals and an independence of mind. The St. Germain fair, lasting two months every year, increased the scandals of all sorts.

When, in 1642, Father Olier, accompanied by six priests and eight seminarians, took possession of the parish of St. Sulpice, in the center of that celebrated faubourg, he was aware of the greatness of his task. But the holy pastor also saw at once the means he would have to adopt to perform his difficult mission:[16] the training of the young clerics, the sanctification of the doctors and priests; the instruction and sanctification of the people.

We have seen the servant of God laboring in the training of clerics by the founding of seminaries. For the sanctification of the priests, he judged that no more sure means could be found than that he and his companions should strive to sanctify themselves as much as possible: their example would be more effective than the most eloquent sermons.

In fact, the life of the priests working under the direction of Father Olier in the parish ministry of St. Sulpice was exemplary. They lived in community. A cassock of common serge was their street dress, and a surplice without lace was their dress in the sanctuary. Rising every day at five o'clock, some-

[16] Olier, *Lettres autographes*, p. 18.

times earlier, they began their day by a meditation of three quarters of an hour, and a perpetual silence was strictly observed in the house outside the times of recreation. Their food was simple and frugal. For dinner they had a plate of soup and a small portion of boiled meat, without dessert; in the evening, a little roast lamb.[17] The example was contagious. Soon, according to the report of Bishop Godeau of Vence, the other large parishes of Paris followed the example of the parish of St. Sulpice.

Such priests could now labor more effectively in the training and sanctification of the people. This was the third aim of Father Olier. His method was simple and practical. He divided his vast parish into eight sections, putting at the head of each a priest whose duty would be to ascertain the spiritual and temporal needs of his district. These priests, in turn, were aided by pious laymen, appointed to watch over each street. Besides these priests of the sections, others were appointed to bring the sacraments to the sick, to baptize, to bless marriages, to conduct the lesser burials, to hear confessions at any hour of the day. To make sure that this zeal was always conducted wisely, each day after dinner the superior had presented to him the cases and difficulties that arose in the parish. When he himself could not solve the difficulty, he sent some learned priest of the company to the Sorbonne to seek the solution.[18]

Of all the parish works, none was dearer to Father Olier than the work of the catechism classes. This work was assigned especially to the seminarians. The city of Paris was edified at the sight of these young men, most of them of distinguished families, seen on the streets of the poorest districts, as they visited the houses to call the children, then distributing to them bread and the word of the gospel, with that earnestness of zeal which the instructions and example of the venerated pastor

[17] Du Ferrier, *Mémoires,* August 15 and 19, 1642.
[18] *Ibid.,* p. 189.

lighted in their young souls. Such was the origin of the catechism classes of St. Sulpice, where so many devout Christians and holy priests have been trained.[19]

The founding of several schools for poor children and the creation of a great work under the name of "House of Instruction" completed the parish organization of St. Sulpice.[20] The means of sanctification became so abundant and numerous that they were like the exercises of a continual mission. To all these works of charity the holy priest devoted himself with all his heart. One day he wrote as follows: "This morning my spiritual director gave me as my subject of meditation the importance of helping souls, and I felt my heart all on fire, I experienced desires to give to my God a thousand, nay, a thousand million lives, if I could do so, to procure some glory for Him." He wished especially that the heart of all the parish works of piety should be in the worship of the Blessed Sacrament and in that of the Blessed Virgin. To spend the day in work and the night at the foot of the tabernacle: such would have been the ideal of his life. Through him, as Fénelon says, "solid devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and to the Blessed Virgin, which was becoming dry and weak day by day through the criticisms of the innovators, was the real inheritance of the house of St. Sulpice." [21]

The Company of the Blessed Sacrament

The biographers of Father Olier tell us that, about 1635, the holy priest joined a "Company of the Blessed Sacrament." The same fact is reported of St. Vincent de Paul, Father de Condren, and John Eudes. The Company of the Blessed Sacra-

[19] On the catechism method of St. Sulpice, which is preserved almost as Father Olier instituted it, see Faillon, *Méthode des cat. de Saint-Sulpice;* cf. Dupanloup, *L'œuvre par excellence.*

[20] Letourneau, *Le ministère paroissial de Jean-Jacques Olier,* pp. 107–11.

[21] Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier,* I, 166.

ment was made up of laymen and clerics of all conditions: prelates, abbots, princes, state councilors, merchants, bourgeois, who met each Thursday afternoon. So much humility and charity prevailed among them that their meeting was an image of the first spirit of Christianity.[22] In 1885, at the Bibliothèque nationale, the discovery of the *Annals of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament* and especially the complete publication of this precious document in 1900 by a Benedictine monk, Dom Beauchet-Filleau,[23] have thrown a definite light on that association. Its correct presentation here will be useful, because certain recent authors have distorted it, some regarding it merely as the shady politics of a cabal of pious people, and others so exaggerating its importance that the personal influence of Condren, Olier, and Vincent de Paul seemed to disappear or to be reduced to a mechanical execution of the orders of the powerful "secret society." [24]

Among the fervent Catholics who were charmed by the writings of St. Theresa and of St. Francis de Sales and who were touched by the first charitable works of St. Vincent de Paul, several wondered whether the hour had not come for Christians living in the world to react against the spirit of the age and to unite with the priests in organizing an apostolic work. In place of the political and warlike League which their fathers had formed, the time seemed to have come for the formation, under an inspiration peaceful and strictly religious, of a league of piety and charity. A great lord, Henri de Lévis, duke de Ventadour, lieutenant general of the King in Langue-

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] René de Voyer d'Argenson, *Annales de la Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement,* published and annotated by Dom Beauchet-Filleau, Benedictine monk.

[24] Such is the tendency of Raoul Allier in his book, *La Cabale des dévots,* which abounds with facts and interesting documents. But the reported facts themselves belie this tendency. St. Vincent de Paul in his works of charity appears less isolated than had been supposed until recent times. Probably no one will ever be able to say exactly what the saint owed to the pious Company, and what the Company owed to him.

doc, in 1627 became the earnest interpreter of these feelings with a few of his friends. Three holy priests to whom he communicated his idea (Father de Condren of the Oratory, Father Suffren of the Company of Jesus, and Father Philippe d'Angoumois, a Capuchin) approved it. Says Father Rapin:

> The basis of his plan consisted in procuring the glory of God by doing real good and by hindering real evil. This program, including all sorts of good works in their full extent, determined the authors—the Capuchin, the Jesuit, and the Oratorian—to impose on this Company a universal spirit to work in every way to assist the neighbor without any limitations. Thus, taking for their model that greatness of soul which religion gave to the first Christians, who did not impose any limits on themselves when the interest of God and of neighbor was in question, the Company resolved to admit no one belonging to a religious community lest the work should assume any kind of particular spirit which fills each Order, and thus preserve that boundless charity of the first ages and that general spirit of the Church.[25]

One of the first decisions of the new group was not to admit to membership any person belonging to a religious community.

The pious gentleman who took the initiative in this enterprise was of a sort to attract everyone's good will. A soldier renowned for his valor, well known in the highest society through his connection with the illustrious family of the Condes, Henri de Lévis, Duke de Ventadour, had kept in camp and at court an upright soul, delicate and pure, worthy of the finest ages of faith. In 1623 he married Marie Louise of Luxembourg. One morning (September 24, 1628) he and his wife appeared at the Carmelite church without a suite or carriage. There, in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, they offered to God, in the simplicity of their heart, their pure conjugal love and transformed it into pure angelic love. The next year the young duchess entered the Carmelite convent of Avignon; the Duke

[25] Rapin, *Mémoires*, p. 326.

came back to Paris, doubly resolved to labor unremittingly for the glory of God and the good of souls.

The first rules of the Company reflected the spirit of piety and zeal of the noble founder. The chief purpose of the Company was the revival of the spirit of the first Christians, a profession of belonging to Christ by word and by holiness of life, the performance of all good works for the glory of God and the salvation of the neighbor.[26] The rules of the Society contained the following provisions: it is composed of ecclesiastics and laymen without distinction; three of the members are chosen to be respectively superior, spiritual director, and secretary; the superior may be an ecclesiastic or a layman; the spiritual director shall always be an ecclesiastic, who will see to it that the spirit of the rules is well kept; the Company shall meet once a week, on Thursday, the day consecrated to honoring the Blessed Sacrament; each member will there make a report of what he has done; but at the meeting no one will speak anything except what concerns the glory of God and the neighbor. The aims proper to the society are enumerated: the exercises and charitable object of the members will be the hospitals, the prisons, the sick, the poor, the afflicted, whoever have need of help, with regard to the magistrates the maintenance of the Christian government and the decrees against heretics, settlement of lawsuits and personal animosities, the drawing of people away from sin, the repression of all vices so far as possible, and lastly the favoring of whatever contributes to the glory of God, which each member will procure as much as he can either by himself or through others. A special article declares that the society will remain secret, having its basis only in a deep humility and charity, imitating as much as possible Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, who remains hidden there.[27]

[26] "Réglement de la petite Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement à la campagne," in D'Argenson, *Annales*, p. 303.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 299–301.

Especially in this last article some persons thought they perceived the deliberate plan of a cabal. As several members of the new Company belonged to that group of zealous Catholics, called "the devotees," who, under the inspiration of Father de Berulle and Michael de Marillac, opposed the religious policy of Richelieu, some persons considered the new institution a "Cabal of Devotees." [28] A more natural and juster view would be to accept the explanation given by the Company itself: "The purpose of the secrecy is to provide the means of undertaking the works with greater prudence, to secure self-effacement and avoid contradictions, because experience shows that public display is the ruin of good works.[29] In fact, from the outset, the Company was known to Cardinal Richelieu, who encouraged it, to King Louis XIII, who took it under his protection, to the archbishop of Paris, Jean François de Gondi, who was asked to authorize the meetings, and lastly to the Pope, who was informed of the new foundation by two of the members, the Abbot of Loyac and M. de Brassac.[30] Gradually, however, in the face of suspicions on the part of the authorities and of certain opposition coming particularly from the Jansenist party, the rule of secrecy was made stricter to conceal the works of the Company even from some bishops and to be satisfied merely with a tacit approval of the Pope and to distrust particularly the intervention of Mazarin.

Meanwhile, "in Paris and in the rest of the kingdom, whatever persons were distinguished by their rank and by their piety wished to belong to this Society as soon as they began to learn of its spirit." [31] Thus Father Rapin speaks in his *Mémoires.* Among these first members of the Company we note: the Marshal of Schomberg, Prince de Conti, Marquis of Liancourt,

[28] Raoul Allier, *op. cit.,* especially chap. 2.

[29] D'Argenson, *op. cit.,* p. 195.

[30] Allier, pp. 47–49; D'Argenson, p. vi; Rébelliau in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 1903, p. 51.

[31] Rapin, *op. cit.,* II, 327.

Count de Noailles, Count de Brassac, the Count of Fontenay-Mareuil, the magistrate de Mesmes, the future magistrate Lamoignon (at that time master of requests), Jean de Barraut (archbishop of Arles), and Jacques de Grignan (bishop of Uzès). Under the impulse of its founder and of the holy priests who encouraged it, the charitable society set to work with wonderful activity.

The Company's Activities

In that year 1627 the most crying needs of the people, if not the deepest, were those that came from the general wretchedness and from the plague. The plague lasted until 1632 and was at once followed by war and invasion, then (1642–53) by the increasing burden of taxes and by the civil war, and lastly (1659, 1660, 1662) by famine. During these thirty-five years of different and continual trials, the Company of Paris—to speak only of that one—was concerned not only with the capital but also with the environs and the most afflicted provinces: Champagne, Lorraine, Picardy. In 1632 its coffers were empty; several times it was in debt. In 1636 it had a tax put on meat for the benefit of the sick poor. It required the sisters to clothe and care for the little children of the sick women. It never was satisfied with merely giving the usual alms in money; it resorted especially to ingenious alms in kind, as when it sent wheat seed to the farmers of Picardy and Champagne, or when it distributed to the peasants of the Paris environs furniture and utensils to refurnish their devastated homes, or when it sent through France surgeons directed to operate gratis upon poor villagers.

The most remarkable work of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, in the way of charity, was perhaps the General Hospital. The question was discussed at the first meetings.

Means were sought for gathering together the poor who were at large on the Paris streets, and for housing them for their own material and spiritual good. M. du Plessis-Montbart, who was the first to envisage this great plan, and St. Vincent de Paul were engaged in realizing it whole-heartedly. The General Hospital, authorized in 1656 by a decree of Louis XIV, opened its doors on May 18, 1657. The first batch admitted numbered 5,000 vagabonds.[32] In less than six years the General Hospital received or aided 60,000 indigent persons. Marseilles, Angouleme, Orléans, Toulouse, Grenoble, and Périgueux also soon had their General Hospital.

But the chief aim of the Society was to care for the public misfortunes in their moral causes. These causes were met with in the frequent immorality of the people, in the scandals of the great, in the culpable neglect of the public authorities and even of the clergy. The Company of the Blessed Sacrament, prompted only by its zeal, had the daring to attack each of these abuses.

In 1631, almost as soon as the Society was established, we see it concerned over the perils of the young women who, coming from the country districts to Paris, were exposed to many temptations. It hired a devout person who, in the Faubourg Montmartre, with difficulty taught twenty-four poor girls to read, write, and pray. Five years later, at Montmorency, it assisted an establishment whose purpose was to aid girls whose mothers had become impoverished.[33] The next year it aided the institute of the Daughters of Providence, who supplied an asylum for girls in moral danger.[34] In 1639 it decided to remove, from the arrival stations of the stages coming from the provinces, persons whose business it was to attract girls arriv-

[32] At that time 40,000 beggars were to be found divided among the eleven courtyards of the Miracles at Paris.

[33] D'Argenson, p. 69; Allier, p. 73.

[34] D'Argenson, pp. 70, 85.

ing in Paris to the wretched procurers who were waiting for them and who would, under a pretext of charity, offer them a place of retirement.[35]

The disorders in high society likewise received attention from the Company. With all its might it fought the two vicious customs that were the scandal of the great ones of that period: gambling and dueling. In this campaign, unfortunately it encountered a powerful opposition; the proprietors of gambling houses, whom it turned against, were protected by persons in high places; some enactments of Parliament, which it obtained with difficulty, were not carried out, and gambling penetrated even the court, where the young Queen was a passionate adept of it.[36] The campaign against dueling was temporarily more successful, but it raised against the Company a violent opposition that became the first cause of its ruin.

Dueling

About Father Olier, pastor of St. Sulpice, and under his direction, about 1646 a number of great lords (Baron de Renty, the Duke of Liancourt, the Marquis of Saint-Mesmes) gathered and agreed to break with the maxims of the age and to neglect nothing to abolish dueling, blasphemy, and swearing. Courage was needed to attack that prejudice about points of honor, which, with the applause of the nobility and of the court, daily set at strife against one another the bravest officers and made them, for quarrels often futile, pour out the blood they should have reserved for the defense of the country. A further step was made in 1651. One of the most outstanding partisans of the custom of dueling had been that Marquis de Fénelon who, enrolled in a Company at the age of sixteen, was always

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 84.
[36] Allier, p. 120.

distinguished by his deeds of valor. An excellent Catholic also, he used to rescue the wounded under the fire of the enemy, carried them on his shoulders, brought them back to the rear, and procured means for them to make their confession. The severe rebukes of Father Olier finally led him to distinguish the false points of honor, resulting from human respect, from true honor, resting on the judgment of conscience and of God. On Pentecost Sunday, 1651, along with some friends, he presented himself in the chapel of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and all together promised not to engage in personal strifes any more; thus the honor which gentlemen make not to go back on their promise obliged them henceforth to refuse dueling which the false points of honor had formerly made them accept.

Then arose an outcry of indignation among the gentlemen. People cried out against these "absurd devotees, who had probably the excuse of being lame." The great Condé himself said to the Marquis de Fénelon, "I have to be as sure of the fact of your valor as I am, not to be alarmed at seeing you to be the first to break the ice thus." But the steps taken by several members of the Company, particularly Father Olier, brought about the affiliation of a hundred great lords, whose courage was above any suspicion. Officers, who were covered with wounds received from the enemy, renewed the promise made by Fénelon and his friends. Marshal Schomberg, a member of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, obtained from the marshals of France a public approval to the resolution that had caused so big a scandal. On August 28, 1651, the Assembly of the Clergy of France issued anathema against "the insolence and the barbarism of duels." On September 7, at a bed of justice, King Louis XIV, renewing all the previous condemnations, declared that henceforth no pardon would be granted to the delinquents. The frivolous nobility living at the court never pardoned the "Cabal of Devotees" for its initiative in this affair.

The Laboring Classes

Among the causes of social disturbance, one, scarcely apparent in the first half of the seventeenth century, would be revealed by the future as the most formidable and most profound of all.

While famines and wars were spreading wretchedness everywhere, the development of great commerce and the perfecting of industrial methods had brought about profound changes in the condition of the laboring classes. "The patron of the Middle Ages, who worked in his shop with a few apprentices and companions, was replaced by a sort of proprietor. These men strove to derive the greatest profit from their money and from their workmen. They maintained the low price of manual labor and increased the hours of work." [37] The wretched condition of the workers was aggravated by the almost countless difficulties which they encountered to attain a mastership. A distinction was observed between the trades organized in corporations and the free trades. In the former, the masters, in those times of economic troubles, finding their advantage lay in not increasing the number of their competitors, complicated the examinations required for obtaining a mastership certificate. They required masterpieces that were costly and took a long time to produce, and they were easy only with the sons of masters or with companions who married the widow of a master.[38] In the free trades, becoming more and more numerous, where a person could become a master without a mastership certificate, obstacles were equally numerous; for the new industries which had given birth to most of these trades (for instance, printing and silk manufacture) generally required costly material, a large personnel, and considerable equipment.

A general uneasiness agitated the mass of workers. Lacking

[37] Mariéjol, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

the Church, which no longer had enough social influence to speak to them with authority and in which they did not have faith enough to hear with docility, the laboring class lent their ear to counsels of revolt and revolution. Since at that period revolt always took the color of heresy or blasphemy, the societies in which the malcontents were gathered assumed curious forms. A new association, the "Trade Union of Duty," became an impious counterpart of the Christian corporation. A member of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament soon discovered the revolutionary spirit and sacrilegious practices of this "trade union."

Among the most faithful members of the Company, which had gradually spread into all social classes, was a simple shoemaker. His name was Henry Buch or Buche. He was born at Erlon in Luxembourg. Endowed with remarkable graces from his childhood, Henry Buch early was detached from any worldly ambition and, in traveling from city to city, sought especially to win souls to God by his holy and novel persuasion. We see him in the stores and the cafes making himself a sort of missioner to the workmen. For him the supreme victory consisted in obtaining from a comrade the promise to make a general confession. Then he zealously instructed the new convert in the means for obtaining and preserving grace, he exhorted him to flee from evil companions and the occasions of sin, to go to the sacraments, to devote himself to prayer, and to attend the divine office often. At the same time he gave all he had, including himself, in the relief of the shoemakers in need. To provide the expenses of charity, he deprived himself of necessities and worked at night.[39]

The reputation of the virtuous workman, of "good Henry," as he was called, spread into all the suburbs. It reached the ears of one of the principal members of the Company of the Blessed

[39] Vachet, *L'artisan chrétien ou la vie du bon Henry, instituteur des Frères Cordonniers*, p. 38; Allier, p. 196.

Sacrament, Baron de Renty, that great Christian whom the Protestant Burnet places among the greatest models that France furnished in the seventeenth century. The soul of the gentleman and that of the workman were made for mutual understanding. Baron de Renty was a convert. Naturally fiery and haughty, a scoffer, he had been detached from the illusions of the world by the reading of the *Imitation.* Thenceforth he became a model of edification at war and at court, as well as within his family. He early joined the Company of the Blessed Sacrament and was soon the soul of the pious society, which chose him eleven times as its superior. As his biographer says, "no undertaking concerning the honor of God and the good of the neighbor but had him for its author and promoter, or its doer, and sometimes both together." [40] This zealous gentleman grasped the aid which the pious workman could bring to the Company of the Blessed Sacrament and urged him to join the Society.

Thereafter a touching intimacy sprang up between the noble baron and the modest workman. They worked together like two brothers. They might be seen teaching catechism to the ignorant and the fallen-aways, the workman easily finding the words, images, and sentiments that spoke to the heart of his unfortunate comrades, and the gentleman making them understand a noble and lofty language by which these humble workmen felt their soul purified and enlarged. The "good Henry," always in quest of some new wretchedness, made them known to the generous baron, in whom he found, for the comfort and relief of his protégés, resources and helps such as he would not have dreamed of finding. When a poor man from the provinces had a case in court in the capital, Baron de Renty used his good offices with the judge to have the case tried promptly. When an unfortunate Paris workman decided to return to his village and his deserted home, from persons of standing in

[40] Saint-Jure, *La vie de Ch. de Renty,* p. 148. Cf. Faillon, *op. cit.,* II, 275.

Paris a letter of recommendation was obtained to the lord or pastor of the place he had come from.[41]

Trade Unions

At this juncture Henry Buch was surprised to hear, among his fellow workmen, strange talk, enigmatic allusions to things he did not understand. Sometimes the gestures were more mysterious than the words. When strangers would make these gestures or pronounce these words, they were at once treated as close friends. Henry Buch wondered what might lie hidden beneath these cabalistic practices. He observed more closely, he listened more attentively. He discovered the existence of the trade union. The first detail that he learned was enough to amaze him. The members of the "Trade Union of Duty" were bound to secrecy by a solemn and abominable oath. The initiated member had a sponsor and promised on his faith and his chance of paradise not to reveal to anyone anything he did or saw.[42]

Buch spoke of this discovery to a few friends. Soon no doubt remained: they were in presence of an association dangerous for the Church and for society. Some details were particularly revealing. Among the saddle makers, for example, the reception of future members took place with a mockery of the Mass. The celebrant, taking a piece of bread and a little wine, said to the recipients: "This bread that you see is a figure of the true body of Christ; this wine that you see is a figure of His pure blood." The tailors erected a sort of altar with a cloth spread over it, and the new member was given a history full of impurities about the first three members. Says Vachet: "We do better to pass over in silence many things so as to spare the ears of simple persons and not to give to the wicked new ideas of crimes and sacrileges."[43] The spirit animating such associa-

[41] Vachet, pp. 19–25, 33.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 49–51. Cf. Lebrun, *Histoire des pratiques superstitieuses*, IV, 54; Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France*, I, 703.

tions was a spirit of strife and of hatred of the working class against the class of employers. In consequence the masters suffered great inconvenience. If, for example, a master in the slightest way displeased a member working for him, or if the member took a notion to offend the master and to take vengeance on him, he simply walked out; then all the other members working there were obliged by their trade union duty to walk out after him; and if they refused to do so, they were mistreated and were even in danger of their lives.[44]

Thanks to the means of information which the Company of the Blessed Sacrament possessed, an investigation was opened and continued about four years. In 1638 it disclosed with certainty that an organized society, acting in the dark, had for its purpose, not only to form a workmen's association, with a common treasury and obeying a command to go on strike, but also to propagate sacrilegious rites in which the sacraments of the Church were horribly parodied.

The report and evidence of the inquiry were communicated to the Sorbonne, which (September 21, 1645) declared that the practices of the Companions of Duty contained sacrilege, impurity, and blasphemy, that the oath taken by the members was neither just nor lawful, and that the members were not in a state of safe conscience.[45]

Workmen's Societies

But the two apostles knew well that institutions can be effectively suppressed only if they are replaced. On February 2, 1645, they founded the pious association of the Brother Shoemakers, whose rule was soon approved by the Archbishop of Paris.[46] Without pronouncing vows, the members lived to-

[44] Vachet, *op. cit.*, p. 60. Cf. H. Hauser, *Ouvriers des temps passés;* Martin Saint-Léon, *Le compagnonnage, son histoire, ses coutumes, ses règlements, ses rites.*

[45] Allier, pp. 199, 209.

[46] Vachet, pp. 69–81.

gether and wore uniform dress, consisting of a jacket, a cloak of tan-colored serge, and a rabat. They rose at five o'clock in the morning, had morning prayer in common, and then went to work. During their work, at the stroke of the clock, the superior recited a short prayer in French. They took turns in going to Mass. After night prayers they went to bed at nine o'clock. During meals, the brothers listened to reading, and every year they made a retreat of a few days. On fixed days they visited the hospitals, the prisons, and the sick poor at their homes.[47]

In 1647 a community of Brother Tailors was founded on the same model. Similar associations were later established, under the patronage of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, at Soissons, Toulouse, Lyons, Grenoble, and other cities. They kept a large number of workmen from the dangers presented by the Society of the Companions of Duty.

Other Activities

All the dangers were not averted. In their inquiries into the miseries of the people, the members of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament often had occasion to note that many of the evils afflicting the common people were to be blamed on the neglect or ill will of the administrative and judicial authorities. The chief abuses of the public and judicial administration consisted in the partiality, at times revolting, by which frequently the interests of the poor and the feeble were sacrificed to those of the rich and powerful, and in the arbitrary harshness with which prisoners were treated. In 1643 the Company decided the superior should delegate every three months some persons capable of giving to the poor a disinterested help.[48]

In 1655 it entrusted to two very experienced persons the care

[47] Allier, p. 202.
[48] D'Argenson, p. 90.

of offering some remedy for the abuses and the prolongation of lawsuits.[49] One of its members, Count Gilbert Antoine d'Albon, went further and proposed the formation of a Charitable Council to terminate lawsuits by friendly agreement.[50] Finally, just when the Company was dissolved, it was elaborating, with a view to stopping usury, the project of a society powerful enough to loan charitably and safely to persons in need.[51] The Company followed with its solicitude the unfortunates who had fallen under the blows of public vindictiveness and was watchful that justice should not be violated in their persons. One of its first cares was to improve the lot of persons condemned to the galleys. It undertook consideration of this question in the last months of 1630.[52] In 1636 the Company of Paris denounced certain police officers who took abusive advantage of the simplicity of the poor, arrested them arbitrarily, imprisoned them, and extorted from them a pretended "prison payment." [53] This obtained for the prisoners, upon payment of the wages of four guards, the privilege of passing a while outdoors from time to time instead of remaining buried in the dungeons where they rotted alive. For those who were sick, it also obtained the right to be loosed from their chains and to receive medicine and soup.

The Company could not stop there. In the work of assistance and reform that it undertook, it was inevitably led to go farther and higher. Its leaders could not hide from themselves that none of their endeavors in temporal relief or moral reform would have lasting results without a restoration of Christian morals. This desirable result seemed impossible to them without a re-establishment of true and solid piety in men's souls. Moreover, in all these works the intention of Christian propaganda had been continually present and dominant. It kept in

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[51] D'Argenson, p. 233.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 18; Allier, pp. 51–55.
[53] D'Argenson, p. 90.

mind the extension of the kingdom of God.[54] In its concern to re-establish piety in men's souls, the Company placed in the first rank the two objects that would become the center of the whole spirituality of the great saints of that period: devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and the dignity of the priesthood. A Protestant historian, author of the *Cabale des dévots,* says: "The continual thought of the Blessed Sacrament is what communicated an identical significance to all its works." [55] The Company, in fact, professed to be different from all other congregations and confraternities by its determination not to have a special spirit, but solely the general spirit of the Church. But the living soul of the Church has only one center: Jesus Christ living, interceding, immolating Himself, and giving Himself in the Blessed Sacrament of the altar; and the body of the Church has only one living authority: the priesthood, continuing the work of Christ, under the direction of the bishops and of the pope. Hence the two concerns of the Company: by every means to promote the worship of the Blessed Sacrament and the honor of the priesthood.

To aid the poor and devastated churches, to supply vestments and sacred vessels for the holy sacrifice, to make reparation by collective prayers and penances for the outrages committed against the Blessed Eucharist, to neglect nothing to obtain from the faithful the respect due to the churches, where God dwells: such were its ceaseless concern.[56] The scandals that were to be remedied were often most revolting. At the door of the church of St. Sulpice magical emblems were being sold.[57] At certain other churches a perpetual chattering and open flirting went on during Mass. At Notre Dame the evil was still greater.[58] The Company ascertained the facts, reported them to the Arch-

[54] Rébelliau, in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* 1903, p. 68.
[55] Allier, p. 19.
[56] D'Argenson, pp. 36, 73, 107, 109.
[57] Faillon, *op. cit.,* II, 5.
[58] D'Argenson, pp. 51, 53; Allier, pp. 127–29.

bishop of Paris, denounced them to the King, brought them to the attention of Parliament, and ceased its remedial efforts only when it obtained strict decrees, precise orders, rigorous commands.[59] The publication of the documents regarding the Company of the Blessed Sacrament has shown that a great number of practices restored to honor in the seventeenth century by the ecclesiastical authorities with regard to the worship to be paid the Eucharist, to the good order of processions, to the observance of the liturgical regulations in exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and the celebration of the holy mysteries, were inspired by the pious society.[60]

As regards the reform of the priesthood, the attitude of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament became more delicate. A society composed mostly of laymen might, indeed, intervene with utmost discretion in matters of piety and of liturgy. But by what right could it interfere in the reform of the clergy? Probably the members of the famous Company asked themselves this question with some anxiety. If sometimes they answered the question with untimely zeal, their excuse was the crying need to correct certain abuses.

In those churches where Massillon reproached his hearers with coming to the holy mysteries to stir up shameful passions and to make of the temple of God a meeting place of iniquity, we see a large number of vagabond priests who brought shame upon the priestly character; and several of them, although wearing the garb of priests, were really not priests at all. Some dressed as hermits that they might beg alms more freely and profitably in these borrowed religious habits.

Members of the Society in Paris did not hesitate to take the place of negligent priests to assure the proper behavior in the churches. In 1634 they drove out vegetable merchants who were cluttering the space in front of Notre Dame. In 1636 they

[59] Allier, p. 129.

[60] D'Argenson, pp. 51–53, 71, 72; Allier, p. 130.

succeeded in having the chapel of the Grand Châtelet closed, which was profaned by a multitude of indecencies. In the church of Quinze-Vingt, for greater security, they installed a sacristan of their choice and had the lamps lighted in the sanctuaries. In 1658 and 1660 they invited the Paris pastors not to tolerate indecent tapestries along the route of religious processions. Bearing in mind that under the regime of a state religion the civil authorities had a right and a duty to interfere in the protection of public worship, they appealed to the magistrates to have the legal feasts and the abstinence observed and to regulate the sale of meat on the forbidden days. They denounced to the authority the priests who celebrated Mass in an unbecoming manner and had them excluded from the ministry or even imprisoned at St. Lazare, where they were maintained at the Society's expense.[61] The Company did indeed prosecute negligent priests, but it was especially concerned with stirring up holy priests and training them. We have already noted the efforts of three of the most influential members of the Society (Father de Condren, St. Vincent de Paul, and Jean Jacques Olier) for the improvement of the clergy. If the regency of Anne of Austria honored itself by the recruiting of an episcopate worthy of its high mission, credit for this condition should go especially to the presence of St. Vincent de Paul in the Council of Conscience and to the intervention of fellow members of the Society who kept him rightly informed.

Orthodoxy of the Company

In carrying out so many undertakings of a diverse and delicate nature the Company of the Blessed Sacrament sometimes went beyond the limits of its competence. But it was kept from any harmful deviation by two feelings that were always dominant in it: an invariable attachment to the Supreme Pontiff

[61] Rébelliau, *loc. cit.*, p. 73.

and an uncompromising opposition to all heresy. Again and again D'Argenson declares the loyalty of the Company to the Roman doctrines, its filial submission to the doctrinal decision of the popes. From the outset Father de Condren, through the mediation of the nuncio and of Father de Brassac, French ambassador at Rome, had tried to obtain a papal brief of approval. The pope merely blessed the society as a work of edification and piety and granted it the favor of several indulgences. The Company asked for something more, but did not insist,[62] resigning itself to the fulfillment of a hidden mission, lacking precision, ill defined, which perhaps was thus the more effective. Yet it remained no less strictly attached to the Roman Church.

This fact is evident from its attitude to Protestantism and Jansenism. The Protestants, obstinately denying the mystery whose glorification was the Company's special task, had no more determined adversary than the Company of the Blessed Sacrament. Some even regarded it as a survival of the Holy League. Indeed it proceeded from the same spirit. As Father Bourdoise said somewhat crudely, "most priests remained with folded arms; God had to stir up laymen, cutlers and haberdashers, to do the work of the lazy priests." [63] As in the League, priests and laymen, noble and peasant, were mingled in an association without official connection with the hierarchy. As in the League, the Society had a single aim: to preserve in France the religious ideal of the ancestors by purging the country of all heresy and infidelity. The debates at Metz in 1654, the missions in Le Puy in 1653 and at Limoges in 1660 for the conversion of the Protestants, were undertaken in this spirit by the zealous Company. In 1652 a monthly fund was established for the new converts.[64] They tried to exclude Huguenots from

[62] D'Argenson, p. 24.
[63] Faillon, *op. cit.*, II, 368.
[64] D'Argenson, p. 131.

the liberal professions, particularly from the practice of medicine, by which these heretics seduced Catholics from the true faith.[65] In the Faubourg St. Germain the Company had a Huguenot academy closed,[66] denounced and refuted Protestant pamphlets, such as Dumoulin's *Anatomie de la Messe,*[67] and continued to be watchful over the sermons, publications, and other attempts of proselytism by the so-called Reformers.

The Company was equally opposed to Jansenism. The society founded by the Duke de Ventadour and that directed by St. Cyran were not without some similarity. Both aimed at leading the Church back to the purity of its discipline and doctrine. Both, more or less secret, made up of priests and laymen, included eminent persons, powerful friends at court and in the nobility of sword and robe. In 1630, by Sebastian Zamet (bishop of Langres), a zealous member of the Company and auxiliary of Mother Angélique, by Father de Condren and St. Vincent de Paul, who had friends on both sides, by the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament which counted its most fervent followers on both sides, a connection seemed to exist between the two societies. This was broken on the day when the leaders of Port Royal openly manifested the position they had taken with regard to the Church. Father Vincent felt a shiver of alarm upon hearing the Abbé de St. Cyran declare that, according to his view, no Church existed any longer, and that such had been the case for the past five hundred or six hundred years.[68] Condren and Zamet shared the feelings of St. Vincent de Paul. Thenceforth the Company resolved to oppose that condemned doctrine as a declared heresy. At every election of its officers—superior, treasurer, and secretary (which they usually held every three months)—these leaders

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 77.
[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 34, 74, 84.
[68] Abelly, *op. cit.*, Part II, p. 412.

were chosen from the ranks of those who cried out: No Jansenists. Thereafter great care was taken to refuse membership to Jansenists.[69]

Opposition to the Company

After thirty years of tireless activity, the Society founded by the Duke de Ventadour had fully succeeded in gathering all classes of society in a mighty common effort for the restoration of faith and Catholic morals. Since the great movement of the third orders in the Middle Ages, the Christian people had never given a more notable example of docile initiative and prudent courage. But the very success of the work, as inevitable indiscretions revealed its existence and organization, stirred up against it bitter hatreds and mounting animosities. To the workingmen belonging to the Companions of Duty, who were irritated by the Sorbonne's condemnation, and to the great worldly lords who did not pardon the campaign against dueling, were now added statesmen, jealous at seeing private initiative taking their place, even for the good of France.

The absolute monarchy, though doing little to improve the general well-being and the public order, did not wish to have anyone else do so. Its councilors and theorists assiduously advised it not to permit anyone to encroach upon the attributes of sovereignty. In 1652 the parliamentarian Le Bret, in his *Traité de la souveraineté des Rois,* claimed for the royal authority not only the instituting of the major administrations, such as the postal service, but also that of the universities, schools, and academies, as likewise the exclusive right to prevent by police regulations the corruption of good morals. He demanded for the King the privilege of great charities, for, he said: "Although they are most praiseworthy in all sorts of people, yet he who engages therein beyond the sovereign Prince makes

[69] Rapin, *op. cit.,* II, 331.

himself suspect to the state." In 1649 one of the official publicists of the French court, Samuel Sorbière, translated one of Hobbes' books in which the author holds that the king is established to take a hand in all parts of the life of the nation as God Himself, and that, with regard to individuals, the public tranquillity is harmed if they are disposed to entertain the ambition of good services.

The members of the Society of the Blessed Sacrament took account of this state of mind. Du Plessis-Montbard (1657) wrote: "Our employments, by their diversity and by their strength, belong rather to sovereigns than to us." The Society included: a group of high nobles, "the devotees," as they were called, great officers of the court, such as the Prince de Conti, the Marquis de Fénelon, and Marshal Schomberg; important magistrates such as Lamoignon, Ormesson, and Séguier; prominent prelates and influential priests, such as Bishop Godeau, Grandin (a doctor of the Sorbonne), Father Olier (pastor of St. Sulpice). All these joined hands in a common activity and more than once took part in political strifes, as they did manifestly at the time of the cabal of the Important and on occasion of the trial of the superintendant Fouquet. Cardinal Mazarin, though unacquainted with the organization of the Society, could not view this situation without distrust.

In public opinion a vague movement of unrest was evident, which was sometimes justified by acts of imprudence and excesses of zeal. The moral reforms undertaken by the Company seemed excessively harsh to some; its inquiries seemed indiscreet. The Jansenists, who were strong in their influence upon the opinion of high society and who were quite aware of the disposition of the "party of the devotees" toward them, lost no occasion to discredit them. The libertines nourished the same attitude toward them. In the seventeenth century, "about the young King who was on the point of assuming power, a whole party labored silently, despite the converted Anne of Austria,

to perpetuate laxity of morals and of thought which her regency restrained. In the group of the Countess de Soissons, the Princess Palatine, and the Duchess of Orléans, of the Count of Harcourt, of the Marquis de Vardes, and of Marshal de Gramont, the "devotees" were ridiculed and were opposed as rivals for power. At least at Paris, the bourgeoisie of the lawyers and doctors made common cause with the epicureans or literary free lances and also with the sensual courtiers.[70] The spirit of the world could not endure the Company.[71]

That world had a chance to rejoice maliciously when, in 1660, two pamphlets appeared denouncing the activities of the Company: one attacking the Company at Caen, the other against the activities of Argentan and Séez. According to these charges, Lower Normandy had been, for several months past, much disturbed by a group of priests and young men who met in a house called the Hermitage and who went about in the city to make extravagant manifestations. One day they were seen stirring up the people with outcries that all the Caen pastors, except two, were disciples of Jansenism. Another day a group, under the leadership of a priest, shouted vigorously with wild gestures, urging the faithful to flee to Canada if they wished to preserve the treasure of the faith, which was being endangered by the Jansenists.

That some acts of extravagance, more or less exaggerated in the two pamphlets, had been committed by members of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, seems likely. But an attempt to make the whole Company responsible was unjust. Yet such was the contention of the two authors. One of these was the Jansenist Nicole. He plainly and expressly names the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, which was denounced as a se-

[70] Rébelliau, *loc. cit.*, p. 898.

[71] See Perrens, *Les Libertins en France;* and Victor Giraud, *Pascal,* Index (s.v., Libertins).

cret society, acting against the King, the bishops, and the magistrates.

The stir produced by the publication of these pamphlets was enormous. The authors had a large number of copies printed and sent them to all the civil authorities and ecclesiastical superiors, and spread them profusely among the people. On September 28, 1660, Guy Patin, in a letter to his friend Falconnet, spoke with feeling of the discovery of this conspiracy and denounces this "congregation which has an understanding with the same confraternity at Rome and which plans to introduce the Inquisition in France." [72]

The tribunals of justice were moved and (December 13, 1660) a court decision "forbade all persons of whatever quality and condition to hold any meetings in this city or elsewhere without the express permission of the King and certified letters patent."

At the time of this decree, the president of the Company was Lamoignon. Owing to his intervention, the Company was not at once dissolved; from 1660 to 1665 it was still able to have meetings. But plenary sessions, which until then had been weekly, were now rare. The relations of the Paris Company with the provincial Companies gradually ceased and, about the end of 1665 or the beginning of the next year, the last elements of the Society completely disappeared.

According to the *Mémoire* of Count d'Argenson, the only solid and permanent works of the Company that survived its ruin were: the Company of Prisons, the Company of new converts, the Company for the spiritual succor of the sick and the dying in the Hôtel-Dieu, the Companies of Ladies, the parish Companies for the well-to-do who had become impoverished, and especially the General Hospital and the Society of Foreign Missions. In fact, the spirit of charity and apostolic zeal,

[72] Guy Patin, *Lettres choisies*, II, 123.

which it had helped to spread among the clergy and the world in general, even beyond the circle of its members, outlived it. Again and again we shall meet its influence in the course of the history of the seventeenth century.[73]

[73] On the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, see, besides the works already cited, A. Auguste, *La Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement;* Maurice Souriau, *La Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement de l'autel;* Féron, *Contribution à l'histoire du jansénisme en Normandie.*

CHAPTER VI

The Foreign Missions

THE earnest proselytism of the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, from the Society's very beginning, reached beyond France and Europe. The Duke de Ventadour, its founder, had acquired (1625) from his uncle, the Duke de Montmorency, the office of viceroy of Canada and was eager to enter upon negotiations with the Recollect Fathers to organize the spread of the gospel there. His project was to settle large colonies there, where efforts would be made to establish the Indians in a settled life and to found schools where the young Indians would be taught.[1] Later the Company was interested directly in the foreign missions. The Marseilles group was, by its location, indicated to act as intermediary. To them the Paris brothers wrote as follows: "Gentlemen, we take great promise for the future from so great fervor in the situation in which you are. We hope that you will carry over seas the good odor of the God of heaven to all the places of earth where your sailors direct their commerce and where your soldiers carry their victories." In 1653 D'Argenson noted that "there were great foreign mission undertakings in which the Company was much interested. It made wonderful contributions for the spiritual comfort of the Hebrides, the Irish Orcades, the English coast, and the islands of America." [2]

But in this work of the distant missions, the members of the Blessed Sacrament encountered an organization already solidly established. We must now go back to a somewhat earlier period

[1] Faillon, *Histoire de la Colonie française au Canada,* I, 210.
[2] D'Argenson, *Annales,* p. 135.

to trace the history of this movement and thus better grasp its providential development.

The great efforts of internal revival in the Church were almost always accompanied by great movements of external propagation. Even while St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis de Sales, and St. Vincent de Paul were laboring to restore Christian life and ecclesiastical life, new missioners were repeating the wonders of the apostles of the first century, of the Benedictines of the seventh century, of the mendicant friars of the thirteenth. They had spread not only in Europe,[3] but also in Asia, in Africa, in the newly discovered regions of America, and had won to the Catholic faith more souls than Protestantism had taken from it. Without as within the Church, a period of great vitality followed a period of decadence.

St. Francis Xavier (1506–51)

Francis Jassu de Xavier was born on April 7, 1506, in the château of Xavier at the foot of the Pyrenees, seven or eight leagues from Pamplona in that upper Navarre which for some time had belonged as a fief to the crown of France.[4] This name of Xavier perpetuated one of the most ancient and illustrious families of the country. Remarkable aptitudes and a pronounced taste for study made him early choose the career of teaching in preference to that of arms, which all his brothers had embraced. In 1525 he came to the University of Paris. The remarkable gifts of his mind, his brilliant imagination, the

[3] In Europe, in all the countries fallen into heresy or schism, the attitude of the Church had been not merely defensive. In Germany the missions preached by Canisius and his disciples resulted in the conversion of several Protestant theologians. In Switzerland, thanks to the efforts of St. Charles Borromeo, St. Fidelis Sigmaringen, and St. Francis de Sales, seconded by the Capuchins and Jesuits, the conversions had been much more numerous; the Bishop of Basle and the Abbot of St. Gall had recovered their former jurisdiction over many districts.

[4] On the exact date of the birth of St. Francis Xavier, see Charles Cros, *François Xavier, documents nouveaux,* p. 132.

youthful and somewhat tumultuous vivacity of his character, the attraction of his noble and likeable features, soon drew upon Xavier the attention of his fellow students and of his professors. He received his master's degree in March, 1530. The next October he was appointed to publicly comment on Aristotle at the college of Beauvais.

The young professor did not at that time think of anything but to make a name for himself in the educational world. With this aim in view, he even began to join with several young men inflamed by the new ideas. The conversations of one of his countrymen, Ignatius Loyola, would lead him to an ideal more worthy of his Christian faith. Ignatius, who had already decided to form a company of zealous and learned men, cast his eyes upon the young man of Navarre. He used to repeat to Xavier: "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world if he loses his soul?" We read that the brilliant young Xavier began by poking fun at the poor student who, simple and poorly dressed, kept repeating the same maxim every time he met him.[5] Ignatius' insistence and the power of the truth finally overcame him. Some spiritual exercises, performed under the direction of his friend, fixed him in his resolve to devote himself to God and souls. On August 15, 1534, he was one of the seven who, in the chapel of Montmartre, vowed themselves to a life of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Thenceforth the desire to go and preach the gospel to the infidel nations of the Indies never left him. His vows were soon made good.

Shortly afterward he received the following word from his superior, Ignatius, who wrote to him in the name of Pope Paul III: "By counsels far higher than those of our feeble judgment, it is you, Francis, who are destined to the mission of the Indies. This overseas journey to barbarous countries, which we have earnestly desired and which we waited for so long at Venice, is now offered to us at Rome. No longer is it, as we

[5] Cf. Fouqueray, *His. de la C^ie de Jésus en France*, I, 41.

asked, a single province that God gives us, but the entire Indies, a whole world of peoples and nations." The apostolic field here indicated by St. Ignatius would become even vaster. Not only to the Indies, but also to Japan and China St. Francis Xavier would go and there start the greatest movement of religious expansion that has occurred since the preaching of the apostles.

India, which a tradition says was evangelized by St. Thomas and which even yet has a few groups of Christians, with a more or less altered faith, who claim to trace back their conversion to the illustrious apostle,[6] presented the most formidable obstacles to the spread of the Christian faith. The old Brahamanism, that complex religion so well adapted to the Hindu race with its polytheism appealing to the popular soul and its fundamental pantheism furnishing philosophers and poets with the subject of the most brilliant speculations, seemed indestructible. Buddhism, born on the soil of India in the sixth century of our era, was unable to supplant the ancient worship and had taken root only in the two extremities of the country (in Ceylon and Nepal) and especially beyond the frontiers, in China and Japan. The division of the people into different castes, mutually exclusive, and the absolute authority of the Brahmans, lofty personages, untouchable, jealous guardians of the old rites and distrustful of foreigners, seemed to erect insurmountable barriers between the religion of Brahma and any outside influence. The difficulties were increased by the bad example given to the peoples of these countries by the Portuguese merchants and soldiers, who for them were the only representatives of the religion and civilization of Europe. None of these obstacles dismayed Xavier. He was not exaggerating when he said: "I fear God, and nothing else in this world." As he stepped ashore at

[6] "The apostolate of St. Thomas in India is a fact attested by the early ecclesiastical annals, Greek, Latin, and Syriac" (Assémani, *Diss. de Syris Nestorianis,* IV, 439). Cf. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums,* p. 440.

Goa (May 6, 1542), the apostle rejoiced at sight of a cross planted on the bank.

The heroic practice of the Christian virtues and of religious observances had moderated that ardent soul. Nothing could be more prudently calculated than his apostolic method. His first two concerns were: to inquire carefully into the customs and traditions of the peoples so as to avoid every clash and scandal; to prepare for preaching by fervent and assiduous prayer. He could not fail to see that the first obstacle to overcome was that which arose from the bad morals of the Portuguese. But he could not make an immediate frontal attack on the conduct of these hard and dissolute men. Xavier began by preaching the gospel to the children. Every day, after a long invocation of God in prayer, he walked through the city of Goa, ringing a hand bell. He would cry out: "Christian faithful, friends of Christ, send your sons and your daughters, as also your slaves of both sexes, that they may hear the holy doctrine, for the love of God." [7] Before this world of little people, before these poor slaves, the former professor of the Beauvais college, the brilliant commentator of Aristotle, adapted his intelligence, generally made use of a sort of Portuguese patois, the only language that his hearers could understand,[8] and he found in his heart pathetic accents that moved souls. People admired him, they fell in love with him, they were edified by his mere presence.

However, an imperious feeling drew him to the pagans. On the eastern shore of Cape Comorin some pearl fishers had already been baptized by Portuguese priests. But their religion was superficial and not very firm. Xavier visited village after village, accompanied by some Tamil interpreters. At the sound of his hand bell, he gathered men and children, recited the usual prayers and the articles of faith. On Sunday he gave

[7] Cros, *Saint François Xavier, sa vie et ses lettres,* I, 216.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 217.

longer instructions. He entered into their cabins, talked with the poor people, won their heart, taught them patiently. Then, when the instruction of the neophytes seemed to him to be sufficient, he baptized them. Soon not only isolated individuals asked for Christian instruction; but people came to him in throngs. His arms grew tired and his voice became hoarse in administering the sacrament. "Often," he wrote, "my hands became exhausted; sometimes my voice was so tired that I could not speak." [9] He visited the huts to baptize the dying and the newly born. In fact, the tireless apostle had absolute confidence in the supernatural efficacy of the sacrament of baptism. He wrote: "Nobody can tell all the fruit that is derived from the baptism of the new-born. . . . These baptized children soon showed an eager love for the divine law." [10]

In a short time thirty villages were evangelized. In each village Xavier left a catechist whose duty it was to continue the instruction, to have the articles of faith sung on Sundays and feast days. What he now begged from the Portuguese authorities, what he asked of his European friends, in tones of burning eloquence, was priests to help him. In one of his letters he writes: "Often the thought comes to my mind, to visit the universities of Europe, especially the University of Paris, and cry out to all those doctors who have more knowledge than charity: 'Behold these thousands of souls which, through your fault, are losing heaven and falling into hell.' " [11]

On the two southern coasts of the Hindustan triangle he proclaimed to all, from the pariahs to the Brahmas, not as formerly Buddha did at the other end of India "the good law of Nirvana," but "the good tidings of eternal life." [12] However, while the pagans were won to the faith by the holy missioner,

[9] Pagès, *Lettres de saint François Xavier,* I, 81.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 83–85.
[12] Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire de la litt. de l'Eglise,* p. 894.

the irregular morals of the Portuguese, their abuse of power, their impiety, scandalized these simple souls. At Cochin, especially at Malacca, the peril was urgent. In vain Xavier begged of the government a regime of severe repression. He then turned his apostolic activity to these bad Christians. With his bell in his hand, he visited the European quarters of the city. "Pray," he cried out, "pray for all those who are in mortal sin. Pray for the departed who are suffering in purgatory."

At Malacca (July, 1547) he met a Japanese, named Anjiro or Anger, "seeking peace of conscience and of heart." Xavier instructed him and baptized him. But his relations with Anger called his attention to that active, intelligent, people, eager for learning and prompt in action, which the neophyte made known to him.[13] On June 24, 1549, provided, through the care of the governor of Malacca, with rich presents for the Mikado, he turned toward Japan, accompanied by Anger, who now bore the name Paul of Holy Faith, and by two Jesuits. Sailing on a Chinese junk, on August 15 he landed at Kagoshima on the island of Kyushu.

In Japan were two religions: 1. Shintoism (shinto = path of the gods), which in its origin was confused with the beginning of the nation and which, having no dogmas, consisted in the worship of the great men of the country; 2. Buddhism, imported from India in the sixth century. To acclimate Buddhism more easily, the bonzes had cleverly fused it with the national religion, giving the people to understand that the gods of India were none other than the gods of Japan under different names. In their Shintoist temples the Japanese let the bonzes celebrate the Buddhist ceremonies. But the essential spirit of Shintoism, which was a grim devotion to the divinized nation, survived this superficial and arbitrary fusion. The Buddhist bonze, lazy and corrupt, spent whole hours meditating on this maxim, "There

[13] See his letter of January 20, 1549, in Cros, *op. cit.*, I, 408.

is nothing." Thus he was never attractive to this active people, which had a God, namely, the fatherland, and a worship, that of honoring this God.

Japan's political constitution was strictly feudal. The authority of the emperor, or dairi, in principle was absolute, and in reality nominal. In fact, it resided in the lords (daimios), served by men of arms (samurai), and represented before the sovereign by a lieutenant general (shogun).[14]

The religious and political situation of the country favored the apostolate of Xavier. His firm and decided manner, the chivalrous spirit which he derived from his race, his lofty intellectual culture, which the simplicity of his speech did not hide, pleased feudalists, who prided themselves on their love of letters as well as on their bravery. The missioner had hoped to establish contact with the sovereign of the country; but this he was unable to do. However, several of the most powerful daimios authorized him to preach in their states, and several samurai placed themselves at his service. The apostle exulted with joy; he called Japan "the delight of his soul." At one time we see him, on some elevated place where he preached, explaining the truths of the faith; at another time we see him in some abandoned bonzerie which has been placed at his disposal by the local lord, where from morning to night he answers the countless questions of visitors impatient for solution of their doubts. He scarcely had time to eat. Part of the night he spent in prayer. But his courage did not weaken. Writing to his brethren in Europe, he said: "I am old; I am all white. Yet I feel myself as robust as ever, for the hardships that one undergoes to convert a reasonable nation that loves the truth and sincerely wishes its salvation, is a deep joy for the heart." Moreover, God renewed, in his behalf, the gift of the most wonderful miracles. He preached in different languages, foretold the future, cured the sick, brought the dead back to life.

[14] Francisque Marnas, *La religion de Jésus au Japon,* I, 4–6.

His enemies were especially the bonzes, who, seeing the people on the point of slipping from them, filled the air with their clamor, seeking to disturb the meetings where the saint addressed the throng, intriguing with the lords, and even obtaining from the prince of Sassuma a decree against Christianity, closing the temples in sign of alarm, and seeking to stir up the people. In a series of famous conferences lasting three days, the saint easily succeeded in destroying the scaffolding made up of their calumnies and in showing the hollowness of their beliefs. In short, at the end of 1551, after a sojourn of twenty-seven months in Japan, Xavier had baptized thousands of infidels, won to his cause the heart of many princes, and confounded the idolatry in the pride of its priests.[15] Then a decision of Ignatius appointed him the first superior of the province of the Indies, recently created. Xavier returned to the region that had been the first fruits of his apostolate. But, faithful to his motto of *Amplius, amplius,* he thought of new conquests. His hope now was to win to Christianity the country whose name was uttered with veneration in the Indies as it was in Japan, a country that seemed to be the nursery of Asiatic civilization, China.[16]

China received its Buddhism from India. With it two other religions were mingled: Taoism and Confucianism. "Remember that all movement leads to nothingness," said Buddha. "Let yourself be moved by the divine breath that produced heaven and earth," said Laotse, the founder of Taoism. "Practice the worship of the family and for the rest adapt yourself to the circumstances," said Confucius. In these words will be found the whole mentality of the Chinese, with its indolent conservatism,

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 15.

[16] Bœhmer, *Les Jésuites,* p. 155. The apostolic career of St. Francis Xavier and the order in which he accomplished his various missions seem to have been determined by prudent and enlightened reflection. We wonder, therefore, what reason Bœhmer, after saying that Francis "had an almost unequaled talent as an organizer," proceeds to remark that "Xavier nowhere acted with perseverance, but was a restless vagabond from place to place" (Bœhmer, *op. cit.,* p. 150).

its opportunism from day to day, its vague pantheism, and its worship of ancestors.[17] To enter that immense empire, to separate from such beliefs the craving for the supernatural that lay hidden in them, and to meet that craving by preaching of the Catholic truth: this was Xavier's desire. But the demands and cruelties of the Portuguese merchants closed all the ports of China. Only an embassy from a European sovereign could cross the frontiers. A wealthy merchant, Pereira, offered to pay for Xavier the expenses of an embassy. But the governor general of Malacca, representative of the king of Portugal, not only refused to grant Xavier the diplomatic title which the apostle requested; he placed an embargo on his ship. In vain Xavier, employing his powers as papal legate, issued an excommunication against the governor, who was guilty of hindering the spread of the gospel. Xavier was thus forced to attempt a secret entry into China.

Along the southern coast of the Celestial Empire, not far from the port of Macao, is a little island, dry and barren, called Sancian, where the Chinese authorities allowed foreign ships to deposit their merchandise. Here Xavier landed and lodged in a wretched hut with the intention of waiting patiently for the providential circumstance that would enable him to enter China. But he lacked everything: the two interpreters whom he had attached to himself deserted him; the Chinese merchant who, in return for a huge payment furnished by Pereira, had promised to facilitate Xavier's passage of the frontier, did not keep his word.[18] A malignant fever seized the missioner. The crew of the ship that brought him there, fearing the wrath of the governor of Malacca, abandoned him. After five days of illness, Xavier breathed forth his soul to God (November 27,

[17] On the religions of China, see *Dict. apolog. de la foi cath.*, art. "Chine," by Father Léon Wieger, S.J. This article is based entirely on original Chinese sources.

[18] Letter of October 22, 1552, in Cros, *op. cit.*, II, 320.

1551).[19] He was forty-six years old and had consecrated ten years to the foreign missions.

During those ten years of his apostolate, Xavier had converted several hundred thousand men.[20] As if he had foreseen, on the part of the yellow race, at the beginning of modern times, a peril similar to that which the Mussulman world had aroused in the Middle Ages, he endeavored to bring the light of the gospel to the three chief centers of civilization in the Far East. India, Japan, and China itself, to which the fame of the great apostle reached and which could not help but venerate his grave as that of a hero, were touched by the Christian influence. Xavier's successors merely had to walk in his footsteps.

The Jesuits in India

In India, Francis Xavier had evangelized the Fishery Coast, Travancore, and the north of Ceylon. After his death, his brethren of the Company of Jesus turned their steps in large numbers toward the breach he had opened. Fifty years later they had two large provinces in the Indies: in 1660, more than four hundred Jesuits were there devoting themselves to the service of souls.

But their apostolate did not yet reach any but the lower castes. The Indian of the upper classes despised the converted pariahs, and these foreign preachers, these impure *Pranguis* who ate any kind of food, who defiled themselves by all sorts

[19] For the moving details of this death, see the report of Antonio de Santa Fé, a Chinese catechist, in Cros, *op. cit.*, II, 341–54. This catechist was the only person who witnessed the saint's death. From his account it seems certain that St. Francis died on Sunday, November 27, not December 2, as has been generally accepted. This historical correction, defended by Father Cros, has the approval of Father Van Ortroy, Bollandist (*Anal. bolland.*, XXIII, 410).

[20] *Multa centena hominum millia,* says Urban VIII in his bull of canonization (August 6, 1623). Father de Rhodes speaks of 300,000 or 400,000. Father Brou, in his *Vie de saint François Xavier,* thinks this figure should be much reduced.

of contacts. These men without any caste and consequently without morals, aroused only repulsion among the high caste Indians. In 1608 a Jesuit, Robert de' Nobili, resolved to turn to the Brahmans themselves. His companion Laerzio says:

> Penetrated with the grand thought that Jesus Christ came for the salvation of all men, that He must everywhere triumph over the demon, destroy his kingdom, and release his captives, recognizing also the true cause of an obstinacy so frightful and perverse, Father Robert de' Nobili resolved to apply to this evil an effective remedy. Imitating the example of St. Paul, who became all things to all men, and that of the Eternal Word, who became man in order to save men, Father Robert said within himself: "I also will make myself an Indian in order to save the Indians." He saw at a glance all which this sublime purpose involved, and without fear he accepted all.[21]

Like many of his brethren of the Society of Jesus, Robert de' Nobili was of noble ancestry. Nephew of Cardinal Bellarmine and a close relative of Pope Marcellus II, he had renounced the brilliant destiny which the world offered him and embraced the poor and devoted life of a missioner. To win souls for Christ, no labor seemed to him too great. He turned to a Saniassi or Brahman penitent of the Malabar Coast, bought for himself the red cap, the veil, and the muslin dress of the Saniassi. Then he shaved his head, painted his forehead with the yellow paste of sandal-wood, and retired to a grass hut and there lived as a solitary, eating only vegetables and drinking nothing but water. At the same time he studied the sacred books of the Hindus and soon succeeded in having a thorough understanding of their most secret doctrine.

Little by little the renown of the great Saniassi who had come from the West, spread through the countryside. The most famous scholars sought audience with him. All were enchanted by the distinction of his manners, fascinated by his eloquence, amazed by the readiness and purity with which he expressed

[21] Quoted by Marshall, *Christian Missions,* I, 219.

himself in their tongue and by the quotations he could adduce by memory from their most famous authors. Some Brahmans asked his advice on perfection and enlightenment on the most obscure points of their doctrines.

The old Brahman whom he had chosen for his teacher was his first conquest. Soon a score of other Brahmans imitated him. Father Robert de' Nobili explains the ingenious tactics he employed to lead them to the Catholic faith. "Apart from my kind of life," he says, "another circumstance greatly helped me to bring about conversions: the knowledge I had acquired of the most secret books of the religion of the country. I ascertained that the primitive religion had four laws or vedas. Three of these were the ones that the Brahmans taught. But, as all confessed, none of the three vedas is able to bring salvation. Salvation, I said, is in that fourth law, a purely spiritual law, which you acknowledge has been lost and cannot be recovered by human power. I have come from a distant country with the single aim of bringing you this law of the spirit, this fourth veda, which God gave to the world and which you are waiting for." "Thus I adapted my language to their ideas, following the example of the Apostle, who preached the unknown God to the Athenians." [22]

The success of this pious strategem was prodigious. "The Lord brought into the fold so many new sheep," Nobili wrote to his provincial, "that soon my church will not be able to hold the neophytes." [23] It is true that the missioner's austere life and his charity counted for much in these conversions. Father Anthony Vico wrote to Father Acquaviva, the Jesuit general, "I would call this man the type of ideal perfection of a missioner." [24]

However, Father de' Nobili's refusal to perform or even to

[22] J. Bertrand, S.J., *La Mission du Maduré, documents inédits* (1847–50), I, 21.
[23] *Ibid.*, II, 73.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

sanction certain pagan rites aroused some Brahmans against him. Some Christians, scandalized by his attitude, cited him before the tribunal of the archbishop of Goa in 1618. The affair was brought to Rome. Cardinal Bellarmine himself was for a while disturbed by the reports he heard about the apostolate of his nephew. But the latter explained his conduct; and the Cardinal's anxiety vanished. Pope Gregory XV, by a bull of January 31, 1623, explicitly approved the method followed by Nobili. That decision remained the charter of the mission for more than a century.[25] In 1639 Nobili supplemented his system by instituting two classes of missioners: those (Brahman-Saniassi) who, like him, subjected themselves to the full etiquette of the Brahmans; the others (pandara-swamis) who could visit all classes. When Father Robert de' Nobili died in 1656, the Madura mission counted a hundred thousand Christians.

Zealous missioners continued his work. The greatest of all was the martyr John de Britto. The son of the viceroy of Brazil, brought up at court as companion of the princes, John de Britto was favored at the age of fourteen by a grace of healing through the intercession of St. Francis Xavier. He promised to follow in the footsteps of his powerful protector. After his arrival in India (1665), nine years after Nobili's death, he baptized within less than five years six thousand pagans. As superior of the mission, he renewed it by his zealous energy. He refuted the Brahmans with their own books and reserved for himself the most abandoned and the poorest of the Christian centers to evangelize them. John de Britto used to say: "I did not know true nobility until I became the companion of the friends of Christ." God blessed his preaching by miracles. From an eyewitness we have the following testimony: "I have had the joy of observing that some of the prodigies which contributed to the conversion of pagans in the days of the primi-

[25] The Malabar rites were later forbidden, as also the Chinese rites.

tive Church were daily renewed in the Church that we have founded." The fame of such an apostolate aroused the wrath of the pagans. Like St. Paul, De Britto endured flogging, prison, hunger, thirst, wandered about without finding a refuge, appeared before the tribunals and there professed the faith of Christ. One day he was exposed on a rock to the burning rays of the Indian sun; another day he was beaten with rods until his flesh was in pieces. A price was put on his head. Arrested and judged at Ramnad, he was brought to Oréiour and there (February 4, 1693) he was beheaded. The witnesses who deposed at the process of beatification, related that he advanced to the place of execution like a conqueror marching in triumphal procession. After St. Francis Xavier, Blessed John de Britto [26] must be considered the principal patron of the Indian mission.

The Missions in Japan

As in the Indies, in Japan the memory of St. Francis Xavier remained a program of action, a stimulant of zeal, and gauge of success. For almost half a century the Jesuits were the only ones who had the privilege of continuing in Japan the work of their glorious Father Francis.[27] The Japanese people responded generously to these efforts: the fervor of the first Christian communities seemed to revive in these young Christian centers, and the courage of the first witnesses of the gospel was found again in the intrepidity of its martyrs. "Whole families received baptism on the same day and, under the breath of grace, the new converts became apostles. Then began to flourish the Christian centers of Hirado, Omura, and Nagasaki, which, by the fervor of their neophytes, the austerities of their penitents, and the purity of their virgins recalled the most beautiful days

[26] The solemnity of his beatification took place August 21, 1853.

[27] In 1593 the Franciscans joined hands with the Jesuits and were their emulators in the apostolate of Japan.

of the primitive Church. Fifteen bonzes of great renown were converted in 1560. Two years later the daimio of Omura was baptized along with thirty of his samurai. Soon afterward it was the daimio of Amakusa and that of the Goto Islands; then one of the greatest warriors of the time, Takayma, and his son, Prince Justo.

In the midst of a feudal society, such personages could not enrol under the banner of Christ without bringing in their suite a throng of their subordinates. But what contributed still more to the rapid spread of Christianity was the favor accorded to the missioners by a man famous in the history of those times, an outspoken enemy of the bonzes and a real sovereign of Japan since 1565. He was called Nobunaga. Haughty and magnanimous, serious and dissolute, but above all ambitious, Nobunaga showed genius. He it was who, to save his country from anarchy, conceived the plan of concentrating in the hands of a single master a power that the daimios disputed at the point of the sword to the great harm of the nation. Though Nobunaga, on account of his passions, was far from embracing Christianity, he often declared his admiration for it and showed himself favorable to those who taught it. Under his government the Catholic Church counted in Japan as many as 200,000 members and 250 churches; three daimios sent an embassy to the Supreme Pontiff.[28]

Intoxicated by his triumph, Nobunaga had erected a temple where he himself was to be adored. But his life was cut short by death in 1582. His successor was the first persecutor of the Christians. His name was Hideyoshi. From the post of a simple servant of an officer, he rose through his talent and his work, to the grade of generalissimo. He was a small man, but a powerful one, whose very bearing and countenance were frightful.[29] Dominated by a mighty ambition, he could not

[28] Marnas, *op. cit.*, I, 16–19.
[29] Charlevoix, *Histoire du Japon*, Bk. VI, chap. 11.

tolerate near him any rival power. In 1587 the bonzes succeeded in persuading him that the missioners were spies and instruments of conquest in the service of Spain. Thereafter he hesitated at no measure of violence. He swore to abolish the religion of Christ in all his states. A decree of banishment was issued against the European priests, who must leave Japanese territory within twenty days, and orders were given to tear down everywhere the churches and the crosses.

Under these circumstances, the conduct of the Jesuits was a wonder of prudence and tactical adroitness. One of their greatest men had just arrived in Japan. This was Father Alexander Valignano, born at Chieti in the Abruzzi (February, 1539). "The nobility of his family and the brilliant qualities of his mind, enhanced by a noble countenance, promised a great future for him. He offered to God the sacrifice of all his worldly hopes, and took the habit of the Company of Jesus at Rome on May 27, 1566. After a few years he was regarded as fit to train others in the religious life. To him was entrusted the training of the novices then resident in the Roman College. Among these was Matteo Ricci, the future great missioner of China." [30] Owing to the firm diplomacy of Father Valignano, the Jesuits were able to remain in Japan for ten years notwithstanding the decrees, and that without any shedding of blood. Not one of them left the country. They withdrew to the homes of the Christian princes and to the daimios who were favorable to them, and from there they parleyed with the imperial government. Valignano, accredited as ambassador of the viceroy of the Indies, presented himself in person to the sovereign, loaded with presents, and respectfully discussed his forebodings, and courageously proposed to the ruler that ten Jesuits be kept as hostages. Hideyoshi was disturbed by this offer. At that very time his armies were victorious in Corea, thanks to the brilliant deeds of arms of a Christian prince, General Yukinaga.

[30] J. Brucker, in *Etudes,* July 20, 1910, p. 193.

He was calmed little by little. Christianity continued to progress. The number of Christians soon rose to 300,000 under the direction of 134 religious.[31]

Things stood thus when (July, 1596) a Spanish galleon, the St. Philip, going from Manila to New Spain, was cast by a storm on the shores of Tosa and, according to Japanese custom, was confiscated to the profit of the emperor. In the hope of saving his rich cargo, the pilot tried to intimidate the government of Hideyoshi. In an interview with one of the ruler's officers, he showed him on a map of the world the many regions subject to the king of Spain, in Africa, in Asia, and in America, in fine, that whole empire on which the sun never set. The surprised officer asked: "How was such a vast monarchy established?" "By religion and by arms," replied the imprudent Spaniard. "Our priests prepare the way. They convert the populations to Christianity. After that it is merely a game for us to subject them to our authority." This declaration was at once reported to Hideyoshi. Nothing more was needed to revive his anger. "The traitors," he cried. "They will learn what it is to play with me." [32] On his order at once a list was drawn up of all the Japanese who were in relation with the missioners. The most pitiful episode of this persecution was the crucifixion of twenty-six Christians, priests and laymen, in the city of Nagasaki. They endured martyrdom with admirable courage. Among them were many children. According to the report of eyewitnesses, "the blood that flowed on their cheeks moved the pity of the hardest hearts." [33] The emotion was increased when they heard one of the martyrs, a little Mass server, intone the *Laudate pueri Dominum,* then the invincible Paul Miki, a Japanese cleric of the Society of Jesus, preach the gospel from his cross until he drew his last breath.

Hideyoshi's rigors were merely the prelude of a more gen-

[31] Marnas, *op. cit.,* I, 25.
[32] Charlevoix, *op. cit.,* Bk. X, chap. 4.
[33] *Ibid.,* chap. 10.

eral and terrible persecution, which broke out in 1614. Some Dutch and English merchants had formed a plan to seize the commerce of Japan. In the words of a Protestant historian, "These Calvinists and these Anglicans showed no scruple in stirring up the shogun to drown the Japanese Church in blood. They succeeded only too well." [34] The shogun Ieyasu ordered the banishment of all the missioners, the demolition of all the churches, the apostasy of all the Christians under pain of death. "The number of victims was much greater than that of the persecutions against the Christians of the Roman Empire: it rose to 30,000 in the single year 1624, and the atrocity of the sufferings surpassed all that Eusebius relates about the martyrdoms of the Christians of Egypt under Maximin and Decius." [35] In 1640 the following announcement was made known to the public: "So long as the sun warms the earth, let no Christian be so bold as to come to Japan! Let all know, even the king of Spain in person, or the God of the Christians, or the great Buddha himself, whoever violates this prohibition will pay for it with his head." [36] Crosses were engraved or painted on the wharves of all the ports so that no Christian could pass without trampling on that sacred sign; in the eyes of the Japanese, such an act was equivalent to apostasy. The head of every foreign missioner, daring enough to enter the empire, had a price put on it. Even the natives could not, under pain of death, leave their country or return to it if they had gone out. The effect of these measures was to close Japan to Europe for more than two centuries.

The Missions in China

Mysterious China, with its immense material resources, and also intellectual and moral powers in reserve, was the last aim

[34] Bœhmer, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] Marnas, *op. cit.*, I, 44.

of St. Francis Xavier's apostolate. His brethren in religion were faithful to the honor of realizing his last desire.

China at that time had almost reached the height of the period of its history which is characterized by the rule of the literati.[37] Just as India could not be reached profoundly without first winning the Brahmans and as no lasting work could be accomplished in Japan without making sure of the support of the feudal lords, evidently the preparatory work in China was to overcome the directing class of the literati. This was understood by the disciples of St. Francis Xavier and particularly by the worthy follower of Robert de' Nobili and of Alexander Valignano, Matteo Ricci.

Matteo Ricci (1552–1610)

The missioner to whom Providence reserved the conquest so greatly desired by Francis Xavier came into this world at the very time when Francis was making his last effort to gain entrance into China. Born on October 6, 1552, of a noble family at Macerata in the Papal States, Matteo Ricci studied law at Rome for two years. On August 15, 1571, he interrupted his studies to enter the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, where Father Valignano, his "Father Master," inspired him with the apostolic zeal with which he himself was inflamed. The young man's special aptitudes for the exact sciences induced his superiors to direct him to the study of mathematics, cosmography, and astronomy, along with philosophy and theology. But Matteo Ricci's success in these different sciences did not turn his thoughts from the preoccupation that he cherished since the time of his novitiate. After the conclusion of his studies, he

[37] "The period extends from 1280 to 1905. It is marked by the decline of Buddhism and Taoism. The offices and the examinations that gave access to them had passed into the hands of the literati, who thus became the dominant power" (Léon Wieger, *loc. cit.*). This period came to an end by the decree of September 2, 1905, which abolished the former literary examinations.

begged and obtained the favor of being sent to the missions of India. He did not stay there long. Presently, in company with Father Ruggieri, he was drawn to the mission of China, where his scientific knowledge would prove to be of the greatest usefulness.

The two religious humbly asked the maritime prefect of Canton for permission to settle at Chao-king. According to the words of their petition, "they were religious men who had left their own country upon the good renown of the good government of China, to come there with a view to remaining and dying there. They requested only a corner of earth, where, with the help of alms, they would build a little church, without causing inconvenience to anyone, and would live on the alms already received." [38] Soon the scientific knowledge of the two peaceful strangers made them celebrated among the literati. Father Ricci translated into Chinese the Elements of Euclid, made some sun dials and some terrestrial and celestial globes, which attracted the good will of the mandarins. Ricci's aim was to present himself at court and to settle at Peking. He was persuaded rightly that, if he should succeed in having himself accepted in the capital and in there establishing a residence, missioners would have no difficulty in penetrating the whole Empire.

About the beginning of 1599 Matteo Ricci, accompanied by Michael Ruggieri and, like his companion, dressed in the silk costume of the mandarins, made his entrance into Peking, where finally, after a few difficulties, he was able to settle definitely on January 24, 1601. The emperor, Wan-li, charmed by the world maps, allowed him to reside in the capital, wherever he wished. Christianity then began to have legal authorization. The missioners profited by this to explain more freely to the

[38] Ricci, *Dell' intrata della Compagnia di Gesù e christianita in Cina,* Bk. I, chap. 2. Father Trigant has translated into Latin these memoirs of Father Ricci under the title *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinos* (1615).

literati who came to consult them, the chief mysteries of the faith. Conversions increased. In 1605 the mission counted more than two hundred neophytes, several of them being personages of note. Such was that doctor Li, who composed seven volumes on mathematics, translated the works of Aristotle, and left more than twenty works in manuscript on various subjects of philosophy.

Some writers have criticized and even distorted the apostolic method of the famous Jesuit. That method, so far as it is special, seems to have been inspired by a twofold preoccupation: to make Catholic doctrine accepted by Chinese thought and to preserve, in the national customs and rites, whatever did not appear incompatible with the faith and morals of the gospel. From these considerations came the rules of conduct that should be followed by the missioner: 1. first he published a treatise, *The true Idea of God* (Tien-chu-she-i), in which according to his own words, "he does not treat of all the truths of our holy faith, but only of some of the principal ones, . . . since his only purpose is to prepare the way";[39] 2. he declared open war on Buddhism and Taoism, but he did not attack Confucianism, and rather praised it;[40] he even attempted to make use of the national sage in his apologetics, in the same way that the apologists and the theologians of the first centuries supported their stand on Plato and Aristotle; 3. he accepted the idea that the converted Chinese might take part in the cult of the ancestors and even that the mandarins should do so to their spiritual ancestor, Confucius; he judged, in fact, that these rites were nothing more than a filial respect or the gratitude of disciples toward a master; 4. he called God *Tien-chu* (the Lord of heaven), because, in the Chinese language, he did not find any name that corresponded to the name of God, and because the name of God itself, *Dio,* could not very well be pro-

[39] Quoted by Brucker in *Etudes,* September 20, 1910, p. 771.
[40] *Ibid.,* p. 769.

nounced in that language, which has not the sound "D," but he permitted the designation of God by the name *Chang-ti,* employed by Confucius and by the literati to designate the principle of the world.[41]

"In 1610 the strength of Father Ricci was exhausted, less through age than through the fatigues of an apostolate that filled all his days and a great part of his nights. After a short illness, he expired (May 11), kissing the crucifix and the image of St. Ignatius, whose worthy son he had been."

On his deathbed he designated as his successor Father Longobardi, who had been living in China since 1596 and who had a very different view of the "Chinese rites." [42] He rigorously forbade Christians to practice them. Numerous and noteworthy conversions continued under this new regime.

Under the Tartar Manchu dynasty, which seized the throne in 1644 and which inaugurated the golden age of the literati,[43] two missioners were especially conspicuous by the prestige of their scientific knowledge and the effectiveness of their apostolate in the upper classes of China: they were Father Schall and Father Verbiest.

Johann Adam Schall (1591–1669), a native of Cologne, acquired such a reputation by his Chinese writings on mathematics and astronomy that he was appointed president of the mathematical tribunal, or bureau of astronomical observations of Peking. Emperor Shun-chi bestowed on him precious marks of esteem, raised him and his ancestors to the rank of nobility according to Chinese custom, and granted him a piece of land on which Father Schall in 1650 laid the foundations of a great Catholic church. But in 1664 a Mohammedan astronomer,

[41] Ricci endeavored to prove that this name, in the texts of Confucius and his first disciples, designates the true God who is adored in Europe. In this he was not in accord with the common explanation of the modern Chinese literati. But several of the best European Sinologists agree with Father Ricci.

[42] He also forbade the use of the name Chang-ti to designate God. See Longobardi, *Traité sur quelques points de la religion des Chinois.*

[43] Wieger, *loc. cit.*

Yang Kweisien, removed from the direction of the observatory, presented against the missioners charges of conspiracy against the state. These charges led to a persecution. Father Schall, after being arrested and sentenced to be cut into ten thousand pieces, was released, following an earthquake which terrified the population. He died on August 15, 1666, at the age of seventy-five.

Father Verbiest, a Belgian by birth, succeeded him. Well versed in astronomy, he showed the inexactness of the calendar prepared by Yang Kweisien and corrected it. He constructed new instruments for the observatory and, upon the Emperor's orders, even cast some brass cannons. He died on January 9, 1688. The Emperor decreed that the tribunal of mathematics should be permanently placed under the direction of the Jesuits.

The Chinese Rites

Meanwhile members of other religious orders and priests trained in the new Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions had arrived in China. Many of these observed with astonishment and scandal that the Chinese converts were offering sacrifices to their ancestors and to Confucius. Opinion was divided. The Jesuits generally clung to the method of Father Ricci; but most of the missioners of the other congregations took Father Longobardi's view. Then began those long and painful discussions on the Chinese rites, discussions that would be so injurious to the future of Catholicism in the Celestial Empire.

In 1643 Father Morales, a Dominican, submitted to the Holy See a series of questions or doubts, which were answered in a decree of Propaganda, approved by Pope Innocent X and dated September 12, 1645. The Chinese rites as set forth by Father Morales were therein condemned and forbidden. The Jesuits asked for a chance to explain their view. The result was a decree of the Holy Office (March 23, 1656), approved by Pope

Alexander VII, which "allowed to the Chinese the said ceremonies, with all superstitions removed, because it seemed that they constituted a rite purely civil and political." These first two replies by ecclesiastical authority, in which each of the two parties claimed to find justification for its method, were supplemented by a third decree (November 20, 1669), approved by Clement IX, which declared that "each of the two former decrees must be observed, according to the questions, the circumstances, and whatever was contained in the doubts proposed."

Light and peace did not yet come. The persecution that broke out in 1665 seemed to produce agreement on the problem. Jesuits and Dominicans, thrown into the same prison, thought they could not better employ their forced leisure than in agreeing on a uniform method of apostolate. Forty-two articles were drawn up in 1668 and placed under the protection of St. Joseph, the patron of the Chinese missions. But as soon as the missioners were freed from prison, both parties resumed their former positions. The strife was the more bitter as these confessors of the faith introduced into it the whole ardor of their zeal.

To put an end to the dispute the peremptory decision of Clement XI was needed. On November 20, 1704, he forbade all offerings and ceremonies, whether solemn or less solemn, made in the temples or halls of Confucius and of the ancestors, and banned the use of the words *Tien* and *Chang-ti* to designate God. But when the papal legate, Charles Maillard de Tournon, presented himself (December 31, 1705) before Emperor Kang-ti to convey the papal decision, the sovereign at once ordered him to leave Peking, then had him arrested and imprisoned at Canton. This unfortunate effect of the papal decree must be attributed especially to the lack of tact by the legate charged with giving notice of the decree and having it carried out.

Many recent Sinologists recognize that the basis of the do-

mestic Chinese ceremonies is religious, almost identical with that worship of the penates and lares, that was the foundation of the Roman religion.[44] Even had these rites been merely suspect, the Church had the right to forbid them to converts in order to remove any equivocal practice. Three successive decrees, in prudently restrained words, had not brought a clear light. The importance of the question, the sharpness of the quarrel, the insistence of the adversaries, obliged the papacy to issue a categorical decision; this it could do only in the sense of absolute truth. Later (1742) Benedict XIV renewed, by his bull *Ex quo singulari,* the prohibitions of his predecessors in the strictest sense and added the severest sanctions. Today every missioner arriving in China must swear in the hands of his bishop and must send a copy of his oath to Rome, to attest before God that he admits the said bull in its entirety and accepts all its consequences.

The Missions in South America

Since the discoveries of Christopher Columbus, America offered a new field for the zeal of missioners. From the religious viewpoint two great regions were marked out: the region of the Center and the South, which, colonized by the Spanish and the Portuguese, became almost entirely Catholic and received, in ecclesiastical language, the name of Latin America; and the region of the North, which, entered by the Protestants, principally by the Episcopalians of England, the Puritans of Scotland, the Reformed of Holland, and the Huguenots of France, soon became the country of cosmopolitan Protestantism.

The arbitral decision of Alexander VI, who in 1493, by his bull *Inter caetera,* designated the famous line of demarcation between the Spanish influence and the Portuguese influence,

[44] This is the view held by Fernand Farjenel in his *Le peuple Chinois.* Cf. Cordier, *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales,* III, chap. 25.

clearly drew attention to the idea that should inspire the two nations: the conversion of the infidels to the faith of Christ. If the governments often changed this thought by calculations too human, holy missioners devoted themselves to it with generosity. Bartholomew de Las Casas in San Domingo and Mexico, St. Turibius and St. Rose in Peru, Blessed Anchieta and the eloquent Vieira in Brazil, and the Jesuits who evangelized and organized Paraguay, were the admirable founders of the Churches of Latin America.

The island which the ships of Columbus saw rising (December 6, 1492) like an emerald on the blue sea and which the great navigator wished to name Hispaniola, was called by its Indian name, Haiti. Today it is better known by the name of San Domingo. After Haiti, the cross of Christ was planted on the shores of Puerto Rico, Cuba, Jamaica, the Greater and the Lesser Antilles. In 1517 Fernando Cortez landed in Mexico. The preaching of the faith kept step with the conquest. In 1512 San Domingo and Puerto Rico received from Pope Julius II their first bishops; ten years later Cuba received its bishop from Adrian VI; and in 1527 Clement VII sent to Mexico its first prelate. Under Paul III the sees of Guatemala, Lima, and Quito were created. By the middle of the sixteenth century the new continent, as well as the islands, had an ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Bartholomew de Las Casas (1474–1566)

But we must not fall into a delusion. The Christian spirit did not yet triumph in these countries. The conquerors were unfortunately the first to scandalize these new peoples by their excesses of all kinds. The very wealth of the discovered countries and the natural mildness of the conquered populations were for the Spaniards and the Portuguese an occasion of licentiousness and unheard-of cruelties. To populate Haiti,

they depopulated the other Antilles,[45] they pitilessly removed from the islands of St. John and Jamaica almost 600,000 Indians, they hindered the instruction of the natives through fear lest they might not so easily exploit them,[46] almost everywhere they abused the natives' simplicity, ignorance, and weakness.[47]

A holy priest rose up against these hateful practices with courageous indignation. His name was Bartholomew de Las Casas. He was sprung from a French family of which one member, who came into Spain under the reign of Ferdinand III, was distinguished at the siege of Seville and there acquired the title of nobility for himself and his descendants. The account of the inhuman treatment which the Spaniards were inflicting on the Indians deeply afflicted the generous soul of Las Casas. In 1498 he returned the Indian whom his father, a companion of Columbus, had sent to him from America for his service.[48]

Ordained priest in 1510, he asked permission to exercise his ministry in the Antilles, with the declared purpose of becoming the protector of the savages. What he saw with his own eyes increased his zeal. As a true priest he devoted himself to the supernatural good of souls. But his apostolic method was based on the principle that, to labor for the salvation of the Indians, he must begin by laboring for their freedom. Thenceforth not a single atrocity committed by the *conquistadores* in San Domingo, Mexico, or Peru came to his ears without the guilty person hearing his energetic protest. Twelve times he crossed the ocean to obtain from Ferdinand, from Charles V, and from Philip II precise instructions or to promote their execution.

In 1515 the great Cardinal Ximenez, regent of Castile, un-

[45] Charlevoix, *Hist. de saint Domingue,* pp. 316, 318.

[46] Touron, *Histoire générale de l'Amérique,* pp. 261, 313.

[47] Las Casas, *Brevissima relacion de la destruccion de las Indias occidentales per los Castellanos,* chap. 30.

[48] It is not true that in 1493, at the age of nineteen, he took part in Columbus' expedition. See Hefele, *Life of Cardinal Ximenes,* p. 496.

derstanding the significance of his work, named him protector of all the Indians, and, to aid him in his mission, appointed a commission made up of priests, laymen, and a lawyer who was to be a sort of magistrate. In 1520 Emperor Charles V granted him by royal patent a domain in the province of Cumana and authorized him to introduce there a colony of laborers, workmen, and priests. In 1544 he was raised to the dignity of bishop of Chiapa. But these powers and dignities, though extending the scope of his activity, became for the ardent apostle the occasion of hard trials. By a blameworthy condescension, the commission appointed to assist him, allowed the establishment of the sale of Indians as slaves, and the governor of Puerto Rico directed an expedition against Cumana to enslave the colony that Las Casas established there with such care.

Weighed down by so many misfortunes, the virtuous priest, in 1522, took the habit of a Dominican at San Domingo. His fervor increased daily. He spent his nights in prayer and, with the coming of day, went into the forests and into the caves to look for the savages being hunted by the Spaniards and taught them Christianity. He was then accused of being a fomenter of disturbance and seditions. To justify himself he had to go to Spain in 1542. Before an assembly of theologians and magistrates, gathered at Valladolid, he defended himself and courageously attacked the barbarism of the Spanish governors and their subordinates. At the age of ninety years he still found enough strength to write a book defending the cause of the Indians and of liberty. If the efforts of Bartholomew de Las Casas were not always crowned with immediate success, he left the example of a hero of Christian charity.[49]

[49] The most exact study on Las Casas is that found in Hefele's *Life of Cardinal Ximenes*. We ought to point out, in the life of Las Casas, a grave mistake. So greatly was he preoccupied by his love for the Indians that, for purposes of the forced labor, he considered replacing them by the Negroes, who were introduced into America. This was the beginning of the Negro slave trade. Cf. Hefele, *op. cit.*, pp. 503 f.

Peru

By the lure of its gold and silver mines, Peru attracted a large number of Spanish adventurers, more concerned with enriching themselves and, once enriched, with giving themselves up to every vice, than with civilizing the native population. But Providence, as a remedy for such abuses, had prepared a man who has been called the St. Charles Borromeo of Peru, St. Turibius (1538–1606). He was the son of a gentleman of Mogrobejo in Spain and in 1580 he was holding the office of president or chief magistrate of Granada, when Philip II, wishing to fill the place of the archbishop of Lima, thought of him. No choice could have been better than that of this noble layman, energetic and good, experienced in the direction of civil affairs, and versed in the lofty ways of the Christian life. All the necessary dispensations were accorded by the Supreme Pontiff. Turibius received all the holy orders in the space of a few weeks and arrived in Peru in the course of the year 1581.

During the twenty-five years of his episcopate, St. Turibius, like the illustrious Archbishop of Milan, founded schools, hospitals, and seminaries, held synods, trained missioners destined for the evangelization of his vast diocese, journeyed through it himself several times. He showed himself kind for the oppressed, but severe for the public sinners and for unworthy priests. Pope Benedict XIII canonized him in 1726. His apostolate was seconded by the admirable examples of holiness which, in the very city of Lima, gave two holy souls: St. Francis Solanus, a Friar Minor, who strove to walk in the footsteps of St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Rose, a Dominican tertiary, who took for her model St. Catherine of Siena. A strong love for God characterized these two souls. Brother Francis considered all the brightness of nature a symbol of charity. Of a calmer disposition, Rose, under the weight of trials, said to God: "Lord, increase my suffering if at the same time Thou wilt in-

crease my love." St. Francis Solanus died in 1610, with the words: "God be praised." St. Rose of Lima left this world seven years later, exclaiming: " I am going to behold the face of my God."

Brazil

In the missions of South America we have thus far met only the old orders of St. Dominic and St. Francis. In fact, the new Society of Jesus was to be found mingled with Dominicans and Fransiscans in Mexico and Peru. But its activity was especially dominant in Brazil and Paraguay. There we must examine the results of its new methods and of its genius of organization.

Someone has said that the Jesuits made the Brazilian nation. This honor may be claimed particularly in favor of Joseph Anchieta, the wonder-working poet, and of Anthony Vieira, the mighty orator.

Born at Teneriffe, Joseph Anchieta (1533–97) was descended from an ancient family of Biscay related to the Loyolas. He obtained his education in the island where he was born, then in the celebrated University of Coimbra, where he derived that taste for beautiful Latinity which never left him, even amid the most savage peoples. His biographers depict him, at the age of twenty, as a mild, meditative young man, with a delicate complexion, of great intelligence, with ardent feelings that were expressed in vivacious eyes.

He early joined the Society of Jesus and, in 1553, his superiors sent him to the vast solitudes of Brazil, whose geographical extent was unknown and whose peoples were almost unknown. Joseph Anchieta had a poetic imagination as well as the soul of a missioner. When the missioner used to return home, worn out by the hard labors in which he had to meet the opposition of men and that of the elements, the poet sang, in the language of Virgil, of the splendors of nature and of the

supernatural beauty of heaven. Soon, when he had a deep grasp of the language of the country, in the dialect of his young Christian peoples he composed poems, songs, canticles, and moral dialogues, which were repeated by the children, the young women, and the men. In consequence of continual aggressions of a savage tribe against his Christian center and probably also because of the precarious state of his health, he had to retire to a safer and healthful spot, where he composed his great Latin poem on the Blessed Virgin. The missioner himself tells us that he wrote it on the shore, facing the immensity of the ocean. The waves sometimes blotted out his writings; but the poet's memory retained the fruits of his inspiration. Thus were kept from oblivion the 4,500 verses making up Anchieta's poem.

In 1576 he was appointed rector of the College of St. Vincent; then, in 1578, provincial of his Order in Brazil. The cares of his office did not prevent the zealous missioner from engaging in the personal work of the apostolate among the Indians. We see him choosing by preference the most savage tribes. He buried himself in the forests that were reputed the most dreadful, and his gentleness had such a charm that the most heartless men respected him. At the age of fifty-two the exhaustion of his health obliged him to be relieved of his duties as provincial. He retired to Rio di Janeiro, then to a secluded country place where he spent much time rereading the Fathers of the Church, specially St. Basil and St. Augustine, with delight. He completed several of his works, among them a grammar and a dictionary of the Brazilian language. There he peacefully expired on June 9, 1595.

We are told that the catechumens wished to carry his venerated body to Espirito Santo, which is fifteen leagues distant. Three hundred Indians formed his funeral cortege. Father Anchieta for a long time had a repute for holiness which God seemed to will to confirm by numerous miracles. In view of the popular milieu from which most of the accounts of these mar-

vels have come to us, we cannot today determine the exact portion of historical truth in the events related. The bringing back to life of dead persons, graces of bilocation, extraordinary power over wild animals and over lifeless matter: no supernatural gift seems to have been refused the Blessed Joseph Anchieta. Says Kelker: "It would be reckless to reject all these accounts without exception and without examination; such a prejudgment would offend against true science no less than against the true faith." [50]

Half a century after Anchieta's death, Brazil saw the arrival of another son of St. Ignatius. By different means, he would consolidate the work of his predecessors. This man was the illustrious Anthony Vieira, whom Portugal counts among its greatest protectors, whom history considers one of the ablest diplomats, and whom religious history must regard as one of the mightiest orators that has ever appeared in the Christian pulpit. He was born at Lisbon in 1608, but grew up in Brazil, where his father had brought him in his early years. Antonio Vieira early consecrated himself to the service of God in the Society of Jesus, with the determined resolve to devote his life to the conversion of the infidels. But the viceroy's confidence in him called him to Portugal, where King John IV admitted him to court, appointed him his ordinary preacher, and employed him as ambassador in various negotiations in England, Holland, France, and at Rome. "The memoirs that he composed at this time show that he had broad and lofty views which perhaps would have restored Portugal's glorious days if they had been followed." [51] After 1652 he devoted himself more particularly to the Indian missions in Brazil. He succeeded in evangelizing and organizing fifty Indian villages along the north shore of the Amazon for a distance of 400 leagues.

[50] Kerker, art "Anchieta" in Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexikon.* The Bollandists (*Acta sanctorum,* June 9) give a short account of Joseph Anchieta.

[51] Denis, art. "Vieira" in *Nouvelle biographie générale.*

The great foes of Vieira, in this work of civilization, were the colonists, who maintained that they were hindered in their slave trade.

The eloquence of the Jesuit produced such an impression that in 1653 the people of St. Louis and of Belem unanimously declared themselves in favor of the suppression of man-hunting. . . . Thereafter the courageous Jesuit could successfully undertake the spiritual conquest of the countries of the Tapuyans and the Caribs. Wherever the blackrobes appeared, the Indians by the thousand exchanged their freedom for the gentle sovereignty of the fathers and established themselves in villages under the fathers' direction. Even the dread cannibals of Ceará and of Piauhy began to join owing to the gentle exhortations of Vieira. Attacks by the forest Indians ceased; the frontier territory of the colony was opened to colonization.[52]

On August 15, 1658, Vieira was able to celebrate a Mass of thanksgiving for the treaty which he had concluded with the chiefs and representatives of more than 100,000 natives.[53]

The zealous missioner was equally determined to defend his Christians against the dangers of Protestant heresy. During the siege of Bahia by the Dutch, he was unsparing in his tireless preaching to raise the people's courage, to arouse them to prayer and penance so as to obtain their safety from God. But the siege kept on. Vieira, in a remarkable movement of faith and eloquence, suddenly declared that he intended now to turn only to God. We ought to quote in full that incomparable address in which the orator, like another Jacob, wrestled in combat with the Almighty, subdued the Eternal, and tried by force of eloquence, piety, and love, to wring the thunderbolts from Him.

Lord, nothing is hidden from Thy infinite knowledge. Thou seest what is, what was, what will be, and what can be. Lord, behold what

[52] Bœhmer, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[53] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V, 114.

would happen if Bahia were to fall into the hands of the Dutch. . . . Hear the groans of the aged, of the women, of the children. . . . The heretic is forcing the door of this church, he is snatching from the altar that pyx where our eyes loved to contemplate Thee, where our hearts loved to adore Thee. . . . Thy altars are overturned, and the statues of Thy saints are broken. Sacrilegious hands reach out even to Thy Mother. . . . The grass is growing on the floor of Thy churches. Christmas comes, Lent, Easter. No one meditates any longer on Thy birth and Thy Resurrection. If anyone should ask the little children of that time, the children of those who are listening to me at this moment: "Little ones, to what religion do you belong?" they would answer: "To the religion of Calvin." Lord, Thou didst not come here for this. Not for heresy didst Thou have the faith preached to these souls.[54]

Neither Father Vieira's eloquence nor his virtues kept him from being the object of various attacks and calumnies. The colonists' hatred did not pardon him for snatching the Indians from slavery. He was arrested, put on a ship, transported as a criminal to Lisbon. A book he had written, setting forth his projects and hopes, was the pretext for bringing him before the tribunal of the Inquisition, which condemned him, had him imprisoned, and at length released him without requiring any retractation from him. After various journeys to Rome, where he received favors from the Pope, Vieira returned to Brazil as head of the mission of Amazons and visitor general of the whole country. He died (July 18, 1697) at the age of eighty-nine. Thanks to his efforts and those of all his brethren, an immense extent of country, formerly inhabited by cannibals, was civilized. "A frightful undertaking," says Boehmer, "in which nothing but the heroism and the complete abnegation of religious enthusiasm could succeed. The Jesuits were animated by this heroism. They had also the necessary enthusiasm and courage to solve the difficult question of the natives, which was indeed the vital question. They had settled the question in

[54] See *Etudes*, February 20, 1899, pp. 534–36.

a way that even today can furnish indications for colonizing states." [55]

The Jesuits in Paraguay

More powerful and original was their action in the famous reductions of Paraguay. Most of the eighteenth-century philosophers, pleased to see in this work an application of their humanitarian ideas, have spoken of it with admiration, even with enthusiasm. Says Voltaire: "The establishment of Christianity in Paraguay by the Spanish Jesuits alone seems in some respects the triumph of humanity." [56] Buffon, Montesquieu, Abbé Raynal, and the Protestant Robertson speak in the same way. Others regard it as an anticipation of socialism and even of collectivism. The simple account of the facts will show that never did the Jesuits in Paraguay intend to apply any theory. They tried simply to adapt the means of evangelization and of civilization which they had at their disposal to the customs of the savage peoples to whom they turned, and the full independence granted them by the Spanish government enabled them to extend their methods fully. This is the whole explanation of their conduct. Moreover, in this work we shall find no outstanding personality. The Society, with its characteristic spirit of initiative and discipline, of able adaptation and strong organization, is what accomplished all. Perhaps nowhere else do we recognize more easily its energetic and supple hand.

In 1588 the first three Jesuits arrived at the city of Asuncion, the capital of Paraguay, built by the Spaniards fifty years before. They were invited there by the bishop of Tucuman, Francisco Victoria, discouraged at the futile attempts previously made to convert the natives. These belonged almost all to the family of the Guaranis, whom ethnographers connect with the same race as the Caribs of the Antilles. Peaceful and even in-

[55] Bœhmer, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

[56] Voltaire, *Essai sur les mœurs*, chap. 144; in *Œuvres* (Beuchot ed.), XVII, 462.

dolent, they were often the victims of the neighboring tribes, who were cannibals, and of that hybrid population, composed of half-breeds, of fugitive Negroes, and of whites driven from the coasts because of their crimes, whom the Spaniards called *Mamelucos* (Mamelukes). The Spanish conquest had merely added to their wretchedness; their conquerors, in fact, seemed often not to be concerned about converting them, but only about exploiting them to their own advantage.

The Jesuits, instructed by their experience on their missions of Brazil and Peru, were soon convinced that no attempt could be effective unless they began by separating the cause of the gospel from that of the Spanish colonists. They approached the savages, even penetrating into the trackless forests, armed with nothing but their faith and their charity. When they won a few souls by gentle and peaceful words, they journeyed along the rivers with their neophytes, singing pious canticles which they accompanied on musical instruments. Important groups were converted. To consolidate these conversions, the fathers decided in 1609 to gather their neophytes in Christian villages, which are known as reductions.[57]

The Spanish commanders at first viewed these autonomous organizations with an evil eye; but the fathers easily persuaded the King of Spain that the independence of their little Christian centers was less dangerous than the condition of perpetual revolt kept up by the former state of things. The Spanish government, after receiving an oath of fidelity to the crown, confirmed the independence of the reductions. In 1629 the missioners of the single province of Guayra reckoned the population of their villages at 100,000 souls. The "Christian Republic of Paraguay" was founded.

Thus established under conditions determined by the necessity of the moment, this sort of state was gradually organized.

[57] The reductions were already in existence in different countries of Latin America, and this system had been practiced by the Dominicans and Franciscans.

Surrounded by numerous enemies, that is, the cannibal tribes encompassing them and the Spanish colonists who hoped to make it serve their interests, the best assurance of security they could find was an almost absolute barring of outsiders from its territory. The greater part of the agricultural developments were created by the work of all; the Guaranis, moreover, had the practice of living in common; these exploitations were, then, the property of the whole community, which assumed responsibility for aiding the subsistence of each of its members. "Labor according to capacity, and division according to needs," was the rule that was applied almost of itself. The people readily lent themselves to it; and the Jesuits, who practiced it in their Order, had the required experience to watch over its application.

In their European colleges they had already elaborated a system of pedagogy which aimed at prompting to labor by making it joyous and regulating it wisely. To these peoples who were of childlike nature, they adapted with discernment the usages of their colleges. Every morning a signal was given half an hour before rising. After hearing Mass, they sang some songs, went to work at the sound of the fife and drum, carrying in great pomp the image of some saint. At each place of work a festive tune was played, and the number of works and regulations was increased. As in the colleges, the people wore a sort of uniform. All were dressed in the same kind of cloth and ate the same kinds of food: equality was thus as absolute as can be imagined.

Each reduction had two schools and a hospital, placed under the direction of the pastor. "The pastors of the reductions are not, like their brethren of Europe, simply charged with celebrating the Divine Office, instructing the faithful, and administering the sacraments. To that heavy burden they add all the care of the temporalities; they are likewise the civil prefects of the villages, the administrators of the common property, and the

magistrates whose duty it is to administer justice among all the citizens." [58]

The material cares never made the fathers forget that the first purpose of their mission was the spiritual conquest [59] of souls. The church was, in a way, the center of all the luxury of this austere population. There they were pleased to gather the precious metals and the art objects. The general procession of the Blessed Sacrament in which the entire people took part, with its congregations of verses, its companies of militia, its choral and musical societies, which followed one another along richly decorated streets, amid salvos of artillery and fireworks constituted the great feast of the nation. The greater part of the ground not occupied by individuals and called the domain of God, the *tupambac,* was cultivated by all the citizens one after the other; furthermore, it was not used solely for the needs of public worship, but also for the assistance of the poor, the sick, the widows, the orphans, those to whom the assigned ground did not yield a large enough return, and also for the general expenses of the Republic.

In its general lines, such was the organization of the Christian Republic of Paraguay. During more than a century of intense life, until the day when the Spanish government, yielding to selfish interests and taking umbrage at the so-called political power of the reductions, forced them to dissolve, by the disastrous treaty of 1750,[60] that organization gave, from the Christian viewpoint, the most wonderful results. A great number of travelers, who cannot be suspected of partiality, were pleased to acknowledge these results. Chiefly a religious work, the Christian Republic of Paraguay was not essentially dis-

[58] Rastoul, *Les Jésuites au Paraguay,* p. 24.

[59] The expressions "conquista espiritual" and "conquista de almas" were currently employed, not only in the letters of the fathers, but also in the official documents of the Spanish government to designate the chief aim of the mission.

[60] Rastoul, *op. cit.,* p. 42.

tinguished from so many other colonies founded by the Franciscans, the Dominicans, or the priests of the Paris Foreign Missions. The union of the powers of a spiritual order and of a temporal order in the hands of the chief of the mission, and the community organization of the property were facts that are met with at the beginning of almost all the works of civilization. The Jesuits of Paraguay carried them to a more perfect degree than anywhere else, and perhaps they brought to the undertaking, with the spirit particular to their Society, something more strict in discipline and at the same time more yielding in the use of the means of government: this was their only originality.[61]

The Missions in North America

The full success of the reductions of Paraguay encouraged the Jesuits to introduce their system of apostolate in North America. But there they met with greater difficulties. Besides the distrust of the native races and the hostility of the European colonists, they had to contend with the difficulties that arose from the Protestant heresy.

The story is told that when Columbus reached the Greater Antilles and hesitated to continue his route to the west, one of his companions, Martin Alonzo Pinzon, perceived in the late afternoon a flock of parrots flying toward the southwest. Supposing that these birds were going to pass the night on the coast, he urged the Admiral to follow that direction. Says Alexander von Humboldt, "If Columbus had resisted the counsel of Martin Alonzo Pinzon, and continued to steer westward, he would have entered the Gulf Stream, and been borne to Florida, and from thence probably to Cape Hatteras and Virginia—a circumstance of incalculable importance, since it might have

[61] See Charlevoix, *History of Paraguay;* Muratori, *A Relation of the Missions of Paraguay;* Rastoul, *Les Jésuites au Paraguay.*

been the means of giving to the United States of North America a Catholic Spanish population, in place of the Protestant English one by which those regions were subsequently colonized." [62]

When, in fact, the discoveries of Cabot, Cortereal, Balboa, De Soto, and Cartier completed the discoveries of Columbus and revealed North America to the Europeans, a current of emigration toward that country was established in England, in Holland, and in France. By its maritime and commercial power, England soon occupied a preponderant position in Virginia, Maryland, New Plymouth, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Haven. Except Virginia, the centers of colonization were not dependent directly on the royal power, and, as could be foreseen, some day they would proclaim their independence. But their attachment to Protestantism was deep; the Puritan spirit, in its rigidity and intolerance, dominated there. Would North America remain outside the Catholic influence? The missioners did not let themselves be discouraged by the situation. Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, Sulpicians, and priests of the Paris Foreign Missions vied with one another in zeal, fighting against the paganism of the natives and against the Protestantism of the colonists.

The Jesuits, by two different routes, were the first to launch the assault on the New Continent. In the west, by way of Mexico, already Christianized by them, they extended as far as California, where they resumed the work of the reductions and made, as it were, a second Paraguay. A Protestant writer, Simpson, says that the Jesuits in Lower California showed that nothing is impossible to energy and perseverance.[63] The sons of St. Francis continued the work of the Jesuits and deserve the same praise. Any unbiased student must admire what these

[62] Humboldt, *Cosmos*, II, 262.
[63] Simpson, *Journey Round the World*, I, 186.

missioners accomplished in California. Theirs was a work of civilization through teaching and example.[64]

By way of the Antilles and Florida, the fathers of the Society of Jesus advanced as far as Canada. There they won the admiration of the heretics themselves. "Before a Virginian had crossed the Blue Ridge, and while the Connecticut was still the extreme frontier of New England, more than one man whose youth had been passed among the warm valleys of Languedoc, had explored the wilds of Wisconsin, and caused the hymn of Catholic praise to rise from the prairies of Illinois. The Catholic priest went even before the soldier and the trader; from lake to lake, from river to river, the Jesuits pressed on unresting, and, with a power which no other Christians have exhibited, won to their faith the warlike Miamis and the luxurious Illinois." [65]

The most illustrious of them was the heroic Father Jogues. He returned to Quebec by way of Ottawa and the St. Lawrence in company with the warrior Ahositari and a band of Christian Hurons. Ahositari was the native chief who, after being baptized, enrolled a band of converts, savages like himself, traversed the region crying out: "Let us strive to make the whole world embrace the faith of Jesus." Suddenly a band of Mohawks poured on the little group. Ahositari was seized and was condemned to be burned alive. Fastened to a pole, he sang some hymns up to his last moment. A young novice, René Goupil, was slain with a stroke of a tomahawk, and Father Jogues, because of his infirmities, was told he might go about among the tribe. His martyrdom would be longer and more terrible. Throughout four years he experienced all kinds of torture. His hair was torn out, and his fingernails were ripped off to their base. They cut off his fingers, joint by joint. Some Dutchmen paid his ransom. Upon his return to Rome, he asked the

[64] Morrell, *A Narrative of Four Voyages*, p. 212.
[65] Quoted by Marshall, *Christian Missions*, II, 291.

Supreme Pontiff for a dispensation to celebrate Mass with his mutilated hands. The Pope gladly granted the request, saying to him: "It would not be just that a martyr of Jesus Christ should be deprived of the happiness of drinking the blood of Jesus Christ." [66] Jogues went back to America and there underwent torture once more, and was at length put to death by the Iroquois on October 18, 1646. We are told that his executioner, touched by grace at his last hour, died a Christian.

But at that time, in that vast territory which, under the name of New France, included all of Canada and part of the present United States, new workers came and added their efforts to those of the Jesuits: they were the priests of St. Sulpice.

In 1640 Jean Jacques Olier, who had never ceased thinking of the work of the missions and who at that time was particularly concerned with the conversion of the savages of New France, providentially met at Meudon, near Paris, an Angevin gentleman, Jerome de la Dauversière, who for some time before had entertained similar projects. By agreement on August 17, 1640, they established the basis of a society whose purpose would be the colonization of the island of Montreal in Canada.[67] A number of families of Lower Normandy and Upper Brittany were gathered together. A courageous young woman of Langres, Jeanne Manse, offered her services for the care of the sick. A devout Christian, experienced in arms, Paul de Chaumédy of Maisonneuve, eagerly agreed to take charge of the military conduct of the colony, which embarked in June, 1641, and about a year later landed on the island where Montreal would arise.

The beginnings were painful. To scarcity of food were added continual alarms. The Iroquois, the most cruel among the tribes

[66] *Indignum esset Christi martyrem non bibere Christi sanguinem.*

[67] For the principal provisions of this agreement, see Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier* (4th ed.), III, 400.

of New France, harassed the little colony. "They pressed us so hard," wrote Mlle Manse, "and their attacks were so frequent and so sudden that no security remained for anyone." [68] Many of the colonists were slain, many houses were burned. The hospital where Jeanne Manse exercised her devoted service escaped ruin thanks to a strong garrison established there to provide for its defense. In 1658 reinforcements were asked from France. A hundred strong men who had served in the royal army, were chosen by De Maisonneuve; they embarked joyfully to lend their help to the colony.

They were accompanied by a valiant young woman of Troyes, Margaret Bourgeoys, a worthy imitator of Jeanne Manse, whose name, blessed by Canadians, remained connected with most of the charitable foundations of the country. The settlement that one day would become the city of Montreal was then composed of fifty houses, scattered here and there, and a few cabins in the countryside beyond. Margaret Bourgeoys by herself each day visited these houses and cabins, instructing the children and the ignorant, taking care of the sick, mending the clothes of the poor, laying out the dead for burial. Soon she alone did not suffice for the task; but France sent her some helpers, with whom she founded the Congregation of Notre Dame.[69]

In the hands of the Sulpicians, Montreal became, after Quebec, the most important parish of Canada. There they built the parish church and a seminary. On the principal part of the mountain they opened little schools for the Indian children; they taught religion to the Iroquois, the Hurons, and the Algonquins. This zeal was rewarded by martyrdom. Two Sulpicians, Vignal and Lemaître, were slain: the first was wounded by a rifle shot, the second was beheaded after being mortally injured by shots of the savages. The apostolate of these priests was not limited to Montreal and its vicinity. We find them

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 405.
[69] Faillon, *Vie de la Sœur Bourgeois.*

among the Acadians, a population made up of fishermen, soldiers, and adventurers, and grouped in four chief centers: Port Royal, Beaubassin, Beauséjour, and Gaspareaux. At Port Royal, M. de Breslay, although pursued by the English, under threat of death, and obliged to stay in hiding, remained so long as his age and strength allowed him to be useful to his flock. Longfellow, in his *Evangeline,* pictures him as boundless in his charity and unshakable in his devotion.[70]

The priests of the Paris Foreign Missions arrived in Canada in 1659 with Bishop Laval, who confided to them the Quebec seminary and the college of St. Joachim. Several of them turned their efforts to the missions among the Indians. Such were Father Thury, who preached between the St. George River and the Kenebec, Father Pelmenand, who entered Arcadia, and his colleague Father Gaulin, whose dauntless courage resisted the ceaseless vexations by the English. The Recollects, who in 1629 were expelled from Canada by England, came back in 1670.

At that date the work of a century and a half of the missions in North America seemed ruined forever. In spite of the heroic resistance of Montcalm at Quebec and of Vaudreuil at Montreal, Canada at length fell into the hands of the English, whose possession was confirmed by the Treaty of Paris (February 10, 1763). The closing of the novitiates of all the foreign communities and the prohibition against the religious of France coming to assist their brethren in Canada seemed to forecast the ruin of all the missions in a short time. The Paris Foreign Missions withdrew from America; the Sulpicians remained; but, by gradual decimation, their numbers were reduced until in 1793 they counted only two infirm old men. The mission of the Recollects did not survive the destruction of their church and of their hospice in 1796. As for the Society of Jesus, sup-

[70] C. de Rochemontrix, *Les missions catholiques,* VI, 33. Cf. *idem, Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVII^e siècle;* Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française au Canada;* Longfellow, *Evangeline,* lines 460 ff.

pressed by Clement XIV (July 21, 1773), it had to turn over to the bishops its works and its property.

Thus ended the missions of New France under the ancient regime. They were revived in the nineteenth century.

The Missions in Africa

The great efforts attempted in the New World by the Catholic missioners did not absorb the force of expansion of the Church. On the old soil of Africa the sons of St. Dominic and St. Francis, as also those of St. Ignatius and St. Vincent de Paul, accomplished prodigies. Central Africa was still impenetrable. But on the coasts, where Henry the Navigator had set up the cross, the apostles of the gospel were able to establish themselves. By the missions of Barbary in the north, of the Congo in the west, of Mozambique and Ethiopia in the east, the circle began to form, which would later enclose African paganism and Mohammedanism.

If, however, the provinces of North Africa have not yet been reconverted from the Mohammedan apostasy, it has not been for want either of apostles or martyrs. Thirty-nine houses of Trinitarians were founded in England in the twelfth century, whose members were bound by vow "to gather alms and carry them into Barbary for the redemption of slaves." In the single year 1261, more than two hundred Franciscans were martyred by the Mussulmans; and not long after, as if this were an incomplete sacrifice, one hundred and ninety Dominicans received from the same hands the baptism of blood. . . . In 1630, the Franciscan John de Prado, still honored as the patron of Tangier, sealed with his blood the new mission which he had founded. . . . Other religious societies had preceded it, and it was to the Fathers of the Order of Mercy that the captive Cervantes, while planning in his dungeon the liberation of twenty-five thousand Christian prisoners, owed his own redemption from the Moors. But of all the missionary communities which have chosen Africa for the field of their labors, none have surpassed the children of St. Vincent.[71]

[71] Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, 550.

The charitable saint knew the difficulties standing in the way of the conversion of the Mussulmans. But he knew also, by experience, what solace could be brought to the Christian slaves and how, by the exercise of charity, some hope might be entertained of touching the heart of the most obstinate infidels. From the Barbary authorities Vincent obtained permission to send, with the French consul, a resident chaplain, then a second. The first died a victim of his devotedness during the plague; the second as a victim of his faith. Twenty-five prisons at Algiers, Tunis, and Bizerta became, by the savings of the poor captives, so many little parishes, where Mass was celebrated every day, High Mass on Sundays and feast days; jubilees and retreats brought back to God hardened sinners and apostates: the Mussulmans themselves were moved.

The Congo, peopled by men given to the practice of fetishism, was one of the first countries reached by the missioners when the movement of apostolic expansion awoke in the Church in the fifteenth century. Dominicans, sent by King John II of Portugal, obtained complete success. In 1491 the chief of the country was converted, and his successors not only remained Christians but even became apostles, although with some serious defections. In 1645, at the request of the chief himself, the Holy See established a monastery of Capuchins and a prefect apostolic at Sogno, which became the center of the whole mission.[72] In 1773 some French missioners, arriving in the Kakongo on the other side of the river, estimated at several hundred thousand the Christian population they found there.[73] Unfortunately the bad example of the whites, the influence of the climate, and the political difficulties that desolated this region ruined this portion of the Church.

To the east, in the Portuguese colony of Mozambique, the success of the missioners was more dearly bought and was more

[72] *Bullarium capuccinorum*, VII, 189.

[73] Proyart, *Histoire de Loango, Kacongo et autres royaumes d'Afrique*, p. 306.

precarious. There the missioners were confronted with the Mussulman fanaticism, and Father Silveira of the Society of Jesus had been massacred by the followers of Islam. The mission was almost abandoned.

Abyssinia or Ethiopia, which received the faith of Christ as early as the year 330 by St. Frumentius, a disciple of St. Athanasius, seemed, in spite of its participation in the Eutychian heresy, to give the Catholic Church most promising hopes. In the fifteenth century it courageously shook off the yoke of the Mussulmans and in the middle of the next century it favorably received the Portuguese soldiers who came to bring them aid in the defense of their independence, and missioners who came to preach the faith to them. In 1589 success seemed to be final. Father Paez, the head of the Catholic mission, received the solemn abjuration of the king of Abyssinia, Socinios; thirty-five years later (December 11, 1624) the Church of Ethiopia abjured the errors of Eutyches. But upon the death of Socinios the people revolted, and the new king returned to the heresy. Since then it was only at the peril of their lives that a few missioners, such as Father Brédevent, a Jesuit, were able to enter Abyssinia.

The large island of Madagascar gave the same hopes when, in 1648, in the suite of the French, the devoted sons of St. Vincent de Paul penetrated there. The soul of the great saint thrilled with joy.[74] Twenty-six years of labor and strife resulted, alas, only in the ruin of the colony. But the seed planted by the priests of St. Lazare would germinate for the future, and this mission of Madagascar was for the holy founder the occasion for him to develop in a memorable letter the principles of the evangelization of the infidels as his great soul understood them. He wrote:

[74] Letter of March 22, 1648, to Nacquart, in *Lettres de saint Vincent de Paul*, I, 230.

When you reach that island, after laboring to live among those whom you are to convert in the odor of holiness and good example, you must give those poor people, born in the darkness of ignorance, a grasp of the truths of our faith, not by the subtle arguments of theology, but by reasoning found in nature; for you must begin there, seeking to make them understand that you are merely developing in them the marks that God has left in them, and that the corruption of nature, long accustomed to evil, had long blotted out. For this, you must often turn to the Father of lights. . . . Although many books treat of this matter, the best book will be prayer: abandonment to the Spirit of God, who speaks in these meetings of the soul with Him.[75]

From St. Francis Xavier to St. Vincent de Paul the methods of the apostolate had varied according to the customs of different peoples and the character of different congregations that evangelized them. But one thing did not change: the spirit of tender and exhaustless charity which these admirable lines breathe.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 231.

CHAPTER VII

The Intellectual Movement

THE intellectual edifice of the Middle Ages was like the political edifice: the various sciences were organized under the supremacy of theology, as the states of Christendom were in a hierarchical order under the moral hegemony of the pope. But the revolutionary agitation that shook the political equilibrium did not spare the scientific equilibrium. The spirit that secularized the institutions likewise laicized the mental disciplines. Art, sciences, and philosophy became independent. Rubens, that great genius in whom all the artistic currents of the Renaissance flowed and spread out in transplendent productions, worked for the Church more than for the world. By the dozen he devoted his paintings to the Jesuits, his former teachers;[1] but neither he nor his contemporaries thought of asking from theology, for the composition of their scenes or their decorations, those rules which the Middle Ages had followed so scrupulously.[2]

Even in the sixteenth century these rules were the inspiration of the three masters: Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo da Vinci. Galileo (1564–1642) purposed living and dying a good Catholic; but he violently repulsed every interference of theology in the natural sciences. Philosophy used the same languuage. We cannot question the religious sincerity of Descartes (1596–1650). "I revered our theology," he wrote,

[1] For their church in Antwerp, the Jesuits ordered at one time thirty-nine pictures from Rubens. A. Michel in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. Générale,* V, 443.

[2] Emile Mâle has proved this in his learned works, *L'art religieux au XIII^e siècle en France* and *L'art religieux à la fin du Moyen Age.*

"and, as much as anyone else, I hoped to gain heaven." [3] But was there question of writing a philosophical work? He maintained that he was seeking no knowledge but that which could be found in oneself or in the great book of the world.[4] Although he held that his philosophy was more in accord with all the truths of the faith than was that of Aristotle,[5] he sought accord only in defending his doctrine of complete solidarity and continuity with theology, only by putting aside the truths of faith and by opposing, as a final rejection, merely these words: "Theology is not my business." [6] Cartesian philosophy prepared the way for rationalism by this attitude and by its doctrines of the absolute clarity of thought, of the so-called sufficiency of philosophy and science, of the independence of morality, as also by the suppression of any rational preparation for faith, of any action of reason in faith, of any understanding of faith. Another sincere Christian, the Oratorian Malebranche, supplemented the system by assimilating reason to the divine Word, to indicate the logical passage which, leaving Christian Cartesianism, would produce the Cartesian freethinker.[7]

The Study of Theology

Dethroned from its sovereign prestige in the eyes of the world, theology still continued to develop and to be enriched. Soon, in another way, we see it recover the attention of the world in the midst of Jansenist and quietist disputes. Meanwhile it extended and diversified its branches. Beside rational theology, whose traditions were maintained by the sons of St.

[3] Descartes, *Discourse on Method,* Part I, no. 11.

[4] *Ibid.,* no. 14.

[5] Descartes, *Œuvres* (Cousin ed.), IX, 359.

[6] *Ibid.,* VI, 73, 108, 133, 309; VIII, 328.

[7] Cf. Bossuet's letter (May 21, 1687) to a disciple of Malebranche, in which he says: "I see a great conflict in preparation against the Church under the name of Cartesian philosophy." *Correspondance de Bossuet* (Levesque and Urbain ed.), III, 372.

Dominic and of St. John of the Cross, patristic theology, too much neglected since Peter Lombard, profited by the immense works of erudition of the Renaissance. From the necessity of commenting on the reforms of the Council of Trent was born pastoral theology. The revival given to ascetical and mystical theology by St. Ignatius, St. Theresa, and St. Francis de Sales was continued by the Oratory and by St. Sulpice. The need of adapting the principles of morality to the new conditions of modern times gave birth to casuistry. The need of defending the faith against the Protestants and the libertines gave a new impulse to polemical and apologetic theology.

Spain has always been the classical land of traditional scholastic theology. The University of Salamanca replaced in its schools Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences* by St. Thomas' *Theological Summa;* this innovation, soon imitated by the other Spanish universities, gradually spread to most of the universities of Europe.[8] In 1631 the Discalced Carmelites began the publication of the celebrated dogmatic theology of Salamanca, the most grandiose and complete work of the Thomistic school. Five religious took part in the composition of this immense work, and its publication required seventy-one years. Each question, before receiving the *Imprimatur,* was submitted to the examination and discussion of the whole college. The religious scholars wished thus to guarantee the unity of the work and the most perfect accord of their teaching, even in the least details, with the doctrine of St. Thomas. Sometimes the question was decided by vote. Thus the work represents less the views of the different authors than the official teaching of the Order.[9] The twelve volumes of the *Salmanticenses*—thus the work is spoken of—had been prepared by a course of philosophy in four volumes, published by the Alcalá (*Complutum*) college of the Discalced Carmelites and known as *Com-*

[8] Cf. De Wulf, *Histoire de la philos. médiévale,* p. 439.

[9] B. Zimmerman, art. "Carmes" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol. cath.,* II, 1789.

plutenses. They were completed by a course of moral theology in six volumes, composed in the same conditions as the course of dogmatic theology and destined to enjoy the same esteem.

Some critics have blamed the *Salmanticenses* for not always quoting exactly the words of the authors they cite. The Carmelites reformed by St. Theresa, to avoid the abuses resulting from attendance at the universities, forbade such attendance, and thus the ground cultivated by the scholars of the Order was much limited.[10] The same may be said of the University of Paris, which in the fourteenth century Pope Benedict XII had called the source of all the sciences [11] and which would soon take the place of Salamanca as the center of theological studies. A powerful scientific activity appeared there at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Although the traditions of dialectical teaching were religiously preserved in the old Sorbonne, philosophical and critical ideas were stirring the students who gathered about the professorial chairs of the young Collège de France. The Jesuits in their colleges were trying to give satisfaction to two tendencies. Little by little these tendencies penetrated each other. Thus, although Hebrew was scarcely taught except in the Jesuit schools and at the Collège de France, the critical and exegetical method had its defenders and representatives at the college of Navarre: such was Father de Launoy, a ruthless scholar and a great investigator of the lives of the saints. This house soon was accessible to all the ideas and all the intellectual and political movements that were taking place outside. It did not rest simply on old practices or on traditional teaching, but entered into the current of the times. Of the three chairs of theology in the college of Navarre, two were concerned with the refutation of heresies and with controversy.

Among the professors who were outstanding at the Sor-

[10] *Ibid.*, col. 1785.

[11] *Studium parisiense, quod est caeteris praecipuum et fons omnium studiorum. Bull. Rom.*, Part II, p. 211.

bonne, history should retain the names of two men who would take an important part in the disputes of Gallicanism and Jansenism: Andrew Duval and Nicholas Cornet. A single fact will be enough for the eulogy of the former: he was the friend, the advisor, and the confessor of St. Vincent de Paul. The first to fill the chair of theology founded at the Sorbonne by Henry IV in 1596, chosen later to be one of the three visitators of the Carmelites of France, Andrew Duval neglected no occasion to win acceptance for the Roman doctrines and to defend the authority of the pope. He translated and completed the hagiographical work of Ribadeneira and published against Edmond Richer, in 1614, a treatise on the pope's supreme power over the Church. Nicholas Cornet, whom Richelieu wished to have for his spiritual director and to whom Mazarin confided the presidency of the Council of Conscience, occupied a chair at the college of Navarre, where he was Bossuet's teacher. Bossuet praised him as a learned doctor who was wonderfully familiar with all the opinions of the School and who spoke with such weight and moderation that even his enemies had no quarrel with him.[12]

Students of all nations thronged the lectures at the Sorbonne to win the much desired cap of doctor in theology. The process was hard. First they had to obtain the degree of master of arts, which was awarded only after two formal examinations. The first examination took place at the school, the second at Notre Dame or at St. Genevieve, before a chancellor assisted by four professors. Then began the studies of theology. These lasted three years, after which the candidate could face the tests of the baccalaureate. The degree of bachelor in theology was obtained by successfully sustaining a thesis called the Tentative. But the Tentative was preceded by two new examinations. One bore on philosophy, the other on theology; each lasted four hours and took place before four doctors drawn by lot. The

[12] Bossuet, *Oraison funèbre de Nicolas Cornet.*

favorable votes of the four doctors was required. After obtaining the bachelor's degree, a candidate had to wait at least two years before beginning the licentiate. These two intervening years were employed by the students in the reception of holy orders, in preaching, and in preparation for the last two examinations, required for entrance to the licentiate. Bossuet preached several of his sermons during that period of his university education. In the course of the licentiate, the candidate had to sustain three theses: the Minor, the Major, and the Sorbonne. The Minor began at eight o'clock in the morning and ended at half-past four in the afternoon; but the Major and the Sorbonne began at six o'clock in the morning and lasted until six o'clock in the evening. These last two could not take place in the same year. Ten examiners attended each thesis. Before receiving the emblems of the doctorate, the candidate sustained what was called the Vespers. The session lasted three hours and a half. It was devoted partly to a discussion with a young bachelor on the thesis called Expectative, partly to replying to the arguments advanced by the doctors. The next day, or a few days later, the candidate presided at what was called the Aulica; then he received the doctor's cap. On his knees, with bare head, and his hand on the Gospel, he took his oath before the general assembly of the faculty, and finally he was admitted to take his place among the doctors.

Positive Theology

We have noted that, in the studies at the Sorbonne, concern with historical and critical questions mingled happily with rational speculation. In the case of some French theologians they became preponderant. Positive theology, which had its forerunner in Melchior Cano, arose in France with Father Petau (Jesuit) and Father Morin (Oratorian).

"Denis Petau soared like an eagle above all the theologians

of his day." [13] Pope Leo XIII puts him at the head of "the eminent men that the Church of France had a right to be proud of." [14] Born at Orléans (August 11, 1583), Denis Petau revealed in early childhood exceptional powers of memory and intelligence. By the time he reached adolescence he was writing poetry, by way of amusement, in the language of Virgil and Homer. That was the period when the Protestants were extolling the prodigious labors of Scaliger in the realm of historical chronology and were defying the Catholics to present a monument comparable to the *De emendatione temporum.* The father of Denis Petau, an ardent Catholic and polished literary man, contemplated, for his son, the glory of accepting that defiance. Often he used to say: "My son, some day you must overcome the giant of the Allophyles." [15] Jerome Petau's wish was heard. At the age of seventeen, Denis won brilliantly at the Sorbonne, in the presence of the doctors Duval, Ysambert, and Gamache, the title of master of arts, by a thesis sustained in Greek. Two years later he obtained a chair of philosophy in the University of Bourges. Three years after this, he joined the Society of Jesus and entered upon practices of the most earnest piety and showed a tireless passion for historical studies. In 1627 appeared the first of his great works, *De doctrina temporum,* in two large volumes, to which were soon added a third, a chronological encyclopedia which surpassed the work of Scaliger and prepared the way for the masterpiece of the Benedictine school, *L'art de vérifier les dates.*

Appointed professor at the celebrated college of Clermont, Denis Petau reached the height of his renown by the publication of his *Dogmata theologica,* which appeared in four volumes from 1644 to 1650. This was a work without precedent. Two other great Jesuits, Suarez, in his vast dissertations, and Bel-

[13] *Omnium theologorum hujus periodi gloriam obscuravit Dionysius Petavius aquilae in morem alios praetervolans.* Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius,* I, 398.

[14] Leo XIII, Encyclical of September 8, 1899.

[15] Nicéron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres,* XXXVII, 83.

larmine, in his immortal *Controversies,* had astonished the world by their prodigious erudition. But the former was conceived from the metaphysical point of view; the latter had a polemical tendency; in both cases the exactitude was all that might be desired. In his *Dogmata theologica,* Petau, remaining strictly on the terrain of history, merely questioned the Fathers and registered their testimony, such as reported by their authentic writings, expurgated from all subsequent revision and from all tendacious commentary. Indeed, the work was not perfect. The author himself felt obliged to revise it here and there later. He was blamed for having let a suspicion of Arianism rest on the ante-Nicene Fathers,[16] for having somewhat exaggerated the doctrine of the Greek Fathers on the sending of the Holy Ghost.[17] But Petau's work as a whole remained an imperishable monument of theological science.[18] That great man, who had a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin and who left off his patient researches only to spend long intervals before the Blessed Sacrament,[19] died at Paris on December 11, 1652.[20]

Archaeology, exegesis, and history, no less than positive theology, have a right to claim Father Jean Morin as one of their glories. Born at Blois in 1591, in the heart of Calvinism, he studied first at Leyden, then at Paris, philosophy, theology, Oriental languages, Sacred Scripture, the Fathers, and the councils. The violent disputes of his coreligionists, which he had witnessed in Holland, drove him from Protestantism. A few conferences with Cardinal Duperron led him to the Catholic faith. In 1618 he asked to be received into the Oratory. The

[16] Hurter, *op. cit.,* I, 404, note 1.

[17] Labauche, *Leçons de théologie dogmatique,* I, 161.

[18] Cf. Bossuet, *Premier avertissement aux protestants.*

[19] Hurter, *op. cit.,* I, 400.

[20] This great scholar did not possess the gifts for teaching. At the college of Clermont, where Maldonatus had his lecture hall filled to capacity, Petau talked to an almost empty hall; his few listeners often fell asleep. A certain German remarked: *Vidi Petavium docentem et discipulos dormientes.*

publication of his great work (1633), *Exercitationes biblicae,* in which he set forth the first general theory of biblical criticism, drew the attention of the learned world to him. Various treatises of positive theology and especially his celebrated treatise on penance, at which he labored for thirty years, made his reputation almost world-wide. Richard Simon's publication of Father Morin's correspondence after the latter's death showed that Father Morin had literary relations with most of the great men of his age, in France as also in Italy, England, Germany, Holland, and even the Orient. This man, whose fame was so great, was a model of humility and simplicity. He studied much, but he prayed still more. His conversion to Christianity alienated him from his close relatives. His only revenge was to bequeath his patrimony to them and thus to leave them the double testimony of his disinterestedness and of his charity.[21]

Pastoral Theology

Pastoral theology had been taught with incomparable authority in the sixteenth century by St. Charles Borromeo and Venerable Bartholomew a Martyribus. The Carthusian Molina (d. 1619), the Jesuit Renaud (d. 1623), and the Marchand brothers (d. 1648, 1661) continued their work. Molina's *Instruccion de Sacerdotes,* which was placed in the sacristies at the disposition of the clergy, [22] the *Pratique du tribunal de la pénitence* by Renaud, which St. Alphonsus esteemed so highly, James Marchand's *Hortus pastorum,* and Peter Marchand's *Tribunal sacramentale* prepared and furthered the admirable works of Francis de Sales, Berulle, Vincent de Paul, and Olier for the reform of the clergy.

General moral theology, represented at first by Sánchez (d. 1610), Bonacina (d. 1631), Coninck (d. 1633), and Santarelli

[21] Perraud, *L'Oratoire de France,* p. 279.
[22] Hurter, *op. cit.,* p. 222.

(d. 1639), developed in the direction of casuistry, which triumphed with Bauny (d. 1649), Diana (d. 1663), and Escobar (d. 1669). "The intervention of the priest between man and God," says a non-Catholic historian, "the institution of a canonical and penitential jurisdiction, produced in Catholicism two considerable things, spiritual direction and casuistry. The former was intended to advance man in the way of perfection and might lead to the excess of mysticism and quietism; the latter provided rules to apportion the satisfaction to the offense, and, like all possible jurisprudence, inclined to subtlety." [23] The government of souls by spiritual direction, which sounds them to their depths and sets them in motion by the action of an idea or feeling, is suited rather to tranquil ages. But when a social upheaval has stirred up on all sides new situations and unforeseen cases of conscience, these cases must be solved. Thus we can explain, at the time of the barbarian invasions, the penalties, sometimes strange ones, that fill the penitential books of that period. Thus is justified, at the coming of modern times, the revival of casuistry. A "jurisprudence" is constituted; the most frequently consulted repertories were Bauny's *Somme des péchés,*[24] Antonino Diana's *Resolutiones morales,*[25] and the *Universae theologicae moralis receptae sententiae* by Father Escobar.[26] Unfortunately reasonable limits were not always respected. Etienne Bauny (d. 1649), so it seems, was "a man of ancient manners," [27] and of genuine scholarship. But his idea of placing before the eyes of the public the detailed catalogue of all sins seemed at least singular, and his decisions were found to be far-fetched. Antonino Diana (1585–1663), a priest of

[23] Cournot, *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes,* I, 364. On casuistry, see Brunetière, "Une apologie de la casuistique" in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* January 1, 1885; article "Casuistik" in *Kirchenlexicon* (2nd ed.), II, 2035–44.

[24] Bauny, *Somme des péchés qui se commettent en tous estats, de leurs conditions et qualités, en quelles occurences ils sont mortels ou véniels.*

[25] In twelve volumes, Lyons, 1629–59.

[26] In seven volumes, Lyons, 1652–63.

[27] *Vir antiquae probitatis,* Hurter, *Nomenclator,* I, 494.

Palermo, did not deserve such reproach. St. Alphonsus, however, finds that he too often leans toward the broadest views.[28] The most blameless of the three is undoubtedly the Jesuit Antonio Escobar y Mendoza. This austere religious who, at the age of eighty, never dispensed himself from the rigorous observance of the fasts of the Church, this zealous missioner whose apostolate, for fifty years, was spent preferably in the hospitals and prisons, gathered in his books the results of his long experience which he tried to base on the opinions of authorized doctors. Some critics have been able to find here and there an inexact citation, a weak argument, a solution too condescending to human weakness. But, all in all, Escobar's work does honor to the science of morals. Only by relying on mutilated texts has anyone been able to reproach him with maxims that are scandalous or ridiculous.[29]

Ascetical Theology

Ascetical and mystical theology had its doctor in St. Francis de Sales. But this great bishop merely summed up in easily understood language and placed within reach of all the faithful the doctrine of the classical masters of the spiritual life. A new school would draw directly from St. Paul and the early Fathers a mystical doctrine more original and providentially applied to the needs of modern times. Of all the Christian ideas, perhaps none had been more veiled, more altered in the eyes of the world during the agitations of the Renaissance and under the absolute regimes which followed that period, than the idea of the priesthood.

Berulle, Eudes, Bourdoise, Vincent de Paul, Olier, in general all those raised up by God at the beginning of the seventeenth century for the regeneration of the clergy, had from

[28] St. Alphonsus, *Theol. moral.*, Bk. VI, no. 257.
[29] Karl Weiss, *P. Antonio Escobar y Mendoza.*

childhood been impressed by the idea of the holiness of the priest. In fact, "they became effective promoters of the ecclesiastical reform only by becoming doctors of the eternal priesthood. To be filled at first with the ideal of the priesthood, to be passionately enchanted by it, then to reveal its greatness to the clergy, in their books or their conferences,[30] such was the purpose of Condren in *L'idée du sacerdoce et du sacrifice de Jésus-Christ,* of St. Vincent de Paul in the *Conférences de Saint-Lazare,* of Olier in his *Traité des saints ordres.* Thomassin in the second book of *Traité de l'Incarnation* and Bossuet in his *Méditations sur l'Evangile* and his *Sermon pour l'Ascension* magnificently developed their doctrine.

In fact, from what had been merely an instinctive feeling in their childhood, the reason and faith of these great reformers of the clergy made a doctrine. In avoiding excessively subtle views or such as were reckless, to be found at times, views that the relative novelty of this theology may suffice to explain, this is what it is reduced to in substance in the writings of Cardinal de Berulle, Father de Condren, and Father Olier. For the author of the *Grandeurs de Jésus,* of the *Vie de Jésus,* and of the *Elévations à Jésus-Christ,* the model and the source of all priesthood is Christ the Priest, who is Priest only because He is the Son of God, according to the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews (5:5): "Christ also did not glorify Himself that He might be made a high priest: but He that said unto Him: Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee."

For the founder of the Oratory, all the problems of theology are to be found in the relations with the fundamental mystery of the Incarnation of the Word; the dogma of the Incarnation is always what clarifies them.[31] Father de Condren, starting from this doctrine as from a base, and considering the priesthood and the sacrifice of Christ as the accomplishment of the

[30] Grimal, *Le sacerdoce et le sacrifice,* p. xxi.

[31] Perraud, *op. cit.,* p. 72.

traditional rites of the Old Law, considers in Christ the Priest five successive phases, appealing to one another, which, from the consecration and from the oblation, accomplished in the very act of the Incarnation, finally, by the immolation which is their outward realization, end in the glorious consummation of the victim and finally in His communion in the bosom of God.[32]

Bossuet speaks of this heavenly priesthood of Christ when he says: "I am enchanted when I consider Christ, our great sacrificer, officiating before that eternal altar where God is adored. . . . Lord, Thou dost celebrate for us an office and a feast eternally at the right hand of Thy Father. Thou showest Him ceaselessly the wounds that appease Him and save us. Thou offerest Him our prayers, Thou intercedest for our faults, Thou blessest us, Thou consecratest us." Father Olier goes a step further in this doctrine. "Our Lord," he says, "made me see that two persons had already labored to make Him honored in His mysteries, namely, Father de Berulle to have His Incarnation honored, Father de Condren to have His Resurrection honored, and that He willed I should make Him honored in His Blessed Sacrament."

A doctrine that Father Olier held also from Father de Berulle was that of the interior life, that of Jesus living in our souls. To consider Christ as the vine of which we are the branches, to have within us the sentiments of our Lord's soul, to assimilate them, to be consumed in Him that He may do all in us: such was the profound thought of the future founder of the Company of St. Sulpice. "His living faith in the Eucharistic mystery, of which he became the minister, saw the image of that consummation in the wonderful transubstantiation which his word operated at the altar." He wrote: "In those days, O my God, Thou didst make me desire to be the bread that is to be used

[32] Monier, *Vie de M. Olier,* Bk. II, chap. I.

at the Mass, that I might be converted entirely into Thee." [33]

Eight years later, in that forty-day retreat which the servant of God made before he took possession of his parish and which was the culminating point of his interior life, Father Olier experienced the same sentiments with a greater intensity. His biographer writes: "We are not mistaken in thinking that this retreat was a Eucharistic retreat passed entirely at the foot of the altar." [34] From his long meditations, we have an expressive symbol in a figure that he later had reproduced by the painter Le Brun in which, around the sun of the ostensorium, he had inscribed the religious acts that recalled the doctrine of his masters, Berulle and Condren, "and those that are found accomplished only in the state of victim that understands all the perfection of religion." [35]

Such, in its broad lines, was the spiritual doctrine that the Oratory and St. Sulpice taught and propagated in the seventeenth century. Primarily inspired by care for the reform of the clergy, it has since shown its beneficent fruitfulness for the direction of souls in general, and even those who refuse to profess it cannot fail to see that it is profound, harmonious, and great.[36]

Profound, harmonious, and great is likewise the idea of the organization and the rites of the Church set forth by the canonist Barbosa [37] and by the liturgists Gavanti and Baudry. We would look in vain in Barbosa's twenty big tomes, in Gavanti's *Thesaurus sacrorum rituum,*[38] and in Baudry's *Manuale sac-*

[33] Monier, *op. cit.*

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Olier, *Mémoires,* III, 37.

[36] Grimal, *op. cit.*

[37] Agostino Barbosa (1589–1649) was a Portuguese priest, endowed with an astonishing memory and with an almost unbelievable power of work. According to Hurter, he was the leading canonist of his time. Cf. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* I, 485; *Kirchenlexikon,* I, 1985.

[38] Batholomew Gavanti, an Italian priest (d. 1638). His great work is regarded as the most valuable of the practical manuals.

rarum caeremoniarum[39] for an attempt to connect the laws and ceremonies of the Catholic Church with any vast philosophical and historical synthesis. At that period no one seems to have suspected the usefulness of such points of view. The purpose envisaged is exclusively practical. But by their solidity, order, and clarity, the works of Barbosa, Gavanti, and Baudry have deserved to become lasting monuments. In the various states, great lawyers were elaborating, outside the Church and often against the Church, the principles of a new law. But, thanks to the writings of the canonists and liturgists of this period, the clergy would become more clearly aware of their own rights. While French etiquette was of obligation in the courts of Europe, the students of St. Sulpice,[40] trained by Baudry, and the ecclesiastics of the whole world, instructed by Gavanti, were giving to the ceremonies of public worship a majesty and splendor worthy of them.

Biblical Exegesis

Exegesis, archaeology, and history, exploiting the material accumulated by the Renaissance, soared to new heights.

In the domain of exegesis, the first part of the seventeenth century saw the appearance of four works of considerable importance: the *Commentaries* of Bonfrère, the *Commentaries* of Cornelius a Lapide, the *Polyglot of Paris,* and the *Polyglot of London.* The first commentaries of the Belgian priest, Jacques Bonfrère, on the Pentateuch, which appeared in 1625 and were soon followed by commentaries on the other books of the Bible, obtained a brilliant success. By the clearness of its preliminary explanations, by the soberness of its exegesis, and

[39] Michael Baudry or Bauldry, Benedictine monk of the abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés.

[40] Father Olier asked Dom Baudry to train the St. Sulpice seminarians in the liturgical ceremonies. For several years he performed this duty with great success. Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier,* III, 40, 139.

by the judicious choice of its patristic quotations, the work corresponded to a real need of the clergy and the faithful. "Of all the Jesuit commentators on Holy Scripture, none had followed a better method." [41] But it was soon surpassed by that of a more considerable work, coming from the pen of another Belgian Jesuit, Cornelius Cornelissen van den Steen, better known as Cornelius a Lapide. The latter's Commentaries on all the books of the Bible, except the Psalms and the Book of Job, appeared at Antwerp from 1616 to 1645, in twenty large volumes. No work on Holy Scripture became more widespread or remained longer in vogue. Inferior in its scientific value to the studies of Maldonatus on the four Gospels and to those of Estius on the apostolic Epistles, it contained such an abundance of material that it formed a sort of rich scriptural library of undeniable usefulness for exegetes and especially for preachers.

While Bonfrère and Cornelius a Lapide were concerned with placing within the reach of all the faithful the acquired results of biblical science, two great works, with a view to promote the progress of that science, were published successively at Paris and at London. In Christian antiquity, Origen was the first to attempt to place side by side, for the purpose of comparison and critical study, the different versions of the Bible. His *Hexapla* was the first Polyglot. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the great Cardinal Ximenez thought of making use of the critical researches of his time to take up again, on a new plan, the work of Origen. In 1520 the publication of six folio volumes, entitled *Biblia Polyglotta, nunc primum impressa,* realized his dream. The work cost him more than 150,000 ducats. Six expert scholars, three of them converted Jews, labored at it for eighteen years. When the last sheet of this colossal work was brought to Ximenez, that great man declared: "Lord, I thank Thee that Thou hast brought to a good end so difficult an undertaking." It is the Polyglot known under

[41] Quoted by C. Sommervogel, art. "Bonfrère" in *Dict. de la Bible.*

the name of *Complutensis,* or Polyglot of Alcalá. Fifty years later the Polyglot of Antwerp, published in that city at the expense of King Philip II of Spain, completed the work of Ximenez.[42]

These two works contributed greatly to revive biblical studies. But both of them left something to be desired. At the outset of the seventeenth century, the scholar Cardinal Duperron and Jacques de Thou, the royal librarian, conceived the project of publishing, with the help of two Maronites, a new Polyglot, more exact and more complete. After the death of both these men in 1618, the lawyer Guy le Jay took up the work. Advised by Cardinal de Berulle and powerfully aided by Father Jean Morin, he brought it to a happy conclusion in 1645. By the beauty of the paper and of the typography, the Polyglot of Le Jay, called the Paris Polyglot, in an incomparable monument. But the expenses of publication had been enormous and ruined the brave scholar who undertook it. Moreover, it had little influence, being soon supplanted by the London Polyglot (Walton's Polyglot). The latter, issued in six volumes (1654 to 1657) in a format that was more convenient, contained important improvements, which made it preferred to the Paris Polyglot. This London Bible was composed under the direction of the Anglican Bishop Brian Walton and under the successive patronage of Cromwell and Charles II. It was put on the Index in 1663; but it is no longer included in the official edition of forbidden books.

The revival of the old studies did not absorb all the activity of the scholars. At Rome a new science, the archaeology of the catacombs, was born. Its author was Antonio Bosio, a scholar possessed of amazing information, an explorer of tireless intrepidity. He undertook to begin the interpretation of monuments of all sorts, even the humblest, by the help of ancient

[42] The Antwerp Polyglot was published between 1569 and 1572. See Mangenot, art. "Polyglotte" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*

texts gleaned from the writings of the Church Fathers and of other ecclesiastical writers.[43] To explore at the peril of his life all the labyrinths of the Roman catacombs and to gather with close attention and faultless method the writings of the Fathers, Latin, Greek, and Oriental, the canons of the councils, and the letters of the popes, in a word, all the documents that could throw light on the Church of the first centuries: such was the task he undertook. The appearance in 1634, four years after his death, of his great work, *Roma soterranea,* was the fruit of his immense labors and has won for him the title of "The Columbus of the Catacombs." De Rossi writes: "I declare that this great man knew everything that could be known in his time about underground Rome." [44]

The Study of Church History

In Church history, Baronius always remained the master who was continued and imitated by others. None of his continuators, neither Sponde nor Rainaldi nor Bzovius, is comparable to the great Oratorian. But the special Churches and particular institutions of different peoples found historians of great merit. Such were Mariana, the Spanish Livy, and André Duchesne, "the Father of French History." Lastly, this period saw the beginning of two historical works of capital importance, sufficient to make a century illustrious: the *Gallia christiana* and the *Acta sanctorum.*

The idea of a catalogue of the archbishops and bishops of all the French sees was a very old idea. The merit was to make this catalogue a scientific work. This advance was attempted in 1621 by Jean Chenu of Bourges, a lawyer in the Parliament of Paris, then, more successfully, by Claude Robert, archdeacon

[43] Leclercq in *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.,* I, 1087.

[44] De Rossi, *Roma soterranea crisitiana,* I, 81. Cf. Leclercq, art. "Bosio" in *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.*

of Châlon-sur-Saône, who in 1626 published, under the title of *Gallia christiana,* a folio volume of new chronological tables, accompanied with summary notes, taken from the episcopal and monastic records. The work was still imperfect. In 1646 the two brothers Scévole and Louis de Sainte-Marthe, lawyers in Parliament and historiographers of France, presented to the Assembly of the Clergy the dedicatory letter of a new *Gallia christiana.* The work, considerably enlarged, contained a biographical note on each of the persons named and added to the list of names of prelates that of the abbots of monasteries. The two brothers were descended from a line of scholars which would be perpetuated after them. They had already given in several works, notably in the *Histoire généalogique de la Maison de France,* which appeared in 1619, a promise of solid scholarship. But the work they had undertaken exceeded their strength and could be brought to perfection only by a society of scholars. The *Gallia christiana* of the Sainte-Marthe brothers, published in 1656 in four folio volumes, after their death, through the care of a son of Scévole, was replaced half a century later by the *Gallia christiana* of the Benedictines of St. Maur, published under the direction of Dom Denys de Sainte-Marthe, a distant relative of the preceding.[45]

The project of assembling in a single work the lives of all the saints from the very earliest time of the Church, had often tempted the pen of ecclesiastical writers. Since Surius, who received encouragement from St. Pius V, Father Ribandeneira, the Jesuit, had published (1599–1601), under the title of *Flos sanctorum,* two folio volumes, soon translated into different languages throughout Christendom. But these works had as their sole object the edification of the faithful and did not always observe the rules of prudent criticism. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Father Heribert Rosweyde, a pro-

[45] Cf. Langlois, *Manuel de bibliographie historique,* p. 297; Moréri, art. "Sainte-Marthe" in *Dict. historique.*

fessor at the Jesuit college of Douai, conceived the plan of a hagiographical collection following the principles of a truly scientific erudition, and he started to gather the material.

After Rosweyde's death (1629), Father John van Bolland was ordered by his superiors to utilize the precious collections of Rosweyde. These he augmented by extending his researches to the libraries located outside the Netherlands, which Rosweyde had not explored. A workshop was established at the Antwerp residence, with correspondents wherever there were members of the Society. Bolland is the one who drew up the plan of the publication: they would furnish the *Acta sanctorum,* that is, the documents relating to the lives of the saints, with preliminary dissertations, notes, and indexes, following the order of the Roman calendar.[46]

The first volume of the collection of the Bollandists appeared in 1643. In this first volume the critical spirit appeared. In its totality the work would give great honor to the Order that had dared to assume so immense a task. Its scientific character became more and more pronounced.[47] Like Rosweyde, Bolland did not appreciate the vastness of the task he had assumed. We are told that he planned, after completing the *Acta* of the saints of the Latin Church, to publish those of the Greek Church, and then in his later years to relax by writing on other subjects. But he lived only to issue the first eight volumes containing the lives of the saints honored in January, February, and March.

The Anti-Christian Movement

While these enormous works were being prepared, works that would symbolize that harmonious equilibrium between science and faith, between modern aspirations and ancient culture, a spirit of unbelief and disorder, spreading in literature and in the salons, gradually invaded the souls of the time.

[46] Langlois, *op. cit.,* p. 211.

[47] Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* V, clxiii.

Its starting point is not distinguishable from that of Protestantism, and its development would lead to the French Revolution.

Repressed by the authorities and compromised by its own excesses, the movement of the Renaissance and of the Reformation had at length resulted in Stoicism and in Epicureanism, both of them stemming from a vague deism.

"Germany, with its leaden sky, more serious consciences, and harsher life, was the place where Stoicism again came to life: the severity of the first Reformers extended a hearty welcome to it. From there it passed to France." [48] Montaigne and Charron were its representatives. Montaigne, considering dogmas, said: "What do I know?" And when he came to morals, he declared: "We must accept nothing but ourselves. Let us make our contentment depend on ourselves." Montaigne continued going to Mass because Cicero, in his *Treatise on Law,*[49] prescribed it for him. The *Encheiridion* of Epictetus circulated in society. The Stoic spirit was dominant in literature. Balzac's ambition was to live and die like Socrates. The personages most highly praised by the great Corneille have about them something Stoic. Descartes' Christianity has many analogies to the doctrine of the Porch. The central idea of his morals is, according to his own expression, "to so act that his chief contentment shall depend only on himself." [50] These are almost the very words of Montaigne.

But the same causes that gave birth to Stoicism in strong and grave souls produced Epicureanism in less elevated natures. We know Bacon's principle of morality, which was to accommodate his spirit to the occasion and the opportunity, to pursue several aims so as to attain the secondary if the chief one should elude him.[51] In what a manner the celebrated chan-

[48] Strowski, *Pascal et son temps,* I, 19.
[49] *Ibid.,* p. 30 note.
[50] Descartes, *Correspondance,* IV, 221.
[51] Cf. Hoeffding, *History of Modern Philosophy,* I, 190.

cellor conformed his life to these principles, is well known. In passing from utilitarian England to sensual Italy, this doctrine became accentuated. The Italian Lucilio Vanini pushed it to its logical consequences. In curious dialogues, published in 1616 under the title *De naturae arcanis,* which Father Garasse calls rather *An Introduction to the Indevout Life,* this curious philosopher, who received the priestly anointing, professes the most absurd unbelief. He speaks in a lively and reckless tone, observes no moderation, makes fun of believers, undertakes to sharpen people's wits and to teach them to live according to nature. Burned at the stake at Toulouse in 1619 as an atheist and blasphemer of the name of God, he died crying out: "Nature is the only God, and death opens the repose of nothingness." [52]

This Vanini is a representative personage. Many others of the same sort came, like him, from Italy to France and there made numerous disciples. In 1623 Father Garasse, a Jesuit, pointed out these libertines, "these Epicureans, these parasites, these drunkards, these indecent men . . . who seek their contentment in the vapor of their own filth." [53] The French character, with its qualities of discipline, logic, and clearness, practically tempered the excesses of that fantastic and crass Epicureanism. The Hôtel de Rambouillet, which opened its doors to the fine minds about 1617, and which shone in all its brilliance in 1630, was moderately penetrated by it. But here and there in the world pamphlets circulated, and satires and poems, which advanced the theory of this worship of nature.[54]

Thus the Catholic reform had in vain refuted the errors of the Protestants, had repressed their revolts, and, by genuine reforms, had removed every pretext of the critics who made up

[52] On Vanini, see Strowski, *op. cit.,* pp. 143–57.
[53] Garasse, *La doctrine curieuse des beaux esprits de ce temps,* p. 954.
[54] Mersenne, *L'impiété des déistes, athées et libertins de ce temps.*

the strength of Luther and Calvin. The religious danger was reborn in another form; it extended to the very countries which the Protestant Revolt had spared. At the side of Protestantism, which spread under its varying forms, beside the Gallicanism which was far from being disarmed, soon a new Stoicism arose and tried to penetrate the Church under the name of Jansenism. A new form of Epicureanism threatened the Church under the appearances of philosophy.[55]

France seemed to become the principal center of these doctrines. Thus we can put our finger on the inadequacy of the policy of Henry IV, Richelieu, and Louis XIV. They had eliminated heresy, but society had let itself be penetrated by paganism.

[55] Strowski, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

PART II

ORTHODOXY

Up to the middle of the seventeenth century, the Church had been able to devote her best efforts to the restoration of faith and morals. From that time on, the strife against the growing errors absorbed her. Protestantism, triumphant at Westphalia, entertained new ambitions; Gallicanism, formulated by Richer and Dominis, became more threatening with Louis XIV; Jansenism had its doctors and its organization; the libertines and the headstrong spirits constituted a sect with an importance that could not be ignored; the painful quarrel of quietism, which set two great bishops in opposition to each other, complicated the uneasiness from which the Church suffered. A political and social crisis extending to all Europe aggravated the religious crisis and, as in the sixteenth century, threatened a general outburst. Few men seemed to take account of the gravity of the situation. The papacy, stripped of the political prerogatives it enjoyed in the Middle Ages and henceforth curtailed in the purely ecclesiastical domain, limited itself to protesting against the new forms of error. But it did so forcibly, with perseverance and authority. So well did it pursue this course, that, in the shipwreck of the other social powers, it remained the only power capable of being accepted by the new governments that arose from the revolutionary distress. Therefore, before following in detail the phases of these various strifes, we will take a brief view of the Roman Pontiffs who followed one another during this period.

CHAPTER VIII

The Popes of the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century (1655–1700)

THE conclave that opened in the first days of 1655 to provide a successor to Innocent X, presented an unusual appearance. On the occasion of the preceding elections, too often nephews of the deceased, surrounded by a band of partisans, presented themselves, ready to seize the power. Innocent X left no nephew who could form a faction. The members of the Sacred College felt themselves under obligation to no one. They entered the conclave with complete freedom. Cardinal Pallavicino relates that a number of them, distinguished and independent men, had formed an alliance, promising one another to obey only their own convictions. The Spanish ambassador called them "the flying squadron." This designation clung to them and served later to qualify similar associations.[1] We are told that, at the opening of the conclave, when one of the cardinals proposed to make a choice among the leaders, they replied: "Everybody has a head and feet for himself." [2]

Alexander VII (1655–67)

The deliberations of the conclave lasted almost three months. From the first day, however, the eyes of all turned to one of their number. Beside the deathbed of Innocent X, whose advanced age had been surrounded by so many intrigues, Car-

[1] The "flying squadron" exercised its good influence until the eighteenth century.
[2] Ranke, *History of the Popes,* II, 364.

dinal Ottoboni declared: "We must now seek a man of virtue." One of his colleagues, Azzolini, pointing to Cardinal Chigi, replied: "If you are looking for a perfect upright man, there is one." Fabio Chigi was not only renowned for his spotless probity; under the preceding pontificate he had shown himself an outspoken foe of the crying abuse that had aroused public indignation: nepotism. But his candidacy encountered keen opposition on the side of France. Mazarin, offended by certain resistance that Chigi had made to his policy with regard to some diplomatic negotiations, neglected no steps to keep Chigi from the papal see.[3] This circumstance was the cause of numerous difficulties that obstructed the election. At last (April 7, 1655) the "flying squadron" was victorious. Fabio Chigi was elected and took the name of Alexander VII.

The news of this election was everywhere received with joy. According to memoirs of the time, "at Paris bonfires were lighted all through the city. People spoke of the new Pope as a fearless man. They added that neither prison nor the threat of death would ever be able to force him to do anything contrary to the resolves he had taken." [4] His past seemed to give promise of his future. As representative of the Holy See in the negotiations that ended in the Treaty of Westphalia, his spirit of conciliation was matched by his uprightness. After the signing of the Treaty, he had protested against the clauses that Innocent X later disapproved. The worthiness of his life, his enlightened taste for the arts, his judicious choice of the men who composed his habitual entourage, in the eyes of everybody these facts presaged a pontificate that would be one of reform and glory.

But the great difficulties that the Pope had to face from the first days of his reign and that continued to increase, prevented the realization of these hopes.

[3] On Mazarin's intrigues in this matter, see *Revue des questions historiques,* XXVI, 9–23; XXX, 115–20.

[4] Hermant, *Mémoires,* II, 661.

In France the disturbances of the Fronde had produced divisions and bitterness which the Jansenist quarrel revived. When Alexander VII took possession of the papal see, the astute Mazarin, fearing to see all the strength of the former Fronde and of the Jansenists join hands against him in the person of the Cardinal de Retz, moved heaven and earth to keep his dread adversary from the archbishopric of Paris. His supreme maneuver was to launch against Gondi a charge of high treason. Alexander dreaded to displease a French minister and to strengthen the party of Arnauld, connected to the Cardinal de Retz. But, on the other hand, he could not resolve to let a member of the sacred college be brought before a civil tribunal. Long diplomatic negotiations resulted in a compromise: the Cardinal would leave the government of the archbishopric of Paris to a vicar, whom he would choose from a list of six names presented by the King. Retz would not consent to hand in his resignation until seven years later, that is, in 1662.[5]

The situation was more tense in Spain, where the government refused to the official representative of the Holy Father the title of nuncio and the right to open the tribunal of the nunciature. In Poland, John Casimir, a weak prince, was ill prepared by his former life to strive against the most formidable perils which his nation ever encountered.[6] That was the hour when, as Bossuet says, "all that was left was to consider in what direction the great tree would fall, after being shaken by so many hands and struck by so many blows to its roots." [7] John Casimir could offer the Church only the homage of a sincere faith and a powerless good will. Venice, in former times the bulwark of Christendom against the Turk, was now reduced to the necessity of asking the Pope for help.

[5] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal,* V, 559–73; Artaud de Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Popes,* VI, 79–82.

[6] John Casimir had been a religious of the Society of Jesus. When he became heir to the throne of Poland, the Pope released him from his vows. He then married his sister-in-law Marie-Louise, queen dowager.

[7] Bossuet, *Oraison funèbre d'Anne de Gonzague.*

In Germany, Ferdinand was engaged in forwarding the Counter Reformation in his hereditary domains, but sometimes his rigorous methods in dealing with the Protestants became more compromising than salutary; his authority declined. Alarmed by the progress of Sweden in the north and understanding that the restoration of a monarchy comparable to that of Charles V was now impossible, "he merely tried to give some new support to the imperial power: to this end he introduced eight new members into the 'college of the princes,' hoping that they would, through gratitude or self-interest, give their votes to the Habsburgs." [8]

Moreover, this conduct was in harmony with the movement taking place throughout Europe. There was never a time more favorable to the aristocracy than the middle of the seventeenth century, when, throughout the whole extent of the Spanish monarchy, that power which preceding kings had withdrawn from the high nobility, again fell into their hands; when the constitution of England acquired, amid the most perilous conflicts and struggles, that aristocratic character which it retains even to our times; when the French Parliaments persuaded themselves that they could perform a part similar to that taken by the English houses; when the nobility acquired a decided predominance through all the German territories—one here and there excepted, where some courageous prince overpowered all efforts for independence; and when the Estates of Sweden attempted to impose insufferable restraints on the sovereign authority, and the Polish nobility attained to unfettered self-government. This spirit was now becoming prevalent in Rome; a numerous, powerful, and wealthy aristocracy surrounded the papal throne; the families already established imposed restraints on those that were but newly rising; from the self-reliance and authoritative boldness of monarchy, the ecclesiastical

[8] Blondel in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. générale,* VI, 547.

sovereignty was passing to the deliberation, sobriety, and measured calmness of aristocratic government.[9]

In what more particularly concerned the Pope, the organization of the Roman Congregations, such as was done by Sixtus V and completed by Urban VIII, thereafter lessened his initiative. In strictly spiritual affairs, of course the absolute power of the supreme pontiff was not contested. But in the questions of making war, concluding peace, or raising taxes, he was obliged to consult the cardinals.

Such were the causes that prevented Pope Alexander VII from acting as a St. Gregory the Great, a St. Gregory VII, or an Innocent III would have done, even if he had the genius of those great pontiffs. At the end of a year, his confidant, Father Oliva, rector of the Jesuits' college, directly declared that the Pope would be guilty of a sin if he did not summon his nephews to his side. He maintained that the foreign ambassadors never would have so much confidence in a mere minister as in a near relation of the Pope; that the Holy Father, being thus less perfectly supplied with information, would have fewer facilities for the due administration of his office.[10] The cardinals, consulted in the consistory of April 24, 1656, were of the same opinion as the pious Jesuit. Alexander VII then recalled to Rome his brother Mario and his nephews; one of these, Flavio, became a cardinal, the other married a Borghese. But the Pope's relatives did not obtain the political preponderance expected. The Pontiff, giving up all hope of grasping the personal power on which he had counted, turned over most affairs to the Congregations, and particularly to Cardinal Rospigliosi, who later succeeded him as Clement IX.

Alexander VII then devoted part of his time to the study of literature and philosophy, in the company of some scholars.

[9] Ranke, *op. cit.*, II, 371.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 366.

Among these was Sforza Pallavicino, who dedicated to the Pope his *History of the Council of Trent*. Alexander collected the poems he had written in his youth and published them under the title of *Philometi labores juveniles*. However, nothing would be more unjust than to attribute to this pope the defects and vices with which his memory has been besmirched by several historians, on the basis of an apocryphal account by the Venetian, Angelo Corraro.

The Pope's taste for beautiful edifices is undeniable, and on their construction he spent enormous amounts of money. But, to be quite just, we must recognize that he used a large part of his revenues for this purpose and that the buildings he put up contributed greatly to the adornment of the Eternal City. He finished the Sapienza College, begun by Leo X according to the designs of Michelangelo, he erected the magnificent colonnade of the piazza of St. Peter's, constructed the fine Chigi Piazza, made the clearing for the piazza of the Pantheon, engaged Bernini for the decoration of the Porta del Popolo, made the marshes of Baccano a healthful place, built an arsenal at Civitavecchia, and equipped several ships to help the Venetians and the Emperor in the war undertaken against the Turks.

These material achievements were merely the least part of the works of Alexander's pontificate. He fought vigorously in the defense of the rights of the Holy See, for the maintenance of the faith and of sound morality: he fearlessly resisted Louis XIV in the affair of the Pope's Corsican guard; he ordered the Jansenists to sign a precise formula that left no room for subterfuge; he condemned certain maxims of lax morality; he put on the Index the book written by Father Pérot of the Society of Jesus for the *Apology of Casuists*. Christian piety owes to Alexander's pontificate the ratification of the immemorial cult rendered to King Ferdinand III, the canonization of St. Francis de Sales, and the publication of the famous bull *Sollicitudo,* dated December 8, 1661, by which, without explicitly defining

the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Pope affirmed it, recommended the veneration of the Blessed Virgin under this title, and, under the gravest canonical penalties, condemned those who should dare to attack the pious belief, whether publicly or privately. This bull, joyfully welcomed by the Catholic world and celebrated in Spain with public manifestations, was regarded as the final blow against the enemies of the dogma before its full definition and its supreme triumph.[11]

About the middle of 1667, the Pope, suffering terribly from gall stones, which had long afflicted him, and from a continual fever that was slowly sapping his strength, summoned to his bedside the members of the sacred college, gave them a report of his conduct during the twelve years of his pontificate, and showed them the cypress coffin he had prepared for himself at the beginning of his pontificate. Was he simply moved by a feeling of humility in the presence of death? Was he thinking of the sad end of his predecessor, Innocent X, whose body remained unburied for three days in a garret for lack of a coffin? His last words were these: "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity." He died May 18, 1667, at the age of sixty-eight.

Clement IX (1667–69)

The conclave to elect Alexander's successor lasted nineteen days, during which the famous "flying squadron" again played a dominant part. Then, on June 20, 1667, the sacred college elected Alexander VII's secretary of state, Cardinal Rospigliosi, who took the name of Clement IX. Since he had conducted negotiations with France and Spain under difficult circumstances, he was familiar with the strength and weakness in the diplomatic situation of the papacy. From the outset of his pontificate, Clement IX took the attitude that he kept to the very end, the attitude of conciliator. The cabinets of Paris and

[11] Dubosq de Pesquidoux, *L'Immaculée Conception, histoire d'un dogme,* I, 447–64.

of Madrid had both supported his election.[12] He attempted to maintain with France and with Spain relations of good understanding, even though he had to support the most annoying demands of their governments.[13]

On the other hand, the Jansenist crisis, which reached its convulsion following the imposition of the famous formulary, threatened to create a permanent division in the episcopate of France. The Pope, satisfied with a submission less explicit than his predecessor had required, realized in 1668, with the approval of all, that "peace of the Church," called also the "Clementine peace," which continued for thirty years and permitted the "golden pen" [14] of the Jansenists to turn against the Protestant heresy.

At the same time that he worked to reconcile Jansenists and Jesuits, to combine the efforts of all against Protestantism, he succeeded in re-establishing harmony between France and Spain, in the plan to unite them for a campaign against the Turks, who were threatening Candia. In the Roman states Clement's firm conduct toward his nephews, to whom he abandoned his patrimony, refusing them any kind of other favor, was well calculated to disarm envy; his excellent measures to lessen taxes made his authority popular;[15] his piety, his modesty, his application to the functions of his spiritual office,[16]

[12] Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France,* I, 221; C. Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège,* p. 192; Gazier, *Les dernières années du cardinal de Retz,* p. 140.

[13] Sometimes the red hat was asked for candidates who were unworthy of that honor; sometimes French bishops, backed by the King, took upon themselves to suppress certain holydays of obligation; sometimes serious changes were made in the condition of the French religious. Such was the decision of the Council of State (March 4, 1669), subjecting exempt religious to the ordinary of the place for preaching and hearing confessions. Cf. Gérin, *op. cit.,* p. 370. But Clement IX resisted Louis XIV whenever the cause of justice seemed to him to be seriously endangered.

[14] Some time earlier, the apostolic nuncio, receiving the visit of Antoine Arnauld, invited him to employ "his golden pen" in the defense of the Church.

[15] Ciaconius, *Vitae pontificum,* IV, 776.

[16] Gérin, *op. cit.,* p. 229.

won universal veneration for him. But the thwarting of the Candia campaign, which had been the great concern of his reign, was a fatal blow for him. At news of the disaster, he had a long fainting spell.[17] Shortly afterward, during the night of November 30, 1669, he died, at the age of sixty-nine. Abbé de Bourlemont, the chargé d'affaires of France, wrote to Louis XIV: "Your Majesty loses much, and so does all Christendom."

Clement X (1670–76)

A short time before his death, Clement IX, wishing to perpetuate the peaceful policy of his pontificate, had called to his side the president of the Apostolic Camera, Emilio Altieri. This venerable aged man who, in the course of various diplomatic missions and of the government of the Church of Camerino, had shown qualities of prudence and moderation, was told by the Pope: "I am conferring the purple on you because I feel that you will be my successor." And he made him a cardinal.[18] These words and this act were an indication for the sacred college. The rivalry of the factions of France and Spain delayed the election for about five months. Finally, on August 29, 1670, Cardinal Altieri received the required number of votes. He was at that time almost eighty years old. His advanced age made his steps somewhat halting, but his robust constitution and alert mind gave hope for many years of an active and fruitful pontificate.[19] To indicate his intention of continuing the policy of his predecessor, Altieri took the name of Clement X. He held to this determination and solved the difficulties that were pending at the time of his election, as he did also the difficulties that arose during the six years of his reign, in the same spirit as that of the deceased Pontiff.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 314.
[18] Muratori, *Annali d'Italia* (ann. 1670), XI, 241.
[19] *Ibid.*

The Jansenist quarrel, which was thought ready to revive at the slightest incident, the pending conflicts between the Holy See and the French court, the struggle of the Christian rulers against the Turks, continued to be burning questions. The Clementine peace had been unable to remove all the causes of bitterness and to appease all suspicions. The three chief ministers of Louis XIV—Lionne, Le Tellier, and Colbert—for various reasons became favorable to the Jansenists, intervening in their behalf. Vigorous polemics sprang up again in Germany in connection with a new writing, *Salutary Warnings of the Blessed Virgin to Her Indiscreet Followers*. Clement resisted the solicitations of the French court and condemned the incendiary work, whose author was a lawyer of Cologne, Adam Widenfelt.[20]

Other troubles arose from the decree of the Council of State, which, in 1669, by its own authority had restrained the privileges of exempt religious. The Pope, by his constitution of June 21, 1670, issued certain regulations, still in force, about the rights of religious in the matter of preaching and confessions. For preaching in their own churches, religious must obtain the approbation of their superiors and must ask the blessing of the bishop of the place. But they could not enter the pulpit of an outside church without the express approbation of the ordinary. In the monasteries, or even in colleges where the regular life was in vigor, the superiors and the confessors of the religious could validly and licitly hear the confessions of seculars belonging to the religious family and of permanent members of the household. But in any other place a special approbation would be needed, even if they were approved for the diocese of their penitent. In cases of doubt about the extent of their privileges, the question would be taken, not before the metropolitan, but before the Supreme Pontiff.[21]

The political pacifying of Europe presented more difficulties.

[20] Hurter, *op. cit.*, II, 53.

[21] Constitution *Superna magni Patris familias; Bull. rom.*, 1733, VII, 30.

The Turks, masters of Candia, were menacing Italy. To maintain or re-establish peace between the Christian rulers, with a view to leaguing them against the common enemy, had been the great concern of Clement IX; it was likewise that of Clement X. In 1672 he intervened to reconcile Genoa and Savoy; in 1675 and 1676 he offered to mediate to settle the war stirred up again between France and the house of Austria. Meanwhile, with encouragement and material help, he aided the Poles who, under the leadership of John Sobieski, were bravely opposing the Moslem invasion. Unfortunately the policy of Louis XIV, favorable to the Turkish alliance, hindered the realization of Clement X's great project.

In the same spirit of pacification, the Pope regulated several questions of jurisdiction that arose in connection with the missions of the Far East.[22] He also issued a series of decrees about the organization of the German College,[23] the removal of the bodies of saints from the catacombs,[24] the publication of various works about the missions,[25] the conditions under which missioners could practice medicine or surgery.[26] Clement X had reached the age of eighty-six, but he was still full of strength and was endowed with all his clearness of mind.[27] On July 22, 1676, he succumbed to an attack of dropsy.

Innocent XI (1676–89)

The conciliatory attitude of the last two popes had obtained a part of the desired results; dangerous reefs had been avoided, the Church had been spared internal divisions that might have

[22] *Bull. rom.*, VII, 245 f., 250, 264.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 197, 296, 309, 311.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[27] It is not exact to say that he abdicated his power into the hands of Cardinal Altieri, his adopted nephew. On the unjust suspicions of the French ambassador in this matter, see Gérin, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

been irreparable. But the growing boldness of Gallicanism, which was then incarnate in Colbert, the ablest of the ministers, in the service of the most absolute monarch, Louis XIV, the rumblings of Jansenism, which had not disarmed, and the increasing danger of a Turkish invasion, made desirable the coming of a leader with a stronger hand, with prompter decision, with more daring initiative. The Church was in need of a pope of the race of St. Gregory VII. These hopes were realized in the person of Cardinal Benedetto Odescalchi, who was elected September 22, 1676, and took the name of Innocent XI.

The history of Gallicanism shows us the great Pontiff in the affair of the right of asylum, in that of the regalia, and in that of the four articles of 1682, sustaining a heroic struggle against the King of France and against part of the Gallican episcopate. Under less tragic circumstances he was no less firm. On the very day of his election, so it is said, he showed his resolve to reject all nepotism. Summoning his only nephew, Flavio Odescalchi, who was twenty-two years old, he said to him in a tone of authority: "You will in no way alter your present condition; you will continue your studies; you will receive no present because of your relationship to me, and you will not at all meddle in the government of the Curia." On another day he was presented with a list of candidates for ecclesiastical appointments, with the letters of recommendation from their respective patrons. The Pope asked: "Where are the ones not recommended by anybody?" These names were then pointed out to him, and he put them on the same rank as the others, even appeared to give them a place of preference.

He recalled that the College of Apostolic Secretaries, founded by Callistus III in days of old and often a center of scandal, still existed. He pronounced the dissolution of this College, thus braving the wrath of powerful personages who might be offended by his act of authority. Against the usury of the Jews he published severe decrees, which public opinion had long been

clamoring for but which his predecessors had always hesitated to promulgate. His decrees against immodest dress aroused bitterness against him. But to all this opposition he paid no attention. He was aware that Louis XIV had backed his candidacy to the papacy: yet this consideration carried no weight on the day when the King of France violated the rights of the Holy See. He foretold that a condemnation of the maxims of the casuists would make him seem to favor Jansenism; but when the voice of duty had spoken, he did not hesitate to condemn forty-five maxims tainted with laxism.[28]

He refused to agree with Louis XIV in the measures taken for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.[29] He did not let himself become involved in the imprudent acts of James II for the re-establishment of Catholicism in England. He was even less willing to unite its cause with that of William of Orange, although the latter had informed the Pope that he was taking up arms to defend the rights of the Empire and of the Church against Louis XIV. In fact, the plan of the English malcontents who called William to them, was to dethrone the Catholic King James II and to restore Protestant worship in their country. Innocent, knowing this ulterior purpose, maintained a prudent and circumspect attitude.[30]

The promptings of justice and peace dominated his whole policy. Immediately after his elevation to the papal throne, when notifying the Christian rulers of his election, he informed them that he was ready to go to any Catholic city that might be selected to discuss in person the articles of peace. At the same time he directed his nuncios to remind all the courts of the past victories of the Turks and the great dangers with which they were menacing Europe and the Church. Emperor Leopold listened to his appeal; but Louis XIV, especially concerned with weaken-

[28] Denzinger, nos. 1101–45.
[29] Ranke, *op. cit.*, II, 464 (Bk. IX, chap. 1).
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 466.

ing the Empire, turned all his attention to directing the Ottoman forces against Austria and Sicily. One historian rightly says: "That was a shortsighted policy. The Pope had another policy, bigger and nobler. He sent his nuncio to cast himself at the feet of John Sobieski, already the terror of the Ottomans since his victory of Kotzim. They found him on the national pilgrimage of Czenstochowa. At the Pope's word, John forgot his just resentment against the Emperor and set out on the march, on the feast of the Assumption. On Sunday, September 12, 1683, he served Mass, received Communion, and led the immortal charge that forever broke the Ottoman might, as he cried out: *Non nobis, Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam.* After Tours, Navas de Tolosa, and Lepanto, Vienna is indeed, according to Montaigne's expression, "one of the four most beautiful victories that the sun ever shone upon." It saved Christendom and the civilization of the world.

The great Pontiff's last years were passed in the practices of a deep piety. As the Protestant Ranke says, this Pope was austere, humble, pious. The strict integrity that ruled his private life also urged him to fulfill the duties of the papacy, without any lax compromises. So well did he reform and simplify the administration of the Apostolic Camera, that, notwithstanding the abolition of certain taxes, the receipts were soon notably in excess of the expenses. Vigilant against all errors and always firmly independent, he condemned (1687) sixty-eight propositions of the Spanish priest Miguel de Molinos. But the Pope appreciated Molinos' personal qualities and had the consolation of receiving, on September 7 of that year, in the church of the Minerva, the abjuration of this doctor, whose quietist doctrines would soon revive under another form.

Two years later (August 12, 1689), Innocent rendered his soul to God in the deepest sentiments of piety. A few moments before his death, when a certain ambassador assured him that his master would take the Odescalchi family under his protec-

tion, Innocent replied: "We have no house or family. God gave us the pontifical dignity not for the advantage of our kindred, but for the good of the Church and the nations." [31]

Alexander VIII (1689–91)

Alexander VIII and Innocent XII, the two immediate successors of Innocent XI, did not possess the lofty qualities of the deceased Pope. Both, however, benefited by the great efforts and the firm policy of their predecessor.

Pietro Ottoboni, elected on October 6, 1689, under the name of Alexander VIII, was an aged man, seventy-nine years old, but alert and vigorous. His perspicacity and prudence, his rare knowledge of affairs which he had shown as *referendarius* of the two signatures,[32] as bishop of Brescia, and as a member of the sacred college, in the pontificates of Alexander VII, Clement IX, Clement X, and Innocent XI, had brought him general esteem. The Duke de Chaulnes, French ambassador, warmly favored his candidacy for the tiara. Alexander VIII was an able administrator. Notwithstanding his subsidies to Venice for the fight against the Turks and his excessive bounty to his relatives, he succeeded in reducing the debt of the States of the Church.

As a watchful guardian of doctrine, he condemned the strange and dangerous theory of "philosophical sin," which was imagined or revived in 1686 and 1689 by two Jesuits, one from Dijon and the other from Pont-à-Mousson. The former maintained "that a human act committed in opposition to right reason by someone who does not know God or who is not thinking of God at the time, is never a mortal sin, no matter how serious

[31] Cf. Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, VI, 148; Immisch, *Papst Innozenz XI.*

[32] The "signature" is a sort of rescript sent without any seal, under the simple signature of the Pope or of his delegate. We must distinguish between the signature of justice and the signature of grace. The former is issued in matters of dispute; the latter in matters of favor.

it may be." This would be a simple "philosophical sin." The other Jesuit held that, "for an act to be moral, it is enough that it tends to its final end in an interpretive way, without a person being ever obliged to love that end." Such propositions seemed to repeat errors condemned by Alexander VII and Innocent XI.[33] The Jansenist party became indignant. A lively controversy began. Antoine Arnauld denounced the propositions. By a decree of August 24, 1690, Alexander VIII pronounced the first proposition erroneous and scandalous, the second one heretical.[34]

The Pope was no less attentive to defend the rights of the Holy See against the encroachments of regalian Gallicanism. In this matter Innocent XI had prepared the way. "However, the Pope and the King remained in a sort of effective neutrality. Alexander waited until he was on his deathbed to publish the bull *Inter multiplices* (August 4, 1690),[35] and he adjured Louis XIV, whose Catholic sentiments were well known to him, to accept the bull favorably. In fact, the King successfully opened negotiations with Alexander's successor, resulting in an honorable peace." [36]

Alexander VIII died on February 1, 1691, at the age of almost eighty-one years, after warmly urging the cardinals to think only of the Church in the discussions of the next conclave. On a single point he had not been faithful to the directions of his great predecessor: by his fatal condescension toward his relatives, the plague of nepotism, which Innocent XI had attempted to destroy, reappeared. The consequences of such a weakness might be incalculable and might endanger the results of all his efforts for the defense of the Church if the condition were not promptly remedied.

[33] See Denzinger, nos. 1101, 1155, 1156, 1157.
[34] See Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, I, 748–51.
[35] *Bullarium*, IX, 38.
[36] Hemmer, art. "Alexandre VIII" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, I, 748.

Probably this thought guided the choice of the sacred college in the election of his successor: one of the first acts of Innocent XII was the publication of a severe bull against nepotism.

Innocent XII (1691–1700)

Antonio Pignatelli, who assumed the tiara on July 16, 1691 [37] under the name of Innocent XII, issued from one of the most illustrious families of Naples. Made a prelate in 1635 by Urban VIII, when he was barely twenty years old, sent as inquisitor to Malta, then as nuncio to Florence by Innocent X, then to Poland by Alexander VII and to Austria by Clement IX, Antonio Pignatelli had passed his whole life in the highest offices without losing any of his simplicity and humility. This grave and gentle old man seemed, according to Muratori's expression, to bear "the soul of a Roman emperor," which Christian mildness had penetrated.[38]

At the very outset of his pontificate he gathered about himself a large number of the poor and said: "Here are my nephews." To put an end to nepotism, he published (June 23, 1692) a constitution by which, "in conformity with the holy canons, which forbid bishops to enrich their relatives with the goods of the Church," he declared that he was imposing an inviolable rule, not only for himself, but for all succeeding popes. This rule provided that no pope, under any pretext whatever, not even as recompense for services, should dispose of any goods or office of the Roman Church in favor of his relatives or friends. He says expressly: "If the head of the Church has some poor relatives, he will grant them relief in the same way that he would strangers." Furthermore, to forestall every such temptation, all offices, whether civil, military, or ecclesiastical, that were ordi-

[37] He had been elected July 12, 1691.

[38] Muratori, *Annali*, XI, 343.

narily conferred on nephews of the pope, were suppressed. The constitution also prescribed that all new cardinals and all future popes should swear to observe its provisions.[39]

With this great danger averted, Innocent devoted his attention to putting an end to the differences that had arisen between Rome and the French court. After two years of negotiations, he had the happiness of seeing the French bishops declare to him that they held as non-existing the declarations of the Assembly of 1682. "The French monarch, by a letter to the Pope dated September 14, 1693, revoked the edict published upon the declaration of the clergy of France in regard to the ecclesiastical power." [40]

Innocent XII also had to decide the controversy which had sprung up between Bossuet and Fénelon over the book, *Les maximes des saints*. The edifying submission of the Archbishop of Cambrai in this affair prompted a special brief, full of joy and thanksgiving to God for the happy termination of that regrettable quarrel. The conversion of Frederick Augustus, elector of Saxony, brought the Pontiff another consolation. This return of a ruler whose domains had been the scene of the first advance of the Protestant heresy seemed to be a fine augury for the future. But the conciliating briefs which the Pontiff published on the subject of Jansenism did not obtain all the results that Innocent hoped for. When, in the spring of 1700, the Pope was stricken with the illness that would soon be fatal, the Jansenist party again began to act in a disturbing manner. At the same time, sad news came from China, where the unfortunate conflict between the Dominicans and the Jesuits was becoming worse and was threatening to endanger the future of the missions. When about to leave this world (September 27, 1700), Innocent XII could realize that, in spite of all his labors, he was leaving a heavy burden to his successor.

[39] *Bullarium*, IX, 260–63.
[40] Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, VI, 159.

CHAPTER IX

Protestantism

PROTESTANTISM, officially recognized by the contracting parties of the Treaty of Westphalia, had beheld its newly formed dogmas and discipline break up in consequence of the dissolving principles that it contained within itself. Although Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin had arrogated to themselves the right to separate from Rome while still remaining Christians, who would forbid their followers to separate from these new leaders while still remaining Protestants? However, the conquering ambitions of the heresy were not dead. In Germany we see it, with Leibnitz, try to establish between its different faiths a ground of common understanding; with Spener it will try to find an internal restoration by piety. In England, with Cromwell, it will set itself up as a political institution. In France it will rely on the Edict of Nantes to constitute a state within the state. Everywhere it will insinuate its spirit of religious individualism and social revolution.

The Crisis in Germany

Nowhere was Protestantism's internal crisis more acute than in Luther's fatherland. Founded on the two contradictory principles of a profession of Christian faith and of private interpretation, did the Reformed Churches make choice of the formula of faith? In that event, they oppressed freedom of conscience under an authority more intolerable than that of the Catholics, because they could not invoke the same supernatural guaranties.

Did they rely rather on private interpretation? They would thus render any formula of faith unstable and would soon witness its disappearance.

The sincere believers grieved at seeing the work of the Reformation crumble and dissolve. The German patriots suffered from the damage which such divisions inflicted on the cause of the Germanic fatherland, and they envied the strength which the unity of religion gave to Catholic France. The peril was the greater because the political and social crisis brought on by the dissolution of the Holy Empire and the development of a new aristocracy, was accentuated by the penetration of Roman law into the German laws and jurisprudence. The influence of the jurists, so powerful in Italy and France for three centuries past, had thus far respected the Christianized German law. But at length it was introduced there, and the consequences of that introduction had been lamentable. The absolutism of the princes, the substitution of governmental officials for the municipal powers and the diets, the military collection of the taxes, the deterioration of the condition of the serfs, to whom was applied the legislation relating to the Roman slaves, all these ought to be regarded as the results of the new law.

Under such conditions, to restore the Christian spirit in all its might appeared, even in the eyes of mere statesmen, as the most pressing need. But how could Protestantism, divided and weakened, be given the cohesion and strength that it lacked? Among the men who were concerned with this regeneration, two currents of ideas developed. Some dreamed of rallying on a ground of common beliefs all the Reformed Churches and, if need be, the Catholic Church itself: their system was called syncretism. Others, giving up any hope of an agreement on a dogmatic formula, wondered whether it might not be possible to restore unity by the single means of an intensity of Christian life; they founded Pietism. The two movements eventually found their leaders. The extensive and syncretist movement

had its most illustrious representative in Leibnitz, and the intensive and Pietist movement had Spener as its apostle.

The syncretist movement is an old one in Protestantism. The syncretists of the seventeenth century, like those of our day, always appealed to the name of Melanchthon, who, in the Augsburg Confession, deluded himself with the hope of uniting in one faith both Catholics and Protestants. In the first half of the seventeenth century a professor of Helmstedt University, Calixt by name, took up Melanchthon's idea with greater precision and proposed a basis of Christian faith that would unite Lutherans, Calvinists, Greeks, and Catholics: it was the *Consensus quinquesaecularis,* or symbol of the councils of the first five centuries. In 1646 he wrote: "I do not wish to conceal the fact that for many years I have had at heart the ecclesiastical concord; I have thought that by this concord the Church would be led back to its ancient state, and that the general commonwealth of the Christian world could be saved from death." [1]

Such words, frequently repeated before large audiences in that Helmstedt University, which in 1630 counted more than 16,000 students, did not remain fruitless.[2] But this doctrine was vigorously opposed by the theologians of Lutheranism, who charged Calixt with "crypto-Calvinism." Syncretism persisted scarcely anywhere except in the University, where it had been officially taught. A disciple of Calixt, one Molanus, a Protestant pastor, whom Duke John Frederick of Brunswick had appointed president of the consistory of his capital, became its defender. From 1674 to 1694 "a tentative religious union, which has not yet been the object of historical research, stirred official Germany under the impulse of the bishop of Neustadt, Christopher Royas, of the Spinola family." [3]

Of a sudden the question entered a new phase and assumed

[1] Henke, *Die Universität Helmstädt,* I, 3.
[2] Baruzi, *Leibniz et l'organisation religieuse de la terre,* p. 258.
[3] Baruzi, *Leibniz,* in the collection *Pensée chrétienne,* p. 36.

great importance when, in December, 1676, a young philosopher, summoned by Duke John Frederick, arrived in the city of Hanover. His fame had already spread over Europe.[4] It was William Leibnitz.

The Duke, recently converted to Catholicism,[5] had to govern Protestants. This duty was full of difficulties and was a matter of continual concern to the ruler. Since 1667 an Italian priest named Maccioni, entrusted with the direction of religious affairs, had labored at the preparation of a restoration of Catholicism in Hanover. But his efforts, often indiscreet, aroused vigorous protests. At his death (August, 1676) many converts returned to Protestantism. John Frederick dreamed of a work of pacification. No one was more disposed to second him in that work than Leibnitz, still much impressed from his conversations with Malebranche, Spinoza, the "Great Arnauld," Father de la Chaise, the learned Huet, and the famous Huygens. At Paris, at London, at The Hague, he had associated, without discrimination, with Protestants and Catholics, with the Jesuits and the men of Port Royal. Everything seemed to increase his enthusiasm for this question of the union of the Christian Churches. Leibnitz, one of the most representative geniuses that positive and dreamy Germany has produced,[6] enamored alike of minute analyses and of grandiose syntheses, seemed organized for the attempt to resolve into unity all the superficial oppositions [7] and to see everything in large perspective. At the time when he appeared, the Spanish and Portuguese discoveries had opened almost infinite perspectives to a world that was still agitated by the Renaissance ideas. The notion of a world transformation, in the religious order as well as in the political order,

[4] "He returned to Germany, enveloped in one of those grandiose legends that hide an indiscreet curiosity" (Baruzi, *op. cit.*, p. 25).

[5] He abjured Protestantism in 1651.

[6] He was born June 21, 1646, at Leipzig. His family was of Slav origin. Cf. Tannery, art. "Leibniz" in the *Grande Encyclopédie.*

[7] Cf. Baruzi, *Leibniz et l'organisation religieuse de la terre,* p. 238.

captivated this powerful mind. He thought of a broadened and renovated Christianity. In his early youth, in his father's library where he browsed at pleasure, his encyclopedic tastes were awakened. As he himself said, he took pleasure in the writings of Calixt.[8] His conversations with Molanus, Spinola, and Duke John Frederick fixed his attention on the problem that Calixt had proposed. His interviews with the diplomats soon convinced him that the desire of the Duke of Brunswick was shared by most of the rulers of Germany.[9]

When asked by the Duke of Hanover to begin the work, Leibnitz undertook to get in touch with some Catholic personages of authority. Among his correspondents the principal ones were Pellisson, a convert from Protestantism since 1670, the Abbess of Maubuisson, and especially Bossuet, the bishop of Meaux.

The controversy between Bishop Spinola and the Protestant pastor Molanus, so far as we can judge from the few available documents, did not go beyond some equivocal generalities. These referred to three points: an agreement or understanding on a few easy questions, reservation to a future council of difficult questions, and meanwhile intercommunion of the different faiths through submission to the infallible authority of the Church represented by a council. But a fundamental question remained in suspense: how the future council should be composed. Should Protestants be admitted to it? Would it be authorized to review the decisions of the Council of Trent?

But these were precisely the questions that, from the outset of his discussions, Leibnitz seemed to ignore or at least to attempt avoiding at any price. The representative of John Frederick strove to find a basis of agreement in another direc-

[8] "When scarcely more than a child I used to browse at will in my father's library. . . . I took much pleasure in the writings of Calixtus" (quoted by Baruzi, *op. cit.*, p. 191).

[9] Almost every page of the Treaty of Westphalia shows the desire for the union. See particularly the Treaty of Osnabrück, Art. V, nos. 14, 24, 48.

tion. He held that it was derived from tradition. He wrote: "God does not refuse His grace to those who do what they can.[10] This maxim is common to the theologians. . . . Moreover, certainly the theologians commonly distinguish between material heretics and formal heretics; the latter they condemn, but not the former." [11] "But a Protestant who, mistaken about the fact, does not believe that the Council of Trent was ecumenical, would be only a material heretic." [12]

It was to Pellisson that Leibnitz wrote these lines. Pellisson was one of the most charming men of his time. He was twenty years older than the philosopher of Hanover. His four-years imprisonment in the Bastille had been for him an occasion for prolonged meditation on the loftiest questions of religion. From this experience he kept a sober and austere piety which, however, in no way changed the amiable qualities of his character. On his return to the court, he resumed his former polished manners, which delighted those about him. The exquisite tone of his first letters charmed the German philosopher.[13] In a most gracious manner, Pellisson had consented to pursue the discussion on the grounds which the philosopher prepared for him. He wrote: "It is not by the authority of the Council of Trent that we urge the Protestants to become Catholics, but by the authority of all the Catholic Churches, which constitute only one." [14]

Of course; but to argue thus was, with a view of not offending Leibnitz and the Protestants, merely to push the difficulty further back. For would they grant that the Council of Trent represented all the "Catholic Churches"? And what was to be understood by those two words? The discussion continued.

[10] *Facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam.* Letter to John Frederick (1677), published by Stein, *Leibniz und Spinoza,* p. 300.

[11] Leibniz, *Œuvres* (Foucher de Careil ed.), I, 127.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 129.

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 126.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 140.

Other personages entered into it. The abbess of Maubuisson, Louise Hollandine, sister of the Palatine Anne of Gonzaga, that famous princess herself, then the spiritual Madame de Brinon, long the confidante of Madame de Maintenon at Saint Cyr; lastly, the queen of "learned" ladies, Mlle de Scudéry.[15]

Such are the surprising figures we meet along with Pellisson in this correspondence undertaken for the union of the Churches. In it we feel the weakening of Leibnitz' genius. The Duke de Broglie says: "A tone of playful affectation, an ill-timed display of literary and philosophical subtlety, the pleasure of carrying on a discussion rather than a desire to reach a conclusion, are unfortunately only too evident in all that came from his pen during this second period. You might say that he relished the prolongation of a situation which procured for him such flattering advances and which, without committing him to anyone, deluded him with fine compliments." [16]

But of a sudden the intervention of a new correspondent altered the character of the discussion and, as with a breath, upset the scaffold of the combinations imagined by Leibnitz and his amiable controversialists. Did they, or did they not, accept the Council of Trent? Leibnitz was told: "No hope for the reunion exists so long as Trent's discussions on faith are regarded as in suspense. Therefore some declarations conformable to the decrees of the Council must be fixed upon . . . or another time or other dispositions on the part of the Protestants must be awaited." [17] He who spoke thus was the Bishop of Meaux. He had, in fact, not been a stranger to the preceding controversies. Madame de Brinon, the most active and most serious leader of the little feminine congress, had communicated to him several important documents of the affair.

The great Bishop waited for the opportune moment to let fall

[15] De Broglie in the *Correspondant*, LI, 230.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Leibniz, *op. cit.*, II, 501. The date of the letter is June 25, 1693.

from his pen the terrible dilemma, with the full weight of his genius and from the height of his episcopal office. Leibnitz, not accustomed to being treated so frankly, could not suppress a feeling of surprise and vexation. He complained "of the haughtiness of the Bishop of Meaux," "of the attitude of superiority that eloquence and authority give to great men." [18] Soon, with incomparable suavity, he tried to resume, under various forms, the two arguments on which his whole dialectic rested: that the Council of Trent represented the Church, is not certain; even if the Council of Trent has the authority which Rome gives it, the Protestants refuse it this authority in good faith and with sincerity of heart. He wrote: "The reasons of our persuasions are of two kinds: some are explicable, the others inexplicable. Those I call explicable can be proposed to other persons by a distinct process of reasoning; but the inexplicable reasons consist solely in our conscience or perception, and in an experience of inward feeling into which we cannot make others enter." [19] Bossuet refused to enter into a consideration of these psychological questions. It is a fact, he replied, that the Council of Trent is accepted by all Catholics. "On this point full accord is found in France and in Germany, as also in Italy and in Spain: this unanimous agreement establishes the undeniable reception of the Council in all that concerns the faith." What purpose is served by alleging the good faith of the Protestants in their resistance to the Council? This good faith can make them excusable in the eyes of God; it does not open for them the gates of the visible Church.

During an interval of three years (1693–96), when we may say that Bossuet is tired of making the same reply to the tireless argumentation of his opponent, Leibnitz continued the discussion with Madame de Brinon alone. Perhaps nowhere else did he put more of his soul or better reveal the depth of his complex

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 377.
[19] *Ibid.*, I, 127–35.

thought, in which objective diplomacy is so often mingled with subjective religious concern. He does not hide from Madame de Brinon any of his grievances against Catholicism. She, on her side, makes no attempt to conceal the anxiety she feels for the salvation of the Protestants. They exhort each other. She begs him to give himself a month of reflection in solitude and recollection. He eludes the suggestion by replying: "What is a month, Madame, compared with the many years I have employed in this endeavor since the age of twenty-two?" [20]

But Leibnitz was a philosopher besides being a diplomat. While he was opening his soul to Madame de Brinon and was carrying on his discussion with Bossuet, he resorted to measures of expediency which were "artifices of a double loyalty." [21] The first was to conclude negotiations with Louis XIV over the head of the Bishop of Meaux; the second was the publication, under the name and appearances of a Catholic scholar, of a study in which, proceeding from thoroughly orthodox principles, he advanced to the most extreme concessions. The book appeared under the title of *Judicium doctoris catholici.* But Louis XIV, an old man, worn out with these religious disputes, thought he would do well to communicate to Bossuet himself the propositions advanced by the philosopher of Hanover. And there the matter rested. Some conferences likewise undertaken by Leibnitz with various leaders of the Protestant Churches had no further results, in spite of the activity of William of Orange, who declared that he had decided "to give all his attention to this work." [22]

Such an undertaking ill accorded with that which aimed at a union between Protestants and Catholics, for that very William of Orange wrote: "Our whole right in Great Britain is in the exclusion and detestation of the Roman religion." An accord

[20] *Ibid.*, II, 24, 85.
[21] *Correspondant,* LI, 235.
[22] Baruzi, *op. cit.*, pp. 350–52.

based on a community of hatred was sure to be unstable and barren. Both undertakings of Leibnitz failed. In 1701 people no longer talked of either of them. The philosopher and diplomat seemed even to fear the resumption of a project of union with the Catholics. "All the rights of the house of Hanover," he wrote, "are based solely on the hatred and exclusion of the Catholic Church: therefore everything must be avoided that would indicate only slight zeal against the Romanists." The cares of the statesman, always mingled in him with the cares of the man of religion, at length supplanted the latter. Therein especially must be sought the cause of the failure of a negotiation conducted by two men of genius, rather than in the haughty tone of the Bishop of Meaux. Moreover, perhaps it is chimerical to count on general movements for a return to religious unity. History shows us many apostasies en masse, but very few collective conversions.

Pietism

At the time when these projects of union were under way, a certain number of Protestants, concerned over the future of their Churches and over the safeguarding of the Christian spirit, thought they had found the final form of their beliefs in Pietism. The chief representative of the pietist movement at the end of the seventeenth century was Jacob Spener, whose name deserves an important place in the religious history of Germany. In the words of Franz Werner, "Modern Protestant Germany, so far as it rests on supernatural foundations, is marked with the intellectual seal of Spener more than that of Luther." [23]

In its basis and primary inspiration, the pietist movement, like the syncretist movement, goes back to the very origins of Protestantism. Whereas the syncretists always appealed to the

[23] Werner, art. "Spener" in *Kirchenlexikon.*

authority of Melanchthon, the Pietists claimed that of the name of Schwenkfeld. As the theories of Melanchthon had been developed at the beginning of the seventeenth century by Calixt, those of Schwenkfeld were taken up again at that same time by Johann Arndt, whose ideas would exercise a determinant influence on Jacob Spener. Arndt, a tender and mystic soul, from his youth was nourished on the *Imitation of Christ,* and on the works of St. Bernard and Tauler. In 1606 and 1608 appeared his important work, *Wahren Christenthum* ("True Christianity").[24] In four books, entitled *The Book of Scripture, The Book of Life, The Book of Conscience,* and *The Book of Nature,* he glorified the life of prayer, the pardon of offenses, the hatred for sin, the practical love of neighbor, the spirit of humility and poverty, forgetfulness of self, and complete abandonment to the will of God.[25] His language was simple, pithy, full of unction. All that he said on these subjects was almost entirely Catholic. He even advised external worship. "For God to be aroused," he said, "He has no need of our calls; but man, indolent and lax, needs to be led to the thought of God by external worship." Johann Arndt's whole mysticism rested on the Lutheran doctrine of justification.[26]

He put Luther in the same rank as the Fathers of the Church and the apostles.[27] But, as he did not insult the Roman Church and as he broke with Protestant Scholasticism, the orthodox Lutherans heaped abuse on him. Osiander spoke of his writings as containing "the most monstrous mixture of papist, Manichaean, Pelagian, and Calvinist heresies." According to Osiander, Arndt "had written at the dictation of Satan; he had drunk the infected and foul water where the papists slaked their thirst." These attacks did not prevent the success of the book.

[24] *Wahren Christenthum.* Translated under the title *True Christianity.*

[25] Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* VII, 656.

[26] For his explicit declarations, see *True Christianity,* I, xxix; Bk. I, chaps. 5, 19, 34, 41; Bk. II, chaps. 1, 2, 3.

[27] *Ibid.,* I, 300 (Bk. I, chap. 39).

No human writing, if we except the *Imitation,* has been reprinted more often than Arndt's *True Christianity.*[28] A Latin translation, printed in 1687 without any author's name, spread in this form among Catholics.

Jacob Spener (1635–1705)

The agitations and disturbances brought on by the Thirty Years' War put a stop to the surge of the pietist movement. But after the Peace of Westphalia, a man who combined the tender piety of a mystic and the organizing genius of a statesman gave it a fresh impulse. His name was Philip Jacob Spener. He was born in 1635 at Rappoltsweiler in Alsace, was brought up in the family of Count von Rappolstein, where his father was tutor. There he received lessons from the most distinguished teachers of his time, among others the famous Hebraist Buxtorf. His extensive acquaintance with literature, philosophy, theology, and Oriental languages seemed to destine him for one of the highest posts in the teaching of the universities. His special competence in the science of heraldry and genealogy brought him into relation with the greatest nobility of Germany.

But the profound impression made on his religious soul by the death of his benefactress, Countess von Rappolstein, and then, shortly after, the reading of the sermons of Tauler and especially his reading of Arndt's *True Christianity,* finally turned him toward piety. Appointed chief pastor at Frankfort-on-Main, he devoted himself wholly to the apostolate of the poor, visiting their homes, preaching the gospel to them, appeal-to the lords for a mitigation of their wretchedness. Soon he acquired a remarkable influence among the people. His doctrines did not appreciably differ from those of Arndt. But, better than his predecessors, he understood the need of organizing the

[28] Mangenot, art. "Arndt" in *Dict. de théol.*

religious life. From the outset of his apostolate, he started catechism classes to prepare the faithful for the reception of confirmation, and pious societies for the laity and for the pastors. His complete plan for organization was not revealed until 1675 by the publication of his *Pia desideria.*[29]

The principal aims of the celebrated pietist pastor were the following: the organization of a simple instruction in accordance with a short catechism, in the form of questions and answers;[30] the diffusion of the works of Thomas a Kempis, Tauler, and the *German Theology;* the abandonment of scholastic and rational theology; the formation of a body of well prepared pastors, some of whom would cultivate high philosophy, whereas the others would preach with apostolic simplicity; lastly, the foundation of special associations, called *Collegia pietatis,* for the laity, and *Collegia philobiblica* for the clergy. Spener's book had a prodigious success. Germany became covered with *Collegia pietatis.* But the official doctors of Lutheranism were no gentler with him than they had been with his precursor, Johann Arndt. His refusal to condemn the writings of Jacob Boehme and to disavow the manner of life of the latter's followers drew down upon him the almost unanimous disapproval of the theologians. He had to flee from Frankfort to Strasbourg, from Strasbourg to Dresden, and from Dresden to Berlin, where he died in 1705, convinced of the near approach of the kingdom of God. Modern Protestants regard him as "the Father of Pietism," [31] and Catholics recognize in him "one of the noblest and purest characters that Protestantism has produced." [32]

Pietism declined after Spener's death. Two of his disciples,

[29] Spener's *Pia desideria* appeared first in 1675 as a preface to Arndt's *Wahren Christenthum;* in 1678 it was published separately at Paris.

[30] In 1677 he himself published a little catechism, which he called *Simple Explanation of Christian Doctrine.*

[31] Bonifas, *Hist. des dogmes de l'Eglise chrétienne,* p. 491.

[32] Werner, art. "Spener" in *Kirchenlexikon.*

Christian Hochman and Gerhard Tersteegen, tried to continue his work in the same spirit. Their personal influence on the people was considerable. Hochman preached most often in the open air, in the fields, and "when he spoke," say the contemporary reports, "his hearers thought they saw the aurora of eternity rising." [33] Tersteegen led the life of a poor man; from him we have some touching prayers. But a third disciple, Dippel by name, discredited the master's doctrine by his ridiculous behavior and his questionable morals. The people, who had called the followers of Hochman "fine fasters," called the followers of Dippel "fine feasters."

The eighteenth century witnessed the complete decline of Pietism in Germany. Impelled to rally about a doctrine, the Pietists divided into three schools: that of Samuel Collenbrusch, who tried to subordinate dogma to religious practice and succeeded in ruining the Lutheran doctrine bit by bit; the school of Kohlbrugge, who attempted to subordinate religious practice to the Lutheran dogma of justification by faith alone and succeeded merely in discouraging piety. A third school, that founded by the curious visionary Elias Eller, led to the most grotesque and tragic scenes.

Pietism spread in different parts of Europe and America with numerous ramifications. With Emmanuel Zinzendorf, the founder of the Moravian Brethren, it reached even Greenland and Labrador; with John Wesley, the father of the Methodists, it became established especially in England; with Swedenborg it reached America and won many followers in Sweden and in Russia, where the famous Baroness von Kruedener, who exercised considerable influence on Emperor Alexander and on the Holy Alliance, became the ardent apostle of its doctrines. In spite of everything, Pietism would be perpetuated in the German people. Its influence on the mind of Kant is well known.

[33] Philipps and Goerres, *Historich politiche Blaetter,* XLII, 25.

Leibnitz and Spener made great efforts to reconstruct the religious unity of Protestantism. The failure of this attempt encouraged the rationalist movement. Leibnitz' chief disciple, Wolff, stressed the naturalist tendency of his master. Kautzen, a Lutheran theologian, held that the Bible ought to be replaced by conscience. Semler, Mendelssohn, Lessing, and Herder went even farther in the same direction. We have no right to say that the rationalist current of the eighteenth century belongs strictly to France. German Protestantism contributed a considerable affluent to this current.

Protestantism in England

By various routes English Protestantism gave rise to a similar result. A man of deep mind, or at least of amazing political cleverness, would break up the Anglican Church such as it had been established by the long efforts of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth. But the Puritan Reformation of Oliver Cromwell would in turn collapse and leave, on the soil of the United Kingdom, only a division of sects, some having the character of dubious illuminism, the others of a disturbing rationalism, both of them alongside a mysterious society that would become their powerful auxiliary.

In 1648, at the time when the Treaty of Westphalia was concluded, Great Britain, not a party to this treaty, was both powerful and very disturbed. By her strong administrative and financial organization, which she owed to Queen Elizabeth, by the expansion of her frontiers, which now embraced Scotland, and by the number and importance of her colonies, England took her place in the front rank of European powers. The United Kingdom—so called after the annexation of Scotland—was, of all the European states, the one that could most confidently, in the face of foreign powers, count on the loyalty of all its citizens.

Charles I

However, since the middle of the seventeenth century, the internal dissensions, political and religious, were such as might presage a revolution. Charles I, then reigning, was not altogether that "just, moderate, and magnanimous king," with no fault except clemency, whose portrait Bossuet traced with an embellishment of eloquence, at the time when a great misfortune brought that monarch much respect. The successor of James I was, indeed, not without moral and intellectual qualities that commanded esteem, and the noble attitude with which he died showed the fundamental loftiness of his soul. But, through a false principle of government or a weakness of character, he made the mistake of carrying the exercise of absolute power to arbitrary extremes and of carrying diplomacy to the point of duplicity. One day in the House of Commons, Cromwell, without arousing the indignation of his hearers, declared that the king was intelligent, but the most persistent of liars. Married to a Catholic princess, Henrietta Maria of France, daughter of Henry IV, he was said to have endeavored to win acceptance for this marriage by persecution of the Queen's coreligionists.

Two facts of James I's reign had already aggravated the situation of the Catholics: the oath of allegiance had divided them, and the Gunpowder Plot had, in the cleverly prepared public mind, attributed to them the crime of a few isolated gentlemen. Under Charles I, during the long strifes between the authority of the king and that of the Parliament, between the Established Church and the Puritan Church, the Catholics received blows from both sides at once and were the target of political schemes of the one and the fanaticism of the other. The severest of their trials came from the oath against transubstantiation, which the King, always concerned with effacing the impression produced by his Catholic marriage, imposed on

them under penalty of the confiscation of two-thirds of their property. However, their attitude was admirable. The Catholics had never been sparing in their testimonies of loyalty to the king's authority. In the war declared by Parliament, they resolutely took their stand on the side of the traditional monarchy. This loyal policy was fatal for them. After the King's defeat, they were naturally reckoned among the foes of the new order of things and were treated with new rigors.

Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658)

The man who assumed the direction of the English government after the death of Charles I was Oliver Cromwell. Should we regard him as a sort of hero, soaring above other men by the prodigy of his genius and of his will, as Thomas Carlyle would have us believe?[34] Should we not rather, in agreement with David Hume,[35] consider him a fiery fanatic? Recently a certain writer has maintained that he was in all respects a mediocre statesman, and that merely the events made him appear great.[36] Should we accept as final Bossuet's judgment, that Cromwell was "a moving and daring spirit who seems to have been born to change the world" and that he was "an accomplished hypocrite as well as a clever politician"? We cannot in a brief summary express all the aspects of that complex and unhealthy nature, such as it appears to us in the latest historical inquiries.[37]

Cromwell was born in 1599, of a country gentleman, on the bank of the Ouse River, not far from Cambridge, in a region where prophets and visionaries were not rare. He belonged to

[34] Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes and Hero Worship.*

[35] Hume, *History of England,* year 1658.

[36] Filon in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (November 15, 1902) and *Journal des Débats* (November 26, 1902). "Olivier is not a man of genius; he is not even a man of superior talent." (Filon, *Journal des Débats, loc. cit.*).

[37] John Morley, *Oliver Cromwell.* Cf. art. "Cromwell" in the *Dictionary of National Biography.*

the family of that Thomas Cromwell, first Lord Essex and minister of Henry VIII, who contributed so much to the establishment of Episcopalianism in England and the absolute power of royalty. These two institutions were precisely the ones against which Oliver Cromwell would direct all his strength. His early education seems to have been limited almost entirely to the reading of the Bible and to hearing Evangelical sermons. The somewhat crude literary style of his correspondence [38] indicates the incomplete character of his education.

At the age of twenty, following some youthful fault, a sudden change toward austerity took place in him. The fear of God, the dread of hell, then the feeling of grace, the assurance of salvation, the fixed idea of holiness, a holiness of which he thenceforth became the ideal according to his own experience, and which later he wished to impose on all who came in contact with him: such were the feelings that determined and accompanied what he called his conversion.

In 1628, when he was barely twenty-nine years old, he appeared in Parliament, a man careless about his clothes, with an enormous head, broad shoulders, and fiery countenance. By his rustic manners and by his features, now jovial and now surly, he was quite at variance with the brilliant knights trained at the sumptuous court of Queen Elizabeth. He was a poor speaker. But when he was shaken by violent feeling, his voice, habitually low and shrill, became thundering and impassioned.[39] The prestige of his name, which Protestant England had not forgotten, was added to that of his words. As his ideas were simple in their expression and radical in their tendency, he soon became the head of a party. His aim was the triumph of real Protestantism, of that which Luther had sketched and which Calvin and Fox had perfected. Between Christ and the indi-

[38] Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.*

[39] Sir Philips Warwick, in his *Memoirs,* relates the impression made on him by Cromwell in Parliament.

vidual man, no intermediaries: this is the fundamental principle that he took from Luther.

Moreover, in the work of justification and salvation which Christ operates in man, grace must be regarded as something felt and impossible to be lost, as Fox and Calvin taught. The man who is justified and assured of his justification, is the saint. The saint must triumph. Force cannot be better employed than in fighting for holiness. But the great force is the army. A religion organized in a military way; an army marching, obeying, and maneuvering at a religious command: that was Cromwell's ideal. One of his contemporaries describes the army assembled by the celebrated agitator to fight Charles I. He says: "Sometimes these soldiers come to a halt to hear a sermon; sometimes they sing psalms while drilling. Some captains were heard to cry out: 'Take aim. Fire. In the name of the Lord.' Each roll of the drum had a biblical name. An officer said: Drum St. Matthew's call to arms; or the general call of the Apocalypse."

Such was the army that became Cromwell's instrument to overthrow the kingship of Charles I in England, then to establish his own dictatorship there, to organize it and defend it. Between Luther—the mystical Protestant, whose ambition was limited to reforming the Church—and Jean Jacques Rousseau —the social Protestant, whose aim was nothing less than the transformation of society—Cromwell was the political Protestant, whose ideas were translated into governmental institutions.

We must recognize that the events served the strange fortune of this man. The English Church of Henry VIII—that Catholicism without a pope and subject to a king—successively undermined by Lutheran infiltrations, broke up under the influence of an internal logic. They began by saying: No pope. They ended by saying: No priest. Moreover, public opinion, seeing the reaction, had been so long wearied with the

pomp of pretentious cavaliers, with their big plumes and long swords, that it turned agreeably to these austere Puritans, who marched wearing somber cloaks, a Bible in their hand. The King's policy of expediency was driving him more and more to arbitrary measures and was making his absolute power odious. The religious authority, like the political authority, seemed to offer itself to anyone who would have a strong enough hand and a great enough daring to seize it. Cromwell, backed by his Puritan army, had that daring and that strength.

We know how, on December 6 and 7, 1648, took place the purge of the English Parliament. An officer of Cromwell's army, stationed at the door of the House of Commons, with a proscription list in his hand, informed eighty members of the Parliament of their exclusion. The minority remaining, trembling and docile, voted the charges against the King. Charles, convicted by a so-called court of justice, met his death on January 30, 1649, with such nobility that history is tempted to forget the faults of his life. A few days later the abolition of the kingship and of the peerage was proclaimed. England became a republic, and Cromwell, with the title of Protector, became its all-powerful dictator.

Cromwell's Government

Cromwell made use of his unlimited power to impose his ideal. He said that the saints, meaning his friends the Puritans, were destined to govern the world; everyone must be subject to the saints. But, to assure the supremacy of the saints, first papism, Episcopalianism, and Presbyterianism must be crushed. This task the clever party chief set out to accomplish at the beginning of his political career, and he proceeded to execute it with a knowing and calculated method. The destruction of "papism" was the first of these aims. The mere word "papism" had something magical about it and inflamed the

passions of the English Protestants. From the time that Oliver Cromwell acquired the preponderance in the deliberations of the Parliament,

> scarcely a day occurred in which some order of ordinance, local or general, was not issued by the two houses; and very few of these, even on the most indifferent subjects, were permitted to pass without the assertion that the war had been originally provoked and was still continued by the papists, for the sole purpose of the establishment of popery on the ruins of Protestantism. The constant repetition acted on the minds of the people as a sufficient proof of the charge; and the denials, the protestations, the appeals to heaven made by the King, were disregarded and condemned as unworthy artifices, adopted to deceive the credulous and unwary. Under such circumstances, the Catholics found themselves exposed to insult and persecution wherever the influence of the Parliament extended.[40]

The ruin of the Episcopalian Church was the second aim pursued by the tireless agitator. He took advantage of the irritation aroused among the people by the rigorous sanctions which certain prelates employed, and he profited by the scandal which their excessive luxury provoked. In Parliament he directed a campaign of speeches and of all kinds of publications against the episcopate. A commission, presided over by a military officer, the Count of Manchester, was charged with "purifying" the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In Cambridge University alone the number of exclusions rose to two hundred. Several, through fear, resigned from their position.[41]

The Presbyterians remained to be dealt with. More formidable because of the connections they had in the popular masses, but compromised in the regime that was crumbling bit by bit, they had allied themselves with the Independent Puritans in the struggle which the latter had just been sustain-

[40] John Lingard, *History of England* (10 vol. ed.), VIII, 70.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

ing against the royalty, papism, and Episcopalianism. Moreover, they prevailed over the Independents by their number and social authority. "They possessed an overwhelming majority in the assembly, the senate, the city, and the army; the solemn league and covenant had enlisted the whole Scottish nation in their cause." [42] Cromwell faced the difficulties of the strife and was not discouraged. After all, the Independents, the "saints," had on their side, besides their claim to divine right to govern the world, the energy that is derived from absolute confidence in a cause and in a leader.

> They never exceeded a dozen in the assembly; but these were veteran disputants, eager, fearless, and persevering, whose attachment to their favorite doctrines had been riveted by persecution and exile. . . . The very nature of the contest between the king and the parliament was calculated to predispose the mind in favour of their principles. It taught men to distrust the claims of authority, to exercise their own judgment on matters of the highest interest, and to spurn the fetters of intellectual as well as of political thraldom. In a short time the Independents were joined by the Antinomians, Anabaptists, Millenarians, Erastians, and the members of many ephemeral sects, whose very names are now forgotten.[43]

By the aid of this party Cromwell made his assault on the Presbyterian Church; with it he invaded Ireland and Scotland. Surrounded by this restless, daring, and revolutionary party, he made his greatest conquests.

But, like Luther, Cromwell soon made acquaintance with the humiliation of revolutionary leaders, when, after releasing the passions of their followers, they see themselves reduced to the necessity of fighting their former most ardent friends and of putting their reliance on their former enemies.

The heat of the battle had notably contributed to turning the Puritan party toward the most radical doctrines. Within it a

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 75.
[43] *Ibid.*

sect was formed, which took the name of Levellers. Lilburn, a demagogue and pamphleteer, had preached community of goods, hatred of the rich, the abolition of all political and religious hierarchy; his arrest stirred up the mass of the people in his favor. Cromwell saw the danger. Lilburn was released; but the Protector crushed pitilessly, in his army, every chief that he suspected of sharing the ideas of the Levellers. We then see him make up to the Presbyterians and promise them his protection. We see him careful not to alienate the various sects of the Illuminated. We see him especially relying on the Jews, whose power was real though hidden. The Jews had been legally expelled from England in 1290 by Edward I. That ordinance had never been revoked. The Protector authorized the Jews to filter back again quietly into England. Soon they filled the commerce and the administration. A contemporary annalist says that soon you might see Cromwell, while conversing with some lord, suddenly break off the conversation to receive a shabby old man who was asking to speak to him. It was a Jew, who had come with a bit of news, some secret of his enemies or of foreign powers.[44]

Cromwell's ambition was never limited to making Puritanism triumph in England. What the saints were predestined to was the government of the world. This is not the place to show how, in foreign policy, he carried the same fanatical and tricky spirit which had assured his triumph in Great Britain. Finally, almost all the monarchies, in spite of the repulsion which a regicide must have inspired in them, rallied to his rule. The Dutch, overcome by him, promised never to give asylum to the Stuarts. Denmark, Sweden, Portugal, concluded treaties of commerce and navigation with him. The King of France and the King of Spain, who were so closely united to the family of the Stuarts by ties of blood, vied with each other for an alliance with Cromwell. What is especially noteworthy, is that in most of these

[44] Guizot, *Histoire de la République d'Angleterre* (2nd ed.), II, 154.

negotiations the idea of religious propaganda was uppermost in the Protector's mind. When he declared for the French alliance in preference to the Spanish alliance, his purpose was not merely to profit by the maritime decadence of Spain, but, as we may well surmise, also to follow the traditional English hatred for the country of the Inquisition and of the Armada. To the same Protestant zeal may be attributed Cromwell's support of the Vaudois against the Duke of Savoy. Even into the depths of Transylvania the hand of Cromwell protected Protestantism. Elizabeth's policy lived again, enlarged and triumphant.

In the midst of this triumph the Protector expired. He died September 3, 1658, not of gall stones, as Pascal says, but of a fever. Says Hume:

> At length the fever increased, and he himself began to entertain some thoughts of death, and to cast his eye towards that future existence, whose idea had once been intimately present to him; though since, in the hurry of affairs and the shock of wars and factions, it had, no doubt, been considerably obliterated. He asked Goodwin, one of his preachers, if the doctrine were true, that the elect could never fall or suffer a final reprobation. "Nothing more certain," replied the preacher. "Then I am safe," said the protector; "for I am sure that once I was in a state of grace." [45]

Charles II (1630–85)

Until William of Orange, England did not see a statesman comparable to Oliver Cromwell. But the Church experienced the most extreme vicissitudes. The government of Cromwell's oldest son, Richard, was insignificant in its character and in its duration, which was less than two years. At his death, England fell into anarchy. General Monk, governor of Scotland, took advantage of the conditions to bring to London, without firing a shot, the pretender Charles Stuart, son of Charles I, who took the name of Charles II.

[45] Hume, *History of England,* V, 485 (year 1658).

Although a Protestant, the new King was married to a Catholic princess of the house of Braganza, a cousin of Louis XIV. Until his coming to the throne he had been backed by the Catholic party [46] and, during his residence in France, he enjoyed close relations with several venerated members of the clergy.[47] These circumstances gave reason to expect that he would be favorable to Catholicism. This hope was soon deceived. Charles II presently showed that he was one of the most shameless libertines of his time. The party of the Cavaliers, which, since the death of Elizabeth, had been supplanted by the party of the Puritans, gathered round a sovereign whose elegant and dissolute manner of life agreed well with their own tendencies. In consequence of the discredit of Puritanism, Anglicanism triumphed. In 1662 the King published the Act of Uniformity by virtue of which two thousand Nonconformist pastors were driven from their posts. In 1665 the Five Mile Act aggravated the persecution: refractory pastors were forbidden to come within five miles of a corporate borough, and were thus effectively prevented from returning to their former parishes.

But the storm soon turned more particularly against the Catholics. In 1672 the King, by virtue of his prerogatives, without consulting Parliament, published a Declaration of Indulgence, which suspended the execution of the penal laws enacted against the Nonconformists. This royal edict has been regarded as a measure in favor of the Catholics, an effect of the alliance between the Stuart king and the Bourbon king. Men's minds were stirred; the hatred for "papism" redoubled. The alleged misdeeds of the Catholics were recalled. In September 1666, an accidental fire had destroyed a considerable part of London. By means of the most absurd accounts, the enemies of the Catholics

[46] "Charles II, in his flight after the battle of Worcester, saw fifty-eight Catholics vow their head to the scaffold to save his" (Destombes, *Histoire de la persécution religieuse sous les successeurs d'Elisabeth*, p. 437).

[47] On the relations of Charles II to Father Olier, see Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier* (4th ed.), II, 323.

succeeded in convincing the people that the disaster was imputable to the Roman Church. "It was said and believed that men had been apprehended carrying with them parcels of an unknown substance, which on compression produced heat and flame; that others had been seen throwing fireballs into houses as they passed along the street; that the foreign enemy had combined with the republicans and papists to burn the city." [48] The repetition of these rumors added to the consternation. In 1673 the Parliament refused to vote the subsidies, having obtained the royal sanction for the Test Act. This measure made the denial of transubstantiation a necessary qualification for office.[49] The chief purpose of the Act was to exclude from all public office the Catholics and in particular the King's brother, James of York, who had just been publicly converted to the Roman faith.

Five years later (1678) an even more odious machination resulted in excluding the King's brother from the Privy Council and in obliging him to leave England. A certain person, Titus Oates, devoid of morals or of good repute, denounced to the Parliament an alleged Popish Plot. It was the strangest story that could come out of a disordered mind. The European monarchs, worked on by their Jesuit confessors, so the story went, had elaborated the project of conquering England so as to establish despotism there and to make it a vassal of the Holy See. Five thousand Catholics, concealed in London, agreed to set the city on fire a second time and to carry out a general massacre of the Protestants. The Jesuits and the Benedictines had reserved for themselves the job of slaying the King with silver bullets or with the dagger. Charles II did not believe a word of this fable; but the Parliament feigned to credit it, and the people reached a height of frenzy. Six Jesuits perished on the scaffold;

[48] Lingard, *op. cit.*, IX, 128.

[49] This was the fourth oath imposed on the Catholics of England. The four oaths were as follows: oath of supremacy, under Henry VIII; the oath of allegiance, under James I; the declaration against transubstantiation, under Charles I; the test oath, under Charles II.

the Catholic lords were expelled from Parliament by virtue of an Act that was not abrogated until 1829. A large number of Catholics were arrested and put to death by proceedings that violated every divine and human law.[50]

Unfortunately the religious question was complicated by a political question. The Duke of York, brother of the King, heir presumptive to the throne, represented both Catholicism and absolute power. A party was formed that set up in opposition to him a natural son of the King, the Duke of Monmouth, and made of him the defender of Protestantism and of Parliamentary prerogatives. The members of Monmouth's party took the name of Whigs, previously given to Scottish bandits, while the Duke of York's partisans received the name of Tories, which designated in Ireland the proscribed papists. The violent conflicts of these two parties disturbed the last years of Charles II's reign. The King died February 6, 1685, after abjuring heresy and receiving the last sacraments. If, as we may hope, God did grant His grace, at that last hour, to this King who had been so complacent to heresy and impiety throughout his reign, to this man who had been so plunged in debauchery during his whole life, we cannot find in the course of the ages a more striking example of the divine mercy.

The regrettable mingling of politics in religious doctrines, which took place under Charles II, was unfortunately accentuated under the government of the Duke of York who, at his brother's death, became king of England under the name of James II.

James II (1633–1702)

As soon as James II took possession of his throne, he found that he must decide between the two great influences which, in England as well as on the Continent, were then in conflict: that of Pope Innocent XI and that of King Louis XIV. Innocent

[50] See the details in Lingard, *op. cit.*, IX, 381–87.

counseled James to use prudence in the protection of Catholicism and to respect the parliamentary liberties. On the other hand, Louis urged him to employ measures of religious reaction and to establish an absolute power. James II had the misfortune of following the advice of the King of France.

Macaulay, the Protestant English historian, expresses his opinion as follows:

> The return of the English people to the fold of which he (Innocent) was the shepherd would undoubtedly have rejoiced his soul. But he was too wise a man to believe that a nation so bold and stubborn, could be brought back to the Church of Rome by the violent and unconstitutional exercise of royal authority. It was not difficult to foresee that, if James attempted to promote the interests of his religion by illegal and unpopular means, the attempt would fail. . . . On the other hand, it was probable that James, by acting with prudence and moderation, by strictly observing the laws and by exerting himself to win the confidence of his Parliament, might be able to obtain, for the professor of his religion, a large measure of relief.[51]

The Pope sent two messengers to England, the Italian Francesco d'Adda and the English Dominican John Leiburn. He charged these messengers to preach prudence by their sermons and by their example. Adda's dispatches testify to the political wisdom of the papal envoy. "In these dispatches Adda gives strong reasons for compromising matters by abolishing the penal laws and leaving the Test." [52] He considered the conflict with Parliament a great misfortune; again and again he expresses his opinion, that the King could, by a constitutional policy, obtain a great deal in favor of the Catholics.

While Adda was advancing these arguments, the King was receiving quite different advice from Louis XIV. Prompted by the desire to have his doctrine of absolute power extend to England and to remove Great Britain from the coalition that was

[51] Macaulay, *History of England* (5 vol. ed.), II, 52.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 329 note.

being formed against him in Europe, the King of France urged on the intense strife. He knew that England, if left to her natural impulse, would join the enemies of France. He also knew that, if James II should undertake seriously to establish the Catholic religion in England, that country, divided into political and religious factions, would count for nothing in the affairs of the Continent.[53] Louis could then easily have James II accept the vassalage in which he had been at such pains to hold Charles II.

Ill advised from the outset of his reign by a baleful counselor, Lord Sunderland, the King of England followed the line traced for him by the King of France. Not content with appointing Catholics to office and dispensing them from the Test Oath, he nominated Catholic priests to the benefices, had chapels opened contrary to the laws, planned to have Mass celebrated in Whitehall Palace in the presence of the Court, and to have the monks appear there in the habit of their order. The Jesuits were unpopular. But he confided to them colleges in London. He required the nuncio to assist at an official reception, dressed in his pontifical robes. By virtue of the right of supremacy, he revived an old institution of Elizabeth, and from this court obtained the suspension of the Bishop of London. All the English religious bodies, all the enemies of absolute power, uttered cries of horror against what they called Roman idolatry and tyranny.

The Pope's presentiments came true. The English people more and more identified in their mind Protestantism and civil liberty, papism and absolute power. Therein lies the whole secret of the rapid fall of the house of the Stuarts and the triumph of William of Orange.

William of Orange was a nephew of James II and husband of Mary, a daughter of James. For some time he had been preparing to dethrone his uncle and father-in-law. At the end of 1688 he judged that public opinion was ripe for a revolution. On

[53] Mazure, *Hist. de la Révolution de 1688,* II, 43.

November 5 he landed in England at the head of an army of 16,000 men, preceded by a flag bearing these words: "For religion and liberty." James II, abandoned by his most trusted supporters, withdrew to France, where Louis XIV gave him generous hospitality at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. There he died in 1702 in Christian sentiments of piety.

The policy of James II served as a pretext for all the vexatious measures that the houses of Orange and of Hanover exercised against the Catholics. Under William III a law was passed excluding all Catholics from the throne; under Queen Anne, some years after William's death, the famous Laws of Discovery against the Catholics of Ireland were promulgated; these laws restrained the civil rights of Catholics, declaring them incapable of acquiring landed property, of making a lease of more than thirty-one years, of lending on mortgage, and so on, and punishing the celebration of Mass by deportation, and, in case of repetition of the offense, by the gibbet.[54]

However, these repressive measures did not profit the Established Church, which in 1676 included 95 per cent of the population, but which at this time did not count even half of England among its members.

Under George I, George II, and George III, a few independent sects developed prodigiously. Some were moved by a sincere desire, though a mistaken one, to attain real holiness: such were the sect of the Quakers, founded in the middle of the century by the shoemaker Fox,[55] and that of the Methodists, founded by John Wesley. Amid numerous extravagances and errors, they gave real examples of moral loftiness. Other sects, taking the name of Latitudinarians, sought to expand by reducing the

[54] A summary of these laws will be found in Chateaubriand, *The Genius of Christianity,* appendix: note UU, i.e., p. 758, "The Irish Massacre."

[55] The Quakers based the whole of Christianity on internal enlightenment, excluded the taking of oaths, the making of war, and even outward expressions of politeness. On the Quakers and their chief theologian, see articles "Quakers" and "Barclay" in *Kirchenlexikon;* Moehler, *Symbolism,* Part II, chap. 2. See also Algermissen, *Christian Denominations,* pp. 831–36. [Tr.]

number of dogmas and obligatory practices. They easily ended in unbelief. Then it was that Collins invented the name of "free-thought," and Toland that of "pantheism."

The government of the houses of Orange and of Hanover marked, along with a movement toward political liberties, a decline of religious beliefs. The evil was that public opinion, by associating these two things too closely together, distorted the notion of them. The famous Declaration of Rights (February 23, 1689), in which we may discover the general inspiration of the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, revealed the ruinous notion of a political liberty independent of the religious idea. Contemporaries saw this. A certain philosopher says: "As all the political discussions of the sixteenth century had reform for their object, those of the next century became connected directly or indirectly with the English Revolution. Hobbes opposed it, Locke defended it; and on that same terrain Bossuet and Jurieu contended." [56]

Another element, destined to favor this evolution, appeared in England during this period. At the time of the strife between the Stuarts and the Parliament, and later between the Stuarts and the house of Orange or that of Hanover, the political parties had gathered about them certain corporations of building masons which, under the name of freemasons, drew up statutes for themselves and formed real social forces.[57] When the party of the Stuarts lost all credit, the Jacobite masonry and the Orangist masonry fused. But in losing its political character, the institution admitted, as a basis of understanding, some philosophical principles taken from the current ideas of the time.[58]

England, like Germany, contributed largely to the movement that would agitate the end of the eighteenth century. In reality,

[56] Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique* (2nd ed.), II, 265.
[57] Gustave Bord, *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France*, I, 17, 50.
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

the French Revolution was not merely a European revolution by the extent of the transformations it produced; it was also European by its deepest and most authentic sources.

Protestantism in France

By triumphing with the princes and by persecuting the Catholics, English Protestantism proceeded in big strides toward its two issues: illuminism and freethought. In undergoing an almost uninterrupted persecution, French Protestantism advanced along the same path and attained the same results. In England and in France, as likewise in Germany, the evolution of the pretended reform owed less to the outward circumstances in which it moved than to the very principles which it carried within itself.

The political situation brought about for the Protestant party by the Edict of Nantes, the concession of a right to keep certain strongholds, to hold assemblies, and to have at Court something like legates, merely incited their claims. We recall Turenne's reply to Catherine de Medici's remark that "the King wished only one religion in France." The Huguenot replied: "Madame, we also wish it; but we intend that it be ours." And the Protestants purposed to accomplish their end by all the means at the disposal of an organized state, including the use of armed force and foreign alliance. At the death of Henry IV, Duplessis-Mornay declared: "The King is a minor; let us be majors." On May 10, 1621, the Assembly of La Rochelle came to a bold decision, which went beyond the rights accorded by the Edict of Nantes.[59] The reformed France was divided into eight circles, an expression taken from the political establishment of Germany. Each circle would be under the government of one of the party chiefs. The superior authority was entrusted to the Duke de Bouillon. The governors were empowered to levy taxes,

[59] G. de Félice, *Hist. des protest. en France*, p. 240.

organize armies, engage in battles, appoint to offices. Three deputies of the Assembly should participate in the councils held by the commander-in-chief and by the military commandants. Lastly, the Assembly reserved to itself the power to conclude peace treaties.[60]

Such a decision, while it openly violated legality, was equivalent to the proclamation of a Protestant republic and a declaration of war against the monarchy. True, the provinces that had been divided into circles did not unanimously answer the call of the Assembly. Picardy, Normandy, the district of Orléans, the Île-de-France, the Dauphiné, and Poitou refused to take up arms. The Duke de Bouillon declined the responsibility of commander-in-chief. In vain they turned to Maréchal de Lesdiguières, who was on the point of becoming a Catholic, to Marquis de la Force, who was fearful of becoming embroiled with the Court, to the Duke de Sully, who was growing old. In short, every effort was concentrated on Saintonge, Guyenne, Quercy, and the two provinces of Languedoc, under the conduct of the Duke de Soubise and his brother the Duke de Rohan, who decided to cast their whole fortune into a new war of religion.[61]

Two successive uprisings, terminated by peace treaties (August 10, 1622, and February 5, 1626), left no doubt about the political and revolutionary character of the movement and about the support it obtained from abroad. At the treaty of 1626 the English ambassadors intervened. "So long as the Huguenots have their feet in France," declared Richelieu, "the king will never be master within, and he will be unable to undertake any glorious action outside." [62] The larger part of the Protestant forces had taken refuge at La Rochelle, the fortified city that was reputed to be impregnable. There, during the wars of religion, Condé, Coligny, Jeanne d'Albret, and Henry of Béarn

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

[62] Letter of May, 1625, quoted by Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, VI, Part II, p. 257.

had found a safe asylum. This city, though reunited to France, long enjoyed the privilege of self-government. A governor resided there in the name of the king. But the townsmen would not let him have the power to keep a garrison there or to build a citadel. The real head was the mayor. Under a kingship of divine right the people of La Rochelle had republican customs.[63] The city, in the hands of the Protestants, was a port open to their allies, the English. Richelieu attached his political fortune to the taking of La Rochelle, persuaded that, if he succeeded in this expedition, he would crush the party of the Huguenots, would lessen the first houses of the kingdom, and would leave in France only one power standing: the kingship.[64]

We know the story of that siege, begun in 1627, in which the republican enthusiasm, mingled with the Protestant exaltation, resisted for eleven months all the efforts of the great minister. The diary of one of the besieged, Pierre Nervault, relates the touching vicissitudes: the famine decimating the inhabitants, the sermons of the minister Solbert inflaming their courage, the mayor of the city, Guitton, sticking his dagger in the table at a council and swearing to kill the first person who talked of surrender; the royal army erecting a gigantic dike to close the port; Richelieu and the King coming to urge on the work; the Cardinal lending a hand at a wheel to set the cannons in their emplacements; two English fleets trying in vain, in response to the desperate appeals of the besieged, to break the terrible dike; the city at length (October 29, 1628) opening its gates after it had lost three-fourths of its inhabitants by famine.

Louis XIII recognized at La Rochelle the liberty of conscience, but he abolished the city's privileges and razed its fortifications on the land side. Protestantism had lost its last bulwark. Malherbe addressed his ode to Louis XIII, and at Paris the cornerstone of Notre Dame des Victoires was laid. A

[63] Puaux, *Hist. de protestantisme français,* p. 208.
[64] De Félice, *op. cit.,* p. 253.

few months later (June 28, 1629) the Edict of Alais granted to all the Reformers full liberty to practice their religion, but took from them the right to hold assemblies, to raise taxes, and to be represented at Court. Protestantism no longer existed legally as a political party. Two months afterward, Richelieu, receiving at Montauban a delegation of Huguenot ministers, declared to them that, since now they were reunited in the common rule of all the subjects, His Majesty would make no further distinction between them and the Catholics; that he himself would be happy to serve them on all occasions. To Louis XIII he said: "I have wished only to remove faction from the midst of your subjects, the rest (the conversion) being a work that must wait on Heaven, without our promoting it except by good life and good example."

In consequence of these principles, the Cardinal always refused, in the King's councils, to interpret in a sense unfavorable to the Protestants the obscure points of the Edict of Nantes. He saw to it that justice was rendered to them with firmness, and on this occasion withstood the scandal of public opinion. He called some Huguenots to the great state functions; he had them granted employment as counselors to Parliament and as marshals of France. But the provincial and municipal authorities did not imitate this liberal attitude; to such an extent that a custom arose of saying that a Huguenot becomes a counselor of Parliament more easily than he becomes a local tax collector.

The death of the great minister (December 4, 1642), soon followed by that of Louis XIII (May 14, 1643), might be expected to give a new direction to the religious policy toward the Protestants. But the latter were presently reassured. Mazarin was little interested in proselytism, and he especially dreaded the creation of embarrassments. "I have nothing to complain of regarding the little flock," he said, speaking of the Protestants; "if it browses on poor pastures, at least it does not stray away."

Louis XIV

In 1660, with the personal government of Louis XIV, a new phase of political action began. Even more than Richelieu, Louis XIV grasped the need of political and religious unity in the realm and wished to make sure of it at any price. We may well believe that, from the beginning of his reign, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was decided upon. Perhaps he hoped that it would fall of itself, that the mass conversion of the Protestants would make its provisions useless. But the future did not correspond to his hopes, and unforeseen circumstances led him to a premature revocation of the Edict and determined him to let his officers accompany that revocation with measures that were most violent and sometimes most odious.

The policy of Louis XIV regarding the Protestants was at first one of persuasion. But soon it changed into a policy of intimidation. Certain ones of his ministers or of his subordinate agents made it a policy of terrorism.

Louis XIV, indeed, never manifested toward the Protestants the confidence that Richelieu had shown them. He always interpreted and made others interpret the Edicts of Nantes and of Alais in the strictest sense. In 1662 he forbade the meeting of the triennial synod of the Reformed Churches; the next year he had the relapsed and apostates punished with banishment; two years later he permitted the children of Protestants to become Catholics, at the age of fourteen for the boys, twelve for the girls; in 1666 he granted only to Catholics the right to direct colleges and academies. However, no one can deny that his desire had been to obtain only sincere conversions, prompted by the power of the truth; he encouraged the clergy to increase the number of their sermons and missions; he protected all the new institutes that were founded in his reign; [65] he favored confer-

[65] The principal new institutes were the Oratorians (1611), the Lazarists or Vincentians (1624), the Daughters of Charity (1638), the Sulpicians (1641), the Trappists (1662), and the Brothers of the Christian Schools (1680).

ences and peaceful discussions between the Catholic priests and the Protestants desiring instruction. The conversion of Turenne, Pellisson, La Trémoille, and of a large number of nobles seemed to justify this procedure.

The causes inclining the King more and more to employ coercive measures, "to aid," as they said, "human weakness and to second the grace of God," were many. In this matter political considerations and religion were mingled. The most urgent suggestions for pursuing this method came, strangely enough, from Pellisson and from Madame de Maintenon. Attempts were made to obtain abjurations by promises and favors. "God makes use of all ways," said Madame de Maintenon. Making an unwarranted use of a saying of St. Gregory the Great, which Cardinal Ximenes had already unfortunately exploited,[66] she added: "One may well be resigned to the making of hypocritical fathers with the thought that their children will be sincere Catholics." Beginning in 1684, the influence of Madame de Maintenon, the King's secret wife, was all-powerful at Court; but as early as 1669 Louis XIV had heard Bossuet, in his funeral sermon of Henrietta of France, remind him that the diversity of the sects had led in England to the fall of Charles I. Might not the same causes produce the same results in France? For a long time Bossuet and Father de La Chaise, by arousing Louis' remorse for the grave faults of his private life, had stirred in his soul, which was deeply believing, the desire to make reparation. After the example of the kings and lords of the Middle Ages, who tried to redeem their sins by going on crusade against the Turk, might he not expiate his disorders by pursuing the Heretic?

Some statesmen, such as Le Tellier, remarked to him that, from the juridical point of view and in the thought of his ancestor Henry IV, the Edict of Nantes was only a provisional transaction, which had ceased to be in harmony with his govern-

[66] *Vie de Ximénès,* Bk. I, p. 67. Cf. Brugère, *De ecclesia,* p. 384 note.

ment; that, from the standpoint of private international law, religious unity was the law of all states;[67] that, from the diplomatic point of view, an urgent need was present for giving to the Pope, then cool toward the Court of France, a striking pledge of zeal; furthermore, from the simple point of view of the constitutional right of monarchies, the sovereign had the power to justify every measure by reasons of state, whenever the public safety was at stake. Such was now the case; the French Calvinists were accused with applauding the success of the Calvinists in Holland, with being ready to support a landing of Corneille Tromp on the coast of Guyenne or Poitou. In certain provinces these suspicions fostered a painful restlessness, which might become intolerable and might let loose civil wars. All these reasons were quite in agreement with the imperious temperament of the King of France, and so they prevailed. On October 28, 1680, Madame de Maintenon, in a triumphant tone, wrote as follows: "The King thinks seriously of the conversion of the heretics; and in a short time we shall have only one religion in the kingdom."

The Edict of Nantes

Madame de Maintenon's illusion was shared by most of the Catholics. The conversion of the Protestants was considered to be a simple matter. The Huguenots' conscience and their enthusiasm for the Scripture were not understood.[68] The persistence of the Protestants after a formal command of the King and the exposition of the true faith that would be given them by learned men, seemed to be an incredible obstinacy. But radical measures should not be resorted to without preparation. The

[67] At this period there was not in Europe a single state where nonconformists enjoyed all their civil, political, and religious rights.

[68] Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* VII, Part II, p. 43.

general Assembly of the Clergy in 1651 had requested that, if His Majesty's authority could not stifle the evil at a single stroke, it should enfeeble it and bring about its destruction little by little by the lessening of its power. This procedure was the one that was carried out. At Pellisson's instigation, a big relief fund was founded to assist the new converts. The Protestants were excluded from all the liberal professions. The age at which children could abjure the heresy in spite of their parents' opposition was lowered to seven years. Louvois imposed on the Protestants the obligation of lodging in their houses soldiers who were in transit. The dragoons were especially conspicuous for their deplorable excesses; their deeds of violence were the disgrace of this campaign, and we should like to believe that the King was unaware of these strange means of conversion. Lastly, the Protestants, having emigrated en masse to foreign lands, Louis XIV, upon Colbert's advice, ordered the confiscation of their property, declared null any sale of property made within a year preceding their leaving France, and made the heads of the émigré families liable to the penalty of the galleys.

Other measures, harder to justify, because they affected the interior life, were decreed against the heretics. A Protestant woman could not receive the services of a midwife except a Catholic one. This prohibition dates from February, 1680; in March of that same year, a letter of Colbert forbade Protestant women to hold meetings for the assistance of the poor of the said religion; a declaration (November, 1680) directed the local judges to go to the houses of Protestants who were sick for the purpose of seeing if they wished to die in the said religion. We may well suppose that only too often these measures taken by police officers or subordinate magistrates were carried out in a most offensive way. Pellisson, Louvois, and Colbert went beyond the wish of the King, and their instructions were ordinarily exceeded by their subordinates. The Huguenots, however,

endured all these vexations in silence. Hence arose the expression, "patient as a Huguenot." But secret hatreds smoldered in their souls, as the future would soon reveal.

To give the final blow to the heresy, the authorities thought that a vigorous act would suffice. The King was assured that it would not cost a drop of blood. Another consideration was even a greater factor in impelling Louis XIV to act. His attitude regarding the Assembly of 1682, which we shall speak of presently, had deeply offended the Pope. The King, aware of this, hastened to give the Holy Father a pledge of his orthodoxy. He thought he could measure the purity of his zeal by the vigor with which he suppressed heresy and he no longer hesitated to deliver the great blow that was being asked of him.

The text of the royal decree revoking the Edict of Nantes had been proposed by Le Tellier. After being amended by the King, it was signed on October 18, 1685. Prompted by the alleged fact that "the best and the larger part of our subjects, who formerly held the so-called reformed religion, have embraced the Catholic religion," the King judged he could do nothing better, to completely blot out the memory of the troubles caused by the progress of the false religion, than to revoke entirely the said Edict." Therefore the public exercise of the reformed worship was forbidden throughout the realm, except in Alsace. The Protestant ministers were ordered to leave France within the space of fifteen days. The others must remain under penalty of the galleys. Their children would be brought up in Catholicism; but, according to the last article, they would not be molested on the score of religion.

Enthusiasm was universal. Enlightened persons, as well as the populace, applauded the act. Madame de Sévigné declared that "no king had ever done or could do anything more memorable." Bossuet, Massillon, Racine, La Bruyère, La Fontaine, and "the Great Arnauld" were at one in the same admiration. To understand this moral unanimity of sentiments, we should

recall that need of order, of unity, and of splendor that was common to all Frenchmen, that instinctive temperamental aversion for the sternness, the dogmatism, and the foreign atmosphere of the Huguenot preacher,[69] and especially the conviction that, with the better and larger part of the Protestants sincerely converted to the Catholic faith, the rest would follow the movement without difficulty.

Events soon showed how great was the error on this last point. More than 200,000 Protestants went into exile. Almost all the wealthy emigrated. The poor, the peasants of Languedoc and of Saintonge, and the mountaineers of the Cévennes remained with their pastors and sought in the very text of the new decree a guaranty of their beliefs. The last article said that no one would be molested on the score of religion. Of what use, then, would it be to abjure? A large number of those who had been converted en masse returned to Calvinism. Meetings, more or less secret, were held in private houses, in the woods, on the moors, in the mountain ravines, in "the Desert," as they were accustomed to say.

The "synods of the Desert" increased in number particularly in the Cévennes and the Alps. Attempts were made to prevent them. Bands of partisans, most of them wretched and ill clothed, the Camisards, organized under the command of a leader endowed with the qualities of a real captain, Jean Cavalier. In many provinces royal officers, magistrates, and soldiers did not hesitate to use violence upon consciences. The intendants of Languedoc and of Béarn wrote: "No means but constraint will bring back the heretics. . . . A salutary vexation must open in their minds." [70] At that moment a number of bishops—Bossuet, Fénelon, Percin de Montgaillard, Noailles, Le Camus—protested. Bossuet declared that "to force to the Mass those who refused a confession of faith and its consequences, was to lead

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[70] *Ibid.*, VIII, Part I, 375.

them into error and to degrade the Mass in their mind . . . and to make them believe that the exercise of the Catholic religion consisted in an external worship in which evidently one does not believe." [71] Louis XIV was told that the bishops who protested the most strongly were precisely those who were the most highly praised by the court of Rome. Le Camus, bishop of Grenoble, whose protest had been particularly vigorous, was raised to the cardinalate in 1686 without the King's presentation.

Pope Innocent XI had, in fact, kept apart from the movement of repression and coercion organized in France. True, by a brief (November 13, 1685) he had vaguely felicitated Louis XIV on his edict. But the King expected more. In his reply he begged His Holiness to contribute to this undertaking by all means that God had entrusted to him. At the same time he wrote to his envoy at Rome, Cardinal d'Estrées: "My reply to the Pope's brief will give opportunity to make further attempts to persuade His Holiness to do what is asked of him for the good and advantage of religion and the consideration he ought to have for me." But "the more the French government increases the rigors against the heretics, the more the Pope shows himself charitable toward persons and severe in matters of doctrine." Innocent XI found that he had to solicit James II, through his nuncio in England, to intercede with the King of France in favor of the French heretics.[72] Thus the Church, faithful to her ancient traditions, did not forget the respect owing to souls, even when the most serious reasons necessitated the repression of heresy.

Some writers have exaggerated the material losses undergone by France in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. To deny the losses altogether would be false to historical evidence. But we should reduce their importance to true proportions. A large number of merchants, manufacturers, and farmers emigrated to other countries. Near Berlin the village of

[71] Bossuet, *Œuvres complètes* (Lachat ed.), XXVII, 143.
[72] Cf. Mazure, *op. cit.*, II, 126.

Charlottenburg was created by French farmers; at London a suburb was filled with French silk workers; more than 12,000 officers and soldiers eventually formed those regiments that France would encounter on all the fields of battle. But the religious and moral evolution that took place at the close of the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century, under the influence of the events that we have just related, has a still greater import. In those "synods of the Desert" where the Protestant worship was celebrated during all of the eighteenth century, illuminism, always latent in the Huguenot soul, revived with unparalleled intensity. Everywhere new prophets arose.

Moreover, the wanderings of the exiled Protestants had accustomed them to a cosmopolitan life. Meanwhile the political leaders of the school of Michel de l'Hôpital, in their desire for pacification at all costs, were impelled to take small account of dogmas, and they arrived progressively at a rationalist deism. Illuminism, cosmopolitism, and deism are the three characters which the society of the ancient regime finally transmitted to revolutionary society. Of course, nobody pretends that such tendencies were not developed outside Protestantism. The responsibility for them sometimes falls on the very ones who fought the Huguenots most intensely. By mixing in political questions, religious proselytism had lost much of its prestige. Seeing the Christian spirit defended by certain men whose private life was an outrage to the fundamental virtues of Christianity, a person could not easily preserve the same respect for it. When Bossuet pointed out to Jurieu the fatal tendency which led from private judgment to deism, the Protestant pointed to the slippery path which led from the corruption of morals to the denial of God. Both men at last asked themselves, not whether France would become Christian in the manner of Rome or of Geneva, but whether it would long remain Christian at all.[73]

[73] On the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, see the following: *Recueil des édits . . rendus pour l'extirpation de la R. P. R.* (last ed., 1885); *Procès-verbaux des*

Furthermore, Protestantism and political Catholicism were not the only religious scourges of Europe. Gallicanism, Jansenism, quietism, and rationalist philosophy were also preparing the way for the new times.

---

assemblées du clergé (9 vols., 1767–78); *Mémoires du clergé* (12 vols., 1716); Rulhière, *Eclaircissements sur les causes de la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes;* Rousset, *Hist. de Louvois;* Rébelliau, *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme;* many articles in the *Revue des questions historiques,* the *Revue historique,* the *Etudes,* and the *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français.*

CHAPTER X

Gallicanism

At the end of the wars of religion, although men's minds continued to be upset, the search for a formula of assuagement was kept up. The seventeenth century would soon discover that solution in the Gallican compromise.[1] To represent Louis XIV's religious policy as a compromise with Protestantism may seem to be a paradox, after the account we have just given. But the Gallican theories, under the various forms in which they have appeared, reach back to origins earlier than Luther and Calvin. No less true is the fact that the state of the Gallican spirit, composed of distrust toward Rome and excessive attachment to a national religious autonomy, has its analogy in one of the most essential traits of the Protestant spirit. It might have appeared to many, at the close of the religious wars, as an acceptable compromise.

Gallicanism

In spite of its name, the Gallican error was not special to France. In the history of the eleventh century we saw the strife against Rome break out in Germany with greater violence under Henry IV than it ever had in France. At the end of the eighteenth century we shall see the attachment to the national rites assume a more stubborn character in Austria, under Emperor Joseph II. The word "Gallicanism," which has prevailed as a name to designate this doctrine, undoubtedly came to it from the fact that the French spirit, more precise and systematic, was able to supply it with more exact and sharp formulas.

[1] Hanotaux, *Hist. du cardinal de Richelieu*, II, 17.

Moreover, under this word are included diverse doctrines, sometimes divergent, that must be carefully distinguished if we wish to be free from regrettable confusions and unjust qualifications which historians have not always succeeded in avoiding.

One is a political Gallicanism, which tends to limit the power of the Church by the power of the state, at times through suppression of the former by the latter. This doctrine derived its strength in the Western Schism, and the absolute regimes that were established after the sixteenth century in modern Europe made it more or less the principle of their religious policy. Quite different was ecclesiastical Gallicanism, which, within the Church, sought to limit the power of the papacy by that of the episcopate, of the clergy, or even of the body of the faithful. Formulated at the councils of Constance and Basle, ecclesiastical Gallicanism survived the Western Schism and took on various forms. Episcopalian with Gerson, it became Presbyterian with Richer,[2] multitudinist with Marco Antonio de Dominis.[3] With several persons, Gallicanism was nothing more than a vague tendency, made up of distrust of possible encroachments by the court of Rome, of jealous and too exclusive attachment to national ecclesiastical customs and the prerogatives of the civil power.

In France, once the legists became a power, especially since the parliaments recruited by heredity, were constituted, in the

[2] Edmond Richer was born at Chource in the diocese of Langres in 1560. He died at Paris in 1631. Appointed syndic of the Faculty of Theology of Paris in 1608, three years later he published his doctrines in a book entitled *De la puissance ecclésiastique et politique.* See Puyol, *Edmond Richer.* Richer regarded as the seat of ecclesiastical power the *totum ordinem hierarchicum, episcopali et sacerdotali ordini constantem.* Cf. Puyol, *op. cit.,* I, 251 and appendix.

[3] Marco Antonio de Dominis was born in 1566 on an island off the coast of Dalmatia. He became a Jesuit, then a secular priest and archbishop of Spalatro. In his *De republica christiana* he maintained that the authority of the Church is in the totality of the faithful. *Totam ecclesiam esse columnam et firmamentum veritatis, et hanc ecclesiam totam non esse in solis episcopis et presbyteris . . . et consensus totius ecclesiae intelligitur etiam in laicis* (*De republica christiana,* Bk. I, G. 12, nos. 10, 42).

absence of the States General, as a permanent political power, a new form of Gallicanism was born. This new form, without professing new doctrines but simply by systemizing the theories and the political aspect of Gallicanism, came to exercise in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the most formidable opposition to the papacy. "The Christian kingship had shown rather a certain tendency to live in good accord with the papacy. But the ministers of the kings—and also the judges of the higher courts, the officials of every rank, who had no diplomatic relations to maintain with Rome—those sons and grandsons of bourgeois families neglected no occasion to stir up the leaven of discord that always exists between two rival powers." [4] In the second half of the sixteenth century the court of Rome by ostensibly taking the part of Spain, the pope by arrogating the right to dethrone Henry IV for the crime of heresy, the League by sustaining his doctrines by force of arms, had by reaction won for the Gallican thesis a good part of the people, until then unconcerned with such discussions. By recalling the memory of Jacques Clément, who had slain Henry III, of Jean Châtel, who had nearly assassinated Henry IV, and of Ravaillac, who succeeded in doing so, men were able to associate in the popular imagination the idea of the papacy with the picture of the assassination.

Richelieu's Religious Policy

Richelieu, with that profound sense of government which made him one of the greatest statesmen of modern times, understood that it was time to hold the Gallican movement within just limits. Yet, because of his too exclusive concern with the national interest and his readiness to make the Catholic spirit bend before reasons of state, he made himself the unchangeable defender of this restrained and unified Gallicanism.

[4] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 26. The doctrine of parliamentary Gallicanism is set forth in the famous work of Pierre Pithou, *Les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane.*

We see him condemn the pamphlets of those who still maintained the theories of the Leaguers about the temporal power of the pope [5] and the Gallican doctrines that went so far as to associate simple priests in the government of the Church. On October 30, 1625, he had the provost of Paris publish a decision that every seditious pamphlet should be burned in the Place de Gréve, and that prescribed most severe penalties against any printer who printed it and any bookshop that sold it.[6] About a month later he directed the bishops to punish the authors of the pamphlets and, after the protests of the nuncio Spada, he turned the affair over to the Parliament. Some independent bishops, with Archbishop Trapes at their head, protested, and declared proudly that religious questions concerned them alone and that they forbade Parliament to concern itself with these matter in the future.[7]

Richelieu then brought the question before the King, who (March 26, 1626) blamed the Parliament for its interference and the bishops for the terms of their reply. In that same year Father Santarelli, a Jesuit, published at Rome a treatise *De haeresi, schismate et apostasia,* in which the Roman doctrines were set forth in extreme terms. The Parliament ordered the seizure, at the Cramoisy bookshop in Paris, of the package of books intended for sale and ordered all the Jesuits then present in Paris to sign four propositions, as follows: 1. the king of France holds his power only from God and his own sword; 2. the pope has no power over kings, either coercive or directive; 3. the king cannot be excommunicated; 4. the kingdom cannot be put under interdict. Richelieu's personal intervention moderated the penalty. Finally a decision was reached that the four superiors of the houses of the Company of Jesus located in Paris would disavow the opinions of Father Santarelli. The

[5] On these pamphlets, which mostly attacked Richelieu directly, see Hubault, *De politicis in Cardinalem Richelieu libellis,* and Maynard, *Saint Vincent de Paul,* IV, 1.

[6] Puyol, *Edmond Richer et la rénovation du gallicanisme au XVII^e siècle,* II, 259.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 264.

Cardinal's letter promulgating this compromise was imperative and haughty. He wrote: "I counsel you to sign this, or else prepare to leave the kingdom." [8]

With the pamphlets suppressed and the Jesuits humbled, Richelieu turned to the Gallican peril. In the course of this same year 1626 the Sorbonne, fearing to see the Roman doctrines triumph among its members, had forbidden the religious to take part in its deliberations, and the Parliament seconded it to a certain extent. Richelieu (November 2, 1626) had the King sign an edict declaring that the religious "will go as they did in the preceding years to the meetings of the faculty." This time the Parliament and the Sorbonne, the two chief defenders of Gallicanism, found themselves dominated by the powerful hand of the great minister.[9]

In the eyes of the Cardinal and of his faithful confidant, Father Joseph, a particular theory seemed especially subversive: that Presbyterian or rather clerical Gallicanism of Edmond Richer, according to which the power in the Church belonged not to the pope or to the bishops, but to all who were admitted to holy orders. Richelieu foresaw a possible application of this ecclesiatical democratic theory to the realm of politics. Father Joseph saw in it one of the gravest attacks that could be made on the Catholic hierarchy. This zealous religious, by dint of repeated attempts, succeeded in obtaining from Edmond Richer, the principal author of the doctrine, a retraction that seems to have been sincere.[10]

Was political and religious security obtained by these condemnations, these repressions, and these abjurations? Those

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 242–45.

[10] According to Moréri (art. "Richer" in the *Dictionnaire*) Richer's retractation was forced from him with a poniard at his throat, amid a dramatic scene, arranged by Father Joseph in the room of the Capuchin. This account, still repeated in the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses* (*s.v.* Richer), originated in a spurious and calumnious letter of one Morizot. See Puyol, *op. cit.*, II, 375–81. Richer died in 1631, after solemnly declaring that his retraction was entirely free.

persons about the great minister may have thought so. But for him, what he had so far done was merely the prelude of the political undertaking that he had in mind. In fact, with regard to the relations of Church and state, he was considering the formulation of a firm and definitive doctrine that would accord to the Roman Pontiff the minimum of the rights which orthodoxy demanded, and that would assure to the civil power the free and full exercise of the sovereign functions which the national tradition attributed to it. After having this doctrine approved by the pope and having it accepted by public opinion, he would reorganize the Church in France on these foundations.

For the realization of his plan, Richelieu cast his eyes on a scholarly magistrate who, by the resources of his mind as well as by the pliability of his character, seemed likely to be a valuable auxiliary. The name of this man was Pierre de Marca. Born in Béarn in 1594, of a noble family, he became president of the Parliament of Pau and at Paris filled the office of counselor of the king. His extensive knowledge and his brilliant mind had been remarked. Bossuet called him "a man of fine genius, but versatile and elusive, a man who had the unfortunate facility of passing from one opinion to another under cover of a few ambiguities and of treating ecclesiastical matters in a tone of derision." [11] In 1641 the learned magistrate published a large volume under the title of *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii.* With remarkable erudition, in a pure and correct style, the author, whose pen was evidently guided by Richelieu, established in the first place and in a strong manner the infallibility of the Church. But where do we find the seat of this infallibility? Marca was cautious not to declare the doctrine of the superiority of the council over the pope, or that of the supremacy of kings in the Church. He merely said that, if the head of the Church is infallible, this infallibility can be validly

[11] Bossuet, *Gallia orthodoxa* (Lachat ed.), XXI, 24.

exercised only with a certain consent of the Church herself. He further held that the kings held their power by a divine right and, after condemning the interferences of the emperors of the Orient and of King Philip the Fair in Church matters, he proclaimed the right for the prince to blame the act of an ecclesiastic who would violate, in his official acts, the canons and decrees confirmed by the royal power.

In spite of the precautions of style, Marca's book was condemned at Rome, since it admitted neither the absolute infallibility of the pope, since it laid down as a condition a "certain consent of the Church," nor his absolute disciplinary power, since it set up in opposition the divine right of the kings.[12] Negotiations with a view to giving an episcopal see to Pierre de Marca, who decided to take orders, fell through.[13] However, Richelieu held in reserve other means of action.

We do not know with certainty whether the idea, enunciated around Richelieu by his collaborators and friends, of erecting the Church of France into a patriarchate, with the Cardinal-minister at its head, was simply a clever maneuver intended to intimidate the court of Rome, or whether the design was serious. What is certain is that Richelieu found a Jesuit to defend this project, to maintain that such an undertaking was in no way schismatic, and that the consent of Rome was not needed for the creation of a patriarchate in France, that such consent had not been necessary for the establishment of the patriarchates of Constantinople and of Jerusalem. The author of this defense was called Michel Rabardeau. His work, *Optatus Gallus,* was condemned by the Holy Office (March, 18, 1643).

Cardinal Richelieu was already dead, and his astonishing project, if it was indeed his serious plan, died with him. But the

[12] First on April 7, 1642, then on November 5, 1664.

[13] Pierre de Marca, ordained after the death of his wife, was appointed archbishop of Toulouse in 1655.

results of his religious policy continued and would develop afterward. Of that Gallicanism, which perhaps the great Cardinal wished merely to use as an instrument of pacification, Louis XIV made an arm of war. The University and the Parliament would make use of it to discredit the Roman doctrines; diplomacy, to threaten the pope even in his own states; the king, to force the bishops and the regulars; and all of Bossuet's wisdom and authority would be needed to halt a great assembly of prelates on the road of schism.

In 1661, when Louis XIV inaugurated his personal government, Gallicanism had its army, its program, and its chief.

The first element of that army and the most solid was the magistracy, which was anticlerical. The magistrate and the cleric both wore a Roman robe, but the robes did not come from the same Rome. The magistrate and the cleric were concurrent judges. Ever since the Middle Ages the civil magistrates strove to remove more and more classes of legal cases from the jurisdiction of the clergy to that of the civil tribunals. Being laymen, they were laicizers and converted the liberties with regard to the pope into servitude toward the crown.[14]

In the Sorbonne, rebuilt in 1629 by the care of Richelieu, where the body of the great Minister was laid at rest, the anti-Roman tradition was an old one. Although some resolute partisans of papal infallibility were to be found there, the faculty's attitude of dependence toward the king made it a pliable instrument of the royal policy.

The lower clergy retained all its sympathies and devotedness for the Church of Rome. But the upper clergy, after the concordat of 1516, was recruited under the preponderant influence of the king, and was related to the great families of the magistracy and the nobility; therefore its members often resided at the court. Thus it was unprepared to resist the orders of the king.

[14] Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, VII, Part II, 16.

Henceforth Gallicanism had a well formulated program. Pierre Pithou's *Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane* became the manual, the catechism, we may say the Code of the party. Its eighty-three maxims, in consequence of their being invoked and applied by the courts, entered into the body of the law of the state. Some of the accepted maxims were, that no subject can be judged outside the kingdom, that the king has no superior in temporal matters, that he cannot be excommunicated. And the commentators of these principles even improved on them. A certain Pussort, a state counselor and uncle of Colbert, declared that "the king is the master of the goods of all his subjects, principally of ecclesiastical goods," [15] and the clever jurist Le Vayer de Boutigny, who was later appointed intendant of Picardy, wrote in his collection of civil and canonical law, that "the bishops hold from the state whatever temporalities they have." [16]

Religious Policy of Louis XIV

Gallicanism had its leader, no longer a minister however powerful, but the King himself. Louis XIV, from the outset of his personal government, clearly manifested two intentions: to govern alone, and to govern by the most general laws. To govern alone, he determined to reduce the three organized powers that rose up in the face of his power: the Protestant Church, the Parliament, and the Jansenist party. But the Catholic clergy, which rallied to the pope, might be a formidable obstacle to his system of government. The royal policy never lost sight of this perspective. To combat the Roman influence, Louis XIV did not hesitate, when the case arose, to make appeal to the Parliament itself. His logical and systematic mind, enamored of general laws that were common to all his subjects,

[15] Cf. *Mémoires de Louis XIV*, p. 118; quoted by Gérin, *Recherches historiques sur l'Assemblée de 1682* (2nd ed.), p. 52.

[16] Quoted by Gérin, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

hostile to all exceptional jurisdictions and to all privileged situations, labored ceaselessly in this direction.

An incident of seemingly small importance, the sustaining of a theological thesis, opened the conflict. On December 16, 1661, a Flemish Jesuit, Father Coret, sustained, at the college of Clermont, a theological thesis which said that the pope received infallibility from Christ, and that this infallibility extends to facts as well as to law. Was this a clever tactic of the Jesuit? The Jansenists then maintained that the *Augustinus* was *de facto* outside the infallible condemnations of the Holy See; and the Gallicans sharply opposed the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. To sustain papal infallibility was to furnish the King with arms to combat Jansenism, but by a fatal blow to Gallicanism. Whatever may have been the intention of the young doctor, his thesis succeeded merely in arousing the ire of the Jansenists and of the Gallicans at the same time. Arnauld published a violent little work entitled *La nouvelle héresie des jésuites,* soon followed by other works. The King, though strongly opposed to the Jansenists, declared himself against the Jesuit's thesis. The intervention of Father Annat, the confessor of the King, and especially a clever memorandum of Archbishop Marca of Toulouse, the scholar to whom recourse was had in difficult cases, put an end to the incident. But passions had been stirred and they would reawaken later. The King had been offended, and he would not forget the offense.[17]

Affair of the Corsican Guard

Scarcely was this affair terminated, when Louis XIV took advantage of another incident to make a direct attack on the Pope and to treat him haughtily. On August 20, 1662, three partly intoxicated Frenchmen, belonging to the household of

[17] Louis XIV, wishing to reward De Marca for his services, had him appointed archbishop of Paris. But the prelate died (June 29, 1662) three days after receiving his bulls.

the French ambassador at Rome, the Duke de Créqui, began quarrelling with the Corsicans of the papal guard. Some Corsican soldiers came to the help of their comrades and fired shots at the Farnese palace, where the ambassador resided. Créqui was just then entering the embassy in a carriage; a bullet killed a page on the carriage step, another bullet grazed the cheek of the ambassador's wife. The King of France received word of the incident about a week later. He immediately ordered the papal nuncio to leave the court. The next day he wrote to the Pope, threatening vengeance upon him, "for an outrage the like of which had never occurred even among barbarians." To all Europe he complained of the attitude of the Pope, who evidently delayed in granting the reparations that were demanded. But, in fact, the King's anger was feigned. To De Witt he acknowledged that the affair was a mere bagatelle. He wrote to Créqui: "I must tell you that while I am making a great ado . . . I hope that the noise will be enough." [18] The noise did not suffice. To attain his end, the King was led to go farther. He had Avignon seized, and he spoke of sending troops into Italy. Pope Alexander VII was obliged to present apologies to Versailles through his nephew Cardinal Chigi and to erect at Rome a pyramid in memory of the offense and the reparation.

This unfortunate affair resulted in a revelation of the antipapal feelings entertained by certain bishops, by most of the jurists, and by almost all the Jansenists. Archbishop Bourlemont of Toulouse even asked Colbert to fill the Holy Father with fear. To his colleague of Béziers, he wrote: "I hope they will demand of the Pope something more solid than the punishment of a few Corsicans." The *Gazette de France,* in long correspondence from Rome, set forth the facts while seeking to make the Pope's conduct odious. At the beginning of 1663, a new thesis, defended in the Sorbonne, raised another storm and

[18] Quoted by Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* VII, Part II, p. 270. Cf. Gérin, *op. cit.*

compelled the faculty of theology to declare itself for or against the Roman doctrines.

"On January 19, 1663, a young bachelor of the Sorbonne, named Gabriel Drouet de Villeneuve, a Breton, who had imbibed among the Jesuits, with whom he studied the humanities, sentiments somewhat less harsh with regard to the pope than those current at the Sorbonne, presented a thesis, less to say what he thought than to learn what ought to be thought. His first proposition was that Christ had given to St. Peter and his successors a supreme authority over the Church; the second, that the popes, for good reasons, had accorded privileges to certain Churches, such as the Church of France; the third, that the general councils were useful but not absolutely necessary." [19]

The defense of this thesis provoked "a sort of sudden raising of shields in the sense of the Gallican liberties." [20] Denis Talon, the Advocate General, addressed to the Parliament a denunciation of the faculty of theology of Paris as "occupied by a powerful cabal of monks and of a few seculars bound together by their interests and by faction." The Procurator General, Achille de Harlay, went at once to the King. When the King asked him what brought him to the Louvre, the magistrate replied: "Sire, I come to know from Your Majesty whether you wish that the pope should have the power to take the crown from your head whenever it pleases him." At these words the King "opened his eyes wide." Harlay explained to him that such was the sense of the thesis defended at the Sorbonne. The Parliament (January 22, 1663) issued a decree forbidding the faculty to allow such propositions to be maintained in any thesis, and ordered that this decree would be entered in the register of the faculty.

[19] Rapin, *Mémoires*, III, 195.
[20] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, IV, 152.

In the face of this order, the Sorbonne showed a courageous independence. It refused to make the inscription pure and simple of a decree bearing on theological matters, and claimed the right of a preliminary deliberation on the matter. The faculty, as we know, included a certain number of doctors firmly convinced of the doctrine of papal infallibility; these members resisted to the very end. The others finally agreed to a formula that was a *via media:* that the pope is infallible was not denied, but that the papal infallibility is certain was contested.

The King decided that the affair should rest there. He saw the danger of exasperating the doctors of the Sorbonne or of putting them into violent conflict with the Parliament. He says in his *Mémoires:* "I thought that the shortest solution was to let them write what they pleased in their so-called registers." But the question did not depend on the will of a sovereign, even one as absolute as the King of France, to suppress a pending question which involved the most essential principles of the government of the Church. The discussion continued under cover, as we may see from the correspondence of the nuncio Gargellini. Now the question concerned a conflict of jurisdiction between regulars and seculars, now it was regarding an interference of Parliament in religious affairs, again it concerned a new thesis reviving the Gallican question, stirring up men's minds and threating to flow over into the political terrain. In the month of March, 1669, the nuncio wrote to Rome: "I have the King, the ministers, everybody against me."

In fact, Jansenists and Gallicans found themselves, since the affair of Drouet de Villeneuve, in combination against the partisans of papal infallibility. A new incident divided them and turned sharply against the King two of the men whom the Jansenist party especially boasted of.

The Regalia

A royal declaration of February 10, 1673,[21] deciding that "the right of regalia belonged universally to the king in all the bishoprics of the kingdom," started a new conflict. By "right of regalia" was meant the right which the king of France claimed during the vacancy of a bishopric, to receive its revenues and to appoint to the benefices dependent on it until the new incumbent should have taken the oath of fidelity and had this oath registered with the Cour des Comptes. The jurists distinguished two elements in this right: the right to receive the revenues, the temporal regalia, and the right to appoint to vacant benefices, the spiritual regalia. The temporal regalia had their origin in an immemorial custom. In the early Middle Ages, because of the fear that the vacancy of an episcopal see would be an occasion of pillaging the goods confided to the bishop, the temporal ruler (count, duke, or king), as the suzerain of the deceased prelate, assumed the responsibility for maintaining order in the episcopal domains and, in compensation, received the revenues of the vacant bishopric. The popes had not protested against the exercise of this right, which seemed to be based on the services rendered. Quite other was the pretended right of spiritual regalia. The story of the investiture quarrel shows how energetically the popes contested the interference of the temporal power in the appointment to benefices. From Charles the Simple to Charles VII many encroachments of this sort were repeated by the kings of France. But we know the solemn protests of Innocent III and Clement IV.[22] A declaration of the Second Council of Lyons (1274) issued excommunication *latae sententiae* against those who should usurp the right of regalia and exhorted those who were

[21] Isambert, *Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises*, XIC, 67–69.

[22] See Fleury, *Hist. ecclés.*, Bk. LXX, chap. 34; Bk. LXXVI, chap. 61; Bk. LXXXV, chaps. 44, 58.

in possession of these rights, through the foundation of Churches or through an ancient custom, not to make abusive use thereof.[23] But Louis XIV not only proclaimed the right of regalia, as a right inherent to his crown, but he extended it abusively to all the dioceses of his kingdom, attributed to the Parliaments the exclusive competence in questions connected with this right, and gave a retroactive effect to his edict. The bishops of dioceses exempt from the regalia were required to register their oaths of fidelity in the Chambre des Comptes within two months. If they should fail to do this, the regalia would be open in their dioceses.

Relying on the text of the Council of Lyons, which forbade princes to extend the right of regalia, two bishops declared that they could not obey the King's orders: the goods of the Church entrusted to them were, they said, a sacred deposit which they wished to keep intact for their successors. These two bishops were Nicholas Pavillon, bishop of Alet, and François Caulet, bishop of Pamiers.

Nicholas Pavillon (1597–1677)

Nicholas Pavillon, born at Paris in 1597, of an official of the Chambre des Comptes, was a former disciple of St. Vincent de Paul, who had made use of his services for five years in his different works. St. Vincent used to call him his right arm. His manner of speech was simple, austere, and apostolic, like his life. When he became bishop of Alet in 1637, he devoted himself entirely to the evangelization of that poor diocese. The episcopal city was a town of less than two hundred homes, his palace a house in ruins, the cathedral a former refectory without a floor and with a roof falling to pieces. In this wild district

[23] The Council declared excommunicated *ipso facto . . . universos et singulos qui regalia de novo usurpare conantes, bona ecclesiarum . . . occupare praesumunt.* Mansi, XXIV, 90. Cf. Loyson, *L'Assemblée du clergé de France de 1682,* p. 4.

of the Corbières, long abandoned by its bishops, the spiritual wretchedness that he met was worse than the bodily miseries. Peasants and lords, laymen and even priests, had fallen into a lamentable state of ignorance and immorality.

The organization of his seminary seemed to him to be his work of capital importance. He himself kept the active direction of it until his death. The Bishop's life was the best sort of sermon for the people of his diocese. He slept in a sort of hayloft; the frugality of his meals disconcerted his visitors; after his death the marks of his bodily mortifications were seen on his body. His most faithful friends, such as St. Vincent de Paul, had not failed to note what was extreme or rough in the austerity of the Bishop of Alet. Excessive also were his spirit of independence, his inflexibility in the defense of his prerogatives as a bishop, and his assurance in the affirmation of his alleged rights. He believed that "the key of science and of discernment is essentially joined to the episcopal character." Neither king nor pope, except in the respect due them, had any influence or hold on Pavillon.[24] Arnauld d'Andilly, after hearing him preach, became his admirer. The Jansenists promptly encompassed him. Such a bishop could be a valuable helper, perhaps a leader for the party. Nicholas Pavillon had scarcely any interest in questions of pure doctrine. Finally he replied to the advances of Port Royal, but after a delay of several years; then his move was to join the opposition of Port Royal and to go beyond it when the famous question of the formulary arose.

François Caulet (1610-80)

François Caulet, bishop of Pamiers, was his neighbor. Born at Toulouse (1610), a son of a president of the Parliament of Languedoc, educated by the Jesuits of La Flèche, he completed

[24] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, IV, 358.

his studies at Paris and placed himself under the direction of Father de Condren, who had introduced him to Father Olier. The latter at first used him in the missions of Auvergne, then in the foundation of the seminary of Vaugirard. In 1642, Father Olier, upon becoming curé of St. Sulpice, entrusted to Father Caulet the direction of the seminary. Two years later, at the proposal of St. Vincent de Paul, the King named him bishop of Pamiers. This diocese was one of those which the wars of religion had disturbed most deeply. While the Protestant heresy there exercised its ravages, the Catholics, even the clergy, had too often lost the regularity and gravity of Christian morals.

Bishop Caulet had learned at the school of Father Olier that the basis of every religious restoration is the reform of the clergy. Hence he devoted himself to that reform with tireless energy. Provided with bulls from the Pope and letters patent of the King, he conferred the office of canon only on priests who agreed to live in community according to the rule of the canons regular. The chapter of Pamiers, which had been the great scandal of the diocese under Bishop de Sponde, became a model under Bishop Caulet. The zealous Bishop founded two seminaries, where he received boys at a very early age. Under this name of seminary he created a sort of normal school for teachers that supplied the region with schoolteachers full of zeal.

The prelate's life was the most effective preaching. In his house he had neither groom nor valet nor almoner. The furniture was old or very simple. No rich pictures; nothing but prints. His rule of life, which his whole household and also his guests had to follow, was nearly the same as he had followed at the seminary of St. Sulpice: rising at five o'clock at the sound of the bell; meditation; Mass attended by all; a simple breakfast at which there was reading, even if notables were present; two or three days a week, after supper, catechism or instruction

for the servants; evening prayer in common and the reading of a subject of meditation for the morrow. The Bishop had a renown for holiness. Bossuet declared to Louis XIV that the people of the district of Foix regarded Bishop Caulet as a saint.

Like Nicholas Pavillon, François Caulet refused, in 1665, to sign the formulary by which the signers declared that they condemned the five propositions of Jansen in the sense of their author. He gave as his reason "that the Church always made a great difference between revealed dogmas and non-revealed facts, requiring a submission *de fide* for the former, but being satisfied with a respectful deference for the latter." [25] This attitude has put Caulet in the ranks of the Jansenist prelates. But perhaps he does not deserve this qualification.[26] He was a better informed theologian than Pavillon and cannot be reproached with any heterodox opinion. The biographers of the two bishops relate that the Bishop of Alet, when he was having Arnauld's *Frequent Communion* and St. Cyran's *Letters* read at table, interrupted the reading the whole time that the Bishop of Pamiers was at Alet, knowing that this prelate could not endure the reading of them.

The declaration of 1673, subjecting all the bishoprics of France to the regalia, had aroused in the upper clergy only some vague murmuring, which probably could be easily overcome. To obtain this result, Louis XIV solemnly renewed his orders in 1675. A general Assembly of the Clergy, being held in Paris at that very time, raised no protest. The royal jurists were triumphant. But on April 27, 1677, the Bishop of Pamiers published an ordinance by which he declared that, in conformity with the General Council of Lyons, he could not consent to the extension

[25] Bertrand, *Bibliothèque sulpicienne,* III, 25.

[26] This point seems to be established by Bertrand's study in his *Bibliothèque sulpicienne,* III, 22–25. Betrand quotes in full the *mandement* issued by the Bishop of Pamiers on the occasion of the formulary prescribed by Alexander VII. *Ibid.,* pp. 24–26.

of the regalia, which had never taken place in his diocese. He added that, since his cathedral church was regular and reformed, this further reason prevented him from admitting this right. This ordinance of the Bishop was annulled by a decision of the Archbishop of Toulouse. The Bishop of Pamiers replied to this decision by an act of October 18, 1677. On the 26th of the same month, he notified the Archbishop that he was appealing to the Holy See. The Pope was already acquainted with the purity of Bishop Caulet's zeal, and had already (December 1, 1676) paid homage to his piety and virtue.[27] On March 2, 1678, he speaks of the Bishop's ardent zeal for the restoration of discipline and of his admirable submission to the Holy See.[28] But the step taken by the Bishop of Pamiers irritated the court, and his revenues were seized.

Nicholas Pavillon died on December 8, 1677, at the age of eighty years, after being bishop thirty-nine years. François Caulet alone remained at the breach. For three years "this little man," as he was ironically called by Bishop Rapin, bishop of an abandoned diocese of the Midi, maintained a relentless struggle against the King, against the Parliament, against the intendant Foucault. This agent, sent by the King to seize the Bishop's temporalities, carried out the seizure with so much rigor that the Bishop saw himself reduced to beggary. To Louis XIV he wrote as follows: "Sire, for the past months I have been deprived of the revenues of my bishopric, which are the patrimony of Jesus Christ. I have been left not even the things that are most necessary for life, which are not refused to the worst criminals." Some devoted Catholics, moved by this wretchedness of the Bishop, sent him aid. The royal justice pursued them. But we are told that Louis XIV prevented the royal agents from putting in the Bastille a gentleman who had given aid to the Bishop

[27] Berthier, *Innocentii Papae XI epistolae*, I, 60.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

of Pamiers. "No one shall be able to say," he declared, "that I have put anyone in the Bastille for a deed of almsgiving."

Three different times Innocent XI wrote to the King of France to remind him of the respect due the episcopacy and the goods of the Church. His third brief, dated December 27, 1679, closed with these words: "Henceforth we will not treat of this matter by letters; but we will not neglect the remedies which the power that God has bestowed upon us has placed in our hands." Madame Sévigné, writing to Madame de Grignan, gives a summary of the letter and says: "You will see a strange pope. He speaks as a master. You would say he is the father of Christians." What the Pope intended was indeed a threat. This the King understood. He waited six months; then he obtained from the general Assembly of the Clergy, meeting in July, 1680, a letter in which they declared that "they were bound to His Majesty by ties that nothing can break" and expressed "a certain displeasure" at the papal letter. Then the King informed the Pope that he was sending Cardinal d'Estrées to him for the purpose of discussing the regalia.

A moment of calm followed. But new incidents arose. Bishop Caulet died (1680) at the age of seventy. Madame Sévigné wrote: "The holy Bishop of Pamiers died on August 21. The affair of the regalia is ended. . . . The five against whom they wished to proceed will be before the great Judge, who will show them more kindness than they received in this world." In this world, alas, the poor diocese of Pamiers experienced a resumption of the old rigors. When the chapter elected to the office of capitular vicar a canon who had been removed by the King, the latter annulled the election. The terrible Foucault went to Pamiers with several companies of cavalry and started a sort of dragonade. The Pope protested again. This time his protests awakened no echo at the French court. The situation between the two powers became more and more strained.

The Nuns

Gallicanism was everywhere triumphant: in the Parliament and the Sorbonne, which had proscribed all theses favorable to papal infallibility; at Rome, where the Duke de Créqui imposed his conditions on the papal court; in all the dioceses of France, where the regalia seemed permanently established; in the Assembly of the French Clergy, which, in the midst of the latest incidents, expressed its attachment to the royal authority. In the affair of the regalia the previously most devoted defenders of the papal power, the Jesuits, spoke out against the two refractory bishops and on the side of the King. Then Louis XIV, as if resolved to attack the last power that could put an obstacle in the way of his absolute sovereignty, laid hands on an institution which the concordat of 1516 evidently intended to withdraw from the civil authority: the convents of nuns.

Such a claim seems to us strange if we image the picture of a great abbey of women at the close of the seventeenth century. Such an abbey was a real social power, almost a political power. An abbess styled herself "abbess by the grace of God," quite as the king was called "king by the grace of God." At the great ceremonies an officer carried her crosier before her, as a royal scepter is carried. In some cities the abbess had a tribunal: at times she exercised a jurisdiction over the clergy, as at Remiremont; over the male religious, as at Fontecrault. The abbeys of Fontevrault in Poitou or of Chelles in the Île de France were so important that they were reserved to princesses of the royal blood. But the concordat of 1516, which gave the king of France the right of appointment to the abbeys of men, retained the electoral method for the abbeys of women. In fact, the kings had found a way to evade the law. They designated a person of their choice; thereupon the pope issued a bull declaring that, the king having written in favor of such-and-such a person and the community having accepted her, he instituted her as abbess or

prioress. The pope, however, did not always lend himself to this subterfuge. The king then named his protégée, not as abbess, but as econome of the temporalities. By this title the appointee obtained at least the revenues of the abbey; in many a case this had been the real purpose desired.

The absolutism of Louis XIV could not be satisfied with these expedients. Always desirous of basing his government on general principles, the King directed his jurists and theologians to establish juridically and canonically the right of the king over the convents of women. The jurists were most prompt and categorical in their replies. The learned and obliging Baluze wrote to the King (December 11, 1669): "I have drawn up a little memorandum regarding the benefices. I have added a copy of the *Declaration verbale* of King Henry III for the appointment to the elective abbeys and priories of some women. . . . This kind of appointment by the king has passed into the law of the kingdom." In favor of the royal right over the convents of women the subtle argument of the jurist Charles Dumoulin was recalled: "When mention is made in the masculine, if the matters under consideration are favorable to the right of the king, we must understand that the reference is to women." [29] The reply of the Sorbonne was less categorical and more embarrassed. But six doctors were found who thought they could extricate themselves by a certain artifice. They declared that if the king of France did not possess undeniably the right to appoint the abbesses, in such event the ecclesiastical superiors of convents, bishops or provincials, could, "in case of imminent danger to the property," appoint an "econome for the temporalities" and even to give her, while awaiting the necessary bulls, a "commission for the spiritual." But, they added, it belonged to the king to declare the imminent danger to the goods of a community.

[29] Dumoulin, *De resignatione.* Cf. Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* IV, 401.

These consultations removed Louis' last juridical scruples. He distributed the best abbeys to his protégées. The famous intendant Foucault, whose services we are acquainted with, wrote in his *Mémoires:* "March 20, 1675. My older sister has been named to the abbey of Jarcy, in consideration of an annual payment of 1,500 livres.—December, 1675. The King has given to my younger sister, Anna Foucault, the abbey made vacant by the death of my sister Claude.—December 18, 1680. I wrote to Père La Chaise, begging him not to take away this benefice from my family." In 1670 the two abbeys of Chelles and of Fontevrault were governed by two natural daughters of Henry IV. The death (1670) of the abbess of Fontevrault, Jeanne Baptiste de Bourbon, was the occasion for Louis' replacing her by a young sister of Madame de Montespan. A few years later one of the evidences of the influence of Mlle de Fontanges, who replaced Madame de Montespan with the King, was the appointment of her sister Catherine to the abbey of Chelles, replacing Madame de Brissac, whose resignation was obtained.

The Convent of Charonne

The affair of the convent of Charonne, occupied by nuns of the Congregation of Notre Dame, showed how far the audacity of the King and his jurists could go. The special circumstances of the foundation of this convent seem to have given it every desirable security against the encroachments of the lay power. After its establishment, owing to the generosity of Margaret of Lorraine, duchess of Orléans, in 1643, and its approbation by letters patent of Louis XIV, the Pope, by a brief, had regulated the conditions of election of the superior. He decreed that, after the death of the superior foundress, those who should succeed her would be named and chosen for a three-year period by the chapter and by means of election. This regulation did not hinder the King. In 1677, after the death of the second superior, Mad-

ame de Kerveno, Louis XIV declared that he took the convent of Charonne under his protection and he imposed on it for superior a Cistercian nun, Madame de Grandchamp. The nuns protested. The expulsion of four of them, who were conducted to the frontier, on the pretext that they were Lorrainers and that they might be in connivance with the enemy, did not lessen the courage of the community. On January 18, 1680, the sisters, forewarned of the arrival of Madame de Grandchamp, barricaded themselves and refused to open the doors of the convent to the King's protégée. At the same time they kept the Pope informed of the affair. By a brief of August 7, 1680, Innocent XI annulled the appointment of Madame de Grandchamp and ordered the recall of the four exiled nuns. The religious, strengthened in their determination by this papal decision, then elected a superior, Sister Levesque.

In vain Louis XIV turned the matter over to the Parliament and had it issue a declaration of abuse against the brief of the Pope. In vain Chancellor Michel Le Tellier, in the King's name, transmitted to the nuns the order to disperse. In September a second brief of the Pope confirmed the election of Mother Levesque; on December 18, 1680, a third brief censured the decree of the Parliament. But the King had gone too far to retreat. On January 14, 1681, the Parliament declared the convent of Charonne seized by its creditors and suppressed it. A few days afterward Archbishop Harlay of Paris prescribed the necessary measures for the secularization of the consecrated place, for the removal of the Blessed Sacrament, for the exhumation of the deceased, and so on. This forcible measure, in spite of the Pope's protests, opened up the gravest of the conflicts.

Policy of Louis XIV

We recall that the third brief of Innocent XI, issued with regard to the affair of the regalia, contained this threat:

"Henceforth we will not treat of this matter by letters; but we will not neglect the remedies which the power that God has bestowed upon us has placed in our hands." Since that letter, the situation had become worse. Would the dispersion of the Charonne convent prompt the Pope to carry out his threat? With Louis XIV and his entourage the fear of an excommunication was serious. Archbishop Charles Maurice Le Tellier of Reims wrote: "The Pope will not be turned aside from this plan to issue an excommunication by the maxims of His Majesty's officers, who hold that the king cannot be excommunicated and that the censures against his sacred person are null and abusive. The views of the Romans are altogether opposite, and they are not without decretals in their favor, and they have canonists to support their doctrine."

At this critical juncture the King resolved to set between the Pope and himself the clergy of France. He knew that, in this affair, he could count, for the defense of the prerogatives of the crown, upon Archbishop Harlay of Paris. François de Harlay, of the branch of Champvallon, born at Paris in 1625, abbot of Jumièges at the age of twenty-five, archbishop of Rouen the next year, transferred to the see of Paris in March, 1671, created duke and peer in 1674, commander of the Order of the Holy Ghost, and a member of the French Academy, was the accomplished type of great prelate of the ancient regime. Saint-Simon discerned "that broad, just, solid, and yet ornate spirit which, from the government's viewpoint, made a grand bishop and, from the viewpoint of the world, a most likeable grand seigneur and a perfect courtier." [30] But he adds that Harlay's learning, his eloquence and facility in preaching, his able management of his diocese, his business acumen, and the authority he had acquired among the clergy, all this was a contrast to his personal morals and his courtierlike behavior.[31] The looseness

[30] Saint-Simon, *Mémoires* (year 1695), II, 350.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 349.

of his private life was no secret to anyone. They used to say as he passed by: "At Paris as at Rouen he does everything that he forbids." [32]

The depth and soundness of his theological knowledge, the correctness and promptitude of his perception of affairs, had given him a great authority among the clergy and at court. He presided over six assemblies of the clergy of France. Every week the King gave him several hours for a discussion of the interests of the Church of Paris. Harlay was one of the chief instigators of the measures taken by Louis XIV against the Jansenists and against the Protestants. He had already been one of the staunchest supporters of the royal power in the matter of the regalia. He it was who had the assembly of 1680 vote the famous address in which the clergy of France declared to the King that "nothing would separate them from him." Some writers have even said that, in the history of the seventeenth century, Harlay appears as the man who held in his hands the threads of every affair.[33] In any event, in the project that Louis was meditating and that would result in the drawing up of the four articles of 1682, Harlay would take the principal part.

Assembly of the Clergy

We may well suppose he was the one who suggested to the King the expedient that permitted the question to be brought before an assembly of the clergy. The coming assembly would not meet until 1685. That of 1680 was dissolved. But only the assembly itself had authority to regulate the dates of its meetings. Advantage was taken of the presence at court of a number of bishops. The King "advised" the agents general of the clergy to convoke them for the purpose of consultation on the means

[32] In his famous letter to Louis XIV (1693), Fénelon said: "You have a corrupt, scandalous, incorrigible, false archbishop. . . . You yield to him because he thinks only of pleasing you by his flatteries" (*Lettre de Fénelon à Louis XIV* [1825 ed.], p. 23).

[33] Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux lundis*, V, 173.

for "pacifying everything." Fifty-two bishops were found, thus showing, as Racine says, "that we had fifty-two prelates who were not in residence."

This gathering was what has been called "the Little Assembly." These court prelates were found so promptly only because they were not at their post of duty as bishops. They were asked to convoke urgently a General Assembly of the Clergy. This extraordinary assembly was given an exceptional character. It was defined as "extraordinary general assembly representing the Council." This title quite well indicated the end that the King and Harlay had in view, namely, to settle questions concerning discipline and dogma. Moreover, they must be assured of a docile assembly. The "Little Assembly" of 1681, following custom, had regulated that the General Assembly should be composed of two deputies of the first order and two of the second order from each province. *Lettres de cachet* were sent out, in a great number of dioceses, under the following formula: "We are sending you this letter . . . that you should choose a deputy other than deputy N. For such is our good pleasure." The fact of pressure exercised on this occasion by the King and his chancellor is beyond any shadow of doubt. Bossuet himself, who would be the glory of this assembly, came to it only by order. "They wish that I should be one of the Assembly," he wrote to Rancé on September 22, 1681.[34] This indefinite pronoun "they" meant the King. Fleury in his notes says: "The King wished the Bishop of Meaux to be there."

The Assembly met on October 1, 1681. Harlay de Champvallon presided. Bossuet was designated by the King to make the usual opening address. The two influences of Harlay and of Bossuet would now find themselves face to face and would take each other's measure. The face of the Bishop of Meaux offered

[34] Urbain and Levesque, *Correspondance de Bossuet,* II, 256.

a striking contrast to that of the Archbishop of Paris. The strong side of Harlay was his cleverness, flexibility, and a fascinating distinction: "All the graces of his mind and body, which were boundless, were perfectly natural to him." [35] Bossuet's weakness was a frank timidity, almost naïveté. "A simple soul, lucid and candid, with neither brutality nor flattery, no one was farther removed from trickery and deception." [36] The worthiness of his life was known to all, and the most despicable and malicious attacks on his reputation were made only after his death.

Born in 1627 of a family of the nobility of the robe, with "the blood of parliamentarians in his veins," he was admired for his clear and firm judgment, his sense of justice and his notion of the possible, a robust good sense which he carried to the point of genius, and that splendor of common sense which is eloquence. From the solid studies of his boyhood and youth he had preserved the alliance of the two antiquities, a taste for ancient letters and a love for theology, the cultivation of the *Iliad* and that of the Bible. His first thesis, brilliantly sustained in 1648 before the great Condé, his first controversies against the Protestants of Metz, his *Refutation of the Catechism of Paul Ferry* (appearing in 1655), his preaching before the court beginning in 1662, the publication in 1669 and 1670 of his funeral sermons of Henrietta of England and Henrietta of France, the duties of tutor of the Dauphin (1670–79) which he performed with so great fidelity, gave him a unique prestige among the bishops of France.

His doctrines in 1681 remained what they had been at the college of Navarre. Deeply attached to the primacy of the Roman pontiff, he feared, however, that the Holy See might encroach on the temporal prerogatives of the state. He also feared that the Reformers, whose reunion with the Church he had tried to

[35] Saint-Simon, *op. cit.*, II, 350.
[36] Lanson, *Hist. de la litt. française* (7th ed.), p. 370.

bring about since the beginning of his priestly ministry, would be kept aloof from Catholicism by that same fear. On December 1, 1681, he wrote to Cardinal d'Estrées: "It seems to me that nothing is more odious than the opinions of the ultramontanes, and that nothing can put a greater obstacle in the way of the conversion of the heretical or infidel kings. . . . My idea has always been that, if we explain the authority of the Holy See in such a way as to set aside what makes some people fear it rather than revere it, this holy authority, without any loss, appears agreeable to everyone, even to the heretics and to all its enemies." [37]

Considering the pressure under which its members were elected, we are not surprised that the Assembly showed itself out-and-out Gallican. It decided to approve the conduct of the King in the matter of the regalia and of the Charonne convent, and it also seemed resolved to vote in favor of the superiority of the councils over the pope. Several members held for the independence of the national Churches and for their subjection to the civil powers. A schism might well be feared.

What would be the attitude of the Bishop of Meaux? Personally he would have desired that the Assembly, instead of making any pronouncement on the burning question of the infallibility of the pope, would proclaim, according to a formula that was much cherished by him, "the infallibility of the Holy See." "But, however seductive this theory of infallibility might be, however great Bossuet's confidence in it might be, he had even more confidence in peace, and he would have preferred that such questions should not be raised. Were he to speak freely, he would have blamed with equal force the King's claims and Rome's stubborn resistance. At first he tried to bring about an accord." [38]

The opening discourse, which he delivered on November 9,

[37] *Correspondance de Bossuet*, II, 280.
[38] Strowski, *Bossuet*, p. 285.

1681, at the Mass of the Holy Ghost in the church of the Grands Augustins, was a masterpiece of eloquence, wisdom, and moderation. He hailed the fullness of apostolic power in the chair of Peter. For, as he said, the Roman faith is always the faith of the Church. There they always believe what has been believed. The same voice resounds everywhere, and Peter remains in his successors the foundation of the faithful. But he added that, although everything depends on the head, this is with a certain order, and we must come to the Holy See by the bishops. He recalls St. Bernard's saying, that "we make a monster out of the human body if we attach all the members directly to the head." [39] Then passing on to the rights of princes and to the liberties of the Gallican Church wisely understood, he declares that "to proceed in the footsteps of St. Louis and Charlemagne, is not to be separated from the Holy See; on the contrary, it is to carefully preserve even the smallest fibers holding the members united with the head; it is not to lessen the fullness of the apostolic power, for even the ocean has its bounds in its fullness and, if it trespasses beyond these, its fullness would be a deluge that would ravage the whole world." The Pope, the bishops, and the King were satisfied. Bossuet, knowing his mastery of word and thought, wrote the next day to Cardinal d'Estrées: "Yesterday I delivered the sermon of the Assembly; and I would have preached in Rome what I said there, with as much confidence as in Paris." [40]

But the accord, comparatively easy on the general principles, broke apart in the particular questions. Archbishop Harlay of Paris, Archbishop Le Tellier of Reims, son of the Chancellor, Bishop Choiseul-Praslin of Tournai, Père La Chaise himself, and especially Colbert, who stirred up their minds from behind the scenes, wished to settle in the first place the question of the

[39] St. Bernard, *De consideratione*, Bk. III, chap. 4.
[40] Bossuet, *Correspondance*, II, 268.

regalia to the advantage of the royal authority. "The Pope has driven us," they said; "he will repent of it." Bossuet, despairing of preventing the discussion, bent all his efforts to keep the decision of the Assembly from being offensive to Rome. He almost succeeded. They decided that the right of regalia should be extended to all the bishoprics, but that incumbents of benefices with the care of souls appointed by the king should ask for canonical investiture. The temporal regalia were extended; but the spiritual regalia were almost abolished: the canon law seemed to be essentialy safeguarded. As soon as this resolution was voted (February 3, 1682), the Assembly wrote the Pope a letter in which it congratulated itself for having labored for the necessary union between the priesthood and the Empire. But it added: "Most Holy Father, we beg you to consider a little what a king we have." The Pope did not reply.

A great debate on the very basis of all the questions of discussion, that is, on the authority of the pope, was inevitable. Bossuet needed all his wisdom and eloquence to keep the deliberations from resulting in a schismatic declaration or one suspect of schism. Following a long report by the Bishop of Tournai, in which the divine right of kings was strongly affirmed and the so-called encroachments of the popes were sharply criticized, the assembly was asked to vote a declaration rejecting the indefectibility. The Bishop of Meaux protested. The indefectibility of the Holy See seemed to him to be peremptorily established by the very words of the Savior to St. Peter: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." [41] Moreover, he carefully distinguished between such and such a pope, whom he believed capable of a passing error, and the Holy See, that he judged is preserved from any permanent error.[42]

[41] Luke 22:32.

[42] This was the celebrated distinction *inter Sedem et Sedentem,* now condemned by the Council of the Vatican, but it was then a question that might be freely argued among Catholics. Cf. Fénelon, *De Summi Pontificis auctoritate,* II, 11–15.

The Four Articles of 1682

The Bishop of Meaux was charged with summing up the Gallican doctrine. This he did in the famous Four Articles of 1682. These declared substantially: 1. that St. Peter and his successors received no authority over the temporal affairs of kings; 2. that the pope is inferior to the council, as the Council of Constance declared in its fourth and fifth sessions; 3. that the pope can exercise his authority only in the limits of the canons of the universal Church and in conformity with the maxims of the Gallican Church; 4. that the decisions of the popes, even in matters of faith, are irrevocable only after they have been confirmed by the judgment of the whole Church.[43]

These four articles were voted (March 19, 1682) by the seventy-two members of the Assembly. They have been evaluated by a learned jurist in the following terms: "Of these four articles, two at least bore on dogmatic questions which only an ecumenical council could decide and which were outside the competence of a General Assembly of the French Clergy." [44] In law the declaration was null even if it had been exact in fact. But was it so? A rapid inspection of the four articles will show us.

The first article declares that the secular power is independent of the spiritual power, that in temporal matters kings are not subject to any ecclesiastical power, that the pope cannot depose them either directly or indirectly, and cannot absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance. In support of its declaration, the Assembly appealed to the Gospel text: "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's." We have two remarks to make on

[43] For the full text of the four articles, see Denzinger, nos. 1322–26.

[44] The French bishops said that they did not intend to give a dogmatic decision, but merely to declare what was the sentiment of the Church of France in these matters. But the mere fact of stating such a declaration in the face of Rome and, as it were, under the protection of the King of France, constituted a rashness open to suspicion.

this first article. 1. The Church has always taught that the two powers, the temporal and the spiritual, are sovereign, each in its own domain; but a twofold condition must be observed. The independence should be reciprocal, and each power should remain in its own domain. Formerly this was not always the case, when the parliaments often encroached on the domain reserved to the Church. 2. The article does not specify, for cases in which the matter is mixed or in which a conflict arises, which of the two powers ought to have the last word; yet this is precisely the important point. On this point the popes of the Middle Ages had elaborated and had wished to impose the theory of the direct power of the Church over the state. That theory is sharply rejected by the first article. But, in the seventeenth article, most of the theologians maintained another theory, a more exact one, the theory of the indirect power of the Church. These theologians said that, in case of conflict, the Church cannot depose kings directly, but it can and should indicate to the faithful what is their duty; it then belongs to the faithful, as citizens, to perform this duty if they can. They are informed that the ruler has exceeded his powers, that he has gone beyond the limits of his sovereignty: the citizens should act to make him return to his proper domain. What the Church is unable to do, the nation can do, either by resisting the ruler or by deposing him.[45] The first article of the declaration of 1682 did not contain a clear explanation of this theory, which is quite irreproachable.

The second article proclaims that in spiritual matters the pope, vicar of Jesus Christ, has all power, but with the reservation that the decrees of the Council of Constance, passed in sessions 4 and 5, regarding the authority of general councils, will retain their full force and vigor. It adds that it rejects the opinion of theologians who consider the Constance decrees doubtful or not approved, or as relating only to the times of the Schism.

[45] This is what Fénelon calls the directive or declarative power of the Church. See his *De Summi Pontifici auctoritate,* chap. 39; *Œuvres complètes* (1848), II, 46.

These decrees, some said, admitted the superiority of the councils over the Holy See. The assembly of 1682, in appropriating these decrees, following the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, committed a double error.

The third article, which is rather vague, limits itself to saying that, with regard to the pope, the canons inspired by God and consecrated by the respect of the whole world, ought to be observed, and also the rules, customs, and constitutions admitted in the Kingdom of France and in the Gallican Church. Furthermore, the article did not define exactly what must be understood by the customs of the Gallican Church. On this subject a conflict existed between the parliaments and the bishops. The parliaments held that these customs were none other than the eighty-three articles of the Code of Pithou. The bishops and Bossuet, on the contrary, affirmed that the intention was to exclude the abuses introduced by the magistrates against the rights of the Church. Their protests were in vain. In fact, the parliaments regarded the Code of Pithou as consecrated legislatively by the declaration of 1682.

The fourth article, which was very short, touched an important question of dogma. "Although the pope has the principal part in matters of faith and although his decrees are addressed to all the Churches and to each of them, his decisions are final only if they have been confirmed by the judgment of the whole Church." In other words, the pope, even in matters of faith, however great may be his authority in this regard, is not infallible. This article was contrary to the teaching of St. Bernard and St. Thomas Aquinas, which was precise on this point.[46] It

[46] See the following text of St. Thomas: "Whether it belongs to the Sovereign Pontiff to draw up a symbol of faith.—I answer that a new edition of the symbol becomes necessary in order to set aside the errors that may arise. Consequently to publish a new edition of the symbol belongs to that authority which is empowered to decide matters of faith finally, so that they may be held by all with unshaken faith. Now this belongs to the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, to whom the more important and more difficult questions that arise in the Church are referred. . . . The reason of this is that there should be but one faith of the whole Church,

was contrary to the definitions given by the ecumenical councils of Lyons (1245) and of Florence (1439) and, what is more to the point, to the declarations made in 1625 and 1653 by two General Assemblies of the Clergy of France. Nevertheless, to employ the expressions of the canonists, the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope, if not accompanied with a sanction of anathema, was still not *de fide;* it was merely *prope fidem.* However, it is no less true that, of the four articles of 1682, two at least were not conformable to the common doctrine of the Church.

Bossuet's intervention had kept from the declaration of the clergy of France any schismatic formula. But they were always on the verge of schism. In an assembly made up of members chosen under royal pressure, Louis XIV had no great difficulty in forcing some declarations in agreement with his views. The King would find the same ready compliance in the Parliament. But in the religious orders, in the Sorbonne, in all those who were animated by a deeper Catholic sense, in that nameless force with which even absolute monarchs must always reckon, public opinion, and especially in the head of the Church, the King would find an uncompromising opposition. Finally, once more in history, an all-powerful temporal authority would correct itself before an unarmed spiritual authority.

On March 22, 1682, the King confirmed the declaration by an edict which the Parliament promptly registered. This edict forbade the King's subjects to teach or write anything contrary to the doctrine contained in the declaration and enjoined on all professors of theology to comment on it every year. This order was of exceptional gravity. The faculty of Paris alone, in 1682, counted 753 doctors. The houses of the Sorbonne, Navarre, Cholets, St. Sulpice, and others, and the various communities

according to I Cor. 1:10: That you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you: and this could not be secured unless any question of faith that may arise be decided by him who presides over the whole Church, so that the whole Church may hold firmly to his decision" (*Summa theol.,* IIa IIae, q. 1, a. 10).

flourishing at Paris and composing the body of the faculty, trained most of the bishops and priests of the Church of France. If the wish of the King and his counsellors had been obeyed, it would have been the end of belief in papal infallibility among the clergy of France. But these had not forgotten that, as St. Thomas says, "it belongs to the sole authority of the Sovereign Pontiff to publish a new edition of the symbol, as do all other matters which concern the whole Church." [47] The best portion of the priests believed in the infallibility of the pope. Even the Gallican Fleury declares: "In France you can hardly find any regulars who are not persuaded of the infallibility. And not only the religious, but the communities of priests, although without privileges and subject to the bishops, incline to that side as more conformable to piety." The Sorbonne resisted. On May 2, a delegation of the Parliament ordered the registration of the declaration and of the edict. The senior by age, Bétille, enfeebled by advanced years, on whose weakness they had counted, expressed his view by saying simply: *Gratias agimus amplissimas.* In reply to a further injunction, he replied: *Facultas pollicetur obsequium* ("the faculty promises respect"). Then he arose and went out. On June 16, the registrar of the Faculty, ordered to appear in the Parliament, under compulsion registered the declaration at the dictation of the registrar of the court.

Eight doctors were exiled to the provinces by *lettres de cachet.* On June 29 a *lettre de cachet* suppressed the meetings of the Sorbonne. In fine, worn out by all these vexations, the professors of theology finally resigned themselves to comment on the four articles, but they did so in their own way, and some of them even opposed the sense which the assembly intended them to have. Louis XIV, in a letter written in 1713, declared that he had not obliged anyone to maintain the propositions of the clergy of France if these were contrary to his own opinion.

Amid these strifes, public opinion took the side of the inde-

[47] *Ibid.*

pendent clergy. The obsequious bishops and abbots were openly satirized. In 1685 Madame Sévigné, recalling a thesis dedicated to the King, in which he was compared to God, but in such a way that God was the copy, exclaimed: "Too much is too much."

The King took more and more account of the criticisms, as we see from a letter written by the Marquis de Siegnelay to La Reynie: "His Majesty has been informed that several songs have been composed on the affair of the regalia and the Assembly of the Clergy. He directs me to write to you that you should take every pains to discover the authors." [48]

Reaction of Innocent XI

Innocent XI did not judge, for the present, that a condemnation of the four articles was timely. He merely refused to give canonical investiture to priests promoted to bishoprics if they had taken part in the assembly of 1682. Louis XIV was at pains to propose only such. The Pope remained firm. The result was that in January of 1688 thirty-five sees were vacant.

But at that period a fresh incident embittered the relations of the French court with the papacy. The Catholic ambassadors residing in Rome had gradually extended to the whole district of their residence the right of sanctuary and of immunity enjoyed by the building where they resided. This abuse permitted criminals to evade judicial pursuit. The immunities had become the most serious obstacle to the promotion of peace and to public morals.[49] Innocent desired to abolish them. He easily obtained the consent of all other rulers. But Louis XIV proudly replied that God had established him to serve as an example to others and not to regulate his conduct by the example of anyone else. His new ambassador, the Marquis de Lavardin, entered Rome insolently with 200 armed men to occupy the Farnese quarter.

[48] Depping, *Correspondance diplomatique sous le règne de Louis XIV,* II, 571.
[49] Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs,* I, 284.

The Pope excommunicated him.[50] Louis XIV had Avignon seized and (September 24), in the presence of Père La Chaise his confessor and of Archbishop Harlay of Paris, he issued an order to the Attorney General to lodge an appeal to the future council in regard to all steps taken or to be taken by the Pope against him.

Alexander VIII, who succeeded Innocent XI in August, 1689, not only persisted in refusing the bulls of institution in the cases foreseen by his predecessor, but he accentuated his attitude. By the bull *Inter multiplices* (August 4, 1690) he declared the acts of the Assembly of 1682 null, invalid, and without force. This bull was accompanied with a touching letter, written by the aged Pope on his deathbed. In it he begged the King of France to revoke his decisions. A moment later he expired.

This was the starting point of a relaxation of tension. Louis XIV for some time was desirous of putting an end to the conflict. Colbert's death (1683) and the formation of the League of Augsburg (1686) had increased the embarrassments of his domestic and foreign policy. Moreover, since 1685 the influence of Madame de Maintenon had awakened his religious sentiments. In 1685 Louis XIV chose the Pope to arbitrate between him and the Emperor in the matter of a territorial dispute; and, partly to show his orthodoxy, he hastened the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Negotiations, undertaken in 1690, were continued for two years. The Pope promised to give bulls to the designated bishops who declared that they heartily repented of what they had done at the Assembly of 1682 and rejected what had there been done against the papal power. On September 14, 1693, the King wrote to Innocent XII: "Most Holy Father, I am happy to inform Your Holiness that I have given the necessary orders that the things ordained by my edict of 1682 . . .

[50] Louis XIV was himself excommunicated on November 18, 1687, by a letter of Innocent XI. But, as requested of the Pope by Louis XIV, the secret of this canonical penalty was strictly kept. See Dubruel, "L'excommunication de Louis XIV," in *Etudes* (December 5, 1913), pp. 608–35.

should not be observed." [51] And Bossuet, obliged to revise the *Defense de la Declaration,* declared: *Abeat ergo Declaratio quo libuerit!* ("Let the Declaration begone, wherever it wishes!").[52]

Organization of the Church of France

Shortly afterward (April, 1695), Louis XIV issued a long edict which deserves to be specially analyzed because it was later applied without appreciable modification at the time of the French Revolution.

This edict regulated the juridical condition of the persons and the goods of the Church, whether from the judiciary or the administrative point of view. From the judiciary point of view it finally consecrated the diminution of the rights and competence of the ecclesiastical tribunals in accordance with a multitude of former ordinances.[53] Louis XIV declared that, from the time of the publication of his edict, the competence of ecclesiastical judges would extend only to cases that concerned doctrinal questions, the administration of the sacraments, the observance of the vows of religion, the regulation of salaries due the clergy and employees of the Church, and to Church discipline. Apart from these cases, the civil judge remained the only one competent. The temporal jurisdiction which, since Constantine, had always belonged to churchmen in a measure more or less broad, henceforth was entirely removed from them. As for spiritual jurisdiction, apparently it remained entirely in the ecclesiastical

[51] The text of this letter, formerly disputed, has been published by Artaud de Montor in his *Histoire de Pie VII* (3rd ed.), II, 171.

[52] These words do not mean that Bossuet had abandoned the Gallican doctrine of the Declaration. Bossuet remained always opposed to the infallibility of the pope; but he held to the indefectibility of the Holy See, understood more and more in a sense favorable to the Roman pontiff.

[53] The juridical competence of the ecclesiastical courts was very extensive in the Middle Ages. That extent, reaching its maximum in the thirteenth century, was a benefit for society, as the ecclesiastical judges were the most learned and the most equitable. The new conditions of modern society required a revision of that judicial organization. Unfortunately political passion was injected into the question.

tribunals, and these even had the right to resort, in case of need, to the secular authority for the execution of their sentences.

But we should not forget an important restriction, which the edict of 1695 expressly recalled. It says: "The decisions handed down by Church officials were indeed sanctioned by the civil power, but on condition that the sentence should not be declared abusive by the parliament of appeal. In fact, the King, while forbidding the secular judges to mingle in the religious or disciplinary questions, permitted them to take cognizance of these cases under pretext of abuse; the exception almost destroyed the rule. In the Middle Ages the Church courts had been blamed for encroachment on the domain of civil justice; however, in the eighteenth century the reproach might well be reversed." [54]

However, we should recognize that the regulation of questions of administration was prompted by a broad spirit and accorded to the Church a real independence. The archbishops and bishops will be named by the king, but will be canonically instituted by the pope. Their right is recognized to give their "visa," after inquiry, to persons appointed to benefices by Rome, to visit their diocese or have it visited, to give and to revoke the powers of preachers and of confessors, to regulate whatever concerns the divine service, burials, the good conduct of the curés, both regular and secular. They will also have the right to make visitation of the non-exempt monasteries to remedy abuses, and, if need be, to call in the aid of the civil power to the extent they will judge fitting. The churchwardens must obey their orders. Preceptors, regents, and schoolteachers will be approved by the curés, examined on the catechism by the bishop, and will be subject to dismissal by him.

Lastly, the bishops will have the right to fix the amounts payable for church functions, using proper moderation, to institute or suppress religious feasts at their pleasure and watch over

[54] Chénon in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Hist. générale,* VI, 260.

the administration of the hospitals and establishments of charity.

In short, the distinction of the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, was carried out in a fair spirit. But the half-conquered Gallicanism left alive in France a doctrine more deeply subversive of the Christian order, a doctrine which, like Gallicanism itself, sprang from a pretended spirit of preservation, from a self-stlyed return to primitive Christianity, and worked more effectively for the ruin of the Church. We are referring to Jansenism.

CHAPTER XI

Jansenism

Origin of Jansenism

THE middle of the seventeenth century saw the appearance of Jansenism. But its doctrine and spirit have deep roots, which we must study by going back to the middle of the preceding century.

The Jansenist doctrine was formed in the Louvain faculty of theology.

In the sixteenth century, just when the Council of Trent was opening, the celebrated Flemish university, richly endowed by the generosity of Charles V and Philip II, was at the height of its renown. Six thousand students, divided into forty-two colleges, were ardently devoting themselves, under the direction of eminent teachers, to the study of divine and human sciences, particularly to theology. Of all the theological questions, none so deeply stirred the minds of that period as the great problem of the accord of grace with free will. The Protestant heresy, by solving this hard question in a radical fashion, gave it a new timeliness. The two tendencies that had long separated theologians on this point, and forty years later became formulated under the names of Thomism and Molinism, divided teachers and pupils. While the chancellor of the University, Ruard Tapper, took his stand resolutely on the side of human free will, and thus left room to suspect his belief in the universal efficacy of divine grace, the disciples of the Dominican Peter de Soto defended the unlimited power of God's action with so much ardor that their adversaries accused them of bringing in doubt the existence of free will.

Michael Baius (1513–89)

About 1550 Leonard Hasselius, the professor of Sacred Scripture, and Ruard Tapper were delegated to the Council of Trent, to represent the University there. A fervent disciple of de Soto was given Hasselius as assistant. His name was Michel de Bay (Michael Baius). Born in 1513 in a city of Hainaut, he was remarkable for the worthiness of his life as also for his extensive learning. He was of an inquiring mind, industrious, discerning, daring, served by an elegance and facility of speech, but exclusive in his points of view, systematic in his reasonings. Moreover, he was a loyal soul, with a sincere and deep faith. After Hasselius' death at Trent in 1552, Baius was appointed to the vacant professorial chair. In a short time he gathered enthusiastic disciples about him.

Michael Baius clearly announced his twofold aim: to free dogma from all the foreign elements that the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages had introduced into it and that constituted the sole obstacle, he declared, to the conversion of the Protestants; then to study the Catholic doctrine in its true sources, which are Sacred Scripture and the writings of the early Fathers. In fact, basing his views solely on Scripture and the Fathers, especially on the writings of St. Augustine, the daring reformer of theological studies set forth a system which gave to human weakness and the unlimited power of God a larger part than the Scholastics had done, a view which thereby rather closely approached the ideas of Luther.

The following is a summary of his doctrine, such as can be extracted from his various opuscula,[1] and especially from the seventy-nine propositions taken from his works and condemned en bloc by the Holy See. Baius considers man successively as

[1] *De libero hominis arbitrio et ejus potestate, De justitia et justificatione, De sacrificio, De meritis operum, De prima hominis justitia et virtutibus impiorum, De sacramentis in genere,* and others.

follows: 1. in the state of innocent nature, such as he was created by God; 2. in the state of fallen nature, such as original sin made him; 3. in the state of elevated nature, such as the redemption by Christ has rendered him. According to Baius, man, upon coming from the hand of his Creator, possessed a perfect righteousness, which theology has called habitual grace, or supernatural state, because it makes him capable of uniting himself to the divine nature, but which ought rather be called a natural state, because that righteousness was due man's nature. Indeed, man is truly man only when he accomplishes works meritorious for heaven.[2]

But original sin, that is, according to Baius, concupiscence, enslaving our will internally, and almost ruining the power of our free will, has ruined the whole primitive economy. No doubt the will pure and simple, even determined by an inner force, is a foundation sufficient for moral responsibility, if it is exempt from all outside constraint. But it no longer has power except to turn to evil, or to will goods of a temporal order. Such a state is not in relation with our end. "All the works of infidels are sins, all the virtues of the philosophers are vices." [3] Finally, nothing efficacious takes place in the order of salvation except by grace, the supernatural help of God which produces good acts in us, that is, acts inspired by charity. Only these have a power of justification.[4] Beyond this actual grace, does Baius admit a habitual grace? Does he identify habitual grace with charity? These are questions that he leaves in the shadow, perhaps because he is not interested in them.[5]

What was the genesis of this doctrine? Evidently it comes from a wrong interpretation of certain passages of the Fathers, particularly from certain maxims of St. Augustine. In fact, patristic texts are not wanting in which we find forcibly as-

[2] Cf. Denzinger, nos. 1021, 1011.
[3] *Ibid.*, nos. 1066, 1039, 1025.
[4] *Ibid.*, no. 1016.
[5] *Ibid.*, no. 1015.

serted, that from the beginning man was called to eternal life, to perfect union with God, and to a special order of morality which alone is proportioned to that sublime end.[6] Baius' error was that therein he saw a destiny not only in fact but of right. Hence his persistent denial of the supernatural character of the primitive gifts; hence, in his system, the exclusive aptitude of theological charity for procuring for us the moral life or the union with God.[7] Hence his Pelagian optimism in the psychology of man in the state of innocence, and his Lutheran pessimism in the psychology of fallen man.

The warm conviction with which the new professor set forth his ideas, the apparent logic of his system, the fascination that every new doctrine easily exercises on youth, increased the number of his followers. These were found not only on the benches of the university of Louvain; they might be met also in several schools of the city and the environs. Many houses of the Cordeliers were won to the cause of Baius.

The chancellor, Ruard Tapper, upon returning from the Council of Trent about the middle of 1552, was alarmed at this movement of men's minds. In vain he tried to calm it. In 1558, at his request, the representative of Philip II in the Low Countries ordered Baius to suspend his courses. The next year the Faculty of Paris censured fourteen of his propositions. For a time a certain fear existed that the affair would end in a conflict between the two universities of Paris and Louvain. Diplomacy took a hand in the affair. Cardinal Granvelle, the prime minister of Spain in the Low Countries, entered into negotiations about the question with his brother, the ambassador of Philip II at the French court. In 1561 a brief of Pius IV, calculated to restore peace, urged Baius that in his teaching he should not depart from the manner of speaking employed in the schools. In 1563 Baius and his friend John Hessels were chosen to

[6] Le Bachelet, art. "Baius" in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 46.
[7] *Ibid.*

represent the university of Louvain at the Council of Trent. Thus the ferment was temporarily calmed. Unfortunately Baius, after giving to the fathers and the theologians of the Council the impression of a learned and pious man,[8] upon his return to Louvain resumed the teaching of his former doctrines with fresh ardor.

In 1567 Pope Pius V decided to intervene. By his bull *Ex omnibus* (October 1) he condemned en bloc, as temerarious, suspect, erroneous, or heretical, 79 propositions of the Louvain professor. But out of regard for Baius, the Pope did not mention him by name. The confirmation of this condemnation, made two years later, following a new examination requested by Baius, brought about the sincere submission of the famous theologian. In 1575 his colleagues elected him chancellor of the university. This office carried with it that of Inquisitor for Brabant.

Meanwhile some zealous disciples of the master had stirred up a subtle quarrel. In the sentence condemning the errors of Baius, a change in the position of a comma would completely alter the meaning of the condemnation.[9] Before submitting, the fervid partisans of Baius wished to be officially informed about the authentic position of the comma. A new bull was needed, published by Gergory XIII (January 29, 1579), to put an end to these demands. Father Franciscus Toletus of the Company of Jesus, charged by the Pope with bringing the bull to Louvain and with publishing it there in the name of His Holiness, had the consolation to see Baius submit to the Pope's authority with touching docility. He expressed his praise of the Chancellor in these words: *Nil Baio doctius, nil humilius* ("Baius is second to none in point of learning and humility"). Gregory XIII, too,

[8] Pallavicini, *Hist. du Concile de Trente*, Bk. XV, chap. 7.

[9] In the sentence *Quas quidem sententias, quamquam nonnullae aliquo pacto sustineri possent, in sensu ab assertoribus intento damnamus,* if we drop the comma after *possent* and insert a comma after *intento,* Baius escapes the papal condemnation, at least partly.

wished to give the doctor of Louvain a testimony of his great satisfaction by addressing (June 15, 1580) to him a brief full of benevolence.

Nine years later, Michael Baius, at the age of seventy-seven, died in the peace of the Church. His doctrines would soon be taken up again, defended, exaggerated, carried to extreme, by a party whose birth the pious Chancellor had not foreseen and that he certainly would have disavowed with all the strength of his believing soul.[10]

Cornelius Jansen (1585–1638)

Baius' immediate successor, Jacques Janson, has only one title to historical remembrance: that he discovered Jansen. Endowed with greater devotion to the Baianist ideas than with aptitude in spreading them, Janson sought, among his hearers, someone who would be the intellectual heir of the master. About 1604 his attention was fixed on a young student whose industrious and retiring habits seemed to promise what he expected. This student was a Fleming, twenty years old, with an awkward bearing, sparkling eyes, a projecting forehead, aquiline nose, and pale complexion. His name was Cornelius Jansen. A cloud of uncertainty hangs over his childhood and youth. According to unreliable report, he was born of poor parents,[11] was obliged to earn his living as a carpenter's

[10] A group of theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, usually called Augustinians, their chief representatives being Cardinal Noris, Fulgentius Belleli, and Lorenzo Berti, took up the re-examination of the texts of St. Augustine on which Baius had based his erroneous doctrines. These texts they tried to explain by a different system. They said: "God, as seen and possessed in Himself, is man's natural end, not in the sense that we can attain thereto by our own strength or by natural means, but in the sense that we are led toward that end by an inclination and a desire placed in us by divine Providence." This doctrine aroused much controversy. Benedict XIV had the suspected writings of Noris, Belleli, and Berti examined by two theologians, who rendered a judgment favorable to the accused. See Hurter, *Nomenclator*, III, 3; Le Bachelet in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*, II, 92.

[11] Rapin, *Hist. du jansénisme*, p. 3.

apprentice, then as a domestic servant; his evenings he devoted to study, having recourse to Protestants, and now to Catholics, in his study of grammar, the humanities, dialectics, and theology. We are told that, uncouth and ill clothed, he presented himself at the Jesuit novitiate, and that he took their rejection of him as a mark of their disdain of him and consequently conceived a deep hatred for the Society of Jesus.[12]

The latest biographer of the father of Jansenism, attempting to reconstruct his life on the basis of original documents, found merely that he was born on October 27, 1585, in a little village of the States of Holland, of a family of poor working people; and that at first he studied in his native district, then at Louvain.[13] In this city his eagerness in study was equaled only by his enthusiasm for the new ideas propagated by Baius. An illness, brought on by his excessive application to study, obliged him to take a rest. The doctors advised him to go to France for a change of climate. He went to Paris and there developed a close intimacy with a student four years older than himself, Duvergier de Hauranne,[14] who, already well known in society, procured for him the post of tutor in the house of a counselor at court. Hauranne's influence on Jansen was decisive for him in a way different from that of Jacques Janson. Without Duvergier the destiny of Jansen would probably have been quite other. Duvergier, while still quite young, had those characteristic features depicted in the portrait by Philip of Champagne. His face was criscrossed with wrinkles, his forehead sunken and furrowed.[15] His moral traits corresponded to his physical. Enthusiastic, keen, subtle, rigorous, stubborn, and overflowing with activity, his spirit was as complex as his face.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 2–8; Bayle, *Dict. historique;* Vandenpeereboom, *Jansenius.*

[13] Vandenpeereboom, *op. cit.*

[14] It has been conjectured that Jansen and Duvergier were already known at Louvain. Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal,* I, 279.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 285, 302.

Duvergier was born in 1581 at Bayonne of a rich and noble family. He made his first studies with the Jesuits. Soon he discovered in his Flemish friend a silent discontent. He was not long in discovering the cause. Jansen, who had been accustomed, at the school of the Baianist Janson, to meditate on the great problems of grace and predestination and to examine them in the light of Scripture and of the Fathers, found himself disconcerted upon listening to the Parisian doctors. These latter, under the direction of Chancelor Duval, lectured only on the secondary questions of the relations to be established between the king, the Holy See, and the bishops. In fact, the period was that of the controversies aroused by the Gallicanism of Edmond Richer.

Duvergier took advantage of this state of his friend's soul. Would no one think of taking up again and carrying on to conclusion the great movement of restoration which Baius had begun? Assuredly Paris could be of no help in this matter. But at the foot of the Pyrenees, in an estate of his family, called Champré, Duvergier offered to Jansen a quiet retreat where together they would study the early Fathers, especially St. Augustine, and would undoubtedly succeed in recovering and restoring the doctrine and discipline of the Church in their primitive purity.

Jansen accepted the invitation. That was in 1611. One of the most serious historians of Jansenism, Dom Clémencet, compares their studious retirement to the penitential and fruitful life which St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen followed long before. Jansen, stimulated by his host, there began and continued without interruption the colossal work that he would bring to completion only on his deathbed. We are told that the elder Madame de Hauranne used to say to her son "that he would kill this good Fleming by making him study so hard." [16]

[16] Lancelot declares that he saw, in St. Cyran's house, an old armchair with one arm turned into a writing table. It was in this chair that Jansen studied, almost lived; for he rarely went to bed. Cf. Lancelot, *Mémoires,* I, 103, II, 308.

The object of so much labor was the composition of a work in which he would endeavor to establish, by numerous authentic texts, that the doctrine of Baius was that of the early Fathers, particularly that of St. Augustine. At first the book was going to be called *Baii apologia;* but later it was decided to give it a more general title: *Augustinus, seu doctrina sancti Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses.*[17] In the mind of Duvergier this intellectual work was merely one of the elements of the vast reform which he had dreamed of accomplishing in the Church.

His correspondence with Jansen became very active after 1617, when the latter returned to Louvain. It leaves no doubt on the subject. They make use of veiled expressions. A sort of code was adopted. The great project being undertaken was called Pillemot; Jansen was Sulpice, Duvergier de Hauranne was called Rongeart or Durillon or Calias; the Jesuits were Chimer or Porris; St. Augustine, Seraphis; and so on. They spoke mysteriously of trees to be planted, of houses to be built, of ships to be equiped. They were wrathful against the Pope. Fear was expressed that Rome would do to Jansen "what she had done to others before everything would be ripe." On January 20, 1622, the author of the *Augustinus* congratulated his friend upon his handling of persons of note. In a letter dated June 2, 1623, we find these significant lines, in which we can glimpse, in its first idea, the whole organization of Port Royal: "People of this sort (the religious) are unusual when they embrace something, and my opinion is that it would be of considerable value if Pillemont were seconded by some such company." [18]

Duvergier did more than merely write; he acted. Jansen

[17] Du Chesnne, *Hist. du baianisme*, p. 301.

[18] Jansen's letters, seized in 1638 at St. Cyran's house, were deposited at the College de Clérmont in Paris, where the Jesuits kept the originals at the disposition of the public.

might well congratulate him on so well handling persons of note. A desire to win the favor of persons in high places had always been a dominant preoccupation of this man. In 1609 King Henry IV, having jokingly asked some courtiers if, in case of famine, a subject ought to give himself as food to the king rather than let the king die of starvation, Duvergier at once took up his pen and wrote a little work entitled: "A royal question, in which it is proved that a subject may be obliged to preserve the life of the prince at the cost of his own." In this work he seriously solved the case of conscience in the affirmative. We are told that on this occasion Father Coton, the King's confessor, declared that the author of the pamphlet deserved to be a bishop.

Later, in 1617, happening to be at Poitiers, where the Bishop had taken up arms against the Protestants and had defeated them at the head of an armed force, Duvergier published a work with the title: "Apology for Henry de la Rocheposay, against those who say that it is not permitted for ecclesiastics to resort to arms." The Bishop appointed him a canon and, three years later, resigned the abbey of St. Cyran in favor of Duvergier, who thereafter is commonly spoken of as St. Cyran.

St. Cyran, profiting by the Bishop's favor, tried to carry out at Poitiers his plan of reform. His first project was to oblige all the faithful to assist at the parish Mass under pain of mortal sin. But this attempt disturbed the clergy and finally estranged the Bishop. In 1620 St. Cyran left Poitiers for Paris. Soon we see him frequenting the home of Jerome Bignon, the Advocate General, the home of De Gondi, father of Cardinal de Retz, of Berulle, the homes of the elite, of notable persons of the world and of the Church. But what St. Cyran hoped to win to himself and his cause was the entire episcopate. In 1632 the English Jesuits, having had some disputes with the vicar apostolic sent to England, St. Cyran wrote on the subject under the trans-

parent pseudonym of Petrus Aurelius,[19] a series of dissertations in which he maintained the rights of the bishops in such a way as to have almost all of them on his side.[20] Cardinal Richelieu himself seems to have been won by the prestige of the learned abbé. In 1633 a violent pamphlet appeared under the title of *Mars Gallicus*. It was directed against the kings of France, the Salic Law, the gift of curing scrofula (king's evil), and especially against Richelieu's foreign policy. The Cardinal asked St. Cyran to reply. But the author of the anti-French satire was none other than Jansen, who turned for a moment from his great patristic labors to write as a good subject of the King of Spain.

The *Mars Gallicus* brought its author the bishopric of Ypres. Jansen was consecrated on October 28, 1636. "Thus was rewarded at the price of the altar and of the blood of Jesus Christ a satire so scandalous.[21] On the other hand, we are told that St. Cyran, by not accepting Richelieu's proposal, incurred the Cardinal's resentment.[22] Furthermore, as his subversive ideas came to light, pious priests who had been seduced by the extent of his learning and the austerity of his life, withdrew from him. Vincent de Paul, whom he had met at the house of Berulle, heard him say one day: "God has given me to understand that we have had no Church for the past five or six centuries." Another time he declared in the presence of Father de Condren: "The Council of Trent was most of all a political assembly. . . . St. Thomas has ruined real theology." Father Vincent and Father de Condren broke off relations with him and warned their friends against him. Soon Richelieu opened his eyes; or at least his confidant, Father Joseph, enlightened

[19] This name, Aurelius, was not selected by chance. It was suited to the future title of the work (the *Augustinus*) which Jansen was writing. St. Augustine's name was Aurelius Augustinus.

[20] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, I, 315.

[21] Rapin, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

[22] *Ibid.*

him. The discerning Capuchin, during one of his absences, had charged St. Cyran with the direction of a certain convent of sisters. On his return he noticed in the community the evidence of a suspicious spiritual influence, and pointed out the danger to the Cardinal.

But St. Cyran was not a man to let himself be disconcerted by this failure. The resources of that extraordinary mind were boundless. Abandoned among the clergy by the eminent men on whom he had counted, he turned to the lay world and in a short time acquired a dominant influence there.

Arnauld d'Andilly

In 1620, while St. Cyran was living at Poitiers, a pious lady, attracted to his plans of reform, introduced him to one of her brothers, an auditor in the royal council of the Treasury. A close frendship soon was formed between the ecclesiastic and the courtier. Arnauld was the accomplished type of man of the world, amiable, affable, well known in all ranks of society, plain or elegant according to circumstances. A guiding principle of his life, one that he strongly recommended to his children, was to make friends of people in all stations of life, from the least clerk in the royal household to the commander-in-chief. He made use of his standing among the great to render service to the lowly, and thus he acquired an almost universal popularity.

This Robert Arnauld d' Andilly was the oldest of twenty children of Antoine Arnauld,[23] the renowned lawyer who was well remembered for his famous speech, delivered in 1594 in the

[23] Of these twenty children, only ten survived so as to take a part in Jansenism. Arnauld d'Andilly had three brothers: the abbot of St. Nicholas, born in 1597, who became bishop of Angers; Simon Arnauld, born in 1603, and Antoine Arnauld, the "Great Arnauld," born in 1612. He had six sisters, who were all nuns at Port Royal: Madame Lemaître, in religion Sister Catherine of Genoa or of St. John, born in 1590; Mother Angélique, born in 1591; Mother Agnes, born in 1593; Sister Anne Eugénie, born in 1594; Sister Marie Claire, born in 1600; Sister Madeleine St. Christine, born in 1607.

name of the University against the Jesuits. The Arnauld family was connected with the greatest names of France, such as Créqui and Montmorency. Consequently its members preserved a certain pride of bearing. They belonged to the nobility of the robe, counting especially parliamentarians and lawyers, among whom the spirit of formalism and pettifoggery, along with a solemn rigidity, was perpetuated. Thus we find a Calvinist harshness in this family, in which many ancestors had embraced the Protestant heresy.

When he first met Abbé St. Cyran, Arnauld d'Andilly was scarcely thirty-one years old; he was then in the glory of his worldly fame. This "friend of mankind' was outwardly the most affable and amiable of men.

St. Cyran saw at once the advantage he might derive, for the realization of his plan, from the personal qualities and the association of such a friend. The letter which he wrote on September 25, 1620, to Arnauld contains the warmest declaration of friendship that we can read anywhere. He says that he is devoted to Arnauld, not by imagination or by affection or by letter or by the spoken word: all that would be less than what he feels in his heart.[24]

Presently we shall see how the dreams of St. Cyran were fulfilled. D'Andilly's friendship put him in touch with the most distinguished society of the kingdom; and the whole family of the Arnaulds put itself at the service of his ideas with complete devotion.

Mother Angélique (1591–1661)

In that year 1620 Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, and all his circle with him, were proud of the reforms which the second daughter of Antoine Arnauld, Jacqueline by name but better known as

[24] Rapin, *op. cit.*, pp. 99–102.

Mother Angélique,[25] had just brought about in the two celebrated abbeys of Port Royal and Maubuisson.

The Abbess of Port Royal and Maubuisson had embraced the religious life at an early age. In fact, she was only eight years old when, in 1599, her father and her maternal grandfather, solicited for her from King Henry IV and from Pope Clement VIII the benefice of an abbey. The papal bull, however, was obtained only with the help of a deception by which the Holy See was misinformed about the child's age.[26] Later on Mother Angélique herself said: "This maneuver made me cursed in the eyes of God." [27] The child, having entered the convent out of obedience to her father, gave no sign of a religious vocation. The abbey of Maubuisson, where she made her novitiate, was governed by Madame Jacqueline d'Estrées. We can well fancy what must have been the habitual dissipation in the convent, when we recall that the sister of the Abbess, the ill-famed Gabrielle d'Estrées, made complaint about the scandals of that convent. The Port Royal convent, where Angélique Arnauld became abbess in 1602 at the age of eleven, did not deserve any better reputation. The so-called religious life being led there consisted in reading fashionable novels, receiving visits, amusing themselves, on feast days hearing a more or less fantastic homily by a Cistercian student.

But in 1607 the young Abbess, a prey to ennui and sickness, retired for a while to her family home for the care of her health. She intended not to return to the convent. But her father, entering abruptly into her room, made her sign, by surprise and by duress, a paper in which she declared that she ratified the vows made by her eight years before. The religious respect that she had for her father's authority made her accept as a

[25] On the day of her confirmation she took the name Angélique out of deference for her abbess, who was called Angélique d'Estrées.

[26] The petition asked an abbey for "Angélique Arnauld, a nun of seventeen years."

[27] *Mémoires de Port-Royal,* II, 264.

duty the unwelcome task which had frightened her until then. Angélique Arnauld was in many respects a choice soul. St. Francis de Sales, when he met her for the first time thirteen years later, admired her extraordinary gifts. The austerity of her piety revolted at the sight of so much worldliness in the convent atmosphere. Unfortunately her spirit of independence, which she had from the Arnaulds, with the blood of their stock, led her to count too much on her own strength to carry out a needed reform. The excess of austerity and the excess of independence, which marked Mother Angélique's whole life and thereby all Jansenism, was in evidence from the outset of her rule.

On March 25, 1605, a date carefully preserved in the history of Port Royal, while a Franciscan, Father Basil, was speaking in the convent about the abasements of the Son of God, Angélique felt herself suddenly altogether changed. From that moment she devoted herself utterly to the reform of the convent. Moreover, she began with her own reform. We see her caring for the repulsive sore of a novice, retiring at night to an attic to pray there for whole hours. Every worldly trace disappeared from her religious dress as abbess; a coarse woolen garment scratched her wrist. By her exhortations and example she succeeded in forming a nucleus of solid religious, who abandoned their habits of elegance, of worldly life, of good cheer in food, of vanity. One of the reforms that was hardest for her was the re-estabishing of the cloister. In this undertaking she had against her, not only the opposition of her religious, but that of her own family. But she overcame every obstacle. The history of Port Royal preserves the memory of a certain famous day, as a country keeps the memory of the great victories that founded it; this was the Day of the Grille. Antoine Arnauld, accompanied by several members of his family, had come to see his daughter at Port Royal. The Abbess refused to receive them within the cloister of the convent. Through the

grille the Arnauld family begged, threatened. Angélique was inflexible. In short, after a prolonged strife all agreed to go to the parlor, where the Abbess, exhausted by so many emotions, fell to the floor unconscious. The father, vanquished by so much energy which he admired, at length gave in; thereafter he became his daughter's most devoted auxiliary in the work of reform.

By her influence, so far as possible Angélique profited by the fault committed in the matter of her appointment as abbess. She induced her father to write to Pope Paul V to avow her culpable weakness and to implore his pardon. The Supreme Pontiff, learning of the wise reform introduced by Mother Angélique, granted the bulls and regularized the situation of the young Abbess. The reform was accomplished. All the usages of the time of St. Bernard flourished again. At two o'clock in the morning the pious house echoed with the chant of Matins. The money saved by forgoing superfluities was distributed to the poor of the neighborhod. The religious habit of the nuns of Cîteaux reappeared in all its simplicity: a serge dress, white tunic, and black veil;[28] every superfluous ornament was banished. In this praiseworthy work of reform, sometimes the bounds of discretion were exceeded. Some of the religious passed weeks, even whole months, without speaking a single word. A novice, inadvertently sent into an abandoned cell, encumbered with rubbish, remained there until the mistake was noticed. Another novice, upon returning from an adoration of the cross, not finding her shoes, let several days go by rather than break the silence. The dauntless superior was a chief ruling by her ascendency rather than a mother governing by affection. When her religious were ill, she herself was the one who bled them, even five or six times in two days. Through the grille she rendered the same service to the people of the

[28] To this was later added the scapular of the Blessed Sacrament, bearing a red cross.

neighborhood, who admired the prompt and confident way this abbess handled the lancet and the bistoury.

The city and the court soon learned of the wonders accomplished by this astonishing sister of D'Andilly. The Marquis of Sablé, the Princess de Guémené, the Duchess de Liancourt, all came to make retreats at Port Royal. They did not always go forth converted. "Alas," said the Marquis de Sablé, who was worldly to her last breath, "it requires a grace to leave the world; but two graces are needed to hate it." The ascendence of the young Abbess was exercised fully in her family. Antoine Arnauld, conquered on the Day of the Grille, placed his experience in affairs at the service of the community. Five of his daughters, six of his nieces, and even his wife, one after the other, placed themselves under the guidance of Mother Angélique. Catherine, the eldest, after a most unfortunate marriage to M. Le Maître, there led a life of silence, piety, and of charity toward the poor. Anne Eugénie, at first worldly, elegant, and passionately fond of all pleasures, there relished the delights of the contemplative life. Marie Claire, the gentlest and most docile of the daughters, there underwent without complaint all the humiliations by which the strong-minded superior thought she ought to try her sister's virtue. Agnes, an ardent soul, whose mystical transports needed an attentive control, engaged in those strange meditations that soon formed the Rosary of the Blessed Sacrament.

Reports of the Port Royal reform reached the ears of Louis XIII. There was an abbey which the pious monarch resolved to lead back to its primitive observance; it was Maubuisson, which Henry IV had had the weakness to entrust to the sister of Gabrielle d'Estrées. Neither the words of the abbot of Cîteaux, M. Boucherat, the ecclesiastical superior of the Abbess, nor the supplications of Archbishop Sourdis of Bordeaux were able to obtain from Madame Angélique d'Estrées a beginning of reform. The Abbess of Port Royal, who knew

Maubuisson, since she there spent the first years of her religious life, seemed to be the only one who could realize the King's desires. She gladly accepted the formidable mission.

The memoirs and letters of the time tell of the episodes, at times tragic, at times comical, of the strife that ensued between the two women. The King's commissioner, when he presented himself at the abbey, was seized and beaten by the valets of the Abbess. Then, on February 3, 1618, the royal archers forcibly seized the Abbess of Maubuisson and brought her to the Penitent Daughters of Paris. Angélique Arnauld then entered the abbey, choosing for her cell a garret close to a nauseous sewer, speaking, preaching, conjuring the sisters "to tear their breasts asunder." She won a certain number of them. Finally Angélique d'Estrées, escaping from her prison, reappeared (September 6, 1619) at six o'clock in the morning, in the choir of the chapel and claimed her stall of superior. Then the struggle was carried on within the convent until the day when 500 archers besieged the convent and took it by assault. Mother Angélique again took possession with bells ringing and torches burning, at the head of a cortege composed of all the clergy of the city and a large number of the faithful accompanying them, carrying candles in the hand.[29]

The reform of Maubuisson then took place as did that of Port Royal, by the same means and with the same results. At that period, Mother Angélique had the good fortune of a priceless spiritual guidance. From 1618 to 1622 St. Francis de Sales was her spiritual director.[30] Who can say what might have been accomplished for the good of the Church by the incomparable strength of that soul if it had been regulated by the wisdom of the Bishop of Geneva? But the correspondence of the Abbess

[29] On Maubuisson's reform, see Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, I, 78–81, 190–202; Monlaub, *Angélique Arnauld*, pp. 135–57.

[30] In the reform of the convents of Port Royal and of Maubuisson, Mother Angélique had taken the advice of three religious: Father Archangel, a Capuchin, Father Suffren, a Jesuit, and Father Eustache de Saint-Paul, a Feuillant.

with the holy Bishop shows her capital defect. At the very outset Francis de Sales saw the weak side of that soul and the remedies that would be useful for it. "Ceaselessly animate your humble courage and your humility and the desire to be humble. Animate them with trust in God. . . . Let all your conversation be marked with sincerity, gentleness, and cheerfulness.[31] . . . Gradually tame the vivacity of your spirit to patience, sweetness, and affability." [32] In his letter of February 4, 1620, the saint bantered her with much wit and gentleness about the displeasure she experienced at being called "my daughter" by her confessor, instead of "my mother." Under the good influence of Francis de Sales, humility seemed to be getting the better of haughtiness, simplicity seemed to be overcoming the entanglements of pride.[33] She expressed a desire to resign from her office and retire to the Visitation and there lead the hidden life of a humble religious. The holy director hesitated to decide. Later on he wrote to the Jesuit Father Binet: "I dodged so far as I could. I saw that this desire was extraordinary; but I also saw an extraordinary heart. I saw the inclination of that heart to command; but I saw that it was for the purpose of overcoming this inclination that she wished to bind herself to obedience." The matter dragged on, and the holy Bishop died on December 28, 1622, leaving the Abbess of Port Royal without direction and guidance.

Proud and dominating instincts then too often gave themselves free rein in that soul. In 1625, when the new abbot of Cîteaux, Father de Nivelle, disapproved one of her projects, the foundation of Port Royal of Paris,[34] she obtained, by certain solicitations and maneuvers, from Urban VIII (1627) a bull freeing it from the jurisdiction of Cîteaux. Then she drew up against the whole Order of Cistercians a long indict-

[31] Letter of September 11, 1619; Migne, V, 1170.
[32] Letter of September 12, 1619; Migne, V, 1175.
[33] *Ibid.*, col. 1224.
[34] Letter of November 11, 1621; Migne, V, 1335.

ment which she charged the lawyer Jerome Bignon to read in a plenary session of the Parliament of Paris. Three years later, in 1629, after resigning as abbess of Port Royal, she speaks, in a letter, of the regime that succeeded hers in terms that show dissatisfaction and bitterness.[35] "As soon as I had quit my office, Mother Genevieve changed the whole order of that house. . . . In the church, quantities of perfume, plaited linens and bouquets. . . . Everyone is asked to come there and preach . . . sometimes a Jesuit, as Father Binet. . . . Along with all this, extraordinary austerities." [36]

"Pure as angels and proud as devils," was the comment which thirty-five years later M. de Péréfixe made about the religious of Port Royal. Mother Angélique already began to justify this remark.[37]

St. Cyran and Port Royal

Ever since 1620, the date of his close association with Arnauld d'Andilly, St. Cyran had closely followed the events

[35] The superior had left Maubuisson in 1623 and had returned to Port Royal des Champs.

[36] *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Port-Royal* (1742), I, 333.

[37] It was in this year 1630 that the following incident took place. A young woman, coming to see a nun of Port Royal of Paris, met the Mother Abbess at the grille. Angélique relates: "I was seized with so violent a movement that I said to her that she would be lost in the world, that she must enter the house at that very hour, although she had not come for that purpose, that she must do violence to herself."

"I experienced a horrible anguish," continues the young woman, later Sister Pineau, "and I kept saying: 'O God, grant me the grace to do my will and not thine,' not realizing what I was saying.

"'At this moment you must enter,' insisted Madame; 'God wills that you be a nun.'

"Standing before the grille, I grasped the iron bars with both hands to keep from falling. Grief and repugnance made me strike my head against the bars, rather sharply without feeling it.

"'I wish you to go to the door. I am going there to receive you. You must not deliberate longer.'"

"Thus spoke Madame; and I went there like a criminal being led to execution, having no consolation but the thought of approaching death. She opened the door. I threw myself at her feet, bursting into tears. The next night I was taken with a fever, and I did not recover for six weeks." (Quoted by Monlaub, *op. cit.*, p. 212).

of Port Royal. In 1621 he ventured to visit Mother Agnes at Port Royal des Champs. On July 4, 1623, he wrote to Mother Angélique to congratulate her on her management at Maubuisson. Duvergier de Hauranne had shortly before received the famous letter of June 2, in which Jansen, after recalling the power of the religious orders, added: "It would be of considerable value if Pillemont were seconded by some such company." Pillemont's organization already existed. Port Royal would be its core; the high society into which Arnauld d'Andilly had introduced St. Cyran would supply the framework. Mother Angélique writes: "M. de St. Cyran took the trouble to write to me to thank me as if he were the father of all these daughters; from that hour God gave him charity toward me." The relations of St. Cyran with the superior of Port Royal remainded for several years of a superficial sort. He was not accustomed to push himself forward of his own accord. He always had to be urged before he would enter into any affair. But once entered, he did not withdraw. This, at any rate, is the view of Sainte-Beuve.[38]

The relations became closer only in 1630, on the occasion of a little mystical writing composed by one of Mother Angélique's sisters. It bore the title, *The Secret Rosary of the Blessed Sacrament.* It was a meditation in sixteen points in honor of the sixteen centuries that had passed since the Savior's death. Sixteen attributes of Christ's divinity are adored: the inaccessibility, the incomprehensibility, the incommunicability, the boundlessness, etc.; in short, all the attributes capable of showing us the Savior as an inaccessible Master, not any attribute that leads us to regard Him as a father and a friend.

St. Cyran, consulted by Mother Angélique, read and reread the little writing. He considered that nothing was better calculated to transfer to the practical domain the lofty theological speculations which he was preparing for publication.

[38] *Port-Royal,* I, 331.

He had *The Secret Rosary* approved by Jansen and by several other doctors of Louvain. When a commission of Sorbonne doctors condemned the book as "containing many extravagances, impertinences, errors, and impieties," St. Cyran took up the defense of the writing and made a commentary on it.

This active intervention of Duvergier de Hauranne in the work of Port Royal brought him into relation with M. Zamet, bishop of Langres, who was then working, in concert with Mother Angélique, to found an Institute with the special aim of adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. *The Secret Rosary* would be a sort of mystic program for it.

Sebastian Zamet, bishop of Langres, had earlier, at the court of Marie de Medici, led the life of a worldly priest. A serious illness turned his soul to God. Thereafter his conduct was that of an exemplary priest, and all his efforts tended to spread about him a religious reform. The Jansenists later attacked his spirituality. But he was held in high esteem by the most worthy personages of the seventeenth century: Father Condren, Cardinal Berulle, St. Francis de Sales, and Father Olier. This esteem was a guaranty of the soundness of his faith and the purity of his zeal.[39] Impressed by the learning and austerity of St. Cyran, he associated him in the new work. When, in May, 1633, the house of the Blessed Sacrament opened in Paris, with the blessing of De Gondi, Father Zamet welcomed St. Cyran as a helper and a friend. For two whole years the Abbé merely gave conferences at the grille. Preaching penance and recalling the times of austerity of the early Church, he gradually undermined the spirituality of the Bishop of Langres. Often he made an abusive application of a maxim which he said he learned from St. Francis de Sales, but which was not a maxim of that saint, at least not in the sense

[39] Sainte-Beuve, in his *Port-Royal*, has been too much influenced by the prejudices and bitterness of the Jansenists with regard to Zamet. The pages concerning the Bishop of Langres are among the most faulty of his great work.

which St. Cyran gave to it: "Out of ten thousand priests, you will scarcely find one good one." [40] And he intimated that the good one was not the Bishop of Langres. The perfection that he preached appeared to be placed on an austere summit, hard to reach, reserved to a few choice souls. Mother Angélique embraced these doctrines passionately. The formidable nature of the austerities was but an additional attraction for her. The arduous difficulties of the ascent enraptured her. For the destiny of that strong soul was to escape the reefs of lower temptations and to be broken to pieces by seeking to reach the summits which she thought she could see.[41] She drew her daughters after her. Bishop Zamet, after passing a few months in his diocese, upon his return found the community transformed. The sisters no longer went to communion or to confession. Prostrate on the floor of the chapel, as far away as possible from the Blessed Sacrement, to adore it with the more respect, they rose up only to grieve over the laxity of the times and to appeal to the ancient discipline of early times. When the Bishop of Langres, superior of the community, wished to have them return to the former practices, the Abbess was stubbornly immovable. St. Cyran, who for some time had been awaiting this conflict, then appeared and obliged the nuns to decide between the Bishop of Langres and him. He did not intervene until he was sure to succeed. Without consulting any of her ecclesiastical superiors, Mother Angélique summoned Mother Genevieve, installed her in her place as abbess and, by the very carriage what had brought her, departed for Port Royal. There the direction of St. Cyran was exercised now without any constraint.

Port Royal was won. The center of action desired by Jansen was found and founded. But St. Cyran's ambition went further. He wished to group about this center people of the

[40] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, pp. 275, 446.

[41] Monlaur, *Angélique Arnauld*, p. 244; Prunel, *Sebastien Zamet.*

world whose good will had been won by the relations of D'Andilly. Under his direction they would form a sort of militant company, capable of defending the cause of Jansenism against the Society of Jesus itself. The institution of the hermits of Port Royal realized this dream.

The first one whom the Abbé succeeded in attracting to Port Royal was Antoine Le Maître, famous lawyer, nephew of Mother Angélique Arnauld.[42] Le Maître had entertained some thought of marrying. But at the first mention of this intention, Mother Agnes, his aunt, wrote to him, saying: "My dear nephew, I will henceforth love you with a very ordinary affection, since you will be in a condition very common." [43] He gave up the idea of marriage. Shortly after his mother's death, St. Cyran persuaded him to abandon the bar. At the age of thirty he retired to Port Royal, where he engaged in the lowliest labors of the field. You might have seen him digging or reaping, performing the most painful labors, in the spirit of penance. He never became a priest; but he exercised a great influence at Port Royal. He it was who turned Racine from the theater.

Soon we see about him Simon Le Maître de Séricourt, the younger brother of Antoine, who had intended to become a Carthusian and who was persuaded by M. de Barcos, nephew of St. Cyran, that the Carthusian rule left too much to the individual's choice; Claude Lancelot, the future author of the *Racines grecques,* who later rendered so much service to "the little schools" of Port Royal; Antoine Singlin, a former disciple of St. Vincent de Paul, who would become the great orator of the Jansenist party; M. de La Rivière, cousin of Duke de Saint-Simon, who became forest warden and at his leisure hours translated the works of St. Theresa; M. de la Petitière, a former officer of Richelieu's Guards, who made shoes for the

[42] He was the son of Isaac Le Maître de Saci, who married Catherine, the oldest daughter of Antoine Arnauld. The name Saci is merely the anagram of Isaac. To Isaac Le Maître de Saci we owe the famous translation of the Bible, called the Saci Bible.

[43] Letter of June 11, 1634, quoted by Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.,* I, 375.

nuns; M. Hamon, physician, who became the doctor of the community. All these men, whether coming from the middle class or from the upper classes, laymen or priests, had a sort of worship of Mother Angélique. When she used to go to visit the hermits, the bells were rung and sometimes bonfires were lighted.

St. Cyran now had the Company he had dreamed of. He strove to infuse his own spirit into it. St. Vincent de Paul relates one of his tactics: "I have heard it said that M. de St. Cyran would declare certain truths to a group of persons capable of accepting them, and then, passing to another room, would say the contrary to other persons not so disposed. He held that our Lord acted in this way and he ordered the like method to be used." As to his doctrine, we can sift it out from what we have already seen of his writings and his acts: a dogma of despair, resting on belief in predestination, in the servitude of the will, and in the small number of the elect; an inhuman morality by force of austerity, proscribing poetry, disparaging marriage, repressing all family affection, all natural inclinations; a liturgy without splendor, adopting from the first centuries their most severe customs; public penance, obligatory High Mass, and so on; ecclesiastical discipline reduced in its most essential elements: namely, the authority of the pope, whose decisions were disputed, that of the bishops, whose authority was lost by a single grave sin;[44] in short, a semi-Protestantism. In fact, a real bond existed between the internal Christian inspiration of St. Cyran and that of the leading Reformers: for all of them a faith in the word of God was based less on the tradition of the Church than on the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Both St. Cyran and the Reformers presupposed an interruption of tradition, a radical corruption

[44] In his *Petrus Aurelius,* St. Cyran held that a single sin against chastity completely deprived a bishop of his power.

and a very early one in the Catholic Church.[45] Furthermore, St. Cyran openly declared that he held as true the thought of Calvin, merely rejecting its awkward formulation.[46]

We are here face to face with a real sect, closely resembling Protestantism, but not wishing to separate from the Catholic Church. This sect had its leader, St. Cyran; its center of action, Port Royal; its friendly relations with high society by the hermits and the ladies of high society who made retreats there. It had its doctrine, a sort of Calvinism; it had its doctor, who was spoken of in tones of mystery and whose book was impatiently awaited, Jansen. Such an organization was of a sort to constitute little by little, like French Protestantism, a peril for the state. A man as discerning as Richelieu could not ignore or disdain this peril. The Cardinal ordered an inquiry. Zamet, Condren, Vincent de Paul, De Caulet, and Chancellor Séguier were questioned. Several depositions, notably that of De Caulet, were overwhelming in condemnation of the party.[47] St. Cyran was represented as a revolutionary, exercising an absolute authority over his entourage, and determined to upset the Church on the pretext of reforming it. Richelieu apparently remained impassive and left for Compiègne with the court. But on May 15, 1638, when Péréfixe, then tutor of the Dauphin and later archbishop of Paris, entered the Cardinal's room, the latter said to him: "Beaumont, today I have done something that will stir up a cry against me: by order of the King, I have had Abbé St. Cyran arrested. Scholars and some well-intentioned men will perhaps raise a disturbance. Nevertheless I am confidant that I have rendered a service to the state and to the Church. Many evils would have been avoided if they had imprisoned Luther and Calvin as soon as they began to dogmatize."

[45] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, III, 619.

[46] *Calvinus bene sensit, male locutus est,* declared St. Cyran to St. Vincent de Paul.

[47] Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, I, 538.

That morning, at five o'clock, an officer of the guard had arrested Abbé de St. Cyran and brought him to the castle of Vincennes.[48]

The *Augustinus*

Eight days before St. Cyran's arrest, Jansen was dead. In that bishopric of Ypres, to which he was promoted in 1636, he had just put the last stroke to his great work, when, at the beginning of May, 1638, he was stricken with a mysterious disease. The doctors diagnosed it as the plague or anthrax. No epidemic of this sort was then prevalent in the district. Some have supposed that he had touched some old infected documents in the archives. Others conjecture that his feverish activity in his eagerness to finish his work had "fired his blood." [49] The patient's condition was soon considered hopeless. He made his will, by which he charged his chaplain and his two friends, Fromont and Calénus, to publish the *Augustinus*. He said: "I believe that nothing in it can be altered without great difficulty. But if the Holy See wishes any change to be made, I am an obedient and submissive son of that Church in whose bosom I have always lived even unto this deathbed." He then made a general confession to his chaplain and, after receiving Viaticum and extreme unction, rendered his soul to God. He was fifty-three years old and had governed the Church of Ypres for eighteen months.[50]

The friends of St. Cyran had not told him of the death of Jansen until they were assured of the completion of the *Augus-*

[48] Hermant, *Mémoires,* I, 81. Hermant attributes St. Cyran's arrest to his opinion about attrition, which Duvergier said was insufficient for the pardon of sins, even when accompanied by confession. He also surmises that Father Joseph's "jealousy" over St. Cyran's influence with the nuns of Valvary may have brought about his imprisonment. Both of these explanations are unlikely and do not at all accord with the character of Cardinal Richelieu and of Father Joseph.

[49] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.,* II, 93.

[50] Hermant, *op. cit.,* I, 105; Rapin, *Histoire du jansénisme,* p. 369.

tinus. At one and the same time the Abbé heard the bad news and learned of the only consolation that could moderate it for him. The testamentary executors promptly had the work printed, but in secret and without submitting it in any way to the Holy See. The work so impatiently awaited at Port Royal appeared at Louvain in 1640, then in 1641 at Paris,[51] and finally at Rouen. The success of these three folio volumes was prodigious. In September, 1640, they were on sale at the fair of Frankfort. Guy-Patin wrote: "This book was received with great esteem among reputable men." One of the first copies off the press was brought to the prisoner of Vincennes, who declared: "After St. Paul and St. Augustine, Jansen stands as the third of those who have spoken divinely of grace. . . . The *Augustinus* will be the book of devotion of the last times; this book will endure as long as the Church." These words of "the confessor of the faith" were repeated and spread. The enemies of the Jesuits, the parliamentarians, were eager to read the volume so highly recommended by St. Cyran.

The crude and ponderous work that was so eagerly devoured comprises three parts. The first part, forming an historical exposition, endeavored to establish a logical continuity between the doctrine of the Pelagians, that of the Semipelagians, and that of the Jesuits. The second part, intended to be a study of supernatural psychology, insisted on the two extreme states of man: almost a god before his fall; after his fall, almost a demon. The third part contained dogmatic and moral conclusions: man, radically evil of himself and unable to do anything good except by the grace of God, finds himself placed between two attractions, the evil and the good, and these necessarily draw him either toward the evil or toward the good, according to their predominance, eternally decreed by the good pleasure of God.

This obscured Baianism, or, if you prefer, this moderated

[51] Hermant, p. 109.

Protestantism,[52] was set forth in a Latin often insipid and inelegant, although not devoid of a certain energy. Nevertheless persons who prided themselves on following the movement of ideas read the *Augustinus* and, to go back to the sources, read the works of St. Augustine. Madame de Sevigné took delight in reading St. Augustine's treatises on predestination and on the gift of perseverance; she valued his doctrine on the sovereign will of God, she advised M. de Coulanges to read the treatise *De vera religione,* and even expressed her opinion of St. Augustine's Jansenism.

But Jansen's opponents were able to procure copies of the printed pages as fast as they came off the press. The publication of the book found them ready. As early as March 22, 1641, a Jesuit father at Louvain sustained the thesis that the doctrine of the *Augustinus* was contrary to the definitions of the Council of Trent, and was in agreement with propositions condemned by Pius V and Gregory XIII.[53] Other theses followed. The followers of the Bishop of Ypres replied. At first the Pope was unwilling to see in these disputes anything more than an infraction of Paul V's decree which, in 1607, forbade the publication of any writing on the controverted questions of grace. On August 1, 1641, a decree of the Inquisition forbade the printing of Jansen's book and that of the theses sustained by the Jesuits.[54]

[52] According to Jansen, man before original sin was almost an angel. Enveloped and sustained by supernatural grace, he cooperated therewith with all his strength. We might say that the psychology of man in the state of innocence, according to Jansen, was Molinist. Baius absorbed the supernatural in the natural. Jansen preserved the two orders by exalting the action of grace to the supreme degree. But then came the Fall. It was lamentable. By this impetuous fall from the summit where grace had raised him, man ruined himself, lost all his powers. No liberty was left, no spontaneity. Baius preserved the shadow of it. Jansen kept the name of free will, but denied its reality. A decree of the Redeemer will indeed redeem the world, but that decree will reach only the small number of the predestined. They dared not say, like Luther, that He depraves the others, but they declare that He abandons them in the mass of perdition, *massa perditionis.* See Paquier, *Le Jansenisme,* pp. 121–58.

[53] Hermant, I, 137; Rapin, p. 433.

[54] Hermant, I, 140; Rapin, p. 437.

The friends of Jansen rejoiced: the opinions of Jansen and those of the Jesuits seemed to be placed on the same plane. In a solemn service celebrated at Louvain for the anniversary of Jansen's death, a Premonstratensian delivered a funeral oration which was simply a pompous eulogy of the Bishop of Ypres and a series of invectives against the theologians of the Company of Jesus.[55] On the other hand, Cardinal Richelieu, unfavorably impressed by the agitation which the *Augustinus* produced at Paris, urged the Pope to condemn the book.[56] At Richelieu's invitation the theological lecturer of Paris, Isaac Habert, preached at Notre Dame against the doctrines of Jansen and prepared public opinion to receive a papal condemnation with a thorough knowledge of the case and with respect. The Pope grasped that the controversy went beyond the limits of the earlier theological disputes which were the concern of the Congregation De Auxiliis. It was the Jansenists' turn to tremble. At the solicitation of D'Andilly, Liancourt, and a certain person of dubious conduct who was mixed up in all the intrigues of the court, by name Chavigny, the prisoner of the Vincennes castle had signed a letter intended for the eyes of the Cardinal, a letter that was a sort of apology of his doctrines.[57]

The Jansenist Fontaine in his *Mémoires* relates: "Of a sudden God seemed to awaken from a deep sleep to render justice to those who cried to Him night and day." The event to which the Port Royal annalist refers was the death of the terrible Cardinal Richelieu, which occurred on December 4, 1642. A month later, St. Cyran, still in prison but on the point of leaving it, wrote this militant letter: *"Tempus tacendi et tempus loquendi.* The time to speak has come. I would be guilty of a crime to keep silent now. . . . The time for hesitation has passed. Even though we should all perish and make the great-

[55] Rapin, p. 437.

[56] *Ibid.*

[57] Sainte-Beuve says: "We admit that the great servant of God had a moment of weakness" (*Port-Royal,* II, 19).

est uproar that was ever heard, we must no longer let the sermons (of M. Habert) pass without replying to all the leaders in particular. Silence or dissimulation must no longer be employed for fear of injuring my fame."

Six days later St. Cyran was free.[58] His return to Port Royal was a triumphal celebration. He again took up his lodging in the Faubourg St. Jacques, not far from his friends. The great ones, the ladies of high station, prompted by Arnauld d'Andilly, came in throngs to visit him. D'Andilly, before whom all doors opened, presented St. Cyran to the queen mother, Anne of Austria, as "the greatest saint and the most learned doctor of modern times." This move was calculated to overawe. Richelieu was no longer to be feared; Mazarin was busy with something else. Report had it that Pope Urban VIII had drawn up a bull condemning the *Augustinus*. The rumor was true. But well known was the weakness of Cardinal Barberini, the Pope's nephew, who was conducting affairs, and who, altogether concerned with the matter of his uncle's health, wished above everything else to avoid giving him cause for violent emotions. Then threats were used. A hint was given out that a great trouble would be stirred up. Some said that the bull, ready for publication, was the work of the Jesuits, and that it would not be received. Barberini kept delaying the publication of the document, which, dated March 6, 1642, did not appear until June 19 of the following year.[59] Its opening words were *In eminenti.*

Feeling ran high. St. Cyran declared: "They have gone too

[58] Apparently this liberation was owing to a ruse of the Jansenists. It was obtained through the intermediary of a Jesuit, Father Ferrier, the King's confessor. The King was petitioned to grant pardon to those detained in the Vincennes castle. To this petition was added a list of the prisoners, but St. Cyran's name was not put in the list. However, the *lettre de cachet* freeing the prisoners was general: St. Cyran profited by the ruse.

[59] The bull is dated March 6, 1641. But we know that, in the style of the bulls, the year begins *ab incarnatione Domini,* i.e., March 25. March 6, 1641, thus becomes March 6, 1642, in the ordinary way of reckoning dates.

far. They must be shown their duty." [60] He was, of course, referring to the Jesuits; for in his party the writing of the bull was generally attributed to them. Even if it were the work of Pope Urban VIII, it could not be accepted, said the Jansenist party, with full safety of conscience; for the Pope was without competence. He lacked also authority: was he qualified to make a decision on the meaning of a book? After all, what was condemned in this book? The fact that it reproduced the doctrine of Baius. But was that doctrine authentically condemned? Not at all. Moreover, Baius and Jansen had done nothing more than repeat the doctrine of St. Paul. The head of the Church condemning the Apostle of the Gentiles! St. Peter condemning St. Paul! This simple hypothesis was an insult to the Church.

Such were the protests raised by the bull *In eminenti,* when the Jansenist party lost its leader. Upon release from prison, Duvergier de Hauranne set to work to refute the doctrines of the Jesuits.[61] These labors, added to infirmities which his imprisonment had but increased, crushed him. On feast days he might be seen in the church of St. Jacques du Haut-Pas, his parish, walking with weary step, to receive communion at the High Mass, wearing the stole over his cloak. His friends were disturbed at his burdened and downcast air. Yet, says Hermant, "the freedom of his spirit was so great that, even the day before his stroke, he was still at work on his book, saying that a priest is a king, and that a king ought to die on his feet." [62] The next day he suffered a stroke of apoplexy. Eight days later (October 11, 1643) he expired in the arms of his curé, Father de Pons, who had been summoned to administer the last sacraments.[63]

[60] Sainte-Beuve, III, 90.

[61] Hermant, I, 218.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

[63] *La Gazette de France,* favorable to the Jansenists, says, in its number of October 17, that "he died of a stroke of apoplexy, which came upon him after he had received Holy Viaticum." Rapin quotes a letter of Abbé de Pons, pastor of St. Jacques, which contradicts this testimony: "You ask me if M. de Saint-Cyran received his sacraments at the time of his death; no one can better answer that question than I can.

"The Great Arnauld"

We are told that on his deathbed Duvergier de Hauranne said to his doctor, who was connected with the college of the Jesuits: "Tell your fathers that I am leaving twelve who are better than I am." [64] He was probably alluding to his devoted nephew, M. de Barcos, to M. Singlin, the fashionable orator, to M. de Saci, the esteemed spiritual director, to M. D'Andilly, whose worldly connections were of so great value, and perhaps also to the youngest of the Arnaulds, Antoine, who until then had been merely the most brilliant of the soldiers, but who had just shown himself a leader by the publication of his great work on frequent Communion.

The twentieth son of Antoine Arnauld was born in 1612. At the time we are speaking of he was thirty years old. Six of his sisters had entered Port Royal as nuns; two of his brothers lived there as hermits.[65] His other brothers were dead. His father had become the counselor and the habitual guest of Port Royal; his mother had entered that convent under the name of Sister Catherine. Antoine Arnauld, from childhood, had breathed the Jansenist spirit. But his youth was somewhat worldly. His conversion to a life of austerity occurred under the influence of St. Cyran, prisoner in the castle of Vincennes. Antoine, then a subdeacon, was looking forward to obtaining the doctorate. One day he wrote to the prisoner, telling about thoughts of pride that were tempting him. He received the following reply: "The doctoral dignity has deceived you, as the beauty of Susanna deceived the two old men." In another letter the "confessor of the faith," whose every word Antoine weighed

---

I was called by his servants to give him extreme unction. But before I had finished, he died. . . . As to the other sacraments, he did not receive them; he did not even mention them" (Rapin, p. 505).

[64] Sainte-Beuve, III, 22.

[65] Arnauld d'Andilly, his oldest brother, and the Abbé de Saint-Nicolas, the future bishop of Angers.

as a person might weigh gold coins, wrote: "You must build an internal library. Nothing is so dangerous as learning; the words of the Son of God are alarming: *Abscondisti haec a sapientibus.*" The terrible director then laid down for Antoine a rule of life: two fast days every week, frequent prayers, a hermitical life, the postponement of the doctorate until after receiving the priesthood, not to receive the priesthood until he had made an internal donation of all his goods to Port Royal.[66]

All this happened in 1640. Shortly afterward (February 4, 1641) Antoine lost his mother. When the dying woman was about to receive extreme unction, Antoine, then a deacon, asked for a surplice that he might assist at the ceremony. But Father Singlin, confessor of the nuns, judged he ought not to grant this request. He said that, as M. de Saci had already obtained this permission, to let her son Antoine also enter would be according too much to nature. Antoine then was satisfied to ask that he be informed of his mother's last counsel. Father Singlin brought these words to him, words that must have remained graven in his memory: "I beg you to say to my last son . . . that he should never relax in the defense of the truth, but sustain it without fear, even if it should cost a thousand lives."

This young man, who would soon be called "The Great Arnauld," was small, dark, and ill-favored. In the forty-two quarto volumes that comprise his writings you cannot find one of those expressions that hold the attention, that shine, or that stand out, not a single expression that might be called a sign of genius.[67] But when Antoine Arnauld spoke, this son and grandson of lawyers manifested all the qualities of the profession of his ancestors. Fire, color, and life were in his words. Later when his friends, captivated by his conversation, read

[66] "A great obscurity covers the measures according to which the hermits of Port Royal gave and assured their fortune to the community. . . . A curious economic chapter would be that of the finances of Port Royal and of Jansenism, from the donation of the 'Great Arnauld' to the *boite à Perrette*" (Sainte-Beuve, II, 18).

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 173.

his writings, they thought they were still listening to him. For those who had seen him or who had been told of him, of the warmth of his conversation and the activity of his devotion, the charm of his word and the influence of his person passed into his writings. As orator, writer, controversialist, and organizer, he was "The Great Arnauld." [68]

The occasion of his first book, which made him famous at once, was a commonplace case of conscience between two friends of Port Royal, the Marquise de Sablé and Princess Rohan-Guémené. These two ladies had been invited to a ball that was to be held on a day when they were to go to Communion. They consulted their respective confessors. Mme Guémené, whose conscience was formerly directed by the Jesuits, had now taken St. Cyran as her director. In this case she consulted also Father Singlin. Madame Sablé, although greatly attached to Port Royal, still went for spiritual guidance to a father of the Company of Jesus, Father de Sesmaisons. Madame Guémené, alleging the rule of life given her by her Jansenist director, excused herself for not accepting the invitation to the ball. Madame Sablé, in conformity with the spiritual direction of her Jesuit confessor, went to the ball and the next day submitted the case of conscience to Father de Sesmaisons, telling him about the rule of life imposed on her friend. The Jesuit not only approved of his penitent's conduct, but, with the help of his fellow Jesuits, Fathers Bauny and Rabardeau, undertook a refutation of the doctrine of Port Royal in a little writing bearing the title, *Question s'il est meilleur de communier souvent que rarement.*

Arnauld became acquainted with the work even before it was placed in the hands of the printer.[69] Indignant at seeing the author admit to Communion even those who are filled with self-love and who are attached to the world, and taking advantage

[68] This appellation was accepted even by the foes of Jansenism.

[69] Hermant, I, 213 note.

of what he appealed to as the better rule, to regard what is conformable to the early practices of the Church, Antoine Arnauld decided to destroy his adversaries' thesis by showing that all antiquity was contrary to it.[70]

This was the entire aim of his book, which was entitled, *De la fréquent Communion.* The work was divided into three parts. The first part was a treatise of positive theology. He assembled there and coordinated texts of Scripture and of the Fathers on the dispositions a person should have for receiving Communion. The second part was a moral treatise. The author tried to demonstrate that penance should precede Communion. The third part was a treatise of asceticism. There the author examined the best means for fruitful reception of Communion. This part was preceded by a preface where we read these words, destined to arouse so much discussion: "St. Peter and St. Paul, these two heads of the Church make but one."

The work, arranged in methodical order, written in a cold style, but clear and provided throughout with fine quotations from the Fathers, had an immense success. Since the appearance of St. Francis de Sales' *Introduction to the Devout Life* forty years before, no book of spirituality had obtained equal favor. It was put on sale in the summer of 1643. Princess Marie de Gonzaga found delight in reading it. Men of letters, such as Doctor Pallu, devoured it.[71]

La fréquent, as the book was commonly called, introduced among the general public questions which previously had engaged the attention only of theologians and a few eager minds in high society. But an uneasiness arose in the Church and spread among its most devoted defenders. The Company of Jesus, the Vincentians, and St. Sulpice were conspicuous for their zeal in defending the traditional doctrines against the innovators.

[70] *Ibid.,* p. 212.
[71] Sainte-Beuve, II, 225.

The Jesuits

Racine in his *Histoire de Port Royal* regards the prompt attack by the Jesuits as merely the consequence of a grudge of literary men. He says: "The Jesuits had seen themselves for a long time in possession of the first rank in letters, and people read almost no books of devotion except theirs. Therefore it pained them to see themselves dispossessed from that front rank and from that public favor by the newcomers, before whom it seemed that all their genius and all their learning melted away." Such a statement of the question narrows it too much and misrepresents it. We saw above that the divergence of ideas and attitudes between the Jansenists and the Jesuits dates far back. The whole spirit of Jansenism was opposed to the spirit of the Company of Jesus. The Jesuits, born in the danger of the Church, we may even say born of that very danger, were the restorers of that order and of discipline. The Jansenists were individualists. They were attached to Catholic unity, but by a sort of personal adherence. For them the principal personage in religious life was the "director," the one who spoke to the conscience, or rather it was conscience itself.[72] If they professed blind obedience to the Church, this was to the Church of early times, not to the Church of today.

A fresh occasion of conflict had arisen for some years past between the Company of Jesus and Port Royal. The Jesuits, from the beginning of their society, had devoted themselves especially to the education of youth. But St. Cyran, a short time before his imprisonment, had laid the basis of the institution which soon became celebrated under the name of "the little schools." According as the reputation of Port Royal spread, leading families eagerly sought the favor of having their children educated in an environment so scholarly, so austere, and so distinguished. In 1643, at the very time when *La fréquent*

[72] Lavisse. *Hist. de France,* VII, Part I, 101.

was published, "the little schools" were obliged to move from Port Royal des Champs to the château du Chesnay near Versailles. M. Le Maître, the great lawyer whose oratorical triumphs were not forgotten, showed a zeal to which St. Cyran testified in his celebrated "Meeting with M. de Saci." With equal devotion and in a wiser pedagogical sense Claude Lancelot, the "essential teacher," there taught Greek and mathematics. These first teachers were soon joined by Vallon de Beaupuis, whose thesis at the Sorbonne had been an event a short time before. He was won over to Port Royal by his reading of *La fréquent.* A young man of twenty years, Pierre Nicole in 1645 added new luster to the institution, teaching belles lettres there with a delicate taste.

Each school was divided into chambers. Each chamber included not more than six pupils, placed under the direction of a special teacher. When the pupils were more than twenty, they were divided into several bands or houses. Besides the band of the château du Chesnay, these now included that of the château of Trous near Chevreuse and that of the château des Granges near Port Royal des Champs. The teachers had to be tutors rather than professors, educating the children without rigor but without indulgence or feasts or noisy games or means of emulation. From these schools came *La logique de Port-Royal,* the *Grammaire générale,* the *Jardin des racines grecques,* and other works.[73]

The doctrine of these gentlemen of Port Royal was suspect. Their mounting influence over the youth was not viewed, we may well suppose, with complacency by the Jesuits. If they were not pleased at the prospect, we cannot blame them. Their

[73] But we must not deceive ourselves about the effectiveness of these methods. Suppressed nature sometimes reasserts itself violently. Lancelot relates several escapades of these "young gentlemen," such as that of the boy who stole the calotte of the venerable Father Singlin and sold it for two farthings, then stole some silver spoons, and finally fell into all sorts of disorders. But Lancelot concludes by saying that the boy was not predestined. Lancelot, *Mémoires,* I, 184.

attack on Arnauld's book was prompt and strong. Father Nouet,[74] preaching (August, 1643) in the professed house of St. Louis in Paris, sharply denounced the coming publication of a book that would renew the errors of Calvin. When the work appeared, bearing the approbations of fifteen bishops and twenty doctors, the preacher's attacks, far from lessening, became more pronounced. The Jansenists then declared that such sermons were public outrages upon the episcopate and the Sorbonne. They called for a repression. But Mazarin, quite occupied with other matters, had neither leisure nor taste for this kind of affair.[75] Archbishop François de Gondi of Paris was asked to intervene by his nephew, Paul de Gondi, the future Cardinal de Retz, in favor of the Jansenists. The Archbishop forbade the Jesuits to discuss Arnauld's book in the pulpit and even obliged Father Nouet to disavow the attacks with which he was being blamed. Not long afterward the Company of Jesus put forward against "The Great Arnauld" the most learned man they then had, Denis Petau. No one was more familiar with the early Fathers. Petau had no difficulty in proving that the author of *La fréquent* interpreted certain texts wrongly and omitted others that would have served as a corrective for his doctrine: this was the purpose of his volume, *De la pénitence publique*. But the work, written in a heavy style, did not win attention.

Soon the news spread that many of the bishops who had approved *La fréquent* had not read the work and that they had simply yielded to the solicitations of a certain Floriot, curé near Paris, who had been sent around by Port Royal to obtain approbations. A change of opinion took place. Now came Arnauld's turn to submit. He signed a declaration (March 14,

[74] Jacques Nouet (1605–80), author of the *Homme d'oraison*. He was a most highly esteemed ascetical author.

[75] The "cabal of the Important" was suppressed in September, 1643, by the imprisonment of the Duke of Beaufort and the exile of the principal mutiners. But the danger was not altogether removed. It revived later.

1644) by which "he submits his work to the judgment of the Roman Church and of our Holy Father the Pope, revered as the sovereign vicar of Jesus Christ on earth." [76]

When Urban VIII received word of this declaration, he was almost dying. He expired on July 7, 1644. Innocent X, elected September 15 of the same year, thought he should not condemn the whole book.[77] In 1645 he merely declared heretical Arnauld's expression about St. Peter and St. Paul, so far as it supposed a complete equality between those two apostles.[78] And this decree was not published until January 24, 1647. The Jansenists rejoiced, because they held that they were not condemned by a pronouncement couched in such terms. But the future showed that the Holy See made no mistake in thus temporizing. The opinion of wise and holy men turned from Port Royal. Men of clear and practical mind, like Vincent de Paul, and mystics full of ardent love of God, like Olier, all repudiated Jansenism. Catholic feeling sensed a heresy in the Jansenists' somber joy in celebrating man's original corruption, his utter helplessness, and God's remote sublimity.[79]

Moreover, a feeling prevailed that these men were not speaking their full mind. They were men of mystery. Jansenism was suspected of unavowed audacity in some of its tenets.[80] In this group of men and women with their center at Port Royal about the Arnauld family, was to be found a sort of clannish spirit, a sectarian air. The sect was duplicated by a political coterie. The remains of the Fronde were attached to Jansenism. The gentlemen of Port Royal readily welcomed persons who had fallen into disgrace. Factious sentiments appeared in the periodical of the Jansenist St. Gilles.[81]

[76] Arnauld, *Œuvres,* XXVIII, 37.

[77] Later (in 1690) Alexander VIII condemned thirty-one propositions, among which are at least five taken from Arnauld's book.

[78] *Omnimodam aequalitatem.* Denzinger, no. 1091.

[79] Lavisse, *op. cit.,* VII, Part I, 92.

[80] *Ibid.,* p. 93.

[81] *Ibid.,* p. 108.

St. Vincent de Paul had been the friend of St. Cyran, whose learning and talent he admired. The Jansenists profited by all occasions to refer to Vincent's approval. They used to recall that the holy priest visited the prisoner of Vincennes and that he had spoken kindly about him. But the sight of the disastrous effects produced on the faithful by Arnauld's book detached him completely from the sect. He wrote: "It is true that too many people misuse this divine sacrament, I myself more than anyone else. But the reading of that book, instead of drawing men to frequent Communion, keeps them from it. . . . St. Sulpice has 3,000 less communicants then in the years past. . . . What you say may be true, that some persons in France and in Italy have profited by this book; but for a hundred who perhaps have profited by it in Paris and have become more respectful in using the sacraments, at least ten thousand have been utterly ruined by it."

Precisely when the founder of the Lazarists wrote these lines, the founder of St. Sulpice also had occasion to separate from the gentlemen of Port Royal. Soon he would be brilliantly opposing them.

Jean Jacques Olier

Like Vincent de Paul and Pierre de Berulle, Jean Jacques Olier had had good relations with the Abbé de St. Cyran. His devoted attachment to the Holy See was well known, but also his aversion to the bad "casuists." "I prefer," he said, "to see a sick man besieged by a legion of the spirits of darkness rather than to see him put his trust in a casuist, who, to enlarge the way of salvation for him, opens wide for him the gate of hell." [82] Attempts were made, if not to win over the curé of St. Sulpice, at least to make use of his words, of his authority, to introduce Jansenism into his parish. In the Faubourg St. Germain the party had some salons of high society which were

[82] Quoted by Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier,* II, 4, 8.

devoted to it. The houses of Liancourt and of Nevers were Jansenist centers. But Father Olier everywhere expressed his views with a freedom that made him worthy of commendation in his parish; thus most of those who were beginning to favor the new doctrine became cool toward it. For this he was not pardoned at Port Royal.[83] The sect then turned to the parish of St. Merry, whose new curé, Father du Hamel, not satisfied with spreading the doctrines of the *Fréquent,* undertook to put them into practice. The faithful were obliged to observe "hours of tears" and "hours of flagellation." Contemporaries remark that these exercises were carried out in the midst of scenes that were most fantastic, sometimes most immoral.[84]

In 1649 the curé of St. Sulpice thought he ought to protest publicly against these scandals. On the day of the patronal feast of the parish, in the presence of the King, the Queen, the court, and several bishops and generals of religious orders, especially assembled, he preached a great sermon on penance. In this he declared: "Christian penance is not that outward penance, which leads some persons of our day to say that they must therefore quit the cities, all worldly business, even business that is necessary for life." Then, attacking the sophism of the return to the first centuries, which was upsetting some pious souls, he showed that it is just and useful that certain things change in the Church and that the Spirit of God, after rescuing the Christian people from the sensuality of paganism by the public penance of the first centuries subsequently desired to reserve the penitential life to holy religious orders. He concluded by saying that we have a way to recognize if the Holy Ghost is in a new institution, namely, whether God confirms it by miracles, whether the authors of these novelties are submissive to the Church, and whether the pope approves them.[85]

[83] Rapin, *op. cit.,* I, 136.

[84] See several of these details in Rapin, I, 222, 444–48; Fuzet, *Les jansénistes du XVII^e siècle,* pp. 162–65; Faillon, *op. cit.,* II, 443–45.

[85] Faillon, II, 447.

Thus were clearly envisaged the doctrines of Port Royal and the practices of St. Merry. Thenceforth Father Olier was regarded by the Jansenists as a Pelagian, just as they called Father Vincent merely a weak and ignorant spirit.

Now the Jesuits were not alone in combating Jansenism. St. Lazare and St. Sulpice had entered the lists. The Sorbonne and the episcopate would soon follow. The crown would lend its hand, and the Holy See would at length explicitly condemn the doctrines of Jansen.

The Five Propositions

Most complex and hard to set forth definitely was this accumulation of doctrines and practices which has been called Jansenism. A dogma formulated with texts taken from St. Augustine, a moral system resting on the practices of the early Christians, a vague spirit of independence, all these readily found evasions and subterfuges when they were the object of attack. The syndic of the Paris faculty of theology, Nicholas Cornet, with the help of forty-one of his colleagues undertook the difficult task of condensing in a few propositions the whole doctrine of the Bishop of Ypres interpreted by Port Royal. The result of these labors was the drawing up of seven propositions, soon reduced to five, which, according to him, summed up the thought of Jansenism concerning the radical corruption of human nature, the all-powerful efficacy of grace, the denial of free will, and the small number of the elect.

These five propositions were as follows:

1. Some of the commandments of God cannot be observed by the just, who wish and endeavor to keep them according to their ability for the time; neither have they the grace that might enable them to do so.

2. In the state of corrupted nature, one never resists the action of interior grace.

3. Moral merit or demerit in the state of all fallen nature does not require in man a freedom exempt from interior necessity; it suffices that a man be exempt from all external constraint.

4. The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of an interior prevenient grace for all good works, including the beginning of faith; but they were heretics inasmuch as they taught that the will is capable of resisting or responding to grace.

5. It is a Semi-Pelagian error to say that Christ died and shed his blood for all men.[86]

The denunciation of the propositions to the Sorbonne (July 1, 1649) stirred up a tempest. Dr. Louis de Saint-Amour and some others opposed the examination of the propositions by the faculty, calling such a proceedure an abuse of its deliberations. They signed petition after petition, and made motions after motions. At the same time the Jansenists published statements and pamphlets against Cornet. The sharpest was undoubtedly Arnauld's *Considérations sur l'entreprise faite par M. Cornet.*

The disturbance soon reached the Parliament, which received a complaint against what was called the irregularity of a censure illegally pronounced by the commissioners of the Sorbonne who were appointed to study the question. The censure was the work of a forger, they said. Who was its author? The Jansenists charged their enemies with having made it up to terrorize them. The latter supposed that the Jansenists had forged it out of whole cloth that they might have a pretext for bringing the affair to the Parliament. However this may be, the Parliament was impressed. It forbade the Sorbonne to examine the propositions.

We have now reached the end of 1649. The quinquennial Assembly of the French Clergy was to be held in March of 1650. While the followers of Jansen tried to base their reliance

[86] For the Latin text, see Denzinger, nos. 1092–96.

on the magistracy, Cornet and his friends thought their best move was to address the episcopacy. After negotiations in which Vincent de Paul took an active part, eighty-eight bishops signed a petition asking Pope Innocent X to issue a decision on the five propositions drawn up by Nicholas Cornet. At the same time Vincent de Paul had three Sorbonne doctors leave for Rome, directed to press the affair. Saint-Amour and two of his friends reached Rome ahead of them, carrying to the Supreme Pontiff a cleverly worded memorial, signed by eleven bishops, among whom was Archbishop de Gondrin of Sens. This prelate, already known as one of the most devoted partisans of the Jansenists,[87] would subsequently play an important role in the party. This memorial to the Holy Father set forth that the five propositions had been drawn up purposely to stir up trouble; that besides, the episcopate had the right to judge the matter in the first instance; that the reputation of the Holy See was at stake in pronouncing against the view of the Fathers in favor of the "new Scholastics."

Innocent X had the question studied by a commission of cardinals, on which was only one Jesuit, Sforza Pallavicino. From the month of September, 1651, and during almost two full years, in about fifty meetings, ten of them held in the presence of the Pope, the memorials presented by both sides were carefully examined. On May 31, 1653, Pope Innocent X, with full knowledge of the case, issued his bull *Cum occasione,* condemning the five propositions as heretical.

Vincent de Paul's attitude was admirable for its charity. The great concern of this holy priest was to restrain his friends from triumphing too loudly. He wrote to several of them in this sense and eagerly made a visit of courtesy to Port Royal and to vari-

[87] This prelate, uncle of Madame de Montespan, had a very worldly youth, and evidently professed the austere morality of Port Royal only in theory. The sumptuous meals he gave his friends were celebrated. A considerable stir was caused by a suit he had to plead against his perfumer for a note of 800 francs. See Fuzet, *op. cit.,* pp. 158, 167.

ous eminent persons attached to the party, who promised him obedience to the Holy See.

In fact, many submissions edified the Church. In this number were those of the celebrated Oratorian Thomassin, who with moving delicacy sent word of his disavowal to all those whom he thought he might have influenced in favor of the Jansenists,[88] and that of the Irish Recollect Wading, who published a most honorable and humble retractation.

We cannot say the same of the great ladies whom the fashion had attracted about Port Royal. The memoirs of the time relate how Isabelle de Choiseul, countess du Plessis-Guénégaud, almost fainted upon learning of the publication of the bull.[89] Anne de Rohan, princess de Guémené, took an attitude equally lacking in respect. When she went to the court to beg the release of Cardinal de Retz, the Queen, upon seeing her, said: "Madame, we have a bull. You will accept it of course, for at Port Royal they have promised to submit." "Yes, Madame," replied the Princess; "we will accept the bull when Your Majesty receives the brief that we are awaiting for the release of Cardinal de Retz." [90]

With regard to the leaders of the party, they found themselves in an embarrassing position. They were too intelligent and prudent to think that a new religious revolt could be undertaken. Hermits though they were, they were well acquainted with the actual world. To realize the Church which they im-

[88] In 1668, in the preface of his second memoir on grace, Thomassin wrote an explicit retractation of his Jansenist opinions.

[89] The Duchess d'Aguillon had directed her friend, the Marquise du Vigean, to inform the Countess du Plessis-Guénégaud of the bull. Father Rapin relates that the Countess had taken some medicine.

"Have we news from Rome?" she asked.

"Yes," said the Marquise, "but you are not in condition to hear me."

"Not at all," said the Countess.

"The bull has arrived, my dear; the Jansenists are condemned."

At that moment the Countess, in urgent distress, ran to the toilet, and there she almost burst with spite and with her medicine (Rapin, II, 133).

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

agined, they would have to turn the world over. This they could not do. But must they therefore leave the Church? This they were unwilling to do. Or would they submit? They would not and could not do this. One thing was left that they might do: to form a party. They temporized.[91] Since only the first of the five propositions was taken verbatim from the works of Jansen, they held that the propositions were not to be found in Jansen's writings, or at least that the sense in which they were condemned was not the sense of Jansen. Was the Pope capable of defining a man's inner thought?

The Formulary

Such reasoning contained a subtle equivocation. No doubt the Church is not the judge of a man's interior thoughts. But to refuse it the power to define the natural sense of the words used by an author, would be to take from her infallibility all its practical efficacy. Her authority, given her for the regulation of particular and concrete situations, must be able to extend to particular and concrete doctrines.

Only one procedure seemed able to put an end to a quarrel that threatened to be interminable: to draw up a clear and precise formulary and to oblige the recalcitrants to sign it. In consequence of various circumstances, the Jansenist question by 1654 had in many ways become a political question, almost a court cabal. Mazarin, who dreaded nothing so much as to see Cardinal de Retz at the head of the archbishopric of Paris, had recently imprisoned him. But Retz was the friend of the Jansenists. To proceed against the sect would be, it was hoped, to enter again into the good graces of the Holy See and perhaps to obtain from the Pope an assurance that he would not protest against the imprisonment of the Cardinal, even that he

[91] Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VII, Part I, 104.

would accept the Cardinal's resignation as archbishop.[92] If a theologian would devise a formula of faith without any loophole for the subtlety of the gentlemen of Port Royal, the government in accord with the Pope would oblige them to sign it and would compel each of them to declare his attitude clearly.

One man, by his learning and by his dispositions toward the government, seemed to be the very one to draw up the projected formulary: this was De Marca, archbishop of Toulouse, whose part in the Gallican question we have already studied. According to reports, he was longing for the archbishopric of Paris. That high post could be the reward for his services.

In fact, in 1655 the Archbishop of Toulouse drew up a formulary worded as follows: "I condemn both in thought and by word of mouth the doctrine of the five propositions of Cornelius Jansen contained in his book *Augustinus,* which the Pope and the bishops have condemned; this doctrine is not that of St. Augustine, whose true meaning Jansen has distorted." The signing of this formulary would be prescribed by the General Assembly of the Clergy in 1656. But meanwhile a new incident embittered the quarrel.

As we pointed out above, among the centers of Jansenism was the house of Roger du Plessis, duke of Liancourt, whose loose youth was a matter of common talk. At the age of forty he entered upon a more regular life which, under the direction of the gentlemen of Port Royal, soon became a sort of penitent life. In his new life, loaded down with practices of piety, the former libertine sometimes showed through.[93] But his admira-

[92] On Mazarin's policy in his relations with the Holy See, see Gérin, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, chap. I.

[93] The Duke de Liancourt had promised his daughter to the Prince de Marsillac. Madame de Guémené showed him some letters proving that the Prince had an affair with Madame d'Olonne. "Indeed!" exclaimed the Jansenist Duke. "Marsillac is a galante. I have been so myself. I have now the greater regard for him. . . . I did not suppose he had so much spirit." And the marriage took place. See Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.,* V, 47.

tion for the men and the things of Port Royal was unbounded. When approaching the "holy city," [94] he could not repress his emotion. When he perceived some sort of peasant at a distance, he opened his eyes wide and, taking off his hat, whispered to someone at his side: "Is that one of those gentlemen?" Even the cowherd was venerable in his eyes.[95] In his luxurious Paris house the noble Duke used to receive two notorious Jansenists, Father Des Mares and Abbé de Bourzéis, but for confession he went to a priest of St. Sulpice, Father Picoté. In the autumn of 1655 the Duke of Liancourt, upon returning from the country, went to St. Sulpice to take a day for confession. Father Picoté, disturbed over Liancourt's increasingly close relations with Port Royal, said to him: "I should like to take counsel about what attitude I ought to adopt in your case. Come back in a few days." Meanwhile four doctors of the Sorbonne, upon being consulted, replied at first that the confessor of a friend of Port Royal, under the conditions mentioned, would do well to refuse absolution. Then they conceded that the confessor might advise the penitent to go elsewhere for confession. The priests of St. Sulpice then declared that, if the Duke presented himself for Communion, it should not be denied him. The Duke, personally satisfied, thanked Father Olier for the solution of this affair.

But the party was stirred. So the fact of having some close relations with Port Royal might be a reason for refusal of absolution! Some curés in Paris, as zealous as the curé of St. Sulpice, would have acted likewise if this first attempt had succeeded.[96] Antoine Arnauld took up his pen. In a *Lettre à une personne de condition,* then in a *Lettre à un duc et pair,* he rose up against "the temerity of those priests who, without authority, arrogate to themselves the right to exclude the gentlemen

[94] Port Royal was so called.
[95] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.,* III, 29.
[96] Hermant, *op. cit.,* II, 626.

of Port Royal from the communion of the Church." The Duke of Liancourt, turning against St. Sulpice, used to repeat everywhere that "the Sulpicians were not fit to be spiritual guides and that he would scarcely entrust to them the guiding of his turkeys." [97]

The incident, however, would not have had grave consequences if Arnauld, in his *Lettre à un duc et pair,* had not maintained: 1. that the first of the condemned propositions was true, and 2. that the four others were not Jansen's nor were they to be found in Jansen. This was equivalent to resuming the whole Jansenist doctrine, to resisting the Pope, the Sorbonne, and the King. Evidently it made Port Royal the center of a party, at one in the case of any offense considered as being made to one of its friends. Thus it reawakened all the old suspicions against the Jansenists. Alexander VII, who had just succeeded Innocent X, by a bull (October 16, 1656) confirmed that of his predecessor and made its meaning more precise, explicitly condemning the five propositions "in the sense intended by Jansen." [98] In the formulary was now inserted submission to this second bull, which determined its meaning in a stricter manner. A royal declaration imposed the formulary upon all ecclesiastics of the realm. After a little resistance the Parliament registered both the bull and the royal declaration in the presence of the King. In the meantime the Sorbonne, directly attacked by the Jansenists, imposed censure on the Lettre à une personne and the Lettre à un duc et pair. After a most lively debate, it removed from the list of its doctors the name of Antoine Arnauld, as also the names of sixty-two of his followers.

Blaise Pascal (1623–62)

The biographer of Antoine Arnauld, Pasquier Quesnel, relates that on January 17, 1656, at the very hour when the

[97] Quoted by Fuzet, *op. cit.,* p. 285.

[98] Denzinger, no. 1098. It is the bull ***Cum ad sancti Petri sedem.***

censure was pronounced in the Sorbonne, the great man was walking in one of the porches of Port Royal. Suddenly these words of St. Augustine on Psalm 118 arose in his mind: "Since what they have persecuted in me is the Truth, help me, O Lord, that I may fight for the Truth until death." [99] This was a sort of echo of the words that had been brought to him from his mother's deathbed: "I beg you to say to my last son . . . that he should never relax in the defense of the truth, but sustain it without fear, even if it should cost a thousand lives."

The situation was most critical. A historian of Port Royal had compared the year 1655 to a sort of defile, becoming ever narrower, where they must proceed at all costs. All the public powers—the king, the Parliament, the Assembly of the Clergy, the Sorbonne—seemed to be in conspiracy against the followers of Jansen. Public opinion, enlightened by the Jesuits, the Vincentians, and the Sulpicians, were against them. The *Almanach de la déroute et de la confusion des jansénistes* was being circulated. A refusal to sign a precise, carefully prepared formulary, one that closed the door to every subterfuge, seemed difficult for men who wished to remain in the Church.

Unexpectedly two events raised the courage of the Jansenists: these were the success of the *Provincial Letters* and the miracle of the Holy Thorn. The genius of man and the power of God apparently took up the quarrel for the persecuted "saints." The men of Port Royal and their friends resumed the strife with redoubled energy.

In December 1655, at the very time of the great debates in the Sorbonne which would result in the condemnation of Arnauld's book and the erasure of his name from the registers of the Faculty, a number of hermits and of their friends happened to be gathered at Port Royal. "You cannot let yourselves be condemned like a child," said one of them, addressing "the Great Arnauld." The latter, turning to a young man of thirty-

[99] *Vie de Messire Antoine Arnauld,* by Father Quesnel, p. 68.

two years, said: "You who are young ought to do something." This young man was Blaise Pascal. He was the third child of Etienne Pascal, president of the Court of Aids at Clermont. At the age of twelve he gave astounding signs of his aptitude for mathematics. Four years later he amazed Descartes by his treatise on conic sections. In 1631, exhausted by his labors, he experienced the first attacks of the disease which, by aggravating his sensitiveness, gave his style a vibrant quality.[100] He came to Paris in 1631 with his father, who then settled down there. Soon he made the acquaintance of the Arnauld family. The apparent logic of their doctrine seduced the mind of the young man. These influences and especially the inner development of his religious life [101] prepared him for the definite crisis of the night of the 23d of November, 1654, a night of ecstasy and joy, when he gave himself to God with finality.

The methods of an excessively abstract and formalist casuistry aroused his indignation. The prosecutions and vexations from which he saw his friends suffering and complaining, stirred his desire to defend them by the means at his disposal. A few days after Arnauld's invitation, Blaise Pascal brought him some pages of a manuscript, in the form of a *Lettre à un Provincial.* Arnauld relished the natural, keen, and strong eloquence which the young scholar put into his writing, the incisive and supple style that says what it wished to and in the way it wishes.[102] On January 23, 1656, appeared the first *Provinciale.* Between that date and March 30 three other letters made their appearance, written on the basis of documents furnished by Nicole and Arnauld. The aim of these first four letters was to show that the Jansenist doctrine on grace is the true Christian doctrine. What characterizes Christian morality and separates it radically from pagan morality is the recognition

[100] Lanson, *Hist. de la litt. française* (7th ed.), p. 448.

[101] On the question whether the *Discours sur les passions de l'amour* is the work of Pascal, see Victor Giraud, *Blaise Pascal, etude d'histoire morale,* p. 145.

[102] *Vie de Pascal,* by his sister, Madame Périer.

of the gratuitous assistance of God, that is, grace, merited by Christ, without which man is incapable of attaining his end. But this essential doctrine, said Pascal, is rejected by the Molinists because they make salvation depend, at least partly, on man's effort; and the Thomists weaken it because, while admitting physical premotion, they have not the courage to carry their principles to the logical conclusion, and they use this expression, which they cannot reasonably explain: sufficient grace; a sufficient grace that does not suffice.

We easily see where the pretended logic of this argumentation is in fault; for the Molinists did not grant that the action of man hinders the power of grace, and the Thomists claimed to justify without difficulty the expression with which Pascal reproached them. In the traditional doctrine, sufficient grace is truly sufficient, because it really produces the effect for which it is intended: it truly arouses the will to will. But if the will resists, the sufficient grace remains ineffective. If the will accepts it, the man then acts infallibly in the direction of the sufficient grace by an efficacious grace which never fails to be given.

The public, however, devoured the spiritual letters; and Pascal himself, who wrote them under the inspiration of his friends, did not fathom this reasoning. They were carried away by the eloquence and fervor of the pamphlet or by the passion to defend the persecuted friends.

These four letters maintained a comparative moderation. The Jansenists were more concerned with defending their orthodoxy than in attacking that of others. An extraordinary event presently revived their confidence and made them take up a determined offensive against their foes.

A devout priest, Father de la Potterie, had lent to the community of nuns of Port Royal one of the thorns from our Lord's crown. On March 24, 1656, this precious relic was exposed in their chapel. That day was the Friday of the third

week of Lent, when the Church chants at the Introit of the Mass these words of Psalm 85: *Fac mecum signum in bonum* ("Show me a token for good"). At the close of Vespers hymns and prayers were sung suitable to the holy crown of thorns and the mystery of the Passion. After this, the nuns went forward to kiss the relic. When it was the turn of the little Périer, the mistress of the boarders said to her: "My child, recommend yourself to God and have your eye touched with the holy relic." The girl did as she was told, and thereafter declared that she had no doubt, on the word of her mistress, that the holy thorn would cure her. Following this ceremony, all the boarders retired to their room. At once she said to her companion: "Sister, I am suffering no longer, the holy thorn has cured me." [103]

The miracle was affirmed by physicians. The vicars general of Paris, after investigation, declared it authentic. Soon the report spread through Paris. People hastened to Port Royal to obtain cures. Within a short time, eighty cures were reckoned.

These events transformed Port Royal's state of mind, changing the anxieties of recent times into a triumphant joy.[104] Pascal confidently wrote in his notes: *Ad tuum, Domine Jesu, tribunal appello.* All Port Royal shared these feelings.

On March 30, six days after the miracle of the holy thorn, a few days after the appearance of the fifth *Provinciale,* a government officer, Daubray by name, came to these gentlemen to obtain their signature of submission. Not a single one gave it. Most of them, forewarned in time, were absent. Some remained, disguised as peasants, feigning not to understand what was being asked of them, thus playing a comedy which we would hardly believe on the part of such serious personages unless the facts were attested by the most reliable witnesses.[105]

[103] Racine, *Hist. de Port-Royal; Œuvres* (Lahure ed.), II, 54.
[104] Madame Périer, *op. cit.*
[105] Sainte-Beuve, III, 169–72.

With the fifth *Provinciale,* the direct attack, at times ironical and contemptuous, at times violent and wrathful, against the moral teaching of the Jesuits, began. "We read but little of the Fathers," it reported someone as saying to a Jesuit: "We quote only the new casuists. When you Jesuits arrived, we put away St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and the others. But I wish to know the names of those who have succeeded them. Who are these new authors?"

Indeed, in the writings of the casuists of that period anyone might find some maxims that cannot be approved. Pope Innocent XI, twenty years later, by his decree of March 2, 1679, condemned sixty-five propositions that were horribly lax.[106] But the mistake of Pascal or rather of those who were supplying him with the documents, was to attribute merely to the Jesuits and to all the Jesuits what was the case with some isolated casuist. They were caught in their very offense of falsification or rather of false interpretation of texts. They were rightly charged with confounding moral laxism with casuistry, "which is an art and a method indispensable for those who have the charge of directing souls." [107] They have been rightly blamed for speaking lightly of holy things and for having thus "opened the way to Voltaire." [108] Unfortunately the authors who undertook to refute Pascal's book had not his genius. This work won approval by its beauty of style and the perfection of a language in which, after almost three centuries, not a single word has grown old. As much as any other factor, it prepared the minds of men for the movement that, a century later, led to the expulsion of the Jesuits.

The Resistance of the Four Bishops

The eighteenth and last *Provinciale* appeared on March 24, 1657. A decree of the Index, dated September 6 of that year,

[106] Denzinger, nos. 1151–1215.
[107] Lavisse, *op. cit.,* VII, Part I, 106; Brunetière, *Manuel de littérature,* p. 161.
[108] Lanson, *op. cit.,* p. 455.

condemned the work. Three years later a royal ordinance directed that the book be burned publicly. In February, 1661, the General Assembly of the Clergy again insisted upon the signing of the formulary. But the party, emboldened by the success of the famous *Letters,* continued its resistance. Four bishops—Henri Arnauld of Angers, De Buzanval of Beauvais, De Caulet of Pamiers, and Pavillon of Alet—refused to sign. They maintained that the Church had the power to condemn a doctrine, but not to declare that this doctrine was contained in the writings of such or such an author. In other words, that the infallible Church, infallible in matters of right, is not so in matters of fact. This was the famous distinction of right and fact. The constitution *Regiminis apostolici* (February 15, 1664) renewed the injunction to sign the formulary, but it was unable to make the four bishops yield.

That year Hardouin de Beaumont de Péréfixe received his bulls appointing him archbishop of Paris. One of his first acts was to publish (June 8, 1664) a mandatum in which, to facilitate the obedience of the Jansenists, he set down a difference between a matter of fact and a matter of right, namely, that in a matter of fact a person is bound only to an act of human faith, whereas in a matter of right he is bound to an act of divine faith. The next morning the Archbishop went to Port Royal to urge the nuns that they should sign. But he was met with unanimous refusal,[109] and had to return several times. On one of his visits he said to Madame de Guémené the following words, which have since then marked the spirit of Port Royal: "These women are pure as angels and proud as demons." Eight years of negotiations, disciplinary measures, and exhortations were required to bring all the nuns to obedience. The distinction imagined by Péréfixe between divine faith and human faith

[109] Mother Angélique died August 6, 1661. Some have seen a retractation of Jansenist doctrines in her last words: "Lord, grant Thy mercy to all. . . . I say, to all, my God, to all."

was sharply opposed by Arnauld. Indeed the word "human" was ill chosen. He should have said "ecclesiastical faith," adding that this faith rests on supernatural authority as does divine faith.[110] In short, following various conferences, in which Bossuet had a considerable part,[111] the nuns of Port Royal signed a declaration in which they "condemned the five propositions in all sincerity, without exception or restriction, in the sense in which the Church had condemned them."

As to the four bishops, Rome likewise accepted a moderated formula. On both sides the parties were tired of strife and aspired to peace. Arnauld, for twenty years wandering from one place of hiding to another, desired nothing better than to enter into negotiations with the Holy See and with the King. The four bishops consented to send a letter to Rome. By this letter they declared their submission to the formulary, "having toward the Holy See the same disposition of mind as the bishops of the Gallican Church had in the early ages of the Church." At bottom, as Pavillon declared in the synod he held to obtain the signature of his priests, they were making all their reservations on the infallibility of the Church in matters of dogmatic facts. They could do so without heresy;[112] and men like Pavillon and Caulet were incapable of a dissimulation or toning down of their thought. Clement IX was aware of all these acts and on January 19, 1669, wrote to the four prelates to felicitate them "on the true and perfect obedience with which they subscribed to the formula." Three months earlier Antoine Arnauld had been received by the nuncio, who counseled him

[110] On ecclesiastical faith, see Brugère, *De ecclesia Dei Christi,* p. 390.

[111] On Bossuet's part in this affair, see Urbain and Levesque, *Correspondance de Bossuet,* II, 85–87.

[112] That the Church is infallible in the definition of dogmatic facts seems undeniable; for example, on the fact whether such a doctrine is contained in such a book, whether such a council is ecumenical. Without this infallibility her power, it seems, would be ineffective. In fact, the Church has always acted as if it were infallible in such cases. But it does not follow that this infallibility is *de fide.* Cf. Hurter, *Theologia dogmatica, De ecclesia,* thesis 55 (7th ed., I, 303).

to use his golden pen in the defense of the Church. Ten days later a decree of the royal Council forbade any attack or provocation against him on the score of what had happened in the past. The next day Arnauld was received by Louis XIV and said to him: "Sire, I regard as the greatest good fortune of my life the honor which Your Majesty bestows on me by permitting me to be in your presence." Peace was established. It would last about thirty years, and was called the Clementine Peace, from the name of Clement IX.

Arnauld and his friends followed the nuncio's advice. They made of this period of peace a fruitful period in works of apologetics, piety, and scholarship. *La perpetuité de la foi de l'Eglise catholique touchant l'Eucharistie* was the most important of the books coming from their pens. It was the work of Arnauld, Nicole, and Renaudot. Bossuet encouraged the undertaking. Louis XIV made use of high diplomatic circles to assist the industrious authors.[113] The purpose of the work was to show, against the Protestants, that the faith about the Eucharist had been perpetual in the Church from the time of Christ down to our own day. The book had a great success.

Claude and Jurieu tried to reply to this monument of erudition. Undeniably one of their arguments *ad hominem* struck a blow at the Jansenist authors. "If your rule of faith," they said, "involves such long studies, it becomes the privilege of a select circle of scholars, and you cannot properly appeal to it over the rule of Protestant faith." In rejecting the authority of the contemporary Church, or at least in seeking to verify and confirm it by reference to the Church of the first centuries, the doctors of Port Royal prevented themselves from giving a satisfactory answer to this objection. Although the work was

[113] De Nointel, ambassador to Constantinople, supplied Nicole with a large number of attestations, letters, and reports. Galland, the future translator of *A Thousand and One Nights,* who had accompanied De Nointel, brought back numerous documents to the gentlemen of Port Royal. When De Pomponne, the son of Arnauld d'Andilly, was Secretary of State, they found themselves at the very source of information.

not faultless, as a whole it was solid. Bossuet, whose approbation appeared at the beginning of the first volume, was right in saying that the book conformed to the Catholic faith and was well suited to lead back those who had strayed away from the faith.[114] The *Préjugés légitimes,* the *Traité de l'unité de l'Eglise,* and especially Nicole's *Essais de morale,* revealed to the general public that clear, placid spirit, though lacking in unction and brilliance, but full of good humor.

The Jansenist spirit found its way into two scholarly works: the Mons Bible[115] and the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine.[116]

The Jansenist spirit was far from being dead. Several of those who signed the formulary retracted their submission. They had obeyed the King's injunction out of fear of the Bastille;[117] now safety gave them courage. The Duchess of Longueville, whose house became the center of the party after 1666, exercised considerable influence in this movement of retractation. Among the best known of those who withdrew their submission were Bishop Laval of La Rochelle, son of Madame de Sablé, Bishop De Ligny of Meaux, brother of the Abbess of Port Royal, and immediate predecessor of Bossuet, and

[114] Urbain and Levesque, *Correspondance de Bossuet,* I, 508.

[115] In 1671 Arnauld and Nicole proposed to Bossuet that he aid them in revising a version of the New Testament made at Port Royal and called the Mons Bible because it had been published in that city. Bossuet had not the time to follow the work to its end. Thus the Jansenists were later prevented from appealing to Bossuet's authority in favor of their Bible.

[116] This edition had a Jansenist color by its notes, by its tables, by its use of capital letters. Mabillon had written the preface, which Bossuet was asked to revise. Subsequently they wished to make the Bishop of Meaux responsible for the Jansenist tendencies of this edition. See Ingold, *L'édition bénédictine de Saint-Augustin.*

[117] These Jansenists had signed with mental restrictions or with equivocations. For this they were blamed by Pascal, who said: "Those who sign, while speaking only of faith, take a middle way which is abominable before God, contemptible before men." His sister Jacqueline, in religion Sister St. Euphemia, wrote: "I ask you, what difference do you see between these dissemblings and the offering of incense to an idol with the pretext that you have put a cross in your sleeve?" See Feugère, *Lettres, opuscules et mémoires de Jacqueline Pascal.* However, Sister St. Euphemia signed the formulary. Shortly afterward she died in anguish.

especially the Oratorian Pasquier Quesnel, who, after Arnauld's death in 1694, took up the direction of the Jansenist party.

Pasquier Quesnel (1634–1719)

Pasquier Quesnel, born in Paris in 1634, joined the Congregation of the Oratory in 1657. In 1662, when he was only twenty-nine years old, he began writing a commentary on the Gospels. His writing contained all the charm of a soul full of unction and of a mind wonderfully subtle. His relations with several friends of Port Royal early inclined him toward Jansenism. His attachment to Father de Sainte-Marthe, superior general of the Oratory, who was exiled by the Archbishop of Paris, was the reason for his being removed beyond Paris in 1681. Four years later, when he refused to sign a doctrinal formula which the general assembly of the Oratory had imposed on all members of the congregation, he withdrew to Brussels. There he lived with Antoine Arnauld, whose closest confidant he became. Meanwhile his little volume, published in 1671, was favorably received by the public. Quesnel repeatedly revised it and added to it in successive editions. All these changes were in the direction more favorable to the doctrine of Port Royal. In fact, the edition published in 1693 under the title of *Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament,* formed four large octavo volumes. These really presented the whole Jansenist doctrine in a captious form. Quesnel's ideas on the constitution of the Church approach the doctrine of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. He says: "What is left for a soul that has lost grace, except sin and the consequences of sin: a proud destitution, a slothful indigence, a general powerlessness to make effort and to perform any good act?" [118] "Grace is an operation of the all-powerful hand of God, which nothing can hinder or retard." [119] "Christ delivered Himself to death to save the first-

[118] Denzinger, no. 1351.
[119] *Ibid.*, no. 1360.

born, that is, the elect, from the hand of the exterminating angel." [120] "It is wise to give souls the time to bear the weight of their sin and to feel this weight . . . before reconciling them." [121] "Sometimes the holiest souls, most closely united to the Church, are looked upon and treated as unworthy of belonging to the Church and even as separated from the Church. But the just man lives by faith, not by the opinion of men." [122]

Such language, full of vibrant feeling, fed on the Scriptures in a forced meaning, had a greater power to penetrate souls than the learned dissertations of the *Augustinus* or even of the *Fréquent Communion.* The work carried at this head the approbation which Bishop Vialart of Châlons had given to the small edition of 1671 and which was repeated in this greatly augmented and revised edition.[123] Soon we see added to this approbation a letter of praise from Bishop de Noailles, successor of Bishop Vialard in the see of Châlons. This letter was written in 1695 and recommended the work to the faithful. This mistake of Bishop de Noailles was the start of all the later mistakes into which this prelate let himself be drawn.

More so than Jansen or St. Cyran or Arnauld or Pascal, Quesnel became the idol of the party. The charm and kindliness of his personal relations added greatly to his popularity. According to his followers, no one ever saw a man who was gentler, more equable, more accomodating to those who lived with him.[124] When he traveled, his friends regarded as a blessing that he would spend a little time visiting each of them.[125] The Carmelites of Faubourg St. Jacques had the greatest possible veneration for him.[126]

This man, with a disposition apparently so mild, showed a

[120] *Ibid.*, no. 1382.
[121] *Ibid.*, no. 1437.
[122] *Ibid.*, no. 1447.
[123] Vialard died in 1680.
[124] Letter quoted by Sainte-Beuve, VI, 273.
[125] *Ibid.*
[126] *Ibid.*, p. 274.

stubborn obstinacy. After making the boldest statements in his book, he let loose the most violent tempests and became the head of that militant and aggressive Jansenism of the eighteenth century. By the low standard of its mysticism and by its seditious doctrines, it was the precursor of the great catastrophe that was to cast a cloud over the Church of France and the kingdom.

Chapter XII

Quietism

JUST when Quesnel's *Réflexions morales* was spreading and was preparing the way for this new phase of Jansenism, another religious dispute broke out.

At the beginning of 1694 Bishop Godet des Marais of Chartres, visiting at the house of St. Cyr, was alarmed at the maxims he heard there. Madame de La Maisonfort, one of the chief helpers of Madame de Maintenon, openly declared that a person need not restrain himself or look into his own heart.[1] Such maxims came to her from her spiritual director, the Abbé Fénelon, and particularly from one of his relatives, Madame Guyon de La Motte. For the past four years at St. Cyr Fénelon had been giving conferences on the spiritual life.

Madame Guyon (1648–1717)

Jeanne Marie Bouvier de La Motte was born at Montargis on April 13, 1648. Her parents were Claude Bouvier, lord of La Motte Vergonville, procurator of the king in the bailiwick of Montargis, and Jeanne Le Maistre de La Maisonfort. The vivacity of her nature early led her to a visionary and unreal sort of piety. If we are to believe her autobiography, she had visions at the age of five, aspired to martyrdom from that early age, passed through a crisis of flirtation when fourteen years old, and then returned to a life of prayer and mortification, all this while suffering from unusual and interminable sicknesses.

[1] Phélipeaux, *Relation de l'origine du progrès et de la condamnation du quiétisme*, I, 46.

What we are certain of is that at an early age she became exceedingly fond of the works of St. Theresa, that she read avidly the life of Madame de Chantal, and that she was seized with a powerful desire to imitate those two saints. Some have thought that perhaps this desire prompted her too much in the account of her own life and that her rich imagination may have made her see in her past many things that she later wished to find there.

Married (January 18, 1664) to Jacques Guyon du Chesnoy, son of a rich merchant, she was not happy in this union. Upon being widowed at the age of twenty-eight, she gave herself up entirely to piety. One of her relatives, a Barnabite priest, encouraged her in the practice of interior prayer by his example and his words. A Franciscan, whom she often consulted, used to tell her: "Accustom yourself to seek God in your heart, and you will find Him there." This advice was quite in conformity with traditional Christian mysticism. But the ardent soul of the pious widow carried her beyond the bounds of prudence. Four years after her husband's death, a certain spiritual director, no less given to mystical dreaming, plunged her into a singular kind of piety, the origin of her long trials and grave errors.

Bishop d'Arenthon of Geneva, meeting the young widow at Paris in 1680, was touched by her misfortunes, by her virtue, and by her piety. He persuaded her to retire to Gex, in a community of New Catholics which had just been established there. The superior of this community was a certain Barnabite, Father Lacombe. This priest was tall, of great outward composure, with a bearing of modesty and holiness, although something sinister appeared in his looks. He was a native of Thonon in the diocese of Geneva. Report had it that, during a visit to Rome, he was a disciple of Molinos, who was then spreading his illusions.[2] At about the age of thirty his life was troubled by

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

violent passions, which he later avowed.[3] Upon returning to God he at once experienced a special taste for spiritual and mystical authors. He even foolishly imagined that certain stains might be a means which God employed to raise up a soul to lofty degrees of spirituality.[4] This queer director of conscience later died insane after a life full of distress and much of it spent in prison.

In her own account, Madame Guyon writes: "As soon as I saw the father, I was surprised to feel an interior grace which I may call communication, and which I had never felt with anyone before. It seemed to me that an influence of grace came from him to me by the innermost part of the soul and returned from me to him, in such a way that he experienced the same effect. . . . I was put into such a state that I spoke to him only in silence. There it was that we spoke together in God in a manner that was quite ineffable and divine." These "communications" and these "silent words" would play a great part in Madame Guyon's spirituality.

Gradually Father Lacombe and his penitent imagined that they were designed by God to renew the world by the teaching of pure love. The Bishop of Geneva took alarm at this turn. His remarks were taken as an indication of Providence that they should leave the diocese of Geneva and begin carrying out the divine plan. Madame Guyon, whose large fortune enabled her to journey frequently, moved successively to Thonon, Turin, Grenoble, Marseilles, Verceil, Dijon, and finally to Paris, where she fixed her residence in 1686. At Grenoble she had printed *Le moyen court et facile pour faire l'oraison* ("A Short and Easy Method of Prayer"). At Marseilles she was consoled by the famous blind priest François Malaval. At Paris she again met her friend the Duchess of Charost, who introduced her to three other duchesses. There she met also her

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 2–4.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 3 f.

cousin Madame de la Maisonfort, who later introduced her to St. Cyran, at the house of Madame de Maintenon. Father Lacombe had rejoined his friend in the capital. He preached there. Madame Guyon distributed profusely the books in which she had set forth his doctrine: *Les torrents spirituels* and *Le moyen court*. Everywhere, in her relations with the world of high society, she sought what she called "mystical children."

However, from almost every place where she had passed, people wrote letters against her and against Father Lacombe. François de Harlay was then governing the diocese of Paris. Whatever blame he may rightly incur, at least he had the wisdom and merit of exercising extreme care in combating all the novelities that might disturb the peace of the Church and the public order.[5] In 1687 people were much interested in the investigation begun at Rome against the doctrines of Miguel de Molinos,[6] doctrines that were later condemned by the decree of August 28 and by the constitution *Coelestis Pastor* of November of that same year.[7] Molinos' errors, as we can extract them from his *Guide spirituelle,* from the bull of condemnation, and from other contemporary documents, are summed up in the following two propositions: 1. The path to be followed in going to God consists in a complete annihilation of our powers, in such a forgetfulness of everything and in particular of our-

[5] In 1688 or 1689.

[6] Miguel de Molinos was a Spanish priest. He was born in 1627 or 1640 at Muniesa in Aragon. He went to Rome and there acquired a high repute as a spiritual director. At the solicitation of his many friends, he published in Italian in 1675 a summary of his doctrine. The work was evidently approved at first by several theologians and had a great success. It seems that Innocent XI, who had great admiration for him, gave him an apartment at the Vatican. But our only knowledge of these details comes from the reports of the French ambassador, who at that period "seized on every opportunity to humiliate and mortify Innocent XI by showing the world that the Most Christian King was a more vigilant defender of the faith than the Pope was" (Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VIII, Part I, 303). Molinos' book was condemned by papal decree, November 19, 1687. Molinos himself was condemned as a heretic to life imprisonment. He died repentant in 1696.

[7] Denzinger, nos. 1221–88.

self that we no longer think of hell, of heaven, of our own perfection, or of our own salvation. 2. The end to be attained is a state of union with God by pure contemplation, without images of any sort, and by a love detached from every personal consideration. Molinos summed up his whole system in these words: "To go by annihilation to peace," [8] that is, "to God pure and ineffable, abstracted from any particular thought, in interior silence." [9] The Marseilles priest who had consoled Madame Guyon when she visited that city, Father Malaval, had written thus: "Whoever has reached a place of rest . . . if sometimes he thinks about the road, that is merely by way of recollection, but not by way of returning to it." [10] This was contrary to the most explicit language of St. Theresa, St. Ignatius, and all the mystics. To speak thus was to exclude from the contemplative life all worship, any external practices, even the consideration of Christ's humanity.

In her *Moyen court,* Madame Guyon taught that God's design is to strip the soul of its own operations, to substitute His in their place.[11] In the *Interprétation du cantique des cantiques,* we read that "as soon as the soul begins to flow to God, like a stream back to its source, it must be wholly lost in Him; it must even lose the sight of God and all distinct consciousness." [12]

In a short work by Father Lacombe, which appeared at Verceil in 1686 we find passages like the following: "When the Spirit of God has penetrated into a man, it changes him into another man, who is then acted upon by God rather than acting himself. The love of God operates in him at its good pleasure,

[8] Molinos, *Spiritual Guide,* Bk. III, chap. 21, no. 207.

[9] *Ibid.,* chap. 13, no. 129.

[10] Malaval, *Pratique facile pour élever l'âme à la contemplation,* p. 48. François Malaval (1627–1719), a priest of Marseilles, was blind since the age of nine months. The Pope granted him a dispensation to be ordained. Although a pious and well-educated priest, he let himself be seduced by Molinos' ideas, which he spread in France with some modifications. When condemned by the Holy See, he submitted most humbly.

[11] *Moyen court et très facile de faire oraison* (2nd ed., § 17, p. 71.

[12] *Interprét. du cantique des cantiques,* chap. 6, no. 4.

in eo pro libitu suo ludit. Such a gift is bestowed on more persons than is commonly supposed." [13] A little farther on, the author, claiming to rest his view on the Scripture, invites to the permanent feast of contemplation, children, simple people, the ignorant.

The similarity between these doctrines and those of Molinos, and also serious charges against the morals of Father Lacombe and Madame Guyon, moved Bishop de Harlay to adopt measures of precaution and severity. In October, 1687, Father Lacombe was arrested, at first detained in the house of the Fathers of Christian Doctrine, then imprisoned in the Bastille. From there he was transferred to Île d'Orléron, and from there to the castle of Lourdes.

Madame Guyon was arrested in January, 1688, and taken to the convent of the Visitation. She remained there only eight months. The denunciations against her on the ground of her moral conduct could not be sustained.[14] Showing that she had no attachment to her own ideas, she declared that she was ready to abandon them as soon as they should be declared false. Thus her orthodoxy seemed to be assured. Once she was released, Madame Guyon, far from finding her standing lost by these events, saw her credit increased. Few persons seemed to possess a gift of seduction equal to hers. Anyone who met her was won over to her, those who heard her were soon persuaded. Certain women venerated her as a saint. Madame de Maintenon carried a copy of the *Moyen court* with her. Now Madame Guyon made the acquaintance of Fénelon.

Fénelon (1651–1715)

The tutor of the future king of France was at this time in a position of considerable eminence. He was thirty-seven years

[13] *Orationis mentalis analysis,* § 16, p. 91.

[14] Those who most earnestly fought the errors of Madame Guyon did not present any charges against her virtue. Cf. Bossuet, *Œuvres* (Lachat ed.), XXVIII, 656.

old. Since leaving St. Sulpice in 1674, he was scarcely ever out of Paris.[15] Presently his name, his earnestness, his cleverness, and his piety endeared him to many aristocratic souls. He preached often, heard confessions, gave spiritual direction, made friendships. The Archbishop of Paris in 1678 appointed him superior of the New Catholics. Having an ardent soul and an adventurous imagination, and being without any idea of the impossible, every religious chimera that he would later carry into political life, into education, and into social reform, could be found in the beginnings of his religious life. He was and always remained very pious. In his *Réfutation du système du P. Malebranche,* he could not find harsh enough epithets to qualify the monstrous doctrine which ventured thus to lower the love of God. Holiness attracted him. He wished to recognize it in himself or in others.

The memory of the great mystics of the preceding century lived in him. He knew that St. Theresa had directed not only her own daughters, but also learned and famous men.[16] Without being aware of it, he was going beyond his Theresa or his Jeanne de Chantal. Madame Guyon came to him one day in October, 1688. Their meeting occurred in the country at Beynes, at the house of the Duchess de Charost. Says Saint Simon: "He saw her, their spirits were drawn to each other, their sublimity merged." "I felt," says Madame Guyon, "that this first meeting was not enough." The two went off together in the same carriage from Beynes to Paris. During the journey Madame Guyon explained to him all the principles of her doctrine. When she asked him whether they easily entered his head, he replied that they entered by the wide carriage entrance. The conquest was triumphal.[17]

[15] After his ordination to the priesthood, he remained four years attached to the parish of St. Sulpice.

[16] Letter to Madame de Maintenon, March 7, 1696.

[17] Masson, *Fénelon et Mme Guyon,* p. xxx.

We wonder what would have happened if at that moment Madame Guyon had met a clear-sighted and firm spiritual director, capable of dominating her too fervid imagination and of sifting from her doctrine what was useful. Such a man might have made impossible Rousseau's blossoming of sentimentalism half a century later. Father Fénelon wished to be that man. The study of his spiritual correspondence shows him utilizing and transposing his friend's maxims. Unfortunately he was unable to free himself from the dazzling impression which that woman caused. Moreover, the misty doctrines favored too much the development of quietism.[18] Even in the most approved books of spirituality, people spoke too much of the corruption of human nature; in letters they praised too much a stoical devotion; Christian philosophy was too much enamored of new theories about the union of soul and body. The Lutheran pessimism, the Jansenist stoicism, and the Cartesian dualism prepared men's minds to consider without astonishment this picture, presented by Molinos and Madame Guyon, of a soul flying to God by contemplating Him in pure love, without concerning itself with its body.[19]

At any rate, the incident provoked at St. Cyr in 1694 by Madame de la Maisonfort revived the old rumors about the character and doctrine of Madame Guyon. Bishop Godet des Marais of Chartres decided to intervene. Madame Guyon's doctrine was suspect. Fénelon, a close friend of Bossuet, asked him to examine the incriminated works. Madame Guyon was confined in a convent at Meaux so as to be more easily within reach of the Bishop. Soon Bishop de Noailles of Châlons and Father Tronson, superior of the seminary of St. Sulpice, were added to Bossuet. The conferences were held at Issy, in the

[18] The word "quietism" is found for the first time in a letter of Caraccioli, archbishop of Naples, to Innocent XI, January 30, 1682. Cf. Bossuet, *op. cit.*, XVIII, 674.

[19] Molinos developed this antithesis in the *Spiritual Guide,* Bk. III, chap. 21, nos. 210 f.

country house of the seminary. They continued for no less than nine months and ended (March 10, 1696) with the drawing up of thirty-four articles, which Fénelon signed.

Voltaire speaks with pity of "those wretched disputes of quietism . . . which would have left no trace in the memory of men but for the names of the two illustrious rivals who were engaged in the conflict." [20] The truth is that the discussions carried on in the shadow of the Issy seminary involved the loftiest questions. This significance is grasped by all who understand the part which true and false mysticism have played in the Church, by those who appreciate the place occupied by a St. Benedict, a St. Francis of Assisi, a St. Catherine of Siena, and a St. Theresa. It is grasped by those who note the countless disorders which have sprung up in the Church, from the Gnostics of the second century to the Spiritists of our day, all those who have made improper use of the maxims of the spiritual life. In the writings of the most highly approved saints may be found the words "pure love," "disinterested love," "contemplation," "quietude," "repose in God," "the passive state"; and the Jansenist Nicole had no right to ignore this fact.[21] Yet we must acknowledge that these words have not always been used in their writings with all the preciseness desirable. On such capital points the least error was capable of leading to the most regrettable consequences.

The illustrious prelates chosen to cast light on the discussion viewed the question in its true bearing. In the articles of Issy they sanctioned pure and disinterested love,[22] and also the prayer of contemplation or quietude, and the other extraordinary prayers, even passive prayers.[23] They likewise condemned the excessive timidity that sometimes makes people regard

[20] Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV*, chap. 38.
[21] Nicole, *Réfutation des principales erreurs quiétistes*, Bk. II, chap. 18.
[22] Art. XIII.
[23] Art. XXI.

contemplation as a dangerous practice [24] on the pretext of the abuse that has been made or can be made of it. But a close study of Madame Guyon's works made them perceive four chief errors in them: 1. that man's perfection consists, even during this life, in a continual act of contemplation and of love; 2. that a soul which has reached this perfection is not obliged to explicit acts distinct from that charity; 3. that this soul is indifferent with regard to all things for the body and for the soul; 4. that in the state of perfect contemplation the soul should reject all distinct ideas, and consequently even the thought of God's attributes and of the mysteries of Jesus Christ. In short, the errors of quietism were to put sublimity and perfection in things that are not, or in any case, that are not of this life.

The prelates therefore rejected "the perpetual and unique act" of pure love; but they accepted the habitual state.[25] They declared that the state of contemplation is compatible with acts of virtue other than charity. "These acts may not always be methodical and arranged, even less reduced in formulas and under certain words," but at least "sincerely formed in the heart, with all the holy sweetness and tranquillity which the Spirit of God inspires." [26] They acknowledge that holy Christian indifference regards the events of this life, the dispensation of consolations or of spiritual aridities, but not the things which have relation to salvation.[27] They pointed out as a dangerous error, the idea of excluding from contemplation the attributes of God and the mysteries of the incarnate Word.[28] They declare that without the extraordinary prayers a person can become a very great saint and attain to the perfection of Christianity.[29]

[24] *Ibid.*
[25] Art. XIX.
[26] Art. XII.
[27] Art. IX.
[28] Art. XXIV.
[29] Art. XXII.

On July 10, 1695, Fénelon, appointed archbishop of Cambrai, was consecrated by Bossuet. The good understanding seemed to be sealed. But the accord on the ideas, or at least on the terms expressing them, between Bossuet and Fénelon, let a deep divergence of tendencies subsist. The Bishop of Meaux, whose mind was not suited to follow a soul in its twists and turnings, possessed a remarkable aptitude for grasping the leading tendency.[30] He at once suspected dangerous reservations in Fénelon and especially in Madame Guyon. The delicate and subtle sensitiveness of the future Archbishop of Cambrai had at once perceived this disposition in Bossuet. A vague and reciprocal distrust animated the two prelates. Hence, in the case of each, their first care was to explain, each from his own viewpoint, the articles of Issy. Bossuet's commentary appeared in a pastoral letter and especially in a treatise on the states of prayer, the manuscript of which he sent to Fénelon. The Archbishop of Cambrai, noting that the writings of Madame Guyon were criticized in this latter work, refused to give it his approbation. He got ahead of Bossuet when he published his *Explication des maximes des saints* in February, 1697, a month before the *Etats d'oraison* was printed.[31]

The Maxims

A general history of the Church is not called on to follow the long discussions that divided these two great men. The theologically minded Bishop advanced relentlessly against his opponent the logically connected series of his deductions; the other bishop, who was psychologically minded, subtle and clever, dodged the shafts aimed at his *Maximes* by pointing out an overlooked meaning of his adversary. The wrathful eloquence of the former did not always restrain his blows against

[30] See many instances in his *History of the Variations of Protestantism.*

[31] Lanson, *Bossuet, estraits de ses œuvres,* p. 557.

"the Montanus of a new Priscilla." The latter's sensitiveness reacted vigorously under the attack. The intervention of the Holy See put an end to a strife in which personal questions were too often interjected.

Fénelon, in the presence of the attacks against his book, did not at the outset refuse to enter into discussion with his fellow bishops. But, then seeing that an accord was impossible, he broke off the conferences and asked the King to submit his work to the judgment of the Holy See. On April 16, 1697, through the Duke of Beauvillier, Louis XIV authorized him to appeal to the Pope. The inquiry in the Roman court lasted two years. The question was a most delicate one. Fénelon in his *Maximes* began by explicitly rejecting the fundamental principle of quietism, that is, the chimerical supposition of a continual state of contemplation and prayer. In his "notice to the reader" he said that the whole plan of his book consisted in establishing four truths, namely: 1. that all the interior ways lead to pure love; 2. that the trials of the interior life have for their purpose the purification of this love; 3. that contemplation is its tranquil exercise; 4. that the unitive life, or the passive state, is its entire purity and its habitual state. But, in his attempt to sustain the doctrine of pure love, Fénelon had not succeeded in giving his expressions the exactness and precision announced in his preface.[32] In Bossuet's judgment the errors of the book could be reduced to four. According to Fénelon, the soul in the habitual state of pure love: 1. loses all desire for eternal salvation; 2. it becomes indifferent for its own perfection; 3. in certain states it loses the distinct and reflective view of Christ; 4. it can make to God the absolute sacrifice of its eternal happiness. On March 12, 1699, Pope Innocent XII condemned twenty-three propositions of the *Maximes*. Fénelon submitted. He published a declaration to make known that he accepted the condemnation without reservation. His declara-

[32] Gosselin, in *Œuvres de Fénelon*, IV, xcix.

tion ends thus: "Please God, it may ever be said of us that a pastor ought to bear in mind that he must be more docile than the least sheep of the flock." [33]

Orthodoxy was saved. But the harm produced by the deadly error [34] continued. At the close of that seventeenth century, men's souls, parched and constrained by the somber moral teaching of Jansenism, aspired to move freely in love. The attempt made within the Church failed, compromised and misguided by the aberrations of a visionary. The way was open for the rationalist sentimentalism of the eighteenth century, forerunner of the revolutionary utopias.[35]

The Age of Louis XIV

Let us not forget that the second half of the seventeenth century was not filled simply by the great controversies we have just described. This was the time when Bossuet preached his sermons and funeral orations, when Racine wrote his tragedies, Boileau his letters and satires, La Fontaine his fables, La Rochefoucauld his *Maximes,* Fénelon his *Télémaque* and his *Treatise on the Existence of God.* It was then that Madame Sévigné drew the picture of that brilliant society, that La Bruyère satirized it and that Bourdaloue denounced its hidden vices with apostolic vigor. So many marvels appeared in the

[33] It is true that Fénelon always maintained that he had never thought the condemned errors. He wrote: "In docile submission to the Pope I can indeed condemn my book as expressing what I had never meant to express. The Pope understands my book better than I have understood it; for this reason I submit. But as to my thought, I can say that I know it better than anyone else" (Fénelon, *Œuvres,* Leroux-Gaume ed., IX, 727).

[34] The quietism of the *Maximes des saints* had been condemned as an error, not as a heresy. Cf. Denzinger, nos. 1327–49.

[35] On quietism see the following: Phélipeaux, *Relation de l'origine, du progrès et de la condamnation du quiétisme,* 1732; Gosselin, "Analyse de la controverse du quiétisme" in *Histoire littéraire de Fénelon,* 1843; Matter, *Le mysticisme au temps de Fénelon,* 1865; Guerrier, *Mme Guyon, sa vie, sa doctrine et son influence,* 1881; J. Lemaitre, *Fénelon,* 1910; Paquier, *Qu'est-ce que le quiétisme,* 1910; Bremond, *Apologie pour Fénelon,* 1910.

space of thirty years, as the fruit of seeds which the preceding ages had patiently cultivated. All those masterpieces are, in fact, the product of ancient culture and of the Christian spirit, admirably welded together.

The labor of the Renaissance and the faith of the Middle Ages there met. "Racine and Fénelon breathe the elegant purity of the finest period of Athens; Bossuet reflects the virile simplicity of Homer, and Massillon the Roman elegance of the Augustan Age; Fléchier imitates the learned art of the ancient orators; La Bruyère has something of the spirit of Seneca; Madame Sévigné studies Tacitus and recovers the vigor of his style to honor the virtues of Turenne." At the same time, the more we advance in the Age of Louis XIV, the more literature, sacred oratory, the theater, in short, all the memorable faculties of thought, take on a religious, Christian character, and, even in the general sentiments which they express, the more they evidence that return of belief in revelation, in a humanity seen in and through Christ. Herein we note one of the most striking traits and the most profound of that immortal literature.[36]

Bossuet (1627–1704)

We have already seen the great figure of Bossuet in the controversies of Protestantism, Gallicanism, Jansenism, and quietism. We must leave to literary history the consideration of the beauty of his work. Let us simply recall the remark of a competent critic: "Above all else, Bossuet is a priest; this quality determines the form of his spirit and of his conduct: each of his works comes in its own proper time to meet an actual and precise need, with no desire for literary glory; and the service he renders to his king, his country, and his neighbor is such as a priest can do." [37]

[36] Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires,* II, 5.

[37] Lanson, *op. cit.,* p. 569.

Fénelon (1651–1715)

At the side of Bossuet, Fénelon, no less Catholic, no less a priest, but with a more seducing complexity and more disconcerting, likewise unites the culture of antiquity and the Christian spirit in his sermons, in his philosophical and pedagogical writings, and particularly in that *Télémaque,* where his whole psychology is revealed and explained. In the words of a discriminating critic, perhaps no book exists "that is more pagan and more Christian, more chimerical and more prudent, more clever and more ingenuous, no book that appears closer to the ancients when it is read superficially, and that is more removed from them when its hidden depths are sounded. It is the book of a great poet, of a genius, but lacking one of the most precious qualities of a man of genius, of a great poet, a certain simplicity of good sense which makes the eternal charm of Homer and Bossuet." [38]

Bourdaloue (1632–1704)

When Bossuet's voice no longer spoke, his contemporaries scarcely perceived the loss because they heard Bourdaloue. More within the grasp of his hearers, clear in his explanation of doctrine, precise in his moral exhortations, and penetrating in his analysis, this worthy religious bore no trace of author or writer in any of his offices, but was occupied only with the thought of accomplishing good.[39] We may say that the best reply the Society of Jesus ever made to the *Provincial Letters* was to have Bourdaloue preach.

About the celebrated Jesuit other preachers honored the Christian pulpit. Such were Fléchier (1632–1710), Massillon

[38] Silvestre de Sacy, *Variétés littéraires, morales et historiques,* I, 64–75.
[39] Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi,* IX, 296.

(1663–1742), and Mascaron (1634–1703). But for the time of Louis XIV to deserve the title of The Grand Age, it was enough that it heard and was able to appreciate Bossuet, Fénelon, and Bourdaloue.

PART III

The Strife against Unbelief

PREFACING his studies on Port Royal, Sainte-Beuve asks by what mysterious cause the beauty of the seventeenth century became, as it were, suddenly dead. The next century, the eighteenth, taking little account of the ideas of its predecessor, seemed rather, except for the polish of its outward form, to be a direct continuation of the sixteenth.[1] The contrast is more apparent than real. In the preceding pages we have seen some of the causes that contributed to this result. The reaction of popular opinion against the repressions of Louis XIV [2] is not sufficient to explain the religious disaffection which made its appearance almost everywhere after the death of the great King. The rigor of the Protestant and Jansenist doctrines contributed largely: it is by presenting Christianity in the somber teaching of Calvin and Jansen that Voltaire and his followers succeeded in making religion odious to a large number of his contemporaries. Moreover, Protestantism went ahead toward unbelief, Jansenism turned to rebellion, and Gallicanism, which became Josephism, made strides toward outright schism.

Parallel to this movement, the Christian sense weakened in society. Possibly the sight of the political preponderance and the material prosperity of non-Catholic countries, amply explained by natural causes, contributed to estrange some superficial minds from Catholicism.[3] At any rate, among men of learning, a growing enthusiasm for the ideas of science and nature, from Descartes to Bayle, tended to make these ideas prevail over those of faith and the supernatural. In the upper classes of society the concentration of the nobility at the court

[1] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal,* I, 8.
[2] Cf. Ranke, *Lives and Times of the Popes,* II, 484.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 480.

and the worldly life of the salons, greatly favored the irreligion of thought and morals. Lastly, unbelieving and lukewarm Catholics joined a mysterious society, Freemasonry. All the trend of ideas tended to melt into a vague deism; all the oppositions seemed to turn to a vague dream of social renovation. The outcome of this evolution appears in two men: Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau. In Voltaire was incarnate the genius of destruction; in Rousseau, that of utopia. A clergy too much involved in worldly affairs was unable to confront the flood of unbelief with the heroic effort that might have halted it. From France, where all the currents of rationalist impiety appeared to flow together, the torrent overflowed on all Europe and there prepared the deepest and most universal of catastrophes.

CHAPTER XIII

The Last Popes of the Ancient Regime

Clement XI (1700–21)

NEVER was a heavier task imposed on the papacy. Cardinal Giovanni Francesco Albani, elected November 23, 1700, assumed the tiara under the name of Clement XI. He seemed to be designed for a most fruitful pontificate. As secretary of secret briefs, he had been in relation with all the European courts. He it was who collaborated in the drawing up of the bull published by the dying Alexander VIII against the Assembly of 1682 and in the constitution of Innocent XII against nepotism. He had favored the candidacy of Frederick Augustus, elector of Saxony, for the throne of Poland and that of the Duke of Anjou for the throne of Spain. Commissioned to receive and sustain the Catholic adherents of James II, who was forced, by the triumph of William of Orange, to exile himself at Rome, his intervention had a reverberation in England.

If his great experience in affairs brought him the respect of the great, his tender devotion and benevolence won him the favor of the people. Clement XI strictly observed the constitution on nepotism in which he had collaborated. His deep piety was shown in his sermons, before and after his election, on the feasts of the Church, sermons that have been largely preserved. A perfect harmony always prevailed between his private life, his public life, and his spoken word. But what talents or virtues could dominate the terrible obstacles that arose on all sides during his pontificate of twenty-one years? Neither the bull *Vineam Domini* (July 14, 1705) nor the destruction of Port

Royal by the King of France (1709) nor the bull *Unigenitus* (September 8, 1713) could restrain the growing boldness of Jansenism, which, at the same time that it disturbed all France, formed itself into a Church in Holland.

Pope Clement's policy had no greater success in Germany. In 1701 Emperor Leopold, aggravating the rupture of Catholic unity, consecrated the sacrilegious usurpation of Albert of Brandenburg by erecting the duchy of Prussia into a kingdom. The Pope's energetic protest had no other effect than to precipitate the imperial forces into Italy. A similar failure awaited him in Spain. Clement had in vain tried to maintain a strict neutrality between the two candidates, who were contesting the kingdom between them; his nuncio was driven from Madrid, and all correspondence between the Spanish bishops and the Roman court was forbidden.[1] In Poland, indeed, the candidate of the Holy See, Frederick Augustus, was victorious over Charles XII, thanks to the help of Russia; at Utrecht the envoys of the powers, after prolonged discussions, finally stipulated that whatever concerned the Catholic religion should be maintained in the state in which things were before the war.

But these were only negative triumphs, with the single result that they hindered at one point the march of a sort of conspiracy of the nations against the papacy. In Italy sad events detached Sicily from the Papal States. Even at Utrecht the European diplomacy treated of the lot of that province without the least regard for the rights of the pope. In the East a schism broke out among the Maronites; and in the Far East neither the most urgent papal bulls nor the repeated intervention of his legates was able to calm the quarrels aroused by the question of the Chinese rites or to disarm the anger of the emperor of China.

France continued to lead in the general movement of ideas. People passed from hand to hand and eagerly read two books that were forerunners of a movement that would bring about

[1] Baudrillart, *Philippe V et la cour de France*, I, 316.

the worst catastrophes. The first of these was the *Histoire des oracles;* its author, Fontenelle, criticizing the faith of the early Church, directed his attack against the foundation of Christianity.[2] The other book was Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique,* which set forth whatever, in the previous 150 years, might serve for the destruction of religion.[3] These two books were but the prelude of more general and more dreadful assaults. Thus opened the eighteenth century, the century of Voltaire and Rousseau, of Joseph II and Louis XV, of Pombal and Choiseul, of the *Encyclopedia* and the Revolution.[4]

Innocent XIII (1721–24)

The movement of unbelief in the eighteenth century has some analogy with the flood of barbarism which rose even to the Holy See in the tenth century and with the invasion of paganism which reached the papal court at the time of the Renaissance. But the resemblance is not complete. The papacy of the eighteenth century entirely escaped the baleful influence: the century of Voltaire and Louis XV had no John XII or Alexander VI.

Like Alexander VII, Clement IX, Clement X, Innocent XI, Alexander VIII, Innocent XII, and Clement XI, Michelangelo Conti, who was elected pope on March 8, 1721, and crowned on May 18 under the name of Innocent XIII, belonged to a noble family of Italy. He had been trained in the highest offices of the papal administration and was commendable to all by his solid virtues. Almost all the popes of the eighteenth century have the same noble origin, the same serious training, the same worthiness of life.[5]

[2] Lanson, *Hist. de la littérature française,* p. 627.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 628.

[4] On Clement XI, see the article in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.* Cf. Reboulet, *Hist. de Clément XI;* Lafitau, *Vie de Clément XI.*

[5] Clement XIV was the son of a physician and had not held any high offices in the papal government. The other popes belonged to the nobility and had been trained in diplomacy.

In the sacred college the traditions of the famous "flying squadron" are perpetuated, even accentuated by the group of the so-called *Zelanti,* who agreed together not to be guided in the choice by any considerations except purely religious motives. Often the action of this group was decisive. Furthermore, with good reason the college of cardinals was watchful against foreign influences. Since the ruin of the Holy Empire the sovereigns of Spain and of France had arrogated to themselves the right, concurrently with the emperor of Austria, to exclude from the papacy any candidate unacceptable to them. They said that this was the inheritance of an imperial privilege going back to the fourth century. They held that Nicholas II, when he confided the election of the pope to the cardinals alone, did not intend to abolish this right, and that Gregory XV had in a way consecrated it by calling it by its true name, the right of exclusive.[6] We can surmise that the example of the Protestant princes, exercising an effective power over their Churches, was a further reason.

In any event, the question of the right of exclusive had been theoretically discussed among theologians and canonists. The celebrated Jesuit cardinal, De Lugo, in a work published in 1644, at the time of the conclave in which Alexander VII was elected, concluded in favor of this right, which the scholarly Cardinal Albizzi opposed in energetic terms.[7] The question presented itself, from a *de facto* point of view, in the conclave which followed the death of Clement XI: Cardinal Conti was elected in consequence of an exclusion pronounced by Cardinal Paolucci in the name of the Emperor of Austria. Must we admit another and more positive intervention by the French gov-

[6] Bull *Aeterni Patris,* § 18; on this right, called *exclusio* or more often *exclusiva,* see *Kirchenlexikon, s.v.* Exclusiva; Moroni, *Dizionario, s.v.* Exclusiva; Ortolan in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.,* III, 719–24. The last use of the exclusiva was made by Austria (August 2, 1903) against Cardinal Rampolla, at the conclave that elected Pius X.

[7] No papal document ever sanctioned this right or pretended right. But the Church accepted or tolerated its exercise until the present century.

ernment, urging the election of Conti, in consideration of his written promise to close his eyes regarding those who opposed the bull *Unigenitus* and to appoint Abbé Dubois cardinal? Saint-Simon declares that such was the case.[8] Concerning this affair, the secret reports preserved in the archives of the French Foreign Office show simply that the court of Louis XV, long favorable to the candidacy of Conti, presented a note to him containing its wishes: an expectant attitude relative to Jansenism, and the promotion of Dubois to the cardinalate. The note added: "Whoever will be elected pope can and should favor the wishes herein contained." Conti read the document and declared that he found in it nothing reprehensible. No insistence could wring from him a single word beyond this statement. After Innocent XIII's election, Dubois rejoiced at the coming of a "moderate and peace-loving" pope who "would prefer religion to every other aim."

Great hopes were placed in Innocent's pontificate. The precarious state of his health and the shortness of his reign did not allow these hopes to be realized. In his praise we may say that he took the bull *Unigenitus* under his protection against the seven French bishops who asked for its suppression, that he exercised great solicitude for the defense of the island of Malta, which was hard pressed by the Turks, and that he protested strongly against the cession by the Emperor to Don Carlos, the Infanta of Spain, of the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, fiefs of the Holy See. But he had the misfortune of elevating Abbé Dubois, minister of the Duke of Orléans, to the cardinalate. Says Muratori: "The morals of this man deserved something quite different from the purple.[9] But the pressure of the Regent was so strong that the good Pontiff, fearing lest resistance might be harmful to the religious affairs

[8] Saint-Simon, *Mémoires,* XXXIV, 250.

[9] However, he was calumniated by his enemies. See Bliard, *Dubois, cardinal et premier ministre.*

of France, finally yielded." [10] The historian Novaes says that almost all the sovereigns added their urging to that of the Duke of Orléans, and so in a way this appointment was the result of a European coalition.[11]

The cares of governing the Church undoubtedly shortened the life of the worthy Pontiff, who died May 7, 1724. The people lamented, says Muratori,[12] the death of this pope, a man of majestic bearing, humble and kind toward the poor, but one whose efforts failed in the face of steadily growing political powers.

Benedict XIII (1724–30)

Pietro Francesco Orsini, who succeeded Innocent XIII on May 29, 1724, under the name of Benedict XIII, belonged to the Order of Friars Preachers. Charged with governing the diocese of Benevento, he there showed himself a pious pastor, vigilant over the observance of discipline and the reform of morals. His writings in theology and piety, published during his lifetime, testify to the culture of his mind and the loftiness of his soul. At the conclave he was conspicuous among the *Zelanti.* Benedict XIII brought to the chair of St. Peter the ardent and enlightened zeal which he had shown in his episcopacy. He encouraged the creation of seminaries;[13] he published several constitutions to regulate the worldly life of the clergy, and in particular to moderate the excessive luxury of the cardinals and of the legates.[14] His intervention during the Jansenist strifes was firm and prudent. He strongly prescribed the acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus,* but made it clear that he was not condemning in any way St. Augustine's teaching on grace or that of the Dominicans on predestination to glory.

[10] Muratori, *Annali,* XII, 102.
[11] Novaes, *Elementi della storia de Sommi Pontifici,* XIII, 14.
[12] Muratori, XII, 108.
[13] *Bullarium,* XI, Part II, 409–12.
[14] *Ibid.,* p. 400.

He had the happiness to see the bull finally accepted by Cardinal de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, in 1728. In short, in the administration of Benedict XIII we find nothing to justify our calling him a great pope, even though the results of his foreign policy might permit that title.

His great fault was to give his confidence to a hypocrite, Cardinal Coscia, a venal man, whose unpopularity would be reflected on the Supreme Pontiff. By following the advice of this man and of his secretary of state, Cardinal Lercari, he was led to make regrettable concessions to various sovereigns. Victor Amedeus of Sardinia received the right to nominate to the sees of his kingdom, the King of Naples obtained the exorbitant privilege of instituting a supreme judge for ecclesiastical affairs. Benedict XIII also yielded to the excessive demand of King John V of Portugal, who asked the red hat for the Lisbon nuncio, Bichi, who was recalled to Rome by the Pope. But when the sacred college was consulted, they opposed the elevation, fearing that the Holy See would thus create a precedent and that in the future a pope would not be able to recall one of his ambassadors without being obliged to offer some compensation to the state which might be displeased with such recall.

Benedict XIII canonized a large number of saints, among them St. John of the Cross, St. Aloysius Gonzaga, St. Stanislas Kostka, St. John Nepomucene, and St. Gregory VII. He bestowed the purple on eminent priests, the most celebrated being Cardinal Fleury, future prime minister of France, and Cardinal Lambertini, who became pope under the name of Benedict XIV. Those who were intimate witnesses of his life did not hesitate to regard him as a saint.[15] However, his death (February 21, 1730) was not lamented by the people. Scarcely had the rumor of the sad news spread, than a tumultuous crowd, with cries of death, rushed to the palace of the famous Car-

[15] *Era riguardata qual santo* (Muratori, XII, 129).

dinal Coscia; the deceased Pope was accused of having too long favored him. The Cardinal himself was able to escape; but two members of his household were seized and taken to prison. He himself shortly afterward fell into the hands of justice and expiated, by ten years of imprisonment and by the confiscation of his property, the many malpractices that he was guilty of.[16]

Clement XII (1730–40)

The conclave following the death of Benedict XIII was stormy. But the name of the successful candidate seemed one calculated to calm all disturbances. It was Lorenzo Corsini, who took the name of Clement XII. His family, one of the most illustrious of Tuscany, was very rich. No one ever suspected it of turning the revenues of the Church to its own advantage. Profiting by the example of his predecessor, he gave his confidence only to worthy men. He did justice on Coscia and all his accomplices. His first care was to correct the abuses that had been introduced in the reign of Benedict XIII. His notable experience in affairs, his immense fortune, the influence of his family, created an exceptional situation for him. This he used only for the good of the Church, the solace of the poor, and the good administration of the Papal States. We see him in 1735 during a famine distribute large sums of money to the poor. He encouraged commerce and industry, reorganized the police, enriched the Vatican Library with numerous volumes,[17] generously subsidized the learned Maronite Assemani, whose researches greatly profited science, and constructed several important monuments, notably the façade of St. John Lateran.[18] But these deeds were the limit of his success. His foreign policy brought him no less disappointments

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[17] *Bullarium*, XIV, 379.

[18] The monthly lottery that he instituted and that became the favorite game of the Romans, reflects less honor on his pontificate.

than Benedict XIII experienced from his. At the death of the last Farnese in 1731, he saw Spain seize Parma and Piacenza without deigning to pay him homage for those apostolic fiefs. In that same year, the Republic of Genoa haughtily repelled the Pope's mediation in a dispute it had with Corsica.

From 1733 to 1737, during the war of the Polish succession, Clement XII saw his States violated several times by the Spanish forces as well as by the imperial army. His negotiations with the court of Spain for the conclusion of a concordat dragged on. Meanwhile Philip V, impelled by his second wife, Elizabeth Farnese, imprudently meddled in ecclesiastical affairs. He demanded for his third son, then eight years old, canonical institution as archbishop of Toledo. The young eighteen-year-old King of Naples claimed for the crown the right of appointment to all benefices. Sardinia, offended by the Pope's refusal in the matter of a similar claim, abruptly broke off diplomatic relations with the Holy See. While the Catholic states were giving the Pope so many causes of grief, in northern Europe three big non-Catholic powers—Russia, Prussia, and England—were growing tremendously. This situation was not the result of the triumph of one dogma over another, of Protestantism over Catholicism; yet it would exercise a reaction upon spiritual affairs. The religious parties had strengthened themselves with the states. Russia instituted Greek bishops in the united provinces of Poland; the rise of Prussia gave the German Protestants a new feeling of independence and power; and the more the Protestant power of England succeeded in absolutely dominating the seas, the more the Catholic missions might well fear seeing their progress halted.[19]

But the head of the Church felt nothing more keenly than the afflictions he suffered from his own children. The new

[19] Ranke, *op. cit.*

system, which was called Bourbonism and which tended to join together in one empire all the neo-Latin nations,[20] was unfortunately penetrated with a spirit that went back beyond Protestantism, to the jurists and humanists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Since the ruin of the Holy Empire, were not these combined princes, the natural protectors of the Church, the heirs of the rights of the emperors? Their jurists thought so and said so vociferously, aggravating their theory with principles coming to them, through the men of the Renaissance, from pagan antiquity. In fact, the rude Hohenstaufens, at the very height of their strife against the papacy, never thought of denying the higher principles of morality which regulate political transactions and the law of nations. But in the eighteenth century a representative of the new legal system wrote: "In political matters we must discard speculative ideas which the vulgar form about justice, equity, candor, and the other virtues. In the last analysis it all boils down to might." [21]

The spread of such principles was the more dangerous as it coincided with an unbridled license of morals and thought. The Regency had freed from all restraint all those who had until then been kept within bounds by the presence of the great King. At least thus things were taking place at Paris. But Paris was already the center of that immense republic of cultivated minds whose coming would soon be hailed by Voltaire.

Moreover, in the Latin countries as in the Germanic countries, the network of a new society began to spread. This was a mysterious society which, born in England, had reached into France, Italy, Spain, Germany, Switzerland, and Sweden: it was Freemasonry. Pope Clement XII, before descending into the tomb, had the glory of uttering the first cry of alarm against

[20] Baudrillart, *op. cit.*, I, 1.

[21] De Bielfeld, *Institutions politiques*, II, chap. 4, "De la puissances des Etats," § 30.

the dangers which this association raised up for the Church and for Christian civilization. The Pope, in his bull *In eminenti* (April 23, 1738),[22] said: "Public report has made Us know of the far-reaching spread of the societies or conventicles, commonly called lodges of free masons, in which, under the pretext of accomplishing duties of natural uprightness, men of every religion and sect join together by strict and occult promises, binding themselves to inviolable secrecy." The Pope in conclusion forbids all Catholics, under pain of excommunication *ipso facto,* to become members of these societies or to concur therein in any way whatever. During his reign he expended his strength in the propagation of the gospel, encouraged the missions, sending European religious to preach the faith in Tibet; in the diocese of Bisignano in Calabria he founded a seminary for young men of the uniate Greek rite. He received the abjuration of 10,000 Copts, saw the Patriarch of the Arminians remove from the dyptics the anathemas against the Council of Chalcedon, and received the brother of the Emperor of Morocco, who asked for baptism. After these considerable accomplishments, at the age of eighty-eight, weighed down with infirmities, almost blind, Clement XII peacefully ended his days on February 6, 1740. During his pontificate many servants of God died in the odor of sanctity. Such were St. Veronica Giuliani, a Capuchin, who was favored with the same extraordinary grace as St. Francis of Assisi and received on her body the stigmata of the Passion;[23] Blessed Thomas of Cori, friar minor of the Observance, who successfully preached the gospel in the territory of Subiaco;[24] St. John Joseph of the Cross of the same Order, in whom shone the love of prayer and the practice of the strictest poverty.[25]

[22] *Bullarium,* XIV, 236.

[23] Beatified by Pius VII (June 8, 1804).

[24] Beatified by Pius VI (August 18, 1786).

[25] Beatified by Pius VI (May 15, 1789).

Benedict XIV (1740–58)

The vacancy of the Holy See was a long one. The cardinals, who entered the conclave on February 18, 1640, were still discussing the merits of the candidates in the middle of August. Men worthy of the tiara were not lacking,[26] but the three factions—Italian, French-Spanish, and the *Zelanti*—held one another in check. Neither the virtuous Vincenzo Gotti, venerated for his piety, nor the able Aldrovandi, for whom European politics seemed to have no secrets, nor the ardent leader of the *Zelanti,* the camerlengo Annibale Albani, had been able to obtain the two-thirds majority required for election. The heat was becoming unbearable. Several members of the sacred college were suffering greatly from this long confinement. On August 17 Cardinal Troiano Acquaviva, minister of Spain, proposed the name of Prospero Lambertini. He was learned, well liked by everyone, of remarkable good sense and jovial humor. A few days before, someone heard him say jokingly: "If you want a saint, take Gotti; if you want a good fellow, take me." Acquaviva's proposal was like a sudden illumination for all. Amid the inextricable difficulties in which the papacy was moving, a solid good sense, a constant self-possession, and a likable good humor were indeed the outstanding qualities that ought to be expected in the head of the Church. Evidently the cardinals thought so. Cardinal Lambertini, who had received only one vote on the sixteenth, on the next day obtained them all except his own, which he cast for Cardinal Aldovrandi. Says Muratori: "God is able to disconcert all the combinations of men's policy and to make true merit triumph." [27]

The new Pope was entering his sixty-sixth year. His contemporaries represent him as a man of medium height, a plump

[26] Muratori, XII, 203. Muratori died in 1750 at the age of eighty-eight. In his *Annali* he is a most valuable witness for the events of this period.

[27] *Ibid.*

body, lively eyes, habitually pleasant countenance but easily assuming, when circumstances required, an expression of gravity that inspired respect and that commanded obedience. His conversation was brilliant, his repartee full of spirit, his judgment sound, his piety profound.

Born on March 31, 1675, of an old and honorable family of Bologna, he went through a long and laborious career at Rome in the congregations, where his serious qualities of mind, his good memory, his unusual perspicacity, and his wide knowledge were able to expand freely. But he never let himself be absorbed by his outward occupations; his tastes inclined him to study. The fruits of his labors had already appeared in important treatises, among them his learned writings on the Sacrifice of the Mass and on the canonization of saints.[28] Brought up in the absolutist traditions of the princes of the eighteenth century, he had grievously experienced their disadvantages. So he took hold of the government of the Church with a pronounced bent toward moderation. This policy would make him incur, and perhaps merit, the reproach of excessive condescension.

The character of his rule appeared in the very first acts of his reign. At his first consistory he relieved the unfortunate Cardinal Coscia of the censures he had incurred and freed him from imprisonment. Nepotism was odious to him. How much so, we see in a letter to his nephew Egano Lambertini, senator at Bologna, in which he writes: "You will not come to Rome until I send for you." And he never sent for him. Shortly afterward, on the subject of lending at interest, he published the celebrated encyclical *Vix pervenit* (November 1, 1743).[29] Its teaching was made more precise by his treatise *De synodo dioecesana.* Firmly maintaining the condemnations of the Church about usury strictly so called, that is, interest based solely on

[28] *De sacrificio missae, De servorum Dei beatificatione et canonizatione.*
[29] Benedict XIV, *Bullarium,* I, 258–60.

the fact of a loan, *ipsius ratione mutui,* Benedict XIV recognized legal titles to lawful interest, notably the privation of the enjoyment and benefit which the lender would suffer and by which the borrower would profit, *damnum emergens, lucrum cessans.*

Economic and juridical questions, which he had studied extensively, engaged the attention of the new Pope. He favored commerce, lowered customs taxes, reorganized the Roman nobility. The draining of the Pontine marshes, the navigation of the rivers, the improvement of the ports of Ancona and Civitavecchia, the restoration of the fine highways of Italy, received his care. The advancement of studies, a matter that corresponded with his personal preferences, were not less dear to him. Four academies were founded by his interest; therein were studied Roman antiquities, both profane and Christian, the history of the councils, canon law, and the liturgy. By his constitution *Sollicita ac provida* (July 10, 1753) he laid down for the Congregation of the Index the wisest regulations, requiring them, as far as possible, in the grave mission entrusted to them, to conciliate the reputation of the authors, the good of the Church, and the welfare of the faithful.[30] He particularly urged them to avoid condemning a book on account of an isolated proposition, because it often happens that an obscure expression is found explained by another and clearer passage in the same book.[31] If, moreover, the author is a Catholic, of good repute for doctrine and religion, simple equity seems to require, he says, that, so far as possible, the author's words be explained favorably and that they should be taken in a good sense.[32]

Benedict XIV used to relax from the labors of his office in the company of scholars and literary men. He carried on a

[30] *Ibid.,* pp. 50–54; Constitution *Sollicita,* § 20.
[31] *Ibid.,* § 18.
[32] *Ibid.,* § 19.

correspondence not only with Montfaucon, Maffei, Muratori, but also with Frederick II and even with Voltaire. When this last dedicated his tragedy *Mahomet* to him, the Pope replied by a letter that was most courteous, for which Voltaire hastened to thank him.

Benedict's relations with the various courts of Europe were marked by a spirit of friendliness that some writers regard as weakness. He seemed to pursue quite willingly a policy of concessions which Benedict XIII had been forced to adopt reluctantly. In the first years of his pontificate he granted to the king of Portugal an extensive patronage over benefices; the next year he sanctioned by his authority the institution in the Two Sicilies of a court of justice in which lay judges would sit and which would judge ecclesiastics in the first instance; Sardinia and Spain obtained analogous rights; the Pontiff, far from lamenting over this, thought only of rejoicing over the peace and good harmony that resulted from this state of affairs: the king of Sardinia received the title of Vicar of the Holy See, and the king of Portugal that of Most Faithful King. The king of Prussia, whom the papal chancery had until then called the margrave of Brandenburg, was officially recognized by Benedict XIV. Expressions of good will came to him from all sides: Empress Elizabeth of Russia showered on him marks of esteem, and the Grand Turk paid him compliments.

His spirit of conciliation applied not only to matters of discipline; it extended to the more strictly religious questions of dogma and morals that were so greatly stirring up the minds of that time. Appealed to by the Assembly of the Clergy of France to decide as arbiter in the lively dispute which divided the Catholics regarding the affair of refusing the sacraments to those who opposed the bull *Unigenitus,* Benedict XIV in 1756 declared that submission to the bull was a duty, but that the public administration of the sacraments need be refused only to notorious opponents. He took up the defense of the

Augustinians Noris, Berti, and Belelli, who were accused of perpetuating Baianism.[33]

There were few popes who accorded to the Society of Jesus so many privileges and so many laudatory and cordial apostolic letters.[34] Of all the heads of religious orders, the general of the Jesuits was the only one who had free access to the Pope every week. But the Pope condemned Father Colonia's *Bibliothèque janséniste,* Father Pichon's *Esprit de Jésus-Christ et de l'Eglise sur la fréquent communion,* and, at the request of the minister Pombal, he appointed (April 1, 1758) Cardinal Saldanha visitator apostolic of the Jesuits of Portugal, "commissioned to inform himself thoroughly about whatever concerns the Company and to make a detailed report to the pope." [35]

Benedict XIV's great piety edified the pilgrims who came to Rome for the jubilee of 1750. But his decrees reducing the number of feast days, which had become too numerous in Spain, Austria, Sicily, Sardinia, Tuscany, and his own States, gave him, in the eyes of the philosophers, the reputation of being a liberal pope. That same conciliatory and tolerant attitude enabled him to calm the disturbances that had arisen among the Maronites and to see an enduring revival in Syria of the Greek Uniate patriarchate, known as Melchite. His charities made him popular. He praised his predecessor, Benedict XIII, when he said: "We love that Pontiff, who had his carriage backed up to avoid a dispute with a cartdriver." And he attempted to make his own conduct conform to that example. Even the Protestants tended to be converted after hearing him. One English lord said that the Pope would make them all papists if he should come to London.

[33] Hurter, *Nomenclator,* III, 3.

[34] De Ravignan, *Clément XIII et Clément XIV,* p. 70. Cf. the following bulls: *Devotam* (1746); *Gloriosa Domine* (1748); *Quantum recessu* (1755).

[35] Ravignan, *op. cit.,* pp. 66–72. On the following May 15, Benedict XIV being then dead, the cardinal visitator declared that the Portuguese Jesuits had carried on an unlawful and scandalous business affair.

However, Benedict never forgot to perform the duties essential to his office. Voltaire, taking unfair advantage of the interest which the Pope showed him on the occasion of his tragedy of *Mahomet,* endeavored to make people believe that the head of the Church was favorably disposed to him: Benedict XIV, by a decree of February 22, 1753, condemned the edition of Voltaire's works. The Freemasons had spread a report that, since the coming of Benedict XIV, his predecessor's bull *In eminenti* had ceased to be obligatory; but Benedict XIV, by his bull *Providas* (May 18, 1751), forcibly renewed the prohibitions issued by Clement XII.[36] The Jansenists, on the basis of his condescension toward them, also tried to give out the impression that he was favorable to the errors of their party. Such was the aim of an anonymous work entitled, *Apologie des jugements rendus par les tribunaux séculiers en France contre le schisme.* The same was the purpose of a volume by Father de la Borde, *Principes sur l'essence, la distinction et les limites des deux puissances.* But the Pope condemned the former work as favoring the schism, and the latter as formally heretical.[37]

Benedict's deeply religious sense appeared especially in his writings, in which this great Pontiff seems to have put the best part of his soul. Everybody agrees that his work on the canonization of the saints treats the subject exhaustively. The treatise *De synodo dioecesano,* seeming to discuss merely a transient act of diocesan administration, lays down for the bishops the most prudent rules on a large number of points that have daily application. The passing of time has confirmed the authority of these two monuments of ecclesiastical science.

Benedict XIV died on May 3, 1758. To the very end he preserved his gentle serenity and left behind him a universally venerated memory. After his death, Count de Rivera of Pied-

[36] *Bullarium,* III, 167–69.

[37] Decree of November 20, 1752, and brief of March 4, 1755.

mont wrote: "Unheard-of wonder! The people say nothing ill of the dead Pope, not even Pasquin." Posterity's judgment of Benedict XIV seems to ratify the opinion of Walpole's son which was set forth on a monument erected at London in honor of this Pope: "A pontiff beloved by the Catholics, esteemed by the Protestants, humble, unselfish, a monarch without any favorite, a pope without nepotism, a censor without severity, and a doctor without pride." [38]

Clement XIII (1758–69)

Benedict XIV's good sense undoubtedly kept him from misunderstanding the times: the benevolent atmosphere of peace that surrounded his person could be nothing more than a truce. The political movement and the intellectual movement against which the papacy had been obliged to strive were too powerful not to reappear with new power at the first opportunity. This reappearance would be formidable. In this aggregation of European peoples, which had been formed from the debris of medieval Christianity, we see that a league was formed in the eighteenth century: the league of the northern powers against Poland. And we see a circumstance in which the powers of the West and the South will in concert pursue a common aim: the suppression of the Jesuits.[39] Furthermore, in that same century, we will discover a single institution in which will coalesce, for an attack on the Church, the various intellectual movements and the social aspirations of that period: this institution was Freemasonry.[40]

Meanwhile leagues of princes and literary coteries had but

[38] Muratori, *Contin.*, XIII, 182.

[39] Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française*, I, 67.

[40] Schlegel, in his lectures on the philosophy of history, given at Vienna in 1826, pointed to the important part taken by Freemasonry in the eighteenth century. See Schlegel, *Philosophy of History*, pp. 455 ff.

one objective, the destruction of the Jesuits. The question of the continuation or the suppression of the Society of Jesus did, in fact, seem to exercise a preponderant concern over the minds of the cardinals during the conclave. Would the new Pope be favorable or unfavorable to the Jesuits? We are told that on June 28, 1758, just when Cardinal Calvalchini, who the day before had obtained twenty-seven votes, was about to be elected, Cardinal de Luynes in the name of France gave notice of the exclusive against him. The reason was not hard to see: Cavalchini was known for his attachment to the Society of Jesus and had voted for the canonization of Bellarmine, the defender of the rights of the Holy See against the claims of the princes. The representative of France made himself the interpreter of all the Bourbon courts. All looks then turned to Cardinal Rezzonico, bishop of Padua. He was born at Venice, in 1693. Benedict XIII had appointed him an auditor of the Rota, Clement XII made him a cardinal, and Benedict XIV a bishop. Highly esteemed for his virtue and for his theological and canonical learning, he had been closely associated with the government of Pope Benedict XIV, who held him in high regard. On July 5, 1758, Rezzonico received the required number of votes and took the name of Clement XIII.

His election was welcomed with universal satisfaction, which failed to foresee the countless contradictions with which his pontificate would soon be confronted. Abbé Clement, the future constitutional bishop, who had been sent to Rome by the Jansenists to influence the conclave, was lavish in his praise of the new Pope's exemplary life and boundless charity. The famous astronomer Lalande even went beyond this eulogy.

The new Pope took advantage of these good dispositions toward him for his zealous labors to correct all the abuses and to encourage all good works. One of his first acts was to remind all the bishops of the world of their duty to reside in their dioceses and there to act like men of prayer and doctrine and

to be fathers of the poor and angels of peace.[41] Continuing at Rome the sort of labor that had won him the veneration of his people of Padua, he reformed and favored several corporations of artisans,[42] issued many ordinances about the good administration of the Papal States, moderated the regime of the Roman prisons,[43] encouraged the *montes pietatis,*[44] urged the teaching of Christian doctrine to the people,[45] and provided new regulations for the library and the museums of the Vatican.[46]

But at the very outset of his pontificate Clement found himself confronted with the affair that would be the torment of his reign until the very end: the suppression of the Society of Jesus, demanded by almost all the Catholic courts.[47] An attempt on the life of Joseph I of Portugal (September 3, 1758) served as a pretext for the Portuguese prime minister, the Marquis de Pombal, to imprison 221 Jesuits and to cast all the others on the shores of the Papal States. Less than four years later (January 16, 1762) Louis XV of France, upon the advice of the Marquise de Pompadour, requested that the Pope designate, for the French Jesuits, a special vicar general, almost independent of the general of the Order. Soon after this (August 6) the Parliament of Paris, presently followed by the other parliaments of the country, pronounced the suppression of the Society of Jesus within its jurisdiction. On February 27, 1767, King Charles III of Spain signed a decree banishing all the Jesuits from his realm and his colonies. The young Duke of Parma, grandson of Louis XV and nephew of Charles III, issued a decree (January 14, 1758) forbidding admission into his states for any papal bull, brief, or other document unless it had received his *Exequatur.*

[41] Barberi, *Bullarii romani continuatio,* I, 27.
[42] *Ibid.,* I, 34, 195–201; II, 178–80; III, 85–100.
[43] *Ibid.,* II, 271–77.
[44] *Ibid.,* III, 81, 203, 276–382.
[45] *Ibid.,* II, 134–36.
[46] *Ibid.,* pp. 262–64.
[47] J. de la Servière, art. "Clément XIII" in *Dict. de théol. cath.,* III, 115.

Certain other affronts were more painful to the heart of the Pontiff, those coming from his friends, from those on whom he had showered special testimonies of his benevolence. Maria Theresa, the queen of Hungary, on whom the Pope had just conferred the title of Apostolic Majesty, and her son Joseph II, whom he had recommended to the electors of the Empire, refused to intervene with the Bourbon courts in favor of the persecuted religious. Venice, the Pope's native land, favored the intrusion of a schismatic clergy in the church of St. George, built for the sake of the Uniate Greeks. Genoa, in whose favor the papacy had often offered its mediation to appease the disputes that were rending it, promised a reward of 10,000 ecus to anyone who would deliver into its hands the papal legate sent to visit Corsica.

Not one of these outrages was consummated without the Pontiff raising his voice, now sadly, now forcibly. But, for the most part, these protests merely stirred up resentment. These attacks had their source in a state of mind which continued to spread in Europe and which would lead to the crisis of the Revolution. Jansenism, Gallicanism, and unbelief took root in men's minds. The Jansenists, largely sustained by the parliaments, continued their opposition to the bull *Unigenitus;* the Holland group, erected into a Church, held its first synod in 1764. Loménie de Brienne, minister of Louis XV and archbishop of Toulouse, decided, without any recourse to Rome, the gravest questions of canon law, set back the age required for vows, limited the number of convents in cities, and suppressed the monasteries where the subjects were few in number. In Germany the cumulation of bishoprics and the granting to lay courts the right to try clerics proceeded from the same spirit of independence of the secular powers with regard to the authority, even spiritual, of the Holy See. Clement protested vigorously against so evident a violation of his rights.[48] Helvetius'

[48] Barberi, *Bull.*, I, 42; II, 82; III, 7, 152.

Esprit, the *Encyclopedia* of Diderot and Alembert, Rousseau's *Emile,* all these spread the doctrines of a philosophy hostile to every idea of the supernatural, sometimes to every idea of sound morality. Clement condemned several Jansenist books, including the *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne* of Mésenguy and the *De statu Ecclesiae* of Febronius (Nicholas of Hontheim, auxiliary of Trier), and pointed to the rebel attitude of the sect as one of the causes of the decadence of morals and faith.[49] A brief of January 31, 1759, proscribed the *Esprit* of Helvetius as a work subversive not only of Christian doctrine, but also of the law and of natural uprightness.[50] A decree of September 3 of the same year referred to the *Encyclopedia* as containing false doctrines, leading to contempt of religion and corruption of morals.[51] On October 26, 1763, Clement approved the condemnation of *Emile* by the Sorbonne.[52] Lastly (November 25, 1766), in the face of the increasing diffusion of irreligious books, he addressed a remarkable encyclical to all the bishops of the Catholic world, pointing out the extreme danger which the Church and human society was running from the publications of the so-called philosophers. In this encyclical he said:

The enemy of all good has sowed the evil seed in the Lord's field; and the evil plant has grown. It threatens to stifle the good harvest. . . . The time has come to use the scythe. . . . Brethren, there is nothing which the impious men of our day do not venture to attack. God, the great God who watches over our souls and who speaks to them, Him they have represented as a dumb, inert Being, who exercises neither providence nor justice. Our soul, that soul which the Creator has raised to a dignity scarcely below the nature of angels, this soul, they say, must die. For them matter is everything, or at least it dominates everything. . . . And even those who reject these errors do not hesitate to scrutinize haughtily our mysteries and to

[49] *Ibid.,* III, 828, 835.
[50] *Ibid.,* I, 88.
[51] *Ibid.,* p. 223.
[52] *Ibid.,* II, 419.

subject everything to their reason. . . . The peril is the greater as the books propagating such doctrines are cleverly composed and are written with considerable art. They reach out everywhere, spreading their evil poison far and wide. . . . Venerable brethren, we conjure you, see to it that in all places the ministers of Jesus Christ endeavor, each according to his position and the available means of action, to denounce the peril and to combat it by word and works. Beg the Christian rulers to take up the defense of the suffering Church.[53]

Clement XIII did still more. Not content with denouncing to the entire world the dissolving and fatal doctrines of Jansenism, Gallicanism, and philosophism, he had the consolation and glory of indicating to the Christian world a life-giving devotion, which alone can regenerate it: the devotion to the love of God under the symbol and through the cult of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

For more than a century past, the devotion to the Savior's humanity, considered in His heart of flesh, the symbol of His love, had spread among pious souls. In 1674 Father Eudes had been authorized by Clement X to establish in his congregation a feast of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary. About the same time, while the withering doctrines of Jansenism entered deeper and deeper into Christian life, and only a cold and abstract rationalism prevailed in philosophic thought, a humble nun of the Visitation, kneeling in the chapel at Paray-le-Monial, had a vision of the Savior showing her His heart inflamed with charity. The divine Master, complaining of the coldness and outrages He met with among Christians, expressed to her His ardent desire to be loved by men, to place them, as by a loving redemption, in the sweet freedom of the empire of His love. He asked of her the establishment of a public cult of His Sacred Heart. Thus the devotion of the Sacred Heart was introduced into a new phase.

[53] *Ibid.*, III, 225–27.

The Jesuits became increasingly its earnest promoters. Under their prompting, petitions in great numbers went to Rome, asking the Holy See to establish a feast in honor of the Sacred Heart. Clement XIII thought the time had come to accede to these desires. On February 2, 1765, he published a decree of the Congregation of Rites,[54] by which "the Congregation, considering that by this devotion is symbolically renewed the memory of that divine love by which the only Son of God, clothed with human nature and obedient unto death, has said that He gave the example of being meek and humble of heart," fully acquiesced in the petitions that were made. The next July 17 the Assembly of the Clergy of France, at the solicitation of Queen Marie Leczinska, wife of Louis XV, expressed the wish that the feast of the Sacred Heart should be established in the dioceses where it did not yet exist. In spite of the clamors that arose in the camp of the Jansenists and in the camp of the deist philosophers of the time, the devotion to the Sacred Heart, which led piety back to the cult of Christ's humanity, by considering especially in that humanity the symbol of love, invigorated the Christian spirit by turning it to its purest sources. By the memorable decree of 1765, Jansenism received a terrible blow. And the Jesuits, at the very time when they were expelled from almost all the Catholic countries, at any rate saw the triumph of one of their most cherished devotions.

The gentle and devout Clement XIII died on the night of February 2, 1769. The proceedings of the conclave following his death showed that the enemies of the Society of Jesus had not disarmed and that the suppression of the celebrated Society was still the chief aim of the European courts. The cardinals of these courts had as their mission the election of a pope hostile to the Jesuits.[55]

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[55] Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

Clement XIV (1769–74)

After four months of intrigues, Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli was unanimously elected. The Spanish cardinals strove vainly to wrench from him a written promise to suppress the Society of Jesus. If we are to believe the testimony of Bernis, the representative of France at the conclave, they had to be satisfied with a writing that was not at all obligatory, in which Ganganelli, as a theologian, said that he thought the Sovereign Pontiff could in conscience wipe out the Society of the Jesuits, by following canonical regulations and the rules of prudence and justice.

Giovanni Vincenzo Ganganelli, was born near Rimini. His father was a physician. Giovanni had made profession in the Cordeliers under the name of Lorenzo. In the various posts which he filled, whether as professor or as a member of the Roman congregations, he had shown himself a good religious, a learned theologian, and an amiable character. He was the only religious of the conclave. We know what close bonds connected him to the founder of the Passionists, Paul of the Cross. His opposition to certain acts of firmness by Clement XIII won him the good will of the Bourbon courts, without alarming the groups of the Zelanti. In memory of Pope Clement XIII, to whom he owed his elevation to the purple, he took the name of Clement XIV.

His encyclical on the occasion of his taking possession of the Holy See indicates what would be the dominant idea of his reign: to keep peace with the Catholic courts, to obtain their support against the increasing irreligion. He wrote: "At what period did the world ever see such pernicious opinions rise up? When did we ever behold men, seduced by the charms of novelty, led by a sort of avidity toward a strange science, allow themselves so foolishly to be drawn toward it and to seek it with such excessive eagerness?" Then, addressing the princes,

as "Ministers of God established for man's good," he implores them "to love the Church as their mother and to defend her rights." Bishops and priests were exhorted "to teach the people not only to obey the rulers, but also to honor them and love them; for they labor effectively for two things that cannot be separated: the tranquillity of the state and the good of the Church." [56]

To mark his desire for conciliation, Clement XIV decided to suppress the annual publication of the bull *In coena Domini,* which contained strong allegations that contributed to embitter the preceding quarrels. It was even said that he intended to amend it, adapting it to the needs of modern times.[57] The first promotion of cardinals included the brother of the prime minister of Portugal, Paul de Carvalho. Active negotiations resulted in an ordinance of Joseph I, granting free communication with Rome. The painful incidents which had made the Holy See's relations with Parma so difficult were ended by a benevolent act of the Pontiff, who graciously accorded the dispensations needed by the Infanta for his marriage with his cousin, Archduchess Maria Amelia, daughter of Maria Theresa.[58] The political horizon was once more serene.

But the Pope was quite aware that the burning question was still that of the suppression or the continuance of the Jesuits. This cloud on the horizon threatened to let loose a storm. The tempest broke out on the occasion of the brief of July 12, 1769, encouraging the missions of the Society of Jesus in infidel countries. The complaints of the governments of France and of Europe went to the point of insolence. Duke de Choiseul even intimated an ultimatum to the Supreme Pontiff. To Cardinal de Bernis he wrote: "It is of the utmost urgency that His Holiness decide. The delay granted him to form a plan and carry it

[56] Theiner, *Clementis XIV epistolae et brevia.*
[57] Theiner, *Hist. du pontificat de Clément XIV,* I, 480.
[58] *Ibid.,* p. 15.

out must not be more than two months. . . . When this time has expired, the sovereigns of the house of Bourbon cannot be prevented from breaking off all communication with a pope who is simply amusing us or who is useless to us." [59] Clement XIV sought to gain time. He wrote to Louis XV (September 29) that he needed certain documents in order to examine the affair maturely.[60] The reply of the King of France was haughty. He said: "Your Holiness is too enlightened not to be persuaded that, by making use of the sovereign right belonging to our crowns, when we have judged it fitting, the King my cousin, the King my nephew, and I myself, to banish from our states a society which has appeared to us dangerous, we have at the same time thoroughly examined the just motives which determined our course." [61] Charles III of Spain was even more urgent. The Pope's declarations, while maintaining the need of personal information, had to be more condescending and more precise to calm the irritation. To the King of Spain he wrote (November 30, 1769): "We have now gathered the documents. . . . We shall submit to the examination of Your Majesty a plan for the absolute extinction of that Society. Your Majesty will receive it shortly." [62]

All was certainly not weakness and mere diplomacy in Clement's attitude. The Pope seems to have been convinced, as Benedict XIV had been, of the existence of certain abuses in the famous Society and of the need of providing some remedy for them. To induce patience in the courts and to wait for a more favorable moment for his moderating action, he was eager to give the crowns some pledge of his intentions. He took away from the Jesuits the Frascati seminary and the Greek college; [63] with extreme rigor he ordered an inspection of the

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 371; Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 279.
[60] Theiner, *Epistolae*, p. 31.
[61] Theiner, *Histoire*, I, 393.
[62] Theiner, *Epistolae*, p. 33; Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 295.
[63] Theiner, *Histoire*, I, 381.

Roman College.[64] But he failed to count on the obstinate fierceness of the powers. On July 4, 1772, the Spanish court plainly threatened the Pope with a schism.[65] In return for his condescension, he was given to expect the restitution of Avignon and of Benevento, detained by France and Spain. At this attempt at bargaining, the Pope's pride revolted. He replied that he did not traffic in these matters.[66]

For some time the courts of Spain and France, after a search of their archives, accumulated their grievances against the Society: moral laxity, a spirit of intrigue, love of money, the formation of a formidable international power dangerous to the peace of the nations and even of the Church. The Pope adopted additional measures of rigor against the Jesuits: inspections, trials, confiscations, vexations of every kind, to such a point, says a historian, "that in less than a month the Jesuits in the Roman states would have disappeared as a body without any general suppression of the Order being decreed." But the implacable minister of Spain wrote: "It is in vain that one distresses these poor people. A single word suffices: abolition."[67] Clement XIV withdrew in retreat for several weeks, then he signed (July 21, 1773) the celebrated brief *Dominus ac Redemptor,* which was not published until the following August 16.

After appealing to the supreme right of the papacy, used by his predecessors more than once, to reform and to dissolve religious orders that were pernicious and more calculated to disturb the tranquillity of peoples that to procure it for them, the Pontiff then comes to the Society of Jesus. "Almost at its birth," he says, "it saw take root in its bosom different germs of discord and jealousy which not only divided its members but also led them to rise up against the other religious orders, against

[64] *Ibid.,* pp. 361–402.
[65] *Ibid.,* II, 242.
[66] *Ibid.,* p. 241; Ravignan, *op. cit.,* p. 347.
[67] Ravignan, *op. cit.,* p. 371.

the secular clergy, academies, universities, colleges, public schools, even against sovereigns who had admitted them into their states." Of all the grievances accumulated against the Society, he specifically takes note only of this one: that the Jesuits had brought disturbance into society. He resolutely discards the charges against the morals and orthodoxy of the Order and merely mentions the accusations of pride, ambition, and cupidity, without agreeing that such charges were well founded.

The supreme head of the Church concludes thus: "Prompted by the Holy Spirit, as we are convinced we are, impelled by the duty of restoring concord in the bosom of the Church, convinced that the Society of Jesus can no longer render the services for which it was founded, and determined by other reasons of prudence and wisdom in the matter of governing, reasons which we keep enclosed in our soul, we abolish and destroy the Society of Jesus, its functions, its houses, and its institutes." [68]

One of the most illustrious of the sons of St. Ignatius has written the account of the execution of this brief, which was the most painful trial of his fathers. He says: "August 16, 1773, a day of painful memory, had arrived. About nine o'clock in the evening a certain prelate, Macedonio by name, came to the Gesù. To the father general he presented the official announcement of the brief which suppressed the Company throughout the world. Macedonio was accompanied by soldiers and police officers, for the purpose of maintaining order, which probably no one had any thought of disturbing. At the same hour, likewise by order of the Pope, other distinguished prelates and ecclesiastics brought information of the brief to the rectors of all the other colleges and houses that the Jesuits had in Rome. These men also, accompanied by soldiers and notaries for the same purpose, placed seals on the archives, on the

[68] *Bullarium*, IV, 619.

account books, the sacristies. Until the issuance of new orders, the Jesuits were forbidden to exercise any kind of ecclesiastical functions, such as preaching, hearing confessions; and for a while they were also forbidden to go out of their houses.

"The next day, August 17, the general was brought to the English College, which served him as his prison until he was transferred to the Castle Sant' Angelo. Soon the assistants and several other members of the Order shared the lot of the general.

"There began the memorable trial of the head and the principal superiors of the extinct Society, a trial that lasted more than two years and that was not followed by any sentence." [69]

Shortly after the promulgation of the brief a former member of the dissolved Society, Father Corbara, wrote: "I think that no one can condemn the Pontiff who, after so many hesitations, considered that he could rightly condemn the Company of Jesus. I love my Order as much as anyone does; yet, placed in the same situation as the Pope, I do not know but that I would have acted as he did. The Company, founded for the good of the Church, perished for that same good: it could not have found a more glorious end."

Two unorthodox sovereigns, Frederick of Prussia and Catherine of Russia, sustained the Jesuits against the Pope. On their orders, the bishops of Silesia and of White Russia refrained from promulgating the brief in their dioceses; and, as such promulgation was the canonical condition of its execution, the Jesuits who sought refuge in those two countries considered that they might continue their life in common and their ministry.

In the Catholic courts for a time it might be thought that the hostilities were over. In Portugal the nuncio was received amid joyous manifestations; Maria Theresa and Louis XV, at the Pope's solicitation, refused to encourage the application

[69] Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

of the ideas of Febronius.[70] King Charles III of Spain had Clement XIV approve an order of chivalry devoted to the Immaculate Conception. But the appeasement was only superficial: the hostility toward the Church remained profound. The immediate effect of the suppression of the Jesuits "was felt in all Catholic countries. The Jesuits had been persecuted and hated especially because they defended the most rigorous doctrine of the supremacy of the Holy See. People pretended to believe that the Pope, in allowing them to fall, was renouncing that doctrine and its consequences. The philosophical and religious opposition had, so they said, won the victory. The outer ramparts were taken. The attack by the victorious party must begin again with still more energy.[71]

The sight of this renewal of hostility against Catholicism clouded the last days of Clement XIV, who died piously, assisted by St. Alphonsus Liguori, on September 22, 1774. He had had the joy of seeing the daughter of Louis XV, Madame Louise of France, enter the Carmelite Order,[72] the patriarch of the Armenians and his six suffragan bishops renounce the errors of Eutyches in 1771; and about the same time almost all the country of the Szeklers in Hungary abandon Socinianism and return to the Catholic Church;[73] he had blessed and canonically approved the Congregation of the Passionists; but he derived no consolation from the great scandals that afflicted the Church during his last years: the "apostolic" empress, Maria Theresa, took part in the shameful partition of Poland; "the most Christian King," Louis XV, subjected to his visa the publication and execution of all papal letters, even those addressed to private persons; the most sectarian Jansenism penetrated the Austrian universities through the Dutchman

[70] Theiner, *Histoire*, I, 420; II, 428.
[71] Ranke, *op. cit.*, II, 498.
[72] L. de la Brière, *Madame Louise de France.*
[73] Theiner, *Histoire*, II, 272; Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

Van Swieten; in France philosophism triumphed through the public homages paid to Voltaire.

Favored by the parliaments and sometimes by the princes, Gallicanism and Jansenism were following the path that would lead them to the Synod of Pistoia and to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; hailed in the salons of the eighteenth century, philosophical deism advanced with great strides along the path leading it to the declaration of the rights of man and to the feast of reason. The French Revolution, which appeared to some as the subversion of the old European world, to others as its regeneration, was merely the natural and necessary sequence of the history of Europe.[74]

[74] Sorel, *op. cit.*, I, 3.

CHAPTER XIV

Development of Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century

Protestantism in Germany

In Germany the failure of the syncretist attempt had brought about a threefold orientation of the Protestants: some went individually to Catholicism, such as Duke Christian August von Holstein in 1705, Ulric von Brunswich in 1710, Count von Nassau Siegen in 1729, Duke Charles Alexander von Würtemberg in 1733, Margrave William of the Rhine Palatinate in 1769, and Margrave Charles William in 1771; others in discouragement became weak in their faith; still others, to satisfy their inner need of belonging to an organized Church, gathered more closely about their princes. The most remarkable of these groups was formed in Prussia under King Frederick William I. From 1713 to 1740 the Prussian monarch administered and regulated the national Church, claiming for himself the functions of supreme bishop and exercising them with military, meticulous, and despotic harshness, which was the most characteristic trait of his temperament.

Under his impulsion, attempts were made to fuse all the Protestant denominations into a single official religion. The regime of the Lutheran consistories, dependent on the king, tended to replace, even among the Calvinists, the regime of synods. The pastors were regarded as royal functionaries. Frederick William I wrote (December 24, 1729): "The Protestant princes of Germany, in virtue of the *summum jus circa sacra,* should be regarded as popes over their territory." By speaking thus the Lutheran king rendered involuntary homage

to the Catholic organization, which he profaned while imitating it. But his supreme power would turn against Christianity itself; for his son and successor, Frederick II, a prince devoid of any religious principle, made use of his authority to favor anti-Christian rationalism in his states.

A dissolving dualism ruined German Protestantism even in its doctrine. Supernaturalism and rationalism until the end of the eighteenth century vied with each other for the mastery of Protestant theology. Between these two theological instincts the divergences were notable, since apparently the former led to integral faith and the latter to absolute negation; yet they resembled each other in their way of viewing the religious problem. Supernaturalists and rationalists disputed over the content of Christianity. The former tried by every device to hold it intact; the latter set themselves to whittling it away piecemeal. The theological discussions amounted to questions of more or less; they were bargaining over Christian revelation.[1] Some thinkers, Semler (1725–91) and Lessing (1729–81), took alarm at this decadence; but the remedy which they offered was simply a further dissolvent. Lessing wrote that it matters not that religion is unable to reply to the objections of reason, if only it leaves to the heart of Christians an inner sentiment of the dogmas it announces. A Protestant rationalist of the nineteenth century, Adolph Harnack, has celebrated that emancipating phrase,[2] which, developed and pushed to its extreme consequences, might be the motto of the liberal Protestantism of the twentieth century. In 1679 Lessing himself provided a most significant commentary to his thought, when he maintained that all religions are equally false.[3]

The issues of pietism were not more reassuring than those of syncretism. The most striking representative of pietism in the eighteenth century was the Swedish visionary, Emmanuel

[1] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, Le protestantisme,* pp. 72–74.
[2] Harnack, *Das Christentum und die Geschichte,* p. 18.
[3] Lessing, *Nathan der Weise.*

Swedenborg, a man remarkable in some respects for the extent of his knowledge and the vigor of his mind, but a man who, by his tendency to illuminism, was thrown into the strangest fancies. For him the center and heart of every religion is the Incarnation. "The faith of man," he says, in a formula susceptible of a profound sense, "is comparable to a look cast up towards the heavens, and would be utterly lost in the vague and immeasurable; but through Christ it hath received its proper object and is, thereby, become more definite." [4] Yet the actual world is in darkness. He declares that it is Christian only in name, and no longer has anything spiritual about it.[5] But the new Jerusalem will come down from heaven as soon as Swedenborg achieves his great work, the *Vera christiana religio.* Says Moehler:

> Swedenborg is really exalted to be the centre-point of all history, and to hold the place of the true Redeemer; with him, and not with Christ, the golden age returns. The translations of Swedenborg's writings find, as we hear, a very great sale in and out of Germany, and the number of his followers daily increases. . . . The yearning soul of man is not to be satisfied with such idle talk; and when you take from it true miracles, it will then invent false ones. Our age is doomed to witness the desolate spectacle of a most joyless languor, and impotence of the spiritual life, by the side of the most exaggerated and sickly excitement of the same; and if we do not, with a living and spiritual feeling, return to the doctrine of the Church, we shall soon see the most wretched fanaticism obtain the same ascendancy, as we saw the most frivolous unbelief established on the throne.[6]

Protestantism in England

In England, at the coming of William of Orange, the cause of Anglicanism seemed lost, or at least much endangered. Wil-

[4] Moehler, *Symbolism,* Part II, chap. 4, p. 466.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 450.
[6] *Ibid.,* p. 464.

liam was a latitudinarian; personally he experienced no scruple in receiving Communion according to the Anglican rite, but he had little concern about knowing in what rite his subjects received Communion.[7] But the dynasty that succeeded the Stuarts possessed a title that was parliamentary rather than hereditary. Henceforth the king's supremacy signified the supremacy of the Parliament. And the Parliament was composed of dissidents, skeptics, or indifferents, ready to decide religious questions on the basis of political considerations.[8] But the Established Church and the state had a common enemy, the fallen dynasty, which sought to seize the power again: this is what united them. The Anglican Church thus had, from purely political reasons, a new *raison d'être*. In 1701 the lower house of the convocation of Canterbury denounced the dangerous tendencies of the bishop of Bangor, Hoadly, who preached in favor of religious liberty.

The government refused to the Anglican clergy the right to meet in convocations or assemblies. It said that the clergy possessed enough influence by its wealth; it had furthermore enough defenders in the person of the bishops sitting in the House of Lords.[9] Thus organized, the Anglican Church continued to strive against the Catholic influence. In the middle of the eighteenth century an English tribunal declared that the law did not recognize any Catholics in the realm. Not until 1779 were the Catholics assimilated with the other dissidents for the exercise of their private rights. They were always excluded from political office, municipal and judicial. The Established Church showed itself less severe toward the latitudinarian or rationalist tendencies of its own members. Of these several profited by that tolerance to profess doctrines which were far removed from the very foundations of Christianity.

[7] Macaulay, *History of England,* chap. 11.
[8] Wilberforce, *An Enquiry into the Principles of Church Authority.*
[9] Hallam, *Constitutional History of England,* III, 247.

Protestantism in France

In France the situation of the Protestants was quite different. The royal power considered them not only dissidents in religion but also adversaries ever ready to become conspirators in the political realm, kept a vigilant eye on their proceedings and, at the slightest sign of rebellion, treated them mercilessly. These executions terrified some, but turned others into fanatics. Tracked into their mountains, the Huguenots of the Cévennes were awaiting the coming of the prophet who would emancipate them. The exiles, whom the revocation of the Edict of Nantes had cast outside the frontiers, thenceforth formed natural connections between their persecuted brethren in France and foreign governments. The ancient regime would have no fiercer enemies than the Protestants of France.

In 1698 Cardinal de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, wrote in the King's name to all the bishops of France to request from them as promptly as possible a memoir on the means they judged proper for converting the Protestants or at least for keeping them faithful to their duty. These memoirs still exist. All acknowledged that the Protestants, even those converted, formed a sort of body united by their former belief, by the promises they had made; in short, by a spirit of cabal that prevailed in their secret consistories. The bishops were unanimous about the necessity of maintaining the unity of faith and worship in the kingdom, but they were not equally unanimous about the means to be employed to realize this unity. The bishops of the North asked for the use of mildness. The Archbishop of Reims said: "The most suitable means for bringing back the Protestants is to tolerate them and to labor at instructing them with gentleness and charity." Bossuet rose up indignantly against the penalty which consisted in the guilty being drawn on a hurdle. He wrote: "This custom causes more horror against the Catholics than the good effects it brings about for the re-

united." But the bishops of the South all asked that the evangelical means be accompanied with a certain use of the public power. "I recognize," wrote Fléchier, "as St. Augustine did in his day, that preaching, reasoning, conferences, and all the offices of charity scarcely promote their conversion if they are not sustained by fear of the laws and ordinances of the princes. . . . Fear alone would make men rebellious; but instruction alone would not move them enough."

The intendants of the provinces were consulted at the same time as the bishops. "Prompted especially by political considerations, the intendants were unanimous in calling for a severe repression of all the acts that would be of a nature to impair the public tranquillity or the laws of the state, insisting on heavy fines, life sentence to the galleys, and, in certain cases, the death penalty, against those who took part in the secret assemblies or who should attempt to leave the kingdom without authorization."

From 1700 to 1715 no special measure was decreed against the Protestants. The only procedure was a more or less attenuated application of the existing laws. Encouragement was given to a greater amount of sermons and an increase in the number of Catholic schools. Attempts were made to change the internal dispositions.[10] Lastly, the illusion which had hastened the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was renewed. On March 8, 1715, Louis XIV, supposing that now France contained only Catholics, declared subject to the penalty of the relapsed all those who would henceforth live or die in the so-called Reformed Religion, "the mere fact of their living in the kingdom being more than sufficient proof that they had embraced the Catholic religion." This legal fiction persisted, at least in principle, in French legislation until 1787. On August 15 of the same year the Huguenots of the South replied to the royal declaration by holding their first "synod of the Desert."

[10] Cf. Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VIII, Part I, 385.

After the death of Louis XIV (September 1, 1715) the government of the regent, Philip of Orléans, a prince fond of pleasures and rather indifferent to things religious, at first left the heresy in comparative tranquillity. The Protestants met together without hindrance. Their ministers visited their flocks, spread Protestant writings, raised funds, and issued certificates of marriage and baptism as in the past. Duclos in his *Mémoires* speaks of meetings held in Poitou, in Languedoc, and in Guyenne. He says that the anxiety of the government increased by the discovery of a large store of guns and bayonets near a place where the Protestants were assembled. On August 29, 1723, the General Assembly of the Clergy of France, in a remonstrance to King Louis XV, complained of the growing agitation of the new converts: "They hold assemblies, we are told; they perform marriages without observing the laws of the Church and of the state; . . . they declare openly that they belong to the so-called Reform, so that this sect increases day by day."

The government judged that this license must be repressed. By its declaration of May 14, 1724, Louis XV renewed and, on certain points, increased the severe penalties decreed by Louis XIV. But, says Picot, "the spirit that prompted this new law seems not to have been a spirit of persecution. Evidence of this fact is that the edict of 1724 was not observed. The parliaments and the intendants were equally averse to rigorous measures. The minister wished merely to inspire the non-Catholics with greater reserve." Cardinal de Fleury, who was in power from 1726 to 1743, inclined to peaceful measures. The Protestants took advantage of this attitude to develop. They again established schools and consistories, distributed books and catechisms, convoked assemblies, and little by little resumed the exercise of their worship. They went further: in August, 1744, they held a national synod. Deputies from all the provinces gathered near Sommières, on the confines of the

diocese of Uzès. Article X of the resolutions reads: "As there are several provinces where the exercises of religion are still held during the night, the synod . . . to show more and more the purity of our intentions, . . . charges the pastors and the elders to conform, so far as prudence allows, to the Churches that perform their exercises openly." [11] Before adjourning the assembly ordained a solemn fast for the preservation of the sacred person of His Majesty and the success of his armies.[12]

The Assembly of the Clergy in 1745 called the King's attention to the undertakings of the Protestants; but the minister, with whom the influence of Marquis d'Argenson, a friend of Voltaire, was preponderant, was favorable to them. La Beaumelle, in his letters, speaks of assemblies of 20,000 persons held in Dauphiné, Poitou, Vivarais, and Béarn, and of sixty temples erected in the single province of Saintonge. In short, from 1724 to 1756 there were only some local persecutions, provoked by movements of public opinion or by the initiative of intendants more zealous than the government.

But in certain places these repressions were extremely severe. In the years 1745–47 the Parliament of Grenoble condemned 300 persons to be flogged, to imprisonment, to degradation from the nobility, or even to death.[13]

Then it was that some of the Reformers addressed to Rousseau and Voltaire a request to plead their cause. Rousseau evaded, replying: "I feel how hard it is to see oneself incessantly at the mercy of a cruel people, without having even the consolation of hearing the word of God. But that same word is explicit on the duty of obeying the laws of the princes. . . . An indiscreet word on my part would but injure the cause which I would undertake to defend. You have done well to turn to M. Voltaire. Yet I doubt that any great zeal for this cause will

[11] G. de Félice, *Hist. des protestants en France*, p. 391.
[12] *Ibid.*
[13] Desdevises du Dézert, *L'Eglise et l'Etat en France*, I, 228.

be found in him. . . . He is without the desire; I am without the power."

Rousseau was mistaken. Voltaire, with all the strength of his fervor took up the Protestant cause and made of the two trials of Calas and Sirven great events in the history of France and even in that of Europe.[14]

One evening (October 13, 1761) a young man, Antoine Calas, was found hanging from a doorway of his own house at Toulouse. Through the crowd that gathered in the street the word spread that the young man's family, which was Protestant, had slain him to prevent his becoming a Catholic. The chief magistrate of Toulouse, David de Beaudrigue, accepted the truth of this report. Without further investigation, he arrested the whole Calas family. The Parliament of Toulouse, to which the case was referred, condemned Jean Calas, the father, to the torture of the wheel. The sentence was executed on March 10, 1762. Voltaire, asked to intervene, hesitated for a long time. He was no more favorably inclined to the Protestants than to the Catholics. At first he made fun of "this Abraham who killed his son in order to satisfy his conscience." But soon, seeing that the case was a good one, he eagerly undertook an active campaign of rehabilitation in favor of Calas. He displayed his fervent activity with its amazing resources. Fiery pamphlets followed one another, stirring up public opinion. Soon on the streets and in the salons the Calas affair was the only thing talked about. On March 9, 1765, the Council of Requests overruled the decision of the Parliament of Toulouse and rehabilitated the memory of Jean Calas.

Before the termination of the case, another like it claimed attention. The affair occurred at Saint-Alby near Castres. On January 2, 1762, a young woman, Elizabeth Sirven, mentally deranged, threw herself into a well. General rumor accused her parents with having murdered her. Report had it that they

[14] H. Carré in Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VIII, Part II, 342.

persecuted her because she wished to become a Catholic. Sirven and his wife were able to flee in time and reached Geneva. Voltaire then took up their defense, as he had done for Calas, and obtained a reversal of the decree that condemned Sirven as a parricide to the torture of the wheel.

Voltaire triumphed. The affair of the chevalier de la Barre capped his success.

In 1765, on a bridge at Abbeville, a crucifix was mutilated by saber cuts at the hands of persons unknown. Suspicions turned on a young man, Jean François de la Barre, well known for his habits of debauchery and impiety. He was arrested along with four of his companions. The fact came to light that an assessor of the procurator of the King at Abbeville was the personal enemy of the Abbess of Villaucourt, aunt of the chevalier de la Barre. It is now established that this connection played a decisive part in the conduct of the trial. Voltaire himself saw that the whole trial was the effect of a provincial quarrel and of a family enmity. Nothing in the depositions of the witnesses or in the answers of the accused proved the guilt of the latter. The charge of outrages to the crucifix was then abandoned. But several persons, though acquitting the accused of the crime of sacrilege, charged him with having uttered impious words, of obscene speech, and of scandalous acts. On this score he was condemned to death and, in spite of the intervention of the Bishop of Amiens, who petitioned the King for a commutation of the sentence, he was executed at Abbeville on July 1, 1766. Voltaire, who had tried to save him, broke forth into cries of indignation against the condemnation.

The chevalier de la Barre was not a Huguenot. But the Protestants defended his cause out of sympathy for his defender, out of hatred of his judges, and out of love for liberty of conscience to which he was considered a martyr. In the ensuing campaign against the traditional institutions of the Church and the state, Huguenots and philosophers were hence-

forth joined together. Moreover, they found, for the success of this campaign, a precious auxiliary in a party which, apparently starting out from an altogether different basis, assumed more and more revolutionary attitudes. It was Jansenism.

Jansenism in the Eighteenth Century

With Quesnel's *Réflexions morales,* and especially with the *Problème ecclésiastique,* a violent and anonymous pamphlet which in 1699 presented Louis Antoine de Noailles, bishop of Châlons, in opposition to Louis Antoine de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, a new Jansenism was born, radical and factious. Never was Jansenism more akin to Protestantism in its doctrines; never was it closer to it in its attitude and methods. The publication (1702) of a new pamphlet, entitled *Cas de conscience,* rudely awakened all the controversies raised since the very beginning of the sect. A certain penitent in theory condemned the five propositions, but kept a "respectful silence" with regard to the question of fact, believed in the efficacy of grace *in se* and in the necessity of a beginning of love in contrition, thought that acts performed without love are sins, read the *Letters* of St. Cyran, Arnauld's *Fréquent communion* and the Mons Bible. Could such a one receive absolution? Forty doctors of the Sorbonne answered: Yes. Pope Clement XI, by a brief of February 12, 1703, condemned the *Cas de conscience* in severe terms and pointed out to the Faculty of Theology of Paris the temerity of some of its doctors. Fénelon, in an eloquent pastoral letter,[15] refuted the doctrine of the *Cas de conscience,* showing the absurdity and the absence of good faith in the "respectful silence." This vigorous protest was the starting point of a movement of opinion which found expression in the letters of several bishops.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 339.

Louis XIV then feared seeing the Jansenist faction raise its head again. He was informed that the Jansenists were not well disposed toward his person and for his state. He had a fear of this kind of independents who were said to be ill disposed to the royal authority no less than they were refractory to that of the pope: a republican party in the Church and in the state. Louis XIV asked the Supreme Pontiff to send, for the unmasking of the last subtleties of the Jansenists, a precise and energetic bull which, registered by the parliaments, would become the law of the realm and would be executed by the magistrates of the kingdom. Thus was provoked the bull *Vineam Domini Sabaoth,* which appeared July 15, 1705. The Pope condemned the "respectful silence" as "a deceitful veil to be used in making a mockery of the Church instead of obeying her." [16] Recalling all the condemnations by his predecessors, he required that the Church be obeyed by an internal submission, *non tacendo solum, sed et interius obsequendo.*[17]

Nothing equaled the clearness and precision of this act of supreme authority unless it was the accord with which it was received.[18] We cannot easily find a more remarkable example of agreement between the two powers, spiritual and civil. The Assembly of the Clergy received it with perfect submission; the Parliament registered it without objection; all the bishops except one (the Bishop of Saint-Pons) published it without reservation. The cause of Jansenism seemed to be lost.

A single difficulty remained to be overcome: to obtain the submission of the nuns of Port Royal des Champs, the last official remaining group of Jansenism. To smooth out the obstacles, to assuage sensibilities, it was decided to address the nuns' confessor, Father Marignier. This priest received

[16] Clement XI, *Bullarium,* p. 148.
[17] *Ibid.;* Denzinger, no. 1350.
[18] Gaillardin, *Hist. du règne de Louis XIV,* IV, 623.

(March 18, 1706) notice of the bull *Vineam,* of the episcopal ordinance publishing it in the diocese, and of the formula which he was asked to sign, namely: "The above-mentioned bull and ordinance have been read and published at the grille of Port Royal by us, the undersigned priest, in charge of the guidance of the nuns, and was received with the respect due to His Holiness and to His Eminence by the nuns."

The situation was decisive. An act of filial obedience, performed in all sincerity and simplicity, would have marked the end of the whole dispute. The nuns of Port Royal asked for time to reflect, and they consulted their friends.

But, although the calm was restored in France, the agitation was extreme in Holland. Quesnel, in refuge, stirred up men's minds there. Violent outbursts, directed against the bull, reached Paris. The spirit of revolt and the spirit of peace would engage in keen strife in the soul of the Jansenists consulted. Finally, the spirit of revolt won the day. To make an example of some of the nuns might have been a clever tactical move. It is true that the authorities did not require of them an explicit and personal act of submission; the nuns decided to make an explicit act of revolt. They loudly protested that they would accept the bull only with the addition of the following formula: "Without derogating from what had been done regarding them, for the peace of the Church, under Pope Clement IX." By requiring this singular and ridiculous formula,[19] they placed the ecclesiastical and civil authorities in the necessity of retreating before women or of proceeding against them with severity. To do one or the other was to run the risk of turning public opinion in favor of a cause for which the nuns would be either victors or martyrs.

The future showed the correctness of these calculations. The shifty and impressionable character of Cardinal de Noailles led him to fall into the trap. Louis XIV's exasperation, then at

[19] Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal,* VI, 184.

its height, prompted him to adopt extreme repressions. By this strategy the Jansenists lost Port Royal, but they recovered a popularity.

Port Royal

Men's minds became inflamed. "Must we give up our consciences?" the nuns demanded. One of the oldest of them said: "The mere thought that I shall suffer for the truth fills me with joy." Quesnel, from his retreat in the Netherlands, wrote to these future martyrs to sustain their courage. But events were soon precipitated. Under Noailles' influence, Louis XIV forbade the nuns of Port Royal des Champs to elect an abbess or to receive any novices; the diocesan authorities stripped them of their goods, joining these to the property of Port Royal of Paris.[20] The nuns protested. In November, 1707, Noailles pronounced excommunication against them. The protests were redoubled. Apparently the party wished to force the Archbishop and the King to go to the last extremities. Noailles turned to the Pope who, in a desire to promote peace, proposed a compromise: the property of Port Royal des Champs should be joined to that of Port Royal of Paris, as the King and the Archbishop demanded; but the refractory nuns might remain in peace at Port Royal des Champs until their death. This measure, which did not satisfy the King, was likewise not satisfactory to the Jansenists. In March, 1709, the Pope decided to publish a bull authorizing the transfer of the nuns of Port Royal des Champs to various convents.

In the execution of this order by the royal agents reasonable moderation was not observed. On October 29, 1709, D'Argenson presented himself at the grille with an escort of archers, ready to assist him with force. And carriages were on hand to transport the recalcitrant nuns. The grille was forced; the com-

[20] The nuns of Port Royal of Paris no longer professed Jansenism and had broken off all relation with Port Royal des Champs.

munity was at once assembled in the chapter room; each of the nuns received the *lettre de cachet* assigning her to her future residence. Then followed a touching scene. When D'Argenson saw these women kneel before their superior to receive a last blessing, promising to meet again in eternity; when he had to aid the most aged and the infirm to leave, even having some of them carried in litters, he could not restrain his feelings; he asked pardon of the nuns for the mission that he was obliged to perform. Some people of the neighborhood, friends of the convent, ran up and gathered about the archers, crying out for their benefactors, their "mothers." The feeling soon reached the general public. A month later, Fénelon, so opposed to Jansenism, could not help writing to the Duke de Chevreuse: "Such a blow of authority can but arouse compassion for these women and indignation against their persecutors." [21]

During the days following the dispersion, pilgrimages came to the deserted convent one after another. The relatives of those whose bodies rested in the chapel, petitioned the King for the removal of these remains. The Marquis de Pomponne, grandson of Arnauld, implored the King to permit him to transport to his domain the bodies of his relatives buried at Port Royal. A rumor spread that Louis XIV thought of destroying the convent chapel. But the very report of the steps taken by the Jansenists seems to have urged the King to hasten the execution of this project. A decree of the Council (January 22, 1710) ordered the demolition of the buildings of Port Royal.

The order was carried out promptly. The venerable monastery was razed, as also all the buildings that had been successively added to it. The materials were sold, and attempts were made to wipe out even the traces of the constructions. But the bare soil remained a sacred relic; it contained the remains of Le Maître, Arnauld, Racine, and many illustrious persons whose memory is still recalled by the misfortunes of Port

[21] Fénelon, *Œuvres*, III, 815.

Royal. In 1711 the tombs were opened, and the bodies were exhumed, the bodies of those who had wished to be eternally reunited, and they were dispersed in the churches of Paris and in the cemeteries of the neighboring villages.

As we may see from the bitterness of these complaints, Louis XIV's stroke of authority was not a solution. On the contrary. It was precisely after the ruin of Port Royal that we see the Jansenists closing their ranks and forming themselves in Paris like a little city apart. St. Jacques du Haut-Pas received the body of St. Cyran and the heart of Madame de Longueville; St. Etienne du Mont received the mortal remains of the great Pascal, Boileau, Racine, Le Maitre, and de Saci; Nicole slept beneath the vault of St. Médard. The triangle formed by these three churches is where they lived by preference.

Archbishop de Noailles

From this center, Jansenism radiated. It had already penetrated the seminaries. All those studying at the Sorbonne, except the seminarians of St. Sulpice and a small number of others, entered into the spirit of Jansen. The imprudences and the unreflecting acts of Archbishop de Noailles of Paris did but accelerate this movement. In contrast to this predecessor, François de Harlay, whose moral conduct was subject to criticism and whose government was wise and prudent, Archbishop de Noailles, a sincerely pious prelate, endowed with estimable qualities, gave the example of deplorable inconstancy. His great misfortune was that he listened too readily to false friends and listened too much to himself. Since the death of Bossuet,[22] who had been his beneficent moderator, Noailles, abandoned to his own will, too often gives the spectacle of a character without consistency or firmness. We need not here relate the story of his strifes with Louis XIV and with the

[22] Bossuet died in 1704.

Society of Jesus, or give a full recital of his shifty actions with regard to the *Réflexions morales* of Quesnel. In 1711, by a series of unbelievable abuses of authority, he condemned a pastoral letter of the bishops of Luçon and La Rochelle against Quesnel's book, ordered the superior of the seminary of St. Sulpice to expel two nephews of those prelates. Suspecting the Jesuits of being in connivance with his enemies, he withdrew from most of them the faculties for hearing confessions. When called upon to condemn the *Réflexions morales,* he hesitated endlessly; this he did to such an extent that Louis XIV, having become impatient, revoked the privilege accorded for this work and ordered that all copies of it be seized. Nothing less than a direct and explicit intervention of the Pope could put an end to so many conflicts. This was the origin of the bull *Unigenitus.*

This bull, which would stir up long and fiery discussions throughout the course of the eighteenth century, was published on September 8, 1713. It condemned 101 propositions of Quesnel. The Assembly of the Clergy of France received it with submission and respect; the King ordered its execution by letters patent; the Parliament, after expressing some reservations on the liberties of the Gallican Church, registered it, and Cardinal de Noailles revoked the approbation he had given to the book of the *Réflexion morales.*

The Jansenists experienced a moment of stupefaction. But the death of Louis XIV (September 1, 1715) and the coming of the regent, Philip of Orléans, whose religious indifference was well known, revived their courage. Then they began a desperate resistance. We have not here occasion to follow in all its details this campaign of intrigues, disputes, the secret and open maneuvers, in which no great theological problem was involved, in which no great man appeared. The Jansenism of the seventeenth century is no longer to be recognized in this emaciated and dried-up Jansenism, like the branch of a river

turned aside into the sand and lost in stony ground. Even less is it to be found in that political Jansenism, which will enable many people to belong to it without being party to the dogma or even to religion at all.[23]

In 1717 four bishops (Soanen of Senez, Colbert of Montpellier, De la Broue of Mirepoix, and De Langle of Boulogne) appealed from the bull to the future general council. Out of 130 bishops, 16 gave their adherence to this appeal; 87 doctors voted for the erasure of the bull from the registers of the Faculty; several religious and secular priests, Oratorians, Canons of St. Genevieve, Benedictines of St. Maur, curés of Paris, altogether 3,000 ecclesiastics out of 100,000, followed the movement. The "appellants," as they were called, remained a very small minority, but a turbulent and obstinate minority which, by its endless discussion about the authenticity of the bull, by its ceaseless recourse to the parliaments of France and to foreign allies, by its continuous stream of publications, by the so-called miracles and the "convulsions" of its disciples, would stir up public opinion, disturb the state, and afflict the Church.

In 1718, Clement XI, by his bull *Pastoralis officii,* separates the "appellants" from the Church. They appeal against this new bull. Then the Regent, and especially his former tutor, now become his prime minister, the famous Dubois, start to open their eyes upon the import of these maneuvers. A more serious vigilance is inaugurated under the ministry of the old Cardinal de Fleury, who, in 1727, authorizes De Tencin, then archbishop of Embrun, to hold a provincial council. Bishop Soanen of Senez is there declared suspended from his office and, on his new appeal to the future council, he is exiled by *lettre de cachet* to the abbey of Chaise-Dieu.[24] The Jansenist party breaks up. Noailles declares his acceptance of the constitution *Unigenitus* and, by this act of submission (1729), terminates

[23] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.,* VI, 242.

[24] He died there thirteen years later, in 1740, at the age of ninety-three.

his life of perpetual vaccilation. On December 15, 700 doctors of the Faculty of Paris, 39 of them bishops, ratify the acceptance of the bull.[25] The only ones thenceforth left are Colbert, bishop of Montpellier, Caylus of Auxerre, and Bossuet of Troyes, unworthy nephew of the great bishop.

In desperation the sectarians seek everywhere for support. In 1728, twelve doctors of the Sorbonne commission a certain Jubé, curé of Asnières, to negotiate an understanding with the Russian Church on the basis of the Gallican principles. The doctrines of the Anglican Church do not alarm them, and Doctor Ellies Dupin enters into parleys with Archbishop Wake of Canterbury to negotiate a union based on the abolition of the vows of religion, of auricular confession, and of clerical celibacy.[26] These attempts prove fruitless. But the party finds an effective support in the Parliament of Paris, where independence toward the pope is an old tradition. In 1732, when the new archbishop of Paris, Gaspard de Vintimille, issues a decree ordering obedience to the bull, the Parliament declares that this is an abuse of authority. Four councillors, the most violent, are then condemned to exile. The Parliament protests: all the magistrates, except those of the Grand' Chambre, sign their resignation. On June 20 they leave the palace two by two to the number of 150, in the midst of a crowd that cries out: "Behold the true Romans and the fathers of the country!"

To spread their ideas the Jansenists, since 1727, have a secret paper, the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques,* which, in spite of the police, continues to be published in France until 1794, in Holland until 1805.[27] They also have the famous *boîte à Perrette,* so called, it was said, from the name of Nicole's governess, who contributed the first funds to it; a mysterious war chest which,

[25] Lafitau, *Hist. de la Constitution Unigenitus,* pp. 507–9.
[26] *Ibid.,* Bk. V, p. 413.
[27] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.,* III, 130.

from 40,000 francs at the death of Nicole, increased to more than a million.

But did not God Himself seem to favor the spread of the Jansenist ideas and to approve the "appellants"? Strange scenes took place in the cemetery of St. Médard. A deacon, named Pâris, was buried there in 1727. He had been a fervent disciple of Port Royal. It was said that out of humility he was never willing to be raised to the priesthood; he even remained two years without receiving Communion. All during his life he shared with the poor his income of 10,000 francs a year, and he died in a poor wooden hovel in the Faubourg St. Marceau. The word spread that sick persons, when they lay on his grave, recovered their health. People thronged the spot. Cures were soon accompanied with remarkable scenes. Men and women fell down there in convulsion, epileptics foamed at the mouth. Besides, there were "helps" given by the "brethren" to their convulsed "sisters." Young boys, called "helpers," struck their victims with their fists, with sticks, on the head, on the stomach. Their flesh was tortured, they were crucified. And they pretended that they felt an indescribable delight. On September 29, 1732, the police closed the cemetery. The abominable scenes went on in secret, at the homes of the initiated, in barns or cellars. Thus they continued until the end of the century.

The resurgence of the Gallican errors in Germany under the name of Febronianism and Josephism later aggravate the difficulties of the Church.

Gallicanism

Gallicanism had been enthusiastically embraced by public opinion, as much abroad as in France. However, until the middle of the eighteenth century the Gallican theories seemed confined to the countries governed by the princes of the house of

Bourbon. Spain by restraining the jurisdiction of the pope and of the episcopate, by the concordats of 1737 and 1743, and by making the Inquisition more and more a power of the state; Genoa and Savoy by profiting from various pretexts to recall their ambassadors from Rome; Naples by proclaiming the direct divine origin of the power of kings; Parma by refusing to pay its tribute to the Holy See; Venice by stirring up endless quarrels with the Holy See, prefacing the conspiracy of the Latin courts which would result in the expulsion of the Jesuits. The works of the Frenchman Ellies du Pin and the Fleming Van Espen, who maintained the pretended divine origin of the power of kings in opposition to the so-called ecclesiastical origin of the power of the popes, was spread with the favor of the absolute monarchs.[28]

Febronianism

In the middle of the eighteenth century this theory entered Germany through the publication (1743) of a work entitled, *De praesenti statu Ecclesiae deque legitima potestate romani Pontificis.* The author, who concealed his identity under the pseudonym of Justinus Febronius, was merely repeating the doctrines of Ellies du Pin and Van Espen. Christ, he said, transmitted His authority to the mass of the faithful, in whom it rests *radicaliter et principaliter.* The bishops have the use and usufruct of this authority. Moreover, they hold this power from God Himself without intermediary. The pope has no preeminence over them except that of a metropolitan over his suffragans. He may command each individual bishop; but the bishops as a body are above him. It is true that in the course of time the Roman pontiffs, either by the concession of the bishops or by extortion, obtained all sorts of rights. But the time has come to strip them of these and to lead the Church

[28] Ranke, *Lives and Times of the Popes,* II, 450.

back to its primitive constitution. If the popes refuse to lend themselves to this reform, the Catholic princes have the duty to force them to do so.

Febronius' book produced an enormous stir. The German mentality has a double tendency: its minute precision is unsurpassed when it engages in the analysis of a text; but, if it engages in the consideration of an idea of a vast synthesis, there is no telling how far its daring will take it. The German canonists, conscientiously supplied with the tools of a traditional science, with great fidelity interpreted the text of the Decretals, without seeing therein the germ or the fruit of a historic evolution.[29] Febronius' new conception completely altered their point of view. For it pointed to the origins of the Roman constitution of the Church as something to be found in the contingent facts of history; this it set up in opposition to primitive Christianity; and it showed its destruction in the Christianity of the future. German science became enamored with a moving canon law, whose final term would realize all the anti-Roman claims of Germany in the course of several centuries. It seemed, indeed, that the old historical grievances of the nation against the financial procedures of the Holy See became vocal and found an echo. Between the ambition of the prince-bishops and the young school of the canonists the alliance was quite natural. From the entourage of an ecclesiastical elector, that of Trier, it was that the most illustrious theorist of the new law came forth, at first masked, and then openly.[30]

He who had signed his manifesto with the mysterious name of Febronius was Nicholas von Hontheim, coadjutor of the Bishop of Trier. He also held the office of councillor of the prince-elector George von Schönborn. He was well known for his learning. He had published studies, drawn from the best sources, regarding the antiquities of the Trier country. In him

[29] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* I, 8.
[30] *Ibid.,* p. 8.

were combined the rancor of the feudal vassal and the utopias of the canonist.

The aim of Hontheim's work was of a nature to give it a celebrity in the Protestant world. Regarding himself as Bossuet's successor, he said that he foresaw, after the ruin of the Roman centralization, a vast expansion of religious unity. A certain Febronian Jesuit declared: "Let Febronius' reform be carried out, and all Germany will become Catholic." [31] Surely this was making little of the grave dogmatic differences that separated the teaching of Luther from that of Rome.

In fact, the traditional Protestantism fought the Febronian doctrines as well as Roman orthodoxy. Lessing and Johann von Müller repudiated them outspokenly. Clement XIII, Clement XIV, and Pius VI condemned them.[32] But the terrible work, favored more or less openly by the governments, made the round of Europe. In France two translations of it were published in rapid succession; at Venice it was re-edited under the patronage of the Senate; the Council of Castile met the expenses of a special edition; in Portugal it was distributed gratis and in great numbers. Within a year seven hundred copies were sold at Vienna. Choiseul wrote: "If Febronius' book has been able to spread the doctrine of the Gallican Church in the other countries, it is an eternal obligation which those prelates will owe to the Elector of Trier." But it was in the German Empire that Febronianism bore its full fruits.

We cannot deny that Empress Maria Theresa, who presided over the destinies of the Empire since 1740, possessed the highest qualities of a sovereign: courage, activity, intelligence, irreproachable virtue. The valiant heroine who, when threatened by all Europe, had faced Europe and had aroused, for the defense of the country, her people of Hungary by raising her young son in her arms, deserves the name of "Mother of our

[31] Quoted by Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[32] Clement XIII in 1764; Clement XIV in 1769; Pius VI in 1775.

Country," which was given her by the gratitude of her subjects. The faithful wife, the generous and compassionate Christian, in many respects was worthy of the title of "Catholic Majesty," which the Sovereign Pontiff bestowed on her. But the excessive favor she accorded to the disciples of Febronius casts a shadow on her great reign. Maria Theresa had conceived the praiseworthy project of regulating the legal condition of Church property, of establishing a civil statute regarding the religious, and of favoring the progress of clerical studies. Unfortunately, for the carrying out of these reforms she turned to men imbued with the new ideas. Her two chief collaborators were the Benedictine Raustenstrauch, abbot of Braunau, and her Dutch physician, Van Swieten. The former was a disciple of Febronius; the latter maintained continual relations with the Jansenists of Holland and the philosophers of Berlin. Under their influence the property of the Church was made subject to the administration of the state, and the conditions of religious profession were regulated by imperial decrees.

No doubt, the considerable improvement of clerical studies was owing to the Abbot of Braunau. Thanks to him the study of patrology and of pastoral theology became more familiar to the Austrian clergy. But his aversion to Scholasticism and in particular his efforts to withdraw the education in the seminaries from the direction of the bishops and to place the seminaries under the direction of the state, had deplorable consequences and prepared the way for the baneful religious policy of Emperor Joseph II.

Joseph was not devoid of genuine qualities. His sincere though bungling intention to procure the good of his subjects, and his frank claim to reform the Church of Austria by himself, seem undeniable. But his upbringing had furnished him with false ideas which he was unable to shake off, in which, on the contrary, he persisted to the very end. The Jesuit Frantz, half-Cartesian, half-Scholastic, had filled Joseph's mind with

vague abstractions;[33] an anti-Christian professor, Martini, had taught him natural law according to even more dangerous principles; and, after the completion of his studies, an active influence of Freemasons and visionaries had circumvented the young prince.[34] When he came to power, he pushed Febronianism to its most extreme consequences. His system has been given a special name: Josephism.

Josephism

The parent idea of his doctrine is this principle: that the care for harmonizing the Church with the age belongs exclusively to the state. The state is the one charged with regulating, modifying, and at need limiting the methods of the Church's activity. The doctrine of Febronius was surpassed. For the author of the *De statu praesenti Ecclesiae,* the episcopate at any rate remained standing and had its word to say about discipline and dogma. But the emperor-theologian desired only a silent and obsequious episcopate. Febronianism wished to promote among the faithful a powerful and autonomous Christian life; Josephism allowed no place for the contemplative life or for asceticism.[35] For the regulation of public worship, the order of ceremonies, and the number of Masses to be said in the churches and chapels, the Emperor himself would care for that. Frederick II called the Emperor of Austria "my brother the sacristan."

We must say that these regulations were generally suppressions and confiscations. Joseph II had the jewels taken from the statues of the saints, he sold to Jews the treasures, reliquaries, and sacred vessels, closed 624 monasteries, and forbade pilgrimages, instituted civil marriage and divorce. His

[33] Wehofer, O.P., *Das Lehrbuch der Metaphysik für Kaiser Joseph II,* pp. 112–20.
[34] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 25.
[35] See the references given by Goyau, p. 45.

so-called purified Christianity had a similarity to the deism of the philosophers. Voltaire was now right: The Holy Roman Germanic Empire was no longer either holy or Roman. At bottom, Emperor Joseph II was a revolutionary. As Hontheim, to draw the throng of the dissidents into the Catholic edifice, had dislocated that edifice at its base, so Joseph II, to improve religion and again bring it into favor, overthrew it completely. He acted with the religious society as others soon would act with the civil society.[36] In pushing Gallicanism to its utmost limits, Josephism prepared for the French Revolution.

Christopher de Beaumont

For that same Revolution in its last phase the Jansenist party also labored, and a certain historian has said that the followers of St. Cyran and Quesnel, by taking a factious attitude in the seventeenth century, laid down the generative principle of 1789.

Indeed the strife had become more and more acute between the Parliament and the clergy at the time of the affair of the so-called *billets de confession,* or "the refusal of the sacraments."

Christopher de Beaumont, raised to the see of Paris in 1748,[37] had from the outset of his episcopate ordered his priests to require from every sick person who asked for Viaticum or extreme unction a note stating that he had been assisted by an approved priest. This provision was in conformity with an old tradition in the Church and was especially sanctioned by one of the councils held at Milan between 1565 and 1582 under St. Charles Borromeo. But in 1752 the Oratorian Lemère, being unwilling to furnish the required note, was refused the sacraments by the curé of St. Etienne du Mont in spite of an order from the Parliament. Thereupon a decree was issued (April

[36] *Ibid.,* p. 22.

[37] He had been bishop of Bayeux 1744–45, archbishop of Vienne 1745–48.

28), which forbade all ecclesiastics to do any acts tending to schism, especially any refusal of the sacraments under pretext of the lack of *billets de confession* or of a refusal to accept the bull *Unigenitus,* under penalty of being prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace and punished according to the rigor of the ordinances. This decree opened the way to grave conflicts.

Christopher de Beaumont, born July 26, 1703, was one of the most majestic figures of Catholic France in the eighteenth century. Of this vigorous champion of the rights of the Church, it has been said that never did a greater prelate occupy the see of St. Denis, of Goslin, and of Sully. Never, at least, in the course of so long an episcopate (1741–81) did any prelate see himself confronted with more complex difficulties, contrived by the most determined adversaries. But likewise never did a prelate accept the strife more generously and carry it on more fearlessly and persist more obstinately or with more success.

King Louis XV tried to resist the Parliament. He proclaimed the nullity of the decree of April, 1752, and of a second decree which confiscated the goods of the curé of St. Etienne du Mont. But in the face of this juridical body that had but lately been appealed to to set aside the last will of Louis XIV, the monarch was henceforth powerless. Finally the King yielded, forbade the refusal of the sacraments, and in 1754 exiled De Beaumont to Conflans. On October 16, 1756, Pope Benedict XIV in a spirit of peace, while maintaining the ordinances of the Archbishop, moderated them and declared that they no longer applied except to such as should be publicly refractory to the bull *Unigenitus*. But the Parliament was adamant and, by a decree of December 7, suppressed the papal brief as assailing the laws and maxims of the kingdom. At last, in 1765, the Assembly of the Clergy drew up an "Exposition on the rights of the spiritual power," in which it proclaimed the bull *Unigenitus* to be a dogmatic judgment of the universal Church. But the Parliament annulled the acts of the Assembly. Thus by way of a narrow

policy of chicanery, the Jansenist party of France marched openly into schism.

In the Netherlands the final step had just been taken. The Oratorian Peter Codde, who went there as vicar apostolic in 1688, favored the spread of the party. His refusal to sign the formulary caused him to be finally suspended from office in 1704. The presence of Quesnel in Holland stirred up men's minds. In 1723 a pseudo-chapter, meeting at The Hague, elected as archbishop of Utrecht Cornelius Steenhoven, who was excommunicated by the Pope. But instead of submitting, he consecrated two suffragan bishops. The schism was consummated.

In Holland as in France thus ended, in wretched quarrels and in open revolt, the great movement from which St. Cyran, Arnauld, Nicole, and Quesnel expected the renewal of the Church, the restoration of the pure Christian spirit.

Descartes

Such events were sure to favor the progress of unbelief which, ever since the Renaissance, was spreading in the various nations of Europe, especially in France. At the same time two other causes contributed to this development: the philosophical movement and the laxity of morals.

To shake off the yoke of theology and to be free from Aristotle: such was the double watchword of Descartes and his disciples. In reality the Cartesian philosophy was too much separated from religion and from tradition. In short, it was too isolated from life. Yet that philosophy was accepted by the strongest minds of the great century. By its fundamental theory of clear and distinct ideas and by its universal mechanism, it satisfied minds that were attracted especially by order and clearness. By its learned method and its high regard for individual reason, it favored independence. By its new demonstrations of

the immortality of the soul and of the existence of God, it founded, alongside Christianity, respectfully left to the domain of faith, a sort of natural religion, simple and noble, but dry and abstract. Gradually it became evident that its basis was narrow and its constitution not very solid. Some persons attacked it in the name of religion, which it contracted, others in the name of personal and social experience, which it despised.

Locke

The realist positivism of Locke and Condillac appeared as a reaction against the idealist intellectualism of Descartes. From this twofold movement was born Voltaire, a true child of Locke in his sensualist positivism, and of Descartes in his "delusive clearness."

Voltaire is the demolisher, Rousseau the deist builder. Belief in the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, proved by reason, and faith in the sufficiency of nature: such is the basis of the *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard,* the starting point of the *Contrat social.* At the same time, a breath of Calvinist enthusiasm passed through the dream of this sick man, who was depraved by the moral laxity of his age.

The society of the eighteenth century, which perceived itself in these two men and in their disciples, welcomed them heartily, and feasted them with delight. The reaction against the depressing dogmas and morality of the old Jansenism finds expression in their works with an enthusiasm that charmed their contemporaries. The naturalist optimism of the Renaissance seemed to be justified by reason: it reached out easily to the court and to the city. A property of exaggerated doctrines is to aggravate, by the shock which its rebound produces, the very evils which they pretend to cure.

The fashionable salons opened their doors to the "philosophers." This is the name which these so-called thinkers

bestowed on themselves. With vague phrases taken from the naturalism of the Renaissance and from the dubious remnants of all the philosophies and religions of the past or from the arbitrary rejection of traditional views, they assumed a right to be regarded as above criticism, to utter a priori conclusions, to hold that the ideal view of things determines reality.[38] At the house of Madame Tencin the "philosophers" guided the representatives of the highest nobility, of the gravest magistrates, of the Church itself. All institutions and all beliefs were there subjected to criticism. They believed in progress and were earnest that this progress should be a fact. All authorities that still wished to subdue men's minds or that opposed the growth of well-being were despised. The same philosophy decided on a question of sewers and on the existence of God.[39]

The Encyclopedia

This philosophy was propagated by every kind of literary means: letters, novels, poetry, dissertations, history, dramas, pamphlets, stories, and especially by that immense publication which, for more than half a century, so profoundly moved public opinion in France and in other countries: *The Encyclopedia.* This work was a sort of *Summa* of rationalist philosophy; it condensed and popularized; it supplied to the people and to the bourgeoisie what its authors had spread profusely in the salons: opinions, solutions, plans, hopes, and dreams for every matter of thought and of human activity. Henceforth the ancient regime appeared to be an institution condemned to perish.

Undoubtedly the ruin of the old society had other profound causes. It was not the philosophers who, under Richelieu and under Louis XIV excessively centralized the absolute power,

[38] Lanson, *Hist. de la littér., française,* p. 619.
[39] *Ibid.*

drew to the court the nobility of the provinces, unfairly assessed taxes and improperly regulated their collection. The philosophers were not the ones who passed on the power of Louis the Great to the voluptuous Louis XV and who, under this latter, let the power fall into the hands of a Pompadour and a Du Barry, deplorable personages.[40] The philosophers did not drain the public treasury or bring on famine and severe cold or crush the people with excessive burdens. But, after enlisting the help of all kinds of literary production, they enlisted all classes of the nation. They were unable to obtain the King's support; at least they obtained his neutrality. From Madame Pompadour they sought aid and protection, and they succeeded in having her for a powerful ally. Among the great ones they were able to make some their valuable disciples; they won some, others they disarmed before the people. The parliamentarians supplied them with helpers of the first order; the men of finance gave them the backing of a new power; in most of the salons they were established as masters, and from there they were able to radiate over the polite society of France and of other countries. They won the bourgeoisie, which became transformed under their influence. Lastly, they conquered the popular masses, whom they drew to themselves thanks to generous claims set forth in a simple and striking form.

From Paris, from France, the philosophy of the eighteenth century soon extended to all Europe. Paris attracted foreigners who wished to live its life, to be admitted to those salons which all Europe talked about, which impressed them by its dazzling splendor. Paris feted them magnificently; a broad cosmopolitanism opened doors and hearts. Count de Creutz, ambassador of Sweden, Marquis de Caraccioli, ambassador of Naples, Prince de Ligne, Stedingk, Fersen, all these were French in taste, tongue, and mind. Those who could not come, France

[40] Chateaubriand, *Œuvres*, (1833), XVII, 455.

sought out by written or printed correspondence.[41] In Germany, Lessing depends on Bayle, Voltaire, and Diderot; Schiller and Kant owed much to Rousseau. In Italy, Goldoni imitated Molière; Alfieri, Voltaire; and Condillac taught the Prince of Parma. Through Naples relations were readily established with Spain. More than anywhere else, these relations were very close in England, which furnished the philosophers, if not with their principles, at least with examples, verifications, and the initial impulse.[42]

Freemasonry

From the outset of the eighteenth century a powerful association remarkably favored the concentration of the anti-Catholic forces: it was Freemasonry.

As an occupational corporative institution, freemasonry undeniably goes back to remote antiquity.

In the period when more men were leaving the nomad life, the art of building soon acquired a preponderant importance in society. It required technical knowledge which, before the progress of the exact sciences, had to be empirical. This knowledge was secretly transmitted to the initiated. Thus the builders soon formed a mysterious aristocracy, organized with a hierarchy, as required by the very nature of the various labors of their art. We may suppose that, along with the secrets of their trade, the stone masons at an early date transmitted from one to another certain religious beliefs adapted to their point of view. The nomad tribes regarded the heavens and conceived religion under the form of a siderial mythology; the masons regarded the earth and imagined it under the form of an ideal work, continually being constructed, repaired, and brought to its perfection by a Great Architect.

[41] Lanson, p. 811.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 809.

The history of these associations of builders in antiquity is purely legendary. But, following the barbarian invasions, when the peoples of the West became definitely fixed on the soil in stable groups, corporations of masons began to spread through Europe, erecting cathedrals, palaces, highways, and canals. Nicholas III in 1277 and Benedict XII in 1334 confirmed certain privileges of jurisdiction in their favor and certain exemptions from taxes, in consideration of their public services: hence their name of freed masons, or freemasons.[43]

Such an institution, when time or favorable circumstances would permit, seemed likely to play a considerable political role.

It did fill this political role especially in England and Scotland, where, at the close of the sixteenth century and in the seventeenth, it succeeded in putting itself under the protection of influential personages. We may consider as certain that William III (of Orange) was initiated into this association about 1694, or more correctly, that at that period certain lodges of English masons put themselves under his protection and that in this capacity he several times presided over their meetings at Hampton Court. In the strife between the Stuarts and Parliament, and later between the Stuarts and the house of Orange or of Hanover, the political parties grouped the corporations about them. The Stuarts, from James I to Charles III, even copied the masonic organization for introduction into the regiments. In 1689 the Scotch and Irish regiments disembarked in France with their masonic orders. In time there was introduced into corporative freemasonry a philosophical element which later on would cement the fusion of the Jacobite lodges with the Orange lodges on the terrain of egalitarianism.[44]

In 1646 the freemasons of Longer noticed in the meeting hall a group of men strangers to their trade, men who were called

[43] Gustave Bord, *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France*, I, 45.
[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 46–51.

the Brethren of the Rosy Cross. Just what were they? No one can say precisely. They formed a secret society for the purpose of seeking for the transmutation of metals, the art of prolonging life, and certain occult practices which have not yet been brought to light. Descartes in vain tried to enter into relation with them.[45] At any rate we know the philosophical theories of him who, in 1617, became the apologist of the society, Robert Fludd. At first a soldier, then a physician and theosophist, in his *Apologia*[46] of the Rosy Cross, he gave an interpretation of the Christian revelation which leads to pantheism, inclining rather toward matter than toward spirit.[47] Decidedly masonry was abandoning its concern with material building and taking up the thought of the construction of an ideal society. Says a Masonic writer: "The mason-philosophers were presently strong enough to operate the much desired transformation." Among these so-called philosophers, some have mentioned Chancellor Bacon, to whom a dominant role has been attributed.[48] Bayle, Swedenborg, Willermoz, and Saint-Martin, the celebrated "unknown philosopher," that original figure of Christian theosophist, apart from all the systems, decidedly revolutionary, but deeply disinterested, romantic and mystical, who later seduced Joseph de Maistre.

Historians generally fix the date of 1717 as that of the birth of speculative or philosophical Freemasonry. A regulation of this period shows that it then comprised master, companions, and apprentices; that an initiation had to be undergone for admission, and that secrecy had to be kept about the doings of the lodges.[49] As for the philosophy which had become the very soul of the society, if we are to believe Findel, it was the religious feeling, but of such sort that its essence consisted in

[45] Doumic, *Le secret de la Franc-Maçonnerie*, p. 56.
[46] Bord, p. 27.
[47] Ragon, *Orthod. mac.*, p. 31.
[48] Doumic, *op. cit.*
[49] Bord, p. 48.

the expansion of each one's personality in the being of his neighbor and of things; according to Ragon,[50] it was a universal fraternity. Condorcet says that the object of Freemasonry was to supply the place of philosophical proselytism, then dangerous, by spreading safely the essential truths of the philosophy among a number of adepts.[51] From that time on, such seems to have been the real character of the society.

According to the General Constitutions of Masonry, published at London in 1723, a Mason is obliged, as a true Noachite (i.e., son of Noe) to conform to the rule of morals. After that each may remain in his denomination or religious persuasion. A vague deistic religion, in which the vaporous and inert Divinity is lost in the abstraction or is confounded with the world; a supple morality accommodated to the circumstances: such seem to have been the basic doctrines of speculative Masonry at its beginning. According to the Constitutions just referred to, Masons should remain peacefully subject to the civil authorities; yet a brother who is engaged in a revolt against the state and has not otherwise committed any fault, ought to remain attached to the lodge.[52] With regard to the society's means of action, they were indicated by one of its most famous leaders, Weishaupt, whom Louis Blanc called "the deepest conspirator that ever appeared." "When some great event has occurred," says the *Original Writings,* "we ought to suggest that it is owing to us. If a man of great repute appears, give out the notion that he is one of us. When one of us has acquired some part of the government, we give the impression that we had no part in it, so as not to arouse any alarm; on the contrary, where you can accomplish nothing, you will assume the attitude of a man who can do all. You must find an explanation of Christianity that calls the superstitious back to reason.

[50] Ragon, *op. cit.*
[51] Quoted by D'Estampes and Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution,* p. 163.
[52] *Ibid.,* p. 164.

For this purpose you need merely quote various texts of Scripture and give some explanations true or false, it makes little difference, if only each person finds a sense in accord with reason." [53]

While Masonry was evolving in England, becoming professional politics and speculative politics, it spread out to the chief states of Europe. We find it in Holland in 1725, in Spain in 1726, in Portugal in 1727, in Sweden in 1736, in Switzerland in 1737, in Italy in 1739. Deep mystery prevails about the time of its introduction into Austria. We know merely that in 1797 it was in great favor there.

Freemasonry in France

It spread more rapidly in France than elsewhere. By penetrating into the upper society and into the philosophical and literary world, it exercised a potent influence. A Masonic letter patent (June 7, 1760), published by Gustave Bord, bore the signatures of Marquis de Seignelay, colonel of the grenadiers of France, of De Gourgue, chief justice, of the Marquis of Evry, and of the Marquis of Clermont.[54] At the same time the lodges contained a large number of small merchants. No precise rule prevailed. Until the installation of the Grand Orient in 1773, each one did in his lodge whatever pleased him, retaining from the English rules only the initiation ceremonies and the joyous meetings, followed by banquets that often became tumultuous.[55] The first Grand Master, elected June 24, 1738, was Duke d'Antin; his successor was Louis de Bourbon-Condé, count of Clermont.[56]

[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 96, 102.

[54] Bord, p. 183.

[55] *Ibid.*, pp. 152–54.

[56] On these first two Grand Masters, see Bord, pp. 162–72. Cf. Deschamps, *Les sociétés secretes et la société, ou philosophie de l'histoire contemporaine* (1883), I, 546; Bord, I, 236.

But in those same lodges, where representatives of the old French society came for questionable amusement, philosophers were hatching the conspiracy that would wreck the old order of things. After the fusion of French Masonry with illuminism, Voltaire joined the lodge of the Nine Sisters. Immediately after his reception, he was installed in the Orient, where he was welcomed by the Venerable, the atheist Lalande. For him was reserved the apron of Helvetius, which the lodge preserved as a relic. Before fastening it on, Voltaire kissed it. Thereafter in the correspondence of the "patriarch of Ferney" allusions to Freemasonry occur frequently. To Alembert he wrote (April 20, 1771): "Let the true philosophers form a fraternity like the Masons, let them meet together, let them sustain one another, let them be faithful to the fraternity, and then I will let myself be burned for them." Again to the same he wrote (in 1766): "Grimm has informed me that you initiated the Emperor to our holy mysteries." In 1763 he had written: "The mysteries of Mythra must not be revealed." Father Deschamps, in his work on *Les sociétés secrètes et la Société,* attempted to compare the intimate correspondence of the philosophers with the doctrines of Masonry; and that examination fully justifies the following declaration of a Mason: "Masonry had prepared the minds of men for a great moral revolution, when the works of the philosophers, Helvetius, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, d'Alembert, Condorcet, Cabanis, brought their powerful light, as the sun blends with the day to augment its brightness."

In 1737 Cardinal Fleury in the King's name forbade the meetings of the Masons; but Louis XV, perhaps thinking that those who were at the head of the society were going to suppress the danger, permitted the lodges to reform freely in 1772 and 1773.[57] Spain and Portugal tolerated them; all the

[57] Bord, pp. 64, 192.

other countries protected them.[58] The papacy alone clearly saw the danger. Clement XII by his bull *In eminenti* (March 4, 1738) and Benedict XIV by his bull *Providas* (June 15, 1751) warned the faithful against the meetings of the Masons. The future fully justified their fears, and the latest research corroborates the grave words pronounced at Vienna in 1827 by the illustrious Frederick Schlegel: "There are, in the history of the eighteenth century, many phenomena which occurred so suddenly, so instantaneously, so contrary to all expectation, that although on deeper consideration we may discover their efficient causes in the past, in the natural state of things, and in the general situation of the world, yet are there many circumstances which prove that there was a deliberate, though secret, preparation of events, as, indeed, in many instances has been actually demonstrated." [59]

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[59] Schlegel, *Philosophy of History*, p. 455. Frederick Schlegel was born at Hanover in 1772. This scholar, philosopher, and poet was connected with the eighteenth-century masters of German thought, Schleiermacher, Schelling, Hegel; he was a friend of Madame de Stael. He was converted to Catholicism in consequence of his historical studies on the Middle Ages.

On Freemasonry, see an article by Father Thurston in *The Month*, June, 1917, pp. 529–42; Father Dudon in *Etudes*, December 20, 1917, and Father Gruber, art. "Masonry" in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, IX, 773 ff.

CHAPTER XV

The Catholic Forces in the Eighteenth Century

SINCE the formidable coalition of passions and interests which, in the sixteenth century, had given the Lutheran heresy its extension and its significance, the Church did not experience any other equal peril. The assault that it encountered in the eighteenth century was, in many respects, even more formidable: the attack was more universal, better organized, better led; the plan of campaign was clearer and more precise. But the forces of resistance were likewise greater on the side of the Church: the papacy was finally freed from the misfortunes that had obscured its prestige and weakened its strength in the period of the Renaissance; the clergy of both classes, brought back by the discipline of the seminaries to purity of life and of faith, formed a powerful body in normal hierarchical order; religious congregations, in the full fervor of their beginning or of their reform, were instructing the great and the common people; and, in circles most penetrated with the poison of unbelief or license, even at the court, the purest sanctity flourished.

Spain

In the Churches of Spain, Italy, Austria, and France, during the eighteenth century, the appearances were, we must confess, finer than the reality. The social edifices like the material structures, kept an appearance of grandeur and solidity until the moment when they collapsed.

In old Spain, proud of her orthodoxy, Catholicism, the religion of the state, still imbued the institutions, the laws, and

the morals. Countless religious monuments, on which the generosity of her kings and her people had lavished the gold of the New World, covered her soil. More than 70,000 secular clergy, 180 archbishops and bishops, 37,000 professed religious men, belonging to 40 religious orders, and 37,000 nuns, divided among 30 congregations, were engaged in works of education and charity. The Spanish episcopate had not the aristocratic and haughty mien of the French episcopate; the monk and the *señor cura* were popular; they were par excellence men of good counsel.[1] The faith of the people was warm in its expression. But superstition and fanaticism were daily gaining ground in the popular classes. The clergy slumbered in a soft indifference. Several dioceses had no seminary; the lower clergy lived in ignorance and idleness. The tone of the preaching declined until it became trivial or even grotesque. The episcopate no longer had the energy to resist the encroachments of the royal power, which became more and more despotic. After the concordats of 1717 and 1723, which were nothing more than provisional compromises, the concordat of 1753 recognized in the king of Spain the universal "patron" of the churches of the kingdom during eight months of the year. In 1765 the jurist Campomanès published his treatise on the royal right to alienate in mortmain and proposed to the Council of Castile that it declare ecclesiastics incapable of acquiring real property. On various pretexts the kings here and there put Church property up for sale.[2] The French regime of the intendants, introduced into Spain by Philip V and made general by his successors, added the social uneasiness to the religious uneasiness. Although the philosophical doctrines had not openly entered Spain, an unexpressed irritation was disturbing men's minds.

Then in the bosom of the Church some men arose to react against the invading evil. Father Isla published his famous

[1] Desdevises du Dézert, *L'Espagne de l'Ancien Régime*, II, 38.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

Fray Gerundio to lead preachers back to simplicity and good taste. A number of bishops joined to their exhortations the example of their holy lives. Don Martin Cenarro y Lapiedra, bishop of Valladolid from 1743 to 1753, economized on his table in order to make generous alms; Diego de Rivera, bishop of Barbasto, throughout his life preserved the simplicity of a monk; Don Antonio Golvan, archbishop of Granada, had 300 children brought up at his expense; the monks of Madrid each day distributed 30,000 plates of soup to the needy.

Other priests undertook to organize the charity. The type of these apostles was Don Diaz de la Guerra, bishop of Siguenza from 1777 to 1800, whose name deserves a place of honor among the greatest bishops of the eighteenth century. He transformed one of his country estates into a model farm, built a village about one of his castles, founded textile mills and paper factories, visited and aided the workers in tanneries and dyeworks, which were numerous in his region. Son of a lowly mason, he was always fond of assisting the artisans; but intellectual culture was not less cherished by him. He himself inspected the schools and presided in person at the *concursus* established for nomination to the benefices. He founded a school of music and bequeathed a valuable library to the college of Jerez, his birthplace.[3]

Italy

The religious condition of Italy, where the treaty of Cateau-Cambresis in 1559 assured the Spanish preponderance, was not unlike that of Spain. According to the statistics of the time, the kingdom of Naples then counted 81,000 priests or religious men, and Sicily more than 63,000.[4]

The Catholic faith was officially professed and protected, without great care for what today we would call liberty of conscience. Nowhere

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[4] Berthe, *Saint Alphonse de Liguori*, I, 105.

did anyone acknowledge in principle the right to favor irreligion by book or by spoken word. The bishops claimed and obtained the intervention of the public civil power to put an end to guilty unions and to scandals that were pointed out to them by their parish priests. The latter required, at Easter time, certificates of communion from all their parishioners. The religious processions took place in public with a pomp and frequency not usual elsewhere. People took delight in ceremonies of this sort, in brilliant retinues, in richly ornamented wayside altars. Along the streets and highways the Madonnas were numerous: there the people used to express their joy by fireworks and concerts.[5]

But that demonstrative devotion and that fondness for spectacles, although it was sincere and gracious in its naïve expressions, somewhat deserved the criticism expressed by a French traveler, that it was too external and inconsistent. St. Alphonsus wrote that in the many convents of the kingdom most of the nuns had entered without any real vocation, constrained to do so by their parents.[6] He also declares that many secular priests never opened a book, once they were ordained, and forgot the little they had learned.[7] The greater part of the clergy, not having any care of souls, exercised no active ministry. They lived at home with their family on the fruit of their benefice.[8] The life of these priests was not always edifying; the morals of the laity were very lax. The faith itself tended to disappear. In 1753 St. Alphonsus was alarmed at the number of atheists he found in the city of Naples. In Italy also this muffled murmur of impiety was mounting, which Fénelon had heard in France. Italy, like Spain, needed saints. God, who measures His graces according to the dangers, bestowed them abundantly on the Italian soil. Four great saints presented, in the face of the rising tide of vices and impiety, the austerity of their teaching

[5] Angot des Rotours, *Saint Alphonse de Liguori*, p. 8.
[6] St. Alphonsus, *Réflexions utiles aux évêques.*
[7] Angot des Rotours, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
[8] Berthe, *op. cit.*, I, 165.

and of their example. These were: Francesco Girolamo who edified Naples; St. Leonard of Port Maurice and St. Paul of the Cross who preached in northern Italy; and especially St. Alphonsus Liguori whose activity went beyond the limits of his country and whom Pope Pius IX proclaimed a doctor of the universal Church.

St. Francesco Girolamo (1643–1716)

Francesco Girolamo, a Jesuit, renewed in his popular preaching at Naples and vicinity the prodigies of the monastic preaching of the fifteenth century. At his words, throngs of people burst into tears, sinners made public confession of their faults; congregations of merchants and of artisans were formed after his sermons and placed themselves under his guidance.[9] Since Savonarola, Italy had not witnessed such spectacles.

St. Leonard of Port Maurice (1676–1751)

With equal ardor the Franciscan Leonard of Port Maurice preached throughout a great extent of country. In the first days of his priesthood he had thought of consecrating his life to the foreign missions, then to make a deep study of the sacred and profane sciences to strive against the enemies of religion. Providence did not allow him to realize these two projects. The servant of God suffered much thereby. He had to expend his life here and there in his country, without plan or preconceived order, according to the needs of the people. The dioceses of Alberga, Massa, Arezzo, Volterra, the country districts of Siena, Genoa, and Corsica were places where he preached, by word and example, austerity, charity, and the purest love of God. The Grand Duke of Tuscany sent for him to reform the morals of his states. All Italy wished to see him and hear him.

[9] Francis Girolamo was canonized (May 26, 1830) by Gregory XVI.

He died November 26, 1751, at the age of seventy-four. He had consecrated almost fifty years of his life to the apostolate. We may say that he has not ceased to preach, for today in the whole world thousands of souls hear Mass by following the method of St. Leonard of Port Maurice.[10]

St. Paul of the Cross (1694–1775)

While Francesco Girolamo in the Company of Jesus and Leonard of Port Maurice in the Order of St. Francis were preaching to the peoples of Italy, Paul of the Cross, a former soldier, then a hermit, was laying the foundations of a new institute of missioners, destined to preach the faith in the whole world and to labor particularly for the conversion of England. Such was the origin of the congregation known later under the name of Society of the Passionist Fathers. Their first mission opened at Orbitello in Tuscany, September 14, 1737.

Five years before, in the little town of Scala on the picturesque shore of the Tyrennian Sea, not far from Amalfi, St. Alphonsus Liguori had constituted the first community of the Redemptorist Fathers.

St. Alphonsus (1696–1787)

Alphonsus Liguori had first been a brilliant lawyer. He was born in 1696 of a noble Neapolitan family. Solid studies developed in him the gifts which he had received from Providence: a brilliant imagination, a retentive memory, a sound judgment, an exquisite heart. The juridical culture, which reached to the highest metaphysics by the principles it involved, the finest psychology by the studies of morals that it required, the most delicate arts by the suppleness that it exacted, had achieved the training of that richly endowed soul. Every cir-

[10] He was canonized by Pius IX in 1867.

cumstance prepared Alphonsus Liguori to become the doctor of modern times. The young man cultivated the gifts he had received from nature and he responded generously to all the solicitations of grace.

In 1723 a providential event gave a definite direction to his life. A dispute of gravest importance had arisen between Duke Orsini and the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Alphonsus accepted the defense of Duke Orsini's interests. With utmost care he studied the case and, believing in the justice of his client's case, used all his talent in its behalf. But at the hearing of the case he saw that he had been mistaken about the meaning of a document. He acted accordingly. But thenceforth he resolved no longer to use his time in engaging in purely human affairs; he would now plead only the cause of God. On October 23 of that same year he put on the clerical habit. Advancing by the various degrees to the priesthood, he was at length ordained priest on September 21, 1726. Thereafter Alphonsus labored for the Church by the continual devotedness of a life that God prolonged to the age of ninety years, by the labors of the new order which he founded under the title of the Most Holy Redeemer, by the admirable writings that won him the title of doctor of the Church.

The warmth of his piety was poured forth in numerous ascetical writings. The best known of these are his paraphrase (1750) of the *Salve Regina* under the title of *The Glories of Mary,* and the remarkable commentary on four verses of St. Paul on charity,[11] which he gave to the public in 1763; it is a complete manual of perfection for the use of persons of every state of life. From 1748 to 1779 he published eight editions, repeatedly re-edited and augmented, of his *Theologia moralis.* This work is a monument of science and wisdom, which made an epoch in the history of clerical science.

Between the rigorism of the Jansenists and the laxity of

[11] See I Cor. 14: 4–7.

certain casuists, this prudent theologian established, for the solution of cases of conscience, precise formulas that would eventually constitute the Liguorian system of equiprobabilism. In the maze of opinions and authorities, which is the path the conscience must follow? The holy doctor had been taught that the more probable course must be followed. But experience soon led him to abandon that theory. In 1749, in a special dissertation on the question, he took the stand that "even in the presence of a more probable opinion, it is permissible to follow a probable opinion, if this rests on a serious reason or authority." But did not that rule grant too much to liberty of choice? The saint thought so and, in 1755, he added a reservation to his principle: "provided that the difference of probability is not enormous between the two opinions." Finally, after further studies, discussions, and reflections, he reached (1767) his definitive formula, which grants liberty of action for or against the law only in the case of conflict between different opinions "almost equally probable." [12] The formula of equiprobabilism was found.[13] Subsequently the rational basis of the view would be discussed, but the solutions reached by St. Alphonsus by his system became, for moralists and for confessors, a safe rule, officially recommended by the Supreme Pontiffs.

Not only by his writings, but also by the congregation which he founded the holy superior extended his influence beyond the frontiers of Italy. On his first disciples he imposed the vow to preach the gospel to the infidels if the superiors destine them for that work. In 1764 he indicated in his constitutions the way the members residing abroad are to correspond with their superiors. However, in 1785, when the holy founder, weighed down by interior and exterior trials, had only two years more to live, the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer had not

[12] *Dico non licere sequi opinionem minus probabilem, cum opinio quae stat pro lege est certo probabilior.* On the contrary, *cum opinio minus tuta est aeque vel fere aeque probabilis, potest quis eam licite sequi* (*Theologia moralis,* 7th ed.).

[13] Kannengieser, art. "Alphonse de Liguori" in Vacant's *Dict. de théol.*

yet extended beyond the borders of the Peninsula. From the heart of Germany two new disciples came to him in time to console his last days.

Clement Mary Hofbauer (1751–1821)

One of these men was Clement Mary Hofbauer. He was born December 26, 1751, at Tasswitz, a little village of Moravia in the Austrian Empire, of a family of poor farmers. Successively baker's assistant, servant in a monastery of Premonstratensians, hermit at Muhlfrauen, obliged to resume his first occupation after the suppression of the hermitages by Joseph II, Hofbauer had long suffered from that internal distress about vocation to the perfect life which has been experienced by many great souls. At Rome, where he went on pilgrimage to seek light, while he was hearing Mass in a church of the Redemptorists, he felt himself suddenly enlightened, and asked admission into the new institute. Two years later, he crossed the mountains again and established houses of his Order at Warsaw, then at Vienna. At that time Josephism, Jansenism, and philosophism were extending their ravages in those countries. The intrepid son of St. Alphonsus confronted all the dangers. His work would appear incredible were it not vouched for by eyewitnesses.[14] He concerned himself with all souls in distress. Germans, Poles, Catholics, Jews, Protestants, rich and poor, clergy and laity, all were the object of his zeal. He felt keenly the need of new forms of preaching that were demanded by the new times. He said: "The gospel must be preached today in an altogether new way." Having settled at Vienna in 1809, there he passed the last twelve years of his life, striving against Josephism, and he there revived the finest days of the reign of Maria Theresa.[15]

St. Alphonsus' solicitude extended not only to the people

[14] Berthe, *op. cit.*, II, 630.

[15] St. Clement Maria Haufbauer was canonized by Pius X in 1909.

governed by the "sacristan emperor." The progress that impiety was making in the Catholic countries deeply afflicted the soul of the holy old man. In 1777 he published a small work (*La fedeltà dei Vassalli*) which in fiery language implored the Christian kings to combat the progress of unbelief in the interest of their thrones as well as for the sake of their subjects. He declares: "In vain can we say that human laws and their penal sanctions are enough to safeguard states. This is a profound mistake. Neither laws nor punishments will halt the audacious man who has no purpose in this world but the gratification of his lusts. Only religion produces morals and brings about an observance of the laws. . . . The kings who forget the interests of God and think only of their own interests are working for their ruin." [16] In various ways St. Alphonsus succeeded in having copies of his work reach the hands of all the sovereigns of Europe and also their principal ministers. But the ministers of the Christian kings of that period were Tanucci, Aranda, Pombal, and Choiseul. They had just exterminated the Society of Jesus and accorded all their favors to the philosophers.

The holy old man's cry of alarm was not heeded by the princes of Europe. He then turned to the valiant apologists who were fighting in France against the harmful doctrines of *The Encyclopedia.* Especially alarmed at the influence exercised by Voltaire, he wrote to Father Nonnotte who had just published a refutation of the philosopher of Ferney, to encourage him in his labors. To him he said: "Allow an old bishop to address these few lines to you. My age and infirmities obliged me to resign my episcopal office. . . . I am writing to you with the purpose of urging you not to let any occasion pass to answer the venomous productions of those agents of the devil who are called philosophers." [17] The evil was immense everywhere in Europe, particularly in France.

[16] Quoted by Berthe, *op. cit.*, II, 440.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 443.

The Church of France

The apparent firmness of the outward organization of the French Church should not deceive us. Those 135 bishops and 40,000 curés who in 1787 possessed about a fifth of the total land of France and received an annual revenue of almost 250,000,000 francs;[18] that clergy which played a part in the state by its General Assemblies held every five years and which had its own fiscal administration in the diocesan offices, the ecclesiastical chambers; this Church so closely united with the state that the two institutions seemed to enter into each other and to strengthen each other; all that traditional and majestic organization, elevated in its outward manifestations by an etiquette religiously observed, gave at first glance an impression of strength and stability. The 1,356 abbeys, 1,200 priories, and almost 1,500 convents, housing approximately 20,000 religious men and 30,000 nuns during the second half of the eighteenth century, seemed to double the strength of the secular clergy. But in reality the rights accorded to the king of France by the concordat of 1516 and the abuse often made of them, had rendered the clergy too dependent on the civil authority. Its territorial wealth was sometimes a source of danger for it. The commendam had placed the government of a large number of monasteries in the hands of superiors who did not live in them. Hence came a decadence, not general, yet real in many of the monasteries.

The real Catholic strength lay in the holiness of certain great bishops, in the devotedness of a large number of priests and of devout and well-educated religious, in the deep piety of certain of the laity, in the remains of a traditional faith which lived the stronger and more deeply rooted in certain souls as these took account of the growing ravages of impiety about them.

[18] This is the figure given by Taine, *L'Ancien Régime*, chap. 2.

In the French episcopate of the eighteenth century we do not find names comparable to those of Bossuet and Fénelon; but we see a large number of prelates of irreproachable morals, of evangelical heart, and more than one saint. At Gap, De Malissoles who was called "the saint of the Alps," at Cambrai, Rosset de Fleury who had already merited, in the see of St. Martin, the name of "the little saint of Tours"; at Marseilles, De Belzunce whose devoted labors during the terrible plague of 1720 had won the admiration of all; at Clermont, De Bonal whose holiness was venerated by Louis XVI; all the bishops in succession on the nine episcopal sees of Catholic Brittany; all those who occupied the three sees of Gascony, those of Paris from the death of Harlay de Champvallon in 1695 up to the end of the next century, gave an example of truly apostolic life.[19]

Two men especially seem to personify what was truly noble in the French episcopate of the eighteenth century: Christopher de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, Louis François d'Orléans de la Motte, bishop of Amiens. We have already taken note of Beaumont who, amid the most difficult circumstances, for thirty-five years battled for the defense of sound doctrines.

Louis de la Motte, born in 1683 at Carpentras in the Comtat Venaissin, educated in the Jesuit college of Avignon, early showed that querulous trait of mind and that exuberance of outward life which, in the men of his region, are often found associated with a fairness of practical good sense and soundness of judgment. Successively theological canon of Carpentras, missioner, vicar general of the archbishop of Aix, he was appointed administrator of the diocese of Senez when in 1727 the Council of Embrun condemned Bishop Soanen as refractory to the decisions of the universal Church. The good that he accomplished in his various posts led to his being appointed (1773) bishop of Amiens. In this new office his first care was the sanctification of the clergy. A collection has been made of

[19] See Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France*, Part I, Bk. III, chap. 3 (II, 72–100).

a number of his counsels given to his seminarians, of his conference to his priests, of letters he wrote on various topics concerning the spiritual life; this collection forms the most complete, practical, and lofty code of the clerical life. Ordinarily his expressions were lively and picturesque. For example, he said: "On arriving in a parish, a priest ought to be all eyes and ears, and to have neither tongue nor hands." The amiability of his manners no less than the lofty worthiness of his life won for him the outspoken favor of the Queen and the Dauphin, who professed a special esteem for him. He made use of this regard to speak freely before the heir to the crown about abuses in the matter of the residence of bishops and about the unjust distribution of ecclesiastical goods. One day Queen Marie Leczinska said to him: "Do you know, my saint, that when you are with my son you do nothing but slander? I have reason to fear that, after you have passed in review the wrongs of the men of the Church and those of the court, you will turn your attention to the queens." "Madame," replied M. de la Motte smiling, "the greatest wrong that queens could do would be to fail to take Your Majesty for their model." "Oh," exclaimed the Queen; "just look at the Bishop of Amiens talking the language affected by the court."

History is necessarily better informed about the life of the great than about that of the lowly. It supplies us with only rare documents concerning the existence of the country pastors in the eighteenth century. No name emerges from the ranks of those obscure servants of the Church. At least we know the general conditions of their life and the general results of their activities.

Nothing today can give us a true notion of what the rural clergy was in the eighteenth century. They kept the registry of births and deaths, received last wills, took a preponderant part in the meetings of the inhabitants. According as the upper

clergy abandoned residence in their sees, the influence of the rural clergy increased. The curé became the organ of the law, the ordinary agent through whom the higher authorities transmitted their decrees. In Brittany he was the intermediary of the diocesan commissions for the division of certain taxes (tallage). In 1716 the question arose of granting similar powers to all the curés of France. Turgot regarded the curés as his subdelegates; he declared that it was a good fortune to have in each parish a man who had received some education and whose duties would themselves inspire him with ideas of justice and charity.

The moral influence of the country curé was notably increased since the seventeenth century: the great reform movement undertaken by the Oratory, St. Lazare, and St. Sulpice, had reached him, and the philosophism, which disturbed the ideas of some members of the episcopate and the city clergy, had not yet reached the country curé.

A deep-rooted fault, however, remained in the ecclesiastical organization: the tithes collected in the parishes were ordinarily received by big tithe-owners who did not reside there and who left to the priest serving the church a scant portion of the revenue, called "portion congrue." In Artois the tithe took as much as 8 per cent of the product of the soil, and many curés were in the "portion congrue" class, without a presbytery; the church was falling into ruin, and the one who held the benefice gave nothing to the poor.[20] Hence arose a deep uneasiness, a silent irritation, in which the people and the curé felt themselves united because they suffered from it at the same time. At the States General, out of 300 deputies of the clergy, 208 were curés and, like the nobility of the provinces, they brought with them the defiance which they nourished for a long time against their chiefs. If the first two orders were constrained to join

[20] See other details in Taine, *L'Ancien Régime*, I, 114–20.

with the commons, that was because at the critical moment the curés withdrew in favor of this union.[21]

Elementary Education

The influence of the clergy upon the faithful was exercised by the education of youth, by religious instruction, and by works of charity.

From the beginning of the seventeenth century to the French Revolution the movement in favor of elementary education continued to be emphasized and to spread steadily and universally. In the country districts popular instruction was provided by the establishment of a multitude of schools, here by the curé, there by the vicar, elsewhere by clerics or masters. Many of these schools were free, thanks to the foundations of the church revenues or of pious individuals. Others were maintained, in a very modest way, through certain fees paid to the teachers by the pupils. The progressive diminution in the number of ecclesiastics in the recent centuries, by obliging the parishioners and the curés to resort to lay teachers, raised the question of assuring a salary for these latter and as far as possible donations in favor of the parochial schools.

An original and touching figure of past times is that of the master of the ancient regime, who was at the same time school teacher, chanter, and sacristan. The master was likewise and most of all the agent of the fathers and the auxiliary of the minister of religion. He taught the child the first elements of its mother tongue. He put the son of farmer and artisan in a position to keep the accounts of the farm and of his commerce. He was, next to the pastor, the man of the parish. He lent the help of his voice at the wedding Mass, and he murmured the last prayers at the grave. The state did not yet raise him to the dignity of a public officer; but the whole parish was attentive

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

to his needs: they used to combine to augment his wages and to improve his school; the death of this man of good deeds was a public grief; his grave, like that of the pastor, had a place reserved for it in the cemetery or in the church.

The Church was not satisfied with merely favoring elementary instruction; it gave birth to several new congregations devoted to the education of the children of the people. Such were the Sisters of Providence of Evreux, founded in 1702; the Sisters of Christian Doctrine, called Vatelottes, from the name of the venerable priest who instituted them in 1712, Father Vatelot; the Sisters of Wisdom, whose first establishment was made at La Rochelle by the zeal of Blessed Grignon de Montfort in 1715; then later the Sisters of the Holy Ghost, established near Saint-Brieue, the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament at Mâcon, the Sisters of Mercy in the district of La Manche, those of St. Charles at Nancy and the Daughters of Providence of Portieux.

St. John Baptist de la Salle (1651–1719)

The congregations of women devoted to elementary education were numerous in France. The efforts to found, for the same purpose, religious societies of men had not at first been happy attempts. Neither Father Barré, a Minim, who in 1678 tried to found at Paris some seminaries of schoolmasters, nor the earnest M. Demia, who established a similar work at Lyons in 1672, obtained lasting results. In 1682 a young gentleman, John Baptist de la Salle, priest and dignitary of the Church, not content with becoming the protector of the Christian schoolmasters, determined to become poor himself and to be an instructor of the poor.

He was born at Reims in 1651, at the age of fifteen had been provided with a canonry; six years later, by the loss of his parents, he found himself at the head of a considerable for-

tune, and a few years later brilliantly won the degree of doctor of theology. The most esteemed positions seemed open to him in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But concern for the poor children was the whole ambition of the young doctor. In his canon's house, then in a more spacious abode, he received in residence humble schoolmasters. They shared his meals, his whole life. Thus the young priest was able to study at close range these guests of his, making them gently feel conscious of their defects, finding means to reform their outward bearing at the same time that he regulated their interior life.[22]

His family considered this sort of intercourse unseemly and said that John Baptist was forgetting his birth and rank. But the gentleman priest continued devoting himself to these modest natures to elevate them, and in them he found treasures of generosity. He resigned his post as canon and distributed all his goods to the poor without keeping anything of it for his work, which now lived on alms. If a teacher was lacking, the holy priest himself took over the class of small children. His parents, his friends, members of the upper clergy, all treated him as one out of his mind. He used to say that the approval of a few holy souls and especially that of his spiritual director, Father Barré, were enough for him. He adopted for himself and gave to his companions as outward garb a cassock of coarse material, closed in front by a metal clasp, like the dress worn by poor clerics at the end of the seventeenth century. To this he added a cloak with wide flowing sleeves, much in use among the peasants of Champagne, a white rabat, a three-cornered hat with wide brim, and thick-soled shoes such as worn by laborers.[23] This dress was an occasion of fresh derision. But the spirit of humility, poverty, obedience, obscure life, and hidden devotedness entered into the new religious family.

In 1695 the saint thought the time had come to set down in

[22] Quoted by Delaire, *Saint Jean-Baptiste de la Salle*, p. 54.
[23] Guibert, *Hist. de saint Jean-Baptiste de la Salle*, p. 132.

writing the rules and practices that were observed for more than fifteen years in his community.[24] This was the origin of the rules of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools: revised by an assembly in 1717, they still govern the admirable society which by itself, during the nineteenth century, furnished half of the schoolmasters belonging to religious communities. The other congregations founded later for the same purpose are all more or less inspired by this institute. Its pedagogical methods have spread even to the public schools.

Among the reforms that stimulated the progress of elementary education, St. John Baptist de la Salle must be credited with two important innovations: the substitution of the simultaneous method for the individual method in the teaching, and the custom of having the reading of French precede the reading of Latin.

The practice, general until then, of giving instruction to each of the children, one after the other, seemed to him imperfect. Even when this method was supplemented by mutual instruction and when a throng of officers, intendants, decurions, pretors, and repeaters passed along the tables to supplement the master, it was hard to avoid lack of discipline and sloth in a large class. The wise teacher traces the plan of the new method in the following lines: "While a passage is being read, all the others having the same lesson will follow in their book. The teacher will, from time to time, have some of them read so as to surprise them and find out for himself if they are following." The teacher will not simply talk, as in preaching, but will question, sustain the attention, awaken ideas, accustom the children to seek by themselves, will train them to reflection.

A second innovation, which now appears to us quite natural, at that time alarmed the contemporaries of John Baptist de la Salle, as being excessively daring. Before his time the view was commonly held that children should learn to read Latin

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

well before being taught to read French; the reason given was that the reading of French was much harder and that the children should begin with the easier.[25] The saint decided upon the contrary method, which had already been tried in the Little Schools of Port Royal, but which disappeared with their suppression. The wise founder said: "The first book in which the children will learn to read will be filled with all sorts of French syllables." The future soon justified the excellence of the innovation.

The holy founder died August 7, 1719, leaving a religious family composed of 274 members, divided into 23 houses and teaching 9,885 children. In 1900 it counted about 20,000 brothers or novices, directing 2,000 schools and giving instruction to 350,000 children or young men.

Secondary Education

At the outset of the eighteenth century a man who combined a great teaching experience with a prudently progressive spirit, the venerable Charles Rollin (1661–1741), profiting by the rules adopted in the Jesuit schools and the methods employed in the schools of Port Royal, set forth in his celebrated *Traité des études* the code of secondary education. The cause of letters has been advocated with greater enthusiasm and eloquence, but no one ever spoke on that subject with more competence or with greater love. No one ever showed greater ability in drawing up the rules of that classical education which, by a sure and lofty progress, awakened the thought of the child, trained his judgment, developed his taste, and led him by steady ascent to the full flowering of his faculties.[26]

But the intellectual movement which led to the production of *The Encyclopedia* started a campaign against Latin. The amaz-

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[26] Sicard, *Les études classiques avant la Révolution*, p. 42.

ing progress of the natural and mathematical sciences, of history and geography, undoubtedly justified, in secondary education, innovations similar to those which De la Salle carried out in elementary schools; and the pedagogical narrowness of certain followers of the old system evidently was open to criticism. But the reaction was excessive. Voltaire said: "I left college with Latin and stupidities." D'Alembert, Diderot, Grimm, Helvetius called for an abandonment of the Latin studies. Rousseau, in his *Emile,* without treating the question directly, abandons the pupil to his own spontaneity. The discredit of the practice of Latin exercises and Latin poetry, the use of interlinear translations, at the disposal of the student for his translations, were the results of this campaign in many schools. As these violent attacks against the old methods coincided with the equally violent attacks against all the positive precepts of religion, the consequences were fatal: the spirit of youth was nourished by the examples and maxims of pagan antiquity, but without the intellectual discipline that regulated the mind, without the moral discipline that governed the heart. The sonorous and vague declamations of the orators of the French Revolution were the outcome of this movement.

Two religious congregations courageously tried to stem the flood.

In the Oratory the famous Father Lamy, an enthusiastic partisan of the mathematical and natural sciences, at one stroke condemned Scholasticism, the use of Latin dictations, and Latin verse. But his congregation did not adopt all his ideas. In the upper classes a considerable place was given to the natural sciences, to mathematics, to history, and to geography. But the teaching of Latin and Greek continued to be the basis; and religion was always its general inspiration and its crown.

The Jesuits also had their man in the vanguard, Father Buffier, who wished to introduce the new sciences into the program of studies. But the pedagogical methods of the Society

remained faithful to the great authors of antiquity, especially to Cicero, the master of oratorical and literary style. By maintaining the practice of literal translation, of Latin compositions and dissertations, of Latin verse, of grammatical, logical, and literary analyses, they required a continual effort on the part of the student, and thus safeguarded mental discipline, indispensable for any education worthy of the name. On the other hand, the deep Christian sense of these schoolmasters made them avoid, in the daily intercourse with pagan authors, the real danger that might be encountered there. Their method consisted in presenting the Greek and Latin authors while at the same time taking them out of a particular environment, presenting them to their pupils, not as men of such a place and such a time, but rather as impersonal models belonging to all countries and all ages.[27] The student thus trained kept from these authors only their admirable formative perfection, that harmonious advance of thought in its natural movement. From that form the student then put on the Christian ideal, which the sons of St. Ignatius, by their instructions, their retreats, their numerous exercises of devotion, endeavored to nourish in souls.

Higher Studies

Higher religious studies were cultivated either in the religious orders or in the universities.

The seventeenth century at its close bequeathed to the eighteenth works of incomparable richness. Polyglot Bibles, corrected with the greatest care, had put within reach of the exegetes the earliest texts of Scripture. Bossuet and Richard Simon, representing two opposite tendencies, had thoroughly discussed the rules of sacred hermeneutics. Lenain de Tillemont, in his *Mémoires sur les six premiers siècles de l'Eglise,* with tireless patience and wonderful critical sense, had har-

[27] *Ibid.,* p. 376.

vested the most precious documents of Christian antiquity. Thomassin, under the title of *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise,* had studied with utmost precision the offices, the rights, the duties, the prerogatives of the religious orders of the Church, the condition of every kind of Church property, and whatever concerned benefices. Petau had published his marvelous studies of positive theology. Mabillon had, so to speak, created, or at least constituted on a scientific basis, the science and art of deciphering the old documents. The Bollandists had continued the publication of their incomparable *Acta sanctorum,* a critical collection of all the original documents about the lives of the saints. Noël Alexander had published his great *Histoire de l'Eglise,* and Claude Fleury had begun the publication of his.

The long disputes of Gallicanism and especially of Jansenism had a twofold result: to turn many eminent minds from the works of pure science; to fill with a poison of unorthodoxy many works of this time and thus to make them suspect to Catholics.

In the eighteenth century several scholars mentioned above and many others, such as Dom Calmet, the learned Scripture commentator, Dom Bouquet, who started the *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France,* Dom Ceillier, the author of the moumental *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés ecclésiastiques* in twenty-five quarto volumes, Dom Rivet, who published the first volumes of the *Histoire littéraire de la France,* Dom Vaissette, the scholarly historian of Languedoc, and numerous others less celebrated, had courageously continued the work of their predecessors. In the teaching of the traditional theology, Dr. Tournely, professor of the Sorbonne, Dr. Witasse, Father Legrand of St. Sulpice, and especially the illustrious Dominican Billuart, one of the most profound commentators of St. Thomas, cast a luster on the ecclesiastical science.

But while the Oratorians and a number of Benedictines were won over by the Jansenist error, the Jesuits were pursued, then dispersed; and soon afterward, efforts were made to turn over to the civil power the direction of all education.

The University of Paris still enjoyed, in the eighteenth century, two sorts of privilege: civil privileges, guaranteed by the king, and apostolic privileges. The former consisted at first in the exemption from certain burdens, such as the poll tax, money contributions, quartering of troops, conscription for military service; they also included the academic right by virtue of which masters and students, if they should be plaintiffs or defendants, could litigate their case before the judge preserver of the privileges of the university. Letters patent of March 30, 1759, confirmed all these privileges. As for the apostolic privileges, they included for the masters the right to confer degrees, and for the holders of degrees the right of "expectative" of vacant benefices.[28]

In February, 1763, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, a royal edict, composed of twenty-eight articles, regulated the situation of the various schools of the kingdom. The bishops retained direction of them only in what concerned spiritual matters and the teaching of the faith; in the government of these houses, all the rest was placed in the hands of a commission of eight members, on which the bishop was the only ecclesiastic. On November 21 of that year, royal letters patent centralized this new organization in the Collège Louis-le-Grand, destined to form "a nursery of masters." The General Assembly of the Clergy in 1765 saw the danger. It was a first attempt of the future University of France. The bishops protested vigorously. "The exercise of the essential functions of our ministry," they said, "obliges us to protest against the edict of February, 1763. The bishops are scarcely permitted to have

[28] The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, chap. 19, De reformatione) had in a general way abolished the expectatives.

anything to say in the administration of the colleges. All parts of education are essentially connected together. The same teachers are charged with the teaching of human letters and with training the youth in the practice of religion. These two functions will continue to be inseparable so long as Christianity is the rule of our schools." In reply to this memorial, the government declared that no one can make any decision without first taking the advice of the clergy. But this promise was kept only in what concerned the military schools, which the next year were for the most part confided to religious congregations.

Apologetics

In the measures taken in 1763 to centralize the public instruction in the hands of lay officials of the state, the Assembly of the Clergy perceived the hidden influence of the philosophical sects. The enemies of religion regarded as an essential point the removal of the clergy from the care of training the youth. The strife now must be directed against these enemies. Apologists arose. A Jesuit (Father Nonnotte), a secular priest (Father Guénée), and a bishop (Lefranc of Pompignan) became particularly conspicuous in this conflict.

Claude Adrian Nonnotte, who was an object of Voltaire's pleasantries and sarcasms, was born at Besançon in 1711. Considered one of the most remarkable preachers of the Society of Jesus, he had been thus regarded in the city of Turin by the King of Sardinia. He assumed the ungrateful task of discussing for twenty years with a man who answered his arguments by witticisms and ridicule. His chief works are: *L'esprit de Voltaire* in two volumes and the *Dictionnaire philosophique de la religion* in four volumes.

Father Antoine Guénée, born at Etampes in 1717, rose by his own efforts and talent from a very humble condition to the highest scientific distinctions. He had the honor to succeed the famous Rollin in his chair of rhetoric and to be admitted in

1778 to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. In 1769 he published his principal work, *Lettres de quelques juifs à M. de Voltaire.* In this he vindicated the Holy Scriptures from the jokes and criticisms of the philosopher of Ferney. Voltaire wrote of him, saying: "The Jewish secretary is not without spirit and knowledge; but he is as mischievous as a monkey: he bites while seeming to kiss one's hand." George Lefranc de Pompignan, born in 1715, was the son of a president of the Montauban *cour des aides.* At the age twenty-eight he was appointed bishop of Le Puy, and was later raised to the archiepiscopal see of Vienne. He attacked Voltaire, Rousseau, and the whole sect of the Encyclopedists and philosophers. Simply by the aid of his writings we might reconstruct the history of unbelief in France from about 1750 to about 1775.

In his *Questions diverses sur l'Incrédulité* (1751), then in the *Controverse pacifique sur l'authorité de l'Eglise,* the *Dévotion réconciliée avec l'Esprit,* the *Religion vengée de l'Incrédulité par l'Incrédulité elle-même,* and lastly in 1774 in a solemn *Avertissement sur les dangers de l'Incrédulité,* Lefranc de Pompignan undertook to reply to all the objections, to establish all the distorted dogmas, all the misinterpreted facts. The style of his apologetic has unfortunately not the impassioned eloquence of the author of the *Contrat social,* or the inexhaustible fervor of the author of *Candide.* But his judicious mind saw and showed better than any of his contemporaries the essential vices of philosophism: its cult of the abstract, its irreligious positivism. Rousseau's system, he said, is condemned by the simple fact that there has been no *Emile* anywhere and never would be. He proved that to rest moral goodness merely on social utility, as did the philosophers of his time, was the incurable evil.[29]

In short, Lefranc de Pompignan, Guénée, Nonnotte, and a few others in the eighteenth century nobly sustained the holy

[29] *Œuvres complètes de Jean-Georges Le Franc de Pompignan,* I, 282.

cause of the Church. But when an increasingly numerous public was devouring Voltaire's pamphlets, was enthusiastic for the utopias of the *Contrat social* and of *Emile,* undoubtedly an apologetic of greater scope was needed. Subsequent history might have been different if, in the middle of the eighteenth century, a man of genius had appeared, taking up the great apologetic opened up by Pascal, dreamed of by Bossuet and Fénelon, from the threefold point of view of metaphysics, history, and life; a man who would have made palpable and impressive the need of believing, the reasons for adhering to the Church, the means of acquiring the faith, and the happiness of possessing it.

"Begin by showing that religion is not contrary to reason," Pascal said; "then that it is venerable; then make good men wish that it were true; and then show that it is true." And Fénelon, in one of his letters, spoke also of a vast plan of apologetics "embracing the two extremities of mankind, reaching everyone." He mentioned this plan to the Bishop of Meaux. The question was to first show that the worship of God is necessary for man, then that Christianity alone is capable of paying to God a worship worthy of Him, and finally that the Catholic Church can alone teach this worship in a way suited to the need of all. "Do we appreciate what would have happened if, during the ages which saw the apogee of the monarchy, there had arisen bishops, priests, and laymen to proclaim the eternal social principles of Christianity—who, going beyond the Renaissance to the great doctors of the Middle Ages, would have taught an astonished world that there is such a thing as Christian politics, not to be confounded with the politics of royal absolutism, but containing at once the eternal truths and their applications, *nova et vetera?*" [30] Did those men fail in their mission whom God had prepared for that work? This apologetic is not met with at that time.

[30] Godfrey Kurth, *The Church at the Turning Points of History,* p. 186.

Preaching

At any rate, preachers animated by a great apostolic zeal labored to awaken in souls the purity and fervor of Christian faith.

Pulpit eloquence was not lacking in the eighteenth century. Any period that could boast of a Grignon de Montfort and a Brydaine is not without sacred orators.

Father Grignon de Montfort, who died April 28, 1716, at the age of forty-three after sixteen years of priesthood, had preached in all provinces of the West. In 1715 he founded the Society of the Daughters of Wisdom for the care of the poor sick, and in the same year founded the Company of Mary to evangelize the country districts. Since St. Vincent Ferrier the Church had not heard a more inflamed word; and few men of the eighteenth century bore more deeply engraved on them the marks of Providence, than this other Elias. His entire life was a manifestation of the holy folly of the Cross. His sermons, his writings, and his conversation were all impregnated with prophecies and prophetic views about the last ages of the Church.

Since the epistles of the apostles, it would be hard to find such burning words as the pages of his prayer for the missioners of his Society. Few pages exist, in fact, more pathetic than the prayer of this earnest servant of God, when, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, seeing the flood of impiety threatening souls, he exclaimed:

> Lord, God of goodness, be mindful of Thy former mercies. Remember the prayers of Thy servants during the course of so many centuries, of their longings, of their sighs. Remember, Lord, the blood of Thy Son. . . . Impiety is on the throne; the abomination is even in the holy place. Just God, must not Thy kingdom come, and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven? . . . Lord Jesus, give us priests. Priests free with Thy freedom, detached from everything, without

father, without mother, without relatives . . . slaves of Thy love and of Thy will . . . souls raised up from the earth . . . who are ready to go forth burning like fires, to enlighten like suns the darkness of the earth. Lord, send us this aid, otherwise take away my soul, grant that I may die.

The Breton missioner [81] had scarcely quit this earth, when the Provençal Jacques Brydaine began his fruitful apostolate. By the bold strokes of his descriptions, by the clearness of his argumentation, and by the adaptation of his words to the most varied audiences, he appeared as the model of popular Christian orator. Born near Uzès in 1701, beginning his classical studies under the Jesuits at Avignon and starting his training in clerical virtues under the Sulpicians in the same city, while still only a deacon he began (1722) preaching. Having been ordained priest, he traversed most of France, giving missions, 256 of them, which were followed by many conversions. Benedict XIV, marveling at his success, conferred on him the title of general missioner. He died, worn out by the labors of his apostolate, near Avignon in 1767. The purity of his life, his zeal for souls, merited for him the right to be proposed as the model of priests.

"The word of God," said Brydaine, "is a hammer with power to subject the most rebellious spirits and a fire suited to soften the most hardened hearts. It is a violent wind that breaks the cedars. It is a thunder that alarms, a two-edged sword that penetrates to the deepest corners of the soul." This word of God, so well handled by the great missioner, is scarcely met again in the second half of the eighteenth century. However, four orators are notable for their talent and zeal: Father Le Chapelain, Jesuit, who eloquently developed the hisorical proofs of Christianity, Father Poulle, Father Charles de Neuville, and Father Clement. This last was called the Rousseau of the

[81] Blessed Grignon de Montfort was born at Montfort-sur-Meu in 1673. See his biographies by Jac (1903) and by Laveille (1910).

pulpit: he was fond of showing Christianity as tending to the general usefulness of humanity. After them, toward the end of the century, Father Maury, Father de Boismont, and Father Boulogne let themselves be too much beguiled by the spirit of their times and transformed the sermon into a sort of philosophical address.

Piety

Preaching is not the only way that the teaching of religious truth and the rules of Christian life are transmitted to the faithful. Ascetical and mystical works become an active agent of the apostolate. The *Imitation of Christ* in the fourteenth century and *Introduction to the Devout Life* in the seventeenth had exercised an incalculable influence on the Christian world.

In the eighteenth century spirituality did not produce any deeply original work in France. The Brothers of the Christian Schools published (1739) posthumously a work of their holy founder: the *Explication de la méthode d'oraison,* a wise and clear interpretation of the traditional methods; and Father de Caussade, Jesuit, brought out, two years later, *Instructions spirituelles sur les états d'oraison,* in which he seeks merely to popularize the method of Bossuet in catechetical form. Both these works emphasized, in spirituality, the part taken by contemplation and love. St. John Baptist de la Salle repeatedly spoke of the prayer of "simple look," of "that simple attention to the presence of God, without any particular view or any reflection, an attention that penetrates the heart . . . and that makes the way shorter and levels all difficulties."

The spiritual works published in the course of the century were marked by a calm unction that contrasted with the agitations of that time.

A mystical work is rarely a reflection of the outward events which history notes at the surface of an era. More often it is the reaction of an interior life which, under the shock of the

boisterous agitations, turns back upon itself and seeks its nourishment in a deeper and more peaceful source. It was amid the troubles of the Great Western Schism that the *Imitation of Christ* was composed; St. Theresa's *Way of Perfection* was contemporary with the greatest quarrels of Protestantism; the century that echoed with the bantering laughter of Voltaire and the eloquent chimeras of Rousseau, also witnessed the appearance of books of lofty spirituality: Father Caussade's *L'abandon à la Providence divine,* Father de Lombez' *Traité de la paix intérieure,* and Father Grou's *Caractères de la vraie dévotion.*

Addressing souls already accustomed to the efforts of the Christian life, deeply impressed with the idea of duty, and feeling the need of expanding in the holy liberty of the children of God, Father de Caussade begins thus: "Today God still speaks as He spoke to our fathers, when there were no spiritual directors or method. Faithfulness to God's command was the whole of spirituality; but it was not reduced to an art that explains it in so sublime and detailed a way. Undoubtedly our present needs require it. But in the first ages it was not so." The author presents a striking picture of what must have been the spirituality in the soul of the Blessed Virgin, who in her reply to the angel, *Fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum,* expressed the whole mystical theology of the ancients. Then the learned Jesuit, in language of unusual depth and of accomplished literary beauty, shows how "the duties of each moment are the shade under which the divine action is hidden," as the accomplishment of these duties "is a source of growth in holiness," as God at times "enlivens a soul that abandons itself to Him by means that seemingly would bring about its death: and as always "He assures the soul a glorious victory." [32]

The *Traité de la paix intérieure,* by Father Ambrose de Lombez, of the Order of Capuchins, teaches the excellence of

[32] Father de Caussade, *L'abandon à la Providence divine.*

peace of soul, the obstacles opposed to this peace, the means of acquiring it, and the way to practice it. "All our piety," he says, "tends simply to unite us to God by knowledge and love, to make Him reign in us by our faithful correspondence with all His interior attractions, while we await the time when He will make us reign with Him in His glory. But, without interior peace, we can possess these advantages only very imperfectly. . . . The din within us, in our very depths, which affects the powers where God wishes to operate, distracts us more than that which comes from without, which strikes merely our ears." [33]

Few books have been written which, in a style so limpid and impressed with so agreeable an unction, give more practical counsel on the fulfillment of our daily duties, prayer, relations with our neighbor, scruples, aridity. The good Franciscan is one of those whose word seems to carry with it the virtue which it recommends. He says: "If fervor is necessary, interior liberty is needed even more. . . . In constraint we are stiff, inflexible, downcast, devout by system and method, rather than by grace and fidelity. The soul that is attached solely to the will of God enjoys the liberty of children: it is mild, modest, simple, submissive, sociable, always disposed to prayer." [34] It is such a soul that you fancy you are hearing, seeing, and feeling alive at your side when you read Father de Lombez.

Les caractères de la vraie dévotion, published by Father Grou, S.J., in 1788, after the suppression of the Society, and soon followed by the *Science pratique du Crucifix* and *Méditations en forme de retraite sur l'amour de Dieu,* were the echo of a beautiful soul. Father Grou himself wrote (1784): "My spirit is that of childhood and simplicity. I gave myself to God twenty-four years ago. At that time I received the gift of prayer and of the habitual presence of God. What I am able to know of spiritual things, I did not acquire by my reflections

[33] *Traité de la paix intérieure,* Part I, chap. 1.
[34] *Ibid.,* Part IV, chap. 10.

and labor. I speak and write without ever thinking of what I will say or write." The treatise on the *Intérieur de Jésus et de Marie,* published after the author's death, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, pointed to the soul of the Savior and of His Blessed Mother as the source and model of all profound piety.

Works of Charity

A spirit of kindness, gentleness, and generosity spread over all the clergy at the end of the eighteenth century and entered the soul even of those whom the worldly spirit had won or whom the philosophy of the day had more or less seduced.

The episcopate of that century showed itself faithful to the charitable traditions bequeathed to it by the preceding ages. Of Archbishop Christopher de Beaumont of Paris it was said that his charity was one of the glories of his age. Out of his annual income of 600,000 livres, at least 500,000 went to the poor. When fire destroyed part of the Hôtel-Dieu, the sick were moved to his episcopal palace. The Archbishop, after winning a lawsuit that vested him with the ownership of the Hôtel Soubise, at once turned it over to the hospitals: this amounted to giving more than 500,000 livres to the needy.[35] With modest resources, Bishop de Pressy of Boulogne carried out remarkable works. Archbishop de Durfort of Besançon practiced the generosity of a prince. The same may be said of De Fumel at Lodève, of Cardinal de Bernis at Alby, of De la Motte at Amiens, of De Bezons at Carcassonne, of De la Tour du Pin at Nancy. These prelates experienced, as it were, a need to give. Their heart was as noble as their birth, and their instinct of nobility corresponded to their sacred duties as bishops.[36]

But we must also note that these great prelates were not

[35] Sicard, *op. cit.,* I, 386.
[36] *Ibid.,* p. 392.

satisfied with merely giving alms so generously; they were also engaged in organizing charity. Generally unknown is the fact that it is to them we owe, under the ancient regime, the creation of our fire insurance companies, under the form of an annual contribution.[37] Bishop de Pradel of Montpellier, at the close of the seventeenth century, inaugurated an institution for gratuitous and charitable loans. Bishop Jean de Caulet of Grenoble established an office of legal assistance. Bishop de Machault of Amiens, in 1778, organized an office of charity with headquarters at the diocesan office. Bishop du Plessis d'Argentré of Limoges in 1770, along with his friend Turgot, presided over the first meeting of the great bureau of charity established in that city.[38]

One of the most original charitable organizations of that period was the "General Alms." This had been founded in the middle of the seventeenth century by a Jesuit, Father Chaurand, aided by several of his fellow Jesuits. It was a work of charity at home. The offerings of the benefactors were sent, not directly to the needy, but to an office formed of certain lay commissioners and certain priests deputed by the curés. The office aided preferably craftsmen, domestic servants or journeymen, persons over sixty years old and unable to earn their living, and persons with family dependents. In the organization of the General Alms, we may distinguish an effort toward the establishing of an effective aid furnished to fathers for the education of their children, and even of a general public relief. Toward the end of the eighteenth century the rise in the price of bread, the lessening of zeal, and especially the expulsion of the Jesuits, who were the promoters of the institution, led to the decline of the General Alms. The Revolution suppressed it altogether.

The workmen's corporations, whose origin goes back beyond

[37] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 395–97.

[38] Cf. Sicard, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Bk. II, chap. 6: "Les évêques et la charité."

the thirteenth century, were always regulated, at least in the general lines of their functioning, by Boileau's *Livre des métiers*. Organized into occupational "families," composed of a master, of one or two journeymen, and of an apprentice, grouped about a syndical authority who looked to the safeguarding of the general interests, they possessed, with their status of legal personality, the right to acquire and to administer property movable and immovable. Favored by the Church, which presided over the principal acts of the corporative life, these corporations enabled the workman to defend his rights effectively, to contend against foreign competition, to uphold the honor of the trade by the exclusion of incapable or disloyal workers, and especially to preserve the religious traditions in his daily life.

The efforts of the absolute monarchs to centralize the workmen's organization, the edict of March, 1691, which withdrew from the corporations the right of naming their administrators and replaced these by public functionaries, the edicts of 1694, 1696, 1702, 1704, 1706, 1708, and 1709, all were powerless to obstruct the corporative movement.[39] Some corporations had redeemed their ancient franchises at a high price.[40] In short, from this traditional institution emerged a labor organization which, during the eighteenth century, brought the products of French artisans to a perfection unequaled by anything else in Europe. A still greater benefit lay in those confraternity feasts in which the people of one craft knelt together about the banner of a patron saint, organized themselves in solemn processions, cooperated in coming to the aid of the sick or aged brethren, preserving, amid an invading impiety, the Christian spirit of past ages.

The same traditions, assailed in the cities, still continued in

[39] Martin-Saint-Léon, *Histoire des corporations*, p. 298.

[40] For the details of this organization and for the history of the corporations, see *ibid.*, and Hubert-Valleroux, *Les corporations*.

the villages. At the end of the eighteenth century the church was still the center of the community as well as of the parish. The church steeple was the bell-tower of the commune. The bell, which had been solemnly baptized and had been given a name, to which was attributed a sort of personality, marked for the peasant the hours of labor, of rest, of prayer, of the communal deliberations. The feasts were still numerous despite many suppressions since the Middle Ages. The Sundays were faithfully observed. On those days the peasant, dressed in his best, went to church, which stood in the middle of the cemetery, where his dead were laid to rest. However hard might be the famine, however heartbreaking might be the news of the wars, however heavy the taxes, he felt himself freed from the grief and servitude by the consciousness of his dignity as a child of God and a brother of the saints.

The bourgeoisie and the provincial nobility, alas, were reached by the works of Voltaire and Rousseau and the rumors of the court scandals. But in them the strong family and Christian virtues were far from being extinct. The memoirs of the time and those admirable *livres de raison* give us undeniable evidences of this fact. In the middle of the eighteenth century, Ange Nicolas de Gardanne wrote in the book containing items of the great family events and the counsels of the ancestors: "Do not have an insatiable thirst for money. . . . Economy is virtue and wisdom. . . . Money is an abominable master, it ought to be only the servant." Toward the end of the century, John Baptist Garron de la Bévière wrote these lines, intended to be read by his sons: "Most men make their happiness consist in the possession of the goods of this life. . . . Solid happiness is in the peace of a good conscience." A merchant of Aix left to his descendants these last recommendations: "I recommend to my heirs that they ever keep God in view in whatever they do. . . . Solace the poor, frequent the sacraments. . . . Always have death and judgment before

your eyes." In 1728, following the death of the Regent, a country gentleman, drawing up the genealogy of his ancestors since 1433, added: "It may be that our family goes back beyond this; but it should suffice us that all our known ancestors were always upright people. . . . A good reputation is of greater value than 10,000 livre income." The family penetrated the administration itself. The Parliament of Provence wrote (February 17, 1774) to the King: "Each community among us is a family that governs itself, that imposes laws on itself, that watches over its interests; the municipal officer is the father of this family."

It is in one of these Christian families, which had preserved uprightness and piety from father to son, that Providence bestowed an offspring in 1748. This son would become the man who, at the very time when the most shameless license proclaimed its depravity in high places, carried contempt for the pleasures and goods of this world to its most extreme limits. Benedict Joseph Labre, born in the town of Amettes in the diocese of Boulogne, at first tried to embrace the perfect life at La Chartreuse and at La Trappe. He was destined to practice as a layman the most austere virtues of the religious. Having left the cloister, he went through the world as a pilgrim, edifying, France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, especially the city of Rome, by his humility, his patience, his charity, his mortification, his devotion to the Eucharist and to the Blessed Virgin. Under the rags that scarcely covered him, the face of this beggar shone with heavenly sweetness. He died at Rome on April 16, 1783. The funeral of this man, poor of his own accord, who had sought only obscurity and abjection, was a triumph such as the Eternal City had not witnessed for a long time.[41]

At the very time when the beggar of Amettes rendered his

[41] See Desnoyers, *Le Bienheureux Benoît-Joseph Labre;* Aubineau, *Le Bienheureux Labre;* Mantenay, *Saint Benoît Labre.*

soul to God, Madame Louise of France, daughter of Louis XV, was edifying the Carmel of St. Denis by the sight of the purest virtues.

On January 30, 1770, Archbishop de Beaumont, long the confidant of the desires and projects of the young princess, asked the King for his consent necessary for her entrance into religion. In the manuscript annals of St. Denis we read that the monarch, upon hearing the prelate's request, recoiled as from a blow, deeply moved. The Archbishop later declared that, if he had foreseen the painful emotion the King would feel, he would never have undertaken such a mission. Louis XV finally granted the permission. On September 10 of that same year, Madame Louise Marie de Bourbon was clothed in the habit of the daughters of St. Theresa, under the name of Sister Theresa of St. Augustine. For seventeen years the prayer of the holy nun and the fragrance of her virtues ascended to God as an intercession and a reparation. The noble daughter of France died December 23, 1787.[42] Two years later the Revolution began the series of its outrages.

[42] Grandmaison, *La Vénérable Louise de France.*

CHAPTER XVI

The Eastern Church During the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

THE great troubles that agitated the Church of the West were not without effect on the Eastern Church. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the latter went through one of the most stirring periods of its history.[1]

The Greek Orthodox Church

The most notable event in the history of the Eastern Church in the patriarchate of Constantinople is the resistance to the Protestant infiltrations, and finally the indirect triumph obtained by the Reformers once the period of strife was over. With the question of the rebaptism of the Latins, this event dominates the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[2]

We note the failure in 1452 of negotiations undertaken between the Hussites and the Greeks of Constantinople, perhaps at the initiative of the latter. In 1559 the patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II, charged the deacon Dimitrius to make inquiry at Wittemberg itself about the new Reform: the copy, in Greek translation, of the *Confession of Augsburg,* which Melanchthon sent to the patriarchal envoy, sufficed to enlighten Joseph II, who did not continue the relations any further.

[1] This chapter is owing to the collaboration of my dear friend and former student at the seminary of St. Sulpice, Father Cyril Karalevsky (Charon). He is the author of the great *Histoire des patriarcats melkites.*

[2] On the relations of the Greeks with the Protestants, see Schelstrate, *Acta orientalis Ecclesiae contra Lutheri haeresim* (1739). Cf. Kimmel, *Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis,* pp. 24–44. The acts of the Council of Jerusalem are in Hardouin, XI, 179–274.

On the other hand, a professor of Rostock, David Chytraeus, after dealings with some Greeks at Vienna in 1568, published at Wittemberg (1575) his *Oratio de statu Ecclesiarum in Graecia, Asia, Africa, Boemia.* In this work he tried to show the practices of the Greek Church as a confirmation of the Lutheran faith, while sharply attacking those which were too near the practices of the Latin Catholic Church. This *Oratio,* which he spread in Sweden, brought him into controversy with Father Antonius Possevinus, S.J., who was then engaged in the conversion of that kingdom. But the controversy was limited to a war of pamphlets.

In 1573 Jakob Andreae, chancellor of Tübingen University, with the collaboration of Martin Crusius (Kraus), professor at the same university, sent to Constantinople a Lutheran minister, Stephen Gerlach, bearing letters addressed to Patriarch Jeremias II, known for his theological science and uncommon courage.

Gerlach had a conference with the Patriarch and several members of his clergy. After long discussion, they separated without coming to a full agreement, in spite of the precautions which Gerlach took to attenuate, in the Protestant dogma, whatever might frighten away the Greeks.

Jeremias halted Protestantism at the door of the ecumenical patriarchate. Cyril Lukaris would permit it to enter. Born at Candia in Crete (November 13, 1572), he made his studies at Venice and Padua, where the disguised skepticism of his teachers made him lose his faith. Priest in 1594, vested with high offices by the Patriarch of Alexandria, he made several visits to Ruthenia during the period of the Union of Brest, and had a hand in negotiating the entente between Protestants and schismatics of Poland to wreck that very union. Suspected of Calvinism, in 1601 he had to make a profession of contrary belief, which subsequently was utilized by the Ruthenian Catholics. In 1602 he succeeded Meletius Pighas in the patriarchal

see of Alexandria and had himself elected to that of Constantinople on November 4, 1620. Until his death (June 27, 1638) he occupied the patriarchal throne seven different times, surpassed in this by no other occupant of that see, where the changes were so frequent.

The new Patriarch's well-known Calvinist leanings were evidently a great peril for the Greek Church. He had against him also the Holy See, which continually opposed him through the ambassadors of Venice, France, and Austria. And these ambassadors themselves were urged on by their sovereigns. Lukaris, on the contrary, had in his favor England and Holland. A first time he was removed from the patriarchate in the last days of April, 1623, and was replaced by Gregory IV of Amasia. In reality, he had already been elected (1612), but was forced to retire almost at once before the opposition of numerous bishops. Gregory was not able to pay in full to the Turks the customary tribute money. After being in the patriarchate two months, he yielded his place to Anthimus II of Adrianople, who remained in the see only three months. The ambassador of Holland succeeded in having Cyril come back from his exile in Rhodes.

Scarcely returned to Constantinople, Lukaris set to work spreading Calvinist catechisms written by hand, and he prepared a profession of faith altogether Protestant, which appeared in 1629 in Latin, probably at Geneva.[3] At an early date reprinted several times in different languages, it made a stir and provoked a number of protests; however, its authenticity is doubtful. In 1630 Isaac of Chalcedon succeeded in having himself named patriarch; but Lukaris had him sent away to Caesarea and recovered the power until October, 1633. At that date Cyril Kontaris, metropolitan of Berrhoea in Macedonia, overthrew him for eight days only; in March, 1634, it was the turn of Athanasius Patellaros, metropolitan of Thessalonica.

[3] Greek text in Michalcescu, pp. 267–76.

In June, Lukaris returned, but was chased out again the next March by Cyril of Berrhoea. It would have been easy to remove the Calvinist patriarch to some Christian country and to hold him under guard: such was the advice of Propaganda. But the blundering of Cyril of Berrhoea spoiled the plan.

However, Lukaris remained in exile. But this continual change of patriarchs finally involved the treasury of the Church of Constantinople in serious debt. A regulation in eight articles was drawn up to remedy the situation. When Cyril of Berrhoea, unwilling to conform to these regulations, deposed Lukaris, who nevertheless still counted some followers, the Holy Synod revolted against him and overthrew him in June, 1636. The ambassador of Holland, unable to restore Lukaris at once, put in Cyril's place the metropolitan of Heraclea, Neophytus, who remained in office until March, 1637, the date when Lukaris began his seventh and last patriarchate. Thanks to the assistance of Rome and of the Emperor of Germany, Cyril of Berrhoea succeeded in finally overthrowing his rival in June, 1638. To be quite rid of him, Cyril had Lukaris strangled, or at any rate let him be strangled, by the Turks on the 27th of the same month. On September 24 of that year a synod solemnly condemned all the errors of Lukaris. Much inclined to Catholicism, Cyril of Berrhoea even made a Catholic profession of faith but was deposed in the midst of numerous intrigues and was strangled by order of his successor, Parthenius I (July, 1639).[4]

The influence of Cyril Lukaris, however, lasted for a long time in the Greek Orthodox Church. Parthenius II (1644–46) showed his favor to the Calvinists and exiled Meletius Syrigos. Then profound troubles disturbed the patriarchate. In consequence of this upset condition there were no less than ten

[4] Besides his catechism and his confession of faith, Cyril Lukaris undertook to give the Greek people the first complete translation of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. In this work he conformed to the ideas received among the Protestants.

successive patriarchates from 1646 to 1657, the date of Parthenius III's election. Meanwhile all these discussions were lost sight of. But Protestantism gradually infiltrated into Orthodox theology, even so far as to change it profoundly on many points.

Outside of Constantinople the strife continued. In 1668 a synod was held on the island of Cyprus, the Archbishop presiding, to condemn again the doctrines of Lukaris. But the most important and most famous event, apart from the conferences of Iassi and the collective letter of the Eastern patriarchs in 1643, was the council that met at Jerusalem in 1672, convoked by Patriarch Dositheus, following the restoration of the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. Besides Dositheus, there took part in this council the former patriarch Nectarius and seventy-one Greek bishops or clerics. The acts of this council [5] consist essentially of three parts: a letter addressed to all Orthodox Christians on the subject of the Protestant errors, a long exposition of the controverted points, divided into chapters, and the so-called *Confession of Dositheus,* rightly regarded as one of the most important monuments of Greek creedal writings. Dositheus played a considerable part in the condemnation issued by the patriarch of Constantinople, Callinicus II, in 1691, of the errors of a disciple of Theophilus Korydaleus, a certain John Karyophyllis, who denied transubstantiation, and in particular the use of the Greek word to express it.[6]

The holding of the Synod of Jerusalem was owing in large part to the influence of the Marquis of Nointel, ambassador of France to the Porte since 1670. This was the same Marquis, a friend of the gentlemen of Port Royal, who used with all his might to obtain the numerous attestations of Eastern prelates which adorn the celebrated *Perpétuité de la foi.* Almost all the

[5] Text in Michalcescu or in Hardouin, XI, 179–274.

[6] Text in Gédéon, Κανόνικαι διατάξεις, I, 99–105.

communities of the East figure in it. This zeal did not prevent Nointel from being later disgraced by the King.[7]

In fact, the habit which the Orthodox clergy had of going for studies to the Protestant universities of Germany or England, the influence of Peter the Great, who was imbued with the principles of the Reformers by his tutor the Genevan Lefort, the school of Theophane Prokopovitch and of all those who followed him, finally reacted on the doctrine of the Orthodox Church. For her the ordinary magisterium, in the sense in which we other Catholics understand the term, is the ecumenical council. But, for the Orthodox, for a thousand years there has been no such council, and the Orthodox theologians are not agreed about the value to be attributed to the different creeds spoken of above. The ancient hierarchical idea has been replaced by Holy Synods in Russia, Greece, Rumania, and Serbia, exactly copying the Protestant consistories. Moreover, the doctrine has changed: the deuterocanonical books, which until the seventeenth century were accepted as inspired by the Greeks and the Russians, are no longer so regarded.[8] The notion of the satisfaction value of penances imposed by the priest in connection with confession has been completely changed. We may note further many other infiltrations caused as much by the Protestant influence as by the determined intention to deny vigorously whatever the Roman Church affirms: the Immaculate Conception, accepted by the Greeks and the Russians in the seventeenth century but today rejected; the coming of St. Peter to Rome, now denied and even removed from the liturgical books, at least by the Greeks; and so on.

The last discussion of any importance that occurred in the

[7] The relations between Greeks and Protestants gave rise to several interesting documents for theologians, dating from the same period. See Mansi, XXXVII, 453–471.

[8] See Jugie, *Histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise grecque et l'Eglise russe.*

patriarchate of Constantinople in the eighteenth century referred to the validity of the Latin and Armenian baptism, otherwise known as baptism by infusion, opposed to that by immersion. We know that the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, which had been denied in Africa, was, on the contrary, always admitted by the Roman Church, provided the Trinitarian formula was kept. In the East we see at an early date the formation of two currents of doctrine: some accepting the teaching of Rome whereas others agreed rather with the African practice. However, as regards the baptism of the Latins, Photius, though rejecting the rite of infusion, said nothing that leads us to think he regarded the baptism thus conferred as null; Michael Cerularius likewise. Here and there we find texts showing that certain Greeks, after the Schism, rebaptized Latins who passed over to Orthodoxy, but these are isolated instances, as is evident from other texts of Greek theologians of the Middle Ages, who do not even raise the question. In the Council of Florence this problem was not even taken up, an evidence that it did not exist. As a fact, in 1484 Patriarch Simeon of Trebizond required merely the anointing with holy chrism after the profession of faith, and Cyprian of Constantinople (1708–9) without hesitation admitted the validity of the Latin baptism; in a reply to Peter the Great, Jeremias III (1716–26) held the same view. The anti-Catholic Synod of Constantinople of 1722 does not speak of the matter at all.[9]

In Russia we see some instances of rebaptism in the early Middle Ages; but these evidently arose from the ignorance of certain priests who confused an accessory rite with the essential. It was through fanaticism that the patriarch of Moscow, Philaret Nikitich, in the synod of 1620, ordered the rebaptism of all Catholics who should pass over to Orthodoxy, whether they were of the Latin rite or of the Oriental rite. In any event,

[9] Mansi, XXXVII, 127–207.

that decision was overruled by the decision of the great Synod of Moscow of 1667. Since then the Russian Church has always admitted the validity of the Latin baptism. The Orthodox profession of faith and the anointing with holy chrism suffice for reception into Orthodoxy.

In 1750 a Greek hermit, Auxentius by name, living in the little village of Katirli near Ismidt (Nicomedia), had acquired renown for holiness, real or supposed, for on this point the Greek sources themselves do not agree. Wishing to increase his popularity, he began to preach against the Latins and to teach that their baptism was invalid. Patriarch Cyril V (1748–51) secretly supported him. His successor tried to repress Auxentius.[10] The latter ended by stirring up the beginning of a sedition. The Turks, deciding to rid themselves of him, sent him to Constantinople, and during the voyage drowned him in the Propontis or Sea of Marmora (September 5, 1752). The Sultan then put Cyril V back on the patriarchal throne, which he occupied once more from 1752 to 1757. In January, 1755, he published an encyclical in which he declared as null all the sacraments of the Latins.[11] But the bishops of the Holy Synod, who did not share his view, publicly condemned a pamphlet directed against Latin baptism (April 28, 1755),[12] and re-established the true doctrine of the Orthodox Church. Patriarch Cyril, enraged, obtained an order of the Porte to send all the bishops back to their eparchies, and then he himself, the next July, published a new sentence of condemnation of Latin baptism, which he had signed by Matthew of Alexandria and Parthenius of Jerusalem.[13] Officially the Church of Constantinople still holds to this decision, in spite of the protests of many of its theologians.[14]

[10] *Ibid.*, XXXVIII, 587–605.
[11] *Ibid.*, cols. 605–9.
[12] *Ibid.*, cols. 609–17.
[13] *Ibid.*, cols. 617–21.
[14] *Ibid.*, cols. 621–27, 629–33.

The Church of Constantinople

From the internal point of view, the most striking fact of the history of the Greek Church of Constantinople is the considerable number of patriarchs succeeding one another in that see. With Matthew II (1598–1602), according to the chronology established by Father Simeon Vailhé, we reach the 161st patriarch and the 188th patriarchate, for it sometimes happened that the same person occupied the see four, five, six, and even seven different times. A recent patriarch, Joachim III, who remained in office more than ten years, was an exception to the usual practice, that an ecumenical patriarch was removed at the end of about four years of office. With Neophytus VII (1798–1801), who closed the eighteenth century, we reach the 213th patriarch and the 278th patriarchate, which gives us 90 patriarchates and 52 patriarchs in the space of two hundred years. We find few sees with such mobility of its titularies.

The jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch extended as far north and west as the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire of that time: this principle, which served as a pretext for the greatness of the Church of Constantinople, is the principle regulating its increase, then its decline. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the patriarch of Constantinople exercised authority over Thrace, Macedonia, Albania, and Epirus, as far as Scutari and Montenegro, a region now forming Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Rumania, the islands of the Archipelago, Crete, Asia Minor to the boundaries of the patriarchate of Antioch, that is, the Cilician Taurus and the Antitaurus to Diarbekir. As to the hierarchical titles at the end of the seventeenth century, there were 63 metropolitan sees, 18 autocephalous archbishoprics, that is, exempt sees dependent directly on the ecumenical patriarch without the intermediary of any metropolitan, and from 66 to 70 suffragans of a few metropolitans; in all about 150 eparchies or dioceses. The general tendency,

in disregard of all canon law, is to transform little by little all the episcopal or archiepiscopal sees into metropolitans.

The Patriarchate of the South

Of the four Greek patriarchates of the East, that of Constantinople, in spite of its disturbed history, still shows some life. The Church of Egypt sank long since: the only Christians of the country, apart from a few Greeks, are Monophysites, whose history is still enveloped with too much obscurity to enable us to present any summary of it. The Greek patriarchate of Alexandria is scarcely more than a title, and the prelates who have been vested with it are more often on the shores of the Bosphorus than on the banks of the Nile. Their names have been mixed in all the Calvinist quarrels. In the country itself, the hierarchy, counting ten ecclesiastical provinces in the sixth century, with a considerable number of suffragan bishoprics, in 1715 was reduced to four metropolitans without suffragans, of whom at most one or two resided intermittently, and with about ten churches for the whole patriarchate.[15] We have to wait until the nineteenth century for immigration to give a little luster to that desolated Church.

At Jerusalem the three metropolitan sees and the fifty-five bishoprics existing in the fifth century were reduced in 1709 to six metropolitans, seven archbishops, and one bishop: but many of these prelates resided in the Greek monasteries of the Holy City; at most four of them lived in their eparchies. Another, that of Sinai, half-independent, lived in his monastery, which, with two or three fishing villages, formed his entire flock.[16] But this Church, however poor in the number of its faithful, was rich in landed property. The patriarchs and bishops often went begging in Walachia, Ruthenia, and Muscovy:

[15] Cf. Charon, *op. cit.*, III, 214–21.
[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 261–67, 352.

they brought back large sums. The revenues from this immense landed property, which did not arouse the cupidity of the governments until the nineteenth century, passed into the hands of the Hagiographic Confraternity, a sort of Eastern religious order, organized in the sixteenth century and composed solely of Greeks recruited in all the islands of the Archipelago, Greece, Europe, and Asia. The natives, the "Arabs" as they were contemptuously called, that is, the autochthonous Melchites, were rigidly excluded; all the dignitaries of the patriarchate, all the members of the hierarchy, were taken from its membership. The "Arabs" were allowed to furnish merely village priests. Conditions have not changed since that time.

Such was the system inaugurated in 1534 by Patriarch Germanus II the Peloponnesian (1534–79), consolidated by Sophronius V (1579–1608), a Greek of the Peloponnesus like his predecessor Theophanes IV (1608–45), who re-established the schismatic hierarchy in Ruthenia, and who nevertheless was able to deceive his time so well that for a moment Propaganda believed in his Catholic feelings. Paisee II (1645–61), administrator of the "dedicated goods" of Walachia, succeeded in having himself recognized only by force, thanks to the money he lavished on the Turks. Nectarius (1661–69), former archbishop of Sinai, occupied the patriarchal throne only transiently. Dositheus II (1669–1707) was certainly one of the most remarkable prelates of Hellenism in the seventeenth century. Born in 1641 at Arakhova, not far from Corinth, he became a deacon at the age of eleven, entered the service of Paisee of Jerusalem, then of Nectarius, and was consecrated by him in 1666, when twenty-five years old, metropolitan of Caesarea. The Holy Synod of Constantinople, petitioned by Nectarius at his resignation to give him a successor, chose Dositheus in 1669. He was then only twenty-eight years old. As soon as he was chosen, he made a journey to Walachia and brought back from there enough funds to pay part of the debts of his see. In 1671

he rebuilt the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, and the next year convoked the synod against the Protestants, of which we have spoken above. He took a notable part in the secular strife between the Greeks and the Franciscans for the possession of the holy places, with alternating success and reverse, and withstood the Reformers that arose in the bosom of Greek Orthodoxy, like John Karyophyllis and others. He also intervened in the affairs of the Russian Church. During his long patriarchate of thirty-eight years, he saw nineteen different occupants of the see of Constantinople come and go. His overshadowing of the highest authorities of Orthodoxy, his real learning, no less than his undeniable fanaticism and his hatred of the Latins, put him in the front rank of the Greeks of his time. At his death at Constantinople (February 6, 1707), besides other writings he left four large works. One of these, the *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem,* an unmethodical compilation of almost universal Church history, has 1240 pages in folio, in fine print, including the additions of his nephew and successor, Chrysanthus. The generous hospodars of Walachia met the expense of publishing all these works, in which each page shows the deep hatred of the schismatic full of prejudices and bitterness. They were distributed gratis.[17]

Chrysanthus (1707–31) was also a great adversary of the Latins of Palestine and, like Dositheus, he published several works, somewhat less violent in tone. But the whole intellectual activity of these patriarchs was viewed from the side of the Greeks: nothing was done for the natives. The frequent sojourns of the Jerusalem Church authorities at Constantinople brought about the almost entire dependence of their see on the Holy Synod of the capital. Chrysanthus' successors—Meletius (1731–37), Parthenius (1737–66), Ephrem (1766–70), and so on to the end of the century—were elected at Constantinople, not at Jerusalem.

[17] Cf. Palmieri, *Dositeo, patriarca greco di Gerusalemme.*

The patriarchate of Antioch for a longer time resisted the Hellenic influence. The native Melchites, Syrians by race and language, had almost entirely lost contact with Hellenism and had translated into Syriac and then into Arabic, the books of the Byzantine liturgy when they adopted it.[18] After the conquest of Syria by the Ottomans (1536), the patriarchs of Antioch abandoned that city and established their residence at Damascus. Of about 150 metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops of the sixth century, just before the Arab conquest, there remained, in 1715, 17 sees, all residential, and many of them were still occupied by native Melchites.[19]

This quiet and mild population was plunged into schism more by the absence of relations with Rome than by its formal fault. Meletius Karme, archbishop of Aleppo from 1612 to 1635, became patriarch under the name of Euthymius that same year. He revised the Arabic version of the liturgical books which then supplanted the Syriac version, entered into relations with Propaganda concerning the printing of the Arabic Bible which was then being done at Rome, and finally sent his priest Pachomius to make his profession of Catholic faith and to accept the Council of Florence in his name. But he died in 1635, before he was able to sign the formula that Rome sent to him.

In 1626 two Jesuit fathers founded a mission at Aleppo. Its beginnings were hampered by two great difficulties that came to them especially from missioners already established in the region. Euthymius Karme had been succeeded by a monk, a Greek of Chios, named Eutychius Saqzi (1635–48), then by Archbishop Meletius Zaim of Aleppo, under the name of Macarius III (1648–72). Well educated, but crafty and knowing how to take advantage of every situation, Macarius cleverly maneuvered between the Jesuits and the party favoring the Catholic Church, which their preaching was beginning to form,

[18] Charon, *op. cit.*, III, 1–54.
[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 227–32, 237–41.

and the other Eastern patriarchs. Twice he went to Russia, where he took part in the condemnation of Nikon, patriarch of Moscow, had a share in all the great manifestations of Orthodoxy in his time, and yet succeeded in making people believe in his pretended Catholic feelings. Married before entering holy orders, he managed to win the good graces of the Pasha of Damascus, who at his death was succeeded by his grandson Constantine, then fifteen years old, under the name of Cyril V. But the Holy Synod of Constantinople, to which the bishops of the patriarchate had appealed the matter, designated in his place Neophytus Saqzi, bishop of Hama, relative of the patriarch Eutychius. Apparently Neophytus died in 1686. The patriarchate was then divided between Cyril V Zaim, who resided at Damascus, and Athanasius IV Dabbas, who lived at Aleppo. Each of these men sought to supplant the other. Finally they agreed to divide the patriarchate between them.

The mission of the Jesuits bore its fruits, since Father Queyrot, brought to Damascus by Euthymius Karme, there began gradually to arouse a movement sympathetic toward Rome. This movement was so strong that Cyril V made his profession of Catholic faith in 1717. Sylvester Dahan, metropolitan of Beyrouth, had preceded him in 1701; Euthymius Saifi, metropolitan of Tyre, probably nephew of the Patriarch Euthymius Karme, a pupil of Father Queyrot, consecrated by Cyril V in 1683, had always been Catholic. Other bishops were more or less favorable to the union; and when Cyril V died in 1720 and Athanasius IV Dabbas was sole master of the patriarchate, this latter was earnestly urged to declare himself for Rome. At Damascus and at Aleppo especially, the people were mostly Catholic. Athanasius IV was at bottom convinced of the truth of Catholicism; but, having been always mixed up in the Hellenic Orthodox world, he continually trimmed his sails, and even readily signed the famous anti-Catholic synod of Con-

stantinople in 1722.[20] This synod had been convoked especially at the instigation of Chrysanthus of Jerusalem. However, at his death (July 28, 1724) he retracted and made profession of Catholic faith.

The Melchites

Without loss of time, the Catholics of Damascus elected as patriarch the nephew of Euthymius Saifi, the priest Seraphim Tanas, under the name of Cyril VI. The newly elected, though not without ambition, was sincerely Catholic: he had been educated at Rome, at the college of the Propaganda. But the Greeks of Phanar did everything possible to overthrow him: a synodal sentence of December, 1724, declared him an intruder. In his place was chosen a Greek of Cyprus, Sylvester, animated with fanaticism against the Catholics. Cyril VI had to flee to Lebanon, where his successors resided for more than a hundred years.

A sharp strife ensued between the two rivals. Propaganda made every attempt, through the ambassadors of France and Austria, to have the sultan recognize Cyril alone; then to have Cyril recognized by the Catholics, and Sylvester by the schismatics. The attempt failed. Southern Syria, half independent under the domination of the emirs of Lebanon, in part converted to Christianity, inclined toward Catholicism; the northern part, except Aleppo, more directly under the hand of the Turkish pashas sold to the Phanariotes, remained Orthodox. A double hierarchy was formed. But, while the Catholic patriarchs of Antioch, successors of Cyril VI, were all native Melchites, those of Sylvester were like him Greeks. Not until our day did the Orthodox, aided by Russian influence, force the Greeks to give way to them.

However, Cyril VI, elected in 1724, was not confirmed by

[20] The text in Mansi, XXXVII, 127–207.

Rome until 1729, and did not receive the pallium until 1744. The reason for the delay was to be found in the arbitrary modifications, introduced in the discipline and the rite by Euthymius Saifi, his uncle, which the nephew had also adopted. At Rome, the authorities required the exact observance of the Greek rite and were unwilling to yield on this point to the demands of the Orthodox. The constitution of Benedict XIV, *Demandatam caelitus* (December 24, 1743), has remained as celebrated for the East as the bull *Unigenitus* for the West.

Catholic propaganda was powerfully aided by the establishment of the two monasteries of St. John of Shuweir (1697) and St. Savior (at the beginning of the eighteenth century) in the eparchies (dioceses) of Beyrouth and Saida. The monks adopted the form of the Western congregations, with a general, chapters, the Rule of St. Basil, and, at least for the Shuweirites, approved constitutions. But, once the period of persecutions was passed, they soon fell into decay. The secular clergy, reduced to some village pastors, married priests, did not revive with the practice of celibacy until much later.

Cyril VI abdicated without consulting the Holy See in 1759, designating for his successor his nephew, whom he consecrated bishop under the name of Athanasius Jauhar. He himself died in 1760. But Rome refused to recognize this election and designated in his place Maximus Hakim, archbishop of Aleppo (1760–61). At Maximus' death the bishops chose Athanasius Dahan, metropolitan of Beyrouth, under the name of Theodosius VI (1761–88). Athanasius Jauhar tried again to seize the patriarchate, but Rome intervened and succeeded in putting him down; he managed to become patriarch only at the death of Theodosius VI, and occupied the see from 1789 to 1794. In 1790 he assembled at the monastery of St. Savior a council that gave the Melchite Church a more precise legislation; but this council was not approved at Rome. After Cyril VII Siaj

(1794–96), the Catholic Melchite see was occupied by Agapios III Matar (1796–1812), under whose pontificate Jansenism and Gallicanism succeeded in being introduced into Syria, again retarding for a long time the real progress of the Melchite community.

The person most culpable in this affair was Germanus Adam, bishop of Acre, then metropolitan of Aleppo, an archiepiscopal see raised in 1790 by the council of St. Savior to the dignity of a metropolitan see. Born at Aleppo in 1738, he made his studies at the Propaganda from 1754 to 1765. He acquired extensive knowledge, which resulted in his receiving the see of St. John of Acre in 1774, then being transferred to Aleppo in 1777. He never resided in that city on account of the persecutions, but in Lebanon, whence by letters he directed his eparchy while mixing actively in the ecclesiastical affairs of Syria. He enjoyed the confidence of the Holy See, which even delegated him to a Maronite synod. But, having lost a futile affair which he himself brought before the Propaganda in 1796, he conceived a bitter resentment against Rome. Upon his return he passed through Tuscany where he made close connections with Scipio Ricci, the famous bishop of Pistoia and Prato, adopting all his ideas, as well as those of the French Gallicans. His tendencies made considerable stir, but the whole Melchite nation regarded him as an oracle. Sharp controversies followed: all the Catholic communities of Syria were involved. In 1806 the patriarch Agapios Matar convoked a synod at the monastery of St. Anthony of Qarqafe; Germanus was the heart of this assembly and filled it with his spirit. He died in 1809; all his writings, mostly unpublished, but copied by hand, were condemned by Gregory XVI in 1835, at the same time as the Council of Qarqafe, when it attempted to confirm the election to the patriarchate of his chosen disciple, Maximus Mazloum. Adam's influence lasted for a long time after his death, and the ideas of

withdrawal from Rome, which he had largely helped to preserve or to spread, have been overcome only in our day.[21]

The Maronites

The other Eastern Churches, contrary to the Melchite Church, still remain for us plunged in obscurity so far as any serious history of them is concerned. No systematic and critical work has yet been written on the Maronites, the Syrians, even the Armenians, although this nation possesses a rich ancient and modern literature. Hence I limit myself to a few words on each of these groups.

1. The Maronites, so named from the monastery of St. Maron on the banks of the Orontes, which in the eighth century became the center of Monothelitism in Syria, were at that period separated from the Orthodox Church of Antioch. Thenceforth they were called the Melchite Church, and they were given a bishop, then a patriarch who, in imitation of his Jacobite colleague, took the title of Antioch. In relations with the crusaders, they had in part embraced the Catholic faith, perhaps all of them, and apparently fell back into their heresy and consequently into separation from Rome. In the sixteenth century their final conversion took place, thanks largely to the missions of the celebrated Father Eliano, S.J.

In 1584 Gregory XIII founded the Maronite College at Rome, and about fifty years later a second college of that nation was installed by the Propaganda at Ravenna. In the college at Rome several distinguished men were trained, who rendered eminent service to the Catholic Church and to Syriac and Arabic letters: Abraham 'el Haqlani, better known under his Latinized name of Abraham Ecchellensis, who died at Rome in 1664 at a very advanced age, after collaborating in the Polyglot of Le Jay at Paris, and in the Arabic Bible printed by the Propaganda at

[21] The Melkite councils since 1720 will be found in Mansi, Vol. XLVI.

Rome in 1671. He was also the author of more than a dozen interesting works, in which, however, the critical sense is sometimes lacking in consequence of his not having had a long preliminary preparation.

This same remark can be applied also to many other Eastern scholars of that period and even of a period closer to us. We must also mention Gabriel Sionita, Victor Sciala, and Faustus Nairon, contemporaries of Abraham; in the next century, the members of the famous Assemani family: Joseph Simeon (1687–1768), prefect of the Vatican Library and titular metropolitan of Tyre, a fine type of Oriental scholar, who, under Clement XI, enriched the Vatican with a considerable number of Syriac, Arabic, and Greek manuscripts and became immortal by the publication of his *Bibliotheca Orientalis,* devoted to the literary works of the Jacobite Syrians, the Melchite Syrians, the Maronite Syrians, and the Eastern Syrians or Chaldeo-Nestorians; a rich mine where there is always something more to be found while taking account of the works written in our own day. His nephew Stephanus Evodius, or Awwad, made the catalogue of the Oriental manuscripts of the Vatican and of the Laurentiana of Florence (1709–1782). Another nephew, Josephus Aloysius (1710–82), is the author of the *Codex liturgicus Ecclesiae universae,* an unfinished work. The last of the family is Simeon Assemani (1752–1821), an esteemed scholar, although less celebrated than the preceding.

The Maronite scholars of this period, though deserving of praise, have not resisted the temptation to exalt their nation extravagantly. But this defect is common to all the Orientals. They made every effort to accredit the legend of the perpetual orthodoxy of the Maronites. Only in our time has this legend been shown to be utterly false.

The inner history of the Maronite Church is rather unknown. Confined to Lebanon, where they emigrated at an early date, half independent of the Porte, the Maronites have thus been

able to preserve their Christian faith without great persecutions, as also to give asylum to others. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries they made considerable changes in the liturgy, bringing it closer to the Latin rite. This move was a mistake. It is true that at that period concern over these questions was not as great as it is today. The vague state of discipline occasioned endless quarrels between the patriarch and the bishops. The latter did not have a fixed residence or even dioceses with definite boundaries. Moreover, they were looked upon as auxiliaries of the patriarch rather than as residential prelates. To remedy these and many other evils, in 1736 the celebrated Libanese Synod was held in the monastery of Louaise near Beyrouth, the Patriarch and Joseph Simeon Assemani presiding.

The Syrian Church

The seventeenth century also saw the formation of a Syrian Catholic Church, that is, the return of part of the Jacobite Syrians. The union which they concluded at Florence had been merely ephemeral. The sixteenth century witnessed a few attempts without serious results. At Aleppo the establishment of the Carmelites, Jesuits, and Capuchins gave a fresh prospect to the Catholic propaganda: a considerable group of Jacobites were converted and received a bishop in the person of Andrew Akidiian, a former student of the Maronite college at Rome, in 1656. When the Jacobite patriarch died, the converts, called Catholic Syrians, elected Andrew patriarch: he addressed his profession of faith to the Holy See in 1661. But the Jacobites did not look upon this promotion with favorable eyes, and their patriarch, Abd-el-Messiah, obtained from the Porte a firman against the successor of Andrew, a certain Peter, former Jacobite bishop of Jerusalem, who had been converted by the Patriarch Andrew and a Jesuit father, his confessor. Patriarch Peter succeeded, however, in obtaining a

counterorder and in being left in almost peaceful possession of the Church of Aleppo. But in 1687, at the instigation of a new Jacobite patriarch, George Mossul, the persecution began again, and Peter died in prison in 1701. For almost the whole eighteenth century the Catholic Syrians, in spite of the efforts of Propaganda, were unable to elect a religious chief and had to turn to the ministry of the Latin missioners.

In 1736 Michael Jarue was born at Aleppo of a Jacobite family. Ordained heretical priest in 1737, he started with great zeal to imitate the Catholics in everything. Father François Gausset, Jesuit, succeeded in converting him in 1760: this conversion was kept secret. Jarue, consecrated bishop of Aleppo by the Jacobite patriarch George II, made preparations to declare his conversion openly and to bring along with him the greater part of his flock. George III, successor of George II, having wind of this, kept him for four years in the distant monastery of Deir-az-Zafaran near Mardin, the residence of the Jacobite patriarchs. At last Jarue escaped, returned to Aleppo, renewed his profession of Catholic faith, and was confirmed in his episcopal see by Rome. The Jacobite patriarch tried unsuccessfully to recover the Church of Aleppo from him, then managed to drive him out. He died in 1781. At once most of the bishops assembled at Mardin chose Jarue for patriarch: two opponents formed an opposition party and a fierce strife followed. Jarue remained alone with four faithful bishops while the other party elected an antipatriarch and appealed to the protection of the Gregorian Armenian patriarch (not Catholic) of Constantinople. After many vicissitudes, Jarue, disguised as a Bedouin, fled to Syria; his bishops reached Aleppo and Egypt. Jarue established himself, in the greatest poverty, in a ruined monastery of the Kesrawan and finally acquired that of Charfe, not far from Beyrouth, where he established the patriarchal see of the Catholic Syrians. Owing to his indomitable energy, he managed to direct his scattered flock more or less successfully,

while waiting for better days. He died September 16, 1800, in the odor of sanctity. He is the real founder of the Catholic Syrian Church.

The Chaldeans

Farther east lived the Chaldeans, a branch detached from the Nestorians in the sixteenth century, after some previous relations with the Sovereign Pontiffs. In 1551, at the death of the Nestorian catholicos, Simeon V, a competition brought to the "see of the East," as it was usually called, the archimandrite of the monastery of Rabban Hormizd, John Sulaka, who went to Rome to be consecrated by Julius III. He was put to death in 1555 by the Pasha of Diarbekir, but his bishops then elected Abdisho, who set out at once for the West to seek his confirmation at Rome. There he received the pallium; he even assisted (December 4, 1563) at the final session of the Council of Trent. Until about 1675 the series of the catholicoi united to Rome followed one another without interruption. At that period the Union seems to have been abandoned. The other succession of catholicoi which was formed in 1551 with Simeon bar Mama, the opponent of Sulaka, remained mostly Nestorian, although many of them, between 1607 and 1660, made their profession of Catholic faith. The patriarchate of the Nestorians was then divided into two branches, its titulars residing respectively at Kotchannes and at Alkosch. The last of the Alkosch series died in 1775 and had no successor, for his nephew, who was to succeed him, Mar Hanna, became a Catholic. The series of Kotchannes catholicoi still continues: it is that of the Nestorians.

An appendix of the Chaldean Church was formed by the Christians of St. Thomas on the Malabar coast in India. The Nestorian missions had been very prosperous during the Middle Ages and included Christian centers not only in India and the island of Ceylon, but also in what now forms Russian

Turkestan and in China. Peking was the see of a metropolitan, and the famous Christian inscription of Si-ngan-fou is of Nestorian origin.

The Armenians

Although at different periods there had been Armenian patriarchs, either of Sis or of Etchmiadzin or of isolated groups in communion with Rome, the foundation of a Catholic Armenian Church does not go back beyond the eighteenth century. Bishop Tazbas Melkoun of Mardin, a former Propaganda student, inculcated Catholic principles in Abraham Ardzivian, born at Ain-Tab in 1679. Abraham was ordained priest by the catholicos of Sis, Peter, in 1706, and was consecrated bishop by him in 1710. A Catholic from childhood, he was dispensed from pronouncing the anathema against the Council of Chalcedon. Thus he and his consecrator were subjected to numerous persecutions on the part of the Armenian patriarchs of Constantinople. When freed, he continued his apostolate at Mardin, Diarbekir, and Orfa (Edessa), but he had to withdraw to the Lebanon. There, with the help of some young Armenians of Aleppo, at the monastery of Kreim he founded the Order of the Armenian Antonines, which presently assumed considerable development. In 1740 he was able to return to Aleppo and there continue his preaching. With the assistance of two Catholic Melchite bishops, he gave himself a coadjutor, then consecrated two other bishops for Killis and Mardin.

In 1737, Luke, the catholicos of Sis, died in communion with Rome. As his successor remained a heretic, the three Catholic bishops in 1740 set up Abraham in opposition to him. Two years later Benedict XIV confirmed this election and the new patriarch received the pallium at Rome. Upon leaving Rome, he wished to establish his see at Constantinople or in Egypt or even at Damascus, but he was unsuccessful in this endeavor and had to return to Ker Kreim in Lebanon. There he died a

holy death in 1749. His successor, James Hovsepian, removed the pathiarchal see to Bzommar, close to the Syrian monastery of Charfe, where he remained until 1867. From Bzommar the patriarchs of Cilicia, the province where Sis was situated, directed the dioceses spread through Asia Minor, except Constantinople. In this city the Catholics of the Armenian rite were subject to the Latin patriarchal vicar; but both of them in civil matters before the Porte were dependent on the Gregorian patriarch of the capital. The latter persecuted the Catholics, and this situation created numerous difficulties and disputes over the question whether the Catholics could lawfully attend the heretical churches. Rome decided clearly against such practice, in spite of the efforts of the celebrated John of Serpos. The Catholic Armenians did not have religious peace until 1831.

All these persecutions forced them to seek a support outside of Turkey. Mechitar of Sivas or Sebaste, born in 1676, was ordained deacon at the age of fifteen. After long journeys through the East, in 1700 he formed a plan for a congregation that would engage solely in promoting the Catholic faith among the Armenians. With a few companions he opened a printing establishment, but soon afterward had to leave the capital and seek refuge in a Christian land. He chose the Peloponnesus (Morea), then in the power of the Venetians, and founded a monastery at Modon. At the time of the Turkish invasion (1715) he had to flee again, and sought refuge at Venice. In 1717 the Most Serene Republic permitted the Armenian monks to establish themselves on the island of St. Lazare which was ceded to them in perpetuity. He was able to accomplish the construction of the new monastery, completed in 1740. He died in 1749 at the age of seventy-four. He gave to his monks, with the name of Antonines, the Rule of St. Benedict and their own constitutions. The services they rendered to science and to the apostolate of the press are incalculable. However, a disagree-

ment over questions regarding the monastic constitutions soon arose and, toward the end of the century (1772–73), a colony, under the leadership of Babik, went first to Triest, then to Vienna, to found a separate community that kept the same rules and the same name of Mekhitaristes, but with a distinct organization: it also rendered and still renders valuable services.

The Copts

There is little to be said about the Coptic Church of Egypt. The Union of Florence was ephemeral for this Church as for the others, though several patriarchs had correspondence with Pius IV and Gregory XIII. In 1582, thanks to the Jesuit missions, a council met at Memphis, and Patriarch John XIII again concluded a union with the Roman Church. But the day before the signing of the decrees, he died suddenly, probably poisoned, and the schismatic party nullified this attempt. In 1593 Patriarch Gabriel VIII, John's successor, made profession of Catholic faith and renewed it expressly two years later through an envoy he sent to Rome.

When the Franciscans were established in Egypt at the close of the seventeenth century, a few Catholics were still there. In 1731 Clement XII granted to the Coptic and Ethiopian monks the monastery of St. Stephen, situated near the Vatican, but this was rather a hospice for the pilgrims who came to Rome. That same year this Pope had a dozen young men admitted to the College of Propaganda, with a view to training the nucleus of a native clergy. In fact, in 1741, under Benedict XIV, the Coptic bishop of Jerusalem, Athanasius, embraced the Catholic faith and was made administrator of the faithful of his rite in Egypt. However, he never saw his flock, as he continued to reside at Jerusalem and was represented at Cairo by a vicar. About the same period Raphael Tuki, consecrated titular bishop of Arsinoe, passed most of his life at Rome and

there published the first printed edition of the principal liturgical books. He died in April, 1772. Athanasius of Jerusalem disappeared at the same period and was replaced by John Farargi, titular bishop of Hypsopolis. The bishop of Girgeh, Anthony Flaifel, became a convert, but had to come to Rome, where he died at a very advanced age early in the nineteenth century. John Farargi never received episcopal consecration. His successor, Matthew Righet, vicar apostolic of the Copts from 1788 to 1822, was in the same case.

The Ethiopians

Ever since the Copts had been led into heresy and schism, the Ethiopians had no relations with Catholicity. In 1546, following various advances made by the kings of the country, St. Ignatius decided upon the mission of Ethiopia. In 1551 Pope Paul IV appointed a Jesuit patriarch of Ethiopia, but the mission had almost no success up to the beginning of the seventeenth century, the date when conversions became numerous. King Susneos made his solemn profession of faith in 1626, but the disputes with the opposing party became more intense, and a few years later, Susneos' successor, his son Basilides, expelled the Jesuits. Their departure left in the country a taste for religious discussions. Two doctrinal currents sprang up, one of them close to Catholicism. But the mission of Abyssinia was not resumed until the nineteenth century.

The Serbs

The period embraced in this volume witnessed important events in the history of the Churches of eastern Europe. New formations took place at the side of iniquitous absorptions accomplished by the patriarchs of Constantinople supported by the Turks.

The Serbs, who came from a region north of the Carpathians, had settled in the district that in the seventh century took its name from them. They were converted in the eleventh century by Byzantine missioners. Their first archbishop, quasi-independent, was St. Sava or Sabas, son of King Stephen Nemania. He died in 1237. In 1351 King Stephen Dushan, called the Strong, proclaimed the complete independence of his Church from the jurisdiction of the Byzantine patriarch, who sanctioned this measure only in 1376.

The autocephalous archbishopric of Achrida owed its erection to the first Bulgar empire, ruined by Basil II the Bulgaroktonos in 1019. It had subsisted, remaining independent of Constantinople even with Greek incumbents, like the Bulgar patriarchate of Ternovo, which from 1204 to the Turkish conquest of 1393, had ruled the second Bulgar empire in spirituals; and it continued after that period. As long as it was in the hands of the natives, it was able to live in spite of the exactions of the Turks. But from the middle of the eighteenth century the Greeks of the Phanar succeeded in gaining control, thanks to the increasingly higher bids which they offered to the sultans. Thus they completely ruined the see and, when it was ruined, they obtained its suppression pure and simple in 1767, two years after the destruction of the Serb autonomy of Ipek. Furthermore, that conquest was the last one made by the Phanar: then began the fatal decline.

The Rumanians

Christianized by Latin missioners who followed the colonists of Trajan, the Rumanian people of Walachia and Moldavia followed the Latin rite until their incorporation in the first Bulgar empire in the ninth century. This empire exerted a Slav influence on the religious point of view and made them dependent on the archbishopric of Achrida, under the jurisdic-

tion of which the two provinces remained, at the same time as later they kept their autonomy in the face of the Turks, until the end of the fifteenth century. At that time Constantinople succeeded in bringing them under its jurisdiction. But Slavic remained the language of the Church and of the administration until the seventeenth century, whereas the people spoke Rumanian. The Phanariotes, while they were obtaining a wide political influence in the Danubian provinces, were Hellenizing the monasteries, where all education was concentrated. As the Slavonic tongue came to be more and more abandoned, the liturgical books had to be translated into Rumanian, but written in Slavonic characters, to assure the religious service in the country districts. In the middle of the eighteenth century this work was completed, and later the Latin alphabet was everywhere substituted for the Slavonic alphabet, owing especially to the Rumanians of Transylvania.

The Rumanians formed a numerous population spread through an autonomous grand duchy united to the Austrian crown in 1688; but it was not completely absorbed by Hungary until 1867. In the sixteenth century Calvinism was brought in there and led to a great laxity in ecclesiastical discipline, along with the ignorance characteristic of all the countries where the Eastern Schism then dominated. The repeated missions of the Jesuits in the country eventually inclined many toward union with Rome: in this number was Theophilus, bishop of Fagaras or Alba Julia.

The metropolitan of Bucharest was opposed to the conclusion of the union effected by Theophilus in 1697; and the Transylvanian boyars, for the most part won over to Calvinism, did all they could to make it fail under his successor Athanasius, even resorting to violence.

But an imperial decree (March 19, 1701) placed the Catholic Rumanians on the same footing as the Latins with regard to privileges and immunities; Cardinal Kollonitz, archbishop of

Gran and primate of Hungary, provided Athanasius with a theological adviser in the person of Father Baranyj, S.J.

Kollonitz, undaunted, sent young men to study in Rome, at the German College, the Greek College, and the College of Propaganda. Notwithstanding fresh storms, at Athanasius' death (August 19, 1713) the Rumanian Union was solidly established.

The protopopes or archpriests of the eparchy thought at first of replacing him with his last theologian, Father Szunyogh, S.J.; but he refused. A new election was annulled by the court of Vienna because of a defect of form, and the see remained vacant until 1721, the date when Rome sent the bulls to John Pataky, one of the Rumanians that Cardinal Kollonitz had formerly sent to the German College. During the vacancy various Jesuit fathers acted as administrators.

John Giurgiu, surnamed Pataky, was born in 1682. Educated at Rome, he had been ordained in the Latin rite, which fact, according to the discipline then in vogue, included his ipso facto passing to that rite. For many years he exercised the ministry among his countrymen. His election was well received by Emperor Charles VI and was confirmed by Rome in spite of the opposition of the Latin bishop of Transylvania, who desired a bishop of the Greek rite, but on condition that he should be subordinate to him, in accord with a canon of the Fourth Lateran Council. At the same time Innocent XIII canonically erected as independent the already existing Rumanian see of Fogaras or Alba Julia, but as suffragan of the Hungarian primate of Gran. Pataky occupied his see from 1721 to 1727; in 1725 he held an important synod and transferred the episcopal residence to Balaszfalva or Blasendorf. After his sudden death, Father Adam Fitter, S.J., administered the see during the vacancy, and held a synod in 1728. The next year John Innocent Micu, better known under the German name of Klein, was elected and confirmed by Clement XII.

Maria Theresa conferred on him the title of Baron von Szad, and Klein profited thereby to raise the prestige of his community. Another synod was held in 1739, but the Bishop had to strive against the Serb monk Bessarion, sent by the patriarch of Ipek, Arsenius Tchernoievitch, to bring back the Rumanians to the Orthodox communion.

To these serious difficulties was added the anticanonical conduct of Bishop Klein, which forced the Holy See to order an apostolic visitation. This was carried out by the Ruthenian bishop of Munkacz, Manuel Oslavsky. Klein had to give up his see and was replaced by Peter Paul Aaron, former student of the Greek College at Rome, with the title of vicar general and administrator. He also had to strive against the Serb emissaries, but, from the time of his episcopal consecration (1752), he gave a lively impulse to the works of the Union, convoked a synod the same year, constituted a cathedral chapter, opened a college at Blas, a theological seminary, and a printing establishment. The violent activities of the Serbs of Karlovitz required an armed intervention by the crown. In the course of a pastoral visitation, Peter Paul Aaron died in the odor of sanctity (March, 1764).

At this same period, in virtue of the same canon of the Fourth Lateran Council which had almost prevented the confirmation of Pataky, Benedict XIV established for the Rumanians living in the diocese of Nagy Varad, or Grosswardein, a vicar bishop in the person of Meletius Kovacs, bearing the title of bishop of Tegee. Here we have the beginning of the Rumanian eparchy of Oradea Mare, the Rumanian name of Nagy Varad.

After Paul Aaron came Athanasius Rednik (1764–72). During his episcopate the former Bishop Klein, who retired to Rome in 1768, died. There also ended the institution of Jesuit theologians attached to the person of the titular of the diocese. But the young Church could not yet fully govern itself by its

own power. The great foe of Rednik, Gregory Major, followed him (1773–82). However, the Society of Jesus, suppressed by Clement XIV, was able to devote the labors of its last members, now secularized, for the benefit of the Rumanians. Gregory Major sent a large number of young men to study at Rome and thus prepared for the brilliant literary renaissance of the next period.

The Serbo-Croats

In spite of every kind of difficulty, the Union spread also among the Serbs who emigrated on the lands of the Austrian Empire, and that at the very start of the seventeenth century. Simeon Vratanya, a Serbian monk and one of the emigrees, had embraced the Union. To him the Latin bishop of Zagreb, Peter Dimitrovics, granted a church for the purpose of founding there a monastery destined to become a nursery of clergy for the Serbian colonists of the Oriental rite.

In 1777 Maria Theresa, notwithstanding the resistance of the Latin bishops, who desired to keep their direct jurisdiction over the Serbs, put herself in accord with the Holy See. Pius VI (June 16, 1777) erected the city of Krijevtsy (in German, Kreutz; in Hungarian, Koros) into a Serb episcopal see of the Oriental rite. The first incumbent of the new diocese was the vicar of the bishop of Zagreb, Basil Bojitchkovitch.

The Albanians

The ancient Greek element of Sicily and of southern Italy had almost entirely disappeared in the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the seventeenth under various influences. But some Albanians, who came there about the end of the fifteenth century, had founded four colonies in Sicily and about twenty-five others in Calabria. They remained attached to the Greek rite. Partly for them Gregory XIII founded the Greek College

at Rome in 1577. To avoid the intrusion of Greek bishops, often schismatic, who were coming from the East or from the Archipelago to install themselves in Calabria or in Sicily, Urban VIII established at Rome a metropolitan prelature of the Greek rite. The titular would officiate in the church of St. Athanasius and would ordain the clergy of his rite. These Albanians, called also Italo-Greeks, remained subject to the Latin bishops of the dioceses where they lived, and in 1742 Benedict XIV, in the constitution *Etsi pastoralis,* gave them the legislation which still governs them.

In 1715 Father George Guzzetta, an Albanian priest of Sicily, founder of a congregation of the Oratory of the Oriental rite which the revolutions of the nineteenth century have ruined, established at Palermo a seminary for the education of the Albanian clergy. In 1736 Clement XII founded another at St. Benedict of Ullano for Calabria, with a titular bishop at the head to confer holy orders. In 1784 another titular bishop of the same sort was established in Sicily.

As for the many Greek monasteries of Sicily and southern Italy, they had been reduced to a congregation after the fashion of the Benedictines, but under the Rule of St. Basil, at the close of the sixteenth century. Some of these followed the Latin rite, others the Greek rite, and often the monks passed from one to the other with the greatest facility. Soon these were joined by some Spanish monasteries, all of the Latin rite. This mixture was prejudicial to the purity of the Greek rite, which soon became altered in an incredible way: the famous monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome, the only one remaining after the revolutions of the nineteenth century, was long a curious example of this. However, these Basilians had a certain influence: in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they even had a whole mission of the Greek rite in the district of the Chimera on the shore of Epirus, north of Corfu.

The Georgians

I add a few words on the Georgian Church of the Caucasus, subject at first to Antioch, then independent, completely Byzantinized in the eleventh century by the Georgian monks of the monasteries of Athos, fallen into schism rather by lack of relations with Rome than for any other reason. With a view to leading it to the Union, Propaganda sent to the Caucasus in 1626 some Italian Theatines, who established themselves in eastern Georgia: in 1663 some Capuchins succeeded them. Whether from unfitness for these missions among people of the Greek rite or from some other unfavorable circumstances, they obtained only partial success. In 1801 the incorporation of Georgia into Russia made impossible any apostolate for the Union, and the few Catholics of the Byzantine rite still remaining passed over to the Latin rite or the Armenian rite, while the Orthodox Church of Georgia was incorporated in the Russian Holy Synod.

The Ruthenian Church

The most interesting part of the Eastern world at the period we have now reached is the vast region formed by the Kingdom of Poland and the young Russian Empire. Politically, ecclesiastically, and to a certain extent even ethnographically, these two countries form two worlds altogether in contrast to each other, which need to be treated separately, though we must keep in mind their mutual relations.

At the opening of the seventeenth century the Ruthenian Church of the Kingdom of Poland, extending especially in eastern Galicia, Red Russia, White Russia, and the district about Kiev, grew tired of seeing that the patriarchs of Constantinople, who there exercised religious supremacy ever since the conversion of the Ruthenian people with St. Vladimir, did

nothing more than levy taxes without showing any concern for the religious welfare of the population. A discontent, fostered by the societies that were founded by the chief laymen, showed a desire for a change. The Jesuits, who then had residences and flourishing colleges in Poland, noted this movement and tried to take some advantage from it. Father Skarga, one of the most famous orators of the sixteenth century, published in 1576 his book on *The Unity of the Church* and dedicated it to the most powerful nobleman of Poland, the prince of Ostrog, Constantine. This book made such a stir that it had to be reprinted in 1590.

In that same year the bishops, meeting at Brest Litovsk, decided to break off relations with the Eastern patriarchs who were doing nothing for the country and not to recognize any other authority but that of the king. Sigismund III, a devout sovereign and openly Catholic, pointed out to them the only path for them to follow: union with Rome. Meanwhile the Prince of Ostrog, to counterbalance the influence of the bishop of Lutzk, Cyril Terlitzki or Terlecki, with whom he had just been embroiled, had placed on the see of Vladimir his friend, the senator Hypace Pociej, and came to an understanding with him for the conclusion of the Union.

In June, 1596, the metropolitan and a few bishops drew up their act of union with Rome, which Hypace Pociej and Cyril Terlitzki at once brought to Clement VIII. In a solemn consistory the Pope admitted the Ruthenian Church to the communion of the Holy See, guaranteeing it the maintenance of its rite and privileges. Several million souls were thus gained.

But the agitation of the partisans of the schism was such that the cause of the union would have succumbed if Providence had not sent unexpected helpers.

These did not come from the Latin clergy. The Kingdom of Poland embraced three nations, we might even say four: Polish, Lithuanian, Ruthenian, and Armenian. The Polish element was

certainly the most cultivated, but also the most penetrated with its own worth, and the least disposed to hide it.

The Latin clergy did not know the ancient Slav language, the sacred idiom of the Ruthenians, and the Ruthenian pope or monk did not know Latin. Invincible prejudices, even yet too lively, separated these two elements. Although the Ruthenians remained schismatics, the consequences did not make themselves felt sharply; but immediately after the Union, with a few exceptions, the national antipathy had free rein.

Rome was obliged to intervene several times and to declare that the Ruthenian bishops, although of the Greek rite, were true bishops, possessing a true jurisdiction, and that the Latin clergy did not have the right to require the tithe from the Ruthenian clergy. The latter were married and ignorant, and had to rid themselves of all the vices engendered by the schism. The Polish clergy, celibate, proud of their real worth, instead of extending a charitable hand to their brethren and helping them to rise, generally heaped contempt upon them. For most of the Poles, the Ruthenians, even the Catholics, were not, and are not even now, anything but quasi-schismatics that must be made Catholic by making them Latin. In vain Rome severely forbade the arbitrary passing to the Latin rite; the decree on this subject issued in 1626 and several times renewed since then, could not be published on account of the opposition of the King, who in turn feared the opposition of the Latin clergy. This is a painful page, too often unknown or misunderstood, of the religious history of Poland, and one of the causes of the final punishment that still weighs on that nation.

At the moment when the Union, seriously threatened by these different circumstances, was about to collapse, God raised up St. Josaphat Kuncevyc and Benjamin Rutsky. John Kuncevyc was born at Volodymyr about 1580. In 1604, under the name of Josaphat, he entered the monastery of the Holy Trinity of Vilna and succeeded in winning to his kind of life a certain

Ruthenian young man, Benjamin Rutsky. The latter, born in Calvinism in 1573, but converted at Prague in 1591, was directed by the Jesuits to the Greek College in Rome, where he spent four years. There, by express orders of Clement VIII, he took an oath that attached him all his life to the Greco-Slav rite. After many vicissitudes, he accepted the consequences of an oath made at first against his own wishes. In 1608, under the name of Joseph, he made his profession in that same monastery of the Holy Trinity where Josaphat had preceded him. Two years later the metropolitan Potsiey made him his vicar general for all Lithuania. In 1609, following a general uprising of the schismatical party and an attempt to assassinate the metropolitan, King Sigismund III and his tribunals rendered justice to the Catholics: Potsiey was able to have a coadjutor in the person of Rutsky, capable of continuing his work some day. He died peacefully in 1613.

The monastery of the Holy Trinity of Vilna, reformed by Rutsky and Josaphat, was able to spread and make new foundations. The priests of the Society of Jesus helped for the training of novices. In 1617 Rutsky laid the foundations of a new Basilian congregation organized on the model of the Latin orders. This congregation by itself was the salvation of the Ruthenian Union. Unfortunately neither then nor later could anything serious be realized for the secular clergy: not until the beginning of the eighteenth century do we find at Leopol (Lemberg, Lwow) the first Armeno-Ruthenian seminary, and that with the cooperation of the Italian Theatines. The Basilian monks were everything in the Ruthenian Church; they were even too influential. Although the hierarchy was taken exclusively from their ranks, their antagonism toward it, as also toward the secular clergy, would later have harmful consequences.

In 1617 Josaphat Kuncevyc was consecrated coadjutor of

Polotsk with right of succession. But, three years afterward the patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes IV, called by the schismatic party, was all-powerful at Kiev and the neighborhood. At a single time he consecrated a metropolitan, Job Boretsky, and eight bishops. These he set up in opposition to the Catholic prelates. The best educated and the most brilliant was Meletius Smotritsky, a former student of the Academy of Ostrog, a fervent polemist and talented writer.

A bitter strife ensued, amid vicissitudes that were sometimes bloody. The most illustrious victim was the archbishop of Polotsk, Josaphat Kuncevyc, who, through the agitation stirred up by Smotritsky, suffered death at the hands of an excited mob at Vitebsk in 1623. This martyrdom was the salvation of the Union. The civil authorities bestirred themselves and severely punished the guilty persons, and at the same time the process of Josaphat's beatification was opened. Smotritsky himself, after a long moral crisis, was converted in 1627, fell back momentarily through weakness, but promptly returned and died a holy death in 1633.

The death of Sigismund III (1632) and the coming of his son Wladislaus IV led to fresh conflicts. The electoral diet made important concessions to the schismatics. The execution of these "articles of pacification" was an endless source of legal proceedings which the King's lukewarmness encouraged. Making claim to the throne of Muscovy, Wladislaus wished to coax the so-called Orthodox element, but thus, without being aware, he was laying the basis of one of the causes of the fall of Poland.

The end of the Cossack wars and especially the glorious reign of John Sobieski (1674–96) permitted great progress in the Ruthenian Catholic Church in spite of the culpable indifference of the Latin clergy. Under the metropolitan Cyprian Jokhovsky (1674–93), the eparchies of Leopol (Lemberg, Lwow), and Peremyshl passed to the Union with their bishops; the Ukraine

itself was converted almost entirely. But Kiev was at hand, under the domination of Russia, like the citadel of the schism. The metropolitan Leo Zalenski (1694–1708) was exposed to the persecutions of Peter the Great whose armies had invaded Poland to put Augustus II in place of Stanislaus Leszcynski. In 1720 the Czar established a schismatic bishopric at Moghilev in White Russia. However, Leo Kishka (1714–28), successor of George Vinnitzki (1708–13), was able in 1720 to convoke in peace at Zamosk a council that has remained celebrated in the history of the Ruthenian Church, although its Latinizing influence has been exaggerated. From this period, however, the Ruthenian nobility, yielding to the age-old prejudices of the Poles, passed more and more to the Latin rite, the outward success of the ecclesiastical institutions changed even to the point of regrettable extravagances, which later served as a pretext for the destruction of the Union in the Russian Empire, after the last partition of Poland.

It was under the metropolitans Florian Ghrebnitsky (1748–62) and Philip Volodkovitch (1762–78) that appeared the signs premonitory of the total ruin of one part of the Union. The schismatic Bishop George Koninsky of Moghilev and Melchisedech the head of the monastery of Motrena, on the banks of the Dnieper near Kiev, agreed together about organizing an active anti-Catholic propaganda, backed by the Russian Holy Synod, with perpetual recourse to the diet of Varsovie, supported by the Russian ambassador Repnine. At the same time the confederations of Slutsk, Thorn, and Radom, followed by the confederation of Bar, prepared the way for foreign intervention. The first partition of Poland, in 1772, put under Russian domination 900,000 Catholic Ruthenians; the partitions of 1793 and 1795 increased this number to several million. A new situation began for the Ruthenian Church in Russia and Austria, but its history belongs to the nineteenth century.

The Russian Church

The northernmost branch of the Eastern Church was the Church of Russia, or rather, as it was then called, of Muscovy: the term "Russia" was applied to what we now call Galicia and Little Russia. In Volume III of this work we saw how St. Vladimir was baptized in 988: at an early date a bishopric was founded at Kiev, soon changed to a metropolitan see, and several episcopal sees created in accordance with the diffusion of Christianity. The Mongol invasion at the end of the thirteenth century obliged the metropolitans to transfer their residence at first to Vladimir, then to Moscow, but all of them continued to bear the title of "metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia," and depended hierarchically on Constantinople. It was from Moscow that Isidore set out in 1437 to attend the Council of Florence. When he returned he had to accept the Union at Kiev, but not at Moscow. When he left that city to return to Italy, the grand kniaz Basil (Vasily) III declared the see vacant, and (December 5, 1448) a council of Russian bishops, assembled by his orders, appointed to the see the bishop of Riazan, Jonas, who even succeeded in being recognized in 1451 by King Casimir of Poland, who protected the antipope Felix V. At the latter's death, Casimir was reconciled with Rome, and the nine eparchies dependent on the Polish crown in civil matters were detached from the Muscovite group in 1458 by Callistus III, then by Pius II his successor. This was the Church of Kiev.

Jonas died in 1461. His successors kept the title of Kiev, but no longer appeared there. Besides, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the strictly Russian eparchies, subject to various princes, witnessed many changes. The metropolitan see of Moscow increased in proportion with the increase of the domain of the grand kniaz of the city, who soon took the title

of czar. But both Moscow and Kiev continued to depend on Constantinople.

This was not the doing of the czars. In 1586 the Melchite patriarch of Antioch, Joachim V, went to Russia to beg. Czar Theodore (Feodor) I, or rather his counselor Boris Godunov, requested Joachim to erect the see of Moscow into a patriarchate. Joachim declined to do so, but promised to speak of the proposal to his colleague of Constantinople, Jeremias II, the man we saw at the beginning of this chapter in conflict with the Protestants. Jeremias came to Smolensk in 1558, and both Theodore and Boris repeated their request. On Juanary 26, 1589, the metropolitan of Moscow, Job, was consecrated bishop a second time, but with the title of patriarch, by Jeremias himself. The new Patriarch had jurisdiction over all the lands subject to the czar, and the see of Moscow soon came after that of Jerusalem, that is, ranking fifth among the Eastern patriarchates. In 1590 a synod of Constantinople ratified this election: the patriarchs of Antioch and of Jerusalem subscribed to the acts and, in 1593, at the urgent petition of Moscow, the patriarch of Alexandria, Meletius Pighas, likewise approved them.

The Russian patriarchate lasted from 1589 to 1700, the year when the last titular died. The person who held this high office enjoyed an immense influence: after the adventure of the false Dmitri and all the events known in Russian history as "the time of troubles," the Patriarch Philaret Romanov, father of Czar Michael Romanov, the founder of the dynasty, was the real master of the power from 1619 until his death (1633). In his time began the correction of the ecclesiastical books. This would later lead to a terrible schism, aggravated by political complications.

The Byzantine or Greek liturgy was not permanently fixed until the use of printing. Before that, the variants in the office books and even in the text of the Mass were numerous, and many special usages prevailed here and there. The same was

true in Russia. Besides, the Slavonic version, owing to copyists' errors, contained a large number of mistakes. The people, stagnating in a deplorable ignorance, held to what they saw and heard as to the essential of religion. In 1506 a monk of Athos, Maximus the Greek, who had been called by Czar Basil IV, paid dearly for his attempts of reform. Ivan IV the Terrible introduced the printing press into Muscovy. The first books printed were liturgical works. In 1618 the archimandrite Dionysius, because he corrected several evident mistakes, was thrown into prison. Then the idea of reform was more or less abandoned.

It was taken up again by the third successor of Philaret Romanov, Nikon (1652–58), an energetic and sometimes violent man, but a man who had the misfortune of living at a time when education was rare in Russia. In 1654 he assembled at Moscow a council that decided upon the general correction of the Church books according to the Greek manuscripts that had been brought from the East at great expense, and also in practice according to the editions printed by the Greeks at Venice. Thus today, we find no striking difference between these and the Greeks, apart from a certain number of details.

This reform, no less than the Patriarch's haughty character, won him many enemies, so that he resigned his office in 1658 and subsequently tried in vain to recover it. He died in 1681.

Yet the reform was accomplished. But the partisans of the old books and of certain ceremonies that were suppressed, stirred up a schism with its center at the monastery of Solovetsk on the White Sea. Its chief promoter was a protopope or archpriest by the name of Avvakum. The use of arms was required to overcome them; but that was in vain. The Raskolniki (schismatics), divided into two principal groups, continued to exist: the more numerous, called Staroviertsi ("old believers"), still form a Church apart, more flourishing than ever. As for the antihierarchical sects, the civil reforms of Peter the Great in-

creased the number of their followers, notwithstanding the rigor with which they were pursued. Maintaining the principle of private interpretation, they divided into a multitude of secondary sects, at times extravagant and cruel. The vague mysticism natural to the Slav race has helped to give them a particular stamp.

The last patriarch of Moscow, Adrian, died in 1700. Peter the Great, not wishing to have confronting him a power almost a rival to his own or able to counterbalance it, left the patriarchal see vacant, and entrusted the administration of the Church to the archbishop of Ryazan and Murom, Stephen Javorsky, with the title of patriarchal exarch. Somewhat later he confided to Theophane Prokopovitch, whom he had placed on the see of Pskov, the editing of a new ecclesiastical code, the Rule, which bears the name of Peter. This situation lasted twenty years. Prokopovitch, much inclined to the Protestant ideas, was a docile instrument of Peter, who was the real author of the celebrated Ecclesiastical Rule. Little by little it was signed by most of the bishops and archimandrites of the Empire. They conformed with a compliance that showed how completely the Russian Church was ready for total servility to the state. On January 25, 1721 the imperial manifesto was signed; and a month later was officially inaugurated the Most Holy Governing Synod, a sort of ministry quite like the other government machinery, consisting of bishops, archimandrites, and priests, few in number, but powerless to do anything without the imperial procurator, always a layman. All the Synod could do was to prepare the materials, study them, and propose a solution: but the final decision belonged to the czar, who thus combined in himself the two powers, civil and religious. The most curious fact is that this bizarre institution, which still governs the Russian Church and which has been extended to all the Orthodox states, was approved by the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Antioch in 1723.

In the course of this chapter we have seen the formation of a whole series of Eastern Churches in communion with Rome. But Russia obstinately remained outside the movement. The chief cause of this exception is the government's dominance of the spiritual power. At the time of Peter the Great's visit to Paris in 1717, the Gallican Sorbonne took the occasion to elaborate a full plan of reunion with the Catholic Church, giving the pope the least possible place in the scheme. Of course, the plan failed, in spite of the efforts of a Jansenist in relation with the schismatic hierarchy of Holland. This man was Abbé Jubé de la Cour, who became the promoter of the idea in Russia itself, with a zeal worthy of a better cause. Up to our time, Russia has remained closed to Catholic propaganda.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume.

ABELLY, Louis: *Collection des Lazaristes.*
Vie de Saint Vincent de Paul.
Acta Sanctorum by the Bollandists.
AGREDA, Maria de: *La mistica ciudad de Dios.*
ALARCON, Julio: *El Beato Juan de Ribera,* 1896.
ALGERMISSEN, Konrad: *Christian Denominations,* 1945.
ALLIER, Raoul: *La cabale des dévots,* 1902.
ALPHONSUS LIGUORI, St.: *Réflections utiles aux évêques.*
Theologia moralis.
ALZOG, Johannes Baptist: *Church History.*
ARGENSON, René de Voyer d': *Annales de la Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement.*
ARNDT, Johann: *Wahren Christenthum;* tr. as *True Christianity.*
ASSEMANI: *Diss. de Syris Nestorianis.*
AUBANEL, Pierre: *Galilée et l'Eglise,* 1910.
AUBINEAU, Léon: *Le Bienheureux Labre.*
AUGUSTE, A.: *La Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement à Toulouse,* 1913.
AVRIGNY, Hyacinthe d': *Mémoires chronologiques et dogmatiques,* 1725.

BARBERI, Andrea: *Bullarii romani continuatio,* 1835–57, 19 vols.
BARUZI: *Leibniz* (in collection *Pensée chrétienne*).
Leibniz et l'organisation religieuse de la terre.
BASSOMPIERRE, François de: *Ambassades en Espagne,* 1661.
BATIFFOL, Louis: *History of the Roman Breviary.*
BAUDRILLART, Henri: *Philippe V et la cour de France.*
BAUNY: *Somme des péchés.*
BENEDICT XIV: *Bullarium.*
BERNARD, St.: *De consideratione.*
BERTHE: *Saint Alphonse de Liguori,* 1900, 2 vols.

BERTHIER: *Innocentii Papae XI epistolae,* 1890.
BERTI: *Copernico e le vicende del sistema copernicano.*
BERTRAND, J.: *La Mission de Maduré.*
Les fondateurs de l'astronomie moderne.
BERTRAND, Louis: *Bibliothèque sulpicienne,* 1900, 3 vols.
BIELFELD: *Institutions politiques.*
BLIARD: *Dubois, cardinal et premier ministre.*
BOEHMER: *Les Jésuites.*
BONIFAS: *Histoire des dogmes de l'Eglise chrétienne.*
BORD, Gustave: *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France,* 1909.
BORONAT Y BARRACHINA: *Los Moriscos españoles y su expulsion.*
BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne: *Correspondance.*
Gallia orthodoxa.
History of the Variations of Protestantism.
Œuvres.
Oraisons funèbres.
BOUGAUD: *St. Vincent de Paul.*
BOURDOISE: *Sentences chrétiennes.*
BRÉMOND: *Apologie pour Fénelon,* 1910.
La Provence mystique au XVII^e^ siècle.
BROGLIE, E. de: *Saint Vincent de Paul.*
BROU: *Vie de saint François Xavier.*
BRUGÈRE, Louis-Frédéric: *De ecclesia,* 1873.
Tableau de l'histoire de la littérature de l'Eglise.
BRUNETIÈRE: *Manuel de littérature.*
Bullarium capuccinorum.
Bullarium Romanum.
BZOVIUS: *Paulus Quintus.*

CALENZIO, G.: *La vita e gli scritti del card. C. Baronio.*
CANTU, Cesare: *Storia universale,* 1838–47, 35 vols.
CARACCIOLI: *Vie du P. de Condren.*
CARLYLE, Thomas: *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.*
On Heroes and Hero Worship.
CAUSSADE, *L'abandon à la Providence divine,* 1905.
CHARLEVOIX, François-Xavier: *Histoire de saint Domingue,* 1730–31, 2 vols.

Histoire du Japon, 1715, 3 vols.
History of Paraguay, 1769.
CHARVERIAT: *Histoire de la Guerre de Trente ans.*
CHATEAUBRIAND, François René de: *The Genius of Christianity.*
CHEVALIER, Cyr Ulysse: *Université catholique.*
CIACONIUS: *Vitae pontificum.*
COCQUELINES, Carolus: *Bullarium magnum,* 28 vols.
CORDIER, Henri: *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales.*
COURNOT, Antoine Augustin: *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes,* 1872, 2 vols.
CRÉTINEAU-JOLY: *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus,* 1844–46, 6 vols.
CROS, Charles: *François Xavier, documents nouveaux,* 1894.
Saint François Xavier, sa vie et ses lettres, 1900.
CROS, J. M.: *Saint François Régis.*
CZINSKI, J.: *Copernik et ses travaux,* 1847.

DELAIRE: *Saint Jean-Baptiste de la Salle.*
DENZINGER, Heinrich: *Enchiridion symbolorum,* 1937.
DEPPING: *Correspondance diplomatique sous le règne de Louis XIV.*
DESCARTES, René: *Correspondance.*
Discourse on Method.
DESCHAMPS, Nicholas: *Les sociétés et la société.*
DESNOYERS: *Le Bienheureux Benoît Joseph Labre,* 1856.
D'ESTAMPES and JANNET: *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution.*
DESTOMBES: *Histoire de la persécution religieuse sous les successeurs d'Elisabeth.*
DEZERT, Desdevises du: *L'Eglise et l'Etat en France.*
L'Espagne de l'Ancien Régime, 1899.
DIANA, *Resolutions morales,* 1629–59.
DÖLLINGER, Ignaz: *The Church and the Churches.*
DOMINIS, Marco Antonio de: *De republica christiana,* 1617.
DOUMIC: *Le secret de la Franc-Maçonnerie,* 1905.
DU CHESNNE: *Histoire du baianisme.*
DU FERRIER: *Mémoires.*

DUMOULIN : *De resignatione.*
DUPANLOUP : *L'œuvre par excellence.*

ESCOBAR Y MENDOZA, Antonio : *Universae theologiae moralis receptiores sententiae,* 1652–63.

FAGUET, Emile : *Le XVI^e siècle en France.*
FAILLON : *Histoire de la colonie française au Canada.*
Methods des catéchismes de Saint-Sulpice.
Vie de la Sœur Bourgeois, 1853.
Vie de M. Olier, 1873.
FARJENEL, Fernand : *Le peuple Chinois,* 1904.
FELICE, G. de : *Histoire des protestants en France.*
FÉNELON, François : *De Summi Pontificis auctoritate,* 1848.
Maximes des saints, 1697.
FERON : *Contribution à l'histoire du jansénisme en Normandie,* 1913.
FEUGERE : *Lettres, opuscules et mémoires de Jacqueline Pascal.*
FLEURY : *Histoire ecclésiastique.*
FOUQUERAY : *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France.*
FRANCIS DE SALES, St. : *A Treatise on the Love of God.*
Introduction to the Devout Life.
Œuvres.
FUNCK : *Zur Galilei Frage.*
FUZET : *Les jansénistes du XVII^e siècle.*

GADUEL : *Vie de Barthélemy Holzhauser.*
GAILLARDIN : *Histoire du règne de Louis XIV,* 4 vols.
GARASSE : *La doctrine curieuse des beaux esprits de ce temps,* 1623.
GARZEND, Léon : *L'Inquisition et l'hérésie, à propos de Galilée.*
GAZIER : *Les dernières années du cardinal de Retz,* 1875.
GERIN, Charles : *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège,* 2 vols.
Recherches historiques sur l'Assemblée de 1682.
GINDELY : *History of the Thirty Years' War.*
GIRAUD, Victor : *Blaise Pascal,* 1905.
GOYAU : *L'Allemagne religieuse.*
GRANDMAISON : *Le Vénérable Louise de France,* 1910.

GRIMAL, J.: *Le sacerdoce et le sacrifice,* 1908.
GRISAR: *Galileistudien.*
GUERRIER: *Mme Guyon, sa vie, sa doctrine et son influence,* 1881.
GUIBERT: *Histoire de saint Jean-Baptiste de la Salle.*
GUIZOT: *Histoire de la République d'Angleterre.*
GUYON, Madame: *Interprétation du cantique des cantiques.*
Moyen court et très facile de faire oraison, 1686.

HALLAM, Henry: *Constitutional History of England,* 1827.
HAMON-GONTHIER-LETOURNEAU: *Vie de saint François de Sales,* 1909.
HANOTAUX, Gabriel: *Histoire du cardinal de Richelieu.*
Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France, 1888.
HARNACK, Adolf von: *Das Christentum und die Geschichte.*
Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums.
HAUSER, Henri: *Ouvriers des temps passés,* 1898.
HEFELE: *Life of Cardinal Ximenes.*
HELYOT, Pierre: *Histoire des ordres monastiques.*
HENKE: *Die Universität Helmstädt.*
HERMANT: *Mémoires,* 1905, 6 vols.
HÖFFDING: *History of Modern Philosophy.*
HUBAULT: *De politicis in Cardinalem Richelieu libellis.*
HUBERT-VALLEROUX: *Les corporations.*
HUMBOLDT, Alexander von: *Kosmos.*
HUME, David: *History of England.*
HURTER, Friedrich von: *De ecclesia.*
Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II und seiner Eltern, 1850.
Nomenclator literarius.
Theologia dogmatica.

IMMISCH: *Papst Innozenz XI,* 1900.
INGOLD: *L'édition bénédictine de Saint-Augustin.*
IRAILH: *Les querrelles littéraires.*
ISAMBERT: *Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises.*

JANET, Paul: *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale,* 1872.

JANSSEN: *L'Allemagne et la Réforme.*
JAUGEY: *Le procès de Galilée et la théologie.*
JOLY, H.: *Le Bienheureux Jean Eudes,* 1907.
Le vénérable Jean Eudes.
JUGIE: *Histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Eglise grecque et l'Eglise russe,* 1909.

KARALEVSKY, Cyril: *Histoire des patriarcats melkites.*
KEILBLINGER: *Histoire de l'abbaye de Mélek,* 1851.
KIMMEL: *Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis.*
KURTH, Godfrey: *The Church at the Turning Points of History.*

LA BRIÈRE, L. de: *Madame Louise de France,* 1899.
LACOMBE: *Orationis mentalis analysis,* 1686.
LAFITAU: *Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus.*
Vie de Clément XI.
LANCELOT, Claude: *Mémoires,* 1738.
LANGLOIS: *L'Inquisition d'après les travaux récents,* 1902.
Manuel de bibliographie historique.
LANSON, Gustave: *Histoire de la littérature française,* 1894.
LAS CASAS, Bartolomé de: *Brevissima relacion de la destruccion de las Indias occidentales per los Castellanos.*
LAVIGNE, Germont de: *La sœur Marie d'Agréda et Philippe IV,* 1855.
LAVISSE, Ernest: *Histoire de France jusqu'à la Révolution,* 1900–11, 18 vols.
LAVISSE and RAMBAUD: *Histoire générale du IV^e^ siècle à nos jours,* 1893–1904, 12 vols.
LEBRUN: *Histoire des pratiques superstitieuses.*
LEIBNITZ, Gottfried von: *Œuvres.*
LEMAÎTRE, J.: *Fénelon,* 1910.
LETOURNEAU, G.: *La mission de J.-J. Olier.*
Le ministère paroissial de Jean Jacques Olier.
LEVASSEUR, Pierre Emile: *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France,* 1895, 2 vols.
LINGARD, John: *History of England,* 1819–30, 8 vols.
LOMBEZ, De: *Traité de la paix intérieure.*
LONGOBARDI: *Traité sur quelques points de la religion des Chinois.*
LOYSON: *L'Assemblée du clergé de France de 1682,* 1870.

MACAULAY, Thomas: *History of England.*
MALAVAL: *Pratique facile pour élever l'âme à la contemplation.*
MALE, Emile: *L'art religieux à la fin du Moyen Age.*
L'art religieuse au XIII^e siècle en France.
MANSI, Giovanni Domenico: *Concilia.*
MANTENAY: *Saint Benoît Labre,* 1909.
MARIANA, Juan de: *De rege et regis institutione.*
MARNAS, Francisque: *La religion de Jésus au Japon.*
MARSHALL, T. W. M.: *Christian Missions: their agents and their results,* 1870, 2 vols.
MARTINIS, De: *Juris pontificii de propaganda fide.*
MASSON: *Fénelon et Mme Guyon,* 1907.
MATTER, Jacques: *Le mysticisme au temps de Fénelon,* 1865.
MAYNARD: *Saint Vincent de Paul.*
MAZURE: *Histoire de la Révolution de 1688.*
Mémoires de Port-Royal.
MOEHLER: *Symbolism.*
MOLINIER: *Les sources de l'histoire de France.*
MOLINOS, Miguel de: *Spiritual Guide.*
MONIER: *Vie de M. Olier.*
MONLAUR: *Angélique Arnauld.*
MONTAIGNE, Michel de: *Essays.*
MONTOR, Artaul de: *Histoire de Pie VII.*
The Lives and Times of the Popes.
MORLEY, John: *Oliver Cromwell,* 1900.
MORRELL: *A Narrative of Four Voyages.*
MOTT: *Saint Vincent de Paul et le sacerdoce.*
MURATORI: *A Relation of the Missions of Paraguay,* 1759.
Annali d'Italia.
MACQUART: *Lettres de saint Vincent de Paul,* 1882.

NICERON: *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres.*
NICOLE, Pierre: *Réfutation des principales erreures quiétistes,* 1695.
NOUET, Jacques: *Homme d'oraison.*
NOVAES: *Elementi della storia de Sommi Pontifici.*

OLIER, Jean Jacques: *Lettres autographes.*
Mémoires.

ORLÉANS, D': *La vie du P. Coton.*

PAGES: *Lettres de saint François Xavier.*
PALLAVICINI, Pietro: *Storia del Concilio di Trento,* 1657, 2 vols.
PALMIERI: *Dositeo, patriarca greco di Gerusalemme,* 1909.
PAQUIER: *Le jansénisme,* 1909.
Qu'est-ce que le quiétisme, 1910.
PERATE, Eugène: *Le Vatican, les papes et la civilisation.*
PÉRIER, Madame: *Vie de Pascal.*
PERRAUD: *L'Oratoire de France au XVII^e siècle.*
PERRENS: *Les Libertins en France,* 1896.
PESQUIDOUX, Dubosc de: *L'Immaculée Conception, histoire d'un dogme.*
PHELEPEAUX: *Relation de l'orgine du progrès et de la condamnation du quiétisme.*
PICOT, Michel: *Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France,* 1824, 2 vols.
PITHOU, Pierre: *Les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane,* 1594.
POMPIGNAN, Jean-Georges Le Franc: *Œuvres complètes.*
PROYART: *Histoire de Loango, Kacongo et autres royaumes d'Afrique,* 1776.
PRUNEL: *Sebastien Zamet.*
PUAUX: *Histoire de protestantisme français.*
PUYOL: *Edmond Richer,* 1876.

RACINE: *Histoire de Port-Royal.*
RANKE, Leopold von: *History of the Popes.*
RAPIN: *Histoire du jansénisme.*
Mémoires, 1865, 3 vols.
RASTOUL: *Les Jésuites au Paraguay,* 1907.
RAVIGNAN, De: *Clément XIII et Clément XIV.*
REBELLIAU: *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme.*
REBOULET: *Histoire de Clément XI.*
RICCI, Matteo: *Dell' intrata della Compagnia di Gesù e christianita in Cina;* tr. as *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinos.*
RICHELIEU, Cardinal: *Mémoires.*
Testament politique.

RICHER, Edmond: *De la puissance ecclésiastique et politique.*
ROCHEMONTRIX, C. de: *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVII^e siècle.*
Les missions catholiques.
ROSSI, Giovanni Battista de: *Roma soterranea cristiana.*
ROTOURS, Angot des: *Saint Alphonse de Liguori,* 1903.
ROUSSET: *Histoire de Louvois.*
ROVERIUS: *De vita P. Petri Cotoni,* 1660.
RULHIERE, Claude de: *Eclaircissements sur les causes de la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes,* 1788.

SACY, Silvestre de: *Variétés littéraires, morales et historiques.*
ST. CYRAN: *Petrus Aurelius.*
SAINTE-BEUVE, Charles Augustin: *Causeries du lundi,* 1849–61, 15 vols.
Nouveaux lundis, 1861–66, 13 vols.
Portraits littéraires, 1832–39.
Port-Royal, 7 vols.
SAINT-JURE: *La vie de Ch. de Renty.*
SAINT-LÉON, Martin: *La compagnonnage, son histoire, ses coutumes, ses règlements, ses rites,* 1901.
Histoire des corporations.
SAINT-SIMON, Duc de: *Mémoires.*
SCHELSTRATE: *Acta orientalis Ecclesiae contra Lutheri haeresim.*
SCHLEGEL, August von: *Philosophy of History.*
SCHOENHER: *Histoire du Séminaire de Saint-Nicolas.*
SCHROEDER, H. J., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* 1941.
SERRY: *Hist. cong. de Auxiliis.*
SICARD: *L'ancien clergé de France.*
Les études classiques avant la Révolution, 1887.
SIMPSON, George: *Journey Round the World.*
SIRI: *Memorie.*
SOREL, Albert: *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* 1885–1903.
SOURIAU, Maurice: *La Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement de l'autel.*
SPENER, Philip: *Pia desideria.*
Simple explication de la doctrine chrétienne.
STEIN: *Leibniz und Spinoza.*

STROWSKI: *Bossuet.*
Pascal et son temps.
Saint François de Sales.
SUAREZ, Francisco: *Defensio fidei.*

TAINE, Hippolyte: *L'Ancien Régime.*
TALON, Omer: *Mémoires.*
THEINER: *Clementis XIV epistolae et brevia,* 1852.
Histoire du pontificat de Clément XIV.
THOMAS AQUINAS, St.: *Summa theologica.*
THOMASSIN: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline.*
TIRABOSCHI, Girolamo: *Storia della letteratura italiana,* 1771–82, 13 vols.
TOCQUEVILLE, Alexis de: *The Old Regime and the Revolution,* 1856.
TOURON: *Histoire générale de l'Amérique.*

URBAIN and LEVESQUE: *Correspondance de Bossuet.*
URBAN VIII: *Maffei Barberini poemata.*

VACANDARD: *Etudes de critique et d'histoire.*
The Inquisition.
VACANT: *Dictionnaire de théologie.*
VACHET: *L'artisan chrétien ou la vie du bon Henry, instituteur des Frères Cordonniers,* 1670.
VOLTAIRE: *Essai sur les mœurs.*
Siècle de Louis XIV.

WALTER: *Manuel de droit canonique.*
WARWICK, Philips: *Memoirs.*
WEHOFER: *Das Lehrbuch des Metaphysik für Kaiser Joseph II.*
WEISS, Karl: *P. Antonio Escobar y Mendoza,* 1911.
WULF, De: *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale.*

INDEX

Aaron, Peter Paul (bishop of Blasendorf), 576
Abbesses: Appointment of, 337; in seventeenth century, 337
Abbeville, 481
Abd-el-Messiah (Jacobite patriarch), 566
Abdisho (bishop of the Chaldeans), 568
Abelly (bishop of Rodez), 132
Abraham 'el Haqlani (biblical scholar), 564
Abrizzi (preacher), 60
Abruzzi, The (Italy), 197
Absolutism, Royal, 176 f.: of Charles I, 288
Abstinence days, Sale of meat on, 173
Abyssinia. *See* Ethiopia
Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 534
Academy, The French, 341
Acadians, Sulpicians among the, 225
Achrida, Church of, 573
Acquaviva, Claudius (Jesuit general), 80, 193: and Henry IV, 93
Acquaviva, Troiano (cardinal), 451
Acre (see), 583
Act of Uniformity, 297
Acta sanctorum (Bollandists), 247, 249, 531
Adam, Germanus (bishop of Aleppo), 563
Adda, Francesco d': papal envoy to James II, 300
Adrian (patriarch of Moscow), 588
Adrian VI (pope) and bishop of Cuba, 207
Adrianople, 549
Africa, Missions in, 226
Agapios III Matar (Melchite bishop), 563
Agde, Seminary at, 134
Agen, Seminary at, 134
Agnes, Mother (abbess): to Antoine Lemaitre, 381; Father Olier and, 136; St. Cyran's visit to, 378
Agreda, Mary of. *See* Mary
Ahositari (Indian convert), 222
Aiguillon, Duchess of: and St. Vincent, 145; Seminary endowed by, 123
Aix (France), 151, 521
Akidiian, Andrew (Syrian bishop), 566
Alais, Edict of, 307
Alba Julia (see), 574 f.
Albani, Annibale (cardinal), 451
Albani, Giovanni (Clement XI), 440
Albania, 555
Albanians, The, 577
Albert of Brandenburg, Usurpation of, 441
Albizzi (cardinal) on the exclusive, 443
Albon, Count Gilbert d': and lawsuits, 170
Albret, Jeanne d': at La Rochelle, 305
Alcades and Spanish absolutism, 70
Alcalá: Carmelites of, 71; Polyglot of, 246
Alcalá University, the *Complutenses*, 232 f.
Aldobrandini (family) and the Farnesi, 15
Aldobrandini, Ippolito (Clement VIII), 11 note
Aldobrandini, Pietro (cardinal), 10, 15
Aldrovandi (cardinal), 451
Alembert: the *Encyclopedia*, 461; Voltaire to, 508
Aleppo (Syria)
  Adam bishop, 563
  Capuchins, 566
  Carmelites, 566
  Catholics, 560
  Church of, 567
  Jesuits, 566
  Mission at, 559
Alest, Seminary at, 332
Alet: Pavillon bishop of, 331; See of, 413
Alexander VI (pope): Arbitral decision of, 206; bull *Inter caetera*, 206

Alexander VII (pope), 255
Affair of the Corsican Guard, 327
Bulls: *Cum ad sancti Petri sedem,* 407; *Sollicitudo,* 260
Chinese rites, 204 f.
Death of, 261
Devotion to study, 259
Election of, 255 f., 443
Jansenism, 260: condemned, 407
Louis XIV and, 260
Nepotism of, 259
Ordination retreats, 131
Philometi labores juveniles by, 260
Policy of, 259
Rome adorned by, 260
St. Francis de Sales canonized by, 260
St. Peter's colonnade erected by, 260
Sapienza College finished by, 260
Spanish government and, 257
Venice asks help of, 257
Alexander VIII (pope), 269
Approval of Congregation of the Mission, 149
Bull *Inter multiplices,* 270, 354
Death of, 270, 354
Nepotism of, 270
Alexander (Russian emperor), 286
Alexander, Noel: *Histoire de l'Eglise* by, 531
Alexandria, 549, 586: Patriarchate of, 556
Alfieri, Voltaire's influence on, 503
Algiers, 36: Christian prisoners in, 227
Alhausen, Protestant Union formed at, 28
Alkosch (Nestorian see), 538
Almanach de la déroute et de la confusion des jansénistes, 408
Almodovar (Spain), 72
Aloysius Gonzaga, St. (Jesuit): Canonization of, 42, 446
Alphonsus, St. (founder), 515
Ascetical writings, 516
Atheists in Naples, 513
At deathbed of Clement XIV, 470
On Diana, 240
Equiprobabilism, 517
Glories of Mary, 516
La fedeltà dei Vassalli, 519
Theologia moralis, 516
Altieri, Emilio (Clement X), 263
Amakusa (Japan), 196
Amasia (Asia Minor), 549
Amazon (river), Vieira along the, 213
Amedeus, Victor (of Sardinia): Concessions to, 446
America: Missions to islands of, 181; Pietism in, 286; Spanish emigration to, 69. *See also* North America, South America
Amettes, birthplace of St. Benedict Labre, 545
Amiens, Seminary at, 134
Anatomie de la Messe by Dumoulin, 175
Ancestors, Cult of: Ricci and, 202
Anchieta (Blessed), Apostle of Brazil, 207, 211: Death of, 212; Marvels in life of, 213
Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise, 531
Ancient regime: End of, 3 note; Religious conditions in, 4
"Ancient regime," Meaning of, 3
Ancona, Improvement of port of, 453
Andilly, Arnauld d'. *See* Arnauld d'Andilly
Andreae, Jakob (chancellor of Tübingen), 548
Andrew Avellino, St. (Theatine): The beatification of, 42
Andrew Corsini, St. (Carmelite): Canonization of, 56
Angélique, Mother (abbess of Port Royal), 370
Attracted by austerity, 380
Bishop Zamet and, 175
Bleeding the sick, 373
Confirmation of her vows, 371 f.
Day of the Grille, 372 f.
Influence on her family, 374
At Maubuisson Abbey, 374
Reform of Maubuisson, 374
Reform of Port Royal, 372 ff.
Resignation as abbess, 377
St. Cyran and, 378
St. Francis de Sales director of, 375
On suffering of the poor, 142
Vocation of, 371
Weak side of, 376
Anger. *See* Anjiro
Angers, Henri Arnauld bishop of, 413
Anglican Church: Break-up of, 291; Cromwell and, 293; Dupin (Jansenist) and, 490
Anglicanism under Charles II, 297
Angouleme, General Hospital, 161
Angoumois, Philippe d' (Capuchin):

Angoumois (*continued*)
Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 157
Anjiro (Japanese), baptized by St. Francis Xavier, 287
Annales ecclesiastici by Baronius, 17
Annat, François (Jesuit): confessor of Louis XIV, 326
Anne, St.: Devotion to, 40
Anne (queen of England): anti-Catholic measures, 302; Laws of Discovery, 302
Anne of Austria (queen of France): Charity of, 146; St. Vincent and, 127, 145, 147; and worthy episcopate, 173
Anne of Gonzaga (princess), 279
Annecy, Visitation beginning at, 97
Anthimus II (patriarch), 549
Antilles: Caribs of the, 216; Depopulation of, 208; Discovery of, 207; Las Casas in, 208
Antin, Duke d': Masonry, 507
Antioch: Catholic patriarchs of, 561; Patriarchate of, 555, 559
Antipope (Felix V), 585
Antitaurus, The, 555
Antonines, Order of the Armenian, 569 f.
Antonio de Molina (Carthusian) and frequent Communion, 80 note
Antwerp, 245: Jesuit church in, 230 note; Polyglot of, 246
Apologetics, 232, 533
Apologia of the Rosy Cross by Fludd, 505
Apology of Casuists, 260
Apostolic Camera, Administration of the, 268
"Apostolic Majesty," Title of, 460
Apostolic Secretaries, College of: dissolved, 266
Aquinas. *See* Thomas
Arabic (language): Bible in, 559, 564; Byzantine liturgy in, 559; Chairs of, 31
Arakhova, 557
Aranda (minister), 519
Arcadia, Early missions in, 225
Archaeology, Christian, 246
Ardzivian, Abraham (bishop), 569
Arenthon, D' (bishop of Geneva), 421
Argenson, Count d', 174, 179: and foreign missions, 181
Argenson, Marquis d': dispersion of Port Royal nuns, 485; and Huguenots, 479
Argentan, Denunciation of, 178
Aristotle translated into Chinese, 202
Arles (see), 160
Armand (Jesuit) at court of Henry IV, 93
Armenian Antonines, Order of, 569
Armenians, 569: Persecution of Catholic, 570; Submission of, 470
Armies, Permanent, 63
Arminians and Council of Chalcedon, 450
Arnauld (family): aristocratic connections, 369 f.; Mother Angélique's influence on, 374; and Pascal, 409
Arnauld, Agnes (Port Royal nun), 374
Arnauld, Anne (Port Royal nun), 374
Arnauld, Antoine (father), 369: Children of, 369 note
Arnauld, Antoine (the "Great Arnauld"), 390
Body at Port Royal, 486
Book on the Eucharist, 415
Error of "philosophical sin" denounced by, 270
La nouvelle héresie des Jésuites, 326
Leibnitz and, 276
Lettre à un duc et pair, 406 f.
Lettre à une personne de condition, 406
Name removed from Sorbonne register, 407
On Frequent Communion, 334, 393
Restoration of, 262 note
And St. Cyran, 390
At service of Port Royal, 374
Submission of, 396, 414
Wanderings of, 414
Arnauld, Catherine: wife of Le Maître, 374
Arnauld, Henri (bishop of Angers), 413
Arnauld, Jacqueline. *See* Angélique
Arnauld, Madame: Death of, 391; Port Royal nun, 390
Arnauld, Marie Claire (Port Royal nun), 374
Arnauld, Robert. *See* Arnauld d'Andilly
Arnauld d'Andilly, 369, 390: Bishop Pavillon and, 332; hermits of Port Royal, 381; St. Cyran and, 377 f., 387; St. Cyran presented to the queen mother by, 388
Arndt, Johann (preacher), 82: Theories

Arndt (*continued*)
of, 283; *True Christianity* by, 284; *Wahren Christenthum* by, 283
Arsinoe (see), 571
Ascetical theology. *See* Theology
Asia Minor under patriarch of Constantinople, 555
Assemani, Joseph Aloysius: *Codex liturgicus Ecclesiae universae,* 565
Assemani, Joseph Simeon, 565 f.: *Bibliotheca Orientalis,* 565
Assemani, Simeon, 565
Assemani, Stephanus Evodius, 565
Assembly of La Rochelle, 304
Assembly of the Clergy of France, 530: Archbishop Harlay and, 342
(1606), 100
(1614), 106
(1625), papal infallibility, 351
(1645), 123 f.
(1650), and the five propositions, 402
(1651), 311: on dueling, 163
(1653), papal infallibility, 351
(1661), and the formulary, 413
(1675), 111, 334
(1680), 342: loyalty to Louis XIV, 336
(1681), 343 ff.: Bossuet at, 344 ff.; Gallicanism of, 345; and papal authority, 347
(1682): Alexander VIII, 354; Bossuet, 351; Declaration of, 272; the four articles, 348 ff.; Innocent XI and, 353; Louis XIV and, 351
(1723), on the Huguenots, 478
(1745), on Protestant activities, 479
(1765), 532: feast of the Sacred Heart, 463; Parliament annuls acts of, 498; rights of the spiritual power, 498; the *Unigenitus,* 498
Astronomy: Nicholas of Cusa, 48; Ptolemy, 48. *See also* Galileo
Asuncion (Paraguay), Jesuits at, 216
Athanasius (bishop of Jerusalem), 571
Athanasius IV Dabbas (patriarch), 560
Athanasius Dahan, 562
Athanasius Jauhar, 562
Athanasius Patellaros (patriarch), 549
Athos (monastery), 579, 587
Attrition, St. Cyran on, 384 note
Augsburg, League of, 354
Augsburg, Peace of, 27, 46
Augsburg Confession, 46, 275
Augustine, St.: Baius and writings of, 359; Benedictine edition of, 416; Duvergier's study of, 365; Jansenism and, 360, 400; Jansen's study of, 365
"Augustinians" and Baianism, 363 note
Augustinus, The, 384
Beginning of, 366
Contents of, 385
Its printing forbidden, 386
Jansenists and condemnation of, 326
Publication of, 385
St. Cyran on, 385
Theses against, 386
Augustus II (of Poland), 584
Aulica, The: at the Sorbonne, 235
Austria: interference in papal elections, 443; Jansenism in, 470; Masonry in, 507; state direction of seminaries, 495
Auvergne (district), 333: Father Lejeune in, 152
Auxentius (hermit), 554: Death of, 554
Auxiliis, Congregation De, 387
Avignon: Carmelite convent at, 157; College of, 521; Offer to restore, 467; seized by Louis XIV, 354; Sisters of Mercy at, 152
Avully, Baron d': Conversion of, 90
Azzolini (cardinal), 256

Babik (monk), 571
Baccalaureate (Sorbonne), 234
Baccano, Marshes of, 260
Bachelor in theology (Sorbonne), 234
Bacon, Francis: principle of morality, 250
Bahia, Vieira and siege of, 214
Baianism, 358 ff.: of the *Augustinus,* 385; censured by Faculty of Paris, 361; Comma in condemnation of, 362; Louvain University, 361
Baius, Michael, 359
Character of, 359
Condemnation of 79 propositions, 362
At Council of Trent, 362
Death of, 363
Doctrinal aim of, 359
Doctrine of, 359 f.
Elected chancellor of Louvain, 362
Louvain professor, 359
On original sin, 360
Submission of, 362
Balance of powers, 63

Balaszfalva (see), 575
Baluze on royal rights over convents, 338
Balzac, 250
Baptism: by heretics, 553; by infusion and by immersion, 553; St. Francis Xavier's esteem for, 186
Baranyj (Jesuit), 575
Barbary: Missions in, 35, 226 f.; Spanish Moors, 74
Barberini (cardinal) and the *Augustinus*, 388
Barberini (family) and the Farnesi, 56
Barberini, Maffeo (Urban VIII) and Galileo, 49
Barbosa, Agostino (canonist), 243
Barcos, De (nephew of St. Cyran), 381, 390
Baronius (cardinal), 14
  Annales ecclesiastici by, 17
  Confessor of Clement VIII, 11
  At election of Leo XI, 17
  At election of Paul V, 18
  Henry IV and, 17 note
  Master of Church history, 247
Barraut, Jean de (archbishop of Arles), 160
Barré (Minim), 525 f.
Bartholomew a Martyribus, pastoral theology, 238
Bartholomew Holzhauser, reformer, 84
Bartholomites, Congregation of the, 82: Approval of, 85
Basel. *See* Basle
Basil, St.: Rule of, 562, 578
Basil IV (czar), 587
Basil, Father (Franciscan): at Port Royal, 372
Basil II the Bulgaroktonos, 573
Basilides (king of Ethiopia), Jesuits expelled by, 572
Basle (see), 181 note
Basle, Council of: Gallicanism, 318
Bassancourt (Sulpician), 139
Bassompierre, 36
Bastille, The, 416: Father Lacombe in the, 425; Pellisson in the, 278
Baudry, Michael: *Manuale sacrarum caeremoniarum*, 243
Bauny, Etienne (Jesuit): casuist, 239; *Question s'il est meilleur de communier souvent que rarement*, 392; *Somme des péchés*, 239
Bavaria, Bartholomites in, 86
Bay, Michel de. *See* Baius
Bayeux (diocese), 150
Bayle, Pierre, 505: *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 442
Bayonne, birthplace of St. Cyran, 365
Béarn (France), 322
Beaubassin (Canada), 225
Beauchet-Filleau (Benedictine), 256
Beaucousin (Carthusian), director of Berulle, 116
Beaudrigue, David de: arrest of Calas family, 480
Beaufort, Duke of: "cabal of the Important," 396 note
Beaufort, Eustache de: Sept-Fons Abbey reformed by, 108 note
Beaumont, Christopher de (archbishop of Paris), 497, 521: Charities of, 541; Episcopate of, 498; exiled, 498; and Madame Louise, 546
Beaumont de Péréfixe. *See* Péréfixe
Beaupuis, Vallon de: the "little schools," 395
Beauséjour (Canada), 225
Beauvais, Buzanval bishop, 413
Beauvais College: St. Francis Xavier at, 183; St. Vincent at, 131
Beauvillier, Duke of, 431
Beggars dressed as priests, 172
Belelli accused of Baianism, 455
Bellarmine (cardinal), 14, 39
  Canonization of, 458
  Controversies, 237
  At election: of Gregory XV, 33; of Leo XI, 17; of Paul V, 18
  Galileo and, 51
  Robert de' Nobili, nephew of, 192
Bellefonds (marshal) at La Trappe, 109
Belzunce (bishop of Marseilles), 521
Benedict XII (pope), building corporations, 504
Benedict XIII (pope), 445: Canonizations by, 210, 446; a Dominican, 445; and predestination dispute, 445
Benedict XIV (pope), 451
  Abraham Ardzivian and, 569
  Absence of nepotism, 452
  On acceptance of the *Unigenitus*, 498
  Bologna birthplace of, 452
  Bulls: *Ex quo singulari*, 206; *Providas*, 456, 509
  Chinese rites, 206
  Condescension of, 452

Benedict XIV (*continued*)
Constitutions: *Demandatam caelitus,* 562; *Etsi pastoralis,* 578; *Sollicita ac provida,* 453
Coptic Church, 571
De synodo dioecesana, 452, 456
Death of, 456
Description of, 451
Encyclical *Vix pervenit,* 452
Favors to Jesuits, 455
Jacques Brydaine and, 537
Jubilee year 1750, 455
Learned writings of, 452
Long conclave for election of, 451
Piety of, 455
On the process of canonization, 456
Rumanians and, 576
On usury, 452
Voltaire's works condemned, 456
Benedict (of Nursia), St.: Rule of, 570
Benedict Labre, St., 545
Benedictines: Congregation of St. Maur, 40
Benevento: Offer to restore, 467; See of, 445
Berlin, Spener in, 285
Bermond, Françoise de: and the Ursulines, 110
Bernard of Clairvaux, St.: papal infallibility, 350
Bernard of St. Joseph (Carmelite), 71
Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Naturalism of, 88
Bernini: interior of St. Peter's, 61; Piazza del Popolo decorated by, 260
Bernis, Cardinal de, 464 f.
Berrhoea, 549 f.
Berry, Father Lejeune in, 152
Berti accused of Baianism, 455
Berulle, Pierre de (cardinal), 104, 115, 159
Carmelites and, 110
Character of, 116
Education of, 116
Esteem for Bishop Zamet, 379
Form of the Oratory, 117 note
Founding of the Oratory (France), 118
Holiness of the priesthood, 240
Meeting of St. Cyran and St. Vincent at house of, 368
Relations with St. Cyran, 398
Richelieu and, 45
Berulle (*continued*)
St. Francis de Sales and, 99
Visited by St. Cyran, 367
Besançon, birthplace of Nonnotte, 533
Bessarion (Serb monk), 576
Bethlehem, Church of the Nativity, 338, 551
Bétille, papal infallibility, 352
Beynes (France), 426
Beyrouth, 560, 566 f.
Béziers (see), 327
Bible: in Arabic, 559, 564; canon in the Orthodox Church, 552; deutero-canonical books, 552; Study of, 244
Bibles, Polyglot, 530
Biblia Polyglotta by Ximenes, 245
Biblical exegesis, 244: Science and, 53 note
Bibliotheca Orientalis by Assemani, 565
Bibliothèque janséniste, 455
Bichi (nuncio), 446
Bicken, Johann von (archbishop of Mainz), 82
Bignon, Jerome (lawyer), 377: St. Cyran at home of, 367
Billets de confession, 497: Decree concerning, 498
Billuart (theologian), 531
Binet, Etienne (Jesuit), preaching at Port Royal, 377
Bishops: Appointment of, 356; obligation of residence, 20; Richelieu on qualities of, 115; Rights of, 356
Bisignano (see), Uniate Greeks, 450
Bizerta, Christian prisoners in, 227
Blackwell, George: and Paul IV's condemnation, 26
Blasendorf (see), 575
Bleeding the sick, 373
Blessed Sacrament, Company of the, 104, 155
Activities of, 160, 169
Aid to poor churches, 171
Aims of, 158
Annals of the, 156
Devotion to the Eucharist, 171
End of, 179
Foreign missions, 181
Jansenism and, 175, 178
Jansenists not admitted, 176
Jansenists' attitude to, 177
Justice to the poor, 169
Membership, 158

Blessed Sacrament (*continued*)
Opposition to, 176
Origin of, 156 f.
Orthodoxy of, 173
Papal favors to, 174
Practice to usury, 170
Secrecy of, 158
Suppression of dueling, 162
The working classes, 167 ff.
Workmen's societies, 169
Blessed Sacrament, House of the (Paris), 379
Blessed Sacrament, Jansenists' attitude to, 380
Blessed Sacrament, Sisters of, 525
Blessed Virgin. *See* Mary
Blois, birthplace of Jean Morin, 237
Blois, Ordinances of (1579), 114
Boehme, Jacob: Writings of, 285
Bohemia: Protestantism in, 29; Serfdom in, 29; Utraquists in, 29
Boileau: Body of, 487; *Livre des métiers*, 543; Satires of, 432
Boismont, De: Preaching of, 538
Boite à Perrette, 490
Bojitchkovitch, Basil (bishop), 577
Bolland, John van (hagiographer), 249
Bollandists: *Acta sanctorum*, 247, 531; Beginning of the, 249
Bologna, birthplace of Benedict XIV, 452
Bonacina, Martino: moral theology, 238
Bonal, De (bishop of Clermont), 521
Bonfrère, Jacques: *Commentaries*, 244
Bons-Enfants, Collège des, 131
Bonzes: Conversion of, 196; St. Francis Xavier and the, 189
Bordeaux, galley convicts, 147
Boretsky, Job (bishop), 583
Borghese, Camillo (Paul V), 19
Borromeo, Charles. *See* Charles
Borromeo, Frederick: at election of Gregory XV, 33
Bosio, Antonio (archaeologist), 246: *Roma soterranea*, 247
Bossuet (bishop of Troyes), the *Unigenitus*, 490
Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne (bishop of Meaux), 343, 433
At Assembly of 1681, 344
On Bishop Caulet, 334
Conflict with Fénelon, 272
On constraint of Huguenots, 313
Defense de la Declaration revised, 355
Bossuet (*continued*)
Fénelon consecrated by, 430
Funeral of Henrietta, 309
And infallibility, 345, 355 note
Investigation of Madame Guyon, 427
On King Charles I, 288
At La Trappe, 109 f.
Leibnitz and, 279 f.
Leibnitz' correspondence with, 277
Méditations sur l'Evangile, 241
On Nicholas Cornet, 234
On Oliver Cromwell, 289
On Pierre de Marca, 322
Policy of, 344 f.
Prestige of, 344
On the priesthood of Christ, 242
Protestantism and, 345
Qualities of, 344
Refutation of the Catechism of Paul Ferry, 344
Sermon pour l'Ascension, 241
And submission of Port Royal, 414
Treatment of Huguenots, 476
At Tuesday conferences, 132
Tutor of the Dauphin, 344
Boucherat, Nicholas (abbot of Citeaux), 107, 374
Bouillon, Duke of (Huguenot), 304 f.
Boulogne, Father: Preaching of, 538
Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 531
Bourbon, Jeanne de (abbess of Fontevrault), 339
Bourbon-Condé, Louis de: Masonic Grand Master, 507
Bourbonism, 449
Bourdaloue, Louis (Jesuit), 434: The preaching of, 432
Bourdoise, Adrian, 104, 120
And first Sulpicians, 138
Holiness of the priesthood, 240
On indolent priests, 174
On neglect of churches, 143
At Vaugirard seminary, 139
Bourgeoisie, Christian virtues among, 544
Bourgeoys, Margaret: in Montreal, 224
Bourges, 247
Bourges, Pragmatic Sanction of, 350
Bourges University, Petau at, 236
Bourgogne (college), Berulle at, 116
Bourgoing (Oratorian), 122: and John Eudes, 123

Bourlemont (archbishop of Toulouse), affair of the Corsican Guard, 327
Bourlemont, Abbé de, 263
Bourzéis, Abbé de (Jansenist), 406
Bouvier, Claude, 420
Braganza, Portuguese house of, 47, 297
Brahmanism, Stubbornness of, 184
Brahmans: Attitude of, 184; John de Britto and, 194; Robert de' Nobili and, 193
Brahman-Saniassi missioners, 194
Bramante, 32
Brassac, Count de: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 159 f.
Brassac, Father de (ambassador), 174
Braunau. *See* Broumov
Brazil: Anchieta in, 211; The Church in, 211; Jesuits in, 211-13; John de Britto in, 194; Vieira in, 207, 213
Brazilian language, Dictionary of, 212
Bréchard, Charlotte de (Visitation nun), 97
Brédevent (Jesuit), missioner in Ethiopia, 228
Brescia, Ottoboni bishop of, 269
Breslay (Sulpician) at Port Royal (Canada), 225
Brest, Union of, 548
Brest Litovsk, 580
Brethren of the Rosy Cross, 505
Breviary: revision by Clement VIII, 15; revision by Urban VIII, 57
Brie, Madame de: St. Vincent and, 144
Brienne, Madame de, 279: Bossuet and, 279; Leibnitz and, 280 f.
Brissac, Madame de (abbess of Chelles), 339
Brittany: Le Nobletz in, 149; Montreal colonists, 223 f.; the rural clergy, 523; Superstitions in, 149
Britto, John de (missioner), 194: Martyrdom of, 195
Broglie, Duke de: on Leibnitz, 279
Brother Shoemakers, Association of, 168
Brother Tailors, Association of, 169
Brothers Hospitallers of St. John of God, 78
Brothers of the Christian Schools: early growth, 528; Establishment of, 308 note; method of instruction, 527; Rules of, 527
Brou, birthplace of Bourdoise, 120
Broumov (Russia), Protestants in, 29
Bruno, St. (founder): Canonization of, 40
Brunswick, 275
Brussels, Antoine Arnauld in, 417
Buch, Henry (shoemaker), 165: and Trade Union of Duty, 167
Buch, Jacques: Preaching of, 537
Bucharest (see), 574
Buckingham, English prime minister, 44
Buddhism: in China, 189; in India, 184; in Japan, 187; Ricci and, 202
Buffier (Jesuit), school curriculum, 529
Bulgar empire, 573
Bulgaria under patriarch of Constantinople, 555
Bulgaroktonos, Basil II the, 573
Bulls, Papal (list of)
Aeterni Patris, 443 note
Cum ad sancti Petri sedem, 407
Cum occasione, 60, 402
Divinam Psalmodiam, 58
Ex omnibus, 362
Ex quo singulari, 206
In caena Domini, 21, 48, 465
In eminenti, 388, 450, 456, 509
Inter caetera, 206
Inter multiplices, 270, 354
Pastoralis officii, 489
Pastoralis romani pontificis vigilantia, 48 note
Providas, 456, 509
Sollicitudo, 260
Unigenitus, 441, 444, 448 ff.
Vineam Domini, 440, 483
Zelus domus meae, 65
Burgundy, Father Lejeune in, 152
Burnet on Baron de Renty, 166
Buxtorf (Hebraist), 284
Buzanval (bishop of Beauvais), 413
Byzantine liturgy, 559, 586
Bzommar (see), 570
Bzovius (historian), continuator of Baronius, 30, 247

"Cabal of Devotees," 156 note, 159, 163
"Cabal of the Important," 396 note
Caen: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 178; Seminary at, 123 f.; Society of Jesus and Mary founded at, 123
Caesaropapism in Germany, 81
Cahors, Seminary at, 134

Cairo, 571
Cajetan of Thiene, Beatification of, 42
Calabria, 450: Albanian clergy, 578; Albanians in, 577
Calas, Antoine: Case of death of, 480
Calas, Jean: rehabilitated, 480
Calasanctius, St. Joseph, 40
Calendar (Chinese) corrected by Verbiest, 204
Calénus, friend of Jansen, 384
Calixt, 283: *Consensus quinquesaecularis*, 275; Leibnitz and writings of, 277
Callinicus II (patriarch), 551
Callistus III (pope): College of Apostolic Secretaries founded by, 266; and Polish Church, 585
Calmet (Scripture exegete), 531
Calvalchini (cardinal), The exclusive against, 458
Calvin, St. Cyran's esteem for, 383
Calvinism: among Rumanians, 574; in Transylvania, 574
Calvinists in Germany, 27
Calvinists (French). *See* Huguenots.
Cambridge University, Cromwell and, 293
Camera, Apostolic: Administration of, 268
Camillus de Lellis, St.: Work of, 78
Camisards, Huguenot bands, 313
Campagna, Roman: Insecurity in the, 30
Campomanès (jurist), 511
Canada, 223: Duke de Ventadour and missions in, 181; Jesuits in, 222; Sulpicians in, 223 f.
Candia, 548: threatened by Turks, 262
Canisius. *See* Peter Canisius
Cannibals, Vieira and conversion of, 214
Cano, Melchior (theologian), 235
Canonesses of Notre Dame, Founding of, 110
Canonization, Benedict XIV on process of, 456
Canton (China), 201
Capuchins
  At Aleppo, 566
  Berulle's retreat with the, 116
  In the Congo, 227
  Expelled from Venice, 22
  In Georgia, 579
  In Italy, 80
  In Switzerland, 181 note
Caraccioli, Marquis: ambassador of Naples, 52, 502
Caractères de la vraie devotion by Grou, 539 f.
Caraffa, Carlo (founder), 40
Cardinals: the Congregations, 259; consulted by the pope, 259; Non-residence of, 21; Power of the, 259
Caribs (tribe), 214, 216
Carlos, Don (of Spain), 444
Carlyle, Thomas: on Oliver Cromwell, 289
Carmelites
  At Alcalá, 71, 232 f.
  At Aleppo, 566
  And attendance at the universities, 233
  Congregation of St. Elias, 71
  Rational theology, 231
  Richelieu and reform of, 105 note
  Of Salamanca, 71, 232
  In Spain, 70
  Worldwide foundations of, 71
Carmelites (nuns): Madame Louise joins, 470; promoted by Madame de Villemar, 110; Spreading influence of, 71
Carpentras, 521
Carvalho, Paul de: made cardinal, 465
Cas de conscience, 482
Casimir, John (of Poland), 585: released from his vows, 257 note
Castile, Febronianism in, 494
Castres (France), 480
Castro (duchy): Farnese estate, 16; seized by Urban VIII, 56
Casuistry, 239: of the Jesuits, 412; Origin of, 232
Catacombs: Archaeology of the, 246; removal of saints' bodies, 265
Cateau-Cambresis, Treaty of, 512
Catechism, method of St. Sulpice, 154
Catherine (of Russia) and suppression of Jesuits, 469
Catherine de Medici on religion in France, 304
Catholic Controversy, The: by St. Francis de Sales, 91
"Catholic Majesty," Title of, 495
Catholic reform in France, 87 ff.
Catholic renaissance, 3 ff.: in Spain, 68
Catholicoi, Chaldean, 568
Catholics in England, Disabilities of, 475
Catignac (France), 152

Caucasus, Georgian Church, 579
Caulet, Jean (bishop of Grenoble), Charities of, 542
Caulet, François (bishop of Pamiers), 332 f., 413
  Appeal to the pope, 335
  Bishop Pavillon and, 334
  Death of, 336
  Founding of Sulpicians, 138
  Jansenism, 334
  Private life of, 333
  Reform of the clergy, 333
  Right of regalia, 334 f.
Caussade, De: *Instructions spirituelles sur les états d'oraison*, 538; *L'abandon à la Providence divine*, 539
Cavalier, Jean: Huguenot leader, 313
Cavaliers, Party of the, 297
Caylus (bishop of Auxerre), the *Unigenitus*, 490
Ceará, Vieira and cannibals of, 214
Ceillier, *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés ecclésiastiques*, 531
Cenarro y Lapiedra (bishop of Valladolid), 512
Central America, colonized by Catholics, 206
Ceremonial of Bishops, New edition of, 15
Cerularius, Michael: and baptism by infusion, 553
Cervantes, 70: Captivity of, 226; *Don Quixote* by, 12 note; and expulsion of Moors, 74
Cesar de Bus, 60
Cévennes, Huguenots of the, 313, 476
Ceylon: Buddhism in, 184; Nestorian missions, 568; St. Francis Xavier in, 191
Chablais (province), St. Francis de Sales in the, 89
Chaise-Dieu (abbey), 489
Chalcedon, 549
Chalcedon, Council of: The anathema against, 569; Arminians and, 450
Chaldeans, The, 568
Chaldeo-Nestorians, 565
Châlon-sur-Saône, 248
Châlons (see), 418
Chambre des Comptes, 331
Champagne, 160: Father Lejeune in, 152; St. Vincent's work in, 147; Suffering in, 160
Champré, Jansen at, 365
Chang-ti as name of God, 203, 205
Chantal. *See* Jane Frances
Chao-king (China), Missioners at, 201
Charfe (monastery), 567, 570
Charity, Daughters of: Approval of, 149; Conferences of charity and, 144; Establishment of, 308 note; Ladies of Charity and, 147
Charity, works of, 541: in France, 141-80
Charlemagne, 346
Charles V (emperor): Las Casas and, 208 f.; Louvain University endowed by, 358
Charles VI (emperor), 474
Charles I (of England), 288
  Absolutism of, 288
  Cromwell's war against, 291
  Death of, 292
  Fall of, 309
  Marriage to Henrietta of France, 45
  Policy of, 292
Charles II (of England), 296: Death of, 299; and Walton's Polyglot, 246
Charles VII (of France), 330
Charles III (of Spain): and Clement XIV, 470; and Jesuits, 466; Jesuits expelled, 459
Charles V (of Spain) and the Moriscos, 73
Charles Alexander von Würtemberg, Conversion of, 472
Charles Borromeo, St., 77
  Canonization of, 31, 78
  Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld and, 106
  Missions in Switzerland, 181 note
  Pastoral theology, 238
  Schools founded by, 77
Charles Emmanuel (duke of Savoy), 89
Charles Stuart (pretender), 296
Charles the Simple, 330
Charles William (margrave), Conversion of, 472
Charlottenburg (Germany), 315
Charon, Father, 547 note
Charonne, Convent of, 339
Charost, Duchess de, 422, 426; Fénelon at house of, 426
Charron, attitude to Catholicism, 88
Chartres (see) made suffragan to Paris, 35

Châtel, Jean: attempt on life of Henry IV, 319; Trial of, 92
Chaulnes, Duke de: ambassador, 269
Chaumrédy, Paul de: in Montreal, 223
Chaurand (Jesuit), poor relief, 542
Chavigny and St. Cyran, 387
Chelles (convent): Abbess of, 337; Henry IV's natural daughter abbess of, 339
Chenu, Jean, 247
Chesnay, Château du, 395
Chevreuse, 395
Chiapa, Las Casas bishop of, 209
Chieti (Italy), 197
Chigi, Fabio (Alexander VII), 256
Chigi, Mario (brother of Alexander VII), 259
Chigi Piazza, constructed by Alexander VII, 260
Chimera (district), 578
China
  Buddhism in, 184, 189
  Dominicans and Jesuits in, 205, 272
  The literary examinations, 200 note
  The literati, 200
  The missions in, 199
  Missioners and the literati, 201 f.
  Nestorian missions, 568
  Paris Foreign Mission Society, 204
  Persecution in, 205
Chinchilla (Benedictine) and frequent Communion, 80 note
Chinese rites, 204, 272
  Benedict XIV and, 206
  Clement XI and, 205
  Decree of Propaganda, 204
  Domestic, 206
  Forbidden by Longobardi, 203
  Holy Office and, 204 f.
  Question of the, 441
  Ricci and, 203
Chios, 559
Choiseul, Duke de: and the Jesuits, 465
Choiseul, Isabelle de: Jansenist, 403
Choiseul-Praslin (bishop of Tournai) and the regalia, 346
Chosen. *See* Corea
Christian August von Holstein, Conversion of, 472
Christian Brothers. *See* Brothers of the Christian Schools
Christian Doctrine, Congregation of, 79
Christian Doctrine, Sisters of, 525
Chrysanthus (patriarch), 558
Church: Authority in the, 492; of Constantinople, 555; Father Olier on the early, 399
Church property, Treaty of Westphalia, 65
Chytraeus, David: *Oratio de statu Ecclesiarum in Graecia, Asia, Africa, Boemia,* 548
Ciampoli, Giovanni Battista, 50
Cicero, Treatise on Law, 250
Cistercian nuns, Habit of, 373
Cistercians, Mother Angélique's charges against, 376
Citeaux (abbey): and Port Royal, 376; Port Royal under jurisdiction of, 107; Reform of, 107
Citeaux (nuns), Habit of, 373
Civil power, supremacy in religious matters, 65
Civitavecchia: Arsenal at, 260; Improvement of port of, 453
Clairvaux (abbey), Reform of, 107
Claude on rule of faith, 415
Claver, St. Peter, 70 f.
Clémencet on Jansen's study, 365
Clément, Jacques: assassin of Henry III, 319
Clement IV (pope) and state encroachments, 330
Clement VII (pope): and bishop of Mexico, 207; and the Spanish Moriscos, 73
Clement VIII (pope), 11
  Attitude to Henry IV, 10
  Baronius confessor of, 11
  Cardinals of, 14
  Conflict with Caesar d'Este, 12
  Consultation of cardinals, 15
  Crusade project, 12
  Death of, 16
  Early career of, 11 note
  Friendliness for France, 16
  James I of England and, 14
  The jubilee, 8
  And Molinism, 16 note
  Mother Angélique's benefice, 371
  New edition of the Index, 15
  Oath of Rutsky, 582
  Reforms of, 14
  Revision of breviary by, 15
  The Ruthenian Church, 580

St. Philip Neri, friend of, 11
Treaty of Lyons, 12
Treaty of Vervins, 12
Veneration of St. Charles Borromeo, 78
Clement IX (pope), 261
Absence of nepotism, 262
Chinese rites, 205
Death of, 263
Election of, 261
And Jansenism, 262
Submission of the four bishops, 414
Clement X (pope), 263: Death of, 265; Election of, 263; Jansenism and, 264
Clement XI (pope), 440
Absence of nepotism, 440
Bulls: *Pastoralis officii*, 489; *Unigenitus*, 441, 488 ff.; *Vineam Domini*, 440, 483
Cas de conscience condemned, 482
Chinese rites, 205
Dispersion of Port Royal nuns, 485
Vatican Library, 565
Clement XII (pope), 447
Bull *In eminenti*, 450, 509
Condemnation of Freemasonry, 450
Death of, 450
Monthly lottery, 447 note
Rumanian Church, 575
St. Francis Regis canonized, 151 note
St. Stephen monastery (Rome), 571
St. Vincent canonized, 149, 151 note
Seminary at St. Benedict of Ullano, 578
Warning on Masonry, 509
Clement XIII (pope), 457: Death of, 463; encyclical on errors of the day, 461; feast of the Sacred Heart, 463; Febronianism condemned, 494
Clement XIV (pope), 464
Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*, 467
Death of, 470
Febronianism condemned, 494
Jesuits suppressed, 226, 467
Louis XV and, 466
Clement, Abbé (Jansenist), 458
Clement, Jacques: attempted assassination of Henry III, 92
Clement Mary Hofbauer, St. (Redemptorist), 518
Clementine peace, 262, 415
Clerical conferences at St. Lazare, 132
Clerical reform, 240 f.: Council of Trent on, 98
Clerks Regular Ministering to the Sick, 78
Clerks Regular of Christian Doctrine, 60 note
Clerks Regular of the Pious Schools, 79: Approval of, 40
Clermont: birthplace of Pascal, 409; De Bonal bishop, 521
Clermont (college): Berulle at, 116; Coret's thesis at, 326; Petau at, 236
Cluny (abbey), reformed by Richelieu, 108 note
Cochin, St. Francis Xavier, 187
Codde, Peter (Oratorian): Jansenist, 499
Codex liturgicus Ecclesiae universae, 565
Coëffeteau (bishop), 126
Coelestis Pastor (constitution), 423
Coimbra University, Anchieta at, 211
Colbert (bishop of Montpellier), the bull *Unigenitus*, 489 f.
Colbert, Jean Baptiste, 327
Death of, 354
Huguenots and, 311
Minister of Louis XIV, 264
The regalia, 346
Repression of Huguenots, 311
Coligny at La Rochelle, 305
Collège de France, 233
Collège des Bons-Enfants: Retreat exercises at, 131; Seminary at, 134 note
Collège Louis-le-Grand, 532
College of the Propaganda, Founding of, 57
Collegia Philobiblica, 285
Collegia pietatis, 285
Collenbrusch, Samuel (Pietist), 286
Collins, the term "freethought," 303
Cologne, birthplace of Father Schall, 203
Colonia, Father: *Bibliothèque janséniste*, 455
Colonnade (St. Peter's), erected by Alexander VII, 260
Columbus, Christopher, 206: counsel of Pinzon, 220; discovery of Hispaniola, 207
"Columbus of the Catacombs," 247
Comma in condemnation of Baianism, 362
Commendam in France, 520

Commentaries by Bonfrère, 244
Commentaries by Cornelius a Lapide, 244
Communion, St. Philip Neri and frequent, 80
Comorin, Cape: St. Francis Xavier at, 185
Companies of Ladies, 179
Companions of Duty. *See* Trade Union of Duty
Company of Mary, Founding of, 536
Company of New Converts, 179
Company of Prisons, 179
Company of the Blessed Sacrament. *See* Blessed Sacrament
Compiègne, Richelieu at, 383
Complutenses, The, 72, 232 f., 246
Comtat Venaissin, 521
Concordat with France (1516), 324, 337, 520
Condé, Prince of, 344: at La Rochelle, 305
Condorcet, philosophy of Freemasonry, 506
Condren, Charles de (Oratorian), 115, 119 f.
  Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 155, 157, 174
  Director of Caulet, 333
  Esteem for Bishop Zamet, 379
  Father Olier and, 137, 139
  Jansenists and, 175
  L'idée du sacerdoce et du sacrifice de Jésus-Christ, 241
  On the priesthood of Christ, 241 f.
  St. Cyran and, 368
Conferences, clerical: at St. Lazare, 132
Conférences de Saint-Lazare by St. Vincent, 241
Conferences of charity, St. Vincent and, 144
Confession of Augsburg, 46: Greek translation, 547
Confession of Dositheus, 551
Conflans, De Beaumont exiled to, 498
Confucianism, 189: Ricci and, 202
Congo, Missions in the, 226 f.
Congregation of the Mission, Approval of, 57, 149
Congregations, New religious, 110
Congregations, Religious. *See* Religious orders
Coninck, Giles de: moral theology, 238
Connecticut (colony), Protestantism in, 221
Conquistadores, Atrocities by, 208
Consensus quinquesaecularis, 275
Considérations sur l'entreprise faite par M. Cornet, 401
Constance, Council of, 349: Gallicanism, 318
Constantinople
  Anti-Catholic synod (1722), 553, 560
  Church of, 557, 560
  Holy Synod of, 557, 560
  Patriarchs of, 323: Jurisdiction of, 555; Number of, 555; Succession of, 548 ff.
Conti, Michelangelo (Innocent XIII), 442: promise before election, 443 f.
Conti, Prince de, 159: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177
Contrat social by Rousseau, 500
Controverse pacifique sur l'authorité de l'Eglise by Lefranc, 534
Controversies by Bellarmine, 237
Convents: number in France, 520; Royal rights over, 337 f.
Converts, Relief for, 174
Copernicus, Nicholas: *De revolutionibus orbium caelestium,* 48
Copts, The, 571: Abjuration of, 450; Gregory XIII and, 571; Pius IV and, 571
Corbara (Jesuit) on suppression of the Jesuits, 469
Corbières, Religious conditions in the, 332
Corea, Japanese victories in, 197
Coret (Jesuit) on infallibility, 326
Corinth, 557
Cornet, Nicholas: Bossuet on, 234; the five propositions, 400; and Navarre College, 234
Coronel, Mary. *See* Mary of Agreda
Corraro, Angelo: account of Alexander VII, 260
Corregidors, 69
Corsica, dispute with Genoa, 448, 460
Corsican Guard, Affair of the, 260, 326
Corsini, Lorenzo (Clement XII), 447
Cortez, Fernando: in Mexico, 207
Coscia (cardinal): Benedict XIII's confidence in, 446; freed from imprisonment, 452; Imprisonment of, 447
Cospéan (bishop of Lisieux), 112

Coton, Pierre (Jesuit), 92
Appearance of, 93
Confessor of Henry IV, 367
Confessor of Louis XIII, 96
At court of Henry IV, 93, 95
Death of, 96
On the Oratory, 118
Coulanges (abbey), 132
Coulanges, De, 386
Council of Conscience, 173: Cornet president of, 234; St. Vincent and the, 127
Council of Requests, 480
Councils, Superiority of general, 349 f.
Councils, List of
Basle (1423), 318
Chalcedon (451), 450
Constance (1414), 318, 349
Embrun (1727), 521
Florence (1423), 553
Lateran III (1179), 37
Lateran IV (1215), 576
Lyons I (1245), 351
Lyons II (1274), 330 f., 334
Moscow (1654), 587
Zamosk (1720), 584
Counter Reformation in Germany, 258
Cour des Comptes, The, 330
Court of Aids, 409
Coutances: See of, 140; Seminary founded at, 123
Cramoisy bookshop, 320
Créqui, Duke de, 327, 337
Crete, 548: under patriarch of Constantinople, 555
Creutz, Count de: ambassador to Sweden, 502
Cromwell, Oliver, 289
Anti-Catholic spirit of, 293
Charles I and, 288
Death of, 296
Education of, 290
Foreign policy of, 295
Jews and, 295
Member of Parliament, 290
Presbyterians and, 293-95
Puritan Reformation, 287
Religion of, 291
Title of Protector, 292
Walton's Polyglot, 246
War against Charles I, 291
Cromwell, Richard: ruler of England, 296
Cromwell, Thomas: minister of Henry VIII, 290
Crusade: Clement VIII's project, 12; Henry IV and projected, 12 note
Crusius, Martin, 548
Crypto-Calvinism, 275
Cuba: Adrian VI and bishop of, 207; Discovery of, 207; First bishop of, 207
Cum ad sancti Petri sedem (bull), 407
Cum occasione (bull), 60, 402
Cumana (province), Las Casas and, 209
Cyprian of Constantinople (patriarch), 553
Cyprus, Synod of, 551
Cyril V (patriarch), 554, 560
Cyril VI (patriarch), 561
Cyril VII Siaj (patriarch), 562
Cyril Lukaris. *See* Lukaris
Cyril of Berrhoea (patriarch), 550: Death of, 550
Czech Protestants, 29
Czenstochowa, 268

Dahan, Athanasius, 562
Daimios, 188, 196
Damascus, 560: Catholics at, 560 f.; Patriarchs of Antioch at, 559
Daubray and submission of Port Royal hermits, 411
Daughters of Charity. *See* Charity
Daughters of Notre Dame. *See* Notre Dame
Daughters of Providence. *See* Providence
Daughters of Wisdom. *See* Wisdom
Day of the Grille at Port Royal, 372 f.
De Auxiliis, Congregation, 17, 387
De concordia sacerdotii et imperii by De Marca, 322 f.
De doctrina temporum by Petau, 236
De emendatione temporum by Scaliger, 236
De haeresi, schismate et apostasia by Santarelli, 320
De la pénitence publique by Petau, 396
De la puissance ecclésiastique et politique by Richer, 318 note
De naturae arcanis by Lucilio, 251
De praesenti statu Ecclesiae by Febronius, 492
De republica christiana by De Dominis, 318 note

De revolutionibus orbium caelestium by Copernicus, 48
De statu praesenti Ecclesiae by Febronius, 461, 496
De statu religionis et reipublicae by Sleidanus, 27
De synodo dioecesana by Benedict XIV, 452, 456
Declaration of Indulgence, 297
Declaration of Rights (English), 303
"Defender of the Church," Title of, 35
Defenestration of Prague, 29
Defense de la Declaration, revised by Bossuet, 355
Deir-az-Zafaran (monastery), 567
Deism, Masonry and, 506
Demandatam caelitus (constitution), 562
Demia, seminaries of schoolmasters, 525
Denis (abbot of Clairvaux), 107
Denis, St. (bishop of Paris), 35
Denmark, treaty with Cromwell, 295
Deplessis-Mornay, 304
Descartes, 499: Brethren of the Rosy Cross, 505; Philosophy of, 231; Sincerity of, 230
Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la Société,* 508
"Desert, The," Huguenots in, 313
Des Mares (Jansenist), 406
Deuterocanonical books of Bible, 552
Devotion réconciliée avec l'Esprit by Lefranc, 534
Dialoghi delle nuove scienze by Galileo, 54
Dialogo dei due massimi sistemi del mondo by Galileo, 54
Diana, Antonino (casuist), 239 f.: *Resolutiones morales,* 239
Diarbekir, 555, 568 f.
Dictionnaire historique et critique by Bayle, 442
Dictionnaire philosophique de la religion by Nonnotte, 533
Diderot, the *Encyclopedia,* 461
Dijon (France), 269
Dimitrovics, Peter (bishop), 577
Dionysius (archimandrite), correction of liturgical books, 587
Dionysius (of Paris). *See* Denis
Diplomacy, Development of international, 63
Diplomatic career, Origin of, 13 note
Dippel (Pietist), 286
Directorium in exercitiis spiritualibus, 80
Distinctio inter Sedem et Sedentem, 347 note
Doctorate in theology (Sorbonne), 235
Doctrinarians, 79
Dogmata theologica by Petau, 236 f.
Dominic of Jesus Mary (Carmelite), 71
Dominicans
  In Africa, 226
  In the Congo, 227
  And Jesuits in China, 205
  Jesuits versus, 10, 16
  Martyred by Mussulmans, 226
  Missioners in South America, 207 ff.
  Rational theology, 231
Dominis, Marco Antonio de: Career of, 318 note; *De republica christiana,* 318 note; multitudinist Gallicanism, 318
Dominus ac Redemptor (brief), 467
Don Quixote by Cervantes, 12 note
Donauwörth: under ban of the Empire, 28; Disturbance at, 27; Rudolf and, 28; seized by Maximilian, 28
Donnadier (bishop), preparation of his ordinands, 130
Dositheus (patriarch of Jerusalem), 557: *Confession of,* 551; *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem,* 558
Drechsel, Jeremias (preacher), 81
Dresden, Spener in, 285
Du Barry, Madame: Influence of, 502
Dubois, Guillaume (cardinal): and bull *Unigenitus,* 489; Elevation of, 444
Duchesne, André (historian), 247
Duclos, *Mémoires,* 478
Dueling: Henry IV's edict against, 96; Prohibition of, 15; Suppressing of, 162
Dumoulin: *Anatomie de la Messe,* 175; on royal rights over convents, 338
Duperron (cardinal), 14, 92: and Morin, 237; project of new Polyglot, 246
Dupin, Ellies (Jansenist): and Anglican Church, 490; power of kings, 492
Dupleix, 126
Du Plessis d'Argentré (bishop), bureau of charity, 542
Durfort, De (archbishop of Besançon), 541
Du Vair, attitude to Catholicism, 88

Duval, Andrew, 234: confessor of St. Vincent, 234; Sorbonne professor of theology, 234
Duvergier (*see also* St. Cyran)
Becomes abbot of St. Cyran, 367
Character of, 364
Code terms used by, 366
Jansen and, 364
At Paris, 367
Study of St. Augustine, 365

Eastern Church, 547-89
Ecchellensis, Abraham, 564
Ecclesiastical courts, Competence of, 355 and note
Ecclesiastical Reservation, 27
Echter, Julius (bishop of Würzburg), 82
Edessa, 569
Edict of Alais, 307
Edict of Nantes, 9, 310
French Protestantism, 304
Huguenots exiled, 476
Innocent XI and revocation of, 314
Louis XIV's interpretation of, 308
Revocation of, 267, 308 f., 312 ff., 354
Richelieu's interpretation of, 307
Edict of Restitution by Ferdinand II, 45 ff.
Education in France, 524 ff., 528: and classical studies, 529; Elementary, 524 ff.
Edward I (of England), expulsion of Jews, 295
Egypt: Church of, 556, 571; Franciscans in, 571; Monophysites in, 556
Elections, papal. *See* Papal elections
Eliano (Jesuit), Missions of, 564
Elizabeth (of England), 287
Elizabeth, St. (of Portugal), Canonization of, 56
Elizabeth (of Russia), Benedict XIV esteemed by, 454
Elizabeth (wife of Philip II), 72
Eller, Elias (Pietist), 286
Embrun, Council of (1727), 521
Emile by Rousseau, 461, 529: condemned, 461
"Eminence," Title of, 47 note
Emperor, title of "Defender of the Church," 35
Encheiridion by Epictetus, 250
Encyclical *Vix pervenit,* 452
Encyclopedia, The, 461, 501: condemned, 461; study of Latin, 528 f.
England
Anne, queen of, 302
Aristocratic character of constitution of, 258
Catholics excluded from office, 298
Charles I, 288 f.
The Church in, 25
Colonization of North America, 221
Cromwell's government, 292
Disabilities of Catholics, 475
Growth of power of, 287
Jews expelled from, 295
Landing of William of Orange, 301 f.
Masonry in, 504, 506
Persecution of Catholics, 25
Pietism in, 286
Political influence of Masonry, 504
Protestantism in, 8, 287, 474
Puritanism in, 287
Sea power of, 448
Trinitarians in, 226
English College (Rome), Jesuits imprisoned in, 469
Ephrem (patriarch of Constantinople), 558
Epictetus, *Encheiridion* by, 250
Epicureanism, Modern, 250
Epirus, 555
Episcopalians, American colonists, 206
Equiprobabilism of St. Alphonsus, 517
Erlon (in Luxembourg), 165
Escobar y Mendoza, Antonio: casuist, 239 f.; *Universae theologicae moralis receptae sententiae,* 239
Espirito Santo (Brazil), 212
Esprit by Helvetius, 461: condemned, 461
Esprit de Jésus-Christ et de l'Eglise sur la fréquent communion, 455
Essais de morale by Nicole, 416
Este, Caesar d', 12
Estius, 245
Estrées, Cardinal d': Bossuet to, 345 f.; French envoy to Rome, 314, 336
Estrées, Gabrielle d', 371
Estrées, Jacqueline d' (abbess of Maubuisson), 371, 374
Etampes, birthplace of Guénée, 533
Etats d'oraison by Caussade, 538
Etchmiddzin, Armenian patriarchs of, 569

Ethiopia: Eutychianism in, 228; Missions in, 226, 228, 572
Ethiopians, 572
Etsi pastoralis (constitution), 578
Eucharist. *See* Blessed Sacrament
Eudes, St. John (founder), 122
  Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 155
  Congregation of the Good Shepherd, 150
  Feast of Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, 462
  Holiness of the priesthood, 240
  Missioner, 149
  As Oratorian, 122
  Preaching of, 150
European equilibrium in Treaty of Westphalia, 63
Euthymius (patriarch), 559
Euthymius Saifi (patriarch), 560, 562
Eutychianism: the Armenians renounce, 470; in Ethiopia, 228
Eutychius Saqzi (patriarch), 559
Evangelical Union and Ferdinand II, 30
Evangeline by Longfellow, 225
Evreux: Seminary founded at, 123; Sisters of Providence, 525
Ex omnibus (bull), 362
Examination of conscience, St. Francis de Sales on, 101
Exclusive, Right of, 443: Albizzi on, 443; against Cardinal Rampolla, 443 note
Excommunications, Annual publication of, 48
Exegesis, Biblical, 244
Exequatur, Requirement of, 459
Exercitationes biblicae by Morin, 238
Existence of God by Fénelon, 432
Expectative, Right of, 532: at the Sorbonne, 235
Explication de la méthode d'oraison, 538
Explication des maximes des saints by Fénelon, 430
Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne by Mésenguy, 461

Faculty of Theology (Paris), 482, 489: acceptance of the *Unigenitus,* 490; Baianism censured by, 361; Composition of, 351
Fagaras (see), 574 f.
Faith, human faith and divine, 413 f.
Falconnet and Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 179
Family names (French), 125 note
Far East, Clement X and mission in, 265
Farargi, John (bishop), 572
Farnese (family): and the Aldobrandini, 15; and the Barberini, 56
Father of Pietism, 285
"Fathers of a Good Death," 78
Fathers of Christian Doctrine, 425
Favre, Jacqueline (Visitation nun), 97
Feast days, Reduction of number of, 455
Febronianism, 492: papal condemnations, 494
Febronius, Justinus: *De praesenti statu Ecclesiae,* 461, 492; Doctrine of, 496
Felix V (antipope), 585
Felix of Cantalice, Beatification of, 42
Fénelon, François de (bishop of Cambrai), 425, 434
  On apologetics, 535
  Appeal to Rome, 431
  On Archbishop Harlay, 342 note
  Cas de conscience refuted by, 482
  Conflict with Bossuet, 272
  Consecrated by Bossuet, 430
  Contents of the *Maximes,* 431
  On dispersion of Port Royal nuns, 486
  On example of St. Sulpice, 155
  Explication des maximes des saints, 272, 430
  Influence of Madame Guyon on, 427
  Meeting with Madame Guyon, 426
  Quietism, 420
  Réfutation du système du P. Malebranche, 426
  At St. Sulpice, 426
  Submission of, 431
  Télémaque, 432, 434
  Treatise on the Existence of God, 432
Fénelon, Marquis de: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177; and dueling, 162 f.
Feodor I (czar), 586
Ferdinand (archduke) and German conflict, 28
Ferdinand II (emperor), 83: Catholic champion, 30; Decline of authority of, 258; Edict of Restitution, 45 ff.; and prince electors, 34
Ferdinand III (of Spain), 208: Cult of, 260; Las Casas and, 208
Ferrara (duchy), 12

Ferrier, Jean du: Father Condren and, 137; and founding of Sulpicians, 138; Louis XIII's confessor, 388 note
Fersen, 502
Feuillants, reformed by La Barrière, 108 note
Fidelis Sigmaringen, St.: in Switzerland, 181 note
Findel, philosophy of Freemasonry, 505
Fire insurance companies, Origin of, 542
Fishery Coast (India), St. Francis Xavier, 191
Fitter, Adam (Jesuit), 575
Five Mile Act, 297
Five propositions (Jansenist), 400: condemned by Innocent X, 402
Flaifel, Anthony (bishop), 572
Fléchier, Preaching of, 434
Fleury, Abbé: at La Trappe, 109
Fleury, André de (cardinal): bull *Unigenitus*, 489; made cardinal, 446; Masonic meetings forbidden, 508; treatment of Huguenots, 478
Fleury, Rosset de (bishop of Cambrai), 521
Florence, Council of (1439), 553: papal infallibility, 351
Florence, Union of, 571
Floriot, Father: and approval of *Frequent Communion*, 396
Fludd, Robert: *Apologia* of the Rosy Cross, 505
"Flying squadron," 254, 261, 443
Foix (district), 334
Fontaine (Jansenist), *Mémoires*, 387
Fontainebleau, 93
Fontanges, Catherine de (abbess of Chelles), 339
Fontanges, Mlle de: and Louis XIV, 339
Fontcouverte, birthplace of St. Francis Regis, 150
Fontenay-Mareuil, Count of, 160
Fontenelle, *Histoire des oracles*, 442
Fontevrault: Jurisdiction of abbess of, 337; Henry IV's natural daughter abbess of, 339
Foreign missions, 181-229
  In Africa, 226
  In China, 199
  Gregory XV and, 39
  Henry IV's interest in, 96
  In Japan, 195
Foreign missions (*continued*)
  In North America, 220
  In South America, 206
Foreign Missions, Paris Seminary of, 204
Foreign Missions, Society of, 179
Formulary (anti-Jansenist), 404: rejected by four bishops, 413; Revision of, 407
Forty Hours' Adoration, Institution of, 15
Foucault (intendant), 335: Dragonade under direction of, 336; his sisters appointed abbesses, 339
Fouquet (bishop of Bayonne), 132
Fouquet, Madame: and St. Vincent, 145
Fouquet (superintendant), Trial of, 177
Four articles of 1682, 348: Louis XIV and, 352
Fourier, St. Peter, 110
Fox, George: Quakers founded by, 302
France
  Administration of the colleges, 532
  Anne of Austria queen, 127, 145-47, 173
  Anticlerical magistracy, 324
  Catholic reform in, 87 ff.
  Concordat (1516), 324, 337, 520
  Conditions in, 141
  And Cromwell, 295
  During Thirty Years' War, 141
  Elementary education, 524 ff.
  Exclusive against Calvalchini, 458
  Famine, 160
  Growth of the Jesuits in, 95
  Habsburgs versus, 36
  Higher studies, 530
  Influence in the Orient, 36
  Interference in papal elections, 443
  Jesuit schools, 95
  The laboring classes, 164
  Masonry in, 507
  The plague, 160
  Protestantism in, 304, 476. *See also* Huguenots
  Regulation of education, 532
  The schoolmaster, 524
  Schools in, 524
  Secondary education, 528
  Tributary to foreign industry, 141
  Tridentine decrees not accepted, 114
  Tridentine reforms, 87
France, Church in, 520
  Appointment of bishops, 356
  Appointment of prelates, 100, 112

France (*continued*)
Assembly of the Clergy. *See* Assembly
Clergy in education, 532
The commendam, 520
Concordat of 1516, 100 note
Ecclesiastical feudalism, 114
Influence of the clergy, 112
Life of the prelates, 112
The lower clergy, 113
The missions, 128
Number of religious houses, 520
Organization of, 355
Reform of monasteries, 106
The regular clergy, 105
Restrictions on, 114
The rural clergy, 522 f.
The secular clergy, 111
Sees vacant in 1688, 363
Seminaries, 123, 132
The tithes, 523
The upper clergy, 324
Wealth of, 520
Wealth of the clergy, 111
Works of charity, 141-80
France, Collège de, 233
France, University of, 532
Frances of Rome, St.: Foundation by, 97
Francesco Girolamo, St., 514
Francis I (of France), 35
Francis Borgia, St.: Beatification of, 42
Francis de Sales, St., 88
Admiration for Mother Angélique, 372
Ascetical theology, 232, 240
Canonization of, 260
Cardinal de Berulle and, 99
Catholic Controversy by, 91
In Chablais province, 89
Character of, 88
Diocesan synods, 98
Director of Mother Angélique, 375
On duties of one's state of life, 101 f.
Education of, 89
Efforts to found a seminary, 99
Esteem for Bishop Zamet, 379
Esteem for the Jesuits, 96
On examination of conscience, 101
Handwritten leaflets, 90
Henry IV and, 91
Introduction to the Devout Life, 101, 393
Jane de Chantal and, 97
On meditation, 101
On the Oratory, 118
Francis de Sales (*continued*)
In Paris, 91
On piety of the laity, 100
Reform of the clergy, 98
In Savoy, 90
In Switzerland, 181 note
Treatise on the Love of God, 89, 102
The Visitation founded by, 97
Writings of St. Theresa, 101
Francis Regis, St., 150 f.: Canonization of, 151 note
Francis Solanus, St.: in Lima, 210
Francis Xavier, St. (missioner), 40, 182
Attempt to enter China, 190
Beatification of, 31
And the bonzes, 189
Canonization of, 40
Death of, 190, 191 note
Esteem for baptism, 186
At Goa, 185
In India, 184
In Japan, 187 ff.
Method of, 185
Number of converts, 191 note
At Paris University, 182
Return to India, 189
St. Ignatius and, 183
Sent to India, 183
Vows at Montmartre, 183
Franciscans
In Africa, 226
In California, 221
In Egypt, 571
Martyred by Mussulmans, 226
Missioners in South America, 210
In Spain, 70
Frankfort, Fair of, 385
Frankfort-on-Main: Spener, pastor of, 284
Frantz (Jesuit) and Joseph II, 495
Frascati seminary, 466
Fray Gerundio by Father Isla, 511
Frederick (elector Palatine), leader of Protestantism, 28
Frederick II (of Prussia): anti-Christian rationalism, 472; Benedict XIV and, 454; and Jesuit suppression, 469; and Joseph II, 496
Frederick Augustus: Conversion of, 272; elector of Saxony, 440; victory over Charles XII, 441
Frederick William I (of Prussia), national Church, 472

Freemasonry. *See* Masonry
Frémyot. *See* Jane Chantal
French Academy, 341
French Revolution, Jansenism and, 497
Frequent Communion, by Antoine Arnauld, 334, 393, 482: Attacks on, 396; Condemnation of, 397; Consequences of, 399
Friars Minor. *See* Franciscans
Friars Preachers. *See* Dominicans
Fromont, friend of Jansen, 384
Fronde, The, 142: Results of, 257; St. Vincent during, 147
Frumentius, St.: in Ethiopia, 228
Fulda (monastery), German monasticism and, 83

Gabriel VIII (Coptic patriarch), 571
Galanti, Ippolito, 79
Galerie, La (Annecy): The Visitation foundation, 97
Galicia, 579, 585
Galileo, 48
  Attitude to the Church, 230
  Bellarmine and, 51
  Cardinal Barberini and, 49
  Character of, 50
  Condemnation of, 51 f.
  Death of, 54
  Dialoghi delle nuove scienze, 54
  Dialogo dei due massimi sistemi del mondo, 54
  Imprisonment of, 54
  Istoria e dimostrazioni intorno alle macchie solari, 49
  Paul V and, 49
  Urban VIII and, 54
Galley convicts, St. Vincent and, 146
Gallia christiana, 247 f.
Gallican Church, the customs of, 350
Gallicanism, 317-57, 491
  Assembly of the Clergy (1681), 345
  Boldness of, 266
  Bossuet, 343
  Ecclesiastical, 318
  Four articles of 1682, 348
  Innocent XI and, 353
  Louis XIV, 325, 340
  The new, 319
  In the Parliament, 337
  Presbyterian, 321
  Proposition signed by Jesuits, 320
Gallicanism (*continued*)
  Regalian, 270
  Richelieu, 319 f.
  Richer, 321
  In the Sorbonne, 337
  The term, 317
  And Western Schism, 318
Gamache, Sorbonne doctor, 236
Gambling at French court, 162
Ganganelli, Lorenzo (Clement XIV), 464
Garasse, 143: on modern Epicureans, 251
Garfellini (nuncio), 329
Gaspard de Vintimille (archbishop of Paris), 490
Gaspard Hoffmann (abbot), 83
Gaspareaux (Canada), 225
Gaulin, missioner in Canada, 225
Gausset, François (Jesuit), 567
Gavanti, Bartholomew: *Thesaurus sacrorum rituum,* 243
Gavantus (Barnabite), 80
Gayet, Palma (historian), 126
Gazette de France on affair of Corsican Guard, 327
"General Alms," The: Organization of, 542
General Assemblies of the Clergy. *See* Assembly
General Hospital of Paris, 148, 160 f.
Geneva: D'Arenthon bishop of, 421; Sirvens flee to, 480
Genevieve, Mother (abbess of Port Royal), 377: Installation of, 380
Genoa: dispute with Corsica, 448, 460; and the Holy See, 492; price on head of papal legate, 460; and Savoy reconciled, 265
George II (Jacobite patriarch), 567
George III (Jacobite patriarch), 567
George von Schönborn (prince elector), 493
Georgia: incorporated into Russia, 579; Theatines in, 579
Georgians, 579
Gerlach, Stephen (Lutheran), 548
German College (Rome), 265, 575
German mentality, 493
Germanus II (patriarch), 557
Germanus Adam, 563
Germany
  Absolutism of the princes, 274

Germany (*continued*)
Caesaropapism in, 81
Calvinists in, 27
Catholic princes, 27
The Church in, 27, 80
Church property, 27
Clerical reform, 82
Counter Reformation, 258
Disregard of the Holy See, 460
Influence of Gaspard Hoffmann, 83
Influence of monasticism, 82
Lutherans in, 27
Penetration of Roman law, 274
Power of the princes, 81
Predominance of the nobility, 258
Project of Melk congregation, 82
The Protestant princes, 27
Protestantism in, 8, 273, 472
Religious syncretism, 274
Roman law in, 81, 274
St. Peter Canisius in, 181 note
Seminaries in, 85
Swedish invasion of, 83
Gerson, episcopalian Gallicanism, 318
Gesù (church, Rome), 468
Gex, Madame Guyon at, 421
Ghrebnitsky, Florian (bishop), 584
Girgeh (see), 572
Girolamo, St. Francesco, 514 f.
Girolamo da Narni (Capuchin), 39
Glories of Mary by St. Alphonsus, 516
Goa: Nobili and archbishop of, 194; St. Francis Xavier at, 185
Godeau (bishop of Vence), 132, 154: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177
Godet des Marais (bishop of Chartres), 420: and Madame Guyon's doctrine, 427
Goldoni, Molière's influence on, 503
Golvan, Antonio (archbishop of Granada), 512
Gondi (family), 113: St. Cyran at home of, 367
Gondi, Emmanuel de: St. Vincent and, 126, 146
Gondi, Henry de (cardinal), 119, 146: Louis XIII and, 105
Gondi, Jean de (archbishop of Paris): Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 159; retreats for his ordinands, 131
Gondi, Madame de: Death of, 129; St. Vincent and, 128 f., 145
Gondrin, De (archbishop of Sens): Apparent austerity of, 402 note; Jansenist, 402
Gonzaga, Aloysius. *See* Aloysius
Gonzaga, Princess: and St. Vincent, 145
Good Jesus of Ravenna (congregation), abolished, 60
Good Shepherd, Congregation of the: Founding of, 150
Goodwin (Puritan preacher), 296
Goto Islands (Japan), 196
Gotti, Vincenzo (cardinal), 451
Goupil, René: Martyrdom of, 222
Gournay, Marie de: Olier and, 135
Grace, efficacy of, 358 f. *See also* Jansenism
Grammaire générale, 395
Gramont, Marshal de: and Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 178
Gran (see), 575
Granada (Spain), St. Turibius in, 210
Grand Age, The, 432 ff.
Grand Châtelet, Chapel of the, 173
Grand Orient: first Grand Master, 507; Installation of, 507
Grandchamp, Madame de: superior of convent of Charonne, 339
Grandin, Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177
Grands Augustins (church, Paris), 346
Granges, Château de: "Little schools" at, 395
Granier, Claude (bishop of Geneva), 90
Granvelle (cardinal) and Baianism, 361
"Great Arnauld." *See* Arnauld, Antoine
Great Augustinians, Monastery of, 105 note
Great Britain. *See* England
Greater Antilles, Discovery of, 207
Greece: Holy Synod, 552; under patriarch of Constantinople, 555
Greek College (Rome), 575-77, 582
Greek liturgy, Variants in, 586
Greek Orthodox Church, 547
Greek rite: Alteration of, 578; Clement VIII and the, 15; in Italy, 578
Greek Uniate patriarchate, 455
Greeks (Uniate): in Bisignano diocese, 450; in Venice, 460
Greenland, Pietism in, 286
Gregory IV (patriarch), 549
Gregory VII, St. (pope): Canonization of, 446

Gregory XIII (pope)
Baius' submission, 362 f.
Bull against Baianism, 362
Coptic Church, 571
Greek College founded by, 577
Maronite College founded by, 564
Missions of the Orient, 39
Moors of Spain, 73
Gregory XV (pope), 33
Bull *Aeterni Patris*, 443 note
Canonizations by, 40
Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld and, 106
Character of, 33
Congregation of Propaganda, 39
Death of, 37, 41
Election of, 33
Friendly to the Jesuits, 33
On the Immaculate Conception, 41
On papal elections, 38
Piety of, 39
Policy of, 33
Reform efforts, 37
Religious congregations approved by, 40
The right of exclusive, 443
Gregory XVI (pope), Council of Qarqafe condemned, 563
Grenade, De: *Le guide des pécheurs*, 100
Grenoble: Caulet bishop of, 542; General Hospital, 161; See of, 314; Workmen's societies at, 169
Grignan, Jacques de (bishop of Uzès), 160
Grignan, Madame de, 336
Grignon de Montfort (Blessed), 525: Company of Mary, 536; Daughters of Wisdom, 536; Preaching of, 536
Grisar on Galileo's condemnation, 52 note
Grisons (canton) and Valtellina, 36
Grosswardein (see), 576
Grottaferrata (monastery), 578
Grou: *Caractères de la vraie dévotion*, 539 f.; *Intérieur de Jésus et de Marie*, 541; *Science pratique du Crucifix*, 540
Guaranis (tribe), 216
Guatemala, see created, 207
Guayra (province), Reductions in, 217
Guémené, Princess de: Jansenist, 403; retreat at Port Royal, 374
Guénée (apologist), 533: *Lettres de quelques juifs à M. de Voltaire*, 534
Guide des pécheurs by De Grenade, 100
Guide spirituelle by Molinos, 423
Guignard (Jesuit), Execution of, 92 note
Guitton, mayor of La Rochelle, 306
Gunpowder Plot, The, 14, 25
Gustavus Adolphus (of Sweden), 46
Guyenne (France), 305, 310: Huguenot meetings in, 478; Jesuit houses in, 94
Guyon, Madame, 420
Arrest of, 425
Confined in Meaux convent, 427
Father Lacombe and, 421 ff.
Le moyen court et facile pour faire l'oraison, 422 ff.
Les torrents spirituels, 423
Meeting with Fénelon, 426
Orthodoxy of, 425
Theological inquiry at Meaux, 427
Guyon du Chesnoy, Jacques, 421
Guy-Patin, 385
Guzzetta, George: Oratory of the Oriental rite, 578

Habert, Isaac: preaching against Jansenism, 387
Habit of Citeaux nuns, 373
Habsburgs: Ambition of, 13; Empire of the, 13; Strength of, 9; versus France, 36
Hagiographic Confraternity, 557
Hague, The: Leibnitz at, 276; Pseudo-chapter at, 499
Hainaut, 359
Haiti: Discovery of, 207; Measures to populate, 208
Hakim, Maximus, 562
Hama (see), 560
Hamel, Father du: Jansenist practices, 399
Hamon (physician), Port Royal hermit, 382
Hampton Court, 504
Hanover (Germany), 276
Hapsburgs. *See* Habsburgs
Haqlani, Abraham 'el, 564
Harcourt, Count of: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 178
Hardouin de Beaumont de Péréfixe. *See* Péréfixe
Harlay, Achille de (Procurator General), 328
Harlay, François de (archbishop of Paris), 341 f.

Harlay (*continued*)
Investigation of quietism, 425
Jansenists opposed by, 342
Louis XIV and, 354
Private morals of, 487
And quietism, 423
And the regalia, 346
Secularization of Charonne convent, 340
Harnack, Adolph, 473
Hasselius, Leonard (Louvain professor), 359: at Council of Trent, 359
Hauranne, Duvergier de. *See* Duvergier
Hebrew: Chairs of, 31; Teaching of, 233
Hebrides, The: missions, 181
Helmstedt University, 275
Helvetius: Apron of, 508; *Esprit* by, 461
Henrietta of England, Bossuet's funeral sermon, 344
Henrietta of France: Bossuet's funeral sermon, 309, 344; wife of Charles I of England, 45, 288
Henry III (of France): Attempted assassination of, 92; Assassination of, 319; *Declaration verbale,* 338
Henry IV (of France), 91
Acquaviva (Jesuit general), 93
Appointment of prelates, 100, 112
Assassination of, 29
Attempted assassination of, 92, 319
Baronius and, 17 note
Character of, 9
Clement VIII's attitude to, 10
And crusade project, 12 note
Duvergier's pamphlet, 367
Esteem for St. Vincent, 126
Father Coton, confessor of, 367
Favors to Jesuits, 94
Heart bequeathed to La Flèche, 96
La Flèche founded by, 95
And Maubuisson Abbey, 374
Mother Angélique and, 371
The pope and, 319
Private morality of, 95
Recall of the Jesuits, 92
Reform of Paris University, 94
St. Francis de Sales and, 91
And the Sorbonne, 234
Supposed grand design of, 13
Suspicion against the Jesuits, 93
Treatment of Protestants, 87
Urban VIII and, 42
Venetian conflict with Paul V, 24
Henry of Béarn at La Rochelle, 305
Henry the Navigator, African missions, 226
Heracles, 550
Herder, 287
Hermant on St. Cyran, 389
Hermitage, The (in Normandy), 178
Hermits of Port Royal, 381: regard for Mother Angélique, 382
Hessels, John: at the Council of Trent, 362
Hexapla by Origen, 245
Hideyoshi, persecutor, 196-98
Hindustan, St. Francis Xavier's preaching, 186
Hirado (Japan), Christian center, 195
Hispaniola, Discovery of, 207
Histoire de l'Eglise by Noel Alexander, 531
Histoire de Port Royal by Racine, 394
Histoire des oracles by Fontanelle, 442
Histoire généalogique de la Maison de France by Sainte-Marthe, 248
Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés ecclésiastiques, 531
Histoire littéraire de la France by Rivet, 531
History of the Council of Trent by Pallavicino, 260
History of the Council of Trent by Sarpi, 24
History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem by Dositheus, 558
Hoadly (Anglican bishop), 475
Hochman, Christian (Pietist), 286
Hofbauer, St. Clement, 518: strife against Josephism, 518; Vocation of, 518
Hoffmann, Gaspard (abbot), 83
Hohenstaufens, The, 449
Holland
Colonization in North America, 221
Jansenist Church in, 441, 460
Jansenists in, 484, 495, 499
Masonry in, 507
Quesnel in, 499
Treaty with Cromwell, 295
Hollandine, Louise (abbess of Maubuisson), 279
Holy Alliance, The, 286
Holy Ghost, Order of the, 341
Holy Ghost, Sisters of the, 525
Holy Office on Chinese rites, 204 f.

Holy Roman Empire: Decline of, 81; Dissolution of, 274; End of, 64
Holy Synods, 550, 552
Holy Trinity (monastery), 581 f.
Holzhauser, Bartholomew (reformer), 84
Homme d'oraison by Nouet, 396 note
Hontheim, Nicholas von (bishop of Trier), 493. *See also* Febronius
Hortus pastorum by James Marchand, 238
Hospitallers of St. John of God, 78
Hospitals, Administration of, 357
Hospodars of Walachia, 558
Hôtel-Dieu (Paris), 541
Houbigant (Oratorian), 119
Houmain (Sulpician), 139
House of Instruction in St. Sulpice parish, 155
Hovsepian, James, 570
Hradschin castle, 29
Hrob, Protestants at, 29
Huet, Leibnitz and, 276
Huguenot assemblies, 478 f.
Huguenots
  American colonists, 206
  Conversion of, 310, 476
  Edict of Alais, 307
  Exile of, 313, 315, 476
  Intendants on treatment of, 476
  The liberal professions, 174 f.
  Louis XIV's measures against, 308 f.
  Material losses of, 314
  National synod, 478
  Organization of the, 304
  Penalties against, 311
  Repression of, 311
  Richelieu and, 307
  "Synods of the Desert," 313 ff., 477
  Violent methods of conversion of, 311
Humboldt, Alexander von: on Columbus' voyage, 220
Hume, David: on death of Cromwell, 296; on Oliver Cromwell, 289
Hungary: Bartholomites in, 85; devotion to St. Joseph, 40; Heretical sects in, 9
Hurons (tribe), 222
Hussites and Greek Church, 547
Huygens, Leibnitz and, 276
Hyacinth (Capuchin), 34
Hyacintha Mariscotti, St. (Franciscan), 80
Hysopolis (see), 572

Iassi, Conferences of, 551
Ieyasu (shogun), Missioners banished by, 199
Ignatius Loyola, St.: ascetical theology, 232; Beatification of, 31; Canonization of, 40; St. Francis Xavier and, 183
Île de France, 337
Île d'Orléron, Father Lacombe imprisoned at, 425
Illuminated, The, 295
Illuminism and Masonry (French), 508
Imitation of Christ, 283, 538
Immaculate Conception: Cult of, 60; Doctrine of, 41; dogma affirmed by Alexander VII, 261; in Orthodox Church, 552
Immunities, Ecclesiastical, 22
In caena Domini (bull), 21, 465
In eminenti (bull), 388, 450, 456, 509
Incarnation, Traité de l': by Thomassin, 241
Independent Puritans, 293
Index, The: New edition of, 15
Index, Congregation of the, 453: *Provincial Letters* condemned, 412 f.
India (*see also* Nobili)
  Early evangelization of, 184
  Jesuits in, 191
  John de Britto in, 194
  Nestorian missions, 568
  Religions of, 184
  St. Francis Xavier sent to, 183
  St. Francis Xavier's return to, 189
Industriae ad curandos animae morbos, 80
Industry, France tributary to foreign, 141
Infallibility, Papal
  Bossuet and, 345, 355 note
  Coret on, 326
  In definition of dogmatic facts, 414 note
  De Marca on, 322
  Distinction of right and fact, 413
  And Jansenists, 404
  Limitation of, 350
  Parliament against, 337
  St. Thomas on, 350 note, 352
  The Sorbonne and, 329, 337

Innocent III (pope) and state encroachments, 330
Innocent X (pope), 59
Bulls: *Cum occasione,* 60, 402; *Zelus domus meae,* 65
Character of, 59
Character of preaching under, 60
Chinese rites, 204
Condemnation of the *Frequent Communion,* 397
The dead body of, 67
Death of, 67
External policy of, 61
The five propositions condemned, 402
Jansenism condemned, 402
Jubilee (1650), 59
Nepotism of, 66
Petition of French bishops, 402
Protests against Treaty of Westphalia, 65
Rome adorned by, 60
Treaty of Westphalia, 256
Innocent XI (pope), 265
Absence of nepotism, 266
Admiration for Molinos, 423 note
Advice to James II, 300
Approval of the Bartholomites, 85
Assembly of the Clergy (1682), 353
Charonne convent, 340
Condemnation of forty-five maxims, 267
Death of, 268
Excommunication of Louis XIV, 354 and note
Gallicanism, 353
James II and, 300
Laxism condemned, 412
Louis XIV felicitated, 314
Quietism condemned, 268
Threat to Louis XIV, 336, 341
Innocent XII (pope), 271
Bull against nepotism, 270 f.
Death of, 272
End of nepotism, 11 note
Fénelon's *Maximes* condemned, 431
Jansenism and, 272
Louis XIV and, 270, 354
Innocent XIII (pope), 442: Death of, 445; promise before election, 443 f.; and Rumanian Church, 575
Inquisition: printing of the *Augustinus* forbidden, 386; Vieira condemned, 214
Inquisition (Spanish), 73, 492
Institute of the Visitation, 96
Instruccion de Sacerdotes by Molina, 238
Intendants on treatment of Huguenots, 476
Inter caetera (bull), 206
Inter multiplices (bull), 270, 354
Interdict, Treatise on the: by Sarpi, 24
Intérieur de Jésus et de Marie by Grou, 541
Interprétation du cantique des cantiques, 424
Introduction to the Devout Life by St. Francis de Sales, 101, 393
Ipek (see), 576
Ireland, Catholics persecuted under Queen Anne, 302
Iroquois (tribe), 223: instructed by Sulpicians, 224; and Montreal colonists, 224
Isaac (patriarch of Constantinople), 549
Isaac Jogues, dispensation to say Mass, 223
Isidore the Laborer, St.: Canonization of, 40
Isla, *Fray Gerundio* by, 511
Ismidt (Nicomedia), 554
Issy: investigation of quietism, 427; St. Vincent at, 126
Italo-Greeks, 578
Italy
Austro-Spanish influence, 45
The Church in, 77, 512
Greek rite in, 578
Greeks of southern, 577
Masonry in, 507
Menaced by Turks, 265
Spanish power, 8
Ivan IV the Terrible, 587

Jacobite Syrians, 566
Jacobites, Conversion of, 566
Jamaica: Discovery of, 207; oppression of Indians, 208
James I (of England), 288: greetings from Clement VIII, 14; oath of supremacy, 25; and Venetian conflict with Paul V, 23

James II (of England), 296
Adda papal envoy to, 300
Catholicism in England, 267
Death of, 302
And French Huguenots, 314
Innocent XI and, 300
At La Trappe, 109
Louis XIV and, 300
Louis XIV's hospitality to, 302
Papal envoys to, 300
In Rome, 440
James of York, Conversion of, 298
Jane Frances de Chantal, St.: on Father de Condren, 120; Fénelon and, 426; Madame Guyon's fondness for life of, 421; and St. Francis de Sales, 97
Janson, Jacques: chancellor of Louvain, 363
Jansen, Cornelius, 363
Armchair of, 365 note
The *Augustinus*, 384 ff.: its beginning, 366
Becomes bishop of Ypres, 368
Code terms used by, 366
Death of, 384
His hatred of the Jesuits, 364
Last illness of, 384
Letter to St. Cyran, 378
Letters of, 366
Mars Gallicus by, 368
On original sin, 386 note
In Paris, 364
The Secret Rosary approved by, 378
Study of St. Augustine, 365
Jansenism, 358-419, 482
In Austrian universities, 470
Becomes schism, 499
Benedict XIV and, 456
Bishop Pavillon, 332
Blaise Pascal, 407 ff.
The case of conscience, 392
Clement IX and, 262
Clement X and, 264
The Clementine peace, 415
Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 175, 178
Condemned by Alexander VII, 407
Condemned by Urban VIII, 47
The condemned propositions, 334
The contents of, 400
Doctrine of, 382
Evasions of, 400
The five propositions, 60, 400 ff.
Jansenism (*continued*)
Foes of, 408
Formed into a Church, 441
The formulary, 334, 404 f.
And French Revolution, 497
Individualism of, 294
Innocent X's condemnation of, 60
Innocent XII and, 272
The Jesuits and, 394
New formulary, 407
Olier and, 398
Opposed by Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 175
Opposed by Father Olier, 399
Origin of, 358
Port Royal the center of, 383
Quesnel, leader of, 417
Repudiation of, 397
Resistance of the four bishops, 413
A semi-Protestantism, 382
A sort of Calvinism, 383
Submission of the four bishops, 414
Jansenist Church in Holland, 460
Jansenists
Attitude to Blessed Sacrament, 380
Attitude to bull of condemnation, 389
Attitude to the Church, 175
Clannish spirit, 397
Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 159, 177
Denounced by St. Vincent, 126 note
Formulary to be signed by the, 260
In Holland, 484, 495, 499
Jesuits versus, 389, 394 ff.
Opposed to devotion to Sacred Heart, 463
Opposition to the *Unigenitus*, 460
"Philosophical sin" denounced by, 270
"Respectful silence," 482
The Russian Church and, 490
Secret paper of, 490
Submissions of, 403
View of infallibility, 326
Zamet attacked by, 379
Japan
Banishment of priests, 197
Buddhism in, 184, 187
Closed to Europeans, 199
Jesuits in, 195
The missions in, 195
Political constitution of, 188
Rapid spread of the Church, 196

Japan (*continued*)
St. Francis Xavier, 187 ff.
Shintoism in, 187
Jardin des racines grecques, 395
Jarue, Michael, 567
Jauhar, Athanasius, 562
Javorsky, Stephen (bishop), 588
Jeremias II (patriarch), 548, 586
Jeremias III (patriarch), 553
Jerez, college of, 512
Jerusalem: Athanasius bishop of, 571; Council of (1672), 551; the Eastern Church, 556; Patriarchate of, 323
Jesuitesses, Suppression of, 57
Jesuits
In Africa, 226
At Aleppo, 566
Attacked by the *Provincial Letters*, 409 ff.
Banished from France, 92
In Brazil, 211-13
In China, 204
Demand for suppression of, 459 f.
Destruction of the, 458
Development in France, 95
Devotion to the Sacred Heart, 463
And Dominicans in China, 205
Dominicans versus, 10, 16
Expelled from: Ethiopia, 572; France, 92; Prussia, 469; Spain, 459; Venice, 22
Gallican propositions signed by French, 320
Grievances adduced against, 467
Imprisonment in Portugal, 459
In India, 191
Intention to suppress, 457
Favored by Benedict XIV, 455
Foreign missions of, 465
And Jansenism, 394
Jansenists versus, 387, 389, 394 f.
Jansen's hatred of, 364
In Japan, 195
In Mexico, 211
Noailles withdraws faculties of, 488
Opposed by Archbishop Harlay, 342
In Paraguay, 207, 211, 216
In Peru, 211
In Poland, 580
Recalled to France, 92
Refuge in Silesia and White Russia, 469
And the regalia, 337
Jesuits (*continued*)
Report of visitator, 455 note
Return to France, 94
Rubens' paintings for the, 230
In Rumania, 574
St. Francis de Sales' esteem for, 96
School curriculum, 529 f.
Schools in France, 95
In Spain, 70
Suppression of, 225 f., 467
In Switzerland, 181 note
Unpopular in England, 301
Jesus and Mary, Society of, 123
Jews: Cromwell and the, 295; expelled from England, 295
Joachim III (patriarch), 555
Joachim V (Melchite patriarch), 586
Jogues, St. Isaac: dispensation to say Mass, 223; Martyrdom of, 222 f.
John II (of Portugal), Congo missions, 227
John IV (of Portugal) and Vieira, 213
John V (of Portugal), Benedict XIII and, 446
John XIII (Coptic patriarch), 571
John Baptist de la Salle, St., 525: *Explication de la méthode d'oraison*, 538
John Eudes, St. (founder), 122
John Frederick (duke of Brunswick), 275: Political difficulties of, 276
John Joseph of the Cross, St. (Franciscan), 450
John Karophyllis, 551, 558
John Nepomucene, St.: Canonization of, 446
John of Serpos, 570
John of the Cross, St.: canonized by Benedict XIII, 446
John Sigismund III (of Poland), 30
Jokhovsky, Cyprian (bishop), 583
Josaphat Kuncevyc, St., 581 f.: Martyrdom of, 583
Joseph, St.: Devotion to, 40; Feast of (March 19), 40; "Preserver of Peace," 40; and St. Cyran, 368 f.
Joseph II (of Austria): Aim of, 495; Clement XIII and, 460; Confiscations by, 496; and the episcopate, 496; influence of Father Frantz, 495
Joseph I (of Portugal), 465: Attempted assassination of, 459
Joseph II (Greek patriarch), 547

Joseph, Father (Richelieu's confidant), 44, 321
Joseph Calasanctius, St. (founder), 40
Joseph of Leonessa, St.: Apostle of the Turks, 80
Josephism, 496: Doctrine of, 496; Hofbauer's strife against, 518
Joyeuse, De (cardinal), 25
Juan Bautista of the Immaculate Conception, 72
Juan Falconi (brother of Mercy) and frequent Communion, 80 note
Jubilee: (1600), 8; (1750), 455
Judicium doctoris catholici by Leibnitz, 281
Julius II (pope), American foreign missions, 207
Julius III (pope), 568
Jumièges, Harlay, abbot of, 341
Jurieu (Huguenot), 315: on rule of faith, 415
Justo, Japanese convert, 196

Kagoshima (Japan), St. Francis Xavier at, 187
Kakongo, Christian population in the, 227
Kang-ti (Chinese emperor), 205
Kant: influence of pietism, 286; influenced by Rousseau, 503
Karalevsky, Cyril, 547 note
Karme, Meletius, 559
Karophyllis, John, 551, 558
Kautzen (Lutheran theologian), 287
Kenebec River, 225
Kerveno, Madame de, 340
Kiev, 579, 583: Church of, 585
Killis (see), 569
Kings, divine right of, 347
Kishka, Leo (bishop), 584
Klein, John Innocent (bishop), 575 f.
Klesl (cardinal), 83
Klostergrab. *See* Hrob
Kohlbrugge (Pietist), 286
Kollonitz (cardinal), 574
Koninsky, George (bishop), 584
Kontaris, Cyril (patriarch), 549
Korea. *See* Corea
Koros (see), 577
Korydaleus, Theophilus, 551
Kotchannes, 568
Kotzim, Sobieski's victory at, 268
Kovacs, Meletius (bishop), 576
Kraus. *See* Crusius
Kreim (monastery), 569
Kreutz (see), 577
Krijevtsy (see), 577
Kruedener, Baroness von, 286
Kyushu (Japan), St. Francis Xavier on, 187

La logique de Port-Royal, 395
La paix intérieure by Lombez, 539
La perpetuité de la foi de l'Eglise catholique, touchant l'Eucharistie, 415
L'abandon à la Providence divine by Caussade, 539
La Barre, Jean François de: The case of, 481
La Barrière, Jean de: Feuillants reformed by, 108 note
La Beaumelle on Huguenot assemblies, 479
Labor, condition in France, 141
La Borde, *Principes sur l'essence, la distinction et les limites des deux puissances*, 456
Laboring classes in France, 164: Company of the Blessed Sacrament and, 167 ff.
Labrador, Pietism in, 286
Labre, St. Benedict, 545
La Broue (bishop of Mirepoix): appeal from bull *Unigenitus*, 489; at La Trappe, 109
La Bruyère, Writings of, 432
La Chaise, François de, 339: confessor of Louis XIV, 354; Leibnitz and, 276; Louis XIV and, 309; the regalia, 346
La Chassaigne (Sulpician), 139
La Chassaigne, Madame de: St. Vincent and, 144
Lacombe, Albert (Barnabite): Imprisonment of, 425; Madame Guyon and, 421 ff.; *Orationis mentalis analysis*, 424
La Dauversière, Jerome de: and colonization of Montreal, 223
Ladies of Charity, 145: and Daughters of Charity, 147; founded by St. Vincent, 128
La Flèche (Jesuit school), 95, 332: Henry IV's heart bequeathed to, 96
La Fontaine, Fables of, 432

La Force, Marquis de, 305
La Guerra, Diaz de (bishop of Siguenza), 512
Lalande (astronomer), 458
La Louvesc, St. Francis Regis at, 151
La Maisonfort, Madame de, 420
La Manche, Sisters of Mercy, 525
Lambertini, Prospero (Benedict XIV), 451: made cardinal, 446
Lamoignon, Guillaume de, 160: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177, 179
La Mothe-Brion, Count de, 151
La Motte, Jeanne de. *See* Guyon
La Motte, Louis de (bishop of Amiens), 521
Lamy (Oratorian) and education, 529
Lancelot, Claude: the "Little schools," 395; *Racines grecques,* 381
Langeron, Abbé de: at La Trappe, 109
Langle, Abbé de: at La Trappe, 109
Langle, De (bishop of Boulogne): appeal from bull *Unigenitus,* 489
Langres (France), 223: See of, 175, 379
Languedoc, 332: Huguenot meetings in, 478; and Huguenot war, 305; Huguenots of, 313; Jesuit houses in, 94
Laotse, 189
Lapide, Cornelius a: *Commentaries,* 244
La Régripière (monastery), 105 note
Largentier, Claude (abbot), 107
Largentier, Denis (abbot), 107
La Rivière, Port Royal hermit, 381
La Rochefoucauld, François de (cardinal), 105: Gregory XV and, 106; *Maximes* of, 432
La Rochelle
  Assembly of, 304
  Government of, 306
  In hands of Huguenots, 306
  Huguenots at, 305
  See of, 416
  Siege of, 306
  Sisters of Wisdom, 525
L'art de vérifier les dates, 236
La Ruelle, Servet de: Premonstratentians reformed by, 108 note
La Salle, St. John Baptist de, 525
Las Casas, Bartholomew (missioner), 207: becomes Dominican, 209; and beginning of the slave trade, 209 note
La Suchère, 151
Lateran Basilica, Façade of, 447
Lateran Council III, 37
Lateran Council IV, 576
Latin, The study of, 528 f.
Latin America: colonized by Catholics, 206; Portuguese scandals in, 207; Spanish scandals in, 207
Latitudinarians (English), 302
La Trappe (abbey): Bossuet on, 110; reform of, 108
La Trémoille, Conversion of, 309
Launoy (hagiographer), 233
Laurentiana (library, Florence), Oriental manuscripts, 565
Laval (bishop of La Rochelle), Submission of, 416
Laval, François (bishop of Quebec), 225
Lavalette (cardinal), 47
Lavardin, Marquis de (French ambassador): excommunicated, 353 f.
Laws of Discovery (England), 302
Laxism condemned by Innocent XI, 412
Lazarists: Origin of the name, 129. *See also* Vincentians
League of Augsburg, 354
League of the Rhine, 64
League of Würzburg, 28
Lebanon, 563, 569: Maronite Church in, 565; Syria under emirs of, 561
Le Bret, *Traité de la souveraineté des rois,* 176
Le Brun (painter), 243
Le Camus, made cardinal, 314
Le Chapelain (Jesuit), Preaching of, 537
Leclerc, Alix, 110, 151
Leczinska, Marie (queen), 522
Lefort, tutor of Peter the Great, 552
Lefranc, George (archbishop of Vienne), 534: *Controverse pacifique sur l'authorité de l'Eglise,* 534; *Devotion réconciliée avec l'Esprit,* 534; *Questions diverses sur l'Incrédulité,* 534; *Religion vengée de l'Incrédulité,* 534
Legrand (theologian), 531
Legras, Mlle (Louise de Marillac), 148
Leibnitz, William, 276 ff.
  Attempt to unite Protestantism, 273
  Bossuet and, 279 f.
  On Council of Trent, 277 f., 280
  Judicium doctoris catholici, 281
  Louis XIV and, 281
  And syncretism, 275
  Union of Christian Churches, 275 ff.

Leiburn, John: papal envoy to James II, 300
Leipzig, birthplace of Leibnitz, 276 note
Le Jay, Guy: Paris Polyglot, 246, 564
Lejeune, John (Oratorian), 119, 152: "the blind priest," 152; Preaching of, 152
Lemaitre (Sulpician), slain by Indians, 224
Le Maitre, Simon: Port Royal hermit, 381
Lemberg. *See* Lwow
Lemère (Oratorian), *billet de confession,* 497
Le Nobletz, Michel: missioner, 149
Leo X (pope), Sapienza College begun by, 260
Leo XI (pope), 17
  Character of, 18
  Death of, 18
  Election of, 17
  Spanish influence at election of, 17
  Veneration of St. Charles, 78
Leo XIII on Denis Petau, 236
Leon (see), 149
Leonard of Port Maurice, St., 514: Preaching of, 514
Leonardo (doge), 22
Leonardo da Vinci, 230
Leopol. *See* Lwow
Leopold (emperor): and Innocent XI, 267; Prussia made a kingdom, 441
Le Puy, 151: Missions in, 174
Lercari (cardinal), 446
Lerma, Duke of: and Philip III, 69
Les sociétés secrètes et la Société by Deschamps, 508
Lesdiguières, Maréchal de, 305
L'esprit de Voltaire by Nonnotte, 533
Lesser Antilles, Discovery of, 207
Lessing, 287, 473: Febronianism rejected by, 494; and French "philosophers," 503
Lestonnac, Jeanne de: Daughters of Notre Dame founded by, 110
Leszcynski, Stanislaus, 584
Le Tellier, Charles (archbishop of Reims): on excommunication of Louis XIV, 341; and the regalia, 346
Le Tellier, Michel: and Charonne convent, 340; on Edict of Nantes, 309;
Le Tellier (*continued*)
  minister of Louis XIV, 264; revocation of Edict of Nantes, 312
Letourneau on Bourdoise, 121
Lettre à un duc et pair, 406 f.
Lettre à une personne de condition, 406
Le Vayer de Boutigny (intendant), 325
Levellers, The, 295
Levesque, Sister: superior of Charonne convent, 340
Levis, Henri de: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 156 f.
Leyden University, Jean Morin at, 237
L'Hôpital, Michel de: rationalist deism, 315
Li (Chinese convert), 202
Liancourt, Duchess de: retreat at Port Royal, 374
Liancourt, Duke of: absolution of, 406; and dueling, 162; Jansenist, 405; and Sulpicians, 407
Liancourt, Marquis of, 159
Liberal professions, Huguenots in the, 174 f.
Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane by Pithou, 325
"Libertines," The: at Paris, 143
Licentiate in theology (Sorbonne), 235
L'idée du sacerdoce et du sacrifice de Jésus-Christ by Condren, 241
Ligne, Prince de, 502
Ligny (bishop of Meaux), submission of, 416
Liguori. *See* Alphonsus
Lilburn (a Leveller), 295
Lima: St. Francis Solanus in, 210; St. Rose of, 207, 210; St. Turibius made archbishop of, 210; see created, 207
Limoges, missions at, 174
Limousin, Father Lejeune in, 152
Lionne, minister of Louis XIV, 264
Lisbon: birthplace of Vieira, 213; Vieira sent to, 214
Lisieux: Cospéan, bishop of, 112; Seminary founded at, 123
Litanies, Liturgical, 15
Literati, The Chinese, 200, 203: and missioners, 201 f.
"Little Assembly" of the clergy (1681), 343
Little Schools of Port Royal, 381, 394, 528: method, 395
Liturgy, The Byzantine, 559

Livre des métiers by Boileau, 543
Locke, 500
Lombard. *See* Peter Lombard
Lombez, Ambrose de: *Traité de la paix intérieure,* 539
London: Fire of (1666), 297; Leibnitz at, 276; Suburb of French silk workers at, 315
London Polyglot, The, 246
Longer, The Masons of, 504
Longfellow, *Evangeline* by, 225
Longobardi (missioner): in China, 203; Chinese rites forbidden, 203
Longueville, Duchess of: Heart of, 487; Jansenist, 416
Lorenzo da Brindisi, St.: apostle of the Jews, 80
Lorraine: St. Peter Fourier in, 151; Suffering in, 160
Louis IX, St. (king of France), 346
Louis XIII (king of France)
  Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld and, 106
  Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 159
  Father Coton, confessor of, 96
  At La Rochelle, 306
  At Marmoutiers Abbey, 105
  Port Royal reforms, 374
  See of Paris, 35
Louis XIV (king of France), 308
  Absolutism of, 338
  Advice to James II, 300
  Affair of the Corsican Guard, 326
  The Age of, 432
  Alexander VII and, 260
  Appeal to future council, 354
  Archbishop Harlay, 342
  Arnauld received by, 415
  Assembly of the Clergy, 351
  Avignon seized, 354
  Bishop Caulet's letter to, 335
  Bull *Vineam Domini,* 483
  Convent of Charonne, 339
  The convents, 337
  Copies of *Réflections morales* seized, 488
  Death of, 488
  Dispersion of Port Royal nuns, 486
  Early policy of, 325
  Ecclesiastical courts, 355
  Excommunication of, 354 and note
  Father La Chaise and, 309
  The four articles, 352
Louis XIV (*continued*)
  The General Hospital, 161
  Hospitality to James II, 302
  Influence of Madame de Maintenon, 354
  Innocent XI, 267
  Innocent XII, 270, 354
  James II (of England), 301
  Last will of, 498
  Leibnitz, 281
  Oratorians in Rome, 119
  Port Royal des Champs, 484
  The regalia, 331, 334 ff.
  Religious policy, 308, 325, 340
  Repression of Huguenots, 309
  Revocation of Edict of Nantes, 267, 309, 312 ff., 354
  Threat of Innocent XI, 336, 341
  On treatment of Huguenots, 476
  Turks favored by, 265, 267
Louis XV (king of France)
  Clement XIV, 466
  Exequatur required, 470
  Febronianism, 470
  Jesuits, 459, 466
  Madame Louise, 546
  Masonry, 508
  Parliament versus, 498
  Penalties against Huguenots, 478
Louise, Madame: becomes Carmelite nun, 470, 546
Lourdes castle, Father Lacombe's imprisonment, 425
Louvain University
  The *Augustinus,* 385
  Baianism, 361
  Endowed by Charles V, 358
  Endowed by Philip II, 358
  Faculty of theology, 358
  Jansen's anniversary celebrated, 387
  Question of grace and free will, 358
  Thomism and Molinism, 358
Louvaise (monastery), 566
Louvois, repression of Huguenots, 311
Love of God by St. Francis de Sales, 89, 102
Loyac (abbey), 159
Lucaris. *See* Lukaris
Ludovisi, Alessandro (Gregory XV), 33
Ludovisi, Ludovico, 33
Lugo on the exclusive, 443
Luillier, Marie: and founding of Sulpicians, 138

Lukaris, Cyril (patriarch), 548: Calvinist catechisms, 549; Calvinist leanings, 549; Death of, 550
Luke (catholicos of Sis), 569
Lunéville, 151
L'unité de l'Eglise, 416
Lutheran consistories in Prussia, 472
Lutherans in Germany, 27
Lutzk (see), 580
Luynes, De (cardinal), 458
Lyons, Council of (1245): papal infallibility, 351
Lyons, Council of (1274): the regalia, 330 f.
Lyons, Treaty of, 12
Lyons, Workmen's societies at, 169
Lwow: Armeno-Ruthenian seminary at, 582; See of, 583

Mabillon: deciphering of documents, 531; preface to edition of St. Augustine, 416 note
Macao, 190
Macarius III (patriarch), 559
Macaulay on policy of James II, 300
Maccioni, Father: in Hanover, 276
Macedonia, 549, 555: and suppression of Jesuits, 468
Macerata (Papal States), 200
Machault (bishop of Amiens), diocesan charities, 542
Machiavelli, 63
Mâcon, Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament, 525
Madagascar, Vincentian missioners in, 228
Madeleine of St. Joseph (Carmelite) and Father Berulle, 117
Maderna, Carlo: completion of St. Peter's, 32
Madrid: monastic poor relief in, 512; Nuncio driven from, 441; Treaty of, 36
Maffei, 454
Magasin charitable (periodical), 146
Magius (Jesuit) and Berulle, 117
Mahomet by Voltaire, 454
Maignelay, Marchioness of: St. Vincent and, 128
Maillard, Charles (papal legate): in China, 205
Maine (colony), Protestantism in, 221
Maintenon, Madame de, 279, 420
  Esteem for Madame Guyon, 425
  Huguenots and, 310
  Influence on Louis XIV, 354
  Repression of Huguenots, 309
  St. Cyran at house of, 423
  Wife of Louis XIV, 309
  Secret marriage to Louis XIV, 309
Mainz, Prince elector of, 28
Maisonfort, Jeanne Le Maistre de la, 420, 423
Maisonneuve (France), 223
Maistre, Joseph de: Saint-Martin and, 505
Major, Gregory (bishop), 577
Majorca, Jesuit college at, 71
Malabar Coast, 192, 568
Malacca, St. Francis Xavier at, 187
Malaval, François, 424: blind priest, 422; Ordination of, 424 note
Maldonatus, 245
Malebranche (Oratorian), 119, 231: Leibnitz and, 276
Malherbe, 306
Malissoles (bishop of Gap), 521
Malta: Defense of, 444; Pignatelli at, 271
Mamelukes, 217
Manchester, Count of, 293
Manchu dynasty in China, 203
Manse, Jeanne: in Montreal, 223
Manuale sacrarum caeremoniarum by Baudry, 243
Mar Hanna, Conversion of, 568
Marais, Godet des. *See* Godet
Marca, Pierre de (archbishop of Toulouse), 326: appointed archbishop, 326 note; author of the formulary, 405; *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, 322 f.
Marcellus II (pope), Robert de' Nobili relative of, 192
Marchand, James: *Hortus pastorum*, 238
Marchand, Peter: *Tribunal sacramentale*, 238
Marco de Sadis Cusani, 79
Mardin, 569: residence of Jacobite patriarchs, 567
Margaret of Lorraine, 339
Margaret of Valois, St. Vincent and, 126
Maria Amelia (daughter of Maria Theresa), 465
Maria Theresa (empress)
  "Apostolic Majesty," 460

Maria Theresa (*continued*)
Bishop Klein honored by, 576
"Catholic Majesty," 495
Character of, 494
Febronianism, 470, 495
Jesuits, 460
Partition of Poland, 470
The Serb Church, 577
Maria Vittoria (Blessed), founder, 79
Mariana, Juan (Jesuit), and regicide, 92
Marianna of Jesus (Blessed), 72
Marie de Gonzaga, and the *Frequent Communion*, 393
Marie de Medici, 35: Zamet at court of, 379
Marie Leczinska (queen), 463, 522
Marie Louise of Luxembourg, 157
Marie of the Incarnation, 71
Marignier, confessor at Port Royal, 483
Marillac, St. Louise de: founding of Sisters of Charity, 148
Marillac, Michel de, 159
Marmoutiers (monastery), Louis XIII at, 105
Maronite College (Rome), 564
Maronites, 564: Disturbances among, 455; Schism among, 441
Marot, Hymns of, 143
Marquemont (archbishop of Lyons), 98
Mars Gallicus by Jansen, 368
Marseilles: De Belzunce bishop, 521; galley convicts, 147; General Hospital, 161; Madame Guyon at, 424; Sisters of Mercy at, 152
Martin, Madeleine (founder), 152
Martini, anti-Christian professor, 496
Martinitz (governor of Prague), Death of, 29
Martyribus, Bartholomew a: pastoral theology, 238
Mary (Blessed Virgin): Devotion to, 40 f.; doctrine of Immaculate Conception, 41
Mary, Company of: Founding of, 536
Mary of Agreda, 75: advice to Philip IV, 75; *The Mystical City of God* by, 76
Mary of Jesus. *See* Mary of Agreda
Mary Stuart, wife of William of Orange, 301
Maryland (colony), Protestantism in, 221
Marzilla (Benedictine) and frequent Communion, 80 note
Mascaron (Oratorian), 119: Preaching of, 435
Masonry
Antecedents of, 503
In Austria, 507: influence on Joseph II, 496
Clement XII's warning, 509
Date of origin, 505
Deistic religion, 506
In England, 303, 504, 506: organization copied in army, 504; William III, 504
In France: and illuminism, 508; installation of Grand Orient, 507; meetings forbidden, 508; Voltaire, 508
General Constitutions of, 506
In Holland, 507
In Italy, 507
In Portugal, 507 f.
In Spain, 507 f.
Spread of, 449
In Sweden, 507
In Switzerland, 507
Mass: Mockery of the, 167; prohibited in Ireland, 302
Massachusetts (colony), Protestantism in, 221
Masillon, Jean Baptiste (Oratorian), 119: on misuse of churches, 172; Preaching of, 434
Master of Arts (Sorbonne), 234
Mathurin Regnier (poet), 126
Mattaincourt, 110: St. Peter Fourier at, 151
Matthew II (patriarch), 555
Matthew of Alexandria, 554
Matthias (emperor), 30, 83
Maubuisson (convent), 277, 279
Henry IV and, 374
Louis XIII and, 374 f.
Madame d'Estrée, abbess, 371
Mother Angélique, abbess, 371
Reform of, 374 f.
Reformed by Mother Angélique, 375
Maury, Father: Preaching of, 538
Maximilian (duke of Bavaria), 29: and Bohemian Protestants, 29; and German Catholics, 28; made elector Palatine, 34
Maxims of the Saints by Fénelon, 272, 431: condemned, 431; Contents of, 431; Errors of, 431
Maximus Hakim, 562

Maximus Mazloum, 563
Mazarin (cardinal), 388
  Cardinal de Retz and, 404
  Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 159, 177
  Council of Conscience formed by, 127
  The Huguenots and, 307
  Nicholas Cornet, 234
  Opposed to Cardinal Chigi, 256
  Opposition to Cardinal de Retz, 257
  Recalled to Rome, 47
  St. Vincent and, 147
Meaux (see), 416: made suffragan to Paris, 35
Mechitar (abbot), founder of Antonines, 570
Medici (family), Illustrious members of, 18
Medici, Alessandro de (Leo XI), 18
Medici, Marie de, 35
Meditation, St. Francis de Sales on, 101
Méditations sur l'Evangile by Bossuet, 241
Mekhitaristes (monks), 571
Melanchthon, 547: *Augsburg Confession*, 275; pietism, 283
Melchite Church, 564
Melchite patriarchate, 455
Melchites, 557, 559, 561
Meletius (patriarch of Jerusalem), 558
Meletius Karme (patriarch), 559
Meletius Pighas (patriarch of Alexandria), 548, 586
Meletius Syrigos (patriarch), exiled, 550
Meletius Zaim (patriarch), 559
Melk (monastery): Influence of, 84; project for congregation, 82 f.; Rule of, 82 f.
Memphis, Coptic council, 571
Mendelssohn, 287
Mendon (France), 223
Mercy, Order of: in Africa, 226; in Spain, 70
Mercy, Sisters of, 525: Founding of, 152
Mersenne, 143
Mésenguy, *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne*, 461
Mesmes, 160
Mespelbrunn, Julius Echter von, 82
Methodists, founded by John Wesley, 286, 302
Metz, Debates at, 174
Mexico: Cortez in, 207; first bishop, 207; Jesuits in, 211, 221; Las Casas in, 207
Mézeray (historian), 122
Michael Cerularius, and baptism by infusion, 553
Michael Romanov (czar), 586
Michelangelo, 32, 230: Sapienza College designed by, 260
Micu, John Innocent (bishop), 575 f.
Middle Ages, Intellectual edifice of, 230
Miki, Paul (martyr), 198
Minerva (church, Rome), 268
Miracles, The (asylum, Paris), 161 note
Miramion, Madame de: and St. Vincent, 145
Missal, New edition of the, 15
Mission, Congregation of the: Papal approval of, 149
Missioners (in China), and bull *Ex quo singulari*, 206
Missions, Foreign. *See* Foreign
Missions, Parish: in France, 149
Modon (monastery), 570
Moghilev (see), 584
Mogrobejo (Spain), 210
Mohammedans. *See* Moors
Mohawks (tribe), 222
Molanus (Protestant pastor): Leibnitz and, 277; and syncretism, 275
Moldavia, Church of, 573
Molina (Carthusian): *Instruccion de Sacerdotes*, 238; pastoral theology, 238
Molinism, Clement VIII and, 16 note
Molinists and Thomists, 10
Molinos, Miguel de
  Abjuration of, 268
  Admired by Innocent XI, 423 note
  Death of, 423 note
  Doctrine of, 423 ff.
  Errors of, 268
  Guide spirituelle, 423
  His doctrine condemned, 423
  Imprisonment of, 423 note
  At Rome, 421
Monasteries: closed by Joseph II, 497; Decline of, 105; number in France, 520; Reform of French, 106; Visitation of, 356
Monasteries, List of
  Athos, 579, 587
  Braunau, 495

Monasteries (*continued*)
Chaise-Dieu, 489
Charfe, 567, 570
Citeaux, 107, 376
Clairvaux, 107
Cluny, 108 note
Coulanges, 132
Deir-az-Zafaran, 567
Fulda, 83
Grottaferrata, 578
Holy Trinity, 581 f.
Jumièges, 341
Kreim, 569
La Régripière, 105 note
La Trappe, 110
Loyac, 159
Louvaise, 566
Marmoutier, 105
Melk, 82-84
Modon, 570
Motrena, 584
Rabban Hormizd, 568
St. Anthony of Qarqafe, 563
St. Cyran, 367
St. Etienne du Mont, 106
St. Gall, 181 note
St. John of Shuweir, 562
St. Maron, 564
St. Maur, 489
St. Remi, 151
St. Savior, 562
St. Stephen, 571
Salzburg, 83
Sept-Fons, 108 note
Solovetsk, 587
Monasticism: Decline of, 105; in Germany, 82
Monk (general), governor of Scotland, 296
Monmouth, Duke of: pretender, 299
Monophysites in Egypt, 556
Monothelitism in Syria, 564
Mons Bible, 416, 482
Montaigne: attitude to Catholicism, 88; modern Stoic, 250
Montauban, Seminary at, 134
Montcalm at Quebec, 225
Montenegro, 555
Montes pietatis, 459
Montespan, Madame de: her sister made abbess, 339
Montfaucon, 454
Montfort, Grignon de. *See* Grignon
Montfort-sur-Meu, birthplace of Grignon de Montfort, 536
Montmartre (church), Jesuit vows at, 183
Montmartre (faubourg), 161
Montmorency, Duke de, 161, 181
Montpellier: Colbert, bishop of, 489 f.
Montreal: Beginning of, 223 f.; Colonization of, 223; seminary established, 224
Moors: Dominicans martyred by, 226; expelled from Spain, 69, 74; Franciscans martyred by, 226; in North Africa, 226; in Valencia, 73
Moral theology. *See* Theology
Morales (Dominican missioner) and Chinese rites, 204
Moravian Brethren, 286
Morin, Jean (Oratorian), 119, 235, 237: Blois birthplace of, 237; Conversion of, 237; *Exercitationes biblicae*, 238
Moriscos in Spain, 73
Moscow: Adrian patriarch of, 588; Synod of (1667), 554
Mossul, George (patriarch), 567
"Most Faithful King," Title of, 454
Motrena (monastery), 584
Moyen court et facile pour faire l'oraison by Madame Guyon, 422 ff.
Mozambique: Missions in, 226; Portuguese colony, 227
Müller, Johann von: Febronianism rejected by, 494
Münster, Treaty of Westphalia, 62
Muhlfrauen, Monastery at, 518
Munkavz (see), 576
Murad IV (sultan), 36
Muratori, 454
Murom (see), 588
Muscovy. *See* Russia
Mustafa I (sultan), 35
Mystical City of God by Mary of Agreda, 76
Mystical theology, 232
Mysticism: of Johann Arndt, 283; Quietism and, 428

Nagasaki (Japan): Christian center, 195; Crucifixions at, 198
Nagy Varad (see), 576
Nairon, Faustus, 565
Names, Family (French), 125 note
Nancy, Sisters of St. Charles, 525

Nantes, Edict of, 9, 310
French Protestantism, 304
Huguenots exiled, 476
Louis XIV's interpretation of, 308
Revocation of, 308 f., 312 ff., 354
Richelieu's interpretation of, 307
Naples: appointment to benefices, 448; Atheists in, 513; and the Holy See, 492; number of clergy, 512
Nassau Siegen, Count von: Conversion of, 472
Nativity (church, Bethlehem), 551, 558
Navarre, 182
Navarre, College of, 233: Bossuet at, 344
Nectarius (patriarch), 551, 557
Neophytus (patriarch), 550
Neophytus VII (patriarch), 555
Neophytus Saqzi (patriarch), 560
Nepal, Buddhism in, 184
Nepotism
Alexander VIII, 270
Character of, 11
End of, 11 note
Innocent X, 66
Paul V, 32
Urban VIII, 47
Nervault, Pierre: on siege of La Rochelle, 306
Nestorians, missions in Asia, 568
Netherlands, devotion to St. Joseph, 40
Neustadt (Germany), 275
Neuville, Charles de: Preaching of, 537
New Catholics, Fénelon, superior of the, 426
New France. *See* Canada
New Hampshire (colony), Protestantism in, 221
New Haven, Protestantism in colonial, 221
New Plymouth, Protestantism in, 221
Nicholas II (pope): and papal elections, 37; right of exclusive, 443
Nicholas III (pope), building corporations, 504
Nicholas of Cusa, astronomy, 48
Nicholas of Hontheim. *See* Febronius
Nicole, Pierre (Jansenist), 178, 491
Body of, 487
Book on the Eucharist, 415
Essais de morale, 416
Jansenist, 428
The "little schools," 395
Nikitich, Philaret (patriarch), 553
Nikon (patriarch), 560, 587
Nivelle, Peter de (abbot), 107, 376
Noachites (i.e., Masons), 506
Noailles, Count de: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 160
Noailles, Louis Antoine
Archbishop of Paris, 482
Bishop of Châlons, 482
The *Frequent Communion* approved by, 418
Inconstancy of, 487
Investigation of Madame Guyon, 427
Huguenots and, 476
Jesuits' faculties withdrawn, 488
Port Royal nuns, 484
Port Royal nuns excommunicated, 485
Réflections morales, 488
Unigenitus accepted, 446, 489
Nobili, Robert de' (missioner), 192 f.: Death of, 194; Method of, 193 f.
Nobility, Growing power of the, 258
Nobility of the robe, 370
Noble Widows of Dole, confirmed by Innocent X, 60
Nobunaga, Japanese Church under, 196
Nointel, Marquis of, 551
Nolay, Hilarion de, 140
Nonconformists under Charles II, 297
Nonnotte, Claude (Jesuit), 533: *Dictionnaire philosophique de la religion,* 533; *L'esprit de Voltaire,* 533; refutation of Voltaire, 519
Non-residence, Penalties for, 20
Non-residence of cardinals, 21
Non-resident clerics, Council of Trent on, 20
Noris, accused of Baianism, 455
Normandy: Father Lejeune in, 152; Montreal colonists, 223 f.; St. John Eudes in, 149 f.
North America
Colonized by Protestants, 206
Discoveries, 221
Dutch colonization in, 221
English colonization of, 221
French colonization of, 221
The missions in, 220
Notre Dame (cathedral, Paris), 234: Vegetable merchants at, 172
Notre Dame, Congregation of, 339: founded in Montreal, 224; Founding of, 151

Notre Dame, Daughters of: Foundation of, 110
Notre Dame des Victoires (church), 306
Notre Dame of Loreto, Olier's visit to, 135
Nouet, Jacques (Jesuit): attack on the *Frequent Communion*, 396; *Homme d'oraison*, 396 note
Nouvelle héresie des jésuites by Arnauld, 326
Nouvelles ecclésiastiques, Jansenist paper, 490
Novaes on election of Innocent XIII, 445
Noyon, Seminary at, 134

Oates, Titus: and the "Popish Plot," 298
Oath of Supremacy, 25
Observance of Melk, Approval of, 83
Ochsenfurt (in Franconia), 83
Odescalchi, Benedetto (Innocent XI), 266
Old Regime. *See* Ancient regime
Olier, Jean Jacques, 104, 134, 398
  Appearance of, 135
  Benefices held by, 135
  Catechism at St. Sulpice, 154
  Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 155, 177
  Director of Caulet, 333
  Doctrine of spiritual life, 242
  And dueling, 162
  Esteem for Bishop Zamet, 379
  His program at St. Sulpice, 153
  Holiness of the priesthood, 240
  And Jansenism, 398
  Jansenism opposed by, 399
  Jansenism repudiated by, 397
  Mother Agnes, 136
  Pastor of St. Sulpice, 139, 153
  On priesthood of Christ, 242
  Regard for the pope, 140
  Retreat at St. Lazare, 136
  St. Vincent confessor of, 136
  Traité des saints ordres, 241
  At Tuesday conferences, 132
  At Vaugirard, 138
  Vision of, 136
  Worldly life of, 135
Olimpia Madalchini, sister-in-law of Innocent X, 66
Oliva, Gian Paolo (Jesuit general), 67: confidant of Alexander VII, 259
Olivares, Duke (Spanish minister), 44, 69, 74
Omura (Japan), Christian center, 195 f.
Optatus Gallus by Rabardeau, 323
Oratorians: ascetical theology, 232; bull *Unigenitus*, 489; Colleges of the, 119; established in France, 308 note; ordination retreats, 131
Oratory, The, 116
  Activities of, 119
  Approval of, 78, 118
  Founding of, 118
  And Scholasticism, 529
  Spread of, 119
Oratory of the Oriental rite, 578
Orbitello, Passionist mission in, 515
Orcades (the Irish), Missions in, 181
Orders, Religious. *See* Religious orders
Ordinances of Blois (1579), 114
Ordinances of Paris (1624), 114
Ordination retreats, 129-31: by Oratorians, 131
Orfa (Edessa), 569
Orient: Influence of France in the, 36; Missions of the, 39
Origen, *Hexapla*, 245
Original sin: Baius on, 360; Jansen on, 386 note
Original Writings of Masonry, 506
Orléans: birthplace of Petau, 236; General Hospital, 161
Orléans, Duchess of: and Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 178; and convent of Charonne, 339
Orléans, Duke of (regent), 444: bull *Unigenitus*, 489
Orléans, See of: made suffragan to Paris, 35
Ormesson, Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177
Orontes (river), 564
Orsini, Pietro (Benedict XIII), 445: bishop of Benevento, 445
Orthodox Church: the canon of the Bible, 552; clergy in Protestant universities, 552; Theologians of, 552; validity of heretical baptism, 553
Osiander on Arndt, 283
Oslabsky, Manuel (bishop), 576
Osman II (sultan), Assassination of, 35
Osnabrück, Treaty of Westphalia, 62
Ossat, Arnaud d': and Clement VIII, 13

Ottoboni, Pietro (Alexander VIII), 256, 268
Ottoman Empire, 555: Weakening of, 12
Ottomans, Syria conquered by, 559
Our Lady of Mercy (nuns), 72
Ouse River (England), 289
Oxford University, Cromwell and, 293

Pacifique (Capuchin), friend of Berulle, 117
Padua (see), 458
Paez, Father: missioner in Ethiopia, 228
Paisee II, 557
Palatine, Princess: and Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 178
Palermo, Albanian seminary at, 578
Pallavicino, Pietro Sforza (cardinal), 402: on election of Alexander VII, 254; *History of the Council of Trent,* 260
Pallu and the *Frequent Communion,* 393
Palma Gayet (historian), 126
Pamiers (see), 332, 413: Caulet bishop, 332 f., 413; Chapter of, 333; Religious conditions in, 333
Pamplona (in Navarre), 182
Pandara-Swamis missioners, 194
Pantheon (Rome), 61
Paolucci (cardinal), Austria's exclusive, 443
Papacy (*see also* Popes)
  (1600–55), 8-67
  (1655–1700), 255-72
  (1700–74), 440-71
  Authority of the, 492
  Indefectibility of the, 347
  Opposition of Gallicanism, 319
Papal authority, Assembly of the Clergy and, 347
Papal bulls. *See* Bulls
Papal elections
  Austria's interference, 443
  France's interference, 443
  Gregory XV's constitution, 37
  Imperial placet, 37
  Modes of, 38
  Spain's interference, 443
Papal States: Administration of, 447; Invasion of, 448; Sicily detached from, 441
Paraguay: Jesuits in, 207, 211, 216; The reductions of, 217 f.
Paray-le-Monial (convent), apparition of Sacred Heart, 462
Pariahs, 191
Paris
  Attractions to foreigners, 502
  Duvergier at, 367
  The General Hospital, 160 f.
  House of the Blessed Sacrament, 379
  Illustrious bishops of, 35
  Jansen in, 364
  Leibnitz at, 276
  Made metropolitan see, 35
  Ordinances of (1624), 114
  St. Francis de Sales in, 91
  St. Vincent in, 147
  Sisters of Mercy at, 152
  Suffragan sees of, 35
  Treaty of (1763), 225
Pâris (deacon): Jansenist, 491; Scenes at grave of, 491
Paris Foreign Mission Society: missioners' arrival in Canada, 225; missioners' arrival in China, 204
Paris Polyglot by Le Jay, 246
Paris University
  Decline of, 94
  Faculty of Theology of, 328, 361
  Gallicanism, 324
  Jean Morin at, 237
  Privileges of, 532
  Rise of, 233
  St. Francis Xavier at, 182
Parish church, center of life, 544
Parish missions in France, 149
Parliament (England), 475: Cromwell's purge of, 292; war against Charles I, 289
Parliament (Paris), 162
  Banishment of the Jesuits, 92
  Billets de confession, 497
  Bull *Vineam Domini,* 483
  Charges against Cistercians, 377
  Complaint to Louis XIV, 351
  Declaration of abuse, 340
  And Faculty of Theology, 328
  Gallicanism, 324, 337
  Gallicanism defended by, 321
  Independence toward the pope, 490
  Jansenism, 407
  The Jansenist propositions, 401
  Louis XV versus the, 498
  Papal infallibility, 352
  Religious questions, 320

Parliament (*continued*)
Sorbonne versus the, 329
Suppression of Jesuits, 459
The *Unigenitus*, 498
Unigenitus registered, 488
Parliament (Grenoble), penalties against Huguenots, 479
Parliament (Provence), 545
Parliament (Toulouse), decision overruled, 480
Parliaments (France), 258: and the bishops, 350
Parma (duchy): ceded to Don Carlos, 444; and the Holy See, 465, 492
Parthenius (patriarch), 57, 550, 554
Pascal, Blaise, 407
Apologetics, 535
Conversion of, 409
In Paris, 409
The *Provincial Letters*, 408-12
Remains of, 487
Youth of, 409
Pascal, Etienne: father of Blaise Pascal, 409
Pascal, Jacqueline: Death of, 416 note
Passionists: Approval of, 470; Founding of, 515
Pastoral theology, 232, 238
Pastoralis officii (bull), 489
Pastoralis romani pontificis vigilantia (bull), 48 note
Pataky, John (bishop), 575
Patin, Guy: and Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 179
Patriarchate of France, Project of, 323
Patriarchate of the South, 556
Patristic theology, 232
Patrology, Study of, 495
Pau (France), 322
Paul III (pope): Latin American sees, 207; and St. Francis Xavier, 183
Paul IV (pope), Church of Ethiopia, 572
Paul V (pope), 18
Approval of Daughters of Notre Dame, 110
Bohemian rebellion, 30
Canonizations by, 31, 78
Character of, 19
Completion of St. Peter's, 32
Conflict with Venice, 22
Death of, 32
Economic measures, 31
Election of, 18 f.
Paul V (*continued*)
Enforcement of clerical residence, 21
English oath of supremacy, 26
The French Oratory approved, 118
Galileo and, 49
Law enforcement, 31
Mother Angélique pardoned by, 373
Nepotism of, 32
Oratorians in Rome, 119
The Oratory approved, 78
Passion for splendor, 32
Promotion of catechetics, 31
Questions of grace, 386
Reform efforts, 30
Rome adorned by, 31
St. Vincent and, 126
Vatican Library enriched by, 31
Paul of the Cross, St., 515: Passionists founded by, 464, 515
Paul of Holy Faith, convert of St. Francis Xavier, 187
Pavillon, Nicholas (bishop of Alet), 132, 331, 413: and Bishop Caulet, 334; Death of, 335; his seminary, 332; on infallibility, 414
Peace of Augsburg, 27, 46
Pébroc (abbey), 135
Peking: Catholic Church in, 203; Father Schall in, 203; Father Ricci in, 201; Nestorians in, 568
Pellisson: Conversion of, 309; correspondence with Leibnitz, 278; repression of Huguenots, 309, 311
Pelmenand, Father: in Canada, 225
Peloponnesus, 557, 570
Penitent Daughters of Paris, 375
Penitents of Third Order of St. Francis, Reform of, 108 note
Perche (province), 109
Péréfixe, Hardouin de Beaumont de (archbishop of Paris), 383, 413: comment on Port Royal nuns, 377; and submission of the Jansenists, 413; tutor of the Dauphin, 383
Pereira and St. Francis Xavier, 190
Peremyshl (see), 583
Périer, miracle of the holy thorn, 411
Périgueux, General Hospital at, 161
Pérot (Jesuit), his book on the Index, 260
Perraud (cardinal), *L'Oratoire de France au XVII^e siècle*, 117 note
Perrochel (bishop of Boulogne), 132

Peru: The Church in, 210; Jesuits in, 211; St. Rose in, 207; St. Turibius in, 207; Spanish scandals in, 210
Petau, Denis (theologian), 235
De doctrina temporum, 236
De la pénitence publique, 396
Death of, 237
Dogmata theologica, 236 f.
Positive theology, 531
Petavius. *See* Petau
Peter Canisius, St.: missioner, 80; missions in Germany, 181 note
Peter Claver, St.: apostle of the Negroes, 70 f.
Peter Fourier, St. (missioner), 110, 151
Peter Lombard, 232: *Book of Sentences*, 232
Peter of the Mother of God (Carmelite), 71
Peter the Great (czar): Civil reforms of, 587; Lefort tutor of, 552; Persecutions by, 584; Religious influence of, 552
Petitière, De la: Port Royal hermit, 381
Petrus Aurelius, pen name of St. Cyran, 368
Phanar, The, 573
Phanariotes, The, 561, 574
Philaret Nikitich (patriarch), 553
Philaret Romanov (patriarch), 586
Philip II (of Spain): Las Casas and, 208; Louvain University endowed by, 358; and Polyglot of Antwerp, 246; Turibius made archbishop of Lima, 210
Philip III (of Spain)
Death of, 69 note
Effort to encourage agriculture, 69
Expulsion of Moors, 74
And Ferdinand II, 30
Rule of, 69
Treaty of Madrid, 36
Philip IV (of Spain): conflicts with the Holy See, 77 note; Death of, 76; decline of Spain, 74; Rule of, 69
Philip V (of Spain): meddling in Church affairs, 448; regime of intendants, 511
Philip Neri, St. (founder), 77
Beatification of, 31
Biographies of, 78
Canonization of, 40
Clement VIII friend of, 11
Philip Neri, St. (*continued*)
Form of the Oratory, 117 note
And frequent Communion, 80
Veneration for, 78
Philip of Champagne (painter), 364
Philip of Orléans (regent), 488: attitude to Huguenots, 478
Philometi labores juveniles by Alexander VII, 260
"Philosophers," The, 500 f.: The influence of, 502
"Philosophical sin," Doctrine of, 269
Philosophy: of Descartes, 231, 499; of Locke, 500
Photius on baptism by infusion, 553
Pia desideria by Spener, 285
Piacenza (duchy) ceded to Don Carlos, 444
Piauhy, Vieira and cannibals of, 214
Picardy, 325: Father Lejeune in, 152; St. Vincent's work in, 147; Suffering in, 160
Piccinardi, Execution of, 20
Pichon, *Esprit de Jésus-Christ et de l'Eglise sur la fréquent communion*, 455
Picoté (Sulpician), 406
Pietism
In America, 286
Decline of, 285
In Germany, 282
In Greenland, 286
In Labrador, 286
Methodists, 286
Moravian Brethren, 286
Spener apostle of, 275, 285
Piety, 538
Pighas, Meletius (patriarch), 548
Pignatelli, Antonio (Innocent XII), 271
Pinzon, Martin: advice to Columbus, 220
Pious Missioners, approval of the, 40
Pithou, Pierre: *Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane*, 325
Pithou, Code of, 350
Pius II (pope) and Polish Church, 585
Pius IV (pope) and Coptic Church, 571
Pius V, St. (pope), 73, 248: bull *Ex omnibus*, 362; propositions of Baius condemned, 362
Pius VI (pope): and Baius, 361; Febronianism condemned, 494; and the Serb Church, 577

Pius X (pope), The Austrian exclusive at election of, 443 note
Pius XI (pope), St. Alphonsus proclaimed doctor, 514
Place de Gréve (Paris), 320
Plessis, Roger du (Jansenist), 405
Plessis-Guénégaud, Countess du (Jansenist), 403
Plessis-Montbart, 161, 177
Pociej, Hypace (bishop), 580
Poitiers, Duvergier at, 367, 369
Poitou (France), 310, 337: Huguenot meetings in, 478
Poland
  Bartholomites in, 85
  Defense against Turks, 265
  Greek bishops in, 448
  Independence of the nobility, 258
  Jesuits in, 580
  League against, 457
  Nationalities in, 580
  Partition of, 470, 584
  Russian Empire and, 579
  Theatines in, 582
Polemical theology, 232
Polish succession, War of the, 448
Polotsk (see), 583
Polyglot Bibles, 530
  Alcalá, 246
  Antwerp, 246
  Le Jay's, 564
  London, 244
  Paris, 244
Pombal, Marquis de (Portuguese minister), 455, 519: Jesuits imprisoned by, 459
Pomerania, Gustavus Adolphus in, 46
Pompadour, Madame de: Influence of, 502; Jesuits and, 459
Pompignan, Lefranc de, 534
Pomponne, Marquis de: Port Royal and, 486
Poncet, Conversion of, 90
Pons, Father de: at death of St. Cyran, 389
Pont-à-Mousson, 269
Pontifical, The: New edition of, 15
Pontine marshes, Draining of, 453
Pontoise, Convent at, 142
Poor, St. Vincent on serving the, 144
Poor Clerks of the Mother of God, 79
Pope, temporal power of the, 320
Popes. *See* Papacy
Popes, election of. *See* Papal elections
Popes, List of
  Clement VIII (1592–1605), 11
  Leo XI (1605), 17
  Paul V (1605–21), 18
  Gregory XV (1621–23), 33
  Urban VIII (1623–44), 41
  Innocent X (1644–55), 59
  Alexander VII (1655–67), 255
  Clement IX (1667–69), 261
  Clement X (1670–76), 263
  Innocent XI (1676–89), 265
  Alexander VIII (1689–91), 269
  Innocent XII (1691–1700), 271
  Clement XI (1700–21), 440
  Innocent XIII (1721–24), 442
  Benedict XIII (1724–30), 445
  Clement XII (1730–40), 447
  Benedict XIV (1740–58), 451
  Clement XIII (1758–69), 457
  Clement XIV (1769–74), 464
"Popish Plot," 298
Port Royal (Canada), 225
Port Royal (convent, France), 175, 485
  Archbishop Noailles, 484
  Austerity at, 373
  Bishop Pavillon, 332
  Buildings demolished, 486
  Bull *Vineam Domini*, 484
  Center of Jansenism, 383
  Day of the Grille, 372 f.
  Great ladies attached to, 403
  Hermits of, 403
  Jurisdiction of Citeaux, 107
  Laxity at, 371
  The "little schools," 381, 394, 528
  Miracle of the holy thorn, 411
  Mother Angélique abbess, 371
  Mother Genevieve abbess, 377
  Opinion alienated from, 397
  Reform of, 372 ff.
  Rodriguez' book favored by, 70
  St. Cyran and, 377
  St. Cyran's power at, 380
Port Royal des Champs (convent), 142, 378, 395
  Bull *Vineam Domini*, 483
  Dispersion of the nuns, 485 f.
  Louis XIV and, 484
  Nuns excommunicated, 485
  And Port Royal of Paris, 485
Port Royal nuns: condemnation of the five propositions, 414; Pride of, 413

Port Royal of Paris (convent): Foundation of, 376; and Port Royal des Champs, 485
Porta del Popolo, decorated by Bernini, 260
Portieux, Daughters of Providence, 525
"Portion congrue," The, 523
Portugal
  Febronianism, 494
  Masonry in, 507 f.
  "Most Faithful King," title, 454
  Report on Jesuits in, 455 note
  Treaty with Cromwell, 295
  Urban VIII and, 47
Portuguese: in China, 190; colonists in America, 206; in India, 184
Positive theology. *See* Theology
Possevinus, Antonius: in Sweden, 548
Potages économiques, 146
Potier (bishop of Beauvais), St. Vincent and, 130
Potsiey (bishop), 582
Potterie, Father de la: and the holy thorn, 410
Poulle, Father: Preaching of, 537
Pouy, birthplace of St. Vincent, 125
Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection by Rodriguez, 70
Pradel (bishop of Montpellier), Charities of, 542
Prado, John de (martyr), 226
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, 350
Prague, Defenestration of, 29
Pranguis (pariahs), 191
Pratique du tribunal de la pénitence by Renaud, 238
Preachers, Order of. *See* Dominicans
Preaching, 536: under Innocent X, 60
Predestination, Benedict XIII and question of, 445
Préjugés légitimes, 416
Premonstratensians, 518: reformed by De la Ruelle, 108 note
Presbyterians, Cromwell and, 293-95
Pressy (bishop of Boulogne), 541
Priesthood: Idea of the, 240; Reform of the, 172
Priests, Houses for retired, 85
Prisoners, Treatment of, 170
Problème ecclésiastique, 482
Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard, 500
Prokopovitch, Theophane (bishop), 552, 588
Propaganda College (Rome), 571, 575: Founding of, 57
Propaganda, Congregation of, 37: on Caen seminary, 124; on Chinese rites, 204; developed by Urban VIII, 39; established by Gregory XV, 39
Protestant Union, The, 28
Protestantism (seventeenth century), 273-316
  In Bohemia, 29
  Bossuet and, 345
  Break-up of, 273
  In England, 8, 287, 474
  In France, 87, 304, 476. *See also* Huguenots
  In Germany, 8, 273, 472
  Gustavus Adolphus, 46
  In North America, 221
  In Switzerland, 8
Protestants, North America colonized by, 206
Protestants in France, Treatment of, 475
Provence (France), 151: Father Lejeune in, 152; Parliament of, 545
Providas (bull), 456, 509
Providence, Daughters of, 151, 525
Providence, Sisters of, 525
Provincial Letters by Pascal, 408-12: Condemnation of, 412 f.; Occasion of, 409
Prussia: Lutheran consistories, 472; made into a kingdom, 441; Rationalism in, 472; recognized as kingdom, 454; Rise of, 448
Pskov (see), 588
Ptolemy, Astronomical system of, 48
Puerto Rico: Discovery of, 207; first bishops, 207
Puritanism in England, 287
Puritans, 292: Independent, 293
Puritans of Scotland, American colonists, 206
Pussort on royal absolutism, 325

Quakers, founded by Fox, 302
Quebec, Seminary at, 225
Quercy (France), 305
Quesnel, Pasquier (Jansenist), 417
  Antoine Arnauld and, 417
  Biographer of Arnauld, 407
  Bull *Vineam Domini,* 484
  In Holland, 499
  Jansenist leader, 417 ff.

Quesnel (*continued*)
Propositions condemned, 488
Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament, 417, 482: Attitude of Noailles to, 488
In refuge, 484
Questions diverses sur l'Incrédulité by Lefranc, 534
Queyrot (Jesuit), 560
Quietism, 420-38: Condemnation of, 268, 429; Errors of, 429. *See also* Guyon

Rabardeau, Michel (Jesuit): *Optatus Gallus*, 323; *Question s'il est meilleur de communier souvent que rarement*, 392
Rabban Hormizd (monastery), 568
Racine: Body of, 486 f.; *Histoire de Port Royal*, 394; influenced by Antoine Le Maître, 381; Tragedies of, 432
Racines grecques by Lancelot, 381
Ragon, philosophy of Freemasonry, 506
Rainaldi, continuator of Baronius, 247
Rambouillet, Madame, 150
Ramnad (India), 195
Rancé, John de (abbot), 104: Bossuet on, 343; Conversion of, 108; reform of La Trappe, 108
Raphael (painter), 230
Rapin (bishop), 335: on Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 157; *Mémoires*, 159
Rappolstein, Count von, 284
Rappoltsweiler (Alsace), birthplace of Spener, 284
Raskolniki, The, 587
Ratio studiorum, 80
Ratisbon, Monastic assemblies at, 83
Raustenstrauch (abbot), Febronianism, 495
Ravenna, Maronite college at, 564
Recollects: and Canadian missions, 181; expelled from Canada, 225
Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, 531
Rednik, Athanasius (bishop), 576
Reductions of Paraguay, 217 f.
Referendarius, 269
Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament by Quesnel, 417, 482: attitude of Noailles, 488
Reform, Clerical: in France, 105-40; St. Francis de Sales and, 98
Reform efforts: by Gregory XV, 37; by Paul V, 30
Reformed Protestants of Holland, American colonists, 206
Reformers, The Protestant: and St. Cyran compared, 382
Réfutation du système du P. Malebranche by Fénelon, 426
Refutation of the Catechism of Paul Ferry by Bossuet, 344
Regalia, The, 330
Archbishop Harlay, 342
Bishop Caulet, 334 f.
Extension of the, 330
Louis XIV, 331, 334 ff.
Meaning of, 330
The spiritual, 330, 347
The temporal, 330, 347
Regensburg. *See* Ratisbon
Regiminis apostolici (constitution), 413
Regis, St. Francis: missioner, 149
Regnier, Mathurin (poet), 126
Reims: birthplace of St. John Baptist de la Salle, 525; See of, 476
Reiner von Landau (abbot), 83
Religion vengée de l'Incrédulité by Lefranc, 534
Religious: faculties for confessions, 264; regulation of preaching, 264
Religious (exempt) in France, 264
Religious equality, Principle of, 64
Religious instruction, 79
Religious orders: approved by Gregory XV, 40; New, 110; opposition to Louis XIV, 351; in Spain, 71
Religious orders, congregations, and institutes (list of)
Armenian Antonines, 569
Bartholomites, 82, 85
Capuchins, 22, 80, 227, 566
Carmelites, 70 f., 231 ff., 470
Charity, Daughters of, 149
Charity, Ladies of, 128, 145, 147
Charity, Sisters of, 147 f., 152
Christian Doctrine, Fathers of, 425
Christian Schools, Brothers of the, 527 f., 308
Clerks Regular Ministering to the Sick, 78
Clerks Regular of Christian Doctrine, 60 note
Clerks Regular of the Pious Schools, 40, 79

Religious orders (*continued*)
Congregation of Christian Doctrine, 79
Congregation of the Mission, 57, 149
Dominicans, 207 ff., 226 f.
Feuillants, 108 note
Foreign Missions, Society of (Paris), 179
Franciscans, 210, 221, 226
Good Jesus of Ravenna, 60
Good Shepherd, Congregation of, 150
Holy Ghost, Order of, 341
Holy Ghost, Sisters of, 525
Hospitallers of St. John of God, 78
Jesuitesses, 57
Jesuits. *See* Jesuits
Jesus and Mary, Society of, 123
Lazarists. *See* Vincentians
Mary, Company of, 536
Mercy, Order of, 70, 226
Mercy, Sisters of, 152, 525
Mission, Congregation of the. *See* Vincentians
Noble Widows of Dole, 60
Notre Dame, Congregation of, 151, 224, 339
Notre Dame, Daughters of, 110
Oratorians, 116, 118, 131, 308 note
Oratory of the Oriental rite, 578
Order of Preachers. *See* Dominicans
Our Lady of Mercy, 72
Passionists, 470, 515
Penitent Daughters, 375
Penitents of Third Order of St. Francis, 108 note
Pious Missioners, 40
Poor Clerks of the Mother of God, 79
Preachers, Order of. *See* Dominicans
Premonstratentians, 518
Priests of the Mission. *See* Vincentians
Providence, Daughters of, 161, 525
Providence, Sisters of, 525
Recollects, 181
St. Basil of the Armenians, 60
St. Charles, Sisters of, 525
St. Elias, 71
St. Maur, 40
Secular Priests of Christian Doctrine, 60
Somaschi, 60
Sulpicians, 138, 308 note
Theatines, 22, 582
Trappists, 108, 308 note
Trinitarians, 226
Religious orders (*continued*)
Ursulines, 80, 110
Vatelottes, 525
Vincentians, 129, 149, 308
Visitation, 42, 96 f.
Wisdom, Daughters of, 536
Wisdom, Sisters of, 525
Remiremont, jurisdiction of abbess, 337
Renaissance, The Catholic, 3 ff.: in Spain, 68
Renaud (Jesuit): pastoral theology, 238; *Pratique du tribunal de la pénitence*, 238
Renaudot, book on the Eucharist, 415
René Goupil, Martyrdom of, 222
Renty, Baron de, 166: and dueling, 162
Resolutiones morales by Diana, 239
"Respectful silence," Question of the, 482
Retreats for ordinands, 129-31: at St. Lazare, 131; and the Vincentians, 128
Retz, Cardinal de, 367
Archbishop of Paris, 257
Friend of the Jansenists, 404
Imprisonment of, 403
Louis XIII and, 105
Mazarin and, 404
Mazarin's opposition to, 257
St. Vincent tutor of, 126
Vocation of, 113
Revival, the Catholic, 3 ff.
Rezzonico (Clement XIII), 458
Rheims. *See* Reims
Rhode Island (colony), Protestantism in, 221
Rhodes, 549
Ri, birthplace of St. John Eudes, 122
Rians (France), 152
Riazan (see), 585
Ribandeneira (hagiographer), 248: hagiographical work, 234
Ribera, Juan de, 73
Ricci, Matteo (missioner), 197, 200
Apostolic method of, 202
Death of, 203
Chinese rites permitted by, 203
Euclid translated into Chinese, 201
At Peking, 201
Studies in natural sciences, 200
The True Idea of God, 202
Ricci, Scipio, 563
Richelieu (cardinal)
Arrest of St. Cyran, 383

Richelieu (*continued*)
Cluny reformed by, 108 note
Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 159
Condemnation of the *Augustinus* requested, 387
Death of, 387
Dislike for St. Cyran, 368
European equilibrium, 63
Gallicanism, 319 f.
On Huguenot peril, 305
Huguenots and, 307
Inquiry into Jansenist party, 383
Limitation of the Church, 322
Made cardinal, 35
The *Mars Gallicus*, 368
Nicholas Cornet and, 234
Offer to first Sulpicians, 139
Opposition to Habsburgs, 44
Program of, 44
Project of French patriarchate, 323
On qualities of a bishop, 115
Reform of the Carmelites, 105 note
Religious policy, 319
Richer's doctrines opposed by, 45
And seminaries, 133
Seminary at Caen, 123
Taking of La Rochelle, 306
Urban VIII and, 45, 47
View of political justice, 63 note
Warned against St. Cyran, 369
Won to St. Cyran, 368
Richer, Edmond, 234
Career of, 318 note
De la puissance ecclésiastique et politique, 318 note
Gallicanism, 321
Presbyterian Gallicanism, 318
Retraction of, 321 and note
Richelieu opposed to doctrines of, 45
Righet, Matthew (bishop), 572
Rio di Janeiro, Anchieta at, 212
Rites, The Chinese, 204
Rivera, Count de: on Benedict XIV, 457
Rivera, Diego de (bishop of Barbasto), 512
Rivet, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 531
Robert, Claude: *Gallia christiana*, 248
Rodez (see), Abelly bishop, 132
Rodriguez, Alonzo, 70: *Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection*, 70
Rohan, Anne de (Jansenist), 403
Rohan, Duke de, 305
Rohan-Guémené, Princess: case of conscience, 392
Rollin, Charles, 533: *Traité des études*, 528
Roma soterranea by Bosio, 247
Roman Campagna, Insecurity in the, 30
Roman College, 197: inspection ordered, 467
Roman law: in German jurisprudence, 274; in Germany, 81
Romanov, Michael (czar), 586
Romanov, Philaret (patriarch), 586
Rome
Alexander VII adorns, 260
Aristocratic government of, 258
Completion of St. Peter's, 32
Famine of 1649, 59
Farnese quarter, 353
Hofbauer at, 518
Innocent X adorns, 60 f.
Monthly lottery, 447 note
Oratorians in, 119
Paul V adorns, 31
St. Benedict Labre at, 545
St. Louis of the French (church), 119
St. Vincent at, 126
Rosary of the Blessed Sacrament, 374
Rose of Lima, St., 207, 210
Rosella, Isabel: founder of the Jesuitesses, 57
Rospigliosi (cardinal): under Alexander VII, 259; becomes Clement IX, 261
Rosweyde, Heribert: project of the *Acta sanctorum*, 249
Rota, The, 458
Rouen, 94: the *Augustinus*, 385; Father Lejeune at, 152; Harlay archbishop of, 341; Seminary founded at, 123
Roumania. *See* Rumania
Rousseau: appealed to by Huguenots, 479; *Contrat social*, 500; *Emile*, 461, 529; Naturalism of, 88; *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard*, 500
Royas, Christopher (bishop of Neustadt), 275
Rubens (painter), devotion to the Church, 230
Rudolf II (emperor), 83: and Bohemian Protestants, 29; Character of, 9; and city of Donauwörth, 28; Problems of, 9

Rueil, Château de, 139
Ruggieri, Michael (missioner): at Peking, 201
Rumania: Conversion of, 573; Holy Synod of, 552; Jesuits in, 574; under patriarch of Constantinople, 555
Rumanian (language), Liturgy in, 574
Rumanian Union, 575
Rumanians, The, 573; in Austrian Empire, 574; Calvinism among, 574; Jesuits among the, 576 f.
Russia, 556
  Frederick Augustus helped by, 441
  Georgia incorporated into, 579
  Greek bishops in Poland, 448
  Jesuits find refuge in, 469
  Mongol invasion, 585
  Pietism in, 286
  Poland and, 579
  Rebaptism in, 553
Russian Church, 585: Holy Synod, 552; Jansenism and, 490
Ruthenia, 556: Cyril Lukaris in, 548
Ruthenian Church, 557, 579: Rights of the, 15
Ruthenians, Attitude of Poles to, 581
Rutsky, Benjamin, 582
Ryazan (see), 588

Sabas, St.: bishop of Serbs, 573
Sablé, Marquis of: retreat at Port Royal, 374
Sablé, Marquise of, 416: case of conscience, 392
Saci, De, 390: Body of, 487; at Madame Arnauld's deathbed, 391
Sacraments to the dying, 497
Sacred Heart: apparition at Paray-le-Monial, 462; Devotion to the, 462
Sacred Heart, Feast of the, 463
Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, Devotion to, 150
"Sacristan emperor" (Joseph II), 519
Saddle makers, Union of, 167
Sadis Cusani, Marco de, 79
Saifi, Euthymius, 560, 562
Saint-Alby, Sirven case, 480 f.
Saint-Amour, Louis de: and examination of Jansenism, 401; at Rome, 402
St. Anthony of Qarqafe (monastery), 563
St. Athanasius (church, Rome), 578
St. Basil of the Armenians (congregation), abolished, 60
St. Benedict of Ullano, Seminary at, 578
Saint-Brieue, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, 525
St. Catherine of Langeac (convent), 136
St. Charles, Sisters of, 525
Saint Cyr (France), 279, 427
St. Cyran (abbey), Duvergier becomes abbot, 367
St. Cyran (i.e., Duvergier)
  Adversaries of, 368 f.
  Arnauld d'Andilly and, 369, 378
  Arrest of, 383
  Attitude to the Church, 175
  On attrition, 384 note
  On the *Augustinus*, 385
  Bayonne birthplace of, 365
  Body of, 487
  Director of Port Royal nuns, 380
  Doctrine of, 382
  House of the Blessed Sacrament, 379
  Jansenists and, 175
  Last days of, 389
  Letter from Jansen, 378
  Letters, 334, 482
  Liberation of, 388
  Meeting with Madame Guyon, 423
  Mother Agnes, 378
  Mother Angélique, 378
  At Poitiers, 369
  Port Royal and, 377
  And Reformers compared, 382
  Richelieu's dislike of, 368
  St. Vincent and, 368
  Secret Rosary approved by, 378
  Spiritual director, 392
  Tactics of, 382
  Visit to Mother Agnes, 378
St. Denis (convent), 546
St. Elias, Congregation of, 71
St. Etienne du Mont (church), 487, 497 f.
St. Etienne du Mont (monastery), reform of, 106
St. Gall (abbey), 181 note
St. Genevieve (church, Paris), 234
St. George (church, Venice), 460
St. George River, 225
St. Germain (faubourg), 126, 139, 143: Evil conditions in, 153; Huguenot academy in, 175; Jansenism in, 398

St. Germain-des-Prés (abbey), 140: Reform of, 135
St. Germain-en-Laye, James II at, 302
St. Gilles (Jansenist), 397
St. Jacques (church, Paris), 389 note
St. Jacques (faubourg): Carmelites of, 418; St. Cyran's lodgings, 388
St. Jacques du Haut-Pas (church), 487
St. Joachim (college, Quebec), 225
St. John (island), oppression of Indians, 208
St. John Lateran, Façade of, 447
St. John of God, Brothers Hospitallers of, 78
St. John of Shuweir (monastery, Beyrouth), 562
St. Julian of Brioude, Chapter of, 135
St. Lazare (in Paris)
Clerical conferences at, 132
Father Olier's retreat at, 136
Founding of, 124
Headquarters of Vincentians, 129
Plundered by the rabble, 147
Priests confined at, 173
Retreats at, 131, 139
St. Lazare (island), Armenian monks, 570
St. Louis of the French (church, Rome), 119
St. Magloire (college), 119
St. Malo: Diocese of, 150; Seminary at, 134
St. Marceau (faubourg), 491
St. Maron (monastery), 564
St. Martin, theosophist, 505
St. Maur (abbey): bull *Unigenitus*, 489; *Gallia christiana*, 248
St. Maur, Congregation of, 40
St. Médard (cemetery), 491
St. Médard (church), 487
St. Merry (church), 399
Saint-Mesmes, Marquis of: and dueling, 162
St. Nicholas du Chardonnet, 138: Seminary of, 122
St. Peter (basilica): alteration of plan, 32; Breviary at, 58; Completion of, 32
St. Peter's chair (Rome), 61
Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de: Naturalism of, 88
St. Remi (abbey), 151
St. Savior (monastery), 562
St. Simon, Duke de, 140: on Archbishop Harlay, 341; on election of Innocent XIII, 444
St. Stephen (monastery, Rome), 571
St. Sulpice (church): Fénelon at, 426; Method of catechism at, 154; Father Olier pastor of, 153
St. Sulpice (parish): House of Instruction in, 155; Life of the clergy at, 153 f.
St. Sulpice seminary, 138: anti-dueling pledge, 163; Father Caulet director of, 333; not Jansenist, 487; origin of name, 139
St. Sulpice, Society of: Origin of, 139 f.
St. Thomas Christians, 568
St. Vincent (college), Anchieta rector, 212
Sainte-Beuve, Madame de: and the Ursulines, 110
Sainte-Marthe, Abel Louis de (Oratorian), 119; Exile of, 417
Sainte-Marthe, Denys de (Benedictine): *Gallia christiana*, 248
Sainte-Marthe, Louis de: *Gallia christiana*, 248
Sainte-Marthe, Scévole de: *Gallia christiana*, 248
Saintes (France), Seminary at, 134
Saintonge (France), 305; Huguenots of, 313
Saints, List of
Aloysius (Jesuit, d. 1591), 42, 446
Alphonsus (founder, d. 1787), 515
Andrew Avellino (Theatine, d. 1608), 42
Andrew Corsini (Carmelite, d. 1373), 56
Bruno (founder, d. 1101), 40
Benedict Labre (pilgrim, d. 1783), 545
Cajetan of Thiene (founder, d. 1547), 42
Camillus (founder, d. 1613), 78
Charles Borromeo (cardinal, d. 1584), 31, 78
Clement Hofbauer (Redemptorist, d. 1821), 518
Elizabeth of Portugal (queen, d. 1336), 56
Felix of Cantalice (Capuchin, d. 1587), 42
Fidelis Sigmaringen (martyr, d. 1622), 181 note

Saints (*continued*)
Frances of Rome (founder, d. 1440), 97
Francesco Girolamo (preacher, d. 1716), 514
Francis Borgio (Jesuit, d. 1572), 42
Francis de Sales (bishop, d. 1622), 88
Francis Regis (missioner, d. 1640), 150 f.
Francis Solanus (Franciscan, d. 1610), 210
Francis Xavier (missioner, d. 1552), 31, 40, 182
Frumentius (apostle of Abyssinia, d. *cir.* 383), 228
Gregory VII (pope, d. 1085), 446
Hyacintha Mariscotti (Franciscan tertiary, d. 1640), 80
Ignatius Loyola (founder, d. 1556), 31, 40
Isaac Jogues (martyr, d. 1646), 222
Isidore the Laborer (farmer, d. 1130), 40
John Baptist de la Salle (founder, d. 1719), 525
John Eudes (founder, d. 1690), 122, 150
John Joseph of the Cross (Franciscan, d. 1739), 450
John Nepomucene, (martyr, d. 1393), 446
John of the Cross (founder, d. 1591), 446
Josaphat Kuncevyc (martyr, d. 1623), 581
Joseph Calasanctius (founder, d. 1648), 40
Joseph of Leonessa (Capuchin, d. 1612), 80
Leonard of Port Maurice (preacher, d. 1751), 514
Lorenzo da Brindisi (Capuchin, d. 1619), 80
Louise de Marillac (founder, d. 1660), 148
Paul of the Cross (founder, d. 1775), 515
Peter Canisius (missioner, d. 1597), 80
Peter Claver (missioner, d. 1654), 70 f.
Peter Fourier (missioner, d. 1640), 110, 151
Philip Neri (founder, d. 1595), 31, 40
Saints (*continued*)
Pius V (pope, d. 1572), 362
Rose of Lima (Dominican tertiary, d. 1617), 210
Stanislas Kostka (Jesuit, d. 1568), 446
Theresa of Avila (founder, d. 1582), 31, 40
Turibius (missioner, d. 1606), 207, 210
Veronica Giuliani (Capuchin, d. 1727), 450
Vincent de Paul (founder, d. 1660), 144 ff.
Vladimir (Russian ruler, d. 1015), 579
Saints ordres, Traité des: by Olier, 241
Salamanca, Carmelites of, 71
Salamanca University: St. Thomas' *Summa* at, 232; the *Salmanticenses,* 232
Saldanha (cardinal), visitator apostolic, 455
Salic law, The, 368
Salmanticenses, 72, 232 f.
Salons, The, 500
Salutary Warnings of the Blessed Virgin by Widenfelt, 264
Salzburg (monastery), Congregation of, 83
Samurai, 188, 196
San Domingo: Discovery of, 207; First bishops of, 207; Las Casas in, 207, 209
San Felice (cardinal), 85
Sánchez, moral theology, 238
Sancian (island), St. Francis Xavier's death, 190
Sanctuary, Right of: Extension of, 353
Saniassi (Brahman penitent), 192
Sant' Angelo (castle), Jesuit general imprisoned in, 469
Santarelli (Jesuit): *De haeresi, schismate et apostasia,* 320; moral theology, 238
Sapienza College: designed by Michelangelo, 260; finished by Alexander VII, 260
Saqzi, Eutychius (patriarch), 559
Saqzi, Neophytus (patriarch), 560
Saragossa University, 126
Sardinia and the Holy See, 448
Sardinia, King of: "Vicar of the Holy See," 454
Sarpi, Paolo, 23: *History of the Council of Trent* by, 24; *Treatise on the*

Sarpi (*continued*)
Interdict by, 24; Venetian veneration of, 42
Sarrasin (bishop of Vicenza), Arrest of, 22
Sassuma (Japan), 189
Sava, St.: bishop of Serbs, 573
Savoy (duchy): Ambition of, 8; Charles Emmanuel duke of, 89; and Genoa reconciled, 265; St. Francis de Sales in, 90
Scala (Italy), Redemptorists founded at, 515
Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum*, 236
Schall, Johann (missioner), 203: Chinese writings of, 203; Death of, 204; in Peking, 203
Scherer, Georg (preacher), 81
Schiller, influenced by Rousseau, 503
Schlegel, Frederick von, 509 note: Conversion of, 509 note; on history of eighteenth century, 509; on international peace, 64
Schönborn, George von, 493
Schomberg, Marshal, 159: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177; and dueling, 163
Scholasticism, Aversion to, 495
Schoolmaster in France, 524
Schwenkfeld, Theories of, 283
Sciala, Victor, 565
Science, Bible and, 53 note
Science pratique du Crucifix by Grou, 540
Scotland: General Monk governor of, 296; political influence of Masonry, 504
Scriptural exegesis, 244
Scripture, Study of, 530
Scrofula, Curing of, 368
Scudéry, Mlle de, 279
Scutari, 555
Sebaste, 570
Secret Rosary of the Blessed Sacrament: approved by St. Cyran, 378; condemned by Sorbonne, 378
Secular Priests of Christian Doctrine, Approval of, 60
"See of the East," 568
Séez (see), 150, 178
Segneri (preacher), 60
Séguier (chancellor), 142: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 177
Séguier, Madame: and St. Vincent, 145
Seminaries
In charge of Vincentians, 134
Founded by Bishop Caulet, 333
Founding of, 445
In France, 123, 132: opposition of Assembly of the Clergy, 124; Richelieu and, 133; State direction of, 495
In Germany, 85
Seminary: at Caen, 124; Francis de Sales' efforts to found a, 99
Seminary of Foreign Missions (Paris), 204
Seminary of St. Sulpice, 138: origin of name, 139
Semler, 287, 473
Senez (see), 521
Senlis (see), 106
Sens (see), 402
Sept-Fons (abbey), reformed by Beaufort, 108 note
Seraphim Tanas (patriarch), 561
Serbia: Holy Synod of, 552; under patriarch of Constantinople, 555
Serbo-Croats, The, 577
Serbs, The, 572: Conversion of, 573
Serfdom in Bohemia, 29
Séricourt, Simon Le Maître de: Port Royal hermit, 381
Sermon pour l'Ascension by Bossuet, 241
Sesmaisons, the case of conscience, 392
Seven Tours (castle), 35
Sévigné, Madame de
On Bishop Caulet, 336
On glorification of Louis XIV, 353
On Innocent XI and Louis XIV, 336
Reading of St. Augustine, 386
On revocation of Edict of Nantes, 312
Writings of, 432
Seville, Siege of, 208
Shintoism, 187
Shoemakers, Association of Brother, 168
Shoguns, 188
Shun-chi (Chinese emperor), 203
Shuweirites, 562
Sicily: Albanians in, 577; detached from Papal States, 441; Greek element in, 577; Greek monasteries, 578; number of clergy, 512
Sick: Bleeding the, 373; Care of the, 77 f.
Siegnelay, Marquis de, 353
Sigismund III, John (of Poland), 30, 580, 582
Signatures, the two, 269 note

Silesia, Jesuits find refuge in, 469
Silveira (missioner) in Africa, 228
Simeon V (Nestorian catholicos), 568
Simeon bar Mama (catholicos), 568
Simeon of Trebizond (patriarch), 553
Simon, Richard (Oratorian), 119: and Father Morin, 238
Simon de Rojas (Blessed), 72
Simpson, on Jesuits in California, 221
Sinai: Orthodox bishop of, 556; See of, 557
Si-ngan-fou, Inscription of, 569
Singlin, Antoine, 390: the case of conscience, 392; Jansenist orator, 381; Severity of, 391
Sionite, Gabriel, 565
Sirven, Elizabeth: Case of, 480
Sis, Armenian patriarchs of, 569
Sisters of Charity, Founding of, 147 f., 152
Sivas (Sebaste), 570
Six premiers siècles de l'Eglise, 530
Sixtus V (pope), the Congregations of cardinals, 259
Skarga (Jesuit), *The Unity of the Church*, 580
Slavata (governor of Prague), Death of, 29
Slave trade, Beginning of the, 209 note
Sleidanus, *De statu religionis et reipublicae* by, 27
Smolensk, 586
Smotritsky, Meletius (bishop), 583
Soanen (bishop of Senez): appeal from bull *Unigenitus*, 489; condemned by Council of Embrun, 521; Death of, 489 note; suspended and exiled, 489
Sobieski, John, 583: Polish patriot, 265; victory at Vienna, 268
Society of Foreign Missions, 179
Society of Jesus. *See* Jesuits
Society of Priests of the Mission, approved by Urban VIII, 129
Society of the Blessed Sacrament. *See* Company of the Blessed Sacrament
Socinianism in Hungary, 470
Socinios (king of Abyssinia), 228
Sogno (Congo, Africa), 227
Soissons, Workmen's societies at, 169
Soissons, Countess de: and the "devotees," 178
Solbert (Huguenot minister), 306
Solitaries. *See* Hermits
Sollicita ac provida (constitution), 453
Solovetsk (monastery), 587
Somaschi, union with Secular Priests of Christian Doctrine, 60
Somme des péchés by Bauny, 239
Sommières, Huguenot synod near, 478
Sophronius V (patriarch), 557
Sorbière, Samuel: and royal absolutism, 177
Sorbonne, 233 f., 395
  Anti-Roman tradition, 324
  Case of conscience, 406
  Companions of Duty condemned by, 168
  Degrees at, 234
  Emile condemned by, 461
  Gallicanism defended by, 321
  Gallicanism in the, 337
  Jansenism: censured by, 407; denounced by, 401; in seminary of, 487
  Meetings forbidden, 352
  Opposition to Louis XIV, 351
  Papal infallibility and, 329, 352
  Rebuilt by Richelieu, 324
  Religious excluded from deliberations, 321
  Royal rights over convents, 338
  The Secret Rosary condemned, 378
  Versus the Parliament, 329
  Villeneuve's thesis at, 328
Soto, Peter de: on grace and free will, 358
Soubise, Duke de, 305
Sourdis (archbishop of Bordeaux) and reform at Maubuisson, 374
South America: colonized by Catholics, 206; The missions in, 206
Souveraineté des rois by Le Bret, 176
Spada (nuncio), 320
Spain
  Alexander VII and, 257
  Bartholomites in, 85
  Catholic renaissance in, 68
  Church in, 68, 510
  Clerical ignorance, 511
  The clergy, 511
  Concordats, 492: (1717), 511; (1723), 511
  Cromwell and, 295
  Decline of power of, 68
  Despotism of the monarchy, 69, 511
  Devotion to St. Joseph, 40
  Economic decline of, 74

Spain (*continued*)
Emigration to America, 69
Expulsion of the Moors, 74
Holy bishops, 512
The Inquisition, 492
Interference in papal elections, 443
King as "patron" of the churches, 511
Lack of seminaries, 511
Land of scholastic theology, 232
Limitations of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 492
Maritime decadence of, 296
Masonry in, 507 f.
Moors in, 73
Penalties against apostates, 73
Power in Italy, 8
Pressure on Europe, 12
Property rights of the clergy, 511
Quality of preaching, 511
Regime of favorites, 69
Regime of intendants, 511
Religious monuments in, 511
Religious orders in, 71
Religious spirit, 70
Sale of Church property, 511
State of agriculture, 69
Spalatro (see), 318 note
Spanish colonists in America, 206
Spener, Jacob, 284: apostle of pietism, 275, 282; *Pia desideria,* 285
Spinola (bishop), Leibnitz and, 277
Spinoza, Leibnitz and, 276
Spiritual Combat, 100
Spiritual Guide by Molinos, 423
Spondanus. *See* Sponde
Sponde, Henri de (bishop of Pamiers), 333: continuator of Baronius, 247
Stanislas Kostka, St.: Canonization of, 446
Staroviertsi, The, 587
States General (1614), 106
Stedingk, 502
Steenhoven, Cornelius (schismatic archbishop of Utrecht), 499
Stigmata, St. Veronica Giuliani, 450
Stoicism, German, 250
Strasbourg, Spener in, 285
Strikes, and Trade Union of Duty, 168
Stuart, Charles: pretender, 296
Suarez, Theological works of, 236 f.
Subiaco, preaching by Thomas of Cori, 450
Suffern (Jesuit), Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 157
Sulaka, John (archimandrite), 568
Sully, Duke de, 305: *Mémoires,* 13
Sulpicians
Among the Acadians, 225
Ascetical theology, 232
In Canada, 223 f.
In colonial America, 223
Founding of the, 138, 308 note
And Jansenists, 406 f.
Summa theologica by St. Thomas: at Salamanca, 232
Sunderland, adviser of James II, 301
Surius (hagiographer), 248
Susneos (king of Ethiopia), 572
Swabia, Bartholomites in, 86
Sweden: Estates of, 258; Growing strength of, 258; Masonry in, 507; Pietism in, 286; treaty with Cromwell, 295
Swedenborg, Emmanuel, 286, 474, 505: *Vera christiana religio,* 474
Switzerland: Conversions in, 181 note; Masonry in, 507; Protestantism in, 8
Sylvester Dahan, 560
Syncretism, Religious, 274 f.: in Germany, 472 f.
Synods, Diocesan: St. Francis de Sales, 98
"Synods of the Desert," 313, 315, 477
Syria: conquered by the Ottomans, 559; Church in, 561, 563; Melchite patriarchate, 455
Syriac, Byzantine liturgy in, 559
Syrian Church, 566
Syrians: Catholic, 567; Literary works of, 565
Szeklers in Hungary, 470
Szunyogh (Jesuit), 575

Tahayma, Japanese convert, 196
Tailors: Association of Brother, 169; Union of, 167
Talon, Denis (Advocate General), 328
Talon, Omer: on war suffering, 141
Tamil (language), 185
Tanas, Seraphim (patriarch), 561
Tangier, John de Prado patron of, 226
Tanucci (minister), 519
Taoism, 189: Ricci and, 202

Tapper, Ruard (chancellor of Louvain), 358: and Baianism, 361; at Council of Trent, 359
Tapuyans (tribe), 214
Tartar Manchu dynasty, 203
Tasswitz, birthplace of Hofbauer, 518
Tauler, Sermons of, 284
Taurus, Cilician, 555
Tazbas Melkoun (bishop), 569
Tchernoievitch, Arsenius, 576
Tegee (see), 576
Télémaque by Fénelon, 432, 434
Tellier, Le, 147
Temporal power of the pope, 320
Tencin (archbishop of Embrun), Provincial council under, 489
Tencin, Madame de: Salon of, 501
Teneriffe, birthplace of Anchieta, 211
Tentative, The: at the Sorbonne, 234
Terlitzki, Cyril (bishop), 580
Ternovo (see), 573
Tersteegen, Gerhard (Pietist), 286
Test Act, 298
Test Oath, 301
Theatines: expelled from Venice, 22; in Poland, 582; sent to the Caucasus, 579
Theodore I (czar), 586
Theodore of Beza, 50 f.
Theodosius VI (patriarch), 562
Theologia moralis by St. Alphonsus, 516
Theology, The study of, 231
Theology, Ascetical, 232, 240
Theology, Moral: Bonacina, 238; Sánchez, 238. *See also* Casuistry
Theology, Mystical, 232
Theology, Pastoral, 232, 238, 495
Theology, Patristic, 232
Theology, Positive, 235: Petau, 531
Theophanes IV (patriarch), 557, 583
Theophanes Procopovich, 552
Theophilus (bishop of Fagaras), 574
Theophilus Korydaleus, 551
Thesaurus sacrorum rituum by Gavanti, 243
Theresa of Avila, St.
  Ascetical theology, 232
  Beatification of, 31
  Canonization of, 40
  Influence of, 426
  Madame Guyon's fondness for writings of, 421
  Way of Perfection, 539
Thessalonica, 549
Thibet. *See* Tibet
Third orders in Middle Ages, 176
Thirty Years' War, 43, 284: Beginning of, 29; End of, 62; Sufferings of the, 141, 145; Urban VIII, 45
Thomas, St. (apostle): in India, 184
Thomas Aquinas, St.: papal infallibility, 350 note, 352; *Summa* at Salamanca, 232; *Summa* in European universities, 232
Thomas of Cori (Blessed), Franciscan, 450
Thomas of Jesus (Carmelite), 71
Thomassin (Oratorian), 119: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise,* 531; disavowal of Jansenism, 403; *Traité de l'Incarnation,* 241
Thomists and Molinists, 10
Thonon: birthplace of Father Lacombe, 421; Protestantism in, 89
Thorens (in Savoy), 88
Thorn, The holy, 410 f.
Thou, Jacques de: project of a Polyglot, 246
Thrace, 555
Thury, Father: in Canada, 225
Tibet, Missions in, 450
Tien-chu as name of God, 202, 205
Tillemont, Lenain de: *Les six premiers siècles de l'Eglise,* 530
Tithes, Collection of, 523
Tivoli, Arms factory at, 43
Toland, the term "pantheism," 303
Toletus (cardinal), 14
Toletus, Franciscus: and submission of Baius, 362
Tor de Specchi, 97
Tories (party), 299
Tosa (Japan), 198
Toulouse
  Bourlemont bishop of, 327
  Case of Antoine Calas, 480
  De Marca archbishop of, 323 note
  General Hospital, 161
  Lucilio executed at, 251
  Parliament of, 332
  See of, 335
  Workmen's societies at, 169
Toulouse University, 126: St. Vincent honored by, 126 note
Touraine: Choiseul-Praslin bishop of, 346; Father Lejeune in, 152

Tournely (theologian), 531
Tournon, Charles de (papal legate): in China, 205
Trade Union of Duty, 167: Spirit of, 165; Strikes and, 168, 176
Trade unions in France, 167
Transylvania, 574: Calvinism in, 574; Protestantism protected by Cromwell, 296
Trapes (archbishop), 320
Trappists, The, 108: Establishment of, 308 note; reformed by Rancé, 108
Travancore (India), St. Francis Xavier in, 191
Treaties
  Cateau-Cambresis, 512
  Lyons, 12
  Madrid, 36
  Paris (1763), 225
  Vervins, 12
  Westphalia. *See* Westphalia
Tréguier: Diocese of, 149; Seminary at, 134
Trent, Council of
  Attitude of French clergy to canons of, 106
  Clerical life, 31
  Commentaries on reforms of, 232
  Ecclesiastical immunities, 22
  Episcopal residence, 20
  Its decrees not received in France, 114
  Leibnitz on, 277 f., 280
  Reform of the clergy, 98
  Reforms in France, 87
Tribunal of mathematics (China) under direction of Jesuits, 204
Tribunal sacramentale by Peter Marchand, 238
Trinitarians, 72: and Barbary missions, 226; in England, 226; in Spain, 70
Trinitarians, Discalced, 72
Trinity, Order of the. *See* Trinitarians
Tromp, Corneille: and Huguenots, 310
Tronson (Sulpician), investigation of Madame Guyon, 427
Trous, Château of: the "little schools," 395
Troyes (France), 224: Seminary at, 134
True Christianity by Arndt, 284
True Idea of God by Ricci, 202
Tucuman (see), 216
Tübingen University, 548
Tuesday conferences, 132: Bossuet on, 132
Tuki, Raphael (bishop), 571
Tunis: Christian prisoners in, 227; St. Vincent at, 126
Turenne (Huguenot): Conversion of, 309; on religion in France, 304
Turgot, regard for the curés, 523
Turibius, St.: Apostolate of, 210; Canonization of, 210; in Peru, 207, 210
Turkestan, Nestorian missions in, 568
Turks
  Alexander VII and war against, 260
  Attack on Malta, 444
  Candia threatened by, 262
  Defeated by Sobieski, 268
  Europe menaced by, 267
  Favored by Louis XIV, 265, 267
  Italy menaced by, 265
  Poland defended against, 265
  Venice at war with, 269
  Weakening of, 12
Tuscany, 447: Ambition of, 8
Tyre (see), 565

Ukraine, Conversion of the, 583
Ulric von Brunswick, Conversion of, 472
Unbelief, Development of, 472-509
Unigenitus (bull), 441, 444 f.
  Accepted by Noailles, 446
  Benedict XIV on acceptance of, 498
  Bossuet (bishop of Troyes), 490
  Individual refusal to accept, 498
  Jansenist opposition to, 460
  Origin of, 488
  Quesnel's propositions condemned, 488
  Treatment to opponents of, 454
Union of Brest, 548
Union of Florence, 571
Unions, Trade: in France, 167
United Kingdom, 287. *See also* England
Unity of the Church by Skarga, 380
Universae theologicae moralis receptae sententiae by Escobar, 239
Universities, List of
  Alcalá, 232 f.
  Bourges, 236
  Cambridge, 293
  Helmstedt, 275
  Leyden, 237
  Louvain, 358 ff.
  Oxford, 293

Universities (*continued*)
Paris, 182, 233, 237, 532
Salamanca, 232
Tübingen, 548
University of France, 532
Urban VIII (pope), 41
Activities of, 56
Anti-Jansenist bull, 47
Bull condemning the *Augustinus*, 388
Bulls: *Divinam psalmodiam*, 58; *In caena Domini*, 48; *In eminenti*, 388
Canonizations by, 42, 56
The Castro war, 56
Congregation of Propaganda, 39
Congregations of cardinals, 259
Death of, 58, 397
Early career of, 42
Galileo and, 54
Greek rite in Italy, 578
Interest in fortifications, 42
Nepotism of, 47
Observance of Melk approved, 83
Port Royal and, 376
Publication of excommunications, 48
Reform measures of, 42
Relations with France, 42
Religious orders encouraged, 57
Revision of the breviary, 57
Richelieu and, 45, 47
Society of Priests of the Mission approved, 129
Valtellina conflict, 43
Venice and, 47
Ursulines: promoted by Madame de Villemar, 110; Spread of, 80
Usury: Abuse of, 170; Benedict XIV on, 452; Decrees against, 266
Utraquists in Bohemia, 29
Utrecht: Jansenist schism, 499; Religious decisions at, 441
Uzés (see), 478, 537

Vaissette (historian), 531
Valdemarino (abbot), Arrest of, 22
Valencia (Spain), 73
Valignano, Alexander (missioner), 197
Valladolid: Cennaro y Lapiedra bishop of, 512; Las Casas at, 209
Vallon de Beaupuis, the "little schools," 395
Valtellina, Conflict over, 36, 43
Van den Steen. *See* Lapide
Van Espen, power of kings, 492
Vanini, Lucilio: *De naturae arcanis*, 251
Van Swieten (Jansenist), 471, 495
Vardes, Marquis de: Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 178
Vatelot, Father (founder), 525
Vatelottes, The, 525
Vatican Council, 347 note
Vatican Library, 565: enriched by Clement XII, 447; enriched by Paul V, 31; Oriental manuscripts, 565
Vaudois, Cromwell's support of the, 296
Vaudreuil at Montreal, 225
Vaugirard (village), 138: Growth of seminary at, 139; Seminary at, 333
Velay, St. Francis Regis in, 150
Venaissin, Comtat, 521
Venice
Ambition of, 8
Birthplace of Clement XIII, 458
Capuchins expelled, 22
Conflict with Paul V, 22
Decline of, 21
Disdain for the papacy, 21
Ecclesiastical restrictions by, 22
Excommunications against, 21
Febronianism, 494
Fire in, 21 note
Help asked of Alexander VII, 257
And the Holy See, 492
Ill will of, 47
Jesuits expelled, 22
Mechitar at, 570
Sarpi canonist of, 24
Schismatic clergy in, 460
Senators excommunicated, 22
Theatines expelled, 22
Treaty with Turks (1573), 21 note
Veneration of Sarpi, 42
War against, 21
At war with Turks, 269
Ventadour, Duke de, 175: viceroy of Canada, 181
Vera christiana religio by Swedenborg, 474
Verbiest (missioner): and Chinese calendar, 204; Death of, 204
Verceil, 424
Veronica Giuliani, St. (Capuchin), 450
Vervins, Treaty of, 12
Vespers, The: at the Sorbonne, 235
Vialart (bishop of Chalons), 132, 418
"Vicar of the Holy See," Title of, 454
Vico, Anthony: on Nobili, 193

Victoria, Francisco (bishop of Tucuman), 216
Vieira, Anthony: in Brazil, 207, 213; Death of, 215
Vienna, Redemptorists at, 518
Vigeau, Mlle de: and St. Vincent, 145
Vignal (Sulpician), slain by Indians, 224
Villa Barberini (Rome), 61
Villemar, Acarie de: promotion of Carmelites and Ursulines, 110
Villeneuve, Gabriel de: Thesis of, 328
Villeneuve, Madame de: founding of Sulpicians, 138
Vilna, 582
Vincennes castle, St. Cyran imprisoned in, 384
Vincent de Paul, St., 104, 124
  Advice to missioners, 229
  Barbary missions, 227
  Bishop Caulet and, 333
  Canonization of, 141, 149 note
  Cardinal Mazarin and, 147
  Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 155
  Conférences de Saint-Lazare, 241
  Conferences of charity, 144
  Confessor of Father Olier, 136
  Death of, 149
  Early life, 125 f.
  Esteem for the priesthood, 124 f.
  Father Duval confessor of, 234
  First attempt to found preparatory seminary, 134 note
  On the *Frequent Communion*, 398
  Friendship for St. Cyran, 398
  During the Fronde, 147
  Galley convicts, 146
  General Hospital, 148, 161
  Holiness of the priesthood, 240
  Honored by Toulouse University, 126 note
  Influence in Gondi family, 113
  Jansenism repudiated by, 397
  Jansenists and, 175
  The missions, 128
  Opposition to Jansenism, 402
  Parish missions, 128
  Paul V and, 126
  Pavillon disciple of, 331
  Poverty of his origin, 125
  Queen Anne and, 127
  Relief undertakings, 146
  Retreats, 128
Vincent de Paul, St. (*continued*)
  At Rome, 126
  Royal chaplain, 126
  St. Cyran and, 368
  On serving the poor, 144
  Slave at Tunis, 126
  Virtue of, 127
  Work of, 144
Vincentians: in Africa, 226; Approval of the, 149; Establishment of, 308 note; in Madagascar, 228; missions, 128; retreats, 128; seminaries, 132, 134
Vineam Domini (bull), 440, 483
Vinnitzki, George (bishop), 584
Virginia (colony), Protestantism in, 221
Visitation, Order of the: Approval of, 42; Foundation of, 97; Rapid spread of, 98
Vitebsk, 583
Vivarais, St. Francis Regis in, 150
Viviers (see), 151
Vix pervenit (encyclical), 452
Vladimir, St.: conversion of Ruthenians, 579
Volodkovitch, Philip (bishop), 584
Voltaire
  Becomes Mason, 508
  Calas case, 480
  Correspondence with Benedict XIV, 454
  Defense of Huguenots, 479
  Glorification of, 471
  Huguenots' appeal to, 479
  Influence of, 519
  On Jesuits in Paraguay, 216
  La Barre case, 481
  Mahomet by, 454
  Sirven case, 480
  Works condemned, 456
Vratanya, Simeon (Serbian monk), 577

Wading (Recollect), disavowal of Jansenism, 403
Wahren Christenthum by Arndt, 283
Wake (Anglican archbishop), 490
Walachia, 556-58: Church of, 573
Wallenstein (general), 46
Walpole on Benedict XIV, 457
Walter on Treaty of Westphalia, 66
Walton, Brian (Anglican bishop), London Polyglot by, 246
Wan-li (Chinese emperor), 201

Warsaw, Redemptorists at, 318
Way of Perfection by St. Theresa, 539
Wealth of French clergy, 111
Weishaupt, Masonic leader, 506
Werner, Franz: on Spener, 282
Wesley, John: founder of Methodism, 286, 302
Western Schism and political Gallicanism, 318
Westphalia, Treaty of, 59, 62, 256, 273, 284, 287
Whigs (party), 299
White Hill (battle), 30, 34
Whitehall Palace, 301
Widenfelt, Adam: *Salutary Warnings of the Blessed Virgin*, 264
Willermoz, 505
William III (of England)
  Anglicanism at coming of, 474
  Anti-Catholic spirit of, 281
  Catholics and, 302
  Freemason, 504
  Innocent XI and, 267
  Leibnitz and, 281
  Mary Stuart wife of, 301
William (margrave of the Palatinate), conversion of, 472
William of Orange. *See* William III (of England)
Wine merchant to the court, 135 note
Wisdom, Daughters of: Founding of, 536
Wisdom, Sisters of, 525
Witasse (theologian), 531
Wittemberg, 547
Wladislaus IV of Poland, 583
Wolff, disciple of Leibnitz, 287
Working classes, Company of the Blessed Sacrament, 167 ff.
Workmen's corporations, 543

Ximenez (cardinal): *Biblia Polyglotta*, 245; Las Casas and, 208 f.

Yang Kweisien (astronomer), 204
Ypres: Jansen bishop of, 368; See of, 384
Ysambert, Sorbonne doctor, 236
Yukinaga (Catholic prince), 197
Yvan, Anthony (founder), 152

Zagreb (see), 577
Zaim, Meletius (patriarch), 559
Zalenski, Leo (bishop), 584
Zamet, Sebastian (bishop of Langres), 175, 379 f.: Conversion of, 379; House of the Blessed Sacrament, 379
Zamosk, Council of, 584
Zelanti, in papal elections, 443, 445, 451
Zelus domus meae (bull), 65
Zenon, Bernardine (Jesuit), 79
Zinzendorf, Emmanuel: founder of Moravian Brethren, 286

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME SEVEN

1775-1823

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV. FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME SEVEN

PERIOD OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

(1775-1823)

MONASTERY OF SAINT DOMINIC
13th AVENUE AND SOUTH 10th STREET
NEWARK 3, NEW JERSEY

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS 2, MO.
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON W. C.

MONASTERY OF [illegible] DOMINIC

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-507

IMPRIMATUR

✠ Joseph E. Ritter, S.T.D.
Archbishop of St. Louis

August 27, 1954

COPYRIGHT 1955 BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Printed in the United States of America
by Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton, New York

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

PART I

DECLINE OF THE ANCIENT REGIME

CHAPTER

I. THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CRISIS 9
Abuse of Royal Absolutism 12
The Clergy 14
Josephism and Febronianism 16
The Punctuation of Ems 16
Synod of Pistoia 18
Church and State in France 20

II. THE INTELLECTUAL CRISIS 23
The Philosophical Movement in England 24
The Philosophical Movement in Germany 25
The Philosophical Movement in Italy 27
The Philosophical Movement in Holland 29
French Philosophers 32
Voltaire 33
Rousseau 35
Influence of the New Theories 38
The Clergy 43

III. THE FIRST YEARS OF THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS VI . . 46
Pius VI 46
The Pope's Popularity 48
The Danger of Philosophism 50
Pius VI's Visit to Vienna 52
Difficulties with Russia 55
Grand Duke of Tuscany 57

PART II

THE REVOLUTION

CHAPTER		PAGE
IV.	THE CHURCH DESPOILED	63
	The Conditions in France in 1789	64
	The Assembly	65
	The Upper Clergy	67
	The Lawyers	69
	The Lower Clergy	69
	Abbé Sieyès	70
	Mirabeau	72
	Beginning of the Anarchy	74
	The Pillage of St. Lazare	74
	The Taking of the Bastille	76
	The Provinces	78
	The Night of August 4	79
	The Tithes	81
	Hostility toward the Holy See	82
	The Cahiers of the Three Orders	84
	The Clergy	84
	The Three Principles of the Declaration	88
	Development of Anarchy	90
	Four Destructions	92
	Church Property	95
	Talleyrand	97
	Abbé Maury	100
	The Religious Orders	106
	Church and State	112
	The Civil Constitution of the Clergy	116
	Final Appeal	119
	The Civil Constitution of the Clergy	121
	Foreign Views of the Revolution	125
	Pius VI's Inaction	127
	The Pope and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy	132
V.	THE PERSECUTION	137
	The Taking of the Oath by the Clergy	138
	Aim of the Assembly	140

CHAPTER PAGE

Louis XVI and Pius VI 144
The Avignon Affair 147
Abbé Grégoire 152
Bishops Boisgelin and Bonal 154
The Papal Condemnation 156
The Constitutional Clergy 158
Archbishop Gobel 159
Bishop Grégoire 161
The Legislative Assembly 167
Cardinal Bernis 171
The Provinces 172
New Laws of Persecution 174
Execution of Priests 176
Danton 179
Imprisonments 180
The Taking of Verdun 182
The September Massacres 184
Massacres at the Abbaye 185
Massacres at the Carmelite Monastery 187
Further Massacres 189
The Oath of Liberty and Equality 192
The Convention (1792–95) 196
The *Emigré* Priests 199
The *Emigrés* in Germany 205
The *Emigré* Priests in Italy 209
The *Emigré* Priests in America 212
Fresh Outbreak of Revolutionary Persecution . . . 215
Execution of Louis XVI 219
Consequences of the King's Execution 221
The Liturgy 226
The Constitutional Clergy 228
Despotism of the Convention 231
Brittany and the Vendée 236
The First Vendean Insurgents 241
Cathelineau 243
The Second Period 246
The Other Provinces 250
The Vendée and Brittany 257
The Constitutional Church (1795) 265

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. THE CHURCH SUPPLANTED BY CIVIL RELIGION . . . 271
Second Encyclical of the Constitutionals 275
Decrees of the Pseudo-Council 278
Failure of the Council 279
A National Religion 280
The Weekly Holyday 284
Irreligion (1789–99) 287
The Terror under the Directory 289
The Armistice of Bologna 293
Recoil of the Directory 295
The Taking of Rome 298
The Persecution in France 300
Exiles in Guiana 302
The Interned Priests 305
Deeds of the Directory 310
The Persecution in Belgium 312
Motive of the Persecution 314
Sacking of Rome 317
Pius VI in France 321

PART III

TOWARD A RELIGIOUS RESTORATION

VII. THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN 1799 327
The Protestants 328
The Jews 329
The Freemasons 331
Vitality of Catholicism 332
Popular Feelings 334
Switzerland 337
The Catholic Cantons 338
Ireland 340
Napoleon 342
The Conclave 344
Election of Pius VII 346
Life of Pius VII 347
Pius VII and Bonaparte 349

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. THE FRENCH CONCORDAT OF 1801 350
First Acts of Pius VII 350
Roman Distrust 355
Louis XVIII 359
Papal Envoys to Paris 363
Spina and Bernier 366
First Proposals 368
Diplomatic Activities 370
Consalvi and Bonaparte 374
The New Concordat 378
Ratification of the Concordat 380
The Organic Articles 383
Religious Situation 385
Resistance of *Emigré* Bishops 389
The Significance of the Concordat 392
Protestantism in France 398
Napoleon Proclaimed Emperor 402
The Coronation 406
Humiliations of the Pope 408

IX. THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRE (1804–14) 410
Napoleon's Project 410
The Marriage of Jerome Bonaparte 412
Conflict between Napoleon and the Pope 415
The Holy Roman Empire 417
New Threats 420
Sentence of Excommunication 424
Arrest of Pius VII 426
Imprisonment of the Pope 428
Napoleon's Divorce 430
The French Church 435
French National Council of 1811 442
Pius VII at Fontainebleau 445
The Concordat 447
Napoleon and the Protestants 450
Napoleon and the Jews 452
Napoleon and the Freemasons 454

X. LAST YEARS OF PIUS VII 457
European Situation 458

CHAPTER PAGE

The Holy Alliance 462
The Church in France 468
Concordats 472
The Papal States 478

XI. The Religious Movement 481
Chateaubriand 482
Joseph de Maistre 486
Louis de Bonald 488
The Clergy 490
La Mennais 493
Germany 497
England 505

XII. The Foreign Missions 508
Interest in the Foreign Missions 509
New Apostolic Workers 511
Korea 514
India 516
China 518

XIII. The Eastern Church 523
Non-Catholic Greek Church of Constantinople . . . 523
Melchite Catholic Church of Antioch 530
The Churches of Eastern Europe 533
The Ruthenian Catholic Church 541
The Catholic Church in Russia 547
Alexander I 552

Appendix I. Declaration of the Rights of Man . . . 559

Appendix II. French Concordat of 1801 562

Bibliography 575

Index 587

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume VII

I. Decline of the Ancient Regime

II. The Revolution

III. The Religious Restoration

Introduction

VOLUME VI of this history of the Church described the elements of religious revival and social preservation that made the "great century." It also discussed the various heretical, irreligious, and antisocial currents that prepared for the French Revolution. The present volume has the following aims: 1. an account of the various efforts of the papacy, from 1775 to 1789, to preserve from religious and social decadence the Christian nations, which had been undermined by a spirit of revolt and impiety; 2. a description of the persecutions undergone by the Church in its possessions, in the person of its faithful, and in its worship, from 1789 to 1799, under the regime of the unrestrained Revolution; 3. a picture of the religious revival that took place following the storm, from 1800 to 1823, not merely among Catholic peoples but also in the countries where heresy prevailed, and consequently even in the infidel regions most remote from the center of Christianity.

Two long pontificates filled this period. From 1775 to 1799, Pius VI attempted at first to restrain the revolutionary movement; then he resisted it courageously. From 1800 to 1823, Pius VII, amid countless difficulties, directed the work of the Catholic restoration.

Sincere and competent persons, viewing the events from opposite points of view, have expressed divergent appreciations of the Revolution. According to Ballanche and Buchez, the Revolution was a reflection, even a social realization, of Chris-

tianity.[1] Joseph de Maistre regarded it as satanic in its very essence.[2]

Indeed certain declarations of the first leaders of the Revolution—about individual liberty, equality before the law, the brotherhood of man, justice in the application of punishments—are nothing more than an echo of the truths promulgated by the gospel. They are the reverse of the morality prevailing in the days of the pagan world. But if, in the work of the Revolution, we consider the war upon the Church and the application of the theories of the social contract, we can to some extent agree with De Maistre's severe judgment.

The French Revolution was indeed a most complex affair. To appraise it fairly, we should distinguish its three movements from one another: the political reform, the social renovation, and the anti-Catholic persecution.

The movement of political reform, if considered within the limits of the desires expressed by the cahiers of the States General, can be approved in its main lines. The clergy of the two orders defended it earnestly, King Louis XVI favored it without ulterior considerations.[3]

The movement of social renovation was unfortunately inspired by the false principles of Rousseau. Today we no longer have any need of showing their falsity. Experience has manifested the emptiness of those utopias. The ideas of original perfection, of absolute equality, and of the social contract have to give way before the sounder ideas of original corruption, of a necessary hierarchy, and of tradition.

As for the movement of anti-Catholic persecution, from 1789 to 1799, from Mirabeau to Robespierre and from Robespierre to Barras, it simply advanced toward a more radical and more sectarian impiety. We may well condemn this as-

[1] Buchez, *Traité de philosophie,* III, 571–73; Ballanche, *Œuvres,* VI, 268.

[2] De Maistre, *Considérations sur la France,* chap. 5.

[3] Cf. Godefroid Kurth, *The Church at the Turning Points of History,* 1929, pp. 159 ff.

pect of the Revolution with utmost severity. The present volume will be devoted mostly to an account of this third movement.

What aggravated the character of this movement is that it not only developed parallel to the other two movements, but progressively invaded them and penetrated them with its spirit. Gradually it became their heart and soul. The formulas of the Declaration of the Rights of Man are susceptible of being understood and accepted in a Christian sense. But they were interpreted and applied in the sense of the unbelieving philosophers of the eighteenth century. Thereupon the political reforms themselves collapsed lamentably: the reaction against the royal absolutism of the old regime led merely to the despotism of the Convention and the corruption of the Directory; the aristocracy of the old nobility merely gave place to the oligarchy of the ideologists; the court clergy, formerly too dependent on the king, disappeared only to give free play to a constitutional clergy, servilely submissive to the new government. The old state religion survived in a way under the form of an official worship, rigidly imposed on all. This new religion was the worship of the Revolution, whose "immortal principles" were regarded as sacred, whose laws were untouchable, whose heroes were thought worthy of apotheosis, and whose violators were considered guilty of treason and of betrayal of justice. We may perhaps see in this attitude the basic error of the Revolution. The Revolution did more than create a new state religion; it became itself the object of a new religion, destined to supplant the old one. The state was conceived as a sort of Church against the Church.

Humanly speaking, we may say that in those conditions Christianity appeared to succumb, and the triumph of the Revolution seemed to be final. However, the contrary happened. A certain writer, who often has the appearance of a prophet and sometimes the intuitions of one, wrote in 1796 as follows:

Attend to my words, all of you who have not been well instructed by history. You said that the scepter sustained the tiara. Well, now the scepter has been crushed. You did not know how far the influence of a rich and powerful priesthood could sustain the dogmas it preached. Now the priests are no more; or at least those who escaped the guillotine and deportation now receive the alms which formerly they bestowed. You feared the force of custom, the dominance of authority. Now we no longer have customs, no longer any masters; each man's spirit is his own. You no longer need fear the enchantment of the eyes; men no longer behold the magnificence of ceremonial pomp; the temples are closed. . . . Philosophism has nothing to complain of; all the chances are in its favor. . . . But if Christianity comes through this terrible trial purer and more vigorous, if a Christian Hercules by his own strength raises up the son of the earth and stifles him in his arms, *patuit Deus,* God is there. . . .[4]

The clergy of France should not sleep; they have numerous reasons for thinking they are summoned to a great mission. The same conjectures that enabled them to perceive for what they suffered, also permit them to believe themselves destined to an essential undertaking.[5]

Fifteen years later the prediction was fully realized. At the dawn of the new century the clergy of France, chastened by poverty and matured by persecution, filled their temples with the joyous Easter alleluias. The French concordat became the model after which the principal nations regulated the conditions of their religious life. *The Genius of Christianity,* translated into all languages, carried the echo of a Catholic rebirth everywhere. And again France gave to the distant apostolate the most intrepid of its laborers and the most abundant of its resources, by the restoration of the foreign missions and the formation of the work of the Propagation of the Faith.

[4] De Maistre, *ibid.,* chap. 5.
[5] *Ibid.,* chap. 2.

PART I

Decline of the Ancient Regime

THE Protestant Revolt was furthered by the misunderstandings arising from the need of a religious reform; the French Revolution took place in consequence of the attitude produced by the need of a political and social reform. But neither the statesmen, who were won over to the new ideas or were blind to the dangers of those ideas, nor the churchmen, too long absorbed in matters of internal conflicts and too often influenced by the doctrines they had to combat, were able to assume in time the leadership of the reform movement. This movement was marked by an anti-Christian and revolutionary spirit, under the direction of a rationalist philosophy. A history of the Revolution, therefore, will not be adequate unless we first study the political and intellectual crises that prepared the way for it.

CHAPTER I

The Political and Social Crisis

THIS crisis is marked by three European political facts: a great event of world-wide political significance, and two profound modifications in the internal organization of human society, particularly of French society.

The War of the Austrian Succession, the partition of Poland, and the expulsion of the Jesuits are events for which the great courts of Europe were responsible. But these three events showed an abdication of the old traditional public law, the lack of respect that was accorded to solemn agreements, and the ignoring of the established sovereignties, particularly the spiritual sovereignty of the pope. The War of the Austrian Succession showed that the might of states could take precedence over the rights of sovereigns; and the partition of Poland showed that the might of sovereigns could take precedence over the rights of states.[1] By the expulsion of the Jesuits, a deed concerted and matured in the Bourbon courts, civil society showed its determination to interfere in the organization of the Church and to regulate the activity of the Church by its own initiative.

On the other hand, men were stirred by the enthusiasm which the American War of Independence evoked. The Declaration of Independence (1776) was based on the civil and political equality of the citizens. In the preamble of the Declaration we read: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men

[1] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* I, 89. Voltaire wrote to Frederick II: "Sire, you are said to be the one who imagined the partition of Poland. I believe it is so, because it has the mark of genius." Letter of November 19, 1772.

are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, . . . that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it." In France on June 11, 1780, the Assembly of the Clergy, when asked to grant a subsidy to the government on the occasion of the American war, generously voted a gift of 30,000,000 francs without any discussion about the particular character of the war.[2]

The events of foreign policy coincided with a crisis of the internal institutions in the European nations, particularly in France. A spirit of impatience over feudal rights and an undercurrent of revolt against royal absolutism were the chief signs of this crisis.

At the close of the eighteenth century serfdom was completely abolished in almost no part of Germany. Generally the people remained attached to the soil, as in the Middle Ages. Nearly all the soldiers making up the armies of Frederick II and Maria Theresa had been serfs.[3] England was also administered as well as governed by the wealthy landowners.

But while the people saw the nobility assure public order, render justice, execute the laws, and come to the aid of the weak, they had endured without much impatience, almost as the public of today supports its government, the burdensome rights and the sometimes irksome privileges of the landed aristocracy. But according as the latter ceased to render the services corresponding to its rights, its authority became more onerous.

The weight of this authority was felt particularly in France. Serfdom, which had almost completely disappeared, continued only in one or two provinces. Almost everywhere the peasant ceased to be a serf. He even became a landowner. But this very situation made more unbearable for him the permanence of the feudal taxes that weighed so heavily on him and that were piti-

[2] Picot, *Mémoires* (3rd ed., 1855), V, 131–34.

[3] A. de Tocqueville, *L'ancien régime et la Révolution,* pp. 53 f.

lessly collected by intendants for the profit of a nobility living in affluent ease at the court. In a celebrated chapter of the *Origines de la France contemporaine,* Taine speaks of those "thoroughbreds that had double or triple rations that they might be idle and might do nothing after all, while the draft horses rendered full service on a half-ration which often they did not receive." [4] In a less figurative language, Alexis de Tocqueville depicts the French peasant at the close of the eighteenth century, as a small landowner, passionately fond of that piece of land which he has bought out of his savings, everywhere confronted with the privilege of his powerful neighbor who annoys and hinders him. To acquire his property he had to pay a tax, not to the government, but to a big near-by landowner, a man as unconnected with the government as the peasant himself. This same neighbor obliges him to abandon the cultivation of his fields in order to render some service without pay; or he waits for him at the crossing of some stream to require a toll tax from him. Or the peasant goes to market, where the powerful neighbor sells to him the right to sell his own produce; and when, upon returning home, he wishes to use for himself what is left of his grain, he can do so only after sending it to be ground in the mill and baked in the oven of that same man.[5] Feudalism had been one of our greatest and most beneficent national institutions. Upon ceasing to fulfill the social function for which it had been established, feudalism became a most serious danger.

[4] Taine, *L'ancien régime,* Vol. I, Bk. I, chap. 4. "About the middle of the eighteenth century, if, in the material and moral budget, you were to make two totals, one for the debts, the other for the credits, you could have calculated that the more capital a man contributed the less dividend he received. The privations of the large number supplied the superabundance of the small number. This fact applied to all the categories, thanks to the effective preferences favoring the court nobles at the expense of the provincial nobles, the nobility at the expense of the commoners, the cities at the expense of the country districts, and in general the strong at the expense of the weak. This scandalous disproportion finally shocked everyone, because almost everyone suffered from it." Taine, *Le régime moderne,* II, 80.

[5] Tocqueville, *op. cit.,* p. 86.

Abuse of Royal Absolutism

The same may be said of royal absolutism, which had been rendered inevitable by the need of restraining the factions of the great nobles and of guaranteeing national unity. This absolutism at its origin was as popular as the feudal institutions had been. But this absolute power of the kings now became a cause of political and social unrest. Only the appearance remained of those municipal institutions which, from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth, had turned many cities of Germany, Italy, and England into little, wealthy, and enlightened republics, powerful and free cities. The communal activity, energy, and patriotism, together with the virile and fruitful virtues which they had inspired, gradually disappeared. Those provincial assemblies and those states general, where unhampered initiative and the free speech of the people of France used to be openly displayed, were abolished or survived merely in name.

We should, of course, avoid confusing the absolutism of Philip V of Spain, of Maria Theresa of Austria, or even of Louis XIV and Louis XV with that of an Oriental potentate or with that of an emperor of the Roman decadence. The great jurist Loyseau said that three kinds of law limit the power of the sovereign: the laws of God, the rules of natural justice, and the fundamental laws of the state. The basis of this limitation is that the prince is bound to make use of his sovereignty according to its proper nature and the conditions thus established. Bossuet observes: "To say that government should be absolute, is one thing; to say that it should be arbitrary, is something else. Even in empires certain laws exist, against which any enactment or deed is null." [6]

In a certain sense, the royal power of Louis XIV, by its undeniable glories, shows the most perfect accord of the people

[6] Bossuet, *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte,* Bk. VIII, art. 1, prop. 1.

in one man that history has ever seen. But the very prestige of those glories created a danger. Says La Bruyère: "Whoever considers that the countenance of the prince makes a courtier's whole joy, will understand a little how seeing God can make the whole happiness of the saints." In reality, however, these earthly gods were merely gods of flesh and blood, or clay and dust. Too often, instead of governing solely for the nation, they governed for themselves.

After overthrowing all the ancient political pillars of the state to assure for themselves alone the whole power of government, they make the royal power like a Gothic cathedral where the height of the structure and the pointed arches have been pushed to the point of paradox. They must govern with the maximum of foresight, order, and moderation if they are to avoid seeing the edifice totter on its foundation. . . . Were the successors of Louis XIV at the height of their duties? We believe that the historian cannot truthfully say that they were. The central power too often became the prey of intrigues by courtiers and favorites. It lost something of its stability and prestige. The government remained absolute, but its action fell into incoherence. France no longer had at its head a monarch who guided it confidently along the glorious path of its destinies. Soon at the very heart of the overcentralized nation a sort of corruption appeared as in a fruit that is overripe. As the common soul grew weak in the person of the king, each one regretted the earlier sacrifice of independence, the people became accustomed to despise its leaders, and anarchy tended to break out in the centralization.[7]

From all these disproportions, all these faulty adaptations, and all these dangers, the whole nation suffered, not merely the peasant and the artisan, but also the nobleman, the great lord, the prelate, and the king himself.[8] We shall see in the sequel what the grievances of the cahiers of 1789 were. But already in 1775, in a remonstrance dated May 6, the court of aids said:

[7] G. A. Gautheror, *Conférences sur les origines de la Révolution,* conference 2, p. 12.

[8] Taine, *Le régime moderne,* II, 80.

"They have labored to stifle in France the entire municipal spirit, to extinguish it, if they could, even to the feelings of the citizens. They have, as it were, interdicted the whole nation." [9] In a speech (February 23, 1787), delivered by order of the King and in his presence, M. de Calonne declared: "The abuses that men talk of abolishing are of serious importance and are the ones most protected." [10]

The Clergy

This political and social crisis brought so much suffering to the Church because, in consequence of her close union with the state, she found herself intricately involved in it. By her upper clergy she was involved in those privileges with rights that became daily more hated. She had the entree in those courts where the affairs of the country were centralized. Moreover, in the person of the humblest of her priests, the little country curé *à portion congrue,* she heard the griefs of the people, whose burdens and miseries the pastors shared.[11] Berulle, Vincent de Paul, Olier, Hofbauer, and Alphonsus Liguori had strongly imprinted a virile faith and a firm discipline on the clergy of the ancient regime. These qualities had enabled this great body of the state to escape, in large part, that corruption of the people of the world, those utopias of the literary class, and that irritation of the common people, which constituted the essential ills of the closing years of that century. Two favorable traits showed this fact morally and socially: a spirit of charity, manifesting itself on every occasion with chivalrous generosity,[12] and a spirit of fervor that remained alive in chosen souls, which the scandals of the time did but stimulate. Yet the clergy of

[9] Gustave Gautherot, *op. cit.,* p. 17.

[10] Quoted by Taine, *op. cit.,* II, 81.

[11] On the wretched situation of the curés *à portion congrue,* see Taine, *L'ancien régime,* I, 114–20.

[12] Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 109.

the eighteenth century did not succeed in avoiding a threefold danger.

In the practice of charity they were too inclined to follow in the wake of the philosophers of the age; they too often used the language and the so-called principles of those philosophers. They did not appeal earnestly enough to the strong theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, where they would have found many fruitful maxims and many safe rules. Nor did they appeal loudly enough to the traditions of the Church, where they would have met many fine models; and thus they allowed the sentimental philosophy of the eighteenth century to profit by the prestige of their devotedness.[13]

Between the two orders of the clergy a chasm had been opened by the social and political conditions. The clergy themselves made this gulf the more evident. The upper clergy, drawn from the ranks of the nobility and the higher bourgeoisie, sometimes laid claim to honors instead of devoting themselves to the ministry of souls. The lower clergy, recruited from the humblest ranks of society, often had nothing but duties to perform without profit or honor to encourage them. More than one poor priest, upon returning from the bishop's residence where he had beheld the splendors of a princely installation, kept a bitter remembrance of the riches he had seen. Perhaps, in his lowly presbytery, he cast his eyes on some issue of the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques,* in which the Jansenist party railed at the luxury and the attitudes that were traits of the nobility and that had been introduced into the Church. Or his eyes might fall upon one of those revolutionary pamphlets which the Encyclopedists were circulating in the most remote provinces.[14] Then the poor plebeian curé felt arising in his soul a vague feeling of unrest

[13] Cf. *ibid.,* II, 43, 101; Kurth, *op. cit.,* pp. 182 ff.

[14] In 1782 Archibishop du Lau of Arles noted the scandalous spread of the works of Voltaire and Rousseau. He complained that licentious writings were thrown at night even into the enclosures of monasteries. See De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* I, 67.

and hatred, no less threatening to the social order and the peace of the Church than was the blind tranquillity of the great Church dignitary taking his repose in the luxury of his sumptuous palace.[15]

In fine, part of the upper clergy let themselves be drawn into too close alliances with the state. The three chief centers of these alliances were Vienna, Florence, and Paris.

Josephism and Febronianism

Toward the end of the eighteenth century two theories, often confused by historians because they were themselves merged in a common action, obtained a great credit with the king and the upper clergy. These were Josephism and Febronianism.

The Josephist theory, much earlier constructed by the jurists and confused with texts of the Roman law, maintained that the religious establishment was a matter of the civil government. Maria Theresa, and especially Joseph II, had injected this system into the laws. It renewed, in aggravated form, the errors of the Caesarean Gallicanism of the kings of France.

The Febronian theory, based on arguments of a canonical order and on conciliar texts of the fifteenth century, particularly on the rights of the sovereign, revived and exaggerated the claims of the episcopal Gallicanism of the French bishops. The leading bishops of Germany, chosen from the most devoted partisans of the emperor, spread the spirit of this view.

The Punctuation of Ems

But the exigencies of the strife soon practically united the adherents of the two theories. In 1781 Febronianism, in the

[15] Many priests even went so far as to join Masonic lodges. See De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

person of its chief, Nikolaus von Hontheim, placed itself at the service of Josephism. Five years later the three ecclesiastical electors of the Empire—Baron Charles Joseph von Herthal (archbishop of Mainz), Clement Wenceslaus of Trier, and Archduke Maximilian Franz of Cologne—together with the Archbishop of Salzburg, sealed the alliance in the famous twenty-three declarations, known in history under the name of the Punctuation of Ems.

As Cardinal Pacca wrote in his *Mémoires,* the Churches and the clergy of Germany, at the close of the eighteenth century, were at the height of human greatness. The most beautiful and most fertile regions of Germany belonged to the clergy, who there possessed the right of temporal sovereignty. In the electoral college, out of eight electors three were ecclesiastics: these were the archbishops of Mainz, of Trier, and of Cologne. When we reflect that these prelates in their opulence were not greatly satisfied to pay the levy imposed on them by the Holy See,[16] that they were easily faultfinding with regard to that Roman power, and that their spirit of absolutism took proud pleasure in holding up their crosiers in the presence of the tiara, we are not surprised at their complacency toward the new movement. Pecuniary interest, the desire to flatter public opinion, and their hierarchical sensibilities, all conspired to stiffen them against Rome. Says Hergenröther: "A large number of bishops dreamed of establishing a national German Church." [17]

The Congress of Ems, held in the month of August, 1786, declared that the pope had no right to send nuncios invested with any jurisdiction. Its members acknowledged in the Sovereign Pontiff merely a right of primacy and of general inspection; but, on the other hand, they granted to all the bishops the

[16] The Roman monetary demands on the prince electors appear excessive if we simply look at the figures. But the amount that had to be paid once and for all by the archbishop of Mainz was no more than a twenty-eighth of his annual revenue. G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse,* I, 39–42.

[17] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. VII, Bk. II, Part II, chap. 4.

most absolute right of binding and loosing, without any recourse from the episcopal jurisdiction to the jurisdiction of the Holy See. Every bull, every papal brief, was to be regarded as null unless received and accepted by the bishops. The declarations of Ems mark the last insurrection of ecclesiastical nationalism against the Roman Catholicism. They were eagerly backed and encouraged by Emperor Joseph II. But many members of the episcopate, notably the bishops of Freising and Spires, taking umbrage at the slight account which at Ems was taken of the right of simple bishops, voiced energetic protests. The nuncio at Munich, Zoglio, and the nuncio at Cologne, Pacca, sustained them in the name of Rome. The people joined their voices to them in the name of its traditions. Josephist statesmen and Febronian prelates thus had against them the ancestors of that Catholic people which more than once in the course of the nineteenth century would constrain the upper clergy of Germany to take account of the directions of Rome. By a letter dated November 14, 1789, a masterpiece of calm and moderate firmness, Pope Pius VI condemned the doctrine of the four bishops. The controversy died out in the uproar of the French Revolution.

Synod of Pistoia

But another center of revolt against Rome was lighted up in Italy, where the brother of Emperor Joseph II, Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, was maintaining similar principles. Joseph II found his inspiration in the philosophers; Leopold I welcomed the teaching of the Jansenists. However, on the question of the relations between Church and state, the two doctrines easily came into accord. The man whom Leopold used to consult for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs was Scipio Ricci. This man was an ambitious and intriguing bishop whom

the Emperor put in the see of Pistoia in 1780. He was related to the general of the Society of Jesus, the celebrated Lorenzo Ricci, who had died five months before as a prisoner in the Castle Sant' Angelo following the events related in the preceding volume. Bishop Ricci, a daring and meddlesome man, had early embraced the principles of Jansenism. A faithful imitator of the "appelants" of France, he took for himself and proposed to others as a model the following four men: Soanen, whom he called "the great bishop," Quesnel "the martyr for truth," and Mésenguy and Gourlin "the lights of the Church." He said that his aim was to combat the "spiritual Babylon," for the communion of saints and the independence of the princes. He gathered about him a few priests already known for their liberal opinions: Tamburini, Zola, Natali, Bottieri, and Palmieri. Then, in agreement with Grand Duke Leopold, he convoked at Pistoia a synod intended to provide a remedy for the abuses in the Church.

The Synod of Pistoia, which opened on September 18, 1786, was attended by 234 priests. They began by proclaiming the principles of the most radical Jansenism on faith, grace, and predestination. They forbade the worship of the Sacred Heart. Ricci had a special antipathy for this devotion. Then the question of the authority of the Church was taken up. They proclaimed the pope the ministerial head of the Church. This view, taken in the sense that the pope received his powers from the Church itself, was heretical. They adopted the four articles of 1682. Further, they declared that, in the doctrine of salvation, nothing is true except what goes back to antiquity, and that what has been produced in the course of time is necessarily false. Consequently they maintained that all the doctrinal decisions reached in the Church during recent centuries are without any authority. Lastly, they invited Leopold to reform the Church by virtue of his own authority, to abolish certain feast days,

to regulate the parishes; and they expressed the wish that all the religious orders should be reduced to a single one, in accordance with the constitutions of Port Royal.

Ricci's project was to have the Pistoia decrees confirmed by a national council. With a view to preparing for such a council, Leopold summoned the seventeen bishops of Tuscany to meet at Florence in April, 1787. Only three answered the summons. The meeting could not be held. The clergy became divided. The popular opinion turned against Ricci, and his palace was sacked. When, upon the death of Joseph II in 1790, Leopold left Tuscany and ascended the imperial throne, the Bishop of Pistoia was obliged to abandon his see and flee to Florence. Four years later Pope Pius VI, after mature examination, issued his bull *Auctorem fidei* (August 28, 1794), condemning eighty-five propositions taken from the Synod of Pistoia.[18] The papal bull was generally received respectfully. Bishop Benedict Solari of Noli was the only prelate who publicly refused to publish it.

Church and State in France

France did not witness manifestations of this sort until after the fall of the monarchy, when it was evidenced by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. But, ever since the beginning of the eighteenth century, the spirit that dominated the relations of the state with the upper clergy was very much like that which animated the courts of Vienna and Florence.

As Pierre de La Gorce says, close to every cathedral stood an edifice having the appearance of a palace. This mansion was the bishop's residence. No presentation, whether of the bishops of the province or of the local authorities, guided or hindered the decision of the prince. Under the title of *ministre de feuille*, the monarch had a sort of minister of worship who proposed to him the candidates to be nominated. This high office was held,

[18] Denz., nos. 1501–99.

until 1777, by Bishop Jarente of Orléans, an unworthy prelate. The Holy See refused to grant institution to the person thus designated. At the end of Louis XIV's reign, Massilon wrote: "The Church has no need of great names, but of great virtues." In the eighteenth century the practice had become established of nominating to prelacies only men of the nobility. In the list of bishops given in the royal almanac of 1788, we find all the great houses of the kingdom represented. At Metz was a Montmorency; at Strasbourg, a Rohan; at La Rochelle, a Crussol; at Besançon, a Durfort; at Laon, a Sabran; at Auch, a La Tour du Pin. In 1789 we find two Talleyrands, "as though one would not have been enough." [19] The 1,500 church benefices subject to royal nomination "became a sort of mint for the benefit of the great. In accordance with the custom of giving more to those who have the most, the wealthiest prelates had, over and above their episcopal revenue, the richest abbeys. According to the Almanac, Bishop Rohan of Strasbourg thus had an additional income of 60,000 livres; Archbishop La Rochefoucault of Rouen, 130,000." [20]

These immense incomes were used by some to maintain "the dignity of their rank," as they said; by others, to reward the assiduous attentions of their close friends. Still others, more scandalously, spent these incomes at the court.[21] A type of these court prelates was that Duke de Rohan, bishop of Strasbourg, whose culpable and heedless conduct in the "affair of the necklace" stirred popular indignation against the Queen. Another was La Font de Savine. His family's influence with Louis XVI obtained for him in 1778 the bishopric of Viviers. By the rashness of his doctrines and also by the oddities of his

[19] De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* I, 41.

[20] Taine, *L'ancien régime,* I, 101.

[21] D'Argenson, with some exaggeration, exclaims: "The court! In this word is the whole evil. The court has become the Senate of the realm; the lowest Versailles valet is a senator; the chambermaids are part of the government. . . . The court is the death of the nation." Quoted by Taine, *op. cit.,* I, 113.

life he was deservedly called by his followers the Rousseau of the clergy.[22]

We do not see the authoritative representatives of the French clergy opposed to a reform of the ecclesiastical organization. None dared to demand the maintenance of the *status quo*. On May 29, 1790, Archbishop Boisgelin of Aix, speaking in the name of the clergy of the Assembly, declared: "Undoubtedly, abuses must be reformed, and a new order of things must be introduced." [23]

In what spirit would this needed reform take place? The Archbishop of Aix asked that the reform be undertaken by the Church, or at least with the consent of the Church. But the Gallicans and the Jansenists wished to have it accomplished by the state alone; and the so-called philosophers thought of having it carried out in the spirit of their doctrines. These last tendencies would prevail. The political crisis, which was threatening the ruin of the ancient regime, would be complicated by a no less formidable intellectual crisis, which tended to nothing less than the overthrow of the very foundations of the social order.

[22] Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 51.
[23] *Moniteur* of May 30, 1790, p. 610.

CHAPTER II

The Intellectual Crisis

JOSEPH DE MAISTRE says that the French Revolution was prepared by its victims. But this statement, if taken without qualification, is an exaggeration. The Revolution, that is, the revolutionary and antireligious character given to the legitimate movement of reform which took place at the close of the eighteenth century, was owing to unchristian philosophy. Robespierre's triumph was prepared by Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

We cannot say that the revolutionary spirit originated in France alone. If the French Revolution so promptly won practically all Europe to its cause, that success and consequence is to be traced to the fact that everywhere the soil was well prepared for it. England, Germany, Italy, and Holland were ready to receive the revolutionary poison. We know how much in the way of ideas Voltaire took from the English philosophers. Rousseau's chief principle, that the moral question merges into the social question, that is, the origin of our evils does not come to us from our nature but from the organization of the society in which we live, is a principle taken over from English philosophy. In Germany the advisers of Joseph II got their inspiration from the Lutheran Reformers as much as from the French philosophers. In Italy the utopias of Campanella and the fiery verses of Alfieri in behalf of abstract and almost deified liberty had almost the same tone as the enthusiastic pages of the French visionaries. In Protestant Holland the disciples of Grotius and Spinoza did not wait for the publication of the *Encyclopedia* and of the *Social Contract* before they fancied a

complete restoration of the law of nations and of the political organization. The revolutionary spirit was everywhere. And everywhere, in the elation of minds and the eagerness of efforts, the same two traits stood out: the utopia in the ideal aimed at and the violence in the proposed means. These will be the two elements of the Revolution, which will be the work of the ideologist and of the Jacobin.

The Philosophical Movement in England

In England, from More to Hobbes and Locke, social philosophy developed with theories that possessed an unheard-of daring.

In Thomas More's *Utopia,* which appeared at the beginning of the sixteenth century, how much was purely chimerical and how much was serious? [1] The fantastic paradox, which aroused the attention and tempered astonishment with a smile, was often the form chosen by the innovators to insinuate more surely the truths they considered useful. More's *Utopia* was clearly inspired by Plato's *Republic.* The Greek philosopher had said: "So long as the wise will not be kings and so long as the kings will not be philosophers, no remedy will be found for the evils that desolate the states." Like Plato, More made his whole social conception rest on the criticism of ownership. His ideal was a society where all goods would be in common. He was, however, far removed from Plato by a broad feeling of humaneness and by a deep sympathy for the classes that suffered. His republic had no castes: each citizen was called on to engage in material labors, ennobled by intellectual recreations. The principle of power was placed in the consent of the people, and the regime of the state was that of an industrious and democratic republic.

What More had conceived with his Catholic spirit, sincerely

[1] *De optimo reipublicae statu, deque nova insula Utopia,* first published in 1516.

submissive to the Church, Hobbes and Locke took up from an entirely different point of view. Imbued with Bacon's utilitarian ideas,[2] which were far from being lofty or philosophical, they set forth the plan of their society, based on the ideas of conservation and interest. Hobbes established the theory of absolutism, but based it on such arguments that he stirred discussion of it and opposition to it. For him morality is not an end; it is a means, the means for having order and peace.[3]

Hobbes had written against the English Revolution; Locke took up his pen in its defense. Hobbes was the first to imagine that the origin of civil society might be found in a certain state preceding society. Locke set out from the same hypothesis. But there, where Hobbes thought he could establish the basis of despotism, Locke claimed to find the justification for a permanent right of rebellion. In reply to the question, "Who shall be judge whether the prince or the legislative power acts contrary to its trust?" he answers: "The people shall be judge. For who shall be judge whether his trustee or deputy acts rightly and according to the trust reposed in him, but he who deputes him?" [4] Locke also held that all the power of civil government relates only to the civil interests, is limited to the things of this world, and has no concern with the world to come.[5]

The Philosophical Movement in Germany

In Germany, the social philosophy offered nothing original. But metaphysics, from Wolff to Kant, and religious criticism,

[2] "What I attack is the idea of English science, which is not lofty or philosophical. There they judge science merely by its practical results and its civilizing effects. This way of viewing science is unsafe. It is as if, for establishing morality, we should confine ourselves to setting forth the advantages it procures for society." E. Renan, *L'avenir de la science,* p. 22.

[3] Cf. Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale* (2nd ed.), II, 266–306. Hobbes' ideas are set forth in his *De cive* and his *Leviathan.*

[4] Locke, *Of Civil Government,* Bk. II, chap. 19, no. 240.

[5] This is the principle of his *Epistola de tolerantia,* which appeared in 1689.

from Semler to Goethe, turned in the direction of a revolutionary naturalism.

Christian Wolff, who undertook the task of summarizing the philosophy of Leibnitz and pushing it to its ultimate consequences, taught that God cannot be man's end and that society should be organized merely in view of an earthly end. The popular acclaim given to his writings was extreme; the study of his doctrines was made obligatory for all candidates who presented themselves for theological degrees. The invasion of Wolffianism into German theology was disastrous. On the pretext of scientific thought, many persons attenuated Christian dogma; others abandoned it entirely and accepted no laws but those of reason, those of free choice.[6]

Later on we find Kant deriving his inspiration from Rousseau in his individual and his social doctrine. Rousseau's "conscience" becomes the "categorical imperative" of Kant's practical reason; the general principles of the *Social Contract* dictate Kant's whole political system. Those principles are that of "the general will" considered as the sole source of the laws and that of the distinction, in each individual, between the "citizen lawmaker" and the subject.

German religious thought, which appealed to the authority of Scripture, regarded by Protestantism as the only source of revelation, developed in the direction of an autonomous naturalism. In 1771 Semler proposed a new criterion for establishing the canon of the Bible: to accept as inspired by God only the books producing a moral betterment. In 1777, the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments,* edited by Lessing but composed by Samuel Reimarus, a professor at Hamburg, absolutely denied miracles, particularly the miracle of Christ's resurrection, and declared the impossibility of a divine revelation. Shortly afterward, in a personal work, the drama of *Nathan der Weise,* Lessing clearly professed religious indifferentism.

[6] Hergenröther, *op. cit.* (4th ed.), Bk. II, Part II, chap. 13.

On the ruins heaped up by radical naturalism, in Germany then developed a visionary pantheism which received the name of Illuminism. Herder, Goethe, and Schiller, in different degrees, may be considered its most illustrious representatives. Johann Gottfried Herder, poet and philosopher gifted with a mighty imagination, in his *Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* preached a vague and grandiose religion, with ill-defined dogmas, almost identical with the worship of humanity. Goethe, failing to see anything higher than the ancient Hellenism and earthly beauty, deified plastic beauty and the satisfaction of the senses. Schiller who, at the close of his days, was not far removed from Christian ideas and became almost Catholic, bemoaned the death of the gods of Greece and Rome.

The Philosophical Movement in Italy

Italy likewise had its social utopia in Campanella's *Civitas Solis*. More's *Utopia* is a popular republic; Campanella's *Civitas Solis* is a theocratic republic. At the summit of the state is the metaphysician, a sort of "good tyrant" whose office is to enforce the sway of reason; beneath are three magistrates (Might, Love, and Wisdom), applying the prescriptions of Reason. The function of the first is the national defense; that of the second to watch over the development of the population; the third has charge of the progress of the sciences and the arts. In the *Civitas Solis* the communism goes beyond that of the *Utopia*. It includes not only property, but also the women and the family.

More restrained in his plan of reform, but more precise in his demands, Marquis Cesare Beccaria of Milan simply gathers together, a hundred years later, in his *Tratto dei delitti e delle pene* and in his work on agriculture and manufactures, all the appeals that had been disseminated during a century in a countless number of pamphlets and large volumes. Avoiding the use

of trifling expressions and digressions, he lays down several of the principles that later, with the doctrines of Adam Smith, constituted the liberal political economy. For Beccaria the best social organization is the one that produces the largest amount of useful labor. By useful labor he means that which gives the greatest quantity of negotiable products. He analyzes the real functions of productive capital and the vicissitudes of the population. He recommends the division of labor and proposes a decimal system based on the system of the world. But, with most of the economists of the time, he declares that manufacturing is barren. A peaceful and even timid man, Beccaria took little part in the agitations of the world; but his ideas exercised a notable influence on men's minds.

Almost at the same time as Beccaria's work on agriculture, in Italy, under the title of *Scienza della legislazione,* a great work appeared which, in a vigorous, picturesque, even theatrical style, embraced not only political economy, but also public and private law, the family, education, and religion. This book was the work of a young man, thirty years old, Gaetano Filangieri of Naples, who died six years later without seeing his utopias evaporate before the lessons of experience. Filangieri's aim was to reform humanity from top to bottom. For the realization of his projects he counted on the unlimited power of the laws and of authority. According to him, authority gives birth to the geniuses and creates the philosophers. A ruler, merely by pressing the mainspring of honor, can form legions of Scipios and Reguluses. He would concentrate all the social functions in the hands of the prince, whose authority he wished to see enter everywhere. Filangieri and other Italian writers of the time, being without experience in political affairs, indulged in fanciful schemes that failed to appreciate the practical obstacles in the way of their abstract maxims.[7]

An Italian poet spread the revolutionary ideas among the

[7] Cf. Cesare Cantu, *Storia dei cent' anni, 1750–1850.*

common people. Alfieri of Asti was an aristocrat enamored of the abstract liberty then being preached. He boasted that he scorned Rousseau and the philosophers, but he imitated them. In him every sentiment turned into passion, every passion into frenzy; a frenzy of study, of love, of liberty. In his political comedies his humor consisted in showing the heroes on their prosaic and grotesque side. In *La tirannide* he exaggerated Rousseau's doctrines, attacked the arts and industry, proclaimed that Christians were more enslaved than were the Orientals, and advised everyone to come to an agreement not to obey the despots. In one of his plays, he puts on the lips of a jester of Philip II this question: "What would Your Majesty do if, when you say Yes, everyone else should say No?" He witnessed the Revolution, but did not grasp its import. Death came to him in 1803, after he had dedicated several of his tragedies to posterity.[8]

The Philosophical Movement in Holland

Like sunny Italy, foggy Holland had its authoritarians and its republicans, its partisans of the "good tyrant" and its abettors of anarchy. The difference separating one party from the other was less than may appear at first sight. The former appealed to the authority of the jurist Grotius; the latter claimed the authority of the philosopher Spinoza. Both aspired to a complete regeneration of society.

Grotius is known especially as the one who revived the law of nations. Although his fame on this point is overrated, for he was preceded by the Dominican Vittoria,[9] therein lies his true title to renown. But Grotius was also concerned with the renewal of political and social institutions; and his ideas, sys-

[8] Arthur Graf, in his well documented work, *L'Anglomania in Italia* (Turin, 1911), shows that Alfieri and the Italian writers of the eighteenth century, generally owe much to the English influence.

[9] See his *De jure belli.*

tematically arranged and explained by his disciple Pufendorf, inspired the policy of Joseph II. His conclusions were not unlike those of Hobbes; but his procedure was quite different. What the English thinker examined as a philosopher, the Dutch thinker studies as a jurist. Grotius treats the questions of the natural law by the maxims of the civil law. The civil law which he invoked is that of ancient Rome. With a text of the jurist Paulus he decides the question of the origin of property;[10] and again following Paulus, he solves the problem of sovereignty by an argument of analogy with the Roman tutorage. He says: "There is no reason why civil governments should not exist that are established for the advantage of the sovereign. Even when the establishment of the government has taken place in the interest of the subjects, this condition would not require in consequence the superiority of the people over the sovereign, for nobody considers that the pupil should be above the teacher."[11]

Spinoza is a philosopher, and his metaphysics, at least at first glance, presents a certain principle of grandeur and dignity, which is quite absent from the metaphysics of Hobbes. According to Spinoza, man is not merely a part of nature, he is a part of the Divinity. But, as some have held that the Amsterdam philosopher is "intoxicated with God," and others that he is basically atheistic, his political and social doctrine evidently contains a fundamental ambiguity. To one of his friends, Spinoza wrote: "What distinguishes my political views from those of Hobbes is that I preserve the natural law, even in the civil state, and that I grant the sovereign rights over the subjects only according to the measure of his power."[12] But if the natural law is preserved, how is force the measure of the right; and if force is the measure of right, how does the natural

[10] Grotius, *De jure pacis et belli,* Bk. II, chap. 3, § 3.
[11] *Ibid.,* Bk. I, chap. 3, § 15.
[12] Spinoza, *Epist.* 25.

law remain? However this may be, Spinoza's doctrine differs essentially from that of Hobbes in its spirit. Hobbes requires of the state nothing more than order and peace. What Spinoza demands of it is first of all liberty. He says that if we give the name of peace to slavery, barbarism, and solitude, then peace is the most wretched thing in the world. Peace, however, does not consist merely in the absence of war, but in the union of spirits and in concord.[13] On the question of the advantages of monarchy, he is in direct opposition to the English philosopher. He says: "Some think that if the power is given to a single man, it will be stronger. This view is wrong. A single man has not the strength to support so great a burden: hence he will have counselors who will govern for him; and this government, which has an appearance of being monarchical, will in practice be an aristocracy, but a hidden aristocracy, and thereby the worst of all. Furthermore, if the king is a child, an invalid, or aged, he is king only in name; often, when impelled by his passion, he leaves the power in the hands of a mistress or a favorite courtier." [14]

Thus from one end of Europe to the other a general unrest stirred men's minds. Reform plans of vastest scope, the most rash, the most general, the most hateful, the most subversive, and the most revolutionary, arose on all sides, stirring an enthusiasm the more lively since they were often vague as a dream, rallying to their support a number of minds as great as generally they were ambiguous: abstract and calculating, under a scientific and precise appearance, pagan and mystical, glorifying in turn despotism and anarchy, tracing everything to man and nature, and making of man and nature a sort of divinity. But this widespread excitation had a center, France, toward which, since the "great century," all the thinkers of Europe persistently turned their eyes.

[13] Spinoza, *Tractat. polit.*, § 4.
[14] *Ibid.*, chap. 6, § 5, 8.

French Philosophers

An endless subject of discussion is provided by the question of the influence exercised by France and the influence exercised upon France in the spread of the revolutionary ideas. But we may be certain that, where an outside influence is evident, the French expression of it finally prevailed. The success of this formulation of the ideas was owing to the clearer, more ingenious, or more eloquent turn that it took. In this respect, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopedists are truly the fathers of the Revolution.

We have already studied the history of their predecessors.[15] The Renaissance of ancient literature had, in many souls, brought about a revival of the pagan spirit. Pantheistic or atheistic rationalism, which in the Middle Ages appeared under the form of Averroism and Illuminism, gradually assumed the form of radical unbelief. This rationalism was spread quietly by the semi-rationalism of Faustus Socinus, which attacked the divinity of Christ and even the nature of God. The movement was also furthered by the literary skepticism of Rabelais, the changing and varied dilettantism of Montaigne, the political indifferentism of Michael de l'Hospital, the theoretical Epicureanism of Gassendi, and the exaggerated cultivation of science and the laws of nature as set forth by the school of Descartes and brilliantly interpreted by Fontenelle. This same movement was also affected by the harmful influence of that increasing group of reckless spirits who were pardoned everything by the salons of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and who alarmed not only the orthodoxy of Father Garasse and Father Mersenne but also the good sense of Nicole and Leibnitz. Naturalism had thus leaped over the various stages that led from Petrarch to Voltaire, from humanism to philosophism, from the college of apostolic secretaries to the salon of Ninon de Lenclos,

[15] Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, VI, 499 ff.

and from the movement of the Renaissance to that of the *Encyclopedia.*

We have already spoken of this vast undertaking, which brought together men of the most diverse views—atheists and deists, revolutionists and conservatives, individualist economists like Turgot and communist economists like Mably. But this same undertaking found its unity in an identical inspiration, belief in the supremacy of reason.

These men met one another in the salons of high society. The salons of the seventeenth century had produced psychologists; those of the eighteenth century produced philosophers, or at least men who called themselves philosophers. In the list of the subscribers of the *Encyclopedia,* we find the greatest names of France.

In the course of the eighteenth century the literary people used to meet especially in the salons of two women well known for the looseness of their morals and the freedom of their spirit: the notorious Ninon de Lenclos and the extravagant Madame de Tencin. So fashionable was the frequenting of the salon of Ninon de Lenclos that we find there the most distinguished persons of the royal court and such celebrities as Saint-Evremond, Guy-Patin, Molière, La Fare, and Chaulieu. Abbé de Châteauneuf there presented his godson, François Arouet. Ninon was so impressed by the mind of this young man that she bequeathed to him 2,000 francs for the purchase of books for his library.

Voltaire (1694–1778)

Thus began the fame of François Arouet de Voltaire. This renown was like that of most of his contemporaries. To be launched by a salon was the surest means of attaining fame. For budding reputations the salon was in those days what the press is today.

In a general history of the Church we have no need to relate in detail the life of Voltaire. But the part this man played in the strife against Catholicism requires that we briefly take note of his person and his work. Voltaire did incalculable harm. Few characters have been more contemptible than his, and even his writings are a strange mixture of literary values. But he possessed an undeniable power of seduction. He was representative of a whole group of minds, and he exercised on his age an incomparable influence.

The first part of his life, until 1746, was devoted to acquiring a reputation. While still a youth he succeeded in widely extending his relationships. College students, eminent people of the world, literary people, persons of the business world, actors, in all these circles he counted his friends. He engaged in every form of writing: epic poetry in his *Henriade,* tragic poetry in his *Œdipe* or his *Zaïre,* didactic poetry in the *Epistles* or the *Discourses on Man,* history in his *Charles XII,* scholarly writing in the *Memoirs* that he composed for the Academy of Sciences, philosophy in his *Lettres anglaises* and his *Essay on the Philosophy of Newton.* His ambition was to be the teacher and guide of the minds of his time.

His ideas are summed up in three essential works: the *Epîtres à Uranie* (1722–31), the *Philosophical Letters* (1733–34), and the *Discourses on Man* (1734–38). The first of these works proposes deism or natural religion in opposition to revealed religion; the second exalts the idea of science; the third popularizes a number of ideas current in English philosophy, such as the idea that virtue is measured by the degree of social usefulness, and the progress of mankind by the development of the arts and of life. In short, Voltaire nowhere shows himself an original thinker. But in a lucid, incisive, and unequaled popular style, he presents under a form easily grasped the ideas scattered in the world of the libertines, the venturous minds, and the innovators of every sort. Voltaire sets forth

in detail and explains the great discoveries, the great hypotheses of the human mind. He parades before his readers' astonished eyes—but with distortion, caricature, and ridicule—the great men of sacred and profane history, the ancient religions, the old legends. The Frenchmen of his time discussed these books, pamphlets, treatises, novels, histories, and dictionaries, in which all human knowledge, all reviews of the past, all the disputes of the day, and all dreams about the future were gathered together in lively phrases, in sparkling metaphors, in familiar proverbs, and in indecent anecdotes. "I have done more in my time," said Voltaire, "than Luther and Calvin did in theirs." At least he had in common with the two Protestant Reformers this trait, that he finally aggravated all the ills of his time.

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778)

Voltaire was only a destroyer. Jean Jacques Rousseau wished to be a reconstructor. Taine, with his habitual vigor, has depicted the dominating powers of "this man of the people, ill suited to the elegant world, ill at ease in a salon, ill born, ill brought up, stained by his wretched and precocious experience, sick in soul and body, carrying the defilement of his temperament even into his austere morality and into his purest idyls. He was alien, Protestant, at once philanthropic and misanthropic, dwelling in an ideal world which he had erected into something quite the reverse of the real world." [16] Yet this man would exercise over his contemporaries and especially over generations to come, an influence greater than that of Voltaire. In fact, the latter was effective only by satire; Rousseau was particularly captivating by his fancies. He was not merely an amusing comedian, he was a magician who charms, a man of passion who draws others in his train. He spoke of conscience,

[16] Taine, *L'ancien régime,* II, 104–7.

of duty, of Providence, of the Gospels, of Christ "whose death was that of a God, as the death of Socrates was that of a sage." All this he did with a contagious warmth, in a style overflowing, virile, forcible, impetuous, vibrant, and sonorous.

Le Play has denounced the false dogmas bestowed on the Revolution by Rousseau. These doctrines are three in number: the dogmas of man's original perfection, of man's providential equality, and of the right of revolt; and are found set forth in three chief works: the *Discourse on Inequality,* the *Social Contract,* and *Emile.*

Outraged at the miseries of the present world, Rousseau imagines a perfect state, which he supposes was and must have been the natural and primitive state of mankind. He built up his ideal man out of whole cloth, a man such as must have come forth from the hands of the Creator. This man is strong and agile, able to triumph over all the obstacles of nature; the passions have not changed his harmonious constitution; a rare delicacy of the senses, a feeling of conservation, an instinct of goodness, and a natural sobriety assured him of tranquillity and happiness. Rousseau writes: "I see him sitting down under an oak, quenching his thirst at the first brook, finding his repose under the same tree as furnished his repast; and thus all his needs are satisfied." [17] The society of the eighteenth century, so artificial, so polished, so complex, but suffering from that very complexity, contemplated this ideal man with delight and surprise and, by the very contrast, became enamored of him. "By this contrast," says Taine, "Rousseau found himself so forcible. He showed the dawn to people who never rose from bed before noon. In a society where life consisted in strutting gracefully according to a set manner, he preached the return to nature, independence, a life active, earnest, happy, and free, in the light of day and in the open air." [18]

[17] *Discours sur l'inégalité,* Part I (1864 ed.), I, 536.
[18] *L'ancien régime,* II, 110.

Rousseau could easily show that in this primitive state of original perfection providential equality prevailed. The less human nature was developed, the less it took account of differences between men. The most natural and the most equal state is that of the germ. Inequality is, then, the work of civilization, of the passage from the state of nature to the social state. Work created property, property created inequality, and inequality gave rise to the social organization, which by its laws established the domination of the strong and the servitude of the weak. Rousseau said: "Such was and such must have been the origin of society and of laws, that provided new shackles for the weak and new power for the rich, permanently destroyed natural liberty, fixed the law of property and inequality, and, for the advantage of some, thenceforth subjected the whole human race to labor, to servitude, to wretchedness." [19]

In these terrible words is found the sentiment that would supply Rousseau with the third of his "false dogmas," the dogma of the perpetual right to revolt. The people have, first of all, the right and the duty to revolt against the social state which he showed had an unjust origin. He says: "For man to give up his liberty is to give up his quality of being man." [20] Even when the people, in conditions which the philosopher carefully determines, have stipulated a social contract, this contract does not oblige. The people are sovereign, and a sovereign cannot bind himself except toward himself. "It is against the nature of the body politic for the sovereign to impose on himself a law that he is unable to break: whence we see that no fundamental law, not even the social contract, can be obligatory for the body of the people." [21]

Such a theory so excessively flattered the passions of a soft

[19] *Op. cit.,* I, 558.
[20] *Contrat social,* Bk. I, chap. 4.
[21] *Ibid.,* chap. 7.

and corrupt society that it found therein great acceptance. With most men of the Revolution, we find a surprising contrast between their idyllic dreams and their bloody acts, a contrast that is explained by Rousseau's doctrine. These utopias of the Constituent Assembly and the massacres of the Terror are connected with the *Discourse on Inequality* and the *Social Contract*. The ideologist and the Jacobin would find their views in Jean Jacques Rousseau.[22] In his writing as in the work of the Revolution, the idyl gave birth to tragedy.

Influence of the New Theories

The revolutionary doctrines spread the more easily as they found powerful auxiliaries among the Gallicans and the Jansenists, incomparable aid in Freemasonry, and accomplices even in the Church.

We have already noted how the Jansenism and the parliamentary Gallicanism of the eighteenth century, while firmly determined to remain in the Church, had been led to take an attitude clearly revolutionary.[23] The religious policy of Joseph II in Germany and the attitude of the Synod of Pistoia in Italy were the last stages of that evolution. These two events exercised a notable influence over men's minds.

"During the second half of the eighteenth century, not only theology, but the faith itself underwent a profound decline. The old methods no longer exercised any attraction; the new ideas brought honors and advantages; the novel doctrines were expressed in a sparkling style that fascinated people." [24] By a phenomenon that is met more than once in the history of apolo-

[22] On Rousseau, see J. Lemaitre, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau,* and Faguet, *Vie de Rousseau.* On the philosophers of the eighteenth century in general, see, besides the works of Taine and Roustan, the following: Faguet, *Le XVIII^e siècle;* J. Fabre, *Les pères de la Révolution,* favorable to the philosophers; for a different view, Tornézy, *La legende des philosophes.*

[23] Mourret, *op. cit.;* see Vol. VI, Index.

[24] Hergenröther, *op. cit.,* Vol. VII, Bk. II, Part II, chap. 14.

getics, defections took place among the most earnest opponents of the current errors. Some Benedictines and some Jesuits, through studying the aberrations of Josephism with a view to refuting them, had let themselves be taken in by their sophisms. Furthermore, too much emphasis was given to the sole aim of refuting the adversaries. Thus the studies of the Catholics became dependent on those of the Protestants; all continuity with the great preceding era was broken; rationalist, Jansenist, and revolutionary elements penetrated Catholic literature; theology took the tone of the philosophy of the time; attempts were made, by transforming it in a more "rational" sense, to put it in the current of the so-called progress. In 1774 the Benedictine Rautenstrauch, director of the faculty of theology at Vienna, prescribed the abandonment of the scholastic dryness to give more importance to exegetical, patristic, and historical studies.

Soon prudent men could see that the new regulation had merely favored frivolity and caprice, especially when Emperor Joseph II proclaimed liberty of conscience and liberty of the press. The exegete Christopher Fischer and the scholar Jahn were notable for their doctrinal boldness; the historian Dannenmayr published a manual of history filled with prejudices against the Holy See. A Vienna ecclesiastical review, the *Wiener Kirchenzeitung,* took for its motto, "To work for the progress of the earliest Christianity and of the most modern philosophy." A former Jesuit, Joannes Yung, professor at Mainz, remained faithful to Catholic dogma, but he favored the novelties in discipline; a Friar Minor, Philip Hedderich, insulted the Apostolic See in his lectures on canon law; a Benedictine, Andrew Spitz, took his inspiration from the same spirit in his lectures on history; another Friar Minor, Elias Van den Schüren, taught a pure subjectivism. The Bishop of Trier sanctioned with his approbation the most dubious theories. Many Bavarian Benedictines openly embraced the doctrines of Wolff; others, the doctrines of Kant.

These dissolving influences reached the ranks of the lower clergy and even the laity. Some priests who, under the Josephist regime, sat beside the young Protestant pastors at the lectures of the theologian Paulus and whom the state wished to make good "teachers of the people" rather than ministers of God, became, as someone has said, "the interpreters, always banal even though elegant, of a natural ethics, half-rationalist and half perfumed with incense." [25]

Their "enlightened" catechisms preached a sort of higher morality, purposely leaving in the shadow the fundamental mysteries of Christianity: original sin, the Incarnation, and the redemption.[26] In the presence of this German Church, which blushed for its dogmas, which veiled or dissimulated, with shame and embarrassment, its most traditional patrimony and its most essential reason for existence, German rationalism felt its arrogance increase. Those who followed the lead of the French philosophers and those who jealously defended the autonomy of German thought were at least agreed on the decline of Catholicism. "The Church of Rome," said Herder, "no longer resembles anything but an old ruin, where no new life can enter." In like vein, Nicolaï said: "Only among the superstitious populace can the Roman faith be prolonged; before science, before culture, it will no longer exist." [27]

The secret society of the Illuminati, founded (March 1, 1776) by a professor of canon law, Adam Weishaupt, found a terrain well prepared for its recruitment. This society pretended to reveal "the hidden meaning of the doctrines of the great teacher of Nazareth"; it pretended to give the true significance of the dogmas of original sin, of the redemption, and of grace.

[25] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse,* I, 162.

[26] Abbé Baston, a canon of Rouen, exiled by the Revolution, has left us a picture of those Westphalian priests who frequented the inns and said Mass wearing boots. They were well enough educated and upon the whole they were virtuous; but in matters of ceremonies they were without any propriety. Baston, *Mémoires,* II, 275 and *passim.*

[27] Quoted by Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 161.

According to Weishaupt, those dogmas signified simply that man, fallen from his primitive state of probity and liberty by the violence of his instincts and passions, and having degenerated into barbarism, was imperfectly liberated by the work of the priests, of the scholars, and of the statesmen, and would be freed completely by the effort of his own reason, by the consciousness of his own dignity, and by the free use of his own strength. These tenets were the very principles of Rousseau, elaborated by the mystical brain of a German.

In 1784 the Illuminati imprudently made public their internal dissensions: on February 11, 1785, Weishaupt was removed from his office of professor; he withdrew to the home of Duke Ernest of Gotha. Several of his followers were exiled or imprisoned. Most of them already had relations with the secret society of the Freemasons. These relations became more intimate, but without ending in complete fusion. The society founded by Weishaupt continued to spread with increased precautions and reserve.[28]

In France the Jansenist dispute had ended in disastrous consequences for the Church and for society. "In one sense it inflicted greater harm than Protestantism, because the Jansenist error was better adapted to the French temperament of the eighteenth century; it was more dissimulated and clever." [29] In sharply criticizing the traditions and the persons of the Church, the Jansenists had opened the way for the raillery and the negations of the Encyclopedists. Moreover, by stirring up endless disputes, they had turned the defenders of the Church aside from more serious and fruitful labors. On January 26, 1762, Voltaire wrote: "The Jesuits and the Jansenists continue to tear each other with sharp teeth; we must shoot at them while they are engaged in biting each other." [30]

[28] On this whole movement in Germany, see Hergenröther, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, Bk. II, Part II, chap. 14.

[29] J. Bourlon, *Les Assemblées du Clergé et le Jansénisme.*

[30] Voltaire, letter 3517 to D'Argenthal; Lefèvre ed., LX, 143. Cf. p. 139.

Unfortunately the constituted authorities showed themselves more and more favorable to the sect. The parliaments, always censorious, became its more or less avowed defenders in many circumstances. In 1723, King Louis XV refused to create the independent and impartial tribunal which the Assembly of the Clergy had requested to judge the religious disputes. In 1725 the prime minister, the Duke of Bourbon, abruptly had the dissolution of the assembly decreed just as it was about to condemn the Jansenist libels, and the Duke even erased from the records of its sessions a note regarding the sending of a letter of protest to the King. Finally, in 1762, indirectly but not less injurious to the interests of religion, the government of Louis XV became the active accomplice of the judiciary *coup d'état* which abolished the Society of Jesus in France and thus removed the mightiest adversary of schism and unbelief.

Ever since Henry IV the Jesuits were the ones who had educated generations that were the most devoted to the Holy See. The sophisms and the unsound practices of the false disciples of St. Augustine had no hold on minds trained by the Jesuits, for they vigorously combated rationalism and naturalism without ignoring the legitimate rights of nature and reason. When they disappeared from the scene, they were replaced by congregations, like the Oratory, the doctrinaires, and the Benedictines of St. Maur, who were more and more imbued with Jansenism and sometimes, especially toward the end, with revolutionary philosophy. The mild stubbornness of Rollin had anchored the Paris University itself deeply in lamentable errors that even admired the convulsionary "miracles."

Although religious teaching did not disappear from the colleges at the end of the eighteenth century, we can say that religion was often presented there under an altered and ridiculous form which naturally made the students, who were entrapped in the impiety of the age, consider religion with disgust and aversion. The extravagant worship of the deacon Pâris was confounded with real piety, of which this devotion was merely a sacrilegious parody. And as the abstention from the sacraments dried up the piety of the purest souls, "the ancient faith of

the nation, a victim of both feverishness and anemia, was declining along with the morals; the national religion appeared superficially like a citadel of early times, half ruined, stripped of its best soldiers, occupied by invalids, many of them in a state of intoxication, and, in spite of the immense population still living under its shelter, unable to resist the enraged assaults of the passions and of the reasonings combined against it. The barbarians could now enter and celebrate their insolent and tragic triumph on these ruins.[31]

The Clergy

This triumph was the easier as the revolutionary spirit found accomplices in the souls of those very ones who reckoned themselves among the most submissive sons of the Church or who professed to be the most loyal supports of tradition. Such venerable priests, who with all their might rejected the Jansenist doctrines condemned by the Church, felt its hidden influence, approached the sacraments with trembling timidity, kept the faithful from the sacraments, and thus took from them the surest means of living the Christian life and of defending it against its enemies. Some others, too imprudently although in a spirit of zeal, had read the publications of the time and had unconsciously absorbed their poison. True, the germs of religion which a strong Catholic education had sowed in their hearts remained deeply rooted there, even under the dust of contrary germs. But slowly, gently, without thought of treason, without hypocrisy, in these priestly souls the entrance of supernatural inspirations became more difficult, whereas that of the pseudo-philosophical and vaguely humanitarian speculations grew apace. A certain fact is characteristic of this state of soul. Pierre de La Gorce says:

In many cities of France, Masonic lodges were established. Their names have a certain sameness: Egalité, Sincérité, Parfaite Union,

[31] Gautherot, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

Parfaite Amitié. At these lodges poetry was read, music was played, and collections were taken up for the needy. The program was that religion should not be mentioned; but they flayed superstition, in which they included everything that the veneration of men has proclaimed sacred. . . . Who would have expected to meet priests at these meetings? Yet some were there. At Béthune several priests belonged to the lodge; at Besançon among the members were some Bernardines, a Carmelite, and five canons of the chapter.[32]

On July 15, 1778, Archbishop Conzié of Tours, a prelate quite free from prejudices, writing to Archbishop de Brienne, regarded as ridiculous the charge brought against a Cordelier who had joined the Masons. "It has seemed to me," he said, "very amusing that the great reproach of Seigneur Saint-Luc [33] against this religious is that he is a Freemason."

Not many priests were Freemasons. In 1775 the Assembly of the Clergy had approved an association of writers and theologians founded to combat unbelief. In 1782 the defenders of the good cause were recommended to the munificence of the minister of the press; a sum of 40,000 livres was subscribed for the republication, after Bossuet's works, of those of Fénelon. But these measures came too late. In 1778 Voltaire's coming to Paris had been an occasion for a sort of apotheosis. In the salons the philosophers were the masters of the conversation. The Jansenists, who had them condemned by the Parliament, read their writings in secret and were delighted at seeing them avenge their old grudges. At the court the Encyclopedists found powerful friends. According to a historian favorable to the philosophers of the eighteenth century, "Madame de Pompadour was for them more than an ally; she was a genuine friend." [34] She was the one who prevented the publication of Dupin's criticism of Montesquieu.

[32] De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* I, 63–65.
[33] That is, Bishop Conen de Saint-Luc of Quimper.
[34] Roustan, *op. cit.,* p. 97.

The authority of the Most Christian King slowly started moving to repress these disturbances of the religious and social order. Many Catholics then wondered if the greatness of the danger had not been exaggerated. Perhaps these criticisms of the philosophers did not have the import attributed to them. On July 17, 1787, De Montmorin, the minister of foreign affairs, wishing to calm the anxieties of the Pope, wrote to Cardinal de Bernis, French ambassador at Rome, that, since the death of Voltaire the books against religion were hardly being read at all. In that same year Abbé Bertola concluded his philosophy of history with these words: "Few reforms remain to be done. They will take place peacefully. As for a revolution, Europe no longer need fear any." [35]

We have thus reached the year 1789, which would be decisive for the history of Europe and of the whole world.

Before relating the tragic vicissitudes of the French Revolution, we must turn our attention to the Supreme Pontiff of the Church, who would have the heavy responsibility of steering the bark of Peter through the great storm.

[35] Quoted by Cantu, *op. cit.*, II, 48.

CHAPTER III

The First Years of the Pontificate of Pius VI (1775–89)

THE pope who took possession of the see of St. Peter (February 15, 1775) under the name of Pius VI seemed in no way prepared to withstand a revolution. On the contrary, everything apparently had destined him to govern the Church gloriously in an era of peace and prosperity.

Pius VI

The new pope was a tall man of majestic bearing, a friend of festivities and ceremonies that brought him into contact with his people; he was benevolent, generous, with a sincere worthiness of life and piety, which always inspired respect in the minds of the most ill-willed. He seemed to be one of those whose names are transmitted to future generations with the epithets of Good, Magnificent, or Magnanimous. A scion of the noble family of the Braschi, he had acquired the fondness of the masses and the esteem of the influential in the various offices he held: administrator of the diocese of Ostia and Velletri, private secretary of Benedict XIV, treasurer of the Apostolic Camera, cardinal, and commendatory abbot of Subiaco.[1]

Says the most recent biographer of Pius VI: "I do not know if, in the history of the Church, any pope saw his reign open under such happy auspices, and his coming greeted with so

[1] See Jules Gendry, *Pie VI, sa vie, son pontificat*, I, 1–65. This work, published in 1906, is based on the Vatican archives and various other unpublished documents.

much enthusiasm by the whole Catholic world." [2] The republics vied with the kings; the prince electors with the sovereigns. Empress Maria Theresa did not wait for the official notification of the election before sending her felicitations to the common father of the faithful; and the emperor of the Romans, Joseph II, in a long letter written by his own hand, assured the Pope of his joy and devotedness.[3]

The new pontiff was in the full vigor of mature years.[4] His soul opened to the most grandiose projects. The affairs that had engaged the pontificates of Clement XIII and Clement XIV seemed to be settled. The disputes that had arisen with the house of France ended with the re-establishment of the sovereignty of the Holy See over Comtat Venaissin. The Pope's first projects were directed to the prosperity and embellishment of the Papal States.

Many pontiffs, from Boniface VIII to Clement XIII, had tried to make habitable the extensive plains which, under the name of Pontine Marshes, thirty-six miles long and twelve miles wide along the coast of the Mediterranean, were in such condition that agriculture was impossible there. Pius VI appealed to the cooperation of all to assure the success of this vast enterprise. In the spring of 1780 we see him, accompanied by some persons of his suite, encourage by his presence the 3,500 workmen engaged in the drainage of the stagnant waters; for ten years each spring he watched over these gigantic works and stimulated the workmen.

The great expenses thus occasioned prompted the Pope to introduce a drastic economy in the management of the public funds. While he had been treasurer of the Apostolic Camera, he gave proofs of his vigilance and of his firmness in the

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[3] For the text of this letter, cf. *ibid.*, p. 489.

[4] Pius VI, at the time of his elevation, was fifty-seven years old. Some remarked that no pope of his years had ever been elected who enjoyed sturdy health equal to his. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 106.

government of the Treasury.[5] The financial regime introduced into the Papal States by Sixtus V [6] had been powerless to save them from the distress which all the national economies of Europe were experiencing at that time.[7] The vigor with which the Pope repressed the malpractices, which included those of the prefect of the Congregation of the Annona,[8] Nicholas Bischi, inspired a salutary fear in all the employees of the Treasury Office.

While treasurer of the Apostolic Camera, Cardinal Braschi had been authorized to create, for the assemblage of the masterpieces of sculpture, a museum called the Clementine Museum. Upon becoming pope, he urged the excavations required to discover the treasures of art buried in the Roman soil and he enlarged the museum destined to receive them. Eleven fine halls, among them the Belvedere, the Gallery of the Statues, the open loggia, and the Sala a croce graeca, were restored or constructed by order of Pius VI. The new museum, one of the richest of Europe, rightly then took the name of Pio-Clementine Museum.

The Pope's Popularity

The people, who for a long time had seen only popes bent under the weight of years, acclaimed this pontiff of robust appearance, majestic bearing, smiling countenance, and firm and dignified step. They could not restrain the expression of their joy as he passed, "How handsome he is!" The frugality of his life and the purity of his morals made them add, "He is as holy as he is handsome." The Jews, whose requests he generously

[5] We find related that the employees of the Treasury used to say of him: "Our treasurer has a good nose for scenting and teeth for biting."

[6] Mourret, *op. cit.*, V, 538; Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 123.

[7] Cardinal de Bernis wrote: "All Europe is sick; all its finances are in disorder." Quoted by Masson, *Le Cardinal de Bernis*, p. 122.

[8] The prefect of the Annona had charge of provisions, the markets, and food allowances.

granted by allowing them to leave the confines of their ghetto during the night,[9] by authorizing them to bury their dead according to their own rites, and by correcting the injustices by which they had sometimes been oppressed, joined their acclamations to those of the Christians. Furthermore, the most devoted friends of the Jesuits, the Zelanti, as they were called, were gratified, for the most part, with the new pope's attitude toward the Society of Jesus, by whom he had been educated. Pius VI, in spite of the insistence of the Spanish diplomacy,[10] disapproved of the proceedings that had been previously followed against the Jesuits. He called these proceedings "a mystery of impiety";[11] in the face of much opposition, he had decided on the liberation of the Jesuit fathers who were imprisoned in the Castle Sant' Angelo. Unfortunately this decision, which freed the assistants of Father Ricci, no longer found the general of the Society alive. Father Ricci had died on November 24, 1775, protesting under oath and in the presence of the sacred host which was brought to him on his deathbed, that he had not deserved the prison where he was about to die. Pius VI ordered a solemn funeral for him and decided that he should be buried in the church of the Gesu as his predecessors had been.[12]

The schismatical and heretical sovereigns entertained courteous and deferential relations with the Supreme Pontiff. Empress Catherine II of Russia, who had energetically refused to publish in her states the decree of suppression of the Jesuits,

[9] The law which ordered the closing of the gates of the ghetto every night was prompted by the desire of protection from the Jews and also with a view to protecting the Jews themselves from the hatred of the people.

[10] Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

[11] Hergenröther, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, chap. 3, § 1.

[12] *Ibid.* But Pius VI persistently refused to annul Clement XIV's decree of suppression of the Jesuits. He even condemned the writings that were published against that decree. See *Bullarium* (Barberi ed.), VI, 332, 347. To Ricci have been attributed the words, *"Sint ut sunt, aut non sint."* But the saying was not his. We find it, at least in substance, in a letter of Clement XIII to Louis XV (January 28, 1762). Cf. Boero, *Osservazioni sopra del pontificato di Clemente XIV* (2 vols., 1853), II, 15.

obtained from Pius VI, in 1778, a secret approbation (for Russia) of the suppressed Order.[13] Shortly afterward (1783) Catherine received with the greatest honors the apostolic nuncio, Archetti, who was provided with all powers to regulate the religious affairs. On this occasion the Pope officially recognized the title of emperor given to the sovereigns of Russia. In that same year King Gustavus III of Sweden came to Rome to see the Pope and confirmed the edict issued two years earlier to assure the Catholics the free exercise of their worship, and he accepted the sending to Stockholm of a vicar apostolic. The next year the Church in the United States, recently freed from England, obtained from the Holy Father the appointment of a vicar apostolic to govern the Catholics of that country. Five years later (1789), when the government of the American Union was established, Pius VI had the joy of placing at the head of the Catholic hierarchy in America, on the episcopal see of Baltimore, a holy prelate, Bishop Carroll, a personal friend of Washington.

The Danger of Philosophism

All this occurred at the moment when the revolutionary movement, let loose in France and ready to pour out over all Europe, was preparing for the Pontiff the most cruel anxieties perhaps that a head of the Church universal had ever known.

Never was Pius VI misled about the perils which the license of morals and the impiety of men's minds made the Church and society undergo. His first encyclical (December 25, 1775) denounced "the corruption of morals, of speech, and of life" which characterized the society of the ancient regime at that time, and the daring of "those wretched philosophers who, repeating to the point of weariness that man is born free and

[13] A written and open approbation would have stirred the wrath of the Bourbon courts.

that he ought not to submit to the rule of anyone, ended only by the loosening of the bonds that joined men together." [14] But that such doctrines would soon manifest themselves by a political and social revolution and that this revolution would first break out in that France where the pious King Louis XVI reigned, all this the Pontiff was far from suspecting at the time.

Other dark days would precede that great storm. When the first acclamation that greeted his coming quieted down, the Sovereign Pontiff soon perceived on the political horizon four dark spots, apparently localized and precise. The Kingdom of Naples' inclination to independence with regard to the Holy See, Emperor Joseph II's encroachments on the spiritual authority of the Church, the interference of the court of Russia in the affair of the Jesuits, and the penetration of Jansenist doctrines into the court of Tuscany: such were the objects of Pius VI's first concern.

An ancient feudal tribute, going back to Robert Guiscard, obliged the king of Naples to bring yearly to the Sovereign Pontiff a sum of 10,000 Roman ecus. This tribute had given rise to diplomatic differences between the court of Naples and the Holy See. From the beginning of the eighteenth century the question had been assuming graver proportions. With regard to this conflict, the Roman Curia had filled the chanceries with its complaints.[15] In 1759 Ferdinand IV ascended the throne of Naples. This pupil of Tanucci, who strangely mingled a sincere religious piety [16] with the principles of Rousseau's philosophy, did but embitter the quarrel when he became king. He obstinately refused to render the traditional homage of vassalage that was demanded of him. Neither the rebukes of the Supreme Pontiff nor the intervention of friendly powers

[14] Barberi, *Bullarium,* V, 180–85.
[15] Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 91.
[16] *Ibid.,* I, 92.

nor the compensations proposed by Pius VI, who offered to the King of Naples even the right of nomination to bishoprics,[17] was able to move Ferdinand to perform a ceremony in which the Holy See saw the recognition of a lawful tribute, but which the Neapolitan court regarded as an outworn ceremony, irreconcilable with the spirit of modern times. Fundamentally the great question of the French Revolution was in this conflict. That fact was undoubtedly what gave the affair so much importance. This famous question of the tribute was terminated only by the French invasion, the deportation of Pius VI, and finally the expulsion of the King of Naples.

In Germany, too, Pius VI encountered a form of the revolutionary crisis. We are acquainted with the movement of ideas that occurred in the Germanic countries during the second half of the eighteenth century. The two chief forms of Gallicanism —Caesarism and episcopalism—had entered there and had even acentuated their offensive against the papacy, under the names of Josephism and Febronianism.

Pius VI's Visit to Vienna

In 1781, while the commission of regulars in France, under the auspices of the sole authority of the civil government and apart from any influence of the Holy See, was pursuing the pretended reform of the monastic life, Emperor Joseph II of Germany, on a vaster scale and with far greater activity, had already undertaken to regulate the entire discipline of the Church in his states. To require the imperial placet for the publication of all papal bulls, to suppress all monasteries that did not tend to the development of the national education such as he meant it, to forbid all religious houses to hold any relations with foreign superiors, to place in the hands of the state the

[17] *Ibid.*, II, 91.

entire public education, including that of the clergy, to suppress confraternities, to abolish processions, to regulate the number of Masses, Benedictions, and even the number of candles to be lit at certain church services: such had been the principal measures undertaken against the Church by him whom Frederick II of Prussia called "my brother the sacristan." With uneasy forebodings, Pius VI followed the steps taken against the Holy See by the son of Maria Theresa, and at first showed a paternal condescension toward the sovereign. Then, seeing that his protests obtained no good result, he took, in spite of the contrary advice of all the ambassadors accredited to him and of most of the members of the Sacred College, a supreme resolve: that of going to Vienna to talk to the Emperor, who he knew was endowed with great natural qualities, particularly with a sincere devotion to the welfare of the people.[18]

The Emperor did not dare oppose the Pope's journey. But, at the Vienna court, those who inspired the Emperor's religious policy trembled. The minister, Kaunitz, proposed to Joseph II that a circular instruction should be issued, directing all the bishops to remain in their episcopal cities as long as the Pope was at Vienna.[19] He feared a contact of the head of the Church with the episcopate. Certain others even feared that the Pope, once he should arrive at the Austrian capital, might take advantage of some solemnity to interpellate the Emperor directly and thus exert a mighty influence on the masses. Joseph judged it more prudent in receiving the Holy Father to act "as a respectful son of the Church, as a courteous host," yet, as he added, determined not to let himself be taken advantage of by

[18] This journey was not something unprecedented in the history of the papacy. From Innocent I (409) to Clement VIII (1598) thirty-seven pontiffs had taken up the traveler's staff from a sense of duty. See *Histoire des voyages des papes depuis Innocent Ier jusqu'à Pie VI* (1786).

[19] Schlitter, *Die Reise des Papstes*, p. 36.

any tragic acts of the Pope and to remain unshakable in his principles.[20]

On March 20, 1782, Pius VI made his entry into the Austrian capital. The Emperor and his brother came out to meet him at a distance of a few miles from the city. The people gave the Pontiff a most enthusiastic testimony of their respect and affection.

> Almost every day the two sovereigns had long conferences by themselves. They used to pass three or four hours together and, when they separated, they appeared satisfied with each other. Very likely they really were so, and evidently this satisfaction could be produced only by a common understanding. If the results corresponded so little to the hopes, we may well suppose that this failure was owing to Kaunitz and Cobenzl, and that a large part of the responsibility for the subsequent acts must weigh on those ministers, those two evil geniuses of the Emperor.[21]

Upon returning to Rome, Pius VI did indeed have the pain of learning that the Emperor was continuing to abolish the monasteries and to regulate public worship as before. Had the Pontiff's journey, then, been useless? Far from it. Josephism had experienced some fear; this was the most notable result of the step taken by Pius VI. Joseph II had felt in the papacy a power in public opinion which he must take account of. When, two years later, the Emperor, having arrogated to himself the free disposal of the Lombard bishoprics, judged that he must go to Rome and there confer with the head of the Church and conclude a sort of concordat with him, Pius VI could know that his journey to Vienna had constrained Josephism to inaugurate a policy of deference toward the Holy See.[22]

Six years later, when, prompted by the episcopalism of Fe-

[20] Letter of March 7, 1782, quoted in *Joseph II und Leopold von Toscana* (1872).
[21] Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 265.
[22] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse*, I, 52.

bronius, the ecclesiastical electors of Germany, in a memorial presented to the Diet of Ratisbon, demanded a new law of the Empire, which would suppress on German soil the jurisdiction of the nuncios; when, the following year, four days after the taking of the Bastille, Archbishop Erthal of Mainz issued to his priests, as a defiance to the Holy See, a circular letter of convocation to the national synod, the danger seemed to arise again under another form. But "successive incidents caused the adjournment of the assembly; then the brutal reality, in the person of Custine and French soldiers, stifled the schism even before it started." [23]

Difficulties with Russia

At the very height of the Josephist crisis, the Pope found himself involved in the greatest difficulties with Russia. We have already seen how, at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits by the different states of Europe, Empress Catherine II received them with favor. A ukase of Peter the Great had forbidden these religious admittance into the Empire. But Catherine, after the partition of Poland, was able to appreciate the education given by the fathers in their flourishing colleges of Mohileff and Polotsk. The governor of White Russia,[24] Tchernychef, pushed his sympathy for the Society of Jesus so far that, when Clement XIV's brief of suppression appeared, he forbade, under the severest penalties, the publication in Russia of any brief coming from Rome.[25] By making

[23] *Ibid.*, I, 79.

[24] The term White Russia designates the country which Russia acquired by the partition of Poland. It comprised almost the entire diocese of Livonia and the part of the diocese of Vilna professing the Latin rite. On the attitude of the Jesuits at the time of the partition of Poland, see Zalenski, S. J., *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche* (French translation, I, 244).

[25] "The parish priest of Orcha and that of Vitebsk published the brief of suppression. Soon afterward a messenger came to them, with his carriage, and took away the poor priests to join the other exiles in Siberia." Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 340.

itself the protector of the Catholic cause, the government of St. Petersburg surpassed at a single stroke the utmost limits of the Gallicanism practiced at the courts of Versailles and of Vienna; or rather, Gallicanism, everywhere latent, took in each country the form adapted to the national customs. The Muscovite autocrat did not stop there. Catherine had noticed among the new subjects that the treaty of 1772 had given her a canon of Vilna by the name of Siestrzencewicz, a man of rare intelligence and vast erudition.[26] The Czarina obtained from the nuncio of Poland, Garampi, a decision that Siestrzencewicz should be consecrated titular bishop of Mallo.[27] An imperial decree (May 12, 1774) attributed to the newly chosen prelate an annual salary of 10,000 rubles and assigned Mohileff to him as his residence. Then, not satisfied with erecting on her own authority a new Catholic episcopal see, the schismatic sovereign gave to the incumbent of this bishopric a universal jurisdiction over the Latin Catholics of her Empire. This move was paralleled by the audacity to which, sixteen years later, the authors of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy would proceed.[28]

Some declare that, before his consecration, the Bishop of Mallo had signed and placed in the hands of the Empress an explicit promise to maintain the Jesuits in the fullness of their status.[29] Whatever may be the truth of this statement, Russia soon became a refuge for the members of the Society of Jesus, expelled from Poland, Germany, and Italy. The Bishop of Mallo arrogated to himself the right to ordain them even to the priesthood. The Bourbon courts protested vigorously.[30] The Pope seemed to be in an impasse. From the religious point of view his conscience refused to abrogate the decree of Clement

[26] On this strange personage, skeptical, worldly, and clever, a Russian type of the eighteenth-century episcopate, see Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 257–64.

[27] Gendry, *op. cit.*, I, 329.

[28] Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 261.

[29] Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 338; Gagarin, *La Compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie*, p. 29; Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 268.

[30] Cf. Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 344.

XIV and to pursue the Jesuits in their last asylum. From the political point of view he was obliged to conciliate both the Catholic kings of the house of Bourbon and the haughty Czarina, who threatened expressly to withdraw from her subjects the liberty of professing the Catholic religion if her desires were not heeded.[31] Pius VI protested, by a letter addressed (January 27, 183) to the King of France and the King of Spain, that he confirmed the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* of his predecessor, but he approved orally, in an audience given in March of the same year, granted to the coadjutor of Mohileff, the *status quo* of the Society of Jesus in Russia. Henceforth the Society had a vicar general in the person of the vice-provincial, Father Stanislaus Czerniewicz, who was succeeded two years later by Father Lenkeiwicz. At the same time the Bishop of Mallo, now promoted to the archbishopric of Mohileff, received the title and powers of apostolic visitator of all the houses of regulars established in Russia.[32]

Grand Duke of Tuscany

While the Russian court was so keenly taking up the quarrel for the Jesuits, the court of Tuscany moved to defend Jansenism. We know what spirit prevailed at Florence under the rule of Grand Duke Leopold, brother of Emperor Joseph II, and under the influence of Bishop Scipio Ricci. We are acquainted with the principal decisions of the strange gathering assembled at Pistoia (September 15, 1782) under the name of a council. Its undisguised aim was to introduce the maxims and the spirit of Port Royal, first in all the religious houses, then in all the churches of Tuscany. But when (April, 1787) the Grand Duke, in conformity with Ricci's desires, convoked at Florence an assembly of the seventeen bishops of his duchy for the pur-

[31] See the letter quoted by Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

[32] Zalenski, *op. cit.*, I, 322–25.

pose of carrying out the decree of the so-called council, fourteen of them firmly refused. They were, moreover, the interpreters of public opinion, outraged by the Jansenist innovations, which were intended to replace the traditional worship.

Ricci and his followers day by day made themselves more disliked. On May 20, a popular uprising directed against them suddenly broke out and, as usually happens in such circumstances, became unbounded. The day was a Sunday, toward evening. The faithful were coming for a festivity which the Confraternity of a Happy Death was celebrating at the cathedral of Prato. All of a sudden the report spread that Ricci and his followers decided to destroy the altar which had a particularly venerated Madonna. The church bells were rung. At this summons the people of the city and neighborhood came running, armed with clubs and picks. Crying out, "Long live the Holy See," they seized the bishop's throne,[33] smashed it, and burned it. They spent the whole night collecting, at the seminary or in various other places, crucifixes, Madonnas, and other images which Ricci had removed from the churches. These they carried in procession through the city and forced Ricci's followers to acclaim them. The tumult continued for several days. The Bishop's residence was broken into; his manuscripts and his Jansenist books were burnt in the public square.

For the time being the only effect of these deeds of violence was to exasperate the irritable spirit of Bishop Ricci. As counselor of Leopold, he instigated the latter to adopt the most odious measures against the popular devotions, particularly against the devotion to the Sacred Heart; the congregation established under this title was suppressed. But these excesses by a prelate whose unbalanced character had offended many persons, finally turned even the Grand Duke's advisers against him. When in 1790, on the death of Joseph II, Leopold

[33] The see of Prato was joined to that of Pistoia, where Ricci was bishop.

left Tuscany to assume the imperial crown, the hatreds that the Bishop of Pistoia had stirred up against himself broke loose. Driven out of Pistoia by the people, Ricci withdrew to Florence, and there he resigned his see.

These events put the Sovereign Pontiff in a delicate position. He could not seem to approve doctrines manifestly unorthodox, nor could he sanction a popular movement that had been stained by disorder and hatred. Pius VI also judged that the interests of the Church would not be served by risking, against the Emperor, a strife that might have disastrous consequences. He temporized. He ordered a close study of the seven volumes containing the acts of the Synod of Pistoia. Scarcely had Emperor Leopold been laid at rest, when the bull *Auctorem fidei* officially proclaimed the Catholic doctrine, by solemnly condemning the decrees of the so-called council.

The "acts of emancipation" of the court of Naples, like the abusive interference of the court of Russia, the ideas that the minister Kaunitz suggested to Joseph II, like the policy which Bishop Ricci inspired in Leopold, were merely intermittent and scattered manifestations of a state of mind that was agitating all Europe. France was about to give the final maxims of this state of mind.

PART II

The Revolution

THE Revolution, though a European event, was in some ways universal; but the heart of it was in France. There we can more easily mark the various stages that it passed through. From the religious viewpoint these stages were three in number: the Constituent Assembly stripped the Church of her goods and her rights; the Legislative Assembly and the Convention persecuted her in the person of her ministers and her faithful; the Directory tried to supplant her in her worship. From this religious point of view, which is the one we intend to take, the picture we shall have to paint of the revolutionary work may appear to some readers as depicted in too somber colors.

But we adopt as our own the declarations which the eminent author of the *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution* puts at the head of his work. We, too, wish that the reader should see in our severity "neither lack of justice nor any trace of passion." In our turn, "if we were to judge in its totality the work of the Constituent Assembly, we would not fail to place in relief, among all the reforms accomplished by it, those measures that marked memorable progress in the field of administration, and especially in civil, financial, and criminal legislation." [1] We shall also have occasion to note that the Catholic Church was never the foe of these progressive measures. Her faithful and her ministers were often the first to second them; more than once they took the initiative in these matters. Only by falsification of history can anyone maintain that the honor belongs only to her enemies.

[1] De La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* I, iv.

CHAPTER IV

The Church Despoiled (1789–90)

On May 4, 1789, the city of Versailles presented an unusual sight. King Louis XVI, accompanied by representatives of all the classes of the nation, took part in a procession of the Blessed Sacrament, which was followed by a Solemn Mass in the church of St. Louis.[1] Archbishop de Juigné of Paris pontificated, and Bishop de La Fare of Nancy delivered a discourse which had for its subject the influence of religion on the happiness of nations. Some passages of the sermon, when the preacher directed his attack against the abuses of the political and religious institutions and called for liberty as the chief remedy, were received by prolonged applause, which some persons judged little suited to the sacredness of the place. The next day the King, with great solemnity, opened the States General. In the hall of the Menus-Plaisirs the King took his seat, surrounded by the princes of the blood royal. The court was ranged on the steps of the throne. The three orders occupied the rest of the hall: on the right the 291 deputies of the clergy; on the left the 270 representatives of the nobility, glittering with gold and em-

[1] This procession was not merely a liturgical ceremony, isolated and unconnected with the feelings of the people. The whole nation set itself to pray, asking God to bestow His blessings on the States General. We have before our eyes one of the printed sheets which at that time circulated among the priests and the faithful. It says: "Let us do a holy violence upon the Lord to obtain from His mercy that He will direct the counsels and measures of the assembled nation and that He will spread in all hearts a pure, efficacious, and generous love for the public welfare. And let us beg favors and success for ourselves and for our country only as a means of attaining that blessed and eternal society where we shall all be kings and where one single good will suffice for all and for all time by its immense fullness." The sheet ends by the repetition of several different prayers, the first three of them being taken from the Paris Missal, "For the holding of the States General."

broidery; at the rear, on the lower seats and in simple black dress, bareheaded, the 584 members of the third order.

In this city of Versailles, which the absolute power of Louis XIV had created, all the classes of society and all the provinces were represented. All the demands, all the wishes of the people of France which, for almost two centuries, had not had royal audience were at length able to find expression.[2]

The Condition of France in 1789

A subdued and restless discontent stirred the masses. The harshness of the winter of 1788, marked by famine, had exasperated men's minds. The 1,200 deputies[3] assembled about the King could render a report of those conditions. The representatives of Normandy were prepared to tell of the scenes of pillage and death that smeared their province with blood.[4] The Bretons could relate how some people of Nantes had almost cut to pieces a man who was thought to be a receiver of stolen goods. The deputies from Provence could likewise draw a picture of the violence committed by an incensed populace at Marseilles, Aix, Toulon, Brignoles, Riez, and Manosque.[5] Touraine, Poitou, the Orléans district, Burgundy, Auvergne, and Languedoc had witnessed similar scenes.[6] Everywhere, among these people that famine exasperated, that the social inequalities enraged, certain vague hopes appeared. In the newspapers and in pamphlets that the public read avidly, the sole question was that of a new era of liberty, of equality, of moral and material well-being, which they felt was now at hand.

[2] The last meeting of the States General had been held in 1614. An assembly of the notables had been convoked by Richelieu in 1626. The assembly of the notables, called by Louis XVI in 1787, adjourned to give way to the States General.

[3] The exact figure is 1,158.

[4] Floquet, *Histoire du parlement de Normandie,* VII, 508.

[5] Taine, *Les origines,* III, 27–33.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 15. "In the four months before the taking of the Bastille, France witnessed more than three hundred uprisings." Taine, *loc. cit.*

What the Bishop of Nancy had just openly proclaimed in the Versailles church, in the presence of the King and the deputies, many a village curé had already said to his people. For several years parish and provincial assemblies had been held. At those meetings, where plebeians sat beside lords, the raising of taxes was discussed and decided. On Sunday upon coming out of church, or on market days, at the village inn, the peasants were made acquainted with the situation. The royal letter of July 5, 1788, permitting to all competent persons and bodies the sending of memorials on the state of the country, and the regulation (January 24, 1789) requiring that, "from the remotest places of the kingdom and from the most inconspicuous habitations, each should be assured of sending its wishes and its demands to His Majesty," [7] had encouraged the popular movement. Serious ecclesiastics constructed gigantic systems for the reorganization of the possessions of the clergy.[8] The *Journal ecclésiastique,* issued since 1760 under the direction of Father Barruel, a former Jesuit, was the organ of the most orthodox Catholicity. In its columns, beginning in April, 1789, was a special section in which the abuses of the times were pointed out.[9]

The Assembly

After such a movement of popular opinion, we should not be surprised that the first session of the States General was

[7] Duvergier, *Collection des lois et décrets,* I, 1–23.

[8] In Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* I, 61–63, the reader will find the curious project of Father Thuin. The general principle of the project was the cession to the state of the entirety of the ecclesiastical goods. With the liquidation of these possessions an annual net revenue of 456,000,000 francs should remain available. Four-fifths of this revenue should furnish the support of the clergy; the rest would be divided between the poor and the church boards, these latter being responsible for the upkeep of the religious buildings. The nation would receive from the division a revenue of 76,000,000 francs.

[9] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 64–67.

marked by an unusual agitation. Moreover, in the outward circumstances everything seemed calculated to provoke this agitation. The assembly included many upright and educated men, some eminent persons. But the fact of the immense number of the members was not favorable to serious discussions. The large size of the hall—a detail brought out by Taine's psychology—by obliging the speakers to raise their voices, favored pompous and abstract oratory. Besides, from the very first session, an impression was given that the division of the three orders no longer corresponded to the actual situation; but their suppression apparently could not be made without disturbance and clamor.

At any rate, might a man be found in the assembly, capable of taking the lead in the movement so as to direct it or at need to restrain it if not to halt it?

The natural head of this assembly, King Louis XVI, was evidently not of a stature to fill such a part. Kind, affable, and sincerely attached to the Catholic Church, whose precepts he observed most exactly in his private life, he had been received, at his entrance, with bursts of enthusiasm, but at the same time with cries of complaint against the disgraces of the preceding reign. But in the fifteen years during which he held the reins of government, he had too often shown a gentleness that tended to weakness, to indecision, to blundering evasions. The various influences active about him were successively cast off, one after the other. Maurepas, Turgot, Malesherbes, Necker, to whom he appealed to relieve the disastrous state of the finances, had fallen. The Queen then decided to intervene in the handling of the affairs and in the choice of the ministers, but she raised up against them and against herself such unpopularity [10] that the King had to turn again to Necker. The

[10] The unfortunate affair of the necklace is too well known to require relating here. It greatly injured the Queen's popularity. She was also accused of having understandings with the powerful enemies of France. But Marie Antoinette was a

summoning of an assembly of the notables, then of the States General, seemed to be the supreme remedy for the situation. But now the question arose whether the path on which they were entering was not full of formidable complications.

The Upper Clergy

Often, in great critical epochs, the king of France had found in some member of the upper clergy a prudent and loyal adviser. Four prelates stood out among the members who sat at the King's right: they were Archbishop de Juigné of Paris, Bishop de La Fare of Nancy, Archbishop Le Franc de Pompignan of Vienne, and Archbishop de Boisgelin of Aix.

De Juigné, son of Marquis de Juigné who was killed in the Battle of Guastalia, was charity personified. The 600,000 francs that the archbishopric of Paris brought to him was used entirely in alms: each day hundreds of the poor received at the Archbishop's door food which he put at their disposal with inexhaustible generosity. No one ever knew the number of persons that he pensioned from his personal resources. He had a cultured mind; his ideas were orthodox beyond reproach. The flatteries heaped on him by the Jansenists at the outset of his episcopate were powerless to win him to their cause. Unfortunately with Archbishop de Juigné the qualities of mind and will were not at the level of his charity and piety. To discern the future, to sense the strong side and the weak side of men and of things, to fix a rule of conduct, and to adhere to it with energy, such was never the good fortune of this virtuous prelate. Although an excellent shepherd so long as he had merely to walk along paths already marked out, he was unequal to his

complete stranger to the intrigues of the affair of the necklace. The entire responsibility in the case falls on Madame de La Mote and Cardinal de Rohan. As to her so-called steps toward bringing foreign interventions into France, we shall see later what is to be thought of this accusation.

task when he should have to give proof of far-sightedness and firmness.[11]

Neither the clear view of the reforms to be accomplished nor the courage required to pursue them was lacking in Bishop de La Fare of Nancy and Archbishop de Pompignan of Vienne. The former, after boldly speaking of abuses to be fought and of liberty to be established, in his opening address in the church of St. Louis, would have to defend vigorously on the rostrum of the Assembly the independence of the goods of the Church and the life of the monastic institutions. De Pompignan, who in his writings had disclosed the poison of Rousseau's doctrine better than anyone else, would soon have to lend the King his devoted collaboration to safeguard whatever could still be rescued of the traditional institutions of France. But neither of these men was a politician in the lofty sense of the word.[12]

The title of great politician seems rather to belong to Archbishop Boisgelin of Aix. Before appearing in the States General this noble prelate was known simply as a strong and hardy thinker by his commentary on Montesquieu. In times of disturbance he had been seen holding under his strong and supple hand the agitated population of Provence.[13] Again and again we shall see him manifesting the clear-sightedness and the spirit of decision that belong to a statesman. If the Assembly that was opening were capable of listening to a doctrine of moderation, of justice, and of prudent progress, De Boisgelin would have furnished it with convincing formulas. But the

[11] On Archbishop de Juigné, see Lambert, *Vie de Mgr de Juigné* (1821); Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* I, 91 and *passim;* Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* I, 77–112.

[12] See Claude Bouvier, *Le Franc de Pompignan,* pp. 89–98.

[13] Cardinal de Bausset, who had been Archbishop de Boisgelin's vicar general, relates how that Provençal prelate in the winter of 1789, by the influence of his virtue, the persuasive power of his words, and the wisdom of his procedure, was able to calm an almost general uprising of the city of Aix. See Picot, *Mémoires,* V, 354. In the *Œuvres oratoires de M. de Boisgelin,* p. 196, see the order issued on that occasion, March 27, 1789.

men of that time, according to the remark of Joseph de Maistre, seemed to be led by a power stronger than themselves.[14] The passion agitating them would heed only the language of passion, and the worthy prelates who sat in their midst could not offer them this language.

In this tumultuous gathering of men sent to Paris to express the wishes of France, we may distinguish two rather compact and distinct groups in spite of all the artificial divisions: the group of jurists, 374 in number, and the lower clergy, counting no less than 208 representatives.

The Lawyers

In an assembly meeting with the vague intention of recasting the constitution of France, the group of lawyers would enjoy a decisive role. Unfortunately these men brought with them all the prejudices of parliamentary Gallicanism and of the Jansenist sect. Camus and Treilhard, whom we shall see taking part with all the prestige of their technical erudition and of their tricks of procedure, will not for a moment lose sight of the two aims of the old Gallicanism and the most radical Jansenism: to oppose the so-called encroachments of Rome and, by the intervention of the civil power, to lead the Church back to a so-called spirit of the first centuries.[15]

The Lower Clergy

By their closer contact with the people the priests of the lower clergy had, more than the others, an appreciation of the miseries of the regime. Out of pity for their brethren much more than by a one-sided desire for innovation, they aspired to an

[14] De Maistre, *Considérations sur la France,* chaps. 1 and 5.

[15] On the clearly Gallican principles of Camus and Treilhard, see Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 3–7.

era of social reorganization. But their tendencies, precisely because they proceeded from sentiment rather than from reason, ran the risk of being chimerical. Too many, while energetically rejecting the antireligious theories of the reformers, readily gave ear to their political and social ideas. One of them, Sieyès, in the interval between the dissolution of the assembly of the notables and the meeting of the States General, had published three ringing pamphlets. Their subjects were respectively: View on the means of execution, Essay on privileges, What is the Third Estate? Their contents may be summed up in two phrases: "What is the Third Estate? Nothing." "What ought it to be? Everything."

Abbé Sieyès

Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, born at Fréjus on May 3, 1748, would become one of the most noteworthy figures of the Revolution and perhaps the most singular.[16] At any rate, he would become the most representative man of the Constituent Assembly, to which he would, most of the time, furnish the inspiring idea or the final formula of its declarations. With a doubtful religious vocation, he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice at the age of seventeen. There he expressed such hardy ideas that his teachers invited him with friendly consideration to withdraw to another establishment.[17] After receiving his licentiate at the Sorbonne, he was ordained priest a few years later at the seminary of Saint-Firmin. Soon afterward, from his reflections on the writings of Condillac, Bonnet, Helvetius,

[16] Sainte-Beuve, *Galerie de portraits historiques,* p. 537.

[17] In the register of the seminary of St. Sulpice we read the following: "Josephus-Emmanuel Sieyès, entered November 13, 1765, left December 4, 1770; sly, of a spirit suspect. He was advised to leave. He went to the seminary of Saint-Firmin." Some of Sieyès' manuscripts of this period are venturesome outlines. As Sainte-Beuve says, we can easily understand that they aroused his superiors' suspicions. Sainte-Beuve, *loc. cit.*

Rousseau, and some economists, Abbé Sieyès composed a personal doctrine of "social art," as he called it. This "social art," which he declared he had discovered, consisted essentially in the abolition of the privileges of the aristocracy and in the organization of democracy in certain extremely complicated arrangements. Its basis was the division of labor applied to various functions of the state, and an ingenious system of representation of persons and interests.

Venturous minds and some naive souls took up these innovations with passionate enthusiasm. One day Madame de Staël, in her salon, declared that the Abbé's writings and opinions would form a new era in the art of government as those of Newton did in physics.[18] And Sainte-Beuve said that in Sieyès was something of Descartes, that is, of the man who gladly made a *tabula rasa* of everything that had gone before, a man who began over again a new organization in every matter, social, economic, and political.[19]

Sieyès' ideas so well corresponded to the general tendencies of the Assembly that they exerted a preponderant influence there. The attitude of the clergy from the outset was largely dependent on this influence.

The representatives of the three orders, as all the classes of French society, were dominated more or less by the spirit of those who called themselves "the philosophers." Two men summed up that so-called philosophical spirit. They were Voltaire and Rousseau: Voltaire the demolisher of the old world, and Rousseau the self-designated builder of a new world. The teaching of both of them had received a hearty welcome in the salons of the upper society and had been effectively propagated there. Freemasonry counted among its members or friends a number of persons belonging to the high nobility and the clergy.

[18] Testimony of Gouverneur Morris, quoted by Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, p. 542.
[19] *Ibid.*

Mirabeau

But neither the Jansenism of Camus and Treilhard nor the utopias of Sieyès nor the doctrine of the "philosophers" nor the influence of Freemasonry would have acquired a prompt and effective influence unless they had found a powerful mouthpiece to express and impose them. We meet this organ of expression in a man who would be the most fiery of the orators and the most crafty of the politicians: Mirabeau. A man of aristocratic stock, whose family reckoned more than four hundred years of established nobility and who had just now passed over to the Third Estate out of contempt for aristocracy, Mirabeau, even when he sold himself to the monarchy, even when he proposed to the clergy that he would become the defender of their rights, would always remain the type of revolutionary, who upsets the established order and suggests a new order.

In him everything was a power because in him everything was a seductive influence that exerted a sort of violence on men's impatient spirit. He himself said, "No one knows all the might of my ugliness." This man, in disrepute because of his immorality, might well speak thus of his moral ugliness no less than of his physical ugliness. When, proudly thrown back on his bull-like neck, his enormous head appeared on the rostrum, with its olive tint, his cheeks scarred from smallpox, his flaming eyes, which passion at times animated to the point of their being bloodshot, and his mouth with its irregularly lined lips, from which a thunderous voice issued forth, whatever revolt was in men's souls recognized itself at once. The speaker's words were repeated throughout France. The dreams and passions that were fermenting in the souls of the people and finding expression in his fiery words increased the people's uneasiness. Anarchy was near the point of breaking forth.

The Antireligious Work of the Constituent Assembly

At the very first sessions of the Assembly that anarchy burst out, and events occurred pell-mell. By the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which because of the anarchy was practically interpreted as a forgetfulness of the rights of God; by the law "placing at the disposal" of the state the goods of the Church, which thus ended in the out-and-out spoliation of the clergy; by the suppression of the vows of religion, which amounted to suppression of the religious life; and by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which was the utter control of the clergy by the state: by all these measures the Revolution soon accomplished the first stages of the war undertaken against the Catholic Church.

Two expressions of Mirabeau and of Sieyès let loose the revolutionary movement. On June 17 the deputies of the Third Estate, on Sieyès' motion, declared that, as they represented 86 per cent of the nation, they constituted themselves the "National Assembly." Six days later the King annulled the decisions of the 17th and ordered the three estates to break up instantly. Thereupon Mirabeau exclaimed: "Nothing but force can make us depart. As for myself, I shall be put forth only if I am pierced with bayonets." [20] And Sieyès, addressing his fellow deputies, said: "You are today what you were yesterday; continue your deliberations." A short time afterward the majority of the clergy and forty-seven members of the nobility, with the Duke of Orléans at their head, joined the deputies of the Third Estate. The better to indicate its aim, the Assembly took the name of Constituent Assembly. The Revolution had begun in principle.

[20] These were Mirabeau's actual words. They have often been wrongly quoted as: "Go tell your master that we are here by the will of the people and that we will leave only by the force of bayonets."

Beginning of the Anarchy

Such events could not take place without a deep echo in the popular mind. We are not called upon to relate the excitement that followed: the concentration of troops at Versailles and Paris; the dismissal of the minister, Necker; the disturbance at the Palais Royal when Camille Desmoulins, with a pistol in his hand, shouted to the crowd: "The dismissal of Necker is the signal for a St. Bartholomew slaughter of patriots: To arms!"; the people wearing a new cockade as a rallying sign; Paris suddenly filled with an armed mob; the shops closing everywhere; the church bells ringing the alarm almost ceaselessly. Paris was exhibiting "a spontaneous anarchy," according to Taine's expression.[21]

Two incidents marked the character of the movement: the pillage of St. Lazare (July 13, 1789) and the taking of the Bastille (July 14).

The Pillage of St. Lazare

For the pillage of St. Lazare we have a detailed account in a memorial drawn up by two eyewitnesses. The report bears the marks of a most exact truthfulness.[22]

The house of St. Lazare was then inhabited by almost 400 persons: 200 priests, more than 100 novices or students, 80 brothers and boarders. . . . In the night of July 12, without any forewarning, 200 men variously armed rushed in tumult to the gates. They seemed to

[21] Taine, *Les origines de la France contemporaine,* Vol. III, Bk. I, p. 3. Taine's expression, "spontaneous anarchy," has had a remarkable success. But this term is not altogether exact. The real anarchy did not begin until the taking of the Bastille and the night of August 4. Even then the anarchy was encouraged, sometimes provoked.

[22] The authors of this account were Father Dubois and Father Philippe, priests of St. Lazare. Father Dubois became pastor of St. Margaret's church and died in 1824. The narrative which we here quote is taken from the account first appearing in the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion à la fin du XVIII^e siècle,* published by Abbé Jaufpret.

be undecided what to do. Then, at half-past two in the morning, at the command of some leaders, the doors were battered down. The brigands poured into the house. . . . They began eating and drinking in the refectory and demanded money. At first the hope was that they could be made to leave without difficulty. But, as all the entrances were open, a countless throng filled the house. About ten o'clock in the morning a horrible devastation began. They smashed the furniture, decorations, windows, beds; they pillaged all the rooms. The big library, containing almost 50,000 volumes, those of the professors, students, and boarders, were thrown out of the windows, scattered over the courtyard, reduced to a hopeless state of ruin. . . . They ravaged the room of St. Vincent de Paul, where various objects used by him were preserved. They smashed his statue, recently placed in a vestibule.

They killed some sheep that were feeding in the enclosure. They set fire to the barns, and the firemen had difficulty in preventing the spread of the conflagration. . . . Even the priests of the house were in danger. Several of them were beaten, but none were killed. A number of them climbed over the walls of the enclosure; some sick persons were taken to the house of the Recollects near by and to the Hôtel-Dieu. . . .

Word had spread that the Lazarists had large stores of wheat, that they were hoarders. But the provision that was found would hardly have been enough to supply the house for three months. That whole section knew that, during the preceding six months, the Lazarists had distributed bread and soup to several hundred poor people. But the mob wished to give the charge the semblance of truth in the eyes of the people. They seized a priest and a subdeacon of the house. These two men, wearing their cassocks, were put in a cart, seated on sacks of wheat, and were thus taken to the market place, escorted by men who carried torches and arms. These men would finallly have immolated the two victims but for the cleverness and energy of an officer of the guard.

Amid this disaster certain circumstances were noteworthy. No profanation occurred in the church, the only spot in the whole establishment that was spared. Moreover, in the wrecked bedrooms the crucifixes were respected. Another striking incident concerned a ven-

erable old man, almost eighty years of age, who was a paralytic. At the infirmarian's request, they themselves carried him to the house of the Daughters of Charity, whose spiritual director he had been. When they reached there, they said: "We are bringing your father to you." A few hours later, that is, about five o'clock, a larger number appeared at the house of the Daughters of Charity in the hope of finding there that store of wheat which they had vainly searched for at St. Lazare. Some of these men decided to enter the chapel, where the novices were gathered together. The evident fright of these young women and the holiness of the place impressed the men. They withdrew with signs of respect. A few of them even knelt down. In the course of these various visits not a single indecent word was heard.

This account, with all the marks of sincerity, shows us the nature of those first popular uprisings. Camille Desmoulins, a theorist, a journalist, a young lawyer without any practice, a man not yet thirty years old, nourished on the theories of the *Social Contract,* was the one who set everything going. A starving populace turned to pillage. Yet, at the very moment of their greatest excitement, the people still retained an instinctive respect for religion, for modesty, and for all holy things. This condition would not last; and the people of Paris, as well as those throughout the rest of France, would unfortunately become accustomed little by little to every sort of sacrilege and horror.

The Taking of the Bastille

Mere hatred for the "hoarders" had stirred up the mob in the pillage of St. Lazare. The taking of the Bastille, which occurred the next day, was owing to a movement of political excitement.

The Bastille was an old state prison where persons were confined by simple *lettre de cachet* of the king.[23] In the public mind

[23] A *lettre de cachet* was a judiciary act, issued by the royal power, without any opportunity of defense by the accused and without any legal procedure whatever.

the Bastille was the most conspicuous personification of despotism. True, in it had been imprisoned far more great lords than common people. Historical evidence has shown that the prisoners generally led a rather comfortable life.[24] But legends and pamphlets had made of it a place of mystery and dread, and the people clung to this notion of it.

The events of July 14 are so well known that we need not recount them here: the attack led by the militia, hastily armed with rifles and cannons taken from the Invalides; De Launey (the governor of the prison), Flesselles (the provost of provisions), and several subordinate officials massacred, their heads streaked with blood, stuck on the ends of pikes above a howling mob; and the freed prisoners paraded in triumph. These prisoners were seven in number: four forgers, two lunatics, and a sadist. Louis XVI, upon hearing a report of the event, is said to have remarked, "Is this a revolt?" To which the Duke of Liancourt answered, "No, Sire. It is a revolution." The mob, which the day before had halted in the presence of the image of Christ, would not recoil before the symbol of what it called tyranny.

The event produced a deep impression throughout Europe. The sovereigns saw in it a presage of approaching upsets in their states.[25]

We should note that neither the people nor even the clergy seemed to regard this event as an attack on religion. The next

[24] Funck-Brentano, *Légendes et archives de la Bastille* (1904). By the same author, *Des lettres de cachet à Paris* (1903). Cf. Lavisse, *Hist. de France,* Vol. III, Part I, pp. 314–17.

[25] Michelet relates the following anecdote about Kant. For sixty years Kant used to set forth each day at precisely the same hour. For a definite number of minutes, without speaking to anyone, he followed exactly the same route, as we see on certain old city clocks an iron man come forth, strike the hour, and then return. But one day a strange irregularity was noted by the inhabitants of Königsberg. The familiar planet was not following his set course. Emmanuel Kant was walking toward the highway by which the courier from France used to come. The previous day Kant had learned of the taking of the Bastille. He had a presentiment that a great event had taken place.

day a deputation of the Assembly, taken from the three estates and including Count de Lally, Tollendal, Archbishop de Juigné of Paris, and Bailly, the deputy of the capital, went to the Hôtel de Ville. Bailly was acclaimed mayor of Paris in place of the provost Flesselles; Lafayette was given the command of the National Guard. Then the Archbishop invited the people to come to the cathedral for the singing of a Te Deum "in thanksgiving for the re-establishment of peace." [26] Between the brutal passions of the mob, the philosophical chimeras of Rousseau's disciples, and the principles of the gospel, a confusion existed at least in a large number of minds. This confusion would disappear only little by little. Its persistence enables us to understand many of the events among those we are about to relate.

The votes taken during the night of August 4 and the Declaration of the Rights of Man, published August 23, reveal the continuance of the same state of mind.

The Provinces

The example given by the capital was followed in the provinces. The mobs had pillaged Paris: they had destroyed the symbol of tyranny; in a spontaneous movement they had elected a municipal government. Under the inspiration of seditious papers, circulated profusely in the cities and country districts, and at the instigation of revolutionary agitators who journeyed through France sowing false terrors, bands of brigands rose up everywhere. The alarm was spread wherever a center of "hoarding" was pointed out, wherever a feudal or monastic "bastille" rose up. Seize the grain being held to provoke a famine; destroy the last asylums where social inequalities were being perpetuated: such were the watchwords.

At once those who might naturally be expected to take up

[26] Picot, *Mémoires,* V, 368.

the defense of the ancient regime began to emigrate. The Count of Artois with his two sons, Prince de Condé, Prince de Conti, Maréchal de Broglie, Maréchal de Castries, the Duke de Polignac, Prince de Lambesc, Baron de Breteuil, and many other members of the nobility fled to foreign lands. Their abandoned estates were seized by armed bands that pillaged them; bonfires were lighted, the flames fed by old charters; many a château was a prey to the flames: [27] such was the end of a regime that had become hateful. To complete the ruin of the nobility, cities and towns accomplished their municipal revolution, as was done at Paris: they elected permanent committees, armed the National Guard, dismissed the agents of the central power, and tried to govern themselves.

The Night of August 4

The reports of these disturbances reached the capital and troubled men's minds. The most effective means of calming the popular excitement seemed to be to sacrifice whatever angered the populace. What the people were going to take by force had better be offered to them with good grace. Such was the origin of the decisive action taken on the night of August 4.

A representative of the nobility, Viscount de Noailles, proposed the immediate abolition of all feudal taxes; the clergy, in a burst of enthusiastic generosity, at once joined in the proposal. They were used to great sacrifices; at every crisis they had offered their *dons gratuits* bountifully to the monarchy.[28] This time the gift was as reckless as it was generous. By the lips of Archbishop de Juigné the clergy gave up their land taxes. Then, one after the other, Bishop de La Fare of Nancy,

[27] In January, 1790, Necker estimated at 60,000,000 francs the amount of the indemnities due the victims of these outrages. Prudhomme, *Révolutions de Paris,* no. 47.

[28] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* V, 17 ff.

Bishop de Lubersac of Chartres, and Archbishop de Boisgelin of Aix arose: the first condemning the feudal taxes of the "ecclesiastical lords"; the second speaking against "the right of the chase"; the third denouncing the arbitrary extension of the so-called rights of domain, the salt tax, and other taxes. The Assembly voted the redemption of the tithes, the prohibition of plurality of benefices, and the abolition of the right of *deport,* that is, the right which, in several dioceses, was held by the bishops or the archdeacons to enjoy the revenues of vacant parishes.

The curés, having no feudal rights to sacrifice, offered at least their perquisites. With impulsive ardor they associated the pope himself in this sacrifice by suppressing the annates. Toward the close of the session, Abbé Grégoire mounted the rostrum and said: "I propose the abolition of the annates, that monument of simony against which the Council of Basel has already decreed." Men's minds were too heated for a cool discussion of this question which, however, deserved the trouble. The authority of the Council of Basel could not be canonically appealed to. Moreover, the French clergy could not juridically dispose of the rights of the Sovereign Pontiff without even consulting him. Furthermore, the question of the annates had been regulated by an explicit provision of the concordat of 1516.[29] But the abolition of this right was decided without any discussion. The entire collection of articles was passed amid general enthusiasm. The deputies of the Third Estate, to have their part in this movement of generosity, gave up the privileges belonging to certain provinces and cities. The clergy, through the Archbishop of Paris, offered to chant a solemn Te Deum of thanksgiving at Notre Dame, and the nobility, through Marquis de Lally-Tollendal, proposed to decree for Louis XVI the title of "Restorer of French Liberty."

[29] It is true that this tax was paid very irregularly and only by a few of the benefice-holders. Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* V, 258.

On the following days the Assembly, far from manifesting any regret over its decision, did but accentuate the provisions.

The Tithes

Article 5 of the decree passed on the night of August 4 ordered the redemption of the tithes due to the clergy. But, in the deplorable situation to which the finances of the state were reduced, how could the state meet the obligations created by the redemption? On August 8, in connection with a loan requested by the minister (Necker), Marquis de La Coste, deputy from Charolais, proposed to hypothecate this loan on the possessions of the clergy. The measure was premature and, for the time being, was rejected. But the next day Mirabeau asked the Assembly to vote the suppression of the tithe pure and simple.

After all, was the tithe anything more than a form of salary always subject to revocation, "with which the nation paid the officers of morality and education"? When these words provoked some murmuring, the orator with the full thunder of his voice replied: "I know of only three ways of existing in society: a man must be a beggar or a thief, or he must be salaried." The whole principle of communism was in these words. A notable part of the Assembly was drawn by Mirabeau's discourse. But Abbé Sieyès had the courage, in this circumstance, to utter words of good sense. He drew attention to the fact that the property burdened with the tithe had been purchased by the present owners only with a reckoning of the charges that were incumbent on it. To suppress these charges would simply raise the value of such property. He wisely remarked: "I do not think we need to make a present of 70,000,000 francs in taxes to the owners of this property. Those who profit by the outright abolition will not be the poor; they will be the rich." In a more pathetic tone a humble curé declared: "Gentlemen of the Third Estate, when you asked us to come to you in the

name of a God of peace, did you do so to strangle us or make us die of hunger?" In fact, the suppression of the tithes diminished by half the revenue of the clergy.[30]

Hostility toward the Holy See

But the Assembly was beginning to feel the influence of the mobs, exasperated by wretchedness, fascinated by social utopias, and exploited by the leaders who were eager for popularity. On August 10, disorderly bands from Paris arrived at Versailles, asking with loud outcries for bread and demanding it from the property of the priests. The next day, to disarm any prejudice that might be felt toward them, the clergy decided not to prolong a discussion in which they blushed to defend their pecuniary interests. Several curés called for the reading of a bill in which they declared that they gave up their rights to the tithe. The Archbishop of Paris mounted the rostrum and made the following declaration: "My colleagues have merely gone beyond the sacrifice we are all offering to our country. We, all of us, place in the hands of the nation all the ecclesiastical tithes, and we entrust ourselves entirely to our country's wisdom. Let the gospel be proclaimed, let divine worship be celebrated with decency and dignity, let the churches be provided with virtuous and zealous pastors, let the poor be succored: this is the purpose of our ministry."[31]

That same day a memorial sent to the Assembly from the Roman court asked the French lawmakers to revoke the decision about the annates. This communication led the members of the Constituent Assembly to make more emphatic the character of their decree on the rights of the Holy See. Someone asked to whom the bishops should henceforth turn for their institu-

[30] At the session of April 9, 1790, Chasset estimated these revenues of the clergy at 170,000,000 francs. *Moniteur*, I, 412. But Necker, in 1784, put the figure at only 130,000,000. Necker, *De l'administration des finances de la France*, II, 316.

[31] *Journal ecclésiastique* of September, 1789, p. 36.

tion if the annates were suppressed. The Jansenist Camus answered: "The bishops will be confirmed by the metropolitans, the latter by the national council." Thus the Assembly decreed that the diocesans should henceforth address their bishops for all provision of benefices and dispensations. Says Frédéric Masson: "The whole Civil Constitution of the Clergy is to be found in germ in this resolution." [32] But the members of the clergy undoubtedly failed to perceive its full import, and no protest was raised against Camus' proposal.

A frank enthusiasm blinded the best minds. On August 14, in a charge to be read from the pulpit by all priests having the care of souls in the diocese of Paris, Archbishop de Juigné declared: "O ever-memorable epoch in the history of the nation! What you might have beheld, my brethren, taking place on the fourth of this month in the National Assembly! How thankfully you would have seen these representatives of all the estates, of all the provinces and all the cities of the kingdom, animated and transported by love and enthusiasm for the public good, emulating one another in stripping themselves of the most ancient and most precious privileges and rights so as to sacrifice them for the solace of the people and the general happiness of our country!" [33] The Jansenists, on their side, rejoiced at seeing the Church at length "spiritualized" by abandonment of its material riches. The revolutionary Prudhomme wrote in his diary under date of August 16, "France emerges from a long and humiliating slavery." Lastly, the *Moniteur* had the following remark: "In a single night the face of France has changed; in one night the famous tree of feudalism, whose shadow covered all France, has been reversed; in one night a new people seems to have repeopled this vast empire."

The lawmakers were too much encouraged by such approbations for them not to go further. In declaring themselves a Con-

[32] Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

[33] *Journal ecclésiastique, loc. cit.*

stituent Assembly, they showed their intention of performing a more positive work. On the ruins of the ancient regime they intended to erect a new constitution.

The Cahiers of the Three Orders

The memorials of grievances drawn up by the three orders furnished them with a natural basis.[34] On several points these memorials were almost unanimous. A division of powers, such as England practiced and such as Montesquieu had extolled; administrative decentralization by suppression of the intendants, of internal customs taxes and of all hindrances to commerce and industry: such were the wishes on which the nobility and the clergy agreed with the Third Estate. But the nobility and the Third Estate differed on the way the taxes should be assessed; and the clergy differed from both by the preponderant place it gave to religion in the social organization.

The Clergy

A capital importance was attached to the memorials of the clergy because of the gravity of their wording and the loftiness of their general inspiration. An attentive study of them reveals the deepest and truest thought of the nation at the close of the eighteenth century. In certain particularly vibrant expressions, we feel the very heart of France beating, as it were, with all the passions then agitating it.

The clergy seemed to be unconcerned with defending the

[34] The most complete publication regarding the cahiers of the States General is that issued in 1875 by Madival and Laurent. It appeared first in the *Archives parlementaires,* then separately in six quarto volumes and a seventh volume of tables. The Constituent Assembly ignored most of the cahiers, having under its eyes only the general summary (by Prudhomme and Laurent de Mézières), which was tendentious. Even today we do not possess a complete publication except for ten provinces. See Edme Champion, *La France d'après les cahiers de 1789* (3rd ed., 1907). Cf. Vialay, *Les cahiers de doléances du tiers état en 1789* (1910).

political aspect of the ancient regime. Periodical meetings of the States General, the development of provincial assemblies, and the abolition of *lettres de cachet* formed the program of a liberal political constitution which was not opposed in any of the clergy's memorials. Sometimes a favorable echo of such proposals is found therein.[35] Apparently the clergy were resigned to the fall, not of the monarchy—on the contrary, they asked for its continuance—but of the political part of the ancient regime. What aroused the clergy's solicitude was the danger to the Catholic faith by the growth of unbelief, the corruption of morals, and the lack of zeal in too many priests. The clergy of the Amiens district proposed that an inspection service of publications should be organized under the direction of a commission composed of an upright magistrate, an incorruptible man of letters, and an exact theologian. A certain district of the Midi proposed, as an antidote to the publications of unbelief, the widespread circulation of a popular explanation of Catholic doctrine. Many memorials asked for a closer organization of the clergy by the establishment of diocesan synods and provincial councils and by the formation of special schools of preaching where the young priests would be trained in public speaking.

The demands of the clergy for the maintenance of their rights was not without a certain sharpness of expression which they make no attempt to hide. These complaints were evidently discussed, sometimes in stormy sessions, by men who suffered from the social disorder. Where the influence of the upper clergy prevailed, the memorials recall: "with a haughtiness mingled with uneasiness, that the clergy is the first order of the

[35] Bishop de Chabot of Saint-Claude, in the assembly of the Aval bailiwick, demanded equality of taxation, the suppression of mortmain, and the reform of the constitution. Cf. A. Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français*, p. 107. Bishop de La Luzerne of Langres spoke out clearly against absolute power, saying: "It is dangerous that there should be only one power in a great nation; for, if this sole power is that of the sovereign, it will degenerate into despotism." *Ibid.*

state. The demand is the more insistent as it shelters itself behind the cause of God." [36] When the influence of the lower clergy is dominant, the expressions of grievances sometimes have a vague accent of revolt. Almost everywhere, in the north as well as in the south, in the east as in the west, the curés are plainly rising up against an old edict that gave the bishop the right to impose on his priests a three-month internment in a seminary. Many of the memorials ask that henceforth access to ecclesiastical dignities should be by way of concursus, conditions of age and of length of time in the priesthood. "This desire was altogether just. But the request was anonymous only in appearance. In the eyes of those who framed it, the petition had in mind a definite person, the bishop appointed at too early an age, the vicar general who is utterly ignorant, and the canon promoted at the age of twenty-five, who at that early age began a life of repose." [37]

In many places the bishops made reservations in their memorials. The Bishop of Amiens expressed the fear that the Estates General would contain too few prelates and that the religious questions would be discussed without competence. The Bishop of Evreux protested against the spirit of cabal and insubordination on the part of the curés at the assembly over which he presided. He declared: "Justice cannot mean that a class should exist which, by the superiority of thirty votes against one, would overwhelm the rest." He railed at the presumption of the curés, who, in drawing up of the memorials, prided themselves on being "administrators, jurists, and men of finance." [38]

We should note a curious fact, one that gives us a glimpse of the clergy of France as representative of the whole nation. The acrimony, the rancour, and the half-suppressed rivalries

[36] De La Gorce, *Histoire de la Révolution française*, I, 98.
[37] *Ibid.*, I, 100.
[38] *Archives nationales.* Cf. *ibid.*, I, 101; Mathiez, p. 104.

that show through here and there in the documents of this period between the different classes of society do not hinder the touching and sometimes naive unanimity with which prelates and curés ask for whatever can improve the lot of their flocks. A breath of Christian philanthropy pervades these memorials of the clergy of France. In these they request a greater number of asylums for the aged, schools, relief offices, and free distribution of medicine in the country districts. The clergy of Charolles, demanding the maintenance of the monks, emphasize that they are useful for "the relief of families." [39] Everywhere a reaction is manifested against the excessive centralization of the ancient regime. A wish is expressed that the money of the provinces should be spent where it is produced and that the offices and dignities be reserved to people of the district.[40] Everywhere also appear the words "liberty, reform, fraternity, nation, and equality." The frequency of these terms indicates a fermentation of ideas in which the spirit of Christianity and that of the eighteenth-century philosophy are strangely mingled.[41]

The theorists of the Assembly intended to establish the basis of the French constitution on these general ideas, which were often ambiguous. Unfortunately they interpreted these ideas in the sense of the rationalist philosophy. The men who succeeded them almost always applied these ideas in a spirit hostile to the Catholic Church. Thus the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which, in the minds of its authors, was to be merely the philosophy of the cahiers of the three orders, became in fact the starting point of measures of persecution taken against religion.[42]

[39] Mavidal and Laurent, II, 614.

[40] Grille, *Tableau comparatif des mandats et pouvoirs donnés en 1789 aux représentants de la nation* (1826), Vol. II, *passim.*

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] Barnave, for instance, on the sole basis of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, asked for the suppression of the religious orders. The Legislative Assembly would take the same basis to proclaim divorce.

The Three Principles of the Declaration

In its first session the Assembly decided that the new constitution, in imitation of the American Constitution, should be preceded by a declaration of principles. On August 19, Abbé Sieyès presented a project which "was found too metaphysical by most of the speakers." [43] The meetings on the following days were devoted to the discussion of several other projects. Two philosophical currents then appeared. But the constitutional school, which was connected with Montesquieu and which was represented by Mounier, Lally-Tollendal, Clermont-Tonnerre, and Necker, tried unsuccessfully to have adopted a realistic and moderate policy. The democratic school of Rousseau, defended by Sieyès [44] and Mirabeau, soon won over the majority of the Assembly to its abstract and systematic theories. Says Condorcet: "The method of the mathematical sciences opened new avenues for the political and social sciences." [45] The lawmakers of 1789 seemed to be inspired by this maxim. On August 23, "in the presence of the Supreme Being and under His auspices," there was published the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. This decree had a preamble, which Mirabeau declared to be his work, and seventeen articles. Of these the first three were inspired by Lafayette.[46] These three articles, containing all the essential provisions, from which all the others could be logically deduced, may be summed up in these three words, which express Rousseau's *Contrat social:* liberty, equality, and sovereignty of the people.

Article 1 says: "Men are born and remain free and equal before the law." The most orthodox theologians had long since

[43] Prudhomme, *Les Révolutions de Paris,* no. 6, p. 36.

[44] Sieyès always denied that he belonged to the school of Rousseau, but he continually got his inspiration from the spirit of the *Contrat social.*

[45] Condorcet, *Tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain,* tenth epoch.

[46] Prudhomme, *op. cit.,* no. 6, p. 37.

proclaimed that "all men are equal in nature and that, by nature, no one is either inferior or superior"; but they had been careful to add that the community has received from God the right to transfer the power to one or to many, who will then command each one in the name of God.[47] The revolutionary declaration, on the contrary, seemed to proclaim the primitive liberty and equality as something inalienable.

Article 3 says: "The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation." Cardinal Bellarmine had taught, in the sixteenth century, that "the public power resides immediately in the multitude as its subject." This doctrine, taught by most scholastic authors, rested on the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas. But the learned Jesuit denied that such a principle implied for the people the perpetual right of revolt.[48] This right is indeed what the lawmakers of 1789, after the example of Rousseau, seemed to affirm.

The radical error, suited to give a revolutionary meaning to the three words, "liberty, equality, popular sovereignty," was found in article 2, restricting the purpose of any political association to the preservation of the natural and inalienable rights of man. Both the whole Catholic school of thought and tradition taught that the purpose of civil society is to assist man, within the sphere of his temporal interests, to accomplish his duties toward God and toward his fellow men. Mirabeau himself, supported by the Jansenist Camus, spoke right when, presenting a project in nineteen articles "intended to establish

[47] *Compendium Salmanticense,* tract. III, *De legibus,* cap. 2, punctum 1, inq. 2. St. Gregory the Great wrote: "Since our Redeemer, the Maker of every creature, vouchsafed to assume human flesh for this end, that . . . He might restore us to pristine liberty, it is a salutary deed if men whom nature originally produced free, and whom the law of nations has subjected to the yoke of slavery, be restored by the benefit of manumission to the liberty in which they were born." *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (1895), XII, 191. Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* III, 105.

[48] On this subject, see Mourret, *op. cit.,* V, 631 f. As regards St. Thomas, see *ibid.,* p. 84.

reason and perfect human liberty," he declared: "What we need to proclaim is not the declaration of rights, but the declaration of duties." [49]

Less realist on this point than the fiery orator, and more reliant on the wise interpretation of a declaration drawn up "in the presence of the Supreme Being and under His auspices," the members of the clergy did not discern clearly enough the dangers of the formulas they were asked to subscribe to. All of them agreed to these formulas without any thought of making a schism.[50] We have seen Christian kings, in a respectful sense and one not excluding the rights of God and the Church, apply this formula of the jurists, likewise unacceptable in its literal sense, namely, that "the good pleasure of the king has the force of law." [51] Events would soon dispel these illusions.

Development of Anarchy

The proclamation of the rights of man, interpreted in the individualist and rationalist sense which Rousseau's philosophy gave it, was certain to favor the development of the ferments of anarchy which we have already seen appear in the first days of the Constituent Assembly.

The very day when the Declaration was published, the journalist Prudhomme remarked in his paper that the sixty dis-

[49] Mirabeau saw the essential defect of the *Contrat social.* He wrote: "Man is truly man only when society begins to organize itself." On this subject see Faguet, *XVIII^e siècle,* p. 497. On the Declaration of the Rights of Man see Godard, *Les principes de 89 et la doctrine catholique,* and Emile Keller, *Le Syllabus et les principes de 89.*

[50] So said Father Emery. See Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 448.

[51] *Quidquid placuit Principi, legis habet vigorem.* Cf. Funck-Brentano, "La popularité et le 'bon plaisir' du roi" in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (October 15, 1911, pp. 926–33). However, since Louis XIV the absolutism was hardly any longer in the person of the king. He found himself in a system, with the king its chief slave. "Slave of his court," wrote Madelin, "slave of his minister and of tradition, the king sometimes aspired to freedom more than his subjects did." L. Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 4.

tricts of Paris, formed to replace parish boundaries, considered themselves independent authorities, assuming legislative functions and revoking decrees that did not satisfy them. In conclusion he said: "Such are the causes of the anarchy into which we are plunged. Each day aggravates our situation in this respect." [52] Besides the district committees, the clubs and the Masonic lodges also took the initiative into their own hands. Gustave Bord has shown that, as early as the beginning of 1789, the following were Masonic societies, at least through affiliation of their most influential members: the *Société du Port,* whose leading member was Lafayette; the *Société Bergasse,* which paid the expenses of publishing Brissot's pamphlets; the *Société de Viroflay,* which, according to Lameth's Masonic expression, labored "for the progress of lights"; and especially the *Club breton,* the future *Club des jacobins,* which already was preaching "a cavern policy."

About these associations certain more or less spontaneous clubs and groups of wretched men, embittered by misery, provoked frequent alarms. "From the 14th of July, the ministry was dominated by the Assembly; the Assembly, by the clubs; the clubs, by the demagogues; the demagogues, by the armed populace, fanatical and starving, which they thought they were leading but which in reality was driving them before it." [53]

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen merely fanned the fire of these revolutionary undertakings. Basing the entire social organization on the single protection of individual independence, the Declaration intoxicated the "citizens" with their own might. "The divine right of the crowds," according to the words of a certain psychologist, "then pretended to replace the divine right of kings." [54] On

[52] Prudhomme, *Révolutions de Paris,* no. 7, pp. 7–9. Cf. *Avant-Moniteur* (made up chiefly of Bailly's *Mémoires*), VII, 9. See Ernest Mellié, *Les sections de Paris pendant la Révolution française.*

[53] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* II, 4.

[54] Gustave Le Bon, *La psychologie des foules,* p. 3.

August 24, Bailly wrote in his *Mémoires:* "Today the distribution of bread was most painful. . . . An uprising of the workmen of Montmartre was feared." [55] The preceding day, Prudhomme wrote in his paper: "We have been free for only one day. Shortly the districts will be peopled only with slaves, and the committees will be composed only of tyrants." [56]

A sort of feverish excitement stirred the man of the people as well as the bourgeois and accompanied him even in the common pastimes of his daily life. In the paper having the widest circulation at that time, under date of August 25, 1789, we read: "At Paris they are having the visit of the paintings on exhibition at the Louvre. The number of visitors is smaller than in preceding years. In fact, the allegories of love, the portraits of courtiers, the flatteries of slaves, all these are of little interest to us. Henceforth Brutus, pronouncing the death of his son, or Decius, dying for his country, are subjects that will appeal to us." [57]

Four Destructions

In the presence of such a disorganization and such a state of effervescence, four traditional powers, if wisely restored, might have effectively withstood the rising flood of anarchy. These controlling factors were the royal power, the authority of the judiciary bodies, the influence of the professional corporations, and the ascendancy of the clergy, regular and secular. The Assembly strove to destroy each of these forces, one after the other.

Here we shall do no more than summarily recall how the first three destructions were accomplished. In the presence of the

[55] *Avant-Moniteur,* p. civ.

[56] Prudhomme, *op. cit.,* no. 7, p. 11. The avowal is notable. In preaching man's duties, the gospel had trained free souls; in proclaiming only man's rights, the Revolution was preparing slaves and tyrants.

[57] *Ibid.,* no. 7, p. 18.

constitutional projects that practically annihilated the royal power, Bailly wrote, under date of August 28: "It seems to me that the result of the constitution is a democratic monarchy or a royal democracy." [58]

At the side of kings, the parliaments had constituted very potent powers. A law of November 3, 1789, decreed their adjournment *sine die,* and these "sovereign courts," as they were called, which more than once had dared to withstand the might of kings and even that of the popes, let themselves be dissolved. Some of them did so after a few vain protests; others, as the parliament at Toulouse, deplored "the irresistible force of circumstances." Persons might have said that they felt themselves powerless in the presence of a revolutionary movement which they had favored in spite of themselves by their principles and often by their attitude.

The corporations of arts and crafts were also a strong social force. For the working classes they constituted a sort of nobility, sometimes hereditary, which gave the profession and the individual a dignity they were rightly proud of. But in 1789 these corporations went through a hard crisis. A royal edict of 1776 had reorganized them according to a plan that quite changed them. The edict established, besides the organized professions, free professions, admitted women to the mastership, lowered by two-thirds, sometimes by three-fourths, the payments for admission, and provided for the election of the administrators and syndics, thereafter assisted by a permanent council. "We may well believe that if the time should have come to consolidate the work of the royal edict, the societies would have acquired the unity and cohesion that had been the strength

[58] *Avant-Moniteur,* p. cvi. In the declaration the democratic school of Rousseau prevailed. But in the constitution the constitutional school of Montesquieu guided the provisions. Hence resulted a contradictory dualism, which was expressed by the formula of the letters patent: "Louis, by the grace of God and by the constitutional law of the state, King of the French." But little by little the King will be disarmed, and the nation will be provided with formidable weapons.

of their predecessors, and this without deserving the same criticism or falling into the same abuses." [59] Unhappily they had not emerged from their period of transition when the Revolution broke out. Unable to reorganize themselves amid the ceaseless disturbances, they found themselves actually destroyed when (June 14, 1791) the Le Chapelier law suppressed them legally, forbidding workmen to "form regulations about their so-called common interests."

One institution remained, the Church, with its immense religious ascendancy and its undeniable power. By its vast possessions, valued at 3,000,000,000 francs,[60] it had continually remained in permanent contact with the people. Its great monasteries and the sumptuous palaces of its bishops, not only imposed respect by their massiveness or their fine architecture, but also had poured out, in times of distress, the most generous alms. And the little curacies and humble chaplaincies, where poor priests courageously shared the hard life of the populations to whom they ministered, had made the influence of the Church reach into the remotest country districts.

Three important decrees of the Constituent Assembly aimed at destroying that power. By the decree of November 2, 1789, which placed all ecclesiastical property at the disposal of the nation, by that of February 13, 1790, which suppressed the vows of religion, and by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (July 12, 1790), which made even the ministry of the clergy dependent on the state, the Constituent Assembly did not fear to attack this last rampart of the Christian faith, of the social order, and of true liberty.

[59] Martin Saint-Léon, *Histoire des corporations,* p. 593.

[60] According to Chasset's report, the clergy possessed a fifth of the landed property. *Moniteur,* I, 412. De La Gorce says 2,992,538,400 livres. "After examining the different evidences," writes Madelin, "we must grant that De La Gorce is right. The annual revenue was 85,000,000 francs. But this sum was almost doubled by the tithes, which amounted to about 80,000,000 francs." Louis Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 6.

Church Property

Of course, since the formation of the National Assembly the clergy no longer existed as the first order of the state. But its immense landed possessions might, so it was said, render it formidable. Moreover, on this point as on many other points, the jurists and the philosophers of the ancient regime had prepared for the Revolution. In 1749 an edict forbade any bequest in favor of the Church and decided that acquisitions by gift or with any obligation attached would not be valid except by special authorization.[61] In the *Encyclopedia,* Turgot proclaimed the right of the government, for reasons of public utility, to suppress all foundations.[62] In certain districts the lower clergy vaguely adopted these views, declaring that small ecclesiastical properties were sacred and inalienable, and letting it be understood that the same restriction did not apply absolutely to large properties.

On August 6, following the generous sacrifice which the clergy had just made of the revenues, one of the deputies, Buzot, ventured this remark: "I hold that all ecclesiastical property belongs to the nation." Two days later Marquis de La Coste repeated the same thing. But these words did not then find any response. Public opinion was not ready for an immediate spoliation. Three months afterward, when the question was put clearly before the representatives of the nation, even those who most eagerly desired the ruin of the Church or its political subjection to the civil power had to avoid so shocking an expression of their views. They enveloped their thought in clever circumlocutions. To obtain the votes of the other members they will be obliged to offer reasons of a political and economic order.

[61] Isambert, *Anciennes lois françaises,* XXII, 226. Louis XIV said in his *Mémoires:* "The kings are absolute lords of all the goods, whether of seculars or of ecclesiastics, to use them according to the needs of the state."

[62] Under the word *Fondations,* VII, 75.

The Assembly was divided into committees. The formation of an ecclesiastical committee showed from the start the desire to give a large place to the religious questions. But the composition of this committee gave reason to fear that these questions would be settled only in a Jansenist, Gallican, and rationalist sense. The committee had eleven members, six of them lawyers. Among these we find four men already known for their opposition to the Roman doctrines: Durand de Maillane, Lanjuinais, Treilhard, and Martineau.

Durand, born at Saint-Rémy in Provence in 1729, had been a lawyer in the Aix parliament. His reputation was that of an honest and learned magistrate, and his name was well known to the public by a commentary, published in 1771, on Pierre Pithou's articles concerning the Gallican liberties, and by several works on canon law. In these writings the doctrines of the most radical Gallicanism were plainly professed. Canon law was also the subject to which the lawyer Lanjuinais applied himself particularly. In the two Latin works that he wrote on canon law, according to the testimony of his son Victor, "his sole desire was to revive the faith by a return to the discipline of the first centuries."

Less scholarly than Durand de Maillane, but a man of no less probity and austerity, Lanjuinais, descended from an old Breton family, would show throughout his life, in defense of his ideas, the proverbial tenacity of the people of Brittany. We shall see him in the Convention, during the uprising of May 31, 1793, after being thrown down from the rostrum, mount it again and cling there amid pistols and fisticuffs. John Baptist Treilhard, son of a sculptor of Brives, unlike Durand and Lanjuinais, did not profess an austere Christianity. Rather his ideas attached him to irreligious philosophy. His uncouth appearance, his slow and at first hesitant manner of speech, were not in his favor. But his deep knowledge of affairs and his remarkable suppleness of mind would soon win for him a par-

ticular influence in the committee and in the assembly. The Parisian lawyer Martineau had the reputation of being an active, hard-working, and scholarly man, who openly professed the purest Catholic faith. His Jansenism seems to have been beyond doubt.[63] On this point we have precise evidence, not only in the testimony of his contemporaries [64] and in his own explicit approval of the official journal of Jansenism,[65] but also in the very text of his report and discourses. The influence of these four men, in whom the Gallican spirit, the Jansenist spirit, and the philosophical spirit of the age were fused in their defiance of Rome and in their jealous attachment to so-called national liberties, would be decisive in the revolutionary legislation regarding the clergy.

Talleyrand

But the person who, in the Assembly, brought up the question of ecclesiastical property was not one of these men. That role would belong to a member of the frivolous society of the eighteenth century, to a member of the upper clergy and the high nobility, Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, bishop of Autun. Nothing seemed to designate Maurice de Talleyrand for this audacious project. "Formerly as general agent of the clergy,[66] he had proclaimed the domain of the Church inalienable. At the beginning of the States General he had backed the court, advised resistance, and only later on rallied to the National Assembly. The devastation that followed July 14 reached

[63] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[64] See Abbé de Bonneval's testimony in *Etudes* for April 20, 1907, pp. 263, 267.

[65] "Martineau's report was strongly applauded. . . . Nothing could be more judicious or more conformable to the spirit of the Church." *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* of July 24, 1790, pp. 117–19.

[66] The general agents of the clergy, instituted at the close of the sixteenth century, were the permanent delegates of the clergy to the royal authority. They were in continual correspondence with the dioceses. On this important institution, see L. Serbat, *Les Assemblées du clergé de France,* pp. 178–89.

him even in his personal interests: the Sénozan château, one of the finest in the Mâconnais district, which was burned down on July 28, was a possession of his family." [67] But the later events made him give more and more significant approval to the new ideas. Chosen a member of the constitution committee along with Sieyès, Mounier, and Lally-Tollendal, he had, by virtue of his position, taken an active part in the formulation of the famous Declaration of the Rights of Man. A priest without a sacerdotal vocation,[68] Talleyrand was advanced to the episcopacy by reason of his administrative services and in spite of the notorious disorder of his morals. He was more daring than deep, indifferent to the means employed and almost to the purpose intended, if only he found some personal success therein.[69] His complete change of attitude, which would be followed by many other such changes during the rest of his life,[70] was not otherwise mysterious. The cause of the ancient

[67] De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 140. Cf. Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France*, II, 129 ff.; Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionel*, p. 217; Bernard de Lacombe, *Talleyrand, évêque d'Autun.*

[68] "My parents, according to what they considered a family interest, decided to lead me to a state of life for which I showed no disposition." Talleyrand, *Mémoires* (published by Duke de Broglie, 1891), I, 16. Talleyrand reveals the depth of his soul and the mentality of the age when, a little further on, he writes; "Youth is the period of life when a person has the greatest uprightness. I did not yet understand what it was to enter into a state of life with the intention of following another, to go to the seminary for the purpose of becoming minister of finance. . . . But I had no means of defense; my entire surroundings had ready-made answers for all my objections. My weary spirit resigned itself: I let myself be brought to the seminary of St. Sulpice." *Ibid.*, p. 19. Count de Choiseul relates that, being at Talleyrand's house the evening before the latter's ordination to the priesthood, he found him in a violent state of interior struggle, of tears and despair. The Count then made every effort to dissuade him from going on. But Talleyrand's fear of his mother and of a public sensation at his tardy change of mind, as also a false shame, deprived him of courage. He exclaimed: "It is too late for me to withdraw." Note of M. de Bacour, inserted in Talleyrand's *Mémoires* by Duke de Broglie, I, 23.

[69] Guizot, *Mémoires*, I, 37.

[70] On Talleyrand's conversion shortly before his death, see Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, I, 234–58. Cf. Baron de Nervo, *La conversion de Talleyrand*, and the *Mémoires de Talleyrand* (edited by Duke de Broglie), V, 482–84.

regime now appeared to him to be lost. Having nothing to hope from it, he separated from it with a grand flourish and gave himself unreservedly to the movement of the future. The more his antecedents made him an object of suspicion, the more striking must now be his pledge to the victorious party.

On October 10 the Bishop of Autun, with that slow and jerky step which lost nothing of its distinction because of a slight lameness, mounted the parliamentary rostrum. He then read a bill directing the sale of all the landed property of the clergy for the benefit of the state, the state being charged with assuring the subsistence of the pillaged ecclesiastics. As we learn from contemporary witnesses, the gentleman prelate with a flexible and almost caressing voice, delivered a fatal blow to the Church, of which he was one of the high dignitaries.

His arguments were chiefly of a financial sort; the economic situation of France was indeed almost desperate. In spite of Mirabeau's eloquent apostrophe: "Bankruptcy is at your gate . . . and still you deliberate," two loans, one of 30,000,000 francs and the other of 80,000,000 had not been subscribed; the "patriotic contribution of a fourth" of the revenue had produced nothing. But the debt rose to a billion and a half francs. After enumerating the resources that seemed to him insufficient, the Bishop of Autun added:

> An immense resource remains, one that does not violate rights of ownership; the property of the clergy. . . . The clergy are not owners after the manner of other owners. . . . The portion of these goods required for the decent sustenance of the clergy is all that belongs to them; the rest is the property of the temples and the poor. If, then, the nation reserves an honorable subsistence to each holder of a benefice, of whatever nature, this policy is sure not to infringe any true ownership. By assuming responsibility for administering the rest, and by fulfilling the obligations attached to it—such as the support of hospitals and of charitable workshops, the repair of church edifices—the

intentions of the founders will be carried out, and every demand of justice will be strictly observed.

The Assembly seemed to be impressed by this clever sophism. Then De Boisgelin arose. In less elegant language but in a graver tone and loftier attitude, he rightly noted that the goods had been given, not to the Church, but to various institutions —abbeys, curacies, hospitals, colleges—for precise purposes. A few days later the Archbishop of Aix again mounted the rostrum to offer, in the name of his order, a sum of 400,000,000 francs to hypothecate on the ecclesiastical property. The financial argument fell of itself, and all the prejudices against the so-called selfishness of the clergy should have fallen at the same time.

A deputy from Rennes, La Chapelier by name, then resolutely placed the question on the political terrain. According to him, the important thing was not so much to balance the finances of France, but rather to prevent the political preponderance of the clergy. "You wished to destroy the orders," he declared, "because their destruction was necessary for the security of the state. If the clergy keeps its property, the clerical order is not destroyed. The clergy offer gifts. Be suspicious of this pledge. The clergy wish to rise from their ashes that they may again form themselves into an order." To cut short this so-called peril, Mirabeau for a moment entertained the idea of having the nation proclaimed the proprietor of the goods of the clergy. But the step was too radical. It stirred lively protests.

Abbé Maury

The most eloquent objection was that of Abbé Maury. Disclosing the secret influences that were affecting many of his fellow deputies, he showed that the proposed measure would be the triumph of the speculators. He pointed out that these

men were accustomed to profit from the ills of the state, "speculating on the ruin of the clergy, silently waiting for this rich prey that was being prepared for them, devouring these properties in advance, watching impatiently for the time when the sale of Church property, by raising the value of the government securities, would thereupon suddenly increase their fortune." [71]

Maury next denounced the harmful consequences, social, religious, and political, that would follow the spoliation of the clergy. He said:

> We have usurped nobody's possessions. Our possessions belong to us because we have acquired them or because they have been given to us. . . . But ownership is one, and is as sacred for us as it is for you. Our right of ownership guarantees yours. We can produce the titles of our acquisitions. We came into them under the express authorization of the laws. . . . If the nation can go back to the origin of society to strip us of our possessions, recognized and protected by the laws for fourteen centuries, this new metaphysical principle will lead to all the insurrections of the agrarian law; the people will take advantage of the chaos to demand the partition of your possessions.

But will not religion recover its ancient purity in consequence of this spoliation? Not at all, said the orator. "The public worship will be compromised if it depends on a declining and uncertain salary. Soon irreligion and cupidity will reduce the price of these functions and will seek the least costly worship and will finally come to the suppression of any worship at all." Maury concluded his solid and brilliant address, one of the finest masterpieces of parliamentary eloquence, by showing "the kingdom given over to anarchy and soon learning from its disasters this great truth, that political order rests on religion and that the ministers of public worship are the only ones who can truly voice the sentiments of the people." He finally pointed to the Kingdom of England, which, "after usurp-

[71] Picot, *op. cit.*, V, 389.

ing the possessions of the richest dioceses and chapters of Europe, was obliged to replace the alms of the clergy by the taxation of the poor." [72]

The discussion was interrupted by the removal of the Assembly from Versailles to Paris, where it was resumed under more unfavorable conditions. To the disorder resulting from the large number of members, the vast size of the assembly chamber, and the general tense excitement of men's minds, were added the disorders provoked by the frequent invasion of the hall by the mob. In fact, from the time of their installation at Paris, the members of the Constituent Assembly were almost continually under the insolent control and sometimes the threatening influence of the clubs, the district committees, and the unorganized mobs, which disturbed the deliberations by their applause or their hoots, hindering or dictating the laws according to their passions or their whims.

Before dawn on November 2, the day when the discussion was to close, the Assembly hall was surrounded by a riotous populace. But Mirabeau, who was never without a clear-sighted political sense, recoiled before the rejection of his first proposal. He abandoned the hope of seeing the Assembly decree that the goods of the clergy were the property of the nation. The proposed decree said: "The National Assembly decrees that all ecclesiastical goods are at the disposal of the nation." [73] In this form the decree was passed by a vote of 368 to 346. Forty

[72] Maury, *Œuvres choisies,* III, 380. Le Chapelier had said: "The clergy exercises but a sterile and perilous charity. The nation, on the contrary, will establish in its houses of prayer and of repose some workshops useful to the state, where the poor man will find his subsistence by work. No longer will we have wretches except those who wish to be so."

[73] These goods were placed at the disposal of the nation, which assumed the following obligations: 1. that suitable provision be made for the expenses of public worship, the support of its ministers, and the relief of the poor, under the watchfulness and according to the instructions of the parishes; 2. that, in the arrangements for providing suitable support of the ministers of religion, no pastor of souls shall be allotted less than 1,200 livres a year, besides living accommodations and the gardens attached thereto."

members present abstained from voting. Three hundred deputies, almost the whole right and center, frightened by the uprising, did not attend the session.

The new wording of the measure removed much of the opposition. The next day one of the most intelligent members of the minority, Boisgelin, wrote as follows to the Countess de Gramont: "I have won three points: 1. The law does not state that the property belongs to the nation, but merely that the goods of the clergy are at the disposal of the nation; 2. in the views expressed, the idea of alienation was given up; 3. and also the idea of government administration of this property." Yet in the same letter the Archbishop of Aix also said: "The cause of the clergy is lost." [74]

He wrote truly. Laws are of avail less by their wording than by the spirit in which those words are applied. In fact, Mirabeau's second formula was considered equivalent to the first.

The decree of November 2, by placing the ecclesiastical possessions "at the disposal of the nation," did not regulate the measures the government would take in the matter. From November 19, 1790, to March 19, 1793, a series of decrees would mark the progress of the most brutal and complete spoliation.

The simple enumeration of these legislative acts is sadly eloquent. On November 19, the property valued at 400,000,000 francs was put on sale. Two decrees (April 14 and 16) transferred the administration of these properties from the clergy to the departments or the districts. A month later the procedure to be followed was made precise: with a view to facilitating the operations, the purchasers could enter into possession after a down payment which, in the case of rural real estate, must be merely one-twelfth.

But this alienation of 400,000,000 francs' worth of property was soon judged insufficient. Subsequent decrees (June 24, 26,

[74] Quoted by Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante*, p. 85.

29, and July 9) ordered the total sale, except of property belonging to the fabrics (church boards), colleges, seminaries, and hospitals. This exception, however, was not of long duration. The Constituent Assembly decided (May 6, 1791) on the sale of the suppressed churches. The Legislative Assembly and the Convention decreed as follows: (July 19, 1792) the sale of the episcopal palaces; (July 31 and August 7) the sale of houses occupied by the religious; (August 19) the sale of the property of the fabrics; (March 8, 1793) the sale of the possessions of all ecclesiastical establishments of public education; (March 19) the property of the hospitals. This series of enactments brought about the destruction of a large number of works of social welfare, but it did not succeed in balancing the budget. However, the men of the Revolution could tell themselves that the influence of the clergy as a political body was indeed ruined at its very foundation and that a multitude of purchasers of ecclesiastical property was henceforth closely bound to the cause of the Revolution by their own material interests.[75]

The way these decrees were applied added to their odious character. In some provinces the peasants and the bourgeois pounced upon the ecclesiastical property with scandalous avidity. The most shameful speculation became involved in the affair. The sale of these properties was combined with that of the possessions of the *émigrés*. A sudden drop in the price of landed property took place. Immense estates were sold at ridiculously low prices. One day someone said to Mirabeau: "You cannot sell all these lands at one time." "Very well," he replied, "we will give them away." The people, fascinated at the sight of so much property being put on sale, were the victims of almost incredible illusions. We are told that in the Aisne a

[75] On January 10, Thomas Lindet wrote: "The assignats will soon be scattered. Their holders will, in spite of themselves, become defenders of the Revolution." "This operation," said the reporter of the law, "is going to bind all the citizens to the public interests." Cf. Madelin, *La Révolution*, p. 121.

hairdresser bought an immense domain belonging to the Abbey of Saint-Quentin-en-l'Ile; a baker purchased two large properties of Saint-Nicholas-aux-Bois. What happened then? Generally these purchasers were unable to furnish even the first payment of a twelfth as required before entering into possession. At this point the speculator slipped in. He replaced the insolvent purchaser by a second insolvent one, then by a third. By means of fictitious purchasers he continued to lower the price. Finally, at the favorable moment, he himself appeared as purchaser and profited by the depreciation of the property value. Such was a man named Marlier who, from February to December, 1791, counted no less than 197 transactions in his name. These purchases amounted to more than 2,000,000 francs.[76]

We need not say that the state finances were not benefited by these operations. Maury exclaimed: "A person does not inherit from those he murders." Yet the majority of the Constituent Assembly had instituted a "bank of extraordinary deposits" to receive the proceeds of these alienations. This bank was authorized to issue, pending the receipt of the funds, "assignats" guaranteed by the proceeds from the sale of the national properties. We know the discredit that befell these promissory notes, a debacle recalling that of Law.[77] As for the clergy, reduced to the receipt of an indemnity which Burke called "miserable," they presently felt their prestige lessened by the condition of a salaried official to which the government reduced them. Bishop Le Mintier of Tréguier declared: "The Church has fallen into servitude; its ministers are threatened

[76] Abbé Sicard, "La spoliation du clergé sous la Révolution," *Correspondant* (October 10, 1911). At the abbey of Dammartin, of the Premonstratensian Order, in the diocese of Aurens, a scandalous scene occurred. From the neighboring villages the peasants precipitated themselves on the place to pillage and destroy everything. At Saint-Omer the reredos of the high altar of St. Bertin's church, painted by Memling, was bought by a baker for a few cents.

[77] Cf. Pisani, *op. cit.*, I, 136.

with being reduced to the condition of appointed commissioners." Maury's eloquent predictions and Boisgelin's sad presentiments were fully realized.[78]

The Religious Orders

The Assembly had undertaken to reduce the secular clergy to the condition of salaried employees of the state. It tried to make the regular clergy simply pensioners of the state.

In attempting to regulate the religious orders, the Constituent Assembly could appeal to some precedents in the ancient regime. Apart from the measures taken against the Society of Jesus,[79] the King's Council (May 26, 1765) had appointed a commission of five prelates and five state councilors and entrusted to them the strange mission of reforming all the religious communities of men in the Kingdom. This commission prepared an ordinance (March 24, 1768) which decided: 1. that the age for vows would be set at twenty years for men, eighteen for women; 2. that all the religious must be French; 3. that not more than two houses of the same order can be in one city; 4. that each monastery must have at least fifteen religious. This commission, called the Commission of Regulars, functioned from 1768 to 1790; and the decree of March 24 was not a dead letter. In 1790 it had suppressed nine congregations,[80]

[78] The question of the sale of the national properties has been the object of an open concursus by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. Three of the crowned *mémoires* appeared in 1908. They are: Marcel Marcon, *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution;* G. Lecarpentier, *La vente des biens ecclésiastiques pendant la Révolution;* A. Vialay, *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution.* On the same subject, see an article by M. de Lanzac de Laborie in the *Correspondant* (December 25, 1908); that by E. Sicard in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* (July, 1906).

[79] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.*, VI, Index.

[80] C. Gérin, "Les monastères franciscains et la commission des réguliers," *Revue des questions historiques,* XVIII (1875), 88. Cf. Prat, *Essai historique sur la destruction des ordres religieux en France au XVIII^e siècle.*

and the four orders that followed the rule of St. Francis of Assisi had lost 3,756 professed members.[81]

In some monasteries where regular observance had become lax, the religious were quite agreeable to the secularization measures. On September 26, 1789, a representative read to the Assembly an amazing letter, signed by thirteen Cluny monks living in the monastery of Saint-Martin-des-Champs at Paris. After offering to transfer the property of their monastery to the possession of the state in return for the assurance of an annual pension of 1,500 francs, they expressed "their desire for liberty, which they wished to enjoy like other Frenchmen." The official account of this session of the Assembly states that the Assembly "has gratefully received these proofs of patriotism." [82] A month later (October 25) a committee reported to the Assembly about letters written by two monks and by one nun, protesting against perpetual vows. Then a law was passed declaring that "all taking of vows should be suspended in all monasteries and convents." As the clergy noted at the time, this suspension was tantamount to utter suppression of vows.[83]

One of the chief concerns of the ecclesiastical committee, which (1790) took up the work of the commission on regulars,[84] was to open an inquiry about the situation of the religious orders in France. The calculations of several historians tend to establish the fact that France then counted 60,000 religious of both sexes,[85] with 4,000 religious houses.[86] We find difficulty in expressing with a single phrase the spirit that prevailed in these houses. In one place would be found the most

[81] Gérin, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

[82] Picot, *Mémoires*, V, 381.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 391.

[84] This had been suppressed by Louis XVI.

[85] De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 168; Taine, *Les origines*, I, 321. The men religious were about 25,000; the nuns were about 37,000. We may estimate the secular clergy at about 70,000. France then counted a population of 24,000,000.

[86] Of these houses, 2,489 were for men, 1,500 for women. Taine, *ibid.*

rigorous fervor, as in the Benedictine abbey of Marolles in the diocese of Cambrai. There, upon receiving word that the magistrates would come to question them, the monks solemnly met together, read their formula of profession, and again vowed to live and die in the life they had freely embraced.[87]

In a few monasteries the laxity was scandalous. Such was the Preuilly abbey, where the prior, upon learning of the decree suppressing religious vows, wrote, in the name of his ten monks: "As my fellow monks and I are all zealous partisans of the present Revolution, we await merely the first signal to depart from this house." [88] In many places the good religious were equally without the heroic ardor that is ready to face martyrdom and without the laxity that is ready to desert the cloister. An old monk of Tarascon wished "to end his career in peace." Some, in the style of the time, expressed their "deep concern over being separated from their beloved confreres." As a whole the monks of the ancient regime at first gave an example neither of heroism nor of laxity. But, as though suddenly awakened from their lukewarm tranquillity, many of these religious, who had entered the cloister with a doubtful or unreflecting vocation, showed regrettable hesitation. Soon, in the presence of open persecution, they would feel an awakening of their former languid faith and would then resist even to exile, even to martyrdom. The nuns especially would rise to a degree of heroism worthy of the finest ages of faith.[89]

However, the left wing of the Assembly became impatient with the slowness of the ecclesiastical committee. The fiery opposition of Lanjuinais, Durand de Maillane, and Treilhard against the religious was vigorously countered by the bishops

[87] Documents of the ecclesiastical committee. Quoted by De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 171.

[88] *Ibid.*

[89] This judgment regarding the monastic spirit at the close of the eighteenth century is founded on investigations made by De La Gorce in the *National Archives*, in the documents of the ecclesiastical committee. See De La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 160–79.

of Clermont and Luçon in the committee. On February 4, 1790, on the pretext that the fifteen members of the committee were overburdened with work, Treilhard proposed that the number should be doubled. The fifteen new members, appointed three days later, were almost entirely from the left. The Jacobite spirit was then in the majority.[90] After this manner the right refused to collaborate any longer in the work of the committee. The bishops of Clermont and Luçon withdrew from it. Treilhard, whose determined aim had long been to have the religious orders suppressed, then had free rein. On December 17, during the discussion of the decree applying the 400,000,000 francs' worth of property of the clergy to pay the debts of the state, he proposed that religious vows be no longer recognized, that the monasteries be suppressed, and that pensions be granted to the religious who should wish to leave their monasteries. About a month later he succeeded in having his proposal advanced to its second reading.

The debate was most spirited. Amid murmurs, laughter, and even hooting, Bishop de Bonal of Clermont and Bishop de La Fare of Nancy offered the Assembly the most judicious and lofty reflections. The Bishop of Clermont declared: "The religious who would take advantage of your decree before being authorized to do so by the spiritual authority would be failing in their most sacred obligations. Your decree would be a temptation that is unworthy of you to offer them. . . . A sad philosophy indeed, that would regard as contrary to the rights of man for him to be able to offer his liberty in homage to Him to whom we owe everything. . . . Ought we to cut down a tree that has borne such excellent fruits, on account of a few parasitic branches?" The Bishop of Nancy pointed out that a project which would ultimately increase the financial burden of the state and would disturb the divine worship was condemned both by sound politics and by religion.

[90] Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé*, p. 98.

But the most violent passions were let loose. In the name of the left, Barnave arose and declared that he considered the committee's project too moderate. He proposed to suppress, without reservation or delay, all the monastic orders.[91] In a thundering voice Garat shouted: "I swear that I have never conceived how God can wish to repress in man the first of the goods He has bestowed on him, namely, liberty." [92] These words stirred up a tumult. The right, through the Bishop of Nancy, Count de Cazales, and several others, demanded that "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion be declared the national religion." "Such a proposal," declared Charles de Lameth, "is a conspiracy against the tranquillity of the people." [93] M. de Menon added that the motion by the Bishop of Nancy tended to nothing less than a revival of the wars of religion.[94] Two hours and a half passed in this turmoil. Twice the president's bell was broken.[95]

The decree was passed. It began thus: "Article 1. The National Assembly decrees, as a constitutional article, that the law no longer recognizes solemn monastic vows for either sex. Hence it declares that the orders in which such vows are made are and shall remain suppressed in France, without any such being allowed to be established in the future. Article 2. All individuals of either sex residing in the religious houses will be free to leave them upon making their declaration before the municipal authority of the place." To each mendicant religious that should depart from the cloister was granted 700 francs, 800 francs, or 1,000 francs according to his age. Abbé de Montesquieu had an amendment adopted, which included the Jesuits among the religious of mendicant orders for the purpose

[91] *Moniteur* (February 14, 1790), p. 181.
[92] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[93] *Ibid.*
[94] *Ibid.*, p. 186.
[95] *Mercure de France* (February 20, 1790). Cf. Aulard, *La Révolution française et les Congregations*, p. 16.

of this decree. He said: "You will not refuse your justice to this famous congregation, whose faults have been a problem and whose misfortunes are not a problem." [96] Moreover, religious who should leave their religious house were declared incapable of benefiting by any testamentary provisions; they could receive only pensions or life annuities.[97] This perfidious provision resulted in making the former religious closely dependent on the state. Shortly afterward a new decree showed still more plainly the intentions of the authors of the law. Such former religious as should refuse to take the constitutional oath or who should retract it after taking it, would be deprived of their pension. Thus the lawmaker, after offering a premium for the violation of the oaths which the religious had taken to God and to the Church, penalized, by the privation of their last means of subsistence, the violation of the oaths which they had been obliged to take to the Revolution.

Under these liberal appearances, the law by which the state no longer recognized monastic vows did in fact provoke the ruin of the religious life in France. Of course, the voluntary departure of monks without vocation, for whom the monastic discipline was an ill-tolerated yoke, and the exodus of those who were disturbed by the revolutionary utopias would not have been an evil for the Church of France. But other causes determined the dispersion of the religious. The decree of February 13 had dried up the recruiting of the monasteries. Subsequent decrees (March 20 and 26, 1790, and January 2 and 4, 1791) enacted that the collective properties of the congregations must be absorbed in the national patrimony since these congregations had ceased legally to exist. It was also decided (February 8 and 12, 1791) that all the subjects belonging to any one order should

[96] *Mercure de France* (February 27, 1790).

[97] Picot, *op. cit.*, V, 412. Before the vote was taken, Garat obtained the floor and said: "I declare myself as good a Catholic Apostolic Christian as anyone. . . . And I joyously approve the desire to suppress the religious orders." *Moniteur* (February 15), p. 186.

be gathered together in a single house. This last provision of itself led to several departures, since the houses thus combined by legislative authority had often not the same rules and the same customs. But especially the uncertainty of the future and the evidently provisional character of the asylum offered to the persevering monks prompted several religious to withdraw to their families or to the homes of trustworthy friends, not with a view of abjuring their promises, but, on the contrary, to lead there a life more in conformity with their vows. A certain number resolved to join that courageous party of the clergy which, after refusing to take the oath, exercised their ministry in secret amid continual perils. This existence, which became more and more dangerous, necessitated a wandering life at the mercy of spies and informers.[98] The statistics of the dispersed religious, if interpreted in a sense of a total defection, would be misleading.[99] Thus we might wrongly take as apostates those who were in reality most courageous apostles.

Church and State

But the ecclesiastical committee, under the inspiration of Treilhard, had not yet spoken its last word. A certain historian, who had made himself the defender of the religious policy of the Constituent Assembly, says so directly:

Nobody can doubt that one of the chief aims of this legislation was to give the Church of France a life independent of Rome. To dispute the pronounced Gallicanism of the Constituent Assembly would be a childish undertaking. Certainly the members, with much sincerity and persistence, intended to bring the Church and state together as closely

[98] Pisani, *op. cit.*, I, 146–48.

[99] A table which appears to date from 1790 indicates, for the city of Paris, 451 secularizations out of 943 religious. Pisani, *op. cit.*, I, 146. Encouragements for defection were not lacking. On February 20, 1790, Prudhomme wrote in his journal: "The first person who marries one of these former nuns would, in our opinion, deserve a civic crown." *Révolutions de Paris,* no. 30.

as possible, and even to merge one with the other. . . . On the one hand, to free the Church of France from subjection to Rome; on the other hand, to nationalize that Church and make it the moral tutor and safeguard of the new political regime: such was their profound intent.[100]

The decree of November, 1789, on ecclesiastical property, and the decree of February 13, 1790, on religious vows, were the first acts of this policy. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was its complete realization.

On the regulations of the relations of Church and state, understood in the Gallican sense, the men of the ecclesiastical committee found more than mere indications in the ancient regime. They found there a whole code of regulations, which was the collection of the famous articles of Pierre Pithou.[101] Durand de Maillane had written a learned commentary on them in five big volumes. More recently, in 1786, the Synod of Pistoia had formulated, with regard to the civil power in Church affairs, certain reckless maxims continually applauded in the Jansenist paper, *Les nouvelles ecclésiastiques.* Several of the eighteenth-century philosophers had surpassed the Gallican and Jansenist doctrines about ecclesiastical law. Voltaire, their spokesman, wrote to the Russian Schowalof: "Only your illustrious sovereign is right: she pays the priests; she opens their mouth and closes it; they are under her orders; and everything is tranquil." [102]

Ever since Treilhard's clever maneuver assured a powerful majority of the left in the ecclesiastical committee, the jurists

[100] Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante,* p. 78.

[101] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* VI, 325.

[102] Letter of December 3, 1768. The context is significant. "The time has come for the monster of superstition to be chained. The Catholic princes are beginning to repress its undertakings to some extent. But instead of cutting off the hydra's heads, they merely bite its tail. They still recognize two powers, or at least feign to do so, and they are not daring enough to declare that the Church must depend solely on the laws of the sovereign. . . . Only your august ruler is right." Voltaire, *Œuvres* (Beuchot ed., 1883), LXV, 250.

and canonists composing it had patiently worked out a whole series of laws on the organization of the clergy and the administration of their property. In this labor the canonist Durand de Maillane had been actively seconded by two men who would soon play an important part in the wording and application of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy: one was a Parisian lawyer, Martineau; the other would be the principal author of the Civil Constitution. Expilly would be the first of the constitutional prelates to receive episcopal consecration.

Divided into three sections, the members of the committee, because of a work assiduously and methodically carried out, were able, between the middle of February and the beginning of April, to sketch the general lines of their project. About the end of May three reports were presented to the Assembly: the first, on the constitution to be given the clergy, by Martineau; the second, on the salaries to be granted the ministers of worship, by Abbé Expilly; the third, on foundations and patronage,[103] by Durand de Maillane. The first of these was unquestionably the most important.

The report started with a magnificent eulogy of "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, handed down to our fathers by the first successors of the apostles, itself incorruptible, which still teaches what it always taught from its birth and will always teach."[104] After this hymn to Catholicism, Martineau called upon the reforming hand of the lawmaker to regulate the external discipline of the Church. He said: "The plan of regeneration that we have the honor to propose to you will

[103] In the matter of benefices, patronage consisted in the right to nominate or present a candidate to a vacant benefice. A distinction was made between ecclesiastical, lay, and mixed patronage. See Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline,* Part II, Bk. I, chaps. 29–34.

[104] *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* (1790), p. 117. We do not understand how Mathiez, who paid his respects to Martineau's sincerity (*Rome et le clergé,* p. 155), can hold that Martineau was a philosopher (in the sense of the eighteenth century), and by no means a Jansenist (*ibid.,* p. 92).

consist solely in a return to the discipline of the primitive Church." [105]

As a consequence of these principles, in which parliamentary Gallicanism and Jansenism were so well combined, namely, that the civil lawmaker has the right to regulate the external discipline of the Church and that he has the duty to do so by a return to the primitive Church, Martineau, entering into the details of the reform to be made, reduced them to three chief heads: 1. ecclesiastical titles, offices, and functions which should be preserved or suppressed; 2. the way to provide for the offices and functions that may be judged proper to keep or to reestablish; 3. the salary that should be paid to the ministers of religion.

On the first of these topics, the report lays down the following rules: 1. that the civil power has the right to suppress, by its own authority, whatever ecclesiastical office it judges useless; [106] 2. that the only useful functions are external functions whose object is the instruction of the people and the administration of spiritual aid. "Every other function," said Martineau, "is a parasitic function, an abuse in the order of nature and of religion. We must promptly extirpate it." [107]

Hence he proposed not only the suppression of the simple benefices,[108] which he called benefices without duties and offices without functions, but also the suppression of all the canonical prebends and even of chapters, whose members have "no function but to recite prayers either in public or in private."

[105] *Ibid.*

[106] Martineau, *Rapport fait à l'Assemblée nationale au nom du Comité ecclésiastique sur la Constitution du clergé,* p. 17.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[108] *Ibid.* A simple benefice was one in which the holder of the benefice did not have the care of souls or the obligation of going to choir. Such were the priors and abbots *in commendam,* and chaplains whose only obligation was the celebration of a few Masses, which they could have said by others. A double benefice was one that had some administration attached to it.

Thus, he said, we would return "to the uniform discipline of the Church in the days of its glory." The aged or infirm curés "will be given, at the expense of the nation, a substitute that, while solacing their burden, will not break their earlier habits but will permit them to remain in the midst of their flock. . . . What more delightful retirement than that of this good curé, this aged man, who has been made still more venerable by his long services! His age and infirmities do not let him fly to his parishioners, but they will be able to come to him."

By such utopias and idyllic fancies Martineau settled the first question. Then he introduced the second: how to provide for the functions preserved or restored. An abstract principle and a pretended return to the primitive Church would supply the answer. Said Martineau in his report: "Whoever must be obeyed by all must be chosen by all." Thus, he declared, the Church of the first centuries understood it. "No one was then raised to the episcopacy, no one was even advanced to the order of priesthood, except by the votes of the people. Our *Pontificales* even yet contain traces of that practice. A bishop never confers sacred orders until he has asked the approval of the people."

Concerning the support needed by the ministers of worship, Martineau declared his confidence in the nation, saying that it would fulfill candidly and loyally the duties incumbent on it toward those who, "engaged in maintaining peace in the families, no longer have time to be occupied with the question of means to provide for their subsistence. The nation would assure what is necessary for a frugal and temperate man." [109]

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy

Nothing was better calculated to win the hearts of that time than such abstractions and such appeals to a vague tender-

[109] For all the details here enumerated, see Martineau, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–18.

ness. On May 29, the day fixed for the general discussion of the project, the case for the ecclesiastical committee seemed to everyone something won.

Treilhard was insolent. In a speech, interrupted again and again by applause, he declared: "When a sovereign believes that a reform is necessary, nothing can stand in his way. A state can admit a religion or not admit it." Another representative, who was not a member of the committee, but was familiar with canon law, would find a way to surpass even Treilhard's insolence. This man was Armand Camus, deputy of the Third Estate of Paris. His extensive erudition had won him the position of advocate of the clergy of France.[110] He had played an important part on the day of the Tennis Court Oath and, at the time of the debate on the Declaration of the Rights of Man, he had, like Mirabeau, called for a Declaration of the Duties of Man. At the time we are speaking of, he held the office of archivist of the Assembly. "We are a National Convention," he exclaimed. "Assuredly we have the power to change the religion." He did at once add: "But we will not do so; we could not abandon it without committing a crime." [111]

The right had scarcely any illusions about the outcome of the debate. We do not see them renew, against a majority whose minds were already made up, the earnest struggle they had attempted in the debate about monastic vows. The Archbishop of Aix, who was the spokesman of the right, simply delivered a calm and noble protest:

The Committee wishes to remind the clergy of the purity of the primitive Church. The bishops, successors of the apostles, and the

[110] The office of advocate of the clergy did not become an organized institution until about the end of the sixteenth century. The advocates of the clergy not only pleaded their case when as a body they were a party in litigation, but also and especially upon request they gave counsel to all ecclesiastics and holders of benefices. Ordinarily these advocates met at the house of the senior among them. During the assemblies of the clergy, the place was the Grands-Augustins. On the advocates of the clergy, see L. Serbat, *Les assemblées du clergé de France*, p. 188.

[111] *Moniteur* (June 2, 1790), p. 622.

pastors charged with preaching the gospel, are not the ones who can reject this truth. But, since the Committee reminds us of our duty, it will permit us to remind it of our rights and of the sacred principles of the ecclesiastical power. . . . Christ gave His mission to the apostles and their successors for the salvation of the faithful. He entrusted this mission neither to the magistrates nor to the king. We are in this matter concerned with an order of things in which the magistrates and the kings have the duty of obedience.

At these words, as the *Moniteur* notes, murmurs were heard. The prelate continued: "I ought to point out that the question is one of purely spiritual jurisdiction. Abuses have crept in. This I do not pretend to deny. I grieve over these as others do. . . . Retrenchments can be made in the Church. But the Church must be consulted. To deprive her of her administration would be to lay sacrilegious hands upon her." A curé of Roanne, Father Goulard, made the closing remark of Archbishop de Boisgelin more precise by saying: "If the Assembly wishes to follow up the project, it should ask the King to send it to the Supreme Pontiff with a request for him to examine it. This method is the only means of avoiding a schism." Unfortunately Goulard afterward expressed adherence to the doctrines of Camus.

Whereas the leading defenders of the project based their case mostly on the principles of Gallicanism and Jansenism, a lawyer of Arras, whose name would later become sadly famous, in his plea for passage of the law invoked the theories of the *Contrat social.* This man was Robespierre. Starting from the principle that the priests are merely government officers, with no reason for existence except their social usefulness, he deduced logically, not merely that they depended completely on the civil authority, but also "that they should be joined to that society by all the bonds which [112] . . ." At these words he was

[112] For these various speeches, see *Moniteur* (May 30 and June 1, 1790), pp. 610–18.

interrupted by loud objections. The Assembly understood that he was about to ask for the marriage of priests. The Jansenist austerity was startled. The authors of the project desired to pose as defenders of the purest Catholicism. At the very time the committee was elaborating its project, a strange thing happened. On April 12, 1790, the deputy Dom Gerle—the former prior of the Carthusian monastery of Pont-Sainte-Marie, who sat on the extreme left wearing the habit of his order and who soon became involved in the foolish enterprises of a visionary, Catherine Théot—suddenly proposed to the Assembly that it declare Catholicism the religion of the state. Thereupon those very deputies who, on February 15, had contemptuously rejected an identical proposal made by the Bishop of Nancy, all rose up to acclaim the proposal, now being put forward by a monk-philosopher. If the president had not hesitated for a moment to put the question to a vote, if he had not given the Assembly time to recover its calm, the measure would have been passed unanimously.

Final Appeal

The general debate came to a close on May 31. Before passing to the discussion of the articles, the authorized leaders of the clergy, whose spirit of moderation did not falter for an instant, made a final appeal to the wisdom of the Assembly. Bishop de Bonal of Clermont repeated a proposal already made by Archbishop de Boisgelin during the general debate. He asked, as a preliminary condition for any deliberation on the subject, that a national council be convoked. The holy Archbishop du Lau of Arles gave his support to this proposal. Father Guégan, a priest of Brittany and rector of Pontivy, offered a measure drawn up in the same spirit. He asked that "the King should be petitioned to take all steps judged necessary and conformable to the holy canons and the liberties of the Gallican

Church to assure the full and entire execution of the present decree." [113] Both formulas offered a terrain acceptable to the Catholics, even those most prejudiced with Jansenist or Gallican ideas. According to a statement of Durand de Maillane, the committee decided to advise the adoption of this proposal.[114] But Camus' intervention turned the Assembly from this path. Using the subtle argumentation of a lawyer experienced in juridical discussion and making use of the undeniable canonical erudition which the exercise of his office had given him, the former advocate of the clergy tried to show that the spiritual authority had no place in the present discussion. Citing the Gospel, the Council of Trent, and the Pontificale, he maintained that ordination itself confers on priests and bishops the power to exercise their office anywhere in the world. Of course, he added, for the sake of good order the jurisdiction of both bishops and priests should be limited to a determined territory; but who is competent to make this delimitation? The Church, which has no territory will not do it but the state, which alone has competence and authority in this matter. Hence the whole jurisdictional organization of the Church practically comes within the competence of the state.[115]

The members of the clergy may have thought that, in the eyes of a prejudiced assembly, considerable difficulty would be experienced in refuting the sophisms of the clever canonist.[116] Perhaps they judged any opposition futile. At any rate, once again the skill of these lay jurists, whom the Church had al-

[113] *Moniteur* (June 2, 1790), p. 622.

[114] Durand de Maillane, *Histoire apologétique du Comité ecclésiastique,* p. 79.

[115] *Moniteur, loc. cit.*

[116] An experienced canonist would have found in Suarez, Thomassin, and Bossuet the means of peremptorily refuting this fundamental sophism of Camus. In the beginning the Church did indeed ordain priests and bishops without other limits of jurisdiction than those of the peoples they converted. But, subsequently, she was obliged to limit that jurisdiction. And then she herself assumed the right to regulate this jurisdiction. See Suarez, *De legibus,* Bk. IV, chap. 42, no. 11, and Bk. VIII, no. 8; Thomassin, *Anc. et nouv. discip.,* Part II, Bk. I, chap. 42, no. 8; Bossuet, *Variations,* Bk. VII, nos. 42 ff.; Brugère, *De ecclesia Christi,* pp. 81, 219–22.

lowed to inject themselves into the handling of her affairs, turned against the Church. The Assembly rejected, even in the moderate form in which they were proposed, the projects of De Bonal and De Guégan, which would have safeguarded the essential rights of spiritual authority. Then, as he had foreseen, the Bishop of Clermont, followed by a certain number of those who usually voted with him, declared that he would no longer take part in the deliberations of an assembly that he considered radically incompetent.[117] From that moment the discussion was speedy and almost without interest.

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy

The Civil Constitution was passed on July 12, 1790. Its aim was clear: to constitute a national Church in France. The chief provisions of the Civil Constitution had for their purpose to regulate the relations of this national Church with the pope, the civil authority, and the people.

As regards the relations of the Church with the pope, article 4 of Title I "forbade every church and parish of France, as well as every French citizen, to acknowledge in any case and under any pretext the authority of an ordinary bishop or metropolitan whose see should be established by designation of a foreign power." The allusion to the Supreme Pontiff was evident. Lanjuinais, whenever he was addressing the Assembly from the tribune, affected always to speak of "the bishop of Rome." Camus had said: "What is the pope? He is a bishop like the others. . . . The time has come for the Church of France to be freed from this servitude." Moreover, article 19 of Title II was explicit, declaring that the bishop-elect "must not address himself to the pope to obtain any confirmation, but

[117] Archbishop de Boisgelin of Aix did not imitate the Bishop of Clermont. Though not taking an active part in the deliberations, he followed them closely, still counting on the eventuality of some arrangement.

should write to him as to the visible head of the universal Church, in testimony of the unity of faith and of the communion that he should maintain with him."

The relations with the civil government, on the contrary, were most exactly determined. Article 1 of Title I established that "each diocese would have the same limits as the department." Article 17 of Title II indicated, in case of disagreement between a bishop and his metropolitan about canonical institution, as final recourse "the appeal against an abuse of power." A decree of November 15, 1790, specified that this appeal would be taken before the civil court of the district, which would pass judgment on it as the court of last resort. Articles 2 and 3 of Title III decided that the bishops and the curés are not allowed to be absent from their place of residence longer than fifteen days without permission of the directory of their department or of their district.

Lastly, the Constitution determined the relations of the bishops and the curés with the people, by regulating (articles 1, 2, and 3 of Title II) that both bishops and curés would be chosen by election, in the same forms as the deputies and other officials, according to the decree of December 22, 1789. Abbé Gregoire in vain asked that non-Catholics should not be included in the number of the electors. But the Assembly decided that it had no need to debate the amendment of Abbé Gregoire.[118]

Two of the articles of this famous Constitution became, for a large number of priests, an occasion of deep anxiety of conscience: these were articles 21 and 38, referring to the oath. But for a better appreciation of these anxieties, we must examine, in chronological order, the succession of decrees issued on this subject by the Constituent Assembly.

On February 4, 1790, the Assembly, taking advantage of a

[118] *Moniteur,* June 10, 1790, p. 658.

visit by the King, who had just promised to favor the new order of things with all his power, had at once voted, in a movement of enthusiasm, a form of oath which each of the representatives, as his name was called, took solemnly in the tribune: "I swear to be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the king, and with all my power to maintain the Constitution decreed by the National Assembly and accepted by the King." [119] A few deputies who were absent or who withdrew at the moment of the taking of the oath, declared a few days later that they reserved the right to examine and to endeavor to modify a Constitution that was not yet completed and that contained several provisions which seemed to them to be regrettable. Notwithstanding the murmurs of a certain number, the Assembly accepted these reservations as something implied in the principle of "freedom of writing" and in the right inherent in the nation to revise the Constitution that it gave itself.[120]

Article 21 and article 38 of Title II of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy obliged bishops-elect and curés-elect, before entering upon their office, to take the oath prescribed by the decree of February 4. On July 9, during the preparations for the great feast of the Federation that was to take place five days later at the Field of Mars, the deputy Target returned to the question and proposed that before the altars on July 14 the King, the Assembly, and the whole nation should renew the oath of loyalty to the Constitution, according to the formula passed on February 4. Bishop de Bonal of Clermont then spoke:

Permit me to make a remark. In some matters honor and religion do not leave the slightest doubt. We are about to renew the oath of loyalty to the nation, to the law, and to the king. What Frenchman, what Christian, would hesitate to participate in a movement of pa-

[119] *Moniteur,* February 6, 1790, p. 150.

[120] *Ibid.,* February 8, 1790, p. 157; Picot, *Mémoires,* V, 405.

triotic enthusiasm? . . . But, while recalling what I owe to Caesar, I cannot forget what I owe to God. In this matter any dissimulation would be a crime. I except from my oath whatever concerns spiritual things. This exception, which my conscience exacts of me, ought to prove to you the loyalty with which I shall carry out all the other parts of my oath.

The Assembly, after hearing this declaration, adopted without change the project that had been presented to it.[121]

Three months later (November 27) the deputy Voidel had them extend the obligation of the oath to all the clergy of the realm, under pain of being deprived of their office, of losing their rights of citizens, and, in case of meddling in their functions, of being prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace.[122] Some disagreements then appeared among the clergy. The consciences of several revolted. In spite of its general terms, the oath seemed to have the Civil Constitution in mind. Only one authority could solve the distressing question, the authority of the Supreme Pontiff; but the Pope had not yet issued any firm and public judgment on the religious situation of France. On March 29, 1790, in an allocution delivered in secret consistory, he had, so it was reported, deplored the French laws that had ended in the spoliation of Church property, in the suppression of monasteries, and in the ruin of public worship. Then, recalling Isaias' self-reproach, "Woe is me, because I have held my peace" (Isa. 6:5), he added: "To whom should I address my words? To the bishops, who are deprived of all authority? To the clergy, who are dispersed and humbled? To the Most Christian King, from whom authority has been taken?"[123] But this allocution was never officially published. Many persons were unaware of it or questioned its authenticity.

[121] *Moniteur,* July 11, 1790, p. 788.

[122] *Ibid.,* November 28, 1790, p. 1378.

[123] Hulot, *Collection des Brefs de Pie VI,* p. 1. This allocution was not published in the Roman *Bullarium.* The chief extracts from it will be found in Picot, *op. cit.,* V, 421 f.

Pope Pius VI in this address gave some of the reasons that had thus far imposed silence on him. To better grasp and judge his attitude, we must cast a rapid glance over Europe.

Foreign Views of the Revolution

When the members of the Constituent Assembly had set forth the principles of the Revolution, they had not pretended to legislate merely for Frenchmen, but for all men. The most eloquent witness of the period, André Chénier, wrote as follows: "The Revolution which has taken place among us is, so to speak, big with the destinies of the world." [124]

In this sense, indeed, the peoples and rulers had accepted the taking of the Bastille and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The former of these events was everywhere considered the symbol of the fall of the ancient regime.[125]

Johannes von Müller, the historian of Switzerland, regarded this victory of the people as "the most beautiful day that has been seen since the fall of the Roman Empire." Some German thinkers, upon reading the Declaration of the Rights of Man, thought they perceived the realization of the abstract ideal which they were pursuing in the footsteps of Puffendorf and Wolf. . . . Kant admired it as the triumph of Reason.[126]

In the palaces of St. Petersburg and Moscow they amused themselves in talking about the abuses of the feudal regime and the virtues of liberty. "True, indeed, the tone changed as soon as the thoroughly democratic character of the Revolution became manifest to these gentlemen." [127] In northern Italy some poets (Pietro Verri and Pindemonte) sang of the coming of a new era.[128] At Vienna, where the reforms of Joseph II had

[124] André Chénier, *Œuvres en prose*, 1872; *Avis aux Français*, August 28, 1890.

[125] A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française*, II, 10.

[126] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[127] *Ibid.*, p. 16. Cf. Pingaud, *Les Français en Russie*, p. 165.

[128] Franchetti, *Storia d'Italia*, chap. 2: *Primi effetti della Rivoluzione francese*, p. 48.

undermined the ancient regime, the first events of the French Revolution aroused excitement in all minds. The streets, as also the churches, were filled with handbills on which was written: "Here as at Paris." [129]

Let us note that, although the principles proclaimed in the Constituent Assembly stirred the enthusiasm of the populace, the weaknesses and the errors of the politicians who were directing France aroused the contempt of the governments. The minister of the United States in France, Gouverneur Morris, in the early days of the Assembly announced the utter failure of the French Revolution.[130] Baron de Staël, minister of the king of Sweden, Mercy, ambassador of Austria, and Florida Blanca, minister of Spain, all clearly declared they foresaw the ruin of France. As Hertzberg wrote to the King of Prussia, "the prestige of royalty is annihilated in France." Catherine of Russia did not refrain from denouncing the National Assembly, calling it a hydra with twelve hundred heads. Emperor Joseph II, brother of Marie Antoinette, declared that he could no longer draw from the Kingdom of France either men or money. In short, the European governments saw nothing but the total eclipse of the French power in the world; and, according as they were hostile or friendly to France, they condemned the Revolution or rejoiced over it.[131]

What was the Pope's impression? Pius VI, at first glance, undoubtedly did not see the real import of the events that were taking place in France. In this respect he was like most men of his time. But the common father of the faithful shared neither the enthusiastic optimism of the people with regard to the first manifestations of the Revolution nor the contemptuous pessimism of the statesmen regarding the government of France. As he had done in the affairs of Russia, Austria, and

[129] Sorel, *op. cit.*, II, 20.

[130] G. Morris, *Memorial and Correspondence.* See especially the notes written on July 1, 1789, and January 24, 1790.

[131] A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution,* II, 22.

Tuscany, he temporized; more than in Joseph II, in Leopold, or in Catherine II, he had confidence in Louis XVI. If the future deceived him, the blame can be laid to lack of perspicacity, a too naive kindness of heart, or the fatal nature of the circumstances. But we have no right to see in his attitude the calculations of a selfish and low policy.[132]

Pius VI's Inaction

Can we endorse the view of one historian, who says that the mind of Pius VI was not suited to comprehend the Revolution?[133] But what should we understand by "The Revolution"? Does it mean the totality of that historic event, "perhaps the most complex that ever occurred"?[134] Who at that time understood it in this sense? Does the expression mean the philosophical spirit which inspired the Declaration of the Rights of Man? Pius VI had pointed to it and described it in the first of his encyclicals, with wonderful exactness; or does it mean the Jansenist and Gallican spirit, which dictated the Civil Constitution of the Clergy? The Pope in his disputes with Emperor Joseph II and Leopold of Tuscany had sufficient experience to make him acquainted with the proceedings of that spirit.

In 1789 Pius VI, abandoned or threatened by all the Catholic powers, had no longer any hope except in France and its King.

[132] According to Mathiez, Pius VI's condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was a question of temporal interest. The Avignon affair decided the whole thing. He says: "The Pope saw himself threatened at the same time as pontiff by the Constituent Assembly and as chief of State by his temporal subjects. If the pontiff yielded at first, the chief of State did not hesitate . . . heeding only his pride of sovereign and his liberty. . . . The reasons of his policy are explained easily enough. He waits . . . because he does not wish to sacrifice his temporal interests to his spiritual interests. . . . His calculation proved false, his delay was to no purpose. He compromised only his own interests, and he threw France into schism and civil war." A. Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé sous la Constituante,* pp. 62, 300.

[133] L. Madelin, "Pie VI et la première coalition," *Revue historique,* LXXXI, vi.

[134] This is the expression of Albert Vandal, quoted and made his own by Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. vi.

If France alarmed him by its philosophers, it reassured him by its traditions of native generosity, and especially by its sovereign, so pious and of such pure morals. One day the Pope, speaking to Cardinal Bernis, said: "My entire hope rests on His Majesty's love for religion, on his attachment to the Holy See, and on his wise policy." Would Louis XVI, whose conciliatory character and kindness were not unlike those of Pius VI, consent to enter upon the way opened by his brothers-in-law, the Emperor of Germany and the Grand Duke of Tuscany? This hypothesis seemed unlikely. Therefore the policy of the Holy See would remain most benevolent toward the King of France. The National Assembly was indeed much agitated, and its power over the sovereign was great; but, so far as Rome was concerned, any sharpness of language would be avoided, any words that might provoke a formally schismatic declaration. They would await the inevitable appeasement. "How much I would lose," said the Pope to Bernis, "if I should lose the support of France!" [135]

On the side of Pius VI everything seemed combined to sustain his optimism. The French ambassador, Cardinal Bernis, so it seems, could, by his numerous relations with Paris, have kept the Pope informed about the events that were taking place. But the people at Paris who could have kept Bernis posted, did not do so, either because they feared the tampering with the mail or because they hesitated to disturb the quiet of the aged ambassador. Thus they failed to acquaint him with these affairs of the gravest significance.[136] Montmorin, the minister of foreign affairs, a grand seigneur and philosopher, a shifty politician, and a skeptical spirit, whose whole ambition was to maintain himself in power,[137] was careful not to have Bernis informed of the course of religious affairs in France. In fact,

[135] P. de la Gorce, *Hist. rel. de la Révol.*, I, 371.
[136] Masson, *Bernis*, p. 450.
[137] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

Bernis was kept quite out of touch with events.[138] If by chance he asked a precise question, he was answered with words like these: "Our internal difficulties are not of a sort that are viewed from outside. In a very short time they will be calmed." [139] On other occasions, by way of reply, he was presented with a stupid comparison between the pope and the sultan.[140] Bernis, whose frivolous youth was spent amid philosophers and courtiers,[141] and who in his wise old age returned to the traditional beliefs and the old fidelities, was not at times without the sad presentiment of a great catastrophe. He wrote on December 5, 1785: "I am old and I should like to end my life without being a witness of the Revolution that threatens the clergy and religion itself." [142] But Montmorin took such pains to lull the old cardinal's vigilance and, at need, to distort the events that a sense of security prevailed in Bernis' mind. Moreover, everything was so calm in the Eternal City, where, as dean of the diplomatic corps, surrounded with honors and respect, he was fond of hearing himself called "the second personage of Rome." In that capital of the Christian world the feasts were still so beautiful! The magnificence of the public worship hid the decadence of the faith.[143]

Besides Bernis, whose diplomatic office did not permit him to tell everything to the Pope, the Holy See had at Paris a nuncio, Dugnani, and an auditor, Quarantotti. But "evidently they were lacking in sharpness, for they did not warn the Secretary of State that affairs were taking a turn quite different from that which they had expected. Their dispatches were most precisely drawn up when they concerned simple facts; but the

[138] Masson, *loc. cit.*

[139] *Ibid.*, p. 451.

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 450.

[141] Bernis' worldly youth is well known. On his close relations with Voltaire and his important part in the suppression of the Jesuits, see Masson, *Le Cardinal de Bernis*, and Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, Vol. VIII.

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 452.

[143] P. de La Gorce, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

Secretary of State was quite uninformed about the new ideas." [144]

Such being the condition of affairs, the report of the first outrages committed by the French Revolution against the Church reached Rome only as an echo, softened and, as it were, muffled. Furthermore, in reply to the apprehensions which Pius VI had expressed to Louis XVI, the King wrote a letter full of the most religious veneration, saying that he would be watchful, with the attention of a Christian and of an elder son of the Church, to prevent any injury being inflicted upon the religion of his fathers, the union with the Roman Church, and the respect due to the ministers of religion.[145] The Pope then charged Bernis with the duty of thanking the King "for his edifying and gracious letter and of expressing the Pope's heartfelt and most sincere gratitude." [146] The abrupt suppression of the annates, decreed in spite of the Concordat of 1516, keenly pained the Supreme Pontiff; but, Montmorin having assured him that the measure had been decided on only by urgent financial necessities and that it left intact the respect due to the solemn treaties and the rights of the Holy See, the Pope condescendingly informed the French court that "his heart was always disposed, in the presence of these cruel circumstances, to grant as a favor, in particular cases, the suppression of the payment of the annates." [147]

A short time afterwards the decree that placed "the possessions of the clergy at the disposal of the nation" revived the Pontiff's alarms. But the astute Montmorin hastened to make known to the Pope that the question was not definitively terminated, that some expedients would be able to conciliate every-

[144] Pisani, *op. cit.*, p. 167. Cf. Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires de France*, I, 264, and Gobbio, *La Chiesa e lo stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione*, 1905, p. 73.

[145] *Archiv. Vat., carte sciolte*, quoted by Gendry, II, 112.

[146] Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé*, p. 42.

[147] On the conciliatory attitude of the Pope in the affair of the annates, see Masson, *Bernis*, pp. 460–65.

thing.[148] The fact that the ministry included Champion de Cicé, archbishop of Bordeaux, and especially Le Franc de Pompignan, former archbishop of Vienne,[149] reassured the Pope. Could the devout and courageous prelate, who had so vigorously unmasked the philosophers, give his approval to the maneuvers of the enemies of the Church? The Pontiff's anxiety was the more easily calmed since he now had at his side, as chief minister, in place of Cardinal Buoncompagni, the peaceful Cardinal Zelada, an old man of seventy-two, "a friend of repose, an enemy of rigorous measures, and altogether devoted to France." [150]

The suppression of monastic vows, news of which reached Rome at the beginning of March, 1790, was a most cruel blow for the heart of Pius VI. Montmorin, fearing an outburst, went to see the nuncio. He urged Bernis to obtain the Pope's silence. But certain influences were being exercised in the opposite direction. Several persons of the French court who had been driven from Versailles by the events had emigrated to Rome. There they even formed a sort of elegant and polite society, in which the most conspicuous personages were the Polignacs, the Vaudreuils, and the Choiseuls; the heart of this group was Cardinal Bernis' palace.[151]

From this circle came the most urgent suggestions to persuade the Pope to condemn the new government of France. Pius VI hesitated. He had begun working on an encyclical when the intervention of Bernis, ambassador of France, and of Azara, minister of Spain, prompted him once again to delay. He was afraid that a public manifestation on his part might precipitate events by way of a violent persecution. He felt that he would satisfy his duty of conscience by protesting against the new

[148] P. de la Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 272.

[149] Pompignan had resigned his office of archbishop upon entering into the ministry, August 4, 1789. See Bouvier, *Le Franc de Pompignan*, p. 88.

[150] P. de la Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 278.

[151] Masson, *op. cit.*, pp. 468–70.

law in a secret consistory. No word of the allocution was to be transmitted to the chanceries, which would thus be supposed to be entirely ignorant of it. The Pope's protest took place on March 29. In it the Pontiff condemned in energetic terms, not only the law suppressing monastic vows, but also the abolition of the tithes, the nationalization of Church property, and the admission of non-Catholics to all civil offices. The French government took every possible precaution to keep this document from receiving any publicity.

However, as Montmorin wrote, a moment came when every clever attempt failed.[152] "If the Church of France," wrote Bernis, "continues to be treated so harshly, I cannot answer for the patience of the head of the Catholic Church." [153]

The Pope and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy

The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the event that obliged the Pope to make a solemn pronouncement on the religious affairs of France.

Articles 21 and 38 of Title II of this law obliged bishops and priests to take an oath of loyalty to the Constitution. Hence arose distress of conscience for a large number of the clergy, for they were not certain whether this oath had in view the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. If such was, in fact, the case, was the Constitution manifestly schismatical?

Today we answer "yes" without hesitation. But the fact was less clear to the faithful and the priests who asked themselves these questions in 1790. Had not the Assembly recognized that a person could take the oath to a Constitution while retaining the right to examine it and to oppose it by legal methods? [154] Had not the Assembly accepted the reservation

[152] *Ibid.*, p. 478.
[153] P. de La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 276.
[154] See *supra*, p. 123.

made in open session by the Bishop of Clermont, with regard to the spiritual power of the Church?[155] Was the Civil Constitution of the Clergy incurably bad? Abbé Barruel wrote in his *Journal ecclésiastique:* "I was the first to remark how various articles . . . could become legitimate by the approbation of the Holy See and of the bishops."[156] Moreover, the proposed Constitution contained a final article as follows: "The king will be begged to take all measures judged necessary to carry out the full and entire execution of the present decree." Was this statement not an indication that the King would receive a commission to negotiate with Pius VI? Furthermore, this last article had indeed not been submitted to the vote of the Assembly; but the reason for this suppression was well known. Treilhard explained it in the tribune: following some disturbances in Avignon, the relations between Rome and Versailles had become so strained that the two courts were no longer able to treat freely with each other. Meanwhile the word was circulated that Rome was disposed to enter upon a negotiation.[157] Thirty bishops, deputies in the National Assembly, published an *Exposition des principes sur la Constitution du clergé,* which was drawn up by Boisgelin. This statement, in beautiful and firm language, pointed out four points of the Civil Constitution sharply opposed to the canon law: 1. the suppression of fifty-one episcopal sees; 2. the election of bishops and curés by electoral colleges open to non-Catholics; 3. the granting to metropolitans the canonical institution of bishops; 4. the suppression of the relations of obedience with the pope. But this document itself, which was signed by all the bishops of France except four,[158] expressly recognized that the schism was not yet accomplished, and that negotiation with the pope could still

[155] *Ibid.*

[156] *Journal ecclésiastique,* December, 1790.

[157] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 163.

[158] Brienne of Sens, Talleyrand of Autun, Jarente of Orléans, and Savine of Viviers.

remedy everything. The bishops said: "We wish to avoid a schism. Why has the Assembly not declared the incompetence of the authority to which we appeal? . . . Because the Assembly has the feeling of the rights of the Church, although it does not mention the Church. Its silence is the avowal of the justice and of the necessity of our demands." [159]

Of course the Jansenists advanced arguments more decisive in their eyes. We read in the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques:*

> You say that the Constitution is in opposition to the Council of Trent. But this Council has not been received in France; and the secular authority that rejected it, against the wish of the bishops, was indeed less legitimate than the authority which today opposes it in a number of provisions. Yet all the French monarchs who have died since the Council of Trent have died in the peace and communion of the Church. In vain does anyone allege that the new Constitution contains some abuses. It does not contain so many as the Constitution under which we were living.[160]

Yet the Pope, always ill informed about the character of Louis XVI, and sincerely believing that this prince would never sanction the Constitution so long as it had not been submitted to the Holy See, had abstained from intervening officially that he might leave the freedom of initiative to the French government. The Pope merely wrote to the King [161] and to the two archbishops who were members of the council of ministers (Champion de Cicé and Le Franc de Pompignan), counting on them to prevent the promulgation of the decree. The former archbishop of Vienne did not attend the meetings of the Council on August 24, 1790, when the King of France decided, with

[159] *Exposition des principes,* p. 12. Cf. Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 34.

[160] *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques,* February 1, 1791, p. 19. This number of the *Nouvelles* is devoted almost entirely to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. We scarcely need to note the difference between the attitude of the kings of France and that of the Constituent Assembly. These kings had delayed making the decrees of Trent laws of the state; the Assembly made laws of the state containing provisions contrary to the Council.

[161] Roskovany, *Monumenta,* I, 434.

death in his soul, to approve the Civil Constitution;[162] but the Archbishop of Bordeaux had the lamentable courage to overcome the King's hesitation. If the sincere repentance of Champion de Cicé has won his pardon before God, history has only one word to characterize his act: treason.

The deed was done. In spite of the Pope's brief *Intimo ingemiscimus corde,*[163] which implored the King to exercise in-

[162] Abbé Barruel, in his *Journal ecclésiastique* of February, 1791, p. 280, then in his *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* p. 58, sharply attacked the memory of Le Franc de Pompignan, whom he charged as follows: 1. with being associated (August 24) with Cicé's steps to induce the King to approve the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; 2. with having kept secret the letter which the Pope had written him on July 10 and which clearly disapproved the Civil Constitution. Feller, in his *Biographie universelle,* art. Pompignan; Guillon, in the *Collection des Brefs du Saint-Siège,* I, 38; Royou, in the journal, *L'Ami du Roi,* and some others repeat the same charges. But Emery, in his note inserted at the beginning of the works of Le Franc de Pompignan (ed. Migne, I, 15), refutes Barruel's accusations, saying that Barruel was ill informed. With regard to the supposed part taken by the Archbishop of Vienne at the Council meeting of August 24, the library of St. Sulpice (Emery documents) contains testimony which seems to us conclusive. Abbé Pichot, who belonged to the clergy of St. Sulpice in 1790 and who died as canon of Lyons in 1814, wrote to Father Emery (March 8, 1802): "No one can charge Pompignan with having cooperated in the Civil Constitution of the clergy, since he was not at the Council meeting. In fact, he fell ill on August 17, 1790, and left his apartment only to be carried to the grave. But the approval did not take place until August 24. I call Saint-Priest, Minister of the Interior, to bear witness to this fact. That same day he came to Pompignan to inform him of what had taken place. I myself witnessed the tears shed by both of them. The next day certain business brought me to the Marchioness de Gramont. As I concluded this matter of business with her, three bishops entered (of Bourges, of Dijon, and of Castres). The Marchioness asked them news of the Assembly. They replied that at the King's Council the members had taken advantage of the illness of the Archbishop of Vienne so as to have the Constitution approved and that they were persuaded it would not have taken place if the Archbishop had been present. They had the King's explicit promise to this effect." As to the Pope's letter not being made known, the Archbishop of Vienne should not be held responsible. The letter, by its very nature, was a document not intended for publication. Says Father Emery: "Three or four days after the death of the Archbishop of Vienne, when the brief was found among his papers and was communicated to the most zealous bishops of the Assembly, such as the Bishop of Clermont, these judged, in accordance with the tenor of the letter, that its publication would be imprudent." Migne, I, 16. We can, moreover, note this by the text of the letter, published by Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de France,* I, 9. Cf. C. Bouvier, *Le Franc de Pompignan,* pp. 89–101.

[163] September 22, 1790. Roskovany, I, 437.

vincible opposition to the law, the weak Louis XVI went to the very limit in yielding. In December, 1790, he confirmed the decree which imposed on the bishops and curés the obligation of taking the oath to the Constitution, under pain of being deprived of office.[164]

This decree opens a new phase. By the laws referring to the goods of the clergy, and to monastic vows, and by the Civil Constitution of July 12, 1790, the Church had been stripped of her patrimony and the most essential of her rights. The decree of November 27 inaugurated a new era of persecution.

[164] This act of Louis XVI was his first juridical act of cooperation in the Civil Constitution. To speak of a *sanction* given to this law by Louis XVI is incorrect. According to the principles laid down on October 1, 1789, the Constitutional laws had no need of the royal sanction. Yet the *approbation* given by the King on August 24 was a pledge of his cooperation for the application of the law.

CHAPTER V

The Persecution (1790–99)

IN THE words of a certain historian devoted to the revolutionary ideas, "The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was the chief error of the Revolution." [1] The philosophers had fancied a "citizen-clergy," [2] as they said, professing the faith of the Savoy vicar; the Gallicans had dreamed of a Church subordinate to the state; the Jensenists, of a return to the purity of morals of the first centuries. Never were expectations more brutally contradicted by the facts. A few months after the promulgation of the celebrated Constitution, the majority of Catholic France, taking their stand about the Pope, cursed the Revolution. The clergy faithful to the Church were forced to refuse their obedience to the state, and the clergy loyal to the Constitution, who were often centers of intrigues, ambitions, and greed, were far from recalling the austere virtues of the primitive Church. The consequences of the Civil Constitution would extend farther: the exiles and massacres, and the civil and foreign wars, which desolated France during the last years of the eighteenth century, were, as the subsequent pages of this history will show, connected with that important act of the Constituent Assembly.[3]

[1] Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat, de 1789 à 1870,* p. 68.

[2] *Adresse de l'Assemblée au peuple français,* drawn up by Talleyrand, February 11, 1790.

[3] Cf. Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française* (7th ed.), II, 115. "The scaffolds of the Terror are to be found in germ in the decrees of 1790." Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* VI, 18.

The Taking of the Oath by the Clergy

The days that followed the promulgation of the law seemed to justify its authors. About half of the parish clergy, which was a third of the secular clergy, considered as a whole, took the required oath.[4] Most of the jurors (those taking the oath) retracted later on; but at the outset only one expert canonist saw the schismatical depth of the Constitution, only one experienced statesman foresaw the remote consequences of it. Let us imagine the country pastor, confronted by an oath of obedience to the laws, which had been passed by the assembly of the people's representatives and which had been approved by the Most Christian King. Such a pastor is under the necessity of taking this oath under penalty of abandoning his church, his rectory, his flock, and even of being prosecuted as a disturber of the public peace. In many parishes the good curé did not hesitate; he took the oath without any qualms of conscience. His error was the more excusable since, by various reports, he was able to know that, even after the passage of the law, negotiations were being carried on between the court of Rome and that of France. He was, indeed, well aware that the dependence of the clergy on the civil power was not something new in the land of France.

Most assuredly the bishops and even the Pope were exceedingly slow in giving up hope of an understanding[5] with the French government. Louis XVI, in his somewhat misty policy, had made known that his acceptance of the law was in a way conditional and that he would wait for the Pontiff to regularize, by a brief, the provisions of the law which were not in accord

[4] Such are the results of the labors of Sagnac, "Essai statistique sur le clergé constitutionnel et le clergé refractaire," in the *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* November, 1906, pp. 97–115, and of Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* I, 184–89.

[5] See Bridier, *Mémoires inédits de M. de Salamon, internonce à Paris de 1790 à 1802,* documents, no. 6. Pius VI in his correspondence often alludes to these delays and to the astonishment they must cause. Cf. Theiner, *Documents,* I, 15, 34, 76.

with the common law of the Church.[6] And, after all, everyone saw especially in the new law, the abolition of a worn-out regime which had too long weighed on all. Lastly, with that optimism in the future which then filled all men's souls, many better-minded people persisted in counting on the goodness of men and on the providence of God, to smooth out the difficulties that still remained to be resolved.

Little by little we see these illusions disappear. Soon the game of Montmorin, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, became evident: to play both the Pope and the King. The negotiations begun were continued in useless parleys. Evidently the Assembly had decided to apply the law in its full scope, whatever might be the reply of the Holy See. The French ambassador at Rome, Cardinal Bernis, was instructed to notify Pius VI that the new conversations did not have in mind an examination of the Constitution, far less its amendment, but simply its application. Before applying the law, they did not even wait for the Pope's reply. Upon the death of the Bishop of Quimper on September 30, the president of the ecclesiastical committee, Abbé Expilly, was elected in his place as bishop of Finistère, according to the form established by the Constitution.[7] At the same time Archbishop Loménie de Brienne of Sens organized the episcopal council according to the new regulations. Public opinion was not deceived about the personal dispositions of such prelates; according to Mirabeau's expression, it regarded them merely as "officials of morality." Addressing the bishops on November 20, Prudhomme wrote the following in his journal: "Gen-

[6] See the letter of Louis XVI, under date of September 6, 1790. (*Archives des affaires étrangères, corresp. de Rome,* reg. 913.)

[7] Four hundred electors met at the cathedral and, on the third ballot, Abbé Expilly was elected by 233 votes. On November 23 Montmorin wrote to Bernis: "We think that His Holiness should be able to find some means of validating the election of Quimper. . . . Having emerged from this series of difficulties, we would seek some suitable solutions whenever new difficulties come up." Expilly's election took place on October 31. [Quimper had been the episcopal see in the department of Finistère—Tr.]

tlemen, no other restraint is needed than that of a national code." [8] Thereafter one of the most obsessing passions of the members of the Constituent Assembly was evidently the anti-religious passion.[9]

The Pope, however, continued to preserve silence. This silence lasted until March 13, 1791. Faithful to the policy he had followed with regard to Joseph II, Catherine II, and Leopold of Tuscany, the Holy Father did not wish to destroy anything. His desire was to make every effort to avoid a schism. Pius VI would be the last to cling to belief in Louis XVI's energy. Perhaps he also feared—and he would have had good reasons for doing so—that a considerable number of bishops, still influenced by their desire of reconciliation, and a large number of priests, still too ignorant of the real situation, would not heed the counsels of a wise intransigeance.[10] Later on, when the Pope found himself in the presence of precise facts, testifying to the schismatical and revolutionary nature of the law, he made the voice of his authority heard with mighty force; and the events showed that his prudence was sound: the large majority of the priests obeyed him without hesitation, resisting the persecutors with a heroism worthy of the early centuries.

Aim of the Assembly

The events following one another from the end of November, 1790, to the beginning of March, 1791, show that the enthrone-

[8] *Les Révolutions de Paris,* VI, 303 (November 13–20, 1790). Expilly, consecrated on February 24 next, conformable to the rubrics of the *Pontificale,* by Talleyrand, was a true bishop. See, in the *Vie de M. Emery* (I, 256), the precautions which the superior of St. Sulpice took to assure himself of the validity of this consecration. Therefore no one has ever seriously denied the episcopal character of the constitutional prelates and the validity of the ordinations which they subsequently performed.

[9] Sorel, *op. cit.,* II, 115.

[10] In his dispatch of August 18, 1790, Bernis wrote to Montmorin: "The royal sanction takes from the Pope many of the means which he would have been able to

ment of Expilly at Quimper and the new regulations issued at Sens by Loménie de Brienne were not isolated instances, but belonged to a plan systematically conceived and methodically pursued. The manifest design of the fanatics who dominated the Assembly was to apply the Constitution as promptly as possible, in the most brutal manner, and without regard for the authority of the pope.

On November 5 the deputy Duquesnoy, one of the men devoted to Montmorin's policy, speaking from the rostrum, said: "You have published a decree on the Constitution of the Clergy. The Assembly should know that it is being carried out. . . . I ask that, within two weeks, the ecclesiastical committee make a report on the execution of the decrees relative to the Constitution of the Clergy." Lanjuinais, speaking in the name of the committee, made a reply by adducing the election of Abbé Expilly, which had just taken place in the city of Quimper, and by announcing that preparations were made in the other departments.[11] This promise was not long in being carried out.

The first victims of the law were the canons. Undoubtedly it was thought that this procedure would stir less feeling among the faithful. The possessions of the chapters were inventoried, and the members of the chapter were forbidden henceforth to meet together. The chapter of Montpellier had already been suppressed (October 16). The suppression of the chapter of Bourges took place on January 11, 1791; that of Saint-Pons on February 8. The same measures soon occurred at Mirepoix, Tréguier, Saint-Omer, and generally in the provinces.

In certain old cities, where the cathedral or collegiate church was the traditional center of religious celebrations, this first outrage was grievously felt. At Noyon, at Saint-Omer, at Agde,

employ usefully. In fact, he said to me: 'Any papal decision in the midst of the troubles with which France is agitated may become infinitely dangerous and may lead, by the division of the parties, to schism and fatal decisions that we wish to avoid.'"

[11] *Moniteur,* November 6, 1790, p. 1282.

at Tréguier, and at Saint-Pol-de-Léon the impression was very deep.

When the church bells ceased to announce the daily psalmodies; when the silver lamp, burning night and day before the altar, had been taken down; when, in the streets overgrown with moss, people's steps were more rare; when the people saw the little ribbon of the seals come loose from the entrance of the chapter hall, from the sacristry door, from the choir grilles, they understood that the same Revolution as wiped out so many ancient traces would leave deserted the places where all that life had developed. The bishop's palace, disappearing with the chapter, would complete the decadence.[12]

In more than one place the beginning of a resistance occurred. At Laon the people demanded and obtained the reopening of the cathedral; at Cambrai a tumultuous crowd forced the withdrawal of the commissioners who came to affix the seals.[13]

A certain number of bishops (e.g., those of Mirepoix, Verdun, Soissons, and La Rochelle) published official protests.[14] The local authorities then had the protests seized and denounced the prelates to the Constituent Assembly. Some department directories, those of the Jura and the Corrèze, suppressed the salaries of the rebellious bishops. The directory of the Haute-Marne, by its own authority, closed the cathedral of Langres. These measures gradually became general, while the audacity of the fanatics increased daily. Prudhomme in his diary wrote: "Woe to the prelates who persist in keeping some relics of the old regime! They will merely hasten the Revolution that is preparing in the realm of religious ideas." [15] No illusion was any longer possible. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was regarded by the anticlericals as a minimum, an insufficient minimum, a makeshift. The Constitutional leaders demanded the

[12] P. de La Gorce, I, 313.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 314.

[14] See the list of these protests in a report by Voidel, *Moniteur*, November 28, 1790, pp. 1370–72.

[15] *Les Révolutions de Paris*, VI, 303.

marriage of priests, the suppression of the episcopacy, the removal of the barrier separating the clerics from the laity, and so on.[16]

In the Assembly the deputies of the left finally cast off the mask. Henceforth there was no question of respecting the authority of the Holy See or the regulations of ecclesiastical law. Voidel (November 26) declared: "You invoke the canonical forms. Who can be unaware that these canonical forms were, in the hands of the despots and of their base courtiers, a poisoned weapon with which they increase or perpetuate their abuses?" After Abbé Maury had spoken about the pope, the Jansenist Camus said: "The pope holds a position of authority; but he has not the right to give orders to the bishops." [17] Following this discussion, the Assembly (November 27, 1790) decided that within eight days from the publication of the present decree all the bishops and curés should take the oath on Sunday at the close of the Mass and in the presence of the municipal authorities. Failure to comply with this order would deprive them of their office and of their rights as French citizens. Furthermore, if thereafter the bishops and curés should exercise their ministry, they would be prosecuted as disturbers of the public peace. This same penalty was imposed on all persons who "should combine or conspire to arouse opposition to the decrees of the Assembly." [18]

After such declarations and such a vote, Rome could not think of carrying on effective negotiations with France. Every hope of agreement was finally lost. The law of November 27, according to the expression of a contemporary, Montlosier, "had destroyed all the bridges." But this declaration of war, by enlightening the Catholics, awakened their sluggish courage. In the Assembly the left could not restrain an emotion when

[16] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 386.
[17] *Moniteur*, November 29, 1790, p. 1378.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 1372.

Maury addressed these words to them. "Take care: it is not good to make martyrs." [19]

Louis XVI and Pius VI

The law did indeed still lack an element essential for its being put into execution; namely, the King's sanction. But that sanction was not doubtful to anyone's mind. Louis XVI made one last effort to obtain from the Pope a reply that would rescue his conscience from remorse. On December 3 he wrote to Pius VI, begging him to approve the new division of the metropolitan sees and of the bishoprics, such as the Constitution had established. In this letter the King wrote: "Your Holiness' silence or refusal will most certainly bring on a schism. . . . I implore Your Holiness to give me the promptest and most satisfactory reply." [20] The Pope, relying on the movement of opinion that was forming in France, on the 14th replied to Bernis, that, by approving the Civil Constitution of the Clergy he would incur the disapprobation, not only of the universal Church, but also of the Gallican Church. All he could do was to defer his decision.

But in France events happened with precipitation. The local authorities continued to fill the episcopal sees according to the new regulations. A bishop was elected in the Ardennes on November 23; another, in Mayenne on December 12. On the 20th of December the Assembly called on the King to sanction its decree. Louis XVI experienced hours of frightful anguish. He turned to Boisgelin. This prelate, who soon would refuse courageously to take the oath, was touched with pity. He tried to calm the King's conscience, saying to him that from the moment his acceptance was and appeared to be indeed a forced acceptance, he could rest with a calm conscience. An old friend

[19] *Moniteur,* November 29, 1790, p. 1378.

[20] *Archives des affaires étrangères,* quoted by Masson, *Bernis,* p. 489.

of the King, Saint-Priest, the former intransigeant minister, had the same pity for the poor monarch. Neither had the courage to urge Louis XVI to a resistance which they felt was beyond his strength.[21]

On the 26th, with broken heart, the King gave the required sanction. His message was received in the Assembly with applause which, according to the diary of Camille Desmoulins, continued ten minutes.[22] The left acclaimed, as someone has said, not the King, but its own victory.[23]

"I should prefer to be king of Metz," Louis XVI said when signing the decree, "than remain king of France in a situation like this; but it will end soon." [24] He was thinking of the help he hoped for from Europe.

On November 26, the day before the passing of the decree, which now seemed to him inevitable, he wrote to Breteuil, asking him to open negotiations with the friendly courts. He said: "I approve whatever you do to attain the end I have in mind, which is the re-establishment of my lawful authority and the happiness of my people." [25] What the King was thinking of, however, was not a foreign invasion, but a display of force at the frontiers, where the Emperor would mass troops, thus showing that "he regarded as evil the way they were treating the King." [26] The powers did not lend themselves to this chimerical project. No doubt, the situation of Europe with regard to

[21] Documents found in the Tuileries, third collection, no. 175.

[22] *Révolutions de France et de Brabant,* no. 57.

[23] De La Gorce, I, 346.

[24] Marquis de Bouille, *Souvenirs,* I, 185.

[25] Flammermont, *Négociations secrètes de Louis XVI et du baron de Breteuil* (1885), p. 8. Madelin wrote: "Let us not condemn this step too quickly. The appeal to the foreigner, which appears odious to us today, was traditional. . . . Coligny, the League, and the great Condé had provided examples of it. Moreover, we should not consider abnormal the fact that Louis XVI had with the cabinets relations quite different from those which the diplomatic corps engaged in. At Versailles a Secret of the King always existed. Louis XVI should surprise us only by his prolonged scruples." Madelin, *La Révolution* (1911), p. 156.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 157.

the religious questions was no longer the same as ten years earlier. The time had passed when the Bourbon courts agreed together to wrench from the Holy See the suppression of the Society of Jesus. The King of Naples was reconciled with Rome; the Emperor showed himself full of regard for the Supreme Pontiff; the ambassador of Spain, Florida Blanca, put in touch with the emissaries of the Count of Artois, seemed to be more and more unfavorable to the anti-Roman policy which he had formerly championed; at Rome, at Brussels, at Turin, and at Coblenz the French *émigrés* stirred themselves, demanding, if not a serious invasion, as the Count of Artois desired, at least the military display desired by Louis XVI. Some have supposed that Pius VI himself favored, in some way, an intervention of the powers,[27] or at least let himself be influenced by a diplomatic movement in this direction. These guesses, which rest on no historic document, seem to be belied by the very character of the Pontiff.[28] If any power ever tried to ally its cause to that of Pius VI, the action was taken only when the powers' interests were at stake. Thus, as Albert Sorel remarks, the Europe of 1790 was incapable of risking itself for the cause of the kings, still less for the cause of the Church. Christendom no longer was, and, strictly speaking, Europe no longer existed. Nor did the question of right any longer exist; might held the first place. The states, moreover, appeared not more alarmed by the French Revolution than they were scandalized by it. They viewed the Revolution as "a revolt that weak-

[27] The nuncio Dugnani wrote to the Secretary of State as follows: "In the cafes and public squares people speak more than ever of Rome. They say that the Pope is stirring the courts of Europe to send troops against France, and other like calumnies. I believe that the enraged people of Avignon and our other capital enemies are spreading these rumors and are trying to have the reports accepted, rumors tending to exasperate the population and to make them regard the Holy Father as the chief enemy of the Constitution." *Archives vaticanes,* August 23, 1790, quoted by Gendry, *op. cit.*, II, 130.

[28] Mathiez, who credited a movement attempted in this sense, adds: "Yet it is not likely that this diplomatic action, which a person surmises rather than knows, had carried great weight in Pius VI's decision." Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

ened a country they feared: France. They did not at all foresee the power of expansion which the French movement would take. . . . When, two years later, Europe decided to march against the Revolution, the movement was not prompted by a monarchical solidarity (even less to defend the cause of the Church), but in the hope of finding, this side of the Rhine, another Poland to dismember." [29]

The Pope, then, could count neither on the King of France nor on Europe to sustain him in his campaign against the schismatical undertakings of the Assembly. But, more and more attentively and hopefully, he followed the movement of protest which became more pronounced in the clergy and the people. On October 23, 1790, he had sent a brief of praise to the abbess of Remiremont, Adelaide de Bourbon-Condé, who had just protested against the decrees of the Assembly, and on November 11 he wrote to the Bishop of Basel, preoccupied with the question of his see, that, as pope, he would never confide the flock of that bishop to other hands, and that any newcomer would, in his eyes, be an intruder.[30]

Two new facts, throwing still more light on the growing hostility of the Assembly and on the increasing fidelity of the French episcopate, finally moved the Pope to issue a definitive and solemn condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. These facts were first the ensemble of the measures taken by the French government in the affair of Avignon, and secondly the courage which the French clergy showed when they were called upon to take the oath.

The Avignon Affair

Among the territories belonging to the Holy See, Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin enjoyed a particular status. Acquired

[29] Madelin, *La Révolution*, p. 136.
[30] Gendry, *op. cit.*, II, 131.

at different periods,[31] they had kept their old franchises and paid only light taxes, the revenue of which, devoted to the local government, did not come to the Holy Father.[32] These possessions of the Holy See, being enclaves in France, had several times served as pledges to the kings of France when these latter wished to exert pressure on the papal government. Twice, at the conflict over the regalia and at the time of the affair of the franchises, Louis XIV had seized Avignon and the Comtat. From 1768 to 1774 Louis XV, to force the pope to suppress the Jesuits, had repeated the same outrage. The Revolution, on this point as on so many others, continued and aggravated the aggressive measures of the ancient regime.

From the outset of the Revolution, the enemies of the Holy See employed the tactics of spreading the new ideas in the very states of the Holy Father. Camus, who as a member of the assembly played a preponderant part in the discussion of the Civil Constitution, carried on a steady correspondence, from the first months of 1789, with one of the leaders of the Avignon movement, a man named Raphael. Circumstances favored these undertakings. The economic crisis that afflicted France during the winter of 1788 had been particularly terrible in Avignon and in the Comtat Venaissin. In the month of March some uprisings, provoked by the forced unemployment of workers and by the general wretchedness, broke out here and there. The vice-legate, Casoni, had food distributed gratis to the poor, opened for the unemployed workshops of charity, and organ-

[31] The Comtat Venaissin had been given to the Holy See by St. Louis in 1228; Avignon had been ceded to the Holy See by Queen Joanna of Naples in 1348.

[32] On the historic origin of the papal sovereignty in Avignon, on the political regime in vigor there, and on the maneuvers by which the revolutionary party attempted to arouse the country against the pope, see the discourse delivered in the Assembly by Abbé Maury. Maury, a native of the Comtat, set forth the situation with particular competence. See especially his *Seconde opinion sur la souveraineté d'Avignon.* Maury, *Œuvres choisies,* V, 237 ff.

ized patriotic subscriptions.[33] Pius VI himself furnished an expedition of wheat, and sent to the disaffected places a commissioner instructed to receive the complaints and to remedy the abuses that might have been introduced. At the same time he exhorted the people to beware of the snares that were laid for them.[34] But, as at Paris, the word "hoarder," cleverly disseminated in the populace, stirred excitement in their minds. Notwithstanding all the contrary appearances, the ringleaders made the vice-legate responsible for all the calamities. The news of the taking of the Bastille fired men's minds. "Citizen militias" were formed to put down the so-called oppressors of the people. At the instigation of some foreigners, who settled in Avignon and at Carpentras following the French occupations, and of some people of the district, captivated by the current ideas, a new party was formed, which took the name of the party of "patriots." The party grew by the accession of all the malcontents, found its officers and its means of action in the militias, which the overwhelmed vice-legate had to legalize, and soon believed itself in a position to talk big and to demand reforms.

The decrees passed by the Constituent Assembly in the night of August 4, wrote Raphael to Camus, "fired all heads; and each one in this little state desired to procure the same advantages as those provided for all Frenchmen to enjoy. They propose your decrees for their regular model." [35]

A certain Raphael, "a dangerous man, as clever at intrigue as he was crafty and deeply wicked," [36] was appointed first consul of Carpentras. At his side was a philosopher, Baron de

[33] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[34] Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 141.

[35] Quoted by Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[36] Passeri, *Mémoires sur la révolution d'Avignon et du Comtat Venaissin* (1793), I, 56. The reader should not confuse this Raphael of Carpentras with Raphael of Avignon, of whom we shall have occasion to speak presently.

Sainte-Croix. This latter was an enthusiastic man of letters, who had made a deep study of the political institutions of antiquity and who dreamed of transforming his little country on the model of ancient Greece.[37]

Whereas Raphael and Sainte-Croix merely sought to introduce independent institutions, the Avignon agitators demanded union with France. "A former schoolteacher who had become a journalist (Sabin Tournal), a notary (Lescuyer), lawyers (Peyre and Palun), innkeepers (Molin and Peytavin), a butcher (Chaussi), had behind them the laborers, accustomed to follow readily the direction of those who gave them work, and the peasants, who desired the suppression of the feudal rights and the tolls." [38] To be relieved of the burdens of the papal regime without being subjected to those of the French regime was the ideal which the leaders flashed before the eyes of the peasants of Avignon and of the Comtat Venaissin. In the *Annales du comtat Venaissin* we read: "In spite of the shallow sarcasms, we shall have peace, and the French laws, and we shall not have any taxes." [39] Now Pius VI did not at all oppose wise reforms. He instituted an assembly of notables whose task would be precisely to point out to him the abuses to be corrected. But Raphael and his followers wished themselves to make the reforms.[40] The peasants rose up and, as we are told by a contemporary, insurrections became a sort of fashion. One day the people of Caumont forced the monks of the Carthusian monastery of Bompas to cede part of their property to the municipality; another day the people of Bédarrides divided among them the possessions of the archbishop of Avignon. Cavaillon, Bollène, and Avignon instituted "patriotic" (that is, revolutionary) municipalities. On June 11, 1790,

[37] Baron de Saint-Croix was a member of the Academy des inscriptions.

[38] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[39] Antonelle, the mayor of Arles, denounced this false expectation in his pamphlet, *Quelques réflexions sur la pétition du peuple avignonnais.*

[40] Passeri, *op. cit.*, I, 64.

the districts of Avignon voted the union of their city to France, "as the sole means of withdrawing from the vengeance of the court of Rome, from the nobles, and from the aristocrats." [41] At the same time they drove out the vice-legate, who retired to Carpentras, the capital of the Comtat.

The people of the Comtat did not associate themselves with the demand of the people of Avignon; Raphael and Sainte-Croix continued their dream of an independent republic. At Carpentras a representative assembly was formed, which eagerly adopted the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the main articles of the French Constitution. Then, as the Pope refused to approve the decrees of the Assembly, it ignored him, declared its decisions executory, expelled the vice-legate, who withdrew to Savoy, and placed the executive power in the hands of three chiefs of the party of patriots. Thus was completed the rupture with the Holy See. The Pope attempted the use of mild measures, offering amnesty to the disturbers. But the leaders of the revolution haughtily refused the papal pardon.

However, the petition of the Avignon districts reached the Constituent Assembly, which (November 20) decided to send a corps of troops to Avignon. These troops were charged with maintaining order there, "in concert with the municipal officers," that is, with the insurrectionary movement.[42] This step,

[41] *Ibid.*, I, 210.

[42] In the Assembly the debate on this question was most excited. The speech of Maury, who took up the defense of the pope, was broken by interruptions of the left. Robespierre was solemn and tragic. He exclaimed: "We have been told that Avignon was the property of the pope. Good heavens! The people, property of a man! From the very tribune of the National Assembly this blasphemy has been uttered." "At these words," says the *Moniteur,* "the Assembly applauded again and again" (November 20, 1790). For the exigencies of the case, this contention was distortion of the claims of the Supreme Pontiff, the principles of international law, and the facts themselves. Pisani rightly says: "Pius VI could not at the very first blow consent to let himself be stripped of Avignon and the Comtat. The papal temporal power was not like the absolute power of hereditary princes. The oath which he took at his consecration obliged him to keep intact the patrimony which he was to administer. Thus he was not free to alienate Avignon; his resistance was dictated to him by a higher duty. Moreover, the welfare of the people of Avignon did not call for their union with

an open attack on the sovereignty of the Holy See, was an armed introduction of the principles of the Revolution into the States of the Church. Ten days later, under the protection of the French soldiers, the Avignon municipality ordered Archbishop Giovio of Avignon, who had retired to Villeneuve, and all the priests, to take the civil oath under pain of being deprived of their offices. This imposition of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in the domain of the Holy See was the final outrage, which the Pope's patience no longer had a right to tolerate. The hour for denouncing the schismatical Constitution had struck.

Abbé Grégoire

While these events were happening at Avignon and in the Comtat, the attitude of some of the French people changed. A division gradually took place in France among the people and the clergy, between the men who until then had adhered to the same formulas with quite different intentions. Those whose minds inclined toward philosophism or were won over to Jansenism showed themselves ready to obey the decrees of the Assembly and to take the oath; but most of those who had attempted merely to realize a political and social reform in a Christian spirit had decided to refuse the oath energetically and to take an open stand against the Revolution.

Conspicuous in the former group was a man of marked personality. Throughout the course of the Revolution and for the defense of the worst of causes, this man continued to employ a talent of the first order and a rare energy. His name was Abbé Grégoire, curé of Ambermenil. Along with Bishop de La Fare

---

the French monarchy. . . . So true is this fact that the large majority of the people of Avignon and of the Comtat did not ask for a union with France. On the contrary, they openly opposed the move of the "patriots." Pisani in *Revue des questions historiques*, October 1, 1911, p. 528.

of Nancy, he represented in the Assembly the clergy of Lorraine.

Abbé Grégoire was ardent for the Revolution to the point of fanaticism, devoid of the eminent gifts that make a philosopher, a statesman, or an orator, and was often subject to mistakes of judgment and to impulses. He was, nevertheless, desirous of preserving the Christian faith, thoroughly penetrated with his priestly duties, encompassed by the esteem which attached to his uprightness, courage, and regular life, and he did not approve the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; but, satisfied that the dogma of the Church would remain intact, he judged that the safest step to take was submission.[43] On December 27, the very day following that on which the King gave his sanction to the decree of November 27, Grégoire mounted the rostrum to take the civil oath.

He began by protesting his inviolable attachment to religion and the country. He said:

> Of that religion we shall be constantly the missioners; if need be, we shall be martyrs for it. . . . But, after the most mature and serious examination, we declare that we perceive nothing in the Constitution which can harm the holy truths which we must believe and teach. . . . No consideration, therefore, can defer the pronouncing of our oath. . . .
>
> I swear to watch with care over the faithful entrusted to my guidance; I swear to be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the king; I swear to maintain to the full extent of my power the French Constitution, and notably the decrees relative to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

After him fifty-one ecclesiastics took the same oath. The next day (December 28) and the following Sunday (January 2, 1791) two prelates (Talleyrand, bishop of Autun, and Gobel, bishop of Lydda *in partibus,* coadjutor of the Bishop of Basel) went through the same legal formality. Talleyrand did so with-

[43] De La Gorce, *op. cit.,* I, 351.

out comment, like a man eager to finish an irksome and unpleasant task, with that mysterious smile in which could be read the cold skepticism of the man for whom political success was almost all that counted, for whom conviction weighed but little. Gobel pronounced his oath with hesitation and embarrassment, encompassing his oath with prolix restrictions and speaking in a tone that seemed to retract these very restrictions.

Bishops Boisgelin and Bonal

Two days later, the time for the taking of the oath expired. All who had been enlightened by the recent events regarding the intentions of the revolutionary party or who were confirmed in their opposition always regarded as their chiefs the Archbishop of Aix (Boisgelin) and the Bishop of Clermont (Bonal). Both of these men had wished first to exhaust the attempts at conciliation. On December 1 Archbishop de Boisgelin had written to the King, offering him the resignation of the entire episcopate if such a resignation would promote the establishing of peace; he also proposed to the King to intervene with the Pope to obtain authorization for the re-election of the bishops and a general delegation to the metropolitans giving them, in the name of the Holy See, the right of canonical institution of their suffragans.[44] On January 2, 1791, Bishop de Bonal proposed to the Assembly a formula of the oath which explicitly excepted "the objects that depend essentially on the spiritual authority."[45] But Boisgelin's proposals did not result in anything, and Bonal's motion merely provoked threats and hoots: the office of the Assembly refused to receive it.[46] Evidently the session of January 4 would be decisive. The men of the Revolution knew that a large number of the clergy had

[44] *Ami de la religion,* XIII, 165.
[45] Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 52.
[46] *Mercure de France,* January 8, 1791.

decided to refuse the oath. Therefore pressure was brought to bear on them. The preceding day pamphlets were circulated; cries of death were uttered. Well before the session the galleries were filled with rowdies and disturbers, with habitués of the clubs, who resolved to exercise intimidation on the representatives.

The day of signing arrived. After a preliminary debate about the meaning and consequences of the oath, during which Grégoire, Mirabeau, and Barnave spoke in succession, the president proceeded to call by name those expected to take the oath. The first one called was Bishop de Bonnac of Agen. He spoke amid an impressive silence. "I abandon my office," he said, "without regret, as likewise my fortune; but I should feel regret at the loss of your esteem. I beg you, then, to accept the avowal of the pain I experience in being unable to take the oath." A simple priest, Abbé Fournetz, curé of Puymarac, in the same diocese of Agen, followed him: "You wish to recall the first ages of the Church. With the simplicity of the first Christians, I will tell you that I glory in following my bishop, as Lawrence followed his pastor." Leclerc, curé of La Combe near Alençon, began thus: "I am a son of the Catholic Church." But clamorous shouts interrupted him. This series of refusals made the Assembly impatient.

The roll call was suspended. The president [47] declared, again and again, as though to urge the priests to take the oath pure and simple, that the Assembly did not intend to touch spiritual matters. "Let the Assembly embody this declaration in a decree," exclaimed Cazalès. But Mirabeau remarked that "perhaps the dissidents called spiritual what the Assembly called temporal," for example, "the demarkation of the dioceses." Cazalès' motion was rejected. A few ecclesiastics took the oath, but with reservations about spiritual matters; others, with references to the declarations of the Assembly. Four took the

[47] This was Emmery. He belonged to the religion of Israel.

oath pure and simple. At about five o'clock the president, addressing the Assembly, said: "For the last time, I invite the ecclesiastics present to take the oath." No one rose up. In short, as we read in a journal of the time, the effect of this session was the contrary of what the majority had hoped. Out of forty-four bishops or archbishops, only two (Talleyrand and Gobel) had defected. Of the simple priests, two-thirds courageously refused the oath. As the Bishop of Uzès wrote the next day. "This day has honored religion, and we have retired, proud of our glorious poverty." [48]

The Papal Condemnation

News of the memorable session of January 4, 1791, brought great comfort to the Holy Father. Thenceforth he was assured that the French episcopate, enlightened on its duties, would not make a schism. The moment seemed at hand to make public the condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, on which Pius VI had been working for some time. This solemn condemnation would, however, not appear until two months later; but the Pontiff now profited by every occasion to manifest his sentiment. Thus, when Cardinal Loménie de Brienne informed him by letter (January 30) of his taking the oath, the Pope replied by a severe brief, threatening to deprive him of his cardinalitial dignity unless he retracted immediately.[49] On February 9 Pius VI wrote to the Bishop of Toulon to encourage him in his resistance. Lastly, by two briefs (March 10, 1791,[50] and April 13) [51] he formally condemned the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

[48] Letter of Bishop de Béthisy of Uzès, January 5, 1791, read at the session of the Assembly, February 22, 1791.

[49] Brienne did not wait for the effect of the Pope's threat. He resigned from his cardinalitial office; and this former minister of Louis XVI passed over to Jacobinism.

[50] Brief *Quod aliquantum;* Guillon, *Brefs des Instructions de Pie VI* (1798), I, 104–262.

[51] Brief *Charitas;* Barberi, *Bullarium,* IX, 11–18.

The first brief, addressed to the bishops who were deputies of the National Assembly, examined deeply the principles and the chief provisions of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Therein the Pope found two basic principles, which he declared equally heretical, namely: 1. that the ecclesiastical power depends on the authority of the princes; 2. that the election of the pastors of the Church belongs to the people. Replying to the objections of those who, like Grégoire, distinguished between dogma and discipline, and demanding for the latter a complete subjection to the state, the Holy Father said: "How often discipline has a close union with dogma! How often it serves to maintain the purity of dogma! Thus we see the councils pronounce anathema against those who are culpable simply of breaking the laws of discipline."

Then turning to those who had been waiting impatiently, the Pope told them that, if until then he had refrained from separating the authors of the Constitution from the Catholic unity, this delay was with a view to avoiding by patience a deplorable schism. But, after long prayer and reflection, he declared that he could not approve a law that upset all the dioceses of a great realm, adopted the error of Luther and Calvin regarding the election of pastors, gave to the civil courts the supreme jurisdiction of cases purely ecclesiastical, inflicted injury on the authority of the bishops by establishing at their side a council arbitrarily composed, and lastly debased the clergy by replacing the fixed revenues of their benefices with a money salary furnished by the state. In short, he condemned a legislation "worse than all those which princes had formerly issued."

The brief of April 13, 1791, addressed to all the faithful of France, must be regarded as one of the most solemn decisions of the Church. After recalling the reasons developed in his earlier letter, and the *Exposition des principes* which was signed by the whole episcopate of France, except four bishops, the

Supreme Pontiff added: "Now no one of the faithful can any longer doubt that this new Constitution of the Clergy is established on heretical principles and hence heretical in several parts." [52] Consequently the Holy Father expressly forbade "all those who had been irregularly elected and unlawfully consecrated, to perform any act of jurisdiction under pain of suspension and nullity." [53] Yet, wishing to employ every indulgence that he could permit himself, and hoping by this means to remedy the evil already committed and to lead his strayed sons back to the fold, the common Father of the faithful declared that for the present moment he would withhold the more severe censures prescribed by the canons. "But," he concluded, "if, which God forbid, our paternal warning produces no fruit, let all know that our intention is to launch anathema against the unsubmissive, to denounce them to the Church as schismatics, to remove them from the bosom of the Church, and to deprive them of our communion." [54]

The Constitutional Clergy

For all who had seen clearly into the policy of the Constituent Assembly, these two briefs were a solace; for most of the others, they were a light. Many priests who had taken the oath, retracted. The fear of a general apostasy, which had haunted the soul of Pius VI, was dissipated: France would not give the spectacle which, two centuries earlier, the England of Henry VIII had given, as a great nation passing into schism in the footsteps of its bishops and priests.

Yet the constitutional clergy organized themselves the more actively since they were composed, henceforth, solely of sectarians resolved to go to the very limit in the way of revolt, or

[52] Barberi, *Bullarium,* IX, 13.
[53] *Ibid.,* p. 17.
[54] *Ibid.*

of minds sincerely under illusion about their duties. After Talleyrand and Gobel, three bishops had taken the constitutional oath. These were Jarente, bishop of Orléans, whom Cheverny in his *Mémoires* calls "a sort of fool, a villainous man";[55] Savine, bishop of Viviers, a philanthropist of the school of Rousseau, who would upset his diocese by the most fantastic reforms and incoherent philanthropic fancies;[56] and Loménie de Brienne, that atheist archbishop who soon became president of the club at Sens with a liberty cap for a hat.[57] For a return to apostolic times, this ecclesiastical scandal was a poor beginning.[58]

Archbishop Gobel

On March 13, 1791, to replace Bishop de Juigné, who had just emigrated to Savoy, an electoral assembly, consisting of 21 priests and 664 laymen, elected Gobel archbishop of Paris. The life of Jean Baptiste Gobel is perhaps the most lamentable example of the ravages that, by the seductions of a corrupt

[55] Quoted by Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* II, 51. Picot gives us the impression which the sight of this prelate made on him in 1789, a prelate "clothed in ermine and silk, draping himself like a woman for a theatrical performance, a court prelate, devoid of anything serious in his character." Quoted *ibid.,* p. 50.

[56] On Savine, see an excellent monograph by Simon Brugal, *Le schisme constitutionel dans l'Ardèche, La Font de Savine* (1889). Amid his strayings, Savine always preserved a depth of generosity and kindness. After his withdrawl to Paris, he had the honor of being imprisoned for seven months at the Conciergerie for having tried to save an innocent man from death. There during his imprisonment he was touched by the grace of conversion. The conversations he had in prison with a venerated priest, André Georges Brumauld de Beauregard, former superior of the students of philosophy in the St. Sulpice Seminary, opened his eyes in the matter of his straying. At the age of seventy he retired to Embrun, to his family home, and there engaged in the severest austerities. On the fact of his conversion by Beauregard, see Bertrand, *Bibliothèque sulpicienne,* III, 190.

[57] Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 154.

[58] Gobel, auxiliary of the Bishop of Basel for the French part of the diocese, was not reckoned among the prelates of the Church of France. Hence generally only four juring bishops are counted: Talleyrand, Jarente, Savine, and Loménie de Brienne. We must add two prelates not at the head of a diocese: Miraudot, bishop of Babylon, and Martial de Loménie, coadjutor of his brother in Sens.

aristocracy, then by the influences of an unrestrained demagoguery, can be brought about in a soul naturally upright, but vain and weak. Born September 1, 1727, at Thann in Upper Alsace, he pursued brilliant and solid studies in theology in Rome. Soon thereafter, he won the confidence of the prince-bishop of Basel, Frohberg, who obtained him for his suffragan and consecrated him bishop of Lydda *in partibus*.

Well educated, active, regular in his morals, irreproachable in his doctrine, the new prelate seemed at first to justify the confidence that brought him to a position of honor. But his elevation to the episcopal dignity turned his head. Sprung from plebeian stock, he was a contrast in the environment of all those bishops of the ancient regime, recruited from the highest nobility. The pomp which he thought he must indulge in led him into excessive expenses. Although pensioned by the prince-bishop and by Louis XVI, he was obliged to borrow money to meet his extravagances. His need of money and his thirst for honors soon led him to almost unbelievable depths of baseness. He intrigued to obtain the government of a diocese. He gambled; he lost foolishly large sums in brilliant company. To have himself accepted in high society, he made a show of the fashionable vices. In short, the Revolution found Jean Baptiste Gobel crushed with debts and at Paris leading the procession of the most sumptuous prelates.

Elected deputy to the States General by the bailiwick of Belfort and Huningue, he voted, until June 1, 1790, with the most intransigeant part of the clergy. Then suddenly he changed his views. The Revolution won him completely: Gobel became a revolutionary and at once went to the extreme. He joined the Jacobin club and there delivered the most hot-headed speeches. With enthusiasm he enrolled among the Assermentés and presented his candidacy for the bishoprics that would become vacant. The election (March 13) that put him at the head of the constitutional clergy of Paris intoxicated him, as had hap-

pened to him when he was chosen by the prince-bishop of Basel. On March 17, before taking possession of the church of Notre Dame, he made a tour of the city in a popular procession, composed of his electors, at the head of which marched the drummers and musicians of the National Guard.[59] This upstart Talleyrand, without complaisance and without nobility, in his last tragic moments called for the help of the Church he had denied.

Bishop Grégoire

The juring priests of Paris [60] rallied about Archbishop Gobel, but he was never the soul of the Constitutional Church. That place fell to Grégoire, bishop of Loir-et-Cher, who was imbued with adamant prejudices against the Holy See, but who had a strong and upright soul together with a consistent character. He showed as much courage in opposing the anti-Christian manifestations of the Convention and the Directory as he had shown obstinacy in defending the so-called liberties of the Gallican Church against the power of Rome.[61]

[59] Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopate constitutionnel,* pp. 53–59. Cf. G. Gautherot, *Gobel.*

[60] According to the most reliable calculation, the juring priests of the Paris clergy must have numbered about 800. Pisani, I, 218. Later on, many of them retracted.

[61] Henri Grégoire, born at Veho near Lunéville, on December 4, 1750, crowned at the age of twenty-three by the Academy of Nancy for his *Eloge de la poésie,* and shortly after by the Academy of Metz for his *Essai sur la régénération des Juifs,* was curé of Amberménil when the Lorraine clergy sent him to sit in the States General. Having become the chief of the Constitutional Church, Grégoire carried on an immense correspondence with his followers, bishops, priests, and laymen. The thousands of letters received by him have been saved from destruction. Classified methodically by departments, they are today in the possession of M. Gazier, professor at the Sorbonne. (Thanks to the communication of these letters, Pisani has been able, in his *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel,* and again in his four volumes on *L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution,* to compose the biographies of more than one prelate of that period and the history of more than one event.) Grégoire was a revolutionary, and he seldom lost an occasion of saying so; but, being a philosopher only after the manner of Voltaire, of Rousseau, and of the Encyclopedists, he was never a philosopher in the strict sense of the word. No one has more indignantly denounced

Soon, not only Loir-et-Cher, but also other departments of France had their Constitutional prelates. As at Paris, their enthronement took place amid much civil pomp. Drums were played in the fields, cannons thundered, and the National Guard formed the bishop's escort. At Le Mans, Saint-Claude, and Meaux, the municipal musicians filled the cathedral with the air of the *Ça ira*. At Laval, Grenoble, and Tulle, one of the first acts of the new bishops was to preside at a meeting of the clubs of the city.[62] These newly elected Constitutional prelates made little change in the religious ceremonies. The people maliciously remarked that these bishops did not abandon any of the luxurious adornments for which the prelates of the ancient regime had been reproached: neither the glittering ring nor the rich pectoral cross nor the rochet ornamented with fine lace. The title of Monseigneur, which became the style in the eighteenth century,[63] was pleasing to these new dignitaries of the Church; so much so that, among the ruins of so many abolished titles, this one, thanks to them, has been fixed in the usage of contemporary French.[64]

We would by no means assert that these Constitutional prelates were entirely without moral worth. One well-informed historian says:

---

the moral and religious doctrine of those men. In his *Mémoires* he wrote: "I have seen that these philosophers, ever ready with the big words 'humanity' and 'probity,' had two different doctrines, one for theory, the other for practice. Jean Jacques produced his *Confessions* and his hypocrite the *Vicaire savoyard;* the author of the *Dictionnaire philosophique* is also that of the Pucelle; Diderot wrote impieties and an indecent romance; Wilkes and Lewis were unbelievers; Paray, in one and the same work, combined what is worst in impiety and in crime against nature." Grégoire, *Mémoires,* II, 3.

[62] P. de La Gorce, *op. cit.,* I, 410.

[63] Voltaire made fun of the recent practice of the prelates of his time, who, he said, began to "monseigneurize" themselves.

[64] But under the Consulate we see that the Constitutional bishops no longer receive the title of Monseigneur, but that of Reverendissimus. Bishop D'Orlodot of Laval thus entitles one of his charges to the clergy: Charge of the Reverendissimus bishop of Laval. Priests were then designated by the title of "venerable"; thus, the venerable Coisnard. Isidore Boullier, *Mémoires ecclésiastiques,* p. 357.

Often they have been represented as disreputable priests, the scum of the clergy, lacking both faith and morals. Such an absolute judgment would be unjust. Some Constitutional bishops were priests who never had the faith, such as Minée of Nantes or Pelletier of Anger; some were dissolute men, such as Dunouchel of Nimes and Porion of Arras; [65] some were avaricious men, such as Deville or Rodrigue: [66] but those whom a detestable and public vice rendered despicable were scarcely a dozen. We do meet with scholarly men of weak faith, like Lalande or Villar,[67] who made a career of the priesthood; revolutionary orators like Fauchet or Huguet; unscrupulous "arrivists" like Joubert or Mestadier; but of these we do not count more than ten.[68]

The rest [69] were divided into two almost equal parts. On one hand, we see sincerely pious priests, but men whose piety was sentimental and vague. These were virtuous officials, but men of poor judgment. Intoxicated by the grand words of the Revolution or seduced by the honors of the episcopate, they gladly let themselves be elected and in the episcopate continued the relatively upright lives they had formerly led. For instance, Bonnet of Chartres was a zealous bishop, charitable and pious. The influence of his surroundings had drawn him into the revolutionary party. He died in 1793, just when the persecution was about to reach even the Constitutionals.[70] Likewise Avoine of Versailles was always conscious of the dignity of the priest-

[65] See Pisani, *Répertoire biographique,* pp. 335–37. Porion, bishop of Pas-de-Calais, former curé of Saint-Nicolas, apostatized, gave up the priesthood, and married. He was succeeded in 1797 by Asselin, curé of Saint-Sépulchre at Saint-Omer, who was consecrated at Paris, October 8. Asselin used to make his journeys on an ass, to distinguish himself from the pompous bishops of the ancient regime. This patriarchal mode of travel won him the epithet of "donkey bishop." Information communicated by Canon Bled of Saint-Omer. Cf. Deramecourt, *Le clergé du diocèse d'Arras pendant la Révolution,* IV, 164–77, 200–74.

[66] Deville was bishop of the Eastern Pyrenees (diocese of Aleth); Rodrigue, of the Vendée.

[67] On Villar, see Boullier, *op. cit.,* pp. 60, 319.

[68] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 25.

[69] The number of Constitutional bishops was the same as that of the departments, eighty-three.

[70] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 70.

hood. He protested against the suppression of the church bells and was denounced to the Convention for having refused institution to a married priest. He died in the same year as Bonnet, 1793.

The second category of Constitutional prelates was that of fighting men. Examples will again clarify the point. Grégoire and Expilly (whom we have already met), Le Coz of Ille-et-Vilaine, and Lamourette of Lyons engaged in striving against the abuses of the ancient regime and of promoting the triumph of the Revolution. Lamourette was a scholarly and pious Vincentian, but a man wholly won over to the sentimentalism of the time. He was seduced by the abstract theories of the philosophers, and at an early hour he became a friend of Mirabeau. He quit his diocese, leaving the administration of it to his vicars, and took his seat in the Legislative Assembly, where he preached union and fraternity. He is famous in history for having provoked the doleful comedy that was called "the Lamourette kiss." He perished on the scaffold in 1794 after retracting his errors.[71]

Other aggressive spirits became rather defenders of Gallicanism and, to some extent, of Jansenism so far as Jansenism preached a return to the primitive Church and limited the powers of the pope.[72]

Périer of Clermont was an Oratorian, of blameless morals and of great worth in education. He was brought to the Constitutional Church by his Gallican theories, by the exaggerated

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 377–82.

[72] Several Jansenists opposed the Civil Constitution: such were Jubineau and Maultrot. Certain others (e.g., Bishop de Noël of Lescar, the Oratorian Father Tabarand, the Dominican Father Lambert) opposed the Revolution itself. Dufraisse and Volfius, both former Jesuits, continued to be adversaries of the Jansenists, even when they became full adherents of the Revolution and entered into the Constitutional episcopate: the former as bishop of Le Cher, the latter as bishop of the Côte-d'Or. Resting his view on these facts, the Constitutional J. J. Mounier maintained that Jansenism had no influence on the Revolution. Mounier, *De l'influence attribuée aux philosophes, aux franc-maçons et aux illuminés sur la Révolution de France,* p. 63. Mounier's conclusion is not correct.

notion he had of the rights of the state. Persecuted under the Terror, he withdrew to Grenoble, where he tried to assemble the Constitutional clergy. Later he returned to Clermont and there labored energetically in the organization of public worship. Appointed bishop of Avignon after the Concordat, he would show under the restoration the same servile devotion to the civil power.

Bertier of Rodez, whose stern bearing and melancholy air always inspired the respect of those who approached him, was not only a man of duty in his private life, but also a man of combat in his public life. He had always professed a moderate Gallicanism, which he defended with grim and uncompromising firmness. He too faced persecution under the Terror. He affirmed his Catholic faith openly, but throughout his life refused to recognize in the pope any primacy other than "one of honor and of jurisdiction regulated by the canons." Such are the very words he used in his last will.[73]

Each department had its Constitutional bishop. But not each parish had its Constitutional curé. We may say that, from this point of view, France was divided into two parts. The regions where the new ideas had penetrated [74] received without ceremony and with a sort of indifference the new curé who was sent to them by order of the district, and who officiated, baptized, and administered the sacraments like his predecessors. His church, however, already not frequented, now became more and more empty according as the conscience of the faithful became enlightened. As for the religious populations of Flanders, Artois, Alsace, Rouergue, Velay, and the whole region of the northwest, they presented an altogether different spectacle, but at first everything passed in a manner equally calm. The faith-

[73] Pisani, *op. cit.*, pp. 377–82. Pisani quotes *in extenso* Bertier's curious will. Pisani's *Répertoire biographique* is the basis for all study of the Constitutional episcopate. Each item is accompanied with an abundant and reliable bibliography.

[74] Ile-de-France, Picardy, the Orléans district, Burgundy, Berry, Touraine, Provence, and the Dauphiny.

ful priest who had refused to take the oath sought refuge in the house of some friend. Almost everywhere he refused to use the faculty, which was granted him, to celebrate Mass in the church after the juring priest had completed his service. The faithful for the most part did not attend the church services of the new worship and gathered about the non-juring priest. On Sunday, around the barn or the chapel of the château where the faithful priest officiated, an overflowing crowd openly participated in the holy mysteries. The decrees forbidding a non-juring priest to exercise the functions of his ministry were practically regarded as null and void. For the celebration of baptisms the faithful contrived, by more or less subtle proceedings, to evade the regulations and to avoid the ministry of the priest sent by the district. For example, for funerals they left to him the removal of the body, but they did not enter the church, and afterward they asked the prayers of the non-juring priest.

The misfortune of these faithful clergy was the departure of their bishops. Many prelates, like Bishop de Juigné, had emigrated. These men generally retained an irreproachable orthodoxy.[75] Among them were some noble and lofty-minded bishops. Several, like Aviau, returned to France at a time when the danger was still great.[76] From these bishops came the most vigorous protests against the Revolution's laws of persecution. "We may, however, believe that many of them, if they had remained in their dioceses, instead of departing to a foreign land, would have more effectively combated the Constitutional schism; and if they had lost their lives there, as did Le Lan, Le Rochefoucauld, Castellane, Sandicourt, and Breteuil, they would have better served the Church than by withdrawing from their flock and losing all contact with it. The good done by the

[75] Yet we find some of these *émigré* prelates later refuse to accept the Concordat or refuse to send the pope the resignation which was asked of them.

[76] Bishop Aviau was the first bishop to return to France.

bishops who remained at their post,[77] shows that staying in France was not impossible.[78]

On the other hand, we cannot pronounce peremptorily on this grave question. As *émigrés,* these bishops remained in communication with their clergy by letters. Moreover, if they had remained in France, a great number of them would perhaps have been deported, thrown into old hulks, guillotined, and many dioceses would thus have lost their shepherds. Whatever the case, the curés and their faithful, under the direction of the vicars-general to whom the emigrant bishops had confided their powers of administration, continued this regime for a while in comparative tranquillity, until the day when the authorities decided to impose the juring priests by force and to drag the refractory priests off to prison.

The Legislative Assembly

The Legislative Assembly would commit this new fault. The Constituent Assembly had deliberated under the influence of the ideologists whose spirit is well summed up in the utopias of Abbé Sieyès: the Legislative Assembly would now see the reign of the Jacobins, which was personified by Danton. Says Taine:

> The Jacobin is like a shepherd who of a sudden, in a corner of his cottage, discovers some parchments that call him to the crown. . . . He fills his imagination with their contents and at once takes on the tone that belongs to his new dignity. Nothing could be haughtier or more arrogant than this tone. "Know that you are kings and more than kings," exclaimed Chalier. "Do you not feel the sovereignty circulating in your veins?" . . . The Jacobin is virtue; no one can resist him without the act being a crime. Consequently nothing is clearer

[77] Such as the bishops of Alaid, Bazas, Lectoure, Dijon, Mâcon, Cavaillon, St. Brieuc, St. Papoul, and Senlis.

[78] Pisani, *op. cit.,* p. 17. In spite of solicitations by their friends and in spite of the extreme dangers of the situation, fifteen bishops refused to abandon their dioceses.

than the object of the government: to subject the wicked to the good, or, what is simpler, to suppress the wicked; for this purpose they will employ deportation, drowning, the guillotine. The Jacobin canonizes his murderers. . . . Whoever follows logic is a fool; whoever believes in conscience is a monster.[79]

The ideologist had dreamed endlessly of the original freedom, of the perpetual equality, of the purity of the primitive Church. The Jacobin seeks to realize these dreams brutally. The fields of action on which the daring of the Jacobins would be exercised was plainly indicated: the Declaration of the Rights of Man and especially the Civil Constitution of the Clergy offered these fields to them.

The Declaration proclaimed the inalienable freedom of man. One of the first acts of the Legislative Assembly was to give freedom to the Negroes of the colonies. No thought was given to the question whether these slaves were prepared to make use of it. In fact, they were not; from the end of October, on the far shore of the Atlantic immense columns of smoke and flames suddenly shot upward; and from week to week the civil war at Santo Domingo increased, wild beasts let loose against their guardians, 50,000 Blacks on the rampage. At the very outset 1,000 persons were assassinated, 15,000 Negroes were killed, 200 sugar factories were destroyed, the damage being estimated at 600,000,000 francs; a colony which was equivalent to ten French provinces was almost wiped out.[80] In the name of liberty, the Assembly abolished the indissolubility of marriage.[81] The result of this decree was more than 20,000 cases of

[79] Taine, *Les origines,* V, 34–38.

[80] *Ibid.,* V, 147.

[81] The decree of November 20, 1792, establishing divorce, began thus: "The National Assembly, considering the importance of allowing to all Frenchmen the right of divorce, resulting from individual liberty, which would be lost by an indissoluble agreement, decrees: 1. Marriage is dissolved by divorce; 2. divorce takes place by the mutual consent of the parties."

divorce in France in the course of the five years that followed, more than 6,000 in Paris in less than three years.

The Declaration proclaimed the perpetual equality of men. In the name of equality the Legislative Assembly suppressed all seigneurial rights that the Constituent Assembly had declared lawful,[82] and it ordered the burning in the public depositories of all genealogical titles of nobility.[83] In the name of equality some representatives of the people proposed, amid the applause of the Assembly, the equalizing of fortunes. Lamarque, in the session of June 23, declared: "The equality of rights cannot be maintained except by a continual tendency toward equalization of fortunes." "Divide the common goods," said François de Nantes, "among the citizens of the neighboring villages, in inverse ratio to their fortunes, so that he who has less patrimonial property may have the greater part in the division." [84]

The ideologists of the Constituent Assembly, in their famous Declaration of Rights, had proclaimed the sovereignty of the nation; but, for the Jacobins of the Legislative Assembly, the nation was solely the popular classes. "Only in the citizens that are contemptuously called the people," exclaimed Lamargue, "do we find pure souls, ardent souls, truly worthy of liberty." [85] Whoever has suffered from the social institutions, whether as a convict or as a bandit, belongs to the true people; and for the Jacobin the people has all rights. The Assembly rehabilitated all the deserters who had quit their standards before 1789,[86] it invited to the honors of its sessions forty Swiss of Châteauvieux taken from prison; [87] it granted amnesty to the band of con-

[82] Decrees of June 18 and August 25, 1792.

[83] Decree of June 19, 1792.

[84] Quoted by Taine, *op. cit.*, V, 157.

[85] *Moniteur*, session of June 22, 1792.

[86] *Ibid.*, decree of February 8.

[87] At the club of the Girondists on April 9, the president Vergniaud welcomed and complimented these convicts.

dottieri of all countries and also old offenders who terrorized Avignon and the Comtat, and it allowed them to return as conquerors. Said the president Daverhoult: "Under the reign of liberty, the people has the right to claim not only subsistence but also abundance and happiness." [88] Even when the law is silent, the people can act to express its sovereign power. "Yes," declared Isnard, "the wrath of the people, like the wrath of God, is often merely the terrible supplement of the silence of the laws." [89]

Did the men who spoke thus see the dreadful danger of such excitations? Did they understand that the unleashing of popular fury would turn against that Church which the chief orators in the Constituent Assembly had proclaimed as having a divine character, and the later orators had solemnly declared to have spiritual independence? The fact is that their words, while stirring the anger of the people, at the same time pointed to the priest as their chief enemy. Said Isnard: "The priest is as lax as he is vindictive. . . . Send these pestiferous men to the lazaretto of Rome." [90] François de Nantes denounced the priests as being men who insinuate into the minds of children the poison of aristocracy and fanaticism.[91] The priests were referred to as the accomplices of the aristocrats and also as rebels against the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

The retractions of the juring priests became increasingly numerous. Nothing contributed more to speed this movement than such invectives, which showed the hostile character of the government and the hateful interpretation it was ready to give to the Constitution. According as the men of the Revolution, departing from vague idealism, from the dubious Christianity that had presided over its beginning, took a clearly anti-Catholic attitude, the Christianity that had been slumbering in many

[88] *Moniteur,* session of January 14, 1792.
[89] *Ibid.,* November 2, session of October 31, 1792.
[90] *Moniteur,* session of January 5, 1792.
[91] *Ibid.,* April 3, August 26, and November 13.

priestly souls of the ancient regime again recovered its strong vitality. At the same time the power, falling from Sieyès to Danton, went on declining still more, from Danton to Marat. Many a prelate, previously luxury-loving and indolent, found in his destitution the austere virtues of his state, and the faithful people gathered closer about their persecuted priests. The Supreme Pontiff, following the march of events with attention and solicitude, raised his soul to the height of the great duties imposed on him by his apostolic responsibility.

Cardinal Bernis

Among the prelates whose worldly life had dazzled the court and the city, none had been more conspicuous than Cardinal Bernis. His light verses had gone the round of the salons; his relations of friendship with Voltaire and Madame Pompadour were known to all.[92] The important diplomatic missions that had been assigned to him at Venice and at Rome, the experience of life that his great age gave him, all these had undoubtedly matured his ideas. But even at the age of seventy-six, this old man was still the great lord, living in grand style in the splendid palace he occupied at Rome. When, in the spring of 1791, the aunts of the King of France, Madame Victoire and Madame Adelaide, sought in the capital of the Christian world liberty to practice their religion, the Cardinal placed at their disposal his twelve carriages, his fifteen horses, his ten mules, and the silver service with which he was able to entertain at his table fifty persons at one time.[93] But the day when the prelate saw obviously that the government which he represented at the Holy See required of him an attitude incompatible with his religion, he resisted nobly, prepared for any sacrifice. When called upon

[92] Like Sieyès, Bernis had entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice and had been invited by his teachers to leave.

[93] Gendry, *Pie VI*, II, 152.

(January 5, 1791) to take the oath to the Constitution, he did so with the following restriction: "Without prejudice to what I owe to God and religion." Montmorin informed him that, unless he sent a formula of oath pure and simple, the King would not be able to let him continue his diplomatic office. He replied with a formal refusal. His letter of recall was transmitted to him almost immediately.

The government, not satisfied with this deprivation, which withdrew from the Cardinal an important salary, shortly afterward refused him the allotment to which he had a right as a resigned bishop.[94] Later, when the Minister of the Interior placed him in the category of *émigrés,* his furniture was inventoried and sold.[95] A pension, which ambassador Azara obtained for him from the King of Spain, was all that kept him from the direst poverty. The noble prelate with Christian dignity endured his trials, which he had clearly foreseen upon refusing the oath pure and simple. He wrote: "I am far from regretting the loss of a fortune acquired by long and useful services. I have sacrificed all to the faith of my fathers and to the honor which they were always jealous of." [96] The historian who had before his eyes Bernis' most intimate documents and who analyzed them thoroughly has written: "As Bernis accepted ruin and almost poverty, we may be sure that he would have accepted prison and the guillotine." [97]

The Provinces

In the lower grades of the hierarchy we meet with the same examples of courage. In July, 1791, some priests of Le Finistère, rather than take the oath, let themselves be imprisoned at Brest, by order of the directory of the department. Bishop

[94] This allotment was due him by the terms of article 3 of the decree of July 24, 1790.
[95] Masson, *Bernis,* p. 504.
[96] Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 154.
[97] Masson, *Bernis,* p. 560.

Expilly was a member of this directory. Soon, when the directory of Maine-et-Loire arrogated to itself the same right of throwing the refractory into prison, the latter sought hiding on farms. But the soldiers of the National Guard tracked them down in their retreats and finally carried off 300 of them to the premises of the former minor seminary; there, deprived of everything, they had to undergo atrocious sufferings. Similar scenes were repeated at Laval, where several priests had sought refuge and, protected by the devotion of a deeply religious population, were celebrating Mass and administering the sacraments to the faithful in private houses. Domiciliary visits, threats, arrests, and fines failed to overcome their courage. But a decree of the directory of the department (June, 1792) had them imprisoned in the former monasteries of the Cordeliers and Capuchins; from there these valiant servants of the Church wrote to the Supreme Pontiff an address vibrant with the purest heroism.[98] At Le Mans, Nantes, and Luçon the priests opposed the chicanery of the local powers and the attacks of the clubs with the same courage. At Luçon a decree of the municipality (January 28, 1792) forbade all assemblies. The faithful did not suppose that the prohibition concerned them. The next Sunday 1,500 persons, men, women, and children, met in the public square and knelt piously while a Mass was being celebrated in the near-by chapel. Nothing less than the proclamation of martial law and the arrival of a considerable armed force was required to disperse the gathering.[99]

In several departments—Cantal, Rhône, Haute-Garonne, Basse-Pyrénées, and others—like scenes took place. Minister Roland, in a report to the Legislative Assembly (April 24, 1792), testified that neither violent expulsions nor imprison-

[98] This letter, printed in Barruel's *Journal ecclésiastique* (June, 1792), undoubtedly did not reach the Holy Father. See Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 173–75, and Isidore Boullier, *Mémoires ecclésiastiques concernant le clergé de Laval,* pp. 103–5.

[99] See Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 176, who depends on a pamphlet entitled, *Exposé sincère de la situation des catholiques à Luçon.*

ments were able to bring the non-juring priests to submission. His conclusion was that these measures would have to be generalized and that new rigors would have to be decreed against the insubmissive ecclesiastics.[100]

These rigors did but arouse new acts of heroism. The clergy now knew what position they should take regarding the wish of the Holy Father. They knew that, deeply pained by the misfortune of Bernis, Pius VI persistently declined to receive his successor, Philip de Ségur, for the simple reason that the new ambassador had taken the Constitutional oath.[101] Furthermore, the Pontiff seized every occasion to sustain the courage of the oppressed. Writing to the Bishop of Puy (January 28, 1792), he said: "I know nothing nobler and more edifying than the conduct of nearly all the bishops of France, so that we may say that the Gallican Church never shone with more radiant light." [102] On March 24 he felicitated the Bishop of Senez, imprisoned for the faith, on having suffered with constancy "the most unworthy treatment, even prison, thus following the luminous footsteps of the most illustrious confessors of the Church." [103]

New Laws of Persecution

The Assembly was eager to follow the wishes of Roland. On April 26, Anastase Torné, Constitutional bishop of Cher, whose age of sixty-five years should have preserved him from the revolutionary delirium, asked that the Assembly forbid the wearing of religious dress except within the temples, "as being an outrage against the unity of the social contract and against equality"; for, he said, "if, after the suppression of these bodies, we should see religious garbs on the streets of our cities or

[100] *Nouveau compte-rendu au roi,* a 32-page pamphlet. *Moniteur,* April 26, 1792.
[101] On this point, see Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 155–57.
[102] *Ibid.,* II, 181.
[103] *Ibid.,* II, 182.

in the country, who would not suppose he was beholding roaming ghosts?" Two days later this same Torné, seized with a sort of rage against the religion from which he had apostatized,[104] asked that they should even "forbid all obedience to vows that had been taken." [105] On May 2 the Assembly ordered, in the name of liberty, the suppression of all the confraternities and even of all associations of piety and charity. "Thus," says an annalist reporting this decree, "conspiracy was allowed in the clubs against the safety of the state and the liberty of persons, but gathering to pray to God and to solace one's brethren was forbidden." [106] The odiousness of all these measures was now surpassed, on May 27, by the passing of a decree which condemned to deportation the non-juring priests and, as it were, making them outlaws. After a confused discussion that turned almost exclusively on the choice to be made between thirty projects more or less tyrannical, the following proposal was passed:

The National Assembly, considering that the efforts in which the non-juring clergy are continually engaged to overthrow the Constitution, do not allow us to suppose in these clergy the willingness to join in a social pact; considering that the penal laws are without force against these men, who work on consciences to lead them astray; after declaring a state of emergency, decrees as follows: Art. III, When twenty active citizens of any one canton join together to demand the deportation of a nonjuring ecclesiastic, the directory of the department shall be obliged to pronounce the deportation if the view of the district of the department is in accord with the petition.[107]

[104] Torné was a former doctrinaire. On February 5, 1792, we find under the pen of Prudhomme, who was, however, an educated man, this stupidity: "Christ did not wear a religious habit. Do you want proof of it? Go and see the paintings of Jouvenet at Saint-Martin-des-Champs."

[105] Picot, *op. cit.*, VI, 183.

[106] *Ibid.*

[107] According to the law of December 22, 1789, the members of the department and district directories were chosen by election in two steps, by secret ballot and by a majority of votes. The law of June 27, 1792, was surpassed in rigor by the law of August 26 of the same year.

No voice arose, either from the benches of the Girondists, who pretended to defend against the Jacobins the cause of moderation and liberty, or from the Constitutional bishops, or from the lawyers, to protest against such a decree, which outraged both liberty and religion, which introduced anarchy in the administration of justice. A writing of Boisgelin, *Observations sur le décret de déportation,* points out what in this law rendered it incompatible with the principles of the French Constitution; the pious Archbishop de Lau of Arles published an address to the King, begging him not to sanction the decree. But Roland was insistent on obtaining the royal sanction.

We know the tragic sequence of the conflict that arose on this subject: the King's resistance, Roland's insolent letter, read in the open Assembly: "Sire, if this law is not put in force, the departments will be obliged, as they have already done, to substitute violent measures for it"; the dismissal of the factious minister; the excitation of the people, aroused by the clubs; the invasion of the Tuileries during the day of June 20; the Assembly's declaration that the country was in danger; the Assembly itself invaded by the Federates; the Brunswick manifesto heating men's heads; a new power rising up, dominating Paris and France, that of the insurrectionary Commune; the massacres of August 10; the King deprived of his functions on August 12 at the Commune, which interned him and his family in the Temple.

Execution of Priests

Such commotions could not but precipitate religious persecution. This persecution was about to have its terrible days, early in September, by the assassination of more than 1,600 victims, among whom were more than 200 priests;[108] but many a murder had preceded this great massacre.

[108] According to one estimate, more than 1,600 persons perished at Paris alone.

The first in date was that of Abbé Raynau, archdeacon and vicar general of Senez. Arrested at Entrevaux, near Nice, on June 6, 1792, at the very moment when he was escaping from the persecution, along with two canons of his diocese, Father Michel and Father Langin, he was showered with blows by the soldiers of the garrison, and died the same evening, after pronouncing these last words: "I pardon you all the evil you are doing me." [109] A month later, a vicar-general of Bordeaux, Jean Langoiran, and one of his companions, Louis Dupuy, beneficiary of Saint-Michel parish, were arrested by a group of armed men. The next day these priests were slain in the courtyard of the archbishop's residence, where the department administration fixed the place of its meetings.[110] On that same day a band of furious revolutionaries at Les Vans forced their way into a prison where nine refractory priests were confined. The priests were dragged to the bank of the river and, under the threat of raised swords, they were ordered to choose between the oath and death. "Death," replied a firm and solemn voice. It was that of Father Bravard, a priest of St. Sulpice, former director in the major seminary of Avignon. At this word the nine confessors of the faith fell to their knees and were horribly mutilated with blows of swords and hatchets.[111] On July 12, at Clairac in the diocese of Agen a venerable priest, Pierre de Lartigues, who generously used his large fortune in good works, was put to death by the unbridled populace after

---

Of this number, 217 were ecclesiastics, divided thus: 113 at the Carmelite monastery, 76 at St. Firmin, 24 at the Abbaye, 4 at La Force, 2 elsewhere. Lenôtre (*Massacres de septembre,* p. 283) proposes the figure of 1,614 victims.

[109] Caron, *Les confesseurs de la foi,* I, 1.

[110] On the occasion of this tragic event, Champion de Cicé, archbishop of Bordeaux, published (August 10, 1792) a touching pastoral instruction. Therein he bitterly deplores the fault he committed in affixing the royal seal to the Civil Constitution. See some passages of this instruction in Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise de France pendant la Révolution,* Vol. III.

[111] Mollier, *Saints et pieux personnages du Vivarais* (1895), p. 197; Mourret, *La vénérable Marie Rivier* (1898), p. 67.

he had suffered a long agony with wonderful patience.[112] Three days later at Marseilles, two Minims, Father Miratte and Father Tassy, were surprised in the retreat where they had sought refuge to exercise their holy ministry. They were summoned to take the Constitutional oath. Upon their refusal they were struck with the sword and then hanged to the two lamposts at the entrance of the city hall.[113] On August 4 at Manosque in the Basses-Alpes, a Franciscan, Father Ponthion, and three secular priests (Fathers Pochet, Vial, and Reyra) were dragged by the populace into an almond orchard and there were hanged on trees.[114] About the same period in Le Perche, Father Duportail de la Binardière was assassinated in the public square of Belesme by revolutionaries of the place, who wished to force him to take the oath; in Normandy, Father Guillaume de Saint-Martin was shot to death at Pont-Ecrepin by patriots who ordered him to renounce his religion and the pope.

During these times at Paris the efforts of the factions were particularly directed against the royalty, and the priests seem to have been forgotten. We have evidence of the murder of only one priest there, Father Chaudet, a former curé of Rouen. He was arrested, then released, and after a few days was assaulted in his house, thrown out of the window, and beaten to death in the street.[115] But the leaders of the Jacobin party had not disarmed against the priests. Soon scenes of murder would be multiplied in Paris, with circumstances more frightful than anywhere else.

On the evening of August 10, in that tragic session, the wretched Louis XVI might be seen attending in the reporters' lodge, to which he had taken refuge at the fall of the monarchy.

[112] Caron, *op. cit.*, I, 155.
[113] Picot, *Mémoires*, VI, 191.
[114] Caron, *op. cit.*, I, 25; Guillon, *op. cit.*, under the word "Pochet."
[115] Picot, *Mémoires*, VI, 192; Guillon, *op. cit.*, under the word "Chaudet."

The Legislative Assembly, under the pressure of the delegates of the Commune, passed the convoking of a National Convention and the suspension of the royal power until the Convention should pronounce upon it. By a vote of 222 out of 285, it had elected Danton as minister of justice. This choice was the crushing of the Girondist party, the complete triumph of Jacobinism.

Danton

Jacques Danton, who thus attained to the post of minister in the French government, "like a cannon ball," to use his own expression, was the son of a country attorney. The favor of the Duke of Orléans, whose agent he had perhaps been,[116] the backing of the Masonic lodges, which he had frequented at an early date,[117] and the recommendation of the most extreme clubs, where he used to make speeches, began his reputation. A real power of work, in spite of intervals of almost incredible indifference, a fierce patriotism, a strange mixture of violence and weakness, even the expression of his face, which was that of a lion and that of a bull-dog, features reflecting the brutal fire of his passions, gave this "vulgar Mirabeau," this "monster of patriotism," as he has been called, a place of his own from which he soon dominated both Vergniaud and Robespierre.

Jacobinism had found its leader; the Assembly provided him with the work for him to perform. In the session at which it elected Danton minister of justice, it declared that the decrees which had not received royal sanction would have the force of law. The principal decree that they had in mind was evidently the one aimed at the deportation of non-juring priests. The Commune of Paris, the center of the most rabid Jacobinism, which had just become aware of its might and which assumed

[116] Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 246.
[117] *Ibid.*

the government of Paris, did not delay in acting.[118] On August 11 about fifty ecclesiastics, guilty of not taking the Constitutional oath, were brought before the committee of the Luxemburg section, which met in a hall of the Seminary of St. Sulpice. After a short questioning, they were taken to the former monastery of the Carmelites that would be their prison. The Carmelites themselves who lived there received orders (August 1) to disperse before October 1. The Commune advanced this date. It obliged the religious to withdraw to the inner portion of the monastery, and set apart the church and adjoining premises for the internment of the prisoners. Among the imprisoned ecclesiastics we find three bishops: Le Lau archbishop of Arles, whom we have seen taking a courageous attitude in the Assembly, and two brothers belonging to the illustrious family of the La Rochefoucauld: one was bishop of Beauvais, the other of Saintes. In the same prison was also Father Savine, superior of the seminarians of St. Sulpice, with two of his confreres.[119]

Imprisonments

On August 15 further arrests were made. Armed bands invaded the Issy seminary,[120] and the near-by house that served

[118] The Directory of Paris, suspected of moderation, was obliged to resign on July 23. The Jacobins, whose influence was all-powerful over the forty-eight sections, brought about the decision that each section should nominate one or more commissioners to help in the government of Paris. On August 9 these commissioners formed themselves into an assembly which, under the name of the Commune of Paris, assumed a position above that of the Legislative Assembly, seized the executive power, and organized the persecution and the massacres. Marat reigned supreme in the Commune. Danton, who liked neither Marat nor the Commune, both of which were a hindrance to his power, felt himself left behind; he publicly favored the Commune and Marat, became their willing accomplice, and gloried in this association with them. Cf. Madelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 253–55, 259. On Danton, see Hilaire Belloc, *Danton*, 1928. [Tr.]

[119] Regarding Father Savine and his arrest, see Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery*, I, 190, 285. On the community of clerics of St. Sulpice, cf. Leclercq, *Les martyrs*, XI, 46–48.

[120] On the invasion of the Issy seminary, see Gosselin, I, 288–94.

as a place of retirement for aged and infirm priests. The invaders did not hesitate to arrest these venerable priests and lead them, with the beating of drums, escorted by the National Guard, to the church of the Carmelites. An eyewitness, Father de la Pannonie, has left us an account of the scene: "Words cannot describe the feelings we experienced at the sight of these respectable old men. Several of them could scarcely stand up. The treatment they endured during this journey made me tremble with horror. One of them especially was prevented by his infirmities from following his cruel guides with equal step; they bruised him all over by striking him with the butts of their rifles to make him walk." [121] The next day Father Gallais, a priest of St. Sulpice and superior of the seminary of the Robertines [122] and twelve of his companions were added to the number of their confreres imprisoned in the Carmelite monastery.

The condition of the prisoners in the restricted quarters reserved for them was lamentable. They had to pass the first nights on the stone floor of the church. At the end of a few days mattresses were brought in. These were set down on the floor of the nave, one against the other. However, the doctors, fearing the consequence that might follow from the closeness of almost 200 persons in a narrow and poorly ventilated space, obtained for the prisoners permission to walk for an hour in the morning and the same in the evening in the monastery garden.

The imprisoned priests had no illusion about the lot reserved for them. Father de Cussac, a priest of St. Sulpice, had the Acts of the Martyrs brought to them. From this they made their spiritual reading. Some friends, authorized to visit them

[121] Quoted by Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise catholique en France* (ed. of 1873), XIX, 512.

[122] This seminary took its name from one of its superiors, Father Robert. See Faillon, *Vie de M. Olier*, III, 100, and Gosselin, I, 58. On the arrest of Father Gallais, cf. I, 295–98.

for the purpose of bringing them food, kept them acquainted with news from the outside. Thus they learned that a guillotine had been erected in the Place de Carrousel and that a military court, established August 17, every day pronounced terrible sentences, which were followed by prompt execution.[123] On August 26 the Assembly seemed to intend to save the lives of the non-juring priests, by decreeing against them the penalty of deportation. But the very ones that passed this law were not fooled by this pretended moderation. Says Michelet: "No one was in doubt about the massacre." [124] On August 28 Danton obtained authorization for domiciliary visits. These visits resulted in new imprisonments at the Abbaye, the Carmelites, and La Force. The populace milled about these prisons, with cries of death. At midnight on September 1, a commissaire, escorted by gendarmes, came and notified the prisoners of the decree of deportation passed by the Assembly and he attempted to assure them that no danger of death threatened them. But the previous evening the Commune had irrevocably determined their fate. It had instituted a committee of execution, charged with providing all the details of the bloody work that was about to be done. A significant letter issued from this committee, written to citizen Maillard. He was there directed to "dispose his band in a useful and sure manner, to take precautions so as to prevent the cries of the dying, . . . to have a provision of brooms to sweep away the blood." [125]

The Taking of Verdun

In spite of the guarded secret of these preparations, most of the prisoners had not changed their conviction that they were

[123] Picot, *op. cit.*, VI, 213; Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

[124] Michelet, *Histoire de la Révolution*, IV, 121.

[125] Senar, *Relations puisées dans les cartons des comités de salut publique et de sûreté générale*, chap. 7; Guillon, *Les martyrs de la foi*, I, 169.

soon to be put to death. The successive taking of Longwy and Verdun stirred up the populace. The Legislative Assembly, where scarcely 260 out of 750 members were in attendance at the sessions, was aware of its political powerlessness. The Commune was now more insolent than ever. Danton, in the presence of the German invader, urgently appealed for concord. But on what ground was concord to be made? In connection with an enrollment of volunteers, that was to take place on September 2 at the Champs de Mars, Danton declared: "The tocsin that is about to be rung is not a signal of alarm: it is the charge upon the enemies of the country. To overcome them we have need of audacity, and still audacity."

What was the real import of these last words? Men could recall that recently in the Jacobin club Danton had exclaimed: "Let the Confederates not separate before the traitors have been punished." [126] On August 31, at the vigilance committee of the Assembly, he said: "We cannot remain exposed to the fire of the enemy and to that of the royalists. . . . We must put fear into the hearts of the royalists. . . . Yes, fill them with fear." And a gesture of a death stroke completed his thought. So, when (September 1) Letourneur tried to reassure the prisoners by giving them a false glimpse of the possibility of liberation, one of them (Tessier) replied: "No, my son, we shall not go forth from here." [127] As we learn from the account of an eyewitness, "soon someone came to ask the old men to what place they wished to be taken upon leaving the Carmelite monastery. Everyone went to confession. The question was discussed whether they could offer to take the oath in the event that such an act might lead to their being released, or to accept it if it were proposed to them. It was decided that they would

[126] *Journal des Jacobins,* no. 201.

[127] *Souvenirs inédits de M. Letourneur,* quoted by Alexander Sorel, *Le Couvent des Carmes,* p. 78.

have to refuse it." [128] The executioners could come; the martyrs were ready.

The September Massacres

At noon on September 2 the alarm cannon at the Pont Neuf thundered: a large black flag was raised on the city hall. According to the announcement, all this had for its purpose to arouse some legions of heroes against the enemy; what the signal actually did was especially to set in motion a band of assassins against the prisoners of the Commune.

The number of men in this band has been exactly computed; they were not more than 150.[129] But for six days they terrorized Paris and governed as masters. At their head was a young man twenty-nine years old, married three months before, Stanislas Maillard by name. Presently he received a confidential mission from the Commune. He was the son of a merchant of Gournay, and worked as receptionist clerk in the office of his brother, Thomas Maillard. Tall, thin, elegant in his dress, a good talker, fond of appearing and orating, he was to be seen in the first ranks of the agitators in most of the revolutionary manifestations. The *Moniteur* listed him among the vanquishers of the Bastille; on October 5 he placed himself at the head of the Parisian women and returned in a carriage of the court to receive the compliments of the members of the municipality. Maillard was cruel by pose, as Danton was by passion, Robespierre by cold logic, and Carrier by bestial instinct. In the massacre at the Carmelites, was he the knowing agent of Marat and of the Commune? The collection of testimonies and documents scarcely admit of any doubt about this fact. The role of secret emissary was that of his whole life. His existence is full of suspicious dealings and dubious missions. A striking

[128] Report of Abbé Montifleury (*archives du Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, Papiers Emery*, III, 3).

[129] G. Lenôtre, *Les massacres de septembre* (1907), p. 9.

fact is that, continually regarded with jealousy by his accomplices, denounced by his enemies, several times imprisoned, Maillard always found powerful protectors to defend him or to release him.[130] Though weakened and spitting blood, he is seen, even to the time of his death (1794), spying, examining, and directing a band of spies enrolled by him and paid by the Surété générale,[131] engaged in hunting "the game of the guillotine."

Massacres at the Abbaye

Most of the arrested priests had been directed either to the prison of the abbaye of Saint-Germain or to the prison of the Carmelite monastery. The abbey of Saint-Germain then consisted of immense structures, chapels, cloisters, assembly halls, cellars, and kitchens, all opening on a courtyard almost square in shape, at the side of the church of Saint-Germain-des-Pres.[132]

About two hours had passed since the ringing of the tocsin. A band of cutthroats, with Maillard at its head, had gathered in the courtyard of the monastery, awaiting the arrival of the prisoners whom Billaud-Varenne had promised to bring there.

Regarding the scenes of savagery that took place that evening, we possess two important documents, independent of each other, each of them coming from an eyewitness of the events: the report of Méhée de Latouche, secretary of the Commune, and that of Father Sicard, the renowned teacher of the deaf-mutes, saved from the massacre by the courage of a citizen, who recalled this priest's services to humanity.

The time was about half-past two.[133] Father Sicard writes:

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 331.

[131] Cf. *ibid.*

[132] Some important fragments and a complete façade remain. These can be seen by anyone entering into the court of the house which bears the number 14 bis of rue de l'Abbaye.

[133] Méhée, in Lenôtre, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

We arrived at the Abbaye. The courtyard was filled with an immense throng.[134] Our carriages were at once surrounded; one of our comrades thought he could escape; he opened the door of the carriage, jumped into the midst of the crowd, and was at once butchered. A second person made a like attempt; he squeezed his way through the crowd and proceeded to escape; but the assassins fell upon this new victim, and blood flowed again. A third met the same fate. The carriage went ahead toward the hall of the committee; a fourth prisoner then sought to escape; he received a stroke with a sword . . . With the same rage the murderers turned on the second carriage.[135]

Says Méhée:

I saw blood gushing in streams. "We must kill them all, they are knaves," shouted the crowd. The fourth carriage contained only corpses. . . . The bodies of the dead were thrown into the courtyard. The twelve prisoners who were still alive stepped out of the carriages to enter the hall of the civil committee; two of them were slain as soon as they set foot on the ground. The committee did not have the time to proceed even to the briefest examination. A multitude armed with knives and swords poured in, snatched the prisoners and slaughtered them. . . . It was now five o'clock in the evening. Billaud-Varenne, the substitute for the procurator of the Commune, arrived. He stepped over the dead bodies, made a short harangue to the people, ending thus: "People, you are slaying your enemies; you do your duty." [136]

Twenty-one prisoners thus perished upon arriving in the courtyard of the Abbaye. Of a sudden, at the side of Billaud-Varenne, a voice called out, the voice of Maillard: "Nothing more is left to be done here. Let us go to the Carmelites." [137]

[134] According to the documents published by Granier de Cassagnac in his *Histoire des massacres de septembre,* it was supposed until recent years that the massacre took place on the very threshold of the prison. Father Bridier's publication in 1896 of the *Mémoires de M. de Salamon,* internuncio, who was likewise a witness of the assassinations, has proved that they took place in the heart of the Abbaye, in the court of the garden, under the windows of the guest house. See the plan in Lenôtre, pp. 168.

[135] *Relation de l'abbé Sicard,* quoted by Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* XI, 70.

[136] *Relation de Méhée de Latouche,* quoted by Lenôtre, pp. 178–82.

[137] Méhée, *op. cit.,* cf. Lenôtre, p. 182.

The Massacres at the Carmelite Monastery

At the Carmelites, after noon, the guards had been relieved. The new guards were men of sinister appearance, wearing the red cap and armed with pikes. At two o'clock the commissaire of the committee of the section had ordered the prisoners to go to the garden for their daily walk. Even the aged and the sick were forced to go out. We have the following report from one of these prisoners. He says: "We withdrew to the far end of the garden, behind a hedge; others sought refuge in a little oratory situated in a corner of the garden, where they began to recite their Vespers." [138] Suddenly cries were heard from rue Vaugirard. "Now, Monseigneur," cried out Father de la Pannonie, turning to Archbishop du Lau of Arles, "I believe they are going to assassinate us." To this the Archbishop replied: "My dear Father, if it is the moment of our sacrifice, let us thank God that we can offer Him our blood for so fine a cause."

The prisoners were not mistaken. A few moments before, in the church of St. Sulpice, transformed into the assembly hall of the Luxemburg section, a wine merchant, Louis Pirère, after leaping into the pulpit, which thus became his rostrum, there declared that he would not budge so long as they had not yet freed themselves of the prisoners and especially of the priests detained in the monastery of the Carmelites. Thereupon the Assembly decided "to purge the prisons by pouring out the blood of all those detained." [139] A band of raging men set out from the church in disorder and turned toward rue de Vaugirard. Upon reaching rue Cassette, this group met another band armed with swords and pikes dripping with blood. This was

[138] *Relation de l'abbé Berthelet de Barbot.*

[139] The original of the official report of this session has been found in the archives of the palace of justice by Dom Leclercq and has been published by him for the first time in 1912 in *Les martyrs,* XI, 67.

Maillard and his band, who were coming from the Abbaye. The two troops merged and irrupted into the monastery of the Carmelites.

Father Berthelet wrote: "At first we saw enter in fury seven or eight young men. Each of them wore a belt carrying pistols, besides the one he held in his left hand, and at the same time, with his right hand, he brandished a sword." [140] The assassins first, with strokes of the sword, struck down Father de Salins, who was absorbed in some reading; then, wounding or killing those they met on their way, they rushed to the end of the garden, crying out: "The Archbishop of Arles! The Archbishop of Arles!" Archbishop du Lau, who was kneeling before the oratory, arose and turned toward the assailants, saying: "I am he whom you seek." A violent blow of a sword was dealt him on the forehead. A second stroke from behind opened his skull. Three other blows brought him to the ground, where he lay unconscious. Then a pike was thrust into his breast, and the assassins trampled him underfoot.[141]

While a hunt was organized in the garden by the murderers, a good number of prisoners entered the church. They took their stand before the altar, giving absolution to one another and reciting the prayers of the dying.

Meanwhile one of the leaders, on whose identity the accounts do not agree but who seems to have been Maillard himself,[142] installed himself before a little table near the door opening on the garden. He had brought to him the list of the imprisoned priests, proceeded to the calling of the prisoners, asked each one whether he persevered in refusing the oath, and, upon an affirmative answer, sent him back to the garden, where the prisoner was immediately massacred amid furious outcries,

[140] *Relation de l'abbé Berthelet de Barbot,* quoted by Lenôtre, p. 253.

[141] Guillon, *Les martyrs de la foi,* III, 39.

[142] This is the opinion of Alexander Sorel, in his *Le couvent des Carmes,* p. 132. We note a striking similarity between the procedure used at the Carmelites and that which Maillard carried out two hours later at the Abbaye. Cf. Leclercq, p. 77.

among which could be distinguished the cry of, "Long live the nation!"

Thanks to the disorder, several managed to escape by crossing the garden and climbing over the wall of the enclosure. Almost 120 priests lost their lives in less than two hours. In the annals of Christianity the date of September 2, 1792, shines with a halo equal to that of its most glorious days. The prison of the Abbaye "has almost entirely disappeared today; but the monastery of the Carmelites, which still stands, with its church, the gloomy corridor where most were massacred, the oratory where the holy Archbishop of Arles fell, remains one of the most venerable monuments of the Church of France.

Further Massacres

These memories cannot make us forget the seventy-six priests who perished the next day at the seminary of St. Firmin, the three priests who were slaughtered in the prison of La Force,[143] and those who, on the night of September 2, met death at the Abbaye. After the massacre at the Carmelites, Maillard returned to the Abbaye and there, with a similar procedure, he organized a slaughter. Among the prisoners who were made to appear before him, Maillard found himself faced by the former minister of foreign affairs, whose wily policy had been long engaged in deceiving the vigilance of the Holy Father: this was Count de Montmorin. Says Méhée: "The ex-minister declared that he did not accept the members of the commission as his judges, that they did not hold the office of judges." In the presence of this accused man, who spoke so haughtily, Maillard exercised a cruel irony. A moment before, an agreement had been made that, "to avoid any scene of violence in the interior of the prison, the word 'death' was not to

[143] At La Force was slain Father Jean-Baptiste Bottex. Dementhon has written a most interesting life of him. Dementhon, *Vie de l'abbé J.-B. Bottex*.

be pronounced in the presence of the condemned; merely 'To La Force' would be said.'" [144] "Since you hold that your affair does not fall under our jurisdiction," said the president, "you are going to be sent to La Force." Montmorin thought he had won his case and, in a mounting tone of contempt, he replied: "Mr. President, since you are so called, I beg you to provide me with a carriage." "You will have it," replied Maillard coldly. Montmorin went forth from the hall and was at once massacred.[145]

Scenes no less horrible occurred in the other prisons of Paris, at Le Châtelet, the Conciergerie, the Tour Saint-Bernard, the Seminary of St. Firmin, at Bicêtre, and the Salpêtrière.[146]

While the blood was thus flowing in Paris, on September 3 the Commune's committee of execution and vigilance sent to all the municipalities of France the following circular, signed, among others, by "Marat, the friend of the people"—thus he called himself in the document itself—and countersigned by the minister of justice, Danton.[147] "The Commune of Paris eagerly

[144] *Relation de Méhée,* in Lenôtre, p. 187.

[145] Cf. Lenôtre, p. 191.

[146] Cf. Taine, *Les origines,* VI, 56; Mortimer-Ternaun, *Histoire de la Terreur,* III, 399, 592, 602–6. An informative process was undertaken in 1901 by order of Cardinal Richard for the canonization of the priests put to death for the faith during the days of September, 1792. The investigations of Bishop de Teil have resulted in the presentation of a list of 217 martyrs. See this list in Leclercq, *op. cit.,* pp. 137. The discoveries made by Bishop de Teil in the National Archives enabled him to point out several inexactitudes that escaped the patient studies of Alexander Sorel. The learned prelate, in an interesting report (July 5, 1904) remarks that the martyrs of September appeared like a representation of ecclesiastical France. They belonged to all the ranks of the hierarchy; the secular clergy were there associated with the religious orders; Bayonne and Nancy, Brest and Lyons, Boulogne-sur-Mer and Embrun are there likewise represented. See A. C. Sabtié, *Les massacres de septembre: les martyrs du clergé.*

[147] Danton's responsibility in the September massacres, a responsibility denied by Aulard, *Histoire générale,* VIII, 152, 155, has been long studied by Seligman, in a memoir read at the session of January 27, 1912, of the Academy des sciences morales et politiques. From documents indicated by Seligman, it appears that Danton, as also Roland, at first held aloof from the affair. He took part only when he saw the Girondins threatened with being affected. His intervention with Robespierre then brought an end to the massacres, which ceased on September 6. In any event, as

informs its brethren of all the departments that a party of ferocious conspirators detained in the prisons has been put to death by the people; acts of justice which seemed to them indispensable to restrain by terror the legions of traitors enclosed within its walls, at the very moment when it was about to march against the enemy: without doubt the nation will hasten to adopt this means, so useful and so necessary." [148]

Not fully satisfied with this bloody mission, the Commune had sent into the departments emissaries charged with the execution of its wishes. On September 3, Paris revolutionists arrived at Reims and there arrested four priests, who were soon massacred by the populace.[149] The next day, at Meaux, seven priests were put to death under the same circumstances.[150] On September 3 a certain Fournier, an atrocious fellow, called "the American," who had taken part in the massacres of September, decided on the execution of forty-four priests at Versailles. Among these was Bishop de Castellane of Mende who, it was said, received the confession of all the prisoners.[151] On all the roads groups of priests who, to escape from the fury of the assassins, were making their way toward the frontiers, were assaulted, maltreated, stabbed, attacked with stones or clubs, thrown into the rivers.[152]

Says Taine:

Welschinger remarked in the same session, too much insistence cannot be stressed on Danton's personal responsibility as minister of justice.

[148] Quoted by Papon, *Histoire de la Révolution,* VI, 277.

[149] Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 220.

[150] *Ibid.,* p. 221.

[151] *Ibid.,* p. 222.

[152] See Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 223. At Gacé in Normandy, four priests on their way to Le Havre were slain; Father Valframbert, a Capuchin, was put to death at Alençon, with atrocious refinements of cruelty; Father Loiseau was cast into a river and was held under water until he expired; four priests of St. Sulpice who were making their way toward the frontier were slain at Couches, near Autun; Father Cartier, vicar of St. Madeleine at Aix, was massacred at Antibes while on his way to Italy. Many other names might be added to this list. On the murder of Father Valframbert, see Piolin, *L'Eglise du Mans pendant la Révolution,* II, 144, and Leclercq, *Les martyrs,* XI, 151.

In the departments we count by hundreds the days similar to that of September 2. On all sides the same fever, the same delirium indicating the presence of the same virus; and that virus was the Jacobin dogma. Thanks to that dogma assassination clothed itself in the garb of political philosophy; the most outrageous attacks became lawful, for they were the acts of the lawful sovereign, charged with providing for the public safety.[153]

The Oath of Liberty and Equality

Two legislative acts, passed in the course of the events we have just narrated, should evidently have halted the massacre of non-juring priests. On August 10, 1792, the Legislative Assembly, with a view to suppressing mention of the king in the formula of an oath which it had been the first to violate, prescribed the taking of a new oath worded thus: "I swear to maintain with all my strength liberty and equality, or to die in their defense." The new formula not only passed over any mention of fidelity to the king, but it made no allusion whatever to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Moreover, on August 26 the Assembly passed a law subjecting the non-juring priests to deportation. This law, by its severe provisions, aggravated the former law of deportation (May 27); but, as it carried precise penalties against a refusal to take the oath, this new law should logically have put an end to the arbitrary proceedings and penalties which the municipalities introduced regarding refractory priests. We may even suppose that many of those who voted for the August law of deportation had in view a restraint on deeds of popular fury, whose terrible outbursts might easily be foreseen. A return to pity is understandable even in the soul of a Jacobin. Men are never as good or as bad as their principles.[154]

[153] Taine, *op. cit.*, VI, 65.

[154] During the September massacres, Danton had saved the life of Father Lhomond, his former professor; Robespierre, former pupil of Father Bérardier, snatched him

However that may be, nothing now stopped the course of the massacres, and the new oath of liberty and equality—the little oath, as it was called—had as its particular effect the provoking of painful differences and grievous discussions among the Catholics; the refusal of the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy had united faithful priests into a compact and disciplined batallion; that union was now broken.

The fifteen bishops remaining in France and also a few *émigré* bishops, such as Boisgelin and Barral, authorized their priests to take the oath; most of the prelates residing abroad declared such an act illicit. Almost all the clergy of Paris, the members of the congregations of the Oratory, of St. Lazare, and of St. Sulpice, some houses of the Sorbonne and of Navarre, took it.[155] Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice, wrote: "The equality, as we understand the term, can be quite innocently promised because, 1. the clergy and the nobility have given up all their pecuniary privileges; 2. all our criminal laws make no distinction, based on diversity of rank, among various convicted persons; 3. the admission of all subjects to all offices and employments has been recognized and accorded by the King, to whom the clergy and the nobility have fully acquiesced." [156] Worthy prelates, like Bausset and La Luzerne, saw, moreover, an interest of the first order for the clergy in not appearing to be the adversary of a political liberty wisely understood, in not crediting the calumny of those who loudly proclaimed the incompatibility of Catholicism with liberty. On the other hand, some ecclesiastics, no less commendable for

from death; Maillard himself, by a semblance of improvised tribunal, contributed to saving the lives of several prisoners. Lenôtre, *Les massacres de septembre,* p. 331. Robespierre used to give alms to the poor. Lenôtre, *Vieilles maisons,* II, 62. Hébert used to write *Le Père Duchesne* at the side of his wife, who was kneeling in prayer (*ibid.,* II, 377), and Fourquier-Tinville wore about his neck a medal of the Blessed Virgin (*ibid.,* II, 289). Regarding this last mentioned, see A. Dunoyer, *Fouquier-Tinville.*

[155] *Annales catholiques,* I, 466.

[156] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 273.

their intelligence and their virtue, saw in the oath of liberty and equality a formula at least captious. Every profession of faith, they said, must be interpreted in the sense intended by him who imposes it. But, if we are to interpret the words "liberty and equality" by the acts of those who apply them under the egis of the government, these words signify only a revolutionary liberty and equality, destructive of the legitimate government and the Catholic religion.

Maury, who was then living in Rome, where he had been consecrated archbishop of Nicaea and where he was in close touch with the *émigrés,* became the vigorous spokesman of this latter opinion. He wrote: "This oath seems to me more perfidious and impious than the first. The first was merely heretical; this one consecrates rebellion. . . . As to its perfidy, that is well proved, since this formula has seduced so many people of good will and of good minds." [157] And the fiery prelate, who later so gravely disobeyed the Holy Father, let it be known that the attitude he was attacking was perhaps prompted by a lack of courage or a lack of loyalty to the Holy See. The superior of St. Sulpice replied, with the pride of a father who could appeal to the testimony of the blood shed by his children: "Monseigneur, the living members of my Company are nearly all dispersed in different parts of Christendom and are not involved in the matter of the oath. I say 'the living members'; for thirteen have been massacred; and I have the consolation of seeing my Company, though the smallest of all, give more martyrs in this cause of the Church and of the Holy See than all the other secular companies together.[158] But some remain about me,

[157] Méric, *op. cit.,* I, 272.

[158] The Company of St. Sulpice counted, in 1791, about 500 members. From 1792 to 1794, eighteen of them poured out their blood for the faith. See Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 451. Almost all the religious communities were represented in the bloody martyrology. The Jesuits, dispersed since twenty-five years before, were present at the moment when they would have to offer their lives in the cause of God and the Church. Out of the 217 martyrs at the Carmelites on September 2, we count twenty-four Jesuits, that is, an eighth of the victims.

and we are neglecting nothing to show the Holy See our boundless attachment." [159]

Father Emery had in mind to suspend his judgment and to determine his opinion on the basis of authority; but communications with Rome, too slow and difficult, did not allow him to receive in time an effective direction from the Holy See. In these circumstances the priests of France, reduced to the necessity of taking counsel only with themselves, experienced that torment of delicate and courageous souls that would not hesitate to die in the performance of their duty, but that do not know precisely where that duty lies. Father Emery, wishing to reply to the chief objection of his adversaries, placed himself in relation with Gersonné, the reporter of the decree on the "little oath" and submitted to him the commentary he had drawn up on it. Gersonné fully approved this commentary. At length a reply from Rome arrived. It was dated October, 1792. The Pope, faithful to his prudent and patient policy, declared that, before deciding about the oath in question, he wished to know what was the exact meaning attributed to the words "liberty and equality." In the month of May, 1793, Cardinal Zelada, the Pope's minister, who was consulted by Father Emery, replied: "The Pope has made no pronouncement on the oath in question; if it is purely civic, it may be taken." In various briefs (October 5, 1793; April 1 and July 29, 1794; April 22, 1795) the Pope merely makes the same reply, with some precise details, namely: 1. that he does not pronounce a decision on the oath; 2. that he does not require any retractation by those who have taken it.[160] This waiting attitude, conformable to the general policy

[159] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 326.

[160] Dom Piolin, in his *L'Eglise du Mans pendant la Révolution,* II, 93, maintains that Pius VI had, "by a decision addressed to the Chambery chapter, condemned the oath of liberty and equality as formally culpable." Misermont, in an article in the *Revue des études historiques* (January–February, 1910), published the text of this decision and, abandoning Piolin's opinion, concludes simply that the Pope, while respecting the persons of those who have sworn, is clearly opposed to the oath itself. We cannot share this conclusion. The Pope declared merely: 1. that the oath will

of Pius VI, now appears to us as the wisest that could be taken by him who had the formidable responsibility of the supreme government of the Church; but the anguish of souls, called upon to form their conscience by themselves, continued to remain painful.[161] Soon it would be renewed in connection with new oaths, but then the question will be placed on a clearer terrain, and the Holy See's reply will be a categorical condemnation.

The Convention (1792–95)

While the Catholics were greatly disturbed in conscience over these grave problems, the Legislative Assembly was succeeded by the Convention. The newly elected deputies were

---

have to be regarded as evil "if, from the circumstances, it is found to be according to the other heretical and schismatical decrees that purposed destroying the Church"; 2. that those who have taken the oath with a doubtful conscience will have to put themselves in line with their conscience. These are the two particular solutions of cases of conscience which Father Emery undoubtedly had in mind to bring into question, for they are merely the application of the most general principles of moral theology. See St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Theologia moralis,* Vol. III, no. 148. On the question of the oath, see, besides the works already cited, J. Meilloc, *Les serments pendant la Révolution.*

[161] We have before us a paper that circulated among the faithful at this period. It says: "The bark of Peter is violently stirred, and the tempest spreads such a darkness that we can hardly see to guide ourselves. . . . Peter and Andrew are rowing on one side, James and John on the other; all four of them undoubtedly intend to save the bark, but they may be putting it in great peril. Where shall we find our safety? No doubt, in the middle. Let us remain between the four rowers; let us not create a schism with anyone. Let us hold to the middle, at the feet of Christ who seems to be sleeping. Let us awaken Him by our prayers. Let us cry out to Him: 'Lord, save us, we perish,' so that He may arise and command the tempest and He may restore the calm." Thus did the Catholics pray. The Freemasons did not suffer the same anxieties. In an undated address, composed on the occasion of the feast of the Federation, the Draguignan lodge thus expressed itself: "We swear, on the word of Masons, to maintain the Constitution with all our means and, if need be, to combat with the flaming sword the aristocracy, despotism, and all the tyrants of the earth. . . . In our vast republic of brethren, our ties can become the conductors of that civic electricity which ought to establish, in the machine of the world, an equilibrium of happiness." *Archives nationales,* C. 123, no. 398, quoted in the *Revue des questions historiques,* LXXXVIII (1910), 532–34.

divided into three hostile groups, suspicious, ready to devour one another: the Gironde (Girondists), the Plain, and the Mountain. Two passions, however, dominated these internal hatreds: an almost delirious patriotism, intoxicated by the recent victories in which the Republic's "volunteers in sabots" had repulsed the old armies of the European coalition; and the rage to make an end of the two secular powers, only half overcome, whose bloody debris still barred the way to the triumphant Revolution: the Church and the monarchy.

In this history of the Church, our task does not require us to relate in detail the political work of the Convention: the proclamation of the Republic (September 21, 1792); the strife between the Mountain and the Gironde; the trial and condemnation of the King; the first coalition, formed against France by William Pitt; the treason of Dumouriez; the fall of the Gironde; the uprisings in the provinces; the war, becoming the pretext for a Jacobin dictatorship; Lazare Carnot "organizing the victory," while Marat organizes the Terror; the guillotine permanently established; Marat, Hébert, and Danton put to death; the Revolution "devouring its children like Saturn"; Robespierre alone remaining unscathed and, amid the military triumphs of France, victorious beyond her borders, dreaming of founding, under the egis of the Supreme Being and of Reason, some sort of bloody Salian priesthood; the new dictator himself falling; the subsequent reaction; the "gilded Youth" gathered about Talien, drunk with pleasures as well as with vengeance; lastly, the "giant Assembly" tired and discredited, despite its important financial and administrative reforms,[162] declaring (October, 1795) its mission terminated, at the very

[162] To the Convention must be credited the uniformity of weights and measures, the creation of the Institute and the Normal School, the Polytechnic School, the Central School of public works, the Conservatory of arts and trades, the National Institute (Conservatory of Music), and the Bureau of Longitudes, the final organization of the Institute of blind youth, and the opening of the Museum of the Louvre.

moment when the political scene witnessed the appearance of the young general who would become master of the French Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte.

The policy of the Convention remain unchanged on one point, the religious persecution. One of the first concerns of the Assembly was to assure the execution of the deportation decree against the non-juring priests; the last of its acts was the proclamation of general amnesty, from which the refractory ecclesiastics were expressly excepted.

Under the Legislative Assembly the situation of the faithful priests had grown daily worse; their security became more and more endangered. Most of them, separated from their bishops who, after the example of Bishop de Juigné, had chosen to expatriate themselves, leaving their powers in the hands of vicars general; not finding in these vicars the authority, promptness, and firmness of decision which the pending difficulties required; pursued by bitterly hostile municipalities; and, in many places, given over to the mercy of the popular movements, at every moment stirred up by some impromptu agitators; many priests, among the better ones, judged that the moment had come for them to follow the counsel of the Master: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another." [163] After the emigration of the nobility, that of the clergy began.

These two emigrations do not deserve the same judgment of history. The emigration of the nobility, especially that of 1789, which one lawmaker called "the emigration of pride," has been the subject of well-founded criticism. We would do them an injustice if we regarded these noble *émigrés* as accomplices of the foreigner. They were French after their own manner. If several of them asked Europe to intervene in the affairs of France, by way of monarchical solidarity, "these very men would have throttled the first person that spoke of paying for

[163] Matth. 10:23.

the intervention with a single fortress of the kingdom." [164] But when at Brussels, Turin, Mainz, and Coblenz certain wealthy lords, who smiling departed from France "until the squall should pass over," scandalized their hosts by the frivolity of their manners and the skepticism of their spirit. They deserved the severe blame which the venerable Cardinal Pacca indignantly expressed in a celebrated memorial.[165]

Quite different was the attitude of the *émigré* clergy and, we must acknowledge, also of that part of the nobility which became voluntary exiles only in the last extremity, when the ruin of their châteaux and the organization of a regime of exception in their regard, had rendered their situation intolerable in France. Toward the end of 1792 the emigration of the clergy took on considerable proportions. The latest biographer of Pius VI says: "The numerous stagecoaches no longer were enough to transport the fugitives. All the roads leading from France to Spain, England, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, and especially to Italy were jammed with ecclesiastics and monks who were fleeing from prison and death." [166]

The *Emigré* Priests

The priests of Languedoc turned their steps toward Spain. The Catholic peninsula seemed to them to be a sure asylum. There, however, they met with many disappointments on the part of the civil authorities. Indeed, few statesmen were more opposed to the Revolution than Florida Blanca, the prime min-

[164] L. Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 159. Chateaubriand has strikingly set forth the case of conscience which the patriotism of the *émigrés* asked itself, and the replies that they gave to their doubts. See Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* (ed. Edmond Biré), II, 33–35; and *Essai sur les Révolutions*, pp. 428–34.

[165] Pacca, *Œuvres*, II, 261.

[166] Gendry, *Pie VI*, II, 195. All of chapter 30 of this work, based solely on archival documents, is devoted to this emigration of the clergy and the measures taken by Pius VI on that occasion.

ister of Charles IV; but this opposition extended to France herself. "Florida Blanca had such a horror of the French ideas that the *émigrés* themselves appeared to him to be dangerous people. In July, 1791, a royal edict subjected foreigners residing in Spain to the closest and most humiliating surveillance of the police. . . . The edict was drawn up in general terms; but in reality it was directed against 13,000 Frenchmen who had become established in the peninsula." [167] Count Aranda, who succeeded Blanca at the beginning of 1792, effected an altogether opposite policy. Aranda had been known by his campaign against the Jesuits. He had lived in Paris for seven years and had introduced Freemasonry into Spain.[168] His ministry was even less favorable to the *émigré* priests. However, this ministry was of short duration. The too famous Godoy, who replaced Aranda in August, 1792, had a vain and vile soul with only one ambition: to hold on to the power at any price. He cynically declared that he longed to come to a good understanding with the Jacobins, provided his own security was assured.[169] Nothing good was to be expected from the initiative of such a man. But an energetic action in favor of the *émigrés* did not seem impossible.

A noble gentleman of Languedoc, Count Antraigues, and his worthy mother, Madame Sophie d'Antraigues, generously took up the defense of the French priests who had sought refuge in Spain. They stirred to action the Spanish ambassador to Venice and Cardinal Bernis; then, having obtained the assurance that a suggestion from His Holiness would be received with satisfaction by His Catholic Majesty,[170] they begged the Pope to intervene. Pius VI gladly acquiesced to this desire, and the King of Spain declared his readiness to accord hospitality to the French ecclesiastics, "provided they should not gather in large numbers

[167] Desdevises du Dezert, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* VIII, 727.
[168] *Ibid.,* p. 278.
[169] *Ibid.,* p. 729.
[170] *Archives vaticanes, Nunziat di Madrid,* quoted by Gendry, *op. cit.,* II, 196.

and that they should faithfully observe the laws of the country." [171] The welcome accorded to the proscribed priests by the Spanish clergy was admirable. Montserrat Abbey in Catalonia opened its doors wide to the persecuted. The archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Lorenzana, and Bishop Quevedo of Orense in Galicia were conspicuous for their liberal hospitality.[172] According to one calculation, Spain received about 7,000 French priests.[173]

England received the *émigré* priests of Normandy, Brittany, and the border provinces. On September 16, 1792, it already counted 3,000 of them and, about the middle of the next year, almost 8,000. The general enthusiastic good will which Great Britain showed in these circumstances is one of her most beautiful titles to the gratitude of the French nation.

Moreover, beginning fifteen years earlier, the situation of Catholicism in England had improved. The preoccupations caused by the war which resulted in the independence of the United States had led the government of George III to desire no enemies on the side of the Roman Church. The two rival statesmen who contested for the power, Pitt and Fox, took the same view of this matter. Laws passed in 1775 and in 1780 gave to English Catholics reliable guaranties for their ownership of property, their worship, and their teaching. The Catholics of Ireland and Scotland were in the way of obtaining, with the same guaranties, access to all judicial careers and to almost all the honors previously reserved to the Protestants. Yet the attitude of public opinion toward the French Revolution was wavering. No one is unaware of the deep influence exercised by the English philosophers on the men who had just given a new constitution to France, and many gloried in that influence.

[171] Dispatch of the Spanish nuncio; cf. *Ibid.*, p. 197.

[172] See the testimony of Father Nicard in *L'ami de la religion* (1814), Vol. II. Cf. Barruel, *Histoire du clergé*, p. 342.

[173] This is the figure given by Father Contrasty in his interesting study, *Le clergé français exilé en Espagne* (1792–1802), published in 1910.

Mackintosh in his *Vindiciae gallicae,* composed in 1791, praised the work of the Constituent Assembly; Thomas Paine, more radical, in his *Rights of Man,* made of 1791 and 1792 a parallel between the two revolutions, the English and the French; Fox, the adversary of the house of Bourbon, declared himself a friend of the new France. Conformable to these ideas, the "Society of the Revolution" called for the suppression of the tithes; the "Society for the Development of Constitutional Knowledge" undertook a campaign for universal suffrage; the "Corresponding Societies," with their center in London, had continual relations with the clubs of Paris and inclined toward the Republic.[174] But, on the other hand, the excesses of the Revolution alarmed the reflecting and industrious people of Great Britain. From the end of 1790 one of its most powerful thinkers, Edmund Burke, was the eloquent spokesman of this apprehension in his *Reflections on the French Revolution,* in which he pointed unerringly, as the end of an unexampled anarchy, to the most absolute despotism which has ever appeared under heaven.[175] Pitt, the eminent statesman, whose clear, practical, and always calm mind seemed to embody the best qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race, openly declared himself against Jacobinism. Yet on one point the liberalism of Fox, the wisdom of Burke, and the conservative policy of Pitt met: a breath of sincere humaneness animated these men, as well as the whole British nation, whose illustrious representatives they were, and as it did also the King, whom they purposed serving with different opinions; and this sentiment made them sympathetic to the misfortunes of the French *émigrés.*

A first group of proscribed priests set foot on the shores of England in August, 1791.[176] They received a hearty welcome.

[174] Sayous in *Histoire générale,* VIII, 644.

[175] See also his *Letters on a Regicide Peace.* [Tr.]

[176] The Bishop of Saint-Pol-de-Léon, harassed by the government police, fled to England in 1791 and settled in London. There he remained almost alone until

We let one of these exiles comment on the event. Says Father Barruel:

A person must have been three years in France amid the Constitutionalists, Girondists, Maratists, and Jacobins of all sorts, to experience fully how much restfulness and delight that first welcome of the English brought to each of these priests. It was like the sweet awakening of the soul which, after being long tormented with the image of monsters and furies, comes out of that frightful dream and finds about it only reassuring and peaceful objects. I know this from my own experience and from that of my brethren deported along with me.[177]

Bishop Lamarche of Saint-Pol-de-Léon, who was living in London since the previous year, sought to obtain help for his unfortunate compatriots. Wilmot, a member of Parliament, placed himself at the head of a committee of initiative that made an appeal to the public. Edmund Burke eagerly espoused the cause of the proscribed; he even drew up an address, that was inserted in all the newspapers and that brought in more than 84,000 francs. The next year Parliament voted a sum of money intended for the succor of the *émigré* priests and nobles; this appropriation was repeated every year, and, according to one calculation, up to 1806 a total of 42,620,000 francs, had been distributed.[178] Father Carron, a holy priest of Rennes whose devotedness to the popular classes had not saved him from the persecution of the Jacobins, in 1792 founded in Jersey two schools for the instruction of the *émigré* youth, a chapel for the exercise of Catholic worship, pious associations, and a library for the priests. Four years later at London, aided by the Bishop of Saint-Pol-de-Léon and sustained by the personal benevolence of King George III, he was able to extend his good works.

August, 1792. Father de Lubersac, *Journal historique et religieux de l'émigration et de la déportation du clergé de France en Angleterre*, p. 1.

[177] Barruel, *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française*, p. 349.

[178] Picot, VI, 241. For the details, see Lubersac, *Journal de l'émigration*, pp. 16–30; Barruel, *op. cit.*, pp. 351–55.

Establishments of benevolence and chapels were erected, thanks to him, in several quarters of London,[179] and Chateaubriand is the genuine and eloquent echo of the general opinion of his time, when he calls Father Charron "the Francis of Paula of the exile, whose renown, revealed by the afflicted, penetrated even through the fame of Napoleon." [180] England became as it were the heart of the emigration. London received the larger part of the men whose talent was an honor to France.[181] At London, Archbishop Boisgelin of Aix published his metrical translation of the Psalter, Father Barruel his *Histoire du clergé de France pendant la Révolution* and his *Mémoires sur le jacobinisme,* Delille his poem, *La pitié,* and Chateaubriand began his *Essai historique sur les révolutions.*[182] The French priests did not limit their activity to their ministry in favor of their fellow countrymen. We quote the following tribute of Father Madaune.

Our confessors of the faith spread into the different counties. Some became tutors in rich families; others opened schools; some founded missions. Of these missions the district of London alone, including the present dioceses of Westminster and Southwark, counted thirty. The most important were at Chelsea, Kennington, and Hommersmith. High Mass became a general practice in the London chapels. English and Irish priests profited from the help brought by these foreigners to engage more actively in the care of their scattered flocks. At the same time many of the anti-Catholic prejudices disappeared from the spirit of the Protestant people when they found themselves in contact with the life and the example of these confessors of the faith, as pious as they were resigned. We may well believe that the admirable British

[179] One of the chapels then erected in London was founded by Francis Emmanuel Bourret, a priest of St. Sulpice, under the title of Our Lady of the Annunciation. See Lubersac, *op. cit.,* p. 46.

[180] Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* I, 178. On Father Charron, see *ibid.*

[181] Antonin de Saint-Gervais, *Histoire des émigrés français,* II, 9, 13.

[182] Chateaubriand, *op. cit.,* II, 190. Father de Lubersac in his *Journal de l'émigration* has a long chapter entitled, "Liste des principaux ecclésiastiques français qui, pendant leur émigration à Londres, ont publié des ouvrages sur la religion ou qui y ont quelque rapport; courtes analyses de ces ouvrages," pp. 188–271.

charity was pleasing to Him who promised a reward for a cup of water given in His name and that, from that hour, England rewon her rights to religious truth.[183]

The *Emigrés* in Germany

Pius VI, upon learning of the charitable welcome given by the English nation to the persecuted priests, at once sent to King George III a brief of felicitations.[184] Soon his attention was especially drawn to the situation of the *émigré* priests in Germany.

In Germany the reaction to the revolutionary movement divided the people of the country. Nowhere perhaps had the principles of the Revolution aroused a greater sympathy among intellectual men; but also nowhere did the progress of the Revolution provoke a firmer opposition among statesmen. Kant recognized in the Declaration of the Rights of Man the principles of right, autonomy, and liberty, which he had made the basis of his moral system. With still warmer passion, Fichte had taken up the defense of Jacobinism itself.[185] The "friends of lights," continuing Lessing's work, spread the ideas of liberty and of political renovation. A group of young poets, taking their inspiration from Klopstock,[186] celebrated, in the French Revolution, the rationalist and mystical character of its inspiration. Those who, gathered about Jacobi, were reacting by the cult of sentiment against the followers of an excessively dry intellectualism, united with them in admiration of the new ideas, and the Illuminati of Weishaupt's school surpassed all

[183] Madaune, *La Renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre,* p. 7.

[184] Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 197. Gendry quotes several other briefs sent to Bishop Lamarche, Edmund Burke, Andrew Stuart, and others.

[185] In 1793 Fichte published the *Zurückforderung der Denkfreiheit von den Fürsten Europas;* in 1794, his *Beiträge zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums über die französische Revolution.*

[186] Klopstock, the author of the *Messiade,* had glorified in verse the States General of France with the same pen that had just celebrated the advent of Christ.

in the admiration they professed for the new principles.[187]

All the currents of German thought seemed to merge in the glorification of the Revolution and in its work; but all the political interests appeared to be menaced by it. In fact, as Cardinal Pacca, then nuncio at Cologne, remarks in his *Memoirs,* "the first objects that infuriated the French philosophers and revolutionists were the aristocracy, the feudal system, the clergy's power and wealth. But all that was in full vigor in Germany, a country essentially aristocratic and feudal, where the clergy was sovereign over a great part of the country." [188] Furthermore, many of the German nobility had considerable possessions in Alsace, in Lorraine, and in Burgundy. The decrees passed on the night of August 4 had injured these lords in their feudal rights. The Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia, at the instigation of the deputies of the Upper Rhine district, intervened with Louis XVI to ask of him the re-establishment of the former state of affairs. Besides, the statesmen of Germany no longer were blind to the significance of the French Revolution. Cardinal Pacca reports two statements by Kaunitz, minister of the court of Austria, and by Hertzberg, minister of the court of Prussia. The former was asked how long the movement begun in France would last. "A long time, perhaps without end," answered the aged minister. Count Hertzberg used to repeat to anyone willing to listen: "The Revolution will make the tour of Europe." [189]

The arrival of the first *émigrés* did but increase the confusion of ideas and feelings in the midst of which Germany was struggling. The historian of the French *émigrés* does not hesi-

[187] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* I, 175, 177–81; G. Blondel in *Histoire générale,* VIII, 715–22. On the movement of political and social philosophy in Germany of that period, see Paul Janet, *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale* (2nd ed.), II, 620–84; Harald Höffding, *History of Modern Philosophy.*

[188] Pacca, *Relation sur sa nonciature de Cologne* in his *Œuvres complètes* (French tr., 1845), II, 250.

[189] Pacca, *op. cit.*, II, 250.

tate to acknowledge that the nobility "displayed too much luxury at Coblenz," that they had not "the grave and austere tone suitable to proscribed men," and "that such an attitude was able to lead to that principle of indifference of which the sovereigns had given many proofs." [190] Cardinal Pacca says without evasion:

> The close relations I had with the *émigré* nobles almost made me lose hope of seeing an end to the evils that desolate France. Most of these nobles, especially the great lords of the court, practice no act of religion; furthermore, they publicly affect a complete indifference for all religious principle. The city of Coblenz has, so to speak, become a new Versailles; the same cabals prevailed, the same court intrigues, the same dissoluteness, without concern for the public. These examples gravely scandalized the Germans and did much harm to the Catholic religion in Germany.[191]

The documents recently published by Vaissière fully confirm this appraisal by the papal nuncio.[192] The conduct of some *émigré* bishops was unfortunately subject to similar criticism. Says Pacca: "It is known that the great majority of the French bishops were an edification for all Europe; but I must confess with bitterness that the conduct of a small number of them was far from corresponding to the high opinion which had been entertained of them. Some pious ladies of Cologne, who were expecting to venerate in them Hilarys and Eusebiuses, were astonished at seeing their uncanonical manner of dress and the frivolity of their conversations in the world of high society." [193] The lower clergy saved the honor of the Church of France. Says Pacca: "The priests belonged mostly to the venerable class of curés. They maintained a conduct truly edifying and fully justified the good repute which had preceded them." [194]

[190] Antonin de Saint-Gervais, *Histoire des émigrés français,* I, 112.
[191] Pacca, *Œuvres complètes,* II, 262.
[192] P. de Vaissière, *Lettres d'aristocrates* (1907).
[193] Pacca, *op. cit.,* p. 261.
[194] *Ibid.*

Bishops and priests had received a generous hospitality in Germany, both from the princes and from the people. But the invasion of Savoy in September, 1792, by General Montesquiou, and that of Belgium in November by Dumouriez drove into Germany a still greater number of fugitive priests. New efforts and sacrifices became necessary. On September 21, 1792, after the invasion of Savoy, Pius VI wrote a brief to the entire clergy of Germany, recommending to their charity the persecuted priests of France.[195] The German people responded to this appeal in a noble manner. Thanks to the zeal of Cardinal Caprara, nuncio at Vienna, several Austrian monasteries opened their doors to the unfortunate exiles. Relief funds were organized and associations were founded to provide help for their needs. The city of Munster and its bishop, Maximilian, elector of Cologne, were particularly outstanding by their zeal and generosity.[196] Some nuns exiled from France were placed in various houses and by their virtues edified the persons who gave them hospitality.

The Swiss cantons showed themselves worthy of their old renown for hospitality. As Barruel says:

> The Swiss could not offer the same help as the opulent nations; but they had the heart of benevolent people. At sight of these homeless priests they sheltered them under their rustic roofs. The peasants went out to wait for them along the highways to offer them lodging. . . . A just gratitude then inspired in these priests the desire to make themselves useful to these patriarchal families. They gave lessons to the children. Some of them even helped in domestic labors. Father Dubois, professor in the Orléans college, writes: "I have seen several of these priests mowing hay with as much assiduity as the peasants who had received them in hospitality." [197]

[195] Gendry, II, 199.

[196] Picot, VI, 237, according to a manuscript memoir of Father de Sagey, vicar general of Mans, an eyewitness of the facts related by him.

[197] Barruel, *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* pp. 343, 345.

The Holy Father sent (April 20, 1795) the avoyer and the council of the canton of Fribourg a brief of felicitation praising the charity of all Switzerland.

The *Emigré* Priests in Italy

From the southeast part of France more than 3,000 priests took the road to Italy. As in Spain, England, Germany, and Switzerland,[198] the austere life of most of these priests and the example of their virtues gave edification to the people. To a considerable extent this edification compensated for the scandals given to the foreigner by the writings of the French philosophers and by a large number of the *émigré* lords. In all Europe the French clergy, providentially scattered by the storm, were preparing, in suffering and humiliation, for the Catholic revival that would follow the Revolution.

The propagation of the revolutionary ideas had found in Italy both great obstacles and earnest accomplices. The obstacles came not only from the government and the privileged classes of the peninsula, who were not less mistrustful of the new ideas than were those of the great states, but also the common people. These found themselves more bound to the life of the local aristocracy, less weighed down by taxes, more inclined perhaps than people elsewhere to prefer to the abstract freedom preached by the Revolution the concrete and tangible freedom which their local rulers granted them. They valued the ease which the oligarchies of Venice and Genoa and the paternal administration of the papal court procured for them. A favorable reception of the revolutionary ideas was to be found in the survival of that republican spirit which had agitated Italy of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and in the excessive individualist temperament referred to by Tasso when he wrote:

[198] A certain number of priests took refuge also in Belgium, Holland, and Russia.

Alla virtu latina
O nulla manca, o sol la disciplina.[199]

The same spirit was likewise met with in the emotionalism which may be explained by the climate, and especially in that "fondness for conspiracies, the habit of secret societies," [200] which were then being perpetuated at Naples, Venice, Milan, and Rome, in the lodges of the Freemasons and the Illuminati.[201] However, in the Italian people habits of a sincere and deep faith persisted.

The crimes of the Convention divided the various currents that were mingled in Italy. The princes, one after the other, entered the coalition that was formed against the French Revolution; the wild enthusiasts and the Freemasons organized into clubs, which maintained continual relations with the Committee of Public Safety.[202] Persons of deep faith were moved to pity at seeing the French priests, arriving daily in larger numbers, who, to follow their conscience, left their own country and resigned themselves to beg their daily bread from the charity of their brethren. Cardinal Costa, archbishop of Turin, in a pastoral letter (October 5, 1792) recommended these exiles to the charity of his faithful. The other prelates followed this example. Chapels, houses of hospitality, and provisions of clothing were placed at the disposal of the unfortunate fugitives, who lacked everything. The nobility and rich persons were admirable in their devotion.[203]

The influx of the French priests into Italy, principally into

[199] During a journey in Italy, Kant complained of not finding the French spirit of sociability and society. Cf. A. Fouillée, *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens* (1903), p. 93. The Italian historian Ferrero says: "A single Italian is worth more than a German, but four Germans together are worth more than twelve Italians" (*L'Europa giovane*, p. 376).

[200] Fouillée, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

[201] C. Cantu, *Gli eretici in Italia.*

[202] Pingaud in *Histoire générale*, VIII, 762.

[203] For details, see Auribeau, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la persécution* (1794), Part IV.

the Papal States, suggested to Pius VI the thought of creating "the pious work of French hospitality." In fact, this work existed from the very beginning of the emigration; but it was fully organized only at the end of September, 1792. Its president was the Secretary of State, who was admirably seconded by Monsignor Caleppi, former auditor of the nunciature at Vienna.[204] The *émigrés* were distributed in four large cities: Bologna, Ferrara, Perugia, and Viterbo. On October 10, 20, and 30, 1792, circular letters were sent out by the Secretary of State to all the monasteries of Italy, recommending the French priests to them. To maintain discipline among the numerous *émigrés,* two important regulations were published by the Pope: one on January 26, 1793, the other on January 25, 1794.[205] Twenty-four exiled prelates were gathered about the Pope. Among them was to be seen Philippe Casone, count of Villeneuve, vice-legate of Avignon, whom the Revolution had forced to flee successively from Avignon to Carpentras, from Carpentras to Chambery, from Chambery to Rome; Archbishop Giovio of Avignon, who had experienced almost the same vicissitudes; the bishops of Sisteron, of Vaison, and of Carpentras. This last, who had come on foot from Savoy to Rome (October, 1792), had been preceded by one of his diocesans, Father Jean Siffrein Maury, the mighty orator whose eloquence had held its own in the face of that of Mirabeau. The Pope, wishing to recompense the services rendered to the Catholic cause by this courageous priest, made him titular archbishop of Nicaea. Maury merited the gratitude of the Church. In difficult times his unruffled composure, the vivacity of his repartees, and the flexibility of his logic, had, in the face of the revolutionists, made him a formidable champion. But the greatness of his talent was not equaled by nobility of character.

[204] Gendry, II, 198.
[205] Cf. *ibid.,* II, 200 ff.

The new prelate in 1792, in the name of the Pope, performed some useful missions;[206] but he shared too intimately the grudges of the lay *émigrés,* intervened too haughtily in the question of the oath, and finally compelled the Pope to suspend him from his functions of bishop. A greater figure was that of François d'Aviau, archbishop of Vienne, who, driven from his diocese by the persecution, reached Rome, after various wanderings, at the beginning of 1794. Pius VI valued the holy prelate, who in 1795 directed from Rome the three dioceses of Vienne, Viviers, and Die. In 1797, disguised as a peasant, he evangelized, at peril of his life, the mountains of Vivarais and Forez. Finally, in the archiepiscopal see of Bordeaux, he gave the example of the loftiest virtues.[207] Like this pious bishop, most of the *émigré* ecclesiastics at Rome there showed a new zeal for the spread of the gospel. In times of persecution as in those of prosperity, the Eternal City always showed itself the center and head of the Catholic Church.

The emigration extended outside the limits of Europe, reaching beyond the ocean to America; in the New World, as in the Old, it sowed the seed of future harvests.

The *Emigré* Priests in America

The American Revolution, although starting with a Declaration of Rights similar, from the political point of view, to that which the French Revolution adopted later, did not have the same antireligious character. The first amendment of the American Constitution forbids Congress to prohibit the free exercise of religion. The appointment (1789) of Bishop Carroll, a personal friend of Washington, to the see of Baltimore, did more than found the Catholic hierarchy in the United States; it appeared to all as a pledge of fruitful peace between the Church

[206] Gendry, II, 206.

[207] Lyofnet, *Vie de Mgr d'Aviau.*

and the state. But, in the vast extent of the apostolate which then opened out, the needed apostolic workers were lacking. The number of Catholics scattered in the different states of the Union has been estimated at 24,000; and the clergy amounted to only twenty-two priests.[208] A college founded by the Jesuits at Georgetown in 1786 was the only institution which the Church possessed; it had neither parish schools properly so called, nor girls' boarding schools, nor seminaries, nor hospitals, nor charitable institutions.[209]

But in 1791 Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice, alarmed at the progress of the Revolution and inspired by the spirit of the venerable founder of his Company, Father Olier, resolved to send some priests of his Congregation to that foreign and free land. These new missioners devoted themselves in a special manner to the formation of a native clergy, destined to spread amid the Protestants and the Indian tribes the love of the Catholic Church. Upon accomplishing this work, they would return to a freed and peaceful France, there to resume the direction of seminaries and to raise up the Church again from its ruins.[210]

No proposal could have been more welcome to Bishop Carroll of Baltimore, who joyfully accepted Father Emery's offer. On April 8, 1791, four Sulpicians (Fathers Nagot, Levadoux, Tessier, and Garnier), accompanied by five seminarians, embarked at Saint-Malo on a ship that was chartered for them. A few laymen were permitted to join them. Among these was Vicomte Chateaubriand, who in the introduction of his *Voyage en Amérique* and in his *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* has left us a brilliant account of this voyage.[211]

[208] A. Guasco in *Missions catholiques,* I, 165.

[209] G. André in *Dictionnaire de théologie* (Vacant), under the word "Amérique," I, 1054. Guasco (*loc. cit.*) also mentions a convent of Carmelites.

[210] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 104.

[211] Biré ed., I, 310. Another account of this voyage, drawn up by Father Mondésir, one of Father Nagot's companions, and preserved among the manuscripts of the

On July 10, 1791, the little group of Sulpicians landed at Baltimore. Other priests, driven from Santo Domingo by the bloody insurrection of the Negroes, soon joined them. In short, from 1791 to 1799, twenty-seven French missioners, twelve of them Sulpicians, took their place among the clergy of the United States. Of these priests six became bishops: Flaget at Bardstown, then at Louisville; Cheverus at Boston; Dubourg at New Orleans; Maréchal at Baltimore; Dubois at New York; David, as coadjutor, at Bardstown and at Louisville. Of Bishop Flaget, whose life and vigor were prolonged beyond the common limits, it was said that, in his apostolic journeys, he marked an episcopal see by each of his principal stops.[212] Under the direction of such valiant bishops, the *émigré* priests performed wonders. Stephen Theodore Badin founded the mission of Kentucky; his brother Vincent that of Michigan, among the savage tribes of the Algonquins, the Ottawas, and the Sioux. Gabriel Richard, sent to Detroit, there preached the faith over a district vaster than France and Spain; he was later elected a representative to Congress.[213] The young Catholic centers of the United States began the course of their brilliant destinies. Once more God manifested the fruitful vitality of His Church.

The first apostles of Greece and Rome were victims of Jewish persecution. The early spread of the gospel among the barbarians had been owing to the bishops who were proscribed by the Roman Empire. The conquests of St. Francis Xavier in Asia had closely followed in the sixteenth century the ravages of Protestantism in Europe. So too, the end of the eighteenth century, which witnessed the efforts of impiety to destroy the Church in the European nations, saw the birth of a new Church

St. Sulpice Seminary, has been published by Victor Giraud in his *Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand* (1912), pp. 156–74.

[212] G. Moreau, *Les prêtres français émigrés aux Etats-Unis* (1856), pp. 81–87.

[213] On Gabriel Richard, a Sulpician, born at Saintes in 1767, of Francis Richard and of Marie Geneviève Bossuet, see Bertrand, *Bibliotheque sulpicienne*, II, 107. The city of Detroit has erected a statue to Gabriel Richard, as one of the most eminent men of the state of Michigan.

beyond the Ocean; and France, the heart of the revolutionary agitation, prepared the cradle of this new birth.

Fresh Outbreak of Revolutionary Persecution

The news he received from the young Church of America cheered the heart of the Supreme Pontiff. But two tragic events deeply afflicted him. We refer to the murder of the French agent at Rome, Bassville (January 13, 1793), and the execution of King Louis XVI at Paris (January 21). The former of these events let loose new hatreds against the papacy. The death of Louis XVI, by becoming the pretext for a revival of the foreign war, became the starting point of a more bloody, general, and methodically organized persecution, one that was more terrible than what had been suffered up to then: for the priests, for the religious, for all the peaceful citizens of France, it was the Terror.

Since the withdrawal of Bernis and the Pope's refusal to receive Count de Ségur,[214] the diplomatic relations were broken between the Holy See and France. But neither the Legislative Assembly nor the Convention was resigned to remain apart from the important movement of relations and ideas that was centered in Rome. Not only did the clubs of Paris maintain about the Holy See emissaries charged with exercising a surveillance over the so-called plots of the counterrevolution; but, when the Pope decided to proceed with rigor against the agitators, the French minister at Naples, Mackau, determined to intervene to protect them.[215] This Mackau, an intriguing and ambitious person, desirous of succeeding Bernis at Rome, was seconded, after August 12, 1792, by a no less disturbing secretary, whom the favor of Lebrun, the minister of foreign affairs,

[214] Gendry, II, 156. The memoir sent by the Pope to all the nuncios on this subject is dated May 29, 1791.

[215] For instance, in the affair of Ratter and Chinard, see Gendry, II, 222. Mackau had been sent to Naples by Dumouriez as minister plenipotentiary on April 30, 1792.

had raised to that post. The name of this son of an Abbeville dyer, was Nicholas Jean Hugon, but he was more commonly known as Bassville. He was said to have been a deacon, secularized since the Revolution.[216]

On November 13, 1792, Bassville arrived in Rome, installed himself there, and presented himself to the Secretary of State as a simple traveler. He soon assumed the attitude of an accredited diplomat, seized upon every circumstance to take the defense of the French nationals, gave banquets to his countrymen, organized investigations, informed minister Lebrun of the military forces at the disposal of the Papal States. The revolutionary press then clamored for the invasion of Rome and the deportation of the Pope.[217] Bassville boasted of obtaining from the Secretary of State, who feared him, whatever he wished. In the month of December he installed himself with his wife and child in the palace of the Academy of France.

Bassville had not reached the term of his insolences. A circular issued by Monge, minister of the navy, dated November 28, 1792, directed all consuls to replace, over their entrances of the consulates, the fleur-de-lis escutcheon by the monogram of the Republic, adding, however, that "the substitution should be subordinated to times and circumstances." Taking no account of this last clause, Bassville, accompanied by Charles de Flotte, a young naval officer of the old nobility who had bowed to the new ideas, notified the Holy See of the circular of Monge; then, without waiting for the Pope's reply, on the night of January 1, 1793, he had the fleur-de-lis escutcheons taken down from the palace of the Academy and the residence of the consul. He then prompted the students to pull down the statue of Louis XIV, the founder of the Academy. A few days later, in that same palace, a statue of Brutus was installed, and about it speeches were delivered. Following these agitations, the mob

[216] *Ibid.*, pp. 184, 223.

[217] F. Masson, *Les diplomates de la Révolution.*

dragged through the streets the statue of Louis XIV and the statues of several popes and cardinals.

But the Pope replied (January 8) to the request of France by a letter addressed to the consul. Pius VI opposed to the demands of the French government an explicit refusal, giving his reasons for the refusal. The Republic, he said, by withdrawing its ambassador, broke all diplomatic relations with the Holy See; why should the Holy See recognize the Republic? The new government of France was not yet recognized by any cabinet. The act requested of the Pope seemed to be a tacit approval of all that had been done in France against religion. The Pontiff could not forget that in France, on March 3, 1791, they had burned his briefs and also an effigy of him; that at Avignon they had driven out his nuncio; that at Marseilles they had torn down his coat of arms from the house of his consul, and had hung it at a lamp-post and broken it in pieces; and that, when the Holy See protested against these acts and demanded the replacing of the coat of arms, the French government replied that the circumstances did not permit it to satisfy the claims of the Holy See.[218]

As soon as the Pope's reply was communicated to him, Mackau broke out in bitter denunciations and directed Flotte to express his protestation to the Pope. Flotte executed his mission brutally. He transmitted his dispatch to the Secretary of State, threatening him with the destruction of Rome if the Pope persisted in his refusal.

Such events could not occur without deeply arousing public opinion. That Bassville who, without any official title, so insolently lorded it over the consulate, the Pope, and the Roman state, became odious. If we are to credit the report of Digne (the French consul), Flotte and Bassville, when coming down the steps of the Vatican after the accomplishment of Flotte's

[218] Gendry, *Pie VI*, II, 226; Artaud de Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Popes*, VII, 233 ff.; *Moniteur*, February 4, 1792, p. 166.

last mission, expressed their dissatisfaction so clamorously that the report of it spread rapidly among the people.

On Saturday, January 12, the rumor spread that, on the following day, the coat of arms of the Republic, that is, a Minerva wearing a Phrygian cap and holding a spear in her hand, would be set up at the consulate. The papal government, foreseeing an outburst of popular wrath on that occasion, reinforced the police with a body of soldiers.

These precautions, however, proved to be in vain. On Sunday, January 13, at four o'clock in the afternoon, the very hour when the streets were filled with unusually large throngs of people, Flotte, Madame Bassville, and her son, were crossing the city in a carriage, the coachmen and footmen wearing the Republican cockade, the young Bassville waving a tricolor flag. The Roman people supposed all this was an expression of defiance of them. Stones were thrown at the carriage. Someone cried out: "Down with the cockades!" A shot, fired from the carriage, increased the irritation. Flotte was surrounded by the crowd as he tried to flee into the house of a French banker, where Bassville then was. Bassville appeared, with a pistol in each hand. He had taken these pistols from Flotte to prevent his using them. The assailants thought that Bassville meant to make use of these arms. Someone of the throng, who has remained unknown, struck him in the stomach with a dagger. Flotte succeeded in fleeing by way of the roof of a neighboring house; but Bassville could not be saved. He died, after repudiating all the oaths he had taken in opposition to the laws of the Church, and received the sacraments, declaring that he had been the victim of Flotte's imprudences.[219]

At the first reports of the disturbance, the Pope gave orders to General Caprara to direct his forces against the disturbers.

[219] Gendry, II, 228–32. The *Moniteur* of February 4, 1793, published the report of Digne, French consul at Rome, which substantially agrees with the account given above.

The soldiers arrived in time to protect the Academy of France and the houses of some friends of Bassville, that were assaulted or threatened. Some priests were appointed to preach the restoration of peace and calm in the public squares. Pius VI, not satisfied with sending his own physician for the care of the wounded man, personally made arrangements for the obsequies of Bassville, facilitated the departure of Flotte, as also of Bassville's wife and son, and had a detailed report of the incidents sent to all his nuncios.

But Flotte reached Paris and related after his own manner the events of January 13. The Convention made common cause with him, adopted the son of Bassville, and drew up a whole plan of campaign against the Pope, unless he would subscribe to the following conditions: public apology, immediate acceptance of the Republic's coat of arms, expulsion of the *émigrés* from the Papal States, and an indemnity to the Frenchmen who suffered from the uprising.

Execution of Louis XVI

While the Convention was thus threatening the Pope, events of utmost gravity were being precipitated in France. On December 11 the Convention had made Louis XVI appear at its bar to undergo a humiliating examination. He was obliged to return on the 26th, accompanied by his defense attorneys, Malesherbes, Tronchet, and de Sèze, who tried in vain to exculpate him from the charges brought against him and to stir the pity of the Assembly in his favor. The party of the Mountain had already decided: they intended "to defy Europe by throwing at it the head of a king." The Girondists were divided. A formidable pressure was exercised on the hesitants. On January 15 the Assembly unanimously declared the King "culpable of conspiracy against the liberty of the nation and of attempts against the safety of the state." On the next day, out of 721

members voting, 337 decided for the penalty of death without condition, against 334 who favored conditional death or imprisonment. Among the 17 Constitutional bishops present at the session, five condemned Louis XVI to the penalty of death; 18 Constitutional priests out of 25 took the same stand.[220] On January 21, in the public square, "formerly called Place Louis XV," the King of France died on the scaffold with a nobility of attitude, a courage, a piety, a forgetfulness of the outrages received, a self-abnegation, and a confidence in the eternal justice which make of his last moments one of the greatest examples of virtues that can be proposed to men. Says one historian: "For the first time since he began to reign, Louis appeared to be master of his role. The Convention, by stripping him of the royal mantle and the crown, which weighed him down, disclosed in him the man, who possessed the most touching virtues of mankind." [221]

Pius VI, who had always nourished a tender esteem for the King of France, at news of his death showed a deep impression of sadness and indignation. Five months later, at the secret consistory of June 17, his emotion had not lessened. He went so far as to give Louis XVI the title of martyr, for, he said, "who can doubt that this king was slain principally out of hatred for the faith and because of his fidelity to Catholic dogmas?" But the hope which the Pontiff had kept in France was now deeply shaken. "O France, France!" he exclaimed, "you who in the fervor of your faith and devotion to the Apostolic See, did not follow others, but always went ahead of them, know that the faith is what makes the firmness of kingdoms, because it is the faith that suppresses the abuses of governments and the unrestrained license of the people." [222]

[220] Their names may be found in Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 265.

[221] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* III, 269.

[222] Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de France, 1790–1800* (1857), I, 177–91.

Consequences of the King's Execution

The grief of the common father of the faithful was fully justified. The execution of Louis XVI would be the pretext, for the European coalition, of a fierce war against France; and the foreign war would become the occasion of an unprecedented revival of persecution by the Convention.

The desire to avenge the death of Louis XVI was merely the sentimental pretext of the great coalition that combined against France, under the direction of William Pitt: England, Holland, Spain, Austria, Germany, Prussia, Naples, and Piedmont. The bravado of Danton, setting the natural limits of France at the ocean, the banks of the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was a more genuine reason; but the chief motive was the hope of sharing the provinces of France, which was thought to be unable to withstand the allied nations. France would, however, inflict on them a brilliant defeat and, though deprived of her king and even subject to the most revolutionary authority, would defend the integrity of her soil with unconquerable energy.

But the necessity of national defense favored the establishment of a dictatorship, which was exercised especially against the priests and the Catholic religion.

The first act of this dictatorship was the establishment of a revolutionary tribunal. In the midst of the violent excitement produced by the defeat of Aix-la-Chapelle and by the taking of Liége, Barère exclaimed (March 10): "For the saving of our country, the question is not one of dying for it, but of living to disclose the traitors."[223] Robespierre added: "I say that so long as the traitors remain unpunished, the nation will always be betrayed."[224] Following these discussions, the Con-

[223] *Moniteur,* March 12, p. 324.
[224] *Ibid.,* p. 325.

vention issued a decree. Article 1 was thus worded: "There will be established at Paris an extraordinary criminal tribunal, which will take cognizance of every revolutionary undertaking." [225] Article 6 attached to the tribunal a public prosecutor. He would be Fouquier-Tinville. Article 16 provided that the decisions of this court would be final, without appeal to the Court of Cassation.[226] A few days afterwards, the creation of a revolutionary committee in each commune,[227] then the establishment of the famous Committee of Public Safety "whose duty should be to exercise vigilance over the executive power, to suspend the decrees, and, in urgent circumstances, to take measures of general internal and external defense," completed the organization of the dictatorship. The Convention was armed to act against its enemies, against all that it suspected of being so.

These enemies were especially the refractory priests. On March 18, 1793, the Convention decided that "any citizen who knows of a priest or *émigré* refractory to the law of deportation, is authorized to arrest him," and that the priest or *émigré* found guilty shall be put to death within twenty-four hours.[228] This provision was a notable aggravation of the penalties imposed by the law of August 26, 1792, which punished with ten years of imprisonment a deported person who returned to France. But up to this time only the priests were aimed at. A decree of April 21–23, 1793, extended the obligation of the oath and the penalties attached to refusal to take it, "to all ecclesiastics without exception, regulars, seculars, and lay brothers." [229] From archbishop and abbot to the lowliest of

[225] The complete text of the decree may be seen in the *Moniteur* of March 12, p. 326.

[226] *Ibid.*

[227] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[228] *Moniteur*, March 20, 1793, p. 357.

[229] Ludovic Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé*, III, 378.

the brother porters, the entire faithful clergy of France was ostracized and threatened with death.

The decree of October 21, 1793 (30 Vendémiaire) further augmented the rigor of these laws. It punished with death not only the *émigré* priests who should again set foot on French territory and those who should not leave the country within ten days, but also every non-juring priest found having arms (Articles 1, 15, 17). Every citizen was invited to denounce, arrest, or have arrested any priest subject to deportation, with a promise of a reward of 100 livres (Article 18).[230]

Throughout France they began to arrest the priests en masse. When the prisons could hold no more, they loaded these wretched priests by hundreds on carts and brought them to Bordeaux, Blaye, Lorient, Nantes, and Rochefort. The presence of the English fleet prevented the deportation of these priests to America. But it was rightly considered that a ship's hold would be the harshest prison. At Rochefort the priests were at first put in an old ship that was serving as a hospital for the galleys. There the priests were mingled with the galley convicts. Later two other ships, the *Washington* and the *Deux-Associés*, were assigned them as their prison. For a great number, these ships became their tomb.[231]

These various laws were executed in a terrible manner. In the last of these ships 440 priests, crowded into a narrow space, facing four cannons loaded with grapeshot, could neither stir nor sit down, forced to remain standing all day long. At night they were literally heaped together below deck where each was allowed a space of less than half a square foot. One of these prisoners, Father De La Briche, wrote: "Beyond imagination was the foul and corrupt air, the vileness that emanated from this stinking place and that at the doorway lays hold on you and presses your heart. . . . Often at daybreak two or

[230] *Moniteur* of 2 Brumaire of year II (October 23, 1793), p. 128.
[231] Sciout, *loc. cit.*

three of the prisoners were found dead, who had expired during the night. On one occasion as many as fourteen died in twenty-four hours on the *Washington* and the *Deux-Associés.*"[232] Out of 825 clerics taken to Rochefort, 542 perished amid these horrible tortures.[233]

The persons threatened and pursued were no longer merely the clergy, but all their helpers, all the faithful, all persons under suspicion of loyalty. The decree of October 21 applied the penalties pronounced against the non-juring clergy to "the public school teachers, lay brothers, and laymen" (Art. 10);[234] and the decrees declared liable to deportation any citizen guilty of harboring a refractory priest (Art. 19).[235] The law of September 17, called the "law of suspects," declared suspect whoever showed himself in any way "an enemy of liberty" or who should not show his "attachment to the Revolution" (Art. 2) and it ordered that every suspect be placed under arrest (Art. 1).[236] The law of Prairial of the year II (May 10, 1794), in the organizing of the revolutionary tribunal, seemed to express the last word of arbitrary procedure and ferocity. Article 4 says: "The revolutionary tribunal is instituted to punish the enemies of the people." "Enemies of the people," declares Article 6, "are those who attempt to change the purity of the revolutionary principles." Article 7 was worded as follows: "The penalty for crimes which fall within the competence of the revolutionary tribunal is death." Article 13 decides that, "if material or moral proofs exist, witnesses' testimony will not be required." Article 16 adds that the law "grants legal defense to patriots, not to conspirators."[237] Revolutionary tri-

[232] Quoted by Sciout, *op. cit.*, III, 279–382.

[233] Manseau, *Les prêtres et religieux déportés dans la Charente-Inférieure* (1886). Cf. E. Sevestre, *La déportation du clergé orthodoxe pendant la Révolution.* Register of the non-juring clergy embarked at the principal ports of France, 1792–1793 (1913).

[234] *Moniteur* of 2 Brumaire of the year II (October 23, 1793), p. 129.

[235] *Ibid.*

[236] *Ibid.*, September 19, 1793, p. 1111.

[237] *Bulletin des lois,* I, 1–7.

bunals to the number of 178 were established in France. From April 16, 1793 to July 27, 1794 (9 Thermidor, year II), the Paris tribunal sent to the guillotine 2,628 persons. Marat had said: "Violence is the means by which we must establish liberty."

Likewise by violence Jacobinism, not satisfied with persecuting persons, made an attack on all religious monuments. Bands of "patriots" overran France, sacking churches, profaning them, sometimes even demolishing them. The revolutionary vandalism seized on thousands of statues and paintings of great value. In his report on the vandalism, presented at the session of 14 Fructidor of year II (August 31, 1794), Grégoire declared: "In the realm of the arts, the mere list of objects stolen, destroyed, or defiled would fill several volumes." [238] Church bells valued at 80,000,000 francs, were turned into cannons; the silver articles of the churches were melted down and made into coins. The reliquary of St. Genevieve, with an estimated value of 1,500,000 francs, was taken to the mint on the night of December 6, 1792.[239] At about the same time "at Dijon we see the ten or twelve Hercules of patriotism traversing the town, each with a chalice under his arm." [240] All the ecclesiastical buildings were likewise sequestrated, along with their furniture. Had not the people been told that these possessions form "the patrimony of the sans-culottes"? [241] This property would be "the reward of their valor." [242] The most beautiful reliquaries were the booty of these bandits, and the relics were burned or scattered.[243]

[238] Grégoire, *Rapport sur les destructions opérées par le vandalisme,* session of 14 Fructidor of the year II, reprinted at Caen in 1867. See especially p. 44.

[239] Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 311.

[240] Taine, *French Revolution,* III, 261.

[241] *Ibid.,* III, 271.

[242] *Ibid.* These words were the declaration of Desmoulins.

[243] On the vandalism of the Convention, see the details given in the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* of November 25, 1793; see also Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 314–17; Gosselin, in his *Notice sur les instruments de la passion qui se conservent a l'église*

The Liturgy

To drive out the priests, to close the churches, to smash the sacred vessels, and to scatter the remains of the saints did not satisfy the fury of those who, with Holbach, thought that, "when you wish to be occupied usefully with the welfare of men, you must begin with the gods of heaven." [244] The people, deprived of their public worship and of their priests, kept the memory of their saints in the calendar of the civil year. The order of the weeks and months always gravitated about those two great feasts, Christmas and Easter, one of them celebrating the coming of our Lord into this world here to serve us as our model, the other celebrating His resurrection to life eternal to draw us after Him. These two feasts summed up well the whole of religion. The day of rest for working men was always based on a division of time that recalled the creation of the world and periodically brought around the Lord's Day. After being driven out of the churches, Christian piety would have continued to be nourished on the remembrance and the symbols of the liturgical life. In that reminder the Revolution decided to extinguish it. The instincts of destruction are often as unerring as those of preservation.

On October 5, 1793, Fabre d'Eglantine, in a report presented to the Convention, spoke as follows: "The priests had assigned to each day of the year the commemoration of a so-called saint. That catalogue was a collection of lies. We have thought that the nation, after removing this list of the canonized from its calendar, ought to put in their place objects worthy, if not of its worship, at least of its culture, the useful products of the earth, domestic animals, and so on." Consequently a new era, dating from September 22, 1792, the date of the proclamation

---

métropolitaine, relates how the relics of the true cross and of the holy crown of thorns, venerated at Notre Dame, were taken by the profaners.

[244] Holbach, *Système de la nature,* Vol. II, chap. 13.

of the Republic, was decreed. The twelve months of the year were made exactly equal; each was divided into three decades, of ten days each, the last day of each decade being consecrated to rest. Thus the Sunday disappeared. In place of the names of the saints, whose memory was attached to the different days of the year, were substituted names of flowers, plants, animals, and farm implements. Such was the basis of the republican calendar which would remain officially in use in France until January 1, 1806. This reform, besides outraging religion, did not possess the merit of having social usefulness. As a certain historian of the Revolution remarks:

Whereas by the metric system the Convention offered the nations a basis on which all could unite, by its calendar it suppressed an existing accord; it broke not only with the past but also with the present; it isolated itself in the world; for it could not expect to have the world adopt the era of the French Revolution or to vanquish the universe by imposing this reform on it. The naming of the new months, which Fabre d'Eglantine was so proud of, was hardly exact in its relation to the climate in the two extremities of France. What would have been their unfitness if it had to include, we do not say the antipodes, but merely the northern and southern extremities of Europe, from Sweden to Spain? [245]

[245] Henri Wallon, *La Terreur,* critical studies on the history of the French Revolution (1881), II, 183. The republican calendar was the work of the mathematician Romme and the poet Fabre d'Eglantine. The first year was to begin on September 22, 1792, the day of the proclamation of the Republic. A volume was published with the title, *Manuel pour la concordance des calendriers républicains et grégoriens,* 1806. The following is a summary:

AUTUMN	SPRING
Vendémaire (September–October)	Germinal (March–April)
Brumaire (October–November)	Floréal (April–May)
Frimaire (November–December)	Prairial (May–June)
WINTER	SUMMER
Nivôse (December–January)	Messidor (June–July)
Pluviôse (January–February)	Thermidor (July–August)
Ventôse (February–March)	Fructidor (August–September)

At the end of each year, five supplementary days, or *épogomènes,* were added.

The Constitutional Clergy

The revolutionary ideas had advanced. No longer, as under the Constituent Assembly, was the question that of "returning to the traditions of the early Church," but quite simply of reviving paganism. This attitude of the Convention dissolved the constitutional clergy. Some persons, following Gobel, advocated the abolition of every priestly function and the adoption of the single worship of Reason; others, like Grégoire, protested in the name of Christianity, whose faithful disciples they wished to remain, and strove with all their might against the reborn paganism; some even courageously suffered death for their religious convictions.

We have seen how the constitutional clergy was recruited without great difficulty, at first from the ranks of unworthy priests, then among the Gallicans and the convinced Jansenists. The constitutional Church, if we can apply that name to a body of pastors that had neither unity of belief nor unity of hierarchy, about the beginning of 1793 counted 30,000 pastors or curates.[246] At Paris, Gobel was at the head of 600 cooperators, 500 of them being employed in the parishes.

On November 6, 1793, a simple incident at one of the sessions ended in a result of exceptional seriousness. The constitutional pastor of the parish of Mennecy, whose private conduct had become a public scandal, induced his parishioners to close the church and suppress the public worship. Was such a step legal? The Assembly promptly replied in the affirmative, and the incident was closed.[247] But it was suggestive for those who, like Robespierre, had from the outset of the Revolution dreamed of abolishing in France all positive religion and found-

[246] The figure given by Pisani, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[247] *Moniteur,* November 8, 1793, p. 195. On this matter, the reporter declared that "the lawmaker did not recognize any cult but that of liberty, no altar but that of the fatherland, no pontiffs but the magistrates of the people" (*ibid.*). The *Moniteur* said: "These words were applauded by the Assembly."

ing there a natural, civic religion, following the principles of Rousseau. The people were apparently not disposed to accept such an innovation on the part of the government. Would they accept it if, as at Mennecy, it were presented to them on the initiative of their priests?

On the evening of that day (November 6) a deputation of the sections and of the central committee of the popular societies came to the house of Gobel, the metropolitan bishop of Paris. By his situation, by the profession of a religious faith, watered down and false but sincere, Gobel enjoyed a certain consideration among the constitutional clergy. However, he was known to be weak enough to yield to a summons of the committee. Yet a long struggle was needed to bring Gobel to abjure his faith, or at least to annul his ecclesiastical functions and thus to give place to the sole worship of the Supreme Being and of Reason. "I do not know of any errors in my religion," objected the wretched man; "I have nothing to abjure." He was attacked on his weak side. He was told: "The question is simply of sacrificing yourself to the public welfare, to yield to the wish of the people by abdicating functions which they no longer desire." Gobel yielded. "If such is the wish of the people," he said, "very well. The people have elected me; the people dismiss me." [248] The next day Gobel, accompanied by eleven of his vicars, presented himself at the bar of the Convention and there pronounced a discourse which ended thus: "Since no other worship must be but that of Liberty and of holy Equality, since the Sovereign thus wills it, in accord with my principles I submit to its will. From today I give up the exercise of my functions of minister of Catholic worship." In reality, this

[248] We possess three accounts of the events that occurred on that tragic night: that of Gobel himself, that of Father Grégoire, and that of Gobel's vicar general, Amable Lambert. For the account of this last, see *Ami de la religion,* CXXXVI, 239–42. These three accounts differ in certain details, but they agree in stating that Gobel yielded only through terror to the ultimatum which was brutally presented to him.

formula was only a resignation from his functions; but the Assembly wished to see in it an abjuration. Laloy, the president of the Convention, declared: "After the abjuration he has just made, the Bishop of Paris is now merely a being of reason. But I am going to embrace Gobel." The weak Gobel did not dare to protest against this interpretation of his words. He received the accolade of the president and placed his pastoral cross on the desk and put on the red cap.[249]

Scarcely had Gobel retired when the procession of the other apostates began. Thomas Lindet, married bishop of Eure; Bourdeau, juring curé of Vaugirard; Coupé, of the Oise; Julien, of Toulouse,[250] mounted the tribune and declared, in the vague phraseology of the time, that they were giving up all the functions of worship.

At that moment Grégoire entered. He at once asked for the floor. All thought that he, too, was going to apostatize. The Bishop of Loir-et-Cher expressed himself in these terms: "People speak of sacrifice to the fatherland. I am accustomed to that. Is the question one of attachment to the cause of liberty? My proofs have been given long since. . . . But is religion the question? This article is outside your domain, and you have not the right to attack it. A Catholic by conviction and by feeling, a priest by choice, I have been designated by the people to be bishop, but not from them nor from you do I hold my mission. I have tried to do good in my diocese; I remain bishop that I may continue to do so. I appeal to the freedom of worship." [251]

[249] *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques,* September 11, 1793; Aulard, *Le culte de la raison,* p. 446; *Moniteur* of November 9, 1793, p. 199.

[250] Sieyès did not make his abjuration until November 9. "Citizens," he said, "ever since several years ago I have abdicated every ecclesiastical character. . . . I have no resignation to give to you; but I have an offering to make to the fatherland, that of an income of 10,000 livres which the law has granted me." *Moniteur,* November 11, p. 208. Julien of Toulouse was a former Protestant minister.

[251] Gazier, *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* pp. 212–14. *Moniteur,* 19 Brumaire, p. 200, gives a different version, which Grégoire, in his *Histoire des*

This courageous example found few imitators. For about a month declarations like that of Gobel followed one another on the rostrum.

Despotism of the Convention

Meanwhile the cathedral of Paris had been profaned by a sacrilegious ceremony. On November 10 an actress, arrayed in a white dress and a blue cape, wearing a red cap, and symbolizing Reason, was seated on a platform in the middle of the church of Notre Dame, at the crossing of the transept,[252] amid a theatrical setting, and at her feet choirs sang the *Hymn to Liberty,* to which Joseph Chénier had added the following stanza:

> Descend, O Liberty, thou born of Nature!
> The people now reclaim immortal power;
> On crumbled ruins of the old imposture
> The labors of their hands raise up thy altar.

In the afternoon the goddess Reason was carried on a litter by four citizens and was brought to the Assembly, where she was invited to take her place on the platform beside the president Puis. The deputies, on the proposal of the former Capuchin Chabot, having voted that the church of Notre Dame should be called the temple of Reason, went in a body to the church

---

sectes religieuses, calls an odious falsification. Many evidences do, in fact, show that the *Moniteur,* written by partisans, often falsified the discourses of the orators. The text as we quote it is that given by Grégoire. Did he revise his address when writing it? Perhaps he did so. But what is certain is that Grégoire, summoned to apostatize, energetically refused to do so. Pisani, *op. cit.,* II, 65.

252 The person who represented Reason on this occasion has been identified. Probably she was a stage singer (James Guillaume, *Etudes révolutionnaires,* 1st ser., p. 54). Only by oratorical metaphor has she been referred to as a woman lightly clad and seated on the altar. Pisani, *op. cit.,* II, 70. The spectacle, as it actually took place, was grievous enough without any exaggeration of the circumstances.

and there added their voices to those of the choristers. Gobel with shame joined the crowd that profaned the august sacred place.[253]

Like ceremonies were celebrated in other parts of France. The head of each *departement* wished to have a feast of Reason. However, this worship was only a passing crisis. After a few weeks it permanently disappeared, along with its founders, Hebert and Chaumette, who were beheaded on March 24, 1794. But the antireligious hatred, thus grotesquely manifested, survived. Chaumette had sworn to "unpriest" the clergy of France. From the outset of the Revolution the enemies of the Church understood that the surest means of accomplishing that result was to favor the marriage of priests.[254] From July 9 to November 15, 1793, the Convention passed no less than five decrees on this subject.[255] The foes of religion soon had reason to rejoice at the result of their legislation. Grégoire, in his *Histoire du mariage des prêtres,* gives the names of twelve married constitutional bishops and reports as two thousand the number of priests who followed their example.[256]

[253] A certain liberal historian says: "The writers most favorable to the Revolution no longer pretend to justify these eccentric proceedings. They merely appeal to attenuating circumstances. Aulard says that we should see in these events nothing more than an expedient employed by the Revolution to vanquish the Church that had risen up against the state. . . . Perhaps we would do even better to regard the feast of Reason as an enormous farce." Desdevises du Dezert, *L'église et l'état en France (1598–1801)*, 1907, p. 313. But in fact we should consider it a horrible sacrilege.

[254] See *supra,* p. 118, Robespierre's address delivered during the discussion of the Civil Constitution.

[255] On July 9 the Convention declared that no law will deprive the married priests of their salary; on the 29th of the same month it decreed that the bishops who placed any obstacle in the way of the marriage of priests would be deported or replaced; on August 12 it annulled all dismissals pronounced against priests on the occasion of their marriage; on September 17 it ordered that, if a priest should be disturbed on the occasion of his marriage, he could withdraw elsewhere and receive his salary at the expense of the commune which persecuted him; the law of November 15 declared that "the ministers of Catholic worship who are married will not be subject to deportation or imprisonment even if they did not take the prescribed oaths."

[256] Cf. Picot, *op. cit.,* VI, 320–22.

The attitude of many of these apostates was disgusting. Writes Beaulieu in his diary: "On November 22 the Bishop of Périgueux came to the Convention there to pay homage to his wife." [257] Fifteen days later, Chabot informed his colleagues of his own marriage. He said: "All know that I have been a priest, even a Capuchin. I should, therefore, explain the reasons for the resolve I have taken. As a legislator, I considered that my duty was to give an example of all the virtues." "The future wife of Chabot," says Beaulieu, "was Frey by name; she was the sister of two German bankers from whom he acknowledged having received 200,000 francs, the fruit of their fraudulent practices." [258]

We know that more than once the marriage of the constitutional priests was only a pretense; but too often these fictitious unions were changed into real ones and, in all cases, in the eyes of the Church they amounted almost to the same thing.[259] Of better inspiration were those whom the example of Gobel and his followers indignantly aroused and who, following Grégoire, had the courage to protest against the impieties of the Convention. Brongniart, constitutional curé of Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet, declared that he regarded as null the order he had received to close his church. When deprived of his salary, he replied that he had no need of being paid by the Commune for the performance of the functions of his ministry. He was

[257] Quoted by Wallon, *La Terreur,* I, 256.

[258] *Ibid.* The constitutional clergy of France at that time was increased by the addition of some German priests, imbued with rationalist ideas. Cardinal Pacca, in his *Mémoires,* furnishes interesting details about two of these apostates whom he had known personally: Father Dereser, a discalced Carmelite, and Father Schneider, a Franciscan, at first episcopal vicar of the bishop of Strasbourg, then public prosecutor in the criminal tribunal of the Lower Rhine, who was conspicuous for the worst excesses. He was executed on April 1, 1794, convicted of being an agent of the enemy. Pacca, *Œuvres complètes,* French trans., II, 267–69.

[259] When, after the Concordat, Cardinal Caprara was commissioned to regularize the situation of the married priests who asked to be rehabilitated, he rightly showed himself severe toward those lax priests for having tried to save their life by a pretense of marriage.

arrested on 3 Frimaire (November 23, 1793) and was imprisoned successively at Sainte-Pelagie, Saint-Lazare, and the Conciergerie. He did not show a moment of weakness. Judged and condemned on 8 Thermidor, he courageously met his death the same day. His confrere, Bénière, curé of Chaillot, had been beheaded a few days before. Some other priests, who had taken the oath, underwent long imprisonment for disobedience to the antireligious laws. Such were the curés of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Saint-Merry, Saint-Jacques, and Saint-Séverin.[260]

Although the conduct of a notable number of the constitutional priests was worthy and courageous in the presence of the revolutionary tyranny, the attitude of most of the non-juring priests was heroic. Father Felicité de Lamennais, recalling the scenes he had witnessed in his childhood, wrote in 1808:

> Whereas the mass of the clergy, scattered in foreign lands, there planted the seeds of Catholicism which, fertilized by time, will perhaps some day develop a large number of priests prepared for martyrdom, in France they braved all dangers to distribute to the faithful the helps of the sacraments and the consolations of hope. How many heroic deeds, what lofty traits of devotion I might recall! Never did religion appear more beautiful. If the triumphant philosophy thought up new crimes, persecuted Christianity brought forth new virtues.[261]

The fiery apologist of that day recalled Masses celebrated at midnight in an attic of his home by a non-juring priest on a table transformed into an altar and lighted only by two candles, while the aged servant was on watch outside, ready to give the alarm at the least noise.[262]

Similar scenes took place in all the provinces of France. In the Vivarais, where the lamentable defection of Savine and his pernicious advice had determined the momentary apostasy of

[260] Pisani, *op. cit.*, II, 88–91.

[261] F. de Lamennais, *Réflexions sur l'état de l'Eglise en France.*

[262] Boutard, *Lamennais*, I, 14.

a large number of priests, could be seen a simple country girl, Marie Rivier, passing from village to village that had been abandoned by their pastors, teaching catechism to the children, then preaching to the men and women, to reanimate, by all the means in her power, the slumbering faith and zeal. The decree proclaiming the heroic virtues of the servant of God declared that she "filled, as far as the condition of her sex permitted her, the ministry of an apostle." [263]

But in that country of France, where two centuries earlier the League took up arms to defend the Catholic religion against the intrusion of heresy, resistance to the Revolution would not be confined to acts of passive protest, to these attempts of religious apostolate. Already from 1790 to 1792 on the field of Jalès, on the borders of le Gard, l'Ardèche, and of la Lozère, more than 30,000 men rose up, a red cross on their breast, with the cry, "Long live the religion!" [264] In the month of September, 1793, the city of Lyons, aroused by the massacre of priests which had taken place within its walls, attempted to shake off the yoke of the Jacobins.[265] Meanwhile a man of undoubted ability and remarkable tenacity, Armand Tuffin, marquis of La Rouërie, had organized in Brittany a vast conspiracy for the purpose of overthrowing the Republic and restoring the monarchy.[266] But all these attempts had been more or less prompted by political considerations. In the spring of 1793, a movement appeared in Anjou, in Poitou, and in Brittany. This movement continued to develop and increase; its

[263] Decree of the Congregation of Rites, June 13, 1890. Cf. F. Mourret, *La Vénérable Marie Rivier,* 1898, pp. 72, 93–95, 110, 346.

[264] Firmin Boissin, *Le Camp de Jalès,* p. 156. In this study Boissin shows that, of the three federations of Jalès, the first two, composed of 40,000 men, in 1790 and 1791 had an especially Catholic character. The third, composed of 2,000 men only, was undeniably a royalist movement, but it placed at the head of its program the defense of religion. Cf. Ernest Daudet, *Les conspirations royalistes sous la Révolution,* 1881, p. 1.

[265] Guillon, *Histoire du siège de Lyon,* 2 vols., 1797.

[266] Lenôtre, *Le Marquis de La Rouërie et la conjuration bretonne.*

leaders seemed to be guided especially by their religious convictions. Thus began the great war of the Vendée and of Brittany which a famous soldier of modern times calls "a war of giants."

Brittany and the Vendée

Like the rest of France, the people of the Vendée [267] and of Brittany had enthusiastically accepted the first reforms and the first declarations of the Constituent Assembly.[268] But the deep social unrest, which we pointed out in the other provinces, was not felt to the same degree in these regions. The peasants of the Vendée and Brittany had nothing to complain of about the arrogance of their lords except their unreasonableness in the collection of the feudal taxes. With rare exceptions, the Vendean or Breton gentleman resided on his land, in his plain manor house, located at the center of his farm land. The regime of share-cropping prevailed almost everywhere and the relations between owners and tenant farmers were frequent, necessitated by the division of the crops. The peasant received the visit of his lord in his cottage in hours of suffering and mourning; the lord himself, after the office on Sundays and feast days, came to take part in the sober and modest dance in the courtyard of his château. The Vendean clergy shared the hard and poor life of the people of the country; and if the Breton clergy were rich, they claimed no other privilege than that of devoting themselves to the service of the people confided to

[267] We use the word Vendée in contradistinction to Brittany, Anjou, and Poitou. The name *Vendée militaire* designates a more extensive region, embracing the *départements* of Vendée, Deux-Sèvres, Vienne, Maine-et-Loire, Loire-Inférieure, Sarthe, Mayenne, Ille-et-Vilaine, Morbihan, Côtes-du-Nord, Orne, Calvados, and Manche (Deniau, *Carte de la Vendée militaire* at the head of his *Histoire de la Vendée*).

[268] Father Felix Deniau, *Histoire de la guerre de Vendée,* 3 vols., 1906–1908, I, 93 ff. The first three members of the clergy who met with the third estate (June 13, 1789) were three curés of lower Poitou. Deniau, *op. cit.,* p. 97.

them. With greater animation in Vendée, more melancholy and grave in Brittany, the man of these districts, unspoiled and industrious, despised both pleasures and death. Respectful and proud, he willingly bowed before two masters, God and the king, but he did not readily bow his head before any other authority. The first assaults delivered by the Revolution on the monarchical institutions of France afflicted him deeply. Nevertheless, says a historian devoted to the monarchy, "we may suppose that, if this sturdy and pious district had not been attacked in its Catholic beliefs, it would have let the Revolution pass without drawing the sword." [269]

The first feelings were manifested upon a report of the passing of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, July 12, 1790; then at news of its approval by the King the following August 24. Then juring priests, the intruders as they were called, filled the people with such an aversion that many an intruder was obliged to leave his parish, being unable to endure the void he saw formed about him.[270]

At Ploughuerneau 600 men and 4 cannons were needed to install the Constitutional curé. When the authorities proceeded to use force against these recalcitrants, several skirmishes ensued between the peasants and the gendarmes. A farm worker of Lower Poitou, surrounded by a group of gendarmes and armed merely with a pitchwork, offered a desperate resistance. "Surrender," cried out the leader of the gendarmes. Upon his replying, "Give my God back to me," he fell, struck by twenty-two strokes of the sword.[271] Said a certain woman to her hus-

[269] Poujoulat, *Histoire de la Révolution française,* II, 43. Cf. Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur,* VI, 260–68.

[270] Cf. Gruget, *Histoire de la Constitution civile dans l'Anjou,* written in 1791 and published in the *Anjou historique,* Vol. III.

[271] These words, worthy of a martyr, were uttered in a battle of May 2, 1791, by a peasant of Saint-Christophe-de-Ligneron, named Guillon. They have been attested by the very gendarmes to whom they were addressed and who were deeply impressed by them. See Deniau, *op. cit.,* I, 211.

band, who let his hand be cut off rather then burn his catechism: "Hold firm. Your deed is for the good God."

At the very time when these events were happening in Anjou, Jean Chouan had already taken up arms in le Maine, along with his two brothers and a few brave peasants. On August 15, 1792, in the town of Saint-Ouen-des-Toits, the headquarters of one of the cantons of la Mayenne, a few miles from Laval, some members of the directory of the district, accompanied by a detachment of gendarmes, had come to enlist a body of volunteers, whose first mission was to go to Laval and there seek the newly appointed constitutional curé. Murmurs arose. The gardarmes were ordered to arrest the "rebels." An uproar of indignation arose. Someone cried: "Down with the patauts; no intruders!" Pataut was the name given to the so-called patriots; "intruder" was what they called the constitutional priests. When acts of violence were about to ensue, a man jumped into the midst of the crowd. With upraised hand he halted the first gendarme who was advancing and with the other hand imposed silence on the gathering. Then he exclaimed: "When the King calls upon us to take arms, we will march. I reply for all. But if we must set out to defend what you call liberty, do you yourselves go fight for it. We all belong to the King, and to the King alone." At once gendarmes, officers, and officials, head over heels, all scattered and fled.[272]

The man who thus took the lead owed to the King that life which he wished to consecrate to the King's cause. He was Jean Cottereau, called Jean Chouan, who, arrested as a dealer in contraband salt, had obtained his pardon from the goodness of Louis XVI.[273] Unlike that in the Vendée, the uprising in Brittany assumed from the outset the character which it kept until the end, that of a clearly royalist war.

[272] Duchemin-Descepeaux, *Souvenirs de la chouannerie*, 1852, pp. 45–47. This volume is the second edition of the *Lettres sur l'origine de la chouannerie*, published in 1825.

[273] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

The men who held the power in France did not wait until these last manifestations to be concerned with the obstacles which the spread of the revolutionary ideas might encounter in the western provinces. The Constituent Assembly, disturbed by the disposition which the Vendée showed immediately after the promulgation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, hastened to send there as emissaries two of its members, Gallois and Gensonne. On October 9, 1791, the two commissioners presented to the Assembly a remarkable report on the state of all the departments of the West. In this report they said: "For the people religion has become the strongest and, so to speak, the sole habit of life. . . . The people's constancy in the matter of their religious affections . . . is one of the chief elements that have agitated them and that may agitate them still more." [274] But the halting of the royalist conspiracy of La Rouërie reassured the Convention. Two high police officers, Barthe and Morillon, sent on mission in the West, wrote to the Minister of Justice: "Citizen Minister, La Rouërie dies in an outburst of rage. Its partisans are in the hands of the law. The former province of Brittany is now peaceful; nothing is to be feared from that quarter. We are now going to hunt down the priests and the nobles. . . . This work of sans-culottism will not take long to accomplish." This letter bore the date of March 5, 1793. Eight days later, the Vendée was in open rebellion.

This work of hunting down the priests and the nobles coincided with the extraordinary drafting of 300,000 men, which the Convention had decreed on February 25, 1793, to face the armies of the coalition. The effect was the exasperation of the people of the West. On March 12 the young men of Maufes,

[274] Long passages of this report may be seen in Deniau, *op. cit.*, I, 267. De Pressensé echoes impartial history when he writes: "These words of one of the leaders of the Gironde contain the most sincere condemnation of all the measures of the Revolution. They show that the civil war could have been avoided by a loyal practice of the Constitution." E. de Pressensé, *L'Eglise et la Révolution*, p. 9.

having been summoned to go to Saint-Florent-le-Vieil for the purpose of taking part in a lottery drawing, went there, with most of their relatives and friends, armed with pitchforks, scythes, clubs, some even with rifles, marching as to a feast, and crying out: "Long live the religion!" reciting the rosary and singing hymns. A cannon loaded with grapeshot was placed by the commissioners of the district in the public square, and appeal was made to the young men. No one answered the appeal. At some indiscreet and violent words which the republican authorities were thought to have uttered, cries of "Long live religion, long live the priests!" broke out on all sides. The military commander ordered his men to fire. A cannon shot was fired; but, aimed too high, it made few victims. This incident was the declaration of war.[275] Led by a young peasant of the village of Chanzeaux, René Forêt, the rebels routed the gendarmes and the administrators, seized the strong-box of the district, and made a bonfire of the documents of the administration.

On the next day, one of these young people, going to Pin-en-Mauges, a little village in the neighborhood, related the affray of the day before to a peddler of the country, Jacques Cathelineau. The latter was about to knead the bread for his family. Interrupting his work, in a resolute tone he said: "We are lost if we stop there. We must rise up all together and start the war today."

The humble peddler who spoke thus and who, three months later, would be named commander-in-chief of the Vendeans, was a man of tall stature, vigorous body, features full of fire and expression. Said his contemporaries: "His voice was so beautiful that to hear it was a pleasure when he used to sing at the lectern on Sundays or when, at a wedding, he intoned the joyous song that made everyone join in." He was scarcely

[275] Deniau, *op. cit.*, I, 429–31.

thirty-four years old.[276] From 1785 to 1793 his frequent journeys throughout the region, where he used to go selling thread, wool, and the various objects of his trade, had made him acquainted in most of the towns and villages. The affability of his manner made him universally well liked. Because of his deep piety he was venerated by all. When religion began to be persecuted, Jacques Cathelineau, not satisfied with praying privately at home, organized pilgrimages to the chief shrines of the neighborhood, notably to Notre-Dame-de-Charité and Notre-Dame-de-Bon-Secours. "At his suggestion the parishes having an intruder as pastor wrapped in black crepe the cross that headed their procession. This mournful sight impressed everyone and added to the horror with which the schism and heresy filled this religious people."[277] His faith was so deep and his humility so great that everyone afterward called him "the Saint of Anjou."

The First Vendean Insurgents

On the evening of March 13, Cathelineau had about him twenty-seven young men[278] ready to follow him wherever he would lead them. The impromptu leader decorated his breast with a rosary and a scapular, his men doing the same. The little band went toward Poitevinière, on their way recruiting farm hands, share-croppers, and household servants. Soon they numbered 500, armed only with implements of labor, iron pitchforks, scythes straightened and attached to poles, strong clubs, and a few hunting muskets. Jaillais, Cheuille, and Cholet fell into their hands. The movement spread into the whole Vendée. Soon 3,000 men were under arms. Cathelineau's band grew in

[276] Deniau, *Jacques Cathelineau,* 1896.
[277] Charpentier, *Jacques Cathelineau,* 1911, p. 23.
[278] See their names in Deniau, I, 439.

its march, some troops raised by a game-keeper, Stofflet, others by a village surgeon, Cady, and others by a tobacco merchant, Perdriau. On March 16, the day following the seizure of Cholet, no nobleman had yet commanded this army three times victorious. But the same day as the victory of Cholet, some insurgents, who had not followed Cathelineau, went to the château of La Baronnière and proclaimed the Marquis de Bonchamp their leader. This former officer of Indian troops had served as a major of the Acquitaine regiment under the command of the bailiff of Suffren and then had abandoned his position rather than take the constitutional oath. Bonchamp was thirty-four years old. The nobility of his heart surpassed that of his ancestry. "Let us fortify ourselves with courage," he said to his young wife as he was leaving her. "Let us lift our thoughts toward heaven; but let us not count on human glory, because civil wars do not give any." [279]

While Bonchamp put himself at the head of the insurgents at Saint-Florent, D'Elbée, yielding to the wishes of those from Beaupreau, willingly became their leader. He was a simple pious man, beloved by the peasants who lived about his modest manor. After him, the people of their districts petitioned two other noblemen, Lescure and La Rochejaquelein, who came with their troops and joined the army of Cathelineau. The first was not yet twenty-seven years old. A former captain in the Royal Piedmont regiment, tall, well-built, of noble appearance, sweet disposition, and admirable piety, he became a perfect example of virtue as well as of courage for the Vendean army. La Rochejaquelein was twenty years old. Blond, with a slender and elegant figure, and of shy bearing, this young man was to be one of the most beloved leaders of the Vendean peasants. Although he seldom ventured to give a word in council, he was

[279] See Blachez, *Bonchamp et l'insurrection vendéene,* from original documents, 1902.

always seen in the first line of battle.[280] "My friends," said he to his soldiers when entering his first engagement, "I am nothing more than a child, but I wish, through my courage, to show myself worthy of being your commander. If I advance, follow me; if I fall back, kill me; if I die, avenge me."

The combined forces of Cathelineau, Bonchamp, D'Elbée, Lescure, and La Rochejaquelein made up "the Catholic and royal army." It engaged in its first pitched battle at Chemillé on April 11, took Thouars by storm May 5, overwhelming the troops of General Chalbos nine days later at Châtaigneraie, routed the army corps of Leygonier at Concourson of June 5, on June 8 that of General Salomon, and two days later seized Saumer. As they marched into battle, the Vendean army sang hymns. Before beginning to attack, they knelt to receive the priest's blessing. At Châtaigneraie, while under fire from enemy cannon, Lescure's soldiers noticed a mission cross; they fell to their knees, sustaining grapeshot fearlessly. One of their leaders desired to start moving. "Let them pray," said Lescure; "they will only fight better." They got up as a result full of courage and dislodged the enemy from their positions. From every side new recruits flocked in with a rosary in their buttonholes and a scapular over their hearts. "The like of this has not been seen since the Crusades," wrote Barère to the Convention.

Cathelineau

Until then all the plans of the campaign had been settled in council under the moral influence of Cathelineau. On June 12, Bonchamp, D' Elbée, Lescure, La Rochejaquelein, Stofflet, all the corps leaders elected by unanimous vote as supreme gen-

[280] Deniau, *op. cit.*, I, 625. Cf. *Henri de La Rochejaquelein et la guerre de la Vendée*, 1890.

eral of the Vendean army the man whose influence had impressed itself on all.[281] Cathelineau was not only the one leader who knew better the habits of the Vendean soldiers and the topography of the country where they fought; he also revealed the highest qualities of a soldier: the swiftness of his glance, his skill in maneuvers, the sureness of his advice, placed him over the men whom he commanded.

While the army of Cathelineau fought in the Vendean area which is called Le Bocage, marked with hills and streams, with thorny hedges and hollows, another army fought in the flat and open country called Le Marais. The small farms there were protected by muddy swamps which were jumped over with the aid of long poles and planks hard to carry. The man who commanded the insurgents from the swamp lands was Charette. François Charette de la Contrie was not yet thirty years of age, "in no way resembling the leaders of Anjou and Upper Poitou; he was a man of easy morals; the dazzling extravagance of his dress was something theatrical; but his penetrating gaze, tight lips, and clear sharp voice showed the leader who intended to be obeyed and would be. Besides, as brave a soldier as he was a clever tactician and adroit politician, he was truly worthy of command." [282]

In June, Charette and Cathelineau combined their efforts. For the first time the wealthy and the lowly Vendeans cooperated in the same campaign. The objective was seizure of the city of Nantes, whose fall would deliver Brittany and Normandy. On June 29, while Charette, D'Elbée, Bonchamp, and the other leaders directed the attack on seven different points, Cathelineau assaulted the gates of Rennes, where after a long

[281] Bossard, *Cathelineau, generalissime de la grande armée catholique et royale,* 1893.

[282] Veuillot, *Guerres de la Vendée et de la Bretagne,* 3rd ed., p. 55. See Napoleon's appreciation of Carette in *Memoirs of the Life, Exile, and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon,* IV, 89. Cf. Bittard des Portes, *Charette et la guerre de la Vendée.*

battle he rushed forward at the head of a devoted band of 300 men. Braving heavy fire, he had already reached the Viarme and saw that the enemy was disturbed. A bullet broke his arm and pierced his chest. All was over. He fell. His Vendeans thought only of carrying him away and fought only to retreat. Carried to Saint-Florent, the wounded general continued to issue orders to his army, but gangrene set in, and, on July 14,[283] Jacques Cathelineau died praising God. Four months had sufficed to cover his name with immortal glory. Undoubtedly in his army and especially near his army, more than one crime was committed unworthy of the noble cause he had served. Because of the intrigue of the tax-collector Souchu, who later sought to betray the Vendeans, 500 people were hatefully massacred after the capture of Machecoul. Equally deplorable deeds took place in half a score of localities.[284] But if we must stigmatize these crimes, we should also stigmatize the crimes of the revolutionary demagogue. Justice obliges us to declare that the glory of Cathelineau remained entirely free from these excesses. "Meek, modest," comments a historian devoted to the Revolution, "a true countryman with an unpretending sincere heart, uninterested in mean political passion, he had that composure which overawed and that enthusiasm which spoke to the soul of soldiers." [285] He had that deep and living faith which gained for him the surname of Saint of Anjou.

His death was a major blow to the Vendean cause. As a result, wrote one of the historians of the Vendée, "as long as Cathelineau lived, the principal driving force of the fighting army of the Vendée was kept together by the words and example of this man of faith. That was the period of successive

[283] Most historians fix the date of Cathelineau's death as July 14, 1793; a few the 19th. Célestin Port, member of the Institute, archivist of Maine-et-Loire, thinks he can fix the date as July 4. Port, *Dictionnaire historique de Maine-et-Loire,* s. v. Cathelineau. Deniau holds the date to be July 14 (Deniau, II, *277*).

[284] Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur,* VI, *269–72.*

[285] Port, *loc. cit.*

progress for the Catholic and royal cause; God blessed it. But from the time of the death of this saint of Anjou, when nobles became almost the exclusive masters in the direction of its affairs and gradually substituted the political element for its pious program, reverses followed. God withdrew His favors in proportion to the forgetfulness that they showed Him. From all reports, the death of Cathelineau was therefore a disaster for the Vendée." [286]

The Second Period

We are not here concerned with relating in detail the military phases of the Vendean and Brittany campaign during this second period, which had no lack of noble feats of arms and virtuous heroic acts; but, all in all, the glory of this period is less clear: division gained admission and became more pronounced among the leaders of the Vendean army; less noble sentiments prevailed; suspect men mixed their intrigues and passions in defense of the great Catholic cause.

On the first of August the Convention drew up a decree of savage extermination: "All kinds of combustible substances will be sent to the Vendée to set fire to the woods, brushwood, and broom plants. The forests will be razed, the haunts of the rebels will be destroyed, the harvest will be rooted up by companies of workmen, and the cattle seized." [287] Ten days later 18,000 men from the garrison which had just capitulated in Mainz, and from the garrisons of Condé and Valenciennes, were sent into the West. In all, 100,000 armed men were in the Vendée with the watchword the convention had given them: "We must make the Terror the order of the day." Under the leadership of D'Elbée, who had been elected commander-in-

[286] Deniau, *Histoire de la Vendée,* II, 233.
[287] *Moniteur,* August 2, 1793, p. 914.

chief replacing Cathelineau, the Catholic army, irritated and impatient, answered violence with violence. Hardly any more prisoners were taken by either side. At last, on October 18, the Vendean army was defeated at Cholet. Bonchamp and Lescure were mortally wounded. Pocketed at the Loire were 80,000 men, women, and children, half-mad, without supplies. A dreadful thought struck the enraged mob, that of killing five thousand Republican prisoners whom it had not thought of taking along with it on the right bank of the river. But the dying Bonchamp heard the furious shouts of the multitude. His failing powers revived: "Spare these unfortunates," said he to those who gathered round him; "this is surely the last order that I shall issue to you; give me the assurance that it will be carried out." At these words, the attendants of the Christian hero, moved even to tears, broke out into the crowd crying: "Mercy! Mercy! Bonchamp wishes it." The Republican prisoners were set at liberty, and the crowd crossed the Loire on half a score of boats. La Rochejaquelein, elected generalissimo, reawakened new ardor in the Vendean army. On October 23, after a furious assault, he made himself master of Laval.

It was at Laval that the great Vendean army met the Chouans from Brittany. Since August 15, 1792, when Jean Chouan had made his first attack with a makeshift troop, other bands of rebels had formed. In addition to the Misdon wood, situated seven miles from Laval and having become the general headquarters of Jean Chouan and his brothers, the woods of the Gravelle, the forests of Fougères, of Pertre and Lorge, became populated with armed revolutionaries. A former cavalry officer, the Count of Puisaye, had organized these different bands. Word of the battle given to Laval warned the Chouans of the presence of the Vendeans. Five to six thousand Breton peasants and manor tenants were joined to the large army of La Rochejaquelein. They took part thereafter in all its battles,

its glories, and its defeats. They were singled out by their long hair and their clothes, for the most part the untrimmed hides of goats.

But the generals recently sent to combat the uprising were warriors of great bravery: Kleber, Westermann, Vimeux, and Marceau. On the other hand division had begun in the Vendean army. After the victory at Laval its leaders hesitated on what to do. La Rochejaquelein favored a triumphant return to Poitou; but Talmont suggested marching on Paris and defended his plan tenaciously; some others wished to invade Brittany and enter Normandy. Time was lost in these fatal discussions. Soldiers and people no longer had that unlimited confidence in their leaders which they had given them at the beginning of the campaign. As a matter of fact many among them were baffled by the strangeness of their leaders' attitude.

From May 5, the date of the seizure of Thouars, the Catholic army had in its midst a priest who had presented himself to the Vendean leaders as a prelate sent by Pope Pius VI. He took the title of Bishop of Agara *in partibus,* officiating pontifically on feast days before the throng, exercising unquestioned authority on them by the prestige of his reputation. He was formerly pastor of Dol, named Guyot de Folleville. At last it was discovered that his behavior ill justified the honorary distinctions and confidential missions that he had taken on himself. A papal brief dated July 3, 1793 and addressed to the leaders of the Vendean army, unmasked his deceit. "We advise you," said Pius VI, "to shun this man as an impostor who is stained with sacrilege and to nullify all acts of jurisdiction which he ventured to make." Guyot de Folleville was obliged to refrain henceforth from all episcopal acts. Yet he stayed in the army. He was killed at Angers, February 5, 1794. Another priest of superior worth, whom we shall see in the Consulate under Bonaparte, played a considerable role, Father Bernier, taking part on the side of the pretended bishop of Agra in the

planning of the higher council of the army. This son of a simple peasant, while still very young, on the mere strength of his merit, had obtained one of the chief pastorates of Angers. Father Bernier exercised almost limitless influence on the peasants. His activity was ceaseless, but his conduct was too often prompted by wholly human considerations,[288] and his plans were not always the best. He was the one who suggested the creation of assignats[289] like those of the Republic in order to get some money for himself. His colleagues on the higher council proved their sense of honor by refusing to issue such spurious currency. The decree of proscription against men who served the Republic and against their families, and the obligation imposed on Republicans staying in the Vendée, of giving an oath of fidelity to Louis XVII were measures of Bernier's initiative. Along with a historian of the Vendean campaign, we may make a threefold condemnation of such measures, that of injustice, untimeliness, and weakness.[290]

The check of the Vendean army before Angers and its defeat at Le Mans accentuated the discouragement. They found themselves reduced to a mere 45,000 combatants. The failure of one attempt that had been made to cross the Loire added to their confusion. Nevertheless their faith in God remained steadfast in these well-tempered souls and outlived all deceit and dissension. One day two Vendean horsemen got ready to settle their quarrel in the lists, sword in hand. A man came by and said to them: "Christ pardoned His executioners; and you, a soldier of the Christian army, wish to kill your comrade." They embraced each other. Their faith in the King, who seemed to these men the only defense of the religious cause, was never

[288] "His good qualities," says Deniau, "were dimmed by an inordinate ambition, an insatiable desire to govern all, and a relish for sowing discord" (Deniau, II, 114).

[289] French paper money issued by the Republic, 1789–97.

[290] Veuillot, *Guerres de la Vendée et de la Bretagne,* p. 137. The decree which required Republicans to take an oath to Louis XVII was soon abolished for it ended only in the commission of perjury.

again shaken. The cry of "Long live the King" always accompanied the cry "Long live religion," when the soldier of the Catholic army entered battle or when he fell mortally wounded in the fray. But the confidence of the country folk in regard to the noblemen who directed the war had obviously sunk. Attacked and surrounded at Savenay, their last refuge, by the veteran troops of Kleber, Westermann, and Marceau, the remains of the Vendean army was not only defeated but wiped out. Only the women and a few fugitives barely succeeded in escaping by way of Guérande. Westermann wrote: "Everywhere only the grim reaper is to be seen: in the environs of Savenay alone more than 6,000 bodies have been buried." This was December 23, 1793.

"The great Catholic royalist army had perished, enshrouded in its victories and defeats; but it had saved the honor of Christian France and, in spite of the inherent weakness of human nature, was left to teach and recall by its struggle the noblest examples of heroism, uprightness, and faith." [291] These examples lived again subsequently in campaigns by Charette and La Rochejaquelein in the Vendée, and in Brittany by Cadoudal, hereafter at the head of independent troops. The Convention ended by compromising with them and granting freedom of Catholic worship to Brittany and the Vendée.

The Other Provinces

If, as in the time of the League, the insurrection had been able to carry all France, the Revolution, at least in its anti-religious action, would have been crushed. Perhaps, too, this result might have ensued if one of the princes, so ardently asked for and vainly awaited by the combatants in the West, had come as had the princes of Guise for the League in the sixteenth century to command the insurrection. The regions where re-

[291] Jager, *Histoire de l'Eglise catholique en France,* XX, 146.

ligious faith was less profound or less widespread were able merely to harass here and there. The regions from Bordeaux to Toulon and from Lyons to Marseilles had a few partial uprisings which were at once strenuously repressed. But the persecutors, wherever they tried to force Christians to renounce their faith and disobey their legitimate leaders, met a heroic resistance which was worthy of the first centuries of Christianity. We cannot cite every example. Church history, however, cannot pass over in silence the martyrdom of those whom perhaps one day the Church will number among its saints. In the first rank must be placed Father Noël Pinot, put to death for the faith in the public square of Angers, February 21, 1794; Sister Marguerite Rutan, of the Daughters of Charity, executed at Dax on April 9; the thirty-two nuns guillotined at Orange between the 6th and 26th of July; and the Blessed Carmelites of Compiègne whom the Church already commemorates on July 17, the anniversary of the date of their death.

On the afternoon of February 21, 1794, the population of Angers witnessed a sight unique perhaps in the annals of Christianity. A priest clothed in his sacerdotal vestments, cassock, alb, stole, and chasuble, crossed the city with his hands tied behind his back, escorted by guards and soldiers. Led by a drum, the grim procession went to the Place du Ralliement; there a scaffold was erected on the very spot where the high altar of Saint Pierre had been. This priest's name was Noël Pinot, since 1788 pastor of the parish of Louroux-Béconnais, on the banks of the Loire. Arrested March 4, 1791, for having declared from the pulpit that "he would never submit to laws enacted by the assembly on spiritual matters, even when he saw the punishment prepared for him," he had been, in accordance with the decree of September 27, 1790, adjudged stripped of his rights as an active citizen and incapable of fulfilling any public function. Yet nothing had diminished the zeal of this true pastor. Since then, hunted as a criminal, spend-

ing his days in attics and stables where he slept as he could, devoting his nights to covering the many miles and the three villages of his parish, hearing confessions, preaching, administering the sacraments, celebrating Mass in secret, changing the place of his hideout frequently in order not to compromise the courageous peasants who sheltered him, always alert for the agents of the National Guard and the searching parties, the courageous pastor of Louroux was betrayed by malcontents whom he had supported with his alms. He was arrested in the village of La Milanderie in the home of a pious widow when he was about to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice. Father Gruget who was an eyewitness relates that his judges, in order to add more pomp to his punishment, asked him if he would prefer to go there in his priestly vestments. "Yes," he replied, "that would be a great consolation to me." "Very well," his executioners answered, "you will be clothed in them and be put to death in this attire." [292]

Having come to the scaffold, the moment he placed his foot on the bottom step the saintly priest had a sublime inspiration. The sight of the priestly vestments which he wore reminded him of the Sacrifice of the Mass, in its mystic sense so like that which he was going to offer. Raising his eyes to heaven he exclaimed, *Introibo ad altare Dei* ("I will go to the altar of God"). At these words, the members of the military commission which had condemned him shouted out, "Long live the Republic!" which was the usual signal for the execution. The priest allowed himself to be fastened to the fatal board, and the knife fell. Father Noël Pinot had been a priest until the last.

Sister Marguerite Rutan, who died on the scaffold at Dax in Les Landes two months later (April 9), was also able to give testimony that she had been a Daughter of Charity to the

[292] Marquis de Ségur and C. Sauvé, *Un admirable martyr sous la Terreur,* 1904, p. 153; Uzureau, *Noël Pinot,* 1912.

end. Born at Metz in 1736, this humble daughter of St. Vincent de Paul, after many assignments in the service of the poor, was employed at the hospital in Dax when the decree of August 18, 1792, appeared suppressing "all religious congregations even those devoted solely to hospital work." Sister Rutan, spreading her spirit of determination to her companions, then organized them into an association of "The Ladies of Charity" in which the rules of the religious life were observed as well as the members were able. But her energetic refusal to take the constitutional oath which they wished to force on her under penalty of exclusion from the hospital, focused the attention of the committee of vigilance on her. She was accused, arrested, and condemned to death "as having by her lack of patriotism attempted to corrupt and diminish the revolutionary spirit, and as such was unworthy of fulfilling humane and charitable offices that are due free men."

An eyewitness tells us that, while Sister Marguerite Rutan and the stubborn priest Jean Eutrope de Lannelongue were [293] led to the guillotine in double time and with the roll of the drum, "one of the children that the sister had seen playing in the hospital cast a curious glance into the street from the room where he found himself shut up. His eyes met those of the martyr, who smiled up at him tenderly. The child's mother was near him and in a feeling of horror she shut the window quickly and said to her son: "Fall on your knees and pray for her; the wicked men are going to kill her." The child fell into tears.[294] The biographer of Marguerite Rutan does not hesitate to say that this holy daughter of St. Vincent de Paul was truly a martyr in the most exact sense of the word.

The thirty-two sisters put to death at Orange (July 6–26,

[293] Father de Lannelongue, a heroic priest, exercised his ministry at the risk of his life, still wearing the dress of a peasant as he was dressed when he was arrested.

[294] Coste, *Une victime de la Révolution, Sœur Marguerite Rutan,* 1904. We can also mention the four Daughters of Charity of Arras, guillotined at Cambrai by order of Le Bon. They were declared Venerable by Pius X.

1794) were martyrs, too. Of these thirty-two nuns, twenty-nine had been born at Bollène, a little town in Comtat Venaissin. They were members of two religious communities, the Sacramentines and the Ursulines. The peaceful, delightful city lamented the loss of the kindly and fatherly government of the pope. This fact was known at Avignon and even at Paris. A delegate of the Convention, the terrible Maignet, called the "executioner of the Midi," vowed that he would "chop off the heads of the proud who had not been able to humble themselves before the level of equality." He carried it out to the letter. The Sacramentines and Ursulines, expelled from their convents on October 13, endeavored to preserve the practice of the religious life in their relatives' homes or in a rented house. There the warrants for their arrest were served on each of them. On May 1, twenty-eight Sacramentines under the direction of their superior (Madame de La Fare, sister of the Bishop of Nancy) and four Ursulines who acknowledged as their mother Madame de Troquart climbed up into their carts and were led to Orange. "Poor victims led to slaughter," cried out one of the men in the crowd before the spectacle; for his outburst he was seized and led away with them. "Their wonderful piety in prison," writes one of their historians," their joyfulness at the call of the tribunal, and their stately appearance before their judges and executioners made these thirty-two religious apostles and angels of consolation in the midst of the prisoners." [295] "Arriving at the scene of their triumph," we read in the *Relations* of 1795, "they embraced the scaffold, thanked their judges, pardoned their executioners, and with peace in their hearts and a look of serenity on their faces consummated their sacrifice." The spectators murmured: "Religion alone could inspire so much courage and assurance." [296]

[295] Cherot, *Figures de martyrs*, 1907, p. 147.

[296] Redon, *Trente-deux religieuses guillotinées à Orange en 1794* (1904), p. 105. At Valenciennes, eleven Ursulines were also led to the scaffold. Their cause has been introduced at Rome.

We are told that the religious of Bollène sang hymns while on their way to death. On July 17 Paris witnessed a scene no less touching. Sixteen Carmelite nuns from the convent of Compiègne with their hands tied behind their backs standing in the carts which the populace called "rolling graves," slowly crossed the city to the Palace of Justice where they had been condemned to death, and to the Place du Trone where they were executed. All sang. The streets which had so often echoed revolutionary songs sounded with the Psalmody of the *Miserere* and the *Salve Regina.* Here and there a few savage murmurs were heard, but on almost the entire length of the route the innocent victims were greeted by the respectful silence of the people who listened to them, having been won over by this new harmony. They ended with the *Veni Creator* and renewed aloud their baptismal promises and religious vows.

Of all the victims of the Revolution we note but few whose character of "martyrs of the faith" rests on such convincing proof. A decree of the committee of vigilance at Compiègne, dated June 21, 1794, had denounced them as "always living subject to the fanatical regulations of their cloister." [297] We know what the word "fanatical" meant on the lips of the terrorists. At the height of the trial, the public prosecutor, after presenting other motives, returned to this accusation of fanaticism. One of the religious had the presence of mind to ask for an explanation of the word. After a torrent of insults, driven to extremes the prosecutor answered: "By fanaticism I mean your adherence to childlike belief, your silly practice of religion." "My dear Mother and Sisters," replied the valiant nun, while turning toward her companions, "you have heard the prosecutor declare that it is for our attachment to religion. . . . O how fortunate! How fortunate are we to die for God!" [298]

[297] For the text of the decree, see Sorel, *Carmélites de Compiègne* (1878), p. 27.
[298] Pierre, *Seize Carmélites de Compiègne,* p. 144.

Having arrived at the foot of the scaffold, the prioress, Marie Thérèse de Saint Augustin, asked for the grace of dying last. "The youngest, Constance Meunier, novice since 1789, fell on her knees before her spiritual mother, receiving from her lips the words of blessing, and then as she would have done in the convent, asked for one last favor, the permission of dying. Then she separated from them, climbed the ladder, and presented herself to the executioner. Thus each in turn, accompanied by the chant, which kept growing weaker, the other nuns down to the mother prioress, who like the mother of the Machabees, went up last, assured of the faith of her daughters with whom she was reunited in death." [299]

While faith elevated the souls of the victims to these heavenly heights, in striking contrast the spirit of evil made those of the persecutors descend to the extremes of vileness. Of these none perhaps was more hideous than Jean Baptiste Carrier. In him, following an expression of Taine, Jacobin fury had reached "its extreme." [300] "A tall, lean man," writes Michelet, "of swarthy complexion, awkward in his walk, with sham gestures, restless eyes, bewildered and misguided, he should have been ridiculed, but he was feared." [301] Carrier's moral side was even below the physical. "This man never had a mind," writes Lamartine, "but a depraved instinct. He never had a single idea except fury. Murder was his only philosophy; blood his sole pleasure." [302] "With Carrier as with a mad dog," says Taine, "his brain was completely filled with recurring diabolical thoughts, with never-ending images of murder and death." [303] This terrorist operated at Nantes. The guillotine and the firing squad were not enough for him. One day Carrier, who chose his underlings from the most despicable dregs

[299] Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

[300] Taine, *Les origines*, VII, 341.

[301] Michelet, *Histoire de la Révolution*, VII, 81. Compare this description with the portrait given by Lenôtre in his book, *Les noyades de Nantes*.

[302] Lamartine, *Histoire des Girondins*, Bk. LIII; Le Chevalier, *op. cit.*, III, 281.

[303] Taine, *op. cit.*, VII, 340.

of the people, called upon some barge-men as ruthless as himself. He ordered them to open the sea cocks of a certain number of ships. One of the barge-men asked him for a written order. "Am I not an official?" Carrier answered him. "It is not so mysterious," he added. "You will be loaded with fifty priests and you will let them fall in the water in the midst of the current." The next day he wrote to the Convention that fifty priests had perished by a "new torture." The drownings at Nantes continued for several months. Carrier often took pleasure in riding on these same ships. While he thus had a joyful time with his drinking companions, a stifled groaning informed him that the victims were drowning under his feet; and he continued his drunken bout.[304]

Somewhat like this monster were Le Bon at Arras, Collot d'Herbois at Lyons, Maignet in the Comtat Venaissin, Tallien at Bordeaux, Robespierre le Jeune at Vesul, Saint-Just in Alsace, and Fouquier-Tinville at Paris who took part in so many massacres that more than one grew pale when, at the end of so many crimes, they caught a glimpse of some inevitable punishment. Their victims, on the contrary, at the moment of their execution, thrilled with expectation. "Dear God," cried out one of sixteen Carmelites at the foot of the scaffold, "I would be only too happy if this small sacrifice of my life would appease Thy anger and lessen the number of victims." [305] Eleven days later on July 28, 1794, Robespierre and twenty-two of his accomplices were led to the scaffold. The next day sixty-two members of the Commune were executed. The Reign of Terror was over.

The Vendée and Brittany

From the religious viewpoint, the two chief results of the uprising which had just been effected were the conclusion of

[304] On Carrier, see Lenôtre, *op. cit.*

[305] Jauffret, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Révolution,* II, 353.

the Treaty of La Jaunais with the Vendean leaders and the reopening of a large number of churches.

That the resistance of the Vendée might be ended, the commander-in-chief of the Republican troops in the Vendée, Turreau, formerly Baron of Garambouville, had organized there, since January 20, 1794, twelve mobile columns, called "infernal columns," with orders to burn whatever could be burned.[306] But the result had to be awaited. In spite of the regrettable divisions that had arisen among the Vendean leaders, the 400,000 souls still [307] remaining in the Vendée proved themselves to be irreducible. In April the Convention impatiently gave Turreau a month to finish the undertaking,[308] which ended by an understanding, especially after the death of Robespierre, that violence and terror never had any effect on the souls of the Vendeans and Bretons, as firm as the granite on which they stood. They began by speaking of forgetting grievances, of harmony. The offer which the Vendeans themselves had made to the government was rejected until the 9th of Thermidor brought matters to an end. General Hoche, placed at the head of the troops of the West, made great efforts to prevent all plunder. Liberty of worship was in a way the basis. He said: "Rebuild your cottages, pray to God as if you mean it and work in your fields." A perspicacious and understanding man, Hoche joined to his talents of generalship a genuine ability to govern. This new policy succeeded in the country. Many priests, no longer considering the cause of the Church bound to the cause of the monarchy, recommended submission to the government. Toward the end of 1795 most of the peasants, without treating Charette as an enemy, refused to serve him, and maintained scrupulous neutrality. On December 2, 1794, Carnot, as member of the Committee of Public Safety, proposed the

[306] See his order of the day to General Huché, dated 2nd Ventôse, in Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

[307] This is the appraisal given by the Conventionist Lequinio. *Ibid.*, p. 268.

[308] *Ibid.*, p. 293.

following decree and had it adopted by the Convention: "All people known in the districts of the West, on the shores of Brest and Cherbourg, by the name of rebels of the Vendée or Chouans, who lay down their arms within the month following the day of publication of the present decree will neither be molested nor be investigated in the future for taking part in their rebellion."

On all sides minds were prepared for peace. On February 17, 1795, eleven members of the National Convention on one hand and twenty Vendean officers on the other signed a treaty at La Jaunais near Nantes. The first three articles of the treaty are the following: "Article 1: Every individual and all sections of citizens whatever are able freely and peaceably to exercise their religion. Article 2: Individuals and ministers of all creeds whatever will not be troubled, disturbed or investigated for the free exercise, peaceful and internal, of their religion. Article 3: Civil authorities and commanders of the army are charged with taking the execution of the present treaty in hand." Breton and Vendean blood had not been shed in vain.

"Just as the fall of Robespierre had led the Republic to the notion of humanity from which the Vendée benefited, in like manner the religious liberty granted to it would lead the Republic finally to grant liberty of religion to the nation, not only in principle but in reality." [309] Louis Veuillot could write: "The resistance of the Vendée was not a mere episode in the vast, tragic picture of the fall of the old monarchy; it was the only action which had counterbalanced, for the future of French society, the victorious events of the Revolution. Royalty, nobility, institutions, laws, and distinctions of dress had all succumbed. That which the Vendée had protected especially, that which had put armed forces in its hands, never was lost. The Vendean fought for the cross." [310]

[309] Brugere, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise*, p. 1135.
[310] Quoted by Eugene Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

The revolution had not in reality brought the immediate cessation of the persecution against priests. "Two months after the fall of Robespierre some priests accused of emigration were even guillotined at Paris. These were the priests last released from prison. On the margin of one writ of liberation we read these words: "Postponed since he is a priest." [311] Moderates and Jacobins found themselves in accord when the question concerned religious matters. The clearly voiced will of the rural population was in favor of the re-establishment of worship, a will manifest not only in the West, but even in part of Normandy, in the sections of the central Massif in Franche-Comté and in some parts of the Midi, which exerted the first wholesome pressure on legislation. The Treaty of La Jaunais brought the movement to a close. "The Convention," as Aulard declares, "noted that the people were always Catholic, and loudly demanded the realization of the decree on liberty of worship. The Revolution had been able neither to assimilate Catholicism nor to destroy it, but had to resign itself to living side by side with it, considering religions as peculiar societies, which had the right to exist under law without interference from the state, which remained secular." [312] Such indeed were the thoughts that inspired the law of February 21, 1795, on the freedom of worship and that of May 30 on the reopening of non-alienated churches.

"In conformity with article 7 of the Declaration of the Rights of Man," reads the first article of February's law, "the practice of any cult cannot be disturbed." The truth is that the nine articles following this one are applied to restrict the expressing of this liberty of worship. Thus article 5 forbade "appearing in public in the dress, decoration, or costume appropriate to religious ceremonies"; article 3 forbade to communities "all pur-

[311] Pisani, *L'Eglise de Paris de la Révolution,* II, 153. Father Emery, superior of St. Sulpice, was not freed until October 25, 1795, and Father Duclaud, his future successor, remained in prison until January, 1795.

[312] Aulard, *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française,* II, 139.

chase or renting of a place for the practice of religion"; and article 9 forbade "the making of any endowment, perpetual or for life, and the establishment of any tax to pay its expenses." [313] May's law determined that "citizens of communes or sections of a commune provisionally had the free use of buildings not alienated, originally intended for the exercise of worship" (art. 1). "When citizens of the same commune or of the same section practice different religions, their place of worship will be common," each religion will have days and hours fixed by the municipality (art. 4). "No one, however, will be permitted to exercise the ministry of any religion in these aforesaid buildings without having made an act of submission to the laws of the Republic" (art. 5).[314]

Under what conditions did the "citizens of communes or sections of communes" obtain the free use of their former churches not alienated? The answer to this question allows almost as many distinctions as existed in the matter of opening churches.[315] This condition was seen at Paris in the parish of St. Roch where the pastor, Father Marduel, exclusively managed all the financial administration of the parish through himself or his curate; but elsewhere the secular element interfered. At St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Eustache, St. Lawrence, St. Jacques du Haut-Pas, St. Etienne-du-Mont, societies of worship were formed which took the temporal administration of the parish into their hands, displaying a true zeal in the repair of churches, the purchase of objects necessary for worship, the maintenance of the ministers and officers, but sometimes exceeding the limits of canon law by their excessive meddling in parochial government.[316]

[313] *Bulletin des lois.* III, no. 665.

[314] *Ibid.*, IV, no. 150.

[315] J. Grente, *Le culte catholique à Paris de la Terreur au Concordat* (Paris, 1903), p. 20.

[316] Grente, *op. cit.*, pp. 21–24; Victor Pierre, *L'Eglise Saint-Thomas d'Aquin pendant la Révolution;* L. Soutif, "Une société du culte catholique à Paris pendant la

In the early months of 1795, many constitutional priests retracted their errors and returned to the Church. At Paris the vicars general of De Juigné received a large number of these recantations.[317] The movement was no less marked in the provinces. Every place saw priests abjuring the schism, as the newspapers of the time attest.[318] The large number of retractions is admitted by the constitutionalists themselves in their paper. It is the subject of more than ordinary derision and complaints to be found on each page. They treat the priests who abjured the schism as cowards and self-seekers.[319] Unquestionably the conduct of those who retracted at once after the papal condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, when the government reserved its favors for those alone who took the oath, was otherwise heroic. Now the state abandoned the constitutional clergy to the common law, concurring with the Catholics loyal to the Pope. Members of the constitutional clergy whined bitterly over this situation. One anonymous petitioner declared that the law of February 21, 1795, made any religion impossible for "lack of a place of worship, lack of ministers, and lack of funds." [320] Father Adrien declared: "Your decree of February too greatly favors the non-jurors who preach royalism; it has too little protection for Republican priests." [321] The behavior of the retractants was nevertheless most meritorious because the Church, before again admitting them into the body of the hierarchy, maintained steadfastly the observance of the

première séparation," excerpt from *La Revue des questions historiques,* 1908; A. Mathiez, "L'exercise du culte sous la première séparation," from the *Revue politique et parlementaire* of January 10, 1907.

[317] Michel Priot, in his *Mémoires,* declares that he read the long list of these retractations in a special register preserved by the Archbishop of Paris. This register was lost in the destruction of 1830. Priot noted among the names of the retractors those of the two episcopal vicars of Gobel: Gerard and Mille. Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 132.

[318] See the *Annales de l' Abbé de Boulogne,* III, 255.

[319] *Annales de la religion,* II, 597; IV, 121, 145; Picot, *Mémoires,* VI, 433.

[320] Quoted by Gazier, *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* p. 258.

[321] *Ibid.*

severe tests which the Pope exacted from the priests who had taken the oath.[322] Required of them were public abjuration, abdication of the usurped parish, penance proportionate to the scandal given, restitution of ecclesiastical goods unduly collected, and other conditions. The retractant also ran the risk of encouraging the dislike of administrative authorities, who on the whole remained favorable to the constitutional Church and especially continued to hate the Roman Church.

We have no need, in fact, to exaggerate the improvement brought about in the situation of the Catholic clergy by the revolution of July 27 (9 Thermidor). The July reaction was more a political reaction than a religious one. Those same ones who triumphed could not be of great assistance to the Church. The reaction personified itself and showed especially in these "golden youth" made up of Girondin and royalist young men dressed in the fashion of dandies and wearing the green cape of the Breton Chouans. They soon made themselves masters of the streets of Paris. They indulged in festive gatherings at the Palais Royal, in the salons of Madame Tallien and Madame de Staël, leaving these gatherings to attack the Jacobins in their clubs with blows of their canes and making the streets resound with revengeful songs.

> The tardy day of vengeance
> At length makes hangmen pale.

At the theater they applauded these lines of Mahomet:

> Wipe out, great God, from the earth where we are
> Whoever with joy pours forth men's blood.

This was the time when the *émigré* princess, the Count d'Artois, the Count of Provence, and the Prince de Condé, wondered if the moment had not come to re-establish the royalty

[322] See the briefs of Pius V of April 13, 1791, and June 13, 1792; Hulot, *Collectio brevium Pii VI*, pp. 223, 270, 315, 329, etc.

and abolish the entire work of the Revolution. Paul Thureau-Dangin in his important work on the days following July 29 tells of the series of projects, conferences, and intrigues that had led up to the proclamation of Verona and the unfortunate expedition of Quiberon.[323]

The Church could not be expected to give its approval to a frivolous and skeptical society, which fought the results of the Revolution while perpetuating its profound causes. The clearest consequences of the July reaction was the provoking of reprisals against the clergy. In the session of April 14, 1795, Rewbell called for a redoubling of persecution against priests "who were not contented with saying Mass in church, but who wished to make France a new Vendée." "We need not persecute priests as priests," he declared, "but as seditious men, as apostles of royalism." [324] On September 22 Marie Joseph Chénier, in an account abounding with attacks on the Jacobins and the Catholics, proposed the institution of civil feasts and, on 17 Pluviôse, Escasseriaux indicated the spirit of these feasts where "men of all creeds would meet to celebrate the Supreme Being, listen to charming addresses on patriotism, and forget the illusions of fanaticism." Chénier's proposal did not pass. Just when it was going to be passed by acclamation, an unexpected opponent appeared on the rostrum. "If you were in good faith," he exclaimed, "you would admit that your clearly evident purpose is to destroy Catholicism." [325] And then, to deny the supposed alliance of the Church with royalty, the orator made an effort to show the joint solidarity of Catholicism with the Republic. In this refutation of a false allegation the speaker fell into a manifest error. The assembly went on scorn-

[323] P. Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et républicans* (the question of monarchy or republic from July 27 to November 11), pp. 3–67.

[324] *Moniteur* of April 17, 1795, p. 846.

[325] This speaker was Grégoire. Gazier, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* pp. 242–44, 341–65.

fully to the order of the day. Chénier's proposal would be taken up later and it would triumph.

A law of November 20 affected the use of priests' rectories (not yet sold) for school purposes. On February 2 Lecointre asked the Convention to sell all the rectories and churches. The purpose appeared more and more in evidence: in place of the dispossessed clergy to install, as a new kind of pastor, the teachers, appointed guardians of a new orthodoxy. The project about public education, reported on November 20, 1795, by Lakanal, would, according to the intentions of its authors, "exercise an influence on the spread of knowledge and the destruction of prejudices." [326]

The Constitutional Church (1795)

These trials, which came from the enemies of all belief, were increased for the Church by more intimate afflictions, occasioned by the obstinate schism of the constitutional priests and by the revival of the discussions among loyal Catholics with respect to the last formula of the oath.

In the spring of 1795 the constitutional Church was in a state of decay. "Of the eighty-two bishops holding their sees in 1792, ten were dead, six of them on the scaffold; twenty-four had apostatized, of whom six had attempted marriage; twenty-four had renounced their ecclesiastical functions; twenty-four had fled almost untouched by the crisis, or if they had given up their ecclesiastical titles, this move was only after a long and

[326] Aulard, *Histoire politique de la Révolution,* p. 535. Cf. Albert Duruy, *L'instruction publique et la Révolution;* A. Perrin, "Quelques grands ancêtres de nos manuels scolaires," in the *Revue pratique d'apologetique* of July 15, 1911. Cf. the anonymous work published in 1817, the *Génie de la Révolution considéré dans l'éducation (Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'instruction publique)*, 1789, by the author of the *Itinéraire de Buonaparte.* This work has for its author Jean Baptiste Fabry (1780–1821), founder in 1805 of the *Spectateur français.*

depressing imprisonment. In every case, these rare survivors of the wreck, scattered, discouraged, abandoned by their priests, scorned by the faithful, systematically ignored by the civil authorities, still trembled at the thought that the Terror might start over again.[327] The law of July, in establishing freedom of worship and in virtually abolishing as a consequence the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, seemed to have inflicted a death sentence on the constitutional Church.[328] This effect would have been the final blow but for the energy of Grégoire.

A certain historian whom we like to quote here because he had under his eyes all the papers of the Bishop of Loir-et-Cher, says:

> Grégoire appeared in the midst of these drole figures as great because of the dignified attitude he had taken during the Reign of Terror. His merits might be called into question, he might be criticized for having been a slave to his prejudices and grudges and for not having preserved in the presentation of his ideas the calmness and impartiality which are a safeguard against exaggeration and injustice. He might well be called upon for a strict accounting of the stubbornness with which he defended false and dangerous opinions until the end; but it is not less certain that in 1795 he was the man who personified, if not religion, at least the constitutional party and who, having shown great courage at the moment when so many others rivaled one another in cowardice, he was the only one who seemed able to restore his Church, if it could be restored.[329]

Grégoire devoted himself to his work with tireless perseverance. During the winter of 1794 he gathered about him four of his colleagues: Royer from l'Ain, Saurine from Les Landes, Gratien from the Seine-Inférieure, and Desbois from La

[327] Pisani, II, 190.

[328] Aulard denies that the Civil Constitution was abolished by the law of 1795 (*La Révolution française,* Vol. LII, January, 1907); but does he not say in his *The French Revolution,* III, 262, that in 1795 the constitutional clergy no longer had any legal existence?

[329] Pisani, II, 192.

Somme. Royer was an honest nobody; Saurine, an intelligent but fantastic man; Gratien, a learned man deluded by all the revolutionary prejudices; Desbois, a priest of irreproachable morals and especially a money lender.[330] At the suggestion of Grégoire the five prelates formed a permanent council, styling itself the Council of United Bishops. Its first acts were to establish a party journal which took the title of *Annales de la religion,* and then with money placed at its disposal by Desbois, set up on rue Saint-Jacques an *imprimerie-librairie-chrétienne* destined to become the chief propaganda machine of the constitutional Church.[331] Some devoted laymen placed at the service of the "United" the full ardor which they had recently employed in favor of the Civil Constitution. On March 15, 1795, ten constitutional bishops published a document entitled, *Lettre encyclique de plusieurs évêques de France à leurs frères les autres évêques et aux églises vacantes.* This letter contained dogmatic declarations and disciplinary decisions: the belief in all that the Church believes was proposed while making reservations on the power of the pope; then, severe measures inspired by Jansenist rigorism were laid down with respect to those who had taken part in the worship of Reason.[332] In order to bring back the faithful to "the beautiful times of the primitive Church," they decided that in all the chief towns of dioceses whose bishop had died or disappeared, the senior pastors, united in a council under the name of "presbytery," would assume the directive authority. In fulfillment of this prescription, on March 31, 1795, four Paris pastors organized the presbytery of Paris, which, though not without storms, directed the constitutional

[330] On these bishops, see Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel.*

[331] The *Annales de la religion* lasted until 1803. For its foundation, see Gazier, *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* pp. 282–88. To combat this *Annales,* Fathers Sicard and Jauffret founded the *Annales religieuses et littéraires* in February, 1796, which, under the direction of Father de Boulogne, soon became the *Annales catholiques.*

[332] See the text of this letter in the *Annales de la religion,* I, 49–58.

clergy of Paris until November 3, 1801.[333] Pushing their audacity further, the "united bishops" installed themselves on April 27 in the church of Saint-Médard without having bought the property or rented it or obtained any title of administration. Many other episcopal cities (e.g., Versailles and Colmar) made up presbyteries like that of Paris. Grégoire, the soul of the entire movement, spent himself on it without counting the cost.

The leader of the constitutional Church was not satisfied with being impudent to the civil authorities: he was far too aggressive and haughty to the clergy who had not taken the oath. Strict in regard to repentent sinners, he accused those who did not take the oath of moral laxity, letting fly at them the revived epigrams of Pascal. The law of May 30, which permitted the opening of churches, was a new point of conflict between the constitutional clergy and those loyal to the pope. Here the non-jurors had to retreat before the jurors; there the two clergies continued to be separated like the hours of the day; everywhere Catholics were to suffer attacks and intrigues from the party to which Grégoire had given direction, a party few in number, but active and busy, whose several members had compromised with the men of the Revolution. Not only had Durand de Maillaine and Lanjuinais collaborated with Daunou and Boissy d'Anglas in drawing up the famous constitution of 1795, but they were always fighting their common enemy, the clergy who submitted to the pope.

During this time the loyal clergy suffered from fresh and painful divisions, born on the occasion of the promise of submission to the laws of the Republic which the law of May 30 had required from priests to allow them the use of the churches. Some spurned it with horror as apostasy, others counseled it as licit and useful. Said the former: "Religion and justice join to forbid such a step." They showed that incompatible with the

[333] The register of the deliberations of the "presbytery of Paris" is preserved in the archives of Grazier.

most formal laws of the Church were many laws of the Republic: the laws authorizing divorce, suppressing the Sabbath repose, consecrating the Republican calendar, and authorizing the sale of Church property; and that even when the act of submission would not be contrary to religion, it would still be illicit because, in making it, priests would be recognizing the Republic, a recognition incompatible with the fidelity due to the legitimate sovereign.[334]

But many ecclesiastics, among others de Bausset, bishop of Alais, Father de Boulogne, director of the *Annales ecclésiastiques,* and in particular Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice, were not upset by this reasoning. To prove that the promise of submission was licit, Father Emery showed that the promised submission might be regarded simply as opposition to the revolt; but Catholics have as a principle that of non-rebellion, even against faulty laws; that submission to the laws of the state should be understood as a submission to civil and political laws; moreover, that this submission implied neither approval of these laws nor of the authority to which they submitted. To support his interpretation he called upon the text of a circular sent June 17, 1795, by the legislative committee to the directories of departments. Says the circular: "For you to point out that the Civil Constitution of the Clergy is no longer a law of the Republic, is useless for you. Besides, always recall this principle: the law purposes to assure and facilitate more and more the free practice of religion." [335] As to the usefulness of the proposed step, Father Emery saw it in the possibility of taking immediate possession of the churches, coveted by the constitutionals and threatened with disaffection or ruin, and bringing them back to the use of Catholic worship.

Meanwhile a law of September 20, 1795, stated more pre-

[334] Notice published by one part of the episcopate and quoted by Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé,* VI, 398.

[335] Quoted by Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 435.

cisely the sense of the promise, imposing the following formula: "I recognize that the whole citizenry is the ruler, and I promise submission and obedience to the laws of the Republic." The arguments continued, urged on by one side or the other with ardent convictions, becoming more and more sharp and painful. In the mean time the labors of Daunon, Boissy d'Anglas, Durand de Maillaine, and Lanjuinais had finally resulted (August 10, 1795) in the Constitution of the year III by which an effort was made, without returning to the monarchy, to avoid the disagreeable features of the means employed by demagogues. The executive power, confined to a directory of five members elected for five years; the legislative power and the judicial power, divided between two elected councils and renewable periodically; and an ingenious system of election in two stages: all this division of powers was calculated to make any dictatorship impossible. On October 26, 1795, the Convention broke up; the next day the government was formed on a new basis, and the horizon opened on hopes for order and peace.

CHAPTER VI

The Church Supplanted by Civil Religion (1795–99)

ORDER and peace were the two outstanding needs of France; but the regime of the Directory was unable to satisfy these needs. In confiding the executive power to five men and the legislative power to two different bodies, the authors of the Constitution of 1795 aimed at neutralizing tyrannical influences, but they merely stirred up conflicts, strifes, and *coups d'état*. This result was the more to be expected since behind these constituted powers two new influences were growing and tending toward predominance: that of the ideologists of the Institute and that of the generals of the army.

An incomplete account of the spiritual movement and even of the political movement of this period would be given if the Institute were left out. "This grand, learned body," writes Albert Vandal, "which took its existence from the Constitution, under the same title as the Directory and the two councils, almost formed a fourth power in the state. It was the guardian of doctrine." [1]

The shrewd ambition of General Bonaparte was not mistaken here. He hastened to add that "he belonged to the religion of the Institute." [2] These words were a way of expressing the cleverest compliment. Most of the members of the Institute were deeply anti-Christian. Napoleon was confronted with their impious sectarianism at the time of the Concordat. From this body, as we shall see, rose the system destined to replace the Catholic religion.

[1] Vandal, *L'avènement de Bonaparte*, p. 4.

[2] See Aulard, *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française*, II, 143.

On the other hand, by the same force of events, the influence of the generals made itself felt even in the political field. The momentous wars of the Convention had stirred up extreme patriotism. In the midst of heaped-up ruins the military establishment had grown in power. Such leaders as Marceau, Hoche, Kleber, and Massena, were strong with the confidence of the soldier. One still more famous would rise in the Italian campaigns and soon absorb all the others. Meanwhile everything that called itself patriotic or national was sure to find an echo among the people. If a new religion could become acclimated in France, this would have to be, seemingly, a national religion.

Until then the Revolution was a work especially of destruction; the Directory now assumed the task of rebuilding. Moreover, politicians, theorists, and generals were all imbued with that vague idealism taken from Rousseau's writings, which were an influence inspiring the entire revolutionary work. Robespierre had said, in a program of action as vast as the world: "We wish to substitute in our country morality for selfishness, truth for splendor, a high-minded and mighty people for a frivolous and wretched people, the virtues of the Republic for the vices of the monarchy. We desire that France may become the model of nations, the fear of oppressors, the consolation of the downtrodden. To see the dawn of universal happiness shining, that is our ambition, our goal." [3] The foes of Robespierre, in breaking his political power, had nothing to disown in this program. Rousseau's philosophy, on which they had all been nourished, reminded them that "the question is less of convincing men than of arousing them"; [4] that "morality reaches men only by robbing them of all their faculties"; [5] "by the passions we must make men happy." [6] They concluded that

[3] *Rapport du 5 fevrier, 1794,* on the principles of public morals.

[4] Mirabeau, *Travail sur l'éducation publique,* 1791, p. 22.

[5] Talleyrand, *Rapport sur l'instruction publique,* 1791, p. 111.

[6] Vergniaud, in the session of November 9, 1792; *Moniteur* of November 11.

their action ought to be first of all a religious action. But the new religion would have to be distinct from the old one by two traits: it would be natural and civic. Grégoire had said: "The Revolution returns us to nature." [7] David added: "Men are only what the government makes them."

The foundation of a natural and civic religion was now going to be the dominant preoccupation of the men who pretended to guide public opinion under the Directory. Such an undertaking was certain to run aground, but only after it had profoundly disturbed men's souls and upset society.

One man who despised the theorists of the Directory and who scornfully called them "the ideologists," General Bonaparte, had devised a more practical project. With that positive spirit, and that sense of the real and the realizable which he would reveal later with so much clearness in the discussion of the civil code and in the negotiation of the Concordat, Bonaparte understood that the only religion to restore was the traditional religion of France, and the only way to make it a national institution was by coming to terms with the pope. In the first days of June, 1796, following the events to which we have just returned, he sent to Pius VI, through the good offices of Azara, the Spanish minister at Rome, the request for a papal bull recognizing the new Constitution. With this act they would answer for the French government's side with generous and kindly measures in regard to the Church. The Pope did not refuse to enter upon the path thus proposed and, at any rate, the draft of a brief was drawn up which corresponded with the presumed wishes of the Directory.[8] Pius VI proclaimed the recognition of the French Republic and charged Catholics to be subject to it "without allowing themselves to be misled by an ill-ordered devotion (*sub pietatis colore*) which would give

[7] Grégoire, *Rapport* of 12 Prairial, year I.

[8] Pisani, III, 95; Giobbio, *La chiesa e lo stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione,* pp. 305, 323, 324; De Teil, *Naples et le Directoire,* p. 238.

the innovators a pretext to discredit religion." [9] Cacault,[10] the representative of France at Rome, communicated the document to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Delacroix, in August, 1796, and the *Annales de la religion* [11] published it as did the *Annales catholiques.*[12] But as the French government had never given or definitely promised the legitimate satisfactions which General Bonaparte had led to be expected, the brief was not even communicated to the bishops and the nuncios, nor was it officially promulgated in any manner.[13]

This brief, which bore the date of July 5, 1796, and which began with the words *Pastoralis sollicitudo,* thus never had any canonical value. This circumstance, however, was not an evident matter for the people of the day. The publication of the brief stirred up tempests. While the royal *émigrés* asserted that it was false, that it was a pure invention and was reprobated by the Pope,[14] at the same time the Jacobins called it "a shameful recantation;" [15] while, curiously enough, the constitutionals violently attacked an act which no longer in any way gave them the exclusive privilege of submission to the laws,[16] the superior of St. Sulpice seeing in this brief, whose authenticity he did not question, the confirmation of his opinion, published a translation in a small pamphlet.[17] It appeared that the document expressed the Pope's thoughts; it was never promulgated, nor was it ever further attacked.[18]

[9] See the full Latin text in Pisani, III, 109.

[10] He had received his credentials January 19, 1793. See Gendry, II, 233.

[11] *Annales de la religion,* III, 489–91.

[12] *Annales catholiques,* II, 241–43.

[13] See a letter of the Secretary of State, published in the *Annales catholiques,* III, 477.

[14] *Annales catholiques,* III, 476.

[15] *Amis des lois,* cited by Pisani, III, 101.

[16] *Annales de la religion,* V, 529–51.

[17] Paris, printed by Guebart.

[18] The discussions, raised with respect to the brief *Pastoralis* among the men of the day, were perpetuated by historians. Baldassari believes in its authenticity; Méric, in his *Histoire de M. Emery,* places it in doubt; Gendry does not venture to

Second Encyclical of the Constitutionals

Napoleon's daring project had failed, but it would be repeated with greater success five years later. In the interim the Constitutional Church, profiting by the division of the Catholics, gained strength, claimed to be the national Church in the full force of the term, and was unwilling to share this title with any other institution.

On December 13, 1795, the four constitutional bishops who had taken the name of "United" published a second encyclical addressed "to their brethren the other bishops and to the vacant Churches." Protesting "their unshakable firmness in the faith and in the ancient discipline," they haughtily laid claim to an exclusive right of regulating the internal organization of the Gallican Church, denying this right both to the pope and to the state. They proclaimed the abolition of episcopal councils (established in 1791), abandoning, they said, "that innovation ill according with the pen of history," and replaced the councils by "presbyteries." [19] Their aim was the convoking of a national council; at this council the Church of France would receive its definitive organization. The encyclical of March 15, 1795, had clearly declared that religion was a national affair, and that the Catholic Church was nothing more than an aggregation of different national Churches united by the bonds of charity.[20] The national council then logically became the supreme authority. But the lack of safety on the highways, which were infested by bandits, and the disturbance of wars, had until now delayed the meeting of the assembly. According to the *Annales de la religion,* they were waiting "for the olive

pronounce clearly and merely speaks of it "with utmost reserve" (Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 250). Pisani is of the opinion that a simple outline of the brief was prepared, which the unwillingness of the Directory did not permit to be followed up. Pisani, III, 95–100. This last view seems to us the most likely.

[19] Encyclical letter of December 13, 1795, p. 44.

[20] Encyclical letter of March 13, 1795 (chapter 3, article 1 of the preamble).

branch of peace to cast its shadow over the soil of the fatherland." [21] This moment seemed to have arrived in the spring of 1797. A circular in the month of March gave notice that the meeting of the council was not far off.[22] A semi-official note, published in the *Annales,* fixed the solemn opening for August 15, the feast of the Assumption. On July 22 the *Annales de la religion,* at the close of negotiations with the Directory, announced that the government stated it "could only applaud such peaceful and admirable intentions" as those that have been made known to it with regard to the coming council.[23]

The assembly, opened as scheduled, was presided over by Claude Le Coz, bishop of Rennes.[24] Grégoire had cleverly remained in the background. To prevent Le Coz from taking the leadership of the opposition, Grégoire supported him for the presidency. Le Coz was an obstinate and aggressive man and accomplished in debate. For the past two years he had supplied bitter contributions to the *Annales de la religion,* being always ready to speak and to write, with equal self-assurance, on any subject whatever. Grégoire thought that in an assembly which was not lacking in utopians and loquacious men, Le Coz, instead of being a perpetual leader of the opposition, would make an authoritative presiding officer, and with a firm hand would be able to hold in check the nervous or calculated agitations of the malcontents and therefore to dominate them.

In turning over the journals of the period, the *Annales de la religion* and the *Voix du Conciliateur,* which praise the deeds and achievements of the conciliar fathers, the *Annales catholiques* and the *Patriote français,* which note the regrettable incidents, and especially in reading the valuable and almost un-

[21] *Annales de la religion,* II, 543.

[22] Ibid., V, 144.

[23] *Ibid.,* V, 305.

[24] In their encyclical of December 13, 1795, the United Bishops had given up the name of the department of which they called themselves bishops and took the name of their episcopal city.

obtainable *Journal de concile national de France,*[25] we can note that important manifestation whose soul was Grégoire.

The meetings of the congregations were held in a rented house on rue des Saints-Pères; the solemn sessions were held at Notre Dame. The *Journal du concile national* mentions the presence of nine bishops and fifty-two priests at the first session.[26] The sixth and last session took place on November 15.

The outstanding event was the reading of a long report by Grégoire, entitled "Report of the United Bishops." [27] After giving a table of the constitutional Church,[28] he recommended the various works of propaganda undertaken under its auspices: the *Annales de la religion,* the *Voix du conciliateur,* and the *Société de philosophie chrétienne,* founded "to tighten the bonds which, by joining the love of religion with love of the Republic, would identify the qualities of Christians and of citizens." [29] The author of the report then enlarged on his correspondence with foreign Churches. For some time past, this widespread propaganda was his chief concern. As the Constituents at the time when they were drawing up the Declaration of the Rights of Man, as Robespierre when he was having decreed the worship of the Supreme Being and belief in the immortality of the soul, Grégoire likewise wished to exert his influence on the world. He spoke of works that he had sent to Spain, of constitutional encyclicals that had been spread abroad from Trebizond to Quebec, of the hopes he expected to be realized in Germany, where the *Annales de la religion* had

[25] This Journal appeared from August 17 to November 15, 1797. The *Voix du conciliateur* appeared likewise during the sessions of the council in seven numbers of twenty-four pages each. The purpose of the latter publication was doctrinal and polemical. Pisani, following the *Annales de la religion,* states that he "was not able to have at his disposal the *Journal du concile.*"

[26] *Journal du concile,* no. 1, pp. 20–22. The *Journal* gives the list of the members present.

[27] This report is found reproduced in the *Annales de la religion,* VI, 1–28, 29–73, 223–28.

[28] The table is not accurate. See Pisani, III, 158.

[29] *Annales de la religion,* VI, 17.

been translated, of General Toussaint-Louverture's request "for a dozen priests who had submitted to the laws," [30] of steps he had taken to introduce the spirit of the Constitutional Church into all the colonies, and of his hopes to see the disappearance of the temporal power of the popes and the Inquisition. To the grand inquisitor of Spain he wrote a long letter intended to make him ashamed of his office.[31]

Decrees of the Pseudo-council

Purely theological questions held little place in the acts of the council. Hardly noticeable was a timid demonstration in favor of Jansenism in the decree on faith,[32] and a trace of Gallican opinions in the decree on marriage,[33] the essence of which was in the civil contract. The decrees about worship and discipline engaged the further attention of the members of the council. To be noted also are the wise prescriptions about the conduct of the clergy and the faithful, and the measures to be taken to safeguard children from the corruptive lessons of immoral or impious teachers.[34] But what seemed to be dominant was the desire to make of the Constitutional Church a national and republican Church. The council's first decree begins with the following articles: "Article 1: Every French Catholic owes to the laws of the Republic an entire and genuine submission. Article 2: The Gallican Church admits to the ranks of its pastors only those who shall have shown their fidelity to the Republic." [35] The council at the same time endeavored to reconcile among its own members the two parties of the juring fathers: those who followed Grégoire and those who remained faithful

[30] *Ibid.*, VI, 55–58.

[31] See this letter, *ibid.*, pp. 373–96.

[32] *Journal du concile*, November 15, 1797, pp. 171–75.

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 162–64. Article 1 says: "The Gallican Church recognizes as legitimate marriages only those that have been contracted in accord with the civil laws."

[34] *Annales de la religion*, VI, 85–88.

[35] *Journal du concile*, September 7, 1797, p. 51.

to the ideas of Gobel; it tried a conciliation with the non-jurors and in this sense wrote a letter to the Pope; at the same time it tended to penetrate the masses, whom it invited to its grand ceremonies in the metropolitan church of Paris.

Failure of the Council

None of these goals was attained. The elections in the month of Floreal of the year V shifted the powers to the moderates. On 29 Prairial (June 17, 1797), Camille Jordan, deputy from Lyons, said what has since then been often repeated: "Give us the religion of our fathers." *The Annales de la religion* accused Jordan of being in accord with the non-juring priests.[36] On 7 Fructidor (August 24) the elders passed the resolution that opened the doors of France to all the exiled priests. The constitutionals saw therein a lessening of their hope to keep for themselves a privileged position in France. The *coup d'état* of 18 Fructidor (September 4, 1797) did not alter the situation. Three days later Le Coz vainly had the conciliar assembly take a solemn oath of submission to the Republic. The Council of the Five Hundred, upon receiving notification of this oath on September 21 (fifth complementary day of the year V), declared that "they could not recognize that religious corporation." [37] The Pope did not reply to the letter which the pseudo-council sent to him.

But Grégoire's work was not altogether futile. He reunited and reorganized the constitutional Church, which had been scattered by the Terror.

Dispersed, frightened, dishonored by the faults of their confreres, the juring priests wandered like stray sheep. The council gave them confidence. In three-fourths of the departments the constitutional

[36] *Annales de la religion,* V, 499.
[37] *Moniteur,* September 26, 1797, p. 20.

bishops resumed their functions. Grégoire's energy had accomplished this wonder: not that of a dead man brought back to life, but of a corpse which a powerful electric current made stand up on its feet. After 18 Fructidor, however, the persecution begins again, less bloody than that of 1793, but no less dangerous, often more perfidious. In the course of this trial, the corpse, momentarily galvanized, slowly fell into decomposition from which it had been drawn by the mighty but artificial effort of the council.[38]

A National Religion

Thus neither the clergy that submitted to Rome nor the constitutional clergy satisfied what had been one of the most cherished and persistent dreams of the men of the Revolution: to found a national religion, rejuvenated in its dogmas and its discipline, and to make of that religion an instrument of propaganda for the revolutionary doctrines. Such had been one of the first aims of the Constituent Assembly. Such was still the aim of the Directory.[39]

But on the morrow of the Fructidor *coup d'état,* while feeling the need of shaking loose from the Constitutional Church, the new government found a new religion, already organized, which seemed more in conformity with its own aspirations: this was the cult of theophilanthropy.

This new religion came forth from the initiative of a book publisher, Chemin-Dupontès, a person otherwise insignificant, who, in October, 1796, issued a *Manuel des théanthropophiles.* Freemason Chemin seemed to have no other purpose but to found a sort of open Freemasonry;[40] but his project was re-

[38] Pisani, III, 177.

[39] This conclusion is what two historians, belonging to diametrically opposed views, had demonstrated: Father Sicard, in his *A la recherche d'une religion civile,* and Mathiez, in his second doctoral thesis, *Les origines des cultes révolutionnaires.*

[40] This expression is the one used by Mathiez in his learned work, *La théophilanthropie et le culte decadaire,* p. 82. Mathiez destroyed the legend that made Larevellière-Lépeaux the inventor of theophilanthropy.

vised and broadened by a man of higher intellectual worth, the philanthropist Valentin Hauy, who was the renowned founder of the Institute of Blind Workingmen. Hauy himself seems to have belonged to Freemasonry;[41] at any rate he had enthusiastically rallied to the revolutionary ideas.

The new religion, which Hauy called theophilanthropy instead of theanthropophily, rested on the twofold dogma of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. But these truths should not be proved by reason; they were admitted "as necessary for the preservation of society and the welfare of the individuals." Morality rested on a principle as simple as it was also vague. The *Manual* said: "Good is everything that tends to preserve man and to perfect him." Worship was at the same time domestic and public. Domestic worship consisted in two essential acts: an elevation of the soul each morning before the marvels of creation; an examination of conscience each evening before going to sleep. The public worship is first of all paid to God under the vault of the sky, "the only temple worthy of the Divinity"; but people were to assemble also "in temples built by the genius of men."[42] The direction of the Society of Theophilanthropists pertained to two committees, one charged with the material and financial part, the other with the religious and moral part.

The first meeting for worship was held on January 9, 1797. The new cult at first seems to have met with only indifference or hostility on the part of the towns and the government. But

[41] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 89. Valentin Hauy was the brother of Father Hauy, an excellent priest, the creator of cristallography.

[42] The following are some excerpts from the prayer proposed to the theophilanthropists: "Father of nature, I do not ask of Thee the power to do good; Thou hast given me this power and with it the conscience to love the good, reason for knowing it, the freedom to choose it. . . . I will not address Thee with indiscreet prayers. . . . I beg of Thee only to correct my errors and those of others, because nearly all the evils that afflict men come from their errors. . . . Fully trusting in Thy justice and Thy goodness, my only desire is that Thy will be done" (quoted by Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 96).

the crisis of the year V had a considerable influence on its development.

The Directors, until then united, were now divided. Carnot and Barthélemy desired a policy of appeasement, but Rewbell and Larevellière-Lépeaux, considering the Republic in danger, counseled violent measures. After 18 Fructidor the deportation of Barthélemy and the flight of Carnot left the power in the hands of their foes.

Larevellière-Lépeaux, the son of a Vendean middle-class father, at an early age withdrew from Catholicism, which he regarded as an instrument of oppression and corruption. At Angers, where he settled after the Constituent Assembly, he had been one of the leading orators of the revolutionary clubs. He was a clever and experienced lawyer and enjoyed a general reputation for honesty. But nothing was sacred to this man when his dominant passion spoke in him: that passion was hatred for priests. This educated bourgeois had another passion: innate contempt for the populace.[43]

The time was the moment when General Bonaparte was marching against Rome and when the days of the papacy seemed to be numbered. Larevellière, if we are to accept the *Mémoires* of Barras, showed for the first time his sympathy for the theophilanthropists.[44] To him this utterly simple worship seemed to be of a nature to replace advantageously the dying Christianity. At the Institute,[45] of which he was a most influential member, he delivered a discourse devoted almost wholly to the praise of theophilanthropy. Of a melancholy nature and romantic imagination, Larevellière, when speaking of the new religion, soared to lyrical heights. The replacing of a fallen Catholicism by a simple, reasonable, natural, and grand worship was his chimera. "I tell you," he said, "that man has in him a religious fiber which we must recognize. . . . Society

[43] Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
[44] Barras, *Mémoires*, II, 347.
[45] On May 1, 1797.

asks of you a God that is not the God of Catholicism." Presently adherents came to him from all the parties. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, author of *Paul et Virginie,* the poet Marie-Joseph Chénier, the journalist Sébastien Mercier, the poet Andrieux, the former minister Servan, the ex-Barnabite Dubroca, who became the outstanding orator of the sect, all these flocked to theophilanthropy. Some towns raised obstacles against the ceremonies of the new worship; Larevellière and the minister of police, Sotin, overcame these oppositions.[46] "The theophilanthropists were openly favored, they received subsidies, their books were placed in the program of the official schools, Hauy was appointed a member of the board of education of the department of the Seine, the Institute itself joined the party and appointed a commission "instructed to find out means of making the speeches and the music of the national feasts heard by all those present, however numerous they might be." [47] The theophilanthropists at Paris used, concurrently with the Catholics, a large number of churches, among which were Notre Dame and St. Eustache. Grégoire has left us a description of their religious ceremonies, in which "readers" vested in a blue habit, with a rose-colored cincture and a white gown, read in turn from the Bible, Confucius, Aristotle, Voltaire, and Franklin.[48]

But division soon made its appearance among the leaders of theophilanthropy. One of the new followers, Etienne Siauve, an apostate priest and head of the philosopher theophilanthropists, complained that the religion imagined by Chemin was not sufficiently in accord with the principles of Rousseau and the republican ideal; but the people, for whose sake all the ceremonies had been provided, gave evidence of a growing dislike for these novelties. At Sainte-Marguerite, during the office, a placard was posted bearing these words: "Band of pickpockets! Watch

[46] Mathiez, *La Révolution et l'Eglise* (1910), p. 207.
[47] *Ibid.,* p. 196.
[48] Grégoire, *Histoire des sectes religieuse,* I, 396.

out for your handkerchiefs." The words had a notable success. The people jokingly called the followers of the new religion the "band of pickpockets." An official report (in the month of Nivôse, year VII) said: "The number of theophilanthropists is not increasing, and their worship is without acclaim." Chemin, discouraged, asked for a pension, and Dubroca requested a place in the ministry. After the forced resignation of Larevellière (June 18, 1799), the hopeless decline followed. From that time on, theophilanthropy merely vegetated. The police decree of 11 Ventôse of the year X, explicitly banning "the practice of the natural religion called theophilanthropy," thus confirmed an accomplished fact. The religion which had the favor of the Directory and the Institute did not enjoy two years of regular functioning.

The Weekly Holyday

The theophilanthropy had indeed met with the concurrence of another worship, that which was called the decadaire worship. This worship went back to the institution of the Republican calendar. A decree of 14 Germinal of the year VI (April 4, 1798) ordered the decadaire repose for all governmental bodies, and for all the work yards. The laws of 17 Thermidor (August 4, 1798) and 23 Fructidor (September 9) emphasized these ordinances. But soon the fact was evident that the people could not be condemned to the repose without doing something to occupy their time. Decadaire feasts were organized. The poet François Neufchâteau, who was now Minister of the Interior, with his facile and elegant pen drew up the program of national rejoicings. These included the feast of youth, that of married couples, that of old age, that of thanksgiving, and that of agriculture.[49]

At the feast of the sovereignty of the people, the old men

[49] See Mathiez, *op. cit.*, p. 429.

and the fathers were to relate "their former exploits, the marvels of the Revolution, the principal traits of its history." In country districts the farmers, in the words of the program, "should gather about the wine-press and the still wet vats the active and faithful cohorts that have helped them in despoiling the mountains of their resplendent booty." [50]

Mighty efforts were made to exploit the Republican calendar. With its sonorous, poetical, and reminiscent names, which summoned before the eyes of the people the whole cycle of the year, from the splendors of Thermidor to the sadness of Nivôse, it was expected to win acceptance by its own worth and promptly to supplant the outmoded cycle of moribund Catholicism.

The decadi, last and culminating day of the decade, would replace Sunday. Instead of the Lord's Day the people would undoubtedly prefer "the Day of the Fatherland." In fact, the decadaire worship pretended to be, contrary to the old religions, which were based on absent and mysterious realities, the worship of these two palpable and visible realities: nature and fatherland. On the day of the decadi, then, in a scene both pastoral and solemn, the officials of the canton gathered the people about an altar raised to the glory of the nation, and then, with an accompaniment of organ music and song, read the laws and commented on them, questioned the children, and recounted the traits of civic virtue.

The hollowness of these feasts soon led to their lack of esteem. Then dances and games were introduced, conducted by song leaders. But the dance itself did not possess the gift of awakening the animation of these solemnities. Even under the Directory, the admission was made that people do not have the heart to dance every day.[51]

More was to follow. Soon the decadaire worship was seen to be, in the mind of its organizers, an instrument of the destruc-

[50] Boissy d'Anglas, *Essai sur les fêtes*, p. 53.
[51] Sicard, *A la recherche d'une religion civile*, p. 185.

tion of the Christian worship. "The idea of elevating the national sentiment by means of spectacles suited to strike the people's imagination, undoubtedly had in itself nothing but what was lofty and praiseworthy. It corresponded to the theatrical taste of the period. The folly of the revolutionists was to set it up in opposition to the traditional beliefs. The altar of the fatherland was erected in the midst of the church, often relegating the tabernacle to a place behind the choir or to some lower place on the side. During the lay office orders were given to remove the religious emblems entirely or to cover them. Catholics were given their place and their hours. At Paris the Catholic worship had to cease on the decadi at precisely half-past eight in the morning and could not be resumed until after the civil ceremonies, "provided, however, that it was not later than six o'clock in the evening in the summer, and eight o'clock in the winter." Elsewhere a number of government officials, on the pretext that the decadi was the only day legally a holiday and that the rest of the time should belong to work, issued a prohibition against the opening of the churches on any other day, whereby public worship had to bow before the decadaire worship and be subordinate to it.[52] Thus the decadi suppressed the Sunday, with which of course it was not in accord; it suppressed the Sunday Mass, the most important act of worship, the necessary act, the act which, in the eyes of the people, expresses and marks out the religious life.[53]

More oppression followed. "In certain respects the anti-religious mania passed all bounds and reached the height of the absurd to supreme ridicule. By a decree of 14 Germinal of the year IV, fish markets were forbidden to open on the days formerly Fridays; at Paris the oratory in the former chapel of the Carmelites was closed because at that place had been cele-

[52] See the decree of the consuls (7 Nivôse, year VIII), revoking these measures. *Correspondance de Napoléon,* VI, 4471.

[53] Albert Vandal, *L'avènement de Bonaparte* (1903), p. 30.

brated the feast of the Kings; at Strasbourg a merchant was found guilty for having set out, in his store, more fish than ordinarily; 350 gardeners were prosecuted for having sanctified the Sunday by not taking their vegetables to market that day." [54]

"To ridicule for such measures was soon added the irritation of the country people, who for the most part were attached to the religion of their fathers. They were annoyed, they were disturbed in their habits, in the sale of their produce, in their way of reckoning the days and months, in all their religious convictions. So many various causes were sure to strike with sterility all the efforts of the Revolution in spite of the continually renewed attempts and a perseverance that continued for almost ten years." [55] Edgar Quinet wrote: "Feasts, anniversaries of the Revolution, where are you? The people have not kept a single one of the feasts instituted from 1789 to 1800. That immense commotion has not succeeded in removing even one village saint." [56]

Irreligion (1789–99)

From 1789 to 1799 the religious ideal of the Revolution had, as we have seen, undergone a profound decline. The authors of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy still believed in the Church, although distorting the notion of it; the constitutional fathers of Grégoire's school, even after their schism, professed their faith in the divinity of Christ; the theophilanthropists had established their worship on the basic dogmas of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul; the adherents of the decadaire cult saw in the Revolution and the fatherland a vague

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 33. For the text of the decrees, see Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile*, III, 176, 390.

[55] Sicard, *loc. cit.*

[56] Quinet, *Œuvres*, II, 91.

incarnation of the Divinity. But, under the Directory, the learned body that had the high pretention of directing the movement of ideas, the Institute, was made up of men who had lost all belief in Christ, in God, and in an immortal soul. Lalande, Naigeon, Cabanis, Volney, all these were out-and-out materialists, avowed atheists.

"In every work that competed for the prize of the Institute," says Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, "the name of God was for them a sign of reprobation." The author of *Les harmonies de la nature* experienced the sentiments of his colleagues when (July 3, 1798) he was reading to them a report on the foundation of morality. Scarcely had he pronounced the name of God when a cry of rage broke out in the meeting. He was jeered at, threatened, and challenged to a duel. They asked him where he had seen God, what shape God had. Shouted Cabanis: "I swear that there is no God." Bernardin de Saint-Pierre was obliged to leave the hall. His report was not printed by the Institute: the author had to resort to the expedient of having it distributed at the door of the assembly hall.[57]

In 1796 an article in the *Décade philosophique,* attributed to the academician Andrieux,[58] greeted the appearance of Diderot's posthumous work, *La religieuse,* in which convent life was portrayed with the features most calculated to make it hated.[59] In 1798 the academician Naigeon, emphasizing his atheistic propositions by tendentious notes, brought out the complete works of Diderot. The irreligious book of Dupuis on *L'origine de tous les cultes,* which appeared in 1795 and was

[57] See Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, *Œuvres,* I, 236–45. The report will be found, VII, 371–87.

[58] Diderot, *Œuvres,* V, 5.

[59] Some writers (e.g., Ludovic Sciout, *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé,* I, 150) have thought that Diderot's *La religieuse* influenced the abolition of monastic vows. True, some literary critics (e.g., Louandre in his *Introduction aux Conteurs français de XVIII^e siècle*) made the same mistake. *La religieuse,* written about 1770, was known at that time by a few friends of the author in manuscripts that circulated secretly; but it was not published until the year V. See Diderot, *ibid.,* V, 3, 175.

published in an abridged popular edition in 1796, went to the extreme of contempt for all religion.

From such a regime, whatever the apparent moderation of its policy, nothing could be expected but vexatious measures against Catholicism. This fear became a reality. While with one hand, as we might say, the Directory sought to erect a new religion, with the other it ceaselessly struck the Catholic Church in head and members. Some historians have judged they might call this period the Little Terror or the Second Terror. The period well deserves this name. "On certain points the Directory aggravated the Great Terror itself, whether by more scholarly or more severe laws or by the privilege it assumed of executing these laws itself." [60]

The Terror under the Directory

The "Second Terror" did not begin in reality until after 18 Fructidor (September, 1797), but attacks upon the Holy See date from the first days of the Directory.

Let us recall that (February 6, 1793), after the murder of Bassville, the Convention imposed on the Pope several conditions to be carried out if he wished to avoid war with France. Whether he doubted the sincerity of the French government or found those conditions unacceptable, the Supreme Pontiff considered that he could not accept them.

This attitude which in other times would have aroused the most violent recriminations, passed almost unnoticed. The plans of the Conventionals were not in agreement: Robespierre was expressly against an invasion of Rome; the internal divisions which split the Convention turned its attention from any other affairs; furthermore, the French troops had too much to do elsewhere, and conditions were not ready for a campaign in Italy.

[60] Victor Pierre, *La Terreur sous le Directoire* (1887), p. viii.

One of the first concerns of the Directory was to realize the threats made by the Convention. To meet this need it had to count on the army.

Amid so many accumulated ruins, the Convention, as we have already remarked, left untouched one institution, the army. As Albert Vandal wrote: "At the time of the great spasm the accumulated energy at the basis of French generations, an energy fashioned in the virile education of the old regime, suddenly aroused by the patriotic idea, occurred in a terrifying explosion. . . . Apparently the force, the heat, and the richness of the Gallic blood took refuge in the armies that continued to defend the Republic." [61] The names of Marceau, Hoche, and Schérer eclipsed those of Larevellière-Lépeaux, Rewbell, and Letourneur. The spirit of the army was indeed republican, but among its leaders the most ambitious and most clear-sighted saw in the conflict of parties a role of regulator and arbiter to be taken. Hoche offered himself for this role; another would soon seize on it and exercise it with almost incredible daring. When (October 5, 1795) Barras needed "to sweep the rebellious sections," he chose as his assistant a young brigadier general whose energy and coolness had been manifested but lately in the siege of Toulon; this genius was General Bonaparte. A few days later Barras resigned in favor of his protégé, who thus found himself invested with the command of the army of the interior. On March 26, 1796, the Directory appointed him to replace Schérer, who had resigned, to head the command of the army in Italy.

Little by little Bonaparte's dominance effaced that of all the other generals. The Italian campaign, which is not our business to relate here, revealed in him who was destined to be the Emperor Napoleon, the most eminent qualities of tactician and statesman. A few months afterward, all echoes were repeating his glorious name; some dreading it, others placing in him all

[61] Vandal, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

their hope. The popular imagination was obsessed with the image of the hero; and doubtless splendid visions of the future were already in his mind. On April 17, 1796, Bonaparte was indeed already speaking as a master of the world: "The French people," he said, in a proclamation, "is the friend of all peoples; come forth to meet her." The Directors wrote to him: "You have the Directory's confidence: the services that you render daily give you a right to it."

To this man the Directory entrusted the task of carrying out its plan of vengeance against the Holy See. On February 3, 1796, he received a letter from the French government which "counseled" him to go and extinguish in Rome "the torch of fanaticism." [62] "This is a resolve that we have formed," the Directors wrote to him.[63] The General, who at that time was pursuing his able campaign against Austria, did not at once turn aside from his plan, which was to terrify his enemy by the rapidity of his conquests in northern Italy. When, disconcerted by his daring, the Austrian troops had carried out their retreat movement from the Adda to the Mincio, Bonaparte turned toward Rome.

On May 11 a messenger who was sent to the Secretary of State, Zelada, by the legates of Ferrara and Bologna, announced to him that 10,000 French had debouched on the plain of Piacentino and were marching against the Eternal City. All resistance was futile. Pius VI was not in a condition to sustain a war against the Republic. The States of the Church, deprived of a regular army and lacking generals, could not dream of fighting against war-hardened, disciplined soldiers, led by able officers. To purchase peace, as the King of Sardinia and the dukes of Parma and of Modena had just done, and as the King of Naples was preparing to do, was the only move possible. In the previous year, by a secret article of the treaty of 4 Thermi-

[62] Madelin, *La Révolution,* p. 462.
[63] Gendry, *Pie VI,* II, 269.

dor (July 22, 1795), Spain had been recognized as intermediary between France and the Holy See. Pius VI instructed the ambassador Azara to proceed to Milan as minister plenipotentiary, there to halt the French at the very gateway of his States and to conclude an armistice with them.

Don José Nicolas de Azara, accredited to Pope Clement XIII in 1765, and since then maintained at his post, was an old career diplomat, acquainted with all the traditions of the papal chancery. For twenty years, the friend and at times the rival of Bernis (the ambassador of France), he was equally familiar with the usages of French diplomacy. Renown places him among the most expert diplomats of his time.[64] He showed himself worthy of his reputation.

General Bonaparte, who then held the city of Milan, had there abolished the authority of the pope and imprisoned Cardinal Ferrara. He haughtily declared that he would not treat with the representative of Spain except out of consideration for his court. Then he signified, without other formality, that he was demanding of Rome all that he would be able to have if he were himself master of the Capitol. To this Azara said: "Go, then, and take it yourself." At this reply, Bonaparte jumped up, stormed, swore that he would have his treaty, and, in his fury, tore to pieces with his teeth a sheet of paper which he was holding in his hand, chewing it with frenzy. He was already the crafty negotiator who later, in a celebrated interview with Pius VII, displayed all the resources of the most versatile comedian and the most vehement tragedian.

Further griefs awaited Azara. He understood that, while in these stormy conferences he was defending inch by inch the rights of the pope and the Church, defections were occurring among the protégés of the Holy See. All the cities of Romagna had made their submission to the French; treason had slipped

[64] Vicomte de Richemont, "La première rencontre du pape et de la République française," in the *Correspondant* of September 10, 1897, p. 803.

even into the Eternal City. Bonaparte received, from a well-informed person, an inventory of everything at Rome that was most precious in gold, silver, jewels, paintings, and statues, as well as a list of the palaces and of wealthy persons.[65] When in the morning of June 27 the conferences were resumed, at Azara's first attempts to reduce the demands of the Directory, Bonaparte arrogantly replied: "What have I to do with your proposals? The peoples themselves are my superiors." General Bonaparte, consenting to reduce his demands, decided to lower from 40,000,000 francs to 21,000,000 the sum which the Pope must pay the Republic. Besides this amount, the Holy See must turn over 500 manuscripts, 100 paintings and statues, notably the bust of Brutus, open its ports to French ships, close them to the ships of powers hostile to France, and permit French armed forces to pass through his territory whenever such permission would be requested.

The Armistice of Bologna

Such were the principal conditions of the armistice signed at Bologna on June 23, 1796. Napoleon's final concessions have sometimes been attributed to the regard he had for the King of Spain and to Azara's astuteness. In a letter written to the Directory two days before the treaty, the General indicated a different motive. He says: "This armistice being concluded with the Dog Star rather than with the army of the Pope, my opinion would be that you do not urge the making of peace, so that in September, if our affairs with Germany and northern Italy go well, we may seize Rome." [66]

At any rate Rome was saved. Azara wrote to the Pope: "The treaty that I have made is iniquitous, barbarous, and outrageous; but, to excuse it, I will say that I have saved a plank

[65] Richemont, *op. cit.*, p. 807.

[66] Quoted by Gendry, *op. cit.*, II, 245.

from the wreck. The person of Your Holiness, the Holy See, religion, all the inhabitants of Rome, everything there both sacred and profane would have been hopelessly lost." [67]

The papal government at once set to work to carry out the treaty. From Castle Sant' Angelo were brought forth the ancient treasures which the popes had amassed there and had preserved under threat of the most terrible excommunications. The churches of the Papal States were required to turn over their objects of gold and silver; the simple citizens had to send to the treasury a complete list of the precious metals they possessed. The banker Torlonia and several other emissaries appealed to the credit of the different cities of Italy.

Meanwhile an envoy of the Pope, Pieracchi, discussed at Paris with the minister Delacroix the ratification of the armistice. At the very first conference (August 12) the minister increased his claims. To the clauses stipulated by General Bonaparte he added the obligation imposed on the Pope to revoke all the bulls relative to the affairs of France since 1789. This demand set forth inadmissible conditions. Pieracchi protested, Delacroix grew angry. The discussion ended by a decree of expulsion against Pieracchi and his colleague, Evangelisti (August 14, 1796).

On the other hand the people of Rome expressed their indignation against the conditions of the armistice. One morning on the walls could be seen placards bearing these words: "Neither paintings nor manuscripts shall leave Rome." French commissioners who had come to Rome for the purpose of assuring the execution of the armistice were thronged, hissed at, and insulted. The Pope, after the outrage inflicted on his legates and the Directory's refusal to ratify the treaty, considered that he was no longer obliged to observe it.

On September 12, Pius VI assembled the Sacred College and questioned the cardinals one after the other. The opinion

[67] Quoted by Richemont, *op. cit.*, p. 808.

of all was that the Holy See could not, without being false to its duties, subscribe to the terms that were demanded of it. A memorandum, intended to be presented to the Directory, was drawn up in this sense and two days later was read to the Sacred College. It ended with these words: "Let the Directory consider the motives that have constrained the conscience of His Holiness in a refusal that he will be obliged to sustain even at the peril of his life." At these words the one who was reading the document paused, saying: "Does Your Holiness quite mean these last words?" The Pope resolutely replied: "Yes, at the peril of my life." [68]

The die had been cast; the supreme head of the Church had taken the resolution to defend the faith even to martyrdom.

Recoil of the Directory

Pius VI's energetic action gave momentary pause to the Directory. Bonaparte, then at Ferrara, called on the archbishop, Cardinal Mattei: "Your Eminence," he said, "the Directory does not desire war with Rome. I desire to be, not the destroyer, but the savior of that city." [69] We may suppose that Bonaparte, despite alliances with the revolutionists, hesitated before an attack on the Eternal City.[70] Moreover, an expedition against Rome at that moment, when he was considering the plan of

[68] Richemont, *op. cit.*, p. 332, according to the account of J. B. de Rossi, who learned the detail from his father, who was secretary of Cardinal Caleppi.

[69] Gendry, II, 268.

[70] Independently of his religious faith, which was never perhaps entirely stifled, either by his revolutionary utopias or by his own ambition, Bonaparte felt that at the close of 1796 the Catholic religion had again become a powerful social force. On December 4, 1796, Clarke wrote to him: "We have lacked our revolution in religion. In France they had again become Roman Catholic. . . . If one had been able to annihilate the Pope three years ago, Europe could have been regenerated; at the present moment, would not his abasement be to expose ourselves to a permanent alienation from the government of a crowd of Frenchmen that submits to the pope and that might rally to him?" *Correspondance inédite,* II, 430, quoted by A. Dufourq, *Le régime jacobin en Italie* (1900), p. 38.

turning his arms against Austria, would have made him lose precious time. Now he and the Pope abruptly changing their roles, he it was who for two months was urging the Pope to conclude a treaty, whereas the Pope was wisely deferring the action.

In the course of sixty-nine days, fruitless conferences were held, in which Cacault represented the Directory and Cardinal Busca, then Cardinal Mattei, defended the cause of the Holy See. In the meantime the Pope was raising troops that he placed under the command of the Austrian general, Colli. Bonaparte advanced against the little force, crushed it (February 5, 1797) on the Senio, seized Ancona and Loreto, and then at Tolentino awaited the effects of his words of clemency and his acts of terror cleverly combined.

From Tolentino, where he arrived on February 13, the General sent to Rome Father Fumé, general of the Camaldolites, with instructions to say to Pius VI that Bonaparte was not an Attila and that, should he be so, the Pope might remember that he himself is the successor of Leo. To Cardinal Mattei he wrote: "I wish to prove to all Europe the moderation of the Directory. . . . I desire, as far as may be in my power, to give a striking proof of the moderation I have for the Holy See." [71]

The Pope thought he ought to yield to demands so repeated. A deputation, made up of Cardinal Mattei, Marquis Massimi, and the prelate Caleppi, set off for Tolentino. Said Pius VI to them: "Go and make every sacrifice except in what concerns religion." At the very first interview, Bonaparte, prudent statesman that he was, understood that in the spiritual field the plenipotentiaries would be unyielding. He played his part and showed all the resources of his wonderful genius, turn and turn about caressing and terrible, in fighting on the political and financial field. On February 19, 1797, after three days

[71] Gendry, II, 275.

of discussion, the Treaty of Tolentino was signed. It contained twenty-six articles. The Pope recognized the French Republic, abandoned his rights over Comtat Venaissin, ceded to France three rich provinces which were the legations of Bologna and Ferrara and all Romagna, and promised to remit to the French government the sum of 30,000,000 francs. "Rome is saved," Mattei wrote sadly, "as also religion, but at the price of what sacrifices!" [72]

The carrying out of a treaty so onerous was for the Pope the occasion of grave solicitudes. In the Papal States revolutionary plots followed one another almost without interruption. Joseph Bonaparte arrived at Rome on August 31 to "watch over the execution of the treaty concluded by his illustrious brother," as we read in his credentials. He surrounded himself with all the malcontents as well as all the partisans of the new ideas. In the month of September, Pius VI, overwhelmed with grief, fell gravely ill.

Toward the end of December, while the Pope's robust constitution seemed about to triumph over his illness, a tragical event, somewhat like the murder of Bassville, which had been the occasion of so many evils, occurred to redouble the Pontiff's anxieties.

In the afternoon of December 28, 1797, a group of rioters ran through the city of Rome, shouting: "Long live liberty! Long live the French Republic!" They were answered with: "Long live the Pope! Long live the Madonna!" A detachment of cavalry advanced to drive back the band of rioters. Some French officers, with the commandant Duphot at their head, emerged from the Corsini palace, where the representative of the Directory, Joseph Bonaparte, was lodged. These officers confronted the papal cavalry. Their move, they said, was simply for the purpose of quieting the tumult; on the contrary, they manifestly inflamed it. Duphot, sword in hand, threatened a

[72] Letter of February 19, 1797, quoted by Gendry, II, 276.

sergeant. The latter, after vainly ordering that the sword be returned to the scabbard, fired on him, the shot entering the lung.

The tumult subsided; the rioters, whom Cardinal Consalvi estimated at about 500, dispersed.[73] But Joseph protested that the embassy had been violated and abruptly left Rome. "Nothing," writes Cardinal Consalvi, "could hold him back, neither the request of the Holy See nor the offer of a considerable reparation in case some wrongs had been committed."

The Taking of Rome

At Paris the news of Duphot's death violently aroused public opinion. The newspapers misrepresented the facts.[74] The Directory had Marquis Massimi arrested, confiscated his papers, and ordered a march on Rome by a body of 15,000 men, followed by other corps. On January 11, 1798, Bonaparte wrote to General Berthier, who had been put at the head of the first corps: "The speed of your march on Rome is of the utmost importance. . . . You will advance to within two days of Rome, then threaten the Pope and all members of the government who have made themselves guilty of the greatest of all crimes, in order to fill them with fear and make them flee." [75] As we are told by Consalvi, "General Berthier's army arrived with the suddenness of lightning. On the evening of February 9 it occupied Monte Mario. . . . The following morning an officer and a trumpeter presented themselves at the gate known as the Angelica. They found the gate open and lacking any preparations of resistance. The Pope had not the forces to repel the

[73] Consalvi, *Mémoires*, p. 333.

[74] Two regrettable dispatches of the Secretary of State were exploited against the Holy See. By imprudence or excessive fear the Cardinal presented the excuses of the Holy See in such a manner that he furnished his adversaries with arms against his government. Gendry, II, 288.

[75] *Correspondance de Napoléon Ier*, III, 475.

invasion and he was unwilling to expose his people, who were ready to defend him. Furthermore, that defense would have been as perilous for the Romans as it would have been insufficient for the Holy Father." [76]

Consalvi, who played an active part in the events that followed, relates with much feeling the painful scenes that took place in the Castle Sant' Angelo when he was ordered to take charge of its evacuation. With admirable energy and self-control, he succeeded in preventing a popular outburst, which the Directory had perhaps anticipated and secretly desired to justify its intrusion in Rome.

The sick Pontiff considered himself thereafter a prisoner. On February 15, 1798, the anniversary of his elevation to the papacy, he decided to hold pontifical services in the Sistine Chapel. In the evening General Cervoni notified him officially of his deposition and the proclamation of the Roman Republic. The Supreme Pontiff said that he adored the impenetrable decrees of Providence. He added: "I ask most earnestly that the Catholic religion be respected and that the blood of those who have faithfully served me shall not be shed." [77]

As the general, reminding the Pope that he had become a French citizen, presented him with a tricolored cockade, the Holy Father smiled sadly and refused it, saying: "I know no other uniform but that with which the Church has honored me." On the 17th, when he was notified that he would leave Rome in three days, he expressed the desire to be taken toward Naples. This wish was not granted, but he was informed that he would take the road of Tuscany. In the account of Father Baldassari, a priest close to Pius VI, is the touching recital of the final separation.[78] The night of February 19 was wholly employed in the preparations for departure. The next morning

[76] Consalvi, *Mémoires* (1866), II, 60–62.
[77] Gendry, II, 229.
[78] Baldassari, *Relazione de' patimenti di Pio VI.*

the Pontiff took the Blessed Sacrament and placed it in a pyx which was suspended from his neck, as the custom is when the popes leave the Eternal City. Then, leaning on the arm of his chamberlain, Monsignor Carracciolo, he proceeded slowly to the carriage awaiting him. "God wills it," he said; "let us be ready to accept whatever Providence reserves for us." What the Directory had in reserve for him was death, death in exile.

The Persecution in France

In France, after the lull of Thermidor, the Directory resumed (18 Fructidor, September 4, 1797) its work of persecution. This undertaking has for a long time been too much passed over. Father Rohrbacher, in his history of the Church, there devotes hardly three lines to the subject.[79] The truth is that from September 4, 1797, to November 9, 1799, almost 300 priests were deported to Guiana, where half of them died, 1,200 others were interned in the fortress of the Ile de Ré and the Ile d'Oléron, between 8,000 and 9,000 had to undergo exile or imprisonment, and 150 persons, priests and laymen, paid with their lives for the right to live in their fatherland. Such are the figures established by Victor Pierre in his scholarly work *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* patiently composed according to archival documents and studies of local history.[80]

We have seen that Larevellière-Lépaux was a sentimental utopian who fancied the establishment, in France and throughout the world, of a religion of nature and the fatherland. But in him was also another man, conceited, headstrong, fanatical, who, at the opening of the National Assembly, at once went over to the extreme left, who denied to the king the right of enclosing his domains, who, in place of the motto, "the Nation, the Law, the King," wished to have inscribed on the flags, "Lib-

[79] Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* XXVII, 626.
[80] Pierre, *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* p. xiv.

erty or Death." [81] Trembling under the Terror, hiding for two years in the neighborhood of Péronne, Larevellière rose again to power as a member of the Convention, then as a member and afterward as president of the executive Directory. This small hunch-backed man, whose long, glossy hair framed a weak and silly face, became the most unyielding and fanatical of the persecutors. He personified what was most partisan in the Directory.[82]

On September 6, 1798, Larevellière, in his capacity of president of the Directory, signed the following decree: "Article 1: The persons condemned to deportation by the law of 19 Fructidor of the year V, the list of whom is here annexed, will be transferred to Cayenne. Article 2: For this purpose, at the port of Rochefort a vessel of the Republic will be put in readiness and will depart for that destination as soon as they are on board." [83] The first deportation convoy, which was directed to Guiana (September 9, 1797) had in it only one priest, Father Brotier; but the second convoy (March 12, 1798) included 155; the third (August 2), 25; and the fourth (August 9), 108. Moreover, starting with the month of May, 1798, the minister of police began to send to the Ile de Ré, opposite La Rochelle, the "deportable" individuals, and eight months later (January 17, 1799) the Directory designated the Ile d'Orléron, at the mouth of the Charente, as the place of residence for the condemned persons whose health did not permit their transfer to Guiana.

Thereafter the scenes of torture and death were in four chief places: Guiana, the Ile de Ré, the Ile d'Oléron, and continental France.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[82] Larevellière was so brazen as to write in his *Mémoires* (II, 136, 141) that, beginning with 18 Fructidor, no one was disturbed and that not a single warrant was issued. But, on several thousand deportation decrees, we find his signature, written with painstaking flourishes. Cf. Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Exiles in Guiana

From the first convoy, almost entirely made up of political prisoners, 48 escaped, and only 16 reached Cayenne. Within less than a year eight of these died there. In this number was Father Brotier. Austere and reserved, Father Brotier had lavished his cares on the sick; and he won the high esteem of the blacks, who called him "father." His dying words were these: "We receive our death from the hands of the five Directors; may they enjoy this life which they are taking from us. I pardon them; may Christ likewise pardon them. May they, at their last hour, not be deprived of the presence and the consolation of their families as I am of mine." [84]

Among the 155 ecclesiastics who composed part of the second convoy, were included: 27 priests of Brittany; 13 from the Vosges, a few of whom, having taken the oath, were not legally subject to deportation, but they were actually deported; 11 from the Aisne; 8 from Cher; 10 from the Doubs, from Haute-Saône, and from the Jura (among these were three cousins, François, Denis, and Nicholas Daviot, likewise victims of the speed with which the condemned were embarked, although they were in good standing with the law); 14 from Deux-Sèvres, from the Vendée, and from Vienne; from Belgium also 14, one of them a young tonsured cleric, who was arrested and condemned in place of his brother. These ecclesiastics had as companions 38 laymen, among whom were: two members of the Council of the Five Hundred, the journalist Perlet, and the song writer Ange Pitou, who was spared by the Convention but was condemned by the Directory.

The twenty-five priests who were in the third convoy owed their freedom to an unforeseen circumstance. The ship carrying them was attacked by an English man-of-war and was forced to strike its colors; the English captain, paying homage

[84] Barbé-Mabbois, *Journal d'un deporté non jugé*, I, 260; II, 17.

to the innocent victims of the French Revolution, had them taken to England, where they were welcomed with warm hospitality.

The last ship transporting deportees to Guiana left August 9, carrying 108 priests and 11 laymen. One of these priests, Father Brumauld de Beauregard, vicar general of Luçon, who had already seen two of his brothers put to death under the Terror, has left us some interesting memoirs of his captivity.

The climate of Guiana, the defective conditions of the lodgings assigned to the deportees, and the evil treatment inflicted on them brought about the death of a large number. "Neither table nor chair was provided in the place where they were housed. The service by the Negroes was rendered with scandalous negligence. These Negroes, as soon as they had obtained their freedom, complied with no regulation; they insulted and maltreated the sick; they bargained with the prisoners in return for money for the most indispensable cares." [85] Alas for the deceased who left no bequest! A priest of Vendée, Father Brenugat, remained three days without being buried; his fellow priests had to dig his grave with their own hands.[86]

The mortality was especially frightful beginning with the month of August, 1798, when the agent of the Directory forbade for the deportees the sojourn at Cayenne and had them distributed in the various agricultural exploitations of Guiana.

During the following six months the deportees, exposed to the inclement weather of that distant colony, to the stifling vapors of the swamps, and to the painful toil of the fields, as also to diseases that were new to them, far removed from one another, isolated in the midst of the Negroes whose language they did not understand, have a history that is an unbroken story of their sufferings and often of their death.[87]

[85] Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 304.
[86] See Ange Pitou, *Voyage à Cayenne*, II, 105.
[87] Pierre, p. 300.

That history is also the story of their zeal and their admirable virtue. In some places they had the consolation of exercising their apostolate toward the Negroes. Father Brumauld de Beauregard wrote:

> We are grouped on a little island called *Les deux Flots*. A number of Negroes who came to see our labors heard Mass. We instructed them, and they went to confession. I heard their confessions seated on an old log, where the insects were devouring both penitent and confessor. Several of the Negroes I united in marriage. Many I baptized. We taught them prayers, they sang hymns and went away contented. I entertain the hope that some of them have remained good Christians.[88]

Ange Pitou, notwithstanding his levity, and Barbé-Marbois, in spite of his revolutionary prejudices, did not conceal, in their *Mémoires,* their admiration for the good morals of the priests who were their companions of deportation. Writes Barbé-Marbois: "All those who died over there are venerated there as martyrs." Brumauld de Beauregard stresses the purity of morals which the priests preserved in an atmosphere where that virtue was but little respected. He writes:

> Amid general corruption God preserved the deportees without reproach. Not even one strayed from the laws of wisdom; more than once I had occasion to point this out to the irreligious inhabitants. Among us we had men who had not been altogether faithful to the Church; dangerous objects encompassed the deportees; but God has protected us all, and we have preached by our example the most beautiful of the virtues in a place where it is almost unknown and where the occasions of losing it are frequent.[89]

If we turn our look from the victims to the executioners, we experience a painful distress because the sight that meets our gaze is that of the most deplorable moral wretchedness.

[88] Brumauld de Beauregard, *Mémoires,* II, 472.
[89] *Ibid.,* II, 493.

"Whether they were carrying out instructions or whether they blamed the climate for so many hecatombs, agents of the Directory were there on the spot; they saw the prisoners die and they adopted no means and extended no aid that might testify to their humaneness." [90] And those who, from Paris, confided their mission to them, were perhaps still more guilty, for, in the inflexibility of their decrees, in the affected indifference for so many sufferings, we are not rash in seeing the effect of a fanatical hatred.[91]

The Interned Priests

Haste, negligence, disorder: these traits are what we are obliged to note in the conduct of the Directory with the unfortunates deported to Guiana. These same traits we meet with in the way of dealing with the departees of the Ile de Ré and the Ile d'Oléron.

The fortress of the Ile de Ré, built by Vauban, was magnificent. Its massiveness was imposing, its portal majestic. Entrance was by a drawbridge of prodigious breadth and length. The interior of this fortress resembled a little town. An immense courtyard was intersected by pavillons that formed several streets. The ramparts were pleasant promenades with wide and regular slopes.[92] But the devastations by the revolutionists who, to destroy the fleurs de lis of the façade, had fired on the fortress with grapeshot, and in the course of several years, the lack of repairs had made the building almost uninhabitable. At every rainfall the water poured into most of the pavillons.

Starting in May, 1798, into this fortress the minister of

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 312.

[91] See in Victor Pierre the chapter entitled: "Le Directoire et les deportés," pp. 313–17.

[92] J. P. Fleury, *Mémoires*, published by Dom Piolin, p. 357.

police sent a large number of persons judged subject to deportation. The total number of those who were there detained has been reckoned at 1,065, of whom 697 were French priests and 222 were Belgian priests.[93] All the departements of France except eight [94] were represented.

As at Guiana, the Directory had not ordered preparations to be made nor had the most commonplace precautions been taken for the reception or installation of the deportees. In some of the rooms the rain came through; no furniture, no beds, not even a pallet, sometimes not even straw were provided in the room. . . . Rooms twenty feet by eighteen had to accommodate twelve, fourteen, sixteen priests. Where cots were to be found, these were so crowded together that no space at all was between them. The squalid condition bred vermin. If diseases occurred, the patient was taken to the hospital, where every requisite was lacking except the nurses who, you might say, were placed there less to care for the sick than to exploit them.[95]

This fortress, which seemed intended to be a rest resort, was in reality a prison. At every moment new vexatious regulations were issued, painful forced labor, a thousand physical and moral sufferings.

Only their piety sustained these unfortunate prisoners. They attempted to group themselves, as far as they could, by dioceses or by regions; then they decided to make their spiritual exercises in common. One day Father Cholleton, the future vicar general of Lyons, having procured some vestments and sacred vessels, put an altar in a hallway and was able to say Mass there. Soon other altars were put up in the attics and lofts. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved, and the priests instituted perpetual adoration of the Eucharist. They even organized theological and scriptural conferences.

They were without a leader: the Directory sent one to them.

[93] Pierre, pp. 339–41.
[94] *Ibid.*, p. 341.
[95] *Ibid.*, p. 344.

On February 28, 1799, to the Ile de Ré the police brought Bishop de Maille de la Tour Landry of Saint-Papoul. This man, after his military service, was early promoted to the office of vicar general of Bishop de Grimaldi of Le Mans, became bishop of Gap in 1777, and was transferred to Saint-Papoul in 1784. At first this cultured prelate astonished the people of his diocese by the considerable retinue of his house and his brilliant receptions. In his manner of life some thought to see a levity of conduct, which was probably a matter of outward habits (still a bit too unreserved) of his worldly and military life.[96] However this may be, he was one of those whose courage, zeal, and apostolic virtues showed themselves with the greatest luster during the revolutionary anguish. He was the only prelate who continued to exercise his episcopal functions during the Terror. In hiding at Passy, he there exercised his ministry and performed ordinations. Whereas his brother and his nephews perished at Paris on the scaffold, he was fortunate enough to escape the executioner. He was seen opposing the Jansenists under the Constituent, the constitutionals under the Legislative and the Convention, and, on the question of the oaths, to adopt the conciliatory principles of his friend Father Emery, the superior of St. Sulpice.[97] Bishop de Coucy of La Rochelle, who had occasion to oppose the ideas of Bishop de Maille regarding the oath, but who entertained lofty esteem for his virtue, eagerly confided to him all powers of jurisdiction over the deportees of the Ile and the faithful living there.

About the end of January, 1799, at the Ile de Ré the overcrowding was so great that the government designated the Ile

[96] On Bishop de Maille, see De Broc, *Un évêque de l'ancien régime,* and Pisani in R. Q. H., of October, 1912.

[97] This attitude brought upon him violent opposition from the Jansenists, the Constitutionals, and a certain number of Catholics, more rigid than he was on the question of the oath, but we should note that neither the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* nor the *Annales de la religion* ever attacked his private conduct.

d'Oléron to receive the new deportees. Priests to the number of 192 were transferred there. Their life, their trials, and their piety were almost the same as those of their brethren. For us to sketch the picture would be merely a repetition. The Ile de Ré and the Ile d'Oléron formed, on the coast of France, a sort of little Church, about a new kind of monastery.

Thus, when the Revolution seemed to have destroyed all the religious communities on the soil of France,[98] the Directory, without intending to do so, raised new communities, equally fervent and austere, whose influence spread and whose prayers and sufferings ascended to God to obtain from His mercy the end of so many trials.

A decree of the Directory did indeed arouse among Catholics some disagreements that had already appeared on the occasion of the constitutional oath and the oath of Liberty-Equality; but a strong bond of love toward the Church and toward the Sovereign Pontiff never ceased to animate those who embraced divergent opinions. When, as we have just seen, the same prison held them, their emulation was only one of courage and self-abnegation before the sacrifice.

We allude to the oath of "hatred toward royalty and anarchy" which (September 5) the Directory had imposed on all members of the clergy.[99] Such a formula, if proposed without commentary, would doubtless have aroused a general reprobation and would have met with adamant opposition; but deputy Chollet, a member of the special commission deputed to elab-

[98] Mention is made of a Trappist abbey, which the Revolution had forgotten, at Boscodon near Embrun. That was the scene of the death of De Savine, former bishop of Viviers, converted and penitent. We should recall also that on November 21, 1796, the venerable Marie Rivier had founded at Bourg-Saint-Andéol the new congregation of the Presentation of Mary and that a year later this congregation received its first ruler from a priest of St. Sulpice, Father Pontanier. Cf. F. Mourret, *La vénérable Marie Rivier*, pp. 106, 113.

[99] In the decree of September 5, 1797, article 25 was thus worded: "Ecclesiastics authorized to reside on the territory of the Republic will take the oath of hatred toward royalty and anarchy, of attachment and fidelity to the Republic and to the Constitution of the year III."

orate the laws concerning the clergy, had declared, in the name of the unanimous opinion of the commission,

> that the person of the king was not what they were called upon to hate, since the Republic day after day signed treaties of friendship with kings; the hatred was not that of a Brutus or a Cato against everything that bore the name of king; that the hatred did not include belief in a political dogma about the best form of government; but that the ecclesiastics owed this hatred for what some were trying to re-establish in France, since the social pact rejected it and since no one could be subject to a republican constitution without rejecting every idea that would tend to overthrow it.[100]

In the presence of these explanations men were divided in mind. In many dioceses the clergy showed themselves opposed to the oath. Archbishop de Juigné of Paris, after being of this mind, abandoned it and allowed the generality of his clergy to take it. Father Emery did not take it, and was unwilling to advise others to take it; but, after learning that a certain number of priests of Paris were resigned to it, said: "Providence has permitted that they view the question from a point of view that seems to allow it to them so as to preserve for us the possession of our churches, which the different sects would assuredly have invaded." [101] The thought that the Catholic churches might be devoted to irreligious use and that all worship might be abolished, dismayed this man of God. "I cannot become used to the idea of a country without worship." [102]

This conciliatory attitude of part of the clergy did indeed permit the exercise of worship to be continued in many parishes. But vexations of all sorts were not lacking. The hate of the fanatics who wished to destroy Christianity in France was not disarmed. To grasp the depth of the malice we must, after studying the religious policy of the Directory in its measures of repression, study it in the principles of its lawmaking.

[100] *Moniteur,* 21 Frimaire of the year VI.
[101] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* I, 463.
[102] *Ibid.*

Deeds of the Directory

Three words, as we have seen, sum up the conduct of the Directory with regard to the deported priests: haste, negligence, and disorder; two words suffice to characterize its legislation and its internal government: arbitrariness and tyranny. To avoid "the caprices of despotism" the Constituents had decreed the separation of the three constitutional powers: they wisely thought that the prejudices and passions of the legislator might thus be counterbalanced, if not by wisdom, at least by the contrary prejudices and passions of the representatives of the judicial power and the agents of the executive power. But the Directory concentrated in the hands of the minister of police the power of judging and the power of executing his sentences. This arrangement was a return to one of the chief abuses of the absolute monarchy, without the counterpoise of personal responsibility and the dynastic interest. The individuals who had the chief direction of the police (Sotin, Dondeau, Lecarlier, and Duval) were notable for their servility to the five directors and by their cruelty toward their victims.[103]

The police service functioned in the following manner. Upon denunciation by a commissioner of the Directory or by a private person, the minister of police had the right to arrest such a priest or such a group of priests and submit their case to an inquiry. When this investigation was finished, if the priests were charged with some specific crime, their case was referred to the criminal tribunals or, as more usually happened, to a central bureau, composed of political men who sought only to give pledges of their persecuting zeal. As for the priests against whom no precise crime could be charged, but who were supposed to be disturbers of the public tranquillity, the Directory itself retained jurisdiction of the case. It was its manner to

[103] See Pierre, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

limit arbitrary acts,[104] but it limited the arbitrariness of its tribunals only by substituting its own.

One of the most revolting applications of this policy was the label of *"émigré"* fastened, with all its juridical consequences, upon the priests who had left France to conform to the decree of August 26, 1792. Article 1 of that decree ordered all non-juring priests "to leave the realm within fifteen days." The act of obedience to the decree was transformed into an act of rebellion. From October, 1797, to March, 1798, bureaus functioned at Paris, Nantes, Marseilles, Besançon, Nancy, Metz, and other places, commissioned to interpret the terrible prescription in this sense. By the end of 1797 the Marseilles commission had already imprisoned at the fortress Saint-Jean nine priests, among whom was an old man of eighty years, Father Donnadieu, former director of the minor seminary. On February 23, 1798, the venerable priest, condemned to death along with a former pastor of Saint-Ferréol, Father Baudin, traversed the city, walking with firm step between his guards, in prayerful recollection. We are told that at the moment of his execution his brains burst out and that a pious girl, Marie Gouverne, gathered them up and sent them to a priest as a precious relic.[105] Father Patenaille in the Jura, Father Galmiche in the Haute-Saône, Father Nicholas at Metz, in all thirty-one priests, illegally classified as *émigrés,*[106] underwent death in the same dispositions of courage and faith. The authorities arrested as an *émigré* a priest of Tours, Jean-Joseph Glatier, who had never left the country; but the publicity which he gave to the exercise of worship and his former relations with the Chouans caused him to be regarded as a man dangerous for the Directory. Condemned to death on March 23, he was

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 176.
[105] *Ibid.*, p. 148.
[106] *Ibid.*, pp. 144–61.

executed the next day by a firing squad along with three former soldiers of the wars of Brittany, who had been arrested with him.[107]

Victor Pierre estimates at 1,756 the number of French priests who were reached by the decree of the Directory. If we reflect that the clergy of France had just been decimated by the executions of the Terror and by exile, this figure appears considerable. Conjecture has been made that it represents a fourth of the priests then living in France.[108] Moreover, the persecution extended to all parts of the country. Out of eighty-nine departments, barely two or three were entirely exempt from it.[109]

The Persecution in Belgium

The persecution passed beyond the old frontiers into Belgium, which had been recently annexed and divided into several departements designated as "reunited departements." [110]

As soon as Belgium was turned over to the hands of the proconsuls of the Republic, at the time of the Convention, that country was administered after the manner of France. There the Committee of Public Safety organized committees of surveillance; the scaffold was paraded from city to city; the Belgian Terror even survived for six months after the death of Robespierre.

The Directory wished to oblige the Belgian clergy to take all the oaths prescribed for the French priests. The Belgian priests en masse refused to take any of these oaths. In them a feeling of national independence was joined to apprehensions which their religious faith dictated to them. Louvain, the seat of the great Catholic university, gave the signal of resistance. On

[107] Piolin, *L'église du Mans sous la Révolution,* III, 441–50.

[108] Pierre, *op. cit.,* p. 253.

[109] *Ibid.*

[110] Decree of September 30, 1795.

October 9, 1797, Cardinal Frankenberg, archbishop of Malines, was arrested and deported beyond the Rhine. On the 28th the University of Louvain was suppressed; its library, its archives, its physics laboratory, and its botanical garden, all were confiscated by the Directory; and on November 8, an order was given to the central bureaus to draw up a list of all the priests living in their jurisdiction.

The agitation began to reach the people, who resorted to all ruses to safeguard their priests and their worship. As in France, non-juring priests were forbidden to exercise their ministry. But they celebrated Mass in private houses before sunrise. In some neighborhoods people passed over the frontier, and certain localities where Catholic worship was celebrated became for the Belgians as places of pilgrimage.

Then against the priests, who were accused of being "instigators of disorder" and "sowers of discord," appeared individual and collective arrests. Soon rumblings, precursors of an approaching explosion, were heard; people spoke of a "new Vendée"; the collective arrests increased in number: on 17 Nivôse (January 6, 1798) sixty priests were arrested for having "inspired hatred toward the republican government and for having gathered their followers together during the night with a view to evade the surveillance of the constituted authorities";[111] on 14 Pluviôse (February 2), a collective decree was issued against twenty-nine priests, charging simply "their fanatical doctrine and their anti-revolutionary principles."[112] At bottom, the government was prosecuting in these priests the patriots no less than the defenders of the faith. They were endeavoring to check at the start a revolt that was ready to break forth.

The affair exploded on November 28, 1798. The city government of Brussels had given notice of the immediate call of

[111] Decree of September 30, 1795.
[112] *Ibid.*

200,000 conscripts to the colors. The young men thus called refused to present themselves; liberty poles were cut down, and placards containing vigorous protests were posted. Soon the movement spread into the county districts. On October 17, at Remich, fifty young men armed with stout clubs cried: "Long live the king," and refused to break up. Two days later, at Saint-Vith, 1,500 in revolt, coming in three columns, seized and strangled the commissioner. On October 28, at Malmedy, the number of revolters was 3,000. The situation was like a new Vendée, but the strife did not assume the same proportions.

This struggle does not lend itself to a methodical account. It was a series of separate combats, of skirmishes, and of sudden attacks. No properly so-called battle took place nor was a plan of campaign followed. But the struggle had two marks: one, we regret to have to say, was the cruelty of the victors who often shot the conquered after the fight; the other consisted of combats apparently decisive but in reality not conclusive.[113] Finally the insurgents were unable to withstand the war-hardened troops that were sent in large numbers from France to fight them; the conclusion of this campaign was the unheard-of decree, issued on November 4, 1798, and signed by Larevellière-Lépeaux, condemning to deportation all priests who had taken the oath.[114] This monstrous proscription affected about a thousand priests. Many succeeded in eluding their persecutors at the price of countless alarms and dangers; many were deported to France and were there mingled with the French priests, from whom history can no longer distinguish them.

Motive of the Persecution

Anyone who has perused the long series of decrees passed by the Directory and the orders issued by the minister of police

[113] Pierre, *La Terreur sous le Directoire*, p. 241.
[114] *Ibid.*, p. 248.

against the priests of France and Belgium, cannot fail to make a certain reflection. The three leading complaints appealed to against the priests are the refusal to take the oath, the so-called emigration, and the antirevolutionary propaganda. Yet we get the impression that such were not the real motives of the persecution. Whenever a priest showed a true zeal for religion, even if he had never left France and had taken all the constitutional oaths and had ostensibly separated from the royalist party, he was prosecuted, judged, and condemned. All these facts suggest the idea that the government under Larevellière-Lépeaux had but one aim: to replace the Christian religion by the natural and civic religion which this ardent disciple of Rousseau took under his protection. This conjecture becomes a certitude when we study the conduct of the Directory toward the constitutional clergy.

The constitutional priests enthusiastically took all the oaths. Their leader, Grégoire, made their apology and was the one who inspired them. The republican ideas counted no adherents more fervent than these men, who always condemned the emigration as a laxity and a betrayal. However, they did not escape the persecutions by the Directory.

In fact, many of those who took their stand about the Bishop of Loir-et-Cher continued the exercise of the ecclesiastical office, said Mass, preached and heard confessions, with a regularity and seriousness that rendered difficult for anyone to distinguish between their ministry and that of the non-juring priests. The revolutionary utopia which lured them from the path of obedience to the pope, and the weakness or ambition which led them to bow before the civil authority, did not contaminate their Christian faith. This quality was reason enough for the Directory to hold them as suspect. They were charged "with having taken the oath only that they might conspire with the greater boldness," "with having, under the shelter of their oaths, continued their maneuvers against the safety of the Republic." Such were the headings of accusation brought against

a former subprior of the Trappist monastery of Mortagne (Father Magnier), against Goury-Lay and Vaillant of Cher, and against Debeaussard and Hugues of Eure. Father Druyer, the constitutional pastor of Serville in the Eure-et-Loir, in vain offered the authentic list of his oaths and the testimonials of his parishioners in support of his fidelity to the Republic; he was judged and condemned. Father Marcepoil, the pastor of Isle-en-Dodon, published several writings in favor of the oaths; Father Zabée, a juring priest of the Ardennes, was even conspicuous by the intemperance of his republicanism. All these favorable circumstances were of no avail. Since they remained faithful to their parochial ministry, they embarrassed the policy of the Directory; they were deported.

In the eyes of Larevellière and his friends, the guilt of these priests was the greater when, in the exercise of their pastoral functions, they added the refusal to take part in the decadaire feasts. We would doubtless be exaggerating to call this attitude, as Grégoire did, "a sublime resistance" and to say that "the decadaire feasts were for the constitutional clergy the era of the martyrs." [115] Victor Pierre remarks: "If the constitutional clergy had been as numerous and as disposed for martyrdom as some would have us believe, they would have furnished more victims to the persecution; but they formed among the deportees an inconsiderable minority. . . . Only twenty constitutional priests are to be found in Guianna, eighty at the Ile de Ré." [116] Two juring bishops were prosecuted by the Directory. Mandru, of the Vosges, was charged with having spread a synodical letter of the national council of France, which appeared in September, 1797, and which criticized "the dry and bombastic teaching of the republican schools"; but he was sentenced merely to a fine of 100 francs and imprison-

[115] Grégoire, *Histoire des sectes religieuses,* I, 323–40; II, 453; *Annales de la religion,* June 3, 1797.

[116] Pierre, pp. 213, 216.

ment for six months; the minister of the interior considered "that we should not apply to him the law of 19 Fructidor for the reason that the refractory priests, even more dangerous than the others, derived from that rigor a subject of victory." The same was not true in the case of Le Coz, constitutional bishop of Ille-et-Vilaine, charged with having, in writing, attacked the substitution of the decadi for the Sunday. The charge was dropped since it might end in a condemnation that would be a triumph for the enemies of the Directory.[117]

Sacking of Rome

At bottom the enemy, so they considered, was especially Roman Catholicism. Toward that enemy no considerations should be entertained, no indulgence; but the law must always be interpreted in the narrowest sense, always applied in its most cruel rigor. This policy appears in the brutality of the proceedings used against the Papal States and against the very person of the Supreme Pontiff.

When Pius VI, led away by the emissaries of the Directory, had left Rome (February 20, 1798), the Eternal City was at once given over to methodical pillage. In an official memorandum of July 25, 1796, we read: "The fanaticism must be destroyed; but the popes' spiritual power rests particularly on their temporal power, on the revenues which they receive therefrom." [118] General Berthier, who needed money to pay his troops, deduced the consequences of this reasoning in seizing the goods of the Holy See. On March 25 the lands which Duke Braschi had purchased in the Pontine Marshes were confiscated; On April 6, 9, and 10, they were sold. All the furniture of Pius VI that was found in his palace of Terracina was

[117] *Archives nationales,* F[7] 7398.

[118] *Affaires étrangères, Mem. et doc.,* XII, 56, cited by Albert Dufourcq, *Le régime jacobin en Italie* (1900), p. 567.

treated in like manner. A band of commissioners invaded the Vatican and the Quirinal and pillaged them.[119] When, at Paris, the Jacobins learned that the Papal States were invaded and that the pontifical government was overthrown, they rushed there to grab a share in the booty. Berthier by means of several decrees tried to halt them, but in vain. Massens, his successor as commander of the troops, was no more successful.[120] Even the consuls, officially charged with maintaining order, with the help of the French commissioners,[121] had not been in power six months when public rumor accused them of the worst exactions. The *Moniteur,* in its number of September 12, gave wide publicity to these charges. Visconti pilfered the medals of the Bracciano Museum; Angelucci, who but lately did not have a franc to his name, was buying extensive properties; Matteis was speculating on the sale of the notes; Reppi was paying his debts and increasing his capital, no one knew how; Panazzi displayed for sale the precious jewels of the Bambino stolen at Ara Coeli.[122]

Amid these disturbances many Romans left the city. Several cardinals judged the situation intolerable; only thirteen of them stayed in Rome. Eight of them were arrested, imprisoned, then deported.[123] Two shamefully abandoned the Holy Father, abdicated the cardinalitial dignity, and handed it over into the hands of the commander-in-chief of the French troops. These men were cardinals Altieri and Antici. The latter had received the purple only at the pressing request of the King of Prussia and the King of Poland. Crushed with grief and for a while hesitant about what measure he should take, Pius VI, by two briefs of September 7, 1798, declared that the two cardinals

[119] Gendry, II, 329.

[120] *Ibid.,* p. 337.

[121] The Directory (March 20, 1798) had solemnly installed on the Capitol twelve consuls. During the festival, invocation was made to the "manes of the Emilies and the Scipios." *Ibid.,* p. 135.

[122] *Ibid.,* p. 341.

[123] *Ibid.,* p. 309.

had forfeited their office and that they were thereafter deprived of any active or passive voice in the future conclave.[124] These two briefs were dated from the Chartreuse of Florence, where the Pontiff had arrived on June 2, 1798, after a three months' sojourn at Sienna and after there writing for the courts of Europe a solemn protest against the outrages that had been inflicted on him.

In this retreat, where he stayed two months, Pius VI, notwithstanding the decline of his health and the hateful surveillance exercised over him, engaged actively in the general interests of the Church. Two particularly important letters were dated at the Chartreuse of Florence. One (January 30, 1799) was aimed at the professors of the Sapienza who had taken the oath of "hatred for royalty and anarchy," prescribed by article 377 of the Roman Constitution. These professors had formed their consciences on a simple declaration of the magistrate commissioned to receive this oath. This magistrate had assured them that the oath did not oblige them to anything beyond abstaining from any conspiracy against the Roman Republic. "Although we know," said the Pope, "that the words of an oath must be understood in the sense intended by the person who requires it, the verbal declaration which the said professors made before the magistrate charged with receiving their oath, could not change its substance; no one but the lawmaker is its interpreter, not the simple magistrate delegated to obtain the material execution of the law." [125]

[124] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

[125] Picot, *Mémoires,* VII, 218. Father Emery in several letters and especially in an article which he published in 1800 (*Annales philosophiques,* I, 155) held that the lawfulness of the oath of hatred prescribed in France, if taken in the sense of Chollet's explanations, was confirmed rather than brought into doubt by the brief of January 30, 1799. For, he says, if by this brief the Pope reproved the oath taken by the professors of the Sapienza, this rebuke was because a magistrate, charged with the material execution of a law, was not qualified to give it an interpretation different from its apparent meaning. Hence, Father Emery concludes, if the explanations had been given, as in France, by the lawmaker himself, the Holy Father would probably not have taken exception to the oath. Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 414.

The other papal document, likewise dated from Florence, is more important. It is a constitution regulating the holding of the next conclave. For a long time past, this eventuality was one of the chief concerns of Pius VI. By two bulls (December 29, 1796, and February 11, 1797), with a view to assuring the tranquillity of the future conclave, he derogated from the traditional rules.[126] A constitution dated November 13, 1798, provided that at the Pontiff's death the right of election should belong to the largest group of cardinals gathered together in the states of a Catholic prince and to all those who wished to join this group. The cardinals would have the right to determine the place of the conclave and to regulate whatever concerned the future election. All the censures imposed by Paul II on those who should concern themselves with a future papal election, were abrogated.[127]

At Rome, however, the revolutionaries, not satisfied with pillaging and persecuting, tried, as in France, to replace Catholic worship with civil ceremonies. On November 17, 1798, in Piazza d'Espagna, a huge amphitheater had been erected, with these inscriptions: "Reason triumphs over pride," "humanity triumphs over tyranny," "truth rises from the ashes of superstition." In the amphitheater, in the presence of the consuls, senators, and pretors of the Roman Republic, the eldest of the Borghese princes and the prince of Santa Cruce burned the golden book of the nobility and the bull of St. Pius V creating the tribunal of the Inquisition.

This action, too violent a wound to the Catholic faith of the Italian people and their traditional attachment to their old customs, exasperated a populace already greatly irritated against the demands and the depradations of the French. In February, 1798, an uprising of the people of Trastevere had been stifled in blood. The Romans now loudly called for the

[126] Gendry, II, 325, 484.
[127] *Ibid.*, p. 327.

Neapolitan armies, hoping that these would bring deliverance. On October 28 the king of the Two Sicilies, Ferdinand IV, in answer to this appeal, addressed to the French an order to evacuate the papal territory; on November 14, from his headquarters at San Germano, he published a proclamation to the Roman people. When General Championnet, commander of the French forces at Rome, did not reply to the order of the King of Naples, General Mack, commander-in-chief of the Neapolitan troops, opened the hostilities.

Immediately the people of Rome again rose up. Championnet, not having a force large enough to fight against an internal uprising and at the same time against the army of Mack then threatening him, abandoned the city of Rome, which (November 29) opened its gates to the King of Naples. An edict of December 3 invited the inhabitants to have full confidence in His Sicilian Majesty. But the peace was of short duration. The French army, reinforced by new troops, turned back toward Rome, met the Neapolitan forces before the walls of Civita Castellana, completely routed them, and, passing through Rome at full gallop, seized Naples on January 23, 1799.

Pius VI in France

Upon learning of these events, the Pope was apprehensive. He feared that the Directory might make them a pretext for taking more severe measures against his person and against the Church.[128] He judged rightly. On March 26 two French officers came to the Chartreuse in Florence and informed him of the order that he must proceed to Parma without delay.[129] He had to leave two days later (March 28) at three o'clock in the morning. The Pontiff, whose health was notably weakened, had not yet recovered from the fatigue of the journey when (April

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 351.
[129] *Ibid.*, p. 406.

13) a dispatch instructed the Pope's guards to transfer him at once to Turin, where he arrived at night, exhausted. There he was informed that the goal of his journey was France. Raising his eyes to heaven, he said: "I will go wherever they purpose taking me." In the evening of the 30th, after a painful and perilous crossing of the Alps, he set foot on French soil. Perhaps he then recalled the touching words he had uttered in his allocution in the consistory of June 17, 1793: "France, France, that our predecessors called the model of Catholic unity, the unshakable prop of the faith, thou that surpassed the other nations by thy zeal and thy devotion to the Apostolic See, how different thou hast become!" [130]

The sight of the august victim along his route would awaken in many consciences sentiments of faith until then slumbering.

> In vain would anyone try to recognize in this old man, led by fifty horsemen, the majestic pontiff whom the Austrian populace had admired seventeen years before. An attack of paralysis had deprived him of the use of his legs, and his brow, under a crown of white hair, bore the weight of almost eighty-two years. Nevertheless his sufferings and the cruel infirmities to which he was condemned did not disturb the serenity of his spirit; in his captivity he had preserved the full liberty of his soul and the full energy of his heart.[131]

In a brief to the bishops of France (November 10, 1793) he wrote: "What have we to fear? Death? No, indeed. When we live only for Jesus Christ, we can merely gain by leaving this life." [132]

In the midst of his sufferings, the Pontiff had the sweetest consolations that can touch the soul of a representative of Jesus Christ. At Briançon, in the midst of a throng of people who had come from the surrounding country to greet him on

[130] Barberi, *Bullarium*, IX, 327.

[131] A. M. de Franclieu, *Pie VI dans les prisons du Dauphiné.*

[132] Guillon, *Brefs et institutions de Pie VI relatifs à la Révolution française* (1798), II, supplement, p. 52.

his journey, with tears in his eyes he repeated the words of the Master: "Amen I say to you, I have not found so great faith in Israel." At Savine a noble lady dressed in mourning knelt at his feet, begging him to bless her and bestow on her the peace she had lost since the schism of her son. She was the marquise of Savine, mother of the former constitutional bishop of Viviers.[133] At Gap, the constitutional pastor of the cathedral, Father Escallier, begged the Pope to grant him absolution for his apostasy.

Pius VI reached Valence on July 14, 1799. As his residence he was assigned the citadel of the city. As soon as he was brought to his apartments, the outer doors were closed, and he was declared to be "in the state of arrest." [134] The citadel had a chapel where the Pope had the consolation of hearing Mass every day. "The Holy Father," says Baldassari, "each morning recited the canonical hours, ordinarily heard two Masses, made long and fervent prayers to the Holy Trinity, to our Lord, to St. Peter. . . . Toward evening he recited the Rosary with us." [135] From his prison he followed the affairs of Rome and of the whole Church. News of the victories of Suvorov gave him some hope for an amelioration of the religious situation. The contrary is what happened. The French government, concerned with the progress of the Austro-Russian army, decided (July 25, 1799) that the Pope, "regarded as a hostage," should be removed to a point remote from the frontier.[136] The executive Directory decreed, "The late Pope will be transferred from Valence to Dijon." At the foot of this decree Pius VI had the sadness to read the name of an apostate priest, Sieyès.

But the paralysis from which the Pope was suffering for a considerable time, reached the intestines; the ailment progressed rapidly. The doctors judged that his transfer would be im-

[133] M. de Savine was converted eight years later.

[134] Gendry, II, 417.

[135] Baldassari, *Relation sur l'enlèvement et la captivité de Pie VI*, IV, f. 212.

[136] Letter of the minister of the interior, cited by Franclieu, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

possible. The commissioner, Curnier, wrote: "Is it not the policy of the French government to preserve this important hostage as long as it can?" [137]

On August 28, 1799, the sick man's condition was such that he received the sacrament of extreme unction. His last words, spoken with difficulty but in a fully intelligible voice, were these: *"Domine, ignosce illis"* ("Lord, forgive them").[138] That night, at about midnight, during the prayers for those in their last agony, the Pope, raising his arm, with a triple sign of the cross blessed the persons present; then his hand fell back lifeless, letting the crucifix which he was holding fall. Pius VI was dead. He was the most august and last victim of the French Revolution.

[137] Franclieu, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

[138] The following words are also reported: "Recommend to my successor that he pardon the French as I pardon them with all my heart." Gendry, II, 424.

PART III

Toward a Religious Restoration

Pope Pius VI died in exile. Viewed superficially, this disaster, following so many others, marked the final fall of the papacy before the triumphant Revolution. Three years later, however, the man who had been sent to Rome "to extinguish the torch of fanaticism" did in fact treat with the Supreme Pontiff about the re-establishment of Catholic worship. The people most enamored of the subversive doctrines of the *Contrat social* and the *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard* now had a taste of the Catholic poetry of the *Genius of Christianity*. The sons of the kings who had expelled the Jesuits, who had patronized the philosophers and backed the Jansenists, became champions of a Catholicism thoroughly devoted to the Roman pontiff. Shortly afterward, some philosophers, Joseph de Maistre and Bonald, Ballanche and Lamennais, though following different tendencies, were outlining the plan of a society with Christianity as its basis. Writers and artists found their inspirations in the ages of faith. This immense effort toward a religious restoration was not, moreover, limited to France; Germany and England took part in it. But the result was not without a mixture of errors, or without painful shocks. The very first quarter of the nineteenth century would see Gallicanism come to life again with Napoleon, and liberalism appear with Lamennais. In the face of these obstacles and errors, Pius VII would begin the long struggle which Gregory XVI and Pius IX zealously continued.

CHAPTER VII

The Religious Situation in 1799

CHATEAUBRIAND, on his return from exile, described France in a few picturesque lines.

> You might say that a conflagration had passed through the villages. . . . To the right and left of the highway appeared ruined castles and mansions. Of their destroyed old forests nothing remained but a few sawed-off stumps on which children were playing. You would see enclosure walls with gaps in them, abandoned churches from which the dead had been driven out, church towers without bells, cemeteries without crosses, headless and battered statues of saints in their niches. On the walls could be seen already worn-out republican inscriptions: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity or Death. In some places an attempt had been made to erase the word "Death," but the black or red letters were visible under the coat of whitewash. This nation, which at the moment seemed to be dissolving, was again beginning in the world, like people emerging from death or from the barbarism and destruction of the Middle Ages.[1]

This picture might be enlarged. The conquests of the Revolution had, indeed, extended its work of religious destruction. In the Batavian, Cisalpine, Helvetic, Roman, and Neapolitan republics, successively established between 1795 and 1799 in Holland, Milan, Switzerland, Rome, and Naples, the revolutionary oaths had been imposed under severe penalties, many faithful priests had been banished, churches had been pillaged; in places where the armies of the Revolution had not penetrated, at least its ideas were triumphant.

The revolutionary irreligion had spread even outside of

[1] *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, II, 235.

Europe. The ruin of the Society of Jesus, which in 1775 counted 16,000 missioners, inflicted a disastrous blow on the foreign missions; the spoliation of the possessions of the Church by the Constituent Assembly wiped out the resources of the clergy; the suppression of monasteries and the persecution of the priests dried up the sources of vocations. The attempt in 1792 and 1793 to impose the constitutional oath on the missioners of India forced a large number of them to abandon the field of their apostolate.[2] The Directory, going even beyond this, in 1796 backed the nabob of Mysore, Tippo Sahib, who was persecuting the Christians. Some Jacobins, coming to Mysore, there founded clubs in which was decreed "the destruction of all tyrants except the citizen prince Tippo the Victorious, the friend of the French Republic, its close cousin." [3]

At Rome itself, the very center of Christianity, religion was not secure. At the time of Pius VI's death, the city was evacuated by the French army, but the Sacred College had been obliged to disperse. Most of the cardinals fled to Venice. In that city of lagoons, in a Benedictine monastery on St. George island, they met in conclave to choose a new head for the Church.

What seemed to complete the decay of Catholicism was the evident favor enjoyed by its enemies: the Protestants, the Jews, the Freemasons, and the atheists.

The Protestants

During the French Revolution, Protestantism, according to the expression of one of its historians, "had gone ahead firmly and rapidly." [4] The edict of November, 1787, gave the Protestants their civil status; and for more than ten years the Hugue-

[2] In 1793 Bishop Champenois of French India was expelled for refusing to assist at the planting of a liberty tree.

[3] A. Mazon. *Un missionaire vivarais aux Indes, l'abbé Dubois,* p. 10.

[4] G. de Felice, *Histoire des protestants de France,* p. 580.

not Necker exercised a considerable influence in the conduct of political and financial affairs. The salon of his wife was the most frequented meeting place of authors, publishers, and notable foreigners. A law of December 24, 1789, assured the Protestants of the exercise of all political rights. A few months later the Constituent Assembly raised to the presidency the Protestant pastor Rabaut Saint-Etienne. After that the Assembly gave the Protestants fresh pledges of its good will.[5] By a decree of July 20, 1790, it restored to them all property confiscated from their ancestors for religious reasons. By another decree (December 16, 1790) it granted all rights of French citizenship to the descendants of the refugees on condition that they return to France and there take the civic oath. Following this last legislative act, numerous Protestants came from abroad, established themselves in France, and soon exercised a great influence there. Of this number was Benjamin Constant, then twenty-three years old. Under the different governments, even to the monarchy of Louis Philippe, he would defend, in politics and in religion, the most individualist liberalism, and he would exert a considerable influence on public opinion, as also on the progress of state affairs.

The Jews

Political favor came to the Protestants without any exertion on their part. But the Jews had to win it by main force. In August, 1789, a deputation of Alsatian Jews presented themselves at the bar of the Assembly to appeal for the emancipation of their fellow Jews. This step led to the presentation of a project rehabilitating the four classes of persons who at that time did not enjoy civil rights: the Protestants, the actors, the hangmen, and the Jews. But the Assembly merely voted the re-

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 588.

habilitation of the Protestants, the actors, and the hangmen. It refused the same consideration to the Jews, who it knew were organized and powerful, and whom it considered politically formidable. Rewell and Maury became the interpreters of these fears. During the discussion a deputy declared: "You are opening the doors of France, not to individuals, but to a nation."

The Jews, however, were not discouraged. In their number were some persons of intelligence. Henrietta Hertz, the friend of Mirabeau, was a Jew,[6] and the sect of the Martinists, made up almost exclusively of Jews, had just fused with Freemasonry. Most of the speakers in the parliamentary debate who were heard in favor of the Jews were Freemasons.[7] In 1791 the Jews of Paris resolutely took the direction of the affair. They were not numerous, hardly five hundred, who used to meet faithfully in the synagogue on rue Brisemiche.[8] But they were generally quite advanced in modern ideas and were closely connected with the philosophers. Their leader, the banker Cerfbeer, who later put his financial experience in the service of Napoleon, had made influential friends. At the session of January 18, 1791, Duke de Broglie accused him of spending large sums in Paris to win over the defenders of his cause.[9] But money was not the only means used. The Paris sections had become a power. Men made the rounds of the capital's sixty sections, suggesting petitions, stimulating steps to be taken. The result of this agitation was a popular demonstration on September 27, 1791, the day before the final adjournment of the Assembly. Under the pressure of this manifestation the members of the Assembly declared that the Jews would enjoy in France the rights of active citizens.[10]

[6] Lémann, *La prépondérance juive,* I, 146.
[7] Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes,* Vol. II, Bk. II, chap. 6.
[8] Lémann, *op. cit.,* p. 175.
[9] *Moniteur,* January 20, 1791.
[10] *Ibid.,* September 29, 1791.

The Freemasons

At the very time when the Jews thus entered upon the enjoyment of French citizenship, the Freemasons were already influential in France. We have seen the part played by the lodges in the upper society of the ancient regime. At first the Revolution favored their cohesion. Rebold, a Freemason historian, writes: "The Revolution did more in the interest of Masonic unity than all the combined efforts of the Grand Orient." [11] In 1789, thanks to subsidies from the Duke of Orleans, the "club de propagande" was founded. This club was destined to overthrow all the established governments, paying the traveling expenses of missioners, who were called "apostles." [12] Lodges were to be found in 292 cities. Condorcet, Danton, Chénier, and Rabaut Saint-Etienne might be seen in the lodge of the "Nine Sisters"; Lafayette, Laclos, and Dr. Guillotin, in the lodge of "Candor." But the most active group was the Breton Club, which became the club of the Jacobins and set up branches throughout France. Apart from its public meetings, it held secret sessions open only to the initiated.[13]

Beginning in 1792, the Masonic influence was eclipsed. As Rebold states, the society had to act with much caution.[14] The violent factions that split the Legislative Assembly and the Convention prevented any common action, and all initiative became risky. The Duke of Orleans published (February 22, 1793) in the *Journal de Paris* his resignation as grand master of the order. "I joined Freemasonry," he said, "because it offered me a sort of image of equality. I have since quit the phantom for the reality." [15] Consequently three months later

[11] Rebold, *Histoire des trois grandes loges,* p. 88.

[12] G. Gautherot, in *Dictionnaire apologetique de la foi catholique,* under the word *Franc-Maçonnerie,* II, 106.

[13] Gautherot, *op. cit.,* col. 107.

[14] Rebold, *op. cit.,* p. 82.

[15] *Ibid.*

the office of grand master was declared vacant, and for several years the Grand Orient remained quiescent. But in 1799 Freemasonry realized a more solid direction than any that had been attempted up to that time. This improved condition was the work of an active and intelligent person, Roettiers de Montaleau, who was employed in grouping the Masonic forces into a single fasces. His efforts ended (May 23, 1799) in the agreement that united the former grand lodge of France and the Grand Orient, which thereby found itself invested with unquestioned authority.

Protestantism, Judaism, and Freemasonry had not exhausted the favors of the Directory. The "philosophy" had its share. We know what was understood by "philosophy" in 1799. From Rousseau to Cabanis the sense of this word had undergone a radical change. The author of *Emile* still paid homage to Christ; Mirabeau professed at least faith in God. In 1791, during the discussion on the Declaration of the Rights of Man he declared: "God is as necessary for man as liberty." But for Volney, Cabanis, Lakanal, Naigeon, and Lalande, to be a philosopher was to deny the existence of God and the spirituality of the soul, to profess atheism and materialism. These very men, all of them, were members of the Institute, founded (October 27, 1795) to gather together the most eminent persons of France.

Vitality of Catholicism

In 1799, at the time of Pius VI's death, the Catholic Church, either by the official discredit heaped on it or by the favors accorded to its adversaries, appeared condemned to inevitable decay. But the reality was quite otherwise. To the eye of a close observer, atheism, Freemasonry, Judaism, and Protestantism, outwardly triumphant, were inwardly enfeebled and their strength sapped, whereas Catholicism, officially pro-

scribed, was animated by an intrinsic and mighty vitality.

Nowhere was the weakness of atheism more evident than at the time of the competition opened in 1796 by the Institute on the means for founding a system of morality among the people. All the competitors naturally treated the subject in the spirit of their judges. The two reports by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre (July 3, 1798) and by Guinguené (January 5, 1800) showed the void in all those programs from which the thought of God was systematically excluded. The memorial that Guinguené thought superior to all the others proposed as a basis of virtue the equality of possessions, a just balance between our needs and our possessions. The others proposed to found a journal of good deeds, to oblige everyone to cultivate the field of the widow, the aged, and the orphan, to erect in the public squares statues to the honor of virtuous men (Orestes, Pylades, Sully, Montaigne, and La Boétie), to institute a court of morals, made up of wise old men. "On reading these proposals we should remember that they came from the minds of serious men, some of whom have left a name in history, such as Destutt de Tracy and John Baptist Say. We cannot help wondering whether they needed to take the trouble to declaim so much against Christian morals, only to arrive at such a shipwreck of common sense." [16]

Freemasonry was unable to attain a higher ideal. It had reached the worship of the Supreme Being; but gradually its doctrines were fused with those of the philosophers and underwent the same evolution. Condorcet even restricted the part of Masonry to supplementing the philosophical proselytism, and basically the union which the Grand Orient had just realized between the different lodges in 1799 was more artificial than real, or at least more suited to a work of destruction than to a positive undertaking of moral and social reconstruction. The weakly servile character of this society would make it bow to the absolute power of Napoleon with such baseness that

[16] Sicard, *A la recherche d'une religion civile*, p. 270.

it even flattered both the aristocracy of the ancient regime and the demagogic passions of the Revolution.

In their rise to power, the Jews were obliged to follow the same path. The Paris synagogue had won its influence only by its relations with the philosophers and the Jacobins; and thenceforth, by the rendering of public services, it took precedence over the other religious groups, some of which, such as that of Alsace, remained more attached to the old beliefs. Generally in the Jewish world Lessing's rationalist criticism prevailed over the sentimental deism of Mendelssohn.

The ruin of the traditional faith, like the development of the political influence, was more felt among the Protestants. Necker's daughter, Madame de Staël, and her friend Benjamin Constant, at that time represented in the intellectual domain the Protestant thought, as Lessing represented the Jewish thought. They had so greatly moderated Calvin's doctrines by those of Voltaire and Rousseau that their religion was reduced to what the Duke de Broglie called "a pietistic latitudinarianism," a vague belief which accommodated its dogmas to suit all religions and all philosophies.[17]

At bottom, if in this last year of the eighteenth century, people wished to find a real moral and religious force, they must look for it in Catholicism, flouted by the philosophers of the ancient regime, stripped of its possessions, persecuted in its ministers, and replaced in its worship by the Revolution.

Popular Feelings

No one has perceived and analyzed the elements of this force in a more penetrating way than the author of the *Origins of Contemporary France*. Says Taine:

[17] "Madame de Staël has the soul of Rousseau; but by the spirit of her mind she is the daughter of Voltaire; the religion of the time is her religion" (Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 864).

Thanks to the Revolution, the uneducated or uncritical Catholics had acquired the feeling of the binding force by which in their Church the liturgy, the hierarchy, and the statement of dogma were united to the inner religious life. Never did they ask themselves how orthodoxy differs from schism, or how positive religion is opposed to natural religion. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy is what makes them distinguish the non-juring pastor from the intruder, and the good Mass from the bad Mass; the prohibition of the Mass is what made them understand the importance of the Mass; the revolutionary government is what turned them into theologians and canonists.

Under the Terror they were obliged to sing and dance around the goddess of Reason, then in the temple of the Supreme Being, having been subjected, under the Directory, to the novelties of the republican calendar and the insipidity of the decadaire feasts. Thus they had measured with their own eyes the distance separating a present, personal, incarnate, redeeming, and saving God from a non-existing or vague deity and, in any event, an absent God. They saw the difference between a living, immemorial, revealed religion and an abstract, artificial religion; between their spontaneous worship, their act of faith, and the imposed religion, a mere cold, outward show. They saw their priest in surplice, vowed to continence, delegated from on high to open for them infinite perspectives of paradise or hell, and the republican celebrant, in tricolor scarf, more or less married, delegated from Paris to give them a course of lessons in Jacobin morals. By this very contrast, the people became more attached to their clergy, to all their clergy, secular and regular.

Pastors and prelates, religious men and women, the people had seen suffer for their faith, which was that of the people. In the presence of the clergy's constancy, equal to that of the traditional martyrs, the people's lukewarmness changed to an attitude of respect. . . . Seeing the clergy without bread, without a roof, imprisoned, deported, everyone at least a fugitive and hunted out, the people, during the persecutions of the year IV and the year VI, had received them, hid them, and fed them. . . . Each morning the man or the woman of the people passed some of those buildings that had been sequestered from their religious use. By their form and their name they loudly proclaimed what they had been, what today they would become again. . . . The

solemnities, the big feasts, and the Sundays were lacking; and this lack was a periodic privation for their ears and their eyes; they regretted the absence of the ceremonies, candles, chants, the sound of the church bells, the morning and evening angelus. Their heart and their feelings had remained Catholic and longed for their Church of former days.[18]

We may add that their heart and soul had become more Roman. The events of the Revolution had taught them this need. They knew certain truths, that, if the sacraments necessary for their religious life must be conferred on them by a priest, this priest, marked with a unique and indelible character, had to be ordained by a lawful bishop and that this bishop was not lawful unless he himself had been instituted by the pope. Consequently without the pope, no bishops; without the bishops, no priests; without priests, no sacraments; without the sacraments, no salvation,[19] or at least, salvation rendered incomparably harder.

Hence in the districts where the non-juring priests had been able to remain or to return, the people flocked to their Mass and were unwilling to accept any other. Hence also, in places besides the Vendée, the people rose up against government agents who were depriving them of their public worship. Often, indeed, these people went beyond the bounds of lawful defense. Beginning in 1799, from Marseilles to Lyons, along both banks of the Rhone, the revolt went on for five years. Royalist bands, swollen by refractory conscripts and favored by the populace that humored them, slew and pillaged the agents of the Republic and those who acquired national properties. In August, 1799, 16,000 insurgents of Haute-Garonne and of the six neighboring departments, led by the Count de Paulo, unfurled the white flag. In more than thirty departments intermittent and scattered Vendées occurred. All the Catholic departments had their latent Vendées.[20]

[18] Taine, *Les origines de la France contemporaine,* X, 43–49.
[19] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 42.
[20] Ct. *ibid.*, IX, 164–66.

Switzerland

Several of the countries conquered by the Revolution had offered similar resistance to its interference in the domain of the faith. After Belgium, the Catholic cantons of Switzerland rose up. They were to the number of seven: Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucern, Zug, Solothurn, and Fribourg. Peopled by poor and hard-working peasants, their constitution had a more democratic character than that of the rich, Protestant cantons, such as Bern and Zurich, which were ruled by a well-to-do aristocracy. However, Church property was considerable in these cantons, and it aroused the eager cupidity of the Directory, in search of money to feed its armies and supply its arsenals. Switzerland was also regarded as a hotbed of conspiracies of royalists and English. The invasion of this country was, then, a double enterprise of revolutionary proselytism and of heavy taxation.[21]

This invasion had been prepared for in the course of many years by the sending of agents who propagated the new doctrine in Switzerland. A party was even formed, distinctly favorable to democratic institutions analogous to those of France. This party had at its head two men: Pfeffer of Lucern and Ochs of Basel; it formed plans of constitutions and stirred up insurrections here and there. We do not intend to relate the campaign which, under the direction of General Brune, resulted (April, 1798) in the proclamation of a new Swiss constitution. The Swiss confederation, made up of cantons mutually independent in domestic affairs, was followed by the Helvetic Republic, one and undivided. New cantonal boundaries were set up. The old Protestant canton of Berne was made into a fourth canton; on the other hand, the four small Catholic cantons of Schwyz, Uri, Zug, and Unterwalden formed only a single canton under the name of Waldestetten.

[21] Albert Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française*, V, 293.

The Catholic Cantons

Following these oppressive acts, you could see, on a more limited stage, but imposing by its memories, a sight most deserving of posterity, a strife forever memorable. Whereas the rich cantons under their aristocratic governments—Bern, Zurich, Basel, and Lucern—bowed their head beneath the yoke with humiliating weakness, the little Catholic cantons, which saw their truly democratic constitution taken from them, put up the most heroic resistance. When a proposal was made to these simple men that they send representatives to Aarau for the purpose of accepting the constitution, at first they believed that they would be allowed to make some remonstrances. The envoys whom they deputed to Bern, to the French commissioner, were ignominiously expelled. Soon afterward a proclamation by General Schassenburg, who was made military commander after the departure of Brune, declared that the priests of the five little cantons where the opposition seemed to be keener would be held responsible for whatever should disturb the public tranquillity. In fact, no one could fail to see that the movement was prompted chiefly by the religious attachments of this simple population. Did they not have to fear that, in depriving them of their hereditary liberties, the rulers would turn to take away their liberty of religion? This reasonable suspicion explains the part taken in this strife by the secular and regular clergy of the little cantons. What is certain is that these brave mountaineers, most of them unfamiliar with the use of arms, enlisted as one man and, thoughtless of the dangers, were ready to resist an experienced army four times the size of their little force.[22]

A young officer, thirty-three years old, Baron Aloys von Reding, one of whose ancestors was immortalized by a victory in 1315 over the Austrians, was asked to place himself at the

[22] Picot, *Mémoires*, VIII, 156.

head of the rebels. The new general marched on Lucern and (April, 1798) seized it almost without firing a shot. The first act of the victorious army was to go to the church, there to hear Mass and ask God's protection. In fact, the French army did come up, and the encounter gave promise of being terrible. It took place about the Morgarten, near the Lake of Zug, on May 2, a day ever since celebrated in the Swiss annals by the victory which they won there and which founded the independence of the nation. Such a memory electrified the Catholic army, which again and again repulsed the troops of Schassenburg. After two days of fighting, however, Aloys von Reding was obliged to ask for an armistice from the French general who, admiring so great courage, offered the Swiss army an honorable capitulation: provided the new constitution would be recognized, the Catholic religion would be maintained in the ancient part of Switzerland.[23]

These conditions came near being rejected. The people hesitated to sacrifice their old liberties. But in a general assembly held in the town of Schwyz, where the entire people began by falling on their knees to implore the divine assistance, the priests begged their fellow citizens to accept the conditions offered them. Canon Schüller said to them: "You have sworn to die rather than accept the new constitution; but in uttering this oath you were convinced that this constitution threatened your faith and the freedom of your religion. Since, then, the capitulation gives assurance in these matters, your oath has ceased to exist." [24] Aloys von Reding seconded this view, which finally prevailed.

Unfortunately the article stipulating the freedom of the Catholic worship had not been set forth in writing in an offi-

[23] F. de Crue in *Histoire générale,* VIII, 823. We know that this ancient part of Switzerland had as its center the three Catholic cantons of Schwyz (whence the word "Switzerland"), Uri, and Unterwalden.

[24] For this discourse in full, see Raoul-Rochette, *Histoire de la Révolution helvétique de 1797 à 1803.*

cial document. This regrettable omission occasioned a new uprising the next August with regard to the constitutional oath, which the Catholics were unwilling to take except with the most explicit reservations. Lower Unterwalden was the chief scene of the strife, which on both sides was fiercer than the preceding. The shepherds of Unterwalden had put on as cockades some images of the Blessed Virgin. Accompanied by their womenfolk, who dragged the cannons and passed the ammunition to the fighters, they defended themselves to desperation. Some monks exhorted them to fight well and to die well. More than one of them picked up a musket of a dead comrade to make use of it.

Schassenburg, in a letter published in the *Moniteur* of September 28, 1798, furnishes some details of these atrocious combats of the Unterwalden shepherds. He says: "We lost a large number, as was inevitable with the unbelievable obstinacy of those daring men, brave to the point of fury. They fought with clubs; they attacked with stones. . . . Several priests, and also a large number of women, remained on the spot." The victorious general could not resist showing his regrets to the victims of this heroic battle; he ordered that the children be gathered together and that a thousand rations of bread be distributed each day to the inhabitants who were left; the celebrated Lavater raised his voice in behalf of the oppressed, in a letter that he dated from "the first year of the Swiss servitude." Addressing the British Parliament, William Pitt paid a touching homage to them; and the economist and educator Pestalozzi was glad to receive in his schools a large number of the children who had been orphaned by this terrible war.

Ireland

Amid different circumstances but with equal warmth, the Catholics of Ireland also defended the freedom of their faith. Ever since Ireland, in its attachment to the Roman Church, had

taken a stand against the tyrannical measures of Henry VIII, that fidelity to Catholicism had remained the characteristic trait of the Irish. The harsh regime under which Protestant England had long tried to subject Ireland is to be explained by this fact. Toward the end of the eighteenth century, however, a lull was produced. Several penal laws, but lately enacted against the Catholics, had been abrogated. Following the advice of their priests, the Irish Catholics consented to take the oath to the constitution: a law of 1793 granted them the right of voting, until then reserved to the Protestants. But the influence of the French Revolution had disturbed men's minds. The liberal party, enthusiastic for the new ideas, in the realm of its just complaints against the English tyranny had drawn to it a number of Catholics. Such was the origin of the association which later became famous as the Society of the United Irish. On the other hand, the rigid Protestants, vexed at seeing the Catholics enjoy rights that had formerly been reserved to themselves and alarmed at the projects of the new society, formed counterassociations. These, unswervingly loyal to William of Orange, took the name of "Orangemen," and their foes called themselves "Defenders." Both sides bound themselves by oaths and stirred up seditions. Blameworthy excesses were committed; blood flowed.

Priests and religious took an active part in these disturbances, allying themselves to men whose aim seemed to be the separation of Ireland and England and the establishment of a republic in the spirit of the French Revolution. One priest, Edward Murphy, even led men to battle. But the heads of the Irish Church took note of the danger. On May 22, 1798, the four Catholic archbishops, the twenty-two bishops, along with several lords and notables published a manifesto in which they proclaimed their attachment to the established order and forcefully protested against the direction given to the Society of United Irishmen.

Not all the Catholics followed these wise counsels; but the

majority did so. Among the Catholics were some who freely entered the service of the government. In this number was Daniel O'Connell, who subsequently showed noble generosity in the defense of his religion and his country.

These events had two results. The English government, then in the hands of Pitt, crushed the Irish insurrection and profited by its victory to have the Parliament pass the Act of Union, which was approved by the King on July 2, 1800. In virtue of this Act, Ireland and England formed a single United Kingdom. The Irish Parliament was dissolved, and the deputies of Ireland who wished to sit in the Parliament of the united countries had to take an oath that was contrary to the Catholic faith. This requirement would, in fact, exclude them from the Parliament; such was the deplorable consequence of this Act. Moreover, of thirty-two Irish counties twenty-one protested energetically against the destruction of their parliament. Then Pitt resorted to a stratagem. To appease the resistance, he promised to emancipate the Catholics. Thus the agitation had this happy result.[25] William Pitt's request of King George for the emancipation of Irish Catholics was one of the reasons for his dismissal; all of O'Connell's efforts, crowned with success thirty years later, rested on this promise, explicitly and formally made in 1799 and stubbornly disregarded.

Napoleon

A glance at Italy, Spain, Germany, and even the Scandinavian countries would show there, more or less evidently, the awakening of Catholic vitality. All in all, the movement was undeniable. One man, whom we know well, had calculated its importance. This man was General Bonaparte. While the chief events we have just related were taking place, he was forming in Egypt the most grandiose plans, and expected to change the

[25] On this promise, see Thiers, *Histoire du consulat et de l'Empire,* II, 394.

face of the earth.[26] Of a sudden news was received (October 9, 1799) that he had landed at Saint-Raphael near Fréjus on the coast of Provence.

He was expected, desired. The conqueror of the Pyramids, of Abukir, and of Mount Thabor had grown to the proportions of a hero in the popular imagination. In the *coup d'état* of 18 Brumaire (November 9, 1799), from which he emerged first consul, that is, practically the supreme head of France, Bonaparte was swept to power by the popular flood even more than by his own effort.[27] He at once appeared as being of the race destined to govern the world. His political genius was not less than his military genius. But in what direction was he going to exercise his power? By his connections with the Jacobins and by his philosophical ideas he belonged to the Revolution; by his political sense, perhaps also by a remnant of faith preserved in his Corsican soul, he was induced to take in hand the restoration of Catholicism. The Church might well fear everything from this man, and hope for everything.

His first statements were words of concord and peace. Said he: "No longer are we to have Jacobins or moderates or royalists, but everywhere Frenchmen." Some of his acts seemed to justify these words: the law of hostages was repealed, the graduated import duties were abolished. But the measures of religious pacification, which the Church hoped for, encountered obstacles in the first consul's entourage. The permission to return to France was at first granted only to such members of the clergy as had taken the constitutional oath or had given up their clerical status. The first consul even reproved the priests who in the pulpit too enthusiastically greeted the coming of the reparation regime.[28] His measures of clemency were prompted probably too much by political considerations. Little

[26] On these plans, see Albert Sorel, *op. cit.*, V, 430–45.

[27] See Vandal, *L'avènement de Bonaparte*, pp. 268–403; Albert Sorel, *op. cit.*, V, 475–89.

[28] Pisani, IV, 18.

by little, however, the 3,000 priests that the revolutionary laws had forced to exile themselves were able to return to France and, provisionally put under the surveillance of police authorities, they were able to have their names removed from the list of *émigrés*. The bishops were not able to profit from this measure until two years later. In short, the new regime aroused some mistrust, but at the same time also some hopes.

The Conclave

The eyes of all Catholics turned anxiously toward Italy, where preparations were being made for the election of the next pope. In accord with a provision of Pius VI's will, the cardinals were allowed to meet in conclave wherever they should be found in the largest number. Emperor Francis II, through his minister Thugut, offered the cardinals the city of Venice for the purpose. Thirty-five cardinals [29] went there and (November 30, 1799) met in the Benedictine abbey of St. George. Consalvi, the future cardinal, was appointed secretary of the august gathering. In his *Mémoires* he has left us a vivid account of this conclave.[30]

Emperor Francis II of Austria, in taking under his protection the assembly that was going to give a pope to the Church, may have wished to make reparation for the troubles his father Leopold II and his uncle Joseph II had caused the papacy. Did he dream of taking over in the Church the old traditions of the Holy Empire? Soon his aim became evident: especially to have a candidate of his choice elected, or at least to prevent at any price the choice of a rival who might put an obstacle in the way of his policy.

[29] The total number of cardinals was forty-six. Of these, eleven, scattered in different parts of Europe, were unable to come to Venice.

[30] Consalvi, *Mémoires*, I, 199–291. The details given by Consalvi are confirmed and supplemented by the scholarly work of Father Van Duerm, *Un peu plus de lumière sur le conclave de Venise*, 1896. Cf. the bitter and exaggerated account by Maury, *Mémoires*, I, 183–375.

From the outset the preference of most of the cardinals centered on Cardinal Bellisomi, bishop of Cesena. But Cardinal Herzan, the representative of Austria, was instructed to maintain energetically the candidacy of Cardinal Mattei, archbishop of Ferrara. As legate of the Holy See, Mattei had signed the Treaty of Tolentino, which granted Austria the possession of the three legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna. Hardly would anyone suppose that, once elected pope, he would think of destroying what he had agreed to as Cardinal. Besides, Vienna knew the gentle, affable, and conciliatory character of Cardinal Mattei and hoped to exercise a political influence over him.[31] For almost two months Cardinal Bellisomi day after day had twenty-two votes, and Cardinal Mattei continued to have the thirteen votes of his followers without any of them seeming disposed to shift his vote to the majority.

Then Consalvi began to show that political character, a mixture of sound logic, coaxing shrewdness, and outspoken flattery, which won for him the esteem and confidence of diplomats of the time.[32] He let the factions wear themselves out. A few bolder spirits, impatient to conclude the affair, proposed the candidacy of the learned Cardinal Gerdil, held in high regard for his works of philosophy and scholarship no less than for his virtues. But Gerdil was born in Savoy, and Savoy had just been annexed to France. Austria took alarm. At once Cardinal Herzan uttered the exclusive[33] against Gerdil. The court of Vienna was thus using up its power, for the exclusive could

[31] An incident, known to the court of Vienna, showed the character of Cardinal Mattei. When Bonaparte, upon entering Ferrara in 1796, learned that the archbishop of that city had introduced the papal troops, he was enraged, ordered Mattei to his headquarters at Brescia, and declared: "Do you know, Archbishop, that I could have you shot?" "You are the master," answered the Cardinal. "All I ask is a quarter hour to prepare myself." To this Napoleon replied: "Such is not the question. How quick you are!" Mattei's words gave rise to the saying, that the Archbishop of Ferrara was better able to die well than to govern well.

[32] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Pie VII,* I, 84.

[33] On the origin and nature of the exclusive, see Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* VI, 443.

be given only once. Herzan, on the other hand, had the imprudence to ask his colleagues for a delay of eleven or twelve days, saying that such delay was needed for sending a messenger to his sovereign and receiving a reply.

The move seemed offensive enough in the actual circumstances. Consalvi in his *Mémoires* says that it furnished grounds for a fear that a pretext would be established to revive the old abuse of petitioning the permission of Caesar before installing a new pope. This was the moment chosen by the clever secretary of the conclave to act with promptness and decision, guided solely by solicitude for the interests of the Church and the papacy. He turned to Cardinal Maury, whose word exercised a real influence over the Sacred College. Consalvi and Maury, appealing to the spirit of independence which must be safeguarded against outside interference, soon detached from the two parties a number of cardinals, jealous to affirm the freedom of their vote.

Election of Pius VII

Thus was again formed the "flying squadron," which in former elections exercised a preponderant and decisive part. The flying squadron was soon master of the ground and, under Consalvi's inspiration, chose for candidate the bishop of Imola, Cardinal Barnabas Chiaramonti. Until then his name was not even mentioned in the conclave. Chiaramonti had been the most beloved helper of the late pope; he was but fifty-eight years old, as was his predecessor at the time of his election, and tradition was against the raising of such a young man to the supreme pontificate. As Consalvi said, these conditions at first seemed to constitute "extrinsic obstacles" in the way of electing the Bishop of Imola. However, everyone appreciated his personal qualities. The cardinals at the funeral of Pius VI said to one another, when they mentioned Chiaramonti: "What a pity

that this conclave is the one that must choose a successor of Pius VI! If we but had a pope between the two, in three days we would name the new one, and this is the one."

A great gentleness of character, an unsurpassed purity of morals, a constant prudence in conducting his two dioceses of Tivoli and Imola, successively entrusted to his care, recommended the person of the holy prelate to universal esteem. The whole tactics of Consalvi and Maury consisted in demolishing what the far-sighted secretary called "the extrinsic obstacles." Their combined efforts succeeded. On March 14, 1800, Barnabas Chiaramonti was elected pope and, in memory of his venerated predecessor, took the name of Pius VII.

Life of Pius VII

The new pontiff, born at Cesena in the legation of Forli on August 14, 1742, came of an illustrious family and received an education worthy of his rank. His father, Count Scipio Chiaramonti, was a man of intellectual worth. "His mother, daughter of Marchese Ghini, was indeed a lady of singular excellence, renowned in the world for every religious quality. After having completed the education of her children, when the future pontiff had reached the age of twenty-one, in 1763, she entered a convent of Carmelites at Fano, where her memory is still cherished, and where she died in 1771, at the age of sixty." [34] From his early years he who would exercise over the episcopate the greatest act of authority recorded in the history of the papacy, he who would defend the Church against the enterprises of the mightiest of potentates, showed a gentle, amiable, and peace-loving character, These traits led to his being spoken of in the biblical words describing Moses: "He

[34] Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 23. Wiseman also relates that at Rome people used to say that the persistent opposition of the son, when he was raised to the supreme pontificate, was the only thing that prevented a solemn recognition, by beatification, of the extraordinary holiness of his mother.

was a man exceeding meek above all men that dwelt upon earth" (Num. 12:3).

At the age of sixteen, upon finishing his education in the college of nobles, he made a decision that surprised no one who knew him intimately: he became a novice in the Benedictine abbey of Santa Maria del Monte, near Cesena, his native city. Twenty-four years of monastic life fully trained in detachment from the world the future prisoner of Savona and Fontainebleau. There also he developed that strength, often a trait of amiable characters, which can endure without complaint and act without discouragement. Well versed in sacred and profane sciences, he was successively professor in the colleges which his order had at Parma and Rome, then in the monastery of St. Callistus, where he taught canon law. In 1782 Pius VI entrusted to him the government of the diocese of Tivoli, and three years later with that of the diocese of Imola; that same year the Pope created him cardinal. In these two posts Chiaramonti had occasion to show that gentleness and application to study were not his only virtues. Pacca wrote: "Having attentively studied his character, and well knowing his disposition, I can affirm that Pius VII was a man by no means deficient in talent, nor of a weak, pusilanimous nature; he was conspicuous for his firm resolution and the liveliness of his mind. He possessed that description of good sense that in matters of business intuitively perceives the difficulties to be overcome and sees everything in its proper light." [35]

When the legations were invaded by the French armies (February, 1797), the cardinal-bishop of Imola was not willing to present himself before the conquering general, but he did not withdraw from his diocese, as did the bishop of Ancona, Cardinal Banuzzi. This conduct was noted by Bonaparte, who was displeased with the flight of the Bishop of Ancona. To the people of the country who brought him the keys of Ancona, he

[35] Cf. Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

said: "The Bishop of Imola, who is also a cardinal, did not flee. As I passed there, I did not see him, but he is at his post." [36]

The Bishop of Imola promptly showed that his attitude did not imply any systematic opposition to the new political forms that were being implanted in Italy, but simply reprobated any attack on the Church and against right. In a Christmas sermon (December 25, 1797), soon made public with his name, he said: "The democratic form of government is not at all repugnant to the Gospel. On the contrary, it requires all the lofty virtues that are learned only at the school of Jesus Christ. May virtue, vivified by the natural lights and strengthened by the teaching of the Gospel, be the solid foundation of our democracy." He concluded by saying: "Be Christians, and you will be excellent democrats." [37]

Pius VII and Bonaparte

This sermon would be severely criticized in Italy and France. It was received with restrictions by more than one historian. At least the pope who had thus spoken would not refuse to accept a government, whatever it might be, that would consent to treat with him on the basis of respect for the rights of the Church. The first consul, for his part, felt disposed to enter into negotiations with him whose intrepid courage and peaceful spirit he had experienced. Pius VII and Bonaparte were ready to negotiate together, between the French government and the Church, the concordat which all France was waiting for and the whole Christian world would welcome in its good results.

[36] Count d'Haussonville, *L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire,* I, 27.

[37] For the text of this sermon, see *ibid.,* I, 355–71. Cf. Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, chap. 4, and Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* Bk. 90.

CHAPTER VIII

The French Concordat of 1801

First Acts of Pius VII

MANY of the great popes, in their first encyclical, have outlined the program of their pontificate. In 1775, Pius VI, who was destined for a quarter of a century to defend the Catholic Church ceaselessly against the various attacks of the revolutionary spirit, had, with wonderful clearness, announced the two major dangers of his time: "the corruption of morals, language, and life," which was preparing the fall of the old regime, and the venturesome rashness of the philosophers who, "proclaiming that man is born free and has no need of submitting to anyone," prefaced all the utopias of the Revolution. In 1800, Pius VII, whose task during the course of twenty-five years would be to labor with rare loftiness of mind in concert with the rulers, at a work of religious restoration, declared the basic conditions of that restoration. He said:

> The decrees of kings and the military forces of the generals have been able to re-establish order, so deeply disturbed; but if the poison of bad doctrines is not removed and if it is allowed to develop, I declare to you with alarm, venerable brethren, that this poison will spread over the whole world and then neither armies nor militias nor fortifications nor munitions of war nor the armaments of mighty empires will be able to safeguard us from it. The Church with her holy laws, the virtues and piety that emanate from her, is the true remedy for the terrible poison. . . . Princes and heads of states should, then, understand that nothing can in a greater degree contribute to the welfare and glory of the nations than to let the Church live according to her own laws in the freedom of her divine constitution. Let them recall

the words of our wise predecessor, St. Zeno: "A ruler can do nothing more profitable for his own interests than to bow before the authority instituted by God, whenever the cause of God is involved." [1]

At the very time when the Sovereign Pontiff was speaking thus, the attitude of the princes and the various peoples toward him was of a sort to offer him serious hopes. The Emperor of Austria, disappointed in his designs, at first showed his dissatisfaction by refusing to allow the new pontiff to be crowned in the church of St. Mark;[2] but finally he accepted the accomplished fact with good grace and sent envoys to greet the Pope. Pius VII likewise received the homage of the representatives of Sardinia, Naples, and Spain. The emperor of Russia, Paul I, delegated a special envoy to the Pope. The Holy Father at his entry into Rome (July 3, 1800), was hailed with demonstrations of universal joy.

The first acts of his government increased his prestige. The appointment of Cardinal Consalvi to the post of Secretary of State was a guaranty of a prudently progressive administration. The finances were reorganized; the shipment of grain was freed from taxation; many abuses were abolished. To wipe out the debt of 5,000,000 francs which weighed on the state following the sad events of the recent years, the new Pope gave the example of a strict economy in the management of his household. His aim was to take up again, as soon as possible, the tremendous projects of Pius VI for the relief of commerce and industry. The Roman states (unfortunately minus Beneventum and Pontecorvo, which remained in the hands of the king of Naples and the three legations which Austria still held) witnessed a rebirth of peace and relative tranquillity. But Napoleon's intervention presently upset the order of things in Italy.

At the very time when Pius VII's first encyclical appeared

[1] Encyclical of May 15, 1800, in Barberi, *Bullarium*, XI, 24.

[2] Van Duerm, *Un peu plus de lumiere sur le conclave de Venise*, p. 264.

(May, 1800), the first consul, amid difficulties of all sorts, was accomplishing that famous passage of the Alps which deserves to be counted as one of his most memorable undertakings. About four weeks later, after a series of battles, the daring general routed the army of Mélas at Marengo. In less than a month Austria lost all she had taken a year to conquer, and her army withdrew behind the line of the Mincio.

But Bonaparte amid his triumphs declared that, conformably to the unanimous wish of the peoples, he himself aspired only to establish a solid peace in the world. On the morrow of his election to the office of first consul, he wrote to the King of England: "Sire, will the war, which for ten years has ravaged the four quarters of the world, be everlasting? Surely we must feel that peace is the first of needs as it is the first of glories." A letter conveying the same sentiments was sent to the Emperor of Austria. Diplomatic negotiations had succeeded in separating from the European coalition the Emperor of Russia and the King of Spain; an army of 25,000 men held Portugal in submission, and the operations of Kleber in Egypt and of Moreau in Bavaria had, according to the assurances of the first consul, no other purpose but to impose, by terror, peace upon the belligerents.

That peace, which he desired to give Europe, Bonaparte wished also to establish about him. The cessation of wars was not enough for him; he dreamed of a final pacification of minds. To rally the republicans to him he relied on the presence of Carnot and Fouché in his ministry; on the presence of Talleyrand he counted to win royalists. Said he to his brother Joseph: "What revolutionary will fail to have confidence in an order of things where Fouché will be minister? What nobleman will not hope to find a means of livelihood under the former bishop of Autun? The one guards my left, the other my right."

But this arrangement did not yet solve the problem. Neither the pacification of the nations nor that of the parties could give the results which the first consul expected in the religious

pacification. Bonaparte's deep political understanding had glimpsed this truth in 1797; he was still more impressed with it in 1800. He was convinced that nothing would be accomplished so long as the government of the French Republic had not concluded an agreement with the head of the Catholic Church.

But, after certain words and certain deeds which the Catholics could not erase from their memories, he needed to give them some pledges. On June 5, when about to leave Milan to give combat to Mélas, General Bonaparte assembled the clergy of the city and addressed these maturely weighed words to them.

I have desired to see you all gathered here that I might have the satisfaction of making known to you the sentiments that animate me with regard to the Catholic, apostolic, and Roman Church. . . . Being now in the enjoyment of full power, I have decided to put in motion all the means that I judge most suitable to assure and guarantee that religion. The modern philosophers have striven to persuade France that the Catholic religion was the implacable foe of every democratic system and of all republican government. . . . I, too, am a philosopher, and I know that in any society no man can pass for virtuous and just if he does not know whence he comes and whither he is bound. Mere reason cannot give us certainty about that. Without religion we are always walking in darkness; and the Catholic religion alone gives man certain and infallible lights on his origin and his last end. A society without religion is like a ship without a compass. . . . Let not the way the late Pope was treated inspire you with any fear. . . . When I shall be able to confer with the new Pope, I hope to have the happiness of removing all the obstacles that might still rise up to hinder the full reconciliation of France with the head of the Church.[3]

This address was printed[4] and spread in large quantity; the reverberations of it were immense and such as Napoleon had desired for it. The victory of Marengo did not divert him from

[3] *Correspondance de Napoléon 1er*, VI, 339–41.

[4] Notably in the *Annales philosophiques, morales et littéraires* (1800), II, 246, and in the *Etrennes religieuses* published by Father Courbon.

his project. On the contrary, by augmenting his prestige that brilliant success enabled him to be more daring. On June 18 he decided to assist at the solemn *Te Deum* in the Milan cathedral, and to the two other consuls he sent the following proud dispatch: "Today, in spite of what the Paris atheists may say of it, I am going in full pomp to assist at the *Te Deum* which will be sung in the metropolitan church of Milan."

In most minds such steps effaced the sad impression left by Napoleon at the time of his first Italian campaign. The way was now prepared for a negotiation. The first consul took a further step. Among the priests gathered about him at Milan, he noticed a venerable old man, a pious and simple soul, Cardinal Martiniana, bishop of Verceil. On this man he turned his eyes to open the preliminaries with the Sovereign Pontiff. On his way to Paris, he stopped for a few hours at Verceil and took the aged bishop aside,[5] saying to him:

I wish religion in France. The intruders of the first and the second order are a mass of disgraceful bandits, whom I wish to shake loose from me. Some of the old bishops receive no consideration in their dioceses, where they almost never reside; several have emigrated merely to conspire. The question of their resignation will be taken up with them. Moreover, the dioceses are too numerous. I wish to make a clean slate of the Gallican Church.[6] I desire a new clergy. If the Pope will be reasonable, if he grasps the present situation, we will be able, the two of us together, to reconcile France with the Church. Go to Rome and tell the Holy Father that the first consul wishes to make him a present of 30,000,000 French Catholics.[7]

[5] Letter of Cardinal Martiniana to Pius VII, quoted by Cardinal Mathieu (*Le concordat de 1801,* p. 3). The letter was published for the first time in full by Father Rinieri, S.J., in his *La diplomatie pontificale au XIX^e siècle, le concordat entre Pie VII et le premier consul* (Verdier translation, pp. 16–18).

[6] *Vuol far caso vergine della chiesa gallicana,* wrote Martiniana. Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 4.

[7] On this conversation of General Bonaparte with Cardinal Martiniana, see the Cardinal's letter to Pius VII in Mathieu, *Le concordat de 1801,* pp. 3–5, and Maury, *Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires,* I, 461.

The good, trustful soul of the pious cardinal saw in these words nothing more than the announcement of a new era of peace and holy prosperity for the Church. Incapable of perceiving in the General's authoritarian and dictatorial tone the threatening forecast of the future strifes,[8] he wrote to the Pope that, "once the idea of the first consul is accepted, everything will be easily arranged," and he begged His Holiness to authorize him to continue his dealings with "the illustrious and most distinguished principal." [9]

Roman Distrust

The proposals of "the illustrious and most distinguished principal," even when read with the benevolent interpretation of the Bishop of Verceil, inspired at the Roman court merely an admiration mingled with much reserve. Was not this Bonaparte the one who imposed the Treaty of Tolentino, so disastrous for the Holy See? Today he calls himself a good Catholic; but are we not told that only recently in Egypt he declared himself a Moslem?

This distrust was but too well justified. Of course we cannot easily weigh, in the souls of men, the allowance for generous ideas and for personal calculation. "Such a judgment belongs to a tribunal more infallible than that of history." [10] But what we know about Pius VII and about Bonaparte enable us, even at this juncture, to formulate a hypothesis that will receive a striking confirmation in the subsequent story of this period. Under similar formulas of pacification and conciliation we can readily see profound differences in the tendencies of the Pope and of the first consul. When even at Imola the future

[8] "His intentions are as pure as his mind is circumscribed," commented Ghislieri, the representative of Austria at Rome. Maury, speaking more crudely, says of him: "He has no head." Mathieu, p. 10.

[9] Mathieu, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[10] D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, I, 67.

Pius VII loyally accepted the democratic government of the legations, he was guided entirely by the thought of the salvation of souls.[11] When, with a sincerity that we have no right to question, General Bonaparte proclaimed the benefits of the Catholic religion, his correspondence and his confidences prove that he was already thinking of the empire and the coronation. Says the Count d'Haussonville: "Read through the pages of his correspondence. You will there discover on every page a ceaseless preoccupation: somewhere to strike a blow not less resounding than the one he has just delivered; the trophies of Marengo have, in his eyes, their whole value only if they mark the route that would lead to the empire." [12] Already anyone could foresee that every time some opposition arose, in the sequence of events, between the rights of absolute justice and Bonaparte's ambition, serious conflicts would have to be feared between the head of the Church and the first magistrate of the French government.

This fundamental divergence would be the chief source of the difficulties that arose in the sequel between Pius VII and Bonaparte. Other difficulties sprang up in their train.

The most intransigeant of the *émigrés* had their center in Rome. At the conclave they even tried to have their own candidate. On August 12, 1798, the Count of Provence, who, after the death of the dauphin, took the title of Louis XVIII, wrote to Cardinal Maury: "I should like the future head of the Church to be a man of mature age, whose hard trials have given splendor to his courage, whose eloquence should be known to all Europe. All that is lacking to this portrait is your name. You, therefore, are the one I desire to see raised to the papal

[11] Recalling an earlier incident in the life of Pius VII, Cardinal Wiseman, speaking of him, notes: "The same courage in meeting an enemy face to face, and the same bold adhesion to duty, will be found blended with the same condescension and readiness to avoid useless resistance and fruitless collision" (*Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 101).

[12] *D'Haussonville, op. cit.*, I, 66.

throne." [13] Such a candidacy had no chance of succeeding, and the idea was given up. But the ambitious Maury, officially representing King Louis XVIII at the papal court, kept the prince acquainted with all the political and religious affairs. This unreliable man, who ten years later would grievously afflict the Pope by his exaggerated imperialism, moved heaven and earth to thwart, between Pius VII and the first consul, any accord that would consolidate the new regime to the detriment of the rights of the traditional royalty. Bishop Nicolai of Bézier had exactly the same view of the situation. "My system," he said, "is that without legitimate royalty, no Catholicity in France; likewise, without Catholicity, no royalty." [14]

In Bonaparte's entourage, from an entirely different point of view, the opposition was not less keen with regard to any understanding with Rome. The *Decade philosophique,* the organ of the members of the Institute, published bitter articles against the Pope and the clergy. The *Ami des lois* wrote: "You will see that the priests are going to resume their grasping and ambitious views. . . . Some have carried their impudence to the point of hoping that they will induce the consuls to go to Mass." [15] By Fouché the antireligious spirit entered the ranks of the police, who multiplied the investigations of the "refractory" priests and pointed to their so-called intrigues. In

[13] Maury, *op. cit.,* I, 188.

[14] Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du Concordat,* I, 75. This quarrel over the projects of a concordat was an appendage to a more general quarrel, stirred up in regard to the promise of "fidelity to the Constitution," which a decree of December 28, 1799, required of the priests. Maury, with the unreflecting enthusiasm of his eager imagination, hurled himself into the strife, giving forth with assurance that such an oath, opposed to the inalienable rights of the king of France, was reproved in a high place, presenting himself as interpreter of the cardinalitial congregations, taking to task Archbishop de Juigné of Paris for his lack of energy, accusing that prelate with being "intoxicated with Presbyterianism and democracy." Maury, *op. cit.,* II, 94. Father Emery wrote: "To think like that is to imagine that we can restore the old government; this is to deceive ourselves and sacrifice religion to illusions." Letter of January 31, 1800, to Father de Romeuf. Cf. L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* I, 280–87.

[15] *Amis des lois,* January 3, 1800.

the words of one report: "Priests are actively going about to re-establish the fanaticism." In another police report we read: "Emboldened by indulgence, they redouble their efforts to destroy the most sacred institutions." [16] "The old religion," wrote Fouché himself in a circular to the prefects, "is taking up again the sway it had before the Revolution. The government places no obstacle in their way, but their intolerance is added to their domination and to their desire to destroy all the republican institutions." [17] Other reproaches seemed to reflect on the first consul himself, for the words allegedly being spoken by the priests, the minister of police regarded as injurious to the government; but they were the very words pronounced by the first consul at Milan. Said Fouché: "The priests are spreading the word that the government feels the need of a religion, that no civilized state exists which has not its religion, that in France we cannot have any other religion but the Catholic religion, and that the government is convinced of this truth, being persuaded that order and internal peace will be re-established only by the aid of religion." [18]

But neither Pius VII nor Bonaparte was ready to retreat before such opposition. Bonaparte had trust in his own strength and, as he said, in "his star." Pius VII, "as soon as he was elected, offered himself to God as an expiatory victim to obtain the end of the revolutionary strife and the return of France to the practice of religion." [19] In all these threats the Pope saw simply the occasion to realize his generous offering.

[16] According to the national archives; quoted by Pisani, *L'église de Paris pendant la Révolution,* IV, 26.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 42.

[18] Circular of 20 Thermidor, national archives, A F IV, 1329. Quoted by Pisani, IV, 44. See *ibid.,* pp. 45–47, for the various police measures taken with regard to a teaching prospectus of the College of Navarre, in which we read a denunciation of "the antirevolutionary intrigues" of some "retrograde teachers." This prospectus is quoted by Aulard, *Paris sous le Concordat,* I, 506.

[19] Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 9.

By a letter dated September 13, 1800, the Pope informed the French bishops about the opening of the preliminary negotiations with the first consul. Supposing that the negotiations would take place in Italy, he had sent to Verceil, to be at Martiniana's side, Spina, the archbishop of Corinth, a devout and enlightened prelate, personally known to General Bonaparte and highly esteemed by him.[20]

Louis XVIII

On both sides the expected opposition broke loose. On September 8, at the first rumors of a possible conference between the Pope and the first consul, Louis XVIII wrote to the Emperor of Russia, Paul I, the following letter:

> Dear brother and cousin, never perhaps has the cause of the French monarchy run a greater danger than at this moment; never also have I turned to Your Imperial Majesty with more confidence. To spare your time, I shall not enlarge on the proceedings of Bonaparte regarding the Pope, on the consequences it may have, and on the remedies I have tried to apply. But, imploring your support, I beg you to give the Holy Father, by your powerful intervention, the strength to resist the insidious proposals of the hypocritical usurper. I am certain of the effect that a step by Your Imperial Majesty would produce on the mind of the Pope, and I hope that Your Imperial Majesty is assured of the deep gratitude which you will arouse or rather will redouble in me.[21]

Paul I did not lend himself to a proceeding that he judged vain. Toward the end of September, Cardinal Maury, by the hand of his brother and vicar general, Father Maury, presented to the Pope a note in which were found ably set forth all the difficulties and objections that the enemies of any accord were

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 10.
[21] Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801*, p. 17.

opposing to the initiative of the first consul and to the favorable consideration by the Pope.[22] A month later (October 30, 1800) Louis XVIII addressed the following letter to Bishop de la Fare of Nancy, who was his representative at Vienna: "Bonaparte's proposals seem not such as can be accepted by the Holy Father; but if His Holiness has that weakness, the King counts on the firmness of the majority of the bishops of his realm not to submit to laws that the Pope himself, and *a fortiori* an illegitimate government, has not the right to impose on it." [23]

The schism of the Little Church can be seen in germ in these last lines; but they are to be explained from a purely political point of view. Bonaparte, by contributing to the re-establishment of worship, would by a single stroke win the gratitude of the mass of Catholics and would thus deprive the royalist party of its best supports.

This opposition of the royalists was sure to prompt the first consul to hasten the conclusion of an accord with the Pope. But Bonaparte would encounter from the Pope difficulties no less grave. None of the learned men and lawyers that Bonaparte liked to have about him, and none of his companions in arms, approved of the idea of restoring Catholicism. To surmount these obstacles the first consul was obliged to call upon all the prodigious resources of his facile mind. His tactics varied according to the nature of the resistances. At times his method was brutal. One annalist well situated to know the small incidents of that policy, tells us: "Bonaparte discussed the matter with Volney, having told him that he intended to re-establish the worship and to pay salaries to the clergy. Thereupon Volney was outspoken in criticism of this plan and alleged that enough would be done if they re-established freedom of worship and left to each one the care and burden of main-

[22] This long *Note sur les conférences de Verceil* was published for the first time in full by Ricard, *Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires inédits du Cardinal Maury*, I, 461–79.

[23] Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du Concordat*, I, 105.

taining it and of paying the ministers of whatever religion he professed." "But," said Bonaparte, "France asks me to be responsible for both." To this remark, Volney replied, perhaps with that arrogance which was usual to him: "Very well, if France asked you for the Bourbons, would you give these to France?" At these words, Bonaparte, not restraining his temper any longer and giving free rein to one of those outbursts not rare with him, knocked Volney down with a kick in the stomach; then, ringing for an attendant, he cooly ordered that Volney be taken to his carriage.[24]

The most terrible opponents were not those of Volney's stripe. Other counsellors of the first consul, that they might block the negotiations, proceeded to organize a clever and cunning work; a system of deceits and intrigues hard to thwart. In the very first rank of these evil counsellors was the former bishop of Autun, who was at this time called citizen Talleyrand. After he had inaugurated the constitutional schism, "he discarded the new Church as readily as he had the old," [25] and, having returned to the lay state, he was united in matrimony to a divorced, Protestant English woman, Mrs. Gand.[26] On July 15, 1797, he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs. Reappointed to these same functions after a short interruption, he was officially commissioned in 1800 to treat with Rome. Talleyrand was careful to avoid clashing head-on with the first consul; and at bottom, the re-establishment of the old religion was in accord with his own mind inasmuch as he hoped to obtain an honorable place in the new organization; but as soon as he saw that such a place would be refused him, he strove continually, if not to oppose the enterprise openly, "at least to

[24] Besnard, *Souvenirs d'un nonagénaire,* II, 197. Besnard, a defrocked priest, was a special friend of Volney. The recollections concerning the old regime and the Revolution, says Cardinal Mathieu, "are one of the most interesting books that have been written about this period." Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 84.

[25] Mathieu, *op. cit.,* p. 35.

[26] Mrs. Gand, English by her husband's nationality, was French by birth. See *Correspondant,* CCXX, 659.

lack zeal for it, to stir up incidents, and to slow the proceedings by placing obstacles in the way of the relations of the Roman court with his principals." [27] Then, when he judged that the moment had come, he gently insinuated to Napoleon that the latter's first move had perhaps not been good; before the mind of the man whose dominant instincts he knew, he evoked the pope of Canossa and the adversary of Philip the Fair. From then on, he never neglected an occasion to hinder the negotiations, to increase the obstacles, to arouse misunderstandings, and to spread snares of all sorts. Said Caselli, one of Pius VII's representatives: "We have many enemies, of whom the most implacable and most powerful is the Bishop of Autun." [28] As Cobentzel wrote to the Emperor of Austria, "in general Talleyrand has always shown the greatest ill will for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in France." [29]

Back of Talleyrand, another priest of quite different manner, Grégoire, that unreformed revolutionary who recited his Breviary and defied the atheists, that obstinate champion of a Christianity more moral than that of Talleyrand, but perhaps more hostile to the authority of Rome, put to work all his dealings to influence the first consul in the direction of abandoning any project of agreement with the Pope, and utilized all the resources of his theological and canonical knowledge to point

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[28] Letter of June 1, 1801, published *ibid.*, p. 37.

[29] Dispatch of June 10, 1801 (*ibid.*, p. 36). The facts mentioned above, many of which will be explicitly recalled in subsequent pages of this volume, did not prevent Talleyrand from writing in his *Mémoires,* when speaking of the Concordat: "This great reconciliation with the Church, to which I powerfully contributed . . ." (Talleyrand, *Mémoires,* I, 284). If we were to take the history of the negotiations in its aggregate, we could not affirm more clearly the contrary of the truth. Yet we would not be exact in declaring, as certain historians have done, that Talleyrand employed a systematic one-sided attitude to hinder the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. While he was able to hope for a preponderant part, he desired it. Bernard de Lacombe has proved this view by decisive documents, emanating from the most irrefutable participants or witnesses. Cf. B. de Lacombe, "Le mariage de Talleyrand," in the *Correspondant,* August 25 and September 10, 1905 (CCXX, 658, 853).

out the dangers of a re-establishment of Roman Catholicism in France.[30]

Bonaparte did not see his way to rid himself of these diverse influences, some of which corresponded with his own inmost sentiments. Evidences of this fact we shall see presently. But the re-establishment of Catholic worship in France was too closely bound up with the general plan of his policy and with the goal of his ambition for him to entertain the thought of abandoning the undertaking. He advanced firmly along the path he had marked out for himself.

Papal Envoys to Paris

On September 4, 1800, Bonaparte had his minister of foreign affairs, Talleyrand, write the following letter, addressed to Cardinal Martiniana. "The first consul . . . has the greatest satisfaction in seeing that the Holy Father's sentiments of concord agree with his own. He thinks he should await the arrival of Monsignor Spina at Verceil before giving me the order to reply in his name. He directs me to send you the passports necessary for this prelate's coming to Paris."

These last words utterly disconcerted the papal legates and the Holy Father himself, who were counting on having the negotiations carried on in Italy. But Bonaparte, who probably feared to have the eyes of Europe as well as those of his entourage perceive his initiative in this affair, had perhaps also hoped to exercise at Paris a more direct influence on the Italian diplomats. By one of those sudden decisions not unusual with him, he himself, without any prearrangement with the Pope, decided this serious question of the place for the negotiations. The Pope considered that he ought not raise a protest against this demand, which, moreover, accidentally procured an ad-

[30] See Mathieu, p. 44, the summary of the memorial addressed by Grégoire to the first consul in August, 1800.

vantage for him. Monsignor Spina perceived that the good Cardinal Martiniana, in his desire to please the first consul, had already made excessive concessions to him, and from these Bonaparte subsequently never ceased to take advantage.[31] The transfer of the negotiations to Paris enabled Pius VII more easily to withdraw the excessively frank diplomat from the affair, in spite of his most urgent offers of service.

The Holy Father sent with Monsignor Spina a Servite priest, Father Caselli, well known for his theological skill. The two papal envoys reached Paris on November 5, 1800,[32] and took up a modest lodging in a small furnished house, the Hôtel de Rome, on rue Saint-Dominique.

The Pope and his legates were quite aware of the difficulties of the situation. To carry on the negotiations at Paris was not only to assume the attitude of a somewhat humiliating initiative, but it was also to give the appearance of accepting the French government at the very moment when certain venerable men, such as Father Emery and Father de Boulogne, by the simple fact of their promise of fidelity to the Constitution, were the objects of the bitterest recriminations on the part of some ardent Catholics. The situation might seem to imply that the papal envoys were discussing, on a footing of equality, almost of inferiority, with the apostate or rebellious clerics who were in Bonaparte's entourage: Talleyrand, Sieyès, Fouché,[33] perhaps Grégoire, the most fanatical if not the most irreligious of all, who was charged with having presented the project of the meeting. Apparently Grégoire had an effective hand in prepar-

[31] Later on, to the objections of the Roman diplomats, Bonaparte replied: "You are going back on your word: Martiniana told me that was agreed to." Cardinal Consalvi wrote on January 11, 1801: "No one would believe the prejudice which Cardinal Martiniana has caused for the negotiation in the little he had to do with it."

[32] *Annales catholiques,* VI, 384.

[33] Fouché was not in holy orders, but had put on the cassock and filled the functions of professor in several colleges of the Oratory, including that of Juilly.

ing a project; but the first consul no doubt feared that the thought of treating with the head of the schismatics would make the Holy Father hold back; Bonaparte therefore declined the offers of the Bishop of Loir-et-Cher.

To obviate these grave disadvantages as far as possible, Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State, enjoined on Spina to avoid with utmost care whatever might give a diplomatic character to his mission. He was to consider himself and present himself merely as an envoy commissioned to hear the proposals that would be made and transmit them to the Pope, without being authorized to solve anything whatever.[34] At the outset of the negotiations the first demand to be made by Spina will be for the abolition of the promise of fidelity to the government. In other words, the able Secretary of State, the better to protect himself from the eventual complaints of the party that had Maury for its violent interpreter, insisted on noting the difference between an act of submission to persons not implying adherence to any principle, and the acceptance of laws which might amount to an acceptance of the principles.[35]

Spina and his companion were scrupulously exact in following this line of conduct. Retiring to their modest apartment, they closed the door to all, even to Father Emery, who tried in vain to reach them.[36] They saw only one diplomat, Musquiz, the Spanish ambassador, who was the only one representing at Paris any great Catholic power that was at peace with France. With regard to the men and affairs of Paris and of the consulship, Musquiz gave them indications of their complete lack of such information as would enable them to avoid proceeding as blind men and to avoid irritating or producing friction with those they needed to convince and win.

[34] Instructions of October 13, 1800, published by Boulay de la Meurthe, III, 597–637.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery.* II, 41.

Spina and Bernier

The superior of St. Sulpice echoed the feelings of part of the Paris clergy, discreetly grieving at so mysterious a procedure. He said: "I fear the arrangements without anyone being consulted." [37] The future would show that the tactics ordered by Consalvi were the safest.[38]

On November 8, 1800, the Archbishop of Corinth saw enter his room at the Hôtel de Rome a little, thickset, squint-eyed man with features far from handsome, whose intelligent and sharp eyes, however, and clear speech, logical and earnest, had a winning quality. He presented himself in the name of the first consul, who had commissioned him to confer with the papal envoy on the pending questions.

The man thus chosen by Bonaparte was a priest [39] of blameless doctrine but one whose political life, until then greatly agitated, gave rise to quite divergent judgments of him. This man was Father Bernier, formerly pastor of Angers. Over the revolting peasants of the Vendée he exercised an almost incredible influence. He had actually taken part in the combats and entered into the councils of the Vendean leaders, at first dominating them; after strifes and intrigues in which his part had appeared suspect, he became embroiled with the principal generals of the Catholic army. At the close of 1799, after 18 Brumaire, at the very time when everyone was desiring peace, he had gone to General d'Hédouville of the republican army and abruptly said to him: "Let our peasants have their pastors, and I will undertake to withdraw them from the King." Better than anyone else he was acquainted with the rural population

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[38] "I have no fear," wrote Cardinal Mathieu, "in pointing out to the young men connected with the Quai d'Orsay, Consalvi's instructions to Spina as a model for study and a masterpiece of honest and prudent diplomacy." A summary of these instructions will be found in Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801*, pp. 60–71.

[39] At this period, the priests, apart from their ecclesiastical functions, generally dressed as laymen. Even Spina was obliged to follow this practice.

of Anjou and the Vendée and knew well how to manage them. He fulfilled his promise. To bend the most faithful partisans of the old monarchy, he spread the rumor that Bonaparte was a secret friend of the Bourbons and would soon bring them back into power. This deception was but one of the countless perfidies for which his enemies reproached him. After the conclusion of the peace, Bernier settled at Paris. As throughout most of his life, he there filled an enigmatic role. He received numerous Chouans, who came to consult him about the conduct they ought to follow, and he was received familiarly by the first consul, who recognized in him a force that he would make an instrument of his schemes when the suitable moment arrived.

That moment had come. Kept acquainted with Bonaparte's intentions, Bernier, at this first interview, broached the chief conditions set down by the first consul, especially the full renewal of the episcopate.

The next day Bonaparte received Spina at Malmaison and "spoke most respectfully of the Holy Father." [40] The papal envoy wrote to the Cardinal Secretary of State that he was satisfied with this beginning.[41]

The conferences between Spina and Bernier continued without serious incident, at least apparently, until the end of 1800, either in the little chamber of the Archbishop of Corinth at the Hôtel de Rome or in the modest apartment occupied by Bernier on the third floor of the Hôtel d'Orléans, rue des Petits-Augustins.[42] On December 21, the Gazette de France published the following note: "Announcement is made of a coming peace between the Republic and the Holy See." Father Emery wrote: "I continue to believe that we are approaching a solution." [43]

[40] Letter from Spina to Consalvi (November 12, 1800), quoted by Boulay de la Meurthe, I, 23.

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] The rue des Petits-Augustins is the part of the present rue Bonaparte between the Quai and the rue Jacob.

[43] Boulay de la Meurthe, I, 169.

The negotiations were not so far advanced as was imagined by those on the outside. Spina, conforming to the prudent instruction of Cardinal Consalvi, listened to Bernier's different proposals: general resignation of the bishops, legalization of all the confiscations of Church property, the first consul's right to nominate the new bishops. The representative of the Holy See made a few amendments to the first point,[44] and to the second merely offered some objections of principle; but, with regard to Bonaparte's claim to name the new bishops, he had clear instructions from the Secretary of State, and urged them strongly. "The first consul wished to inherit the right of episcopal nominations which the kings of France had possessed. But did he, like them, make public profession of the Catholic religion? Did he recognize it as the religion of the state? If not, he should be satisfied with the regime established in England, Prussia, and Russia for the ecclesiastical benefices. Those who wished to profit by the inheritance from the Bourbons, should at least accept the burdens of it."

First Proposals

The Archbishop of Corinth sent a faithful report of all these incidents to Consalvi. On the advice of the latter, in opposition to a first concordat project put forth by Bernier on November 26, he presented a counterproposal, which he communicated to Consalvi in the middle of December. To this proposal the French government replied by a second project, which, not being agreed to, gave way to a third, then to a fourth, and finally to a fifth, entirely written in Bonaparte's own hand. This last project was submitted to Spina on February 2, 1801.

But at that moment a new incident arose. Along with Bonaparte's chief claim, on which clearly he would not yield, namely, the right to appoint the bishops, was expressed another claim,

[44] For the system proposed by Spina, see Pisani, IV, 112.

equally unacceptable, of the minister of foreign affairs, Talleyrand. This former bishop of Autun had entered into a union with an English divorcée, Mrs. Gand, and plainly intended to marry her civilly and religiously. But Talleyrand did not wish a concordat that would not recognize the legality of that union. The first consul, desiring to satisfy his minister, pretended, according to his custom, to settle the question with a single stroke. In the fifth project, presented on February 2, he himself had drawn up an article in these words: "The ecclesiastics who have, since their consecration, entered into bonds of matrimony or who, by other acts, have notoriously renounced the ecclesiastical state, will enter the class of simple citizens and will, like these, be admitted to lay communion." [45] Spina made clear that the words "or who, by other acts, have notoriously renounced the ecclesiastical state" would never be accepted at Rome. On February 23 he wrote to Rome: "I do not know whether Talleyrand wishes to be included in this provision. But I have made known that neither a bishop nor anyone who is bound by solemn vows can enjoy the apostolic indulgence." [46]

The two capital difficulties had been broached. How would they be solved? Neither Pius VII nor Bonaparte wished to abandon the project of a concordat. The Roman court sought to gain time. Pius VII had organized at Rome, along with the recent congregation of extraordinary affairs, a small congregation made up of four cardinals whose office was to study the questions arising at Paris. To obviate any surprise, Consalvi repeated that Spina was merely a *missus ad audiendum et referendum,* in other words, that he was to listen to everything, discuss everything, observe everything, but conclude nothing and to refer everything to Rome. "Bonaparte," says Albert Lorel, "saw through the game and procrastinated on his side."

[45] Boulay de la Meurthe, I, 353.
[46] *Ibid.,* II, 63.

His temperament led him to make abrupt decisions and *coups d'état;* but he knew how to await the occasion.

Diplomatic Activities

That occasion was not slow in coming. The peace of Luneville (February 9, 1901), by settling the abasement of the house of Austria, gave the first consul a new prestige. To this he wished to add a title and the pope's recognition: he gave up the idea of the Roman Republic and returned to the Holy See its states such as they were in 1797, that is, diminished only by the loss of Romagna and the Legations. Then he proceeded to act with vigor.

Bonaparte was well aware that his fifth concordat project was examined at Rome by the two cardinalitial congregations. Summoning Spina, he gave him a prompt reply and, to hasten the solution, sent to Rome a cleverly chosen extraordinary agent. This man was François de Cacault, a Breton whose qualities of decision and whose abilities the first consul appreciated at the treaty of Tolentino. His sincere and solid religious faith had already made him appreciated at Rome. From the political angle he called himself "a reformed revolutionary." He held the modern ideas with the distinguished manners of a man of the ancient regime.

Cacault, reaching Rome on April 8, was well received by the Secretary of State, who communicated to him the results of the labors by the Roman Congregations. After lengthy discussions, the cardinals decided to go to the extreme limit of concessions. The Holy See would grant the first consul the right to name the bishops, who would then receive canonical institution by the Holy See; the Pope dispensed from the obligation of restitution those who had acquired ecclesiastical property. He also agreed, in concert with the government, to establish new boundaries of the French dioceses; but he re-

quired: (1) that the laws contrary to the dogmas and discipline of the Church should be abrogated, and (2) that the Catholic religion should be recognized as that of the great majority of French citizens.[47] With this project, Pius VII sent a long letter, written by his own hand, in which, with gentle and firm language, he gave the first consul the reasons why he could not sacrifice certain fundamental articles. "You will understand," he said, "that what would be re-established in France would not be the Catholic religion but a different religion if we were to sanction by our concessions any of the maxims that we must reprove." [48] On the question especially concerning priests who were married during the Revolution, the Pope explained his stand with a fatherly kindness: "As to the absolution of the married priests, and as to the absolution of those who may have withdrawn from the Church in other ways, we will provide by issuing the powers necessary so that they may be absolved according to the regulations and ecclesiastical discipline, assuring you that we consider our duty is to show them the effects of every fatherly condescension as far as it can be extended." [49]

All these labors of discussion and revision had lasted to the 12th of May. This is the date of the papal letter. On the next day a special messenger was on the way with it to Paris, where he arrived on May 23. But this messenger of peace passed on the way a messenger from Bonaparte, bearing a tempest with him.

The first consul's patience was exhausted. About him the foes of the concordat were spreading evil reports. As the delay increased, secret motives were looked for: that Rome was intriguing with Austria, England, or Russia, and trying to gain

[47] See the complete text in Mathieu, pp. 145–48.

[48] The text of this letter was published for the first time by Cardinal Mathieu, *op. cit.*, pp. 150–53.

[49] Bernard de Lacombe, "Le mariage de Talleyrand," in *Le Correspondant,* August 25, 1905, p. 677.

time that she might shake loose from France.[50] Grégoire insinuated his habitual suggestions on "the bad faith of the Roman court." Talleyrand, taking umbrage at Rome's refusal of the clause relative to his future marriage, urged the first consul to act with energy. On May 19, 1801, Bonaparte sent to Rome an ultimatum which may be summed up in these terms: "If, within five days, the Pope has not accepted the first consul's project, all further relations will be broken off. Cacault was to leave Rome and withdraw to Florence." [51] The ultimatum reached the Holy Father on May 29. At the same time the Pope received letters from Spina, informing him that the first consul, now incensed, threatened to make his decision without regarding the Church, charged Conslavi with treason, and spoke of invading the States of the Church and of becoming a Protestant.

The situation was critical. The Roman commission of extraordinary affairs met and declared the proposal of the first consul unacceptable. This would be the rupture with the direst consequences.

A courageous and clever inspiration of Cacault saved the situation. The French negotiator [52] had brought with him as secretary an intelligent young man, Artaud, the future historian of Pius VII, who relates the incident in his touching pages.

> This able minister requested me to visit him and, after I read the letter, he said to me: "I must obey my government; but a government must have at its head one who understands the negotiations, and ministers who advise him well, and that all this be understood. . . . We all know that the head of the state wishes a concordat; he has wished it for a long time past; for that very purpose he sent me here and he has given me as aide the very one I would desire. . . . Neither of us

[50] Pisani, IV, 131.

[51] Boulay de la Meurthe, II, 419–22; Mathieu, p. 179.

[52] Cacault did not receive the official title of minister of France until after the signing of the concordat.

is a bad Christian. I have indeed seen what you have been up to the present; as for myself, I am a reformed revolutionary. . . . On the other hand, I like Bonaparte, I like the general. . . . But you know that, even though liking him very much, I call him under my breath 'the little tiger,' to describe his figure, his tenacity, his agility. . . . Well then, the little tiger has made a mistake, one that can be repaired. But I have need of everyone. . . . If you help me, you will perhaps be enough, the two of us will be enough, for no one ever corrects with impunity those who govern."

I replied to the minister that I keenly desired to see a concordat concluded, and that in all things I would follow in his steps. . . . He went at once to Cardinal Consalvi, read to him the formidable dispatch without suppressing a single word. Then he added: "Some misunderstandings are present. The first consul does not know you. Go to Paris." "When?" asked the Cardinal. "Tomorrow," I answered. "You will please him, you will understand each other; he will see what is a cardinal, a man of acuteness; you will make the concordat with him." [53]

Cacault had judged aright. Only one man was competent to overcome the formidable difficulty. That man was the eminent Secretary of State, who had, till then, so prudently directed the negotiations from a distance: he was a polished gentleman, conciliatory, cultured, whose charm Bonaparte appreciated; he was the irreproachable ecclesiastic, whose lofty dignity made an impression on everybody in the most critical moments. The expedient suggested by Cacault seemed to the Pope and to the cardinals, who were all consulted, the only remaining chance of avoiding the rupture with France and all the ills that would ensue.[54] Cacault withdrew to Florence, and Consalvi set out for Paris, while the representative of France notified Talleyrand of the coming arrival of the Cardinal Secretary of State in the French capital.

[53] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Pie VII* (3rd ed., 1839), I, 108. This account, written soon after the events, has been confirmed as authentic and exact by Cacault. *Ibid.*, p. 108 note.

[54] Mathieu, p. 191.

Consalvi and Bonaparte

Consalvi reached Paris June 20 and took up lodging in the Hôtel de Rome with Spina and Caselli. The next day Bonaparte summoned him to an interview to take place the day following. Consalvi's *Mémoires* gives us a striking picture of this audience, in which everything was calculated by the first consul to overawe, fascinate, and disconcert the Cardinal and to wring from him a reply favorable to the wishes of the French government.

> At the appointed hour I arrived at the Tuileries. . . . I was brought into a reception room on the ground floor. There I remained alone, without anything to look at about me except a deep solitude. A few moments later, the master of ceremonies pointed to a little door. As I passed through this I experienced the same surprise as a person feels in a theater at the sudden change of scene, when from a cottage or a prison the scene changes to the dazzling sight of a magnificent court.

The day was, in fact, one of state pomp at the Tuileries. Consalvi describes the grandiose picture that struck his eye: the troops lined up on the stairs and in the halls, paying him military honors as he passed. Others present were the gentlemen and dignitaries of the palace, the generals in full uniform, the members of the Tribunate, of the Senate, and of the legislative body; then, surrounded by the ministers of state and other high officials in festive attire, the first consul in full dress. Bonaparte, profiting by the supposed amazement of the Cardinal, came up to him, majestic and courteous, haughty and cheerful. Protesting his veneration for the Pope, he repeated against the court of Rome the most injurious accusations and finally announced the presentation of a last project. He said: "I wish absolutely that you sign it within five days."

The Cardinal, at first disconcerted, had time to gain his self-control. He himself relates in his *Mémoires:* "By a special

grace of heaven, and nowise by my own merit, I replied to each point what I might say without stirring up dissension and without letting any complaint against Rome go without a suitable justifying reply." [55] At a nod from the first consul the audience was ended, and Consalvi departed, divided between hope and fear.

At bottom the impression produced by Consalvi had been good. Bonaparte, who always esteemed, even among those who opposed him, self-possession, courage, and intelligence, recognized these qualites in the Secretary of State. On June 25 Consalvi wrote: "The government is heaping attentions on me. Yesterday the first consul invited me to dinner, at which he showed me all possible courtesy." The cause of the Holy See was half won.

On June 27 the Cardinal received the famous project already announced. But this project, the seventh,[56] did not take into account the observations already made. Out-and-out Consalvi refused to sign it; calling to his aid Spina and Caselli, during the following night he drew up a counterproject, accompanied by a long memorial, which at an early hour the next morning he sent to Bernier.

Talleyrand had left Paris for the waters of Bourbon-l'Archambault. Had Bonaparte, remembering that Pius VII had expressed to him the desire of not seeing at the bottom of the concordat the signature of a bishop who had broken away from the Church, removed his minister from the scene for the time being? Or did the latter, seeing that his attempt had failed, withdraw of his own accord? The fact is that, with the departure of Talleyrand, the largest of the difficulties seemed to be ironed out. Consalvi made known to the first consul that the question of the marriage of the apostate priests was in the

[55] Consalvi, *Mémoires*, I, 328.

[56] A sixth project (April 17) was proposed to Spina but was dropped because of the incidents related above.

category of disciplinary matters and that the Church had as great interest as did the state in bringing peace to these unfortunates.[57]

Bonaparte no longer spoke of his ultimatum. The five days' delay had run out. A single major difficulty remained: the question of the consuls' profession of the Catholic faith, which the Pope presented as a condition for the right of nominating bishops. An eighth project, presented by Bernier, passed over this point in silence. But (July 12) each side had the impression that the end was near; a decree of the consuls fixed the morrow for the signing of the treaty. In place of the minister of foreign affairs, who was absent from Paris, it would be signed by the first consul's brother, Joseph Bonaparte, and by the Counsellor of State, Crétet. On the day following, Bonaparte would solemnly promulgate it.

But on the 13th, upon glancing over the text that he was invited to sign, Consalvi was startled. Talleyrand, whose friends kept him informed of the proceedings, had his tool, the apostate priest Hauterive, insert an article permitting the marriage of the priests who had abandoned the Church during the Revolution. Other modifications also had been introduced into the project. The Cardinal refused to affix his signature to the document. A long discussion ensued between the plenipotentiaries, which lasted without interruption from eight o'clock of the evening of July 14 until four o'clock the next afternoon. Said Consalvi: "We took merely a bite of breakfast in the morning, for which we had little fancy." The clause about the marriage of priests was removed.[58] Finally the discussion boiled

[57] Boulay de la Meurthe, III, 162; VI, 76.

[58] After the signing of the Concordat, Talleyrand returned to his charge, increased his earnest requests to obtain from the Pope the permission to marry. All he obtained was a brief (June 29, 1802) which lifted the excommunication imposed on him and granted him lay Communion. But he did not receive the permission to marry. The first consul, however, interpreted the brief in his own way: a consular decree, inserted in the *Bulletin des lois*. declared that it gave full effect to the papal

down to two points: Would the Catholic religion be declared the religion of France; would the police regulation of public worship be in the hands of the state? Mutual concessions were made. These provided that the Catholic religion would be declared the religion of the majority of Frenchmen, and that the police regulation of worship would be in the hands of the state, but only for what concerned public peace and security. In short, agreement was reached. Then, through scrupulous concern, Joseph wished, before signing the final text, to communicate it to his brother. He went to the Tuileries. There he found the first consul exasperated by these delays. Seeing that new modifications had been made, Bonaparte, violently tearing the paper in pieces, threw them into the fire. Once again, everything seemed to be lost.

By Consalvi's self-control all was saved. The first consul had ordered for the 14th of July a national festivity, and a magnificent dinner with 250 places was prepared. At the banquet he expected to announce the great news. Upon Consalvi's arrival, he exploded, in the presence of his guests, in one of those outbursts in which no one could say whether they were calculated or spontaneous. He delivered invectives against the Pope, the cardinals, the Roman policy, even indulging in gross and brutal insult. The calmness of the Cardinal, who more than once restrained on his lips a ready and irritating reply, disarmed Bonaparte, and cooled his anger. The text of the last accord, of which a second copy had fortunately been made, was then placed before his eyes, and seemed to him not so

---

brief, putting the minister of foreign affairs in the secular and lay state, leaving the impression that he had the right to marry. Consequently (September 10, 1802) Talleyrand married Mrs. Gand at the town hall of the tenth arrondissement of Paris. Was this civil union followed by a nuptial blessing at Epinay? Some, without positive proof, have held that it was. At any rate, the religious marriage would have been vitiated by radical nullity. On this subject, see Bernard de Lacombe, "Le mariage de Talleyrand," in the *Correspondant* for August 25 and September 10, 1905.

inadmissible as its first reading had made it appear. Yet he proposed some changes and authorized a final conference for the next day.

Not until eleven o'clock the next evening, after engaging in a long and minute examination of each word, did the plenipotentiaries reach an accord. Joseph Bonaparte had little liking for the task of going again to his brother and running into a fresh outburst of wrath. At two o'clock in the morning a happy event made him decide. Word was brought to him that he was a father for the third time. The plenipotentiaries acclaimed the happy news, and Joseph, taking courage, undertook the office of announcing to the first consul the birth of his nephew and the signing of the Concordat. Bonaparte, without objection, gave his final ratification. A new era would now open for the Church of France. A renewal was prepared for the whole Church.

The New Concordat

The treaty signed by the plenipotentiaries of the Holy See and those of the French government did not realize the ideal of the relations that ought to exist between the Church and the state. What human institution has ever done so? But it established a *modus vivendi* acceptable in the given circumstances. Unlike the concordat of 1516, that of 1801 was, in form as well as in substance, a reciprocal contract, concluded between the spiritual power and the temporal power. By the approval of the pope and of the first consul, it would become the law of the Church and the law of the state. The text contained a preamble and seventeen articles.

By the preamble "the government of the Republic recognized that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is that of the great majority of the French people" and particularly "that of the consuls." The seventeen articles regulated in a general way the condition of ecclesiastical persons, the status of the

Church property, and the role of the state with regard to the Church. The bishops will henceforth be appointed in accordance with a new arrangement of diocesan boundaries, established by the Holy See in agreement with the government (article 2); the pastors in a new arrangement of parish boundaries, made by the bishop and approved by the government (article 9). The bishops will be named by the government and instituted by the pope "following the forms established in France before the change of government" (article 4).

"His Holiness declares that neither he nor his successors will in any way trouble those who have acquired Church property" (article 13); the government "will assure a suitable revenue for the bishops and the pastors (article 14) and will guarantee to the Catholics the freedom to make foundations in favor of their churches" (article 15).

"The first consul will enjoy with the Holy See the same rights and prerogatives as those enjoyed by the former government" (article 16); but, in the event that one of his successors should not be a Catholic, these rights and prerogatives will be regulated by a new agreement (article 17).

By virtue of a transient arrangement, the pope must ask the former bishops for their resignations and, in case they refuse, he must proceed to the appointment of new bishops (article 3).

In their general lines such were the dispositions of this diplomatic convention, one of the most important to be met with in the history of the Church. From one point of view it seemed to ratify the political results of the French Revolution, since "the papacy recognized in the first consul of the French Republic the same rights and prerogatives as were enjoyed by the former government," namely, the rights and prerogatives of that traditional monarchy whose kings had all been consecrated by the Church; and, in this first respect, the Church would arouse among some royalists defiances hard to overcome. But, in the other respect, the papacy emerged from the crisis greater

than ever. The Revolution had begun by pretending to regulate at its own pleasure the discipline of the Church; brought to a stand as in an impasse, it had been obliged to recognize that it could do nothing without the pope; and for the pope it recognized a heretofore unheard-of right, or at least a right which no pontiff had previously made use of: that of removing by his own lawful authority all the bishops of France, for the purpose of re-establishing religious peace. The consequences of this act would be far-reaching, extending over the entire world. As Taine says, "an indestructible precedent was set up." [59] In the structure the corner stone was recognized to be the papacy. Since the French concordat of 1801, more than thirty concordats have been concluded between the Holy See and the different states, not only of the Old World, but also of the New, and everywhere they have the same character; wherever the revolutionary spirit, after upsetting the traditional organisms, would necessitate an ecclesiastical reorganization, it has opened paths to a more direct and unremitting action of the papacy on the reconstituted Christianities. "In this way," concludes Taine, "all the great existing churches of the Catholic universe are the work of the Pope, his latest work, his own creation attested by a positive act of contiguous date. . . . None of them can assert or even believe itself legitimate without declaring the superior authority to be legitimate which has just endowed it with life and being." [60] The Terror had made the Church more clearly aware of its faith and piety; the Concordat established its ancient hierarchy on more solid foundations.[61]

Ratification of the Concordat

The agreement, signed at Paris on July 15, 1801, by the plenipotentiaries, had to be ratified by the pope and the first

[59] Taine, *The Modern Regime,* II, 48.

[60] Taine, *op. cit.,* II, 50.

[61] For the text of the Concordat, see pp. 562–74.

consul within forty days. Pius VII's signature was put to it on August 15, that of Bonaparte on September 8, and the official exchange of ratifications took place on September 10. On August 27 the Pope designated to represent him at Paris as his legate *a latere* Cardinal Caprara, who had already, under Pius VI, filled the posts of nuncio at Lucerne and Vienna. There he had ably defended the Holy See against the undertakings of Kaunitz and Joseph II. But the mission entrusted to him by Pius VII presented a different sort of difficulty. Charged with watching over the execution of the Concordat, he would have to contend at the same time with the formalism of Portalis, the slippery politics of Talleyrand, and the calculated violence of Bonaparte. At no time could he count on Bernier's support, which was timid and not altogether sure.

Traps were set for him on all sides. Caprara could not avoid all of them. On March 30, 1802, Portalis, taking advantage of a moment of weariness and emotion in which the nuncio was placed after a long discussion with the first consul, read to him a regulation that would later be published under the title of "the organic articles." Caprara, not having the text before his eyes, listened but, as he declared in a letter, he did not grasp the exact import of the document, yet he did request that some changes be made in it. He was promised that these modifications would be made. Without further formality, on April 5, Portalis presented to the Chambers, as constituting something indivisible, the concordat followed by the organic articles.[62] The legislative body, on April 8, by 228 votes against 21, passed the new law, which, not having been attacked in the ten days in the Senate as unconstitutional, became (April 18, 1802) a law of the Republic.

Early Easter morning (April 18) the great bell of Notre Dame, which had been silent for ten years, began to ring. At the hour for High Mass, the consuls in red dress, the ministers and the ambassadors in uniform, and the general officers in

[62] Boulay de La Meurthe, V, 276–79, 297–391, 407.

full dress uniform, entered the cathedral, where the new archbishop of Tours, Archbishop de Boisgelin, preached a special sermon for the occasion. The solemnity closed with the chanting of the *Te Deum*. The popular emotion ran high. We are told that in the streets people wept and embraced one another and that one resident of the Ile Saint-Louis fell dead through his overwhelming impression of joy.[63]

This joy extended to all of France. Most of the churches had already been reopened, but until then many of them were shared with the constitutionals; in these places Catholic worship was celebrated with timidity and apprehension, almost in hiding.[64] On the morrow of the Notre Dame solemnity the public worship resumed its ancient splendor. Again processions passed along the streets and in the public squares; again were to be seen the grand liturgical celebrations and the spontaneous manifestations of piety. The seminaries opened once more,[65] the chapters were again organized, the vestry boards were again established, foundations in favor of churches increased, priests no longer were afraid to appear in public in ecclesiastical dress,[66] hospices, prisons, and lyceums received chaplains. In an allocution delivered on May 24, 1802, the Supreme Pontiff

[63] Pisani, *Le clergé de Paris et la Révolution,* IV, 286.

[64] L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* I, 292–98.

[65] The first consul (October 6, 1802) returned to its former use the seminary of St. Sulpice, at that time occupied by women of ill repute, who, on his orders, were then brought to Bicêtre (*Correspondance de Napoléon 1er,* VIII, 79). In 1800, profiting by the relative calm then prevailing, Father Emery had grouped together, under the direction of his confrere, Father Duclaux, a few young seminarians in a house on rue Saint-Jacques. Wearing lay dress, the seminarians took their recreations by walks along the neighboring boulevards. Dogma was taught by Father Frayssinous, moral by Father Fournier (future bishop of Montpellier), and canon law and history by Father Emery, who, more suspect than the others, did not lodge in the house with the others but on rue d'Enfer and came from there for his classes. At the beginning of 1801 the number of students was thirty; among them were two future bishops (Quelen and Feutrier) and a brilliant young man who became the founder of Stanislas College, Father Liautard.

[66] In 1801 the priests, without yet venturing to resume the cassock at Paris, had begun to wear a large black cloak. Lanzac de Laborie, *op. cit.,* p. 296.

gave expression to the universal joy when he said: "What a new spectacle France presents to the whole world at this moment! The temples of the Host High are again open, the sheep are again restored to their lawful shepherds, the sacraments of the Church are again publicly administered, the standard of the cross is again unfurled, and the supreme head of the Church is solemnly recognized: such are the immense blessings for which we must rejoice in the Lord." [67] Consequently the Pope invited the Catholics of France to celebrate a jubilee of thanksgiving.

The Organic Articles

This joy was not unmixed, and this triumph was traversed by many a trial. The organic articles, which the first consul had rapidly communicated to Caprara in a sort of surprise ambush, were in some aspects the very negation of the concordat agreement.

Says a certain French jurist:

> We should not confuse, as was sometimes formerly done, these organic articles of the year X with the concordat itself, although they were part of the same law of the state. The concordat, agreed to between the two powers, is a law both of the Church and of the state. The organic articles, the work exclusively of the French government, were never submitted to the pope or approved by him. Bonaparte presented them as a law intended to regulate the details of the concordat and to assure its execution. In reality he sought, in a roundabout fashion, to go back on certain compromises that he had been obliged to make in his first projects. Taking his inspiration from principles formulated in the Gallican Declaration of 1682, he endeavored to re-establish to his own advantage over the new Church of France the rights which the absolute kings had formerly arrogated to themselves with regard to the Church. He used this procedure as a means of holding the clergy in his hand, in the hope of making them serve his interests.

In the promulgation of the organic articles, Bonaparte pretended to

[67] Barberi, *Bullarium,* XI, 335–39.

be exercising the police right which the concordat recognized with regard to public worship. He was not unaware that he was exceeding these rights. The concordat had, in fact, after long and minute negotiations, restrained this right of police to the cases in which the public tranquillity would be involved. But the organic articles started by repeating: 1. the old Gallican rules relative to the verification of the acts of the Holy See and of the decrees of synods held in other countries, "even those of general councils," which must be submitted to the *placet* (articles 1 and 2); 2. the bishops were forbidden to meet in council or synod in France without the authorization of the government (article 4), or to leave their dioceses, even for the purpose of going to Rome, without an express permission (article 20); 3. the old appeal as from an abuse, under the form of recourse to the Council of State (article 6). All these measures had been, in the course of the negotiations, the object of sharp opposition on the part of the papal envoys.

The organic articles then proceeded to take up questions with regard to discipline, to doctrine, and even to dogma, that is, questions purely spiritual, which are outside the competence of the civil power, and with regard to which several articles were in contradiction to the canons and even to the concordat which they were supposed to apply. Such were the following: article 10, which abolished "every privilege carrying exemption from episcopal jurisdiction"; article 11, which subordinated to the authorization of the government the establishment of chapters and seminaries that the concordat authorized; articles 13, 14, 15, which determined the pastoral duties of the archbishops and bishops; article 24, imposing on seminary professors the obligation "of subscribing to the Declaration of 1682 and of teaching the doctrine therein contained"; article 29, which prescribed the adoption in France of a single catechism and a single liturgy; article 26, which, contrary to the canons, fixed the age and the conditions required for the ordination of priests. To justify the organic articles, Portalis said: "They did not introduce a new right and were but a new sanction of the old maxims of the Gallican Church." This fact was precisely what condemned them.

The organic articles were the source of further quarrels with the Holy See. In consistory (May 24, 1802) the Pope vehemently pro-

tested against the duplicity of the first consul. He then charged Caprara to protest to Talleyrand against these articles, "that His Holiness had not been invited to examine and that essentially involved the customs, discipline, rights, instruction, and jurisdiction of the Church." To Caprara's long letter (August 18, 1803) Portalis replied (September 22) by a still longer plea, in which he tried to justify Bonaparte. Another note from Cardinal Caprara, addressed to Talleyrand on the subject of Napoleon's coronation, showed to the latter that the Pope persisted in distinguishing between the concordat, which he had accepted, and "the so-called organic laws, in which several articles could not accord with the principles and maxims of the Church." This time (July 18, 1804) Talleyrand replied: "The concordat is the result of the will of the two contracting parties. The organic laws, on the contrary, are merely the manner of extension adopted by one of these two powers. The manner is susceptible of change and improvement, according to circumstances. No one can therefore, without injustice, confound the one with the other in the same expressions." Cardinal Consalvi, in the name of the Pope, made note of Talleyrand's declaration by which "the seventeen articles of the concordat agreed upon with the Holy See are utterly separate from the organic laws, to which they were attached in the decree of 18 Germinal of the year X," and which His Holiness hopes "to have His Imperial Majesty change and improve." [68] The Pope's hope was not well founded. He was able to obtain nothing from Napoleon and could do nothing more than repeat his most vigorous protests, notably in his bull *Quam memorandam* of June 10, 1809.[69]

Religious Situation

In the negotiations of the concordat, Pius VII had the consolation of seeing the great mass of his bishops, priests, and

[68] Letter of August 28, 1804.

[69] Emile Chénon, professor in the law faculty of the University of Paris, in the *Histoire générale* of Lavisse and Rambaud (IX, 263–66). Cf. Gaudry, *Traité de la législation des cultes,* 1854; *Ami de la religion* (August 1, 1854); Dudon, "La réponse de Portalis à la note du cardinal Caprara sur les articles organiques," in the *Revue historique de droit,* 1907 (XXI), 269–309.

faithful take their stand around his sovereign authority. The abjurations of the constitutional priests were made in great number. From the documents published by Taine, we are led to suppose that the number of the faithful who remained attached to the Church of the oath did not, in 1801, exceed a tenth of the population; in other words, out of a population of 35,000,000 of Frenchmen and of 30,000,000 Catholics, 27,000,000 remained united to the pope.[70] The constitutionals who still followed the directions of Grégoire were perhaps more ardent than ever. They had begun by making a desperate opposition to the concordat; then soon, seeing the uselessness of their efforts, they accepted the treaty; but they did so in the hope of turning it to their profit. In fact, we see their activity, their cleverness, and especially their almost unbelievable tenacity, permit them to keep a part of their positions and obtain, if not all the honors of war, at least an advantageous capitulation.[71]

Bonaparte never had a taste for the constitutional Church; he called it "a comedy played by some ideologists and schemers." Nevertheless, while he was negotiating the concordat, whether because he was feeling his way or because he wished to intimidate the Pope, he allowed the constitutionals to meet in councils. Several provincial councils were held, notably at Rouen and Bourges in 1800. A national council opened its sessions on June 21, 1801, at the very time of Consalvi's arrival in Paris. It was presided over by Le Coz, metropolitan of Rennes, who had already been president of the conciliar assembly of 1797. The solemn sessions were held in Notre Dame. Thirty-nine departments were represented. This body, like a headquarters' staff, wished to give the impression that it had a large army behind

[70] Taine, *Les origines,* X, 47 note; reports of Barbé-Marbois on Brittany, of Français de Nantes on Vaucluse and Provence, of Lacuée on Paris and the seven neighboring departments. In some departments, as in the Vosges, the constitutionals were stronger; but in others, their Church was completely reduced to nothing. Pisani, IV, 157, 185.

[71] Pisani, IV, 154.

it. But such was not at all the fact. The holding of this pseudo-council did not deeply move public opinion. The members of the assembly were well aware of this fact. They contented themselves with protesting their obedience to the established powers, writing to the Pope to beg him "to second their efforts" toward religious peace and to express to him all their earnest desires in the undertaking of a concordat "which would put an end to the religious dissensions." They did not even attempt to carry out the vast plan of reforms which they had conceived. Even had they wished to do so, their internal discussions and an order of Fouché ordering them to dissolve (August 25), would not have given them time for it.[72] The concordat had just been ratified by the Pope: Fouché no longer felt the need of shaking before him the bugbear of a schismatic council.

But a man of Grégoire's stamp was not ready to surrender without a fight. He knew that in the government he was backed by Talleyrand, who, although laicized, always had the feelings of a father for the constitutional Church and gladly became its advocate in the council of the ministers. Talleyrand soon found occasion to act thus.

The first five concordat projects contained a more or less explicit mention of the juring priests; but the text finally adopted was silent on the subject. Moreover, when (July 24, 1801) the first consul, in a conference with Consalvi, introduced the question of the rehabilitation of the constitutional bishops, the conversation became stormy. "What are you asking of these bishops," said Bonaparte, "to reconcile them with the Church?" Consalvi answered: "A retraction, that is, the acknowledgment of their errors and acceptance of the papal briefs." "They will never retract," the consul angrily replied. "A man who retracts dishonors himself. I would be the first to despise him. I wish to name eight or nine bishops drawn from

[72] See the report of these provincial assemblies and of the national council in the *Annales de la religion.*

the constitutional clergy, but not from those who make a retraction. Arrange for their return into the Church, but do not ask from them any act contrary to honor." [73]

This attitude of the first consul was the result of Talleyrand's perfidious insinuations. The constitutionals did indeed wish to return to the Church, but to do so without bowing their heads, without abjuring anything. Bernier himself pleaded their cause. "The government," he said, "would not suffer that they should appear to abjure the results of the Revolution." [74] By the efforts of diplomacy, the Holy See succeeded in having the first consul accept the text of a brief which the Pope addressed to Spina regarding the constitutional priests. This brief, as Bernier himself avows, "was filled with a spirit of condescension and charity." But it did not have the expected success. Its import, authority, and authenticity were discussed. Then Bonaparte, who had expressed his fear of seeing the constitutional priests "dishonor themselves" by obedience to the head of the Church, did not hesitate to call on them, in the name of the state, to hand in their resignation. Portalis, after conferring with several of them, drew up the formula which almost all signed and then sent it to the Pope through Spina. They said: "We profess to the Sovereign Pontiff, lawful successor of St. Peter, obedience and submission, conformably to the canons and the holy decrees of the Church." [75] These last words offered some ambiguity, but Caprara was at pains to see each of the bishops and, by oral explanations, to give the formula an orthodox meaning.

Two constitutional bishops (Grégoire of Loir-et Cher and Moïse of the Jura) wished to give their letters of resignation some appearance of blustering manifestation. The first consul was not satisfied with these bishops and systematically removed them from the new hierarchy formed by the Concordat. He

[73] This conversation is related by Consalvi in a dispatch addressed to Cardinal Doria. Boulay de la Meurthe, III, 292.

[74] *Ibid.*, III, 313.

[75] For Caprara's letter to Consalvi, see Boulay de La Meurthe, IV, 164.

who had been the undisputed head of the constitutional Church became in retirement the center of a small group of impenitent constitutional priests. He died, himself impenitent, on April 24, 1831.

Twelve juring priests had places in the new episcopate. Two of these (Charrier de La Roche of Versailles, and Montault des Iles of Angers) humbly submitted. But the others boasted for a long time that they had nothing to retract in their past life. Those who resisted longest made their submission, more or less sincere, only in 1804, and the bulls of confirmation of their election did not arrive from Rome until June 17, 1805.[76]

Resistance of *Emigré* Bishops

The impenitent constitutionals unfortunately had occasion to note, among the most ardent of their political adversaries, acts of disobedience which they maliciously compared with their own revolt. In a letter signed by thirteen *émigré* bishops in England, we read these words:

> Most Holy Father, we are obliged to refuse to you the customary obedience. . . . The experience of the countless calamities that have been desolating our fatherland for many years makes us fear that the universal and simultaneous abandonment of all the sees will be, for the Catholic faith, only a new source of evils; and it pertains only to a general assembly of the bishops of the Gallican Church to make known to Your Holiness the surest means of avoiding these evils.[77]

Of the nineteen *émigré* bishops in England, only five submitted; the other fourteen showed themselves openly refractory. This example had lamentable consequences. At the end of November word had already come from Germany that four episcopal resignations had been made as against eleven refusals. As for the eleven bishops living in France, all of them, in terms

[76] Pisani, *L'episcopat constitutionnel,* p. 49.
[77] *Annales de la religion,* XIV, 412.

of the most filial submission, gave the resignations asked of them. To cut short the problem, Pope Pius VII employed the supreme right belonging to the papacy in such events. By his bull *Qui Christi Domini vices* (November 29, 1801),[78] he declared that the 135 bishoprics of old France, those of Belgium, and those of the left bank of the Rhine, were suppressed; consequently, whether they handed in their resignations or not, the bishops lost all jurisdiction, since the object of that jurisdiction no longer existed.[79]

The greater part of the refractory bishops finally submitted. The chief motive of their insubmission had been of a political order. Being royalists, living in the atmosphere of the *émigré* nobility and affected by its influence, they were disinclined to lend themselves to any move that might in France sanction the Republican government.[80] But their deep Catholic spirit could not allow them to persist in their refusal in the presence of the formal expression of the Pope's will. Two among them, however, never rendered their submission, but even became the centers of a resistance which they encouraged by their official injunctions and their private letters. We are referring to Bishop Jean de Coucy of La Rochelle and particularly Bishop Alexandre de Thémines of Blois, who may be regarded as the founder of the sect of the anticoncordatists, and thereafter better known under the name of "The Little Church." Alexandre de Thémines had acquired at the court, where he was chaplain of King Louis XVI, and then was bishop of Blois, to which dignity he was raised at the age of thirty-four, the reputation for ardent piety, incorruptible virtue, and a strictness in conduct which was in striking contrast to the general morals of his surroundings. In the assembly of the clergy (1788) he alone

[78] Barberi, *Bullarium*, XI, 245.

[79] The number of the new bishoprics was reduced to sixty.

[80] See especially the memorial published by these bishops on June 8 and called *Déclaration dur les droits du Roi.*

raised his voice in favor of the parlement of Paris, which was then exiled at Troyes. Under the Revolution he had energetically refused to take any of the oaths and left his post only at the last moment (February 12, 1791) under the pressure of a peremptory injunction of the municipality and a popular uprising that put his life in danger. To the last moments of his life he would protest with all his might against the concordat concluded with Bonaparte, even refusing, in 1814, to return to France in answer to the appeal of Louis XVIII, for, as the inflexible prelate said, "to bring back a bishop into his country after so many storms, a restoration of the monarchy does not suffice; the religion of our fathers must be restored in full." Bishop Thémines had, however, before his death, the happiness of being reconciled with Rome.[81]

The most compact group of the dissidents was formed in the Vendean Bocage, which belonged to the new diocese of Poitiers. Especially in Lower Poitou and the district of Lyons the name of The Little Church was given to these dissidents. Less important centers of resistance were formed in other districts. Under the various names of Clementines at Rouen, of Filochois at Tours, of Louisets at Rennes, of Enfarines at Rodez, and of Fideles in Provence, the anticoncordatists met in private oratories, refusing to participate in the ceremonies celebrated in concordatist churches or by priests who had submitted to the concordat. After Thémines' death in 1829, they no longer had any bishop at their head; in 1847 they lost their last priest. Important conversions brought about during these latter years seemed to forecast the approaching end of the sect.[82]

[81] Roussel, "Le centenaire de la Petite Eglise," in the *Correspondant,* March 10, 1903. The sect of foes of the concordat spread the rumor that Pius VII had ceded his spiritual rights in order to keep his temporal domain.

[82] On the Little Church, see Drochon, *La Petite Eglise;* Mangenot, under "Anticoncordataires" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie;* Latreille, *Après le Concordat,* 1910; Latreille, *La Petite Eglise de Lyon.*

The Significance of the Concordat

For the zeal of Pius VII, as also for the ambition of Bonaparte, the religious pacification of France was but a starting point. What each of them desired, with different points of view, was the religious pacification of the whole world. As has been rightly said, the intentions of the two contracting parties recalled the Holy Empire more than it did the old regime. Bonaparte was thinking of Charlemagne or, if you prefer, of Barbarossa and Frederick II, rather than of Louis XIV. Pius VII was pained at seeing the Catholics increasing the obstacles to his government. One day he said to Cacault: "Alas, I have real peace only in the government of the Catholics who are subjects of the infidels or of the heretics. You know all that my predecessor had to suffer from the changes carried out in Austria by the emperors Joseph and Leopold. You are witness of the assaults that are inflicted on me every day by the courts of Spain and Naples." [83] Nor did Italy spare the Pope many trials. The formation of the Cisalpine Republic had not only created Italian nationalism,[84] but it had also favored the diffusion of the revolutionary ideas in Italy. A proclamation (February 3, 1797), addressed to all the bishops by the ministers of the Republic, said to them: "Henceforth every document coming from the court of Rome will be *ipso facto* regarded as null." [85] In vain had General Bonaparte said: "We have given you liberty; know how to keep it; favor the spread of the lights and respect religion." [86] The bishops were forbidden to mention, in their pastoral letters, either the Holy See or the powers received

[83] Letter of Cacault to Talleyrand, quoted by Theiner, *Histoire des deux Concordats*, II, 25.

[84] Hazard, *La Révolution française et les lettres Italiennes;* Henry Cochin, "La Révolution française et l'Italie," in the *Correspondant* of October 25, 1911.

[85] Theiner, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

therefrom. Bonaparte's celebrated discourse at Milan (June 6, 1799) had not calmed men's minds. On November 23, 1800, the first consul wrote to Talleyrand: "You will make known to citizen Jourdan and citizen Petiet (ministers of the Cisalpine Republic) that I am pained to see efforts being made to disquiet the priests." [87] To reassure the clergy, toward the end of 1801 he insinuated to the Cisalpine government the thought of accrediting a representative to the Holy See. The man chosen was the minister of France at Rome, Cacault. Then he directed Talleyrand to assemble at Lyons, by way of extraordinary consultation, the most prominent members of the Cisalpine Republic.

From that time the religious affairs of Italy entered upon a path of appeasement. But not all the obstacles had disappeared; this improvement needed the indomitable energy of the first consul, the fine considerateness of Cacault, and the unalterable patience of Pius VII to surmount them and finally to arrive at a relative pacification.

The consultative representatives of the Cisalpine Republic met at Lyons in January, 1802. Contemporary witnesses in words of admiring praise, have described the spectacle of that great assembly, in which were to be seen 452 Italian notables, among whom were venerable prelates, "wishing to be present," as they said, "at the proclamation of the independence of their country by the hero who had brought it about." Bonaparte arrived on January 13, fixed the limits of the new state, gave it a constitution like the French constitution, and was proclaimed its first president. Two weeks later, at a most imposing session, the first consul, seated on a platform and surrounded by his family and his ministers, solemnly promulgated the new constitution. "You might have supposed you were seeing Charlemagne, assisted by the bishops, the great vassals of the empire,

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

nobles and generals, drawing up laws for the Church and the state in the assemblies of Worms or Aix-la-Chapelle." [88]

This ceremony was, in fact, a preparation for the proclamation of the empire. For the first time, the first consul was there acclaimed under the two names joined together of Napoleon Bonaparte. One of the principal acts that he sanctioned was an ecclesiastical legislation, presented under the name of "organic laws" of the clergy and destined to lay the basis of an Italian concordat. The first article of the Cisalpine constitution proclaimed "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion the religion of the state," but the organic laws decided that "the bishops would be named by the government and would be instituted by the Holy See; that the pastors would be chosen and instituted by the bishop in agreement with the government; that the limits of the dioceses would be defined anew, if need be, in concert with the Holy See; that each diocese would have its seminary with endowment; that no property possessed by the Church could be sold; and that the clergy would be dispensed from all military service.[89]

The Pope expressed his satisfaction in a letter (March 18) to the first consul and appointed Cardinal Caprara for the negotiation of a concordat. But a decree (June 23, 1802) issued by the vice-president of the Cisalpine Republic, Melzi, seemed to destroy all the hopes based on the Lyons assembly. On the pretext of determining the functions of the minister of public worship, the new decree subjected to the approval of the civil power almost all the acts of the ecclesiastical minister.[90] Pius VII sent his indignant protests to Napoleon, who, passing over the decree signed by Melzi, presented (August 4) to the Holy Father a concordat project. But a formidable opposition arose among the chiefs of the Cisalpine state. Titanic outbursts were

[88] Theiner, *op. cit.*, II, 10.
[89] For the complete text of these organic laws, see Theiner, *op. cit.*, II, 10–14.
[90] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

to be foreseen. To avoid these, Pius VII proposed to the first consul that any concordat project be renounced. The Pope said that the Church of Italy had not undergone so profound disturbances as the Church of France. Would not the situation be met sufficiently by regulating the pending difficulties through briefs? Calmer days could be awaited for starting a negotiation. The Pope's idea was wise; but Bonaparte, impatient to level the obstacles confronting him, wished to go ahead. Negotiations, in which Consalvi and Caprara took part in the name of the Pope, Bernier and Cacault in the name of the French government, were carried on amid difficulties without number, and finally led to the writing of the concordat which was signed at Paris (September 16, 1803) and ratified (November 2) by Napoleon Bonaparte, acting as president of the Italian Republic. This concordat, drawn up in the same spirit as the French concordat, was officially published at Milan on January 26, 1804. Unfortunately it was accompanied by a decree, signed by Melzi, which once again, for the pretended purpose of assuring the execution of the law, violated several most important articles of it. Decidedly the bad will of the Italian government did not recoil before any hypocrisy. Napoleon tried to calm the Pope's alarms by a letter (April 24, 1804), professing that henceforth his protection would be more effective. The first consul was thinking of the empire, of the consecration he was going to receive, and undoubtedly also of the iron crown of the kings of Italy that he was going to assume the next year. But, on the contrary, the situation grew worse than ever. The Gallican maxims would, in 1810, be declared for all Italy the laws of the empire, and the recalcitrant bishops would be imprisoned by order of the new emperor.

The Church of Spain was destined to share the lot of that of Italy. But it had passed through different phases. Up to the proclamation of the empire, the Iberian states did not have to undergo the invasion of the French armies. In Spain, the min-

ister Godoy was the ally of Bonaparte; in Portgual, the regent, from 1801 to 1803, had purchased peace with France at the price of repeated subsidies. But, to remain under a constitution of the old regime, the states of the Iberian peninsula were not exempt from a secret spirit of hostility toward Rome.

On October 9, 1801, Vargas, the Spanish minister in Rome, informed Cardinal Consalvi of several claims formulated by his sovereign, Charles IV. He required that the papal nuncio should have no jurisdiction at Madrid. In a diplomatic note, he said: "The king of Spain knows that those who in his states are ecclesiastics are nonetheless his subjects." [91] The Madrid court formulated other claims.

Attempts were made to put the regulars under the domination of the bishops and to withdraw them from the authority of their general superiors. The government strove to accredit the bishops with faculties for all matrimonial dispensations and desired to monopolize the collation of all the benefices and other considerably extended powers. The court of Madrid demanded the right to confer at will the ecclesiastical goods and even to confiscate several of these properties, to the evident prejudice of the clergy. In short, it demanded at one and the same time so many things and so important things that no one could credit these claims if they were here enumerated.[92]

By his prudent condescensions, the Cardinal was able to smooth out these difficulties. Cardinal de Bourbon was appointed visitator of all the religious orders of the realm; a concordat was concluded with Charles IV, to whom subsidies were granted in view of the war against the English.

Scarcely were the difficulties on the part of Spain settled, when Portugal stirred up new ones.

The court of Portugal published an edict that wounded the rights of the Holy See and several canon laws. The Holy Father, who was then in France, where he had gone to consecrate Napoleon, wrote

[91] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Pie VII,* I, 207.
[92] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* II, 278.

from Paris to the prince regent of Portugal; but, owing to the ruses of the Lisbon cabinet, this effort had little success. Perhaps we would have reached a favorable conciliation if the affairs of France had not then absorbed the care of the Pope and his minister.[93]

This concern for the affairs of France likewise delayed the solution of the religious affairs of Germany. Catholic Germany which, like Italy, had been invaded by the armies of the Revolution, and, more than Spain and Portugal, imbued with the anti-Roman ideas that had been propagated there by Febronius and Joseph II, was perhaps, after France, the country most deeply disturbed, the country where the need of religious peace was most deeply felt. News of the conclusion of the French concordat produced an immense sensation there.

In no country was this concordat more admired than in Germany. It revived the hopes of the Catholics. With what joy they thus saw shortened the days of their griefs and the inalienable rights restored to the Church! This concordat was greeted as a happy presage of a delivery soon. The Catholic rulers, as well as the Protestant, soon saw themselves obliged to guarantee by special concordats the rights of the Church which triumphant impiety on one hand and secular intolerance on the other had so stubbornly contested and cast under foot.[94]

These tendencies reached their full realization only after the re-establishment of the empire. Unfortunately the German princes found in Napoleon's conduct a precedent that permitted them to retain several of the ancient abuses; for Napoleon had done two things which he presented as complementary and inseparable: the concordat and the organic articles. The concordat did indeed pay homage to religion, but the organic articles were a sort of trick. The German sovereigns "traced almost servilely the lines of their ecclesiastical policy upon those of Napoleon. They demanded and obtained from Rome that a structure be

[93] *Ibid.*, II, 282.

[94] Theiner, *Histoire des deux Concordats*, I, 297.

given to their Churches; then they proceeded to regulate without restraint the detail of those structures, even though the structure itself would have to suffer thereby." [95]

Protestantism in France

The French concordat of 1801 did more than influence the organization of the national Churches in the other Catholic states; it was the starting point of a policy of Napoleon's understanding with the other religious faiths.

The Protestants were rather numerous and influential in France in the reign of Louis XVI but they became more so in the course of the Revolution, thanks to the backing brought to them by the conquests of French armies. Under the Directory, Madame de Staël went so far as to advise the public authorities to adopt Protestantism as the state religion.[96] The proposal was not judged practicable, but "most of the men in high places extended to the Reformed religion a benevolence made up of the desire to make a show of tolerance and to plague the Catholics." [97] Under the Consulate, the Council of State, in a memorial presented to the consuls (January, 1802), thus expressed their mind: "The government, while declaring that Catholicism is the religion of the majority in France, did not intend to exclude the Protestant worship from its protection. Protestantism is a Christian communion, which has a right to protection. Its founders were the first to spread in Europe liberal maxims of government." [98] We are not surprised to see the first consul present to the legislative body, at the same time as the organic articles of Catholic worship, the organic articles of Protestant worship. This organic law of April 7, 1802, is

[95] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* I, 140.

[96] See the memoir published by Paul Gautier in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (November 1, 1899).

[97] L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* I, 336.

[98] Quoted by G. de Felice, *Histoire des protestants de France,* p. 602.

divided into three titles, and regulates the situation, not of all the Protestant faiths, but of two only, that of the Reformed Churches (Calvinist), and that of the Churches of the Augsburg Confession (Lutheran). Title I contains general dispositions for all the Protestant communities. Napoleon's political considerations and a certain distrust of the Protestant cosmopolitanism are revealed in the following articles: in article 1, declaring that "no one can exercise the functions of public worship unless he is French; in article 2, enacting that neither "the Protestant Churches nor their ministers can have dealings with any foreign power or authority"; in articles 4 and 5, saying that "no doctrinal decision and no disciplinary change can take place without the authorization of the government." In return, by virtue of article 6, the pastors will receive support from the state.

Title II is concerned with the Calvinist worship and institutes for it pastors, consistories, and synods. The pastors will be elected by the consistories and will be confirmed by the government. The consistories will be composed of the pastors administering a district of 6,000 souls, and from 6 to 12 laymen. The synods will be composed of the pastors of five consistorial churches. They shall meet in accordance with the authorization of the government, to which they shall submit their decisions.

Title III concerns the Lutheran religion. Its organization is analogous to that of the Calvinist religion, but somewhat more complicated. It embraces pastors, local consistories, inspectors, and general consistories.

In short, the two Protestant religions found themselves placed, by the law of 18 Germinal, in a condition of rather strict dependence on the state. But neither the pastors nor the faithful complained. "They were less sensible of the sacrifice of part of their religious independence than of the advantages which they promised themselves from the payments by the state; for they found therein two major advantages: an undeniable legal

recognition, and the official guaranty of a perfect equality with the Roman Catholics." [99] Rabaut-Dupuy, who was president of the Legislative Body in 1802, later, in a circular addressed to the members of the Reformed Churches of the Empire, said: "You who lived under the yoke of intolerance, look and compare. No longer in the deserts will you pay homage to the Creator, your temples are restored to you, your pastors are recognized public functionaries and are paid salaries by the government." [100]

Later, many Protestants, including some of the most prominent of them, did not hide their dissatisfaction with a law that, as they said, utterly deformed the primitive organization of Calvinist Presbyterianism. Instead of a religious society existing in itself and by itself, appointing its ministers, passing judgment on differences, and deciding all doctrinal or disciplinary questions in independent conferences, the Germinal law instituted a civil society dependent in everything on the secular power, resting its existence on a power alien to the very basis of Presbyterianism. From the Protestant point of view, that was the first evil of the new organization. Its second defect was the absolute suppression of the prime element of Protestantism, the individual Church, with its consistory and its pastor, and instead founding it in a consistorial Church, made up of assembled pastors.[101] But, once again, all this unfitness passed unperceived or was regarded as largely compensated by the advantages of an official recognition of the Protestant Churches and by the assured support of their pastors. The president of the Geneva consistory became the spokesman of all the ministers and of all the Protestants by officially addressing his thanks to Napoleon.[102]

[99] G. de Felice, *op. cit.*, p. 604.

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 605.

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 607. Cf. Vinet, *Essai sur la manifestation des convictions religieuses*, p. 387; F. Puaux, *Histoire populaire des protestants français*, p. 361.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 610.

The first consul intended to regulate in a like manner the situation of the Jews. But in 1802 the memory of certain speculations engaged in by the Jews on the national possessions was still too vivid in the minds of the people. Napoleon thought that a law which would make the scattered Jews in France a more compact and more independent body, was a premature undertaking. The official organization of the Jewish religion was not regulated until six years later.

Meanwhile the Jews, who in large numbers had joined Freemasonry, found some compensation in the favor shown to that society. At a feast (April 10, 1801) which brought together more than 500 masons at the Grand Orient, Freemasonry acclaimed Bonaparte.[103] By Cambacérès and Dubois, already initiated, it had in the consular government powerful protectors. The first consul replied to the advances of the society. We have no proofs that he had been initiated; but the annals of Masonry relate, under date of September, 1802, the naming of General Murat, who was governor of Paris, as first guardian,[104] and, under date of December 18, 1803, the raising of General Massena to the rank of grand ruler.[105] The year 1804 became one of the most important dates in the history of Masonry by the merging of the Grand Orient with the general Grand Lodge. The agreement that consecrated this fusion is known by Masons under the name of the Concordat of 1804. As related by one who is almost an official historian of Masonry, "it was signed on December 3, 1804, in the house of Marshal Kellermann."[106] When the Empire was proclaimed, "Masonry," says Bazot, then secretary of the Grand Orient, "counted almost 1,200 lodges. At Paris, in the departments, in the colonies, in the reunited countries, and in the armies, the highest public officials, marshals, generals, magistrates, schol-

[103] Rebold, *Histoire des trois grandes loges de France,* 1864, p. 79.
[104] *Ibid.,* p. 89.
[105] *Ibid.,* p. 92.
[106] *Ibid.,* p. 94. Rebold's work bears the Imprimatur of the Grand Orient.

ars, commerce, industry, nearly all France in its prominent men, fraternized in Masonic fashion with the Masons who were simple citizens." [107] These enthusiastic lines undoubtedly contain an exaggeration; but what seems likely is that Bonaparte, clever in seizing to his own profit all the political and social powers, tried to make use of Freemasonry for the realization of his grand projects. The eminent historian, Frederick Schlegel, who had close relations with the leaders of the rationalist and the Jewish world, wrote: "Can we find anyone who does not know or who has forgotten with what skill the man who in these latter times ruled over the world utilized that vehicle in all the vanquished countries, and used it as an organ suited to mislead and nourish all public opinion with false hopes?" [108]

Napoleon Proclaimed Emperor

In 1804 public opinion in France and in Europe seemed ready to accept the realization of the vast ambitions of Napoleon Bonaparte. By prodigies of energy he who had surmounted the prejudices of his entourage, the opposition of the constitutional clergy, the trickery of Talleyrand (Minister of Foreign Affairs), and the intrigues of Fouché (Minister of Police), in effecting the Concordat, thought that the head of the Church would not refuse him a testimonial of gratitude for so many efforts and that Pius VII would be willing to give a consecration to the coveted high dignity, which was nothing less than to place the imperial crown on the head of Napoleon Bonaparte. But for this new title of emperor, an extraordinarily solemn consecration was needed. The coronation conferred by a French bishop in the Reims cathedral, such as had been given to the

[107] Bazot, *Code des franc-maçons*, p. 183, quoted by Gautherot under the word "Franc-Maçonnerie" in the *Dictionnaire d'apologétique*, II, 110.

[108] Schlegel, *Philosophie de l'histoire*, French tr., II, 365.

kings of the former monarchy, would not be enough. Napoleon wished a coronation at Notre Dame in Paris, in a ceremony presided over by the pope himself.

We know how, following a proposal (April 23, 1804) by the tribune Curée, the Senate proclaimed Bonaparte emperor of the French.

Officially informed by a letter of Caprara, dated May 11, 1804, that the Emperor wished to be consecrated by the pope, Pius VII fell into a great dejection.[109] The Holy Father was not unmindful that the first consul, by bringing about the religious pacification, had always sought to strengthen and increase his own power. In having himself crowned emperor by the head of the Church, one of his chief purposes was to remove the strongest supports of Louis XVIII. For the Pope to lend himself to Napoleon's plan was consequently to stir up against himself the royalist party, already decidedly aroused. Perhaps it would also be to lend himself to a new orientation of the political destinies of Europe. At the same time the Pope could easily foresee what would be the consequences of a refusal, opposed to such a man at such a moment.

Pius VII, that he might not bear alone the responsibility for the decision, assembled the Sacred College. Fifteen cardinals out of twenty declared themselves in favor of the Holy Father's journey to Paris, but with reservation of the following four conditions: a promise to reform "some organic articles that exceeded the liberties of the Gallican Church";[110] a full observance of the consecration ceremonies; refusal by the Pope to receive the constitutional bishops who have not adhered to the decisions of His Holiness regarding the ecclesiastical affairs of France; refusal by the Pope to receive Madame Talleyrand, whose marriage His Holiness would never recognize.[111] Ber-

[109] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VII,* II, 93.
[110] *Ibid.*
[111] *Ibid.,* II, 99.

nier, now bishop of Orléans, in a reply made in the name of the first consul, acknowledged "that too many of the maxims of the old parlements had been mingled with our liberties," and that "four constitutional bishops unfortunately had not observed the proprieties of their state"; that this question, as also that of the consecration ceremonial, could best be decided at Paris.[112] In a clever note, Talleyrand gave almost the same guaranties and endeavored especially to imply that the contemplated step by the Pope could not create any grave difficulty for the Holy See. He said:

> The journey of His Holiness to France can inspire in the foreign courts no sort of suspicion. France did not hesitate to recognize His Holiness, although his election took place in the states of a foreign sovereign and amid enemies that France had to fight. How would those same powers, today friends or allies of France, look with an evil eye on an event by which the common father of the faithful should honor with his presence this vast and glorious empire restored to religion? . . . His Holiness has nothing to fear from the old parties that for so long a time divided France. Scarcely will he set foot on the soil of France, when he will perceive that these parties no longer exist.[113]

On August 3, 1804,[114] Napoleon himself promised the Holy Father complete satisfaction in the matter of the execution of the Italian concordat.[115] The preliminary conferences continued for more than two months longer. Ever since the preceding year, Napoleon, in view of the negotiations that he was planning and with the purpose of facilitating a conclusion favorable to his desires, sent his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, to Rome as ambassador.

This appointment did not fail to stir up keen feeling in the papal court. They regretted the loss of Cacault, whose devoted-

[112] For Bernier's letter, see Artaud, II, 105.

[113] See this note in Artaud, II, 109–11.

[114] Here for the first time Napoleon did not make use of the Republican calendar.

[115] Artaud, II, 113.

ness to the Holy See had been evident by eminent services; and the antecedents of Napoleon's uncle were calculated to arouse well-founded misgivings. A priest before the Revolution, Joseph Fesch had, during the Terror, abandoned the priestly career. As partisan of the new ideas, he exercised the functions of commissioner of war, and returned to the Church only after the 18th Brumaire. The favor of his nephew rapidly advanced him to the office of archbishop of Lyons and to the dignity of cardinal. His life, which until then had been rather stormy and was dominated by preoccupations of temporal interest, became regular, and even austere and modest. He reached Rome on July 2, 1803, accompanied by a secretary whose name, already celebrated, would continue to grow, Viscount Chateaubriand. Cardinal Fesch's intelligence was not outstanding, but his activity was extraordinary and notably contributed to the success of the diplomatic mission entrusted to him.[116]

On October 29 the Pope again assembled the Sacred College and announced to it that, positively knowing the Emperor's firm determination to protect the Church more and more, he would, for the good of religion, undertake the long journey to Paris. Consalvi, his Secretary of State, would have full powers during his absence, to regulate the spiritual and temporal affairs.

Pius VII left Rome on November 2, crossed through Italy and France amid the heartiest testimonials of respect and affection. He was the object of particularly touching manifestations at Lyons. All heads bowed religiously to receive the blessing of the holy Pontiff, whose noble bearing, thin features, slightly bowed head, affable smile, and deep-set eyes breathed an air of religious majesty and fatherly kindness.[117]

[116] Lyonnet, *Le cardinal Fesch,* 1841; Gattet, *La verité sur le cardinal Fesch,* 1842.

[117] The *Annales religieuses* of Orleans (March 20, 1898) contains a report by an eyewitness on the occasion of Pius VII's passing through Montargis. This account contains a detailed description of the Holy Father's appearance. In reply to Fouché,

The Coronation

Everyone is acquainted with the grandiose scenes of December 2, 1804; its chief act has been popularized by David's celebrated picture. All the bells of the city and the great bell of Notre Dame pealed their mightiest; in the old cathedral, adorned with purple draperies having golden bees here and there on them, the hero advanced under a canopy, with scepter in hand, and his head crowned with the laurel of the Caesars; Napoleon swearing on the Gospel ever to render to the Church and the Roman Pontiffs the honors that are their due; Pius VII, following the traditional rite, anointing the Emperor and the Empress; then, by a sudden violation of the ceremonial, the sovereign crowning himself and Josephine with a bold gesture; the ceremony terminating by triumphal acclamations to the crowned potentate, while imperial music conducted the Pontiff back to the archiepiscopal palace as the procession repeated the *Tu es Petrus.*[118]

The impression left upon the people by this great religious solemnity was not the only beneficial result of the Pope's journey. His coming to Paris was the occasion for the renunciation of their schism by a large number of constitutional priests; Napoleon expressed his gratitude to the Pope by re-establishing and officially recognizing several Catholic institutes and establishments, such as the institute of the Lazarists and that of the Daughters of Charity, the Foreign Mission Seminary, and the seminary of the Holy Ghost. To a long memorial presented by Caprara, the Emperor replied in a note (March 11, 1805), drawn up by Talleyrand, marked by a great moderation and proclaiming important principles. As the note said, Napoleon recognized that, in the interest of religion, Pius VII should be

who asked him on his arrival how he had found France, the Pope answered: "Heaven be praised! We have passed through the midst of a people on their knees."

[118] Isabey et Fontaine, *Cérémonies et fêtes du sacre,* 1805.

respected, not simply as head of the Church, "but also as an independent monarch"; the Emperor "places in the very first rank of the deeds that have cast splendor on his life the respect he has shown for the Church of Rome." [119] But these general formulas were not accompanied by any precise engagement relative to the particular requests contained in Caprara's memorial, and more than one procedure of the Emperor left a secret bitterness in the heart of the Sovereign Pontiff when he departed from Paris, April 4, 1805.

The first of these proceedings regarded Napoleon's marriage. The day before the coronation, a visit from Josephine de Beauharnais had moved the Holy Father deeply. The official wife of the Emperor [120] confided to him that she had not been married by a priest. Pius VII received the Empress with kindness, but declared to her that, following the laws of the Church, he could not proceed to the ceremony of the consecration until the Emperor should regularize the situation. Napoleon, though angry when he learned of the step taken by Josephine and the Pope's resolution, but promptly understanding how unshakable that resolution was, yielded. Cardinal Fesch, grand chamberlain of the imperial house, being informed of the decision, asked of the Pope the necessary powers and dispensations, and obtained them all to celebrate the marriage in the abnormal conditions that presented themselves. The marriage was performed on December 1 about four o'clock in the afternoon, before Fesch, without witnesses and without the presence of the proper pastor. Napoleon, who was already thinking of a divorce, believed that the lack of these formalities would some day allow the canonical rupture of his marriage. To Fesch he remarked the absence of the witnesses, but the Cardinal disregarded the

[119] For further details, see Theiner, *Histoire des deux concordats,* II, 231–87, and Houssonville, *L'église romaine et le premier empire,* I, 319–54.

[120] Josephine Tascher de la Pagerie, born at Martinique in 1763, had married in 1779 the Viscount de Beauharnais, who died on the scaffold in 1794; then in 1796 she married General Bonaparte.

difficulty and blessed the marriage of December 1, 1804, which is generally regarded as a marriage canonically regular.[121]

Humiliations of the Pope

The Pontiff was likewise afflicted by other incidents, which Consalvi recalls in his *Mémoires* with scarcely restrained feeling. Writes the Secretary of State:

I will not speak of all the Pope had to suffer. I will refrain from relating how and why, on the day of the consecration, Napoleon made His Holiness wait an hour and a half; how the ceremony took place so differently from what had been agreed upon; how the Emperor crowned himself, after rudely seizing the crown on the altar before the Pope put out his hand to take it. I will not speak of the way Bonaparte, on all occasions when he appeared in public with the Pope, took a place at his right, and the lack of respect with which he treated him. . . . I enumerate these sufferings that you may grasp to what extent the Pope needed strength, moderation, and kindness to follow, in his humiliations, Him whose vicar he was on earth.[122]

The Pontiff was the object of ovations as he passed again through France and Italy. But these were not sufficient to dissipate the sadness of his soul. He soon learned that certain Catholics of Vienna, of Naples, and of other places were accusing him of weakness, of prevarication, and of apostasy for

[121] Such is the solid conclusion of Welschinger in his work, *Le divorce de Napoléon,* 1889. However, Lecoy de La Marche, in a study published in the *Univers* (May 7, 1889) and reproduced in his *La guerre aux erreurs historiques* (pp. 322–45), strongly opposes this opinion. According to him, "the religious marriage of Napoleon and Josephine, celebrated on December 1, 1804, was simply a comedy." "If later on it was ruptured in a fashion not altogether regular, reasons enough were present for the annulment." These reasons were: the lack of witnesses, a defect poorly covered by the general concession of the powers given to Cardinal Fesch, and especially the defect of consent by Napoleon, who did not wish at any price to marry Josephine, and who agreed to the ceremony only because it was laid down as a condition for the consecration, and who, by requiring and expressly noting the absence of witnesses, indicated his desire to bring about canonical causes for the annulment of this fictitious marriage.

[122] Consalvi, *Mémoires,* II, 403.

the step that had cost him so many painful anxieties and so many deceptions.[123] He did not regret what he had done. "The venerable Pontiff, in coming to consecrate the Emperor, had shown to the French how lofty and touching was the majesty of a pope. He had proved his desire to conciliate everyone in order to favor the new rise of religion in France." [124] With Napoleon he left these grave words: "You have made us conceive a great hope; we confidently expect that you will fulfill that hope as emperor of the French." [125] But the Emperor, blinded by so many triumphs, did not heed these wise counsels; and the re-establishment of the empire was but the prelude of a new strife between the priesthood and the empire.

[123] See the sadly famous letter of Joseph de Maistre. "Here people make fun of the simple fellow. . . . The offenses of an Alexander Borgia are less revolting than this hideous apostasy. . . . With all my heart I should wish that the unfortunate Pontiff went to Santo Domingo to consecrate Dessalines." J. de Maistre, *Correspondance,* I, 138.

[124] Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'Empereur,* 1905, p. 45.

[125] Letter of August 2, 1804. For the entire text of the letter, see Theiner, *op. cit.,* II, 288.

CHAPTER IX

The Church and the Empire (1804–1814)

THE historian of Pius VII, Artaud de Montor, whose judgments deserve particular attention because he was, as a diplomat, involved in most of the events that he relates, thus evaluates the character of Napoleon:

> In him, when he was treating of religious matters, were to be found two distinct men: first, a spirit that was exact, prompt, affable, clear, ready to ask advice on questions with which he was not well informed, receiving useful guidance with good grace; then, a restless spirit, possessed by a foolish vanity, with uncertain learning, envious of the mission of the priests, and considering himself humiliated by the fact that, in his leisure intervals between battles, the emperor was not the pontiff of the nation, as he was the supreme regulator of the operations of the army.

In the course of the negotiations preparatory to the concordat, he was heard to say, with a touch of humor: "The priests wish to take the souls and to leave me the corpses." At news of the ovations given Pius VII during his journey through France, Napoleon exclaimed bitterly: "They would walk a league to see me, but they would walk twenty to be blessed by the pope." The splendors of the consecration and the coronation did but exalt that jealous ambition.

Napoleon's Project

Directly after the ceremony at Notre Dame the Emperor seems to have conceived the project of keeping the pope in France. The thought of Philip the Fair exercising a haughty

watchfulness over the pope of Avignon seemingly haunted the Emperor's mind.

> The Pope never would divulge who was the high officer that one day spoke to him of living at Avignon, or of accepting a papal palace in Paris. . . . The diplomatic corps at Rome were speaking of such rumors; these were so confidently repeated that the Pope judged he ought to make a reply to the same high official: "A report has been spread that we can be kept in France. Very well, suppose they take away our liberty; all this has been provided for. Before leaving Rome we signed a regular abdication, available. . . . When they have signed the plans which they meditate, you will have left in your hands only a miserable monk, who will call himself Barnabas Chiaramonti." [1]

This energetic reply brought an end to all the rumors. If, as Artaud hints, Napoleon intended to feel out the ground by allowing these reports to circulate, the experiment had been made; the imperial dream had to be abandoned.

The first note of the disagreement that would soon grow worse in such a tragic way between the Pope and the Emperor broke out in connection with the Italian affairs. On May 26, 1805, Napoleon crowned himself at Milan as king of Italy. Seizing the iron crown of the Lombard kings, he forcefully repeated the famous formula: "God gives it to me; let anyone who touches it beware!" A few days later (June 8) he reorganized the regular and secular clergy of Italy, re-established numerous congregations, and restored the former revenues to the bishops, the seminaries, and the fabrics.[2] The people and clergy of Milan at first greeted this act with their enthusiastic acclamations and declared Napoleon the restorer of the Church of Italy.

But Pius VII took a different view of the decree of June 8 and pointed out in it two serious encroachments on the rights

[1] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VII*, II, 194.

[2] See the text of the decree in the *Bolletino delle leggi del regno d'Italia*, pp. 123–40. A summary of it will be found in Theiner, *Histoire des deux concordats*, II, 338–43.

of the Church: (1) this decree, issued simply by Napoleon's own authority, openly violated article 20 of the Concordat, according to which all dispositions to be taken regarding the affairs of the Church must be previously concerted between the Holy See and the president of the Italian Republic; (2) the decree embraced, along with several favorable dispositions, certain harmful measures, such as the introduction of the Napoleonic Code in Italy, thus authorizing divorce. These observations were the subject of a brief (July 11) to which Napoleon replied (August 19) in a rather sharp tone: "As I have said more than once to Your Holiness, the court of Rome is following a policy which, good in different times, is no longer adapted to the age in which we are living." [3] The closing lines of the letter, however, were milder. "I will lend my cooperation in all possible modifications," said the Emperor. Pius VII therefore did not despair of reaching an understanding and took under consideration the choosing of negotiators instructed to confer on the matter with Cardinal Fesch, the Emperor's plenipotentiary. But a new affair soon arose, which would accentuate the disagreement between Napoleon and the Holy See.

The Marriage of Jerome Bonaparte

A brother of Napoleon, Jerome Bonaparte, the future king of Westphalia, had contracted at Baltimore (December 24, 1803) a regular marriage with Miss Patterson. But for this purpose he had asked the consent neither of his mother nor of his brother, Napoleon. The latter, with insistence and a menacing tone, called upon the Pope to declare, by a bull, the nullity of this marriage. Jerome, he said, was a minor, he had failed to get the consent of his mother, he had married a heretic, and the marriage took place without the presence of his pastor: for these three reasons the validity of the marriage could not

[3] *Correspondance de Napoléon,* XI, 119.

be admitted. The Emperor added: "I could easily have this matrimonial bond annuled in Paris, as the Gallican Church regards these marriages as null. It seemed to me better that this be done at Rome, if only for the example of sovereign houses that might contract marriage with a Protestant."

The reason for such insistence can be explained only by the desire, with the complicity of the Holy See, to create another rupture of the conjugal bond. Ever since his coming to the imperial power, Napoleon seemed to be obsessed by the thought of breaking his own marriage with Josephine de Beauharnais. A papal bull, giving to the dissolution of Jerome's marriage a universal reverberation, would accustom the people to these annulments of lawful marriages, which public opinion was disposed to look upon in an unfavorable light.

But Pius VII, as always, on this occasion consulted in the first place the law of the Church. But according to this law (1) the lack of the parents' consent is not a diriment impediment; (2) though unions contracted with heretics are illicit, they are not consequently null; and (3) the absence of the proper pastor is an absolute impediment to the marriage only in places where the Council of Trent has been promulgated, but that council was not promulgated in Baltimore. The Pope then concludes in favor of the validity of the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte with Elizabeth Patterson and of the impossibility of dissolving it canonically.

The Emperor's unbounded wrath was expressed in terms as unworthy of a sovereign as of any son of the Church. "The Pope," he wrote to Cardinal Fesch (January 7, 1806), "has sent me a most ridiculous and senseless letter. . . . My intention is to recall you and replace you by a layman. Since these imbeciles do not find any unfitness in having a Protestant occupy the throne of France, I will send them a Protestant ambassador." [4] These threats did not scare Pius VII. On January

[4] For this letter, see *Correspondance de Napoléon,* XI, 643.

29 he wrote as follows to the Emperor: "If the state of tribulation for which God has reserved us should reach its height, if we are to see ourselves despoiled of the friendship and benevolence of Your Majesty, the priest of Jesus Christ, who has the truth in his heart and on his lips, will support all with resignation and without fear." [5]

Evidently these last lines of the Pope's letter produced a lively impression on Napoleon.[6] But in these early days of 1806, following the great battle of Austerlitz and the treaty of Pressburg, Napoleon, intoxicated with his triumphs, had opened his soul to an unmeasured ambition. To dictate to Austria the harshest terms of peace, to suppress the Bourbons of Naples, to bring to his feet the German princes as so many vassals, to deal out principalities to his generals and crowns to his brothers, all these undertakings were not enough for him who henceforth believed himself greater than Charlemagne, mightier than the mighty emperors of the past. After fifteen days of silence, he replied to the Pope thus: "Your Holiness is sovereign of Rome, but I am its emperor. . . . Answerable to God are those who use so much zeal in protecting Protestant marriages, those who delay the expedition of the bulls of my bishops and who turn my dioceses over to anarchy." [7] On October 6, 1806, The Emperor obtained from the compliance of his diocesan court the annulment of his brother's marriage. By virtue of this decision King Jerome married (August 22, 1807) a Protestant princess, the daughter of the King of Würtemberg; and the Emperor had the effrontery to send word of it to Pius VII by an official letter. The Pope replied: "We hope that new and just motives, with which we have not been made acquainted, were presented. . . . This hope sustains us in the bitterness and forboding which we cannot shake off."

[5] Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 257.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Letter of February 13, 1806. See *ibid.*, pp. 258–63.

Conflict between Napoleon and the Pope

The affair of Jerome's marriage was a mere incident of the great quarrel. Napoleon's claim or assertion, in his letter of February 13, over the government of Rome, had a general bearing which the head of the Church could not let pass without protest.

On March 21, 1806, after consulting the cardinals, Pius VII wrote to the Emperor: "Your Majesty asserts on principle that you are the emperor of Rome. With apostolic frankness we reply that the Sovereign Pontiff, sovereign of Rome, does not recognize and never has recognized in his states a power superior to his own. You are immensely renowned, but you have been chosen, consecrated, crowned, recognized as emperor of the French and not of Rome." [8] One historian remarks: "Let us note well that, at the moment when the peoples, princes, and kings bow before the dominating authority of Napoleon, only an aged pontiff, without resources and without backing, dares to confront that all-powerful and proud despot." [9]

But the Emperor had already passed from words to acts. The year before, under pretext of measures necessitated by his war against Austria, he ordered Gouvion-Saint-Cyr to seize Ancona. On the very day of his famous letter to the Pope, he wrote to Fesch: "No Swedish, English, or Russian vessels must enter a port of the Papal States, otherwise I will have them confiscated." Two months later (April 18) Cardinal Fesch was abruptly recalled, being replaced as ambassador by the regicide Alquier. The Emperor ordered Civitavecchia to be occupied and had the *Moniteur* announce that he disposed of the principality of Beneventum in favor of Talleyrand, and the principality of Pontecorvo in favor of Bernadotte. These were two principalities of the papal territory.

[8] Letter dated February 13, 1806. *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[9] H. Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'Empereur*, p. 56.

Cardinal Fesch's last mission had been to demand from the Pope the recognition of Joseph Bonaparte as king of Naples. One of Alquier's first missions was to require the Holy Father to dismiss Cardinal Consalvi, whose knowledge and skill might be an obstacle to the Emperor's designs. Pius VII, in a spirit of peace, decided to sacrifice Consalvi, whom he replaced by a man of austere virtue, the venerable Cardinal Casoni, an old man of seventy-four, one-time vice-legate of Avignon and formerly nuncio to the court of Madrid. But the Pope declared that he could not recognize Joseph Bonaparte as king of Naples, a man who had violently invaded the states of Ferdinand VII. A fulminating note arrived from Paris, enjoining the Pope to recognize Prince Joseph without delay, under pain of seeing the Emperor cease to admit the papal sovereignty.

But the Pope was not to be frightened by any threat. To Alquier he said: "We are disposed to do everything possible for the future good relations and concord, provided the integrity of the principles is maintained. . . . This decision is a matter of our conscience. . . . Above all monarchs reigns a God who is the avenger of justice." Alquier wrote to Talleyrand: "People are strangely mistaken about the character of this sovereign if they suppose that his apparent condescension yields to every movement that is attempted to impress him." Napoleon failed to grasp the sincerity of so righteous a resistance. He thought that Pius VII was subject to the influence of certain cardinals, and the Emperor believed he would get the better of him by terror. He wrote: "I will set up at Rome a king or a senator. I will cut up his states into several duchies." After the decisive success of Friedland (Pravdinsk) and after the peace of Tilsit, Napoleon decided to put his plan into execution.

The Holy Roman Empire

We have now reached the year 1807. A year earlier an event of grave importance took place, which was of a nature to give Napoleon's authority a new brilliance and a new power. On August 6, 1806, Emperor Francis II had renounced his title of head of the Germanic Empire.[10] His act seemed to lack spontaneity. The new Augustulus, as has been said, merely foretold a new Odoacer. However this may be, the event was serious.

It was the crown of Augustus, of Constantine, of Charles, and of Maximilian that Francis of Hapsburg laid down, and a new era in the world's history was marked by the fall of its most venerable institu-ton. One thousand and six years after Pope Leo had crowned the Frankish king, eighteen hundred and fifty-eight years after Caesar had conquered at Pharsalia, the Holy Roman Empire came to its end.[11]

Up to that time, although the papacy had not, for a long time past, received any effective help from the Holy Empire, nevertheless toward it the pope had turned in moments of distress. Francis II was the one who, as Germanic Emperor,[12] had taken the conclave of Venice under his protection. With this great institution in ruins, Napoleon no longer saw any limits to his pretention to take in hand the scepter of Charlemagne.

On this ground he had already increased his interference in the religious domain. At first came countless benefactions. The goods of the fabrics that had not been sold were restored to them; the support of 30,000 chapels was assured; 24,000 burses were granted to the diocesan seminaries. The congregations of the Foreign Missions, of St. Lazare, and of the Holy Ghost were re-established.[13] The priests of St. Sulpice were reor-

[10] *Histoire des traités,* Vol. VIII. *Corpus juris confoederationis germanicae,* I, 70.

[11] James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire,* p. 359.

[12] After the abdication of August 6, 1806, Francis II remained emperor of Austria and took the name of Francis I.

[13] A. Launay, *Histoire générale de la Société des Missions étrangères,* III, 420.

ganized under the direction of Father Emery and took possession of many diocesan seminaries with the benevolent backing of Cardinal Fesch.[14] The Christian Brothers had obtained authorization to resume their religious garb.[15] The Emperor consented to the re-establishment of the Trappists, who had founded two houses at the very gates of Paris.[16] By these measures Napoleon affirmed the claim to take up the protective work of Charlemagne. But notable was the difference between the proceedings of Charlemagne and those of the new Emperor of the French;[17] and the Catholics could not for a long time be under any illusion on the matter. After authorizing the three congregations of the Foreign Missions, St. Lazare, and the Holy Ghost, Napoleon abrogated to himself the right to merge them into one, to be directed by a council with Cardinal Fesch at its head.[18] Napoleon combined all the religious periodicals into one, which he called *Le journal des curés*.[19] He instituted two new feasts: St. Napoleon (from St. Neapolysus, martyr under Diocletian), which he fixed for August 15, and the feast of the coronation, which he put on the Sunday following the day which corresponded to 11 Frimaire.[20] He undertook to impose his wishes on the archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Belloy, a feeble and venerable old man, who was utterly devoted to him;[21] Napoleon interfered by criticism of such and such pastoral letters, such and such sermons.[22] A priest was de-

[14] Méric, *Histoire de M. Emery,* II, 173–75.

[15] J. Guibert, *Histoire de saint J.-B. de la Salle,* p. 646. In the decree of November 17, which created the imperial university, the Brothers were incorporated in the university. Guibert, *ibid.*

[16] Picot, *Mémoires,* the year 1807.

[17] Cf. Artaud, *op. cit.,* II, 258–62.

[18] A. Launay, *op. cit.,* III, 420–22. "This decree was not carried out. The three congregations remained in their condition unchanged. This state of affairs could scarcely be otherwise, for they were composed merely of a few scattered members; a merger would simply have pooled their wretchedness."

[19] Haussonville, *L' Eglise romaine et le premier empire,* II, 229.

[20] *Ibid.,* pp. 230–34.

[21] On Cardinal de Belloy, see Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* IV, 1.

[22] *Ibid.,* pp. 222–27.

nounced to Napoleon for having made, in the pulpit or merely in conversation, an inconsiderate remark, or for having expressed some "ultramontane" doctrine; the Emperor had the priest arrested and, without investigation, had him put in a monastery or imprisoned. The dungeon of Vincennes, the prisons of Fenestrelle, Ivrée, and Ile Sainte-Marguerite received priests who were never able to surmise the reason for their arrest.[23] Lastly he ordered the printing of a catechism in which the text declared that every Christian "owed to Napoleon I love, respect, obedience, fidelity, and military service." [24]

Such encroachments and the growing ambition of Napoleon were not of a sort to reassure the Supreme Pontiff. At the beginning of 1807, he wrote: "We are still pontiff, free perhaps for a few months. Who knows but new victories in northern Europe will not be the signal of our ruin? Let us hasten to the celebration of a feast in which the tiara which an ungrateful son has given us may be able still to rest on our head." [25] Pius VII was referring to a canonization. In the preceding forty years, Rome had not seen a ceremony of this sort. Neither Clement XIV nor Pius VI had proclaimed a canonization, one of the most imposing ceremonies that a pope can celebrate. On May 24, 1807, in the Vatican Basilica, illuminated by thousands of sconces and ornamented by the banners of the new saints, Pius VII, surrounded by the cardinals and a brilliant procession, ordered to be inscribed in the number of the saints a humble young woman, reformer of the Franciscans, St. Collette; a poor Sicilian shepherd, St. Benedict the Moor; the foundress of a religious order, St. Angela Merici; a simple nun, St. Hyacinth Marescotti; and lastly a pious and charitable

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 227; Lanzac de Laborie, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 248. Apart from the political passages that Napoleon inserted, the imperial catechism had a real value. The commission which drew it up took as a basis the catechism of Meaux, composed by Bossuet, whose words were kept verbatim as far as possible. On the writing of this catechism, see Haussonville, *op. cit.*, pp. 236–72.

[25] Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

priest, St. Francis Caracciolo. The French ambassador, Alquier, in a diplomatic note, relates that "the canonization of five blessed servants of God had attracted a prodigious throng . . . and that people came from the depths of Bohemia and Hungary." [26] The former member of the Convention might well compare the spectacles he had witnessed at Paris with those he viewed at Rome. Before the ashes of the "great men" to whom the Revolution had dedicated its Pantheon, crowds of men had filed past, guided by banal curiosity or by a cold admiration; at the feet of the new saints whom the Church was placing on her altars, the Christian people went to their knees in veneration and love, as to the feet of so many brethren, friends, and good and powerful protectors to whom they could henceforth confidently turn with supplication and whom they could regard as models. On the morrow of the great storms just passed through, and on the eve of those that could still be feared, the majestic liturgical solemnity of May 24, 1807, was a supernatural solace for the Pope and for the Church.

New Threats

These new storms were not long delayed. On July 22, 1807, concerning a refusal, given by Casoni in the Pope's name, to institute bishops in Italy so long as the Emperor should violate the ecclesiastical immunities, Napoleon wrote to the viceroy of Italy: "Perhaps the time is not far off when I will recognize the pope merely as bishop of Rome. . . . Let all know: for the court of Rome I shall always be Charlemagne and never Louis the Pious." [27] In August, Talleyrand was unexpectedly replaced in the foreign affairs office by Count de Champagny. What mystery was hidden under this little cabinet revolution? Did Talleyrand withdraw of his own accord, with the hope of

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

still directing foreign affairs through a subordinate in his place? Or, on the contrary, did this change indicate a new direction of the imperial policy? [28] Shortly afterward, a report spread that Napoleon intended to go to Rome. What was the purpose of this journey? The Holy Father judged that a favorable interpretation of the project was more charitable as well as more prudent. To the Emperor he offered the hospitality of the Vatican.

Napoleon's only reply was an order to General Lemarois that he should seize the duchy of Urbino, the province of Macerata, Fermo and Spoleto, and to keep Cardinal Bayane at Milan until Prince Eugene learned from him whether he had the necessary powers to settle the differences between Rome and Paris. The Pope must march in step with the French scheme; otherwise the Emperor would appeal the question to a general council, "the sole infallible organ and supreme arbiter of all religious disputes." [29]

After such threats, the Pope, with his territory violated and his cities seized, could not repeat his conciliatory proposals. The situation was open war against the Holy See. Pius VII, instead of confirming the powers already given to Cardinal Bayane to treat with Napoleon, suspended them and ordered the cardinal to return to Rome.

From that moment the Emperor no longer restrained his anger. He instructed Prince Eugene (January 10, 1808) to direct on Rome General Miollis at the head of a brigade. On February 2 the French troops, entering the city by the Porta del Popolo, disarmed the guard, occupied the Castle Sant' Angelo, and, while the Pope and the Sacred College were celebrating the solemn function of the Purification in the Quirinal chapel, a body of cavalry and infantry was stationed in the big square of the papal palace. Ten pieces of artillery were set

[28] Welschinger, "Jugement de Villemain sur le prince de Talleyrand," in *Nouvelle revue,* November 15, 1894.

[29] Welschinger, *op. cit.,* p. 65.

up facing the windows of the Pope's apartment.[30] In a vigorous note, Pius VII declared that, as long as Rome should be invaded, he refused to engage in any sort of negotiation, and he ordered the papal representative at Paris, Cardinal Caprara, to ask for his passports.

General Miollis distributed his forces in the different sections of Rome and, by order of his government, began that series of outrages which, as Pacca says, "would hardly be believed by anyone who had not been a witness of them." At the end of February the Neapolitan cardinals received orders to leave for Naples within twenty-four hours. The papal troops were obliged to be incorporated in the French forces; the officers who resisted were arrested and were led off to the fortresses. On March 27 Cardinal Doria, who, with the title of pro-Secretary of State, had replaced Cardinal Casoni, was hauled off from Rome by force. On April 22 Monsignor Cavalchini, governor of Rome, was seized by a detachment of soldiers and was taken to the fortress of Fenestrella. At the same time word of the imperial decree of April 22 reached Rome. By this decree Napoleon, "considering that the sovereign of Rome has continually refused to make war on the English and that the donation of Charlemagne was made for the good of Christianity and not for the benefit of the enemies of our holy religion, joined to his kingdom of Italy the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camerino." [31]

Such a reason could not fool anyone. That the Emperor's actual concern was to isolate England from the rest of the world, was known to all. Having no hope of conquering her on her island, he decreed against her (November 21, 1806) that famous continental blockade by which all commerce with England was forbidden, and he was irritated that the Pope would not, by his religious authority, give his backing to this war

[30] Pacca, *Mémoires* (French trans.), I, 54.

[31] *Correspondance authentique de la cour de Rome*, p. 25.

measure against a Protestant state. Let Miollis increase the avenging sanctions. He obeyed. On June 16, 1808, the armed force penetrated the papal palace and, near the Pope's apartment, arrested Cardinal Gabrielli, who since March 27 had replaced Cardinal Doria as pro-Secretary of State; Doria had been expelled from Rome as being a Genoese. Only one last outrage remained to be perpetrated.

Pius VII foresaw it; but he maintained his attitude courageously. In the last days of August, Cardinal Pacca, called to take the place of Gabrielli at the Secretariate of State, informed the Pope that an English frigate, sent from Palermo by King Ferdinand of Sicily, was cruising before Fiumicino to take His Holiness to Sicily, should he so desire. Pius VII reflected an instant, then replied: "No, we will not quit the Holy See unless we are taken away by force." [32]

The brutal force was being secretly prepared. Miollis' instructions were that he should act "slowly and without a sudden blow." [33] The General sought to graduate his outrages. On September 6 a Piedmont officer entered Cardinal Pacca's presence and transmitted to him the order that he must leave Rome without delay. The Cardinal declared that he would not leave without the Holy Father's orders. At that very moment the Pope entered the Cardinal's apartment. After a protest, says Pacca, "he took my hand and said to me: 'Cardinal, let us go.' And, through the midst of the papal servants, who applauded him, he returned to his own apartment." [34] The officer hesitated to exercise violence on the person of the Pontiff; but the supreme outrage was merely delayed; a more favorable occasion was awaited to consummate it.

The years 1807 and 1808 were the most critical for the imperial policy. This period was the time when the peoples who

[32] Pacca, *Mémoires,* I, 91.
[33] *Ibid.,* p. 56.
[34] Artaud, *op. cit.,* II, 335.

were worn out and ruined by the privations which the continental blockade imposed on them, murmured, were restless, and experienced within them an increase of the feeling of their nationalities. Little mysterious associations were formed everywhere against the potentate who closed their ports, disturbed their commerce, drove out their princes, and halted the national life. This period was the time when Spain rose up and started the momentous war which, for six years, held the Emperor's best generals in check. The princes and the oppressed peoples took the side of Spain and were on fire to imitate her. But the Emperor concentrated his troops; and he reinforced them. To the 60,000 conscripts, raised in September, 1808, he added 40,000, taken from the classes before that of 1810. By joining the Polish, the Italians, and the Germans of the Rhine Confederation to the French, he was able to put in the field 425,000 men. No more formidable army had ever appeared before. Then Napoleon marched against Vienna, the center of the resistance, and, after the victories of Thann, Abendberg, Eckmül, and Ratisbon, he made his triumphal entry for the second time (May 13, 1809) into the capital of Austria.

Now he could turn toward Rome. Four days after his entry into Vienna, he signed the two decrees that finally united the Papal States to the French Empire, declaring Rome to be a free imperial city and creating an extraordinary council to take possession of the Roman states in his name.[35] The king of Naples, Murat, was chosen to direct the occupation of the Papal States.

Sentence of Excommunication

Pius VII foresaw these decrees and the brutal application that would be made of them. In that foresight he secretly pre-

[35] Haussonville, *op. cit.*, III, 80.

pared two bulls: one simplified the conditions for the election of the future pope in the event that the College of Cardinals should find themselves scattered at the time of the vacancy of the Holy See; the other bull pronounced sentence of excommunication against the invaders of the Papal States.

On June 11, by order of General Miollis, the Emperor's decree joining the states of the pope to the Empire was placarded along the streets of Rome; with the sound of artillery salvos, the papal flag was lowered from the Castle Sant' Angelo, and the tricolor flag was run up. As Pacca relates, "The time was two o'clock in the afternoon. I rushed to the appartment of the Holy Father and, as we met, both of us in the same breath uttered these words of the Redeemer: *Consummatum est.*'" [36] Then the Holy Father went to his table and there, without saying a word, signed the bull of excommunication. However, before transmitting it to those who were to post it, he went up to the Cardinal and said: "In our place, what would you do?" "Holy Father," replied Pacca, "I would publish the bull." The Pope raised his eyes toward heaven and, after a short pause, issued the order for posting the bull of excommunication "against the violators of the patrimony of St. Peter." [37] Official notification of the excommunication was given to the Emperor by a brief dated June 12, 1809. Unlike the bull, which indicated no person by name, this second document explicitly named Napoleon I, emperor of the French, as having incurred the excommunication.[38]

Informed of the sentence of excommunication, Napoleon

[36] Pacca, *op. cit.*, I, 112.

[37] For the entire text of the bull, see Pacca, *op. cit.*, I, 129–48.

[38] In a consultation with Bigot de Preameneu, Napoleon was assured that he was not affected by the bull, "because, according to the rules, penalties against invaders of ecclesiastical temporal goods did not touch sovereigns unless they had been expressly named." Bigot ignored the existence of the brief of June 12, 1809. For the text of this brief, see Welschingr, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

wrote to the King of Naples (June 20): "At this moment I have received news that the Pope has excommunicated us. It is an excommunication that the Pope has issued against himself. . . . He is a wild fool, who must be interned. Arrest Cardinal Pacca and other adherents of the Pope." [39] This letter is dated from the palace of Schömbrunn, where twenty-one years later the little King of Rome died.

Murat already had orders to arrest the Pope in the event that he should preach revolt.[40] For the execution of this order, Murat at once appointed a man known for his abundant energy, General Radet. Etienne Radet, former cavalry lieutenant, was one of the brave officers who had attempted, in 1791, to save King Louis at Varennes. In 1794 he was brought before the revolutionary tribunal and, as if by a miracle, escaped sentence to capital punishment. Upon receipt of his fatal mission, Radet had a moment of hesitation; but he thought that "his oaths and his sacred duty obliged him to carry it out," and he obeyed.[41]

Arrest of Pius VII

On the night of July 5, by Radet's order, the Quirinal was surrounded by the troops. After an hour of violent attempts, by the use of scaling ladders and the smashing of doors, the soldiers, guided by a traitor, penetrated into the papal palace, with General Radet at their head. Pius VII, vested in mozzetta, rochet, and stole, awaited the invaders in his study. Radet writes: "Finding myself with an armed force before that sacred head, an oppressive and spontaneous movement ran through all

[39] *Lettres inédites de Napoléon Ier*, I, 317.

[40] Letter of June 19.

[41] Radet, *Relation au pape Pie VII.* Radet wrote: "The military have duties so painful that a person is tempted to elude them. But a righteous man is sustained in his obedience by sworn faith and by honor." Radet, *Mémoires*, p. 171. Radet was sincere; but the error of his reasoning is evident. No promise or oath can dispense from the observance of the higher law of justice.

my members. A holy respect filled my whole being." [42] At last the General approached and presented to the Pontiff for his signature a document that contained the removal of the excommunication. The Pope shoved it aside, saying: "In the whole affair I acted only after consulting the Holy Ghost, and you will rather tear me to pieces than make me retract what I have done." Then, after a moment of silence: "We cannot. We ought not. We will not." [43] "In that case," replied Radet, "I have orders to conduct you far from Rome."

Thereupon Pius VII stood up and, without taking anything but his breviary, which he put under his arm, advanced to the door, giving his hand to Cardinal Pacca. Radet, greatly moved, bowed and kissed the papal ring. Pius VII left his apartment. Amid the debris of smashed doors, he slowly descended the great stairs and reached the Court of Honor, where the rest of the detachment was waiting. There the Pope gave a last blessing to the city of Rome, then entered a berlin that was waiting for him, while the soldiers, impressed by this majestic tranquillity, presented arms.[44]

The most precise details of the Pope's removal have been left us by the two personages who, in different capacities, were witnesses of it: General Radet and Cardinal Pacca. In their *Mémoires* you may read the account of the painful journey of the Holy Father from Rome to Savona, passing by the Chartreuse of Florence, Alessandria, Mondovi, Grenoble, Valence, Avignon, Aix, and Nice. Along the route of his exile, the Pontiff had the consolation of seeing the crowds thronging about him to ask his blessing. After traveling forty-one days, he arrived (August 16, 1809) at Savona, where he was to remain until June 19, 1812.

[42] Radet, *Mémoires*. "At that moment," Radet later said to Artaud, "my first Communion came to my mind." Artaud, *op. cit.*, III, 92.

[43] These words are the formula by which the parlements used to refuse the registration of the royal edicts: *Nec volumus, nec possumus, nec debemus*. Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 353.

[44] Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur*, p. 87.

The little city of Savona, located on the Gulf of Genoa and recently annexed to the French Empire, had been pointed out to Napoleon by Fouché to serve as the Pope's place of residence rather than Paris, where public opinion would have been more impressed by the Pontiff's presence. There he would be without official pomp, without insignia, for the Pope had brought with him no papal vestments, without counselor, for they separated him from Cardinal Pacca, without news, for orders were given to exercise watchful vigilance over his correspondence. Thus they hoped to wear down the Pope's patience, to obtain more easily from him what he had refused when the traditional pomp of the Quirinal and the Vatican surrounded him, giving him, as it were, the feeling of a universal empire. Fouché and Napoleon were mistaken. Isolated, without the marks of his power and without any relation with his advisers, the Pontiff "enclosed himself in a sort of immobility which was his force. Deprived of freedom, he did not budge a step, waiting to move only when freedom should be restored to him." [45]

Imprisonment of the Pope

Even more than the continental blockade, which had so deeply irritated the nations of Europe, this violent hand of the Emperor of the French laid upon the head of the Catholic Church was a threat for the peoples as well as for the rulers. Surely an imprisoned pope, never left out of sight by a sovereign, could not preserve over the Christian peoples the authority attached to his spiritual office. And might not the princes fear that the hand of the despot, not hesitating to lay hands on the highest majesty of this world, would some day descend cruelly on them? Said Pacca: "The nations shuddered at the deportation of Pius VII. Yet no protest was uttered. Not a protective

[45] H. Chotard, *Le pape Pie VII à Savone.*

voice came down from the Catholic thrones in favor of this illustrious captive." [46] From which of the European courts could a demand be expected? Austria, beaten to the earth, was still trembling from her defeat; Spain and the kingdom of Naples were a prey to the imperial tyranny; England and Portugal were at war with Napoleon; Russia, Prussia, and the little German states were indifferent to the blows struck at the Catholic Church. Of all the ruling princes, even the Catholic monarchs, the most independent and most nobly proud in the presence of the despot, was indeed the aged imprisoned Pontiff himself.[47]

Pius VII had just reached his sixty-seventh year; fatigues and cares had seriously debilitated his physical health. Lodged, not in the Savona fortress, as some have held, but at first in the palace of Count Sanson, then soon afterward in the episcopal residence, in this latter house he occupied an apartment composed of two rooms and a loge from which he could follow the offices of the cathedral.[48] Chabrol (prefect of Montenotte), General Bertier (commander of the troops of the fortress), and Prince Borghese (governor of the departments beyond the Alps) had personally an esteem for the aged august prisoner; but letters from the Emperor, rude sometimes to coarseness, came in rapid succession to remind them of the strictness of their task. One day Bertier received orders to arrest the former confessor of the Pope, as being "a scoundrel"; another day Prince Borghese was admonished to make considerable savings on the amount assigned for the Pope's subsistence.[49]

[46] Pacca, *Mémoires,* X.

[47] Welschinger, *op. cit.,* p. 100.

[48] At the bishop's house in Savona you can still see the two rooms that were occupied by Pius VII and the balcony from which each evening he blessed the city.

[49] Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* p. 93. See especially Mayol de Lupe, *La captivité de Pie VII,* according to unpublished documents, 1912.

Napoleon's Divorce

What, then, were the great plans of the potentate? Now that everything seemed to be his, the souls as well as the bodies,[50] where was his ambition leading him? Was he, like Joseph II, going to regulate by himself the details of Catholic worship, or, like Louis XIV, try to screen his pretended rights under the prestige of an assembly of the clergy, or, like Philip the Fair, attempt to frighten the Pope by some violent aggression? None of these undertakings gave him hesitation; but, for the moment, another object absorbed him: to break the childless marriage with Josephine Beauharnais, which he had entered into reluctantly on the eve of his coronation. As his power became strengthened, his desire to assure himself of a legitimate heir, by a marriage with the daughter of some sovereign, had increased at the same time. In 1807 he drew up a list of marriageable princesses in the different European courts.[51] A project of union with the Grand Duchess Anne, sister of Czar Alexander, did not succeed because of the demands of the Russian court; he then turned his choice to the Archduchess of Austria, Maria Louisa. But Emperor Francis II, knowing of the ceremony performed on the eve of Napoleon's coronation, was unwilling to give his daughter unless the religious marriage with Josephine should be dissolved.

We will not relate the moving scene of December 15, 1809, when Napoleon and Josephine, in a family council, declared that they separated voluntarily, "both of them glorious at the sacrifice made for the good of the country," nor of the solemn session that took place the next day in the Senate to receive the declaration of the two spouses and, by a decree of the Senate,

[50] Let us recall the expression of Napoleon when he was first consul: "The priests take the souls and leave me only the corpses."

[51] This document is in the national archives, containing eighteen names, ten being names of Protestant princesses.

to regulate the situation of Josephine.[52] The capital difficulty remained: to have the religious authority declare the nullity of the marriage contracted on December 1, 1804.

Napoleon had at hand an acute and crafty jurist, Cambacérès, whose learned juridical devices had more than once enabled him to succeed in similarly embarrassing cases. The archchancellor of the Emperor was not unaware that, according to the very principles of the Gallican Church and historic traditions, the marriage of princes was one of the major causes that must be referred to the Supreme Pontiff. If they could have hoped from the prisoner of Savona a reply favorable to the Emperor's desire, the solution would be simple: to request the Pontiff to sanction by his supreme authority the declaration of nullity of the marital bond contracted between the Emperor Napoleon and Josephine. But all the circumstances convinced them that the Pope, even though an isolated prisoner, would show the inflexibility which he had manifested in the case of the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte and Elizabeth Patterson. In the present case Cambacérès judged that the Gallican traditions could not be applied, that they took into account only ordinary cases and not exceptional situations such as the one in the present instance. More conformable to those traditions would be the substitution, in place of a Roman commission, whose functioning was impossible, a system of jurisdiction composed of French ecclesiastical tribunals. For the present case, therefore, they instituted a procedure in three degrees: diocesan court, metropolitan court, and the primatial court of Lyons.[53]

[52] On Napoleon's divorce, see Welschinger, *Le divorce de Napoléon,* 1889; Geoffroy de Grandmaison, *Napoléon et les cardinaux noirs;* Lecoy de la Marche, "Le mariage religieux de Napoléon et de Josephine," in *La guerre aux erreurs historiques;* Dudon, "Le divorce de Napoleon, lettre inédite du cardinal Fesch," in *Etudes* (August 25, 1901), pp. 606–22.

[53] This last, in fact, as we shall see later on, was not consulted.

On December 22, 1809, the officialis and the promoter of Paris, upon the order of Cambacérès, learned the will of the master. The archchancellor of the Empire gave them to understand that he did not expect from them any long delays and that they had no need to follow the usual forms. The promoter, Father Rudemare, though keenly affected, could not refrain from sustaining the rights of the Holy See and, to shield his responsibility, asked that his competence in the case be submitted to a higher ecclesiastical authority.

In the month of November, 1809, the Emperor, on the pretext that the Pope was disturbing the functions of the capitular vicar during the vacancy of episcopal sees,[54] had constituted, under the presidency of Cardinal Fesch, a council of eight theologians, called "The Ecclesiastical Council." In that council could be seen, at the side of men absolutely devoted to the Emperor, such as Cardinal Maury and Bishop Manny of Trier, other ecclesiastics of great learning and solid virtue, such as Father Fontana, general of the Barnabites, and Father Emery, superior of the Sulpicians. These last, having entered this council with apprehensive anxieties of conscience,[55] were obliged, on occasion, to oppose the Emperor, on more than one point, with effective resistance; and we should properly recognize that Cardinal Fesch, whose presidency of the council was owing to his relationship to the Emperor, showed a sincere will to keep the imperial policy within the limits of respect due the Roman pontiff.[56] Did he thereby wish to make reparation for the grievous wrongs of his conduct at Rome during his period as ambassador there? However this may be, the Ecclesiastical Council, consulted on the question of the competence

[54] Napoleon I, *Mémoires,* I, 121.

[55] Father Emery wrote on this occasion to his friend, the Bishop of Alais: "How I should bless an illness that would come to me in these circumstances, even though it would carry me off!" Meric, *op. cit.,* II, 327.

[56] On the testimony of the chancellor Pasquier, see his *Mémoires,* I, 440.

of the diocesan court, answered with a favorable opinion.[57]

The inquiry began. Three witnesses, Berthier, Duroc, and Talleyrand, affirmed that "several times they heard His Majesty say that he did not intend to engage himself and did not consider himself in any way bound by an act that had neither the character nor the solemnity prescribed." Cardinal Fesch declared that two days after the marriage the Emperor declared to him that "all he had done had no other purpose than to quiet the Empress and to yield to the circumstances; that at the very moment when he was founding an empire he could not give up the prospect of offspring in the direct line." Cambacérès urged that the general powers given by the Pope to Cardinal Fesch had for their purpose only to permit him, at the most, to take the place of the proper pastor, whom they did not have time to notify, but not to dispense from all the required formalities, such as the presence of witnesses, etc.

The diocesan court took cognizance only of this second cause of nullity: the omission of the required formalities. It did not dare invoke the defect of consent; this reason it discarded, according to the expression of one of its members, "out of respect for His Majesty"; for, said Father Rudemare, "how could we urge, in favor of a man who made us all tremble, a reason for nullity which was never usefully appealed to except for a minor taken by surprise and under duress?" Consequently (January 9, 1810) the officialis of Paris, Father Boislève, rendered a decision by which, "considering the difficulty of recourse to the visible head of the Church, to whom, in fact, always belonged the cognizance and decision of these extraordinary cases," the marriage contracted between Emperor Napoleon and Empress Josephine, without the presence of the required witnesses and the proper pastor, was declared null.

[57] On the canonical reasons for this view and on the attitude of Father Emery in this affair, see Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery*, II, 247–49.

Three days later the metropolitan court came to the same conclusion, but taking for the chief basis the lack of consent by the parties to the marriage. By this decision, notice of which was duly given by the French ambassador at the court of Vienna, the difficulties advanced by the Emperor of Austria fell; and, by his marriage, celebrated April 2, 1810, with Princess Maria Louisa, granddaughter of the great Queen Maria Theresa and niece of King Louis XVI, Napoleon Bonaparte not only had the hope of establishing a dynasty, but also found himself connected with the greatest sovereign houses.[58] He had reached the summit of human glory.

On April 2, in the great gallery of the Louvre, brilliantly adorned and illuminated, his proud look might have surveyed with satisfaction the long row of generals, senators, ministers, princes, and kings who formed a sort of escort for him, while he took by the hand, as wife and almost as a trophy, the descendant of the Hapsburgs.

However, on coming forth from the religious ceremony, a frown of anger darkened the face of the Emperor. His intimates had heard him murmur words that made them tremble: "Ah! the fools. . . . To protest against the legitimacy of my race! To unsettle my dynasty!" The Emperor had noted about the altar, among the reserved places, thirteen vacant seats. Out of twenty-seven cardinals whom he had brought and kept at Paris, only fourteen resigned themselves to attend the ceremony; the others, considering that the unlawfulness of the Emperor's first marriage had not been recognized by the Pope, were courageous enough to absent themselves. Pius VII, in fact, upon learning at Savona the decisions handed down by

[58] The fiercest adversaries of Napoleon were at this moment much impressed by this alliance. De Maistre (February 25, 1810) wrote to King Victor Emmanuel: "This wonderful man has finally married the daughter of the Austrian Emperor. With the matter decided, I have nothing to say, and I even believe that henceforth I ought to change my style in expressing myself with regard to this personage, who at present should be treated as another sovereign."

the courts of Paris, protested against the irregularity of that procedure.[59]

The Emperor had succeeded in only half of his designs: everything gave him hope of founding a great dynasty, but the head of the Catholic Church had not bent before him.

The thirteen cardinals who had avoided appearing at the ceremony were summoned to the ministry of worship. Their pensions were suppressed; their personal goods were seized; they were ordered to withdraw two by two to cities of the provinces and to remove the cardinalitial insignia. Hence arose the name of "black cardinals," which has been preserved in history.[60] Besides, Napoleon was strengthened in the project of organizing a system of Church government apart from the Pope and the Sacred College. With this organization once assured, people would see whether the Pope himself would not be obliged to accept the situation. The formation of an ecclesiastical council, the calling of the national council of 1811, and the concordat of Fontainebleau were the steps in execution of this new plan.

The French Church

An ecclesiastical council had functioned at Paris from November, 1809, to January, 1810. We have just seen that it determined the competence of the French courts in the question of the Emperor's marriage. But questions of a more general sort had been submitted to it. At the end of November, the

[59] The Pope's protest, we may remark, never concerned anything but the irregularity of the procedure. Whether through prudence or out of respect for the rules of canon law, by virtue of which a higher tribunal takes cognizance of a case only by the appeal of one of the parties, or because the fundamental question did not appear clear to him, the Pope never pronounced on the validity of Napoleon's first marriage. According to Father Rohrbacher (*Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* XII, 45), here was a genuine cause of nullity, which no one dared mention, but which determined the votes of the courts. Cf. Méric, *op. cit.,* II, 339.

[60] G. de Grandmaison, *Les cardinaux noirs.*

minister of worship proposed to it, in the name of the government, three series of questions: the first, on what concerned the affairs of Christianity in general; the second, on those of France in particular; the third, on those of Germany and Italy. In what concerned the affairs of France, the Emperor insisted upon four well determined points and called for precise replies. The questions regarded: (1) juridically fixing the rights of the Emperor over the Papal States; (2) finding the means to render useless the canonical institution of the bishops; (3) proving that the bull of excommunication was not effective, and (4) establishing, in the Emperor's favor, the right to convoke a national council without the intervention of the Pope.

Father Fontana, the general of the Barnabites, because of illness had unfortunately to be absent after the first sessions. Father Emery, who took part in several discussions, always used the language of a theologian devoted to the Church and to the Holy See. Such is the testimony given him particularly by Frayssinous, who was added to the commission as secretary, as also that of Father Rauzan. But his views were not successful in winning the bishops. The answers of the latter showed the embarrassment of men who feared to violate the principles too strongly and yet were primarily solicitous not to wound the vanity of an irascible man, whose iron hand was already laid so heavily on the vicar of Jesus Christ and might indulge in new deeds of violence.

With a compliance that could not be excused by a few timid reservations in favor of the pontiff imprisoned at Savona, the commission declared: "that the pope cannot, for the simple reason of temporal affairs, refuse his intervention in spiritual affairs," as if the outrages against the freedom of the head of the Church, which were the reason for refusal of the bulls to the nominated bishops, had been a purely temporal affair. On the subject of the means to be employed to supplement the defect of the bulls, the commission, after first evading a solution

of this question and proposing to submit it to a national council, finally declared, upon the repeated demand of the Emperor, that the national council could, "according to the urgency of the circumstances," enact that the canonical institution would be given by the metropolitan or the eldest suffragan. Lastly, regarding the bull of excommunication, the commission declared it null and of no effect, "as having been issued only in behalf of temporal interests." [61] Father Fontana, because of illness, had not been present at most of the sessions. Father Emery, seeing in the questions presented by the Emperor a predetermination to impose his wishes, rarely came to the meetings of the Council, where he warmly defended the rights of the Holy See,[62] and refused to sign the replies. These were transmitted to the Emperor on January 11, 1810.[63]

Provided with these new arms, Napoleon lost no time in promulgating (February 17, 1810) a Senate decree which proclaimed the union of the States of Rome to the Empire, and declared that "the imperial prince would bear the title and receive the honors of king of Rome." Thus, "several weeks before the Austrian marriage and many months before the birth of a son, Napoleon decreed that this son would be an heir who would occupy the preponderant place in the city of the popes; that he would be the king and would receive royal honors." [64] The Senate decree also bore this haughty title: "On the independence of the imperial throne over all authority on earth." We know what happened to this proud dream: when barely four years old, the King of Rome no longer had a crown and, in the eyes of Europe, he was merely an Austrian prince.

[61] Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery,* II, 238. The replies of the council have been given by Talleyrand with some abbreviations. Talleyrand, *Mémoires,* II, 52. On the Church council of 1809–1810, see the profound study by Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* pp. 82–138.

[62] See Gosselin, *op. cit.,* pp. 239–43, for Father Emery's attitude.

[63] Talleyrand, *Mémoires,* II, 71.

[64] Welschinger, *Le roi de Rome,* p. 3.

Napoleon's religious marriage with the Archduchess of Austria did but exalt still more the potentate's insatiable ambition. Says the historian of the religious conflicts of this period: "From this moment Napoleon no longer observed the least consideration for the Holy Father." [65] He pictured himself master of the Eternal City, which he intended to make one of the capitals of his great empire. "This empire," he said, "will rise higher than it has ever been since the last of the Caesars. To myself I reserve the glory of appearing as its father." Providence never allowed Napoleon to realize this desire. But meanwhile the Emperor did not hide his idea: to accomplish the political ruin of the papacy and to leave it only the appearance of spiritual power. To all bishops going to Savona orders were given that they should try to wring from the Pope the surrender of all his prerogatives. "The entire decree of the Senate, and nothing but that"; [66] such was the watchword of the Emperor.

Had the Emperor of Austria, following the old traditions of the "apostolic" monarchy, wished then to take in hand the cause of Pius VII or at least to intervene in his behalf, the occasion was presented to him by the unforeseen alliance he had just contracted with the Emperor of the French. An intervention did take place, but in a way not to compromise the Austrian monarchy in a delicate negotiation. The one chosen for this negotiation was that Prince Metternich, who was not unacquainted with knotty situations and was not without ability in unraveling them. But he seemed to have for his motto the words of Walpole: *Quieta non movere* ("Do not stir up things that are quiet"). At Vienna he continued the Josephist traditions, full of distrust for the papal authority. No one was less suited to be a knight of the papacy in a diplomatic mission. Besides, we know today, by the publication of the *Mémoires* of the illustrious statesman, the basic inspiration of his measures.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Therein he sees the occasion to pursue the dominant idea of his whole policy: to raise up again and develop the Austrian supremacy. He wrote to Francis I: "If the attempt does not succeed, Your Majesty will nevertheless have played a fine role." [67] What mattered to him was this role rather than success. Napoleon made him some fine promises: he agreed "to remain faithful to the religion of St. Louis and not to raise any schism over spiritual questions." But what did Napoleon mean by "spiritual questions"? We know how singularly he limited their scope. As for the Pope, Napoleon recognized him as bishop of Rome, but expressed the hope and desire that he should reside in Paris, where he would be closer to Madrid, Lisbon, and Vienna.

Such were the declarations which satisfied the Austrian plenipotentiary. These he transmitted to his government in a report dated May 10, 1810. That very day Napoleon at Breda in Holland gave an audience to the members of the two clergies, Protestant and Catholic. The latter he upbraided insultingly, saying to them: "Bigots! If the matter depended on you, you would throw me into a monastery, like Louis the Pious. . . . God is the one who has placed me on my throne. . . . I must render account of my conduct only to God and Jesus Christ, not to a pope. . . . You have calumniated the Protestants. I have 600,000 Protestants in my empire, and never have I had occasion to complain of one of them." [68]

Ten days later the Pope wrote a brief to the Austrian ambassador, Lebzeltern. Therein he declared that he gladly renounced all the material advantages that might be offered him, but he forcibly rejected all schemes that would injure the dignity of the Church and he asked above all the opportunity to communicate with his faithful.[69]

[67] Metternich, *Mémoires,* II, 333–55.

[68] F. Schoell, *Recueil de pieces officielles,* IV, 247. Quoted by Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* p. 125.

[69] Chotard, *Le pape Pie VII à Savone,* p. 124.

The sturdy resistance of the one whom he had hoped to master by isolating him exasperated the Emperor. On July 25, 1810, he ordered Prince Eugene to have a number of religious arrested, as being guilty of expressing their sympathy for the Pope. On November 1 on his own authority he appointed to the archbishopric of Paris, Cardinal Maury, who had the weakness to accept the appointment.[70] This act brought grief to Pius VII, who at once wrote to the Cardinal: "Thus, after courageously pleading the cause of the Church in times of storm, you now abandon her who has lavished on you her dignities and favors." The unworthy prince of the Church perhaps found that the dignities and favors offered by the Emperor of the French more appreciable.

Napoleon heaped favors on him. On the other hand, in the new ecclesiastical council, which he formed in January, 1811, under the presidency of Fesch, the Emperor counted especially on Maury to defend his religious policy. The new committee included, along with Fesch and Maury, Cardinal Caselli, the archbishops of Tours and Malines, the bishops of Evreux, Treves, and Nantes. Napoleon wished also that Father Emery should be added. The anguish of the superior of St. Sulpice revived. After vainly begging the Emperor to excuse him from such a mission or, at least, to give him merely a consultative voice, he felt that he ought to accept, not having lost all hope of exercising over the members of the committee an influence favorable to the rights of the Church.

He did not suspect what low servility lay in the soul of Maury, who but recently from Rome, where he was living in the midst of the *émigré* nobles, had so bitterly reproached Father Emery for his so-called weakness toward the established powers, showed himself a most complacent flatterer of the despot. On the other hand, when Napoleon was irritated and wished to force from the lips of the members of the ecclesi-

[70] Cardinal Fesch, to whom the Emperor turned first, had the courage to refuse.

astical council, some words of disavowal about the Supreme Pontiff, he found before him a man courageous enough to resist him to his face. This man was precisely the superior of St. Sulpice.

On March 16, 1811, the Emperor had summoned the ecclesiastical council to the palace of the Tuileries, in the presence of Cambacérès, Talleyrand, and the members of the Council of State. Napoleon had a fondness for these imposing manifestations, and knew how to exploit them to his advantage. Artaud de Montor gives the details of this meeting, according to a note found in the papers of Consalvi.

The Emperor, who made them wait for two hours, said that they were blockheads. Napoleon appeared in extraordinary apparel, encompassed by his great officers, and he opened the session with a long and vehement address against the Pope. Although this discourse was a tissue of vile calumnies, none of the cardinals or bishops seem to have attempted to declare the truth against the might and power. But, for the glory of religion, a simple ecclesiastic was there who would save the honor of the state which he professed. That man was Father Emery. He had not wished to attend the assembly. Cardinal Fesch had sent two bishops to find the modest Sulpician.

After speaking with violence, Napoleon looked at all those present, and then said to Father Emery: "What do you think of the Pope's authority?" Father Emery, directly questioned, with deference turned his eyes to the bishops, as if to ask permission to be the first to express his opinion, and then answered: "Sire, I can give no other view on this point than that which is contained in the catechism taught by your orders in all the churches; to the question, 'What is the pope?' the answer is given that he is 'the head of the Church, the vicar of Jesus Christ.' " "But Jesus Christ did not give him the temporal power: it was Charlemagne who gave it to him; and I, the successor of Charlemagne, wish to take it from him, because it keeps him from exercising his spiritual functions." "Sire," Father Emery replied, "Your Majesty honors the great Bossuet and is pleased to quote him often. I will quote verbatim from him this passage, which I well remember. Sire, Bossuet

speaks thus: 'To the Apostolic See were conceded the sovereignty of the city of Rome and other possessions that the Holy See, freer and more assured, might exercise its power throughout the world. . . . For this we felicitate the universal Church and we heartily pray that this sacred principality may remain safe and sound.' "

Napoleon then spoke mildly, as he always did when he was fearlessly contradicted, and he said: "I do not reject the authority of Bossuet. All that was true in his day, when Europe acknowledged several masters. At that time it was not fitting that the pope should be subject to an individual ruler; but what is unsuitable in the pope's being subject to me, now that Europe recognizes no other master but me alone?" Father Emery was at first a bit embarrassed. Yet he replied: "Sire, you know the history of revolutions as well as I do. What now exists may at some time cease to exist. The improprieties foreseen by Bossuet may reappear. An order so wisely established ought not to be changed.[71]

The date was March 16, 1811, when Father Emery dared to say: "What now exists may at some time cease to exist." Three years later Napoleon, abandoned by all, signed his abdication; and the very one of whom he said: "I will never let him enter Rome," returned there as sovereign, in spite of Napoleon.

French National Council of 1811

The words of the venerable priest produced a strong impression on the Emperor's mind. When some prelates, at the close of the meeting of March 26, sought to excuse the superior of St. Sulpice by alleging his advanced age, Napoleon replied: "I am not irritated against Father Emery. He has spoken as a man who knows his subject. I like people to speak to me thus." [72] But he did not give up his idea of convoking a national council.

[71] Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, III, 14–17.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

On June 17, 1811, ninety-five prelates, assembled at the archiepiscopal palace, celebrated the opening of this council. We will not recount the details of the council.[73] We shall merely say that, on the essential points, the council declined to bend to the imperial will. The example given by Father Emery had revived their courage. The bishops required in the first place that the Pope be set free. As for the Emperor's claim to do without papal institution of the bishops, the prelates plainly declared that they saw no means of dispensing with the papal bulls and that the council was without competence in the matter, even to give a provisional decision and in an urgent case. A report drawn up to this effect by the Bishop of Tournai put the Emperor in a state of deep irritation. On the evening of July 10 an imperial decree declared the council dissolved. Two days later, at three o'clock in the morning, the bishops of Tournai, Gand, and Troyes, these last two chaplains of the Emperor, were arrested in their beds and imprisoned at Vincennes.

Deplorable was the effect of this violence. In an attempt to allay the state of public opinion, a rumor was spread that the three bishops had entered into relations with the enemies of the state.[74] This subterfuge, which was soon abandoned, deceived no one. Moreover, the *ab irato* interruption of the deliberations did not bring any solution to the serious questions that had prompted the convocation of a council. Maury, who is said to have been flattered at again enjoying, in this assembly, the oratorical successes of the Constituent Assembly, and to be plotting the intrigues that he had carried on at Rome, appeared to be particularly mortified.[75] On the advice of the

[73] A learned treatment of them will be found in a long chapter of Welschinger, who was the first one to consult, in the national archives, all the unpublished documents concerning the council. Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur,* pp. 197–287.

[74] Pasquier, *Mémoires,* I, 483.

[75] Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* IV, 344.

Archbishop of Paris, the Emperor requested the dispersed bishops not to leave Paris and, when the presence of a respectable number of the prelates was assured, they were gathered in a preliminary assembly to ask for the reopening of the council. This reopening was authorized by imperial degree. On August 5, without discussion, the mutilated assembly adopted a decree which, in case of refusal or abstention by the pope, after six months gave to the metropolitan or the dean of the bishops of the province the right to confer canonical institution on the nominated bishops.[76]

After this result was obtained, most of the bishops remained at Paris to await the return of a deputation sent to Savona. On September 20, Pius VII, circumvented and deprived of complete information, being desirous of ending the widowhood of so many Churches, signed a brief which accepted the decisions of August 5, but with some important modifications. Thus the Pope required that the canonical institution given by the metropolitan must be made "in the name of the Supreme Pontiff."[77] Napoleon, not satisfied with these modifications, imperiously sent from Gorcum, where he then was, an order to all the bishops to return to their dioceses without delay and informed the Pope that he himself would institute the bishops and, if there should be need, would annul the Concordat.[78]

Even though a prisoner, even deprived of all relations with the outside, enfeebled by age and illness, the old man of Savona refused to bend before the orders of the Emperor. The latter then thought of a supreme means of overcoming what he called "the headstrong obstinacy of the Roman priest": to bring the Pope to Paris, where he would be close at hand, and there by a direct pressure of that will which nothing resisted, to induce the Pontiff to subscribe to all his claims.

[76] Welschinger, *op. cit.*, p. 281.
[77] *Ibid.*, p. 334.
[78] *Ibid.*

Pius VII at Fontainebleau

Pius VII, through M. de Chabrol, prefect of Montenotte, received (June 9, 1812) the following letter: "Most Holy Father. The known plan of the English to make a descent on the coast of Savona with a view of taking you off obliges the French government to have Your Holiness come to the capital. Consequently orders have been given that Your Holiness come first to Fontainebleau, where you will have the lodging which you already occupied. Your Holiness will remain at Fontainebleau only until the apartments are prepared at the archiepiscopal palace in Paris, where you will then live." Only a few hours was given the Pope for leaving Savona.

Haussonville relates, following an authentic report, the sad incidents of that hurried journey; the Pontiff's departure in the middle of the night, in a padlocked carriage; the grievous illness from which Pius VII was suffering in the course of the journey, at Mt. Cenis, where he nearly succumbed to atrocious pains; the arrival (June 19) at Fontainebleau, where, contrary to the promises, nothing had been prepared to receive the Pontiff, and the installation of the supreme head of the Church in a modest lodge, furnished for the porter of the château.

At that time Napoleon was far from Paris. Never perhaps did he think himself nearer the realization of his grandiose dream. On June 24, 1812, he crossed the Niemen and was threatening Russia, as he exclaimed: "The destinies are about to be fulfilled." Once conqueror of the czar, would he not be able to do what he wished with the Pope? Napoleon was reckoning without the formidable might of the Russian Empire, without the severity of the climate, and without the just decrees of divine Providence.

Everyone knows about the disasters that befell the Grand Army: the dreadful Moscow fire, the premature snowfall, the

sudden upset of all the plans of campaign, discouragement replacing enthusiasm, and, notwithstanding the heroic efforts of Ney, Drouot, officers, and soldiers, the retreat from Russia transformed into a catastrophe, while in France the conspiracy of General Malet, who almost succeeded, showed that the Empire in the absence of its head was at the mercy of a surprise coup.

Napoleon returned to the Tuileries (December 18, 1812) and, after attending to urgent matters, informed the Pope (December 29) of his desire "to put an end to the differences that were dividing the state and the Church." This first overture was the preliminary of the negotiations that were carried on between the bishops of Treves and Evreux, representing the Emperor, and four Italian cardinals representing the Pope.[79]

Napoleon's plan was said to be to weary, by prolonged conferences, the spirit of the Pontiff, already much weakened, and to await, for personal intervention, the Pope's state of prostration which would leave him defenseless.[80] The conjecture is quite probable. At any rate, in the evening of January 19, 1813, the prisoner of Fontainebleau saw the Emperor abruptly enter the sitting room where he was, cast himself into the Pope's arms, kiss his face, and make a thousand expressions of friendship toward him. Says Artaud: "The Pope always liked something in Napoleon's qualities. In the boundless goodness of his heart, he had always attributed the evil treatment to which he was subjected to wicked subalterns. He seemed to be satisfied with these outward demonstrations; to the persons whom he saw habitually he recounted these expressions, and he did not forget the embrace and kiss of Napoleon." [81] At this little first evening meeting, no business matters were brought up.

These matters were introduced the next day. Five hours

[79] Cardinals Doria, Dugnani, Ruffo, and Bayane.
[80] Artaud, III, 36.
[81] *Ibid.*

passed in long and serious discussions. History must forego an account of the incidents. The famous scene so dramatically described by Alfred de Vigny does not rest on any authentic testimony. The words of *Commediante* and of *Tragediante* were never uttered.[82] But we know with certainty that Napoleon spoke to the august and enfeebled Pontiff with full military rudeness. The Pope, several times questioned on the fact that he was struck by the Emperor, always answered that the accusation was not true. He said: "No, the Emperor did not resort to such an indignity, and God permits that on this occasion we have not to utter a falsehood." [83]

The Concordat

Pius VII was then seventy-one years old. As we learn from Artaud, "physical ailments, a sensibility stirred by the desire of again seeing the cardinals that were being kept prisoners, the importunity of Bertalozzi who urged him to accord everything, the entreaties of certain Italian cardinals who wore him out with menacing conjectures, the absolute silence of any wise and high-minded voice coming to relieve that soul afflicted with suffering: all contributed to discourage the Pontiff." On the evening of January 25, 1813, he was presented with a project that was to serve as a basis for a final agreement, and to which he was asked to attach his name. The aged august Pontiff turned imploringly to the four cardinals present (Doria, Dugnani, Ruffo, and Bayane). Napoleon too was there, attentive and impatient. From the cardinals not a word, not a sign that could make known to the Pope what advice they had to offer. But the previous evening they had told him that his duty was to put an end to the sufferings of the Church, to the exile of his counsellors, to the imprisonment of his priests. Pius VII

[82] Alfred de Vigny, *Servitude et grandeur militaires,* chap. 5.
[83] Artaud, III, 37.

put his signature on the document, and at once the Emperor signed his name beside that of the Pope.

Pius VII had signed the so-called concordat of 1813, which Napoleon hastened to promulgate and to make obligatory for the whole Empire. The main provisions of the treaty were the following: the pope, who would receive an income of 2,000,000 francs, would fix his see in Italy or in France; the full right to appoint bishops in the whole Empire would belong to the Emperor, with the exception of the suburbicarian sees and ten others to be determined; further, the decree of the national council would remain in force. In return for these concessions, the cardinals and the imprisoned bishops would immediately be freed.

This act was an implicit renunciation of the Papal States; it was an abandonment of the rights for which the strife had hitherto been carried on. As the "black cardinals," Gabrielli, Pietro, especially Pacca and Consalvi, arrived at Fontainebleau, the Pope's conscience, enlightened by the advice of these prudent counsellors, who had been so cruelly separated from him, awoke the most poignant regrets. His grief was profound; for several days he abstained from celebrating Mass. The opinion of the newly arrived cardinals was that the Pope ought to protest, by a letter written by his own hand, against the concordat as null and void, inasmuch as it was extorted from him by fraud and violence. This letter [84] was signed March 24, 1813. Six weeks later it was followed by a brief pronouncing null the institutions that might be given by the metropolitans, the bishops thus instituted as intruders, and the consecrating bishops as schismatic.

From this moment the Holy Father recovered his serenity. He said to his cardinals: "I feel my heart relieved of an enormous weight." However, he might well be fearful of the effects of his letter and his brief.

[84] The full text may be seen in Pacca, *Mémoires*, II, 131–40.

Events would have to solve the situation. On April 25 Napoleon had gone to take command of the army in Germany, counting on returning after his victory to obtain satisfaction from the unmanageable old man. The success of the battle of Lutzen (May 2) enlivened his hopes. A circular communicated the news of the victory to all the bishops of the Empire, and a letter announced it to the Pope as a happy event for religion as well as for the Empire. But the victory of Lutzen was destined to be the last smile of Napoleon's good fortune. On October 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1813, the coalition of Europe delivered to the Emperor of the French one of the bloodiest battles known in history, the famous Battle of the Nations, which saw 120,000 men fall on the fields of Leipsic. Two months later, in the night of December 31, 1813, a foreign army of 200,000 men crossed the Rhine; and almost at the same time, by the frontiers of Germany, Switzerland, and Spain, 800,000 men (Russians, Austrians, Germans, Swedes, English, and Spaniards) invaded France.

Confronted by the foreign invasion, Napoleon wished to rid himself of his prisoner. He had him taken to Savona (January 23, 1814); on March 10 he had the Pontiff set at liberty. The Pope reached Rome on May 24, after a triumphal journey. Napoleon had signed his abdication April 11, in that same palace of Fontainebleau which he had wished to make a prison for the vicar of Christ.[85]

[85] Within a short interval the people of the Midi saw two processions pass, that of the Pope and that of the Emperor. Cardinal Pacca relates that, while the Pope was crossing the Rhone on the bridge of boats from Beaucaire to Tarascon, the inhabitants of the two cities gathered together to offer him the testimony of a most tender veneration. Nothing could be heard but shouts of joy, applause, felicitations. Colonel Lagorse, charged with conducting the Pope, then said to this whole people: "What, then, would you do if the Emperor were passing?" To these words the people answered: "We would give him a drink." As the colonel became angry, one of the most violent of the crowd cried out to him: "Colonel, are you thirsty also?" Artaud, III, 81. He thus predicted what happened two months later, at Orgon, where the dethroned Emperor, according to Thiers' expression, experienced "the saddest humiliation of his life." To escape from the violence with which these ter-

Napoleon and the Protestants

"The Concordat, which in principle was a work of pacification and reconciliation, Napoleon tried little by little to turn into an instrument of personal domination." [86] An immense vanity explains the conduct of this man, whose genius was able to realize that restoration of the Church which France was waiting for after the ruins of the Revolution. That same vanity explains the policy he followed with regard to Protestantism, Judaism, and Freemasonry.

Fundamentally, we may believe, by his early education and his reason Napoleon was Catholic. The desire to make his Catholicism serve his personal ambition does not necessarily exclude the sincerity of his belief.[87] But his attitude toward the Protestants, Jews, and Freemasons seems inspired solely by political calculation.

At St. Helena, when an Irish doctor asked Napoleon if he had not encouraged the Freemasons, the prisoner replied: "A little, because they combated the Pope." [88] This reason and also the desire to seize considerable political forces for his own advantage also explains his policy toward the Protestants and Jews.

The organic law of 18 Germinal of the year X (August 8, 1802) had united the two chief Protestant religions, that which went back to Calvin and that which claimed its origin from Luther, on a footing of equality with the Catholic Church. On

rible Provençals were threatening him, for they had already prepared a gallows from which to hang him, Napoleon had to put on a foreign uniform so as to appear to be one of the officers of the escort. Thiers, *Histoire du consulat et de l'empire,* XVII, 834.

[86] Welschinger, p. 455.

[87] On Napoleon's religion, see Mathieu, *Le concordat de 1801,* pp. 30–33, 346. The celebrated text on the divinity of Christ seems to be authentic beyond question. See the book entitled *Sentiments de Napoléon sur le christianisme, conversations religieuses recueillies à Sainte-Hélène.* The words on first Communion seem not to be apocryphal, although they have been arranged.

[88] Account by O'Meara, quoted in *La correspondance de Napoléon,* XXXII, 394.

the day of his consecration Napoleon, receiving the president of the Geneva Consistory, who offered him the homage of all the Protestants, told him "how satisfied he was with the fidelity and the good conduct of the pastors and faithful of the different Protestant communions," and promised to protect the free exercise of their worship.[89] As we are told by a historian of Protestantism, "the Emperor abided by his promise. No persecution of the Protestants under his regime; no acts of violence in high or low places; a full and continuous security." [90] "No important book of dogma, Church history, or sacred eloquence is known which dates from the reign of Napoleon"; [91] but in 1808–10 the Emperor, by creating a faculty of Protestant theology at Montauban, favored the movement of studies in the Reformed Church; at Paris, churches were placed at the disposition of the Protestants, such as the church of St. Thomas of the Louvre, which they already had the use of, that of the abbey of Penthemont (rue de Grenelle), that of the Visitation (rue de Saint-Antoine), and in 1811 the large and beautiful church of the Oratory (rue Saint-Honoré). Under the Empire many Protestants occupied high posts, such as Senator Sers, Pelet de la Lozère the Counsellor of State, the tribunes Jaucourt and Boissy d'Anglas, the bankers Delessert and Mallet. We have seen that in Holland in 1811 the Emperor repeated to the Protestants the assurance of satisfaction that he gave them in 1804. How completely gratified he must have been! The Protestants offered incense to his power no less than the most complacent of the Catholics and they eagerly fought the power of the pope. In 1810 Rabaut-Pommier undertook to establish, by a well-ordered demonstration, that the coming of Napoleon had been announced by the prophets.[92] Nowhere was the feast of the fifteenth of August celebrated with greater

[89] G. de Felice, *Histoire des protestants français,* p. 610.
[90] *Ibid.,* p. 611.
[91] *Ibid.,* p. 612.
[92] Grégoire, *Histoire des sectes religieuses,* II, 109.

ardor than in the Protestant temples; and several of the pastors justified the expression of Madame de Staël, who, in her famous report to the Directory, pointed to Protestantism as "the most formidable war machine" that could be used to oppose the papacy.[93]

Napoleon and the Jews

The law of 18 Germinal of the year X, which granted legal recognition to Catholic and Protestant worship, refused it to Jewish worship, because, said Portalis, "the Jews form a religion less than they do a people."[94] That religion was therefore neither regulated nor subsidized by the state.

Since the decrees of the Constituent Assembly the Jews enjoyed personally both civil and political equality. But precisely since they "formed a people" they constituted a power that Napoleon's genius could not but reckon with; for, according to the direction which that power might take, it could be useful or injurious to his cause. During his campaign in Italy, Napoleon valued the financial services which the Jewish banks of the Michels, Cerfbeers, and Bedarrides rendered to him. True, their exactions and the rigor they exercised in the prosecution of their debtors often stirred public opinion against them. In 1805 the Jews of Alsace, by their intervention in the sale of the national goods, and by their usurious loans, had particularly drawn the attention of the Emperor, who, by a decree of May 30, 1806, obliged them to submit, at least provisionally, to a regime of exception, to suspend for a year the execution of the judgments granted in their favor.[95] But this people, active and clever, seemed at the same time desirous of attaching themselves closely to the state. In their synagogue on rue Sainte

[93] Gautier, *Mme de Staël et Napoléon.*

[94] Boulay de la Meurthe, *op. cit.*, V, 387.

[95] Lemann, *Napoléon Ier et les Israelites*, pp. 18–24; Sagnac, "Les Juifs et Napoléon," in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 1900 to 1902.

Avoye, the Parisian Jews were most exact in solemnizing all the great political events. The proclamation of the Empire and the coronation were there celebrated with Hebrew songs and speeches in French. Napoleon profited by these dispositions, which could not but flatter his ambition.

Noteworthy is the way he was affected by these dispositions. With the Catholics, who have a common doctrine and a single head, Napoleon was able to conclude a concordat. With the Protestants, who have neither, he proceeded by use of his own authority. But what was to be done in the case of the Jews? They did not have a single head, but they had a common doctrine. That doctrine was to some extent formerly safeguarded by the great Sanhedrin which had condemned Christ and St. Paul; and doubtless, if in 1806 it still had its seat at Jerusalem, Napoleon would have treated with it. But the great Sanhedrin, whose authority, moreover, had never been supreme, was now nothing but a distant remembrance. Napoleon's desire was to have before him some authority that could enlighten him on the principles professed by the Jews regarding the civil society and to assure him that none of their religious regulations were incompatible with the safety of the state. As that authority did not exist, he decided to form it.[96]

By Napoleon's order representatives of all the synagogues of the Empire were summoned to Paris and there met together under the name of Great Sanhedrin. The sessions of the assembly opened on February 10, 1807, in a hall next to the City Hall, and they continued until April 9. The imperial commissioners placed before the representatives of the Jewish religion the following questions: "Do you recognize France as your fatherland? Do you promise to obey its laws, notably the laws about the military service and monogamy? Lastly, do you admit that the rules of honesty and humanity, which you regard as obligatory with regard to your coreligionists, are likewise so regarding the French?" A decree of March 2, 1807, noted the

[96] Chenon, in *L'histoire générale*, IX, 270.

affirmative answers that were made to these questions and registered them as "doctrinal decisions." [97] Several other decisions then regulated the legal situation of the Jews and their religious organization.

The most important of these legislative acts is the organic decree of March 17, 1808, which regulated the condition of the rabbis, synagogues, particular consistories, and the central consistory. This last was to be composed of three rabbis and two laymen, appointed the first time by the Emperor.[98]

This official recognition was welcomed by most of the Jews with triumphant gratefulness. An address by the Paris consistory (July, 1809) said: "Sire, to whom heaven has reserved the power to place man on an equality with man. . . . Thanks to your mighty genius, we are no longer strangers on the soil which has witnessed our birth." [99]

Napoleon and the Freemasons

Like the Jews, the Freemasons showed themselves quite disposed to place their undertakings under the protection of the Empire. Rebold informs us that, in 1801, at the Grand Orient they glorified "the idol of the day." [100] Did Napoleon respond fully to these advances? We may suppose so when we read the discourse delivered (June 23, 1810) in the Marie-Louise lodge at Rome by General Radet: "In this feast I proclaim the Emperor as the protector of Freemasonry, and I add this new title of glory to all those titles which have already been bestowed on him by the men whose welfare he has been." [101] The poet Arnault was doubtlessly exaggerating in

[97] Theodore Reinach, *Histoire des Israelites*, pp. 334–37.

[98] Lanzac de Laborie, *op. cit.*, p. 375.

[99] Lemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 114–20; Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations*, p. 341.

[100] Rebold, *Histoire des trois grandes loges*, p. 89.

[101] Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon*, p. 351; Bourgin, in the review, *La Révolution française*, I, 427.

the opposite sense when he summed up Napoleon's attitude by this expression, which the Emperor is supposed to have spoken regarding the Freemasons: "They are children amusing themselves; let them do so and watch over them." [102] The exact note seems to have been given by Portalis in a confidential report: "In France no one could destroy the meetings of men and women known under the general name of Masonic lodges. . . . The real means of preventing their degenerating into harmful assemblies has been to grant them a tacit protection by having them presided over by the chief dignitaries of the state." [103]

What we are certain of is that the reorganization of the Grand Orient, which took place toward the end of 1803, was accomplished in a way to relieve the authority of all anxiety. The Council was largely composed of generals and high officials. Masonry had a great interest in relying on the public powers. Says Rebold: "In 1803 the Grand Orient, seeing that opposition was being renewed against its power, sought a greater support with the government. It succeeded in having the duties of the order's grand administrator accepted by general Massena, who was proclaimed in that capacity on December 18." [104] The next year the convention, called "The Concordat of 1804," by which the general Grand Lodge and the Supreme Council merged with the Grand Orient, was signed (December 3) in the house of Marshal Kellermann.[105] In 1805 the grand master Roettiers de Montaleau, the great restorer of Masonry, "nobly resigned," says the *Annals,* "and yielded his place to the prince Joseph

[102] Arnault, *Souvenirs d'un sexagénaire,* I, 150.

[103] Quoted by Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon,* IV, 377. "The statement of Napoleon's supposed affiliation to Freemasonry rests only on some vague data. The *Abeille maçonnique* affirms it; Besuchet (1829) holds that it took place on the island of Malta at the time of the Egyptian expedition. Landry reports that Emperor Napoleon on that day, along with Duroc and Lauriston, went to a lodge of the faubourg Saint-Marcel. These declarations are gratuitous." Max Doumic, *Le secret de la franc-maçonnerie,* p. 199.

[104] Rebold, *op. cit.,* p. 92.

[105] *Ibid.,* p. 94. On the general Grand Lodge and the Supreme Council, see *ibid.,* pp. 87, 95.

Bonaparte." [106] Rebold adds that Joseph Bonaparte had been named for the post of grand master by the Emperor himself.[107] Some of the chief officers of Masonry at this period were the following: grand master, prince Joseph Bonaparte; adjutant grand master, prince Louis Bonaparte; grand administrator, Marshal Masséna; first grand sentry, Marshal Murat; second grand sentry, Lacépède; grand orator, Lalande.[108] What was the genuine role of a society with such a staff? We know that the lodge of Neuf-Soeurs, faithful to its title, took a large share in the literary exercises. The lodge Sainte-Caroline, one of whose members was the Duchess de Carignan, mother of the future king of Sardinia, and another the former Duchess de Luynes, was distinguished by its dances and its gay banquets.

But behind these worldly celebrations, were political intrigues concocted? Were plots formed there against the Church and the papacy? The answer to such questions, according to the prudent remark of a certain historian, could be profitably looked for only in the archives of the rue Cadet.[109]

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 99.
[107] *Ibid.*, p. 106.
[108] *Ibid.*, p. 98.
[109] Bourgin, in the review, *La Révolution française,* II (1905), 52.

CHAPTER X

Last Years of Pius VII

PIUS VII's solemn entry into Rome took place on May 24, the feast of Our Lady Help of Christians. The Church, in her offices, in the celebration of this anniversary attributes to the protection of the Blessed Virgin the deliverance of the supreme head of the Church.[1] Cardinal Pacca, who had again become the faithful companion of the Pontiff, thus recalls the joys of that day, which he himself witnessed.

> Others have spoken at considerable length of the joy, devotion, and love which the good Roman people showed in that triumphal entry. For fear of describing something above the reality, I hesitate to speak of it. I will merely say that, wherever the carriage bearing the Holy Father passed, you could see a multitude of persons whose tears of joy choked their words.[2]

Before his arrival at Rome, Pius VII had given orders that a kindly welcome should be extended to the Emperor's mother, Madame Laetitia, who, after the manner of Mesdames Adelaide and Victoire (aunts of Louis XVI), of King Charles IV of Spain, of Queen Maria Louisa, and of many other royal persons stripped of their power, came to Rome to shelter great misfortune in the Eternal City. Shortly afterwards the Pope, through the intermediary of Consalvi, recommended the family of the dethroned Emperor to the generosity of the allied rulers.[3] Pius VII had never been able to rid himself of a sym-

[1] See the Roman Breviary, feast of Our Lady Help of Christians, third lesson of the second nocturn.

[2] Pacca, *Mémoires*, I, 407.

[3] Letter to Consalvi, October 6, 1817, quoted by Haussonville, V, 347.

pathy for Napoleon. He believed in the Emperor's Christian dispositions; throughout his life the Pope remained under the charm of the great man with whom he had signed the concordat. In 1817, moved by the sufferings of the august prisoner at the time of his banishment to St. Helena, the Pope's magnanimity went so far as to ask of the Prince Regent of England an amelioration of the treatment that was being dealt out to his former persecutor. Napoleon's mother wrote (May 27, 1818): "We find no sympathy and refuge except in the papal government. I speak in the name of a whole family of the proscribed, especially in the name of him who is dying by slow torture on a barren rock." [4] Thus did the Pope take his revenge. The Emperor, at the time of his career's approaching end, mindful perhaps of this kindness, requested of Rome a priest to receive his last confidences and to assist him to pass in a Christian manner the last years of a life so glorious and so distressed.[5]

European Situation

But while the merciful heart of the Pontiff turned with pity to the misfortune of his fallen enemy, his attention was sharply drawn to the new situation created in Europe on the morrow of the great Emperor's fall. This situation would impose new duties on his apostolic solicitude.

An eminent Protestant historian, Leopold von Ranke, rightly remarks that the result of the great wars of Napoleon had been to rally round the Pope, not only the descendants of the Catholic sovereigns who had the most violently driven the Jesuits from their states, such as the kings of France, Spain, and Portugal,

[4] Letter to Cardinal Fesch, May 27, 1818.

[5] On Napoleon's Christian death, see, in the *Gaulois* of April 6, 1912, or in the *Revue du clergé français* of May 1, 1912, the testimony of Countess Lapeyrouse de Bonfils, daughter of General de Montholon, who received the Emperor's last sign and who closed his eyes.

or who had most warmly sustained Jansenism, such as the sovereigns of Tuscany and Austria, but also the representatives of the Protestant or schismatic nations where the rationalism of Voltaire had found its strongest support, England, Germany, and Russia. When these nations sought to realize a political restoration, they were led to rest it on a religious restoration in agreement with the Pope, and "when the four great alliled powers, three of them anti-Catholic, met at London to regulate the international situation, one of the first questions they had to consider was the desire expressed by the Pope that he recover the possession of the whole Roman state." [6] As following the fall of the Roman Empire or of Charlemagne's Empire, the papacy remained the great moral power, standing amid the ruins.

If we would express in a word the desire of Europe in 1815, we find nothing better than the word "Restoration." As Cardinal Hergenröther wrote, "In the best minds of this period all concern seemed to be determined by a need for restoration." [7] This restoration was first desired in the political order. No one, not even Metternich, who would thenceforth for more than thirty years be the arbiter of Europe, thought of reviving the organization of the old regime. No doubt some intentional exaggeration was to be found in the word spoken at the Congress of Vienna by Cardinal Consalvi: "Between the present times and ancient times I see more differences than between the era following the Deluge and that preceding it." [8] But the Revolution and the Empire had established facts against which any reaction was futile. Statesmen's looks turned less to the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV than to the institutions of con-

[6] Ranke, *Histoire de la papauté* (French trans.), III, 372. This desire of the Pope, which Ranke speaks of, was expressed in a letter from Pius VII to the congress of Prague in 1813. Cf. Van Duerm, *Correspondance de Consalvi avec Metternich*, p. v.

[7] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte*, VIII, Bk. III, Part I, chap. 7.

[8] Quoted by Goyau, "Consalvi au congrès de Vienne," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of September 1, 1906, p. 147. Cf. Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon*, p. 681.

stitutional England, which acquired a new prestige from her material prosperity and her recent victories. Following the regime of repression which Emperor Napoleon had exercised over them, the nations aspired to "develop henceforth according to the specific laws of their historic traditions and their ethnic qualities, in relations regulated solely by the reciprocity of their rights and their own aspirations." [9]

After the disturbances of the Revolution and the wars of the Empire, the restoration of economic life and of public liberties, so long fettered, was also one of the urgent needs. The tendency toward the same goal we see in Russia changing her serfs into workers, and her rich lords into manufacturers; in Prussia seeking the progress of her industry by joining tariff associations; in France replacing her old landed aristocracy with a military aristocracy of the vanished regime. Everywhere the youth, which for a long time had been thrilled at the word "glory," now was enthused at the word "liberty." Says Musset: "A man mounted the speakers' platform, holding in his hand an agreement between the king and the people; he started saying that glory is something beautiful, as also warlike ambition; but something more beautiful is liberty. At this word the children raised their heads." [10]

In this enthusiasm for a public life more industrious and more free, some revolutionary elements secretly mingled with the lawful claims. In Poland and Italy these claims aimed more and more especially at winning an individual nationality, in Germany the attainment of unity, in England an electoral reform, in France the acquisition of a national charter. But secret societies having their origin under the Empire, to some extent everywhere, for the purpose or on the pretext of resisting oppression, were carrying on their underground work after the re-establishment of peace. Of these societies the typical one was

[9] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *ibid.*

[10] Alfred de Musset, *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*, chap. 2, p. 6.

the Carbonari. This society, originating in Calabria under the government of Murat, was at first directed against foreign rule but soon affiliated with Freemasonry, from which it took its principal rites. The Carbonari would spread from Italy into Austria and France, where Saint-Simonianism developed steady relations with them.[11]

The statesmen who met at the Congress of Vienna (September 22, 1814) had thus no small task before them. We are not here called upon to recount their political work, the sudden interruption of the Congress (March 11, 1815) at news of the return of Bonaparte and his march on Paris, the flight of King Louis XVIII, the Hundred Days, the catastrophe of Waterloo, then the second and final abdication of Napoleon and his exile to St. Helena, where he arrived on October 15, 1815. When Murat, taking advantage of this revolution, invaded Rome, Pius VII, following the dictates of prudence, left the Eternal City and temporarily withdrew to Genoa, but without being frightened over the future. To Jancourt, the French ambassador, he said: "Have no fear; this storm will not last three months." [12]

When the storm had passed, the Congress of Vienna again took up its labors. Consalvi, who appears as the superior diplomat even in the face of Talleyrand and Metternich, step by step argued with his colleagues for the integrity of the Papal States, which were restored to the pope, including the three legations and the principalities of Benevento and Ponte Corvo.[13]

But the rulers and the diplomats who discussed so many high

[11] On the origin and development of the Carbonari, see Cantu, *Histoire de cent ans (1750–1850)*, II, 430–34.

[12] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VII*, p. 123.

[13] Cf. the important work of Father Rinieri, *Della diplomazia nel secolo XIX*, Vol. IV: *Il congresso di Vienna e la santa Sede;* Vol. V: *Corrispondenza inedita dei cardinali Consalvi e Pacca nel tempo del congresso di Vienna.* Van Duerm, *Correspondance de Consalvi et de Metternich.* Historians had credited the good will of Russia and Prussia with the re-establishment of Pius VII in his states. Father Rinieri's work shows decisively that Consalvi's chief auxiliary was Metternich.

political problems were too well informed to close their eyes to a truth that had struck Napoleon Bonaparte at the close of the Revolution. Evidence for this truth had since then continued to increase: that no political or social restoration could be firmly organized without the help of religion. This conviction at first inspired him with the idea of the Holy Alliance, then, after the failure of this first attempt, with the more practical thought of an entente between the rulers and the Holy Father. That entente was brought about by a series of concordats, most of them in imitation of the French concordat of 1801.

The Holy Alliance

In February 1816, a diplomatic treaty was promulgated having a basis and form in singular contrast to all the acts of this sort generally known. The signatories of this treaty were Emperor Alexander I of Russia, King Ferdinand William III of Prussia, and Emperor Francis I of Austria, to whom were soon added all the kings of Europe except those of England and Saxony. They declared that, "being intimately convinced that the powers must base their advance on the sublime truths taught us by the eternal religion of God the Savior, they proclaimed before the whole world their unshakable determination to take as the rule of their conduct only the precepts of that holy religion, precepts of justice, charity, and peace." Henceforth, conformably with the words of Holy Scripture, they would regard one another as brothers and compatriots, would remain "united by bonds of a true and indissoluble brotherhood," and would offer one another "on every occasion and in all places, assistance, aid, and succor." Ever since at Mersen, in 847, the sons of Louis the Pious, concerned with the safety of their common realm, had solemnly proclaimed "the need of living in concord and union, as wished by the order of God and true brotherhood," such language had never again been spoken by kings.

The publication of this document, soon famous as the Treaty of the Holy Alliance, produced a profound feeling. While some hailed it as the dawn of an immense and favorable Christian rebirth, others cursed it as the announcement of an era of slavery for the peoples. The Treaty of the Holy Alliance deserved neither that enthusiasm nor those curses. Evidently the first idea of it came from the King of Prussia in 1813 after the Battle of Bautzen; but it was the personal work of Emperor Alexander, suggested by an enthusiastic woman, Baroness von Krüdner.

Born at Riga on the shores of the Baltic in 1766, the same year as saw the birth of Madame de Staël, she had an impressionable and mystical nature which was at first nourished by the writings of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and Swedenborg. Afterward she mingled in the high society of Europe at the time when the tragical scenes of the Revolution and the threatening wars of the Empire were upsetting the nations. This woman, Juliana von Wietinghoff, Baroness von Krüdner, was one of those souls whose sensibility vibrated at the shock of all the events they lived through and whose imagination at once transposed the impressions into grandiose visions, into gigantic projects. At the beginning of 1815, while she was in Switzerland, some circumstance brought her into the presence of Emperor Alexander I, whose enthusiastic and visionary nature was prone to accept the strangest missions. That which Baroness von Krüdner pointed out to him consisted in nothing less than the regeneration of the world. "The black angel," whom Providence had recently banished to an island of the Ocean, would be succeeded by "the white angel," the "universal Savior," coming, as she said, "from the countries of Aquilon" (the North Wind). Presently she became the confidante of the Russian Emperor, his Egeria. The text of the famous treaty, which we have set forth in general terms, was drawn up in final form (September 26, 1815) only after it had been carefully compared with that which was its first inspiration.

This mystical pact was endorsed by Prince Metternich, who became its earnest defender because he probably saw in it the means of bolstering his monarchical policy. In spite of this noteworthy support, it soon languished, then broke completely. The English non-intervention policy, then that of Eastern Russia, the policy of England and France in favor of Greece, were its manifest contradiction. These religious flights of fancy, which did not venture to name the Church of Christ, with the idea that all beliefs could therein fraternize together, was unable to result in anything practical or to hold any of the contracting parties in a union where the bond was so vague. The Holy Alliance, under its ill-defined form, "was merely the proclamation, from the heart of the political tempest, of that disease of the nullity of faith, of modern indifference and wretchedness, which, with more or less authority and illusion, would in various ways be explored by de Maistre, Saint-Simon, Ballanche, Fourier, and Lamennais." [14]

Far better inspiration had prompted those German princes who, at the beginning of the century, strove to solve the religious question by concordats imitating that which the Pope concluded with Napoleon. In 1803 a certain ecclesiastic, devoted to the Febronian doctrines, made advances in this direction to Pius VII, in the name of Bavaria. The next year a rumor was current in the chanceries that Emperor Francis II was studying a concordat project for the whole Empire. In 1806 the nuncio (della Genga) at Ratisbon discussed the respective advantages of a concordat of the whole Empire or of a series of individual concordats. Napoleon pretended, of his own accord, to regulate the question by an imperial concordat that would consolidate his formation of a confederation of the Rhine. But this project encountered the preferences of the German rulers, naturally in favor of particular concordats for their states. This conflict indefinitely prolonged the conferences.

[14] Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits de femmes, Madame de Krüdner,* p. 404.

The imprisonment of the Pope rendered their continuation useless. But the fall of the Empire permitted their resumption in 1815; from that time, not only Germany but all the Catholic nations, one after the other, took up the religious policy of the concordats.[15]

We note a strange fact. Following Napoleon's fall, the first nation with which Rome negotiated a concordat was a non-Catholic one, the nation from which, since the sixteenth century, the Church had suffered the bloodiest persecutions, the country of Henry VIII, Elizabeth, and Cromwell.

The political combinations, by which His Britannic Majesty was made the chief adversary of Napoleon, made him also the defender of the rights of the pope. The King of England was the one who supported the demands of the Holy See when Pius VII presented claims to the works of art that had been taken off to Paris. We are told that George III spent 200,000 francs to have these masterpieces transported to Rome and have them again set up there. When, before the opening of the Congress of Vienna (March, 1814), Cardinal Consalvi came to London, where the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Russia then were, with a view to assuring the Holy See of the backing of the sovereigns, he there received a most friendly welcome on the part of the people, as likewise from the prime minister, Lord Castlereagh, and even from the King himself.[16] The accomplished diplomat profited by this circumstance. Not satisfied with treating the question of the full restoration of the papal domain, he broached the question of the rights of English Catholics.

We know that, ever since the reign of Elizabeth, all relations between Great Britain and Rome were severed. The Statute of Praemunire provided that any person who would receive

[15] On the history of these first negotiations of Germany, see Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* I, 107–11.

[16] Viscount de Richemond, "A la veille du congrès de Vienne," in the *Correspondant* of September 25, 1905, p. 1114.

from Rome any document whatever should be guilty of high treason. This article had never been abrogated. On the contrary, it was applied in 1792 under circumstances emphasizing its gravity. When Pius VII wrote to the King of England to thank him for the hospitality extended to the French clergy in his states, the prelate charged with carrying the papal document was notified, upon his arrival, that, according to existing laws, he could not be received. The oath of allegiance (abjuration of belief in the transubstantiation and the recognition of the supremacy of the king in the Church) was always required of all who wished to enter the military or civil service, or to sit in Parliament.

Two facts, however, had weakened the prejudice of the English people against what they called "the papist superstition." Eight thousand French ecclesiastics, proscribed by the Revolution and generously welcomed on English territory, had there won the high regard of their hosts. Besides, the novels of Walter Scott accustomed the English imagination to sympathize with Catholic personages, and the writings of Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey had accomplished in England a work like that of Chateaubriand in France and of Goerres in Germany.

After Waterloo, English thought, now freed from the gigantic efforts that had absorbed it during the struggle against Napoleon, gave more attention to the religious problems. Matured by the tremendous crisis they had just passed through, rulers and subjects turned to Christianity there to find a doctrine of peace and of life, rather than an occasion of strife against Rome.

In these dispositions of mind the conference began at London between Consalvi and Lord Castlereagh. The minister at the outset clearly declared "that he could not think of requiring from the Catholics anything beyond what their principles allowed." For the abrogation of the penal laws against Catholics

and the full emancipation of Catholics, he prefaced three conditions: 1. the taking of an oath of fidelity to the Constitution; 2. the intervention of the government in the nomination of bishops, either by a veto or by some other form to be considered; 3. the submitting of all documents coming from Rome to the royal exequatur. The Holy Father, to whom Consalvi referred the question, replied: 1. that he judged legitimate the oath of fidelity and that he gladly would accept the formula inserted in the French concordat or any analogous formula; 2. that the question of the nomination of bishops involved more serious considerations, because the Roman pontiffs had never granted the requested right to any sovereign belonging to another communion, but that the Holy Father, without compromising the basic principle, could heartily accept certain conciliatory forms; 3. lastly, the Pope declared that he could in no wise accept the royal exequatur for all rescripts of the Holy See. This point touched the very life of the Church, whose spiritual independence the pope must maintain at all costs.

This reply of Pius VII was evidence of his disinterestedness. "His opposition to the wishes of the English cabinet might lose at Vienna a support on which he was basing valuable hope, but he did not hesitate thus to risk his temporal power in order to safeguard the spiritual interests of the Church." [17]

Such were the foundations on which Consalvi was authorized to negotiate with the prime minister of England. Circumstances prevented the two diplomats, while they were at Vienna, from concluding the project. As remarked appositely by the historian who was the first to make public the history of this interesting attempt, "in this realm of ideas, failures are not so much defeats as they are steps preceding the victory, and every sincere effort brings the hour nearer." [18] Before Consalvi left

[17] Viscount de Richemond, "Un essai de Concordat entre l'Angleterre et le Saint-Siège," in the *Correspondant* of October 10, 1905, p. 76.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

Rome, Castlereagh in words of praise declared that "the cardinal's conduct gave an exact notion of what the clergy of the Roman court really is." In the course of the conferences he had proposed an exchange of diplomatic envoys between the king of England and the pope.[19] Four years later King George III accredited a minister to the Holy See. In the sequel formidable obstacles would arise against the proposed diplomatic entente and against the movement of individual conversions to Catholicism; but the advance toward Rome had begun.

The Church in France

Quite different was the situation in France. King Louis XVIII (June 4, 1814) granted a charter, in its political portion imitating the English Constitution, but declaring the Catholic religion the religion of the state. Other legislative acts soon emphasized the clearly Catholic policy of the Restoration. Before the Hundred Days, an ordinance (March 2, 1815) reestablished the Foreign Mission Seminary and the seminaries of the Holy Ghost. The Jesuits, without being the object of a special authorization, returned, relying on the guaranties which the charter contained about liberty. The "Chambre introuvable" abolished the divorce law; the bishops obtained partial direction and supervision over the educational establishments, and the observance of Sundays and feast days was prescribed by law.

But Pius VII soon perceived that this protective policy would not lack a hidden hostility to his personal authority, a hostility which showed itself both in the government and in some of the upper clergy of France.

We recall that, when in 1801 the Holy Father called for the resignation of all the bishops, thirty-six members of the episcopal body refused submission to this measure. Death re-

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

duced their number to about one-half. But the restoration of the king, whose devoted followers they had remained, strengthened their claims. Gathered round a prelate whose influence constituted their main strength, Talleyrand-Perigord, former archbishop of Reims and a personal friend of King Louis XVIII, they openly bore the title of their see even when this had been suppressed by the new diocesan boundaries in accord with the concordat. They held in disdain those whom they called "the bishops of the concordat" and they recalled that their sovereign, during his exile, had ever protested against the agreement concluded between Pius VII and Bonaparte. The revision of the concordat of 1801, the total removal of the concordat prelates, the re-establishment of all the bishoprics existing in 1789, the appointment of new titulars to the vacant sees according to the regulations of the 1516 concordat: such were their clearly defined demands. An ecclesiastical commission, appointed by the King and instructed to study the question, endorsed all these claims. These demands were sent to the French ambassador at Rome, de Pressigny, the former bishop of Saint-Malo, by the minister of foreign affairs, Prince Talleyrand.

At Rome, feeling ran high. The Pope appointed, to assist Consalvi, a commission of three cardinals. These replied to the proposals of the French government with the following counterproposals: 1. the bishoprics of 1801 would be maintained along with their titulars; 2. the government would bestow on the clergy a permanent endowment; 3. it would assure the submission of the former bishops who had not resigned. The pretention of the thirty-six bishops to impose their interpretation on the Church, was particularly objectionable to Consalvi. "All the Catholic Churches," he said, "those of Spain, Italy, Germany, Poland, as also the Church of America, have assented to the Holy Father's act and hold communion with the concordat bishops. How, then, can anyone dare to say that the whole

Catholic Church rests in the thirty-six non-resigned bishops, now reduced to ten or twelve in number?" [20]

Long discussions ended in a "Convention of August 25, 1816," by which the concordat of 1516 would be re-established. As for the concordat of 1801, it was neither disavowed nor expressly revoked, but would cease to have its effect. In return, the organic articles were revoked. To obtain this last result was the reason why the Pope consented to abandon the concordat of 1801. Now was the turn of the French ministers to protest. What would happen to "the privileges of the Church of France"? Influenced by the Duke de Richelieu and chiefly by Duke Decazes, Louis XVIII ratified the convention, but with a reservation of "the liberties of the Gallican Church."

In the presence of this unexpected restriction and of fresh intrigues contrived by Talleyrand-Perigord, Decazes, and Richelieu, the Pope refused to ratify the treaty. The agreement of 1816, sometimes called the concordat of 1816, thus became a dead letter, and that of 1801 resumed its full force.[21]

But Louis XVIII and the bishops who followed the inspiration of Talleyrand-Perigord could not resign themselves to remain under the regime of a convention signed by Bonaparte.

Fresh negotiations were then entered upon, which finally ended in the concordat of June 11, 1817. It embraced seventeen articles. The proposals of the Pope were admitted in principle, but with vague restrictions which practically could be eluded when the king judged it well to do so. The bishoprics of 1801 were maintained, along with their titularies, but "saving some particular exceptions founded on serious and legitimate reasons" (arts. 4, 7, 9). An endowment in landed property and in revenue from the state was assured the clergy, but only

[20] Richemond, "Consalvi à Paris en 1814," in the *Correspondant* of October 25, 1905, p. 253.

[21] For details of the negotiations related above and the full text of the 1816 concordat, see Feret, "Le concordat de 1816 (according to the archives of the ministry of foreign affairs)" in the *Revue des questions historiques,* XXVI (1901), 187–240.

when "the circumstances would permit it" (art. 8). The King did not explicitly promise to obtain the resignation of the former bishops who had not resigned, but merely "to use all means in his power to remove as soon as possible the obstacles that were opposed to the good of religion and to the execution of the laws of the Church." The ratifications were exchanged without delay and, on July 19, 1817, the Pope published the new concordat by his bull *Ubi primum.*

The accord seemed to be final. A constitutional scruple on the King's part made the whole project collapse. Some ministers (Pasquier, Decazes, and Lainé) thought that the concordat should be submitted to the approval of the Chambers. The King joined in this view, which the spirit of the charter seemed to favor. But the time was the very moment when the liberal opposition on one side and the extreme royalists on the other were conducting their most violent campaigns. The *Observations d'un ancien canoniste* by the former Oratorian and *Essai historique sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane* by Grégoire had reawakened the old religious quarrels against Rome. The new concordat, even cleverly made part of a legal project that revised the organic articles, stirred up a formidable opposition by the doctrinaire majority; and Count de Marcellus, in the name of the extreme right, rejected it as an attack on the rights of the Church. The project, introduced into the Chamber on November 22, 1817, was withdrawn by the ministry at the end of the following March. Fresh negotiations, which could merely exasperate, were then carried on between Paris and Rome until the hour when Pius VII, worn out by the variations of the French government and little satisfied with the rest of an agreement which he had signed with reluctance and as a last resort, declared by a *motu proprio* (August 23, 1819) in favor of maintaining provisionally the concordat of 1801. This provisional approval became final. A law of May, 1821, authorized the government to negotiate with Rome, on these bases, the crea-

tion of thirty new sees. All the discussions relative to this affair were ended by the publication of the bull *Paternae caritatis* (October 10, 1822), establishing for the dioceses in France a new circumscription, which did not subsequently undergo any important modifications. On November 19 the King of France, finally renouncing any new demand, thanked the Supreme Pontiff "for all that His Holiness had done to assure the prosperity of the Church of France." [22]

Concordats

The failure of the attempted French concordats of 1816 and 1817 was not indeed a matter of regret either for the state or for the Church. The agreement of 1801, in spite of its imperfections, offered a basis of more solid understanding. The Bavarian concordat of June 5, 1817, was drawn up on that model, "copying it almost word for word." [23] The state guaranteed to the Church the exercise of all the rights flowing from her divine constitution and the canonical prescriptions; the Pope granted to the King the right to nominate the bishops, reserving to the Pontiff the instituting of the bishops. The kingdom was divided into two ecclesiastical provinces, with six suffragan sees, and religious corporations were authorized.[24] This treaty might be called the one "most closely approaching purely Catholic maxims." [25] This judgment is true only with regard to the concordat text taken in itself; for the concordat "was almost immediately imperiled by the way the Bavarian government published it. . . . To it was applied 'an edict of religion,' which

[22] See Feret, "Le concordat de 1817," in *Revue des questions historiques* (January, 1902, p. 201). Cf. Sagnac, "Le concordat de 1817," in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* (December, 1905, and March, 1906).

[23] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* I, 140.

[24] For the text of this concordat, see Martens, *Nouveau recueil de traités,* III, 106–26, and Barberi, *Bullarium,* XIV, 314 ff.

[25] Cantu, *Histoire de Cent Ans,* II, 395.

subordinated the Church to the state. The signature given to the Pope by the King of Bavaria was revised and half withdrawn by the addition of organic articles, which made with the concordat a single block, a hybrid and incoherent charta, which required the oath of ecclesiastics and office holders." [26] After long negotiations, the King of Bavaria in 1821 promised that the concordat of itself would have the force of a law of the state and that the guaranties which it accorded to the Catholic Church could not be diminished or restricted by the stipulations of the edict of religion.[27] The jurists still found occasion to complain of this declaration; but Rome had won much by getting recognition in principle of the intrinsic legislative force of the concordat.[28]

The tireless Consalvi, simultaneously with the onerous labors involved in the affairs of England, France, and Bavaria, carried on diplomatic negotiations with Russia. These resulted (January 18, 1818) in the signing of a concordat, specifying that at Warsaw would be an archbishop and in Poland eight episcopal sees. At the same time was settled the question of fees to be paid for expediting the bulls of institution.[29]

The discussions with King Ferdinand of Naples, who, by a decision of the Congress of Vienna, was made king of the Two Sicilies, were particularly annoying; to reach an accord required all the diplomacy of Consalvi. At first the Pope, in the name of the ancient rights of the papacy, protested against the new title taken by King Ferdinand, who in return refused to recognize in the pope any supremacy beyond that of head of the Church. Consalvi proposed to Medici, the prime minister of Naples, that he should go to Terracina and there treat of the pending difficulties orally. Following these conferences (February 16, 1817), was signed a concordat which, in its first article, pro-

[26] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
[27] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XV, 120.
[28] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
[29] Artaud, *op. cit.*, IV, 200.

claimed the Catholic religion as the religion of the kingdom. Those persons in possession of ecclesiastical property that had been sold would not be disturbed; the religious orders would be subject to their superiors general; the bishops could convoke synods and could make a visit *ad limina apostolorum;* and all the faithful would have the right of appeal to the Holy See.[30]

The treaty with Piedmont contained this special item, that the Jesuits were there charged with the education of youth and that an association of secular priests, the Oblates of the Virgin, who made a special vow of obedience to the Holy See, was legally instituted.[31]

The regulation of the status of the religious was also the subject of negotiations undertaken with Switzerland. In 1814 Pius VII had given Switzerland a vicar apostolic. By the terms of the constitutional pact concluded in 1821, Fribourg received the Jesuits within its walls, and the existing religious orders were to be kept. A short time afterwards Pius VII restored the diocese of Basel and entrusted the Catholics of Geneva to the bishop of Lausanne. Shortly before his death (1823) he erected the abbey of St. Gall into an episcopal church and joined it to the bishopric of Chur. All these arrangements, however, had merely a provisional character. The final concordat with Switzerland was not concluded until 1828, under Leo XII, who promulgated it by the bull *Inter praecipua.* The 900,000 Swiss Catholics were thenceforth divided in five dioceses (Basel, Lausanne, Sion, Chur, and Como). St. Gall, made autonomous in 1845, would form a sixth diocese.

To his regret, Pius VII was unable to do anything for the Catholics of the Netherlands, where the stadholder laid a heavy yoke on them. Leo XII in 1827 signed with him a concordat which was not executed. From that time the violent separation of Belgium, three quarters composed of Catholics, seemed

[30] Cantu, *op. cit.,* II, 394; Barberi, *op. cit.,* XV, 8–14.
[31] *Ibid.,* p. 395.

inevitable. That separation did, in fact, take place in 1830.

In Germany a group of Protestant states remained to be considered, with their million and a half of Catholics, for whom the Pope wished to assure a legal status. First was Prussia, where the descendant of Albert of Brandenburg and of the king-sergeant tried in 1815 to come to an understanding with him whom his two great ancestors called the Antichrist. Frankfort also was the place where a sort of syndicate of Lutheran princes was formed to work out with the Holy See the legal status of the Catholics of Baden, Würtemberg, Hesse, and Nassau.

"The Congress of Vienna, by assuring Prussia of considerable territories along the Rhine valley, had oddly increased the number of Prussia's Catholic subjects, and the Catholic question became from day to day more lively and painful. Frederick William III was aware of this condition. . . . Prussia could no longer present herself before Germany as a power essentially Protestant." [32] The Prussian minister at Rome was then the illustrious historian Berthold Niebuhr. For this zealous Protestant,

> the religion and practices of the Roman Church were displeasing, but his dislike of the papist religion did not degenerate into intolerance and, once he came to know Pius VII and Consalvi, he was almost won by these two men. In the Vatican library Pius VII had some fine manuscripts, a charm that appealed to the scholarly minister of Prussia: it paid honor to this pope who gave the minister access to the hidden records of the past. The conversation between the two men passed gently to matters of the Church. Niebuhr listened to the desires of the aged pontiff and found them just, even moderate. . . . When the patient labors of Niebuhr had advanced the question sufficiently, Chancellor Hardenberg himself came to Rome to give himself the easy honor of reaping the fruit. The result was the bull *De salute animarum* (July 17, 1821).[33] This bull extended to the whole kingdom of Prus-

[32] Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 144.

[33] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XV, 403.

sia; it adjusted the old Prussian provinces to the diocesan divisions. By this bull archbishoprics and bishoprics were given boundaries such as they still are.[34]

The nomination of bishops was granted to the chapters on this condition, that the candidate should be of Prussian origin. The brief *Quod de fidelium* (July 16, 1821) explained that the fact that the candidate was German would suffice.[35]

With regard to the group of Protestant states that, by an ecclesiastical commission, was preparing at Frankfort a project of entente with Rome, they began by clashing sharply with Cardinal Consalvi.

The sovereigns who let their Febronian advisers whisper to them that a day would come when the pope, fallen from his primacy, would be brought back to his function of preacher, requested the Vatican to mark on a map the new ecclesiastical boundaries and then leave them in peace. The Pope refused to be simply a surveyor and to sacrifice implicitly his prerogative as spiritual head of the Church. However, such were the distress of souls and the anarchy of the clergy that, to put as promptly as possible a little order in this chaos, a provisional agreement was signed in 1821. Rome created four bishoprics and an archbishopric, and the governments promised endowments for these revived Churches. But scarcely had these outlines been traced, when the lay powers, eager to dismiss the Holy See, which they thought they no longer needed, drew forth from their files two documents, one called "The Instrument of Foundation," the other "The Pragmatic of the Church." The five ecclesiastics whom they thought of making bishops, were put under the necessity of adhering to these documents. Four of the five agreed to do so. But in these acts Febronius fully revived.[36]

Rome protested. Baden invoked the help of Austria. To avoid any misunderstanding, the Pope required explicitly the free-

[34] Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 145.

[35] Since 1841, in Prussia, the king was presented with a list of candidates from which he rejected the names that did not please him, with the condition that he leave on the list at least three names.

[36] Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 151.

dom of the episcopal jurisdiction in place of the lay dominance. The powers published this bull, declaring its acceptance but adding "that no one may deduce therefrom anything that can be contrary to their rights of sovereignty." The discussions continued without either Rome or the states being willing to withdraw any of their demands. Formidable conflicts were foreseen as likely to arise in the matter of interpreting the papal bull and the postscript which the sovereigns wished to have added. But the Catholics were armed; they would enter the strife, defending themselves with the arms furnished them by the pope; they would protest and would enter these protests in the diplomatic papers.

The concern felt by the common father of the faithful over the situation of the Catholics in the old nations of Europe could not make him unmindful of the young Church of America. In 1808 Pius VII created the province of Baltimore with four suffragan sees (New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown). But in these new lands where the growth of Catholicity gave bright prospects, two dangers had to be averted. Under the influence of a revolutionary spirit and undoubtedly also by the close proximity of the Protestants, lay boards, encouraged by a few thoughtless or turbulent priests, assumed the full administration of Church property and thereby virtually of the direction of the parishes. They even pretended to have the right to choose their pastors without the approval of the bishop and even contrary to his wishes. Pius VII's brief *Non sine magno* condemned these assumptions.[37] An equally serious danger appeared on the horizon: the strange interference in the affairs of the American Church, mainly in the nomination of the bishops. Archbishop Marechal of Baltimore obtained from the Supreme Pontiff a brief granting exclusively to the American bishops the right of presenting the names of candidates to the episcopal office. This decision, by freeing the American

[37] Viscount de Meaux, *L'Eglise et la liberté aux Etats-Unis*, pp. 273–91.

Church from the unwarranted control which some European states attempted to exercise over it, resulted in a stronger attachment of the clergy of the United States to the See of Rome, and at the same time to their own country.[38]

The Papal States

So many delicate negotiations would have been impossible except for the prodigious activity of him whom his contemporaries called "the great cardinal." For a quarter of a century Cardinal Hercules Consalvi was a moral force that had to be reckoned with in Europe. Confronted with Bonaparte in 1801, with Metternich and Talleyrand in 1815, he had obtained these two notable victories: the French concordat and the restoration of the Papal States to the Holy See. But his solicitude neglected nothing that could concern religion in any part of the world.

External affairs did not absorb him completely. After his triumphs at Paris, London, and Vienna, he gave attention to the care of the internal administration of the states of the pope. His administrative and judiciary reforms deserve particular attention. We know that Napoleon introduced the French civil code at Rome. Many clauses of the old law of the ancient Roman regime were outworn, but the sudden introduction of a new legal code brought on numerous troubles. Consalvi knew how, according to the words of a historian, "to establish a just equilibrium between the old juridical institutions and the new code brought in by the French."[39] He repressed the boldness of the feudal barons, who were profiting by the reaction of 1815 to invoke privileges of another age and who accepted from the French law only the provisions that experience showed were useful. He ratified the sale of Church property, but he was watchful to have returned to their former destinations, by

[38] G. André, in *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 1057.

[39] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte*, VIII, Part II, Bk. III, chap. 7.

money compensations, the episcopal residences and the monasteries needed by the religious. Perhaps his masterpiece was that commercial code, which Guizot calls "a monument of wisdom." Nor did the eminent Secretary of State neglect the protection of the fine arts. In his veneration for the grandeur of Rome, he strove to embellish its monuments and repair its ruins. To him is owing the achievement of the celebrated promenade of the Pincio. At his request, the Pope created two new chairs of archaeology and of natural history at the Sapienza and called the learned Cardinal Angelo Mai to the Vatican library. He ordered some manuscripts that enriched the treasury of Rome's antiquities and, to the end of his life, he was the friend and protector of Canova.

Besides, Consalvi was the most obliging of friends, the most charming talker in informal conversations. But what most fittingly should be held about him, is that this prince of the Church, who merits a place among the foremost statesmen, in the calculations of a worldly policy or in the charms of worldly dealings never lowered the ideal of his ministry and the majesty of the Church he represented. Napoleon, a man who was a good judge of men and who had seen the cardinal yield to no one in the most complex political questions and in the observance of the nicest rules of court etiquette, said of him: "Consalvi has not the air of a priest, but he is really one of the most priestly men I have known."

Relying on this able and faithful adviser, Pius VII, in his advanced age, worked to promote, in the center of Christianity, that religious restoration which he had encouraged in the rest of the world.

After his great struggles with the Empire, the first of his cares was the reconstitution of the religious orders and their centralization in Rome. By his bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum* (August 7, 1814) [40] he officially reconstituted the

[40] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XIII, 323–25.

Society of Jesus, which had already founded several communities in the Papal States, Sardinia, Naples, England, Switzerland, France, and America; and when in 1815 the Jesuits were driven out of Moscow and St. Petersburg, then in 1819 out of all Russia, he favored their establishment in Austria. Pius VII showed particular benevolence toward the Academy of the Catholic Religion founded in Rome (1800) by Archbishop Coppoli of Myra. He also reopened the English, Scotch, and Germanic seminaries, and reorganized the Propaganda. Several sovereigns paid visits to him at Rome: Emperor Francis I came in the spring of 1819, with a large and brilliant suite; King Frederick William III of Prussia came in 1822. Pius VII during his last years had the joy of seeing five new countries (Russia, Prussia, The Netherlands, Hanover, and Würtemberg) establish diplomatic representatives accredited to the Holy See. At the same time he was grieved to note the developments taken by the sect of the Carbonari and he condemned this society by a special bull (September 13, 1821).[41]

On July 7, 1823, the fourteenth anniversary of the day when he was suddenly snatched away from Rome, the Pope, already much enfeebled by age, suffered a fall which involved a fracture of the leg. The consequences of this fall seemed serious to the physicians in attendance on the Pope. In the evening of August 20 he expired while praying to God and uttering a few vague words, in which "Savona" and "Fontainebleau" could be made out. He was ninety-one years old and had reigned twenty-three years, five months, and six days. During this long pontificate, marked by a few outstanding joys and by inexpressible griefs, he had tried to heal the nations of the wounds inflicted on them by the antireligious Revolution; and almost everywhere, before his death, he had the consolation of seeing, in spite of the numerous efforts of the anti-Christian sects, some germs of Catholic restoration.

[41] *Ibid.*, XV, 446.

CHAPTER XI

The Religious Movement

WHATEVER the importance of the political events we have just been considering, whatever the genius or holiness of the men who were the chief actors, neither the greatness of those events nor the value of those men could of themselves account for the movement of religious restoration that occurred after the Revolution. That movement had its principal source in a work of interior renovation which took place in the depth of souls and which we find expressed in the writers of the period.

The most eminent of these writers, Chateaubriand, said about his work, in the pompous tone customary with him: "Napoleon would not have been what he was if the Muse had not been there: reason carried out the ideas of the poet." In fact, the poet, like the lawmaker, "far from suddenly transforming public opinion, owed his very success to what that opinion had already more or less secretly changed." [1] We have already pointed out the main causes of the change. Chateaubriand himself, speaking of a different period, which bore a certain likeness to his own, wrote:

> When the dust rising from the wreck of so many monuments settled down, when death silenced the groans of so many victims, when the noise from the fall of the colossus ceased, then a cross was seen, and at the foot of this cross a new world. A few priests, carrying the Gospel and seated on these ruins, raised up society amid the tombs, as Jesus Christ brought back to life the children of those who believed in Him.[2]

[1] Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française,* p. 883.

[2] Chateaubriand, *Etudes historiques,* at the end of the discourse on the fall of the Roman Empire.

These lines refer to the fall of the Roman Empire. The best informed masters of historical criticism, without using this glowing language, say the same thing.[3] Following the Revolution—Chateaubriand is still speaking—"how many families torn asunder had to seek from the common Father of men the children they had lost! How many broken hearts, how many solitary souls called upon a divine hand to cure them! The victims of our distresses were saved at the altar, as shipwrecked persons cling to the rock on which they hope for safety." [4] Poets, artists, and philosophers, from Chateaubriand to La Mennais, from Overbeck to Goerres, from Walter Scott to Pusey, became the more or less faithful echo of this awakening of religious faith which had its three chief centers in France, Germany, and England.

Chateaubriand

On the very day (April 18, 1802) when a solemn *Te Deum* was sung at Notre Dame in Paris to celebrate the conclusion of the concordat, the *Moniteur* published an article by Fontanes on the *Génie du christianisme,* which appeared four days before. The author was that young Viscount Chateaubriand whose name we have already met several times. When an *émigré* in England he had there published (1797) a curious work, the *Essai sur les révolutions.* According to his own declaration, its essential idea was that "nothing is new under the sun and that we find in ancient and modern revolutions the personages and the principal traits of the French Revolution." [5] In this work of his youth, a work of doubt rather than of real negation, some pages evidently inspired by the doctrines of the *Encyclopedia* were to be found beside pages that have a

[3] Mommsen and Marquard, *Manuel des institutions romaines,* XII, 89; G. Boissier, *La religion romaine, la fin du paganisme,* preface of 1826.

[4] Chateaubriand, *Génie du christianisme,* preface of 1826.

[5] Preface of 1826 in *Œovres de Chateaubriand* (1853), XIII, 9.

thoroughly religious inspiration.[6] A year later the author of the *Essai,* upon learning of his mother's death, felt a sudden change take place in him. He wrote: "I wept, and I believed." "From the crisis brought on by this death," says Brunetière, "he emerged a changed man. The thought of his *Génie du christianisme* was born from the depth of his grief." The aim of this work was to show, contrary to what was taught by the *Encyclopedia* and by the *Essai sur les mœurs,* that

> of all religions (and we might say: of all doctrines of morality) that ever existed, the Christian religion is the most poetic, the most human, the most favorable to liberty, to the arts and letters; that the modern world owes everything to it; that nothing is more divine, nothing more amiable and more stately than its dogmas, its doctrine, and its worship; that it favors genius, purifies taste, develops the virtuous passions, gives vigor to thought, offers noble forms to the writer and perfect models to the artist.[7]

The original edition, in five octavo volumes (4,000 copies), was exhausted in a few months. "This newcomer spoke a language with new breadth, harmony, and majesty. Imagine the eloquence of Rousseau, the coloring of Bervordin, the winning sweetness and laguid charms of Fenelon poured together." [8]

The literary quality of the *Génie du christianisme* was of the highest and its apologetic value was real. The latter has often been misjudged from a failure to consider its special point of view.

At the origin of the stream of unbelief that corrupted the last years of the old regime and vitiated the whole Revolution, we have noted two main sources: the ruinous irony of Voltaire and the sentimental utopia of Rousseau. The *Génie du christianisme* silenced Voltaire's laughter and turned Rousseau's

[6] Chateaubriand later incorporated almost all these latter pages in the *Génie du christianisme.*

[7] *Génie du christianisme* (1854 ed.), p. 7.

[8] Victor Giraud, *Pages choisies de Chateaubriand,* p. 84.

sentimentalism toward the Catholic religion. By showing that Catholicism is something beautiful and that we should admire it, he prepared the way for those who would demonstrate that it is true and should be believed. Thus the new apologist simply applied the apologetic method used by Pascal: "To show that religion is venerable, to pay it respect; then to present it as something likeable; to make good men wish that it were true; and then to show that it is true." [9] Voltaire had expended much wit in his desire to show that the Sacred Books, even if not apocryphal or corrupted or deceitful, were immoral, absurd, and ridiculous. Chateaubriand, proudly comparing the Bible with the poems of Homer, showed in the Holy Scripture not only the loftiest moral teaching, the most sublime views on the origin of the world and its destinies, but also the noblest, simplest, and most varied and sublimest style that men ever heard.[10] Jean Jacques Rousseau had sung hymns to conscience and had grieved at seeing men accept "so many intermediaries between God and themselves." Chateaubriand set forth the greatness and beauty not only of God and Christ, but of the Church, her priesthood, her sacraments, and her ceremonies. In celebrating the ceremonies of Corpus Christi and the greatness of the sacraments of extreme unction and penance, he employed figures so beautiful and accents so touching, in a language so harmonious, that men's hearts were stirred by them.

In truth, anyone may rightly note what makes such an apologetic incomplete and, in certain regards, suspect: "a diffuse plan with no philosophy; a style often pompous; an abuse of antitheses and drawn-out contrasts; empty and high-sounding phrases; perpetual confusion of the marvelous with

[9] Pascal, *Pensées* (3rd ed.), p. 414. People endlessly discussed "the religion of Chateaubriand." The true solution of all the difficulties is found in this declaration by himself: "My whole life has been tossed between doubt and faith." We must unhappily recognize that these alternatives presented themselves at the very moment when Chateaubriand was writing his *Génie du christianisme,* or at least that his faith was not then strong enough to inspire him with conduct conformable to his beliefs.

[10] *Génie du christianisme,* Part II, Bk. V.

the supernatural; gaps and sophisms."[11] Such defects, we must grant, contributed to the success of this book no less than did its qualities. Its influence was far greater than it deserved. The book was less the work of a man than the work of a situation. This dazzling charmer, who wished to lead the world back to the religion of the past, entered so well into the prejudices of the men of his time and so wonderfully grasped their aspirations, tastes, and attachments!

On the closing pages of the *Génie du christianisme* we read:

> To investigate the influence of Christianity on laws and governments, as we have done for morals and poetry, would be the subject of a fine work. We merely point out the way. . . . Montesquieu has well demonstrated that Christianity is, by its spirit and its admonitions, opposed to arbitrary power. . . . Do not some Christian republics exist that seem to be more attached to their religion than the monarchies are? . . . The representative system springs partly from ecclesiastical institutions. Of these the Church offers the first model in her councils. . . . Christianity is especially admirable for having converted "the physical man" into "the moral man." . . . The precepts of the Gospel form the real citizen.[12]

In an important page of his preface for a new edition of the *Essai sur les révolutions,* Chateaubriand returned to these ideas. "I will not become an unbeliever until someone proves to me that Christianity is incompatible with liberty. . . . For me Christianity bears two proofs of its heavenly origin: by its moral teaching, it tends to free us from the passions; by its political influence, it abolished slavery. It is, then, a religion of freedom; it is mine."

These lines gave a forecast of the whole political and social movement that would fill the first half of the nineteenth century; the ideas and fancies that would stir the thoughts of La Mennais and Saint-Simon are therein already vaguely sketched;

[11] Léon Gautier, *Portraits littéraires,* p. 5.

[12] *Génie du christianisme,* Part IV, Bk. VI, chaps. 10, 11.

and we are not surprised to read in the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe:* "Since the *Génie du christianisme* was not yet written, I would conceive it quite differently. . . . I would show that Christianity is the thought of the future and of human freedom . . . because it places, beside equality, the need of duty, the corrective and regulator of the democratic instinct." [13]

Joseph de Maistre

In the field of religious restoration considered from the political and social point of view, Chateaubriand was not the only Catholic whose voice was raised. When the *Génie du christianisme,* in its final chapters, was outlining an apologetic based on the adaptation of the doctrines of Christianity to the constitutional and democratic aspirations of the time, two religious writers had viewed the problem from an altogether opposite angle. If we had wished to conform to the succession of the works rather than the succession of the influences, we would have spoken of Joseph de Maistre and Viscount Bonald before mentioning Chateaubriand.

Six years before the appearance of the *Génie du christianisme* in 1796, and almost simultaneously, Joseph de Maistre brought out at Lausanne his *Considérations sur la France,* and

[13] *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* II, 200. We know the strange fancy that Chateaubriand placed in the last book of his *Mémoires d'outre-tombe:* "If I had been tutor of the young prince (the future Henry V), I would have striven to win his confidence. When he should recover his crown, I would have advised him to wear it only with the idea of removing it at the proper time. A beautiful and illustrious day that would be when, after raising up religion, perfecting the constitution of the state, and enlarging the rights of the citizens . . . my pupil would say to the nation solemnly convoked: Frenchmen, your education is finished along with mine. . . . I step down from the throne while freeing you from your oaths to the monarchy. Compare this end with that which the decrepit sons of Henry IV would manifest, obstinately clinging to a throne submerged in the democracy." On Chateaubriand's democratic ideas, see Charles Maurras, *Trois idées politiques: Chateaubriand, Michelet, Sainte-Beuve:* anarchy, democracy, organized imperialism (1912). Cf. Jules Lemaitre, *Chateaubriand,* 1912.

Bonald published at Constance his *Théorie du pouvoir civil et religieux*. But these two works, written specially for the philosophers and the statesmen, exercised their influence rather slowly; Chateaubriand's work, literary and dramatic, combining all literary forms and tones and at the same time providing precepts and models, easily surpassed them. After a while, however, the philosophical works of the two thinkers won equal public recognition. "Chateaubriand was from Brittany, Joseph de Maistre from Savoy, Louis de Bonald from Auvergne. The different provinces of France (Savoy being then French in speech and spirit) seemed to contribute to the work of renovation. All three belonged to the nobility. The frivolous aristocrats of the eighteenth century had shaken off the Christian ideas. After Viscount Chateaubriand, came Count de Maistre and Viscount Bonald, like valiant knights, to fight for the old faith."[14] By their methods and by their doctrines, Joseph de Maistre and Louis de Bonald are sharply distinct from Chateaubriand.

The method of de Maistre, as Auguste Comte remarks,[15] was essentially a positive method. No one succeeded better in showing the practical and effective advantages of religious doctrines and institutions.[16] In his book of *Considerations* which appeared in 1796, as in that of *The Pope* (1819) and in the *Soirées de Saint-Petersbourg* (1821, after his death), his purpose was nothing less than to show in the truths of religion certain social truths, or, as he said, "laws of the world." On this point his style, given to paradox and exaggerations, seems to embody formulas which a sound orthodoxy, careful to defend the autonomy of the supernatural, could not admit. "Theological truths," he wrote, "are merely general truths, manifested and divinized in the religious order, in such a way that

[14] Léon Ollé-Laprune, *La vitalité chrétienne*, p. 13.
[15] *Politique positive*, Vol. IV, appendix.
[16] C. Calippe, *L'attitude sociale des catholiques français au XIX^e siècle*, I, 41.

no one can attack one of them without attacking a law of the world." But what is this higher law of the world, to which everything is bound? It is chiefly that "man, as a being both moral and corrupted, must necessarily be governed." Hence, when the Revolution attempted to establish or regulate authority by popular vote, it produced a work "radically evil," "Satanic in its essence";[17] for "it is a truth as certain in its realm as a mathematical proposition, and no great institution results from a deliberation."[18] Even the infallibility of the Church is merely the application "of the right common to all possible sovereignties."[19]

Such are the maxims which Joseph de Maistre professed, affirmed, and proclaimed, "facing the prejudices, vexing the contrary passions, and shattering resistance: haughty, biting, merciless, sententious as Montesquieu and sarcastic as Voltaire."[20] But though we must acknowledge that not all the doctrines of the Savoy philosopher can be admitted unreservedly, two merits cannot be denied him: no one better than he showed the hollowness and danger of the utopias found in Rousseau and, on the other hand, no one better showed to the readers of Voltaire what human truth is contained in Christian dogmas, what social value in Catholicism; and, from these points of view, his apologetic, freed from its excesses of language and doctrine, combined with Chateaubriand's and happily completed it.

Louis de Bonald

Like Joseph de Maistre's theory and that of Chateaubriand, the doctrine of Louis de Bonald is not without exaggeration. In Bonald's case the exaggeration consists in greatly enlarging

[17] *Considérations sur la France,* chaps. 4, 5.
[18] *Ibid.,* chaps. 6, 7.
[19] J. de Maistre, *Du pape,* chap. 1.
[20] Ollé-Laprune, *op. cit.,* p. 10.

the influence of tradition at the expense of reason. He was the initiator of that traditionalism which later on the Church had to condemn. But his first plan was good and opportune: to revive in men's minds, disturbed by revolutionary innovations, the idea of tradition. Bonald defends his doctrine with a remarkable sharpness of observation and force of logic. Unfortunately his observation is often too restricted and his logic too rigid. He says: "If man is everywhere born the same, the same political and religious constitution ought to be suitable for all societies." [21] But the constitution which tradition indicated to Bonald as the only possible one is monarchy. Hence he concludes: "Without monarchy, no constitution. A republic is essentially an unorganized state." [22] Moreover, man exists only for society, and society forms him only for itself.[23] Bonald had an absolute confidence in legislation to alter customs. What, then, is the remedy for the greatest corruption? Perfect laws.[24] Joseph de Maistre had never believed that the strife against individualism could authorize such maxims. "Every law," he said, "is useless and even harmful, however excellent it may be in itself, if the nation is not worthy of the law or made for the law."

But on one point Bonald deserves to be unreservedly approved. With untiring energy and persistence he proclaimed that in the social organization respect for morality ought to precede solicitude for riches; man before the machine. In his own words, "the duty of a government is to improve men morally as well as physically, rather than to improve machines." [25]

[21] *Théorie du pouvoir,* preface.

[22] *Ibid.,* Part I, Bk. I, chaps. 3, 6, 10; *Législation primitive,* Part I, Bk. II, chap. 10.

[23] *Théorie du pouvoir,* Part III, chap. 3; *Législation primitive,* Part III, chap. 5. On these exaggerations of Bonald and his desire to place a monopoly of teaching in the hands of the Jesuits, see Longhaye, *XIX^e siècle* (1900), pp. 250–56.

[24] *Législation primitive,* preliminary discourse.

[25] *Obsérvations sur la Révolution française,* sect. 6.

In short, with less brilliance than Chateaubriand, with less sharpness than Joseph de Maistre, Bonald brought his tribute as a thinker to the work of religious restoration. Had he done nothing more than present the great idea of tradition and that of man's dignity, he would merit a place of honor among the French thinkers of the nineteenth century.

The Clergy

The three apologists we have been speaking of were laymen. The Church had not yet seen rise up from the ranks of her clergy a doctor, prepared by Providence, as in times of crisis she always found on her path; and men looked for him who, such as an Athanasius before Arius, a St. Augustine before Pelagius, or a Cajetan before Luther, would demolish the revolutionary idol before the followers of Voltaire and Rousseau.

Since the Revolution holy priests had expended treasures of zeal and knowledge in strengthening the faithful and withstanding the enemies of religion. Several former members of the Society of Jesus, under the provisional name of Fathers of the Faith and Fathers of the Sacred Heart, had preached missions and founded colleges.[26] The history of the Church ought to commemorate the names of these brave apostles: Fathers de Clorivière, Varin, Tournely, Delpuits. This last named on February 2, 1801 (feast of the Purification) in his lowly room as a religious, with six students of law and of medicine, reconstituted a pious association, founded formerly in 1760 under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin. Lacordaire, speaking of Father Delpuits, said: "Others have acquired more glory in their relations with the youth of France, but none has greater claim to such glory." The society restored by the holy religious was none other than that celebrated Congregation which a

[26] We know that Alphonse de Lamartine was a student under the Fathers of the Faith at Belley.

hateful legend called a permanent conspiracy but which in fact was especially an association of pure and genuine piety, a center of charitable works. Future priests, such as Paul Teysseyrre, future bishops, such as Charles de Forbin-Janson, future teachers of science, such as René Laennec and Augustin Cauchy, were there trained in solid devotion and apostolic zeal.[27] The Society of the Missionaries of France, founded at Lyons in 1808 by Father Rauzan, had preached the gospel in cities and country districts.[28] At the beginning of the century, in a chapel of the church of St. Sulpice, Frayssinous taught youth the fundamentals and first truths of the faith.[29] La Luzerne and Combalot [30] had stirred the people with their preaching. Archbishop Aviau of Bordeaux [31] and Bishop de Miollis of Digne gave a most edifying example of virtue. The Sulpician, Father Boyer, reanimated the zeal of the clergy by his pastoral retreats, preached in all the dioceses of France. The priests of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, known as Picpus Fathers, founded by Father Condrin in 1801 at Poitiers,[32] and the Basilians, instituted at Annonay in 1801 by a country pastor, Father Lapierre, devoted themselves to the education of youth. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, incorporated in the University by a decree of November 17, 1808, exercised the apostolate with a devotedness worthy of their founder.[33] On August 5, 1804, Father Liautard, while still a deacon, inaugurated in Paris the establishment destined to render notable service to Christian youth under the name of

[27] See Geoffroy de Grandmaison, *La Congrégation.* The chief works founded by the Congregation or revived by it were the *Société des bonnes études,* the *Refuge des jeunes condamnés,* the *Association de Saint-Joseph,* the *Société des bonnes œuvres,* the *Bibliothèque catholique,* the *Association pour la défense de la religion.*

[28] Delaporte, *Vie de H. Rauzan.*

[29] A. Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature sous la Restauration,* pp. 155–70.

[30] A. Ricard, *Le P. Combalot.*

[31] Lyonnet, *Vie de Mgr d'Aviau.*

[32] Perron, *Vie du P. Condrin.*

[33] Guibert, *Histoire de saint Jean-Baptiste de La Salle,* p. 646.

Stanislas College.[34] Soon after the concordat, a holy priest of Marseilles, Father Allemand, founded in his native city a fine work for youth, which would serve as a model for all similar undertakings.[35] La Trappe and the Chartreuse, reconstituted in 1815 and 1816, opened new retreats for souls drawn to a life of solitude.[36] However, the ruins accumulated by the Revolution were so extensive that the work to be done appeared still a vast undertaking.

From 1800 to 1815 the number of priests was so reduced that only the cities could be cared for; the country districts had to be left unattended. Father Rohrbacher relates that, after his ordination, he was assigned seven parishes to be served by himself alone. During Father Muard's boyhood, in his district only one catechism was available for six parishes. Under the restoration, Bishop Frayssinous stated in 1820 that, "in the Most Christian Kingdom 15,000 places remained vacant owing to lack of priests to fill them." [37]

The Voltarian spirit was still dominant in the intellectual circles and in the official world, even under the restoration. In many souls Chateaubriand's influence stopped with a vague religiosity, and the works of Bonald and Joseph de Maistre, which were too philosophical, appeared to some as pleadings excessively dominated by a political thought. The generation that had reached maturity was not cured of the rationalist

[34] Liautard, *Mémoires,* I, 51.

[35] Gaduel, *Vie et esprit de M. Allemand,* p. 121.

[36] An enumeration of all the congregations founded in France after the concordat would be useless. The list of the principal ones will be found in Baunard's *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* p. 277. Let us note the *Petits Frères de Marie* (Marists), instituted by a priest of Lyons, Father Champagnat; the *Enfants de Marie Immaculée,* better known as Fathers of Chavagnes and the Sisters of Chavagnes, founded by Father Baudouin in the Vendée; the *Frères de la société de Marie* (Marianists), founded at Bordeaux by canon Chaminade; the *Fathers of the Sacred Heart,* established at Lyons in 1822 by Father Frechard, a former Benedictine; the *Frères de l'instruction chrétienne,* known also as *Frères de Ploërruel,* founded in 1819 by Father Jean de La Mennais; and we note especially the progress of the illustrious institute of Madames of the Sacred Heart, begun in 1800 at Paris by Madame Barat.

[37] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* p. 134.

poison, and the tyranny of human respect exercised its sway over the youth. Montalembert wrote:

I can adduce the recollection of all those who, like me, were then ending their education. At that time among us how many were Christian youth, even in the most famous colleges? Scarcely one out of twenty. If we went into a church and there met one of those college students, one of those men who today fill our temples, the meeting produced almost as much surprise and curiosity as the visit of a Christian traveler in a mosque of the Orient.

La Mennais

Such was the state of men's minds when in 1817 a book appeared with the modest title, *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* by Father de La Mennais. The name of this priest was promptly hailed as that of the doctor for whom the Church was waiting.

A hundred and fourteen years had passed over the tomb of Bossuet, a hundred and three years over that of Fenelon, seventy-six over that of Massillon. . . . After death had silenced those eloquent lips, the Church of France still had distinguished scholars, controversialists, and preachers: no longer did it have names that go far in posterity; and after that time no priest won in France the renown of a writer and lofty personality, when La Mennais appeared, the more timely as the eighteenth century had recently again taken up arms. His book was a remarkable resurrection of the old and eternal reasonings that prove to men the necessity of the faith. . . . It was received with unrestrained enthusiasm and acclaim. In one day La Mennais found himself invested with the might of Bossuet.[38]

These lines are no exaggeration. Father Teysseyrre, when announcing to a friend the proximate appearance of the *Essai*

[38] Lacordaire, *Considération sur le système philosophique de M. de La Mennais,* chap. 1. The author of *L'essai sur l'indifférence* did not sign himself Lammenais until 1833.

sur l'indifférence, wrote: "You are going to see a work that unites the style of Jean Jacques Rousseau, the reasoning of Pascal, and the eloquence of Bossuet." [39] When the book came out, Frayssinous declared: "This man has an eloquence fit to raise the dead."

The priest who stirred such enthusiasm was a Breton, as was Chateaubriand, but in his political and religious tendencies he was closer to Joseph de Maistre and Bonald. Reaching to the heart of the question closer than was done by the author of the *Génie du christianisme,* who pointed out particularly the political and moral fitness of the faith, and more penetrating than the author of *Le pape* and the *Législation primitive,* who rather endeavored to discern the social fitness of the faith, the author of the *Essai* invited his readers merely to seek the truth. For, he said, "the most ailing age is not the one that has a passion for error, but the one that neglects and despises the truth." The first part of the *Essai* was devoted to opposing the various forms of indifference: indifference of the statesmen, who merely sought a belief useful to the people; indifference of the eighteenth-century philosophers, who systematically stopped at a so-called natural religion; indifference of the Protestants, who left to each individual the right to make up his own belief. All these forces, he said, end in atheism, because "every religious system based on the exclusion of authority carries atheism in its bosom, and sooner or later will give it birth." [40] The attitude of those who are satisfied with looking only to the social usefulness of religion was an attitude that aroused his indignation especially. He exclaimed: "Can what is greatest and noblest in man be the product of error? . . . Philosophers have less to say about the dignity of man, or else respect it more." The second part was devoted to showing the importance of religion to those who are indifferent through heedlessness or

[39] Paguelle de Follenay, *M. Teysseyrre,* chap. 4.
[40] *Essai,* chap. 6.

sloth. This second part contained deeply touching passages, with an undying eloquence. In conclusion the author announces that, after destroying one of the foundations of dogmatic indifference, he would prove in the succeeding pages of his work "that a true religion exists, and that for all men it is the unique way of salvation." But first "it is incumbent on us to seek how, in our present condition, we arrive at a certain knowledge of the truth."

This second question, the subject of the second volume (1820),[41] came to be the author's stumbling-block over which he came to grief. The new apologist was ill prepared to take up this difficult question of the foundations of certitude. Felicité de La Mennais, of an impressionable and sickly nature,[42] brought up in the melancholy little town of Saint-Malo, amid the storms of the Revolution, left almost to himself in planning his studies, at first lost his faith after reading the works of the eighteenth-century philosophers, especially of Rousseau. Various circumstances, chief of which we must consider the example of his holy brother Jean-Marie (ordained priest in 1801), led him to the belief and practice of religion. He thought he ought to go farther and follow his brother in the priesthood. From 1809 to 1816, without passing through the regime of the seminary, he received holy orders, in the midst of strange alternatives of thrilling enthusiasm and heart-rending anguish.[43] In 1808, while still a layman, he published, in collaboration with his brother, an anonymous work, *Réflexions sur l'Eglise de France,* a veritable program of almost universal ecclesiastical reform, a work which Fouché, the prefect of police, was eager to suppress. In 1814 appeared a second writing, like-

[41] The third volume appeared in 1823.

[42] On La Mennais' excessive impressionability and his sickly state, see Boutard, *La Mennais,* I, 6, 37; Spuller, *La Mennais,* p. 41.

[43] Three months after his ordination to the priesthood (June 25, 1816), he wrote: "All that remains for me to do is to arrange myself as well as I can and, if possible, go to sleep at the foot of the stake to which I have been chained."

wise with his brother's collaboration and also anonymous, the *Tradition de l'Eglise sur l'institution des évêques,* an eloquent defense of "the full and entire authority of the Roman Pontiff" against the pretentions of Gallicanism.

In these two works, as in various articles that La Mennais contributed to the royalist papers, the *Defenseur,* the *Conservateur,* and the *Drapeau blanc,* readers admired the splendid figures, a rigorous dialectic, and an impetuous style that recalled the manner of Jean Jacques Rousseau. The author of *Emile* seemed to have communicated his emotional power to his former disciple, now his terrible adversary. But La Mennais, undoubtedly unconscious of the fact, took from Rousseau more than his fiery eloquence; and the second volume of the *Essai sur l'indifférence* would reveal the apologist's fundamental mistake, which was the source of all the errors into which he afterwards fell.

We know that the author of the *Social Contract* regarded the will of the people as the origin or at least the manifestation of all right. The author of the *Essai* was far from accepting such a doctrine; it is likewise true that the theory on which he based all certitude closely resembled that of Rousseau. For him the foundation of all truth cannot be the individual reason, but only the universal judgment of mankind. Though he did not say, as he later on said, that the peoples' consent produces all justice, he taught that this consent promulgates all truth. This theory would soon be condemned by Pope Gregory XVI as a "fallacious doctrine," and some of La Mennais' disciples were alarmed at seeing him maintain, "under the vague term of human race a primitive Church, prior and superior to the Jewish Church and the Christian Church." [44] Yet the error did not appear final. For, on the other hand, the author of the *Tradition de l'Eglise* had affirmed his belief "in a full and entire authority of the Roman Pontiff, without any limits but

[44] Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise,* I, xlv.

those it imposed on itself." [45] In case of conflict between these two rules of certitude enunciated by the new apologist (the consent of the people and the decision of the supreme head of the Church), on which side would he take his stand? The Church of France had just placed its confidence in this priest. Would he follow the path of obedience, where his Catholic and Roman faith was leading him, or would he follow the way of revolutionary spirit, a way toward which he seemed to be inclined by his restless temperament and certain hidden influences?

The problem was complicated by another one, of a more general sort. Lamartine and Vigny had published their first works. The new literary school, regarding Chateaubriand as its father, had taken the name of romantic school; and its young leader would define romanticism as "liberalism in literature." Romanticism set out to shake off the yoke of pagan mythology and to demolish the artificial rules of the past century. But even that concealed a sharp dualism. Would the new literary school, with a more sincere, living, and Christian accent, revive the faith in souls, or, by a predominance of sentiment over reason, of fancy over order, reform and corrupt the old beliefs from which it purposed drawing its inspirations?

Germany

The same question, on a slightly different ground, arose in Germany. We should recognize that romanticism, so far as it was a revival of the medieval artistic forms and spirit, was born beyond the Rhine.[46] There it was first manifested in the fine arts. A distinguished critic relates its birth thus:

German classicism had become fixed more and more in a mechanical art. . . . At Eastertime, 1793, Vackenroder and Tieck undertook a

[45] *Tradition de l'Eglise,* p. xxv.

[46] It entered France by the channed of the *émigrés,* and especially by the pen of Madame de Staël.

journey of discovery across Germany. They strayed into the churches and cemeteries, meditated near the tombs of Albert Dürer and Peter Fischer. . . . *The Epanchements de cœur d'un moine ami des arts,* which Vackenroder published in 1797, soon became the breviary of many young artists. Yet the best artists of Germany did not draw their inspiration from the national source; the new pilgrims set out for Rome, *Nach Rom;* in Christian Rome, the Rome of the catacombs and the cloisters, was the place where they sought inner counsel and pious inspirations. In 1810, in the abandoned halls of the monastery of San Isidoro on Mount Pincio four young men, excluded from the Vienna Academy for the crime of heresy, founded an association. These were Frederick Overbeck, Franz Pforr, Louis Vogel, and Hettinger. About their meetings for conversation and work others soon gathered, the greatest being Peter Cornelius. The life of these young men, marked by monastic seriousness and regularity, was divided between visits to the basilicas and other churches and personal studies. But their hearts were especially penetrated with emotion when, in the course of a journey through Tuscany, they learned to know Duccio of Siena, Fra Angelico of Fiesole, and Benozzo Gozzoli. In the frankness of their enthusiasm they thought that they had found their true teachers, though scarcely yet able to understand the lessons. By way of derision, their comrades called them "Nazarenes." [47]

The surge of patriotism which took place in Germany during the first years of the last century, on the occasion of the French victories, accentuated the movement of men's minds toward the Middle Ages, where the German fatherland found its origins. Goerres in 1810 wrote: "The German people has succumbed because it has forgotten its character, its purpose, its history, because it has forgotten itself." [48] These lines were a sort of program which Goerres and his friends brought to reality. The year of Austerlitz was the time when Germany, with Arnim

[47] André Michel, in the *Histoire générale,* IX, 349. On the fraternity founded by Overbeck, cf. G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* I, 228–30. With the exception of Cornelius, the members of the group belonged by birth to the Protestant religion.

[48] Goerres, *Politische Schriften,* I, 117–32.

and Brentano for teachers, again learned to sing as it had done in the Middle Ages. The year of Jena, at the very time that saw the closing of the tomb of the Holy Empire, was the year when historic and literary romanticism, in refuge at Heidelberg, attempted to reopen the tomb of the old German people."[49]

This complexity of the origins of German romanticism was reflected in its character. In the presence of the rich and pure emotions offered by the religion of the Middle Ages, these artists and poets, who at first had been moved by a simply archaeological and aesthetic curiosity, felt themselves brought to disdain the cold religion of Luther and to love that of Rome. Tieck, in *Franz Sternbold,* reproached Protestantism with having produced an empty intellectualism; Novalis proclaimed the praise of Christianity, published the *Hymns to the Virgin,* and lauded the Jesuits.[50] On the other hand, German patriotism, by exalting itself, again found its old bitterness against the Latin genius. The intense aesthetic life of the young German romanticists, not yet free enough from the influence of Goethe and his "cult of self," often developed into a strange individualism. In Tieck's *Sternbold* and in Novalis' *Henri d'Ofterdingen* fancy overflowed into an anarchy that seemed to be the contrary of Catholicism. In a word, in the romantic singing of Germany the *Los von Rom*[51] resounded at the same time as the *Nach Rom.*[52]

In short, the movement toward Rome carried the day. In 1813 Overbeck was converted to the Catholic religion in the hands of the future Cardinal Ostini.

He still had fifty-three years to live. Except for two short spells in Germany, he passed those years in Rome. This humble and modest man, who reminded his visitors of the most emaciated figures of the Siena artists, and who seemed to step down out of an old picture of

[49] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 249.
[50] *Ibid.,* pp. 207, 208, 211.
[51] "Let us withdraw from Rome."
[52] "Let us go to Rome."

holiness, opened a baptistery at Rome, while he was also the head of a school. . . . The painters and sculptors that came down from Germany to the Eternal City felt their eyes open. Rome revealed to them, as Chateaubriand had revealed it to the French, that in Catholicism lay hidden, for the creation of art, a "genius." For nearly thirty years in the German colony at Rome, conversion to Catholicism was a sort of contagious phenomenon. The list of these neophytes would be endless. Before Overbeck, in 1807 we have the Riepenhausen brothers, talented engravers; in 1811 the painter Frederick Cramer. In 1813, at the same time as Overbeck, we have Vogel, director of the Dresden Academy, the painter Louis Schnorr of Carolsfeld, and the archaeologist Platner. After Overbeck, in 1814, came the two Schadows (William, painter and future director of the Dusseldorf Academy, and Rodolph the sculptor); they bade farewell to Luther at the very hour when their father Gottfried, also a sculptor, was finishing in Germany a monument of the reformer. Still in 1814 we have the painter Klinkowstrom, who returned from Rome to Vienna and there joined the Catholic Church at the feet of Father Hofbauer, with Frederick Schlegel as his godfather.[53]

Frederick von Schlegel, in the world of historians and philosophers, had already exercised an influence similar to that of Overbeck in the world of artists. Born in 1772 in the city of Hanover, he showed at an early age such an enthusiasm for Hellenism that Schiller bantered him on it. The Greek city, the Greek drama, the Greek temple, had at first been his absolute deal of the beautiful. In 1800, as professor at the Jena University, he delivered lectures on the religion of art before a brilliant audience. Schelling and Hegel, who were among his hearers, reported them to the learned world. Like so many others he was attracted by the romantic movement and eagerly studied the history and literature of the Middle Ages. A purer ideal of beauty, morality, and holiness was revealed to that ardent soul, no less earnest for moral purification than for aesthetic contemplation. In 1805 he abjured Protestantism at

[53] Goyau, *op. cit.*, pp. 229–33.

Cologne and thereafter, in the intellectual circles, became a most zealous apostle of the Catholic religion. His *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur,* his *Ideas on Christian Art,* and especially his *Philosophy of History* are the monuments of his learning and of his pure Catholicism.

At the side of Schlegel we see Count Frederick Leopold von Stolberg, remarkably well prepared for a work of apologetics. By his knowledge of antiquity which Schiller and Goethe might envy, he placed the ancient world at the foot of the cross by the publication of the first fifteen volumes of his *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi,* which appeared from 1807 to 1819. Says Kraus: "This book opens a new era; from this cradle German theology took to its wings." [54] At the same time the tender piety of this noble Christian appeared in his *Büchlein von der Liebe,* a work of his last days.

Other apologists deserve mention along with these two outstanding men: the priest Sailer, whose many works of Christian instruction and piety rendered in Germany the same service as the writings of St. Francis de Sales did in France; Zacharias Werner, that ardent preacher, that combination of Augustine and Savonarola, who in 1815, while preaching at Vienna before the representatives of European diplomacy, recalled, as he struck his breast, the time when, still an unbeliever, he rendered homage to Rousseau; Adam Müller and Charles von Haller, both of them students of government and sociologists after the manner of Bonald and Joseph de Maistre, but more careful to defend the rights of individuals against absolutism; lastly, that humble teacher of youth, Bernard Overberg, son of a simple peddler, who "for half a century would plant the seeds of Christianity in all the fields of Westphalia and there bring them to fruition." [55]

But the man whose activity and renown dominated the whole

[54] Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise* (French trans.), III, 414.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

history of Catholic Germany during this period was Joseph Goerres. Coming from pure Jacobinism to pure Catholicism, taking part in all the political and social events of his time, Joseph Goerres, a universal genius like Leibnitz, pursued his investigations into all the branches of human knowledge and everywhere shed such brilliant light that Catholic German scholarship still regards him as its initiator and guide. Goerres' writings form, as it were, the philosophy of all the social and literary events that unfolded under the Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration.

In 1799 his enthusiasm for the Revolution fell suddenly. He went to ask the first consul, Bonaparte, to regulate the liberty of Germany; he failed. So, he said to himself, the French Revolution has not conquered the peoples in order to liberate them. And he exclaimed: "Study Suetonius, for the new Augustus has appeared." Goerres thereupon renounced all political action. Passionately he studied letters and sciences. Henceforth from intellectual culture he sought Germany's regeneration, which the French Revolution was unable to give it. His *Teutschen Volksbücher,* published in 1806, put the people in contact with the ancient national literature of Germany; his *Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt* (1810) won him a place of considerable authority among scholars; the *Rheinische Merkur,* which he founded in 1814, spread his ideas of intellectual renovation everywhere. His Coblenz house became, as it were, a place of pilgrimage where thousands of patriots came to see and consult the great agitator. Napoleon called him "the fifth of the powers confederated against me."

After the fall of the Emperor, Goerres momentarily hoped to see triumph a policy animated by a feeling of respect of peoples and kings. Before long he had the sadness of noting that the decisions of the Congress of Vienna were dictated only by combinations of greed. He protested with his powerful voice. In his book, *Teutschland und die Revolution,* given to the

public in 1819, he showed to the princes, with history in hand, that a restoration without God and without the Church would bring them to fresh revolutions. The hatreds that he stirred up obliged him to leave his country. In refuge at Strasbourg, he engaged more and more in religious studies. By his review, *Der Katholik,* and by his book on St. Francis, he prefaced the deep study that he would devote to Henry Suso, and to his great work, *Die Christliche Mystik.* Before his death in 1847, he said: "The revolution cannot long delay. . . . We are now at the end. . . . Pray for the peoples, who no longer count for anything."

With Goerres the romantic movement of Germany entered a new phase. More than Schlegel, Müller, and Haller, this great man sought in the Middle Ages for something besides aesthetic themes. As remarked by the historian of Catholic Germany of the nineteenth century, he had asked of the Middle Ages "lessons in political architecture, maxims of Christian social life, norms for a Christian economic order. . . . For these reasons, when later a popular opinion would have the right to exist, it will not condemn Schlegel, Müller, and Haller as accomplices of the vanquished bureaucracies; as for Goerres, it will honor him as a precursor of the victory." [56]

Unhappily this Catholic current was not the only one that took place. From the study of the Middle Ages, interpreted in the pretended light of a false mysticism and an erroneous philosophy, another current of studies arose, which resulted in ruining the faith in many souls.

Along with Novalis singing *lieder* in honor of the Virgin Mary and with Tieck depicting in *Genovefa* the ardent faith of chivalry, Amadeus Hoffman made alive again in *Bruder Medardus* the terrors which the devil inspired in the Germans of a former age; others devoted themselves to the study of sorcery; in such a coterie of students, they now talked of

[56] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 391.

nothing but somnambulists, clairvoyants, dreams, and presentiments. Those days were the time when Schelling's philosophy, teaching that the dividing line between the conscious and the unconscious cannot be determined, spread in the university circles. The young archaeologists hurled themselves eagerly on this philosophy to find there the synthesis of their historical observations. Said one of them:

> We read Schelling, who has a talent to influence young minds and easily becomes their tutor. He became our hero. . . . Later the mystical fog of that philosophy disappeared under the rays of the rising sun of Schleiermacher. . . . With Schleiermacher, God was restored, but only by losing His personality; quite the same as Christ, to be placed on His throne again, had to renounce any kind of supernatural prerogative.[57]

The writer of these lines was David Frederick Strauss. At that time he was engaged in the study of the famous *Commentar über das N. T.*[58] by Henry Paulus. Paulus, a disciple of Spinoza and Kant, with a view of ridding the figure and work of Christ from everything supernatural, had tried to provide a natural explanation of each miracle. "But," wrote Strauss, "the reasonings of Paulus appear to me inadmissible. I cannot grant him the right to remove their miraculous character from events while preserving their historical character. A miracle is not a superficial envelope that we can remove superficially. It can be removed only by taking away with it a bit of history." [59] But "thus to take away the whole history" of Christ is to destroy all religion. A deep study of Hegel extricated the exegete from his embarrassment. There he learned that "the Christian religion and philosophy have the same content: the former under the form of the image, the latter under the form of the idea." [60] The principle of the solution had been

[57] Strauss, *Essai d'histoire religieuse* (French trans.), pp. 225, 248.

[58] This work came out between 1800 and 1804.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[60] *Commentar über das N. T.*

found. To safeguard Christianity, he would simply have to admit that the accounts of miraculous happenings are figures symbolizing the faith. In 1803 the learned Christian philologist Heyne had enunciated the following principle: "From myth all history and all the philosophy of the ancients derive their source." Creuzer interpreted paganism as a religious symbolism, under which was hidden an older and purer faith. Wolf, enlarging the theory, applied it to the poems of Homer. Strauss set to work and wrote the book which, published in 1836, made his name famous: *Leben Jesus*. It was not destined to be a durable work; but, though not yet ruined by criticism, it did accomplish in many minds the work of destruction begun by Paulus, who had denied the supernatural in the Gospel narrative. Strauss denied even its authenticity;[61] and the religion that it pretended to erect on these ruins was but a vague Christianity, without rational consistency and without historic support.

England

The study of the Middle Ages had in like manner in England been the starting point of a religious movement. The historian of *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre* credits the novels of Walter Scott with an influence comparable to that of the writings of Chateaubriand in France and of Goerres in Germany.[62] The fine example given by the French *émigré* priests prepared England to relish the history of the Catholic heroes. From 1814 to 1824, a period when the masterpieces of the great novelist appeared, the English became exceedingly

[61] On the history of the rationalist exegesis in Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century, see Vigouroux, *Les Livres Saints et la critique rationaliste*, II, 436–50.

[62] Paul Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, 1899, Vol. I, chap. 2. Newman and Pusey speak of the influence of Walter Scott. Cf. *Life of Pusey*, I, 254.

fond of those gallant knights and crusaders who prayed to the Virgin Mary, marched behind the banners of their patron saints, confessed their sins to a priest, and obeyed the pope. The Catholics described by Newman at the beginning of the century, "found in corners and alleys and cellars," trembling like a timid flock overawed "by the high Protestants, the lords of the earth," [63] now felt less weighed down by the atmosphere of contempt which formerly surrounded them. They raised their heads. Even the Anglican Church was penetrated by a gentler and more flexible spirit. The same Newman relates the deep impression made on him, in the fall of 1816, by the reading of a *Church History* by Joseph Bilners, an Anglican theologian of the evangelical school, in which were to be found long passages from the Fathers, and some time later, by a sermon of Doctor Hawkins, renowned Oxford preacher, on the doctrine of tradition. The preacher declared that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine and that, if we wish to learn the doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularities of the Church, such as the catechism and the creeds.[64]

We must not suppose, however, that this tendency led solely to Catholicism. The writers who, after Walter Scott, enjoyed public favor (Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey), those poets of quiet solitudes and peaceful woods, those Lake poets, as they were called, often turned the religious sentiment in the direction of unsubstantial dreaminess or depressing melancholy. Newman remarks that ridicule and contempt were still systematically directed against the Catholics; [65] even those who were introducing Catholic ceremonial into Anglican worship kept their prejudices against the Roman Church. You might say that in certain minds the evolution which was leading them

[63] *The Second Spring,* § 12; preached at Oscott, July 13, 1852.
[64] Newman, *History of My Religious Opinions.*
[65] Newman, *op. cit.*

toward Catholicism by giving them a closer view of it, by that same fact re-awakened the old antipathies and that the more conversion became logically necessary, the more they stiffened themselves against it.[66]

[66] See Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*

CHAPTER XII

The Foreign Missions

As we have seen, Europe was not the only part of the world to suffer from the revolutionary distress. From one point of view the disaster that nearly everywhere afflicted the foreign missions seemed deeper and harder to repair. Already under the old regime the regrettable disputes that arose between certain religious orders had considerably disturbed their apostolic works. In 1772 the suppression of the Society of Jesus, which furnished the entire mission field 16,000 subjects, was a most baleful blow to them. The infiltration of rationalist philosophy had spread in Europe, even in Christian circles, a practical indifference that amounted to a diminution of zeal and had dried up the source of apostolic vocations.[1] Lastly, the spoliation of the clergy's possessions by the Revolution considerably lessened the resources of the missions; and, if we except the United States and Canada, where particular circumstances favored the activity of the *émigré* priests, everywhere else their poverty and isolation and the lack of organization and resources paralyzed their good will. In one place Christian centers succumbed under the blow of violent persecutions; in another place, deprived of priests and public worship, they slowly dissolved.

But in the first years of the Restoration three chief facts reanimated the work that seemed to be dying and to give it a new impulse. These three were: in 1814 the restoration of the Society of Jesus; in 1815 the reconstitution of the Society

[1] Father Bucker, in *Etudes* of February 20, 1899, p. 551, notes that the number of missioners in 1789 probably did not exceed 300.

of the Foreign Missions; from 1815 to 1822 the founding and organization of the work of the Propagation of the Faith. Thanks to these three events, the undertaking of the missions again found workers and resources. The Church, without ceasing its strife against the disciples of Voltaire, Rousseau, Kant, and Hegel, again came into contact with the naturalist cults of China, India, and the savage tribes of America, with the metaphysical cults of the Brahman philosophers and educated Buddhists, and with the moral and social culture of Islam;[2] in civilized lands it combatted all the forms of learned unbelief, and in uncivilized countries all degrees of spontaneous superstition.

Interest in the Foreign Missions

Although the notable mission movement was not resumed until after the fall of the Empire, anyone would be mistaken if he were to attribute to the Emperor a systematic hostility to these religious undertakings.[3] Napoleon at an early hour understood that colonial expansion would be the principal aim of the governments in the nineteenth century, and he perfectly discerned the help which the Catholic missions would be able to supply to the development of the French colonial empire and to the revival of French prestige abroad. Thus at the peace of Amiens (1802) we see him imperiously demanding the restitution of all the colonial conquests of the French Revolution and, as soon as the peace was signed, work with feverish eagerness at reconstituting the French colonial hegemony.[4] At the same time he asked Portalis for a report on the Catholic missions.

[2] We know that the historians make a distinction between: 1. the naturalist religions; 2. the metaphysical religions; 3. the religions more specially moral and social. Cf. Carra de Vaux, "Les religions non chretiennes," in *Un siècle* (1900), pp. 694–729.

[3] See Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* p. 424.

[4] Alfred Rambaud, *La France coloniale* (1895), p. 33.

This report, dated November 7, 1802, proposes to the first consul that he sustain and encourage the French missioners, chiefly the Vincentians and the priests of the Foreign Missions. The following reasons are adduced: 1. the Catholic missions promote the welfare of humanity, and France will be honored by contributing "to the common interest of all nations and all mankind"; 2. the Catholic missions are one of the most effective means of serving the interests and glory of the French nation; 3. France should not let herself be outstripped by England, which has grasped the usefulness of the missions in conquered countries and favors them with all her might.[5]

Public opinion showed itself favorable to the missioners. The eloquent pages that Chateaubriand devoted to them in the *Génie du christianisme* had produced a deep impression everywhere. Pius VII was disposed to encourage the work wholeheartedly. One of his conspicuous concerns had been the reconstitution of the College of Propaganda, founded in 1622 by Gregory XV. The establishment had been sacked in 1798, but a senate decree (April 2, 1808), which united the States of the Church to the French Empire, declared that the debts of Propaganda would become debts of the Empire and that the property and income of the establishment would be administered by a commission, in which the Marquis de Fortia was a member. This marquis, by his prudence and zeal, seconded Pius VII in his views for the re-establishment of the college. Gradually new students were able to be received there; the chapel, which had become a storehouse, was restored to the use of worship, and the institution of the Propaganda soon was in a position to continue the mission assigned to it by Gregory XV: this mission was to give to the apostolate of distant nations both resources and subjects.

Unfortunately the great wars of the Empire hindered the projects as they did so many others. This fact was the more

[5] Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères,* II, 356–59.

regrettable since the Protestant nations, Holland and especially England, continued to favor their missioners. The Bible Society, founded in London in 1780, with its revenue increased in fifty years from 5,000 pounds to 200,000, was a mighty auxiliary of the Protestant missioners. According to official statistics, in one year the Bible Society, sixty years after its foundation, distributed nearly 1,700,000 Bibles besides religious tracts and in every way sustained the preachers of the Reformation.[6]

Thus we are not surprised that, with peace restored to Europe, the missions aroused considerable enthusiasm.

New Apostolic Workers

In the bull *Sollicitudo* (August 7, 1814), which re-established the Society of Jesus, Pius VII exhorted "all the superiors, all the provincials, all the rectors, and all the members of the re-established Society to show themselves faithful imitators of their father." In this connection a historian of the Jesuits writes: "The Society of Jesus did not abdicate its genius of evangelical conquests; it did not give up its inheritance of martyrdom and of the promotion of civilization which its predecessors bequeathed to it. Its memories of past times, the wishes of the peoples, and the needs of religion became a law for the new Jesuits to enter again the career of the missions." [7] This enthusiasm did not weaken, since, almost a century later, the Company of Jesus would by itself, furnish the various foreign missions almost 4,000 missioners.[8]

On March 2, 1815, an ordinance of King Louis XVIII re-established the Society of Foreign Missions, which had been dissolved by a decree of Napoleon (September 26, 1809).[9] The

[6] William Marshall, *Christian Missions,* I, 12.

[7] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus,* VI, 351.

[8] Brucker, *Etudes* of February 20, 1899, p. 552.

[9] A. Launay, *Histoire générale de la Société des Missions étrangères,* II, 433.

glorious future of this Society could be foreseen when, in 1815, it again took the road of the Indies and of martyrdom.

Inaugurated in 1658 by the first vicars apostolic and finally founded in 1663, the Society of Foreign Missions had already existed for 157 years. Its birth had been painful; its growth, slow. At no period had the number of its priests reached sixty in number. The fact is not without some surprise; but admiration mingles with the astonishment when we consider its vast field of battle, the numerous events in which it was involved, and the success it obtained. . . . It had been obliged to strive against Portugal, which looked upon it as a foe of the spiritual power of its bishops; against the pagan governments of Siam, Cochin China, Tonkin, and China; against the Mohamedans of Sumatra; against the English Protestants of Canada and the Indies. . . . Some of its missions had given excellent results. Yunnan, Kongchow, Cambodia, and Siam were in a very sad situation; but Cochin China, Tonkin, and Su-tchuen were prosperous and solid. The native clergy, trained by the Society and always exclusively secular, were pious, able, and devoted; these had again and again saved the Churches. . . . In France the Society endured the Revolution, refusing apostasy, living in exile, buying back its seminary. Such was its past.[10]

Shortly afterwards, Bishop de Mazenod founded at Aix the congregation of Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and at Lyons Father Colin created that of the Marist Fathers. Both these societies would go at the side of the old revived congregations of Dominicans, Redemptorists, and Vincentians, to beg the honor of engaging in the most remote and most dangerous missions.[11]

The initiative of some humble women of France soon furnished to these valiant forces the resources which they needed for their apostolate.

[10] Launay, *op. cit.*, p. 488.

[11] The institute of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, founded in 1807 by Madame Javouhey, would be of great help for the missioners.

In 1815 Bishop Dubourg of New Orleans, on his way back from Rome, communicated to a devout widow of Lyons, Madame Petit, the idea of founding an association of popular alms, by way of one franc a year, to back up the spiritual needs of Louisiana. The few and small offerings collected by her did not form a large treasury; but it was the widow's mite. . . . In 1819 Miss Pauline Jaricot, a young woman of Lyons, received from her brother, a seminarian at St. Sulpice, a letter expressing his grief over the destitution of the foreign missions. This pious woman organized among the working people of Lyons a collection in the amount of one sou a week for the Foreign Mission Seminary. In this way 2,000 francs were collected and sent to that seminary, to be forwarded by it to that old Asia from which Lyons had received the blessing of the faith.

The two sources were merged some years later on the occasion of the visit of Bishop Dubourg's vicar general. A meeting of twelve persons of Lyons decided that the Association should be extended to all the missions of the globe and that the membership should be solicited and received without geographical limitation. The date was May 3, 1822, the feast of the Finding of the True Cross. On that day the Propagation of the Faith Society was founded.

The receipts of the first month had been 520 francs from the diocese of Lyons, those of the first year rose to 15,272 francs. In 1838 the work took in 1,343,000 francs. Two years later it gathered in more than 2,000,000, and thereafter the receipts continued to increase.[12]

Meanwhile the work had been organized. The members were asked to supply priests as well as alms. Later on, two other similar works, that of the Holy Infancy and that of the schools of the Orient, would further augment the budget of the missions and would permit every Christian, even children, to contribute, by their prayers and their sacrifices, to the glorious work of the apostolate, which has always been a marked char-

[12] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* pp. 426–28.

acteristic of the true Church and a most striking sign of its vitality.

Korea

Pope Pius VII was unable to witness in this world the fruit of all this devotedness. But before he rendered his soul to God (August, 1823), if his gaze turned toward the infidel nations where the missioners would direct their steps, his heart would have been filled with most legitimate hopes. You might have said that when Providence was arousing a new zeal in the Catholic peoples, it was preparing the souls of far-off peoples to receive the blessings of that zeal.

One of the first regions to which the thought of Pius VII turned, when the events of 1815 restored peace to the world, was Korea. He recalled that in 1792, amid the distress, he received the homage of a Church founded in that country, a Church that, while he was a prisoner at Fontainebleau, had sent him a moving appeal of the Korean faithful asking for priests.

The way this Korean Church had been formed seemed to be one of the most touching miracles of the divine goodness. This instance is the only example of a country converted apart from any apostolate from the outside.

Korea, an extensive mountainous peninsula of northeast Asia, situated between the Japan Sea and the Yellow Sea, had, like China, whose vassal it was, its security in absolute isolation. At the close of the eighteenth century this closed country had never seen a priest. At that time a few wise men of the country happened upon some books of Catholic devotion, written in Chinese characters and accidentally imported along with certain scientific works. These Catholic books impressed them. One of them, Seng-Houn-i, made contact with the bishop of Peking, the illustrious Alexander de Gouvea, a Portuguese

Franciscan, who instructed and baptized him. Thereafter the neophyte had but one desire: since China and Europe would not send catechists to his country, he himself became a catechist. Aided by one of his friends, the virtuous Piki, he instructed many fellow countrymen and baptized them. These in turn became apostles. Books of instruction composed by the missioners of China were translated into Korean and were circulated in the world of the educated, then in the middle class and among the common people.

The faith of these new Christians was so sturdy that when, in 1791, orders from Peking commanded them to renounce their new religion, a considerable number of them courageously underwent the tortures of the bastinado, the disjointing of the bones, and other forms of suffering. A Chinese priest, James Tsiou, was finally sent to them in 1794. The loftiest virtues, virginity, humility, charity, flourished in the young Church. Two new persecutions (1799 and 1801) were met with the same courage. Father Tsiou, after being subjected to the ordinary sufferings, was beheaded on May 31, 1801. Pius VII could do nothing for these admirable Christians of Korea except to sustain them by his paternal encouragement and to place them under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Peking. His successor, Leo XII, would organize the mission, confiding it to the Society of Foreign Missions and placing at its head as vicar apostolic Bishop Bruguière.[13]

Not far from there, another prodigy of grace, which Europe was to learn of only later on, occurred in Japan under no less wonderful circumstances. Twenty-five Christian centers, going back to St. Francis Xavier himself, thanks to the transmission of their traditions, without any sacraments but baptism, preserved the sacred fire of the true faith. They were confidently

[13] See De Gouvea, *Relation de l'établissement du christianisme dans le royaume de Corée,* 1800; Dallet, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Corée;* A. Launay, *Les missionaires français en Corée,* 1895.

awaiting a priest to whom they would entrust themselves. This priest they would recognize by three signs: his devotion to the Blessed Virgin, his obedience to the pope, and his vow of virginity.[14]

India

We have already noted that the French Revolution had sad consequences for the Church of the Indies. In the colonies which the treaty of Versailles in 1783 restored to France,[15] two former Jesuits, a few Capuchins, and some priests of the Foreign Missions were laboring under the orders of Bishop Champenois. The combined persecutions of the Moslem sultan Tippo-Saibet and the revolutionary agents coming from France scattered priests and faithful. One of the missioners, Father Dubois of the Society of the Foreign Missions, wrote (September 15, 1798): "What will become of us? Persecuted and proscribed by the French, suspected by the English, abandoned by the Portuguese clergy, God alone will be our help." [16] In 1805 Bishop Champenois, exhausted by sickness and fatigue, in vain asked for an auxiliary. In 1813 the seminary founded at Pondichery was at the end of its resources. Three years later Father Dubois wrote: "All, as many of us as are here, are overwhelmed, some by age, the others by infirmities. Can you not send us one or two subjects to bury us?" [17]

Almost discouraged, its apparent influence over a population which the revolutionary spirit endeavored to mislead, at the same time as the Moslem fanaticism terrorized it, Father

[14] Marnas, *La religion de Jésus au Japon,* I, 488; A. Launay, "Le Japon," in the *Missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle,* III, 417.

[15] Pondichery, Karikal, Mahe, and Chandernagor.

[16] See the interesting pamphlet by Mazon, *Un missionaire vivarois aux Indes, l'abbé Dubois* (1899), p. 14.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 16.

Dubois devoted himself especially to works of corporal charity and to the composition of a great work on the customs of the country that he was evangelizing. But his work was not as fruitless for the apostolate as he thought. The benefactor of the poor and the scholar prepared the way for the catechist. By his charity as also by his learning he won the good will of the great and of the common people. The English governor of Madras wrote: "When Father Dubois in his journeys was on his way to a village, the Brahmans, by a spontaneous feeling of deference, made everything spic and span, and prepared everything to receive him." [18] The high council of the Company of India, at a price of 20,000 francs, bought from him his great work, *Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde,* and had it printed in English at London in 1817. The learned Max Muller, in his preface to a later edition of this work, in 1897, says that the work is that of an eyewitness and still retains all its value.[19] The 20,000 francs was used by Dubois for the reorganization of the Pondichery seminary; but especially the high regard which the zealous missioner had acquired and which later benefited his fellow workers wonderfully prepared men's minds for the great mission movement that would take place fifteen years later in the region of the French Indies.

[18] Mazon, *op. cit.,* p. 20.

[19] For Muller's preface, see Mazon, *op. cit.,* pp. 61–63. In 1825 Father Dubois published in French a carefully revised edition: *Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde.* This edition is now rare and can be found in the *Bibliothèque nationale* under the classification OK 2.149. Father Dubois was born at Saint-Remèze in the Vivarais (January 10, 1766) and died at the Foreign Mission Seminary on February 17, 1848. He published also, in English, *Letters on the State of Christianity in India,* 1823; and in French, *Exposé de quelques-uns des principaux articles de la theologie de Brahma,* 1825; *Le Pancha-Tautra, fables de brahme Vichnou,* 1826, re-edited in 1872, with thirteen engravings by Leonce Petit. The *Tablet* (May 7, 1898) commented that the celebrated book of Dubois is an encyclopedia of all that concerns Indian life; the author's political finesse and the clearness of his mind would do honor to a statesman.

China

This method of penetration by the prestige of learning was one which experience had shown as the most effective in the atmosphere of the Chinese population. It was the method employed in China, following the Jesuits, by the Vincentians and priests of the Foreign Missions, who replaced them after their dispersion.[20] From 1775 to 1823 their work of evangelization was hindered by violent persecutions; but the courage of the Christians, the martyrdom of Blessed Dufresse in 1815 and that of Blessed Clet in 1820 recalled the most heroic times of the history of the Church.

The first three Vincentians reached Peking on April 29, 1785. They were Father Raux, a distinguished astronomer and pupil of Lalande, Father Ghislain, a man of cultivated mind and one well versed in science, and Brother Paris, a clock maker whose mechanical ability was said to equal that of Vaucanson. A few former Jesuits, who had remained in China, aided them unselfishly. Father Bourgeois, former head of the mission, presented Father Raux to the Emperor; and Father Aymot ceded to the learned Vincentian his functions of imperial interpreter for the Europeans. Sons of St. Ignatius and children of St. Vincent de Paul fraternized with touching intimacy. Father Bourgeois in 1788 wrote to his confrere Father Beauregard, the renowned preacher: "No one can say whether Father Raux is living as a Jesuit, or whether we are living as Vincentians." [21] This evangelical union obtained the happiest results. The missioners succeeded in having admitted into the great library founded at Peking by Emperor Khien-Long several Christian works, among them the *Tien-tchou-che-i* (The True idea of God) by Father Ricci, a masterpiece that certain

[20] The decree of Propaganda entrusting the missions of China to the Vincentians is dated December 7, 1783.

[21] Huc, *Le christianisme en Chine,* IV, 230.

mandarins read and reread to train themselves in literary style. Under Khien-Long's successor, Kia-Khing, in 1800, while Catholic worship was still persecuted in France, forbidden in England, and disturbed in Italy, a solemn procession, reported in the *Annales,* was able to be held in the streets of Peking, on the feast of Corpus Christi.[22] In 1803 the vicar of Se-tchuen, Bishop Dufresse, of the Foreign Missions, profiting by the peace, held the first Chinese synod.

The statutes coming from this synod are the most important act that has been published, since the *Monita* of 1664, to regulate the conditions of missionary life in China. The statutes are divided into ten chapters. The life of the missioner is regulated as a life of prayer, of retreat, and of interior silence. He is then advised to exercise great prudence in his outward relations, discretion in his alms collecting, in the administration of temporalities, in the imposition of public penances, for which the opportuneness must always be submitted to the judgment of the bishop. Then the statutes speak of apostolic zeal, of attempts to found Christian schools, of measures to be employed to prevent the Catholics from participating in the superstitious customs of the pagans. We quote the following comment by a historian of this mission.

By a good fortune which is not granted to all, Bishop Dufresse had time to apply the rules he had composed, to supervise their functioning, and to have them penetrate the habits of his fellow workers. No persecution, no political disturbance, was able to prevail against the vigor which the continual observance of the wise regulations gave to the mission of Se-tchuen, which thenceforth remained like those monuments that a tempest assails without being able to shake their solid foundations.

Eleven years passed in this relative tranquillity. But, toward the end of 1814, a pagan made known to the viceroy of Se-tchuen, Chang-Ming, the state of the mission, which he learned while feigning a wish

[22] *Annales,* XXI, 7.

to embrace Christianity. He divulged the establishment of the seminary, the number of the students and professors, and denounced by name Bishop Dufresse, who was arrested on May 18, 1815 and led to Tcheu-tou, the capital of the province.

The Bishop remained in prison for four months and underwent several interrogatories. On September 14, the viceroy Chang-Min summoned him before him. The high mandarin had previously made himself acquainted with all the documents of the trial, and resolved to issue a capital sentence against the prelate and to carry it out without referring it to the Emperor.

As soon as Bishop Dufresse appeared, the viceroy at once assembled all his officers and condemned the prisoner to be beheaded. We are told that the saintly old man summoned his judge to God's tribunal and told him that his own death would come soon; this prediction was, in fact, realized.

He was stripped of his shirt, which two soldiers tore up. He was led on foot to an open place at the north gate, situated outside the city and about a mile from the palace. Thirty-three Christians were taken from their prison and were brought to the same place, surrounded by executioners and by all the apparatus of the punishment. On their arrival a mandarin ordered them to renounce Christ. In the presence of the immense crowd gathered about them, the faithful, with a single exception, protested that they were ready to die. Kneeling down, they asked the holy Bishop to absolve them from their faults, to strengthen them, and to console them by granting them his last blessing. The prelate delivered a short exhortation and gave them absolution. Then, without displaying any emotion, he turned to his executioner and bowed his head. The soldier raised and lowered his sword, and the head of the victim rolled on the ground.[23]

The next year, Pius VII in the course of an allocution spoke of this death, saying: "As we read the account, we seemed to be reading again the annals of the primitive Church." Bishop Dufresse was declared Blessed by Leo XIII in 1900.

The persecution, begun in 1815, continued for several years.

[23] A. Launay, *Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle,* III, 254–57; *Histoire des Missions étrangères,* II, 439–47.

The most outstanding event of that period was the martyrdom of Blessed Cletus, a religious of the Congregation of St. Lazare. This seventy-two-year-old priest lived in the mountains of the province of Hong-Kang, harbored by some Christian families. A reward of 1,000 taels (about $1,500) was promised to anyone who would have him arrested. In the course of several months the holy priest evaded all attempts to find him, hiding in caves and often changing his abode. He was seized on June 6, 1819. With no regard for his old age, his executioners treated him shamefully, striking his face with leather thongs, and loading him with heavy chains. He was strangled for the faith on February 18, 1820. As in the case of Bishop Dufresse, the Church has placed him in the number of her Blessed.

Chinese priests, catechists, and simple faithful were also put to death. Others were thrown into prison, sent into exile to the depths of Tartary. Yet the work of evangelization, without gaining ground, was strengthened. The distress in which the Christians found themselves provoked admirable acts of charity. A letter, written by a missioner under date of September 16, 1820, and inserted in the *Annales,* says: "We are always in hiding, often with Christians who are not well off. Almost all of them are poor. Those who would have been able to help us have suffered notable losses during the persecutions." [24] Bishop Fontana, a Portuguese Vincentian, vicar apostolic of Se-tchuen, wore clothes that were in rags. In 1824, Bishop Florens, of the Foreign Mission Society, bishop of Sozopolis, former coadjutor of Bishop Dufresse, sold his spare clothes to buy rice for some Chinese dying of hunger. We see here the duplication of the first Christian communities, having but one heart and soul, giving a hopeful promise, for a time of peace, of a magnificent flowering of Catholic life.

On the other hand, the national feeling of the Chinese grew more bitter. One of the pretexts in the recent persecutions had

[24] *Annales,* I, no. 6, p. 26.

been the seizure, on the person of a messenger, of letters and topographical data, intended for Europe. In fact, Emperor Napoleon in 1805, impressed by the influence which the prosperity of the Far East missions might exercise in favor of the French policy, had set aside special aid for them and had chosen three learned men to carry out a lay mission in China.[25] The Austrian war, then the war with England, prevented their departure. But King George wrote to the emperor of China, putting him on his guard against the undertakings of the French.[26] As might be foreseen, "Europe, penetrating China by force, would bring there a new element of power, but also, we must say, a danger to the evangelical workers." [27]

In short, the religious situation of the mission countries, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century,[28] was not without an analogy to that of the European countries at the same period. As in France, where the religious aspirations, expressed by Chateaubriand and La Mennais, offered more than one ambiguity; as in Germany, where the romantic current separated in two opposite tendencies; as in England, where the impulse that would lead Newman to Catholicism was counterbalanced by that which fixed Keble and Pusey in ritualism; everywhere mankind appeared to be raised up by a mighty movement of grace toward an era of Catholic renewal, but also to be everywhere imperiled by the spirit of evil; and fidelity to this movement of grace depended on a choice for which man's freedom would have to bear the dread responsibility.

[25] Bishop Favier, in the *Missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle,* III, 70.
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] A. Launay, in the *Missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle,* III, 258.
[28] We have merely wished here to cast a rapid glance over the principal Catholic missions having historical significance from 1775 to 1823. For many countries the preaching of the gospel dates from the middle of the nineteenth century. The most complete work on this matter is that of Louvet, *Les missions catholiques au XIX^e siècle,* 1898.

CHAPTER XIII

The Eastern Church

THE turmoils that accompanied what we have come to call the Period of the Revolution were not without influence on certain branches of the Eastern Church. This condition is what we are about to review in the following pages.[1]

The Non-Catholic Greek Church of Constantinople

Between 1789 and 1823 the see of Constantinople saw the passing of eleven patriarchates, but only eight patriarchs. The most remarkable was Gregory V, who occupied the see three times (1797–98, 1806–8, 1818–21). He ended the famous controversy of the *colybes,* accomplished numerous reforms, all of which unfortunately did not survive him, and died a martyr for the cause of Hellenic independence.

The *colybes* are wheaten cakes, abundantly sprinkled with sugar and variously decorated, which are blessed in church, according to the Eastern rite, on the occasion of funeral anniversaries or on the feasts of saints. They are a Christian survival of the use of funeral repasts by the ancients. That is all, however, that we can scientifically say about their origin. The *colybes* are used chiefly in the commemorative services taking place on the third and the fortieth day after death.[2]

In the Greek monastic liturgy Saturday is a day particularly

[1] This chapter comes from the pen of Father Cyril Karalevsky, a priest of the Greco-Slavic rite.

[2] The reader will note a slight difference from the Western usage of the third, seventh, and thirtieth days.

consecrated to services of this kind for all the dead, especially for the deceased benefactors of the monastery. Around the year 1754, the construction of a new church for a skyte, or secondary convent, of Mount Athos caused donations to flow in and consequently many requiem services to be celebrated. The monks of Athos, who went to the market of Karyes on Saturday to sell the products of their small industry (ikons, sculptured wood, and so on),[3] got the idea of transposing a good number of the services for the dead to Sunday.

We can hardly imagine the uproar this innovation excited on the "Holy Mountain" and in the ecclesiastical world, the mass of pamphlets, petitions, and appeals to the Ecumenical Patriarch, besides the forcible expulsions wrought now by one party and presently by the other, or the death of those monks whom their adversaries cast into the sea by way of argument. This fact would be unbelievable if the accounts of the contemporaries did not attest it.[4] We find therein all the names of Greek theology of the time: Athanasius of Paros, Nicodemus the Hagiographer, Agapios Leonardos—all for the conservative position which sought to keep the observances on Saturday. Nevertheless Patriarch Theodosius II left to all the liberty to do as they wished, and prevented the two parties from excommunicating each other and from deviating from the usages of the principal convents. In 1776, Sophron II excommunicated the advocates of Saturday alone and effected the return of peace for a time. In 1800, the monk Theodoret, commissioned to

[3] Karyes is the village where the quaimaqam, or Turkish subprefect, resides; it is also the place where all visitors are obliged to halt. See the interesting account of the journey of Father Placid de Mester, O.S.B.: *Voyage de deux Bénedictins au monastère du Mont Athos* (1908), pp. 43 ff. This book is a good popularization of what should be known about Athos. I have only one fault to find with it: it gives too roseate a picture of the holy mountain of the Orthodox world and it suppresses too much the deep wretchedness.

[4] See L. Petit, "La grande controverse des colybes," in the *Echos d'Orient,* II (1899), 321–31; the principal documents in Mansi, XXXVIII, 937–40, 945; XL, 39–44, 79–82.

revise the essays of the famous *Pidalion* (of which we shall speak later on), introduced into it a long note which was contrary to the opinions of Agapios and Nicodemus, and Patriarch Neophytus VII had to issue a special encyclical to point out the corrections that must be included in the text. The conflict, which had involved the whole Greek world, became localized on Mount Athos, and, in 1807 and 1819, Gregory V renewed the right for everyone to do as he was accustomed. Today, curiously enough, the commemorative services are almost always on Sunday, and this practice for the same reason had caused the monks of Athos to introduce the innovation: it is the day when everyone is free.

Another equally childish quarrel deserves mention only because it exemplifies the exaggerated attachment that was held for certain customary rituals in the Greco-Slavic countries. It recalls certain aspects of the schism of the Starovier Russians and that of the Utraquists of Bohemia. Patriarch Gregory V had one other merit: his reforming views occasioned his first downfall, after only a year and a half in the patriarchate, at the end of 1798. Re-elected in October, 1806, he at once resumed the same line of conduct: acts regulating the affairs of the bishops absent from the capital, the meetings of the Holy Synod, the regular collection of the taxes, and clerical and monastic discipline, appeared one after another.[5] The following year he made a tour for the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist.[6] Deposed at the end of September, 1808, Gregory remounted the patriarchal throne at the end of 1818, at the time when the Hetaeria, formed in Walachia with a view to rendering liberty to Greece, caused more and more discussion of that subject. He had time to terminate the controversy over the *colybes,* as we have seen, and to proclaim afresh the canonical law which prevented clerics in major or-

[5] See these documents in Mansi, XL, 3–26.

[6] Mansi, XL, 27–38.

ders from contracting second marriages after the death of their first wife.[7]

When the Greek revolution burst into the open, the Turks, as might be expected, laid the blame on the higher clergy as a consequence of their civil privileges, which made them the leaders of the nation. Gregory, evidently as a matter of form, had to launch excommunication against the chiefs of the movement.[8] Nevertheless he was seized at the beginning of the Easter ceremonies of April 10–23, 1821, and was strangled, and his corpse was hung at the gate of the patriarchal palace, where it remained exposed for three days before being delivered to the Jews. The members of the Holy Synod were given over to torture. The Greeks considered Gregory a martyr for the national cause rather than for the Orthodox faith, and his benediction cross is preserved at the Phanar as a relic which is shown to the people on tragic occasions.[9]

On the very day which saw the execution of Gregory, the Turks caused Eugenius, the metropolitan of Pisidia, to be elected in his place.[10] This election, however, did not prevent the sack of several churches, and in vain Eugenius renewed the excommunication that had been rigorously pronounced by Gregory, thereby smiting seven bishops of continental Greece.[11] The reaction to this sentence was the proclamation of the Assembly of Epidaurus (1822), which declared Greece independent, religiously as well as politically. This move was the beginning of the effective emancipation of the Church of Greece which we shall see proclaimed again later on and finally recognized by the patriarch of Constantinople, though not until 1850.

[7] Mansi, XL, 83–86.

[8] The text in Mansi, XL, 151–55.

[9] For example, at the end of August, 1911, at the time of the manifestations that took place at Constantinople following the assassination, probably perpetrated by emissaries of the "Union and Progress" Committee of Emilien, metropolitan of Grevena.

[10] Mansi, XL, 91.

[11] The text in Mansi, XL, 155–58.

Eugenius II, chosen in the midst of these tragic circumstances, was mercilessly beaten by the Turkish populace and died of exhaustion and sorrow in the following year (1822).

Several other patriarchs followed rapidly in the see of Constantinople, always the butt of the Turks' vexations until the time when the Greek independence was at last recognized by the Porte under pressure of the Powers.

The second patriarchate of Neopytus VII (1789–1801) saw the appearance of a work that has remained famous in the history of the canon law of the Orthodox Church: the *Pidalion* (the helm, or rudder), a large folio of 556 pages, published at Leipzig in 1800. This collection contains the original texts of the monuments of the ancient law of the Greek Church, that is, the so-called canons of the apostles, those of the first seven ecumenical councils, those of the particular councils received within the body of the Byzantine law, the decisions of certain Fathers arranged under the same title, a treatise on the degrees of kindred, some formulas for official acts, and the plan of a church constructed according to canonical regulations.

The texts are accompanied with an explanation gathered by the authorized commentators of the Greek ecclesiastical law: Balsamon (patriarch of Antioch), Zonaras, Alexis Aristenus, and others. This explanation is translated into vulgar Greek. At the bottom of the pages are long notes, likewise in vulgar Greek, which form a second commentary. They are the work of two monks of Athos, Agapios Leonardos (1741–1815) and Nicodemus the Hagiographer (1749–1809).[12] These notes are most curious. They are not remarkable for great canonical erudition, but by way of compensation they contain many childish trifles, traditions of uncertain value, and especially an arsenal of prejudices against the Catholic Church. The first edition has a particular value because it lacks the corrections intro-

[12] On Agapios Leonardos, see the article of Petit in the *Echos d'Orient,* II (1899), 204–6.

duced in the later reprinting. The *Pidalion,* completed by the synodal decisions of the patirarch of Constantinople and in the Kingdom of Greece by the Holy Synod, and by the civil laws on religious matters, forms even today the great source of modern Greek canon law. We need scarcely say that, produced by the Orthodox, this collection has next to no authority for Catholics outside of the personal skill of Agapios and Nicodemus, which was just as meager.

From the theological point of view, the Greek Church, properly speaking, did not produce a single name during the period which we are now studying, with the exception of Eugenius Bulgaris, to be compared with those of the preceding age. Its minds were unfortunately too much occupied by the question of the *colybes.* We must mention, however, that Christodulus of Acarnania, after traveling extensively in Europe and visiting some philosophers of every opinion, embraced the doctrines of Spinoza. He was accordingly condemned some months after his death by the patriarch Neophytus VII during his first patriarchate.[13]

However, general instruction did not develop among the Greeks of that time. In 1765, in the Peloponnesus, Agapios Leonardos and his confrere Gerasimus founded the school of Dimitsana, which has become lastingly famous. That of the Convent of St. John the Evangelist at Patmos continued to prosper until the death of Daniel Kerameus (1801) and the Greek insurrection. The theological school of Athos, opened in 1758 at the monastery of Vatopedi by Eugenius Bulgaris, maintained itself intact until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The spread of education prepared the affranchisement of Greece.

Nicodemus the Hagiographer, whose name we have seen in connection with the *Pidalion,* was also a prolific writer. He translated into the vulgar tongue the liturgical works of Simeon

[13] The text of the sentence in Mansi, XXXIX, 983–98.

of Thessalonica and, what is less praiseworthy, those of the protagonist of Hesyphasm, Gregory Palamas. A special mention must also be made of the founder of the Academy of Athos, Eugenius Bulgaris. He was born at Corfu in 1716, studied principally at the University of Padua, was preacher of the Church of St. George of the Greeks at Venice, founded, before that of Athos, the School of Janina at Epirus (1742), set out once more for Europe after Cyril V forced him to quit Athos, was recommended by Frederick of Prussia to Catherine II of Russia, was promoted by her to the archbishopric of Kherson in Taurida (which he soon resigned that he might continue his studies), and died at St. Petersburg in 1806. Theologian, exegete, and polemist, Bulgaris was one of the most learned Greeks of the eighteenth century. In his *Theologicon* he follows the scholastic method and places Tournely under contribution, but he is far from drawing nearer to the theology of the Catholic Church. Several of his writings are directed against her, and he had the patience to translate into Greek the enormous and indigestible patristic compilation of the Lutheran Adam Zoernidav on the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone. Many of his works are yet unpublished.[14]

We have almost nothing to say about the three Greek patriarchates of the South during the period we are considering. The see of Alexandria continued to be semititular, its occupants passing the greater part of their time on the Bosphorus: it would not resume activity until a later time, under Mohammet Ali. At Jerusalem it tried to signalize a period of acuteness in the secular struggle between the Greeks and the Latins for the exclusive possession of the holy places. In 1809 the Franciscans were still masters of the shrine of the Holy Sepulcher within the basilica. When the church was damaged by fire, the Greeks rebuilt it; not until 1852 did it again become a common

[14] See the article by Father Aurelio Palmieri, O.S.A., in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, II, 1236–41.

sanctuary. In the patriarchate of Antioch the Greeks, installed to the detriment of the native Melchites by Sylvester of Cyprus (d. 1766), placed themselves on the patriarchal throne and in most of the episcopal sees, without any striking results. The Patriarch Seraphim (1813–23) was, as we are about to see, a persecutor of the Catholic Melchites.

The Melchite Catholic Church of Antioch

From 1816 to 1833 the patriarchal see of the Catholic Melchites was occupied by Ignatius V Qattan, who, contrary to the customs inaugurated with Cyril VI Tanas in 1724, came from the secular clergy. From being pastor of the village of Zoug-Mikhail in the Lebanon, he passed directly to the patriarchal throne. This election seems to have been owing to a compromise between the two rival congregations of Basilians, the Salvatorians and the Chouerites, which comprised almost the entire hierarchy. This, in turn, had been reduced to four bishops at the time of the election of Ignatius Qattan.

Aleppo remained the most important center of Catholic activity. In 1817 the Orthodox metropolitan, Gerasimus, obtained a decree from Sultan Mahmud which prohibited all missionary endeavors, forbade the Catholics to visit the Latin missioners, and ordered all Melchites to return to the Orthodox obedience. The robbery was complete: the archiepiscopal church, the residence attached to it, and all the property of the diocese passed into Orthodox hands. The Catholic clergy of the Greek rite were condemned to exile. The pasha tried to persuade the people to submit but was not able to obtain anything. Then, influenced by a considerable bribe from Gerasimus, he caused nine young Melchites, a Syrian, and a Maronite to be seized, and all were put to death. These were, however, the only victims. On the other hand, many of the Aleppians emigrated either to the Lebanon, Constantinople, Leghorn, or Marseilles. The Catholic

Melchite clergy were unable to return until much later, when the Egyptian invasion of 1831 and the emancipation of all the Catholic Orientals in the Empire wrested from the Sultan by France, put an end to the violent persecutions.

Gerasimus of Aleppo soon joined Zachary, the Orthodox bishop of Akkar, near Tripoli, and together they journeyed to Damascus to execute their decree. Not much effort was needed to uproot the Melchites there. They had already been despoiled in 1724, and their priests were forced to celebrate Mass in private houses. A decree similar to the first gave the Orthodox patriarch, Seraphin, the same rights over the Catholics of Damascus as Gerasimus of Aleppo had over those of that city.

The procedure followed was the same as at Aleppo: when the judicial decisions were against the Orthodox party, the patriarch obtained with money the degradation and exile of two priests, and a deacon and six notables were condemned to drubbing. Only four survived it; two died under the blows. Large contributions were levied on the Catholics, several of whom apostatized. The priests were at the same time exiled, as at Aleppo. But the isle of Rouad, which is not far from Tripoli and which was designated as the place of their deportation, was subject to the pasha of Acre, who had many Catholic Melchites in his service; they persuaded him to allow the escape of the priests, who were able to take refuge at the convent of the Holy Savior in the Lebanon, where they were in safety. They returned to Damascus only secretly and were not able to resume their ministry until after the death of Seraphin in 1823. Only the Egyptian invasion gave them complete liberty.

From an internal point of view, the Melchite Church continually suffered from the troubled state in which the Jansenist and Gallican doctrines of Germanos Adam had put it. The seminary of Ain-Traz, founded in 1811 by Patriarch Agapius III Matar, had no success. Propaganda closed it in 1815 because the superior, Maximus Mazloum, intruding into the diocese

of Aleppo, was too compromising in the affair of the synod of Qarqafe and too favorable to the ideas of Adam. The Basilian congregations, which had rendered so many services during the period of the great persecution of Sylvester, were now exhausted from the troubles that were caused by the repeated intrusions of Ignatius Jauhar in the patriarchal see. The Chouerites in particular had lost their first fervor. Ignatius Sarrouf, the metropolitan of Beirut from 1778 to 1812, had tried to reform them: when nothing came of his efforts, he desired to start a new congregation, but Rome suppressed it for fear that it would merely add to the confusion. The local disputes, which became intense among the Chouerites, had to be settled by a compromise: the Aleppine element separated from the Lebanese element and became another congregation. Propaganda sanctioned the arrangement in 1819. The secular clergy had dwindled to several married priests who were without any sort of education. Nonetheless no attempts to rehabilitate them were made until the following period, but then it was with a celibate clergy.

A division in the congregation of the Antonians among the Maronites had the same causes as that between the Lebanese and Aleppian Chouerites. This separation was not recognized by Benedict XIV, but was finally sanctioned by Clement XIV in 1770. The troubles introduced by the affair of the visionary Hendyye and the lack of observation in the dispositions of the Lebanese synod of 1736 rendered the effects of that assembly little more than nothing, instead of what might have been expected. At last, the patriarch, John Helo, convoked a new synod at the monastery of Louaise, near Beirut, in April, 1818.[15] There the deplorable usage of mixed monasteries of monks and nuns was definitely abolished, and each bishop was assigned a fixed residence. The patriarchal simplicity in which the

[15] See the acts in Mansi, XXXIX, 247–52.

Maronite people lived, as well as the firm hand of the Emir Bechir Checab, prince of Lebanon, lessened the disadvantages of this legislative anarchy which had caused the worst consequences in other countries.

The Syrian Church also went through a troubled period. The Patriarch Michael Jaroué died in 1800; his successor, Michael Daher, a priest of Aleppo, was not elected until 1803, and he resigned eight years later. His successor, Gregory Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, was elected in 1814 and likewise resigned. Rome nominated the archbishop of Aleppo, Denis Hadaia, as the administrator of the patriarchate. Not till 1820 was Gregory Peter Jaroué proclaimed patriarch. He was the bishop of Jerusalem, and under his patriarchate several brilliant conversions took place which gave a new development to this small but heroic Church.

The cause of this eclipse of the real Oriental Churches must be looked for partly in the suppression of the Jesuits. The French government, which had contributed so much to this end, attempted to assign their missions in the Lebanon to the Vincentians, but these were not able to undertake the task, mainly because the Revolution had hindered their growth. The vigor of Catholic life within the Ottoman Empire did not take hold until after the great emancipation of 1931.

The Churches of Eastern Europe

Since Europe had experienced in a special way the effects of the French revolution, we are about to see a whole series of transformations brought about by the new order of things.

At Rome, first of all, the establishment of the Republic in February, 1797, although lasting only a few months, considerably disturbed the administration of Propaganda. The revenues of most of the colleges dependent on it were confiscated, and

these colleges remained closed; such was notably the lot of the Greek College and that of Propaganda itself. Cardinal Gerdil, prefect of the congregation, took refuge at Turin, and Cardinal Stefen Borgia, the proprefect, at Padua, in the house of Bishop Speroni of Adria. Both continued to do their best to direct the missions, often in critical circumstances: Borgia was so short of resources that he did not have the means to employ a secretary. This state of affairs continued until the return to Rome, after the Conclave of Venice in 1800. The missions could not remain without a protector in the Ottoman Empire, and as early as 1792 the Holy See turned to Austria, which gladly accepted the function. The situation remained thus until 1803. Moreover, in the past, Propaganda had willingly turned to the emperor for the protectorate over the Catholic Ottoman subjects as often as to France.

Everywhere that the armies of the Directory penetrated, freedom of religion was proclaimed. At Venice, at the time of the Conclave of 1800, the Greeks of St. George, who were Catholics only outwardly, refused to ring their bells, and thus quit the Roman communion. At Ancona the schismatics took possession of the Greek Catholic church and did not give it up until much later, after the restoration of the papal power.

Dalmatia, where the simplicity of a completely patriarchal life preserved the customs of the Middle Ages, contained around 50,000 Orthodox of the Serbian race and nearly five times as many Latin Catholics. The Venetian government, on which the region was dependent, held tightly to the principle of the state religion; the Greeks, as they were called, were considered Catholics, but they paid dues to the Latin clergy, and their rite was regarded as inferior. Propaganda undertook to unite them in a more sincere union, and in 1742 the Bishop of Ossero, who was sufficiently acquainted with literary Slavonic and the Eastern ceremonies, received the privilege of pontifi-

cating in that rite in order to perform necessary ordinations.[16] Catholics were ordered to preserve their own rite whenever they had a priest available.

But the Russian influence was large among them; as early as 1759, Maria Theresa authorized, upon the Russian demand, an openly schismatic Church at Trieste.[17] When (May, 1797) Dalmatia was given to Austria after the fall of the Republic of Venice, the Serbs determined to free themselves completely; they were encouraged in this resolve by the metropolitan of Montenegro, Peter Petrovich. After the preliminaries at Leoben and then the Treaty of Campo Formio (October, 1797) had confirmed the existence of Austrian rule, they elected the archimandrite Simeon Ivkovich as bishop, but the new governor, Count von Thurn, let the affair drag on, and the consecration never took place.[18] In February, 1806, the French, after Austerlitz, entered Dalmatia, and the country became part of the Kingdom of Italy. Under the imperial provincial, Vincenzo Dandolo, the most noted personage among the Serbs was the archimandrite Gerasimus Zellich; he was made an equal to the Latin bishops, and by the decree of Saint-Cloud (September 8, 1808) provision was made for the establishment of an Orthodox bishopric, which the synod of Zara organized under the presidency of Dandolo. But Zellich had certain deplorable habits—for instance, he might be found in the street in a drunken state—and he could not be nominated; not until 1810 did the consecration of Bishop Benedict Kraljevich take place. He resided first at Sebenico, then at Castelnuovo, with

[16] See the text of the brief in Raffaele de Martinis, *Ius pontificium de Propaganda Fide,* III, 82.

[17] The documents are in the archives of Propaganda, *Scritture riferite nei Congressi: Greci di Croazia,* Vol. I.

[18] On Dalmatia at this period, consult the excellent work of Father Pisani, *La Dalmatie de 1797 à 1815; Episode des conquêtes napoléoniennes* (1893). The affairs of the Orthodox Serbs occupy pages 84–85, 236–38, 374. See also A. Ratel, "L'Eglise orthodoxe de Dalmatie," in the *Echos d'Orient,* V (1902), 362–75.

the title of Zadar. In 1815, Dalmatia was returned to Austria, and the Orthodox bishopric continued to exist, but not until 1870 was it divided and a new eparchy erected at Kotor (Cattaro).[19]

I have just mentioned Peter of Montenegro. This tiny Church arose out of the patriarchate of Ipek, and later, from the time of Daniel Petrovich, elected in 1697, out of the archdiocese of Karlovitz, which included various lands of the Ottoman Empire. From uncle to nephew, the metropolitan's see remained hereditary in the Petrovich family till 1858; at that time Daniel Petrovich was secularized and he named as metropolitan Nicanor the archimandrite. Furthermore, after 1830 the Church of Montenegro made itself completely independent of the archbishop of Karlovitz; and its titulars in Belgrade, Dalmatia, and St. Petersburg petitioned for episcopal consecration.

Although the Serbian revolution began in 1806, Serbia proper did not obtain semi-independence until 1830, but the Orthodox Church in that country remained subject to the patriarch of Constantinople until 1879. The Church of the Kingdom of Hungary, fully emancipated, received absolutely complete freedom of worship through the edict of toleration of Joseph II on October 25, 1782. But the obligation which he imposed on all the officials of the Empire in the next year, requiring them to be able to speak and write German fluently within three years, turned everyone against him, the Serbs as well as the Hungarians. The latter, by way of reprisal, suppressed the

[19] Bishop Benedict Kraljevich was well disposed in favor of the Union. The Austrian imperial government seconded his views: to train a serious clergy, Kraljevich opened a seminary that he entrusted to four Ruthenian priests of Galicia. But the opposition on the part of the Orthodox party was stronger than he. The victim of an attempted assassination, he had to resign his see in 1829. A decree of that year (March 19) placed the bishopric of Dalmatia subject to the Serbian metropolitan of Karlovitz. Uuder the new bishop, Joseph Rajatchich, three villages passed to the Union in 1831: a violent persecution so lessened the number of the faithful that now they number not more than fifty.

Latin language little by little in all their public acts and replaced it with Hungarian (Magyar), but they were wrong in the attempt to impose their own tongue on all the races inhabiting the same territory as themselves. In 1790–91, the emperor, Leopold II, granted the Serbs civil rights. This was the time when the Serbian monk, Dositheos Obradovich (1739–1811), gave the impulse to modern Serbian literature. Until that time the ecclesiastical idiom, Old Slavonic, was the only one in literary use. In 1792 the archbishop of Karlovitz and his suffragan bishops, as representatives of the Serbian nation, obtained the right to sit in the Hungarian diet, but almost forty years passed before that right came into practical use. In fact, the opposition to this point and to several others was much more political than religious.[20]

Bukovina, reunited to the Austrian Empire in 1775, following the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji of July 21, 1774, had previously formed an Orthodox diocese carved out of the archdiocese of Iassi and Suceava, having the town of Radautz for its see. The change in political rule necessitated the introduction of a change in religious alliance: in 1781 the bishop of Radautz obtained his independence and moved his residence to Tchernovitz. An imperial decree in 1785 placed the bishop of Tchernovitz under the Serbian metropolitan of Karlovitz. This arrangement endured until the emancipation of 1873. But the members of his flock were not Serbian in race or language: a minority were Ruthenian and the majority were Rumanian—a confusion that was matched everywhere in Austria.[21]

[20] On the Serbs of Hungary, a good work exists in French, based on Serbian sources and written by Picot, former French consul at Temesvar: *Les Serbes de Hongrie, leur histoire, leurs privilèges, leur état politique et social* (1873). The chief documents touching the privileges of the Serbs of Hungary have been published by P. L. Petit in Mansi, XXXIX. Picot uses especially Orthodox writings and is influenced by his liberal ideas in matters of religion. In his political views he is unfriendly to the Hungarians, and rightly so.

[21] See an article by A. Ratel in the *Echos d'Orient,* V (1902), 232–36, entitled "L'Eglise orthodoxe de Bukovine."

At the head of the Rumanian Church of Transylvania from 1783 to 1830 was John Bobu, born in 1739 at Ormany, in the country of Szolnok in Hungary. Having at first joined the Basilians of Balaszfalva, he abandoned them before his profession, dismayed by the rigorous fasts to which the bishop, Athanasius Rednik, subjected the novices. A secular priest in 1778, he was named bishop of Fagaras by Joseph II in 1782, was confirmed in the appointment by Rome in the following year, and was consecrated by his resigned predecessor, Gregory Major, in 1784. He had some serious difficulties with the Basilians, Gabriel Sinkai, Paul Major, and Samuel Klein, who were the most noted representatives of the Rumanian literary Renaissance of the age. In 1807 he founded a cathedral chapter at Fagaras with the approval of Rome and, after the close of the Napoleonic wars, he convened a diocesan synod at Blas in 1821, which was preparatory to the plenary council of Hungary convoked by the primate of Strigonia, Alexander Rudnay, in 1822. He died (October 2, 1830) at the age of ninety-one after forty-seven years in the episcopate.

The see of Fagaras, erected by Innocent XIII in 1721, comprised all Transylvania, but nothing more. In the Latin diocese of Nagy-Varad (or Gran-Varadin), in Rumanian Oradea-Mare, were also many Rumanians. The zeal of the Latin bishop, Paul Laszlo, led seventy parishes into union with Rome. Bishop Csaky's request that Rome give him an auxiliary of the Greek rite was granted by Benedict XIV to his successor, Paul Forgach of Ghymes, in the person of Melece Kovacs, originally from Macedonia. Kovacs was appointed titular bishop of Tegea by a decree of the Consistory (July 12, 1748). He died in 1770, and Maria Theresa decided upon the erection of an independent Rumanian diocese. She named Moses Dragossy for it on July 26, 1776. At first, Pius VI refused to confirm this measure; but all the difficulties were settled, and the bull *Indefessum personarum* (July 16, 1777) accorded the canonical erection

of the see. The new bishop had ordinary jurisdiction over all Rumanians in Hungary living outside of Transylvania, and his metropolitan was the Latin archbishop-primate of Strigonia or Esztergom.

In 1781, Joseph II confirmed the endowment of the see made by Maria Theresa. Moses Dragossy (d. 1787) was succeeded by Ignatius Darabanth (1788–1805), and Samuel Vulcan (1806–39), under whom the see acquired seventy-two parishes which were detached from the Ruthenian eparchy of Munkas by Pius VII. In 1836 Samuel Vulcan opened the still flourishing episcopal gymnasium or college of Belenyes. Under Bishop Basil, baron of Erdelyi (1842–62), numerous conversions seemed to compensate for certain losses caused by the Revolution of 1848. The erection of the Rumanian ecclesiastical province in 1853 brought about some changes once again.[22]

In this review of the Churches of eastern Europe subject to Austria-Hungary, we should not overlook two groups of Latin rite Catholics who were, for the time, either directly or indirectly under the domination of the Turks and who, in our own day, served as a point of support for Catholic propaganda in the Oriental rite. These two groups are the Bulgaro-Walachian mission and the diocese of Bacau in Mildavia.

The Latin Catholics of Bulgaria, or the Pavlikans, are the descendants of ancient Manichaean heretics who were deported into these regions by the Byzantine emperors of the Middle Ages. Those of Philippopolis, for instance, came from Asia Minor. From Bulgaria their doctrines spread throughout eastern Europe and gave birth to the sects known as the Cathari, Albigenses, and so on, quite familiar to the pages of history.

The sect of those called Bogomiles, from the name of a Greek priest who had been their teacher in the tenth century,

[22] These details are taken from the long and interesting introduction of *Schematismus historicus Venerabilis Cleri Dioecesis Magno-Varadinensis graeci ritus catholicorum pro anno 1900.*

was condemned by the Bulgarian councils of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. After the Moslem conquest most of them embraced Mohammedanism. Those who remained were converted to Catholicism, but no one knows how or when. In the sixteenth century the popes made them a visitation through the archbishops of Antivari, and later confided them to the Franciscans of Bosnia. The Franciscans also founded the Custody of Bulgaria in their midst, which lasted from 1624 to 1763. From that date till 1781 the Baptistines of Genoa replaced the Bosnian Franciscans within the whole area outside of Walachia itself. In 1781, Pius VI entrusted the diocese of Nicopolis (Rouchtchouk), on the right shore of the Danube, today on the Bulgarian side, to the Passionists. In 1688, the Turks destroyed Chiprovatz, which was the bishop's residence, and a considerable migration set out across the lands of the Empire; it was followed by another in 1724. A third came about in 1812, after an outbreak of the plague; the emigrants crossed the Danube and founded the village of Cioplea in Walachia, close to Bucharest. The Passionist bishop, who had followed the faithful, also decided to reside at Bucharest after 1847. In 1833 Bucharest had been elevated to a Latin archbishopric, and Rouchtchouk became a separate diocese directly dependent on the Holy See.

The see of Sofia, detached in 1610 from the Bosnian Franciscans' mission, became an archdiocese in 1643, but the persecutions of the Turks laid it waste during the eighteenth century. In 1835 the Redemptorists established there a prefecture apostolic, which was transformed into a vicariate in 1848, with Italian and Austrian Capuchins after 1841.

In Moldavia, upon the requests of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, Urban V erected a diocese at Sereth in 1370, which was transferred to Bacau after the end of the fifteenth century. It was abandoned in 1497 following the Turkish persecutions, but was re-established at the end of the seven-

teenth century. As a result of diverse political situations, the right of nomination belonged to the king of Poland; the bishops, all Poles, hardly ever resided in their diocese. In 1818 the see was suppressed, and the Latin Catholics, consisting mostly of Rumanized colonies from Hungary, were confided to the care of regulars. This state of affairs lasted until the establishment of the see of Iassi by Leo XIII in 1884.

The Latin Church within the kingdoms of Bulgaria and Rumania today is represented by four dioceses which are independent of one another: in Bulgaria, the diocese of Bouchtchouk and the vicariate of Sofia; in Rumania, the archdiocese of Bucharest and the privileged diocese of Iassi. In 1823, at the time when this volume closes, the Greek patriarch of Constantinople still extended his jurisdiction over the whole Balkan peninsula, and the Turkish power held sway everywhere either directly or indirectly through the limited vassalage of the principality of Moldavia-Walachia.[23]

The Ruthenian Catholic Church

The Church that was most tried by the transformations of the era we are now studying was the Ruthenian Church.[24]

[23] On the Latin Church in Bulgaria, see the article "Bulgarie" in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* II, 1231–36; on the Bogomiles, see the article "Bogomiles," II, 926–30. On the Latin Church of Rumania, see the article under the same title in the *Echos d'Orient,* VI (1903), 42–50, with the important corrections of page 224.

[24] For the history of the Ruthenian Church at this period, see Harasiewicz, *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenicae* (1862), pp. 497 ff.; Julian Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* (1880), II, 495 ff.; Lescœur, *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe* (1772–1875), I, 1–126; Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège* (1902), Vol. V. The last work is of the highest value and abundantly indicates the bibliography of the subject, but it is confined to the relations with Rome. Harasiewicz, a Ruthenian author of doubtful erudition, is animated by an excessively anti-Polish spirit; Pelesz, also Ruthenian, is too Polish. In these questions to maintain a just middle course is indeed hard. In truth, the history of the Ruthenian Church is still to be written. Consult also the work of Father Theiner, *Die Neusten Zustande der katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katharine II bis auf unsere Tage* (1847); this work has been translated into

On the eve of the partition of Poland in 1772, the Ruthenian hierarchy included eight eparchies or effective dioceses: Kiev, the theoretical seat of the metropolitan, although, after the return of that city to Russia in 1667, he resided by turns at Vilna, Novgorod, and finally at Radomychl in Ukrainia; Polotsk, Vladimir in Volynia, Loutsk, Lvov or Leopol (Lemburg), Peremychl, Kholm, and Pinsk. These eight dioceses counted around 13,000 parishes, large and small, and a Catholic Ruthenian population which amounted to about 5,000,000 souls.[25]

The first partition of Poland (1772) placed a part of White Russia and a good piece of the archdiocese of Polotsk under the scepter of Catherine II of Russia; under that of Austria went the eparchies of Peremychl and Lvov, except the district of Kamenietz-Podolsk. The sections taken by Russia were within the solidly Polish region of the kingdom.

The second partition (1793) gave Russia almost the whole metropolitan eparchy, the district of Kamenietz-Podolsk from Lvov on, the eastern part of the diocese of Loutsk, the city of Pinsk with nearly all the territory of the diocese, and finally the remainder of the eparchy of Podolsk. At the third partition (1795), which was only a continuation of the first, Russia received the rest of the eparchies of Loutsk and Pinsk and the whole eparchy of Vladimir in Volynia. Likewise, in 1795, Austria received the territory of Kholm. In 1793 Russia had taken over Great Poland, a completely Polish district, but in

---

French and Italian, but the German edition is the best because it contains documents that are lacking in the translations. See also, though with caution in what concerns the Jesuits, *L'histoire de Clement XIV,* by the same author.

[25] Each bishop could have one or more coadjutors, who were then decorated with the title of some city in the eparchy, sometimes itself a former episcopal see: this institution is to be found in the Russian non-Catholic Church and in the Rumanian Church. To Polotsk were thus attached the ancient sees of Vitebsk, Mscislav, Orcha, and Moghilev; to Vladimir, Brest-Litovskij; to Loutsk, Ostrog; to Leopol, Galitch and Mamenietz-Podolskij; to Peremychl, Sanok and Sambor; to Kholm, Belz; to Pinsk, Tourov.

1795 she added Mozaria and a part of Lithuania with it: a good many Ruthenians who were thus left without their bishop (of Vladimir and Brest) might be found in the latter region.

The Treaty of Tilsit in 1807 set up the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, which lasted under a form of independence until the treaties of 1815. The eparchy of Kholm was included therein, even though the Lithuanian portion was ceded to Russia in 1795. In 1815 Kholm passed to Russia. The Ruthenian Church then found itself placed under the authority of two sovereigns: the czar of Russia and the emperor of Austria. Except for Red Russia, of which Galicia is a part, the czar regained possession of all the domains over which the old Russian princes of Riourik had ruled.

The political causes for the fall of the Polish kingdom are well known. The nation perished a victim of its anarchical constitution [26] and the unscrupulous ambition of King Frederick II of Prussia. Together these two things forced the hand of Maria Theresa.

From a religious point of view, divorce had reached an unheard-of frequency in Poland—to such an extent that various ambiguous clauses which made separation on the plea of nullity very easy were inserted into the marriage contract. The clergy, unfortunately, too often approved of these maneuvers. The population was once again reduced to a servile state, and the Ruthenians, who formed nearly half of the population, were continually victims of various incurable prejudices that retarded their progress. The children of Ruthenian priests were legally no better than serfs. The Catholic bishops of the Greek rite could not take a seat in the Senate, where the Latin

[26] Poland was an elective and representative monarchy. Between one reign and another, the power was exercised by the archbishop primate of Gnesen until the electoral diet. Often the period was one of anarchy. The laws were voted by the diet, but the principle of the *liberum veto* could prevent their application: a protest of a few nobles, publicly recorded, was enough to halt everything. The king had merely the executive power.

prelates were admitted by law—the metropolitan himself did not obtain a seat until the close of the Republic in 1789. Transfer to the Latin rite became more and more frequent in the upper classes owing to the lack of legislation which Rome had desired to enforce ever since 1624, but which had been refrained from because of opposition from the king and the ecclesiastical authorities.

From an internal point of view, the whole effectiveness of the Ruthenian Church rested with the Basilians. They alone were educated since they alone had theological schools and were free from the dominance of the landed nobility. All the bishops were recruited from their ranks, and the Council of Zamosc in 1720 passed a law requiring every secular priest who was called to the episcopate to make monastic profession before his consecration.[27] Since a general belief prevailed at that time that such was the true discipline of the Eastern Church, Rome had confirmed the measure. The religious were everything: they occupied the important positions in the diocesan curias and cathedral chapters—an institution evidently of Latin origin but one which had been firmly established since before the Union of Brest in 1595.

As for the secular clergy, they were almost all married, deprived of seminaries in spite of all the efforts to remedy that need, chained to the soil which they often worked with their own hands, and regarded as low and commonplace by the upper classes. The best secular clergy, and the only ones that were generally celibate, were students of the pontifical colleges of Lvov and Vilna. But often they would despair of improving their lot and entered the Basilians upon completing their studies.

This preponderance of the Basilians, which was abnormal in a country where the secular clergy had been at the peak of

[27] When the rule finally became the exception, the Council of Leopol in 1891 abolished the decree of Zamosc.

its task, was the cause of a good many of the troubles, especially after the middle of the eighteenth century, that beset this Church.

To improve the secular clergy, they needed to be assured of equality with the Latin clergy before the civil law of the state, to be given seminaries, and to be rendered celibate little by little. This change supposed a compromise between different factors that could not or would not support any reforms.

Not only through corrupt morals and the frequency of divorce had the Polish nobility been infected, but the skepticism introduced by the circulation of the writings of the French philosophers caused ravages among the members of that group along with the others. Freemasonry had also been introduced into the kingdom, and, if some of the bishops did perhaps stand up against it, they did not always do their duty in this regard. Finally, the bishop of Vilna, Ignatius Massalski, was responsible for having placed in the upper hierarchy a Calvinist of imperfect conversion, Stanislas Siestrzencewicz of Bohusz, who would be at the head of the Latin rite in Russia for half a century and who would conduct himself in all matters in accord with the principles of purest Febronianism.

The pretext invented by Frederick II of Prussia and Catherine of Russia for intervening in Polish affairs and preparing the partition of the country was the question of the dissidents, the Protestants and the Ruthenian schismatics. In the sixteenth century, the Jesuits, working with a less corrupt society, had been able to check the former and they converted a large number. Unfortunately, to continue this work took all their effort.

With regard to the Ruthenians who had not yet embraced the Union, the ease with which Ukrania, the citadel of schism in the old days, had been won by Catholicism indicated that the same procedure would have been used in White Russia, if the fault of permitting the establishment of the diocese of Moghilev, which became the center of ceaseless agitation for Rus-

sian intervention, had not been committed. The abandonment of the Ruthenian Church by the Polish people was one of the chief causes for the fall of their nation.

At the time of the first partition, the metropolitan of Kiev was Felician Volodkovitch (1762–78). A projected synod could not be held, and various accusations which have not been made clear even in our own time caused the metropolitan to resign all jurisdiction over his own eparchy and over the eparchy of Vladimir, which he governed as administrator. The former was entrusted to the care of Leo Cheptitskij, the bishop of Lvov, and the latter to Anthony Mlodovskij, the bishop of Brest and coadjutor of the diocese of Vladimir. The king of Poland, Stanislas Augustus Poniatowski, was very active in having the arrangement confirmed by Rome, and the Holy See, after learning all the details of the affair, gave its approval. This affair was not ended until 1774—Volodkovitch died in 1778. His successor was Leo Cheptitskij, bishop of Lvov, but only for the space of one year, for he died at the end of 1780. Jason Smogorjevskij, archbishop of Polotsk, was elected in his place and passed again under Polish domination in order to take possession of his see. Dead in 1786, he had Theodosius Rostotskij, the bishop of Kholm and his coadjutor, for his successor. Around the time of the third partition of Poland, he was held in semi-captivity at St. Petersburg, where he died in 1805. The Ruthenian Church was, except for the ancient eparchies, established in Hungary, which had always had a separate existence, divided into three parts, between Prussia, Russia, and Austria.

In Prussia, first of all, the division of the eparchy of Brest-Vladimir, which had fallen under that power, reinforced the archimandrate of Suprasl which dated from a foundation of the metropolitan of Kiev, Joseph Soltan, in 1553. On March 4, 1798, Pius VI elevated Suprasl to a Ruthenian diocese and named Theodosius Vitotskij, the archimandrite of the monastery, as its first bishop, from the Carthusian monastery in

Florence where the Roman Republic had forced the pope to take refuge.

The king of Prussia assured the new bishop and also his cathedral chapter of a considerable endowment. Vitotskij died around 1805, and his successor, Douchnovskij, followed him to the grave before being able to obtain episcopal consecration. In 1807, by the Treaty of Tilsit, the territory of this short-lived eparchy passed to Russia, and no Ruthenians were any longer left in Prussia.

The Catholic Church in Russia

In Russia the treaty signed by Catherine II in 1793 following the first partition of Poland granted expressly the exercise of their religion to the Catholics of both rites. But Catherine did not respect this article of the treaty any more than she did the others.

Already since 1766 she had been intervening in the affairs of the Latin Catholic community in St. Petersburg at the request of some of its members. Formerly this community had been dependent on Propaganda through the intermediary of the nuncio of Warsaw or Vienna, but after this time, on account of the many law suits between the clergy and the faithful —and the divisions between them had not a little to do with the affair—it was to be dependent on the College at St. Petersburg and, in a way, on the Ministry of Justice. The regulations of 1769, never approved by the Holy See, were the embodiment of all the legislation that regulated the Catholic Church of both rites in Russia.

The Latin dioceses of Poland had been dismembered just as the Ruthenian eparchies were after the partitions.[28] In 1772,

[28] The Latin dioceses in Poland comprise seventeen sees: Gnesen (primatial see), Leopol (archbishopric), Kamenietz, Chelm (Kholm), Cujavie, Culm, Kiev, Cracow, Luck (Loutsk), Plock, Posen, Peremychl, Samogitie, Smolensk, Varmie, Pilten, and Vilna. Each can have a coadjutor, who is called suffragan.

an imperial decree of December 14 determined the lot of Latin and Ruthenian Catholics without the least taking note of the authority of the Holy See. As it was, Catherine applied the principles of Febronianism in all cases and the archbishop whom she herself installed and whom Rome was forced to recognize was not one to turn her from its maxims.

After this decree all communication with the Holy See was forbidden unless it passed through government channels. The whole Empire would have but one Latin diocese, and all religious without exception would be subject to it: legislation from St. Petersburg in 1769 rendered it exactly thus. As for the titular of this immense diocese which included all European and Asiatic Russia, he was not named for some time. With regard to the Ruthenians, since the archbishop of Polotsk, at that time Jason Smogorjevskij, had his residence in Russian territory, the decree conferred on him the same authority for his own rite as it had on the Latin bishop.

Massalski's protégé, Siestrzencewicz,[29] obtained the necessary bulls from Rome to become the suffragan of Vilna within Russian territory through his donor's influence—Massalski always tried to be *persona grata* to Catherine. Consecrated titular bishop of Mallo on October 1, 1773, he departed almost

[29] This unlucky man, who governed the Latin Church in Russia from 1774 to 1826, that is, for half a century, was a Lithuanian of the lower nobility, born a Calvinist, became a volunteer in the Prussian army, was wounded either in war or in a duel; he was converted at Berlin after his wound—according to some, following a love romance; at the home of the Radziwills, say others. He was a student at Berlin and at Frankfort, then tutor of the children of Martin Radziwill and was named an officer in the Lithuanian guards. Ignace Massalski, his protector, bishop of Vilna, was a worldly prelate, such as many were in Poland of that time. He was a passionate gambler, always short of funds in spite of an immense fortune, a great builder of churches, and concerned with spreading instruction in the popular masses. He is the one who pushed Siestrzencewicz into holy orders about 1764, and then made him canon of Vilna, pastor of Bobruisk, and *ad interim* administrator of the diocese. At the time of the 1794 revolution, Massalski was massacred by the populace because of his Russophile tendencies. Stanislas Siestrzencewicz died December 1, 1826, at the age of ninety-six.

immediately for St. Petersburg. He had the confidence of the Polish nuncio, Garampi, as well as that of Massalski and Catherine II, and not long afterward his true feelings were discovered at Rome. Since Catherine did not wish to deal with the pope personally, she charged Siestrzencewicz with all negotiations with the Holy See, and, without giving more attention to the matter, named him bishop of Moghilev in White Russia by decree of November 22, 1773. Having the welfare of souls in mind and not suspecting anything, Clement XIV recognized the usurper of the powers binding upon all the Latin Catholics in the Empire.

At Rome no way out of this inextricable situation could be found. Between times, hundreds of parishes in Ukrainia had been snatched from union by measures in which violence played a great part. Later, four schismatic eparchies were erected in the territories obtained at the second and third partitions of Poland. An attempt at mediation by Maria Theresa met with no success whatever. Jason Smogorjevskij was elected metropolitan in 1780, and just as he resided in Poland, his successor, Bishop Maximilian Ryllo of Kholm, preferred to live in Austria. Therefore Catherine entrusted the administration of the see to a consistory. Thus the Ruthenians no longer had any hierarchy, and the Latins had a bishop who was only canonically supplied with binding faculties.

In 1780 Pius VI himself wrote to Catherine to ask for the nomination of a Ruthenian bishop. Catherine answered him by calling in turn for the erection of Moghilev into an archdiocese and the pallium for Siestrzencewicz, with a coadjutor in addition. Since the Pope delayed on account of an injuction which Siestrzencewicz had issued and which the Pope wished him to retract, Catherine named her protégé archbishop of Moghilev by a decree of January 17–28, 1782, illegally conferred on him ample powers over the religious, and gave him the former

Jesuit, Benislawski, for coadjutor. The organization of the archdiocese and the installation followed at once, and Siestrzencewicz consented to it all.

This period in the history of the Catholic Church in Russia is linked too much with that of the Jesuits not to say a short word about it here. The brief of Clement XIV, *Dominus ac Redemptor,* had to be published in each diocese in order to accomplish its purpose. Catherine, who needed the Jesuits for the education of the nation's youth and who was well acquainted with their superior methods, formally forbade Siestrzencewicz to publish the brief. The Jesuits in White Russia, where their college at Polotsk had been famous for a long time, were thus held together. The ill will of the Bishop of Mallo toward the Society gave way before the will of the Empress, but at the Vatican the publication of the brief was insisted on under pressure from the Bourbon courts. In reality, Pius VI had desired to save the Jesuits and he was delighted from the first by the opening of a novitiate at Polotsk—with the consent of Siestrzencewicz, but forced by the Empress in the meantime. The Pope indicated this fact to Benislawski in several significant conversations when the latter came to Rome to hasten the negotiations while the Russian ambassador at Warsaw, Stackelburg, pressed the nuncio, Archetti, more and more.

Moreover, Archetti desired the mission to Catherine with which he was entrusted at the end of 1783. He arrived in St. Petersburg in July, and was well received there by the Empress, who flattered herself with having vanquished the pope. Actually, the desire to save the 12,000,000 Catholics of both rites in Russia from the evident menace of the autocracy had caused Pius VI to overlook the repeated and pressing demands for the suppression of the Jesuits from the Bourbon courts.

At the end of December, 1783, Archetti canonically erected the archdiocese of Moghilev by means of cleverly drawn-up official acts in a way to safeguard the pope's rights, and shortly

afterward Heraclius Lissovskij was lawfully enthroned in the Ruthenian see of Polotsk. After a stay of eleven months in Russia, Archetti returned to Poland in order to receive the red hat, which his Russian mission and the renewed esteem of Catherine for the Pope had earned for him. The Empress had desired the same favor for Siestrzencewicz, but this time Pius VI was immovable.

After the third partition of Poland, Catherine erected three new Latin dioceses in her own domains, at Livonia, Pinsk, and Latychev, upon the ruins of the former sees without referring to the Pope, and she placed all the Ruthenians under the archbishop of Polotsk. Her purpose was to destroy the united Church bit by bit. She would undoubtedly have accomplished this purpose if death had not carried her off in 1796.

Her son, Paul I, was as tolerant as his mother was intolerant. A stay at Rome in 1782 filled him with veneration for the Pope, Pius VI, and he protected the Jesuits and held them in high regard. The coronation of the new emperor and his good disposition greatly facilitated the mission to St. Petersburg of Msgr. Lorenzo Litta, the nuncio at Warsaw in 1797. The following year, after some negotiations which had at times been rather difficult because Paul held strongly to his autocratic power in spite of his benevolence, a series of decrees from Litta organized the Catholic Church in Russia on a regular basis. The diocese of Moghilev retained its vast territory, but it was given two suffragans: one at St. Petersburg and one at Moghilev. Siestrzencewicz became the metropolitan of all the Latin Churches in the Empire, and for himself and his successors obtained the privilege of wearing red garb. Within the recently annexed provinces, five bishoprics were either confirmed or established: Vilna (with four suffragans), Loutsk-Jitomir, Kamenietz-Podolsk, and Minsk. None of Litta's decrees provided for the Ruthenians, still he did not overlook them entirely, for he obtained two new sees in their favor: Loutsk

and Brest Litovsk. Unfortunately the affair at Malta, too complicated to be recounted here,[30] caused Msgr. Litta's disgrace at the court and he had to quit Russia in 1799.

Yet his achievements endured. Paul I continued to protect the Jesuits, and asked the pope to formally recognize them at the very time when negotiations for uniting the Russian and Roman Churches were being opened by Father Gruber as intermediary. Paul's assassination during a palace revolution (March 11–23, 1801) put an end to everything. In spite of his fanciful character, great things might have been expected from an emperor who had enough insight to banish the unworthy Siestrzencewicz and replace him with Benislawski.

Alexander I

Siestrzencewicz returned with the accession of Alexander I. The new czar, an adherent of liberal ideas, showed himself well disposed toward the Jesuits, but he let himself be taken in by the cleverness of the metropolitan archbishop of Moghilev, who had resigned his see. The Emperor showed that he was being influenced at the creation of the Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical College in 1801. This college replaced the former department in the Ministry of Justice and had the last word in the administration of the Catholic Church in Russia. It consisted of nine ecclesiastical members, three of whom were permanent (the archbishop of Moghilev and two assistants named by the college with imperial approval), and six others who were named for a term of three years by each of the six Latin dioceses. The arrangement had nothing to do with the Ruthenians.

This disastrous influence of Siestrzencewicz also served to hinder Msgr. Arezzo's mission to St. Petersburg in 1803. He

[30] Cf. Pierling, pp. 255 ff.

was interested in settling the question over the right to nominate the bishops, a thing which Litta had not been able to decide, and in regulating the status of the Ruthenians. They had obtained four sees with double representation in the College in 1802, but with a direct right of appeal to the Senate, a solidly schismatic body of legislators—a right which was not without some danger. The deplorable Vernegues affair,[31] which had the air of placing the Holy See in conflict with Russia over a question having to do with a French conspirator, put an end to Msgr. Arezzo's mission in 1804. With such a man as Siestrzencewicz as head of the Catholic College, correspondence with Rome necessarily became more and more difficult. At any rate, soon after Arezzo's departure, the bishops were again forbidden to contact Rome unless through government channels.

The last metropolitan of Kiev, Theodosius Rostotskij, died at St. Petersburg on January 25, 1805, after obtaining, in his last days, permission to resume his metropolitan jurisdiction. On July 24, 1806, Alexander I named Heraclius Lissovskij metropolitan of the Uniate Churches of Russia, just as Siestrzencewicz was of the Latin Churches. Of course, Rome had no voice in the affair. Since the treaty of Tilsit had reunited the eparchy of Suprasl to Russia, it was returned to the eparchy of Brest, and Leo Javoroskij was consecrated suffragan of Brest with the title of bishop of Vladimir in Volynia at a later date. Lissovskij fixed his residence at Vilna and he had a suffragan in the person of Adrian Golovnia, with the title of bishop of Orcha. At his death (August 30, 1809) he was succeeded by Gregory Kokhanovitch (1809–15), bishop of Loutsk.

The Ruthenian hierarchy in Russia, therefore, comprised the metropolitan see of Vilna with a suffragan at Orcha, the see of Polotsk with the rank of an archbishopric, the diocese of

[31] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 401 ff.

Loutsk, and the diocese of Brest with a suffragan at Vladimir. Lissovskij had no papal confirmation for his elevation to the dignity of metropolitan, nor did Kokhanovitch, and without this confirmation they were not able to consecrate new bishops. Since recourse to Rome was not possible for definite reasons, Kokhanovitch made use of epikeia. A written declaration recognizing all the rights of the Roman Pontiff was sent to Rome through the nuncio at Vienna, and three new bishops were consecrated. This same procedure was followed in 1817, after the death of Kokhanovitch, when Josaphat Boulghak succeeded him. Circumstances forced matters to be arranged as best they could. At the death of Alexander in 1825, Catholic Ruthenians along the frontiers of the Empire officially numbered 1,427,559. Thanks to the tolerance of Paul I, of Alexander, and of Nicholas I during the first years of his reign, the Ruthenians counted a million and a half ten years later.

In 1815, several conversions made by the Jesuits in high Russian society led to their expulsion from the Empire. But henceforth the storms against the Society were a thing of the past: miraculously preserved in Russia, they went forth from there and established themselves anew throughout the world.[32]

Alexander passed his last few days (November 19 to December 1, 1825) at Taganrog on the Sea of Azov. Ever since 1812 some mysterious attachment had been bringing him closer and closer to the Catholic Church. He showed himself so sincere that he entered into relations with Pope Leo XII the very year of his death and petitioned the papal envoy in Russia for a priest appointed by the Pope, who would prepare the way for his conversion. We are almost absolutely certain that Alexander I died desiring in his heart communion with the Church

[32] On the Jesuits of Russia, the most accessible work is that of Father Stanislas Zalenski, *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche*. On the conversions that brought about their expulsion, see the interesting *Vie du P. Marc Folloppe* by Father Gagrine (1877), pp. 34 ff.

of Rome, if he did not have the ministrations of a Catholic priest at his deathbed.[33]

We must say a few words about the part of the Ruthenian Church that passed under Austrian rule. Here, at least, was no fear of violence. Maria Theresa was full of good will toward the Ruthenians. In 1774 she erected a central seminary at Vienna, close to the Ruthenian church of St. Barbara, which was intended for subjects from the Galacian eparchies. At the same time the Ruthenian clergy were put on an equal footing with the Latin clergy. The queer ideas entertained by Joseph II (1780–90) were felt as much in Galacia as anywhere else: the magnificent pontifical college at Leopol for Ruthenians and Armenians was closed down and replaced by one of the Emperor's notorious general seminaries, which, in this case, cast Latins, Ruthenians, Armenians, Rumanians, and Serbs together into one confused lot. Political changes caused the addition of new districts to the eparchies of Leopol and Peremychl, but everything was done with the regular approval of the lawful metropolitan, Jason Smogorjevskij. Francis II (1792–1835) likewise respected Theodosius Rostotskij's authority over the eparchies of Leopol, Peremychl, and Kholm, after the partition of 1795. In 1802, Pius VII once again most explicitly forbade the passage from one rite to another without the permission of the Holy See, as a consequence of new quarrels caused by a movement to the contrary which had been undertaken by the Polish clergy. This body proved itself to be no more broadminded in regard to the Greek rite in Russia or Austria than it had been in what had once been Poland.

In 1805 the Ruthenian procurator at Rome, Father Jourdan Mitskievitch, took steps toward the restoration of the former metropolitan see of Galitch. Following the death of the bishops of Peremychl and Kholm, the new bishop of Peremychl re-

[33] This question is studied in all its details by Father Pierling in an interesting pamphlet, *Empereur Alexandre Ier est-il mort catholique?* (1901).

mained a sole administrator of the Ruthenians in Austria. Eight days before the calends of March, 1807, Pius VII issued the bull *In universalis ecclesiae,* restoring the metropolitan diocese of Galitch. Situated in territory belonging to the eparchy of Leopol, Galitch was united with that archbishopric, and Peremychl and Kholm became its suffragans. Anthony Anghelovitch became the first metropolitan of Galacia.

The treaties of 1815 passed Kholm over to Russia. Anthony Anghelovitch had died in the previous year and was succeeded in 1818 by Michael Levitskij, who would die a cardinal. His story belongs to the following period.[34]

[34] The Ruthenians of Austria at this period might have amounted to two million. Their number is now more that double that number.

Appendixes

APPENDIX I

Declaration of the Rights of Man (at the head of the Constitution of 1791)

THE representatives of the French people, constituted in national assembly, considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man are the only cause of public evils and the corruption of governments, have resolved to set forth, in a solemn declaration, the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of man to the end that this declaration, perpetually present to all the members of the social body, will ceaselessly remind them of their rights and duties; that the acts of the legislative power and those of the executive power may be at all times compared with the demands of the citizens and henceforth based on simple and incontestable principles, may always be directed to the maintenance of the Constitution and the welfare of all.

Hence the National Assembly acknowledges and declares, in the presence of and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following rights of man and of the citizen.

Article 1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions can be based only on the common usefulness.

Article 2. The purpose of every political association is the preservation of the natural and inalienable rights of man. These rights are liberty, ownership of property, safety, and resistance to oppression.

Article 3. The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation; no body and no individual can exercise any authority which does not expressly emanate therefrom.

Article 4. Liberty consists in being able to do whatever does

not injure another: thus the exercise of each man's natural rights has no bounds but those which assure to the other members of society the enjoyment of these same rights. These bounds can be determined only by the law.

Article 5. The law has the right to forbid only actions that are harmful to society. Whatever is not forbidden by law may not be hindered and no one may be constrained to do what the law does not ordain.

Article 6. The law is the expression of the general will. All the citizens have the right to participate in its formation either personally or through their representatives. This law must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in its eyes, are likewise eligible to all public offices, places, and employments, according to their capacity, with no distinctions but their virtues and talents.

Article 7. No one may be accused, arrested, or detained except in the cases determined by the law and in accordance with the forms it has prescribed. Those who solicit, dispatch, execute or have executed arbitrary orders should be punished; but every citizen summoned or seized in virtue of the law must promptly obey: by resistance he renders himself culpable.

Article 8. The law should establish only penalties that are strictly and evidently necessary, and no one may be punished except in virtue of a law established and promulgated previous to the offense and legally applied.

Article 9. Everyone being presumed innocent until he has been declared guilty, if it is judged indispensable to arrest him, all rigor not necessary for assuring his person must be severely repressed by the law.

Article 10. No one is to be troubled for his opinions, even religious opinions, provided their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law.

Article 11. The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of man's most precious rights; every citizen, there-

fore, may speak, write, and print freely, except that he must be held responsible for the abuse of this freedom in the cases determined by the law.

Article 12. The guaranty of the rights of man and the citizen requires a public force: this force, then, is instituted for the benefit of all, and not for the particular advantage of those to whom it is entrusted.

Article 13. For the maintenance of the public forces and for the expenses of administration, a common contribution is indispensable; it should be shared equally by all the citizens, on the basis of their ability to contribute to it.

Article 14. All citizens have the right to determine, by themselves or through their representatives, the need of the public contribution, freely to agree to it, to watch over its collection, and to determine its amount, its assessment, its collection, and its duration.

Article 15. Society has the right to require from every public agent an accounting of his administration.

Article 16. Every society in which the guaranty of rights is not assured and the separation of powers is not determined is to be regarded as not constituted.

Article 17. Ownership being an inviolable and sacred right, no one can be deprived of it except when public necessity, lawfully established, evidently so requires, and under the condition of a just and previous indemnity.

APPENDIX II

The French Concordat of 1801

THE government of the Republic recognizes that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is the religion of the great majority of French citizens.

His Holiness recognizes that this same religion has derived and expects even more at this time the greatest splendor from the establishment of Catholic worship in France and from the special profession of that religion by the consuls of the Republic.

Wherefore, in accordance with this mutual recognition, for the good of religion as also for the maintenance of internal tranquillity, they have covenanted as follows:

Article 1. The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion will be freely exercised in France. Its worship will be public, in conformity with the police regulations that the government will judge necessary for public tranquillity.

Article 2. In concert with the government, the Holy See will make a new circumscription of the French dioceses.

Article 3. The Supreme Pontiff will declare to the titulars of the Churches of France that he expects from them, with firm confidence, for the sake of peace and unity, every kind of sacrifice, even that of their episcopal sees.

If, after this exhortation, they refuse to make this sacrifice sought for the good of the Church (a refusal which, however, His Holiness does not expect), provision will be made, by new titulars, for the government of the bishoprics of the new circumscription, in the following manner.

Article 4. The first consul of the Republic, within three

months following the publication of the bull of His Holiness, will nominate to the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the new circumscription. His Holiness will confer canonical institution according to the forms established in relation to France before the change of government.

Article 5. Nominations to the bishoprics that will become vacant subsequently will likewise be made by the first consul, and the canonical institution will be given by the Holy See, in conformity with the preceding article.

Article 6. Before entering upon their office, the bishops shall make directly into the hands of the first consul the oath of fidelity that was in use before the change of government, expressed in the following terms.

"I swear and promise to God, upon the holy Gospels, to keep obedience and fidelity to the government established by the Constitution of the French Republic. I promise also to entertain no knowledge, to participate in no counsel, to enter into no league, whether internal or external, which may be contrary to the public tranquillity; and if, in my diocese or elsewhere, I learn that anything is being contrived to the prejudice of the State, I will make the same known to the government."

Article 7. The ecclesiastics of the second order will take the same oath in the hands of the civil authorities designated by the government.

Article 8. At the end of the divine office the following prayer will be recited in all the Catholic churches of France:

"Domine, salvam fac Rempublicam; Domine, salvos fac Consules."

Article 9. The bishops will make a new circumscription of the parishes of their dioceses, which will go into effect only after the consent of the government.

Article 10. The bishops will appoint the curés. Their choice will designate only persons approved by the government.

Article 11. The bishops may have a chapter in their cathedral and a seminary for their diocese, without the government being obliged to endow these.

Article 12. All metropolitan churches, cathedrals, parish churches, and others, not alienated, will be put at the disposition of the bishops.

Article 13. His Holiness, for the sake of peace and the happy re-establishment of the Catholic religion, declares that neither he nor his successors will in any way disturb those who have acquired alienated ecclesiastical property; consequently the ownership of these same properties, together with the rights and revenues attached thereto, will remain indefeasible in their hands and those of their assigns.

Article 14. The government will assure a suitable support (salary) to the bishops and the curés whose dioceses and parishes will be embraced in the new circumscription.

Article 15. The government will likewise adopt measures so that French Catholics, if they so wish, may make foundations in favor of the churches.

Article 16. His Holiness recognizes in the first consul of the French Republic the same rights and prerogatives as those enjoyed in relation to him by the former government.

Article 17. It is agreed between the contracting parties that, in the event that any of the successors of the first consul should not be Catholic, the rights and prerogatives mentioned in the foregoing article and the appointment to the bishoprics, will be regulated with regard to him by a new convention.

Organic Articles of the Concordat of 1801

Title I

Of the governance of the Catholic Church in its general relations with the rights and police of the State

1. No bull, brief, decree, mandate, appointment, signature in lieu of appointment, nor other dispatches from the court of Rome, even concerning merely individuals, can be received, published, printed, or otherwise put into execution without the authorization of the government.

2. No individual calling himself nuncio, legate, apostolic vicar or commissioner, or availing himself of any other title, may, without the same authorization, exercise on French soil or elsewhere any function relative to the affairs of the Gallican Church.

3. The decrees of foreign synods, even of general councils, may not be published in France before the government has examined their form, their conformity with the laws, rights, and liberties of the French Republic, and whatever, in their publication, might alter or concern the public tranquillity.

4. No national or metropolitan council, no diocesan synod, and no deliberative assembly can be held without the express permission of the government.

5. All ecclesiastical functions shall be gratis, save for the offerings that will be authorized and fixed by the regulations.

6. Recourse will be had to the Council of State in all cases of abuse on the part of superiors and other ecclesiastical persons.

Cases of abuse are: the usurpation of authority or excess by the power, contravention of the laws and regulations of the Republic, infraction of the rules consecrated by the canons received in France, attacks on the liberties, privileges, and cus-

toms of the Gallican Church, and any undertaking or procedure that, in the exercise of worship, may compromise the honor of the citizens, arbitrarily disturb their conscience, or degenerate into oppression or injury of them, or into public scandal.

7. Likewise recourse will be had to the Council of State if offense is offered to the public exercise of religion and to the freedom which the laws and regulations guarantee to its ministers.

8. The recourse is available to any person concerned. In the absence of complaints by a private person, it will be made *ex officio* by the prefects.

The public official, the ecclesiastic, or the person who wishes to take recourse, will address a detailed and signed memorial to the Counselor of the State charged with all affairs concerning public worship. He must, with the shortest delay, take note of all suitable information. On his report, the affair will be continued and finally terminated in the administrative form or, according to the requirement of the case, referred to the competent authorities.

Title II

Of the ministers

Section 1. General provisions

9. Catholic worship will be carried out under the direction of the archbishops and bishops in their dioceses, and under that of the curés in their parishes.

10. Every privilege bearing exemption from the episcopal jurisdiction is abolished.

11. The archbishops and bishops, with the authorization of the government, may establish in their dioceses cathedral chapters and seminaries. All other ecclesiastical establishments are suppressed.

12. Archbishops and bishops are free to add to their name the title of Citizen or that of Monsieur. All other titles are forbidden.

Section 2. Archbishops or metropolitans

13. The archbishops will consecrate and install their suffragans. In case they are hindered or refuse, their place will be taken by the senior bishop of the metropolitan district.

14. They will watch over the maintenance of the faith and discipline in the dioceses dependent on their archiepiscopal see.

15. They will take cognizance of the claims and complaints brought against the conduct and decisions of the suffragar bishops.

Section 3. Bishops, vicars general, and seminaries

16. No one may be appointed bishop before the age of thirty years and unless he is of French birth.

17. Before the expedition of the decision of nomination, he or those proposed will be obliged to bear a testimonial of good life and morals, to be sent by the bishop in whose diocese they have exercised the office of ecclesiastical minister. And they shall be examined on their doctrine by a bishop and two priests, who will be commissioned by the first consul, and these shall report the result of their examination to the Counselor of State charged with all matters concerning public worship.

18. The priest named by the first consul will promptly report the institution by the pope.

He may not exercise any function before the bull of institution has received the sanction of the government and he has in person taken the oath prescribed by the convention entered into between the French government and the Holy See.

This oath will be taken before the first consul; the official document will be drawn up by the Secretary of State.

19. The bishops will appoint and institute the curés. However, they will not make known their appointment and will not give canonical institution until the appointment has been approved by the first consul.

20. They will be held to residence in their dioceses. They may leave their dioceses only with permission of the first consul.

21. Each bishop may appoint two vicars general, and each archbishop may appoint three. They will select them from the priests having the qualifications for becoming bishops.

22. Every year they will personally make a visitation of part of their diocese, and in the space of five years the entire diocese. In case of lawful hindrance, the visitation will be made by a vicar general.

23. The bishops will be charged with the organization of their seminaries, and the rules of this organization will be submitted to the approval of the first consul.

24. Those who will be chosen for teaching in the seminaries will subscribe to the declaration made by the clergy of France in 1682 and published by the edict of the same year. They will agree to teach there the doctrine contained in that edict. The bishops will send a form of this agreement to the Counselor charged with all the affairs concerning public worship.

25. The bishops will every year send to the Counselor of State the names of persons studying in the seminaries and destined for the ecclesiastical state.

26. They will not ordain any ecclesiastic unless he shows possession of property producing an annual revenue of at least 300 francs, and has attained the age of 25 years, and possesses the qualifications required by the canons received in France.

The bishops will not perform any ordination before the number of persons to be ordained has been submitted to the government and approved by it.

Section 4. The curés

27. The curés will enter upon their functions only after they have taken, in the hands of the prefect, the oath prescribed by the convention agreed to between the government and the Holy See. An official certificate of this oath will be drawn up by the secretary general of the prefecture, and a verified copy of it will be delivered to them.

28. They will be put in possession by the curé or the priest whom the bishop will designate.

29. They will be held to residence in their parish.

30. The curés shall be directly subject to the bishops in the exercise of their functions.

31. The curates and other officiating priests shall exercise their ministry under the surveillance and direction of the curés. They will be approved by the bishop and subject to recall by him.

32. No foreigner may be employed in the functions of the ecclesiastical ministry without the permission of the government.

33. Every function is forbidden to any ecclesiastic, even French, who does not belong to any diocese.

34. A priest may not leave his diocese to serve in another without the permission of his bishop.

Section 5: Cathedral chapters and the government of the dioceses during the vacancy of the see

35. The archbishops and bishops wishing to make use of the faculty granted them to establish chapters may not do so without having reported the authorization of the government, both for the said establishment and also for the number and choice of the ecclesiastics destined to form them.

36. During the vacancy of the sees, for the government of

the dioceses provision will be made by the metropolitan or, in case of his failure or inability to do so, by the senior of the suffragan bishops. The vicars general of these dioceses will continue their functions, even after the bishop's death, until he is replaced.

37. The metropolitans, the cathedral chapters, will be held, without delay, to notify the government of the vacancy of the sees, and of the measures that will have been taken for the government of the vacant dioceses.

38. The vicars general who will govern during the vacancy, as also the metropolitans or capitularies, will not permit any innovation in the usages and customs of the dioceses.

Title III

Worship

39. There will be only one liturgy and one catechism for all the churches of France.

40. No curé may order public extraordinary prayers in his parish without the special permission of the bishop.

41. No feast day, except Sunday, may be established without the permission of the government.

42. In religious ceremonies the ecclesiastics will use dress and vestments suitable to their title: in no case and under no pretext may they assume the color and the distinctive marks reserved to the bishops.

43. All ecclesiastics will be attired in the French manner and in black. The bishops may add to this costume the pastoral cross and violet stockings.

44. Domestic chapels or private oratories may not be established without an express permission of the government, granted at the request of the bishop.

45. No religious ceremony will take place outside of edi-

fices consecrated to Catholic worship, in the cities, where there are temples destined for different religions.

46. The same temple may be consecrated for only one and the same religion.

47. In the cathedrals and parishes there will be a special place for Catholic individuals who hold civil and military offices.

48. The bishop will concert with the prefect the manner of calling the faithful to divine service by the ringing of the church bells. Without the permission of the local police these bells may not be rung for any other purpose.

49. When the government orders public prayers, the bishops will confer with the military commandant of the place regarding the day, the hour, and the manner of carrying out these orders.

50. Solemn preaching, called sermons, and preaching known under the name of stations of Advent and Lent, will not be given except by priests who have obtained a special authorization of the bishop.

51. The curés, at the sermon of the parish Masses, will pray and will have prayers said for the prosperity of the French Republic and for the consuls.

52. In their instructions they will not permit themselves any blame, either direct or indirect, against the persons or against the other religions authorized in the State.

53. At the sermon they will not make any publication foreign to the exercise of worship, unless such is ordered by the government.

54. They will not give the nuptial blessing except to those who certify, in good and due form, that they have contracted marriage before the civil official.

55. The registers kept by the ministers of religion, since they concern only the administration of the sacraments, cannot

in any case take the place of the registers ordered by the law for certifying the civil status of Frenchmen.

56. In all ecclesiastical and religious acts there is the obligation of making use of the equinox calendar established by the laws of the Republic; the days are to be designated by the names they have in the solstice calendar.

57. The day of rest for public officials will be fixed for Sunday.

Title IV

The circumscription of archbishoprics, bishoprics, and parishes; edifices destined for worship; the support of the ministers

Section 1. The circumscription of archbishoprics and bishoprics

58. There will be in France ten archbishoprics or metropolitans, and fifty bishoprics.

59. The circumscription of the metropolitans and of the dioceses will be made in conformity with the subjoined table.

Section 2. The circumscription of the parishes

60. There shall be at least one parish for every justice of the peace.

In addition there will be established as many subsidiary churches as need may require.

61. Each bishop, in concert with the prefect, will regulate the number and extent of these subsidiary churches. The plans drawn up will be submitted to the government and will not be carried out without its authorization.

62. No part of French territory can be erected into parishes or auxiliary churches without the express authorization of the government.

63. The priests serving the auxiliary churches will be named by the bishops.

Section 3. The support of the ministers

64. The salary of the archbishops will be 15,000 francs.

65. The salary of the bishops will be 10,000 francs.

66. The curés will be divided into two classes. The salary of the curés of the first class will be 1,500 francs; those of the second class will receive 1,000 francs.

67. The allowance payable to them for executing the laws of the Constituent Assembly will be deducted from their salary.

The general councils of the large communes may, from the income deriving from their rural possessions or from their tolls, grant the curés an increase of salary if the circumstances so require.

68. The curates and other functioning subordinate priests will be chosen from the number of ecclesiastics receiving income in execution of the laws of the Constituent Assembly. The sum total of these payments and the product of the offerings will form their salary.

69. The bishops will draw up projects of regulations relative to the offerings which the ministers of worship are authorized to receive for the administration of the sacraments. The projects of regulations, drawn up by the bishops, will not be published or otherwise put into effect until they have been approved by the government.

70. Every ecclesiastic receiving an allowance from the State will be refused his allowance if he refuses, without legitimate cause, the functions that may be confided to him.

71. The general councils of a department are authorized to procure a suitable lodging for the archbishops and bishops.

72. The rectories and adjoining gardens that have not been alienated will be placed at the use of the curés and the other priests serving the subsidiary churches. If such rectories are

lacking, the general councils of the communes are authorized to procure for them a residence and a garden.

73. Foundations which have for their object the support of the ministers and the exercise of worship may consist only of revenues constituted on the State; they will be received by the diocesan bishop and can be executed only with the authorization of the government.

74. Real property, apart from the buildings intended for residence and the adjoining gardens, cannot be assigned to ecclesiastical titles, nor can they be held by the ministers of worship by reason of their office.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume.

ANGLAS, Boissy d' : *Essai sur les fêtes.*
ANTONIN : *Histoire des émigrés français,* 1828.
ARNAULT : *Souvenirs d'un sexagénaire.*
ARTAUD de Montor : *The Lives and Times of the Popes.*
Vie de Pie VII, 1839.
AULARD, A. : *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française,* 1924.
Histoire politique de la Révolution française, 1901.
Le culte de la raison.
Paris sous le Concordat.
AURIBEAU : *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la persécution,* 1794.

BALDASSARI : *Relation sur l'enlèvement et la captivité de Pie VI.*
BALLANCHE : *Œuvres.*
BARBE-MARBOIS : *Journal d'un deporté non jugé.*
BARBERI (ed.) : *Bullarium romanum.*
BARRAS : *Mémoires.*
BARRUEL : *Histoire du clergé pendant la Révolution française,* 1793.
Mémoires sur le jacobinisme.
BASTON : *Mémoires,* 1899.
BAUNARD : *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* 1902.
BAZOT : *Code des franc-maçons.*
BEAUREGARD, Brumauld de : *Mémoires,* 1843.
BECCARIA, Cesare : *Tratto dei delitti e delle pene.*
BERTRAND : *Bibliothèque sulpicienne.*
BESNARD : *Souvenirs d'un nonagénaire.*
BLACHEZ : *Bonchamps et l'insurrection vendéene.*
BOERO : *Osservazioni sopra del pontificato di Clemente XIV,* 1853.
BOISGELIN : *Observations sur le décret de déportation.*
BOISSIN, Firmin : *Le Camp de Jalès.*
BOSSIER, G : *La religion romaine, la fin du paganisme.*

BONALD: *Theorie du pouvoir civil et religieux.*
BOSSARD: *Cathelineau, generalissime de la grande armée catholique et royale,* 1893.
BOSSUET, Jacques: *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte.*
BOUILLE, Marquis de: *Souvenirs.*
BOULLIER, Isidore: *Mémoires ecclésiastiques,* 1846.
BOURLON: J.: *Les Assemblées du clergé et le Jansénisme,* 1909.
BOUTARD: *Lamennais.*
BOUVIER, Claude: *Le Franc de Pompignan,* 1903.
BRIDIER: *Mémoires inédits de M. de Salamon, internonce à Paris,* 1892.
BROC, de: *Un évêque de l'ancien régime,* 1894.
BRUGAL, Simon: *Le schisme constitutionnel dans l'Ardèche,* 1889.
BRUGERE: *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise.*
BRYCE, James: *The Holy Roman Empire.*
BUCHEZ: *Traité de philosophie.*
Bullarium romanum (ed. Barberi).
BURKE, Edmund: *Reflections on the French Revolution.*

CALLIPE, C.: *L'attitude sociale des catholiques français au XIX^e siècle.*
CAMPANELLA: *Civitas Solis,* 1643.
CANTU, Cesare: *Gli eretici in Italia.*
Storia dei cent' anni, 1750–1850.
CARON: *Les confesseurs de la foi.*
CASSAGNAC, Granier de: *Histoire des massacres de septembre.*
CATTET: *La verité sur le cardinal Fesch,* 1842.
CHAMPION, Edme: *La France d'après les cahiers de 1789,* 1907.
CHARPENTIER: *Jacques Cathelineau,* 1911.
CHATEAUBRIAND: *Essai sur les révolutions.*
Génie du christianisme.
Mémoires d'outre-tombe.
Œuvres.
Voyage en Amerique.
CHENIRE, André: *Œuvres en prose.*
CHEROT: *Figures de martyrs,* 1907.
CHOTARD, H.: *Le pape Pie VII à Savone.*

CONDORCET : *Tableau des progrès de l'esprit humain.*
CONSALVI : *Mémoires.*
CONTRASTY : *Le clergé français exilé en Espagne (1792–1802)*, 1910.
Corpus juris confoederationis germanicae.
Correspondance de Napoléon, 1887.
COSTE : *Une victime de la Révolution, Sœur Marguerite Rutan.*
CRETINEAU-JOLY : *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus.*

DALLET : *Histoire de l'Eglise de Corée.*
DAUDET, Ernest : *Les conspirations royalistes sous la Révolution.*
DEBIDOUR : *Histoire des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat de 1789 à 1870.*
DELAPORTE : *Vie de H. Rauzan.*
DEMENTHON : *Vie de l'abbé J. B. Bottex,* 1903.
DENIAU : *Histoire de la guerre de Vendée.*
Jacques Cathelineau.
DESDEVISES du Dezert : *L'Eglise et l'état en France,* 1907.
D'HAUSSONVILLE : *L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire.*
DIDEROT : *La religeuse.*
DOUMIC, Max : *Le secret de la franc-maçonnerie,* 1905.
DROCHON : *La Petite Eglise,* 1894.
DUBOIS : *Le Pancha-Tantra, fables de brahme Vichnou.*
Letter on the State of Christianity in China.
Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde.
DUCHEMIN-DESCEPEAUX : *Souvenirs de la chouannerie.*
DUFOURQC, Albert : *Le régime jacobin en Italie,* 1900.
DUNOYER, A. : *Fouquier-Tinville,* 1913.
DUPUIS : *L'origine de tous les cultes.*
DURUY, Albert : *L'instruction publique et la Révolution.*
DUVERGIER : *Collection des lois et décrets.*

FABRE, J. : *Les pères de la Révolution.*
FABRY, J. B. : *Génie de la Révolution considerée dans l'éducation.*
Itineraire de Buonaparte.
FAGUET : *Le XVIII^e siècle.*
Questions politiques.
Vie de Rousseau, 1911.

FAILLON: *Vie de M. Olier.*
FELICE, G. de: *Histoire des protestants de France,* 1895.
FELLER: *Biographie universelle.*
FERRERO: *L'Europa giovane.*
FICHTE: *Beitrage zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums über die französische Revolution.*
Zurückforderung der Denkfreiheit von den Fürsten Europas.
FILANGIERI, Gaetano: *Scienza della legislazione.*
FLAMMERMONT: *Négociations secrètes de Louis XVI et du Baron de Breteuil,* 1885.
FLEURY, J. P.: *Mémoires.*
FLOQUET: *Histoire du parlement de Normandie.*
FOLLENAY, Paquelle de: M. *Teysseyrre.*
FOUILLEE, A.: *Esquisse psychologique des peuples européens,* 1903.
FRANCHETTI, A. M. de: *Pie VI dans les prisons du Dauphiné.*
FUNCK-BRENTANO: *Des lettres de cachet à Paris,* 1903.
Légendes et archives de la Bastille, 1904.

GADUEL: *Vie et esprit de M. Allemand.*
GAGARIN: *La Compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie.*
GAGRINE: *Vie du P. Marc Folloppe.*
GAUDRY: *Traité de la législation des cultes,* 1854.
GAUTHEROT, G. A.: *Conférences sur les origines de la Révolution.*
GAUTIER: *M^me^ de Staël et Napoléon.*
Portraits littéraires.
GAZIER, A.: *Etudes sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* 1887.
GENDRY, Jules: *Pie VI, sa vie, son pontificat,* 1906.
GIOBBIO: *La chiesa e lo stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione,* 1905.
GIRAID, Victor: *Pages choisies de Chateaubriand.*
GODARD: *Les principes de 89 et la doctrine catholique,* 1865.
GOERRES, Joseph: *Die Christliche Mystik.*
Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt.
Politische Schriften.
Rheinische Merkur.
Teutschen Volksbücher.
Teutschland und die Revolution.

GOSSELIN: *Relation de l'établissement du christianisme dans le royaume de Corée.*
GOYAU, G.: *L'Allemagne religieuse,* 1906.
Vue générale de l'histoire de la papauté, 1895.
GRAF, Arthur: *L'Anglomania in Italia,* 1911.
GRANDMAISON, Geoffroy de: *La Congrégation,* 1890.
Les cardinaux noirs, 1895.
GREGOIRE: *Essai historique sur les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane.*
Histoire des sectes religieuses.
Histoire du mariage des prêtres.
Mémoires, 1839.
GRENTE, J.: *Le culte catholique à Paris de la Terreur au Concordat,* 1903.
GRILLE: *Tableau comparatif des mandats et pouvoirs données en 1789 aux représentants de la nation,* 1825.
GROTIUS: *De jure pacis et belli.*
GUIBERT: *Vie de J. B. de La Salle.*
GUILLAUME, James: *Etudes révolutionnaires.*
GUILLON, M. J.: *Brefs et Instructions de Pie VI,* 1798.
Histoire du siège de Lyon.
GUIZOT: *Mémoires.*

HAUSSONVILLE: *L'Eglise romaine et le premier empire,* 1870.
HERDER, J. G.: *Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit.*
HERGENROTHER-KIRSCH: *Kirchengeschichte.*
Histoire des voyages des papes depuis Innocent I^er^ jusqu'à Pie VI, 1786.
HOBBES: *De cive.*
Leviathan.
HOFFDING, Herald: *History of Modern Philosophy,* 1900.
HOFFMANN, Amedeus: *Bruder Medardus.*
HOLBACH: *Système de la nature.*
HUC: *Le christianisme en Chine.*
HULOT: *Collectio brevium Pii VI.*

ISABEY and FONTAINE: *Cérémonies et fêtes du sacre,* 1805.
ISAMBERT: *Anciennes lois françaises.*

JAGER: *Histoire de l'Eglise de France pendant la Révolution.*
JANET, Paul: *Histoire de la science politique dans ses rapports avec la morale.*
JAUFFRET: *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Révolution,* 1803.
Joseph II und Leopold von Toscana, 1872.

KELLER, Emile: *Le Syllabus et les principes de 89,* 1866.
KRAUS: *Histoire de l'Eglise.*
KURTH, Godefroid: *The Church at the Turning Points of History,* 1929.

LABORIE, Lanzac de: *Paris sous Napoléon,* 1908.
LACOMBE, Bernard de: *Talleyrand, évêque d'Autun.*
LACORDAIRE: *Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. de La Mennais.*
LA GORCE, De: *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française,* 1923.
LAGRANGE: *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup.*
LAMARTINE: *Histoire des Girondins.*
LAMBERT: *Vie de Mgr de Juigné,* 1821.
LAMENNAIS: *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion.*
Reflexions sur l'état de l'Eglise en France.
Tradition de l'Eglise sur l'institution des évêques.
LANSON: *Histoire de la littérature française.*
LANZAC de Laborie: *Paris sous Napoléon,* 1908.
LAREVELLIERE-LEPEAUX: *Mémoires.*
LAUNAY, A.: *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères.*
Les missionaires français en Corée.
Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e^ siècle.
LE BON, Gustave: *La psychologie des foules,* 1895.
LECLERCQ: *Les martyrs.*
LEMAITRE, Jules: *Chateaubriand,* 1912.
Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
LEMANN: *Napoléon I^er^ et les Israelites.*
LENOTRE, G.: *Les massacres de septembre,* 1907.
Les noyades de Nantes, 1911.
Vieiles maisons.

LE PLAY, F.: *Programme des Unions de la paix sociale,* 1877.
LESCOEUR: *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement Russe.*
Lettres inédites de Napoleon I^er^.
LONGHAYE: *XIX^e^ siècle,* 1900.
LIAUTARD: *Mémoires,* 1844.
LOCKE: *Epistola de tolerantia.*
On Civil Government.
LOUANDRE: *Introduction aux conteurs français de XVIII^e^ siècle.*
LOUVET: *Les missions catholiques au XIX^e^ siècle.*
LUBERSAC: *Journal historique et religieux de l'émigration et de la déportation du clergé de France en Angleterre,* 1802.
LYONNET: *Le cardinal Fesch,* 1841.
Vie de Mgr d'Aviau.

MADAUNE: *Le Renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre.*
MADELIN, Louis: *La Révolution,* 1912.
La Rome de Napoléon, 1906.
MAISTRE, Joseph de: *Considerations sur la France.*
Soirées de Saint-Petersbourg.
MANSEAU: *Les prêtres et religieux deportés dans la Charente-Inférieure.*
Manuel pour la concordance des calendriers républicains et grégoriens, 1806.
MARCON, Marcel: *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution.*
MARNAS: *La religion de Jésus au Japon.*
MARSHALL, William: *Christian Missions.*
MARTENS: *Nouveau recueil de traités.*
MARTINIS, Raffaele: *Ius pontificium de Propagande Fide.*
MASSON, F.: *Le cardinal de Bernis.*
Les diplomates de la Révolution.
MATHIEU: *Le concordat de 1801.*
MATHIEZ: *La Révolution et l'Eglise,* 1910.
Les origines des cultes révolutionnaires, 1904.
Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante.
MAURRAS, Charles: *Trois idées politiques.*

MAURAY: *Correspondance diplomatique,* 1895.
MAURY: *Mémoires,* 1891.
Œuvres choisies.
MAYOL de Lupe: *La captivité de Pie VII.*
MAZON: *Un missionaire vivarais aux Indes,* 1899.
MEAUX, Viscount de: *L'Eglise et la liberté aux Etats-Unis,* 1893.
MELLIE, Ernest: *Les sections de Paris pendant la Révolution française,* 1898.
Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion à la fin du XVIII^e siècle.
MEESTER, Placid de: *Voyage de deux Bénédictins au monastère du Mont Athos.*
MERIC: *Histoire de M. Emery.*
METTERNICH: *Mémoires.*
MEURTHE, Boulay de la: *Documents sur la negociation du concordat.*
MICHELET: *Histoire de la Révolution.*
Précis d'histoire modèrne, 1835.
MIRABEAU: *Travail sur l'éducation publique.*
MOILLANE, Durand de: *Histoire apologétique du Comité ecclésiastique.*
MOLLIER: *Saints et pieux personnages du Vivarais,* 1895.
MOMMSEN and MARQUARD: *Manuel des instructions romaines.*
MORE, Thomas: *Utopia.*
MOREAU, G.: *Les prêtres émigrés aux Etats-Unis,* 1856.
MORRIS, Gouverneur: *Memorial and Correspondence.*
MORTIMER-TERNAUN: *Histoire de la Terreur.*
MOUNIER, J. J.: *De l'influence attribuée aux philosophes, aux francmaçons et aux illuminés sur la Révolution de France,* 1828.
MOURRET: *La vénérable Marie Rivier,* 1898.
MUSSET, Alfred de: *Confession d'un enfant du siècle,* 1887.

NAPOLEON: *Correspondance,* 1887.
Mémoires.
NECKER: *De l'administration des finances de la France.*
NERVO, Baron de: *La conversion de Talleyrand,* 1910.
NETTEMENT, A.: *Histoire de la littérature sous la Restauration.*

NEWMAN, John H.: *History of My Religious Opinions.*

Œuvres oratoires de M. de Boisgelin.
OLLE-LAPRUNE, Léon: *La vitalité chrétienne.*

PACCA: *Mémoires,* 1885.
Œuvres, 1845.
PAPON: *Histoire de la Révolution.*
PASQUIER: *Mémoires.*
PASSERI: *Mémoires sur la révolution d'Avignon et du Comtat Venaissin,* 1793.
PAULUS, Henry: *Commentar über das N. T.*
PELESZ, Julian: *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom.*
PERRON: *Vie du P. Condrin.*
PICOT: *Les Serbes de Hongrie.*
Mémoires, 1855.
PIERLING: *La Russie et le Saint-Siège.*
PIERRE, Victor: *La Terreur sous le Directoire,* 1887.
Seize Carmélites de Compiègne.
PIOLIN: *L'Eglise du Mans pendant la Révolution.*
PISANI: *La Dalmatie de 1797 à 1815.*
L'Eglise de Paris et la Révolution.
L'épiscopat constitutionnel.
Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel, 1907.
PITOU, Ange: *Voyage à Cayenne.*
PORTES, Bittard des: *Charette et la guerre de la Vendée.*
POUJOULAT: *Histoire de la Révolution française.*
PRAT: *Essai historique sur la destruction des ordres religieux en France au XVIII^e siècle,* 1845.
PRESSENSE, E. de: *L'Eglise et la Révolution.*
PRUDHOMME: *Révolutions de Paris.*
PUAUX: *Histoire populaire des protestants français.*

QUINET: *Œuvres.*

RADET: *Mémoires.*
RAMBAUD, Alfred: *La France coloniale.*

RANKE: *Histoire de la papauté.*
RAOUL-ROCHETTE: *Histoire de la Révolution hélvetique de 1797 à 1803.*
REBOLD: *Histoire des trois grandes loges de France,* 1864.
REINACH, Theodore: *Histoire des Israelites,* 1885.
RENAN, E.: *L'avenir de la science.*
Révolutions de France et de Brabant.
RICARD, A.: *Le P. Combalat.*
RINIERI, I.: *La diplomazia pontificia nel secolo XIX,* 1902.
ROCQUAIN: *L'esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution.*
ROHRBACHER: *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise.*
ROSKOVANY, A. de: *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae,* 1870.
ROUSSEAU, Jean-Jacques: *Discourse on Inequality.*
Emile.
Social Contract.
ROUSTAIN: *Les philosophes et la société française au XVIII^e siècle.*

SABTIE, A. C.: *Les massacres de septembre: les martyrs du clergè,* 1912.
SAINTE-BEUVE: *Causeries du lundi.*
Galerie de portraits historiques, 1883.
Portraits des femmes.
SAINT-LEON, Martin: *Histoire des corporations,* 1895.
SAINT-PIERRE, Bernardin de: *Œuvres.*
SCHLEGEL, Frederick von: *Philosophy of History.*
SCHLITTER: *Die Reise des Papstes.*
SCHOELL, F.: *Recueil de pièces officielles.*
SCIOUT, Ludovic: *Histoire de la Constitution civile du clergé.*
SEGUR and SAUVE: *Un admirable martyr sous la Terreur,* 1904.
Sentiments de Napoléon sur le christianisme.
SERBAT, L.: *Les assemblées du clergé de France,* 1906.
SEVESTRE, E.: *La déportation du clergé orthodoxe pendant la Révolution.*
SICARD: *A la recherche d'une religion civile,* 1895.
L'ancien clergé de France avant la Révolution, 1917.

SIMON, Eugène: *La cité chinoise.*
SOREL, A.: *Carmélites de Compiègne,* 1878.
Le couvent des Carmes, 1864.
L'Europe et la Révolution française, 1915.
SPULLER: *La Mennais.*
STOLBERG, Leopold von: *Büchlein von der Liebe.*
Geschichte der Religion Jesus Christi.
STRAUSS, David: *Essai d'histoire religieuse.*

TAINE: *French Revolution.*
L'ancien régime.
Le régime moderne.
Les origines de la France contemporaine.
TALLEYRAND: *Mémoires,* 1892.
TEIL, De: *Naples et le Directoire.*
THEINER, A.: *Die neusten Zustande ker katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katherne bis auf unsere Tage.*
Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France, 1790–1800, 1857.
Histoire des deux concordats.
L'histoire de Clement XIV.
THIERS: *Histoire du consultat et de l'empire.*
THOMASSIN: *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline.*
THUREAU-DANGIN: *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre.*
Royalistes et républicains.
TIECK: *Franz Sternbold.*
TOCQUEVILLE, A. de: *L'ancien régime et la Révolution,* 1860.
TORNEZY: *La legende des philosophes.*

UZUREAU: *Noel Pinto,* 1912.

VAISSIERE: *Lettres d'aristocrates,* 1907.
VANDAL, Albert: *L'avènement de Bonaparte,* 1903.
VANDERPOL: *La guerre devant le christianisme,* 1912.
VAN DUERM (ed.): *Correspondance de Consalvi avec Metternich,* 1899.

VEUILLOT: *Guerres de la Vendée et de la Bretagne.*
VIALAY, A.: *La vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution. Les cahiers de doleances du tiers état en 1789,* 1910.
VIGNY, Alfred de: *Servitude et grandeur militaire.*
VINET: *Essai sur la manifestation des convictions religieuses.*
VITTORIA: *De jure belli.*
VOLTAIRE: *Discourses on Man.*
Epîtres à Uranie.
Philosophical Letters.

WALLON, Henri: *La Terreur,* 1881.
WELSCHINGER, H.: *Le pape et l'empereur,* 1905.
Le roi de Rome, 1897.
WISEMAN: *Recollections of the Last Four Popes.*

ZALENSKI, Stanislas: *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche* (French tr., 1886).

Index

Abbaye of St. Germain: Father Sicard's account of the massacres at, 185; Imprisonments at, 182; Massacres at, 185, 189
Absolutism of Hobbes, 25
Absolutism, royal, 90: Abuse of, 12
Actors, Civil rights of, 329
Advocates of the clergy, 117 note
Alençon, Murder of Father Valframbert at, 191 note
Alexander I (czar), 552: friendly to Catholic Church, 554; The Holy Alliance, 462; Leo XII and, 554
Alfieri (poet), 23: *La tirannide* by, 29
Alquier: envoy to Pius VII, 415; on scene of canonization, 420
American Revolution, French aid to, 10
Anarchy: in Paris, 90; in the provinces, 78
Ancient Regime, Decline of, 8 ff.
Ancona, seized by Napoleon, 296
Angela Merici, canonized by Pius VII, 419
Angers, Defeat of Vendeans at, 249
Annates: Abolition of, 80; memorial from Rome, 82
Anona, the, 48 note
Antibes, Murder of Father Cartier at, 191 note
Antraigues, Count: and *émigré* priests, 200
Antraigues, Madame, 200
Aranda (count) and *émigré* priests, 200
Archetti (nuncio), 50
Army, the: under the Directory, 290
Arouet de Voltaire. *See* Voltaire
Artaud de Montor, secretary of Cacault, 372
Articles of 1682, 19
Artois, Count of: Emigration of, 79
Assembly, Constituent. *See* Constituent
Assembly of the Clergy (1775): Association of writers approved by, 44; Jansenism and, 42
Assignats, 164
Atheists in the Institute, 288
Auctorem fidei (bull), 20, 59
August 4, Night of, 79
  Action of the clergy, 79
  The curés, 80
  De Juigné, 79 f.
  De Juigné's praise of, 83
Aulard on feast of Reason, 232 note
Austria: conquered by Napoleon, 424; French *émigrés* in, 208
Austrian Succession, War of the, 9
Autonomous naturalism, 26
Aviau, François d': *émigré* at Rome, 212
Avignon
  Affair of, 147 ff.
  Camus and, 148
  The civil oath ordered in, 152
  Economic crisis, 148
  Pius VI and reforms in, 149 f.
  The Pope's duty, 151 note
  Possession of Holy See, 148
  Revolutionary propaganda in, 148
  Status of, 147
  And union with France, 150
  Uprisings in, 148
Avoine (bishop), 163
Azara, 292 f.: and armistice of Bologna, 293; Qualities of, 292

Bailly proclaimed mayor of Paris, 78
Ballanche: view of the Revolution, 3
Baltimore, Province of, 477
Barruel, Father: editor of *Journal ecclésiastique*, 65; on *émigré* priests in England, 203
Basel, Diocese of, 474
Bassville (French agent), Murder of, 218 ff.
Bastille, the, 76: The prisoners in, 77; Taking of, 76
Batavian Republic, Persecution in, 327
Bavaria: Concordat with, 472; Edict of Religion, 473

Bayane (cardinal) ordered back to Rome, 421
Beauharnais, Josephine. *See* Josephine
Beauregard, Brumauld de: on priests in Guiana, 303
Beauty, deified by Goethe, 27
Beccaria, Cesare: on capital and labor, 27; *Tratto dei delitti e delle pene* by, 32
Belgium
  Arrest of priests, 313
  Combats in, 314
  Committee of Public Safety in, 312
  Deportation of juring priests, 315
  Louvain University suppressed, 313
  Non-juring priests, 313
  Persecution in, 312 ff.
Bellarmine on civil power, 89
Belloy, de (cardinal), devoted to Napoleon, 418
Benedict the Moor canonized by Pius VII, 419
Benefice, Simple, 115 note
Benière, Father: Execution of, 234
Bérardier, Father: saved by Robespierre, 192 note
Bernier: and Concordat of 1801, 366; influence in the Vendée, 366; leader of Vendeans, 248; Spina and, 366 ff.
Bernis (cardinal): kept in ignorance, 128; Luxury of, 171; oath to the Constitution, 172; pensioned by King of Spain, 172
Berthier (general): Goods of Holy See seized by, 317; march on Rome, 298
Bertier of Rodez, 165
Besnard, Father: *Souvenirs d'un non-agénaire* by, 361
Bible Society (London), 511
Binardière, Duportail de la: Murder of, 178
Bishoprics, nomination of nobles to, 21
Bishops, French
  Abjuration of several, 230
  Canonical institution of, 436
  Election of, 122
  Emigré, 166, 389
  Income of, 21
  Institution of, 83
  Juring, 159
  Number of married, 232
  Pope's right to remove, 380
  Resignation of, 468
Bishops (*continued*)
  Two defections, 156
Bishops, Constitutional, 265
  Character of, 162
  One for each department, 163, 165
  Rehabilitation of, 387
  Validity of consecration of, 140 note
"Black cardinals," the, 435: at Fontainebleau, 448
Blanca, Florida: opposition to France, 199
Bogomiles in Bulgaria, 539
Boisgelin (bishop)
  Character of, 68
  Concordat of 1801, 382
  His offer to the king, 154
  At London, 204
  On need of reforms, 22
  On night of August 4, 80
  On ownership of Church property, 103
  On rights of the clergy, 117
  On sale of Church property, 100
  At States General, 68
Boislève (officialis): Nullity of Napoleon's marriage declared by, 433
Bollène, Execution of nuns of, 255
Bologna: Armistice of, 293; ceded to France, 297
Bonal (bishop): Form of oath proposed by, 154; National council asked by, 119
Bonald, Louis de, 488: *Législation primitive* by, 488; *Théorie du pouvoir* by, 489 note
Bonaparte, Jerome: Annulment of marriage of, 414; Marriage of, 412
Bonaparte, Joseph: and concordat of 1801, 376; at Rome, 297
Bonaparte, Napoleon. *See* Napoleon
Bonchamp, Marquis de: Vendean leader, 242
Bonnet (bishop), 163
Boscodon, Trappist abbey at, 308 note
Bossuet on arbitrary government, 12
Bottex, Father: Murder of, 189 note
Bourbon, Cardinal de: visitator in Spain, 396
Bracciano Museum, medals pilfered, 318
Braschi family, 46
Bravard, Father: Murder of, 177
Breda (Holland), Napoleon at, 439
Breton Club, 331
Briefs (papal)

Briefs (*continued*)
Charitas, 156
Dominus ac Redemptor, 550
Intimo ingemescimus corde, 135
Non sine magno, 477
Pastoralis sollicitudo, 274
Quod aliquantum, 156
Quod de fidelium, 476
Brittany and the Vendée, 236 ff.
Brongniart, Father: constitutional curé, 233
Brotier, Father: deported to Guiana, 302
Bruder Medardus by Hoffmann, 503
Bruguière (bishop) in Korea, 515
Brussels, Anti-Republican manifestations in, 313
Buchez, view of the Revolution, 3
Büchlein von der Liebe by Stolberg, 501
Bulgaria: Bogomiles in, 539; Latin Catholics in, 539
Bulgaris, Eugenius: *Theologicon* by, 529
Bulls (papal)
Auctorem fidei, 20, 59
De salute animarum, 475
In universalis ecclesiae, 556
Indefessum personarum, 538
Inter praecipua, 474
Paternae caritatis, 472
Quam memorandam, 385
Qui Christi Domini vices, 390
Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum, 479, 511
Ubi primum, 471
Burke, Edmund: and French Revolution, 202
Busca (cardinal), papal envoy, 296

Cacault, François de
Artaud, secretary of, 372
And concordat of 1801, 370
To Florence, 373
French envoy, 296
Suggestion to Consalvi, 373
Caesarean Gallicanism, 16
Cahiers, the, 84: of the bishops, 85; of the clergy, 84
Calendar, Republican, 226, 284
Calvinist Churches regulated by Napoleon, 399
Cambacérès (jurist) and Napoleon's divorce, 431
Campanella: *Civitas Solis* by, 27; Utopias of, 23
Camus
And Avignon, 148
In Constituent Assembly, 89
Gallicanism of, 143
On institution of bishops, 83
On jurisdiction of clergy, 120
On state control of religion, 117
At States General, 69
Candor, Lodge of, 331
Canonizations by Pius VII, 419
Canons, chapters of: Suppression of, 141
Cantons of Switzerland, 337
Capital and labor, Beccaria on, 27
Caprara (cardinal)
And *émigrés* in Austria, 208
Organic articles read to, 381
Papal envoy, 381, 394
Recalled by Pius VII, 422
Carbonari, the, 460: condemned, 480
Cardinals: Abdication of some, 318; arrested in Rome, 318; Removal of thirteen from Paris, 435
Carmelite nuns, Execution of sixteen, 255
Carmelite monastery: Massacres at, 187; Prisoners in, 180 f.; Some escapes from, 189
Carnot, Lazare, 197
Carpentras, Raphael consul at, 149
Carrier, Jean: Description of, 256; drownings at Nantes, 256
Carroll, John: appointed by Pius VI, 212; Pius VI and, 50
Cartier, Father: Murder of, 191 note
Caselli, Father: and concordat of 1801, 364
Casoni (cardinal), Secretary of State, 416
Castellane (bishop), Murder of, 191
Castle Sant' Angelo occupied by French troops, 421
Castlereagh: conferences with Consalvi, 466; Consalvi welcomed by, 465
Catechism, ordered by Napoleon, 419
Catechisms, "Enlightened," 40
Cathelineau, Jacques, 243 ff.: Vendean hero, 240
Catherine II of Russia, 547
And the Jesuits, 49
On National Assembly, 126
Pius VI and, 49
Siestrzencewicz named bishop by, 56
Catholic cantons of Switzerland, 338

Catholic emancipation in Ireland, 342
Catholicism in France in 1799, 332
Catholics, Irish: Political rights of, 341
Cattereau, Jean: Vendean patriot, 238
Cayenne, Deportations to, 301
Cerfbeer (banker), 330
Cervoni (general), Pius VI and, 299
Chabot (priest), Marriage of, 233
Champagny, Count de: Talleyrand replaced by, 420
Champenois (bishop) in India, 516
Champion de Cicé, Disloyalty of, 134
Chapters of canons, Suppression of, 141
Charette, François: Vendean leader, 244
Charitas (brief), 156
Charles IV, Pius VI's concordat with, 396
Chateaubriand, Viscount, 482 ff.
  Essai sur les révolutions by, 482
  Genie du christianisme by, 482: on missions, 510
  At London, 204
  Mémoires d'outre-tombe by, 486
  In Rome, 405
  In the United States, 213
Chaudet, Father: Murder of, 178
Chemillé, Vendean battle at, 243
Chemin-Duponte, *Manuel des theanthropophiles* by, 280
Cheverus (bishop), 214
Chiaramonti (Pius VII), 346: Benedictine life of, 348; bishop of Imola, 348
China, 518 ff.
Chinese synod, The first, 519
Chollet (deputy) on oath of hatred, 308
Chonan, Jean: Vendean patriot, 238
Chouans, the: in the Vendean War, 247
Christian Brothers, religious garb resumed by, 418
Christliche Mystik by Goerres, 503
Church in France
  And the Empire, 410 ff.
  Persecution of (1790–99), 137 ff.
  Possessions of, 94
  Supplanted by civil religion, 271 ff.
  Wealth of, 94
Church and state: in France, 18, 20, 112 ff.; Robespierre on, 118
Church property: at disposal of the nation, 102; its sale proposed by Talleyrand, 99; Sale of, 99 ff.; Successive legislation on, 103
Churches, Sacking of, 225
Cicé, Champion de (bishop): Disloyalty of, 134; Pastoral of, 177 note
Cisalpine Republic: Anti-Roman spirit of, 392; concordat project, 395; organic laws, 394; representatives assembled at Lyons, 393
Civic religion, 272
Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 116 ff., 121 ff.
  Approved by Louis XVI, 134
  Clergy's duty of residence, 122
  Condemned by Pius VI, 147, 157
  Consequences of, 137
  Elections of bishops and curés, 122
  Favored by Jansenists, 134
  Gallicanism of, 121
  Oath not taken by some, 154
  Oath taken to, 153 f.
  Opponents to, 164
  Opposition to canon law, 133
  Pius VI and, 132 ff.
  Prudhomme on, 142
  Sanctioned by Louis XVI, 144
  Taine on, 335
Civil government, Locke on, 25
Civil religion, 272; Church supplanted by, 271 ff.
Civita Castellana, Victory of French at, 321
Civitas Solis by Campanella, 27
Clairac, Murder of Father Lartigues at, 177
Clement XIV, brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*, 550
Clementine Museum, Pius VI and, 47
Clergy of France, 14-16, 43
  Cahiers of, 84
  Conduct of the *émigré*, 198
  The constitutional, 158, 228
  Emigration of, 198
  General agent of, 97 note
  The lower: at States General, 15, 69
  Non-juring: Deportation of, 175; encouraged by Pius VI, 174; in the provinces, 172
  Oath to the Constitution by, 138 ff., 143, 153, 155
  Obligation of residence, 122
  "Officials of morality," 139
  Reckless generosity of, 79
  Revenue of, 82 note
  Support by the state, 116

Clergy of France (*continued*)
Two orders of, 15
The upper, 15: and the state, 16; and States General, 67
Clergy of Germany: opposition to Rome, 17; Power of, 17
Cletus, Blessed: Martyrdom of, 518, 521
Clubs, the, 91: Jacobin, 331
College of Propaganda: Debts of, 510; founded by Gregory XV, 510; reconstituted, 510
Collette, canonized by Pius VII, 419
Colybes, the, 523
Committee of Public Safety, *222*: in Belgium, 312
Commune of Paris, 179
Committee of execution appointed by, 182
Committee of execution circular by, 190
Danton and, 180 note
Execution of 62 members of, 257
Fifty clergy imprisoned by, 180
Insolence of, 183
Marat and, 180 note
Origin of, 180 note
Communism of the *Civitas Solis*, *27*
Comtat Venaissin: economic crisis, 148; Pius VI yields, *297*; Status of, 147
Conclave: Pius VI's constitution on, 320; at Venice, 328
Concordat with
Bavaria, *472*
Cisalpine Republic, 395
Holland, 474
Naples, 473
Piedmont, 474
Russia, 473
Spain, 396
Switzerland, 474
Concordat of 1516, Project to re-establish, 470
Concordat of 1801, 350 ff.
Bernier, 366
Boisgelin preacher, 382
Cacault, 370
Commission of cardinals, 369
Consalvi, 365
Eighth project, 376
Fifth proposal, 368
First proposals, 368
Father Caselli, 364
Grégoire, *362*
Concordat of 1801 (*continued*)
Joseph Bonaparte, 376
Napoleon's ultimatum, *372*
Opponents in France, 391
Opposition of *émigré* royalists, 390
Papal envoys to Paris, 363 ff.
Pius VII, 370
Popular joy over, 382
Provisions of, 378
Ratification of, 380
Ratified by Napoleon, 378
Seventh project, 375
Significance of, 392 ff.
Spina, 363-65
Talleyrand, 361, 369: absent from Paris, 375
Text of, 562
Concordat of 1813: pronounced null by Pius VII, 448; Provisions of, 448; signed by Pius VII and Napoleon, 448
Concordat of 1816: a dead letter, 470; not ratified by Pius VII, 470
Condorcet on Masonry, 333
Confraternities suppressed, 175
Congress of Ems (1786), 17
Congress of Vienna, 461: Consalvi at, 461
Consalvi (cardinal)
Cacault's suggestion to, 373
The commercial code, 479
Concordat of 1801, 365
Conferences with Castlereagh, 466
At Congress of Vienna, 461
Dismissal of, 416
The fine arts fostered by, 479
At London, 465
Named Secretary of State, 351
Napoleon and, 374 ff.
Napoleon on, 479
Negotiations with Naples, 473
Negotiations with Russia, 473
To Paris, 373
Reception by Napoleon, 374
Reforms in Papal States, 478
At Venice conclave, 344
Welcomed by Castlereagh, 465
Considérations sur la France by De Maistre, 486
Constant, Benjamin, 329, 334
Constituent Assembly
Abolition of tithes, 82
Aims of, 140 ff.

Constituent Assembly (*continued*)
Antireligious work of, 73
Bishop de Bonal, 119
Beginning of anarchy, 74
Camus at, 83, 120
Change of States General into, 73
Church and state, 112 ff.
On Church property, 99 ff.
Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 116 ff., 121, 137
Constitution committee, 98
Corporations suppressed, 93
Disregard of the pope, 141
Ecclesiastical committee of, 96, 108
Gallicanism of, 112
Mirabeau at, 81, 89
Parliaments dissolved, 93
Religious orders, 106 ff.
Religious vows suspended, 107
Removal to Paris, 102
Report on conditions in the Vendée, 239
Sale of Church property, 99 ff.
States General changed into, 73
Support of the clergy, 116
Suppression of religious orders, 109 ff.
Suppression of religious vows, 110
Talleyrand at, 97 ff.
Constitution of the year III, 270
Constitutional bishops, 162, 265
Character of, 162
Number of, 163 note
One for each department, 163, 165
Rehabilitation of, 387
Valid consecration of, 140 note
Constitutional Church, 265 ff.
Councils of, 386
Grégoire leader of, 268
Its claims to be the National Church, 275
National council of, 276: letter to Pius VI, 279
Constitutional clergy, 158, 228
Constitutional curés, Success of, 165
Constitutional priests, Abjuration of, 262, 386
Constitutionals, Grégoire leader of, 386
Consuls, Charges against the, 318
Continental blockade against England, 422
Convention, the (France), 196 ff.
Decree: against ecclesiastics, 222; against harboring refractory priests, 224; against refractory priests, 222; of Vendean extermination, 246
Despotism of, 231
End of, 270
The Girondists, 197
Laws on marriage of priests, 232
The Mountain, 197
The Plain, 197
Saints' feasts abolished, 326
Worthy measures of, 197 note
Coppoli (archbishop), Academy of the Catholic Religion founded by, 480
Corea. *See* Korea
Coronation: Feast of the, 418; of Napoleon, 406
Corporations, Suppression of, 93
Costa (cardinal) and French *émigrés* in Italy, 210
Couches, Murder of priests at, 191 note
Council of Pistoia. *See* Pistoia
Council of "United Bishops" founded by Grégoire, 267
Crisis, The intellectual, 23 ff.
Curés
Country, 14
Election of, 122
On night of August 4, 80
A portion congrue, 14
Success of constitutional, 165
Cussac, Father de: imprisoned, 181
Czerniewicz, Jesuit vicar general, 57

Dalmatia, Latin Catholics and Orthodox in, 534
Dannenmayr, 39
Danton
Appeal to violence by, 183
Character of, 179
And the Commune, 180 note
Father Lhomond saved by, 192 note
Jacobins personified by, 167
And limits of France, 221
Minister of Justice, 179
And September massacres, 190 note
Daughters of Charity: executed at Cambrai, 253 note; re-established by Napoleon, 406
De jure belli by Vittoria, 29
De jure pacis et belli by Grotius, 30
De salute animarum (bull), 475

Decadaire feasts, 316
Decadaire worship, 284
Declaration of Independence (American), 9
Declaration of the Rights of Man, 73, 87 ff.: Christian understanding of, 5; Text of, 559
Deport, Right of, 80
Deportation: decreed by the Assembly, 182; of non-juring clergy, 175, 192; of priests, 301
Der Katholik (periodical) by Goerres, 503
Dereser, Father (apostate), 233 note
Desmoulins, Influence of, 76
Diderot, *La religieuse* by, 288
Directory, the, 270 ff.
  Arbitrariness of, 310
  The army under, 290
  Attacks on Catholic religion, 289
  Deeds of, 310 ff.
  Napoleon and, 290
  Number of priests persecuted by, 312
  Oath of hatred toward royalty, 308
  Persecution under, 300 ff.
  Power of minister of police, 310
  Prosecution of the *émigrés,* 311
  Recoil of, 295
  The Terror under, 290
  Tyranny of, 310
Discourse on Inequality by Rousseau, 36
Discourses on Man by Voltaire, 34
Divorce, Napoleon's, 430 ff.
Divorce decree, 168
Divorce law abolished, 468
Dominus ac Redemptor (brief), 550: confirmed by Pius VI, 57
Donnadieu, Father: Execution of, 311
Doria (cardinal), expelled from Rome, 422 f.
Dubois, Father: in India, 516; *Mœurs . . . de l'Inde* by, 517
Dubois (bishop of New York), 214
Dubourg (bishop of New Orleans), 214: at Lyons, 513
Dufresse, Blessed: Martyrdom of, 518
Duke of Orleans, resignation as grand master, 331
Du Lau (bishop), Murder of, 188
Du pape by De Maistre, 487
Duphot, Murder of, 297
Duportail, Father: Murder of, 178
Dupuis, *L'origine de tous les cultes* by, 288
Dupuy, Father: Murder of, 177
Durand de Maillane, 96

Eastern Church, 523 ff.
Eastern Europe, Churches of, 533 ff.
Ecclesiastical Committee of Constituent Assembly, 96: on Church property, 113; Packed membership of, 109
"Ecclesiastical Council": on canonical institution of bishops, 436; established by Napoleon, 432; on nullity of Napoleon's excommunication, 437; Questions submitted to, 435
"Edict of Religion," Bavarian, 473
Emery, Father: Napoleon resisted by, 441; and oath of hatred, 309; on oath of liberty and equality, 193; Priests sent to America by, 213
Emigration: of Count of Artois, 79; of the nobility, 79
Emigré bishops, 166: Resistance of, 389
Emigré priests. *See* Priests
Emigrés: in Germany, 205 ff.; Prosecution of, 311; at Rome, 131
Emile by Rousseau, 36
Empire of France (1804–14) and the Church, 410 ff.
Ems: Congress of (1786), 17; Punctuation of, 16
Encyclopedia, the: The unity of, 33
Encyclopedists: Influence of, 15; Influence at court, 44; Madame de Pompadour friend of, 44
"Enemies of the people," Decree against, 224
England
  Catholics in, 506
  Condition of Catholics in, 201
  Emigré priests in, 201
  Influence of *émigré* priests in, 204
  Lessening of anti-Catholic prejudices, 466
  Philosophical movement in, 24
  Prestige of, 460
Epitres à Uranie by Voltaire, 34
Ernest (Duke of Gotha), 41
Essai sur l'indifférence by Lamennais, 493
Essai sur les révolutions by Chateaubriand, 482

Europe, Restoration of, 459
Europe, Eastern: Churches of, 533 ff.
Expilly (bishop), 114: elected bishop of Finistère, 139
Exposition des principes, 157

Fabre d'Eglantine and republican calendar, 226
Feast of the Federation, 123
Ferdinand IV (king of Naples): offer to take Pius VII to Sicily, 423; order to French in Rome, 321; and tribute to Holy See, 51
Fesch (cardinal)
  Ambassador to Rome, 404
  At head of "Ecclesiastical Council," 432
  Marriage of Napoleon and Josephine, 406, 408 note
  Napoleon's envoy, 412
  And religious congregations, 418
Ferrara: ceded to France, 297; Napoleon at, 295
Ferrara (cardinal), imprisoned by Napoleon, 292
Fichte, Jacobinism defended by, 205
Filangieri, Gaetano: *Scienza della legislazione* by, 28
Fischer, Christopher, 39
Flaget (bishop of Bardstown), 214
Florence, Pius VI at, 319
Florida Blanca: opposition to France, 199
"Flying squadron," the: at conclave (1799), 346
Folleville, impostor among Vendeans, 248
Fontana (bishop) in China, 521
Fontainebleau, Pius VII at, 445
Fontenelle, 32
Foreign Mission Seminary, re-established by Napoleon, 406, 468
Foreign Mission Society, 508: dissolved by Napoleon (1809), 511; re-established, 417, 508, 511; Work of, 512
Foreign missions, 508 ff.
  Effects of the Restoration, 508
  Favored by Napoleon, 509
  Jesuits, 511
  Korea, 514 ff.
  Report of Portalis, 509
  Restoration of Jesuits, 508
Foreign views of the Revolution, 125
Forêt, René: Vendean patriot, 240
Fouché, 364: Council of constitutionals dissolved by, 387
Fouquier-Tinville (prosecutor), 193 note, 222
France
  Bishops from the nobility, 21
  Break of diplomatic relations with Holy See, 215
  Calvinist Churches regulated, 399
  Church and state in, 20
  Clergy in, 43
  Conditions in 1789, 64
  Diocesan boundaries, 472
  Economic classes in, 11
  Emigrés' return to, 342
  Foreign invasion of (1813), 449
  In 1799, 327 ff.
  Jews in, 401
  Lutheran Churches in, 399
  Masonic lodges in, 43
  Minister of worship in, 20
  Number of Catholics (1801), 386
  Population (1801), 386
  Protestantism in, 398 ff.
  Resignation of the bishops, 468
  Return of refugees to, 329
  Royal government in, 13
  Serfdom in, 10
  Upper clergy in, 67
  Wealth of Church in, 94
Francis I (emperor) at Rome, 480
Francis II (emperor): Abdication of, 417; and conclave (1799), 344; The exclusive by, 345
Francis Caracciolo, canonized by Pius VII, 420
Frankenberg (cardinal), deported from Belgium, 313
Franz Sternbold by Tieck, 499
Frederick William III, 475: at Rome, 480
Freedom of worship decreed (1795), 260
Freemasonry: Chief officers of French, 455; in France, 43
Freemasons
  During the French Revolution, 331
  And Illuminati, 41
  In Italy, 210
  Napoleon and, 401, 454
  Oath to the Constitution, 196 note
French philosophers, 32
French Revolution. *See* Revolution

French Republic recognized by Pius VI, 273, 297
Fribourg, Jesuits received in, 474
Friedland, Battle of, 416

Gacé, Murder of priests at, 191 note
Gallais, Father: imprisoned, 181
Gallicanism: Caesarean, 16; Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 121; of Constituent Assembly, 112; in Russia, 56
Garampi (nuncio), 56
Gassendi, 32
General agent of the clergy, 97 note
Generals, Political influence of, 272
Genie du christianisme by Chateaubriand, 482, 510
Genoa, Pius VII at, 461
George III (of England): and *émigré* priests, 203; return of art works to Rome, 465
Georgetown College, 213
German romanticism, 497
Germany
  Anti-Roman ideas in, 397
  Attitudes to French Revolution, 205
  Churches of, 17
  Emigré priests in, 205
  French *émigrés* in, 205 ff.
  Hospitality to *émigré* clergy, 208
  Illuminism in, 27
  Philosophical movement in, 25
  Power of upper clergy in, 17
  Prince electors: Rome's monetary demands, 17 note, 21
  Serfdom in, 10
Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi by Stolberg, 501
Ghislain (C.M.) in China, 518
"Gilded Youth," the, 197
Girondists, the, 197
Glatier, Father: Execution of, 311
Gobel (bishop)
  Abdication of, 229
  Career of, 159
  Election of, 159
  Oath taken by, 159
  And Paris clergy, 229
  Resignation of, 229
Goddess of Reason, Worship of, 230
Godoy (Spanish minister), 395; and *émigrés* in Spain, 200
Goerres, Joseph, 498, 502
  Der Katholik (periodical), 503
  Die christliche Mystik by, 503
  Die Teutschen Volksbücher by, 502
  Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt by, 502
  Rheinische Merkur founded by, 502
  Teutschland und die Revolution by, 502
Goethe, Beauty deified by, 27
"Golden youth," 263
Goulard, Father: on reform project, 118
Graf, Arthur: *L'Anglomania in Italia* by, 29 note
Grand, Mrs.: marriage to Talleyrand, 361
Grand Lodge, Grand Orient merged with, 401
Grand Orient: Grand Lodge merged with, 401; without grand master, 332; Reorganization of, 455
Greek Church of Constantinople, Non-Catholic, 523
Greek revolution, 526
Grégoire (bishop)
  And abolition of annates, 80
  Career of, 161 note
  Character of, 152, 161
  And concordat of 1801, 362
  And the constitutional Church, 279
  Council of United Bishops founded by, 267
  Death of, 389
  Leader of constitutional Church, 268
  Leader of constitutional priests, 315
  Leader of the constitutionals, 386
  And the "National Council," 276
  Against new paganism, 228
  Opposition to feast of Supreme Being, 264
  Pisani on, 266
  Refusal of apostasy, 230
  On religious domain, 230
  "Report of the United Bishops," 277
  Resignation of, 388
  Soul of constitutional Church, 161
Gregory I (pope) on human liberty, 89 note
Gregory XV (pope), College of Propaganda founded by, 510
Gregory V (patriarch), Death of, 526
Grievances, Memorials of, 84

Grotius: *De jure pacis et belli* by, 30; and law of nations, 23, 29
Guégan, Father: on religious proposals, 119
Guiana
  Conditions in, 303
  Constitutional priests in, 316
  Deportations to, 301
  Exiles in, 302 ff.
  Priests deported to, 300
Guillotine: Installation of, 182; made permanent, 197
Guinguené: on system of morality, 333
Gustavus III of Sweden, Pius VI and, 50
Guyot de Folleville, impostor among Vendeans, 248

Hardenberg (chancellor) at Rome, 475
Hauy, Valentin: and theophilanthropy, 281
Hedderich, Philip (O.F.M.), 39
Helvetic Republic, Persecution in, 327
Herder, J. G.: *Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* by, 27
Hertz, Henrietta, 330
Hertzberg on the French Revolution, 206
Herzan (cardinal) at conclave (1799), 345
Hobbes: Absolutism of, 25; on origin of society, 25
Hoche (general), 258
Hoffmann, Amadeus: *Bruder Medardus* by, 503
Holland: Catholics of, 474; Concordat with, 474; Philosophical movement in, 29
Holy Alliance, the, 462
Holy Ghost, Congregation of the: re-established, 417
Holy Roman Empire, End of, 417
Holy See: Ambassadors to, 480; Break of diplomatic relations with France, 215; memorial on the annates, 82
Holyday, The weekly, 284 ff.
Hontheim, Nikolaus von, 17
Hugon, Jean (i.e, Bassville), Murder of, 215 ff.
Huguenots. *See* Protestants
Hyacinth Marescotti canonized, 419
Hymns to the Virgin by Novalis, 499

Ile d'Oléron: Deportations to, 301; Exiled priests at, 308; Priests imprisoned at, 300
Ile de Ré
  Conditions at, 306
  Constitutional priests at, 316
  Deportations to, 301
  Description of, 305
  Life of deported priests at, 306
  Priests imprisoned at, 300, 306
Illuminati, the, 40: German, 206; in Italy, 210; and Masons, 41
Illuminism in Germany, 27
In universalis ecclesiae (bull), 556
Indefessum personarum (bull), 538
India, 516 ff.: Father Dubois in, 516; Jacobins in, 328; Missions in, 328
"Infernal columns," the, 258
Institute, the, 271: atheists in, 288
Intellectual crisis, the, 23 ff.
Inter praecipua (bull), 474
Intimo ingemiscimus corde (brief), 135
Ireland: Act of Union, 342; Catholic emancipation, 342; penal laws, 341; political rights of Catholics, 341
Ireland, Parliament of: suppressed, 342
Irish, Society of the United, 341
Irreligion (1789–99) in France, 287
Issy, Arrests at, 180
Italian spirit, 209
Italy: *Emigré* priests in, 209 ff.; Philosophical movement in, 27; Revolutionary ideas in, 209

Jacobi and French Revolution, 205
Jacobin clubs, 331
Jacobinism, defended by Fichte, 205
Jacobins, 167: in India, 328; Influence of, 179
Jalès, Federations of, 235 note
Jansenism
  Assembly of the Clergy and, 42
  Bishop Ricci and, 57
  Defended by Duke of Tuscany, 57
  Influence of, 41
  Among the Maurists, 42
  Among the Oratorians, 42
  At Synod of Pistoia, 18 f.
Jansenists: Constitution of the Clergy favored by, 134 ff.; Influence of, 15
Japan, Preservation of the faith in, 515
Jarente (bishop), 21: Oath taken by, 159

Jerico, Pauline: and foreign missions, 513
Jerome Bonaparte, Annulment of marriage of, 414
Jesuits
  Abolished in France, 42
  Catherine II and, 49
  In China, 518
  Expulsion of, 9: from Russia (1815), 554
  In foreign missions, 511
  Included in suppressions, 110
  Louis XV and, 42
  Peter the Great and, 55
  Received in Fribourg, 474
  Re-establishment of, 480, 508, 511
  Return to France, 468
  In Russia, 550 ff.: Pius VI and, 49, 56 f.
  Russia refuge for, 56
  Among September victims, 194 note
  Suppression of, 328, 508
  Vicar general in Russia, 57
Jerome Bonaparte, Marriage of, 412
Jews, the
  In France, 401
  In the French Revolution, 329
  Napoleon and, 452
  Pius VI's popularity among, 49
  Rise to power in France, 334
Joseph II of Austria, 16: Pius VI and, 47; Regulation of the Church by, 52
Joseph Bonaparte, king of Naples, 416
Josephine Beauharnais, Napoleon's marriage to, 406, 408 note, 430
Josephism, 16
Journal des curés, 418
Journal ecclésiastique, 65
Juigné (bishop)
  On abolition of tithes, 82
  Character of, 67
  Charity of, 67
  On night of August 4, 79
  And oath of hatred, 309
  On sacrifices of the clergy, 83
  At States General, 63
Juring bishops, 159: Retractations of, 170

Kant: news of taking of the Bastille, 77 note; Rousseau's influence on, 26
Karalevsky, Cyril, 523 note
Kaunitz on French Revolution, 206
King of Rome, title of imperial prince, 437
Klopstock and French Revolution, 205
Kommentar über das N. T. by Paulus, 504
Korea: Bishop Brugière in, 515; Father Tsiou in, 515; First Catholics in, 515; Missions in, 514 ff.
Krüdner, Baroness von, 462; and Holy Alliance, 463

La Bruyère on courtier's joy, 13
La Fare (bishop), at States General, 63, 68
La Font de Savine (bishop), 21
La Force (prison): Imprisonments at, 182; Murders at, 189
La Gorce, Pierre de: on Masonic lodges, 43
La Jaunais, Vendean treaty at, 258 f.
La religieuse by Diderot, 288
La Rochefaucauld (bishop), imprisoned, 180
La Terreur sous le Directoire by Pierre, 300
La tirannide by Alfieri, 29
Lafayette: commander of National Guard, 78; influential Mason, 91
Lake poets, the, 506
Lamennais, Félicité de: *Essai sur l'indifférence* by, 493
Lamennais, Jean-Marie, 495
Landry, Maille de la Tour: at Ile de Ré, 307
L'Anglomania in Italia by Graf, 29 note
Langoiran, Father: Murder of, 177
Lanjuinais, 96: on execution of Constitution of the Clergy, 141
Larevellière-Lépaux, president of executive Directory, 301
Lartigues, Father de: Murder of, 177
Latin rite Catholics in eastern Europe, 539
Laval: Persecution at, 173; Vendean capture of, 247
Law, Spinoza on, 30
Law of nations, Grotius on, 29
Lawyers at States General, 69
Lazarists. *See* Vincentians
Le Coz (bishop): Charge against, 317; and the constitutionals, 386; president of the "council," 276

Le Franc de Pompignan, Charges against, 135 note
Le Lau (bishop) imprisoned, 180
Le Perche, Murder of Father Duportail at, 178
Leben Jesu by Strauss, 505
Législation primitive by Bonald, 488
Legislative Assembly, 167 ff.
  Confraternities suppressed, 175
  Decree of deportation, 182
  Deportation: of clergy, 175; of non-juring priests, 192; of non-jurors, 179
  Divorce decree, 168
  Freedom to colonial Negroes, 168
  Oath of Liberty and Equality, 192 ff.
  Split in, 331
  Succeeded by the Convention, 196
Lenkeiwicz, Jesuit vicar general, 57
Leo XII: Alexander I (czar) and, 554; bull *Inter praecipua,* 474; and Korean mission, 515
Leopold (duke of Tuscany), 18: becomes emperor, 20
Les Vans, Murder of priests at, 177
Lessing; *Nathan der Weise* by, 26; and *Wolfenbüttel Fragments,* 26
Lettres de cachet, 76 note
Lhomond, Father: saved by Danton, 192 note
Liberty, Gregory the Great on, 89 note
Liberty and Equality, Oath of, 192 ff.
Licentious writings, Spread of, 15 note
"Little Church," the, 360, 390
"Little Terror," the, 289
Liturgy, Convention decrees on, 226
Locke: on civil government, 25; on origin of society, 25; Philosophy of, 25
Loiseau, Father: Murder of, 191 note
Loménie de Brienne (bishop), Oath taken by, 159
London: Consalvi at, 465; *Emigré* priests at, 204
Longwy, Taking of, 182
Loreto seized by Napoleon, 296
L'origine de tous les cultes by Dupuis, 288
Louis XIV: Glories of, 12; Royal power of, 12
Louis XV, and Jesuits in France, 42
Louis XVI
  Character of, 66
Louis XVI (*continued*)
  Constitution of Clergy sanctioned by, 134, 144
  Execution of, 219 ff.
  And foreign powers, 145
  Misty policy of, 138
  And Necker, 66
  New title of, 93 note
  Oath to Constitution approved by, 136
  Order to States General, 73
  Pius VI and, 144 ff.
  Pius VI's confidence in, 128
  Pius VI's esteem for, 220
  Procession at Versailles, 63
  In refuge at Legislative Assembly, 178
  Religious loyalty of, 130
  States General opened by, 63
Louis XVIII, 359 ff.
  Charter granted by, 468
  On future pope, 356
  Letter to Paul I, 359
  Society of Foreign Missions re-established by, 511
Louvain University suppressed, 313
Lower clergy of France, 15: at States General, 69
Loyseau on limits of royal power, 12
Lucern, Battle of (1798), 339
Luçon, Devotion of the people at, 173
Lutheran Churches in France, 399
Lutzen, Battle of, 449
Lyons, Cisalpine Republic's representatives at, 393

Mack (general), received in Rome, 321
Mackintosh and French Revolution, 202
Madaune, Father: on *émigré* priests in England, 204
Mai (cardinal): Vatican librarian, 479
Maillane, Durande de, 96: commentary on articles of Pithou, 113
Maillard, Stanislaus
  At the Abbaye, 189
  Career of, 184
  Character of, 184
  And committee of execution, 182
  At massacres: at Carmelite monastery, 187; at the Abbaye, 187
Maille, de (bishop): At Ile de Ré, 307
Maistre, Joseph de, 486
  Considérations sur la France by, 486
  Du pape by, 487
  On the Revolution, 6

Maistre, Joseph de (*continued*)
Soirées de Saint-Petersbourg by, 487
View of the Revolution, 4
Monosque, Murder of priests at, 178
Marat: and the Commune, 180 note; The Terror organized by, 197
Marechal (archbishop of Baltimore), 214: nomination of bishops, 477
Marengo, Napoleon's victory at, 352
Maria Louisa, marriage to Napoleon, 434
Maria Theresa: and Josephism, 16; and Pius VI, 47
Marie Antoinette, Unpopularity of, 66
Marist Fathers, Foundation of, 512
Maronites, 532
Marriage of priests, 232
Married bishops, Number of, 232
Married priests, Number of, 232
Marseilles, Murder of priests at, 178
Martineau: Ecclesiastical legislation by, 115; Jansenism of, 97
Martiniana (cardinal): and concordat of 1801, 363; Napoleon and, 354
Martinists (sect), 330
Masonic societies (1789), 91
Masonry. *See* Freemasonry
Masons. *See* Freemasons
Massacres, the September. *See* September
Massena (general): Freemason, 401; and the pillage of Rome, 318
Massimi (marquis), Arrest of, 298
Mattei (cardinal): at conclave (1799), 345; and Napoleon, 295; papal envoy, 296
Maury: *émigré* in Italy, 211; made archbishop of Paris by Napoleon, 440; on oath of liberty and equality, 194; on sale of Church property, 100; suspended, 211
Maximilian (elector) and French *émigrés*, 208
Mazenod (bishop), Oblates of Mary Immaculate founded by, 512
Meaux, Murder of priests at, 191
Méhée, Father: Account of massacres, 186
Melchite Catholic Church of Antioch, 530 ff.
Mémoires d'outre-tombe by Chateaubriand, 486
Memorials of grievances, 84
Mennecy, Closing of church at, 228
Metaphysics of Spinoza, 30
Metternich: defender of Holy Alliance, 464; negotiations with Napoleon, 438
Michael de l'Hospital, 32
Milan, Napoleon at, 411
Minister of police, Power of, 310
Minister of worship, in France, 20
Miollis (general): in Rome, 422; Seizure of Rome by, 421
Mirabeau
Character of, 72
At Constituent Assembly, 81
Influence of, 72
In National Assembly, 89
On ownership of Church property, 102
Physical appearance of, 72
At States General, 72
Miracles, Denial of Christ's, 26
Miratte, Father: Murder of, 178
Missions, Foreign. *See* Foreign
Mœurs . . . de l'Inde by Dubois, 517
Moïse (bishop), Resignation of, 388
Moldavia, 540
Monarchy, Spinoza on, 31
Monasteries, Suppression of, 109 ff.
Montaigne, 32
Montaleau (Mason), 332
Montenegro, 536
Montesquieu on division of powers, 84
Montmorin, Count de: Bernis kept in ignorance by, 128; Murder of, 189; Policy of, 139
Monserrat abbey, and *émigré* priests, 201
Morality, Proposed system of, 333
More, Thomas: *Utopia* by, 24
Morris, Gouverneur: on French Revolution, 126
Mount Athos, Monastery of, 524
Murat (general), Mason, 401
Murat (king of Naples), 424: Arrest of Pius VII ordered by, 426
Musquiz and concordat of 1801, 365
Mysore, Nabob of, 328
Mythengeschichte der Asiastischen Welt by Goerres, 502

Naples: Concordat with, 473; seized by French, 321
Naples, King of: tribute payable to Holy See, 51

Napoleon
Abdication of: first, 449; second, 401
Absence of cardinals at marriage of, 434
Address to clergy of Milan, 353
Affectionate meeting with Pius VII, 446
Ambition of, 342, 414
Ancona seized by, 296
Anger of, 292, 360, 377
Austria conquered by, 424
Benefactions to Church, 417
Benevolence to Protestants of Holland, 439
At Breda (in Holland), 439
Cardinal Martiniana and, 354
Character of, 377
Choice of second wife, 430
Christian death of, 458
Concordat of 1801, 350 ff.: negotiations with Pius VII, 359 f.; ratified by, 378
Concordat of 1813 signed by, 448
Conflict with Pius VII, 415
Consalvi and, 374 ff.
Continental blockade by, 422
Coronation of, 406
Coup d'état (1799) by, 342
Crossing of the Alps by, 352
Daughters of Charity re-established by, 406
Demands upon the Pope, 293
Desire for agreement with the Pope, 352
Divorce of, 430 ff.: devised by Cambacérès, 431; the diocesan court, 433; Pius VII's protest, 435
"Ecclesiastical Council" established by, 432
Entry into Vienna, 424
Excommunicated, 425
Exiled to St. Helena, 564
Foreign Mission Seminary re-established by, 406
Foreign Mission Society dissolved by (1809), 511
Foreign missions favored by, 509
And the Freemasons, 401, 454
At Ferrata, 295
His family welcomed by Pius VII, 457
His wish to be crowned by the Pope, 403
Napoleon (*continued*)
And the Jews, 452
As king of Italy, 411
Lazarists re-established by, 406
Loreto seized by, 296
March against Rome, 291
Marriage to Josephine, 406, 408 note
Marriage to Maria Louisa, 434
Maury made archbishop of Paris by, 440
At Milan, 292, 411
On need of peace, 352
Pius VII and, 349
Pius VII's intervention for the exiled, 458
A priest requested by, 458
Printing of a catechism ordered by, 419
Proclaimed emperor, 402
Project to keep Pope in France, 410
And the Protestants, 450
Reception of Consalvi, 374
Request for papal recognition of new Constitution, 273
Resisted by Father Emery, 441
Retreat from Russia, 445
Rise of, 290
Roman distrust of, 355
Second abdication of, 461
At Tolentino, 296
Victory at Marengo, 352
Victory at Pravdinsk, 416
Volney kicked by, 360
Napoleon Bonaparte, first use of the double name, 394
Nathan der Weise by Lessing, 26
National Convention, Convoking of, 179
"National Council" (1797), 276
National Council (1811), 442
Decisions accepted by Pius VII, 444
Ordered dissolved by Napoleon, 443
Reopened, 444
Three bishops imprisoned, 443
"National Council" of Constitutional Church: decrees of, 278; letter to Pius VI, 279
National Guard, Lafayette commander of, 78
National religion, a, 280 ff.
Nations, Battle of the, 449
Natural religion, 272
Naturalism, 32: Autonomous, 26
Neapolitan Republic, Persecution in, 327

Necker: Dismissal of, 74; Influence of, 329; Louis XVI and, 66
Negroes, Emancipation of colonial, 168
Netherlands. *See* Holland
Neufchateau, François: on national feasts, 284
Nikolaus von Hontheim, 17
Niebuhr, Berthold (Russian minister), 475
Nine Sisters, Lodge of the, 331
Ninon de Lenclos: salon of, 33; Voltaire and, 33
Nobility, Emigration of the, 79, 198
Nobles nominated to bishoprics, 21
Non sine magno (brief), 477
Non-juring clergy
  Decree of deportation of, 192
  Deportation of, 175
  Encouraged by Pius VI, 174
  Heroism of, 234
  Life of, 166
  In the provinces, 172
Notre Dame cathedral, Profanation of, 231
Nouvelles ecclésiastiques, Jansenist journal, 15
Novalis, *Hymns to the Virgin* by, 499

Oath of allegiance, English, 466
Oath of hatred toward royalty and anarchy, 308: and De Juigné, 309; explained by Chollet, 308; Father Emery on, 319 note
Oath of Liberty and Equality, 192 ff.
  Divergent views about, 193
  Father Emery on, 193
  Maury on, 194
  Pius VI on, 195
Oath to the Constitution: approved by Louis XVI, 136; by the clergy, 123, 138 ff.; taken by clergy, 155
Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Foundation of, 512
Ochs (Swiss leader), 337
O'Connell, Daniel, 342
Orange, Execution of 32 nuns at, 253
"Orangemen," 341
Oratorians, Jansenism among, 42
Organic articles, the, 373
  Portalis and, 381
  Provisions of, 384
  Revocation of, 470
  Talleyrand on, 384
Orleans, Duke of, 179: resignation as grand master, 331; Third Estate joined by, 73
Our Lady Help of Christians, Feast of, 457
Overbeck, 498 f.

Pacca (cardinal)
  On *émigré* bishops in Germany, 207
  On *émigré* nobles in Germany, 207
  On *émigré* priests in Germany, 207
  Expelled from Rome, 423
  Nuncio at Cologne, 18
  On Pius VII's character, 348
  On Pius VII's return to Rome, 457
  Secretary of State, 423
Paganism, Schiller and, 27
Paine, Thomas: and French Revolution, 202
Papal bulls. *See* Bulls
Papal elections, Bull on, 425
Papal primacy, Synod of Pistoia and, 19
Papal States, the, 478
  Annexed to French Empire, 424
  French *émigrés* in, 210
  Under Pius VII, 351
  Reforms of Consalvi, 478
Paris: Anarchy in, 90; Bailly acclaimed mayor of, 78; Murder of Father Chaudet at, 178; "Spontaneous anarchy" in, 74
Paris Commune. *See* Commune
Paris sections, 180 note: and Jews, 330
Pâris (deacon), Veneration of, 42
Paris, Brother (C.M.), in China, 518
Parishes, Temporal administration of, 261
Parliaments, French: dissolved, 93; and Jansenism, 42
Pastoralis sollicitudo (brief), 274
Patterson, Miss: Jerome Bonaparte's marriage to, 412
Patronage of benefices, 115
Paternae caritatis (bull), 472
Paul I (czar), 551: envoy sent to Pius VII, 351; letter from Louis XVIII, 359
Paulo, Count de: royalist leader, 336
Paulus, Heinrich: *Kommentar über das N. T.*, 504
Peasants, oppression of, 11
Pensions to ex-religious, 110
Périer of Clermont, 164

Persecution of the Church (1790–99), 137 ff.
Under the Directory, 300 ff.
At Laval, 173
Fresh outburst of, 215
New laws of, 174 ff.
Peter the Great and Jesuits, 55
Petit, Madame: and foreign missions, 513
Pfeffer (Swiss leader), 337
Philosophers: French, 32; Rousseau's debt to English, 23
"Philosophers," the: and French Revolution, 332
Philosophical Letters by Voltaire, 34
Philosophical movement: in England, 24; in Germany, 25; in Holland, 29; in Italy, 27
Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit by Herder, 27
Philosophism, Danger of, 50
Philosophy: influence on the Revolution, 23; Sentimental, 15
Philosophy, social: in England, 24
Philosophy of History by Schlegel, 501
Pidalion, the, 527
Piedmont, Concordat with, 474
Pieracchi (papal envoy), 294
Pierre, Victor: *La Terreur sous le Directoire* by, 300
Piki, Korean convert, 515
Pillage of St. Lazare, 74
Pinot, Father: Execution of, 251
Pio-Clementine Museum founded by Pius VI, 47
Pistoia, Synod of, 18
Condemned by Pius VI, 20, 59
Jansenism at, 18 f., 57
And papal supremacy, 19
Sacred Heart devotion condemned, 19
Pithou, Pierre: Articles of, 113
Pitt, William: Act of Union under, 342; and coalition against France, 221; and French Revolution, 202
Pius VI, 46 ff.
Allocution on spoliation of the Church, 124
And the annates, 130
Attack of paralysis, 322
Avignon reforms, 149 f.
And Bishop Carroll, 50
Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor,* confirmed by, 57
Pius VI (*continued*)
Briefs: *Charitas,* 156; *Intimo ingemiscimus corde,* 135; *Quod aliquantum,* 156; *Pastoralis sollicitudo,* 274
Bulls: *Auctorem fidei,* 20, 59; *Indefessum personarum,* 538
Catherine II and, 49
Character of, 46
Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 132 ff.: condemned, 127, 147, 157
Clergy encouraged by, 174
Confidence in Louis XVI, 128
Constitution on conclave, 320
Council of Pistoia condemned by, 59
Death of, 324
Delay by, 131, 138
Deposition of, 388
Difficulties with Russia, 55
Doctrine of German bishops condemned by, 18
Draining of Pontine Marshes, 47
Early career of, 46
Esteem for Louis XVI, 220
Exile of, 300
Favors to the Jews, 49
Finances of, 47
First encyclical of, 50
First years of pontificate of, 46 ff.
At Florence, 319
In France, 321 ff.
And French *émigrés* in Italy, 211
French Republic recognized by, 297
Gustavus III and, 50
Illness of, 297, 299, 321
On interpretation of an oath, 319
And the Jesuits, 49, 56
And Jesuits in Russia, 57
John Carroll made bishop by, 212
Joseph II and, 47
Kept uninformed, 129
Louis XVI and, 144 ff.
Maria Theresa and, 47
And murder of Bassville, 219
Pio-Clementine Museum founded by, 47
Popularity of, 48
Recognition of French Republic by, 273
Rumanian Church and, 538
At Siena, 319
Synod of Pistoia condemned by, 20
Temporizing policy of, 127 ff.
At Turin, 321

Pius VI (*continued*)
At Valence, 323
Visit to Vienna by, 52
Pius VII
Academy of the Catholic Religion, 480
Accident to, 480
Affectionate greeting by Napoleon, 446
Angela Merici canonized by, 419
Appeal of Korean Catholics, 515
Arrival at Savona, 427
Benedict the Moor canonized by, 419
Briefs: *Non sine magno,* 477; *Quod de fidelium,* 476
Bull on papal elections, 425
Canonizations by, 419
Carbonari condemned by, 480
Character of, 355
Collette canonized by, 419
And concordat of 1801, 350 ff., 370
Concordat of 1813 signed by, 448
Concordat negotiations with Napoleon, 359 f.
Concordat with Spain, 396
Death of, 480
Decisions of the National Council accepted by, 444
Departure from Rome, 427
Departure from Savona, 445
Discouragement of, 447
Economies of, 351
Election of, 346
Excommunication of invaders of Papal States, 425
Family of Napoleon welcomed at Rome, 547
At Fontainebleau, 445
Francis Caracciolo canonized by, 420
On freedom of the Church, 350
At Genoa, 461
His isolation at Savona, 428
His lodging at Savona, 429
Hyacinth Marescotti canonized by, 419
Imprisonment of, 428
Intervention for exiled Napoleon, 458
Jesuits reconstituted, 480
Journey to Paris, 405
Last years of, 457 ff.
Liberation of, 449
Life of, 347
And marriage of Jerome Bonaparte, 412
Pius VII (*continued*)
Mother of, 347
Napoleon and, 349
Napoleon excommunicated by, 425
Napoleon's conflict with, 415
Nullification of concordat (1813) by, 448
Province of Baltimore erected by, 477
Qualities of, 348
Re-establishment of Jesuits, 511
And religious orders, 479
At Savona, 449
Seizure of, 427
Suppression of French bishoprics, 390
Triumphal return to Rome, 449, 457
Welcome to Napoleon's mother, 457
Pius VII, bulls of
De salute animarum, 475
In universalis ecclesiae, 556
Paternae caritatis, 472
Quam memorandam, 385
Qui Christi Domini vices, 390
Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum, 479, 511
Ubi primum, 471
Plain, the, 197
Plato, *Republic* by, 24
Plouguerneau, Difficulty of installing curé at, 237
Poets, The English, 506
Poland
Divorce in, 543
Form of government, 543 note
Partitions of, 542
Seculars and Basilians in, 544
Third partition of, 551
Political and social crisis, 9 ff.
Political economy, 28
Political reform, Desire for, 4
Pompadour, Madame de: friend of Encyclopedists, 44
Pompignan, Le Franc de: Charges against, 135 note; at States General, 68
Pondichery, Seminary at, 516
Pont-Ecrepin, Murder of Father de Saint-Martin at, 178
Ponthion, Father: Murder of, 178
Pontine Marshes, Draining of, 47
Pope, right to remove bishops, 380
Popes: Pius VI (1775–99), 46 ff.; Pius VII (1800–23), 347 ff.

Portalis: and the organic articles, 381; report on Catholic missions, 509
Power of sovereign, Limits of, 12
Praemunire, Statute of, 465
Pravdinsk, Battle of, 416
"Presbytery" of Paris, 267
Presentation, Congregation of the, 308 note
Priests
  Abjuration of constitutional, 386
  Deaths on prison ships, 223
  Deportation of, 223, 301
  Deported to Guiana, 300, 302 ff.
  Drowning of fifty, 256
  Heroism of non-juring, 234
  Imprisoned at Ile de Ré, 306
  The interned, 305 ff.
  Marriage of, 232
  Murder of, 176
  Murder of emigrating, 191
  Number of married, 232
  Persecution of the juring, 315
  Saved by English man-of-war, 302
Priests, *Emigré*, 297 ff.
  In England, 201: Financial help for, 203; Influence of, 204
  In Germany, 205
  At Montserrat, 201
  In Spain, 199
Prince electors, Rome's monetary demands, 17 note
Promise of submission to Republic, 268
Propaganda, College of: Debts of, 510; founded by Gregory XV, 510; reconstituted, 510
Propaganda seminary reorganized, 480
Propagation of the Faith Society, 509: Founding of, 513
Protestant cantons of Switzerland, 337
Protestantism in France, 398 ff.
Protestants in France: during French Revolution, 328; Property restored to, 329; Napoleon and the, 450
Provinces, Anarchy in the, 78
Provincial assemblies (1789), 65
Prudhomme: on Constitution of the Clergy, 142; on Paris anarchy, 90
Prussia: Catholics in, 475; nomination of bishops, 476
Punctuation of Ems, 16

Quam memorandam (bull), 385
Qui Christi Domini vices (bull), 390
Quieta non movere, motto of Metternich, 438
Quirinal: invaded by French troops, 423, 426; Pillage of, 318
Quod aliquantum (brief), 156
Quod de fidelium (brief), 476

Rabelais, Skepticism of, 32
Radet (general): Pius VII arrested by, 426; Quirinal invaded by, 426
Raphael of Avignon, 149: consul at Carpentras, 149
Rationalism of Socinus, 32
Rautenstrauch (O.S.B.), 39
Raux (C.M.) in China, 518
Raynau, Father: Murder of, 177
Reason, Worship of, 231
Rectories for school purposes, 265
Reding, Aloys (Swiss general), 338
Reflections on the French Revolution by Burke, 202
Reform, Desire for, 4
Reform, Social: Filangieri's aim, 28
Refugees, French: Return of, 329
Reimarus, Samuel, 26
Reims, Murder of priests at, 191
Religion, State control of, 117
Religion, Civic, 272
Religious dress, Wearing of, 174
Religious houses combined, 111
Religious orders in France
  Membership of, 107
  Pensions to former members, 110
  Pius VII and, 479
  Regulation by the old regime, 106
  Suppression of, 109 ff.
Religious papers combined, 418
Religious vows, Suppression of, 110
Renaissance catholique en Angleterre by Thureau-Dangin, 505
Renan, E.: on idea of English science, 25 note
Republic by Plato, 24
Republic, French: recognized by Pius VI, 273
Republic, Roman: Proclamation of, 299
Republican calendar, 226, 284
Restoration, the French: reanimation of foreign missions, 508
Restoration of Europe, 459
Retractants, Conditions imposed on, 262
Revelation, Denial of possibility of, 26
Revenue of clergy, 82 note

Revolt, Right to: Rousseau on, 36
Revolution, American: French aid, 10
Revolution, French
  De Maistre on, 6
  Desire for reform, 4
  Foreign views of the, 125
  Influence of philosophy, 23
  Movement of social renovation, 4
  Object of a new religion, 5
  Three movements of, 4
  Views of, 3
  Worship of, 5
Revolutionary ideas in Italy, 209
Revolutionary tribunals, 221, 224
Rheinische Merkur (weekly), founded by Goerres, 502
Ricci, Lorenzo (Jesuit general): Death of, 19, 49
Ricci, Matteo: *True Idea of God* by, 518
Ricci, Scipio (bishop)
  Jansenism of, 19, 57
  Popular outbreak against, 57
  See resigned by, 59
  At Synod of Pistoia, 19
Richard, Gabriel: French *émigré* in United States, 214
Rights of Man, Declaration of the, 73, 87 ff.
Rights of Man by Paine, 202
Rivier, Marie: foundress, 308 note; Zeal of, 235
Robespierre: Execution of, 257; Father Bérardier saved by, 192 note; Rise and fall of, 197; on Church and state, 118
Roettiers de Montaleau (Mason), 332
Rohan, Duke de: "affair of the necklace," 21
Roland and non-juring clergy, 176
Romagna added to France, 297
Roman Republic: Persecution in, 327; proclaimed, 299
Romanticism, German, 497
Rome
  Anti-Catholic ceremony in, 320
  Berthier's march on, 298
  At death of Pius VI, 328
  Former sovereigns in, 457
  French *émigrés* in, 131, 356
  German clergy's opposition to, 17
  Sacking of (1798), 317 ff.
  Seized by French troops (1808), 421
  Seminaries reopened, 480
  Taking of, 298 ff.
Romme (mathematician) and calendar, 227 note
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 35
  Character of, 35
  Debt to English philosophers, 23
  Discourse on Inequality by, 36
  Emile by, 36
  Influence of, 35, 71
  Kant influenced by, 26
  On origin of our evils, 23
  On primitive state of man, 36
  On right to revolt, 36
  Social Contract by, 36
Royal power, Limit of, 12
Rumanian Church, 538
Russia
  Catholic Church in, 547 ff.
  Concordat with, 473
  Economic changes in, 460
  Gallicanism in, 56
  Jesuits in, 550 ff.
  Jesuits expelled from, 554
  Napoleon's retreat from, 445
  Pius VI's difficulties with, 55
  Refuge for Jesuits, 56
Rutan, Sister Marguerite: Execution of, 252
Ruthenian Catholic Church, 541 ff.

Sacraments, Abstention from, 42
Sacred Heart devotion and Synod of Pistoia, 19
Saint-Etienne, president of the Assembly, 329
St. Firmin, Seminary of: Murders at, 189
St. Gall, Diocese of, 474
St. George (monastery, Venice), 328
St. Helena, Napoleon exiled to, 461
St. Lazare, Pillage of, 74
Sacramentines, Execution of, 28, 254
St. Louis (church, Versailles), 63
Saint-Martin, Father de: Murder of, 178
St. Maur, Benedictines of: Jansenism among, 42
St. Napoleon, Feast of, 418
Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de: on system of morality, 333
Sainte-Croix, Baron de: and Avignon, 150
Salins, Father de: Murder of, 188
Salons, French, 33

Santo Domingo: The civil war in, 168; Priests in United States from, 214
Sapienza, the: New chairs at, 479; Oath taken by professors of, 319
Savine (bishop): Conversion of, 159 note; Death of, 308 note; imprisoned, 180
Savona: Arrival of Pius VII at, 427; Pius VII's departure from, 445; Pius VII's isolation at, 428; Pius VII's lodging at, 429
Schassenburg (general), 338
Schiller and paganism, 27
Schlegel, Frederick von: *Philosophy of History* by, 501
Schneider, Father (apostate), 233 note
Scienza della legislazione by Filangieri, 28
Scott, Walter: Influence of, 505
Secret societies, 460
Sections, Paris: and Jews, 330
Seminaries (Roman) reopened, 480
Sentimental philosophy, 15
September massacres, 184 ff.: Danton and, 190 note; Father Sicard's account, 185; Process of canonization of victims of, 190 note
Serbia, 536
Serfdom: in France, 10; in Germany, 10
Sicard, Father: account of September massacres, 185
Siena, Pius VI at, 319
Siestrzencewicz, Stanislas, 545
  Bishop of Mallo, 548
  Bishop of Moghilev, 549
  Career of, 548 note
  Evil influence of, 552
  Jesuits and, 550
  Named bishop by Catherine II, 56
Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph (priest)
  Abjuration of, 230 note
  And abolition of tithes, 81
  Influence of, 71
  Pamphlets by, 70
  Seminary studies by, 70
  "Social art" by, 71
  At States General, 73
Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, 512 note
Skepticism of Rabelais, 32
Social Contract by Rousseau, 36: influence on Kant, 26
Social philosophy in England, 24
Social reform, Filangieri's aim, 28
Social renovation, Movement of, 4
"Societies of worship" and administration of parishes, 261
Society, Locke and Hobbes on origin of, 25
Society of Jesus. *See* Jesuits
Society of Foreign Missions. *See* Foreign
Society of the United Irish, 341
Socinus, Faustus: Rationalism of, 32
Solari, Benedict (bishop), 20
Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum (bull), 479, 511
Spain: *Emigré* priests in, 199; Godoy, minister, 395; resistance to Napoleon, 424
Spina: Bernier and, 366 ff.; and concordat of 1801, 359, 363 ff.
Spinoza: on law, 30; Metaphysics of, 30; on monarchy, 31
Spitz, Andrew (O.S.B.), 39
"Spontaneous anarchy" of Paris (1789), 74
Staël, Madame de, 334: advice about Protestantism, 398
State, Upper clergy and the, 16
State and Church in France, 18, 20
State control of religion, 117
States General
  Attendance at, 63
  Boisgelin (bishop) at, 68
  Camus at, 69
  Change into Constituent Assembly, 83
  First sessions, 65
  La Fare (bishop) at, 68
  Lawyers at, 69
  Lower clergy at, 69
  Louis XVI's order to, 73
  Mirabeau at, 72
  Opened by Louis XVI, 63
  Pompignan (bishop) at, 68
  Prayers for the, 63 note
  Session of, 65
  Sieyès at, 73
  Transformation into Constituent Assembly, 73
  Treilhard at, 69
  Two groups in, 69
  Upper clergy at, 67
Statute of Praemunire, 465
Stolberg, Count von, 501: *Ein Büchlein von der Liebe* by, 501; *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* by, 501

Strauss, David: *Leben Jesu* by, 505
Sulpician *émigrés* in United States, 213
Sulpicians: diocesan seminaries, 418; reorganized, 417; among September victims, 194 note
Sunday observance: prescribed, 468; Suppression of, 285
Switzerland
  Catholic cantons of, 338
  Catholic revolt in, 338
  Concordat with, 474
  Democracy in, 337
  Dioceses of, 474
  French *émigrés* in, 208
  French invasion of, 337
  Protestant cantons of, 337
System of morality, Proposed, 333

Taine on Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 335
Talleyrand-Périgord (bishop)
  Absent from Paris, 375
  Changed attitudes of, 98
  And concordat of 1801, 361, 369
  At Constituent Assembly, 97 ff.
  Expilly consecrated by, 140 note
  Made minister of foreign affairs, 361
  Marriage of, 361, 369, 376 note
  Oath to the Constitution, 153
  Oath taken by, 159
  On the organic articles, 384
  Replaced by Champagny, 420
  On sale of Church property, 99
  Vocation of, 98 note
Tassy, Father: Murder of, 178
Tencin, Madame de: Salon of, 33
Terror, the: organized by Marat, 197; under the Directory, 289
Terror, The Belgian, 313
Teutschen Volksbücher by Goerres, 502
Teutschland und die Revolution by Goerres, 502
Theologicon, the: by Bulgaris, 529
Theology: Influence of Wolff on, 26; Study of, 38
Theophilanthropy, 280
Théorie du pouvoir by Bonald, 489 note
Théot, Catherine (visionary), 119
Thuin, Project of, 65 note
Thureau-Dangin, *Renaissance catholique en Angleterre* by, 505
Tieck, *Franz Sternbold* by, 499
Tilsit, Treaty of, 416: and Poland, 543
Tippo Sahib, 328
Tithes, Abolition of, 81: Juigné on, 82; Mirabeau on, 81, 99; Sieyès on, 81
Tithes, Monetary value of the, 94 note
Tolentino: Napoleon at, 296; Treaty of, 297
Torné, Anastase (bishop), 175
Trappist abbey at Boscodon, 308 note
Trappists re-established, 418
Tratto dei delitti e delle pene by Beccaria, 27, 32
Treaty of Tolentino, 297
Treilhard (Gallican): in ecclesiastical committee, 109; Qualities of, 96; on state control of religion, 117; at States General, 69
Trusteeism in United States, 477
Tsiou, Father: Chinese missioner in Korea, 515
Tuffin, Armand: leader of Brittany, 235
Turreau (Republican general), 258
Tuscany, Duke of, 57

Ubi primum (bull), 471
Unbelief, Spread of, 33
"United Bishops," encyclical of, 275
United Kingdom, the, 342
United States
  French *émigré* priests in, 212
  Nomination of bishops, 477
  Pius VI and Church in, 50
  Priests from Santo Domingo in, 214
  Sulpician *émigrés* in, 213
  Trusteeism in, 477
Upper clergy of France, 15: and the state, 16; and States General, 67
Upper clergy of Germany, Opposition to Rome by, 17
Ursulines, Execution of, 254
Utopia by Thomas More, 24

Van den Schiren (O.F.M.), 39
Vargas, Spanish minister at Rome, 396
Vatican, Pillage of, 318
Vatican library, 479
Vendean army: Defeat of, 249; Dissent in, 248; Excesses of, 247
Vendean treaty, 259
Vendean War, Second period of, 246
Vendée, the
  Brittany and, 236 ff.
  Convention's decree of extermination, 246

Vendée (*continued*)
Clergy of, 236
First insurgents of, 241 ff.
Intruding priests in, 237
Owners and tenants in, 236
Resistance of, 239
Venice, Conclave at (1799), 328, 344
Verdun, Taking of, 182
Versailles: Murder of priests at, 191; Paris mob at, 82; States General at, 63
Vienna, Pius VI's visit to, 52
Vienna, Congress of: Consalvi at, 461
Vincentians: in China, 518; re-established, 406, 417
Vindiciae gallicae by Mackintosh, 202
Vittoria, *De jure belli* by, 29
Volney, kicked by Napoleon, 360
Voltaire, 33
Debt to English philosophers, 23
Discourses on Man by, 34
Early life of, 34
Epitres à Uranie by, 34
Ideas of, 34
Influence of, 71
Voltaire (*continued*)
Ninon de Lenclos and, 33
In Paris, 44
Philosophical Letters by, 34
On state control of Church, 113
Writings of, 34
Vows, religious: Suspension of, 107, 110

War of the Austrian Succession, 9
Warsaw archbishopric, 473
Weekly holyday (decadaire), 284 ff.
White Russia, 55 note
Weishaupt, Adam: and Illuminati, 40 f.
Wiener Kirchenzeitung, 89
Wietinghoff, Juliana von. *See* Krüdner
Wolfenbüttel Fragments, 26
Wolff, Christian: Doctrines of, 26

Yung, Joannes, 39

Zelada (cardinal), 131: Secretary of State, 291; on taking the oath, 195
Zelanti, the, 49
Zoglio, nuncio at Munich, 18

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

MOURRET-THOMPSON

VOLUME EIGHT

1823-1878

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY

THE REV FERNAND MOURRET, S.S.

TRANSLATED BY

THE REV. NEWTON THOMPSON, S.T.D.

VOLUME EIGHT

PERIOD OF THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

(1823-1878)

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS 2, MO.

AND

33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-507

IMPRIMATUR

✠ Joseph E. Ritter, S.T.D.
Archbishop of St. Louis

May 20, 1957

COPYRIGHT 1957 BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Printed in the United States of America
by Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton, New York

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

PART I

LEO XII AND PIUS VIII

CHAPTER

I. CHRISTENDOM IN 1823 13
Political Organization of Europe 13
The Social Crisis 17
The Social Question 21
Romantic Literature 25
The Secret Societies 29

II. THE FORCES OF THE CHURCH 35
Parish Missions 36
New Religious Congregations 40
The Congregation 45
Catholic Schools 49
Religious Movement in Italy 53
Religious Movement in Germany 56
Religious Movement in England 58

III. LEO XII (1823–1829) 62
The Conclave 63
First Difficulties 67
Religious Indifference 73

IV. THE CHURCH IN FRANCE 77
Gallicanism 78
Catholic Liberalism 81
The Jesuits 84
King Charles X 88
Religious Orders 90

CHAPTER PAGE

V. The Church in Austria, Germany, and England 92
Austria 92
Germany 95
Ireland 99
The Oxford Movement 104

VI. The Church in Other Countries 108
Spain 108
Italy 113
The Netherlands . . . 115
Russia 118
Greece 121
Foreign Missions 122
Last Acts of Leo XII 124

VII. Pius VIII (March 31, 1829, to November 30, 1830) 128
The Conclave 128
Cardinal Albani 131
Religious Situation in France 133
Dangers of the Catholic Movement 137

VIII. The July Revolution 142
The New Government and the Church 146
Belgium 151

IX. The Church in Poland and Great Britain . . 156
Poland 156
Ireland 158
Scotland 161
England 162

X. The Church in Other Countries 164
Germany 164
Italy 169
Non-European Countries 173

PART II

PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY XVI

XI. Gregory XVI and the Papal States (1831–1832) 179
Liberalism in the Papal States 180

CHAPTER		PAGE
	The Conclave	185
	Gregory XVI	186
	Cardinal Bernetti	190
	Foreign Intervention	194
	Conflict between France and Austria	197
XII.	GOVERNMENT OF THE PAPAL STATES	205
	Fiscal Reforms	206
XIII.	THE CHURCH IN PORTUGAL AND SPAIN	212
	Portugal	214
	Spain	218
XIV.	THE CHURCH IN POLAND AND SWITZERLAND	222
	Poland	222
	Switzerland	227
XV.	THE CHURCH IN ITALY	235
	Mazzini	235
	Defense Measures of Gregory XVI	239
XVI.	THE CHURCH IN IRELAND AND ENGLAND	246
	Ireland	246
	The Repeal of the Union	248
	Newman	251
XVII.	THE CHURCH IN GERMANY	257
	Bunsen	257
	Archbishop Droste-Vischering	260
	George Hermes	262
	Arrest of Droste-Vischering	265
	Catholic Renaissance in Germany	270
XVIII.	THE CHURCH IN FRANCE	274
	Idealistic Socialism	277
	The Catholic Press in France	279
	Lamennais	280
	The *Avenir*	282
	The *Avenir's* Excesses	284
XIX.	LAMENNAIS	289
	The Case in Rome	289
	The Roman Decision	292

CHAPTER PAGE

The Encyclical *Mirari vos* 293
Disciples of Lamennais 301

XX. MONTALEMBERT 306
The Order of St. Dominic 307
Abbot Guéranger 308
The St. Vincent de Paul Society 313

XXI. CATHOLIC SCHOOLS 318
Villemain 322
Louis Veuillot 325
Catholic Education 327

XXII. OTHER ACTIVITIES 330
The Jesuits 330
Socialist Movement 336
Dupanloup 337
Works of Charity 340
Works of Scholarship 343
Theological Errors 344
Gallicanism 346

XXIII. GREGORY XVI AND THE FOREIGN MISSIONS . . . 349
The Near East 349
The Far East 354
India 356
Indochina 359
China 360
Korea 361
Japan 363
Africa 364
Algiers 364
Abyssinia 367
Central Africa 368
The United States 369
Canada 371
South America 372
Oceania 373
Death of Gregory XVI 375

CHAPTER PAGE

PART III

PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX

XXIV. PIUS IX AND THE PAPAL STATES (1846–1849) . . 379
The Conclave 380
Pius IX 381
Italian Political Parties 382
Liberal Measures of Pius IX 383
The Revolutionaries 387
Austrian Invasion 390
The Pope's Liberal Reforms 392
Sardinia 394
Count Mamiani 396
Rossi, Pius IX's Minister 398
Pius IX's Exile at Gaeta 401
Antonelli, Secretary of State 403
Attitude of the French Government 404
Proposed French Expedition to Italy 408
Siege of Rome 411
Letter of Louis Napoleon to Colonel Ney . . . 413
Pius IX's Return to Rome 416

XXV. PIUS IX AND THE CHURCH OF FRANCE (1846–1854) 417
Catholic Action in France 418
The Revolution of 1848 420
The Social Question 425
Catholic Schools 429
Parliamentary Discussion 433
The Socialist Peril 436
Restoration of the Empire (1852) 437
The Pagan Classics 439
Attacks by the Press 442
The Curé of Ars 445

XXVI. THE CHURCH IN ITALY 448
Victor Emmanuel 449
First Steps of Persecution 452
Further Measures of Persecution 456

CHAPTER PAGE

Cavour 457
Religious Orders 459
Other Measures 461

XXVII. The Church in Austria and Germany . . . 464
Austria 464
Emperor Francis Joseph 466
Germany 468
Prussian Hegemony 469
Bismarck 472
Catholicism in Prussia 474
Bismarck's Policy 478
Bishop von Ketteler 480
The Rhineland Bishops 483
Bishop Vicari 484

XXVIII. The Church in Other Countries 488
Switzerland 488
Religious Condition of Switzerland 491
England 493
Manning 496
Puseyism 498
Holland 500
Belgium 501
Spain 502

XXIX. Anti-Catholic Movement 506
Dogma of the Immaculate Conception 507
Anti-Catholic Movement 509
Cavour's Policy 512
Garibaldi 514
Cavour's Difficulties 515
Attempted Assassination by Orsini 517
Napoleon III and Cavour 519
The Motara Incident 520
Religious Policy of Napoleon III 522

XXX. The War with Austria (1859) 524
The Italian Campaign 524
Napoleon III and Bishop Donnet 527

CHAPTER PAGE

Pamphlet on the Papal Domain . . . 529
Opposition to the French Policy . . 530
Garibaldi 532
Treaty of Turin (1860) 532
Papal Volunteers 535
Garibaldi's Prestige 539
Battle of Castelfidardo 542
Siege of Ancona 543
Intervention of Napoleon III . . 545

XXXI. Attitude of Various States . . . 548
France 550
Other Countries 550
Russian Persecutions 552
Persecution of Polish Catholics . . . 553
Antichristian Intellectual Movement . 557
Ernest Renan 558
Congress of Malines (1863) . . . 563

XXXII. The Encyclical *Quanta cura* . . . 567
Reasons for the Encyclical . . 567
Reception of the Encyclical . . 570
Social and Political Doctrine . . . 575

XXXIII. The Roman Question 578
Attitude of Various Governments . 580
Communism 583
Frederick Le Play 584
Paris Exposition 586
Project of an Ecumenical Council . 587
Invasion of the Papal States 590
Franco-Italian Conflict 592
Austria 592
Repressions in Other Countries 593

XXXIV. Convocation of the Vatican Council . . . 596
Anti-Catholic Movement 596
Plan of a Masonic Anticouncil 598
Schismatic and Non-Catholic Churches . . . 599
The German Protestants 601
The English Protestants 603

CHAPTER PAGE

Pusey 604
The Catholic Rulers 605
Attitude of the Catholic World 608
Article in the *Civiltà cattolica* 609
Döllinger 612
Bishop Maret's *Du Concile général* 614
Article in the *Correspondant* 617
Dupanloup's Observations 618

XXXV. Opening of the Vatican Council 622
The Question of Procedure 624
The Bull *Apostolicae Sedis* 626
Groups in the Council 627
The Heads of the Groups 630
The Program 634
The Constitution *De fide* 637

XXXVI. Disciplinary Questions 640
Outside Discussions on Infallibility 643

XXXVII. Papal Infallibility 649
Projected Constitution *De romano pontifice* . . 651
Infallibility Attached to the Papal Office . . . 654
Pope's Direct Authority over Dioceses 656
Discussion on Infallibility 657
Absentees 660
The Vote 661
Franco-Prussian War 662
The Taking of Rome 663
Bishop Fessler's Pamphlet 664
Submission of the Opposition Bishops 666

XXXVIII. The Church in Italy and France 669
Rome 669
Victor Emmanuel in Rome 672
The Law of Guaranties 675
Protests of Pius IX 677
The Church in France 679
The Paris Commune 681
Montmartre Basilica 683

CHAPTER PAGE

Catholic Schools 683
Anticlericism 685

XXXIX. The Church in Other Countries 687
Germany 687
The Center Party 688
The Kulturkampf 688
Ludwig Windthorst 690
The May Laws 692
Courage of the Catholics 695
Switzerland 696
Bishop Mermillod 698
Swiss National Catholic Church 702
Austria 704
The School Laws 707
Spain 709
Alphonse XII 711
England 712

XL. Catholic Works 716
Devotions 716
Works of Charity 721
Christian Art 728
Philosophy and Theology 730
Spiritual Writings 732

XLI. Foreign Missions 736
The Near East 737
The Far East 745
India 746
China 748
Missions in Japan 751
Discovery of Christians in Japan 753
Korea 757
Oceania 758
Africa 761
America 762

Bibliography 766

Index 781

A HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Volume VIII

I. Leo XII and Pius VIII

II. Pontificate of Gregory XVI

III. Pontificate of Pius IX

Introduction

THE work of the Church in the nineteenth century was complex. It cannot be grasped without a glance at the general movements of the world in that same period. The study of past ages will undoubtedly enable posterity to assess the significance of this period of history in relation to the times that went before it and those that came after it. At least we can even now discern, apart from the religious activities, which will form the special material of our account, four particular movements. These, taken together, seem to mark the characteristic of this century: a movement of internal policy, one of external policy, a social movement, and an intellectual movement. From the viewpoint of internal policy, some have called this period the century of democracy. This expression needs to be explained.

Democratic Trends

This century began with the personal rule of Napoleon I and the Bourbon kings. It then witnessed the formation in its midst of constitutional systems with limited suffrage, resulting later in universal suffrage. In many countries the power, after being in the hands of the right, passed successively to the center, then to the more advanced left. Yet we must recognize that the trend toward democracy was neither world-wide nor regular. Perhaps it was more apparent than real, more superficial than deep.

On one side were Russia, Germany, Austria, and the Ottoman Empire. During the nineteenth century, in spite of a certain swing of ideas toward popular government, those countries kept their personal governments. In England, amid similar changes,

a constitutional monarchy remained. On the other hand, where the stages toward a democratic regime were more regular and distinct, the democratic movement of 1848 was followed by an abrupt return to personal government under the second empire. Let us add that the political system of democracy, where it seemed to triumph, has often been charged with having a deceptive appearance. Even the defenders of the popular form have called such pretended democracy a decapitated monarchy. This qualification is not without some basis. We may contrast the bourgeois aristocracy of the government of July with the military aristocracy of the first empire and the land-holding aristocracy of the Restoration, the Jewish and Masonic oligarchy of the third republic with the financial oligarchy of the second republic.

These trends affected the Church. Whether true or false, sound or perverse, the democratic agitation manifested in the ideas of the nineteenth century could not remain alien to the concern of the Church. The acts of Gregory XVI and Pius IX against liberalism, of Leo XIII and Pius X in the matter of Christian democracy, were provoked by this movement.

Now let us consider, not the internal organization of the states, but their diplomatic relations. Here we note that in the nineteenth century foreign policy took on a new expansion. In the sixteenth century the policy of Christendom was based on a European policy; in the nineteenth century it tended to be absorbed in world-wide interests. The preponderant part which colonial questions took in relations of people to people, the sudden entrance of Japan in the movement of European civilization, and the importance of the United States as a commercial nation and a political organization widened the diplomatic horizon. The major policies of this century aimed at nothing less than to rule the world. From 1801 to 1815 it was the ambition of Napoleon, and Germany, united by Bismarck, nourished the

same dream at the close of the century. We can easily figure what effects such movements had on the religious situation and to what extent the Catholic Church had to take account of them.

From another point of view, without seeming too exclusive, we can define the nineteenth century as the century of social revolution. However sharp may have been the political discussions in this period, the social questions came more and more to dominate and condition them. The rise of capitalism, brought about by the industrial and commercial progress, and the spread of ideas of political equality, gave birth to what has been called the social question. In the course of the century this social question provoked theories that were more and more radical. Omitting the secondary systems, let us merely note the three principal steps of the movement: the socialist theory of Saint-Simon, the communist theory of Karl Marx, and the anarchist theory of Bakunin.

The socialism of the Frenchman, Saint-Simon, which was spread during the Restoration, appeared under the form of a sentimental and pacifist philanthropy. Such also is the character of various other schools formed under the government of July. But the *Communist Manifesto,* the work of the German Karl Marx, in 1847 opened a more militant phase of the social reform. It lays down in principle the strife of the classes and looks to the overthrow of the bourgeois class by the working class. In 1868 the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, founded by the Russian Mikhail Bakunin, goes still further and openly advocates anarchy. The anarchist doctrine opposes any social organization, whether social, political, religious, or financial, and urges their destruction by direct action, that is, by violence and uprisings.

In the course of the nineteenth century we shall more than once see the Church step in. It does so to condemn the excesses

of socialism or to forestall its baneful influence on the nations. The Church was actively engaged in spreading social undertakings animated by a Christian spirit.

In considering a fourth aspect of the century that followed the French Revolution and that witnessed the first stirrings of the great war of 1914, some have called it the century of criticism. In fact, the period that saw the spread of Kant's doctrines, the publication of the works of Jaffé, Potthast, Duchesne, and De Smedt, the organization of the school of Chartres, and the popularity connected with the names of Sainte-Beuve, Pasteur, Renan, and Strauss, can boast of having pushed to their utmost limits, for good or ill, philosophical, historical, literary, scientific, and biblical criticism. But in this realm of ideas, more than in any other, it encountered the authority of the Catholic Church, ever ready to promote the real progress of science and letters, always alert to condemn their abuses.

The Church in the Nineteenth Century

Important was the action of the Church in relation to the political, social, and intellectual movements of the lay society. But its chief work did not lie there. The French Revolution had profoundly shaken the disciplinary organization of the Church and corrupted the beliefs of many of its faithful: in the nineteenth century its primary task had to be a work of restoration.

The revolutionary turmoil had, indeed, scattered the clergy. It had also overthrown their organization and confiscated their possessions. It had likewise let penetrate into men's minds, under more or less dubious forms, a poison of false ideas and utopias, propagated most eloquently by Rousseau and having formulas that received a sort of official consecration in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The French Revolution by its very excesses had brought about a wholesome reaction in many minds. The ridic-

ulous failure of its attempts to introduce a civil religion, and then practical atheism, made the people see the need of a religious authority solidly established and of a body of doctrine enunciated with the finality of ascertained truth.[1] In the course of the nineteenth century the Church relies precisely on this legitimate reaction to repair the ruins of the revolutionary period, to restore her hierarchy, and to strengthen her dogma.

This undertaking of disciplinary and dogmatic restoration may be considered in three chief periods. At the outset of the century, for the accomplishment of her work the Church counted on the support of the governments. The outstanding event of this period was the French concordat of 1801, followed by more than thirty other concordats. But the ill will which the Church soon experienced from various states, imbued with Gallican or Josephist ideas, led her, at about the middle of the century, to count more on the influence of public opinion. The French law of 1850 on freedom of teaching, several laws favorable to Catholicism in Prussia and in England, were the fruit of press campaigns and programs of public addresses. But the Church presently discovered in these popular movements certain illusions and errors, which she strongly condemned under the general name of liberalism. Moreover, soon the Supreme Pontiffs were evidently tending to free themselves as much as possible from outside influences and to count on the Church herself. The Vatican Council, to which for the first time no head of a Christian state was invited, plainly showed this tendency.[2]

Epitome of Church History

These summaries are mere generalizations. Whatever may be thought of them, the accounts of events related in the present

[1] See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* VII, 327 ff.

[2] Pius X, in abolishing the right of exclusive, again confirmed this attitude of the papacy.

volume will enable the reader to judge whether they are well or ill founded. In any event the impartial study of the history of Catholicism in the nineteenth century seems to us, by the variety and importance of the questions raised, especially useful for Christians of the twentieth century. Someone has remarked that therein we find almost all the kinds of strifes that the Church has had to sustain from her first days. This study thus takes on the appearance of an epitome, a picture of the whole of Church history. "In fact, nothing is lacking: neither conflicts with the temporal powers nor the forcible oppression of the Church nor the inner rending of the Church by the budding of new doctrines which it has had to condemn nor the strife with heterodox thought, against the civilized paganism which adorns itself with the name of free thought, nor the triumphs." [3] Let us add that, notwithstanding the momentous events which have taken place since then, the intellectual, social, political, and religious problems which presented themselves before the minds of the nineteenth century have lost none of their actuality.

But nothing can better prepare the new generations to take up these problems and to solve them than a study of the attempts made by preceding generations to find an answer. The history of our predecessors' failures and successes in the means employed may spare us many mistakes and may supply us with many useful indications. Through the conflicts that have divided several eminent Catholics, we can retain our admiration for whatever was noble and generous in them. What more earnest and likewise more comforting spectacles do we witness than those of a Montalembert at the age of twenty years consecrating his entire life to the glorious and holy cause of his country and his God? We see a Louis Veuillot ever at the breach to defend the Church with his pen like the gallant knights of the Middle Ages defended it with their swords; a Newman and a Manning who,

[3] *Un siècle. Mouvement du monde de 1800 à 1900*, p. 765.

in different and at times divergent ways, but with equal sincerity and ardor, stimulating the trend of our separated brethren of England toward integral Christianity; a Windthorst, leader of the Catholics of Germany in the combat of the Kulturkampf; a Lavigerie becoming the apostle of Africa. We are heartened at sight of Pius IX sacrificing the tranquillity of his pontificate and his personal popularity for the relentless defense of the purity of doctrine against all its enemies, its defamers, and its well-meaning but imprudent champions; and a Leo XIII, showing to people and kings, to laborers and intellectual workers, the Catholic Church as the mother of true civilization.

But let us not deceive ourselves. In the account of so many struggles, which still resound in our present world, in the description of so many men who have left impassioned disciples, we may think that impartiality, the first duty of a historian, is his chief stumbling block. We believe we have not failed to respect this impartiality while trying to rise to the point of view where the Church stands when she deliberates in her councils, when she legislates by her hierarchical representatives, when she speaks by means of her Supreme Pontiff. If in spite of our pains we have fallen short in any respect, we confide the judgment to the common father of the faithful for whatever may be defective in our work, submitting this present effort to his authority without reserve.

PART I

Leo XII and Pius VIII

CHAPTER I

Christendom in 1823

Pope Pius VII died on August 24, 1823. His last words were: "Savona . . . Fontainebleau." Emperor Napoleon had preceded him to the grave two years before; his last words were: "Head . . . army." These two men, who attained sovereign power at almost the same time and disappeared from the scene at a short interval from each other, had personified the two foremost powers of the world. Napoleon in his last moments was recalling the mighty military glory with which he had dazzled the men of his time; Pius was thinking of the redemptive sufferings by which he had continued the work of Jesus Christ in the Church. With these two leaders now dead, the strife between the world and Christ would take new forms. Following the fall of Napoleon and the weakening of several Bourbon monarchies, Gallicanism and Josephism would lose some of their strength. But the independence movement that carried the European nations toward nationalist policies and constitutional systems would give birth to liberalism. In the process of these changes almost everything was a trial for the Church. The authoritarian monarchies had given her the indispensable security which she needed for reorganizing her worship and discipline, but the liberal movement would allow her to develop her action by the acquisition of various precious liberties.

Political Organization of Europe

What was the political condition of Europe? At the time of Pius VII's death the status was regulated by the final act of the

famous Congress of Vienna, held in 1815. It was "the vastest treaty ever signed, the first attempt to give Europe a charter, at least a territorial charter, to fix the state of each one's possession, . . . to base the general peace on a collective pact." [1] Never had the stability of the states been more maturely studied by men so experienced in the science of international questions, or on a free field of experimentation. Two aims were in mind: to prevent the return of a hegemony like that of Napoleon, and to strive everywhere against the revolutionary spirit. To attain this double end, Metternich proposed the principle of equilibrium, already applied in the Treaty of Westphalia; Talleyrand preached the principle of legitimacy. A combination of these two principles formed the basis for the work of European reconstruction which the diplomats began at Vienna. Our task is not to set forth the details of their work, which they considered final.

A new international code was proclaimed. Resting on the principles of legitimacy and equilibrium, introduced by France into the public law of Europe, the authors of the treaties of 1815 declared that henceforth any aggrandizement of a state at the expense of another was forbidden. Whatever state should make an attack on the equilibrium would be regarded as revolutionary, a disturber of the European order, and would risk seeing Europe join together against it. At the same time, unfortunately, the European diplomats failed to take account of two important factors in the peace of nations: the question of nationality and that of religion. By placing Magyar Hungary under the domination of German Austria, by subjecting Greece to Turkey, and by confiding northern Italy to the hands of the Hapsburgs, they were preparing the way for future national claims. By systematically neglecting to take up the question of the Ottoman Empire, they were leaving open the

[1] Albert Sorel in Lavisse, *Histoire générale.* Cf. Sorel, ***Essais d'histoire et de critique: Talleyrand au congrès de Vienne.***

question of the Orient. By establishing schismatic Russia's rule over Poland and of Protestant Holland over Belgium, they were wounding the consciences of the Catholics. By letting Austria lay hands on Venetia, they aroused the legitimate dissatisfaction of the Holy See.

The Vienna treaties did not appear solid in 1823. They were broken in 1830, partly reversed in 1848, utterly forsaken in 1860, 1866, and 1870, by the creation of an independent Belgium, of an Italian monarchy, and of a German empire. The yoke of those treaties was painfully borne by the peoples, statesmen began to discuss them, and their rupture, at that time regarded as imminent, threatened profound trouble for the Church along with society.

Too exclusive is the view that regards the Congress of Vienna as the starting point of the vast "struggle between conservatives and liberals which forms the political history of Europe in the nineteenth century." [2] What can be said is that, by too readily irritating the national and lawful aspirations of the people and by failing to distinguish what was legitimate in those aspirations from what was revolutionary, Metternich and Talleyrand had unwisely planted the seed of an inevitable reaction. A diplomat whom a delicate moral sense and religious feelings placed on a higher plane and thereby made more clear-sighted did not have that same confidence in the treaties of 1815. Joseph de Maistre, who was strongly attached to the conservative and legitimist cause, wrote, as early as April 11, 1815: "Never perhaps did the world have better princes . . . than those assembled at the Congress. Yet, what is the result? Dissatisfaction is universal. What is strange in this situation is that the greatest of those princes let themselves be influenced by the philosophical and political ideas of the time; and yet never were the nations more despised, trodden under foot in a way more irritating for them. . . . Herein is an eternal

[2] Seignobos, *Histoire de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 8.

seed of wars and hatreds." [3] Consalvi wrote to Metternich: "Some day the oldest monarchies, abandoned by their defenders, will find themselves at the mercy of low-class schemers, whom today no one deigns to notice with a look of forewarning." [4]

In these circumstances what could be the attitude of the papacy? It could not enslave itself to either of the two movements that were about to divide the world between them. That one which Metternich and Talleyrand had just taken in hand to direct, though in one aspect it responded to the conservative tendencies of the Church, was not inspired by a purely Catholic spirit. If, apart from merely utilitarian considerations, one idea had hovered over the deliberations of the Congress of Vienna, it was that of the Holy Alliance.

This idea was at best of doubtful orthodoxy. It expressly confounded the various ways of being a Christian: that of the czar and that of the king of Prussia. It set down frontiers for the Roman Church, extending its protection to the pope as a temporal ruler while purposely ignoring his title of vicar of Christ. Thus it "ratified, however holy it called itself, the secularization of the diplomatic maxims, and against this attitude Rome protested at the very time of the treaties of Westphalia." [5] The expulsion of the Jesuits, wrung from Emperor Alexander I, the intrigues contrived by Talleyrand to overthrow the Bourbons, and the policy followed by Metternich with regard to the papacy, all would presently show that the Church could not rely on the leaders of the famous congress. She never did put her trust in them. The falsely asserted soli-

[3] J. de Maistre, *Lettres et opuscules inédits,* I, 324.

[4] Consalvi, letter of January 4, 1818, quoted by d'Estampes and Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution,* p. 249. "By a thoughtlessness that would have frightful consequences," says Crétineau-Joly, "the allied sovereigns intended to muzzle the Revolution, and they turned loose the revolutionaries." *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution,* II, 5.

[5] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* I, 313.

darity between the Church and the Holy Alliance, so often exploited by the enemies of Catholicism, is an utter calumny.

On the other hand the liberal movement, as manifested in the first years following the Congress of Vienna, was not such as to inspire the Church with confidence. Soon the anti-Christian sects endeavored to exploit it to their advantage, seeing therein a means of undermining the old monarchies and the principle of authority.[6] We shall see the pope then clearly condemn, so far as it is revolutionary, the insurrection movement which seeks, by unsound principles and by unjust means, to overturn the thrones; in particular he strikes the secret societies, which were treated with too much consideration by the sovereigns.[7] But in all circumstances where justice or religion seemed to him to be involved, he withdrew sharply from the policy of the allied kings. He made some restrictions apropos of the French expedition in Spain; and, notwithstanding the protests of the European sovereigns, he recognized the republics of South America.

The Social Crisis

We have considered the threats to the political order. Now we must consider the causes of trouble threatening the social order. The fall of the Empire, by the very fact that it put an end to the big European wars, had been the starting point of an immense industrial, agricultural, and commercial progress. The invention of the steam engine by Watt, of the miner's lamp by Davy, and of spinning machines by Arkwright, Le-

[6] Cf. L. d'Estampes and Jannet, *op. cit.*, and Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.* The subsequent pages of this volume will, by the presentation of facts, justify the present assertion.

[7] "Every day I speak to the European ambassadors of the future dangers which the secret societies are preparing for the order barely reconstituted, and I perceive that they reply only by manifest indifference." Consalvi, letter to Metternich, January 4, 1818.

noir, Girard, and Jacquart, added a considerable impulse to industry. In a short time the production of cotton thread and fabrics became a thousand times more important, that of iron and steel was increased tenfold, and the English coal mines were actively worked. Big industry was born. Manufacturing on a small scale, which produced only for the near-by markets, disappeared in the face of immense factories, owned by stock-company corporations with negotiable securities, which extended its markets beyond the frontiers of the country where it was located, sometimes to the ends of the earth. Anyone could foresee the importance that city life would assume and the power that would be acquired by the groups of the working population.

On the other hand, the formation and functioning of the vast new enterprises would lead to the associations of capital. From 1818 to 1820 the first large fire insurance companies appeared. In 1821 and 1822, societies were formed to lend the state the funds needed for the building of large canals which were required by the development of commerce. Important transportation companies were formed. Stockholders' shares were bought and sold on the Exchange, where gradually they came to have official quotations. Then came negotiable securities, speculation, stock-jobbing. Confronting the world of workingmen, on the way to grouping and organizing themselves, appeared the world of capitalism, likewise on the way to its organization.

The commercial laws of different countries sometimes made acute the relations between these two social forces. The interest of the big manufacturers is that foreign products be taxed so heavily at their entrance that their price will be higher than that of the national products. At the request of the owners of French iron mills, certain laws of 1814 and 1822 laid heavy taxes on importation of foreign iron. Soon the textile industries were protected by similar measures. But the foreign countries

followed the same system. The English imposed heavy taxes on French wines and alcohols and on articles from Paris. They kept out the silk goods of Lyons.

The producers' interest seemed to be favored by this system of protection. But the interest of the consumer appeared quite other: he wished to buy the best possible products, from wherever they came, at the lowest possible price. Hence arose an antagonism between the capitalists and the workers. In the matter of grain, a French law of 1814 had satisfied the consumers; a law of 1819, inspired by a system practiced in England since the end of the seventeenth century, came to the relief of the producers. It established a sliding scale; that is, it taxed foreign wheat more or less heavily according as the price of native wheat was higher or lower. This system continued, with a few interruptions in its application, until 1861. "In fact, the sliding scale did not succeed in raising the price of wheat, as those who favored it had hoped; it scarcely prevented a price decline, but this relative benefit was dearly paid for by the continual price fluctuations consequent on its application." [8]

This account is a mere summary. But such an epitome of the economic situation at the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century was needed to throw light on the origin of the social crisis which was about to arise at that epoch and to seriously disturb all the European states. However, it does not provide a full explanation. The evil must be looked for in deeper causes. The French Revolution had not only suppressed the former corporations of craftsmen, which procured stability and security for their members along with protection of their common interests. It attacked the very spirit that animated those institutions, that Christian feeling which bound together the employer and the workman in the practice of the same faith,

[8] A. Viallate in *Histoire générale,* X, 465. Cf. A. Foville, *La France économique;* E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France depuis 1789;* Clément, *Histoire du système protecteur en France depuis Colbert.*

in the reception of the same sacraments. In consequence of the change, we witness a selfish and heartless individualism, which looked upon labor, independently of the worker, from the single point of view of its mercantile value.

Further, this individualism removed from property ownership its character of social obligation, which devolved upon it by natural law and by the divine commandment of the Gospel. Hence came the abusive advantage taken of men's labor, the destruction of family life, and the uncertainty of the workingman's subsistence, which was subject to the fluctuations of production.

On the other hand, the state's seizure of Church property in the name of the secularization of society, then in the name of so-called equality the seizure of the property of the nobility, had created dangerous precedents. The collective spoliation, in the name of pretended social principles, was supposed thus to create legitimate titles of ownership. Might not the working class appeal to such reasons to despoil the bourgeois class for its own benefit? The temptation to reason in this way was the stronger as many of the laws passed under the Empire seemed to have been prompted by an exclusive concern for the interests of the middle class.

A law of 1803 had forbidden associations of workingmen, but had nothing to say about associations of employers. Article 1781 of the civil code said: "The employers' word is accepted on his affirmation in the matter of the quota of wages, of the salary payments of the past year, and of the partial payments made during the current year." A law of 1806 had created arbitration boards in 26 cities of France; but the organization of these boards was judged suspect by the workingmen: indeed employers strictly so-called did not constitute more than half of the members of these boards; but the other half, instead of being made up of wage-earners, contained only foremen and "patented workers," that is, small employers. The

working class as a whole regarded all these laws as a sort of reprisal of the bourgeois class against the initiatives of the working class.

The Social Question

Various disturbances were produced at this time. They occurred in the world of big industry and of high finance as also in the world of workers, and led to what is since called the social question. To solve this question various systems were then proposed. These may be classified into three schools: the economist or liberal school, the socialist school, and the Catholic school.

The economists had a spokesman. In his catechism of political economy and his course of political economy, published in 1815, Jean-Baptiste Say, author of a treatise on political economy that had appeared in 1804, became their mouthpiece. For liberal political economy the solution of the social question is in unrestricted competition. Its motto was *"Laissez faire, laissez passer."* In the mind of this school, the right of property is an absolute right, to which no social obligation is attached. The sole title to ownership is labor; questions of interest between employers and workers should be solved and regulated solely by "the law of brass," the law of supply and demand. Lastly, the liberal political economy declares that it is concerned only with the laws of production, distribution, and consumption of wealth; the moral laws are outside its domain. Several of these principles had already been professed by the Englishman, Adam Smith, and the Frenchman, Turgot.

Such a theory was revolting to many of those who were concerned with the sufferings of the popular classes. By its pitiless law of supply and demand, by its doctrine on ownership and its unconcern with the moral law, it appeared to sacrifice the weak to the strong, the poor to the rich, the worker to

the employer. In the name of humaneness, three men (Owen in England, Saint-Simon and Fourier in France) proposed to remedy the evils of the working class by a reorganization of society.

Owen (1771–1858) was the owner of a big cotton factory. He considered that the cure would be found in the substitution of a cooperative system in place of the capitalist system: the workers would group themselves together to produce in common, instead of laboring for the advantage of a capitalist. The attempts to apply this system did, in fact, provoke combinations on the part of the employers and, in spite of Owen's energetic efforts, it failed completely.

A different system was worked out by Saint-Simon (1760–1825). It was gradually set forth in 1803 in his *Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses concitoyens;* in 1818 in his *Vues sur la propriété et la législation;* in 1819 in his famous *Parabole,* which brought some law suits on him; in 1821 in his *Système industriel;* and especially in a work that did not appear until after his death (1825), the *Nouveau christianisme.* This system, the work of a great lord, in turn soldier, industrialist, farmer, journalist, and pamphlet writer, a man who was both a scholar and a philosopher, had loftier and wider claims than the works of Owen. Saint-Simon envisioned the cure for the physical and moral ills of the workers in a double cult: the cult of labor and the cult of fraternity. Ancient times and the Middle Ages, he said, believed that to live nobly was to do nothing, the contrary was the truth: to live nobly is to labor. Antiquity, he added, also wished to make the social order rest on justice. This foundation was sterile and deceptive because justice is often merely the argument of selfishness.

The true basis of social progress is fraternity, he said. By the feeling of fraternity the rich and the powerful, elder brothers of the poor and the weak, stoop toward their younger brethren to raise them up and thus procure "the amelioration,

physical and moral, of the poorest class," the genuine aim of every social organization. Having reached that point, Saint-Simon recognizes that he has joined hands with the Gospel principle: "Love one another." But promptly he departs to the very antipodes of Christianity. Wishing to assure harmony and unity in the cult of labor and fraternity, he declares that science has supplanted religion and that big industry has taken the place of feudalism. Consequently he decides to entrust the spiritual direction of the world to a body of learned men, and its temporal direction to a body of industrialists. But he does not define what he means by these spiritual and temporal directions. Thus we may say that Saint-Simon was, not the first socialist, but a simple forerunner of socialism. By injecting his doctrine into the realm of practical applications, his disciples, Bazard and Enfantin, became real socialists.

This last title cannot be refused to Charles Fourier (1772–1837). In his treatise on the agricultural domestic association, published in 1822, he set forth the principles of a precise doctrine on ownership and labor. Ownership ought to be abolished, for the only reason that it has been adopted, in spite of the evils it introduces, is that it is a stimulant to work. But labor can dispense with this stimulant. Labor becomes natural and attractive as soon as man is let freely to develop his desires and passions, to obey the "passion mechanics," as animal and plant obey their sensitive and vegetative mechanics, thus accomplishing, without shock or disorder, their destinies in the bosom of harmony. This theory would be tried out by the formation of the "phalansteries" [9] and ended up in the same failure as the theories of Owen and Saint-Simon.

The Catholic Church, however, did not remain indifferent to the ills of society. While the faithful were increasing their

[9] This name "phalanstery" was given to the agricultural or industrial establishment in which workers were grouped into phalanxes of from 1,600 to 2,000 persons, there to devote themselves to the attraction of labor.

works of charity to relieve the present miseries, one of her children, Viscount Louis de Bonald (1754–1840), forcefully pointed out the vice from which the social organization was suffering and the liberal theories that pretended to justify it. That vice he showed in the policy and the activity of modern man. Above wealth, Bonald placed the moral formation of man. Hence he preached, among other reforms, a return to agriculture, "which nourishes those whom it has brought forth, whereas industry has brought forth those whom it cannot always nourish." [10] And he urged a return to the Christian corporations "whose destruction philosophy, that universal dissolvant, has persistently pursued under the vain pretext of a competition which has profited neither the upright merchant nor the arts nor the purchasers." [11]

Bonald's political ideas on absolute monarchy are debatable, and his philosophical theory about the origin of language is erroneous. But we cannot deny that, by his specifying, at the very outset of the nineteenth century, the true ends and conditions of social life, he was the forerunner of the Catholic social school.[12]

To complete the sketch of the social movement during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, we must mention an original writer who, on the borders of socialism and Catholic orthodoxy, exercised a notable influence. This man was Pierre-Simon Ballanche (1776–1847). At the beginning of the century Ballanche of Lyons, when only twenty-five years old, published his *Du sentiment considéré dans ses rapports avec la littérature et les arts*. Of this book a certain critic says: "It is an immature *Genius of Christianity,* which appeared before the latter." [13] In the mind of Ballanche, Christanity is the unique basis of all civilization. But at the same time he thinks

[10] Bonald, *Economie sociale; de la famille et due droit d'ainesse.*
[11] Bonald, *Législation primitive,* Part III, chap. 4.
[12] Michel Salomon, *Bonald.*
[13] E. Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes du XIX^e siècle,* p. 139.

that the French Revolution, despite its errors and crimes, was "one of the progressive realizations of Christianity in the social order." Sainte-Beuve, who felt the influence of Ballanche, speaks of him as "a fine soul that had flashes of illumination in the gloom, . . . a genius more than half veiled, whom people did not clearly understand." But he declares that the reading of Ballanche's writings "contributed greatly to inspire a religious breath in the school of Saint-Simon, which was still materialist." He says further: "As a witness of the effect produced by their reading on some of the most vigorous minds of the school, I can affirm how direct and prompt it was."[14] His works were not free of the illusions that mingled in the ideas of several Catholics of the nineteenth century. For these diverse reasons the name of Ballanche must have a place in this history.[15]

Romantic Literature

Along with his good qualities, Ballanche had also his defects. By his vague idealism and his dreamy Christianity, he belonged fully to that romantic movement which, about 1823, blossomed forth in the literature of Europe. Lamartine and Vigny had just created what is called "meditative poetry." Victor Hugo had published his first adolescent verses in which the glories of religion and of the Middle Ages were celebrated with a flourish. Chateaubriand was in the full power of his glory. Classical mythology seemed to be dead. To sing the new themes the old molds had been broken. No more artificial rules. People dreamed of replacing the chords of the lyre by heart-strings.

Such at any rate was the first phase of Romanticism. Chris-

[14] Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, I, 323.

[15] Ballanche's chief works are: *L'essai sur les institutions sociales, Les essais de Palingénésie sociale*, and some poems in prose (*Antigone, Orphé*, etc.), which the author utilized to contain his doctrines. Cf. Guichen, ***La France morale et religieuse à la fin de la Restauration.***

tianity still lighted up its summits. The rationalism, the sickly sensualism, and the oddities of bad taste that marked its second phase, after 1830, had not yet entered it. But already observable was an excess of sentiment to the detriment of the will, and in this feeling the predominance of a depressing gloom. Said Sainte-Beuve: "The nineteenth century, beginning with the idea of the gigantic will of man with which it identified itself, seemed to have of a sudden given up its faculty of willing." [16] Furthermore, the abrupt transition from an epic life to a calm and bourgeois existence left a vague melancholy in men's souls. "Three elements shared the life being offered to the youth: behind them, a past forever destroyed; before them, the dawn of a vast horizon; and between these two, something ill-defined and fluctuating. . . . A feeling of inexpressible unrest began to ferment in young hearts. . . . Like the Asiatic pestilence exhaled from the mists of the Ganges, a frightful despair stalked the earth." [17]

In the philosophical movement could be noted the same soaring toward the ideal and the same uneasiness. The sensualist ideology of Destutt de Tracy, the materialist physiology of Cabanis and Bishat, the irreligious fatalism of Naigeon, no longer satisfied men's souls. "A protest, at first timid, but persistent, and growing stronger from day to day, arose in favor of the spiritualism and the upright morality of the school of Laromiguière, Maine de Biran, and Royer-Collard. With them the intellect recovered the consciousness of its spontaneity, of its effort, and of its resistence to the material world and the passions." [18]

Unfortunately another trend set in. In a current of ideas that came from the extreme north of Germany, from that country where Pravdinsk, Sovetsk, and Tilsit bore high wit-

[16] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, I, 134.
[17] A. de Musset, *Confessions d'un enfant du siècle,* pp. 9–20.
[18] J. Didiot, in *Un siècle,* p. 373.

ness to the victories of France, that good movement encountered the poison which would paralyze its generous aspiration. Kant's *Critique* made an appeal to those who were seeking to reconstruct their beliefs, and offered them the means of bringing about, at least in appearance, that intellectual and moral restoration with purely subjective elements. The painful labor of an objective reconstruction was spared them. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel followed up the work of Kant. Something mystical and undefined, like the northern fogs, added an additional charm to those doctrines in the eyes of men of that time. Victor Cousin, after his visit to Germany in 1817, colored his eclecticism with a Kantian tint. Conservative minds at first tried to oppose this current by a Cartesianism supplemented by Scottish philosophy. Others, like Bonald, attempted to oppose it by an exaggerated traditionalism.

In 1823 Lamennais, in his *Essay on Indifference,* gave this doctrine the luster of his great talent. According to him, the consensus of mankind on a moral doctrine was the supreme and, everything considered, the sole guaranty that we can have against error. Lamennais did, indeed, then believe that the Catholic Church was the concrete and living incarnation of men's general belief and thereby he thought to save both the cause of religion and that of reason. But thoughtful minds already denounced the errors of this too narrow and absolute doctrine, which would lead its unfortunate author toward that same abyss of pantheism which the heirs of Kant had already reached. The danger was the more serious as Kantian criticism, overstepping the bounds of the purely philosophical sciences, was visibly exerting its influence in the realm of religious beliefs. At first Protestantism, then Catholicism itself, felt the harmful influence.

A double effort was made by Schleiermacher and Hegel. Their attempt to reconcile Protestant theology with the German philosophy resulted merely in impregnating it with sub-

jectivism and pantheism. Said Schleiermacher: "Religion is only the inner sense of contact with God," and he held that faith, thus understood, created theology, instead of faith being formulated by theology. For Hegel, religion was nothing more than "God's awareness of Himself in the finite being." He eventually maintained that Christianity and Hegelianism had the same contents; all that differed was the form.[19]

We see the destructive consequences of such doctrine. A just comment has been made that,

> if religion is nothing more than a matter of consciousness, the history of a religion will be, quite simply, the history of the developments of the religious consciousness. . . . The Hebrew religion, for example, will be regarded as a product of the Hebrew people. It will be treated, a priori, as if it were not a revealed fact, external and superior to Israel; it will be considered the creation of Israel. But Israel cannot have made its religion in the way the Old Testament relates, for there has been no people in whom the religious consciousness was awakened in such a fashion. Hence come the hypotheses about the writings of the Bible, their date, their succession, the artifice of their composition.[20]

The historical criticism of Strauss, Baur, Renan, and Harnach is the victim of these religious theories.

German Catholicism did not escape from this influence. A professor of theology in the faculty of Bonn, George Hermes (1775–1831) expressed, first in 1805, in his *Untersuchung über die innere Wahrheit des Christentums,* then in 1819 in his *Philosophische Einleitung,* the idea of a new apologetic which, neglecting the role of grace in the production of the act of faith, made it a product of the "practical reason," understood in Kant's sense. For Hermes the historical facts,

[19] On Hegel's blasphemies against Catholic dogmas and practices in general, and against the Eucharist in particular, see Saint-Hilaire, *Victor Cousin,* I, 334; III, 373; and Victor Cousin in *La Revue des Deux Mondes,* August 1, 1866, p. 617. On the religious doctrines of Schleiermacher and Hegel, cf. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Protestantisme,* pp. 78–93; *le Catholicisme,* II, 81.

[20] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Protestantisme,* pp. 89–91.

proved true by the history of an external truth, become "internally true" only by the adherence of the practical reason. The commandments of God acquire obligatory force only after being recognized, in consequence of an examination, as comformable to the practical reason.[21] Such a system contained in germ the worst doctrines of modernism.

The Secret Societies

These theories were professed, taught, and spread openly. Against them the Church was able easily to fortify herself. The same was not true of various subversive religious and social ideas that were being spread in the secret societies. Whether the crimes of the revolutionary impiety had discredited the Masonic program,[22] or whether the powerful hand of Napoleon, by making it the instrument of his designs, had sapped the vigor of its autonomy,[23] for the time being it lost, to a great extent, its anti-Christian character. While Napoleon in France was filling the lodges with his agents and was making of the lodges centers of imperialist propaganda, the German and Italian lodges set about inflaming the people against the French Empire and against Austria respectively. But, about 1811, the famous society seemed to reorganize itself on new bases, resuming its old spirit.[24]

To what extent did the Tugendbund of Germany and the Carbonarism of Italy and France belong to Freemasonry? Were they, strictly speaking, ramifications of it? Were they connected with it merely by more or less close bonds of affiliation? We cannot answer these questions with precision. What

[21] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le Catholicisme,* II, 2–12.

[22] Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société,* II, 221.

[23] "Masonry," said Napoleon, "if under my patronage, is not something to be dreaded. As it exists today, it depends on me; I do not depend on it." See Max Doumic, *Le secret de la franc-maçonnerie,* p. 199.

[24] Deschamps, *op. cit.,* p. 222.

is certain is that the revolutionary movement that took place in Europe from 1815 to 1823 came about especially by these three associations.

We are well informed about the Tugendbund ("association of virtue"). We learn its history especially from the works of a Protestant writer, Ed. Em. Eckert,[25] and from the controversial writings which those works aroused in Germany. This society was founded in 1807 by Baron von Stein, minister of the interior at Berlin, for the avowed purpose of hastening the fall of the Napoleonic empire and replacing it by a great and unified Germany under the direction of Prussia and the Masonic principles of the Revolution. In a thoroughly German phraseology, we see philosophy, philology, and natural science presented as forming the Trinity on which the German Church of the future would be founded. In their university chairs and in their books the leaders of the Tugendbund insisted on the moral teachings of Christianity, but they presented the dogmas as a symbol in such a way as to join in German patriotism both unbelief and faith.[26]

Fichte succeeded Baron von Stein as head of the association. He declared: "Society cannot allow its powers to be abused for purposes that are alien to it; it wishes to employ them for aims chosen by itself." In the final analysis the battle was fought in favor of those who devote themselves to the deliverance of the human spirit. In the political order the Tugendbund, at first favorable to the King of Prussia, turned against him when he refused to grant certain rights promised to the members; it then uttered threats and prepared revolts. In the moral and religious order it secretly opposed Christian dogmas.

[25] Eckert's book on the organization of Freemasonry supplies documents on German Masonry. Cf. his *Magazin der Beweisführung für des Freimaurer-Ordens.* Eckert's works were made use of by Father Gyr in his *La Franc-Maçonnerie en elle-même et dans ses rapports avec les autres sociétés secrètes de l'Europe.*

[26] Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 222.

Organized in two sections, the Männerbund ("society of men") and the Jünglingsbund ("society of youth"), it comprised a mysterious hierarchy, with its graduated secrets and revelations that kept growing in boldness.[27] Several members of the university and of the army belonged to the Tugendbund. Eckert has shown that a considerable number of the societies that were made up of the German youth after 1815, such as the *Deutsche Turnschaft* and the *Allgemeine deutsche Burschenschaft,* were penetrated with the spirit of the Tugendbund. This spirit, as its defenders acknowledged, was nothing but the spirit of the Masonic lodges.[28] A document found in the French national archives and published in 1913 by Léonce Frasilier, has demonstrted that the influence of the German secret societies penetrated France by an intermediate center established at Coppet; its chief directors were Madame de Staël and Benjamin Constant.[29] Evidently this penetration preceded that of Italian Carbonarism, which exercised an important influence on the French secret societies.

Like the German Tugendbund, Italian Carbonarism was born at the time of the French domination. If we accept what is said by Crétineau-Joly, who saw the documents which Pope Leo XII had gathered on the secret societies, "Carbonarism, in Calabria and Sicily, sprang from a deeply monarchical thought and, during the first years of the nineteenth century, it offered to its founder, Queen Caroline of Naples, promises of unquestionable fidelity." [30] But the very mystery with which the society enveloped itself, the influence exercised there by certain Englishmen who were imbued with Masonic principles

[27] Gyr, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

[28] In a pamphlet against Eckert, we read: "Everyone knows that to the Masonic lodges is due the birth of most of the societies that have raised up the defeated nations." *Défense de l'ordre maçonnique contre les attaques de l'avocat E. Eckert.*

[29] Simon Duplay, *Mémoire sur les sociétés et les conspirations sous la Restauration.* For the entrance of the German societies into France, see Grasilier's article in *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes* (March, 1913, pp. 51–54).

[30] Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 78.

and all-powerful at the court of Sicily,[31] made it little by little deviate toward revolutionary ideas. One of its principles was that the actual forms of the Church and of states were old forms, destined to give way to organizations founded on the single basis of "nature."

The members used to meet ordinarily in the Abruzzi forests, frequented by the charcoal-burners (*carbonari*). From these they took their name and their principal emblems, as the Masons had taken theirs from the art of building. They were divided into various groups, called *venditas* (huts), analogous to the Masonic lodges. But, whereas the Masons professed to reject all supernatural revelation, the Carbonari, the better to win over the religious population of Italy, put their basis, at least in appearance, on Christianity.[32]

Under the threat of dire penalties, secrecy was required of the members. A special tribunal sat in judgment on infractions of this law; rarely did a delinquent escape from the vengeance of the sect. The bonds attaching Carbonarism with Masonry have been avowed by the Masons; but many of them, humiliated by the bloody deeds of their Italian brethren, have wished to see in them only degenerate sons of the great sect. Wrote the Freemason Blumenhagen: "The Carbonari ostensibly wear the drawn dagger to be used against the foes of the light. The bloody wounds of Sicily are not yet healed. The corpses of slain citizens bear witness against them. Their mere name ought to recall to an instructed Mason to what a degree of degeneration certain sects of our society can descend." [33] In 1818 Carbonarism established one of its huts at Macerata, in the very States of the Church, and several others in Lombardy.

Consalvi's penetrating mind had perceived the danger and,

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] See the ritual for the reception of the Grand Master of the Carbonari in Gyr, *op. cit.*, pp. 381–418.

[33] Blumenhagen, "Confession politique" in the *Revue Maçonnique* of 1828, p. 320.

as early as January 4, 1818, the eminent statesman pointed out this danger to the courts of Europe. But his warning was unheeded. Then, to combat the intrigues of the sect, he favored an "Association of Catholic Friendship," founded by the Count de Maistre. But King Charles Felix considered it a danger to the state. The Austrian government showed less distrust of the Carbonari's huts than it did of a "League of Religious Defense" which Cardinal Pacca and the Jesuits had attempted to found in Lombardy.[34]

In 1821 Carbonarism was established in France, where the German sects had already penetrated.[35] The center of its expansion was a Parisian club called the *Amis de la vérité,* founded by four clerks of the customs administration: Bazard, Flottard, Buchez, and Joubert.[36] "Wonderfully fitting for the Italian character, but not proper to become in France a code of plotters (because of some Christian appearance, necessary in Italy), consideration should be given to the idea of modifying the statutes. . . . The dominant idea of the society had in it nothing precise. The preamble merely decreed the national sovereignty without defining it, following the spirit of Italian Carbonarism. The vaguer the formula was, the better it responded to the diversity of sentiments and hatreds." [37] Further, at the side of the chief hut, central huts, and particular

[34] Cf. Cavalotti, "Memorie sulle società segrete dell'Italia meridionale e specialmente sui carbonari," from the *Bibliotheca storica del Risorgimento italiano,* and a police report of 1822, published by Grasilier in the *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes,* June 5, 1913, pp. 1770 ff. See also Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia.*

[35] According to a police report of 1823, "The statutes of the various German affiliations seem to have served as types for the regulations adopted by the French associations, before the latter were acquainted with the name Carbonari. Of little importance is an inquiry into the changes which the Italian societies made in the first plans taken from the German societies. But that they are owing to Germany is not without interest." *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes,* March 5, 1913, p. 525.

[36] Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans,* I, 82.

[37] Louis Blanc, *op. cit.,* I, 92. Cf. Deschamps, *op. cit.,* II, 237.

huts, it would have for the army the "legion," the "cohorts," the "centuries," and the "maniples." In the writing of a Masonic historian of the Restoration, we read:

> At that time a parliamentary committee (of Carbonarism) existed. Lafayette belonged to it. . . . Provided with letters of recommendation, several young men went into the departments to organize the Carbonari. . . . The seduction was general, irresistible. Almost throughout all France were plots and conspirators. Matters reached the point that, in the last days of 1821, all was ready for an uprising at La Rochelle, Poitiers, Niort, Colmar, Neuf-Brisach, Nantes, Belfort, Bordeaux, and Toulouse. Huts had been formed in a large number of regiments; even the changes of garrisons were for the Carbonari a speedy means of propaganda.[38]

The French Carbonari from that time fused with Freemasonry.[39] Louis XVIII thought a good policy would be to treat with the lodges, even to submit to their influence.[40] Likewise we see the Voltairian ideas rapidly invade France, where they were popularized by Courier in his pamphlets and by Béranger in his songs. We merely recall that between 1817 and 1824 twelve editions of Voltaire and thirteen of Rousseau appeared. Of the former 316,000 copies were issued, of the latter 240,000. The strife against the "priests' party," as people called it, was the fruit of this propaganda; it would last as long as the Restoration and would succeed in wringing from King Charles X in 1828 the expulsion of the Jesuits.[41]

[38] A. de Vaulabelle, *Histoire des deux Restaurations,* V, 148, 151. On the action of the Carbonari in the various plots of that period, see Guillon, *Les complots militaires sous l'empire et la Restauration;* and *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes,* 1913, pp. 526–54. A so-called *Histoire des sociétés de l'armée,* published by Charles Nodier, is a product of the imagination.

[39] See the testimony of the Masonic historian, Jean de Witt, *Mémoires secrèts,* p. 6.

[40] Deschamps, *op. cit.,* II, 225. See also *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique,* II, 111.

[41] Thureau-Dangin, *Le parti libéral sous la Restauration.*

CHAPTER II

The Forces of the Church

To WARD off the various perils that we have just indicated, what were the forces of the Church? Since the coming of Louis XVIII these forces had grown in spite of every influence to the contrary. In vain the King of France seemed to favor the Voltairian ideas, showed himself favorable to the secret societies, and to gratify them entrusted the care of his government to four renegades from their clerical vocation: Talleyrand, Pradt, Montesquieu, and Louis.[1] In the eyes of all, his coming was no less the signal of a religious renaissance; the political restoration of the Bourbons appeared inseparable from a Catholic restoration. After the Revolution, which had persecuted them with violence, and the Empire, which had oppressed them while wishing to make use of them, the clergy of France, as a whole, had acclaimed the return of the Most Christian King with feelings of lofty confidence.[2]

Under Louis XVIII France had a religious renaissance. The stimulation of French missions, the increase in the number of religious institutes, the influence exercised by the Congregation, the development of Catholic schools, works of piety, zeal, and charity, the penetration of the Christian spirit in literature and the arts, though more superficial than deep, but real and efficacious: such were the first manifestations of that renais-

[1] Crétineau-Joly, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution,* II, 2.

[2] In the first number of the *Ami de la religion* (April 20, 1814) Michel Picot wrote as the spokesman of the French clergy, greeting "that family which had given St. Louis to France . . . and which Heaven seemed to hold in reserve to lead it to our aid when the time marked by its decrees at length arrives."

sance. A like movement occurred at the same time in Italy, Germany, and England.

Parish Missions

The *Ami de la religion* was the organ of the French clergy. It published (January, 1815) the following notice:

A number of ecclesiastics are deeply moved by the privation of spiritual helps owing to the scarcity of pastors in some of our provinces. In accord with the wishes of the bishops, they have joined together to form an organization with the chief purpose of giving missions and training missioners for the interior of France. This organization, one of the first fruits of the freedom at length rendered to the sacred word, should interest all the friends of religion and make their hopes come true. . . . Fathers Rauzan, Legris-Duval, and Forbin-Janson are at the head of the organization.[3]

The names of the three directors of the new work were guaranties of success. Father Rauzan (1757–1847), born at Bordeaux, was one of the most venerable priests of the Church of France. Successively vicar and director of a minor seminary in his native diocese, then obliged to expatriate himself during the revolutionary turmoil, he had left everywhere the renown of a learned priest, zealous and charitable; his serious and apostolic eloquence was full of force and unction. After the concordat, Cardinal Fesch, archbishop of Lyons, struck by the priest's outstanding qualities, appealed to his zeal for the founding of a school of higher studies and of sacred eloquence in the episcopal city. But an imperial decree (December 26, 1809), suppressing all the mission establishments in France, did not permit the celebrated prelate's project to materialize. Father Rauzan merely profited by all the occasions offered him to announce the

[3] *Ami de la religion,* 1815, p. 95. In its next number this journal, returning to the subject, added that the new work received the encouragement of the King. *Ibid.,* p. 107.

truths of religion to the people. Discarding the poetical forms by which Chateaubriand championed the Christian religion against the sarcasms of Voltaire, and also the powerful argumentation with which Bonald and De Maistre refuted the sophisms of Rousseau, the new missioner sought his models rather in Vincent Ferrier, Francis Regis, Vincent de Paul, and Bridaine. King Louis XVIII, whom he had accompanied to Gand, appointed him his chaplain; but he thought only of undertaking in France a work of popular evangelization.

At this period divine Providence put him in touch with a holy Breton priest who regarded no work of zeal as alien, Father Legris-Duval (1765–1819). He was born in the diocese of Saint-Pol de Léon and was ordained priest in 1790. He did not have to exile himself because, not yet having received an appointment, he was not obliged to take the constitutional oath. The young priest took advantage of this providential immunity to exercise, during the Revolution, a tireless apostolate in Paris, especially for those condemned to death, whom he accompanied to the scaffold. Helped by Countess de Carcado and by Madame de Saisseval, he founded, for the children of victims of the Terror, that work, Orphans of the Revolution, which, the first of the works of the nineteenth century, was a sort of connection between the charitable institutions of the Ancient Regime and those of the Modern Regime.

While the two apostles were exchanging their views, they met a zealous young man. In order to give himself unreservedly to the apostolate, he had generously renounced the temporal advantages of a high birth, immense fortune, and a princely education. This man was Father Forbin-Janson (1785–1844). Like Father Legris-Duval, in the St. Sulpice seminary and catechism classes he had been trained in habits of zeal. At Paris he devoted himself to all manner of good works, heeding God's call to a more definite apostolate.

A complete accord of views was promptly established among

the three priests. Then they were joined by a few companions. A little house on rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs was the cradle of the new community, which took the name of House of the Missioners of France. Soon it had as patrons Father Frayssinous, already celebrated for his conferences of St. Sulpice, and Father Liautard, who had founded the establishment destined to become famous as Stanislaus College. The material needs of the new work were provided by a committee of ladies, among whom were Princess de Montmorency, Countess de la Bouillerie, the Marchioness de Croisy, and Viscountess de Vaudreuil.

God blessed the pious institution. In a few years three hundred cities had the gospel preached to them by the devoted missioners. They were received in Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Nantes, Bordeaux, and Montpellier, the most populous cities and the ones most filled with the rationalist ideas, with the same enthusiasm as in the humble villages. Often the missioners, upon reaching a city, found hindrances cleverly contrived against them. But eight days of missionary preaching were enough to dissipate these difficulties. The churches re-echoed with popular hymns and acclamations; long processions were organized; crosses, which everyone wished to help carry, were borne triumphantly through the streets, pausing by way of expiation, at the spots where the revolutionary scaffolds had been erected. Triumphal arches were set up at certain intervals along the route; the houses were adorned with tapestries; flags hung from the windows. In several parishes the town officials took part in a body in the religious manifestation. A detachment of cavalry opened the procession; salvos of artillery announced the opening and closing of the ceremony. In some cities of the south, at the foot of a cross, touching dialogues occurred between the preacher and the crowd. At Toulon, Father Rauzan exclaimed: "Before this cross your enmities have been extinguished. . . . Your missioners need something

more. You must love your enemies." "Yes, yes," shouted a thousand voices. "You will love them henceforth. You will form but one people of brethren."

Inevitably some excesses occurred. Immoderate words were uttered here and there; in some places the pressure of the civil authority was exercised more or less indiscreetly over the people; the name of the King was sometimes mingled with the name of God in the popular acclaims. In fact, such occurrences did take place in several places. Men who remained unfriendly or indifferent did indeed point to these manifestations, exaggerating and distorting them, when they blamed the French missions. In reality, what exasperated the unbelievers was especially the religious success of these great outbursts.[4]

In defense of the missions an eloquent voice was raised, the voice of Lamennais:

When Christ appeared on earth, He began a great mission which has continued for eighteen centuries and, though often hindered, was always triumphant and will end only with the end of mankind. . . . Some have asked whether France was, then, peopled with idolaters that it needed to have missioners sent from city to city to announce the faith. We hear endlessly repeated that Christianity is dead; and as soon as a priest opens his mouth to announce its teaching to the people, some cry out: "Of what use? None but Christians are here." Moreover, I care little on which of these two statements you insist. If we no longer have any Christianity, missions are needed to restore it; if the people are Christian, missions are needed to prevent them from falling away. But the missions inflict harm on the liberty of the Protestants, disturbing them. . . . A singular claim, to deprive 25,000,000 citizens of religious liberty in order to assure that liberty to a small number, which no one is attacking! Cannot the Protestants have their liberty except on condition that we be chained? . . . It would indeed

[4] We find an echo of these bitter and unjust charges in Vaulabelle, *Histoire des deux Restaurations,* IV, 425–28. The historian's picture of the missions is a caricature. More authentic documents will be found in the reports issued at the close of these missions. Therein the writers are unbounded in their enthusiasm.

be strange that, when antisocial doctrines have everywhere their organs, Christianity should alone be forced to remain mute![5]

New Religious Congregations

Other congregations sprang up. The Society of the Missionaries of France was not the only religious congregation which, since the restoration of the Bourbons, was devoted to the Catholic regeneration of France. The Trappists, the Vincentians, the priests of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and the Picpus fathers of the Sacred Hearts resumed and developed their former and recent works. At this same time Father Chaminade founded the institute of the Daughters of Mary and the Society of the Marianists, Fathers Collin and Champagnat were laying the foundation of the Congregation of the Marists, Father Mazenod was establishing the Society of Oblates of Mary Immaculate. The Society of Jesus, canonically reconstituted for the universal Church by the bull *Sollicitudo* (August 7, 1814), was preparing for its return into France by the pious associations of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart and the Fathers of the Faith.

Under stress of the revolutionary tempest, Father Chaminade was exiled to Saragossa. There, in the venerated shrine of Notre Dame del Pilar, he felt burning within him the flame of the apostolate which made him take for his motto these words, that became the inspiration of his whole life: "Let us form Christian apostles." His soul's desire was realized when, sixteen years later, he was able at Agen, with the cooperation of a devoted Christian, Mlle de Trenquelléon, to found a commu-

[5] Lamennais, *Mélanges,* Vol. I, *Des missions.* On the missions, see Delaporte, *Vie du R. P. Rauzan.* Father Lacordaire, in his *Eloge funèbre de Mgr de Forbin-Janson* (*Œuvres,* VIII, 75–114) exaggerates Father Forbin-Janson's part in the foundation of the work of the French missions; their real founder was Father Rauzan. Some new details on the French missions will be found in Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France, histoire d'un siècle,* I, 86–89.

nity of "little missioners." Its motto was "the increase of Christians." A year after that, in conjunction with a holy priest, Father Lalanne, he founded a society made up of priests and laymen, with the purpose of pursuing the same apostolic aim, "to increase true Christians" by all the means that the providential circumstances should make opportune. In 1823 the two societies founded by William Chaminade conducted only some free schools, some workshops, and some boarding-schools in the south of France and in Franche-Comté. But their holy founder continually urged them to be ready, for the purpose of making Christians, to go to the ends of the earth. His views became a reality and, shortly after his death, his work had off-shoots in all parts of the world.[6]

In 1816 Chaminade laid the first foundations of a society of Mary, whose members would bear the name of Marianists. At that same time a group of students in the Lyons seminary enthusiastically welcomed the project, manifested by one of them, of founding a body of religious devoted to the Blessed Virgin, which would likewise bear the title of Society of Mary. Thus began two new religious congregations: the Little Brothers of Mary, or Marist Brothers, founded the same year by Father Marcellin Champagnat,[7] and the Marist Fathers, who did not begin to organize until 1823, under the direction of Father Jean-Claude Colin (1790–1836).[8] Like the Marianists, the Marists were soon swarming even to the antipodes; they would furnish Oceania with vicars apostolic and martyrs.

Father Mazenod (1782–1861) was descended from one of the highest families of Provence. At first he directed the aspirations of his zeal toward the distant missions. Then, upon the return of the emigration, he was in a position to see the religious condition of France. He felt that, after becoming a priest,

[6] Simler, *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade;* H. Rousseau, *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade.*

[7] See *Vie du V. Père Champagnat.*

[8] See *Le R. P. Colin* by a member of the Society of Mary.

he had no need to seek the infidels beyond the sea. As he says in the preface to the constitutions of his congregation, he saw that "such were the wickedness and corruption of the Christians that the condition of most of them was worse than that of paganism before the cross overthrew the idols." [9] Following his ordination to the priesthood, as a young curate at Arles he formed the plan of a society of priests devoted to the apostolate of the country districts.[10] In February, 1816, his idea began to see its realization. It gradually took shape by the evangelization of the principal districts of Provence; it would be crowned by the solemn approbation given by Leo XII (February 17, 1828) to the rules of the Institute of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

The new institutes met with opposition. More than once the revolutionary impiety, by its journalists, its pamphlet writers, and its statesmen, some of whom were close to the throne, denounced these new foundations, pretending to point out in them political activity of the "priests' party." But attention was directed to the celebrated Society of Jesus, which had been proscribed by most of the European states in the eighteenth century and which had already returned to Sardinia, Naples, England, and Switzerland. Would the restoration of the Most Christian King enable it to return also to France? If it should attempt to do so, what would be the attitude of the government?

We are told that in 1815, after the battle of Waterloo, Prince Talleyrand, president of the Council, even ventured to express his opinion to King Louis XVIII. "Sire," he said, "Your Majesty hopes to remain at the Tuileries. But you have urgent need to secure the necessary supports. . . . I propose to you the legal reconstitution of the Society of Jesus." [11] We cannot be

[9] Preface to the Constitutions of the Oblates.

[10] Letter of October 15, 1815, in Rambert, *Vie de Mgr de Mazenod*, I, 165.

[11] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, VI, 127.

mistaken about the motives that dictated such a proposal: they were of an exclusively political order. As in the interval Talleyrand fell from power, the project was not taken up. But the question was not thereby suppressed. It presented itself to the mind of the authority the more pressingly as it resulted, not from more or less vague proposals, but from continual and precise facts that had to be elucidated.

First, several bishops, by virtue of a royal ordinance (October 5, 1814) [12] which made the minor seminaries subject to them, had called Jesuits to teach in them. The Jesuits, like other priests subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops and to the laws of the realm, receiving from the bishops merely the power to preach, to hear confessions, and to teach, were content to follow, in their internal life, the rule of St. Ignatius. They did not have nor did they ask for civil recognition as a corporate body; as individuals they merely claimed the rights of citizens and of French priests.[13] Certain court decisions, sanctioned by a royal edict, had indeed abolished the Society of Jesus in France. But had not these decisions been virtually abolished by the concordat of 1801 and especially by the charter of 1814, establishing in its fifth article the freedom of worship?

Protestant England and America, which had similar constitutional laws, interpreted them broadly in the sense of freedom, with regard to the members of the Society of Jesus, which was established there in analogous conditions. Would the government of the Most Christian King show itself less well disposed with regard to religious whose Supreme Pontiff had just officially recognized the institute? In fact, the government of the Restoration did not enter into the question of approving or disturbing the Jesuits, who carried on their work in the minor

[12] This ordinance was not published in the *Bulletin des lois;* it will be found in Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.,* VI, 131.

[13] Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.,* p. 132.

seminaries in the conditions we have just set forth. But the entrance of the Society of Jesus into France was accomplished at the same time by another route.

This was brought about in 1784 by two young priests. Students of the St. Sulpice seminary, emigrants in the Low Countries, Charles de Broglie and Léonor de Tournély, joined two young men recently retired from the army of Conde: Xavier de Tournély, brother of the preceding, and Pierre Leblanc. Both of them wished to perpetuate the traditions of the Society of Jesus, at that time suppressed; they resolved to revive it under another form. For this purpose they founded a society which they called the Society of the Sacred Heart. A few months later they added a new member to their number, Joseph Varin de Solmon, the son of a counsellor to the parliament of Franche-Comté, formerly a fellow student with de Broglie and Tournély at St. Sulpice. After the turmoil of 1789 he too entered the military service in the army of Prince Condé. Like his seminary friends, he was of angelic piety, enthusiastic and brave, like his former comrades in arms. Joseph Varin soon became the soul of the young company. Father Emery, having had occasion to meet the little group during a journey after his release from prison in 1796, expressed his admiration in these words: "These young men live like saints. They are turning over in their heads plans that are most astonishing as they are also altogether holy. I admire their faith and their courage." [14]

Three years later (April, 1799) the Society of the Sacred Heart merged with a society of the Fathers of the Faith, which an Italian priest, Father Paccanari, had founded at Rome in 1797 with the same view of preparing for the reconstitution of the Society of Jesus. Under the direction of Father Paccanari, then of Father Varin, the society of Fathers of the Faith increased its apostolic works. Dillingen, Augsburg, Paderborn, Berlin, Amsterdam, Moravia, Italy, Switzerland, England, and

[14] J. Emery, Letter to Father Courtade, August 28, 1796.

France were the theater of their labors. Lamartine, recalling the Fathers of the Faith, who had been his boyhood teachers at the college of Belley, wrote: "There I saw what could be made of men, not by constraining them, but by inspiring them. . . . Fathers Debrosse, Varlet, Béquet, Wrintz, my friends rather than my teachers, remain always in my memory as models of holiness, vigilance, fatherliness, tenderness, and grace for their pupils." [15] Not satisfied with applying to the education of young men the tried methods of the Society of Jesus, Father Varin made use of those methods in the religious training of young women by founding in 1800, with the help of Madeleine Sophie Barat, the institute of the Madames of the Sacred Heart.

The decree dissolving the society of Fathers of the Faith, which Napoleon issued on November 2, 1807, brought about the dispersion of its members, but not the ruin of their apostolate, which increased in different dioceses and there made known the true spirit of St. Ignatius and increased the seeds of vocation. So fruitful was this zeal that, even before the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum,* which re-established the Society of Jesus throughout the world, a considerable number of the Fathers of the Faith and of their disciples joined the Society where it had already been authorized. Father Varin, admitted to the solemn profession of his religious vows on August 15, 1818, was appointed superior of the house in Paris in October of the same year. He would continue to hold this office until 1853, except for an interval from 1821 to 1825.[16]

The Congregation

The Fathers of the Faith had not been Jesuits, but they were ready to become so at the first opportunity.[17] Meanwhile they

[15] Lamartine, *Confidences,* Bk. VI, notes 2, 3, 4.

[16] Guidée, *Vie du P. Varin.*

[17] A. Brou, *Les Jésuites de la légende,* II, 174. For the origin of the Congregation, see Burnichon, *op. cit.,* I, 115–35.

continually sought to further by their efforts the works founded by the Jesuits or prompted by their spirit. Such was the famous work which, instituted by a former Jesuit in 1801, Father Bourdier-Delpuits, after a quiet development despite the iron hand that was governing France, had a rapid growth at the return of the Bourbons. It spread in all directions, filled the country with centers of faith, prayer, and action, and at once aroused on the part of the anti-Christians such attacks and calumnies that its name is, in the world of unbelievers, a mysterious bugbear: the Congregation.

What is the Congregation? The person that uttered the first cry of alarm was Count de Montlosier, who, in a celebrated *Mémoire,* answered the question thus: "I find as great difficulty in saying precisely what it is as I do in showing how in the past it was successively formed, spread, and organized." [18] Numerous exact documents, brought to light by contemporary scholarship, allow us to answer more precisely.

Many young men were flocking to Paris for study. In 1801, a secularized Jesuit, Father Delpuits (1736–1811), wishing to protect the faith and the virtue of these youth, gathered them into a pious association, taking as its model the statutes of the congregations of the Blessed Virgin in use in the Jesuit schools, then among their former students, since the middle of the seventeenth century. These associations of piety and good works, whose regulations had nothing mysterious about them, had been praised by several popes, notably by Benedict XIV.[19] The meetings were held every two weeks, their sole aim being the edification of their members. Little by little the society developed. To the students were added some business men. At the end of 1805, when Pius VII came to Paris, the Congregation counted 180 members. The Pope authorized it to receive provincial congregations. In 1808 it admitted to membership two

[18] Montlosier, *Mémoire à consulter.*

[19] Bull *Gloriosae Dominae,* September 27, 1748.

learned men of the highest merit: the geometrician Cauchy and the physician Biot. The Congregation drew down the wrath of the Emperor by favoring the publication of the bull that excommunicated the despoilers of the Holy See. In 1809 the members of the Congregation had to disperse. Father Delpuits, weighed down by age and smitten by the events, was obliged to take a well-deserved rest. Lacordaire, speaking of this holy priest, says: "Others have acquired more glory in their dealings with the youth of France: none has better deserved it." [20]

Upon the restoration of the Bourbons, the Congregation saw a new era open up. The newly reconstituted society received members in throngs. Among these we note the following: Prince de Polignac who had just returned from exile, Father Eliçagaray (rector of the University of Pau), Colonel de Montaut (master of the pages of Monsieur), Duke de Bourbon, the Count d'Artois, and the King himself. The king's membership was, indeed, a mere formality of sympathy.

Since the withdrawal of Father Delpuits the society had been provisionally directed by Father Legris-Duval. In the month of August, 1814, it passed to the direction of Father Ronsin, formerly one of the Fathers of the Faith. Like many of his brethren in religion, he had just entered the Society of Jesus. For fifteen years Pierre Ronsin administered the Congregation with a zeal that won the admiration of the Catholics and the most impassioned attacks of the liberals. He was born at Soissons in 1771. Although lacking the alertness of Father Delpuits and the eloquence of Father Legris-Duval, and having modest externals, he soon revealed his intelligent devotion to the work and his tireless energy.

With him a new phase began for the Congregation. While not abandoning the society's first aim of mutual edification, he was much engaged in remedying the physical and moral destitution from which the people of Paris were suffering. At that time the

[20] Lacordaire, *Eloge funèbre de Mgr de Forbin-Janson* (*Œuvres*, VIII, 88).

Congregation, by its organization and its works, recalled the celebrated Company of the Blessed Sacrament, founded in the seventeenth century. Many good works were directed by members of the Congregation under the inspiration of Father Ronsin. These included the Society of Good Works, presided over by Charles de Lavau, which devoted its labor to the relief of the sick and of prisoners and to the patronage of the little Savoyards, the Work of Orphans' Apprenticeship, the Work of Debtor Prisoners, the Work of the Orphans of the Revolution, the Work of the Soup Kitchens, the Work of the Schoolteachers, the Association of St. Joseph for finding jobs for workmen, the House of St. Nicholas for abandoned children, the Society of Good Letters, founded in 1821 under the patronage of Chateaubriand, the Society of Good Studies, formed in 1823, the Society of Good Books, created in 1824.[21]

The convert-making character which the Congregation assumed drew attention to it more and more. Contemporary journalism was born. This form was no longer the annalist, anecdotal journalism which the Ancient Regime knew. It was already that blustering, turbulent journalism of modern times, aspiring to the role of a public power, feeling itself capable of directing the currents of opinion and at need of creating them. The revolutionary press of the period between 1817 and 1830 cannot be reproached with venality; rarely did it make a traffic of its views. But "apart from this justly deserved merit, we must say that it pushed the cynacism of falsehood as far as possible." [22] To seize upon public opinion and to stir it, a sinister word enveloped in mystery was needed. The word "Jesuit" had already been exploited by Pascal. The journalism of the time again used the word for the same purpose, and it added "Congregationist." Says Viel-Castel in his *Histoire des deux Res-*

[21] See Grandmaison, *La Congrégation.*

[22] Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, VI, 147.

taurations,[23] "The words 'Jesuit' and 'Congregationist' became powerful weapons in the hands of the opposition to discredit its adversaries and to ruin their standing." [24] Later we shall see the consequences of this campaign.

Catholic Schools

The fathers of the Society of Jesus increased their works of zeal and charity through the Congregation. But they were not unmindful of the work which, under the Ancient Regime, was their chosen activity, the Christian education of youth. Thanks to the protection accorded by Napoleon I to the Brothers of the Christian Schools, at the solicitation of Napoleon's uncle, Cardinal Fesch, the primary schools, since 1803, were not denied religious instruction. Not satisfied with giving the Brothers a legal existence by his decree of December, 1803, which in France created the monopoly of teaching, the Emperor willed to incorporate the Brothers in the University.[25] Such an arrange-

[23] This history was prompted by a marked antipathy toward the Congregation and the Jesuits.

[24] For the refutation of the calumnies hurled against the Congregation, Grandmaison's book is fortunately supplemented by an article of Edmond Biré, *"La Congrégation,"* which appeared in the *Correspondant* of January 25, 1890. In spite of these two scholarly refutations, we still hear that the Congregation was a secret political association. Undoubtedly some Congregationists, for instance, Montmorency and Polignac, mingled in politics, even imprudently at times; but the Congregation did not do so. But, we are told, the Congregationists were at the head of everything in the state. This assertion can easily be checked. A full list of the members has been published (Grandmaison, *op. cit.*, pp. 399–414). Comparing this list with the royal almanacs of the time, we meet with the following data; in the Chamber of Deputies (1826), 5; in the House of Peers, 7; among the 85 prefects, 4; among the ministers of justice, of foreign affairs, of war and of the navy, not a single one; in the fiscal department, one director and one head of a bureau; in the royal guard, out of 33,000 men, 17 Congregationists. Further, we are told they often received favors from those in power. Such is possible. They were Catholics, royalists, and as a whole good servants of the state. Nothing could be more natural than that they were recompensed. But of these various facts nothing proves that the Congregation was a secret political organization.

[25] Decree of November 17, 1808, art. 109.

ment could, indeed, create for the institute of the Brothers an embarrassing dependence. The broad spirit of Fontanes, grand master of the University, the intervention of Father Emery, and the adaptable energy of Brother Gerbaud, superior of the Brothers, enabled the congregation to escape from this danger.[26] The venerable superior, who had started with 32 houses and 160 Brothers, left, at his death in 1822, 173 houses and more than 600 religious.

Unfortunately the situation of the secondary schools was less satisfactory. Upon Louis XVIII's return to France, one of his first acts was to announce his intention of suppressing the University monopoly and of re-establishing freedom of teaching.[27] But on June 28 a royal ordinance continued the University monopoly provisionally.[28] On February 15, 1815, a new royal ordinance, creating seventeen regional universities, under the direction of a royal council, would have effected a relaxation, to some extent, of the absolutism and centralization in the direction of education, if Napoleon's return had not prevented the carrying out of the plan.[29] After the Hundred Days, Louis XVIII declared that the difficulties of the times did not permit him to undertake a fundamental reform in the system of public schools, and he re-established the University on the bases of the imperial decrees of 1808. From the extreme left as also from the right loud protests were raised. Benjamin Constant wrote: "The authority can increase the means of education; it should not direct it." [30] Lamennais, in an eloquent article, declared: "We hear repeated that the individual reason should be independent of all law, even independent of God Himself; and to the government is attributed the right to enslave the reason of all

[26] Cf. A. Chevalier, *Les Frères des écoles chrétiennes et l'enseignement primaire après la Révolution*, p. 245.

[27] *Moniteur* of 1814, I, 389.

[28] L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France*, p. 110.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

[30] *Mercure de France*, October, 1817, p. 59.

society by seizing on education." [31] In fact, at that time the students of the University were subjected to an influence that was generally grievous, sometimes detestable, on the part of their teachers, who were largely disciples of impiety.

Lacordaire in his *Mémoires* relates that often his mother used to execrate the University, which had robbed her sons of their faith.[32]

"Often," says an eminent historian of that period, "we have known old men who could not recall memories of college without speaking of it with disgust and indignation." [33]

The government of the Restoration resorted to timid palliatives. Not only did it close its eyes to the return of the Jesuits in the minor seminaries, but it let these establishments receive all students who presented themselves there with the intention of later entering upon lay careers. In this way these schools became regular colleges. The government also allowed the formation of religious boarding schools which prepared their students for the royal colleges, but which eluded this obligation by various artifices.[34] A royal ordinance of February 27, 1821, went still further. It ruled: 1. that the bishop, as far as concerned religion, would have the right of supervision over all the colleges of his diocese (art. 114); 2. that the individual houses which had won the confidence of the families could be raised to the rank of colleges with full rights (arts. 21, 22, 23); 3. that the curés or other officially appointed priests could take charge of training two or three young men for the minor seminaries.

At length (June 1, 1822) Bishop Frayssinous of Hermopolis was appointed grand master of the University and president

[31] *Conservateur,* I, 587.

[32] "A shadow of grief clouded the heart of that blessed woman whenever the thought came to her that she no longer had about her a single Christian and that none of her children could accompany her to the sacred mysteries of her religion."

[33] Thureau-Dangin, "Les libéraux et la liberté sous la Restauration," in the *Correspondant* of March 25, 1876, p. 958.

[34] Chabot and Charléty, *Histoire de l'enseignement secondaire dans le Rhône;* Burnichon, *op. cit.,* I, 79, 222–305.

of the royal council of public instruction. The learned and devout prelate, who had become famous through his St. Sulpice conferences, appeared to be the Frenchman best qualified to save the institution by sheltering it under the shadow of a great name.[35] But he did not hide from himself the insurmountable difficulties of his task. To some friends who congratulated him, he sadly replied: "Providence has wished to chastise me by putting on my shoulders a burden above my strength; I cannot accomplish the good expected of me." In reality, the influence of the new grand master would be limited to the suppression of a certain number of scandals. The irreligious spirit of the University as a whole continued. The young Montalembert, a student at Saint Barba College, relates that he met there 120 unbelievers and that he counted 30 students of his class who declared that they did not believe in Christ. But the Catholic press began to arouse public opinion. Lamennais' open letter to the grand master, published in the *Drapeau blanc,* revealed numerous scandals in the establishments of the University. This letter had far-reaching reverberations.[36] It was the start of the campaign which, intermittently carried on until 1850, ended in one effective reform, the freedom of teaching.

For such a movement of public opinion to be possible in 1823 was a sign that Voltairianism had not altogether dried up men's souls. Another sign was the success of the *Essay on Indifference.*[37] The year 1823 was the time when Jouffroy, gathering together a few choice students in his modest apartment on rue du Four, "spoke to them of the beautiful, of moral goodness, of the immortality of the soul, or some other of those truths of Christianity that were then almost novel." [38] Similarly at this

[35] Henrion, *Vie de Mgr Frayssinous,* II, 357.

[36] Lamennais, *Œuvres complètes,* VIII, 355. The *Drapeau* was prosecuted and condemned. See the report of this suit in the *Gazette des tribunaux* for 1823. Cf. also the *Journal des Débats,* September 3, 1823.

[37] See Boutard, *Lamennais,* I, 154; Lacordaire, *Considérations philosophiques sur le système de M. de La Mennais,* chap. I.

[38] Thureau-Dangin in the *Correspondant* of March 25, 1876, p. 961.

same time Vigny, Soumet, Victor Hugo, and Nodier were forming, in the famous salon of the Arsenal, that first Cenacle which would later give birth to the romantic movement.[39] Royer-Collard had just pointed out to the old parties the coming of a new nation, and Guizot had spoken of "this young generation, the hope of France, which the Revolution and Bonaparte had neither shattered nor perverted."[40] Often an ill-regulated enthusiasm would lead this new generation in the direction of fruitless dreams, ruinous utopias, unrestrained action. But beneath its foolish ambitions and its dubious liberalism, a Christian breath, which many of them would presently disavow, penetrated it unawares. Alfred de Musset, who has left us the most somber picture of his youth blighted by the University,[41] would become the eloquent interpreter of that generation when he denounces the teaching of Voltaire and praises the *Hope in God.*

Religious Movement in Italy

A similar movement took form in Italy at the death of Napoleon and Pius VII. It was likewise mingled with more or less visionary hopes and sincere aspirations toward Christianity. The potentate who had just disappeared from the scene left his powerful imprint on the Italian peninsula. In creating that kingdom of Italy, in which the various fragmentary states of the peninsula tended to be absorbed, he had seconded its tendencies toward unity, revived the memories of a past nationality, and aroused the proudest hopes. But when, after the fall of the Emperor, Italy had asked for independence from those who had vanquished it, these replied by a new partition. Austria, not satisfied with taking both Lombardy and Venetia as a conquest

[39] Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française,* p. 926.
[40] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.,* p. 938.
[41] A. de Musset, *op. cit.,* chap. I.

and unconditionally, brazenly set herself up as the protector of the absolute powers against all attempts at self-rule. Hence was born that movement, composed of love for the Italian fatherland and of hatred for the foreigners, which the Italian populations would express by a sonorous word, the *Risorgimento,* and translate by a sullen motto: Out with the foreigners!

The holy pontiff Pius VII had just died. By the magnitude of his strifes and misfortunes as also by the final triumph of his authority, he had cast on the Holy See such a splendor that the Italian people, less than any other, could henceforth neglect or feign to ignore his power.

Among the patriots who aimed at the resurrection of Italy, two parties were formed. Some, approving violent measures and revolutionary principles, declared themselves enemies of the papacy. In history they are known as the party of Young Italy. Mazzini became their leader; the secret societies were their chief means of action. The members of the other party, joining devotion to Italy and that to the pope, formed the party of neo-Guelfs. One of the statesmen who assumed the task of continuing the traditions, describes it thus:

This party, inflamed especially for liberty, read in history that liberty always had the popes for its defenders. The popes were the ones who preserved Italy, saved the remains of ancient civilization, and kept the barbarians from being completely dominant. . . . This party of the neo-Guelfs will be opposed by all those who regarded the papacy as an obstacle to the freedom of Italy; but many a good man and good heart cherished a fondness for this idea. The most famous representative of the neo-Guelfs was Father Gioberti. According to him, the welfare of Italy was impossible without the help of religious ideas; the peninsula could not be free and strong if Rome, its center and moral head, did not rise to her position of leadership. If the political attempts had not heretofore succeeded, this failure was because in those undertakings no account was taken of the clergy and of religious beliefs; it was because the movements forgot that religion

is at the basis of the Italian genius, that Rome is its metropolis, that Italy's only possible greatness must be a result of a confederation of all its states, with the pope at their head.[42]

Such at least was the program that Gioberti gave to the party. About 1820 this program was but a movement of public opinion, which included as its chief representatives the poets Alexander Manzoni (1785–1873) and Silvio Pellico (1789–1854), the lawyer Romagnosi, and the economist Melchior Gioja. Manzoni, at first caught in the current of unchristian philosophy, returned in 1810 to the faith and the practice of Catholicism. Some excellent religious hymns, which appeared in 1813, bore witness to the fervor of his convictions. His masterpiece, *The Betrothed,* did not appear until 1827. Silvio Pellico was already renowned by the success of his tragedy *Francesca di Rimini.* In 1819 the desire to work for the moral emancipation of their fellow countrymen and thus to prepare a future of happiness and liberty for Italy, prompted these men to found a purely literary journal, the *Conciliateur.* Before long this paper aroused the umbrage of the Austrian government.

By virtue of the celebrated decree of August 25, 1820, which imposed the death penalty on any member of a secret society and the penalty of imprisonment *"duro e durissimo"* on anyone who failed to oppose the progress of Carbonarism and who failed to denounce its members, the editors of the *Conciliateur* were condemned en masse. Pellico, condemned to death (February 21, 1822), saw his penalty commuted to fifteen years of severe imprisonment. He relates his sufferings in a book full of the purest Christian resignation, *Le mie prigioni,* which, at once translated into many languages, resulted in serious reforms in favor of prisoners. Manzoni, apart from his literary works, labored in defending Catholic moral teaching against the calumnies of the irreligious. As for Gioberti, a fickle and restless

[42] César Cantù, *La storia di cento anni.*

spirit, by his philosophical and political temerities he later incurred, like Lamennais, the severest condemnation of the Church.

Religious Movement in Germany

The leaders of the Catholic movement in Germany at this time were likewise noted for their tendencies toward the ideas of liberty. A certain historian of Catholic Germany in the nineteenth century says: "Joseph Goerres, Frederick Schlegel, Charles von Haller, and Adam Müller entered, each in his own way, on a campaign against political and social absolutism. . . . They turned to the Middle Ages not merely for esthetic subjects; therein they sought lessons of political architecture, mottos of Christian social life." [43] In 1822 the recently converted Goerres wrote: "I consider that the Church is nowise subordinate to the state and to the interests of the state. . . . And I do not wish that religion be immured in the inner room of the heart. It has too much to do outside. It is in the market place, in the environs of which the Church has a spacious part to play." [44] Frederick Schlegel rejects with all his might any despotism, whether of a prince or of the masses, and he advocates the constitution of a Christian state, with a religious basis "founded on a justice full of love." [45] Haller, born a Protestant as were Goerres and Schlegel, became a Catholic because he saw in Catholicism a principle of regeneration for society.[46] Müller was a German Bonald, romantic and misty, but a clear-sighted and powerful mind. He persistently opposed, in his books and in his polemical articles, two "cursed idols": that of the Roman law and that of the so-called political economy, which he sharply called economic absolutism. He predicted that these

[43] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* I, 390.
[44] Goerres, *Gesammelte Briefe,* III, 34.
[45] Schlegel, *Philosophy of History,* p. 345.
[46] Haller, Letter to his family declaring his return to the Catholic Church.

two idols would crumble and be succeeded by the genuine law.[47] Goerres, Schlegel, Haller, and Müller were laymen. In a more strictly religious sphere, some devoted priests, faithful to the method inaugurated at the outset of the century by a pious ecclesiastic of Westphalia, Overberg, popularized catechetical teaching in Germany.[48] Another priest, Sailer (1751–1832), "the Francis de Sales of the Rhineland," was there making widely known, in countless works, the methods of Christian asceticism and the principles of true piety.[49]

The episcopate was not slow in putting itself at the head of the movement. The treaties of 1815 had stripped it of its possessions and its power. The thirty-eight German princes, to whom the allied sovereigns had guaranteed independence, refused to render to the other princes their old sovereignty, to the Church and the chapters their former rights and possessions.[50] Are we to look upon this change as good for the Church? A clear-sighted and judicious observer of Germany at this period, Cardinal Pacca, in his *Memoirs,* replied to the question as follows: "I dare to answer in the affirmative. I consider that the bishops, deprived of a temporal domain, which could be most useful for sustaining the ecclesiastical spiritual authority when applied to that object, will henceforth be more docile to the voice of the Supreme Pontiff. . . . The Catholic people will be able to behold, in the pastoral visitations, the faces of their bishops. The sheep will hear, at least sometimes, the voice of their shepherds. . . . The grave ideas of the sanctuary will at length dominate those of the militia." [51] Cardinal Pacca saw rightly. In that austere poverty would be trained the great episcopal souls

[47] Goyau, *op. cit.,* I, 380–90.

[48] *Ibid.,* pp. 259–74.

[49] *Ibid.,* pp. 291–309.

[50] Menzel, *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation bis zur Bundes acte,* XII, Part II, chap. 29.

[51] Pacca, *Œuvres complètes,* II, 444.

of a Droste-Vischering, archbishop of Cologne, and of a Diepenbrock, bishop of Breslau.

The Religious Movement in England

In studying the religious condition of Germany after 1815 the Cardinal added to the hopes just set forth another consideration. This was that, by the very effect of the decline of the Protestant sects, a large movement of return to the Roman Church was facilitated. The conversions of Goerres, Schlegel, and Haller were the first fruits of this movement. In 1827 a similar move toward the Roman Church was preparing England and would have as its inspirer another great convert from Protestantism, John Henry Newman. The eminent historian of the Catholic renaissance in England in the nineteenth century, treating of the religious situation in Great Britain for the period between 1813 and 1823, gives us a picture that we are happy to quote.

In the years following Waterloo, the English thought, freed from the gigantic and perilous effort that absorbed it during its struggle against Napoleon, found the leisure for more attention to the religious problems. It seemed at that time divided on this subject between two contrary tendencies. Some, who remained under the sway of the eighteenth-century traditions and of the French Revolution, showed themselves aggressive or disdainful toward any revealed and supernatural religion. Others, matured by the great crisis that the world had just gone through, felt the need of a return to Christianity. Some writers seconded this reaction, accomplishing in England a work like that of Chateaubriand in France, of Goerres in Germany; such, in different ways, were Walter Scott, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey.

Was the Established Church of England ready to face this hostility and to satisfy this need? No one then thought so. The bishops, chosen by political favor, lived sumptuously, nearly always outside their dioceses, where they reappeared only to preside at some rare ceremony.

The clergymen, mostly younger sons of aristocratic families, without even a shadow of vocation from on high, were concerned with obtaining and even of accumulating rich benefices. A few of them had preserved a taste for classical studies. The best of them strove to lead a life which, as was said in England, was respectable and comfortable: nothing of the supernatural; no thought of the invisible; little piety or fervor; still less of asceticism and mysticism. At bottom the Church appeared to be less the custodian of a treasury of beliefs which must be accepted and which obliged the conscience than an "establishment" closely bound to the state and being the recipient of political privileges and of large wealth. . . . An effort had been tried to reanimate the religious life extinct in Anglicanism: this attempt was the evangelical movement, more or less inspired by Methodists. In places where its influence penetrated, it had awakened individual piety. Although its origin did not go back more than fifty or sixty years, it was beginning to show signs of decline; its beneficent power seemed to be exhausted. . . . Where were men to turn? Where find that religious renewal which souls were awaiting? Was it in the so-called liberal school, which, about 1820, was dominant at Oriel College, at that time the most renowned of the colleges at Oxford? But, under the pen of the heads of this school, the Church fathers were simply "certain old theologians"; the doctrinal part of religion was at least minimized. Instead of strengthening religion, the liberals opened the door to free-thought.[52]

One book at that time contributed most effectively in bringing the Anglicans back to the religious conceptions so thoroughly forgotten; this work was a volume of poetry. Its author was a village pastor, John Keble. . . . Beginning in 1819 he used to unbosom the feelings that overflowed his soul by composing short hymns. These were a sort of incense that he liked to make rise heavenward. Little by little his collection grew, and he soon found that he had written hymns for each Sunday and for each feast, as also for the principal acts of the Christian life. Some friends, who became acquainted with these little poems, were not resigned to see them remain under a bushel.[53]

[52] Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle,* I, 1–9.
[53] *Ibid.,* I, 10–12.

Not until 1827 did the book appear, and then anonymously, with the title, *The Christian Year*. At that date the religious revival had another representative in the person of a young vicar of the parish of St. Clement at Oxford. This young ecclesiastic was John Henry Newman (1801–90). "The son of a London banker, he had received from his mother, a descendant of French Huguenots, a religious upbringing impregnated with Calvinism. A precocious student, when barely sixteen years old (1816) he was admitted to Trinity College at Oxford. . . . From that time on, he had an intense interior life, was absorbed in the meditation of things invisible, and eagerly sought to do good and to know the truth." [54] For a short time he felt the influence of liberalism, which was then powerful at the University. But the attachment which he had already professed for the early Fathers, and his study of them were a safeguard for him. "The men of Oriel, with their somewhat capricious independence of mind, at times found themselves mingling in their liberal views certain theses with a Catholic tendency. These were the men to whom Newman preferably attached himself, and whom he held on to." [55] We are told that one of his friends, on hearing him express his theological ideas, often said to him: "Ah, Newman, that will lead you to the Catholic error."

Newman would smile sadly at such prophecies. Catholicism, such as it then appeared in England, had nothing to attract a mind of so rich and noble a culture. Newman himself has left us a striking picture of what the Catholic Church was in England from 1815 to 1823. He says:

> No longer the Catholic Church in the country; nay, no longer I may say, a Catholic community; but a few adherents of the Old Religion, moving silently and sorrowfully about, as memorials of what had been. "The Roman Catholics"—not a sect, not even an interest, as men conceive of it—not a body, however small, representative of

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

the Great Communion abroad,—but a mere handful of individuals, who might be counted like the pebbles and *detritus* of the great deluge, and who, forsooth, merely happened to retain a creed which, in its day indeed, was the profession of a Church. Here a set of poor Irishmen, coming and going at harvest time, or a colony of them lodged in a miserable quarter of the metropolis. There, perhaps, an elderly person, seen walking in the streets, grave and solitary, and strange, though noble in bearing, and said to be of good family, and a "Roman Catholic." An old-fashioned house of gloomy appearance, closed in with high walls, with an iron gate, and yews, and the report attaching to it that "Roman Catholics" lived there; but who they were or what they did, or what was meant by calling them Roman Catholics, no one could tell;—though it had an unpleasant sound, and told of form and superstition. . . . At length so feeble did they become, so utterly contemptible, that contempt gave birth to pity.[56]

Such was Catholicism in England in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. A guess has been made that it did not count more than 160,000 members. At the close of the century, exclusive of Ireland and Scotland, they were about 1,500,000. You might see cardinals sitting beside Anglican prelates in public ceremonies; the statue of one of them may be seen in London in front of the church of the Oratory; and the principal instrument of Providence in this marvelous movement of Catholic rebirth was John Henry Newman.

[56] Newman, *The Second Spring* (1911 ed.), preached at Oscott in 1852.

CHAPTER III

Leo XII (1823–1829)

"EUROPE still contains many inflammable elements." [1] So wrote Joseph de Maistre (April 11, 1815) on the morrow of the Congress of Vienna, in which the allied rulers undertook to accomplish a work of political, social, and religious pacification. The assertion of De Maistre was even truer in 1823. We have seen that, besides the causes of political troubles, brought on by the granting of sovereignty for mere reasons of convenience,[2] present were causes of social and religious troubles. The most evident of these causes were the parties of extreme socialism, the secret societies, the press, and the complex and dubious movements which were taking place in all spheres under the names of romanticism and liberalism.

Joseph de Maistre was not far from thinking that the famous congress must be held responsible for all these troubles.[3] At any rate, we may say that this "federation of crowns," which had just made over the nations of Europe at its good pleasure, at once stirred up a reaction against itself. This reaction, called liberalism and nationalism among the people and called zelantism at the Roman court, had not disarmed. "The party of the crowns" and the party of the zelanti would divide the conclave assembled to choose a successor of Pius VII.

[1] *Lettres et opuscules*, I, 325.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] "The maxim was accepted that a nation, in spite of itself, can be deprived of its legitimate sovereign. Herein is the first consequence, direct and inevitable: hence with greater reason if the nation requests it. But if the nation can pass judgment on its ruler, why should it not do so?" *Ibid.*

The Conclave

The party of the zelanti did not here appear for the first time in the history of the conclaves. It was composed of the cardinals who, in making their choice, were bent on considering only the interests of the ecclesiastical power. In the eighteenth century this group took an active part in the election of Innocent XIII, Benedict XIII, and Benedict XIV. But perhaps it never had a more clearly defined aim than after the death of Pius VII. Its determination was to show itself inflexible toward the claims of the allied states, which, after regulating the political lot of the European nations in 1815, attempted in 1823 to influence the election of the head of Christianity. The zelanti had a candidate, Cardinal Severoli, bishop of Viterbo, former nuncio at Vienna. He was, in reality, a peaceful man who had inconsiderately been given a reputation for stubbornness. The "party of the crowns," backed by the courts of Vienna, Paris, and Naples, favored Cardinal Castiglioni, bishop of Frascati. This man was a pious and scholarly prelate, highly esteemed for the mildness of his character, but in him was evident the goodness of a shepherd and the patience of a martyr rather than the aggressiveness of a fighter.

Among the members of the Sacred College was one toward whom the eyes of all were turned. No one thought of proposing his name for the tiara, but they looked to him because his high influence could, according to its direction, determine the election of the new pope: this was Cardinal Consalvi, the diplomat who at the Congress of Vienna had obtained the restoration of the Papal States.[4] He judged that a pronounced attitude of opposition toward the sovereigns was, under the circumstances, untimely; he sided with the "party of the crowns." Along with him he carried several prudent and moderate men, who agreed

[4] On Consalvi's important part in the Congress of Vienna, see Rinieri, *Il congresso di Vienna e la Santa Sede,* Vol. IV.

with his policy. But the former Secretary of State, the man who held so important a post in the preceding pontificate, had some adamant opponents. Most of these absolute, determined spirits blamed him bitterly for giving too much place, in his policy, to political combinations, and even reproached him for giving the administration of the Roman States a reputation worldly rather than ecclesiastical. They murmured that, although he had finally saved the bark of Peter, he had first pushed it to the edge of the abyss. In short, these foes of Consalvi's policy ranged themselves solidly in the party of the zelanti.

Their attitude seemed to assure the election of Severoli, who, on the morning of September 21, 1823, obtained twenty-six votes. Based on the number of cardinals present, the two-thirds for the validity of an election was thirty-three. The likelihood was that this number would be reached in the afternoon balloting. But the powers were on the watch. At the opening of the afternoon session, Cardinal Albani read a note thus phrased: "In my capacity of ambassador extraordinary of Austria to the Sacred College and also in virtue of instructions given me, I perform this task, unpleasant though it is for me, of declaring that the imperial and royal court of Vienna cannot accept for supreme pontiff His Eminence Cardinal Severoli, and hereby exercises a formal exclusive in his regard."

The effect of this unforeseen event was not precisely what the court of Vienna expected. This high-handed intervention of Austria exasperated the Italian cardinals. The candidate of the zelanti was put aside; but that of the crowns, Castiglioni, who had received seventeen votes in the morning balloting, obtained only eight at the afternoon session. A new candidate must be chosen.

In such circumstances, sometimes the votes were united on the name of an old man, whose brief pontificate would serve as an interval of preparation for an ultimate agreement. Did this

sort of calculation enter the minds of some electors? Possibly so. More direct considerations seem to have prompted most of the cardinals when, on September 28, they elected by thirty-four votes, Cardinal Annibal della Genga. Although only sixty-three years old, he had become an aged man through infirmities.[5]

All were unanimous in recognizing the worth of his talents and the genuineness of his virtues. The older among them recalled how one day Pius VI, making an inspection of the ecclesiastical Academy, had been impressed by the clear and precise answers of the young Annibal and had forthwith made him secret chamberlain. No one forgot the memory of the funeral oration after the death of Emperor Joseph II in 1790 by the eloquent prelate in the Sistine Chapel in the presence of the Sacred College. The task was peculiarly difficult: to judge a sovereign whose reign had been, in many respects, harmful for the Church, without giving offense to the Austrian cabinet and without being disloyal to the truth. By the loftiness, the moderation, and the gravity of his words, the orator succeeded in avoiding the shoals hidden in a like subject. The most exigent minds expressed their satisfaction. The title of archbishop of Tyre, shortly afterward conferred on Della Genga, important nunciatures at Lucern and Cologne, several most delicate missions assigned to him in Germany and France, his elevation to the purple in 1816, and his appointment to the office of cardinal vicar in 1820, confirmed his reputation as a prudent and enlightened administrator.

Moreover, the fervor of his piety seemed to increase with the greatness of his offices. More than once his precarious health seemed to set obstacles to his ministry. After the death of Pius VI he retired to the abbey of Monticelli in the diocese of

[5] For the details of the conclave of 1823, see Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Léon XII,* I, 26–79; Terlinden, "Le conclave de Léon XII" in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* XIV (1913), 272–303.

Fabriano, which the Holy Father bestowed on him. There he had his tomb built, persuaded that he would end his days in that retirement. On several occasions he returned to it, there to await in peace, as he said, the judgment of God. Nothing but duty drew him forth from that repose. At the time when a heavier mission was imposed on him, he ventured to object his sickly condition. When, following the customary formula, the cardinal camerlingo (Pacca) asked him whether he accepted his election as sovereign pontiff, he replied: "Do not insist. You are electing a corpse." The protests that rose around him interrupted him. Then turning to Cardinal Castiglioni, whose name had been pronounced by Pius VII on his deathbed, he said: "Why did they not follow the wish of the late pope?" Then, as if to reserve for Castiglioni the chance of later on taking the name of Pius VIII, as in fact he did, the newly elected, in memory of the kindness which Leo XI had shown to his family, chose the name Leo XII.

"Tall and emaciated, weak in his gait, pallid in countenance, Leo XII appeared as if he had just risen from a bed of sickness, to pass within to that of death." [6] His features were habitually impassive. Yet at times his sufferings became so acute that his mere presence inspired pity and dread.[7] "His eyes, however, and his voice compensated for all. There was softness and yet a penetration in the first, which gained at sight affection and excited me. His voice was courteously bland and winning. There was a peculiar dignity and gracefulness, natural and simple, in his movements, especially in ecclesiastical functions." [8]

[6] Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes,* p. 166.

[7] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Léon XII,* p. 18.

[8] Wiseman, *op. cit.,* p. 177. The most authentic portrait of Leo XII is that painted by Giorgiacomo and engraved by Lepri. After Leo XII's election, a Parisian publisher, urged to issue a portrait of the new pope, found nothing better than to reproduce the portrait of Father Olier, painted by Strésor and engraved by Boulanger, and there to insert the name of Leo XII. Copies may be seen in the Cabinet des Estampes.

First Difficulties

The new pope's feeble health was not the only difficulty he would encounter in the accomplishment of his high mission. After the keen agitations of the conclave, these difficulties might come upon him either from the party that opposed him, whose antipathies threatened to survive his election, or from the party that had elected him and that perhaps wished to keep him dependent on it, or from the great powers that had intervened in the affair of the conclave and that might try to exert a control in the government of a pope whose election had so concerned them.

Up to and inclusive of the last balloting, Cardinal Consalvi had remained faithful to the candidate of the crowns. Would the mighty statesman whose lofty personality dominated all the members of the Sacred College and whose relations extended everywhere, succeed in making a personal policy prevail and hinder the work of Pius VII's successor? The loftiness of the great diplomat's character did not permit his person to lend itself to such an idea. But his party, though much reduced, was active and able; and the group of the zelanti, to which Cardinal della Genga belonged before his election and which regarded him as its choice, had already, by the exaggerations and the rancor of some of its members, furnished pretexts for reprisals that might influence the policy and the person of the new pope. Moreover, some were maliciously exploiting a regrettable incident which, in the course of Della Genga's diplomatic mission to Paris in 1814, had placed him in opposition to Cardinal Consalvi.[9]

[9] In 1814, while Consalvi was accredited to all the sovereigns assembled at Paris, a political party not favorable to the Cardinal had obtained in favor of Della Genga, then archbishop of Tyre, a mission to Louis XVIII. Consalvi, hurt at this proceeding, which he considered a mark of lack of confidence in his regard, uttered some sharp words directed against the prelate (Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 15). Cf. Rinieri, *Missione a Parigi di Monsignor Della Genga e del cardinale Consalvi (maggio, 1814). Civiltà cattolica,* VI (1902), 272–87.

But the fomenters of trouble who speculated on such antecedents were ill acquainted with the noble Christian spirit animating both the Pope and the Cardinal. Their calculations were not long in being thwarted.

The occasion came soon. On the very day of the Pope's enthronement in St. Peter's, Cardinal Consalvi as deacon must present the chalice and the host to the Pope. The biographer of Leo XII, who was present at the ceremony as a member of the diplomatic corps, describes the scene. At the moment when the Cardinal advanced toward the Pontiff, holding the elevated chalice in his hands, from all parts of the vast edifice, especially from the tribunes where the princes and ambassadors were crowded, curious gazes were fixed on the two persons. What attitude would be taken, even at that solemn moment, by the minister of yesterday and by the Pontiff of today? [10] But all those stares of malignant curiosity were disappointed. Another witness of the scene, Cardinal Wiseman, wrote:

> Calm, dignified, and devout, unconscious of the gazing thousands of eyes around him, advanced the aged minister, now the simple deacon, with steady unfaltering step, and graceful movement. . . . From the hand of his humble minister the Pope received the cup of holiest love; their cheeks touched in the embrace of peace, the servant who partook, as is prescribed in the pontifical Mass, from the same chalice as the master. Who can believe that, in that hour, they were not together in most blessed union? [11]

Further events soon confirmed this impression. The powers of prime minister, confided to Consalvi, ended with the death of Pius VII, from whom he held them. Weighed down by age and infirmities, he asked the new pope's authorization to withdraw to his villa of Porto d'Anzio, there to pass his last days in retirement. But Leo XII was unwilling to deprive himself of the counsels of the great statesman. Before completely entering

[10] Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.*, I, 85.
[11] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

upon a policy that had multiple difficulties, he wished to receive the advice of the former counselor of Pius VII. Toward the end of December, 1823, after a painful crisis that almost cost him his life, he summoned the Cardinal to him. Consalvi, himself a sick man, had to be carried to the papal apartments. The audience was a touching one, and the conversation at once was of an elevated character. Questioned by the Pope, Consalvi with complete freedom and simplicity communicated his way of viewing the capital questions that concerned the welfare of the Church.

Two of the most urgent tasks, according to him, were serious attention to the schemes of Carbonarism and the preparation of a great jubilee for 1825. The jubilee would bring to Rome 200,000 witnesses to see a pope free in his capital. According to Consalvi, the Pope ought also to give much thought to the emancipation of the Catholics in England and the protection of the Catholics in the young republics of South America, disregarding, on this last point, the protests of Spain. His opinion was that no reliance should be put on the negotiations undertaken in Russia for the union of the Greeks with the Latins. His reason was that the Russians considered this union too much from the viewpoint of their religious autonomy. On the other hand, the Holy See should draw close to France, there cultivate cordial relations with the King and, to the extent that was possible without offending Louis XVIII, to be closely united to the King's brother, the Count of Artois, who seemed to be better disposed toward the Church.[12]

At the close of this audience the Pope was full of admiration for Consalvi. "What a conversation!" he said to Cardinal Zurla. "Never have I held a more important conference, more substantial, more useful, with anyone. What a man this Consalvi

[12] See a detailed account of this audience in Artaud de Montor (*op. cit.*, I, 166–71), who declares that he learned its chief facts from the Duke de Laval, ambassador of France, from the Duchess of Devonshire, and from the Pope himself.

is! How blessed Pius VII was to have him for his minister! Hereafter we will often work together. But he must not die today." [13]

Consalvi did, in fact, give Leo XII a whole program of government, establishing a continuity with that of Pius VII. Shortly afterward the great Cardinal succumbed to the ailment that was afflicting him for some time. His death removed from the party of the crowns the leader that, more or less rightly, it sought to influence. On the other hand it removed the principal influence opposed to the faction of the zelanti, who recruited their numbers especially among the personal enemies of the former minister. The two parties were now face to face, but with modifications. The zelanti faction was thereafter made up especially of men inclined toward a policy of absolutism and intransigeance. The adherence of several French and Austrian statesmen strengthened its power. The opposed faction included particularly partisans of the moderate ideas; the heritage of consideration left by Cardinal Consalvi was its chief strength, but it remained a minority. From that time the zelanti, obstinately regarding the Pope as one of their own, at least as their elected choice, sought to dominate him. These attempts at subjection would be not the least embarrassment of Leo XII's pontificate.

Following the election of Leo XII, a shrewd observer wrote: "By all sorts of measures the parties will strive to raise to important posts the men of their choice. But these men, once they have reached high places, find a horizon which opens up new lights. They see with new eyes and govern with new outlooks. Friends then arrive on the scene and try to stir them. An upright man, in such a situation, may be distressed but he is not embarrassed about the choice he ought to make. Therein is the future of the history of the pope we have today." [14]

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 171.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

The forecast came true point by point. The first maneuver of the party was to obtain from the new pope, a few hours after his election and under the pretext of succoring his weak health, the formation of a "Congregation of State," composed of cardinals taken from the three orders; in this congregation they carefully contrived to have a large majority of zelanti. A short time later, however, Leo XII, perceiving the snare, declared: 1. that the meetings of the Congregation would not be held at regular intervals; 2. that, in all cases, important matters would be previously examined and reported by the Secretary of State. Then the latter, Cardinal della Somaglia, with a sort of publicity, notified the diplomatic corps that the Congregation was not a Council of State, that it would be merely a consultative body, and that, on occasion, such and such other cardinals would be called in consultation. A diplomatic report (December, 1823), addressed to Viscount Chateaubriand, then French minister of foreign affairs, says: "All these explanations were given in the tone of a man who was as jealous of his ministerial authority as Consalvi could have been." [15] Similar attempts at domination were repeated. At Rome, Cardinal Severoli, urged on by the faction whose candidate he had recently been, abused the confidence which the chivalrous generosity of Leo XII bestowed on him, to impose the zelantist ideas and rancors. The Pope had to put an end to the intrigues of this dangerous collaborator.[16] In France the partisans of the Count of Artois, generally more devoted to the Catholic cause than the people of the King's circle, but counting among them a number of loud extremists, allied themselves with the zelanti of Rome. In concert with the latter they undertook to turn the Pope against the policy of Louis XVIII, whom they pictured as systematically motivated by feelings of unfriendliness toward the Holy See and Catholicism. As we have already seen, the government of the Restora-

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 132.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

tion was not beyond reproach. But the facts subject to criticism were enlarged, falsified, and generalized by partisan spirit.

All these reports were the more painful to Leo XII since he had been told that, immediately after his elevation to the see of Peter, the King had given assurance of his desire "to advance the good of our holy religion and perpetuate the honor of the Holy See." [17] Did not such acts, after such declarations, constitute a hateful hypocrisy? Unable to restrain his feelings, Leo XII wrote (June 4, 1824) a letter to King Louis XVIII in which he blamed the King for not sufficiently favoring the Catholic clergy, for permitting the continuance of laws offensive to religion in many respects, for restoring the practice known as appeal from an abuse, for putting the Protestant temples on a level with the Catholic churches, and for fearing that the influence of the clergy might become too great, while a throng of writers were attacking religion with impunity. The Pope then suggests that the King should choose for his advisers men approved by their political talent and by their piety.[18] This letter came to the court of Louis XVIII like a thunderbolt.[19] The passage in which the King is asked to choose other advisers was considered an insult, the more gratuitous, they said, since the ministry intended by the Pope's letter was that in charge of De Villèle and since this ministry was conspicuous for its opposition to the liberals. By a letter of July 20, 1824, the King, in a sharp tone, expressed "his surprise at the incorrectness of the reports which His Holiness seemed to have received from France and which, prompted by imprudent and unenlightened zeal, had deceived the religion of the Holy Father about the true state of affairs." [20] A lamentable crisis was on the point of breaking out. Profiting by a conflict between Paris and Rome, perhaps another state would take the place of

[17] Letter of Louis XVIII to Leo XII (October 14, 1823). Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 106.
[18] For the full text of the letter, see *ibid.*, pp. 234 ff.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 321.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

France in its relations with the Holy See. The French and the Roman diplomats at the same time understood what each side might lose thereby. The French chargé d'affaires who took the principal part in calming this quarrel[21] has left us a moving account of the steps that ended the misunderstanding and that definitely "ruined the zelanti party in the Pontiff's mind." [22]

But, while freeing himself from one coterie, the Pope meant to show that he would not let himself be circumvented by another. In 1824 he created some foreign cardinals independently of any proposal by the crowns. Thereafter, says his biographer, "everything in his acts proves that, if he could no longer be importuned, he had the courage that commands and that does not accept unreasonable demands." [23]

Religious Indifference

In the course of May, 1824, Leo XII published two especially important pontifical acts. By his encyclical of May 3 he denounced to the bishops of the Christian world the dangers threatening the faith; at the head of these dangers he pointed to the doctrine of religious indifference. By his bull of May 27 he called upon the Catholic world to come to Rome for the celebration of a solemn jubilee.

The encyclical contained the following words: "You are not unaware of the existence of a certain sect, wrongly calling itself philosophical. It has revived almost all the errors of the scattered hosts. This sect, clothing itself with outward flattering appearances of piety and liberality, professes 'tolerantism'

[21] In the absence of the ambassador (Duke de Laval-Montmorency), the chevalier Artaud de Montor, first secretary of the embassy, performed the functions of chargé d'affaires.

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 305–35. A wise observer, the Russian diplomat Italinski, said: "Rome is invulnerable on dogma; as for matters that are not doctrinal, that are called political, Rome is the only country where basic blunders are never made." *Ibid.*, p. 327; cf. p. 345.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 345.

—thus it is called—or indifferentism . . . teaching that God has given full liberty to every man." [24]

The head of the Church could not draw to the attention of the universal episcopate a more serious doctrinal question. Religious indifference, under its most variegated forms and under the names of tolerantism, liberalism, modernism, or the "party of the politicians," would be the great error of the nineteenth century. In 1809 Viscount de Bonald, in his *Réflexions sur la tolérance des opinions,* pointed to those men who, "intolerant on every other subject, advocated an absolute tolerance on religious opinions or beliefs." [25] Father Boyer, in the tract on religion which he taught at St. Sulpice seminary 1809–10; [26] Father Frayssinous in conferences to large groups of the faithful; [27] Father Teysseyre in his catechetical instructions: [28] all had insisted on the danger of religious indifference. Later, Father Lamennais, taking his inspiration from all those works,[29] in a stirring book gave a new echo to these cries of alarm. The error was the more to be feared inasmuch as it was concealed under so many forms. The partisans of political freedom connected it with their claims. But was it not found more subtle and obscure in the doctrine of the two most conspicuous leaders of the conservative reaction? Talleyrand, taking up the defense of the great religious and social principles at the Congress of Vienna, avowed that he was appealing to them merely for something useful.[30] Metternich, another defender of legitimacy and right, gave clearly to be understood that, for him, "security in present possession constituted all right." Both of them, by their high disdain for every doctrinal and moral

[24] *Ami de la religion,* July 8, 1824, p. 245.

[25] L. de Bonald, *Mélanges littéraires, politiques, et philosophiques,* p. 129.

[26] *Archives de Saint Sulpice.* Christian Maréchal, in his *La jeunesse de La Mennais* (pp. 581 ff.), analyzes Father Boyer's work.

[27] Maréchal, *op. cit.,* pp. 584–91.

[28] Paguelle de Follenay, *Monsieur Teysseyre,* pp. 380–410.

[29] Maréchal, *op. cit.,* p. 598.

[30] *Correspondance du prince de Talleyrand et de Louis XVIII,* Preface, p. 6.

truth in their political conduct, were professing, each in his own way, the principle of religious indifference even while seeming to condemn it by their measures of stern repression.[31]

Indifferentism and liberalism were condemned by the encyclical of May 3, 1824. This prelude to the celebrated encyclicals *Mirari vos* and *Quanta cura* of 1832 and 1864, which would move public opinion so deeply, did not stir any notable opposition. The same was not true of the peaceful project calling to Rome the faithful of the whole world to celebrate the jubilee feasts. A tradition 300 years old fixed the recurrence of the jubilee for every twenty-five years. The Pontiff's desire was the more natural since Pius VII, because of disturbances that still continued in 1800, judged he should not celebrate a jubilee at that date. But the mere rumor that the Pope was preparing a bull on the subject started public opinion in motion. Without counting the sectaries, who spread the old Protestant calumny which presented the jubilee as a trafficking in spiritual goods in exchange for pecuniary profits, the non-Catholic powers of Germany did not conceal their hostility. Austria, still under the influence of Josephism, showed herself cool, and the government of Naples not merely objected all sorts of difficulties, but took steps to get the representatives of the powers to present an active opposition.[32]

Moreover, the Council of the papal government entered into the Pope's plan with reserve and apprehension. "The Secretary of State feared the introduction into the provinces and into

[31] Talleyrand's religious and moral skepticism is well known. Metternich was not without moral qualities in private life, and he made profession of Catholic faith. But, as acknowledged by an author sympathetic to his person and his work, "the minister's imperturbable features seemed to cover a heart that did not beat. He took account of this impression. His explanation of it recurs often in his letters. He distinguishes two selves in him, between which the affairs of state interpose an impassable barrier. He declared: 'My life is composed of two parts which my character does not allow me to conduct parallel with each other, and which never fuse.'" C. de Lacombe, "Le Prince de Metternich," in the *Correspondant,* December 10, 1882, p. 912.

[32] Artaud, *op. cit.,* I, 337–66.

Rome of political conspirators and members of secret societies: these, under the cloak of the pilgrim's scalloped cape, might meet in safety to plot destruction. The Treasurer was terrified at the inroad which extra expenses would make into his budget, and protested against financial embarrassments that he foresaw would ensue." [33] But none of these objections deterred the Pope from his resolve. "Say what you like," he repeated; "the jubilee will take place." [34] For the publication of his bull he chose the feast of the Ascension. In the words of Cardinal Wiseman:

> On Ascension Day he issued the bull of preparation, clear, bold, and cheering, as a silver clarion's note. Seldom has a document proceeded even from the Holy See more noble and stately, more tender and paternal. . . . The Pope first addressed every class of men who recognize his spiritual sovereignty, entreating kings to put no hindrance in the way of the faithful pilgrims, but to protect and favor them, and the people ready to accept his fatherly invitation and hasten in crowds to the banquet of grace spread for them. . . . He turns to those who are not of his fold, those even who had persecuted and offended the Holy See, and in words of burning charity and affectionate forgiveness he invites them to approach him and accept him as their father too.[35]

The jubilee took place amid the most touching and splendid ceremonies.[36] The sick pope, whom the factions had at first fancied they would subject to their influence, not only disappointed their expectations; he now triumphed over an opposition which enlisted the mightiest statesmen and even some of his own ministers. Says Cretineau-Joly: "Leo XII did not doubt the faith of the peoples; and the peoples took account of that fatherly confidence." [37]

[33] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
[34] *"Si dirà quel che si dirà; si ha da far il Giubbileo."* Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 369.
[35] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 214.
[36] For the account of these festivities, see Wiseman, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 ff.
[37] *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution,* II, 74.

CHAPTER IV

The Church in France

THESE first difficulties were of a general interest. Apart from them, Leo XII, in his relations with the different countries, from the outset of his pontificate found himself in the presence of numerous delicate questions calling for solution.

The misunderstanding between the Pope and the King of France in June and July, 1824, ended happily. It made both of them realize the value of their alliance. Both had occasion to ponder these words written by Cardinal Bernis on August 17, 1774: "I have made a deep study of France, considering it as a whole and in detail. For the welfare of the state and also that of religion, I have thought that the Most Christian King should maintain a good understanding with the head of the Church." On the occasion (August 25, 1824) of the feast of St. Louis, king of France, Leo XII, though suffering severely at the time, wished, as a sign of complete reconciliation, to go in person and pray before the altar of the holy king, in the church of St. Louis of the French, where he was received with magnificence. The diplomat on whom was incumbent as French chargé d'affaires to pay respects to the Pontiff, relates: "The Pope showed himself well satisfied with all the pains that were taken to receive him; by his mouth the papal government seemed to say, like the character in Tacitus: *'Si cunctatione deliqui, virtute corrigam.'* "[1]

From that moment inevitable contested questions arose. But these differences between the court of Paris and the Roman curia were approached and solved with a mutual desire of good understanding. The best good will on both sides, however,

[1] Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de Léon XII,* I, 335; Tacitus, *Annals,* XV, 2.

could not suppress three irritating questions that were ever ready to stir conflicts: that of Gallicanism, perpetually alive in the heart of the old parliamentarians and of some members of the clergy; that of liberalism, which many ardent youth acclaimed enthusiastically; and lastly the question of the Jesuits, whose return and reorganization in France were followed with as much eagerness by devoted friends as they were looked upon with distrust by impassioned adversaries.

Gallicanism

The French Revolution had renounced the principle of "Catholicism the religion of the state." Moreover, the Charter of 1814 had not restored it. Thus the question of the old Gallican liberties, such as Pierre Pithou had codified them and as the parliaments had professed them, seemed now to be without any object. The secularized state had no occasion to resort to such arms in its defense. Its so-called exemptions became useless.[2] Parliamentary Gallicanism, however, had not disappeared. Among the politicians who surrounded the restored throne of the Bourbons, some had not yet given up the hope of seeing a rebirth of the absolutist traditions of the Ancient Regime; others expected to disarm the liberal opposition by joining in its grievances with regard to the Holy See.

Ecclesiastical Gallicanism was not so much set on opposing the state to the Church as it was on opposing the episcopate to the papacy. The Modern Regime did not touch this Gallicanism directly. Especially as a protest against the so-called encroachments of Rome upon the rights of French bishops, the "Little Church" had been formed. Without going to the point of schism, certain Gallicans became earnest apologists of the four articles of 1682. They found fault with the interventions of the Holy See in so-called national Churches, and sharply at-

[2] Cf. Emile Olivier, *L'église et l'état au concile du Vatican,* I, 281.

tacked the Jesuits.[3] Among those who had valiantly resisted the revolutionary persecution and who were most commendable by their private lives, were some who remained attached to certain maxims and to certain usages current in the Church of France as to an inheritance which they judged worthy of respect. Father Frayssinous, who belonged to this last group, wrote: "I will say without evasion that we should not seek our Gallican liberties either in the pamphlets of pleaders, more lawyers than theologians, or in the jurisprudence which formerly tended to invade everything and which merely put the ecclesiastical ministry in chains." [4] And he quoted the following words of Bossuet: "In my sermon on the unity of the Church I was obliged to speak about the liberties of the Gallican Church. There I proposed two things: one was to accomplish it without any lessening of the real greatness of the Holy See; the other was to explain it in the way our bishops understand it." [5] Almost the same ideas were held by Father De la Luzerne and Father de Bausset and the outstanding ecclesiastical journal of the time, the *Ami de la religion et du roi,* directed by Michel Picot.

Joseph de Maistre's *Du pape* had indeed delivered a hard blow to Gallicanism, even a moderate form of it. And Father Lamennais, giving an account of that work in 1820, declared: "Let anyone judge of the declaration of 1682 by its fruits. What did it produce? What evil? Jansenists, constitutionals, all the sectarians that have appeared in these latter days, have availed themselves of it to authorize their rebellion. It was branded from its birth with the double character of coercion

[3] Father Tabaraud, a priest of the Oratory, who was born at Limoge in 1774 and died in that city in 1832, had published a *Histoire critique de l'assemblé du clergé de France en 1682,* some booklets on *L'appel comme d'abus* and on *L'inamovabilité des pasteurs du second ordre,* and some works especially directed against the Jesuits: *Essai sur l'état des jésuites en France, Du pape et des jésuites.*

[4] Frayssinous, *Les vrais principes de l'Eglise gallicane,* in *Œuvres de Frayssinous;* Migne, *Orateurs sacrés,* 2nd ser., X, 1026.

[5] Migne, *op. cit.,* col. 1027.

and servility. What Catholic instructed by experience would venture to defend it today?" [6] Yet the clergy, without great protest, submitted to certain measures because they emanated from a power favorable to the Church. These measures were dictated by the Gallican spirit, such as the prohibition for the episcopate to correspond directly with Rome, the order given the bishops to submit their pastorals to ministerial censorship, the obligation imposed on seminary professors to teach the four articles of the declaration of 1682.

Yet whenever the measure wounded the rights of the religious conscience too violently, protests were raised. In 1819 the French government removed a mayor for not obliging some priest to give burial to a suicide. Wrote Lamennais:

> No one would wish—and rightly so—to oblige the Jews or the Protestants to bury a Catholic as a member of their communion. Yet do some people think that Catholics may justly be forced to adopt, in the name of their religion, a man who dies by violating one of its first precepts? . . . Have Catholics not a conscience? They say to us: Be tolerant. This word at one time meant: Let yourselves be slaughtered; at another time: Let yourselves be led. . . . The minister deigns to give some lessons of theology. He cites the Rituals. But who will interpret them? Is this interpreter to be the government minister, who has no authority in the Church, or those who are charged by the Church herself with the office of executing her laws? [7]

Anne Cardinal de Clermont-Tonnerre, archbishop of Toulouse, published a pastoral letter in 1823. In this pastoral, which he wrote from Rome, where he had taken part in the conclave, he called for civil modifications with a view to harmonizing the laws of the state with those of the Church. This letter, denounced to the Council of State as being an attack on the Gallican liberties, was suppressed by a royal ordinance under the pretext of "abuse." In a calm and firm tone the editor of the

[6] F. de Lamennais, *Nouveaux mélanges,* p. 139.
[7] Lamennais, *Réflexions et mélanges,* p. 322.

Ami de la religion protested, saying: "What most afflicts us in these circumstances, besides the wrong it does to the episcopal character and the effect it may produce in the minds of the people, is to foresee that the same thing will happen as formerly occurred from the encroachments of the parliaments. A first step led to another. Examples of these measures are but too numerous." [8] In the course of 1824, when the minister required the seminary professors to follow the declaration of 1682, the Archbishop of Toulouse again intervened. In a letter addressed to several bishops who had consulted him in the matter, he declared that the minister's request should be regarded as null. Later, under Charles X, we shall see him defend the rights of the Church even more vigorously against the abusive claims of the civil powers.

Catholic Liberalism

Among the warmest adversaries of Gallicanism was Father Félicité de Lamennais. The brilliant success of his *Essay on Indifference,* the renown of his recent polemics, his exceptional gifts of intellect, warmth, initiative, and animation, and certain aspects of his character, at once winning and imposing, soon made of him, for those who joined his cause, the most beloved of friends and the most commanding of masters. Father Lamennais had become the center of a group of young men in which the seed of a new party could easily be discerned. Those who thus took their stand about the master were Gerbet, Gousset, Rohrbacher, and Lacordaire. They called themselves ultramontanes and on religious questions readily adopted the ideas of Joseph de Maistre. But an undisguised sympathy for the men and things of their time, a deep attachment to the popular classes, and a hearty concern for all political and social progress brought them close to the party that had just been organized in France under the name of liberal party.

[8] *Ami de la religion et du roi,* January 31, 1824, p. 375.

The *Mémorial catholique,* which they founded in 1823 and which was their organ until 1830, had, thanks to Lamennais, who was its real inspiration, a considerable part in the development that was plainly taking place in the very bosom of Catholicism during the last years of the Restoration. It was a sort of precursor of the *Avenir,* for it attempted, though timidly, to separate the religious question from the political one and to contrive in the pure realm of ideas a reconciliation between the Church and modern society. With him apologetics recovered a youthful spirit and lost something of its former rigidity; the ecclesiastical sciences broadened and recovered their standing of authority; the spirit of the clergy changed and began to be open to this simple but quite new idea, that, "to influence the world, we must understand it." [9]

In the campaigns carried on in the *Mémorial catholique,* Lamennais' liberalism was more a spirit than a doctrine. This would not be formulated until 1829, in the writing published by the celebrated polemist under the title of *Des progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'église.* In that work Lamennais attacked Gallicanism as a doctrine of servitude, freeing kings from every rule of justice and leading men to idolatry. He held that peoples can, in certain cases, forcibly resist arbitrary governments, as the Netherlands did against Joseph II, the Vendeans and the Bretons against the Revolution, the members of the League against Henry IV. He taught that the Christian restoration of society can be accomplished only by the triumph of the Church and that this triumph should be won only by the exercise of freedom.

This evolution of Lamennais' ultramontanism or, more exactly, of his anti-Gallicanism, to liberalism took place under a twofold influence. First the contact with the liberal party strictly so called, such as it then appeared in the writings of Benjamin Constant and Corcelles, introduced in the party of the young Catholics some formulas of the liberals. These for-

[9] *Mémorial catholique,* Introduction; Boutard, *Lamennais,* I, 369.

mulas referred to the always beneficent effectiveness of liberty and to the practical indifference of the state toward all religions and to the separation of the state from all the Churches. A second influence, no less harmful, was exercised over the young group of the *Mémorial* by the very fact of the impassioned and excessive temperament of its leader.[10] The romantic Breton who bore within him, along with the physical defect of an abnormal constitution going back to his infancy,[11] the atavism of certain headstrong and contentious ancestors and of some hardy sailors from whom he inherited a taste for adventure and danger,[12] was unable to observe any restraint at the least ruffling of his restless sensitiveness.

He declared that the government was hypocritical in its words, atheistic in its acts. He called Lainé and Corbière the continuators of Henry VIII, and Frayssinous a schismatical bishop and usurper of the rights of Leo XII. "Who, then," he exclaims in one of his pamphlets, "empowered Frayssinous to capitulate to the kings of earth in the name of the spouse of Jesus Christ?" He considered the Society of Jesus ill-suited for the needs of men's minds, and he judged that the theology taught in the seminaries was nothing more than a narrow and degenerate scholasticism.[13]

Such language and thought were rash. They soon awakened

[10] In a penetrating article of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* (1912, p. 617), Maurice Blondel characterizes Lamennais as "that perpetual extremist who puts logic in the service of his passion, or rather who takes his passion for logic itself."

[11] "Born prematurely, with a notable depression of the epigastrium, owing to this infirmity he was subject to painful spasms from which he suffered all his life and which more than once put his life in danger." Boutard, *Lamennais,* I, 6. Cf. Peigné, *Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie,* pp. 51–56.

[12] C. Maréchal, *La jeunesse de La Mennais,* p. 3. Cf. Maréchal, *La famille de La Mennais sous l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution.*

[13] Lamennais was even more violent in private than in his pamphlets. Speaking of the Chamber elected in 1824, the most royalist and most religious of the Restoration, he said: "Never has anyone seen a degradation so ludicrous and a corruption so stupid." Then he concluded: "The three powers of the state, as they are called, seem to be a direct emanation of La Force, of Saint-Pelagius, and of Charenton." In his eyes, Father Clausel de Montals was only "the Marat of Gallicanism." Other quotations may be found in Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et républicans,* pp. 260–63.

uneasiness in some of the clergy and vigorous protests from others. In 1829, after *Des progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'église* made its appearance, the *Ami de la religion* interpreted these feelings and pointed out: 1. the strange relationship of certain doctrines of the author with the most dubious ideas of the liberal party; 2. the unjust violence of his attacks on the Catholics. He was charged with adopting the very formulas of the liberals on freedom of the press and on political freedom; he was criticized for having written that liberalism was nothing but "the feeling, wherever the religion of Christ prevails, which rouses a part of the people in the name of liberty," and for having added that "the party opposed to the interests of the throne had an immense advantage of good sense." He was reminded that the Church, far from admitting these principles in an absolute way, as he seemed to present them, had established a Congregation of the Index to condemn the abuses of the press. Moreover, the Church had also recommended to the people, apart from the most exceptional circumstances, respectful obedience with regard to the established authorities. Lastly, indignation was expressed at Lamennais' contemptuous treatment of the Jesuit order, of whom he had but lately written that "its whole existence was only a great devotion to humanity and to religion." [14] And he was blamed for calumniating that seminary teaching "which could have been saved from so many vagaries if it had better taken lessons from him." [15]

The Jesuits

Gallicanism had other foes, who could not be suspected of sympathy toward liberalism: the Jesuits. Since the promulgation of the bull *Sollicitudo* (1814), which solemnly re-estab-

[14] Lamennais, *Mélanges*, pp. 18, 62 f.
[15] *Ami de la religion*, 1820, pp. 33–37, 238–40.

lished the Society of Jesus in the universal Church, Jesuit houses increased in France, and their apostolate there was fruitful.[16] By means of the Congregation they had organized several works of piety and charity in the upper ranks of society; in their twelve colleges they were educating a large number of sons of the nobility and of the middle class; by their missions they reached the popular class. Gallicans and liberals joined forces to destroy them. Some royalists of the extreme right and some revolutionaries of the extreme left were in agreement to carry on a campaign against them.

The spokesman of these foes was the Count de Montlosier, then seventy years old. Sprung from an old Auvergne family, he had kept in his manners and spirit the strong, violent, and abrupt ferocity of that mountain district where he was born.[17] Of his title of nobility, which had been recently contested, but which Louis XVIII confirmed, he retained scarcely more than an insolent arrogance. A believer in absolute royal power, he jealously nourished in his heart the most stubborn prejudices of the old legists against the Roman Church. This practicing Christian did not hesitate to declare his faith publicly; he did so in a stiff and lofty tone that recalled the austere haughtiness of the Jansenists. However, he was not wanting in brilliant qualities. His notions were confused and muddled, but his ideas were strong and his views shrewd.[18] In the Chamber of Deputies the revolutionaries of the extreme left were sometimes close to this extremist. They agreed on several points, such as accord of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy with Pithou's Gallican liberties, and the absolutism of the Convention with that of the evil days of the Ancient Regime.

In August, 1825, Count de Montlosier published in the *Drapeau blanc* two resounding letters against the Jesuits. Less

[16] Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France,* I, 59–79.

[17] Thureau-Dangin, *Le parti libéral sous la Restauration,* p. 386. Cf. Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe,* II, 156–58.

[18] Burnichon, *op. cit.,* I, 347–87.

than a year later he brought out a work entitled *Mémoire à consulter sur un système religieux et politique tendant à renverser la religion, la société et le trône.*[19] The book was written in a heavy style and was awkwardly constructed, abounding with errors and contradictions. But it was vehement, aggressive, full of mysterious revelations, violent, strong personal references, disconcerting declarations, suggestive allusions. Therein we see the Society of Jesus, thanks to "a system of application the most perfected since Pythagoras, . . . carrying overseas the yoke of its domination, sometimes bloody, sometimes putting forth flowers." [20]

There we read certain statements without the least proof in support of the assertions. Such were the declarations that Louis XIV's affiliation with the celebrated Society was "almost certain"; that "St. Sulpice, as everyone knows, was a creation and an affiliate of the Jesuits"; that "through an association of St. Joseph all the workmen were regimented"; that each section had a sort of centurion, that "the commander-in-chief was Father Loenen, a secret Jesuit"; that the wine merchants and the household servants were similarly organized; that the Chamber of Deputies counted at least 105 members of the Congregation,[21] bound by oath to the terrible Society; that formerly even a royal minister had been found at his death, wearing certain "insignia consecrated by the affiliation." [22]

After revealing these so-called facts, the author of the *Mémoire* pretended to make known precisely the hidden aim of all these undertakings. These he defined as follows: "To make use of religion as a political instrument; to have God obeyed by order of the King, and by authority of the King to

[19] Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 347–87.

[20] *Mémoire,* pp. 10–21. For the following details, see *ibid.*, pp. 23–37.

[21] The Chamber counted exactly five members of the Congregation. Grandmaison, *La Congrégation,* p. 312.

[22] *Mémoire,* p. 27.

extend the authority of the priests." But the kings had to be the victims of such combinations because, says Montlosier, in a tragic tone, "the frail and merely life-long existence of princes is well known. . . . How are we to think that they can contend with a power which neither is born nor dies, . . . that has its militia, a general, with which it decides when and how it should be sovereign?"

The *Mémoire* appeared soon after the two sensational lawsuits brought against the *Constitutionel* and the *Courier français*. These two papers heaped praise on the *Mémoire*. The *Journal des Débats* called Montlosier "the torch of France." His person and his role were exalted. The writers feigned to forget the changes of allegiance which he manifested under the Empire. They affected to see in him only the noble *émigré* of Coblenz and London, the friend of Chateaubriand, the dauntless Catholic who had shut the mouth of unbelievers by his eloquent tirade about the bishops' cross of wood; and they praised this royalist, this believer, for having been independent and courageous enough to denounce the danger that threatened both the Church and society. The *Ami de la religion* and the *Mémorial catholique* and the *Quotidienne* easily pointed out the calumnies of the pamphlet. Viscount Bonald refuted it in a special booklet.[23] But Montlosier redoubled his audacity. Feeling himself backed by the Gallicans of royalism, by the Jansenists whom Tabaraud and Lanjuinais led to the fray, and by the liberals whose bitterness was stirred by the *Constitutionel* and the *Débats,* he addressed to the royal court a formal denunciation of the Society of Jesus. Forty lawyers of the Paris bar subscribed to his conclusions, which called for the application to the Jesuits of all the means of repression by the old and modern laws. The court declared itself incompetent in the matter. Montlosier then turned to the House of Peers and obtained from it a decision that his petition would be transmitted to the

[23] *Réflexions sur le Mémoire à consulter.*

King. For the moment Charles X did not follow it up, but the question of the Jesuits was henceforth placed before public opinion, which would be stirred by it until the time when the King, yielding to the combined pressure of Gallicanism, Jansenism, and liberalism, would accord to these factions the expulsion of the celebrated Society.

King Charles X

King Charles X, who in 1824 succeeded his brother Louis XVIII, seemed to offer the cause of the Church some serious guaranties. Following a riotous youth, for many years past he had returned to the practice of religion. After his coming to the throne one of his first cares was to be crowned at Reims, with all the traditional rites of consecration, to draw down the blessings of God on his reign. Pope Leo XII expressed his joy on this occasion.[24] But, weak in character, undecided, changeable, and easily influenced, Charles X was incapable of presiding over the councils with his predecessor's decision and authority. He was even less able to rule over the factions. Louis XVIII's policy had been to elude the domination by exclusive parties and he repelled in turn the exaggerated liberals and the ultra-monarchists.

But Charles X swung from one extreme to the other. From the very outset of his reign the sudden re-establishment of the titles and functions of the old court served as a pretext to regard him as the restorer of the Ancient Regime. The retirement of 250 generals of the Empire aroused keen discontent in that part of the nation which had special devotion to the imperial glories. A law granting an indemnity of a billion francs to the *émigrés* had been opposed by a part of the right, which saw therein the security guaranteed to the acquirers of

[24] Artaud, *op. cit.*, II, 385.

the national goods, and by the extreme left, the confiscation of the property of the *émigrés* as a penalty justified by their voluntary exile.

A second law, most untimely, punished with the penalty of parricides the profanation of the consecrated hosts. It likewise inflicted the death penalty on every theft committed in a church with breaking and entering or during the night. This law had been attacked in the House of Peers by Chateaubriand and in the Chamber of Deputies by Royer-Collard and in the press by Lamennais. However, this law, passed despite these lively oppositions, was never to be carried out. But the agitation stirred up by these measures did not subside. While the imperialists, offended by the first acts of the King, made common cause with the liberals, a party of dissatisfied royalists, led by Chateaubriand and called "the party of the defection," carried on a relentless strife against the government.

Voltaire's works and the *Encyclopedia* were published in popular editions. Tartuffe was played in the cities where the missions were being presented. The secret societies increased their measures. The specters of the Ancient Regime, of domination by the "priests' party," of the Congregation, and of the White Terror were spread before the eyes of the people. Vainly the King tried (November 5, 1827) to crush the opposition by creating seventy-six new peers and by dissolving the Chamber. These measures exasperated the malcontents. The extreme right and "the party of the defection" joined hands with the left. The society known as "Help yourselves, and heaven will help you," which had some connections with the Carbonari and Freemasonry, directed the new elections, which gave the opposition an overwhelming majority. The King, driven to bay, had to choose a liberal ministry and to make concessions. But the left showed itself more and more threatening. Martignac, the new head of the ministry, advised the King, as a means of

avoiding the peril that menaced his throne, to sacrifice the Jesuits.

Religious Orders

On June 16 King Charles X consented to sign two famous ordinances.[25] The first concerned the establishments known as secondary ecclesiastical schools directed by persons belonging to non-authorized religious congregations, then existing at Aix, Billom, Bordeaux, Dôle, Forcalquier, Montmorillon, Saint-Acheul, and Sainte-Anne d'Auray. These institutions were ordered to be subject, by October 1, to the direction of the University. Thereafter no one might direct a house of education or teach there without having affirmed in writing that he did not belong to any religious congregation not legally established in France. The second ordinance subjected to the government's authorization the establishment of secondary ecclesiastical schools or minor seminaries. It created in their favor burses of 500 francs each; but it fixed at 20,000 the total number of the pupils; it forbade the admission of externs and the wearing of lay dress after two years of classes.

In a memorial sent to the King by Archbishop Quélen of Paris, seventy-three bishops protested.[26] At the same time the episcopate consulted the Holy See. But the letters addressed to

[25] See Henrion, *La vie de Mgr Frayssinous,* for most interesting details taken from Bishop Frayssinous' notes on the circumstances that preceded and determined the celebrated ordinances. On the same question see also Artaud de Montor, *op. cit.,* pp. 372–89; *Ami de la religion,* February 27, 1844. The fullest details on this affair will be found in Antonin Lirac (pen name of Father Clair, S.J.), *Les jésuites et la liberté religieuse sous la Restauration.*

[26] Henrion, *Vie de Mgr Quélen,* p. 192. Only one bishop refused to sign the Memorial; this was Bishop Baillon of Dijon. His reason was, he said, that the royal ordinances did not touch on dogma or Church discipline. On the contrary, the resistance of Archbishop de Clermont-Tonnere of Toulouse was most energetic. When the government insisted that he carry out the ordinances, he replied: "The motto of my family is this: *Etiamsi omnes, ego non.* This is likewise the motto of my conscience."

Rome on this occasion were intercepted by the French government, which on its part sent to the Roman court a jurist instructed to explain to Leo XII "the true state of affairs." The Supreme Pontiff had Cardinal Bernetti write a note which the French ministers published only in part, giving the impression that the Pope approved of their conduct.[27]

The Catholic and royalist historian of the Restoration, Alfred Nettement, speaking of the ordinance of 1829, says:

> From the viewpoint of religious ideas we find three untoward consequences in the ordinances of June 16: they deprived the religious teaching of a source of support; they excluded the bishops from educational matters by the provisions against them; they gave acceptance, in the mind of the common people, of the calumnies piled up against a respectable religious order by proclaiming the need of expelling it. From the political point of view the disadvantages were equally serious: the government informed all concerned with the means of obtaining concessions from it; and the opposition, which it wished to satisfy, felt encouraged to demand more.[28]

[27] See A. Lirac, *op. cit.*, II, 388 ff. The full text of Cardinal Bernetti's note was not known until 1846. Cf. Burnichon, *op. cit.*, I, 288–470.

[28] Nettement, *Histoire de la Restauration,* VIII, 128.

CHAPTER V

The Church in Austria, Germany, and England

Austria

THE statesman who then presided over the destinies of Austria took quite a different attitude. Charles X liked the Jesuits, and he proscribed them; Metternich detested the Jesuit spirit, and he favored the Society of Jesus.

In 1825 some Jesuits, driven out of Russia and settled in Galicia, petitioned the Emperor of Austria for official recognition of their establishment. Prince Metternich on this occasion (October 18, 1825) wrote a long memorial in which, after carefully distinguishing between the Jesuit constitution and Jesuitism, he added: "This difference is of major importance, . . . for I am much inclined to regard the institution as a salutary arm against the invasions of the spirit of error; but no less absolutely do I condemn Jesuitism under all its forms as likewise in all its tendencies." [1] These lines reveal the general policy followed by the celebrated diplomat, who seemed to hold the same views about the Catholic Church. He valued it highly and supported its organization mightily to the extent that it appeared to him useful in maintaining order and discipline; he found fault with its spirit to the extent that this spirit seemed to him to furnish elements of political disorder as he understood this term. When asking his sovereign to authorize the establishment of the Society of Jesus in Galicia, the minister advised him to admit it only by way of trial. He said: "In the event that the Jesuits should not follow a 'correct line,' we

[1] Metternich, *Mémoires*, IV, 237.

might be led to adopt in their regard certain measures that would be inopportune today." [2]

On the lips of Metternich "the correct line" was simple. It was to sustain the institutions of the past or at least as he judged suitable for maintaining the European order. Moreover, such a project was maintained by him with prodigious pride. He considered himself infallible. "Error," he said to Guizot, "has never entered my mind." To this the French minister replied: "I have been more blessed than you, Prince; more than once I have discovered that I was mistaken." [3] His aim was to form a society of states capable of fighting victoriously against the revolutionary revival of nationalities.[4] The center of this society was to be the Germanic Confederation, receiving its orders from Austria. He had formulated this dream, that a word pronounced at Vienna should be received throughout Germany as an "inviolable law." For many years this dream was almost realized so far as concerned the diplomatic relations of the nations and their political organization.

He was less fortunate in what concerned the internal government of his own country and the repression he wished to exercise on the national movements. He himself said: "I have

[2] *Ibid.*, IV, 242.

[3] Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps*, IV, 20. Metternich in his autobiography, inserted in Volume I of his *Mémoires*, professed to be the lieutenant of God. He agreed that Richelieu and Mazarin were persons of merit, but he heaped sarcasm on his contemporaries: "the little Nesselrode," Thiers "a simpleton," and Berryer "a dolt."

[4] Talleyrand, whose practical skepticism was even more blameworthy than Metternich's, found himself in conflict with the latter at the Congress of Vienna. He strove to put a rein on the pretentions of the Austrian minister, who wished to upset the nations, particularly France, in the name of the principle of order. Talleyrand defended the independence of the threatened nationalities by appealing to the principles of legitimacy and of public right. The tactics were clever. They disconcerted the grave assembly and let loose a tumult. The Prussian minister exclaimed: "Why appeal to these principles? That goes without saying." To this Talleyrand replied: "If that goes without saying, it goes still better by saying it." "What has the public right to do here?" murmured another diplomat. "It has this much to do, that you are here," replied the French minister with his dominating coolness.

often governed Europe; I have rarely governed Austria." The very severity of his repressive measures was what exasperated and strengthened the national movement in Italy. In the heart of Germany itself spirits most devoted to the cultivation of Germanic supremacy, such as Goerres and Schlegel, instead of following Metternich's absolutist movement in the organization of the states and his Josephist tendencies in the relations of the civil power with the Church, on the contrary became zealous apostles of liberal ideas in politics and of absolute independence of the Church with regard to the state.

The Metternich system considered almost exclusively, in the Church as well as in the state, the principles of authority and hierarchy. But a young priest of Tübingen University, Johann Adam Moehler, published (1825) *Die Einheit in der Kirche,* a book full of freshness and life. In it he showed, as a principle of unity in Christian society and as a principle of faith in a believing soul, not timorous obedience, which depresses, but love, which elevates and unites.[5] By a more striking contrast, three years later in Vienna itself, that capital where religion, often considered an aspect of politeness or a machinery of bureaucracy, seemed "to lack fresh air," [6] another Catholic priest, Anton Gunther, was trying "to regenerate theology with a real science and a free and ingenious mysticism." [7]

But this time the freedom and ingenuity exceeded the limits of orthodoxy. Strangely, "Gunther, who was one of the wheels of that organization of intellectual repression which was heavy on the religious development of Austria, held the office of censor. . . . This policeman of thought ended by being himself an offender." [8] In his *Vorschule zur speculativem Theologie* (1828) and in several later publications, he held that "the ra-

[5] This book exercised a strong influence on the young German Catholics of the time. See Goyau, "Moehler" in *La pensée chrétienne,* 1905, and *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* II, 24–35.

[6] Goyau, *op. cit.,* II, 43.

[7] Sainte-René-Raillandier, *Revue des Deux Mondes,* October 1, 1843, p. 96.

[8] Goyau, *op. cit.,* II, 44.

tional soul is altogether distinct from the principle of bodily life and of sense knowledge"; he destroyed every bond between the formulas of Catholic faith and the Aristotelianism of the Middle Ages; he enclosed dogma in a new philosophical system that he created; he pretended to explain the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation as subjective awareness of the Divinity; he conceived the mystery of the Redemption as a necessary consequence of the creation. This teaching of his aroused an enthusiasm to which Goerres and Moehler were drawn for a while. But the temerarious doctrines brought upon him the severe condemnation of the Church.[9]

Germany

The center of the Catholic movement in Germany was not, however, at Vienna. It was at Munich. Of all the German states, Bavaria was the one that had been least influenced by the Metternich system and that of the Holy Alliance.[10] It was also the state that showed itself the most devoted to the Church. As Brentano wrote: "In Germany, Bavaria is the part that went furthest in the revolutionary corruption and, like France, it was the first to react." [11] This reaction was particularly notable beginning in 1825, the year when King Louis I came to the throne. After the coronation of the young prince, Goerres, who liked to assume the ways of a prophet, addressed him with the following words, placed on the lips of the revived Prince Maximilian: "What you intend to build, do not construct on the shifting sand of human opinions, but make it rest on God, the citadel of all that is solid. Be a Christian prince. I mean, be a pillar of the faith and a protector of the freedom of the spirit." [12]

King Louis of Bavaria would not continue to be the sure and

[9] *Ibid.*, II, 43–53.
[10] *Ibid.*, II, 63.
[11] Goerres, *Gesammelte Briefe*, III, 293.
[12] This writing will be found in Goerres, *Politische Schriften*, V, 235–65.

solid pillar greeted by Joseph Goerres. But at the outset of his reign his sincere and zealous faith along with his boundless devotion to Christian art and letters gave promise of the finest hopes. The ardent and romantic element of his rich nature was such as to stir the warmest enthusiasm about him. He dreamed of "a realm of beauty extending over the whole of Germany," and over it would preside his friends, the "Nazarene" [13] artists as the statesmen.[14] In more positive matters he settled the many questions in Bavaria by the promulgation of the concordat of 1817,[15] declaring that he would loyally abide by all the clauses according to the spirit of the Church. Faithful to the lessons of his venerated teacher, Father Sailer, he favored the religious life and seconded the efforts of the Benedictines and Redemptorists in the evangelization of Bavaria.

In short, this was a brilliant period for Catholicism. At that time in Bavaria, Joseph Goerres, drawn to Munich by King Louis, stirred a public of choice souls by his teaching on mysticism. Ignaz Döllinger there published his first scholarly works on the Church of the first centuries, Clement Brentano made well known the revelations of Catherine Emmerich and commented on them, and Schelling, drawn into the movement and combating the blasphemies of Hegel, declared that the historic Christ, as he thought, could not be preserved except by obedience to the authority of the pope.

Undoubtedly the works of each of these writers have shortcomings. They often exhibit a lack of moderation, a failure to grasp the nuances, a defect that seems to be a characteristic fault of the German race, the price of its undeniable fine qualities.[16] In Goerres' four volumes of *Christliche Mystik,* science

[13] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 498.

[14] Cf. Taillandier, *La Revolution en Allemagne,* I, 445 ff.

[15] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* VII, 472 f.

[16] Said Brentano: "I was never able to pour water into a glass without making it overflow; I have no grasp of moderation and a proper measure" (Blaze de Bury in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* March 15, 1845, p. 1124). Another German of the time, Frederick Schlegel, in his *Philosophy of History,* wrote that the study of history

abounds and scholarship overflows. But an impression of confusion comes from a reading of this encyclopedia of all the marvels, divine and diabolical, in which ecstatics relate their visions, the stigmatists exhibit the sight of their bleeding dolors, the possessed yell in their contortions, and witches celebrate their infernal sabbaths.[17] Döllinger, when a young professor, in his work on the doctrine of the Eucharist in the first three centuries, showed an extensive acquaintance with the Fathers. But we can already perceive that the contemporary concern and an immoderate preoccupation for reforms were haunting and disturbing that restless spirit. After spreading the wealth of his knowledge in numerous writings, he endeavored by his intrigues to hinder the work of the Vatican Council and died obstinate in schism.[18] Brentano, converted from a loose life to one of piety, became the humble secretary of an illiterate seer, Catherine Emmerich, in the remoteness of a town in Westphalia, and consecrated his life to acquainting a wide public with the revelations of the poor servant of Christ. But he did so in such a fashion that we can scarcely distinguish, in his work, what God revealed to His servant from what the romantic imagination of Brentano unconsciously suggested to him.[19]

Another spiritual leader was Francis Baader. He was less penetrating than Goerres, less scholarly than Döllinger, with a piety less on fire than Brentano's, but with a more winning charm in his words. In his lectures, which continued at the street corners in Munich to the astonishment of passers-by, this superb teacher unfolded the series of his digressions, which

---

should not be neglected by Germans, because it is the most effective antidote for that absolutist spirit which especially marks German science and its speculative direction.

[17] On Goerres' *Christliche Mystik*, see a study by Father Freppel, who became bishop of Angers, in the *Correspondant*, March 25 and July 25, 1852.

[18] Kannengieser, *Catholiques Allemands*, pp. 361–69.

[19] Schmöger, *Das Leben der gottseligen Anna Katharina Emmerich;* Wegener, *Anna Katharina Emmerich und Clemens Brentano.*

converged toward a philosophical explanation of the universe. The philosopher Schelling felt the influence of Baader, who inclined him to Catholicism. Unfortunately Baader himself was swayed by Schelling's pantheistic philosophy, Boehme's mysticism, and Saint-Martin's illuminism. Thus Baader more and more followed a path that would make him an apostate from Catholicism, if at the approach of death (1841) he did not sincerely repudiate the theories which he probably failed to perceive as dangerous in the fullness of his marvelous success.[20] Schelling, through his connection with Baader and by the ardor of his strife against Hegel's anti-Catholicism, seemed for a while orthodox enough for Döllinger to consider making him a collaborator in his periodical *Der Katholik*. But soon people could discern that Schelling had nowise abandoned his basic pantheism and that merely the form of his philosophy and the sympathy of his heart had become Christian.

Yet the movement of Catholic thought in Munich won the enthusiasm of outsiders who witnessed it. Montalembert, speaking of Goerres' lectures on mysticism which he had heard at Munich, wrote: "There a new source of study and pleasures opened up." [21] At a later date Wiseman, with the same admiration for the Munich school, thought of utilizing it as an intermediary to bring about relations between the Catholic clergy of England and those of Germany; [22] Rio and Falloux retained a tender memory of this scientific and artistic movement.[23] Nowhere does the school of the *Avenir,* by its defects perhaps no less than by its warm and sincere faith, find a more vibrant and faithful echo.[24]

[20] Goyau, *op. cit.,* II, 82–85.

[21] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* I, 383.

[22] Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* I, 135.

[23] Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste,* I, 172; Rio, *Epilogue à l'art chrétien,* II, 165.

[24] Boutard, *Lamennais,* II, 208, 323. On the Munich school at this period, see some interesting details given by Charles Sainte-Foi (Eloi Jourdain) in his *Souvenirs de jeunesse,* pp. 239–309.

Ireland

Under Leo XII, Paris and Munich were the two most brilliant centers of Catholic activity. They were the cities where Lamennais was writing and where Goerres was teaching. But our idea of that activity would be incomplete if we were to ignore two other important centers of the religious movement, two cities of Great Britain. These were Dublin, where Daniel O'Connell was fighting for the enfranchisement of his fellow Catholics, and Oxford, where John Newman was slowly preparing for the return of a large number of his fellow Englishmen to the true Church.

The cause being championed by O'Connell was both national and religious. For four hundred years since England conquered it, Ireland had been subjected continually to that regime of terror which we can hardly understand, as a transition measure following a conquest. But this regime affected the religious faith of the Irish as well as their patriotic feelings. As conquerors and as Protestants the English had taken over all parts of the country, there administered justice, and there left three-quarters of the population in a condition of wretchedness. According to an inquiry made in 1822, out of seven million inhabitants, more than five and a half million Catholics were divided in thirty-two dioceses and more than a thousand parishes.

But ever since the time of the Reformation the English government had appointed Anglican bishops and pastors to all existing benefices. Since the Catholics were unwilling to accept their direction, the result was that each parish had two incumbents: the Protestant minister, well-to-do and surrounded with comforts, and the Catholic pastor, languishing in wretchedness like that of his flock, relying for his livelihood on the alms of his poor parishioners. Macaulay wrote that, by this policy of op-

pression, the Britannic government had given an example of the most unjustifiable and most absurd institution of the civilized world. Since 1792 Irishmen possessing an annual revenue of 40 shillings were voters; but they could vote only for Protestant candidates, who alone were able to take the Test Oath [25] and ordinarily were disposed to agree with the Anglican majority of the English Parliament. In 1797 the Irish, at the end of their patience, organized in armed bands. Three years later Pitt undertook to reduce the Irish opposition by abolishing the Irish Parliament and promising to abrogate the laws that deprived the Catholics of civil capacities. The island became peaceful, in the sense that the tyranny of the rich over the poor and of the Protestants over the Catholics was strengthened. Everyone could foresee that the promises made by the government would not be kept.

The Irish as a whole then gave up recourse to insurrection. But their discontent was shown by a legal, stubborn, and irreconcilable opposition to their Protestant masters. The very day when the bells of St. Patrick's at Dublin announced the Act of Union imposed by Pitt and the abolition of the Irish Parliament, a young lawyer, Daniel O'Connell (1775–1847), delivered an address of protest to a gathering of Catholics at the Stock Exchange. Later he said: "On the morning of that day I took an oath that the dishonor would not endure if I could put an end to it."

Daniel O'Connell was born in County Kerry. He came of an old family that had always been devoted to Catholicism and to Ireland. This man, as Lacordaire said, "without being a prince or captain or founder of an empire, but remaining a simple citizen, would govern more than kings did, would win more battles than the conquerors, would do more than all others who have ordinarily received a commission to destroy or to build." [26]

[25] See Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 466.

[26] Lacordaire, *Eloge funèbre d'O'Connell,* in *Œuvres de Lacordaire,* VIII, 162.

He possessed the temperament of an agitator. This was the title he gave himself. O'Connell was said to be made up of three men: at home he was a gentle, peaceful man of joyous humor, seeming to have no other horizon than that of family joys and quiet study; at the bar he was a powerful lawyer, expert at fathoming the enormous arsenal of British laws, always followed by a throng of attorneys and clients at the mass meetings over which he presided, he was an incomparable orator, master of his audience as no one before ever was, knowing how to play the most intimate chords of indignation, irony, joy, and enthusiasm. But under all these different forms, what persisted and what gave them unity was the incorruptible character of the sincere Christian, giving priority, in his public life as in his private life, to obedience to the laws of God and of the Church.[27] His was the loyalty of the citizen, refusing to violate the least law of his country. His unfailing motto was: "Not to shed a drop of blood and to respect all the laws of England."

His activity was almost beyond belief. We see him in a single day make speeches in cities and villages remote from one another. He recruited followers, took up subscriptions, organized meetings, aroused the masses, and bent his knee before the Queen if she chanced to be along his route. But especially at the vast popular gatherings over which he presided in the open air, his influence developed in all its might. Wrote one of his contemporaries:

O'Connell's eloquence was an eloquence that could not be classified, prodigious, striking, spontaneous, such as neither the ancients nor the moderns ever had. This was the great O'Connell, standing on the soil of his fatherland, having the heavens for roof, the vast field for pulpit, an immense throng for audience, and for echo the universal

[27] In 1815 he had the misfortune to accept a challenge to a duel, in which he killed his adversary. In his grief he made a vow never again to issue or accept a challenge. He remained faithful to this vow in spite of the lively controversies in which he was involved throughout the rest of his life.

acclamations of the multitude. . . . He identifies himself with his people, he lives their life, he smiles at their joys, he bleeds with their wounds, he weeps with their sorrows. . . . But he encloses himself and matures in legality as in an impregnable fortress. He is daring, but perhaps more adroit than daring. Punctilious, shrewd, sharp, a subtle attorney, he carries off by cunning what he cannot seize by force. Where others would be lost, he saves himself.[28]

A Catholic Association was formed in Ireland in 1810 under the direction of a silk worker, John Keogh. O'Connell reorganized it. It had its judges, its treasury, its journals. It scrutinized all the acts of the British government. The Parliament passed a law forbidding this kind of society. The Catholic Association declared itself dissolved and at once formed again by changing its statutes. Its daring increased. It now no longer called for merely the emancipation of the Catholics, but the repeal of the Union. It divided its affairs among three special committees, received contributions in each parish by the mediation of the pastor under the supervision of the bishop, and concentrated the grievances and the wishes of the Irish to have them reach the throne.

This agitation was always legal, but ever growing. It embraced six million oppressed Irishmen, obedient to the orders of a deeply respected leader, frightened a considerable number of statesmen. The Whigs showed themselves generally disposed to pass measures favorable to the Irish cause. The Tories were divided. In 1827, Canning, a member of the parliamentary Tories and favorable to the Catholics, became prime minister. But his death, coming soon afterward, occasioned a shake-up in the cabinet. The Catholic emancipation was rejected. O'Connell then made an experiment to convince the government of the necessity of yielding.

In July, 1828, he presented his name at the election in County Clare against a member of the ministry. Although unknown in

[28] Timon (L. de Cormenin), *Le livre des orateurs.*

the district as well as being incapable of sitting in Parliament as a Catholic, he was elected with such popular demonstrations that in the evening of the election the great agitator exclaimed: "Now Ireland is free." He meant that henceforth its cause was morally before the bar of public opinion.

At the reopening of Parliament, Robert Peel and Wellington, in the name of the ministry, decided to ask for the emancipation of the Catholics. King George IV agreed, then refused his approval. Peel offered his resignation. But the King did not find anyone to take the office. The voice of O'Connell became more formidable. Despite his quality of Catholic, he openly affirmed his intention of sitting in the House of Commons. Although he refused to recognize the Protestant supremacy, he offered to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen. Like victors of old, he pretended to enter the place by a breach. The ministries, alarmed by his boldness, by the mighty manifestations that supported him in Ireland, and by the sympathies he was winning more and more in England among the liberals, decided (April 13, 1829) to introduce the Emancipation Bill. It passed by a vote of 348 to 160. Every Catholic who would swear fidelity to the king would be declared to have the right to vote and to be eligible for office. Every Catholic would be eligible to civil and military offices except a few high posts.[29]

O'Connell had freed not only the Catholics of Ireland. The Emancipation Act, in the full scope of its terms, embraced the whole British Empire, including, besides Ireland, Scotland and England and its colonies. More than a hundred million men, on the shores of the twenty seas, could now call themselves Catholic without being treated as a herd of slaves.

The Emancipation Act was acclaimed as a benefit of vast import. It was greeted by public opinion and by the courts of Europe, by the most confirmed representatives of liberalism in

[29] On the negotiations preceding the passage of the bill, see Artaud, *Histoire de Léon XII*, II, 288–90, 335–90, 394 ff., 411–16.

France and Germany, and by the most authorized spokesmen of the old dynasties. While the disciples of Lamennais and Goerres regarded it as "a preparation for the future freedom of Christian peoples oppressed by the iron hand of despotism," [30] Prince Metternich (April 19, 1829), in the name of the Emperor of Austria, wrote to ambassador Esterhazy: "We see in the event (the emancipation of Catholics) not only the triumph of a cause, but likewise the consolidation of an administration on which rest our last hopes of universal well-being. . . . The Emperor desires Your Highness to express on his part to His Britannic Majesty his sincere felicitations on the conclusion of an affair that will add a new luster to the glory of his reign." [31]

The Oxford Movement

The Emancipation Act was disapproved in some quarters. At least a certain anxiety about the possible consequences of this legislative act was encountered among several eminent and sincerely religious members of the Anglican clergy. We have already seen that at the very time when O'Connell was carrying on his vigorous campaign in favor of his fellow Catholics of Ireland, some serious and pious minds, impressed by the decline of the Anglican Church, had thought of communicating a new life to it by steeping it in its early sources. Of this number was John Newman. This freedom granted to a foreign worship, admitted almost on the same footing with the established religion, seemed to them to be a sort of treason to the old national Church. That apparent indifference appeared to them to be prompted, at least partly, by the revolutionary liberalism which

[30] Lacordaire, *Œuvres*, VIII, 175.

[31] Metternich, *Mémoires*, IV, 589. On O'Connell, cf. John O'Connell, *Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell;* J. Gondon, *Biographie de Daniel O'Connell.*

Newman mistrusted throughout his life.[32] At that moment he was unaware that soon he and his friends would ask of Catholic practices and doctrines, better and better understood by them, the regeneration of the Christian spirit which rightly formed their preoccupation.[33] Little by little their prejudices would crumble.

We cannot easily understand such feelings in souls otherwise generous and lofty-minded. But we need merely remark that at this time Catholicism appeared to them, through the Protestant misrepresentations, as an abominable corruption of Christianity. Newman "firmly believed that the pope was the antichrist foretold by Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John. Such was the strength of his feeling that in his *Gradus ad Parnassum* he had effaced the epithets which accompanied the word 'pope,' such as *vicarius Christi, sacer interpres,* and replaced them by uncomplimentary qualifications." [34] From 1822 to 1824 Newman saw some of his prejudices fall in consequence of his relations with a professor of theology, Dr. Lloyd, whose lectures he attended. Lloyd, who in his youth had known some French *émigré* priests and who admired their virtues and appreciated their doctrines, attempted to lead his pupils to less unfavorable views of the Catholic Church.[35] The close friendly relations that soon after were established between Newman and two young Anglicans inclined toward Catholicism, namely, Keble and Froude, continued the work begun by Lloyd. The reading

[32] By liberalism Newman always meant antidogmatic rationalism, the error by which a person submits revealed doctrines to human judgment. Moreover, Newman numbered among his best friends many Catholics who, like Lacordaire and Montalembert, declared themselves in a different sense.

[33] On this attitude of Newman, see Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre,* I, 48.

[34] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.,* I, 18. On the calumnies spread in England against the Catholics and on the efforts made by the episcopate of Great Britain to offset them, see Artaud, *op. cit.,* II, 203–12, 266–68.

[35] *Ibid.,* p. 25.

of the early Fathers, which the three young men studied with avidity in their search for elements of Christian regeneration, destroyed many preconceived notions in their minds. The friendly relations and collaboration of ideas which became established between them and a fourth person, Edward Pusey, had a similar result.

Pusey, whose mind was independent of any school and who had a gentle and austere piety, thought, like Newman, Froude, and Keble, of infusing into the Church of England an interior life more conformable to the Gospel spirit. But, strange to say, when he attempted to spread about him some books and prayers corresponding to his aim, he found them almost always among the books and prayers in use in the Roman Church. In a word, about 1827 and 1828 a transformation had been produced in Newman's mind prompting him to write that his spirit had not found his rest, that he was journeying, that he felt himself advancing slowly, led as a blind man by the hand of God, not knowing where God was leading him.[36] At this time also he refused to sign a petition tending to deny the rights of Catholics,[37] but he persisted in thinking that the favor met with in the emancipation project was "a sign of the times, a proof of the invasion of philosophism and indifferentism." [38] Nevertheless the truth was forging ahead in that upright soul. In 1826 he was made a tutor [39] in Oriel College, a position that gave him considerable influence with the young men of Oxford University. Two years later, still retaining his duties of tutor, he was promoted to the post of vicar [40] of St. Mary's at Oxford. His sermons to the people and his intellectual direction of the youth that thronged around him were inspired by the transformation which was taking place in his soul. He became a center. From

[36] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 36.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 49.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] The post of tutor ordinarily was accompanied with considerable influence.
[40] In the Church of England a vicar is what we call a pastor or parish priest.

that period date the relations he formed with several students: Henry Wilberforce, Frederick Rogers (who became Lord Blachford), and William Gladstone, the future prime minister. Of these young friends, some would follow him all the way to Catholicism, others would stop on the way. But all would keep for John Newman, after as before his conversion, a sort of veneration that never was extinguished.

CHAPTER VI

The Church in Other Countries

POPE LEO XII did not live to see the emancipation of English Catholics nor the conversion movement which Newman prepared. The Pope was already dead two months when Rome received news of the act of Parliament which granted freedom to the Catholics. But Leo XII had collaborated in a way as effective as it was discreet; historians rightly give him this honor.[1] A direct intervention by the Holy See in the campaign waged by O'Connell, in which the Protestants pretended to see only the doings of a political party, might have had more disadvantages then usefulness. Leo XII did not, however, refrain from doing so. But by the letters which he exchanged with George IV [2] and by the encouragements and directions he gave to the English Catholic bishops,[3] he contributed not a little to the success of the movement which ended in the Emancipation Act.

Spain

The Supreme Pontiff showed the same spirit of prudent restraint and of political tact in the affairs that disturbed Spain during his pontificate. Among the heroic populations that, from 1804 to 1814, rose up for the defense of the Spanish soil and that resisted the armies of the French Empire, we can distinguish, beside the pure heroes whose patriotism and faith

[1] Artaud, *Histoire de Léon XII,* II, 416; Crétineau-Joly, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution,* II, 165.

[2] Artaud, *op. cit.,* II, 202.

[3] *Ibid.,* II, 204–12; Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.,* II, 164.

were the sole motives, two classes of men. Some thought less of defending the monarchy and religion than the freedom of their local councils and the independence of their guerilla warfare. The writings of the French philosophers and the principles of the French Revolution had not penetrated into their midst. But, unconscious democrats, liberals without knowing it, they were ready to accept and defend every political institution favoring the sovereignty of the people and limiting the powers of the king and clergy. They were also champions of the constitution of 1812, which gave preponderant authority to the Cortes.

At the opposite extreme, popular masses acclaimed the privileges of the clergy and the absolute power of the king. This attitude was taken less by reflective conviction than by pugnacious instinct, by grudge against the upper classes—bourgeois, nobles, the learned—whom an absolute king would dominate, whom a powerful inquisition would strike without mercy. It was a demagogy of special form, less hideous than elsewhere, because the people had more faith, a higher sense of dignity and of national honor. The influence of religion restrained it and partly ennobled its tendencies.[4] These masses joined their noisy clamors to the acclamations with which the court nobility, and almost the entire clergy, and numerous high dignitaries of the army and the magistracy welcomed (1814) King Ferdinand's return. Ferdinand, carried away by these enthusiastic manifestations, at once re-established absolute power and made imprudent use of it. Arbitrary inequalities and unjustified privileges were again introduced or were freshly created. Exile, imprisonments, and deportations increased. Moreover, the government of Ferdinand VII had none of that continuity and unity in the direction of affairs by which arbitrary monarchies exercise their despotism.

The general welfare of the state was sacrificed no less than personal interests. The seaports were deserted, the arsenals

[4] L. de Carné, *Vues sur l'histoire contemporaine*, I, 316.

were empty. When he wished to make an effort to suppress the insurrection of the Spanish colonies in America, which had just taken advantage of the troubles of the mother country in order to declare themselves independent, Ferdinand was reduced to the necessity of buying eight ships from Russia. When this squadron arrived at Cadiz, only two ships were in condition to set sail. The expeditionary force could not embark. The devotion to the Church, which the King so loudly professed, was itself not to be relied on. He suspended the appointment of prelates so as to use the revenues of the vacant sees for the wiping out of the debt; in his hands the Inquisition seemed to become an instrument of the royal administration.

A reaction was inevitable. It broke out, revolutionary, unjust, violent, attacking the King, the clergy, the whole social order. On January 1, 1820, two young officers stirred up the troops of the expeditionary force that was vainly waiting at Cadiz for orders to leave for America. The movement spread. General O'Donnell, charged with suppressing the insurrection, made common cause with it. The secret societies took charge of its direction. Ferdinand, assailed in his capital, agreed to swear to the constitution of 1812 and to promise liberal institutions. He was too late. The revolution kept him prisoner in his palace and it confiscated the property of the Church to fill up the deficit and to guarantee some loans.

The allied powers aroused themselves, and with good reason. The representatives of France, Russia, Austria, England, and Prussia, meeting at Verona (October 20, 1822), were concerned with a movement that seemed to them to threaten the foundations of the European system. Wrote Metternich: "The disorder which has overturned Spain is of a kind that poisons and attacks the principle of life." [5] France, definitely pledged by her two plenipotentiaries, Montmorency and Chateaubriand,

[5] Metternich. *Mémoires,* IV, 37.

assumed the burden of the expedition. Mingled with the desire to defend the social and religious order threatened by the revolution, was a concern of dynastic interest. Chateaubriand was able to communicate his great hope to King Louis XVIII. He said: "Legitimacy was for the first time going to burn some powder under the white flag, to override Spain in one stride, to succeed on the same soil where recently the armies of a conqueror had reverses, to do in six months what he had not been able to do in seven years." [6] This dream was realized.

The Spanish government, disorganized, lacking both soldiers and money, could not present an effective resistance to the French. The Duke of Angoulême, who was in command of the expedition, covered himself with glory at the taking of the fort of the Trocadero, the key to the defense of Cadiz, where the government had taken refuge. One of the aims of the expedition was attained. France showed Europe that she had recovered an army. But the second aim, the pacifying of Spain, was not realized. Ferdinand VII, resuming the royal power, disdained the counsel of moderation which the Duke of Angoulême gave him, treated the vanquished with pitiless rigor, and thus laid the ground for violent reprisals that disturbed the rest of his reign. On the other hand, the Spanish colonies in America, continuing to profit from the embarrassment of the mother country, separated from it with finality.

Pope Leo XII anxiously followed the course of all these events. The thwarting of the revolutionary sects could but reassure him. At the first news of the French victory, he invited the diplomatic corps and the Sacred College to a *Te Deum* of thanksgiving, which was celebrated in the Lateran basilica.[7] But he did not wish thereby to be too closely allied to the cause of Ferdinand VII. Such a policy would have been to fall into

[6] Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, IV, 285.
[7] Artaud, *op. cit.*, I, 120–23.

the trap from which he could escape with difficulty.[8] He decided to reward, with an honorary distinction, the general who in this affair had shown himself as moderate in his counsels as he was valiant in combat. He therefore paid to the Duke of Angoulême a homage of the two traditional insignia by which his predecessors had honored the great defenders of Christianity: Don Juan of Austria after the battle of Lepanto; Sobieski after the battle of Vienna; Prince Eugene after the battle of Peterwardein. These insignia were a sort of medieval hat, called *berettone* in Italian, and a heavy sword, called *stoco*.[9] At the same time, to show that he was not, as it were, a vassal of the Spanish monarchy, he did not hesitate to enter into relations with the American states that had just separated from Spain and formed themselves into republics.[10] Several sees were vacant there. Spain, though it had lost all effective authority over those countries, insistently claimed the right to nominate the candidates for these sees. Leo XII, in a consistory held May 21, 1827, declared to the cardinals that he had just filled these vacancies "with worthy men by whose care those Churches, cleansed of their stains, would again flourish and would produce abundant fruits of salvation." [11] He acted thus without anyone's cooperation, but solely by virtue of his apostolic authority and his primary duty of feeding the sheep and the lambs.

The court of Madrid showed its dissatisfaction. Ferdinand VII manifested his ill humor by deferring the reception of

[8] On December 2, 1823, the French chargé d'affaires at Rome, Artaud de Montor, wrote to Chateaubriand: "Leo XII, expressing his approval of the noble and vigorous measures that have contributed to the re-establishment of the authority of the King of Spain, seeks the means of avoiding domination by the faction that had chosen him" (Artaud, I, 130).

[9] Artaud, II, 34, 43–46.

[10] From 1810 to 1822 Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, Paraguay, and La Plata separated from Spain.

[11] Artaud, II, 299.

Bishop Tiberi as papal nuncio. Prompted by the same spirit, the Spanish government on this occasion reduced the amount of help it had been accustomed to send to the Holy Land.[12] The Supreme Pontiff wrote to the King of Spain: "Because we place bishops there, where for more than a dozen years you no longer rule, should you menace even your Spanish states that have remained loyal to you with a series of disagreements with the Holy See? Our duties come from on high. You cannot say that we have refused to hear your ambassador. He himself will bear true testimony to our keen grief at being obliged today to decline accord to the desires of His Catholic Majesty." [13]

Labrador, shortly afterward sent to Rome by Ferdinand VII to replace Vargas as ambassador, had the happiness of helping to restore the good harmony between the Spanish court and the Holy See.

Italy

The Spanish disturbances had their repercussions in Italy. There also Leo XII, while applauding the repression of the revolutionary moves, could not always be gratified at the attitude of the absolute powers toward him.

The number of secret societies continued to increase in Italy. Under a variety of names and forms they were extending their ramifications, not merely in the Abruzzi, but also in Romagna, Piedmont, Lombard-Venetia, and the duchies. Italy now had centers organized for a revolutionary agitation. For its outbreak, it needed only that a neighboring people give the example or that an extraordinary measure of repression, emanating from the authority, should be taken as a provocation. The two facts took place almost at the same time. In 1820, Ferdinand,

[12] These subsidies were completely suppressed in 1835.
[13] Artaud, II, 300.

king of the Two Sicilies, tried to use the Calderari in opposition to the Carbonari. The former became the supporters of the absolute power. At the same time the news of the Spanish revolt reached Italy. On July 2, two young lieutenants of the Neapolitan army, Morelli and Silvati, at the instigation of the priest Minichini, stirred up the troops, set out for Naples, and forced the King to swear to the Spanish constitution of 1812. The movement of revolt reached Piedmont, where a revolutionary assembly called itself "the junta of the Italian confederation," and also proclaimed the Spanish constitution.

The allied monarchs, gathered in congress at Troppau (October–December, 1820), commissioned Austria to intervene in Italy. The Austrian army routed the revolutionaries at Novara. But hatred against the foreigners, that is, against Austria and the allied powers, did but increase. The secret societies exploited the national feeling in order to attain their own end, which was the antisocial and antireligious revolution. In vain the monarchies, when they considered everything lost, tried to come to terms with the rebels and to give them pledges. These concessions merely aroused the boldness of the sect. Leo XII, in speaking to Cardinal Bernetti, said: "We warned the princes, but the princes slept. We warned their ministers, but their ministers have not kept awake." [14] Carbonarism even established units in Rome itself.[15] A press subsidized by them spread calumny against all established authority and attempted to compromise the Church in the measures taken by the princes. The outrage upon Cardinal Rivarola in 1826 at Ravenna was one of the results of the dangerous incitements.[16]

However, amid all these disturbances the King of Naples, evidently backed by the allied sovereigns, found the means of

[14] Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 163.

[15] All the secret societies, whatever their form, were organized in units of twenty members.

[16] On the Naples and Piedmont revolutions, see Cantù, *La storia di centi anni,* II, 442–64.

returning to that perpetual question of the *haquenée,*[17] which since the Middle Ages had so often set at variance the Sicilian monarchy and the Holy See, and which the concordat of 1818 seemed to have regulated finally. On April 9, 1825, Baron de Damascus, French minister of foreign affairs, was commissioned by the ambassador of Naples to take up the question with the Holy See. The ambassador's language was haughty almost to the point of insolence. In his dispatch he wrote: "These claims of the Holy See go back to the time when it exercised rights over most of the crowns. . . . But the course of the centuries has made them fall into disuse. The independence of the throne has become the surest guaranty of the prosperity of states and even of religion." The Austrian ambassador sided with the declaration of the French minister. Pope Leo XII replied that he was not free to renounce a right established in favor of the Holy See by authentic treaties. He said: "We are depositaries of our rights only in the quality of an elected prince. We are more constrained than any sovereign of Europe not to relinquish any prerogative of the crown." [18] This reply admitted of no reply by sovereigns who were resting the whole legitimacy of their rights on the inviolability of the treaties and the traditions which had consecrated them long ago.

The Netherlands

At the moment when Leo XII was thus putting an end to the conflict raised by the courts of Naples, Paris, and Vienna, his attention was called to the Church of the Netherlands. There also a sovereign was hindering the action of the Holy See; there likewise were aroused popular feelings that, a few years later, would lead to a revolution.

About the middle of 1825, three serious affairs awakened the

[17] Cf. Mourret, *op. cit.,* VII, 51 f., 473. Cf. IV, 238.
[18] Artaud, II, 427. Cf. p. 353.

solicitude of the Supreme Pontiff in regard to the Netherlands. They were: 1. the appointment of a schismatic bishop at Deventer; 2. the hostile attitude taken by King William toward the Catholics; 3. the excitement aroused by that hostility in the provinces of Belgium.

Ever since the Jansenist chapter of Utrecht had arrogated to itself (1722) the right to name a bishop, the schism was perpetuated in Holland. In 1825 a certain William Vet, having been illegally chosen bishop of Deventer (one of the pretended sees suffragan to Utrecht), had the effrontery to notify Leo XII of his election. The Supreme Pontiff on this occasion addressed (August 17, 1825) a brief to the faithful of Holland. Therein he declared the election of Vet null and his consecration illegal, and exhorted the Catholics to gather about the Apostolic See, the center of unity.[19]

This brief came to the Netherlands at a critical time. It was the very time when the Catholic provinces of Belgium, arbitrarily annexed to Protestant Holland by the treaties of 1815, were undergoing a violent persecution on the part of the King. Notwithstanding the fundamental law of the kingdom, which guaranteed liberty of conscience, King William I plagued the Catholic clergy and faithful in every way. On June 14, 1823, he issued two decrees, by force of which no school could be opened without the assent of the government, which reserved to itself the naming of all the teachers and the supervision of the said schools. Further, all non-approved institutions, particularly all the episcopal seminaries, must regard themselves as henceforth suppressed. All aspirants to the ecclesiastical state must thereafter attend the official schools, in particular a certain "college of philosophy." But these official schools imparted instruction that was notoriously hostile to Catholicism.

The Belgium people's irritation increased. It was the greater inasmuch as, to the indignation aroused by the religious perse-

[19] *Ibid.*, II, 121.

cution, was added the aversion of an oppressed people toward an oppressing people. Would not the secret societies, prompted to seize upon all popular movements as a means of shaking the principle of authority everywhere, try to compromise the persecuted populations of Belgium in some revolutionary undertaking? Leo XII, apparently fearing so, addressed an energetic protest to King William I; but at the same time, through Bishop Mazio, he wrote a letter in which he advised the Catholics and clergy to maintain a passive attitude until such time as the Holy See might judge apropos to come to a decision on the situation.[20]

In accordance with the instruction given by the Pope, the bishops of Gand, Tournai, and Malines refrained from any manifestation when their seminaries were suppressed. Meanwhile the Pope did not remain inactive. To show his disapproval of any violence, he censured a pamphlet in which King William was called "a crowned Luther." But at the same time he gave the impression of an unfailing resistance and hinted that a continuation of the vexatious measures would let loose among Catholics a revolt movement which only his express will was holding in check. This attitude on the part of Leo XII resulted in the issuing, by the Netherlands' minister of the interior, of a circular declaring that henceforth attendance at the "philosophical college" by candidates for holy orders would be simply optional, and no longer obligatory. Shortly afterward (June 18, 1827) a formal concordat was signed at Rome by Cardinal Cappellari, another representative of the Holy See, and representatives of the King of the Netherlands. The second article of this convention stipulated that each diocese would have its chapter and its seminary. The third article provided that the election of bishops would devolve on the chapters with confirmation by the Supreme Pontiff.[21]

Unfortunately this concordat was not conscientiously car-

[20] *Ibid.*, II, 124.

[21] For the text of this document, see Artaud, II, 307–16.

ried out by the government of the Netherlands. Bigoted ministers exerted pressure on the King. In the month of April, 1828, the *Courier des Pays-Bas,* in an endeavor to shift the responsibility, tried to lay the blame for this non-execution upon "the ill-will of the Pope," whom it represented as "coveting the liberties and tranquillity of the country." Leo XII had simply asked for explanations regarding a confidential circular of the government which, a short time after the promulgation of the concordat, had alarmed the Catholics by seeming to say the very contrary to what was affirmed in the solemn treaty concluded with the Holy See.[22] The Catholic agitation began again. By combining with other oppositions of an economic and national order, it would end in the revolution of 1830, which proclaimed the independence of Belgium.

Russia

A conflict of the same sort, but more bitter, stirred up Catholic Poland, subjected to the schismatic empire of the czars. Czar Alexander I, following the religious policy of his predecessor Paul I, had not resumed the persecuting traditions of Catherine II toward the Polish nation. He even wished to make Poland an independent state, with the right to keep its own distinct institutions, its language, its administration, its army, and its Catholic hierarchy.[23] His mistake was to keep at the head of this Catholic hierarchy a man who, pushing to the extreme the traditions of most unadulterated Febronianism, "for fifty-four years of favor and power, had the talent to make use of the Church without ever serving the Church. By underhand methods he purchased the honors that it accorded him with laments, or that he shamelessly usurped." [24]

[22] This circular will be found in the *Ami de la religion,* October 24, 1827, p. 329. On the incidents mentioned, see *ibid.*, April 26, 1828, pp. 344–46.

[23] On Alexander I and his probable conversion to Catholicism on his deathbed, see Mourret, *op. cit.,* VII, 554.

[24] Lescoeur, *L'église catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe,* p. 18.

We are referring to Stanislas Siestrzencewicz. He was born a Calvinist, a former soldier, who, through the intrigues of Catherine II, ascended the throne in the metropolitan see of Mahilev. From Alexander I he obtained the official formation of the too famous "Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical College." This body met at Saint Petersburg, after the manner of the Holy Synod and, made up of men without conscience, religion, or morals,[25] there became nearly all-powerful as the tool of the temporal power. The unworthy prelate crowned his work, by his chicanery, in the dismissal of the apostolic nuncio, whose mere presence at Saint Petersburg was thwarting his designs. Yet the energetic faith of the Polish Catholics enabled them to maintain and, on certain points, to improve their organization. When Czar Nicholas I came to the throne in 1826, the detestable traditions of Catherine II reappeared. On the day of his coronation the new emperor received with many signs of regard the envoy sent by the Supreme Pontiff, Bishop Bernetti, and several liberal measures taken at the outset of his reign favorably impressed Leo XII. At that time the Pope said of him: "Such acts are full of greatness; all that is worthy of Henry IV." But the future held in store a cruel contradiction of these hopes.

Some have said that the Polish insurrection provoked the absolutism of Nicholas I. But the facts belie this assertion. Let us note the first attacks by the government of Czar Nicholas I upon the Catholic Church.

In a period of complete peace, by a ukase of February, 1826, Nicholas began the attacks on the united Church which the considerateness of Paul and Alexander I had allowed to rise from its ruins. This ukase forbade all Polish or Russian merchants belonging to the united Church to sell in the fairs or any other gathering of people, in Little Russia, White Russia, or elsewhere,[26] any book for the use of the faithful of that Church. This measure, however, was but an insignifi-

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[26] On White Russia, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 55, 542.

cant preliminary, only the date being noteworthy. The ukase of April 22, 1828, two years before the Polish insurrection and eleven years before the final fall of the United Church, was the real cause of the ruin. . . . This ukase instituted, after the likeness of the Holy Synod established by Peter the Great, and of the Roman Catholic College designed by Siestrzencewicz, a "united Greek Ecclesiastical College." As Pope Gregory XVI later remarked in a memorable allocution,[27] "it marked an almost total dependence imposed by the Russian government upon the bishops in the exercise of their authority."

Moreover, all the subsequent acts were merely its logical development: formal exclusion from supervision of the teaching of both secular and regular clergy, issued against the bishops and superiors of religious orders, and consequently the forcible intrusion of secular persons and dissenters in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs; the suppression or complete upsetting of the religious orders, on which new regulations were arbitrarily imposed concerning profession, monastic vows, the novitiate, and studies, so to make morally impossible the recruiting of the religious houses that were not suppressed; vacancies of episcopal sees systematically prolonged, and appointments of incapable persons to them, and this by deliberate choice; repeated confiscations of property of religious houses.[28]

Parallel to these measures of religious persecution, repeated acts of systematic oppression had in mind particularly the Polish nation.

Nicholas was willing to be crowned king of Poland; but he no longer convoked the diet and he let Poland be governed by absolutists who spoke of revoking the charter of 1815. One of them declared: "We are not concerned with discussion, but with being obeyed." This regime irritated all the Poles; but on how they were to act, they were divided into two parties. The big landowners and the clergy preferred to submit to Nicholas' despotism rather than expose the Polish nation to complete destruction; they hoped for better times. These formed the

[27] Allocution of July 22, 1842.
[28] Lescœur, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–31.

party of prudence, called the Whites. The young men, the students at Warsaw, admirers of the French Revolution, wished for open strife against the Czar to defend the country's liberty. They formed a patriotic and democratic party, called the Reds, directed by secret societies connected with the Carbonari.[29]

Until 1830 the Whites succeeded in restraining the Reds.

Greece

Thus in Poland as in Belgium, in France as in Italy, the Catholics as a whole conformed to the authority without cooperating in the despotism. They were ready to struggle for liberty while refusing any agreement with the revolutionary societies. The question of what attitude should be observed appeared especially difficult with regard to the Greek revolt. The sympathies in favor of the Greek people created by the writings of Chateaubriand and Lord Byron, the memories of a glorious past and the energetic resistance of a Christian people to Islam, had at first aroused an almost universal enthusiasm in Europe. Artaud de Montor, at that time attached to the Roman embassy, states that persons of Consalvi's school applauded the efforts of the Greeks as likely to usher in happy days for Catholicism.[30] But several personages did not share these feelings. They thought that "a Greek schismatic is often more to be dreaded than all the Ottomans together." [31]

These differences became evident particularly on the occasion, in 1825, of the arrival at Rome of a Greek captain, named Chiefala. He came apparently to treat the question of the reunion of the Greek Church with the Latin Church. But this self-styled plenipotentiary was unable to produce evidence that

[29] C. Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 557.
[30] Artaud, II, 111.
[31] *Ibid.*

he had received full powers in the matter. He was at once discredited because to his quality of envoy extraordinary he joined a claim to offer Cyprus wine at a low price. Stalinsky, diplomatic representative of Russia, said: "What does a man intend to do here who sells wine and Churches?" Leo XII saw in every dealing in the matter only the risk of compromising himself. He avoided all negotiations, and the affair was not pursued further.

Foreign Missions

The dubious attitude of Greece with regard to Catholicism was the more painful to the Pope's heart as he received sad news of the missions established in that country. In that same year 1825, the Duke de Laval, French ambassador to the Holy See, handed to the Cardinal Secretary of State a copy of two letters which the Baron de Damascus had written to Bishop Frayssinous, the minister of ecclesiastical affairs. The first letter, dated June 22, related that the Greek missions, entrusted to the Capuchins, counted no more than thirteen religious, divided among the missions of Pera, Smyrna, Chios, Naxos, Syros, and Canea. The residences of Athens, Parchia, Cimolus, Melos, and part of Candia had no longer any missioners.

The mission of Syria, likewise served by the Capuchins, was in a most deplorable state. It now counted only two religious: one at Algiers, the other at Beyrouth. The other posts—Diarbekr, Damascus, Tripoli, Seyde, Hede, Soleyman, and Gabail —were unoccupied. The Vincentian missions were in the same condition of decline. Where at least thirty religious were needed, not more than ten were there, nearly all of them aged or infirm.[32]

[32] Artaud, II, 49.

The reports that came to the Holy See about the state of the other foreign missions were equally gloomy. The *Ami de la religion* contained (May 22, 1824) the following lines:

> The Foreign Mission Seminary has received sad news on the situation of its missions. . . . That of Siam is reduced to one man, the vicar apostolic, weighed down with years and infirmities. . . . The mission of West Tonkin, which has more than 200,000 Christians, more than 90 native priests, a seminary, two colleges, and about 40 houses of religious, has only one European missioner, namely, a bishop 72 years old. . . . Cochin China, with about 80,000 Christians, has only an eighty-year-old bishop and three young French missioners. . . . The mission of Pondichery, with 500,000 faithful, scattered in several kingdoms, has, besides the bishop, only six French missioners and five Indian priests, who are not of great help. . . . What will become of these missions unless a reinforcement of apostolic workers is sent in sufficient numbers to keep up all the good that has been accomplished there? [33]

The bishops of the United States received financial help [34] and missioners from Europe.[35] The Holy Ghost Fathers could not adequately meet the religious needs of the colonies.[36] Almost everywhere resources and men were lacking. An immediate remedy for all these ills was not in the power of the Supreme Pontiff. But he labored effectively to prepare the renewal of the foreign missions; the result would appear a few years later. Following the example of Pius VII, he encouraged by spiritual favors the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. This work, established May 3, 1822, at Lyons, received yearly increasing alms. Its *Annales,* appearing every two months and sent gratis to each group of ten members, was ac-

[33] *Ami de la religion,* May 22, 1824, pp. 49–53.

[34] *Annales de la propagation de la foi,* no. 10; *Ami de la religion,* July 14, 1827, p. 290.

[35] *Ami de la religion,* October 13, 1827, p. 283.

[36] *Ibid.,* February 17, 1827, p. 26.

quainting Catholics with the needs of the missions. Furthermore, the religious congregations, approved and blessed by Leo XII, were preparing numerous workers for the distant apostolate.

Last Acts of Leo XII

However, neither the preoccupation with big undertakings nor the negotiations carried on with the different European states diverted the zealous pontiff from the cares of his temporal and spiritual government. Leo XII set to work to assure in the first place the material tranquillity of his States. Brigands were still infesting the highways and, after their crimes, withdrew into the almost inaccessible mountains of the Apennines or Calabria. The Pope began by using methods of mildness. He had rewards distributed to those who made their submission. More severe measures were employed against the refractory. The struggle was a long one. For Cardinal Pallota, who was placed in charge of the repression and who did not succeed, Leo XII substituted Bishop Benvenutii. He received as military commander an army colonel, named Ruvinetti. This energetic officer entered resolutely in the strife against the famous Massarone, the head of the brigands, and brought security to the Papal States.

The reduction of the number of wine shops was a measure required for the public peace. Because of the people's habits, the move was the occasion of long struggles, which continued through Leo XII's whole pontificate.[37] The floods of the Anio were, for the people living near Tivoli, a cause of serious losses. The Pontiff had large works undertaken that placed the locality out of danger. Administrative, financial, and judiciary reforms introduced order into the government. One of

[37] For this measure and other details mentioned in the next few lines, see Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, pp. 187, 194–98. 202.

the most extensive works of Leo XII was the rebuilding of St. Paul's outside the walls, which had been destroyed by a fire in the last days of Pius VII's reign. For its rebuilding Leo XII made an appeal to the charity of the faithful of the whole Catholic world; they responded generously. The reorganization of higher schools of learning, the renewal of parish life, and the restoration of the religious life in the various communities of men and of women were the object of the devout Pontiff's ceaseless care.

Leo XII, at the time when he was Cardinal Vicar, often requested of Pius VII an improvement in the lot of the Jews, who at Rome were relegated to a much restricted district. Pius VII acceded to these wishes. But circumstances did not permit him to carry out his design. Leo XII, when he became pope, did what he had proposed to his predecessor. The Jewish quarter, or ghetto, was extended, made more healthful, and enriched with a fountain. Lastly, humane regulations and a wise tolerance were likewise taken account of.[38] To show plainly that this condescension toward the unhappy Jews did not imply, on the Pope's part, any thought of doctrinal indifference, he condemned the secret societies, in particular the sect of the Carbonari, blaming them chiefly for having as their aim to leave to each person the freedom of picking a religion according to his own whim and thus to introduce, as a religion, an indifferentism that could result only in deplorable ruination.[39] He blamed them also "for teaching that people have the right to stir up sedition for the purpose of stripping kings and other rulers of their powers." [40]

In this way Leo XII aided the efforts of the allied sovereigns. In the congresses or conferences of Aix-la-Chapelle, Carlsbad, Troppau, Laibach, and Verona, all but the last one

[38] Cf. Artaud, II, 141.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[40] *Ibid.*

held before the publication of the encyclical, these sovereigns had considered the measures to be adopted to destroy the baneful influence of secret societies. But such was the extent of the troubles that the evil had already caused—such was the blindness of certain courts which were cleverly deceived by cunning and daring adepts—that they were not able to attain this end which they pursued with a too exclusively political point of view.[41] The outstanding driving force of the conservative policy in Europe, Prince Metternich, so renowned for his clear-sightedness, had in his chancery as private secretary a member of the High Vente, whose pen name was Gaetano.[42] Were not such compromises of a sort to annul all the efforts by measures of outward repression? These errors and weaknesses of the statesmen and their ministers were a matter of the greatest anxiety to Leo XII.

Toward the end of 1828 many griefs and labors had worn out the Pope's health, which was precarious five years before. According to a report, one day near the end of January, 1829, the Pontiff in conversation with a prelate of his household, Monsignor Teste, said to him: "In a few days we shall no longer see each other." On the day of the Purification he attended the entire office in the Sistine Chapel. In the morning of February 5 he experienced the first attacks of a strangury. In spite of the assiduous treatment by several physicians, the ailment grew worse. Four days later the Pope asked to receive Holy Viaticum. With devotion and courage he answered all the liturgical prayers. That evening he fell into a deep sleep and breathed his last the following day, in the sixty-ninth year of his age.

The reign of Leo XII was almost completely without any sensational events. But this fact should not deceive us about the importance of his pontificate. Nowhere, indeed, did the Church

[41] Cf. C. Van Durem, *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes*, p. 132.
[42] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 133 note and chap. 10.

win a final victory; but it continued the strife everywhere, prefacing its future conquests. In France, Gallicanism, still alive in the survivors of another age, was seriously checked by the young Catholic school; in Germany the Munich school gave out a bright luster; in England a rebirth of the Roman faith was in preparation. Ireland, Belgium, and Poland advanced toward their liberation; for a restoration of the distant missions, in decline since the end of the eighteenth century, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith prospered and new congregations were more and more fruitful in apostles: both were receiving the resources and men that the Church needed.

A fresh zeal was leading the new generations to the combat. But the situation was not altogether free from illusion here and there, and from evident errors. The dangers appeared in France with Lamennais, and in Germany with the theologians too much imbued with the principles of Kant. Liberalism and rationalist criticism could already be seen as dangers that would soon have to be opposed. The revolutionary movement of 1830 would bring these more to light in the short pontificate of Pius VIII.

CHAPTER VII

Pius VIII
(*March 31, 1829, to November 30, 1830*)

The Conclave

FEW elections had been foreseen longer in advance and had more concerned the diplomats than that of Leo XII's successor. The uncertain state of the Pope's health made a fatal outcome to be expected from day to day. At each perceptible aggravation of the illness the conversations were taken up again between the ambassadors and their respective governments.[1] When the conclave opened (February 23, 1829) thirteen days after Leo's death, with eager curiosity attention was given to the discourses which, according to custom, the ambassadors of the great powers were allowed to deliver before the Sacred College. Count Lützow, the Austrian ambassador, and Count Labrador, the Spanish ambassador, spoke in a conservative tone. Declared Lützow: "The Emperor, and with him the Catholic world, asks you for a pope who, by his wisdom and moderation, will use his twofold power, spiritual and temporal, for the tranquillity, the advantages, and the happiness of all Europe." [2] Labrador was still more explicit. He said: "Your Eminences will elect a pontiff who, disposed to accord what is just, will at the same time, with his evangelical firmness, set up an insurmountable wall against the evil doctrines which, under the false name of generous ideas, are destroying the very foundations of the thrones of Europe and precipitating the nations in

[1] See Artaud, *Histoire de Léon XII*, I, 140–47, 192–97.
[2] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VIII*, p. 40.

ignominy and blood." [3] The French ambassador, at that time Viscount Chateaubriand, expressed the liberal note, saying: "Christianity, which renewed the face of the earth, has since witnessed a transformation of the societies to which it had given life. As I speak, mankind has reached one of those epochs characteristic of its existence." [4] In short, the author of *The Genius of Christianity,* in the name of France, asked for "a leader who, mighty by the doctrine and the authority of the past, was no less acquainted with the needs of the present and the future." [5]

Two tendencies thus showed themselves. They were the ones which a year later would in violent conflict overthrow many a throne of Europe and would shake them all. Public opinion was not misled in this matter. The press noisily discussed the speeches made by the diplomats in the presence of the Sacred College.[6] The questions thus stirred up took on a greater amplitude than had the previous conclave, which elected Leo XII.

The cardinals did not altogether escape from the outside influences. But they did not let themselves be dominated by them. Cardinal Castiglioni, designated to reply to the French ambassador, merely declared to him, in a tone of proud independence, that "the Sacred College was cognizant of the times." [7] Cardinal Castiglioni was the one that Pius VII, shortly before his death, had indicated for the choice of the cardinals as his successor. The former prisoner of Fontainebleau, as report had it, repeated to him in a familiar strain: "Your Holiness Pius VIII will do better than we have done." Of all the eligible candidates, Cardinal Castiglioni was the most conspicuous. Yet he was not elected until after several ballots.

[3] *Ami de la religion,* LIX, 283.

[4] Artaud, *op. cit.,* p. 45.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] For the echoes of these discussions and the different polemics aroused by the conclave of 1829, see the *Ami de la religion,* LIX, 89, 106, 121, 134, 145, 148, 164, 211, 212, 228, 280, 283.

[7] Artaud, *op. cit.,* p. 46.

A certain number of votes at first favored Cardinal de Gregorio, who was known to be desired by the court of Spain and was acceptable to the court of Austria. Other votes, more independent, were cast for Cardinal Pacca, well known for his zeal in defending the rights of the Holy See while he was nuncio at Cologne and more recently under Emperor Napoleon, who had him imprisoned at Fénestrelle. Finally the majority combined on the name of Castiglioni, whose attitude was less clear-cut than that of the other two candidates; but it offered the same guaranties of a firm and prudent policy. Moreover, they knew that his election would be agreeable to Austria and to France. After his election on March 31, 1829, he at once declared with a smile that he would take the name of Pius VIII.

Francis Xavier Castiglioni was born at Cingoli, near Ancona, of a noble family that was highly honored in the province. He was at first noteworthy for his high scientific culture, and in particular for a deep knowledge of canon law, which he had studied under the direction of the celebrated professor Devoti. The prudent and enlightened zeal with which he successively administered the dioceses of Montalto, Cesena, and Frascati won him the confidence and friendship of the two last popes. Gentle, polished, of timid appearance, on more than one occasion he showed that he was capable of confronting all dangers when his conscience would find itself engaged in an affair. Men could remember that Napoleon had been unable to make him bend in a circumstance of that sort. Successively exiled to Milan, Paris, and Mantua, for having refused to comply with the desires of the mighty monarch, by his example he raised the courage of many a wavering spirit.

Trying events were about to unfold in his pontificate. As the sharp-eyed already foresaw, these would require of the Roman Pontiff precisely that temperate firmness and prudence which Francis Xavier Castiglioni had exhibited many times

in the course of his career. The year 1830 marks one of the culminating points in the history of the nineteenth century. That year was the time of an almost general reaction against the absolute powers in favor of constitutional forms. The period was one of unprecedented social agitation in which the most revolutionary ideas did not yet shed a superficial veneer of Christianity. It was the high point of a literary and artistic movement in which good and evil were oddly mingled.

In France, with the school of Lamennais, the movement was the awakening of liberal Catholicism; in Germany, with the affair of mixed marriages, it was the prelude of the Kulturkampf; in England, with the Oxford movement, it was the beginning, still not well directed, uncertain, of a return of several noble souls to Catholicism; in Poland, Belgium, and Ireland, it was the heated campaign, here victorious and there brutally repulsed, of the Catholics for the freedom of their faith. To discern the questions where inflexible resistance was called for, to favor the lawful demands of the population without giving offense to the crowns, to uphold the principle of authority without discouraging the aspirations of the Catholics who would defend their faith in the name of liberty, all these practical problems the pontificate of Pius VIII will have to face. The circumstances, requiring him to adopt a less reserved attitude than that of his predecessor, will not let him intervene as decisively as will his successor in different circumstances. Between Leo XII's policy of appeasement and Gregory XVI's policy of combat, the balanced policy of Pius VIII should be viewed as a necessary transition and thus an interlude to be pointed out in the religious history of the nineteenth century.

Cardinal Albani

Often the Supreme Pontiffs, from the outset of their reigns, have indicated the direction of their thoughts by the choice of

their Secretary of State and by the publication of their first encyclical. Pius VIII's appointment of Cardinal Albani as Secretary of State did not surprise the Roman court and the European diplomatic world. Well known was the conformity of views between Cardinal Castiglioni and the descendant of the illustrious Albani family. Cardinal Joseph Albani,[8] born at Rome (September 13, 1750), was already advanced in years; but his vigorous spirit, active and penetrating, made him well suited for the most delicate functions. He gloried in belonging to the great school of Cardinal Consalvi and, like him, held that a prudent energy always triumphs in the end. A diplomatic mission that he filled at the Austrian court in the pontificate of Pius VII and, people said, some family connection with the imperial family,[9] gave him the friendship of Emperor Francis I and Prince Metternich. He was the one that the court of Vienna had directed, at the conclave of 1823, to pronounce the exclusive against Cardinal Severoli. But notwithstanding what was said by his enemies, he was never the servant of Austria against the French policy.[10] The high encomiums of him by Artaud de Montor, who in 1829 was the French representative at Rome, contradicts the prejudiced insinuations of the Pope's enemies.[11]

Pius VIII's first encyclical was published on May 24, 1829. To be noted was the fact that he there spoke of his authority, "not only over the lambs, that is, over the simple faithful, but also over the sheep, that is, over the bishops." He then warned the Christian people against "those sophists of the time who held that the harbor of salvation is open to all religions," against "those translations of the Scriptures in which the texts are

[8] Several other Albani cardinals had been members of the Sacred College. One of them had been elected pope under the name of Clement XI.

[9] Artaud, *op. cit.*, p. 24 note.

[10] See *Ami de la religion*, LIX, 249, 259.

[11] Artaud, *op. cit., passim*. Cf. Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 289; Moroni, *Dizionario de erudizione*, I, 181; Baudrillart in *Dictionnaire d'historie et de géographie ecclésiastique*, I, 1372.

twisted from their true meaning," and against "those secret societies of trouble-makers who labor to desolate the Church and to destroy the state." Lastly, he urged upon the faithful "respect for the holiness of marriage." [12] The future presently showed how well the Pontiff had discerned the real dangers of the Church. Misunderstanding of the rights of the Roman Pontiff, Protestant propaganda, the sophisms and illusions of indifferentism, the efforts of the secret societies to undermine the foundations of authority in the Church and in the state, and the mistaken notions of the peoples and the civil powers about Christian marriage, all these would constitute the chief perils of the Church and society during the pontificate of Pius VIII. These dangers were to be met with especially in France, the Netherlands, England, Germany, and Italy. They were, indeed, to be found along with noble examples of devotion and also works of piety and zeal, manifestations of faith and generosity that brought consolation to the august Pontiff.

Religious Situation in France

Of these good dispositions and these evil ones, France was the chief center. In spite of the sarcasms of the *Constitutionel,* the pamphlets of Paul Louis Courier, and the songs of Béranger, Catholicism was still a living thing in France when Pius VIII mounted the papal throne. "Notably in France, Christianity for fifty years past showed itself superior to all human vicissitudes. . . . The French are not perfect Catholics; they acknowledge and profess their religion at three great epochs of man's natural and social existence: at birth, marriage, and death." [13] By speaking thus, the journal of the highly regarded Michel Picot had in mind the rank and file of the people. The facts were more reassuring in the case of the

[12] *Ami de la religion,* LXI, 1–6.
[13] *Ibid.,* LXV, 160, 162.

upper classes. In 1828 the liberals' boldness and success brought about the formation of an association for the defense of the Catholic religion. It had the Duke of Havré at its head and counted among its directors Prince Hohenlohe, Count de la Rochejaquelein, Father Salinis, Father Des Genettes, Pierre Laurentie, and Augustin Cauchy.

The association had founded a fortnightly review. That paper was supplied with material by the correspondence of its adherents and took for its mission to point out and refute attacks against the clergy or against Catholic doctrine and practices. The first number of this periodical appeared (March 10, 1829) under the title of *Correspondant.*[14] The new publication was destined to take an important place in the Catholic press, which already included, besides the *Ami de la religion,* read by most of the clergy, the *Mémorial catholique,* the *Défenseur de la religion,* the *Tablettes du clergé,* the *Eclair,* and the *Apostolique,* which was the most zealous of all, though not always the most prudent.[15] Surviving the attacks of Count de Montlosier, the Congregation continued its works, being entrusted, after the resignation of Father Ronsin, to Father de Rohan, then to Father Mathieu, the future cardinal.[16] To the *Société des Bonnes Etudes,* directed by Emmanuel de Surcy, to the section of the *Bonnes Œuvres,* confided to Father Borderie, a magistrate, Jules Gossin added the *Œuvres de Saint-François Régis,* for the rehabilitation of irregular unions. In the salons of Fa-

[14] The principal contributors to the *Correspondant,* from March, 1829, to August, 1831, were Bailly de Surcy, Charles Séré de Rivière, Louis de Carné, and Father Edmond de Cazalés. When the success of the *Avenir* caused the *Correspondant* to lose most of its subscribers, it ceased publication. It was resumed in January, 1843, with part of its first editorial staff, to which were added Marquis Léonce de Vogué and Charles Lenormant. A third series began in 1855. For further details of the foundation of the *Correspondant* and its first editors, see Charles Sainte-Foi (Eloi Jourdain), *Souvenirs de jeunesse,* 1911, pp. 158–79.

[15] *Ami de la religion,* LXI, 225.

[16] Besson, *Vie du cardinal Mathieu,* I, chap. 5.

ther de Salinis, the chaplain of the College Henri IV, used to gather an elite group of young men: Melchior du Lac, Eugène de la Gournerie, Léon and Eugène Boré, Théophile Foisset, Edmond de Gazalès, and Franz de Champagny. We are told by one of the survivors of the group: "To these meetings was brought a great love of truth, an eager love for the cause of the Church. I do not think that Catholic youth ever showed more enthusiasm, activity, and life." [17]

This religious ardor seemed to radiate its warmth. In 1829 Victor Hugo, enamored of the beauties of the Middle Ages, was planning to portray them in *Notre Dame de Paris,* Lamartine published his *Hymn to Christ* and his *Novissima Verba,* and a young man who would soon join the group of the *Correspondant,* Charles de Montalembert, having been introduced into the Cenacle where Vigny, Hugo, Sainte-Beuve, and Musset were conducting the romantic campaign, declared: "Their cause is just and holy. . . . Only there will you find the future, the regeneration, and especially the moral regeneration." [18]

The religious group and the literary cenacle seemed to exercise a reciprocal influence on each other. Montalembert wrote: "I was charmed with the views of Vigny and Sainte-Beuve on the regeneration of Europe by Catholicism." [19] We find a romantic flavor in the volume published by Father Gerbet in 1829 on the *Dogme générateur de la piété catholique.* Picot's classical and somewhat severe taste was criticized for regarding the ancient sacrifices as "the emblem of a mystery from the depth of which forty centuries have heard the voice of hope issue forth." He was also charged with considering the offering that accompanies prayer as a prayer of the senses, and even of saying that "the Eucharistic Communion is the

[17] Melchior du Lac, "Notice sur l'abbé de Scorbiac," in the *Université catholique,* XXIII, 12.

[18] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* I, 86.

[19] *Ibid.*

means by which the permanent incarnation is individualized in each Christian." [20] But such writing as this went to the heart of the men of that time.[21] The many editions of the work and the conversions that it brought about bear witness in its favor. Father Lamennais, writing about Gerbet's book, says: "In my opinion this book is one of the most remarkable works that have been published for many years."

Gerbet's book was not the only one. In that same year 1829 we read in the October number of the *Mémorial catholique* an announcement of a *Bibliothèque des amis de la religion,* a 200-volume collection of the best ancient and modern works treating of Catholic doctrine and morals. The success of this great work did not lessen that of the *Bibliothèque choisie,* published by Pierre Laurentie, of the *Extraits des Pères de l'église* translated by Guillon, of the *Collectio selecta Patrum,* and the *Conférences d'Angers* on practical theology.[22] In 1830, just before the July revolution, the clergy and the literary Catholics eagerly read the *Démonstration philosophique du principe constitutif de la société* and the *Méditations politiques tirées de l'Evangile,* recently published by Viscount de Bonald.[23] And people were enthusiastic over the scientific lectures in which the illustrious Cuvier taught that the positive sciences did not contradict the Bible, but rather confirmed its divine authority.[24]

One man was the leading inspirer of this whole Catholic movement. That man was Father Lamennais. The group that used to meet at the College Henri IV looked upon him as their master. The *Mémorial catholique* was proud of his collaboration; the *Correspondant* paid homage to his ideas; the *Ami de la religion,* although often disagreeing with him, did not dispute his influence over the faithful and the clergy.

[20] *Ami de la religion,* LXII, 98.
[21] E. Forgues, *Correspondance de Lamennais,* II, 60.
[22] *Ami de la religion,* LXII, 144; LXV, 477.
[23] *Ibid.,* LXIV, 352; LXV, 445.
[24] *Ibid.,* LXII, 334.

Dangers of the Catholic Movement

In the eyes of prudent men, however, the enthusiasm of the Catholic movement did not save it from a threefold danger. The first came to it from the romantic school, whose thoroughly superficial Christian spirit soon vanished in smoke. *Notre Dame de Paris,* begun as a pious liking for the ages of faith, ended up in daring descriptions that brought on it the condemnation of the Church; Lamartine's Catholicism changed into a vague and sentimental religiosity; that of Vigny into a haughty and gloomy pessimism. Sainte-Beuve, after seeming to hesitate, entered the Abbey of La Trappe and the Abbey de Thélème,[25] finally chose in favor of the latter.

The second danger of the Catholic movement came to it from the temperament of the man who declared himself its leader. True, Father Lamennais did not lack the fire of a captivating eloquence. Often repeated was the superb appeal to the future which closes his *Des progrès de la Révolution.* He said:

> Do we not see that no concession can satisfy the antichristian party; that its recklessness grows with the fear shown for it? . . . Woe to him who, responsible for safeguarding the doctrine which Christ sealed with His blood, would lower his spirit to earthly thoughts, who would fear man instead of fearing God! . . . Priests of Jesus Christ, on you, on your constancy, depends the welfare of the Church. The fate of the world is in your hands. To save it, what is needed? A word coming from the foot of the cross. May the time come when those who are in darkness will be told: See the light! And they will rise up; with their look turned to that divine splendor, they will joyfully adore Him who enlightens every mind: *Oriens ex alto.*[26]

But the *Des progrès de la Révolution* contains some pages full of unrestrained bitterness. Archbishop Quélen of Paris

[25] L. de Carné, *Souvenirs de ma jeunesse,* p. 136.
[26] Lamennais, *Des progrès de la Révolution,* chap. 9.

in a pastoral letter addressed to the clergy and faithful of his diocese on the occasion of Leo XII's death, warns them against the dangerous tendencies of Father Lamennais. He wrote: "Whereas we thought we had to fear only the audacity or snares of our avowed enemies, now we see that the spirit of system, a sad and perilous temptation of the finest talents, has been introduced, showing itself in the camps of the Lord and threatening us with an internal war." [27] The remark was just and most fitting. Ultramontanism, as the fiery polemist preached it, was of a sort to sow defiance and hatred between the sovereigns and their subjects. The impetuous writer was unable to tolerate, without a public protest, any humiliation that he thought undeserved, or any public criticism.[28] He took up his pen and wrote two pamphlets: *Première* and *Deuxième lettre à Mgr l'Archévêque de Paris.* In these he undertook to prove that ultramontanism is not, as was said, a new opinion, but a doctrine always and everywhere taught by the Church; Gallicanism is merely the mistake of a party and of a period. This error, born of despotism, should disappear with it because peoples are athirst for liberty, and the first condition of nations' liberty is the liberty of the Church.[29] The thesis was defensible if, under the name of ultramontanism, the author had not taken up again the exaggerated ideas which he set forth in his *Des progrès de la Révolution* and if he had not maintained them with unparalleled violence of language. The reader may judge from the closing lines of the *Première lettre:* "Look

[27] Henrion, *Vie de Mgr de Quélen,* p. 201.

[28] All the historians of the private life of Lamennais have noted his excessive irascibility, which may be traceable to his physical constitution. One of his best informed biographers and the most sympathetic to him, J. Marie Peigné, mentions numerous instances. He writes: "Irascible to excess, his outbursts of wrath did not last long. Whether he simply wished to excuse himself or viewed the fact seriously, he repeated that they were necessary for his health and that, to avoid falling into a swoon, he was obliged sometimes to pick a quarrel with the first comer, and then ask pardon for his outbursts." Peigné, *Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie,* p. 55.

[29] Boutard, *Lamennais,* II, 55.

about you, Monsignor, and see who are now defending Gallicanism: wily sycophants of the power, who are pushing it to his ruin; a small number of old men, who are living only on school memories. What is all the rest? Words are lacking to describe the disgusting mixture of haughtiness and stupidity, of silly nonsense, of utter impotence of mind."

Lamennais' friends and his foes went to Rome at the same time. The purpose of the former was to petition a pronouncement against Gallicanism, of the latter the aim was to obtain a condemnation of that ultramontanism mingled with liberalism,[30] which seemed to be a serious danger for society. Both groups were disappointed. Pope Pius VIII did not judge that Lamennais' fault was great enough for a condemnation that would have thrown confusion into the ranks of zealous Catholics who were fighting at his side. On the other hand, to condemn Gallicanism at the very moment when the dispute was becoming more political than religious and when the monarchy of Charles X was tottering, might hasten the fall of the dynasty, to precipitate France into uncertain adventures, and to have the Church held responsible. The Pope refrained from any intervention. Lamennais, in one of his uncontrollable outbursts of anger, wrote: "Smothered is the voice that used to terrify the nations. . . . The sanctuary is empty, nothing any longer emerges from it. . . . God has said to the Power, as to the fig tree of the Gospel: 'Be thou withered.' "[31] This was more than the revolutionary pamphlet of 1834; it forecast the gloomy spirit of revolt.

The third peril that menaced the Catholic movement came to it from the very power that assured the movement of its pro-

[30] This combination of ultramontanism and Catholic liberalism would be understood if these two phrases should mean simply the defense of the liberties of the Church. But we saw above how, for various reasons, especially the contact with the party of the rationalist liberals, this notion was altered.

[31] Forgues, *Correspondance de Lamennais,* letter of May 3, 1829, to Countess de Senfft.

tection. On January 5, 1828, when Charles X yielded to the pressure of the left and accepted the resignation of De Villèle to entrust the ministry to De Martignac, the Duchess of Angoulême said: "My father has taken the first step down from the throne." The King of France took a second step when (August 8, 1829), prompted by the influence of the extreme right, he summoned Prince Polignac. In the words of a judicious historian: "If we consider Polignac with the impartiality of history, we feel surprise, almost stupefaction, and more compassion than aversion. . . . His character was reliable and loyal. But his was not a brilliant mind, his modest bearing ill hid a simple and serene infatuation with himself. This was not the infatuation of a commonplace pride; it was that of a believer, judging himself predestined by God to bring about the triumph of the truth in this world." [32]

The Congregation, counting Prince Polignac among its members, at once resumed its meetings, which had been suspended for some time.[33] This was an occasion for the liberal press to stir up anew the specter of the "priests' party," henceforth in power. Polignac's person itself was particularly unpopular. People recalled that his mother had been the friend of Marie Antoinette and that he himself, after his elevation to the peerage, had for a long time refused to take the oath to the Charter. The indignation of the liberals increased when they read in the *Apostolique,* one of the journals of the extreme right, the following lines: "The sources of the evil come from an impious and atheist charter. Religion, justice, and God Himself command the abolition of all these infamous codes which hell had belched forth." [34] The ministry in vain declared in the *Moniteur* that "no one who has not lost his common sense would be able to conceive the idea of destroying the Charter; the

[32] Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et Républicains,* p. 324.
[33] Grandmaison, *La Congrégation,* p. 356.
[34] *L'Apostolique,* August 4, 1829.

whole liberal press carried on a bitter warfare against the ministry; many government officials sent their resignation to the King. Others remained at their post without hiding their disapproval of the ministry's policy; many were dismissed; they were hailed with cheers. Montalembert wrote: "Nothing in the world is sadder than a state of affairs where the power is entirely outside the nation; where the officeholders form a people apart; where dismissals are titles of honor, and judicial charges are triumphs." [35] Following the formation of the Polignac ministry, Lamennais wrote: "My view is that this ministerial revolution will have no other effect than to concentrate the revolutionary forces in a formidable unity." [36] This prophecy became a reality; and the misfortune, for the Church, was to see that, at the moment when the power was headed to its fall, he ran the risk of drawing with him, in his unpopularity, the cause of the Church, by his alliance with the extreme parties. "The royalists, who had not been able with sufficient clearness to separate the monarchical rights from the royal absolutism, and the liberals, who had not been able to separate the national right from the revolutionary passions, found themselves thus thrown into a new situation," [37] from which the Church had much to dread.

[35] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* I, 92.

[36] Forgues, *op. cit.,* II, 73.

[37] Nettement, *Histoire de la Restauration,* p. 740. This historian adds: "Present was a circumstance attenuating the faults which were committed by all the parties and all the politicians from 1814 to 1830; this was their thorough inexperience in representative government." *Ibid.*

CHAPTER VIII

The July Revolution

THE government of Charles X could not be unaware of the gravity of the crisis. At the beginning of 1830 a strenuous effort was made to raise the prestige and the authority of the civil power.

For sixteen years France and the Algiers regency were at odds in the matter of important claims of two Algerian subjects on the French treasury. The dey of Algiers, Hussein, a real tyrant who terrorized the city of Algiers, had written insolent letters on this matter to the government of Charles X, and had even struck the French consul with the handle of his fly-swatter. Then (1827) a French squadron blockaded Algiers, but without result. On January 31, 1830, a council of the ministers decided to send before Algiers a fleet of 100 warships, escorting 50 transports that would carry 37,000 landing troops. To avenge the honor of France and to abolish piracy and slavery on the shores of the Mediterranean were certainly two of the purposes of the expedition. But the King and Polignac had another aim: a brilliant victory of French arms might silence the parties of the opposition or at least give the government the moral force needed to crush them.

We know the brilliant success of the expedition. The following events were noteworthy: the debarkation of the troops at Sidi-Ferruch, the capture of the camp of Staoueli, the bombardment of the Emperor's fort, the taking of Kasbah, the capitulation of Algiers (July 5). That same evening the white flag of France floated over this coast of Africa which, so long an object of terror for Christianity, would become a French

and Christian land. The Catholics took the greatest part in the universal joy. *Te Deums* were sung in all the churches. Archbishop Quélen of Paris, receiving the King at the entrance of Notre Dame, declared: "Sire, what favors in this single one! France revenged, Europe freed from an odious tribute, humanity triumphant over barbarism, the cross victorious over the crescent! Son of St. Louis, what more legitimate cause of joy for your heart, and for us, your faithful subjects, what cause for joy and delight!" [1]

However, the government was aware that not all distrust was disarmed. Guizot, who was then entering into politics, has left us a vivid picture of the public opinion at that moment. He says: "The disposition of the public is like my own, tranquil on the surface, but beneath much agitated. No one is conspiring, no one is rising up in revolt, but people are in expectation and are preparing for anything. . . . Inactive but not resigned, the secret societies were still there, ready, as soon as a favorable circumstance should present itself, to resume their work of conspiracy and destruction. In the popular masses the old instincts of distrust and hatred for all that recalled the Ancient Regime and foreign invasion, continued to furnish arms and inexhaustible hopes to the enemies of the Restoration." [2]

Charles X and Polignac saw but one means for overcoming these last resistances: a *coup d'état*. Does it not belong to the sovereign to attribute to himself the powers he judges necessary? Has he any need to consult a parliament? Assemblies, like nations, have never created a strong power, but they always accept it. Thus reasoned the politicians of the extreme right. But Polignac still hesitated. One day Michaud, the editor of the *Quotidienne,* said to him: "Sir, do you hesitate to make a *coup d'état?* I grieve at your hesitation." "And why?" asked Polignac. Michaud replied: "Because, as you have for you no

[1] *Ami de la religion,* LXIV, 292.

[2] Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de non temps,* I, 348, 371.

men except those who desire a *coup d'état,* if you do not bring it about, you will then have no one." [3] The *coup d'état* was decided on. On July 25, 1830, the King, appealing to article 14 of the Charter, which recognized in him the right "to make regulations needed for the safety of the state," signed four ordinances: the first suspended the freedom of the press; the second pronounced the dissolution of the Chamber; the third fundamentally modified the electoral system; the fourth convoked the electors for choosing new deputies.

The next morning several papers, having appeared without authorization, were seized. In the evening popular manifestations took place with the cry of "Long live the Charter!" The next day the crowd, after pillaging some armorers', took possession of many military posts. On the 28th the tricolor flag was unfurled on the towers of Notre Dame. The cries of "Long live liberty" drowned the cries of "Long live the Charter!" In the course of that day more than half of Paris fell into the hands of the rebels. The national guard, aided by a regiment of infantry that joined them, seized the city hall. On the following day the uprising, led by students of the polytechnic school, forced the barriers of the Louvre and installed themselves in the palace, shouting: "Long live the Republic!" But the republicans did not form the majority of the insurgents; the imperialists and liberal monarchists of the school of the *Constitutionel* had taken an important part in it. These last, in a proclamation drawn up by Adolph Thiers, asserted that the Republic would embroil France with Europe. This fear was well founded. Metternich was watching for a revolutionary agitation in France in order to combine the great powers against her.[4] The name of the Duke of Orleans was mentioned. The son of Philippe Egalité had fought in the republican army in 1792. In the bourgeoisie he was popular for his affability and

[3] Thureau-Dangin, *Royalistes et Républicains,* p. 328.

[4] Metternich, *Mémoires,* V, 28.

his good nature. At the Palais Royal he readily attracted about him the leaders of the liberal party. The deputies present in Paris at first proclaimed him (July 30) lieutenant general of the realm, then (August 5) king of the French, under the name of Louis Philippe I.

From the political point of view, the revolution ended in a compromise. Louis Philippe declared himself king of the French "by the grace of God and the national will." But the religious revolution was unrestrained. The secret societies, which feared a European coalition while upsetting the monarchy, had not the same fear of throwing down the crucifix and sacking the churches. In the course of the uprising, the residence of the archbishop of Paris had been pillaged; the house of the Jesuits at Montrouge was invaded by the insurgents, who mistreated several religious; the residence of the Missioners of France was set on fire. On the following days churches were pillaged and various profanations took place.[5] As Eugene Veuillot wrote, "the year 1830 was indeed the date when the Revolution, taken possession by the freethought bourgeoisie, was completed and crowned." [6] The historian of the July monarchy has given us the following picture of the religious state of France after 1830: "Catholicism, vanquished for the same reason as the old monarchy, with which it was thought to be solidary, while Voltairianism thought itself called to share the victory of the liberal party; the crosses destroyed by the same hands as destroyed the fleur de lis; everywhere, in the press, in caricatures, in the theater, an orgy and a sort of vengeance of impiety." [7] The chief organ of the Church of France was able to declare, with full justice, that the clergy was thenceforth stricken "with a sort of civil death." [8]

[5] See *Ami de la religion,* LXV, *passim.*
[6] Eugene Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* I, 18.
[7] Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet,* p. 205.
[8] *Ami de la religion,* July 2, 1831.

The New Government and the Church

The secret societies were triumphant and, for the occasion, boldly took off their mask. The society *Aide-toi* communicated to the newspapers a report made to it (August 13, 1830) in a general assembly in which the society avowed with pride its efforts to overthrow Charles X and to accomplish the long-awaited revolution.[9] Shortly afterward a liberal paper, *Ami des peuples,* revealed more specific details on the participation of the secret societies in the revolution, in an article entitled: *Causes secrètes de la révolution de 1830: revelations officielles sur le fameux comité directeur "les Carbonari de Paris."* [10] The purpose of the secret societies in these revelations was not so much to display their strength before the public as it was to intimidate the civil authorities. The reporter of the *Aide-toi* society declared the notable services the association could render during the election period, thanks to the might of its organization in the capital and outside. "What we are doing," he said, "we should continue doing." The liberal papers, which counted nearly all the editors belonging to the *Aide-toi* society or other societies affiliated with the Carbonari—the *Globe,* the *Temps,* the *Constitutionel,* the *Courier français,* the *National,* the *Journal des Débats,* and the *Révolution*—exerted pressure on the government which they proclaimed to be their work.

The government ceaselessly gave them pledges. In a report on the situation of the realm, read at the session of the Chamber (September 13, 1830), the minister of the interior assumed a threatening tone with regard to the Catholics. "The King's government," he said, "is not unaware of the plots hatched by the help of associations or congregations which reject our laws.

[9] *Ami de la religion,* LXV, 187.

[10] This article was reproduced in its entirety in the *Gazette de France* of September 13, 1830, and in large part in the *Ami de la religion* of September 25 (LXV, 363). Cf. *ibid.,* p. 465.

It knows how far the rights of the public power extend." A week later the same minister allowed a public manifestation to display its cortege in Paris and rehabilitate the memory of the four sergeants of La Rochelle, who had been executed in 1822 as conspirators; and the scandal was so great that the *Journal des Débats* wrote: "Beware. It was a jury that made the heads of Bories and his friends fall. . . . To glorify these condemned men is to celebrate for taking the initiative in the destruction of order." At about this same time some deputies asked the Chamber for the re-establishment of divorce. On October 1 a royal ordinance suppressed the partial burses previously granted to the minor seminaries. A fortnight later a new royal ordinance altered the composition of the committees of elementary education, taking the presidency from the curé and giving it to the mayor and suppressing the two notables chosen by the bishop. The Catholics saw in these measures a scarcely concealed advance toward complete secularization of education.

In these distressing circumstances, the attitude of the episcopate and of the clergy in general was calm and worthy. Though respectful of the established order, they did not abandon the defense of the rights of the Church. In a circular addressed to his priests, inviting them to celebrate a service for the intention of the victims of the bloody days, the Archbishop of Paris, with restrained emotion, recalled that, "in the asylum which the poor had offered him during the tempest," he was able to note the extent of the misfortunes. In a confidential letter to his curés and other priests, the Bishop of Orléans indicated to them the measures of prudence which they should take to safeguard respect for the sanctuaries, in the event that the mayors, as had sometimes happened, should wish to assemble the national guard in the churches. "Take no part, my brethren, in the public discussions," wrote the Archbishop of Tours. "The minister of God should open his mouth only to bring

words of comfort to all." The bishops of Angers, Troyes, Blois, and Carcassone made use of similar language, and no discordant note was mingled in their voices.[11]

The clergy followed these counsels. But the obedience they owed to the established power did not prevent them from striving courageously as soon as the good of souls was at stake. On July 6, 1830, the new chaplains of the royal colleges of Paris, setting forth in a memorial the sad moral and religious state of the houses confided to their care, expressed a wish for the freedom of education, and one of them, Father Lacordaire, chaplain of the College Henri IV, explained the meaning of this memorial in an eloquent letter addressed to the *Correspondant*. The editors of this review and of the *Ami de la religion* let pass no attack, no threat to the rights of the Church, without an energetic protest. The Catholic people, after a first moment of stupefaction, recovered and, gathered about their pastors and encouraged by them, made the profaners retreat. A letter by a traveler who had just passed through several districts of the west and south of France, states (October, 1830) that, in many places "you might see men mount guard at night to hinder the profanation of the crosses, and women on watch during the day to prevent similar disorders." In Brittany, under pressure of public opinion, a prefect, instead of throwing down the crosses, urged that they be respected. At Bordeaux restraint had to be used in the zeal of some persons who wished to erect new crosses along the highways.

Under the prompting of the Supreme Pontiff the bishops were careful to keep the activities of the faithful within the limits of strict legality. As soon as the government of Louis Philippe seemed to be firmly established, Pius VIII openly recognized it, confirming the powers of his nuncio, conformable to the constant policy of the papacy with regard to the

[11] For the incidents mentioned in these two paragraphs, see *Ami de la religion*, LXV, 98, 187, 259, 274, 322, 365, 397, 400, 498, 525, 572–77.

established powers. Bishop de Quélen, even after this decision, prescribed public prayers for the head of the state and took his oath, as a peer of France, of fidelity to the Constitution. The Pope wrote to him that he could order public prayers; but he advised the Archbishop to resign as a peer of France if the required oath should be repugnant to his conscience.[12]

Hateful persecutions were stirred up by the new regime. Yet the revolution of 1830, thanks to the strong and prudent attitude of the clergy, ended in three results from which the Church would soon profit. First, no one could any longer attribute the success, influence, and pretended wealth of the Catholic clergy to the backing of the governmental power, and thus many oppositions fell of themselves. Furthermore, the Catholics, relying now only on themselves, were being accustomed to strive by means of their own initiative. Lastly, by thus separating from the socialists, from the plotters of the secret societies, and from those who had just founded the new government, they were becoming accustomed, like their brethren in Ireland, to fight on legal ground. By this method they would soon impress public opinion as a law-abiding power which would have to be reckoned with.

Unfortunately a divergence of attitudes came to light. These different views, blaming each other more and more as time passed, would cause a deep cleavage between defenders of the faith. The *Correspondant,* in an article appearing in the course of 1829, in connection with freedom of education, had shown as a desirable aim the establishment of a system in which we might see "each party, each sect, set up school against school, pulpit against pulpit." That same article spoke of the legal right that would result, in such a system, for philosophism to teach errors. The *Ami de la religion* (October 24) pointed to these assertions as being opposed to the doctrine of the Church and as deriving from the theories of Lamennais; the editor of the

[12] Henrion, *Vie de Mgr de Quélen*, p. 254.

Correspondant (November 3) offered the following explanation: 1. he was not the fanatical and exclusive disciple of Lamennais, as seemed to be implied; 2. in speaking of the legal right of error, he intended merely to take note of a juridical situation, recognizing that only unity is a conserving force and that doctrinal indifference is a social dissolvant; but 3. that, granted the actual order of affairs in which we live, duty should prompt us to make every effort to draw out of it the best possible part. He ended by saying: "Everyone knows that religion has more trouble in being heard than in persuading. But, in this age of independence, the idea that religion can be the instrument of a government, or simply that religion wishes to depend on the government, found many people against it. The only ones who ought to fear the strife are those who are not sure of the goodness of their cause. . . . Let religion appear in all its beauty, and its victory is assured." The *Ami de la religion* (November 14) noted these last words. It said: "For a long time now religion has appeared in all its beauty; yet it has not been victorious in all minds. Must we not take account of human passions, the indifference of some, the hatred of others, the prejudices of some, the propensities of others?" [13]

This dispute was spirited. We have set it forth at considerable length because we find already formulated therein the arguments that will later be advanced, on both sides, in the mighty quarrel of Catholic liberalism. Perhaps they were never presented in a more striking manner than in this first clash of two tendencies among the defenders of the Church. Indeed, we understand that, in a divided society like that of France about 1830, some sincere and zealous Catholics preferred in the struggle against error a regime of liberty rather than a risky protection. But this regime of freedom was imposed in fact—later on people will say, "hypothetically"—and the situation

[13] *Ami de la religion*, LXI 350–52; LXII, 14–16.

gave rise to a fear that the fact might be erected into a right. For these reasons the thesis needed to be affirmed, that no man, no institution, no state, has the right to profess indifference between truth and error, between good and evil. On the contrary, their duty, so far as respect for individual conscience might allow, was to protect the true and the good, in the order of religion as in that of morality, against the snares of error and evil.

Belgium

In its origin, its characteristics, and its first results, such was the French revolution of 1830. Some have said that Prince Metternich was dominated by his prepossession of tracing all the European agitations to a conspiracy against the old monarchies, and that he wished to connect with the July revolution in France the political movements that took place shortly afterward in Belgium, Poland, Ireland, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland. This assertion is not exact and is contradicted by the facts. The July events were apparently the occasion and the signal for most of these movements; but these had their real causes in earlier events of a national sort, and appeared with different traits, conditioned by the circumstances in which they were produced. Thus, whereas the July revolution in France, determined by a coalition of the liberal monarchists, the imperialists, and the republicans against the institutions of the Ancient Regime, took on a clearly anti-Catholic character, the insurrectionary movements in Belgium, Poland, and Ireland had a religious origin and character. Italy's liberal aspirations had as their special aim to shake off the yoke of Austrian domination and united in a single feeling both freethinkers and sincere Catholics. In Germany the demands for independence had the character of an appeal to German unity. The troubles agitating Spain and Portugal would undoubtedly not have

broken out if the irritating dynastic questions were not involved.[14]

The first revolt that was an echo of the July revolution was the one that broke out on the 25th of the following August, in Brussels. In the degree in which he made the Belgian people feel the weight of the Dutch and Protestant yoke, the king of the Netherlands, William I, saw the spirit of opposition to his government growing. In his desire to conciliate this opposition, he adopted some liberal measures; but these fell short, and were always followed by a return to the acts of intolerance and tyranny. Though outwardly affable, King William was as distrustful of others as he was infatuated with his own person and with his personal authority. By a decree of June 20, 1829, he had revoked his decrees of 1825, in what was most oppressive in them: attendance at the philosophical college would no longer be obligatory, and the bishops could now open diocesan seminaries.[15]

But he retained the obligation of every appointed bishop to ask a royal placet, and the consecrating bishop would also have to obtain the King's placet. A few bishops thought they would be acting in accord with their conscience by declaring that they requested a placet only for their bishopric *in temporalibus*. The Bishop of Namur, called to give them episcopal consecration, refused to submit to the wishes of the King, saying that he had no need of a royal placet for the consecration of a bishop any more than he did to perform an ordination or a confirmation. The appointments then remained in suspense.[16]

At this juncture appeared the papal bull ordering the celebration of a jubilee. The King of the Netherlands published the bull, but with reservations on "the clauses that it might contain against the rights of the sovereign and the liberties of the

[14] See Guichen, *La révolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe.*
[15] *Ami de la religion,* LX, 260.
[16] Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VIII,* p. 103.

Belgian Church." As we read in the *Ami de la religion,* "the liberties of the Belgian Church were inserted at a time when that poor Church had not yet the bishops promised to it and when a solemn concordat had remained without effect for more than two years." In December, 1829, King William appointed a notorious Catholic, Baron Pélichy, director of the affairs of Catholic worship. But the Catholics of Belgium anxiously wondered whether they ought to consider that appointment a liberal measure, having as its purpose to give a benevolent interpretation to the civil ecclesiastical laws, or a clever means of introducing into the institutions a governmental control over the affairs of religion. Besides, a law of that same month increased the penalties in matters of the press; a decree of the previous September, obliging the use of the Dutch language over the entire extent of the kingdom, was applied rigorously. Shortly after this (January, 1829) several public officials were dismissed for "having shown aversion to the government system." [17]

The measure of grievances seemed to be filled up. In February, 1830, the Belgian Catholics made an alliance with the liberal party. A constitutional opposition was formed, taking its stand on the ground of liberty, demanding freedom of religion, of teaching, and of the press. The same month the Catholics of Belgium published a manifesto in which we read: "In the face of the terrible danger of seeing the teaching of our children, and through laws governing the press, the teaching of all ages, given over to the good pleasure of man, the Catholics have been forced to seek guaranties. In the age in which we live, no guaranty could be found but that of liberty. . . . The liberals, without their aim being the same as ours, ask for the same liberties. . . . We advance in company with them. But let no one imagine that anything in the world can ever induce

[17] For the details mentioned above, see *Ami de la religion,* LXI, 137; LXII, 154, 157, 173, 332.

us to make the least sacrifice of our principles. . . . We will be free because such is our determined will. Such is our right. We will be free, and many nations of the two worlds will likewise be free. Woe to those nations that remain under the yoke of man!" Father Lamennais, reproducing this manifesto in the *Revue catholique* of March 15, acclaimed "this magnificent movement of a whole people rising up as a single man and, in the name of all that is most sacred on earth, marching to the conquest of its most precious rights." [18]

The French July revolution was what gave the idea of a revolt. On August 25, 1830, at the Brussels theater, during the performance of *Muette de Portici,* the appeals to liberty, which came in this opera, excited the public. People cried: "Let us do as the French have done!" The crowd rushed to the offices of the *National,* a ministerial paper, and to the house of the Dutch minister, Van Maanen, both of which were put to the flames. So far, this was but a local uprising. But two days later the Brabant flag was unfurled. An army of 10,000 men, sent to halt the revolution, was repulsed before the walls of Brussels, by the bourgeoisie in arms. The insurrectionary movement won all the Belgian provinces. Upon the request of King William the signatory powers of the 1815 treaties intervened, but to recognize the provisional Belgian government.[19] A national congress, meeting in Brussels, had proclaimed the independence of Belgium and called for a constitution having its basis in a constitutional monarchy, complete freedom of worship and education, and the communal franchises.

Pope Pius VIII exercised a spirit of pacification. In this spirit he had sought to bring King William to more equitable sentiments with regard to his Catholic subjects, but he had not been without anxieties at the time of the alliance of the Catho-

[18] Lamennais, *Troisièmes mélanges,* p. 67.

[19] On this changed attitude of the great powers, see Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* I, 69–80; Metternich, *Mémoires,* V, 39–46; Talleyrand, *Mémoires,* III, 371–90.

lics with the liberals. Cardinal Albani, Secretary of State, on June 8, 1830, wrote to Count de Senfft:

> The Holy Father is not reassured on the state of minds in Belgium. . . . Will the constitutional union end in consecrating liberty in favor of the Church? The Catholics bring to this union such good faith that the others will scarcely be tempted to mingle therein any duplicity. We think that misunderstandings rather than divergencies exist between the governments and the peoples. Can any remedy be applied? . . . At a distance of a thousand miles, knowledge of characters and facts are hard to obtain; therefore nothing more than general advice can be given. We can set a movement in motion, but specific action must be determined on the spot.[20]

In short, the results of the Belgian revolution were favorable to the Church. It was the starting point of great religious activity in the development of the Christian life, including works of education and of the apostolate.[21]

[20] Quoted by Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 178.
[21] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte.*

CHAPTER IX

The Church in Poland and Great Britain

Poland

IN THE Polish revolution as in the Belgian, religious interests played a large part. As in Belgium, they were connected with national claims. By its origin the revolution in Poland was related to old and deep causes; but its outburst, prepared by the French July revolution, was determined by the Belgian revolution of August. From 1825 to 1830 Poland had continued to call itself a constitutional kingdom. The Czar, however, did his utmost to reduce this title to an empty phrase. Legally Poland was supposed to be governed by the viceroy, assisted by a representative body, to have an independent magistracy, an army separated from the administration, and a free press. As a fact, the Czar intervened personally in the legislative, judiciary, and administrative power, ignoring the established institutions. Legally, according to the very terms of the Polish constitution, "the Catholic religion, professed by the greater number," [1] was to be the object of particular care by the government, without prejudice to the freedom of the other religions, and the property of the Latin clergy and of the Greek uniates was inalienable. In fact, Czar Nicholas assumed the right to carry on meddlesome investigations of the clergy,

[1] According to an official report, read at the Polish diet in 1828, the kingdom had 3,471,282 Catholics, divided among 1,917 parishes. The Lutherans, whose number was estimated at 200,000, occupied 28 parishes. The 100,000 Calvinists had 9 temples; 345,000 Jews, 274 synagogues; the non-uniate Greeks, 6 churches; and the Mohammedans, 2 mosques. For further details, see *Ami de la religion,* LXI, 225–30; LXIII, 312 ff. For articles of the Polish constitution relative to the Catholic Church, see *ibid.,* LXII, 66 note.

hindered the relations of the bishops with Rome,[2] and did not conceal his desire to unite all his subjects in a single Church, subject to his domination.

The news of the Paris revolution produced a lively impression in Poland. The feeling was increased by the preparation which the Czar then made for an expedition against France. Freemasonry, which had been introduced into Poland by Dombrowski and which had already been spread in the army and the universities, exploited the national unrest to stir up troubles. The leaders of the patriot party resisted these intense excitements or at least awaited the next spring to organize a general uprising of the nation. But when (November, 1830) Czar Nicholas, by virtue of his family alliances with the Nassaus and in execution of the treaties of 1815, undertook to send the Polish army into Belgium for the purpose of re-establishing the authority of William I and to replace in Poland the national troops by Russian troops, the insurrection broke out.

On November 29 two officers drew after them the military school and the regiments of Warsaw. The white eagle was unfurled to the national song: "No, Poland, you will not lack defenders!" Chlopicki, a former soldier of Napoleon, was named dictator. While the young men enrolled en masse in the rebel army, the wealthy offered their gold, the church bells furnished bronze for the arsenals, and the sacristies silver for coinage of money. Austria was astounded and at first word of the insurrection sent troops into Galicia,[3] reinforced her armies in Italy, to guarantee herself against an invasion of her frontiers.[4] But Metternich seemed to consider the movement irresistible. To the Austrian ambassador at Berlin he wrote: "By its nature, powder is inflammable; in my eyes, the kingdom of Poland is like a powder magazine." [5] Liberal Europe was inter-

[2] *Ami de la religion,* LXIII, 347.
[3] Metternich, *Mémoires,* V, 70.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 71.
[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 73, 77.

ested in this epic campaign, more dramatic than that of Belgium; the romantic poetry, the singing, and the Catholics thrilling with its emotion. While Armand Carrel celebrated the Polish insurrection in the *National,* while the people sang the *Varsovienne* of Delavigne no less ardently than the *Parisienne,* and while Lafayette declared: "All France is Polish," the young Count de Montalembert wrote in the *Avenir:* "It has at length uttered its waking cry, it has at length shaken off its chains, this proud and generous Poland, so much cherished by all free and Catholic hearts. . . . Free and Catholic Poland, fatherland of Sobieski and of Kosciusko, we salute your new dawn, we invite you to the sublime alliance of God and liberty." [6]

Ireland

The Irish cause aroused an almost equally fervent enthusiasm among the young Catholics. Upon returning from a journey to Ireland, Montalembert wrote: "If ever discouragement should overshadow us, let us think of the marvels of that Catholic Association which began with only seven members and after fifteen years of struggle has won Ireland's religious freedom and laid the foundations of its national independence." [7]

After winning the Catholic Emancipation Act, O'Connell did not abandon the strife. He demanded Ireland's independence, the repeal of the Act of Union. He declared: "The union was not a treaty; it was effected by violence and fraud. It is without obligatory force. The Irish, still treated as aliens in race and religion, demand the repeal of the union." [8] The aim of this demand was chiefly the re-establishment in Ireland of a distinct and home parliament, having absolute control over the

[6] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* IV, 123.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 163.
[8] O'Connell, *Ireland and the Irish.*

affairs of the Irish nation, without breaking off the perpetual alliance of Ireland with Great Britain, by the intermediary of Queen Victoria and her heirs and successors. O'Connell judged that without this guaranty the religious emancipation of Ireland would remain a delusion. For the attainment of this new end, O'Connell's program remained what he had scrupulously assigned to himself and what he had imposed on his party in the campaign for emancipation: "Not a drop of blood to be shed, not an illegal act." Thus the Irish struggle had a character quite different from the campaigns undertaken in Belgium and Poland.

Great was the astonishment in England when, following the Catholic emancipation, they saw a new association organized in Ireland to the cry of "repeal of the union." Promptly a law authorized the lord lieutenant of Ireland to dissolve any association that appeared to him dangerous to the security of the state. Without delay the viceroy employed the arbitrary power put at his disposal. In the winter of 1829 a proclamation of the Duke of Northumberland suppressed the society formed by O'Connell.

When the Whigs came into power in 1830, they thought that the agitator would lay down his arms. On the contrary, he redoubled the virulence of his attacks. That winter the strife became most keen. To evade the act of 1829 against the association, the tireless agitator fancied the creation of societies under different names which, having no bond between them, would not have the semblance of a national association. He began by assembling the trades. Said he: "I am a man with a trade; my trade is agitation." [9] A proclamation promptly was issued, proclaiming the dissolution of the society of trades. O'Connell obeyed; but, since the proclamation dissolved by name "the society of the trades," he organized under the name of "association to prevent illegal meetings." A new proclamation forbade

[9] Jules Gondon, *L'agitation irlandaise depuis 1829*, pp. 76–79.

this association. Then O'Connell proposed "the society of political luncheons," and he called his followers, not to a meeting, but to a luncheon. Then came a new proclamation forbidding the luncheon. O'Connell tried several other combinations, which each time were banned by a fresh proclamation. Finally the lord lieutenant, worn down by this kind of warfare, forbade "any other association of the same nature."

Before the inexorable orders of the government, submission was necessary, and the strife must shift to new ground. First, O'Connell, in sign of mourning, wore a band of crape, which he swore to keep on wearing until the law against the associations would be abolished. Then he attacked his foes on the side they would feel most, by establishing in Ireland a system of non-importation, which closed the outlet of products of English commerce. He gave the example by refusing to receive into his house any tea, coffee, or other products that came to Ireland by way of England. He thought up another stratagem, which affected the insolent financial aristocracy, from whom he was meeting a persistent opposition. The banks had in circulation a large quantity of bank notes. O'Connell determined to discredit this currency. He asked all those who had such notes to present themselves on a given day and demand the immediate and full cash for their face value. This request of O'Connell was received as an order and was at once carried out. General panic followed. At once the bank vaults were emptied. Bankruptcies increased in number. Commercial operations were suspended. Ten days passed without any business being transacted. The drama was not bloody, but it was ruinous. Thus in England people learned what an influence was in the hands of this man whom the Irish had chosen for their leader.[10]

To appease the Catholics, the government departed a little from its rigorous application of the laws about ecclesiastical affairs. The bishops of Ireland, in a pastoral letter to the faith-

[10] *Ami de la religion,* LXIV, 521–23.

ful (February 9, 1830), made no difficulty in acknowledging "that the state of religion was slightly improved." And they expressed their appreciation to the monarch, the ministers, and the Parliament. At the same time they asked the Catholics not to let themselves be weakened by adversity nor be misled by seduction.

Scotland

The courage of the Irish Catholics was an example for those of Scotland. The presence in Scotland of numerous French *émigrés* during the French Revolution and the sight of their virtues had brought about there a considerable number of conversions to the Roman Church. We may fix approximately the Catholic population (March, 1830) at 110,000.[11] But these people, extremely poor, could not provide for the support of the numerous establishments that had to be founded in recent years. A debt of almost $5,000 burdened the Edinburg chapel and the house occupied by the bishop and his missioners. Moreover, this chapel was not large enough, being unable to accommodate more than 1,500 persons, whereas the city counted about 15,000 Catholics. Bishop Paterson (June 19, 1829) made an ardent appeal to the French Catholics.[12] Archbishop Quélen of Paris was listened to by the Catholics of France, who showed themselves generous; and the Pope came to the rescue of the Scotch Catholics to the extent of his means.

The Catholic clergy of Ireland and Scotland were eminent not merely in their courage and zeal. They included several men of distinguished learning. In this number was Doctor Curtis, archbishop of Armagh, highly regarded for his eloquence and for the soundness of his doctrine; Doctor Doyle, bishop of Kildare, former professor in the ecclesiastical college of Car-

[11] *Ibid.*, LXIII, 182. On the state of the Irish Church about 1830, cf. *ibid.*, LXII, 1–5. On the Anglican and Catholic clergy in England, cf. *ibid.*, LXI, 273; LXII, 49; LXIII, 55, 129.

[12] *Ibid.*, LXI, 145–47.

low; and Doctor John Lanigan, recently professor of Hebrew and theology in the University of Paris, then librarian of the Royal Society at Dublin, author of a much valued Church history of Ireland.

England

In England, God was preparing other lights for His Church. "The revolution of 1830 had there given a strong impulse to the democratic movement. The wind of reform which had arisen for some years past in England, rose with the force of a tempest. The coming of a Whig ministry assured the success of electoral reform within a short time; it seemed to presage what was called the reform of the Church. Announcement was made of an intention to revise the Church support, its hierarchy, and its doctrines. This task would have to be undertaken by a Parliament which the suppression of the tests had just opened to non-conformists." [13] The little Oxford group, made up of such men as Newman, Froude, Keble, and Pusey, had been laboring for a reform of the Church to be brought about by the simple return to its own authentic traditions, apart from any intervention of a secular state, which was radically incompetent in that undertaking.

Precisely at this period Newman had undertaken the history of the Council of Nicaea and of the Arians of the fourth century. Filled with admiration for the great Church of Alexandria, he felt the teaching of its theologians and philosophers penetrate his soul. But, while considering this glorious past, he could not help contrasting it with the spectacle offered by his own Church. In the following words he summed up the reflections suggested to him by this contrast: "With the Establishment thus divided and threatened, thus ignorant of its true strength, I compared that fresh vigorous power of which I was reading in the first centuries. . . . I ever kept before me that

[13] Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, I, 51.

there was something greater than the Established Church, and that that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set up from the beginning." [14] Thus arose what would be for many years thereafter Newman's dominant idea: The Church of England, threatened with destruction, can save itself only on condition of rising to the knowledge of its divine origin and mission.[15]

[14] Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua* (ed. 1869), p. 80.
[15] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 53–55.

CHAPTER X

The Church in Other Countries

Germany

IN CERTAIN aspects the situation of Catholicism in Germany was similar to the conditions of its existence in England. In Germany likewise a Catholic minority was dominated by a Protestant majority. There, too, the Catholics, grouped in certain regions, such as Bavaria and Austria, had a chance to organize. But at that point the resemblance ceased.

Germany, as the treaties of 1815 made it, was politically an unstable organization. It balanced between two powerful states, Austria and Prussia, on the one hand, seeking to dominate the confederation, and, on the other hand, forty little states, some of them, like Austria, Catholic, the others Protestant as Prussia was. All of them were impatient to impose their hegemony. From the religious point of view Prussia and the Protestant states, following the Caesaropapist traditions that went back to the first times of the so-called Reformation, and the Catholic governments, still too much penetrated with the Josephist spirit, were more or less putting an arbitrary yoke on the faithful. In the realm of ideas, a double tendency showed itself: a liberal tendency, opposed to absolutism, with Börne and Heinrich Heine as its most eloquent spokesmen, and an ultramontane tendency, opposed to Caesaropapism and Josephism, with Goerres as its most vigorous interpreter. Although inspired by utterly opposite principles, these two tendencies were often combined and mingled, because again and again they had been directed against the same enemy, because, seeking freedom from an odious yoke, they had

frequently used the same motto, that of liberty. Hence the ambiguities, misunderstandings, and confusions that were the source of keen disputes in Germany as in France, Belgium, and Italy.

In Germany, no more than in the other countries that felt the shock of 1830, did the events of July create conflicts, but they determined the violent crisis. At the first news of the Paris insurrection, uprisings broke out in Brunswick, Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, Hanover, and several other small states. The alarmed princes granted liberal constitutions. These were blows to the Vienna treaties, which concentrated all the powers of the state in the person of the prince. Metternich took alarm, declaring that the whole evil came from the faction that was trying to introduce into Germany the dissolving idea of the sovereignty of the people. Under his prompting, Austria reacted with all her might against the invasion of political liberalism and favored its repression in the secondary states. It found, in these revolutionary agitations, an occasion to attach to her the Hungarian magnates, more frightened at the popular liberties than they were hostile to the Austrian domination.

The Catholic clergy, taken as a whole, did not mix in these political movements. Sad to say, the German bishops scarcely concerned themselves with defending the independence of the Church against several abusive interferences by the civil power. We refer to their attitude in the presence of two serious questions which, in the course of 1830, invited the solicitude of Pope Pius VIII: the question of the thirty-nine articles of Frankfort and the question of mixed marriages.

On March 2, 1830, the states of Würtemberg, Baden, Hesse, Nassau, and Frankfort, on the pretext of organizing the five bishoprics which the papal bulls *Provida* (August 6, 1821) and *Ad dominici gregis* (April 11, 1827) had formed into the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, published a Declaration in thirty-nine articles in which the rights of the Church were

openly violated. After proclaiming (art. 1) that "the Catholic Church has the freedom to the profession of its belief and to the public exercise of its worship," other articles proceeded to restrain that freedom in an arbitrary manner. Article 4 subjected every ecclesiastical regulation and circular to the government placet. Article 5 subjected even the papal bulls and briefs to the approval of the states. Article 10 forbade any discussion outside of the ecclesiastical province of disputes concerning Church questions. This prohibition implicitly banned any recourse to Rome. Articles 7, 8, 11, 12, and 13 attributed to the civil authority the right to define the boundaries of dioceses and parishes. Articles 14, 15, and 16 regulated the manner of episcopal elections and required from the bishops an oath of fidelity to the sovereign. Article 18 required the approval of the states for all meetings of ecclesiastics in synods and all the resolutions they would adopt there. Articles 25–29 concerned the recruiting of the clergy. They will be subjected to examinations before entrance into the seminary and during the course of their studies and after finishing the course; these examinations must be passed before the religious and civil authorities. Article 36 gave both ecclesiastics and laymen the right to appeal to the civil authorities to denounce abuses by the ecclesiastical authority.[1]

"The Church of Germany at this time was easy-going and lacked virility. It had a docility which made it, to some extent, an accomplice of the imperious encroachments by the civil power. Of the five bishops aimed at, only one protested, the bishop of Fulda. The archbishop of Freiburg along with the bishops of Rottenburg and of Limburg-in-Nassau, rather than take the trouble to act, preferred the reproach of being 'silent dogs.' "[2]

Pius VIII protested at first unofficially to all the states that

[1] For the complete text, see *Ami de la religion,* LXIII, 321 ff.

[2] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* II, 136.

had signed the Frankfort Declaration. Then, in the presence of the inadequate replies received from various sovereigns, he decided the time had come to write to the Archbishop of Freiburg and the four other bishops (of Mainz, Rottenburg, Limburg, and Fulda) an urgent letter on this affair. "By its divine institution," he said, "the Church, spouse of Jesus Christ, is free. It should not be subjected to any earthly power. But if the civil power should be allowed the right to confirm or reject the councils, to choose candidates for the priesthood, to partition dioceses, to control ecclesiastical education and discipline, even the seminaries, and to hinder the free communication of the faithful with the head of the Church, all this would be to reduce the Church to shameful servitude." The Pope added that his heart had been filled with bitterness upon learning that, among the bishops to whom he was sending this letter, one was found rash enough to dare give his assent to the Declaration of the thirty-nine articles." Then he wrote a second time to the heads of all the states involved.

The question of mixed marriages, which subsequently would provoke heroic resistance, showed the same weaknesses in the German episcopate. A royal ordinance, going back to November 21, 1803, prescribed that all children born in Prussia of mixed marriages were to be raised in the religion of the father. This ordinance, rigorously applied in Silesia, where a large number of marriages had been contracted between Protestant officials and Catholic natives, had considerably developed Protestantism. This measure, formally contrary to the rules of canon law, which requires from future spouses, as a preliminary condition of a mixed marriage, the promise to bring up all the children in the Roman faith, had not encountered grave opposition in Silesia, any more than the administrative regulation that took away from the Catholic schools their own management and conferred control on the representatives of the government.

When in 1814 Prussia took possession of the Rhineland provinces, it first hesitated to apply the ordinance of 1803. But, eleven years later, the King declared that this ordinance would thereafter regulate the civil matrimonial law in the Rhenish districts and in Westphalia. The episcopate uttered no protest; but several priests refused to bless the mixed marriages when the future spouses did not make the promises required by the Church. The Prussian government complained, bringing before its courts the priests who were refractory to the ordinances and required that the bishops inflict punishment on them. These priests, prompted by the Archbishop of Cologne, Ferdinand August Spiegel, an ambitious prelate who fancied himself playing in Germany the role of a primate and of defending the "ecclesiastical liberties" against Rome after the manner of the Josephists and the Gallicans,[3] joined hands with their colleagues of Silesia and petitioned Frederick William for authorization to enter into conversations with the Pope. Permission was granted on condition that their correspondence would be transmitted through the intermediary of Berlin. In a word, the bishops bowed before the royal absolutism and addressed themselves to the Pope to have the right to remain thus prostrate.[4] Pius VIII replied [5] by his brief *Litteris* (March 27, 1830), accompanied with an explanatory note from Cardinal Albani, who declared valid but illicit the mixed marriages contracted without observing the rules laid down by the Council of Trent. The Pope obliged the priests, before the celebration of the marriage, to require from the parties the promise that all the children would be Catholic. If this promise was refused, he forbade the priests to give the blessing to the married couple;

[3] Spiegel's correspondence, published in 1897 (*Briefe an Bunsen*), revealed the character of this prelate, who, although condemning the thirty-nine articles, aspired, with the help of the civil power, to unite the Church of Germany under his authority and to withstand Rome.

[4] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

[5] The request was addressed to Leo XII, who died at this time. Pius VIII took up the affair which had remained in suspense.

but he allowed passive presence.[6] The Holy See had gone to the limit of concessions authorized by the principles of ecclesiastical law. But the Berlin court was not satisfied; it published neither the brief nor the accompanying instruction and set to work to make the Roman court yield.

Secret societies, more or less closely affiliated with Freemasonry, may have had a part in the political agitations of Germany in 1830. We may surmise this; but no precise document is extant to prove it. At this period in Germany a vast association existed, the Teutonic Society. But this association, whose principal aim was the unity of Germany, seems to have been nothing more than the echo of the public spirit, showing itself in young heads.[7] Freemasonry strictly so called, certainly widespread in Austria in 1830, always held its meetings with so many precautions that no information is obtainable on its activities.[8]

Italy

The situation was different in Italy. By the aid of authentic documents, we can follow the movement of the secret societies and their influence on the political and religious revolutions of the peninsula. We may even say that the development of the secret societies in Italy was the chief result of the revolutions of 1830. The Belgian and Polish insurrections had keenly impressed the Italian nationalists. On the other hand, Austria's system of repression in Italy redoubled in rigor after the agitations that had just troubled Europe. The Italian revolution did not break out until the death of Pius VIII and it then assumed a clearly anti-Catholic character.

[6] John Moeller, *Affaires de Cologne,* pp. 58–77. On the situation of Catholics in Prussia at this time, see *Ami de la religion,* LXII, 344; LXV, 132. Cf. *ibid.,* LXV, 363.

[7] Gustave Bord, "Les Illuminés de Bavière, le Tugend-Bund et les sociétés de malfaiteurs," in *Rev. intern. des soc. secr.,* July 5, 1913, p. 2172.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 2174.

This trait came to it precisely from the secret societies. The Italian, more than anyone else, is able to submit to necessity and at the same time to conspire in the dark. In 1830 the occult associations in Italy had two centers: the papal states and the province of Lecca, in the southern part of the peninsula. As early as May 24, 1829, Pius VIII renewed the edicts of his predecessors against them.[9] But the Pope's reputation for kindness encouraged the audacity of the sectaries. Their conspiracies may be discovered in many a revolutionary plot. Austria was menaced and increased her measures of repression. A judiciary commission was formed at Rome, with Bishop Cappelleti at its head. Twenty-six persons were brought before it, charged with belonging to the society of the Carbonari. After long discussions one of them, Joseph Picilli, grand master of the Vente of Rome and first instigator of all the troubles, was condemned to death; but Pius VIII commuted the penalty to deportation for life.

Did Napoleon's family figure in these agitations? What is certain is that the Napoleonic ideas, in Italy as in France, mixed with the ideas of opposition to the governments that were said to belong to the Ancient Regime and that these governments distrusted the Bonapartes. In 1822 Duke de Blacas, ambassador at Rome, wrote to Viscount Montmorency, the minister of Charles X, saying: "The Roman Carbonari and the others of the Italian peninsula find a secret encouragement here in the many meetings of the Bonaparte family." [10] In 1830 the court of Naples requested that Princess Caroline, sister of Napoleon I, who was living in Rome, be asked to leave the city; she withdrew to Austria.[11] Later the two sons of Queen Hortense acknowledged their part in the Italian conspiracies. The head of one of the Italian states, Duke of Modena, also entered into

[9] Encyclical *Traditi* (Artaud, *Histoire de Pie VIII*, p. 561).
[10] *Archives du ministère des affaires étrangères*, 1821, CXLVII, 219.
[11] Metternich, *Mémoires*, Vol. V.

relations with the Carbonari. Cherishing the prospect of placing himself at the head of a liberal movement, which would make him the sovereign of a kingdom in Upper Italy, he got into relation, through the intermediary of a dubious personage, Dr. Misley, with the leader of the Carbonari of Modena, Ciro Menotti by name. But the threats of Metternich, who was informed of the affair, abruptly put an end to the negotiations.

Meanwhile southern Italy, or more exactly the province of Lecca, became a hotbed of new secret societies. Under the influence of Mazzini, who found Freemasonry too aristocratic and Carbonarism too bourgeois, societies of more democratic tendencies were founded. The Genoese agitator gave them the following objectives: Italian unity, anticlericalism, and the republican spirit. One of these new organizations, the Catena Salentina, took for its motto: "Wealth and honors are smoke." The others are known but vaguely, although their existence is certain. They preceded the Society of Young Italy, which, founded in 1831, would be the most active instrument of the *Risorgimento* and of the conspiracies against the Holy See.[12]

The influence of the secret societies appeared likewise in Switzerland in the political agitations that took place there in 1830. That country had been a rendezvous of the different revolutionary sects. The Illuminati of Germany there came in contact with the Carbonari of Italy and France. Under their inspiration, literary and art societies, especially societies of riflemen, were founded in various places; their fundamental purpose was revolutionary plots. These societies played an important part in the cantonal revolutions that occurred in Switzerland, starting in 1830, in a democratic sense and one hostile to Catholicism.

[12] On the secret societies of Lower Italy at this time, see: Oreste Dito, *Massoneria, carboneria ed altre società segrete nella storia del Risorgimento italiano,* 1905; A. Cavalotti, *Memorie sulle società segrete dell'Italia meridionale,* 1904; J. Fraikin, "La Charbonnerie dans l'extrême-sud de l'Italie, de 1815 à 1830," in *Rev. int. des soc.,* May 20, 1914, pp. 1157–64.

We have no evidence that the counterblows of the European revolutions in 1830 were felt in Turkey. But these revolutions coincided with the events that, with the backing of the European states and the intervention of the pope, partially and momentarily freed Armenia from the Ottoman yoke. The Greek war of independence had been the pretext for a violent persecution of the Catholics by Sultan Mahmud, that potentate who pretended to reform his empire on the European model, but who did nothing to moderate the traditional hatred of his nation toward the Christians. Accused of treason to the Porte, the Armenian Catholics everywhere saw themselves stripped of their possessions, proscribed, and condemned to penal servitude or to death.[13]

The situation of the Armenian Catholics was intolerable. What aggravated their condition was the fact that they depended hierarchically on a schismatic patriarch who, instead of taking up their defense, turned them over to their persecutors and constrained them to practice their religion in the secrecy of their homes. The Catholic population asked to form a separate nation, having its civil status and especially its own Catholic spiritual chief. Before the threats of Count de Guilleminot, French ambassador, the Porte decided to liberate the Armenian Catholics from dependence on the schismatic patriarch. Pius VIII, by his bull *Quod jamdiu* (July 6, 1830), then hastened to erect at Constantinople an Armenian archiepiscopal see, having the title and privileges of primatial metropolitan. The holder of this high office was Anthony Nouridgian, a distinguished Armenian priest. He was consecrated in Rome (February 11, 1831) in the presence of the ambassadors of France, Austria, and Sardinia. But this institution did not realize all the hopes that were expected. The Sultan, after freeing the Armenian Catholics from the jurisdiction of the schismatic patriarch, put them under the authority of a civil chief who, at

[13] For the details, see E. Boré, *L'Arménie*, pp. 55–68.

first a simple layman, was later a priest decorated by the Turkish government with the title of patriarch. The existence of these two chiefs at the same time would give rise to painful conflicts.[14]

Non-European Countries

Beyond the Turkish Empire, in the distant regions of Asia, Africa, America, and Oceania, other Christian centers turned their eyes toward Rome to ask for shepherds, resources, helps of all sorts that they were in need of.

The *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* (April, 1829) set forth the sad situation of the Catholic missions in Tonkin and Cochin China. In western Tonkin, where a mission of 150,000 Christians had, for their direction, only three French priests, these were tracked down by the police of King Minh-menh and had to seek safety in hiding. In Cochin China the vicar apostolic Tabert was closely guarded; three French priests succeeded in reaching him secretly.[15] In China, where the persecution was rekindled and all the foreign missioners were expelled, thirty-three Chinese priests, who had made their studies in the Vincentian seminary of Macao, were the only ones to care for the religious needs of the Christians spread through the provinces.[16] Father Maistre, of the Foreign Mission Seminary, was wandering, under every kind of disguise, from the Chinese ports to the deserts of Liaotung, about the impenetrable frontier of Korea.[17] The missions of India had not yet recovered from the disastrous blow given them by the suppression of the Society of Jesus.

Protestant ministers followed in the wake of the English soldiers and American merchants. These missioners, backed by the double prestige of governmental sympathy and of gold,

[14] Petit, s.v. Armenie, in *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1912.
[15] *Annales,* April, 1829, III, 410–86.
[16] Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle,* III, 75.
[17] Marshall, *Christian Missions,* I, 113.

had won large numbers there. In regions placed under the protectorate of Portugal, the situation was scarcely more satisfactory. The archbishoprics of Goa and Cranganore and the bishoprics of Cochin and Meliapour, following the culpable neglect of the Portuguese government, were deprived of incumbents for several years. From the Sandwich Islands missioners wrote that they hoped at the end of a few years to form a core of solid Christians; but their chief obstacle was to be found in the Protestant propaganda.[18] In Brazil, out of seven episcopal sees four were vacant. The new emperor, Pedro, while making a show of sympathetic feelings to the Holy See, was causing anxiety by his encroachments in the domain of ecclesiastical affairs.[19]

The situation of the Church in the United States, although showing a satisfactory development, gave rise to some anxiety. The Irish immigration began to turn its stream on the new continent, even to the point of arousing the jealousy of the descendants of the first English and Puritan colonists. Such was the origin of the movement known as Native Americanism. At first directed against foreigners, the movement soon became, under the influence of religious bigots, a systematic opposition to Catholicism, regarded as something antinational.[20] Other dangers came to the American Church from the surroundings. Such was the intrusion of a democratic spirit into the administration of parishes. This spirit the Church did not find fault with in the political organization, but judged it incompatible with the character of her divine hierarchy. Such also was the too ready occupation of the clergy in secular affairs, which might seriously alter their ecclesiastical spirit.

None of these dangers escaped the care of the provincial council which convened at Baltimore on October 4, 1829,

[18] *Ami de la religion,* LXV, 207.
[19] *Ibid.,* LXI, 188.
[20] G. André, s.v. *Amérique,* in Vacant's *Dictionnaire,* I, 1057.

Bishop Whitfield presiding. The main questions of the agenda concerned: the powers of the bishops, the significance of the promise of obedience made by every priest at the time of his ordination, the means of spreading the faith, polemics with the Protestants, the reading by the faithful of the Bible in the vulgar tongue and of writings by heretics, the organization of a Catholic press by books, reviews, and papers, the conditions of existence of the religious congregations, and lastly the delicate question of the trustees, lay committees that often arrogated to themselves a right to manage the American parishes.[21]

At the close of the Council (October 17) the bishops published two collective pastoral letters. The first one, addressed to all the priests of the United States, strongly urged them not to mingle excessively in the affairs of this world, to practice the truths which they preached, to study the Scripture, to abstain from frivolous reading, and to live free from any reproach, even from any suspicion. The second letter, intended for all the Catholics of the United States, recommended cooperation in the works of the press and of education, warned them against the trustee system, and admonished them against the spirit of religious indifference, which, under a veneer of liberalism, would tend to put truth and error on the same plane.

To provide for the needs of all these missions, Pius VIII, by a rescript of September 18, 1829, recommended to the faithful of the whole world the Propagation of the Faith Society, founded in France a few years earlier. This work, continually prospering since its foundation, was able to distribute in 1829 more than 300,000 francs [22] and in 1830 about the same sum,[23] to the various missions that asked it for help. The number of apostolic workers grew in proportion to the generosity of the

[21] On the 1829 Council of Baltimore, see *Ami de la religion,* LXII, 145–50; LXV, 173–79.

[22] See *Annales,* July, 1830, IV, 251–59. The sum mentioned was the equivalent of about $60,000. (Tr.)

[23] *Ibid.,* pp. 605–13.

faithful. The Foreign Mission Seminary, which had but 25 missioners in 1824, counted 53 six years later.[24] The Vincentians, the Jesuits, and the Holy Ghost Fathers gave more and more numerous workers to the labor of spreading the gospel in distant lands. However, Pius VIII was unable to witness the mighty rebirth of the foreign missions, a consolation reserved for Gregory XVI and Pius IX. After occupying the Apostolic See only twenty months, the wise and pious Pontiff, feeling himself stricken by a disease from which he had been suffering a long time and which was aggravated by the cares of his rule, asked to receive the last sacraments and drew his last breath on November 30, 1830. During his pontificate, amid events that overturned all Europe, many lofty and sincere ideas were mingled with many illusions; generous movements were in contact with revolutionary passions and doctrinal errors. To discern these errors with care and to condemn them forcefully, will be the task falling to Pius VIII's successor.

[24] *Ami de la religion,* LXVI, 518.

PART II

Pontificate of Gregory XVI

CHAPTER XI

Gregory XVI and the Papal States (1831–1832)

THE double task which Pius VIII bequeathed to his successor was to discern and to condemn the errors of the time. This task was the more difficult to accomplish inasmuch as most of these errors found shelter under equivocal appellations. The most elusive was that of liberalism. The revolutionary agitator Mazzini called himself a liberal, as did the conservative Protestant Guizot, as did the ultramontane priest Lamennais, as did the group of young Catholics, Gerbet and Rohrbacher, who again and again in the *Avenir* carried on a valiant fight for "God and liberty." [1] Moreover, the meaning of the word was not exactly the same in the different nations. In Italy the liberal movement seemed to be confounded with the movement for national independence and, considered thus, was acclaimed by men like Silvio Pellico and Manzoni. In England liberalism was understood rather in a dogmatic sense; and Newman, thinking he saw it in the agitations of O'Connell and the Irish Catholics, blamed them for it as a crime.[2] With the head of the liberal movement in France, Father Lamennais, liberalism would successively take the most varied forms: setting out from the most ardent ultramontanism, he ended up in open revolt against the pope. The equivocation did not cease until the supreme authority of the Holy See defined and condemned the liberal error.

[1] The *Avenir* (founded October 16, 1830) carried, at the head of its columns, this motto: "God and Liberty."

[2] On the meaning that Newman attached to liberalism and the manner in which he condemned it, see his *Apologia*. Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, I, 23, 195.

Liberalism in the Papal States

In Italy, even in the Papal States, "liberalism" embraced most diverse aspirations. For some it expressed a noble sentiment of national independence, for others a vague constitutional or democratic tendency, for still others a defiant distrust of the Holy See. For the secret societies, which seized upon the movement, it was the sonorous word by which hypocritical plotters tried to justify the most sacrilegious attacks against the Church and the most dangerous conspiracies against the social order.

The man who would become the inspirer and leader of the revolutionary agitation in Italy, the organizer of Young Italy and Young Europe, Giuseppe Mazzini, summed up the plan in this passage of his instructions: "In Italy the people has still to be created: but it is ready to break the envelope that holds it back. . . . Some words are to be found that ought to be often repeated to the people: liberty, the rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity. This is what the people will understand, especially when we use the mottoes in opposition to despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery, and so on. The difficulty is not to convince the people; it is to unite them. The day when they become united will be the day of the new era." [3] Once the people are aroused, the princes will follow. The famous agitator wrote: "The pope will enter on the path of the reforms by very necessity; the Grand Duke of Tuscany will do so by weakness or imitation; the King of Naples by constraint; the King of Piedmont by the idea of the Italian crown." [4] The idea of the national unity of Italy was one of those which the secret societies exploited with greatest success.

[3] Quoted by Lubienski, *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie,* p. 46, and by Claudio Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie au XIX^e siècle,* p. 148.

[4] Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société,* II, 273.

The history of Italy during the nineteenth century shows more than any other how the harmful influence of Freemasonry and of the sects sprung from its bosom misled the development of the public life among the people where they managed to be implanted. Italy, the outstanding and predestined center of civilization, had been, in consequence of its destiny, the battleground of other peoples. The rivalries of its own children and especially the republican form of its city governments, had kept it from forming a nation at the time when the other European races were constituting themselves into compact monarchies. Foreign domination, to which some of its provinces were subjected, became particularly hard to tolerate in the nineteenth century. The feeling of nationality developed everywhere in the degree to which the governments were centralized to the detriment of local autonomies. Besides, the unjust annexion of Venetia by the treaty of Campo Formio and the shocking disregard of right shown in the Congress of Vienna, by sanctioning this injustice, seriously compromised the principle of legitimacy which Austria was able to invoke over Milan.[5]

The independence and unity of Italy were, then, the watchwords cleverly chosen by the sects. But far-sighted minds easily grasped that, behind these apparent aims, were hidden designs hostile to Catholicism. As we read in a work by a writer closely acquainted with their maneuvers: "Italy was covered with sects. Freemasonry, reinforced by Carbonarism, was humanitarian; its universal brotherhood could be translated into what today would be called socialism and, in radical language, the federation of the peoples. It was anti-Catholic." [6] What all the sects especially desired was the destruction of the temporal power of the pope and of the Catholic Church itself.

In the first rank of those who needed to oppose these sects was Prince Metternich. He especially needed to perceive, denounce, and combat these sacrilegious plans; for he was the

[5] Cf. Jannet, *op. cit.*, p. 147. This book is merely the reproduction of Deschamps, *op. cit.*, Vol. III. This Volume III is the work of Claudio Jannet.

[6] Madame Rattazzi, *Rattazzi et son temps, documents inédits,* I, 20, 46. Cf. Silengardi, *Ciro Menotti.*

statesman who then assumed the role of directing the policy of the great powers of Europe against the revolution. Following the revolution of 1830, the Austrian minister clearly noted the power acquired by the sects that were grouped about Freemasonry. To the Austrian ambassador at Paris he wrote: "Neither the cabinet of the Tuileries nor anyone else can any longer entertain the least doubt about the dangers threatening the social body, in consequence of the extreme force it has acquired, under the shadow of tolerance and impunity, by an antisocial sect which, under this aegis, has been able to form itself into a solid and compact government." [7] But, after so clearly stating the destructive might of the secret societies, what is the institution which the celebrated diplomat sought for preservation from their blows? He did not turn to that principle of legitimacy whose defender he proclaimed himself at the Congress of Vienna, for in the case of King Charles X and the Duke of Bordeaux he showed a selfish disregard. He no longer calls himself the first defender of this temporal power of the Holy See, for he will protect it only in trying to dominate it. We may say that what he sought primarily was the tranquillity of the *de facto* governments, including that July monarchy which he had just counseled his own monarch to recognize.

As evidenced by his diplomatic correspondence, the gist of Metternich's whole effort is evident. It consisted in attempting to circumscribe the revolutionary peril and particularly to induce King Louis Philippe to enter on the path of repressive measures against the sects. In several diplomatic documents of this period, which he inserted in his *Mémoires,* we see him put forward, in order to influence the King of the French, the part taken by the Bonapartists with regard to the secret societies. He says: "The sons of Louis Bonaparte are at the head of the insurgents who wish to take the capital." [8] Later on, returning

[7] Metternich, *Mémoires,* V, 355.
[8] Dispatch of March 9, 1831.

more precisely to his point of view, he wrote: "France is geographically placed in such a position that the Bonapartist monarchy would merely have to cross the Pyrenees and the Bonapartist republic merely to cross the Alps to join hands in the kingdom of France." [9]

While the famous stateman was pursuing these almost fruitless negotiations, the sects had profoundly upset the Papal States. The spark that set off the revolutionary explosion started at the city of Modena. A close friend of Francis IV, duke of Modena, by name Ciro Menotti, an able and intriguing personage and an influential member of the Italian High Vente, organized the uprising. Intimating to the old duke, his master, whose ambitious dreams he carefully cultivated, that he was concerned solely with conquering the political independence of the peninsula and with consolidating that work by placing on the prince's head the constitutional crown of a unified Italy, he had full scope for recruiting secret agents in the various cities of the Papal States and at Rome itself. The high approbation of Francis IV, of whom he availed himself on the occasion as a pledge of success, brought him many valuable followers.[10] If we are to believe the conspirator, among these followers were several highly placed personages of the French government.[11] Assuredly he had in his hand the two sons of Louis Napoleon.[12] But the Duke opened his eyes in time. At last understanding that Menotti's undertaking was directed to nothing less than the outbreak of a social revolution with the Holy Father and the European sovereigns as the principal victims, he forestalled the insurrectionary movement. At the moment when Menotti

[9] Dispatch of September 17, 1834.

[10] Menotti's schemes, their antireligious aim, and his connections with the secret societies cannot be doubted since the publication of the documents of Louis Blanc, to whom Menotti's secret correspondence had been communicated. See Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans* (5th ed.), II, 292 ff.

[11] Menotti, Letter of July 19, 1831, quoted by Louis Blanc, *loc. cit.*

[12] Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 260–62; Louis Blanc, *op. cit.*, II, 295, 317.

was preparing the invasion of the ducal palace, the Duke had him arrested as a perjurer and rebel.

Unfortunately these measures came too late to prevent the execution of a firmly organized plot. At the same time that Menotti was attempting to revolutionize Modena, his associates, faithful to orders, were stirring up Bologna. Shortly afterward the movement won over all the other cities of Romagna, Umbria, the Marches, and all the Legations. The conspirators everywhere formed national guards, then established provisional governments made up of nobles, doctors, and lawyers. Bologna was the headquarters. The prolegate Clarelli, to avoid the greatest evils, had to consent to the formation of a governmental commission, having a provincial guard under its orders. Then, feeling his authority overwhelmed by the new order, he left the city and returned to Rome.[13] Thereafter the rebels no longer hid their aim. After the prolegate's departure, the commission declared, without discussion, "the complete freedom from the temporal dominion of the pope in a single government." Lastly it published a manifesto against the administration of the pope and organized a central government consisting of a president and seven ministers.[14] All these events took place in the interregnum, cleverly chosen, between the death of Pius VIII and the election of his successor. Masters of the legations and the Marches, the rebels had thus far respected the patrimony of St. Peter.[15] But evidently the events that had just taken place were only the prelude of an invasion

[13] Sylvain, *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat,* p. 36.

[14] Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine,* p. 315.

[15] The States of the Church embraced three parts: the Patrimony of St. Peter, the Marches, and the Legations. Article 103 of the act of June 9, 1815, was worded as follows: "The Marches, with Camerino and their dependencies, as also the Duchy of Benevento and the principality of Ponte Corvo, are returned to the Holy See. It again enters into possession of the Legations of Ravenna, Bologna, and Ferrara, except the part of Ferrara situated on the left bank of the Po." Cf. Farges, "Le pouvoir temporal au début du pontificat de Grégoire XVI," in the *Revue historique,* XLII (1890), 317.

of Rome. The governor of the city neglected nothing to uncover the secret of the conspiracy. Informed that plots were being laid in secret, he had the chief suspects arrested (December 11, 1830) and forced the others to leave Rome. Among the persons arrested were Joseph Cannonieri, a lawyer and refugee from Modena, and Guy Fedeli of Recanati, the master of the chamber of Prince Charles. Thanks to these energetic measures, the conclave was able to meet (December 13) in a relative security.

The Conclave

Forty-five cardinals took part in the various ballotings. On the first day Cardinal Pacca, dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal Cappellari, prefect of Propaganda, and Cardinal Giustiniani, former nuncio to Madrid, received the largest number of votes. But the Spanish government, making use of the right of "exclusive," accorded to the Catholic powers by a custom tolerated by the Holy See,[16] presented its veto to the election of Cardinal Giustiniani. The part taken by Giustiniani in the appointment of the bishops of America under the pontificate of Leo XII is supposed to have been the cause of this exclusive. Two were left: Pacca, prominent by his long services in the nunciatures, which revealed his enlightened devotion to the interests of the Church; and Cappellari, whose less brilliant but much esteemed labors recommended him to his colleagues. Pacca, better known in the diplomatic world, was easily accepted by the crowns. Cappellari was preferred by the zelanti.

For almost two weeks the two parties remained evenly balanced, the difference in the votes cast for them being only four or five. To put an end to the stalemate, Albani, whose relations with the crowns were well known, joined the party of the zelanti. Most of the cardinals who followed his lead imitated him. On February 2, 1831, the feast of the Purification, Cardi-

[16] On the right of exclusive, see Mourret, *op. cit.*, VI, 417.

nal Maur Cappellari was elected pope by thirty-one votes. The conclave had lasted fifty days.[17] The new pope, in remembrance of the monastery of St. Gregory, where he had been superior, and of the great saint who had dwelt there, took the name of Gregory XVI. This election was received throughout the world with evidences of satisfaction. In the press that was indifferent or unfriendly to Catholicism, the *National* and the *Temps* praised the new pope. Prince Metternich wrote to Count Lützow, Austrian ambassador to the Holy See: "I need not assure you that no choice by the Sacred College could be more agreeable to our august master than that which has just been made." [18] In the *Avenir,* Lamennais greeted the new pontiff in these words: "Cardinal Cappellari, in his office as prefect of Propaganda, has had an anticipated experience and a sort of magnificent apprenticeship of the papacy. . . . His blessing *Urbi et Orbi,* issuing from the height of St. Peter's basilica, will spread traces of its benefits to the ends of the earth. . . . From the heart of that universal charity, it will ascend the steps of the throne reserved to the supreme defender of truth and justice."

Gregory XVI

The satisfaction was general. It was justified by the character of the new pope, the happy success of the undertakings in which he had been employed, and the soundness of his theological knowledge which he had already shown.

He was tall, his step firm, and his bearing erect in spite of his sixty-five years. In the lines of his face Gregory did not have the distinguished features that appeared in the faces of Leo XII and Pius VIII. The ill-will of his enemies at times caricatured the strongly marked lines of his face, his slightly protruding lips, his big black eyes, and his widely arched eyebrows.

[17] *Ami de la religion,* LXVII, 101. Cf. pp. 86, 118. 209.
[18] Metternich, *op. cit.,* Vol. V, letter of February 12, 1831.

But, according to the reports of all who approached him, the expression of his soul transfigured him as soon as he had to perform a religious function or when he entered into conversation. The devout dignity that he displayed in the liturgical ceremonies, the spiritual amiability that he showed in his converse, the simple, lively, and warm tone by which he put at ease the lowliest of his visitors, touched the heart of more than one heretic. However, in the presence of a flagrant injustice his face quickly assumed a severe expression, almost terrible. But this expression soon gave way to his habitual air of kindness, and evidently the Pontiff had done violence to his kindly nature only in obedience to an imperious duty of conscience.[19]

Such he appeared to those who came into close contact with him. He had been such also in his past life, and such he would be throughout his pontificate: his was a fatherly kindness toward men, a rigid inflexibility toward error. The perfect constancy of attitude and ideas was one of the most characteristic traits in the career of Pope Gregory XVI.

Bartholomew Albert Cappellari was born September 18, 1765, at Belluna.[20] He came of a family of the lesser nobility, commendable by the traditions of virtue that were perpetuated in it from generation to generation. When in 1783 he received the white habit of a Camaldolese monk in the monastery of St. Michael of Venice, the young religious, in memory of one of the cherished disciples of St. Benedict, took the name of Maur. In the successive offices he held in different monasteries of Venice, Rome, and Padua, Dom Maur Cappellari formed those habits of simple, recollected, and laborious life which he would preserve on the papal throne.[21] Moreover, the delicate offices he

[19] On the person and character of Gregory, see the testimony of historians who knew him personally, such as Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes,* pp. 398 ff.; Crétineau-Joly, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution,* II, 189; Gaume, *Les trois Rome,* II, 150.

[20] An ancient and picturesque city of Venetia.

[21] We are told that, after his election to the papacy, when his servant came to

had to fill, either as visitator of the colleges and universities or as reviser of the books of the Eastern Church or as prefect of Propaganda had brought out that art of dealing considerately with men and affairs, which some historians have said, without foundation, Gregory XVI did not possess. But the impartial study of his life will demonstrate their presence. He it was who, under Leo XII, accomplished, as prefect of Propaganda, against the clever diplomacy of Count Labrador, the surrender of the rights which Spain arrogated on the appointment of bishops in the countries of the New World that broke away from her empire. With this expert negotiator the understanding of concrete situations and of the solutions they required never made him forget the inviolability of the principles that directed his steps.

From early youth the future author of the encyclical *Mirari vos* had nothing more at heart than to defend the rights of the Church and of the papacy against the contemporary errors. In 1786, the year of his religious profession, he sustained, in the presence of the patriarch of Venice, a public thesis on the infallibility of the pope.[22] The next year, as professor of theology, he chose by preference, as subjects of his courses, the questions stirred by the philosophers of the day.[23] In 1799 he summed up and supplemented all his ideas previously set forth in his work, *Il trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa contra gli assalti dai novatori, combattuti e respinti colle stesse loro armi.*[24] A few years later Maur Cappellari was one of the chief promoters of the Academy of the Catholic Religion and at its

---

receive his orders for the table, he replied: "Do you think my stomach has altered because I am pope?"

[22] Cardinal Zurla, *Memoire intorno alla vita ed agli studii del Padre Lodovico Nachi, abbate cameldolese.*

[23] The Camaldolese of Monte Coelio still possess the manuscripts of several theses then taught by Dom Maur Cappellari.

[24] A French translation of this work is in Volume XVI of the *Démonstrations évangéliques* by Migne.

meetings he read several dissertations against the errors of the time.[25]

The new pope lacked neither practical experience nor a knowledge of the intellectual problems raised by contemporaries. He soon had need to use both of these qualifications. The political question was the first one he had to handle. The gravity of the rebellion that made its center at Bologna was recognized by all the great powers. They could not doubt that the blow to the Holy See emanated from the revolutionary sects and thereby indirectly threatened their own authority. But none of them showed any eagerness to repress the movement. Some, such as England and the France of Louis Philippe, viewed, not without a certain satisfaction, a breach made in the institutions of the Ancient Regime in papal Italy and replaced by a constitutional regime. The others, with Austria at their head, and with Metternich as its daring and self-appointed spokesman, at first adopted a threatening attitude.

But they showed little zeal in thwarting the insurrection. Perhaps they wished to humor the secret societies, whose might they dreaded, or perhaps they were not displeased to see the ultramontanism shaken and awaited the hour to intervene in favor of the Holy See to force their protection on it. In short, neither the states that loudly proclaimed the principle of intervention, such as Austria by the mouth of Metternich, nor those that withdrew into the system of non-intervention, such as France, tried to give full satisfaction to the Supreme Pontiff. The former, suspected of being guided, not by a generous respect for right, but rather by a national self-seeking, yielded too much to the inspirations of Josephism or Gallicanism; the latter, by their application of *"laissez-faire, laissez-passer,"* in their international relations, did nothing but transfer the pure

[25] Cf. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione,* XXXII, 312. Moroni, who was close to Gregory XVI, is a well-informed witness of the events of his pontificate. A detailed chronology of these events will be found in XXXII, 313–28.

doctrine of liberalism and indifferentism into the realm of diplomatic relations.

Cardinal Bernetti

The Pope could not fail to see the import of the revolutionary moves. A few days after his election, the insurrection entered the Patrimony of St. Peter, even penetrated into the streets of Rome, and there paraded its unfurled banners. Time was not left to resort to preventive measures. The papacy was forced to a close combat with the uprising. Gregory XVI appealed to the devotedness of a man whose strength he knew and whose experience of affairs and fidelity to the Holy See he could rely on, Cardinal Bernetti.

Thomas Bernetti, born at Fermo on December 29, 1779, should be placed, not far below his master Consalvi, in the first rank of the statesmen who served the Church in the nineteenth century. After his literary studies and his law courses in his native city, he came to Rome and was there trained in the practice of affairs under the direction of the celebrated Bartolucci. His first appearance on the political scene was at the time of Pius VII's captivity. Without the knowledge of Emperor Napoleon, whose police he had to evade at any price and whose wrath he had to face, he was to transmit a secret message from the Pope to the Emperor of Austria. Bernetti undertook the delicate and perilous mission. He succeeded in having the letter reach its destination; by the success of the undertaking he rendered a most signal service to the Church. Thanks to him, the plenipotentiaries of the allied powers, gathered in congress, gave the Pope a favorable reply in the matter of the restitution of the States of the Holy See.[26]

After these glorious beginnings, Thomas Bernetti became the right arm of Consalvi. The great statesman confided to him

[26] *Ami de la religion,* CLVII, 121.

the task of re-establishing, as legate, the papal government in the province of Ferrara. The qualities he displayed in this enterprise led to his being called to the duties of assessor of the committee of the armies in Rome, then to those of governor of Rome. Under Leo XII and Pius VIII the position of Bernetti grew and his talents of statesman shone with such brilliance as to draw to him the esteem of the most obdurate foes of the Church. Stendhal, speaking of the conclave of 1829, wrote: "I desire to see on the throne of St. Peter the most reasonable cardinal, and my votes are for Bernetti." [27] The very day of Gregory XVI's election, with a presentiment of the gravity of the revolutionary movement that had broken out in the Bologna legation, he confirmed Bernetti in the government of that province, which had been confided to him by Pius VIII.[28] A few days later, when the revolution reached Rome, he raised the intrepid cardinal [29] to the high post of pro-Secretary of State in order to rely more completely on him. In these painful circumstances, said Gregory XVI, "I wished to have at my side an arm of iron and a heart of gold: I confided to Bernetti the supreme direction of the government." [30]

At his very first glance, Bernetti judged the situation as a real statesman whose look goes beyond the present difficulties. His advice was that the Holy See, confronted by the insurrection, ought to act, so far as would be possible, by its own powers and ought to have recourse to the intervention of the foreign powers only in the last extremity. The future would show how well justified were his apprehensions.

Conformable to the views of his counselor, the Pope first addressed a fatherly appeal to his people. Replying to the calumnies of those who pictured him as the enemy of all progress,

[27] Stendhal, *Promenades dans Rome,* 2nd ser., p. 336.

[28] Maynard, *Jacques Crétineau-Joly, sa vie politique, religieuse et littéraire,* p. 343.

[29] Bernetti was created a cardinal by Leo XII, October 2, 1826. *Ami de la religion,* CLVII, 123.

[30] Maynard, *op. cit.,* p. 343.

he protested his desire to contribute to the material and spiritual well-being of his subjects.[31] But the uprising spread. It reached the cities of Imola, Faenza, Forli, and Ravenna. Sercognani, passing through the Marches at the head of an army of 2,000 men, addressed a proclamation to the Romans, urging them to revolt. The two sons of Queen Hortense left Tuscany to join the rebels. The Pope, to prove to his subjects that his promises of reform were not vain and to reply to the maneuvers of the conspirators, whose first act had been to decree the lowering of the taxes, hastened (February 13) to take similar measures. On the 16th he lowered the customs duties. Three days later he reduced the tax on salt. At the same time he opened the political prisons, setting at liberty seventy persons who had been condemned for crimes against the state.

The Pope needed to show that these measures were not a disguise of weakness and did not constitute a capitulation. While the Pontiff was attempting to disabuse his people of the accusations brought against the government of the Holy See, Bernetti was negotiating the purchase of arms abroad and (February 17) he urged the Romans to form a civic guard. This appeal having received an enthusiastic welcome among the populations of the city of Rome and the Roman Campania, a new act of the papal government (February 21) organized the new institution. Article 1 declared that the civic guard would be composed of all men, except ecclesiastics, over twenty years old and not yet over sixty. Article 2 added that persons over sixty years of age who would offer to give this proof of zeal might form a part of it.

In the mind of the Secretary of State this measure took into account not only the people of Rome, who should be interested in the defense of the city, and the insurgents, who had to be opposed with material force, but also the great powers. The

[31] Apostolic letter of February 9, 1831, in Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, I, 1; Barberi, *Bull. Rom. continuatio*, XIX, 1.

chief among these was Austria, which, having already one foot in Italy, asked nothing better than to intervene again and to make the Pope pay for its designing protection. In fact, Prince Metternich had written (February 15) to his ambassador at the court of France to obtain assurance that Louis Philippe would not oppose Austrian action in the peninsula. The ambassador was to remind the King that "the revolution of the Bonapartists was backed by the French anarchists and that the King of the French would find to his interest not to let a Bonapartist throne be set up next door to him." [32]

As we shall presently see, such declarations deceived neither the French government nor the papal government about the real designs of the court of Vienna. However, the insurrection continued to gain ground and to become more threatening. On February 17 the garrison of Ancona capitulated to the insurgents, and two days later Cardinal Benvenuti, sent by the Holy Father as *legatus a latere* into the revolted provinces to restore peace there,[33] was seized and made a prisoner by the uprising. On February 21 Cardinal Bernetti informed the diplomatic corps of these outrages. A combined action of the Catholic powers, conducted with decision and firmness, would perhaps have succeeded in allaying the danger. Such action did not occur. In the presence of this inactivity, the Secretary of State sent the following note to the powers: "The Holy Father, having exhausted all means in his power, recognizes the necessity of asking foreign assistance. . . . He has turned to the Emperor of Austria and requested the armed help of his soldiers."

The Austrian troops, as the Pope and his minister knew, were already massed on the frontiers. At the first sign from the Holy Father, they crossed the Po. On March 21, Ferrara, Ravenna, and Bologna fell into their hands. A week later the surrender of Ancona ended the campaign. By April 2 the au-

[32] Metternich, *op. cit.*, V, 153.
[33] Barberi, *op. cit.*, XIX, 2.

thority of the Holy See was re-established in all the provinces. All signs indicate that the so-called popular uprising had been the deed of a few clever and turbulent leaders, who deceived some by their perfidious calumnies and terrorized others by their brutal aggressions. Once these leaders were removed, good order was restored. Confidence returned in the Papal States. Gregory XVI took advantage of this situation to address (April 5) to his people a proclamation marked by gentleness and firmness. He solemnly repeated his "firm resolution to create institutions suitable to improve the lot of his subjects"; but he added that "these fatherly cares would be possible only through the maintenance of energetic measures, calculated to prevent the return of fresh disorders."

No time was lost in carrying out this twofold declaration. As first fruits of the judiciary reforms that he proposed to introduce, Gregory XVI declared the abolition of confiscation of property, a penalty which the political customs of civilized peoples no longer justified. As a pledge of the mildness which he intended to show toward those who had strayed, he promulgated a decree of amnesty for all the rebels who, not being civil or military employees of the papal power, would lay down their arms by April 6. But, on the other hand, he named a civil commission instructed to search out and judge the instigators and promoters of the revolutionary movement. All officials, military or civil, implicated in the movement, could not be restored to their offices until they cleared themselves of the charges brought against them. In fact, as Bernetti declared in a note dated April 30, "most of the chief culprits had time to leave the States of the Holy See" and thus escape any condemnation.

Foreign Intervention

The period of the disorders seemed to be ended. Perhaps it would have been so in reality if the powers, faithful to the most

elementary rules of international law, were satisfied with merely protecting external order in the States of the Holy See, refraining from any interference in the internal policy. Unfortunately the government of Louis Philippe and that of Francis I soon agreed to carry out a totally different policy. The cabinet of Casimir Périer, who strongly advocated a policy of absolute non-intervention, proceeded to intervene in the most internal machinery of the papal government; and the cabinet of Prince Metternich, who professed, along with devotion to the papacy, devotion to the most authoritarian institutions of the past, agreed with the government of July in requesting liberal reforms from the Pope. Soon after this, the two governments decided to gather in conference for this purpose, to which France invited Protestant England, and Austria invited heretical Prussia and schismatical Russia.

The conference opened, at Rome itself, under the eyes of the Holy Father, but without his participation. What was the purpose of Austria and of Russia in taking part in such a move? Guizot, in his *Mémoires,* surmises that "they did so out of prudence, at a stormy time, especially with regard to France and England, whose liberal action they feared and whom they hoped to restrain by not separating from them." [34] It was neither well conceived nor praiseworthy. So far as Austria was concerned, it might well be suspected of Josephism as a thought in the back of their minds. The Vienna cabinet, when it acted thus, lent itself to the suspicion that it wished to resume the worst traditions of Joseph II by abusively interfering in the affairs of the Holy See.

The *Memorandum* drawn up by the plenipotentiaries of the five powers at the end of the Roman conference (May 21, 1831) did but confirm these impressions. By a proceeding unprecedented in the annals of history, the five powers presumed to dictate to the Pope the reforms that he must introduce in his

[34] Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps,* II, 291.

states to correspond to the so-called aspirations of his people. This presumptuous decision was monarchical Josephism putting its authority at the service of revolutionary liberalism.

The essence of these strange demands is found set forth in the first two paragraphs of the diplomatic document.[35]

> The representatives of the five powers judge that, as to the State of the Church, the question, in the interest of Europe, concerns two fundamental points: 1. that the government of that state be based on solid foundations by the ameliorations considered and announced by His Holiness himself at the outset of his reign; 2. that these ameliorations which, according to the expressions of the edict of His Excellency Cardinal Bernetti, will found a new era for the subjects of His Holiness, should be, by an internal guaranty, safeguarded from the changes inherent to the nature of every elective government.
>
> To attain this salutary end, which, owing to the geographical and social composition of the States of the Church, is of European interest, the organic declaration of His Holiness should set out from two vital principles: 1. the application of the ameliorations in question not only to the provinces where the revolution has broken out, but also to those which have remained faithful to the capital; 2. the general admission of laymen to administrative and judiciary offices.

Evidently the pretentions of the powers were not limited to a transient intervention. They extended even to a permanent control of the political reforms asked of the Holy See; and no doubt remained that, if the government of Louis Philippe tended to propagate in the States of the Church the constitutional regime of which it claimed to be the model, Austria aspired to fix her influence in Italy by her role of interpreter of the popular demands. On May 22, following the conference, Count Saint-Aulaire, ambassador of France, in a dispatch to his government, stated with apprehension that Austria was becoming popular in Italy. In the preceding month of May, France had already protested against the prolongation of the

[35] The document was written by the Prussian minister, Bunsen.

sojourn of the Austrian troops in the peninsula. France began to wonder if, in the *Memorandum,* she had not been the dupe of Metternich's politics. Bernetti, a shrewd observer, promptly fathomed how artificial and unstable the accord of the powers really was. A solemn and outspoken protest of the Pope against the *Memorandum* taken as a whole accentuated the misunderstanding which the sects had created. More than ever the Supreme Pontiff was made to appear as the defender of the tyranny of the Ancient Regime against the liberal reforms demanded by the sovereigns themselves.

Gregory XVI's calm and dignity were admirable. To the delegates of the conference he pointed out, not without spirit, that he would carry out all the reforms spontaneously promised by him, and all those he might subsequently judge useful. But he insisted on retaining the initiative, strongly resolved to make use of all his prerogatives as a free and independent prince. This attitude was worthy and dignified. If the people of the Marches and the Legations, even those of the Patrimony of St. Peter, had been partly drawn into the movement of revolutionary liberalism, they had preserved in the depth of their heart the feeling of national independence, an instinctive hatred for outside interference in their country.

Conflict between France and Austria

The subdued disagreement, manifested even during the Roman conferences between the cabinet of Vienna and that of Paris, soon became sharper. In the course of the discussions, Count Saint-Aulaire, speaking of Austria, in a dispatch addressed to his government, mentioned odd symptoms of disagreement.[36] A short time later, Louis Philippe hinted to the Pope, through his ambassador, that France would gladly take upon herself the defense of order in the Papal States, if the

[36] Dispatch of May 22, 1831.

Holy See would agree: 1. to set aside the influence of Austria to the advantage of France; 2. to take, without great delay, certain liberal measures, such as the promulgation of an amnesty in favor of the rebels. Bernetti replied to Saint-Aulaire that the French guaranty seemed precious to His Holiness, but that the Pope thought he could not purchase it by measures which would be an abdication of papal independence. As these last words were interpreted by the powers as an implicit rejection of the *Memorandum,* Gregory's minister explained in a later note that, although the Pope could not consent to sanction reforms that would be dictated to him imperiously and at a fixed date, he had for a long time shown by his conduct his eagerness in investigating and carrying out the desirable ameliorations that were compatible with public security.

But the conflict between Austria and France became bitter. France persisted in asking for the evacuation of Italy by the Austrian troops and the amnesty. Metternich, advancing the pretext that the Pope had need of being succored, imposed certain conditions for the withdrawal of the imperial armies.[37] Besides, he complained of the French government's urgence in its demands. "The French cabinet," he wrote, "abandons itself to its desires with an eagerness that makes it blind to the imprudence of the means it adopts." [38] The impatience of the government of Louis Philippe is understandable. The head of the cabinet, Casimir Périer, ever since he came to power, was sustaining an almost relentless struggle against the revolutionary party.[39] The opening of the Chambers was going to take place on July 23. An interpellation by the left on the occupation of the Roman States by Austria was imminent. The French ambassador, in a conversation with Cardinal Bernetti, set forth that, if Austria had not evacuated the papal territory when the legisla-

[37] Metternich, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, letter of June 3, 1831, to Count Apponyi.
[38] Letter of June 4, 1831.
[39] Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* I, 444.

tive labors were resumed, France would be obliged, for a successful reply to an interpellation, to occupy Civitavecchia and Ancona in order to counterbalance the influence of the court of Vienna in the Papal States.

The situation was critical. French and Austrian armies finding themselves in conflict on papal soil, perhaps coming to blows, would create a condition that might be the letting loose of a war. With the tension of the diplomatic relations at that moment, the entente existing between the court of London and that of Paris,[40] the community of ideas which drew together the governments of Prussia and Russia with that of Austria, ran the risk of setting Europe on fire, or at any rate of profoundly disturbing the States of the Church and arousing revolutionary passions. Gregory XVI was ready to stretch to the utmost limits the testimonials of his condescensions. On July 12, 1831, he granted a general amnesty to the insurgents who would sign an act of submission to his authority; but he excepted by name thirty-nine of the ringleaders, among them Mamiani and Pepoli. Three days later he obtained the immediate evacuation of his states by the Austrian troops, but on condition that they would return to lend a strong hand to the papal militia if the tranquillity of the States of the Church should be menaced anew. Were these measures going to put an end to every conflict? [41]

Gregory XVI did not look forward to such a happy result. Though he had momentarily shunted an imminent danger, the deep causes of the crisis from which the Papal States suffered had not disappeared. The inopportune *Memorandum,* with its

[40] England remained, no doubt, at bottom, the rival of France in her general policy; but political complications raised by the Belgian revolution made the two nations proceed in accord. While Austria, Prussia, and Russia viewed with an evil eye the dissolution of the kingdom of the Netherlands and the independence of Belgium, England and France, in sympathy with this revolution, showed a united front to impose this agreement on the powers of the north.

[41] On this occasion, to reward his subjects whose devotedness had sustained him during the crisis, Gregory XVI instituted the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

injunctions about vague reforms, continued to give the revolutionary agitators a point of support and a force which, even if not desired by all the signatories, was nonetheless considerable. Moreover, the situation of the Holy See, without a real army, without important means of defense, offered the sects occasion to resume their conspiracies. The prolegates and the general staffs of the civic guard of Bologna, Forli, and Ravenna organized (December 22, 1831), of their own initiative, a sort of autonomous constitution. They intended to oppose any interference of the papal troops in the Legation. Under a less violent form, this was an insurrection as radical as that which had troubled the States of the Holy See a few months before.

The Pope saw the danger and at once tried to ward it off. Cardinal Albani, whose energy and experience were well known, was made extraordinary commissioner in the four Legations, with most extensive civil and military powers. The pontifical militias, already organized, furnished him with 5,000 men.[42] Unfortunately their military training was not completed; their roll of officers left much to be desired; their action was marked by enthusiasm more than by discipline. When they reached the frontiers of the Legations, they clashed with some troops of peasants, raised by the revolutionary agents, who, with the usual high-sounding words of liberty, independence, and hatred toward the foreigner, had made them fanatics, desperate and ready for anything. Did Cardinal Albani exaggerate the danger? Some historians have thought so. In any event the peril was real, and the need of repressing it was urgent. The Austrians were holding themselves in readiness on the frontiers, resting on their arms. They alone could bring immediate help.

Albani did not hesitate. Without consulting the Pope, whose personal intervention might have stirred up diplomatic compli-

[42] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 517.

cations,[43] he asked General Radetsky, commander-in-chief of the Austrian army, to send him the needed forces, while he himself at the head of the pontifical militia occupied Ferrara, Forli, and Ravenna, Radetsky seized Bologna and all the positions abandoned six months before. In the last days of January, 1832, the authority of the Holy See was restored in all the provinces.

Feeling ran high in France. Thus the great efforts exerted by Périer's diplomacy to keep Austria out of Italy and to develop an entente between the Pope and the reformist movement were abruptly rendered vain. What triumphed was Austria and the policy of repression. Guizot, in his *Mémoires,* expresses the feelings that then stirred the government of Louis Philippe. He says:

> If affairs remained thus, if the French government did not show itself sensible of this failure and prompt to repair it, France would no longer have any consideration or influence in Italy. In France the government did not know what reply to give to the attacks and insults of the opposition. Already it was exasperated, it questioned, it related the griefs of the Italians, the excesses of the soldiers of the Pope, the return of the Austrians in the Legations as rulers. There France had no direct and material interest; but a question of dignity and of national greatness arose, perhaps also of domestic quiet. Périer was not the man to accept this situation idly, and the King shared his view. The Ancona expedition was decided on.[44]

Yet, before carrying out this resolve, the Paris cabinet tried to have the step agreed to by the papal chancery. At the same time that a fleet, under the orders of commandant Gallois and

[43] Croza, ambassador of the King of Sardinia, wrote to his minister (February, 1832): "As to the idea that I have about Cardinal Albani's decision to call the Austrian troops before sounding out the intentions of His Holiness, I am more and more convinced that he did so, not merely because of the urgency of the circumstances, but also to forestall all the possible diplomatic difficulties."

[44] Guizot, *op. cit.,* II, 296.

Colonel Combes, set sail for Ancona, General Cubières was sent to Rome and was instructed to come to an understanding with the French ambassador to give the expedition a direction favorable to the interests and dignity of the Holy See. Unfortunately, by a combination of unforeseen circumstances, as some say, or by a cleverly calculated combination, as others say, while General Cubières' voyage was delayed by contrary winds, the fleet crossed over with unusual speed. At Rome, Count Saint-Aulaire was endeavoring to have Cardinal Bernetti accept a simultaneous military occupation by Austria and by France. Even before General Cubières had landed in Italy, the French fleet appeared in sight of Ancona. It was February 22, 1832. As related by a historian especially well informed on these events,

> Commandmant Gallois found himself in an extremely embarrassing situation. They had received instructions not to do anything without receiving word from the ambassador of France. No one, either at Ancona or at Rome, expected them so soon. They feared, if they delayed one day, to give time for a resistance to be prepared, perhaps even for the arrival of an Austrian force. They were completely unaware of the political situation. Imbued with warlike opinions, favorable to the insurrections, they thought they were headed for hostilities against the Austrians, for an alliance with the Italian revolutionaries. They asked to be allowed to enter the harbor, a permission that was granted in face of their threats. The troops were landed during the night. But they were refused admittance into the city; the city gates were forced. They imprisoned the magistrates, seized the citadel, saying they were allies of the Pope, and had a proclamation printed which seemed to suppose that France was at war with Austria, and that by her arms France was protecting the Italian revolts. Saint-Aulaire was not at all prepared for this grave incident. He was awaiting General Cubières that he might inform the papal government of the resolve to occupy Ancona and he hoped that the Pope, while protesting against this act of hostility, would let it be accomplished without open resistance. Now the question was no longer the same. With armed force and

without previous warning, the French, combining deceit and violence, had taken possession of the city, acting as enemies and conquerors.[45]

Says Guizot, the act seemed too contrary to public law and too reckless to be thus committed in a state of complete peace and without the consent either of the Pope or of the allies of France.[46] The Pope was not the only one who protested. At the court of Vienna they declared that the occupation of Ancona was a European affair. Metternich wrote: "If the French government wishes war, it makes a mistake to begin with the Pope." [47] The court of London also gave warning to the court of Paris. But evidently this latter protest, as also that which the Pope addressed to the Powers, concerned less the French occupation than the brutality with which the proceeding was conducted.

Périer put an end to the aroused feelings of the chanceries by declaring that Commandant Gallois and Colonel Combes had exceeded their instructions. The leader of the fleet was recalled to Paris. Saint-Aulaire himself was blamed for not sending someone to Ancona to convey his orders to the force. Excuses were made to Prince Metternich by the French ambassador at Vienna, Marshal Maison. The French government gave orders to the commander of the occupation forces not in any way to favor the revolutionary movements and protested its absolute devotion to the Holy See, declaring that "the preservation of the Pope and the independence of his states would always be, as in the past, the directing motives of its policy in Italy."

In consideration of these assurances, Cardinal Bernetti declared that the court of Rome would recognize the occupation of Ancona as a temporary fact if the French government were willing to accept the following three conditions: not to increase

[45] Barante, *Notice sur M. le comte de Saint-Aulaire,* p. 114.

[46] Guizot, *op. cit.*, V, 299.

[47] Metternich, *op. cit.*, Vol. V, letter of February 29 to Count Apponyi.

the number of its soldiers, not to construct any fortifications, and to quit Ancona at the same time as the Austrian forces would leave Italy, as soon as the Pope would no longer have need of their help. These conditions were strictly adhered to and followed. The French troops occupied the citadel of Ancona up to the moment of the evacuation of the Papal States by the imperial troops, in 1838, under the minister Molé. If we are to accept the statement of César Cantù, a statesman well situated to know the events in Italy at this period, Cardinal Bernetti had to present a forceful protest against the brutal occupation of Ancona,[48] but really rejoiced at this intervention of France. This occupation of Ancona by the French seemed to him the best counterweight to oppose the domination which Austria sought to force on the Papal States.[49] These sentiments were likewise those of Gregory XVI, who dreaded the hindrances of an oppressive Josephism not less than he did the agitations of a revolutionary liberalism.

[48] According to Crétineau-Joly, when Bernetti learned the circumstances of the occupation of Ancona, he said: "Never, since the Saracens, was anything of this sort attempted against the Holy Father." *Op. cit.*, II, *222.*

[49] Cantù, *Della indipendenza italiana.*

CHAPTER XII

Government of the Papal States

GREGORY XVI had to pronounce certain energetic condemnations in the course of his pontificate. The resulting impression seems to have deceived several historians regarding the character of this pope. His great prudence, as we have seen in the history of his diplomatic relations, did not degenerate into grim intolerance; and his conservative spirit did not prevent him, at the opportune time, from carrying out useful reforms. The organizing activity of Gregory XVI was exercised in the administrative, judiciary, financial, military, artistic, and scientific fields.

Prince Metternich passed a severe judgment on the government of Gregory XVI. To his ambassador at Rome he wrote: "The papal government does not know how to govern.[1] . . . The papal government belongs to the category of those that are the least capable of governing." [2] Metternich, who endeavored to substitute the Austrian influence for the papal influence in Italy, had a political interest in speaking thus. Unfortunately many reputable historians have followed his judgment in their evaluations.[3] A conservative, indeed, more inclined to tradition then to novelty, Gregory XVI was also

[1] Metternich, *Mémoires,* V, 343.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 315.

[3] As Thureau-Dangin says: "Gregory XVI possessed the virtues of a religious or the science of a theologian rather than the qualities of a statesman. In political and administrative affairs he brought much uprightness with but little openness of mind and no experience at all" (*Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* I, 440). The illustrious Roman archaeologist, J. B. de Rossi, a man of broad mind and sound judgment, was indignant whenever he heard such assertions and he resolved on a historic rehabilitation in favor of Gregory XVI, whom he considered a person as just as he was firm, having a remarkable coherent policy. More recently Father Paul Dudon, after inspecting the Vatican archives and those of the French minister of foreign

just, prudent, and moderate. The proof of this is furnished by his internal government as also by his foreign policy.

To be convinced of this truth, we need simply read with attention the official report drawn up at Rome by the French ambassador. This report was intended to inform the French government of the reforms which were carried out by Pope Gregory XVI in 1832. We take it from the *Mémoires* of Guizot, who, in a high spirit of impartiality, thought he ought to insert it among the historic documents that accompany his work. The document, too long for us to quote in full, we here summarize.

The edict (July 5, 1831) concerns largely the administration of the papal domain. This was divided into seventeen delegations, which were subdivided into smaller units. For administrative purposes each entity had a council, which regulated the budget, audited the accounts, apportioned the taxes, and performed other similar functions. In the realm of the administration of justice, the decree introduced a fundamental reform. In Rome alone the variety of courts had fifteen different jurisdictions. These were now simplified, and appeals were regulated in an orderly manner.[4]

Fiscal Reforms

Like reforms were carried out in the financial sphere. Without accepting the injunctions of the *Memorandum,* Gregory XVI on his own initiative carried out more effective reforms than those asked for by the powers. These called for a meeting at Rome of a central junta. The Pope instituted a permanent

---

affairs in what relates to the most critical acts of this pontiff, namely, those that ended with the condemnation of liberalism, comes to the following conclusion: "Historians have seen in Gregory XVI a Camaldolese monk absorbed in the contemplation of eternal things and foreign to things of this world. This view is fanciful. . . . Without straining the terms, we can say that he was experienced in ecclesiastical affairs." Dudon, *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège,* p. 115.

[4] Guizot, *Mémoires,* II, 436–46.

commission whose duty it would be to control the accounts of the different administrations. The commission, called the Congregation of Revision, was composed of a cardinal president, four prelates, and four lay deputies, chosen at Rome or in the provinces. Among its functions were the general supervision of the receipts and expenditures of the state, the drawing up of the budgets, and the auditing of the accounts. It was also charged with the liquidation of the public debt. Besides, the commission was to investigate and submit directly to the Pope all the reforms that it judged necessary in the general system of the finances.[5]

The occasion soon arose for recourse to such measures. Floods, epidemics, earthquakes, and the need to assist the victims of these calamities burdened the treasury heavily.[6] Financial difficulties increased in consequence of the revolt of 1832, which required the organization of an army and the appeal to Austria. Says a biographer of Gregory XVI: "We must say that the devotion of Austria, so urgently asked to come to the rescue of the Holy See, was not at all disinterested. Undeniably well known is the fact that to maintain public tranquillity in the Papal States would be a heavy drain on the papal treasury." [7] To meet these difficulties, Gregory XVI alienated some possessions of the Church, levied a tax on the goods of the clergy, ordered a reduction in the salaries of his employes, was even obliged to resort to borrowing and to the re-establishment to their former rate of certain taxes that had been reduced at the outset of his pontificate. But the Pope himself watched that these measures should be accomplished with order and method. To simplify the transactions, he issued new money, more fully in accord with the decimal system.[8]

The agitations in the Papal States compelled the Pope to

[5] Guizot, *op. cit.*, p. 445.
[6] Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 359.
[7] Sylvain, *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat*, p. 123.
[8] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

think of the military organization. In this branch of the government, as in the administrative, judiciary, and financial departments, he showed the qualities of a far-sighted and attentive statesman. He instituted a body of volunteers for the purpose of maintaining order in the Legations and the Marches. The members of this new militia promised under oath to defend the Holy See even to the shedding of their blood and not to lay down their arms before the submission of the rebels would be complete. The subjects of the Papal States replied generously to the Pope's first appeal. In a short time the number of the pontifical volunteers rose to 50,000 men. Gregory XVI supplemented the defense measures required by the circumstances, engaging and paying two Swiss regiments whose recruiting he entrusted to two officers that had served Charles X; they were Colonel Salies and Colonel Courten.

The political cares of Gregory XVI were great in the first two years of his pontificate. But they did not make him neglect the economic and social reforms which he judged useful for the material and moral well-being of his subjects. Those who tax this Pontiff with indifference or inattention in that respect, undoubtedly have not remarked that in 1832 the Pope had already started at Tivoli the extensive works that succeeded five years later in diverting the course of the Anio and consequently in saving the district from the disasters which that river caused every year by its sudden floods; that he undertook the restoration of the Forum, continued the adornment of the Pincio, reconstructed the basilica of St. Paul, established the seat of the Academy of Archaeology in the Roman College, improved the hospice of St. Michael, and favored the foundation of a Chamber of Commerce at Rome. Subsequently he continued these reforms by introducing, in the system of customs duties of the Papal States, wisely calculated changes of a sort to favor commercial freedom without in any way impairing the interests of the treasury. He fixed the age of majority at twenty-one

years, thus facilitating the making of contracts; he authorized foreigners to acquire territorial property in the Roman state; he created a discount bank in the interests of commerce, and a savings bank for persons in moderate circumstances; he organized mobile columns of dragoons to repress brigandage and make travel safe; he established a bureau of statistics that enabled him to keep track of the shifting of the population and of changes in other affairs.[9] He repaired and embellished the monastery of St. Gregory together with the surrounding roads. He exercised watchful care that the prices of primary necessities did not rise too high; he founded evening schools for apprentices and workmen; he took effective measures to prevent the excessive raising of rents; and, during the terrible cholera epidemic that desolated the city of Rome in 1837, he organized works of assistance with a zeal to which Cardinal Wiseman bears witness.[10] Cardinal Hergenröther says that we must indeed recognize that Gregory's aptitudes led him to engage in strictly religious questions rather than in negotiations that concern temporal interests. But his devotion to the improvement of the condition of the popular classes is beyond dispute and, in his own time, he was loudly proclaimed by the people themselves. We need only recall the enthusiastic ovations that marked his journeys in August and October, 1841, to Loreto, and in May, 1843, to Anagni, Frosinone, and Terracina.[11]

[9] Sylvain, *op. cit.*, pp. 122, 246, 290–328.

[10] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

[11] Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* III, Part I, chap. 8. Gregory XVI has been reproached with three chief faults from the viewpoint of the temporal administration of the Papal States. He has been accused: 1. with being opposed to the construction of railroads in his states; 2. with favoring the rapid enrichment of the Torlonia family to the detriment of the public treasury; 3. with having forbidden his subjects to participate in scientific congresses. The first of these three has some foundation. Like many of his contemporaries, Gregory XVI had some misgivings regarding the new method of travel. He feared especially that it would become, in his states, an active agency of the cosmopolitan revolution. But his apprehension was in no way prompted by a preconceived opposition to material progress. He eagerly adopted

The progress of sciences, letters, and arts did not leave Gregory XVI indifferent. The Roman universities had to interrupt their courses during the disturbances of 1831 and 1832, but they were reopened in the autumn of 1833, and learned men were called to teach there. Under the Pope's auspices the publication of the great *Bullarium Romanum* was undertaken; the Pope rewarded with the purple the scholarly labors of Mai and Mezzofanti. He encouraged the first philosophical work of Rosmini, the historical publications of Crétineau-Joly, and the artistic works of Overbeck; he enriched the zoological museum of the Gregorian University and founded two new museums in the Vatican (the Etruscan museum and the Egyptian museum); in the papal palace itself his faithful servant Moroni compiled that important *Dizionario di erudizione* whose 300 volumes give us, not only the fruit of immense researches, but also valuable details on the Roman institutions of the time of Gregory XVI and on the person of the Pontiff.[12]

We have sketched the progress realized by Pope Gregory in the administrative, judiciary, financial, economic, and intellectual realms in governing his own states. This sketch suffices to show that, if he refused to let himself be led by the liberal movement which the *Memorandum* of the powers wished to

---

steamboats, seeing in their invention a powerful means of serving the commercial and moral interests of the Old World and the New World (Sylvain, p. 246). As for the enrichment of the Torlonia family, that cannot be made a complaint against the administration of Gregory XVI. Upon taking possession of the Holy See, the Pontiff found the administration of the tobacco trade in a deplorable state. The wastage and various other abuses were numberless. Knowing the impossibility of curing the situation by himself amid the cares thrust on him by the revolt of part of his states, he decided to auction off this administration. The Torlonia family, having obtained the concession by lawful and regular means, derived great profits from it, but without depriving the treasury of any of its ordinary resources. As for the third complaint, the prohibition of the Pope's subjects from taking part in scientific or literary congresses is to be explained by the fact that these congresses were nothing more than cleverly imagined means for spreading the revolutionary doctrines of the secret societies (Sylvain, p. 255).

[12] Notably XXXII, 312–28, s.v. Gregorio XVI. See also, under the words Ferrara and Forli, for the revolutions in the Papal States.

impose on him, he was able to carry out what was reasonable and practical in that movement. The study of his diplomatic relations with different governments and his intervention in the great disputes that agitated them after the revolution of 1830 will show him at grips with similar problems on a vaster scale.

CHAPTER XIII

The Church in Portugal and Spain

THE government of the Papal States was faced with many internal political questions. But the relations with the various states of Europe presented more burdensome difficulties to Gregory XVI. Austria and the Catholic powers that gravitated in her orbit, such as Spain and Portugal, represented the tradition, order, authority, and official protection of the Holy See; but their intentions were sometimes annoying and their services indiscreet. Belgium, Ireland, and Poland had valiantly fought for their Catholic faith. But they did so while attacking the authorities reputed legitimate, invoking mottoes that seemed dubious, and accepting alliances that appeared compromising. Such causes of anxiety presented themselves when people lent an ear to the fiery polemics that violently stirred the youth of the time.

No one showed more fearlessness in defending the rights of the papacy than did Lamennais in France, or Goerres in Germany. But none showed themselves more favorable to the modern liberties, for the high-sounding formulas that seduce the masses, for the demands of the people against the undertakings of the kings. Gregory XVI was following the profoundly conservative tendency that was in his nature and that he believed was his duty. He did not always succeed in perceiving the fine points of a problem; sometimes such or such an aspect of a political situation escaped his attention; in the expressions of his decisions he did not in every case restrain a vivacity that pained those he had to strike. But who, considering the circumstances we have recalled above, can make them a crime? That his gen-

eral conduct was too often prompted by an ill-restrained passion and by a fierce stubbornness or by excessive narrowness of mind, is a calumny which an impartial study of the events will suffice to dissipate.

In short, two questions filled the public mind. The first question, regarding the attitude which the Holy See would take toward the governments that sprang from the recent revolutions, aroused especially the concern of the chanceries. The second question, regarding the conflicts that arose within the nations between liberty and authority, was especially discussed in the press. The first was the one that most insistently called for a solution.

Should the Pope establish diplomatic relations with the governments of France and Belgium, born of the revolt? For him to do so might be looked upon as encouraging rebellion, might seem to sanction that revolutionary movement which aimed at undermining the thrones and upsetting society. On the other hand, to refuse to treat with the new powers might be to leave the Church without defense and without protection in the nations from whom religion could expect much. A few years earlier, Pope Leo XII, finding himself faced with the fact of the declaration of independence by the Spanish colonies of America, had solved practically a similar question by entering into official relations, in spite of Spain, with the young American republics. But the hour seemed to have arrived for the proclamation of a general principle, intended to serve as a rule in all analogous cases. Ireland and Poland were still on edge, ready for anything to defend their rights against England and Russia respectively. Dom Pedro and Dom Miguel were in conflict over the throne of Portugal; Don Carlos and Maria Christina, over that of Spain. Such contests might arise also with other nations.

Gregory's decision was set forth in a constitution beginning *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum*. He decided that, in the cases of change

of government and of vicissitudes of the states, "the Roman Pontiffs would enter into relations, for the Churches of those countries, with those who were *de facto* in possession of the power; but of course the Holy See did not intend to confirm them in their offices nor to confer on them any sort of new rights." [1]

Says Cardinal Wiseman: "At the moment when changes were rapidly made in governments and dynasties, and when scepters passed from hand to hand with the rapidity of magical or illusory exhibitions, it was at once bold and prudent to lay down simple principles by which the judgment of the Holy See might be easily anticipated; at the same time that it kept itself clear of all internal disputes and embarrassing appeals during actual contests." [2]

Portugal

At the beginning of Gregory's pontificate two parties were at strife in Portugal. In one respect the conflict was of a purely dynastic order. King John VI died in 1826, leaving two sons. The elder, Dom Pedro, who was living in Brazil and had just had himself proclaimed emperor, considered himself the lawful successor of his father. But, declining to reign in Portugal, he ceded his rights to his daughter Dona Maria de Gloria, a seven-year-old child, and designated as regent his younger brother Dom Miguel, to whom he promised the hand of the young queen. At first Dom Miguel seemed to accept this arrangement. But a party, the soul of which was Dona Joachina, the queen mother, formally rejected it.

[1] Barberi, XIX, 38–40; Bernasconi, I, 38–40. The principle proclaimed by Gregory XVI rested on certain precedents. Clement V, John XXII, Pius II, and Clement XI were moved in these acts that are recalled by the bull *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum*. We need not remark that the doctrine here proclaimed by Gregory XVI has nothing in common with the famous theory of the *fait accompli*, the expression of which would be condemned by Pius IX in proposition 61 of the Syllabus: "An injustice *de facto* crowned with success does not impair the sanctity of right."

[2] Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 341.

Dom Miguel, so they said, had the right to the crown as direct and lawful successor of his father. This they maintained by virtue of the ancient laws of the kingdom, which prescribed that no foreigner could reign in Portugal.[3] They declared that Pedro had become a foreigner by accepting the crown of Brazil, which had cut itself off from Portugal. Having thus lost his rights, he could not pass them on to someone else. Basically what rendered the opposition of the two parties irreconcilable was that Dom Pedro, having abdicated the crown, promulgated a charter for Portugal, establishing a constitutional monarchy similar to that of the French Restoration. The queen mother never accepted such a lessening of the sovereign power. The open and well-known opposition that she manifested toward her husband, King John, during the whole time of his reign, was caused by his acceptance of a constitution, and Dom Miguel had consistently shown himself favorable to his mother's ideas. The conflict between the Miguelists and the Pedrists, as they were called, was thus a conflict between absolutists and constitutionalists. On this basis Dom Miguel soon took a stand with the Spanish Carlists and the two French legitimists, and Dom Pedro won the sympathies of the liberals of France and England. Marshal Bourmont and Marquis La Rochejaquelein placed their swords at the service of Dom Miguel. The absolutist courts of the north were favorable to him; but the courts of London and Paris declared their opposition to him.

Moreover, the secret societies, always eager to seize upon the liberal movement and to echo in the ears of the people, according to the orders of Mazzini, the words "liberty, reform, progress," declared for Dom Pedro; while Dona Joachina and Dom

[3] An old tradition relates that in 1139 Alphonso I had been elected king by his soldiers on the field of battle of Ourique after a brilliant victory over the Moors; the three orders of the realm then acclaimed him, and the archbishop of Braga crowned him, having decided, in the name of the people, in the name of the king, and in the name of God, that never would a foreigner become lord of the kingdom. Therein, they said, was the fundamental formal pact of the Portuguese monarchy.

Miguel promised to restore the Jesuits in Portugal and to have the Catholic religion prevail there in all the strength of its hierarchy subject to the Roman Pontiff. The members of the clergy as a whole acclaimed Dom Miguel and had him acclaimed by the faithful, with cries of "Long live the Catholic king! Long live the absolute king!" But several of them, such as the patriarch of Lisbon and the bishop of Elvas, who had been president of the Chamber of Deputies under King John IV, did not hide their sympathy for the constitutional regime.

Gregory XVI, conformable to the rule of procedure which he had outlined and despite the demands of the Pedrists, agreed to enter into diplomatic relations with Dom Miguel and carried on negotiations with his government so long as the younger son of John VI effectively occupied the throne. But Dom Pedro, backed by England and France, succeeded in driving his brother from the kingdom and conferring the crown on his daughter, Dona Maria. Dom Miguel (May 26, 1834), vanquished and discouraged, agreed, in consideration of a pension of 375,000 francs, never to return to Portugal and he retired to Rome, where the Pope received him with every consideration due to his former dignity, to his misfortune, and to the good will he had manifested toward the Church.

But the master of Portugal, Dom Pedro, was irritated at the support his rival had received among the Portuguese clergy and the friendly relations he enjoyed with the Pope. Egged on by the sects, which had made themselves his powerful auxiliaries in his campaign, he determined to make the Church expiate dearly for what he called its treason. The Jesuits, whom his brother had recalled and to whom he had restored all the goods which the great persecution of the eighteenth century had taken from them, were driven out, after being dragged from prison to prison and being treated outrageously. Dom Miguel, yielding to the promptings of his mother and his own instincts, authoritarian and violent, often showed himself

merciless to his enemies. At 40,000 is estimated the number of those he exiled, and well known was the sort of cruel treatment he dealt out to the French nationals, thereby drawing on himself the severe repression which the French government inflicted on him.[4] By way of reprisal, Dom Pedro closed a large number of religious houses, hospices, and ecclesiastical colleges, and transferred their property to the treasury. To show his hostility toward the Holy See and the Portuguese clergy, he expelled the nuncio, suppressed the nunciature, declared vacant all the bishoprics that had been filled by the Supreme Pontiff in accord with his predecessor, and instituted a commission whose function it would be to proceed to a general reform of the clergy.

In a consistorial allocution (September 30, 1833) the Pope deplored "the grave evils that afflicted the Church of Portugal and the shameful misdeeds, the more to be lamented inasmuch as the Holy See had the less reason to expect them." [5] Again (August 1, 1834) the Pope repeated his protests and threatened the prince with the canonical penalties which his outrages merited.[6] After Dom Pedro's death (September 24, 1834), Queen Maria da Gloria, his daughter, continued his policy for a while and, in the consistory of February 1, 1836, the Pope was constrained to denounce once more the outrages of the Portuguese government.[7] In 1840, a reaction took place. Queen Maria II sent Viscount Carriera to negotiate a concordat with

[4] Two Frenchmen, residing at Lisbon, had been condemned, one to public flogging for sacrilege, the other, for his revolutionary connections, to deportation. A French fleet forced the entrance of the Tagus, captured the Portuguese fleet, blockaded Lisbon, and compelled Miguel to grant all the reparations demanded by the French government (July, 1831). The domineering and harsh character of Dom Miguel is undeniable. But the hatred of the sects has blackened the memory of this prince, and the judgments of the liberal press about his person and his acts need to be carefully checked.

[5] Barberi, XIX, 276; Roskovany, *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae*, II. 336–40.

[6] Roskovany, II, 363–66; Barberi, XIX, 381.

[7] Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, II, 93.

the Pope. Gregory required, as a preliminary condition, that the bishops appointed under Miguel I should be recognized and that the Queen should revoke the prohibition against recourse to Rome for dispensations. The negotiations were resumed and, in testimony of his satisfaction, the Holy Father sent (March 12, 1842) the golden rose [8] to the Queen of Portugal.

Spain

The political crisis in Portugal was complicated by the nearness of a similar crisis in Spain. There also the absolutists and constitutionals were in conflict. The Pope was called upon to take a stand regarding two parties between which the great powers of Europe took opposite attitudes and in which the religious views, mingled with political feelings, assumed a militant, almost violent, aspect.

Ferdinand VII, king of Spain, died September 20, 1833. He bequeathed his crown to his daughter Isabella, who was three years old and was placed under the guardianship of the queen mother Maria Christina. Don Carlos, Ferdinand's brother, who contested the lawfulness of a female succession, at once became the rival of his niece and had been proclaimed in Biscay. The old Spanish law admitted women to the throne. The Bourbon dynasty in 1714 had substituted for this right, if not the Salic law, at least a pragmatic sanction which limited the succession to the case of the absence of any male heir. Charles IV, in 1789, revoked this pragmatic sanction and re-established the former Spanish law; in 1830 Ferdinand solemnly published his confirmation of this revocation. Apparently, then, the question of law was settled in favor of the women's right. But a party strife complicated matters. The absolutists counted on Don

[8] Bernasconi, III, 204. This was the rose blessed by the pope on Laetare Sunday. Ever since the Middle Ages the Supreme Pontiff used to send it to some Catholic prince. See Goschler, *Dictionnaire de théologie*, s.v. *Rose d'or*.

Carlos; Maria Christina favored the liberals. The former were thus interested in the male succession; the latter, in the female. A conflict of influences and intrigues followed between the two parties during the last years of Ferdinand, each seeking to obtain a royal act in favor of his contention. The King wavered between his affection for his daughter and his sympathies for the absolutist party. For a moment this party seemed to have won the day. But its triumph was of short duration. Ferdinand retracted everything that had been wrung from him by the partisans of the male succession, and he died proclaiming the rights of his daughter.[9] France and England promptly declared themselves in favor of Maria Christina, whereas Austria, Russia, and Prussia stoutly maintained their sympathy for Don Carlos.[10]

After thus attaining to power, Maria Christina adopted a complete parliamentary regime, and unfortunately, in Spain as in France, the beginnings of this regime were marked by acts of hostility toward the Church. The Spanish Cortes (April, 1835), confronted by serious financial difficulties, proposed to solve them by secularization of the property of the religious. In vain the minister president of the council, Martinez de la Rosa, tried to proceed with respect for the canonical rules and practices. The Chamber, after replacing the cabinet over which he presided by a cabinet favorable to the strife against the Church, obliged (July 4, 1835) the regent to sign a decree expelling the Jesuits; three weeks later, a second decree suppressing 757 religious houses that contained less than a dozen members each.[11]

At this news Gregory XVI at once recalled his nuncio,

[9] Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, II, 389.

[10] Metternich, *Mémoires*, V, 640.

[11] Martinez de la Rosa, negotiating with Rome for the diminution in the number of these almost empty monasteries and consequently the placing of part of their possessions at the disposal of the nation, endeavored to put an end to the financial crisis. But the sectarian passion of the opposition did not enable him to follow up the project.

Amato de Santo Philippo, who, recently arrived in Spain, was about to present his credentials to Maria Christina. Then (February 1, 1836), in a consistorial allocution the Pope denounced the latest acts of the Spanish government and declared them null. He declared: "To the calamities of Portugal are now added those of Spain. There also laws are promulgated which are contrary to the authority of the Apostolic See." [12]

However, the Pope refrained from a declaration in favor of Don Carlos. This he did in spite of the pressure brought to bear on him by the legitimists of France, the Miguelists of Portugal, the Carlists of Spain, and the chancery of Austria. But the clergy of Spain did not imitate his reserve. The greater number of them openly embraced the cause of the pretender, favored the enrollment of his partisans and the activities of his army. For seven years a bitter civil war embraced Navarre, Catalonia, Castille, and Aragon, a war of partisans and surprise attacks, in which the two parties engaged in cruelties in return for cruelties.[13] The government revenged itself by depriving the priests of their support, by suspending from the religious the pension that was their due, and by leaving the dioceses without bishops. The coming of a moderate majority in the Cortes in 1839 brought about a calm. Some of the measures against the Church were revoked, and negotiations were again taken up with the Holy See for filling the vacant dioceses.

The Carlists, active, determined, commanded by able leaders, whose principal chief, Zumalacarreguy, combined to a rare degree the qualities of warrior, party leader, and popular hero, had at first obliged to draw back to the very gates of Madrid the poorly disciplined forces of the Christinos. But Zumalacarreguy's death in 1835, the appearance at the head of Maria Christina's army of an experienced and courageous leader,

[12] Bernasconi, II, 93.

[13] General Mina in cold blood had the mother and the three sisters of the Carlist Cabrera put to death. Cabrera, in reprisal, had 300 Christinos prisoners shot.

Espartero, and the deplorable divisions of the Carlists into "apostolics," who wished a war to the finish, and "transactionists," who wished to put an end to the war by a compromise, gave new daring to the liberals. Espartero, vanquisher of the Carlists, was named regent in 1840. He increased all the preceding outrages and had the representative of the Holy See taken to the frontier.

In the consistory of March 1, 1841, Gregory XVI voiced a protest more energetic than the previous ones. To the members of the government who had passed laws prejudicial to the rights of the Church and to the clergy who had cooperated in these wrongs, he recalled the grave censures which they had incurred.[14] The fall of Espartero in 1843, the proclamation of the majority of Isabella in 1844, and the coming of a conservative ministry permitted the new queen to inaugurate a policy more worthy of the old traditions of Spain. In 1845 a plenipotentiary was sent to Rome with a view to concluding a concordat with the Holy See. Gregory XVI, after laboring in its preparation, did not have the consolation of signing it. This was reserved to his successor, Pius IX.

[14] Bernasconi, III, 109–12.

CHAPTER XIV

The Church in Poland and Switzerland

Poland

LESS complex in its causes but sharper in its manifestations, was the political and religious crisis that kept stirring and dividing Poland and Russia. On one side was an oppressed people to whom the Church was greatly indebted for having been, more than once, the bulwark of Christendom on its eastern front. This people, armed, asked that its faith be respected, that its promised liberties be maintained, those liberties pledged by the very treaties that had stripped them of their nationality. On the other side, a mighty empire which, for a quarter of a century, had become the defender of the principles of tradition and legitimacy, asked the Pope, the born protector of the social order, to defend it against the spirit of revolt and revolution. There was to be encountered, with its disconcerting equivocations, that eternal question of liberalism, which would trouble Europe so profoundly in the course of the nineteenth century.

The common father of the faithful could not but be keenly moved by the heroism of those Polish Catholics who braved death and a captivity harder than death when fighting under the noble watchword of their fathers: "We love liberty more than anything else in the world, and the Catholic religion more than liberty." [1] But he was aware that in Poland, as in Italy, Belgium, and France, the sects were endeavoring to exploit the popular uprising to their advantage, that many Poles identified

[1] This was the watchword adopted by the Polish Catholics during the persecution of Catherine II.

the religious cause with the political cause, that some were captivated by the high-sounding watchwords of revolutionary liberalism. The Russian diplomats exaggerated these facts and generalized them, representing the Polish insurrection as a serious danger to the tranquillity of Europe. The Czar appealed to the Pope to intervene and to summon the Poles to obedience. The Czar insinuated that the Pope, by his silence, made himself responsible for the measures of violent repression that would surely be provoked by his refusal to intervene.[2]

Gregory XVI judged that he should yield to the insistence of the Russian government. To the Polish clergy he addressed an encyclical (June 9, 1832) [3] in which, without referring to any other question, he reminded them of the maxims of the Catholic Church regarding submission to temporal powers. Accepting as true the one-sided allegations of the Russian minister, he said: "We have learned that the frightful calamities which have desolated your kingdom have their sole source in the doings of some who make use of wiles and lies, who, under pretext of religion, in our distressful age, raise their head against the power of the princes."

The effect produced by this letter was deplorable. Emperor Nicholas, not satisfied with having it read and spread everywhere, presented it as an approbation of his policy, as an excommunication of the rebels. Then, taking advantage of the stupefaction into which the Poles were plunged by this interpretation of the encyclical, he increased the violence and hypocrisy of his persecutions. A decree of 1832 ordered that all children of mixed marriages be brought up in the schism; that all the religious schools and seminaries of the uniate rites be closed, and the pupils of these institutions be constrained to follow the courses of a schismatic university.

[2] Note sent to the Holy Father (April 20, 1832) by Prince Gagarin, Russian minister at Rome. See the principal passages of this note in Lescœur, *L'église catholique en Pologne*, p. 49.

[3] Bernasconi, I, 143.

Gregory XVI, profiting by the occasion of his pacific encyclical addressed to the Poles, sent to the Russian embassy a confidential note concerning the outrages directed against the Catholic religion in the imperial domains. No reply was given to this note. It was followed by a second note (September 6, 1832) in which fresh grievances were detailed. Instead of giving any attention to it, the Czar instructed his minister Guriew to present the Pope with a long memorial which, dated May, 1833, reached the utmost limits of insolence and hypocrisy. Said the Russian minister: "The clergy are the ones who, by their culpable and ungrateful conduct, have rent the pact which assured them the peaceful enjoyment of the benefits flowing from it. The government returns to the full exercise of its rights of conqueror. . . . To the government alone pertains the decision about the means it judges most effective to forestall new disorders." [4]

In short, the unfortunate condition of Poland, instead of improving in consequence of the encyclical, was made worse. The Pope understood that he had made a mistake in yielding to the Czar's demands. Sometime later he said to General Zamoyski, who represented the Polish Catholics: "I never disapproved of you, but I was deceived in regard to you. I was disturbed by threats. I trembled at thought of the persecution that would be let loose on you. I yielded to a veritable demand." [5] And when, in 1840, the knight Furhmann, in a report, sought to explain the removal of thousands of Polish children, who were transported to Siberia because their parents refused to apostatize,[6] Gregory, in the presence of the cardinals gathered in consistory, delivered a solemn allocution (July 22, 1842) which made a deep impression. The Pope said:

[4] Quoted by Lescœur, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
[5] Lescœur, pp. 55–61.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 71–78.

The time has come to speak. What we have done without ceasing, for the defense of the rights of the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire, the public does not know. . . . The enemies of the Holy See, with the hereditary deception that distinguishes them, spread the rumor that we are covering with our silence the great evils by which a part of our flock was crushed and that we had thus almost abandoned the cause of the Catholic religion. We owe to God, to religion, and to ourselves to reject far from us even a suspicion of so outrageous an insult. Such is the reason why all the consequence of the efforts undertaken by us in behalf of the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire has been set forth in a special paper.[7]

In this restrained and enlightening exposition, Gregory, with apostolic simplicity and vigor, told the whole world that touching story of weakness in the grip of force, of truth unarmed in conflict with perfidious violence. And all Europe, Catholic or Protestant, liberal or not, read this pathetic account with a feeling and sympathy that did honor to human nature.[8]

Three years later (December 13, 1845) the Czar arrived at Rome at four o'clock in the morning. He alighted at the Giustiniani palace, the residence of his representative, at once sent word to the Vatican, and asked for an audience. Gregory replied that he would receive the monarch that day at half-past eleven. What took place in the interview that the Pope and the Emperor had together? No report of it was ever revealed during the lifetime of Gregory XVI, who, when asked, merely replied: "I said whatever the Holy Ghost prompted me to say." However, sufficient evidences were known that the Vicar of Christ worthily represented his master before the crowned persecutor. Cardinal Wiseman reports the following:

An English gentleman was in the same part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview,

[7] Bernasconi, III, *223*.
[8] Lescœur, p. 80.

and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand, as it was from statue-like features, stately frame, and martial bearing; free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of ante-rooms, the Imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, "with plumes unruffled, and with eye unquenched," in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever wearied, of beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again, with head uncovered, and hair, if it can be said of man, disheveled; haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting: he waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court, and hurried away from apparently the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, "from his nest among the stars," his feathers crumpled, and his eye quelled, by a power till then despised.[9]

Twenty-one years later we have a new account of the situation of the Catholics in Russia. In this report Pius IX revealed the details of the interview of 1845. Gregory entered into the heart of the question, without hesitation recalling to the Emperor the laws of the Empire which most wounded the Catholics, and the deeds of brutality with which the laws had been applied; and he handed to the Emperor a written account in which all these things were vouched for by supporting documents. Nicholas left with a promise that he would suppress all the abuses with which he would become acquainted; and undoubtedly we must attribute to this interview the origin of the concordat which the Czar signed (August 3, 1847) with the successor of Gregory XVI. The European press was almost unanimous in paying just tribute to the Pope as soon as it knew the significance of this audience. As the journal *La Réform* said, "The conflict of right against might is always a magnificent spectacle. The papacy has shown itself worthy of its finest days. Justice, right, and liberty have found an interpreter in

[9] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 406.

the Roman sanctuary. The modern conscience can rest satisfied." [10]

Thus spoke an important organ of the liberal press, happy to see a despot's outrages condemned by the Roman Pontiff. To be just, we should add that, at this same period, Gregory XVI was obliged to condemn, with equal energy, certain acts no less prejudicial to the laws of the Church, committed by a purely democratic government, that of Switzerland.

Switzerland

One of the wisest decisions of the Congress of Vienna had been to assure the neutrality of the Swiss Republic. This it did by granting its federal constitution to it under the guaranty of the great European powers. Setting aside the centralized constitution which Napoleon had given it in 1803 and which did not correspond to the traditions and the needs of a country fashioned for centuries to cantonal and communal independence, the allied monarchies had stipulated that each canton would preserve its absolute sovereignty and also gave guaranties to prevent any one of them from ever prevailing over the others. Nevertheless a diet, composed of the deputies of the twenty-two cantons, with one vote for each canton, was to meet in turn at Zurich, Bern, and Lucern, to deliberate on common concerns and to smooth internal differences. But this solution was not accepted equally by all. Whereas the "federals" were attached to the revival of their old traditions, the "radicals" worked for the formation of a more centralized state, which they hoped to bring under their sway. Reduced to these terms, the conflict remained purely political. What enhanced its importance was that, as in France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and

[10] One of the most stirring episodes of the persecution of the Polish Catholics by the Russian government is the story of the hateful treatments inflicted on the Basilian religious of Minsk. See *Martyre de sœur Irena Macrina Mieczysloska et de ses compagnes en Pologne.*

Russia, as almost everywhere at that time, the social question, the religious question, and the political question were closely intermingled.

After the revolution of 1830, Switzerland became a land of asylum for all the revolutionary refugees of the various countries. Bands of French, Italian, and German fugitives made it a common meeting place. In 1834 thither they called the famous conspirator, Mazzini. This man, on April 15 of that year, created at Bern a cosmopolitan alliance under the name of Young Europe. The alliance centralized the efforts of several particular societies, confederated together: the Young Italy, the Young Germany, and the Young Swiss.[11] The spirit of Freemasonry inspired all these associations. The authorities of Geneva, in January, 1834, arrested some bands of suspect refugees; but the cantonal powers of Bern and Vaud allowed them to organize.

The radical party, whose tendencies they seconded, soon made common cause with them. Mazzini stayed two years in Switzerland. He was exceedingly active, bringing there that spirit ever hostile to Catholicism, opposed to the monarchies, but deist and mystical, which seduced the young men of the time. His motto was: "Liberty, equality, humanity, one God, one sovereign, the law of God." His followers were taken mostly from the well-to-do classes: lawyers, doctors, professors, officers. He gave it out that he was a foe of the Carbonari, but he employed the same methods, partial uprisings, and the murder of princes and traitors.[12] During Mazzini's sojourn in Switzerland we see the beginning and growth of all those scientific, historical, literary, and agricultural associations which became effective means of revolutionary propaganda and which later spread in Italy to the great harm of religion and good

[11] Later were formed the Young France, the Young Poland, and the Young Spain.

[12] Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine,* p. 317; Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société,* II, 274; Eckert, *Magazin der Beweisfürung für Verurtheilung des Freimaurer Ordens,* II, 218.

social order.[13] Meanwhile the radicals, who had arrived in power in the cantons of Solothurn, Zurich, Aargau, and Basel, abolished all seigniorial rights, the rights of the bourgeoisie, and all privileges; they favored Protestant and impious propaganda, and multiplied hindrances to the Catholic works.

The federalist party, attached to the best traditions of the country, feared the revolutionary agitation and was heartily backed by the Catholics. In some cantons, flourishing colleges directed by the Jesuits spread the true Roman doctrines among the youth and the bourgeoisie. A devout and well-trained clergy labored to give the people a solid nourishment, equally removed from childish superstitions and from dangerous novelties. This clergy was divided in five dioceses, which were subject to no metropolitan but were directly dependent on the Holy See, represented by a nuncio who resided at Lucern. The Catholics, led to organize themselves for the defense of their beliefs and of their institutions, had three principal leaders: the lawyer Meyer, who placed his remarkable legal and diplomatic talents at the service of the cause; the magistrate Siegwart-Muller, a sincere Catholic and convinced democrat; a peasant of the district of Schwytz, Joseph Leu, a simple man but one of valiant faith and a natural eloquence that moved the masses.

Four notable incidents marked the strife that arose between the two parties and that would end under Pius IX in the Sonderbund War. These were: 1. the plan to modify the federal pact in 1832; 2. the Baden conference in 1834; 3. the forcible *coup* of the radical party against the conservative government of the canton of Vaud in January, 1845; 4. the formation of an alliance between the seven Catholic cantons of Switzerland in December, 1845.

A revision of the federal pact, permitting the radical and Protestant majority of the diet to govern the civil and religious

[13] Paolo Menacci, *Memorie documentate per la storia della rivoluzione italiana*, I, 10.

administration of each canton was the first step in the program of the radical party. For its preparation they called upon the skill of an eminent lawyer, whom we shall meet several times in the course of this history, Pellegrino Rossi. Born at Carrara in 1787, he became a doctor of law in 1806, professor of civil procedure and of penal law at Bologna in 1814, then of Roman law at Geneva. He was celebrated for the part he took in 1815 in the ephemeral undertaking of Murat, king of Naples and by the publication in 1818 of a treatise on penal law which brought him a reputation as a great criminologist. Honored with the right of citizenship at Geneva in 1819, a member of the Geneva council from 1820 on, he was reputed in Italy, France, and Switzerland, not only as a jurist, but also as an orator and statesman, and he was certainly at that time the personage that the Swiss confederation was most proud of. A Catholic, like his fellow countrymen Silvio Pellico and Manzoni, like them he had taken part in the liberal movement in Italy and perhaps belonged to Carbonarism. His moderate opinions connected him to the school that was represented in France by Guizot, Royer-Collard, and Villemain. No one seemed better fitted to draw up and lead to success a revision of the federal pact. The project which he was appointed to report in the federal diet meeting at Lucern in 1832, was prompted by the imperial act of 1803. It transferred to the diet the most important of the powers which, since 1814, had belonged to the authorities of the individual cantons.

This move was the crushing of the Catholics. The three primitive cantons of Uri, Schwytz, and Unterwald assembled at Sarnen the representatives of the cantons that wished to maintain the federal pact. The Catholic cantons answered the call. They formed, indeed, only a weak minority. But the cause they were defending became easily popular. The peasants and shepherds of the little cantons lacked confidence in a constitution that might strip them of their traditional rights to the ad-

vantage of the people of the cities and the big cantons. Besides, in spite of the dissolution of the league of Sarnen, and in spite of the skillful modifications proposed by the learned jurist, when the new constitution, approved by the diet on July 17, 1832, was submitted to the vote of the cantons, the majority of them rejected it. This was a victory for Catholicism and liberty.

But the sect which in this affair had in view the defeat of Catholicism did not consider itself beaten. On January 20, 1834, some delegates of the cantons of Bern, Lucern, Solothurn, Thurgau, Basel-Land, Saint Gall, and Aargau met at Baden. The presiding officer of the meeting, Edward Pfiffer, declared in his opening address that Switzerland should be independent in religious as in political matters. Then he proposed the measures which, according to him, would assure that independence. The result of the Baden conference was the passing of fourteen articles. One of these put the synodal assemblies under the supervision of the government; another made the publications and the acts of ecclesiastical authority subject to the placet of the civil authority; a third declared that "ecclesiastics were bound not only to do nothing contrary to the present dispositions, but also to denounce such a case to the respective authority." The conference proposed also to oblige Catholic priests to bless the mixed marriages, agreed to lessen the number of feast days and fast days, submitted to governmental approval the internal regulations of the seminaries and religious houses. The fourteen articles of Baden recalled the French Civil Constitution of the Clergy.

Gregory (May 17, 1835), by a letter to the bishops and faithful of Switzerland, condemned the fourteen articles.[14] He denounced "the wicked men who, under the guise of the public interest, passed into law perverse and erroneous doctrines." The radicals replied to this denunciation by expelling from Lucern (November 4, 1835) the apostolic nuncio, Monsignor

[14] Bernasconi, II, 32–36.

de Angelis, by closing Catholic schools and novitiates, by pestering the religious communities with repeated inventories and endless vexations, by giving a chair of theology to the German professor Strauss, famous for his attacks on the divinity of Christ.

Gregory protested (April 1, 1842) publicly against these fresh outrages, declared legally null all the measures taken against the laws of the Church, and exhorted the Catholics to resist these criminal attacks.[15]

The Pontiff's appeal was heeded. The Swiss Catholics took as their motto, "to live as Catholics or to die." They elected as their representative in the great council Joseph Leu, who became the champion of all their rights. The great council removed from its body the intrepid athlete. The people elected him again. Condemned to be fined and to be imprisoned, Joseph Leu appeared greater than ever. Reduced to inaction, he repeated the maxim of his old master Wolf: "Prayer will save the fatherland." However, with a faith no less living, the lawyer Meyer attempted to act by way of diplomacy, seeking a support in the powers that had declared themselves protectors of the traditional liberties of his country.

Since the attempt to modify the federal pact, a pact sanctioned by the treaties of 1815, the leading powers signatory of these treaties were on the watch. A centralized and radical Switzerland seemed to them to disturb the equilibrium and security of Europe. In the name of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, remonstrances were addressed to the Swiss government. England rallied to their side. As to the "France of July," it was divided between the desire to back the liberal party in Switzerland and the apprehension she felt from the presence, close to her frontiers, of revolutionary refugees openly protected by the radicals. France hesitated, then abstained from any decision.

[15] *Ibid.*, III, 208.

Several events occurred to raise the courage of the Swiss Catholics. Lucern had shaken off the radical yoke; her turn was about to come to be the seat of the federal diet. The papal nuncio, Monsignor d'Andrea, made his solemn entry there. The people of Lucern considered confiding to the Jesuits the theological institute and the seminary of their canton. Their right was undeniable. But was it prudent to exercise that right? On this question of action, the two most influential leaders of the Catholics were not in agreement. Joseph Leu, concerned especially with removing dubious influences from Lucern, urged that the Jesuits be called in. Meyer, more calculating, feared to associate unnecessarily the conservative cause with that of the highly unpopular religious. The latter feeling was that of Metternich, who, at Meyer's request, had tried at Rome, though without success, to obtain a decision that the Jesuits should decline the mission which was intended to be confided to them.[16] The view of Leu prevailed. The call for the Jesuits was passed in 1844.

The exasperated radicals replied by violent opposition to what they called "a defiance cast at the Protestant and radical opinion." [17] A *coup,* attempted in February, 1845, against the conservative government of the Vaud canton, was the starting point of a series of attacks which a certain historian has characterized by saying: "Never has political brigandage shown itself more undisguised in a civilized country." [18] In the month of March the people of Lucern, attacked by an army of 8,000 men, defeated their assault with a much smaller force. But the seditious bands, protected by the radical authorities, spread terror everywhere. Meyer barely escaped the ambushes devised against him. Joseph Leu was not equally successful. He was slain (July 20, 1845) traitorously in his bed with a pistol shot.

[16] Metternich, *op. cit.,* VII, 115; *Mémoires de Meyer;* Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* VII, 174.

[17] Dispatches of Guizot to Pontois, December 26, 1844, and March 3, 1845.

[18] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.,* VII, 175.

The Catholic cantons thought the hour had come for them to organize to defend themselves. A confederation, called Sonderbund ("separated alliance") by their foes, was concluded (December 11, 1845) between the seven cantons of Lucern, Uri, Schwytz, Zug, Fribourg, and Valais. This pact contained nothing contrary to the laws and traditions of Switzerland. The radicals had several times given an example. These latter did not shout the less loudly at the violation of the federal pact. But the energy they displayed and the means they employed to fight the new federation showed that they appreciated the power that arose before them. We have no need to recall here the Sonderbund War and its lamentable conclusion in the crushing of the Catholic cantons. Gregory XVI would not live to witness the events of this war, which took place in the pontificate of his successor.

CHAPTER XV

The Church in Italy

Mazzini

WHILE following with anxiety the revolutionary movement in Switzerland, Gregory XVI could not lose sight of its progress in Italy. At Marseilles, Mazzini had founded the Young Italy in 1831; at Geneva in 1834 he had organized the Young Europe; in England he then directed his work of propaganda; but for him Italy always remained the center of the European regeneration which he dreamed of.

His program was clear and simple. As the resistance of the princes and the local spirit had till then been the two chief obstacles to the liberty of Italy, Mazzini wished to rid himself of the one by the republic, of the other by the establishment of unity. He used to say: "Young Italy is unitarist and republican": republican because the republic is the only form of government that satisfies reason as also the Italian traditions; unitarist, because "unity is the condition of strength, and because Italy, surrounded by unitarist powers, which are jealous and strong, needs especially to be strong"; because also "federalism, by destroying the unity of the great Italian family, makes impossible the mission which Italy is called upon to fulfill in mankind." [1]

[1] The Congress of Vienna in 1815 created three middle states. In the north were the Sardinian states, placed under the old authority of the house of Savoy and enlarged by the addition of the former republic of Genoa. To the south was the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, put under the house of Bourbon. In the middle were the States of the Church, which comprised four distinct parts: Rome and the Patrimony of St. Peter, then Umbria with the provinces of Perugia, Spoleto, and Rieti; also, on the eastern slopes of the Apennines, the Marches of Ancona, and the Legations of Bologna, Ravenna, Forli, and Ferrara; from there the papal domain ex-

To attain the ideal regime that he dreamed of, Mazzini preached a method quite different from that which was employed by the revolutionaries preceding him in Italy. Up to then the malcontents had organized secret societies, whose projects formed a mystery for the indifferent populations. In place of their methods, Mazzini wished to substitute the uprising of an entire people, conscious of its strength and its rights. "The means which Young Italy plans to use for the attainment of its end," he said, "are education and insurrection. Education, for instance, by the spoken word and by books will give twenty million Italians an awareness of their nationality so that the insurrection finds them ready against their oppressors." Thus they will be able to do without any foreign intervention; "what they lack in order to free themselves, is not the power, but only faith." [2]

The education of the people, planned by Mazzini, was to be accomplished by special means. These were historical publications systematically given a direction toward the intended aim, and congresses with a scientific emblem, which were sessions of patriotism understood in the sense meant by the agitator. With Canina, the Turin university became a center of the new ideas. Under the direction of Sclopis, Cibrario, and Soli, the *Monumenta historiae patriae* revived the memory of the ancient

---

tended to the banks of the Po. To these relatively large monarchies, were added three little states, one of which, Tuscany, had its traditions, it glorious memories, and its historical *raison d'être*. The two others were merely arbitrary political creations; these were the Duchy of Modena and the Duchy of Parma. Lombardy and the former republic of Venice had been attached to Austria under the name of Kingdom of Lombardo-Venetia. The chief aim of the plenipotentiaries of the Vienna congress had been to guard themselves against the undertakings of France, regarded as the agent of the revolution; and the soldiers of Austria were there as a sort of advanced sentry, charged with the assurance of conservative Europe. But Austria had expanded her mission to the point of quite distorting it. Under the pretext of protecting the sovereigns of Italy against revolutionary enterprises, she installed garrisons among them and reduced them almost to the state of vassals. Cf. "Les origines de l'Unité italienne," in the *Correspondant,* November 13, 1893, p. 436.

[2] A. Pingaud, in *Histoire générale,* X, 584.

glories of Italy. In 1838 the scientific congresses, which had become annual, kept up a permanent agitation in the peninsula. In 1841 the *Archivio storico italiano* became its organ.

Further, the republican unity of Italy was only part of Mazzini's program. For him, as for all who were in accord with his ideas, Rome must be the center of Italy's political life, the indispensable capital of its unity; and thereby, for most of them, the pope, by isolating it in a way for the advantage of the unity of the Catholic Church, became an obstacle, an enemy that must be fought and suppressed. Moreover, as everyone understood, this destruction of the papacy would entail the destruction of Catholicism and the inauguration of a broader religion, as wide as humanity. Said Mazzini: "The Italian people is called upon to destroy Catholicism in the name of the continuous revelation." [3] God is God, and mankind is His prophet. God is perpetually incarnate in humanity. Humanity is the religion. We must believe in humanity, the sole interpreter of the law of God on earth.[4] Christ is a saint, whose voice has been received as being divine.[5] But Catholicism is dead. It is a worn-out symbol, preserved only by the amateur admirers of antiquity.[6]

Such was the doctrine by Mazzini.[7] Some of his hardy notions alarmed more than one of his followers, still attached to Catholicism. The carrying out of the second part of his program, the revolutionary agitation, detached from him many other partisans. We have no need here to recount the history of this movement. In 1833 at Genoa, the Ruffini brothers stirred up a revolt, which was promptly put down and was followed by a period of terrorism in Piedmont; in 1834 Ramorino vainly attempted to stir up the rural districts of Savoy; similar endeavors were made in 1843 in Romagna, in 1844 in Calabria. A

[3] *Iniziativa revoluzionaria dei popoli.*
[4] *Proclama agli Italiani.*
[5] *Prose politiche,* p. 221.
[6] *Prefazione a uno scritto di Charles Didier.*
[7] Cf. Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia.*

relatively moderate party was formed and received its program under the inspirations of three men: Gioberti, Balbo, and Azeglio.

Vincenzo Gioberti was a priest of Turin. A daring philosopher, rash theologian, unsteady spirit, impressionable and violent, he was at first a disciple of Mazzini, but was unwilling to follow him to the very limit. In his book *Del primato d'Italia,* published in 1840, he exalted the primacy of the fatherland among the nations, but he saw the condition of this primacy in the papacy, the ancient protector of the nation and, he added, "in our days the inviolable asylum of civil tolerance and generous hospitality, open to all honorable men, especially if they are victims of misfortune, whatever their religion."

Gioberti had been appalled at Mazzini's irreligious radicalism; Balbo was shocked by his revolutionary radicalism. Gioberti had tried to attenuate the doctrine; Balbo tried to limit the violence of the practical program. The son of a Sardinian minister and former auditor in Napoleon I's council of state, having a greater sense of the practical realities than did Gioberti, Cesare Balbo, in a book published in 1844 under the title, *Espérances de l'Italie,* held that the primacy of Italy celebrated by Gioberti, could be realized only after the complete expulsion of Austria. He realized also that the task of driving Austria out of Italy by force of arms would be rash; but, he said, they might confidently hope that the question would be solved of itself in consequence of the events that were being prepared.

Two years later, Marquis Massimo d'Azeglio, published a resounding pamphlet, *Gli ultimi casi de Romagna.* There and in several subsequent writings, he proclaimed the Italians' right to rebel against Austria, and indicated Charles Albert, the king of Piedmont, as their leader.

The moderate party of the Italian patriots now had its program. Gioberti had laid down the principles; Balbo had set

forth the conditions of success; d'Azeglio had pointed out the means to be taken and the chief to be chosen. All three rejected the anti-Catholic and revolutionary spirit of Mazzini, but none of them was free from the reproach of liberalism, in both the religious and the political order. Gioberti fancied, for the people's role, a sort of indifferentism; Balbo shared this fancy; d'Azeglio criticized the papal government in such a way that he discredited the very authority of the Holy See.

Defense Measures of Gregory XVI

The Pope had to intervene. The complexity of this movement, and the confusion between the religious question, the national question, and the political question made this intervention a most delicate matter. Gregory XVI thought that the most effective means of combating the revolutionary movement was to bring into the open the real designs of those who made use of the national feeling and of the idea of Italian independence in order to attack the Holy See and the Church. Mazzini had left Carbonarism, but only to establish in the Young Italy and in similar societies a law of secrecy even stricter than that of the conspirators of 1820. Article 30 of the rules of the Young Italy reads: "Those who do not obey the orders of the society, those who disclose its plans, will be stabbed pitilessly." [8] Besides, Young Italy and Carbonarism fraternized by the common bonds that attached them to Masonry.[9] As for d'Azeglio, he himself, in his *Ricordi,* relates that he made a journey to Italy in the interest of the secret societies with a view to lead the followers of Mazzini and the republicans to join the monarchists and Charles Albert for the purpose of bringing about Italian unity.[10]

[8] Deschamps *Les sociétés secrètes,* II, 273.

[9] Eckert, *op. cit.,* II, 213, 219; Jannet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie au XIX^e siècle,* pp. 207–11.

[10] Chap. 34; Jannet, *op. cit.,* p. 155.

At the outset of his pontificate the Pope had been able to obtain a certain number of documents establishing the preponderant part which the secret societies played in the contemporary agitations. He sent (May 23, 1846) for a writer well known for the fearlessness of his courage and the liveliness of his mind, Jacques Crétineau-Joly. The author of the *Histoire de la Vendée militaire* and of the *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagne de Jésus,* had already laid himself open to charges of excessive impetuosity in his polemics and thus of injustice in some of his appreciations. But his two capital works had, as a whole, rendered service to the cause of the Church.[11] Moreover, he was a man who would not recoil before any perilous enterprises. To him the Pope said: "My son, you have always had the courage of your opinions. I ask you to trim your pen and promise me, without halting before any obstacles, to write a history of the secret societies and of their consequences." [12] The Pontiff placed in his hands a large number of important documents that would serve as material for the projected work. The *Histoire des sociétés secrètes,* in consequence of various circumstances, was not published; but the most important of the documents confided to Crétineau-Joly were made use of in the two volumes that appeared in 1858 under the title, *L'église romaine en face de la Révolution.*

The work requested by the Holy Father could not have an immediate effectiveness. And Gregory did not wait for its accomplishment before taking measures against the threatening insurrection. In this labor he was energetically seconded by his Secretary of State, Cardinal Lambruschini. Louis Lambruschini, born in Liguria on June 2, 1776, joined the Barnabites at an early age. He rendered services to the Church under Leo XII and Pius VIII. Gregory, in the first year of his reign,

[11] In his youth he had abandoned the practices of religion. He returned to them only at the hour of his death. See Maynard, *J. Crétineau-Joly,* 1875.

[12] Maynard, *Crétineau-Joly,* p. 340.

raised him to the purple and entrusted several important missions to him. In 1836 Metternich, vexed at a criticism of himself by Cardinal Bernetti, laid down, as a condition for the evacuation of Italy by the imperial troops, the change of Secretary of State.

The Pope, in his desire for conciliation, yielded to this demand, and Cardinal Lambruschini succeeded Bernetti.[13] The new Secretary of State, entering on his office, as it were under the auspices of Austria, would, more than his predecessor, turn his eyes willingly toward the court of Vienna. His temperament likewise inclined him to leave to the severities of the law an initiative with which Bernetti merely threatened the revolution.[14] But in 1845 he declined the armed help which Austria proposed to him for the repression of the renewed insurrection in the Legations; however, he followed attentively the various ramifications of the secret societies in Italy. A good number of the documents handed to Crétineau by the Pope to help him in disclosing the mysteries of the sect had been gathered by the pains of Lambruschini. The watchful minister strove also to check the propaganda of the liberal ideas among the secular and regular clergy.

Gregory XVI was convinced that nothing is more effective in fighting evil than the spread of good. In line with this conviction, he favored with all his power the pious associations that purposed the development of the faith or the practice of charity. He bestowed spiritual favors on the two congregations of priests founded by Father Jerome Chemin of Bassano, to preach retreats to ecclesiastics and the laity. He encouraged the Oblates of the Blessed Virgin instituted in 1826 at Pignerol by the venerable Bruno Lanteri for the service of the missions, and the Oblates of St. Alphonsus Liguori established in 1839 at Bobbio. He confirmed the rules given in 1825 by Theodora

[13] Maynard, *op. cit.*, p. 343.
[14] Crétineau-Joly, *op. cit.*, II, 356.

Campostrina to the Little Sisters of the Compassion of Mary, those of the priests of the Mother of Good Counsel and those of the Pious Works of the Mission. He procured the establishment at Rome and Turin of the institute of Perpetual Adorers of the Blessed Sacrament, founded in 1807 by Sister Mary Magdalen of the Incarnation (in the world, Catherine Sordini) for the purpose of repairing by uninterrupted adoration the insults offered to the Eucharist. Among the less known congregations that were the object of decrees of approval by Gregory XVI we may also mention the following: at Turin the Society of the Faithful Servants of Jesus, that of the Sisters of St. Anne, and the Penitents of St. Mary Magdalen; at Genoa, the Daughters of Mary; still others at Verona and Venice.[15]

Among the works that Gregory XVI blessed and approved were two which deserve special mention. They were notable by the particular interest the Pontiff showed for them, by the good they accomplished, and by the personal worth of the priest who founded them: the institute of the Fathers of Charity and that of the Sisters of Providence, founded by Antonio Rosmini of Rovereto.

In 1823 the future Pope Gregory XVI, then procurator general of the Camaldolese at Rome, met Antonio Rosmini.[16] This priest, then twenty-six years old, was pondering the idea of fighting the errors and miseries of his time by science and charity. Born at the castle of Rovereto in the Tyrol, of a family of the old nobility, he entered the seminary at the age of seventeen in spite of the lively opposition of his parents, who were counting on him to perpetuate the illustrious house of the Rosmini counts. After being ordained priest in 1821, he declined to enter the diplomatic career, to which his family and his friends were urging him. He retired on his paternal domain, which he had

[15] Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* II, Bk. III, chap. 17; *Civiltà cattolica,* VII, 3, 81.

[16] For the following details of Rosmini's life, see Lockhart, *Vie de Rosmini,* pp. 80 ff., 90, 103, 172, 188.

just inherited by his father's death, there to follow a life of prayer, study, and good works. For his motto he took these three words: To adore, to practice silence, to rejoice. His wish was that the peoples among whom he lavished his charities should know him by no name but that of Don Antonio. A devout Christian, the Marchioness Magdalen Canossa, foundress of a charitable association to which the young priest's sister, Margaret Rosmini, belonged, helped him in his works of charity. Two profound feelings united Dom Maur Cappellari and Don Antonio: a great devotion to the Holy See and a great love for the religious life. A warm friendship was soon formed between them.

In 1826 Rosmini wrote to the venerated Camaldolese monk, felicitating him on his elevation to the purple. In this letter Rosmini explained the plan for a religious order which he planned to found: it was to engage in all the works of charity which the times would call for. Two years later Cardinal Cappellari encouraged him to publish his treatise on the origin of ideas and to undertake an exposition of his philosophy, "persuaded that it is destined to revive the study of St. Thomas, Aristotle, and Plato at the center of the Christian world, close to the infallible seat of Catholic doctrine." He also wrote to Rosmini (July 2, 1830), who had sent him a detailed memoir on the institute he was planning: "I have read your description of the institute. The description is short, clear, and precise. I intend to make a copy of it for the Holy Father." Five months later the Holy Father was Maur Cappellari himself enthroned under the name of Gregory XVI. At first by an *oraculum vivae vocis,* then by apostolic letters (November 20, 1839), the Supreme Pontiff, after a single modification, approved the rules that had been submitted to him.[17]

[17] Bernasconi, II, 361–74. In this document will be found the full text of the rules of the Institute of Charity. Rosmini is there called *vir rerum divinarum atque humanarum scientia illustris, eximia pietate, religione, virtute, probitate, prudentia, integritate carus, ac miro in catholicam religionem atque hanc apostolican sedem*

Rosmini's philosophy was inspired by the highest and purest zeal. But it was developed with a view to refuting the modern errors more directly, and was oriented in paths not yet trod. It would not escape the condemnation of the Church. A decree of the Holy Office (December 14, 1887) censured forty propositions taken from his philosophical works. But, a few days before the promulgation of the condemnation, Leo XIII wrote to the archbishops of Turin, Verceil, and Milan: "We do not wish any harm to come to the Society of Charity, which has been so usefully devoted to the services of humanity according to the spirit of its institution. On the contrary, we hope it will continue to prosper and bear more and more abundant fruit." [18]

Rosmini had, in fact, founded two distinct works: the institute of the Brothers of Charity and that of the Sisters of Providence. The former had as their aim "their own sanctification and, by means of this sanctification, any works of charity whatever, especially those having as their object the eternal salvation of souls." [19] The flexibility of this aim would enable the society to adapt itself, according to circumstances, to the needs of times and places. The pious founder wished to introduce a

---

amore ac studio fulgens (*ibid.*, p. 372). This praise is the more remarkable since Gregory XVI knew the originality of Rosmini's philosophical system and his connection with Manzoni and other personages of the advanced national party.

[18] Lockhart, *op. cit.*, p. 557. For the condemnation of the Rosminian errors, see Denzinger, nos. 1891–1930. Rosmini's purpose was to fight the sensualism and subjectivism by the exposition of a philosophy resting on the positive observation of facts, and, on the other hand, reaching the intellectual reality beyond the sensible reality, the non-ego and God beyond the ego. Rosmini remarks that, if we closely observe the phenomena of knowledge, we find, at the base of each of them, a common element: being, undetermined and universal being: the things are this or that, but they are something. But being presents itself to us under the form of a feeling, under the form of an idea, or under the form of a relation between the feeling and the idea. Hence three divisions of Rosminian philosophy: reality, ideality, morality. Rosmini's doctrine was condemned as being tainted with ontologism. On Rosmini's philosophy, see Palhoriès, *Rosmini;* Segond, *Œuvres de Rosmini;* Trullet, *Examen des doctrines de Rosmini; Bulletin critique,* XIV, 309–12; *Revue du clergé français,* LIX, 309–18.

[19] Art. 3 of the rule (Bernasconi, II, 363).

similar flexibility in the organization of his society. Living in common as religious, practicing strict poverty in their manner of life, the Brothers of Charity would retain, like the secular priests, the ownership of their personal possessions, on condition of using them only for works of piety or charity.[20] The Brothers of Charity soon spread, not only in Italy, but also elsewhere, especially in England, where they led to many conversions to Catholicism.

The Sisters of Providence was approved by the same apostolic letters as the institute of the Brothers, as an affiliated community. At first it had been brought together by the initiative of Father Loewenbruch, one of the early disciples of Rosmini, who soon placed their spiritual and temporal direction into the hands of his superior. Their success in the different works entrusted to them, notably in the education of girls, brought from all sides requests for the *maestre rosminiane,* as they were called. In 1888 they numbered more than six hundred. Introduced into England in 1843 by Lady Mary Arundell, the daughter of the pious Marquis of Buckingham, they opened several boarding schools for young ladies of the upper aristocracy and the English middle class, and many schools for the poor classes. They likewise took up the care of the sick in hospitals, home visits of the sick, practicing, according to the instructions of their founder, "the union of the contemplative life with the active life and with the sort of active life that is the most simple, humble, and laborious." [21] The good they accomplished in these different works and the esteem they won powerfully seconded the work of the missions preached by Father Gentili and Father Furlong in all the Catholic centers of England and contributed greatly to the progress of the religious renaissance in that country.

[20] Arts. 23–28 (Bernasconi, II, 365).
[21] Lockhart, *op. cit.,* p. 378.

CHAPTER XVI

The Church in Ireland and England

FROM 1831 to 1846 the Catholic movement in England, Germany, and France assumed a particular breadth. In England the period was that of O'Connell's great agitation, wringing from the government the abolition of its most unjust laws against Catholics. The period also saw the development of the Oxford Movement, which led in 1845 to the conversion of Newman and several other eminent doctors of Anglicanism. In Germany those years marked the victory of the Catholic episcopate in the important question of mixed marriages. In France the same period laid the groundwork for the winning of the freedom of education.

Ireland

The Emancipation Bill of 1829 did not indeed give full liberty to the Irish Catholics. They rightly complained that they had to pay annually almost one million pounds for the clergy of the Protestant Churches, which had a membership of hardly 800,000, whereas their own clergy, who were ministering to 6,000,000 Catholics, had no resources for their living but the charity of an impoverished population. The Irish Catholics complained, and not without good reason, of being crushed under the weight of exorbitant farm rents and of being pitilessly evicted from their cottages when, following a poor crop, they could not pay these rents to the agents of the landlords. They recalled, lastly, that Ireland was inadequately represented in the English Parliament. In other words, the three questions

which, since the fourteenth century, had, one after the other or at the same time, stirred that country, seemed to them not settled. On March 22, 1829, even before the emancipation was an accomplished fact, O'Connell wrote to a friend that no one should think all would be finished after the Catholic emancipation; this would be merely the time to begin the struggle for the rights of the nation.[1]

The Agitator was then at the height of his popularity and power. At the age of fifty-four he still preserved all his physical vigor. In his long strifes he had acquired an experience of men and things that made him more than a popular tribune, a politician in the finest sense of the term. Contrary to the opinions of some of his friends, he judged that the political question ought to follow on the other two, and he started his new campaign in the Parliament itself. Some might have wondered whether the great orator of the Irish meetings would be able to adapt his words to the debates of a legislative assembly. O'Connell did not hesitate; his successes during his seventeen years in the House of Commons justified his daring.

Although the emancipation of the Catholics had been granted by the Tories, O'Connell resolutely took his stand on the side of the Whigs. This party was then demanding an electoral reform and, to prevail over the opposition in Parliament, they needed the support of the Irish votes. This support O'Connell offered them. In return he could ask for promises favorable to the Catholics.[2] Moreover, the Tories, preservers of the existing state of things, clearly represented themselves as defenders of the Established Church.

The success but imperfectly corresponded to O'Connell's hopes. The presence of the Whigs in power for six years gave Ireland a comparative peace. The country was governed with

[1] A. Langlois, "O'Connell d'après sa correspondance," in the *Correspondant* of January 25, 1889, CLIV, 247.

[2] On these promises, see Langlois, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

fairness. The magistrates regarded all those before them as citizens without the former odious distinction between an Irishman and an Englishman, a Protestant and a Catholic.[3] Moreover, on the floor of Parliament, as before the great popular gatherings, O'Connell appeared as a power. The contest that he sustained during the eleven days of the famous debate on the Coercion Bill showed him to be a formidable master of parliamentary tactics, discussing foot by foot, article by article, that bill which, amplifying the power of the magistrates, put Ireland almost in a state of siege. In an effort to overcome his resistance, he was offered an important magistracy in Ireland. O'Connell, in order to keep his independence, was unwilling to accept anything. In the work of the baneful bill, he again found the animation, irony, and sarcasm which formerly stirred the crowds of his compatriots. His improvised speech (February 5, 1833), in the opinion of Michelet, is the most thrilling piece of eloquence heard since Mirabeau.[4] The minister withdrew his bill. But O'Connell's parliamentary campaign brought few practical and immediate results. The abolition of one of the taxes for the support of the Anglican worship, the suppression of some Anglican bishoprics in Ireland, and a slight change in the manner of collecting the tithes were almost the only positive fruits obtained by so much effort.

The Repeal of the Union

In 1839 the Liberator, as the Irish called him, feeling worn out from his labors, thought of ending his days in a monastery.[5] But the coming of the Tories to power in 1841, having Robert Peel at their head, threw O'Connell into the opposition.

[3] Gondon, *L'agitation irlandaise depuis 1829*, p. 83.

[4] This speech will be found in Marcel, *Chefs d'œuvre de l'éloquence française et de la tribune anglaise*, III, 562–72.

[5] Langlois, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

Up to this time he had suspended all popular agitation in Ireland and he himself refrained from demanding the repeal of the Union, that is, the legislative autonomy of Ireland by the establishment of a parliament at Dublin. To his friends he wrote: "Henceforth my hope is solely in Ireland." In spite of his age he resumed his journeys as agitator.

We shall not detail this new series of campaigns. By the manifestations they appeared to be purely political. But in the course of them O'Connell, first of all a Catholic, never lost sight of the question that was always uppermost in his eyes, the religious liberty of his country. This liberty, he was convinced, would remain illusory and precarious so long as it should not be guaranteed by political liberty. The repeal of the union was his watchword; the defense of Catholicism in Ireland remained his primary objective.

Notwithstanding the murmuring of some of his too fiery partisans, his agitation remained always legal. He declared at Dublin (April 11, 1843): "I will violate neither the law of God nor the laws of men; but as long as a shred of the constitution is left to us, I will give it my support and will there place the influence with which I intend to maintain the uncertain liberties of my country." At Tara, the seat of the ancient kings of Ireland, the Liberator gathered together and harangued (August 13) 700,000 persons; the *Times* spoke even of a million. Another meeting, attended by 400,000, was held at Mullaghmast. A still more colossal meeting was announced for October and was to be held at Clontarf. O'Connell, learning that the government was prepared to disperse the meeting by force and that troops and cannons were proceeding toward Clontarf, foresaw a bloody clash between the armed forces and the crowd. At the last moment he forbade the meeting and was pleased that he was obeyed by 500,000 determined to give their lives for their country. The English government had him arrested, condemned, and imprisoned as guilty of conspiracy. But the House

of Lords (September, 1844) reversed the decision and freed O'Connell. At the same time the Tory cabinet did not venture to carry out its threats. At the close of 1842 Robert Peel, though imposing an income tax in England, did not dare to impose it in Ireland. The next year he declared that he was determined to do anything for the welfare of the Irish. O'Connell, in his deep faith, wrote that the hand of man is not in this matter, but that Providence is the one that answers the prayers of the faithful people of Ireland.

The big popular manifestations in celebration of the great agitator's liberation were his last triumphs. In the words of Lacordaire, "this great Christian merited that God should purify him from the subtle poison of glory and place on his head, after so many untarnished crowns, that supreme crown of adversity without which no glory, either on earth or in heaven, is perfect." [6] In spite of the Whigs' return to power, in spite of the excellent choice of officials appointed for Ireland, the year 1846 was the saddest in O'Connell's life. Two facts contributed to embitter his last days. The extreme dissidents, who wished to win Ireland's liberty by violence and who were known as "Young Ireland," a society that openly declared its opposition to O'Connell, and a frightful wretchedness caused (1845–46) by the failure of the potato crop, brought about the death, through famine or typhus, of almost a fifth of the Irish population. The great agitator, overwhelmed by physical and moral sufferings, wished, before dying, to go to Rome, there to lay at the feet of the vicar of Christ the testimonial of his fidelity. But God did not permit him to reach the end of his pilgrimage. He died at Genoa on May 14, 1847; and Pius IX shortly afterward, embracing O'Connell's son, rejoiced to hold in his arms the son of "the hero of Christianity." [7]

[6] Lacordaire, *Eloge funèbre d'O'Connell,* in *Œuvres,* VIII, 190.
[7] Lacordaire, *op. cit.,* p. 191.

Newman

Several members of the Whig (or Liberal) Party showed themselves more or less favorable to the cause of O'Connell. But they were not led to act thus by their slight zeal for the national religion; nor was their religious indifference in favor of the progress of the true religion. By a no less singular phenomenon and, we may add, no less providential, the obstinate attachment of several members of the Tory (or Conservative) Party to the Established Church, resulted in a Catholic revival. Keble, Froude, and Newman were not merely outspoken partisans of the Tory Robert Peel; more conservative than their chief, they forsook him when they saw him decide for the emancipation of the Catholics, accusing him of betraying the Anglican Church.[8] But with the same zeal for defending their Mother Church and of giving her a powerful vitality, these men were led to say to themselves that it had need of being reformed; and the reforms which they imagined or which they took from the old traditions, for giving life to that Church, were remarkably close to Catholic beliefs and practices.[9]

The Tractarian Movement would lead Newman and many of his friends to Catholicism. He later wrote that he always considered, as the starting point of that movement, a speech by Keble in regard to the bill which, in 1833, suppressed part of the bishoprics in Ireland.[10] Was this not lax apostasy, to disorganize the Church of England at the very time when the freethinkers on one hand and, on the other, the Irish Catholics were carrying a fierce war against her? Keble entitled his discourse "The National Apostasy." And he distributed copies of it widespread. The conclusion of this manifesto was that, in

[8] Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre,* I, 49.
[9] See *supra,* pp. 104–6, 162.
[10] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.,* p. 67.

such a crisis, every faithful churchman ought to devote himself fully to the cause of the Anglican Church. Some churchmen agreed to answer this appeal. This agreement had as its first result the appearance (September 9, 1833) of an anonymous writing of three pages, addressed to the writer's brothers in the holy ministry, "the priests and deacons of the Church of Christ." The guiding idea of this little leaflet was to recall to the clergy, who had too much forgotten it, that their powers came, not from the state, but from the apostolic succession; that it belonged to them, independently of the state, to take the initiative of any reform, of every act capable of restoring to the Church of England its vitality, its greatness, and its fruitfulness. This was the first of the so-called tracts that came out in the course of twelve years and explains why the movement is called the "Tractarian Movement."

"The second tract attacked the Irish Bill because it was taken without consulting the Church; the third denounced certain changes in the liturgy and the funeral services; the fourth returned to the question of the apostolic succession; the fifth set forth the constitution of the Church and of that branch established in England; succeeding numbers treated analogous subjects, seeking in every way to make the religion loftier, deeper, and more real." [11] Most of them, the most brilliant and striking of them, were from Newman's pen. At first zealous friends distributed these leaflets, passing whole days in going on horseback from one rectory to another. Soon no need required them to be spread from hand to hand. Their fame helped their diffusion. Some were in such demand that a second edition had to be published.[12] They became a matter of frequent discussion. The Evangelicals denounced their papist tendencies; the liberals, their dogmatic rigor; the prudent conservatives of Anglicanism, their recklessness. Newman continued to remain

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

the soul of the movement. He compared the stimulant of the tracts to an application of volatile salts for a fainting person. Moreover, they did not take seriously the reproach of papism. For Newman himself to become a Romanist seemed more and more impossible to him. In fact, at this period he thought he had found the means of separating from the Church of England without joining that of Rome.[13]

In 1835 the Tractarian Movement took on a new character by the intervention of Pusey. The publications became little complete treatises, somewhat heavy, but solid. The effect has been compared to the coming of a battery of heavy artillery on a battlefield where before only rifle skirmishes had taken place.[14] Froude's death that same year was an appreciable loss for the movement, but did not slow it down. Furthermore, the tracts were no longer the sole means of propaganda. Newman became pastor of St. Mary's at Oxford and there raised the parish worship from the sort of lethargy into which it had fallen. The success of his sermons kept increasing. The collection of these sermons [15] was regarded, even by the Protestants, as one of the most precious monuments of English literature of the nineteenth century,[16] and contributed as much as the tracts in winning followers to the movement.[17]

We have already mentioned how the condition of being pariahs had produced in the Catholics of England a sort of social and intellectual depression. "When they came forth from the catacombs, we might say that the full daylight dazzled them. They remained timid and distrustful." [18]

[13] This he called the *Via media.*

[14] Church, *The Oxford Movement,* p. 136.

[15] The first volume (1834) was followed by eleven other volumes.

[16] Gladstone, at the close of his life, was asked which were the finest prose writers of his time. He named Newman and Ruskin.

[17] Further, this movement of a great number of cultivated Protestants toward the Roman doctrines coincided with a movement of English Catholics toward scientific and literary culture.

[18] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.,* I, 120.

But a Catholic, a priest, was at hand. He was English enough to understand his fellow Englishmen and to make himself understood, yet by his personal training, free enough from the Catholics' habits of mind not to have their timidity or their short views. This man was Nicholas Wiseman.[19] Born at Seville in 1802 of an English family, brought up in England from early childhood, sent to Rome in 1818 with a group of young students, there to occupy the English College recently re-established, the young Wiseman was already revealed to be an orator, poet, exegete, and Orientalist. His meeting a young convert of noble ancestry, the last son of Lord Spencer,[20] turned his thoughts to the conversion of England. The visit of Newman and Froude in 1833 acquainted him with the importance of the Oxford Movement.[21]

A short stay in Paris in 1835 reanimated his courage and confidence. It was the time when his friend Lacordaire was starting his conferences in Notre Dame before a hostile or indifferent public. The next year Wiseman delivered some lectures in London. These were intended for the Protestants as well as for his fellow Catholics; they treated the principal doctrines of the Catholic Church. The simple and courteous tone of his lectures and his evident pains to enlighten without irritating drew many non-Catholics about his pulpit. In consequence several Anglicans of note were converted. Many others, without going so far as conversion, felt their prejudices destroyed or lessened.[22] Wiseman founded the *Dublin Review* in May, 1836. The first number succeeded in giving the Catholic movement an impulse and breadth that revealed to Protestants the might of the Roman Church and gave the Catholics a new confidence. It was the prelude of all the works which

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[20] Madaune, *Ignace Spencer et la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre*, p. 155.

[21] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–113.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

Catholicism would accomplish in the course of the nineteenth century in England.[23]

Newman, however, remained unmoved in his *Via media,* and his influence did but increase. When one of the most original and spontaneous minds of the Oxford Movement, William George Ward, was asked what was the symbol of his belief, he merely answered: *"Credo in Newmanum."* But when Newman's influence was at its height, and his authority unquestioned, when apparently he would be able to form a new Church with himself at the head, he began more and more to see that the intermediate way he intended to place between the Church of England and the Church of Rome was untenable. The Church of England, a national institution that had separated from the great Church, seemed to him to have neither Catholicity nor apostolic succession. Any other new Church would have the same defects; while the Church of Rome alone, as he saw, possessed, *de jure* and *de facto,* a boundless continuity and geographical extent. A phrase uttered by St. Augustine in connection with the Donatists, one repeated by Wiseman in the *Dublin Review,* kept recurring to his memory: *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* He wrote later: "The words of St. Augustine struck me with a power which I never had felt from any words before. To take a familiar instance, they were like the 'Turn again Whittington' of the chime; or, to take a more serious one, like the *'Tolle, lege,—Tolle, lege,'* of the child, which converted St. Augustine himself." [24]

In 1842 Newman felt the need of quiet and reflection to find the light and grace needed for the solution of the great problem that was troubling him. For this purpose he withdrew to the solitude of Littlemore. A few disciples, unable to do without his counsels, joined him there. He let them share his life of silence

[23] Wilfrid Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (1912).
[24] Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua.*

and retreat; but no one could induce him to resume his public life. For more than two years he prayed, reflected, discussed with himself, considered all the aspects of the questions disturbing him. He studied especially the question of the development of Christian doctrine and began writing on this subject one of the most penetrating works that came from his pen.[25] He wrote to his friend Pusey that he was as near the decisive step as if he had already taken it. On October 8, 1845, in his Littlemore hermitage, he made his abjuration of Protestantism and his profession of the Catholic faith in the hands of Father Dominic, a Passionist. A few of his disciples, Ward, Dalgairns, and St. John, foreseeing this issue of the crisis, had preceded their master and on August 13 and 19, and October 2 abjured Anglicanism. Others soon followed. Among their names should be mentioned Faber, the future Oratorian. His writings, as also those of Dalgairns, would enrich the Catholic literature of the nineteenth century.[26]

The number of conversions immediately following that of Newman has been reckoned at three hundred, and the movement has continued ever since. Gladstone spoke truly when he said that Newman's conversion to the Roman Church marked an epoch in the history of the Church of England.[27] More recently Lecky, one of the outstanding historians of England, was not uttering a paradox when he declared that, in the order of ideas, no greater event had happened since the time of the Stuarts.[28]

[25] Newman, *Essay on the Development of Doctrine.*

[26] Among Faber's works we note especially the following: *All for Jesus, The Creator and the Creature, The Precious Blood, The Blessed Sacrament,* and *Spiritual Conferences;* of Dalgairns': *Holy Communion* and *Devotions to the Sacred Heart.* Among the eminent men born in Catholicism, England counted Cardinal Acton, whose theological and canonical knowledge were rightly esteemed, and the historian John Lingard, whose *History of England* was highly appreciated even by the Protestants themselves.

[27] Gladstone, *Life of Bishop Wilberforce,* I, 328.

[28] Lecky, *History of Rationalism,* I, 159.

CHAPTER XVII

The Church in Germany

THE future Cardinal Hergenröther was teaching Church history at Würtzburg. In one of his lectures he made a similar assertion regarding the events occurring in Germany at this same period. He said: "Since the Reformation the Church has not known a more important event than the Cologne affair." [1] That affair was merely the sequel of the affair of the mixed marriages, a problem that had its beginnings under Leo XII and Pius VIII.

Bunsen

The court of Berlin received Pius VIII's brief, *Litteris,* condemning its claims. But finding nothing better to do about it than to hide the document from the public and to try to make the Pope yield, it followed the same plan after the coming of Gregory XVI. The personage chosen by the King of Prussia to carry on the discussions with the Roman curia was Count von Bunsen; the diplomat appointed by the Pope to represent him was Cardinal Lambruschini. This Bunsen, who drew up the *Memorandum* of the powers, was the type of sectarian and dominating Protestant.

He possessed a verbose and labored erudition. He was also well versed in the knowledge of the ancient liturgies and considered himself qualified to infuse a new life into the religious institutions sprung from the Reformation. Not only did he fancy a mighty Prussian national Church in which the king would be the head; he also devised a vast Protestant coloniza-

[1] Cf. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* II, 220.

tion plan, like former such undertakings. We may believe that, in the course of the journey he made in 1828 with the crown prince, Bunsen and the future Frederick William IV gladly joined hands in concerting the coming triumphs of the God common to Prussia and the Reformation.[2] But at Rome he was known. He had been seen when he was taking his first steps in the diplomatic career as Niebuhr's secretary. In the very palace of the minister he opened a little chapel where he pretended in some way to centralize Christian truth by the purification and modernizing of the rituals with a view to spreading it over the whole earth.[3] When Gregory XVI and his legate met the Protestant ambassador Bunsen and heard him insistently ask that the Catholic priest take part in the marriage ceremonies with the rites and conditions which he had determined, they showed themselves inflexible. Lambruschini, in the Pope's name, declared that they intended to abide by the declarations of Pius VIII without any concessions or modifications.

The discussions lasted two years. The Prussian chancery was not discouraged. After failing to win over the Pope, it set out to deceive the faithful. The German episcopate, whom they had already found complaisant, supplied some accommodating prelates who, in ambiguous terms, gave them a hope that in time the passive presence of Catholic priests at mixed marriages, as permitted by Pius VIII, would gradually be changed into active presence, even if the spouses would not conform to the conditions laid down by the canon law. For a moment the plan seemed to succeed. Without any fuss the Prussian government would fill the Catholic districts with Protestant officials and, by some cleverly contrived marriages, would endeavor to make the district Protestant. The essential point was to obtain the docile obedience of the faithful and the silence of Rome.

[2] Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 130. Bunsen's religious ideas will be found in his book, *Gott in der Geschichte.*

[3] Nippold, *Bunsen,* I, 165.

Among the people and clergy a rumor circulated that a brief of Pius VIII would be issued, opposing the Prussian demands. Bunsen tried to end these rumors (June 19, 1834) by elaborating with a compliant archbishop, Spiegel, and his vicar general, München, an agreement that claimed to take the papal document as its basis but, through a cunning falsification, adapted it to the royal edict of 1825. In short, the so-called convention ended with an order that the pastors abandon entirely, in cases of mixed marriages, the requisite that a promise be made regarding the bringing up of the children. Thus circumvented and perhaps proud to take on themselves an initiative that was represented to them as the guaranty of a religious peace saving the honor of their king, Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne and his three suffragans (of Trier, Münster, and Paderborn) consented to apply the agreement of 1834; at the same time they informed the Pope that they would execute the brief. Basically this move was a deception of the people and of the Pope.

Bunsen now thought that his positions were protected by these crafty arrangements. But just then Lambruschini, having wind of these maneuvers, called upon Bunsen for explanations. The Prussian diplomat brazened it out. He let out indignant cries when they spoke to him of the agreement of 1834, saying at first that such a convention was morally impossible, then giving positive assurance that it never existed. A more shameless lie was not possible. The German prelates, likewise brought into the case, did not use the same audacity. But, having set foot on a false path and not daring at first to forsake it by a frank disavowal, they tried to justify themselves by equivocation. They replied that they had indeed concluded a sort of pact, but merely to interpret, from a practical viewpoint, certain doubtful cases. For the honor of the Catholic Church of Germany, we are happy to note that such a yielding by the episcopate was neither general nor lasting.

At the close of 1836 the Bishop of Trier, on his deathbed,

heeded the voice of conscience. Ashamed of the miserable reticence behind which he had covered his weakness, he wrote to the Pope to confess his fault, to retract his compromising acts, and to ask pardon. Bunsen, at once involved, did not consider himself beaten, drew up some adroitly jumbled notes, tried to have the affair accepted as a misunderstanding, appealed from the declaration of the deceased bishop to that of the living prelates. But the latter could hardly continue in the policy of loopholes and evasions which they had adopted, and the retractation of the Bishop of Trier would soon find on the lips of a living bishop a forthright echo; its reverberations were widespread, and its significance incalculable.[4]

Archbishop Droste-Vischering

Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne died August 2, 1835. Then the government's desire was to find a successor both agreeable to the clergy and favorable to the convention of 1834. The government thought it found these two conditions combined in the person of the venerable coadjutor of the Bishop of Münster, Clemens August Droste-Vischering, who, on an intimation from Berlin, was elected by the Cologne chapter, preconized by the Holy Father (February 2, 1836), and enthroned three months later. The first condition required by the civil authority was certainly found in the venerable prelate, whose pious life and apostolic zeal were an edification to all. But did he fill the second desire of the Berlin court? Under the Napoleonic domination he did not fear to take up the defense of the rights of the Church, refusing to recognize canons appointed merely by the authority of the Emperor. Later, when the King of Prussia took under his protection the teaching of Professor Hermes, Droste-Vischering was alarmed at Hermes' doctrine and forbade the Westphalian seminarians to attend his classes.

[4] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

But the Bishop of Münster was old and supposedly worn out. His was a contemplative soul, attracted by the devotion of the cloisters. He was thought to be timorous or unmindful of the noisy conflicts. The Berlin government did not know or had forgotten that the contemplative life of the monasteries had trained the virile courage of an Athanasius and of a Gregory VII and that piety, inclining men's souls to the miseries of the weak, helped them to stand up against the threats of the strong. In the question of Hermesianism and in that of mixed marriages, Droste-Vischering was not slow in showing himself as belonging to the race of the most valiant champions of the Church.

At first glance the issue did not appear momentous. The view may seem strange to regard as great episodes of Church history the conflicts that arose in connection with the orthodoxy of a professor of theology and with the ceremonies to be observed in the marriage of a Catholic party and a Protestant party. The breadth and import of these struggles can be grasped only if we consider them in their relation to the general policy of Germany at this period. To exercise a political, intellectual, and religious domination over the world had long been the dream of several German statesmen. This dream had, in 1835, assumed a precise form; and on this point the liberals did not think otherwise than the adherents of absolutism.

To the German democrats the 1830 revolution had given hope and new encouragement. The princes in Brunswick, Saxony, and Hanover hastened to give constitutions to their people. Even the students who plotted in the secret societies against absolutism, and the insurgents who alarmed Metternich, all were singing Becker's *Rhin Allemand* with the same spirit and showed the same enthusiasm in raising the flag of the Burschenschaft, the black, red, and golden standard that had become the symbol of unified Germany. These various classes all nourished the same hope of a Germany enlightening the world.

For a moment the princes, even the King of Prussia, deluded themselves, believing that by this movement they were realizing the great ambition of the race. Becker received an honorary cup from the King of Bavaria and a pension from the King of Prussia. Some writers, such as Ranke, showed themselves skeptical of the movement;[5] but the secret societies, now long centralized in Berlin, were the ones that preached the realization of the German dream under the direction of the King of Prussia.[6] This organization would officially affirm its stand in 1842, when, on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone for the completion of the Cologne cathedral, a national festival gathered together all the German princes under the presidency of the King of Prussia. It was already an accomplished fact in 1835.

At this period Prussia assumed to dominate the thought of Germany and thereby of Europe and the world, by an official teaching. And it tried to regulate the ceremonies of religion by royal decrees. The strifes stirred up on the occasion of Hermesianism and of mixed marriages were two episodes of the campaign undertaken for this purpose.

George Hermes

Prussia had become mistress of the Rhenish provinces. She considered making Cologne lose her old scientific prestige and had introduced in Bonn an elite number of professors who, placed especially under dependence on the civil authority that had brought them there, would give a sort of official teaching.[7] Among these professors was one outstanding by the originality and boldness of his doctrine. His name was George Hermes.

[5] For Ranke's opinion, see J. Bainville, *Histoire de deux peuples*, p. 220.

[6] "The lodges judged that, of all the states of Europe, Prussia was the most capable of realizing their work." Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 400.

[7] Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 369.

Although a Catholic, he had been recommended to the Prussian government by the Protestant Niemeyer.

His *Untersuchungen über die innere Wahrheit den Christenthums,* published in 1805, and his *Philosophische Einleitung* on the introduction to philosophy, which appeared in 1819, set forth an effort at synthesis. It was perhaps sincere but disquieting, in which Protestant thought and even Kant's rationalist thoughts and those of Hegel seemed to merge in the conception of a novel Catholicism. Hardly had Hermes entered upon his professorship in 1820, when he was considered for the rectorship of the university. Fragments of his *Dogmatik* and especially his review for Catholic philosophy and theology, founded by his disciples in 1832, after his death, spread his doctrine in all German-language countries.

This doctrine began by claiming to be nothing more than a reaction against the dry scholasticism of certain second-rate theologians. But its conclusions tended to a dubious intellectualism which had about it nothing Catholic but the name. Appealing to freethought, as did the Protestants, and turning to no means of investigation but pure reason, like the rationalists, Hermes pretended to reconstitute the totality of the dogmas defined by the Catholic Church. Such an eclectic undertaking at once obtained the favor of the Prussian court, which hastened to give Hermesianism a sort of lay consecration by erecting it into a theology of the state.[8] But Gregory XVI, in his encyclical *Dum acerbissimus* (September 26, 1835), condemned Hermes' doctrine as departing from the tradition of the Church and leading to a variety of errors. The Pope made his own a decision of the Holy Office, condemning in the doctrine of Hermes several errors on the rule of faith, the essence

[8] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 12. Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 142, 145. For fuller treatment of Hermes' doctrine, see Goyau, *op. cit.,* pp. 2–12, 142, 146, 166–69; Kleutgen, *La philosophie scholastique,* I, 432; the article "Hermes" in the *Kirchenlexicon,* V, 1875–99.

and attributes of God, original sin, grace, and the future life.[9]

Droste, as administrator of the diocese of Münster, had already shown his mistrust regarding Hermes' doctrine. On taking possession of the see of Cologne, he found himself in the presence of a conclusive act of the papal authority. Losing no time in carrying it out, he asked the Bonn professors to submit to the decision of the Holy See and he ordered the students not to attend the classes of the refractory teachers. This act was a serious one, equivalent to placing an interdict on professors appointed by the state. It was to graft on the religious conflict a political conflict. The government threatened to take disciplinary measures, even to the point of excluding from the university those who should obey the orders of the Archbishop. The leaders of the Hermes party proposed a public debate. The Archbishop was not moved by the government's threat and declined to accept the proposed debate. No longer was anyone in a position to debate the cause of Hermes. It had been judged by the Pope. Droste merely extracted from the papal encyclical eighteen condemned theses and asked of his clergy unqualified adherence to these condemnations. Berlin insisted, reducing the exigencies of its demands. They would be satisfied with the Archbishop's silence or at least with a halfway condemnation that would allow the Hermesian doctrine to be spread in a discreet and occult way, letting it be attenuated in explaining it.[10] Said Droste: "The encyclical of the Pope is there." Without willing to give further explanation, he resumed that life of prayer and good works which appeared to the government a guaranty of his docility.

On another occasion the venerated prelate made no different reply to the agents of the King of Prussia. These asked him to agree to the governmental declarations or at least to maintain

[9] Denzinger, nos. 1618–21.

[10] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

silence on the question of mixed marriages. "The Pope's encyclical is there," he said. He then spoke of the encyclical of Pius VIII. Placing side by side the papal letter on the 1834 convention and the act of the King, he was unable to reject that of the Pope; thus he had to condemn that of the King.

Arrest of Droste-Vischering

But the government desired silence at any price. Being unable to force the Archbishop to be silent, it determined to prevent the people from hearing his voice. For the government the spread of Hermesianism was the means of fusing the different religious and philosophical parties of Germany; so the multiplication of mixed marriages, understood in its own fashion, was the most effective procedure for realizing this fusion in the realm of the practical life. Thus only one German religion would prevail, one German philosophy, as one German fatherland. But to attain this end, they needed the silent complicity of the clergy. As the Archbishop of Cologne placed an obstacle in the way of these plans, they decided to intern him in a fortified place. Thus would they stifle his word, and the example of the punishment would deter his colleagues of the episcopate from raising their voice.

In the evening of November 20, 1837, the St. Gereon square, where the Archbishop's residence was located, was suddenly occupied by troops. Then the Prussian state, under the protection of bayonets, made its entrance into the residence. Bodelschwingh, in the name of his king, had the palace evacuated. The aged prelate was placed in a carriage. A gendarme accompanied him at his side; another was on the watch on the driver's seat. The next morning the faithful of the Cologne diocese learned with amazement that, by the King's will, their archbishop, accused of arrogating arbitrary power and of trampling the royal authority underfoot, was placed in seclusion in

the fortress of Minden, in the depth of Westphalia.[11] The silence and inaction of the German episcopate following this outrage seemed to justify all the hopes of the Prussian government. Canon Lennig at the Würzburg assembly declared: "At the time of Clemens August's arrest, an unprecedented thing in the history of the Church took place. It occurred in consequence of a lack of unity: the German episcopate did nothing." [12]

A center was lacking in Germany, but not at Rome. From Rome arrived the solemn and peremptory protest. Gregory XVI, in the presence of the Sacred College (December 10, 1837), complained "of the grave indignity he had received." In the name of the violated ecclesiastical immunity, of the despised episcopal dignity, of usurped jurisdiction, and of the rights of the Catholic Church and of the Holy See trodden underfoot, the Pope praised the eminently virtuous bishop whom Prussia had just deposed in an unworthy manner.[13] A week later Cardinal Lambruschini transmitted the text of the papal allocution to all the members of the diplomatic corps by a most solemn letter.

The impression produced by this allocution was immense. Lamennais, separated from the Church, had, in his *Paroles d'un croyant* and later in a sensational pamphlet, *Les affaires de Rome,* represented Gregory as bold against whatever seemed to him to be error, but as timid toward the mighty. In the present circumstance the Pope's attitude was a clear denial of such a view. Montalembert rejoiced. In the *Univers* for December 29, 1837, he wrote a stirring article, saying: "The Supreme Pontiff's allocution is an event. . . . Its importance will increase as events follow. Henceforth the most distrustful and irritated souls, if they have kept some good faith, will

[11] Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 171.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 173.
[13] Bernasconi, II, 237.

know how to view these reproaches of servility, of connivance with the oppressors of religion, reproaches that have been hurled at the court of Rome." [14]

Montalembert spoke truly. From the Pope's allocution (December 10, 1837) dates the awakening of Catholic Germany. A young priest of Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle), who had gone to Belgium to avoid the teaching at the Bonn university, the future Bishop John Laurent, translated the allocution into German and sent bundles of copies for his fellow Germans in the Rhineland. Goerres took up his pen and, in four weeks, composed a book entitled *Athanasius,* a sparkling and animated commentary on the papal document. Therein he said that the Church did not seek the state, but the state, coming after the Church, went to find it; the Church, dwelling in the house before the state, received it there, but on condition that the state would keep the peace.[15] He was called the German O'Connell. His pen, in the words of John Laurent, "was worth four army corps." At his side two theologians, Döllinger and Moehler, and two jurists, Moy and Phillips, entered the lists. The impulse was given.

The Catholic people, tired of the heavy oppression under which they had been held by a servile episcopate, of a sudden rose up in favor of the imprisoned prelate. At Cologne the mob broke the windows of the houses of canons who were guilty of not defending their archbishop. At Coblenz and Paderborn could be seen men mounting guard day and night to protect priests they thought might be arrested by the police. In Westphalia the nobility decided to abstain from amusements, and to suspend dances and big evening parties so long as Droste-Vischering remained in prison. In the churches of Aachen the people gathered together and recited aloud prayers for the liberation of the Archbishop.

[14] Montalembert, *Œuvres*, III, 252, 254 f.
[15] Montalembert, *op. cit.*, III, 252–55.

The official circles at Berlin were much humiliated and disquieted. This state of affairs was at the time when the government felt victory almost in its grasp. It was the moment when the different Protestant Churches without exception, the most independent scholars of the Reformation, even Schleiermacher, the champion of freedom of consciences, had bent before the dogmatizing of a Hohenzollern. Moreover, at the cost of so many efforts and deceptions, they had obtained from the Catholic episcopate a timid, almost complaisant, silence. Then indeed the Pope's words troubled all Germany and threatened the collapse of the edifice they had patiently built up. Should they act rigorously? Should they break with the Pope? Some advised this course. But the undertaking seemed full of perils. Ambassador Neibuhr did not hesitate to criticize the Berlin policy; even the prince apparent, Frederick William, complained of the agents who had conducted the affairs so clumsily.[16] The mighty defender of order and authority in Europe, Prince Metternich, declared that the unpleasant situation of the Prussian government was owing to the clumsiness of its policy.[17]

The Berlin court hesitated. It did not dare use force to suppress the popular manifestations, yet it was unwilling to let the Pope's act pass without reply. It had the bishop of Posen, Martin von Dunin, arrested and haled into court for having threatened with suspension any priests who would bless the mixed marriages without the required promises. The consistorial allocutions (September 13, 1838, and July 8, 1839) in strong language condemned these encroachments by the civil power on the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. All the lower clergy of Germany echoed the Pope's words. Priests suppressed the pomp of public worship in their churches, and some of the laity were seen

[16] Ranke, *Zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Frankreichs im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, p. 366.

[17] Metternich, *Mémoires*, VI, 274.

wearing permanent mourning for the period during which the Bishop would continue to be imprisoned. The sympathetic feeling reached the worldly or indifferent. The young August Reichensperger, the future great orator of the German Center, felt himself torn from a life of an idle man of letters in order to devote himself to a life of action and strife. All Europe was interested in the lot of the illustrious prisoners. Montalembert wrote to the Bishop of Posen: "From the depth of your prison, as from a sanctuary, you are a lesson and a consolation for the whole Church." [18] The twelve bishops of North America, assembled in council at Baltimore, in 1840, sent to the imprisoned prelates the expression of their deep admiration.

At this juncture, in 1840, Frederick William III died, leaving the throne to his son. This son, Frederick William IV, had already taken account of the dangerous situation. His mind was especially concerned with the need of strongly maintaining the unity of the kingdom of Prussia. But the recent events threatened serious danger to that unity. The Westphalians, assigned to Prussia by the treaties of 1815, had accepted their new masters willingly enough. But, ardent Catholics that they were, the vexations against their archbishop exasperated them and made them regret the loss of their independence. For the Poles, who had always desired national autonomy, the imprisonment of their bishop made the domination of the King of Prussia more intolerable. Assuredly Frederick William III, wishing to strengthen the national unity by religious uniformity, had taken no steps to prepare for the political division of his nation. Frederick William IV resolved to establish the political union by the restoration of religious peace.

By a royal decree of July 29, 1840, the Bishop of Posen was authorized to return to his diocese. In virtue of an accord with the Holy See, the Archbishop of Cologne, released from his imprisonment, received a coadjutor who administered the dio-

[18] Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 36.

cese in his name. By this sacrifice, to which the Pope agreed only after long discussions, the King granted full liberty to the Catholic Church in the kingdom of Prussia.[19]

Catholic Renaissance in Germany

The results of this struggle and this victory were immeasurable. The Catholic regeneration of Germany dates from the Cologne affair. Thereafter the Prussian policy with regard to the Catholic Church was bound to be one of pacification. On the other hand, under the pressure of the events, a Catholic opinion was formed, which had its eloquent spokesmen and organized manifestations. The new attitude of the state and the activity of the Catholics made possible the creation of works of education, of propaganda, of religious defense, of social action, and of scientific apologetics. All these were the glory of Catholic Germany in the nineteenth century.

For the Church of Prussia, with the coming of Frederick William IV, began the winning of its liberties. In the first months of 1841 the only Germanic country where the clergy could communicate with the Holy See unhindered and publish the acts of Rome without hindrance was the kingdom of Prussia. The Punctuation of Ems, by which the prince archbishops of the eighteenth century dismissed the nuncios, became decidedly obsolete. The Church was no longer a subordinate entity, but a contracting party. In his short work on the Church and the state after the error of Cologne, Goerres took account of this new fact. In the years after 1841 the difficulties were solved in a bilateral fashion, by arrangements between the bishops of Prussia and the Prussian ministry. Berlin accepted or refused or proposed; but Berlin no longer imposed. Previously a bureaucracy, mostly Protestant, passed on its orders

[19] For fuller details, see Hergenröther, *Kirchengeschichte,* III, Part III, chap. 11, sec. 7.

to the bishops; now, in the Berlin ministry of worship, was a Catholic section, composed of Catholics and having as its function the affairs of the Roman Church. In January, 1841, Frederick William IV created this institution. It assured to Prussia, until the Kulturkampf, thirty years of religious peace.[20]

At the same time the Catholics, shaking off their apathy, were ceaselessly active. The political poet Hoffmann von Fallersleben declared to the German sovereigns: "You have awakened Michael; you will not succeed in putting him to sleep again." [21] Having awakened at the time of the Cologne affair, a marvelous power arose: something that no one had invented or led or regulated, a Catholic opinion.[22] Although no one had created this new power entirely, it had some eloquent interpreters. We mention the aged Bishop Keller, who in 1842 obtained from the first Würtemberg Chamber a vote favorable to the liberty of the Church; Professor Franz Joseph Buss, who in 1845, in the archduchy of Baden, organized a petition for the recovery of religious liberties. Everywhere, from top to bottom of the social ladder and in all parts of Germany, a movement took shape which an orator of the time compared to the Irish agitation under the leadership of O'Connell.[23]

One of the first happy results of this agitation was felt in the religious education of the people. Criticism has been directed against the theological construction of John Baptist Hirscher, professor in Tübingen faculty, then in that of Freiburg in Breisgau. We must confess that, in the exposition of dogma, he departed from the Scholastic method and that he preferred to follow the historical order in expounding religious truths. But, if we consider his point of view and the marvelous results obtained by his method, his work on catechetics (1831) and his *Catechism* (1845) must be regarded as masterpieces of

[20] Cf. Goyau, *op. cit.*, pp. 253–59.
[21] Saint-René-Taillandier, *Histoire de la jeune Allemagne*, p. 60.
[22] Eichendorff. See Keiter, *Joseph von Eichenforff*, p. 94.
[23] Lenning, at the Catholic Congress of Mainz, 1848.

pedagogy. The Jesuit Deharbe and Father Schuster and Father Stolz follow a somewhat different path. But no one can deny that the pedagogical zeal of the clergy for the teaching of catechism received an impetus from the initiatives of Hirscher. Between 1840 and 1846 the publisher Herder prepared the publication of the *Kirchenlexikon*. This work was undertaken under the direction of Wetzer and Welte and with the collaboration of Allioli, Hefele, and the leading Catholic scholars of Germany. Copies of this work would enrich the libraries of German ecclesiastics and educated laymen. In 1844 the Borromeus Verein was active in grouping studious persons together, in procuring books by the foundation of libraries, and in opening to Catholic writers markets for the publication of their works.[24]

Even Catholic art became more Catholic, or at least took on a more distinctly Catholic coloring. Around the first pictures of the "Nazarenes" the two Christian religions seemed to have sworn to a sort of truce of God: a city as Protestant as Frankfort invited the Catholic Veit to come and direct its museum. Now this truce was abandoned. In 1845 and 1846 Father Martin Deutinger, philosopher of Munich, published two volumes on esthetics in which he showed how the artistic conscience needs divine revelation for its expansion. In Deutinger's mind, worship and art are the two culminating points of civilization; and esthetics invites art to become the devotee of revelation.[25]

The life radiating from Catholicism exercised its influence on the Protestants themselves. The historian Frederick Hurter, the author of a life of Innocent III which won Montalembert's

[24] In 1832 Catholic literature was enriched with Moehler's *Symbolik*, a work of capital value, which brought together for comparison Catholic logic and Protestant logic. The whole plan of this powerfully constructed work is expressed in the statement of its author: "Why the Catholic Church conceives justification as it does and cannot conceive it otherwise, and why the Protestant has to conceive justification as it does, these are questions that no one can penetrate without grasping the organic connection of all the doctrines."

[25] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

enthusiasm, became a convert in 1844. Many of his fellow Protestants, though remaining outside the Roman Church, admired its majesty, its beauty, and the fruitfulness of its works in the course of history. The poet Novalis sang the praises of the Blessed Virgin, and the historian Boehmer, who published the *Regesta* of the old empire, hailed in the papacy a supreme preservative against military despotism.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Church in France

WE HAVE related the history of the Catholic revival in Germany. We likewise had occasion to note the echo it had in France, in the young school that had Montalembert for its most eloquent spokesman. There also a new generation, earnest, devoted to the liberty of the Church, had arisen and declared itself in broad daylight. Montalembert (April 16, 1844), addressing the House of Peers, said: "Gentlemen, among you a generation of men has sprung up whom you do not know. Whether you call them neo-Catholics, sacristans, or ultramontanes, as you choose, the name is of no moment; the thing exists. . . . In the midst of a free people, we do not wish to be islets. We are the successors of the martyrs, and we do not tremble before the successors of Julian the Apostate. We are the sons of the Crusaders, and we do not recoil before the sons of Voltaire." [1]

How was this Catholic movement formed in France, amid what difficulties did it grow, toward what goal did it advance? The answer to these questions is what remains for us to set forth in order to complete the features of the pontificate of Gregory XVI.

The beginning of the July monarchy was marked by violent attacks on religion. Yet King Louis Philippe did not inaugurate a policy openly hostile to the Church. Personally a skeptic or at least but little concerned with religious questions, not perceiving their true import,[2] he understood, by instinct and

[1] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* I, 293, 404.

[2] The significance of the struggle of Catholics for the freedom of education always eluded his grasp. He never understood Montalembert's religious convictions, when the latter, in the Chamber, was fighting to defend his faith. He used to ask: "When

experience, the danger involved for the civil power in alienating a force such as that of the clergy, in disturbing the conscience of Catholics. He said: "Never should anyone meddle in the affairs of the Church." With regard to Catholicism he would gladly have adhered to this policy of non-intervention which was his program in international relations. Louis Philippe was full of personal valor, but he was timid in political matters.[3] He let his officials—ministers, magistrates, or prefects—do as they liked when, imbued with bitter prejudices against the Catholic Church, they exercised local vexations, they allowed or incited popular uprisings against the "priests' party," as it was then called.

The conflict which the Church in France had to endure was indeed not, as in Germany, a direct struggle with the civil power. Rather it was a conflict against doctrines and passions toward which the government showed an excessive weakness, sometimes a secret satisfaction. These doctrines and passions assumed two forms: that of the Voltairian spirit widespread in the middle classes and that of revolutionary socialism, much in favor in the popular classes.

Beginning in 1830 the greatest poets of the period, Lamartine and Victor Hugo, turned to rationalist deism. Good critics have thought that between the emancipation of the imagination which found expression in the romanticism of the day, and the emancipation of individual reason which revived Voltairianism, more than a simple coincidence existed, rather an intimate relation.[4] The skeptical and jeering spirit was expressed by a certain man, possessed of mediocre talent, a colorless and commonplace style,[5] but of such popularity that no writer of the

---

will Montalembert receive holy orders?" The discussion over the freedom of education he called a quarrel of pedants and sacristans.

[3] Every Sunday Louis Philippe attended Mass in a chapel, but without ado or ceremony.

[4] F. Brunetière, *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française*, p. 454.

[5] Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 955.

time, not even Victor Hugo, could rival his glory,[6] the song writer Béranger. Chateaubriand even compared him to La Fontaine, Horace, and Tacitus.[7] In his *Dieu des bonnes gens,* smiling and fluent, Sainte-Beuve, likewise a skeptic, acknowledged a God as Voltaire thought of Him in his best moments.[8] Béranger expressed the ideas of the contemporary bourgeois; hence his success.[9] Around him was an outburst of caricatures outraging the clergy, theatrical performances with titles that insulted religion. The following are samples: *The Jesuit, The Congregationist, The Dragons and the Benedictines, The Cloistered Victims.*[10] In the press some papers disappeared along with the government they had overthrown, and the *Globe* survived it for only two years. But from the *Journal des Débats,* which already gloried in having on its editorial staff the most remarkable literary talents, to the *Charivari,* a periodical leaflet full of spirit and insolence, the most widespread press in the constitutional camp as also in the liberal camps, some more restrained in style, others more violent, had not repudiated the spirit of Voltaire. This spirit it expressed more crudely and violently, without the serious tone and moral veneer of the Restoration.

The popular classes did not escape the imprint of that Voltairian spirit. But more profound and more serious concerns, at once taking a perverse turn, had likewise seized them and remarkably disturbed them. By a strange coincidence, exemplified at the close of the eighteenth century, the outburst of scoffing impiety was accompanied with an irresistible need for the religious ideal. The religious sentiment seemed to be astray

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 954.

[7] "Under the simple title of song writer, a man has become one of the greatest poets that France ever produced. With a genius that connects him with La Fontaine and Horace, he has sung when he wished, as Tacitus wrote." Chateaubriand, *Etudes historiques,* p. 20.

[8] Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains,* I, 93.

[9] Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* I, 250.

[10] Lanson, *op. cit.,* p. 955.

in society like an exile who goes rapping on all doors. The religious longing, finding the door of Catholicism closed by the railing skepticism of Voltaire, sought its satisfaction in socialism.

Idealistic Socialism

The word "socialism," which for men of today suggests especially ideas of political organization, awakened quite different notions following the July revolution. The French socialist from 1830 to 1848, is a dreaming idealist who, with more or less good faith, tries to reconcile the principles of the revolution with those of Christianity. In 1831 the *Nouveau Christianisme*, a posthumous work of Saint-Simon, became the manual of his school, which was directed by two of his disciples, Bazard and Enfantin. Fourier had published his principal writings; Leroux had set forth his ideas in the *Globe,* and Buchez in the *Européen.* One of Saint-Simon's last words on his deathbed was this: "Religion cannot disappear from the world; it is merely transformed"; and his disciples formed themselves into a sort of Church with its different degrees of initiation, its worship, its feasts, its officers, its supreme father, or pope, in the person of him who was called Father Enfantin.[11]

Buchez, of all the leaders of the school the nearest to Catholicism, went so far as to say that he saw salvation for society only in the civilizing influence of the Roman Church. With the same zeal and the same conviction he preached the sovereignty of the people, the abolition of capital, the social equality of all men, the love of duty, and Christian brotherhood to the point of sacrifice. His chief followers would be Roux-Lavergne, Réquédat, Piel, Besson, Olivaint. The first of these, having turned back from the utopian contents of the master's doctrine, later became canon of Nîmes; Réquédat, Piel, and Besson died

[11] See *Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*, III, 176 and *passim*.

in the Dominican habit;[12] Olivaint became a Jesuit and gave his life for the faith during the Paris Commune in 1871;[13] and Buchez, rewarded for his uprightness, received a priest when he was dying and died a genuine Christian.[14]

However, we must not suppose that the socialists of this period exhausted all their efforts in the domain of fanciful dreams. Although they did not organize political parties, they were the creators of socialism. They were the ones who thought up all the criticisms of existing society, all the maxims, even the practical schemes and measures of socialist reform. Before 1848 they were already talking of "the exploitation of man by man," "the right of labor, of anarchy, of social democracy, of the strifes of the masses, of the workingman's party, of an international entente between workers, of emancipation of the proletariat, of the organization of labor. They proposed the cooperative association of producers, national workshops, free credit, progressive taxation, the eight-hour day, the general strike. The socialist parties which developed later lived on the intellectual work of the first half of the century."[15]

A general inspiration of brotherhood animated various socialist schools following the July revolution. This led some of Buchez' disciples to Catholic orthodoxy. But in the case of the followers of Saint-Simon, it degenerated into a sensualism that, not content with being theoretical, ended in the most scandalous disorders. A certain historian of the July monarchy rightly says that Saint-Simonism, fruitless for good, was not so for evil. It produced an unhealthful poison that penetrated the veins of the nation. It sought to substitute for Christian hopes an impatient pursuit of immediate blessings and the rem-

[12] Cartier, *Vie de R. P. Besson.*

[13] Clair, *Vie du P. Olivaint.*

[14] On Buchez, see Calippe, *Attitude sociale des catholiques au XIX^e siècle,* pp. 137, 191.

[15] Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine,* p. 686.

edy for all evils in the complete reshaping of the social mechanism. Thus it abandoned Christian doctrine, which taught renouncement and respect for authority, after at first unfurling the banner of this sound teaching. By a utopian desire for equality, wishing to apportion the fruits of labor and the revenues of capital through the medium of authority, it prepared the way for the despotic schemes of state socialism.

By these tendencies the socialism of 1830, or at least the most important branch of it, joined hands with philosophical rationalism and in this combination constituted a peril for the Christian faith. A good number of French Catholics saw this danger and endeavored to thwart it.

The Catholic Press in France

One of the outsanding propaganda instruments of the Voltairian spirit and of the socialist doctrines was the press. By means of the press also the Catholics resolved to enter the strife. To affirm the faith against all the negations of Voltairianism and against all the attenuations of Gallicanism; to defend, against the utopias of socialism, the well-being of the people and their liberty: such was the program of the group of Catholics which (October 16, 1830) brought out the first number of a daily with the title of *L'Avenir,* bearing the motto "God and Liberty."

Three papers had already assumed the task of defending religion. These were the *Ami de la religion et du roi,* the *Mémorial catholique,* and the *Correspondant.* The first of these, founded in 1814 by the scholarly author of the *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique du XVIII^e^ siècle,* Michel Picot, grouped about its industrious and intelligent director the most eminent representatives of Catholic thought: Bishop Boulogne, Father Frayssinous, Father Lécuy, Father Lamennais, and

Viscount Bonald. The abundance of its accounts, the honesty of its news, both contributed to its great success in the Catholic world.[16]

But many persons complained that it had a sympathy for a moderated Gallicanism. The *Mémorial catholique,* started in 1824, had a more militant appearance, but it addressed a special public, which was further lessened by the appearance in 1829 of a new Catholic paper, which came out semi-weekly, the *Correspondant.*[17] The new organ counted among its collaborators Louis de Carné, Franz de Champagny, Théophile Foisset, and Edmond de Cazalès. For its slogan it took the saying of Canning: "Civil and religious liberty for the whole universe." After the July revolution its editors, all originally legitimists, declared that they separated the cause of the Catholic Church from that of the vanquished princes, and that it accepted any government that would assure order by giving religious liberty.

Lamennais

But the group of young Catholics that followed Lamennais as their leader hoped to have a big daily paper. It should be more alive, freer from attachment to the former parties, more exclusively Catholic, and more devoted to the popular cause. As his followers knew, Father Lamennais originally had been a royalist of the extreme right, a believer in theocracy, favoring the absolute and paternal power of a monarch subject to the lofty pre-eminence of the Roman Pontiff. But they knew also that, in his book on the progress of the revolution, he foretold the fall of a royalty that refused to follow his program and he

[16] These qualities make them the most valuable source that can be consulted on the religious history of the first half of the nineteenth century. After the July revolution the *Ami de la religion et du roi* suppressed part of its title and became the *Ami de la religion.* It then appeared three times a week instead of twice. See Ledos, article "Ami de la religion," in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire ecclésiastique,* II, 1225.

[17] The *Correspondant* did not appear in the form of a review until 1843.

earnestly wished for a revolution to avenge the misunderstood right. And then, seeing O'Connell snatch Irish liberty from the English monarchy, the Belgians win their independence by an alliance with the liberals, and the French overthrow a royalty guilty of no more respecting the rights of the people than the rights of the Church, he rejoiced at seeing his prophecies realized. From that time on, all his former sympathies for the monarchy were dead and never revived.

Some have said that for Lamennais the events of July had been like a revolutionary Sinai, where, in the midst of the lightning, he thought he heard a divine voice, which converted him to liberalism and democracy.[18] The comparison will not appear extraordinary to those who have closely studied that strange character, so versatile and absolute, moved by his impressions when he thought himself led by logic, and ever ready to take the promptings of his self-esteem or of his anger for messages of God.[19] When, in September, 1830, Father Gerbet passed on to him the money offering of an obscure writer, Harel du Tancrel, for the foundation of a daily paper, Lamennais accepted it enthusiastically. Besides other motives, an additional one was probably that of having an organ of his school, of his personal thought, because all the future editors who took a stand at his side—Gerbet, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Charles de Coux

[18] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, I, 286.

[19] Benoit-Champy wrote: "You would have to live, as I did, in a long intimacy with Lamennais, to understand his strange character. . . . A simple credulity was there mingled with a headstrong stubbornness. In the evening smashing the idol he had adored in the morning, a rigorous logician to the utmost limits, even to absurd consequences, he had to be what he was, ultramontane and revolutionary: despite his perpetual contradictions, believing himself, or at least forcing himself to believe himself, the most logical man and the least changeable; ever seeking his path, ever thinking he had found it, even while endlessly changing it. . . . For that vast and impressionable mind, religion, that is, the faith, and submission to the rule were necessary because nothing else could give him calm and serenity" (Benoit-Champy, *Quelques souvenirs sur la mort de M. de Lamennais*). Benoit-Champy, one of the testamentary executors chosen by Lamennais, was, by relationship and intimate association, one of the most authentic witnesses to his life and thoughts. The lines quoted above give the key to many problems in the agitated life of Lamennais.

—felt the sway of his renown and were prepared to develop his doctrines. The *Avenir* was Lamennais, with his generosities, his impetuosity, his excesses of language and thought, and his imprudences of policy.

The *Avenir*

We must acknowledge that never was the Catholic faith expressed in language more lofty and vibrant. Declared Montalembert: "We gather up the debris of the cross and swear eternal worship for it. . . . If we had been granted the privilege of living in the time of Christ and of seeing Him but for a moment, we would have chosen that moment when, crowned with thorns and falling from fatigue, He advanced toward Calvary; just as we thank God for having placed the short instant of our mortal life at a time when His holy religion has fallen on evil ways, that we may be able to sacrifice our existence to Him more completely, to adore Him more closely." [20] The valiant paper denounced the outrages to religion, the vexations of the mayors or local officials toward priests and the faithful, along with the weaknesses and complicity of the authorities with the enemies of religion. The paper went even further. Lacordaire suggested (November 25, 1830) that the bishops reject the first episcopal nominations made by Louis Philippe.

His article and one by Lamennais on the oppression of the Catholics were made the basis for legal charges against the two writers; but they were acquitted by the jury. To meet the expenses they opened a subscription for which contributions from five centimes (one cent) to five francs (one dollar) were accepted. The success of this case decided Lamennais to found the general agency for the defense of religious liberty. The

[20] *Avenir* of February 21, 1831.

association was to prosecute before the courts every act committed against the liberty of the clergy, to uphold the right of holding meetings, and to group together the local societies that purposed assuring religious liberty. In fact, several local societies were founded. Montalembert toured southern France, and there his enthusiastic words won a considerable number of adherents to the cause of religious freedom.[21]

The *Avenir,* to offset the socialist danger, took up the economic and social problem and championed the defense of the popular classes. Lamennais, with his usual penetration, saw that, although the "legal country" under the July government was constituted by the bourgeoisie, beneath this organization in the political sphere was the people, almost ignored by the Charter, but the people that was stirred, that discussed the problems, and that, like the third estate of the Old Regime, complained of being nothing and wished to be everything.

One of the contributors to the *Avenir,* Charles de Coux, spoke with true competence. He denounced the faulty sharing of the goods of this world, the exploitation of the workers by capitalism, and, in reply to certain Catholics of the time, the inadequacy of the alms to remedy the misery. He attacked the liberal economics of Smith, Say, and Sismondi. He charged it with being concerned only with the production of wealth and with its distribution, of attributing to industrial progress an end in itself, and consequently of taking no account of the worker, the real producer. It sacrificed the worker, he said, to material prosperity, considered him merely a machine that must indeed be maintained in good condition that it may function with regularity, but from which it is allowable to require more and more work, while spurring it by stimulants like hunger and need. He said: "The economists were careful not to ask whether the distribution of the public wealth is not as impor-

[21] C. Weill, *Histoire du cath. lib. en France,* p. 40.

tant as its increase; in such inquiry they would have encountered Catholicism." [22] He then accused them of drying up the sources of the religious life in the hearts of workers and employers, and thus of destroying the most powerful basis of true progress. In the presence of the wretchedness of the people, the economists, said Charles de Coux, "would be scarcely more useful to the common people than would a dancing teacher to paralytics." [23]

As a cure for this state of things, the *Avenir* favored with all its might the experiment of associations. It admired the wonderful corporative organization of the Middle Ages. It blamed the Revolution for their destruction and spoke of trying to re-establish them. Meanwhile it favored the foundation of agricultural colonies, a combination of industrial activities and farming activities, and particularly of the priests' participation in these undertakings. Said Lamennais, "this intervention will always be needed not merely to give these associations the moral character on which their political usefulness and their material prosperity would depend, but also to provide a third, disinterested party that could intervene between the rich and the poor."

The *Avenir's* Excesses

These campaigns were in themselves praiseworthy. But unhappily the *Avenir* used violent language and doctrinal exaggerations which soon aroused the susceptibilities of part of the clergy and would lead to the paper's condemnation by the Pope.

The program of the *Avenir* contained two parts: one negative, the other positive. The negative part was summed up in

[22] *Avenir* of January 10, 1831; *Mélanges catholiques,* I, 107. Under the title of *Mélanges catholiques extraits de l'Avenir,* the *Agence générale pour la defense de la liberté religieuse* published, in 1831, a collection of the principal articles that had appeared in the *Avenir.*

[23] *Avenir* of June 30, 1831; *Mélanges catholiques.* I, 85.

two points: for what concerned the Church, its complete separation from the state; for what concerned the people, its freedom from all political and social authority. The separation of Church and state was something the *Avenir* asked for in full, an absolute separation, without any transition stage, without preliminary agreement, with immediate renunciation of state support. According to Lamennais the union of Church and state led necessarily to the enslavement of the Church; the state support led to its shame and its discredit among the people. "The bit of bread that the state throws to it, is the basis of its oppression; although free according to the law, it is, whatever it does, enslaved by this support." [24] As for the people, like a child that has grown up and possesses freedom as his father does, so the people, having grown up in intelligence, acquire the right to manage themselves. This time has come for the Christian peoples; it will come for the others. As this freedom is exercised solely by intelligence and love, not under compulsion, this new sovereignty of the peoples will not be oppressive like that of the kings. Consequently it will be a friend of the Church, which will become the firmest support of popular liberties, not by the exercise of any political jurisdiction, but by its own inner and spiritual strength.

The positive part of the *Avenir's* religious and political program was summed up in an article published by Lamennais under this title, *Ce que sera le catholicisme dans la société nouvelle*. In the future society, constituted by the liberated peoples and by an independent Church, the author sees three things develop. First, it will have a truly Catholic science, no longer simply a matter of words, abstract and empty, like that of the Middle Ages, which will penetrate dogma far enough to disclose there and clarify, in a way, the very laws of creation, and which, based on the constituent laws of intellect, will bring the various orders of knowledge into unity. Secondly, it will have a

[24] *Avenir* of October 18, 1830. Cf. *Mélanges catholiques*, I, 150.

political harmony which, founded on love, "will successively efface, as far as possible on earth, what divides individuals and nations, and these, politically freed, will live a powerful and common life." Lastly, it will have a social organization such that the poor and the workmen, instead of being the pariahs of society, will in reality become what they are in the true concept of Christianity, the friends of the priest, "the privileged ones of Christ, who was Himself poor and suffering, of Christ who said, Blessed are those who weep." Particular applications of this program showed its utopian and dangerous parts. In two articles on the future of society, the director of the *Avenir* demanded of the government without delay six principal liberties: 1. liberty of conscience, complete, universal, without distinction and without privilege; 2. liberty of teaching, as promised by the Charter; 3. liberty of the press, for it should have faith in the truth and its eternal power; 4. liberty of association, which is a matter of natural law; 5. liberty of election, which should reach to the bosom of the masses; 6. liberty of the provinces and the communes by decentralization.

Such a program contained some good reforms. But it was dominated by an erroneous principle. Said Lamennais: "The truth is all-powerful. What most retards its triumph is the support which material force tries to lend it." [25] The uneasiness aroused by this program increased when the director of the *Avenir* tried to unite in a vast federation, not only the Catholics of France, Belgium, Ireland, Poland, and Germany, but even the liberals of all countries. An Act of Union was drawn up to this effect, which the editors of the *Avenir* presumptuously called "The Great Charter of the Age." [26] The governments bestirred themselves. Some saw in Lamennais' project a sort of new Carbonarism, and denounced him to Rome. Such an agita-

[25] For the passages quoted and details referred to in the preceding paragraphs, cf. *Avenir*, 1830; *Mélanges*, Vol. I.

[26] Boutard, *Lamennais*, II, 189–215.

tion, uniting in an affirmation of the same aspirations and toward a goal much suspected of revolutionary liberalism, of Catholics and unbelievers, could not but be ill received by the Holy See.

The writers of the *Avenir,* with too little reflection and prudence, signing the "Act of Union," had in a way signed their own condemnation.[27] Protests arose in France and Italy; several bishops showed their disapproval; many subscribers refused to receive the paper or no longer renewed their connection with it. An ill-considered and violent article against the Carlists of Spain, who were accused of sacrificing God for their king and of degrading their altars to be merely a throne,[28] exasperated the royalists of all countries. The *Gazette de France* joined the *Ami de la religion* in attacking the *Avenir* and in leveling at its editors the most treacherous insinuations.[29] Discontinuance of subscriptions increased. From 3,000, the subscriptions fell to 1,500. Poorly managed, the paper's treasury was empty. In May, 1831, an urgent appeal for funds was issued, addressed to some friends in France and Belgium. Several followers withdrew from the master.

Father Prosper Guéranger wrote to Lamennais (June 11, 1831): "I learn with pain that Léon Boré has left you." Others, on the contrary, felt their ardor redouble in the strife. Father Guéranger, in the letter just quoted, said: "I hope to work always under your direction and to make myself more and more worthy of the benevolence you have ever shown toward me." The young, zealous canon of Le Mans announced to Lamennais that he was sending him a book which he had just published on

[27] *Ibid.,* II, 215.

[28] *Avenir* of February 18, 1831.

[29] Canon Sibour, future archbishop of Paris, wrote from Nimes to Lamennais (November 13, 1831): "I need to pour out my heart to you. The purest intentions are misunderstood. The calumnies accumulate. One bishop wrote to his priests: 'I know that you belong to that sect of presbyterians who no longer desire a hierarchy.' . . . Do but look at the arms which your adversaries are using: intrigues, insinuations, outrages." Cf. Boutard, *op. cit.,* II, 244–48.

the abolition of concordats, hoping that "this book, by directing the attention of the clergy, would prepare for the great work of the abolition of the concordats in France." [30]

But the stockholders of the *Avenir,* at their meeting in Paris on November 11, did not hide from themselves the seriousness of the paper's situation. They unanimously declared that, if "the material position of the enterprise permitted it to continue for several months," the suspension of the paper seemed to them to be demanded for the sake of the doctrines defended by the *Avenir.*[31] Consequently in the number of November 15, 1831, the editors announced that, "to advance, as far as it depended on them, the desired moment that would calm all consciences, three of them—Father Lamennais, Father Lacordaire, and Count Montalembert—would leave at once for Rome. Some say that we are condemned at Rome. Very well, to Rome we will go to hear our sentence, prostrate before the see of St. Peter." [32]

[30] A. Roussel, *Correspondance inédite de Lamennais et de l'abbé Guéranger (1820–1832),* pp. 20 f. This correspondence is quoted by Roussel in his *Lamennais et ses correspondants inconnus,* pp. 189–231. Guéranger had been one of the guests at La Chênaie and collaborated in the *Avenir.* The author of *Dom Guéranger, abbé de Solesmes,* rightly says that Father Guéranger, in attaching himself to Lamennais, saw in him especially the undisputed and venerated leader of the ultramontane school; but he is less exact when he declares that Guéranger was far from espousing his philosophical system. On March 15, 1830, Prosper Guéranger wrote to Lamennais: "The war against common sense (that is, against the philosophical system of the *Essay on Indifference*) and its consequences is ever flagrant to St. Sulpice. Carrière had just put the last touch to his folio of last year. . . . Besides, he is the most loyal of your adversaries. He has read and reread you; he even knows you by heart. Only, he does not understand you, and I fear that he will never understand you" (Roussel, *op. cit.,* p. 14).

Rohrbacher, another collaborator of the *Avenir,* drawn to Lamennais by the desire to defend the ultramontane doctrines and to oppose Gallicanism, also adhered to the master's philosophical doctrines. In the preface of the second edition of his *Kirchengeschichte,* he relates how, in 1828, he withdrew from the connection. Some Jesuits, among them Father Brzozowski, assistant to the General, had likewise been attracted by Lamennais' doctrines, by his anti-Gallicanism and his antirationalism. Neither of these two men followed Lamennais in his defection. See Burnichon, *op. cit.,* II, 13–46.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XIX

Lamennais

FOR a long time scant information was available about the sojourn of the three pilgrims in Rome. Relying only on Lamennais' *Affaires de Rome* and the incomplete correspondence of his two companions, the account of this episode, so important in the history of the Church in the nineteenth century, has too often been written in terms but little favorable to the reputation of Pope Gregory XVI. Lamennais has been represented as vainly waiting for two months to hear the reply that a pontiff "pious but ignorant of the state of the Church and the condition of society, immovable in the darkness with which he was encompassed," refused to provide. The indignation of the misunderstood priest overflowed when he learned that the cabinets of Vienna, Saint Petersburg, and Paris, of almost all Europe, alarmed at his republicanism, exerted pressure on the Pope, calling for Lamennais' condemnation. He left Rome, indignant and embittered, and the violent terms of the encyclical *Mirari vos,* which condemned him, determined in that impressionable temperament and proud spirit, which they had done everything to exasperate, a revolt that, however culpable it may have been, could appeal to extenuating circumstances.

The Case in Rome

In the presence of the documents which public and private archives have recently brought to light, this view can no longer be held.[1] The gravity of the question justifies a detailed con-

[1] Notably the documents found in the Vatican archives and in those of the French minister of foreign affairs, published by Paul Dudon in his book, *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège.*

sideration. Gregory XVI, who was not narrow-spirited, inflexible, and ill-informed, had not waited until the arrival of the *Avenir's* three editors before making a deep examination of the serious questions of dogma, of moral, and of religious politics, raised by that paper. Three leading personages were consulted: Father Ventura, general of the Theatines, with whom Lamennais would receive hospitality during his stay in Rome,[2] Cardinal Lambruschini, former nuncio at Paris and thus well informed about the state of minds in France, and Father Baraldi of Modena, a learned and pious ecclesiastic, founder of a journal sympathetic to the group of La Chênaie. We possess their written replies. Ventura declared that Father Lamennais is an extraordinary genius and that his life is beyond reproach, but that several of his theories are dangerous and that care must be taken not to give him or promise him a written approbation of his doctrines. His friends would make abusive use of it.[3] Lambruschini judged that the best procedure would be not to give Lamennais any answer. He came to Rome expecting a triumph; this should not be given him. He intends to give the Pope a sort of summons; to reply is not in accordance with the Pope's dignity.[4] Baraldi was of the opinion that Lamennais should be received cordially, that acknowledgment should be made that he is right in certain things, but his thesis on the sovereignty of the people overthrows the constitution of the Church and of society, and that he should be made to understand this.[5]

What was the attitude of the *Avenir's* editors? Father Vuarin, who saw Lamennais when the latter was passing through Genoa, wrote: "For three hours we listened to his out-

[2] Boutard, *Lamennais,* II, 261; Rastoul, *Le P. Ventura.* Lamennais was so affected by the gracious welcome of the good religious that to him he confided the direction of his conscience during his stay in Rome.

[3] Dudon, *op. cit.*, pp. 127–32.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 133–35.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 135–37.

bursts of anger. . . . He went to Rome to convert the Pope. . . . His political heresy might indeed throw him into religious heresy." [6]

Having reached Rome, the three journalists, with an insistence that appeared excessive, urged the Holy Father to make a decision. They said: "The Holy See's silence would have as its effect to weaken the courage of those who are devoted to it. This silence would be regarded as a condemnation. An immense part of the population would draw away from religion with more hatred than ever." [7] A commission of theologians was appointed to study the memorial. While these theologians were seriously deliberating, Lamennais, more and more embittered, wrote: "One of the most beautiful days of my life will be that on which I come forth from this big tomb. The mission of the papacy is to hasten the final destruction that must precede the social regeneration. God will save Catholicism by the people." [8] Gregory XVI had Lamennais informed by Cardinal Pacca that the examination of his doctrines, which would have to be thorough and deliberate, could not be done hastily and that he could return to France with his colleagues.[9]

Lacordaire alone understood.[10] Lamennais remained stubborn. He declared that this profound examination was a victory for his cause and that he would stay in Rome to furnish indispensable explanations and to answer any objections.[11] An audience with the Pope (March 13, 1832), at which Gregory did not say a single word about the affair in question, was interpreted by Lamennais as a second victory.[12] To his friends he spoke of nothing but his plan to resume the publication of

[6] *Revue des Deux Mondes*, November 1, 1905, p. 191.

[7] Dudon, p. 148.

[8] Boutard, *op. cit.*, pp. 282–84.

[9] Dudon, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

[10] Lecanuet, *Montalembert*, II, 285. Lacordaire's departure was decided before the reception of Cardinal Pacca's letter. Blaize, *Œuvres inédites de Lamennais*, II, 98.

[11] Dudon, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

the *Avenir;* far from abandoning or toning down any of his ideas, he accentuated them by writing a 300-page volume on the ills of the Church and of society and the means of curing them. However, the Holy Father's silence, the growing divergencies between Lamennais and Lacordaire,[13] the moderation of Montalembert's ardor, the inaction, the separation from his friends in France, financial difficulties,[14] and the French ambassador's lack of zeal for his cause, irritated and troubled him. The appearance of the papal brief (June 9, 1832), advising the Poles to submit to Russia, filled the cup of Lamennais' irritation. On July 1 he wrote to his brother that, considering his mission finished, he was going to leave Rome. In fact, he did so (July 9, 1832) and along with Montalembert went to Munich and there rejoined Lacordaire.

The Roman Decision

But an important happening prompted the Pope to break the silence sooner than he had intended. Even before the examination of the *Avenir's* doctrine began at Rome, some French prelates, with Archbishop Astros of Toulouse at the head, had, with the concurrence of three priests of St. Sulpice, drawn up a list of the theological errors which they had found in the *Essay on Indifference* and in addition some blameworthy prop-

[13] Lacordaire wrote to Gerbet (June 25, 1832): "The resumption of the *Avenir* seems to me to be in opposition to the act that suspended it and to be destructive of the influence that Father Lamennais has acquired with Catholics." Two months later he wrote that the renewed publication of the *Avenir,* which appeared imminent, seemed to him both fatal and hopeless. "I stand aloof," he said, "so as not to be either a collaborator or a foe of a work that distresses me" (letter transmitted to us by Father Even, a Paris diocesan missioner).

[14] A *Libraire classique élémentaire,* in which Lamennais had sunk his funds, became insolvent. One of the creditors obtained a court decision ordering the imprudent investor's arrest for debt. A letter written by Lamennais from Venice (July 31, 1832) contains the information that at this date his financial affairs were not yet arranged and that he was waiting for an arrangement before returning to France.

ositions in the political and social theories of the *Avenir*.[15] This list was sent to Rome on July 15, 1832. The prelates requested the Pope to confirm their judgment to the extent and in the manner he would find suitable.[16] This intervention of the episcopate made the pontifical commission's decision urgent. That decision, already prepared for by long investigations, was soon issued. The consultors were unanimously of the opinion that the Pope could not longer remain silent. However, in condemning Lamennais' ideas, the Pope, they advised, should act prudently by not naming the father of these errors.[17] On August 9 they presented to the Holy Father a note worded in this sense and accompanied by a suggested apostolic letter in conformity with their conclusions. This was the sketch of the encyclical *Mirari vos* which Gregory XVI published a week later.[18]

The Encyclical *Mirari vos*

The papal document, accompanied with a letter of Cardinal Pacca, was sent to Lamennais on August 20, through the Munich nunciature. It reached him in the middle of a banquet

[15] A collection of letters concerning this affair, called "The Toulouse Censure," is to be found in the archives of the St. Sulpice Seminary. This correspondence was made use of by Father Dudon in his *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège.*

[16] Dudon, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[18] In his book, *Affaires de Rome,* Lamennais presents the encyclical as having been drawn up under the pressure of European diplomacy, in particular the urging of Prince Metternich. The assertion is not accurate. The following are the facts as established by the documents preserved in the diplomatic archives. Metternich did, in fact, send to Lützow, Austrian ambassador at Rome, a long note of complaint against the two men, Lamennais and Chateaubriand. He particularly accused Lamennais of confounding, in the *Avenir,* evangelical equality with social equality, of engaging in a revolutionary work under the pretext of a religious work. The Holy Father replied to Metternich that the *Avenir* did, in fact, have revolutionary tendencies and that he could distinguish in this affair what was religious from what was political. After the appearance of the encyclical *Mirari vos,* Metternich regretted that it did not contain an authentic consecration of the principles of legitimacy. Cf. Dudon, pp. 118, 120, 208.

that the leading scholars and literary men of the Bavarian capital were offering to the three representatives of the *Avenir*. The first movement of the illustrious writer was that of complete obedience. After acquainting himself with the encyclical, he merely whispered to his two collaborators: "I have just received a letter of the Pope against us; we must not hesitate to submit." Upon his return to France, he promptly (September 10) signed and published, conjointly with the editors of the *Avenir,* members of the council of the *Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse,* a declaration of submission. The *Avenir,* provisionally suspended, no longer appeared; the *Agence* was dissolved. These declarations were well received at Rome, and Cardinal Pacca felicitated Father Lamennais in the name of the Pope.

However, on both sides the new encyclical was the object of impassioned comment. The attention of the *Avenir's* friends, as also of its adversaries, turned especially to those passages where liberalism, in the various articles of its program—freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press—was sharply condemned. Even in our time, some historians seem to perceive nothing else in the encyclical. This view is to misunderstand the breadth of the famous pontifical document. It began by formulating discreetly and firmly all the main and just complaints which the editors of the *Avenir* impressed on public opinion. They had lamented the decline of the Catholic liturgy, they had attacked the blasphemies of rationalist impiety, the encroachments of human politics on the untouchable domain of the religious conscience, the relaxing of the bonds that ought to unite all members of the Church to the supreme pontificate of Rome. They had strongly protested against the corruption of the education given to youth by the professors of the University. They had disclosed the imprudence of those monarchs who, by shaking off the restraints of religion, were laying the ground for the fall of their own

thrones, and they had shown the danger of those secret societies which embraced all the elements of disorder to undermine the religious and social institutions.[19] The encyclical *Mirari vos* made itself the echo of all these demands. Said the Holy Father: "With our heart penetrated by a deep sadness, we come to you to speak about what we lament and weep over. The majesty of divine worship is turned into derision by perverse men. The laws of the Church, its rights, its institutions, these are not safe from the tongues of iniquity. They bitterly attack this Roman See. The bonds of unity are loosened. The authority of the Church is trampled on by human politics. Youth is corrupted by the instruction and examples of the teachers. When the yoke of divine religion is cast off, what do we see being prepared if not the fall of princes and the overthrow of all legal power? And these accumulated calamities have their source especially in the conspiracy of those societies whence flow what is most sacrilegious in heresies and schisms." The Pope next denounced in terms never more vigorously surpassed by the author of the *Essay on Indifference,* "that foul source of indifferentism from which come forth the evils that afflict the Church and contemporary society." And he pointed out in particular as traceable to that source, the overflowing "freedom of opinions which, against all good sense, sanctions the spread, sale, and consumption of all the poisons on the pretext that no remedy exists against them, and that unrestrained ardor of a brazen independence, which, in harmony with Luther, aspires only to congratulate itself with being free in all matters." The Pontiff ends his encyclical by recommending to princes that they exert all care to maintain intact religion and piety toward God.[20]

In its tenor such is this celebrated encyclical. Some critics

[19] *Avenir* of April 23, 1831, article of C. de Coux, *Des sociétés secrètes en Italie.* Cf. *Mélanges,* II, 30-40.

[20] Bernasconi, I, 169–74.

have affected to see in it the condemnation *in toto* of all modern society, but it contains only the condemnation of the revolutionary and lay state. We should recognize it as a simple and energetic, though necessary, reaction of good sense, instructed by the notion of society against the pretentions of any prince or people who would claim that the free conflict of ideas, true or false, is a good in itself,[21] that the right of revolt is a permanent right of peoples, or that an ignoring of the rights of God is permitted to kings.

Neither Lamennais nor the *Avenir* was named in the encyclical. This omission was for the purpose of not offending the great writer who, by self-correction, might still render important services to the Church.[22] A second reason was to show that the condemned doctrines were not so much those professed explicitly and verbatim by the school of the *Avenir* but rather those that might logically be deduced from the direction it was taking.[23]

Unfortunately the Holy Father's prudent reserve was not imitated by all. Archbishop Astros' intimation to the sixty-three bishops who signed the Toulouse censure: "Keep silence so as not to irritate the censured writers," was not observed by all the prelates. Some of them required of their *ordinandi* an oath to reprove the doctrines of Lamennais and to conform to the censures of the bishops.[24] Astros himself, having received from the Pope a letter which expressed the wish that his judg-

[21] G. Goyau, *La papauté et la civilisation.*

[22] Cardinal Gregorio, in transmitting (August 18, 1832) the encyclical *Mirari vos* to the nuncio at Paris, wrote to him: "The Holy Father, wishing to avoid the occasion of irritating a celebrated man who might do much good, has in his wisdom judged as fitting to give an indirect reply that would suffice to let him understand that his views are opposed to those which His Holiness recommends to all the bishops."

[23] Father Lacordaire always maintained that, for what concerned him, he had never intended to uphold, in the *Avenir*, the thesis of religious liberty taken in an absolute sense, which, he said, is manifestly absurd; but he acknowledged the blameworthy exaggerations of the paper. On this subject, see an interesting letter of Lacordaire to Count de Falloux, dated July 27, 1859, and published in the *Correspondant* of June 10, 1911, pp. 358–63.

[24] Dudon, p. 249.

ments be accepted in a sincere and absolute manner, wrote to Cardinal Gregorio: "I have no intention of going against the intentions of His Holiness by letting this brief be published in the papers." But the document did, in fact, appear (July 20, 1832) in the *Ami de la religion* and was warmly discussed in the press.

This publication may have been called for. It was fatal. Journalists saw in this brief, or feigned to see in it, an allusion to the person of Lamennais and called on him to submit or to explain himself. The Gallicans, forgetful of their old distrust toward the Holy See, now spoke only of obedience to the Pope. They distorted the meaning of the encyclical, representing it as inspired chiefly by the defense of the princes against those who attacked them; and the liberal press in turn considered the papal letter under this aspect. Lamennais had retired to the solitude of La Chênaie, purposing to live there unnoticed, in the company of a few faithful followers, removed from any controversy.

But echoes of the disputes that were stirred up in the press reached him there and exasperated him. On November 15, 1832, he wrote to Baron de Vitrolles: "Our friend Coriolis is quite right in telling you that I was not the least shaken in my opinions, that I did not give up any of them, and that, on the contrary, I held to them more than ever." The coolness of some friends, whom he hoped to find more devoted to his cause, the separation from Lacordaire, who, after an attempt to lead him to sentiments of complete submission, abruptly left La Chênaie (December 11, 1832), all these were acute griefs for him and embittered him still more as he revolved them in his mind. Thus the solitude where he went to seek peace exalted him. At times, when speaking of Rome, of the Roman congregations, or of the Pope, he used extremely harsh words.[25] At

[25] Boutard, *op. cit.*, p. 350. "I went to Rome. I saw there the most infamous sewer that ever offended the eye. The gigantic sewer of the Tarquins would be too narrow to provide passage for so great indecencies." Letter, November 1, 1832, to Countess de Senfft.

other times he sought refuge in prayer. He wrote (February 27, 1833): "Providence has not assigned to me the government of the Church. On this subject I have said what I thought useful; my task is finished, and my conscience is tranquil: all I have left to do is to pray." [26] But for Lamennais, prayer seems never, or rarely, to have been that dew which refreshes the soul, which he spoke of in his *Paroles d'un croyant;* he said rather that he sought in prayer something he did not find in reality.[27] Feeling himself abandoned by men and by God, or imagining that he was, this man who was not only a firebrand, but also—this was the second trait of that strange nature—a man impatient of any yoke or domination, and for whatever he took to be a yoke and a domination, was prepared for the final fall. A letter from Cardinal Pacca in the Pope's name precipitated the catastrophe.

Up to that time Lamennais' obedience consisted in ceasing from any campaign, in keeping quiet. His enemies loudly remarked this; and perhaps the indiscretions of certain friends gave occasion for thinking that the editor-in-chief of the *Avenir* had not abjured any of his ideas. Cardinal Pacca wrote to him that his submission to the encyclical *Mirari vos* was considered insufficient and that he needed to supplement it by a simple, absolute, declaration without reservations. Without delay Lamennais signed a declaration by which he agreed to "follow solely and absolutely the doctrine set forth in the encyclical." [28] But a letter to Montalembert, enclosing the text of this declaration, contained the following words, which appalled Montalembert: "I renounce without exception all that filled my previous life." To an urgent request from his young friend, he answered that, in acting as he had done, "he regarded in this sad affair only a question of peace at any price and that he was

[26] Letter in the archives of St. Sulpice Seminary.

[27] "Some torrid winds pass over a man's soul and dry it up. Prayer is the dew that refreshes it." *Paroles d'un croyant,* chap. 17. Cf. H. Bremond, *L'inquiétude religieuse,* 2nd ser., *Le silence de Dieu.*

[28] Lamennais, *Affaires de Rome,* p. 162.

resolved to sign, not only what they required of him, but anything else they might ask of him, even were it a declaration that the pope is God, the great God of heaven and earth, who alone ought to be adored."

The letter containing these lines was dated January 1, 1834. When Lamennais wrote it, he had ceased celebrating Mass and never after that performed any priestly function.[29] Four months later, toward the end of April, appeared under his signature a strange book, which he entitled *Paroles d'un croyant* ("Words of a believer") at the very time when the faith was almost dead in his soul. It was a series of meditations, dialogues, prayers, and visions which, in the solitude of La Chênaie, since the appearance of the encyclical, he had written under the influence of various promptings. This book, beginning with an invocation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, treated kings in general as having their foot on the crucifix and drinking human blood from a skull.[30] In particular it represented William IV of England, in his death throes, pale as a shroud, Louis Philippe as a perjurer and tyrant, clinging to bags of gold, Francis II of Austria as condemning to every sort of physical and spiritual torture persons unfortunately suspected of having uttered the word "fatherland," Czar Nicholas as bearing in his heart, in place of God, whom he had driven out, a worm ceaselessly gnawing, and even Pope Gregory XVI, who was abused in unmeasured terms. The pages of this work were more virulent than any

[29] As we read in Caussette, *Manrèze du prêtre,* Lamennais had for some time, on the pretext of his labors, ceased to recite the Breviary, and this neglect of the liturgical prayer may have determined his defection. The following are the facts that gave occasion to this report. Its source was a letter written by Félicité Lamennais to his brother Jean, August 25, 1819 (Blaize, *Œuvres inédites de F. Lamennais,* I, 390). With this letter Lamartine, without Lamennais' knowledge, had obtained for him from Rome, a dispensation from the Breviary, on the ground of the poor condition of his eyes. But Lamennais refused to make use of this dispensation, alleging that his vision was good. On this subject, see Roussel, *Lamennais d'après des documents inédits,* I, 177–80.

[30] Lamennais, *Paroles d'un croyant,* chap. 12.

political pamphlet he had ever published.[31] However, the book contained clear, penetrating passages that revealed a soul truly moved.[32] But many chapters are nothing but a varied and complex echo, often disconcerting in its contradictions, of a soul perpetually shifting, ever ready to change at the different contacts with men and things, even when he held that he was obeying only the strictest logic and when he boasted of the grimest independence, always the slave to his impressions of the moment.[33]

From the time of the publication of the *Paroles d'un croyant,* which was soon condemned (June 25, 1834) by the bull *Singulari vos,* the name of Lamennais does not further belong to the history of Europe. Abandoning both Catholic discipline and Catholic dogma, he adhered to socialism, which was then starting to be organized as a political party and which considered him one of its leaders. Thus he who, during the first part of his life, had, along with Rohrbacher and Guéranger, given the early impulse to the most advanced ultramontane party, he who later, along with Montalembert and Lacordaire, had given the liberal Catholic party its motto and its direction, finally devoted himself to revolutionary democracy, lending the support of his talent and the help of his activity to the three great currents of ideas that most stirred the nineteenth century.[34]

[31] *Ibid.,* chap. 31. The kings are not mentioned by name, but they are readily identified. With regard to Gregory XVI, in the first edition Lamennais replaced by dots the page concerning him. Later he allowed the primitive text to be printed without omissions.

[32] Many of these expressions will be found *ibid.,* chaps. 15–40.

[33] Thus one of the impressions that most contributed to vex Lamennais against Rome and to precipitate his fall was his almost morbid fear of the snares which he dreaded on the part of the Roman curia and the Jesuits. Unfortunately some young and imprudent correspondents nourished this fear in him. One of them, Father Emmanuel d'Alzon, wrote to him from Rome: "M. C. (MacCarthy) has informed me of some people's plan to make you come to Rome. I can assure you that the scheme was a snare, and I have good reason to believe that the ones who intended to spread the net live at the Gesù." Boutard, *Lamennais,* II, 40. Cf. I, 366; II, 367; III, 67.

[34] A confusion of dates has led some to suppose, among the causes of the defection of Félicité Lamennais, his break with his brother Jean. The following are the

Disciples of Lamennais

We cannot easily be precise about the part due to Félicité de Lamennais in the religious movement that took place in the nineteenth century. Like Chateaubriand at the beginning of the century, so Lamennais, before becoming a leader, was an echo. In his *Essay on Indifference,* he made himself the eloquent interpreter of the feeling that Silvestre de Sacy expressively described when he said: "The unbelief of the eighteenth century had the pleasure of unbelief; we are now having the

---

facts. After the publication of the *Paroles d'un croyant,* Bishop Lesquen of Rennes asked from Father Jean Lamennais a letter by which he would explicitly disapprove this latest work of his brother. The prelate promised that this letter would not leave his hand and that it would serve merely to confound those who might denounce the venerable priest. The letter was written on May 10, 1834. Hardly had it reached the Bishop's office, when it was made public. On May 24, 1834, the *Ami de la religion* quoted it from the *Gazette de Bretagne.* Félicité's irritation was extreme. From that moment he no longer showed his brother the same confidence as formerly. In 1837 he completely ceased seeing him. The only effective influence that could still be exercised on Father Félicité, after the death of Teysseyrre, thus disappeared, at the very time when the unfortunate writer had started on the road of open revolt. On that road he proceeded farther and farther. The publication of the *Affaires de Rome* in 1836, the *Livre du peuple* in 1837, *Le pays et le gouvernement* (pamphlet), for which he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment at Sainte-Pélagie in 1840, and in the same year *L'esquisse d'une philosophie,* were progressive steps toward a vague pantheism. In 1848 he was elected a deputy to the national Assembly by the department of the Seine. There he had no success and appeared ill at ease. One day Berryer was attacking apostasy. He said: "I then saw a man rise abruptly and slide the length of the benches to go out. The man was Lamennais. My heart was pained, for in speaking I had not been thinking of him" (Lecanuet, *Berryer,* p. 81). Lamennais passed his last years in discouragement. Wrote Benoit-Champy: "From the time when he broke the bonds attaching him to Catholicism, I always knew him as a sad man" (*Quelques souvenirs sur la mort de M. de Lamennais*). On July 11, 1848, he wrote: "What we see is not the Republic; it is not even something that has a name." On February 27, 1854, he died, surrounded by a few friends (Henri Martin, Hippolyte Carnot, Armand Lévy, and a few less well known), of a disease that his relative and friend Benoit-Champy was not able to determine. The day before, he had the following conversation with his niece, Madame de Kertanguy: "Féli," she said, "do you wish a priest? You wish a priest, do you not?" "No, no, no. Leave me in peace." Then for about eight hours he was unable to talk although his mind seemed to be clear. In the midst of a confused babbling, the single word "paper" could be distinguished. Then tired at being unable to make himself understood, he turned toward the wall, and the death agony began. At the moment of his death, according to a report published by Eugene Pelletan in the *Siècle* of March 4, 1854, "a long tear

suffering of it; we feel its emptiness. . . . We raise our eyes on high, seeking a light there." [35] This light Father Lamennais showed in the Catholic tradition, in the Church, in the pope; and in his campaign he awakened public opinion. He also gathered about him, drawn into the arena, a choice group of priests and laymen who, after his defection, would continue the work brilliantly and successfully.

For the author of the *Paroles d'un croyant* was not followed by his disciples in his defection. By separating himself from the Church, this priest, who had as great prestige as the most celebrated of the ancient apostates, did not create a schism, as Photius did, nor a heresy, as Luther did. On the contrary his disciples, on the morrow of his fall, found themselves at the head of most of the religious enterprises. In 1835 Lacordaire began his Notre Dame conferences and Montalembert on the floor of the Parliament voiced the Catholic claims. The restoration of the Benedictine Order (1836) by Dom Guéranger and the re-establishment of the Friars Preachers three years later were the work of two of his collaborators.[36]

St. Vincent de Paul Conferences enlisted several former members of Lamennais' school. The great history of the Church that Rohrbacher would publish had been undertaken with the encouragement of Lamennais. In the work of defending the papacy and in the strife against Gallicanism, the *Uni-*

---

flowed silently down the cheek of the dying man. But it dried at once, devoured by the burning fire of grief." The next Sunday Father Gratry, preaching in the Oratory, said: "Should we despair of the salvation of this poor soul? No. That this great example might serve for our instruction, God has permitted that the end appear without any hope. But his soul had contributed to raise up the religious feeling in our country. May we not think that it had a return hidden from our eyes and that it obtained mercy?"

[35] Silvestre de Sacy, *Variétés littéraires,* Vol. II. *De la reaction religieuse.*

[36] One of his young disciples, Father Emmanuel d'Alzon, who, even after the appearance of the *Paroles d'un croyant,* sent him from Rome the expression of an earnest fidelity (Boutard, III, 67; cf. *ibid.,* II, 367, 400), would also later on found a religious congregation, that of the Augustinians of the Assumption.

vers, with its militant editorship, would continue, without any ambiguity,[37] the traditions of the *Avenir.*

In the Catholic renaissance from 1833 to 1841, some events are noteworthy. We should mention particularly the preaching of Lacordaire in the pulpit of Notre Dame, the speeches of Montalembert on the floor of Parliament, the re-establishment in France of the Order of St. Dominic and that of St. Benedict, the liturgical revival undertaken by Dom Guéranger, and the works of charity started by Frederick Ozanam and some of his friends.[38]

The religious revival that, beginning in 1830, took place in the souls of the young men consisted rather of vague sentiments than of deliberate convictions. This trait did not escape the discernment of a group of Catholic students who were concerned with the apostolate. In January, 1834, they asked Archbishop Quélen of Paris to have some conferences given in the church of Notre Dame where the new generation would be able to hear the truths of the faith set forth in a language conformable to its state of mind. An attempt was made that year according to a plan conceived by the Archbishop; but it did not attain the desired result. However, the next year Archbishop Quélen, yielding to the urging of these young people who had taken the

[37] "The *Avenir* rose to its notable height and rendered great services. By its strife against Gallicanism it effectively served the religious cause in the domain of doctrine; it served it also in the domain of politics by ceaselessly establishing that Catholics ought not to tie the religious interests to any form of government, even to legitimate royalty. An elite rose up. The encyclical *Mirari vos* killed the *Avenir.* But although the paper disappeared, still existing were the ideas and needs, sources of the movement. The field must not be left free to the Gallican and narrowly royalist press. On November 3, 1833, the first number of the *Univers* appeared" (E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* I, 351–56, 362–65). Among the first editors of the *Univers,* some were formerly disciples of Lamennais. Later on, at the time of the Vatican Council, the editor of the *Univers,* Louis Veuillot, recalled that no one strove harder to forward France toward the saving dogma of papal infallibility. Louis Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile,* Vol. II.

[38] Under the general title of *Ecole menaisienne,* Bishop Ricard published: *Lamennais* (1881), *Lacordaire* (1882), *Gerbet et Salinis* (1883), *Montalembert* (1884), *Rohrbacher* (1885).

first steps, decided to turn over the pulpit of his old basilica to a young priest who had made his first trial at arms in the *Avenir,* Father Lacordaire. Bruised by his break with him who had been his master, almost disheartened by the failure of a work to which he had devoted himself with his whole soul, Lacordaire spent three years in a life of prayer and labor, hardly interrupted by some instructions given in a college.[39]

This young priest at once obtained a prodigious success. He had called himself "a son of his age," and declared that "all his previous life, even including his faults, had prepared in him some understanding of his country and of his time." Soon 6,000 men filled the naves of the old cathedral. Mostly they were young people, representing the intellectual life of that period and all the hopes of the future. If you were to glance over them while they were waiting, you would see that this gathering was not made up of people accustomed to frequent church. It was indeed the new society of the nineteenth century, such as it came forth from the revolution of 1830, in a way dechristianized, that was forming around a Christian pulpit an audience such as perhaps had not been seen since St. Bernard.[40]

The young Father Lacordaire introduced a new form of apologetics. Its orthodoxy and timeliness were later approved by the Vatican Council. First he put his hearers face to face with the fact of the Catholic Church, that is, of Christianity under the living and, so to speak, the palpable form which it had before their eyes. He spoke to them of the necessity of the Church, its constitution, its moral and infallible authority, its head, its relations with the temporal order, and its coercive power. The next year he led his listeners over the threshold of

[39] After separating from Lamennais, Lacordaire gladly withdrew into solitude. He wrote: "I have a feeling of joy in the solitude about me. It is my element, my life" (letter to Montalembert, September 8, 1833). In another letter to Montalembert (June 30, 1833) he wrote: "Every man has his proper hour. He simply must wait for it and do nothing contrary to Providence."

[40] Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet,* p. 10.

dogma: the doctrine of the Church in general, tradition, Scripture, reason, faith, and the means of acquiring the faith. The continually increasing throng of his hearers, following his theme more and more attentively, gathered about the Catholic orator. They were eager to hear the word which, by its new accent and its modern terms, gave them the sort of pleasure that a traveler in a distant country feels upon suddenly hearing the tongue of his native land. Bishop de Quélen himself, but little prepared by temperament and training to enjoy the flavor of things modern, was quite won by this eloquence and called Lacordaire a new prophet.

Some men were astonished at these daring presentations. This preacher of Christian doctrine was regarded by them with some suspicion, a preacher who scarcely mentioned the name of Christ, "that wild republican," as they called him, "who preached doctrines taken from anarchy." In reality this preacher, whose words were sometimes venturesome, was a humble and austere apostle. Later on people learned that, upon coming down from the pulpit and still trembling with the triumphs that he won from his enthusiastic listeners, he went off to scourge his body with instruments of penance, to humble his soul with avowals of the faults of his past life. When at the very height of his fame, he interrupted his conferences and went to Rome, there to seek peace and solitude before returning in the habit of a mendicant friar. Meanwhile his work had borne fruit. His sermons, which had been blamed as having a tone too much of this world, disposed his listeners to kneel down in the tribunal of penance and come to the Holy Table, when the evangelical word of Father de Ravignan persuasively invited them to come there.[41]

[41] On Lacordaire, see Chocarne, *Le P. Lacordaire, sa vie intime;* Foisset, *Vie du P. Lacordaire;* H. D. Noble, *Lacordaire apôtre et directeur des jeunes gens;* J. D. Folghèra, *L'apologétique de Lacordaire.* On Father de Ravignan, see Ponlevoy, *Vie du P. de Ravignan.*

CHAPTER XX

Montalembert

UNDER the vault of Notre Dame a son of that skeptical and pleasure-loving bourgeoisie which the July monarchy had just raised to the preponderant political influence, was conducting his generation toward the eternal truths of Christianity. At the same time another editor of the *Avenir,* a descendant of the nobility, a peer of France, a "son of the crusaders," was declaring from the French rostrum the proud claims of Catholicism, almost everywhere oppressed and despised. When (September 8, 1835) the young Count Charles de Montalembert, then twenty-five years old, spoke for the first time before the House of Peers and there, simply and firmly, without bragging or fear, affirmed his religious faith, the first feeling of the high assembly was a sort of stupefaction. Someone rightly remarked that "the entrance into the Luxembourg court of a knight wearing the armor of the Middle Ages and a cross on his breast, would not have appeared stranger." [1] The new knight, with modest and dignified graciousness, excused himself for uttering in the High Chamber a language alien to the ideas that were usually expressed there. He asked that he be allowed to follow the frankness of his age. From 1835 to 1841 he took part in the discussions on the press, Polish nationalism, emancipation of slaves in the colonies, ecclesiastical property, insane asylums, traffic regulations, various questions of foreign policy, the work of children in factories, and the freedom of education.[2]

Whatever might be the subject of discussion, he kept in mind

[1] Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état,* p. 49.
[2] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* I, 1–266.

the defense of Catholicism, which he championed with an alert, lively, and remarkably supple eloquence. Therein feeling often gave way to irony, and lofty enthusiasm gave way to scathing retort. Not hiding a whit of his Catholic faith or of his obedience to the latest condemnations by Rome, he declared in his first discourse: "I frankly avow that liberty of conscience is not one of my principles; I have no idolatry for it; I profess and acknowledge the most ancient, lofty, and holy principles. . . . If absolute truths are to be found in politics, I hope the same may be found in religion." [3]

The Order of St. Dominic

Montalembert was one of the first to whom Lacordaire announced his project of re-establishing the Order of St. Dominic in France. To him Lacordaire wrote (July 1, 1838): "I may say that this act is the unfolding of my life. God calls me to put on a new power. . . . Let us be humble, belonging solely to God, without party spirit, ready to live or to die." The next year appeared the *Mémoire pour le rétablissement des Frères Précheurs*. The undertaking was crowned with full success. The best recruits of the new foundation came to him from those youths brought back to the faith by his Notre Dame conferences. During the early weeks of 1841, Father Lacordaire, returning from Rome, wearing his new costume, crossed through an astonished and friendly France. When he reached Paris, he pointed to his white habit and said: "I am a liberty." He had won before public opinion, and consequently before the government, not only the cause of the Friars Preachers, but that of the religious orders in general. The Jesuits were among the first to profit by this changed condition.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 39.

Abbot Guéranger

A few years earlier, with not so much publicity, a less celebrated disciple of Lamennais had re-established in the former priory of Solesmes an equally illustrious order, which was destined to render to the Church of France no less conspicuous services: the Order of St. Benedict. That man, Prosper Guéranger, in his early youth had dreamed of the monastic life. That life appealed to him as a center of prayer, a power of influence for the Church, at the same time as a life of studious leisure. This persevering concern explains the interest he brought to the Society founded by Father Lamennais under the name of the Congregation of St. Peter.

After this work was thwarted, Guéranger turned finally to the Benedictine life. On December 14, 1832, he rented the former priory of Solesmes in the diocese of Le Mans, and there installed himself a year later with three companions; of these, two were priests, and one was a deacon.[4] Then followed for them the trials of poverty, uncertainty of the morrow, and ill-disposed attacks by those who were ready to see in the little band a resumption of the Lamennais school. But the four zealous pioneers, wishing to carry on the glorious traditions of Cluny and St. Maur, began their labors. A translation of the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori, which was soon interrupted, a new edition of the *Liber pontificalis* of the Church of Le Mans, a *Life of St. Julian,* and the *Annales ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise du Mans,* were their first undertakings. Lacordaire and Montalembert offered warm encouragement to their friend.[5] The continuation of the *Gallia christiana,* entrusted to the young community, seemed to it a precious promise of vitality. The solemn approbation of its rules, the erection of the Solesmes priory

[4] *Dom Guéranger,* I, 78, 105, 107.
[5] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* II, 38.

into an abbey, and the conferring of the abbatial office on Dom Guéranger (July 14, 1837) assured it a canonical existence.[6]

Four years later, on the feast of St. Dominic, the restorer of Benedictine life in France, now confident of the future, turning his regard toward the restorer of the Dominican life, wrote to him: "This morning I sang the Mass with the intention of gathering more solemnly the good wishes of my brethren for you, our very dear friend, and for your entire family." [7] He now set out to devote himself without reserve to the three missions which he proposed to himself through restoring the Order of St. Benedict in France: the development of the religious sciences, the exaltation of the papal power, and the restoration of the liturgy. Of these works, the first two would come to fruition with the cooperation of other efforts. But the liturgical restoration, such as it was effected in the nineteenth century, was owing particularly to Guéranger's initiative and remained the characteristic of his labors. History must pay him a special tribute.

The essential ideas that would develop and sustain the author of the *Institutions liturgiques* and the *Monarchie pontificale* are to be found in four articles that he published in 1830 in the *Mémorial catholique*.[8] While, in his journal, Lamennais was fighting Gallicanism in the field of theoretical doctrine, his young collaborator undertook to dislodge it from the positions it wrongly held in the domain of the practical. The Gallican heresy, as he said, appeared to be implanted in France under the form of rites that systematically separated from the Roman tradition. "Thirty years after St. Pius V's famous constitution *Quod a nobis,* out of the 130 dioceses which France then contained, not even six had failed to adopt the ensemble of the Roman liturgy; and now in 1830 hardly a dozen dioceses re-

[6] *Dom Guéranger*. II, 128.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 289.
[8] *Mémorial catholique,* February 28, March 30, May 31, and July 31, 1830.

mained faithful to that fine uniformity. The Church of France had, then, on this point abandoned the Roman Church. It had, according to the expression of the saintly Pope, torn to shreds the communion of prayers and praises which should be addressed to the one God with one and the same voice." [9] The Gallican heresy had become the antiliturgical heresy.

Said the author: "I know that I am going to wound many prejudiced men. But we are always strong when we are right. I challenge every man of good sense, every theologian, to refute my principles, and every logician to reject my conclusions." [10] He first sketched the development of the liturgical life, "coming forth from the catacombs with the Church, spreading with it in the temples built by Constantine, creating a language worthy of it, finding an expression in the confessions of its faith, the sighs of its hope and the ardor of its love, the needs of its children and the groans of its sinners." He then placed beside her majestic beauty the ungraceful diversity of these new liturgies, some of which boasted of a century of possession, and others could not justify themselves by an existence of fifty or thirty or ten years, perhaps hardly one year. This general shortcoming, at which the earnest polemist leveled his sarcasms, was especially evident in the Parisian liturgy. He said: "We are not ignorant of the spirit that give it birth; we are also aware of the one who presided over its latest changes." This was Charles Coffin, openly claimed by Jansenism, rejected by the Church; in a word, a heretic. In order to provide a new chant for the new words, recourse was had to that Father Le Boeuf, who, "after spending ten years in putting notes over the lines and lines under the notes, presented to the Paris clergy a monstrous composition." [11]

[9] *Dom Guéranger,* I, 59.
[10] *Mémorial catholique,* February 28, 1830, p. 49.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 57.

The depth and form of these articles were sure to please Father Lamennais. On April 15, 1830, he wrote to the author: "Everyone that I have seen is greatly pleased with your two articles. You would, I believe, perform a genuinely good service by continuing them." But some persons of moderate views were shocked by the exaggerations which they thought to find there. Said Michel Picot in the *Ami de la religion* of June 2: "Why represent the diocesan liturgies as tendencies to schism, as the fruits of a sectarian spirit? Such a view shows prejudice and is exaggerated. The author indulges in a magnificent eulogy of the Roman liturgy. If he confined himself to saying that the Roman liturgy is the most venerable by the authority from which it emanates and by its antiquity, we would be in entire agreement with him. But he supposes that this liturgy has never varied, that all the Churches followed it for several centuries. These suppositions are not verified by history. From the very birth of the Church diversity existed in the rites and in the prayers. The practices at Rome differed from those at Jerusalem. The Churches of Gaul had their particular rites and, in Italy itself, the Church of Milan had its distinct liturgy. St. Gregory the Great advised St. Augustine of Canterbury to take from the Churches of Gaul what he would judge suitable for the English." [12]

Fundamentally, in spite of his excesses of language, Father Guéranger was right. The diocesan liturgies, particularly the Paris liturgy, had, to some extent, felt the influence of Gallicanism and of Jansenism. The hymns of men like Santeul and Coffin, the music of Le Beuf, notwithstanding the science and technical ability which they showed, could not stand comparison with the simple and appealing hymns which Rome and Christian antiquity bequeathed us. Every Catholic must unreservedly applaud the words of Father Guéranger when he

[12] *Ami de la religion,* LXIV. 97.

said: "I have heard some persons remark that we find the most beautiful arguments of religion in its liturgy." [13]

In 1840 appeared the first volume of the *Institutions liturgiques,* the fruit of twelve years of study.[14] This work enkindled the zeal of Guéranger's friends and the polemics of his opponents. This publication opened a series of five volumes, intended to introduce young clerics to the mysteries of the divine worship and prayer. The impression produced was not uniform. Madame Swetchine wrote: "While reading your book I breathed an air of truth, pure and unmixed." [15] But Father Lacordaire rejected the idea of an "antiliturgical heresy," which according to him never existed.

The *Année liturgique*—the first volume appeared at the close of 1841—was a complement to the preceding works of Dom Guéranger. The purpose of this new publication was to make accessible to all the faithful the teachings which the Church gives us when, in the course of the twelve months of the Christian year, she recalls and, in a way, reproduces the different mysteries of our redemption by Jesus Christ. Each of the liturgical periods of the Christian year must be explained: 1. in the historical light of its origin; 2. by the mystical interpretation of its rites; 3. by an indication of the outward practices and of the internal dispositions which it should stir in the soul of a Christian. This work was one of peace and edification. But at the very time when pious souls were relishing the new work of the abbot of Solesmes, fresh controversies arose following a case of conscience, publicly proposed by Archbishop Gousset of Reims, on bishops' rights and duties in regard to the liturgy. Dom Guéranger's publication of his letter to the Archbishop of Reims on the right of the liturgy was the first act of this dispute. We shall return to this question presently.

[13] *Mémorial catholique,* July 31, 1830, p. 246.
[14] *Institutions liturgiques,* 2nd ed., I, 85.
[15] Falloux, *Lettres inédites de Mme Swetchine,* p. 413.

The St. Vincent de Paul Society

Frederick Ozanam, the founder of the St. Vincent de Paul conferences, was not, like Prosper Guéranger, a disciple of Lamennais. He met Lamennais only once (December, 1831); that single meeting seems not to have awakened any great sympathies between the celebrated writer and the young student.[16] But Ozanam, from the time of his early youth, thought of a religious apologetics capable of winning the mind and heart of his contemporaries. With his entire generous nature he eagerly followed the campaign of the *Avenir* and became attached to two of its chief editors. One of these was Father Gerbet, the learned philosopher and deep theologian whose *Considérations sur le dogme générateur de la piété catholique* entranced him.[17]

The other was Father Lacordaire, whose warm eloquence and apostolic zeal thoroughly corresponded to Ozanam's own feelings. Guéranger had been especially attracted to the group of the *Avenir* by his ultramontane tendencies; but Ozanam was attracted to that same group by his desire of drawing the contemporary society to Christ and by his interest in the popular classes.[18]

[16] Baunard, *Fréderic Ozanam d'après sa correspondance,* p. 49.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 72.

[18] Lacordaire, like Ozanam, never felt deeply attached to Lamennais. They did not have the same attitude to ultramontanism. Moreover, in his plans for social regeneration, Lacordaire had in mind especially an interior and supernatural influence on souls; Lamennais, regarding Christianity as a work of politics and social transformation rather than as a work of individual sanctification, seemed to look to a reform of society. This idea was evident in the strange preamble to the Rules of the Congregation of St. Peter, drawn up by Félicité de Lamennais. This preamble may be seen in an article by Father Dudon in *Etudes* for November 20, 1910, pp. 452 ff. Cf. Lamennais, *Réflexions sur l'église de France,* p. 93. Lamennais' correspondence, compared with that of Lacordaire, shows clearly the difference we have pointed out. In an effort to formulate Lamennais' dominant tendency and to set forth what led to his fall, opinions are divided. Spuller and others have considered him an eternal democratic. Thureau-Dangin and some others have called him a perpetual theocrat. Rohrbacher, from his first relations with the master, thinks to see in him a vague pantheism, which gradually became more explicit. If we may be permitted a neologism, we would say that Lamennais was essentially not a pantheist but a demo-

Frederick Ozanam, born in 1813 of a Christian family, was trained in philosophical and religious studies by an exceptional teacher. This master was Father Noirot, whom Victor Cousin called the leading professor of France. As early as the age of seventeen, Ozanam thought of a great work, which he entitled *Démonstration de la verité de la religion catholique par l'antiquité des croyances historiques, religieuses et morales.* In 1831 he published his *Réflexions sur la doctrine de Saint-Simon.* As he himself said later on, in this work he sowed the seed of the idea that would engage his whole life. This dominant idea of his life was an apologetic of Catholicism intended for his contemporaries. This thought he pursued in his historical works and in his works of charity.

Of these latter works the principal one, and the only one which we purpose speaking of here, was the St. Vincent de Paul Society. In founding it, Ozanam had several aims: first, to strengthen the bonds of friendship between the young Catholics; he said that the strongest principle of true friendship is charity, and charity finds its nourishment in good works; secondly, to drawn down God's blessing on his apostolic labors, for, he said, an apostolate is not complete if it lacks works of benevolence, and the blessing of the poor is that of God; lastly, to supplement the apologetics of the Church in past times by showing its present works. He wrote: "Our enemies say to us: In former ages Christianity produced prodigies of charity, but it is dead. Let us prove that it is living by showing its good works." [19]

---

theist. When as a fervent Catholic he regarded truth as consisting of a sort of universal suffrage of minds, he was already placing infallibility in the people; later he put justice and right in the same depositary. At first he believed that the organ of the people was the king, then the pope, then finally he admitted that the infallibility of the people was a sort of incommunicable privilege. This last stage of his thought was expressed by him in 1848 in a work entitled *De la société première et de ses lois, ou de la religion.*

[19] Ozanam formulated this twofold aspect of his work in two phrases, which have sometimes been criticized but which he successfully defended as having an orthodox

In May, 1833, six students, answering Ozanam's appeal, joined him at 18 rue du Petit-Bourbon-Saint-Sulpice, in the office of the *Tribune catholique*. The meeting was presided over by the director of the paper, Emmanuel Bailly. One of the seven founders has written an account of that memorable session.[20] It opened with the recitation of the *Veni sancte Spiritus,* the *Ave Maria,* and an invocation of St. Vincent de Paul. Then they studied the practical means of visiting the poor in their homes. They decided to obtain addresses of needy families from Sister Rosalie, the apostle of the Mouffetard quarter, and they requested her to turn over to the Society a certain amount of the goods that she had for distribution to the poor. The meeting closed with a collection among the members and with prayer. By the end of the school year the Society counted fourteen members. It grew steadily.[21] The members who returned home after finishing their studies founded new conferences. Before long the Society spread beyond France.[22]

The visiting of the poor in their homes remained the essential purpose of the conferences. But special works were soon added: clothing depots, where used clothes were received and were then given to the needy; libraries intended to meet the growing need for reading matter; Holy Families, or associations formed among Christian working people for mutual edification and religious instruction; patronages of workers and apprentices;

meaning: "Let us pass to the barbarians," and "Let us go to the poor." By "the barbarians" he meant the unbelievers of the nineteenth century. When he said "let us pass to the barbarians," he did not advocate joining Mazzini, but the people whom Mazzini deceived. "We will probably," he said, "not convert Attila and Genseric, but perhaps we will succeed with the Huns and the Vandals." His expression, "Let us go to the poor," did not contain any implication of dubious democritism. Said Ozanam: "We must do what is most agreeable to God. Hence we must do what our Lord did in preaching the gospel. Let us go to the poor."

[20] *Origines de la Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul.*

[21] In 1835 Paris had four conferences. The name "conference" was adopted in accord with the traditions of the *Société des Bonnes Etudes,* to which the first members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society belonged.

[22] In 1953 the United States alone had 2,810 conferences. (Tr.)

and other undertakings suggested by the needs of places and circumstances.[23] The Congregation of Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, founded by one of Ozanam's first companions, Léon de Prévost, with the idea of engaging in undertakings for workingmen, was likewise an offshoot of the society founded by Ozanam.[24]

This program of works of charity was indeed vast. But that wide scope did not limit the zeal of the founder of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. He published articles of apologetics in the *Tribune catholique,* directed by Bailly, and in the *Univers,* recently founded by Father Migne. The foundation and success of the Notre Dame conferences were partly owing to his help. He collaborated in the formation of a Catholic society of fine arts, and he gave glory to the Church in scholarly historical studies. As a student at the Sorbonne he had obliged Theodore Jouffroy to retract certain attacks directed against Christian revelation; as a professor he succeeded in interesting large numbers of listeners in the glories of Christianity. In one of the campaigns conducted by the Catholics of the time in behalf of freedom of education, he was unable to take an active part. But his attitude was worthy and courageous. As Lacordaire wrote: "In the conflict that arose between the Church and the University, Ozanam was placed in a most painful situation. Earnest Catholic though he was, still he could not ignore the fact that he

[23] From the outset an understanding was established that the St. Vincent de Paul conferences would be open to Catholics of all parties. Ozanam wrote in 1835: "I should like the disappearance of any political spirit to the advantage of the social spirit." He did not intend to introduce a special system of social organization. But his writings reveal philosophical views on property, which he regarded as a social function (*Mélanges,* II, 339), on wages, analyzing the normal conditions apart from which the worker's labor becomes an exploitation of man by man (*ibid., Notes d'un cours de droit commercial*), on association, which attaches the workers to their labor as to something belonging to them and leading them to habits of morality (*ibid.*), on democracy, which he declares the natural term of progress (letter of March 11, 1849).

[24] *Vie de M. Le Prévost.*

belonged to the body that was the legal depositary of the University monopoly. But he remained fully united with those who were defending the cause of freedom of education." [25]

[25] On Frederick Ozanam, see Mgr. Ozanam, *Vie de Frédéric Ozanam;* Baunard, *Frédéric Ozanam;* Curnier, *La jeunesse de Frédéric Ozanam.*

CHAPTER XXI

Catholic Schools

WE MUST now turn to the campaign for the freedom of education. Of all the Catholic campaigns of the nineteenth century, none was more glorious and none was more fruitful in useful lessons than the one which, after twenty years of strife, resulted in the abolition of the monopoly of the University. It deserves to be recounted in some detail.

In this campaign Lamennais played a major part. To him belongs the merit of being the first who, with incomparable brilliance, raised the question of freedom of education. The articles which, at the time when he was in the fervor of his Catholic and royalist convictions, he published in the *Conservateur* and the *Drapeau blanc* were, in thought and style, the most powerful that had appeared in the French language.[1] The *Avenir,* in its early numbers, gave his views a widespread influence on public opinion. In October, 1830, appeared three eloquent articles by Lacordaire, in which he demanded that the hated University monopoly be abolished in the name of liberty and progress. He said: "The servitude of teaching is incompatible with any liberty; for liberty is obtained by teaching. . . . Mankind wishes progress, the aim of all liberty. But is progress possible with the monopoly?" [2]

The editors of the *Avenir* did more than repeat these demands. Manifestos, polemics, every avenue was used by them to stir public opinion on the question of the freedom of education. They even had recourse to a proceeding novel in French practice. The Charter of 1830 in article 69 promised the pro-

[1] E. Spuller, *Lamennais,* p. 122.
[2] *Mélanges catholiques,* I, 238.

mulgation as promptly as possible of a law on the freedom of education, and article 70 declared all contrary laws and dispositions at once abrogated. Basing their contention on these articles of the Charter, Father Lacordaire, Count Charles de Montalembert, and Count de Coux opened at Paris (May 9, 1831) a free school without authorization. Two days later the police commissioner of the district ordered the children to withdraw. As these orders remained unobserved, the teachers and the children were excluded by the public force, and the three professors were arraigned in police court.

These teachers wished for nothing better than an occasion, in a widely publicized trial, to plead the cause of the fathers of families. They succeeded beyond their hopes. Count Montalembert, a peer, had just died. His son, Viscount Charles, succeeding to his rights, was, by his new dignity, subject to trial only before the peers. In consequence of the indivisibility of the offense and of the trial, he brought with him his fellow accused before that high jurisdiction.

After the pleadings of the lawyers, the young Count Montalembert, scarcely twenty years old, stepped forward to the bar of the House. His youth, his signs of mourning, and his personal position won the deep attention of his hearers. Thus he began: "Peers of France, the task of our defenders is accomplished; ours now begins. They took their stand on the ground of legality; for us, the accused, the duty now is to speak the language of our heart and our faith: the Catholic language." Perhaps the noble court never had heard a more courageous and touching profession of faith. In conclusion the young orator said: "I shall always felicitate myself on having been able in my youth to bear testimony to the God of my childhood. To Him I commend the success of my cause, of my holy and glorious cause. I call it glorious for it is that of my country; I call it holy, for it is that of my God." [3]

[3] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* I, 29.

Lacordaire, a former lawyer, kept for himself the reply to the public ministry, whose spokesman was the procurator general Persil. A short time earlier the latter, taking his stand on the principle of ministerial responsibility, had upheld the charge of high treason against the last four ministers of Charles X. Lacordaire's vigorous speech began thus: "Noble peers, I look about me and I am astonished. I am astonished at seeing myself on the bench of the accused, while the procurator general is on the bench of the public ministry. With what does he charge me? With having made use of a right written in the Charter and not yet regulated by a law. And he recently called for the heads of four ministers by virtue of a right written in the Charter and not yet regulated by a law. If he could do that, I can do the same; with this difference, that he asked for blood, and I wished to give free instruction to the children of the people." [4]

The three accused men were condemned, each to a fine of 100 francs and jointly to the expenses of the trial. But in fact the result was a defeat for the government, for public opinion had been impressed by the reports of the trial debates. Unfortunately the circumstances served the cause of the University. The campaign so brilliantly begun was adversely affected by the discontinuance of the *Avenir,* the dissolving of the League for the Defense of Religious Liberty, and the attention of man's minds diverted by the revolutionary troubles of 1831 and 1832 and by the uprising of the royalist provinces of the West at the voice of the Duchess de Berry.

But the agitation was not fruitless. The law of June 28, 1833, on elementary education, known as the Guizot law, may be considered one of the indirect results. This law was liberal enough, as was its author. The monopoly of elementary education was suppressed. The Brothers of the Christian Schools

[4] Lacordaire, *Œuvres,* VII, 163.

benefited by the exemption from military service on the same basis as the lay teachers. The right to teach was granted to any member of a congregation who presented a letter of obedience from his superiors. This last provision was a testimony of confidence given to the superiors of the teaching congregations, which were supposed to be justly engaged with replying to the lawful requests of the families and the requirements of teaching by the good choice of their schoolmasters.

This testimonial of confidence was not, however, an isolated fact. A notable improvement took place in the relations of Church and state in France. In that same year 1833, the government, without raising any protest, allowed Father Guéranger to restore the Benedictine Order at Solesmes, openly recognized the rights of the Catholic clergy to the buildings devoted to worship,[5] and did nothing to hinder the works of the fathers of the Society of Jesus: to such an extent that the chargé d'affaires of the Holy See, Mgr. Garibaldi, said: "We are obtaining from King Louis Philippe what any other government would have refused." [6]

This assertion, as far as it concerned the person of Louis Philippe, was true only in a general way. On this question of the freedom of education the King showed himself particularly hostile. The law of June 28, 1833, rightly called the Guizot law, was in fact the work of the minister, not of the King, who accepted it only against his will. And when, in 1840, an ecclesiastical society was formed to denounce the University monopoly in liberal and Catholic France, under the presidency of Father Rohrbacher, a disciple of Lamennais, and when the next year the new archbishop of Paris in his first pastoral letter set forth his stand, in restrained language, for a freedom of education

[5] *Moniteur* for January and May, 1833. Guizot granted an annual allotment to the Benedictines of Solesmes for the continuation of the *Gallia christiana*.

[6] Besson, *Vie du cardinal Mathieu*, I, 146.

subject only to the restrictions required by the interest of religion, of morals, and of instruction, the King showed his disapproval.[7] But he distrusted a University that would be too powerful. He was not averse to counterbalancing it with a prudently regulated rival. A bill on secondary schools, which the Guizot ministry presented to the Chambers in 1841, accorded with these wishes. But, far from bringing peace, it started a fight.

Villemain

The minister of public instruction, Villemain, was author of the new bill. Guizot, whether he was discouraged by the failure of a proposed law which he presented in 1836 or whether he was then absorbed by the direction of foreign affairs, remained almost entirely aloof from the problem. This condition was a misfortune. Villemain was a distinguished writer, eminent professor, restorer of literary criticism, and creator of the history of literature, at the same time as his two colleagues Guizot and

[7] Father Cruice, the future bishop of Marseilles, relates the following anecdote. King Louis Philippe was pleased to show his regard and fondness for Archbishop Affre of Paris. He often consulted him about nominations for the episcopal sees. But when the prelate broached the question of freedom of education, the King, by countless shiftings, avoided the subject. One day when the Archbishop insistently returned to the question, the King said:

"Archbishop, you must decide between my wife and me. How many candles should be lighted at a marriage? I hold that six candles are enough. My wife maintains that twelve are needed. I recall that at my wedding we had six candles."

"Sire," replied the Archbishop, "of little importance is the question whether six or a dozen candles are lighted at a marriage. But please listen to me about the most serious question."

"But," replied the King, "this is a very grave question; my household is divided; my wife claims she is right, I hold she is wrong."

The Archbishop without replying to the King's question, continued the defense of the freedom of teaching. At this the King interrupted him.

"But, Archbishop; how about my candles?"

The Archbishop continued. The King in anger exclaimed: "Stop; I do not wish to hear about your freedom of teaching. I have no liking for ecclesiastical colleges. There the children are taught the verse of the Magnificat: *Deposuit potentes de sede.*"

The Archbishop then withdrew. Cruice, *Vie de Denis-Auguste Affre, archevêque de Paris,* p. 218.

Cousin founded the political history and the history of philosophy. Yet he had no qualities of a statesman. Furthermore, odd prejudices against the Jesuits which dated from the Restoration,[8] and which, growing worse, led him to madness in his latter days, could not leave him the calm needed in a discussion on the freedom of education. At any rate, his bill showed his complete ignorance of the susceptibilities of the Catholic conscience. This he wounded both by the maxims on which he pretended to base his views and by the applications he deduced therefrom. In his statement of his motives, the minister even denied the principle of the freedom of teaching, which, he said, "may have been admitted by the Charter but which is not essential to it." In the provisions of his bill he even withdrew from the bishops the exclusive direction of the minor seminaries and placed these schools under the jurisdiction of the University.

Until then the bishops did not mingle in the polemics regarding the freedom of education. This restraint they exercised in a spirit of conciliation and out of consideration of the friendly efforts which the July monarchy had been showing toward the Church. But the provisions concerning the minor seminaries the bishops felt were an invasion of their special domain and their spiritual jurisdiction in the work of the moral and intellectual training of their priests. Spontaneously, without any previous agreement among them, they uttered their protests. For some months the papers were full of episcopal pronouncements, some in a tone of grief, others in an almost threatening tone, denouncing the projected attack on the liberty of the Church.[9]

In the presence of this unanimous manifestation, the bill was weakly supported by the parliamentary left, which considered it too liberal toward the Catholics, and it was withdrawn. But the public opinion thus provoked did not subside. The episcopate

[8] G. Vauthier, *Villemain*, p. 97.

[9] See the *Ami de la religion* of 1841.

rose up to give battle; and it did not disarm thereafter. The group of laymen that, after Lamennais' defection, followed the lead of Count Montalembert and that, before the presentation of the Villemain project, had consented to negotiate with the government, henceforth took a clearly militant attitude. In self-defense the enemies of the Church, men jealous of her influence, then tried to shift the debate to the question of the Jesuits. This issue became an open and declared strife.

From 1841 to 1843, on the side of the Catholics, no concerted plan of campaign was evident. Bishop Clausel de Montals of Chartres published vigorous pamphlets; Archbishop Affre of Paris sent memorials to the King. But in 1843 the example of the Catholic party in Belgium suggested to the French Catholics a method and a program. A journey of Bishop Parisis to Belgium made him grasp the role which could be taken by the Church in modern societies.[10] On his return to France he published pamphlet after pamphlet which brought increasing notice. Nothing in his previous record seemed to point to such an attitude. He had found fault with Lacordaire's apologetics,[11] and was supposed to be rather unfavorably disposed to the new ideas. But when Montalembert and the former editors of the *Avenir* appeared to hesitate, Bishop Parisis announced definitely the character which the strife against the University ought to take and he indicated the polemical methods which seemed to him suited to the present times. First of all, he did not intend that the great debate which had sprung up should be turned into a wretched quarrel between the clergy and the University. In his very first writing, he said: "We should refrain from repeating that we are defending the cause of the clergy; we must show that we are defending the cause of all." [12] In the

[10] C. Guillemant, *Pierre-Louis Parisis*, II, 16–22.

[11] *Correspondance de Lacordaire avec M^me^ Swetchine*, p. 392.

[12] In a book which appeared in 1847, entitled, *Cas de conscience à propos des libertés exercées ou reclamées par les catholiques*, Bishop Parisis even said that, "all circumstances being considered, our liberal institutions, in spite of their abuses, were the best for the state and for the church."

defense of this cause, he declared opportune: 1. that the episcopate take part in a public and legal agitation; 2. that the laity have their place therein and that Count Montalembert be its heart and soul.[13]

This appeal of Bishop Parisis was effective. The other bishops began to stir themselves, the group of former editors of the *Avenir* recovered their confidence, and Montalembert published his famous pamphlet on the *Devoir des catholiques dans la question de la liberté d'enseignment.* Of course many formulas of the *Avenir* were repeated, and the new campaign seemed to some merely a revival of the recently condemned campaign. But an attentive eye would see in it two notable differences. In the first place, the battle bore on a precise, concrete question, and not on a complete restatement of the relations of Church and state as in the time of the *Avenir;* a new strategy was proposed, new principles were proclaimed. In the second place, the movement was undertaken in accord with the episcopate, and Montalembert declared that he did not wish to attempt anything apart from that accord.

Louis Veuillot

The union of the Catholics was based on this program. The *Correspondant,* which had ceased publication, was reorganized by some of its former editors; the *Univers* entered strongly into the campaign.[14] It had a new editor, a former ministerial journalist, recently converted to Catholicism. His initiative and

[13] See his booklet, *Du silence et de la publicité.* On Bishop Parisis' role from 1843 to 1848, see Follioley, *Montalembert et Mgr Parisis.*

[14] "The constitutional point of view," wrote Veuillot to Bishop Parisis, "is the one we must take. It will close the mouth of the liberal of bad faith, and will open the eyes of the liberals of good faith. It will lead Christians on the broadest and most practical road that today is open to ideas. For a long time now, I think, God has reserved for us, in the Charter and in the laws, powerful weapons, which we ought to use. . . . To remember that he is a citizen, is a Christian's duty." L. Veuillot, *Correspondance,* I, 210.

talent at once was felt by all his collaborators and his name soon became inseparable from the paper: it was Louis Veuillot. He was born at Boynes. His father was a Burgundian, a cooper, and his mother was a native of Orléans. Neither of them was a Christian. The boy grew up, so to speak, by himself, with no religious education, first at Boynes, then at Paris, where his father, in 1820, opened a small wine shop. As a simple lawyer's clerk, he devoured books and composed poetry. Then, fired with a desire to write, after the revolution of 1830, when not yet twenty years of age, he accepted the role of defending the July monarchy with his pen. At bottom he detested that bourgeois regime, which was sensualist and practically atheist, and which gave the worker "masters to sell him water, salt, and air, taking from him the tithe of his sweat and requiring from him the blood of his sons, but never offering him a protector to defend him or a guide to enlighten him, to teach him hope." [15]

But the journalist was soon ashamed of his trade. He declared: "If my father knew what I was doing, what I was writing, he would have refused the bread that I was providing for him." The young man, on the point of passing to socialism, reflected and became a Christian. In the course of a journey to Rome, which he made in the company of a Catholic friend, he was entranced by the beauty and strength of Catholicism. According to his own expression, "he became a Christian from head to foot," decided to combat not only manifest unbelief, but whatever seemed to lessen or falsify the authority of that Church in which he had found peace of soul and the satisfaction of all his aspirations toward justice.

"His entrance into the journalistic world gave the Catholic press what it no longer had since the *Avenir*. That was an alert and vigorous polemist, such as no paper possessed at that period; a born writer, with a pen flowing with flashing wit; a master of satire, able to grasp and at need to create ridicule; a

[15] Louis Veuillot, *Les libres penseurs*, p. 10.

courageous fighter, making himself hated, but listened to." [16] He had the biting, arrogant spirit of Lamennais. He wrote: "Although I hardly like the times in which I am living, I recognize in myself more than one trait of its character, conspicuously that which I condemn the most: I am scornful." [17] His particular pleasure will be to slash the insolent face of impiety.[18] Mingled with his lively love for the Church was always that hatred of the wealthy and egoist bourgeoisie which in childhood he felt so harsh toward his own. And at times "surprise is felt at seeing him of the same mind on this question with the most decided revolutionaries." [19] But a warm piety and a sincere obedience to the directions of the Holy See preserved him from the shoals where Lamennais foundered.

Catholic Education

Louis Veuillot issued his *Lettre à M. Villemain,* a vehement pamphlet of which about 15,000 copies were sold in a few weeks. Almost at the same time Montalembert published his appeal on the duties of Catholics, and Bishop Parisis his first booklet. All the Catholic groups joined hands. Veuillot wrote in the *Correspondant,* and the *Univers* opened its columns to Montalembert. The Archbishop of Paris and his suffragans had sent the King a confidential memorial against the educational monopoly; the editor of the *Univers* procured a copy of it, published it, and thus obtained a public manifestation of fifty-six bishops, who gave their approval to the memorial.[20] The legitimists put themselves at the side of the former editors of the *Avenir;* one of the signers of the ordinances of 1828, Vatimesnil, took his stand beside Montalembert, and the

[16] Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* V, 475.
[17] L. Veuillot, *Les odeurs de Paris,* p. 15.
[18] L. Veuillot, *Les libres penseurs,* p. 20.
[19] Lemaitre, *Les contemporains,* p. 31.
[20] Guillemant, *op. cit.,* II, 45–47.

Catholics, receiving their directions from a committee of laymen, recognized Bishop Parisis as the ecclesiastical leader of the campaign,[21] as their doctrinal guide.

A second bill, presented by Villemain (February 2, 1844) merely tightened the union. By a contemptible maneuver, the government tried to obtain the adherence, or at least the silence, of the episcopate by increasing the number of burses granted to the minor seminaries and to soften the parliamentary opposition by entrusting the report of the law before the Peers to a well-known Catholic, Duke Victor de Broglie. The new law, while proclaiming the educational freedom, organized and perfected the monopoly. It admitted the foundation of free schools, but subjected them to the supervision, control, and jurisdiction of the University in the smallest details of their functioning. Louis Veuillot expressed the view of all the Catholics when he declared: "For the love of God, let us be victims, but not dupes." Most of the prelates, grouped about their metropolitans, sent protests. During the discussions before the Chambers (April 22 to May 24, 1844), Montalembert championed, against Cousin, the cause of freedom with an eloquence that was the foundation of his repute as a parliamentary speaker.[22]

The Catholics, with the high approval of Bishop Parisis,

[21] Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* I, 409.

[22] Said the young orator, as he faced his astonished adversaries with his clear and loyal eye: "Gentlemen, we must persuade you that you do not finish with consciences as with parties. Do you know what is the most unbending thing in the world? It is the conscience of convinced Christians. We know, indeed, that our rights as Christians are prior to all the constitutions of the world; but we are happy to see that these rights are consecrated by the constitution of our country. The Charter is the ground on which we take our stand. Freedom is our sun, and no one is privileged to extinguish its light. Because we are of those who go to confession, do not think that we rise from the feet of our priests disposed to hold out our hands for the fetters of an anticonstitutional legality. In the midst of a free people, we are unwilling to be islets. We are the successors of the martyrs, and we do not tremble before the successors of Julian the Apostate; we are the sons of the Crusaders, and we do not recoil before the sons of Voltaire." Discourse of April 16, 1844; Montalembert, *Œuvres,* I, 364–401.

decided, in the early days of 1845, to found a committee of action. This was called "The Committee for the Defense of Religious Liberty," and Montalembert was acclaimed its president. The vice-presidency was given to Vatimesnil, a former member of the Martignac ministry, and to Charles Lenormant, a Catholic member of the University. Veuillot became the propagandist of the movement by founding in other parts of France committees for the purpose of backing up the *Univers*.[23] He answered Guizot, who reproached Montalembert for an unjustified claim to represent the Church: "Yes, M. de Montalembert is only a child of the Church, but he is the child on whom the mother relies." [24] Lenormant and the liberal Champagny replied to the Lord Chancellor, who had called their group "the Catholic party": "We would not have proposed the term; but if it is cast at us as a reproach, we accept it." [25]

What was organized was indeed a Catholic party, under the direction of a lay leader and with the approbation, at least tacit, of the large majority of the episcopate. But neither the bishops nor the orators nor the journalists who commended it considered it a permanent and normal institution. Montalembert, Veuillot, and Parisis presented it merely as a transient strategy, which most of them abandoned in 1848, when they found themselves in the presence of a great conservative party, able for the defense of religion, the family, and society without compromising the authority of the Church in its polemics. The same was true, at least in the minds of many, of the motto which all adopted at this period: "Liberty as in Belgium," [26] that is, the liberty of common rights, war against any monopoly even in favor of the Catholic Church, "which would be the most fateful gift that could be bestowed on her." [27]

[23] Veuillot, *Correspondance*, I, 179.
[24] E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, I, 426.
[25] *Correspondant*, X, 934; XIII, 581.
[26] E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 487.
[27] Montalembert, Discourse of April 26, 1844; *Œuvres*, I, 453.

CHAPTER XXII

Other Activities

The Jesuits

To REGARD all those who were then defenders of the University monopoly as partisans intent on the destruction of the Church would be incorrect and unjust. Such a qualification could not be laid on Victor de Broglie, Guizot, Cousin, or Villemain.[1] But behind these men were some for whom the actual struggle was merely an episode of a more general war against the Catholic influence under whatever form it should appear. These men, feeling that their contention was, for the time being, lost on the field of freedom of education, attempted to open a breach at a point which they judged harder to defend. The attacks increased against the so-called encroachments of the religious congregations and their misdeeds. Shamelessly these were charged with undue influence in the making of wills, with thefts, with countless crimes. Then little by little the accusations were especially centered on the Jesuits. A strong

[1] Villemain, however, was obsessed with a fear of the Jesuits, which would bring him to a state of mental derangement. Says Thureau-Dangin: "Villemain always imagined Jesuits about him, spying on him and threatening him. One day, in company of a friend, he left the House of Peers where he had delivered a brilliant discourse. He was talking quite normally, when, upon reaching the Place de la Concorde, he stopped, frightened. 'What ails you?' asked his friend.

'Do you not see?' he answered.

'No. Nothing,' said the friend.

Then, pointing to a heap of paving stones, he said: 'Stop. There are some Jesuits. Let us go away.'

Toward the end of December, 1844, Villemain, oppressed by domestic griefs and by political annoyances, had a violent attack of madness and jumped from a window of the cabinet hall." Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* V, 546.

counterattack, ably and vigorously conducted, soon took on such proportions that, in the press, in parliament, even in diplomatic negotiations, all other questions appeared to be relegated to a second place, giving place to the question of the Jesuits.[2]

Two professors of the Collège de France, Jules Michelet and Edgar Quinet, opened the contest in 1843. Both of them had previously shown a friendliness to Catholicism. At least they had admired its poetry and its social benefits. Said Michelet: "The most filial things that have been said about our old mother Church, have been said by me." And Quinet delighted to read the Psalms and the *Imitation of Christ.* But Michelet, a sensitive, impressionable, changeable soul, devoid of religious habits, not baptized till the age of eighteen, without strong convictions, following all the suggestions of his successive sympathies, suffering at the least wound to his tender feelings, was ready for all changes. In Quinet's vague and visionary religiosity, in which Herder's philosophy kept close to Chateaubriand's romanticism, were mingled anticlerical and revolutionary tendencies.

The two professors adopted a completely opposite attitude. Was this change owing to a desire to avenge the University for certain excessive insults directed against it in the writings of a Jesuit?[3] Should we suppose, in the case of Quinet, the gratification of a long restrained hatred; in the case of Michelet the desire for a clamorous popularity, as a revenge for mundane humiliations from which he had greatly suffered? Whatever may be the answer to these questions, the two professors chose ultramontanism and the Jesuits as the subject of their courses in 1843. Michelet, relying on the *Monita secreta* (the work of an impostor),[4] on the *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius,* and

[2] Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France,* II, 493–572.

[3] *Le monopole universitaire, destructeur de la religion et des lois,* by Father Deschamps.

[4] "To see that the *Monita* are a satire, you have only to open them and read them

on the Constitutions of the Society, which he distorted by evident misinterpretations,[5] represented the teaching and work of the Jesuits as a doctrine and work of tyranny and corruption. Young students, avid for scandal, flocked to the courses of the two professors, who possessed real talent. When Michelet, with his feverish eloquence, and Quinet, with his tone of a prophet, stirred up the worst passions, their baneful suggestions were met with tumultuous applause and cries of hatred.

The professors' success tempted the journalists to imitate them. A certain writer, who was lacking in culture, but gifted with imagination, animation, and jeering gusto, Eugene Sue, had just published in the ministerial *Journal des Débats,* under the title of *Mystères de Paris,* a description of the filth of Paris. Sainte-Beuve, speaking of this work, says: "The essential inspiration of the *Mystères de Paris* is a foundation of debauchery." [6] The *Constitutionel* offered Sue 100,000 francs for a serial that would pillory the Jesuits. Thus originated the novel, *The Wandering Jew,* an unwholesome and calumnious work. Its author himself said in his *Mémoires:* "The desire to increase the popularity of the *Constitutionel* made me indifferent to the subject and to the moral aim of the book." In a short time the number of subscribers to the paper mounted from 3,000 to 25,000. The illustrated editions of the book were numerous. Ballanche wrote (November 26, 1844) to Ampère: "The whole world is devouring it; it is spreading more quickly than the cholera."

---

without prejudice. . . . The work appeared at Cracow in 1614, being the work of a Jesuit who was expelled from the Order" (Boehmer-Monod, *Les Jésuites,* pp. 64–66).

[5] Says Alfred Monod: "All the quotations given by Quinet and all his translations betray the prejudice with which he read and interpreted the texts" (*ibid.,* p. 12). St. Ignatius wrote: "When a superior gives an order, let us be persuaded that the order is just, let us reject any contrary feeling, whenever we cannot perceive in it any sin." Michelet, in his course, quotes this passage, but suppresses the restriction (*ibid.*).

[6] Sainte-Beuve, *Chroniques parisiennes,* p. 169.

But the exaggerations of the calumniators hurt their cause. People saw that the serial novel of Eugene Sue appealed to antisocial passions no less than to antireligious passions. Michelet, continuing his attacks on the Society of Jesus, finally made his assault on the citadel of Christianity itself, treating it as the foe of the revolution, as the city of evil opposed to the city of good. Quinet went further, bestowing on the revolution the universal papacy and the government of souls.[7] Indeed, the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* reviewing the book on the Jesuits, in which the two professors had combined their lectures of 1843, wrote: "The attack has perhaps overreached itself." The public was ready to hear the Jesuits' reply. The stirring and serious reply came from a man who, in the Notre Dame pulpit, along with Lacordaire, had acquired a renown for eloquence, wisdom, and holiness. Under the title, *De l'existence et de l'institut des Jésuites,* Father Ravignan set forth, in a dignified, calm, and fearless style, the constitutions, teachings, and works of the Society to which he belonged. The work had an immense success. As Sainte-Beuve said in the *Revue Suisse,* the work was worthy of a great and holy cause.

However, the government took account of the attacks on the Jesuits. It feared that it might be drawn into one of those religious strifes which, taking the appearance of a persecution of consciences, is never a success for the powers that undertake it. Guizot, at least, saw this danger and sought to avoid it by referring the question to the spiritual authority,[8] that is, to the Holy See. He chose as the negotiator a man who, in the discussion of the education law in the House of Peers, had adroitly taken a position between Montalembert and Cousin. This man

[7] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.,* V, 509.

[8] Guizot, "Lettre au P. Daniel," in the *Etudes religieuses* for September, 1867. The government of the Restoration, at the time of the ordinances of 1828, had also attempted to have the Holy Father intervene. And these "appeals to Rome," on the part of a government for which an appeal to Rome was an offense of the state, are not unique events in history. In 1832 Rossi became a naturalized Frenchman, and was a peer of France when Guizot selected him for plenipotentiary.

was Pellegrino Rossi, the jurist whom we have seen, in 1832, draw up, in Switzerland, a revision of the Constitution favorable to the radical party.

Such a choice could not be pleasing to Rome. Rossi's political party and his marriage to a Protestant were of a nature to make him suspect in the eyes of the Holy See. But the negotiator possessed at bottom the qualities that have made the renown of the diplomats of his race: a precise and clear judgment, a rare suppleness in his moves, and, under the forms of an urbanity of manner at times exuberant, a cool perseverance in the pursuit of his designs. In the course of March, 1845, he came to Rome. There for two months he experienced the trial of a coolness which was at first general at the papal court, then considerably attenuated, thanks to the friendly relations he was able to cultivate among the prelates. Early in May sharp debates arose in the French Chamber of Deputies over the religious congregations and a resolution was passed by the representatives of the nation requesting the government to have the laws of the state executed against them. These events gave him an occasion to have Rome see the dangers of the Church in France: the probable dissolution of all the congregations, the people already stirred up against the Jesuits, repeating against them, with greater violence, those outbursts which had so greatly saddened France. Although France was Catholic after the July revolution and King Louis Philippe was personally well disposed toward the Church, yet he was constitutionally powerless to repress an uprising of so great importance.

Cleverly Rossi insinuated that, for the peace of the Church, every pretext for agitation needed to be removed. Was not the Catholic party quite likely to compromise the Holy See by its violent acts and to disturb the hierarchy by its daring initiative; for what is that militant group of laymen, formed apart from the episcopate and issuing orders to the bishops, except a

survival of the *Avenir,* the "coda of Lamennais"? In a word, urgently needed was an understanding for a combination that, without approving the detractors of the Jesuits and without encouraging their dangerous defenders, would assure the peace of the Church and of the state.

The existing circumstances could not have been more adroitly exploited. But, in his discussion of these questions with Cardinal Lambruschini, Rossi was face to face with a diplomat of his own stature. Gregory XVI's Secretary of State judged that a rejection of Rossi's request would not be opportune. He sought merely to reduce the concessions of the Holy See to a minimum in the proposed "combination." Rossi, who had at first called for a papal order expelling the Jesuits from France, finally agreed that these religious be asked "to place themselves in a condition that will enable the government to close its eyes to their presence," for example, by withdrawing from the big cities and numerous houses of the Society or by installing themselves in less important localities. Moreover, the Cardinal obtained Rossi's agreement that the Pope would not intervene officially in this measure, which would be carried out by the General of the Society himself. Consequently Father Roothaan, the Jesuit General, wrote (June 14, 1845) to the provincials of Paris and Lyons directing them to proceed "gently and quietly" to the diminution or the dissolution of the houses of Paris, Lyons, and Avignon. Presently he added the house at Saint-Acheul and several novitiates.

The Paris government congratulated itself over this result as being a success,[9] and sent its felicitations to Rossi. But in reality the papal diplomacy had triumphed. "The question of the Jesuits disappeared, without the Jesuits themselves disappearing." [10] On July 15, 1845, Montalembert declared in the House of Peers, addressing his remark to the ministers: "The

[9] Guizot, *Lettres à sa famille et à ses amis,* p. 230.

[10] Thureau-Dangin, V, 574.

question of the schools and that of religious liberty remain untouched. They ran a risk of being absorbed in the question of the Jesuits. You have separated the two questions." [11]

Socialist Movement

The strife over the religious question did not indeed cease, but it was less heated, less sharp on both sides. The notion of an accord by mutual concessions began to appear. The government opened its eyes on the socialist peril. The period from 1840 to 1845 was the time when the propagators of the social utopias began to organize into a political party. A writer who was less original than either Saint-Simon, Leroux, or Fourier, but more aggressive and more popular, Louis Blanc, was the chief promoter of this evolution. The champions are no longer dreamers, but tribunes; their followers are not a sect, but a faction. In 1843 the movement was spread by a new socialist organ, *La Réforme,* founded by Ledru-Rollin and inspired by Louis Blanc. Two years later a petition circulated in the workshops of Paris, calling for a political revolution as a condition of the social revolution. The *Journal des Débats* took alarm. Guizot recognized frankly that each hindrance imposed on the religious influence was one more force given to the socialist perversion; and Louis Philippe, enlightened by experience, said to his prime minister: "You are right; where we must fight the revolutionary spirit is in the depth of men's minds." [12]

Count de Salvandy, the new minister of public instruction who succeeded Villemain, was quite filled with these views. In 1845 he protested against the impiety in the teaching, which, he said, would be a public crime. That same year he stopped the continuance of the courses of Edgar Quinet and in a bold move

[11] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* II, 197. On the attitude of the Roman court and particularly on the personal attitude of Gregory XVI in this affair of the Jesuits, see Guillemant, *op. cit.,* II, 127–32, and Burnichon, *op. cit.,* II, 646–75.

[12] Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet,* p. 117.

he substituted for the royal Council of the University, all-powerful because of its life tenure and most hostile to the demands of the Catholics, a Council of thirty members, which was renewable yearly.

The Catholics, on their side, explained that they would not refuse a prudent compromise. Frederick Ozanam declared his approval of this attitude. Lacordaire advised less animosity against the University, and concern for the lukewarm, the indifferent, the politicians, and the wavering masses.[13] But one of the most important events of the religious history of the period was the publication in 1845 of a writing entitled *De la pacification religieuse*. Its author was the superior of the minor seminary of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet at Paris, Father Dupanloup.

Dupanloup

Already the year before, Father Dupanloup had taken a hand in the controversy over the freedom of education. This he did by the publication of two letters to M. de Broglie and, in 1848, by a pamphlet, *Les associations religieuses, véritable état de la question*. He was already known as a preacher, catechist, and educator. Born in Savoy (January 3, 1802), abandoned by his father at the time of his birth,[14] but brought up in a Christian manner by a pious mother, he had early felt the call to the priesthood. He prepared for this vocation by earnest studies and an intense religious training in the minor seminary of Saint-Nicolas [15] and in the seminary of St. Sulpice. Appointed curate in the parish of the Madelaine immediately after his ordination and charged particularly with the catechism classes, he showed himself from the start an incomparable teacher. He himself said: "They came from all directions, from

[13] Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet*, V, 444-95.

[14] E. Faguet, *Mgr Dupanloup*, p. 2.

[15] Before entering the Saint-Nicolas seminary, Felix Dupanloup had studied in the institution of M. Poiloup.

distant countries; for the revolutions of 1830, 1831, and 1832 had brought to Paris children from Italy, Poland, Portugal, Germany, and Brazil." One day he was able to note among his listeners three queens. This son of the people, called to deal with the great, honored with the friendship of the Duke de Rohan, later appointed to give religious instruction to the Duke de Bordeaux, then to the Duke de Nemours and Princess Clementine, easily found himself, by his lofty culture and the elevation of his soul, on a level with the noblest minds.

Probably no compliment touched him more than the one addressed to him by Royer-Collard upon meeting him at the deathbed of Prince Talleyrand: "You are a priest." Dupanloup was indeed fully a priest when, in 1834, the Archbishop of Paris appointed him director of studies in the minor seminary of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet. Only those who knew Saint-Nicolas during those brilliant years (1834–35) can form an idea of the intense life developed there," wrote Ernest Renan. "And that life had a single source, a single principle, Father Dupanloup. He took the place of all. To be a writer or orator was secondary with him; as an educator, he was unequaled." [16]

In his book on religious pacification, Father Dupanloup took up the question of general religious policy for the first time. There he showed himself, both in his ideas and in his style, such as he would be to the end of his life: a warm defender of the Church in the presence of modern society, to the point of being called by the freethinkers "a fierce reactionary," and a defender of modern society in the presence of the Church, to the point of incurring and at times deserving the epithet of being a liberal and a Gallican. In both cases he was a stubborn fighter, a tireless polemist; preaching pacification and conciliation with unparalleled liveliness; having an intense supernatural life with a depth and solidity revealed in his intimate writings, but never suppressing the natural impetuosity of his temperament; a

[16] Renan, *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse.*

burning fire fanned in turn by grace and nature.[17] "Peace," he said, "is the wish of our heart. But the peace we desire is peace in liberty, peace in justice. Any other peace would be shameful. We can be humble; we should not be abject." He added: "Will France have a statesman who wishes to attach his name to a new and glorious concordat?" For the making of this concordat, he indicated the dispositions which he professed toward modern society: "We accept, we appeal to the principles and liberties proclaimed in 1789. . . . You made the Revolution of 89 without us and against us, but for us, God willing it thus in spite of us."

The author of the work on religious pacification was not contradicted by the editor of the *Univers*. Declared Louis Veuillot: "We have said and repeat that a new era begins, the fruit of long revolutions that have stirred us. Democracy arises, and the Church is there as a mother beside the cradle. . . . Citizen by the same title and with the same rights as the impious, let the Christian be in every juncture the defender and apostle of his belief, as the impious is the advocate and servant of his unbelief. This noble and new use of political right is enough in a way to dissipate all the dangers." [18]

In the elections of 1846 the Catholics took their stand on "liberty for all." Practically the electoral committee for the defense of religious freedom declared that, "since religious liberty is for Catholics of an interest above any other, we should not exclude any candidate who promises to defend that liberty consecrated by the Charter of 1830." [19] This admonition was followed, and the elections sent to the Parliament 146 candidates recommended by the committee, at the head of which was Montalembert. This number did not amount to a majority. Besides,

[17] This is the testimony of Father Debeauvais, who had been a fellow student of Felix Dupanloup in the seminary and his close friend to the end of his life.

[18] Louis Veuillot signed himself as associate editor. After August 3, 1845, the editor-in-chief was Charles de Coux. Cf. *Univers* of August 3, 1845.

[19] *Univers* of December 7, 1845.

among the promises of the candidates, many appeared to have doubtful sincerity and firmness. But it was a considerable success, owing to the union and the timeliness of a strategy which, without sacrificing principles, made the Catholic cause more popular. Unfortunately the expressions used in recommending this strategy had an equivocal meaning and would soon arouse very lively controversy among those who had unanimously proclaimed them.

Works of Charity

Pope Gregory followed all these strifes with a fatherly eye. He rejoiced at seeing the bishops of France once again taking the road to Rome, whether to make a report of their spiritual administration in accordance with their promise at their consecration, or to receive instructions from the Holy See in difficult situations, or simply to show their union with the chair of Peter. The Pope also felt grateful to the French government for not hindering these manifestations of fidelity. When receiving some of these prelates, he told them how happy he was to be surrounded by the bishops, "his support and his defense."

The movement toward liturgical unity seemed to Gregory to be a guaranty of that hierarchical unity which Christ established in His Church. He praised Bishop Parisis of Langres for having brought all his clergy to the universal practice of the Church. But, understanding that an exaggeration in this direction or too great haste in carrying out the projected reforms might have its dangers, he declared to the Archbishop of Reims that, for the avoidance of grave dissensions, he judged that for the present he should refrain from treating the subject at length or even from giving detailed replies to the questions submitted.[20]

[20] Letter of August 6, 1842; cf. Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii papae XVI*, III, 224.

Gregory XVI rejoiced at the wonderful development of works of charity under his pontificate: "a new charity, private charity in place of official and public charity; organized charity instead of scattered and spontaneous charity; fraternal charity to the people by the people." [21] The St. Vincent de Paul Society with all the works depending on it, and the Propagation of the Faith Society had been the outstanding expressions of that charity. But the Pontiff's heart was particularly moved at noting that the charitable works had developed in France in a dependence on a spirit of prayer and sacrifice. To assist the poor, to care for the sick, to educate children, and to provide relief for the aged, religious congregations had been founded.[22] Among these works one seemed especially marked with a divine seal: the Little Sisters of the Poor. "The extraordinary and supernatural peculiarity of this work had been that of a charity which became, not only servants of the poor, but beggars for them; this sublime and daring trust in God, excluding possession of anything; no foundation or endowment; everything at the risk of a precarious charity, with no guaranty but a word of the Gospel." [23] And Providence blessed this hardihood. In 1841, in a little town of Brittany, a former servant girl, Jeanne Jugan, seconded by three poor working girls and directed by a humble curate, Father Lepailleur, had vowed her life to the service of the poor and infirm aged people and founded the institute which, a century later, counted more than 4,000 religious, divided into more than 250 houses scattered over the face of the earth.

Gregory rejoiced also to see works of piety flourishing, in particular works of devotion to the Blessed Virgin. He saw the birth at Paris and its wide extension of that association of

[21] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'église de France,* p. 271.

[22] For a list of these works, see Baunard, *op. cit.,* pp. 270–97.

[23] Baunard, *op. cit.,* p. 283. (In 1953 the Little Sisters of the Poor in the United States numbered 860 and had 51 homes for the aged. Tr.)

prayers, placed under the auspices of the immaculate heart of Mary and called by that title. Its rapid progress and the countless favors were no less wonderful than those of the Little Sisters of the Poor. On November 27, 1830, a pious Daughter of Christ, Catherine Labouré, had been favored with an apparition of the Blessed Virgin, surrounded by rays of light, her feet on a half-globe, and encompassed with an invocation in letters of gold: "Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee"; and a mysterious voice asked her to have a medal made after this model. Following lengthy inquiries, Archbishop Quélen of Paris consented to have a medal made according to the indicated model. This medal, by the prayers it stirred up, by the devotion to the Virgin Mary which it awakened in souls, operated prodigies of conversion. A zealous priest of Paris, Father Dufriche-Desgenettes, pastor of Notre Dame des Victoires,[24] having given the precious medal as their symbol to an association founded for the conversion of sinners, in a short time saw his parish take on new religious life. The Supreme Pontiff, on April 24, 1838, made the pious association an archconfraternity, and authorized it to affiliate with itself similar associations in the whole Church. After that the archconfraternity experienced marvelous developments and became an inexhaustible source of graces.[25] On February 14, 1841, Father Lacordaire, wearing the Dominican habit in the Notre Dame pulpit, saluted, as a glory and national hope, the meeting of souls of a hundred countries [26] at that church of Notre Dame des Victoires.

[24] Cf. E. A. de Valette, *Vie de M. Dufriche-Desgenettes.*

[25] Cf. Aladel, *La médaille miraculeuse.*

[26] Lacordaire, *Œuvres,* IX, 219. Among the numerous conversions brought about through the medal, thereafter called the miraculous medal, we must mention the return to God of an Alsatian Jew, Alphonse Ratisbonne. Later, with his brother Theodore, he established the congregation of Our Lady of Sion, founded for the conversion of the Jews.

Works of Scholarship

Gregory XVI was well versed in the ecclesiastical sciences. He was pleased to note that philosophical, theological, and historical studies had continued to be successfully cultivated in spite of the disturbances of the time. To the founder of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* he expressed his gratification in 1840.[27] These *Annales,* founded in July, 1830, by a member of the *Société Asiatique,* Augustin Bonnetty, were an important manifestation of this scientific movement among Catholics. In the beginning their purpose was to make known whatever human sciences, particularly history, archaeology, astronomy, natural history, jurisprudence, and the like, contained in the way of proofs and discoveries in favor of Christianity. We have already referred to the works of Gerbet, Rohrbacher, Guéranger, Frayssinous, Lacordaire, and Lamennais. A former ardent disciple of the *Avenir,* Father Maret, in his essay on pantheism, had vigorously fought the "separated philosophy" of the eclectics of the school of Cousin and the socialist doctrines of the school of Saint-Simon and Leroux, in which he found the same source of errors, an avowed or disguised pantheism. Father Gousset, vicar general of the diocese of Besançon, had issued (1832), against the survivors of Jansenism, a work to justify the moral theology of St. Alphonsus Liguori. In 1844, after he was made archbishop of Reims, he published his moral theology for the use of pastors and confessors, a clear and solid work, which obtained a notable success.

The struggles carried on by the Catholics for the primary and secondary schools did not make them forget the question of higher education. In 1845 Bishop Affre founded the *Ecole des Carmes* at Paris, intended to train writers capable of com-

[27] See *Annales de philosophie chrétienne,* XXI (1841), 471–73.

posing solid writings in favor of religion. There the students prepared for the licentiate and the doctorate, either in letters or in sciences. Three years later the *Ecole des Carmes* saw its students receive twelve licentiates. After another two years it had its first doctor, Father Lavigerie, later a cardinal. For the teaching in the major seminaries, Joseph Carrière published (1837–46) his *Praelectiones theologicae majores* in eight volumes; it had successive editions and contributed to the raising of theological studies among the clergy.[28] But no publication contributed more effectively to the progress of higher ecclesiastical studies than the two patrologies of Migne.

About 1840 news was received that a priest of Auvergne, Father Migne, intended to publish a new and convenient edition of a complete patrology, that of the Greeks as well as that of the Latins. The undertaking was a colossal one. Though not a theologian *ex professo,* Father Migne was gifted with a remarkable theological sense. His project met with difficulties of all sorts. But he succeeded by force of tenacity and skillful management. The two patrologies were published, one after the other, beginning in 1844, and were welcomed gratefully by scholars who were engaged in the study of the early Christian literature.[29]

Theological Errors

The theological errors of this period, by the discussions they stirred up and by the writings they provoked, contributed to the advance of the religious sciences. Among these errors, we must mention the most notable and most widespread: traditionalism. This error was an exaggerated reaction to the rationalism of the eighteenth century and the shameful excesses of the French Revolution. The philosophy of the eighteenth century had attacked revelation and tradition. The Revolution

[28] E. Levesque, s.v. "Carrière" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire,* II, 1804.

[29] J. Bellamy, *Théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle,* p. 47. Migne had conceived his project in 1836. The Latin Patrology, which appeared in 1855, contains 221 volumes; the Greek Patrology (1857–66) is in 166 volumes.

tried to justify its spirit of revolt by human reason, which it attempted to deify in 1793. Some Catholics thought that the time was at hand to dethrone this pretended divinity. They believed they could undermine rationalism at its foundation by showing that individual reason is powerless to demonstrate religious and moral truths; that these truths are the patrimony of humanity, which receives them from divine revelation and hands them on by tradition. The traditionalist movement had two chief centers of propaganda: the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* and the group of disciples who gathered about a former professor of philosophy at Strasbourg, a convert to Catholicism who became a priest, Father Bautain.

Carried to its extreme consequences, traditionalism invited a double reproach. By putting on the same plane and confusing in one and the same demonstration the truths that are in the domain of reason and those that are in the domain of faith, it failed to distinguish between the natural and the supernatural order and led to the absorption of one in the other. By proclaiming the radical impotence of individual reason to ascertain the truth, it did not allow in universal reason the collectivity of individual reasons. Father Bautain was obliged to subscribe (1840), by order of Gregory XVI, to six propositions, by which he acknowledged the power of human reason to prove with certitude the existence of God, the truth of revelation, the authenticity of the New Testament, and so on.[30] The followers of traditionalism humbly submitted. They had the merit of bringing into the light certain notions treated by the heirs of Descartes with too much contempt, with having restored to a place of honor the ideas of tradition and authority and with searching for remnants of the primitive revelation in the history of ancient peoples, the product of remarkable works, thus making them the forerunners of the history of religions.

An excessive reaction against Gallicanism, after disturbing

[30] Bellamy, s.v. "Bautain," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire,* II, 481–83.

the Church of France, eventually, by a closer examination and by a supreme decision of the Holy See, established some disputed points of discipline.

Gallicanism

The two Allignol brothers, priests of the diocese of Viviers, were ecclesiastics of blameless morals. But they were somewhat lacking in the observance of residence and had a vexatious irritability of character. Considering themselves victims of unjust prejudices on the part of the episcopal administration, they published (1839) a pamphlet entitled *De l'état actuel du clergé en France*. In this little work the two brothers, collaborating in it as the Lamennais brothers did in preparing similar publications, tried to defend against the modern discipline, accepted by the French episcopate and inspired by Gallicanism, the old discipline of the Roman Church, which alone conformed to the prescriptions of canon law. According to these brothers, the ministry of pastors was of divine institution, and their irremovable status was a consequence of that institution. Moreover, they said, the bishop has not the right to administer a diocese by himself alone, but only in conjunction with his priests assembled in synod. In a word, in the name of the country pastors, who were removable at the will of the bishop and were without much standing in the eyes of the people, the two authors demanded that the clergy "be freed from the despotism of the bishops." The book was much discussed. Some priests who were piously attached to the Church, while regretting the book's violent language and its doctrine, were not displeased to see the Gallican spirit attacked. Others, embittered and discontented, were glad to see their rage put in the form of propositions. Others were exasperated at this unjust aggression on their esteemed Bishop Bonnel.

The clergy of the diocese of Viviers were divided into two

camps. The strife seemed to reach its climax when, after Bishop Bonnel's death, he was succeeded by a young Oblate, originally from the diocese of Aix, Father Guibert. The new prelate arrived with a well-deserved reputation for being a man of mature mind, correct and confident judgment, solid piety, and of administrative talent which he had shown as superior of the seminary of Ajaccio and vicar general of the diocese. At the very outset he showed his firm determination to do everything to bring peace to the conflict. Unfortunately the quarrel soon assumed unforeseen proportions. The press of Paris took up the affair. Father Clavel, who edited *Le bien social, journal du clergé secondaire,* in which, under cover of a fiery ultramontanism, he pleaded for his personal grudges, made himself the defender of the Allignol brothers. Father Migne in his *Voix de la vérité,* and Father de Genoude [31] in the *Gazette de France,* took occasion of the differences to attack the whole episcopal body, which was "directed by the *Univers,*" said the *Gazette,* "and was tyrannized over by the Jesuits." Marquis de Régnon, in *La Liberté,* lay the blame directly on the Bishop of Viviers. For their part, the Allignol brothers, intoxicated by the fuss made about them, assumed an arrogant attitude, boasting that they were supported at Rome by the Holy Father himself.

Bishop Guibert thought the moment had come for him to act with firmness. On January 6, 1845, he issued his pastoral on "the dangerous tendencies of a party being formed in the Church in France against episcopal authority." "We cannot deceive ourselves," he said; "they wish to free the priests from what they dare to call the despotism of the bishops. This language contains a revolt against the authority of the Church. . . . The Supreme Pontiff is not unaware of what is taking

[31] Antoine Genou, better known as Eugène de Genoude, especially after the title of nobility conferred on him by Louis XVIII in 1822, had been a disciple of Lamennais. He was the author of several highly regarded works.

place in our country. He knows that at the least signal he would be faithfully obeyed; yet he does not impose any change in the present state of affairs." Besides, in reply to the false allegations of the Allignol brothers, the prelate communicated to his clergy and his faithful a letter of Cardinal Lambruschini, the Secretary of State, assuring him that "the assertions of the two refractory priests, far from having any shadow of truth, were entirely false." The Allignol brothers, urged repeatedly by two holy bishops, Mazenod, bishop of Marseilles, and Devie, bishop of Belley, submitted, and Pope Gregory by a brief (November 26, 1845) congratulated the Bishop of Viviers for having, by his prudence, calmed the quarrel by not entering into the debates on the question of the irremovable status of certain categories of priests, on which His Holiness desired silence to be observed.

Once more the wisdom of Gregory XVI, too often represented as a friend of the extreme parties, favored the moderate opinion. Between the excesses of Cartesianism and those of traditionalism, he had recommended, in philosophy and in apologetics, a method where individual reason and tradition would be harmoniously combined. Between the claims of Gallicanism, which tended to exaggerate the rights of bishops, and those of a fanatical ultramontanism, which wished to lessen those rights excessively, he declared himself for the moderate regime which the French bishops, after the Revolution, thought ought to be adopted, at least provisionally, for the good administration of their dioceses and for the good of souls.[32]

[32] On the affair of the Allignol brothers, see Follenay, *Vie du cardinal Guibert,* II, 42–97.

CHAPTER XXIII

Gregory XVI and the Foreign Missions

WHEN he was a cardinal, Pope Gregory XVI gave much thought to the spread of the faith in the infidel, schismatical, and heretical countries. His elevation to the highest dignity of the Church enabled him to give this work a greater expansion. Turkey in Europe and Turkey in Asia, the Far East, Africa, America, and Oceania were the object of his care.

The Near East

At the moment when Gregory XVI ascended the papal throne, the rivalry of Russia and England in Asia gave particular importance to the situation of Turkey. The political power of the Ottoman Empire was in decline. The succession to the "Sick Man" was greatly coveted. But a matter of supreme importance for Europe was that this succession should not be an open question. The balance of the two powers, Russia and England, in the East formed an equilibrium which was an advantage to Europe and which an open strife for the possession of Constantinople would have upset. Moreover, the question of the Dardanelles was then, more than it is today, a European question, even a worldwide question. To prolong the life of Turkey was the big political concern of Europe. All the secondary questions connected with this one made up what was then called "the Eastern Question." In the course of the century the combinations of international politics was almost always colored by this question and often dominated by it.

The gravity of such a question did not escape the attention

of Gregory XVI. But his mind, little occupied with purely political questions, was naturally more concerned with the religious problems. From this point of view, he had perceived another Eastern question of equal importance. In the Ottoman Empire not only were the institutions and customs disintegrating, but so was the official religion, Islam. The religion of Mohammed still boasted of 200 million followers. But in the countries where European civilization had penetrated, in Egypt and India and even in a large part of the Turkish Empire where education was developing, religious fidelity to the Koran was becoming weak. The fighting spirit, which was the soul of Mohammedan propaganda, was extinct. Faith in the Koran, in a God who was master rather than father, a sort of Oriental despot arbitrarily distributing his punishments and his favors, appeared more and more inadmissible. Cultivated men among them were engaged in the interpretation of these dogmas by deforming them. The lofty-minded souls began to blush at the encouragement given by the Prophet to divorce, polygamy, the worst forms of slavery, and that pretended perfection of Islam, engendering in its followers pride, intolerance, and stagnation.

To a close observer, Islam seemed to be on the way to becoming the religion of some fanatics and of the popular masses belonging to the lowest degrees of civilization. Of course, no Mussulman avowed these conditions. The more educated showed themselves as hostile to Christian evangelization as did the most ignorant. But evidently their opposition stemmed from other motives than a deep religious conviction. An unconquerable racial and national pride and the scandal produced among them by the lax morals of many Christians who had settled in the Ottoman Empire easily explain their adamant opposition to every attempt of proselytism.

Eugène Boré was a man of superior intelligence, zealous for the spread of the faith; he had been one of Lamennais' choice disciples. Well versed in the living Oriental languages,

for a long time he had reflected on the means by which the Catholic faith might profit from the slow but fatal dissolution of Islam. For the moment the European political situation favored his hopes, by preventing schismatic Russia and heretical England from seizing the Ottoman Empire; but this result was only negative. Eugène Boré, who received a scientific assignment in Persia by the Académie des Inscriptions, sent memorials to the Institute and reports to the Propagation of the Faith Society. After mature reflection and prolonged discussion of his ideas with a zealous Vincentian priest, he concluded that two indirect means of the apostolate should be employed at the same time: the spread of education to withdraw the Mussulmans from their false beliefs, and the evangelization of the Christians of the Orient to make Catholicism respected and desirable to the minds of these infidels, once they were disabused of their distorted notions. Boré himself founded and directed schools at Ispahan and Djoulfa. Later he devoted himself especially to the evangelization of the Christians in the Orient as a Vincentian.[1]

Gregory XVI was well suited to appreciate the wise views of the apostolate advocated by Boré. No work of direct evangelization of the Moslems was organized in the Orient; but works of education were increased there, and a considerable impulse was given to the evangelization of the Christians, both European and Oriental. In 1840 Father Daviers, a Vincentian, opened at Smyrna and confided to the Daughters of Charity a group of works including an orphan asylum, a foundling asylum, a dispensary, in a word, all the works that habitually constitute the charitable activities of the Sisters of St. Vincent

[1] Eugène Boré, ordained priest in 1850, soon after entered the novitiate of the Priests of the Mission, or Vincentians, and was sent as a missioner to the Orient shortly after pronouncing his vows. There he exercised the office of superior of the Bébek mission, then of prefect apostolic. Called to Paris as secretary of Father Etienne, his superior general, he succeeded him in 1874 and died four years later, after earning the title of apostle of the East.

de Paul. The next year a father of the Picpus Congregation founded, in that same city, a college intended for the children of well-to-do families. At the same time the Jesuits, especially encouraged by the Supreme Pontiff himself, developed their works in Syria.

Gregory XVI had become well informed on the state of the missions by his office as prefect of Propaganda. From the first year of his pontificate he placed at the disposal of Bishop Mazloum, Greek-Catholic bishop, three members of the Society of Jesus, Father Riccadonna of Plaisance, Father Planchet of Gap, and a lay brother, Henze of Hanover, to direct a seminary founded twenty years earlier at Ain-Tras in Lebanon. In consequence of various circumstances, the intended project was not carried out; but the three religious, soon joined by several of their fellow Jesuits, exercised a fruitful apostolate among the Christians resident in Syria, gave retreats to the laity and to the priests, explored the province of Hauran, until then almost unknown, discovered there a Christian population almost abandoned, and prepared the way for a more fruitful apostolate.

Their personal ministry extended to Mesopotamia. There, in 1832, Gregory XVI had instituted an apostolic delegation with a jurisdiction reaching into Persia. Father Riccadonna was given the task of appeasing certain differences that had arisen between the apostolic delegate and the native clergy. Father Planchet, in the name of Propaganda, headed the reorganization of the mission, which was confided to the French Dominicans in 1841. After Father Riccadonna's death, his successor, Father Ryllo, a Pole, was able to purchase, at the gates of Beyrouth, an extensive tract of land, and there built a residence. But his notable work was the foundation (1845) of the Ghazir seminary, which was designated by Propaganda as the central Asiatic seminary. Later on this house developed into two flourishing establishments: a seminary, and a college

where the rich Europeans at first, and then the native notables, the sheiks and emirs, applied to obtain the favor of a distinguished education for their sons.

In 1835 Egypt was opened to the influences of European civilization. At that time the apostolic delegate, Bishop Guasco, asked for the sending of more missioners to help in gathering about him the Coptic Catholics. The Daughters of Charity, at the cost of many hardships, arrived in 1845 to open a hospital and a school at Alexandria. Two years later the Christian Brothers there began for boys the sort of works that were already undertaken for the girls. The comparatively liberal regime inaugurated in Egypt favored also the evangelization of the Melchites. The word "Melchites" ("royalists," or "imperialists") was applied in the course of the fifth century to the Oriental Christians who, conformable to the edict of Emperor Marcian, followed the doctrine of the ecumenical council of Chalcedon, acknowledging in Christ one person and two natures. After being for a long time subject to the schismatic patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, in the eighth century they had energetically refused to follow the movement that came from Constantinople and they declined to break with Rome. The Melchites were consequently the object of many vexations on the part of their fellow Syrians, and they had to resist the government of the Porte, that wished to subject them to the authority of the Armenian patriarch. But the persevering efforts of Pope Gregory ended in their emancipation from all foreign tutelage and in the official recognition of their patriarch.[2] The Pope was also solicitous for the lot of the Maronites. In 1845 he took steps in their behalf with Abdul-Madjid, the sultan, and these efforts obtained a favorable reply from the Moslem sovereign.

European Turkey was not overlooked by the watchful Pontiff. In 1838, in an audience granted to Fieschi-Pasha, the

[2] See Cyril Charon (Karalevsky), *Histoire des patriarchats melkites*, II, 162–207.

ambassador of the Porte at Paris, he gave expression of his joy at the benevolent attitude of the Sultan, who had permitted the Catholics to erect new churches in Constantinople and in the provinces. And the Sultan, appreciative of this step, accentuated his relatively liberal policy toward the Church. At that time European Turkey counted 613,000 Catholics, 180,000 of whom lived in Constantinople. The independence of Greece also permitted the Pope to give a new impulse to the spread of the gospel in that country. By a brief of August 9, 1834, he established an apostolic delegation in Greece. Soon new churches were erected at Piraeas, Patras, Nauplia, and Navarino.

Under Pope Gregory such was the work of spreading the gospel in the East. Toward the end of his pontificate, the superior general of the Vincentians, Father Etienne, wrote: "The Koran has still its disciples, but only because it proscribes all education. At present, however, this prohibition is no longer regarded by the great. . . . Once they are permitted to frequent our schools, the gospel and science will find them equally docile to their instructions. From the moment the Turks are allowed to enjoy liberty of conscience and the blessings of education, the Church will be on the eve of counting them amongst the number of her children." [3] Various obstacles intervened to hinder the progress of the movement pointed out by the venerated religious. But his views have not lost their worth and continue to justify good hopes.

The Far East

Various difficulties were encountered in the Far East. In some respects, these were more painful to the heart of the Supreme Pontiff because many of these obstacles stemmed, not from infidel potentates, as in Turkey, but from Christian rulers, even Catholic rulers. We have noted the sad situation

[3] Marshall, *Christian Missions,* II, 24.

inflicted on the missions in India in consequence of events that preceded, accompanied, and followed the French Revolution.[4] For sixty years (1760–1820) the Catholic missions in India had to be abandoned for lack of missioners and resources. But the English and the Dutch, on the pretext of observing a policy of strict religious neutrality,[5] hindered the spread of Christianity. The East India Company refused to carry on its ships any missioner, whether Catholic or Protestant, bound for China or India. By a government ordinance of 1814, Christians born in the country were excluded from all public offices except the least important.[6] The English government was equally energetic in encouraging the worship of idols as in hindering the preaching of the gospel. A certain English Protestant who lived in India for several years comments that the acts of weakness committed by so-called Englishmen exceeded any idea we might suppose.[7] At the close of the eighteenth century the pagodas in the presidency of Madras were falling in ruin. And the English government was at pains to halt their decay. The ignoble and bloody cult of Juggernaut was not only sanctioned, but was abetted and practiced by the English authorities.[8] The famous general Sir Perregrine Maitland was obliged to return to England for having refused to give the English soldiers an order to fire a salvo in honor of the infamous idol.[9] If to these facts we add the scandal produced on the natives by the bad conduct of most of the Europeans, we must acknowledge, along with a Protestant writer, that this conduct was calculated to lead the natives to a contempt for the religion of Christ.[10]

God, however, was watching over the regions evangelized by Francis Xavier, Britto, Francis Laynez, and their heroic

[4] See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* VII, 516 f.
[5] *Asiatic Journal,* XVIII, 8.
[6] Marshall, *op. cit.,* I, 262 f.
[7] Colin Mackenzie, *Six Years in India,* I, 313.
[8] Marshall, *op. cit.,* pp. 265 f.
[9] See the *Times* of October 14, 1863. Cf. Marshall, I, 267.
[10] Mackenzie, *op. cit.,* I, 333.

companions. The pontificate of Gregory XVI would be marked by a remarkable development of the Catholic apostolate in India.

Many causes favored this development. The Catholic movement manifested in 1830 among the youth aroused a number of apostolic vocations; and the Congregation of Foreign Missions, reorganized in 1826, saw an increase in its membership. The Propagation of the Faith Society, founded at Lyons in 1822, furnished the missioners with more and more abundant financial help. Ocean travel became easier. Since the construction, in 1814, of the first paddle-wheel steamer, the art of navigation had developed. In 1824, the Sirus made the voyage from London to New York in seventeen days. Moreover, the long and apparently fruitless voyages of the Catholic missioners had borne fruit. The tireless devotedness of these men of God and scientific works like those of Father Dubois,[11] had contributed to make the missioners regarded, no longer as pariahs, but as men of high moral and intellectual worth and consequently of enormous importance, and had prepared men's minds to accept the preaching of the gospel.

India

The exceptionally enlightened zeal of a missioner, Bishop Bonnaud, of the Foreign Mission Society, was able to combine, with the help of God's grace, all these elements of success.[12] Bishop Bonnaud, a missioner in India since 1824, was appointed coadjutor of the Bishop of Pondichery in 1833, then vicar apostolic of India in 1836. In his various posts he revealed the highest qualities of missioner and administrator: prudence, combined with firmness, and far-sighted intelligence served by an accommodating activity.

[11] Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 517.

[12] On Bishop Bonnaud, see Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères*, III, 19.

One of his first cares was to publish several works setting forth the teachings of the Catholic Church and works of apologetics, calculated to destroy the prejudices of the Hindus. His principal writing was an exposition of Catholicism in the form of a history of mankind. He sketched the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the history of the Church, carefully noting the appearance of heresies and especially the Protestant heresy, which he refuted in a few short and decisive pages. The book concluded with the picture of Christian doctrine and life, such as the practice of the Church in the nineteenth century, with its feasts, its sacraments, its works of piety and of charity, defended against the objections of its adversaries.

The second care of the great missioner was the training of a native clergy. At Pondichery he founded a minor and a major seminary, clearly separating the two and relieving the professors of any service alien to their seminary functions. The seminarians began by being completely separated from the world, that they might devote themselves entirely to the development of a solid interior life. But, before being called to major orders, they were sent to accompany and help the priests in their apostolic rounds. Several synodal meetings, at which all the missioners were convoked, both secular and regular, were likewise the object of the zealous prelate's solicitude. The most important of these synods was that of 1844, which was held at Pondichery. It was for India what the synod of Se-Tchuen had been for China.[13] Lastly, the education of youth was the object of Bishop Bonnaud's special care. He founded several schools, and, at the request of the French government, himself directed the colonial seminary,[14] and in 1846, in opposition to the liveliest prejudices of the populations of India,[15] some schools for girls, confided to a congregation of sisters.

[13] *Ibid.*, III, 142–47.

[14] Beginning in 1879, the colonial seminary was entrusted to the Fathers of the Holy Ghost.

[15] Dubois, *Mœurs des peuples de l'Inde,* I, 476.

In the *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* we can easily follow the progress of the Indian mission after 1820. About 1821 a missioner wrote: "I am astonished at the faith of these Christians." In 1829 Father Bonnaud, not yet a bishop, made a similar observation.[16] Ten years later, Father Garnier, a Jesuit, related that, notwithstanding much ignorance and many superstitious practices, "the Christians of these countries are in general well disposed and strongly attached to the faith. The usages introduced by the Jesuits still subsist: morning prayer in common an hour before sunrise; evening prayer with spiritual reading; catechism for the children given every day by a catechist; and the devotions of Mass on Sundays in the chapel. When the missionary makes his tour of the district, all approach the sacraments." In 1849 Father Louis de Saint-Cyr noted that "within a certain radius around what we call the center of the mission, all the villages, with rare exceptions, are Christian." The next year, Bishop Borghi, vicar apostolic of Agra, reported: "Surrounded as we are by sects, religion advances in the midst of them, with quiet but steady and uninterrupted progress." [17]

The Indian missions were, however, a cause of grief for the Supreme Pontiff. This grief was the greater as the responsibility could be attributed to the action of a Catholic power, Portugal. To fill the gaps in the clergy of their colonies, particularly in the diocese of Goa, the Portuguese had ordained, without the candidates having sufficient priestly preparation, some native priests, or half-castes, whose disedifying conduct had given the Goa clergy an unpleasant reputation and might seriously discredit the Catholic religion.

[16] Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 250 f. Father Bertrand, writing from Madura, related this fact, often referred to since then: "Among these Indians there are numbers who, if asked whether they commit particular faults, will reply: 'Formerly I did—it is many years since. I told it to the Father, who forbade me to do so, and since then I have not committed it.'" *Op. cit.*, I, 250.

Upon taking possession of the Apostolic See, Gregory XVI, already made acquainted with the situation from his office as prefect of Propaganda, which he had just held, thought that the first measure to be taken to restore the former luster to the missions of the Far East was to put an end to the scandals which the Lisbon government was unable to stop.

He began, therefore, to institute in India some vicariates apostolic and entrusted them to various missionary societies. Thus were established the vicariates of Ceylon, Sirdhana, and Bengal (1834–35), Madras and Pondichery (1836). The Portuguese government protested. The Pope replied by the bull *Multa praeclare* (August 14, 1838), which suppressed the jurisdiction of the Portuguese bishops in the territories attributed to the vicars apostolic. The Portuguese refused to submit, contested the validity of the papal act by juridical quibbles, and finally organized a formal schism. This was "the schism of Goa." The conflict seemed to be appeased when, in 1843, Gregory XVI, in agreement with Queen Maria, placed over the government of the Goa diocese, Bishop Silva Torrès. But scarcely had the newly chosen ruler, backed by the civil authority, arrived at Goa, when he showed his intention of exercising, in spite of the orders of the Pope, all the jurisdiction enjoyed by his predecessors. Thus was resumed the schism of Goa, which would afflict the Church until the pontificate of Leo XIII.[18]

Indochina

Cruel persecutions afflicted the Church in Indochina. On October 17, 1883, Father Gagelin, a priest of the Paris Foreign Missions, underwent death with so calm a piety that the pagan

[18] On this subject see the letter of Gregory XVI of March 1, 1845, the consistorial allocution of Pius IX of February 17, 1851, the concordat between Pius IX and Peter V of Portugal (February 21, 1857), and the accord between Leo XIII and the crown of Portugal (June 26, 1886). Cf. Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises,* II, 200–7.

crowd, witnessing it, was unable to restrain its emotion.[19] Several of his faithful and neophytes suffered the same lot with a like courage. Some of them, before the act of sacrifice, were beaten with rods to the point of seeing their flesh fall in shreds. One of their executioners was heard to exclaim: "Indeed this Christian religion is a good religion." On September 21, 1838, Father Jaccard, a friend of Father Gagelin, received also his crown of martyrdom. The executioners broke ten bamboos on his body without wringing any outcry from him. Bishop Tabert, vicar apostolic of the kingdom of Annam, wrote: "In my vicariate alone 80,000 Christians are flying hither and thither in the deepest distress. . . . Nearly 400 churches, the creation of their labors and alms, are utterly destroyed." [20] Father Marchand, under the torture of red-hot pincers, gave testimony to the truth until his last breath. On November 24, 1838, Bishop Borie, vicar apostolic of Tonkin, was beheaded, after seven unsuccessful attempts by the executioner, whom the martyr encouraged, while the mandarins covered their faces with horror. On September 11, 1840, Father Perboyre, a Vincentian, died after undergoing for a whole year one of the longest and most cruel martyrdoms that any man has ever endured.

China

Not only in Indochina, but also in China the persecution raged with fury. When Gregory XVI mounted the papal throne, the persecution which was let loose in 1814 [21] was still going on. Missioners, Chinese priests, catechists, and simple faithful were put to death, thrown into prison, and sent into exile to the depths of Tartary. "There is no more famous date (1840) in the annals of Chinese missions." [22]

[19] Jacquenet, *Vie de M. l'abbé Gagelin.*
[20] Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, 109.
[21] Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 519 ff.
[22] Marshall, *op. cit.*, I, 128.

From another point of view, we might say that no more shameful date can be found in the history of civilization in the Far East. Several Christian powers were moved and judged the moment had come for them to intervene, if only to protect their material interests. In 1842 England, limiting herself to this concern, obtained from China the opening of a certain number of ports for her commerce. In 1884 the United States, by a special article, stipulated the freedom of the Christian religion in the open ports. Toward the end of that same year (October 23) M. de Lagrenée, minister plenipotentiary of King Louis Philippe, signed, at Canton, with the Chinese minister, Ki-Ying, a similar treaty, but more explicit in its clauses. Exceeding his first instructions but not without referring the question to Guizot, then prime minister, who approved it, Lagrenée obtained from the Chinese negotiator that two edicts should be issued, in the name of the Emperor and under his seal, in favor of native Christians. The first, under date of December 28, granted them the free exercise of their religion. The second, dated February 20, 1846, promised them the restitution of their former churches.[23]

Korea

Korea, a vassal of China and bordering on that kingdom, was also the scene of violent persecutions.[24] We have recounted the preaching of the gospel in this country and told how, in the course of half a century, the Church of Korea, founded without priests, was preserved and spread without priests, except for the five-year apostolate of the Chinese priest James Tsiou. From 1784 to 1835 it underwent four major persecutions, never enjoyed full security, and gave more than a thousand

[23] Piolet, *op. cit.*, III, 79; *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith,* XVIII, 81; XXI, 23–25.

[24] Mourret, *op. cit.*, VII, 515.

martyrs. Bishop Brugnière, appointed vicar apostolic of Korea by Pope Leo XII in 1827, did not succeed in entering the country. He died on the frontier of the empire at the beginning of the winter of 1835, after repeating his fruitless attempts for several years.

The first missioner to penetrate there was Father Maubant, of the Paris Foreign Missions, who arrived in 1836, soon followed by Father Chastan and Bishop Imbert, who had been a missioner in Se-Tchouan for ten years. The presence of these three zealous, courageous, and experienced missioners was an immense benefit for the Christian people there, who began to organize on the model of the European countries. But in 1839 the government of Korea passed into the hands of a sworn enemy of the Christians. The three missioners, betrayed by a false brother, were arrested and, on September 21, were put to death along with 250 of their disciples, of whom 70 were beheaded and 180 were strangled. A few years later (1844) the French admiral Cécille, coasting along the peninsula, sent the sovereign a letter threatening the vengeance of France if the persecution continued. By way of reply, the despot had a native priest, Andrew Kim, put to death. Korea was not freely opened to missions until 1910, after the Russo-Japanese war.

The plan of admiral Cécille, encouraged by Lagrenée's success in China, was to open Korea and Japan to the Catholic missioners. His failure with the Korean government did not discourage him. Moreover, his project was the result of an understanding with the ecclesiastical authorities. When, in 1832, the Holy See erected Korea into a vicariate apostolic, joining to it the Ryukyu islands, the move was in the hope that these islands, near-by and dependent on Japan, would be the gateway by which Christianity would again enter that country. Neither Bishop Brugnière nor Bishop Imbert was able to land on the Ryukyu islands. But in 1844 the French admiral proposed to the procurator of the China missions, Father Libois,

the entry into Japan by one or two of his missioners. Father Forcade, the future archbishop of Aix, offered himself. Accompanied by an intelligent and brave catechist, a former confessor of the faith in China, Augustine Ko, he was presented to the authorities of Nafa, capital of the principal island, as an interpreter of the French admiral, desiring to make a deep study of the Japanese language.

Japan

At that time the empire of Japan was still systematically closed to foreigners. The Russians, English, and Americans had already tried to penetrate at Yeddo and Nagasaki, and had been refused admittance. Long and trying negotiations, carried on perseveringly by admirals Cécille and Guérin, concluded with the authorization given to the missioners to buy a little house at Nafa. But the work of evangelization seemed to be no further advanced. On the pretext of protecting the two foreigners, the king of Nafa had them accompanied everywhere by mandarins, forbade them to enter into the cities, kept them aloof from the common people, and ordered all houses to be closed at their approach. Nevertheless Father Forcade was able to make some reassuring observations. The Japanese people seemed to him to be a gentle people, kindly disposed, polite, intelligent, desiring to enter into relations with the Europeans; he even had serious reasons for believing so, after certain indications that a group of Christians subsisted in Japan in hiding. The future would justify these presentiments. But meanwhile the mandarins increased the precautions to prevent Father Forcade and his companion from undertaking the least religious propaganda among the natives.[25]

[25] See Marnas, *La religion de Jésus au Japon,* I, 80. Cf. Marbot, *Vie de Mgr Forcade.*

Africa

Among the lands that Gregory desired most earnestly to rescue from the yoke of infidelity, was one that in the early days of the Church rivaled the great Church of Alexandria. Having received the gospel in the first century of Christianity and famous for its great bishops and its glorious martyrs, the northern region of Africa, the country of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, of St. Felicitas and St. Perpetua, fell to the power of Islam at the end of the seventh century. The twenty basilicas of the Church of Carthage had been turned into mosques. Since that time Christianity was represented in the Barbary states only by European slaves captured by the Moslems and abandoned to their fate by the Christian rulers. But, thanks to a mission founded at Tunis in the thirteenth century following the expedition of St. Louis, and thanks to the zeal of the Friars Preachers, the Friars Minor, the Trinitarians, the religious of Mercy, and later the sons of St. Vincent de Paul, the light of faith was not entirely extinguished on these shores.[26]

Algiers

The clergy in France were stirred with religious enthusiasm by the conquest of Algiers in 1830.[27] The fleur-de-lis seemed to be a forerunner of the sign of Redemption. In fact, after the victory the Count of Bourmont, commander of the expeditionary army, at once planted a cross on the loftiest monument of Algiers.[28] Unhappily the July government of France, by a misconceived respect for the so-called freedom of conscience, did nothing to acquaint the natives of Algiers with religious truth, nothing to affirm the Catholic faith of the victorious nation.

[26] See Le Roy, s.v. "Afrique," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, I, 543.
[27] See above, p. 142.
[28] Pioneau, *Vie de Mgr Dupuch, premier évêque d'Alger*, p. 87.

Pretense was made to say not a word about religion, to perform no religious ceremony before the Arabs. This policy did not impress them favorably; rather it scandalized them. They despised those Frenchmen, who lived like godless men and, in the words of one of the Arab leaders, "those dogs, who never pray to God." [29] Besides, when, two years after the conquest, a question arose of building a church in the city of Algiers, a Moor made the following reply to a magistrate who asked him how the Mussulman population would view this edifice: "Hasten to erect it, for only then will we believe that you have a God and that your word can be trusted." [30] In 1838 the government finally grasped that for many reasons, among other reasons to win the regard of the natives, Catholic worship needed to be organized in Algiers. Consultations with the court of Rome ended in the erection at Algiers of a diocese that would depend on the metropolitan authority of the archbishop of Aix. A bull of Gregory XVI (August 9, 1838), promulgated in France by the *Moniteur,* officially approved this erection. A short time later, the Pope appointed to the new post a young vicar general of Bordeaux, Father Antoine Dupuch.

Born in the ancient capital of Guyenne in 1800, of an honorable family of merchants, Antoine Dupuch, at first as a law student and later as a lawyer, was one of the most zealous members of the Congregation which Father Ronsin was then directing. As in the case of several of his comrades, the practice of works of charity was for him the prelude of an even loftier vocation. In 1822 he entered the seminary. As a priest, in his

[29] This was the word of Abd-el-Kader to one of his prisoners. See Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* III, 541.

[30] *Moniteur* of August 1, 1832. *The Journal des Débats* had said in all seriousness that, following the conversion of the Arabs, the local color would disappear, a change that would be harmful. Replied Louis Veuillot: "Assuredly we would lose those picturesque rifle shots that lend variety to the march of our troops. We should understand that the Arabs will belong to France only when they become French; they will become French only when they are Christians; and they will not be Christians so long as we ourselves are not."

native diocese, he exercised as missioner, as director of works of charity, and as vicar general an apostolic activity that designated him for the highest and most delicate offices. After his appointment, the *Ami de la religion* commented: "Father Dupuch is well fitted to create in Algiers all that it lacks." But these lacks of the new diocese were vast.

"When Bishop Dupuch landed in Algeria, he found in Algiers only one church, served by a single priest, lacking the objects necessary for public worship, and an establishment of sisters; at Oran, an aged and worn-out priest; at Bone, a wretched chapel, a zealous priest who was without resources, and the beginning of a community of sisters. Nothing else in all these possessions." [31] "A bishop without priests, in the midst of an infidel or unbelieving people; backed up in Paris by the King, in Algiers by the governor general, but having against him an unyielding bureaucracy; repulsed by the indifference of the rich; too poor, even with the many gifts from the faithful in France, Bishop Dupuch at first was merely the most pestered of the persons holding office." [32] But his zeal did not weary. A year after his arrival he had twenty-five priests, eight churches, seven chapels, a seminary, eight schools, two orphan asylums, and a native hospital. In 1840 a mosque was turned over to him to be made into a cathedral. The foundation of several schools and institutions of charity by the Trinitarian Sisters of Valence, in the city of Oran; that of a house of the Good Shepherd in the neighborhood of Algiers in 1843; that of a boarding school of the Madames of the Sacred Heart at Mustapha; the foundation of the Trappists of Staouél in 1845: [33] these works were among the most fruitful of the zealous prelate. Abandoned by the government, at the end of ten

[31] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, III, 541.
[32] Louis Veuillot, *Les Français en Algérie*, p. 297.
[33] Berdange, *Dom François-Régis, fondateur de la Trappe de Staouéli.*

years of the apostolate, he had to return to France. But he left behind him 80 priests, 140 sisters, 60 churches or chapels, a seminary, Christian schools, military hospitals, reformatories, associations of ladies of charity, all a flowering of evangelical works. And he had laid the bases of the chief foundations to which his two great successors, Bishop Pavy and Cardinal Lavigerie, would give such splendor.

Abyssinia

Another old Christian country of Africa was Abyssinia. It had been lost to the Church and had fallen into schism two centuries earlier. During the year following Bishop Dupuch's arrival in Algeria, Abyssinia received a great missioner, Father de Jacobis. A French explorer, Antoine d'Abbadie, who in 1837 had succeeded in penetrating the heart of Ethiopia and who had been impressed by the depth and refinement of the religious sentiments of the inhabitants, went to Rome to communicate to the Congregation of Propaganda the results of his observations. The creation of a mission in Abyssinia was decided on, and its direction was assigned to a priest of the Mission, a native of Naples, Father de Jacobis, who arrived at Massaua in 1839 with the title of prefect apostolic. This man's gentleness, patience, and boundless charity soon won the kindly feelings of the people and even of several chiefs. In spite of the many obstacles arising from human respect and from family ties, two little communities of Catholics were soon formed near Massaua and Gouala, and four parish churches were erected in Agamie. A breath of powerful grace passed over this region. Moreover, helpers arrived to assist the worker who was weakened by excess of labor: Father Biancheri, Vincentian, and in 1846 Bishop Massaia, vicar apostolic of the new Galla mission, along with several Capuchin fathers, who lent him their assist-

ance while waiting for the route to the Galla country to be opened to them.[34]

But at this time a Coptic bishop, the abouna[35] Salama, known for the looseness of his morals and the violence of his fanaticism, had, by his criticisms, raised up a persecution against the missioners. Tracked down by hordes of brigands, the Catholic communities were obliged to disperse. However, the efforts of the enemies of the Roman Church were powerless to destroy the people's friendly feeling toward the missioners. New apostolic centers were formed, and these were the consolation of Bishop de Jacobis, who was consecrated by Bishop Massaia in 1851.

Central Africa

Algeria and Abyssinia were missionary points. From there the missioners of the nineteenth century, following or preceding the explorers and armies of Europe, set out for the conquest of the African continent. Pope Gregory did not live to see the results; but he was able to hail the first fruits.

Bishop Le Roy, one of the apostles of this country, writes as follows:

Providence was preparing a new era for the vast dark continent. In our times when the European powers were going to divide it among them, new apostles had to rise up to precede them or follow them. This movement, which would mark the end of the nineteenth century, was modest in its origin and had its start from the seminary of St. Sulpice. At that time this house had two young Creole seminarians, Frederick La Vavasseur, a native of the island of Reunion (Bourbon), and Eugene Tisserand of Haiti. Having seen at close hand the lamentable abandonment in which the black race was living, they made this situation known to one of their elders. This was Francis Libermann, born

[34] Coulneaux, in the *Missions catholiques*, II, 21.

[35] An abouna is a metropolitan in the Ethiopian Church.

at Saverne in 1803 and recently converted from Judaism to the Christian faith. Shortly afterward (1841) a new congregation was founded, the Society of the Holy Heart of Mary, which, seven years later joined to that of the Holy Ghost, thereafter bore this double title. Its founder died in 1852 and has since been declared Venerable. His first care was to evangelize the blacks of the French colonies, still subject to slavery, and to prepare them gradually for liberty.

The apostolate of Father Laval on Ile Maurice has remained rightly celebrated. Later on, through the care of Father Libermann, the French colonies of Reunion, Guadeloupe, and Martinique were erected into dioceses, and the new society entered the land of Africa. This entrance was undertaken under the patronage of Bishop England of Charlestown. This prelate, stirred by the activity of the American Protestants, who had just founded Liberia, in 1833 called the attention of Propaganda to the state of affairs, and the Council of Baltimore backed his move. Seven years later his vicar general, Father Barron, visited the coast of Africa and, on his return, was appointed vicar apostolic of the Two Guineas. But where were missioners to be found? At that time at Notre Dame des Victoires in Paris, he providentially made the acquaintance of Father Libermann, who was wondering where to send his spiritual sons, and at once supplied seven helpers. The African missions were taken up again and were never abandoned after that.[36]

The United States

The Church in America was then in need of being strengthened. Native Americanism, which we have already spoken of,[37] was trying to stir up a persecution against the Catholics of the United States.

Attempts were made to exclude Catholics from political office. At Philadelphia some churches were destroyed in 1843, and blood flowed. At Boston in 1844 the Ursuline convent was given to the flames, and the city was threatened with civil war. That same year New York

[36] Le Roy, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire,* I, 544. For more details, see Cardinal J. B. Pitra, *Vie du R. P. Libermann.*

[37] See above, p. 174.

with great difficulty escaped bloody conflicts. A bitterly hostile press spread suspicions and calumnies everywhere. The question of the schools aroused still more anti-Catholic feeling of the Protestant population. The Church found herself seriously endangered in her social existence. She seemed to gather all her forces against the dangers, without at the same time ceasing its development in the midst of the prodigious growth of the nation.[38]

Three principal means were employed to remedy the situation: the meeting of frequent provincial councils, the creation of new episcopal sees, and the organization of new missions, generally entrusted to religious. From 1833 to 1849 six provincial councils were held at Baltimore. At the second of these councils was adopted, with the approval of Rome, a method of nominating bishops, which was supplemented by decrees of the third plenary council.[39]

The principal bishoprics erected by Gregory XVI in the United States were those of Vincennes, Detroit, Pittsburg, Nashville, Dubuque, Natchez, Little Rock, Chicago, Milwaukee, Hartford, Buffalo, Albany, and Cleveland. The first bishop of Vincennes was Bruté de Rémur, a Sulpician priest who had accompanied Bishop Flaget to America in 1808. When Bishop Bruté took possession of his see, everything had to be created. His clergy consisted of four or five priests. A wooden cathedral was there, one other wooden church, and a few temporary chapels. His people, less than 30,000 Catholics, were scattered over a territory as big as the fourth of France.[40] Thanks to his zeal and that of his successor, Bishop de la Hailandière, and to the devotedness of their missionary helpers, Fathers Petit, Desseville, Buteux, Benoît, and Schoeffer, the statistics of the Vincennes diocese at the end of 1842 reckoned 36 missioners, 53 churches or chapels, a college con-

[38] G. André, in Vacant's *Dictionnaire*, I, 1057.

[39] On the method of nominating bishops in the United States, see *ibid.*, I, 1063.

[40] Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises*, I, 205.

ducted by the Eudists, 3 schools under the Sisters of Providence, and 2 schools founded by the Brothers of St. Joseph. In 1844 the Bishop had the happiness of remarking that almost all the Catholics fulfilled their Easter duty and attended the offices of the Church.[41]

In the other dioceses recently founded, the new bishops had to engage in similar missionary work. Among the religious that helped to spread the faith in the United States under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, we may mention: the Congregation of the Holy Cross, called by Bishop de la Hailandière; the Fathers of Mercy, established in New York in 1842; the Jesuits, who came to New Orleans in 1837; the Sulpicians, entrusted with the education of young men and with some missions until they could take up the direction of seminaries, the proper object of their institute; lastly, the Madames of the Sacred Heart, the Daughters of Charity, and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Le Puy.

Canada

The years of Gregory's pontificate were fruitful for the Church of Canada. In 1840 Bishop Forbin-Janson organized some missions there. The wonderful fruit of these missions was strengthened by the establishing of parish retreats.[42] In 1841 Bishop Bourget, first bishop of Montreal, invited into his diocese the Oblates of Mary, who realized on the Canadian soil their evangelical motto: *Evangelizare pauperibus misit me.* The next year he invited the Jesuits, who, withdrawn after the conquest, happily returned to the land which their fathers had fertilized by their labors and their blood.[43] Several congregations of sisters were founded. The number of dioceses was increased. Gregory XVI in 1841 erected the diocese of Toronto,

[41] *Ibid.*, I, 207.
[42] Philipin de Rivières, *Vie de Mgr de Forbin-Janson*, pp. 382–402.
[43] Chassegros, *Histoire du noviciat de la Compagnie de Jésus au Canada.*

to which he appointed Bishop de Charbonnel; the next year, that of Saint-Jean, under Bishop Dollard. Two years later he created the ecclesiastical province of Quebec, over which Archbishop Signay was appointed, assigning to him as suffragans the bishops of Montreal, Kingston, and Toronto. The growth of the population called for an increasing number of schools. A devout man, Meilleur by name, in 1842 became superintendent of education for Lower Canada. He gave a vigorous impulse to public education. Conformable to the regulations of 1841, assuring to Catholics and Protestants separate primary schools, the bishops created numerous distinctly Catholic establishments.

South America

We have seen how the revolutionary movement shattered the bonds of many countries of Latin America with Spain. Gregory XVI, solicitous especially for the good of souls, thought the time opportune to treat directly with the new authorities of those countries for the organization of the hierarchy there.[44] That no Church might be outside his care, the Pontiff in 1836 established in New Granada a chargé d'affaires, who would watch over the religious interests of the American republics, which were without any representation at the Holy See.

In South America as in North America an abuse existed that could not leave the head of the Church indifferent: it was the slave trade. Gregory XVI raised his voice (December 3, 1839) to recall the doctrine of the Church on this subject. First the Pope showed how Christianity had gradually made slavery disappear from all countries where it was practiced. Then he added:

But we grieve to have to say that, even among the Christians of today, men shamefully blinded by a sordid desire for gain do not hesi-

[44] See above, pp. 112, 213.

tate to reduce to slavery, in distant lands, or even help in this unworthy crime, organizing the trade in these unfortunates, whom others have put in chains. . . . By virtue of our apostolic authority we reprove all these practices as entirely unworthy of the name of Christian and we forbid any ecclesiastic or layman to teach in public or in private, in any manner whatsoever, anything contrary to these apostolic letters.[45]

Oceania

Oceania is a multitude of islands scattered over the South Sea, which covers a third of the globe. The preaching of the gospel in these Islands presented difficulties of a nature and gravity that could not be foreseen. But these obstacles dismayed neither Gregory nor the valiant workers to whom he turned. By his brief *Omnium gentium* (April 29, 1836) he entrusted to the young Society of Mary the mission of carrying the light of the gospel to Oceania. A group of seven missioners, comprising four fathers and three lay brothers, set out at once. The oldest of these fathers, born in the village of Cuet in 1803, was called Pierre Chanel. As a youth, while shepherding the flocks, he aspired to work in the overseas missions. As soon as he had pronounced his religious vows in the Society of Mary, his desires were gratified. On November 1, 1837, an apostolic band had landed on the Wallis Islands. Winning them to the Christian faith cost four years of prayer, labor, and tribulation for its first apostle, Father Bataillon.[46] The second mission, that of Futuna, was even more costly for the gentle and holy Father Chanel, who after some years of a hard and apparently sterile apostolate, fell under the sword of the enemies of the religion which he was preaching.[47]

The mission of New Zealand was founded by Bishop Pom-

[45] Bernasconi, II, 387.

[46] Mangeret, *Mgr Bataillon*

[47] Nicolet, *Vie du B. Chanel*, p. 272. Father Chanel was declared Blessed by Leo XIII on November 17, 1889.

palier amid sufferings and humiliations. Within a few years six missioners were massacred, five perished at sea, others were devoured by the cannibals. But soon the survivors were able to write: "Religion is winning the ground which it seems to be losing in Europe. *Regnavit Dominus, laetentur insulae multae.*" Cannibalism disappeared everywhere. Some islands formed themselves into a kind of religious community. Others combined into a Christian confederation. All of them formed a sort of necklace of precious gems for the Spouse of Christ. Oceania, with its 180,000 scattered faithful, in the closing years of the nineteenth century offered a sight which perhaps no preceding age had shown.

However, the secondary foreign mission activities increased. The Propagation of the Faith Society, founded in 1822, collected more than two million francs in 1840. At Aachen the Society of St. Francis Xavier began; in 1839, in Austria the Leopoldsverein; in 1843, in Bavaria the Ludwigsverein; in the same year, in France the Work of the Holy Infancy, founded for the purchase and baptism of abandoned Chinese infants; its purpose becoming subsequently more general, the apostolate of Christian children among children in pagan countries.[48]

[48] Sometimes the work of the Holy Infancy has been attacked on the ground that it was without a justifiable purpose since, as was said, the Chinese have great regard for human life, especially that of children. Yet we know from letters of the missioners, as also from authentic declarations of impartial witnesses, such as Admiral Dumont-d'Urville, Baron Hübner, Captain de la Jaille, and Mr. Wade, the English minister at Pekin in 1871, that many infants were abandoned by the Chinese. Says Dumont d'Urville: "The Peking police gather up a good number of these infants in the streets." Some contrary assertions have been made by serious observers, such as Léon Rousset, in his *A travers la Chine*, and Eugène Simon in *La cité chinoise*, where he says: "I affirm that infanticide is much less frequent in China than in France" (quoted by Maréchal, *Histoire contemporaine*, II, 593). Perhaps these travelers never or rarely saw abandoned infants. The Chinese do indeed regard a large family as a blessing of heaven, and in normal times neither rich nor poor think of abandoning their children. But famines are frequent, sudden, and terrible in China (see Maurice Courant, *Annales de l'Ecole des sciences politiques*, July, 1900, p. 526). These are the periods when poverty-stricken families rid themselves of their children, not as in Europe by abortions or the criminal use of preventives, but by exposing infants on the highways or in the streets. As the Chinese

Death of Gregory XVI

The sight of the progress of the Church in pagan countries did not make the Holy Father forget the trials it was experiencing in Europe. The activities of the secret societies, the equivocal attitudes of liberalism, the encroachments of the sovereigns on the religious domain, and the rashness of an irreligious and frivolous literature were continual matters of grief for him. In 1846, at the beginning of his eighty-first year and the sixteenth of his pontificate, he had a foreboding of his approaching end. In his will he wrote: "We, Gregory XVI, unworthy heir of the chair of St. Peter, having before our mind the hour of our death and the summons to the divine tribunal, . . . recommend our poor soul to our Lord Jesus Christ. To the same divine Redeemer we recommend the Church, His well beloved Spouse, in the numerous trials and persecutions with which she is assailed." On May 26, 1846, a rather mild attack of erysipelas prevented his presiding at a religious ceremony. Soon the ailment became grave and took him from this world on June 1, 1846. He died as a poor religious, replying to some persons who were recalling the great works of his pontificate: "I wish to die as a monk and not as a sovereign." These were the Pope's last words.[49] *La Quotidienne* expressed the feelings of the Catholics when, on the morrow of his death, it published the following lines:

The Catholic world has lost a great pope, one of those wise and conciliatory spirits needed in periods of transition. At times astonish-

---

father of a family, like the ancient paterfamilias, had the right of life and death over his children, he was safe from any legal prosecution. Moreover, the missioners declare that a whole year may pass in China without sight of an abandoned infant; but let a year of flood or of drought come, starting with scarcity of food, then the exposing of infants will become frequent. On this subject, see Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères,* III, 125–29; Piolet, *Les missions catholiques françaises,* III, 260–67; *Annales de la propagation de la foi,* XXVIII, 52.

[49] *Ami de la religion,* CXXXIX, 653.

ment was felt at not seeing Gregory XVI take the initiative in certain questions of a general import, of social transformation, or of political liberty, that were preoccupying the peoples and disturbing the states. But history will say that he intervened in all these questions to the extent that suited the present situation of the Church; that, while he respected the rights of the crowns, he proclaimed the rights of consciences, and that in the presence of so many violent and revolutionary deeds perpetrated by Europe, he maintained, as far as he could, the rule of Christian ideas and the holiness of Christian maxims.[50]

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 595.

PART III

Pontificate of Pius IX

CHAPTER XXIV

Pius IX and the Papal States (1846–1849)

GREGORY was elected on the morrow of a great European commotion. He died at a time when a new cataclysm, a deeper one and more violent, was in preparation. The revolution of 1830 marked the triumph of parliamentarianism, gave preponderance to the middle classes, and seemed to end in simple political rearrangements. The revolution of 1848 would directly affect the popular classes and would tend to a complete social reorganization. For some time past, a subdued unrest, not manifest by any precise fact or by any well-defined formula, yet perceptible in its general significance, was stirring France, Germany, Belgium, and especially Italy. But, strange to say, the Catholics of all shades of opinion, who had been amazed by the fall of the Bourbons, considered with unruffled calm the perspective of a future that would give more place to the peoples than to the kings and would introduce an era of greater political liberty.

A few days after Gregory's death, the *Correspondant* wrote: "Today a good understanding with the people is more important than with the princes." [1] In the *Univers* of June 10, 1846, Louis Veuillot said: "The Pontiff whose loss we now mourn will be more illustrious by the great things prepared under his reign than by the things he accomplished. . . . A grateful posterity will refer back to him the triumph of Catholic liberty which is now certain." [2] The *Quotidienne,* the organ of the legitimists, expressed its wish that the "mild and peaceful sov-

[1] *Correspondant,* XIV (1846), 808.
[2] *Univers,* June 10, 1846.

ereignty of the Holy See may long subsist for the order of the world and the liberty of the peoples." [3] Nowhere were the aspirations more boldly declared than in Italy. There Father Gioberti's *Primato,* Count Balbo's *Speranze d'Italia,* and Marquis Azeglio's *Casi di Romagna* had set forth the ideal of an Italian confederation. The pope, having become a liberal and a patriot, would be its head, and the king of Piedmont the arm. At the hour of setting out for the conclave, a member of the Sacred College, Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti, bishop of Imola, asked one of his diocesans to give him these three works, saying "that he might pay homage to the new pope with these three beautiful books." [4]

The Conclave

In the masses the liberal sentiment was less restrained. With a view to preventing this feeling from going to excess and to hinder the great powers from exercising pressure on the coming election, the Italian cardinals urged the fixing of Sunday, June 14, as the date for the conclave, without waiting for the arrival of the foreign cardinals. According to certain rumors, which perhaps were nothing more than an expression of some desires, the conclave would be a long one. A warm strife would ensue—so some said—between Cardinal Lambruschini, who was, rightly or wrongly, represented as the candidate of the absolutist party, and Cardinal Gizzi, who would be backed by the liberal or moderate party.[5] Others held that the conflict which would divide the Sacred College would arise between what was called the Genoese party, directed by Lambruschini, and the Roman party, which would follow the promptings of Bernetti.[6] A hope was entertained that these discussions would permit the revolutionary agitations to break out in the Roman state and would enable the powers to intervene and weigh on

[3] Quoted by the *Ami de la religion,* CXXIX (1846), 596.
[4] Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet,* VII, 221.
[5] Pougeois, *Histoire de Pie IX,* I, 96–98.
[6] *Univers,* June 26, 1846.

the votes of the cardinals. None of these hypotheses was realized. In the first ballot Gregory's last Secretary of State received seventeen votes [7] as a testimony of deference and esteem. In the next three ballots the cardinals more and more concentrated their votes on Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti, whose name, proposed by Cardinal Altieri, bishop of Albano, rallied a large number of votes. The conclave had lasted only two days.

Pius IX

The new pope, who, in memory of Pius VII, his predecessor in the see of Imola, took the name of Pius IX, was fifty-four years of age. Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti, a son of the family of the Counts of Mastai, was born at Sinigaglia in the March of Ancona, on May 13, 1792. Some distant relationship connected him with Pius VII, but he was never seen involved in any great political affairs. The people of Rome did not know him; his name, proclaimed by the cardinal deacon, June 17, from the balcony of the Quirinal, aroused at first only surprise in the crowd.[8] But when the Pontiff appeared to give his first blessing *urbi et orbi,* the harmonious power of his voice, the gentle and majestic beauty of his features, and an impression of goodness emanating from his whole person, immediately won the hearty acclamations of all. The people soon found out that this instinctive sympathy had not been misplaced.

The life of the new pope was soon well known. Noteworthy milestones were: his pious childhood under the care of a noble mother; his first aspiration toward ecclesiastical life, hindered by a terrible attack of epilepsy; his promotion to the priesthood at the age of thirty-one; his first ministry in a humble asylum for poor children; the distant mission given him in 1823 by Pope Leo XII in the New World, to regulate the new relations between the clergy and the state in the republics that had just

[7] This is the figure given in some accounts; others say twelve or thirteen.
[8] Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 127.

shaken off the yoke of Spain; his short and profitable administration of the great hospice of St. Michael at Rome; his bishopric at Spoleto amid the political troubles of 1831 and 1832, where his goodness and charity had disarmed 4,000 insurgents prepared to pillage the city; lastly, his numerous works of charity in the important diocese of Imola. The fervent Catholics rejoiced at the coming of a pope whose soul was filled with the purest evangelical charity. The revolutionists themselves, at a time and in a country where the idea of revolution was covered with a religious and Christian tint, did not hesitate to acclaim a pope who recently had received their brethren of Spoleto with words of kindness and peace. Some added that, by the traditions of his family and by his personal feelings, Pius IX was not unfriendly to the liberal tendencies; that one of his brothers was involved in the uprisings of 1831;[9] and that, at any rate, he was neither a monk nor a foreigner, and that, being a native of the territory that he was to govern, he would be able to take in hand the cause of National independence.[10] The result of all these impressions, of all these memories, and of all these reflections was a general enthusiasm. "Perhaps nothing ever equaled the hosanna of the first days of this reign. The world was dazzled with a feeling of fondness."[11]

Italian Political Parties

The new pope had never previously engaged in any political activity. But he was clearly connected, by his personal sympathies and by his family antecedents, to what was then called

[9] Letter of Rossi, the French ambassador, to Guizot, the minister of foreign affairs in France, under date of June 17, 1846 (Guizot, *Mémoires,* VIII, 341). One day Gregory had said: "In the house of the Mastai everyone is a liberal, even the cat." The authenticity of these words has been questioned (L. Veuillot, *Pie IX,* in *Grandes figures catholiques,* I, 29). But J. B. de Rossi repeatedly asserted their genuineness, declaring that he had them from his father, a close friend of Gregory XVI.

[10] Guizot, *loc. cit.*

[11] Louis Veuillot, *Pie IX,* I, 39, and his *Mélanges,* Vol. I.

the national school. The revolutionary school, to attain its aim, the liberation of Italy, had decided to ignore all laws and all duties, to sacrifice the temporal power of the popes, and to bring about the unification of Italy by democracy. The conservative school, called the German school, was in favor of the *status quo* of everything that had been regulated by the treaties of Vienna, and thought to arrest any contrary movement by force of arms. Between these two schools a third school was formed in Italy, having deep roots among the people. Generally it was called the national school. It claimed to reject the dominance of foreigners and upheld the autonomy of Italy, respecting the rights of the Church and in no way hindering the exercise of the established powers.

Pius IX held himself aloof from the revolutionary school. But his education and his personal aspirations brought him close to the national school. He was a true Italian and patriot in the best sense of the word. . . . Moreover, he was not unaware that a blind opposition to the tendencies of a period almost always constitutes a real danger for a ruler and may lead to catastrophes. Before the desires of his subjects should become demands, Pius IX resolved to make timely and voluntary concessions to the material progress, to the exercise of political liberty, and to the more direct and close association of the people with the government of the state.[12]

Liberal Measures of Pius IX

As we see above,[13] Gregory XVI had carried out notable reforms in the administrative, judiciary, and financial realms, as also in the artistic and scientific order. But, in his mind, these reforms were only the preludes of more important improvements. In public opinion they awakened a desire for new modifications, such as a broader representation of the lay ele-

[12] C. van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes, de 1790 à nos jours*, p. 170.

[13] See above, pp. 192, 194, 206–10.

ment in the temporal government, the establishment at Rome of a consultative assembly elected by the provinces, and the improvement of the railroads. This last benefit and the amnesty of 1,500 proscribed persons whom the tribunals of the preceding reign had condemned for rebellion were impatiently awaited from the new pope.

Pius IX decided to respond to these popular desires in large measure. Was this move a political calculation on his part? Was his purpose to bring back to the cause of the Holy See a public opinion that had gone astray through calumnies and, at the same time, to force the unmasking of the parties that, on the pretext of calling for the reform of abuses, were attacking the very institution of the temporal power? Or was his move an impulse of a generous heart? Was it an illusion of a mind that experience of men and affairs had not yet sufficiently enlightened? Perhaps all three motives simultaneously influenced his noble and lofty soul. On the very day of his elevation to the pontificate, amid the ovations showered on him, he conceived the idea of promulgating a broad amnesty, to restore to their families all the political exiles, and from that day he granted pardon to all the proscribed who asked it of him. A month later (July 17, 1846) a decree granted freedom to all those condemned or accused of political offenses, on the single condition of acknowledging the authority of the pope and promising to conduct themselves as loyal subjects of the Papal States.[14]

At Rome and in the provinces the amnesty decree was re-

[14] For the text of the decree, see Pougeois, I, 152–54. Pius IX, to be better informed on the difficulties and advantages that would be presented by the decree of amnesty, convoked (July 15) at the Vatican a congregation of cardinals. Each of them was permitted to set forth his reasons for or against the decree. The Pope even asked them, according to the custom of the Sacred College, to express by secret ballot their opinion on the proposal. But the opening of the ballot box revealed only black balls. In the presence of this unexpected opposition, Pius IX solved the difficulty by a procedure in which were revealed the qualities of spiritual delicacy, personal initiative, and generous goodness that marked most of the acts and words of his long pontificate. Taking off his white skullcap and putting it over the black balls, he said: "See, they are white." Two days later the amnesty decree was posted in all the streets of Rome.

ceived with acclaim and with popular celebrations, which gave testimony to the universal joy. To the promises that were required on their honor from those pardoned, they added exaggerated forms of oath, "swearing on the head of their children, fidelity to the point of death," promising "to shed their blood to the last drop for the pope." Such demonstrations encouraged Pius IX to persevere in his policy of clemency and concessions. "He believed the good possible, and he stuck to it. He believed in liberty and he stretched forth his arms to it. He believed in gratitude, in honor, and he trusted the oaths." [15]

The Pontiff decided that his palace would be open Thursday of each week to everyone who might have a favor to ask of him or any information to give him. He favored the holding, in his states, of scientific congresses, under cover of which, only recently, were hidden the plots of the factions. Besides, he authorized the opening of the circles whose avowed aim was political. On August 1 he chose as Secretary of State, Cardinal Gizzi, who was said to be one of the chiefs of the liberal party. Commissions were appointed for the study of the questions regarding the exercise of criminal and civil justice, regarding the foundation of evening schools and Sunday schools for the instruction of the working class, for the improvement of the postal service, and that of the customs offices and the railroads. The labors of these commissions soon resulted in practical reforms, accepted with enthusiasm. The municipal franchises of the city of Rome were extended; a civic guard was instituted; an assembly of notables, chosen by the Pope from a triple presentation of the provincial councils, was called to give its advice on all the major temporal matters of the state. The exceptional restrictions until then imposed on the Jews were abolished. At the Pope's voice the barriers of the Ghetto fell. So great was the joy among the Jews that some of them thought to see in the new pontiff the expected Messiah.[16]

[15] Louis Veuillot, *op. cit.*, I, 39.

[16] On all these reforms, see Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 161–86.

The word of these reforms crossed the frontiers and even reached beyond the ocean. The French journal *Le Siècle* wrote: "Apparently on the two shores of the channel civilization is going backward. On the recently disparaged banks of the Tiber, human liberty and dignity, raised up by a magnanimous power, will soon be better founded than among us to demand all their rights." [17] In October, 1847, a big meeting held at New York voted an address to Pius IX. Said this address: "We offer you the assurance of a boundless sympathy, not as Catholics, but as sons of a republic, and as friends of liberty." [18]

Considering such approbations, some historians have wondered whether, in the first years of his pontificate, Pius IX had not misunderstood the limits separating true liberty from license, and even the limits between political liberalism and religious liberalism. Only a superficial study of the Pontiff's acts could have suggested these doubts. From the dispatches (August, 1846) by the French ambassador in Rome to his government, we see that Pius IX from the outset had fixed, even in the political order, certain limits beyond which he never ventured. To Rossi he said: "You know that certain limits exist that we cannot pass beyond." [19] He said further that "a pope must not hurl himself into utopias. Would you believe that some people are even speaking of an Italian league with the pope at its head? As if such a thing were possible! Those ideas are chimeras." [20]

As to religious liberalism, the Pope was far from adopting it. In fact, in his first encyclical (November 9, 1846) the reader can note, in germ, the reprobation of the chief errors that would later be condemned by the encyclical *Quanta cura,* the Syllabus, and the two constitutions of the Vatican Council. Pius IX there energetically denounces "that frightful system

[17] Quoted by Rohrbacher, *Histoire universelle de l'église,* XII, 246.
[18] Quoted by Desdevises du Dezert, *L'église et l'état en France,* II, 116.
[19] Guizot, *op. cit.,* VIII, 347.
[20] *Ibid.,* p. 345.

of indifference which removed all distinction between virtue and vice, between truth and error"; he there lays bare "those secret sects, sprung from the bosom of darkness, for the ruin of religion and of states"; he flays the "execrable doctrine of communism, which would be able to establish itself only by the ruin of the rights and true interests of all"; he condemns the theory of absolute progress of humanity, "which becomes a sacrilege when anyone wishes to introduce it in the Catholic religion, as if this religion were the work of man and not the work of God"; lastly he proclaims "the existence of a living and infallible authority in the Church, which the Lord Christ built on Peter, chief, prince, and pastor." [21]

The Revolutionaries

The sectaries, who had counted on, if not the unintentional complicity, at least the timid silence of Pius IX, for executing their designs, feigned to ignore those wise restrictions and timely declarations. Soon they showed that the improvements of the Roman state, which they wildly applauded, were of little concern to them. "Everyone soon perceived, including the Pope himself, that he was in the presence of interests and problems much vaster. . . . The idea of national unity, monarchical or republican, made its appearance. Almost as soon as he had entered on the plan of the Roman reforms, Pius IX saw opening before him the perspective of Italian wars and revolutions." [22]

The secret societies, taking advantage of the situation falsely attributed to the Pontiff, seized hold of the sort of intoxication that prevailed everywhere. At Rome and in the papal provinces the cleverest emissaries of the Ventes and the Lodges were sent forth into the campaign. They succeeded in insinuating themselves in all the meetings and into all classes of society. They exerted their influence on the

[21] Denzinger-Bannwart, nn. 1634–39; Chantrel, *Annales ecclesiastiques,* I, 3–5.
[22] Guizot, *op. cit.,* VIII, 352.

clergy, the nobility, the middle class, the common people. They created an artificial opinion by their bold speeches, their daily papers, their books, their pamphlets, and their popular feasts.[23] By use of the press they contrived to picture Pius IX throughout Europe, as the author of the odious measures of which they alone were the creators. Thus they made out that he was the declared foe of the Jesuits and of the Sonderbund, the irreconcilable enemy of Austria.[24]

The danger had more to it. The national liberal party pretended to regard Pius IX as one of its chiefs, who had, they said, "found genius in his conscience." [25]

The courts of Europe were moved. Rossi, the French ambassador at Rome, wrote to his government: "The Pope's popularity is almost complete; but I fear that he may be misled thereby, thinking that he can repose as on a bed of roses." [26] Guizot, in replying to him, expressed the wish that Pius IX "would recognize with a penetrating eye the distance that separates change from progress, the necessary from the chimerical, the practical from the impossible, the salutary from the perilous." [27] The court of Vienna, considering itself more directly threatened, declared by the pen of Metternich that "it regarded as being in a state of revolution any state in which the power had in fact passed from the hands of the legal authority into those of another power; but it did not question that this change had taken place in the Roman State." [28]

These apprehensions were not without foundation. If the people showed toward the Pontiff a sincere appreciation for his benevolent reforms, the sectaries took unfair advantage of them. Some of those who profited by the amnesty returned as victors. Journalists made use of the liberties that had been

[23] Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 285.
[24] Van Duerm, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
[25] Massimo d'Azeglio, *Correspondance politique*, p. 3.
[26] Guizot, *op. cit.*, VIII, 349.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 354.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 374; Metternich, *Mémoires*, VII, 394–403, 405.

granted them and loudly called for chimerical innovations. Both groups profited by the right of free speech to organize "the popular enthusiasm into a permanent uprising of ovations." [29] Sedition, bearing flowers in its hands, wrote Veuillot, knelt before the Pontiff and shouted its request for his blessing.[30] Still more vociferous was the cry: "Long live Pius IX!" But they added: "Down with the Jesuits!" They erected arches of triumph to the Pope; but they prevented the prelates of his house from passing under them. In a city of Calabria the mob forced the gates of a prison and freed the prisoners with cries of: "Long live Pius IX!" Acclamations, prompted by a hidden power, became more or less enthusiastic, following the papal acts of the day, following the personages whom the government of the Pope made conspicuous. Ovations were given to Gizzi because they thought he was a liberal; they murmured or greeted his presence with a cold silence when they found he was too lukewarm to suit them. The crowd used its manifestations as a sort of permanent control of the policy of a pope whom it seemed to regard as its ward. When Pius IX appeared on the balcony of the Quirinal, the crowd, prompted by some ringleaders, cried out to him: "Courage, Holy Father!" as if to help him free himself from an excessively conservative entourage.

Soon no doubt was any longer possible. According to Mazzini's uncouth expression, the revolutionaries intended to make of Pius IX "a fat political bull, by smothering him under flowers." The founder of the Young Italy, until then disguising his real aim, now boldly put himself forward, revealed his designs, roused the moderates, and demanded of the Pope nothing less than the freedom of Italy by an offensive war against Austria. The first symptoms of the revolutionary movement appeared in a triumphal parade of the sectaries on September

[29] L. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
[30] *Ibid.*

8, 1846; these signs became more evident in the meetings of the representative assembly of the province in April, 1847, and in the revival of the municipal councils. Gizzi, who advised calm, they pretended to consider an agent of Austria and of reaction. On July 10, 1847, Gizzi, feeling the increase of his unpopularity, resigned as Secretary of State. He was replaced by Cardinal Ferretti, the Pope's cousin. Thanks to this relationship and to personal qualities appreciated by the people, he succeeded, for a few months, in bringing about a comparative tranquillity.

Austrian Invasion

At this juncture, a serious international incident occurred. Six days after Cardinal Gizzi's resignation, the Austrian government (July 16, 1847), concerned over the attacks and provocations in Italy, felt authorized by article 103 of the Congress of Vienna, to send into the city of Ferrara a battalion of infantry, a detachment of cavalry, and a battery of artillery. Upon receipt of this news, the real patriots joined the revolutionaries in loud outbursts; of course the latter sought to exploit the event to their advantage. The situation was extremely delicate for Pius IX. He decided to turn toward France. The government of Louis Philippe had again and again declared that it did not wish to leave the field in Italy free either to the revolution or to Austria. Perhaps, too, Pius IX knew something of the unkind judgments held by Prince Metternich regarding his person and policy.[31]

The reply of the French government was favorable. On September 27, 1847, Count Rossi, the French ambassador at

[31] Wrote Metternich: "The Pope each day shows himself more and more without any practical spirit. Born and grown up in a liberal family, he was trained in a bad school. Warm of heart and weak in ideas, he has allowed himself, from his assuming the tiara, to be caught and enmeshed in a web from which he does not know how to free himself." Metternich, *Mémoires,* VII, 342; cf. pp. 344, 435.

Rome, received from Guizot the following official communication: "Do not leave the Pope in any doubt that, in case of a foreign intervention, we will sustain him effectively, and likewise his government and sovereignty, his independence and his dignity." [32] In fact, Guizot had obtained from the King and the Council of ministers formal decisions to this effect. While Cardinal Ciacchi, legate of Ferrara, sent the members of the diplomatic corps a protest against the act of Austria, a French force of 2,500 men was concentrated at Toulon, and a second force, of equal strength, at Port-Vendres, both of them ready to set sail for the coast of Italy at the first signal under the command of General Aupick.[33] The Austrians countered this step by reinforcing their army in Lombardy and by establishing a military post six miles from Ferrara and from Comacchio. Mazzini, foiled in his plans, made a final effort. On November 25, 1847, he wrote directly to the Pope, begging him to put himself at the head of the national movement; unless he did so, said Mazzini, that movement would withdraw from the religious cause, to the great injury of civilization and of Italy.[34] The Pope took no account of this letter; he also opposed the French government's undertaking a campaign independent of his positive assent. In the Pope's name, Ferretti declared: "Without this assent the French government and navy would find themselves in the same position, with respect to the Holy See, as the Austrian army and cabinet." [35]

Austria soon grasped that she had entered an impasse. She put conditions on the withdrawal of her troops. But these conditions were not accepted by the papal government. After some months of negotiations the Vienna cabinet finally admitted a diplomatic compromise, which was equivalent to a defeat for her. A decision was reached that the Austrians would occupy

[32] Cf. Victor Pierre, *Histoire de la République de 1848,* p. 527.
[33] Guizot, *op. cit.*, VIII, 403.
[34] Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 360; Villefranche, *Pie IX,* p. 49.
[35] Pougeois, *op. cit.*, I, 290.

the citadel, the barracks, and the military magazines of Ferrara, conformable to article 103 of the Congress of Vienna; but the papal Swiss would have the guarding of the city gates and that of the military posts situated in its precincts. Pius IX, seconded by his able cousin, Cardinal Ferretti, showed himself capable of a policy as prudent as it was firm.

The Pope's Liberal Reforms

In the French House of Peers on January 11, 1848, Montalembert spoke on the affairs of Italy. He said:

> I, a Catholic, cannot have the rashness of judging Pope Pius IX. But, if I might do so, I would say that he has been beyond reproach. . . . Within eighteen months he has granted his people the amnesty, a civic guard, the municipal organization, the consulate, that is, reforms so considerable and fruitful that we cannot perhaps find in the annals of any country or any reign an example of so spontaneous and complete generosity. If he fails, Gentlemen, do you know what that will prove? It will not prove that he has been imprudent, that he was charmed; but, as I regret to say, it will prove only one thing, that Italy is not capable of possessing a regular liberty, pure and generous like that which he desires to give it.[36]

Many Catholics, of Rome and elsewhere, did not share that enthusiasm for the reforms so rapidly accomplished by Pius IX. They paid honor to the spontaneous generosity of his heart, rather than the wisdom of his policy. With expressions of sincere respect for the supreme head of the Church, they regretted the change from his predecessor's slower and more calculated way of acting.[37] But to make Italy responsible for their failure would be unjust; that responsibility must rest on the hypocritical partisans whom we have already seen at work.

[36] Montalembert, *Œuvres*, II, 664.

[37] J. B. de Rossi reports this impression as that of his venerable father and of several Catholics whose orthodoxy was beyond question.

Their intrigues were what led (February, 1848) to the fall of the Ferretti ministry after six months, of the Antonelli ministry after three months, and of the Ciacchi ministry after twenty-seven days. Public demonstrations increased on the streets of Rome. Noisy agitators tumultuously demanded the full freedom of the press, the complete secularizing of public offices, the mass arming of the people, and the expulsion of the Jesuits. For some time Pius IX had seen the plots being hatched against him. His allocutions and encyclicals of 1846 and 1847 abound with allusions to the ulterior purposes of the revolutionary sect. But he continued to cherish the hope of winning back his straying people by kindness, and he postponed the use of repressive measures.

On February 11, 1848, a characteristic incident helped to disabuse him. Evening had fallen. During one of those noisy and grandiose ovations that were being incessantly repeated under the windows of the Quirinal, a voice, above the shouting of the crowd, called out: "No more priests in business affairs!" Pius IX, standing in the lofty loggia, was raising his hand to bless the throng; he protested mildly against "certain opinions in which he no longer recognized the heart of his people." Then, as a low murmur seemed to follow the ovation, he was heard to pronounce the formula of protest which many of his predecessors had used in solemn circumstances: "Non posso, non debbo, non voglio" ("I cannot, I ought not, I will not"). Then was sensed the feeling that a sort of abyss had opened between him and the agitators.

Shortly afterward the repercussion of the French revolution of February stirred up in Italy, as almost everywhere in Europe, fresh popular agitations. These became rumbling and threatening. "The uprisings of love changed into uprisings of anger." [38] Under the pressure of the events, Pius IX made a last concession, the most liberal of all. By the constitution of

[38] Dupanloup, *La souveraineté pontificale*, p. 166.

March 14, 1848, known as the Fundamental Statute, he instituted a popular representation, not merely consultative, but deliberative, for the government of his States. This representative regime included two chambers: one appointed by the pope, the other elected by the people. This move was the introduction of the constitutional system into the Papal States. But, far from appeasing the popular movement, it did but arouse it the more. When the news spread that the Lombard-Venetian kingdom was in full insurrection against Austria, the cry "Fuori gli barbari" ("Out with the barbarians") resounded in the streets of Rome, and the Pope was called upon by the mob to preach the holy war. Pius IX resisted.

Sardinia

At this point, unexpected news reached Rome. The king of Sardinia, Charles Albert, without any previous declaration of war on Austria, fell upon Lombardy. On March 23, 1848, at the outset of the campaign, he addressed to the peoples of the Lombard-Venetian kingdom a proclamation in which he said: "We will second you, hoping in God, who has given Pius IX to Italy and who has put Italy beyond the need of anyone." Two days later, at the head of 25,000 men he entered Milan. The situation became more and more complicated for the Pope. The figure of King Charles Albert was indeed a strange one, a sovereign "half-ascetic, half-carbonaro":[39] ardent, chivalrous, and mystic, under an appearance of coldness; acclaimed as a liberal, and frightened at every reform. At bottom he had a sickly nature, not interested in anything except one idea, which dominated his mind and commanded his whole activity: the independence of Italy, in which he dreamed to be the head.[40]

[39] Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste,* I, 444.

[40] King Charles Albert's mysterious character has been wonderfully well grasped by Marquis Costa de Beauregard. See the preface of his book, *L'epilogue d'un règne, les dernières années du roi Charles-Albert.*

The sudden aggression of the King of Sardinia upset the calculations of the old Austrian marshal, Radetzky, who, pressed on all sides, was beating a retreat and withdrew into the Venetian quadrilateral.[41]

The Pope's determined idea was clear. It was to maintain, from the military viewpoint, a strict neutrality, while remaining on the defensive against any invasion of his States. With this policy in mind, he sent 17,000 men to the frontier, on the right bank of the Po, instructed to take no offensive action at any point, but to defend, wherever the need might arise, the inviolability of the papal territory. Unfortunately the leader of the expedition, General Durando, a Piedmontese, did not observe this restriction. Upon arriving at Bologna (April 15), he delivered a fiery proclamation to his troops, declaring, in the name of Pius IX, war on Austria and exhorting his soldiers to undertake a holy crusade of Italy. This act was the first treason from which Pius IX had to suffer during this unhappy campaign.

By a note inserted in the Roman *Gazette officielle,* by a solemn allocution delivered on April 29, 1848,[42] and by a letter four days later to the Emperor of Austria,[43] Pius IX protested that, far from favoring the revolutionary agitations and arousing his people to war against Austria, with all his might he repelled such tendencies. His acts of political reform were but the continuation of the work begun by his predecessor, in the spirit of the Memorandum drawn up by the great powers of Europe.

[41] The Venetian quadrilateral was formed by the strongholds of Verona, Legnago, Peschiera, and Mantua. In a diplomatic memoir, intended to justify his intervention in Lombardy, Charles Albert declared that "he was taking this measure to prevent the actual movement from becoming a republican movement" (Léopold de Gaillard, *Histoire de l'expédition de Rome en 1849,* p. 48). Metternich declared that he wished merely to withdraw Lombary-Venetia from the revolutionary influence. Later Cavour appeals to a similar motive for invading the States of the Church. Says Gaillard: "At bottom, in 1848 as in 1860, to take measures was especially to take something." (*Ibid.*)

[42] Chantrel, *Annales,* I, 36–39.

[43] *Ibid.,* p. 40.

As for the idea of making war on Austria, he proclaimed it entirely contrary to his thoughts, having for his purpose, he said, "only the daily increase of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, which is the Church, and not to reduce the boundaries of his temporal sovereignty." [44]

These declarations had an immense reverberation in the European courts, where they began to regard Pius IX as the chief author of the public commotions that were troubling Europe.[45] Besides, the fall of the Metternich cabinet, which was followed (March 18, 1848) by a liberal ministry, removed from the political scene the diplomat who was the most disposed to be irritated against the attitude of the Supreme Pontiff. Near the end of May, Emperor Ferdinand I showed himself disposed to make broad concessions in favor of peace, going so far as to give up Lombardy on certain financial conditions.[46]

The intrigues of Lord Palmerston interfered with a view to lessening the power of Austria. This English statesman, interested in maintaining the Austro-Italian conflict, and especially the moves of Mazzini, who could not hope to see his revolutionary program succeed except in disturbance, defeated the peaceful designs of the new Austrian cabinet. The court of Vienna withdrew its offers, and the Emperor ordered Marshal Radetzky to reconquer, by prompt and energetic action, the positions taken by the enemy, in order to crush in Italy the perpetually reborn forces of the revolution. This time the assault of the imperial armies was irresistible; the Italians, defeated, were everywhere driven back.

Count Mamiani

Unfortunately this circumstance affected the cause of the Pope. General Durando, whom Pius IX, too trusting or too

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[45] Pius IX himself, in his allocution of April 29, 1848, referred to this charge. Chantrel, p. 37.

[46] Balleydier, *Histoire de la Révolution de Rome*, I, 172.

powerless, had kept at the head of his troops, in spite of his culpable folly of April 5, made common cause with the forces of Charles Albert. A new minister, whom the Holy Father, under pressure from the advanced parties, had been obliged to take at the end of April, Count Mamiani, had fancied a strange expedient to satisfy the fanatical national party without forcing the Pope to involve himself in a contradiction. He decided that the Roman government would not open any hostility against Austria, but that Durando's reconnoitering troops would be placed under the command of Charles Albert. This move would render inevitable the common action of the papal forces and the Piedmont forces.

This Count Mamiani, one of those formerly proscribed by Gregory XVI and pardoned by Pius IX, did not rule over the army and the people any more than did the Pope. The government was in the hands of the clubs, of the press, and particularly of a "popular circle," inspired by the secret societies, which claimed to direct everything, or at least to control everything. The Pope, seeing the peril, little by little lost his former confidence that he could lead the people to him by his kindnesses and thus rescue them from the revolutionary sects. Mamiani, a well-educated and literary man, a romantic poet, a man who admired the Christian doctrine in the manner of an eclectic philosopher, had been accepted by Pius IX. The Pope thought Mamiani capable of accomplishing a work of temporary appeasement and did not suspect that this minister could ever betray the cause of the Holy See.

During his ministry, which lasted only three months, Count Mamiani was said to have had no aim but, by every possible means, to provoke war with Austria and trouble in the Roman States. After falling from power (July 19, 1848), he profited from the long ministerial crisis that followed his fall to stir up the people, not only against the imperial government, but also against the papal temporal power, which he declared was incompatible with the sovereignty and freedom of Italy. Anarchy

prevailed everywhere. According to the report of the French ambassador, the police were powerless to suppress the daily disorders.[47] The legations, legislating of their own accord, issuing paper money, and even setting up committees of public security, were almost separated from the rest of the States of the Church.

Rossi, Pius IX's Minister

In this sad situation, Pius IX turned his eyes to France. Of all the Catholic powers, France was the one to which the Holy Father could most usefully appeal for support. In the first days of August, he addressed General Cavaignac directly and begged him to send a few thousand soldiers to Rome. Under the July government, in the previous January, when the dangers were much less serious, Guizot was preoccupied in preparing such help. The French Republic, at that time less far-sighted, rejected this first appeal of Pius IX. It judged that an out-and-out intervention would be incompatible with the role of mediator which it had assumed in Italy.[48]

Oppressed by his own subjects and feeling himself abandoned by France, Pius IX did not lose courage. He might have given way to the revolution in the hope of appeasing it by sacrifices; he might have reversed his stand and asked the absolutist powers for the consolidation of his throne. Instead of going to either extreme, he wished, in spite of his miscalculations, to make a last effort for the establishment of a regular regime, liberal and lasting. To second him in this generous and daring undertaking, he turned his eyes to the former ambassador of King Louis Philippe, Pellegrino Rossi.[49]

On September 16, 1848, the former statesman of the Hel-

[47] Dispatch of M. d'Harcourt to M. Bastide (September 4, 1848). Quoted by La Gorce, *Histoire de la seconde République,* II, 65.

[48] M. Bastide to M. d'Harcourt, August 25, 1848.

[49] La Gorce, *op cit.,* II, 63.

vetic Republic, former professor of constitutional law at Paris, and representative of the French policy at Rome, accepted from the Pope the post of three portfolios: that of the interior, that of the police, and temporarily that of finance. Few men of the time were better versed in the theoretical and practical science of public and international law. Rossi's earlier relations with the Carbonari had made him suspect to the conservatives, and his negotiations undertaken with a view to the suppression of the Jesuits in France had alienated from him the sympathies of the Catholics. But the exercise of power had progressively moderated his views, and the Holy Father, "in the evil days through which he had just passed, appreciated Rossi's lofty mind and his devotedness." [50]

The Pontiff did not have the sorrow of seeing his hopes deceived. The prime minister chosen by Pius IX started on the task with unfaltering zeal.

When accepting the mission entrusted to him by Pius IX's confidence, Rossi fully understood its importance. The able diplomat and distinguished administrator, possessed the two qualities characteristic of the statesman: the sharpsightedness which sees at once the measures to be undertaken, and the energy to carry them out promptly. On September 16 he presented his program of government to the Pope: from the viewpoint of maintaining public order, to concentrate the authority in his hands and to give confidence and strength to his subordinates; from the military viewpoint, to confide the supreme command of the army to a general who was attached neither to Piedmont nor to Austria; in the order of economic and social reforms, to answer the calumnies of the foes of the papacy by a mighty impulse given to the construction of railroads, to scientific institutions, and to commercial freedom; in the order of internal policy, to maintain strongly the liberal principles of the constitutional Statute, but to repress with energy every

[50] L. de Gaillard, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

anarchical manifestation; lastly, in the order of foreign policy, to favor the establishment of an Italian Confederation, without giving in it a preponderance to the Sardinian States.[51]

This plan of government threw disarray into the camp of the revolutionaries. The man who proposed it seemed to be of a stature to bring about its success to the glory of the Holy See. Thereby the agitators lost the benefit of their long conspiracies. They had one resort left: by a supreme conspiracy to destroy the man who thus barred the way to their dark plots. Count Rossi's death was decided on by the secret societies.[52]

On November 15, 1848, Rossi went to the Chamber of Deputies, which was in session in the palace of the Chancery, for the purpose of developing the program of his policy. By the indiscretion of some conspirators, who perhaps were moved by remorse, the secret of the plot became known. On the previous evening and in the morning itself several letters urgently adjured the minister to be on guard. These warnings he disdainfully disregarded. "The cause of the Pope," he said, "is the cause of God; I will go where duty calls me." He was mounting the steps of the porch when someone slashed his throat with a stiletto, severing the carotid artery. The wound was mortal. Rossi died, after receiving absolution from the parish priest of San Lorenzo in Damaso.

This crime was especially detestable: it was the signal for unbridled forces of anarchy. Riotously shouting crowds poured through the streets of the city; the widow and the children of the victim were insulted; in the evening the city witnessed illuminations to celebrate the so-called victory of the people. The civic guard made no move to lay hold of the assassin or to halt the course of the uprising; in the Chamber of Deputies the

[51] The Sardinian States comprised Savoy, Piedmont, and Sardinia. Their king was Charles Albert.

[52] Mazzini, in a letter that was published, declared that this death was indispensable. Cf. Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société,* II, 299; Lubienski, *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie,* chaps. 12 and 13.

president uttered not a word in denunciation of the outrage; in the press the moderates dared not blame the crime. The sect was absolute master of Rome. The "popular Circle" meant to force on the Pope the carrying out of its program and sent a messenger to him for this purpose. Pius IX at first refused. Shots were fired on the windows of the Quirinal palace. Monsignor Palma, one of the prelates of the papal household, was wounded. On the evening of November 16, Pius IX, seeing himself abandoned by all, yielded to the rebels to avert greater disorders, and declared he accepted a ministry containing Mamiani, Sterbini, and Galetti.

These men were the three idols of the day, the most active instruments of the secret societies, obeying the orders of Mazzini. We have become acquainted with Mamiani. Sterbini, who was called the Marat of Rome because of his repulsive ugliness and his brutal instincts; Galetti, the hypocrite with polished manners and gentle voice, who, having been granted amnesty by Pius IX, had repeated his protests of devotedness: these men represented all that was vilest in the Roman population. Pius IX was the prisoner of the Revolution.

Pius IX's Exile at Gaeta

The Holy Father was indeed a prisoner. At the same time that the uprising had forced him to accept a cabinet favorable to the revolutionists, it had constrained him to entrust his defense to the civic guard, which openly compromised with the rebels. But the members of the Sacred College, born defenders of the Holy See, and the members of the diplomatic corps, incensed at the insults heaped on the Supreme Pontiff, undertook to deliver him. Countess de Spaur, a noble woman of French birth, married to the Bavarian ambassador, conceived the plan of escape and, by her personal efforts, greatly helped in carrying it out. On November 24, 1848, Pius IX, dressed as a simple

priest, left his palace by a secret door and, under the protection of the Bavarian ambassador, went to Gaeta in the kingdom of Naples, where King Ferdinand II paid homage to him and promised his help. During the seventeen months of his exile, Pius IX accomplished several acts of importance.

On November 27 he drew up a protest, declaring null and void whatever his enemies had done at Rome since the death of Count Rossi, and confiding the administration of affairs to a permanent commission appointed by him.[53] By the publication of this document, the equivocal situation which the revolutionists had tried to maintain on the Pope's attitude was dissipated. The representatives of the European powers, with the exception of the Sardinian States, at once left Rome and joined Pius IX at Gaeta.[54] But the party that had seized the power refused to recognize the authority of the commission appointed by the Pope. The commission was unable to function. Even Mamiani, overwhelmed by the fanatical and undisciplined element of the secret societies, had to abandon the field to them. As for Pius IX, from the depth of his exile, he did not let any attack on the rights of the Holy See pass without repeating his protests. On December 17 he declared null the junta convoked at Rome by the usurpers.[55] On January 1, 1849, he recalled the canon of the Council of Trent which pronounced excommunication against those who violate the rights of the Church.[56] Six weeks later, in the presence of the Sacred College and of the diplomatic corps, he declared the nullity of all the acts accomplished at Rome by the revolutionary party and protested particularly against the establishment of the Roman Republic, which had just been proclaimed.[57] A few days later, a diplomatic memoir of Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, informed the powers of

[53] Chantrel, *Annales,* p. 57.
[54] Mathieu, *La souveraineté pontificale justifiée par l'histoire,* p. 629.
[55] Chantrel, p. 61.
[56] *Ibid.,* p. 65.
[57] *Ibid.,* p. 74.

Europe of the events that had happened at Rome since the preceding November and asked them, in the name of the Holy Father, "to cooperate, by their moral intervention, to re-establish him in his see and in the capital of his domains, guaranteed by all the treaties which form the basis of the European public law." [58]

Antonelli, Secretary of State

This important memoir was the first diplomatic act of a statesman who would play a considerable part in European politics. Giacomo Antonelli, born in 1806, had, under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, occupied the post of under-secretary of state in the ministry of the interior, then the treasury of the Apostolic Chamber. Pius IX, appreciating his tact and his experience acquired in administrative and political affairs, at the outset of his reign made him a cardinal and, in March, 1848, appointed him head of the council of ministers not responsible to the parliament. Rossi, during his short ministry, kept Antonelli in the background. But Pius IX, during his Gaeta exile, showed great confidence in him in the management of temporal affairs. This prince of the Church never became a priest, never engaged in matters purely spiritual except to transmit information to the foreign powers or to the episcopate. But in the government of the domain of the Holy See he exhibited an ability and wisdom which have been praised by all impartial historians. Few men have been more attacked both in their private life and in their public life. Speaking of the latter, which alone belongs to history, Emile Ollivier says:

Antonelli's outward way of acting gives but an incomplete idea of his true character. To see him courteous, friendly, displaying a

[58] *Ibid.*, pp. 74–77. In March, however, we see the Pope becoming discouraged and for a moment thinking of resigning the tiara. Marquis de Ségur, *Vie de l'abbé Bernard*, p. 104.

constant equanimity, without stiffness or pomposity, always tempering with a smile the fire of his beautiful dominating eyes, you would call him an agreeable statesman, especially concerned with pleasing and being admired. In reality, proud, impenetrable, stubborn, he was of the number of those great souls, superior to destiny and men's changeable opinions, one who is moved neither by praise nor by blame. . . . The very notion of seeking any sort of domination over the head of the Church was revolting to him. To a certain person who proposed to him the example of Richelieu, he replied: "Richelieu served a king, who was simply a man and ruled only a kingdom; but I serve the Pontiff, the vicar of Christ, who governs the Christian world." He was not learned in what books contain; but he was erudite in the science learned from things, and to the keenness of an alert and open mind he owed his ability to disregard nothing that might be divined. To a highly placed personage of France, Cavour said: "Do not trust this project to your ambassador at Rome. Even should he try to keep the secret, Antonelli is so sharp that he would guess it." [59]

Antonelli grasped that the European states were capable of being moved by the Pope's situation at Gaeta and by the threats of the Roman revolution. He perceived that the moment had come for making an effective appeal to their intervention.

Attitude of the French Government

Feeling ran high in Europe and even beyond at the news of the Pope's flight to Gaeta. While the peoples, touched by this great misfortune, sent to the exiled Pontiff the expression of their sympathy and the assistance of their spontaneous offerings, the governments were concerned over the success obtained at Rome by the revolutionary sects. Their cosmopolitan

[59] Ollivier, *L'église et l'état au concile du Vatican,* I, 502. Antonelli's diplomatic ability has sometimes been called in doubt. These words of Count d'Arnim are quoted. Pointing to the windows of the Secretary of State, he said: "See there, the great misjudged incapacity." Teste, *Préface au Conclave,* p. 46.

ramifications were known, and men could foresee the repercussions of this triumph in the other nations.

Following Count Rossi's assassination, the head of the French government, who was then General Cavaignac, had a noble movement of chivalrous generosity.

> To go to the help of the Pope, to snatch him from the factionists who were holding him captive, to offer him hospitality on the soil of France, to bring him to Marseilles in the midst of a respectful and kneeling people, would be to repeat the tradition of the national policy, and on the eve of the presidential election to rally the votes of the Catholics and to gather around himself that floating mass which is always pleased by a daring initiative. Cavaignac was a man to grasp this role. On November 25, he went straight to M. de Corcelles, whose religious zeal he knew, and confided to him the mission to go to Rome, to provide for the liberation of the Holy Father, and to offer the Pope hospitality on the territory of the Republic.[60]

By its vote on November 30, the French Chamber of Deputies approved the project. A brigade of 3,500 men, assembled some time before on the shore of the Mediterranean, received orders to embark for Civitavecchia; and the minister of worship, Freslon, went to Marseilles to receive the Pope. But the news of the Pope's escape and of his happy arrival on Neapolitan territory made the noble initiative of France useless for the moment.

Cardinal Antonelli's diplomatic note placed the question anew before the chanceries of Europe. Not only the Catholic powers, but also the schismatic and heretical nations, such as Russia and England, showed themselves disposed to reply to the appeal of Pius IX.[61] In France the election of Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte to the presidency of the Republic (De-

[60] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 178.
[61] *Ibid.*, II, 80.

cember 10, 1848) seemed for a moment to compromise the political intervention. The son of the King of Holland had, in 1831, taken part in the insurrection of the people of Romagna against the Pope and subsequently he had not sufficiently disavowed that culpable folly. On November 30, in the Chamber of Deputies, he had abstained in the voting relative to the expedition to Civitavecchia.[62] If on the eve of the presidential election, by a letter to the nuncio Fornari, he disavowed his cousin Charles Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, who had been too much involved in the Roman revolutionary agitations, this disavowal, on the eve of the election, had too much the aspect of an electoral move to constitute a serious guaranty. Moreover, in the Constituent Assembly the republican majority showed itself clearly opposed to any undertaking that would seem to have as an effect the restoration of the temporal power of the pope. Only the extreme right and a few individual members of the other groups had praised this plan. In the ministry the Count de Falloux was its sole supporter.

A fresh incident occurred that apparently would finally eliminate it. Father Gioberti, the famous author of the *Primato,* toward the end of 1848 was called to the presidency of the Council of ministers of the Sardinian States. His first care had been an attempt to realize his dream: the re-establishment of the union between the pope and the people by charging Charles Albert with the forming of an Italy independent in its existence, liberal in its institutions, and unified under the high patronage of the Roman Pontiff. In the lack of Italian princes, who were cool toward the project, the prime minister of the court of Turin met with utmost sympathy with the French government. Prince Bonaparte by his character, a friend of order as a matter of policy, but a dreamer by nature, chimerical

[62] See his letter of December 2, 1848, published in the *Univers,* the *Presse,* and the *Constitutionnel.*

by his tendency, and already enamored of the theory of nationalities, was easily seduced by this scheme. Without hesitation he fully adhered to it.

Alone in the cabinet, being able to count on only a slim majority in the Parliament, the young minister of public education and of worship, Count de Falloux, devoted himself to the task of wrecking the project of the Sardinian minister. "To be willing to hide France behind Piedmont," [63] he said, "was to wish to hide a giant behind a reed." [64] He exerted himself to show to the prince-president, to his colleagues, to the leaders of the political parties of the Assembly, that such an undertaking could procure for France merely dangers and humiliations, without any sort of advantage to compensate for these vexations. The events turned out to be serviceable to him and soon brought the prince, the cabinet, and the Parliament itself to the traditional policy of France in its relations to the papacy.

First, at Rome and in the Papal States the anarchy became more and more threatening. The Roman element was absorbed in the Italian and cosmopolitan element. The worst representatives of the secret societies gathered in the Eternal City and there enacted laws without restraint. A decree of February 21, 1849, declared all ecclesiastical goods the property of the Republic. Four days later another decree struck the rich with a forced loan which, according to the various fortunes, varied from a fifth to two-thirds of the annual income. The government was no longer in the hands of the "popular Circle" but of the "Young Europe," of the "Young Italy," of the "Young Ireland," of all the groups depending on Mazzini. Soon Mazzini himself, who arrived in Rome and was there welcomed with the greatest honors, was in control; he received the title of

[63] The kingdom of Sardinia, or of the Sardinian States, was already being called Piedmont. It was not given this name officially until 1860.

[64] Falloux, *Question romaine,* in *Mélanges politiques,* II, 178.

Roman citizen and was invited to sit in the Parliament beside the president.

Furthermore, Austria, which was the first to feel itself threatened by this agitation, hastened to intervene. On March 21 imperial troops crossed the Italian frontier. Three days later, the Piedmont army was defeated at Novara; and Charles Albert, fearing that his person would become an obstacle to a necessary peace, handed over his crown to his young son, Victor Emmanuel II.

A consequence of these events was to impress a decisive bent on the French policy toward Rome.

> Not hard to guess was the supposition that victorious Austria would not resist the temptation to add to her successes that of bringing the Holy Father back to his capital. But in that event the influence of France in Italy would be ended. The same was true of the liberal work that France had advised and that Pius IX had tried to accomplish. Austria had been let conquer Novara: but following the Novara victory to let her intervene in the capital of the Christian world, would be to push too far the policy of effacement. An important step, if France did not wish to be anticipated, was to hasten. Thereupon the Roman expedition was decided on.[65]

Proposed French Expedition to Italy

On March 31, 1849, the French national Assembly voted to authorize the executive power to proceed to a partial and temporary occupation in Italy. That very evening General Oudinot reached Marseilles to take command of the troops already established on the Mediterranean coast and to make all arrangements for a descent into Italy.

At Rome, Mazzini, the head of a triumvirate that included also Armellini and Saffi, was organizing an outright dictatorship. The intrigues of Piedmont, the plots of Lord Palmerston,

[65] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, II, 85.

and the threats of former companions of the prince-carbonaro tended to delay the French intervention. The Spaniards, Austrians, and Neapolitans were also preparing to intervene.

The prince-president determined not to be anticipated by these powers. His purpose was, in fact, not only to take the power from Mazzini in order to transmit it to Pius IX; it was also to neutralize the influence, too absolutist to suit him, of the three powers, and to assure the maintenance of all the liberal reforms introduced by Pius IX up to November 15, 1848.[66] For this reason he rejected the plan proposed by the Pope, according to which France would occupy Civitavecchia, the province of Spoleto, and that of Perugia; Austria, the Legations as far as Ancona; the Neapolitan army, the provinces of Velletri, Frosinone, and Ascoli; Spain, Rome and its surroundings. France, accepting the simultaneous action of the powers, but not their combined action, took for its objective the occupation of Rome and to that point directed her army as swiftly as possible.

On April 29, 1849, two French brigades, commanded by General Oudinot, entered Civitavecchia without firing a shot. From there the General addressed the Romans in a proclamation, agreed on at Paris, in which he declared that "the French Republic wished to give a striking testimony of its sympathy toward the Roman nation." "Welcome us as brothers," he continued; "we will justify this title." The following day the French army was before the walls of Rome. Oudinot had hoped

[66] Some historians have supposed, parallel to these designs which were openly avowed by Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the concealed aim of obtaining, by way of a hypocritical moderation, the ruin of the papacy's temporal power. Thus they explain the consideration which the prince would have had for the followers of Mazzini and for Mazzini himself (Crétineau-Joly, *L'Eglise romaine en face de la Révolution,* Vol. II, Bk. II; Deschamps, *op. cit.,* II, 300–13). But we cannot easily ascertain whether the compliance of the President of the French Republic should be attributed, as these writers suppose, to an understanding with the Masonic lodges, or whether they were owing to the pressure of his entourage, to purely political calculations, and to the Prince's liberal tendencies.

to enter, as at Civitavecchia, without opposition. But the triumvirs closed the gates to him and entrusted the defense of the city to Garibaldi's volunteers. Moreover, a column of 250 men, caught in a trap, had to consider themselves prisoners. A regular siege had to be determined on.

But the French had to be ahead of the other powers, which, in turn, had crossed the frontiers. The Neapolitans had taken Terracina; the Spaniards occupied the provinces of Rieti and Spoleto; the Austrians, established in the Legations, were beginning to seize the papal strongholds of the north. Oudinot, urged by the French envoys, attacked the city on April 30 with 5,000 men. But he was repulsed. The word of this set-back, reaching Paris on May 4, filled the Assembly with amazement. At a night session three days later, it invited the government to "take such measures as might be necessary that the Italian expedition no longer be turned aside from the purpose that had been assigned to it." Then Louis Napoleon Bonaparte judged the time opportune to take a bold initiative. Without asking, as intended by the Constitution, the assent of the Council of State, without consulting his ministers, he wrote to General Oudinot: "Our military honor is at stake; reinforcements will not be lacking"; and General Changarnier, to stress the importance of this letter, placed it on the order of the day of the army of Paris.

At the same time a diplomat who, as consul general at Barcelona, had just shown a remarkable spirit of decision and ability, Ferdinand de Lesseps, was commissioned to negotiate with the government of the triumvirs. The mission bristled with difficulties. The known liberalism of the plenipotentiary gave ground to hope that his overtures would not be abruptly rejected by the Roman authorities. But his role seemed to be a contradiction, almost a treason, toward the representatives of the powers, who, since March 30, were deliberating together at Gaeta with regard to the Austrian, Spanish, and Neapolitan armies, to whom France had promised a "simultaneous coop-

eration." Furthermore, disagreements broke out between General Oudinot and the French plenipotentiary. Besides, Mazzini, who held the population of Rome under his yoke, opposed an absolute refusal to all the projects of compromise proposed by Lesseps. The tenacity of the diplomat, however, succeeded in obtaining from the dictator that Oudinot's army should remain in the Roman States, as a necessary counterpoise to forces of Austria, Spain, and Naples. By article 1 of a convention concluded on May 31 between the French agent and the Roman triumvirate, the Roman State "considered the French army as a friendly army, coming to cooperate in the defense of its territory," and, by article 3, "the French Republic guaranteed against all foreign invasion the territories occupied by its troops."

Had Lesseps allowed himself to be seduced by the cleverness of Mazzini or intimidated by the blustering of Garibaldi, as the Count de Falloux supposed?[67] Should we see in the convention of May 31 the execution of a plan framed by Freemasonry, as Deschamps insinuates?[68] The fact is that the diplomatic act signed by the French plenipotentiary was judged unacceptable, as being opposed to the precise instructions that had been given him, and as contrary to the interests and the dignity of France.[69] Lesseps was recalled to Paris and was denounced to the Council of State, which administered a reprimand to him. Removed from the diplomatic career, he subsequently exercised his activity in a different way and there acquired a wide celebrity.

Siege of Rome

A new Assembly met on May 28, 1849. Most of its members had been elected on a Catholic program, or at least one favorable to Catholicism. Then General Oudinot received orders to

[67] Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, I, 452.
[68] Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 307.
[69] Falloux, *loc. cit.*

resume hostilities. The siege of Rome was at once begun, under the commands of Generals Oudinot and Vaillant. On June 3, by the occupation of the monastery of St. Pancratius and the Pamphili, Valentini, and Corsini villas, the enemy were driven from all the advanced posts which they were holding outside the walls. The leaders of the French demagogic party tried in vain to turn the government from its expedition. On June 13, at the very moment when the uprising was rumbling at Paris, General Oudinot issued a last summons to the besieged, and then pushed the attack vigorously. The siege was prolonged in consequence of recommendations to the artillery to spare the monuments of the Eternal City. At length, on June 29, the feast of St. Peter, a general assault enabled the French army to seize the top of the Janiculum and to install themselves there, dominating the city. Three days later the triumvirs had to surrender unconditionally. The following day the French army entered Rome. Garibaldi, fleeing with his troops across the Apennines, was closely pursued by the Neapolitans and the Austrians. At the same time Colonel Niel left for Gaeta to bring to the Pope the keys of his pacified capital. Pius IX received the valiant soldier with deep feeling and said to him: "France had not promised me anything, yet on France I have always counted. I felt that at the opportune moment France would give her blood to the Church and, what is more difficult, that restrained courage to which I owe the preservation of my city of Rome." [70]

Nevertheless Pius IX judged that the time was not suitable to return at once to his capital. He was satisfied to send there a commission of three cardinals, charged with taking the most urgent measures in his name. By this step the Pope wished to spare the feelings of the courts of Vienna, Madrid, and Naples, which had only reluctantly ceded the decisive part to the French army, and which desired, after the military action of France,

[70] Falloux, *op. cit.*, I, 516.

to contrive a diplomatic action, but this delay gave time to the advanced parties of the French Chamber to formulate bitter complaints against the policy of the prince-president, who was charged with exceeding the instructions of the national representation in the Roman expedition. To put an end to these oppositions and to give guaranties to the extreme parties, Louis Napoleon, without consulting his ministers and even knowing that he was going contrary to the ideas of most of them, once again performed one of those acts by which the future emperor gave an intimation of what would come.

Letter of Louis Napoleon to Colonel Ney

On August 18, 1849, Louis Napoleon wrote to one of his aides de camp, who was sent on mission to Rome, lieutenant colonel Edgard Ney:

> I learn with pain . . . that proscription and tyranny is spoken of as a basis for the return of the Pope. I sum up the temporal re-establishment of the Pope thus: general amnesty, secularization of the administration, the Napoleonic Code, and a liberal government. . . . When our armies made the round of Europe, they left everywhere, as a trace of their passage, the destruction of the abuses of feudalism and the germs of liberty; it will not be said that in 1849 a French army has been able to act in a different sense and to introduce other results.[71]

This famous letter belongs to history because of the influence it had on Italian affairs. Moreover, it is a revelation of the capricious policy which Louis Napoleon would practice later.[72] It aroused the keenest feeling. Pius IX saw renewed against him, under a more brusque and radical form, the pressure which the great powers had intended to exercise against Gregory XVI by the *Memorandum* of 1831. Donoso Cortès became

[71] For the complete text of this letter, see La Gorce, *op. cit.*, II, 225; Pougeois, *op. cit.*, III, 148.

[72] La Gorce, II, 225.

the interpreter of some Catholics when he wrote: "After such a letter what is to be hoped from this president adventurer?" [73] And a certain newspaper expressed the apprehensions of part of the liberals, pointing to the talons of the imperial eagle under this act of audacious initiative.[74] The French minister of public education resigned.

Pius IX, confronted by the same difficulties as faced Gregory XVI, imitated the prudence of his predecessor. By a *motu proprio* (September 12, 1849) he declared that the "valiant armies of the Catholic powers" which had come to his aid could have had as the object and result only "to re-establish his full liberty and independence in the government of the temporal domains of the Holy See." This independence he purposed to maintain in its fullness before the world.[75] Consequently, by virtue of a free and spontaneous act of his authority, he created a Council of State charged with giving its advice on all projects of law, and a Consultus, having an advisory voice in financial matters. The members of the Consultus would be chosen by the Pope from a list drawn up by the provincial councils. Further, the *motu proprio* gave assurance of extended provincial and communal liberties and announced the reform of the civil and judiciary laws.[76]

Louis Napoleon began to take account of the untimeliness of his letter to Ney. An official note of the *Moniteur* (September 10) declared that "the publication of this letter had been purely unofficial, and that it was without any sort of public character." A week later the reporter of the commission charged with examining a credit request for the Roman expedition, Adolphe Thiers, gave a long account of the question without mentioning the unlucky missive. In the commission itself he had, in favor of the Pope, warm words, which aroused the admiration

[73] Adhémar d'Antioch, *Deux diplomates*, p. 113.
[74] L. de Gaillard, *op. cit.*, p. 318.
[75] Chantrel, *Annales*, p. 84.
[76] *Ibid.*

of the Catholics. He declared: "We cannot do violence to the Pope. Why? Because he is strong? No, but on the contrary because he is weak. Do you know what you would be if you did violence to the Pope? You would be not only a soldier striking a priest, a thing which is dastardly and vile; you would be a nab striking a woman, and we have no name for this iniquity." In the course of the discussion, Alexis de Tocqueville, minister of foreign affairs, declared, in the name of the government, that he accepted the letter of the president, but that he found sufficient guaranties in the Pope's *motu proprio*.

Passions were stirred. During the session of October 19, Victor Hugo, withdrawing from the majority with which he had joined before that, violently attacked the policy and history of the papal government. Montalembert answered him by one of his most magnificent discourses. "History," he declared, "will say that a thousand years after Charlemagne and fifty years after Napoleon, France has remained faithful to her traditions and deaf to hateful provocations. . . . Do you know what would forever dim the glory of the French flag? It would be to oppose that flag to the cross. It would be to change the role and glory of Charlemagne for a pitiful imitation of Garibaldi." Then, repeating and amplifying the comparison made by Thiers, he went on: "When a man is condemned to fight against a woman, if this woman is not the lowest of creatures, she can face him with impunity. She says to him: Strike, but you will dishonor yourself, and you will not win. Well, the Church is not a woman; it is indeed more than a woman, it is a mother. It is the mother of Europe, the mother of modern society, the mother of modern humanity." At these words, as we are told by the papers of the time, applause broke out, such as no one had ever heard in a deliberative assembly.[77]

[77] The whole discourse was filled with wonderful warmth and spirit. The address of Victor Hugo, to whom the orator was replying, had been loudly applauded by the extreme left. "Gentlemen," said Montalembert, at the outset of his speech, "the address that you have just heard, has already received the punishment it deserved

Pius IX's Return to Rome

On April 12, 1850, Pius IX made his triumphal entry into Rome. Five days later he wrote to General Baraguey-d'Hilliers, commander of the expeditionary forces sent to Italy: "My heart expresses the feelings of lively gratitude which I profess for the French nation, which has spared neither labor nor blood to assure the Vicar of Christ his independence." [78] He had already written to General Oudinot: "The triumph of the French army has been won over the enemies of human society." [79] The judgment of the Supreme Pontiff would be the judgment of history.

---

in the applause it received." Murmurs and violent protests interrupted the speaker. The president, Dupin, remarked to him that his expression was unparliamentary. Montalembert replied: "Since the word 'punishment' wounds you, gentlemen, I withdraw it and substitute for it the word 'recompense'" (Montalembert, *Œuvres,* III, 254).

[78] Chantrel, *Annales,* p. 95.

[79] *Ibid.,* p. 81.

CHAPTER XXV

Pius IX and the Church of France (1846–1854)

UNDOUBTEDLY Austria, Spain, and the kingdom of Naples had contributed to the deliverance of Rome from anarchy and its restoration to the head of the Catholic Church. But Pius IX could not forget that in this work France had played a decisive part. Of this fact he was always mindful. On the evening of his return to the Vatican, he expressed the wish that part of the interior service of his palace should be performed by French soldiers. A French army would in fact remain in Rome until 1870 to protect his spiritual and temporal independence. Other reasons prompted the Pope to keep his eyes turned toward the eldest daughter of the Church. In spite of the political troubles which disturbed that nation, in spite of the religious controversies which arose there from time to time, it always appeared to be a warm center of Catholic life. At the time when the second Republic gave way to the second Empire, a prelate, under no suspicion of a liberal tendency, Bishop Pie of Poitiers, expressed the gratitude the Church owed to the government that was about to disappear, and likewise the hopes that would be inspired by the power which was entering the scene. He said:

> Bad taste would be shown by hurling insult at the republican period that was dying. Please Heaven, during the years that are in preparation, our action may continue to develop as freely and effectively as it was exercised the last four years. The prince who is about to ascend the throne has not yet been able to show all his capabilities. But when God, in His mysterious and inscrutable designs, takes by the hand a man, whoever he may be, to raise him to the glory of being, even momentarily, the head of a nation such as France, He always offers this

man graces by which he will be able, if his will corresponds, to accomplish his mission usefully.[1]

The intense development of Catholic life and works in France since the coming of Pius IX, and in particular the ardor of the campaign conducted by the French Catholics for freedom of education, the eloquence and value of their principal leaders, and the impression throughout all Europe of their generous struggles, justified such hopes. If these were not fully realized, if on one hand painful divisions, and on the other hand an excessive distrust of the public powers, disappointed them, yet the good that was accomplished in France and by France corresponded to the fatherly confidence which Pius IX had accorded to the eldest daughter of the Church.

Catholic Action in France

A few days after the election of Pius IX, Bishop Fornari, the papal nuncio at Paris, said to Montalembert: "The need is urgent that you go at once to Rome to enlighten the Pope on the true religious situation and prevent Rossi from deceiving him." In fact the liberals of France were, like the liberals of Italy, counting on obtaining broad concessions from the new pope. Louis Philippe flattered himself that he would obtain from the Pope the complete extinction of the Jesuits. The head of the French Catholic party, replying to the nuncio's desire, drew up a memoir which Father Dupanloup was charged to take to Rome. This memoir sketched the picture of the religious progress accomplished since 1843: the organization of the struggle for the freedom of education, the success of the Notre Dame conferences, the reawakening of the faith signaled by the large attendance at parish devotions, the widespread influence of the episcopal protests, the grouping into the Catholic party of eminent men, who came from various political centers,

[1] Pie, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 530, 533, 557, 560.

such as Vatimesnil, Cormenin, and Lenormant. Pius IX was filled with admiration at reading this memoir, spoke with esteem of Montalembert, "that true champion of the good cause, whose very name is a eulogy." [2]

Louis Veuillot, writing in the *Univers,* ridiculed "the practice of pointing out to the Supreme Pontiff the path he ought to follow to procure peace." Probably the Catholic polemist had in mind especially the *Constitutionel* and the *Siècle,* which were ready to praise "the wisdom and piety of the Pope if he had enough spirit to accept the dedication of *The Wandering Jew";* but he had also a word of defiance for "those estimable men whose courage and good intentions no one honored more than he did"; and he ended his vigorous article by saying: "Pius IX will apply the old truths to the new times, and the world will advance a step in the way of salvation." [3] In short, two centers of Catholic action stood out in relief: one, in the committee for the defense of religious liberties; the other, in the *Univers,* where Veuillot urged an uncompromising attitude.

The divergence of these tendencies was evident in connection with a pamphlet of Dupanloup, *De l'état actuel de la question,* in which Veuillot thought he saw a criticism of his attitude in a sentence of the author on "the extreme parties." A hybrid legal project of Salvandy on the freedom of education, in which the minister, as he himself said, thought he ought "to compromise with evil principles in order to be useful to the good principles," [4] restored the union that had been momentarily endangered. Louis Veuillot wrote: "M. de Salvandy might have divided us; but he drew us together, the first service that he renders us." A big petition was at once organized for the defense of the freedom of education. This petition soon had

[2] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* II, 312–17.
[3] *Univers,* June 24, 1846.
[4] Lecanuet, II, 319–24; E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* II, 161–64.

125,000 signatures. But, whether the deep divergence just spoken of persisted in the common action and paralyzed it in its movements, or whether the relatively benevolent policy of the government had put the bishops' zeal to sleep, or whether the cleverly continued misleading statements about the so-called liberalism of Pius IX had brought a change in opinion, the campaign begun in 1847 did not arouse the same enthusiasm as that shown by the Catholics of France in 1844. Montalembert, in a letter of this period, bitterly criticized those French Catholics, grossly numbed, who "for a moment slightly raised their eyelids when a loudly significant fact made enough noise to disturb their peace; and thereupon they turned on their side, hid their head under any thick veil so as to flee from the troublesome light." [5] Nothing less than the great jolt of 1848 was needed to make them rise up again, united and quivering, for the defense of religious liberties.

The Revolution of 1848

Our task is not to dwell on the remote and proximate causes of the revolution of 1848 and on the various incidents of that important political event. We note the instability of the July monarchy which, to make a compromise between the principle of heredity and that of national sovereignty, was not assured of solid support either in the aristocracy or in the people. The coalition of all those whom it excluded from the right of suffrage because of lack of sufficient capital, added to city and rural laborers a number of men of letters and artists. Discontent was felt by those who lived in the memory of the glories of the Empire and who blushed to see France practice the policy of peace at any price. Further, we hear the complaints of the Church, which in spite of herself was thrown into the opposition by the vexations derived from the Voltairian spirit and by

[5] Lecanuet, II, 329.

the obstinate refusal of a law on freedom of education. Still deeper was a movement of ideas, of aspirations of a sort more social than political, principally manifested by the socialist schools and by the school of the *Avenir*. Such were the causes of the revolution which, in three days, transformed the French government from a monarchy to a republic and had its repercussions throughout Europe.

While the republicans were surprised and astonished at their own success, the Catholics did not tremble, but showed a serene confidence. Following the proclamation of the Republic, the *Ami de la religion* wrote: "An unexampled revolution of the peoples has just been accomplished to the cry of: 'Long live liberty!' May this cry reassure us. The Church remains unmoved on her eternal foundations, God covers us with His protection, Pius IX with his glorious popularity, the people with their generous good sense." [6] "We are not men of yesterday," said the *Correspondant;* "but we should be more and more convinced of the necessity of the Republic. For the last seventy years the world has been gravitating in this direction. France takes her place at the head of the general movement. . . . Let those who would continue to believe that a crown is necessary above our national symbol, render the crown to the only monarch whom the people will never dethrone and whom they will hail as did our fathers: *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat.*" [7] Of all the Catholic organs, the *Univers* showed itself the most enthusiastic. Said Louis Veuillot at the head of the number of January 27: "God speaks by the voice of events. The revolution of 1848 is a notification of Providence. . . . From human governments the Church asks only one thing: freedom. But almost all monarchies more or less attack the liberty of the Church. . . . Lamartine said that the French Revolution is an outflowing of Christianity; these

[6] *Ami de la religion,* CXXXVI, 493.
[7] *Correspondant,* XXI, 807–9.

words are true, and we said them before he did. May the French Republic, then, give freedom to the Church, the only liberty of everyone. The Church asks nothing more than this, and it will pay with an eternal gratitude and immense services the acknowledgment of this right pure and simple: liberty." [8]

The attitude of the people during the disturbance explained what might seem excessive in this confidence of the Catholics. The strifes of the Church with the July government, the compliments paid to Christianity by several socialists, and the liberal reforms accomplished by Pius IX had won for the Catholic religion the good will of many. At the height of the insurrection, while the mob was pillaging the Tuileries, an arresting sight was to be seen: at the word of a student of the polytechnic school, the crowd stopped at the entrance of the chapel, took off their hats, devoutly escorted the crucifix and the sacred vessels to the church of St. Roch, knelt to receive the priest's blessing, and then dispersed with cries of: "Long live Christ! Long live liberty! Long live Pius IX!" [9] A few days later the president of the provisional government, receiving Archbishop Affre of Paris, said to him: "Liberty and religion are two sisters alike concerned to live together well." [10]

Two results of capital importance seemed to be acquired: the accord of all Catholics for one action, with the same program, and the accord of the Catholics with the popular masses. In the office of the *Univers* on the evening of February 24, Veuillot, Lacordaire, and Falloux were reconciled to one another and professed their adherence to the Republic. Veuillot had agreed to take for his watchword, the liberty of common law. Montalembert, who a few days before, when speaking in the Chamber on the question of the Sonderbund, had not concealed his aversion to democracy, and Falloux, who always called himself a

[8] *Univers,* February 27, 1848; March 1, 2, 6, 15, 1848.
[9] *Ami de la religion,* CXXXVI, 498.
[10] *Univers,* March 9, 1848.

legitimist, likewise declared their adherence to the Republic. Soon, upon instructions communicated by Berryre and Rochejaquelein, royalists faithful to the senior branch of the Bourbons, were going to adhere also to the republican government.[11] Their patriotism did not allow them to create difficulties at the moment when the social order might be threatened; and their political faith more easily accommodated itself to the provisional government acclaimed by the people on February 24 than to the bourgeois regime inaugurated by the son of Philippe Egalité.

As to the union of the Church and the people, Lacordaire (February 27) from the Notre Dame pulpit, with the applause of a large gathering, stated it in these terms: "Thanks be to God, we believe in God. If I doubted your faith, people would need only a single look to confound me. Just now, even amid the excited elation of its might, after overthrowing several generations of kings, it carried in its hands as it were associated with its triumph, the image of the Son of God made man." [12] As the *Journal des Débats* reported the next day, "at these words an irresistible feeling seized the whole body of listeners and broke out in applause which the holiness of the place could not restrain. The wise ones may have regretted it, but they took part in it." [13] The Voltairian bourgeoisie itself saw its prejudices against Catholicism fall. Said the *Revue des Deux Mondes:* "It found itself in a civilization where everything is crumbling and shaking, and the Church alone surviving." At the opposite extreme of the republican party, the sworn enemy of the bourgeois, the anarchist Proudhon improved on these declarations. He wrote: "As long as religion will have life in the people, I wish it to be fully and publicly respected." [14]

This union of the Church and the people, of Christ and lib-

[11] La Gorce, *Histoire de la seconde République,* I, 122.
[12] Lacordaire, *Œuvres,* IV, 257.
[13] *Journal des Débats,* February 28, 1848.
[14] Quoted by Desdevises du Dézert, *op. cit.,* II, 120.

erty, had a symbol: the planting and blessing of liberty trees. We read in the *Ami de la religion* (March 25, 1848): "For several days past, the streets and principal squares of Paris have seen the clergy of the parishes pass by in procession, preceded by a cross and respectfully accompanied by the people under arms. The workmen, wishing to inaugurate their last triumph by the planting of liberty trees, have thought they could not better consecrate the memory of their victory than, on their own account, to invite there religion, its ministers, and its august prayers." These scenes were repeated in all the departments.

The episcopate was unanimous in rallying to the new government. On February 24 Archbishop Affre of Paris ordered the pastors of his diocese to celebrate a service for the victims of the insurrection; and three days later Cardinal Bonald, archbishop of Lyons and a son of the author of the *Legislation primitive,* wrote to his clergy: "You have often formed the wish to enjoy that liberty which renders your brethren of the United States so happy. That liberty you will have. The flag of the Republic will always be a protecting flag for religion." On that same day the apostolic nuncio, replying to an address by Lamartine in the name of the diplomatic corps, expressed his gratification at the respect which the people of Paris, amid such great events, had testified to religion;[15] and, on March 20, Pope Pius IX himself, in a proclamation to the peoples of Italy, spoke as follows: "The events of the past two months which have followed one another and have piled up so rapidly, are not a human work. Alas for anyone who, in this tempest by which the cedars and the reeds have been shaken, torn up, and broken in pieces, does not hear the Lord's voice!"[16]

This unanimous accord would not long endure. The socialist republicans soon would oppose the government of conserva-

[15] Cf. *Ami de la religion,* CXXXVI, 735, 495, 515; *Univers,* March 4, 7, 1848.
[16] Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques,* p. 35.

tive republicans; in both groups the enemies of Catholicism would resume their campaign against the Church; and the Catholics themselves would see revive among them the conflicts which had already set the liberals and the intransigeants against each other. Yet the Church showed herself ready to sustain every government, every institution that respected her freedom. This impression would remain in public opinion. She alleviated the dangers of the conflicts that we have just mentioned and she was not alien to the success of the campaign, presently engaged in again by the Catholics, to win freedom of education.

The Social Question

A difference of tendencies appeared first among the Catholics in regard to the social question. The demands of the working classes were not foreign to the revolution of 1848. Once the change of regime took place, the socialists sought to profit by it. Socialism, organized into a political party, was henceforth a power that had to be reckoned with. At the side of its leader, Louis Blanc, were ranged Blanqui, Raspail, and Barbès, agitators rather than theorists, men prepared to let loose a social war. On February 26, to escape from this peril and to show its solicitude for the working classes, the provisional government had decided to create for the unemployed some national workshops, with their direction entrusted to a young engineer, Emile Thomas. But these workshops did not give the hoped-for results. The government was not able to employ in works sufficiently remunerative the 120,000 workers who presented themselves. In three months the undertaking cost 7,000,000 francs.[17]

In the club of the *Révolution* organized by Barbès, in that of the *Amis du peuple* with Raspail at its head, men's minds were disturbed. Socialist papers (the *Atelier,* the *Populaire,* the *Réforme,* the *Représentant du peuple*) came out with daily de-

[17] Emile Thomas, *Histoire des ateliers nationaux.*

mands. In the month of March, on the pretext of replying to a manifestation of the national guards, but in reality to find time for the preparation of an election campaign, a countermanifestation of 100,000 workers marched to the City Hall, demanding the postponement of the elections, which the government had fixed for April 9. They did, in fact, take place on the 23rd of that month. And they did not give the socialists the success they counted on. They once more resorted to an uprising. The occasion was an uprising in Poland in the duchy of Posen. On May 15 a disorderly mob, with cries of "Long live Poland!" invaded the meeting hall of the Assembly and proclaimed a provisional government made up of Louis Blanc, Raspail, Barbès, Blanqui, and some other leaders of the workers' party. General Changarnier, rushing up with the mobile guard, dispersed the uprising; but that day was the prelude of a more serious insurrection.

The Catholics had not remained indifferent to this social agitation. A devout Christian who until then had seemed to be absorbed by the preoccupations of charitable works and historical scholarly works, Frederick Ozanam, had taken the initiative of a social Catholic movement. In an article published by the *Correspondant* on February 10, 1848, he compared the coming of democracy in the nineteenth century with the penetration of the barbarian world in the Greco-Roman society, and Pius IX's attitude with that of the popes of the sixth and ninth centuries. He wrote: "Let us give up our repugnances and our grievances, that we may turn to that democracy, to that people which does not know us. . . . Let us pass to the barbarians and follow Pius IX." [18] After the revolution of 1848, Ozanam thought of spreading his ideas by means of a paper. At that period, to found a paper was not a difficult matter. The only requirement was to gather a few friends together and find a printer: with some money, of course: but so little money was

[18] *Correspondant*, February 10, 1848, p. 435.

needed, merely enough to meet the expense of the first number and, at the worst, of five or six following ones.[19] The rest was the affair of the subscribers. Early in March, 1848, Lacordaire, after an understanding with Ozanam and Father Maret, gave a conference to the Catholic Circle on the state of minds, in the course of which he made known the plan to found a daily paper. A subscription was opened on the spot and amounted to the sum of 11,500 francs.

This new organ of the Catholics was given the title of *Ere nouvelle*. A few days afterward a prospectus, with 50,000 copies, set forth the mind of the paper. It said: "Today two victorious forces exist: the nation and religion, the people and Christ. If these two forces separate, we are lost; if they agree together, we are saved. This happy mutual understanding will result if the Church works for the good of the nation, and if the nation agrees to the good of the Church." This declaration was signed by Lacordaire, Maret, Ozanam, Charles de Coux, Lorain, and Charles Sainte-Foi. Father Gerbet and Father Coeur soon joined the first editors. A certain fear might discourage subscriptions: that of seeing a revival of the *Avenir* under a new form. A letter of Archbishop Affre (April 16) reassured hesitant consciences. Said the prelate: "Not only am I fully reassured against the danger of a so-called resurrection of the *Avenir,* but I know that you will effectively oppose what was blameworthy in the theories of that paper." [20] Lacordaire, refuting his articles in the *Avenir,* gave the reasons why the budget of worship should be preserved.

The *Ere nouvelle* obtained a considerable success. By May 25 it had 3,200 subscribers; in June it issued 20,000 copies. The new paper took a more and more prominent place in the social

[19] Edmond Biré, *La presse royaliste de 1830 à 1852; Alfred Nettement, sa vie et ses œuvres*, p. 366.

[20] G. Bazin, *Vie de Mgr Maret,* I, 227–33. Father Bazin claims for Father Maret the initiative of the undertaking. In any event, Ozanam had the chief part in the editing of the new paper.

questions. It said: "The political theories have not produced the promised felicity; tireless thought calls for another solution to the problem of social harmony." This solution was seen at first by the zealous journalists in the association, to be ruled over by religion. "We have," they said, "monks of science, of the apostolate, of the upper classes; we need monks of labor, of industry, of the working classes." They planned also to found a Catholic social school. They said:

> The aim of social science is perfectly Christian, but it has been inaugurated by impiety. . . . We ourselves must form a social school. In a single center would be united whatever is good, true, and just in the output of economists and socialists, and there we should analyze and judge seriously and impartially all the writings of this kind. We call upon all Catholic economists and members of charitable societies to wrest from the false sects the dangerous power which they assemble by their active propaganda.[21]

The days of June brought a terrible blow to the *Ere nouvelle*. This battle of five days stirred the general opinion, not only against the socialists, but against all those who took a stand on the same ground, whether to fight them or to supplant them. What the *Ere nouvelle* had called the party of confidence began to get out of order. Many Catholics, following the general movement, turned to authority rather than to freedom. Certainly Ozanam and his friends, at the height of the outbreak, had a courageous and glorious part. Owing to their initiative was the step taken by the Archbishop of Paris, who undertook to be a mediator in the midst of the frightful civil war. Accompanied by Ozanam, Cornudet, and Bailly, Archbishop Affre went to General Cavaignac to apprise him of his perilous attempt; with them he headed for the insurgent districts. There they had to let him advance alone toward the barricades, out of obedience to the order of the prelate, who wished to present

[21] *Ibid.*, I, 294. See the *Œuvres complètes d'Ozanam*, Vol. VII, for several excerpts of his articles that appeared in the *Ere nouvelle*, in particular a philosophical and historical study on the origin of socialism.

himself alone that his presence might have a more peaceful appearance.

He was struck down by a bullet before a barricade in the faubourg Saint-Antoine at the very moment when, holding in his hand the promise of pardon, he was beginning to incline their hearts to a conciliation. For large numbers of Catholics his death was a new grief laid to the charge of the popular masses. This outrageous attack seemed to symbolize the peril of Christian society, assailed by a socialist barbarism. Lacordaire judged that the interests of his Order and that of his preaching imposed on him a duty to abandon any responsibility for the *Ere nouvelle,* although he did not withdraw his devotion to it. Montalembert published, in the *Ami de la religion,* a rather bitter article in which, without naming the *Ere nouvelle,* he was pointing to it when speaking of the Catholics who had become, not accomplices, but dupes of the socialist aberrations.[22] Veuillot more directly accused the *Ere* of compromising with the Phalasterians, of entering into good relations with the government, in short, of preaching conciliation to the Church, "which acts only by virtue of a doctrine, from which she can retrench nothing, withdraw nothing." [23] Finally a legitimist, La Rochejaquelein, acquired the paper and made it disappear.[24] In 1871, after the massacres of the Paris Commune, two French officers, Count de Mun and Count de La Tour du Pin, would resume, on broader and sounder foundations, the work outlined in 1848 by Lacordaire and Ozanam.

Catholic Schools

If the June insurrection had the regrettable result of interrupting the generous attempt of Ozanam in the field of social

[22] *Ami de la religion,* October 23, 1848.

[23] L. Veuillot, *Mélanges,* I, 20.

[24] Bazin, *op. cit.* p. 355. On the Catholic social movement in 1848, see Joly, *Le socialisme chrétien.* On the Catholic press and the socialist press from 1848 to 1852, see Hatin, *Bibliographie de la presse périodique française,* pp. 436–525.

reforms, it had the happy consequence of giving a new impulse to the campaign by the Catholics for freedom of education. But in this attack on the University monopoly, the defenders of the Church were not always united. On the contrary, the disagreements were many and heated. On both sides, however, the aspirations were so magnificent and the Church was presented as so fitted, by its beliefs and by its hierarchy, to fight the revolutionary peril, that all men having a care for order and morality in society did not hesitate to grant the Church the right of teaching youth.

The tragic days of June had three immediate effects: they convinced the most heedless of the reality of the revolutionary danger; they showed the clergy under a light more and more sympathetic to the people; lastly, they brought forward the energy and cool-headedness of a young legitimist deputy of Maine-et-Loire, an earnest Catholic, Count Alfred de Falloux. Under the date of June 15, 1848, the Marquis of Normanby, English ambassador at Paris, wrote in his notes: "Amid the wreckage of so many reputations, one man at this moment dominates the storm. M. de Falloux has manifested a quiet energy that assures him an influence among even those with whom his name did not formerly arouse any sympathy." [25] The chronicler of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* wrote: "This man may go far. He has prudence, tact, self-control, and, in his appearance, the bearing of a son of the crusaders." [26]

In December, 1848, the newly elected president of the Republic, Prince Louis Napoleon, offered to Count de Falloux the portfolio of minister of public education; but Falloux felt that he was strong enough to place certain conditions; he would work to put through a bill on freedom of education.[27] The Prince agreed the more readily since he then desired the sup-

[25] Marquis of Normanby, *Une année de Révolution,* II, 57.
[26] *Revue des Deux Mondes,* September 30, 1848.
[27] Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste,* I, 391–99.

port of the Catholics. Besides, the cause of freedom of education had gained ground for some time. Dupanloup had just won over one of the most influential politicians of the left center, Adolphe Thiers. "Cousin, Cousin," said the former minister of Louis Philippe to the celebrated university professor, "Father is right. Yes, we have contended against justice, against virtue, and we owe them reparation." [28] He wrote: "I see safety only in the freedom of education, in the teaching of the clergy. Our enemy is demagoguery. To it I will not hand over the last remnant of the social order, the Catholic establishment." [29]

The minister of public education acted with decision and promptness. On January 4, 1849, he named two extraparliamentary commissions charged with studying all the questions relating to education: one commission for primary education, the other for secondary.[30] Three months later a bill was presented. This bill: 1. declared the freedom of education; 2. changed the Council of the University into a Council of Public Education and admitted to it representatives of free education: bishops, rabbis, Protestant pastors, and laymen; 3. recognized the right of individuals or associations to teach. Was this term "associations" to be understood as including religious congregations, whether officially recognized or not? The authors of the bill had not wished to decide; but the discussions in the commission showed that the members did not intend to exclude the Jesuits. In return for these concessions, the state reserved to itself: the giving of university degrees; a right of inspection over all educational establishments, including the minor seminaries.

[28] Thureau-Dangin, *L'église et l'état sous la monarchie de Juillet*, p. 482.

[29] Among the private initiatives that had favored the cause of freedom of education, we must mention that of Father Emmanuel d'Alzon, who, since 1843, had put his youth, his words, his zeal, and his brilliant fortune in the service of this cause and had formed at Nimes, under the title of College of the Assumption, one of the finest colleges of the Midi. See Besson, *Le R. P. d'Alzon,* in the collection *Les contemporains.*

[30] H. de Lacombe, *Les débats de la Commission de 1849,* p. 11.

The immediate effect of this project was to provoke the most violent charges by the parties of the extreme left and the extreme right. The former exclaimed: "France is given over to the Jesuits; the Middle Ages comes to life again." From the Catholic extreme right came the complaint that the project disposed of the rights of the Church without the assent of the Church herself,[31] and that it gave to the Church, not freedom, but a feeble share of the University monopoly;[32] and that it provided that bishops, in the Council of Public Education, should sit beside rabbis and Protestant pastors.[33]

The Falloux bill, as it was called, was defended by the parties of the center. Dupanloup wrote: "We have thought that the moment has arrived, if it is ever to come, to say: All or nothing. . . . The Church can face dangers, it must never run risks."[34] Thiers, turning toward the Catholics, said to them: "If you persist in exceeding our bill, our laborious work will fail. I will regret it for religion, for the state, for all society." Then, turning toward the university group, he begged them thus: "The project leaves the jurisdiction to the University, the conferring of degrees and the right of inspection, and you complain!" Moreover, not all the friends of the *Univers* agreed with the bitter criticisms of Louis Veuillot. The abbot of Solesmes, Dom Guéranger, wrote: "The monopoly is abolished, the University is done for. Instead of congratulating ourselves on these advantages, we disdain them and we run the danger of endlessly prolonging a regime that has inflicted all the evils of

[31] Cf. E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* II, 356.

[32] Louis Veuillot in the *Univers,* June 29, 1849.

[33] The authors of the bill had decided that the bishops would participate in the councils by the same title as the Protestants and the rabbis. This arrangement gave the Catholics reasons for complaint (E. Veuillot, *op. cit.,* II, 356). Said Bishop Pie: "They wish to drive the Church to make an alliance with the big party of conservative rationalism. The state-God is incensed by all, and Christ is no longer anything but one of the demigods gathered about its altar" (Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie,* p. 290).

[34] Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup,* II, 505.

the Church and of society. In our part of the country all read the *Univers* and love it; but the most intelligent members of the clergy disagree on this point from the view of their paper." [35] Father Ravignan, although, like Guéranger, criticizing certain provisions of the bill, expressed similar opinions.[36]

Parliamentary Discussion

The discussions began in the Legislative Assembly on January 14, 1850.[37] The bill was attacked from the left by Barthélemey-Saint-Hilaire and by Victor Hugo. The former argued against the principle of freedom of education: 1. in the name of the state and of the University, which, he said, would be, in a way, destroyed by the proposed law; 2. in the name of the principles of 89, that is, "of the very spirit of the age, of its works, of its hopes, and of its principles." Victor Hugo aroused the clerical specter. He began by declaring that he desired religion, that he wished all heads to be raised toward heaven, that belief in a better world was the supreme certitude of his reason, as it was the supreme joy of his soul; but he added that he did not wish the teaching of the Church, or rather that he wished the Church to be in its own home, and not in the school. He then added: "I address myself to the clerical party and I say to it: This law is your law. I distrust you. To instruct is to construct. I am distrustful of what you construct. I am unwilling to confide to you the future of France, because to confide it to you would be to betray it to you." Then he evoked the memories of the so-called martyrs of clerical intolerance: Campanella, Harvey, Galileo, Moliere, and Pascal.

From the right of the Chamber the bill was attacked by Fa-

[35] Guéranger, letter of July 21, 1849, in the *Ami de la religion* of July 28, 1849, CXLII, 254.

[36] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* II, 476; P. de Ponlevoy, *Vie du P. de Ravignan,* Vol. II, chap. 20; Lacombe, *op. cit.,* p. 334.

[37] Falloux had just resigned because of illness and was replaced by Parieu.

society, I have extended my hand to those who had opposed me, to those whom I had opposed; my hand is in theirs; there it will remain, I hope, for the common defense of that society which may be indifferent to you, but which affects us deeply." [38] Then he said: "I now pass to the Jesuits. They will return. I ask you, in the name of your principles, how you can oppose their return. An individual presents himself, bringing to you the two required evidences of capacity and morality. Nothing else remains to ask of him. You can require nothing more of him. You may say to me that we will have to examine this point at the time of the law on the associations. Even so. But permit me to tell you that I shall be waiting for you on that day, to know how you will act to interdict the Jesuits." [39] As the *Moniteur* remarked, at these words long laughter broke out.

The bill was passed on March 15, 1850, 399 votes against 237.[40] The next day Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers:* "Let it be well understood that this law is not our work. . . . In our eyes it is only the fortress of the monopoly restored and enlarged. It is a compromise full of traps, a pact with adversaries whose loyalty we do not trust." But the article concluded with this Christian and worthy declaration: "We are ready to defend the law even if we should be tricked. Our self-respect cannot suffer from wounds when the interest of the Church is saved." [41] The press hostile to the Church vehemently showed its irritation. We read in the *National:* "At present the congregations are twofold mistresses of teaching in France; for the law now turns over to them both the free teaching and the public teaching." [42]

[38] For this whole debate, see the *Moniteur,* January 15, 16, 19, February 8, 1850.

[39] Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup,* I, 515.

[40] For the text of the law, see Rivière, Hélie, and Paul Pont, *Lois usuelles,* pp. 304 ff. This law has been modified by several later laws, notably by those of March 9, 1852, June 14, 1854, October 30, 1866, April 10, 1867, February 27, 1880, December 11, 1880, June 7, 1881, March 28, 1882, and October 30, 1886.

[41] *Univers,* March 17, 1850.

[42] Quoted by the *Ami de la religion,* CXLVIII, 34.

What ought the Catholics do? Rome was consulted. By a letter addressed (May 15, 1850) to all the bishops of France, the apostolic nuncio replied, in the name of the Holy Father, that they should accept the law. He said: "His Holiness cannot forget that the Church, in the interest of Christian society, can suffer some sacrifice compatible with her existence and her duties." [43] The submission of the *Univers* was prompt and entire. Louis Veuillot wrote: "The keener our opposition was, the more we must see to it that no cloud arise on the integrity and sincerity of our submission to the directions of the Vicar of Christ." [44]

Subsequent events showed that those favoring the law were right. It was the starting point of a wonderful development of Catholic education. From 1850 to 1852, 257 Catholic establishments of secondary education were founded. In 1854 they amounted to 1,081. As François Poujoulat, a Catholic royalist writer, said, the law of 1850 was a law of compromise; but at the same time it was a law of salvation.[45]

The Socialist Peril

Concern for the social welfare, the desire to defend society from the dissolving doctrine of socialism, had in the minds of many counted heavily in the evolution that decided Thiers and his friends to contend for the freedom of Catholic education. But the socialist peril continued. In the June defeat it had received a terrible blow, but not mortal. After a moment of astonishment, its leaders resolved, not to suspend or moderate their

[43] *Ibid.*, CXLVIII, 34.

[44] *Univers*, May 24, 1850. Some Catholics did not imitate this submission. The *Moniteur catholique*, a fanatical paper, tried to show that the Pope disapproved of the law (*Univers*, May 24, 1840; *Ami de la religion*, CXLVIII, 155). Bishop Clausel de Montals of Chartres, the sole exception among the bishops, refused to comply with the direction given by the Pope. On this fact, see Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, I, 297.

[45] Cf. Lacombe, *Les débats de la commission de 1849*, p. 340.

action, but to transform it. After the period of peaceful propaganda, with Saint-Simon as its chief mover, after that of the open political struggle, organized by Louis Blanc, a third period began for socialism, that of the hidden strife, of propaganda in the little towns and country places. "Let us prepare for 1852; until then, let us be patient": such was the watchword of the socialists in 1850. The year 1852 had been chosen as an objective because they hoped that the multiple ballotings that would take place here and there and the resulting confusion would facilitate a violent *coup* on society.

But Prince Louis Napoleon also had his plan. Surrounded by followers devoted to his person and his name, personally ambitious to resume the work of the first of the Napoleons, he had decided, rather than return to private life, to attempt a *coup d'état*. For this purpose, the strategy was clearly indicated: to arouse in the middle class the feeling of fear, by emphasizing the dangers of anarchy; to win the common people by presenting himself as the armed defender of democracy; to assure himself of the good will of the Church by promising it that he would become the defender of its moral teaching and of its rights. This plan was carried out.

Restoration of the Empire (1852)

At the beginning of December, 1851, public opinion seemed ripe to accept a *coup d'état*. On the night of December 1, five generals and twelve representatives of the people were arrested and imprisoned. The next day the Assembly was dissolved. Terrible repressions got the better of all attempted resistance. On December 20 and 21 a plebiscite gave more than seven million votes to the prince-president, who toured France amid enthusiastic ovations, cleverly prepared. On October 9, 1852, at Bordeaux, at the close of a big banquet, after promising to "win the people to religion, morality, and comfort," he uttered

this famous phrase, "The Empire is peace." A month later a *senatus consultus* proclaimed the restoration of the hereditary empire in favor of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte and his family.

Once again the Catholics had to face the problem concerning the attitude to be taken toward the new power. They divided into several groups. Some, such as Lacordaire, obstinately refused to rally to the Empire. Said the Notre Dame preacher: "Undoubtedly the demagogue prepared a frightful ruin for us; but despotism has never saved anything." He recalled that, "although Napoleon I had re-established public worship in France in 1801, eight years later he imprisoned the pope who had consecrated him emperor." [46] The restorer of the Order of St. Dominic in France then gave up all activity in political life that he might devote himself solely to the religious apostolate. Montalembert, followed by several of his friends, at first in 1851 adhered to the *coup d'état* of the prince-president, because, he said, "elsewhere he observed only the yawning gulf of victorious socialism." [47] But his adherence did not last long. The appearance (October, 1852) of his pamphlet on the *Intérêts catholiques au XIX^e^ siècle* marked his break with the new government.[48]

The *Univers,* followed by the large majority of the clergy, hailed, in Napoleon III, "the great man who had re-established the Vicar of Christ on his see," [49] and Father Ventura, in an enthusiastic book which appeared with a eulogistic preface by Louis Veuillot, regard the restoration of the empire as a work of God, that would bring to life again the beautiful days of the Crusades.[50] The *Univers'* editor-in-chief did not share this optimism. He mingled some reservations with his praises

[46] Lacordaire, letter of March 31, 1852, to Mme de Prailly, quoted by Foisset, *Vie de P. Lacordaire,* II, 254.

[47] Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* II, 39.

[48] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* V, 1–173.

[49] *Univers,* October 3, 1854; cf. *Univers,* December 13, 1855.

[50] Ventura, *Le pouvoir politique chrétien.*

and expressed the wish that "the wise and valiant hand which had been able to repress the Revolution . . . would not deliver the holy truth to the bites of the impious." [51]

The first acts of the Emperor justified the confidence of the Catholics. The education law was applied in a spirit of benevolence toward the Church. A committee on free education labored without interference at the foundation of Catholic colleges.[52] Many municipal councils turned their colleges over to the ecclesiastical superiors or even offered them to the bishops. The right of inspection of the minor seminaries, a right established by the law of 1850, was exercised with a courtesy and deference that touched the clergy. The teachers in elementary schools found guilty of spreading doctrines subversive of the social order or of religion were reprimanded or dismissed. The schools of higher education were watched over by the authorities from this same angle. In short, atheism and anarchy were proscribed in the school as they were in public, and Christian education, under a discreet control by the state, could call itself truly free in its methods and its organization.

The Pagan Classics

Some Catholics thought the time had come to organize a system of purely Catholic education, freed from every element that was alien to the pure doctrines and sound traditions of the Church. In 1851, a year after the law of educational freedom, Father Joseph Gaume, vicar general of Nevers, published *Le ver rongeur des sociétés modernes,* a vehement thesis against the prevailing use of the pagan authors in the Catholic colleges. Basically the claims of the author were not excessive. He asked that, up to the fourth class inclusive, all the classics would be Christian and that the pagan authors might be admitted begin-

[51] François Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* p. 99.

[52] Beugnot, *Rapport au comité de l'enseignement libre.*

ning with the third, but in editions carefully revised and explained.[53] But the tone of the book was violent, absolute, and aggressive. The system followed up to that time was called that of "scholastic paganism." That system was here presented as destructive of the faith, of the family, of authority, and as preparing the triumph of socialism. The new method proposed was set forth as the infallible means of salvation. At the close of his work the author says: "If it goes on, soon it will lead to socialism, communism, and all those formidable errors that threaten to bring us to chaos." [54] The contention was not a new one. Lamennais had already maintained it in his polemic against the University. But, after the law on freedom of education, the thesis acquired a particular publicity. Montalembert, then absorbed in the study of the Middle Ages, at once shared in it with his usual ardor.[55]

Father d'Alzon, the founder of the Assumption College at Nimes, Donoso-Cortés, a recent convert to Catholicism, and especially the editor of the *Univers,* Louis Veuillot, became its earnest champions. But the Jesuits (whose scholastic traditions were opposed by Gaume), Bishop Clausel de Montals, whom we have seen sharply defending the ideas of the *Univers* in the struggle against the University monopoly, and Dupanloup, recently made bishop of Orléans, were in agreement in combating the doctrines of the *Ver rongeur.* The controversy was most spirited. Louis Veuillot wrote: "This dispute is the hottest that I can remember having seen." [56]

The Bishop of Orléans wrote (April 19, 1852) his clergy a glowing letter advising them to make room in the courses for

[53] *Le ver rongeur,* p. 409.

[54] *Ibid.,* p. 413.

[55] Letter of Montalembert (*Univers,* January 7, 1852).

[56] E. Tavernier, *Louis Veuillot,* p. 301. Among those who favored the classical humanities we should include Father Landriot (later bishop of La Rochelle, then archbishop of Reims) and Charles Lenormant. Father Daniel took up the defense of the methods of the Jesuits.

the classics of profane antiquity.[57] In three long articles in the *Univers* (May 7, 8, 10) Louis Veuillot directed ironical barbs at the prelate's letter. The conflict between these two men, from the outset of their relations, continued to be without let-up so sharp that it passed beyond the realm of the scholastic question to such an extent that, in the minds of some, it seemed to be a sort of strife between the lay element and the episcopacy; others regarded it as the conflict of the old Gallicanism against the Roman spirit. The clergy and the Catholics of France found themselves divided. The *Univers* was even forbidden, on this occasion, to all the professors of the seminaries of the diocese of Orléans, as having encroached on the episcopal authority.[58] Yet the polemic, with its regrettable excesses, ended in a true good. The attention of the public was awakened on the important question of education.

The study of Christian authors, which the University had completely despised, since Villemain had published in 1849 his beautiful book on *Eloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle,*[59] had a place of honor. Father Gorini published his remarkable extracts from the Fathers,[60] a prelude to his beautiful historical works on the defense of the Church. The University of France, on its part, gave more room, at least in its programs, to the masterpieces of Christian literature. The *Univers* (September 20, 1852) protested that it did not ask for the total exclusion of the pagan authors, that it did not regard the teaching of them as the sole source of modern paganism; and Bishop Dupanloup by his fine works, *Education* and *Haute éducation intellectuelle,* as also by the brilliant success of his seminary of La Chapelle, showed clearly that his intention was to subordinate to religion all the branches of human knowledge.

[57] *Ami de la religion,* CLVI, 253.

[58] *Ibid.,* p. 613.

[59] The book had appeared in another form eight years before. See G. Vauthier, *Villemain,* p. 120.

[60] Martin, *Vie de l'abbé Gorini,* p. 68.

In 1853 a new dispute arose on the subject of the respective rights of Catholic journalism and of the episcopate. An encyclical of March 21, beginning *Inter multiplices,* voiced the mind of the Supreme Pontiff on the two conflicts which had agitated the Church of France. Pius IX recommended to the bishops that they train the youth "in the art of writing with elegance by studying both the excellent works of the holy Fathers and the writings of the most celebrated pagan writers, carefully expurgated." He then asked them "to encourage the Catholic journalists to defend the cause of truth with zeal and fairness and to admonish them prudently, with fatherly words, if in their writings they happened to fall short in some matter." [61]

Attacks by the Press

Nothing could be more opportune than such exhortations; for, as the Pope noted sadly in the same encyclical, the discussions that arose among the Catholics furnished the enemies of the Church with arms to harass and combat her. The attacks on Catholic dogma and worship increased in the antireligious press. "The most widely read papers," wrote Montalembert, "notably the *Presse* and the *Siècle,* which alone have three times as many subscribers as all the other papers together, contain almost daily attacks against religion and the clergy." On 1852 the most brilliant and popular poet of the time, Victor Hugo, in his virulent invectives, connected the Empire and the Church, or, as he said, "Bonaparte and Mastai." [62] The same year Littré, the most serious of Auguste Comte's disciples, wrote: "The social reforms can be obtained only by the extinction of theological beliefs." [63] With greater fire, Proudhon maintained the same contention. Dupin was satisfied with making odious

[61] Chantrel, *Annales,* pp. 144–46.
[62] Victor Hugo, *Les châtiments,* especially Bk. III, 4, 5; Bk. IV, 2.
[63] Littré, *Conservation, Révolution, Positivisme,* pp. 100, 198.

the Christian regime of the Middle Ages by republishing old calumnies on the so-called "seigneurial right." Michelet, in his introduction to the *Histoire de la Révolution française,* which would appear in 1855, pointed to Christianity as the chief obstacle to the progress of mankind.[64] Quinet, particularly exasperated by the *coup d'état* and by his exile, was even more radical. He declared: "We are here concerned not merely with refuting papism but with wiping it out; not merely with wiping it out, but with dishonoring it." [65] A less apparent corruption, but not less profound, of minds manifested itself at the same time by the diffusion and popularization in France of the rationalist philosophy of Germany.[66]

Of this new outburst of hostility toward the Church, the editors of the *Correspondant* (Albert de Broglie and Alfred de Falloux) placed the responsibility on the polemics of the *Univers,* which it considered excessive and bungling.[67] Veuillot, writing in the *Univers,* remarked that the people of the drawing-rooms who attacked it, almost all being members or future members of the Academy, had the defects that are contracted in the academic cenacles, mutual admiration and a complete indifference for public opinion, franker and sharper than theirs. But both sides did better: they took up, with tireless energy, the defense of the Church against the attacks of unbelief. The *Correspondant,* by the pen of Montalembert, Ozanam, Charles Lenormant, Franz de Champagny, Foisset, Gratry, Augustin Cochin, Fathers Frappel and Sisson, Fathers Chastel and Daniel, of the Society of Jesus, carried on a work of historical, literary, philosophical, and theological apologetics by producing in evidence the blessings and benefits of the Church in the different realms of thought and action. In the *Univers,* Louis Veuillot, Coquille, Aubineau, and Melchior du

[64] See Jules Simon, *Mignet, Michelet, Henri Martin,* the chapter on Michelet.
[65] Quinet, *Le livre de l'exilé,* p. 473.
[66] In 1854 Barni had translated most of Kant's works into French.
[67] The *Correspondant,* April and May, 1856.

Lac did not let pass any calumny or error of the unbelieving or secular press, of the platform, or of the theaters, without pointing it out in a lively style, with prompt retort, often with a brilliance of talent which often crushed the most violent assaults of impiety. Wrote Louis Veuillot: "Why should not truth have light-armed squadrons, soldiers experienced in fighting in thickets?" [68]

Besides, the editor of the *Univers* did not limit himself to this war of sharpshooters. In 1854 he had already published the *Pèlerinages de Suisse, Pierre Saintive,* the *Nattes,* the *Honnête Femme,* the *Français en Algérie,* in which he contrasted the power of Christian civilization with Arab morals, and the *Libres Penseurs,* considered by Jules Lemaitre one of the finest books of social satire.[69] On the other hand Ozanam had brought out his remarkable studies on *Civilisation chrétienne* and the *Poètes franciscains;* Gratry, his works on *Sophistique contemporaine* and his *Théodicée;* Montalembert, fragments of his *Monks of the West;* Pitra, his *Spicilège de Solesmes;* Blanc de Saint-Bonnet, his philosophical meditations on the *Restauration française* and on the *Douleur;* Ginoulhiac, his *Histoire des dogmes chrétiens pendant les trois premiers siècles;* Migne, the greater part of the *Patrologie;* Father de Ségur, his *Réponses aux objections les plus familières contre la religion.* By all these publications, an apologetics, traditional in its principles, new in its form and in its adaptation to the intellectual tendencies of the time, made its appearance.

In 1852 two zealous priests, Father Gratry, former chaplain of the Normal College, and Father Pététot, pastor of St. Roch in Paris, determined to give a fresh impulse and an organization to this movement by founding what Gratry called "a workshop of apologetics." To bring their project to a successful issue, they thought the best instrument would be an association

[68] Tavernier, *Louis Veuillot,* p. 94.

[69] J. Lemaitre, *Les contemporains,* 6th ser., p. 32.

like that founded by St. Philip Neri: small groups of priests, living in common, without vows, quite free in their activities, but encouraging and helping one another. Such was the origin of the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception. The first Oratorian group, comprising, besides Father Pététot as superior and Father Gratry, Fathers Valroger, Cambier, Lescoeur, and Adolphe Perraud, met at first, in November, 1852, at 21 rue de Calais, then moved to 11 rue de Regard; there for several years Father Gratry's sermons attracted a choice audience. There Guizot found himself beside Duke de Broglie; Vitet met Berryer; Montalembert was a regular attendant.[70] As Gratry said: "God inspired in His servants the idea of an embracing science. To connect everything to Christ, letters, natural sciences, arts, philosophy, and history, jurisprudence and laws: this thought is one that ferments in the Church." [71] This great ideal could not be realized; and Gratry, discouraged, twenty years later spoke of what he called "the miscarriage of his project"; [72] but the Oratory had communicated a notable stimulus to a movement that would continue throughout the nineteenth century and that received from Pope Leo XIII most solemn encouragement.

The Curé of Ars

While at Paris eminent priests were undertaking to found a center of Christian science, an obscure village in the diocese of Belley became, by the eminent holiness of its pastor, a center of supernatural graces. In 1854 the pastor of Ars, John Baptist Vianney, unable alone and with the help of the zealous priest who had been his collaborator for six years, to satisfy the spiritual needs of the numerous pilgrims who flocked to him, added

[70] Chauvin, *Le P. Gratry*, pp. 139, 140, 154.

[71] Gratry, *Discours sur le devoir intellectuel des chrétiens et sur la mission de l'Oratoire*.

[72] Chauvin, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

a group of missioners. The holy priest who was thus attracting throngs, was born on May 8, 1786, in the village of Dardilly in the department of the Rhone. His childhood was spent in the labors of the fields. His earliest religious instruction had been given him in secret during the revolutionary persecution. He made his first Communion in a barn, the poverty of which reminded him of the destitution of the stable of Bethlehem. His progress in the study of human sciences and even of ecclesiastical sciences had been difficult. But a boundless faith, an angelic piety, an ardent zeal for the glory of God and the good of souls, all had marked him for the priesthood; and from the time of his appointment to the little parish of Ars, the renown of his holiness kept increasing.

Wonderful deeds of charity, graces obtained through his prayers, the lights which this humble priest shed on the souls that confided in him in the tribunal of penance or even that heard him preach in his church, had spread his reputation of holiness far and wide. From 1848 to 1852, at the time when so many souls, moved by the great events of that time and by the renaissance of a Catholic movement among the educated classes, turned instinctively to religion, pilgrimages were organized from all the provinces of France and even from abroad, to the holy curé of Ars. Many souls found with him the faith they had lacked; others obtained divine enlightenment or even bodily cures, instantly obtained.

This priest's words were simple and without affectation, but they possessed in a high degree that distinctive quality of the priestly word: unction. When speaking of supernatural things —heaven, hell, the Eucharist, the priesthood, sin—his words were wonderfully penetrating. For example, he said:

In heaven a soul will be nourished by the breath of God. Heaven is founded in the soul of the saints. It is like a downpour from above in which they bathe. The damned will be enveloped by the wrath of God. They have lost the power of loving. If a damned soul could say

even once: My God, I love you, hell would no longer exist for it. . . . When we are before the Blessed Sacrament, let us close our eyes and open our heart; the good God will open His. . . . What a grand being a priest is! If we could grasp this truth on earth, we would die, not of fright, but of love. . . . To offend the good God, who wishes us only good! To gratify the demon, who wishes us only evil! What folly! If you saw a man piling up a big pyre, heaping fagots together, and if, when you asked him what he was doing, he should reply: I am preparing the fire that is to burn me up, what would you think? Well, in committing sin we are acting thus.[73]

[73] See A. Monnin, *Vie du Curé d'Ars;* Vianney, *Le bienheureux J.-B. Vianney;* Monnin, *Esprit du curé d'Ars.* (Father Vianney was canonized by Pope Pius XI in 1925. Tr.)

CHAPTER XXVI

The Church in Italy

LIKE the Papal States and France, the other states of Europe, notably Italy, Austria, Prussia, Switzerland, England, Holland, Belgium, and Spain, were more or less disturbed about 1848. There, too, the liberal movement appeared suspect, full of misunderstandings, a mingling of good and bad. Only by studying it in each state can we determine the genuine elements and discern the character of it in each country.

The political situation of Italy was as complex as its religious situation. The kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia, connected to Austria, and the duchies of Parma, Modena, and Lucca, placed under the exclusive protection of the court of Vienna, as well as the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, more jealous of its independence of foreign powers, and the grandduchy of Tuscany, which followed an uncertain policy, were, by their constitutions, their origins, and the princes governing them, born enemies of the revolution. But the spirit of distrust toward the Holy See and the spirit of meddling in ecclesiastical affairs, which Joseph II of Austria and Leopold II of Tuscany had spread at the close of the preceding century, still survived them in the courts of these different states.

Naples continued to avail herself of the so-called privileges of the Sicilian monarchy. Florence was not resigned to let fall into desuetude the principles proclaimed by the pseudo-council of Pistoia. Similar inconsistencies appeared in the liberal movement which, beginning with cries of "Long live religion!" and "Long live Christ!" and "Long live Pius IX!" accepted the promptings of the conspirator Mazzini. By words and deeds,

Mazzini endeavored to keep up a dubious attitude that was calculated to compromise the Holy See and turn to the advantage of the revolution. The kingdom of Sardinia, which, like the other states of the peninsula, was a state of the old regime, but which the prospect of a hegemony over Italy made almost revolutionary, oscillated between the double tendencies, political and religious, that we have just spoken of.

Could it, like Italy, emerge from this incoherence? The evil, though deep, did not appear beyond remedy. Amid so many divergent or contrary currents, one current, broader, capable of drawing with it all the others toward a common ideal, could be distinguished: the ideal of a united and constitutional Italy.

In 1846 Pius IX had tried to direct this mighty current. He had asked the Italian princes to modernize their governments, to give up part of their prerogatives in order the better to win the confidence of their peoples; he himself, giving an example, inaugurated a constitutional regime in his states, with the applause of his subjects and of the world in general. But the revolution had at once tried to seize the Pontiff's undertaking as soon as it began. Mazzini hastened to put forward his program of an Italy one and liberated, and, having been able to draw the Pope into his enterprise, had turned the movement against him. This new plan in turn had failed. The evolution of Italy would take place, not for the Church, with Pius IX, nor for the anti-Christian sects, with Mazzini, but in a dubious way for Piedmont, with Victor Emmanuel.

Victor Emmanuel

If we regarded only the appearances, we might suppose that the young king who succeeded King Charles Albert on the throne of Sardinia was not destined to such a work. The connections of his house, his family traditions, the circumstances of his coming, and even his character seemed to keep him apart

from this movement. To the oldest races of Europe, to the house of Austria, to the house of Bourbon, the house of Savoy, to which the new king belonged, had asked marriage connections. Victor Emmanuel, nephew of the grandduke of Tuscany and of Archduke Rainier; a close relationship connected him with the Bourbons of Naples; he himself had married an Austrian princess. Furthermore, "the dynasty of Savoy, among its titles of honor, prized nothing so much as its traditional renown of fidelity to the Church, strict orthodoxy, and austere devotion."

The circumstances of Victor Emmanuel's coming seemed calculated to turn him away from the political adventure. The first day of his reign had been one of the most tragic in the history of his country. On the evening of March 23, 1849, in the confusion of defeat, in the face of the enemies' camp, Victor Emmanuel received a half-broken scepter by fate. The first act of his power was to beg from Radetsky an armistice and peace. Having barely escaped the danger, would he desire to cast himself back into it? Personally until then Victor Emmanuel had shown no sort of ambition beyond a single one, that of avoiding ceremonial formality which at that time was displeasing to him and for which later on he had a horror. "His education had been that of a gentleman rather than of a politician. Brought up remote from the affairs of the world, he had not been introduced by any progressive experience to the art of governing." [1]

Such were the appearances. But the young king, as the future of his reign would show, possessed a natural gift of intuition, which often takes the place of study and genius. At the first contacts with his people he understood that the mystical reveries of his father Charles Albert on Italy united and freed by Piedmont found a deep echo in public opinion. He acted only

[1] La Gorce, "Les origines de l'unité italienne" in the *Correspondant,* November 10, 1893 (CLXXIII, 441 f.).

to realize those dreams by practical means. Of all the ethnical groups of the peninsula, the Sardinian, Piedmont, and Savoy peoples, whom the diplomacy of Vienna had put under the dominance of the house of Savoy, seemed to him the most robust, the ablest in handling arms, and the most amenable to military discipline. The bonds of obedience which attached them to the dynasty were solid, confused with that love of country so powerful among these generations of shepherds, mountaineers, and plains people. Moreover, the King felt himself surrounded by choice men. In the army he soon felt that warriors like General La Marmora and Colonel Menabrea would be instruments of the greatest value for him. In his council, diplomats like Count Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio impressed him by the daring and firmness of their spirit, as much as by the flexibility of their mind. These were qualities that the young prince possessed himself. Wrote d'Azeglio: "I like loyalty for many reasons; among others, because it frequently serves to deceive others." [2]

Of frankness and dissimulation, of sudden attacks and hidden maneuvers, he would need many to reach the desired end, to humor powerful friends, to lull the watchfulness of some and to stir the activity of others.

What increased the confidence of the King of Sardinia was the attitude of France, promptly perceived by him. "Let us defend the Tessin frontier as well as that of the Var," wrote (October 23, 1848) the French foreign minister.[3] Certain words of Louis Napoleon, spoken in this sense in confidential conversations, had been also remarked. They were repeated in Sardinia, and they were amplified. People remembered that the prince had recently been the friend, even the accomplice, of the Italian liberals, and public opinion counted on him to bring France into a cause that must have been personally appealing to him.

[2] Massimo d'Azeglio, *Lettere inedite,* p. 63.

[3] Bastide, *La République française et l'Italie,* p. 123.

The question of the attitude toward the Holy See remained to be considered. Since the King of Naples had no design of conquest or of supremacy and since the other Italian princes were paralyzed, whether by their vassalage to Austria or by their own weakness, the Pope and the King of Piedmont remained the only preponderant powers in Italy: the Pope, with the prestige of his religious majesty; the King of Sardinia, with that of his military might and of his ambitions. The Sardinian ruler, subordinating his whole policy to his plan of domination in Italy, was faced with this alternative: either to cast his lot with the Pope's party while subjecting it to his views, or to turn clearly against him. The attempts made to win over the Pope to the projects of the King of Sardinia were rejected, and Victor Emmanuel resigned himself to have the court of Rome as an enemy. But such a situation was not without something to frighten him. He strove at any price to avoid any divergence of a dogmatic or disciplinary order, and to limit the disagreement to questions of a purely political order. Such was the aim to which all the efforts of his diplomacy tended. We shall see how the force of affairs rendered these efforts futile and how the court of Turin was brought to adopt measures of persecution.

First Steps of Persecution

Public opinion, cleverly exploited by the secret societies, drew the Turin court into this path. Mazzini and his followers, adroitly associated with the Italian national claims a spirit of opposition to the Holy See; this spirit assumed a coloring of vague Christianity. Mazzini wrote: "Almost two thousand years ago a great philosopher, Christ by name, preached the fraternity that the world still seeks. . . . All personal discontents and disappointed ambitions can serve the cause of prog-

ress." [4] This appeal was calculated to reach the foundations of Christianity which was in the popular soul, and likewise all the evil passions.

This hidden pressure on public opinion had not escaped King Charles Albert. It prompted him to write to Prince Metternich a strange letter, which Metternich inserted in his *Mémoires.* Said the King: "A vast conspiracy is in the world. . . . I am not intending to teach you anything in this regard. . . . What is certain is that the position of every king of Sardinia is the most difficult of all positions. It is never free." [5] King Charles Albert might well reflect that he had contributed to create that situation. His son resolved to extricate himself from it, not by resisting the popular current nor by trying to alter the direction, but by accepting it as it was and yielding to it. "He resigned himself to serve the cause of the revolution because he flattered himself that in this way he would be working for his own advantage. He put himself at the head of the national movement whose riotous demonstrations were organized by the clandestine societies." [6]

Victor Emmanuel II at that time was acquainted with this phrase of Mazzini's Instructions: "The earthly globe is formed of grains of sand; whoever wishes to advance a single step must be one of ours." [7] In any case, the King was inspired by this strategy and advanced, in the path of the persecution, only by calculated steps.

The first step was made by the law known as the law of the Foro, or the Siccardi law. The ground was cleverly chosen. Certain prescriptions of the canon law withdrew from the jurisdiction of the civil courts a certain number of religious cases and, in some instances, even the person of clerics, and made

[4] Lubienski, *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie,* p. 46.
[5] Metternich, *Mémoires,* IX, 267.
[6] Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques,* p. 253.
[7] Lubienski, *loc. cit.*

them subject to trial in the ecclesiastical tribunals. The prescriptions had fallen into disuse in most of the states; but they were still observed in Sardinia, and the concordat concluded between Gregory XVI and King Charles Albert (March 27, 1841) confirmed them, as also certain vestiges of the ancient law of asylum.[8] Anyone might easily conjecture that this legislation was destined to disappear gradually in the Sardinian States, as in the other European states. In proportion as the faith weakened in the masses, they became less suited to grasp the reason for such privileges; and the unjustified scandal resulting could not be compensated for by the good which these privileges procured for the Church. No one objected when the government of the Sardinian States entered on negotiations with the Holy See for a loyal discussion of the question of modifications that were to be made to the concordat of Charles Albert.

We may suppose that such were the intentions of the King of Sardinia. He sent to Portici, where the Pope still resided, Count Siccardi, commissioned to begin the concordat negotiations (October, 1849). But this move was open to suspicion when the King's envoy, in the name of his sovereign, asked as a prerequisite that the Archbishop of Turin and the Bishop of Asti, charged with having protested against the encroachments of the civil power, should be asked to leave their sees. At the same time Victor Emmanuel allowed the press to attack with impunity the clergy and the monastic institutions in a manner extremely heated. The King's aim was said to be to terrify the Pope just when the King proposed to enter upon diplomatic conversations with him. Pius IX was suspicious and declined Siccardi's offer. History has justified this attitude on the part of the Pope: the publication of the correspondence of the president of the Sardinian council has now revealed that at the very time when he was asking the Holy See to give up the

[8] *Acta Pii IX*, Part I, Vol. II, p. 140.

benefit of a concordat stipulation, he wrote: "With the Pope we must use formalities, salaams, and hand-kissings, but an iron firmness, and especially the accomplished fact." [9]

As the "salaams" and "hand-kissings" did not succeed, "the accomplished fact" was to be expected next. Siccardi left Portici in November, 1849.[10] Three months later he presented to the Chamber a bill abolishing the ecclesiastical immunities. Article 1 of the bill provided that all civil cases between ecclesiastics, whether personal suits or property claims or mixed, of whatever sort were subject to the civil jurisdiction. Article 2 subjected to the same jurisdiction all cases concerning the right of active and passive nomination to ecclesiastical benefices, or the property belonging to the latter or to any other ecclesiastical establishment.[11] On the pretext of ending some abuses not favorably viewed by modern peoples, this measure amounted to annulling reciprocal stipulations by the will of merely one of the contracting parties. Furthermore, it arrogated the evidently usurped power of appointments to benefices, and of the goods of the Church. But the defenders of the bill in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Senate passed lightly over these latter points and strove especially to deride "the Gothic and superannuated character" of the institutions which the bill purposed to abolish, appealing to the modern spirit and pre-

[9] Massimo d'Azeglio, *op. cit.*, p. 53. Mazzini, at this time, wrote, in an appeal to the clergy: "Italian priests, listen to us. . . . We would be able to conquer without you, but we do not wish to do so" (quoted in *Ami de la religion,* March 17, 1850, p. 442).

[10] After Count Siccardi's departure, the Holy Father sent Archbishop Charvaz of Sebaste to explain to the King the reason for his refusal. The King's reply (January 25) promised the Pope his protection for the two prelates of Turin and Asti and declared that the negotiations undertaken for the concordat would be resumed at the opportune time. A month later the King presumed to solve the question by a unilateral action on the pretext that the Pope had obstinately refused a new concordat. The history of these negotiations, based on diplomatic documents, has been published in a memoir which is inserted after the papal allocution of January 22, 1855 (*Acta Pii IX*, Part I, Vol. II, p. 9). This memoir is a historical source of the greatest interest.

[11] For the complete text, see *Ami de la religion,* April 15, 1850.

senting this as opposed to the obstinate routine of the Holy See.[12]

The law passed by the Chamber, was ratified by the Senate (April 8, 1850) and promulgated the next day amid noisy manifestations. Cries of "Down with the priests" mingled with those of "Long live the Siccardi law!" [13]

The Supreme Pontiff did not wait for the passing of the law before uttering a solemn protest against an act that violated both the rights of the Church and fidelity due to treaties.[14]

The bill having been passed, the bishops of Savoy and of Piedmont raised their voice in protest. They said that, by breaking concordats made with the Holy See and taking no account of the most solemn treaties, this law offended and afflicted all those who wished to live and die in obedience to the Catholic faith. The bishops of Savoy added courageously: "Perhaps, if the question concerned treaties concluded with one of the great powers of Europe, the government would have acted with greater reserve. . . . These great powers have the effective means of making themselves respected; but Pius IX has no army; he is in exile." [15]

Further Measures of Persecution

The Sardinian cabinet, with Marquis d'Azeglio still at its head, did not stop at these measures. Soon it demanded a new circumscription of the dioceses, the suppression of certain sees, the secularization of several monastic orders. The Roman

[12] In his declaration "To the Italian priests," Mazzini called on the clergy to choose between the spirit of the papacy and the modern spirit, in which he pretended to see the spirit of the gospel. *Ami de la religion,* March 17, 1850, p. 442.

[13] See the accounts given by the *Risorgimento* of April 9, 1850, and by the official journal of the Turin government on the same date (*Ami de la religion,* CXLVII, 201).

[14] The act of protest, addressed by Cardinal Antonelli to Marquis Spinola, chargé d'affaires of the Holy See at Turin, bears the date of February 9, 1950. See Chantrel, *Annales,* p. 91.

[15] *Ami de la religion,* CXLVI, pp. 485, 603.

court then received this impression, that the court of Turin had but one aim: to drive it to refusals which Turin would then noisily point to, presenting them as reactions of the ancient regime against the modern spirit, which Piedmont assumed to be championing. A bill on civil marriage (June 12, 1852) provoked fresh protests on the part of Rome. But in that same year some rearrangements took place in the ministry of King Victor Emmanuel, which were destined to have considerable historical importance. D'Azeglio, bending under a burden too heavy for his shoulders, yielded his place to Count Balbo. The latter in turn, after a few weeks, withdrew before the enormous task which Piedmont had assumed by posing, in the presence of Europe, against the Pope and against Austria, as the moving power of a united and regenerated Italy.

November 4, 1852, is an important date for history. On that day the head of the Sardinian ministry was confided to Count Camillo di Cavour. In appointing him (October, 1850) minister of commerce, the King said to his other ministers: "Take care, this man will take over from you all your portfolios." Indeed, no burden seemed to be unwelcome to this man. Even before holding any official position, he was able, by exercising a tireless activity in the domains of agriculture, industry, finances, journalism, social economy, and religious controversy, to impose everywhere the authority of an astonishing faculty of assimilation and a will that recognized no obstacle. Cavour was about to take upon himself the immense task of carrying on the strife against the Roman court and that of Vienna, and to labor at making Italy one of the great powers of Europe by organizing it about the kingdom of Piedmont.

Cavour

At the age of forty-two, Count Camillo Benso di Cavour was in the maturity of age and strength. "Whoever saw him incon-

spicuously taking a walk on the streets of Turin would hardly have surmised in him the future master of Italy. His small stature, his near-sightedness, his stoutness, a certain negligent and commonplace appearance, all these kept him from the masses. But, although lacking attractive gifts, he had the qualities that subdue: sharpness of views, promptness of resolve, and energy in accomplishing what he had resolved." [16] His almost unbelievable power of work and his aptitude to embrace everything amazed his fellows. Indifferent to praise or blame, he asked only the success of his views, declaring himself a moderate, making appeal to the participation of the worst revolutionaries, setting himself forth as a knight of an ideal of justice and trampling underfoot the rights of the common people, proclaiming himself Catholic in heart and yet not hesitating to outrage the Church in her holiest institutions and in her most venerated leaders.

A Savoyard on his father's side and a Genevan through his mother, offspring of the family of St. Francis de Sales and connected with the Clermont-Tonnerres, he was endowed from childhood with an insatiable curiosity, which he sought to gratify by frequent journeys, by deep inquiries about men and things. Thus you might suppose that his mind would be tossed about by the many influences among which he was a sort of crossroad. But he had a singleness of aim clearly conceived and perseveringly pursued, namely, Italian independence. This unity of purpose set order and clearness, if not greatness and virtue, in that rich organization.[17]

[16] La Gorce, "Les origines de l'unité italienne," in the *Correspondant,* November 10, 1893, p. 456.

[17] The question has been asked whether this celebrated statesman was a Freemason and whether Freemasonry played a part in the formation of Italian unity. According to Cantù (*Gli eretici d'Italia*) and Balan (*Storia d'Italia* X, 324), Cavour had been grandmaster of Freemasonry. The studies published in the *Corriere della sera* (October 30 and November 7, 1913) by Alessandro Luzio, director of the public archives of Mantua, seem to destroy this legend. If the great proponent of Italian unity had obtained that high degree, the Freemasons would have boasted of

With Cavour the policy of Piedmont became more precise and broader. To take hold of the interests of all Italy, without appearing to abandon the particular interests of Piedmont; to organize and make at home in the peninsula the heavy burdens of the great nations (conscription and excessive taxes) without arousing too much outcry; to favor the Italian liberal movements of Italy without alarming the neighboring monarchies; to fight against the Holy See without breaking with the Church: such were the ends which Victor Emmanuel's prime minister proposed to himself. These he pursued at the cost of unheard-of efforts. And these labors wore him out prematurely. But so powerful was the impulse given by him that his work continued after his death.

Religious Orders

In this place we need to study directly merely the religious aspect of that policy. When a simple deputy, Cavour had contributed to the passage of the "law of the Foro"; as president of the council of ministers, he proposed and had passed (March 2, 1855) by the Chamber of Deputies (May 22 by the Senate) the "law of convents." The kingdom of Sardinia at that time had 4 archbishoprics, 26 bishoprics, more than 600 religious communities, a considerable number of collegiate churches and benefices, almost all of them provided with important endowments. The object of the new law was to secularize a considerable part of the ecclesiastical properties. The charitable religious orders were allowed to live; but the goods of the men-

---

it thereafter. Cavour himself would not have been so eager to sustain the *Société nationale*, a rather recent organization, if he could have made use of the powerful association. Besides, Cavour, who hoped to die in the bosom of the Catholic Church and who for some time was known to be indebted to the spiritual helps of Father Giacomo, did not appear to be favorably disposed toward Freemasonry. From 1848 to 1860 that society did not show signs of life in Italy, or at least exercised only a feeble and intermittent influence.

dicant orders would be assigned to a clergy fund. The clergy, no longer a body salaried by the state, would realize the ideal formula: the free Church in the free state.[18] Cavour was not unaware that a measure of this sort was objectionable to the mass of the population, attached as a whole to the religious orders. He had to fight for several months with a tenacity that finally overcame all resistance. His bill, he said, was not aggressive against religion. Economically profitable to the nation, it would end solely, from the ecclesiastical point of view, in a happier partition of the goods of the Church among the members of the clergy. King Victor Emmanuel somewhat disliked to commit this encroachment of the civil power on ecclesiastical property. Once the law was passed, he probably thought to calm his conscience by asking that an exception be made to the confiscation in favor of two chapels which his mother and his wife were fond of visiting.[19] With this reservation, he sanctioned the confiscation law, which was a forerunner of many other spoliations.

Thirty-five monastic orders thus fell under the proscription. Religious to the number of 7,850 were despoiled. Many of those whom the law regarded as contemplatives, were maintaining charitable works. But these perished along with the rest. Certain others were zealously working at the progress of the sciences; they were not spared. Not only did the law outrage

[18] Cantù wrote: "I have heard several of my colleagues boast that they had suggested this maxim to Cavour. But Cavour himself did not claim its paternity. On the contrary he said that 'an illustrious writer, in a lucid moment,' had wished, by this formula, to show to Europe that liberty had mightily contributed to the awakening of the religious spirit (*Actes officiels* of 1860, p. 594). The fact is that Montalembert complained that this formula had been stolen from him and put in circulation by a big culprit (*Correspondant*, August, 1863). We know d'Azeglio's judgment of this expression, and the session of July, 1867, showed what importance the deputies attached to it. It was used by those who like the use of equivocal situations to profit by them" (Cantù, *Gli eretici d'Italia*). Cf. Charles Benoist, "La formula de Cavour: l'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15, 1905.

[19] The chapel of the Sacramentines and the church of the Consolata at Turin. Two statues later marked the place where the pious queens used to kneel there.

religion, science, and charity; it openly violated the constitutional law of Piedmont. In vain, M. de Revel, a former minister of King Charles Albert, appealed to article 29 of the Statute: "All property, without any exception whatever, is inviolable." Parliament ignored the appeal. It was not stopped even by the thought of respecting the wish of the former princes of the house of Savoy, who had intended to perpetuate liturgical prayer on their tombs. The religious of the monastery of Hautecombe had to abandon their sacred post.[20]

Other Measures

The expressions of respect toward the Church, lavishly used by Cavour in the course of the debates, did not deceive the Holy Father. The imprisonment of Archbishop Franzoni of Turin because he protested against the law of the Foro, his banishment on September 25, 1850, the dismissal of a chaplain who recommended prayer for the courageous prelate, the imprisonment and exile of Archbishop Marongini of Cagliari for a similar reason in 1851, the arrest of several priests, pastors or missioners, who were arbitrarily accused of stirring uprisings, insults uttered in the Chamber of Deputies against the episcopate, circulars sent out by Cavour directing the syndics to exercise a continual watchfulness over the pastors,[21] and many other deeds of the same sort left no doubt as to the hostility of the Piedmont government toward the Church.

They exiled bishops and placed the clergy under the surveillance of the police. At the same time the revolutionary and impious press was granted every liberty to insult the Pope and the priests, the revolutionaries were permitted to interrupt the sermons in the churches, and the theaters were allowed to ridicule the holy mysteries. So far did this outrage go that Sauzet, in his

[20] See the text of the law in *Ami de la religion*, June 7, 1855 (CLXVIII, 563–67).
[21] Mentioned by Dupanloup, *La souveraineté pontificale*, p. 309.

famous work on marriage (1853), was able to write: "I know not what fatal spirit has breathed over Piedmont." The government's culpable tolerance encouraged every daring, and the deputy Brofferio even declared in the Chamber: "Let us show these proud prelates that the people also have their fulminations and their anathemas." [22] In vain did the Holy Father repeat his complaints and protests.[23] The government, after some banal replies, paid no further attention to them.

Grieved and disappointed were the eminent Catholics who had but shortly before fancied a movement of national liberation under the auspices of religion. Among these Manzoni and Pellico were especially conspicuous. The illustrious author of *The Betrothed* was now more than ever "that suffering genius, with a gentle and sad face, with eyes full of yearning"; [24] and the author of *Le mie prigioni* wrote: "I do not reply to the people who regard me as a revolutionary nor to the fanatics of liberalism who blame me for not sharing their mad illusions. . . . From me they will receive no answer but my open conduct, without servility with regard to any of the violent parties, and also as Christian as possible." [25] Father Ventura, after allowing himself to be drawn for a while into Cavour's following, nobly retracted. Having learned from experience, he corrected his philosophical and political ideas. Gioberti alone, who had withdrawn from public affairs since 1849, went ahead in his liberal utopias, suggesting to Victor Emmanuel the political line to be followed for accomplishing the regeneration of Italy. But the sharp attacks of his last work, the *Rinnovamento d'Italia,* published in 1851, against the temporal power of the popes, and some other rash views, drew down upon him (January 14, 1852) the placing of all his writings on the Index by the Holy Office.

[22] Cf. *ibid.*

[23] Notably on September 19, 1852, in a letter addressed to the King of Piedmont.

[24] Lamartine, *Harmonies poétiques,* commentary on the "Hymne au Christ."

[25] Letter to Antoine de Latour.

As for the clergy as a whole, both secular and regular, the trials they had just gone through and the prospect of still greater ones, did but tighten the bonds of charity between them. This union made them, as in the first days of the Church, one heart and one soul. These feelings were nobly expressed in the letter which all the superiors of religious orders with houses in the Sardinian States sent from Rome to all the archbishops and bishops of the kingdom. They said: "In our tribulations you have become the buckler of the laws made by the Church to assure monastic vocations under the protection of the cloister."

This union of the monastic body and the episcopate under the supreme authority of the pope would now become especially necessary to face the persecutions which the events of 1850 to 1855 enabled them to foresee.

CHAPTER XXVII

The Church in Austria and Germany

PIUS IX was saddened at sight of the turn taken by the Italian national movement. He had but lately hoped to rule over it by his fatherly influence. But he saw it following the way of revolution and impiety. The power opposed to this movement, the Austrian Empire, born-protector of the Church and of the Holy See, did not spare him subjects of complaint.

Austria

Undoubtedly Austria, by its Constitution of 1848 and its concordat of 1855, seemed willing to abandon finally the Josephist traditions of its bureaucracy. But these legislative acts did not appreciably modify the fundamental tendencies of the court at Vienna and the Austrian administration. The Pope, on his part, still found serious matters of concern.

The revolution of 1848 had its repercussion in Austria. As in France, the consequences had at first been happy for the Catholic Church. In fact, the revolutionary outbreaks in Vienna and in the Austrian provinces in the spring of 1848 were caused by a demand for political rights in favor of the subjects of the Empire rather than by a demand for independence by the various nationalities (Slav, Hungarian, Croat, Albanian, Bohemian) that formed the amalgam of the state. But the movement, at least at the outset, was equally favorable to the cause of the political liberties, civil and religious, as it was to that of the national autonomies. Emperor Ferdinand (April 10, 1848) granted Hungary an Assembly to sit at Pest, the national capi-

tal, the official use of the Magyar language, a broadened, and in principle universal, suffrage, the abolition of feudal dues, and equality of taxation. The sovereign (April 25) promulgated at Vienna a Constitution copying the Belgian regime, establishing a parliament of two chambers, and indirect and electorally qualified suffrage.[1] The tyranny of the old Austrian bureaucracy seemed to be abolished for good.

This same Constitution of April 25, 1848, suppressed the ecclesiastical autocracy of the state, until then tied in with the bureaucracy. It guaranteed the free exercise of worship; and this principle of religious autonomy survived the Constitution itself. In fact, it was maintained even after the revocation of that Constitution by the ministerial decree of May 17 of the same year. Francis Joseph, succeeding his uncle Ferdinand (December 2, 1848), did not change it. At the beginning of the following year, the minister Schwarzenberg invited all the bishops depending on the crown to meet at Vienna to offer their proposals concerning the future relations of the Church and the state. On April 29, twenty-nine bishops, soon joined by six others, began their deliberations, and on June 15, they sent the result to the ministry. By ordinances of April 18 and 23, 1850, the placet was abolished, the dealings with Rome were declared free, as well as the full exercise of the disciplinary authority and of worship; the lawful control of the bishops over higher education was guaranteed.[2] Apparently Josephism was dead.

The fall of Metternich was not unrelated to this emancipation of the Catholic Church. We may well believe that the end had come to that double-faced policy which secretly, by force of the Josephist traditions, pestered the action of the Church and publicly fought against the revolution.[3] Cardinal Schwarzenberg,

[1] Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* XI, 109–15.

[2] Hergenroether, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* VII, 335.

[3] Metternich himself wrote: "For fifty years the moral situation of Austria has been this: it has been engaged in a secret war against the Church while at the same time it is in open war against the revolution" (*Mémoires,* VII, 34).

archbishop of Salzburg, wrote: "Millions of Austrian citizens hail the new order of things, not only because it guarantees them more political liberty, but also because it promises the Catholic Church the same impulses of liberty." [4]

Emperor Francis Joseph

This happy impression would not last. The new emperor, Francis Joseph, whose long reign would be marked by so many tragic events for which history must hold him responsible, was not the man destined to make a regime of liberty prevail in his kingdom and in the Church of Austria. He was personally violent, authoritarian, and sensual, with mediocre intelligence, not without shrewdness but without breadth of view and without loftiness of mind. In consequence of a systematic education, which aimed only at inculcating him with the traditions, way of acting, and thinking of a dynasty, he was the man of that dynasty, the Hapsburg, the guardian of a deposit, of a system of government for which he felt himself accountable only to God, to his ancestors, and to his heirs; in short, less a man than a personage, less a character than a link in a chain.[5] From the religious view, Francis Joseph of Hapsburg-Lorraine, emperor of Austria and apostolic king of Hungary, will increase the public testimonies of his piety and will contribute to giving an unheard-of splendor to the feasts of the Eucharistic Congress of Vienna in 1912. But he will die (1916) without being cleansed of the responsibility for a war which, according to the words of Pope Pius X, "stained his white hair with blood." His last will contains a public avowal of a misconduct that dishonored his home to his last days.[6]

[4] Wolfsgruber, *Joseph Othmar, cardinal Rauscher,* p. 98.

[5] See René Pinon, "François-Joseph" in *Revue des Deux Mondes,* January 1, 1917; Henry Wickam, *The Monarchy of the Hapsburgs;* Louis Eisenmann, *Le compromis austro-hongrois.*

[6] Following the death of Francis Joseph, the newspapers announced that he left in his will a million francs to a former actress, Mlle Catherine Schratt.

Under his reign, the public liberties granted by the Constitution of 1848 would not long continue. His first proclamation announced the intention of uniting all the countries of the monarchy into a great state. A Constitution which he granted, on his own authority, to the whole Empire (March 15, 1849) accorded personal and religious liberty to the citizens, but with capital restrictions. It proclaimed the rights of all nationalities, but without establishing any guaranty of them.[7] This Constitution was never applied. The crushing of Hungary, which had been in revolt since the summer of 1849, returned to the Empire a regime of strictly personal power, marked by the two traits of absolutism in government and Germanization in culture.[8]

By taking up all the traditions of his dynasty, Francis Joseph resumed those of Josephism. True, by a concordat concluded in 1855 he restored to the Church the jurisdiction over education, over marriage, and over such acts of civil life as directly affected the religious life.[9] But these attitudes were in vain. The provisions of the concordat clashed with the Josephist habits of the clergy and the police traditions of the bureaucracy. Part of the secular and regular clergy feared that, if it sought support from the Holy See against the civil encroachments, it would encounter the control which its morals, corrupted by wealth, made particularly necessary. The state dreaded that a clergy too zealous for the welfare of souls would soon cease to be a docile tool of the crown and of the bureaucracy. The Josephist spirit continued to prevail in the official Austro-Hungarian Church.[10]

[7] Eisenmann, *op. cit.*, XI, 128.

[8] The German language became the official language of the Empire.

[9] For the text of the concordat, see *Ami de la religion*, CLXX, 424–31.

[10] The Austrian concordat, containing thirty-six articles, was promulgated in consistory by Pius IX on November 3, 1855, and by the Emperor of Austria two days later. "Pius IX, wishing to draw from this concordat all the good possible, thought he ought to address a brief to the bishops of the Austrian Empire, dated March 17, 1856. In this brief, praising the zeal and prudence of the venerable prelates, he urged them to take advantage of what the new legislation furnished them to preserve their diocesans from the harmful doctrines of rationalism and indifference.

Another subject of grief was given the Pope by Emperor Francis Joseph. In spite of the pressing exhortations of Pius IX, the imperial troops continued to hold Lombardy and Venetia under the oppressive yoke of Austria. The Emperor remained under the blow of severe reproaches addressed by the Sovereign Pontiff to his predecessor, when, in his letter of May 3, he begged His Apostolic Majesty to "withdraw his armies from a war which, powerless to conquer the hearts of the Lombards and Venetians," could end only in "a domination without glory and without happy results, since it rested solely on iron."

Germany

Another dark spot obscured the horizon of Christianity from the side of Austria. Notwithstanding its defects and faults, the monarchy of the Hapsburgs still represented Catholicism. But, since 1848, the question arose whether its power was going to be absorbed, in the project of a new Germany, by the growing might of Prussia, or even whether it would not be expelled from the federation that Prussia was dreaming of. For these plans of absorption or of exclusion of Austria, the reason was precisely the latter's official Catholicism. What the monarchy of the Hohenzollerns was already projecting was nothing less than a league of the Protestant sovereigns confronting Catholicism and Austria.[11] "Catholicism and enemy of Prussia," wrote Bismarck (January 20, 1854), "are synonymous terms." [12] Evidently if such a dream should be realized, "the Germany of the morrow would have neither the same outline nor the same denominational personality. With Austria at the top, the Ger-

---

But the concordat legislation, after being poorly observed, was at first partly violated by laws on marriage and on schools, then brutally abrogated by the public authorities" (A. Pougeois, *Histoire de Pie IX,* IV, 62).

[11] G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* III, 18.

[12] *Briefe Bismarcks an Leop. von Gerlach,* pp. 121–24.

manic body would present a Catholic face; cut off from Austria and seeking its basis at Berlin, it would take on the aspect of a Protestant power." [13]

Prussian Hegemony

The danger was real. It was all the greater since this design of a Germany grouped around Prussia and ruled over by her was the plan for a long time pursued by these secret societies which we have seen laboring for the ruin of the Catholic faith and the triumph of freethought.

The memoirs of General Lamarque show that this plan was already determined on in 1826.[14] Relating the interview he had at that time with Count Bismarck, he adds:

He has found the means of being received in all the secret societies of Italy and Germany, and he holds that these societies are undermining the ground on which the present social order rests. According to him, the Carbonari will attain their goal, which is to unite all Italy in a single power. This desire for union is also one of the chief aims of the Teutonic Society in Germany. The mysterious numbers 37 and 38, which it has adopted, signify that out of thirty-eight princes that shared the rule of Germany, there must be only one who will establish

[13] Goyau, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[14] A letter (1778) from Empress Maria Theresa to her daughter, the queen of France, was quoted in 1868 in a lawsuit of the press at Darmstadt against the paper *Hessiche Volksblaetter*. According to this letter, the plan of Prussian dictatorship over all Germany went back to Frederick II, the head and propagator of the Masonic lodges in Germany, the great correspondent of the Masons in France. "Everyone knows in Europe to what extent we may count on the King of Prussia and what account is to be taken of his word. France has been able to perceive the situation in different circumstances. And yet see the sovereign who has the pretention of raising himself to be protector and dictator of Germany. What is even more extraordinary is that the powers do not think of joining together to prevent such an evil, from which, sooner or later, all will have to suffer the harmful consequences. What I have just said concerns all the powers of Europe. The future does not appear to me bright. . . . If this Prussian beginning is allowed to gain ground, what may be expected by those who will some day succeed us?" Quoted by Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 4.

the constitutional regime and who will lay the foundation of liberty. Which one is this prince, who should succeed so many others and make only one state out of so many states? He is known only to the adepts of the great directive circle.[15]

The secret was not hard to penetrate for anyone who knew even a little about the organization of the secret societies at that time. Frederick William III and his ministers were deeply involved in the Tugendbund, which was given to patriotic tendencies strangely mixed with Masonic ideas. Since 1821 all German Masonry was converging toward Berlin; it had become a sort of branch of the administration, conducted to a determined end with the rigidity proper to the Prussian bureaucracy.[16]

In 1848 the union of Germany was on the point of being realized. The creation of a Prussian empire that would separate France from Russia was the objective of Lord Palmerston. The Masonic paper, the *Globe,* in its August 18, 1849, number, set forth the program of the English statesman: destruction of the arbitrary and artificial structure erected by the Congress of Vienna, and the reconstitution of Europe by the erection of a vigorous German kingdom, with Prussia for its center. The eminent Bishop of Mainz has related that, when at that time he was elected a deputy to the parliament of Frankfort, a personage of high rank declared to him that the chief mission of the parliament was to extend the frontiers of Prussia to the Main, and that his duty as a deputy was to concur in this plan. The prelate adds: "I am now certain that this man was not expressing a personal opinion, but that he had adopted the thought of a secret society." [17]

We have treated at some length this political question of the Prussian hegemony in Germany. We have done so because, as later events show, it was destined to have a considerable influ-

[15] *Mémoires du général Lamarque,* II, 4.

[16] Deschamps, *op. cit.,* p. 400.

[17] Ketteler, *Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866.*

ence on the religious history of the nineteenth and the twentieth century. To substitute Prussian domination for that of Austria in Germany was to substitute the Protestant influence for the Catholic influence; to strengthen, in the heart of Europe, the German Empire thus remade, was to favor the spread of Luther's religion in the world.

Since 1848 this plan had been that of the king of Prussia, Frederick William IV. Unquestionable evidence of this fact is to be found in the private and diplomatic documents of the time, published later. The Berlin government, in its domestic policy, will at first have nothing but flattering smiles for the Catholics; it will even grant them real liberties, to such a point that the Church, deceived for a moment, will indicate to the different rulers the King of Prussia as an example to be followed. But the favors granted in the realm of domestic policy have often been, for the despotic powers, merely the means of veiling the outrages contrived by their foreign policy.[18] This latter, by its very nature, easily escapes the notice of public opinion.[19] However, in 1854 the *Feuilles historico-politiques* of Munich wrote that, wherever occasion offered to wound or mistreat the Church, "we must suspect the Prussian influence, and the thoughts of Prussian hegemony." [20]

We would be mistaken if we were to believe that the definite exclusion of the Catholic influence in Germany, to the advantage of the Protestant influence, dates from the crushing of

[18] At the beginning of his reign Napoleon III will give satisfaction to the conservative party by having religion, property, and public order respected, while its foreign policy will be contrary to the interests of religion and will always be inspired by the feeling which in 1845 prompted the signing of a plan of German unification. (See the document in Deschamps, *op. cit.*, II, 401.) But the policy of the French Emperor will be less consistently pursued in this direction; it will have happy reversals; it will not proceed hand in hand with that of the Prussian King.

[19] Men like Ketteler and Diepenbrock still hoped in 1852 for an intervention by the King of Prussia in favor of the Catholics of Baden. Cf. Pfuele, *Ketteler,* I, 252; Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* IV, 28.

[20] Quoted by Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, 18.

Austria by Prussia in 1866. The military Sadowa was preceded by an intellectual Sadowa. As the historian of *L'Allemagne religieuse* wrote:

> Between her prostration at Olmütz and her victory at Sadowa, Prussia won over Austria, progressively, insensibly, silently, a first victory, at the beginning unperceived by the military general staffs and even by many diplomats. That victory, won on the banks of the Isar, was the moral conquest, not merely of the Bavarian people, but of the Bavarian intelligence, and the formation at Munich of a liberal-national party sharply hostile to Catholicism and to Austria. Therein is to be found the result of the reign of Max. Legends were current according to which the King in vain personally gave a conspicuous example: if Dahlmann, his former professor at Goettingen, had not dissuaded him, he would have become a Protestant. Moreover, he would have tried to receive the Masonic initiation, without the advice of the minister Sfordten, who considered it inopportune. Bound to the Catholic religion by his royal dignity, by the precedents of his house, and by the susceptibilities of his people, Max took his revenge by surrounding himself with advisers all of whom belonged to Protestantism.[21]

One of those advisers was the celebrated historian Heinrich von Sybel, whom a certain writer without any sympathy for Catholicism calls a "Homais of patriotism." [22] Sybel wrote in 1847 that to be ultramontane and a German patriot are two things mutually exclusive.[23]

Bismarck

In 1847 Prince Bismarck entered into the affairs of government. That same year marked the beginning of practical realization of Prussian hegemony in Germany. Otto Leopold von Bismarck-Schoenhausen was born at Schoenhausen in the

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[22] Ernest Denis, *La fondation de l'empire allemand,* p. 132.
[23] Guilland, *L'Allemagne nouvelle et ses historiens,* p. 159.

March of Brandenburg in 1815. At the age of thirty-two he already had that authoritarian attitude, that cold and inflexible manner, that hard look, and, beneath a heavy moustache, that sarcastic line of the lips, which grew more pronounced with age, when the success of his undertakings added to his features an expression of satisfied pride and fierce triumph. The moral character corresponded to the physical. His letters and likewise his speeches were filled with strong figures, sharp retorts, brutal sallies. A skeptic and cynic, he despised men and was accustomed to say that all men had a price if you offered it to them. With much force he asserted his belief in God; but he easily rid himself of the burden of morality. "Scruples did not halt him, any more than did rancor; for him treaties were merely transient combinations, and he judged them outworn as soon as he had drawn from them all the desired advantages." [24] "Conflicts," he said, "become merely a question of might. Whoever has the might goes ahead." This expression was formulated by Count Schwerin in the famous formula, "Might surpasses right."

Bismarck was a Christian in a way. But assuredly he was more German than Christian, and more Prussian than German. He was prepared to subordinate everything to his double objective: Prussia's domination over Germany, and Germany's domination over the world. He said: "Prussia's material importance does not correspond to its intellectual importance. . . . The history of Prussia for a hundred years represents only a series of missed opportunities." By "missed opportunities" he was referring to the neglect Prussia had shown in failing to establish her hegemony in Germany. Moreover, as soon as he attained to power, he went straight toward his goal, rushing on his foes with imperturbable daring. In the Diet the representative of Austria had some exceptional prerogatives. Among other privileges, he alone had the right to smoke there. Bis-

[24] Ernest Denis, in *Histoire générale,* XI, 318.

marck handed him a long cigar and boldly asked the Austrian ambassador for a light. Bismarck's whole character is exemplified in this little incident. The affair of the cigar won for him a prestige among the diplomats. Thereafter nothing remained that he would not dare to try. In a famous report he wrote: "The unity of Germany will be realized, not by speeches or majority decisions, but by steel and blood." That unity will indeed be realized by three wars: by the defeat of Denmark in 1864, by the crushing of Austria in 1866, and by the victory over France in 1870–1871.

Catholicism in Prussia

In the presence of such schemes, what had been the attitude of German Catholics? Most of these men gladly accepted them, even enthusiastically praising the idea of the unification of Germany. But they rejected the idea of a unified Germany that would have Berlin for its capital and that would exclude or absorb Catholic Austria. The Rhineland deputy August Reichensperger became the eloquent defender of this view, which would set up a Catholic "Great Germany" beside a Protestant "Little Germany" distinct from each other by their elements and their aims. Later on, a new idea sprang up among the Catholics as being more in conformity with the state of minds and more easily practical: that of a German unity based on the freedom of the Churches. But the situation facing Catholicism was so different in the different realms that it needed to be the object of a special study for each of the principal states.

In Prussia the attitude of the Catholics was at first hesitant, anxious. On one side, upon hearing statesmen like Bismarck so loudly affirming the identity of the Prussian idea and the Protestant idea, they wondered whether they were not going to be subjected to the lot of their Belgian brethren in the Netherlands and of their Irish brethren in England. On the other side, the

liberties granted to the Catholics in Prussia seemed such as to reassure them.

The status of the Catholic Church in Prussia had, in fact, just been regulated by the Constitution itself. The constitutional act of 1848 proclaimed the autonomy of the Churches. The Prussian bishops at once profited by this declaration to correspond freely with the pope and to confer ecclesiastical benefices on their own authority. The Constitution of February 5, 1850, confirmed these liberties. Article 12 declared that "the Evangelical Church, the Roman Church, and the other religious societies were free to organize their affairs by themselves." Article 13 permitted them to communicate freely with their heads. Article 15 renounced the right of the Prussian state to intervene in ecclesiastical appointments.

These provisions favorable to the Roman Church had been inspired by political views, rather than by a spirit of kindness toward Catholicism. They formed part of the liberal Constitution issuing, in Prussia as elsewhere, from the liberal movement of 1848. Besides, Prussia, to succeed in her design of domination over Germany, needed first of all to conciliate the sympathy of the Catholic party, which might offer formidable opposition to that design. But these clever calculations, which later events clearly brought to light, were not altogether evident. The Catholics of Prussia, the Roman court itself, could be fooled in the matter.

Openly and wholeheartedly the Church in Prussia rejoiced. Pius IX gave it two cardinals, Diepenbrock of Breslau and Geissel of Cologne. The Prussian Church, beguiled and grateful, assisted at the honors which the papal nuncio of Vienna (Viale-Prelà) received at Bresslau when (November, 1850) he brought the cardinalitial insignia to Diepenbrock. Prussia had for a long time refused recognition to every papal envoy, regarding him as a messenger of Antichrist; now in that Prussia both military officers and government dignitaries joined

officially in the ceremonies that celebrated the presence of Viale-Prelà. At Berlin, for the first time since the Reformation, a Corpus Christi procession, led by the pastor Ketteler, made its way along the *Unter den Linden.* As you might have read in the *Civiltà cattolica,* "The movement of Germany toward Catholicism is today so strong that the peoples and the governments yield to a common impulse, without perhaps taking account of it themselves." [25]

Many of the works of charity in which Catholic Germany glories date from these first years of freedom: for example, at Berlin the St. Hedwig Hospital, founded for fifty patients in 1846, five years later was reorganized by Ketteler in a new structure and at once provided 300 beds; at Munster the St. Vincent de Paul Fraternity in 1849 embraced 1,300 generous Catholics to advise on the placing of poor children. The diocese received the Vincentians in 1851, the Franciscans in 1853. These were preceded by the Jesuits, whose first novitiate was opened in Westphalia in 1850. Big missions were begun: those of Cologne in 1850, of Heidelberg in 1851, of Frankfort in 1852, of Augsburg in 1853. These deeply stirred the religious atmosphere of Germany.[26] Some noble minds abjured their Protestantism and increased the number of apologists of the Roman Church. Of this number were the celebrated Countess Ida von Hahn-Hahn, and the future sociologist Vogelsang, who founded the Christian social school in Austria. A large association was founded under the patronage of St. Boniface with the aim of grouping the Catholics together, coordinating their efforts, and supporting their apostolic labors with financial assistance.

By giving freedom to the Catholic Church, Frederick William IV probably did not expect such progress. The Protestant Church took alarm. In 1851 the *Gazette de la Weser* said:

[25] *Civiltà cattolica,* December, 1851, p. 707.
[26] G. Goyau, *op. cit.,* III, 180–91.

"Anyone would have to be blind not to see what dangers Protestantism is running." [27] In August, 1852, the meeting of the Gustavus Adolphus Society [28] called the attention of the Protestants to the gravity of the situation. In September the Protesant congress of Bremen passed a similar declaration.

The Catholics told themselves that they had the Constitution on their side. They thought that to touch the Constitution would be to arouse the liberal party against the government; that the King would not dare attempt anything of that sort. Consequently they were often led to contend side by side with the liberals, at times even coalescing with them, to defend, against the too narrow interpretations of the conservatives, the text of the Act which had given them liberty. As at that very time the Catholics of France were doing in their campaign for freedom of education, so the Catholics of Germany, while rejecting doctrinal liberalism, took their stand boldly on the ground of the liberal Constitution and of the common law.[29] For themselves they demanded no right that they did not at the same time claim for others. August Reichensperger more than once intervened in the Chamber to defend the injured rights of the Protestants.[30] This policy brought to him and to his colleagues of the Chamber a real popularity. In 1852, the group of Catholic deputies sitting in the Prussian Chamber numbered seventy and was a political power that had to be reckoned with.

The Constitution was always their basis, their great argument. They did not suspect that at the side of the Prussian King a minister without conscience, Bismarck, would feel himself but little inconvenienced by a constitutional text, on the day when he might think that reasons of state would call upon him to infringe on it; that he had already worked out his famous

[27] Quoted by the *Civiltà cattolica* of August 11–September 1, 1851.

[28] This Society was founded in 1843 to sustain the small Protestant centers in Catholic countries. The King of Prussia accepted the office of its protector.

[29] Pastor, *Reichensperger,* I, 337, 356.

[30] Goyau, *op. cit.,* III, 246–48.

theory of the "constitutional gaps." This theory consisted in cleverly putting himself in a case that he presented as not foreseen by the constitutional text, and then in solving it according to his own pleasure.[31]

Bismarck's Policy

For Bismarck one principle dominated the Constitution, namely, that the Prussian state was a Protestant state. Thus he considered as not admissible that he should allow the formation in its bosom of a grouping of Catholics that might constitute a state within the state. Prussia could not suffer within it the Roman Church following its own laws. Moreover, in Bismarck's mind the alliance of a certain number of liberal Protestants with the Catholic faction was unpardonable. He conceived the Machiavellian plan of compromising the two parties, one by the other. The order was issued to discredit among the people the liberal Protestants as allied to the Jesuits and to denounce to the court of Rome the Catholics compromised in the liberal movement.

This maneuver was only the preliminary move. What Bismarck wished was the complete ruin or at least the absolute subjection of Catholicism in Germany. "With the ultramontanes," he said, "every concession produced the effect of a partial payment, an encouragement. . . . The invading spirit that prevails in the Catholic camp will force us to engage in a pitched battle."

Frederick William IV finally entered into these views. This prince was sincerely opposed to the growing rationalism and to the Hegelian pantheism, the moral consequences of which he dreaded. Hence he intended to raise up, against these dangerous

[31] Accordingly, when the Chamber plainly showed its dissatisfaction with the royal policy by refusing to pass the budget, Bismarck ignored it and governed against the majority, declaring brazenly that the Constitution had not foreseen the case where the Parliament would refuse the necessary funds.

theories, an effective dike by reconstituting German Protestantism on solid foundations. Two tendencies, however, appeared among the theologians of the Reformation. The "theology of conciliation" or "the unionist theology," erected on the foundations laid by Schleiermacher and Neander, attempted to find a just mean between the orthodox Lutheran theologians and the liberal theologians, inclined to rationalism. It strove to get its views accepted by the *Revue de la science et de la vie chrétienne,* founded in 1850. On the other hand the "neo-Lutheran theology" endeavored to win acceptance for the dogmas of primitive Lutheranism by giving them a form accommodated to the spirit of the age. The neo-Lutheran theology prevailed in the universities.

The King of Prussia at first tried to maintain the peace between the two Protestant parties by a see-saw policy. At one time he gave satisfaction to the party of the Lutheran creed by concessions, at another time he endeavored to restrain it. He was tired of these fluctuations when, in 1852, the congress of Bremen gave him to understand in a brutal way that the only real ground of union between the Protestants was the strife against Rome. This view was a resumption of an idea cherished by Bunsen. According to this idea a vast Evangelical society must be formed to form a counterweight to the Church of Rome.[32]

The first act of political oppression against the Catholic Church was the concession to the Evangelical Church of a series of budgetary favors.[33] Then followed an undertaking of secret negotiations between the Holy See and the Prussian government. These attempts made the Pope hope for the conclusion of a concordat. In the spring of 1853 Manteuffel even seemed inclined to place at the service of the Holy See the politi-

[32] On the organization of German Protestantism during the reign of Frederick William IV, see Hergenroether, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* VIII, 66–73.

[33] Goyau, *op. cit.,* III, 255.

cal influence of Prussia over the other states of Germany. Whether the Roman diplomacy surmised the double game of the Prussian diplomacy,[34] or whether other currents prevailed at Berlin, these negotiations suddenly ceased in 1854. Undoubtedly Bismarck was putting on a sort of rehearsal of the diplomatic comedy which he would later play as chancellor of the Empire and by which he would try to arouse a criticism by the Pope against the center.[35]

We may consider 1854 as the date of the start of Prussia's strife against Catholicism, a strife destined to become widely known under the name of Kulturkampf. It found the Catholics ready to resist. This resistance, directed by a man of high worth, was both able and courageous. Until the day when an exaggerated national pride changed its haughty independence, it won for the German Catholics the honor of being proposed as models for the Catholics of other nations.

Bishop von Ketteler

In the grand duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, in the duchy of Nassau, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, and in the grand duchy of Baden, the strife had already broken out. Particularly in Baden it reached a tragic intensity. Not only did the courts of Darmstadt, Wiesbaden, Stuttgart, and Karlsruhe follow in 1848 the example of Prussia, but since 1820 they had agreed to maintain the same religious policy, the policy of a vexatious and tyrannical bureaucracy. The sovereign, supreme head of the Protestant establishment, claimed the same prerogatives over the Catholic Church. The old Josephist spirit was there completely prevalent.

[34] At the time when Manteuffel was making these advances, Bismarck, in the name of Prussia, was dissuading the grand duke of Baden from coming to an understanding with Rome for a peaceful religious settlement.

[35] Goyau, *op. cit.*, III, *272*.

In the summer of 1850, in Hesse-Darmstadt began the struggle of the Catholics to win their liberties. This strife was carried on under the leadership of the valiant Bishop Ketteler of Mainz. This Baron William Emmanuel von Ketteler, born at Munster in 1811, had at first worn the embroidered uniform of referendary at the court of Saxony. The anti-Catholic persecutions (1834–1838) made him conscious of his priestly vocation. At the age of thirty he began his theological studies. He was ordained priest three years later. His first appointment was as curate at Beckum, a little town of 4,000 inhabitants, then in 1846 he was appointed to take charge of a rural parish of Hopsten, which had about 2,000 souls. For about four years Emmanuel von Ketteler was a model country priest. His works of social doctrines were a sort of forerunner of his later advanced theories. The electors of 1848 sent him to the Frankfort parliament. In a long open letter to his electors, he showed that he was opposed to the centralizing policy. "So long as the family and the commune can suffice for themselves," he said, "they ought to be left their free autonomy. Let the people themselves regulate communal affairs: they will make the experience an apprenticeship for the political life and will acquire the capacity that gives man the feeling of his responsibility." The new deputy would sit on the extreme left and he asked "the greatest possible liberty for all, including the Catholics." [36]

Ketteler, however, had little confidence in purely political arrangements. In his mind the political question was overshadowed by the social question, and this by the religious question. This doctrine was what he set forth (November and December, 1848) in six eloquent sermons delivered at Mainz,[37] after resigning as deputy to devote himself exclusively to the work of

[36] J. Lionnet, *Un évêque social, Ketteler*, p. 25.

[37] These sermons will be found in Decurtins, *Œuvres choisies de Mgr Ketteler;* Lionnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–39, gives a summary of them.

his priestly ministry. Shortly afterward, he was called to direct the important and sole Catholic parish in Berlin, established under the patronage of St. Hedwig .Tirelessly he spent himself in the capital of Prussia, as he had done in the little village of Hopsten. Then the choice of Pius IX appointed him to the episcopal see of Mainz, long before made illustrious by the great apostle of Germany, St. Boniface.[38]

As soon as he was installed (July, 1850), the new bishop displayed in the exercise of his office the apostolic activity which his earlier labors might have predicted. The foundation of a seminary and the holding of annual pastoral retreats awakened the sacerdotal spirit, which for some time had slumbered. Congregations of men and of women, confraternities, and charitable associations, braving the vexations of Josephism, were founded here and there. Ketteler traversed his entire diocese, stirring the zeal of some, quieting the misunderstandings or disagreements of others, sustaining everyone by his counsels. This feudal lord, in his first pastoral to his flock, laid before them the vow of poverty; and this vow he himself held to manifestly.

The progress of Catholicism in the diocese of Mainz began to arouse the complaints of the Protestants and to disturb the bureaucracy of the grand duchy of Hesse. Without being unduly concerned with these agitations and disturbances, the earnest prelate thought to extend his action beyond his diocese of Mainz. If the sovereigns agreed together to maintain their religious policy, why should not the bishops join together on their side for the defense of the rights of the Church? The Rhineland bishops, under the guidance of their venerable metropolitan, responded to his appeal, as did also Archbishop Vicari of Frieburg im Breisgau.

[38] Cf. Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 11. Pius IX appointed Ketteler, disregarding the wishes of the Mainz chapter and of the court of Hesse-Darmstadt. Cf. also Lionnet, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

The Rhineland Bishops

Hermann Vicari, born in 1773, was then about eighty years old. While a young man he had been installed in the office of the episcopal chancery of Constance. Later at Freiburg, under Archbishop Demeter, he valiantly sustained the cause of the canon law in the question of mixed marriages. He was a pious priest, with a gentle disposition, ready for outbursts of cheerfulness, even more ready in outbursts of charity. His charity was boundless; his amiability was perfectly frank.[39] His close circle and undoubtedly he himself would have been astonished if, when he answered Ketteler's appeal, anyone had predicted that the affair in which he was engaged would soon lead him to assume the role of confessor of the faith.

In 1850 one of his priests, Professor Hirscher, invited the Upper Chamber of Baden to follow the example of Prussia and furnish the Archbishop of Freiburg with the necessary funds for the creation of the seminaries that he needed. The Upper Chamber applauded him; but the second Chamber, perhaps obeying governmental solicitations, refused his request.

In March of the next year, the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of the Rhine, encouraged by a brief which Pius IX addressed to them (July 25, 1850), met at Freiburg under the presidency of their metropolitan, Hermann Vicari. There they considered the events of the Baden parliament, and also all the denials of justice and all the administrative vexations which they had been obliged to undergo from the little states included in the ecclesiastical region which they represented. The result of their deliberations was a petition which each of them presented to his respective government. They asked that they be made teachers of their clerics, that they be allowed to found Catholic schools, and that they be permitted to administer the property of the Church without hindrance.

[39] Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 38.

Eleven months later, when none of the governments had given a reply to their petition, the bishops met a second time at Freiburg and openly protested against "a system whose practice would involve the ruin of the Church in the province." The Rhineland states saw in this statement the beginning of an open strife against their religious policy. In this they were not mistaken. In May, 1851, Ketteler, by virtue of the independence which the natural law and the divine law assured to the exercise of purely spiritual power, opened a seminary without asking any authorization from the Hesse government. A year later, when the Baden ministry requested the Archbishop of Freiburg to give a funeral service for Grand Duke Leopold, who died a Protestant, Vicari refused to celebrate the service, alleging the laws of the Catholic Church. The angered government tried to bear down on the priests. Out of 800 priests, 740 gave the same refusal as their archbishop.

On March 5, 1853, the four governments of Hesse, Nassau, Würtemberg, and Baden decided to reply to the episcopal memorials of 1851 and 1852. They rejected all the requests *in toto* and in detail. Vicari replied to this act of the government by informing the Baden ministry that the Catholic bishops had resolved to govern their dioceses freely and to freely administer the ecclesiastical possessions. Almost at the same time they made appointments to parishes without referring the matter to the government of Darmstadt; Bishop Blum of Limburg acted in the same way without previous notice to the Grand Duke of Nassau; the bishops of Würtemberg took the same attitude.

Bishop Vicari

The Grand Duke tried to cut short the movement of independence. This he did by issuing (November 7, 1853) a decree prescribing that "no ordinance made by the archbishop of Freiburg would be recognized in any way if its publication had

not been expressly authorized by him as Grand Duke of Baden or by a commissioner especially named by him." On November 11 Vicari replied by excommunicating *nominatim* the royal commissioner, named Burger. The government forbade the episcopal sentence to be read in the pulpit and attempted to terrorize the clergy and the people by proceeding to a large number of arrests. The population of Baden, despite the insufficiency of a clergy too submissive to governmental influences, had remained devout. The persecution revived the zeal of the lukewarm. Alban Stolz wrote: "With the good Catholics, to have been imprisoned is considered almost a glory." In vain the government resorted to one of those base tricks that dishonor any regime. The Jesuits were told that they would be spared if they would blame the acts of the Archbishop. But the Jesuits preferred to desert Freiburg rather than desert the cause of the head of the diocese.[40] The aged bishop seemed to become young again in the fight. In replying to the messages addressed to him by the Catholics of all the nations of Europe,[41] he used words worthy of an Athanasius, a Chrysostom, a Hilary. His words were so touching that Döllinger could not hear them without weeping.

Some independent Prostestants, such as Leo and Gerlach, were grateful to Vicari for having dared to say that the affairs of the Church concern only the Church. Such a movement was of a nature to alarm the government of Baden. It even wondered whether the religious agitation was going to turn toward Austria certain Catholic populations that were in former times subjects of the Hapsburgs. The court of Vienna offered its diplomatic mediation to appease the differences. Such an undertaking must be forestalled. Ketteler was sounded out, and he consented to enter into discussions with the representatives of

[40] Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 45.

[41] Friedrich, *Döllinger*, III, 135. Cf. *Ami de la religion*, December 1, 1853, p. 521; *Correspondant*, December 25, 1853, p. 442; Montalembert, *Œuvres*, V, 239–41.

the different states. An understanding might have been reached in that year 1854; but certain obstacles intervened on the side of Prussia. Its Catholics appealed to the Church legislation in Prussia as a model in comparison with the different Protestant states. Bismarck, who was then, as representative of King Frederick William, at the Diet of Frankfort, strongly pleaded the cause of Protestantism, which he said was threatened by the Catholic agitation. He was so successful that he obtained not only the suspension of the parleys, but also his being sent to Karlsruhe and Nassau.

When he left these two cities, the desire for an understanding was replaced, in the minds of the two rulers, by the intention to prosecute to the utmost the repression of every manifestation judged hostile to the government. On May 19, 1854, Vicari, accused of fostering disobedience, was declared under arrest and was kept secluded in his residence. All communication with his clergy was forbidden. This hateful outrage did but add to the popularity of the aged bishop. Without any concerted organization, the faithful went into mourning, suspended every festivity, every rejoicing, so long as their bishop should remain imprisoned. This unanimous manifestation, silent and persistent, which was felt to have come from the depth of the consciences, disturbed the governments more than a riotous uprising would have done. The courts of Baden, Nassau, Hesse, and Würtemberg returned to their plans of appeasement.

A messenger of King William of Würtemberg at first, then an agent of the prince regent of Baden, then some deputies from Nassau and Hesse, set out for Rome in 1855. The example of the concordat concluded with Austria that same year was not without influence on the result of the negotiations. These resulted, in 1857 for Würtemberg, in 1859 and 1860 for Baden and the other states involved in the conflicts, in the conclusion of concordats which, in their main lines, gave satisfaction to the episcopal grievances of 1851 and 1853. The bureaucracy was

beaten. But the Catholic Churches of these different states would see rising before them another absolutism, that of the Chambers, that of the ministries, and in this way would undergo persecutions no less grievous.[42]

[42] In the account of the persecutions of the Church in Germany, we have been much indebted to the excellent work of Georges Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme.* We shall have occasion to utilize this same work when we take up again the account of the religious struggles in Germany.

CHAPTER XXVIII

The Church in Other Countries

Switzerland

In Switzerland similar attempts at religious oppression were met with similar resistance, and the courage of Bishop Vicari had its counterpart in that of Bishop Marilley. We have seen how the attacks of the radical party on the old federal constitution of Switzerland brought about, in 1846, the formation of a defensive league on the part of the seven Catholic and conservative cantons of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Fribourg, and Valais. This league took the name of Sonderbund ("separation alliance").

On July 20, 1847, the federal Diet pronounced the dissolution of the Sonderbund. It also ordered that the Jesuits, to whom the radicals attributed the origin of the resistance, should be expelled from the canton of Lucerne. The charge against the Society of Jesus was not justified. Duke Victor de Broglie shortly afterward, when declaring himself the foe of the Jesuits, affirmed in the Chamber of Peers, after inquiry: "During the thirty years that these religious have been in Switzerland, no possibility existed of finding or supposing any fact whatever on which to rest a ground to justify their expulsion." [1] On July 22 the seven cantons published a protest against the measures adopted by the Diet, which seemed to them to violate the federal pact. The twelve cantons forming the majority replied by raising an army of 50,000 men commanded by General Dufour, who, on November 10, made a military occupation of the canton

[1] Montalembert, *Œuvres*, II, 682.

of Fribourg. One after the other the seven cantons, invaded by forces superior to those at their disposal, capitulated. On November 29 the last of the insurgent cantons made its submission.

Almost everywhere the victory of the radicals was accompanied with outrageous excesses. On January 14, 1848, Montalembert in the House of Peers, questioning the government of Louis Philippe on its non-intervention in the affairs of Switzerland, said:

> Have you not seen the so-called regular authorities strike down one after the other all the congregations that were left standing, the bishops and the curé despoiled, . . . the Daughters of St. Vincent de Paul shamelessly driven out like wild beasts, without compensation? Is this outrage all? No. At the present moment perhaps a Civil Constitution of the Clergy has been passed, copied after ours of 1790. . . . But the Catholic religion is not the only one they turned against. . . . On November 24 a decree explicitly forbade to be practiced, in the canton of Vaud, any worship but the self-styled national worship. And do you know what is the state of freedom of the press in that same canton of Vaud? Forbidden is the publication of even simple news items contrary to the national interests. O fatherland of liberty! [2]

Once again the persecutors of the Catholic Church showed themselves the worst enemies of true liberty.

The federal Constitution of September 13, 1848, which issued from the crisis we have just recounted, marks a notable transformation in the political regime of Switzerland. The central power was strongly organized, and the power of the cantons was notably diminished. As for the religious question, the leader of the victorious party, James Fazy, an admirer of American liberalism, wished to destroy the close alliance of the so-called national Church and the state, which for three centuries made the government of Geneva a Protestant theocracy.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 683–86. This speech of Montalembert is considered one of his most beautiful oratorical masterpieces.

But the main body of his party did not let him carry out his idea. In fact, an article was put in the Constitution, which recognized the freedom of religions so far as it would not be contrary to the public peace and the maintenance of order between the different denominations. But if they showed themselves liberal in theory, in practice they were far from being so. The Jesuit order was banned; on several occasions the government resorted to the shabbiest and most odious proceedings to afflict the Catholic Church and her ministers.

On August 15, 1848, the five cantons (Geneva, Fribourg, Vaud, Berne, and Neuchâtel) composing the diocese of Geneva and Lausanne had concluded, by way of concordat, an accord regarding the relations of the Catholic Church with the civil power. The five states reserved to themselves the nomination of the bishops, who had to take the oath of obedience to the Constitution and to all the laws of their canton. The candidates for the priesthood had to pass an examination before a mixed commission. The government's placet was required for "postulation to benefices" and for the exercise of any episcopal office; the exequatur for any notice coming from the Holy See; and reservations were made against the admission of the decisions of the Council of Trent.[3]

When publishing this document, the *Observateur de Genève,* the organ of the Catholics, said: "Everywhere the Catholics must declare: *Non possumus.* They should add, with the same firmness: *Non volumus.* And, if persecution must be undergone, like the marytrs of former times, ah well, we shall see." The clergy of Geneva, meeting in conference, solemnly denounced, in the form of a letter addressed to their bishop, "the appearance of a plan subversive of the divine constitution of the Church." On September 18, 1848, Bishop Marilley of Lausanne and Geneva in a letter protested against the oath which

[3] For the complete text of the concordat, see *Ami de la religion,* September 10, 1848, p. 722.

the people of Fribourg were about to be called upon to take to the Constitution. Summoned three times to withdraw his protest, the prelate declared that, following the example of the apostles, he "must obey God rather than men."

On September 30, Cardinal Soglia, Secretary of State of Pius IX, likewise protested, in the name of the Pope. This he did especially against the right which the five cantons took to themselves to nominate the bishops and against the obligation which they assumed to impose on the faithful the taking of an oath to a Constitution contrary to the rights of the Church. The government replied by arresting (October 25) Bishop Marilley, taking him by force from Fribourg, and interning him in the castle of Chillon. The Fribourg Council of State declared that it would take the necessary measures for the provisional administration of the diocese. But the clergy and the faithful never recognized any other spiritual authority but that of their bishop, who, from the depth of his exile, continued to direct the affairs of his diocese. In December, 1852, the governments of Geneva and of Fribourg, powerless to sever the bond that united the prelate to his flock, decided to enter upon negotiations with Rome. But as Pius IX required, preliminary to any negotiation, the liberation of the Bishop, the Swiss authorities withdrew their project. Bishop Marilley did not return to Fribourg until 1856.

Religious Condition of Switzerland

Whence came, in Switzerland, that religious intolerance which recalled the worst days of the time of Calvin? It sprang from several causes. Switzerland, from the beginning of the nineteenth century, had become the rendezvous of numerous members of the secret societies, who there forcibly injected their spirit of hostility toward Catholicism. The influence exercised in Switzerland by the philosophy of Germany, from which the

universities of Basel, Berne, and Zurich obtained their professors, led, by another route, to similar results. The Christian faith, ruined in its foundations, was lost in an anarchy where twenty different sects—Mormon, Anabaptist, Irvingist, Darbyite—professed the strangest doctrines, sometimes most harmful to society. The need of a reaction was felt. The coming to power of the radical party, which fought for political centralization, favored this reaction. But centralizing tendencies, when they are excessive, easily turn to despotism. This change is what happened. All the Churches, except the so-called national Church, were victims of a real persecution, which struck particularly the Catholic Church, which Protestant radicalism considered its most dread adversary.

However, along with the authoritarian and persecuting movement, was another movement which tended to promote the renaissance or, as it was then called in Switzerland, the religious revival, by completely opposite means. Connected by its origin with the teaching started at Geneva in 1832 by Merle d'Aubigné and still farther back with the "Evangelical Society" founded in 1816 in that same city by some English Methodists, this movement was especially represented by a noble spirit, Alexander Vinet. Without ever repudiating the fundamental principles of Protestantism, Vinet tried to regenerate it in two ways: by freeing it from its connections to the state and by more closely connecting it to faith in Christ, true man and true God. Says Saint-René Taillandier: "We see him attack the system of national Churches with equal dignity and vigor; we see him call for the separation of the spiritual from the temporal in the name of the interests of the soul." [4] He was, says Sainte-Beuve, the principal defender of religious liberty at Lausanne; he took up the right of those who were being persecuted.[5] Alexander Vinet spoke with a tenderness which showed a trace of regret,

[4] In the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15, 1864.

[5] Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, II, 11.

of the flowers of holiness blossoming in the Catholic Church, and he expressed himself on the divinity of Christ in terms marked with the most tender feeling. "I do not understand," he said, "the vague and indiscernible God of the poet Lamartine. He has no feet that I can bathe with my tears, no knees that I can embrace, no eyes in which I can read my grace, no mouth that can pronounce it. He is not a man, and I have need of a God-man." [6]

Vinet's personal influence was considerable. Out of 250 ecclesiastics forming the hierarchy of the "national Church," he withdrew 180 of them. They were at once replaced in the Church which they left. Then they founded at Lausanne a "free Church," which had its special school of theology. But this *via media* was not more tenable than that which Newman had attempted in England. In the space of twenty years it recruited not more than 3,000 members and often had to bear the hostility of the government and the ridicule of the people. Alexander Vinet died in 1847 at the age of fifty years. His disciples, mocked by their adversaries under the name of "mummers" (from "mummery," grimace, dissimulation), finally accepted this title.

England

We have just mentioned Newman and the Oxford Movement. This movement, although more powerful and much deeper than that which Vinet had created in Switzerland, thereafter developed in England as if by two streams. A number of "tractarians," following in Newman's footsteps, turned toward Rome; others, under the leadership of Pusey, labored more earnestly to give life to the Anglican Church by borrowing some elements from the Roman Church, hoping that their work would some day end in the union of the two Churches, but stubbornly refusing any individual step toward Catholicism.

[6] A. Vinet, *Essais de philosophie morale et religieuse*, p. 313.

In his apostolic work, Newman was powerfully aided by Wiseman, and soon received the no less valuable help of Manning. In 1847, after a visit to Rome and on the advice of Pius IX, he established in England, under the name of Oratory, taking his inspiration from the rules given by St. Philip Neri, a congregation of priests and clerics which, in August, 1848, counted more than forty members. In this number were two converts who were destined to exercise a conspicuous influence on the development of piety in England: Faber and Dalgairns.[7]

While under Newman's direction a nucleus of converts was trained in religious virtues and ecclesiastical science at the Birmingham Oratory.[8]

In August, 1847, Wiseman succeeded Bishop Griffith as provicar of the district of London; then, two years later, he was named vicar apostolic. Thus he became the most considerable personage of the Catholic Church in England. One of his first cares was to spread the religious life in England. Within two years he founded ten communities in his district,[9] and he had the happiness of seeing several converts enter the religious orders: Coffin entered the Redemptorists; Tickell, Edward Purbrick and Albany Christie became Jesuits; Lockhart joined the Rosminians (Institute of Charity).

The outstanding event of the period of his vicariate was the re-establishment of the episcopal hierarchy in England. Since the schism of Henry VIII the English Catholics were subject to the regime of mission countries, that is, they were governed in spiritual matters by vicars apostolic dependent immediately on the Holy See. The number of these vicars had been at first four, then eight. The Catholic revival that occurred in England,

[7] The two principal works that give Dalgairns an honorable place among spiritual writers are: *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus* and *The Holy Communion.*

[8] A papal brief fixed the seat of the Congregation at Birmingham. Later a second house was founded in London, first dependent on that of Birmingham, then independent.

[9] W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (1912), I, 503.

first following the Emancipation Act of 1828, then by the conversion of Newman and his companions, and lastly by the apostolic works of Wiseman, gave reason to think that the time had come to re-establish in Great Britain the ordinary regime of Christian countries, comprising definitely bounded dioceses, governed by bishops dependent on a metropolitan. Negotiations had been started for this purpose in 1847; but, hindered by the political troubles in which Rome was the theater in 1848 and by the Pope's exile at Gaeta, they reached a solution only in the autumn of 1850.

On September 29 of that year, a brief of Pius IX declared the ecclesiastical hierarchy re-established in England. It included twelve bishops and one archbishop. Wiseman received this last title, attached to the Church of Westminster. On the next day the new archbishop of Westminster was named a cardinal. A week later Wiseman communicated the news to the Catholics of England by a pastoral letter in which his soul, filled with joy, overflowed in a chant of triumph. He said: "The great work is accomplished. Catholic England has again found its orbit in the religious firmament." But, by the fact of an interpretation which the Archbishop had not at all foreseen, this event was viewed most unfavorably by Protestant opinion in England. They considered it a pretention of the pope to govern England in religious matters, the beginning of a campaign with a view to substituting Catholic bishops for the Anglican bishops. The *Times* spoke of Pius IX's impudence. Lord John Russell, prime minister, denounced the move as an aggression of the Pope against English Protestantism, and promised to examine the present state of the law to see what measures could be taken against this usurpation of powers.[10] The Cardinal, on his arrival at London, was hooted; stones were thrown through the doors of his carriage.[11] His friends were alarmed for his safety.

[10] On these incidents, see Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 538 ff.
[11] *Ibid.*, I, 556.

In these circumstances Wiseman displayed great coolness. In a few days he wrote an eloquent *Appeal to the English People,* which, in calm and clear language, set forth the matter in its true focus. Gradually the irritation quieted down. The *Times* declared that the question thus put deserved the closest consideration. A bill passed by Parliament, which subjected to a fine of 100 pounds any person usurping in the United Kingdom the title of one of the pretended episcopal sees, remained a dead letter.

This unfortunate agitation, so unforeseen by the Catholics, had a no less unforeseen result: this time a happy result for Catholicism: the conversion of him who would be Wiseman's successor in the see of Westminster, Cardinal Manning.

Manning

Henry Edward Manning, like Newman the son of a London banker, was six years younger than Newman. Like Newman he had been brought up in an environment on which Catholicism had no influence. But the tendencies of mind of the two future princes of the Church had been, in their youth, quite different. Whereas with Newman all the energies were directed toward the development of a more and more intense interior life, with Manning the external life was always the aim of his activity. From boyhood the goal of his ambition was the political life, where he aspired to play the part of a statesman. At that time his motto was: *Aut Caesar, aut nihil.* The ruin of his paternal fortune and some other disenchantments of his youth obliged him to give up his ambitious dream, turning his thought to more serious matters. Happily influenced by a pious friend, he turned to the ecclesiastical life. In 1833 he was appointed curate in the parish of Lavington; but he remained outside the controversies over the tractarian movement. More concerned with practice than with doctrine, he applied himself, with a zeal as ardent as

it was wisely inspired, to relieve the moral and material miseries of his people. In 1837 the death of his wife, who died of tuberculosis after four years of an unshadowed union, led him to turn his soul in the direction of piety.

His religious ideas, on the capital points, became almost those which Newman's followers professed. The ties of close friendship which bound him to Gladstone, the future prime minister, then much involved in the Oxford movement, favored this orientation of his life. The prayers and the ceremonies used in the Catholic Church spoke to his heart. But what exasperated him more than anything else in the Anglican Church was to see it governed by a civil authority. To his mind, the things of the Church should depend only on the Church. The interferences of the state in the domain of religious questions repelled him. Afraid of detaching his fellow Anglicans from the Established Church and favoring the exodus toward Rome inaugurated by Newman,[12] he merely groaned in silence. A celebrated lawsuit, the Gorham affair, in which the Privy Council decided, against the ecclesiastical authorities, in favor of a pastor who did not believe in the efficacy of baptism, finally made him lose confidence in the organization of the Anglican Church.[13] The time that passed from the decision of the Privy Council in March, 1849, until the end of 1850 was for Manning a period of agonizing tortures of conscience. He hesitated to leave a Church to which all his memories attached him and in which he no longer believed.

What was called the Papal Aggression summoned him to decide. He did so with courage. Before a notary he made his resignation of his office and his benefice. Then going forth from the lawyer's office, he entered a Catholic church, and there, for the

[12] In 1845, when Newman, who had become his friend, informed him of his abjuration, Manning told Newman of his grief at the move, not hiding from him that in his eyes this defection was a sin, or, as he said elsewhere, a fall. E. S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (1896), I, 309.

[13] On the Gorham case, see Hemmer, *Vie du cardinal Manning*, p. 66.

first time in his life, recited the Hail Mary. On April 6, 1851, Manning made his abjuration in the hands of the Jesuit Father Brownbill. Shortly after, when the *Times* announced his return to the Catholic Church, he wrote to the paper that he had found in the Church all that he was looking for, and even more than he could have imagined before belonging to it.[14] From that moment Manning's zeal for Catholicism, for its rites, for its traditions, and for its infallible head, kept growing until his death.

For three years (1850–53) he divided his time between his theological studies in Rome and some apostolic preaching in England. In 1854 Cardinal Wiseman took him as an auxiliary in his works of evangelization and administration. At this period, under the inspiration of the zealous prelate, he was engaged in the foundation of a community of secular priests, who, placed under the hand of the archbishop, would hold themselves ready to undertake any works of the apostolate that would be entrusted to them. He carried out this idea in 1856 by the foundation of the Oblates of St. Charles. His appointment at this time as provost of the chapter of Westminster, giving him a new authority, enabled him to broaden the field of his apostolate.

Puseyism

By the conversions of Newman and Manning, the Established Church of England had lost the two most eminent of its clergy. After their departure, Pusey became the most prominent personage of the party. Was he going to follow the other two? He did not do so. Despairing of revivifying the Anglican Church, he continued to borrow from the Roman Church its devotions, its prayer formulas, and its ceremonies. He re-established two institutions that seemed to be identified with the essence of Catholicism: the monastic life and confession. He

[14] Madaune, *Histoire de la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre au XIX^e^ siècle*, p. 470.

made the Eucharist the center of worship. But to see in his work a progress toward submission to Rome, would be a mistake. Pusey was unwilling even to have such a step mentioned. The Church of England, according to him, must by itself rise to the purity of doctrine and of worship which it had lost. This transformation accomplished, the moment would then be at hand to negotiate a union with the Roman Church. Meanwhile the individual conversions were, to his mind, merely drops of water futilely falling into the ocean.

By this single trait, Puseyism, as it was called, or ritualism, was distinguished from the tractarian movement. It separated them in two other ways. The followers of Pusey were thenceforth recruited, no longer in the world of university students, but among the members of the parish clergy. For the same reason, the center of this movement, more practical than doctrinal, less academic than parochial, was no longer the University of Oxford.

The tractarian movement, abandoned on one side by Newman and his followers, and on the other by Pusey and his school, rapidly languished and soon appeared dead. Then the liberal school judged the moment had come to seize hold, at Oxford, of the influence lost by the tractarians. It installed itself there. It even tried to organize there a new Church, which called itself the Broad Church, as opposed to the High Church and to the Low Church. Basically the Broad Church designated less a delimited and organized party, with its own Creed, than a state of mind, a tendency. The Broad Churchman was the personage for whom every new and daring opinion had a particular attraction. He professed to draw his information from German literature and science. Most of the reckless opinions held since then in England on the interpretation of the Bible and the transformation of dogmas, were defended by the Broad Churchmen.[15]

[15] On the history of Puseyism, see Thureau-Dangin, *La renaisance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*, II, 37–155, 229–61.

Holland

We must say a few words about the other states of Europe. The religious events that happened in them during the first part of Pius IX's pontificate (1846–1855) had not the same importance as those that took place in France, Italy, Austria, Prussia, Switzerland, and England during this period. Yet they call for mention. Nearly all Europe had experienced the counterstroke of the revolution of 1848, and almost everywhere this shock resulted in the introduction of liberal institutions, from which the Church profited. But, at the same time, as a greater freedom was left to the maneuvers of the anti-Catholic sects, it was subjected, on their part, to ruder assaults.

The Holland Constitution of 1848 guaranteed freedom of education. Encouraged by the dispositions which the new legislation showed, Pius IX thought the moment opportune to resume the negotiations that had been undertaken in 1815, and several times interrupted since then, with a view to reorganizing the Catholic hierarchy in the Netherlands. In 1851 the ministry of that country declared that it did not wish to place any obstacle in the way of this project. Consequently Pius IX, by his apostolic letter of March 4, 1853, decreed the establishment of five dioceses at Utrecht, Harlem, Bois-le-Duc, Breda, and Ruremonde, and erected those five dioceses into an ecclesiastical province under the authority of the archbishop of Utrecht.[16] But this act of the Sovereign Pontiff at once aroused three parties against him: the so-called orthodox party, closely attached to Calvinism and desiring nothing less than the return to the legislation of the old regime, to Protestantism as the religion of the state; the so-called conservative party, which, without going that far, feared to see the disappearance of its influence and its privileges; and lastly the party of the secret societies, which, in Holland especially, had nearly all parties connected with the

[16] This letter may be seen in Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 128–32.

Protestant heresy. An agitation similar to that which three years earlier had been stirred up in England by a similar act of Pius IX, upset the country. But these very violences endangered its success. Several Protestant papers were exasperated and contributed to restore religious peace in the Netherlands.

On August 29, 1853, Pius IX completed the organization of the Catholic hierarchy in Holland. He excommunicated the Jansenist Herman Heykamp, who had usurped the jurisdiction of the diocese of Utrecht, and exhorted the schismatics with fatherly words to return to the fold of the Roman Church.[17]

Belgium

Belgium, which adopted a liberal Constitution in 1830, had no need to modify it in 1848. The attempt of a band of insurgents, who had hastened from France to revolutionize Belgium, resulted merely in attaching it the more strongly to its king, Leopold I. The events of 1848 had, then, little effect on the Church in Belgium. The difficulties it encountered from 1847 to 1855 arose from another source, coming exclusively from the domestic policy of the country.

We have seen that the liberals and the Catholics had joined together in 1830 to win the independence of the nation. This union, which from the outset was declared to be provisional, did not survive the triumph of the national cause. The Catholics, taking for their program the freedom of the Church, and the liberals, adopting for their watchword the independence of the civil power, found themselves opposed to each other. Soon two sharply distinct parties were formed, which, like the Whigs and the Tories of England, would, to our day, by a sort of see-saw, compete for power. In 1847, a liberal ministry replaced a Catholic ministry. Until its fall in 1855, it showed in various ways its

[17] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 151. The papal bull, addressed to all the Catholics of Holland, sets forth the situation of the Jansenist schism in the Netherlands.

suspicion toward the influence of the Church. On May 20, 1850, in a consistorial allocution, Pius IX judged that he ought to express publicly his grief at the sight of the dangers that threatened religion in Belgium. The Catholic press, organized under the direction of the bishops, vigorously sustained the cause of the Church. In June, 1851, the Supreme Pontiff rewarded by honorary distinctions the knight Stas, director of the *Journal de Bruxelles,* P. Kersten, founder of the *Journal historique et littéraire of Liége,* and Baron Gerlache, known by several publications undertaken for the cause of religious freedom.

Spain

Politically isolated from Europe since the fall of the Bourbons, Spain, under the blows of the events of 1848, ran the risk of falling into the power of the factions. But the government at that time had for its leader an energetic general, Narvaez, whose strong hand was able, in the interior, to restrain the parties without injury to the public liberties. In foreign relations he profited by the occasion which presented itself to him to renew the relations of Spain with the European diplomacy: by sending a contingent of troops, he contributed to the re-establishment of the authority of the Pope in the Papal States.[18] Pius IX, in his allocution of May 20, 1850, gave praise to Spain and expressed his gratitude to the government of Isabella II.

The hour had come to take up again, with more chance of success, the negotiations between the court of Rome and the court of Madrid in view of a concordat. These negotiations had begun in January, 1845, but unfortunately had been interrupted. On March 16, 1851, a convention in forty-six articles was concluded at Madrid between the nuncio Brunelli and the minister

[18] On December 21, 1848, the Spanish government, by a diplomatic note, had invited the Catholic states to deliberate on measures to be taken to guarantee the authority of the pope against the revolutionary conspiracies. This letter will be found in Chantrel, *op. cit.,* p. 62.

Manuel Bertran de Lis. This pact guaranteed the maintenance of the Catholic religion as the religion of the state, the inviolability of the rights of the bishops, the capacity of the Church to acquire property, and the re-establishment of the seminaries. In exchange, the Pope consented to the abolition of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions, to a new circumscription of the dioceses, to the maintenance of the old rights of nomination of the Spanish monarchs, and agreed not to raise claims regarding Church property already sold. This concordat was approved by the Cortes, then ratified (September 5, 1851) by Pius IX, who by a circular of May 17, 1852, exhorted the Spanish bishops to profit by the new concordat dispositions to assemble provincial and diocesan councils, to found seminaries, and to defend courageously the freedom of the Church.

Unfortunately the concordat of 1851 could not long be applied. The revolution of 1854 brought on the religious persecution. In the consistory of July 26, 1855, Pius IX was obliged anew to raise his voice against the sale of Church property, the interference of the government in the administration of the dioceses, and other flagrant abuses. He had to wait until 1859 to conclude a new concordat, which was no better carried out.

During this period two remarkable men, one a priest, Jaime Balmes, the other a layman, Donoso-Cortés, particularly honored the Church of Spain. Jaime Balmes was born at Vich in Catalonia, August 28, 1810; he died (July 9, 1848) at the age of thirty-nine. Balmes was a philosopher, historian, social moralist, and political writer. In his *Filosophia Fundamental* he opposed the eclecticism of Cousin and the German pantheism, and endeavored to adapt the doctrine of St. Thomas to the needs of the nineteenth century.[19] In his *El Protestantismo Comparado con el Catolicismo* he corrects Guizot's ideas on the general

[19] Regarding this philosophical work, he himself wrote: "This is merely the philosophy of St. Thomas suited to the needs of the nineteenth century." A. de Blanche-Raffin, *Jacques Balmès, sa vie et ses ouvrages,* p. 299.

movement of mankind, by claiming for Catholicism the large part belonging to it in the formation of modern civilization. In his writings on social economy he marks out a safe way between the utopias of socialism and the merciless axioms of the liberal economists or, in the political domain, he strives to prepare the future without totally rejecting the legacy of the past. In all his writings he introduces an open, penetrating mind, and often profound insight. His tendencies approach the school that recognized as its leaders in France, Ozanam, Lacordaire, and Montalembert.[20]

Donoso-Cortés, marquis of Valdegamas, was born May 9, 1809, in the castle of Valdegamas, in the region of Spain known as Extremadura; he died at Paris, May 3, 1853. Like Balmes he took up the questions of philosophy, history, sociology, and politics; but he considered them from a viewpoint that made him a neighbor of his great friend Louis Veuillot. Balmes admires in modern civilization "that wonderful public conscience" which Catholicism slowly trained and which bestows benefits even on those who insult the Church.[21] Donoso-Cortés holds that between modern civilization and Christianity is a bottomless abyss, an absolute antagonism.[22] Balmes states, without fear and even with real satisfaction: "that spirit of freedom which invades the civilized world and penetrates from all sides like an overflowing river."[23] Donoso-Cortés, in a famous speech, declares: "The question is no longer between liberty and dictatorship; it is posed between two kinds of dictatorship: that of insurrection and that of the government. To a dictatorship coming from below, I prefer one coming from above; since we must choose between the dictatorship of the dagger and that of

[20] Cf. A. Lugan, *Balmès.*

[21] Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared,* chap. 20.

[22] Donoso-Cortés, *Œuvres,* I, 340.

[23] Balmes, *Pie IX.* Cf. Casanovas, *Apologetica de Balmès,* pp. 305–10; Lugan, *op. cit.,* p. 105.

the sword, my choice is made: I choose that of the sword." [24]

Almost everywhere in France, England, Italy, and Germany, this kind of difference of opinion appeared. The revolutions of 1848 posed formidable problems, which thinkers sought to solve, some by leaning toward liberty, others toward authority. These differences will lead, between Catholics, to prolonged conflicts that will be the principal objects of Pius IX's concern during the second part of his pontificate.

[24] Donoso-Cortés, *op. cit.*, I, 337. Cf. the Introduction to this work, by Louis Veuillot, I, 1–64; Montalembert, "Donoso-Cortés," in the *Correspondant,* August 25, 1853.

CHAPTER XXIX

Anti-Catholic Movement

THE world, often failing to look beyond outward events, had until then seen in Pius IX hardly anything more than the head of a state. Until the Gaeta exile those who inclined toward the liberal solutions of the political problems had praised his generosity in responding to the popular aspirations. Beginning with the Gaeta exile, those who inclined toward authoritarian solutions admired him for the courage he showed in the defense of the rights of God and of the Holy See.[1] Only witnesses of his private life and a few penetrating minds, when speaking of Pius IX, considered especially what deep faith and warm piety was in the soul of the new pope. Of this number was Balmes, who, shortly before his death, said: "The question of the change in the Roman policy is most grave and difficult; but I am not much disturbed by it. . . . Pius IX is, first of all, a man of prayer. For this reason I am without misgiving about the final success. What can the revolution accomplish against a man united to God?" [2]

[1] Among those who particularly praised the Pope's efforts to reconcile liberty with power, we mention Balmes, in his book on Pius IX. This was his last work and a sort of last will (see Blanche-Raffin, *Jacques Balmès,* pp. 105–9, 286–91). Among those who attacked the liberal tendencies of the Pope, we should mention Crétineau-Joly (see Maynard, *J. Crétineau-Joly,* pp. 316, 386–87, 402). Crétineau-Joly, in his *Histoire du Sonderbund,* published in 1850, in connection with the Pope's policy in the affairs of Switzerland, takes up the whole history of Pius IX's pontificate, which he pictures insultingly. He represents the Pope as a man of feeble mind, fond of popularity, letting himself be weakened "from ovation to ovation, that is, from fall to fall, to the point of no longer disposing of his will" and condemned to a role "more worthy of a hero in a novel than of the vicar of Christ" (Maynard, *op. cit.,* p. 387).

[2] Blanche-Raffin, *op. cit.,* pp. 104–7.

Dogma of the Immaculate Conception

From childhood he who would become Pope Pius IX was known for his tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Driven from Rome by the revolution, hardly had he reached the place of his exile when he conceived the idea, to avert the calamities which threatened the Church and society, of reanimating the devotion of the faithful toward the Queen of heaven. In an encyclical of February 2, 1849, he wrote: "May the Virgin full of grace and of sweetness ward off from us, by her ready and all-powerful intercession with God, the cruel agonies from which we are suffering . . . , and calm the frightful tempests which assail the Church on every side." [3]

The most suitable means of obtaining a renewal of piety toward the Virgin Mary seemed to him to be the proclamation of the dogma of her immaculate conception. He requested all the bishops of the world to gather together in their dioceses the traditions touching the belief in the Virgin's immaculate conception.

Pious souls grasped the import of the new encyclical. Most of the men of politics, who had given great attention to the administrative reforms of Pius IX, smiled or disdained to concern themselves with this act. In the Pontiff's thought, as indeed throughout the history of his pontificate, it would have a considerable importance. Up to then, Pius IX, without abandoning any Catholic dogmas and without yielding any of the rights of the Holy See, had wished to show that the Church was ready to respond to all the legitimate aspirations of modern times. The thwarting of his generous undertakings could be attributed only to the ill will of the revolutionary sects. He thenceforth sought first of all the welfare of the Church and of society in the restoration of the doctrinal truths and the disciplinary authority that God had entrusted to him.

[3] Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 69–71.

We may say that this new phase of his pontificate opened on December 8, 1854, when, after appealing to the testimony of an ancient and universal tradition, he defined, "by virtue of the authority of the holy apostles Peter and Paul and of his own, that the Blessed Virgin Mary was preserved from every spot of original sin from the first moment of her conception" and he declared "separated from the unity of the Church whoever would hold a belief contrary to that definition." [4] In reality, basically this great act was nothing but the confirmation of a traditional devotion of the Church. In declaring that the Mother of God alone had been freed from the original stain, the Pontiff affirmed once again, against the pride of the age, the existence, too generally forgotten, of a universal fall of mankind. In proclaiming that the Son of God, in becoming incarnate, had taken only a most pure flesh, he maintained very high the dignity of the God-man even in his human nature. In offering to the homages of men a creature absolutely pure, although formed of the same clay as we are, he recalled to all men the wonderful power of divine grace. Lastly, Pius IX, by imposing the new dogma on all the faithful under pain of anathema, affirmed his supreme authority in the realm of teaching and preluded the proclamation of papal infallibility. From that time on, the preoccupations of an external order, such as his conflicts with the civil powers, often disturbed him. But solicitude for the restoration of doctrinal truth and of disciplinary authority had priority over all his other cares.

The bull proclaiming the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was hardly published when the Pope invited the commission formed for the preparation of that bull, to begin studies relative to the condemnation of the principal modern errors.[5]

The idea of gathering together in a sort of table the errors of

[4] Denzinger-Bannwart, no. 1641. See the full text of the bull *Ineffabilis* of December 8, 1854, in the *Acta Pii IX*.

[5] Cf. Schrader, *De theologia generatim*, p. 137.

the time and inflicting on each of them the fitting condemnation, seems to have been set forth for the first time in 1849, at the provincial council of Spoleto, by Archbishop Joachim Pecci of Perugia.[6] Three years later, Cardinal Fornari, on order of Pius IX, communicated privately to the most notable members of the episcopacy and to some eminent laymen the plan of a collection, or syllabus, containing twenty-eight propositions and conforming to the wishes of the council of Spoleto.[7] To examine the replies given to the letter of Cardinal Fornari and further to investigate the important question of the condemnation of the modern errors: such was the task assigned to the papal commission. Pius IX's project resulted in 1864 in the promulgation of the encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Syllabus.

Anti-Catholic Movement

During the ten-year interval (1854–1864) the modern errors gradually became known. The political opposition to the Holy See, directed by Cavour, led to the invasion of the Papal States by the soldiers of Garibaldi; and the nebulous rationalism of the German philosophy led to Ernest Renan's *Life of Jesus*. Cavour's political program introduced a new form of the opposition of the states toward the Holy See. Until then the popes had been obliged to contend either against powers clearly hostile to the Church which persecuted it openly, or against Catholic powers which, on the pretext of protecting it, tried to dominate it. Cavour at the time refrained from fighting the Church or mingling in its affairs; but this restraint was on the condition that the Church intervene in no way and under no pretext, even for the spiritual good of souls, in the affairs of the state. Such was the meaning he gave to the motto which he later adopted:

[6] "Singuli errores . . . veluti sub uno oculorum intuitu . . . nominatim recenseantur." *Collectio lacensis,* VI, 743.

[7] Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* III, 493.

The free Church in the free state. This policy was the introduction of the liberal thesis into the diplomatic relations of the states with the Church.

Cavour's religious policy was marked by two other traits. Although having as its starting point and its final end a strictly national interest, it hoped to draw into its movement all the states of Europe. While wishing to take its stand on conservative and Catholic ground, it expected to win the revolutionary forces for its advantage: an arduous task, a gamble that was not realizable but before which Cavour's daring did not recoil. Pliant as well as obstinate, patient as well as resolute, Cavour methodically carried out the execution of his plan.

The little Sardinian state, a simple fragment of the Italian mosaic, had no voice in the concert of the great European powers. The first thing to be done was to give the Sardinian state that voice. In 1853 the conflict raised by France in the Orient against Russia regarding the question of the Holy Places seemed to the statesman the favorable occasion for an intervention by which Piedmont would rise to the general politics of the big states. By the treaty of January 20, 1855, which admitted Piedmont as an ally of France and England, the Turin chancery held, so to speak, her admission card to the peace congress. Cavour had the talent to communicate this viewpoint to the army of 15,000 men that he directed toward the Crimea. In the mud of the Sebastopol trenches they were aware that with that mud Italy was being made.

This view was grasped even better when, in 1856, at the congress of Paris, the question of Italy was introduced into the deliberations of the powers and was pleaded by Cavour himself in the name of Piedmont. Until then the able statesman had played a pliant and astute game. Allowed to speak by the same title as the representatives of Russia, Austria, England, and France, and confident of the support of England and France, he was daring. He unfolded his whole plan in broad lines. He

pointed out as abnormal the agglomeration of the states of the peninsula and showed, in a violent tone, the threat to Piedmont by the extension of Austria. Moreover, he submitted to Count Walewski and Lord Clarendon, ministers of France and England, a note declaring that the Pope was powerless to govern his States; that a separation, at least an administrative one, of Rome from its Legations, was required.[8] Following a deliberation of the members of the Congress, made acquainted with the proposal of Cavour by the representatives of France and England, protocol 22 of the treaty of Paris was devoted to what was called "the Italian question." The term was too narrow. What was being proposed was the Roman question itself, of concern to the head of the Catholic Church.[9]

This aspect can be seen in the general feeling that followed the deliberations of the Congress. In vain Cavour declared "that his view was not prompted by pretrophobia, that he was ready to give the Church a greater freedom than it was enjoying, that his sole purpose was to separate the temporal domain from the spiritual domain, the state from the Church." [10] While the aging Metternich was writing that "the position taken by the court of Turin made his nerves quiver by a sort of galvanic impulses," [11] Victor Emmanuel was alarmed at the daring of his minister.[12] In fact the congress of 1856 was the

[8] With a view to facilitating the understanding of the facts that we are about to relate, we give here the division of the Papal States, such as it was fixed on November 20, 1850. It embraced the district of Rome and four Legations. The district of Rome included the Eternal City, its outskirts, the provinces of Viterbo, Orvieto, and Civitavecchia. The first Legation, known as the Romagna, embraced the provinces of Bologna, Ravenna, Forli, and Ferrara. The second Legation, called the Marches, was formed of the provinces of Urbino, Pesaro, Macerata-Loreto, Ancona, Fermo, Ascoli, Camerino. The third Legation was composed of the provinces of Rieti, Spoleto, and Perugia; and the fourth, those of Velletri, Frosinone, and Benevento. In some documents the term "Legations" is applied to the Romagna alone.

[9] Cf. *Correspondant,* July 25, 1856; Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société,* II, 333.

[10] Cavour, *Lettere,* II, 453.

[11] Metternich, *Mémoires,* VIII, 394.

[12] Cavour, *loc. cit.*

starting point of a campaign of pamphlets, calumnies, and various outrages in which the treaties of 1815, the Austrian power, the temporal power of the papacy, and the influence of the priests, mingled together and confused, were vilified by unscrupulous pamphleteers.

Bishop Pie of Poitiers, with that ardent spontaneity and that warm devotion to the Roman See, the Roman doctrines, and the Roman interests, which was the characteristic of his episcopal career, expressed indignant protests which, more than the low-class agitators, pointed directly to the states, which he held responsible for the agitation. "The rationalist governments," he said, "could build nothing solid and durable; and their punishment is no less inevitable." [13] The French government admonished him and prepared reprisals.[14] But the militant Catholics, whose organ was the *Univers*, acclaimed the Bishop of Poitiers as their ecclesiastical leader. By his theological science, by his inflexible attachment to tradition, and by the fearlessness of his zeal, the Bishop of Poitiers was the indicated scholar of the group of Catholics which had Louis Veuillot as its vigorous spokesman.

Cavour's Policy

Cavour, however, slowly and surely pursued his work. After winning the world of diplomacy to his cause, he labored to master the revolutionary forces to his advantage. Among the men who understood the import of the decisions taken at the congress of Paris about Italy and Piedmont, was one of Mazzini's disciples, Giuseppe La Farina. He was of an earnest spirit, fond of militant politics, but, like many of his fellow

[13] Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, I, 634. Cf. Pie, *Œuvres*, II, 514, and especially the synodal instruction on "Rome considérée comme siège de la papauté," in *Œuvres*, II, 466–536.

[14] Baunard, *loc. cit.*

Italians, he did not let his ardor in any way obscure the clear view of real situations and of the practical possibilities. Sincerely attached to his master, but more deeply devoted to the Mazzini doctrines, he realized that these would have a chance for a greater success by allying themselves to the fortune of Piedmont and Cavour. But would Cavour consent to be served by him? La Farina supposed that the minister was too intelligent to miss such a force. In this he was not mistaken. An interview (September 12, 1856) between the conspirator and the statesman was enough to bring them into agreement.

The result of their conferences was the foundation of a national Italian society. It was an association both public and secret: public in Sardinia, where its devotion to the cause of Piedmont and its king would facilitate its growth of membership and its influence; but secret outside for fear of arousing national susceptibilities or of provoking repressions by the public powers. Its composition was quite diverse: lawyers and men of letters there met with artisans and laborers. Thus the influence of its members was likewise quite varied. Whereas the man of the people spread the doctrine of the renovation of Italy among his companions of the workshop, poets and artists and novelists exalted the Italian homeland, and scholars patiently gathered all the old texts that could serve to glorify the national cause. Naturally most of the members belonged to the revolutionary sects; Mazzini's ideas formed the basis of their profession of faith; and, if they desired Italian unity as intensely as the minister Cavour desired it, for them the temporal power of the pope was the big obstacle to the realization of that unity. Neither Victor Emmanuel nor Cavour could entertain the notion of altering the ideas of their new collaborators on this point. They must be accepted as they were, or their help must be foregone; they were accepted along with their ideas. Thus was fulfilled Mazzini's prediction: "Piedmont will enter on the path of

our doctrines by the prospects of the crown of Italy." The person of the conspirator had been eliminated as compromising; but his plan triumphed.

Garibaldi

Cavour was desirous of using for his enterprise all the forces he could have under his hand, without too close a consideration of their moral value. In accord with this aim, he would not pass over the strange condottiere who, since 1848, was filling Italy with the sensational rumors of his fame, Giuseppe Garibaldi. Born at Nice in 1807, successively Piedmont sailor, conspirator at Genoa in the service of Mazzini, teacher of mathematics in France, captain of a frigate in the service of the bey of Tunis, and head of revolutionary bands in America, in 1848 he put his sword in the service of Charles Albert in the fight against Austria. In 1849, after the Pope's abandonment of Rome and the proclamation of the Roman Republic, Garibaldi was appointed by Mazzini to defend the Eternal City against the French army of General Oudinot. Obliged to disband his troops, but dissatisfied with inaction, he returned to America, there engaged in industrial undertakings, and finally, foreseeing the awakening of the revolutionary agitation in Italy, he returned there in 1854 with the prestige of a mysterious adventurer.

This singular adventurer had the appearance of a circus hero or a hero from the pages of a novel. He had a martial and grotesque figure, wearing a broad sombrero and over his red shirt an American poncho. His courage was genuine. Sometimes he carried it to the point of the maddest daring. Thus he impressed the masses, whom he attracted also by the oddities of his attitude, by the liveliness of his speech, and by his imperturbable swagger. His membership in all the revolutionary sects extended the circle of his connections. He affected illuminism. Exaggerating the mottoes of Mazzini, he invoked the authority of

Christ, shouting: "On to the pope." He was never prouder than when he could surround himself, in his anticlerical manifestations, with some apostate religious dressed in the habit of their order.

Such was the man with whom Count Cavour got in touch for the first time toward the end of 1857, without hiding from himself that such a helper would perhaps arouse as many difficulties as he might bring him assistance.

Cavour's Difficulties

These difficulties, however, may have seemed to him negligible as compared to those he could foresee. These might come from the side of the powers or from the sects directed by Mazzini or from the Italian Catholics and the Pope himself. Among the powers, France was the only one that disquieted Cavour. Russia was far away; Prussia was still isolated; and England was rather unfamiliar with Italian affairs. The probable past connections of the Emperor of the French with the Carbonari might make him sympathetic to the work of Italian unity if this movement were aided by a Garibaldi; [15] but that emperor, since coming to power, plainly sought to conciliate the good will of the Catholics. The question had concerned the revision of the Organic Articles. Undoubtedly the French Catholics as a whole did not have the frank confidence of Bishop Ségur. Ségur, seeing Napoleon become, as he said, more and more papist, wrote to Bishop Pie: "Restorer of religion in France, the prince will, as a result, be so in all Europe." [16] But the mere concern not to alienate from himself the most compact portion of the conservative party might be enough to make the Emperor opposed to any undertaking threatening the tranquillity of the Holy See.

[15] A cousin of the Emperor, Prince Lucian Murat, a month after the *coup d'état* of December 2, had been elected Grand Master of Freemasonry.

[16] Baunard, *op. cit.*, I, 395. Cf. Marquis de Ségur, *Souvenirs et récits d'un frère,* Vol. I, chaps. 9 and 11.

With anxious solicitude and stubborn perseverance, as evidenced in his correspondence, Cavour strove to combat, in the mind of the Emperor, whatever might unpleasantly trouble him in the Piedmont undertaking.[17]

Cavour's task was made more difficult since he had also to appease Mazzini, who was then profiting from the popular discontent provoked by a recent raising of taxes, to give a new vitality to his party. As for the Italian clergy, although largely favorable to a national movement, it was especially sensitive to any attack or threat directed against the Pope. Pius IX, in his allocution *Probe memineritis* (January 22, 1855), complained of the rashness with which the King of Sardinia did not fear to violate the independence of the Church and to utter the most serious insults on the authority of the Holy See.[18] The triumphal journey made by the Supreme Pontiff, in the course of 1857, to Bologna and several other cities of Italy,[19] proved that the Holy Father's complaints stirred profound echoes of sympathy among the clergy and the faithful of Italy. That same year (March 19, 1857) the publication by an English paper, the *Daily News,* of an important memorandum of the French ambassador at Rome, Rayneval, a memorandum quite favorable to Pius IX and likewise to the Italians, and until then kept secret, might extend to the Catholics of the entire world the sentiments shown by the Catholics of Italy.

The most formidable obstacle to Cavour's projects was perhaps in this popular feeling which might paralyze the action of Sardinia and also encourage Napoleon in his policy favorable to the Holy See. Cavour in vain affected calm and composure, declared that he was neither disquieted nor troubled; he felt the need of masking his religious policy under the cover of a purely national policy and of reviving the popularity of his sovereign.

[17] Cavour, *op. cit.*, II, 484, 492, 605; VI, 69, 100.

[18] *Recueil des allocutions, encycliques, etc., citées dans le Syllabus*, p. 347.

[19] On this journey, see Chantrel, *op. cit.*, pp. 258, 281–86.

With these views in mind, he persuaded the King to make a tour in his states and he stirred up popular acclamations along the route. But his prodigal efforts for the purpose did but evidence his apprehensions.

A tragic event that occured of a sudden determined the attitude of the Emperor of the French and thus ended the anxieties of the Piedmont statesman.

Attempted Assassination by Orsini

On January 14, 1858, at half-past eight in the evening, when the Emperor and the Empress, in a state coach, were passing from rue de Peletier on the way to the Opera, three bombs were hurled in the direction of the sovereigns. The fragments of the bombs riddled the imperial coach and reached more than 150 persons, eight of whom died. The Emperor and the Empress were saved from harm. An inquiry proved that the authors of the outrage were four Italians: Orsini, Pieri, Gomez, and Rudio, and that the plot had been organized by Orsini. He was born in the Roman States and in his youth (1845) he had been sentenced to prison for life for conspiracy against the government of Gregory XVI. Freed the next year by Pius IX, he was soon noted among the hottest agitators of the revolutionary party. Condemned again several times, he succeeded in escaping and wandered through Europe, spreading about him the most subversive ideas. The secret societies appear to have counted him in the number of their most devoted members. A month after the attack, Orsini underwent the penalty of regicides.

But before dying, he was allowed to have read in open court by his lawyer, Jules Favre, a letter to the Emperor. It ended with these words: "I beg Your Majesty to give Italy its independence. . . . May Your Majesty recall that the Italians joyfully shed their blood for Napoleon the Great. . . . Let Your Majesty recall that, so long as Italy is not independent, the tran-

quillity of Europe and that of Your Majesty will be nothing more than a chimera." Shortly afterward, the prefect of police, Pietri, went to see the condemned man in his cell and got him to write a second letter to urge his political friends to abandon the use of violent means, such as assassination, and to give them to understand that the freedom of Italy would be at this price. Orsini wrote the letter and then, paying his debt, mounted the scaffold. There he died, crying: *"Viva l'Italia!"* The day was March 13, 1858. Two weeks later the Piedmont official Gazette published in a prominent place Orsini's two letters, declaring they received them from a reliable source. Modern historians of Italy claim to know that the reliable source was none other than the cabinet of Emperor Napoleon III.[20]

These tragic events had a twofold repercussion on the domestic and foreign policy of the French Empire. In the domestic policy, they marked the beginning of a series of repressive measures, characteristic of an absolute government. The ministry of the interior was entrusted to a general known for his vigor, Espinasse; France was divided into five main military commands, as if it were in a state of siege; more than 2,000 republicans were arrested; more than 300 were deported to the depths of Algeria. At the same time the Emperor's foreign policy, in relation to the Italian movement, was suddenly turned toward the plans of Cavour. The Italians, in celebrating the memory of Orsini "as that of a new William Tell," [21] were not mistaken. Are we to accept the assertion that the conspirator reminded the Emperor of the French of the former oath taken by him at the time when he was a Carbonaro? No precise proof of the statement has been forthcoming. What appears certain is that at this time "the revolution had won Napoleon III." [22]

[20] Bianchi, *Storia documentata,* VII, 403; Cavour, *Lettere,* II, 540.
[21] *Souvenirs* of Marquis d'Azeglio, p. 352.
[22] Debidour, in Lavisse and Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* XI, 157.

Napoleon III and Cavour

The mysterious negotiation that ended in the secret Plombières accord between the Emperor and Cavour (July 21, 1858) was the first step on the path of the new policy. A decision was reached that France would help Piedmont to expel the Austrians from Italy and to make it into a rich and powerful state by joining to it Parma, Lombardia, Venetia, and the Legations themselves. An attempt would be made to have the Pope accept the loss of his provinces by conferring on him the title of "president of the Italian Confederation." One did not need to be a prophet to see that these clauses were only a minimum, with which Piedmont and the revolutionary sects could not be satisfied.

The French press, secretly requested by Napoleon to prepare public opinion for his political revolution, soon went beyond the limits of the Plombières Convention. The *Patrie,* whose governmental connections were well known, merely called for war against Austria; but the *Presse,* directed by Georges Guéroult, a protégé of Prince Napoleon, and the *Siècle,* whose director Havin received communications directly from the court, became defenders of the Italian revolution. Even the *Moniteur,* official organ of the Empire, published articles of Edmond About in which the papal policy was warmly attacked and discredited. These articles were presently gathered into a volume; Napoleon was said to have read the proofs. Several close friends of the Emperor had supplied items of information to the author of the book.[23] The editor of the *Univers* valiantly faced the storm; but he tried in vain to intervene directly with the Emperor to obtain from him the let-up of the bitter campaign. Some good promises of the sovereign were promptly contradicted by the facts.[24]

[23] See *Journal des Goncourt,* I, 277.

[24] The report of the audience granted to Louis Veuillot by Napoleon III was published, thirteen years later, in volume VI of the *Mélanges.*

The Mortara Incident

In 1854 a Jewish child of Bologna, then a State of the Church, had been baptized *in extremis* by a Christian servant. Four years later Pius IX, informed of the event, ordered that, conformable to the papal civil law and the canon law,[25] the Christian child should be brought up in the Christian faith and for that purpose should be separated from its family and placed in a convent. Its parents would be able to see it, but without being permitted to exercise over it a religious influence in the sense of Judaism. As soon as the press hostile to the Church was acquainted with the event, a general cry of *tolle* was raised against the "superannuated laws" of the papal government, against "the oppression of the natural law by the theological law." Not for a long time

[25] Various decisions of the ecclesiastical tribunals and a decision of the Fourth Council of Toledo (December 5, 633) had declared that the sons and daughters of the Jews, baptized *in extremis* or in case of abandonment by their parents—the two cases where baptism can be conferred on them without the consent of their family—should be withdrawn from their Jewish surroundings and be brought up in convents by good Christian men and women (Mansi, *Concilia*, X, 634; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, III, 274). Benedict XIV, referring to these decisions, explains them by saying that the natural right of the father of the family is not suppressed, but that it is superseded by the duty which the religious society has to watch over the education of its members (Benedict XIV, *Bullarium*, II, 85–109). Such is the reason developed by the theologians and canonists (cf. Billot, *De Ecclesiae sacramentis*, I, 242–44).

But Benedict XIV remarks that in his time the measure proposed to assure the Christian education of the Christian child seemed harsh and that, according to several canonists, the child might be left with the parents if these would agree to return it when it reached a suitable age and, meanwhile, that nothing should be taught it against the Catholic faith. Some recent theologians have taught that the separation should not be made "where the civil laws are opposed to it" (Marc, *Institutiones*, Part III, tract 2, chap. 3, no. 1473, p. 48), or "when the secular power is hostile" (Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis*, II, 61). In a more general way Billot teaches that the better course is not to take the baptized child from its parents when, to avoid the danger of an apostasy "a greater evil would be caused or a greater good would be prevented" for such is, he says, "the general rule of prudence." (Billot, *op. cit.*, I, 243). This eminent theologian adds: "Permisit tamen divina Providentia ut ipsis nostris temporibus quaedam exempla darentur, tum in manifestationam sanctitatis et efficaciae sacramenti, tum in attestationem juris atque officii quod habet Ecclesia apud baptizatos" (*ibid.*).

had the enemies of the temporal power found a more promising ground for their attacks. Almost alone in the Catholic press, the *Univers* clearly from the outset took a stand in defense of the Pope's act and of all its possible consequences, of the laws of the Papal State in the full letter of their tenor.[26] Leaving the ground of the defensive and entering upon the offensive, Veuillot recalled that other Mortaras existed in Europe, with whom the present defenders of the paternal authority did not concern themselves: for instance, those orphans of the Irish soldiers who died in the Crimea and whom England had brought up in Protestant institutions; other paternal rights more outrageously violated: those of fathers whom the Swedish law declared deprived of their authority for the single reason that they embraced Catholicism. These replies were appropriate; but they did not silence the outcry which the daily press, the reviews, the theaters, public meetings, and popular images raised for several months in Italy, France, England, in all Europe.

Public opinion had not yet quieted down, when (February 4, 1859) an anonymous pamphlet appeared in Paris, entitled *Napoléon III et l'Italie*. Therein were broached the Roman question and the Italian question, viewed in all their amplitude. The papal government was represented as having an urgent need of renovation, of adaptation to the modern spirit, and the Pope was pictured as incapable of carrying out that renovation. The other princes of Italy were there pictured as equally powerless, either on account of their subjection to Austria or from the fact of their isolation. The salvation of Italy, according to the author of the pamphlet, could come to it only by its unification, realized by virtue of the principle of the nationalities. The head of the Napoleonic dynasty in olden times, when putting on the crown, used to declare: "I have always intended to make the

[26] The controversy sustained by Veuillot in the *Univers* occupies no less than 316 pages in his *Mélanges*. For a defense of the papal authority in this affair, see also the *Civiltà cattolica*, ser. 3, XII, 385 ff., "Il piccola neofito Edgardo Mortara."

Italian nationality free and independent." "Emperor Napoleon I thought he should conquer the people in order to free them; Napoleon III wished to free them without conquering them." Later the certainty prevailed that the pamphlet was written by a devoted follower of the Second Empire, La Guéronnière, at the prompting of Emperor Napoleon III himself.

The plan set forth in the pamphlet was only an application of the general policy of the sovereign of the French. In 1815 Prince Metternich had pretended to assure the final peace of Europe by the simple principle of equilibrium, without taking account of the nationalities. In 1859 Napoleon III pretended to regenerate it by the simple principle of the nationalities without taking account of the equilibrium. Generous and utopian, he thought of the constitution of a free Italy, of a unified Germany, of an independent Poland, of an autonomous Ireland. In consequence of these changes, Austria, Russia, and England would be weakened, while France would obtain as the price of her concourse, Savoy, Luxemburg, perhaps the left bank of the Rhine.[27] The future would witness the collapse of this policy. The alliance entered into with England for the Crimean War had already made the Emperor abandon the cause of Ireland; the fear of a coalition of Russia, Austria, and Prussia kept him from intervening in favor of Poland. When the Napoleonic policy would seem to succeed, the situation would be worse yet: the unifying movements of Italy and Germany were going to raise up for France dreaded neighbors on the eastern frontiers without weakening the other powers.

Religious Policy of Napoleon III

What was Emperor Napoleon's religious policy? Having had the advantage of appreciating the solidity of the support which the Catholics had given him, he resolved not to offend them,

[27] See A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Un empereur, un roi, un pape.*

and would not have wished to dispossess the pope of his temporal domain or to give Rome to Italy as its capital. A liberal constitution, modeled on that of 1848, and the cession of Romagna to Piedmont, would have satisfied his policy. In this matter he went less far in his claims than his ally Cavour, who did not recoil before the idea of Rome as the capital of united Italy under the hegemony of Piedmont. Cavour, in turn, forcefully rejected the idea of a violent aggression on the patrimony of St. Peter. Such an aggression, he thought, would injure the harmony of his relations with France, would give too great a boost to the revolutionary party, and would wound his own inner feelings, which he professed to be those of a Catholic respectful of the head of Christianity. But Garibaldi and his sect had decided not to shun any outrage; and, when the leaders of a movement have once made an appeal to popular passions, the most violent parties are always the ones that carry the day. From the plan of the reform of the Papal State and the unity of Italy to the plan of Rome as the capital, then to that of the spoliation of the Supreme Pontiff, the step would be rapid: the most hesitant would be led to say with King Victor Emmanuel: "We will go to the limit."

CHAPTER XXX

The War with Austria (1859)

NAPOLEON, Cavour, and Garibaldi were not in agreement on the ultimate conduct of the compaign that was about to begin. But they were in accord on the act that should start it: the declaration of war on Austria. On January 1, 1859, at the Tuileries, the Emperor, receiving the diplomatic corps, said to Baron von Hübner, Austrian ambassador: "I regret that our relations with your government are not as good as in the past." Nine days later Victor Emmanuel, opening the session of Parliament, made the following declaration: "If we have respect for treaties, we are not deaf to our people's cry of grief." After another three weeks the marriage of Prince Jerome Napoleon, cousin of the Emperor of the French, with Princess Clotilda, daughter of the King of Sardinia, sealed the alliance of the two states. Cavour spent the winter in putting the Sardinian army on a war footing; Garibaldi spent it gathering together his French forces. On April 23, Austria, feeling herself menaced, called upon Sardinia to disarm within three days. Five days later Cavour rejected the ultimatum of the court of Vienna, and said: "Alea jacta est: We have made history." The campaign that led the Piedmont policy so far, was started.

The Italian Campaign

Here is not the place for us to relate the brilliant military actions which, in two months (May 10 to July 11, 1859), brought the French and Sardinian armies to the gates of Venice. The two marked stages of that victorious advance were the

battle of Magenta where, on June 4, the imperial guard and General MacMahon and the Duke of Magenta covered themselves with glory; and the battle of Solferino where (June 24) 150,000 soldiers of the Franco-Piedmont army routed 220,000 Austrians. The defeated army withdrew to the famous "quadrilateral" formed by the fortified places of Peschiera, Mantua, Verona, and Legnano, ready to wage the decisive battle that would determine the liberty of Italy or submission to Austria.

Of a sudden, unexpected news was received. It reported that Emperor Napoleon, the leader of the Franco-Piedmont army, and Emperor Francis Joseph, in an interview at Villafranca (May 11), had concluded an armistice and drew up the basis of the peace. Napoleon III, in a speech delivered at St. Cloud, later explained the reasons for this sudden step. Warned by the diplomatic agent of Russia that Prussia was preparing to come to the aid of Austria, he did not think that the army he commanded was capable of sustaining the fight at the same time on the Adige and on the Rhine and he had judged that the prudent thing to do was to treat with the enemy. The clauses agreed to at Villafranca were later (November 10) ratified by the treaty of Zurich. The Emperor notified the Pope (July 14) of the agreement in these terms: "Most Holy Father, I have just concluded peace with the Emperor of Austria on the following conditions: 1. the two emperors will strive to constitute an Italian federation under the presidency of the Holy Father; 2. Lombardy is ceded to Piedmont; 3. the dispossessed sovereigns will return to their states; 4. the two emperors will ask the Holy Father to introduce the necessary reforms in his States; 5. Venetia, although remaining under the scepter of Austria, will be part of the Italian confederation; 6. a full and complete amnesty will be granted to those who have taken part in the late events." [1]

This peace satisfied no one. We read that Pius IX, upon read-

[1] For the full text of the letter, see Emile Ollivier, who published it in his work, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile de Vatican*, II, 455.

ing the Emperor's letter, exclaimed: "How handsome! The doge stirring or calming the waves of the Adriatic with a gesture! But I wish no part in this federation or this lay government." [2] He understood that the presidency offered to him would be merely honorary and that the effective presidency of the confederation would belong to Piedmont. Moreover, the French opinion was unfavorable to the treaty. Emile Ollivier wrote: "At that time we were all living on the idea of the irresistible might of the French army. . . . No injurious epithet was spared the Emperor because he had doubted that our soldiers could victoriously sustain the attack of the Austrians on the Adige and of the Prussians on the Rhine. But if in France a deceptive view prevailed, the feeling in Italy was one of despair. Cavour abandoned the helm, almost crazy with grief. People thought they were on the morrow of another Novara." [3] What could have been proposed in 1848 seemed more acceptable in 1859. The idea of a unified Italy under the officially proclaimed direction of Piedmont, and not under its hidden influence, had, thanks to Cavour, made its way, won the minds of the statesmen, and acquired the backing of the masses. "Until then, you might speak of the sects, divisions, federalists, republicans, monarchists; from this moment all were in favor of the unity; by the touch of a wand, what had previously been only the belief of a handful of sectarians became the motto of a nation. On all lips, in Piedmont as in Tuscany and the duchies, a unanimous cry was raised: 'Unity.'" [4]

Action accompanied the words. The states of Florence, Parma, and Modena voted the dismissal of their dukes and put themselves under the protection of Piedmont. Romagna itself rose up and joined the other three states of central Italy. Victor Emmanuel did not dare to accept personally the dictatorship

[2] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, p. 457.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 453.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 459.

offered him. To show regard for Emperor Napoleon and to respect the letter of the treaty of Villafranca, he decided on one of those combinations to which Italian politics often resorted: a prince of the house of Savoy, Prince Carignan, would, for the sole purpose of maintaining order, which was threatened by the plots of Garibaldi, accept the regency over the four states, joined together under the name of Emilia; and he would exercise this regency only through a proxy, Buoncompagni. This move was calculated to reduce to an apparent minimum a taking of possession that was intended to be firm and final.[5]

In short, by all these agitations and combinations, the clauses of Villafranca crumbled to dust. Three of the states that the Emperor of the French had wished to maintain had disappeared; the Papal State that he pretended to safeguard, was dismembered, and this first dismemberment appeared to be a threat of total destruction. On December 26, 1859, the Pope protested against those who, sustained by advisers and by various helps coming from without, raised the flag of defection and revolt in his States.[6] On the 29th, Bishop Pie of Poitiers,[7] on the 30th Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans,[8] then, after them, a considerable number of bishops of the whole world,[9] in pastorals and public letters, denounced the injustices and violences which had just been directed against the head of the Church.

Napoleon III and Bishop Donnet

On October 11, 1859, the Emperor passed through the city of Bordeaux. There he heard from the lips of the prelate who occupied the archiepiscopal see of that city, a protest which, by the circumstances in which it was uttered, was still more re-

[5] La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire,* III, 158–62.
[6] Chantrel, *Annales,* p. 359.
[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 360–62.
[8] *Ibid.,* pp. 363–66.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 366.

sounding. Public opinion, informed of the reception by the official authorities and of the speeches that would be made, awaited impatiently the words that would come from the head of the important diocese of Bordeaux, Archbishop Donnet.

Cardinal Ferdinand Donnet was a striking figure. The legends, the fictions, and the strange hoaxes with which this prince of the Church was pleased to adorn his daily life, would be the subject of conversation among the Bordeaux clergy. Rumor said that his powerful nature, finding itself cramped in the realm of the real, had need to overflow into the imaginary. But the oddities of his life kept up his popularity without injury to his prestige. In his forty-eight years as bishop and thirty years as cardinal, the building of churches, the public religious ceremonies, and the recruiting of priestly vocations were the ceaseless object of his tireless zeal. He had a shrewd judgment of situations and of opportunities, and more than once that of courageous interventions. For the diocese of Bordeaux, which gloried in having seen pass on its metropolitan see several princes of the Church of eminent merit, Cardinal Donnet has remained par excellence "the Cardinal."

Called on to make an address to the Prince, the prelate began by praising the sovereign's recent victories. He then felicitated him on having restored to the Vicar of Christ his city, his people, and the integrity of his temporal power. Finally he expressed the desire that the Prince "remain faithful to that Christian policy." He declared: "We pray with a confidence that persists, with a hope that cannot be discouraged by deplorable events and by violent sacrileges. The motive of this hope, whose fulfillment seems today so difficult, is, after God, you, Sire, you who have spoken these memorable words: 'The temporal sovereignty of the venerable head of the Church is closely bound up with the luster of Catholicism as with the liberty and independence of Italy.' " [10] The Emperor, visibly embarrassed,

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

replied that "the government which had recalled the Holy Father on his throne was not able to express anything but the counsels imposed by a sincere and respectful devotion to his interests." [11]

Pamphlet on the Papal Domain

Two months later (December 22, 1859) appeared a significant pamphlet. Everyone, from the time of its publication, attributed it to the same inspiration and the same editing as the pamphlet of February entitled *Napoléon III et l'Italie*. The new work had for its title: *Le Pape et le Congrès*. It was, in fact, inspired by Napoleon III himself and written by M. de la Guéronnière.[12] With a curious mixture of respectful formulas and haughty pity, the author advised the Pope to reduce his domain to the city of Rome and the surrounding country. Thus the Pontiff would govern his little family as a father. Moreover, was he capable of administering a nation? As someone said, the author wished "to reduce the Holy Father to the vineyard of Naboth without suppressing in his neighbors the covetousness of Achab." [13]

The publication of this pamphlet, which had a wide publicity, marked a date in the religious policy of the Second Empire. Pius IX, when receiving General Goyon and the officers of the occupation force (January 1, 1860), expressed the hope that the Emperor "would condemn the principles contained in the pamphlet," which the Pontiff called "a notorious monument of hypocrisy." [14] Napoleon, in a letter to the Pope, dated December 31, but not made public until the following January 11, set

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 370.

[12] When several personages of the court questioned the Emperor about the pamphlet, he replied: "I am not the one who wrote it, but I approve all its ideas" (letter of Lord Cowley to Lord John Russel, December 25, 1859, *The Life of the Prince Consort*, by Thomas Martin, V, 4).

[13] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 176.

[14] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

forth, in respectful terms, that "he was powerless to halt the establishment of the new regime" and gave the impression that, if the Pope consented to make the sacrifice of the Romagnas, the rest of the Papal State would be guaranteed to him. This proposal was an abandonment of the haughty tone of the pamphlet and of part of its contentions.[15] Pius IX replied "that he could not cede what belonged, not to himself, but to all the Catholics"; that, besides, this concession would be a stimulant for the agitators in the other parts of his States.[16]

Opposition to the French Policy

From that moment all the Catholics who had rallied to the Empire sharply withdrew from its policy. The ultramontane party, whose organ was the *Univers,* did so, appealing especially to all the indefeasible rights of the papacy. The liberal Catholics, such as Dupanloup and Falloux, protested with no less vehemence, by striving to show, in Napoleon III's Roman policy, along with the violation of the rights of the Church, that of the principles of public law and the peace of the world. Thiers, Guizot, Saint-Marc-Girardin, and Villemain appealed both to the principles of public law and to the perils of that principle of nationalities which inspired the policy of the Empire, and they expressed themselves clearly in favor of maintaining the temporal power of the pope.[17] On the other hand, the *Siècle* and the *Constitutionnel* warmly endorsed the political change which the Emperor had just made.

The situation of the French government became difficult. It sought to attenuate the difficulties by suppressing (January 29, 1860) the *Univers* and by urging upon the entire press, by way of the *Moniteur,* the exercise of "moderation, in the interest of

[15] See this letter in the *Moniteur*, January 11, 1860.

[16] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 389.

[17] Cf. Villemain, *La France, l'empire, et la papauté*. For the letter to Villemain by Count de Chambord on the subject of this writing, see Vauthier, *Villemain,* pp. 193–95.

peace and religion." But the *Univers* having disappeared, all its editors except Louis and Eugène Veuillot found their way into the *Monde,*[18] which replaced the *Univers*. The seven years of the *Univers'* interruption were used by Louis Veuillot to write seven volumes, six pamphlets, and a number of periodical articles in which his talents as controversialist and writer appeared under a new form. "They have buried me the journalist," he said; "I sprout a pamphleteer." Moreover, at the side of the *Monde,* the *Ami de la religion* (a daily since March, 1859), and the *Correspondant* continued a vigorous defense of the rights of the Church and of the Holy Father. Under the direction of the two leaders of the episcopate (Bishop Pie and Bishop Dupanloup), Melchior du Lac, Aubineau, Jules Gondon, Louis de Carné, Augustin Cochin, Henry and Charles de Lacombe, Poujoulat, Falloux, Foisset, and many others fought valiantly at the breach.[19] The struggle was far from being over. On the contrary, an increase of activity was needed. About the end of January Count Cavour returned to political affairs as prime minister. The Turin official paper, the *Opinione,* announced this return in the following terms: "Cavour's first ministry signified independence; the second signifies annexation." What annexation was meant? With good reason an annexation was feared that would not spare the papal domain, not even the city of Rome.

[18] On the suppression of the *Univers* and the foundation of the *Monde,* see Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* III, 308–79.

[19] Most of these polemists, as also the non-Catholic liberals who, such as Thiers, came out against the Italian policy of Napoleon III, likewise condemned the violation of the temporal domain of the papacy and the Italian unity. Almost alone, Father Lacordaire, in his pamphlet *De la liberté l'Eglise et de l'Italie* (February 25, 1860), uttered a note appreciably different. He said: "We declare that the temporal domain of the papacy, if we consider it in its essence and history, has about it nothing incompatible with the nationality and freedom of Italy" (Lacordaire, *Œuvres,* VII, 314). Says Foisset: "The work on *La liberté de l'Eglise et de l'Italie* created a lively sensation. In less than two weeks, 12,000 copies were printed. At Rome itself the first impression was favorable" (Foisset, *Vie du P. Lacordaire,* II, 388).

Garibaldi

Soon the word spread that Garibaldi was stirring. Cavour, in his retirement, had never lost from view the Italian political question, and had even helped it by his advice. Garibaldi, for the moment put aside, had continued to keep up the ardor of his followers. In a proclamation (December 24, 1859) addressed to the students of Pisa, he called on them, in the name of the "sublime maxims of Christ," to destroy "the cancer of the papacy." Besides, he had clever words on "the pious and generous king, given by God to the Italians as a redeeming angel," and on France, "mighty ally, which smiled on Italy with the precious blood of her brave sons." [20]

Napoleon's policy was as hesitant in practice as it was venturesome in ideas. He tried to check the movement by the proposal of a new "combination": the Romagnas would be ruled by Victor Emmanuel, but as the vicar of the Pope and with the payment of a tribute to the Holy See.[21] When this plan was rejected, as might have been foreseen, and when the Emperor made a pretense of counteracting the designs of Piedmont in another way, Cavour was not alarmed. "In a few days," he said, "we shall receive from France a sort of rose-water ultimatum." As another Italian said: "The Emperor shows his teeth; but they are artificial teeth."

Treaty of Turin (1860)

As a conclusion to all these parleys, on March 24, 1860, the representative of France, Benedetti, and Count Cavour signed at Turin a treaty by which Italy ceded Nice and Savoy to France on condition that the cession would be ratified by a popular vote. The following month the people of those districts

[20] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 387.
[21] Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste*, II, 308.

voted to ratify the treaty. According to one report, when signing the act that detached from Italy the cradle of the dynasty of his country, Cavour experienced a moment of emotion. But he promptly regained his composure. "This cession was, at bottom, a sort of payment that would dispense with any gratitude and would perhaps authorize new undertakings." [22] As he was going out, the Sardinian minister emphasized the meaning of the treaty. Coming up to Talleyrand, who was the chargé d'affaires of France,[23] he whispered these words to him: "So, Baron, henceforth we are accomplices."

A body of troops was kept at Rome, officially charged with defending the Papal States against any attack. But "at first the protection was only partial. Although real in Rome and in the old Patrimony of St. Peter, it did not cover either materially or morally the districts located beyond the Apennines. . . . Then, the protector, in return for his services, assumed the right to give his opinions, to advise reforms. . . . Besides, the French had their own manner of sustaining the papal power. They did not neglect any occasion of showing their respect for Pius IX; but, with marked affectation, they separated the Pontiff from his entourage. . . . The Holy Father and his advisers were too sharp not to perceive these distinctions." [24]

Evidently the papal government could enjoy complete independence only when it would have resources sufficient for its maintenance and its defense, and would have at its disposal an army fully subject to its command. These two needs were met by the foundation of Peter's Pence and by the creation of the papal volunteers.

In 1849, at the time of Pius IX's exile at Gaeta, Catholics of various nations were eager, by their offerings, to come to the

[22] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 210.

[23] As a gesture of protest against the Italian policy, Napoleon III had recalled his ambassador from Turin and replaced him by a chargé d'affaires. This was the "rose-water protest" spoken of by Cavour.

[24] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 360.

relief of the despoiled Pontiff. The next year a Belgian Catholic, Professor Feije, recalled, in a Dutch review,[25] how, once upon a time, from the eighth to the sixteenth century, the Christian princes had asked from each house of the kingdom, or at least from each member of the nobility, under the name of St. Peter's pence, an annual contribution intended to provide for the needs of the Church and of the pope.[26] In that article and in several speeches, the eminent Catholic showed what a grand spectacle the faithful would give to the world by offering to their common father, prompted solely by their faith and their love, the tribute which they formerly offered in obedience to the orders of their rulers.

This appeal was heeded. Collections and subscriptions were organized in Belgium to provide for the needs of the Sovereign Pontiff. A decision of the tribunal of Mons (July 2, 1860) and a confirmative decree of the court of Brussels (August 10, 1860) condemned the organizers of these collections and subscriptions as violating the royal decree of September 22, 1823, on the crime of begging.[27] But a new decree of the Brussels court (March 9, 1861) declared that the royal edict previously appealed to was not applicable in this case.[28] Meanwhile Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State of the Holy See, by a letter of October 6, 1860, addressed to Cardinal Wiseman, had informed the Catholic world that the Holy Father, "who never wished to accept any money offering on the part of any government, would however on such and such conditions, gladly see the faithful of the Catholic world come to his aid with their Peter's Pence." [29] In consequence of this letter, Cardinal Wiseman, recalling that

[25] *Der Katholick*, XIX, 69 ff.

[26] On the old St. Peter's pence, see Wetzer and Welte, *Dictionnaire de théologie*, s.v. "Denier de Saint-Pierre"; under the same word, in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie* of Dom Cabrol, III, 585. Cf. the *Revue catholique* of Louvain, XVIII, 39.

[27] *Revue catholique* of Louvain, XVIII, 585–94.

[28] *Ibid.*, XIX, 218–22.

[29] *Ami de la religion*, November 15, 1860, p. 383.

the Catholics of England had long ago deemed it a point of honor not to yield to anyone the first place in their devotion of the Apostolic See, invited the clergy of the diocese of Westminster to organize meetings and committees, and appointed a treasurer of the Peter's Pence.[30]

In the *Ami de la religion* (October 23, 1860) Father Sisson made an urgent appeal to the Catholics of France.[31] Louis Veuillot, at that time not allowed to write for a paper, was unable to conduct a press campaign; but Mlle Elise Veuillot, Mesdames Eugène Veuillot, Emile Lafont, and Léon Aubineau, sister and wives of the principal editors of the *Univers,* exercised such zeal to the profit of the Peter's Pence that Pius IX wished to felicitate them publicly.[32] The French government refused to the undertaking the right to form itself into a legal association; but it did not venture to forbid the collections in the churches; as for the subscriptions made in the homes, these escaped government control. In Italy the Catholic paper, the *Armonia,* periodically collected considerable sums. Ireland and Poland, from the depth of their poverty, rivaled the richer countries. At Dublin a collection produced, in a single day, more than 200,000 francs.[33]

Papal Volunteers

The Catholics did not limit themselves to giving Pius IX the tribute of their gold; they offered him that of their blood. Almost every steamer brought to Rome, French, Belgian, Irish, Spanish, and Dutch volunteers. Since the assaulting army became more and more, under the command of Garibaldi, the cos-

[30] *Ibid.,* p. 384.

[31] *Ibid.,* October 23, 1860, VII, 181.

[32] Brief of May 5, 1860. See Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* III, 388.

[33] By the encyclical *Saepe venerabiles fratres* (August 5, 1875) Pius IX gave the work of Peter's Pence an official consecration. See Daux, *Le denier de Saint-Pierre, ses origines, ses raisons, ses convenances.*

mopolitan army of the revolution, that of Pius IX would become that of international Catholicism. In the spring of 1860, Pius IX entrusted the care of organizing this army to a prelate as energetic as he was pious, a former officer of the Belgian army and of the French army, Bishop Xavier de Mérode; and the post of commander to a French general, a hero of the Algerian campaigns, Louis de Lamoricière.

The title of "minister of the armies" was conferred by Pius IX on Bishop Mérode. Under the circumstances this office gave him an exceptional authority in the papal State, at the side of the Secretary of State, Antonelli, whose influence had until then not been counterbalanced by any other; but now it was suddenly limited. Antonelli was supposed to favor the views of the intransigent and authoritarian Catholics; Mérode, brother-in-law of Montalembert, was bound by family connections and friendship with the leaders of the liberal movement. The Secretary was blamed for a cleverness that was not far from dissimulation; the most salient defect of the minister of the armies was an excess of sincerity, sometimes going to the point of rudeness. The tractable Italian and the robust Franco-Belgian were at disagreement more than once; but both of them gave evidence of a like attachment to the person and the cause of the Pope. Pius IX accorded equal confidence to each of them. Antonelli impressed the Pope by his experience, his skill in managing affairs, his exquisite knowledge of men and things in diplomatic relations; Mérode, in spite of his bluntness and blunders, pleased the Pope by his frankness, the spontaneity of his heart and of his spirit, by his unreserved devotion. For the command of his new army, Pius IX sanctioned Bishop Mérode's call to one of his companions-in-arms in Africa, General Lamoricière.

Louis Juchault de Lamoricière, born at Nantes in 1806, had already acquired a glorious renown on the battlefield and in the political strifes. The African wars had revealed his brilliant military qualities. After his return to France, he was acclaimed

as one of the leaders of the conservative republican party. In the days of June, he had crushed the revolutionary effort. At the time of the 1851 *coup d'état* he was exiled by Prince Napoleon, who feared his influence. When he returned to France, he did not re-enter the military service. His sword was thus available. Having long been alien to the practices of religion, seduced as he was, like many men of his time, by the sophisms of the dreamers who were preaching a vague social renovation, he had recently found again the faith of his childhood and declared it with courage before his former friends. A few months earlier, Corcelles, former French ambassador at Rome, was speaking of the papal cause in his presence. At this, Lamoricière said: "It is a cause for which it would be beautiful to die." When (March 3, 1860) Mérode went to Picardy to find him and transmit Pius IX's proposal to him, he did not hide from the veteran fighter the difficulties of the undertaking. The military hero wrote to a friend: "I am not wanting in courage; but I wait for my reward above more than here below." [34]

He left his castle of Prouzel on March 19. Reaching Rome on April 3, he declared to the Holy Father that he would put himself at the Pontiff's service on the single condition that he would never have to serve against France. His first proclamation to the troops showed in what spirit he understood his mission. "The revolution," he said, "as formerly Islam, today threatens Europe. Today, as formerly, the cause of the papacy is the cause of the civilization and freedom of the world."

The task confided to the general required the qualities of an organizer no less than those of a general. "The papal army comprised scarcely 7,000 or 8,000 men, poorly clothed, ill equipped, and not well officered. . . . No war material, or material so outmoded that it belonged only in a museum." [35] "With that tireless

[34] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III 367. On Lamoricière, see Emile Keller, *Vie du général Lamoricière.*

[35] La Gorce, *op. cit.*, III, 369.

activity which France and Algeria had admired, Lamoricière organized, created, improved, developed. Under his powerful impulse, the material was refurnished, the staff of officers was reformed, and the services were regularized." [36] Lamoricière made an appeal to the young Catholics of France, to his former companions-in-arms. Many of these joined him.

During this time Garibaldi, then at Turin, was likewise recruiting volunteers for a mysterious expedition. Was he going to invade the Marches? For a moment such was the surmise. Soon it was learned that he was directing his steps toward the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. According to a trustworthy report, Cavour, having learned of the project, warmly approved it. "It is well," he said; "we must begin in the south and then come up to the north. Be assured that, when the hour arrives, I will be second to none in daring." [37] Officially Victor Emmanuel's prime minister disavowed the expedition.[38] Soon Marsala and Palermo fell to the hands of the adventurer. In the presence of the peril, King Francis II of Naples appealed to a liberal ministry, looked forward to an alliance with Piedmont, then changing his tactics, turned to Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, and England, calling the attention of these powers to the danger of an excessive agrandizement of Piedmont.[39] Not finding a favorable echo in these powers, feeling himself abandoned, betrayed, in Naples itself and even in his entourage, in consequence of intrigues to which Cavour was perhaps not a stranger, on September 6, 1860, the King of Naples embarked with his family on a Spanish vessel and headed to Gaeta, amid a sympathetic people, but a silent one, whose timorous respect did not dare to manifest itself by any outward sign. The next day,

[36] Freppel, *Œuvres,* VII, 200.

[37] Speech of Sirtori in the Italian Chamber, June 19, 1863 (*Parlamento italiano,* p. 214).

[38] *Gazzetta officiale,* May 18, 1860.

[39] La Gorce, *op. cit.,* III, 394.

without firing a shot, Garibaldi, preceding his army with a few companions, took possession of Naples.[40]

Garibaldi's Prestige

Garibaldi's popularity was already great. That *coup,* that unheard-of success in daring, made of him, in the eyes of the masses, a sort of mysterious hero, superhuman. He was the Impregnable, the Invulnerable, the providential Liberator, with the invincible talisman. The prestige of the conqueror of the Two Sicilies even won over some men of the high society. Baron Ricasoli wrote: "Our Garibaldi ought to be the king." [41] Garibaldi was on the road to personify in the eyes of public opinion, more than Victor Emmanuel, more than Cavour himself, that movement of the *Risorgimento,* the mention of which gave a thrill to the Italians. In the strength of such an influence, what was he going to do? To invade the Marches, according to his first plan? To turn northward, according to Cavour's formula, that is, toward the Roman state, after his triumph in the south?

All circumstances led to that surmise. But was Cavour's whole plan going to be upset? The statesman had wished to seize the revolutionary forces to the advantage of the Savoy dynasty; the condottiere, by continuing his triumphant march, had every chance of seizing the power of that dynasty to the profit of the revolution. For a man as unscrupulous as was Cavour, regarding the choice of means, a means presented itself of warding off the danger: to have preceded Garibaldi to Naples had been impossible; he must be preceded at Rome. Cavour's decision was at once made in this sense. An astonishing fact was revealed, which gives an idea of the state of mind of

[40] Garibaldi had set out with a force of about a thousand men. Hence the name of expedition of the thousand, which was given to the campaign.

[41] Ricasoli, *Lettere e documenti,* V, 161.

that period: some Italian patriots of conservative and Catholic tint, seemed to be resigned to this extremity. Said Count Pasolini, former minister of Pius IX: "What would you have? I now understand that Cavour has nothing to do but invade the Marches." [42] That seemed to be the only means of not losing the whole fruit of the national movement.

However, an obstacle rose up. The French troops were still in the Roman state, put there to defend it. But Napoloen appeared to have been vanquished in turn by the reasoning that had decided Cavour. Mysteries still hover over the meeting which the Emperor of the French had on August 28, 1860, at Chambéry with the Italian minister Farini and general Cialdini. If Napoleon did not utter the famous phrase, *"Fate presto"* ("Act quickly"), to whom it has been attributed,[43] it well expresses the depth of his thought, such as revealed by his subsequent acts. A serious historian, writing of Napoleon's attitude in this affair, says: "I do not know whether the word 'complicity' would be too strong; but the word 'weakness' would certainly be too weak." [44]

A pretext was needed for the invasion. Cavour referred to the Pope's armament, "those papal troops, made up of people of every nation and of every religion: all this deeply offends the public conscience of Italy and of Europe." [45] By an ultimatum he demanded the immediate disarming of the new forces of the Holy See. Antonelli's sagacity saw the trap. What was intended was to provoke a violent reply of the Roman chancery, thus giving ground for a *casus belli.* But The Secretary of State of Pius IX was calm, correct, diplomatically irreproachable. But before this reply had reached its destination, the Sardinian troops,

[42] Pasolini, *Memorie, raccolte da suo figlio,* p. 626.

[43] On this interview at Chambéry, see La Gorce, *op. cit.,* III, 406–10, and Villefranche (*Pie IX,* p. 188), who declares that he had from well informed witnesses certain important details of the meeting.

[44] La Gorce, *op. cit.,* III, 408.

[45] *Ibid.,* p. 410.

urged to be ahead of the Garibaldi army, had crossed the frontier.

Lamoricière could not fail to recognize the fact that, notwithstanding his efforts, the armament and the organization of the army that he had at his command was in a state of notable inferiority. He said to his friend Quatrebarbes: "I am in the position of a man who would have to fight at a distance of fifty paces with a pistol against a foe armed with a rifle." [46] Moreover, adapting his conduct to the explicit declarations that reached him from Cardinal Antonelli, he had supposed, up to the last moment, that Piedmont would not intervene in the campaign, and that France would oppose the invasion, even against the Sardinian forces.[47] Consequently the general, expecting only some partial uprisings and an aggression of Garibaldian bands, had scattered his forces over the whole papal territory. The invasion of the state along the entire Piedmont frontier took him by surprise. Only one tactic was possible: to reassemble at one point all the available troops and endeavor to penetrate the Piedmont lines, and to take refuge at Ancona. Next to Rome, that city was almost the only one that could be effectively defended, at least for a certain time. There the defense might be prolonged until the arrival of the French reinforcements. For, confident in the assurances which Antonelli sent to him, Lamoricière kept counting on the assistance of France.

[46] On the armament and organization of the papal army, see (in Eugène Veuillot, *Le Piémont dans les Etats de l'Eglise, documents et commentaires*) the "Rapport du général Lamoricière sur les operations de l'armée pontificale dans les Marches et l'Ombrie," pp. 482–84.

[47] See the explicit declarations in Lamoricière's *Rapport* (*ibid.*, pp. 482, 486, 493). The Duke de Gramont wrote to the consul of Ancona: "The Emperor has written that, if the Sardinian forces enter into the papal territory, he will be obliged to oppose them" (*ibid.*, p. 493). How was Antonelli's far-sightedness at fault in such serious circumstances?

Battle of Castelfidardo

The forces assembled in accordance with that plan met the enemy, near Notre Dame de Loreto, at Castelfidardo, on September 17, 1860. The inevitable clash would apparently take place the next day. The Piedmont troops occupied the hills that descend from the height of Castelfidardo to the plain. Their artillery threatened the slopes on all sides. The chief centers of resistance were two farms, strongly fortified and situated about 2,000 feet one behind the other.[48] The army was commanded by General Cialdini, who had 45,000 men and several cannons. The papal army counted 5,600 men at most and a single artillery piece of old model.

At four o'clock in the morning the soldiers of the Pope, with their two generals at their head, Lamoricière and Pimodan, prepared for the battle by attending Mass in the holy chapel of Loreto. At eight o'clock Pimodan attacked the two farms, following the instructions he had received. The first farm, although stoutly defended, was taken; but the Sardinian troops had time to mass strongly about the second. Arrived at a distance of fifty paces from its objective, the attacking force was decimated by a steady fusillade. The superiority of numbers and of position was so crushing on the side of the Piedmont forces that the issue of the fight could not be doubted. But the papal volunteers wished at least, "while losing the battle, to save their honor." After a momentary retreat movement, they were seen to face about suddenly, await the enemy at fifteen paces' distance, discharge a well directed fire, then make a bayonet charge with such fury that the enemy, disconcerted by such daring, withdrew 200 paces. The death of Pimodan decided the outcome of the combat. Lamoricière, still calm amid the inevitable disorder which followed this loss, tried to direct

[48] For a detailed description of the field of battle, see *ibid.*, p. 497.

the retreat, which became inevitable. Then, believing everything lost, he resolved to carry out, with forty-five horses and only a hundred foot soldiers, the project which he had intended to realize with his whole army. He passed through the lines of the enemy, who were astonished at his daring, and reached Ancona at five o'clock that evening, leaving the Castelfidardo hill and the surrounding fields covered with wounded.[49]

Siege of Ancona

The arrival of Lamoricière and his little force brought to 4,200 the number of soldiers for the defense of the city. This number was indeed small for a place whose defense works had a perimeter of five miles and that was soon assaulted on the land side by the army of Cialdini and on the side of the sea by a fleet of eleven large warships carrying more than 400 pieces of artillery. It was again the fight of "the man who fights at a distance of fifty paces, with a pistol, against a foe armed with a rifle."

On the 18th the firing began from the cannons of the fleet; four days later the blockade of the port was effected. Lamoricière anxiously awaited the arrival of the French army. "If Goyon has not lost any time," he said, "he ought to be on the march." [50] Each day the garrison lost from twenty to eighty men. On the 28th the Piedmont frigates began a furious attack. A large number of gunners were slain; many of the cannons were overthrown; the walls crumbled, and their fall widened the embrasures. A 2,000-foot breach was opened, offering to the

[49] At the side of General Pimodan, the following had fallen for the defense of the Pope: Arthur de Chalus, Joseph Guérin, Félix de Montravel, Alfred de la Barre de Nanteuil, Alphonse Ménard, and many others, whose heroism was celebrated by the funeral orations of Bishop Pie and Bishop Dupanloup. See Pie, *Œuvres,* IV, 44–70; Dupanloup, *Œuvres choisies,* I, 181–226; Veuillot, *op. cit.,* p. 146. Cf. Segur, *Les martyrs de Castelfidardo.*

[50] General Goyon was, as we know, the head of the French troops intended for the protection of the papal state.

enemy the facility of landing on the quay and taking the city by assault. Lamoricière hoisted the white flag on the citadel.[51] The capitulation was on the 29th at two o'clock in the afternoon. The little papal army no longer existed. The Marches and Umbria were occupied by the Piedmont army.

A short time after that (February 15, 1861) appeared a pamphlet entitled: *La France, Rome, et l'Italie.* Its author was Arthur de la Guéronnière, from whose pen had already come two resounding pamphlets: *Napoléon III et l'Italie* and *Le Pape et le Congrès.* They maintained that the one responsible for the recent catastrophies was not Cavour, but the Pope, who, by his stubbornness in not complying with the desires of his people and the requests of the powers, had caused the whole evil. In this pamphlet, the work of a man who had been several times the spokesman of Napoleon III, public opinion saw a new expression of the imperial thought.[52] The strange assertion of this writing was compared with the singular inaction of the troops whom the Emperor had destined for the defense of the papacy. In a pastoral letter dated February 22, Bishop Pie of Poitiers wrote the following words in which everyone saw an allusion to the attitude of Napoleon III: "Pilate could have saved Christ, and without Pilate they could not have put Christ to death. . . . Wash your hands, O Pilate; declare yourself innocent of Christ's death." [53] When denounced to the Council of State as guilty of abusive use of power, the prelate declared that he had intended to depict "not what was, but what would be if the conclusions which the press gave to the pamphlet, but which the pamphlet rejected, would end by being realized." [54] In spite of this defense, the Council of State declared it a case of abuse.

While the trial of the Bishop of Poitiers was going on, a

[51] Lamoricière, *Rapport,* pp. 508–25.

[52] According to Thouvenel, the Emperor had no hand in the pamphlet; but its inspiration came from Count de Persigny (*Le secret de l'empereur,* I, 432).

[53] Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie,* II, 116.

[54] *Ibid.,* II, 125.

young layman, a deputy, had spoken from the height of the rostrum a more direct and no less courageous accusation against the sovereign. Emile Keller, who would later hold a place of honor among the good servants of the Church and of France, was at that time unknown. When he spoke (March 13, 1861) in the Chamber of Deputies, his speech began amid general indifference. But gradually, interspersed with strong reflections that he made on the political and religious events of the preceding year, the lively account caught the attention of his fellow deputies. "Piedmont could have been stopped; but the wish to do so was needed. . . . The revolution, incarnate in Orsini, was what made France draw back." The boldness of these words was even surpassed, if such was possible, when the speaker, using direct discourse, added: "You have recoiled before Garibaldi, at the very time when you were saying you were his greatest enemy; at the same time you sent a help to Piedmont and tatters to the King of Naples; you have written on the same pages the inviolability of the Holy Father and the fall of the Holy Father. Say, then, what you are." By the mouth of the minister Billault, the government attempted to reply, but was unable to escape from the equivocation.

Intervention of Napoleon III

At bottom, ever a chimerical dreamer, Napoleon pursued the idea of making himself the agent of a conciliation between the papacy and Italy on the basis of accomplished facts. This idea furnishes us with the key to all the diplomatic negotiations that continued from 1861 to 1864 between the court of Paris on one side and the court of Turin on the other and that ended in the convention of September 15, 1864.

On May 20, 1862, the Emperor wrote to his minister of foreign affairs, Thouvenel: "My policy has always been the same with regard to Italy: to second the national aspirations and to

induce the Pope to become their supporter rather than their foe; in a word, to consecrate the alliance of religion and liberty." [55] In conformity with these directions, the minister wrote to Marquis de La Valette, French ambassador at Rome: "Any combination resting on another territorial basis than the *status quo* could not be sustained today. . . . The Holy Father could reserve his rights in whatever form he should judge fitting. . . . Italy, on its side, would have to give up its claims on Rome." [56] Thouvenel privately called such a project "the dream of an impossible marriage." [57] Anyone would have to be blinded, as was the mind of Napoleon by the mists of an ideology lacking contact with the realities, not to see that at the point to which matters had come, neither would the Pope sanction these violent injustices just inflicted on him nor would the King of Italy stop, unless by force, in the movement that was pushing Piedmont toward Rome.

On June 24, 1862, Marquis de La Valette acquainted his government of the complete failure of all the steps he had taken with the Holy See to have the imperial proposals accepted.[58] As for the King of Italy, if he decided (August 29) to stop the march of the Garibaldian army at Aspromonte, that decision was solely to prevent the condottiere from acting prematurely and snatching from him the honor of the expedition which he planned to make himself. A dispatch sent (September 20, 1862) to the diplomatic agents of Italy by General Durando, minister of foreign affairs, leaves no doubt on this subject. Said the minister: "The whole nation demands its capital. Not long ago it resisted the ill considered dash of Garibaldi only because it is convinced that the government of the King will be able to carry out the mandate it has received from the parliament with re-

[55] *Moniteur,* September 25, 1862.
[56] *Ibid.*
[57] Thouvenel, *op. cit.,* II, 303. Letter to the Duke de Gramont, May 24, 1862.
[58] *Ibid.*

gard to Rome." [59] In spite of all, Napoleon, obstinate in his dream, continued to seek the compromise formula that would satisfy both the independence of the Pope and the so-called rights of Italy. After several fruitless combinations, the diplomats of Paris and of Turin finally made the Convention of September 15, 1864 between France and Italy. The text is as follows:

Art. 1. Italy agrees not to attack the present territory of the Holy Father and to prevent, even by force, every attack coming from outside against the said territory.

Art. 2. France will withdraw her troops from the Papal States gradually and in the measure in which the army of the Holy Father will be organized. However, the evacuation must be accomplished within two years.

Art. 3. The Italian government refrains from any protest against the organization of a papal army, even composed of foreign volunteers, sufficient to maintain the authority of the Holy Father and the tranquillity of his States, both internally and on the frontier, provided this force does not degenerate into a means of attack against the Italian government.

Art. 4. Italy declares itself ready to enter into an arrangement for taking over a proportional part of the debt of the former States of the Church.

Art. 5. The present convention will be ratified, and the ratifications will be exchanged within two weeks or sooner if possible.

We shall see presently that this convention, instead of assuring the peace, did but let loose the war.

[59] Jules Zeller, *Année historique,* fifth year, 14.

CHAPTER XXXI

Attitude of Various States

IN THE minds of all Catholics, the Franco-Italian treaty seemed to express, according to the words of a historian, "the abandonment to a final expiration of the temporal power and of the papacy " [1] by France. But we need to remark that this policy of abandonment was not special to the French government. Austria, which always gloried in continuing the traditions of the Holy Empire and whose emperor was fond of proclaiming himself the born-protector of the Holy See, had, like France, made promises to the pope, but did not keep them. At the time of the invasion of the papal territory by the Piedmont army, Austrian troops were massed along the Mincio on a war footing. Nothing was needed but an imperial order to launch them on the Sardinian territory. That order was signed by the Emperor; but, two hours later, it was recalled, when his ministers and his principal generals, who were consulted by him, reminded him of the gaps in his army, and pointed out the still bleeding wounds of Magenta and Solferino, and pictured France again passing the Alps and revolution breaking loose in his country. "His fleet remained at anchor in the harbor of Trieste, where it was able to hear, a few days later, the bombardment of Ancona; and the army of the Mincio was immobilized in its quadrilateral, while waiting for Italian unity to become a reality, which would combine forces with Prussia to expel it." [2]

The powers signatory of the treaties of Vienna, who had

[1] Besson, *Xavier de Mérode,* p. 226.
[2] Villefranche, *Pie IX,* p. 195.

sworn to intervene with armed force against whoever should attempt to break the equilibrium established by them, did not move. Russia contemplated the catastrophe without saying anything.[3] England, through its prime ministers, Palmerston and Russell, had, from the outset, vied with France to encourage the projects of Italian unification and thereby the aggression against the States of the Church. As for Prussia, feeling that Italian unity, formed about the Savoy dynasty, would be the prelude of German unity, to be realized around the dynasty of the Hohenzollerns, she had followed the events with sympathy. As formerly the dismemberment of Poland, so the invasion of the papal domain was "the sin of all Europe."

Furthermore, nearly everywhere in Europe the Church had to undergo persecutions or vexations on the part of the states. Adding encroachments in the spiritual order to his aggressions in the temporal order, the King of Italy, by a decree of March 16, 1863, subjected to the royal exequatur "every ecclesiastical provision coming from an authority non resident in the kingdom," and a large number of acts about benefices, pious legacies, alienation of Church property, dispensations from marriage impediments, dispensations from monastic vows, and other similar questions.[4] The next year (July 12, 1864) a royal ordinance required the placet in the kingdom of Italy for all rescripts or decrees of the diocesan ordinaries containing the appointment of pastors or curates, or containing provisions about ecclesiastical property.[5]

[3] "The dislike which Russia had in common with Austria for the principle of nationalities, and the respect she professed for the old European law and for the threatened treaties, seemed to make Russia in duty bound to take part against the Italian unity, but the logic of interests and of passions won the day over the logic of principles. We see her, by her maneuvers, furnish the revolutionaries the support which they lacked." Lescoeur, *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne*, p. 216.

[4] For the complete text of the decree, see Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 522–24.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 548.

France

In France, Napoleon III was disturbed by the opposition which his Italian policy had stirred up among the Catholics. But he thought he could disarm it by giving free rein to the irreligious press. This press, beginning in 1860, redoubled its attacks on the clergy and on the Church in general.[6] The Emperor was not satisfied with this indirect persecution. His minister of justice, Delangle, ordered (March 8, 1861) the procurators general, by virtue of art. 201 and 204 of the penal code, that is, by rendering them subject to imprisonment or banishment, to prosecute the members of the Catholic clergy who, in the exercise of their office, criticized the policy of the government.[7] Lastly, by several acts of the end of 1861 and the beginning of 1862, the imperial government attacked the laity itself, in their charitable and apostolic works, notably in the most flourishing of these works, that of the St. Vincent de Paul conferences. These were called upon, either to accept a president appointed by imperial decree, or no longer to have any connection with one another.[8] Two other significant facts deeply afflicted the Catholics in the course of January, 1862. On the 11th of that month an imperial decree named as professor in the Collège de France, Ernest Renan, who had just given the scandal of his apostasy; the same day a second decree instituted Marshal Magnan grand master of the Grand Orient of France.[9]

Other Countries

Spain, which had been so disturbed in 1859, experienced a revival of troubles in 1866. In the interval between these two

[6] Cf. La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire,* Vol. IV, Bk. XXIV; Weiss, *Histoire du parti républicain en France.*

[7] Chantrel, *op. cit.,* p. 450.

[8] Circular of Persigny, October 6, 1861 (Chantrel, *op. cit.,* p. 459). Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 466, 479, 480.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 470.

dates, the country enjoyed a period of calm which permitted the Catholic Church to develop there. But the campaign conducted between 1861 and 1865 to obtain from Queen Isabella the recognition of the kingdom of Italy, and the success of that campaign in 1865, were a cause of grief for the Catholics, for the aim of the agitators took in the Roman and papal question no less than the Italian question properly so called.

In Portugal a royal decree (March 5, 1861), pronouncing the dissolution of the communities of the Daughters of Charity and declaring their possessions incorporated in the national domain,[10] was the forerunner of other measures touching all the religious congregations.[11]

In Switzerland, Bishop Marilley's return from exile in 1856 had not put an end to the measures of persecution. On July 22, every foreign jurisdiction was suppressed on Swiss territory. The government took part in the direction of the seminaries and monasteries, and gave the clergy numerous matters of complaint. The courts in Sweden continued to act rigorously by penalties of exile and loss of civil rights against persons convicted of embracing Catholicism.[12] In Germany, the Chambers of the kingdom of Würtemberg refused to approve in 1861 a concordat concluded between the King and the Holy See.[13]

In the movement which led the Bulgarians, about the middle of the nineteenth century, to demand their religious independence from the Phanar, an influential minority turned their eyes Romeward and launched the idea of union with the Catholic Church. At Constantinople in 1860 the delegates of 2,000 of them declared themselves Catholics. On January 21, 1861, Pius IX confirmed this act, and less than three months later he himself consecrated the first uniate arch-

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 486.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 487, 495, 524.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 299.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 454.

bishop of Bulgaria, Sokolski, an aged and ignorant archimandrite whom the Turkish government recognized officially on June 1 of the same year. All these events brought about numerous conversions; in a few years the abjurations amounted to 60,000.

Unfortunately for Catholicism, Russia was on the watch. On June 18, 1861, Archbishop Sokolski disappeared suddenly on a Russian ship which conveyed him to Odessa; from there he was conducted to some unknown place. No one has been able to determine exactly whether he must be considered an accomplice or a victim of the Muscovite maneuvers; but the former seems more likely. This unexpected blow slowed down the movement of conversions. In 1862 Sokolski was given a successor in the person of Raphael Popof, who governed the Catholic Bulgarians until 1883. At that date Rome created a new ecclesiastical organization. Constantinople was given an apostolic administrator with the title of archbishop, and two vicars apostolic: one of Macedonia, with residence at Salonica, the other of Thrace, with residence at Adrianople.[14]

Russian Persecutions

The court of Russia was a party to the intrigues in this affair. These showed once more how well inspired the Holy See had been when, neither in 1772, while Catherine II was solemnly promising freedom to the Catholics, nor in 1815, when Alexander I made himself the head of the Holy Alliance against the Revolution, it did not trust unreservedly in the promises of the empire of the Czars. Basically the czars never considered themselves bound by such promises, whether toward the nations of which they made themselves the protectors, or toward the Ruthenian Catholics of their states, or toward those of Poland. The principle of "reason of state," which, under the absolute governments, too often serves to cover the whims of despotism, obliged them, they said, to act thus.

[14] R. Janin, in *Echos d'Orient,* September–October, 1915, p. 521. Cf. S. Vailhé, s.v. "Bulgarie" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* II, 1228–31.

In 1854 the coreligionists of Czar Nicholas were the object of some vexatious measures by the Ottoman Porte. He made this deed a pretext for organizing a formidable persecution against all those of his subjects who did not belong to the Orthodox religion. Mussulmans, Lutherans, Jews, and Catholics were embraced in the same persecution. He held that, in acting thus, he was simply resuming the work of "Russification" dear to Catherine II and for a time abandoned by Paul I. He "purified" the clergy by introducing into their ranks the greatest possible number of those won to his plans. Several of them passed over to the schism. But they did not draw with them the people, who refused to imitate the shameful defection of their leaders and manifested an admirable faithfulness to their beliefs. Prison, the knout, and Siberia made thousands of martyrs. After the coming of Alexander II, who mounted the throne in 1855 and at once showed the desire to pursue his father's plan, Pius IX, by several acts (April 9, 1855, January 30 and September 7, 1856) set forth the complaints of the Holy See. The only results of these steps were some vague declarations and some ineffectual measures. The diocese of Chelm remained the last asylum of the uniate Ruthenians. The Czar sent there, as seminary professors, some clerics trained in the schismatic universities. When, on January 31, 1859, Pius IX repeated his grievances, the Emperor merely replied in general terms that he was watching over the interests of the Roman Catholics.[15]

Persecution of Polish Catholics

In 1856, at the very time when the Russian persecution was being waged against the Ruthenian Church, the court of St. Petersburg appeared intent on adopting a milder policy to-

[15] See E. Likowski, *Historya unii Kasciola ruskiego z Kosciolem rezymskim;* Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège,* Vol. III; Lescoeur, *L'Eglise catholique et le gouvernement russe.*

ward the Catholics of Poland. This attitude was soon explained. The Czar was afraid that the peace treaty which regulated the Eastern question would affect the Polish question. On this point the treaty of Paris was silent. On January 7, 1857, the Czar issued a ukase permitting the repairing of ruined churches and even the building of churches in places that had none. But in practice the government so contrived as to hinder or even to annul the concessions made to the Catholics, and several times the materials prepared by them for the construction of a church were confiscated and given to a pope (that is, a parish priest of the Orthodox Church).[16] On November 12, 1859, a rescript forbade, "under pain of immediate expulsion," any Catholic priest "to admit to any religious act other persons than their own parishioners." [17] This measure amounted to an absolute prohibition of every act of proselyting by the priest and any conversion of the schismatics. In 1860 Father Lescoeur thus defined the state of Poland under the Russian regime: "Total political absorption, gradual but inevitable religious absorption." [18] In 1861 Archbishop Anthony Fialkowski of Warsaw died, and the chapter elected a capitular vicar who was displeasing to the government; the newly elected was imprisoned and the chapter was forbidden to communicate with the Pope. On this occasion armed forces entered several churches to terrorize the people.

The people, closely watched by numerous police agents, gathered about the nobility of the country. These, residing on their domains, had remained attached to the cause of national independence and had their rallying center in an agricultural society with headquarters at Warsaw. During this time the Polish *émigrés* tried to arouse Europe for their cause. The nobles, most of them refugees in Paris, about Prince Czartiryski, counted on the intervention of the Catholic governments;

[16] Cf. Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–23.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 225.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

students and workmen, who had joined the democratic parties, counted on the revolutionary movement. This latter element, however, was never predominant.[19] The Catholic element as a whole always marked the Polish insurrection.

This revolt broke out suddenly in January, 1863. The Russian authorities, on the pretense of an enlistment, had convoked the chief young men suspected of nationalism, and then arrested them. Several succeded in escaping; others, suspecting a trap, did not answer the summons. They took refuge in the woods and there organized themselves in armed bands, which made sudden appearances, engaged in small skirmishes, then disappeared in the forests, concealing themselves in country places, protected by the complicity of the peasants. The strife did not have the same character as in 1831, when Poland possessed a regular army. The Russian government had dissolved the agricultural society; but this, before disappearing, constituted a secret committee at Warsaw, which directed all the operations and which the police were never able to discover. An army of 200,000 men was unable to get the better of these bands of rebels whose total number did not reach 8,000. Alexander II, perplexed, wavered between two policies. At one time he tried, by liberal concessions, to win the Polish population; and then he had recourse to rigorous repression.

The Poles understood that the victory would finally go the number and force of their enemy, if Europe did not come to their aid. But France, Austria, and England limited themselves to Platonic manifestations.[20] As for Prussia, whose political atti-

[19] Garibaldi wrote to the Poles: "Cease giving a religious character to your heroic struggle; for you will thus alienate men's sympathies" (quoted by the *Correspondant,* May 25, 1864, p. 10).

[20] Three times (April, June, and August, 1863) France, Austria, and England took a collective step in favor of Poland. But, as these powers did not hint that they would back up their demands by acts, Russia merely replied that it did not hold itself bound by the treaties of 1815 for the government of Poland, and that it was simply suppressing a revolutionary insurrection. See Montalembert, "Le Pape et la Pologne," in the *Correspondant,* May 25, 1864, p. 9, 17.

tude was governed by Bismarck, it helped the Russian government to crush Poland, signing an agreement which closed the frontiers to the insurgents. The Landtag even accused Bismarck of having turned over some Polish refugees to the Muscovite government.[21] From that time on the lot of Poland was decided. The conqueror took brutal advantage of his material superiority, giving the repression a ferocious and implacable character from which the Catholic religion especially had to suffer. Archbishop Felinski was deported to Iaroslav. His clergy were forbidden to correspond with him. Priests were imprisoned and put to death on the simple charge that they brought the aid of religion to Poles wounded in the fights. Heavy contributions were imposed on the clergy. Many monasteries were converted into barracks, and several churches were sacked. Lithuania, which, transformed into a Russian department, had petitioned its reunion with the kingdom of Poland and had sustained the insurgents, was subjected to the same measures of terror as Poland. General Mouraviev, who was charged with directing this war of destruction, was given the surname of "hangman of Vilna"; but the Russian patriots acclaimed him on his return and even decided on the foundation of an annual feast to commemorate the crushing of the Polish nationality.

The Pope's voice alone championed the cause of justice and religion. On April 24, 1864, Pius IX, celebrating in the chapel of the Propaganda, the feast of a Capuchin martyr, Fidelis Sigmaringen, of a sudden exclaimed:

> No, I do not wish to be obliged some day, in the presence of the eternal Judge to cry out: Woe is me, because I have held my peace! (Isa. 6:5). The voice of the weak and of the innocent call out for vengeance. . . . I feel myself prompted to condemn a potentate whose name I now pass over in silence only to name him in another discourse. . . . He persecutes and massacres the priests. He banishes the bishops to a remote depth of his empire. Mad man! He does not know that a bishop, in his see or in the catacombs, is still the same,

[21] Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, p. 571.

and that his character is indelible. Let no one say that, in rising up against the potentate of the North, I am fomenting the European revolution. I know how to distinguish the socialist revolution from right and from reasonable freedom. If I protest against him, I do so to solace my conscience.[22]

Said an eyewitness: "As he pronounced these words, the Sovereign Pontiff was a sublime sight. A holy anger crimsoned his brow, his voice thundered, and he seemed, from his extended arm, to hurl an invisible thunderbolt." [23]

Antichristian Intellectual Movement

The year 1863 gave the common father of the faithful another subject of grief. The states of Europe, which had impassibly or sympathetically looked on at the invasion of the papal domain and at the crushing of Catholic Poland, offered no hindrance to the spread of a blasphemous writing that repeated the heresy of Arius, adapting it to the mentality of modern times. This book, which had for its title *The Life of Jesus* and was written by Ernest Renan, a professor in the Collège de France, made its first appearance in Paris. It expressed a movement of ideas which, born in Germany, influenced all European thinking more or less.

In 1835, a German, Heinrich Heine, at the close of his *From Kant to Hegel* wrote: "Do not laugh at these counsels, although they come from a dreamer, who asks you to beware of the followers of Kant and Fichte and of the philosophers of nature. . . . Thought precedes action as lightning precedes thunder. The German thunder is not sharp, and it comes in slow rolls; but it will come, and when you hear a cracking such as was

[22] *Correspondant,* May 25, 1864, p. 17.

[23] *Ibid.* On the events of Poland in 1863, see Montalembert, *L'insurrection polonaise;* Lescoeur, *L'Eglise catholique et le gouvernement russe;* Pierling, *op. cit.,* Vol. III; Montalembert, "Le Pape et la Pologne," in the *Correspondant,* May 25, 1864, pp. 1–41.

never yet heard in the history of the world, know that the German thunder has at last touched the end." [24] This is not the place for us to speak of the unwholesome influence exercised by Germany, in the middle of the nineteenth century, on religious philosophy.

Kant, wishing to reduce the gospel teaching to the morality of the categorical imperative, and all the supernatural law of Christianity to the natural law of duty; [25] Hegel, professing the identity of the real and the ideal in a perpetual becoming; [26] the followers of Hegel, representing God as the specter of the human conscience: [27] all these had created a movement of ideas which, by its vagueness, by its equivocations, and by its religious formulas embracing a doctrine of strict individual autonomy, was of a sort to disturb souls profoundly. But the very form of these doctrines hardly permitted them to pass beyond the limited circle of the university public of misty Germany. Twice some Frenchmen had endeavored to translate in a clearer language the new Germanic philosophy and thus to popularize it. Victor Cousin, in 1817, introduced into his system, at least partly, the Kantian theory of knowledge; in 1828 Edgar Quinet, in a study on Herder, glorified the creative idealism of Germany.

Ernest Renan

But Cousin's philosophical initiation was incomplete, and Quinet's work was nothing more than an eloquent appeal. Besides, both of them mingled in the German doctrines some that were their own. The real popularizer in France, and thereby in the whole world, of the German philosophy, propounded if not

[24] Heine, *De l'Allemagne* (French trans.), I, 182.

[25] Ruyssen, *Kant*, p. 353.

[26] C. Renouvier, *Philosophie analytique de l'Histoire*, IV, 19. Hello, *M. Renan, l'Allemagne et l'athéisme au XIX^e siècle*, p. 89.

[27] Saint-René Taillandier, *Histoire et philosophie religieuse*, p. 20.

in all the parts of its technical teaching, at least in the general inspiration of its doctrines and of its method, was a writer devoid of any personal philosophy, but exceptionally supple, varied, subtle, insidious in his thought as in his style: the author of the *Life of Jesus,* Ernest Renan.[28] Breton on his father's side, he belonged, as he tells us, to those "races of fancy" [29] whose "lively and delicate imagination" likes to create for itself an ethereal world; [30] but Gascon on his mother's side, he compared himself humorously, but quite exactly, to the animal of the fable whose two natures formed a mass of contradictions, one being engaged ceaselessly in destroying the other, the first laughing when the second wept.[31]

Born at Trèguier (February 27, 1828), brought up in a deeply Christian atmosphere, the young Breton at first turned to the ecclesiastical state. His classical studies he began at the minor seminary of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet in Paris under the direction of Father Dupanloup; then, at the age of nineteen, he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice. At a later date he paid homage to the virtue and scholarship of the teachers he met there. Soon, however, he lost his faith. "I learned German and Hebrew," he says; "that changed everything.[32] . . . German philosophy was beginning to be known, and it strangely fascinated me.[33] . . . An eternal becoming, an endless metamorphysis, seemed to me to be the law of the world." [34] In other passages of his writings, Renan declared that the loss of his faith in his case was the consequence of his critical studies rather than the result of his reading of German philosophy. This assertion is contradicted by the explicit testimony of one of his fellow stu-

[28] Renan, *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse,* p. 20.
[29] *Ibid.,* p. 40.
[30] *Ibid.,* p. 73.
[31] *Ibid.,* p. 145.
[32] Renan, *op. cit.,* p. 263. We have here an exaggeration. Ernest Renan lost his faith before studying Hebrew. See Cognat, *M. Renan hier et aujourd'hui,* p. 112.
[33] Renan, *op. cit.,* p. 740.
[34] *Ibid.,* p. 742.

dents [35] and by his own writings. The young seminarian was at the beginning of his philosophical studies and had not yet started the study of Hebrew, when, supposing that his sister Henrietta was going to make a journey in Germany, he told her to make a pilgrimage at Königsberg to the tomb of Kant.[36]

After three years in the seminary and before taking the final promises of the subdiaconate, Renan, according to his own expressions, "wishing to quit an interior which could no longer be anything but a lie," [37] abandoned the ecclesiastical state and devoted himself to Oriental studies. His unbelief, his hostility to the Church, appeared first in writings full of bitterness. Saint-René Taillandier wrote:

His first declarations breathe a sharp bitterness. His thought and his language had in them a singularly sharp tone, at times even traces of fury. After the February revolution, irritated at seeing the Catholic Church joining in the feelings of those stormy days and taking a part in the feasts and in the popular ceremonies, with extreme spirit he denounced the hypocrisy of the clerical liberalism. With regard to the great works of German exegesis, if along his way he met a violent writer, he judged him with unexpected sympathy. Without hesitation he wrote phrases like these: "The material temples of the real Jesus will crumble; the tabernacles where His flesh and blood are believed to be contained will be smashed; already the roof is opened to the daylight, and the water of heaven comes through to wet the face of the kneeling believer." [38]

[35] Cognat, *op. cit.*, pp. 31, 112. Cf. Vigouroux, *Mélanges bibliques*, p. 532. Renan's *Souvenirs* always needs to be controlled by those of Father Cognat, his fellow seminarian.

[36] "I greatly like the manner of your German thinkers. If you ever go to Königsberg, I wish you to make a pilgrimage to Kant's tomb." Ernest Renan to Henrietta Renan, *Lettres intimes*, p. 97. Renan's elder sister Henrietta, a school teacher in Poland, had already lost her faith and she is the one who urged her young brother, when he was a seminarian, to study the German thinkers. She was also the one who later decided him to quit the ecclesiastical state. She flattered his pride by making him to see vaguely a great scientific position. See the *Lettres intimes*, passim.

[37] Letter of November 12, 1845 (Cognat, *op. cit.*, p. 189).

[38] Saint-René Taillandier, *Histoire et philosophie religieuse*, p. 2.

Renan's *Life of Jesus,* published in 1863, had some calmer turns. Was the author's unbelief moderated? Not at all. His denial was not a bit less radical; it was more dangerous. It was in vain for him to declare in his preface and to repeat in his conclusion that "Jesus is the common honor of that which bears a heart of man," [39] that "He founded the absolute religion," [40] that "to make Himself adored as He has been, He must have been adorable," [41] that "His sublime person may rightly be called divine." [42] Under this apparent serenity, where a haughty irony showed through, the whole work rested on two philosophical prejudices that he had taken, the first from Kant, the second from Hegel, namely: 1. that all revelation is condemned in advance by philosophy, for it would be a derogation to the general laws of nature; and "whoever speaks of something above or outside the laws of nature in the realm of facts, speaks a contradiction"; [43] 2. that all is in the way of becoming, even God. On these principles, the thought and the phrase of the historian, or rather of the artist or the dilettante, makes game of himself, opposes himself, contradicts himself, tries to conciliate himself in ambiguous, sonorous, and sweet-sounding formulas in which the author takes pleasure at ringing the chimes which he claims he has received, as an innate gift, from nature. Is he a materialist or an idealist? We cannot say; for, if he admits that the world is the rule of mechanics, he professes that an obscure conscience pushes the possible to exist. Is he an atheist or a deist? We do not know; for, "if God is not yet, perhaps He will be some day." Is Renan's method of exegesis naturalist like that of Paulus, or mythical after the manner of Strauss? In fact, he is ready to adopt the most convenient or poetic explanation or

[39] Renan, *Vie de Jésus,* p. liv.

[40] *Ibid.,* p. 446.

[41] *Ibid.,* p. 447.

[42] *Ibid.,* p. 457.

[43] Renan does indeed several times use the word "revelation"; but he intends it in a totally different sense. Cf. *Vie de Jésus,* p. lix.

the most picturesque; the choice matters little to him if only it excludes the supernatural. Lastly, is it religious? He himself gives the answer: yes and no; for this disciple of German thought seems to have taken for his motto these lines of Schiller:

What religion do I profess?
None of those that you name.
Why none?
For the sake of religion.

The scandal produced by the appearance of Renan's *Life of Jesus* was immense. Several editions followed one another in 1863. The next year a popular edition was published, 50,000 copies being sold in a short time. After the educated classes, the popular masses were reached by the poison. The irreligious rejoiced; true believers were pained. Undoubtedly, among those who did not share the Christian faith, some lofty minds felt the unfitness of such a writing; but a number of shallow Christians were to be found for whom the graces of the style, the charm of the descriptions, and the soft seduction of a wavering thought disguised the character of the book.[44]

The priests in the pulpit, the bishops in their pastorals, and Catholic writers in journalistic articles and in pamphlets,[45] refuted the sacrilegious work, which the Congregation of the Index was not slow in condemning.[46] The strongest protest was that of Bishop Pie of Poitiers who, the successor of St. Hilary, not merely stigmatized the blasphemies of the new Arius,[47] but let part of the responsibility for the scandal fall on the public

[44] D'Hulst, "M. Renan," in the *Correspondant,* October 25, 1892, p. 205.

[45] Louis Veuillot, at that time prevented from writing in any paper, in opposition to the *Life of Jesus* wrote a *Vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ,* which of all his writings did the most honor to his character and his faith. Cf. A. Nicolas, *L'art de croire,* II, 240. Cf. also Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* III, 471–82.

[46] Decree of August 24, 1863.

[47] Cf. his synodal address of August 25, 1863; Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie,* II, 198.

authorities.[48] The *Revue des Deux Mondes,* the *Journal des Débats,* the *Constitutionnel,* the *Opinion nationale,* and the *Temps,* the great learned bodies and the government authority itself expressed indignation at this "tone of inquisitor," this "appeal to the secular arm," this *auto-da-fé,* as they said, which was no longer of our age.[49]

Congress of Malines (1863)

Other Catholics wished to raise a protest no less absolute, no less keen, but by placing themselves solely on the ground of respect for consciences and of the freedom of the Church. They chose Malines for a congress that was to be held from the 18th to the 22nd of August, 1863. No question was to be raised about the forms of government, as the Church accepted all forms.[50] They intended not only to make a solemn protest but also to create, according to the expressions of the organizers of the congress, "a center of light, charity, and love where the holy alliance of the sons of the Church would be consolidated." [51]

The chief orator of the congress was Count Montalembert, who, wishing to take a clear stand on the ground already defined by Bishop Parisis, following the conduct of the Belgian Catholics, undertook to set forth the way in which the Catholics, after winning freedom of education, intended to win all religious freedoms. He declared: "Please God, I do not pretend to discuss a dogma, to draw up a formulary, to invent or correct a the-

[48] "Judge to what times we have come, when, in a Catholic nation, a man, not simply anyone, but a public man, showered with high honors, supported by the money of the taxpayers, and still more, officially holding one of the most eminent academic chairs, has yet been able, without the protest of any authority, with the applause of the crowd of journalists, and with still other encouragements, to write, publish, and spread everywhere a book of such impiety." Baunard, *op. cit.,* II, 199.

[49] *Ibid.,* II, 199.

[50] Eugène Veuillot, *op. cit.,* III, 485.

[51] *Compte rendu officiel de l'assemblée,* p. iii.

ology. . . . I do not profess an absolute theory, but a practical doctrine, drawn from the lesson of the events; I do not intend to transform into a question of orthodoxy what is a question of conduct." [52] After making this reservation, the orator made no hesitation about declaring that, "if everywhere, except in Belgium, the Catholics were inferior to their adversaries in public life, that condition was owing to the fact that, in mind and heart, many still belonged to the ancient regime, that is, the regime that did not allow civil equality or political liberty or freedom of conscience." [53] "The Church," he declared, "can be free only in the bosom of general freedom.[54] The Spanish inquisitor saying to the heretic, 'The truth or death,' is as hateful to me as the French terrorist saying to my grandfather, 'Liberty, fraternity, or death.' " [55] "Need I remark," he added, "that the religious freedom to which I appeal, cannot be unlimited, not more than any other liberty, nor more than any authority?" [56]

In the strict meaning of its terms, the doctrine set forth by Montalembert did not contradict the encyclical *Mirari vos*. But the earnest tone, a bit sharp, almost provocative, in which it was presented, the plain allusions to the attitude of the *Univers*, clearly charged with disloyalty,[57] and the very title under which

[52] Montalembert, *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*, p. 93. The speeches of Montalembert will be found also in the *Correspondant* of 1863, Vols. LIX and LX, and in the *Journal de Bruxelles* of August 25 and 26, 1863.

[53] Montalembert, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[57] "If the good faith were banished from the world, said our King John, it would have to be found again on the lips of the king of France. Gentlemen, for the defense of our faith, let us all be kings of France. . . . Let us never imitate those who, in France, under Louis Philippe and under the Republic, called for *freedom as in Belgium*, and, as soon as they think themselves the stronger or, what amounts to the same thing, the friends of the stronger, have not hesitated to say: 'Freedom is good only for us, for we alone have the truth' " (Montalembert, *op. cit.*, p. 137). In a footnote at the bottom of the page containing this passage, Montalembert refers to several articles of the *Univers*.

the two speeches were published (*L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*), a title recalling the famous motto of Cavour, the aggressor of the papal territory, made Montalembert's declarations seriously suspect in the eyes of a good number of Catholics.[58] Therein they saw the revival of the condemned liberalism. The illustrious speaker abstained from attending the second Malines congress, held in 1864, where the two principal speakers were Bishop Dupanloup and Father Félix. According to Eugène Veuillot, the Bishop of Orléans "was able to observe enough moderation so that they were not obliged to take back anything," [59] and the celebrated Jesuit preacher merely said that the Church, after resisting the persecution as also the protection of the kings, would have been able to accommodate herself to their tolerance. As proofs of this view, he referred to Great Britain, "where each rising stage of public freedom marked the increasing progress of Catholic life," and America, "where fifty new dioceses, founded in less than fifty years, show, to those who can see and understand, how freedom destroys us." [60]

A pamphlet entitled *L'erreur libre dans l'Etat libre* sharply attacked Montalembert's speeches, which were, moreover, denounced to the Index.[61] Pius IX, after some hesitation, refrained from any public blame and simply testified to the

[58] Some even believed they could discover an argument against the temporal power of the popes in a phrase of Montalembert, protesting against "that horrible confusion of the two powers which is the ideal of all tyrannies" (Montalembert, *op. cit.*, p. 102). The orator, who had always so ardently taken the defense of the temporal power of the Holy See, as likewise his friends Bishop Dupanloup and Falloux, indignantly protested against this charge (*ibid.*, pp. 102–5). On an inscription in the château of La Roche in Brény, commemorating the promise made in 1862 by Dupanloup, Falloux, Foisset, Montalembert, and Albert de Broglie, to fight "for the free Church in the free fatherland," see two different interpretations given by Lecanuet (Montalembert, *op. cit.*, III, 330–33) and by Lagrange (*Vie de Mgr Dupanloup*, II, 395); and by Eugène Veuillot (*Louis Veuillot*, III, 487–92) and by Jules Morel (*Somme contre le catholicisme libéral*, II, 445, 544).

[59] E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 497.

[60] The *Correspondant*, September 25, 1864, LXIII, 245.

[61] E. Veuillot, *op. cit.*, III, 286.

Catholic orator his dissatisfaction by a confidential letter of Cardinal Antonelli.

Thus about the middle of 1864, not only had the Church been odiously attacked in the temporal power of her supreme head and in the most essential points of her dogmatic teaching; but her own children, the most zealous of her defenders, were divided as they had been in 1831, and in 1850. Pius IX, who, since 1852 was concerned with drawing up a catalogue of modern errors accompanied with suitable censures, thought the time had come to speak to the Catholic world a word emanating from his sovereign authority. He realized this project by publishing (December 8, 1864) his encyclical *Quanta cura,* which reached the bishops of Christendom, accompanied by a catalogue or Syllabus of the principal errors of the time.

CHAPTER XXXII

The Encyclical Quanta cura

WITH the bull *Unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII and the bull *Unigenitus* of Clement XI, the encyclical *Quanta cura* of Pius IX, along with the Syllabus, is one of the three papal acts that have most profoundly stirred public opinion in the course of the centuries. In the *Unam sanctam* the legists took pleasure in showing the papacy's seizure of the lawful authority of the kings; in the *Unigenitus* the Jansenists pretended to see the disowning of the primitive Church; in the encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Syllabus the nineteenth-century denounced the anathema hurled at modern civilization and the liberty of peoples. The study of these two last documents, of their reverberation, and of their consequences up to the Vatican Council, will constitute the chief object of the next chapters.

Reasons for the Encyclical

We would be arbitrarily narrowing the doctrinal scope of the documents that appeared on December 8, 1864, were we to feign to see in them, as some have done, simply a retort to the convention of September 15, 1864, or to the publication of the *Life of Jesus,* or to the speeches delivered at the Malines congress. As history has for a long time amply shown, Pius IX had long considered condemning, by a solemn encyclical, the principal errors of modern times, and we know that the preparatory labors had been undertaken on that subject.[1] The events that we

[1] The document that seems to have served as a starting point for the encylical *Quanta cura* and the Syllabus is a pastoral letter published on July 23, 1860, by

have reviewed, may have hastened this condemnation; but the encyclical carrying that condemnation shows, by its destination and by its contents, that it goes beyond the contingencies of these particular facts. The Supreme Pontiff declares at the very outset that the teachings he is going to give are addressed, "not only to individuals, but also to the nations, not only to the peoples, but also to the sovereigns"; and, in perusing the papal letter, we perceive that the teachings concern the intellectual movement, the social movement, and the political movement of the times.

Of the intellectual movement, Gregory XVI had condemned the traditionalist or fideist tendency, which thereafter disappeared along with the school of Lamennais. Pius IX, whose pastoral solicitude had been made vigilant by the philosophical doctrines of which the *Life of Jesus* was the most scandalous manifestation, pointed and condemned, at the opposite extreme, the rationalist tendency, according to which "human society ought to be constituted and governed without further account being taken of religion than if this did not exist." [2]

In the social order the Pope condemned the doctrine of the socialists, which declared that "domestic society has its whole *raison d'être* in purely natural civil law," that is, in the laws of the state and the doctrine of the economists, teaching, or at least leading by their teaching to his consequence, that the social organization "has no other end but to amass and accumulate riches."

Bishop Gerbet, bishop of Perpignan. We often read that the final form given to the Syllabus is owing to Cardinal Bilio. J. B. de Rossi, questioned about the matter in 1884, at the time of the learned cardinal's death, believed he was in a position to give a formal denial to this report. Cardinal Bilio had declared to him that his only cooperation in the drawing up of the papal document had been to take cognizance of it before its publication and to have had four or five propositions suppressed. On the origins of the Syllabus, see Pierre Hourat, "Le Syllabus," a documentary study, in the collection *Science et religion*. On the participation of Louis Veuillot in the writing of the Syllabus, see Eugène Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 493.

[2] For this text and the texts quoted in the rest of this section, see Denzinger-Bannwart, nos. 1689, 1694, 1691, 1697, 1690, 1692, 1695.

In the political order the Pontiff proscribed, on one hand, the Gallicanism of the heads of states and their advisers, according to which the acts of the Roman Pontiffs about religion need to have the sanction of the civil powers; and on the other hand the liberalism of the democrats, proclaiming that "every citizen has the right to the full liberty of publicly manifesting his opinions, whatever they may be, by the spoken word, the press, or otherwise, without the ecclesiastical or civil authority having any right to limit it."

Lastly, the Pontiff demanded for the Church "the right to govern itself by its own laws and not to permit anyone to put an obstacle in the way of its liberty." [3] He protested against "the abolition of the religious orders, a prohibition which violates the liberty of publicly practicing the evangelical counsels." He rose up against the monopoly in education being placed in the hands of the state, "so far as it has for its effect the complete withdrawal of the training and education of youth from the influence of the Church." In fact, if man is free, "nothing is so mortal as to think that the free will we received at birth is sufficient for us, without having anything else to ask of God, that is, forgetting our Creator, we dare to deny His power in order to show ourselves free." [4] "If kings are independent in temporal affairs, their interest is served, whenever a question arises of the affairs of God, by carefully following the order He has laid down and subordinating the royal will to that of the priests of Christ, and not vice versa." [5]

In short, Pius IX, in promulgating the encyclical *Quanta*

[3] Ecclesiam catholicam . . . sinant (principes) uti legibus suis, nec libertati ejus quemquam permittant obsistere.

[4] Nihil tam praeceps ad casum . . . si hoc solum nobis putantes posse sufficere, quod liberum arbitrium, quum nasceremus, accepimus, ultra jam a Domino nihil quaeramus, id est, Auctoris nostri obliti, ejus potentiam, ut nos ostendamus liberos, abjuremus.

[5] Certum est enim, hoc rebus suis esse salutare, ut, quum de causis Dei agatur, juxta ipsius constitutum, regiam voluntatem sacerdotibus Christi studeant subdere, non praeferre.

cura, was doing nothing more than repeat, as he himself avowed, a teaching several times given by his predecessors, and notably by Gregory XVI in the encyclical *Mirari vos.* But the act of Pius IX had a considerably greater reverberation than that of Gregory XVI. This difference may be traced to several causes.

Reception of the Encyclical

At the very beginning Pius IX expressed himself in a spontaneous manner, gave vent to his grievances in stirring accents, formulated his complaints in direct terms. He was, not so much a doctor who teaches, as a father who, before his children, opens his soul "overwhelmed with grief at sight of the terrible tempest," [6] provoked to indignation at seeing the horrible machinations by which "wicked men . . . , promising freedom, although themselves the slaves of corruption . . . , strive to deprave men's souls." Moreover, even when he begs "the gentle heart of the Savior to draw to Him men's souls by the bonds of His love . . . and the loving Mother of God to have generous pity for our miseries," he cannot, like the divine Master, hold back the hand ready to chastise "the impious and absurd principle of naturalism," and "men of lying tongue," who, in the name of socialism, undertake to ruin the family institution, and the arrant audacity of the heads of states who conspire against the liberty of the Church, and the madness of that liberty of perdition which places its confidence in the language of human wisdom.

A second cause was of a nature to stir men's minds. The encyclical *Quanta cura* did not stop at condemning principles. More than the encyclical *Mirari vos,* it made applications of those principles. When it spoke of the claims of the civil power to control the acts of the Church, to exclude it from the public schools, when it alluded to campaigns of the press against her

[6] Quum videremus summo animi nostri dolore horribilem sane pro cellam.

dogmas, it awoke the memory of recent concrete facts. Besides, it appeared on the morrow of events which were still stirring the intellectual and political world. The sharp fashion in which the Roman question had just been put, the troubles aroused in souls by the appearance of the *Life of Jesus,* the controversies aroused on the occasion of the Malines congress, had, with governments as among the people, in the Catholic world as in the freethinking atmosphere, exceedingly stirred the minds of men.

A last circumstance filled up this excitement. The encyclical of December 8 was, as we have stated, accompanied with a Syllabus of the principal errors. This catalogue contained eighty propositions, taken from various consistorial allocutions, encyclicals, and other apostolic letters. But some of these propositions, isolated from the documents from which they had been taken, were cunningly interpreted by the enemies of the Church so as to make it appear that the Pope was condemning in one mass all the progress of modern civilization and particularly the freedom of philosophy, the independence of the civil powers, and the citizens' liberty of conscience. These were the consequences they pretended to deduce from the condemned propositions numbered 80, 14, 42, and 15, which were thus conceived: prop. 80, the Pontiff can and ought to be reconciled to and put himself in accord with progress, with liberalism and modern civilization; prop. 14, one ought to engage in philosophy without taking any account of natural revelation; prop. 42, in case of conflict between the two powers (civil and religious), the civil right prevails; prop. 15, each man is free to embrace and profess the religion which he has been brought to regard as true by the sole lights of reason.

In the midst of freethought, this was, according to a striking expression of Bishop Dupanloup, like "an abominable death signal of all the snarling of the press against the old disarming of the Vatican." [7] *Le Siècle* considered the Syllabus the "su-

[7] Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup,* II, 450.

preme defiance hurled at the modern world by the expiring papacy." The government of Napoleon III declared the enyclical and the Syllabus "contrary to the principles on which the Constitution of the Empire rests," [8] and it denounced, to the Council of State, as guilty of abuse Cardinal Mathieu (archbishop of Besançon) and Bishop Dreux-Brezé of Moulins, for having had the encyclical read in the pulpit.[9]

All the Catholics submitted to the papal teaching; but, for those who had applauded Montalembert's speeches at the Malines congress, the appearance of the encyclical was, as one of them said, "a thunderbolt," [10] which at first disconcerted them. "Never," wrote Bishop d'Hulst twenty-two years later, "shall I forget the surprise, the emotion, the disquietude in which I was thrown by the reading of this doctrinal document. I saw clearly that I had something to change in my concept of society. . . . The memory of that inner evolution will be ineffaceable in my soul. Beginning in sadness and distress, it ended in joy and peace. But at that time I found it impossible to admit that the liberal error had never existed; for I was aware of it and noted it in myself and did not invent it." [11] Many Catholics then had to modify their ideas. Others suffered only in consequence of regrettable misunderstandings.

Bishop Dupanloup strove to dissipate these misunderstandings by hurriedly drawing up and issuing (January 25, 1865), under the title of *La Convention du 15 septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 decembre 1864,* a commentary on the two papal documents.[12] Basing himself on the distinction, thenceforth admitted

[8] Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques,* p. 569.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 573.

[10] Father de Broglié's phrase, quoted by Baudrillart in the *Correspondant,* March 25, 1902. Cf. *Revue pratique d'apologetique,* November 15, 1907.

[11] D'Hulst, *Le droit chrétien et le droit moderne,* p. 14. Cf. Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst,* II, 8.

[12] This commentary will be found in the *Nouvelles Œuvres choisies* of Dupanloup, Vol. IV. See Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup,* II, 456, for interesting details of the composition, publication, and extraordinary diffusion of that work.

by theologians, between the thesis and the hypothesis, he showed that the encyclical gave the ideal of a completely Christian society, but that it left the faithful free to act in conformity with the conditions of the presently existing political society.[13] Further, putting each proposition of the Syllabus in its context, he showed that the sense that should be attached to it was always just and reasonable.

The papers unfriendly to the Church, confused by these explanations, declared that the Bishop of Orléans had "transfigured" the encyclical. But the Pope himself cut short this subterfuge by writing (February 4, 1865) to Bishop Dupanloup: "You have reproved these errors in the sense in which we ourselves have reproved them." The eloquent prelate was congratulated on his work by 630 bishops.[14]

The Catholics who had pointed out the suspect doctrines in the addresses delivered at the Malines congresses, in the articles published in the *Correspondant* and in the *Ami de la religion,*[15] did not conceal their joy at seeing the condemnation, by the same document, both of freethought and of Catholic liberalism.[16] Among the latter were to be numbered some who gave the papal documents forced interpretations, giving to these pronouncements a character they did not have in the thought of the Holy Father. A theologian not suspected of liberal tendencies, Father Freppel, so held in a letter written shortly before the Vatican Council.[17] If the future bishop of Angers, in writing

[13] The fathers of the Society of Jesus, editors of the *Civiltà cattolica*, had written: "By way of hypotheses, the modern liberties can be legitimate, and Catholics can love them and defend them" (*Civiltà cattolica*, October 17, 1868).

[14] Lagrange, *op. cit.*, II, 465, 473 f.

[15] Since November, 1855, the direction of the paper had passed into the hands of a young priest, Father Sisson, who was attached to the editorial staff in 1854 on Bishop Dupanloup's advice. The influence of the Bishop of Orléans was there predominant. *Dict. d'histoire et de géographie ecclésistique*, s.v. "Ami de la religion," II, 1229.

[16] Pie, *Œuvres*, V, 436; E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot*, III, 497.

[17] For this letter, see Lecanuet, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République*, I, 326; Nicol, *Mgr Bécel*, p. 146.

thus, had in mind some polemical work written after the appearance of the Syllabus, he was undoubtedly thinking of the pamphlet written by Veuillot, under the title, *L'illusion libérale.* This little work, according to Eugène Veuillot, had the purpose, "not so much to refute the enemy as to take to task the liberal Catholics." The celebrated Catholic writer thought thus to fill in a regrettable gap in the work of the Bishop of Orléans. Eugène Veuillot considered the beginning of his refutation of liberalism absolute and severe.[18] Said Louis Veuillot: "The liberal Catholic is neither Catholic nor liberal. 'Sectarian' is his true name." Moreover, the whole pamphlet kept this absolute and severe tone. The editors of the *Correspondant* and of the *Ami de la religion,* the speakers at the Maline congresses, had spoken of the possible adaptations of the Church with modern institutions. Veuillot replied: "The rock (on which the Church rests) is not a rolling stone, inconstant. It has its place, its matter, its form. All is immoveable." [19] Mention was made of the limits which the nature of things put to the power of the pope and of the Church, by quoting words of Bossuet and St. Bernard [20] in this sense. "Let us face the trickery of words. We owe obedience to the Church in the limits she has herself set. . . . If this obedience is theocracy, those who are afraid of it have not enough fear of something else." The writers that Veuillot wished to refute had found fault with the inopportune use of compulsion against the unbelievers, holding that such an attitude was a perpetuation of pagan despotism. Veuillot replied: "The Christians have taken the arms of the pagan society to transform them, not to destroy them. . . . As right by itself is a force, so force by itself can be a right." The liberal Catholics had insisted on the necessary union of the body of the Church, taken as a whole, with its head, the pope. Veuillot

[18] E. Veuillot, *op. cit.,* III, 500, 416, 501.

[19] Louis Veuillot, *L'illusion libérale,* pp. 23, 34.

[20] Bossuet, "Sermon sur l'unité de l'Eglise," *Œuvres,* XV, 532–35; St. Bernard, *De consideratione,* Bk III, chap. 4, no. 17; *epist.* 238, nos. 2, 6; *epist.* 255, no. 2. St. Bernard, *Opera* (Gaume ed.), Vol. I, Part I, cols. 1050, 1051, 500, 502, 538.

admitted their separation, at least as a realizable hypothesis. "I propose a hypothesis. I admit that we all follow the current. I say all, except the pope, for the hypothesis cannot go that far. What would be its result? A power would at least exist on the earth." [21]

After quoting these lines and other parallel ones, the *Siècle* turned to Bishop Dupanloup and said: "You have for allies some organs doubtless less clever than Your Grandeur, but they have at least the merit of a rude frankness." Pius IX did not send a letter of approval to the author of the *Illusion libérale.* Probably he thought the occasion was not opportune to consecrate, by his supreme authority, affirmations which passed beyond those of his encyclical and which at least in their form, of an intentional ardor, could not be presented as expressing the Catholic doctrine; but he refused to impose censures on some propositions that two bishops denounced to him as inexact in the pamphlet. At bottom, he appeared satisfied that his encyclical was shown as condemning at the same time free thought rationalism and liberal Catholicism.[22]

Social and Political Doctrine

Some Catholic places outside of any controversy viewed the papal documents under a different aspect. These places considered them rather in their positive part than in their negative part. Therein they saw the principles of a social and a political doctrine that could open to the children of the Church a most fertile field of action. In this number was the courageous Catholic whom we saw, in 1861, make a noble protest in the Chamber of Deputies against the anti-Roman policy of the imperial government, Emile Keller.[23] In a volume entitled *L'encyclique du 8 décembre 1864 et les principes de 1789, ou l'Etat et l'Eglise*

[21] *L'illusion libérale,* pp. 45, 68 f., 74.
[22] Eugène Veuillot, *op. cit.,* III, 503.
[23] E. Keller, *L'encyclique du 8 décembre,* pp. 268–90.

et la Liberté, he noted that the Pope, in so precisely signaling the shoals of communism on one hand and the liberal political economy on the other, and in showing that the social question was first of all a moral problem, resting on respect for the truth, opened to speculation and to Catholic action a wide and safe field. A. de Mun relates that, in reading and contemplating the chapter of that work which had for its title, "Social truth, principle of social liberty," [24] he had the first intuition of the social apostolate to which he was going to devote his life. He wrote later: "I am asked what relation exists between the Circles of Workers and the Syllabus. It is the same relation as between the product and the principle, between the effect and the cause, between the child and the mother." [25]

From the more strictly political viewpoint, was it not to indicate to the world a safe way, equally removed from despotism and from anarchy, to remind it that right does not consist in the material fact, that other forces exist besides those that reside in matter, that the state is not the origin of all rights, that the violation of an oath is never lawful, even when it is inspired by love of country, that the authority is something other than the sum of numbers, and that the doctrine of the Church is not opposed to the well being and the interests of human society? Such was the sense of propositions 58, 49, 60, 39, 40, and 64 of the Syllabus.[26]

[24] A. de Mun, *Ma vocation sociale,* p. 13.

[25] *Association catholique,* I, 246. Cf. D'Hulst, *Le droit chrétien et le droit moderne,* p. 7.

[26] The theologians have questioned what is the doctrinal authority of the Syllabus. Some, considering that the document is not signed by the pope, have gone so far as to deny it the character of an act of the Holy See. This opinion should be set aside. Cardinal Antonelli sent the Syllabus to the bishops in the name of the Pope. Pius IX and his successors have always regarded the Syllabus as an act of the Holy See. Leo XIII in particular considered it such, when, in his encyclical *Immortale Dei,* he cites propositions 19, 34, 40, and 79. (See Boudinhon, in the *Revue catholique des Eglises,* March, 1905.) But is the Syllabus an act *ex cathedra?* The opinion which maintains the affirmative rests: 1. on the fact that this catalogue of errors makes one body with the encyclical *Quanta cura,* which, being addressed to the

Catholic world to condemn errors, has the character of an *ex cathedra* act; 2. on the fact that the whole Church has accepted the doctrinal authority of the Syllabus, either as it has regarded it as making one body with the encyclical, or as it has regarded it as an act of the ordinary magisterium of the pope. Among those who call in question the *ex cathedra* character of the Syllabus, we may cite: Father Newman of the Oratory who, having written (May 12, 1879) in a public letter to the Duke of Norfolk: "The Syllabus does not have dogmatic force," was made a cardinal by Leo XIII shortly afterward; Bishop Fessler of St. Hippolytus in Austria and secretary general of the Vatican Council, who presented the same thesis as probable in his book *The True and False Infallibility of the Popes* (Eng. trans. by Father Ambrose St. John, 1875); and the learned canonist De Angelis, professor in the Apollinare college. The following is the chief argument of these authors: For a collection, even one made on orders of the pope, to have a special authority as a collection, it is not enough that the collection was made by order of the pope or accepted as authentic by the Christian people; according to the doctrine accepted by all canonists, it is necessary that the pope made it his own, either by his signature or by his seal or by a formal declaration. Thus the decretals collected, on orders of the pope, by St. Raymond de Pennafort, have a proper authority only by the Constitution *Rex pacificus* of Gregory IX, who expressly approved the collection; on the contrary, Book VII of the decretals, although drawn up by order of the pope, has not a proper authority. The same is true of the Decretum of Gratian, which has been unanimously accepted as the official text in the schools, but which no pope has made his own by an express act. Such, they say, is the case of the Syllabus. It was indeed drawn up and sent by order of the pope, like Book VII of the decretals; it was received and accepted by the Church, like the Decretum of Gratian; but, not having been signed or sealed or approved expressly as his own act by Pius IX, it cannot have proper authority. The propositions composing it have precisely the authority of the documents from which they are taken, as they have precisely the meaning given them by the context of those documents. Apropos of the Syllabus, Father Choupin quotes the words said to have been spoken by Pius X in a private audience granted to Mr. Charles A. Briggs. The following are the words of Mr. Briggs: "The Holy Father himself assured me that it (the Syllabus of Pius IX) did not come under the category of infallibility." (C. Briggs, *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*, p. 9.) Cf. L. Choupin, *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*, p. 122. Basically the controversy we have been speaking of has less practical importance than at first view it would seem to have; for those who defend the *ex cathedra* character of the Syllabus concede that each proposition must be taken in the sense given by the source from which it is taken; and those who refuse to acknowledge in the Syllabus the same authority as in the encyclical, are obliged to admit that this latter document contains all the principles of the assertions given by the Syllabus. Various commentaries of the Syllabus have been published. We are not aware of any more reliable than the simple *Recueil des allocutions consistoriales, encycliques, et autres lettres apostoliques des souverains pontifes cités dans l'encyclique et le Syllabus du 8 décembre 1864*. This volume contains the Latin text and the French translation of the encyclical, of the Syllabus, and of all the other documents.

CHAPTER XXXIII

The Roman Question

LIKE the French government, the Italian government at first forbade the publication of the encyclical and of the Syllabus. Soon it revoked this decision. On February 8, 1865, it gave the exequatur to the two documents. Was it returning to a more conciliatory policy? By no means. By the convention of September 15, the court of Turin had at hand an act that would open the way to all its ambitions; it could, for the moment, refrain from any manifestation against the authority of the Holy See. Said General La Marmora, the head of the cabinet: "We can advance slowly; but we must never retreat." [1] The goal of this advance was known: it was Rome. Once Rome should become the capital of the kingdom of Italy, that achievement would be the end of the papal temporal power. As Visconti-Venosta, the minister of foreign affairs said: "Deprived of foreign bayonets, the temporal power cannot last long." The convention granted two years to the French government to withdraw its troops from Rome. During these two years the nations made several supreme efforts at a peaceful solution of the "Roman question." Austria and Spain again took up the plan of a collective guaranty to maintain the papal domain. But Napoleon did not join in these views; he kept hoping to arrive at a solution by a double effort: one, to persuade the Holy See to yield some territorial concessions; the other, to keep the Italian government from proceeding to a violent aggression.

Neither of these attempts came to anything. Austria, whatever her sympathies for the papacy, hesitated to push too far

[1] *Parlamento italiano*, pp. 3728, 3790.

her intervention in Italy, for which she felt an inveterate hostility. Spain was too weak to exercise a preponderant initiative; Emperor Napoleon, in his attempts, was met with a double *Non possumus:* that of the Pope, who, in answer to all the proposals, replied that he was merely the depositary of an authority that he had sworn to defend even to death; and that of Victor Emmanuel, who could neither dispense with the support of the followers of Mazzini and Garibaldi nor make them give up their aggressive claims.

Pius IX, moreover, thereafter participated less and less in the diplomatic negotiations. A fatherly letter which he wrote to Victor Emmanuel on the subject of the religious questions, obtained the return to their dioceses of thirty bishops who had been removed from them, but he made no headway at all in an agreement on the fundamental questions. This failure disabused the Pope of the usefulness of any fresh attempt at discussions. What had he obtained in all the advances heretofore made to the peoples and the princes? To declare his rights and to expect only from God the defense of his prerogatives: Such now seemed to be his whole policy. At the end of the summer of 1865 he removed Bishop Mérode from his office of minister of the armies, and did not put anyone in his place. For the diplomatic negotiations he referred the problems more and more to Cardinal Antonelli, who always loftily proclaimed the principles of his master, without always exactly realizing the Pope's thought.

Pius IX, whose smiling liveliness and amiable spontaneity were in strong contrast with the cold tenacity and calculated attitudes of his Secretary of State, continued to preserve, in spite of age and misfortune, that gracious open-heartedness, that charming good nature, and those other traits which had won him so much popularity at the outset of his reign. "Lively, gentle, full of retorts, he always had on his lips words that characterize the speaker, and precise remarks that put things

in their proper light." [2] "This probably is the last time," he declared (January 1, 1866) to the officers commanding the body of French troops, "that I shall bless you. After your departure the enemies of the Church will perhaps come to Rome." This feeling was not the sadness of discouragement. He said to the ambassador of Spain: "I do not wish to die without having done all I can to fulfill my conscientious duty." [3] Moreover, he did not believe that this conscientious duty consisted in negotiating with the powers that he distrusted, but in repeatedly asserting his rights. Louis Veuillot expressed the Pontiff's thought when he wrote: "Pius IX disdained the underhanded scheming of politics. His mission was not to bring about the triumph of the truth, but to confess that truth until death. To all suggestions, he replied: No. To all threats: Go ahead, do it." [4]

Attitude of Various Governments

In Italy the publication (November, 1865) of the martyrology of the Italian episcopate in the *Unità cattolica* had just made known to the public the extent of the sufferings of the Church, when King Victor Emmanuel forecast fresh sufferings in announcing new legal projects on the separation of Church and state and on the supression of the religious corporations. Six months later (May 17, 1866) a law (the Crispi law, so called from the name of the deputy who introduced it) punished with fine and imprisonment anyone who, during the war against Austria, would be suspected of wishing to restore the old order of things or in any way harm the unity of Italy. The vague terms of this law recalled those of the worst revolutionary laws. The defeat of the Italians (June 24, 1866) at Custozza did not stop the series of scheming measures of persecution. On July 8

[2] Louis Veuillot, *Pie IX*,
[3] La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire*, V, 249, 252 f.
[4] Louis Veuillot, *Le parfum de Rome*, II, 434 f.

of that same year the *Gazette officielle* of the kingdom of Italy published a decree giving the force of law to the project, already approved by the Chamber, which enacted the abolition of all the religious bodies and the "conversion" of the property of the clergy. Half a year later a convention was signed by the representatives of Italy and of France for regulating the papal debt.[5] A few days later this agreement was officially promulgated, and the revolutionary committee of Rome, in a proclamation, said: "The day of December 14, 1866, opens a new era, an era which, at the side of the religious minister, set free from the impure contact of an abhorred despotism, will see Rome free and flourishing." The 29th of that same month, Mazzini exclaimed: "Rome is the tomb of the two great religions that formerly gave life to the world, and Rome is the sanctuary of a third religion destined to give life to the world of the future." [6]

These manifestations were owing not merely to the convention of December 7, but also to the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, which took place on December 11. Emperor Napoleon had indeed tried to palliate the impression produced by this measure; he constituted, for the service of the Pope, a legion raised in France, embodied in the French cadres, and intended to be enrolled under the papal flag. This legion was organized at Antibes: whence the name legion of Antibes, which it retained. But the very way the Antibes legion was organized indicated the hesitation and lack of firmness on the part of the Emperor.[7]

The Spanish government recognized the new kingdom of Italy. This it did (December 14, 1865) in spite of the opposition of the clergy. However, it protested its attachment to the

[5] For the preceding items of this paragraph, see Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques*, pp. 602, 606, 640, 644, 675.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 677, 688.

[7] The Emperor wrote: "The legion must be increased (at first it counted a thousand men); but it should be augmented gradually and quietly." See Maréchal Randon, *Mémoires*, II, 118, 125; Rastoul, *Vie du maréchal Randon*, p. 278.

Holy Father and to his temporal sovereignty; but it declared its approval of the convention of September 15 and thus showed a certain connivance with the governments of France and Italy on the Roman question.

In Germany the preponderant position given to Protestant Prussia by the treaty of Prague (August 23, 1866) created a permanent danger. The future would reveal the importance of this situation, which did not escape the attention of Pius IX. Austria, crushed at Sadowa in the preceding July, was thenceforth eliminated from the Germanic confederation and was despoiled of Venetia to the profit of Italy. The house of the Hohenzollerns would now intend to make the law in Germany. The Prussia of Bismarck, with its formidable military organization, would become a threat for all Europe. And this growth of a Lutheran power took place at the very time when Italy saw the increase of its territorial extent and its hostility toward the papacy, and when France, the sole official protector of the temporal power, saw herself lessened in the face of Europe by the eclipsed, almost servile, part she had played in the recent war.

Furthermore, Catholic Austria forgot her old traditions and, in many circumstances, held to the shabby policy of Joseph II. After Sadowa the Vienna municipal council recovered its energy only to prevent the Jesuits, expelled from Venetia, from finding refuge in the Austrian capital.

In Russia two imperial ukases (November 4, 1866, and January 5, 1867) annihilated all the hopes that had been entertained for an improvement of the religious situation. The first ukase decided that for the future "the affairs of the Roman religion would return to the jurisdiction of the imperial administrations"; the second ukase declared the definitive and complete absorption of the kingdom of Poland in the Russian Empire.

On November 15, 1865, a big meeting at London launched the idea of the union of the Anglican Church with the Russian Church; on February 4, 1866, Prince Orlof, Russian minister in Belgium, declared that he favored such a plan. Three months

later another meeting was held to consider the means for suppressing, in public worship, whatever was not in conformity with the principles of the Reformation. Even the Parliament judged it ought to treat rigorously against the rites thought too much marked with Catholicism and, with this view in mind, denounced the practices of the ritualists.[8]

Communism

A more general and radical danger was threatening civilized Europe. This danger attacked the supernatural principles of which the Catholic Church is the guardian and also the natural principles without which no free and prosperous nation can exist.

After the sentimental socialism of Saint-Simon and the political socialism of Louis Blanc, revolutionary communism was formulated with Karl Marx and Lassalle. Its aim was to group the proletarians of all countries for the purpose of establishing the collectivity of the instruments of labor. The Revolution of 1789 had dispossessed the nobles; the time now came to dispossess the middle class. For this undertaking the workers would not seek any support from outside. "The emancipation of the working class," they said, "must be won by the working class itself." [9] "What we wish to overthrow," declared one of their leaders, "is not merely the tyrant, but tyranny. We wish no more government, for governments crush us with taxes; we wish no more religion, for religion stifles the minds." [10] "Neither God nor master": such might be the motto of the new socialist school.[11]

[8] For these events in Austria, Russia, and England, see Chantrel, *Annales,* 486–673.

[9] Declaration of the Geneva Congress in 1866. C. Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine,* p. 692.

[10] Dupont, president of the Brussels Congress in 1868. Cf. La Gorce, *Histoire du second empire,* V, 433.

[11] On the doctrines of this school and its relations with Freemasonry, see Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société,* II, 545, 555.

Communism was organized by the International Association of the Workers, whose first idea was enunciated in 1862 at the World Exposition of London; it held its first congress at Geneva in 1866.[12] At the closing banquet of this congress, they acclaimed Garibaldi.[13] At a meeting held in 1864, Mazzini had tried to place the Association in the service of his cause.[14] He had in mind a vaster field of action than the one proposed by Karl Marx.[15]

We may well suppose that attacks were not wanting against a theory so radically subversive. But with Lassalle and Marx, they had to deal with formidable foes. Lassalle, a brilliant writer, had, in his principal work on capital and labor, caustically refuted the contentions of the liberal economy. Marx, in his heavy but powerful work, *Das Kapital,* in a scientific way and with close reasoning, set aside a priori any moral or religious argument. He took his stand on the single ground of tangible and visible facts, positive facts duly verified. On these data he pretended to base his doctrine as a necessary deduction, therefore legitimate, of the structure of society and of the essential laws of the world.

Frederick Le Play

But, in 1864, appeared a work which rested solely on the study of facts and general laws scientifically observed. This work concluded to the restoration of society on the traditional foundations of respect for religion, of the family, and of property. This study had for its title, *La réforme sociale en France,*

[12] See E. Lamy, *Le Second Empire et les ouvriers.*

[13] *Annales du congrès de Genève.*

[14] See Seignobos, *op. cit.,* p. 692.

[15] Later on, along with the purely Marxist movement, called also the "integral, revolutionary, or libertarian" movement, we shall see, in the International, take shape the "possibilist" movement, sometimes called "evolutive, political, or moderate" movement. But the aim will always be the same: the total overthrow of religion and society.

déduite de l'observation des peuples Européens. Its author was Frederick Le Play, a mining engineer, member of the Council of State, former commissioner general of the Paris universal Exposition in 1855. The elements of his work he had gathered in the course of numerous journeys in England, Belgium, the Scandinavian states, Germany, Russia, Turkey, Italy, Spain, and central Asia. His method consisted in rejecting a priori, by a methodical doubt like that of Descartes, all theoretical systems of the social schools and in observing impartially the conditions in which nations were living, the families, the free and prosperous societies.[16]

Giving special attention to the working classes, whose condition of living had engaged his concern from childhood,[17] in 1855 he published, under the title *Les ouvriers européens,* monographs about workers' families observed in the most varied surroundings. Soon after this, he founded the *Société d'économie sociale,* which was called upon to continue his immense task. He himself would express the philosophical synthesis of his works by the publication of several writings, besides others the following: the *Paix sociale* (1871), the *Réforme en Europe* (1876), the *Question sociale* (1879), and the *Constitution essentielle de l'humanité* (1881). But in its fundamental elements his doctrine was already expounded in the *Réforme sociale.* The appearance of this work drew the attention of reflecting minds. Sainte-Beuve hailed in Frederick Le Play a new Bonald, progressive and scientific. Charles Montalembert wrote: "Without hesitation I say that Le Play has turned out the most courageous and original book, and in all respects, the strongest of this century." [18] Le Play was certainly courageous, not only in fear-

[16] See Laveleye, *Le Socialisme contemporain;* Winterer, *Le socialisme international.*

[17] Jules Lacointa, "F. Le Play," in the *Correspondant,* April 25, 1882, CXXVII, 215.

[18] Quoted by E. Demolins, "F. Le Play," in the *Correspondant,* December 10, 1879, CXVII, 870.

lessly placing himself on the ground of scientific observation, chosen by the new theorists of socialism, but also in denouncing, in the name of that method, the principles most widely admitted since the Revolution of 1789, the ideas spread by Rousseau under the ancient regime, the "false dogmas," as he called them, of "original perfection," "providential equality," and "the perpetual right of revolt," in proclaiming the need of respect for the family, for the social, political, and religious authorities, in a word, of the "eternal Decalogue." [19]

Paris Exposition

In 1867, when Emperor Napoleon conceived the idea of holding a universal Exposition at Paris, he entrusted the organization of it to Frederick Le Play. The author of the *Réforme sociale* profited by the task entrusted to him to introduce his most cherished ideas into this work. Thanks to him, the universal Exposition of 1867, which assembled at Paris the majority of the products of human activity and drew there most of the sovereigns, was not only the expression of the social state of the world in the middle of the nineteenth century; it also contributed to the progress of the soundest social economy by means of two institutions: the organization of a group comprising "the objects destined for the material and moral improvement of the workers," and the creation of an "order of rewards in favor of persons and institutions assuring the welfare and good harmony of those who collaborated in the same labors." [20]

Of course, in that immense exhibition of the products of the entire world and in that coming and going of peoples of all na-

[19] On F. Le Play, see: C. de Ribbe, *Le Play d'après sa correspondance;* Paul Ribot, *Exposé critique des doctrines de M. Le Play;* Delaire, "Le Play et la science sociale," in the *Nouvelle Revue,* February 15, 1896; H. Ramière, *"L'école de la réforme sociale,"* in the *Etudes* of May and June, 1873; E. de Curzon, *Frédéric Le Play, sa méthode, sa doctrine, son oeuvre.*

[20] On the Exposition of 1867, see La Gorce, *op. cit.,* V, 149, 241.

tions, the faults of modern society appeared. If the conversations that might have taken place among the sovereigns of Europe, gathered in the capital of France, served to avoid certain conflicts, more than one "dark spot," as Napoleon III said, clouded the horizon.[21] Noting that the peoples were greatly absorbed by the cares of material prosperity, Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi might well think that the chivalrous spirit of the Crusades was dead, and that they could with impunity pass over the frontiers of the Domain of St. Peter. Bismarck, according to report, upon leaving a comic opera [22] in which the small details of military discipline were held up to ridicule, thought he saw in this an uncurable decline of France and perhaps of all the nations of Europe to the advantage of Germany. Both judged their age too superficially. The invaders of the papal territory would reach the Eternal City only by passing over the bodies of new Crusaders, who had come from all points of the globe for the defense of the pope; and the day when Prussia, confident in the invincibility of her military organization, would attempt to impose her hegemony on the world, the entire world, half a century later, would rise up against her for the defense of true civilization. The symbol of the real danger then threatening the world was to be seen in that colossal piece of artillery which came from the Krupp works and which by its size so keenly attracted the looks of the curious spectators. Reflecting minds saw in it, and rightly so, the insolent defiance of a people who, by restoring the pagan cult of might, were preparing nothing less than a revival of ancient barbarism.

Project of an Ecumenical Council

The sight of the great industrial, scientific, and artistic manifestations occasioned by the Paris Exposition suggested to the Catholics the idea of another meeting, more solemn and

[21] *Ibid.*, V, 238.

[22] "La grande-duchesse de Gerolstein."

more important, to which the representatives of the whole world would be summoned, to consider, not mankind's material interests, but its eternal destinies. On December 6, 1864, two days before publishing the encyclical *Quanta cura,* Pius IX had made known, before some members of the Sacred College, his intention to convoke an ecumenical council. Since the Council of Trent, that is, for three centuries, the Church had not held such an assembly. Never had so long an interval passed between two general councils.

Early in March, 1865, a commission of five cardinals was appointed to discuss certain preliminary questions. Toward the end of that month thirty-five bishops of the Latin rite had been invited to send to the commission of cardinals a summary of the points of dogma and discipline which they wished to have treated in the assembly. At the beginning of the next year, a similar invitation was addressed to the bishops of the Oriental rite. Both groups replied to the request.[23]

The results of these inquiries were not communicated to the public. But Catholics could not be indifferent to this great undertaking. Pope Paul III had written, when convoking the Council of Trent, that "in the great perils of Christianity, no better remedy could be found than an ecumenical council." [24] In the fourth century, at the height of the Arian crisis, the Council of Nicaea had proclaimed the absolute equality of the three divine Persons and the absolute divinity of Christ. In the sixteenth century, in the midst of the Protestant revolt, the Council of Trent had defined the conditions of man's justification by divine grace. In the nineteenth century, in the face of the revolutionary error, no less invading and no less to be dreaded than the Protestant heresy, people felt that the episcopate was going to take up the notion of the authority in the

[23] On these preliminaries of the council, see T. Granderath, *Histoire du concile du Vatican* (French trans.).

[24] Paul III, in his bull *Initio nostri.*

Church and in the person of the pope. On June 3, 1867, the *Civiltà cattolica* took the initiative of a movement in favor of the papal infallibility, proposing to the Catholics a vow to the public profession and defense of that belief.

However, the revolution, justifying by its acts the alarms of the Catholics, turned its most violent attacks against the pope. In the course of June, 1867, the "insurrectional committee" of Rome circulated the following proclamation: "Romans, the revolution which Italy will accomplish cannot have its full development except at Rome; it can triumph only on the Capitol." On June 21, Marshal Niel complained that a certain number of soldiers of the Roman legion, "shamefully deserting the pontifical flag which they had freely chosen, were abandoning their leaders and were following wretched foreign recruiters." The big feasts celebrated on June 29, 1867, at Rome on the occasion of the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, the ovations that the Pontiff received that day, did but exasperate the hatred of the enemies of the papacy. On July 19, Garibaldi, haranguing the crowd at Pistoia, exclaimed: "Rome ought to be ours." [25] A week later the French government, in the *Moniteur,* declared that it was turning over to the government of Florence [26] the care of protecting the papal frontier. This declaration was a fresh matter of anxiety for the Catholics. On the 31st, the Bishop of Orléans uttered a cry of alarm. "I am uneasy," he declared; "I scarcely believe in Italian good faith. Can I forget Garibaldi's expedition in Sicily, the disavowals and the shamming of Cavour?" The third Malines congress at the close of its deliberations (September 12) declared that it regarded the occupation of the States of the Church, not only as a sacrilegious crime, but also as a most serious prejudice against right, liberty, and the welfare of all

[25] Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 81, 560, 564, 566, 602.

[26] In the convention of September 15 and by virtue of an article of that convention, the capital of Italy had been fixed at Florence.

Christianity. The week before, the conspirator Mazzini had refused to be present at a so-called peace congress held at Geneva by several of his freethinking friends, gathered about Garibaldi, because, as he said, he could not renounce the war against the Church and the papacy.

Invasion of the Papal States

On October 8, the journal *Italia,* the organ of minister Rattazzi, declared that "the solution of the Roman question had become a necessity," that "the moment had arrived when, at all risks and perils, the Gordian knot must be cut." On October 19, Garibaldi, taking advantage of a ministerial crisis, left the island of Caprera, which had been assigned to him as a place of residence, and landed on the continent. Two days later, from Florence, he issued a proclamation full of violent declarations.[27] A few days after this date, he passed beyond the cordon of Piedmont troops placed on the frontier, without meeting any resistance, and at several points he had the States of the Church invaded by his soldiers. His tactic was to entice the pontifical army outside the city of Rome, which would thus be left without defenders, and there promptly to stir up a revolution. In fact, on the night of October 22, in different quarters of the city at the same time, bands of insurgents attacked the posts and the barracks, attempting to penetrate to the Capitol and there sound the alarm bell. But everywhere the papal soldiers remained in Rome; zouaves, carbineers, and gendarmes, successfully repulsed the rioters.

However, the rumor spread that Garibaldi was advancing toward Rome. In fact, the peril was grave. Happily, the heroic resistance which 300 legionaries opposed to the condottiere at Monte Rotondo hindered his advance, and caused a disconcert-

[27] Chantrel, *Annales,* pp. 607, 636, 638, 660, 679.

ing disturbance in his army. He delayed almost two days to deliberate and left the French forces time to reach Rome ahead of him.

France had just decided to intervene. The first article of the September convention, specifying that Italy promised to prevent, even by force, any violation of the papal territory, had it not been openly violated? On October 30, the papal soldiers posted on the heights of the Janiculum heard a sound of bugles and drums. This signaled the arrival of the French vanguard. This was soon followed by two divisions, commanded by General Failly.

General Kanzler, commander-in-chief of the pontifical troops, in a conference with Failly, won the acceptance of his stragetic plan, as daring as it was prudent: to meet the Garibaldian bands and overwhelm them promptly. This scheme was the surest means of localizing the strife, of preventing a conflict in which four armies, prompted by different and ill-defined views, might find themselves oddly implicated: the army of Garibaldi, that of Victor Emmanuel, that of Napoleon III, and that of Pius IX. The papal army, backed by a part of the French army, set out toward the revolutionary troops, which they encountered on November 3, camped in a well-chosen position on elevated land defended by several irregularities in the land formation. There two old castles, that of Mentana and that of Monte Rotondo, played the part of veritable fortresses.

The zouaves claimed the honor of being the first to march to the assault, and seized the first hills, in a dash in which Lieutenant Colonel Charette distinguished himself. The vigorous intervention of the French troops completed the rout of Garibaldi's forces, who left on the field of battle a thousand men, wounded or slain, and 1,500 prisoners besides. Those who escaped were seized at the frontier and were disarmed. The revolutionary army no longer existed.

Franco-Italian Conflict

The battle of Mentana had saved Rome; but it revived the conflict between Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel. In reply to General Failly's words, "Our chassepots [28] did wonders," the King of Italy said: "Those chassepots have crushed my royal heart." When (December 5) the French minister Rouher, wishing to confirm the alliance of his government with the Catholics, said: "Never will Italy take possession of Rome; this France will never tolerate," Victor Emmanuel murmured: "We will make him see his never."

On January 1, 1868, Pius IX blessed France, its Emperor, and its army, which he thanked for having come with such eagerness to the succor of the papacy. But Italy called on France to evacuate Rome by the French troops within two months.[29] By his not fearing to alienate King Victor Emmanuel, for sustaining the Pope and faithfulness to treaties, the Emperor of the French deserved the gratitude of the Catholics. But by entering into conflict with Italy after helping her to become a formidable power, he was preparing difficulties that only an absolute devotion to the Holy See, based on a deep Catholic faith, would enable him to surmount. However, the hesitant and wavering soul of him who then represented "the eldest daughter of the Church" did not possess such a sentiment.

Austria

The Emperor of Austria, apostolic king of Hungary,[30] did not give any better satisfaction to the Holy Father. In the course of 1867 and 1868, the Chamber of Deputies and the Chamber of Lords voted, on the proposal of the Austrian government, a series of so-called confessional laws, which annulled,

[28] A name given to recently adopted guns, so called from the name of the inventor.
[29] Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 728, 741.
[30] On June 8, 1867, Emperor Francis Joseph had been crowned king of Hungary.

without explicit mention, the main clauses of the concordat of 1855. One of these laws instituted civil marriage; another placed both public and private education under the direction of the state. Another regulated the relations between the members of the different religious denominations and the right of a person to change his religion. In vain, precisely when these laws had been presented (September 28, 1867) to the Chambers, the Austrian bishops protested against them by a letter addressed to the Emperor. After noting that these laws were intended to rule a Catholic nation, the bishops ended their letter by these grave words: "The more loudly they proclaim that the will of the people is the sole source of law, the less do they respect the wishes and convictions of the great majority. . . . Sire, the question is not only about the Catholic Church, but also of Christianity. . . . The undersigned bishops, your faithful subjects, are deeply convinced that, in taking up the defense of the rights of the Church, they are fighting for God, for your throne, and for your people." The Austrian Emperor ignored the appeal. The laws contrary to the concordat were promulgated on May 25, 1868. In reporting the debates, which began about two months before, the *Univers* said: "Liberalism goes further in Austria than in the other states of Europe." On December 16 the prime minister of the court of Vienna, Baron von Beust, wrote to the Austrian ambassador at Rome: "We are not yielding to antireligious tendencies. We are simply stating the need of putting the relations of the Church and the state in harmony with the new institutions with which Austria is endowed." [31]

Repressions in Other Countries

Catholic Spain, governed by Marshal Serrano, president of the provisional government, "suppressed (October 18, 1868)

[31] Chantrel, *Annales*, pp. 460–66, 476, 713.

all the monasteries, convents, and other houses of religious and declared their possessions the property of the state." In Switzerland the Council of State at Geneva refused Mermillod his title of bishop on the pretext that it had been conferred directly by the Pope without the consent of the state.[32] The Irish clergy complained more bitterly than ever of the painful situation inflicted on Catholic Ireland by the English government.[33] In Russia, the amnesty ukase (May 17–29) excluded the clergy from this general measure. Were these measures of defiance by the governments toward the Church determined, at least in part, by an influence of the anti-Christian sects? The fact is that the Freemasonry and the International Society of Workers bestirred themselves feverishly. Garibaldi wrote to the Supreme Council of Palermo that haste was required to make "a Masonic Rome," that "the Masonic unity would carry with it the unity of Italy." And the International proposed to make "a revolution against the whole social order." [34]

Undoubtedly the defenders of Catholicism became more ardent than ever. In Germany the *Stimmen an Maria Laach,* with extreme vivacity, attacked the modern liberties; and a speaker at the congress of Trier even proclaimed that the Syllabus "was the greatest act of the century, perhaps of all the centuries." [35] In France, the *Univers,* appearing again on April 16, 1867, declared, in its program, by the pen of Louis Veuillot, that it recognized "no other social architect but the Vicar of Jesus Christ," and for its motto took these words, attributed to a Father of the Church: "Christ is the solution of all the difficulties." "We wish," said Veuillot, "to engage in discussing the imperishable exactness of this inspired word." [36]

[32] *Ibid.,* pp. 826 f. Cf. p. 457.

[33] For the statement of the grievances of the Irish Catholics, in a declaration of the clergy (December 23, 1867), see *ibid.,* pp. 721, 726.

[34] *Ibid.,* pp. 558 f., 566, 838.

[35] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme,* IV, 268.

[36] Chantrel, *Annales,* p. 541.

But at the opposite extreme, in Germany, Döllinger proposed to the Protestants a basis of understanding in which no question of the temporal sovereignty of the pope entered; he even held that the vexations from which the pontiff suffered were of a nature to enlighten him.[37] In France, Father Hyacinthe, Notre Dame preacher, wrote to a democratic paper that he separated his cause "from that of certain Catholics who regretted the Inquisition." [38]

So many agitations and controversies made everyone desire the prompt meeting of a universal council, whose authority, imposed on the entire Church, would render it calmer and stronger to fight its enemies effectively. Moreover, the Catholic world joyfully welcomed the bull *Aeterni Patris,* by which (June 29, 1868) Pope Pius IX convoked the bishops of the whole world to assemble in council at the Vatican on December 8, 1869.[39]

[37] "Vexatio dabit intellectum," he wrote to Gladstone. Friedrich, *Döllinger,* III, 269.

[38] Chantrel, *Annales,* p. 840.

[39] *Ibid.,* pp. 804, 806.

CHAPTER XXXIV

Convocation of the Vatican Council

GRAVE perils threatened the papacy and the Church. These perils came from the vague hostility of the powers, the plots of the anti-Christian sects, and the lively controversies among Catholics themselves. None of these escaped the notice of the Sovereign Pontiff. Said Pius IX: "A council ordinarily has three periods: that of the devil, that of men, and that of God." At the time the period was that of the devil; that of men was soon to arrive; that of God would triumph at last, and it was already in preparation.[1]

Anti-Catholic Movement

The Roman Pontiffs, when condemning the revolutionary secret societies, often considered them the works of the spirit of evil.[2] Pius IX, in a brief to Bishop Darboy (October 26, 1865), had called Freemasonry "the synagogue of Satan."

Since the appearance of Renan's *Life of Jesus,* a twofold character had marked the anti-Catholic movement. First of all, it was a turn toward atheism and anarchy; also, it became increasingly associated with Freemasonry. With blasphemous irreverence Renan had spoken of "those good old words—God,

[1] For a detailed account of the Vatican Council, see Cecconi, *Historia de Concilio ecumenico Vaticano,* 1879; Granderarth, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils,* 1903; *Collectio lacensis,* Vol. VII.

[2] On the various condemnations issued against the secret societies by Clement XIII, Pius VI, Pius VII, Leo XII, Pius VIII, and Gregory XVI, see the allocution *Multiplices* of Pius IX, delivered on September 25, 1865. *Acta Pii IX,* IV, 23; *Dict. apol. de la foi cathol.,* s.v. "Franc-maçonnerie," II, 127.

Providence, soul, immortality—which philosophy would interpret in more and more refined meanings." By this comment he meant more and more favorable to atheism. A short time before Renan, a writer who addressed especially the world of workers, but who, by the paradoxical originality of his thought and apparent strictness of his logic, would influence the cultivated classes, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, bluntly declared himself an atheist, even antitheist. "God is the evil; property is theft." Such were his mottos. But Proudhon openly declared himself a Mason.[3] On the day of his reception into Freemasonry, to the question: "What does man owe to God and to his fellow men?" he answered: "To all men, justice; to God, war upon him."

Like Renan, Proudhon seems to have been subject to the influence of the German philosophy.[4] Through the works of Wirchow, Moleschott, Vogt, and Büchner, translated into all languages at the same time as those of Kant, Hegel, and Feuerbach, that philosophy had spread the most unadulterated materialism. For fifteen years the dissolving idealism of some and the brutal atheism of the others had done their work.[5] In 1866 Bishop Duplanloup uttered a cry of alarm in an eloquent pamphlet, *L'athéisme et le péril social.* Two years later, Montalembert, in one of his last writings, gave Catholics a glimpse of "a development of sensualism, materialism, and atheism which had no example in the eighteenth century." [6]

In his pamphlet the Bishop of Orléans distinguished the anti-religious and antisocial propaganda from the Masonic propaganda. In fact, the most eager adepts of atheism and anarchy came from the Masonic lodges or became admitted to them. Ferry, who, in his electoral program of 1869, declared: "Only

[3] See Proudhon, *De la justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Eglise,* II, 212.

[4] On Proudhon's dependence upon Hegel, see Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française,* p. 902.

[5] The philosophy of Comte and that of Littré had also contributed much to this evolution.

[6] Cf. *Correspondant,* May 25, 1868.

two parties exist: the clerical party and that of liberty"; Léon Gambetta, who, at this same period, proclaimed himself a disciple of Proudhon; Arthur Ranc and Georges Clemenceau, who took their stand about Blanqui, the famous author of the formula, "Neither God nor Master": all scoffed at the spiritualism of the veterans of 1848 and tried to have their political and religious radicalism accepted in the lodges.[7] Moreover, they enthusiastically welcomed a similar movement in Protestantism. Ferdinand Buisson regarded the liberal Christianity which was formed at Neuchâtel in Switzerland, as "a lay religion, without dogma, without moral teaching, and without priests, separated from traditional Christianity." [8] And Edgar Quinet said he saw in Channing's American Unitarianism: "If it still preserved a shadow of Christian antiquity, it extends its hand to the most daring philosophy." [9]

Plan of a Masonic Anticouncil

We are not surprised that the announcement of an ecumenical council deeply moved the Masonic lodges. At the general meeting of the Grand Orient of France in July, 1869, Colfavru proposed to convoke an extraordinary assembly of Freemasons to proclaim, "in face of the ecumenical council the great principles of universal human right." [10] The question was to reply to the Syllabus by "a solemn affirmation of principles, which would serve, in the future, as a banner for Masonry." [11] A member of the Italian Parliament, Joseph Ricciardi, wrote a letter to all the freethinkers of all nations, "to invite them to meet on December 8, 1869, at Naples." Among the adherents might be noted those

[7] On this movement and its connection with Freemasonry, see Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain.* Gambetta received Freemasonry in 1869 (Tournier, *Gambetta franc-maçon,* p. 143). Under the patronage of Masonry was founded the *Ligue de l'enseignement,* presided over by Jean Macé.

[8] See F. Buisson, *L'enseignement de l'histoire sainte.*

[9] E. Quinet, *Le livre de l'exilé,* pp. 538, 568.

[10] See the full official report of the meeting in Cecconi, *op. cit.*

[11] *Ibid.*

of Garibaldi and Victor Hugo. Not satisfied with convoking an anticouncil at Naples, the organization committee prepared, in the chief cities of Italy, some manifestations against the Vatican Council. These demonstrations would, so they said, at the same time be manifestations in favor of Italian nationality.[12]

In spite of this appeal to Italian patriotism, the Naples anticouncil and the popular manifestations that were to accompany it were a complete failure. The organizers were not agreed either on the method of propaganda or on the program of the anticouncil. Whereas one group of Freemasons, whose leader was the freethinker Regnard, wished to declare that "the idea of God is the source of so much despotism and so much injustice," others, more circumspect and perhaps more clever, wished, following Ricciardi, simply to proclaim "the freedom of reason in the face of religious authority and the solidarity of the peoples in the face of the alliance of princes and priests." Three meetings were held (December 6, 10, 16). That of the 10th was the occasion of such subversive clamors that the police declared the meeting dissolved, "because it departed from the domain of philosophy and entered that of socialism." At the meeting of the 16th, the uproar was so violent that the owner of the hall refused after that to receive the members of the "council." They were unable to find any other place in which to meet, and the great projected assembly ended in ridicule.[13]

Schismatic and Non-Catholic Churches

In schism and heresy the Church has often seen the work of the demon. But it has never forgotten that those who adore Christ have not broken every bond with her; she calls them

[12] Cf. *ibid.*

[13] The documents relative to the Naples anticouncil may be found in a 448-page work published at Paris, at the Grand Orient, and entitled *Enquête maçonnique à propos du convent extraordinaire du 8 décembre 1869,* and in the bimonthly, *Le chaîne d'union.* Cecconi, in his volume IV, gives some extracts from these publications.

"separated brethren." Pius IX resolved to invite to the council their hierarchical representatives.

On September 8, 1868, he wrote to the schismatical bishops of the Oriental rite, inviting them to come for the council. "May you come," said the Pontiff, "as your predecessors came to the Second Council of Lyons and to the Council of Florence, that the schism may at last cease." [14] A few days later, Pius IX addressed a letter to the Protestants, or rather, in a more general way, to all those who, bearing the name of Christians, were not in communion with the Roman Church. Said the Pope: "A father never abandons his children, even when they have abandoned him." Then, recalling the marks of the true Church, he contrasted the stability of the Church of Rome with the instability of the other Christian societies. Lastly he urged all Christians to profit by the occasion which the future council offered them "to return to the bosom of that Church to which their forefathers had formerly belonged." At Rome no exaggerated hope was entertained for the success of these invitations.

Concerning the 70,000,000 Christians who, under the names of Copts, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, Greeks, and Russians, constituted the group of Oriental Churches not united, Bishop Valerga, patriarch of Jerusalem, previously consulted by the prefect of Propaganda, foresaw a negative reply. What impression was produced, in the mass of the faithful and among the clergy, by the Roman Pontiff's appeal? This cannot be easily ascertained. Of course, many were unaware of the existence of the papal letter. But we know that some Jacobite bishops, upon receipt of the Pope's invitation, believed they were conforming to the desire of their people by replying: "We wish, indeed, to go to the council of Rome if our patriarch consents." But the

[14] Pius IX, on the occasion of the council, exhorted the Protestants to the union; but he did not invite their bishops to attend the assembly because, in most of the Protestant Churches, the invalidity of the ordinations was not doubtful and because, even among the Anglicans, the validity of the episcopal powers was not certain.

patriarch did not consent. "If the Pope wishes a council," he said, "let him come and hold it here." The jealous autocracy of the patriarchs, who feared seeing their authority lessened, the too strictly national character given to religion in the Eastern countries, the traditional prejudices against Rome, and, especially in the case of the Russian Church, the Caesarian despotism that weighed on it like a nightmare: such were the obstacles which the papal invitation encountered.

In vain Pius IX declared that he would assume the expenses of their journey and their sojourn, that the patriarchs and bishops would receive all the honors due to their rank, that interpreters would be provided, and that they would enjoy entire freedom of speech; no prelate came in answer to the appeal. Some gave no reason for their refusal, like that Syrian-Jacobite bishop of Jerusalem who read the letter, then put it on his desk and merely replied: "Well." Others, such as the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, maintained "that they believed in the infallibility of the ecumenical councils, but that in their eyes such councils were vitiated by the simple fact that the pope did not there take his rank as a simple patriarch, equal to the others." This view was, by a simple sophism easy to refute, to prejudge precisely the very question to be solved. In short, the refusal to Pius IX's invitation by the non-uniated Oriental Churches must be attributed to the despotism of their religious and civil leaders.

The opposition which the Pope's appeal met with in the Protestant Churches was of a diverse nature. Moreover the organization of those Churches was less uniform.

The German Protestants

In Germany a Protestant who would later adjure his heresy, Reinhold Baumstark, wrote a pamphlet in favor of the council, in which he saw the means of realizing the union among all the faithful of Christ. But his peaceful voice was lost amid the

hostile clamors of his fellow Lutherans. On October 20, 1868, the nuncio at Munich wrote to Cardinal Antonelli: "The Pope's letter has stirred up most violent articles in the Protestant press. These articles tend to represent the Holy Father's paternal act as an insult and a defiance, as a poorly disguised solicitation to return to the corruption of the Middle Ages and to the world-wide domination of the popes." The national feeling, so strangely exalted and perverted, combined with the heretical spirit in that irritation of public opinion. The German people were still quivering over the splendid festivities celebrated at Worms (June 18 of that year) in connection with the erection of a colossal statue of Luther. At the moment when the king of Prussia, William I, appeared, surrounded by a brilliant military staff, the cries of "Luther! Luther!" were suddenly drowned by those of "Hurrah for King William! Hurrah for Prussia!" A group of demonstrators had even climbed up on the royal tribune and from there cried: "Hurrah for the Emperor of Germany!" And the King of Prussia greeted this significant shout with a gesture of approval. At the foot of this Luther monument the assembly of the general Protestant Federation wished to draw up a reply to the Roman Pontiff. They said: "We, Protestants, assembled today at Worms . . . at the foot of the Luther monument, taking our stand on the ground common to all men of the Christian spirit, of German patriotism and of civilization . . . publicly protest against the so-called apostolic letters of September 13, 1868, . . . and we energetically reject every hierarchical claim, every dogmatic authority, which for us would be as so many bridges intended to conduct us to Rome."

In France, Guizot, the noblest representative of the Reformed Church, at a meeting uttered the following words: "Pius IX has given proof of an admirable wisdom in convoking this great assembly, from which perhaps will emerge the salvation of the world, for our societies are indeed very sick; but great evils

call for great remedies." [15] Other Protestants, such as Edmond de Pressensé, considering the meeting of the council merely the prelude to the consecration of the Syllabus, and in the Syllabus merely "the absolute bondage of conscience," [16] united in the campaign of the freethinkers' press to protest against the enterprise of Pius IX.

The English Protestants

As might be foreseen, in England the papal letter found the most sympathetic echoes. The Oxford movement had accustomed the minds to the idea of a union of the Churches. Ferard Cobb, a Cambridge professor, published two works on the coming council, both of them from a friendly point of view. Another Protestant, David Urquhart, wrote an appeal to the Pope for the establishment of the law of nations; he even succeeded in having his fellow Protestants send to the Pope a request that, on the occasion of the future council, he take in hand the cause of the law of nations. Among the ritualists some pastors and laymen (e.g., the Scottish Bishop Forbes, residing at Dundee) were disposed to reply to the advances of the Roman Church. Having no objection to the ecumenical character of the council just convoked by the Pope, irritated at the hostility of the civil powers toward them, and persuaded that, as soon as the Anglican Church would no longer be the State Church in Ireland, the days of the Anglican Church as the State Church in England would be numbered; and, seeing therein the breaking of one of the bonds which made their cohesion and their moral force, they turned to Rome with confidence. In February, 1869, an Anglican ritualist, John Stuart, general archivist of Scotland,

[15] For details of the preceding accounts, cf. Cecconi and Granderath.

[16] E. de Pressensé, *Le Concile du Vatican,* p. 197. The *Alliance évangélique* asked the prayers of its followers "at the moment when Rome was going to put the seal on its work . . . by condemning the progress and the liberties without which modern society would no longer be able to subsist."

who was in scientific relations with the Bollandists of Brussels, put Bishop Forbes in touch with the Bollandist Victor de Buck, who shortly before had published in the *Etudes* of the fathers of the Society of Jesus, several articles marked with sympathy for the Puseyite movement. The learned Jesuit was not only an eminent scholar; he had also the reputation of being a man of high doctrine; the Jesuit father general had appointed him, the preceding month, his theologian in the general council.[17] But, from the very first letters exchanged with the Anglican prelate, the Jesuit perceived that a man was increasing the obstacles to the understanding. That man was Pusey.

Pusey

Forbes had the cooperation of Pusey in his replies. But Pusey continually added fresh objections to the first objections submitted by the Scottish bishop. He showed that he was offended at the failure to invite the Anglican bishops personally like those of the Oriental non-united Churches; still more offended at being treated as a heretic. However, he declared he did not admit certain points of Catholic dogma on transubstantion and the authority of the pope. As to the council, on the pretext that the Anglican bishops had not been personally invited, he denied its ecumenical character. Father de Buck wrote: "Pusey stops everything";[18] and a ritualist of Cambridge, making known to the Jesuit father that "Pusey raised all imaginable difficulties to prevent anything being done with regard to the council," added: "Talk to me about the infallibility of the Holy See! It is nothing compared with the need of absolute abandonment of faith, of reason, and of everything into

[17] The details given above are taken from the correspondence of Victor de Buck with Bishop Dupanloup, which is preserved in the archives of the St. Sulpice Seminary, notably the letters written by Father de Buck on January 30, 1869, and March 9, 1869.

[18] V. de Buck, letter of July 29, 1869, to Dupanloup.

the hands of the great Doctor Pusey in person, who reigns as supreme chief among us Anglicans." [19] Such was the first obstacle to the negotiations. A second obstacle was met with. Father de Buck, not thinking himself authorized to treat the affair in person, decided to place it in the hands of Dupanloup, an intermediary willingly accepted by the Anglicans.[20] But Cardinal Bilio required that negotiations should be conducted by Bishop Manning, with whom the ritualists were unwilling to treat at any price. In short, when Father de Buck went to Rome, the Congregation of the Holy Office (November 15, 1869) enjoined on him to break off his parleys with the Anglicans.[21]

The papal letter did not receive any better welcome among the Protestants of Switzerland, Holland, Austria, and America, and there the negotiations remained.

The Catholic Rulers

A no less delicate question was that of the representation of the Catholic rulers in the ecumenical assembly. Since the Council of Nicaea, where Emperor Constantine held a place of honor, the Christian emperors and kings had taken part, either themselves personally or by an ambassador, in all the general councils. But the relations between the Church and the states were so

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] See his letters, passim.

[21] Cecconi (*op. cit.*) conjectures that the reason for the prohibition pronounced by the Holy Office would have been the following: they feared that the negotiations undertaken with the unionist party, which was not numerous (not more than 400 out of 18,000 Anglican clergy), and was detested by the Established Church, would endanger the general movement of the Church of England toward the Roman Church. These reasons, according to the unpublished correspondence of Father de Buck with Bishop Dupanloup, seem to us more likely. The members of the Holy Office were undoubtedly guided by the slightness of hope which they had in the success of the negotiations and perhaps also with the slight confidence they felt in the proposed negotiator. In fact, Bishop Dupanloup published (November 11), in connection with the council and the papal infallibility, a letter which greatly stirred the men at Rome.

profoundly changed since the fall of Christendom, that scarcely can we picture a modern ruler mingled with the episcopal body in the hall of deliberations. After mature examination of the question by the preparatory Congregation, they decided that the Catholic princes could be present at the solemn sessions, but that they would not be invited to take part in the deliberations. Cardinal Antonelli was directed to explain to the diplomatic representatives that "the Holy Father had nowise the intention of keeping the princes apart, but that, because of the impossibility of convoking without distinction all the rulers of Catholicism, one of them being under the ban of excommunication, he limited himself to asking them, in general terms, to lend their benevolent concurrence." [22]

This decision seemed at first to satisfy the minds belonging to the most opposite parties. On July 10, 1868, a liberal deputy, Emile Ollivier, said in the Chamber of Deputies: "Gentlemen, I am not aware, since 1789, of an event of equal importance; it is the separation of Church and state, carried out by the Pope himself. The Church, for the first time, says to the lay powers: I wish to be and to act outside of you and without you. I have my own life, which I hold from my divine origin. This life is enough for me; I ask from you nothing but the right to rule myself in my own way. Gentlemen, I find this language possesses an imposing boldness; it strikes me with respect and admiration." [23] The next day, under the signature of Louis Veuillot, the *Univers* had the following lines: "We have a view of the Christian and Catholic organization of democracy. On the ruins of infidel nations, we see a more numerous rebirth of the multitude of nations, equal with one another, free, forming a universal confederation in the unity of the faith, under the presidency of the Roman Pontiff; a holy people, as formerly a holy empire. And this baptized and consecrated democracy will do what the

[22] E. Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, I, 508.
[23] *Moniteur universel*, July 11, 1868; E. Ollivier, *op. cit.*, I, 401.

monarchies were unable to do and did not wish to do: it will everywhere abolish the idols, it will bring about the eternal reign of Christ." [24]

These optimistic perspectives were far from being realized. A diplomatic agitation, organized in view of the council, was soon produced. The promoter of this agitation was a German doctor whose name will appear again and again in the course of this history, Doctor Döllinger, professor at Munich. He was said to have felt slighted at not having been named to one of the preparatory commissions of the council.[25] Outside the council he would keep up a ceaseless agitation. His first step was to suggest to Prince Clovis von Hohenlohe, the Bavarian minister, the idea of intervening with the different European cabinets to put them on their guard against the danger with which the coming council threatened them. The question was, he said, nothing less than declaring the propositions of the Syllabus dogmas of faith, that is, proclaiming the absolute subjection of the states to the authority of the Roman Pontiff. In fact, on Döllinger's urgent solicitations, Prince von Hohenlohe (April 9, 1869) communicated to all the cabinets of Europe a dispatch drawn up in this sense, and submitted to them the idea of an international conference with a view to meeting the danger.

The intended result was not fully attained. The proposed conference did not take place. Bismarck declared that an intervention of the powers in the affairs of the Catholic Church seemed to him to belong to a state of things that had permanently disappeared. He added, however, that the Roman curia would meet on his part with an energetic resistance as soon as it would per-

[24] *Univers,* July 11, 1868; Louis Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile,* I, nos. 65–66.

[25] On December 28, 1868, he wrote to the Bishop of Orléans: "You ask me whether I have been invited to Rome to take part in the preparatory labors. I answer that I have not been. . . . For some years past I have fallen into disgrace. . . . At Rome they consider me a man too little ultramontane, and you know that this fault is not pardoned." The letter ended with the words, which might already show that a defection was to be feared: "Not without a feeling of admiration mingled with envy do I contemplate you, . . . resolved to defend whatever will be decided at Rome."

mit itself any encroachments on the temporal. Prince de la Tour of Auvergne, Minister of Foreign Affairs in France, declared that the Emperor was disposed to judge the acts of the council in a broad and liberal spirit, but that he was resolved strongly to defend, if unhappily the need should present itself, the rights of which the confidence of the French nation had made him the depositary. This attitude of "threatening expectation" was almost that of all the European cabinets.[26]

Attitude of the Catholic World

In the Catholic world the announcement of a universal council aroused at first unanimous joy. "Countless bishops of all countries spoke to their flocks about the future assembly. Especially notable was a beautiful letter of Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans, which went through a large number of editions and, after its publication, was also translated into German, Spanish, English, Italian, Polish, Hungarian, and Flemish." [27]

But this universal accord could not long endure. The controversies recently stirred up with regard to the *Avenir,* the campaign for freedom of education, the question of the classics, and many other philosophical, social, and political questions, did not disappear without leaving, in the minds of the combatants, certain irritations ready to be transformed into new controversies. The encyclicals *Mirari vos* and *Quanta cura* had succeeded in bringing about unity in the faith and in discipline; they had allowed diversity of tendencies to subsist. Veuillot and Manning did not view the questions from the same standpoint as Dupanloup or Newman. But what marked both groups was, with an

[26] These diplomatic incidents have been extensively set forth by Emile Ollivier in his *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican,* I, 403–536. But we should accept the appreciations of this writer with reservations.

[27] "This letter," wrote Father Victor de Buck, "is probably the best writing that has appeared in this century. It is an example of how we should speak about the Church" (letter of November 13, 1869).

equal desire to serve the Church, an ardor in the strife, an impetuosity in the attack and in the retorts, which recent combats against unbelief had revived and which unfortunately wasted itself in internal quarrels. Moreover, not all the controverted questions had been solved by the latest papal decisions. The program of the council would raise up fresh questions, still more fiery. What Pius IX had called the period of strife against the infernal powers was almost over; but the period of strifes stirred by the passions, misunderstandings, and men's reciprocal failure to understand, was about to open.

The *Civiltà cattolica's* publication of an anonymous correspondence, which was regarded as a manifesto of the ultramontanes, the controversy which soon started in Germany between Doctor Döllinger and Doctor Hergenröther, the appearance of a book of Bishop Maret on *Le concile et la paix religieuse,* the publication in the *Correspondant* of an article in which was seen the program of the liberals, and Dupanloup's entrance into the campaign by the publication of a pamphlet entitled *Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la definition de l'infallibilité:* such were the chief incidents of this period of strife.

Article in the *Civiltà cattolica*

On February 6, 1869, the *Civiltà cattolica,* an Italian review edited by the fathers of the Society of Jesus, published, on the future council, a long French correspondance which contained these lines:

> No one is unaware that unfortunately the Catholics of France are split into two parties: the members of one party are simply Catholics; those of the other call themselves liberal Catholics. . . . The Catholics strictly so called believe that the future council will be very short and, in this respect, will resemble the council of Chalcedon, . . . of such a sort that the minority, however eloquent it may be, will not be able to furnish a long opposition. From the dogmatic point of view,

the Catholics desire the proclamation, by the future ecumenical council, of the doctrines of the Syllabus. . . . They would gladly welcome the future council's proclamation of the dogmatic infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. . . . Everyone is aware that the Pope, by a feeling of august reserve, will perhaps not wish to take the initiative of proposing it. But hope is expressed that the unanimous outburst of the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of the fathers of the future ecumenical council, will define it by acclamation.

The appearance of the *Civiltà's* article had an immense reverberation and aroused lively protests. "By what right," it was said, "does the Roman paper, when speaking of two factions of Catholics who equally make profession of submission to the Church and to the Holy See, permit itself to call one group, to the exclusion of the other, the Catholics strictly so-called?" Furthermore, the way the author of the article expressed himself when he spoke of the desires of the "Catholics properly so-called," seemed to give to his wishes the appearance of a summons. Lastly, were the objects of these wishes, so imperatively formulated, in the spirit of the Church? While desiring that the council would be "very short," and even that the votes would be made "by acclamation," did one forget that, "if Bellarmine and other theologians rejected the Council of Constance defining the superiority of the council over the pope, they did so precisely because that decree was passed without sufficient discussion"? Had one sufficiently reflected that "the Holy Ghost does not inspire the Church, but assists it," and that, "if God, who guides all, should will that something be defined by the council on the infallibility of the pope, that definition ought to be made, not by acclamation or with precipitation, but after mature consideration of the opportuneness, the basis, and the form."

On April 17, 1869, the *Civiltà* declared that it refrained from having "dared to fix the duration of the council and from having

limited it, with a view thus to rendering impossible a thorough examination of the questions." It further said: "For that we would have to be ignorant of the first elements of theology." [28] Besides, the Roman paper declared that, "in accepting the incriminated correspondence, it had no intention to making its own everything therein contained." But these explanations did not lead to peace. Minds were irritated. A controversy began, in the course of which the German *Allgemeine Zeitung,* with insolent acrimony, and *Le Français,* with comparative moderation, maintained their accusations against the *Civiltà cattolica.* The German paper even held responsible for what it called "an outrageous attack on the Church," the Society of Jesus, the Roman court, the Supreme Pontiff himself. "We do not exaggerate," it said, "in supposing that the ideas of the *Civiltà* are in accord with those of the supreme head and the other heads of the court of Rome." [29]

[28] As theologians and Jesuits, the editors of the *Civiltà* could not, in fact, forget the doctrine so masterly expounded by Bellarmine: "Patres in conciliis debent rem ipsam quaerere, id est, conclusiones investigare, disputando, legendo, cogitando." Bellarmine, *Controversia generalis de conciliis,* Bk. II, chap. 12.

[29] We need not remark how far such accusations were gratuitous. The foes of the *Civiltà* were not on the side of truth when they accused it of stirring up the first of the irritating questions with regard to the future council. As early as 1867 several anonymous articles of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and of the *Neue Freie Presse* had broached the same questions, having charged "Manning, for example, with devoting himself to the theory of infallibility with the ardent zeal of a convert." Friedrich (*Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils,* II, 3) is not excusable when he holds that the Roman curia deliberately aroused a controversy on the infallibility "because it needed to have the doctrine attacked so that it might say that it was constrained to propose the definition." All we can say is that "undoubtedly the famous correspondence of the Roman review notably accentuated the movement that was hostile to the council." Who was the author of the famous correspondence? Neither Granderath nor Cecconi nor Emile Ollivier nor any other historian, so far as we know, has named him. In an unpublished letter, addressed (July 20, 1869) to Bishop Dupanloup, Father Victor de Buck wrote the name of Father Darras, the author of a Church history then widely known, but much criticized by the Bollandists. Father de Buck, having at least indirect relations with Father Piccirillo, director of the *Civiltà* (letter of April 15, 1869) and with several other Jesuits of Rome, was in a position to be well informed.

Döllinger

Later the information transpired that the author of the violent articles published under the veil of anonymity in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* was Dr. Ignaz von Döllinger, professor in the faculty of theology of Munich. Between Döllinger and Félicité de Lamennais certain points of resemblance are striking. "Döllinger had formerly taken an outstanding part in the awakening of Catholic Germany; he had fought, as publicist and as parliamentarian, against the religous despotism of the state. In 1848 he figured among the 'grave-diggers' of Josephism; and at that time he received the renown of an ultramontane, which he accepted." [30]

The university of Munich venerated him as a glory; Church history held him to be a master. He had enthusiastic disciples. Says a certain German historian of theology: "For twenty-five years he was looked upon as one of the first theologians of Germany." [31] He was quite conscious of his worth, of his renown, of his influence, and perhaps he exaggerated the power of that influence. His words were vivid, colorful, nervous, cutting. One of his contemporaries has pictured him in these terms: "His head is strong and grave; his eye has the cold limpidity and impassible penetration of the collector of ideas and facts; the ironical grin of his lips excluded all passion, if it is not the passion of knowing." [32] That knowledge was immense. Döllinger was above all a scholar. This quality seemed to dominate everything in him, even—for this was the impression of those who approached him—that of priest. His theological training was incomplete. Never had he grasped the role of the magisterium of the Church, and he got accustomed to the false idea of the

[30] Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme*, IV, 240.

[31] K. Werner, *Geschichte der Katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Konzil*, p. 470.

[32] Emile Ollivier, *op. cit.*, I, 425.

function of the theologian. In a famous speech delivered in 1863 at the scientific congress of Munich, he declared: "As in the time of the Jews, beside the priesthood, was prophecy; so in the Church, beside the ordinary power, is an extraordinary power, which is public opinion. Thereby theological science exercises the influence which returns to it and which, in the long run, nothing resists." Like Lamennais, Döllinger dreamed of an accord between the Church and modern ideas. Being surrounded by Protestants, he was obsessed with the thought of the Churches drawing closer together. "He took an interest in that question as a Catholic, and perhaps even more so as a German." [33] "In 1850, at the Catholic assembly of Linz, he had sketched the architecture of a national German Church which, in the vast Roman unity, would have its own life, its own organization, its councils, and its literature, and its institution would be a first stage toward the reunion of the Christian denominations." [34]

Toward the end of 1869, Döllinger, more and more confident in the victorious power of his science, decided to gather in a little volume the five articles that had appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. "I am gathering together," he wrote on November 29, "the testimonies and the necessary explanations to determine with finality the question of infallibility." [35] The volume appeared under this title: *Der Papst und das Konzil,* and under the pseudonymn of Janus. The author was not satisfied with saying, as did the editor of the *Français,* that the proclamation

[33] Goyau, *op. cit.*, IV, 242.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 241. Many manifestations, prompted by a no less rash spirit, were made in Germany under the form of manifestos. We mention only the address of a number of Catholics of Baden, published by the *Journal des Débats* of July 2, 1869.

[35] An unpublished letter (archives of the St. Sulpice Seminary). The context of the letter breathes such a scientific self-conceit and so well characterizes the unfortunate German professor, that it ought to be quoted: "My citations of editions, volumes, and pages will be so exact, so scrupulously exact, that every person can verify them at once. If a certain number of bishops can be persuaded to enter seriously into the discussion . . . the victory of the truth is almost assured."

of papal infallibility seemed to him inopportune; he attacked the thesis itself. He went still further and held that the council, whatever it should decide, would have no authority, because it would not be free. "In fact," he said, "can we call free an assembly of men on whom is imposed a duty of conscience, sworn to on their honor, to consider as the chief end of their efforts the upholding and increase of the power of the pope? A meeting of men who live in the fear of drawing down on them the displeasure of the curia, who dread the fetters that Rome may put on them in the exercise of their office?" [36]

A doctor having an erudition equal to that of Döllinger and a theological science of better quality, the future Cardinal Hergenröther, took up his pen and, in a work which he called the *Anti-Janus,* subjected the pamphlet to a severe criticism, convicted its author of more than once altering the texts, of having more often selected them arbitrarily and grouped them systematically, and of having drawn fantastic conclusions by procedures where logic was lamentably mistreated. A German priest already in revolt, one who later would separate from the Church by a complete apostasy, Frohschammer by name, subjected Döllinger's work to a criticism in a more terrible sense. He easily showed that Janus, if he wished to be logical with his principles, should have gone farther, denying not only the infallibility of the pope, but that of the Church and consequently withdrawing from it and abandoning the Christian faith.

Bishop Maret's *Du Concile général*

While the different phases of this discussion were unfolding in Germany, a controversy arose in France in connection with a work published in September, 1869, by the dean of the theolog-

[36] Some have held that Bishop Dupanloup made common cause with Döllinger. The latter's correspondence as well as the writings of the Bishop of Orléans belies this too absolute assertion. See Döllinger's letters published by the *Revue internationale de théologie,* 1899, pp. 236, 238. Cf. Goyau, *op. cit.,* IV, 344.

ical faculty of Paris, Bishop Maret. The title of the book was *Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse*. The author, taking his stand on ground different from that of the *Français,* which opposed merely the opportuneness of the definition of papal infallibility, and different from Doctor Döllinger, who made his assault on the very thesis of infallibility, pretended to combat only the doctrine of what he called personal and separate infallibility. "Papal infallibility," he said, "can be understood in different ways. That which seems to prevail in the school which calls for the conciliar definition, is the most absolute of all. In this system, dogmatic infallibility is a privilege entirely and exclusively personal to the pontiff: that is, a privilege of the pontiff teaching alone and without any necessary concourse of the episcopate. Thus understood, infallibility is identical with the pure, indivisible, absolute monarchy of the Roman Pontiff." The author summed up his own doctrine in the following lines:

> The pope is, by divine right, the supreme head of the Church; the bishops, by divine right, share, under his authority, in the government of the religious society. The spiritual sovereignty is, then, composed of two essential elements: a principal one, the papacy; the other subordinate, the episcopate. Infallibility, forming the highest attribute of the spiritual sovereignty, is necessarily also composed of the essential elements of the sovereignty. . . . This doctrine seems to me easily reconcilable with the most moderate doctrines of the school that is called ultramontane. This doctrine does not deny the infallibility, but brings it to its true nature.

Apart from this principal thesis, Bishop Maret advocated the periodical holding of general councils, and, without espousing all the doctrines called Gallican, without holding himself at one with any assembly or any declaration, and professing all due respect for the decisions and bulls of Sixtus IV, Alexander VII, Clement XI, and Pius VI, he said that he considered that the theological Gallicanism, the Gallicanism of the French episco-

pate, seemed to him to contain a fund of eternal and necessary truth. Foreseeing that he would be accused with publicly discussing one of the questions that were going to be submitted to the conciliar deliberations, he availed himself of his title of bishop, of the liberty that seemed to him to properly belong to the preparation of the council as to its debates, and of the fact that several of his fellow bishops had already brought the question before the public.[37]

The work itself touched on burning questions; but the quarrel it aroused was especially embittered by the press. Several months before the appearance of the book, the *Figaro,* the *Indépendance belge,* and some other papers had spread the most fantastic rumors about him. The author, they said, was in previous concert with the Emperor; furthermore, he was merely the mouthpiece of an important group of bishops. They said further that the book was already translated into Latin and the principal European languages; yet neither the Spanish ambassador nor the apostolic nuncio nor the Jesuits themselves had been able to procure the least scrap of proof. The whole thing did not contain a grain of truth. But the stir caused by these rumors was at its height when the work was put on sale. The calmest minds became heated. In the *Univers,* Louis Veuillot, precisely on the basis of the rumor, thought himself authorized to raise his voice with more freedom.

"Bishop Maret lays his book open to the public: undoubtedly that they may read it; he must wish that it be appraised; he must allow himself to be accused." Bishop Pie of Poitiers, Bishop Doney of Montauban, Bishop Plantier of Nimes, Bishop Delalle of Rodez, and Archbishop Manning of Westminster, believing themselves informed on the opinions opposed by Bishop Maret, criticized his work keenly. The religious press entered the fight. The *Correspondant* and the *Français* replied to the *Univers.* "While having the air of attacking only the pope's

[37] *Du Concile général,* I, xviii, xxvi; III, 389.

personal and separate infallibility," said some, "his supreme magisterium is what they have in mind." The others replied: "A strange way of honoring the head of the Church, to separate it from its body." [38]

Amid these disputes, Bishop Maret had to step in several times. Again and again he did not hesitate to declare that, whatever might be the decision of the council, "submission would be easy for him." He would keep his word and declare later on, in lofty language, that he took back whatever in his works would be out of agreement with the conciliar definition of infallibility.[39]

Article in the *Correspondant*

But the French head of the school attacked by the *Civiltà* and the *Univers,* was not Bishop Maret; in the eyes of all, friends and foes, it was Bishop Dupanloup. At the time of his decisive intervention in the campaign conducted for winning freedom of education, Dupanloup's reputation had continued to grow. His strifes for the independence of the temporal power of the Holy See brought him the warm congratulations of Pius IX. Says Granderath: "Rare qualities of intellect, remarkably deep knowledge, were not the only reasons for his pre-eminence; what was dominant and characteristic in him was a tireless activity." After being the inspirer of the *Ami de la religion* and the *Journal des Villes et des Campagnes,* he founded, at the beginning of 1868, the paper *Le Français;* and the editors of the *Correspondant* habitually resorted to his counsels. In the articles of the *Français,* which replied to the French correspondence of

[38] Archbishop Manning, in a pastoral published in the month of October, used the expression "apart from the bishops": these words, taken literally, could be understood in two senses: without the bishops, without their direct concourse; or, against the bishops, in possible opposition to the bishops; in the latter sense the *Univers* apparently interpreted the English expression.

[39] Cf. Bazin, *Vie de Mgr Maret.*

the *Civiltà,* friends and foes recognized his pen; in a sort of manifesto which the *Correspondant* (October 10, 1869) published, his inspiration was evident.[40] In lofty language and under prudent forms, said some, clever forms, said others, the author of the article expressed his hopes about the future council. He could not imagine that the convocation of the States General of the Church could end with the proclamation of a despotic monarchy. Such a result would be contrary to the laws of history as well as to the traditions of the Church. The author hoped that the bishops, far from consecrating certain absolute propositions, whose poorly grasped meaning had troubled the Church, would seek to explain them or reject them.

This declaration stirred up fresh controversies. Louis Veuillot made a lively attack on it in the *Univers.* Bishop Pie criticized "this language with being of a haughty self-conceit." The whole religious press of France, Italy, Germany, and England took up the question.[41]

Dupanloup's Observations

The agitations increased when (November 11, 1869) Bishop Dupanloup, in his own name, publicly intervened in the controversy by a pamphlet in the form of a letter to his clergy,

[40] The author of the article seems to have been Prince Albert de Broglie; but granted the importance of the subject and the habitual relations of the editors of the review with the Bishop of Orléans, probably the article was not published without the approval of Bishop Dupanloup.

[41] The principal religious journals of France were then: the *Univers,* directed by Louis Veuillot; the *Monde,* directed by Taconet; the *Union,* the paper of Sebastian Laurentie; the *Gazette de France,* of Gustave Janicot; the *Français,* of François Beslay. We might add the *Moniteur universel* of Paul Dalloz. The principal periodical publications of the Italian Catholics were the *Civiltà cattolica* of Rome and the *Unità cattolica* of Milan. In Germany the most important Catholic paper in 1869 was the *Volkszeitung* of Cologne, which had a tone corresponding to that of the *Français* and the *Correspondant,* while the *Doxau Zeitung* of Munich was attached to the ideas of the *Univers.* Two Catholic papers of Vienna, the *Volksfreund* and the *Vaterland,* had few subscribers. In England, the chief Catholic paper was the *Tablet,* the organ of Cardinal Manning. The *Weekly Register,* more moderate, was inspired by Bishop Capel.

entitled, *Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la définition de l'infallibilité.* The biographer of the Bishop of Orléans, who was then his close friend, relates that, before issuing this publication, the prelate had engaged in a most rugged combat.[42] Never had he been seen so perplexed. Among the friends that he consulted, some, in particular Count de Falloux,[43] entreated him to keep his situation intact for the debates of the council. Others urged him to go ahead. These were the counsels he heeded. The future showed that the way indicated by Count Falloux was the wiser. Considering the point of irritation to which man's minds then reached, this intervention risked the authority of the Bishop of Orléans in the council and aroused against him controversies that irritated him. He who, in the campaign for freedom of education, had been a wonderful agent of conciliation, an able and happy negotiator, could not enjoy the same role in the assembly of bishops. The aged Bishop Baillès of Lucon said to M. Icard, the director of St. Sulpice Seminary, upon meeting him at Rome (November 28, 1869): "Bishop Dupanloup is overwhelmed." and Father Icard, theologian of the Archbishop of Sens, noted, at his arrival in Rome, that the Bishop of Orléans, by the publication of his letter and by the resulting troubled situation, had forever lost the influence which his talent and his piety had won for him over his fellow bishops, and the calm which he would personally need in his speeches and his proceedings.[44]

[42] Lagrange, *op. cit.*, III, 144.

[43] Letter of Falloux to Montalembert, October 31, 1869. Prince Albert de Broglie wrote to the Bishop of Orléans: "I would keep in the writing what is peaceful; I would remove what is militant" (letter of November 5, 1869). Augustine Cochin offered similar advice. Dupanloup evidently entered into the controversy only in self-defense. On September 17, 1869, he wrote in his private journal: "Appearance of Bishop Maret's book. Most unpleasant complication; perhaps calamity. I became an eldorado of a council of charity, zeal, and love. And behold, of a sudden, by this absolutely blind imprudence, appears a frightful quarrel." In November the "frightful quarrels" began, and the Bishop of Orléans thought he had the duty to participate in them.

[44] Icard, *Journal de mon voyage et de mon séjour à Rome,* pp. 1–13, 25, and passim.

Bishop Dupanloup's writing expounded the principal reasons that could be adduced, according to him, against the opportuneness of a definition of papal infallibility. But, among these objections, was one that concerned the very basis of the question, on the difficulties that some minds would encounter in reconciling papal infallibility with certain historical facts; and these objections were presented under so lively and impressive a form that a pretext was found therein to accuse it with attacking the doctrine itself.[45] At the very least, such a pastoral letter might be said to reveal the polemist rather than the pastor of souls.

On November 18, Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers:* "This letter gives an episcopal head to that, taking up of arms. . . . The opposition has now its leader." Therein was the mischief. The Bishop of Orléans reached Rome with the repute of a party leader, an opposition leader.[46] However, we must not forget that, in his farewell letter to his faithful, the prelate wrote that, "obedient, and obedient unto death, he would faithfully adhere to the decisions of the head of the Church and of the council, whatever those decisions might be, conformable or contrary to his particular thought." [47]

As the date for the meeting of the council approached, peacemaking voices were heard. Archbishop Darboy of Paris published (October 28, 1869) a pastoral letter in which, after briefly setting forth the nature of ecumenical councils, he endeavored to calm the uneasiness aroused by certain evil-minded

[45] Some anti-infallibilists, such as Lord Acton, had the same interpretation. See his unpublished letter of February 9, 1870.

[46] On November 21, 1869, Bishop Dupanloup communicated to his clergy a strong writing, entitled: "Avertissement à M. Louis Veuillot." The Bishop of Orléans charged the editor-in-chief of the *Univers* with "usurpations over the episcopate," with "perpetual intrusions in its gravest and most delicate affairs." In the *Univers* of November 22, Veuillot replied: "We will say the least possible, not wishing to lose all the advantages that comes to us from a too irritated adversary."

[47] Pastoral letter of December 10, 1869. This letter to the faithful and the pastoral to the clergy, dated the 11th, appeared at the same time.

rumors. On November 1, Archbishop Manning requested the faithful of his diocese to await with confidence the decisions of the future council. A few days later the editor-in-chief of the *Correspondant,* Léon Lavedan, wrote: "Respect, duty, and confidence impose on us silence and peace: it is the Truce of God."

Minds were still too stirred to conclude a lasting truce. Besides, as at Trent and at Nicaea, new subjects of disagreement were going to arise from the very heart of the conciliar debates. But henceforth, amid the agitations of men, the Holy Ghost, hovering over the ecumenical assembly by His divine assistance, would realize the work of God.

CHAPTER XXXV

Opening of the Vatican Council

ON DECEMBER 8, 1869, after a day of fast and abstinence which the Holy Father had ordered for the whole Catholic world, the nineteenth general council of the Catholic Church opened at Rome.[1] More than 700 bishops, abbots, and generals of religious orders [2] took their place in the council hall, disposed in the left arm of the Latin cross formed by St. Peter's basilica. In this vast space (about 70 feet by 150 feet), all the nations were represented: the young Churches of America beside those of old Europe; the Latin Church with its shepherds dressed in the white cope and, in accordance with the liturgical prescriptions, wearing a simple linen miter; and the Eastern Church,

[1] Or the twentieth (Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise,* III, 382) for those who consider as an ecumenical council the assembly gathered at Pisa, in 1409, to end the Schism of the West by the election of a pope (Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* V, 136). The first eight councils had been held in the East: I Nicaea (325), I Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), II Constantinople (553), III Constantinople (680), II Nicaea (787), IV Constantinople (869). The succeeding councils were held in the West: I Lateran (1123), II Lateran (1139), III Lateran (1179), IV Lateran (1215), I Lyons (1245), Vienne (1311), Florence (1438), V Lateran (1512–1517), Trent (1545–1563), Vatican (1869).

[2] To indicate the number of the fathers present at the first session is not possible (Fessler, secretary of the council, *Das Vatikanische Konzilium,* p. 13). According to the commonly accepted opinion, the number of fathers present at the various councils was as follows: Nicaea, 300; Constantinople, 186; Ephesus, more than 250; Chalcedon, 520 (according to some), 630 (according to others), II Constantinople, 165; III Constantinople, 170; II Nicaea, 367; I Lateran, between 300 and 400; II Lateran, 1,000; III Lateran, more than 300; IV Lateran, about 1,300; I Lyons, about 300; II Lyons, about 1,600; Florence, between 200 and 400; V Lateran, 120; Trent, 213. These figures are conjectural. Three councils were more numerous than the Vatican Council: II Lyons, II and IV Lateran. But we should note that these three councils admitted to their deliberations a large number of personages who were not bishops.

with its prelates dressed in sumptuous tunics and wearing rich tiaras. The missionary bishops in simple and poor vestments, the regular bishops, uniting to the insignia of their prelatial rank the habits of their religious profession, the abbots and the generals of orders, were easily recognizable.[3]

United in the same faith and subject to the same head, these representatives of all civilizations and all races differed from one another no less by their national habits than by their costumes. The Eastern bishops, elected by the clergy and the people, and consecrated by the patriarchs, who themselves assumed the government of their patriarchates before confirmation of their authority by the pope, were, as was known at Rome, the more jealous of their power, independence, and national customs as they counted among their faithful a good number of recently converted schismatics, whose feelings they had to treat with consideration. Then, too, the Vatican was aware that ths bishops of the United States thought they needed to observe the same cautious attitude with regard to their peoples; that, with this thought in mind, they had spoken the least possible about the Syllabus; that several undoubtedly would carry into the deliberations the democratic habits of their country. No fear about their orthodoxy was felt with regard to the Slav and Hungarian episcopate; but some, like Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar, leaders of the peoples as well as shepherds of souls, after the manner of the great bishops of the fifth century, might introduce in the assembly initiatives annoying for the general good order. Among the German prelates, some minds might be imbued with the disciplinary and doctrinal temerity of Döllinger. The French bishops arrived at Rome sharply divided into three parties, whose controversies, amplified by the press, were still reverberating.

[3] "At the fixed time could be seen the arrival of the bishops of California, Mexico, Brazil, Peru, Chile, New-Granada, the Philippines, and Australia; the vicars apostolic of the East Indies, Siam, Tonkin, China, and Japan" (Fessler, *Le Concile du Vatican*, p. 21).

The Question of Procedure

In such a situation we understand that the Sovereign Pontiff, having to decide the important question of the regulation of the council, wondered whether it was prudent to let these regulations be elaborated, following the invariable usages of the preceding conciliar assemblies, by the council itself. One might rightly fear that this elaboration would become an occasion of painful misunderstandings and thus of endless discussions. On the other hand, to impose on the gathering, contrary to the constant traditions of the Church, a ready-made regulation, might stir up lively discontents. After maturely weighing the pro and con, Pius IX decided for this latter view.[4] The regulation of the council, prepared by the preparatory commission under the direction of Pius IX, was brought to the knowledge of the fathers in the presynodal session of December 2, by the act known under the name of the letter *Multiplices*.

Emotion ran high. The Pope, with a view to simplifying and speeding the council's deliberations, had stressed the centralizing character of the regulation. In fact, according to the apostolic letter: 1. the right of proposing a question to the council would belong exclusively to the Holy See; the fathers, however, were authorized to make motions, but on condition of doing so *privatim,* in their own name, and after a previous communication to a congregation appointed by the Pope; 2. the projects, elaborated for two years past by commissions of theologians, would first be proposed to the general congregations that would precede the sessions; these general congregations would have

[4] To justify the right which the Pope arrogated to himself of imposing a regulation on the council, we do not need to base it (with Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken,* III, 612) on the false idea that the council is only an adviser of the pope. This right, quite compatible with the legislative and judiciary power of the ecumenical assembly, is implied in the fullness of power devolving on the Sovereign Pontiff.

as presidents Cardinals Luca, Bilio, Reisach, Bizzarri, and Capalti, directly designated by the Pope; 3. the Pope, informed by the congregations, would have the exclusive right of deciding whether the propositions emanating from the bishops would be submitted to the deliberations or definitively rejected.

Those of the bishops who had been troubled by the article of the *Civiltà* saw in this regulation the confirmation of their anxieties. Did not these measures indicate a distrust with regard to the episcopate, a desire to put across a program fixed in advance by systematically obstructing, stifling, so to speak, the deliberations of the council? The language of the papers that became the warmest defenders of the Holy See seemed to justify these fears. "When the Pope *will proclaim* the definition of infallibility . . . ," wrote Louis Veuillot in the *Univers* (December 4).[5] The explicit declarations of Pius IX soon calmed these fears. Thus in an audience granted on December 4 to fifteen bishops, he assured them that his sole intention had been "to put some order at the beginning," and that "he wished that they should all be free." In fact, soon it would be noted that the utmost freedom was left to the speakers to expound their opinions.

The Pope forcefully refused an immediate modification of the regulation; but, toward the end of December, he made known to the bishops that, notwithstanding the letter of papal prescriptions, they would be permitted to labor by groups in the editing of their proposals. About the end of January, he declared that a broad interpretation of the regulation would be applied according to circumstances.[6] On February 20, 1870, moved by the needs which experience revealed, he made important changes. The new pontifical act loudly proclaimed the principle of "complete freedom of discussion," permitting the president to put to a vote, on the proposal of ten fathers, the closing of discussion when it would be prolonged beyond meas-

[5] Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, 7.
[6] Icard, *Journal*, pp. 25, 26, 67, 151.

ure. The right of amendment on the projects, or schemas, proposed by the Holy See was officially recognized and regulated. The right of replying to the speakers, the method of voting was also the object of special dispositions. The new regulation was not safe from all complaints. Several bishops asked that specific instruction be given that the decisions of the council should be made, following a usage that seemed to them traditional, by unanimous vote, moral or otherwise, as the act of Pius IX appeared to say, by numerical majority. But when the presidents gave an assurance that the new prescriptions would be applied in the most benevolent spirit toward the fathers of the council, the agitations gradually calmed down.

Two other papal documents, after at first arousing similar feelings, were finally seen to be dictated by wisdom and by a real sense of their opportuneness. We refer to the bull *Apostolicae Sedis,* of October 12, 1869, repeating fundamentally the legislation of the censures, and the Apostolic constitution of December 4, regulating the election of the Sovereign Pontiff for the case that the Holy See should become vacant during the course of the ecumenical council.

The Bull *Apostolicae Sedis*

The idea of codifying and simplifying the penal law of the Church was manifestly opportune. The texts decreeing the different censures—excommunications, suspensions, and interdicts, censures reserved and not reserved, censures *latae* or *ferendae sententiae*—were scattered a little everywhere, in the decretals, in the canons of the councils, in papal bulls, in decrees of the Roman congregations, where great difficulty was experienced in finding them. But some bishops thought it strange that an affair of this nature, concerning the episcopate as well as the Holy See, should be treated and settled under the eyes of the council and without its participation. Others were of the opinion

that such a work was rather suited to a small commission, like that to which the Holy Father had entrusted the preparation of the bull, instead of an immense assembly, that was solicited by questions of greater importance. Another blame was laid on the bull. Among the innovations that it introduced in the penal law, it considered as excommunicated all magistrates and lawmakers who would oblige clerics to appear before the secular tribunals.[7] In the presence of a text so precise, Catholic magistrates and lawmakers of all the states would find themselves called upon to give up their office or to regard the bull as null. The French ambassador had two interviews with Cardinal Antonelli on this subject. In the first of these interviews, the Secretary of State of the Holy See, taken by surprise, declared that he was not well enough acquainted with the papal document to express his opinion. In the course of a second visit which the representative of France made to him, the Cardinal declared that the provision did not concern the concordat states.[8] This reply calmed the susceptibilities of the governments as well as those of the episcopate.

Groups in the Council

All these questions, agitated in different senses, had brought out the different tendencies that divided the fathers of the council, and these tendencies were emphasized by different groups outside the council. Besides the meetings determined by nationality, such as the meetings of the bishops of Spain, the United States, and Canada, four principal centers were soon distinguished. This dissociation was especially the consequence of the attitude taken by the prelates on the touchy subject of papal infallibility. Those favoring an immediate definition of infallibility (the infallibilists, who liked also to call themselves ultra-

[7] See Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* s.v. "Apostolicae Sedis."

[8] Icard, *Journal,* p. 57; Emile Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au Concile du Vatican,* I, 531.

montanes) were grouped about Archbishop Dechamps of Malines. Archbishop Manning of Westminster, Cardinal Cullen (archbishop of Dublin), Bishop Pie of Poitiers, Bishop Plantier of Nimes, Bishop Roess of Strasbourg, Bishop Martin of Paderborn, Bishop Senestrey of Ratisbon, Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore, and Bishop Mermillod (vicar apostolic of Geneva), were the principal representatives of this group.

The bishops opposed to the immediate definition of infallibility formed at first several groups. In contemporary documents they are designated as antidefinitionists or anti-infallibilists. Often their adversaries called them the liberals, the Gallicans, or the opponents.[9] In connection with those who, without denying the infallibility, disputed the opportuneness of its definition, Veuillot created the epithet of opportunist, which has since passed into the political language.[10] The French who followed this line met at the house of Cardinal Mathieu, archbishop of Besançon. Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans and Archbishop Darboy of Paris were the most influential members of this group. Almost all accepted the dogma of the papal infallible authority, but considered that its definition, at least immediately, was not opportune. The German "opponents," who generally went further than the French and some of whom even questioned the very doctrine of papal infallibility, recognized as their leader Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague. The most outstanding among them were Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, Archbishop Haynald of Colocza, Archbishop Rauscher of Vienna, and Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar.[11] A fourth group was

[9] The prelates thus called always protested against this designation. In their turn, they called their adversaries "opponents of the episcopate," and gave themselves the name of "moderates." But these names did not last. Finally they accepted that of "members of the minority."

[10] In the *Univers* of January 12, 1869, Louis Veuillot first used this word "opportunist," or rather "non-opportunist," adding: "I ask your pardon for the word." Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, 104.

[11] Strossmayer was titular bishop of Bosnia, Sirmium, and Diakovar. He had his ordinary residence at Diakovar or Diakovo, whence the title of bishop of Diakovar, which was commonly given him.

called the group of the third party because, less keenly opposed to the definition than were the friends of Schwarzenberg and Dupanloup, they took a less ardent attitude than did the friends of Dechamps. The group had at its head Cardinal Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, and counted among its members Guibert, archbishop of Tours, Lavigerie, archbishop of Algiers, Bernadou, archbishop of Sens, and Forcade, bishop of Nevers.[12]

Before beginning the account of the conciliar debates, we must point out the existence and tendencies of these four groups, because they represented exactly the four movements of ideas then prevalent in the Catholic world. While outside of the council some defended the dogma of the papal infallibility and the immediate definition with such ardor that they seemed at times to forget the divine right of the bishops and wished to stifle their deliberations; others held the inopportuneness of a definition and did so with such arguments that sometimes they suggested doubt about their belief in the doctrine itself. Some Christians, less numerous perhaps, or rather appearing to be less numerous because they were less noisy and less agitated, were confident that, by the help of the Holy Ghost, the fathers of the council would be able, for defining the supreme magisterium of the head of the Church, to find the serene formula that would proclaim the absolute authority of the pope without seeming to absorb therein that of the bishops, the luminous and calm word that would enlighten our separated brethren without embittering them. In this result, by the grace of God, all collaborated,

[12] Other groupings were roughly outlined; they were of less importance than the ones we have just enumerated. Toward the end of January, 1870, Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore tried, in a plan of union, to organize a third party, whose program would be the definition equivalent to that of infallibility, but without using that word (Icard, *Journal,* p. 152). On the other hand, Dupanloup and Darboy attempted to organize an "international commission" with a view to regularizing the action of the different opposing groups. But as Cardinals Mathieu and Bonnechose refused to follow that path, the project did not have the expected success (*ibid.*, p. 76; Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 7). These two cardinals were in favor of another project, that of uniting into one group all the French bishops. In the name of the Pope, Cardinal Antonelli objected to the plan. In the presence of this opposition, the plan was not pursued. Icard, *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 50, 58.

some by forcefully making the absolute character of the dogma stand out, the others by recalling the maternal solicitude of the Church, ever attentive to dispense her teaching under the form best adapted to the needs of souls.

The Heads of the Groups

Among the eminent prelates we have enumerated, some we are already acquainted with: Dupanloup, by the decisive part he took in the campaign for freedom of education and by several works of the apostolate; Manning, by the fame of his conversion and the high position he soon occupied in the Catholic Church of England; Guibert, by the lofty wisdom which he evidenced among delicate controversies. On a higher plane all three were about to employ their eminent qualities: the first in the group of the "opponents," the second in that of the "infallibilists," the third in "the third party." But along with them, and in each of these groups, Dechamps (archbishop of Malines), Pie (bishop of Poitiers), Hefele (bishop of Rottenburg), Strossmayer (bishop of Diakovar), Darboy (archbishop of Paris), Bonnechose (bishop of Rouen), and Mathieu (archbishop of Besançon) would exercise such an influence on the progress of the conciliar deliberations that history must sketch their characteristic features, if only by a few fleeting traits.

Adolphe Dechamps, brother of the Belgian minister, had taken an active part in the Malines congresses, was for a time a follower of Lamennais, then a priest, a Redemptorist, bishop of Namur in 1865, and archbishop of Malines in 1867. For a long time Bishop Dechamps was known by the warmth of his patriotism, the winning liveliness of his apostolic zeal, and the powerful originality of his apologetic teachings.[13] Uniting, as he said, the internal fact and the external fact, he held: 1. that the attentive study of man such as he is "furnishes an absolute

[13] Saintrain, *Vie du cardinal Dechamps, archevêque de Malines.*

proof of the necessity of the Christian revelation"; 2. that the living tradition of the Catholic Church constitutes by itself an absolute proof of the truth of that same revelation.[14] The first of these propositions had brought against him the charge of Baianism; the second made him suspected of fideism. But the Vatican council would clear him of this double charge by declaring: 1. that as result of the fact that God has called man to a supernatural end, "revelation is absolutely necessary for him," and 2. that "the Church is, by herself, an irrefutable witness of her divine mission." [15] As soon as the question of papal infallibility was posed, Dechamps took up its defense. He saw in it the peremptory answer to the Gallican error, which he had fought from his early youth in the liberal and ultramontane journals of Belgium.[16] Dupanloup replied, excusing himself for contradicting "his holy friend," and a lively polemic followed between the two prelates.

In the group over which he presided, Dechamps had no more active helper in his campaign for the definition of infallibility than Bishop Pie of Poitiers. Of lowly birth, born of a village cobbler and a humble daughter of the people, but possessing a dignity of manners that was revealed in the gravity of his countenance and in his majestic bearing, Bishop Pie professed, in politics, devotion to the Bourbon monarchy and, in the religious controversies, ideas most favorable to the pope in regard to the bishops, to the Church in regard to the civil society, to revelation in regard to reason. With equal energy he had fought the policy of Napoleon III, the ideas of Dupanloup, and the doctrines of Victor Cousin.[17]

At the council the Archbishop of Malines and the Bishop of Poitiers met formidable adversaries in Bishop Hefele, Bishop

[14] Dechamps, *Lettres théologiques sur la démonstration de la foi,* p. 296.

[15] Denzinger-Bannwart, no. 1786.

[16] *L'emancipation* and the *Journal des Flandres,* where he signed himself A.V.D., disciple of Lamennais. Dechamps was then less than twenty years old.

[17] Cf. Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie.*

Strossmayer, and Archbishop Darboy. Hefele represented especially science. As Emile Ollivier wrote: "Bishop Hefele is a vigorous spirit and strikes on facts like a blacksmith on his anvil. Gifted with prodigious knowledge, at the same time artless and subtle, under his gruff and rather rough exterior, he has a pliancy quite suited to conciliation." [18] Well in advance of the meeting of the council the Pope had recourse to his inexhaustible science, unusually well informed on the conciliar questions.[19]

Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovar and vicar apostolic of Serbia, represented the eloquence, an eloquence without an affected style, but of singular power. He never took the attitude of a theologian or a philosopher, but of a tactician of the Catholic apostolate. Later he said: "If I opposed resolutely the project of the definition of the dogma of infallibility, that was not because I had, like Döllinger or Hefele, the least theological objection to that dogma; it was not because I feared, like Dupanloup, to stir up uselessly and to irritate what is called the modern spirit. No. I took a point of view, which has directed my life, the development of the Slav nation, which is at the period of formation and which I feared to see hindered by an excessive centralization."

This development of the Slavic race had, in its spirit, a considerable religious capacity. According to him, to prepare the religious peace, the union of the Churches was needed. His town of Diakovar appeared to him as a connecting link between the West and the East, as the meeting-place of three religions: the Roman, the Russian Orthodox, and the Islamic. Strossmayer was in continuous relations with the Russian philosopher Soloviev and with the Roman Barnabite Tondini. This great lord, who had founded a museum with its own pictures and had built a cathedral with the proceeds of the sale of part of his

[18] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, I, 425.

[19] Granderath, *Histoire du concile du Vatican*, I, 88, 92, 468, 481 f., 490 f., 494, 496, 502. Hefele's masterpiece is his history of the councils, translated into French by Father Delarc, then by Dom Leclercq.

forests, was also in correspondence with the minister Gladstone and Prince Michael of Serbia, who treated with him as with a power. At the council, almost always in opposition to the majority of the assembly, he made himself always listened to by it, so natural was his eloquence, so taking, always well suited. After condensing his ideas in a few notes, he improvised his speeches in the purest Latin.[20] "Daring, supple, stirring, spiritual," says Ollivier, "Bishop Strossmayer is always dazzling." [21]

In the opposition, Bishop Darboy represented the diplomacy. "Penetration and serenity, mild boldness, with a captivating air of insinuation—wrote a statesman well placed to know the Archbishop of Paris—behold what one read on the face of Archbishop Darboy. Pious, regular, utterly devoted to his episcopal duties, he was, nevertheless, more of Richelieu than of St. Vincent de Paul. His mighty soul animated a frail body, which it made submit; but in his dealings he brought a certain ease, of charm that no one could resist. . . . The Emperor, whose full confidence he enjoyed, readily followed his indications on ecclesiastical matters." [22]

Cardinal Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, and Cardinal Mathieu, archbishop of Besançon, were spirits of less breadth than that of the men we have just now described. But, less conspicuous by their talents, they effectively influenced the two groups of which they were the heads, and thereby the whole council. Bonnechose had worn the magisterial toga before he was a priest; as a priest he performed at Rome the duties of superior of St. Louis of the French. From his first profession he kept his devotion to justice, the sense of affairs, and the taste for methodical and clear exposition. The archbishop of Besançon,

[20] In 1905 he said: "One reason why I did not in the council come to agreement with the majority of the bishops was that they spoke such poor Latin" (*Correspondant*, April 25, 1905, p. 270).

[21] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 12.

[22] *Ibid.*, II, 12.

with heavy body and subtle mind, possessed in the discussions an advantage rather rare among his fellow French bishops: he handled the Latin language with a dexterity and elegance that was not second to that of Strossmayer. The two French cardinals had given the Holy See striking proofs of their devotedness: Cardinal Bonnechose, in courageously defending in the Senate the temporal power of the pope; Cardinal Mathieu in incurring a declaration of abuse for having published in the pulpit the encyclical *Quanta cura*. Neither of them, however, aroused the suspicions of the French government, which knew their habits of discretion and prudence. Each of them assumed the task of counterbalancing whatever was too sharp in the manifestations of the extreme parties and of upholding the cause of moderation in the council.[23]

The Program

From the mere fact that the classification of the parties took place on the question of papal infallibility, the chief object of the conciliar deliberations could be foreseen. But the program submitted to the assembly was a vast one. The *Index schematum* that was distributed to the fathers of the council [24] embraced a double series of dogmatic and disciplinary questions. The dogmatic questions treated the modern errors coming from materialism, rationalism, and pantheism, as well as the attacks directed against the Church, its organization, and its rights. The disciplinary questions related to ecclesiastical persons (bishops, canons, pastors, religious, etc.), as also to the ecclesiastical institutions and works (seminaries, liturgical ceremonies, the administration of the sacraments, catechism, preaching, missions, Oriental rites, etc.). Article 7 of the regulations ordered the fathers to begin with the dogmatic questions. After that they

[23] See Besson, *Vie du cardinal de Bonnechose; Vie du cardinal Mathieu.*
[24] *Collectio lacensis,* VII, 505.

could deliberate on dogma or discipline at their pleasure. To serve as the subject of their first discussions, the fathers chose the project *De doctrina catholica contra multiplices errores ex rationalismo derivatos.*[25] They would then discuss several disciplinary questions concerning bishops, synods, vicars general, vacancies of episcopal sees, the life of clerics, the editing of a universal catechism, and lastly entered on the dogmatic schema of the constitution of the Church by the question of papal infallibility. This last question had hardly been settled by a solemn definition, when the beginnings of the Franco-German war and the invasion of the papal territory by the Italian troops disturbed and then interrupted the labors of the council.

The conciliar debates, then, comprised three periods: the discussion of the first dogmatic constitution, a series of discussions on various disciplinary questions, and the discussion on the second dogmatic constitution.[26]

The debates devoted to the first dogmatic schema *De doctrina catholica* gave at first the impression of extreme confusion. From December 28, 1869 to January 10, 1870, in the course of six general congregations, thirty-five fathers, belonging to the most diverse nationalities, spoke; of these, twenty-four, with more or less insistence, asked the return of the project to a commission for its revision. It was criticized for resembling a professor's treatise rather than a conciliar doctrinal exposition. Fault was found with the obscurity of its wording and the stiffness and harshness of its expressions. Bishop Connolly of Halifax criticized the whole schema in substance and form and asked that it be not corrected, but buried. *Dimittatur,* he said,

[25] *Collectio lacensis,* VII, 507–53.

[26] These three periods, in a general way clearly distinct, were not strictly separated in their chronological order. The debates on the disciplinary constitutions began when the deliberations on the first dogmatic constitution were not yet concluded; and the deliberations on the second dogmatic constitution were started before the end of the debates on the disciplinary constitutions. For convenience of exposition, we will treat the three phases separately.

non ad corrigendum, sed ad sepeliendum. Bishop Strossmayer declared himself deeply amazed that the proposed text, instead of bearing at its head, like the decrees of the Council of Trent, the words, *Sacrosancta Synodus decernit* ("The holy synod decrees"), begins with the words: *Pius, episcopus, servus servorum Dei, sacro approbante concilio* ("Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approbation of the sacred council"). By reason of the vehemence of his protest on this point, he was interrupted by the president of the council.[27] Outside the assembly, some theologians expressed their opposition to the schema by saying they saw therein the work of the Jesuits, intended to lead the council to adopt the ideas of the *Civiltà cattolica.*[28] Others, including some Jesuits, summoned up their impressions by declaring the work too Germanic. The principal author of the schema was, in fact, a German Jesuit, Fr. Franzelin.[29]

John Baptist Franzelin, born in 1816, at Altino, in Tyrol, was professor of dogmatic theology in the Roman College, from 1851 on. His students admired the breadth of his knowledge, and his works put him in the foremost ranks of nineteenth-century theologians. But clearness of expression did not always equal the depth of his erudition and of his philosophical penetration.[30] In vain he tried to defend the wording of the schema

[27] The bell was struck by President de Luca, and the observation was made by President Capalti. "De Luca was a reserved man, somewhat timid. Capalti answered in his stead." Thus Granderath, *Hist. du concile du Vatican,* II, 124, n. 2.

[28] "Mgr. Vecchiotti thinks that the Jesuits have planned this schema, in order to have the council accept the ideas which they uphold in the *Civiltà cattolica*" (Icard, *Journal,* p. 52.) Mgr. Vecchiotti, counsel of the state at Rome, was the author of a well-known treatise on Canon Law (*Institutiones canonicae,* Turin, 1869). This treatise had been sharply criticised by Fr. Bouix, S.J. Mgr. Vecchiotti had also been sent by the Holy See on several diplomatic missions.

[29] "Father Matignon was not more satisfied with the schema than we were," writes Icard. "He admits that some fathers of the Society are the ones who worked on its composition, . . . but he adds that the product is their personal work, a work too Germanic." Icard, *op. cit.,* p. 77.

[30] On Franzelin, see Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius,* V, 1507–10; Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* VI, 765–67; Louis Teste, *Préface au conclave,* pp. 273–79.

before the deputation of the council.[31] This committee was unanimous in requesting the recasting of the schema, which this time was entrusted to three fathers of the council: bishops Dechamps, Pie, and Martin (of Paderborn).

The new project, brought before the assembly (March 14, 1870) under the title of *De fide catholica,* there received a most favorable welcome. The editors had taken account of the wishes expressed by their colleagues. Its style was simple and clear, the exposition short and methodical. The debates began under the presidency of Cardinal de Angelis, who had just been promoted to that post by the Pope, replacing Cardinal de Reisach, recently deceased. Several amendments were proposed on points of detail, and it was sent back to the commission, which carefully examined them, then proposed them to the vote of the assembly. The fathers could formulate their votes in three ways: a simple *placet,* a simple *non placet,* or a *placet juxta modum,* that is, conditional. In this last case, they handed in their written comments or amendments. The vote on the ensemble of the schema took place on April 12. Present were 598 fathers. Of these, 515 gave a simple *placet;* 83, *placet juxta modum;* no one voted *non placet.* The commission received the comments annexed to the *placet juxta modum,* and took account of them for the revision of the text, which was returned to the assembly on April 23. This time the fathers would vote either *placet* or *non placet.* Any explanation was excluded.

The Constitution *De fide*

On the 24th the project, since known as the *Constitutio de fide catholica* (or *Dei Filius*) was passed, in a public session, by unanimous vote. All the fathers, from the cardinal highest in

---

According to Matignon, Father Franzelin was aided in his work by another German, Father Schneider (Icard, *Journal,* p. 77).

[31] *Collectio lacensis,* VII, 1647.

dignity to the last of the religious superiors, at the call of their name, cast their vote. Only one *non placet* was voted. Says one of the members: "It was like a procession of the whole world to render testimony of the faith of the Catholic world." [32]

Cardinal Manning writes: "The importance of this first Constitution on Catholic Faith cannot be over-estimated, and, from its great breadth, may not as yet be fully perceived. It is the broadest and boldest affirmation of the supernatural and spiritual order ever yet made in the face of the world; which is now, more than ever, sunk in sense and heavy with materialism." [33] As stated in its preamble, "the minds of many have lapsed at length into the depth of pantheism, materialism, and atheism . . . and the Catholic instinct has become feeble." To contemporary unbelief, confounding God with the world when it does not deny Him altogether, refusing in any case to believe in any divine intervention in humanity and in particular in revelation, and denying the possibility of faith or at least subordinating it to reason, the council opposed, in four chapters, a solid and luminous summary of the Catholic doctrine: 1. on God, 2. on revelation, 3. on faith, 4. on the relation of faith to reason. In the first of these chapters it proclaims the existence of a personal God, free, Creator of all things, and absolutely independent of the material and spiritual things that He created. The second chapter affirms the existence of two orders of truths: the order of nature, accessible to the faculties of knowledge possessed by man, and the order of the supernatural, which can be known only by a divine revelation. The third chapter treats of faith; it teaches to see, in the act of faith, an act of reason and an act of freedom, an act of man and an act of God; and it shows how the Church, guardian of the deposit of faith,

[32] Ketteler, in *Der Katholik* of 1870, I, 529. Strossmayer alone did not attend the public session of the 24th. He complained that no account was taken of his reservations. His *placet juxta modum* of April 12 carried these words: *"Salvis conciliorum oecumenicorum juribus."*

[33] Manning, *The Vatican Council,* pp. 55, 50.

bears in herself the guaranty of her infallibility and truthfulness. The fourth chapter, having in view on the one hand the fideist tendency, and on the other hand the rationalist tendency, marks off the two domains of reason and of faith, and recalls that an apparent disagreement between science and religion can come only from an error on the doctrine of the latter or from a false idea on the conclusions of science.[34]

Thus was accomplished the first phase of the Vatican Council. Begun amid divisions and difficulties that seemed irreducible, it ended by a unanimous vote. The apprehensions of those who, at the outset, had seemed to fear a systematic stifling of discussion, were soon dissipated. About 200 prelates had spoken with such freedom that more than one member of the assembly, even among those most jealous of their independence, complained of the excessive tolerance of the presidents. The first discussions, on a theme that was often poorly drawn up, seemed at the beginning only to accumulate mists, but gradually from these mists emerged the clear and luminous formulas of one of the most beautiful conciliar Constitutions. In the midst of the discussions of men, who could then misunderstand the supreme action of the Spirit of God?

[34] See the scholarly commentary on this Constitution in Vacant, *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican.*

CHAPTER XXXVI

Disciplinary Questions

BEFORE the closing of the first discussion, a second phase opened. While the conciliar commission was preparing a revision of the dogmatic schema, the fathers, taking advantage of the faculty granted them by the regulation, chose as the subject of their deliberations two projects of the disciplinary constitution: the schema on bishops, synods, and vicars general, and the schema on the vacancy of episcopal sees.

The discussions began on January 14. Even more than in the debates aroused on the dogmatic questions, very pronounced difference broke out among the fathers. These were to be expected. The truths to be believed are the same throughout the world; but the disciplinary rules, before being adapted to the particular needs of different countries, are necessarily different.

The first admonitions that were presented against the schema *De episcopis* were not, however, prompted by preoccupations of local or national interest, but by that impression, so obsessing with some fathers, that the Roman curia had a prepossession of distrust toward the episcopate. Cardinal Schwarzenberg and Bishop Strossmayer expressed the wish that, before concerning itself with the reform of the bishops, the Vatican Council, following the traditions of several councils, in particular the V Lateran, would issue a decree on the College of Cardinals, on the curia, and on the Roman congregations. More need existed, they said, for this procedure in the present council, since the congregations created by Sixtus V had received their present form after the last council. Some wishes had been deposited on this subject. In what concerned the bishops, why speak only of

their duties? Was nothing to be said about their rights and their dignity, of their election and of their promotion? Bishop Strossmayer, according to his custom, had been particularly keen in the discussion. When Bishop Dreux-Brezé remarked to him that the College of Cardinals had a father, the pope, and that this father would know how to impose a reform on them when that reform would be necessary, Strossmayer replied: "If all of us have a father, who is the pope, all of us have a mother, which is the Church." Moreover, the Church universal, officially represented by its bishops, has the right to ask that the College of Cardinals should be, as the Council of Trent required, a representation of all the Christian nations.[1] Cardinal de Pietro answered the two previous speakers with spirit. According to him, to compare to the pompous princes of the Church in the sixteenth century the present cardinals, so worthy, so austere in their lives, so assiduous in their labors, was to offer them a gratuitous insult. To appear to apply to them the words of Batholomew de Martyribus and to ask "that the most illustrious cardinals have need of a most illustrious reform," [2] was an anachronism entirely unjustified. However, he did not object to having deleted from the schema certain words having an implication somewhat hard for the bishops. The omission of these words was the chief result of the discussion.

The numerous observations suggested to the different fathers by local necessities, by particular customs, at first had the disadvantage of disturbing the ready-made notions and the unduly simplified ideas, even of giving an impression of inconsistency or illogicality in the ecclesiastical discipline; but they had the invaluable advantage of making Rome acquainted with these local needs, those particular customs, and thereby of hindering,

[1] The following are the words of the Council of Trent: "[The cardinals] whom the most holy Roman pontiff shall, in so far as it can be conveniently done, choose from all the nations of Christendom." Sess. XXIV, *de Reform.*, cap. 1. (Cf. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 192. Tr.)

[2] See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church*, V, 568.

as a historian of the council remarks, "that henceforth no attempt would be made to establish general laws when the diversity of practices did not comport with them." [3] Among the speeches that were made on this subject, we must mention that of Bishop Audu, patriarch of Babylonia, of the Chaldean rite. The venerable prelate, evidently alarmed at the thought that the fathers were going to apply a uniform discipline to the East and to the West, begged the council not to do so. He strove to show that between the Western Church and the Eastern Church more profound differences existed than the fathers could imagine. He said: "I implore you not to undertake to treat a patient that has barely emerged from convalescence as if he were a vigorous warrior. We are ill from the insufficient training of our clergy, from the inexperience of many new converts who have barely emerged from the Nestorian sect, from the fewness and the scattered location of our churches, from the oppression of the Mohammedans, from the contact with schismatics. Besides, our peoples have an attachment, perhaps excessive, but needing to be treated with kindliness, for their ancient traditions. I am not opposed to the reform of our Churches, I even ask it; but I judge that the soundest means of carrying it out is to proceed by national synods. I beseech the Pope and the council to fix a date for us and a place of assembly. We will make a choice of disciplinary canons that can be suited to our Churches, we will combine them with our ancient laws, and we will submit to the examination of the fathers our canon law thus worked out." The wisdom of such views could hardly be denied. But Pius IX, to affirm his direct right over the Eastern Churches, sent word to the Chaldean patriarch and ordered him to consecrate without delay two priests whom he, the Pope, had just designated for two vacant sees of Chaldea. The patriarch submitted; but this incident determined, between the Roman

[3] Granderath, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils*, II, 209.

court and the Eastern bishops, a tension that lasted to the end of the council.[4]

After the examination of the two disciplinary projects about bishops and vacancies of episcopal sees, the council entered on the discussion of two other projects about the life of clerics and the writing of a universal catechism. The new debates unfolded with incidents like those which had marked the first deliberation. The following took a notable part in the discussions: Bishop Martin of Paderborn, always ardent in defending the Roman traditions and always on the watch against Gallicanism; Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans, sometimes too quick in repartee; Bishop Langalerie of Belley, with words full of unction; Bishop Guibert of Tours, always master of his discourse, simple, firm, and moderate; Bishop Vérot of Savannah, too often obliged to take back an expression that exceeded or misrepresented his thought; Cardinal Mathieu of Besançon and Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar, two rivals in the art of handling the Latin language, the former with calculated moderation, the other with deliberate boldness. They spoke of the common life of priests, of clerical celibacy, of the Roman breviary, of the advantages and the disadvantages of a uniform catechism for all Christendom.

Outside Discussions on Infallibility

Let us note a strange fact. On subjects that apparently would give rise to an exchange of calm and peaceful remarks, the debate was animated; the discussion waxed hot. When discussing the regulation of seminaries or the dress of clerics, the speakers seemed to have in view more general and exciting questions.

[4] Bishop Audu accepted all the decisions of the Vatican Council. Subsequently new difficulties would arise between him and the Holy See; but he never went as far as schism. He would even energetically resist attempts at schism, which took place in his Church. After his death, Leo XIII praised his zeal and his piety. Cf. *Acta Leonis XIII*, I, 199.

Some speakers seemed ceaselessly afraid of an infringement on the rights of the pope; others, an encroachment on the prerogatives of the episcopacy. Still others, seeing the dangers of these two excessive concerns, asked God for the grace of never separating in their heart the love of the Church from the love of its supreme head.[5] At bottom, the question of papal infallibility, which had not yet appeared on the program, more and more dominated all other questions both in the council and outside of it. It was discussed in the press, where it became the subject of resounding pamphlets.[6] A long controversy, entered into at the beginning of 1870, between Father Gratry of the Oratory and Bishop Dechamps on the subject of the so-called heresy of Pope Honorius, stirred public opinion. An article appearing in the *Moniteur universal* (February 24) under this title, "La situation des choses à Rome," embittered the quarrel. In the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and in the *Gazette d'Augsbourg,* Döllinger violently attacked the very doctrine of infallibility;[7] Hefele and Ketteler, in pamphlets and in periodical articles, repeated the criticisms of Bishop Maret against the "personal and separate" infallibility. Gustave Janicot, in the *Gazette de France,* inserted with commentary the letters of Father Gratry against "the absorbing infallibility."[8] Meanwhile the *Univers* organized peti-

[5] This is the prayer that M. Icard often made and that he mentions several times in his *Journal.*

[6] These disputes often had for their starting point, in the anti-Catholic press, the total misunderstanding of the dogma under discussion. This misunderstanding unfortunately persisted even after the definition of the dogma. You might suppose you were dreaming when reading in Henri Martin's *Histoire de France populaire* (VII, 139): "The infallibility of the pope has as a logical consequence, along with the suppression of all the ancient rights of the episcopacy and the direct sovereignty of the pope over all the dioceses, the renewal of the most exorbitant maxims of theocracy. . . . It implies the claim to the indirect power over the temporal and the condemnation of liberalism and of modern civilization."

[7] "Who today affirms the infallibility? A pope. . . . Moreover, behind the pope, the Jesuits. The Jesuits are the ones who, for several years, have been preparing the definition of the pretended dogma." *Gazette d'Augsbourg* of January 21, 1879.

[8] The royalist daily press was then represented in Paris chiefly by three papers. The *Union,* directed by Pierre-Sébastien Laurentie, strongly defended the doctrine

tions to call for the immediate proclamation of infallibility, and Louis Veuillot lumped together the "antidefinitionists" and the "antiopportunists," as he called them, in the same scornful raillery. "One day," he wrote, "I felt an odor of sweat on me which disturbed me. . . . I summoned the chimney-sweep. . . . The fire was in the girders and began to blaze up. We recognized the opportuneness of extinguishing it. I have recounted the story of the nineteenth ecumenical council. Assuredly, I will not say that M. Janicot and the other knights of the inopportunism are girders. But M. Gratry, of the Academy and of the Oratory, M. Döllinger, of the Faculty and bourgeoisie of Munich, Bishop Maret of the episcopacy and of the Sorbonne, and others whom I refrain from naming, are at least little beams, and no one will deny that they are ablaze. Behold the opportunism." [9] These lines appeared in the *Univers* of February 14, 1870. Two weeks later, Montalembert replied to Louis Veuillot not less spirited in tone. He rose up against "those lay theologians of absolutism, who began by making a litter of all our liberties before Napoleon III, and then immolated justice and truth, reason and history, in a holocaust to the idol which they have erected at the Vatican." [10] "Never," he said, "thanks be to God, have I thought, said, or written anything favorable to the pope's personal and separate infallibility, such as they wish to impose on us." [11] The increasingly sharp tone of these newspaper discussions every day added to the ardor of the two parties. At Rome, in spite of the prudent prohibition by Pius IX, who had forbidden the printing of any writings on the council, the agitations reached

---

of papal infallibility; the *Gazette de France*, under the direction of Gustave Janicot, publicized the objections of Gratry and Montalembert; the *Français*, more moderate, with François Beslay and Paul Thureau-Dangin, followed the ideas of Dupanloup and attacked only the opportuneness of the definition.

[9] Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile*, I, 213.

[10] *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 1386.

[11] *Ibid.*, 1385. Evidently Montalembert's letter made a deep impression on the Pope. Pius IX had the letter read to him three times in succession, listening with closed eyes; then he himself read it again.

the Roman people. Every time that Pius IX appeared in public, a throng received him with cries of "Long live the infallible pope!" At the entrance door of the council the curious gathered, among whom might be noted the sister and the daughters of a French journalist, eyeing the passage of the prelates, and giving each one his note.[12] People repeated the sallies of the Bishop of Tulle. "Those who are wise according to the world," said Bishop Berteaud, "would perhaps have judged that it was not opportune that the Son of God should be born in a stable. That would have been shocking to many ideas of the time." In a more tragic tone, Bishop Wicart of Laval wrote to his diocesans: "Before God, ready to appear before His judgment seat, I declare that I would prefer to fall dead on the spot than to follow the Bishop of Orléans along the path he is following today." [13]

The Pope counseled calm; but he sent his congratulations to the writers who defended the infallibility, and to the faithful who sent petitions for the definition.[14] These interventions were regarded by some as an official pressure that might alter the freedom of the assembly. On February 20, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Daru, sent to Cardinal Antonelli some strictures on this point. On April 6, a document of more considerable significance, a Memorandum was sent by the same minister to all the powers, inviting them to see that the council respected "the rights and liberties of the civil society." [15] This

[12] Upon their aunt's indications, the grandneices gave a smile to the "good" ones, and made faces at the "bad" ones.

[13] Quoted by Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 65.

[14] Granderath, *op. cit.*, II, 374.

[15] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 101. We are certain that the letters written by Bishop Darboy to the heads of the French government informed them of the agitation outside the council. But other indiscretions, important in other ways, committed by lesser officials, by workmen in printshops, pamphlets, etc., had kept the ambassadors acquainted with the most secret documents. On February 9, 1870, Icard wrote: "Bishop Vecchiotti told me that the secret of the council is so poorly kept that often he has seen ministers of the different states (and he mentioned to me among others

diplomatic action aroused an extreme agitation in all Europe, but simply stirred up the zeal of the partisans of infallibility. After all, was so much to be feared from the powers of the world? Their backing could be dispensed with. Following a popular demonstration in honor of the Pope, Louis Veuillot wrote from Rome: "The Pope and the people! I believe that these words are visibly written on the door of the Vatican Council, and that this door is the entrance way of a new world, or rather that it is an arch of triumph on the recovered path of the human race." [16]

Decidedly, since the question of infallibility was arousing so much feeling outside of the council, the question needed to be resolved without delay. The third party, which at first seemed inclined toward the partisans of inopportunism, was turning now toward the defenders of opportunism. Speaking of the former party, they said: *Quod inopportunum dixerunt, necessarium fecerunt* ("They have made necessary the definition which they declared inopportune").[17] The petition voted by the fathers to ask the urgency of a discussion on the question of infallibility had 480 signatures,[18] whereas the petition asking for a delay was signed by not more than 137. From that time the

Odo Russel), who related to him in all detail what was happening and was being said in the congregations" (Icard, *Journal,* p. 188). Sir Odo Russel, later Lord Ampthill, England's chargé d'affaires at Rome, was however, although an Anglican, favorable to the cause of the majority. He had a close friendship with Archbishop Manning. Subsequently Pius IX released the Archbishop of Westminster from his oath of secrecy with respect to Sir Russel so that the latter would be able to rectify, with the diplomatic corps, misleading items of informations coming from elsewhere. Several other prelates of the majority were apparently also relieved of their oath for similar reasons. On this subject, see Hemmer, *Vie du cardinal Manning,* pp. 213–15; Granderath, *op. cit.,* II, 367.

[16] L. Veuillot, *Rome et le Concile,* I, 14.

[17] These words are generally attributed to Bishop Cousseau of Angoulême. But apparently the prelate merely translated into an elegant Latin saying an expression of Veuillot. On this point, see an article of Eugène Veuillot in the *Univers et le Monde* (December 13, 1897) and G. Barbier, *Mgr Sauvé,* II, 181.

[18] This is the figure given by the calculation of Granderath, *op. cit.,* II, 179.

outcome of the deliberation appeared to all as certain, for the number of the fathers opposed on principle to the doctrine of infallibility was insignificant.[19] The question concerned solely the terms of a definition that henceforth left no doubt.

[19] Cardinal Manning says that the number was limited to not more than five. Manning, *The True Story of the Vatican Council,* p. 99. On this point, see Granderath, II, 333–41.

CHAPTER XXXVII

Papal Infallibility

THE drawing up of the dogmatic formula defining papal infallibility passed through several phases which ought to be recounted by us. In January, 1870, Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore wrote and had signed by five American bishops a motion asking for, not the direct definition of infallibility, which would alarm the governments and which the bad faith of the enemies of the Church would seek to make a bugbear for the people, and which a number of bishops, for various reasons, would abstain from voting, but an indirect definition. This would be formulated simply by the proclamation of certain propositions already universally admitted in the Church and from which the infallibility would flow immediately and clearly. For example, the following would be condemned: 1. the contention of appealing from the pope to a council; 2. that of being satisfied with an outward obedience to the pope's authority; 3. the opinion maintaining that the pope, in condemning a proposition, can be deceived as to its true meaning. The main advantage of such a procedure, said the signers of the petition, would be that it would unite, not merely the majority of the fathers, but an overwhelming moral unanimity, thus closing the mouth of all the fomenters of revolt.[1]

The advantages of the procedure suggested by the note of the five American bishops were real; but a certain number of the fathers judged that the proposed formulas would still leave

[1] *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 938–40; Granderath, *Histoire du concile du Vatican*, II, 180–82.

some margin for ambiguity.[2] On February 15, Archbishop Manning, who, for some time "was laboring night and day to procure the happy issue of this grave affair." [3] proposed to formulate anathema against anyone who would maintain that "the decrees issued on matters of faith and morals by the Roman Pontiff, acting as supreme Pastor and Doctor of the universal Church, are reformable." [4] Three weeks later the commission charged with the drawing up of the schema *De Ecclesia* added a chapter entitled, "Romanum pontificem in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errare non posse." [5] This project was destined to have no more success than the preceding, but for reasons quite apart from its form. The schema *De Ecclesia,* to which it was appended and which had been distributed to the fathers on January 21, was, by an abuse of confidence, communicated to the newspapers and stirred up a violent opposition of the governments. In fact, this project touched on the most fiery questions. In its fifteen chapters it treated of the rights of the Church in her relations with the civil society, on the rights of the civil society in its relations with the Church, on the temporal power of the Holy See, on the formula, "Outside the Church no salvation," etc. "Its twenty-one canons fulminated, in short formulas, anathema against those who would dispute the doctrines contained in the schema." [6] "As soon as the genuineness of these reported texts was beyond doubt," says Emile Ollivier, "clamor of disapproval arose in the press of all Europe." [7] Many governments prepared to offer positive resistance to the council, and so informed Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State of the

[2] Icard writes: "It seemed to me that the schema presented to the examination of the fathers of the council included all that, and said it better." *Journal,* 153.

[3] Granderath, II, 173.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 183; *Collectio lacensis,* p. 952.

[5] Granderath, III, 7.

[6] *Ibid.,* III, 7.

[7] Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican,* II, 100.

Holy See.[8] Decidedly the question of papal infallibility was less irritating, at least for the governments, than most of those proposed in the new schema. This consideration, joined to more direct arguments,[9] was not without influence on the decision taken, to introduce the schema *De romano pontifice* before the schema *De Ecclesia.*

Projected Constitution *De romano pontifice*

This decision was a most happy one. If it had not been taken in opportune time, the fathers, soon obliged to disperse in consequence of events that we will have to relate, would have found themselves faced with this alternative: either to leave unsettled a question that was profoundly agitating the assembly, public opinion, and the states; or to resolve it with precipitation, under conditions that would not have sufficiently guaranteed the moral authority of their definition, perhaps even its dogmatic value.

On the contrary, the discussion and the voting on the schema *De romano pontifice* took place in conditions of the widest freedom. An eminent member of the assembly writes as follows: "On the general discussion of the Schema *De romano pontifice* some eighty bishops had spoken. Of these nearly half were of what the newspapers called the Opposition; but the proportion of the Opposition to the Council was not more than one sixth. They had therefore been heard as

[8] Antonelli's emotion was such that, fearing grave diplomatic complications, he prevented Bishop de Dreux-Brezé, bishop of Moulins, from presenting to the deputation of the council a project which he judged was capable of stirring up the governments. In Icard's *Journal,* under date of March 21, 1870, we read: "Cardinal Antonelli, who up to the present has been little involved in the affairs of the council, has halted, as very imprudent, the project that the Bishop of Moulins was fathering. He insisted on the need of proceeding only with the utmost circumspection."

[9] See Manning, *The Vatican Council.*

three to six." [10] The experience of the previous discussions had, moreover, allowed an improvement of the regulation or, at least, a broadening of the interpretation. "The subject matter was distributed in print to every Bishop, and a period of eight or ten days was given for any observations they might desire to make in writing. These observations were carefully examined by the deputation of twenty-four; and when found to be pertinent were admitted, either to modify or to reform the original Schema. The text so amended was then proposed for the general discussion, on which every Bishop in the Council had a free right to speak, and the discussions lasted so long as any Bishop was pleased to inscribe his name. The only limit upon this freedom of discussion consisted in the power of the Presidents, on the petition of ten Bishops to interrogate the Council whether it desired the discussion to be prolonged." [11]

The debates opened on May 13 with a report of Bishop Pie.[12] This report, sometimes read, sometimes improvised, set forth the reasons why the doctrine of the primacy of the pope was put at the head of the Constitution on the Church. It then explained how this primacy essentially allowed two prerogatives: a supreme power in the government, an infallible authority in the teaching. To anticipate misunderstandings on the most burning question which was met with in the schema, the speaker declared clearly that, in the intention of the commission which offered the present text, 1. the privilege of infallibility in no way applied to the pope as a private person, and 2. the pope and the Church could not be separated from each other. "Far from us," he declared, "be that gratuitous, fantastic, and insulting image of a head separate from its body." [13]

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[12] *Collectio lacensis*, VII. 790.
[13] *Ibid.*, 300.

The general debates on the schema were prolonged for almost three weeks. The doctrine of papal infallibility was there attacked chiefly by Bishop Hefele, who based his stand especially on the condemnation of Pope Honorius by the sixth ecumenical council, and by Bishop Strossmayer, who appealed particularly to St. Cyprian's disobedience to Pope St. Stephen in the baptismal dispute. The reply to the first point was that Pope Honorius was not condemned for having taught heresy, but for having not resisted heresy as the duty of his office demanded of him.[14] On the second point, the reply was made that Pope St. Stephen had not published any dogmatic decree against St. Cyprian, and that the latter had never resisted a decree having in his eyes the character of a definition of faith.[15] The inopportuneness of the definition was maintained, among others, by Bishop Clifford of Clifton, by Bishop Rivet of Dijon, by Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague, by Bishop Greith of Saint Gall, and by Archbishop Darboy of Paris.[16] Certain arguments of Darboy, presented against the opportuneness, had the appearance of attacking the doctrine itself. Various bishops claimed that the definition of infallibility might definitely estrange from the Church Protestant and schismatic populations, and even lead to the apostasy of certain Catholics. Such a fear was considered exaggerated by most of the fathers, of whom Bishop Dechamps and Archbishop Manning were the most eloquent interpreters. Moreover, the scandal, if scandal there was, had already taken place, and would be removed not by the simple postponement of the definition.

[14] See Mourret, *op. cit.*, III, 132.

[15] See *ibid.*, I, 404.

[16] Bishop Clifford and Bishop Rivet asked that the definition be postponed out of regard for Catholic opinion, which was not prepared for this dogma and which the Church regularly did not offend uselessly. Bishop Schwarzenberg and Bishop Greith expressed a fear of seeing the governments rise up against Rome and perhaps form national Churches. Granderath, III, 267–71.

Infallibility Attached to the Papal Office

This general discussion, in which a few sharp words, inevitable in such a debate, were spoken, had the appreciable result of removing certain regrettable misunderstandings. The "infallibilists" having often, in defending their thesis, used the expressions "personal infallibility" and "separate infallibility," their opponents, the "anti-infallibilists" or "antiopportunists," reproached them with thus sustaining a doctrine either false or at least equivocal, and with wishing thereby to proclaim a new dogma, if not basically, at least in its terms. In fact, they said, the traditional doctrine, when it speaks of the infallibility of the pope, connects it with the office rather than with the person, and intends it of the pope united to the Church of which he is the head, and not separate from it. Bishop Dechamps, in the name of the commission, declared that, if the infallibility of the pope can be spoken of as personal, in the sense that it belongs to him exclusively and in a way incommunicable, we may rightly say that it is connected to his office, since it belongs to him only as pastor and doctor of the Church. On the other hand, if it can be spoken of as separate because it has no need of the assent of the Church for its exercise, it is not separate in the sense that is supposedly realizable of a pope and a Church forming two beings not connected to each other. Said Bishop Gastaldi of Saluces: "My head has no need of an arm in order to see, to hear, and to speak; however, it is because it is united to the body that it does all that; separate, it would be without life." [17] From these considerations and some other remarks, Bishop Dechamps concluded that the infallibility of the pope, such as they wished to define it, was in no way presented as an absolute infallibility, but as an infallibility clearly limited; and lastly that, under these conditions,

[17] Granderath, III, 279.

it was not possible to see in the schema proposed the intention of introducing a new dogma.

These explanations and this happy stating of the idea in its true light removed many of the oppositions. But a small number of bishops, at whose head were Bishop Strossmayer and Bishop Dupanloup, persisted in calling for a postponement of the definition. Strossmayer still thought that his Slav populations, with their exceedingly naive spirit, would not be able sufficiently to grasp, and consequently would not be able to tolerate, the projected definition. As to Bishop Dupanloup, Emile Ollivier went so far as to say that, if he had not had Louis Veuillot before him, he would have taken his stand among the most ardent infallibilists, as he had done among the most ardent defenders of the temporal power of the pope. This assertion is less paradoxical than it appears to be at first glance. Not that the Bishop of Orléans, as Ollivier adds, "opposed the infallibility only by dislike for Louis Veuillot, its most earnest promoter"; [18] but he knew and perhaps somewhat exaggerated the influence exercised by the editor-in-chief of the *Univers* over certain members of the episcopate,[19] and to the very end he feared that this influence would have the result of making prevail one of those impressive formulas at which the mighty journalist had the happy gift, but which he thought unseasonably placed in a dogmatic definition.[20]

[18] Ollivier, *L'Empire libéral,* XIII, 125. In his writings previous to the council, Dupanloup had always clearly professed the infallibility of the pope.

[19] "The other day"—I have the fact from the Bishop of Vannes, to whom the words were spoken—"when M. Veuillot entered the parlor of the French seminary, a bishop venerable by his age said to Bishop Bécel: 'He is one of ours, and we are his'" (Icard, *Journal,* p. 70). No doubt, in the mind of the venerable prelate, these words had a meaning quite avowable. But such words, reported to the Bishop of Orléans, stirred in him a feeling of hierarchical susceptibility, although its principle was equally respectable.

[20] We hardly need to recall that the assistance of the Holy Ghost guarantees to the Church only exemption from all error, and does not necessarily suggest the happiest formula. This is the ordinary fruit of wisdom and reflection.

Pope's Direct Authority over Dioceses

The proposed Constitution had a prooemium, or preamble, and four chapters. The discussion of the preamble and of the first two chapters was speedily conducted. It was concluded in two general congregations (June 6 and 7). The assembly spent a longer time on the third chapter. Its subject was the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, showing itself chiefly by "a direct authority" of the Holy Father over all the dioceses and by "a supreme and final jurisdiction" in every case, not only of a dogmatic or moral order, but also of a judiciary and administrative order. The question of the pope's direct power over the dioceses of the entire world sharply divided the assembly. Among the canonists to whom the fathers were accustomed to turn in the course of the debates, outstanding was the Italian scholar, Bishop Vecchiotti, counselor of State to the Holy Father, and M. Icard, director of the St. Sulpice Seminary. Father Icard energetically upheld the doctrine of the "ordinary power," which the former forcefully opposed. Vecchiotti maintained that the collision of this direct power of the pope with the special power of the diocesan bishop was of a nature to create confusion and disorder in the Church. His opponent said: 1. that the question was not of two equal and concurrent powers, but of two powers, one subordinate to the other; 2. that the question could be only, on the part of the pope, of a transient intervention in the government of a diocese, not of a substitution of his power for that of the bishop, of an absorption of the episcopal jurisdiction by the papal jurisdiction, which would then be a power *ad destructionem, non ad aedificationem,* according to the doctrine of St. Paul; 3. that, in the course of the ages, the popes had acted as persons possessing this right, and that therefrom a great good had resulted for the Church.[21]

[21] In his *Journal*, Father Icard often returns to this question of the direct juris-

This latter opinion, defended in the council by bishops Desprez, Freppel, and Dechamps, won out in spite of the objections by bishops Dupanloup and Haynald. A lively incident occurred in the midst of the discussion. Several bishops of the majority, among others Bishop Valerga, patriarch of Jerusalem, had, in connection with Gallicanism, strongly attacked the Church of France and the authority of Bossuet. Bishops Mathieu and Dupanloup replied with an eloquence full of emotion, recalling the evidences of devotion given the Holy See by the French clergy, the praises bestowed on them by Innocent III, Benedict XIV, Pius VI, and Pius VII, and that great testimony of blood they had given in the turmoil of 1793. Bishop Valerga returned to the pulpit to declare that "in his words he did not have any idea of ill will and that he did not identify Gallicanism with the French episcopate. He closed his address by exclaiming: "May the noble Church of France live forever!" [22] The incident was closed.

Discussion on Infallibility

The discussion of the fourth chapter, devoted to the question of the infallibility of the pope, began on June 15, 1870, and terminated on July 14. The long-dreaded debates on this burning question were spirited, but serious and comparatively peaceful. Outside interventions, which Cardinal Antonelli had feared,[23] did not occur. The French government, when asked

---

diction of the pope, either to recount his discussions with Bishop Vecchiotti or to recall the efforts made by him to bring Archbishop Darboy around to his view. Cf. Icard, *Journal*, pp. 144, 163, 207.

[22] Granderath, III, 394–99.

[23] "March 27, 1870. This morning M. Combes related to me what was said to him the day before yesterday by the secretary of the imperial Academy, as the defender of Cardinal de Pietro. Cardinal Antonelli, seriously concerned over the consequences which might result from a definition in the present circumstances, gathered together a certain number of cardinals whom he often consulted on political affairs. They agreed that they would go to see the Holy Father and

to intervene by Archbishop Darboy and Father Gratry, rejected these overtures. Writes Ollivier: "We did not hesitate.[24] When the majority tried to draw us to it by the disavowal of the *memorandum,* we replied: No, we side with no one. We made the same reply to the minority." [25]

Speakers to the number of 118 entered their names to speak on the fourth chapter.[26] But, in the course of the preceding discussions, light was shed little by little. Cardinal Manning wrote: "I can conscientiously declare, that long before the general discussion was closed, all general arguments were exhausted. The special discussion of details also had been to such an extent anticipated that nothing new was heard for days. The repetition became hard to bear." [27] Furthermore, the heat was oppressive. Sixty-one fathers withdrew their right to speak.

The amendments offered by the speakers, however, had happy consequences. The commission, after taking note of them, five days later presented a text notably improved. For the original title, *De romani pontificis infallibilitate,* it substituted the following: *De romani pontificis infallibili magisterio.* This change it made to mark that what was meant was to speak of an assistance accorded to the office, to the magisterium. The commission also introduced the formula, *cum ex cathedra loquitur,* a formula that had the advantage of being traditional, for it was in use in the theological schools.[28] In the third place it qualified the privilege of infallibility as a char-

---

earnestly ask him to remove the famous question from the council. The Pope did not at all welcome their remarks. He said to them: "I have the Blessed Virgin on my side; I will go ahead." Icard, *Journal,* p. 298.

[24] See Archbishop Darboy's letter in Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican,* II, 236–38.

[25] For Archbishop Darboy's letter, see *ibid.,* II, 236.

[26] Granderath, III, 89.

[27] Manning, *The Vatican Council,* p. 37.

[28] This is the expression currently used by Bellarmine in his treatise *De Romano Pontifice.*

ism, thus calling up the idea of a *gratia gratis data,* that is, given for the benefit of others, not a grace *gratum faciens,* that is, which sanctifies the one who receives it and which might have suggested the idea of impeccability in the person to whom it is attributed. Lastly, the learned reporter, Bishop Gasser of Brixen, explained that the infallibility of the pope, such as it was proposed to define it, had for its object, like that of the Church, only the preservation and explanation of the deposit of revealed faith. This last remark was of a nature to reassure those who were alarmed at the thought of seeing the pope proclaiming new dogmas.[29]

The fathers of the council, meeting in a general congregation (July 11), adhered almost unanimously to nearly all the propositions of the reporter. On the same day, the commission drew up the corrected schema, which was proposed, on July 13, to the votes of the assembly.

Present were 601 fathers. Of these, 451 voted *placet;* 88, *non placet;* 62, *placet juxta modum.*[30]

Although, according to the rules of the council, a moral unanimity was not necessary, it appeared most desirable. To obtain it, the presidents of the council, in accord with the commission, declared themselves ready to yield, as far as possible, to the wishes of the minority. This minority was granted the suppression of two texts of St. Irenaeus and of St. Augustine, which, separated from their context, might have been understood in an inexact sense;[31] but a deputation—made up of Darboy, Ginoulhiac, Simon, Scherr, Rivet, and Ketteler—were refused the insertion of a clause mentioning the assent of the Church in the definition *ex cathedra.* Furthermore, to avoid any ambiguity on the significance of this refusal, the

[29] Bishop Gasser's report occupied thirty-four entire columns in the *Collectio lacensis* (col. 388–422). Granderath gives a summary of it (III, 92–116).

[30] These 62 conditional votes did not all belong to the minority. Half of these votes were given by prelates who asked for more vigor in the formulas.

[31] *Collectio lacensis,* 473.

formula was revised by the reporter in the following manner: *Hujusmodi definitiones romani pontificis irreformabiles esse ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae.*[32] These two modifications were submitted (July 16) to a vote. The first was accepted by nearly the whole assembly; the second, by a very large majority.[33] The final form of the schema was thus drawn up. Nothing remained but to submit it to the vote of the assembly, whose members had no longer any choice but to accept it or refuse it. According to the customary practice, this vote was deferred to the following Sunday, in public session. The news of the serious conflict that had just broken out between France and Prussia decided the fathers to advance this date. The public session was determined for two days later, July 18. The president of the assembly then read a *monitum* of the Holy Father declaring that the fathers who would have reasons to absent themselves, either for reasons of health or for business reasons, could return to their diocese until November 11, the feast of St. Martin, on the single condition of notifying the secretary of the council of their departure.[34]

Absentees

What were the members of the minority going to do? On this question, let us quote the words of one of those prelates.

[32] "These definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable in themselves, not by virtue of the consent of the Church."

[33] Granderath, III, 126. We see how false is the accusation by Friedrich and reported by E. de Pressensé (*Le Concile du Vatican*, p. 316). Cf. Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 337. In the view of pacification, they had also suppressed the explicit condemnation of the doctrine which attributes to the pope a preponderant part, but not the fullness of the supreme power. But Bishop Freppel, who had this formula admitted, insisted and obtained the reinsertion in the text of these words: *aut eum habere tantum potiores, non vero totum plenitudinem hujus supremae potestatis.* Thus were cut short certain subterfuges of Gallicanism, traces of which had been found in the work of Bishop Maret. See Cornut, *Mgr Fréppel d'après des documents authentiques et inédits*, p. 166.

[34] *Collectio lacensis*, VII, 761.

Bishop Dupont des Loges of Metz relates: "The eve of the day when the schema of the infallibility was to be read in general session, we met together, the bishops of the minority, to examine what procedure to follow. Our opinion was to say: *Non placet.* Bishop Dupanloup came in late. He was made acquainted with our decision. He told us that he could not agree to our view: we could not say *placet,* for no one would believe us; we could not say *non placet,* for the Catholic world would not understand us and perhaps would be scandalized; thus we must abstain. His view prevailed." [35] A letter to the Holy Father was at once drawn up and signed by the 55 bishops agreeing to the decision. The letter, couched in respectful terms, announced to the Pope that, not to have to say, in the face of their father, on a question which touched him so closely: *Non placet,* they were going to return to their dioceses.[36] Several left Rome that same evening.

The Vote

The next day (July 18), at nine o'clock in the morning, following the ordinary ceremonial, the public session took place in the large hall of the council. At the moment of the balloting, a storm, which was rumbling over Rome since early in the morning, suddenly broke out. Says a Protestant witness: "The *placets* of the fathers fought with the storm, amid the roaring of the thunder, the flashes of lightning, shaking all the windows, lighting up the dome and all the cupolas of St. Peter's. . . . This lasted without interruption for an hour and a half. Never have I witnessed a more grandiose scene and a more striking effect." [37] Present were 535 fathers. Only two *non*

[35] This account of Bishop Dupont des Loges, told to Father Bourdon, canon of Rennes, has been published by Father Branchereau in a note of the *Journal intime de Mgr Dupanloup,* p. 311.

[36] See the letter in Ollivier, *op. cit.,* II, 344.

[37] Quoted by Brugère, *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise,* p. 1175.

placets were heard. These were from Bishop Riccio of Cajazzo in the Two Sicilies and Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock in the United States. These two prelates had not been present at the meeting of the minority bishops and they had not been informed of the decision taken. They submitted, both of them, immediately after the definition of the dogma. Report had it that, at the moment when the Pope sanctioned by his supreme authority the dogmatic Constitution, a great calm took place in the atmosphere and a brilliant ray of sunshine illumined the face of the Pontiff. This was the symbol of the entire work of the council, which was opened and continued amid so many storms and which ended in light and peace.

Franco-Prussian War

The next day (July 19, 1870) the French chargé d'affaires at Berlin brought to the chancellery a declaration of war against Prussia. On August 2, Emperor Napoleon III declared that, as the war which had just begun demanded all the forces of France, he intended to withdraw his troops from Rome.

But, as the German historian of the Vatican Council declares, "it is thanks to the armed protection of France that the council was able to last thus far." [38] Thereafter everything was to be feared from the violence of the revolutionary troops and from the complicity of the court of Florence. For a moment at Rome it was hoped that Austria would take in the Holy City the post of honor abandoned by Napoleon III. However, it was soon learned that, on the contrary, Count von Beust, prime minister of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, proposed to the Emperor of the French to abandon Rome to the monarchy of Savoy.[39] The King of Prussia, on whom some Italian Catholics had also counted,[40] informed Victor Emman-

[38] Granderath, III, 180.
[39] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 473; H. d'Hideville, *Les Piémontais à Rome*, chap. 8.
[40] Rothan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie*, II, 84.

uel that "the sympathies of Prussia for the person of the Holy Father had their natural limits in the good relations between Prussia and Italy." [41] After the battle of Sedan (September 2, 1870), which decided the lot of Napoleon [42] and made the Prussian victory evident, Victor Emmanuel no longer hesitated. On September 7 his Minister of Foreign Affairs, Viscount Venosta, informed the foreign powers that "His Majesty the King, in the presence of Europe, assumed the responsibility of maintaining order in the peninsula and of safeguarding the Holy See." But we know what had to be meant by such a formula. On September 10 the King himself wrote directly to the Holy Father: "I see the inevitable necessity that my troops, already put in charge of guarding the frontiers, advance and occupy the positions that will be indispensable for the security of Your Holiness and for the maintenance of order." Upon receiving the King's letter, Pius IX is said to have exclaimed: *"Belle parole, ma brutti fatti"* ("Fine words, but brutal acts"). He answered the sovereign that "his letter was not worthy of a loving son," and that "he placed his cause in the hands of God." [43]

The Taking of Rome

On the 11th of September, 60,000 soldiers penetrated the States of the Church. Surprised at this unexpected attack, the pope's soldiers retreated on Rome and Civitavecchia. The Italian General Bixio marched on this latter city, while General Cadorna advanced toward Rome. Civitavecchia surrendered. The next day, the investment of Rome began. The Pope had at his disposal about 10,000 combatants, resolved to defend

[41] Cadorna, *La liberazione di Rome,* p. 361.

[42] Before his fall, toward the end of August, Napoleon III would have sent Prince Jerome to Florence, charged with obtaining some helps from Italy, by means of the promise of not opposing the taking of Rome. Cadorna, *op. cit.,* p. 52; Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes,* p. 403.

[43] Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques,* pp. 405–10.

themselves until death, on fire to avenge at Rome the ambush of Castelfidardo. The Prussian ambassador, von Arnim, came to get the Pope to consent to the occupation of Rome. But he met with an absolute *non possumus*. On September 20, from five o'clock to ten o'clock in the morning, the Piedmont artillery battered the old ramparts and hurled their projectiles on the city. The first breach was made near Porta Pia. The attack went on, and then the white flag floated on the walls and on Castel Sant' Angelo. Pius IX, wishing to avoid too great bloodshed, gave orders for the resistance to cease. The capitulation expressly stipulated that the Leonine city would remain in the Holy Father's possession; but the following day, Pius IX, in the presence of serious disturbances, had to resign himself to let the Italian forces penetrate there. The ruin of the temporal power was complete. The Pope was left only the Vatican and its gardens. "Gentlemen," said Pius IX, addressing the diplomatic corps gathered about him, "you are witnesses that I yield to violence; from this moment, the Pope is the prisoner of Victor Emmanuel."

What was the council going to become? On October 20, following the publication of the royal decree which changed the patrimony of St. Peter into a "Roman province," appeared the bull of prorogation of the council. Said the Pope: "We have decided to put off the continuation of the sessions to a later time. We declare the council suspended, begging God, the master and avenger of His Church, to restore peace and freedom as soon as possible to His faithful spouse." [44]

Bishop Fessler's Pamphlet

To enlighten public opinion, the secretary general of the council, Bishop Fessler, bishop of St. Hippolytus in Austria, published a pamphlet entitled, *La vraie et la fausse infallibilité,*

[44] *Collectio lacensis,* col. 497. See Fessler, *La vraie et la fausse infallibilité,* p. 41.

which was at once honored by a brief of approbation by Pius IX. Therein he clearly established: 1. that the Vatican Council, in its definitions, did nothing but fix and make precise, according to its expressions, "a tradition going back to the origin of the Christian faith"; 2. that the infallibility of the pope defined by the council was attached only to his office of supreme doctor of the universal Church, and not to the offices of supreme priest, supreme judge, and supreme lawmaker; 3. that, even in the dogmatic decrees, not everything is an article of faith, and it should not be considered as such what is mentioned merely in passing or what serves only as introduction or as grounds; 4. that in saying that the definitions promulgated by the pope "are irreformable by themselves, and not in virtue of the consent of the Church," it is not at all the intention to say that the pope can ever decide something contrary to the tradition or that he can put himself in opposition with all the other bishops; 5. that, in short, theology meets with a small number of *ex cathedra* judgments or infallible decisions of popes in the history of the Church;[45] 6. lastly, that the domain of papal infallibility, far from depending on the pope's arbitrary will, is clearly limited, and that it is impossible, for example, that this domain extend to "juridical matters," which are not contained in divine revelation.[46]

Not content with approving and recommending Bishop Fes-

[45] Fessler, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 63–78.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 78. Similar explanations, likewise approved by a brief of Pius IX, were given (June, 1871) in a collective pastoral instruction of the Swiss bishops. This Instruction is reproduced in Bishop Fessler's work. In his pamphlet, Bishop Fessler seems to limit the papal infallibility to "the revealed truths." If such is the thought of the eminent theologian, it would be erroneous. Papal infallibility extends to truths connected with revelation and to certain facts so bound with the teaching of the revealed truths that have been called "dogmatic facts." For example, the existence of the soul, its spirituality, its immortality, its free will, are truths not revealed, but they are so connected with the faith that to deny them would be to undermine all revelation and all religion at the foundation; the fact that the *Augustinus* contains heresies is a dogmatic fact. On this subject, see Choupin, *Valeur des décisions du Saint-Siège,* pp. 14-18; Dumas in *Etudes* of March, 1876.

sler's pamphlet, Pius IX wished to reassure the heads of the state on the subject of the implications which some publicists attributed to the definition of infallibility. He declared: "It is a pernicious error to represent infallibility as including the right to depose the sovereigns. . . . Only bad faith can confuse matters so diverse, as if an infallible judgment applied to a revealed truth had some analogy with a right which the popes, solicited by the wishes of the peoples, have had to exercise when the general good required it." [47]

Submission of the Opposition Bishops

All the opposition bishops, without exception, humbly submitted to the decisions of the Vatican Council. The most notable were the submissions of bishops Dupanloup, Darboy, Maret, Strossmayer, and Hefele. "Among the liberal Catholics of some renown," remarks Ceconni, "not a single one refused to bow before the oracle of the Holy Ghost." [48] Döllinger in Germany and Loyson in France, who had taken a stand of open revolt against the council, were not followed by any well-known disciple. Loyson tried to found at Paris a "French Church," which was discredited more and more as time went on. Döllinger, who for a moment seemed to dream of playing the role of a Luther, died isolated. Some high personages (Cardinal von Hohenlohe, Bishops Fessler, Nardi, Dupanloup, Father Duchesne) tried to bring him to sentiments of humble submission. Döllinger received their visits and their letters politely, without recrimination, but also without giving them any hope of success.[49] He died suddenly, perhaps without hav-

[47] Allocution of July 20, 1871, quoted by Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 374; Granderath, III, 362; *Voce della Verità*, July 22, 1871. Pius IX explains here the indirect power of the popes of the Middle Ages over the sovereigns, following a theory expounded by Father Gosselin, a priest of St. Sulpice, in his work, *Pouvoirs des papes sur les souverains au moyen âge*. This theory has been sometimes disputed. Pius IX here gives it the support of his authority.

[48] Ceconni, *Historia de Concilio ecumenico Vaticano*, II, chap. 6, nos. 15, 487.

[49] In an unpublished letter to Bishop Duplanloup, Döllinger enumerates several

ing time to repent, at any rate without retracting his errors.

At his side some less celebrated professors (Friedrich and Sepp of the Munich university, Hilgers and Reusch of Bonn, Reinkens of Breslau, Schulte of Prague) pretended to found a Church of "Old Catholics," which the governments of Germany favored eagerly. Döllinger disdained to attend the congress which they held at Cologne in 1872, fraternizing with the Anglicans, the Russians, and the Freemason Bluntschli; he likewise refused to take part in the conciliabulum which they organized at Constance (September 12 to 14, 1873), at which they adhered to the principles of the Lutheran Reformation. In spite of the learning of its organizers, in spite of the backing of the thrones, the German "Old Catholic Church" did not show more vitality than "the French Church." Public opinion never took note of either of them except to despise or ridicule them.

However, the governments generally manifested their hostility to the decisions promulgated by the Vatican Council. France, which, after the war, had elected an assembly with a majority favorable to Catholicism, did not have a hostile attitude; but Prussia affected to regard the dissidents as Catholics; and Austria-Hungary protested against the dogma of infallibility by denouncing its concordat. Most of the German states forbade the publication of the decrees of the council. Portugal did as much. Some Swiss cantons took an attitude clearly opposed to Catholicism; the federal Council elaborated a new regulation of relations between the Church and the state. Bishop Lachat of Basel and Bishop Mermillod, coadjutor of Geneva, who were known as zealous defenders of papal infallibility, were expelled from Swiss territory. In England the former prime minister, Gladstone, undertook to show, in a resounding pamphlet, that the infallibility of the pope not only

---

of these steps. He does so with a curtness in which some bitterness is evident, but which remains strictly polite. The letter ends suddenly, without any form of salutation. Archives of St. Sulpice.

threatened the conscience of individuals, but also the state, "for," he said, "this dogma can, at any moment, put the subject of a nation in the necessity of sacrificing his loyalty to the pope's good pleasure." [50]

This big agitation quieted down. It never took hold of the masses of Catholics. It could not do so. A certain non-Catholic statesman wrote: "No one will admit that a man who believes in revelation, in the divinity of Christ, and in the infallibility of the Church, who has not disputed any of the doctrinal decisions rendered by the popes for eighteen centuries, separates from the communion in which he has lived, because an infallibility, whose necessity and power he does not contest, will be explained by the divine assistance in place of being so by the consent, even tacit, of the bishops." As for the authority of the council, "the various reproaches that have been turned against it did not stand the examination of the next day's calmness." [51] In the council freedom of speech was complete; and can anyone suppose that, in the balloting on infallibility (July 18, 1870) a more overwhelming moral unanimity was needed? Cardinal Manning says:

> Since that date, a crowd of events have hurried to their fulfillment. The French Empire has passed away. Rome is occupied by the armies of Italy. The peace of Europe is broken. . . . The Church may suffer, but cannot die; the dynasties and civil societies of Europe may not only suffer, but be swept away. The Head of the Church, be he where he may, in Rome or in exile, free or in bondage, will be all that the Council of the Vatican has defined, supreme in jurisdiction, infallible in faith. . . . The Council has thus made provision for the Church in its time of trial, when it may be, not only Œcumenical Councils cannot be held, but even the ordinary administration of ecclesiastical government and consultation may be hardly possible. Peter's bark is ready for the storm. All that is needed is already on board.[52]

[50] Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance.*
[51] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 396.
[52] Manning, *The Vatican Council*, p. 164.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

The Church in Italy and France

THE invasion of Rome on September 20, 1870, was but the beginning of a series of trials from which Pope Pius IX would cruelly suffer until his death. These trials came to him especially from Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Spain, and England.

Rome

The very day when the Piedmont troops opened the breach of Porta Pia, Cardinal Antonelli communicated to the members of the diplomatic corps a note by which Pius IX, "declaring null and void the usurpation of which he was the victim," made the King of Italy and his government responsible for that "unworthy and sacrilegious spoliation." [1]

Once this solemn protest had been made, the Secretary of State of the Holy See judged it prudent to provide for the means to assure the safety of the Pope. In the capitulation signed by General Kanzler, a stipulation was contained that the Leonine City would remain to the Holy Father. The next day Cardinal Antonelli informed Baron Blanc,[2] secretary of Visconti-Venosta, Minister of Foreign Affairs, that he desired to confer with him at the Vatican. There Antonelli declared to him that, "as the Leonine City had become the rendezvous of all the criminals and no authority any longer remained there, he asked

[1] Van Duerm, *Vicissitudes politiques*, pp. 418–20.

[2] Baron Blanc, a native of Savoy, had been at first a lawyer at Chambéry, then attached to the personal cabinet of Count Cavour. Subsequently he was called to fill the office of ambassador to Constantinople and to London, and lastly to become Minister of Foreign Affairs.

General Cadorna to establish there, as in the rest of Rome, police posts and a regular service of military administration." The Cardinal specified that this request emanated from the Holy Father's initiative, solely prompted by the desire to avoid violence and other evils to the populations that dwelt in this quarter of the Eternal City. Agreement was reached between the two parties that "the question concerning that part of Rome was not thereby to be prejudged either theoretically or practically." Such were the conditions under which the Italian government at once occupied the territory which it had until then respected.[3]

Moreover, it was not without an inner repugnance that Victor Emmanuel saw himself led to forcibly enter the capital of the Catholic world. He knew that this act would plunge into the most cruel anguish the heart of two pious princesses who touched him closely. Until the last moment, he had hoped that Pius IX would freely let the Italian troops enter the papal territory.[4] The Pope's *Non possumus* disconcerted him. Yet he disregarded it. He believed he had need of the revolutionaries to realize the work of his life, Italian unity; and the party of the revolution forced on him the war on the Holy See, even to the taking of Rome. *Roma o morte* ("Rome or death") was the cry of the Garibaldian bands. The wretched sovereign, however, might have reflected that, in yielding on this point to the insistence of his confederates, he made himself their slave. As Massimo d'Azeglio wrote in 1866: "The day when the government will be in Rome, Mazzini and his will be the masters."

[3] The negotiations that took place on this occasion between Cardinal Antonelli and Baron Blanc involved several other points. They spoke of a temporary *modus vivendi* between the two powers residing in Rome. The details of these discussions may be found in a collection of diplomatic documents published in 1895 by Baron Blanc, printed in small number and not to be found in general circulation. These documents have been in large part reproduced and fully analyzed by François Carry in an article of the *Correspondant* (November 19, 1895) and entitled "Le Vatican et le Quirinal d'après des documents nouveaux."

[4] *Correspondant* of December 10, 1895, CLXXXI, 782.

The forecast of the far-sighted statesman was realized. Victor Emmanuel could henceforth no longer rid himself of the chains that he accepted. To palliate the flagrant injustice of the invasion of the papal territory, a junta, formed at Rome under the protection of the Piedmont army, summoned the electors of the Eternal City and of the entire Papal State to vote, by Yes or No, October 2, on the following question: "Do you wish your union with the kingdom of Italy under the constitutional monarchical government of Victor Emmanuel and of his successors?" The Catholics loyal to the Pope abstained from voting, and the agents of the government admitted to the voting, under the name of *émigrés,* a large number of outsiders, drawn from different provinces and provided with cards of their prefects or subprefects. Under these circumstances, the majority of the Yes votes was overwhelming. Rome gave 46,785 Yes votes against 47 Nos; the whole Papal State, 133,681 votes favorable to the annexation, against 1,507 to the contrary. The fiction of this plebiscite appeared four months later, when 27,161 Romans of voting age and in the enjoyment of their civil rights, affirmed, by their duly legalized signatures, in spite of the pressure of the new government, that they remained faithful to the authority of the Pope.[5] But already, on October 4, the King of Italy, taking advantage of the plebiscite, promulgated the following decree: "Art. 1. Rome and the Roman provinces form an integral part of the Kingdom of Italy. Art. 2. The Sovereign Pontiff preserves the dignity, the inviolability, and all the prerogatives of the sovereign." On October 18, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Visconti-Venosta, addressed to the governments a circular having for its purpose to reassure them about the status given the papacy by the suppression of its temporal power.[6]

In a letter of November 8, 1870, Cardinal Antonelli strongly

[5] See E. Rendu, *La lettre du pape et l'Italie officielle,* p. 64.

[6] Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques,* p. 427.

protested against the affirmations of this circular. He recalled to the representatives of the Holy See accredited to foreign courts, that they might inform the governments to which they were accredited, the principal measures taken by the government of Florence against the freedom of the Church: "the suppression of all the religious orders, the incameration,[7] the shackles imposed on the episcopate, the enlistment of the young clerics in the armies, the imprisonment of ecclesiastics who refused to obey the laws condemned by their conscience, the hindrances to the exercise of worship, the teaching of the most impious doctrines in the classes of the universities, the freedom given to the spread of newspapers, pictures, writings of all sorts, letting loose contempt on the pope and the Catholic religion." [8]

Not without visible apprehension did King Victor Emmanuel affix his signature to these persecuting laws; but "the way he viewed his duties of constitutional sovereign did not permit him to refuse his sanction to the laws passed by the Chambers." [9] His emotion was especially poignant when he had under his eyes the famous encyclical of November 1, by which Pius IX pronounced, "against all those who had perpetrated the invasion, the usurpation, and the occupation of the papal domain, and against all the orderers, aides, and counselors of these acts, the major excommunication and all other censures and penalties decreed by the holy canons." [10]

Victor Emmanuel in Rome

The King's anguish was full when, a short time afterward, the question arose of transferring the court of Florence to the

[7] Thus the Italians spoke of the spoliations of the goods of the Church, which have also been called laicization or disaffections.

[8] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, pp. 428–30.

[9] Count Conestabile, "Le Roi Victor-Emmanuel," in the *Correspondant* of January 15, 1878, p. 200.

[10] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 436; *Acta Pii IX*, V, 623–78; the *Correspondant*, CX, 206.

Quirinal palace. Says a well informed historian: "Victor Emmanuel experienced an invincible apprehension at fixing his residence in the Eternal City." [11] But once again he had to yield. On November 5, a tumultuous crowd, gathered by revolutionary leaders, paraded through the streets of Rome, shouting: "We wish the Quirinal." The Council of the ministers were of a mind to annex the Quirinal to the royal domain. "Victor Emmanuel hesitated before sanctioning this double outrage against the sovereignty of the Pope. Rome, the Holy City, filled this soldier with fear. Summoning a former counselor of King Charles Albert, one of the most devoted servants of the house of Savoy, he declared to him that he wished to abdicate. He ordered him to draw up an act of abdication. On the next day the act of abdication was brought to the Pitti palace in Florence; but he who had been ordered to draw it up could not reach the King. New influences had triumphed over the hesitations of the prince." [12] He was persuaded that, by quitting the throne at so difficult a moment, he was endangering the entire enterprise to which he had dedicated his life. The house of Savoy thought it needed the alliance of the revolution to realize the work of Italian unity, and the Church must pay the costs of that alliance. On December 5, when opening the session of Parliament, the King of Italy spoke these words: "With Rome as the capital, I accomplish my promises and I complete the undertaking begun by my father twenty-five years ago." On December 31 he made his triumphal entry into Rome and installed himself in the Quirinal.

The Catholics had not waited for this last outrage before raising their voice in favor of their common father. Most of the bishops sent to the Pontiff addresses and collective letters to express their sorrowful indignation. Meetings of protest assembled at Vienna, Fulda, Malines. But the great states of Europe remained silent. France was absorbed by her struggle with

[11] Count Conestabile, in the *Correspondant*, CX, 206.
[12] *Ibid.*

Prussia. Among the other states, some appealed to the principle of non-intervention to remain inactive and silent in the presence of the accomplished fact; others took an expectant attitude, which seemed to be prompted by fear of the anti-Christian sects, if not by a secret complicity with them. Only one state uttered an energetic protest: this was a little American republic, Ecuador. On January 18, 1871, the *Journal officiel* of Quito contained the following: "The government of Ecuador despite its weakness and the distance separating it from the Old World, protests, before God and men, in the name of outraged justice, in the name of the Catholic people of Ecuador, against the iniquitous invasion of Rome." [13] The statesman who inspired this protest, Garcia Moreno, would be killed by an assassin's bullet four years later; his last words were those of a Christian hero: *Dios no muere* ("God does not die").

At a certain time people wondered whether the French Republic was going to follow in the footsteps of Ecuador. The Italian government thought so, or pretended to think so. The Assembly elected on February 8, 1871, was certainly the most favorable to the religious cause that France had possessed for a century and a half, perhaps at any time in the course of her history. It did not have a legitimist, Orleanist, or republican majority; but it had a clearly Catholic majority. This character was so marked that unfair writers have said, in a spirit of ill will toward the French Catholics, that, following the war, they had forgotten the work of the preservation of their country only to think of the restoration of the temporal power of the pope. The statement is doubly unjust. The French Catholics, patriots during the war, were not less so after the defeat; if Jules Favre, Minister of Foreign Affairs, informed Pius IX that France would be happy to receive him in the island of Corsica, at the same time he congratulated Victor Emmanuel over "the happy event that delivered Rome." [14] But the King of

[13] Chantrel, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

[14] Lecanuet, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République*, I, 89. Jules Favre

Italy was not unaware that the faithful, in a song that had become popular, called upon God "to save Rome and France." He knew that the French Catholic papers bitterly reproached the Italian government for having profited by the evils of their country in order to seize the Papal States. He had seen the French government testify its gratitude to Pius IX for having been the only sovereign who publicly interested himself in the misfortunes of the "eldest daughter of the Church." [15] He was mindful that one of the most influential members of the French parliament, Adolphe Thiers, had always regarded the temporal power as necessary for the independence of the Holy Father.[16]

The Law of Guaranties

The King of Italy thought that the moment had come to reassure the Catholics, or at least the powers, about the situation of the Pope. He presented to the Chambers, had passed, and signed (May 13, 1871) the measure known as the Law of Guaranties, by which the Italian state recognized the inviolability of the person of the pope and his quality of sovereign, granted him the use of the Vatican palace, the Lateran, the chancery, and the villa of Castel Gandolfo, guaranteed the freedom of conclaves and councils, renounced all control over ecclesiastical affairs, and assured the papal court of an annual gift of 3,225,000 francs. The law was silent on the ruin of the sovereignty over the Leonine City promised by the capitulation of Rome.[17]

The Pope did not accept this law. No government recognized it. Having been passed by the Italian Parliament without any

wrote: "I believe that if you do not go to Rome, the city will fall into the power of dangerous agitators. I prefer to see you there. But of course France does not give you any consent." Beaufort, *Histoire de l'invasion des Etats pontificaux*, p. 486.

[15] Such was the expression used in an official dispatch addressed to the Italian cabinet. Gambetta, upon reading it, said to Chaudordy: "Forward it, but it is useless to publish it." Ernest Daudet, *Histoire diplomatique de l'alliance franco-russe*, p. 52.

[16] See Thiers' clear opinion in the *Moniteur* in the report of the sessions of April 14 and 16, 1865.

[17] See the complete text of the Law of Guaranties in Chantrel, *op. cit.*, pp. 502–4.

agreement either of the Pope, whom it pretended to treat as a king, or of the other powers, this law was without any of the marks of a reciprocal contract. It was a unilateral act, a regulation which the conqueror intended to impose on the vanquished. It had neither the form of a concordat nor even that of a peace treaty, of a capitulation. It was an expedient. An Italian statesman has been obliged to acknowledge its true character. Writes Minghetti: "From sincere minds the fear had to be removed that Italy, in going to Rome, did not purpose touching the spiritual independence of the head of the Catholic religion. Besides, this other suspicion had to be set at nought, that the Italian government might some day make use of the papacy as an instrument for its political views." [18] Was this end attained? Let us hear what Emile Ollivier said in 1879: "The Law of Guaranties reassured no one. The Council of State, so it was said, declared it an integral part of the constitutional order. What value has a declaration of this sort? Who will prevent a new ministry from obtaining a contrary declaration, or who will oblige the deputies to take account of it? The independence of the head of the Catholic religion is at the discretion of a majority vote in an Italian parliament. . . . The abolition of the Law of Guaranties is precisely the slogan of the Garibaldian party. At the same time that the attacks against the guaranties increase, the conduct of the government becomes sharper. Since it has been at Rome, instead of treating the Pope with respect, it is continually aggressive. Without mentioning the wretched fate assigned to the religious congregations, the right of exequatur, reserved to the government, becomes the very negation of the right of free appointments recognized to the pope." [19] Ollivier here alludes to the numerous expulsions of religious congregations, to their dispersion, and to their spoliation. During the first eighteen months of the occupation

[18] Minghetti, *De l'Eglise et de l'Etat*, p. 54.

[19] Ollivier, *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican*, II, 478–80.

of Rome, thirty-two religious houses were expropriated.[20]

At the same time, on the pretext that the Catholics of France were preparing for the coming of Count Chambord and that the latter announced that one of his first cares would be to restore the temporal power,[21] King Victor Emmanuel turned away from France and turned to Germany. His envoys met at Gastein with Bismarck and von Beust, and there they laid the foundation of the Triple Alliance. In February, 1872, Prince Frederick Charles was staying at Rome, went hunting with the royal family, and came out with aggressive proposals against France. To Visconti-Venosta he said: "Are we not behind you? If Italy were to be attacked by France, it would be backed by Germany." [22]

Protests of Pius IX

On April 12, 1872, Pius IX, replying to an address by Italian Catholics, expressed himself thus: "Each day aggravates the affliction which the events of September 20, 1870, have brought to us; and each day the disastrous consequences of that outrage appear more cruel." The next day, when receiving in the hall of the Consistory 400 visitors who had come from France, Austria, Germany, England, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Belgium and America, he had a word for each of those countries, and the Pontiff's tone of sadness was remarked when he spoke of Italy, of "poor Italy"; his tone of profound feeling when he spoke of France, "that country where dwell so many generous souls,

[20] For the list of these houses and the new use they were put to, see Chantrel, p. 587.

[21] On May 8, 1871, Count Chambord, in one of his manifestoes, wrote: "Some have said that the independence of the papacy is dear to me. They speak truly." And on the next July 31, Louis Veuillot wrote in the *Univers:* "The twenty-fifth year of Pius IX is a marvel, which announces another, that of his deliverance by the Most Christian King."

[22] On this subject, see the curious correspondence in the *Univers* (February, 1872). Cf. Lecanuet, *op. cit.,* I, 159.

that France fertile in so many good works, which it would take too long to enumerate." [23] At the end of November, 1872, on the occasion of the presentation of a new bill against the religious orders and for the erection of a Protestant church in Rome, the Pontiff repeated his complaints.[24] From 1873 to 1876, fresh outrages aroused new protests of the Pope. The Italian Chamber having passed (January, 1877) a law decreeing prosecutions and penalties against the priests who, by their discourses or by the spread of papal writings, should continue to oppose civil oppression, Pius IX, now in his eighty-fifth year, and feeling his strength giving way, wished to have the world hear a supreme protest. He declared: "We lack all necessary freedom so long as we are under the yoke of the tyrants. . . . Let the faithful make use of the means which the laws of each country place at their disposal, to act promptly with the men who govern." [25] These words aroused, in the entire world, a movement of petitions, addresses, and motions, by which several governments were stirred.[26] The Italian minister, Mancini, author of the bill, tried to justify it by a circular.[27] But the government recoiled before this universal protest of the Catholics. On May 12, 1877, the Senate rejected the bill, which Victor Emmanuel had declared he would refuse to sign. Report had

[23] Chantrel, p. 632. In that allocution is found this passage, so much commented on by the press: "I pray that certain parties, exaggerated on this side and that, may disappear forever. One party fears too much the influence of the pope. Opposed to this, is another party which entirely forgets the laws of charity." On reading this passage of the allocution, Louis Veuillot exclaimed: "Behold a blessing which enters by smashing the windows!" And he wrote in his paper: "Our business is to obey. . . . If, then, the judge thinks that our work can no longer receive from us the character which the interest of the Church demands, we will disappear." A few weeks later, in answer to a letter from the *Univers*' editor-in-chief, Pius IX declared to him that, "while regretting in him some excess of zeal, he asks him to continue the combat." See François Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* p. 131.

[24] Chantrel, pp. 714-18.

[25] Allocution of March 12, 1877. Cf. Chantrel, p. 582.

[26] On this occasion (May 4, 1877) Gambetta pronounced his famous formula: "Behold, clericalism is the enemy."

[27] Chantrel, p. 589.

it that the pious Princess Clotilda, alarmed at the rapidity with which her unfortunate father let himself be led on the revolutionary descent, had added her suppliant voice to that of the Catholic world. She said to the King, her father: "God may not leave you an hour for your repentance." A few months after this, King Victor Emmanuel (January 9, 1878) appeared before the judgment seat of God. By a singular irony of fate, the minister Crispi, of whom Mazzini had said that he would be the last minister of the Italian monarchy, he who had vowed an implacable hatred for the papcy, was directed to announce to the Italian people that the King of Italy had died in the Quirinal palace, fortified with the sacraments of the Church.[28]

The Church in France

In all these trials of the papacy, what had been the share of responsibility of the governments of France? The Austrian government having (July 20, 1870) suggested to the French government the idea of an agreement that would be for the purpose of handing over Rome to the Italians,[29] the custodian of the seals of the imperial government, Emile Ollivier, at once declared this idea "pitiful and impractical," [30] and Napoleon III fully agreed with the view of his minister.[31] The papal government was nevertheless informed that, as France had need of all its forces in the war it had to maintain against Prussia, the Emperor saw himself in the necessity of withdrawing all his troops from Civitavecchia. Was the alleged reason the real one? In a dispatch (July 31) from the French Minister of Foreign Affairs to his ambassador at Rome, Banneville, another reason was given. Said the dispatch: "Assuredly a strategic necessity is not what prompts us to evacuate the Roman state.

[28] On Victor Emmanuel's last moments and death, see *ibid.*, pp. 691–98.

[29] See the dispatch in Chantrel, p. 393.

[30] Ollivier, *op. cit.*, II, 474.

[31] *Ibid.*

. . . But the political necessity is evident. . . . We must be reconciled to the good intentions of the Italian cabinet." [32]

Of this policy of Napoleon III we may say, once again, that it was at least dubious. Many Catholics judged it with greater severity, some murmured the words of cowardice and sacrilege. Louis Veuillot, viewing the eventualities of the war, wrote: "We have a fine army and excellent fortresses; but if we abandon Rome, and if God Himself asks, for what purpose these serve Him, France. . . ." [33]

Pius IX appeared deeply afflicted at the attitude of the French government; but his grief did not prevent him from being interested in the lot of France. On November 13, 1870, he wrote to the King of Prussia to beg him to halt the shedding of Christian blood.[34] He said: "I do not pass a single day without praying to God for France, whose image ceaselessly appears to my mind." [35] The Pontiff followed with anxiety the terrible vicissitudes of a war that set against each other the country which always showed itself the strongest defender of heresy and the nation which remained the eldest daughter of the Church: the defeats of Wissembourg, Forbach, Reischoffen, and Sedan; the fall of the empire on September 4, 1870; the successive capitulations of Strasbourg and Metz.

With tears of compassion he learned how, on December 2, his papal zouaves, authorized to fight for France under the command of their colonel, Charette, had stained with their blood and ennobled by their glory the plateau of Loigny. They had been hurled against the invader, the flag of the Sacred Heart unfurled, with cries of: "Long live France! Long live Pius IX!" [36]

In spite of the heroic resistence of the French, the German

[32] Chantrel, p. 394.
[33] François Veuillot, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
[34] Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 90.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] Cf. Baunard, *Vie du général de Sonis*, pp. 347–57.

army, long since prepared for the struggle, forced to give way all the armies that were opposed to it. In the north, Fraidherbe beat a retreat. In the east, Bourbaki turned toward the Swiss frontier. In the west, the army of the Loire, commanded by Chanzy, fell back before the superior forces of the armies of the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg and of Prince Frederick Charles. On January 11, the German armies entered Le Mans.

Amid these sad circumstances, some children of the Pontmain parish in the diocese of Laval saw (January 17, 1871) in the air a great lady, her forehead encircled with a golden crown, at her feet the following inscription: "God will shortly hear you; my Son is moved." [37] Eleven days later the belligerent armies concluded an armistice and signed the prelimiaries of the peace.

The Paris Commune

The disasters of the war against a foreign foe were followed, unfortunately, in France, by the horrors of civil war. The causes of the Paris Commune have been discussed at great length. This explosion of revolutionary fury has been attributed to the accumulation of the working population in Paris, to the prolonged sufferings of the siege, to the formidable arming imprudently granted to the national guard. The real causes of this bloody insurrection are of a moral and religious order. In 1865 Archbishop Darboy said: "When antireligious ideas have intoxicated men's minds, all that is needed is one of the thousand accidents which fill the existence of the people for a mass of institutions to be swallowed up in a supreme collapse." [38] Bishop Pie thought the same when he saw in the atrocities committed by the Paris Commune a frightful commentary of the

[37] Pastoral letter published on February 2, 1872, by Bishop Wicart of Laval.
[38] Foulon, *Vie de Mgr Darboy*, p. 339.

condemnations issued against revolutionary naturalism by the Vatican Council.[39]

"From the religious point of view, the only one that needs to occupy us here, the Commune has been rightly called a saturnalia of impiety."[40] The confiscation of all property called "mortmain," that is, ecclesiastical;[41] the immediate and brutal closing of the churches of Paris;[42] the famous decree of the hostages, published on April 5, ordering the arrest of any person accused of complicity with the government of Versailles and the execution of three hostages chosen by lot at the news of every execution of a prisoner of the Commune; the terrible carrying out of this hateful decree; the massacre of Archbishop Darboy and his companions on May 24, of Father Captier and his Dominican brethren on May 25, of Father Olivaint and forty-seven other victims, religious, secular priests, and laymen, on May 26 and 27: such were the principal outrages of the Commune. The union already realized by a Christian submission between the partisans of infallibility and the followers of the "Opposition," was sealed in the blood of both sides.

The terrible events of the Commune, added to the bloody lessons of the war, were the starting point of a springtime in the Catholic works of France. Two brave officers of the general staff, René de la Tour du Pin and the lieutenant of dragoons Albert de Mun, having had to take part, after the war, in the repression of the Commune, found, in the bloody scenes before their eyes, the inspiration to devote themselves thenceforth to the relief of the popular classes. From this inspiration was born the work of the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers*.[43]

[39] Cardinal Pie, *Œuvres*, VII, 197.

[40] Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 98.

[41] *Journal officiel de la Commune*, April 2, 1871, p. 133.

[42] Maxime du Camp, *Les convulsions de Paris, III*, 317; Fontoulieu, *Les églises de Paris sous la Commune;* Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–5.

[43] A. de Mun, *Ma vocation sociale.*

Montmartre Basilica

In the month of January, 1871, during the worst days of the Prussian invasion, some Frenchmen had made a vow "to contribute, according to their means, to the erection at Paris of a church dedicated to the Sacred Heart." [44] The following October 27, Archbishop Guibert [45] encouraged the work, called thereafter the National Vow to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. On July 24, 1873, on the proposal of the minister of public worship, Jules Simon, the National Assembly, by a vote of 389 against 146, declared the public usefulness of the construction of a church at Montmartre. The Archbishop of Paris dedicated the new temple to the Heart of Jesus, and had engraved on the façade the following inscription: *Sacratissimo Cordi Christi Jesu, Gallia poenitens et devota* ("To the Sacred Heart of Jesus, France penitent and devoted"). To the increasing pilgrimages to Lourdes, Chartres, Paray-le-Monial, Salette, and Pontmain, were now added the pilgrimages to Montmartre.

Catholic Schools

The law of July 12, 1875, on the freedom of higher education, had in a way, crowned the great Catholic movement aroused by the events of 1870 and 1871. The first legislative bill on the freedom of higher education was deposited on the desk of the National Assembly, July 31, 1871. The urgent labors of Parliament delayed the discussion of this measure until December. The debates were sparkling and intense. All the Catholics had taken part in the campaign; but, as in 1850 on the question of secondary education, they did not all take exactly the same viewpoint. The encyclical *Quanta cura* and the Vatican Council

[44] Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie*, II, 438.

[45] He succeeded Archbishop Darboy in the see of Paris.

had established unity in the doctrine, but they had not been able to get rid of the diversity of the tendencies. Louis Veuillot, who was suffering, was unable to take an active part in the conflict; yet he intervened to write: "I have not asked the liberals for freedom in the name of their principle. I asked it and I ask it because it is my right. And this right I do not hold from them, but from my baptism, which made me worthy of freedom and capable of it." [46] Father Alzon revived the *Revue de l'enseignement chrétien,* which appeared carrying as an epigraph this war cry, directed against the University: *Delenda Carthago.* Dupanloup employed in the fight that activity, that tactic, that ability in discussion by which, in 1850, he had succeeded in reassuring the moderate parties of the left. As he had formerly won Thiers to his cause, he won to the new project Edouard Laboulaye. Under the republic of 1848, he had appealed to the danger of socialism; under the republic of 1870, on the morrow of more disasters, he took his stand on the ground of patriotism. "Everyone, after the war, notes the gaps of the public education in France, the weakness of the higher education, the need of a scientific renewal; he declared that only freedom, with the competition, would be able to give to the faculties the needed life." [47] The bill, warmly opposed by Challemel-Lacour and Jules Ferry, was passed (July 12, 1875) with a majority of fifty votes.

Higher education was declared free. The departments, the communes, and the dioceses could freely open courses and faculties. For the conferring of degrees, agreement was finally reached on a compromise: the students of the free universities would have the choice of presenting themselves, for their examinations, before the faculties of the state or before a mixed

[46] François Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* p. 143.

[47] G. Weill, *Histoire du catholicisme liberal en France,* p. 196. The two leading organs of the Catholics which placed themselves on the same ground as Bishop Dupanloup, were the *Correspondant* and the *Bulletin de la Société générale d'éducation.*

jury, composed of professors of the state and professors of the free universities, half from each. The mixed juries were later suppressed.

Anticlericism

In the course of the debates on this important question, lively attacks were delivered by the left against Catholicism. The anticlerical opposition, in fact, was not dead, and it took advantage of all the weaknesses of the Catholic movement. The first weakness was in the persistence of the two tendencies, liberal and authoritarian, which we have already spoken of. The second weakness of the Catholics was in their split in several political parties. From different attempts of monarchical restoration, between 1871 and 1874, they emerged more divided than ever into legitimists, Orleanists, imperialists, and republicans. Lastly, the manifestations they had given in favor of the temporal power of the pope, some exaggerations of language by the journalists, some acclamation of the crowds, perhaps imprudent, exploited by the bad faith of the hostile press, made them pass, in the eyes of some people, for reckless provokers of a new war, full of risks. The freethinking committees founded new papers. The Freemason Jean Macé, director of the *Ligue de l'enseignement,* by the publication of numerous pamphlets pushed his rabid campaign for "the republican and lay idea." Gambetta proclaimed himself the "travelling commissioner" of anticlericalism. The *République française,* founded by Gambetta, the *Dix-neuvième siècle,* directed by About and Sarcey, the *Rappel,* with Vacquerie and Lockroy, daily denounced the pretended abuses of the power of the priests. Charles Renouvier, in the *Critique philosophique,* attacked the Catholic principles. Renan recovered his chair in the Collège de France. An effort was made to identify, in the minds of the masses, Catholicism with the conspiracy against the established government, the Republic with free thought. The Chamber elected in 1876

had a republican and anticlerical majority. In vain Marshal MacMahon, president of the Republic, attempted, by relying on the Senate, to resist the Chamber. On May 4, the Chamber, "stating that the ultramontane intrigues constituted a flagrant violation of the laws of the state, asked the government to employ the legal means at its disposal." Two weeks later Marshal MacMahon showed his intention of resisting the Chamber by nominating a conservative minister. The left feigned to see in this act a clerical inspiration. "It is a *coup* of the priests," exclaimed Gambetta; "it is the ministry of the curés." A flood of journals, pamphlets, and booklets, spread abroad by the Freemasonry, propagated this idea in the popular atmosphere, and won them partly. Cardinal Bonnechose wrote in his private journal: "The great mass of the citizens imagines that the triumph of the present government will lead to despotism and a foreign war." [48] Moreover, the elections of October 14–28, 1877, gave a strong majority to the left. Evidently the Chamber would triumph sooner or later over the Senate and the President. "Everything will then be ready," wrote the *Rappel,* "to start the great reforms." [49] "The great reforms" were the open strife against Catholicism under the direction of a man whose influence continued to grow, Léon Gambetta.

[48] Besson, *Vie du cardinal de Bonnechose,* II, 234.
[49] *Le Rappel,* December 24, 1877.

CHAPTER XXXIX

The Church in Other Countries

Germany

DURING the last of the crises we have just related, about the middle of September, 1877, Pius IX, receiving some French pilgrims, ended his fatherly address with this prayer: "O my God, I recommend France to Thee." [1] But France was not the greatest object of his anxieties. From 1870 to 1877, Germany, led by Bismarck, had directed against Catholicism attacks no less violent and more to be dreaded than those which Gambetta was meditating.

The story is told that Bismarck, when receiving at Reims (September 10, 1870) the deputy Werlé, former mayor of that city, said to him: "The Latin races have had their time. . . . A single element of force is left to them, that is religion; when we get the best of Catholicism, they will soon disappear." [2] The surest means of getting the best of Catholicism in the Latin races was to harass it everywhere, even in the Germanic nations. It was harassed in Germany. The tactics employed during the Franco-German war were most insidious. "If we succeeded in making people believe that the Catholic priests were wishing for the defeat of Germany, then in establishing that the German victories were the victories of Protestantism, we would then need only a few votes to put the Catholics outside the law. Then the remarks of the priests were spied on; and the spies, worn

[1] The *Univers*, September 13, 1877.

[2] Mme Edmond Adam, *Après l'abandon de la revanche*, p. 396. Cf. Diancourt, *Les Allemands à Reims*.

out, finally invented them. They said that the priests had prayers said for the victory of the French." And again, "reckless questions were asked: German and Protestant, barbarian and Catholic, became synonymous terms." When, in 1870, the Catholics of Germany organized pilgrimages to Beuron, Fulda, even to Rome, Bismarck showed his displeasure.[3]

The Center Party

Toward the end of that same year, when the sixty Catholics elected to the Prussian Landtag formed themselves into a group under the name of "Center, Party of the Constitution," although the leaders of the group, the two Reichensperger brothers and Savigny, were loyal servants of the monarchy, the *Gazette générale d'Augsbourg* wrote: "A lost battle on the Loire would be a lesser evil." [4] The better to fight Catholicism, Bismarck for a moment had the idea of organizing the "Old Catholics" into a national Church; but he was soon convinced that no real strength was there. The people never let themselves be drawn into that current; the "Old Catholic" Church never amounted to more than a "Church of professors"; Bismarck, with his political sense, said to himself that as a fact of religious movement, three hundred peasants living their faith counted for more than a dozen professors spouting in their chairs.

The Kulturkampf

Following the victory of Prussia over France, on the morrow of the establishment of the empire of Germany to the advantage of William I, Bismarck thought of the Kulturkampf. Baron von Beust wrote in his Memoirs: "In 1871 Prince Bismarck an-

[3] Goyau, *Bismarck et l'Eglise,* I, 41, 69, 71.
[4] *Ibid.,* I, 80.

nounced to me at Gastein the Kulturkampf even in the smallest details."

What are we to understand by this word "Kulturkampf," which is heard in all discussions about the internal politics of Germany? This term, meaning "fight for culture," or "fight for civilization," does not sufficiently specify what it is about. We reach a greater exactness if we remember that, for Bismarck, the whole movement of the world goes back to two cultures or civilizations: the Germanic culture, which takes its inspiration from Luther, and the Latin culture, which comes from Roman Catholicism. The Kulturkampf is, then, the great duel of Germanism against Romanism.[5]

A moderate Berlin newspaper, the *Kreuz Zeitung,* gave the signal of attack in a much publicized article, on June 22, 1871. Later it was known that Bismarck furnished the ideas of the article, and even corrected the proofs.[6]

Actions followed the words. On July 8, 1871, was suppressed by administrative measure, the Catholic section in the ministry of worship. Once this first step had been taken, the measures of violence followed one another in rapid succession. The first persecuting law was passed by the Reichstag. It permitted the courts to condemn to the penalty of prison the priests who "abused the use of the pulpit to endanger the public peace."[7] Under this expression, the broadest path was open for arbitrary action.

The second persecuting law came from the Prussian Landtag. But, Bismarck, when presenting it, meant that it should become a law for all Germany. The object of this law was the scholastic organization. After the creation of the Empire, the

[5] At times the Kulturkampf appeared to be the strife against the Center Party, or the struggle against the Constitution of 1850; but we see that at bottom the whole thing amounts to the battle against Romanism.

[6] Kannengieser, *Catholiques allemands,* p. 25.

[7] Cf. Chantrel, *op. cit.,* p. 596; Goyau, *op. cit.,* p. 209.

question considered was to train the minds in the school as bodies are trained in barracks. On November 19, 1871, the minister laid on the desk of the Chambers a bill that made the state absolute master of the school. The state arrogated to itself the right of teaching the catechism as well as calculus and spelling.[8]

Ludwig Windthorst

He who was already called "the little Excellency" was of very small stature. With his enormous head, his little searching eyes, and his features divided by a wide mouth, which the least outburst of laughter opened wide, you would have thought him a living caricature taken from some drawing of Callot. He was born on January 17, 1812, in Saxon territory, of a peasant lawyer, who engaged in farming and at the same time in the practice of law. Ludwig Windthorst, like his father, at first was a lawyer. In 1837, the persecutions against the illustrious Archbishop of Cologne aroused his deep indignation. The Machiavellian policy of the Prussian bureaucracy, which he himself witnessed, left in him memories that obssessed him throughout his life. He entered the Hanover parliament in 1848 and soon held an important place there. In 1851 the King entrusted to him the ministry of justice. In 1870 he thought, like Ketteler, that the defeat of France would favor the development of Catholicism in Germany. His disillusion was profound. He did not cease loving his German fatherland; but, having entered the Landtag, he there presently became one of the most active orators of the Catholic Center, which purposed, while remaining on constitutional grounds, to defend the Church against every encroachment of the civil power.

He who would become the unquestioned leader of the Catho-

[8] The law was passed on March 11, 1872, after a most lively discussion. It was the occasion of the first big oratorical duel between the Iron Chancellor and a deputy from Hanover, until then little known outside of his little native district, Ludwig Windthorst.

lic Center in the Reichstag had none of that broad and sonorous eloquence which in France was then admired in a Montalembert or a Berryer. Nor was he a strict logician, deducing from a solidly established principle consequences rigidly reasoned. More a debater than an orator, more a strategist than a dialectician, his interventions in a debate were maneuvers. Opponents feared his catchy sayings, his spiritual repartees, his allusions that touched the sensitive point. He was one of the greatest interrupters of the German parliament; but his adversaries interrupted him as little as possible; for they knew that, instead of disconcerting him, on the contrary they but aroused the sharpness of his repartees.[9]

From that first great debate, Windthorst revealed himself with all his qualities of warmth and of wonderful fitness. The materialist Virchow, the jurist Gneist, the radical Lasker, and the sectarian minister Falk tried to prove that all the parts of the parliament ought to be welded together to defend the state against the enterprises of an external enemy, the Church. The state, the interests of the state, the defense of the state: such were the words incessantly recurring on the lips of the speakers. Windthorst, in his little piping voice, but who was manifestly implacable, kept asking: "This state, on what principle does it rest? Is it on the monarchical principle, hitherto respected? Is it on an inverse principle, lately discovered by the Chancellor?" This was to make a gap in the majority which Bismarck had composed at such pains, even to make Bismarck appear as against the King himself. The Hanover deputy continued his speech, full of disagreeable allusions, of personalities remotely alluded to. One said that, on hearing him, the Chancellor almost lost the assurance from which he so rarely departed. When he rose to reply, he did so to escape by outrage, by violent and excessive invective, from the prying questions of the

[9] Guizot, who had observed him, said: "He is the outstanding disputer of our time."

Catholic deputy. He declared that the clergy had more at heart the interests of the Catholic religion than the development of the German Empire; he tried to embroil Windthorst with the Center, by representing him as a compromising speaker. The law was passed with a majority of fifty-two votes; but Bismarck understood that now he would have to fight against a power which, at each encroachment on the rights of the Church, would rise up and confront him.

On May 15, 1872, in the open Reichstag, Bismarck once again had to measure himself with Windthorst. As in the Prussian Landtag, the Catholic deputies of the Reichstag (the parliament of the Empire) were united in a group known as the Center, and the Hanover deputy had soon won the first place. A bill called for the expulsion of the Jesuits from all Germany. Following his usual tactics, Windthorst disclosed the secret aim of the Chancellor. He said: "I perceive your design. Along with Döllinger you have tried to found a national Church. You failed. But you now take up a more contemptible project: you wish to separate the German Catholics from the Holy See in order to subject them to the knout of your police." The democrats and some progressives voted with the Center; but the law exiling the Jesuits was passed by 183 votes against 101, and was published on July 4, 1872.[10]

The May Laws

How rightly Windthorst had been! The events were not slow in showing. In 1872, Bismarck was preparing that Civil Constitution of the clergy of Germany, so sadly famous under the name of the May Laws. It was known that the Iron Chancellor was mightily aided in this preparation by the Freemasonry. Says Georges Goyau: "William I was a devoted and practicing Mason; a Mason who, if we are to believe Bismarck, gladly

[10] Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques,* pp. 649–58.

protected, in their careers as officeholders, certain of his brother Masons." [11] All evidence indicates that his minister Falk, main author of the May Laws, was, in his campaign, the spokesman of the lodges and the one who carried out their designs. Moreover, the Masonic press of Germany, as illustrated by the *Herault Rhenan* of October 25, 1873, gloried in saying: "We believe we can rightly declare that it is the spirit of Freemasonry that, in the last proceedings which it directed against ultramontanism, pronounced the sentence." [12] A few days later the *Freimaurer Zeitung*, following an exchange of letters between Pope Pius IX and Emperor William, published the following lines: "When confronting each other are two antagonists: the Emperor, who, as a Freemason, esteems and protects the order, and the Pope, who curses it, Freemasonry must place itself on the side where it is understood and loved." [13]

The May Laws, so called because they were nearly all passed in May, 1873, May, 1874, and May, 1875, have been justly compared as a whole to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy passed in 1790 by the French Constituent Assembly. The four laws published on May 15, 1873, concerned the education of the clergy, ecclesiastical discipline, and the intervention of the state in the appointment of all the pastors. In vain was it remarked that these laws were in explicit contradiction to two articles of the Constitution: article 15, which recognized "to the evangelical and Roman Catholic Churches the right to administer themselves," and article 18, which likewise recognized "the right to name and confirm the appointments to ecclesiastical offices." The Chancellor insolently replied that articles 15 and 18 of the Constitution did not consecrate a fundamental freedom, but only a *modus vivendi,* conceded to the Church by the

[11] Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 116. Cf. Kohut, *Die Hohenzollern und die Freimaurerei,* pp. 125–89; Bismarck, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, I, 204.

[12] Quoted by Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société*, II, 413.

[13] *Ibid.*, II, 414.

state, and that the state remained master to modify them at its pleasure.[14]

In 1874 the laws of May 11, 1873, were supplemented by three new laws (May 4, 20, and 21). A law of May 4, called the law of banishment, permitted the courts to condemn to prison and even to exile the priests deprived of their office by the government if they exercised any ecclesiastical functions. The law of May 20 attributed to the state exorbitant rights over the vacant Catholic bishoprics. That of May 21 regulated, in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner, the appointing of the clergy.[15] Lastly, in 1875, a law of April 22, suppressing ecclesiastical salaries in Prussia, and a law of May 31, ordering the dispersion of all the religious orders, except those vowed to the care of the sick, and granting to the king the right to suppress these latter, by way of special ordinance, topped the persecution.

In the discussion of these different laws, the leaders of the Center, particularly Windthorst, although certain of the final vote, step by step defended the rights of the Church. In the middle of the debates on the laws of May, 1873, Windthorst declared: "As I well know, many of you would desire to see us Catholics employ illegal means of resistance. Very well, we will not employ them. But a passive resistance exists, fully justified. This we must practice, and we will. Against it, sooner or later, all your schemes will be broken." In 1874 he said: "You wish to take our priests from us, and you think you can send us false priests. What a mistake you are making! Do you wish to annoy our feelings? So be it! But you will not snatch the faith from our souls. Take our churches; we will pray at home. Drive away our priests; we will pray by ourselves."

[14] Bismarck's speech of March 10, 1873. On the May Laws of 1873, see Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, 308–408. See a summary of these laws in Chantrel, p. 274.

[15] See the complete texts of these laws in Chantrel, pp. 274–78. The text of all the May Laws will be found in Lefebvre de Béhaine, *Léon XIII et Bismarck*, pp. 227–49.

Courage of the Catholics

The attitude of the Catholics measured up to this proud language. "In an admirable spirit, faithful and clergy, resolved not to let themselves be absorbed by Protestantism, decided to resist even to martyrdom. Out of thousands of priests, scarcely a dozen were willing to become 'state pastors.' As for the people, the persecution awakened and enlivened their faith. The episcopate and the clergy regarded the May Laws as null, and opposed a formal *non possumus* to the claims of the state. The result was slow in coming. All the seminaries were closed; the convents, too. Some bishops were cast into prison. On February 3, 1873, Cardinal Ledochowski, archbishop of Psenn, was brutally arrested and underwent a harsh detention of more than two years. On March 7, the venerable Bishop Eberhardt of Treves followed the same path and had the glory of dying on a wretched prison cot, after receiving ill usage. On March 31, it was the turn of Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, who left the hands of the jailer only to take the road of exile.

"The calm and unexcited resistance exasperated the government. The bishops remained unshakable, like the confessors of the faith in the early times of Christianity. The auxiliary bishop of Posen, Janiszewski, had taken in hand the administration of the diocese when Cardinal Ledochowski was snatched from his flock. He was arrested on July 27. Eight days later the Bishop of Paderborn was also cast into prison. Then, March 18, 1874, the same lot befell the bishop of Munster, and, on October 19 the auxiliary bishop of Gnesen, Cybichowski. Hundreds of priests were imprisoned, banished, despoiled of their possessions, reduced to starvation and wretchedness. The violent persecution lasted beyond seven years. The effect was quite the opposite to what its promoters expected. It steeled the German Catholics and was the cement that gave the Center that

cohesion by which it became, in spite of its disparate elements, the strongest party of the Reichstag. At the elections of 1871, the Catholics had sent 57 deputies to the parliament. At the close of the Kulturkampf, Windthorst had at his disposal a force three times as great. In Germany was produced that strange phenomenon, that the proportion of the Catholic deputies was greater than that of the Catholic population." [16]

The prince chancellor found that his minister of worship had exercised decidedly too much zeal. On July 3, 1879, the too famous Falk had to hand in his resignation. On the other hand, the Prussian government felt itself invaded by socialism; it needed new supports. In a famous speech, Bismarck said: "The battle for civilization has deprived me of the natural help of the conservative party. But I do not persist the conflicts for durable institutions. The conflicts cease as soon as one has begun to recognize himself in common works." [17] Yet this was not the end of the Kulturkampf, but the prelude of a comparative peace.

Switzerland

If any fact today is proved by history, it is that Bismarck, in carrying on the Kulturkampf in Germany, never lost sight

[16] Kannengieser, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–32. "Moreover, the Catholics were not alone in taking alarm. The practical Protestants, notably the conservatives, had perceived that, behind Catholicism, all Christianity was aimed at. In fact, what were the campaign against the denominational school and the campaign in favor of civil marriage if not two attempts against denominationalism, Protestant or Catholic, and consequently against Christianity itself? Bismarck, on January 1, 1872, declared: 'The Lutheran pastors are not worth any more than the Catholics.' Quite rightly, then, the Protestant deputy Bruel, apropos of the laws on school inspection, declared the danger to which they exposed both denominations. Clearly he declared: 'It is a pagan law; it depends on the pagan idea of the state-God.' A Christian Bismarck was, after a fashion, not wishing to be inconvenienced by God, but fortified by Him for the service of the state. With the Chancellor, Christianity took the form of Germanism.'" Paul Gaultier, "Le Germanisme contre le Christianisme," in the *Correspondant*, May 25, 1917, p. 738.

[17] Chantrel p. 798.

of the work of an international Kulturkampf. "He alone it was," wrote the historian of the *Allemagne religieuse,* "who, at certain times, made an effort to acclimate throughout Europe the idea of a universal war on Rome, and to force this idea on different sovereignties." [18] Nowhere was the Chancellor's plan more fully realized than in Switzerland. "In fact, we can note more than one coincidence between the May Laws issued at Berlin and the open war on Catholics by the governments of Berne and Geneva. No one can be blind to this fact." [19]

By the legendary valor with which its sons defended the independence of their country against the foreigner and by their devoted attachment to their political and religious liberties, Switzerland merits its renown of "the classical land of liberty." But, on the religious plane, nowhere, since Calvin, did Protestantism show itself more intolerant. The federal pact of 1815, in a most formal manner stipulating respect for Catholic institutions, seemed to have put an end to those traditions of religious tyranny. We have seen above how, in 1819, the old Huguenot animosity revived. In 1870, after Prussia's victory, which was looked on as that of Protestantism over Catholicism, and under Germanic influences, which can easily be traced, the spirit of persecution broke out. "At Geneva they were ready. The plan of campaign had been worked out at leisure. On October 23, 1871, the government announced to the Great Council, that is, the Chamber of Deputies, the proximate filing of a bill on the fabrics, "which would have as a result to democratize the Catholic Church." [20]

On this occasion Carteret, president of the Council of State (head of the executive power) spoke these famous words: "What we need is that the Catholic Church should be gone with the cane and the beggar's wallet." Upon reaching to

[18] Goyau, *Bismarck et l'Eglise,* I, 22. Cf. Gaultier, *loc. cit.*
[19] Burnichon, in *Etudes,* February 20, 1868, p. 437.
[20] *Ibid.,* p. 442.

power, this man had declared that he had a commission, that of fighting the "denominational agitations." When we recall that, since the beginning of the century, Switzerland was the gathering place of the secret societies, we can surmise, with considerable probability, whence his commission could have come from; and when we study its phrases, we may conclude with certainty that he received it from Germany.

The first blows were delivered against the religious congregations. A law of February 3, 1872, obliged them to ask authorization from the state. A few months later (June 29, 1872) the government issued a decree of expulsion against the Brothers of the Christian Schools, forbade the Daughters of Charity to teach, and forbade all religious communities to receive new members. These first measures were but the prelude of a more sensational feat.

Bishop Mermillod

On September 25, 1854, Pius IX, already the restorer of the Catholic hierarchy in England and Holland, desiring to supplement his work by the revival of the see of St. Francis de Sales, had named, as auxiliary to Bishop Marilley, for the canton of Geneva, a young priest, already celebrated by the sermons he had given at Turin, Vienne, Paris, and Rome. His name was Gaspard Mermillod. He was born in a humble Christian family in the town of Carouge, near Geneva, and from 1847 to 1857 was a curate of the parish of Notre Dame in Geneva; for the next four years he was administrator of that same parish. When conferring on him the sacred character of the episcopate, the Sovereign Pontiff addressed these words to him: "Go, ascend the see of St. Francis de Sales; go to that Geneva which even calls itself the Protestant Rome, and convert it." [21]

[21] Chantrel, p. 681.

Such an exhortation caused a lively emotion among the Protestants of Switzerland and of the whole world. The "Protestant triangle" (Berlin, London, Geneva), already imperiled at London by the Oxford movement, was it going to receive a new assault at Geneva? The new prelate was not only an eloquent speaker; he was a man of action, a fighter. From the outset of his ministry, during the period of his curateship at Notre Dame in Geneva, he was actively occupied with works of the press and showed that he was a tireless controversialist. In 1851 he joined a group of priests, constituted into an association, to evangelize the canton of Geneva. In 1852 he founded a monthly review, the *Annales catholiques de Genève,* intended especially for the controversy with the Protestants.[22] At the same time he visited the big cities of Europe, begging for his works. Returning to Geneva, he there built churches and schools with the fruits of his begging. In 1867 at Geneva he created a weekly journal, since then become a daily, the *Courrier de Genève,* to stimulate the Catholics in the struggle. After the taking of Rome (September 20, 1870), he was one of the first to condemn the entrance of the Piedmont troops into the Eternal City. He declared: "Pius IX is a prisoner in the Vatican, and Europe remains silent! . . . Would we have believed that our proud age would witness such ignominies?" [23] During the Franco-German war he organized, along with the cooperation of several Catholic publicists of different countries, the *Correspondance de Genève,* which for more than two years was the most widespread international organ for the defense of the Holy See.

The new prelate did not hide his great plans. He even pursued them with an earnestness that no one found untimely. On October 30, 1864, when taking possession of the church of Notre Dame, he declared: "I am going to walk on hot coals;

[22] Dom Grospellier, *Introduction aux œuvres du cardinal Mermillod,* p. 10.
[23] Chantrel, p. 682.

but I naturally like plain and clear situations. . . . The Holy Father was able, at a single stroke, to create a bishopric of Geneva, to revive the ancient diocese. He could do this in virtue of the treaties of 1815; he could do it by virtue of the federal and cantonal laws which guaranteed freedom of worship. By his discretion Pius IX has created only an auxiliary bishop. I am without a salary, without an episcopal residence; but when I have nothing more to give, I will take the pilgrim's staff, I will go and beg in the great cathedrals of Europe." [24] The same day all the curés of the canton read in the pulpit a pastoral letter on the subject of the election of deputies to the Great Council.

The promotion of Father Mermillod to the episcopacy had been officially notified to the Council of State, which registered it without protest; and, for seven years, the authorities of the Helvetic Republic raised no objection to the state of things. But the irritation produced in the Protestant circles by Bishop Mermillod's ceaseless activity increased visibly. In June, 1872, when the prelate appointed a priest to a country parish and notified the government, the latter affected to ignore this notification, and addressed directly the actual ordinary of the diocese, Bishop Marilley, who was residing at Fribourg. He was asked whether the appointment had been made by his order or at least with his approval. Bishop Marilley did not see the trap. The prelate kept in a corner of his heart a drop of bitterness for the dividing of his diocese. He made the mistake of letting the Geneva magistrates see this. He declared to them that, at the request of the Supreme Pontiff, he had turned over to Bishop Mermillod the entire spiritual administration of the Catholics of their canton. Further, he saw no difficulties in the appointment made by his auxiliary.

"This letter, interpreted maliciously, became, in the hands of the Council of State and its chief, a manifest proof of the

[24] D'Agrigente, *Le cardinal Mermillod*, p. 28.

underground machinations of the curia and Bishop Mermillod. So, they said, it was indeed the see of Geneva that one wished to establish on the sly. Everything was allowable for the repression of such a move. On August 30, an order of the government forbade Bishop Mermillod to perform any episcopal act. A few days later, a decree of the Council of State deprived the prelate of his offices of curé and of vicar general; another decree forbade the priests of the canton to have any hierarchical relations with him. An open war was thus begun." [25] Monsignor Agnozzi, the Holy See's nuncio at Berne, vainly proposed to the Geneva Council of State that they confer with a view to an accord. The Supreme Pontiff then decided to subject the Christian Church of Geneva under the regime of the infidel countries by appointing Bishop Mermillod vicar apostolic. This appointment was the subject of a brief of January 16, 1873.

At this news, President Carteret was furious. For a second time he called upon Bishop Mermillod to renounce every ecclesiastical duty and, upon the Bishop's refusal (February 11, 1873), he had him arrested by the police who seized him in his apartment, put him in a carriage, and brought him to the frontier. A decree of the Council of State forbade him to set foot on Swiss territory.[26]

"Bishop Mermillod established his residence in that village of Ferney which had been made famous by the residence there of Voltaire. There the Bishop passed ten years. If he could not go to Geneva, Geneva would go to him. And Geneva did go to him. Furthermore, nothing prevented him from visiting the territory confided to his pastoral care. The canton of Geneva, formed of two narrow strips along the end of Lake Leman and then along the Rhone, is like a corner thrust in the land of France. Without leaving French territory, the vicar apostolic

[25] Burnichon, in *Etudes*, LXXIV, 446.

[26] The details of this arrest and this expulsion will be found in Chantrel, p. 777.

could see all the church towers, could make his voice heard by the peoples who thronged to the frontier at his passing along, could administer confirmation, in a word, fulfill a ministry which the persecution rendered more striking and fruitful." [27]

What was the Council of State going to do by way of revenge? In the German Reichstag, the minister Falk filed (January 8, 1873) his famous bills of persecution. President Carteret found nothing better to do than follow in Falk's footsteps. A short time after this, the *Temps* wrote: "The Swiss Republic might imitate the system of her great sister of the Atlantic; she preferred to imitate Germany and make laws of warfare." On February 19 the Great Council passed a bill of reorganization of the Catholic Church. On May 30, Switzerland had its law of the organization of the Catholic Church, as France had had its Civil Constitution of the Clergy, as Germany had its May Laws, as Austria would have its denominational laws. Following the ordinary procedure, articles 1 and 2 guaranteed "liberty of conscience" and the "free exercise of worship." But article 6 declared that to the Grand Council belongs the right "to suppress parishes or to create new ones"; article 19, that "the surveillance of the religious life and the divine service" belonged to the jurisdiction of the parish councils; articles 25 and 26, that "to be part of the clergy, the Catholic priest would have to request this of the executive council." Articles 29 to 33 regulated the election of the curés by the parish assembly by a majority of votes, and article 48 subjected all instructions and ordinances of the ecclesiastical authority to the placet of the state.[28]

Swiss National Catholic Church

For that "National Catholic Church" priests were needed. To the honor of the Geneva clergy, not a single defection took

[27] Burnichon, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

[28] Chantrel, p. 30.

place in its ranks. Appeal was made to apostates from the outside. A former Carmelite offered himself (October 12, 1873) to the votes of the electors for the parish of Geneva, and he was elected, with two assistants; but less than a year later, unable to tolerate the encumbering tutelage of the lay committee which, conformable to the law, assumed the right to watch over his administration, the wretched intruder resigned from his office, declaring (August 4, 1874) that the so-called liberal and Catholic Church of Geneva appeared to him "neither liberal in politics nor Catholic in religion." Intruders of lesser worth were satisfied with the conditions imposed on them.

For the "National Catholic Church" religious edifices were needed. The new law had declared that every religious edifice would belong by right "to the worship salaried by the state." Consequently the government laid hands on all the Catholic churches, chapels, and rectories. In some places the faithful, despoiled, protested. Many of them were condemned to fine or imprisonment.

In fact, the clergy as well as the faithful, greatly encouraged by their first shepherd, did not let themselves be disheartened by the persecution. They met in sheds and barns, which they transformed into chapels. By a singular irony, where the hand of Providence could be seen, when the Masonic temple of Geneva was put up for sale by a court order, some Catholics acquired it, and the meeting place of the lodges became the church of the Sacred Heart.

In 1879 the "National Catholic Church" was in full decline,[29] and Catholicism at Geneva showed a powerful vitality. If Bismarck had counted on the success of the schism in Switzerland to consolidate his work in Germany, he found himself singularly deceived.[30]

[29] See the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1879, XXXVI, 705.

[30] On this question several interesting documents will be found in an anonymous work entitled *Histoire de la persécution religieuse à Genève, essay d'un schisme d'Etat*. Cf. Marchal, *Les Réformateurs de Genève*.

Austria

In his scheme of an international Kulturkampf, the German chancellor not only sought auxiliaries in Switzerland; he had anticipated the concourse of Austria. In the course of his strife with the Church, till then he had not had a better auxiliary than his Austrian colleague, Chancellor von Beust. At the moment when the schema *De Ecclesia,* including the definition of papal infallibility, was under discussion, in full council the prime minister of Emperor Francis Joseph protested with a haughty brutality that forecast the worst deeds of violence. He said (February 10, 1871), in a dispatch to Count von Trauttmansdorff: "The attitude taken by an imposing minority, in which we are happy to see the most illustrious names of the Austro-Hungarian episcopacy, permits us to believe in a final result more in conformity with our wishes. . . . The imperial and royal government reserves to itself the right to ban the publication of any act harmful to the majesty of the law, and any person infringing such a defense will be held responsible for his conduct before the justice of the country. . . . Please call to the attention of the Cardinal Secretary of State the principles of the application from which His imperial, royal and apostolic Majesty cannot deviate." [31]

This letter was not an empty threat. After the definition of the infallibility, the ministers of His Majesty declared that "the infallible pope was not the pope with which Austria had concluded a concordat and that the bishops henceforth would not be the prelates to whom the concordat had accorded certain rights." In consequence of this declaration, which was published in the *Gazette officielle* of Vienna, the Emperor addressed the following letter to the minister of worship: "Dear minister Stremayr: As the convention concluded at Vienna on

[31] Chantrel, p. 281.

August 18, 1855, with His Holiness Pope Pius IX has been nullified in consequence of the recent declaration of the Holy See, . . . I urge you to prepare the bills that will be needed with a view to regulating the relations of the Catholic Church with my empire, conformable to the fundamental laws and considering the conditions indicated by history. Vienna, July 30, 1870. Francis Joseph."

This denunciation of the concordat did not, indeed, introduce any greatly marked modification in the situation of the Catholics in the Austrian Empire. For a long time the clauses of the concordat favorable to the Church had gradually become a dead letter.

After the outrage of September 20, 1870, against the temporal sovereignty of the pope, the Austrian bishops tried to bring about a complete change of policy of the court of Vienna, by appealing to the religious sentiments publicly professed by the Emperor. They sent him an address in which they begged him to take the initiative of a step to the European states, with a view of requiring from the Italian government at least some serious guaranties of independence for the Holy See. Francis Joseph, as constitutional sovereign, judged that he could not himself reply to this address; this task he left to his prime minister, and von Beust informed the bishops that the government did not favorably receive their request, as "no change could take place in its policy."

In October, 1871, the city of Vienna having granted the use of a public chapel to a rebellious priest, Louis Anton, who professed membership in the "Old Catholic" Church, Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, addressed a complaint to Jirecek, the minister of worship. Jirecek replied that the concession by the Vienna municipality of the St. Savior chapel was not contrary to the fundamental laws of the Empire; then, on the Cardinal's solicitation, as the conflict was of a purely ecclesiastical nature, the government was not qualified

to make a decision. The Cardinal at once counteracted that sophism: "I have not begged Your Excellency," he replied, "to decide the question, but to defend the Catholic Church against a manifestly unjust usurpation. . . . Louis Anton has never been authorized by the ecclesiastical authority to perform acts of the sacred ministry in the diocese of Vienna; and the government well knows that it would not be able to confer such an authorization on him. Is it that henceforth a handful of factious men, by merely taking the name of religious society, will be able to seize churches and rectories and drive out the lawful possessors?" [32] The minister refused to admit that he was wrong; but an interdict, pronounced by the archbishop on the St. Savior chapel, was obeyed by the faithful and put an end to the scandal.

The suppression of two dioceses of Dalmatia, those of Sebenico and of Cattaro, requested by the Reichsrath toward the end of 1871, was a new assault against the evident rights of the ecclesiastical authority. The Archbishop of Zara, in a long memorial published on March 24, 1872, readily showed that the suppression of a diocese could take place only by the authority of the Holy See, and that the reasons advanced for this suppression were vain. This time the Emperor yielded to the reasons adduced by the prelate and promised not to follow up the measure asked for by the Parliament.

The rapprochement which occurred in 1872 between the court of Vienna and the court of the Quirinal was also a sad surprise for the Catholics. Not only did Emperor Francis Joseph accredit an ambassador to King Victor Emmanuel, but he ordered his representative, Count von Wimpffen, to present him with a rich gift which, in the circumstances, seemed to be a congratulation given to the sacrilegious usurper of Rome.[33]

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 588.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 637.

The School Laws

The most fatal blows that the Church had to stand in the Austrian Empire were delivered to her by the educational laws and regulations. The simple enumeration of these legal provisions will be enough to convey the gravity of the evil.

On January 16, 1869, the minister of public instruction, Hosner, considering that "the education of the clergy is not something indifferent to the state," subjected to the control of the government the certificates of studies furnished by the diocesan minor seminaries. On March 1, 1869, an ordinance of the same minister took from the bishops the supervision of the Catholic schools and confided it to inspectors appointed by the governors of the provinces. The bishops would henceforth retain only the supervision of the religious instruction. In the presence of the situation confronting it, the Austrian episcopacy with one accord decided that "the clergy would accept the part which the new legislation left them in the school so long as these schools would remain faithful to the Christian spirit, but would withdraw as soon as the schools should become hostile." This firm protest did not stop the sectarian hatred of minister Hosner, who, at the sessions of April 22, and 23, had discussed and passed by the Austrian Reichsrath a law more tyrannical than all that had preceded. Resting on this pretended principle, that the education of youth belongs exclusively to the state, he restricted and regulated the action of the Church, even in religious instruction. The time fixed for the teaching of religion was reduced; the priests could not put themselves into relation with the schoolmasters except through the mediation of the inspectors appointed by the state; they were rigorously excluded from the normal schools. The very day after the passing of this law, Emperor Francis Jo-

seph, opening the Hungarian Diet, showed himself not yet satisfied. He regretted that the teaching force was in a deplorable situation in consequence of the revolution that had driven out the German professors; he said: "The mission of the Hungarian Diet was to break with the traditions of the past contrary to the progress called for by the present times." On the following June 5, Bishop Rudigier of Linz, arrested for having protested against the school laws in a pastoral letter, was condemned to an imprisonment of fifteen days. The Emperor, in the presence of the agitation which this judgment stirred up among the people, granted pardon to the prelate, but the sectarian spirit continued its work.

On July 27, 1873, it attacked the universities. Those venerable institutions, works of the Church, founded by it out of its own funds, were placed in the hands of the state. The bishops were excluded from the part they had in the administration, and faculties of Protestant theology were admitted on the same footing as the faculties of Catholic theology, and even more, with a favor which they made no attempt to hide. In the House of Lords, Cardinal Rauscher voiced an eloquent protest, saying: To secularize the universities is to tear the best attire of Austria, which will fall into shreds at the first European crisis. But the Josephist poison had too deeply entered into the traditions of the court of Vienna for it to pay attention to his just criticisms. On March 5, 1874, a thoroughgoing revision of the ecclesiastical civil legislation was presented to the Chambers by the Austrian imperial cabinet. Article 1 declared that "the religious prescriptions had force only within the limits of the laws of the state." The other articles, regulating the action of the Church in a large number of its more or less important acts, sometimes of trifling interest in relation to the state, were corollaries of this principle. This series of prescriptions was called the "confessional laws." When the Austrian bishops drew up energetic protests, Pius IX. sent them (April 25,

1874) his felicitations for having fought the detestable principles of these laws. The next year, the Pontiff again had in his heart the pain caused him by the attitude of one who, in his official acts, always gave himself the titles of "imperial, royal, and apostolic Majesty." In an allocution of March 11, 1875, the Pope spoke of "those Catholic governments which surpass the Protestant governments in the shameful scope of religious oppression." He added: "God will cry out to the Protestant persecutor: You have sinned and sinned gravely. But to the Catholic persecutor, He will say: You have sinned still more gravely." [34]

Spain

These words of the Pope, having Austria directly in mind, applied also to another Catholic country, Spain. The provisional government constituted in Spain under the presidency of Marshal Serrano after the revolution of September, 1868, promised freedom of worship as a peremptory need of the time, as a measure of security against difficult eventualities, as a means offered to Catholicism to strengthen itself in the struggle. Such were, in fact, the expressions employed in the proclamation of October 25 of that year. The first results of that proclamation were scenes of disturbance and violence, which occurred with cries of: "Death to the pope! Death to the priests!" and which came near to bringing about the burning of the palace of the nunciature at Madrid. In the course of the discussions of the Constitution, which took place in April and May of 1869, freethinking deputies delivered speeches full of blasphemies and outrages against Catholicism. The proclamation of freedom of worship by the Constitution of June 6, 1869, did but aggravate the situation. You would have said

[34] For these details on the school laws, see *ibid.*, pp. 26, 72, 79, 111, 113, 134, 147, 754.

that, by these words about freedom of worship, the people meant only freedom to outrage the Catholic Church.

That same Constitution, which so unhappily regulated religious questions, declared the re-establishment of the monarchy. What was that monarchy going to be? If France was not opposed to the arrangement that called a Hohenzollern to the throne of Spain, the kingdom would have been governed by a lieutenant of Prince Bismarck. In the midst of the Franco-German war, the provisional government of Madrid turned to the house of Savoy, whose troops had just entered Rome, and proposed the second son of Victor Emmanuel. He was elected by the Cortes and took the name of Amedeus I. In a circular addressed to the diplomatic corp by the minister of state of the new king, he said that the new government "greatly desired to establish with the Holy See relations as cordial as those existing between the Holy Father and the nations that realized civil reforms similar to the recent reforms of the Spanish nation."

So vague a declaration could not lead to religious peace. On June 18, 1871, on the occasion of the feasts celebrated by the Catholics of Madrid in honor of the Pope, who had just reached the twenty-fifth year of his pontificate, tumultuous bands paraded through the city, crying out: "Death to the pope! Death to the pope! Long live liberty!" A few days after this, in the course of an interpellation made in the Chamber by a Catholic deputy, Martos, one of the ministers, declared that the pope's encyclicals needed, for publication in Spain, the royal exequatur. A short time later a decree of January 11, 1872, declared that the state no longer recognized any civil and legal effect for the religious acts and especially for canonical marriage. On March 25 a royal memorandum enacted that every dispensation, every indult, and in general every apostolic favor could be obtained only through the intermediary of a general bureau dependent on the minister of state.

Alphonse XII

Meanwhile the state, failing in its most explicit promises and most established obligations, neglected, under pretext of financial straits, to pay the clergy the salaries fixed by the Constitution of June 6, 1869. The Spanish episcopate, in a petition (October 22, 1872), said: "For almost two years and a half the clergy has not received anything at all of what is due it." The abdication of King Amedeus and the proclamation of the Spanish Republic by the Chamber (February 11, 1873) made the situation worse. A number of Spanish Catholics put their hope in the triumph of the pretender Don Carlos, who, upon taking up arms for the winning of the throne, had said: "My mission is to fight the revolution, and I will destroy it." The liberals of Spain set up in opposition to him the son of Isabella, who took the name of Alphonse XII. He was the last to bear that name. Pius IX, asked by both sides to intervene, simply replied that "he gave apostolic benedictions, but not political benedictions." Alphonse XII began his reign by several measures favorable to the Church. He ordered returned to the ecclesiastical authorities the archives, libraries, and art works which the state had seized, except some art works or precious manuscripts which were assigned to public establishments. He re-established, for the most part, the endowment of the clergy and annulled the most objectionable provisions of the decree of June 20, 1870, regarding religious marriage.

The severe provisions of the law of June 29, 1875, against the Carlists keenly irritated the Spanish Catholics, since most of their leaders were affected by those measures. King Alphonse sought to lessen the effect of that law by showing that the purpose intended by the legislation was purely political. He was urgent with the Holy Father to obtain the sending of a nuncio to Madrid; and the nuncio, Bishop Simeoni, strongly

seconded by the episcopacy, acted so successfully that the Spanish government renounced the admission on the same footing the dissident sects of the Catholic religion and the Catholic religion itself.

The Constitution of 1876 proclaimed Catholicism the religion of the state, while, however, maintaining freedom of conscience, and in a general way imposed the respect due to Christian moral teaching. In favor of this Constitution the government of Alphonse XII finally grouped a serious majority. On March 1, 1876, Don Carlos solemnly laid down his arms. "His flag," he said, "would remain furled until God should fix the supreme hour of the redemption of Catholic and monarchical Spain." Little by little the episcopacy and the clergy, as a whole, rallied to the cause of Alphonse XII.[35]

England

Like Catholic Spain, Protestant England, following the Vatican Council, at first took an attitude hostile to the Church, but this attitude was gradually modified in a direction less unfavorable. The irritation produced in the High Church by the definition of the dogma of infallibility appeared first by the conferring of the doctorate on Döllinger by the University of Oxford, then by the participation of two Anglican bishops and a certain number of clergymen in the congress held in 1872 at Cologne by the Old Catholics.[36] In the government spheres, the discontent determined by the movement of Catholic revival was shown (March 29, 1870) by Parliament passing a motion inviting the public powers to make an inquiry into the inner organization of the monastic institutions and the origin of their properties. On the proposal of Gladstone, the British

[35] For these details on the Church in Spain, see Chantrel, pp. 33, 37, 101, 119, 245, 299, 330, 401, 489, 509, 599–601, 697.

[36] Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre*, III, 149.

houses softened, by a vote of May 2, this harsh decision and enacted that the inquiry would be exclusively into the sources of the monastic possessions, and not on their interior discipline; but even with this restriction the measure appeared tyrannical to the Catholics. Other similar measures were taken in the course of the same year. The Catholics, now accustomed to public life, organized legal agitations.

In November, 1871, all the Irish bishops, who had to suffer so much from the interference of the government agents in their schools, demanded, in a common pastoral letter: 1. the absolute independence of religious teaching in the primary Catholic schools; 2. the sharing by the secondary schools in the government allowances, until then reserved for the Protestant or neutral schools, and 3. the authorization to found a Catholic university or at least Catholic colleges attached to the state universities and enjoying the same rights as the other colleges. On July 16, 1872, in England the young Catholic Union organized at London under the presidency of the Duke of Norfolk a big lay meeting to protest against the conduct of the Italian and German governments, for the former had just closed at Rome the religious houses, and the latter had just expelled the Jesuits from Germany. On January 2, 1873, Bishop Vaughan, recently made bishop of Salford, laid the foundations of an association that would permit Catholics to exercise an effective political influence, not with a view to changing the form of government or to modify the administrative or financial laws, nor to dictate in matters indifferent to Catholic doctrine, on which the faithful were free to vote, at pleasure, along with the liberals or with the conservatives, but with a view to defending, by all lawful means, the religious freedoms, in particular the freedom of the Catholic education of the children of Catholic families.

This agitation, conducted with as much prudence as firmness, was not fruitless. To it can be credited the decision by

which the Parliament declared (July 30, 1872) to maintain a diplomatic agent at the Holy See;[37] and the introduction of a bill by which Gladstone did justice to part of the demands of the Irish Catholics. This bill, however, was not passed by the British Parliament. It failed (March 11, 1873), having obtained only 284 votes in its favor against 287 opposed. The conversion to Catholicism (September, 1874) of the Marquis of Ripon, one of the most esteemed members of the English Parliament, had a considerable influence on the Catholic movement in England. Pius IX rejoiced greatly at this progress. In January, 1872, he said to the Prince of Wales: "I have great respect for that English people because it is more really religious at heart and in conduct than many that call themselves Catholic. When, some day, it returns to the fold, with great joy we will wish a welcome to that flock, which has gone astray, but is not lost."

Pius IX had opened his pontificate by re-establishing the Catholic hierarchy in England. In 1878, the last year of his reign, he wished to give the same honor to the kingdom of Scotland. He signed (January 28) a decree of the Congregation of Propaganda, re-establishing the two old archbishoprics of Glasgow and Edinburg and the four bishoprics of Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Galloway, and Argyll. But death prevented his consecrating and proclaiming these creations. This task was reserved for his successor, Leo XIII, who did so on March 28 next.[38]

Pius IX left this world on February 7. Weakened by age, he had held a consistory on December 28; then he was confined to bed. Thereafter the illness became worse. His last words were:

[37] At the time of the Council, Odo Russel, legation secretary at the court of Naples, had been sent to Rome on a temporary mission to the Vatican. There he remained after the council and was later replaced by another diplomat. This actual situation was regularized by Parliament in 1872.

[38] For these details of the Church in England, see Chantrel, pp. 205, 310, 603–8, 661, 715, 724, 767–71.

In domum Domini ibimus ("We will go into the house of the Lord"). He had entered into his eighty-sixth year, and had occupied the chair of St. Peter thirty-one years. This successor of the Prince of the Apostles had even surpassed the years of Peter, and his pontificate had been not only the longest in history; by the great events that filled it, it had been one of the most memorable.

CHAPTER XL

Catholic Works

In our chronological account of the chief religious events of the pontificate of Pius IX, we have more than once mentioned the good works stimulated by the clergy and the faithful during that period. We must now give a general view of those works. Charity, piety, and zeal were the outstanding traits in the features of that pope who started his reign by so many institutions of benevolence, who labored so earnestly to promote devotion to the Immaculate Virgin, who was concerned with so great watchfulness with the spread and purity of the Catholic faith. To close the history of his long pontificate by a picture of the works of piety, charity, and apostolic zeal that flourished in the Church, from 1846 to 1878, is to give to that pontificate its natural crown, its radiant halo.

Devotions

Most of the works of piety which Pius IX's pontificate saw blossom, can be ranged around three major objects of devotion: the Blessed Sacrament, the Sacred Heart, and the Blessed Virgin.

From 1845 to 1878 a Carmelite of German origin, Father Hermann, a French priest, Father Eymard, two prelates, Bishops Bouillerie and Ségur, two English Oratorians, Fathers Faber and Dalgairns, and a young Carmelite postulant, Théodelinde Dubouché, were the providential promoters of a renewal of the worship of the Blessed Sacrament. "A young Jew of Hamburg, twenty-six years old, Hermann Cohen, a

wonderful artist, after touring Europe in a path of glory, liberty, and voluptuousness, one day entered a church in Paris. 'The priest was at the altar,' he himself relates, 'In his hands he was rasing aloft a white form. I looked. I heard a voice that seemed to come from the Host: I am the way, the truth, and the life.' There, cast to the ground, he was converted, devoted for his whole life to Jesus in the host. The Jew became a Catholic, the Catholic became a Carmelite; the Carmelite would make resound from the greatest pulpits of Europe his cries of enthusiasm for the Eucharistic Christ; the artist chanted the most penetrating mystical melodies, the most inflamed that our age has heard. In 1871 he, too, became a victim for his brethren: he died at Spandau in Prussia, in the service of the French prisoners." [1]

In 1840 a Marist, Father Eymard, felt himself called by God to honor our Lord in the greatest of His mysteries. His superiors understood him. Pius IX encouraged him. In 1856 he founded at Paris, in a modest house on rue Enfer, the Society of the Priests of the Blessed Sacrament. Two years later he instituted the congregation of the Servants of the Blessed Sacrament. Soon thousands of priest adorers gathered about the religious founded by Father Eymard and spread devotion to the Eucharist throughout the world.[2] At the same time Bishop Gaston de Ségur, by his apostolate among young men and by his lively pamphlets,[3] Bishop Bouillerie by his ardent sermons and by his moving poems, Fathers Faber and Dalgairns by their doctrinal and mystical works, turned souls toward the tabernacle. Under the influence of their writings, words, and works, the practice of frequent Communion became general; while that of perpetual adoration, under the impulse of the episcopate, was established in a large number of

[1] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France,* p. 212. See Sylvain, *Vie du P. Hermann.*

[2] *Beatif. et canon. servi Dei Petri Juliani Eymard.*

[3] M. de Ségur, *Mgr de Ségur, souvenirs et récits d'un frère.*

churches and chapels. In 1878, at the death of Pius IX, in a large number of dioceses the Blessed Sacrament, solemnly exposed, was adored throughout the year by each of the parishes or communities in turn.

In 1848, during the June days, at the sound of the cannons of the bloody uprising, Théodelinde Dubouché had the inspiration of a work, then of a religious congregation, which would unite in its double aim the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament with the worship of the Sacred Heart. The Congregation of Ladies of the Adoration of Reparation, founded by her, has for its purpose to offer reparation for the outrages on the Sacred Heart of Jesus by an uninterrupted adoration, day and night, of the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar.[4]

In 1856 Pius IX inserted in the liturgical calendar the feast of the Sacred Heart. Eight years later a decree of beatification placed on the altars the humble Visitation nun of Paray-le-Monial, Margaret Mary Alacoque, to whom the Savior had asked for the institution of a cult toward the divine symbol of His love. The devotion of the faithful responded to this act of the Holy See by the consecration of the month of June to the Sacred Heart and by the pious custom of Communion on the first Friday of each month in His honor. Parishes and dioceses were consecrated to the Heart of Jesus. The events of 1870 favored this movement. A banner on which the nuns of Paray-le-Monial embroidered the divine emblem was borne on the battlefields by the papal zouaves, organized under the name of Volunteers of the West. On June 29, 1873, fifty deputies went on pilgrimage to Paray and "declared, as far as appertained to them, that they consecrated France to the Sacred Heart." [5]

In April, 1875, Father Ramière, director of the Apostleship of Prayer, presented to the Pope a petition signed by 525

[4] D'Hulst, *Vie de la Mère Marie-Thérèse.*

[5] Lecanuet, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième République,* I, 206. We have mentioned above the erection of the Basilica of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre.

bishops, begging the Holy Father to consecrate to the Heart of Jesus the Eternal City and the world. The Pontiff did not think the moment had come to make this solemn consecration, but he gave some satisfaction to this pious wish by ordering the Congregation of Rites to propose to the bishops of the entire world a form of consecration. On June 16, 1875, the second centenary of the apparition of Our Lord at Paray, this form was adopted by a large number of dioceses, parishes, and communities. The official consecration of all the nations on earth to the Sacred Heart would take place only at the close of the nineteenth century by Pope Leo XIII, following a revelation of the Savior to a holy religious of the Good Shepherd, Sister Mary of the Divine Heart (née Droste zu Vischering).[6]

Like devotion to the Heart of Jesus, devotion to the Blessed Virgin developed in wonderful proportions. Three apparitions of the Mother of God (at Salette, Lourdes, and Pontmain) stimulated this devotion.

In the very year of Pius IX's election, two children (Maximin Giraud, eleven years old, and Mélanie Mathieu-Galvat, fourteen years old) saw, in the mountains of la Salette, near Grenoble, a Lady shining with brightness: it was the Virgin herself, who spoke to them with tears about the sins of her people: blasphemy, violation of the Sunday, and forgetfulness of the holy laws of the Church; and she urged prayer to them.[7] From that moment, pilgrimages were organized to the place of the apparition, and most of the pilgrims returned home filled with the spirit of penance. Many persons there imbibed that spirit of victim which associates souls closely to the Savior's sacrifice.[8]

The definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 gave a

[6] See Chasle, *Sœur Marie du Divin Cœur*. Cf. Nilles, *De rationibus festorum SS. Cordis Jesu;* Bainvel, *La dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus.*

[7] On the apparition of la Salette, see Berthier, *Notre-Dame de la Salette, son apparition, son culte.*

[8] Giraud, *De l'union à Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ dans sa vie de victime,* pp. 364–97.

new impulse to devotion to Mary. About three years later, in a little town of the Pyrrenees, at Lourdes, at the foot of the Massabielle rock, the Blessed Virgin appeared again to a girl of the people, Bernadette Soubirous, and again recommended penance. But her look was so gentle, her smile so kind, that the humble girl was entranced by it and comforted. Said the Lady: "I am the Immaculate Conception." This was heaven's response to the definition of earth.[9] With fresh ardor the throngs hastened to Lourdes. On March 4, 1858, more than 20,000 persons thronged to the foot of the Massabielle rock. On April 4, 1864, the number of pilgrims amounted to 60,000; in July, 1876, on the occasion of the crowning of the Madonna, more than 100,000. Soon the number of pilgrims or visitors coming to Lourdes in the course of one year rose to more than a million. Never, in the course of the ages, did devotion set on foot toward a sanctuary more men of all nations. From all parts of the world they came to seek from the Virgin cures of body and soul.[10] Miracles increased there in number.[11] Some of these took place at the grotto; others, more numerous, at the passing of the Blessed Sacrament, as if God wished clearly to indicate that devotion to the Mother of God could not be separated from that due to her divine Son. New congregations were founded under the title of the Immaculate Conception. Countless churches arose in honor of the Virgin. On September 12, 1860, Bishop Morlhon of Le Puy inaugurated, on an incomparable pedestal, in memory of the definition of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, a most gigantic and most gracious statue. This work of a French sculptor, Bonnassieux, made with the bronze of the cannons taken at Sebastopol, carries the title, Notre-Dame de France.[12]

[9] The definition had been made on December 8, 1854; the first apparition took place on February 11, 1858.

[10] See Henri Lasserre, *Notre-Dame de Lourdes.*

[11] See Bertrin, *Histoire critique des événements de Lourdes.*

[12] Dubosc de Pesquidoux, *L'Immaculaée-Conception, histoire d'un dogme,* II, 202.

In 1871, the apparition of Pontmain, which we spoke of above, aroused a new center of pilgrimages, while the old devotion to the sanctuary of Notre Dame of Chartres revived in French hearts.

Works of Charity

From this general movement of piety toward the Eucharist, the Heart of Jesus, and the Blessed Virgin, works full of mercy were born. In the course of his notable studies on the modern regime, Hippolyte Taine relates that Father Etienne, superior general of the Vincentians and of the Daughters of Charity, after showing some unbelievers through some of his charitable works of his two institutes, said to them: "I have made you acquainted with the detail of our life, but I have not imparted to you the secret. And this secret is Jesus Christ, known, loved, and served in the Eucharist." [13]

The priest who is, in Italy, the chief promoter of the works of corporal and spiritual assistance, the founder of the Institute of Charity and of the Sisters of Providence, Antonio Rosmini-Serbati, was distinguished by his devotion to the Eucharist, the Sacred Heart, and the Blessed Virgin. When his works were taking their first great impulse, he wrote in his private diary: "I ask of you, O Father, what is in the Heart of Jesus. . . . O Mary, ask of God for me what is good in God's sight, in the sight of your divine Son." [14] Until the close of his mortal life in 1855, a similar prayer is still found under his pen: "O my God, I ask of you what the Heart of Jesus desires that I ask." [15] Inspired by such a spirit, the Rosminian works developed, increased, overflowed Italy, and worked marvels abroad, principally in England.[16]

[13] Taine, *Le régime moderne*, II, 115.
[14] Lockhart, *Antonio Rosmini-Serbati*, p. 446.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 447.
[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 344–80.

English by race and education, the great man of works in England at this period, Archbishop Manning, created a cardinal by Pius IX in 1875, did not have a different way of viewing and practicing piety. "The priest," he said, "should live as if he had continually at his side his divine Master. If he goes into the world, this should be as a legate *a latere Jesu.*" And that one of his biographers who has most closely studied his social influence adds, after those words: "The devotion to the Sacred Heart, considered as a consequence of the Incarnation, was for him the practical means of establishing that close union between the soul and Jesus." [17] While still attached to Protestantism, he devoted himself particularly to works that had the aim of diminishing among the poor the habits of drunkenness. Having become a Catholic, priest, and archbishop, he continued to spread temperance societies; but he extended the field of his labors. He asked home rule for Ireland, out of compassion for the sufferings of that nation and because he viewed this reform as an application of social justice. His relations with the Irish became the starting point of his relations with the workers of London. He was called "the father of the poor," "the cardinal of the workingmen"; when, in 1889, an immense and terrible strike threatened the city of London, he alone was able to bring peace and get the 250,000 threatening workers to return to their work.[18] "Take care," someone said to him one day. "You are turning to socialism." He replied: "I know not whether for you it is socialism; but for me it is pure Christianity." [19]

What Manning was for England, Bishop Ketteler of Mainz was for Germany. He was called "the social bishop." Like his brother bishop of London, he declared that he drew from the love of God, as taught by Christianity, the solution of all the

[17] Lemire, *Le cardinal Manning et son action sociale.*
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 108.
[19] Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre,* III, 270.

formidable problems raised by the present organization of labor and ownership. He said: "Since the Son of God came down to earth, the creative spirit of Christianity has, within the limits of the possible, solved all the big questions, even those that concern the sufferings and livelihood of men." [20] In the realm of theory, Ketteler expounded his doctrine in a large number of addresses, pamphlets, and extensive works, the most celebrated of which discusses the question of the workingman and Christianity. Therein, with a vigor that few writers have attained, he describes the deep unrest created in society by the development of industry on the one hand, and, on the other hand, by the progress of doctrines worthy of paganism. He then examines and criticizes with rare competence the solutions proposed by the socialists Lassalle, Karl Marx, and Engels. He acknowledges that the founding of cooperative societies of production, solidly organized, would be the most direct means of relieving the condition of the working classes. But he at once adds that such a means could not be effective without the Christian spirit of which the Catholic Church alone has the authentic deposit. "The Church," he says, "which does not exercise its influence by means more or less mechanical, but by the spirit that she inspires in men." [21]

That this action of the Church would necessarily take place in a very slow manner, Ketteler did not hide from himself; but he believed that the Church, which put an end to the ancient slavery by destroying the pride of the master and raising the slave from his degradation, will be able, so far as human condition permits, to overcome the selfishness of the modern capitalist and moderate the envy of the worker.[22] In the practical realm, Ketteler founded at Mainz workers' circles, societies for the building of inexpensive workmen's houses,

[20] Lionnet, *Un evêque social, Ketteler,* p. 70.
[21] *Ibid.,* p. 72.
[22] *Ibid.,* pp. 70, 77.

employment offices, and asylums for all kinds of suffering;[23] and his works were so well conceived that they serve as models for all those afterward formed in Germany. Fathers Kolping and Hitze, to mention only the most celebrated among the "social priests" of Germany, called themselves the disciples of the Bishop of Mainz;[24] and Pope Leo XIII himself would say, apropos of his encyclical *De conditione opificium:* "Ketteler was my great precursor." [25] This great friend of the poor died in 1877, poor himself, in a poor Franciscan monastery of Bavaria, where he asked for hospitality.

In Austria a convert from Protestantism, Baron Vogelsang, increased his works of social science as he more deeply investigated his Catholic faith.[26] Gaspard Decurtins and Charles Verin realized similar works in Switzerland and in Belgium.

In France the spirit of Frederick Ozanam and of St. Vincent de Paul, a spirit of tender and entirely supernatural charity, inspired the continuators of their works: Armand de Melun, Léon Lefébure, Albert de Mun, René de la Tour du Pin, the Daughters of Charity, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul. "From 1838 to 1877 the life of Armand de Melun was, so to speak, identified with the charitable movement." [27] At least we may say that his name, his action, and his initiative are found in all the legislative reforms enacted, during this period, for the material and moral improvement of the popular classes. He was one of the most energetic collaborators of Sister Rosalie, whose life he himself recounted.[28] To him is due the existence or development of the

[23] See Kannengieser, "Ketteler, l'évêque social," in the *Correspondant* of 1893, and *Ketteler et l'organisation sociale en Allemagne.*

[24] On the social works of Kolping and Hitze and on the social movement in general in Germany during the second half of the nineteenth century, see Kannengieser, *Catholiques allemands,* pp. 51–319.

[25] *Correspondant* of 1893, CLXXII, 243.

[26] See Vogelsang, *Morale et économie sociale; Politique sociale.*

[27] Cornudet, in the *Correspondant* of January 25, 1878.

[28] A. de Melun, *Vie de la Sœur Rosalie.*

following: *L'oeuvre de la Miséricorde,* the *Amis de l'Enfance,* the *Apprentis et des jeunes Ouvrières,* the *Société d'économie charitable,* the *Société de secours aus blessés.* Elected a deputy in the legislative Assembly in 1849, he there prepared and defended, with a competence recognized by political friends and foes, the best laws of that period: the laws on unhealthful lodging, on apprenticeship contracts, on pawnshops; and he took an important part in drawing up the law on freedom of education.[29]

Léon Lefébure, in his youth a faithful disciple of Armand de Melun, a collaborator of Frederick Le Play in the Exposition of 1867, deputy from Colmar in 1869, undersecretary of the treasury in 1873, did not give his name to any particular work; but he collaborated with active intelligence in most of the charitable institutions of his time, and prepared entirely the foundation of that *Office central des oeuvres de bienfaisance* which crowned his useful life.[30]

We had occasion above to say how the young lieutenant Albert de Mun and the headquarters captain René de la Tour du Pin founded in 1871 the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers.* Never was a work more brilliantly begun. Under the regime of a National Assembly that was largely deeply religious, we see Albert de Mun, without neglecting his professional duties, but also without quitting the saber and the armor, enthusiastically stir immense meetings, which authorities of all sorts—generals, magistrates, prefects, even the marshal president himself—sometimes honored with their presence. After the disasters of 1870 and the disorders of the Commune, the work of the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers* profited from the eloquent conviction of its apostles and their initiatives, patriotic, social, and frankly Christian. "Men of action and far-sighted patriots joined together to sustain and spread the new work. The favor of a large

[29] Baunard, *Vie du vicomte Armand de Melun.*

[30] Joly, *Ozanam et ses continuateurs,* pp. 183–231.

number of bishops and soon the high approval of Rome did the rest. United in the same sentiment of social preservation and national rescue, workers and the upper classes fraternized. This fact is evident in the report written by Albert de Mun the evening of the pilgrimage of the circles to Notre Dame de Liesse, August 17, 1873.[31] It is a report of victory, written in military style by a fearless soldier." [32] At the side of Captain de Mun, another captain, La Tour du Pin, with a keen-sighted mind, reflective, profound, elaborated in the "Council of Studies," the doctrine which he later formulates in his important work, *Vers un ordre social chrétien* and in his precious little volume, *Aphorismes de politique sociale*. Pascal, Ségur-Lamoignon, Savatier, and Bréda took part in the social discussions presided over by one who dominated them as a master. A review, the *Association catholique,* and a weekly, the *Corporation,* were founded to spread the ideas of the new group.

But these bright beginnings had no sequel. The first generation of young men, united and enthusiastic, was not replaced by sufficient recruits. The doctrine of the work was contested by serious economists. The circles offered to already Catholic workers some real advantages, but they scarcely attracted the others. One has often spoken of the failure, at least partial, of the work of the circles of Catholic workers. One forgets that the work of Albert de Mun and René de la Tour du Pin survived in other works, which, though bearing different names, go back to it for their origin, their spirit, and their impulse. The *Association catholique de la Jeunesse française* is related to a gathering of young men founded by the two valiant officers. The study circles, so widespread in our day, are derived from the Council of Studies. The present Christian trade unions were outlined in the projects of a Christian corporation elaborated in 1871. The "social weeks" had had as their promoters some disciples of de

[31] A. de Mun, *Œuvres,* I, 62.
[32] L. de Grandmaison, in *Etudes,* CXLI, 32.

Mun and La Tour du Pin; and at the beginning of the twentieth century groups sharply hostile in politics appealed with equal ardor to the social doctrines proclaimed after 1870 by the work of the circles.

The Daughters of Charity do not profess a social doctrine; but the successful initiatives of Sister Rosalie, her Bureau of Charity, her various foundations, patronages, congregations, asylums for the aged, different institutions for children, became models for the Daughters of Charity, giving fresh life to their charitable apostolate and enabling them to adapt their traditional methods to the new needs.[33]

Under the pressure of events and under the high direction of Brother Philip, their superior general, the Brothers of the Christian Schools also broadened their means of action. Their starting point, their first work, was the primary school. But, when the family offered so little Christian assistance to the boy who finished the school, naturally his former teachers thought of doing something for him. Brother Philip considered that circles of young men, family houses, classes for adults, farming colonies, orphanages, besides professional, industrial, agricultural, and commercial teaching, was connected with the work intended by St. John Baptist de la Salle, and God blessed them abundantly.[34]

The Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul did not have to consider such questions. They were founded precisely to engage in all the popular works required by the needs of the time. The revolution of 1848, then the war of 1870 and the Commune of 1871 were, for the young congregation, occasions for redoubled activity and success. Wearing lay dress, "the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, unknown to the great number of people, in all externals like the zealous Catholics who devoted themselves to the works, not only escaped the persecutions; they could, in the

[33] A. de Melun, *Vie de la Sœur Rosalie*, pp. 36–163.
[34] Poujoulat, *Vie du Frère Philippe*, pp. 129–61.

midst of the most violent political commotions, continue, almost without hindrance, their hidden apostolate." [35] In 1871 Pius IX asked them to add, in their Constitutions, to the works of workers and of the poor, the works of soldiers.[36] It was in one of their houses, that of Notre Dame of Nazareth, on the boulevard Montparnasse, that the work of the Catholic Circles of workmen was born, and from their initiative was born, under the presidency of Bishop Ségur, friend and protector of the institute, the *Union des associations ouvrières catholiques,* which powerfully contributed to an increase of the workmen's works in all the dioceses of France.[37]

Christian Art

Was it a work of art or a work of the apostolate that, in the time of Pius IX, was pursued by the painter Hippolyte Flandrin in France, the disciples of Overbeck in Germany, the Pre-Raphaelites of England, who took Ruskin as lawmaker and herald? The predominance of the idea of apostolate is undeniable in the painter of the churches of St. Vincent de Paul and St. Germain-des-Prés in Paris, of the church of St. Paul at Nimes. There one sees the marvelous features in which his pure soul shines through, "a tender reflection of the past" rather than the radiant clearness of a "new dawn." [38] But his painting expresses a piety so gentle and recollected that a competent judge has compared it to a "Christian neophyte painting the catacombs" and also to "an artist of the fifteenth century decorating the chapels and monasteries with inexhaustible fervor." [39]

[35] *Vie de M. Le Prévost,* p. 156.

[36] *Ibid.,* p. 262.

[37] For details of the works of the Society of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, see the *Vie de M. Le Prévost,* which is also the history of the Congregation up to 1871.

[38] André Pératé, in *Un siècle, movement du monde de 1800 à 1900,* p. 633.

[39] Address by Beulé, secretary of the *Académie des beaux-arts,* on the tomb of Hippolyte Flandrin. See Louis Flandrin, *Hippolyte Flandrin.*

In the religious renewal of architecture which occurred during the same period, the inspiration is purely Christian in Montalembert, who, in 1833, in his letter on the vandalism in France, wrote: "For the art of the Middle Ages I have an old and deep passion; a passion mostly religious, because that art is, in my eyes, above all Catholic." [40] But with Victor Hugo, Michelet, Mérimée, Vitet, as with the German disciples of Wackenroder, the inspiration is especially artistic. Didron, in his *Annales archéologiques,* founded in 1844, and Arcisse de Caumont, in his *Abécédaire d'archéologie,* which appeared in 1850, prepared its realization. A talented architect, Viollet-le-Duc, whose writings and monumental work dominate the period, realizes it. His restoration in Notre Dame of Paris and in a great number of monuments at Vézelay, Autun, Beaune, Toulouse, and Carcassonne are not beyond all criticism. But his work has admirable parts, and the earnestness of his proselytism was unwearied. His influence penetrated Europe. It was felt in Germany, which would soon glory in completing, with some heaviness, the Cologne cathedral; and his influence, coinciding in England with that of Ruskin, inspired the restoration of several Gothic monuments.[41]

From the monuments of the Middle Ages also religious music sought the secret of its renovation. In 1840, the appearance of the first volume of Dom Guéranger's *Institutions liturgiques* and the publication of the Bishop Parisis' pastoral instruction on the *Chant de l'Eglise,*[42] gave the first impulse to the movement. The formation, in 1849, by the archbishops of Reims and Cambrai, on Pius IX's advice, of a commission charged with restoring the liturgical chant according to the ancient manuscripts, the publication by the Jesuit Father Lambillotte of his *Clef des mélodies grégoriennes,* the particularly suggestive

[40] Montalembert, *Œuvres,* VI, 8.
[41] Pératé, *op. cit.,* p. 629.
[42] Guillemant, *Pierre-Louis Parisis,* I, 200–10.

studies of canon Gontier and the edition, made in 1876 by a canon of Trèves, Hermesdorff, of part of the *Graduale:* such were the principal steps of a reform which was achieved in 1880 by the publication of the *Mélodies grégoriennes* of Dom Pothier. To him belongs the honor of restoring the Gregorian chant in the Church. His capital work was the fruit of twenty years of patient research.

In 1860, Dom Guéranger, while still a simple novice in the Benedictine abbey of Solesmes, struck by Pothier's special aptitudes, directed him to transcribe, with the help of two confreres, Dom Hansion and Dom Fonteinne, the dusty antiphonaries of St. Gall and of the Metz school, to compare the notations of the codices with the texts of the theorists, and to establish a clearly readable copy of the Gregorian *Graduale.* A first attempt appeared in 1868. But "the most delicate points had still to be investigated, and twelve years passed in new attempts, in new works, obscure but fruitful. At length, in 1880, appeared the *Mélodies grégoriennes,* the publication of which aroused a considerable stir among the students of plain chant. The work is as fresh today as when it first appeared; if, in certain respects, it can be supplemented, nothing is found in it to be done over." [43]

In the middle of the nineteenth century the Church borrowed from the Middle Ages not only the principles of the revival of its architecture and its liturgical chant; to the medieval period she also turned to find again the traditional paths of her philosophy and her theology.

Philosophy and Theology

In 1840 the librarian of the royal library of Naples, canon Cajetan Sanseverino, who, it was said, had only two passions: to classify on the shelves the dusty volumes and to read the

[43] Amédée Gastoué, *L'art grégorien,* p. 108. On the beauty of the religious chant of Solesmes, see *Revue des Deux Mondes,* November 15, 1898.

works of Descartes, received the visit of a Jesuit from Reggio, Father Sordi, who revealed to him the depths of St. Thomas' Summa. The good canon, fascinated by the new horizons opening to his mind, studied, with growing fondness, the teaching of the Angelic Doctor; and, after three years of silence and study, published seven volumes, with the title, *Philosophia christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata.* It had a considerable success. Already, among the Catholics, many vigorous and independent minds, disappointed with the vague or inconsistent theories of traditionalism, Cartesianism, and ontologism, turned to the Philosophy of St. Thomas.[44] In 1846, Jaime Balmes began his *Filosofia fundamental* with these words: "This is nothing more than the philosophy of St. Thomas fitted to the needs of the nineteenth century." The appearance of Sanseverino's work emphasized this position. In 1853 Father Gratry, in his book, *De la connassance de Dieu,* wrote: "We can say that St. Thomas Aquinas embraces St. Augustine, Aristotle, and Plato. . . . He needs to be understood. In him are heights, depths, and precisions that perhaps contemporary intellect will grasp only in a few generations, if philosophy recovers." [45] In that same year 1853 a German Jesuit, Father Kleutgen, published the first volume of his *Theologie der Vorzeit.* In Italy another Jesuit, Father Cornoldi, founded at Bologna an Academy of St. Thomas. Pius IX did more than simply praise Sanseverino for having "aided the young clergy in the principles of sound doctrine"; [46] he did not conceal his admiration for the old scholastic doctors, he defended their method,[47] he interpreted some of their fundamental doctrines; [48] and Archbishop Pecci of Perugia, the future Leo XIII, as a prelude to the encouragements he would later give to scholasticism from the height of

[44] Gratry, *De la connaissance de Dieu,* I, 276.
[45] *Ibid.,* p. 326.
[46] Letter to the Archbishop of Naples.
[47] Denzinger-Bannwart, no. 1652.
[48] Brief of June 15, 1857, *Eximiam tuam.*

the papal chair, requested of the Holy Father that he declare St. Thomas the patron of the universities. This movement did not, however, injure the development of positive theology, already illustrated by Melchior Cano, Petavius, and Thomassin. The *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité* of Bishop Ginouilhiac, the patristic studies of Freppel, Hefele's *History of the Councils*, and the scholarly work of Bishop Malou of Bruges, on the Immaculate Conception, are learned counterparts of the learned works of Sanseverino, Kleutgen, and Cornoldi.[49]

Rational theology and positive theology did not absorb the activity of the Catholic clergy. Mystical theology, at about the middle of the nineteenth century, had two illustrious representatives: Father Faber and Father Charles Gay.[50] Of both we may say what Bishop Mermillod said in 1872, when Father Gay had not yet published anything, that they seemed to be placed on the threshold of the new times as St. Francis de Sales was after the Middle Ages, and that after the example of the illustrious and holy Bishop of Geneva, they tried to bring into harmony the old spirituality of the Church with the modern.[51] Both of them assimilated the substance of the great theologians of all times, but both continually had in mind their contemporaries and thus spoke for the men of their age and their country.

Spiritual Writings

Frederick William Faber, born in 1814, in York county, of a Protestant family that had sought refuge in England after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and that proudly preserved the traditions of their Huguenot ancestors, came to Catholicism

[49] For a full idea of the theological movement at this period, see Bellamy, *La théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle*, and Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius*, Vol. V. In these two works will be found the elements of a study on the biblical movement and the apologetic movement during the same period.

[50] Later bishop of Anthédon, auxiliary of Bishop Pie of Poitiers.

[51] Bowden, *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber*.

in 1845 through a thousand distresses and obstacles, because he felt his soul dying of hunger and thirst in Protestantism, because there he found neither angels nor saints nor the Blessed Virgin, nor Jesus present in the Eucharist, nor the Holy Ghost speaking to him through a holy, one, catholic, and apostolic Church. On the day of his confirmation he felt himself, like the apostles, invaded by the sensible presence of the Holy Ghost.[52] And thereafter he sang his happiness. His treatises of spirituality are poems. A less profound psychologist than Newman, a less solid logician than Manning, less scholarly than Manning, he was more supple, more varied, more captivating. His books have not that order which is pleasing to a French reader, but they abound with striking, picturesque, original, and unexpected features.[53] He excells in giving a poetical form to the most austere theses, in expressing in modern metaphors the most ancient dogmas. Says a certain critic: "Father Faber would be an audacious theologian if he were not a well trained theologian." [54] Faber's independence was, however, more apparent than real; and many a one was astonished to see this Anglo-Saxon push the love of Rome to the point of extolling the queerest forms of Italian devotion, and preach, not only devotedness, but even devotion to the pope.[55]

Charles Gay, quite taken with the beauties of art even in childhood, an accomplished musician, a friend of Charles Gounod, was converted when eighteen years old by Lacordaire. When ordained priest, he preferably joined Father Gaston and Bishop Pie, collaborated in this bishop's work, and accom-

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 370.

[53] "The literary spirit of what is called the Romantic school, was not a stranger to Father Faber. He mingled the treatment of morals and even mockery with the most grandiose ideas. He said whatever he thought, and he said it with an artists's stroke." Hello in the *Revue du Monde catholique,* March 28, 1875.

[54] Gautier, *Portraits littéraires*, p. 81.

[55] The writings of Faber include the following: *The Precious Blood, Bethlehem, The Blessed Sacrament, Spiritual Conferences, The Creator and the Creature, All for Jesus, Growth in Holiness.*

panied him to the Vatican Council. There he was a member of the group known as the "infallibilists," among the most decided. In 1874 he published some conferences given to the Carmelite nuns, and gave this book the title, *La vie et les vertues chrétiennes dans l'état religieux*. The work had an immense success. In eighteen months 12,000 copies were sold, without counting the translations. By the classical order that prevailed in these two volumes, Father Gay surpassed Father Faber; but his language has a stiffness which does not always, at the first reading, allow the taste of its full depth, its warmth, and the life in his thought. Not until after his death, by the publication of his correspondence, did the public know all the spontaneity, simplicity, gracious and gentle harmony contained in his soul. However, anyone who did not grasp the depth, surmised it. The special character of Father Gay's work on the Christian life and virtues is the close union of dogmatic theology and mystical theology. Previous to him, many authors had joined them by placing them side by side; with him, they are blended. In one and the same expression the theologian recognizes his doctrine and the mystic perceives his own inner experience.

More than any other, the learned and pious author succeeded in realizing this ideal, for that compenetration of dogma and piety constituted his inner life. Raised in a family that was a stranger to Christian beliefs, he came to Catholicism peacefully, without shock, following the deepest promptings of his reason and his heart. Having arrived at the full truth, he converted all the members of his family by the simple radiance of his interior life, by what he was rather than by what he said; therein was undoubtedly the difficulty he experienced in translating into intellectual expressions what he felt as a life, which at times gave such a tenseness to his style. "Books," he wrote, "at bottom do nothing." [56] "The phrase is a house which our earthly condition makes precious, perhaps indispensable. How many people

[56] Gay, *Correspondance*, II, 50.

tend to transform this abode into a prison!" [57] But the attentive reading of a book as profound as his, makes life visible through the phrase, because the phrase, with this mystic who is a theologian, came forth from his soul and kept, as it were, an echo of the emotion that vibrated in him. Thus his seventeen writings on the Christian life in general, on the virtues which are its fruit, on the religious life, on the obstacles which the Christian life and virtues encounter here below, become nourishment for the mind as for the heart. Is the mystic something different from a soul which, by a special grace of God, feels what the simple faithful believes, or rather, which feels by the heart what it knows by the mind, according to the celebrated saying of the Areopagite? [58]

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[58] Denis the Areopagite, *The Divine Names,* chap. 2, sect. 9. Migne, P.G., III, 647. "What we believe by faith," says St. Theresa, speaking of the mystical states, "the soul perceives by sight." *Interior Castle,* seventh mansion, chap. 1.

CHAPTER XLI

Foreign Missions

A MISTAKEN view sometimes represents the nineteenth century as marked by the elimination of all metaphysics, even of all theological speculation and of all mystical tendency.[1] The immense success of the works of Father Faber and Father Gay are plain refutations of such an assertion. That century had its mystics, as it had its miracles at Lourdes, as it had its saints in the overflowing life of the supernatural, such as the Curé of Ars, as it had its missioners and its martyrs.

The pontificate of Pius IX is precisely marked by a special expansion of the foreign missions and of apostolic zeal, an expansion which Gregory XVI had effectively prepared.

In the course of the centuries the Church has counted three great movements of spreading the gospel. In the first centuries it followed and sometimes went ahead of the Roman eagles, to preach the gospel to the ancient world; in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it followed and often preceded the great European explorers, and eagerly went forth to plant the cross in all the new lands where the love of gold drove the new conquerors. About the middle of the nineteenth century the big evolution of the colonial policy became, for the apostolic zeal of the Catholic Church, a new stimulus. Of course the virtue of the apostolate remains always, for the Catholic Church, a "reserved virtue," as Lacordaire proclaimed from the Notre Dame pulpit; Protestantism, from the religious point of view, continues to disintegrate, and the Greek schism, as a Church, does not emerge from its static condition; but both of them, as national religions,

[1] Well known is the vogue of August Comte's theory of the "three states." See Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes du XIX^e siècle,* pp. 352–58.

follow the movement of penetration which England, Germany, and Russia pursue in the different parts of the world, and implant themselves there under the protection of the civil and military authorities of those states. Was Catholicism going to lose the fruit of its long labors?

The Near East

On the eastern frontiers of Europe, the Greek schism, which made but one with the Muscovite empire, had long had its eye on Constantinople, that key of two worlds, and coveted the domination or at least the protectorate of the Balkan nations. Would the Holy Places be safer in the hands of the Holy Synod than under the authority of the Sultan? Everything pointed to the contrary. But the pre-eminence of Russia or Turkey at Constantinople was a question of the political order with which the Holy See was not directly concerned. On the other hand, from the religious viewpoint, the Catholic Church for a long time had given up any direct undertaking for the conversion of the Greeks and of the Turks; the prejudices of the Greeks were so deep and the fanaticism of the Turks was so violent that one might fear that any attempt of this sort would, without profit for the faith, merely end in an increase of intolerance and hostility.

A step taken by the Sublime Porte in January, 1847, following the election of Pius IX, gave some hope to the Catholics. The Sultan's ambassador at Vienna went to Rome to offer his homage to the Holy Father. This was the first time that an Ottoman diplomat requested an audience of the vicar of Christ. The audience took place on January 20, 1847. The words exchanged were vague, but marked with good feeling on both sides. Six months later, Pius IX, by his apostolic letter *Nulla celebrior,* announced his intention of re-establishing the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem with residence obligatory. In the secret con-

sistory of October, he raised to the high office Father Joseph Valerga, a missioner at Mossul since 1841. On January 6, 1848, he addressed to all the Christians of the Orient a long and eloquent letter, announcing to them the sending of a papal ambassador to the Sublime Porte, recalling the past grandeurs of the Eastern Churches and inviting the separated Christian bodies to unity.[2] Pius IX was under no illusion: the fulfillment of his wishes could take place only after the expiration of a long time; but the different missions that were organized, encouraged, and sustained by him in Palestine, Syria, Chaldea, and Armenia had as their purpose to hasten the return of our separated brethren; apparently this end has been attained to a considerable extent.

In Palestine, the Franciscans, since their foundation, had an important place, which they kept, even after the election of a patriarch residing in Jerusalem.[3] Besides, from time immemorial France exercised there a religious protectorate, officially recognized by agreements concluded, from 1535 to 1740, under the name of "capitulations," [4] a protectorate which the treaty of Berlin in 1878 would recognize and ratify. From 1847 to 1874 Bishop Valerga and Bishop Bracco founded numerous Catholic works in Palestine. Helped by the Propagation of the Faith Society and by the Association of the Holy Sepulcher, founded at Cologne, they made new parishes, called to Palestine a large number of religious congregations, and with their cooperation founded schools, orphanages, and hospices. These foundations counterbalanced as much as possible the influence of the Russian schismatics and the German Protestants, who, with considerable sums available, increased their efforts to consolidate and enlarge their positions in the Holy Land.

One of the most interesting works in Palestine, in the pon-

[2] Chantrel, *Annales ecclésiastiques,* 1847, pp. 6, 11, 14, 19–23.
[3] Civezza, *Histoire universelle des missions franciscaines.*
[4] E. Lamy, *La France due Levant,* pp. 57–62, 164–236.

tificate of Pius IX, was that of Father Marie-Alphonse Ratisbonne. Born in 1814 at Strasbourg, of an Israelite family, raised apart from any religious idea, given to a worldly life and pleasures in his youth, he had been suddenly converted at Rome while on a journey of pleasure, by a miraculous apparition of the Blessed Virgin on January 20, 1842.[5] He entered the Society of Jesus in June of that same year. He felt himself drawn by a growing force toward the apostolate of his brethren of Israel and toward the work which his brother Marie-Théodore, converted to Catholicism a few years before him, had founded under the name of Notre Dame de Sion. In December, 1852, he joined his brother, having no more earnest desire than to go to Jerusalem, to work, "to weep and suffer with Jesus on Calvary for the redemption of Israel." In August, 1855, he set foot on that holy soil where his apostolate lasted more than thirty years. The following year he was joined by a small group of sisters belonging to the Congregation of Notre Dame de Sion, which Father Marie-Théodore had founded at Paris,[6] and which, in the minds of the two brothers, was to assume a double task: one a work of expiation by ceaseless prayer, the other a work of regeneration by the free education of the children of Palestine. The foundations of the sanctuary and of the large orphanage of the *Ecce homo,* of the House of St. John of the Desert, and of the institute St. Peter of Jerusalem realized the wishes of the two holy priests. Other nuns, Carmelites, Trappists, Dominicans, Assumptionists, also established schools, where pupils came in large numbers. These latter were a prelude to their celebrated pilgrimages of the Holy Land.

In 1878 Bishop Lavigerie installed the White Fathers in the monastery of St. Anne of Jerusalem, put at their disposal by the

[5] See the detailed account of these facts in the life of his brother, *Le R. P. Marie-Théodore Ratisbonne,* I, 186, 246.

[6] On the foundation of this Congregation and of the Fathers of Sion, having as their purpose "to labor earnestly to bring back the lost sheep of Israel to the true Church," see *ibid.,* I, 317, 357, 407, 546.

French government.[7] Catholic propaganda strictly so called remained always impossible; but, as a clear-sighted historian remarks, charity, the devotedness of the missioners and of the nuns, brought about a lessening of the fanaticism. "The Turks educated in the Christian schools, who, more and more numerous, held positions in the army and in politics, were free from the instincts of Mussulman ferocity." The girls, trained in Christian boarding schools, had a vision: the dignity of woman, of the wife, of the mother had appeared to them. "It is on the degradation of woman that Islam was founded. The day when the woman, in the dignity of the re-established home, passes her conscience on to the sons raised by her, the woman will vanquish Islam." [8]

Above the Jordan, in the mountains of Lebanon, in Syria, not only the religion of Mohammed, but the Greek schism, the Jacobite heresy, the strange and wild religion of the Druses,[9] and, in the midst of this disparate world, also an intense Protestant propaganda the Catholic missioners encountered. "The fertility of the country, the number of its harbors, and the importance of business there kept a European colony in the principal cities of Syria." [10] The English and the Americans flocked there. "From the island of Cyprus, its eagle's nest, England sent and disseminated its Bibles, its money, and its men." [11] The Protestant ministers of America had established their preaching center among the Druses, a vigorous people, who until then had counted only on themselves against the Catholics, protected by France, against the Moslems, backed by the Porte, against the Orthodox, clients of Russia. These ministers made them see the powerful backing of the Protestant nations. Prot-

[7] Baunard, *Le cardinal Lavigerie*, II, chap. 4.
[8] Lamy, *op. cit.*, pp. 350 f.
[9] See Silvestre de Sacy, *Exposé de la religion des Druses.*
[10] Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 202.
[11] Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Eglise de France*, p. 438.

estantism sought another support in the educated classes. In 1875 it founded at Beyrouth a school which took the name of a university, and from there could graduate doctors, influential men of all kinds, perhaps statesmen, who in their turn could direct public opinion.

The Catholics had for themselves, in the Lebanon mountains, the valiant nation of the Maronites. A target for the perpetual attacks of the Druses, victims in 1860 of frightful massacres, they were helped by France, which, as protector of the Christians of the East, sent a body of 7,000 men to protect them, raised up the nation from its ruins, and obtained for it from the Sultan the appointment of a Christian governor. At the same time Bishop Samhiri, patriarch of Antioch for the Syrians, with tireless zeal traveled through Europe, begging for his poor Church. By his preaching the Capuchin Castelli brought about many conversions among the Jacobites. In 1869, Bishop Samhiri's successor, Bishop Harcus, went to the Vatican Council at the head of eight bishops, who were joined by the Bishop of Madiat in Mesopotamia, converted in 1850. The foundation in 1885 by the Jesuits, under the protection of the French government, of the University of Beyrouth greatly contributed to combat the Protestant influence.

The mission of Chaldea, confided to the Dominicans, Carmelites, Capuchins, and Vincentians, was confronted by the Nestorian heresy. In 1843 an Anglican Puseyite mission, under the direction of the preacher Badger, had established itself at Mossul to oppose the French influence. But the protection accorded by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to this Puseyite undertaking caused scandal in England. Badger left Mossul at the end of 1844. Missions organized by the Americans at Mossul, in Mesopotamia, and in Turkish Kurdistan had no greater success. Distribution of money in profusion injured their cause more than helped it. The Nestor-

ians, speaking of Protestantism, said: "That religion is not a religion; rather it is the overturning of all religion." [12] Catholicism, on the contrary, won many proselytes. Bishop Audu wrote that 35,000 sheep had been brought back to the fold.

Unfortunately the beginning of schism which occurred in the Church of Chaldea interrupted the course of its happy destinies. We saw above what was the attitude of the patriarch Audu at the Vatican Council. There he had strongly defended the ancient usages of his Church regarding the election of the bishops. The appointment of two prelates by Pius IX had greatly offended him. Nevertheless his submission to the dogma of infallibility and the other dogmas proclaimed by the council had been unqualified. He merely added that, from the disciplinary point of view, he made a reservation, already proclaimed by the Council of Florence and not abolished by the Vatican Council: *Salvis omnibus juribus et privilegiis patriarcharum.* Cardinal Barnabo had registered his declaration, remarking to him that the council, by decreeing the direct authority of the pope over the whole Church, made no exception for the Eastern Church, but that this authority would always be exercised by taking account of particular circumstances.[13] But in 1873 difficulties arose, still about episcopal elections, between Propaganda and the patriarch. The latter refused to submit to the decisions of Rome, which he declared were arbitrary, and led with him several bishops, the chief personages of the nation, and the monks of Raban Ormez. On May 24, 1874, on his own authority he consecrated nine bishops. A letter which Pius IX wrote to him on September 16, 1875, was regarded by him as null, because he considered it inspired to the Pope by the jealousy of the Dominicans. But when, in 1877, the Sovereign Pontiff called upon him to comply with the papal orders or to separate from the Church, the venerable prelate, who was animated by a deep sentiment

[12] Marshall, *Christian Missions*, II, 118.
[13] Granderath, III, 268.

of piety and devotion to the Church,[14] promptly submitted. He then had the grief of seeing many of his faithful and of his priests rise up against him. His successor, Bishop Abolian, elected on February 28, 1879, succeeded in establishing peace in the Chaldean Church. We know with what care Leo XIII had at heart to grant the Eastern Churches all the privileges based on respectable traditions and compatible with the essential rights of the Holy See.

Otherwise serious was the crisis that broke out in Armenia. The Catholics of Armenia had passed through varied fortunes. Those who, to escape from the Turkish persecutions, had taken refuge in Austria, had the better lot. Those fixed in Russia saw themselves organized on the model of the Muscovite Church and were never able to have relations with a Catholic missioner. We have already seen how the Catholic Armenians of Turkey, at first made dependent on the schismatic patriarch, were finally freed. In 1850 Catholicism had made such progress that Pius IX authorized Archbishop Hassoun to erect six suffragan bishoprics: those of Brousse, Angora, Artwin, Erzeroum, Trebizond, and Ispahan. Sixteen years later, Hassoun was elected patriarch by the bishops of his district. Pius IX, who knew the new patriarch's devotion to the Holy See, profited by this choice to accomplish in the Armenian Church a reform decided on long before. By his bull *Reversurus* (July 12, 1867), destined to become famous in the history of the Eastern Churches: 1. he united into one the two ecclesiastical circumscriptions of Constantinople and Cilicia and fixed the residence of the patriarch at Constantinople; 2. he decided that in the future the elections to the Patriarchate and to the episcopal sees would be done by the bishops to the exclusion of the laity and that the patriarch-elect would not be enthroned or perform any act of jurisdiction

[14] In his consistorial allocution of February 28, 1879, Leo XIII called him *Antistes quem eximius pietatis et religionis sensus ornabat. Acta Leonis XIII*, I, 199.

before receiving confirmation of his election by the pope; 3. he stipulated that the intervention of the bishops in the election to an episcopal see would consist merely in proposing to the pope three candidates, from whom the pope would make his choice, moreover, reserving to himself the right to choose a priest outside the three proposed if these did not appear to him sufficiently able or worthy.

Protests were made. Those protesting held that the Pope exceeded his rights and reduced those of the nation. An intervention by Bishop Valerga, papal legate, temporarily restored peace in 1868, giving the clergy and people a part in the election of the two bishops who assisted the patriarch. But in a synodal assembly (July 5, 1869) an open revolt broke out. The patriarch was loudly accused of having betrayed, to the profit of the pope, the age-long rights of the Armenian Church. A month later, when Bishop Hassoun had to go to Rome for the council, the boldness of his adversaries increased. The patriarchal administrator, Bishop Gasparian, put himself at their head. The new administrator, sent from Rome, was not received; the bull *Reversurus* was publicly burned. A new patriarch, Badhiarian, was elected. The grand vizir Aali pasha entered into negotiations, to appease the difference, with Bishop Pluym, then with Bishop Franchi, papal legate; but his successor, Mahmoud pasha, favored the dissidents. Patriarch Hassoun was exiled. In July, 1872, he left for Rome. There he remained until February, 1874. At that time he was able to return to Constantinople, but could not yet recover the possession of the property which the dissidents had seized. That restitution was made only to his successor, Bishop Azarian, elected in 1887. After that, the schism disappeared.[15]

[15] The bull *Reversurus*, directed to the Armenians, announced that its prescriptions would presently be extended to all the Eastern patriarchates. But the disturbances stirred up in Armenia by this bull and those provoked in Chaldea by the extension of these measures prompted the Pope not to pursue this project. On this point, see De Angelis, *Praelectiones juris canonici*, I, 131.

This was not, alas, the only calamity the Church had to fight in Armenia. Of all the Eastern nations, none was more disturbed by the Protestant propaganda. "The American societies were established in Armenia after the war of 1854. They were not satisfied with training Armenian ministers and teachers, for the apostolate of Armenia. The children of the most important families were accustomed to seek in Europe, especially at Paris, a more complete education; the advice of the American teachers urged on this elite to London. The English, if they did not put an end to the evils of Armenia, at least proclaimed its rights." [16] This union of peoples attached both to the free government and to the Reformation, would work to the profit of Protestantism.

The importance of this movement cannot be denied. Yet "the influence of the zealous Catholic priests of the Armenian nation and that of numerous Latin missioners, Jesuit, Franciscan, Capuchin, Dominican, and Assumptionist, produced consoling results which increased with time." [17] An Armenian seminary, erected at Rome in 1884, helped to tighten the union of Catholic Armenia with the Holy See.

The Far East

If, from the countries of the East, we pass to the regions commonly designated as the Far East, we shall again meet, at the side of the infidels, whether pagan or Moslem, the formidable competition of Protestantism. In Hindustan, at the outset of Pius IX's pontificate, the evil was twofold. On one hand the substitution of the English influence for the Portuguese favored the development of Protestantism; on the other hand, schemes of the Lisbon court, which avenged its political failures by encroaching on the religious domain and by backing the

[16] Lamy, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

[17] Janin, in the *Echos d'Orient*, January, 1916, p. 32.

schismatic clergy of Goa, hindered the action of the Holy See and thereby of the Catholic apostolate. On May 9, 1853, Pius IX, in severe language, summoned the schismatics to obedience; but the Lisbon Chamber of Deputies (July 20) declared that the act of the Pope was invalid because it was without the royal placet and because the rebellious ecclesiastics had merited well of the fatherland. The treaty concluded (February 20, 1857) between Cardinal di Pietro and the minister Fonseca Magalhaes, provided that the dioceses of Goa, Cranganor, Cochin, Meliapour, Maccala, and Macao would be given boundaries and that the Pope would issue a new bull of circumscription. Thus was the schism virtually ended. And from this period the progress of the Catholic evangelization was rapid. The new archbishop of Goa, Amorin-Pessoa, in 1862 suspended the schismatics who still resisted. But at each difficulty arising between the higher authorities on one side and the clergy and people on the other, the schism, assured of the protection of the government, revived. The Portuguese cabinet, attached to Freemasonry, opposed the sending of religious missioners and contested the validity or the meaning of the apostolic letters or decrees of the Roman congregations. These obstacles, in addition to those created by the caste spirit of the Indians, their idolatrous prejudices, and the Protestant proselytism made the efforts of the missioners most meritorious. The number of Catholics in eastern India, which in 1864 rose to 990,000, attained the figure of 1,210,000 in 1875.

India

The rapid extension of the Catholic missions in India is owing chiefly to the exceptional worth of one missioner, Bishop Bonnaud. Missioner in the Indies in 1824, appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Pondichery in 1833, then raised to the office of vicar apostolic of the Indies in 1836, Bishop Bonnaud had all

the qualities of an apostle and an administrator.[18] He published several works of religious exposition and apologetics. The principal one was the *Veda-poura-telteimaroutel,* an exposition and history of Catholicism under the form of a history of mankind. The work, well written and lively, summed up the Old Testament, the Gospel accounts, and the annals of the Church, carefully noting and then refuting in passing the various heresies, particularly Protestantism and contemporary objections against the true religion. This work made a deep impression in the world of the educated.[19] By the training of a native clergy in minor and major seminaries, by the meeting of several synods at which the most important questions of worship and discipline were regulated, by the education of the youth of the country in numerous schools, Bishop Bonnaud gave a lively impulse to the Catholic movement. One of his most useful creations was that of colleges for girls. Thanks to these institutions, soon very prosperous, the old Indian prejudice forbidding any intellectual training for a decent woman,[20] was attacked and overcome. Thus the condition of woman was raised and her influence was increased.

Bishop Bonnaud died in 1860 in the course of a visit of all India, which the Sovereign Pontiff had asked him to make. This visitation was completed by Bishop Charbonneaux. The results of this survey of the Catholic forces in India, which lasted four years (1858–1862), were beyond measure. Relying on these results, Leo XIII was able to establish (1886) the Catholic hierarchy in India.

Bishop Bonnaud's successor, Bishop Laouënan, harvested the fruits of these labors. His episcopate, lasting till 1900, was, according to the missioners, the most brilliant and most consoling period of the history of Catholicism in India since St.

[18] Launay, *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères,* III, 8, 19.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 141.

[20] Dubois, *Mœurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde,* p. 476. In this work, Bishop Bonnaud was seconded by the zeal of an excellent missioner, Father Dupuis.

Francis Xavier. The chief feature of this period was the evangelization of the pariahs by a holy missioner, Father Ligeon. Making use of a method of evangelization that resembled that of Father Nobili among the Brahmans,[21] Father Ligeon presented himself one day, accompanied by a servant, to a village chieftain. "I am fleeing from the wicked world," he said. "I am seeking a solitude where I may pray." The chieftain pointed out to him a piece of waste land; there, after the manner of the "saints" of the country, he made a shelter of branches, taking neither fermented drink nor animal food. He was venerated. The chieftain said: "This man is a saint. The gods are good since they allow this man to come and sanctify the country." At the end of a month, the inhabitants ventured to speak to him. The solitary replied to them in the words of St. John the Baptist: "Do penance for your sins." Then he taught them that God, the Master of the world, ought to be adored, loved, and served. He baptized those who were willing to accept the doctrine he preached. The baptisms increased in number. After the villages, the towns were evangelized by him. Between 1873 and 1886 he counted 76,000 conversions. This movement of conversion of the poor classes coincided also with a conversion movement among the educated classes. Catholicism soon counted one of its members in the royal Council of Maimour, Tambuchetti by name.[22]

China

Whereas in India the spread of Catholicism met especially the obstacles of a social and religious order, in the organization of the castes, and the people's attachment to a very ancient religion, in China it found itself in the presence of difficulties rather in-

[21] See Mourret, *History of the Catholic Church,* VI, 192 f.

[22] Piolet, *Les missions françaises au XIX^e siècle,* II, 254. Interesting episodes of this conversion movement will be found in the *Annales de la propagation de la foi,* XLV (1872), 194–98.

herent in the national and family order: they did not wish a religion of foreigners, a religion that did not accept the worship of ancestors as practiced in the families of the country.

The treaties concluded (1842–1844) between China on the one side, and England, the United States, and France on the other, opened the Celestial Empire to the free intercourse of these three states. Guizot, president of the council of ministers, even obtained from the emperor, through the intermediary of the French consul, Lagrené, an edict (February 20, 1846) which restored to the Christians their former churches and permitted them to put up churches "at their good pleasure." [23] The missioners had reason to rejoice at these results. However—on this point the missioners did not delude themselves—the era of dangers was not closed. Easy to foresee was that the Chinaman, who is clever even to the point of being astute when he is ill disposed, would find ways to twist the literal force of the treaties; more than that, the freedom which the treaties left to every Christian religion to enter China would put the Catholic missioners in the presence of the formidable competition of the Protestant missioners, backed by England and America.

The immediate consequences of the treaties were excellent. In 1847 Bishop de Bési, making his official visit to the great mandarin of Chang-hai, was received with salvos of artillery.[24] The good dispositions of Emperor Tuo-Koang were continued at the beginning of the reign of his successor, who mounted the throne in 1851 and was prompted by a Christian governess to have a certain veneration of Christianity. During this period of peace the Vincentians Huc and Gabet made a journey in Tartary and Tibet, of which Father Huc wrote a most interesting account.[25] At this same period the Jesuits introduced the Carmelites into China. The Jesuits themselves penetrated into

[23] See *Annales de la propagation de la foi,* XXI, 23 ff.
[24] *Ibid.,* XXI, 28.
[25] Huc, *Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine.*

Kiang-Nan and founded in the Celestial Empire the famous observatory of Zi-Ka-Wei. In 1848 the *Annales de la Propagation de la foi* estimated at 315,000 the number of Christians in China, who were divided into 16 dioceses, evangelized by 84 European missioners (Vincentians, Priests of the Foreign Missions, Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans) and 135 native priests.[26]

But before long a pitiless persecution broke out. In 1851 the young Emperor Hien-Fong, who at first had manifested dispositions favorable to the Christians, let himself be dominated by a trusted sectarian, the literatus Tcheou-tien-tsio. Without openly denouncing the treaties of 1842 and 1844, which had been a *casus belli,* he communicated to the mandarins secret edicts revoking all the concessions made and revived all the ancient laws against the Christians. These latter finally procured the text of the famous edict, for, as Father Delaplace, a Vincentian missioner wrote, "in China no veil is so thick as not to become transparent in the light of a few sapeks." [27] The mandarins then proceeded by roundabout ways. Instead of proceeding against the Christians directly, they were satisfied to let bands of brigands full liberty to plunder and massacre. The *Annales* of 1852 are filled with accounts of outrages of this sort. In a word, in one way or another the treaties of 1842 and 1844 were, for the Chinese, a dead letter.

This violation of international law occasioned the Anglo-French expedition of 1857, which ended with the treaty of Tien-tsin, signed in 1858. Article 12 of the treaty stipulated that "properties belonging to the French and the English would be inviolable"; article 13 provided that "the laws issued against Christianity would be considered abrogated." [28] Bishop Des-

[26] *Annales,* XXI, 12.

[27] *Ibid.,* XXVII, 103.

[28] France obtained the insertion of the following clause: "The passports of the Catholic missioners will be conferred by the French legation alone." This was a recognition of the sole protectorate of France over the Catholic missions. See

flèches of Su-Tchuen, expressing the joy of the missioners, wrote in 1860, in a movement of enthusiasm: "The future belongs to us." But the future undeceived those premature hopes. The missioners had reckoned without the knavery of the Chinese sectarians. Two years had not passed since the signature of the Tien-tsin treaty when the persecutions began again. In 1862 Father Néel, of the Foreign Missions, was condemned to death and executed. Three years later Father Mabilleau was massacred in eastern Su-tchuen, and the mandarin, when called, refused to go to his rescue. In 1869 Father Rigaud was slain at the same time as ten of the faithful while he was kneeling before the altar of his church. From 1873 to 1878 the massacres increased with particular ferocity. Not merely every Christian, but every European was menaced. However, if this regime of terror paralyzed the weak, the noble souls, at sight of the superhuman virtues and the wholehearted unselfishness shown by the Catholic martyrs, began to love a religion that produced such examples of heroism. In the very midst of the persecutions, the missioners kept the hope of seeing Christianity spread in this vast empire. They abandoned neither their missions nor their orphanages nor their colleges, which continued to prosper; this was so true that, after the death of Pius IX, Leo XIII was able to erect several new vicariates or prefectures apostolic.[29]

Missions in Japan

Of all the missions, that of Japan brought the Holy Father the greatest consolations. In Japan the Christians had formerly undergone the most violent persecutions; and at the time of Pius IX's elevation to the Supreme Pontificate, the leaders of that vast empire were still observing with the most pitiless rigor the

---

Cogordan, "Les missions catholiques en Chine et le protectorate de la France," in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* December 15, 1886.

[29] *Acta Leonis XIII,* I, 67; III, 140, 295.

terrible statement of the edict of 1640: "As long as the sun warms the earth, let no Christian enter Japan. Even if it should be the king of Spain or the God of the Christians, he will pay for it with his head." [30]

In 1844, after the conclusion of a pact known as the treaty of Lagrené, which proclaimed religious liberty in China, Admiral Cécille formed the project of opening relations with Korea and Japan. He landed on Riou-Kiou, to the south of Japan, a young missioner, Father Forcade, later bishop of Never, afterward archbishop of Aix, and a Chinese catechist, presenting them to the authorities as two interpreters who were going to learn Japanese on the island. But they were so closely watched and guarded that they were unable to get in touch with the natives, who were forbidden to speak to them under penalty of death. Other missioners had the same fate. Father Colin, who walked 400 miles over horrible roads, in order to penetrate Japan by the north, died worn out by fatigue upon arriving in Manchuria. In 1855 three missioners succeeded in establishing themselves in a monastery of bonzes, on one of the Riou-Kiou islands. This time they succeeded in instructing and baptizing a young man, their servant. But immediately after his baptism, the young neophyte disappeared, probably assassinated; and shortly afterward the King of Nafa issued a law punishing with death whoever should embrace Christianity.

The expedition of the Franco-English fleet in China (1857–1860) had an influence on the relations of Europe with Japan. A treaty of 1858 opened to commerce certain ports of the empire and admitted the presence of a consul general of France at Yedo. In these ports open to commerce some missioners were established; and even the construction of some churches for the use of European Catholics was tolerated; but entrance into them was strictly forbidden to the Japanese. The government had 55 natives arrested who allowed themselves to visit these

[30] See Mourret, *op. cit.*, VI, 199.

places. Seemingly never did a country put up a more invincible opposition to the preaching of the gospel. However, the day of the great evangelization of Japan was approaching. It came following the events that we are about to relate in some details, because they constitute a unique episode in the history of the Church.

For five years (1860–1865) the missioners, deprived of any means of direct apostolate, had nothing else to do but pray and sanctify themselves, while carefully studying the language, the customs, and the political, social, and religious organization of the people they were preparing to evangelize. The population seemed to them mild, intelligent, sympathetic, but trembling under the sometimes meddlesome authority of the lords and of the literati. The lords were divided into two classes: the daimos, belonging to the higher class, who had fortresses and raised armies, and the samourai, who formed a lower nobility. At the apex of the hierarchy, the mikado, legitimate sovereign, residing at Tokio, had a power more nominal than real; immediately below him, the taicoun or shogun, chief of the aristocracy, filled almost the same role as the mayors of the palace under the last of the Merovingian kings. The national religion was shintoism, which honored as gods the ancestors of the mikado; but, in the measure that the mikado's power was weakened, Buddhism, imported from China in the sixth century, had supplanted shintoism, which was scarcely anything more than a national liturgy. While the missioners took note of these details, the population and the authorities, on their side, carefully observed the missioners' life, customs, and, as far as possible, their religious habits.

Discovery of Christians in Japan

About noon on March 17, 1865, the missioners of Nagasaki saw enter into their church a group of from twelve to fifteen persons, men and women, whose religious attitude struck them.

An aged woman came up to them and, holding her hand on her breast, said to them in a low voice: "Our heart is the same as yours. . . . Where is the image of St. Mary?" The visitors were led before the altar of the Blessed Virgin. They fell to their knees. Beyond question, they were Christians. In secret conversations with them, the missioners learned that, for two hundred years, without priests, without the sacraments except baptism—its rite and form having been religiously kept—they had kept the Catholic faith, waiting for priests in whom they were to recognize these three signs: devotion to the Virgin Mary, celibacy, and obedience to the chief at Rome. They had three centers in Japan: the first, in the valley of Urakami, near Nagasaki; the second at Omura, north of Nagasaki; the third in the Soto islands, to the west of the same city.

The Catholic missioners had as their superior a holy priest, Father Petitjean. In the posts which he held successively as professor in the minor seminary, sisters' chaplain, and curé in the diocese of Autun, by his zeal and kindness he won the regard of all. In Japan, where he became the first bishop, he soon received the same testimonies of esteem and respectful confidence. Under his direction the Christian group of Urakami soon became "a nursery of apostles as well as a vast catechumenate." [31] Even some bonzes asked to be instructed in the Christian religion. At first the authorities did not seem to be upset. Were they afraid of reprisals on the part of the European governments or, by a refinement of perfidy, did they intend to encourage the Christians to declare themselves openly that they might be the better known?

However this may be, on the night of July 13, 1867, without any forewarning of such an event, all the chapels of the valley of Urakami were pillaged by emissaries of the government, and sixty-four of the principal Christians were arrested. How are we to account for this sudden outrage? Presently it was known

[31] Marnas, *La religion de Jésus ressuscitée au Japon*, I, 578.

that the policy was largely instigated by the party of the mikado, if not in the outrage itself, at least in the suddenness of its execution. In the conflict that put the partisans of the mikado in opposition to those of the shogun, the former blamed the latter for too easily opening the empire to the foreigners; to strengthen their case, they appealed to the old Japanese patriotism. In taking the initiative of the persecution against the Christians, the mikado claimed to win over or to retain more easily to his cause the patriots of the empire.

The tortures began. They were of an unprecedented cruelty. The victims' arms and legs were twisted, the throat was gradually squeezed to the point of choking, and then they were promised immediate release if they agreed to abandon "the religion of the foreigners" and return to the religion of their country. On the first day, when a leader yielded, many followed his example. But a young man, of timid appearance and of frail constitution, Zen-Yemon, by his unshaken constancy, raised the courage of his brethren. Seven times he was made to appear and be tortured; seven times he refused to deny "the religion of Jesus." Probably out of fear of a repression by the European powers, they did not dare put him to death. His example put to shame the apostates, who retracted in a crowd. After that, the courage of the Christians of Urakami did not give way. Equally admirable was the courage of the Christians of Omura who were proceeded against soon afterward.

But at this juncture (January 3, 1868) a political revolution took place in favor of the young mikado Montzu-Hito; the shogunate was abolished, the party of the nobility was crushed. At first it was believed that this triumph of the party that particularly showed hostility to the foreigners was going to be fatal to the Christians. But it was not so. The troops of the mikado had won only by the support of the nations of Europe and America, which had furnished them with munitions and engines of war; the war power and the industrial and commercial might

of those nations was revealed to the eyes of those Japanese, inquiring minds, ambitious for glory and progress. On the other hand, the abolition of a rival party made more evident the full intent of the new government. This was the starting point of that prodigious rise of the Japanese people toward European civilization which, in a short time, would raise it to the level of the most advanced peoples.

This political revolution would little by little lead the empire of Japan to the tolerance of Christianity. A new persecution did, however, begin in June, 1868. This time it reached not only the Christians of Urakami and Omura, but also those of the Soto islands. From Urakami 4,000 Christians were deported to the different provinces of the empire. Many were tortured; none were put to death; but about 2,000 died in consequence of ill treatment.

But the revolution of 1868 had its repercussion on the religious situation of Japan. The mikado, head of the national religion, advanced the pretext that the Buddhist bonzes had favored his rival and had opposed the reforms. He confiscated their endowments and turned a number of their temples into buildings of public use. This decline of Buddhism was favorable to the spread of Christianity. Fundamentally, shintoism was merely a sort of divinizing of the Japanese patriotism. The missioners pointed out to the Christians that they could, without turning their patriotism into idolatry, show themselves, toward the mikado, the most respectful of his subjects, and, toward their country, the most ardent of patriots. A French diplomatic intervention did the rest. On February 21, 1873, the Japanese minister of foreign affairs transmitted to the dean of the diplomatic corps at Tokio the following note: "Regarding the persons who follow the religion of Jesus, we suppress all the edicts." A month later all the Christian prisoners were released.

Not all the obstacles were removed. The missioners often had to encounter the popular prejudices, the jealousy of the

shintoist priests and of the bonzes, and the ill will of the imperial officials; but the field was open to the apostolate. That apostolate was shown especially in public conferences which attracted large numbers of hearers, by works of the press, which carried religious truth to the popular masses, by works of education, which reached the children of the upper classes, and lastly by the training of a native clergy. On December 21, 1882, Bishop Petitjean ordained the first Japanese priest; he was the son of Zen-Yemon, the heroic confessor of the faith in the Urakami valley.[32]

Korea

The Church of Korea, after being a long time without shepherds, in 1827 was confided to the Society of Foreign Missions, which, barely succeeding in reorganizing its staff which had been destroyed by the Revolution, was able to send to Korea, in 1832, Bishop Brugnière, previously coadjutor of the vicar apostolic of Siam. With the title of vicar apostolic of Korea, Bishop Brugnière spent more than three years crossing China from south to north. Exhausted with fatigue, the venerable prelate died (October 25, 1835) in a village of Mongolia, in sight of the mountains of Korea. At the end of 1837, Bishop Imbert was more fortunate; he joined in Korea two missioners, Fathers Mauband and Chastan, who were already there. But in 1839 a sudden persecution broke out, in which the three apostles received the palm of martyrdom.

For six years the poor Church again was without a priest. In 1845 Bishop Ferréol was able to enter that land, accompanied by Father Daveluy, who was martyred eleven years later, and by Andrew Kim, the first Korean priest, who also gave his life for the faith. On the death of Bishop Ferréol in 1853, a former confessor of the faith in Tonkin, Bishop Berneux, became the next bishop. Under his direction, the mission of Korea de-

[32] For more details, see *Marnas,* op. cit.

veloped. At the beginning of 1866 it counted a vicar apostolic, Bishop Berneux, a coadjutor, Bishop Daveluy, ten European missioners, a seminary, and 18,000 Christians. It had never prospered so well; but, alas, it was on the eve of being completely wiped out. The party hostile to the Europeans controlled the court of Seoul; the mass extermination of the Christians was decided on. Bishop Berneux, Bishop Daveluy, and Father Just Brentenières were the chief victims of that persecution.

At Rome, in the midst of the council (June 5, 1870), on Pentecost Sunday, Cardinal Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, in the presence of thirty-six bishops, nearly all of them missioners and several of them confessors of the faith, consecrated Bishop Ridel, to whom Pius IX entrusted the perilous task of receiving the inheritance of the martyrs. Almost as soon as he entered Korea, Bishop Ridel was arrested and imprisoned. But, after five years of prison, the prelate was simply sent back to China. The Korean government had finally realized the uselessness of its barbarity. The era of bloody persecutions was over. Bishop Ridel, worn out by hard infirmities, died in France, but his successor, Bishop Blanc, whose apostolate was soon interrupted by his death, and Bishop Mutel, who at once took his place, had the consolation of harvesting the graces obtained by so many martyrs.

Oceania

When we pass from Asia to Oceania, we find there at first the young and flourishing Christianity of Australia. The work of the Irish clergy, it counted in 1845 only 46 priests, 25 churches, and 31 schools. In spite of the attacks, sometimes violent, of the Anglicans and the Methodists, the Catholic centers there continued to prosper. By Irish immigrations and by the conversion of Protestants and of natives, the number of the faithful increased to such a point as soon to require the creation of seven new dioceses. An assembly of bishops, held at Sydney in 1866,

considered the questions of schools, mixed marriages, and the state of the seminaries and of the clergy. A second provincial council was held in 1869, at which were convoked the provincials of the Jesuits and of the Marists.

In New Zealand the missioners had also to contend against the Protestants. Not satisfied with evangelizing the natives in the villages and with organizing large religious centers in the cities, the missioners followed the European colonists in their agricultural exploitations, the gold seekers in their placers, and tried to snatch these from vice and crime, to fight by pen and public lectures their heretical doctrines. Their efforts were particularly blessed in the uncivilized island of the Wallis, whose rulers—King Lavéloua, who reigned until 1858, and Queen Falakika, his sister, who succeeded him from 1858 to 1868, and the noble and pious queen Amelia, his daughter, who governed the island after 1868—showed themselves intelligent and energetic protectors of Catholicism. Queen Amelia has left in the memory of the missioners and of navigators who knew her, the impression of a soul remarkably noble and pure. Admiral Aube wrote: "Outwardly mild and humble, but at bottom energetic and resolute, this queen has contributed tremendously to the triumph of Christianity." [33]

In New Caledonia the opposition was violent. The Kanaka cannibals, organized and stirred up by English traders, attacked the missioners and sacked the missions; when France took possession of the country in 1853, the situation did not improve. The vexations of Governor Guillain considerably hindered the work of evangelization. But from 1871 to 1878, under the administration of Bishop Vitte and Bishop Fraysse, numerous conversions took place, and schools were founded. Admiral Courbet, visiting the island at this period, noted with pleasure the progress that Christian civilization had made there.[34]

[33] Piolet, *Les missions françaises au XIX^e siècle,* IV, 105.
[34] Lecanuet, *op. cit.,* I, 149.

Quite rightly the Marists have been called the missioners of Oceania. In the islands of the Wallis, of Futuna, and of Tonga, which constituted the vicariate of central Oceania; in the islands of Samoa, the Fijis, New Zealand, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, and the Solomons, they exercised an apostolic zeal consecrated by the sacrifice of life. The Picpus fathers evangelized the Sandwich Islands and the Marquises; the missioners of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun evangelized the Gilberts, the Ellices, and New Guinea. When reading the annals of their missions, you would think you were reading the accounts of the first ages of Christianity. When Bishop Bataillon, a Marist, felt himself near death, he summoned the Christians to his church, put on his episcopal vestments as on the most beautiful feast days, and received the last sacraments with incomparable serenity. Shortly afterwards, stretched on a straw mat in the shade of a tree, there to die, he was surprised that he no longer heard the noise of the workmen who were working on his cathedral. A Christian replied: "Father, we fear to disturb your last moments." "No, no," he said, "let me fall asleep to the sound of that music, it is already for me a joy of heaven." [35]

That simple heroism is seen in the life of Bishop Pompallier, who devoted himself to the salvation of the poor Maoris of New Zealand; of Bishop Viard, first bishop of Wellington in New Zealand; of Bishop Epalle, vicar apostolic of Melanesia and Micronesia, massacred by the cannibals; of Bishop Douarre, the apostle of the Kanakas. But the most engaging figure is that of Father Damien Deveuster.

"A native of Belgium, he was a member of the Society of the Sacred Hearts (Picpus fathers); his heroic devotion honors the Church and all mankind. Leprosy was ravaging the Sandwich Islands. All the unfortunates afflicted with the scourge were relegated to the island of Molokai. Abandoned to themselves, without help of any kind, they gave themselves up, to forget

[35] Maugeret, *Mgr Bataillon.*

their wretchedness, to drunkenness and the most shocking excesses. Stirred to the depth of his soul, the holy religious asked his bishop to let him go to Molokai. For thirteen years he was the companion of the lepers, as well as their pastor and their father. On April 15, eaten up by the disease which decimated his flock, he died, saying: "Oh, how sweet it is to die a child of the Sacred Heart!" [36]

Africa

At the same time Providence was opening a new era on the great Dark Continent.

While the European powers were going to divide the land of Africa, new apostles would rise up to precede them or follow them. To the east the movement of evangelization started from the Bourbon Island. Successively two holy priests of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, Father Dalmont and Father Monnet, after evangelizing the islands of Sainte-Marie and Nossi-Bé, were appointed vicars apostolic of Madagascar; but death prevented either of them from establishing himself there. Then, in 1850, the mission was turned over to the fathers of the Society of Jesus. We know the great good they have accomplished there. Without them, Madagascar would today be Protestant and English.

Likewise from Bourbon in 1860 set out the first missioner to carry the gospel to Zanzibar; it was Father Fava, who later died as bishop of Grenoble. Shortly afterward the sons of Father Libermann [37] took possession of the mission. The Congregation of the Holy Ghost was thenceforth charged with the evangelization of the greater part of the Dark Continent. However, a new and providential help came to the Church. In 1859 Bishop Marion de Brésillac founded at Lyons the work of the African missions. Ten years later (1868), Archbishop Lavigerie of Algiers gathered about him a few priests of good will who formed the Society of Notre-Dame of Africa. The

[36] Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 445; *Correspondant*, July 25, 1889.

[37] On the foundation of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, see Pitra, *Vie du R. P. Libermann*, and Le Floch, *Vie du P. Poulart des Places*.

"White Fathers," as they are more commonly called, made their first attempts of the apostolate in Kabylie. But in 1876, following the conference of Brussels, which would end eight years later in the congress of Berlin and in the partition of Africa, they saw open before them a new field, vast and fertile.[38]

Greed and ambition were able, with renewed eagerness, to resume "the assault on the Negro countries"; but the Church had solidly set foot there, and the marvels of heroism of which the missions of Uganda would give the spectacle to the world in 1886, would show how deep had been the influence of the Church there.

America

Pius IX, who in his young days had been sent on a diplomatic mission to South America, was particularly interested in that part of the world. Freemasonry was exercising its baleful influence almost everywhere there. In no country was it more powerful than in Brazil, where Emperor Pedro had greatly favored its development. To Freemasonry we must trace responsibility for the law expelling the religious orders and for the persecution against the bishops faithful to defend the rights of the Church. The most courageous of these bishops, Bishop Oliveira of the order of the Capuchins, was exiled in 1874 for having publicly condemned the society of Freemasons and for having refused to appear, in a purely religious case, before the supreme court of Rio de Janeiro. Several priests were imprisoned. However, new elections brought to power men who were more respectful of the independence of the episcopal office. The government maintained a minister plenipotentiary at Rome, and the Pope an internuncio at Rio de Janeiro.

In Venezuela, in the Argentine Republic, evangelized by the new congregation of Don Bosco's Salesian missioners,[39] in the

[38] Le Roy, "Afrique," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie*, I, 543.

[39] See Villefranche, *Vie de don Bosco*.

Republic of Haiti, where the missioners, almost all of French origin, had to struggle against anarchy; in Mexico, where the Dominicans and the Carmelites found themselves in the presence of the emissaries of Prince Bismarck; to some extent everywhere, except in the Republic of Ecuador, the Church was faced with numerous obstacles to its development. One of the most effective measures taken by Pius IX for the religious improvement of those countries was the erection at Rome of a seminary intended to receive the young clerics of Latin America, sent by their bishops to follow the courses of the Roman universities.

In North America, both in Canada and in the United States, the Church, free from these movements, had, during the pontificate of Pius IX, continually grown in numbers, in influence, and in organization. The chief stages of this development in Canada were marked: 1. by the holding at Quebec in 1868 of a provincial council, which stressed particularly the rights of the papacy, and the various works for the preservation, defense, and spread of the faith; 2. by the erection of a large number of bishoprics and the increase in the number of parishes; 3. by the erection at Quebec in 1876 of Laval University, whose various faculties were organized slowly, but with complete success, from 1878 to 1887.[40]

In the United States, immense efforts were crowned with the most brilliant results. In the first place,

the scarcity of priests and the lack of material resources obliged most of the bishops to beg in Europe for vocations and pecuniary help. On the other hand, at each assembly of the episcopate, ecclesiastical discipline was strengthened by a prudent and progressive legislation. The Oxford movement made itself felt in America. Brilliant intellects came to find peace and light in its bosom. Brownson, the celebrated philosopher and writer, Hecker, the future founder of the congregation of

[40] For more information on these developments, see A. Fournet, s.v. "Canada" in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* and the abundant bibliography given in that article.

the Paulists, embraced the Roman faith. The Catholic forces of the United States appeared especially in the plenary council held in Baltimore in 1852, under the presidency of Archbishop Kenrick. Between 1861 and 1866 the Civil War was for the Catholic movement a severe trial. Catholicism had much to suffer in the states of the South and the West, transformed into battlefields. But, after the war, with the approbation of Pius IX, Archbishop Spalding, Kenrick's successor in the see of Baltimore, assembled (October 7, 1866) a second plenary council, which was the starting point of a new flowering of Catholicism in the United States. The naming of the archbishop of New York to the cardinalate in 1875 was the crowning of a hierarchy which, in less than a century, had become strongly constituted.[41]

Following the Vatican Council, the American Catholics might have feared that their submission to the Holy See and the prodigious growth of their institutions, works, and religious congregations would place them under suspicion in the midst of the American Republic. This danger seems not to have developed. The clergy and the episcopate have, on the contrary, enjoyed a more and more intimate contact with the nation and even with the public powers. The government at Washington received with all the honors due to his rank an apostolic delegate of Pope Leo XIII. In 1893, when celebrating the fourth centenary of the discovery of America by Europe, the public authorities invited the Archbishop of New York to inaugurate, by a religious discourse, the universal exposition organized on that occasion, and the Roman Pontiff was himself invited to participate in the celebration of the American civilization. Did our separated brethren of the New World recall that Christopher Columbus, when setting foot on the soil of the new world and planting the cross there, intended to take possession of it in the name of the Roman Church? In the midst of the increasing dissents and the breaking up of the Protestant sects, were they not impressed by the majestic spectacle of the Catholic hierarchy,

[41] André, s.v. "Etats-Unis," in Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie,* I, 1050–61.

by the resulting unanimous accord, among its members, on the great and inevitable problems of life? However this may be, we can say today that the great American Republic regards Rome without hatred or mistrust. Said one of the noblest sons of Catholic America, Cardinal Gibbons: "When a person regards Rome in the midst of Europe, it there appears, like the dome of St. Peter's in the midst of the Roman Campagna, alone attracting and holding the eyes of the traveler, while about him all the rest fades from sight."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of the works referred to in this volume.

Acta Leonis XIII.
Acta Pii IX, 1875, 6 vols.
ADAM, Mme Edmond: *Après l'abandon de la revanche,* 1910.
ADHÉMAR d'Antioche: *Deux diplomates.*
AGRIGENTE, d': *Le cardinal Mermillod,* 1893.
ALADEL: *La médaille miraculeuse,* 1895.
ANGELIS, De: *Praelectiones juris canonici.*
Annales de la propagation de la foi.
ARTAUD de Montor: *Histoire de Léon XII,* 1843.
Histoire de Pie VIII, 1844.
AZEGLIO, M. d': *Lettere inedite.*
Ricordi, 1867.
Scritti politici, 1938, 3 vols.

BAINVEL: *La dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus,* 1916.
BAINVILLE, J.: *Histoire de deux peuples,* 1915.
BALAN, Pietro: *Storia d'Italia.*
BALLANCHE, P. S.: *Du sentiment considéré dans ses rapports avec la littérature et les arts.*
Essais de palingénésie sociale.
Essai sur les institutions sociales.
BALLEYDIER: *Histoire de la Révolution de Rome.*
BALMES, Jaime: *Pio IX,* 1847.
Protestantism and Catholicity Compared.
BARANTE, M. de: *Notice sur M. le comte de Saint-Aulaire.*
BARBERI (ed.): *Bullarii Romani continuatio,* 1835–57, 19 vols.
BARBIER, G.: *Mgr Sauvé,* 1898, 2 vols.
BASTIDE: *La République française et l'Italie.*

BAUDRILLART: *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique.*
Vie de Mgr d'Hulst, 1914, 2 vols.
BAUNARD: *Frédéric Ozanam,* 1913.
Histoire du cardinal Pie, 2 vols.
Le cardinal Lavigerie, 1896.
Un siècle de l'Eglise de France, 1902.
Vie du général de Sonis.
Vie du vicomte Armand de Melun, 1880.
BAZIN, G.: *Vie de Mgr Maret,* 1891, 2 vols.
BEAUFORT: *Histoire de l'invasion des Etats pontificaux.*
BEAUREGARD, Costa de: *L'epilogue d'un règne,* 1890.
BÉHAINE, L. de: *Léon XIII et Bismarck,* 1899.
BELLAMY, J.: *Théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle,* 1904.
BELLARMINE, Robert: *Controversia generalis de conciliis.*
De Romano Pontifice.
BERNARD, St.: *De consideratione.*
BERNASCONI: *Acta Gregorii papae XVI,* 1904, 4 vols.
BERSANGE: *Dom François-Regis.*
BERTHIER: *Notre-Dame de la Salette.*
BERTRIN, G.: *Historie critique des événements de Lourdes.*
BESSON: *Vie du cardinal de Bonnechose,* 1887.
Vie du cardinal Mathieu.
Xavier de Mérode.
BIANCHI: *Storia documentata.*
BILLOT: *De Ecclesiae sacramentis,* 1893.
BIRÉ, Edmond: *La presse royaliste de 1830 à 1852.*
BLAIZE: *Œuvres inédites de Lamennais,* 1866, 2 vols.
BLANC, Louis: *Histoire de dix ans.*
BLANCHE-RAFFIN, A. de: *Jacques Balmès.*
BOEHMER-MONOD: *Les Jésuites,* 1910.
BONALD, Louis de: *Economie sociale.*
Législation primitive.
Mélanges, 1852.
Réflexions sur le Mémoire à consulter.
BORÉ, E.: *L'Arménie,* 1846.
BOSSUET, J. B.: *Œuvres.*

BOUTARD: *Lamennais,* 1913, 3 vols.
BOWDEN: *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber,* 1869.
BREMOND, H.: *L'inquiétude religieuse.*
BRIGGS: *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch,* 1906.
BROU, A.: *Les Jésuites de la légende,* 1907, 2 vols.
BRUGÈRE: *Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise.*
BRUNETIÈRE, F.: *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française.*
BUISSON, F.: *L'enseignement de l'histoire sainte,* 1869.
Bullarii romani continuatio, 1857, 19 vols.
BUNSEN, Baron: *Gott in der Geschichte.*
BUNSEN, Frances: *A Memoir of Baron Bunsen.*
BURNICHON: *La Compagnie de Jésus en France,* 1914.

CABROL: *Dictionnaire d'archéologie.*
CADORNA: *La liberazione di Roma,* 1889.
CALIPPE: *Attitude sociale des catholiques au XIX^e^ siècle,* 1911.
CAMP, M. du: *Les convulsions de Paris.*
CANTÙ, Cesare: *Della indipendenza italiana.*
Gli eretici d'Italia, 1866.
Storia di cento anni, 1851.
CAPPELLARI, B. A.: *Il trionfo della Santa Sede et della Chiesa contra gli assalti dei novatori.*
CARNÉ, L. de: *Vues sur l'histoire contemporaine,* 1833.
CARRIÈRE, Joseph: *Praelectiones theologicae majores,* 1846, 8 vols.
CARTIER: *Vie du R. P. Besson.*
CASANOVAS: *Apologetica de Balmès.*
CAUSSETTE: *Manrèze du prêtre.*
CAVALOTTI, A.: *Memorie sulle società segrete dell'Italia meridionale e specialmente sui carbonari,* 1904.
CAVOUR, Camillo: *Lettere,* 1887, 6 vols.
CECCONI: *Historia de Concilio ecumenico Vaticano,* 1879, 4 vols.
CHANTREL: *Annales ecclésiastiques.*
CHARON, Cyril: *Histoire des patriarchats melkites,* 1910, 3 vols.
CHASLE: *Sœur Marie du Divin Cœur,* 1905.
CHASSEGROS: *Histoire du noviciat de la Compagnie de Jésus au Canada,* 1903.

CHATEAUBRIAND, F. R.: *Etudes historiques.*
Mémoires d'outre-tombe.
CHAUVIN: *Le P. Gratry,* 1901.
CHEVALIER, A.: *Les Frères des écoles chrétiennes et l'enseignement primaire après la Révolution,* 1887.
CHOCARNE, Bernard: *Le P. Lacordaire, sa vie intime,* 1866, 2 vols.
CHOUPIN, L.: *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège,* 1907.
CHURCH: *The Oxford Movement.*
CIVEZZA: *Histoire universelle des missions franciscaines.*
CLAIR: *Les Jésuites et la liberté religieuse sous la Restauration.*
Vie du P. Olivaint, 1879.
CLÉMENT: *Histoire du système protecteur en France depuis Colbert,* 1854.
COGNAT: *M. Renan hier et aujourd'hui,* 1886.
Collectio lacensis, 1870, 7 vols.
CORMENIN, L. de: *Le livre des orateurs.*
CORNUT: *Mgr Freppel,* 1898.
Correspondance du prince de Talleyrand et de Louis XVIII.
CRÉTINEAU-JOLY: *Histoire du Sonderbund,* 1850.
L'Eglise romaine en face de la Révolution, 1859, 2 vols.
CRUICE: *Vie de Denis-Auguste Affre,* 1849.
CURNIER: *La jeunesse de Frédéric Ozanam,* 1888.
CURZON, E. de: *Frédéric Le Play,* 1899.

DALGAIRNS, J. D.: *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart,* 1853.
The Holy Communion, 1861.
DARRAS, J. E.: *History of the Catholic Church,* 1866.
DAUDET, Ernest: *Histoire diplomatique de l'alliance franco-russe.*
DAUX, C.: *Le denier de Saint-Pierre,* 1907.
DECURTINS: *Œuvres choisies de Mgr Ketteler,* 1892.
DENIS, Ernest: *La fondation de l'empire allemand.*
DENZINGER-BANNWART: *Enchiridion symbolorum.*
DESCHAMPS: *Le monopole universitaire.*
Les sociétés secrètes et la société, 1881, 3 vols.
Lettres théologiques.

DESDEVISES du Dezert: *L'Eglise et l'Etat en France,* 1908, 2 vols.
DIANCOURT: *Les Allemands à Reims,* 1884.
Dictionnaire de la foi catholique.
DIDIOT, J.: *Un siècle.*
DIONYSIUS the Areopagite: *De nominibus divinis.*
DITO, Oreste: *Massoneria, carboneria ed altre società segrete nella storia del Risorgimento italiano,* 1905.
DOELLINGER, Ignaz: *Der Papst und das Konzil.*
Dom Guéranger, abbé de Solesmes, 1909, 2 vols.
DONOSO-CORTES: *Œuvres,* 1862, 3 vols.
DOUMIC, Max: *Le secret de la Franc-Maçonnerie,* 1905.
DUBOIS: *Mœurs . . . des peuples de l'Inde,* 1825, 2 vols.
DUDON, Paul: *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège,* 1911.
DUPANLOUP: *La souveraineté pontificale.*
DUPLAY, Simon: *Mémoire sur les sociétés et les conspirations sous la Restauration.*

ECKERT: *Die Freimaureorden in seiner wahren Bedeutung. Magazin der Beweisführung für Verurtheilung des Freimaurer-Ordens,* 2 vols.
EISENMANN, L.: *Le Compromis austo-hongrois,* 1904.
ESTAMPES and Jannet: *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la Révolution,* 1884.

FAGUET, E.: *Mgr Dupanloup,* 1914.
Politiques et moralistes du XIX^e^ siècle, 1898.
FALLOUX: *Mémoires d'un royaliste,* 1888, 2 vols.
FESSLER: *La vraie et la fausse infallibilité.*
FLANDRIN, Louis: *Hippolyte Flandrin,* 1909.
FOISSET: *Vie du P. Lacordaire,* 1870, 2 vols.
FOLGHERA, J. D.: *L'apologétique de Lacordaire.*
FOLLENAY, J. P. de: *Monsieur Teysseyre,* 1882.
Vie du cardinal Guibert, 1896, 2 vols.
FOLLIOLEY: *Montalembert et Mgr Parisis,* 1901.
FONTOULIEU: *Les églises de Paris sous la Commune,* 1873.
FORGUES, E.: *Correspondance de Lamennais.*
FOULON: *Vie de Mgr Darboy,* 1889.
FOVILLE, A. de: *La France économique,* 1890.

FRAYSSINOUS: *Œuvres.*
FREPPEL: *Œuvres.*
FRIEDRICH: *Döllinger.*
Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils.

GAILLARD, L. de: *Histoire de l'expedition de Rome en 1849.*
GASTOUÉ, A.: *L'art grégorien,* 1911.
GAUME, Joseph: *Le vers rongeur des sociétés modernes.*
Les trois Rome.
GAUTIER, Léon: *Esprit du P. Faber,* 1873.
Portraits littéraires.
GIOBERTI, V.: *Del primato d'Italia,* 1840.
GIRAUD: *De l'union à Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ dans sa vie de victime.*
GLADSTONE, William: *Life of Bishop Wilberforce.*
The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance, 1874.
GOERRES, J. J.: *Athanasius.*
Gesammelte Briefe.
Politische Schriften.
GONDON, Jules: *Biographie de Daniel O'Connell,* 1847.
L'agitation irlandaise depuis 1829, 1845.
GOYAU, Georges: *Bismarck et l'Eglise.*
L'Allemagne religieuse, le catholicisme, 1909, 4 vols.
L'Allemagne religieuse, le Protestantisme, 1898.
La papauté et la civilisation.
Moehler, 1905.
GRANDERATH: *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils,* 1906, 3 vols.
GRANDMAISON: G. de: *La Congrégation,* 1890.
GRATRY: *De laconnaissance de Dieu.*
GRIMAUD, L.: *Histoire de la liberté de l'enseignement en France,* 1898.
GUÉRANGER: *Institutions liturgiques.*
L'année liturgique.
GUICHEN: *La France morale et religieuse à la fin de la Restauration,* 1912.
La Révolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe, 1917.
GUIDÉE, P. A.: *Vie du P. Varin,* 1854.

GUILLAND: *L'Allemagne nouvelle et ses historiens,* 1900.
GUILLEMANT: *Pierre-Louis Parisis,* 1916, 3 vols.
GUIZOT: *Lettres à sa famille.*
Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps, 1884, 8 vols.
GYR: *La Franc-Maçonnerie en elle-même, etc.,* 1859.

HALLER: *Lettre à sa famille,* 1821.
HATIN: *Bibliographie de la presse périodique française,* 1866.
HEFELE: *Konziliengeschichte.*
HEINE: *De l'Allemagne,* 1865, 2 vols.
HELLO: *Renan, l'Allemagne et l'athéisme,* 1897.
HEMMER: *Vie du cardinal Manning,* 1898.
HENRION: *Vie de Mgr de Quélen,* 1842.
Vie de Mgr Frayssinous, 1842.
Vie du P. Loriquet.
HERGENROETHER: *Kirchengeschicte,* 1880, 3 vols.
HERMES, G.: *Dogmatik.*
Philosophische Einleitung.
Unteruschungen über die innere Wahrheit des Christenthums.
HIDEVILLE, H. de: *Les Piémontais à Rome.*
HINSCHIUS: *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken.*
Histoire de la persécution religieuse à Gèneve, 1878.
HOURAT, Pierre: *Le Syllabus,* 3 vols.
HUC: *Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine,* 1850, 2 vols.
HULST, d': *Le droit chrétien et le droit moderne,* 1914.
Vie de la Mère Marie-Thérèse, 1882.
HURTER: *Nomenclator litterarius.*

ICARD: *Journal.*

JACQUENET: *Vie de M. l'abbé Gagelin,* 1850.
JANNET, C.: *La Franc-Maçonnerie au XIX^e^ siècle,* 1832.
JOLY, H.: *Le socialisme chrétien,* 1892.
Ozanam et ses continuateurs, 1913.
JOURDAIN, Eloi: *Souvenirs de jeunesse,* 1911.
Journal des Goncourt.

KANT: *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft.*
KEITER: *Joseph von Eichendorff.*
KELLER, E.: *L'encyclique du 8 décembre,* 1866.
Vie du général Lamoricière.
KETTELER: *Deutschland nach dem Krieg von 1866.*
KLEUTGEN: *Theologie der Vorzeit.*
KOHUT: *Die Hohenzollern und die Freimaurerie,* 1909.
KRAUS, Franz: *Kirchengeschichte.*

LACOMBE, H. de: *Le débats de la Commission de 1849,* 1899.
LACORDAIRE: *Considérations philosophiques sur le système de M. de La Mennais.*
Œuvres.
LA GORCE, P. de: *Histoire de la seconde République.*
Histoire du second empire, 1905, 7 vols.
LAGRANGE: *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup,* 3 vols.
LAMARTINE: *Confidences.*
Harmonies poétiques.
LAMENNAIS: *Affaires de Rome.*
Articles publiés dans le Mémorial catholique et l'Avenir, 1836.
De la société première et de ses lois.
Des progrès de la Révolution.
Essai sur l'indifference.
Les maux de l'Eglise et de la société.
Mélanges.
Nouveaux mélanges, 1826.
Œuvres complètes.
Paroles d'un croyant.
Réflexions et mélanges, 1819.
Réflexions sur l'Eglise de France.
Troisièmes mélanges, 1835.
LAMORICIÈRE: *Rapport sur les operations de l'armée pontificale.*
LAMY, E.: *La France du Levant,* 1900.
Le Second Empire et les ouvriers.
LANSON: *Histoire de la littérature française.*
LASSERRE, Henri: *Notre-Dame de Lourdes.*
LAUNAY: *Histoire de la Société des Missions étrangères.*

LAVELEYE: *Le socialisme contemporain,* 1896.
LAVISSE and Rambaud: *Histoire général.*
LE FLOCH: *Vie du P. Poulart des Places.*
Le R. P. Colin, 1900.
LECANUET: *Berryer.*
Montalembert, 1901, 3 vols.
LECKY, William: *History of Rationalism.*
LEHMKUHL: *Theologia moralis,* 1896.
LEMAITRE, J.: *Les contemporains.*
LEMIRE, J.: *Le cardinal Manning et son action sociale,* 1893.
LEROY-BEAULIEU: *Un empereur, un roi, un pape,* 1879.
LESCOEUR, L.: *L'Eglise catholique en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe,* 1860.
L'Eglise catholique et le gouvernement russe, 1903.
LEVASSEUR, E.: *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France depuis 1789,* 1903.
LIKOWSKI, E.: *Historya unii Kasciola ruskiego z Kosciolen rezymskim.*
LINGARD, John: *History of England.*
LIONNET, J.: *Un évêque social, Ketteler,* 1905.
LITTRÉ: *Conservation, Révolution, Positivisme.*
LOCKHART, William: *Antonio Rosmini-Serbati.*
LUBIENSKI: *Guerres et révolutions d'Italie,* 1852.
LUGAN, A.: *Balmès,* 1911.

MACKENZIE, Colin: *Six Years in India.*
MADAUNE: *Histoire de la renaissance du catholiscisme en Angleterre,* 1896.
Ignace Spencer et la renaissance du catholicisme en Angleterre, 1875.
MAISTRE, J. de: *Lettres et opuscules,* 1853, 2 vols.
MANGERET: *Mgr Bataillon,* 1884, 2 vols.
MANNING, H. E.: *The Vatican Council,* 1896.
MANSI: *Conciliorum collectio,* 1927, 60 vols.
MARBOT: *Vie de Mgr Forcade,* 1886.

MARC: *Institutiones,* 1887.
MARCEL: *Chefs d'oeuvres de l'éloquence française et de la tribune anglaise,* 1844, 3 vols.
MARÉCHAL, C.: *La famille de La Mennais sous l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution,* 1913.
La jeunesse de La Mennais, 1913.
Histoire contemporaine.
MARNAS: *La religion de Jésus ressuscitée au Japon,* 1896, 2 vols.
MARTIN: *Histoire de France populaire.*
Vie de l'abbé Gorini, 1863.
MARTIN, T.: *The Life of the Prince Consort.*
Martyre de sœur Irena Macrina Mieczysloska, 1846.
MARX, Karl; *Communist Manifesto.*
MATHIEU: *Le souveraineté pontificale.*
MAUGERET: *Mgr Bataillon,* 1885.
MAYNARD, M.: *Jacques Crétineau-Joly.*
MELUN, A. de: *Vie de la Sœur Rosalie,* 1857.
MENCACCI, Paolo: *Memorie documentata per la storia della rivoluzione italiana,* 1879.
MENZEL: *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen von der Reformation bis zur Bundes acte,* 1848, 14 vols.
METTERNICH: *Mémoires,* 1884, 8 vols.
MIGNE: *Orateurs sacrés.*
Patrologia, 387 vols.
MINGHETTI, Marco: *La chiesa e lo stato.*
MOELLER, J. A.: *Affaires de Cologne,* 1838.
Symbolik.
MONNIN, A.: *Esprit du curé d'Ars.*
Vie du curé d'Ars, 2 vols.
MONTALEMBERT: *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre.*
MONTLOSIER: *Mémoire à consulter,* 1826.
MONTOR, Artaud de. *See* ARTAUD.
MOREL, Jules: *Somme contre le catholicisme libéral,* 1877, 2 vols.
MORONI: *Dizionario di erudizione.*
MUN, Albert de: *Ma vocation sociale,* 1909.
MUSSET, A. de: *Confessions d'un enfant du siècle,* 1876.

NETTEMENT, A.: *Histoire de la Restauration,* 1872, 8 vols.
NEWMAN, J. H.: *Apologia pro vita sua.*
Essay on Development of Doctrine.
The Second Spring.
NICOL: *Mgr Bécel.*
NICOLET: *Vie de B. Chanel.*
NILLES: *De rationibus festorum SS. Cordis Jesu,* 1916.
NOBLE, H. D.: *Lacordaire apôtre et directeur des jeunes gens,* 1908.
NODIER, Charles: *Histoire des sociétés secrètes de l'armée.*
NORMANBY, Marquis de: *Une année de Révolution,* 1860, 2 vols.

O'CONNELL: *Ireland and the Irish.*
Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell, 1847, 2 vols.
Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin.
OLLIVIER, Emile: *L'Eglise et l'Etat au concile du Vatican,* 1879, 2 vols.
ONCLAIR: *La Franc-Maçonnerie contemporaine.*
Origines de la Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul, 1909.
OZANAM: *Vie de Frédéric Ozanam,* 1882.
OZANAM, Frederick: *Œuvres complètes.*

PACCA: *Œuvres complètes.*
PASCAL, G. de: *Mgr Gay d'après sa correspondance,* 1910.
PASOLINI: *Memorie, raccolte da suo figlio.*
PASTOR: *Reichensperger.*
PEIGNÉ, J. M.: *La jeunesse de La Mennais.*
Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie, 1864.
PÉRATÉ, A.: *Un siècle . . . 1800 à 1900.*
PESQUIDOUX, D. de: *L'Immaculée Conception, histoire d'un dogme,* 1892, 2 vols.
PFUELE: *Ketteler.*
PIE: *Œuvres complètes.*
PIERLING: *La Russie et le Saint-Siège,* 1901.
PIERRE, Victor: *Histoire de la République de 1848.*
PIOLET: *Les missions françaises au XIX^e^ siècle,* 1901, 6 vols.
PIONEAU: *Vie de Mgr Dupuch,* 1866.
PITRA, J. B.: *Vie de R. P. Libermann,* 1872.

PONLEVOY: *Vie du P. de Ravignan,* 1860, 2 vols.
POUGEOIS: *Histoire de Pie IX,* 1886, 6 vols.
POUJOULAT: *Vie du Frère Philippe,* 1875.
PROUDHON: *De la justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Eglise.*

QUINET, E.: *Le livre de l'exilé.*

RAMBART: *Vie de Mgr de Mazenod,* 1883, 2 vols.
RANDON: *Mémoires.*
RANKE: *Zur Geschichte Deutschlands und Frankreichs im neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* 1887.
RASTOUL: *Le P. Ventura.*
Vie du maréchal Randon.
RATISBONNE, M. A.: *Le R. P. Marie-Théodore Ratisbonne,* 1905.
RATTAZZI, Maria: *Rattazzi et son temps,* 1881.
Recueil des allocutions, etc. citées dans le Syllabus, 1865.
RENAN, Ernest: *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse.*
Lettres intimes, 1896.
Vie de Jésus.
RENDU, E.: *La lettere du pape et l'Italie officielle.*
RENOUVIER: *Philosophie analytique de l'histoire,* 1897.
REUSCH: *Briefe an Bunsen,* 1897.
RIBBE, C. de: *Le Play d'après sa correspondance.*
RIBOT, Paul: *Exposé critique des doctrines de M. Le Play,* 1882.
RICARD: *L'école menaisienne.*
RICASOLI: *Lettere e documenti.*
RIO: *Epilogue à l'art chrétien.*
RIVIÈRES, P. de: *Vie de Mgr de Forbin-Janson,* 1892.
ROHRBACHER: *Histoire universelle de l'Eglise.*
ROSKOVANY: *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae,* 1847, 2 vols.
ROTHAN: *L'Allemagne et l'Italie,* 1884.
ROUSSEAU, H.: *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade,* 1913.
ROUSSEL, A.: *Correspondance inédite de Lamennais et de l'abbé Guéranger,* 1905.
Lamennais d'après des documents inédits.
ROUSSET, Léon: *A travers la Chine.*

SACY, S. de: *Exposé de la religion des Druses,* 1838, 2 vols.
Variétés littéraires.
SAINTE-BEUVE: *Chroniques parisiennes.*
Portraits contemporains, 1855.
SAINT-HILAIRE, B.: *Victor Cousin.*
SAINT-SIMON: *Le nouveau christianisme.*
Système industriel.
Parabole.
Vues sur la propriété et de la législation.
Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses concitoyens.
SAINTRAIN: *Vie du cardinal Deschamps,* 1884.
SALOMON, Michel: *Bonald,* 1905.
SAY, J. B.: *Traité d'économie politique.*
Cours d'économie politique.
Catéchisme d'économie politique.
SCHLEGEL, Frederick: *Philosophy of History.*
SCHMOEGER: *Das Leben der gottseligen Anna Katharina Emmerich,* 1870, 2 vols.
SCHRADER: *De theologia generatim.*
SEGOND, E.: *Œuvres de Rosmini.*
SÉGUR, Marquis de: *Souvenirs et récits d'un frère.*
Les martyrs de Castelfidardo, 1860.
Vie de l'abbé Bernard, 1883.
SEIGNOBOS: *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine,* 1897.
SILENGARDI: *Ciro Menotti.*
SIMLER: *Guillaume-Joseph Chaminade,* 1901.
SIMON, Eugène: *La cité chinoise.*
SIMON, Jules: *Mignet, Michelet, Henri Martin.*
SOREL, Albert: *Essais d'histoire et de critique.*
SPULLER, E.: *Lamennais,* 1892.
STENDHAL, H. B.: *Promenades dans Rome,* 1858, 2 vols.
SYLVAIN, Charles: *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat,* 1890.
Vie du P. Hermann, 1881.

TABARAUD, M. M.: *Essai sur l'état des jésuites en France.*
Histoire critique de l'assemblée du clergé de France en 1682.

TAILLANDIER, S. R.: *Histoire de la jeune Allemagne,* 1848.
Histoire et philosophie religieuse, 1859.
La Révolution en Allemagne.
TAINE: *Le régime moderne.*
TAVERNIER, E.: *Louis Veuillot,* 1913.
TESTE, Louis: *Préface au Conclave,* 1877.
THOMAS, Emile: *Histoire des ateliers nationaux.*
THOUVENEL: *Le secret de l'empereur.*
THUREAU-DANGIN, Paul: *Royalistes et républicains,* 1874.
Histoire de la monarchie de Juillet, 1885–89.
La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e^ siècle, 1906, 3 vols.
Le parti libéral sous la Restauration, 1876.
L'Eglise et l'Etat sous la monarchie de Juillet, 1880.
TIMON: *Le livre des orateurs.*
TOURNIER: *Gambetta franc-maçon.*

Un siècle, mouvement du monde de 1800 à 1900.

VACANT: *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile du Vatican,* 1895, 3 vols.
VALETTE, E. A. de: *Vie de M. Dufriche-Desgenettes,* 1863.
VAN DUERM, C.: *Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes,* 1890.
VAULABELLE, A. de: *Histoire des deux Restaurations.*
VAUTHIER, G.: *Villemain,* 1913.
VENTURA: *Le pouvoir politique chrétien,* 1858.
VEUILLOT, Eugène: *Louis Veuillot,* 1913, 4 vols.
Le Piémont dans les Etats de l'Eglise, 1861.
VEUILLOT, François: *Louis Veuillot,* 1913.
VEUILLOT, Louis: *Grandes figures catholiques du temps present,* 1895, 2 vols.
Le parfum de Rome.
Les français en Algérie, 1863.
Le libres penseurs.
Les odeurs de Paris.

L'illusion libérale, 1866.
Pie IX.
Rome pendant le concile, 1872.
Vie de Notre-Seigneur.
VIANNEY: *Le bienheureux J. B. Vianney.*
Vie de M. Le Prévost, 1899.
Vie du V. Père Champagnat.
VIEL-CASTEL: *Histoire des deux Restaurations.*
VIGOUROUX: *Mélanges bibliques,* 1888.
VILLEFRANCHE: *Pie IX,* 1889.
Vie de don Bosco.
VILLEMAIN: *La France, l'empire et la papauté,* 1860.
VINET, A.: *Essais de philosophie morale et religieuse.*
VOGELSANG: *Morale et économie sociale.*
Politique sociale, 2 vols.

WARD, Wilfrid: *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* 1912, 2 vols.
WEGENER: *Anna Katharina Emmerich und Clemens Brentano,* 1900.
WEILL: *Histoire du parti républicain.*
Histoire du catholicisme liberal en France, 1909.
WEISS: *Histoire du parti républicain en France,* 1900.
WERNER, K.: *Geschichte der Katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Konzil.*
WETZER and WELTE: *Dictionnaire de théologie.*
WINTERER: *Le socialisme international,* 1890.
WISEMAN: *Recollections of the Last Four Popes.*
WOLFSGRUBER: *Joseph Othmar, cardinal Rauscher,* 1898.

ZELLER, Jules: *Année historique.*
ZURLA: *Memorie intorno alla vita ed agli studii del Padre don Lodovico Nachi.*

Index

Abyssinia, missions in, 367 f.
Affre (archbishop of Paris)
  Death of, 428 f.
  The *Ere nouvelle* and, 427 f.
  Freedom of education and, 321 f. and note, 324, 327
  Louis Philippe and, 322 and note, 327
  The Revolution of 1848 and, 424
  School of journalism founded by, 343 f.
Africa, missions in, 122, 364-69, 761 f.
Alacoque, Margaret Mary: and devotion to the Sacred Heart, 718
Albani, Joseph (cardinal), 132
  On the Belgian revolt, 155
  At the 1823 conclave, 64
  At the 1831 conclave, 185
  And the revolutionaries, 200
  Secretary of State, 132
Alexander I (czar), 118
Alexander II (czar): the Church persecuted by, 553-56; Pius IX's condemnation of, 556 f.
Algiers: French conquest of, 142, 364; missions at, 122, 364-67
Allignol brothers (priests): and the Gallican controversy, 346-48
Alphonse XII, king of Spain, 711 f.
Alphonso I, first king of Portugal, 215 note
Alzon, Emmanuel d': and educational freedom, 431 note; friend of Lamennais, 300 note, 302 note; and the pagan classics, 440
Amedeus I, king of Spain, 710 f.
American bishops, at the Vatican Council, 649
Americanism, Native, 174, 369 f.
Ami de la religion, the, 279 f. and note, 573 note
Amorin-Pessoa, archbishop of Goa, 746
Ancona: capture by Austria, 193; capture by Sardinia, 543 f.; capture by the revolutionaries, 193; French occupation of, 202-4
Ancona expedition, 201-4
Angelis, de (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 637
Anglican Church, the
  Divisions in, 499
  The Old Catholic Church and, 712
  The Oxford Movement, 104-7, 162, 253-56, 493 ff.
  The Russian Orthodox Church and, 582
  The Tractarian Movement, 251 ff., 499
  The Vatican Council and, 603-5
Anglicanism, in the early ninteenth century, 58-60
Angoulême, duke of, 111
Antibes legion, 581 and note
Anton, Louis: Old Catholic priest, 705 f.
Antonelli, Giacomo (cardinal): Secretary of State, 402-4 and note, 579, 627; the taking of Rome, 669-72; the Vatican Council, 606, 646, 650, 651 note, 657 note; the war with Piedmont, 540 f.
Apostolicae Sedis (bull), 626 f.
Architecture, Christian: revival of, 729
Argentina, missioners in, 762
Armenia: the Church in, 172, 743-45; Protestantism in, 745; schism in, 744; Turkish persecutions in, 172, 743
Art, Christian, 728-30
Artois, count of: and Leo XII, 69, 71; member of the Congregation, 49 note
Arundell, Mary: and the Sisters of Providence, 245
Association of St. Joseph, 48
Associations of workingmen, forbidden in 1803, 20
Astros (archbishop), and Lamennais, 292, 296
Asylum, law of: in Sardinia, 454
Atheism: and Freemasonry, 597 f.; progress of, 597 f.

Audu (patriarch of Chaldea): Leo XIII's regard for, 643 note, 743 note; and Pius IX, 642, 742; at the Vatican Council, 642, 643 note, 741
Australia, missioners in, 758 f.
Austria
  Attitude toward Italian unification, 548
  Catholicism of, 468 f., 471
  The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 92-95; during the reign of Pius IX, 464-68, 592 f., 704-9
  In conflict with France, 197 ff., 524-26
  Defeat at Magenta and Solferino, 525
  Defeat at Sadowa, 472, 582
  Ferrara occupied by, 390-92
  Freemasonry in, 169
  Germanic supremacy and, 93 f.
  Intervention in Italy, 114, 193-204, 408, 548
  The Jesuits in, 92 f.
  Liberal reforms in, 464 f.
  Liberalism in, 593
  The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195 ff.
  The Polish revolt, 555 and note
  Prussian influence on, 472
  Repressive laws in, 593
  Restrictions on religious education, 707 f.
  Suppression of 1820 revolution, 114
  The Vatican Council opposed by, 704
  In the Venetian quadrilateral, 395 note, 525, 548
Avenir, the (Catholic paper)
  The campaign for educational freedom, 318, 325
  Contributors to, 281, 288 note
  Decline of, 287 f.
  Excesses of, 284 ff.
  Foundation of, 179, 279, 281
  Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 290-96
  Influence of, 303 note
  Liberal teachings of Lamennais, 285 f.
  Lofty expositions of, 282-84, 294 f.
  Socialism opposed by, 283 f.
  Suspension of, 288, 292 note
Azarian, Armenian patriarch, 744
Azeglio, Massimo d': and Italian unity, 238 f.; on loyalty, 451; prime minister of Sardinia, 456 f.; on the taking of Rome, 670
Baader, Francis (philosopher), 97 f.
Baden (state): conference at, 231; religious troubles in, 165 f., 480, 483-86
Badger, Protestant missioner, 741
Badhiarian, schismatic patriarch, 744
Bailly, Emmanuel: and the St. Vincent de Paul Society, 315 f.
Bakunin, Mikhail (anarchist), 5
Balbo, Cesare: and Italian unity, 238; prime minister of Sardinia, 457
Ballanche, socialist teaching of, 24 f.
Balmes, Jaime: writings of, 503 f., 506 and note, 731
Baltimore, councils of, 174 f., 370, 764: and missions in Africa, 368
Baraldi (priest), and Lamennais, 290, 293
Barat, Madeline Sophie (St.), 45
Barbès (socialist), and the socialist uprising, 425 f.
Bataillon (bishop), death of, 760
Barthélemey-Saint-Hilaire, and the educational controversy, 433
Bautain (priest), and traditionalism, 345
Bavaria: Catholicism in, 95-98; Prussian influence in, 472
Becker, the *Rhin Allemand* of, 261 f.
Belgium: the Church in, 501 f.; persecution by William I, 116 f., 152 f.; the revolt against the Netherlands, 152-55
Benedictine Order, Guéranger's re-establishment of, 302, 308 f., 321
Benoit-Champy, on Lamennais, 281 note, 301 note
Benvenuti (cardinal): captured by the revolutionaries, 193; and the Italian brigands, 124
Béranger, song-writer, 34, 133, 276
Bernadette Soubirous, St.: aparition at Lourdes, 720
Bernadou (archbishop), at the Vatican Council, 629
Bernetti (cardinal)
  At the 1846 conclave, 380
  Diplomatic missions of, 190 f.
  And the French occupation of Ancona, 203 f.
  His removal from office, 241
  The revolt in the Papal States, 191 ff.
Berneux (bishop), missioner in Korea, 757 f.

Berteaud (bishop), and papal infallibility, 646
Bési, de (bishop): missioner in China, 749
Beust, von: and Bismarck, 677, 688; religious persecution by, 704 ff.
Beyrouth: Catholic school at, 352, 741; mission at, 122; Protestant school at, 741
Bilio (cardinal): and the Anglican negotiations, 605; and the Syllabus of Pius IX, 568 note; at the Vatican Council, 625
Bismarck, Otto von, 472-74
  Alliance with Italy, 677
  Attitude toward the Vatican Council, 607
  The Kulturkampf, 688-97
  At the Paris Exposition, 587
  Persecution of the Church by, 478 ff., 687 ff.
  And the Polish revolt, 556
  Political ideas of, 473, 477 f.
  On Protestantism and Prussia, 468, 478
  Religious attitude of, 696 note
  And the religious strife in Nassau and Baden, 486
  And the secret societies, 469 f.
Bizzarri (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 625
Blanc (baron), Sardinian diplomat, 669 f. and notes
Blanc (bishop), missioner in Korea, 758
Blanc, Louis: and the socialist movement, 336, 425 f., 437
Blanqui, and the socialist uprising, 425 f.
Blessed Sacrament, devotion to the, 716-18, 721
Blessed Virgin: apparitions of, 681, 719-21; devotion to the, 719-21
Bologna: Austrian occupation of, 193, 200; revolutionaries at, 184, 189, 191, 200
Bonald (cardinal), and the Revolution of 1848, 424
Bonald, Louis de: on indifferentism, 74; social teaching of, 24; writings of, 136
Bonaparte (family): and the secret societies, 170, 182 f.
Bonaparte, Charles: revolutionary in Rome, 406
Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon
  Intervention in Italy, 407, 409 f.
  And the Italian liberals, 451
  His letter to Colonel Ney, 413 f.
  Liberal tendencies of, 409 and note
  Personality of, 406
  President of the Republic, 405
  The restoration of the Empire, 437-39
  Sardinia favored by, 451, 518 f., 524 f.
  See also Napoleon III
Bonnaud (bishop): death of, 747; missioner in India, 356 f., 746 f.; writings of, 357, 747
Bonnechose (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 629 and note, 633 f.
Bonnel (bishop), and the Gallican controversy, 346 f.
Boré, Eugène: and the missions of the Near East, 350 f. and note
Borghi (bishop), on the missions in India, 358
Bossuet, on Gallicanism, 79
Bouillerie (bishop), and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716 f.
Bourbon (island), and the evangelization of Africa, 761
Bourget, bishop of Montreal, 371
Boyer (priest), 74
Bracco (bishop), missioner in Palestine, 738
Brazil: the Church in, 174, 762; Freemasonry in, 762
Brentano, Clement: and Catherine Emmerich, 96 f.
Broad Church, the (Anglican), 499
Broglie, Albert de: editor of the *Correspondant*, 443; and the infallibility controversy, 618 note, 619 note; at the Oratory, 445
Broglie, Charles de: and the Society of the Sacred Heart, 44
Broglie, Victor de: on the expulsion of the Jesuits from Switzerland, 488; and freedom of education, 328, 330
Brothers of Charity, foundation of the, 244 f.
Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, 316, 727 f.
Brothers of the Christian Schools, 49 f.: exemption from military service, 320 f.; expulsion from Switzerland,

Brothers of the Christian Schools (*cont.*) 698; in Egypt, 353; social work of, 727
Brownson, conversion of, 763
Brugnière (bishop), missioner in the Far East, 362, 757
Brunelli, nuncio to Spain, 502
Bruté, bishop of Vincennes, 370
Buchez, French socialist, 277 f.
Buck, Victor de: and Bishop Forbes, 603-5
Bulgaria, ecclesiastical union with Rome, 551 f.
Bulls, Papal: *Apostolicae sedis,* 626 f.; *Reversurus,* 743 f.; *Unam sanctam,* 567; *Unigenitus,* 567
Bunsen, Count von: the question of mixed marriages, 257 ff.; religious notions of, 257 f.

Canada, the Church in, 371 f., 763
Capalti (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 625, 636 note
Capitalism, rise of, 5, 18
Cappellari, Maur (cardinal): and Antonio Rosmini, 242 f.; at the 1831 conclave, 185 f.; and the concordat with the Netherlands, 117; *see also* Gregory XVI
Capuchins, the: in Greece, 122; in the Near East, 741
Carbonarism, 31-34
  Austrian repression of, 55
  In France, 33 f.
  Freemasonry and, 239
  In Italy, 31-33, 114, 170 f.
  Leo XII's condemnation of, 125
  Napoleon III and, 515, 518
  Organization of, 32
Carlos, Don: dispute over the Spanish throne, 218-21, 711 f.
Carrière, Joseph: theological works of, 344
Carteret, president of Switzerland, 697, 701 f.
Castelfidardo, battle of, 542
Castiglioni, Francis X. (cardinal), 130: at the 1823 conclave, 63 f.; at the 1829 conclave, 129; *see also* Pius VIII
Cavaignac (general), proposed aid to Pius IX, 405
Cavour
  Cession of Nice and Savoy to France, 532 f.
  At the Congress of Paris, 510 f.
  Garibaldi and, 514 f.
  And Garibaldi's conquest of Naples, 538 f.
  Italian unity, 457-59, 510 ff., 523, 531-33
  Napoleon III and, 518 f.
  Personality of, 458 and note
  Pius IX criticized by, 511
  Prime minister of Sardinia, 457 ff., 509 ff., 531-33
  Religious persecutions by, 459-62
Cazalès, de: and the educational controversy, 434
Cécille, French admiral, 362, 752
Cenacle, the, 135
Chaldea, the Church in, 642, 741-43
Chambord (count), 677 and note
Chaminade, and the Marianists, 40
Champagnat, Marcellin, 40 f.
Chanel, Pierre: missioner in Oceania, 373
Charbonneaux, bishop in India, 747
Charbonnel, bishop of Toronto, 372
Charles X (of France), 88: and the conquest of Algiers, 142 f.; and the July Revolution, 143 f.; opposition to, 88 f.
Charles Albert (of Sardinia), 394
  Abdication of, 408
  Concordat with Gregory XVI, 454
  And Italian unification, 406
  Lombardy invaded by, 394-96
  On the secret societies, 453
Chastan (priest), martyr in Korea, 362, 757
Chateaubriand: on Béranger, 276 and note; at the 1829 conclave, 129; literateur, 25; and the Spanish revolution, 110 f.
Chemin, Jerome (priest): religous founder, 241
Chiefala, and Greek reunion, 121 f.
China, missioners in, 173, 360 f., 748-51
Ciacchi (cardinal), legate of Ferrara, 391
Civiltà cattolica (Catholic paper), and the Vatican Council, 609 ff.
Civitavecchia: French occupation of, 409; Italian occupation of, 663

Clausel de Montals (bishop): and the educational controversy, 324, 436 note; and the pagan classics, 440
Clavel (priest), and the Gallican controversy, 347
Clemenceau, Georges (atheist), 598
Clerical immunity, in Sardinia, 453-55
Clermont-Tonnerre, Anne de (cardinal), 80 f.
Clifford (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 653 and note
Clotilda (princess), Victor Emmanuel rebuked by, 679
Cochin China, missioners in, 123, 173, 359 f.
Coercion Bill, opposed by O'Connell, 248
Coffin, Charles: and the Paris liturgy, 310 f.
Colin, Jean-Claude: founder of the Marists, 40 f.; missioner in the Far East, 752
Cologne affair, the, 257-70: and the Catholic revival in Germany, 270 f.
Combes (colonel), and the Ancona expedition, 202 f.
Communism: danger of, 583 f.; of Karl Marx, 5; Pius IX's condemnation of, 387
Communist Manifesto, 5
Concordats
  With Austria, 467 and note
  With Baden, 486
  With the Netherlands, 117 f., 153
  With Portugal, 217 f.
  With Russia, 226
  With Sardinia, 454, 455 note, 456
  With Spain, 221, 502 f.
  With Switzerland, 490
  With Würtemberg, 486
Confiscation of Church property, 20
  In Germany, 57
  In Italy, 581, 672, 676 f.
  By the Paris Commune, 682
  In Portugal, 217, 551
  In Rome, 407, 676 f.
  In Sardinia, 459-61
  In Spain, 219 and note, 503, 593 f., 711
Congregation, the, 45-48: calumnies against, 48 f. and note, 86 and note; and Prince Polignac, 140; works of, 48, 85, 134
Congregations, religious
  Agitations against, 42, 330 ff.
  Foundation of, 38, 40-45, 241-45
  Gregory XVI's encouragement of, 241-45
  Suppression of: in France, 45; in Italy, 581, 672, 676 f.; in Portugal, 217, 551; in Sardinia, 460; in Spain, 219, 593 f.
Connolly (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 635
Consalvi (cardinal)
  Carbonarism and, 32 f.
  Cardinal Bernetti and, 190
  At the 1823 conclave, 63
  Leo XII and, 67-70
  On the secret societies, 17 note
Cooperative system, the, 22
Cornoldi (priest), scholasticism encouraged by, 731
Correspondant, the (Catholic paper), 280: controversy with the *Univers,* 443 f.; foundation of, 134 and note; journalism of, 443
Councils: attendance at, 622 note; list of, 622 note
Cousin, Victor: Kant's influence on, 27, 558
Coux, Charles de: and the *Ere nouvelle,* 427; and freedom of education, 319; socialists opposed by, 283 f.
Crétineau-Joly: Pius IX criticized by, 506 note; work on the secret societies, 240 and note
Crispi law, 580
Crowns, party of the: at the 1823 conclave, 61 f., 67, 70; at the 1831 conclave, 185
Cubières (general), and the Ancona expedition, 202
Cullen (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 628
Curé of Ars, 445-47
Curtis, archbishop of Armagh, 161
Custozza, the Italians defeated at, 580

Dalgairns: conversion of, 256; and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 717; writings of, 494 note
Damascus, mission at, 122
Damien, St.: missioner on Molokai, 760 f.

Darboy (archbishop of Paris): on the causes of revolution, 681; murder of, 682; submission to the Council, 666; at the Vatican Council, 628, 629 note, 633, 653, 658 f.
Daughters of Charity
Dispossessed in Portugal, 551
Expelled from Switzerland, 489
In Egypt, 353
In Switzerland, 698
In Turkey, 351
In the United States, 371
Social works of, 727
Daughters of Mary, 40 f.
Daveluy (bishop), missioner in Korea, 757 f.
Daviers (priest), missioner in Turkey, 351
Dechamps (archbishop): career of, 630 f.; controversy with Gratry, 644; at the Vatican Council, 628, 631, 637, 653 f., 657
Decurtins, Gaspard: social work of, 724
Della Genga, Annibal, 65 f., 67 and note; *see* Leo XII
Della Somaglia (cardinal), 71
Delpuits, and the Congregation, 46 f.
Democratic trends, 3 f.
Desflèches (bishop), missioner in China, 751
Desprez (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 657
Deutinger, work on aesthetics, 272
Deveuster, Damien (St.): missioner on Molokai, 760 f.
Devie (bishop), and the Allignol brothers, 348
Diepenbrock (cardinal), 475
Döllinger, Ignaz, 595
Apostasy of, 666 f. and note
Death of, 666
First works of, 96 f.
Honored by Oxford, 712
Personality of, 612
Vatican Council opposed by, 607 and note, 612-14, 666
Dollard, Canadian bishop, 372
Dominican Order, Lacordaire's re-establishment of the, 307
Donnet, Ferdinand (cardinal): and Napoleon III, 528 f.
Donoso-Cortés: and the pagan classics, 440; writings of, 504
Doyle, bishop of Kildare, 161
Dreux-Brezé (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 641, 651 note
Droste-Vischering (archbishop)
Arrest of, 265 f.
Demonstrations over the imprisonment of, 267-69
Hermes condemned by, 260, 264
And the mixed-marriage controversy, 260 f., 265
Release of, 269
Druses, Protestantism and the, 740
Dubouché, Théodelinde, 716, 718
Dupanloup (bishop of Orléans), 337 f.
The Anglican negotiations, 605 and note
At the Congress of Malines, 565
The controversy over infallibility, 617-20
Defender of the papacy, 531
And Döllinger, 666 and note
And the encyclical *Quanta cura,* 572 f.
And the pagan classics, 440 f.
His pastoral on the Vatican Council, 608
Religious pacification, 337-39
The struggle for educational freedom, 432, 617, 619, 684
Submission to the Council, 666
At the Vatican Council, 628, 630, 655 and notes, 657, 661
Veuillot's conflicts with, 441, 655 and note
His writing against atheism, 597
Dupont des Loges (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 661
Dupuch, Antoine: bishop of Algiers, 365 f.
Dupuis (priest), missioner in India, 747 note
Durando (papal general), treason of, 395-97

East India Company, and hindrances to missioners, 355
Eastern Question, the, 349, 737
Eberhardt (bishop), imprisonment of, 695
Ecclesiastical immunities, in Sardinia, 453-55
Ecclesiastical property, confiscation of: *see* Confiscation

Eckert, Ed.: and freemasonry, 30 f. and note
Economists and the social question, 21
Ecuador, protest over the taking of Rome, 674
Education, religious
In Austria, 707 f.
In Belgium, 116, 152
In France, 49-53, 90 f.: agitation for freedom, 317-30, 336 f., 419 f., 430 ff., 683 f.; freedom of, 683 f.; the pagan classics, 439-41; repressions by the July government, 147; at the restoration of the Empire, 439; *see also* University monopoly
In Germany, 689
In India, 357, 747
In Ireland, 713
In the Near East, 351 f.
In Turkey, 740
Egypt, missions in, 353
Emancipation of Catholics in England, 103 f., 108
Émigrés, indemnity granted to, 88
Emilia (state), formation of, 527
Emmerich, Catherine, 96 f.
Encyclicals, Papal: *Mirari vos*, 293 ff.; *Quanta cura*, 566 ff.
Enfantin, French socialist, 277
England (bishop), and missions in Africa, 369
England
Antiritualists denounced in, 583
Attitude toward Italian unification, 549
Catholicism in, 60 f.
The Church in, 60 f.: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 251-56; during the reign of Leo XII, 103-7; during the reign of Pius VIII, 162 f.; during the reign of Pius IX, 493-99, 712-15
Emancipation Act, 103 f., 108
The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195, 199
The Oxford Movement, 104-7, 162, 253-56, 493 ff.
Paganism supported in India, 355
The Polish revolt, 555 and note
Re-establishment of the hierarchy in, 494 f.
Religious situation in early nineteenth century, 58-61
Sisters of Providence in, 245
The Tractarian Movement, 251 ff.
England (*continued*)
Treaties with China, 361, 749 f.
Unionist movement in, 605 note
Vatican Council favored in, 603-5
Vatican Council opposed in, 667 f., 712
See also Anglican Church
Epalle (bishop), missioner in Oceania, 760
Ere nouvelle, the (Catholic paper): founding of, 426 f.; suppression of, 429
Espartero, Spanish leader, 221
Essay on Indifference, 27, 81, 301: censure of, 292 f.
Etienne (priest): and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 721; on the missions in the Near East, 354
Eymard (priest), and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716 f.

Faber, Frederick: conversion of, 256, 494; and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 717; spiritual writings of, 256 note, 732 f. and notes
Falk, resignation of, 696
Falloux, Alfred de: editor of the *Correspondant*, 445; the papacy defended by, 407; and the Revolution of 1848, 430; and the struggle for educational freedom, 430 f.
Fathers of Charity, foundation of the, 242-44
Fathers of the Faith, Society of, 44 f.
Fava (priest), missioner in Africa, 761
Ferdinand, king of Sicily, 113 f.
Ferdinand VII, king of Spain, 109-13: death of, 218
Ferrara: Austrian occupation of, 193; French occupation of, 390-92; occupation by papal troops, 201
Ferréol (bishop), missioner in Korea, 757
Ferretti (cardinal), Secretary of State, 390 f., 393
Fesch (cardinal), 36, 49
Fessler (bishop), pamphlet on infallibility, 664 f. and note
Fichte, and the Tugendbund, 30
Fideist tendency, Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 568
Fitzgerald (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 662
Flaget, American bishop, 370

Flandrin, Hippolyte: artistic work of, 728
Florence: capital of Italy, 589 note, 672; union with Piedmont, 526 f.
Forbes (Scottish bishop), and the Vatican Council, 603 f.
Forbin-Janson (bishop), and Canadian missions, 371
Forbin-Janson (priest), and parish missions, 37 f.
Forcade (bishop): missioner in Japan, 363, 752; at the Vatican Council, 629
Foreign missions, the
British hindrances to, 355
During the reign of Gregory XVI, 349-74
During the reign of Leo XII, 122 f.
During the reign of Pius VIII, 173-76
During the reign of Pius IX, 736-65
Periods of activity, 736
Portuguese intervention in, 174, 358 f., 745 f.
Protestant interference with, 173 f., 740 f., 745 f.
Foreign Mission Seminary, 176
Foreign mission societies, 374
Foreign Mission Society, the, 356: in Korea, 757
Forli: revolutionaries at, 192, 200; occupation by papal troops, 201
Fourier, Charles: socialist teaching of, 23
France
Algiers conquered by, 142, 364
The Ancona expedition, 201-4
Anticlericism in, 685
Carbonarism in, 33 f.
Catholic action in, 418 ff.
Catholic liberalism in, 81-84
Catholic literary revival in, 135 ff.
Catholic schools in, 49 ff.: suppression of, 90 f.
The Congregation in, 45-49
Educational controversy in, 318-30, 336 f., 419 f., 430 ff., 683 f.: the pagan classics, 439-41; *see also* University monopoly
Gallicanism in, 78-81
In conflict with Austria, 197 ff., 524-26
Intervention in Italy: in 1831–32, 195 ff., 201-4; in 1847–48, 391, 398, 405; in 1849, 407 ff.; in 1859, 519, 524 ff.; in 1867, 591
And the Italian annexation of Rome, 674 f.
The Jesuits in, 42 ff., 84 f.: opposition to, 85-88, 90, 330-36
The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195 ff.
Misunderstanding with Leo XII, 71-73, 77
The Paris Commune, 681 f.
Parish missions in, 36-39
Pius IX's gratitude toward, 412, 416 f., 592
And the Polish revolt, 555 and note
Protestant opposition to the Vatican Council, 602 f.
Religious congregations in, 38, 40-45
Its religious protectorate in Palestine, 738, 741
Religious renaissance in early nineteenth century, 35 ff.
The restoration of the Empire, 437-39
The Revolution of 1848, 420 ff.
The Roman expedition, 408 ff.
Rome besieged by, 410 ff.
Royalist newspapers in 1870, 644 note
Sardinia favored by, 451, 518 f., 524 ff., 546 f.
And the Spanish revolution, 110 f.
Suppression of religious schools, 90 f.
Treaties with China, 361, 749 f. and note
Treaties with Japan, 752
Treaty with Italy (1864), 547
War with Prussia, 662 f., 679-81
Withdrawal of troops from Rome, 581, 662
Withdrawal of troops from the Papal States, 589, 679 f.
Works of charity in, 314 f., 341
France, the Church in
During the July Revolution, 145 ff.
During the reign of Gregory XVI, 274-348
During the reign of Leo XII, 71-73, 77-91
During the reign of Louis Philippe, 418 f.
During the reign of Pius VIII, 133 ff.
During the reign of Pius IX, 417-47, 550, 572-75, 614-21, 679-86

France, the Church in (*continued*)
Freedom of education, 318-30, 336 f., 419 f., 430 ff., 683 f.; *see also* University monopoly
Francis IV (duke of Modena), 183
Francis II (king of Naples), flight from Naples, 538
Francis Joseph (of Austria)
Accession of, 465
Death of, 466
Josephist tendencies of, 467
King of Hungary, 592
Personality of, 466 and note
Religious persecutions by, 704 ff.
Treaty with Napoleon III, 525
Victor Emmanuel congratulated by, 706
Franciscans, the: in Palestine, 738
Franco-Prussian War, 662 f., 679-81
Frankfort, repressive measures adopted by, 165 f.
Frankfort Declaration, 166 f.
Franzelin, John Baptist: at the Vatican Council, 636
Franzoni (archbishop), banishment of, 461
Fraysse (bishop), missioner in Oceania, 759
Frayssinous (bishop)
On Gallicanism, 79
Grand master of the University, 51 f.
Lamennais' criticism of, 83
Minister of ecclesiastical affairs, 122
Parish missions and, 38
Religious indifferentism and, 74
Frederick II (of Prussia), and Prussian hegemony, 469 note
Frederick William III (of Prussia): death of, 269; and the secret societies, 470
Frederick William IV (of Prussia): and Bunsen, 258; and the Lutheran theologians, 478 f.; and Prussian hegemony, 471; religious peace restored by, 269 ff.
Freemasonry
The anticouncil at Naples, 598 f.
Atheism and, 597 f.
In Austria, 169
Carbonarism and, 31-34, 239
In early nineteenth century, 29 ff.
In Germany, 469 note, 470, 692 f.
In South America, 762
Freemasonry (*continued*)
International activity of, 594
Italian unity and, 181 f.
Napoleon I and, 29 and note
The Tugendbund and, 29-31
French Church (schismatic), 667 f.
French Revolution, effects of the, 6 f.
Freppel (bishop): at the Vatican Council, 657, 660 note; patristic studies of, 732
Frohschammer, Döllinger opposed by, 614
Froude: associate of Newman, 105 f., 254; death of, 253

Gaeta, Pius IX's exile at, 401-16, 506
Galetti, revolutionary minister at Rome, 401
Gallia christiana, 308, 312 note
Gallicanism, 78-81: Guéranger's opposition to, 309 ff.; and the Jesuits, 84-88; Lamennais' opposition to, 79 ff., 138 f., 309; Pius IX's condemnation of, 569
Gallois, and the Ancona expedition, 201-3
Gambetta, Léon, 598: anticlericalism of, 678 note, 685 f.
Garibaldi, Giuseppe, 598
Agitations in Italy, 532, 589
Anticlerical attitude of, 515, 523
Career of, 514
Defeat at Mentana, 591
Flight from Rome, 412
At Geneva, 590
Naples occupied by, 536 f.
The Papal States invaded by, 590 f.
On the Polish revolt, 555 note
Rome defended by, 410 f.
Garnier (Jesuit), on the missions in India, 358
Gasparian, schismatic bishop, 744
Gasser (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 659
Gastaldi (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 654
Gastein, Bismarck and von Beust at, 677, 689
Gaume, Joseph: and the pagan classics, 439 f.
Gay, Charles: spiritual writings of, 732-35

Genoude, Eugène de: Gallicanism attacked by, 347 and note
George IV (of England), 103, 108
Gerbet (bishop)
And Catholic liberalism, 81
And the encyclical *Quanta cura,* 567 note
And the founding of the *Avenir,* 281
And Lamennais, 81
Ozanam's attachment to, 313
Writings of, 135 f.
German domination, aspirations to, 261 f.
Germanic Confederation, as proposed by Metternich, 93
Germany
After the revolution of 1830, 165 f.
Catholic renaissance in, 270-73
Catholic scholars and writers, 56 f., 271 f.
The Center Party in, 688, 695 f.
Freemasonry in, 469 note, 470
Jesuits expelled from, 692
The Kulturkampf, 688-96
Philosophy in, 26-29
Protestantism opposed to the Vatican Council, 601 f.
Prussian hegemony in, 261 f., 582
The question of mixed marriages, 167 f., 257 ff., 265
Religious movement in early nineteenth century, 56 f.
Secret societies in, 30 f., 169, 262 and note, 469 note, 470
Vatican Council opposed in, 667
See also Prussia
Germany, the Church in
The Cologne affair, 257-70
During the reign of Gregory XVI, 257-73
During the reign of Pius VIII, 165 ff.
During the reign of Pius IX, 471-87, 687-96
Laxity of, 166 f., 258 f., 266
Persecution of, 687-90, 692-96
Gibbons (cardinal), on the pre-eminence of Rome, 765
Gioberti, Vincenzo: apostasy of, 56; condemnation of his work, 462; and Italian unity, 54 f., 238 f., 406
Giustiniani (cardinal), at the 1831 conclave, 185
Gizzi (cardinal): at the 1846 conclave, 380; Secretary of State, 385, 389 f.
Gizzi (*continued*)
Gladstone, William, 712: friend of Newman, 107, 253 note, 256; on papal infallibility, 667 f.
Goa, schism of, 359, 746
Goerres, Joseph, 56: conversion of, 58; and Germanic supremacy, 94; and Louis I of Bavaria, 95 f.; the papacy defended by, 212, 267, 270
Golden rose, the, 218 note
Gontier (priest), work on chant, 730
Good Shepherd Sisters, in Algiers, 366
Gousset (archbishop): and Catholic liberalism, 81; theological works of, 343
Gratry (priest): and the infallibility controversy, 644, 658; literary works of, 444; Oratory of the Immaculate Conception founded by, 444 f.; on St. Thomas Aquinas, 731
Greece, missions in, 121 f., 354
Gregorio (cardinal): at the 1829 conclave, 130; and Lamennais' condemnation, 296 note
Gregory XVI
Antonio Rosmini and, 242-44 and note
Arts and sciences encouraged by, 209 note, 210
The Baden proposals condemned by, 231
The Church in America, 369-73
The Church in England, 251-56
The Church in France, 274-348
The Church in Germany, 257-73
The Church in India, 356-59
The Church in Ireland, 246-50
The Church in Poland, 222-26
The Church in Portugal, 214-18
The Church in Spain, 218-21
Concordat with Sardinia, 454
Death of, 375
Early life of, 187 f.
Election of, 185 f.
Encyclical *Mirari vos,* 293 ff.
The Fathers of Charity and, 243-45
Fiscal reforms of, 192, 206-9
The foreign missions and, 349-74
The French bishops and, 340
The Gallican controversy and, 348
Judiciary reforms of, 194, 206
Lamennais' condemnation by, 289 ff., 296

Gregory XVI (*continued*)
Liberal reforms of, 205-9, 383
Liturgical reforms in France and, 340
The Memorandum of 1831, 197
Metternich's criticism of, 205
Missions in Africa, 364-69
Missions in the Far East, 359-63
Missions in the Near East, 349-54
Nicholas I and, 223-26
O'Connell's agitation in Ireland, 246-50
The papal militia, 192, 208
Personality of, 186 f.
Political ability of, 205 f. and note
Political reforms of, 192, 206
Public works initiated by, 208 f.
Relations with revolutionary governments, 213 f. and note
Religious congregations encouraged by, 241-45
The revolt in the Papal States, 189 ff.
The revolutionary movement in Italy, 239-41
Traditionalism condemned by, 345
Works of charity, 314 f., 341
Works of piety, 341 f.
Works of scholarship, 308-12, 343 f.
Grieth (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 653 and note
Guaranties, Law of, 675 f.
Guéranger, Prosper: association with Lamennais, 287 f. and note, 300, 311; Benedictine Order restored by, 302, 308 f., 321; on the struggle for educational freedom, 432; works of, 308-12, 321 note, 729 f.
Guibert (archbishop): and the Gallican controversy, 347 f.; and the Montmartre basilica, 683; at the Vatican Council, 629 f., 643
Guizot
And freedom of education, 320-22, 329 f.
French intervention in Italy, 391, 398
The Jesuit controversy, 333
Law on education, 320 f.
On the liberal reforms of Gregory XVI, 206
Metternich and, 93
At the Oratory, 445
On the Vatican Council, 602
Gunther, Anton, 94 f.
Gustavus Adolphus Society, 477 note

Haiti, missioners in, 763
Haller, Charles von, 56: conversion of, 58
Harcus (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 741
Hassoun, patriarch of Armenia, 743 f.
Haynald (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628, 657
Hecker, conversion of, 763
Hefele (bishop): historical work of, 732; and the infallibility controversy, 644; submission to the Council, 666; at the Vatican Council, 628, 631 f., 653
Hegel, philosophy of, 28, 558
Heine, Heinrich: on German philosophy, 557
Herder, *Kirchenlexikon* published by, 272
Hergenröther: Döllinger opposed by, 614; on the Cologne affair, 257
Hermann (priest), and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716
Hermes, George: his condemnation by Droste-Vischering, 260, 264; philosophical teaching of, 28, 263
Hermesdorff (priest), work on chant, 730
Hesse-Darmstadt, religious strife in, 165 f., 480 f., 484-86
Heykamp, Herman: excommunication of, 501
Hirscher, John: German educator, 271 f.
Hohenlohe, Clovis von: and the Vatican Council, 607
Holland, the hierarchy reorganized in, 500 f.
Hosner, Austrian minister, 707
Huc (priest), missioner in China, 749
Hugo, Victor, 25, 135, 275 f.: the Church attacked by, 415, 442; and the educational controversy, 433
Hulst, d' (bishop): on the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 572
Hungary, political concessions granted to, 464
Hurter, Frederick: conversion of, 272 f.
Hussein, dey of Algiers, 142

Icard, M.: at the Vatican Council, 619, 656 and note
Imbert (bishop), martyr in Korea, 362, 757

Immaculate Conception, dogma of the: and devotion to Mary, 720; Pius IX's proclamation of, 507
India, missioners in, 173, 355-58, 745-48: British hindrances to, 355
Indifferentism: the dispute in 1830, 150 f.; Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 295; Leo XII's condemnation of, 73-75; Pius IX's condemnation of, 387
Individualism, 20
Indo China, missioners in, 123, 173, 359 f.
Industrialization, 17 f.
Infallibility of the pope
  Conciliar discussions, 647-60
  Döllinger's opposition to, 613 f., 644 and note
  Dupanloup's opposition to, 617-20
  Fessler's pamphlet on, 644 f. and note
  Maret's opposition to, 614-17
  Opposition after the council, 666-68
  Preliminary controversies over, 609 ff., 644-48
  Submission of opposition bishops, 666
  The vote on, 661 f.
Infanticide in China, 374 note
Insurance companies, 18
International Association of the Workers, 584, 594
Inventions, 17
Ireland
  The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 99-103; during the reign of Pius VIII, 158 ff.; during the reign of Pius IX, 713
  After the Emancipation Act, 246 ff.
  Potato famine in, 250
  Religious emancipation of, 100-103
  Repeal of the Union, 248-50
Isabella, queen of Spain, 218, 221
Islam: conquest of North Africa by, 364; decline of, 350
Italian unification
  Aspirations for, 53 f.
  Attitude of foreign powers, 548 f.
  Austrian recognition of, 706
  Cavour's accomplishments towards, 457-59, 510 ff., 523, 531-33
  Convention of September 15, 1864: 547
  Favored by France, 451, 518 f., 525 ff., 545 f.
Italian unification (*continued*)
  Garibaldi's Neapolitan campaign and, 538 f.
  Napoleon III and, 518 ff., 525 ff., 545 f., 578 f.
  Progress in Sardinia, 449 ff., 510 ff., 523-27, 531-33
  Spanish recognition of, 581
  The taking of Rome, 662-64, 669 ff.
Italy
  Austrian intervention in, 114, 193-204, 408, 548
  Carbonarism in, 31-33
  The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 113-15; during the reign of Pius IX, 448-63, 549, 672, 675-79; persecutions of, 672
  The Law of Guaranties, 675 f.
  Liberalism in, 180 ff.
  Persecution of the Church in, 672
  Political divisions after 1812, 235 note
  The political situation in 1848, 448 f.
  Prussian support for, 662 f., 677
  Revolutionary agitations 1833–44, 237
  Secret societies in, 113 f., 169-71, 239-41
  Treaty with France (1864), 547

Jacobis (bishop), missioner in Abyssinia, 367 f.
Jacobites, the: conversions among, 741; and the Vatican Council, 600-605
Janicot, Gustave: and the infallibility controversy, 644, 655 note
Jansenist schism at Utrecht, 116, 501
Japan: discovery of Christians in, 753-57; missioners in, 363, 751-57; persecutions in, 755 f.; political and social organization in, 753, 755 f.
Jerusalem: Latin patriarchate re-established at, 737; missions in, 739
Jesuits, the
  In Austria, 92 f.
  In Canada, 371
  In China, 749 f.
  And the Congregation, 45-49, 85
  Count de Montlosier's opposition to, 85-87
  And the establishment of seminaries, 51
  Expulsion from Germany, 692, 713
  Expulsion from Lucerne, 488
  Expulsion from Portugal, 216

Jesuits (*continued*)
Expulsion from Spain, 219
Expulsion from Venetia, 582
In France, 45-49, 84 f.: opposition to, 85-88, 90, 330-36; the re-establishment of, 42-45
In Galicia, 92
Gallicanism opposed by, 84-88
In India, 358
Lamennais' opposition to, 83 f., 300 note
Loyalty to Archbishop Vicari, 485
The pagan classics in education, 440
In Prussia, 476
The re-establishment of, 84 f.: in France, 42-45
In Switzerland, 229, 233
In Syria, 352
And Talleyrand, 42
Theological works by, 731
In the United States, 371
Villemain's fear of, 323, 330 note
Jews, the: Leo XII's solicitude for, 125; Pius IX's solicitude for, 385
Jirecek, Austrian minister, 705 f.
Joachina, queen of Portugal, 214 f.
John VI (of Portugal), death of, 214
Josephism, 467
Journalism, Catholic
Chief Catholic papers in 1870, 618 note
And the Congregation, 48
Disputes in, 443
The educational controversy, 325, 327
In France, 134 ff., 279 f.
Literary works, 444
Pius IX on, 442
Jubilee of 1825, 75 f., 152
Jugan, Jeanne (religious founder), 341
July monarchy, religious attitude of, 274 f.
July Revolution, 144 f.: good results for the Church, 149
Jurisdiction, papal, 656 f.

Kant: influence of, 27, 558, 560 and note; philosophy of, 27, 558
Kanzler (general), and the taking of Rome, 669
Keble, John, 59 f., 105 f.: and the Tractarian Movement, 251 f.
Keller, Emile: and the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 575; in defense of the papacy, 545
Kenrick (archbishop), and the First Council of Baltimore, 764
Keogh, John, 102
Ketteler, William
Bishop of Mainz, 482, 484 f.
Early career of, 481
And the infallibility controversy, 644
Pastor in Berlin, 476, 482
Social works of, 722-24
At the Vatican Council, 659
Kim, Andrew (priest): martyr in Korea, 362, 757
Kleutgen (priest), theological works of, 731
Korea, missioners in, 361 f., 757 f.
Kulturkampf: the beginning of, 479 f.; in Germany, 688-96; meaning of the term, 689; in Switzerland, 697 ff.

Labrador (ambassador): at the 1829 conclave, 128
Labouré, Catherine: visions of, 342
Lachat (bishop), banishment of, 667
Lacordaire
The *Avenir* and, 296 note
The campaign for educational freedom, 318-20, 337
Catholic liberalism and, 81
On Daniel O'Connell, 100, 250
Dominican Order re-established by, 307
The *Ere nouvelle* and, 427, 429
Gay converted by, 733
Lamennais' association with, 81, 288, 291 f., 300: differences, 313 note
The Notre Dame Conferences by, 302-5
Ozanam's attachment to, 313 and note
The restoration of the Empire and, 438
On the resumption of the *Avenir*, 292 note
On the Revolution of 1848, 423
In Rome, 288, 291 f.
Separation from Lamennais, 297, 304 and note
On the temporal domain of the pope, 531 note
On the University monopoly, 51
Ladies of the Adoration of Reparation, 718
La Farina, Giuseppe: and Italian unity, 512 f.

La Guéronnière, Arthur de: revolutionary writings of, 521 f., 529, 544
Lamartine, French poet, 275: and Lamennais, 299 note; on the Fathers of the Faith, 45; and the Revolution of 1848, 424
Lambillotte (priest), work on chant, 729
Lambruschini (cardinal), 238 f.
The Allignol brothers and, 348
At the 1846 conclave, 380
The Jesuit controversy, 335
Lamennais and, 290, 293
The question of mixed marriages, 259
The revolutionaries in Italy, 241
Secretary of State, 241
Lamennais, Jean: and Félicité Lamennais, 300 f. note
Lamennais, Félicité
The Act of Union, 286
Apostasy of, 298-300 and notes
After his apostasy, 301 note
Associates of, 281, 287 f. and notes, 300, 302 ff.
The *Avenir* founded by, 281
On the Belgian revolt, 154
Bitterness toward Rome, 297, 299 f.
The campaign for educational freedom, 318
Catholic liberalism and, 81-84
The Congregation of St. Peter, 308, 313 note
Death of, 301 note
Disciples of, 81, 302 ff., 347 note, 350
Döllinger compared with, 612 f.
On the election of Gregory XVI, 186
Essay on Indifference, 27, 81, 301: censure of, 292 f.
On Gallicanism, 79 ff.
Gallicanism opposed by, 79 ff., 138 f., 309
Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 289-96
Guéranger and, 287 f. and note, 300, 311
In Rome, 288, 291 f.
Instability of, 281 and note, 300
Irrascibility of, 83 and note, 138 and note, 299
Jean Lamennais and, 300 f. note
The Jesuits and, 83 f., 300 note
Kant's influence on, 27
Lamennais, Félicité (*continued*)
Lacordaire's association with, 81, 288, 291 f., 300
Lacordaire's separation from, 293, 304 and note
Leader of the Catholic liberal movement, 81, 136 ff.
Liberalism of, 81-84, 179, 285 f.
The pagan classics and, 440
The papacy defended by, 212
On parish missions, 39
Personality of, 83 and notes, 138 and note, 281 and note, 300
Pius VIII criticized by, 139
Political feelings of, 280 f.
Quélen's criticism of, 137 f.
Religious indifferentism and, 74
Religious philosophy of, 313 note
On the separation of Church and state, 285
Silvestre de Sacy and, 301
Submission of, 294, 298
Ultramontanism of, 138 f.
On the University monopoly, 50, 52
See also: Avenir, the
Lamorcière, Louis de (general): career of, 536 f.; and the papal army, 536-38; the war with Piedmont, 541-44
Langalerie (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 643
Lanteri, Bruno: religious founder, 241
Laouënan (bishop), missioner in India, 747 f.
La Rochejaquelein: and the discontinuance of the *Ere nouvelle,* 429; and Dom Miguel of Portugal, 215
La Salette, apparition of, 719
Lassalle, and the communist movement, 583 f.
La Tour du Pin, René de: social works of, 682, 725 f.
Laurent, John: translator of papal allocution, 267
Laval University, erection of, 763
Lavigerie (archbishop): at the Vatican Council, 629; and the Society of Notre-Dame of Africa, 761; and the White Fathers, 739
Lebanon, missions in, 352, 740 f.
Leblanc, Pierre: and the Society of the Sacred Heart, 44

Le Boeuf (priest), and the Paris liturgy, 310 f.
Lecca, center of secret societies, 171
Ledochowski (cardinal), imprisonment of, 695
Lefébure, Léon: social works of, 725
Legris-Duval (priest), and parish missions, 37
Lenormant, and freedom of education, 329
Leo XII
  Cardinal Consalvi and, 67-70
  The Church in Austria, 92-95
  The Church in Bavaria, 95-98
  The Church in England, 103-7
  The Church in France, 71-73, 77-91
  The Church in Ireland, 99-103
  The Church in Italy, 113-15
  The Church in Russia and Poland, 118-21
  The Church in Spain, 111-13
  The Church in the Netherlands, 115-18
  Death of, 126
  Election of, 63-66
  The Emancipation Act and, 108
  Enthronement of, 68
  The foreign missions, 122 f.
  George IV and, 108
  The Italian brigands and, 124
  The Jews and, 125
  The jubilee of 1825, 75 f.
  Last acts of, 124-27
  Louis XVIII and, 71-73
  The party of the zelanti, 67, 70-73
  Portraits of, 66 note
  Relations with Naples, 115
  Religious indifference and, 73-75
  South American republics recognized by, 112, 213
  The suppression of religious schools in France, 90 f.
  William I and, 117
Leo XIII
  Bishop Audu and, 643 note, 743 note
  Bishop Ketteler and, 724
  The Chaldean Church and, 743
  Devotion to the Sacred Heart, 719
  The establishment of the hierarchy in India, 747
  The re-establishment of the hierarchy in Scotland, 714
Leo XIII (*continued*)
  Rosminian philosophy condemned by, 244 and note
  Scholasticism encouraged by, 731
  The United States government and, 764
Leopold I, king of Belgium, 501
Leopoldsverein, 374
Le Play, Frederick: sociological writings of, 584-86
Le Roy (bishop), on the African missions, 368 f., 761 f.
Lesquen (bishop), and Lamennais, 301 note
Lesseps, Ferdinand de: diplomatic failure of, 410 f.
Leu, Joseph: Swiss patriot, 229, 232 f.
Liautard (priest), and parish missions, 38
Liberalism
  Belgian independence and, 153 f.
  Catholic, 81 f., 150 f., 564 f., 573 f.: condemnation of, 294, 573 ff.
  After the Congress of Vienna, 17
  Different meanings of, 179 f.
  Gregory XVI's condemnation of, 294
  In Italy, 180 ff.
  Of Lamennais, 81-84, 179, 285-87
  Leo XII's condemnation of, 73-75
  Of Montalembert, 564 f.
  Newman's notion of, 105 note, 179
  In the Papal States, 180, 183-85
  Pius IX's condemnation of, 569, 575
  The Revolution of 1848 and, 421 ff.
  See also Indifferentism
Liberia, Protestant missions in, 369
Libermann, Francis: and the African missions, 368 f.
Life of Jesus, by Renan, 557, 559, 561 f., 596 f.
Ligeon (priest), missioner in India, 748
Literature, romantic, 25 ff.
Little Sisters of the Compassion of Mary, 242
Little Sisters of the Poor, 341 and note
Littré (socialist), religion attacked by, 442
Liturgical reform in France, 309-12, 340
Lloyd and Newman, 105
Lombardo-Venetia, assigned to Austria, 236 note
Lombardy, Sardinian invasion of, 394-96

Louis I (of Bavaria), 95 f.
Louis XVIII (of France): anti-Catholic policy of, 35; and Leo XII, 71-73, 77; religious revival under, 35 ff.; and the University monopoly, 50
Louis Philippe
The defense of the Papal States, 197 f.
Favorable attitude of, 321, 334
Freedom of education and, 321 f. and note
Proclamation as king, 144 f.
Religious ignorance of, 274 f. and note
Lourdes, pilgrimages to, 720
Loyson, apostasy of, 666
Luca (cardinal), at the Vatican Council, 625, 636 note
Ludwigsverein, 374
Lützow (ambassador), at the 1829 conclave, 128
Lutheranism: the theological dispute in Prussia, 478 f.; and the Vatican Council, 602

Mabilleau (priest), martyrdom of, 751
Macé, Jean: anticlericalism of, 685
MacMahon (marshal): at the battle of Magenta, 525; president of France, 686
Madames of the Sacred Heart, 45: in North Africa, 366; in the United States, 371
Madeline Sophie Barat, St., 45
Magenta, battle of, 525
Mahmud (sultan), persecutor of the Armenians, 172
Maistre, Joseph de: and Catholic liberalism, 81; on the Congress of Vienna, 15; Gallicanism opposed by, 79
Maistre (priest), missioner in China, 173
Malines congresses, 563-65, 589: and the encyclical *Quanta cura*, 572 f.
Malou (bishop), work on the Immaculate Conception, 732
Mamiani, minister of Pius IX, 396-98, 401 f.
Manning, Henry (cardinal), 496-98
Faber compared with, 733
The infallibility controversy, 617 note, 621
Negotiations with the Anglicans, 605
On papal infallibility, 658, 668
Manning, Henry (*continued*)
Social works of, 722
At the Vatican Council, 628, 630, 638, 647 note, 650
Manteuffel, 479, 480 note
Manzoni, Alexander, 55, 179, 230: disillusionment of, 462
Maret (bishop): and the *Ere nouvelle*, 427 and note; philosophical work of, 343; submission to the Council, 662; work on papal infallibility, 614-17
Margaret Mary Alacoque, St., 718
Maria Christina, queen of Spain, 218-21
Maria de Gloria, queen of Portugal, 214-18: recipient of the golden rose, 418
Maria Theresa (empress), on Prussian hegemony, 469 note
Marianists, Society of the, 40 f.: in Oceania, 41
Marilley (bishop): and Bishop Mermillod, 700; imprisonment of, 491; return from exile, 551
Marists, the, 41: in Oceania, 373 f., 760
Marongini (archbishop), banishment of, 461
Maronites, the, 353, 741
Martignac, de, 89 f.: appointment as prime minister, 140
Martin (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628, 637, 643
Marx, Karl: the *Communist Manifesto*, 5; and the communist movement, 583 f.
Massaia (bishop), missioner in Abyssinia, 367 f.
Mastai-Feretti (cardinal): at the 1846 conclave, 380 f.; *see also* Pius IX
Mathieu (cardinal): and the Congregation, 134; Napoleon III's denunciation of, 572; at the Vatican Council, 628, 629 note, 633 f., 643, 657
Mauband (priest), martyr in Korea, 362, 757
Max, king of Bavaria, 472
May Laws, the, 692-95
Mazenod (bishop), 41 f.: and the Gallican controversy, 348
Mazloum, bishop of Syria, 352
Mazzini, Giuseppe
Agitations in Italy, 449
Appeals to the Italian clergy, 455 note, 456 note
Carbonarism and, 239

Mazzini, Giuseppe (*continued*)
The communist movement and, 584
On the "death" of the Church, 581
On Italian liberalism,
Italian unity and, 54, 180, 235 f., 513 f.
Motto of, 215, 228
The papacy attacked by, 237
Religious doctrine of, 237, 452
In Switzerland, 228
Triumphant in Rome, 407 f., 411
Young Europe organized by, 228, 235
Young Italy organized by, 180, 235
Melchers (archbishop), imprisonment of, 695
Melchites, emancipation of the, 353
Melun, Armand de: social works of, 724 f.
Memorandum of 1831, the, 195 ff.
Memorial catholique, the, 280: foundation of, 81 f.; and Lamennais, 136
Menotti, Ciro: and Italian unity, 183 and note
Mentana, battle of, 591
Mermillod, Gaspard: at the Vatican Council, 628; banishment of, 667, 701; bishop of Geneva, 698-702; his episcopal appointment, 594, 698, 700
Mérode, Xavier de (bishop): and the papal army, 536 f.; his removal from office, 579
Mesopotamia, missions in, 352
Metternich
The Cologne affair criticized by, 268
At the Congress of Vienna, 93 note
On the election of Gregory XVI, 186
The emancipation of English Catholics and, 104
Fall of, 396, 465
On the French occupation of Ancona, 203
Gregory XVI criticized by, 205
His influence in Europe, 93
The Jesuits and, 92 f.
The July Revolution and, 144
Lamennais' condemnation and, 293 note
Liberalism in Italy and, 182
Pius IX criticized by, 390 note
Religious indifferentism of, 74 f. and note
The revolution in Spain and, 110
Mexico, missioners in, 763
Meyer, Swiss patriot, 229, 232 f.
Michelet, Jules: the Jesuits opposed by, 331-33; religion attacked by, 443
Migne (priest); Gallicanism attacked by, 347; patrologies published by, 344 and note, 444
Miguel, Dom: cruelty of, 216 f. and note; dispute over the Portuguese throne, 214-16
Miraculous medal, the, 341
Mirari vos (encyclical), 293 ff.: indifferentism condemned by, 295; and Lamennais, 293 f., 296; liberalism condemned by, 294
Missionaries of France, Society of, 38 f.
Mixed marriages, question of: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 257 ff., 265; during the reign of Pius VIII, 167 f., 257 f.; in Switzerland, 231
Modena, duchy of, 236 note: agitation in, 183 f.; union with Piedmont, 526 f.
Moehler, Adam, 94, 272 note
Mohammedanism: decline of, 350; north Africa conquered by, 364
Monde (French paper), the founding of, 531
Monita secreta (of the Jesuits), 331 and note
Montalembert, Charles
Association with Lamennais, 281 f., 288 ff., 298, 300
On atheism, 597
On the Catholic revival in France, 274
On Christian art, 729
At the Congress of Malines, 563-65
Droste-Vischering and, 266, 269
Faith of, 282, 319, 328 note
Freedom of education and, 319, 325, 327-29, 434
In the House of Peers, 306 f., 319, 328 note
The infallibility controversy, 645
On the Jesuit controversy, 334 f.
Liberal views of, 564 f.
Literary works of, 444
At the Oratory, 445
The papacy defended by, 415
On Pius IX's liberal reforms, 392
Pius IX's praise of, 419
Pius IX's rebuke of, 565
On the Polish revolt, 158

Montalembert, Charles (*continued*)
On the religious persecution in Switzerland, 489
The restoration of the Empire and, 438
The Romantic movement, 135
In Rome, 288, 291 f.
Student at the University, 52
His tour of southern France, 283
Montlosier, Count de, 85: on the Congregation, 46, 86; the Jesuits opposed by, 85-87
Montmartre basilica, the, 683
Montmorency, member of the Congregation, 49 note
Morlhon (bishop), and devotion to the Blessed Virgin, 720
Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione* by, 210
Mortara incident, the, 520 f. and note
Mossul, Protestant missions at, 741
Müller, Adam, 56
Mun, Albert de: social works of, 682, 725 f.; and the Syllabus of Pius IX, 576
Munich school of writers, 96-98
Music, sacred: restoral of, 729 f.

Nagasaki, Christian communities near, 753 f.
Naples
Garibaldi's capture of, 538
Intervention in the Papal States, 410
Masonic anticouncil at, 598 f.
Relations with the Holy See, 115
Revolution of 1820 in, 114
Napoleon I
And the Brothers of the Christian Schools, 48
Death of, 13
And Freemasonry, 29 and note
Pius VII imprisoned by, 438
And the University monopoly, 48
Napoleon III
Attempted assassination of, 517 f.
The Church persecuted by, 550
Domestic and foreign policy of, 471 note, 522
Italian policy of, 518 ff., 529 f., 544 f., 578 f.
Religion favored by, 471 note, 515 f., 522, 529 f.
Napoleon III (*continued*)
Rome abandoned by, 622, 663 note, 679 f.
And the secret societies, 515, 518
Treaty with Austria, 525 f.
Vacillating policy of, 532, 545-47
See also Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon
Narvaez (general), and the Spanish government, 502
Nassau, repressive measures adopted in, 165 f., 480, 484-86
Néel (priest), martyrdom of, 751
Neo-Guelfs, 54
Netherlands, the: and Belgian independence, 152-55; the Church in, 115-18, 500 f.
New Caledonia (island), missioners in, 759
New Zealand, missioners in, 759
Newman, John Henry
Anti-Catholic beliefs of, 105
Associates of, 105-7, 251, 256
On the authority of the Syllabus, 577 note
On Catholicism in England, 60 f.
On the condition of Anglicanism, 162 f.
Early studies of, 60 f.
And the Emancipation Act, 104
His history of the Arians, 162
At Littlemore, 255
His meaning of liberalism, 179
And Manning, 497 note
The Oratory founded by, 494
The Oxford Movement, 105 f., 251 ff., 493
Sermons at Oxford, 106, 253
The Tractarian Movement, 252 f.
His *Via media*, 253, 255
Ney, Napoleon's letter to, 413 f.
Nicaea, Council of, 588
Nice, cession to France, 532
Nicholas I (czar): and Gregory XVI, 223-26; his persecution of Polish Catholics, 119 f., 156 f., 223-26, 553
Notre Dame conferences of Lacordaire, 302-5
Notre Dame de Sion, Congregation of, 342 note, 739
Notre Dame of Africa, Society of, 761 f.
Nouridgian, Anthony: patriarch of Armenia, 172
Novara, Austrian victories at, 114, 408

Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 41 f.: in Canada, 371
Oblates of St. Alphonsus Liguori, 241
Oblates of St. Charles, 498
Oblates of the Blessed Virgin, 241
Oceania, missions in, 41, 373 f., 758-61
O'Connell, Daniel, 99-103, 158-60: after the Emancipation Act, 247-50; the Coercion Bill opposed by, 248; death of, 250; repeal of the Union, 248-50
Old Catholic Church, 688: founding of, 667
Olivaint: French socialist, 277; Jesuit, 278
Oliveira (bishop), exile of, 762
Olivier, Emile: on the convocation of the Vatican Council, 606; and the educational controversy, 434; on Italian unity, 526; on the Law of Guaranties, 676; on papal infallibility, 668
Oratory, the: Newman's founding of, 494
Oratory of the Immaculate Conception, 445
Orsini, attempted assassination of Napoleon, 517
Ottoman Empire: decline of, 349 f.; *see also* Turkey
Oudinot (general), and the Roman expedition, 408-12
Our Lady of Sion, founding of, 342 note, 739
Owen, and cooperatives, 22
Oxford Movement, the, 104-7, 162, 253-56, 493 ff.
Ozanam, Frederick
  Charitable works of, 313-16
  And the educational controversy, 316 f.
  The *Ere nouvelle* founded by, 426 f.
  Literary works of, 444
  On the social question, 426

Pacca (cardinal): at the 1829 conclave, 130; at the 1831 conclave, 185; on the German episcopate, 57; and Lamennais' submission, 298
Paccanari, the Fathers of the Faith founded by, 44
Pagan classics, in French education, 439-41
Palestine, missions in, 738-40
Pallota (cardinal), and the Italian brigands, 124
Palmerston: interference in Italy, 396; and Prussian hegemony, 470
Papal army
  Desertions from, 589
  At the fall of Rome, 663 f.
  Formation of, 581 and note
  In the Franco-Prussian war, 680
  Garibaldi defeated by, 590 f.
Papal States, the
  Austrian intervention in, 193-204, 548
  Carbonarism in, 114
  Divisions of, 184 note, 206, 235 note, 511 note
  During the reign of Leo XII, 124 f.
  Fiscal reforms of Gregory XVI, 192, 206-9
  Foreign intervention in 1831, 195 ff.
  French intervention: in 1832, 201-4; in 1847–48, 391, 398, 405; in 1849, 407 ff.; in 1859, 519, 524 ff.; in 1867, 591
  Garibaldi's invasion of, 590 f.
  The government of, 205-11
  Italian absorption of, 671
  Judiciary reforms of Gregory XVI, 194, 206
  Liberal reforms of Pius IX, 384 ff., 392-94, 414
  Liberalism in, 180, 183-85
  Political reforms of Gregory XVI, 192, 206
  Political reforms of Pius IX, 385, 393, 414
  Rebellion in, 184 f., 189 ff., 397 f., 400 ff.
  Revolutionary stirrings in, 387 ff., 393 f.
  Sardinian invasion of, 540-44, 663 f.
  Secret societies in, 170
  Withdrawal of Austrian troops from, 199
  Withdrawal of French troops from, 204, 589, 679 f.
Paris, Congress of, 510 f.
Paris Commune, the, 681 f.
Paris Exposition, 586 f.
Parish missions, 36-39
Parisis (bishop): and freedom of education, 324 f., 328 f.; and liturgical reform, 340; his pastoral on chant, 729

Parma, duchy of, 236 note: union with Piedmont, 526 f.
Pecci (archbishop), scholasticism encouraged by, 731 f.
Pedro, emperor of Brazil: dispute over the Portuguese throne, 214-18; religious persecutions in Portugal, 216 f.
Peel, Robert, 103
Pellico, Silvio: disillusionment of, 462; Italian liberal, 55, 179, 230
Périer, Casimir: French minister, 198, 201, 203
Persia, missions in, 352
Peter's Pence, the establishment of, 533-35
Pététot, and the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception, 444 f.
Petitjean (bishop), missioner in Japan, 754, 756
Phalansteries, 23 note
Philip, Brother: social work of, 727
Philosophy: in the early nineteenth century, 26-29; the German school, 27, 491, 557 f., 597; revival of scholasticism, 731 f.
Picot, Michel: and the *Ami de la religion*, 79, 133, 279; in defense of Gallican liturgies, 311
Picpus fathers, in Oceania, 760
Pie (bishop of Poitiers)
  Career of, 631
  On the Church during the Republic, 417
  In defense of the papacy, 512, 531, 544
  Renan condemned by, 562, 563 note
  Trial of, 544 f.
  At the Vatican Council, 628, 631, 637, 652
Piedmont
  Cession of Savoy to France, 532 f.
  In the Crimean war, 510
  Defeated at Novara, 408
  France allied with, 518 f., 524 ff., 547
  Lombardy invaded by, 394-96
  The Papal States invaded by, 540-44, 663 f.
  Persecution of the Church in, 453 ff.
  Revolution of 1820 in, 114
  Rome occupied by, 663 f., 669 ff.
  Secret societies in, 452 f., 513
  The unification of Italy, 449 ff., 510 ff., 523-27, 531-33
Piedmont (*continued*)
  See also Italy
Pietro, de (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 641
Pimodan (general), at the battle of Castelfidardo, 542
Pius VII, death of, 13
Pius VIII, 130
  The Armenian Catholics, 172
  The Belgian revolt, 154
  Cardinal Castiglioni and, 129
  The Church in France, 133 ff.
  The Church in Germany, 165 ff.
  The Church in Ireland, 158 ff.
  The Church in Scotland, 161 f.
  Death of, 176
  Election of, 128-30
  First encyclical of, 132 f.
  The foreign missions, 173-76
  And the German bishops, 167 f.
  The July government, 148
  And Lamennais, 139
  Secret societies in Italy, 169-71
Pius IX, 381 f.
  Alexander II condemned by, 556 f.
  Amnesty granted by, 384 f. and note, 517
  The antichristian intellectual movement, 557 ff., 596 f.
  Apostolicae Sedis (bull), 626 f.
  Army organized by, 535-37
  Balmes' praise of, 506
  On Catholic journalism, 442
  Cavour's criticism of, 511
  The Chaldean schism, 742 f.
  Christian art, 728-30
  The Church in America, 762-65
  The Church in Austria, 464-68, 592 f., 704-9
  The Church in Belgium, 501 f.
  The Church in England, 493-99, 712-15
  The Church in France, 417-47, 505, 572-75, 614-21, 679-86
  The Church in Germany, 471-87, 687-96
  The Church in Holland, 500 f.
  The Church in India, 745-48
  The Church in Ireland, 613
  The Church in Italy, 448-63, 549, 672, 675-79
  The Church in Poland, 554-56
  The Church in Portugal, 551

Pius IX (*continued*)
The Church in Russia, 553, 582, 594
The Church in Spain, 502-5, 550 f., 593 f., 709-12
The Church in Switzerland, 488-91, 551, 594, 697-703
Crétineau-Joly's criticism of, 506 note
Death of, 714 f.
And devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716-18
And devotion to the Sacred Heart, 718 f.
And the educational controversy in France, 436
Election of, 381
The encyclical *Quanta cura; see Quanta cura*
Exile at Gaeta, 401-16, 506
The foreign missions, 736-65
France's Italian policy and, 529 f.
The Franco-Prussian war, 680
Gallicanism condemned by, 569
His gratitude toward France, 412, 416 f., 592
The hierarchy re-established in Britain, 495
The hierarchy re-established in Scotland, 714
The hierarchy re-organized in Holland, 500 f.
The Immaculate Conception proclaimed by, 507 f.
Liberal ovations accorded to, 385 f., 388 f., 393
Liberal reforms of, 384 ff., 392-94, 414
Liberal tendencies of, 382 ff., 506
Liberalism condemned by, 569
Metternich's criticism of, 390 note
Missions in Africa, 761
Missions in China, 748-51
Missions in Japan, 751-57
Missions in Oceania, 758-61
Missions in the Far East, 745-62
Missions in the Near East, 737-45
Montalembert admonished by, 565 f.
On papal infallibility, 666 and note
And the Papal States, 383-416
And philosophical studies, 730-32
Political reforms of, 385, 393, 414
Preliminary studies for the Syllabus, 508 f.
Pius IX (*continued*)
Relations with the Turkish government, 737
Religious persecution in Sardinia, 454-62
Reversurus (bull), 743 f. and note
On the Revolution of 1848, 424
The Roman question, 579 f.
The Russian persecutions, 553, 556 f.
The Sardinian invasion of Lombardy, 395 f.
Socialism condemned by, 568
The Syllabus; *see* Syllabus
The taking of Rome, 663 f., 669 ff.
Taxes raised by, 516
Victor Emmanuel's attitude toward, 452, 454 ff.
And the unification of Italy, 449
And works of charity, 721-28
And works of piety, 716-21
Plantier (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628
Poland
The Church in: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 222-26; during the reign of Leo XII, 118-20; during the reign of Pius VIII, 156-58; during the reign of Pius IX, 55:, 554-56; Russian persecutions of, 119 f., 223 f., 554, 556
Churches in, 156 note
Persecutions by Nicholas I, 119 f., 223 f.
The revolt against Russia, 157 f., 555 f.
Russian absorption of, 582
Polignac, Count de: and the July Revolution, 143; member of the Congregation, 47, 49 note, 140; the prime minister of France, 140 f.
Pompalier (bishop), missioner in New Zealand, 373 f., 760
Pondichery, missioners in, 123, 356 f., 359
Pontmain, apparition at, 681, 721
Portugal: the Church persecuted in, 216 f.; dispute over the royal succession, 214-18; the foreign missions hindered by, 174, 358 f., 745 f.
Pothier (priest), work on chant, 730
Priests of the Blessed Sacrament, founding of the, 717
Private ownership: the economists' view

Private ownership (*continued*)
of, 21; Fourier's condemnation of, 23; obligations of, 20
Propagation of the Faith Society, 123 f., 341, 356, 364: encouraged by Pius VIII, 175
Property: confiscation of, 20; ecclesiastical; *see* Confiscation of Church property
Protestantism: and Catholic missions, 173 f., 740 f., 745 f.; the disintegration of, 736; in the Near East, 740-42, 745; of Germany, 164, 468 f., 471, 688
Proudhon, Pierre: atheism of, 597; religion attacked by, 442
Prussia
Charitable and religious works in, 476
Italian unification favored by, 549, 662 f., 677
The Kulturkampf, 479 f., 688-96
The *Memorandum* of 1831, 195, 199
The Polish revolt and, 556
Protestantism of, 164, 468 f., 471, 688
The question of mixed marriages, 167 f., 257 ff., 265
Religious liberties in, 270 f., 471, 474 ff.
Religious repressions in, 479 f.
Secret societies in, 469 f. and note
War with France, 662 f., 679-81
Victory at Sadowa, 472, 582
See also Germany
Public opinion, the influence of, 7
Public works: by Gregory XVI, 208 f.; by Leo XII, 124 f.
Pusey, Edward: friend of Newman, 106, 256; his objections to the Vatican Council, 604 f.; and the Tractarian Movement, 253, 499
Puseyism, 498 f.

Quanta cura (encyclical), 566-71
Political teaching of, 569, 576
Preliminary studies for, 508 f.
The publication of, 566
Reasons for, 567-69
The reception of, 570 ff.
Quebec, provincial council at, 763
Quélen (archbishop of Paris)
On the conquest of Algiers, 143
And the July Revolution, 145, 147, 149
The miraculous medal, 341
Quélen (*continued*)
The Notre Dame conferences, 303, 305
Protest over the University monopoly, 90
Warning against Lamennais, 137 f.
Quinet, Edgar: the Church attacked by, 443; the Jesuits opposed by, 331-33, 336; philosophy of, 558

Radetsky (general), campaigns in Italy, 201, 395 f.
Railroads, Gregory XVI's opposition to, 209 note
Ramière (priest), and devotion to the Sacred Heart, 718
Raspail, and the socialist uprising, 425 f.
Rationalism: of the Revolution, 344 f.; Pius IX's condemnation of, 568, 575
Ratisbonne, Marie-Alphonse, 342 note, 739
Ratisbonne, Marie-Théodore, 342 note, 739
Rauscher (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 628; and the Austrian persecutions, 705 f.
Rauzan (priest), and parish missions, 36 f.
Ravenna: captured by Austria, 193; captured by papal troops, 201; revolutionaries in, 192, 200
Ravignan (Jesuit), in defense of the Jesuits, 333
Reichensperger: and the Center Party, 688; and Droste-Vischering's arrest, 269; popularity of, 477; and the unification of Germany, 474
Reisach (cardinal): at the Vatican Council, 625; death of, 637
Renan, Ernest
Apostasy of, 559 f.
In the Collège de France, 550, 685
Condemnation of, 562 f. and note
Kant's influence on, 560 and note
Life of Jesus, 557, 559, 561 f., 596 f.
Personality of, 559
His tribute to Dupanloup, 338
Resorgimento movement in Italy, 54
Reversurus (bull), 743 f. and note
Revolution of 1830, 379
Revolution of 1848, 379
Riccadonna (Jesuit), missioner in Syria, 352

Ricciardi, Joseph: and the Masonic anti-council, 598 f.
Riccio (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 662
Ridel (bishop), missioner in Korea, 758
Rieti, Spanish occupation of, 410
Rigaud (priest), martyrdom of, 751
Right of exclusive: abolition of, 7 note; at the 1823 conclave, 64; at the 1831 conclave, 185
Rivet (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 653 and note, 659
Roess (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628
Rohan, de (priest): and the Congregation, 134
Rohrbacher, 81: association with Lamennais, 288 f., 300; and the University controversy, 321
Romagna, union with Piedmont, 526 f.
Roman question, the, 579 ff., 590-92
Romantic literature, 25 ff., 135 f.
Romantic movement, the, 25, 53, 135
Rome
  Carbonarism in, 114
  Civic guard: of Gregory XVI, 192, 208; of Pius IX, 385, 392
  French occupation of, 412
  French siege of, 410 ff.
  French troops withdrawn from, 581, 662
  Italian occupation of, 663 f., 669 ff.
  Rebellion in, 400 ff., 669
  Secret societies in, 407
Ronsin, Pierre: and the Congregation, 47 f.
Rosalie, Sister: social work of, 315, 724, 727
Rosmini, Antonio, 242 f.: charitable works of, 721; devotion of, 721; philosophical notions of, 244 and note; religious foundations by, 243-45, 721
Rosminian philosophy, condemnation of, 244 and note
Rossi, Pellegrino
  Assassination of, 400
  French ambassador at Rome, 382 note, 388, 390
  French citizen, 333 note
  The Jesuit controversy, 344 f.
  Papal minister, 398-400
  Swiss constitution revised by, 230
Rudigier (bishop), arrest of, 708
Ruskin (artist), 728 f.
Russel, Odo: at the Vatican, 614 note; and the Vatican Council, 647 note
Russell, John: and the re-establishment of the British hierarchy, 495
Russia
  Attitude toward Italian unification, 549 and note
  The Church in: during the reign of Leo XII, 118-21; during the reign of Pius IX, 553, 582, 594
  And the *Memorandum* of 1831, 195, 199
  The persecution of Polish Catholics, 119 f., 223 f., 554, 556
  Poland absorbed by, 582
  And the Polish revolt, 555 f.
  Unreliability of, 552
Ruthenian Church, Russian persecution of the, 553

Sacred Heart: devotion to the, 718 f., 721; Society of the, 44
Sacy, Silvestre de: and Lamennais, 301
Sadowa, Austrian defeat at, 472, 582
Sailer (priest), 57, 96
Saint-Aulaire, French ambassador at Rome, 202 f.
Saint-Cyr, Louis de (priest): on the missions in India, 358
St. Paul's Basilica, reconstruction of, 125, 208
St. Peter, Congregation of, 308, 316 note
Saint-Simon: disciples of, 278 f.; socialism of, 5, 22 f., 277, 437
St. Vincent de Paul Society, 314 f., 341
Sainte-Beauve (French writer), 135, 276: on Ballanche, 25; as Trappist, 137
Salesians, the: in South America, 762
Salinis (priest), social work of, 135
Salvandy, and freedom of education, 419
Samhiri, patriarch of Antioch, 741
Sanseverino, Cajetan: philosophical studies of, 730 f.
Sardinia
  Cession of Savoy to France, 532 f.
  In the Crimean war, 510
  Defeated at Novara, 408
  Friendly relations with France, 451, 518 f., 524 ff., 547
  Lombardy invaded by, 394-96

Sardinia (*continued*)
The Papal States invaded by, 540-44, 663 f.
Patriotism in, 451
Persecution of the Church in, 453 ff.
Rome occupied by, 663 f., 669 ff.
Secret societies in, 452 f., 513
The unification of Italy, 449 ff., 510 ff., 523-27, 531-33
See also Italy
Sardinian states, 400 note, 451
Savoy, cession to France, 532
Say, Jean-Baptiste: on the social question, 21
Schelling, German philosopher, 96, 98
Schlegel, Frederick, 56, 96 note: conversion of, 58; and Germanic supremacy, 94
Schleiermacher, philosophy of, 27 f.
Scholasticism, revival of, 730-32
Schools, religious; *see* Education
Schwarzenberg (cardinal): archbishop of Salzburg, 465; at the Vatican Council, 628, 640, 653 and note
Scotland, the Church in, 161, 714
Secret societies
The Bonapartes and, 170
Consalvi on, 17 note
In the early nineteenth century, 29-34
In Germany, 169, 262 and note
And Italian unification, 180 f., 452 f., 513
In Italy, 113 f., 169-71, 239-41
And the July Revolution, 145 f.
Papal condemnation of, 387, 596
In the Papal States, 387, 401 f.
In Poland, 121
In Portugal, 215 f.
In Prussia, 469 f. and note
In Rome, 407
In Sardinia, 452 f., 513
In Switzerland, 171, 228, 491, 698
Ségur, Gaston de: and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, 716 f.; Napoleon acclaimed by, 515; social work of, 728
Seminaries
In Austria, 707 f.
In Belgium, 116 f., 152
In Beyrouth, 352
In France, 90
In India, 357
In Lebanon, 352
Senestrey (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 628
Serrano, president of Spain, 709
Servants of the Blessed Sacrament, 717
Severoli (cardinal); at the 1823 conclave, 63 f.; and Leo XII, 71
Siam, missions in, 123
Sibour (canon), and Lamennais, 287 note
Sicardi law (in Sardinia), 453-56
Siestrzencewicz, Stanislas (bishop), 118 f.
Signay, archbishop of Quebec, 372
Sisters of Providence, extensive works of the, 245
Smyrna, missions at, 351 f.
Social crisis, in the early nineteenth century, 17 ff.
Social question, the
The Catholic social school, 24
Inventions and, 17 f.
In the nineteenth century, 5, 21-25
Louis de Bonald and, 24
After the Revolution of 1848, 425 ff., 436 f.
Socialism (in France)
Of Ballanche, 24 f.
Of Charles Fourier, 23
After the July revolution, 277 f.
Lamennais and, 300
Le Play's assault on, 584-86
Pius IX's condemnation of, 568
After the Revolution of 1848, 425 ff., 436 f.
Of Saint-Simon, 5, 22 f., 437
Society of Mary, 41: in Oceania, 373 f., 760
Society of Notre-Dame of Africa, 761 f.
Society of the Fathers of the Faith, 44 f.
Society of the Holy Ghost, 369, 761
Society of the Holy Heart of Mary, 369
Society of the Sacred Heart, 44
Society of the Sacred Hearts, 760
Sokolski, Bulgarian archbishop, 551 f.
Solferino, battle of, 525
Sonderbund, the: defeat of, 488 f., formation of, 234
Soubirous, Bernadette (St.), 720
South American Republics
Appointment of bishops in, 188
Gregory XVI's solicitude for, 372 f.
Independence from Spain, 110 f., 112 note

South American Republics (*continued*)
Missions in, 762 f.
Papal recognition of, 17, 69, 112, 213
Slavery in, 372 f.
Spain
The Church in: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 218-21; during the reign of Leo XII, 111-13; during the reign of Pius IX, 502-5, 550 f., 593 f., 709-12
Civil war in, 220 f.
Confiscation of Church property in, 219 and note, 503, 593 f., 711
The dispute between Carlists and Christinos, 218-21
In the early nineteenth century, 108-11
Intervention in the Papal States, 410, 502
The kingdom of Italy recognized by, 551, 581
Religious persecutions in, 219 f., 503 f., 593 f.
The revolution of 1820, 110
Spalding (archbishop): at the Vatican Council, 628, 629 note, 649; and the second council of Baltimore, 764
Spiegel, August (archbishop): death of, 260; and mixed marriages, 168, 259
Spoleto, Spanish occupation of, 410
States of the Church; *see* Papal States
Sterbini, revolutionary minister at Rome, 401
Strossmayer, bishop of Diakovar, 628 note: papal infallibility opposed by, 632 f., 653, 655; submission to the Council, 666; at the Vatican Council, 636, 638 note, 640 f., 643
Sue, Eugene (writer): and the Jesuits, 332
Sulpicians, the: in the United States, 371
Supply and demand, law of, 21
Sweden, persecution of Catholics in, 551
Swiss National Catholic Church, 702 f.
Swiss soldiers, in the papal militia, 208
Switzerland
As constituted in 1815, 227
The Church in: during the reign of Gregory XVI, 229-34; during the reign of Pius IX, 488-91, 551, 594, 697, 703
The episcopate in, 229
Formation of the Sonderbund in, 234
Switzerland (*continued*)
Form of government, 227, 229 f.
Liberal Christianity in, 598
Protestant sects in, 492 f.
Religious persecution in, 231 f., 489-91, 697 ff.
Revolutionary movement in, 228-34
Secret societies in, 171, 228, 491, 798
Vatican Council opposed in, 667
Syllabus, the
Doctrinal authority of, 576 f. note
Misinterpretation of, 571
The origin of, 567 note
Preliminary studies for, 508 f.
Publication of, 566, 571, 578
Syria, missions in, 122, 352, 740 f.

Talleyrand, 35, 43: and Cavour, 533; at the Congress of Vienna, 93 note; and the Jesuits, 42; religious indifferentism of, 74 f. and note
Taxes: in the Papal States, 192, 207, 516; on imports, 18 f.
Teutonic Society, the, 469
Teysseyre (priest), 74
Theological studies, 731 f.
Thiers, Adolphe: attitude toward the temporal power, 675; and the July Revolution, 144; on the protection of the papacy, 414 f.; and the struggle for educational freedom, 431 f., 434 f.
Thouvenel, French minister, 544 note, 545 f.
Tobacco monopoly in the Papal States, 210 note
Tories, the: and the Catholic revival in England, 251; and Irish liberation, 247 f., 250
Torlonia family, and the tobacco monopoly, 210 note
Toulouse Censure, the (of Lamennais), 292 f. and note, 296
Tournély, Léonor de (priest), 44
Tournély, Xavier de (priest), 44
Tractarian Movement, 251 ff.: decline of, 499
Traditionalism, error of, 344 f.
Trappists, in North Africa, 366
Trent, Council of: Paul III's convocation of, 588
Trinitarian Sisters, in North Africa, 366

Triple Alliance, foundation of the, 677
Tripoli, missions in, 122
Tugendbund, the, 29-31, 33 note, 470
Tunis, mission in, 364
Turin, treaty of, 532 f.
Turkey
  Christian education in, 740
  Missions in, 350-54, 737
  Relations with Pius IX, 737
  Religious persecutions in, 172
  Russian and English interest in, 349, 737

Unam sanctam (bull), 567
Unigenitus (bull), 567
Unitarianism, 598
United States, the: Native Americanism in, 174, 369 f.; treaties with China, 361, 749
United States, the Church in the
  Councils of Baltimore, 174 f., 370, 764
  During the reign of Gregory XVI, 369-71
  During the reign of Leo XII, 123
  During the reign of Pius VIII, 174 f.
  During the reign of Pius IX, 763-65
  Persecution of, 369 f.
  The trustee system, 174 f.
Univers (Catholic paper)
  Controversy with the *Correspondant*, 443 f.
  The educational controversy, 432 f.
  Founding of, 303 note
  Reappearance of, 594
  The restoration of the Empire and, 438
  Suppression of, 530
University monopoly
  Catholic attack on, 318-30, 337, 430 ff.
  Changes in, 431 f., 435
  The end of, 683
  Extension of, 90
  Louis XVIII and, 50
  Napoleon I and, 49
  Pius IX's condemnation of, 569
Utrecht, schism of, 116, 501

Valerga, Joseph: papal legate, 744; patriarch of Jerusalem, 738; and the Vatican Council, 600; at the Vatican Council, 657
Vandalism, during the July Revolution, 145
Varin de Solmon, Joseph, 44 f.
Vatican Council
  The Catholic rulers and, 605-8
  The *Civiltà cattolica* and, 609 ff.
  Constitution *De fide catholica*, 637-39
  Constitution *De romano pontifice*, 651 ff.
  Controversies preceding the, 608-21
  Convocation of, 595 ff.
  Disciplinary questions, 634 f., 640-43
  Discussions on papal infallibility, 647-60
  Dogmatic discussions, 635-39
  Fathers in attendance, 622 f.
  Grouping of the fathers, 627-34
  The Masonic anticouncil, 598 f.
  Opening of, 622 f.
  Opposition of the governments, 607 f., 646, 667 f., 704, 712
  Opposition of theologians, 666 f.
  The Orthodox bishops invited to, 600 f.
  Papal jurisdiction and, 656 f.
  Preparations for, 588
  The program, 634 ff.
  Protestants invited to, 600 ff.
  Question of procedure, 624-26
  Schema *De doctrina catholica*, 635-37
  Schema *De Ecclesia*, 650
  Submission of the opposition bishops, 666
  The vote on papal infallibility, 661 f.
Vatimesnil, and freedom of education, 327, 329, 434
Vaughan, bishop of Salford, 713
Vecchiotti (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 646 note, 656 and note
Venetian quadrilateral, Austria in the, 395 note, 525, 548
Venezuela, missioners in, 762
Ventura (priest): disillusionment of, 462; and Lamennais, 290, 293; and the restoration of the Empire, 438
Verin, Charles: social work of, 724
Vérot (bishop), at the Vatican Council, 643
Veuillot, Louis, 325 ff.
  On Catholic liberalism, 574 f.
  On the conversion of the Mohammedans, 365 note, 366
  On the convocation of the Vatican Council, 606
  On the death of Gregory XVI, 379
  In defense of the Pope, 419, 531

Veuillot, Louis (*continued*)
Dupanloup's conflict with, 441
The educational controversy, 325 note, 327-29, 432, 435 f.
On freedom of education, 684
The infallibility controversy, 616, 618, 620 and note, 625, 645
Literary works of, 444, 541, 562 note, 574
The Mortara incident, 521 and note
Napoleon III and, 519
And the pagan classics in education, 440 f.
The restoration of the Empire, 438 f.
On the Revolution of 1848, 421 f.
On the Vatican Council, 647
Vianney, John Baptist (St.), 445-47
Viard (bishop), missioner in New Zealand, 760
Vicari, Hermann (archbishop), and the religious conflict in Germany, 483-86
Victor Emmanuel, 449 ff.
Accession of, 408, 450
Attempted abdication of, 673
Austrian recognition of, 706
Death of, 679
Italian unity and, 523
Political connections, 450
Relations with the pope, 452, 454 ff.
Religious persecutions by, 454 ff.
The taking of Rome, 592, 662-64, 670 ff.
Vienna, Congress of, 14 f., 93 note
Attitude of the Church toward, 16
Criticism of, 15 f., 62
Disregard for, 15
Division of Italy, 235 note
Organization of Germany, 164
Organization of Switzerland, 227
Vigny (writer), 135, 137
Villafranca, treaty of, 525 f.
Villemain: book on Christian eloquence, 441 and note; and freedom of education, 322 f., 328, 330; his fear of the Jesuits, 323, 330 note
Vincentian missions, 122, 351 and note, 364, 367, 749 f.
Vinet, Alexander, 492 f.
Viollet-le-Duc (architect), 729
Visconti-Venosta, Italian minister, 669, 671
Vitte (bishop), missioner in Oceania, 759
Viviers (diocese), Gallican controversy in, 346-48
Vogelsang: conversion of, 476; social work of, 724
Voltaire: influence of, 34; publication of the works of, 89

Wallis (island), missioners on, 759
Ward, William: and Newman, 255 f.
West Tonkin, missions in, 123, 173, 359 f.
Whigs, the: and Irish liberation, 247, 251
Whitfield (bishop), and the Council of Baltimore, 175
Wicart (bishop), and papal infallibility, 646
Wilberforce, Henry: and Newman, 107
William I (of the Netherlands), and the persecution of Belgian Catholics, 116 f., 152 f.
William I (of Prussia): at the festivities at Worms, 602; a Freemason, 692
Windthorst, Ludwig: career of, 690; and the Kulturkampf, 690-92, 694, 696
Wiseman, Nicholas, 254: Newman influenced by, 254 f.; on Leo XII and Consalvi, 68; on the papal recognition of new governments, 214; and the re-establishment of the British hierarchy, 494-96
Work of the Holy Infancy, 374 and note
Workingmen, laws unfavorable to, 19 f.
Würtemberg: opposition to the concordat of 1861, 551; repressive measures adopted by, 165 f., 480, 484-86; religious concessions granted by, 271

Young Europe, organized by Mazzini, 180, 228, 235
Young Ireland, opposed to O'Connell, 250
Young Italy, 54: and Carbonarism, 239; and Freemasonry, 239; organized by Mazzini, 180, 235; secret character of, 239

Zanzibar, missioner at, 761
Zelanti, party of the, 62 f., 67, 70-73, 185
Zen-Yemon, Japanese confessor, 755
Zumalacarreguy, Spanish leader, 220